JUL 29 1944

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 89—PART 11

JUNE 9, 1943, TO OCTOBER 15, 1943

(PAGES A2895 TO A4332)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Subsidy Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Hon. Albert S. Goss, manager of the National Grange, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on the fallacy of paying subsidies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we desire to address our remarks to the announced program of rolling back prices on certain food products to September levels, and the employment of subsidies to make the program work. We are opposed to any such program because it will fail in its purpose for reasons which we will discuss. We shall first point out why price ceilings fail, why any attempt to bolster up an unsound system with subsidies defeats it purpose, then outline a program for holding inflation in check which will work, and finally point out some of the dangers in the roll-back, and the responsibilities of Congress with reference to the whole program as we see it.

While the question before your committee deals primarily with price control and inflation, it cannot be divorced from the problem of food. Food is fast becoming the world's greatest problem. We have heard a lot of fine-sounding speeches about America being the larder for the democracies and a lot of irresponsible promises have been made that we stood ready to feed the world. It is about time that we get down to facts with reference to our food problem.

For 20 years the United States has not fed itself. Every year we have imported more food than we have exported. Our population has increased 25 percent while our food production has remained practically stationary. If we are going to feed the world, or even a very small part of it, we have got to produce more or consume less. Actually we will probably have to do a good bit of both, but the policies we have been pursuing are leading in exactly the opposite direction. Had we deliberately set out to create a food problem, we could scarcely have done more than has been done in pursuing our policies on labor, machinery, and price ceilings. After months of effort we have succeeded in getting part of the labor problem corrected, but only when it is in large measure too late. The machinery and supply situation is being greatly improved, but the price-ceiling policy is getting no better. Typical of the attitude of those responsible for it was the comment of one of the men in charge of establishing ceilings when he said the Office of Price Administration was not interested in the supply, their job was to hold down price. We believe that the first consideration should be given to the food supply. It is possible to do this and to avoid inflation at the same time if we have the moral and political courage to do what must be done.

INFLATION CAUSES

Before we consider methods for the control of inflation, it would be well to consider the causes which bring it about. There are two chief causes of inflation. First is the pressure of surplus income upon an inadequate supply of consumer goods. Second is the loss of faith in the Government's ability to meet its obligations, or to pay its debts in dollars having the same value as the dollar we borrowed.

It is estimated that the total of individual income for 1943 will be approximately $140,000,000,000. Possibly sixteen billion of this will go for taxes, leaving one hundred and twenty-four billion of spending power. At present values the available consumers goods will amount to approximately eighty two billions. This leaves an inflationary gap of forty-two billions. There are numerous estimates as to how much of this will go into savings varying from fifteen to twenty-five billion dollars. This leaves an income in excess of consumer goods of from seventeen to twenty-seven billions all seeking an outlet.

There are two distinct schools of thought with reference to the control of inflation. One school favors establishing price ceilings, enforced by fines and penalties. The other advocates making use of economic forces by increasing production of goods and controlling purchasing power.

Those following the first school of thought, propose to erect a price ceiling dam against this excess income, and thereby shut off the spending outlet. They reason that our economy was in fairly good balance on some given date, and they would freeze everything at that spot. They would thereby prevent any price rises in order to prevent inflation. This is fallacious reasoning, as all history has adequately demonstrated, for never have price ceilings prevented inflation over an extended period in the history of the world, although they have been tried hundreds of times.

The chief reason is that price ceilings ignore production costs and shut off the supply of goods. In wartime, there are many items of cost which arise from war dislocation that cannot be controlled by any price ceiling method. On the farm we send our experienced young men to war and replace them with young boys and old men. We can control the wages by wage ceilings, but the substituted do only half as much work and our labor cost is doubled. There are hundreds of uncontrollable war dislocation costs which force up the costs of consumer goods. When these costs bump into the ceilings, prduction is strangled, and the inflationary gap is increased.

Judge John D. Miller, long a student of attempts at price ceilings, has put it very well when he said:

"We hold it to be self-evident that an effective ceiling on the price of any commodity will in due time restrict the production of that commodity to the quantity that can be produced at that price."

Various methods have been tried to prevent prices from rising. Of course if wages, services, and everything else is strictly controlled, the rise will be slower than where part of the economy are left uncontrolled, but such universal control leads to complete regimentation and even then it has always eventually blown up, not only because of the terrific cost and the unwieldiness of the bureaucracy which was necessary for enforcement, but finally because the production of food was strangled. The experiments in Rome about 300 A. D. and in France following the revolution are classical examples. In the case of Rome the historians tell us that local autonomy disappeared and was replaced by a huge bureaucracy before the crash came. In the case of France the attempt "converted a scarcity into a famine."

We are well on our way toward making these same blunders. In fact, we have already made a lot of them. By bungling price-control methods we have already created a lot of unnecessary food shortages and driven many items into black markets, where the consumer is trimmed up right, and we are rapidly creating a bureaucracy which is constantly finding it necessary to seek more power and regiment more activities to offset the effects of blunders previously made. At first we attempted to control almost everything except labor which was specifically omitted. Everyone knew it couldn't work, but we tried it. Later, an effort was made to include labor, but the issue has been deliberately evaded. While

price ceilings have driven a steadily increasing volume of consumer goods into black markets, and production of many lines has been strangled. It is now proposed to roll back prices—not wages—and hold the line. You are asked to bolster up this whole unsound program by the use of subsidies, to prevent strangling production.

SUBSIDIES

We are opposed to the use of subsidies for such purposes because they will not work, for reasons which I will discuss.

First, however, we want to point out two or three more fallacies in the price-control system as we have tried to operate it. There are 10,000 hamlets and cross-roads in America, each with its own individual production and marketing characteristics. We go into the mountains of Montana, where costs are high, and we find miners and stockmen paying more for their food. The law of supply and demand has adjusted prices to costs. We go into the mountains of the Carolinas, where costs are low, and we find the people are paying low prices for their food. The law of supply and demand has again adjusted prices to costs. Both places are equally distant from the railroad. Under the Office of Price Administration they are forced into a common mold. It is an extreme example, but to a greater or less degree it is typical of what is attempted all over America. The production may not be large in an individual high-cost area, but in the aggregate it is enormous, and this production is largely curtailed or destroyed by rigid price ceilings. No system of subsidies can be devised to meet the tens of thousands of conditions which prevail, and the daily changes which are occurring by reason of dislocation costs.

We have pointed out the enormous inflationary gap we now face. These are not static figures. They will get progressively worse. Assuming that we could dam a $15,000,000,000 flood, we must not forget that it is accumulating; that it will be twenty billions by summer, twenty-five billions by fall, and forty or fifty billions a year from now. Holding it back by price ceilings and subsidies is a complete impossibility.

We should also mention that we have adopted a policy of adjusting wages to meet living costs. Actually, wages have gone up approximately three and one-half times as fast as living costs. These conditions are mentioned merely to point out the complete unworkability of a price-ceiling system which Congress is now asked to bolster up by vast sums taken out of the Federal Treasury.

Now, to enumerate some of the reasons why we oppose subsidies and believe safeguards should be provided against their use:

1. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished.

(a) Subsidies are paid from Federal funds, which must be borrowed. About 80 percent is borrowed from banks and directly increases the surplus income to the extent of such borrowing, thus increasing the inflationary gap. Economic law meets the situation naturally. Rising prices encourage production and discourage consumption. Subsidies upset this normal process and encourage consumption. To the extent that they are not dependable and frequently do not get back to the producer, they fail to encourage production.

(b) Nothing will cause a greater loss of confidence in the financial soundness of our Government than to follow a policy of unwillingness to pay our bills as we go, as far as we can. In the days of our greatest national income, if America refused to pay its food bill, but passes it on to future generations, it is clear that we are deliberately pursuing a policy that leads straight to bankruptcy. Every thinking person knows that such a policy long continued must result in a financial crash.

2. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to post-war chaos. The goal of the present policy is to maintain a rigid price ceiling with the use of subsidies to meet the ever-increasing dislocation costs of production. As the war progresses, dislocation costs will increase; we will find it necessary to increase the subsidies. Thus our price structure will become more unbalanced day by day. If we are to avoid bankruptcy when the war is over, we must balance our budget. When that day comes, subsidies will be the first thing to be cut off. Then one of two things will happen. Either farmers will have to get higher prices to meet their costs, or quit producing.

If we do not have the moral or political courage to pay the cost of our food bill during these days of billions of dollars of excess income and full employment, what chance would there be to raise food prices when men come back from the Army hunting jobs and when income starts down?

The answer is none whatever, and the result will be farm bankruptcy and chaos worse than that following the last war, which was, at least, not complicated by subsidies.

3. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear. It is almost axiomatic that we cannot fight a world war and raise our standards of living at the same time. But that is exactly what we are trying to do. How many of us are worse off financially than before the war started? For most of us our incomes have gone up far faster than our outgo, and we know very well that somebody has got to pay for the enormous destruction going on. Instead of facing the facts and paying the necessary increased living and operation costs (and you will note I am omitting actual war costs), we are insisting on passing these costs on to future generations, and are trying to live better today than ever. While millions of our young men are risking their lives at $600 a year, and we at home ar enjoying the greatest income in history, we feel that it is thoroughly dishonorable to refuse to pay our food bill and pass some billions of it on to these young men to pay when they come home. What are they going to say about it? If there is anything which would invite repudiation, it is a subsidy program such as the administration is trying to launch.

4. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the state to support its people. There was never a time when it was more necessary for the people to support the state than today, but seldom if ever have more people been willing to dodge the responsibility and let the state support them by straining its credit to the danger point.

5. Subsidies lead to political control, and when once used, they are politically almost impossible to get rid of. They are another step toward authoritarian control. The Supreme Court recently expressed it well. An Ohio farmer refused to pay his overproduction fine, arguing that the law had been passed after his wheat crop had been planted, and he was denied the protection of the Constitution which prohibits taking property without due process of law. Pointing out that wheat prices were being maintained by subsidies, the Supreme Court said, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." "The Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." No one can quarrel with the reasoning, but it should be a warning to avoid using subsidies unless we want more Government regulation.

Subsidies are a demagogue's paradise. Fine sounding arguments can be made for them because they will bring low costs to the consumer and high returns to the producer. Of course we cannot live on borrowed money long in any such blissful state, but pay day is conveniently forgotten except by some who are bold enough or frank enough to support subsidies as a means of redistributing the wealth of the people.

There are many reasons why subsidies are dangerous and should be avoided, but we will not encroach further on your time to enumerate them. If there were no better way, one might be excused for advocating subsidies, but there is a way which will work.

INFLATION CURE

The only way inflation has ever been cured is to bring supply and demand into balance. Where countries have been too weak to face the issue, and have tried a lot of expedients, to hold the support of the voters, economic law has eventually stepped in and solved the problem by reducing the purchasing power of money until there was little spending power left, and the supply then caught up with the demand. That is inflation. Inflation means making money so cheap it will not buy anything. It can be prevented by three or four constructive steps.

First, encourage the production of needed goods. There never was inflation where there was an abundant supply. Aside from the weather, three major factors control farm production:

(a) An ample supply of labor.
(b) Adequate machinery and supplies.
(c) A compensatory price.

In the consideration of the subject before your committee we are concerned chiefly with price. The price must be sufficient to secure as much production as can be reasonably expected. If it is too low to attain this end, a support price may be necessary. It may be pertinent to point out the difference between a support price and a subsidy.

SUPPORT PRICES

Years ago we found out that unlimited competition often destroyed supply. We prohibited railroads from cutting rates to destructive levels. We set up controls for minimum premiums for insurance companies. In other words, we set floors designed to prevent prices falling below cost in order to protect certain essential services from destruction. This was no subsidy. There was no element of gift in it. It was merely protection against a destructive practice.

When floors are placed under farm prices to prevent them going so low as to destroy production, the same principle is employed. This is a very different practice from paying out cash in order to hold prices down to the consumer. Usually a support price requires little expenditure. Its purpose is to bring prices into a reasonable economic balance or relationship. The very fact that the money is available frequently stabilizes the market at an equitable level. Even when it becomes necessary actually to buy the commodity, the market usually adjusts itself, so that when the commodity is sold, no loss ensues. The purpose of a support price is to aid in bringing about a reasonable price relationship which may have been upset by unusual circumstances or some emergency. A support price does not develop an unbalanced price structure such as would lead to chaotic conditions following a subsidy program.

When a support price is used in connection with a ceiling which holds the normal market down, and thereby makes the support price necessary, or when a support price is used to buy a commodity and sell it for less than the cost, such a support becomes a subsidy and takes on all the dangerous characteristics of a cash subsidy. That is a practice which has been employed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and one which should be prohibited by law. If there are some commodities where such a policy is justified by reason of special or unusual circumstances, Congress should define or determine those circumstances, and not someone who might want to use the subsidy to bolster up an unsound price control experiment, or possibly for political purposes. A support price which is necessary to secure production and which is not used in connection with a ceiling or other device in lieu of a fair price is sound.

ADJUST THE DEMAND TO FIT THE SUPPLY

If, after all reasonable steps have been taken to encourage production, and the supply will still not meet the demand, then the remedy is to adjust the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways.

First. By syphoning off surplus income. Some of the surplus income will be inevitably syphoned off by paying the increased dislocation costs of producing the food and other commodities people demand. Any excess income should be reached through taxation and forced savings. The savings should be such that the money stays saved until the war and the inflationary aftermath are over. Leaky savings merely serve to fool ourselves.

Second. By rationing, so that all may share equitably in the limited supply. Rationing which fails to cut the demand to fit the supply defeats its purpose. It is possible to ration so as to have a surplus and thereby largely control price. Thus economic law takes the place of an intricate system of price ceilings, margins, grades, and differentials, and about 90 percent of the regulatory work of a price control administration could be dispensed with.

USE OF SUBSIDIES

In making use of subsidies we believe the intent and purpose of Congress are being violated. When the first Price Control Act was passed early in 1942, a provision was included permitting the use of subsidies. After it had been in operation some months it became apparent that it was the intent of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to use subsidies in lieu of a fair price. Believing this to be a dangerously inflationary practice, the Grange appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate when the second Price Control Act was under consideration, and called attention to the danger. We said:

"Subsidies are not mentioned in the President's message. Subsidies are not mentioned in the bill, but all the powers are there for their use if the President so decides. Congress should not pass by such a vital issue without an understanding on it. We believe Congress should set forth the policy of meeting the costs of war dislocations now, by assuring enough flexibility in ceilings to meet these unavoidable costs.

"We recommend that this principle be written into the measure itself by adding the following words after the word 'President' in the second sentence: 'Shall adjust prices where necessary to maintain adequate production goals and'."

We presented a number of reasons why subsidies should be avoided. Congress adopted the principle we suggested when it included the following limiting proviso after setting up the September 15 price level as a base:

"Provided further, That modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, etc."

We felt this was a clear mandate to adjust price ceilings where necessary to obtain production, but various kinds of subsidies have been used in spite of this mandate. We believe Congress should take prompt steps to provide protection against the use of subsidies in lieu of a fair price. To accomplish this, we have a number of recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We have an impossible situation where the Office of Price Administration can slap on a price ceiling which will strangle production, or can let buying power run wild with no adequate rationing system to hold it in check, and the Administrator of the War Food Administration has no authority to adjust the price or influence the distribution. The War Food Administrator should have the complete control of all Governmental functions connected with the production and distribution of food, including the regulation of price ceilings and rationing. If this is not done, at least the War Food Administrator should have the right of veto of any maximum price placed on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part therefrom.

2. No funds should be made available to make loans on, or to purchase, any commodity for the purpose of supporting the price thereon if at the time of purchase any maximum price is maintained on such commodity lower than such support price or if at the time of purchase it is contemplated to resell the commodity at less than the purchase price, except as specifically authorized by Congress as to each individual commodity for which exception is made; provided that in the case of any commodity which is used for more than one purpose, the prices might be so adjusted with respect to the different uses for which such commodity is sold, that the total returns shall not be less than such support prices.

3. Except as normal market conditions justify, no maximum price should be placed on any commodity below the support price so long as the Commodity Credit Corporation holds any such commodity either under loan or through purchase.

4. The law should clearly set forth that it is the intent and purpose of Congress to avoid the use of public funds to prevent agricultural commodity prices from seeking a level necessary to secure adequate production for war purposes.

5. No direct or indirect subsidy shall be paid to any producer, processor, or distributor of any agricultural commodity upon which any maximum price is in effect, except as may be expressly authorized by Congress.

6. You may well ask why we do not recommend the simpler course of prohibiting all subsidies. Occasions may arise when it may be necessary to subsidize production under exceptionally high cost conditions, such, for example, as the high cost copper mines, and we do not think it best to prevent such use, if the cases can be clearly defined and can be properly confined, although we confess we do not know how such farm cases might be defined and segregated without danger of abuse. However, we believe the purpose can be clearly set forth and that Congress should retain very tight control not only of the purse strings from which such subsidies might be paid, but should specifically prohibit any Government corporation from borrowing or furnishing any money for the purpose.

ROLLING BACK PRICES

We have set forth our reasons for opposing price control by the price ceiling method. They, of course, apply to the proposals for rolling back prices. There are some additional vicious features which we wish to point out to your committee:

First, processors and distributors are caught with inventories upon which they must take direct losses. We cannot see how this can be defended. We believe that the Constitution was designed to protect the people from any such action.

Second, the burden of this fantastic attempt to curb inflation is placed on the food industry. Last fall, Congress was requested to provide controls on everything except labor with the promise that wages would be controlled by Executive order, but in one order the basic wage rate was since increased 8⅓ percent, while strikes and upward adjustments have gone on as usual. As we understand it, no attempt is contemplated for rolling back wages, although many believe that excessively high wages and the large increase in wage workers' income are the chief cause for inflation. We do not deplore the high wages and the increased income of wage workers if the increase in usable products resulting from their effort is in proportion to the money paid. However, we cannot lose sight of the fact that this whole unsound price ceiling policy is being carried out in response to the demands of labor leaders who are entirely irresponsible for the Nation's food supply. Nor can we ignore the fact that they are demanding a roll back of some 10 percent in food prices over a period when their income increased more than 15 percent while their cost of living increased about 4 percent. On January 1 our food costs were approximately at the 1929 level, while the manufacturing wage workers' weekly wage was 50 percent higher. Statistically, the roll back of food prices without wage and other adjustments is indefensible.

We feel sure time will result in the abandonment of this new feature, just as it has so many other ill-advised moves, but in the meantime, valuable time is being lost in getting started on sound inflation-control methods and enormous sums are being wasted. For example, we are quite unable to estimate the cost in manpower, in expense, and in subsidy outlay in administering the butter price roll-back of 5 cents per pound, but it would be enormous. The net result would be a saving to the consumer of 65 cents a year in the 13 pounds which he is allowed. Theoretically, the subsidy is justified as a means of keeping the farmer in production, but at the rate his costs have been advancing, we doubt if it will have much effect.

In conclusion, we believe there should be no pussyfooting on this issue. If, after careful study, Congress believes that price ceilings and subsidies are the soundest methods of meeting the inflation danger, it should give all the support at its command to such a program. On the other hand, if Congress believes that other methods are better, it should not allow itself to be forced into supporting what it believes to be an unsound program because some executive department refuses to follow the policies laid down by Congress. Congress owes it to the executive department of Government to set forth its policies so clearly that there can be no doubt as to the intent and purpose. If those policies are not followed due to any lack of clarity, they should be clarified by law. If they are not followed, and Congress tacitly supports the violation of its policies, it is not carrying out the trust the people place in them. We are not charging that any such situation exists. The differences which have arisen may all be due to difference in interpreting the meaning of the law. We feel very sure, though, that the time has come when any doubts as to the meaning should be clarified, that the responsibility is upon Congress, and that when all doubts are resolved, the law should be enforced in accord with the intent and purpose of Congress.

Wartime Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Wartime Subsidies," published in the May 22, 1943, issue of Business Week.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wartime subsidies

[Taken from Business Week, May 22, 1943]

Commodity	Type of subsidy	Supervisory agency	Estimated annual rate of subsidy
Various imports	Absorption of certain payments on war-risk insurance.	War Shipping Administration.	$65,000,000
Sugar	Payments to refiners to cover increased transportation costs and losses resulting from reduction in weight through transshipment.	Defense Supplies Corporation.	30,000,000
Soybean, cottonseed, and peanut oils.	Payment to refineries (½-cent per pound) to absorb rising prices at the farm level.	Commodity Credit Corporation.	17,000,000
Copper, lead, and zinc	Incentive payments to create production in marginal mines. Production beyond established quotas carries a premium of 5 cents per pound for copper and 2¾ cents for lead and zinc.	Metals Reserve Company.	25,100,000
Bituminous coal	Double subsidy consisting of (1) absorption of additional costs on water-borne coal to New England, and (2) direct payments for rail transportation.	War Shipping Administration. Defense Supplies Corporation.	15,000,000 40,000,000
Imported oil-bearing seeds	To keep down pressure on Office of Price Administration ceilings, imported oil-bearing seeds are purchased by the Government and put into trade channels at a loss.	Commodity Credit Corporation.	800,000
Coffee:	Payments, direct or indirect, to cut transportation outlays and absorb higher insurance premiums.	Commodity Credit Corporation. War Shipping Administration.	7,000,000 14,000,000
Henequin	Absorption of higher costs in transportation, insurance, etc.	Defense Supplies Corporation.	5,900,000
Petroleum and petroleum products.	Payments for increased transportation costs, rail hauls, insurance, etc.	----do---- War Shipping Administration.	268,000,000 150,000,000
Imported metals	Absorption of (1) higher shipping costs and (2) increases in foreign sellers' prices.	Metals Reserve Company.	30,000,000
Copper scrap	Absorption of costs in connection with conversion of excess manufacturers' inventories into electrolytic copper.	Copper Recovery Corporation.	(1)
Nicotine sulphate	Payments to manufacturers to compensate for rises in price at the farm level.	Agricultural Marketing Administration.	1,750,000
Alcohol	Absorption by the Government of higher grain and molasses prices freight charges, and war risk insurance.	Commodity Credit Corporation and Defense Supplies Corporation.	(1)
Chilean nitrate	Absorption by the Government of increases in foreign sellers' prices and of increased transportation and insurance costs.	Defense Supplies Corporation.	6,000,000
Cheddar	Payments to processors to enable them to purchase milk for additional cheese production.	Commodity Credit Corporation.	30,900,000
Canning crops	Payments to processors to get bigger supplies of tomatoes, peas, sweet corn, and snap beans from farmers.	----do----	10,000,000

[1] No estimate.

The Principle of Racial Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article which sheds considerable light on the historical background of the so-called Chinese Exclusion Acts, and which shows the attitude of our great Chinese allies on this question which is pending before Congress:

THE PRINCIPLE OF RACIAL EQUALITY

The principle of racial equality is one of the fundamental principles upon which the Chinese Republic is founded and to which it is dedicated.

The principle is applicable both in the relations between the various racial groups within China and in the relations between the Chinese and the non-Chinese abroad.

The Chinese Government treats all the racial components—the Hans, the Mohammedans, the Manchus, the Mongols, and the Tibetans—that make up the Chinese citizenry on the basis of complete equality.

The Hans constitute almost 90 percent of the Chinese population. The Mohammedans number about 45,000,000. Although they are a distinct religious group, racially the Mohammedans at present are hardly distinguishable from the Hans. The Manchus, who conquered the Hans in 1644 and had ruled them until 1911, have been assimilated into the race and culture of the conquered. Today they have ceased to be a distinct minority and have become an integral part of the Chinese population. The Mongols and Tibetans—whose total number is less than 3,000,000—are the only minority groups that are separable from the Hans.

The Chinese Government treats all foreign immigrants and residents in China on the same basis as it treats Chinese. Indeed, before the abolition of the extraterritorial system, foreigners in China were accorded certain rights and privileges which were denied to Chinese themselves.

During the last six or seven decades the overseas Chinese have been subject to a series of discriminatory laws and regulations in Latin America, in the United States, and in the British Commonwealth of Nations. While these laws and regulations are matters of internal administration. China naturally hopes that they will be repealed or modified in the near future so that Chinese immigrants and residents in foreign countries may be treated on the same footing as those of other nationalities.

DOWN THE CUBAN WAY

Of all the countries that have passed discriminatory laws against the Chinese, Cuba is the first to abolish them. In the treaty of amity between the Republic of China and the Republic of Cuba—the first treaty between the two countries—concluded on November 12, 1942, it is stipulated in article V that "the nationals of each of the high contracting parties shall be at liberty to enter or leave the territory of the other under the same conditions as the nationals of the other countries."

In the exchange of notes between Dr. T. T. Li, Chinese Minister at Habana, and Dr. Jose Agustin Martinez Viademonte, Cuban Minister of State, it is stated "that the Cuban Government will enact, as soon as possible, the necessary legislation to carry into effect the stipulations of article V, and that, pending the enactment of such legislation, the laws and regulations now governing the matter shall remain in force provisionally, provided that the provisions of such laws and regulations which may be construed as discriminatory against the nationals of the Republic of China shall not be applied to such nationals."

When Gen. Leonard Wood was in control of Cuba, he issued instructions that Chinese were to be excluded. After the Cuban independence in 1902, the Cuban Government passed laws and regulations which specifically excluded the Chinese, but not all non-Caucasians and non-Americans.

Now under the new treaty the Cuban Government has agreed to repeal the discriminatory laws and regulations and to adopt the necessary legislation in order to put Chinese immigrants on the same footing as those of other countries.

The treaty should be hailed as a significant event. It should mark the beginning of the end of a period of racial discrimination, and open a new era of racial equality.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In the new Sino-American and Sino-British treaties, which were concluded on January 11, 1943, the extraterritorial system and the system of concessions and settlements were abolished, but the problem of Chinese immigration and naturalization was not mentioned.

There is now a movement in the United States to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws. Representative MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York, introduced a Chinese Citizen Act of 1943, which would grant to the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights to citizenship. Representative WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Seattle, Wash., proposed to amend the Immigration Act of 1924 so as to provide that aliens who are citizens of China shall be admitted into the United States. Another bill was introduced by Representative JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, to admit to the United States the Chinese wives of American citizens. Representative VITO MARCANTONIO proposed to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 by inserting the clause: "The right of a person to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race, color, creed, or national origin."

In Canada, Australia, and New Zealand there are statesmen and public leaders who are opposed to the Chinese exclusion laws. But so far no legislation has been contemplated.

There are some 10,000 Chinese seamen on British and Dutch ships. It has been reported that 600 of these, on shore leave in United States ports, have refused to reship. They complain that, while they are asked to face the same risks and perform the same duties as British and Dutch seamen, they are

not treated on the same basis. They receive £5 to £7 less in basic wages than British seamen, and little or no protection against death and permanent or temporary disability.

ATTITUDE OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT

Ever since the Tang dynasty (A. D. 618–906) the Chinese have been migrating abroad, first to the South Sea Islands, then to the Western World. Even today the Chinese in the Malay Peninsula and the East Indies proudly call themselves the people of the great Tang.

In the old days the government never showed much interest in the problem of emigration. Neither the Tang nor the Ming dynasty (1368–1643) encouraged Chinese to emigrate. The Ching dynasty (1644–1911) was definitely hostile to those who went abroad. The Ta Ching Lu Li (Ching laws) said: "All government officials, soldiers, and private citizens, who clandestinely proceed to sea to trade, or who remove to foreign islands for the purpose of inhabiting and cultivating the same, shall be punished according to the law against communicating with rebels and enemies, and consequently shall suffer death by being beheaded." Despite this official prohibition, thousands of Chinese did go (or, more accurately, escape) abroad annually in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

It is clear that Chinese emigration is entirely an unofficial matter. The Chinese Government has never organized or subsidized any systematic emigration project, for fundamentally it has never entertained any imperial (political or territorial) ambition. Although China is a large country which faces a number of small countries in the south, although millions of Chinese have migrated into these countries, the Chinese Government has never contemplated acquiring any colony or exercising any political control. Chinese citizens who have ventured abroad have been motivated by the spirit of free enterprise or compelled by economic necessity. They have gone abroad purely for the sake of peaceful trade. They have had absolutely no thought of imperial expansion.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries overseas Chinese were not protected by the Chinese Government. They were left entirely to themselves. According to the Treaty of Tientsin (1858), the persons and property of British subjects in China were assured protection (art. XVIII), but no mention was made of Chinese subjects who were in, or might go to, British dominions. This is not surprising. For theoretically the Chinese Government at that time outlawed all emigrants.

It was not until the Burlingame Treaty of 1868 that the Chinese Government reversed the old nonemigration law. In that treaty the United States and China recognized "the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents."

The diplomatic protection of Chinese citizens abroad is a comparatively new phenomenon. The first permanent legation was established in London in January 1877, and the minister was accredited to both London and Paris. In October of the same year, a minister was sent to Washington and was accredited both to Washington and Madrid. A month later a minister was sent to Berlin. In the next 2 years China sent ministers to Tokyo and St. Petersburg. From that time on overseas Chinese have gained some amount of diplomatic protection.

The revolution of 1911, which overthrew the monarchy, was largely financed by overseas Chinese. For this reason the Republican Government has adopted the policy of giving adequate protection and education to "those wandering sons abroad."

OVERSEAS CHINESE

Chinese in foreign lands may be divided into three classes: Intellectuals, merchants, and laborers. The latter two classes make up the vast majority of overseas Chinese.

The number of Chinese abroad was estimated in 1935 to be nearly 8,000,000, according to the National Overseas Affairs Commission. Of these about 90 percent are in the neighboring countries in Asia and in the islands of the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

Chinese in Asia

Thailand	2,500,000
Malay Peninsula	1,710,000
Dutch East Indies	1,232,600
Indochina	381,400
Russia (Siberia)	251,500
Burma	193,600
Philippines	110,500
British Borneo	75,000
Formosa	46,700
Korea	41,300
Japan	20,000
India	5,000
Other Pacific and Indian islands	19,000
Total	6,586,600

Chinese in United States of America

United States of America	75,000
Hawaiian Islands	27,000
Total	102,000

Chinese in British Commonwealth

Canada	42,000
Australia	15,000
New Zealand	2,800
South Africa	4,500
England	8,000
Total	72,300

Chinese in Latin America

West Indies	36,400
Mexico	20,000
Central America	9,400
Peru, Venezuela, Chile, Colombia, Argentina, Brazil	13,600
Total	79,400

Chinese in Europe

France	17,000
Holland	8,000
Turkey	7,000
Other countries	6,000
Total	38,000

Overseas Chinese are mostly enterprising merchants and hard-working laborers. They have contributed a great deal to the development of the entire area between the Pacific and the Indian Oceans. In the Dutch East Indies and British Malaya the Chinese have dominated practically every line of retail trade and have been influential especially in the production of tin, rubber, tobacco, sugar, and coconuts. As one writer put it, it has often been the case of a European's holding the cow while the Chinese has milked it. An article on Singapore in Life magazine contained the following suggestive caption "Chinese trade, whites govern, natives labor."

In Thailand nearly all business has been in the hands of the Chinese. Most of the rice mills and saw mills and retail shops have been controlled by them. When one takes a walk along the streets of Bangkok, one will be impressed by the shop signs which are mostly in Chinese characters. It is more like Shanghai than a Siamese city. The Chinese in Indochina, Burma, and the Philippines are mainly merchants.

In the United States and Canada the greater part of the Chinese are engaged in operating restaurants and laundries. Those in Latin America are mostly merchants and farm workers. Those in Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa—many of them descendants of gold miners—are engaged in agriculture and business.

Owing to discriminatory immigration laws and regulations, Chinese in Latin America, the United States, and the British Commonwealth have decreased in number. In south Africa, for instance, there were 55,000 Chinese in 1906, but there are now only 4,500; in Australia there were 42,000 Chinese in 1859, but there are now only 15,000; in the United States there were 107,000 Chinese in 1890, but there are now only 75,000. The Chinese in Mexico numbered 25,000 in 1930, but as a result of a series of anti-Chinese campaigns the number must have been reduced to 20,000.

IMMIGRATION LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Overseas Chinese have suffered a great deal from the immigration laws and regulations adopted by various countries.

The South Seas: Until recently the entry of Chinese into the entire area of the South Seas was free. In fact, this area afforded the only free outlet for China.

In British Malaya an immigration law was adopted, which put immigration on a quota basis. The Chinese quota was 2,500 a month.

Prior to 1934 the immigration law in the Dutch East Indies placed a landing tax of 150 guilders on every immigrant; since then the Dutch Government has introduced a quota system which admits 1,200 Chinese every year.

Chinese migration into Thailand was formerly unrestricted. In 1927 the Thai Government adopted an immigration law, which imposed 5 bahts as a tax of entry. In 1933 a new law was adopted, which increased the tax of entry to 10 bahts, imposed a domicile tax of 100 bahts, prohibited the entry of illiterate Chinese as well as all Chinese women. The object of the law was the gradual exclusion of Chinese from Thailand. In addition to this, the Thai Government levied discriminatory taxes on Chinese commercial enterprises, took over Chinese rice mills under state operation, excluded Chinese from the fishing industry, and curtailed remittances to China.

The immigration law of Indochina is not hard. Although he lacks a passport, a Chinese may land there, provided the head of the Chinese group to which he belongs will serve as guarantor. There is hardly any restriction on Chinese migration into Burma.

The United States: According to the exclusion laws, Chinese laborers are not permitted to enter the United States; Chinese teachers, students, merchants, and travelers are admitted upon presentation of the so-called section-six certificates. All Chinese born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are automatically citizens of the United States, but no Chinese born in China may become naturalized citizens of the United States.

The British Dominions: The immigration laws and regulations in Australia and New Zealand are very similar. In 1901 the Australian Federal Government adopted a uniform immigration law. The restrictions on Chinese immigrants included a 50-word dictation test. The Premier had the power to declare at any time a strict ban on the entry of any people into any port. As a result, the entry of Chinese has been practically stopped. In New Zealand the regulations are even severer. The dictation test consisted of 100 words instead of 50. In addition, there was

a poll tax of £100. The New Zealand Government now forbids the entry of all Chinese immigrants.

In Canada there was no restriction on Chinese immigration in the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1886 a landing tax of $50 was levied; in 1901 it was doubled; in 1904 it was increased to $500. This arrangement, however, has long been suspended, for the Canadian Government has since prohibited the entry of all Chinese, except students and merchants and officials who do not become permanent residents.

In South Africa there were 55,000 Chinese laborers who came under the contract-labor system. They were not permitted to stay, but were repatriated at the end of the contract.

Latin America: China and Mexico in 1899 concluded a treaty, whereby the nationals of each country were given entire freedom to go, travel, reside, and engage in commerce in the other country, and protection was guaranteed to their persons, families, and property. But since then there has been an anti-Chinese movement. Between 1931 and 1935 several thousand Chinese were compelled to give up their business and return home penniless.

Practically all the Latin-American republics have adopted Chinese exclusion laws, which were enforced in the case of Mexico by the Ministry of the Interior, in the case of Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Panama by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in the case of Peru, Chile, and Cuba by the Ministry of Finance.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this brief account of the life and status of overseas Chinese is neither to express any resentment nor to demand any action, but to show that up to this time all nations, including the Chinese, have unwisely followed a policy of racial exclusiveness and to consider the possibility that in the future they may all adopt the principle of racial equality.

As time passes, space shrinks. With each passing day the earth is becoming smaller. The age of exclusiveness is ending, if it has not already ended.

Toward the whole problem of migration China's position may be informally stated as follows:

1. After the war China is going to develop the vast areas of uncultivated land in her northeast and northwest, which will amply take care of all the surplus population in the country. The Chinese Government is not likely to encourage emigration, although it cannot prevent those citizens who are dominated by the spirit of free enterprise and adventure from going abroad.

2. Overseas Chinese and foreign immigrants and residents in China should be treated on the basis of complete equality.

3. China expects that the immigration laws in the South Seas countries will be liberalized and that the Chinese in those countries will be accorded proper protection and proportional representation in legislation and administration.

4. China hopes that the immigration policies of the United States, the British Commonwealth, and Latin America will be so modified as to put Chinese immigrants on the same footing as those of other countries. Cuba has pointed the way in the matter. If the United States places Chinese immigration on a quota basis, only 100 Chinese will be admitted every year—too small a number to disrupt in any conceivable way the American economic life. China does not demand free migration. She simply wishes to see that all discriminatory laws on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin may be abolished, and that thereby an unnecessary source of irritation and disharmony in her relations with the western countries may be eliminated.

Work of the Traffic Department, American Association of Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the traffic department of the American Association of Railroads, showing what they state they have accomplished for the railroads generally for the year 1937. The statement was filed on October 11, 1938.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the very nature of the work of the traffic department it is absolutely impossible to submit more than a very rough estimate of the amount of money its activities have saved to the railroads, although in the aggregate we know this represents a very substantial figure. The reasons for this statement are:

The action of a line or group of lines may threaten the rate adjustment over a considerable territory. Our intervention has in many instances resulted in such proposals being either withdrawn or modified in a constructive way that has prevented reductions in other directions. In the first place, it could never be known accurately what the final development might have been, insofar as the extent of territory is concerned that would be affected by such a readjustment; furthermore, before this could be measured accurately in money it would be necessary to have the exact tonnage moving between the affected territories or the affected points, and even if this were ascertainable it would by no means tell the whole story, for the reason that frequently a reduction on one commodity automatically leads to reductions on other commodities which are competitive therewith. We might list a few things that have been accomplished and then submit a rough guess as to the amount of money involved, but we want it distinctly understood that a reliable estimate cannot be supplied.

Some of the matters of large moment where we know substantial savings in revenue have been secured are:

1. Persuading the railroads from establishing intermediate transit at grain markets in Western Trunk Line territory. Had this adjustment gone into effect it might reasonably have led to the breaking down of the grain rate structure through a large portion of the western district and the resulting loss to the railroad industry as compared with the present adjustment, which was prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, would have reached large figures.

2. Persuading the Chicago lines from increasing their absorption at the Union Stock Yards covering services heretofore paid for by the owner of the livestock, which, if established at Chicago, would have been extended to all markets in western territory and in connection with which it was estimated would have increased the railroads' expenses in handling this business in the western district by at least a million dollars per annum.

3. Persuading the Southwestern lines to change their proportional rates on grain to Memphis, the effect of which would have been to reduce by 40 cents per ton revenues on all grain moving from C. F. A. territory and Western territory into the Southeast and which furthermore placed the Southeastern lines in a better position to defend their adjustment under the investigation which the Interstate Commerce Commission had instituted in docket 17000, part 7A. Here again this represents a large sum of money but it cannot be accurately estimated as no tonnage figures are available.

4. Persuading the Southwestern and the Western Trunk lines to increase their rates and minimum weights on furniture to avoid a reduction in the rates and minimum weights on furniture originating in eastern and southern territories.

5. The Southern and Southwestern lines undertook to reduce their rates on paper and pulpboard into the Northern markets. This would have probably resulted in a reduction in the rates on the entire paper group and paper board group from the North. This controversy was finally adjusted by increasing by 10 percent the level of rates which had been proposed by the Southern and Southwestern carriers.

6. Largely through cooperative efforts of this department the rates on imported vegetable oils from Gulf and South Atlantic ports have been increased from 3 to 6 cents per 100 pounds, making it unnecessary for what otherwise wolud have required a reduction from North Atlantic ports.

There has also been worked out but is not yet effective a substantial increase in the rates on domestic vegetable oils as a result of conferences arranged by this department.

7. Largely through cooperative efforts of this department the effective date of the Ex parte 123 advances were set forward at least 15 days earlier than was anticipated.

8. Restoration of relationships and differentials which were disturbed by the increase in Ex parte 123 by increases rather than reductions.

9. Securing an increase in the rates on rice. This resulted through cooperation between the common carrier barge lines operating on the inland waterways and the competing rail lines largely brought about by the efforts of this department.

10. Securing an advance in the cotton rates in both southwestern and southeastern territories.

11. Saved a lot of reductions in the rates on soda products and created an understanding as between the producing lines in the eastern and southwestern territories that will produce cooperative handling of this rate adjustment and not lead to action by one group that will adversely affect the other.

12. We were instrumental in progressing revision of the estimated weights on fruits and vegetables, in connection with which the carriers will be in position to collect freight charges on the weight handled rather than on the considerably lower basis under the previous estimated weights.

13. Persuading the Comptroller General to change his rulings to the effect that land grant deductions should be made in reduced rates on animal food products in the drought relief territory.

14. We were successful in persuading the southern lines not to make a reduction in their citrus fruit rates which if made would have caused a similar reduction in rates from producing points in Texas and California and which saved well over a million dollars per annum.

Also assisted in forestalling a demand on the part of Florida and Texas shippers for an emergency reduction in rates on grapefruit which would have represented a large loss in revenue.

15. Have been instrumental in having a policy adopted by the individual railroads not to make joint rates with trucking companies, the result of which has saved a considerable sum of money to the railroad industry.

16. Induced the southwestern lines to refrain from establishing transit arrangements on cotton, the effect of which would have required similar action in the Southeast and which would have cost the railroads considerable money.

17. Persuaded the eastern lines to refrain from rescinding their wharfage charges on coal, which if done would have required similar action on the part of the southern lines and would have represented a considerable loss in revenue.

18. Have induced individual lines and groups of lines to comply with orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission constructively where it appeared action might have been taken which would have resulted in substantially less revenue than otherwise would have been received.

19. Activities of this department in assisting in avoiding suspension of increased rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission and in obtaining modification of other orders or requirements of the Commission that might have resulted in reductions in rates or in other unnecessary expense.

20. Activities of this department in the direction of simple and economical publication of freight tariffs.

21. Have participated in conferences with shipper groups and obtained, as a result thereof, higher rates with the retention of traffic than the shippers were originally demanding.

These represent only the high points and, expressed in a money equivalent with no substantial figures possible to furnish in support thereof, it is the judgment of this department that we have saved to the railroads, at a conservative estimate, in the 4 years that this department has been in existence, not less than $12,000,000, or an average of not less than $3,000,000 per annum.

Victory on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered before the Central Retail Feed Association, Inc., at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., June 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, 2 years ago, almost to the very day, I was privileged to speak to this same group on the subject, The Nation's Job.

Our theme then was that the Nation's job was defense in its broadest aspects, not only a military defense but an economic defense, a social defense, and an individual defense. It meant not only the steel armor plate of mechanized defense but also the building of bomb-proof barriers of mental and spiritual defense.

Since that day in June of 1941, much water has gone over the dam. Today we look back on Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, the capture of Attu and Kiska by the Japanese, and our subsequent return to that area.

We can look back on the successful campaign in Africa by our troops, the Battle of the Solomons, the rescue of Australia, the sinking of over 3,000,000 tons of Japanese shipping, the German submarine warfare, the tremendous Russian offensive, the bombing of Germany and her subject nations.

Today there are more than 6,000,000 men already in our armed forces. Five million more men will be inducted. Our home economy is more and more geared to the war effort. We have a two-ocean, yes, even a three-ocean navy. We are shifting from the defensive to the offensive, and we now have 135,000,000 people engaged in the war effort.

Last month, for the first time since the United States entered the war, the balance in the Battle of the Atlantic was in favor of the Allies, and at the very time when huge shipping capacity was vitally needed for rushing invasion troops, supplies, and ammunition to Europe.

The Mediterranean convoy route was cleared by the Tunisian victory. According to Allied estimates, probably 2,000,000 tons of shipping were released for other purposes.

According to the experts, one division of troops would require 150,000 tons of shipping. That means that the Allies almost over night acquired sufficient shipping to move better than 200,000 troops across the Atlantic.

We don't know how many trips such a fleet could make, although some observers have estimated that it could be one a month.

It has been stated in Washington that the April sinkings by enemy submarines were less than half those of March. This improvement was continuing during May. If the rate of sinkings can be held at that low level, the production of our shipyards ought to pile up a surplus of capacity over our losses.

We have a large volume of United States escort vessels now going into service and that has been a tremendous help. It may be that we are utilizing some new secret weapon in connection with the submarine. We certainly have a better aircraft cover for our forces, although we know that increasing numbers of U-boats will prowl along the convoy lanes with the specific objective of halting any possibility of building up a second front force. We can also expect that we will suffer many casualties in the Atlantic fight.

We definitely had air superiority in northern Tunisia. We had a great many patrolling hawks in the skies. At one time we were supposed to have had a five to one advantage. We have had constant airdrome patrols in the air. Yes, the Tunisian campaign tipped the battle of the Atlantic our way and our forces in the Near East and the Far East brought further encouraging reports.

Our military leadership has the confidence of the people, and that is as it should be. Moreover, they have justified that confidence and that also is as it should be.

It cannot be denied, however, that the people do not have that same degree of confidence in our policies and our strategy on the domestic front.

We hear no criticism of the war strategy or the war leadership, and that is as it should be. We do, however, hear criticism of our domestic policies and the principal reason is because we have not evidenced the same degree of sincerity or success which have been evidenced on the military front.

We haven't matched our military effort on the domestic front. We haven't matched it either in strategy or in courage.

Victories on the war front aren't enough. We must also have victories on the domestic front over every single force which impedes our war effort.

If something happens to our production curves in war plants and we eliminate the factors which caused the delays, that is a victory on the home front. If we are blithely spiraling toward inflation and we succeed in arresting that spiral, we have won a major victory on the home front. If there is confusion, duplication, overlapping, and delay in the administration of our domestic war effort, and we eliminate that chaos, then we have won a victory on the home front.

If our food supplies are dwindling as a result of poor governmental planning, and we correct that planning, then we have won a major victory on the home front.

That is why today, my friends, I should like to discuss the subject of victories on the home front. Let me illustrate what I mean.

If we had an army which fought for 15 months without organizing its companies into any kind of permanent organization and without establishing any clearly defined pattern of authority for its generals and its colonels and its captains, it would be a very poor army and it would suffer major reverses under fire.

That, my friends, is what has happened in Washington. In March of this year, some 15 months after Pearl Harbor, we were still creating new agencies, we were still issuing new directives, we were still creating overlapping spheres of authority.

One of these spheres concerns your industry. That was the creation of the new Administration of Food Production and Distribution within the Department of Agriculture under the leadership of Chester C. Davis.

Now, the official reason for Mr. Davis' appointment was that the Secretary of Agriculture, who was Food Administrator, was too busy with a great deal of departmental routine to do the job as Food Administrator.

Now, that was frankly a deceptive smokescreen. As a matter of fact, Wickard lost the job because he never succeeded in getting on top of the critical problem of food supply—and it wasn't his fault either. He didn't have the authority. In any job of food production the three principal elements are:

1. Labor—and these were controlled by War Manpower Commissioner McNutt and Selective Service Director Hershey.

2. The second factor which is vital to any kind of food production is the matter of prices, and Mr. Wickard had no authority here either, because Economic Stabilization Director Byrnes and Price Administrator Brown shared that authority.

3. The third factor was, of course, the factor of machinery and this was something which came within the scope of War Production Board Director Nelson.

At any rate, Wickard never got on top of the critical problem of food supply. He had no authority and, consequently, the job wasn't done. Consequently, it was left chaotic, confused, and disorganized 15 months after the Nation went to war.

Before this talk is finished, I will point out a general moral on this subject, but let me linger for a moment on the problem of the farmer.

This year 10,000,000 or more acres will be returned to production of major crops, due to the lifting of Agricultural Adjustment Administration restrictions. Those figures come from the Department of Agriculture itself.

That will mean that for the first time since we began killing little pigs, American agriculture returned to an economy of abundance instead of scarcity.

The second year of our participation in global warfare brought with it the grim stark realization that we had to feed armies, allies, and even conquered nations.

Finally, at long last, we have abandoned the hybrid, tattered and torn remnant of a doctrine of scarcity which has always been at variance with every fundamental and basic tradition of American life.

Yes, we have finally placed 10,000,000 acres back into production. That won't mean that there will be an abundance of foodstuffs for civilians, but at least it highlights a fundamental change which has been long overdue—the shift from the economy of scarcity to the economy of abundant production. At least it has brought home the fundamental point that if farmers are to be paid anything by Government, they should be paid not for curtailing production, but for increasing production.

That is a very basic change and it finds its counterpart in every phase of our war economy.

I don't know what the post-war plans for our farm life may be. I read recently where the chief agricultural economist of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics advanced a plan to cut the post-war world population to 80 percent of its present level. I don't know whether that means that our planners contemplate a vast machine-laden and industrialized America with a Latin-American food granary or not, but I do know that if that report is correct, it means a rigid program of post-war governmental control for the farmer. I do know that it would mean a blueprint for an organized agricultural market probably with fixed prices, and I might say in passing that this kind of a long range agricultural shackling is contrary to a basic objective for which this war is being fought.

Let us return now to the general subject of victory on the home front, and let me interject at this point that I don't want to be accused of being partisan, nor do I want to say that all of our shortcomings on the domestic front have resulted from one party, nor have all of the sound proposals emanated from one party. The issue of our domestic policies is infinitely greater than any narrow spirit of partisanship.

To begin with, this Congress was born in a spirit of independence. It was born in the belief that it was time for Congress to stop taking orders. It was born in the belief that it was time for Congress—men of every party—to do the job which must be done. It was time for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority and its obligation as the elected representatives of the people. Moreover it was time for Congress to quit stalling on important legislative issues. It was time, and high time, for Congress to approximate in some degree the courage manifested by our men on the fighting fronts.

For almost a decade, legislation lived and died on Capitol Hill in accordance with the mandate of the administration policy.

In the first 3 months of the Seventy-eighth Congress, this Congress broke all records in the intensity and the scope of the investigations it undertook. Now, investigations are a two-edged sword. Sometimes they create more havoc than benefits.

Nevertheless, in the first 3 months of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Congress demonstrated that it intended to regain the functions which it had yielded to the Chief Executive in an earlier heyday.

The Congress refused to accept the ready-made post-war plans of the National Resources Planning Board.

I am not going to comment on that Board or its plans at this point, but I do wish to point out that subsequently the Senate established its own special committee to study and to make recommendations on post-war economic planning in an effort to assume some leadership and to make some constructive contribution on this vital problem.

It was a Senate committee that took the leadership in recommending the abolition of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Works Project Administration, and they were eliminated.

Under Senate leadership, about $1,313,000,000 were saved in Government expenditures. There has been a growing spirit of financial scrutiny in Congress and several of the committees are beginning to serve as public watch dogs in the war agencies.

Congress in the past decade found itself shorn of much of its legislative authority. Some of the agencies which have been created are writing laws of the land through regulations, without any specific reference to the intent of Congress.

The Budget Bureau has been placed under the White House, and Congress is unable to go beyond this Executive agency. On this point, by the way, I believe that Congress must carefully reappraise the work of the Budget Bureau and must strongly reassert its initiative in effecting economy reforms. Perhaps the somewhat neglected Office of the Comptroller General should be studied with a view to reinvesting that office with some of the authority which has been shifted from it to the Budget Bureau.

Now, with all this seething spirit of independence, Congress has before it a picture of a dreary procession of governmental reorganization before Pearl Harbor—from the National Defense Advisory Commission, to the Office of Production Management, to the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, to the War Production Board, in the production field; and from the National Labor Relations Board to the National Defense Mediation Board, to the War Labor Board, in labor relations; and from the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply to the Office of Price Administration, and from Henderson to Brown in the field of rationing and price control.

The Federal Government is the nerve center of the whole war effort, but there is still much chaos. There has been a five-man kitchen cabinet which had no legal foundation. There were reverses and more reverses. There were reorganizations and more reorganizations in War Production Board, and then Nelson turned over almost his entire authority in war production to the Executive Vice Chairman, Charles Wilson, and now James Byrnes is appointed Director of the Office of War Mobilization.

Now at long last, it is time for us to settle our domestic program into a somewhat permanent pattern.

There can no longer be any shilly-shallying with respect to domestic questions of tremendous importance. We got good news from Africa and it is time that we got good news from Washington. Perhaps the appointment of James Byrnes as Director of the Office of War Mobilization is that good news.

We can no longer tolerate indecision and procrastination.

The War Production Board is an example. Mr. Nelson has almost been shelved. The new executive vice chairman, Mr. Wilson, is reported as being in conflict with the Army-Navy procurement authorities, and while that question has been partially straightened out, it hasn't been entirely settled. The Manpower Commission is another illustration. From the Manpower Commission there has poured a deluge of conflicting, bewildering orders and proclamations, but there still is no clearly defined over-all policy, unless out of the appointment of Judge Byrnes we get that result.

We still do not have a clearly defined food-production policy.

Now, I have never felt that the ultimate character of our war Government should be determined by a series of foot races between the Chief Executive and Congress. I do feel that we must decide whether the impelling force behind administrative decisions shall be a legal statute or an Executive order.

I feel, however, that the first necessity for the Nation today is to create a War Cabinet—a genuine War Cabinet rather than a kitchen cabinet working in the back room. The kitchen cabinet performs a useful function, but it certainly isn't the answer to the problems of a war government. This group has done some excellent work. It has made some excellent recommendations, but it has no authority, it has no official status, it has no responsibility. The Chief Executive's authority cannot be delegated to an unofficial group.

It could be delegated to a certain degree to a genuine war cabinet, where each member would have a clear authority to make decisions—and to enforce them—in one specific field. A war cabinet would not eliminate all of the conflicts, but it would provide a mechanism for eliminating a great many of them.

I don't mean that the President's power should be undermined any more than congressional power should be undermined. As a matter of fact, I believe that whatever authority is necessary for the Chief Executive to successfully run this war should be given to him.

We must, however, eliminate delays and conflicts in authority and clashes of personality which hamper the war effort. The Baruch committee said that about the rubber situation. The Maloney committee said that about the fuel oil and gasoline program.

It is true of a great many programs on the domestic front. It was certainly true of the food program.

When there are muddles in government, when the Secretary of War and the Manpower Commissioner disagree publicly about the necessity for drafting labor, that is obviously a temptation to Congress to step in.

In some cases it is necessary for Congress to interfere but in other cases it would not be necessary if there were a war cabinet.

We had a great deal of war muddling in 1917 and 1918, and eventually President Wilson had to create a war cabinet. That provided a mechanism for an intelligent division of responsibility, where the Chief Executive could umpire the fights.

It is possible that such a war cabinet would mean a less costly victory on the battle fronts, and it is possible that it might mean a great many victories on the domestic front.

It looks now as if Washington has caught up with this idea of a war cabinet. At least I hope that is what is meant by putting Justice Byrnes at the head of the new Office of War Mobilization. Byrnes' job is analogous to that of Deputy President. He will have in his cabinet Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Hopkins, and the new Director of Economic Stabilization, Judge Fred Vinson. As you know, the work which has resulted in so much confusion, has been done by czars with no cabinet roles. It is physically impossible for the President to supervise the ramified agencies which have been brought into existence. He should never have expected to be able to act as the clearing house for all the ideas and the problems of all the departments and bureaus. The appointment of Byrnes means it will be his function to iron out the outstanding jurisdictional disputes between the czars.

Last March the so-called Truman committee pointed out three basic weaknesses of administration as a cause for the confusion, delays, and shortcomings in the war program. The committee listed them as:

1. Inadequate over-all planning within Government agencies at the beginning of various programs and delay in determining basic policies necessary to carry out such programs effectively.

2. Conflicting authority over responsibility for various delays in various phases of the war program, resulting in further delays and "buck passing."

3. The hesitancy of government to adopt unpopular and unpleasant policies long after the facts clearly indicated that such policies were necessary.

Let me make it clear that I am not in favor of another purely advisory group but that I am urging the adoption of a genuine war

cabinet where every member has a well-defined authority.

1. I believe that the creation of a war cabinet would be a definite victory on the home front.

2. I believe that the adoption of an intelligent fiscal and taxing policy would be a decisive victory on the home front.

I believe that in order to achieve such an integrated program, particularly in the field of the Budget, we need to correct one fundamental omission in our thinking. We need to correlate for Budget and planning purposes, particularly in the post-war period, revenue raising and Federal spending. We need a better correlation between appropriation and revenue committees in each House of Congress, and then we need a better overall collaboration in this field between the two Houses themselves. In other words, our congressional machinery for dealing with budgets is hopelessly inadequate. Congress is attempting to do its budgetary planning in the most expensive era in history with the same old-fashioned machinery established years ago. If the Executive assumes increasing control over all budgetary operations, it is only a natural consequence of this shortcoming within Congress itself.

The announcement of a decisive, clearly defined labor policy, the announcement of a clearly defined framework for a manpower policy, the announcement of a definite, clearly defined food production program—each of these would be a victory on the home front.

The announcement of a clearly outlined program for our so-called psychological warfare would be very helpful for our morale. The announcement of either a definite correlation or a definite separation between our censorship and propaganda policies, would be helpful.

The announcement of a definite policy with reference to our Federal personnel would be a satisfaction, and in this connection I might add that congressional initiative has already resulted in a reduction of more than 41,000 civilian employees in all departments. If, instead of adding more and more agencies—if, instead of pyramiding more and more bureaus—we were to utilize existing bureaus, it would be a very heartening assurance to our people.

In the post-war period, particularly, it would be very interesting to find out what will happen to the 60 agencies of Government which today operate as corporate entities, paying no interest or taxes on the use of public funds, and which, in many cases, are virtually free from the normal audit and budgetary controls.

An announcement today of the sharp restriction of these Government corporations which operate in direct competition with private enterprise would be a tremendous morale booster.

What I feel is most fundamental, however, is the necessity both during the war and in the post-war period for the adoption of a mechanism which will insure that there will be a working collaboration between the Executive and the Congress. It is axiomatic that the soldiers won the last war and the statesmen and the people lost the peace. That must never happen again. There is little disagreement today on the necessity for some kind of international collaboration for a better world, but unfortunately there has been too little discussion on the simple mechanism which must precede any such collaboration.

Before we can talk of international collaboration, we must make certain that there is domestic collaboration.

Under our Constitution, there are two peace-making authorities and before we can talk of world peace we must make certain that there is peace between our own two peace-making authorities.

Before we can talk about any resolutions relating to the post-war peace problem, we must adopt a simple mechanism for collaboration between the Executive and the Congress with reference to their joint peace action.

If tomorrow we were to have assurance from both the Congress and the Executive that a liaison committee on the problems of the peace would be established to function during every stage of the conduct of the peace, that would be a tremendous victory on the home front, because it would mean that the chances for the adoption of a workable peace would be infinitely increased.

It would be assurance to our boys on every fighting front in the world that their fight would not be in vain—that they would not return home to face the spectacle of Congress and the Executive battling over the terms and the provisions of a peace. It would mean that the representatives of the people would have a voice in the inception stages of a treaty, and it would mean that the comprises would be worked out beforehand.

It would mean that the treaty would not the wrapped up in cellophane and a big blue ribbon and then delivered to Congress by the State Department wouthout any thinking on the part of the people's representatives ever having been incorporated in the treaty.

The presentation of a treaty as a fait accompli by the State Department invites sharp scrutiny by the Senate of an unfamiliar treaty with which it is not conversant. Participation by the Senate in the inception steps of the treaty—not in a spirit of antagonism, but in a spirit of working cooperation—would mean that the treaty which would have to face a Senate vote for approval would have an infinitely better chance of surviving as a hope not only for the United States but for the world.

In this connection, let me say in conclusion that Congress would lose a vital battle on the home front if it does not successfully protect us from economic disaster after the war.

All of our energy today is concentrated on winning the war and that is as it should be. We will win that war, and we must also win a just and a righteous peace. We must also win an economic battle for America—a post-war battle. That is necessary not only for the survival of the United States, but in order to insure that there can be an equitable economic basis for international peace.

Russia's Electric Power Resources

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that we are now in a power economy; that electric power, the supply of electricity, will have more to do with the lives of our people and the future of this country and of the world, than will the supply of silver and gold.

Recently I also took up the question of the development of electric power in Japan and showed that if it had not been for our public power program in this country Japan would today be ahead of the United States, or even with the United States, in the production and use of electric power.

I now desire to discuss the development of electric power in Russia, particularly water power; and at a later date I hope to take up the question of electric power production in other countries, including other European countries, as well as South America.

POWER DEVELOPMENT IN RUSSIA

The question is frequently asked why such a reversal of Russian form and performance, compared to the last war. The answer lies in Russian industrial development along lines of complete electrification, as we know it from our own experience. The story of this change is enlightening

I am picturing this development only from a practical standpoint, disassociated from their political theories. We need to know, for our own well-being, what each country has and how it can use it. We must look realistically at the world around us. An electrified Russia is a vital world force and it is here to stay. Her resource structure is built on American lines, and is easier for us to understand and measure than is the Nazi structure.

Russia has realized the importance of complete electrification. The keystone of her national economy rests on this concept. The outstanding reason for her remarkable war performance was an early realization of the possibilities of electrolytic and electrothermal production processes, as well as the possibilities of automatic electrical equipment, and electric industrial production technique, with the associated increase in production per employee.

Russian leaders saw that the force of electrification would give them a single yardstick by which they could gage their national economy. Their concept of capitalism, unfortunately, was given to them by the German and associated proprietors who controlled and operated Russian industry during the days of the Czar, which drove them temporarily, at least, to the other extreme—communism.

RUSSIAN INDUSTRY UP TO 1917

Practically all of the Russian industry prior to 1917 was foreign owned, with German interests predominating. Ninety-six percent of the entire Russian electrical business was owned and operated by German and affiliated foreign interests. The operation was on a very low and backward level, and by standards as we know them, extremely crude. A reexamination of all controlling factors lead to the conclusion that the Russian people were "sold down the river" by profiteering foreign proprietors.

Between 1900 and 1914 only 14,000 kilowatts of new-production capacity was installed annually in Russia, which is just a little more than the amount now used each year in my congressional district.

The costs per kilowatt and per kilowatt-hour were sky high and the reliability of performance at the bottom of the scale. For example, one electric station was erected in St. Petersburg with boilers so built as to use

Cardiff—English—coal, and the boiler pressure was around the low level of 100 pounds. Fuel supplies at hand were ignored. Another station was built in Moscow equally as antique that could burn only long-haul oil from foreign or Caucasus sources. During this time the Donetz Basin was Russia's principal industrial center. Its mines and mills were primitive. There were hundreds of small mechanical plants, all operating at low efficiencies. The entire electric power for this vast resource region consisted of only 70 kilos—43 miles—of light power lines. The Russian steam boiler inspection records show 21,500 registered boilers. Only 18 percent were water-tube boilers, and the remaining 82 percent were frail pots, sold only to make large sales profits.

Decentralization of industry had been carried to the extreme. St. Petersburg, for example, secured its entire power supply from 105 different generating stations with an aggregate capacity of 193,000 kilowatts and with different operating voltages. Efficiency standards were almost as crude as the Chinese treadmills, and there was no technique. The Government did not know its resources, and the published surveys on quantities were ridiculous.

In 1913 the total Russian electric installed capacity was only 1,100,000 kilowatts and the output 1,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which is less than the amount now used in the State of Washington, Alabama, or Tennessee. Its productive capacity in that year was only about one-twentieth of ours and one-tenth that of Germany. In 1913 only 37 percent of the national power output was used in industry. The average efficiency of the largest generating stations was only 10.7 percent. The Russian electrical manufacturing business was practically nil. Machinery was largely imported with a few foreign workshops, run on a concession basis, handling the small amount of nonimportations. These few descriptions give a picture of the Russian industrial situation at the beginning of the last war.

PLANNED ELECTRIFICATION

In October 1918, the Russian Academy of Science commenced studies on which the new government could plan industrial reorganization, stressing electrification.

In February 1920, the Goelro was founded, which was purely a technical body composed of about 200 of the nation's outstanding scientists. The fundamental work of this commission which has since been known as the Goelro plan, was completed in December 1920, and submitted to the Eighth All Russian Congress of Soviets, and approved. This plan covered the reconstruction of Russia along electric lines, with a high order of technique. In 1921 Stalin referred to the Goelro plan as the best base on which to build a new industrial structure to save an economically backward Russia.

THE GOELRO PLAN

This plan called for an entire reconstruction of industry, based entirely on electrification. It might be said at this point, that the backward conditions made reconstruction easily possible. Its objective was to increase production 180 to 200 percent of the pre-war level, which was to be accomplished in a minimum of 10 years and a maximum of 15 years. This plan had two parts known as A and B. Part A provided for the restoration and reconstruction of pre-war facilities and the development of electrical transmission and distribution networks.

Part B called for 1,500,000 kilowatts of new generating stations and the creation of 30 electrical regions.

The approved basic plan called for the concentration of large regional electric power in supergenerating stations. Power was to be transmitted out of these stations over the entire region through high-voltage networks to industries and other consumers.

These central stations were to be so located as to best serve the raw materials of each region, subject only to the requirements that the backward industrial situation of the entire country be corrected as early as possible, and that local power and fuel sources be used exclusively, to avoid overloading the national rail systems. The power sources to be used were water power, local bituminous coals, oil, oil shales, peat, and anthracite waste culm. When the industries had been rebuilt it was then planned to interconnect the regions by high-voltage transmission ties so that each region could render assistance to other regions, when needed.

Basically, the Russian plan was entirely different from the German concept of decentralizing industry into a number of component parts. The development of this new Russian plan was a natural move, as the Russian leaders knew from bitter experiences what German decentralization and mechanical drives had done to their country's industry from 1914 to 1917. Furthermore, they were thoroughly acquainted with the great productive capacity of the United States and the reasons therefor. Active work was started on the Goelro plan, as soon as internal conditions permitted, but rehabilitation of pre-war facilities largely occupied their attention until 1925, which is the first year in which it is possible to measure results from published statistics.

GOELRO CONSTRUCTION

The original plan called for 28 generating stations west of the Urals and 2 east of that range. The final amendments to this plan increased the total stations west of the Urals to 56 and east of the Urals to 4. The Soviets developed all the waterpower possible under the major requirement of local resource use. The completed plants west of the mountains comprise 10 hydros, 22 coal burners, 10 peat burners, 5 mixed-fuel plants, 1 oil-shale plant, and 8 fuel-oil burners. East of the Urals the plants completed under the Goelro plan comprise 1 hydro and 3 coal-burning stations. These were all superstations. In 1928 it was evident that these 60 stations and their adjacent industrial "combines" would be completed within the minimum period of 10 years or by 1930. Stalin therefore proposed the first 5-year plan, and on the completion of this plan offered the second 5-year plan.

FIRST AND SECOND 5-YEAR PLANS

These plans were a continuation and expansion of the Goelro plan. The first 5-year plan was approved by the Congress of Soviets in 1929. It provided for constructing and enlarging 42 regional electric-generating stations and establishing industrial "combines" in connection with these power outlets. Under this set-up the generating installations in Russia would be increased 3,200,000 kilowatts.

Just prior to proposing the first 5-year plan Stalin employed an American engineer, the late Col. Hugh Cooper, as a consultant. Colonel Cooper and his organization had built the Muscle Shoals and Keokuk Dams, in this country. Stalin secured the services of Colonel Cooper and his organization, after canvassing the international field, and rejecting German offers of assistance. Colonel Cooper had a substantial part in engineering the large Dnieperstroy Dam, which was initially equipped with American water wheels and generators. Dnieperstroy was built along the lines of the Muscle Shoals plant. From the Dnieperstroy experience Russia created electrical manufacturing plants that could satisfactorily build power-plant equipment along advanced American lines. The last four Dnieperstroy units were built in Russia. This Dnieperstroy Dam was blown up by the Russians to keep it from falling into German hands; but it will undoubtedly be rebuilt when the war is over.

The second 5-year plan was a broadening program which included electrometallurgical and chemical industries, and had as its object expanding industrial productions ninefold. It also initially proposed to electrify railroads and to introduce electrical processes into agriculture. In the larger cities this plan included the coordinated operation of steam-electric and steam-heat plants. This second 5-year plan included full transmission-line interconnections between all stations in a region and between regions, and the enlargement of the Donets-Dnieper industrial area into the largest industrial electrical set-up in the world, with an annual consumption of 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The development of manufactured gas from peat and oil shales was also a part of this plan. The full expansion of hydro power was also included. The total new generating stations totaled 79, all of which were superplants. The details of these stations have all been listed in the published documents brought with the Russian representatives of the Third World Power Conference, held in Washington in 1936. I will list the over-all capacities resulting from this and other plans when I measure the results of these various plans.

MEASURING RESOURCES

Because of commercial propaganda, and military reasons, any data put out by any nation on resources should be used with caution until the control fac-

tors have been checked. Information is available in this country, from thoroughly reliable, neutral, and unbiased sources to check any statement on resources. The control statements I have used have been checked. My feeling is that the best approach is to deal in comparative conclusions rather than presenting a mass of so-called absolute statistics.

The Russians, when they attended the Third World Power Conference here in Washington in 1936, submitted a large amount of technical information, which has been published and is available for reference. This has also been largely consolidated in a book printed in England but published in Moscow, entitled, "Electrical Power Development in U. S. S. R."

RUSSIAN RESOURCES

From the standpoint of potential resources Russia is outstandingly rich and ranks up amongst the three highest nations in the long list of principal industrial materials. It has large quantities of all the possible sources of power.

Russia's 1938 population was 180,-200,000. About 5,000,000 Russians are war casualties and about, 60,000,000 have been taken into captivity by the Germans.

Russia covers one-eleventh of the world's land area. She has one-sixth of the world's coal, one-third of the world's oil, and slightly under one-third of the world's undeveloped water power. Her forest area is one-fifth of the total on the globe, and her lower-quality fuel resources are nearly one-half of the world's total. Her natural-gas reserves equal ours. Her proportional endowment of power sources exceeds her land and population percentages. I will discuss water power separately.

One of the richest coal fields on this globe is the Kuznetsk field in Siberia, which has very deep seams of high-quality coal. The second largest field is in the Donets Basin. Large deposits occur in Siberia, north of the Mongolian and Manchukuo frontiers, all the way from the Urals to Vladivostok. Large secondary coal deposits occur in the Moscow region.

The rich oil and gas areas are found around the Caspian Sea and between the Volga and Emba Rivers as far north as the fifty-second latitude circle. Oil is also found in a narrow strip east of the Urals, extending from the Ural River to the Arctic Circle and also north of Afghanistan. Little oil has been charted in Siberia except on the Sakhalin Island, north of Japan. The peat fields are found in the Moscow and Gorki areas and in White Russia. The oil shales are found in the noncoal areas around Leningrad and in the middle and lower Volga territories. Russia affords an outstanding example of how nature distributes her power resources. Where there is a shortage of one type there is usually found a sufficiency of another. Russia's mining resources have not been completely surveyed. The country has many years' supply of manganese, iron, copper, asbestos, zinc, lead, and the precious metals. The greater part of the world supply of platinum will come from Russia.

RUSSIAN WATER POWER

Russian rainfall is extremely variable, varying from 14 inches to 25 inches, near the Baltic Sea. Russia has the largest rivers in Europe, but this is the result of large basins rather than the average rainfall. European Russia has 14,000,-000 potential horsepower at minimum flows and 50,000,000 horsepower available 50 percent of the time. The developed European Russian water power totals about 2,000,000 horsepower. This water power is not evenly distributed and is only found on the lower Dnieper and Volga, in Caucasia, Azov, Trans-Caucasia, Leningrad, Gorki, and Arkangel territories.

Central European Russia and the Moscow area have little developed water power, hence the use of coal, oil, and the lesser fuels for steam generation. The outstanding hydro stations are:

First. Dnieperstroy, which was completed in 1932, has a total capacity of 756,000 horsepower under a head of 116 feet. It has nine large generating units. At the time of its completion it was the largest single power station in the world. It is about the size of Bonneville but is smaller than Boulder or Grand Coulee.

Second. Svir—two stations—of 90,000 and 195,000 horsepower. These serve Leningrad and have heads of 35 and 45 feet.

Third. Chirchik, 230,000 horsepower with a head of 220 feet.

Fourth. Perm—Urals—425,000 horsepower with a head of 52 feet.

Fifth. Rykynsk—Volga—275,000 horsepower with a head of 53 feet.

In addition, 29 other super hydro plants were built between 1930 and 1940 with capacities somewhat lower than the five I have given.

Two large water power installations were being projected for the Volga just before the war at Kuibyshev and Kamyshin, which will be larger than Grand Coulee. Plans were partially completed when Russia was attacked. In addition, there are 10 smaller projects on this river. These Volga projects will total 9,000,000 horsepower with an output of 32,000,000,-000 kilowatt hours per year. Thus the Volga, when developed, will exceed the combined T. V. A., Boulder, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee installations.

Estimates have also been made for the Yenisei project (Siberia) of 16,000,000 horsepower and the Angara project—Asia—of 14,500,000 horsepower. In addition, nine other projects have been planned ranging in size from 2,000,000 to 12,000,000 horsepower each. Asiatic Russia has 64,000,000 potential water horsepower at minimum river flows with 325,-000,000 horsepower at flows occurring 50 percent of the time. At the present time there is only 140,000 hydro horsepower developed in Asiatic Russia, but millions of horsepower have been surveyed and plans drawn for future installations.

Time and space limits a fuller description of Russian water power possibilities. They are enormous. Think of these possibilities under conditions of cheap available construction and manufacturing materials, a large reservoir of manpower, and advancing technique.

THE DNIEPER PROJECT

The super Dnieper project covered navigation, irrigation, and power. The Dnieperstroy Dam, already completed, is at the lower end of the middle river development and is the center of the ultimate project. The third 5-year plan contemplated four additional main river hydro plants, one to be located on the lower stretches of the river, one to be above the Dnieperstroy station, and two stations located on the middle river between Dnieperstroy and Kiev. In addition, large storage dams with two generating stations were projected in the upper reaches in order to regulate the total flow of the river.

The proposed middle and lower river stations were projected in the area of the southern Russian power system, which fed into the Donets region on the east, the Dnieper region in the center, and the Krivoi Rog mining section to the west, and the Odessa-Crimean area in the south. These stations were planned to increase the output of the existing stations to over 8,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year to serve a maximum system peak load of 5,000,000 kilowatts by the end of the proposed third plan.

These stations were planned to be connected by a series of transmission lines with 100,000-kilowatt capacity each. The lower Dnieper area has a deficiency of fuels but will be tied into the coal-burning plants of the Donets region. River transportation will also occupy large part in the complete Dnieper development. On the completion of the dams I have cited Russia will have a completed waterway, connecting the Black Sea with Leningrad and the Donets Basin with the western mining regions.

In addition to these 2 purposes, this super project will irrigate about 4,500,-000 acres in the lower Donets Basin and about 2,000,000 acres in north Crimea, and will drain the bogs of the Ukraine and White Russia, an area of 11,000,000 acres. These irrigated and reclaimed lands were to be put to work developing cotton and wheat in addition to orchards, vineyards, and industrial crops. This proposed project exemplifies the coordination of Russian planning in all directions. The large industrial centers utilizing this power are located at Zaporozhe, Stalingrad, Krivoi Rog, and the Odessa-Crimean area.

GROWTH OF RUSSIAN ELECTRIFICATION

When we compare the growth from 1925 to 1939 of Russian electrification with other countries, we find some very surprising figures. Their rate of growth far exceeds the rate of any other European country.

The generated kilowatt-hour output during the first 5-year plan tripled in 5 years, going from 8,300,000 to 25,900,000 kilowatt-hours. It took Germany 13½ years to acquire such a growth rate, and Great Britain 15.4 years. In other words, the speed of development in Russia was nearly three times the German

rate and over three times the British rate. The greatest German kilowatt-hour increase per year from published statistics was 3,900,000. Russia has exceeded this figure every year since 1933. In 1935 it was over 5,000,000,000.

The best information we have indicates that the Russian yearly increase had amounted to over 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1939. This last rate was five times the British rate, two and a half times the German rate, and seven times the French rate. The rate growth was accelerating in geometrical progression, as new industries were brought into production. With such increase rates the gap between a backward Russia and the most advanced European country was being rapidly closed.

With projects scheduled in the third 5-year plan—but stopped by German aggression—the gap would have been closed before the completion of a third plan. The projected Volga and super Dnieper hydro projects alone will add about 60,000,000,000 annual kilowatt-hours to the Russian systems, or about one-third of our late total. The future projected hydro projects on the Angara and Yenisei, in Asia, will add nearly 100,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, or about half of our own maximum projected wartime output.

Another marked Russian development characteristic is the hours use per year of each kilowatt installed. In 1933 the hours use per year was 2,950 hours. In 1935 it was 3,800 and the estimated 1939 figure was 4,100, or double the German 1936 utilization factor.

In 1914 the Russian output was 1,900,000,000 of kilowatt hours. In 1925 it was 2,900,000,000; in 1935 the figure had risen to about 26,000,000,000. The scheduled projects in the third plan would have normally brought this growth measure to 41,000,000,000 by 1939.

The Russian installed capacity was 1,000,000 kilowatts in 1913, 1,390,000 in 1925, 6,900,000 in 1935, and about 10,000,000 in 1939. From 1929 to 1936 the installed plant capacity in the United States and Germany was stationary, while the Russian capacity increased over fourfold. The Soviets were vastly increasing their tempo, while we remained on dead center during the depression years. This shows that resources are more powerful than gold.

During the second 5-year plan Russia was also electrifying its main trunk railroads. By 1936 about 1,800 kilometers—1,120 miles—of main lines were electrified like our Washington-New York service.

What does all of this mean? Simply the fact that Russia has acquired the "know how" of electrically converting raw resources into finished products at an exceptionally high rate, and under high utilization factors. The "know how" is bound to assure Russia a high place in post-war production.

CONCLUSION

I have today presented a picture of an accelerated development for the utilization and processing of a vast storehouse of raw materials. I have presented this information as I feel that our own well-being must rest on a realistic appraisal of world conditions.

The lesson to be derived is the need for appropriate adjustment of our own program so that foreign commercial interests cannot, by cartels or like manipulations, secure a monopoly over our own controls. We must also recognize the gross errors of that school of economists who have overrated the value of gold and money as applied to world domination. What I have presented, and will later present, should show that the use of labor, manpower, and the industrial and agricultural materials, when processed by low cost electric energy, will control the future international balance, rather than gold or money.

Financial considerations at home need to be considered under our system to promote efficiency and increase morale, but in maintaining our world position we must recognize what surrounds us.

We need more realism, and less propaganda.

Remember we are in the dawn of an electric age.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Solid Fuel Institute of Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a talk I delivered on June 7 before the Solid Fuel Institute of Milwaukee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT NEED OF MANKIND—COOPERATION

The hope of mankind lies in learning cooperation. This calls for getting rid of those forces which would nullify our efforts to learn the art of living and working together. Man's inhumanity to man, man's jealousy, misunderstanding, and bigotry are utter stupidity. Yet they have persevered down through the ages. Why? Because man has not learned to cooperate with man as he should. Let us humans stop being Kilkenny cats.

A mighty awakening, however, is going on. We are beginning to see the practicality of the commandment of Jesus, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

An incident comes to my mind from out of the last war. It was stated that a priest serving a battalion or a regiment of our doughboys in France was the kind of a minister whom all the boys learned to love and respect. He was constantly with them, advising, helping, teaching, encouraging—the incarnation of cooperation.

When the battle was on in the trenches, he was with them. When boys were dying, he was administering the Last Sacrament. When the wounded needed care, he gave that care. He was one of them. He was a great soldier of the Republic. He never hesitated to go into places of danger.

But one night as he was out in no man's land to succor the needy, he "got his." They carried him back and as he was passing on, they heard him mutter "Co-operari."

The incident was related of Goethe, the great philosopher, that when he died his last words were "more light," and the friend who stood by knew that he was not speaking of more candlelight. Rather he was—as he was traversing the vestibule between this life and the next—seeing the great need of mankind, and he was giving the great directive in his expression, "more light."

It is said that great souls can look both ways as they pass through the vestibule, and he saw that the great need of mankind was more light, more cooperation, more brotherhood, and so he said "more light."

So it was with this priest—the great friend of our boys in the last war. He looked back upon struggling humanity and he saw the need for cooperation, and his last words were in the Latin, "co-operari."

We are beginning to learn that mere phrases won't do the job. There must be conviction and action. There are millions of souls who are praying that the light may break through, and that we will be able to see the way which will lead toward that full cooperation which will mean peace nationally and peace internationally.

In the present war situation, cooperation for war between the United Nations is imperatively necessary if we expect to vanquish our enemy. We realize that we should allow nothing to interfere with our efforts—nothing, I say.

Nations with as different ideologies as Russia and the United States are learning the way to cooperation. If we learn through the hard course in war to work together, we should certainly apply in peace the lesson learned in war so that when we face the problems of peace we will unite our effort for peace and the solution of the post-war problems.

Now, the purpose of cooperation in this war is to preserve our freedoms and make sure that our spiritual progress shall continue. Every thinking person recognizes that cooperation is a basic rule for advancing civilization. It is fundamental in the family, in labor and management, in communities, and in world groups.

In Washington we are beginning to realize that the tremendous task that is going to face America in the post-war world requires above everything else that the spirit of cooperation be born and made real in the hearts of men. We will have not only to rebuild a world but enlarge the opportunities of mankind to produce and enjoy new wealth. However, we will never be able to produce wealth in things to the extent that this country will require unless we create the jobs, and we will never be able to create the jobs unless we have the energy and the vision and the cooperation necessary. Learn to cooperate is a call that comes to labor and management, to Government officials, to cities and States and to the Nation. We must enter boldly into a program of action.

We haven't the time to complain about the inadequacy of the planning in the past; but let us learn from our mistakes. The time for doing things is now. We know that our labor supply has grown tremendously because the women during the war are learning how to look after the jobs the men looked after before. Women are becoming industrial workers and find a job and satisfaction in looking after that job.

When the war is over many of these women will want to remain on these jobs. They are creators of wealth and are doing the job as well as men. So we will have a tremendous force of skilled labor that will want to go to work. Therefore, now is the time to build and plan for the peace—a healthy, economic peace, a cooperative peace.

This calls for unity of effort now between the best brains in Government and the best brains in industry and in civilian life.

In other words, we should have a backlog of projects that will be utilized to absorb this tremendous force of labor when the war is over.

Civilization depends upon action, the right action of sane-thinking men, resulting in the creation of jobs, of new wealth, healthy communities where industry and enterprise and virtue dwell. If we get into action now with the spirit of cooperation, the groundwork of a greater world will be laid, and our boys who are fighting our battles will know they will have a chance when they come back, in the dawn of a greater tomorrow—a chance to have a part in rebuilding a world. There will be jobs and opportunities awaiting them.

A father went to visit his son at college, and on his way out to the school, about 11:30 in the morning, he stepped into a drugstore to get a root beer, and he found his son there having a coke. He said, "Son, what are you doing around here at this time of the day?" And his son said, "Oh, dad, I'm just resting up, waiting for those professors to catch up with me."

I am hoping that the powers that be in Washington will catch up with a few of these ideas which we have been talking about. What do I mean? Washington should learn to cooperate. How?

(a) Get men in places of authority who have had the necessary experience to handle the job; not simply theory—practical men, men with common sense. There are more now of that sort than there were when I first came to Washington, but we can use more of the right sort.

(b) Get men in Government who believe in loosening the controls that Government now has through its bureaus and administrators; men who still have faith that the people themselves know what is best for them; men who want to get rid of government by Executive orders and decrees, especially when this war is over. Bureaucracy must be treated as a fungus growth. "Them's my sentiments."

(c) Public servants and all of us must learn that private enterprise, instead of public enterprise, must be fostered, not in order that the particular individuals may benefit but that the public welfare may be subserved. This idea, in my opinion, is important to society, important to the individual, and important to organized labor. If in the post-war period legitimate businesses which have been built up through the industry of Americans have been forced to the wall, the Government will do the employing and the employees will be the creatures of government—all of us had better think this matter through now.

I bring this matter to the fore at this time because government already has some $16,000,000,000 invested in industries of this country—money that the Government got from the people. Now, in wartime, government necessarily, in the interest of security of the nation, reaches out its strong hand and writes the ticket—writes the ticket for management and for labor. If this condition were to continue in peacetime, it would destroy the profit system, individual enterprise, and small business.

We Americans are creatures who have learned through the years to create and build. We want a chance to better our conditions as freemen and not as the tools of a government. But there are those political doctors who want great government corporations to run the show after the war is over.

I tell you frankly, "I'm agin' it."

As I said on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, I expect to see a new economic "creature" come into being, but if I have anything to say about that creature, it will not be one with special privileges. Let that creature in which the Government has money and in which private individuals have money and in which the Government has representation and private individuals have representation—let that creature stand on its own feet and meet every condition and overhead that every private institution has to meet. Let it be subject to taxes and the same regulation and supervision that any private institution in the same class has.

It looks now as if Washington has caught up with an idea that I have been mentioning for a long time, and that is a war cabinet. At least I hope that is what is meant by putting Justice Byrnes at the head of the new Office of War Mobilization. I sincerely hope that this is not simply another bureaucratic creature. The demand for a war cabinet has existed for a long time. President Wilson saw the need of it. I have urged it in my talks in the Senate and in public addresses since before December 1941.

Byrnes' job is analogous to that of deputy President. He will have in his cabinet Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Hopkins, and the new Director of Economic Stabilization, Judge Fred Vinson. At long last the President has bowed to this storm of demand for a functioning war cabinet.

As you know, the work which has resulted in so much confusion has been done by czars with no cabinet roles. It is physically impossible for the President to supervise the ramified agencies which have been brought into existence. He is our Commander in Chief. He should have done long ago this job which has now been done. He should never have expected to be able to be the clearing house for all the ideas and the problems of all the departments and bureaus.

Probably when he appointed Mr. Byrnes in the first place as Director of Economic Stabilization, the President thought that Byrnes could clear the decks. But it didn't work that way because these czars wanted to clear through the President.

The appointment of Byrnes now as the head of the Office of War Mobilization makes him virtually Assistant President. It will be his function to iron out the outstanding jurisdictional disputes between the czars. We wish Judge Byrnes success in bringing order back into this situation.

I have introduced a resolution that would create a joint committee of the House and Senate to study the whole social security problem, having in mind meeting the impact of the post-war period. It is a vast problem and should not be treated in segments. So far no heed has been paid to my resolution. No provision for such a committee has been made.

We have constantly called to mind that one of the great facts that has come out of this war effort is that American industry and enterprise, which includes labor, have done a great job. They have demonstrated the vitality of the old deal. They were given the opportunity to save America, and they have done it. Once more industry and thrift, courage and invention, initiative and teamwork are recognized. This omens well for the future.

The attack for almost 10 years by demagogues and political quacks on men who build and create must not occur again. We will need the vitality of all of us to survive the post-war impacts.

We want cooperation now and after victory between the treaty-making arms of government—the Executive and the Congress. Let us remember no man or group is as great as our country. Its interest comes first.

I introduced a resolution to create a liaison committee between the Executive and the Senate. Just recently the Washington Post, commenting on this subject, said:

"Why, then, has the Senate Foreign Relations Committee been so dilatory in reporting out the Wiley resolution calling for a foreign relations advisory council to act as a liaison between the Executive and legislative officials who share the duty of planning for a lasting peace? * * * The only sound basis on which international cooperation in the post-war world can be laid is cooperation within our own Government in working out the objectives for which the United States will be prepared to stand. Negligible progress in that direction has been made, even though the White House and Capitol are but 2 miles apart."

The Post article illustrating the lack of cooperation stated further:

"Ten months before Pearl Harbor Senator WILEY introduced another resolution asking the Secretary of State to report in executive session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the threat of war in the Far East, and our preparations to meet it. At that time the State Department knew that war in the Pacific was rapidly approaching. But the resolution was pigeonholed. The committee did not get the information sought. No adequate preparations to meet an attack were made. The United States was humiliated at Pearl Harbor and a great sacrifice of human life will be necessary to regain what we have lost in the Far East. No one can say with assurance how the situation would have been changed if the information in the hands of the State Department had been conveyed to key Members of Congress. This much, however, is certain: the withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis. The Senate cannot act too quickly to bridge this dangerous gap between executive and legislative action while the problems of the forthcoming peace are still in the discussion stage."

I spoke on Memorial Day at the Battleground National Cemetery in the city of Washington. It was here that Lincoln stood in 1864 when Washington was in jeopardy. On this occasion I mention the words of Lincoln where he said, "Come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence * * * heed those sacred principles."

I have applied the need of cooperation to the home front. I have illustrated where cooperation would work miracles now, and where, if there had been cooperation, much loss and suffering might have been made unnecessary.

In the post-war period, when the United Nations will have won this war, our big problem will be to find how to put cooperation into effect. Our job will be to find the way so that the world will not again turn to war. Just how will we be able to safeguard this much-contracted globe from another holocaust like the present?

After the last World War, after we had defeated Germany, the nations failed to learn how to cooperate. Our job now is to find that way. Was it the result of a lack of understanding or cooperation?

We do not know how constructive and effective our support and influence and participation might have proved if we had gone into the League of Nations. We do know that because there was not that necessary cooperation to put a stop to the scourge of war, that war came again.

Therefore, we must try—now that the world looks to us for leadership—we must try and not fail to ascertain the way which leads to international cooperation and collaboration. This is the job of all of us. The average citizen must think this problem through. He must not be confused.

I believe that all of us have a sincere conviction on this subject of cooperation and I have faith that when the war is over, America will find that way—the way of international cooperation.

When this Nation consisted of less than 3,000,000 people our fathers dedicated their lives and property and their sacred

honor to carry through to victory. They were freemen in that day though they were colonists. Today the subjects of Hitler are not free. Their lives and property and their conscience are taken over by him. Therefore, we can do no less than our forefathers when they pledged their lives and fortunes and their sacred honor to the cause of freedom.

We must win the war and overthrow the power of the enemy. But that is not all. We must make sure that when the victory is won that we will be worthy to write the peace. With peace will come added responsibility—the responsibility to rebuild bleeding, suffering humanity and make a repetition of war impossible. We are dedicated to fulfill this task. May the God of our fathers guide the leaders of this Nation so that the wisdom of the Most High may be ours today and America's for all time to come.

Strategy of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Clifford B. Ward, on the subject of the strategy of the United Nations. The article was published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

A good guess is that Winston Churchill came to this country principally for the purpose of slowing up any sentiment in this country for devoting major attention to our war with Japan until our war with Germany has been won. Only a few weeks ago, General MacArthur sent members of his staff to Washington, purportedly to ask more assistance in the Pacific area. There followed considerable agitation from others, including Senator CHANDLER, that we recognize our war with Japan for what it is, namely, a very dangerous thing, Congress itself was demanding action against the Japs. Then came Mr. Churchill to soothe the agitation by declaring that England would help us lick Japan after Germany had been licked.

The argument is now being advanced that anyone who urges aid to MacArthur is an isolationist, which is a peculiar line of reasoning. No one is for letting down either England or Russia, but if it has to be a choice between letting our own men down and letting the men of England and Russia down, I think most Americans would favor saving our own. I can be much more nonchalant about 40,000 Russians being captured by the Germans that I can be about 40,000 Americans languishing in the torture camps of Japan.

Japan, it must not be forgotten, has already won its war. It has defeated this country and England everywhere that it wished to defeat them. It outlined a course of conquest for an area in the Pacific and it has successfully put over that course of conquest. Uncle Sam and John Bull have been knocked flat on the floor. We are certain that we can come back and drive the Japs out of the area which it has already conquered, but we can't lie on the floor forever and then stage a come-back. The Japs are already solidifying their gains. They are entrenching themselves and strengthening their life lines. We have had plenty of trouble in driving them off one single island, yet we must drive them off many islands before we can again hold our heads up.

Senator CHANDLER is certainly not an isolationist, nor is he a Roosevelt hater. He and the President have been in perfect agreement about this country's foreign policy. But Senator CHANDLER seems to feel, as do most Americans, that before we make Europe safe, we had better overlook no bets to make this country safe. Some of the folks are poohpoohing the fears of people on the west coast that the Japs may invade this country. Why shouldn't the west coast be jittery, and why shouldn't we be just as sensitive to the fact that California is as much a part of this country as is New England?

Winston Churchill is not a villain because he comes to this country and attempts to sell a program of action which will safeguard England first. If I were an Englishman, I would certainly try to remove the danger from my own doorstep before I joined in a program to eliminate a danger miles off, but I am not an Englishman. Somebody in this country should be fighting for our men in the Pacific as Churchill is fighting for his own men.

If Germany is defeated tomorrow, we are still several years away from any possible defeat of Japan. Our real work will just then begin. In all likelihood, England will cooperate as Churchill promises she will, but there is going to be a difference of opinion about what the objective is. Churchill intimated in his speech that England is going back to reclaim all that was hers when Japan started on the move. Our purpose is not likely to be that, but rather to defeat Japan and reestablish a better deal for everyone in the Pacific area. We have something bigger at stake than merely reestablishment of the British imperialistic set-up. If England thinks we are not too concerned over reestablishing her Empire in the Pacific, maybe the cooperation will not be as enthusiastic as Churchill promises.

Germany must be defeated in this war, but so must Japan or our rather fat goose is going to be badly cooked.

The Battle of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle of Washington," by Jay Franklin, which was published in the June issue of the Railroad Trainman.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON

(By Jay Franklin)

About the best way to get a look at the raging "Battle of Washington" is to appraise it through the broad trends, away and above the pressures and critics.

Winston Churchill's speech is a question in point. He was the only man in the world who could say what he did say and have it carry the proper weight. The President of the United States could have said the very same words but, because at this moment in our national history we are bogged down in domestic issues and manufactured distrust, everything connected with Washington is viewed with a partisan political eye.

Churchill came into Congress sure of himself. At his finger tips he has the world situation catalogued. His manner and tone reflected confidence—not alone in the future but in the deeds and accomplishments of the past.

In every discreet manner possible he pleaded for understanding of the tremendous job which has been the role of the United Nations. He laid it on the line for his friend, President Roosevelt, in a way which could bring about no bitter denunciations from the most partisan. He told the Congress and the Nation as closely as he could of our joint efforts and he expressed the future hope, by which man must live, that the United Nations could accomplish as much or more in the days of peace as they have and will do in the days of war. He left some lines that will gain in importance in this Nation as we face a presidential year and the climax of the war effort.

They were:

"Lots of people can make good plans for winning the war if they have not got to carry them out. I dare say if I had not been in a responsible position I should have made a lot of excellent plans, and very likely should have brought them in one way or another to the notice of the executive authorities. But it is not possible to have full, open arguments about these matters. That is an additional hardship to those in charge—that such questions cannot be argued out and debated in public, except with enormous reticence, and even then there is great danger that the watching and listening enemy may derive some profit from what they hear."

An offside remark by Churchill, while touring around Washington with the President and Mrs. Roosevelt, also has some bearing on the battle of Washington and it points to the reason why such a speech by Churchill to Congress increases in importance. Churchill on one trip to a camp inquired about antiaircraft protection. He said that wherever he went it was provided. But then he said he was never over 15 minutes away from the enemy anywhere around London.

Chances are good that if the Capital of the United States was within such range many of the local fights would lessen in importance.

Take the matter of labor legislation. The United States Senate, after several years, became somewhat frightened over the possibility of a coal strike and gave the Connally bill an O. K. It went to the House where, for the same number of years in which the Senate has refused to act, the Representatives have passed and repassed restrictive labor bills. Immediately there was a rush among the rural legislators to rewrite the bill and get in their pet solutions to a real problem. The bills are now in committee and the show-down now is up to the House of Representatives.

For, bear in mind, the House has also used their legislative powers, knowing full well that the Senate would not concur, by passing labor legislation to appease some of the folks at home. Yet they knew that to tamper too much with the people of the Nation who are doing the actual work in the manufacturing, hauling, and shipping of the materials of war was dangerous.

A simple fact is that the problems in labor relations as well as much of the whole balancing program of the last 10 years are not things someone thought up just to garner votes on election day. The problems are real

and pressing. The effect of inflation upon the frozen wages of the Nation is indeed something different from the effects upon frozen capital. The farmers of the Nation are beginning to realize that there is something to the argument that from 30 to 90 percent of the price the consumer pays for his foods is eaten upon in distribution and handling charges—after they leave the farm. Eventually all of the people of the Nation will come to realize that we cannot afford a processors' paradise here at the expense of all the rest of us.

The "battles of Washington" which we must forego soon are those raging around taxes; the others which are meant to restrict some groups and aid others; for they are, in fact, purely domestic, economic campaigns carried on for the past 50 and more years. In time of war they are simply intensified, as are all other human problems.

A major condition in Washington at this time, and the one most overlooked, is that actually we have a national government in operation. It cannot function with the dictatorial ruthlessness of other nations. No one, including the President, has the power to behead or shoot. We operate within the framework of a democracy at war. Persuasion, fair play, patriotism, loyalty, and common sense are the weapons upon which the war managers must depend.

But the facts are that everyone is in Washington. The symbolic bankers are here. The industrialists have the run of the War Production Board. The Office of Price Administration actually consists of some politicians, representatives of the food industries, professors, economists, and consumers. The War Manpower Commission consists of the same comparative line-ups. The War Labor Board and its many panels are composed of employee representatives, employer representatives, and representatives of the public. On this Board it is important to note that the public representatives usually side with the labor representatives—because, after all, the employees make up the greater part of the public.

The frictions, fights, confusions, and condemnations are, or should be, an accepted part of American life. The struggle goes on every day of peace so it follows that it cannot be entirely—under a democracy—eliminated in days of war.

Underneath the surface, the abused executive officials of Government are working day and night. That they have been effective and that things are being well managed is obvious to any thinking man. Winston Churchill reviewed the problems. He cited the successes. He said at another point in his speech:

"All this gives the lie to the Nazi and Fascist taunts that parliamentary democracies are incapable of waging effective war. Presently we will furnish them with further examples."

For any of us to say at this time that worry was not expressed in this Nation about our ability to wage a total war without almost total restraints would now be foolish. All the barnstorming isolationists pointed to the alleged destruction of all freedom the minute we went to war. That the President must also have worried about it is plain reasoning because he had the fall of France staring at him and the, at times, doubtful ability of England to withstand the onslaught.

But, somehow, we have weathered the storm. We are strong, feared, and going on the offensive—from one end of the Pacific Ocean to the other; from Africa to China; in the Atlantic and wherever else an enemy installs a gun or guides a ship or flies a plane.

The enemy knows this full well. Churchill recited it. Army and Navy experts know it.

What in the hell is the matter with some of the rest of us?

Editorial Tribute to Josephus Daniels From Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the Tacoma News-Tribune of Tacoma, Wash., recently published an editorial paying a very beautiful tribute to Josephus Daniels, who is back in the editorial harness and is now actively in charge of his own newspaper, the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer. Because this is a well-deserved tribute to a great American whose life has been a most valuable contribution to the public, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER SAGE

Josephus Daniels is 81 and is still actively editing the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer. His age must make him pretty nearly the sage of sages of the newspaper field. Until very lately, he was rendering active service as American Ambassador to Mexico.

He must look back tolerantly on the days of the First World War. As the Secretary of the Navy, he was a target for impassioned partisans who professed not to believe that a good-natured, slow-speaking southerner was the right type to head a hard-hitting navy. They forgot that southerners are nothing new in the history of the Cabinet post. No less than five Secretaries of the Navy have come from North Carolina, a record beaten only by Massachusetts, which has had seven. And as time went on and our Navy showed itself in good shape, it came to be recognized that Daniels had done an excellent job.

Now he is back at the newspaper work he loves, hitting the heads he thinks need it. He has not yet lost the skill and courage which enabled him to finish off a likely prospect for the Governorship of North Carolina with this brief news item: "J. C. C. was in town yesterday. He came by the Southern Railway and used pass No. 15,469."

Americans generally will wish many more years of usefulness for Josephus.

Railroad Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting speech delivered by Mr. George M. Crowson, assistant to the president of the Illinois Central system, before the Traffic Club of New Orleans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is one respect in which the Illinois Central is different from every other railroad in the United States. That is in the division of its mileage as between the North and the South. Unlike any other major railroad on the continent, the Illinois Central is almost evenly divided by the Ohio River—3,084 miles north and 3,523 miles south. This unique location insures our direct interest in the flow of commerce not only within but also between these two sections of the country. It puts butter on our bread to do everything we can do to increase the amount of business that is carried on and consequently the amount of traffic to be handled in the North, in the South, and in both directions between the North and the South.

It has been suggested that if the Illinois Central had been completed as much as 1 generation earlier to link the North and the South the terrible and tragic War between the States might not have occurred. I do not want to take the time to develop that thought here, but I mention it because I believe it brings out the fact—I am sure you all will recognize it as a fact—that commerce is one of the greatest unifying factors in our national life. Acquaintance and understanding follow our trade routes. The Illinois Central, therefore, by reason of its North-South location and its efforts to stimulate commerce in and between the North and the South, has contributed, and is contributing, to increased understanding and appreciation as between these two great areas whose only division is a river bridged by the railroads and united by their rails and the commerce that follows them.

This unique location of the Illinois Central as a north-and-south railroad, whose interest so obviously lies in fostering the free flow of commerce in and between the North and South, gives me an excuse to touch upon a topic that has recently been a subject of very considerable discussion in the South and elsewhere throughout the country. That topic is the relation of the railroads to the development of the South, particularly its industrial development, and the relation between such development and the services that are provided by the railroads and the charges that are made for those services.

In taking up this topic, I suppose I ought to make it plain that I do not make any claim to being an expert on freight rates. Anything that needs to be said on this subject from the standpoint of a rate expert I shall leave to others. My claim upon your indulgence is that I am interested in this question as a railroad man, I have made some study of it, and I have reached certain conclusions about it which in all modesty but equal earnestness I believe are worth laying before you.

For quite some time now the South has been making very great strides in industrial development. We all know that to be true, for the evidence is all around us. However, I doubt if the rate and extent of Southern industrial development are as fully known and recognized in the South as I believe they ought to be. A recent study made by the Interstate Commerce Commission shows graphically and specifically how great such development has been and how it compares with the development that has occurred elsewhere throughout the country. The study to which I refer is a study of the economic development of the United States by freight-rate territories. I have examined this study carefully, and these are the high lights of it:

First, it shows that the population of the South increased 2,353,700 between 1930 and

1940—an increase of more than 10 percent—while the population of the North increased 5 percent and the population of the entire country increased 7 percent in the same period.

Second, it shows that the value of manufactured products in the South increased $272,313,000 between 1929 and 1939—a gain of 5 percent—while the value of manufactured products in every other rate territory decreased and in the North decreased 23 percent in the same period.

Third, it shows that employment in manufacturing industries in the South increased 5 percent between 1929 and 1939, while employment in manufacturing industries in the North decreased 11 percent in the same period.

In other words, these three yardsticks of population, industrial employment and manufacturing output all show that the South has gained in industrial development over every other part of the United States. Thus this study goes to prove what we all know to be true as a matter of observation—that the development of the South, and particularly its industrial development, has not been held back for any reason. Obviously it must be concluded from such proof that transportation conditions, including both service and rates, which have a bearing upon industrial development are not unfavorable but are favorable as to industrial development of the South.

The same conclusion is supported by the experience of the Illinois Central in its industrial development program. The experience of our railroad in this regard is of particular interest because of the division of its mileage between the North and the South, to which I have referred. In the 5 years 1939–42, inclusive, the Illinois Central had a hand in the location of 552 new industries on its system lines north and south. For obvious reasons, we measure the importance of new industries by the amount of traffic they produce. These 552 new industries established on the Illinois Central in this 5-year period are producing some 320,000 carloads of freight traffic annually. Of these 552 new industries, 185 were located in the North and 367 in the South. The northern industries are producing nearly 80,000, and the southern industries more than 242,000 carloads of freight traffic annually. I submit this comparison as further evidence of the relatively greater strides that are being made in the industrial development of the South, and, of course, with the help of the southern railroads.

You all know what many of these great new southern industries are—chemicals, rayon, and other textiles, pulp and paper, tires, aluminum, fluorescent lamps, tobacco, iron and steel, furniture and other woodworking plants, to name a few of them. All of them are industries which have been attracted to the South by conditions favorable to industrial development—the availability of raw materials and supplies, a good labor situation, lower living costs, favorable tax rates, and friendly laws and public regulations. I omit transportation only to emphasize it by stating it separately. It naturally follows that the railroads have been providing and are providing the service and rates on raw materials and finished products which enable these new industries to compete with industries elsewhere in the markets of the country, including the concentrated markets which are naturally to be found in the more densely populated northern part of the country.

The extent to which southern industrial products reach northern markets is revealed by another study that was recently made by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This was a study of the interterritorial movement of carload freight traffic. I have examined this study also. It gives a very interesting account of the movement of all kinds of freight traffic between each section of the country and every rate section of the country. But here is the story in a nutshell as it relates to this subject: Of all the carload shipments of manufactured goods originated in the North, 8 percent moves into the South, whereas, of all the carload shipments of manufactured goods originated in the South, 31 percent moves into the North. This official finding should dispose of any contention that the products of the South are barred from the concentrated northern markets by rates or any other factor related to transportation.

It occurs to me that some of the disturbing things that have been said about the relation between freight rates and industrial development in the South have been based upon a fundamental misconception of that relation. I believe I can clear up that misconception with one statement which you as traffic men will instantly recognize to be true. That statement is this: Freight rates are the result—and not the cause—of industrial development. Rates in the South, as elsewhere, are made to move traffic; as traffic offers, the rates are made to move it. That is the history of industrial development. The great industrial development that has occurred and is now going on in the South is an indication that such rates here are being made as they are needed.

The Illinois Central has been working for the industrial development of the South over a long period of years. In all that time our railroad has never lost a prospective industry for want of the freight rates needed to gather its raw materials and put its products in their markets on a competitive basis with other industries. I do not have any doubt that every other railroad throughout the South could say the same thing. I have never heard of a single industry that has ever been lost to the South on account of freight rates. I am certain there never will be such a loss so long as there is no interference with the cooperative method by which freight rates have been and are being made.

It has been suggested that this cooperative method of making freight rates, through a meeting of minds of shippers, carriers, and public authorities, be discarded, and that instead there be exact uniformity of freight rates mile-for-mile throughout the country. Uniformity is a pretty theory, but every traffic man knows it would not be pretty practice. The thought is not original with me, but I suggest that uniform freight rates would fit the business of the railroads no better than a uniform size of clothing would fit every man in the United States. Suppose we were to have uniform freight rates, and on the day they go into effect let every man appear in public in a suit of clothes made to fit the so-called average individual. The grotesque sight of men of all shapes and sizes—tall and short, lean and fat—all attired in one size of clothing would illustrate the then state of business, with all its diversities, under uniform freight rates. The South would be the greatest sufferer from uniform mile-for-mile rates because of its greater distances and therefore higher rates on competitive business to the great concentrated markets of the North.

To sum up, the South has been and is making great strides in industrial development. Southern industry is well and increasingly diversified. It is selling a substantial part of its industrial output in northern markets. The South is not dependent upon the North for manufactured products, and its independence in that regard is constantly increasing. Railroad and industry are not antagonists; they are partners. The railroads of the South have had a great deal to do with industrial development in this section—inducing industries to locate here, providing the service that is needed, making rates to move the traffic. The railroads can be depended upon to strive earnestly and unceasingly for the continued industrial development of the South, not for altruistic reasons but because it is in their own interest to do so.

Bituminous Coal Production in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "West Virginia May Set Record in Coal Output," published in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star. West Virginia is the largest producer of bituminous coal. The article shows that it is probable that the output of bituminous coal in West Virginia this year will exceed all records.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST VIRGINIA MAY SET RECORD IN COAL OUTPUT

CHARLESTON, W. VA., June 10.—West Virginia, the Nation's largest bituminous coal-producing State, may equal or exceed its record output of 1942 despite current contract difficulties, a report of the State mines department showed.

The chance for a new record, although threatened by recent shut-downs of operations and the present negotiation squabble, was based on a department report covering the first 4 months of the year.

Miners in West Virginia have dug 52,352,032 tons during the January-April period, compared with 50,361,416 tons in the corresponding period of 1942, a year in which 156,752,599 tons were produced for a mark unexcelled in the State's history.

Work stoppages prior to the expiration of the first contract dead line May 1 caused a loss of about 27,900 tons during April, since the production that month amounted to 13,671,421 tons, against 13,699,353 tons a year ago. The April 1943 output, however, was higher than either January or February.

Terming it too early to ascertain just what the final effect of the work stoppages would be on the 1943 total, State Mines Chief Jesse Redyard pointed out that every day lost has had a definite effect.

British Public Opinion on Contributions to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, with our vast expenditures and with our good-neighbor policy and with our liberal lend-

lease grants it is interesting to note what credit other countries give our war effort and to what degree our efforts are appreciated. The following article by Helen Essary, writing in the Times-Herald of June 10, 1943, should be read by every American:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

A poll of British public opinion on relative contributions of the nations to the war effort was published recently, and Americans were distinguished by last place.

To be exact about it, 50 percent of the Britons polled thought Russia had done more to win the war than had even their own country; 42 percent put Britain next and that is surprising only that they rated their native land after another. But China came third, with the favorable consideration of 5 percent, and we were down at the bottom, admired by only 3 percent.

Thoughtful Britons who read the result of the British poll also must have been horrified at the answers of the British public. Thoughtful Britons must have seen in these answers a dangerous challenge to the post-war Utopia for which the United Nations are giving the lives of hundreds of thousands of their bravest and best. For it is evident to anybody who understands public opinion that these answers are the result of definite British propaganda.

It may have been necessary a few months ago for Britain to administer mental food to the British public which would boost the British morale at the expense of their allies, particularly their American allies. Recent United Nations successes have made such dosage no longer necessary.

Thoughtful Britons must see that the time has come to change the attitude of the British people and change it at once and sharply. The British public can no longer safely be told that the United States is of poor assistance.

Such a distortion of fact influences the people of Britain against the ally they most need. It enriches the already fertile soil of Anglo-American misunderstanding.

I say again and without expectation of disagreement that such misunderstanding as revealed by the Gallup poll is the result of definite British propaganda. Otherwise the simple people of Britain would have known and appreciated the cooperation they have been getting from the United States.

If the British people have the courage for which the world has long been crediting them, they can stand a few truths about their own part in the war effort. It is also only honorable that British propaganda should tell the people of Britain of the splendid part Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have played in the preservation of the British Isles.

This, I think, is a job for Winston Churchill in person, and to be undertaken at once, with "energy and harmony," to use a phrase of his own.

For the most Britain has fought a defensive warfare. She, like Russia, has had her back to the wall. Both have fought hard. Without minimizing in the least the Battle of Britain—I speak of the bombings by the Germans—in all the bombings 20,000 tons of explosives were dropped on Britain. About the same amount is now being dropped monthly on German cities. As many as 2,000 tons of bombs are dropped on German cities in a single night's raid.

Recently British troops finished proudly in Africa. American troops also were there fighting and dying. The Battle of Dunkerque was a defensive battle. Tobruk fell without glory to Britain. At Narvik, the British retired. Another point not to be overlooked: England continues to keep 4,000,000 troops at home, guarding her own shores. How many of these will be released in the immediate offensive?

It is unfortunate to have to refer to such reality. Doing so may inspire the old name-calling of "Anglophobe." But since, obviously, the British people have been given a distorted story, they must somehow be shown the events of the war in proper perspective.

With the wish to offer something splendid to protest to the world against the destruction of democracy, we offered to our friends the endless resources of lend-lease.

On March 10, 1941, 8 months before Pearl Harbor, lend-lease was set in motion. Undoubtedly, our generosity in thus providing armament may have had a selfish tinge to some minds.

However, it was true that at the moment our own military men were begging for stronger fortifications in the Panama Canal. Yet we ignored the protection of the home front.

And later, we turned away from our own heroes at Bataan. Let them starve to death or be murdered because we believed aid to them would divert supply ships from England's needs.

I notice also that small nations are forgotten in the British war poll. Certainly the Netherlands contributed what she could in the Dutch East Indies. England seems to have overlooked that, just as she overlooked the fact that the first contingent of Canadian troops arrived in England in December 1939, and the sinking of the biggest Italian warship by an Australian crew, and the Royal Air Force flying schools in Canada.

Of course, Russia has fought superbly. But Russia has had a knife at her throat. Her contribution to the war has been herself. The United States has also contributed heroically to the war in Russia. Lend-lease again. And as the weeks go on and the lists of American dead and wounded come in we will feel more deeply our part in the struggle. And much more deeply will we resent a British governmental attitude that tries to keep hidden our share toward producing a sound post-war world.

What is it we are fighting for, anyhow? A continuation of hatred and jealousy, or for that truth and cooperation that sometimes seems to exist only in pretty, vapid speeches?

Britain needs to begin pro-United States propaganda—now. Or a decent peace cannot be made.

Noblesse Oblige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of Gary Post Tribune, Gary, Ind., June 8, 1943:

"NOBLESSE OBLIGE"

"Don't ignore the racial issue in this war. That is in favor of the Japanese unless we do something to counteract it. Pride of race is a primitive instinct. Right now it makes China look ridiculous to be fighting on the side of the white man. The Japanese are exploiting this factor to the utmost."

These words were spoken in a recent New York interview by the celebrated Chinese scholar and philosopher, Dr. Lin Yutang.

The author of The Importance of Living, is convinced, he said, that one of the most effective ways of keeping China in the war is for the United States to stop discriminating against the Chinese, its hard-fighting, heroic allies.

Unless America attacks this race problem squarely, maintains Dr. Lin, "nobody will have won this war except the Rudyard Kiplings."

Dr. Lin is right. No one can blame the people of Free China if they view the post-war aims of their allies with suspicion so long as we in America keep on our statutes without modification the Exclusion Act of 1924 prohibiting the immigration of orientals and depriving them of the right to become citizens.

The position of General Chiang's government is clear enough. All it wants out of this war is to get out from under the Japanese yoke and to recover its lost territories. It has stated explicitly, time and again, that it wants no land which belongs to other people.

Having taken this stand, it is easy to see how the Chinese have been confused, particularly by some of the utterances of the British Prime Minister, and how they have been sometimes led to wonder whether, indeed, they are fighting for the principles of the Atlantic Charter, or merely to help recover extraterritorial possessions lost by the white man to the little brown men from Nippon.

Happily, it begins to look as though we, through our Representatives in Congress, are about to demonstrate to the Chinese that we are prepared to recognize the past errors of our ways and that we mean to be fair with them in the future.

Three bills are now pending in the House of Representatives the effect of which would be to relax the now ironclad restrictions of the Exclusion Act so far as concerns the Chinese. These measures are aimed especially at restoring the right to citizenship and the establishment of immigration on a quota basis.

In the present circumstances, with virtually every American vowing friendship and admiration for the plucky Chinese, there is little doubt that one of these measures will prevail. Such legislation cannot come too soon, for we have been excluding Chinese specifically ever since 1882. Even now, while ranking Free China as one of our three great war allies on the one hand, we extend the right of entry to only 100 Chinese a year, and withhold even from these the right of ever enjoying the privileges of American citizenship.

In the immediate post-war period it may be that we shall witness a revival of the endemic fear we have harbored for so long of oriental competition tending to undermine the interests of our own workingmen.

But this fear has never had any real basis in fact, for even if 10 times the number of Chinese now permitted to enter the country were to work for 20 cents an hour—and even the humblest Chinese laborer is learning these days to ask much more—the impairment of American labor's welfare would be insignificant.

As pointed out recently in the magazine America, "there still is room in this country, if the Chinese quota were many times what it is now, for hard-working citizens, particularly in our rural areas."

Our Oriental Exclusion Act, as it relates to the Chinese, is quite naturally regarded by them as a slap in the face which they never deserved, and it is only a matter of common justice that it be changed so that the United States will no longer be in the position of having singled out this industrious and heroic people, of all the others in the world, for what amounts to undemocratic discrimination.

Americans have never been unwelcome in China, a fact justifiably given emphasis in recent speeches by General Chiang and his charming wife. If we are the protagonists of democracy and equality we like to claim we are, it is time we began accepting this hospitality on a reciprocal basis.

Commercial Feeding Difficulties

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, farmers are generally complaining because they cannot purchase the necessary concentrates to make up their feed rations. They are being told by the O. P. A. to purchase ready-made feeds. Feed dealers complain that they cannot buy corn, which is the base of most of these commercial feeds. This creates a great deal of confusion and it is going to have a far-reaching effect in our production of food, particularly eggs, meat, and milk.

The same kind of management on the part of O. P. A. is going to greatly restrict our supply of canned goods during this season. The season is getting off to an unfavorable start for a good supply of food and the prospects are that the production of food this season will fall far below that of 1942.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point the recommendations of the canning industry that I believe will be helpful.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

CANNING INDUSTRY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Employment of personnel who are practical and not inexperienced theorists.

2. Abandonment of regional area prices and return to formula prices based on the provision of the law that the processor of farm products shall receive a reasonable profit. Formula prices may result in some hardship cases, and a division should be immediately set up to dispose, with prompt dispatch, of old cases now pending as well as future cases.

3. Elimination of present regulations requiring compulsory Government grades on invoices and return to the use of brands or commercial grades, which years of experience have proven to be the most practical method of promoting consumer good will, quality, and production. Also permit the use of the commercial arbitration system established in all important markets in the last 25 years.

4. Increased costs of the 1943 packs to be reflected in price ceilings.

5. The industry is opposed to subsidies on principle, but if they are employed in connection with price control, said subsidies, together with the ceiling prices, should cover the costs of processing plus a reasonable profit. In every case it should be made clear that the processor acts only as agent for the ultimate beneficiary and is never the recipient of any subsidy.

6. Transfer of complete control over manpower and wages of processing employees to War Food Administration, where responsibility for production now rests.

7. In all cases the experience of the industry should be consulted in advance of promulgation of every regulation as required by law.

Little Red Hen in Modernized Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Gould, of the New York Times, which was copied by the Storm Lake Pilot Tribune, of Storm Lake, Iowa, one of the leading newspapers in my district:

LITTLE RED HEN IN MODERNIZED VERSION

"Who will get me a hired hand?" asked Farmer McGregor.

"Not I," said the Employment Service. "We are having trouble locating welders at $140 a week, and precision tool jiggers at $23 a day, and we don't know a soul that can cradle wheat."

"Not I," said the local draft board. "You better find a school kid."

"Not I," said the high-school principal. "This week we're helping the grocer paste ration coupons."

"Not I," said the county agent. "We are busy now teaching women to make plum jam without sugar, syrup, molasses, or plums."

"Not I," said the local defense plant. "We are on a cost-plus basis, and absenteeism costs $10,000 a minute."

"Not I," said the Manpower Commission. "We are working on your problem, but just at present there is a shortage of stenographers."

"Not I," said the War Production Board. "You haven't made the proper application."

"Not I," said the Food Coordinator. "I will issue a directive soon."

"Not I," said the Lend-Lease authority. "We are powerless to act under existing regulations."

"Not I," said the congressional delegation. "Without fear of successful contradiction, we may infer that democracy is at the crossroads, and the flag of freedom must be unfurled from the pinnacle of the globe with blood, sweat and tears until man can again bask in the freedom we fought so valiantly to perpetuate."

"Not I" said the neighbors. "We are working in the shipyards."

So Farmer McGregor with the assistance of his grandmother harvested his wheat. "Now,' said Farmer McGregor, "who will help me eat this wheat?"

"I will," said the county chairman, the dealers, the machinery people, the employment service, the draft board, the county agent, the defense workers, the high school teachers, the Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the welders and shipfitters, the Lend-Lease authority, the neighbors, the Army, the Navy, Coast Guard, Marines, airplane spotters, WAACS, WAVES, SPARS, WAAFS, Russians, British, Chinese, South Americans, Hindus, Eskimos, Mrs. Roosevelt, Congress, the Maritime Commission, the United Service Organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, Secretary Ickes, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and everybody else from Sitka to Casablanca, from Istanbul to Vladivostok, from Maine to California, until the hubbub was unanimous."

The Gasoline Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on several different occasions, I have taken this floor and urged that an increase in the price of crude oil be allowed. This is one of the major factors in relieving the gasoline shortage on the eastern seaboard at the present time. It would bring back into production marginal fields in Pennsylvania and elsewhere. It is something that is needed all over the United States to further the petroleum industry.

I understand that that is being reconsidered today. I hope that this increase in the price will be allowed. It is granted that the gasoline situation on the eastern seaboard must have attention.

However, to take away the gasoline from a small farming population, scattered over a wide area, would not materially benefit the millions and millions of people here on the eastern seaboard. It would not solve their problem.

The great agricultural areas of my district need gasoline for the production of food. There is no pleasure driving when farmers and businessmen are working 12 and 14 hours a day. Practically all of our gasoline consumption is directly connected with the production of foodstuffs and related essential activity.

My territory is not served by a network of busses, streetcars, and other such forms of transportation. A great many of the branch-line railroads have not only been abandoned, but the rails have been taken up.

To further curtail the use of gasoline in Nebraska means to hasten an approaching famine, because it will destroy the production of food, which is the Nation's major war industry.

The price of crude oil should be raised and every possible improvement in the transportation, storage, and distribution of gasoline and oils should be made. This Congress should direct its attention to a greater production of gasoline. That is the answer to this distressing problem.

Recent Practical Aspects of the Laws of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paper entitled "Recent Practical Aspects of the Laws of War" by Maj. Willard B. Cowles, J. A. G. D., delivered before a meeting of the committee on military and naval law of the American Bar Association on May 26, 1943:

In ancient times sacking, pillage, slaughter, carnage, and devastation generally were rampant in time of war; wounded were left unaided on the battlefield to die; and it was usual for belligerents to incite their people to attack and despoil all enemy subjects, at home as well as abroad, by every means at their disposal. Persons who voluntarily and unconditionally surrendered were often put to death. The slaughter of women and children was frequent. After a time the practice of enslaving prisoners of war became customary. Horace reflected the reason for this in his statement: "When you can sell a prisoner, slay him not." A system of ransoming prisoners of war developed later. The state of the development of this aspect of international law when Grotius wrote is reflected in the following sentence from his work: "So far as the law of nations is concerned, the right of killing such slaves, that is, captives taken in war, is not precluded at any time, although it is restricted now more, now less, by the laws of states." (Book III, ch. IV, sec. x, par. 2.) During the eighteenth century the idea began to develop that wars were primarily interstate relations and that individuals should not be considered as enemies to the same extent as their governments. Yet in the early nineteenth century Napoleon seized and confined all Englishmen in his territories, some of them remaining in prison as long as 11 years.

In the early part of the nineteenth century the treatment of prisoners of war and the lack of care of wounded soldiers on the battlefield were still shockingly inhumane in many respects despite attempts on the part of military men, writers on international law, and others to ameliorate them. The first important steps were taken at the time of our war between the Union and the Confederacy. On April 24, 1863, the United States War Department issued the now-famous General Orders, No. 100, "Instructions for the government of the armies of the United States in the field" and in 1864 the first Red Cross convention went into force.

We have often heard that international law should be codified. The laws of war, which I hardly need say is a part of international law, have, to a large extent, already been codified. A publication of the War Department, a basic field manual entitled "The Rules of Land Warfare," is such a code. It contains 403 numbered paragraphs, most of which state rules of the law of war. Among other things, it contains various rules concerning the conduct of hostilities; rights of prisoners of war and duties of captors in relation to them; penalties for violations of the laws of war, armistices, military occupation, the rights and duties of the Red Cross in the field, etc. There are British, French, and German manuals of the same sort.

This field manual has an interesting history which goes back to the Civil War—indeed, in an historical sense, to the Mexican War. During the Mexican War a young officer, Lt. Henry W. Halleck—a graduate of West Point and a lawyer—was a member of the staff of the Commander of the Pacific Squadron. In that capacity he "was often required to give opinions on questions of international law growing out of the operations" of that war. At that time Halleck started a series of notes and extracts which, by 1861, had grown into his work on international law, published that year. In the meantime he had made the acquaintance of Dr. Francis Lieber, a distinguished scholar, then a professor of international law at Columbia University.

In 1861 President Lincoln, apparently somewhat against his better judgment, was induced to commission Halleck a major general. A year later Halleck had become General in Chief of the United States Army. General Halleck's soldiers called him "old brains." Halleck, the immediate predecessor of General Grant, has subsequently been described as a better international lawyer than a general.

During Halleck's tour of duty as General in Chief several serious problems arose involving the laws of war. The Confederate authorities claimed the legal right to send soldiers in civilian clothes inside the Federal lines, there to lie in wait for, and to strike at, Union detachments; to burn bridges and buildings; and to destroy persons and property. As a corollary, the Confederate Government not only demanded that such individuals be treated as ordinary belligerents and given the rights of prisoners of war when captured, but declared that if such Confederate soldiers were treated as spies or guerrillas they would execute Union prisoners of war in reprisal.

Problems also arose in the Union Army. Pursuant to orders of inadequately trained Federal officers, wanton destruction of property was taking place in the South. Reports of such activities were coming in to Halleck in alarming numbers. In this situation Halleck called on his friend Lieber, who replied to the problem of the southern irregulars with the now classic article on guerrilla parties. In order to instruct the Union officers generally on the rules of land warfare, Halleck then called upon Lieber to state the then existing international laws of war in the form of a comprehensive code. Lieber drew up a code of 157 sections. Because of Halleck's position and interest Lieber's code became far more than a writer's dream. It was officially adopted by the United States Army. The code was issued in 1863 by order of the Secretary of War as General Orders, 100 of that year. The Lieber Code has the distinction of being the first practical codification, not only of the laws of war but of any aspect of international law. It became the basis, and, although much has been added since as a result of experience, is still the basis, of the rules of land warfare as they exist today.

It was Lieber's hope that some such code might be adopted internationally by all of the states of the world. Though Lieber's hope was not realized during his lifetime, the idea was taken up by the unofficial Institute of International Law; his code was discussed officially and at length at the Brussels Conference of 1874, and much of the code was officially adopted on a world-wide basis at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907.

One might spend a whole evening on Lieber himself, but this is not such an occasion. It must suffice to say that Elihu Root, in opening his presidential address before the American Society of International Law in 1913, said: "This year, 1913, is the fiftieth anniversary of a very important event in the history of international law—the adoption and enforcement by the American Government of the code of rules governing the conduct of armies in the field, which is known to the American Army as General Orders No. 100, of 1863." Root closed his address by saying that if the American Society of International Law were about to choose a patron saint, and the roll were to be called, his voice would answer, "Francis Lieber." (1913 Proceedings, American Society of International Law, pp. 8, 21.)

Upon the outbreak of the Spanish-American War Lieber's Instructions were republished and applied by the United States forces in that war. The Hague conferences had the benefit of the experiences of the Franco-Prussian, the Spanish-American, the Boer, and the Russo-Japanese Wars. After the First Hague Conference in 1899, the British Government, in 1904, published a handbook on the Rules of Land Warfare, prepared by Holland, the famous English jurist; and, in 1913, the British Government issued a still more complete code drawn up chiefly by Oppenheim.

Some writers on international law, especially in recent times, have stressed the problems of the international rules of peace much more than those of war. In this country, by contrast with Great Britain, legal scholars in the Army and Navy have done much of the important work on the laws of war. A number of the works on international law in this country, which stress the laws of war, have been written by Army and Navy officers. Halleck's work, which first appeared in 1861, went through three editions and is still exceedingly useful. Halleck also published a student edition in 1866, which was a popular text in that day. Maj. Gen. George B. Davis, the Judge Advocate General of the Army from 1901 to 1911, published his Outlines of International Law in 1887. Maj. Herbert C. Fook published a work on Prisoners of War in 1924. On the naval side, the publications of the Naval War College are familiar. Rear Admiral Charles H. Stockton published a book on the Laws and Usages of War at Sea, also a Manual of International Law for the Use of Naval Officers, in addition to his better-known work, Outlines of International Law. In 1895 the West Publishing Co. printed a handbook on international law written by Capt. Edwin F. Glenn, who was then an acting judge advocate of the United States Army.

I mention Captain Glenn for a particular purpose. After the Second Hague Conference and after the British publications had appeared the United States Army realized that it needed a code which would integrate Lieber's work with the new provisions of the Hague Conventions. Research reveals that in 1913 it was Glenn, then Colonel Glenn, who was assigned the job, at the Army War College, of writing a complete manual on the rules of land warfare. The first United States Army Field Manual on the Rules of Land Warfare appeared the next year, 1914. It was reprinted in 1917, with only two minor changes of form; revised in 1934 in order to incorporate the results of the Geneva Conference of 1929; and republished again in 1940 with a few omissions, changes, and additions made by the secretary of this committee, Col. Archibald King.

In connection with the Geneva Conference, where the present prisoners-of-war convention was adopted, it is of interest to note that Maj. Gen. Allen W. Gullion, now provost marshal general, was an adviser. He is now in charge of the administration of that convention on the part of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George B. Davis, the Judge Advocate General of the Army in 1907, was a military delegate to the Hague Conference of that year.

So much for background material. I now turn to some practical aspects of the laws of war and some legal problems in connection therewith. No particular thread will run through the subjects discussed except that most of them will be related, in one way or another, to the Field Manual on the Rules of Land Warfare.

During the course of the present war, we have heard considerable about the invention and use of new weapons and the employment of new tactics, such as flame throwers, parachutists, ski troopers, panzer divisions, and commandos. There is a tendency on the part of people generally, when new and effective instruments of warfare are first used, to consider the persons using them as operating outside the law This feeling existed as far back as the invention of the crossbow. The same reaction was evidenced at the time of the invention of the musket and the bayonet, and the same feeling is apparent today in the often-heard statement, made by civilians, that they would shoot parachutists while they were coming down. The Germans have expressed a similar attitude toward the commandos, and the Japanese toward enemy forces engaged in aerial bombardment. But commando raids are like, and are as legal as, cavalry raids which were practiced generally in past wars. Aviators dropping bombs on military objectives, on defended places, or during the course of valid reprisals cannot properly be deemed to be acting contrary to the laws of war.

There is no valid basis for refusing quarter to troops using new instruments of warfare. It may be presumed that once we learn of a new method we will adopt it ourselves, unless it is barbarous.

Americans were justifiably shocked by the annouucement that the Japanese had tried and either executed or imprisoned the American aviators who were captured after bombing Japan. As you all know, the Japanese refused to give them the rights of prisoners of war to which they were entitled, on the ground that they had deliberately bombed and strafed nonmilitary objectives and civilians. Probably every American is convinced that these aviators did not deliberately bomb nonmilitary objectives or strafe civilians. An American who returned on the *Gripsholm* is reported as saying that it was true that civilians were killed. He believed, however, that they were killed by Japanese dive bombers shooting while diving toward the earth, attacking American planes. Whether or not this is true, I do not know. But on what we all believe to be the fact, our aviators certainly committed no war crimes and consequently should have been given all the rights of prisoners of war. Giving them the death penalty or imprisonment was a definite violation of the rules of international law.

There has been some criticism in this country with reference to the quantity of food allocated to prisoners of war. The objections are to foods which are rationed or scarce enough soon to be put on the ration list. Article 11 of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929, which appears as paragraph 84 of the Field Manual, provides that "the food ration of prisoners of war shall be equal in quantity and quality to that of troops at base camps." In order to comply with this provision the food ration of prisoners of war must be the same, in quantity as well as quality, as the rations of our troops while at base camps. For example, if our troops at base camps are served eggs a certain number of times a week, prisoners of war must also be served a substantially similar amount of eggs. Criticism here against feeding prisoners of war in this country the same type of menu as our troops receive seems to overlook the fact that if we violate this provision of the Geneva Convention reprisals will presumably be taken against our own boys who are prisoners of war in Axis countries. We have already seen, in the manacling case, an example of reprisals against prisoners of war.

This provision of the Geneva Convention—that the food rations of prisoners of war shall be equal in quantity and quality to that of troops at base camps—ought to be changed. Take the Japanese situation, for example: If they feed our men who are prisoners of war in Japan the same type of food as their own troops, the principal item of diet may be rice. The present treaty provision fails to set up a single standard for the quantity and quality of food. It simply requires the captor government to feed their prisoners of war in the same manner as their own troops, whatever they may feed their troops.

Paragraph 104 of the Rules of Land Warfare provides that work done by prisoners of war shall have no direct relation to war operations. One of the current problems is to decide under particular fact situations whether or not proposed work for prisoners of war would have a direct relation to war operations.

It seems not to be generally known that captured officers are paid while in captivity.

We have all heard the stories connected with the popular ballad of the day, Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition. A chaplain under the laws of war, if captured, is not held as a prisoner of war but is returned, as soon as convenient, to his own forces. The reason for this is that, although he is a uniformed officer in the forces, he is in a special class of noncombatants, which includes members of the medical and the so-called sanitary corps. Should a chaplain take part in combat activity he would lose this special privilege. Of more importance than his personal situation is the fact that if many chaplains or other such noncombatants should often engage in fighting, the enemy would presumably hear of it and might draw the conclusion that his enemy was ignoring the rules of warfare. Serious reprisals might result.

Ruses are valid so long as they do not involve treachery or perfidy. For instance, if our troops, or Axis troops, should don hats and overcoats of the enemy and march up to a military objective with the purpose of destroying it, carrying the enemy's flag, this would be a valid ruse, provided the enemy's coats, hats, and flag were discarded before going into action.

The situation I am now to describe must be done in somewhat general terms as I am not at liberty to specify the details. After Benedict Arnold turned traitor in the Revolutionary War and became a general in the British Army, he and a force of British troops invaded various cities in this country. Recently one of our large institutions purchased the papers of a British general, prominent in the American Revolution, who had been one of Arnold's superior officers. Among the papers was a large bound folio manuscript volume, the contents of which appeared to be copies of letters between two prominent American figures of that time. Labeled, say, volume No. 10, it was apparently a part of a series. Upon finding the volume among the papers, the archivist of the institution sent a photostatic copy of the binding to the head archivist of the State concerned, who wrote back that he had identical volumes and that volume 10 was missing. He is convinced that the volume was once a part of the archives of his State and now demands its return. Apparently Arnold had taken this volume as a part of the loot acquired during a raid on the city and had subsequently turned it over to one of his superior officers.

The legal title to this volume did not vest in the British Government. It is true that, when a belligerent captures public property of an enemy, title generally passes to the captor state, but exception is made respecting state papers, historical records, public archives, land titles, legal documents, etc. It is interesting to note in connection with this case, which is current today, that article 7 of the Definitive Treaty of Peace concluded with Great Britain, September 3, 1783, provides that His Britannic Majesty shall "order and cause all archives, records, deeds, and papers belonging to any of the said States or their citizens, which in the course of the war may have fallen into the hands of their officers, to be forthwith restored and delivered to the proper States and the persons to whom they belong." Should title to this volume be litigated, it seems clear that the decision will go in favor of the State concerned.

On December 3, 1942, the Judge Advocate General of the Army held that the files of German and Italian consular representatives taken prisoner of war "may be examined and documents copied, provided that the files are left intact and are preserved." (Bulletin of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, vol. I, p. 353.)

A recent radio report from Africa states that an enormous amount of non-Army personal property belonging to particular German and Italian prisoners was captured 2 weeks ago in North Africa. An interesting specific situation on this subject arose during the last war, the facts of which were vouched for to Judge Manley O. Hudson by the person concerned: "In early 1918, a British officer in service with the British Army in France possessed as his own property a leather traveling bag of unusual shape, design, and marking. The bag had been manufactured by the X Co. in London on the order of the officer, and the name of the manufacturer and the initials of the officer were burned on the leather. In the course of military operations in France, the British forces with which the officer served hastily abandoned a position in which they were promptly succeeded by German forces. The bag of the officer was left behind when the British forces moved; presumably it fell into the possession of the German forces. Several years after the conclusion of the war, when the former British officer was a passenger on a boat from New Haven to Dieppe, he saw in a passenger's luggage the bag which he had formerly possessed in France. The bag was so unique that it was identifiable with no possibility of mistake. Upon inquiry, the ex-officer learned that the bag had been brought on board the boat by a German commercial traveler who claimed to have bought it in a second-hand store in Berlin." (26 A. J. I. L. 340.)

Who had title to the bag? The case unfortunately was not litigated. For a long period of time title to any property, public or private, which a belligerent captured on the battlefield passed to the belligerent state. It was the object of legitimate booty. This rule has been in the process of change for the past century. Article 4 of the Hague Regulations of 1907 provided that all the personal belongings of prisoners of war remain their property except "arms, horses, and military papers." But the owner of the bag was not a prisoner of war. Article 14 of the regulations states that it is the function of the inquiry office for prisoners of war "to receive and collect all objects of persona. use, valuables, letters, etc., found on the field of battle." This provision would seem to mean that title to such objects did not pass to the captor, but it does not so provide in terms. In any event, the bag, though found on the battlefield, was not turned in to the inquiry office.

The Hague conferences had apparently tried to settle generally the question of title

to nonmilitary personal property, except arms, horses, and military papers, found on the battlefield, but they left the matter somewhat ambiguous. The British Government interpreted the foregoing articles as providing that title would not pass (Land Warfare, sec. 433). Judge Hudson seems to have interpreted them otherwise. Perhaps the matter was made a bit more definite by article 4 of the 1929 Geneva Convention on the wounded and sick. It provides that belligerents "shall collect and likewise forward (to each other) all objects of personal use found on the field of battle." (Parentheses supplied.) But, even now, the obligation in terms is only on the belligerent government to return such property. The intent that title should not pass seems clearly implicit in all these provisions, but their language is legally deficient.

It would be useful today if a suggestion made by a United States Circuit Court in 1868 had been followed. The suggestion was that "there should exist a tribunal similar to a prize court, to administer the law of nations with reference to property captured on land" (*United States* v. *269½ Bales of Cotton*, Fed. Cas. No. 16,583, 28 Fed. Cas. 302, 309 (Dist. Mo.) p. 310).

Ten days ago an Associated Press dispatch from China stated that the Japanese had broadcast an offer of reward of 10,000 yen (about $2,300) for the capture "dead or alive" of any member of the United States Medium Bombardment Group based in China. This group has carried out some 70 raids against various Japanese bases during the past year. The report may not be true. I will not comment on it other than to say that in paragraph 31 of the Field Manual it is stated that offering a reward for an enemy "dead or alive" is prohibited by international law, and especially by article 23 of the Hague Regulations, to which Japan is a party.

One of the oldest and most important problems in the law of war is the extent to which civilians and irregular troops can participate in war without being war criminals and without being liable to the death penalty upon being captured and convicted by a military tribunal. The problem of the southern guerrillas presented to Halleck and Lieber was not unique. It has been a perennial one for at least the past several hundred years.

For a considerable period of time it has been settled international law that regular troops could not legally be shot when captured. There was a difference of opinion with regard to certain types of irregular troops. There have been many varieties of irregular troops with almost as many names, such as freebooters, partisans, spies, war rebels, militia, armed prowlers, volunteer corps, free corps, guerrillas, levées en masse, and even bushwhackers. The motivation of these groups was sometimes patriotic, sometimes merely to take advantage of the war situation as an excuse to plunder, pillage, and loot. The question as to which types could be shot for violent participation in the war persisted. It was clear that a well-organized militia should not be treated the same as a spy or a guerrilla.

The question was finally settled by a compromise at the Hague Conferences. Article I of the Hague Regulations provides that the laws, rights, and duties of war apply to regular armies, to militia, and to volunteer corps provided that they are commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates; that they wear a fixed distinctive emblem recognizable at a distance; that they carry their arms openly, and conduct their operations in accordance with the laws and usages of war. Article 2 stipulates that if the inhabitants of a nonoccupied territory take up arms as a levée en masse to resist invading troops they also shall have the rights of war even though they do not wear a distinctive emblem and are not commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates, provided, however, that they carry their arms openly and respect the laws of war.

The reason behind these rules is that opposing forces have a right to know against whom they are fighting. They can then act accordingly. If they do not know this clearly, noncombatants generally are likely to be attacked.

Irregulars who do not comply with these requirements and who engage in personal violence against the enemy commit war crimes and are subject to the death penalty (Field Manual 27-10, pars. 357; 348-349; 351-352). Such irregulars include the individual who shoots a parachutist other than in self-defense; private rifle companies; unorganized factory guards; and irregular snipers. It is noteworthy that parachute watchers in Great Britain are members of an organization known as the Local Defense Volunteers of England. Our Home Guards are, or are being, uniformed.

In contrast to Europe, the probabilities are that there will be little guerrilla warfare in the United States. It is not impossible, however, that in the United States today there are loosely organized potential guerrilla bands made up of reputable citizens who may not realize their potential status. After Pearl Harbor, when the Japanese invasion scare was at its height, on the west coast at least one group of citizens there organized itself into an armed group to oppose a Japanese invasion. They called themselves by some such name as the Freeport Rifles. They had no official standing. They were not connected with the Army, the National Guard, or the newer State Guard.

Certain language from a current promotional pamphlet of the National Rifle Association is of interest in this connection: It says "Modern war has no 'front line.' The airplane, mechanized troop carriers, and fifth-column activities have opened all parts of a nation to possible enemy attack. Home guards, auxiliary police, and industrial defense units are just as necessary in this war as field armies. * * * Today it is the plain duty of every American to acquire a working knowledge of the proper handling of firearms" (pp. 1, 3). In this same connection I might note a remarkable little book which has recently become somewhat of a best seller in this country at 50 cents a copy. It is by "Yank" Levy and entitled "Guerrilla Warfare." It was written primarily for Britishers. From among the many interesting passages in this little book, I can take time to quote only the following: "I would impress upon every potential defender of this country, every member of the population who is fitted to take part in guerrilla fighting, every home guard unit, the golden precept: Be prepared. Instead of having hastily to form our fighting bands on the spur of the moment and then to lose time locating favorable spots for headquarters, hiding places, rallying and dispersal points; instead of having to learn the methods of organized guerrilla fighting by painful and arduous rule-of-thumb trial and error, let us start right now" (p. 39). Among other things Levy advises home guards to keep civilian clothes packed in boxes in the ground so that if they are surrounded by the enemy they can exchange their uniforms for their civilian clothes (p. 46). For present purposes perhaps the most interesting thing about the book is the preface to the American edition, written by Lt. Col. Joseph I. Greene, editor of the Infantry Journal. Colonel Greene states that locally formed groups in the United States have been seeking practical detailed information on methods of warfare they can use in their training. These groups and State Guard units, Colonel Greene says, have wanted to know more about the methods used by guerrillas in trained groups in China, Russia, the Philippines and in occupied countries.

He adds that most of what Yank Levy has to say about guerrilla warfare can readily be applied to our own American scene, and concludes his preface by saying: "We of this country who may conceivably become engaged anywhere with the enemy should study and, it may be, apply these ways of war. Not even a seeming remoteness of encounter can stand for a moment as an excuse for unreadiness."

If such groups as these seriously plan to go into action against possible enemy commando raids or otherwise, as a part of their preparedness they should not overlook the provisions of article 1 of the Hague Regulations. The Russian, Yugoslav, and other guerrillas in the occupied countries are literally taking their lives in their hands. They have no rights whatsoever if captured.

An article in the Saturday Evening Post of May 15 about the Civil Air Patrol is erroneously entitled "Flying Guerrillas." The Civil Air Patrol is supervised and controlled by the commanding general of the Army Air Corps. Although the members of the Patrol serve on a voluntary basis, they wear regular army uniforms with special distinctive emblems. Their planes are marked with the Civil Air Patrol insignia which has been officially communicated to all enemy governments. The planes carry exposed bomb racks and the Patrol conducts its operations in accordance with the laws of war. The members are in no sense guerrillas.

Before concluding this recital of somewhat disjointed matters, you may be interested in two points which concern the larger jurisprudence of the laws of war in the relationship of international law to the constitutional law of the United States.

It is an established rule in our constitutional law that when the terms of a treaty and an act of Congress are in irreconcilable conflict the one later in point of time is the controlling law. It is seldom impossible, however, for the courts to reconcile the provisions of treaties and those of acts of Congress, and the courts will go to great lengths to do so. Yet, irreconcilable conflicts do occasionally occur. An example of this would be where an earlier commercial treaty stipulated that a 15 percent ad valorem duty would be collected on a certain item, and a later statute provided for the collection of a 30 percent ad valorem duty on exactly the same item. In this case the courts in this country would be constrained to give effect to the later statute. The treaty violation would have to be adjusted as an international matter.

This principle has illustrations in the matter with which we are now concerned. The Hague Conventions of 1907 antedate the Articles of War enacted by Congress in 1920, but the Geneva Prisoners of War and the Red Cross Conventions of 1929 went into force later than the Articles of War. The following examples are illustrative of some of the questions which may arise as a result of these differences of time. Article of War 2 lists the persons subject to military law. You will not find prisoners of war in that list. However, article 45 of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929 (Rules of Land Warfare, par. 118, p. 29) provides that "prisoners of war shall be subject to the laws, regulations, and orders in force in the armies of the detaining power." This treaty provision, being later in point of time, in effect amends Article of War 2. Again, under Article of War 96 conspiracy to escape is punishable at the discretion of general or special courts martial. Article 51 of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929 (Field Manual, 27-10, par. 124, p. 31) provides that after an escape by a prisoner of war, his comrades who assisted in the escape may incur only disciplinary punishment on this account. Unless these two provisions can be reconciled the 1929 treaty provision, being adopted later than the Articles of War, must govern the case.

One more instance will suffice to illustrate the point: Article of War 105 provides that when persons subject to United States military law damage property, and when the particular offenders cannot be ascertained but the organization or detachment is known, stoppages in pay to the amount of damages inflicted may be made and assessed in such proportion as may be deemed just, upon the individual members of the organization who are shown to have been present at the time. Article 46 of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention (Rules of Land Warfare, par. 119, subpar. 4, p. 30) forbids any collective punishment of prisoners of war for individual acts.

One of the most important means of enforcing international law is almost wholly unknown to most persons, indeed to many lawyers. I refer to the medium of the national executive, with assistance of the national legislature. Many of the rules of international law, like the rules of domestic law, are not self-executing. The legislatures of the various states of the world enact laws to effectuate the international rules in their own territories, much as administrative agencies formulate and promulgate regulations to carry statutory enactments into effect. In article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, Congress is empowered to define and punish offenses against the law of nations. Under international law a captured and convicted spy may be put to death. On June 4, 1920, Congress enacted Article of War 82. This implements this rule of international law by giving jurisdiction to general courts martial or military commissions to try alleged spies. The act of Congress also mandatorily states that upon conviction of the offense of spying the person involved shall be put to death. A few other examples of enactments by Congress, with special reference to the rules of land warfare, may be of interest. A typical example of the occasion when a safeguard is given is where an army is retreating and where chaotic conditions may prevail when military control is relinquished. In order to protect such places as Red Cross hospitals, churches, art museums, and other public institutions, a military guard is sometimes left as a safeguard of the place. Other times a notice of safeguard is merely attached to the building. Paragraph 241 of the Rules of Land Warfare states that the violation of a safeguard is a grave offense against the laws of war.

This is the international rule. The international rule does not, however, provide for a penalty, but Article of War 78 provides that "any person subject to military law who, in time of war, forces a safeguard shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial may direct." Again, under paragraphs 61 and 329 of the Rules of Land Warfare, the pillage of a town or place, even when taken by assault, is prohibited. This international rule is implemented by Article of War 75 which provides that any officer or soldier who "quits his post or colors to plunder or pillage" shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial may direct. To the same effect is paragraph 327 (p. 83) of the Rules of Land Warfare. It provides that all captures and booty belong primarily to the government of the captor. This international rule is effectuated in this country by Articles of War 79–80 which provide to the same effect and add that any person subject to military law who is guilty of wrongfully appropriating such property shall be punished as a court martial may direct.

In connection with most wars it has been asserted that they were illegally started. The laws of war govern chiefly the conduct of war after it is started, not its commencement. The laws of war deal chiefly with the conduct of belligerents inter se during the progress of war and are not concerned primarily with the causes of the war or whether the war was begun legally or illegally. Even if a war is illegally started, the importance of conducting hostilities in a civilized fashion is as important as if the war is started with all due formality. To suggest, as has been suggested, that the rules for the conduct of warfare itself should be abandoned, and that we are justified in resorting to atrocities or barbarism in general because of the illegal commencement of the war, is to miss the fundamental reason for the growth of this body of rules and the purpose they are designed to fulfill.

The settlement of the question of responsibility for the war itself is a problem to be dealt with at the end of the war, not during the conduct of hostilities. The matter may be settled by such means as reparations, loss of territory or colonies, or even loss of sovereignty.

There is also a startling point of view on the part of some lawyers that if the enemy breaks one rule of law, even though it may have been unauthorized, the bars are down and henceforth there need be no further regard for the laws of war on our part. This is not only analogous to the point of view which upholds lynch law rather than a fair trial, but it would thwart the whole basis and the reason for the existence and growth of the rules of land warfare. It should be taken for granted that some of the rules will be broken from time to time. Our forces should and will be on guard against such violations. When they occur the answer is not lawlessness or wanton destruction on our part but proper reprisals, when authorized. Reprisals are not only legal and provided for in the Rules of Land Warfare but they are highly effective. The military experts who are responsible for the continued existence of the rule that even "military necessity" does not permit the overriding of the laws of war are acting, not from pious notions, but from extensive practical experience in the conduct of war.

National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Galveston Daily News of June 6, 1943, on the national debt:

NATIONAL DEBT

Figures fail to make much of an impression on the average citizen any more when it comes to Government finance. People have become so used to the word "billion" that they take it as calmly as once they took "million." When they start thinking about the national debt, however, they soon are going to have to start thinking in terms of trillions, whether figures that fantastic mean anything to them or not. According to official figures, Congress so far has appropriated or has been asked to appropriate a total of $338,500,000,000 for fighting the war, and that, believe it or not, is more than a third of a trillion dollars. Not only is it more than twice all the money the Federal Government had spent in its entire history up to 1940, when the defense program started, but it is more than twice the assessed value of all property, including houses, factories, farms, fields, and personal belongings in all 48 States and the District of Columbia. Assessed values do not, of course, necessarily represent true values, but they give the average citizen some basis for understanding what is meant when one starts talking about prospects of the national debt reaching $300,000,000,000 by the end of the war.

The gross national debt on May 15 last year was $65,000,000,000 and on the same date this year it was $134,600,000,000. The East Texas Chamber of Commerce estimates that Texas people's share of the present national debt, 3½ percent of the total, is $4,700,000,000, which is a little more than the assessed valuation of all Texas property for 1942, $4,600,000,000. By mid-1944, it is estimated that the national debt will have reached $210,000,000,000, and if it should reach $300,000,000,000, Texas' share of the total would be $14,612,969,072 on a per capita basis.

The level which the debt finally reaches, of course, will be determined by the proportion of the war's cost which is collected in the form of taxes. Congress' behavior to date as regards paying for as much of this cost as possible while the war is being fought furnishes no grounds for optimism. And there is not reason to hope that victory will bring an end of heavy Government spending. In this connection the East Texas Chamber of Commerce asks some questions which every citizen should be pondering in view of the present national debt prospects. Here are some of them: Will the Government undertake to make payments to tide demobilized men over the time between demobilization and their employment? After the war is the United States going to attempt to underwrite food, clothing, shelter, police protection, and credit for all our allies, or even the whole world? Are we going to go "whole hog" for social security under the vague blueprint of the recent National Resources Planning Board report? To what degree and when will the Government drop its controls over men and materials in industry after fighting stops? What are we going to do with our national in-debt? Shall we extend it over and over again, or convert it into paper money, or pay it off through inflation, or begin to pay it off, principal and interest, in honest dollars?

We agree that all of these are questions which should be receiving more thought than they are now that we have started talking in terms of trillions of dollars instead of billions.

Capitol Now Open to Servicemen on Sundays

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called attention to the fact that the Capitol was closed on Sundays and urged that it be kept open so that the many hundreds of servicemen in uniform who come to Washington were not denied the privilege of going through the building. I am glad to report to the House that my request has been complied with.

The Capitol is now open on Sundays to all servicemen, and the guides are giving their services free to conduct men in uniform through the Capitol and show them the building every Sunday.

Power To Carry on the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Merlo Pusey, from the Washington Post of June 8, 1943:

POWER TO CARRY ON THE WAR

(By Merlo Pusey)

After a year and a half of war Congress has apparently decided to invoke its power to undercut any group that tries to sabotage the war effort to win advantages for itself. That is the meaning of the emphatic vote in the House last week for the Harness-Smith substitute for the Connally bill previously passed by the Senate. Leaving aside the details of the two bills, this move to reassert the power of the Government to carry on the war in spite of John L. Lewis and his ilk is one of the most constructive steps that the present Congress has taken.

There is much confusion over what Congress has done. Some of that confusion probably arises from the fact that the House acted in haste without a printed copy of the bill before it. More important, however, is a widespread misunderstanding as to the chief issue by which both branches of the National Legislature were confronted. The people have been told repeatedly that Congress was considering antistrike legislation. The mere use of those words aroused antagonism among many friends of labor, for the right to strike is properly regarded as the chief weapon that can be employed by labor to win fair compensation from employers.

Now neither the Connally bill nor the House-approved substitute would deny the right to strike in the traditional meaning of that word. It is true that the House bill attempts to put collective bargaining ahead of strikes in disputes within war industries. Probably this part of the bill needs further pruning. But the real "teeth" of both bills come into play only when the authority of the Government itself is threatened.

This is a point of the greatest importance. Congress is attempting primarily to assert the power of the Government to carry on this global war without being stabbed in the back by union leaders who think it is more important to force wages skyward than to supply fuel, munitions, rubber, and other essentials to the men at the fronts.

Congress does not presume to say, even in wartime, that unions shall not strike against their employers. The criminal penalties which both houses have approved for anyone attempting to interfere with the operation of war plants would apply only in cases where the Government has been forced to take over war plants to keep them in operation. In other words, Congress would make it a crime to aid or foment strikes among employees working directly for the Government.

Obviously this restriction does not destroy the right of collective bargaining, for there is no such right as collective bargaining with the Government. No group can rightly say to the Government, "You may continue the war under the terms we have laid down." Nor can any employer or union leader be permitted to deprive the Government of the sinews of war until his terms have been met. That basic principle was recognized as to employers long before Pearl Harbor. Its tardy recognition as to union leaders merely completes the powers that the Government must have to assure our national self-preservation.

Even the administration appears to have belatedly swung around to this view. At any rate, administration leaders in the House marshaled their influence behind the Connally bill at the eleventh hour. For the policy of trying to appease men like John L. Lewis has proved to be a flat failure. It should have been recognized as a dangerous policy from the very beginning. The fate of the Nation cannot safely be left to mere understandings or bargains between the President and private groups, which may turn out, as in the case of the miners' no-strike pledge, to be nothing more than a scrap of paper.

Assuming that a satisfactory compromise between the Senate and House bills can be worked out, the effect of this legislation on the coal strike may be decisive. With either bill on the books, a further revolt against Government authority might leave John L. Lewis looking out between bars. At the same time the basic rights of labor remain protected. Both bills specifically leave the individual worker free to quit his job if he wishes to do so. The right to strike against private employers is left largely to the control of labor itself under the no-strike pledge, and the War Labor Board on which workers and employers alike must rely for a fair adjustment of grievances which cannot be ironed out by collective bargaining is notably strengthened.

The implications of this courageous act on the part of Congress are even more far reaching. Congress has once more asserted its power to protect the national interest against powerful internal pressure. It has said that the Government elected by the people as a whole is supreme and that it must not kowtow to any unscrupulous little dictator who may challenge its authority to carry on the war. If Congress and the administration adhere to this sound principle, our democratic system will be greatly strengthened to withstand the shocks that it must inevitably meet in the last stages of the war as well as in the post-war period.

Department of Agriculture Still in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it has been said repeatedly in this House that the production of food is our biggest job. I am wondering, however, if that fact has percolated through to the one Government agency charged with food production; namely, the Department of Agriculture. On March 10 I charged that the Department of Agriculture is more concerned in saving the A. A. A., and F. S. A., and the C. C. C. than it is in organizing a productive food program. At that same time I pointed out that Government employees on the Federal pay roll were traveling about the State of Wisconsin and my district organizing meetings for the purpose of condemning Members of Congress because they would not go along with the Department's program as it affected these agencies. Now again my attention is called to further activities by these same Government employees in which appeal is made to Federal Security Agency clients and to R. A. C. C. borrowers, A. A. A. committeemen and cooperators, and business and professional men in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a letter bearing the imprint of the Department of Agriculture and signed by one Paul Mutanen, chairman. The letter is self-explanatory and again clearly evidences a movement by the Department of Agriculture to stir up sentiment and create pressure on Members of Congress to the end that these identical agencies may be spared.

It is time, it seems to me, that Mr. Wickard and his organization should be active in doing the work it is charged to do rather than spending time and money of the Government in a program designed to thwart the will of Congress.

The letter referred to follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL
ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Hurley, Wis., May 26, 1943.

To Farm Security Administration Clients and Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation Borrowers, Agricultural Adjustment Administration Committeemen and Cooperators, Business and Professional Men of Iron County.

DEAR FRIENDS: Within the next few weeks, Congress will decide the fate of the food-production policies of our Nation.

We are informed by our friends on Capitol Hill, the press, and radio that the congressional farm bloc can be expected to seriously cripple or abolish the Farm Security Administration, Crop Insurance, parity payments, Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program, and the Agricultural Conservation Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, and farmer administration of agricultural programs.

This is a serious situation when farmers need all possible Federal assistance to help raise the needed food and fiber to win this war. Therefore, a county-wide meeting is being called by the Iron County Farm Mobilization Committee to be held at the courthouse in Hurley at 2 p. m., May 28. At this meeting we shall decide—

(a) Whether we are going to sit idly on the side lines and wait for some miracle to secure enough congressional support to safeguard the present aids to agriculture; or

(b) Shall we raise a few dollars to help the small group of farmers who are now in Washington carrying on a valiant fight to preserve the present agricultural agencies with emphasis on family-sized farms and farmer administration.

This meeting is part of the educational work carried out by the National Agricultural Mobilization Committee now 2 months old and covering 18 States. It is a temporary emergency movement which will function only as long as the emergency exists.

Henry Danes, of New Holstein, Wis., chairman of the Wisconsin Agriculture Mobilization Committee will talk. He is a very interesting speaker and has a message you will want to hear.

Please ask a neighbor or businessman to attend this meeting with you.

Sincerely,

PAUL MUTANEN,
Chairman, Iron County Agricultural Mobilization Committee.

Commencement Address at Rogers City High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the commencement address which I delivered today in my home town of Rogers City, Mich., in the high school of which I am an alumnus:

Greetings and congratulations to you members of the graduating class of the Rogers City High School. In this year 1943, as you all know, you are graduating in perhaps the most critical year of our Nation's history. You are graduating and entering upon a world faced with more uncertainty than at any time in the history of our country. Few, if any, of us in public life can offer any definite predictions for the future, and if we can't safely predict the future, how can we expect you to do so?

We can, however, approach the problem studiously and carefully, based on our past experience and our knowledge of the fundamental American history and principles, about which so many in responsible positions today seem to know so very little. If we will go back to those fundamentals and will have faith in the America of the past, in the America of today, and in the America of the future, we can venture some predictions. If in making those predictions, we can bring you some encouragement and light to an otherwise blackened horizon, perhaps we can ease your mind as you look forward to the future.

My advice to you all, as you face the future, is to find out when and how you can continue your education; and in gaining that higher education, keep your eyes not only glued to the future prospects of this Nation, but cemented firmly on the past history of this Nation.

What I am fearful of is that when some of you go into the armed services of this country—or if others of you find your normal pursuit for higher education otherwise interrupted by the war—you may lose your incentive to obtain that essential higher education in the future; and this, in my opinion, would be a calamity. In the post-war world you are going to need every bit of higher education you can gain; and the Nation is going to need from you the benefits you have received from that higher education.

Now in looking into the future, we must take into account a number of fundamental factors to guide us in our thinking.

Of paramount importance, of course, are the coming events in this world-wide struggle for military victory. No man living can safely predict on what day victory will be ours; but we can be definitely certain in our own minds that victory will be ours—and I hope that final victory will be ours by the end of next year. From the various events which have transpired on the battle fronts of the world in recent months; from what inklings we can get out of the recent historic military conferences in Washington and elsewhere; from the trend of changes in our war-production schedules, we may gain some pattern of our war plans. From what Mr. Churchill said in his recent address to the Congress, we can safely predict an ever-increasing aerial onslaught on Germany and the occupied countries. From Mr. Roosevelt's recent sayings—and based upon our spectacular victory in Africa—we may assume the early probability of an all-out ground and aerial attack on Italy—the soft underbelly of the Axis—and possibly also an assault on Norway, thus catching the Germans in a gigantic pincers movement on the west, coupled with a new Russian offensive from the east. When this three-pronged spear has been launched and Germany and the occupied Polish, Russian, and Balkan territory, as well as France and the Low Countries are sufficiently reduced by aerial bombings, then a possible direct frontal assault on the shores of France may be in order. All of this might transpire with considerable suddenness, and when the German and Italian peoples thus realize themselves completely surrounded; when their morale will have been shattered by ever increasingly heavy bombings; when their principal hope of forestalling a successful invasion, through increasingly successful submarine activities in the Atlantic, has been thwarted, through a combination of superior weapons and scientific developments; and when, in turn, they are beset by ever-increasing revolutionary activities in the conquered countries, then surely it is not beyond the realm of possibility that Germany may suddenly collapse as she did before in 1918. That might happen yet this year. Just how much of a factor Italy may be in further tangible aid to Germany is doubtful. Italy gives every indication of cracking now. She is said to be in panic over the invasion threat.

What of the Pacific? There are many of us in Washington who have felt from the very start that our most dangerous enemy in this great war is Japan. Many of us feel that we have too long delayed a greater degree of offensive action against the Japs. Many of us are disturbed by the failure of the Russians to assume a more cooperative spirit in permitting us to establish in Russia many huge air bases from which the heart of Japan proper can be thoroughly, efficiently, and promptly bombed into submission.

On the other hand, there are other encouraging factors in the Japanese situation. First of all, we have been told by Mr. Churchill that the greater proportion of our American troops now overseas are in the Pacific area. As our merchant fleet, being built on the west coast, expands; as our naval strength in the Pacific increases by leaps and bounds; and as our storage of battle equipment in England reaches the saturation point; it is logical to assume that ever more aircraft and other offensive fighting equipment will be diverted to the Pacific war theater. We may expect, therefore, a constant and ever increasing strengthening of General MacArthur's forces in the southwest Pacific. We may confidently expect greater security in Alaska now that our highway through Canada is playing its part.

We are told the British have massed a huge army of some 2,000,000 men on the edge of Burma and at the proper time we may expect that army and a greatly enlarged allied air force, striking from new bases in India, will push through Burma to China and get the necessary aid to the Chinese to enable them to drive the Japanese back off their Chinese shores. And when this is done, it seems to me that by striking at Japan in her own islands we can destroy her; and having destroyed her manufacturing facilities at home can thus more easily drive her out of her vast occupied territory. True, we have learned the Japs are good fighters and do not give up easily, and it may take much longer than any of us suspect; but we can hope for a final allied victory by the end of 1944. Yet that will not mean all of our boys and girls can be demobilized and rush home; because whether we like it or not there is the distinct probability that the United States may be called upon to furnish an army of occupation of around 4,000,000 men as our contribution to at least a temporary United Nations police force to insure post-war peace for some years to come.

Now as to the safety of our young men and women of today, who are graduating from high schools. Even though you may be called into the armed services, I think you need have no serious fears of not coming back safe and sound; and when you do, the experience and training you will have received will have been a mighty good thing for you, providing you are determined that as soon as you can be released from the Army you will resume your higher education. When I say "you can feel safe," I say that advisedly because by the end of this year, we will have raised our total in the armed forces to about 11,000,000 of which it is very doubtful that we will be able to have transported more than 4,000,000 overseas and of these doubtless less than half will ever see actual combat until the victory shall have been won. So much for the possible war events of the future.

The second subject of extreme importance which will affect our lives in this country—but more particularly the lives of your fathers and mothers and the rest of us who stay at home—is just what changes may come about in our Government programs over this stretch of time.

Down in Washington today, we have an ever-increasing number of foreign-born economists and lawyers, seated in the high councils of our Government, who are seeking to change the fundamentals of our American way of life. This we may presume is but natural, because many of them have come to this country in recent years. They know little if anything of our past history. They have themselves lived under the yoke of regimentation and governmental orders, issued by bureaucrats rather than by freely chosen representative law-making bodies of these foreign nations and so, having been entrusted with positions of responsibility in our Government, and having been supported by the Administration in the issuance of bureaucratic edicts—frequently in direct opposition to the spirit and the intent of the Congress in creating those bureaus originally—they have not hesitated to fasten upon the people of this country an ever-increasing amount of regimentation. We may, therefore, expect for the time being considerably more difficulties with rationing of food, clothing, gasoline, and the like. This in turn will tend to disrupt our thinking even more; will drive more and more of our small merchants out of business and will in all probability cause a political upheaval in the national elections of next year—which will be the only way of driving these foreign-born, foreign-educated, foreign-minded bureaucrats out of responsible positions in the Government of the United States. That ballot box is the one way we can return this Government of America to Americans to manage.

One of the greatest economic calamities that could happen to the United States of America and the perpetuation of the American way of life would be the ultimate and permanent collapse of the small businessman of America or the ultimate and permanent ruination of what is known as the middle class of America. That is the backbone of the American way of life. It must be protected at all costs and it is this class that the foreign-born theorists, presently ruling the bureaucracy of America, seek to destroy. Crush the middle class and you crush our freedom.

Now there is another important change which is bound to come about in the Government program which is of potentially great importance in the changing of our economy. As the fortunes of war change, and more especially as our enormous war-production program catches up, and indeed surpasses the requirements of our military commanders and allies at the front, it is but logical to assume that there will be important changes in matériel requirements and there will be

cancelation of many contracts and a few increases in others to fit the impending shift in major war operations. But the over-all war production will drop off sharply.

These changes will be instantly felt in our entire industrial program, both on the part of industry and labor. These changes and these cancelations of contracts will undoubtedly cause the closing down of many war-production lines and will inevitably result in one of several things. Either it will result in a temporary but extremely important wave of unemployment or it will of necessity result in converting those war-production lines into the production of peacetime equipment and peacetime consumer goods.

A great struggle will be in progress to determine whether the Government, which has assumed such a dominant position of ownership in the war-industry field, will permit private initiative and private enterprise to function, either in changing those privately owned properties over into peacetime production, even while war is in progress, or in permitting the temporary and later permanent use of Government-owned facilities for such production. All this, of course, is assuming that sufficient of our present huge production facilities will be kept in production order fully sufficient to be able to cope with the enemy's ability to destroy our fighting equipment thus produced. Or putting it in another way, we must keep these lines in war production sufficiently to supply the needs of our fighting men and those of our allies.

Now, as we approach that period or that following immediately after any collapse or threatened collapse of the Germans and Italians, we will, of course, assume that most of the Government programs will have a distinctly political atmosphere, looking toward the Presidential elections of 1944. It is obvious that both major parties will be soliciting the political favoritism of the well-known large voting blocks. For instance, we will hear much of the National Resources Planning Board's cradle-to-the-grave plan, which, after all, is the well-known British Beveridge plan; both parties will make concessions to the labor and farm groups, and both parties will be offering solutions to the problem of inflation. Later, as the election approaches, we will hear great agitation for guaranteed employment for all discharged armed forces, and it is probable that our present Administration will be placing large orders with manufacturers tor the rehabilitation of the presently occupied countries, which we hope will by that time have been liberated. It is very probable that the internationalist element within our country will be advocating that Uncle Sam finance the reconstruction program for all the occupied countries and that many in the opposition party will be equally as opposed to most of these plans. The nationalists will be standing in opposition to the internationalists. Or, to put it another way, those of us who believe we should look out for America first will stand in opposition to those internationalists who feel America's first duty is to the rest of the world or to the rehabilitation of certain nations in which some of our citizens have huge investments—or in which they seek investments for their own profit.

Meanwhile, and during this period, a gigantic struggle will be waged to maintain the life of free enterprise in this country. Industry will be doing its utmost to provide for refinancing in the post-war period to get ready for all-out peacetime production. Many of our foreign-born bureaucrats, intent on holding on to their fat-salaried Government positions, will most likely be striving to maintain Government controls over free industry and thus further the strangulation of free enterprise.

Those great industries of this Nation which have made such important contributions to our war production effort will be striving to rebuild their sales and advertising forces in order to capitalize on the war effort and to build up their markets for the future within our own Nation and with the foreign countries which we will have benefited. With it all will come improved labor relations and a greater understanding of the mutual objectives of labor and employer, and then the closer we approach the ultimate victcry the more we will see ever increasing study being given to the peacetime applications of the scientific developments that have occurred during this war production rush.

Great will be the stepped-up tempo in production for peacetime transportation. It is universally recognized that, in the post-war world, transportation by air will play a very dominant part. Hundreds of thousands of well-trained pilots will be able to secure their release from the occupational or world police air force and return to civilian flying on a hitherto unheard of international scale. Airplanes as yet undreamed of by the average citizen will fill the skies.

However, great as are the possibilities of the air-borne commerce of the future, nevertheless, the fact still remains that neither our land transportation nor our marine transportation systems will be supplanted.

In the pre-war world, we had just begun to scratch the surface in the rapid means of overland transportation. The streamliner trains had just made their appearance. There will be many more in the post-war world—faster, smoother, more comfortable. On the highways, our automobiles, as we have known them in the pre-war world, will be definitely a thing of the past. Right today even in the manufacture of such heavy cumbersome looking things as the 32- and 60-ton tanks, the marvels of our war-production program are constructing them with a thoroughness of skill hereto unheard of in the manufacture of our highest-priced pre-war automobiles. Your cars of the future will not only be marvels of beauty and stamina and speed but they will be traveling on the super high-speed highways of the future and in greater quantities than heretofore dreamed of, even in this great automotive Nation.

Yes, in the post-war world, even in our homes and in our daily lives—in the food we eat and in the clothes we wear—we will learn quickly of the marvels of modern science as developed in our war-production rush. But all of this—all of these marvels of the post-war world—is going to require an enormous post-war production program, an enormous post-war scientific program; an enormous post-war sales program.

The level of success attained in our post-war economy will be directly proportionate to the energy of our people and the vision of our leaders.

One thing must not be permitted to happen in this post-war world as it happened in 1918. None of the boys who come back from overseas, who elect to return to civilian life, rather than remain in the armies of occupation, must be permitted to sell apples on the street corners. Jobs must be found for all of them—jobs will be found for all of them. But one of our big problems in the post-war world is to keep as many as possible of our young folks in the colleges of this Nation, obtaining their higher education.

Remember these fundamental facts as to employment in the post-war world. First of all, there are today engaged in the war-production program about twenty-two and one-half million people, with 9,000,000 in the armed forces and thirty-one and one-half million in the civilian industries. In the post-war world five of those nine million under arms will be returned to private industry. Our war industries will not completely stop, because we will have to keep abreast the military developments of even our present friends and allies and so it is probable that four or five million will still be engaged in the production of more efficient tanks, more efficient planes, and other implements of death. And so this means that we will have to find employment for approximately 54,000,000 people in civilian industries as opposed to thirty-one and one-half million today. But it is believed that these jobs can be found for them. It is going to take considerable study and cooperation between industry and Government—but not force and regimentation on the part of Government. Governmental force and regimentation stifle production and stifle initiative and make for over-all inefficiency.

There are undoubtedly those who will wonder in view of steadily rising taxes and an inevitable rising cost of living, how we are going to be able to financially stand this increase in civilian employment.

To understand that, I must discuss briefly the questions of changes in production levels and buying power as they were in the pre-war period, as they are today, and as it is predicted they will be in the post-war period.

In the 10 years preceding the war, our total annual production was about $45,000,000,000 and, of course, up until the war broke out in Europe all of that was strictly civilian production. Today our civilian production still averages about $45,000,000,000, but we have added to that a war production costing about $80,000,000,000, so that our total production cost today is about $125,000,000,000. In the post-war world our total production will drop to about $97,000,000,000, of which war production will represent $15,000,000,000 and civilian production $82,000,000,000.

The question naturally arises, where is the buying power to be found to pay for this production? In the pre-war period we had a total national income averaging about $60,000,000,000. Today that has jumped up to $135,000,000,000, broken down into annual savings of about forty-seven billion, which of course is presently going largely into the purchases of War bonds and War Savings stamps. Then we are paying about fifteen and one-half billions in taxes and spending about seventy billions for goods and services. Today we have in this Nation accumulated savings of about one hundred and eighty-two and one-half billion dollars. In the post-war world it is estimated that our national income will drop slightly to about one hundred and thirty billion a year; the increase in savings will drop considerably to about sixteen billions, but at the same time our accumulated savings will have gradually moved up to about two hundred and thirty billion. In the post-war year of 1945—if my schedule is correct—our taxes will have jumped up to twenty-one and one-half billion a year, while our expenditures for goods and services will have come up to $90,000,000,000. In other words, here is the buying power situation in a nutshell. Many people in this country today are making more money than they have ever made in the pre-war period. On the other hand, due to pulling out of the markets many normal civilian goods, due to the regimentation of our economy in the form of rationing, etc., and due to the patriotic urge to buy War bonds, those people are by and large not able to, nor desirous of, purchasing many of the things of life that they would like to buy. However, when the immediate need for the purchase of War bonds and stamps has become a thing of the past and when, on the other hand, these consumer goods they have wanted to buy—such as automobiles, finer clothes, higher grades of food, to say nothing of new washing machines, vacuum cleaners, radios, etc.—make their reappearance on the civilian market, then you will find those people cashing in their War bonds and stamps and converting them into the acquisition of civilian goods.

Two things I want you to remember are these: First of all, in our war-production effort today there are millions of young women capably performing tasks heretofore reserved for men. Some of these women will

want to return to their private lives at the fireside of the home, but many of them will, perhaps, prefer to gain that independence that comes from earning their own individual livelihood. Secondly, remember that when the Government voted to draft men into its armed forces, the Congress provided definitely that those men on their return to civilian life would be able to get their jobs back. It will be very difficult for you to compete with either class.

Therefore, I repeat, the thing for you young men and women to do is to continue your education. Learn all you can so that you will better be able to compete in the post-war world. You will be the scientists of the future; you will be the business executives of the future; you will be the statesmen of the future, providing you apply yourselves to your studies, and providing you apply yourselves to a careful study of the fundamentals of American history and American government and American economy. No one can deny that we in America have our faults. No one can deny that our system has not been heretofore perfect. Study the faults in that system, but remember this: Fundamentally the American system of free enterprise and free initiative has made this country great. Above all and at all cost must we ever dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the Bill of Rights as guaranteed us in the Constitution. And, finally, and in conclusion, let us remember this: We must not at any time permit the abrogation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter as applied to ourselves in these United States of America. We must not give up in this country the freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and we must in the post-war world provide freedom from the fear of want. These things we must preserve for America, but at one and the same time it is not up to us to tell the other nations of the world how they shall live and how they shall conduct themselves; and we shall forever insist that they do not tell us how to run our country. European ideologies did not make America great. Some European ideologies are dedicated to the wrecking of America; some European ideologies are dedicated to the subordination of the great United States of America into some highly idealistic form of world state in which we shall be expected to pay the bills and furnish manpower, but in which we will have but a minor vote when it comes to the expenditure of those funds or that manpower. This must not happen. It is up to you graduates of the high schools and colleges of this country today to dedicate your lives to see to it that that does not happen. We can collaborate; we can cooperate with the rest of the world, but we must preserve America for Americans. The opportunity is yours. What will you do with it?

Resolution Adopted by the Arkansas Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Arkansas Press Association, in annual convention, June 5, 1943:

Whereas our sons, our brothers, and other loved ones today are offering their lives upon the altar of their country's freedom to preserve sacred the great fundamentals of our Nation, guaranteed to us under the Constitution; and

Whereas we at home are suffering inconveniences now and will hereafter gladly suffer sacrifices great and small in our effort to contribute what help we can in their struggle; and

Whereas there appears to be a concentrated effort on the part of certain groups to promote pet political theories and un-American principles under the guise that they are war-born necessities, and these subversive principles are undermining the American way of life, promoting great and powerful centralized governmental bureaus and regimentation of our people; and

Whereas we are fully aware that unless definite steps are taken to curb these rapidly growing tendencies our individual liberties will be lost, our consciences subsidized, great freedoms destroyed, and in their place will be established an all-powerful centralized government ruling the people through virtual dictatorship and against their will; and

Whereas we realize that it is a patriotic responsibility of the unshackled press of our Nation to exert its vast influence in checking the spread of these un-American doctrines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Arkansas Press Association does hereby express itself as unequivocally favoring the principles of free American enterprise and individual initiative, and fully recognizes the wonderful job that American business and industry—the highest exemplifications of these American fundamentals—have done toward winning the war; and be it further

Resolved, That this association and its members do hereby pledge to use their fullest resources and abilities to prevent the destruction of these high American principles, to check the encroaching bureaucratic tendencies, and to preserve those freedoms guaranteed to us under the Constitution of the United States, so that our sons and our brothers and our loved ones who are now offering their lives on the battle fronts will have, when they return to their homes, the right to live their lives and conduct their business in the way they desire; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to every newspaper publisher and its publication urged; and that a copy be sent to every Member of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States Congress.

H. R. 2536—A Great Step Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, it is very likely that today the House will have under consideration H. R. 2536, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

This bill was the subject of conscientious and long-continued consideration by the House Committee on Education. It was evolved only after long consultation among Hon. GRAHAM BARDEN, chairman of that committee and Federal officials in charge of agencies directly interested in the work which the bill authorizes to be performed. The result of these conferences appeared in the form of a bill known as H. R. 699. This bill in turn was given exhaustive study by practically all of the members of the House committee, who in cooperation with the chairman, and after long-extended hearings, both public and executive, have now presented for enactment H. R. 2536.

One of the most notable features of this bill is that it authorizes for the first time the physical restoration of disabled persons, and through contributions by the Federal Government, added to those made by the States themselves, seeks to enable unnumbered thousands of people who now live a life of economic uselessness and are a financial burden on society, to be so rehabilitated physically as to be enabled to take their places, proudly and happily, in the ranks of men and women who are self-sustaining.

For more than 20 years the State of New Jersey, through its rehabilitation commission, and at its own expense, has been carrying on this kind of physical restoration work. The present director of the New Jersey Rehabilitation Commission is Hon. John J. Toohey, Jr. He has shown an intense interest in all phases of the commission's work. Under his administration the work of this commission has gone forward with tremendous enthusiasm and success. As an instance of the benefit not only to those who are physically restored by methods similar to those set out in H. R. 2536, but of the benefit to industry wherein they are given an opportunity to show their abilities, and the ultimate benefit to the communities in which they live, I submit herewith two statements.

The first statement is that of Mr. James Cassidy, which speaks for itself. The second statement is that of Mr. Jacques Kreisler, one of the chief executives of the Kreisler Manufacturing Corporation of North Bergen, N. J. Both statements relate interesting and important stories. In addition to bringing home to us a realization that persons physically handicapped can make good in industry if given a chance, and add to the sum total of happiness and wealth in our country, these statements also offer the surprising and welcome information that not a single workday has been lost through absenteeism by any of this handicapped group employed by the Kreisler Corporation. This instance of their patriotism is at least matched by the further information afforded by the statements that these handicapped workers have made a 100 percent record as blood donors to the Red Cross.

H. R. 2536 is badly needed legislation. The statements follow:

STATEMENT OF JAMES CASSIDY

I became employed with the Jacques Kreisler Manufacturing Corporation on August 1, 1941. The first meeting with Mr. Kreisler and Mr. Stern was in the form of a personal interview in regard to my employment. Mr. Kreisler and Mr. Stern noticed that I was handicapped and at the outset told me that I should not feel self-conscious in the event people stared at me—take it as a matter of form.

My first duties with the Kreisler organization was as timekeeper. Having proven my ability, I was then put in complete charge of all personnel activities. Soon after becoming employed with Kreisler we ran up against a serious personnel problem; that is, the finding of new employees. I spoke with Mr. Kreisler and Mr. Stern and asked them if my work had been satisfactory from the time of my employment to that day. Their answer was "yes." I then asked Mr. Kreisler and Mr. Stern if they would not consider hiring other handicapped people who I thought could do the work that was required of them, such as assembly, power press, lathe work, and polishing metals for precision Government war work. Mr. Kreisler and Mr. Stern told me to go ahead in my own way and employ for a start half a dozen people.

I contacted the New Jersey rehabilitation bureau office, located in Jersey City, and they, in turn, sent me the required number of people. Everyone without exception qualified for the type of work we would employ them for. From then on we employed additional handicapped people until our present complement of handicapped people is between 45 and 50. One department itself, the second shift, from 4 p. m. to midnight, is comprised solely of handicapped men. These men perform war work; that is, operate hubbing machines and bullet dies.

Two of these men own and drive their own cars with the help of what is known as the Stone control. They also transport their fellow workers to and from work. One of these fellows in particular, Daniel Puro, up until about 8 months ago navigated with the sole help of crutches. About 5 months ago he discarded the crutches and took up the use of two canes. About 2 months ago he threw one of the canes away and now owns and drives his own automobile, transporting workers. All the handicapped workers on this shift are transported from their homes to work and back again with the two machines owned and driven by their two fellow handicapped workers.

Since the inception of the employment of these handicapped people we have noticed, by Mr. Kreisler and Mr. Stern granting them this long-awaited opportunity to show industry that if given a chance, they can prove their ability and be self-sustaining.

We have noticed that production in the various departments where these people were placed has gone up considerably. Not only that, but they actually put to shame the other employees in their respective departments who are not handicapped, and production went up noticeably throughout the organization.

Among these handicapped people not one person has lost 1 day from attending to his duties at the Kreisler plant. Most of these people are heads of families, and now, instead of being financial drains on their fine families and the community, are supporting their families and will also make returns in the form of income tax. They are constructively employed toward aiding the war effort.

So successful has this experiment been that further additions of handicapped people are contemplated in the Kreisler organization. Among other duties that these people perform, is that of night nurse performed by a woman 60 years old.

Recently, while at work, one of our handicapped men, Henry Hertel, who is employed in our bullet die hubbing department, experienced the following words running through his mind:

"Rough out that ring and start to sing,
And do the best you can;
You've got a lot of bullet dies,
To polish for Uncle Sam.

"What if they're tough, just use more rough.
Come on, prove you're a man.
And when you do, you'll receive that thanks
Of the sons of Uncle Sam.

"The job's a bore and your hands are sore.
But you're just as proud as I am
To be part of the fight for Democracy
For peace and Uncle Sam."

The above poem was framed and hung in a conspicuous place in the building.

During a recent survey among our employees made on behalf of the Red Cross by our general manager, Mr. Alfred Diringer, for blood donors, to date we have received 288 volunteer blood donors. To date we have computed our findings among the handicapped employees and we found that it totaled 100 percent.

It was explained by Mr. Diringer to the handicapped employees that if they felt that they were not physically able to give their blood, that it would be perfectly all right, but the only reason that they were approached was that the firm of Jacques Kreisler did not want them to think they were being overlooked due to their physical disabilities.

Every one of these people, without exception, insisted that they be considered as a blood donor and stated individually that they considered it an honor and a privilege to give their blood in the hopes that it might save some wounded man regardless of nationality, race, creed, or color.

STATEMENT OF JACQUES KREISLER

NOT TO THE STRONG ALONE

The battle, sir, is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. (PATRICK HENRY.)

The halt, the lame and the blind are coming into their own. They are finding their place in industry. And industry is the winner. For it is the alert mind in the feeble body, the strong shoulders of the lame, the sensitive fingers of the blind that are helping industry overcome its manpower handicap.

In this respect, we at Kreisler are in debt to a young man with a "bum wing." Name: Jimmy Cassidy. He started as a timekeeper and advanced to personnel manager.

It was Jimmy who proposed that in adding to our personnel we employ handicapped people wherever possible. His own success gave weight to his argument. "Go ahead, Jimmy, in your own way and try it out," we said. His next stop was the Rehabilitation Bureau in Jersey City.

And they came.

The man who uttered no word but whose eyes were eloquent * * * the woman who knew no sound but heard words unspoken * * * the man with vision in his finger tips * * *.

They came to replace the fighting men. They stayed to serve the fighting men.

Gentlemen, here are the facts.

There are 50 in our plant and their number is increasing. In one department, the four-to-midnight shift is comprised entirely of men physically handicapped. Here the output actually increased and other departments profited by this example. Among the handicapped, not a single man has lost a single day from his vital war work. Their bodies seem to have taken strength from their spirits.

The Red Cross appeal for blood donors was answered by almost half of the plant's personnel. But the handicapped volunteered without a single exception * * * to give their blood that others might live. Their spokesman said, "It is our honor and our privilege."

These are the brave whom the Nazi "supermen" would condemn to extermination as unfit! These are the weak who will conquer! For the weak who are free are stronger than the strong who are enslaved.

The physically handicapped have come into their own. They have proved themselves! And all of mankind reaps the benefit.

The Connally Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear my position relative to S. 796. The House on Friday, June 4, passed this bill, interpreted as a strike preventive, which I voted against for two reasons. First, because the departments of government having the most to do with the conduct of the war, the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, testified that in their opinion the bill would retard the war effort. Second, because I could not join with a wrathful Congress in making a scapegoat of the great body of loyal workers for the outrageous and flagrant misuse of power by disloyal leadership in pursuing what is in truth a personal feud or vendetta.

I am perfectly aware that the temper of the people is such that they would like to string Lewis up by his thumbs. I am not willing, however, to be a party to letting Lewis wreck the results of long years of honest and constructive effort on the part of responsible organized labor. Do not misunderstand me. I am not saying, "The poor, dear workingman." I am thoroughly disgusted when I see him permit himself to be misrepresented by those who use him for their own interests. But I know these men are as unhappy as I am myself. They are Americans. Their sons—yes, and their daughters, too—are on the battle line. These are fighting for freedom, grimly and to the death. The casualty lists bring home to all of us the bitter toll of war.

The men at the front have more than justification for anger over a situation for which there is no excuse. But if they could have all the facts they too would recognize that two wrongs never make a right.

In considering all the angles of this whole matter, we should remember there is always the possibility that we have failed to see how clever have been the manipulations of those who in the near future will try to shift the responsibility for increasing unrest onto the shoulders of Congress whose power and influence they have long been seeking to undermine.

I believe the time has come when there must and should be sane labor legislation enacted to protect the country as a whole from the depredations of undisciplined, uncontrolled labor power. Just such a moment came to industry. It had to be and was controlled. Labor's moment has now come. If the country is to renew its full confidence in labor there will be no opposition to carefully considered, fair, and just controls, which will give protection to the laboring man against just the kind of destructive leadership the coal miners have permitted themselves to be subjected to, and will

protect the rest of us against unjustifiable demands and strikes.

I recognize that much of the rank and file of labor is not only ready but anxious for the registration of unions and insistence upon financial responsibility to which this bill subscribes. I am as keenly alive to the need to curb strikes as anyone. But as I believe sincerely that S. 796 is opposed to the principles of freedom for which we have gone to war I cannot do otherwise than vote against it. I appreciate that there will be those who disagree with me, but I am sure I can count upon them to believe I have acted upon nothing less than deep conviction.

Justice for Asiatics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of legislation pending in the Congress and the need for enlightenment and discussion on the subject of a change in our Immigration and Naturalization laws, I wish to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as informative matter, a part of an article from the weekly periodical, the Christian Century.

This article throws light on the subject that should be under discussion with that increasing number of citizens who take an interest in international affairs. The article follows:

JUSTICE FOR ASIATICS

Congressman MARTIN J. KENNEDY, influential Democrat from New York, has introduced a bill which would grant admission to Chinese under the quota system. Congressman WALTER JUDD, newly elected Republican from Minnesota, who owes his election largely to the agitation which he has conducted for more intelligent American participation in Oriental affairs, is about to offer a bill which would lift all discriminatory enactments against all Asiatics. (The Minnesota Congressman was formerly a medical missionary in China.) Dr. JUDD'S bill, it is forecast, will debar Japanese so long as we remain at war with that country. Such a provision seems legally unnecessary, though it may be politically expedient. While the two nations are at war there can be, in the nature of the case, no immigration.

Of the two bills, that to be sponsored by Congressman JUDD is immeasurably superior. Bear in mind that the issue at stake is the rankling sense of injustice felt throughout Asia at the present discriminatory racial policies of the United States. An exception made in the case of China alone would be universally regarded on that continent as simply a war bribe offered to soothe an ally who must be kept in line if victory is to be won. It would not be regarded as a genuine effort to do justice; it would leave Filipinos, Indonesians, Malayans, Siamese, Burmans, Indians, and Koreans with an intensified resentment. Indeed, it would be resented by the more thoughtful Chinese, who feel every slight inflicted on other Orientals as an injury to themselves.

Rumors from Washington indicate that there is a possibility that a Senator and a Representative from Pacific Coast States may offer simultaneously in both Houses of Congress a bill designed to deal with this issue. We trust that these rumors prove well founded, and that the bill will, when offered, follow the inclusive pattern set by that on which Congressman JUDD has been working. The Asiatic color bar has been maintained to this day largely as a football of Pacific coast politics. West coast politicians intent on reelection have used this issue much as the "white supremacy" slogan has been used by demagogues in the South. There are evidences, however, that labor, which was originally responsible for the enactment of the various Oriental exclusion laws, is gaining a new point of view. Various Congress of Industrial Organizations unions have gone on record in favor of dropping racial bars, and Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, is understood to be ready to support such a bill if it comes before Congress. If two or three American Federation of Labor leaders on the Pacific coast can be persuaded to change their position, the chances for amendment of the immigration and naturalization laws would be greatly enhanced.

Before the American public can be fully aroused to the importance of the issue at stake, however, it is evident that much still needs to be done to make clear exactly what is proposed and what would be involved if the legislative action advocated should be taken. What is proposed? It is proposed that the people of all nations be placed on exactly the same basis with regard to entrance into this country and the gaining of United States citizenship. It is proposed that all discrimination, overt or implied, on grounds of race, color or place of birth be stricken from our laws. What would be involved if this were done? In the case of one Asiatic nation, China, operation of the quota system would permit 105 Chinese a year to enter this country. In the case of less than a dozen other Asiatic nations, 100 of their citizens a year might be admitted. The total number of admissions would be less than 1,000 a year—a figure far lower than the number which Government authorities estimate were being smuggled in annually from Asia before the war. All thus admitted would be eligible for citizenship.

Such public agitation as has so far supported the elimination of racial discrimination from our immigration and naturalization laws has dealt almost entirely with the wisdom of such a policy as a win-the-war method. The Japanese propaganda in Asia, it is claimed, has pointed to our present laws as evidence of our pretensions to racial superiority. Let those laws be changed, therefore, in order thus to deprive the Japanese of a most effective propaganda weapon. The argument is perfectly sound, as far as it goes. If we are ever to win the enthusiastic support of the "billion potential allies" of Asia, that particular Japanese propaganda gun will have to be spiked. But the Christian Century advocates this change in American policy on another, and a higher, ground. We believe that these laws should be amended as a matter of justice—justice to the Asiatics and justice to the claim of our own Declaration of Independence that we hold all men created equal.

The American churches have a particular stake in this issue. While racial discrimination remains written in our laws, their loyalty to their own gospel of human brotherhood must be in question. And the reality of their professions of concern regarding the nature of the post-war order must be measured in the light of the fact that this is one point at which the building of a better world order can begin now. That better world order waits on our willingness to do justice. And in this matter of racial discrimination it is wholly within the power of the United States either to do or to withhold justice. We need consult with no other nation; the responsibility is ours alone. It is ours now. Drop the Asiatic color bar.

Address by Assistant Secretary Berle to Graduating Class of Utah State Agricultural College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the exceedingly interesting and able address delivered by Assistant Secretary of State, Hon. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., to the graduating class of Utah State Agricultural College, at Logan, Utah, on May 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Only a few short years ago graduation from universities and technical schools was a difficult and unhappy occasion. The young men and women asked anxiously of their elders whether there was any place in the world for them; whether they were needed or wanted; whether their training was of real value. Their elders were not able to give any satisfactory answer. Every profession was said to be overcrowded. In most lines of endeavor a terrible word was used: overproduction. Graduates, who rightly combine great realism with high ideals, left their schools with a real reason to wonder whether their room would not be more welcome than their company.

You have been fortunate in many matters, but particularly in this respect. No one today will leave you wondering whether you are really needed. Instead, there is a great wish that there were many, many more of you. No one will ask whether your training is useful. Everyone knows that every bit of it will be put to work overnight. No one talks of overproduction. Everything that can be produced will be needed, and still there will be none too much. Youth today has its great hour.

I think this is not merely the temporary stress of war. In recent years your elders, too, have been at school—a harder school, which has its own severe way of teaching and which imposes its lessons.

It is not likely that we shall talk of overproduction for some time to come, not even in agriculture. The signs are already out, indeed, that for some time to come every means of agricultural production will be strained to the limit to take care of outstanding and pressing obligations. This situation will last for some time. A single illustration will perhaps serve.

We are at this moment entering a desperate but hopeful stage of this vast World War. We do not fight alone; it is open to question, indeed, whether we could fight alone with real chance of final victory. Our allies, notably Britain, Russia, China, as well as the other United Nations, have strained every nerve to check and defeat the modern imitators of Genghis Khan. Russia alone has had to throw into a fighting front 3,000 miles long the flower of her productive manhood and

womanhood; she lost temporarily a great part of her most fertile land. She will need food to the utmost extent of our transport; she will need it now but she will need it even more pressingly next year. It is, rightly, a part of our obligation to see that food is available and that it goes forward. And this is but one of many claims which we must meet as a necessary and obvious part of winning the war. Even after the military defeat of the Axis there will be a continuing obligation to work toward the necessary clean-up of the greatest mess in history; and supply of food inevitably will be a major part of this process.

This is a single dramatic illustration, but it scarcely gives an idea of the real problem. As countries are liberated, one by one, the immediate problems will not diminish but will grow. Every new victory means an increased demand for supplies. It cannot be otherwise.

You are, therefore, fortunate in having trained yourselves for direct production. That holds equal place with fighting; when the fighting stops, it will hold first place. For production is the base of all economic life. It must be the source of supply. It must make possible necessary distribution. It alone can give value to money and currency. Without it, no structure, economic or social, has any meaning. Today we think of the battle of production as a part of winning the war. It will indeed be the principal factor in winning the peace.

Among the lessons which have been learned of recent years in the hard school of experience has been the lesson that production in any country today depends in great measure on international understanding. This is because, if you disconnect any country from others, production suddenly becomes difficult and is rapidly found to be insufficient. We used to think that the United States was so nearly self-sufficient that international matters did not mean much to our factory towns and to our great farm areas. Many people still felt that as late as December 1941. Then one day a Japanese fleet cut us off from Malaya and the Dutch East Indies; and only a little later a surprised country began to wonder whether it would not be paralyzed for lack of rubber and tin—a paralysis which would cut our motor traffic to nothing, cripple our farm machinery and our distribution, and force its effects back into the most isolated mountain home.

I do not think that anyone here who has faced the possibility that motor transport would stop will say again that this country has no interest in foreign affairs. Again, the illustration could be carried, with less drama, into a thousand fields of life.

Any production of farm or factory is most effective today if it is part of a general cooperative process in which substantially all the nations of the world have a part. Cut any country from the main channels of exchange and trade and you condemn great numbers in that country to economic misery.

There is a name for international economic cooperation. That name is commerce. By commerce we have exchanged services for services, goods for goods, payments against payments. The process can be helped from time to time by credit. When all the lines go down, and when we are dealing with ultimates, as we are in this war, we cut all the corners; we ask all hands to contribute what they can to the common cause; and we call the process "lend-lease." Today substantially all the United Nations are lend-leasing to each other—we to our allies and they to us.

Wars fortunately do not last forever; and it is to be expected that in due time we shall no longer need lend-lease and will develop again the processes of trade and commerce which make your production and mine possible. Probably the readjustment will have to be assisted by credit. But it must be assumed that if we are to live at all the international process will be reestablished. Certainly, if you are to lead happy and fruitful lives in agriculture it must be restored.

These are elementary and obvious facts. Less often do we go behind those facts and see what is really needed if this process of international agreement is to be maintained. There, too, the bitter school of experience has taught some lessons.

Before there can be any soundly based international commerce, there must be peace and the assurance of peace. No one, in the United States certainly, will accept without a struggle the idea that we and our children will live out our lives in a world perpetually at war or perpetually under the threat of war. We propose, if we can, to create a situation in which peace exists and in which the peace will be kept. This is what is meant by President Roosevelt's phrase "freedom from fear." We have learned that peace is not had by wishing. We have seen the most peaceful countries in the world—Norway, for example—shattered, despite the most correct behavior, by a neighbor from whom she had every right to expect gratitude and not enmity. Clearly, more is needed than good intentions and good conduct.

We have learned, too, that the United States has no God-given immunity from this problem. On two occasions during the present war we have been in the most desperate national peril. The first occasion was in the summer of 1940, when the British alone stood against the Axis; when Germany planned, and indeed may have had within her power, the conquest of Britain. In that summer we were not adequately prepared; and had the German plan of seizing Britain, Iceland, and Greenland been carried out we should have had war on our own shores.

The second occasion was last November. An American and British expedition was afloat, headed for north Africa to invade the Mediterranean. At that same moment a powerful Japanese force was launched against Guadalcanal. Fortune blessed our arms and gave us victory in both battles. But had the issue been different we should have been sorely tried. If the Germans had forestalled us on the African shoulder and clinched their control of the Atlantic, if the Japanese had been able to drive us back to the mid-Pacific, we should today have been a besieged country.

The two victories, coming within a few days, changed the entire aspect of the war.

We must never forget that we could not have met this double peril alone. Our north African force was powerfully supported by the British attacking in Libya, by British naval and transport units, and by British and French armies. On the Pacific side, we were working in conjunction with Australia, were using British islands and territories, and could develop our position only because we were in partnership with Australia, New Zealand, and Britain, who held the islands. Together we could block an attack in the Pacific and could smash into the Axis Mediterranean line. Separately, neither would have been able to meet the onslaught.

Just as the combined effort prevented the peace-breaker from being victorious, combined effort could and can prevent anyone from daring to break the peace. The lesson which we did not learn in 1919 is writ for us in letters of fire today. Understandings with peace-loving nations must be found to assure that the peace will be kept. With assurance of peace, the energies of this and other countries can be liberated for the constructive tasks which ought to be the crown of modern civilization. This has to be said and repeated and repeated again. The peace is lost unless it carries with it reasonable assurance that it will continue. Unless this is done, no businessman can make plans; no serious commerce can be started; no constructive program can be realized; no progressive program stands a chance of success.

The second essential is the reliance that the line of free movement of ideas, goods, and services must be kept open. This is itself a short statement of a profound set of conditions. You do not get open channels of trade unless you have safe routes, adequate transport, and safety and certainty of handling. These, in turn, can only exist in a world in which standards of honesty and fair dealing are not only accepted in words but lived up to in dependable practice. In other words, the continued transit of goods which is needed for the life of every country depends at last on a world of honest men, dealing fairly with each other.

National policies must be such that this can happen. You cannot expect to have free transit of goods if the nations of the world are engaged in building higher barriers to trade; if their tariff systems are rigged, one against the other, in the futile hope of catching a temporary advantage; if they have tricks of discriminatory practice; if money and banking and international exchange rates are being worked one against the other. That is why the present discussion in Washington of the Trade Agreements Act, the American method of seeking steadily to reduce these barriers, is of inestimable importance, both as a symbol of our willingness to work in a fairly organized world and for the solid achievements which have been reached by applying this method.

That is why any Government intent on winning the peace as well as the war has to think of the problem of monetary stabilization and to seek sound ways and means by which money shall assist and not retard the flow of goods.

That is why we have to be working toward fair and equitable arrangements for transport, by sea and by air; toward systems of communications which will adequately serve the needs of a modern world; and a number of similar problems.

All these matters are a part of the fabric of affairs which has enabled this country to be productive beyond measure; which has made it possible for the United States to enjoy an abundance unknown in previous history. Perhaps a minor blessing out of the great sorrow of war is the fact that the war has taught us our vital interest in this fabric of arrangement between nations. These arrangements were always present from the beginning of our history; but in older days we took no thought of them or, more accurately, we took them for granted. In the quiet era of the nineteenth century the patterns had been set and they were peacefully observed. We had sufficient freedom to enter these patterns without working toward their creation. First, as a small power, we had little responsibility for building the pattern; later, in our growing strength, we were careful not to interrupt it. This great fabric of national relations thus existed by general consent; and we enjoyed the fruits of it.

With 1914 that peaceful pattern came to a shattering end. It was never fully reestablished, though we had the illusion of its existence during the decade of the twenties. We know today that the forces were building even then for a new and greater catastrophe. One by one, the great trade routes were being cut or strangled; in different parts of the world three nations ordered their lives with the intent not of keeping the peace but of breaking it; of setting up a campaign for world conquest and world plunder on a scale so vast that this country declined to believe that it was the work of sane men. The convulsion of today is the result. Winning the

peace of tomorrow must mean the rebuilding of those conditions under which peace and production under freedom can again go forward.

Today no world offers us entry into a ready-made system. As the strongest single power, the world asks of us what system we will join in creating. It is our turn and time to speak.

Victory, to be complete, must give us the structure of a new plateau of peace—not only as serving our vital national interest but also to meet the dictates of common humanity. It is notable that the conditions of such a plateau of peace are stated as "freedoms"—freedoms under which individuals as well as nations shall enjoy the fruit of victory. We know that freedom from fear and want are within the range of modern productive equipment. Your agricultural technique has opened great vistas in new products. The technicians in laboratories see endless visions to be drawn from the raw materials of the earth. The question asked of us—a question which will be answered by your generation—is whether we are wise enough, restrained enough, straight-thinking enough, and good enough to make sure that our social and political arrangements will permit us to benefit from this advance in technique.

In closing, I dare not omit a statement which may seem strange in these days when economics and engineering are supposed to be dominant. I do not believe in economics or engineering or technique by themselves unless they are informed and directed by a faith which transcends material things. It has recently become usual to sneer at spiritual forces. But the hardest-boiled technical students of history and the men who manage great affairs do not enter into that laughter. The anthropologist knows that no civilization has lasted more than a few years without transcending life itself. The diplomat knows that no community, and no empire has yet been built except by men who had a faith transcending life itself. The diplomat knows that national strength is based on national morals. The building of Utah in a forbidding wilderness is a living witness. Your State was not set up by a colonization company. It was made by men of vision and passionate spiritual belief.

In this war we dispose of forces beyond the conceptions of history. At the close of it we shall have possibilities of production undreamed of by our fathers. We shall have in our hands the tools to make the world as we wish it. But what we wish, and what we will do turns on the faith which each of us has.

We must hold and keep our spiritual life poignantly in the hour of battle, humbly in the hour of victory, proudly in the hour of sacrifice, steadily in the long years of reconstruction. You, as young men and women, will spend your lives in creating the new world. It may not be amiss to remember the words of the One Hundred and Twenty-seventh Psalm: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

Our Great Wall Against the Chinese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Republic of November 23, 1942, which is still remarkably pertinent to a subject which will soon come to this floor—the repeal of the Chinese-exclusion laws:

OUR GREAT WALL AGAINST THE CHINESE

On the eve of the Chinese Independence Day, called Double-Ten, October 10, our State Department announced that we are ready at last to give up our special rights in China. That one gesture has already done us much good in the eyes and hearts of the Chinese people—and I hope in our own hearts and consciences.

What is the next step?

Clearly it must be the revision of those laws which continue to insult the Chinese.

It is well known that we exclude all Orientals from entry into this country for permanent residence. Our courts do get mixed up sometimes and naturalize a Syrian or a Cossack, or a Parsee, or someone else of Asiatic origin, as Raymond Buell has pointed out, and some of the people we let in from southern Europe have much darker skins than the Chinese.

But the main point—and one not so well known—is that while we are excluding all Orientals under one law, we keep on the books a special, older, and therefore even more humiliating restriction against our allies, the Chinese. Before this war it was easier for a Japanese salesman, perhaps a spy, than for a Chinese scholar to visit this country.

This special restriction has to do not with immigration but with visiting, which is going to be important during and after this war—that is, if we are going to have, as I believe we shall, a free world in which men of like minds wish to meet one another, move about freely and together conduct the affairs of science, business, government, and the humanities.

Now, how is it that we discriminate against the Chinese more crudely than against any other people? It goes back to 1880, when we began to pass a series of laws which first regulated and limited, and then suspended, and at last prohibited, permanent Chinese immigration to the United States. Of course that was because we were afraid of what was called a flood of cheap Chinese labor. Nothing that is now proposed would in any way threaten us with such a flood.

Under the comprehensive Oriental exclusion law passed in 1924 we said that we want no Asiatics here as permanent residents. But we do admit certain classes as travelers or visitors—students, merchants, scholars. When that law was passed, we did not put the Chinese on the same footing as the Japanese, the Siamese, and other Orientals.

In the case of Japan and other Asiatic nations we accepted the passport of the traveler's own government as evidence that the visitor was one of those favored classes who were permitted to visit us. A Chinese wishing to visit this country, however, has to have a special certificate called a Section 6 Certificate. We do not accept the passport of the Chinese government but demand in addition to his passport this special American document telling his occupational status. And even so he is likely to be held up for long questioning—even though he be a distinguished Chinese gentleman, coming here, let us say, to give a course of lectures. Only a Chinese government official, with his passport stamped official, can get in without this certificate.

* * * * *

The blunt truth is that we have a peculiar discriminatory attitude toward the Chinese, treating them as we treat the people of no other nation.

An American citizen, born here but perhaps of Chinese descent, who goes to China and marries a Chinese wife, cannot bring her back here. As a Chinese official says, "Many of those whom God has joined together the immigration officials have put asunder."

Chinese can enter the United States only at certain designated ports. A Chinese student booked for a certain college may have to travel hundreds of extra miles by rail or bus because he is not allowed to land at the port nearest his destination. A Chinese merchant in Mexico who may seek entry into the United States in order to sail for China from San Francisco or Los Angeles has to be accompanied by an immigration guard all the way from San Antonio to the West coast and has to provide for the guard's traveling expenses as well as his own. No other nationality is subjected to this.

A Chinese not born in the United States cannot become a citizen by naturalization. We naturalize people of German or Italian descent, but not Chinese.

There are exceptions to this, under the Selective Service Act. Chinese living here are subject to the draft. After being drafted, a Chinese can apply for American citizenship, but only on condition that he has documents to show that he entered this country legally. To a great many of the Chinese now in this country this is just another way of saying that they cannot ever become American citizens. So the strange and unjust situation is that we are forcing them to fight—and perhaps die—for a country which will not accept them as citizens.

Every true American can be heartily ashamed of this attitude of inequality.

What should we do to set ourselves straight?

First, we should repeal at once all those special exclusion laws which discriminate against the Chinese in particular. I take it that no one will object to the abolition of laws which rate our Chinese allies lower than the Japanese and other Asiatics.

The next step would be immediately to take the Chinese out from under the comprehensive Asiatic Exclusion Act of 1924 and put them on the quota basis which we apply to immigrants from European and other countries. The quota system admits a small yearly number from each country, based upon the number of that nationality already here in 1890. On a quota basis, the number of Chinese admitted, according to the official estimates of the United States Department of Justice, would be 100 per year. Certainly not a flood of cheap Chinese labor.

Finally, and as part of the same action, we should make the Chinese living here eligible for naturalization as American citizens. We now have a fourth generation of Chinese-Americans growing up in this country. Those born here are American citizens. Their relatives and friends and others who come here after being born in China should be equally free to become citizens if they wish and if they can pass the rigid requirements which we put upon all foreign-born. The Chinese are almost the best citizens we have. They are industrious, they made almost no calls for relief during the depression, they are notably honest and law abiding. Among all nationalities here, I believe their crime record is the lowest.

If it is argued that we cannot make exceptions of the Chinese, let us remember that before 1870 we allowed naturalization only to "free white persons." After slavery was abolished we extended naturalization rights to "aliens of African nativity and persons of African descent."

We find ways to do these things when we want to do them. I believe that we are now ready, when the Chinese are our valued allies, to take these next steps forward in the march toward human equality.

The Chinese saying is, "Around the four seas all men are brothers." Our saying is, "All men are created free and equal." Let us prove by our acts that we mean it.

RICHARD J. WALSH.

Increased Allotments to Dependents of Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on June 9, 1943, on the subject of a bill I have introduced providing for an increase in the allotments to dependents of enlisted men in the armed services.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., United States Senator from Massachusetts. I speak to you tonight in the midstream of this terrible war, upon which the future of our country and the daily life of every man, woman, and child within this country depends. It is a war in which we have made some real progress. It is really not so long ago that we confronted the humiliation at Pearl Harbor, the tragedy at Bataan, and that we saw our allies, Great Britain and Russia, undergoing a series of reverses. The trend is now our way, although the road ahead is still a hard one.

In order to win this war on which—and I repeat—our very survival depends, we must have large numbers of men in our armed forces. This war must be fought and won by our armed forces under a unified allied command of experienced leaders in the field and not by armchair commentators in the home.

The figure of 10,800,000 men for the Army and Navy has been reached by our General Staff. It is a figure which has been approved by the General Board of the Navy, the joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of War and Navy, and, finally, the President. It was based on the data of the War Production Board, the Department of Agriculture, the Manpower Commission, the Labor Department, and Treasury Department. Both the Chairman of the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission have accepted this figure as an objective which it is their duty to reach. The total of 10,800,000 includes 2,600,000 for the Navy, and the rest—that is, 8,200,000—is for the Army. Of this number about 3,000,000 is for the Air Force, and the rest goes to constitute an Army of 100 divisions. Compare 100 divisions for the United States with 300 for Germany, with the 80 divisions which enfeebled Italy possessed just a short time ago. Compare the fact that our armed forces amount to something more than 7 percent of our population as contrasted with armed forces for Russia which are almost 9 percent, and of Germany which are over 12 percent of their respective populations.

This is a figure, therefore, which we can meet, but in order to meet it we shall probably have to call every physically qualified man.

This is a far-reaching step. It is a hard step, because we all sympathize with the proposition that the man with dependents should be left with his family just as long as possible. This is a view which I have held since the beginning of the war. Only recently the Military Affairs Committee secured a promise from the Selective Service authorities that they would not call the fathers of families into the armed services until all other available categories have been taken. We must be sure that every possible step is taken to prevent the dislocation of family life in the United States.

But at the same time we must realize that a continuance of this war will compel the drafting of all physically qualified men regardles of their family status. This inevitably means the drafting of married men because among married men is found such a high percentage of individuals who are physically qualified.

What more, therefore, can one do to safeguard the family life of the United States? Well, we can try to reach the man with no dependents who is now exempted from the draft without good reason. There has been some talk that in the Federal Government, men were exempted from the draft because of their employment in the Government. To meet this situation, I drafted a bill which passed the House and Senate and was signed by the President and is now law which prevents service in the Federal Government from being used as a device to evade the draft. This type of legislation is helpful to fathers because as long as men who are not family men are being called into the Army the calling of fathers is postponed. What else can we do for the family man? Well, we can see to it that if he is drafted, his wife and children receive proper support from the Government. We not only can see to it—I should use stronger language—we must see to it. It is a duty. It is a humanitarian cause to make sure that the dependents of these men who fight for their country shall be properly cared for. It is for this reason that I decided to introduce a bill to increase the amount to be paid to the dependents of soldiers. The law now in effect was enacted in June 1942 and the rates prescribed in that bill have not been changed since that time. My bill calls for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government contribution to dependents only of enlisted men.

Let us see what the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, which is now in force, provides. Let me give you some typical cases showing the total monthly allowance, including the Government's contribution and the soldiers' contribution.

In the case of a wife but no children, $50 a month.

A wife and one child, $62.
A wife and two children, $72.
A wife and three children, $82.
One child, wife deceased, $42.
Three children, wife deceased, $62.
One parent, $37.
One parent and one sister or brother, $42.
One parent and four sisters or brothers, $57.
Two parents, $47.
Two parents and two sisters or brothers, $57.
No parent but two sisters or brothers, $32.
No parents but five sisters or brothers, $47.
Wife, but no child, and one parent, $70.
Wife, two children, and one parent, $92.

Many other combinations of relatives and dependents are possible and are authorized for allowances when eligible. I have presented the above only as typical examples.

To meet the inadequacies of the present allowance system caused by the rising cost of living, I have introduced a measure which would increase the Government's contribution to dependents 15 percent over what it is now.

I would like tonight to give you my reasons for introducing this bill. I hope I may convince you that it is a worthy bill and that you will feel like giving it your support. It applies only for the duration.

The first reason is that the cost of living has increased since the original law was first enacted. This fact has been recognized by the President of the United States. This fact was recognized by the Congress of the United States when it passed legislation increasing the pay of Federal employees. One of these acts applying to the overtime compensation of Government employees as a whole was approved May 7, 1943. Another, providing additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service, was approved April 9, 1943. If you look at the monthly report of employment by the United States Civil Service Commission for March 1943, you will see that the average monthly salary as of March 31 of this year has increased 15.4 percent over the salary paid in June 1942. In June 1942, the average salary was $160.11 and March 31 it was $184.77.

Another indication as to the increase of living costs is found in the reports regarding the number of dependents of servicemen who are receiving various forms of public assistance. I am advised that in Massachusetts, for example, in the period from September 1941, to June 1942, there were 33 aid-to-dependent-children cases attributable to the fact that their fathers had entered the service. On the other hand, on March 15, 1943, in a report covering 90 percent of the whole State, 446 aid-to-dependent-children cases were found which are attributable to the fact that their fathers had gone into the service. An increase from 33 cases to 446 cases in a year is a substantial and impressive increase. In May 1942, there were 78 families listed in Massachusetts with members in the service who were on general relief. On March 15 of this year, on the other hand, there were 1,481 cases of servicemen whose dependents were receiving various forms of public assistance. What is true of one State is undoubtedly true of others.

I will not tonight attempt to tell you why the cost of living has gone up as much as it has. It will probably increase. I want to talk about the results, about the consequences, of these rapid increases in prices. One of our leading economists and one of our most trusted elder statesmen is Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. In a masterly argument for a really effective price control he says, and I quote, "The point I want to raise is that price control is essential if Government salaries and appropriations are to have any meaning. What will happen to the teachers, war veterans, social security beneficiaries, policemen, firemen, all the hundreds of thousands of Government employees, Federal, State, county, and city, if prices are allowed to run wild? Will the Federal, State, and city governments advance the wages of these people to meet increased costs of living? Or do they propose to leave them victims of fortuitous circumstances?" In a letter to me dated June 3 this eminent man notes the fact that I have introduced this bill to increase the allowance to servicemen's dependents by 15 percent and he says, "In this I heartily concur. The necessity for this was brought about entirely by the inaction and procrastination of the Government. All of the consequences were pointed out in plenty of time from 1931 on and also the remedy that was necessary. I cannot see any argument against the passage of your bill unless the cost of living is controlled and even reduced."

Writing in the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. Robert R. Mullen makes this significant contribution to this vital question:

"The present provision is both inadequate and uncertain. It is inadequate because it provides a total of only $62 a month for a wife with one child, $72 for a wife with two children. It is uncertain because supplementary payments—and who could insist supplementary payments will not be necessary in many instances—are left to the discretion, and resources of local charity.

"The question goes beyond morale and beyond humaneness, for the family, and especially the young, growing families chiefly represented in the age groups to be called, are the social and economic backbone of the Nation.

"Department of Labor figures indicate that about 37 percent of the Nation's families are composed of husband and wife and from one to four children under 16 years of age. While, of course, the largest number of these families are found in the lower-income brackets, it is worth the sharpest notice that as many as 26 percent of those families having one child earn and spend upwards of $2,100 a year, while nearly 20 percent of those having up to four children have unit expenditures in excess of $500, which means incomes above $2,000.

"This is merely supporting arithmetic for that which is apparent to all who look about them in the clean, new suburbs of which America is so proud, namely, that a substantial portion of the home-establishing population of the country is included in the group about to be called to the colors. Economically, this group has advanced beyond the position of most of the young, unmarried men thus far called, in that they have surrounded themselves with a certain amount of property, but few have advanced to positions of full ownership. They have continuing obligations in the form of house mortgages, insurance premiums, installment accounts, and what not.

"To reduce the mother of two small children from an annual expenditure on a plane above $2,000 a year to the $864 presently provided by law implies hardships and heartbreaks that the country should shrink from imposing.

"Great Britain, after fumbling with this question not too successfully, finally adopted a flexible system of grants, tailored pretty much to individual needs, insofar as custom tailoring is possible under a £3 weekly maximum. Russia has done better, at least so it appears on paper, by granting realistic allowances, cutting rents in half for dependents' wives, guaranteeing certain rations and clothing, and by providing jobs for wives and good nursery schools for children."

We have the word of Mr. Paul V. McNutt, the Federal Security Administrator, that in Canada the treatment of soldiers' families is more liberal. Says he, "From the American point of view in contrast with the pay of our own soldiers, the Canadian soldiers' pay and allowances seems to be strikingly generous. A man with a wife and two children received his pay plus allowance of $99 a month in addition to his own keep."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a solemn duty. Never in the whole of human history have men been willing to fight if they were worried about their loved ones at home. History is full of instances in which armies were well equipped and ably led, yet did not fight because they were worried about conditions at home. The wife and children of the soldier have a first claim on our affection. Congress should recognize that fact and do so promptly. I am happy to say that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, has promised me prompt action.

If the war continues, and we must expect that it will, these men with dependents will be called. To provide for them now is merely to exercise common foresight. As was well said recently by the Lowell Sun, "There is merit to the bill presented by Senator LODGE which would increase the Government's contribution to dependents of enlisted men by 15 percent. Particularly is this so because before the year is out it is possible that many men with families and dependents, who have been heretofore exempt from the draft, will be in the armed forces."

"The Senator anticipates such a development, and, at the same time, attemps to correct existing ills through his bill.

"Throughout the country, many cities and towns are reporting that it has been necessary in numerous cases to provide direct welfare to dependents of men at the fighting fronts. The Government's contribution in these cases is admittedly inadequate and not commensurate with the rising cost of living.

"Soldiers and sailors who are fighting to preserve this Nation and its Government deserve more consideration; they must wonder, as they continue their heroic battle under the most torturous conditions, why their Government thinks so little of them as to deny their folks at home enough assistance with which to get by.

"This is no time to pinch pennies and make the families of servicemen the victims. It is not fair that any person legitimately dependent upon a soldier for support, whether a parent, wife, or child, should be forced to the humiliation of applying for local public welfare.

"Senator LODGE's bill should receive ready endorsement from his colleagues in the Senate and likewise from the House."

We must do our simple duty. Good night.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, every time we watch Senator BYRD perform, his true and unappreciated worth impresses us.

The new Byrnes set-up takes over about everything but the coal mines and the kitchen stove.

On top of all our wars in the seven seas, we have got to quell this zoot war at home. When it rains it pours.

When Herbert Hoover talks about food it sounds different than hearing a long-haired professor speak on technology.

Senator REYNOLDS' definition of an isolationist: "One who loves this country more than he loves any other country in the whole wide world."

While the promised continental invasion remains short of real, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees will try to entertain you for the rest of June with the battle of the billions.

Mr. Albert J. Goss, head of the National Grange, made a profound contribution before the Senate committee against incentive or subsidy payments. His parent farm organization can be proud of him.

Senator BAILEY'S ardor in limiting all future presidents to two terms is the perfect example of the traditional stolen horse and the barn door. Some believe, too, that the plan has White House sanction.

The original purpose of the WAAC's and the WAVES was that each should "release a man for active duty." Now there is a sponsored effort to make them equal with men in service with all its hazards—one of the last Nudeal subterfuges.

Mr. Guyer was the dean of the Kansas House delegation, the oldest in years and service. He revered the Constitution; he upheld to the end the finer traditions of his State; and he chose to be buried with the boys and girls whom he had taught.

Post-War Air Transport and the Average Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 10, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert an address delivered by Juan T. Trippe, president, Pan American World Airways System, on the occasion of the award to Mr. Trippe of the gold medal of the National Institute of Social Sciences, in New York City, Wednesday, May 19, 1943:

POST-WAR AIR TRANSPORT AND THE AVERAGE MAN

Mr. President, members and guests of the National Institute of Social Sciences, 88,000 men and women should be here tonight to receive this medal—the 88,000 members of the Pan American Airways organization. Each shares the responsibility for the services our merchant fleet of the air has rendered to its country—each will share responsibility for the services we hope to render to all people of the world—and by people I mean the people—the average man and woman everywhere.

I welcome this honor for all of us: for the faithful weather observer who at this moment checks the cloud ceiling on a mountain top in China; for a mechanic in Africa testing the ignition of a Clipper as if the world's fate hung on his accuracy; for the ground officials and flying crews who, in cooperation with our Army Air Forces and the British, created in 61 days a modern United Nations supply route across Africa; for the master pilot and his flight crew of 10 who on the occasion of the Casablanca Conference flew President Roosevelt to Liberia and safely home again; for those who took Vice President WALLACE on his epic good-will tour of Latin America; for the flight crews who, on many trips throughout her country, transported that gallant woman, Madame Chiang Kai-shek; for all the Pan American men who have pioneered, in 16 years, first the Caribbean, then the Pacific, then Latin America, then Alaska and the Pacific to Australasia and the Orient, then the Atlantic to Europe and Africa until their wings are, indeed, over the world, and all its seven seas.

I accept for all of these men and women not only the medal of the Institute of Social Sciences, but the moral responsibility that goes with it. You have bestowed this honor in other years upon historians, scientists, doctors, educators, churchmen, masters of the arts, and leaders of industry. They make civilization. We hope to carry it, to the common man in the remotest land in the farthest sea. And we shall carry back from that land to the common man in America, the many things that every land has to supply and to teach.

We can carry Americans and American ideas on a scale undreamed of only a few short years ago. Just think! Only 16 years ago, in 1927, American air transport operated its first overseas flight with the one and only plane Pan American owned. It was a flight of 90 miles from Key West to Havana, carrying the mail and eight passengers. Today Pan American Airways has completed more than 120,000,000 miles of overseas flight with the great four-engined Clippers. And as those miles were logged—as problems arose and solutions were found—there developed a treasury of scientific fact elsewhere undiscovered—a fund upon which our armed forces and those of our allies have been free to draw.

There have been such developments as the multiple flight crew, the accessibility of power plants in flight, and a system of scientific flight control so accurate, so scrupulously adhered to, that Clippers regularly keep schedules over 2,000 miles of open sea and set passengers down on time and without incident.

America has evolved a highly trained, professional organization whose precision is unique in world aviation. Pioneering has proceeded in many remote areas—in Labrador, Greenland, Iceland, and Alaska in 1932, in Africa in 1933, in China in 1934. Even in these war days, 60 countries and colonies, including all our Latin American neighbors, are being served. Transit which took months is now telescoped to days.

And let me repeat—this is done by an organization, men and women working in cooperation, but each dependent on the other. No one man, not even a Clipper's master pilot, could fly the ocean without relying on countless other people, on his crew, on the engineers, maintenance men, radio operators, weather observers, forecasters, airport crews—in fact, on the great and complex organization that today conducts any modern transport system.

When the war is won, we will still have a real job to do, to solidify the peace.

As we carry men, mail, and merchandise—ideas and ideals—science, medicine, culture, and the arts, we will again be carrying cargoes of goodwill. I hope we will never carry cargoes of imperialism and hate. We Americans must see that they are not sent. We must remember that air transport is the vehicle, not the cargo. It can serve good ends or bad.

North and South America relied on our air transport to implement the good-neighbor policy. But the Nazis, by the same token, counted on their international air line, the Lufthansa, to help dominate and crush the world.

Air power can further anarchy or peace. It can destroy or build. It can be a lethal weapon or a life-giving tool—sword or plowshare, Frankenstein or Aladdin's lamp, Stuka bomber or Clipper. And as surely as we meet here tonight it can enslave the common man—or it can free him.

Let me suggest, for your consideration, some ways in which air transport can be on the right side and do the right thing—how it can be made more completely the instrument of the common man.

The first way is simple. It is to assume our natural responsibility as a private enterprise and to offer the most value to the most people. That isn't as obvious as it sounds. Because air transport does have the choice, the very clear choice, of becoming a luxury service to carry the well-to-do at high prices, or to carry the average man for what he can afford to pay. Pan American has chosen the latter course.

The decision was made before Pearl Harbor. And over a year ago Pan American had started its program for the construction of 50 giant Clippers, each capable of carrying 153 passengers from New York to London in 10 hours at a fare of a hundred dollars. These same clippers operating over other Pan American Airways' routes would provide 24-hour service to Australia or China, 22 hours to Buenos Aires—all at comparably low fares.

In future years we will do even better. The war has been a bitter laboratory for air transport, but a laboratory nonetheless. Its benefits should be available to all the people in the peace to come.

Nor will these benefits be limited to low-cost travel and fast mail. There will be more instances of the flying of serums and doctors to epidemic areas. There will be food to fight famine. Air transport will bring greater prosperity to all the world—in tourist expenditures abroad—by stepping up the tempo of trade and commerce.

And surely the other great national air-transport systems of the Allies—British Overseas Airways, the Soviet Civil Air Line, Air France, Royal Dutch Airlines, Trans-Canada, and the rest—as well as Pan American will wish to make sure that this new prosperity benefits the people—all the people of all the world.

These are the tangible benefits we may hope for. The intangible may be more precious still.

Understanding between nations should grow as more of us meet each other face to face and talk things over.

If America's railroads had run north and south instead of east and west, there would probably have been no Civil War. We all recall people against whom we were prejudiced by reputation, but whom we have come to like when we knew them. In my opinion the two old adages should be transposed to read "Absence breeds contempt," and "Familiarity makes the heart grow fonder." Our country can foster greater international good will by providing frequent and cheap communications with the countries of the world.

And what is true of passenger service is equally true for mail. A ton of air mail is a normal part of a clipper cargo. A ton of mail—80,000 letters, 80,000 separate ideas—have crossed an international boundary. It would be hard to overstate their influence.

In all these ways, air transport can carry the gospel of international good will. But we must also put our own house in order so that we may serve the peoples of the world to greatest advantage. And along this line we still have work to do.

It is obvious, of course, that the great national air transport monopolies, which represent each of the principal foreign nations, will continue to compete with each other and with us.

But it is vital to establish an equitable basis for such competition. Friendship will result from fair play. And we must correct certain unfair situations that have developed. To cite only one, there is the war-born problem confronting Great Britain.

In our joint war effort, the British are building essentially fighter planes, and other military types. America is building military types and transports. It has been stated that at the peace, America will possess most of the planes that could be used in international air transport—that while both countries have served a war role, unmindful of future commercial advantages, Great Britain, in so doing, has suffered a post-war handicap.

We all share the healthy American aspiration to be the winner of a race or a ball game or international business competition. But fair is fair. If you want to win a baseball game, you try to out-hit the other fellow, but you don't take away his bat.

British Overseas Airways already has in essential war service, three of Pan American's four-engined ocean clippers. But these as well as their sister ships still in our own service will be obsolete. For these compelling reasons, I urge that when the fighting stops British Overseas Airways be permitted to secure on equitable terms all the ocean transport planes that are needed to restore the balance for fair competition. In fact, I urge that this principle shall have application to our dealings with the national air lines representing each of the United Nations.

This world of ours, in the age of flight, should be one world.

Your National Institute of Social Sciences has proved it can be, by confirming in research many of the highest concepts we hold about the natural brotherhood of man.

The law of life is not so much the survival of the fittest as the survival of those fittest to cooperate. In the world scheme of things, only those who cooperate will survive.

Air transport has made use of many sciences, aerodynamics, metallurgy, celestial navigation—in fact every known branch of mathematics—medicine, electronics, chemistry and physics.

But it is to the social sciences that we turn for the solution of the human problems which must be met if we are to be sure of world cooperation without which we cannot progress.

Pan American Airways recently undertook to give wide distribution to the views of such social scientists as John Dewey, Dr. Hu Shih, Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister Padilla, Stephen Leacock, the late Dr. George Crile and the Archbishop of Canterbury. We invited each freely to express his concept of the future. These enlightened minds did not agree on every detail—but there is a basic harmony in all their thinking. We must build a world which increases the stature of the common man.

To the extent that air transport by its vision and its faith can serve the common man, it is worthy of the honor you have conferred tonight.

Chinese Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, among the scores of editorials now appearing in all sections of the press in all parts of the country advocating extending to the Chinese an immigration quota on the same basis as to other Allied countries, one of the most lucid and convincing is from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 9, 1943, as follows:

STIGMATIZED

There is a movement on foot in Congress to remove from the Federal statute books the "stigma" of Chinese exclusion.

A stigma, says the dictionary, is a mark made with a branding iron, and so far as the Chinese are concerned, the brand of our discrimination has been cruelly deep and humiliating. Not even the Japanese have been so sharply segregated by American restrictions; the Chinese, more than any peoples on earth, have been made officially to feel that we regard them as complete inferiors.

Take the oriental exclusion law of 1924, for example. That law said, in effect, that we wanted no Asiatics as permanent residents. But in the case of all Asiatic nations save China, visitors and travelers were admitted on presentation of their government's own passport. For Chinese visitors—even students and educators—we required special precautions. We demanded a special certificate of admission, an extra measure of red tape and questioning.

Even today, while China fights with us as a valiant ally, we cling stubbornly to our old positions of discrimination. The Chinese are good enough to die by the millions in a war against Axis tyranny—but a Chinese who is not born in the United States is not good enough, so the law implies, to become an American citizen by naturalization. A man of German descent may be so naturalized, and so may an Italian. But a Chinese alien is not so fortunate. He is beyond the pale. Officially we regard him as a racial inferior, too far beneath us to deserve the boon of citizenship. To be sure, he may be drafted, and under the Selective Service Act, may then apply for citizenship; but even in these special circumstances, we demand proof of legal entry, which many find it almost impossible to offer.

So the story runs; the Chinese have been a race apart, singled out for discriminations which crassly served notice to them that we considered China a nation on the coolie level, unworthy of our own distinguished company. Yet Americans, deep in their hearts, know better. Within recent years, particularly, they have developed a warm regard for the Chinese, and it is not a regard born solely of China's magnificent resistance to Japan. In the United States we have come to admire the Chinese for his industry, his intelligence, his patriotism, and his good faith, and we have come to see, in the person of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, the symbol of a truly great people.

Under the circumstances it is high time that the injustices inherent in our official attitudes and polices be eliminated. If we placed the Chinese on a quota basis with other nationalities, it would result, according to one official estimate, in only 100 immigrants a year. If we made all Chinese living here eligible for naturalization, it would be no more than they deserve. In such ways as by our rejection last year of the system of extraterritoriality, we could help make amends to a galiant ally for the humiliations we have heaped upon her.

On July 7 China will enter its seventh year of war against Japan, and the occasion will be marked by many glowing tributes from America. More eloquent than words, though, would be the removal of the old stigmas. The Chinese, as a people, have richly earned it.

The Hawaiian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on this day, June 11, the Territory of Hawaii annually commemorates the birth of a great man, who unified the islands in the years between 1790 and 1810. He was Kamehameha I, founder of the Hawaiian kingdom at a time when the United States was organizing its own independent national existence following the American Revolution.

By the standards of any people, Kamehameha was a man of extraordinary powers, both in war and peace. It was he who welded the islands into an independent nation, and it was as an independent nation and not as a purchased or conquered country that Hawaii voluntarily relinquished her sovereignty in 1898 to become an integral part of the United States.

Because of the relationship of the Congress to Hawaii, I feel it is appropriate to call to the attention of Congress some of the contributions the native Hawaiian people have made to our common country. A fitting opportunity to bring that record briefly to your attention is furnished by this Hawaiian holiday, established by act of the Territorial legislature in honor of Kamehameha the Great.

The foremost contribution of the native Hawaiian people, needless to say, was their voluntary transfer to the United States of their political sovereignty, and the riches and strategic value of their land. For that cession, the United States is everlastingly the richer, and the more secure.

Kamehameha was a youth when the islands were first brought to the attention of the outside world by Captain Cook, the British explorer, in 1778. In 1790 he began the series of campaigns which ultimately subdued the warring chieftains of Hawaii and brought the islands together under his own rule. With that consolidation accomplished by force of arms, he firmly established peace, strengthened his government, developed agriculture, and engaged in trade with other peoples of the Pacific. The United States was trading with Hawaiians in 1790, and has been ever since for a century and a half, until now the trade has reached a point which prompted the Joint Congressional Committee on Hawaii to report in 1937:

> It is not often realized that the commerce of Hawaii with other parts of the United States exceeds that between America and all but a few of the great nations of the world.

Hawaii was as much a crossroads of the Pacific in 1800 as it is today. It was the indispensable center from which radiated trade routes to China, Kamchatka, the Pacific northwest, California, and New England via Cape Horn. Over those routes moved cargoes important in the maritime and commercial history of the United States—sandalwood, furs, tea, sperm oil, merchandise from Canton, supplies for miners in the California gold fields. Whaling captains recruited replacements for their crews among Hawaiians. Sailing ships were provisioned with Hawaiian produce, outfitted by Hawaiian chandlers, repaired in Hawaiian ports. In the 1840's and 1850's, when New Bedford was the whaling capital of the world, Honolulu was the principal field base in the Pacific, where six-sevenths of the whaling fleet operated.

During those years Hawaiians willingly made room in their kingdom for an increasing number of settlers from the American mainland and furnished an opportunity for them to establish their businesses in the islands. Hawaiians furnished the land that supports Hawaii's valuable sugar and pineapple industries today.

Hawaii's first treaty with a foreign nation was signed on December 23, 1826, by representatives of the kingdom and by Capt. Thomas Catesby Jones, of the United States Navy, for the latter country. It was a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. In that document the Hawaiian government agreed to admit American ships into Hawaiian ports and to afford them ample protection in time of peace and war, "the citizens of the United States being permitted to trade freely with the people of the Sandwich Islands."

As early as 1853 annexation of Hawaii to the United States was under discussion. On February 6, 1854, Kamehameha III signed an order directing his minister of foreign relations—

> To take such immediate steps as may be necessary and proper * * * to ascertain the views of the United States in relation to the annexation thereto of these islands.

Representatives of Hawaii and the United States drafted a treaty providing for incorporation of the islands as a State into the American union. The king died shortly thereafter, with the treaty left unsigned, and annexation waited until 1898.

In many ways the contributions of the native Hawaiians as a people are distinctive, as it is based on traits of their Polynesian character. What they have offered as a people cannot be measured in terms of prices and trade statistics but in qualities of a more individual and lasting nature.

Conspicuous among these is loyalty, which stems from their devotion to their chiefs in early days down to their present allegiance to the United States as citizens. As loyal citizens today, they are second only to the Caucasians in the number of registered voters in the Territory, and as such are contributing to the stability of the islands and the Nation.

The native Hawaiians' ancient and abiding love of politics is a steadying factor in the islands. They follow political campaigns with intense interest and avail themselves of the ballot with near unanimity at election times. Hawaiians are elected and appointed in large numbers to responsible positions in the Territorial legislature, county governments, and boards and commissions. For more than 20 years the Territory sent Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianaole, an Hawaiian of beloved memory, to Washington as Delegate to Congress. Many men of native Hawaiian stock have served, and still are serving with distinction, as officers as well as in the ranks of our Army and Navy.

Hawaiians have added color to American sports. Duke Kahanamoku, now sheriff of Honolulu, achieved athletic immortality as a United States Olympic swimming champion.

In song, dance, and the graphic arts Hawaii's Polynesian contribution to American culture has been considerable.

In the war, the native Hawaiians are playing their part as true Americans, in the armed services and out. Their per-

formance in the civil defense of the islands has been conspicuous, both in the pre-war organization of emergency disaster units, in the crisis of Pearl Harbor, and ever since.

Finally, the native Hawaiians have something to offer simply by perpetuating their fine traditions in their capacity as American citizens. Not the least of the qualities they brought with them into the Union on Annexation Day were generosity, hospitality, racial tolerance, gayety, loyalty, serenity, and lack of pretension. Hawaiians, as much as the gentle climate, have modified life in Hawaii into a civilization which has distinctive characteristics of its own, consisting in part of the ability of varying peoples to adapt themselves to each other and to a common nation.

David Lynn 5th

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Will P. Kennedy from the Washington Sunday Star of May 30, 1943:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

House Members and veteran Capitol employees are boasting these days of another page boy and active member of the Little Congress who has made good in a big, patriotic way—all within 20 years. He is David Lynn 5th (now 37 years of age), nephew of David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, who also is an example of the principle of working one's way up by industry, devotion to duty, and courtesy. Young Dave Lynn was a House page in 1919 and 1920. He next served as a clerk in the office of the Architect from 1922 to 1930, during which time he attended Emerson Institute, George Washington University, and the National University, from which he graduated in 1929 with a bachelor of laws degree. By extra studies and intensive work he completed his course in March 1929, ahead of the rest of the class. As soon as he was admitted to practice before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District in 1930, he went to St. Louis, where he held legal positions with various insurance companies and independent adjusters. From December 1936 until March 16, 1942, when he was inducted into the military service, he was actively and successfully engaged in the practice of law in California. After 3 weeks' basic training, he was selected to join the regimental headquarters, Gilroy, Calif. While at the headquarters he assisted the trial judge advocate, Major Des Rosier. He was chosen regimental War bond salesman June 12, 1942, and on June 23 was promoted from private to corporal and selected to give a series of orientation lectures to the men of the regiment. On July 17 he was promoted to sergeant and on August 4 was transferred to the service company to work in the plans and training section. On August 20 he was again promoted to master sergeant as regimental operations sergeant in the plans and training section. He was promoted to first lieutenant on October 10 and a week later was sent to Ann Arbor to attend school at the University of Michigan law school. He reported for duty December 26 to the commanding general, northern section, Western Defense Command, Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., which is present headquarters. Since then he has been serving as assistant sector judge advocate of the northern California sector, Western Defense Command.

Statement of Luther Harr, United States Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Luther Harr, United States Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, Washington, D. C.:

All major industrial disputes—regardless of whether or not they involve strikes, lockouts, or voluntary stoppage of work—lead to waste and loss of money. Those of the coal industry are no exception.

Since the cost of these disputes is reflected later in a higher price for the product or commodity involved, it is clear that the ultimate burden falls on the consumer. In fact, it is the consumer who, through no fault of his own, is forced to finance most industrial disagreements.

As the Federal representative of the bituminous coal consumer, I urge that steps be taken immediately to end these perennial wrangles between representatives of the producers and the miners. The consumers, virtually unorganized, are weary of footing the bills for such prolonged controversies as the one which today is delaying and dislocating America's war effort.

In the past 40 years the coal industry has experienced a long series of strikes, little and big, some orderly and many violent. These disputes must not be repeated year after year, for the cost to the public goes on and on. It must be apparent to all that a permanent solution to the coal labor problem must be found. An industry with an average weekly pay roll of approximately $20,000,000 deserves better labor relations—and the consumer now insists such relations be achieved.

Copernicus, the First Modern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial that recently appeared in the Chicago Daily News, entitled "Copernicus, the First Modern":

COPERNICUS, THE FIRST MODERN

Four hundred years ago today, on May 24, 1543, there died in Frauenburg, Prussia, a man who may be called the first modern, for he was the father of modern science and the founder of the scientific method that has become the keystone of the modern world.

Nikolaus Kopernik—or Copernicus, to use the more familiar Latinized version—was trained for the church, but postponed taking orders so that he might continue his scientific studies. He died little dreaming of the religious upheaval his work was to cause, unaware of the fact that an editor's note had been inserted in his book calculated to create the impression that his statement that the earth moved around the sun was theory rather than fact. Despite this disclaimer, Copernicus' book remained on the proscribed list of the church for a century and a half.

Copernicus resumed the study of astronomy where Ptolemy had left off more than 1,000 years previous. The centuries between the two great searchers of the skies were almost barren of scientific advance. The centuries immediately following Copernicus found science remaking the world.

Copernicus, dissatisfied with scientific theories and dogma, abandoned the practice of seeking facts to support a hypothesis and sought to discover physical truths, regardless of whether they supported a theory or not. This method has been the basis of modern scientific research.

Throughout the world people of Polish ancestry will honor Copernicus this year. Scientists and educators will pay him homage. For the Polish people, the observance will have a double significance because Copernicus, in addition to being the first modern scientist, was a Polish patriot—an outspoken foe of the arrogant Prussianism that was exemplified in Copernicus' day by the Teutonic knights, as in modern times by the Junkers and Nazis. In the state archives of Sweden, at Stockholm, is a document brought back by Gustavus Adolphus from his expedition into Poland. It is in the handwriting of Copernicus and, over his signature, it denounces the Teutonic knights for their ruthless invasions. This makes the quadricentennial of his death particularly significant to the Polish people; but to all peoples of the world who believe that the truth shall make men free, the name and the memory of Nickolaus Copernicus should be objects of veneration.

Forest Fire Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from Col. W. B. Greeley, former Chief Forester of the United States, now Secretary-Manager of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, which warmly commends the action of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in recommending $6,300,000 for cooperation by the Federal Government with the States and

private forest owners for forest fire prevention and suppression. The letter advances cogent and persuasive arguments in support of prompt and effective protection of Pacific Northwest forest resources. I urge all my colleagues to read it. The letter speaks for itself. The danger is immediate and pressing. We cannot afford to neglect protecting the great standing timber of the Pacific Northwest from the dangers of sabotage or bombing. The epistle is as follows:

WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Seattle, Wash., June 7, 1943.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. COFFEE: It is a matter of deep gratification to all of us who are close to the forest-protection problems of the Pacific Northwest, that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has so greatly strengthened the provision for protecting forest areas from fire. The committee's recommendation of $6,300,000 for cooperation by the Federal Government with the States and private forest owners, in forest-fire prevention and suppression, will enable the Pacific coast agencies to carry out their plans for unified, minute-man protection of the forest areas; and gives us assurance that we will be well prepared for whatever forest-fire emergencies the coming summer may bring upon us.

In western Washington, the Federal and State forest services and associations of forest owners have just completed 15 conferences with 250 loggers, community by community. Each of these was a strategical planning of the Allies, covering every detail for the mobilization of men and equipment—under unified command—to handle any form of forest-fire emergency. Similar planning and unification of effort are going on in the other Pacific Coast States. They illustrate both the seriousness of the forest-fire hazard as these experienced fire fighters know it, and the necessity for giving their campaign full support of the Federal Government. The defense command of the United States Army is participating in these arrangements and giving them splendid support.

Few people in the United States have any appreciation of what organized forest-fire bombing, or sabotage, could do to the forest areas fronting the Pacific Ocean, timed with one of our midsummer periods of extremely low humidity, unless effectively stopped at the outset. Not only the destruction of forests and logging camps and the essential supplies of war materials—the break-down of hydroelectric power, dislocation of labor, blocking of transportation, and menace to countless communities and war industries might easily turn such an occurrence into a major catastrophe of the war.

The favorable action of the Senate committee was largely, I believe, in response to the strong fight made by the men from the Pacific Northwest in both House and Senate. We greatly appreciate your own efforts in bringing this to pass. May we now ask for your continued aggressive work to hold the forest protection items in the appropriation bill, especially in the crucial test of the conference? There is no question as to the merit of this action and the urgency of this phase of the war. The accomplishment of the full Senate committee's program will be fine service, not only to your State but to the whole country.

Sincerely yours,

W. B. GREELEY,
Secretary-Manager.

Help for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily Times regarding a rally recently held in Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill.:

THIRTY THOUSAND PERSONS AT RALLY ASK FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT TO HELP POLAND

A strong conviction that the United States will champion the rights of Poland in her struggle with Russia was expressed today in a resolution approved by acclaim by 30,000 persons celebrating Polish Constitution Day in Humboldt Park.

"We beseech President Roosevelt to find means of deliverance from Russia of as many Polish citizens as possible," the resolution read.

"We are certain these people, if given the opportunity, would utilize their strength and ability for the common victory of the United Nations."

The celebration, commemorating the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, was sponsored by the Polish National Alliance.

F. X. Swietlik, dean of Marquette University Law School and board chairman of the Alliance, touched on the Polish-Russian conflict by inference.

"Poland is looking forward to the end of the war and a whole Poland—not a crippled or despoiled one," he said.

"Poland will never yield herself even to one of our Allies. American citizens are not fighting to bring about a fourth partition of Poland."

Other speakers at the ceremonies, held at the Kosciuszko Monument, included Governor Green and Mayor Kelly.

Tighten the Belts, Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Daily News of June 9, 1943:

TIGHTEN THE BELTS, FOLKS

Ex-President Hoover and Governor Dewey of New York in the last couple of days have issued warnings of a fast-deepening food crisis. Dewey's warning came with the report of his State emergency food commission, released Monday, and Mr. Hoover's in a speech delivered and broadcast last night before the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting in New York.

The two warnings add up to the same thing; namely, that we are running into a period of food shortages at a time when we need to produce more food than ever before.

Reasons for the situation are the scarcity of farm machinery because of cut-backs only recently restored in part; the bad planting weather this spring; the gasoline shortage; the overdrafting of labor off the farms into the armed forces; the big war plant wages that attract more labor off the farms; the ever-growing armed forces, which produce no food but have to eat; and the fact that nine separate Government agencies are now working at cross purposes to try to raise food production.

Governor Dewey's emergency food commission contributes the fantastic information that production-restriction regulations hanging over from the 1930's are still enforced against many farmers, so that they cannot organize their land for top production.

There is the further fact, just recently floated into the public mind, that we never were the chronic food-surplus Nation we used to be told we were. We long exported a good deal of wheat and meat, but our imports of other foods outweighed those exports, so that on balance we have for decades been a food-importing Nation.

To make the picture still more cheerful, our lend-lease clients are demanding more and more food; and we shall have to help feed any Nazi-stripped territories we may presently take from the Nazis.

All in all, the prospect is not good. We had better all punch another hole or two in our belts and get ready for still leaner times foodwise than we are experiencing now. A stiff dose of that plain living and high thinking which so appealed to our ancestors seems indicated for us. Of course, high thinking comes all but automatically to all Americans, but the plain living may not be so much fun.

Perhaps our trouble at bottom is, as some people surmise, that we have undertaken to fight a 500,000,000-population war with a population of about 132,000,000. If that is the trouble, some of the consequences will be a little tough to take.

Meanwhile, the President, at a farewell reception to the delegates to the recent Hot Springs, Va., United Nations Food Conference, has just made a speech picturing such a postwar paradise as has never yet existed anywhere on this earth.

Everything is going to be lovely after this most devastating of wars, as the President sees it.

PEPPER'S AMBITION

Nations are going to pool their resources for food production, so that every one of the world's 2,000,000,000 people can have the essentials of a balanced diet. Tariff barriers and international exchange difficulties are going to be taken care of, though the President doesn't say how.

We are all going to enjoy freedom of religion and freedom from want and fear. The fourth freedom—freedom of expression—was watered down in this speech to "the opportunity to think freely," perhaps in memory of the White House's partly defeated effort to wall the Food Conference off from the reporters.

Mr. Roosevelt in his farewell address to the food delegates especially welcomed their creation of an interim international food commission to function in Washington, our Government to do the work of getting it well started.

From this interim commission the President hopes that "a permanent United Nations organization" will eventually grow. This outfit's job, we take it, will be to deliver that

quart of milk a day to every man, woman, and child in the world after the war, whether they like milk or not.

All this paints a beautiful picture of happiness to come, though it does not relieve the present food crisis.

The talk about the world food organization indicates one thing clearly, as we see it. That is that when Senator PEPPER of Florida trumpets: "My ambition: To nominate Franklin Delano Roosevelt for the Presidency of the United States of the World," Mr. Roosevelt is in agreement with Senator PEPPER.

War and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York Bar, before the New York State Bar Association annual meeting on January 22, 1943, entitled "War and the Constitution."

This address is offered by me now because of its remarkably clear exposition and interpretation of the background of war agency boards, many of which have a foundation in acts of Congress, some of which depend wholly upon the powers of the President, and the Commander in Chief by virtue of the great law of necessity in time of war, and many upon that enormous reservoir, the Constitution, which grants such power to the President, but some of them being of doubtful source. We are about to consider a conference report on the Connally bill which will remove the doubt regarding certain of the agency boards which are deemed by Congress to be important for the prosecution of the war.

This address will have interest not merely to Members of Congress but to the public generally.

I should state the printing of the address will somewhat exceed the two printed pages allowed, under the rule, and will cost $258.75.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American economic life today is dominated by war agencies, such as the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the National War Labor Board, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office for Emergency Management, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Civilian Defense, the War Manpower Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the Petroleum Coordinator for War, the Office of War Information, the Office of Censorship, the Defense Communications Board, and many others.

The prime characteristic of these war agency boards is that they usually originate and derive their authority from some Executive order of the President, resting on some very general or remote act of Congress, or resting only on the President's powers under the Constitution, and that they seldom originate or derive their authority from an organic act contained in specific legislation enacted by Congress pursuant to one or another of the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution, like the acts from which peacetime departments and Government agencies usually originate and derive their authority, such as the Departments of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the Federal Reserve Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Tariff Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Security Agency, and many others.

Thus the War Production Board was created by an Executive order of the President in the following manner. In the First World War the act of August 29, 1916, established the Council of National Defense, consisting of the Secretaries of War, Navy, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. By the act of June 4, 1920, Congress charged the Assistant Secretary of War with the duty of mobilizing material and organizing industry essential to war uses. Between 1921 and 1940, therefore, the Council of National Defense had no meetings or appropriations, and its records with those of other First World War agencies, such as the War Industries Board and the Committee on Public Information, were kept by the National Archivist. Like Rip Van Winkle, however, the Council of National Defense awakened from its 20 years' sleep in 1940, and the President, by Executive order on May 29, 1940, approved rules and regulations adopted by this reawakened Council of National Defense and established within the Office for Emergency Management an Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, with seven divisions, namely, industrial production, industrial materials, employment, raw products, price stabilization, transportation, and consumer protection.

Here a digression is necessary to explain the Office for Emergency Management. Under the Reorganization Act passed by Congress in 1939, the President promulgated his reorganization plans I and II and in his Executive order of September 8, 1939, authorized "in the event of a national emergency, or a threat of a national emergency, such Office for Emergency Management as the President shall determine." Thereunder the administrative order of May 25, 1940, established the Office for Emergency Management, whose status and functions were further defined by the President's Executive orders of January 7, 1941, and January 11, 1941, and by the administrative order of January 7, 1941.

Returning now to the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense established May 29, 1940, in the Office for Emergency Management. Like a dissolving scene in the movies, out of this Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, but still within the Office for Emergency Management, there emerged by the President's Executive order of January 7, 1941, the Office of Production Management consisting of William S. Knudsen, Sidney Hillman, and the Secretaries of War and the Navy. Again like a dissolving scene in the movies, out of this Office of Production Management, but still within the Office for Emergency Management, there emerged, by the President's Executive order of January 16, 1942, the War Production Board, which succeeded to the Office of Production Management, abolished by the President's Executive order of January 29, 1942, and also to the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, which in turn was abolished by the President's Executive order of January 16, 1942.

This phantasmagoria of war agencies, emerging and merging and submerging like dissolving scenes in the movies, is not perhaps as inexcusable as some think, for in any rapidly expanding business enterprise trial and error are inevitable, and in expanding the national war production from less than $6,000,000,000 in 1940 to nearly $100,000,000,000 in 1943, it is surprising, not that there has been so much, but that there has not been more, of this dizzy succession of councils, advisory commissions, offices, and boards.

Another illustration is the Office of Price Administration. In the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense created May 29, 1940, as already described were divisions for Price Stabilization and Consumer Protection. Out of these, but still within the Office for Emergency Management, there emerged, by the President's Executive order of April 11, 1941, the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply headed by Leon Henderson. This Executive order, typical of most of the President's Executive orders, began:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and in order to define further the functions and duties of the Office for Emergency Management with respect to the national emergency as declared by the President on September 8, 1939, for the purpose of avoiding profiteering and unwarranted price rises, and of facilitating an adequate supply and the equitable distribution of materials and commodities for civilian use, and finding that the stabilization of prices is in the interest of national defense and that this order is necessary to increase the efficiency of the defense program, it is hereby ordered:

"1. There shall be in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply."

This vast generality of purpose, and total indefiniteness of constitutional and legislative authority, and all-embracing assertion of whatever authority may be spelled out of the entire Constitution and the entire statute book, are all characteristic of most of the President's Executive orders. For 9 months the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply carried on with what Mr. Henderson picturesquely described as jaw-bone enforcement.

Actually this enforcement was more than "jaw bone," for over the head of anyone disobeying his price schedules Mr. Henderson held at all times the threat of all the powers the President had obtained from Congress in various emergency statutes between 1933 and 1941, and also all the powers which the Council of National Defense Act of 1916 and the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917 and the Espionage Act of 1917 and other First World War legislation had long ago vested in the President and which Congress had left standing or forgotten to repeal, and also all the powers which, unnoticed and forgotten, had survived in the President through the years in ancient statutes scattered through the statute book, and finally all the vast expanse of power which the President derives as President and Commander in Chief, not from congressional statutes but directly from the Constitution. This miscellany of powers, it was widely assumed, was impressive enough to raise a presumption of constitutionality and validity for all of Mr. Henderson's price schedules during his "jaw bone" enforcement, and this continued until January 30, 1942, when Congress enacted the Emergency Price Control Act which established the Office of Price Administration. This act illustrates the wide generality of language in which Congress has been conferring powers upon the President and his war agencies:

"SECTION 1. (a) It is hereby declared to be in the interest of the national defense and

security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war, and the purposes of this act are, to stabilize prices and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices and rents; to eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency; to assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices; to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, consumers, wage earners, investors, and persons dependent on life insurance, annuities, and pensions, from undue impairment of their standard of living; to prevent hardships to persons engaged in business, to schools, universities, and other institutions, and to the Federal, State, and local governments, which would result from abnormal increases in prices; to assist in securing adequate production of commodities and facilities; to prevent a post emergency collapse of values; to stabilize agricultural prices in the manner provided in section 3; and to permit voluntary cooperation between the Government and producers, processors, and others to accomplish the aforesaid purposes."

The act then continues:

"SEC. 2. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Price Administrator (provided for in section 201) the price or prices of a commodity or commodities have risen or threaten to rise to an extent or in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this act, he may by regulation or order establish such maximum price or maximum prices as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum price, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941, or if, in the case of any commodity, there are no prevailing prices between such dates, or the prevailing prices between such dates are not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, then to the prices prevailing during the nearest 2-week period in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, the prices for such commodity are generally representative for the commodity or commodities included under such regulation or order, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities, during and subsequent to the year ended October 1, 1941."

Greater generality of language, and wider discretion to the Price Administrator, would be difficult to imagine.[1]

The Office of Economic Stabilization illustrates what may result from generality of language in a statute and wide discretion in an administrator.

In September 1942 the President gave notice that unless Congress acted to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries, and to curb inflation, the President would do so. Senator Prentiss M. Brown, who had charge of the stabilization bill in the Senate, maintained that the President already had this power, because he was Commander in Chief and because of title III, section 301, of the Second War Powers Act of March 27, 1942. This power was certainly well hidden in this title, which read "Title III—Priority Powers". This power was also well hidden in section 301, for everything earlier in that section related only to contracts or orders of the Army or Navy. How well hidden this power was appears from the paragraph in which it was contained:

"Deliveries under any contract or order specified in this subsection (a) (that is, any contract or order of the Army or Navy) may be assigned priority over deliveries under any other contract or order; and the President may require acceptance of and performance under such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders for the purpose of assuring such priority. Whenever the President is satisfied that the fulfillment of requirements for the defense of the United States will result in a shortage in the supply of any material or of any facilities for defense or for private account or for export, the President may allocate such material or facilities in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to promote the national defense."

From all these verbal wrappages, like a rabbit from a hat, this power was picked out and exhibited by Senator Brown to the Senate:

"Remember," said Senator Brown, "that the Second War Powers Act was passed in March 1942, a little over a month after the price-control bill was passed, and therefore it supersedes the Price Control Act as to any matters with respect to which the two laws may conflict.

"What does title 3, section 301, of the Second War Powers Act say in substance? I have composed in sentence form a paraphrase of the provisions of the act which apply to the present situation:

" 'That whenever the President is satisfied that the fulfillments of requirements for the defense of the United States will result in a shortage in the supply of any material'—

"At the present time there are very few materials which do not come within that category, for we are short of almost everything.

"For what? First—'for national defense'—

"The Army and Navy. Second—'or for export'—

"That means the lend-lease operations, the support of Russia, of England, of China, and of our other allies. Third—'or for private account.'

"That is the exact language of the law. What does 'private account' mean? It could mean nothing other than the use of the things that you and I wear and the things that you and I eat. That is the subject matter of title 3 of the Second War Powers Act.

"Continuing with the paraphrase—'he may allot such material'—

"How may he allot it? He may allot it 'in such manner'—

"That means the manner of getting it to those who need it 'upon such conditions'—

"What can that mean other than the conditions of the price, terms, and so forth, by which the materials and supplies will reach the public for private account, will reach the Army, and will reach the lend-lease operations? He shall, when he finds it necessary for the defense of the United States, allot the supplies to those three great divisions of consumption 'in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he shall deem necessary in the public interest and to promote the national defense.'

"Mr. President, I can conceive of no language which could be written in general terms which would give the President of the United States greater power over the economic life, the service of supply, and the prices of the things we have to buy and sell, than would the language contained in the Second War Powers Act.

"In my own mind I have not the slightest doubt that the President can handle the entire situation in that way."

This demonstration of unnoticed and unsuspected conferring of power did not deter Congress from enacting the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, amending the Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942. This Stabilization Act began:

"That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."

Twice within the previous 6 months the President had proposed that no one should be allowed to have an income exceeding approximately $25,000 net after taxes. While this stabilization bill was pending before the Senate, therefore, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Senator Brown's colleague from Michigan, apparently feared another case of unnoticed and unsuspected conferring of power. Accordingly, in the course of the

[1] A price schedule issued by Mr. Henderson during his "jaw bone" enforcement prior to this act was challenged as unconstitutional and void in the Supreme Court, New York County, but was upheld (Schmuck, J., not officially reported), affirmed without opinion by the Appellate Division, *Export Syndicate of Steel Producers, Inc.*, v. *Dilisizian, Inc.*, (265 A. D. 923 (Dec. 18, 1942)). In the Appellate Division the then Office of Price Administration filed a brief amicus curiae, in which it cited in *Matter of Kramer & Uchitelle, Inc.* (288 N. Y. 467 (July 29, 1942)) and *Pennsylvania Company for Insurance on Lives and Granting Annuities* v. *Cincinnati & L. E. Ry.* (S. D. Ohio, unreported, Sept. 19, 1941). This brief stated that "vital Presidental acts have necessarily had to be carried out in the absence of legislation specifically dealing with the subject matter involved," examples being "the institution of an emergency price-control program prior to the adoption of the Price Control Act • • • the establishment of the National Defense Mediation Board, establishment of the Office of Civilian Defense, establishment of the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board, opening of the North American Aviation plant, and opening of the Federal Shipbuilding plant at Kearny, N. J." Continuing, this brief stated that "the President as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief must necessarily exercise certain inherent emergency powers for the preservation of the Nation in time of danger," and that "these Presidential powers are strictly constitutional," but "are difficult to define and, indeed, have never been fully defined." This brief mentioned President Lincoln's acts in 1861 and cited *The Prize Cases* (67 U. S. (2 Black), 635, 668–669 (1863)); *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1, 64 (1890)); *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 584, 586 (1895)); *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 116–117 (1926)); *Ex parte Richard Quirin et al.* (317 U. S. 1, 26 (July 31, 1942)); *Columbus Ry. Power & Light Co.* v. *City of Columbus* (253 Fed. 499, 501 (S. D. Ohio 1918)); *United States* v. *Gordin* (287 Fed. 565, 568 (S. D. Ohio 1922)), affirmed 9 F. 2d 394 (C. C. A. Sixth Cir. 1925); E. S. Corwin, The President, Office and Powers (1940), 133, 157–166. The Emergency Price Control Act of 1937 has been held constitutional in *Henderson* v. *Kimmel* (U. S. D. C., D. Kans., Oct. 23, 1942 (not yet officially reported)); *Henderson* v. *Detweiler* (U. S. D. C., D. Nev. Oct. 27, 1942 (not yet officially reported)); *Vecchio* v. *Kelley* (Cir. Ct. Wayne Co. Mich., Sept. 19, 1942 (not yet officially reported)); *Whatley* v. *Love* (First City Court, New Orleans, La., Dec. 8, 1942 (not yet officially reported)).

Senate debate on this bill, Senator VANDENBERG put to Senator Brown, who was in charge of the bill and was one of its authors and was speaking for the administration in connection with it, the following question:

"Could he not"—meaning the President—"Could he not, under that language, reduce all incomes to $25,000 by Executive order?"

Senator Brown's reply was, "I desire to go into that subject later, but it is my judgment that the authority is not contained in a bill which stabilizes salaries as of September 15, 1942."

The impression conveyed by Senator Brown's reply was enhanced by subsequent colloquy with other Senators, in which it was explained that generality of language was necessary in order to enable the President to permit equitable increases of salaries and wages.

On the day following the enactment of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, the President made an Executive order stating:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and particularly by the act of October 2, 1942 [namely, the Anti-Inflation Act], * * * and in order to control so far as possible the inflationary tendencies and the vast dislocations attendant thereon which threaten our military effort and our domestic economic structure, and for the more effective prosecution of the war, it is hereby ordered as follows: * * *

"1. There is established in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of Economic Stabilization, at the head of which shall be an Economic Stabilization Director."

The President then appointed as Economic Director former Supreme Court Justice James F. Byrnes, and on October 27, 1942, Justice Byrnes issued his famous regulation reducing salaries to approximately $25,000 net after taxes, thus achieving what Congress had twice refused to do in the previous 6 months when twice requested by the President. In this build-up of statute, Executive order, and regulation leading up to this $25,000 salary limitation after taxes, it may be harsh to say there was a lack of frankness, but there certainly was a lack of clarity.[2]

The National War Labor Board is an example of an agency created by Executive order resting only on the President's powers under the Constitution. Its background and history are extraordinary.

Relying solely on his powers under the Constitution, and with no act of Congress or legislative warrant of any kind, the President by Executive order of March 19, 1941, created within the Office for Emergency Management the National Defense Mediation Board for the purpose of mediating, settling, and disposing of disputes certified to the Board by the Secretary of Labor, which threatened to "hinder or obstruct the production or transportation of material essential to national defense." To this Board the President appointed two labor members proposed by the American Federation of Labor and two labor members proposed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and four public members and four industry members who were entirely the President's own selection. Each of these four public members was strongly prolabor and each of these four employer members was more labor-minded than any national organization of employers, so that as selected by the President this Board was strongly prolabor, and contained no one proposed by or representing any organization of employers, and no one in any way affiliated with any employer coming before this Board, while the labor members of this Board were all union officials affiliated with either the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, with one or another of which was then affiliated practically every employee coming before this Board.

To get a controversy certified to this National Defense Mediation Board it was allowable, and even essential, under the Executive order creating this Board, for a labor union to carry a controversy to the point of threatening to interfere with the national defense. This would suffice to change even an impartial board from an adjudicating to an appeasement agency, and to this strongly prolabor Board it inevitably imparted the spirit of a pressure agency, exerting all the force of the Nation on the brink of war to induce employers to yield whatever was needed in order to dissuade employees, especially those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from instigating strikes and boycotts that might interfere with the national defense. This Board continued to function in this manner until John L. Lewis, then affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, demanded for his United Mine Workers the exclusive right to work in coal mines operated by the steel companies. When his demand was denied by this Board, Mr. Lewis broke up this Board by forcing the resignations therefrom of all the labor members who were direct representatives and officials of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Immediately after this National Defense Mediation Board broke up the President selected from industry and the public several men to confer with union officials representing the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations in the effort to agree on the basis for a new board.

Though the United States was then in the Second World War, this conference failed to agree because the labor members of the conference, unlike their predecessors in the First World War, were unwilling that labor should agree to refrain during wartime from raising controversies about union status, and were immovable in their insistence that throughout the Second World War labor should be permitted to raise controversies on union status or any other labor matter, and to carry these controversies to the point of threatening to interfere with the war effort.

Though the conference deadlocked sharply on this fundamental issue, the President chose nevertheless to ignore this disagreement, and announced blandly that on the agreement of the conference he was creating by Executive order of January 12, 1942, a new board, namely the National War Labor Board, to finally determine all labor disputes, which might interrupt work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war.

To this new National War Labor Board the President appointed half the membership of its predecessor the National Defense Mediation Board, so that like its predecessor the National War Labor Board consists of two labor members proposed by the American Federation of Labor, and two labor members proposed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and four public members and four industry members who are entirely the President's own selection. In the National War Labor Board, as in its predecessor, there are four strongly prolabor public members, and four employer members who are more labor-minded than any national organization of employers, so that as selected by the President the National War Labor Board is strongly prolabor, and contains no one proposed by any organization of employers, and no one in any way affiliated with any employer coming before the Board, while the members of the Board are all union officials affiliated with either the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, with one or another of which is affiliated almost every employee coming before the Board.

Under the Executive order creating the National War Labor Board, in order to get a controversy certified to the Board, it is allowable, and even essential, for a labor union to carry the controversy to the point of threatening to interfere with the war effort. Against this force, even an impartial Board could not function as an adjudicating agency, but could only act as an appeasement agency. Succumbing to this force, therefore, the National War Labor Board, like its predecessor the National Defense Mediation Board, has become a strongly prolabor pressure agency, exerting all the force of the Nation at war to induce employers to yield whatever is needed in order to dissuade employees, especially those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from instigating strikes or boycotts that may interfere with the war effort.

Both the National War Labor Board and its predecessor the National Defense Mediation Board have each been called boards, and have each been sedulous to imitate much of the form and language of the decisions of peacetime adjudicating administrative agencies like the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and many other peacetime adjudicating administrative agencies. But the resemblance is only superficial, for all these peacetime adjudicating administrative agencies arrive at their decisions by weighing and adjudicating the legal or at least the moral rights involved in the disputes coming before them, while the National War Labor Board and its predecessor the National Defense Mediation Board, though rendering decisions that in form and language appear to weigh and adjudicate legal and moral rights, have in fact been chiefly influenced by the economic strength of the disputants before them, and thus have really been appeasement, not adjudicating agencies, exerting all the force of the Nation at war to induce employers to yield whatever is needed in order to dissuade employees, especially those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations,

[2] This account of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942 is supported by statements in the issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 21-30 and November 5, 1942. Since this address was made on January 22, 1942, Congress has wiped out this $25,000 salary limitation after taxes, by attaching to the Public Debt Increase Act a rider amending the Stabilization Act of 1942 so as to repeal the provisions which served as the basis for the Executive order and regulation reducing salaries to approximately $25,000 net after taxes. A provision retroactive to October 2, 1942, rescinded this Executive order and regulation and all orders, directives, and decisions promulgated or made thereunder that were in conflict with this rider amending the Stabilization Act of 1942. This became law without the President's signature on April 10, 1943. The President vigorously protested and resisted this action by Congress, but it was carried in both branches of Congress by very large majorities in which party lines were disregarded. Throughout this contest between Congress and the President, it seems to have been universally conceded that Congress had the constitutional right to override the President in this matter, and that the power which the President derived from the Constitution, as President and Commander in Chief, did not entitle him to act in defiance of express legislation enacted by Congress.

from instigating strikes and boycotts that may interfere with the war effort.[3]

The Constitution provides (art. II, sec. 1): "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

Section 2: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States * * *."

Section 3: "He shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States."

[3] This account of the National War Labor Board and its predecessor the National Defense Mediation Board is supported by statements of William H. Davis, chairman of both Boards, and statements of other sympathetic observers of these Boards. See Labor Relations and the War, Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, volume 224, November 1942, especially vii, 32–39, 128–134, 141–146. Referring to the National War Labor Board, Chairman Davis says that "a predisposition toward collective bargaining aided by meditation and voluntary arbitration was built into its very fiber" (ibid. 142). Chairman Davis emphasizes that in any procedure based on collective bargaining, mediation, voluntary arbitration or agreement, the dominating factor must be the economic strength of the disputants. "In normal times," says Chairman Davis, "the economic strength that lies behind the right to strike or lock-out is by all odds the most effective single agency for settling labor troubles. This is particularly true of the more serious disputes. The possibility of a strike always colors the normal processes of collective bargaining. It is the common experience of mediators that the parties to most labor disputes, and particularly the more important ones, are brought to agreement in the end by considerations of the possibilities and the costs of a strike or lock-out. After full discussions which have not broken the deadlock, when the alternatives are clearly spread upon the table and the choice has finally to be made, it is then—in the last 15 minutes—that the parties really have to face these possibilities and costs. And it is then, under pressure of economic facts, that the final adjustment is commonly reached" (ibid. 141–142). Dr. Lloyd G. Reynolds, associate professor of political economy, Johns Hopkins University, and State price executive for Maryland for the Office of Price Administration; and Charles C. Killingsworth, instructor of political economy at Johns Hopkins University, referring to the National War Labor Board's decisions say: "The Board has carefully refrained from stating the conditions under which a union security clause will be awarded, on the ground that each case must be considered on its merits; and the Board often modifies the security clause to suit the circumstances of a particular case. Therefore, one does not get very far by looking to Board decisions for general criteria. Decisions awarding maintenance of membership have stressed the threat to the union's existence from the employer or from rival unions, the prevalence of union-shop agreements in the industry or area involved, the extent to which the union constitution safeguards members against arbitrary action by officers, and similar factors. But these seem to be rationalizations rather than reasons for action" (Ibid. 36). "Satisfying dynamic labor groups and their virile leaders" is the summation of the whole matter by Prof. Herman Feldman, formerly dean, school of business and civic administration, College of the City of New York, and now professor of industrial relations, Amos Tuck School of Business Administration, Dartmouth College (Ibid. vii).

The Constitution also provides (art. I, sec. 8): "The Congress shall have power to * * * provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; * * * to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water; to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years; to provide and maintain a navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress * * *; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Section 9: "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it."

From these provisions a man from Mars might conclude that the Constitution confers no war power on the President, and merely directs him to execute the laws enacted by Congress. But a hundred years of American history have established that there is a vast reservoir of power which the President derives as President and Commander in Chief, not from congressional statutes, but directly from the Constitution itself.

President Polk in 1846, with no act of Congress or legislative warrant of any kind, moved American troops into Mexico, and declared a blockade of Mexican ports. One of President Polk's most vigorous critics at that time was Abraham Lincoln, then a Congressman from Illinois.

In April 1861, when Fort Sumter was fired on, Congress was not in session, and President Lincoln did not bring it into session until July 1861. During this interval, with no act of Congress or legislative warrant of any kind, President Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers, incurred a national indebtedness of $250,000,000—a great sum of money in those days—proclaimed a blockade of thousands of miles of the Southern Confederacy coast line, and in many localities throughout the North suspended the writ of habeas corpus and ordered arrests and military detention of many citizens. In those early weeks opinion throughout the North was divided, and President Lincoln knew that action by Congress would certainly be slow, and might be doubtful. Our Southern cousins call it the War between the States, but the term "Civil War" seems to be a truer description, for throughout most of the Northern States there were intense differences of opinion regarding most of the legal and constitutional questions raised by the war.

President Lincoln seems to have believed at first that he was acting without authority, and that he needed ratification by Congress in order to make his acts legal. Soon however he progressed to the view that the Constitution conferred upon him as President and Commander in Chief ample power without any congressional legislation. In this view he was upheld in 1863 by the 5-to-4 decision of the Supreme Court in the Prize Cases. But before this Supreme Court decision was rendered, President Lincoln seems to have progressed to the view that there were many subjects—particularly slavery and the relations between the seceding States and the United States—on which he could act under the constitutional war power he possessed as President and Commander in Chief, but on which Congress could not act under its war power or any other power that it possessed under the Constitution. This view irritated many Republican Senators and Congressmen as much as it irritated the Democratic opposition in and out of Congress, but President Lincoln clung to it tenaciously. Congress in July 1862 enacted that all slaves taking refuge or who were captured should be free. But President Lincoln in his Emancipation Proclamation in September 1862 ignored this act, and relied solely on his constitutional power as President and Commander in Chief. Soon after Fort Sumter was fired on in April 1861, President Lincoln had begun to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. In July 1862 an act of Congress authorized the President to suspend the writ of habeas corpus and to make arrests and hold persons in military detention, but the act required that these arrests and detentions should be reported by the Secretary of War to the United States judge in those localities, and that the judge should discharge these persons if within 60 days the grand jury found no indictment for "aid and comfort to rebellion" or other offense.

In September 1862 President Lincoln issued a proclamation in which he ignored this act and declared that "all rebels, * * * their aiders and abettors, within the United States and all persons discouraging voluntary enlistments, resisting military drafts, or guilty of any disloyal practices, giving aid and comfort to rebels * * * shall be subject to * * * courts martial or military commissions," and suspended the writ of habeas corpus. This proclamation did not require any report to the United States judge and no report was made. In March 1863 another act of Congress authorized the President to suspend the writ of habeas corpus and required that the Secretary of War should report to the United States judge. But again the Secretary of War never reported, doubtless because in his view all arrests and military detentions were made only by the authority of the President's proclamations and not by virtue of these acts of Congress.

How many persons were thus arrested and held in military detention between 1861 and 1865, in disregard of these acts of Congress and in accordance with these proclamations of President Lincoln, is not shown by the War Department records, for many cases do not show charges. The Chief of the Record and Pension Office of the War Department estimated in 1897, however, that this number was at least 13,535. Lalor's Cyclopedia says 38,000, and hostile contemporary estimates ran as high as 75,000.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-two was a congressional election year, and J. W. Wall, an editorial writer of the New York Daily News, was arrested in New Jersey and detained in Fort Lafayette, and Dr. Edson, 70 years old, who had served three terms in the Ohio Legislature and 6 years in Congress, was arrested at night and also detained in Fort Lafayette. Political feeling ran high. Benjamin R. Curtis, a former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, whose minority opinion in favor of Dred Scott had made him a hero throughout the North, denounced President Lincoln as a military despot. Dr. Edson was elected to the Ohio Legislature, and in New York the Democratic nominee for Governor, Horatio Seymour, with the slogan, "The Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was," triumphed over the Republican candidate, Gen. James W. Wadsworth. In these congressional elections of 1862, the Lincoln administration was defeated in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

In 1863, in the Prize Cases, the nine Justices of the Supreme Court comprised three appointed by President Lincoln and six members of the old Court headed by Chief Justice Taney. Two members of the old Court joined with President Lincoln's three appointees in the decision, from which Chief Justice Taney and three members of the old Court dissented. Justice Grier, a member of the old Court, writing the opinion for the majority of the Court, said:

"The greatest of civil wars was not gradually developed by popular commotion, tumultuous assemblies, or local unorganized insurrections. However long may have been its previous conception, it nevertheless sprung forth suddenly from the parent brain, a Minerva in full panoply of war. The President was bound to meet it in the shape it presented itself, without waiting for Congress to baptize it with a name; and no name given to it by him or them could change the fact. * * *

"Whether the President in fulfilling his duties as Commander in Chief, in suppressing an insurrection, has met with such armed resistance, and a civil war of such alarming proportions as will compel him to accord to them the character of belligerents, is a question to be decided by him, and this Court must be governed by the decisions and acts of the political department of the Government to which this power was entrusted * * * the proclamation of blockade is itself official and conclusive evidence to the Court that a state of war existed which demanded and authorized a recourse to such a measure under the circumstances peculiar to the case."

On this ground the majority of the Supreme Court held in the Prize Cases that President Lincoln's blockade, without any act of Congress or legislative warrant, was a valid exercise of the President's war power under the Constitution.

In 1866 in Ex parte Milligan the nine justices of the Supreme Court comprised five appointed by President Lincoln and four members of the old Court. By that time, however, every object of the arrests and military detentions and proclamations during President Lincoln's administration had long since been accomplished. Every member of the Supreme Court in Ex parte Milligan held in effect that these proclamations were unconstitutional outside the theater of military operations and when the civil courts were open. On the constitutionality of these acts of Congress the Supreme Court divided. A minority of four members, comprising two members of the old Court and Chief Justice Chase and another appointee of President Lincoln, held in effect that these acts of Congress were constitutional regardless of the theater of military operations and whether the civil courts were open. The majority of the Court, however, comprising three members of the old Court and Justice Davis and another appointee of President Lincoln, held in effect that these acts of Congress, like the proclamations, were unconstitutional outside the theater of military operations and where the civil courts were open.

Ex parte Milligan, some authorities now believe, is today sound to the extent it indicates that it is unconstitutional to supersede civil with military government, except when the United States is at war, and then only by express act of Congress. The Prize Cases they now think are today sound to the extent they indicate that the President may use such force as he deems necessary to put down public disorder without having to justify his measures in court save in extreme cases of abuse of power. They now concede to judicial review somewhat more than the Prize Cases did, but considerably less than Ex parte Milligan did.[4]

The National War Labor Board likes to bolster its own assertion of the Presidential power by referring to Theodore Roosevelt, who stated in his autobiography that throughout his administration—

"My view was that every executive officer, and above all every executive officer in high position, was a steward of the people bound actively and affirmatively to do all he could for the people. * * * I declined to adopt the view that what was imperatively necessary for the Nation could not be done by the President unless he could find some specific authorization to do it. My belief was that it was not only his right but his duty to do anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution or by the laws. Under this interpretation of executive power I did and caused to be done many things not previously done by the President and the heads of the departments. I did not usurp power, but I did greatly broaden the use of executive power."

Ex-President Taft vigorously criticized this "stewardship theory" in his book Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, but later he changed his view and as Chief Justice writing the opinion for the Supreme Court in Myers against United States he found a grant of power to the President in the opening clause of article II of the Constitution.

The strongest precedents for the most extreme assertion of Presidential power thus seem to come from Republican sources. Most of the war powers exercised by the Democratic war Presidents, President Wilson and President Roosevelt, appear to have been conferred on them or their war agencies by acts of Congress in express or general or colorable terms. But President Wilson armed merchantmen in March 1917 after his bill for that purpose had been defeated in Congress, and he established by Executive order the Committee on Public Information with its voluntary censorship and the War Industries Board "coordinating private industry." Most of the war powers President Wilson exercised, however, were derived from acts enacted by Congress before or during the First World War, such as the Council of National Defense Act, the Priorities Act, the Selective Service Act, the Espionage Act, the Trading With the Enemy Act, and the Lever Food and Fuel Control Act.[5]

[4] This account of the Mexican War and Civil War period is derived from many sources. A few are J. F. Rhodes, History of the United States (1899) volume 4; J. G. Randall, Constitutional Problems Under Lincoln (1926); E. S. Corwin, The President, Office and Powers (1940); *Ex parte Merryman* (Fed. Cas. No. 9, 487 (1861)); *The Prize Cases* (67 U. S. (2 Bl.) 635 (1863)); *Ex parte Milligan* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 2 (1866).

[5] This account of the period of President Theodore Roosevelt, President Taft, and President Wilson is derived from many sources. A few are Theodore Roosevelt, Autobiography (1924) 388–389, and W. H. Taft, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers (1916) 139–140, quoted in the decision of the National War Labor Board in *In re Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Republic Steel Corporation, Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co., Inland Steel Co. and United Steel Workers of America* (C. I. O.) ("Little Steel Companies") reported in 11 Labor Relations Reporter No. 24, September 28, 1942, pp. 32–33, 1 War Labor Reports 342, 352 (1942); E. S. Corwin, The President, Office and Powers (1940); *In re Neagle* (135 U. S. 1 (1890)); *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564 (1895)); *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52 (1926)).

No American war President has been so successful as President Roosevelt in so often inducing Congress to share with him joint responsibility for the powers exercised by him and his war agencies, and in having so seldom been obliged to assert against Congress his constitutional powers as President and Commander in Chief. But like President Lincoln and President Wilson, President Roosevelt has been willing to rely solely on his constitutional power as President and Commander in Chief, when Congress seemed unwilling to confer on him or on a war agency a power that he deemed necessary for the prosecution of the war.

Returning now to President Roosevelt's Executive orders creating the National Defense Mediation Board in 1941 and the National War Labor Board in 1942. Concede that these Boards have not been impartial adjudicating administrative agencies, but have really been prolabor appeasement pressure agencies. Concede also that these Boards have been exerting all the force of the Nation at war to induce employers to yield whatever is needed in order to dissuade employees, especially those affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from instigating strikes or boycotts that may interfere with the war effort. Nevertheless a powerful argument can be made, on the precedents of the past 100 years, that the President's Executive orders creating these Boards have been a valid exercise of the President's constitutional war power.

Under the conditions of modern total all-out global war, it seems at least arguable that the morale of American workingmen in the production plants and distribution channels and assembly lines throughout the American economy now engaged in all-out war effort is not less important than the morale of American fighting men on the battle lines in Guadalcanal and North Africa. The Executive orders creating these Boards indicate that President Roosevelt believes this, and that he also believes that a prolabor appeasement pressure agency is a proper means for maintaining the morale of American workingmen. He is the President and Commander in Chief, and Congress has refrained from exercising its constitutional power to rescind these Executive orders or to forbid the President to exercise his war power in this manner. On these facts, is it likely that anyone challenging the constitutionality of these Boards can ever in wartime convince the Supreme Court or any other Federal court that any court has any right to substitute its own judgment for that of the President as to what are the proper means for procuring the uninterrupted production that seems to be essential to national survival in a modern total all-out global war?

The failure of Congress to overrule the President's Executive orders creating the National Defense Mediation Board and the National War Labor Board seems to be of prime importance, but here must be noted what perhaps may be another case of unnoticed and unsuspected conferring of power by Congress. No one believes that Congress in 1941 and 1942 could knowingly ever have been induced to pass any legislation conferring upon the President or anyone else any such powers and jurisdiction as the National Defense Mediation Board and the National War Labor Board have been asserting and exercising under the President's Executive orders. So high has been the tension, in Congress and outside, on the general subject of labor relations, that Congress has not legislated beyond the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and repeatedly since 1938 the House of Representatives has indicated its disposition to amend even that act to the

disadvantage of labor. But in the Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, in section 1 (a) Congress enacted that

"It shall be the policy of those departments and agencies of the Government dealing with wages (including the Department of Labor and its various Bureaus, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the National War Labor Board, and others heretofore or hereafter created), within the limits of their authority and jurisdiction, to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and equitable wages, and cost of production."

It will be recalled that the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, was an amendment to this Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, and that it was under this amendment that there were issued, as already described, President Roosevelt's much-discussed salary-and-wage-limitation Executive order of October 3, 1942, and Justice Byrnes' much-discussed salary-and-wage-limitation regulation of October 27, 1942. Throughout this Executive order and this regulation the National War Labor Board was repeatedly mentioned, and this Board has also been mentioned in various appropriation acts enacted by Congress. On these facts, anyone challenging in court the constitutionality of the National War Labor Board may have to face the argument that Congress may in some degree have ratified this Board.[6]

In any wartime discussion of the constitutionality of war measures it must not be forgotten that after 1865, and again after 1918, the Supreme Court evinced a disposition to hold invalid war measures which the Supreme Court might perhaps have held valid in wartime.[7]

All this points to the conclusion that for deciding all wartime disputes regarding the proper means for prosecuting a war the best and quickest tribunal has always been the ballot box. This is the lesson of the political reverses suffered by the Lincoln administration in the 1862 elections, and by the Wilson administration in the 1918 elections, and by the Roosevelt administration in the 1942 elections. Today this is doubly significant, for the present Supreme Court seems more disposed than any of its predecessors to rely wherever possible upon the normal political processes as the appropriate check and correction for any extravagances or deficiencies or aberrations of Presidential and congressional action or inaction.

We have traveled far since the Lincoln administration. Civil rights, as we have seen, were then often disregarded. Property rights, however, were then sedulously protected. From 1862 to 1864 the Federal income tax on incomes over $10,000 was only 5 percent, and after 1864 it was only 10 percent. Today income taxes approach confiscation, and property rights in peacetime and wartime have been drastically curtailed by acts of Congress and by Supreme Court decisions. Arrests and military detentions under Presidential proclamations, without an act of Congress or any legislative warrant, were numbered by the thousands during the Lincoln administration. This would be intolerable and inconceivable today, and if a single instance should now occur the administration would immediately be condemned by the country and by Congress irrespective of party and also by the entire Supreme Court, eight of whose nine members owe their present appointment to this administration, for never has the Supreme Court been more determined than now to exert all its judicial power to check and correct any restraint on due process, free speech, free press, and other civil rights, or any restraint that can possibly tend to impede the free operation of the normal political processes.

[6] See *Hamilton* v. *Dillin* (88 U. S. (21 Wall.) 73, 96–97 (1874)); *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.* (236 U. S. 459, 471–483 (1915)); *Swayne & Hoyt, Ltd.* v. *U. S.* (300 U. S. 297, 301–303 (1937)); *Brooks* v. *Dewar* (313 U. S. 354, 360–362 (1941)); *United States* v. *Gordin* (287 Fed. 565, 568–573 (S. D. Ohio 1922)), affirmed 9 F. 2d 394 (C. C. A. Sixth Cir., 1925).

[7] See *Ex parte Milligan* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 2 (1866)); *Hepburn* v. *Griswold* (75 U. S. (8 Wall.) 603 (1870)), overruled in *The Legal Tender Cases* (79 U. S. (12 Wall.) 457 (1871)); *United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Company* (255 U. S. 81 (1921)).

William Green's Threat to Purge Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we are to vote upon the passage of the conference report of the Smith-Connally bill, and each of the 238 Members that voted for the bill have been branded collectively by William Green, the president of A. F. of L., as enemies, under the heading of "The roll call of labor's enemies" in the weekly news sheet of the American Federation of Labor, issue of the date of June 8, 1943, at Washington, D. C.

Personally and individually we cherish his appellation, for we know differently. Now he might have dubbed us enemy to labor racketeers and strikers, and he would have told the whole truth, for we are exactly that. Organized labor leaders have become so dictatorial and won so many battles that the president of the A. F. of L. took off a real high chew when he took unto himself—he and a few labor satellites will defeat those voting for the bill and again after the vote calling to our attention his threat if Congress did vote for this bill and listing those that did vote for the bill in what he terms "mandate" pleases me very much, for the people in Oklahoma are ready to meet his proposal blow for blow at the ballot box.

Now he is ready to throw cut of the window all Members of Congress who see and know of the necessity for even much more stringent laws than this bill is that voted for its passage. Organized labor's policies demand 100 percent performance for a Congressman to cast one vote against any measure in which the leaders oppose is self-inflicted suicide insofar as the leadership is concerned.

I am a new Member of Congress. The people of Oklahoma know my position. I promised to do all within my power to stop racketeering and strikes, and this bill is the best measure that I have had an opportunity to vote upon. I have sponsored and passed through the Oklahoma State senate antilabor racketeering bills, and I am ready to leave nothing undone as a Member of Congress to correct the abuses labor leaders are inflicting upon the war effort.

The country would be much better off by the passage of corrective labor laws than defeating me for reelection. After all I have to live with my conscience and if the price of staying here is letting John L. Lewis, Philip Murray and William Green make my mind up for me I should be defeated.

As aforesaid, I am a new member of this body. I am informed that a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will clearly disclose that fully 75 percent of those Representatives now classed as "enemies of labor" are the men who fought the battles for all the gains in labor legislation brought to the worker during the Roosevelt administration. Oh, Mr. Speaker, ingratitude is a viper in the hands of those vicious labor leaders of organized labor who forget their responsibility to our Nation at war.

I am so proud of my classification by William Green that I wish for his threat and outburst in promising to purge this body be preserved in the archives of this Republic, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, since my time is coming to a close after having first obtained your permission, I wish to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Green's doubleheader threat with 238 members listed for political slaughter, as follows, to wit:

THE ROLL CALL OF LABOR'S ENEMIES

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Before the House of Representatives acted on the Connally-Smith bill, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor issued this warning:

"The American Federation of Labor calls upon Congress to defeat the Connally-Smith bill. We will demand a record vote on this measure. Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted, we shall endeavor to vote out of office any member of Congress who supports it. Into this effort, the American Federation of Labor will pour every resource at its command."

In compliance with this mandate, we publish herewith the names of the 238 members of the House of Representatives who voted for adoption of this vicious antilabor bill.

Abernethy, Mississippi; Allen, Illinois; Allen, Louisiana; Andresen, H. Carl, Minnesota; Anderson, California; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Andrews, New York; Arends, Illinois; Arnold, Illinois; Auchincloss, New Jersey; Baldwin, Maryland; Barden, North Carolina; Barrett, Wyoming; Bates, Massachusetts; Beckworth, Texas; Bender, Ohio; Bennett, Missouri; Bland, Virginia; Bolton, Ohio; Bonner, North Carolina; Boren, Oklahoma; Boykin, Alabama; Brooks, Louisiana; Brown, Georgia; Brown, Ohio; Bryson, South Carolina; Buffett, Nebraska; Bulwinkle, North Carolina; Burch, Virginia; Burgin, North Carolina; Camp, Georgia; Cannon, Missouri; Carlson, Kansas; Carson, Ohio; Case, South Dakota; Chenoweth, Colorado; Chiperfield, Illinois; Church, Illinois; Clark, North Carolina; Clason, Massachusetts; Clevenger, Ohio; Colmer, Mississippi; Cooley, North Carolina; Cooper, Tennessee; Courtney, Tennessee; Cox, Georgia; Cravens, Arkansas; Creal, Kentucky; Cunningham, Iowa; Curtis, Nebraska; Davis, Tennessee; Dewey, Illinois; Dirksen, Illinois; Disney, Oklahoma; Ditter, Pennsylvania; Dondero, Michigan; Doughton, North Carolina; Drewry, Virginia; Durham, North Carolina; Dworshak, Idaho; Eaton, New Jersey; Elliott, California; Ellis, Arkansas; Ellsworth, Oregon; Elmer, Missouri; Elston, Ohio; Fellows, Maine; Fish, New York; Fisher, Texas; Fulbright, Arkansas; Gale, Minnesota; Gamble, New York; Gathings, Arkansas; Gavin, Pennsylvania; Gearhart, California; Gerlach, Pennsylvania; Gibson, Georgia; Gilchrist, Iowa; Gillette, Pennsylvania; Gillie, Indiana; Goodwin, Massachusetts; Gore, Tennessee; Gossett, Texas; Graham, Pennsylvania; Grant,

Indiana; Green, Florida; Gregory, Kentucky; Griffiths, Ohio; Gross, Pennsylvania; Gwynne, Iowa; Hale, Maine; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Halleck, Indiana; Hancock, New York; Hare, South Carolina; Harness, Indiana; Harris, Arkansas; Harris, Virginia; Hartley, New Jersey; Hébert, Louisiana; Herter, Massachusetts; Hess, Ohio; Hill, Colorado; Hinshaw, California; Hobbs, Alabama; Hoeven, Iowa; Hoffman, Michigan; Holmes, Massachusetts; Holmes, Washington; Hope, Kansas; Horan, Washington; Howell, Illinois; Jarman, Alabama; Jeffrey, Ohio; Jenkins, Ohio; Jennings, Tennessee; Jensen, Iowa; Johnson, Anton J., Illinois; Johnson, Calvin D., Illinois; Johnson, J. Leroy, California; Johnson, Luther A., Texas; Johnson, Lyndon B., Texas; Johnson, Oklahoma; Johnson, Ward, California; Jones, Ohio; Jonkman, Michigan; Judd, Minnesota; Kearney, New York; Keefe, Wisconsin; Kilburn, New York; Kilday, Texas; Kinzer, Pennsylvania; Kleberg, Texas; Knutson, Minnesota; LaFollette, Indiana; Lambertson, Kansas; Landis, Indiana; Lanham, Texas; Lea, California; McCord, Tennessee; McGregor, Ohio; McKenzie, Louisiana; McLean, New Jersey; McMillan, South Carolina; McWilliams, Connecticut; Maas, Minnesota; Mahon, Texas; Maloney, Louisiana; Manasco, Alabama; Mansfield, Texas; Martin, Iowa; Martin, Massachusetts; May, Kentucky; Merrow, New Hampshire; Michener, Michigan; Miller, Nebraska; Mills, Arkansas; Monroney, Oklahoma; Morrison, Louisiana; Mott, Oregon; Mundt, South Dakota; Murray, Tennessee; Murray, Wisconsin; Newsome, Alabama; Norrell, Arkansas; O'Hara, Minnesota; O'Neal, Kentucky; Pace, Georgia; Patman, Texas; Phillips, California; Ploeser, Missouri; Poage, Texas; Poulson, California; Price, Florida; Priest, Tennessee; Randolph, West Virginia; Rankin, Mississippi; Reece, Tennessee; Reed, Illinois; Reed, New York; Rees, Kansas; Richards, South Carolina; Rivers, South Carolina; Rizley, Oklahoma; Robertson, Virginia; Robsion, Kentucky; Rockwell, Colorado; Rodgers, Pennsylvania; Rogers, Massachusetts; Rohrbough, West Virginia; Rowe, Ohio; Satterfield, Virginia; Shafer, Michigan; Short, Missouri; Simpson, Illinois; Simpson, Pennsylvania; Slaughter, Missouri; Smith, Ohio; Smith, Virginia; Smith, Wisconsin; Sparkman, Alabama; Springer, Indiana; Stanley, New York; Starnes, Alabama; Stefan, Nebraska; Stewart, Oklahoma; Stockman, Oregon; Sumner, Illinois; Sumners, Texas; Sundstrom, New Jersey; Taber, New York; Talle, Iowa; Tarver, Georgia; Taylor, New York; Thomas, New Jersey; Thomason, Texas; Tibbott, Pennsylvania; Towe, New Jersey; Vincent, Kentucky; Vinson, Georgia; Vorys, Ohio; Vursell, Illinois; Wadsworth, New York; Ward, Maryland; Weaver, North Carolina; West, Texas; Whitten, Mississippi; Whittington, Mississippi; Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Willey, Delaware; Winstead, Mississippi; Winter, Kansas; Wolcott, Michigan; Woodruff, Michigan; Woodrum, Virginia; Worley, Texas; Zimmerman, Missouri.

Skipper Gillan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was published in many newspapers through the Consolidated News Features, Inc. It is the story of Skipper Gillan, written by his father, Jim Gillan, for Jay Franklin.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE, THE PEOPLE; RELIEF FROM DRAMA

(By Jay Franklin)

He's not very big, but the Hitlers and the Japs are words that fascinate him. He had a cousin killed at Pearl Harbor and an uncle, a captain in the Navy, whose car was riddled a minute after he had jumped from it at the Honolulu naval base.

Even at 4 years and under, he has the guns, soldiers, ships, and tanks lined up each day, fighting Japs mostly. His aircraft carrier and planes are always busy.

The rest of the news he does not know: That Japs are wounding Americans intentionally under the theory that it takes other men and time to care for wounded, more trouble for us than the dead. He wouldn't understand, anyway, why American soldiers, in fog and snowdrifts, fighting above the clouds on Attu, face an enemy who prefers death to surrender—or why in the whole Attu battle only four prisoners have been taken by his Uncle Sammy.

Bugs, ants, mosquitoes, vermin, and animals are a part of the daily life of the soldier and marine down in the south Pacific, but to "Skipper," for that's what they call him, those things are just a part of the strange living things that are a constant source of amazement.

Things that do not touch him are many. There is the ugly mood of John L. Lewis, the bickering between Government agencies, the desire of many people to embarrass his nice man, as he calls the President of the Nation whenever he encounters his picture in the magazines.

Nor does he understand the pattern of life in democratic countries which seems to make inevitable such things as the coal strikes, and the lust for power and money at times when the very lives of the nations are at stake. He will read some day of the fall of France and wonder. He will get some kind of an understandable picture of the struggle for political and economic power in north Africa—before the enemy was run out, while the battles were going on and then intensified when the smoke had cleared away. The reason for the writing of all this is a simple incident—the sort of incident, amid all the agony and fear, terrorism and horror, that makes for unforgettable moments in the lives of civilians or soldiers.

For the other day the boy was standing in the driveway of his home watching a long column of soldier-filled jeeps and trucks on their way to maneuvers. He had watched them on many days before. They always waved and they had become a sort of personal fixture and a part of his own personal property.

This last time, he stood in the driveway with an American flag in his hand. He waved it wildly at the passing column. At first there were waves from the uniformed men, then there were yells and then shouts. The whole column shouted and cheered and continued until the last jeep and the last truck were far down the road.

He wondered and then asked why the men had waved so frantically and shouted so loudly. He couldn't make it out. The answers to his questions were difficult.

Difficult, because here was a column of men who soon will be traveling roads through foreign mountains or on foreign deserts. Here were men who soon will have a great deal of time going over the past, remembering America as they left it. They will soon be thinking of home and savagely fighting for the moment they can return.

But the Skipper's question never will be quite answered. No one wants to tell him because no one really knows what goes on in the hearts and heads of the passing column. It's just one of those things packed away in hearts that elevate men into something higher than themselves, that brings shouts and cheers from hardened, sometimes embittered, lips.

The question will, in part, be answered on the battlefield. It will, in part, be answered whenever a man of that column lies awake and asks himself what it's all about.

Part of that answer will be a little golden-haired boy with his blue eyes shining and his flag waving, back in a little Virginia town, standing on the lawn of an ordinary American's home. There are so many of the same homes in Maine, in California, in Texas, and Montana. He is something different from closed mines, the sacredness of a dollar-a-day, or 6 percent, or sales taxes.

Quite different from the worry over the Presidential election of next year, which cripples and distorts older minds.

Different, too, from a snarling, greedy, ambitious enemy bent upon destroying the boy and his future hopes and fun and freedom.

What We Are Fighting For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 11 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a war message entitled "I Am Not Playing for Marbles," which was published by the Nash-Kelvinator Corporation and which I think is especially outstanding.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I'M NOT PLAYING FOR MARBLES * * *"

This is it.

We're headed straight for the open doors of hell, and when we get inside they'll slam 'em shut and lock 'em.

Maybe I'll come out alive, and maybe I won't.

I'll take that chance. I'll take it because I know, now, what I'm playing for over here. And it isn't marbles.

I'm not fighting for the right to wait in line for my daily bread.

I'm not using a bayonet and a knife to carve myself a hole where I'll hide in fear for the rest of my days.

I'm not betting my life out here so anyone can tell me where and what and how to worship.

I'm not outguessing madmen with machine guns in their hands for the privilege of being told what to say and when to say it.

I'm fighting for freedom!

I'm fighting for the things that made America the greatest place in the world to live in * * * that are going to keep America the greatest place in this world to live in!

So don't anybody tell me I'll find America changed. Don't anybody tell me there's no future any more in America.

Don't anybody tell me there's a ceiling on my opportunity to make a million or be President.

Don't anybody tell me there's a bridle and bit waiting for me with my name on it!

That's what took the humanity out of the men I'm up against now. And I don't want any part of it!

I want to come back to the same America I left behind me * * * where our way of living has always brought us new and better things * * * and always will * * * the America where there's clean, hard work to do * * * where there's freedom, and justice, and opportunity for all * * * where, if you can think and plan and act on your own, there are no limits on how high you can rise, how far you can go.

That's what I'm fighting for.

That's America to me.

Keep it that way until I come back!

That This Nation, Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a sermon by the Reverend John Curry Walker, D. D., Second Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn., May 16, 1943:

"Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might." (Ephesians 6: 10.)

The most of us read our newspapers somewhat carelessly after we have finished the leading articles on the first page and the items or features which appeal to our special interest. Ever and again, however, when we catch a familiar name or topic in an unfamiliar place we concentrate again suddenly and eagerly. Some few weeks since I was reading a paper on the train and I was about to put it to one side when my eye caught an unusual heading for a column on the editorial page, "Religion must have place at peace council." I am accustomed to reading admonitions about the importance of religion in the home and the school and even in the market place, but to stress the importance of religion at the peace table was something else again and something very striking and significant. I read that letter to the editor and the editorial comment on the same page with all the greater interest because this letter had been written by none other than our good friend and neighbor, Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury, a layman who has proved his Christian concern and his sound business judgment by his amazing success in the furtherance of such good causes as Bundles for Britain and the British War Relief Society.

What is the gist of Mr. Bennett's suggestion? He founds his appeal on our common conviction that modern western civilization flowed out of and was based upon fundamental Christian religion. It must follow then that to save and perpetuate that civilization we must have Christian principles as the standards and norms by which the thinking, the acts and decisions of the peace conference are to be judged. We must bring the spirit and ethics of Jesus to bear on the hearts and minds of the delegates so that for the first time in history a just and lasting peace, under God, may be established for all nations of the world.

Mr. Bennett reminds us that at all modern international conferences the accredited delegates are supported by a corps of experts, consultants, and specialists on every subject—except religion. Political, material, financial, mercenary considerations have very largely guided the various delegations in times past, notwithstanding the fact that the civilization they professed to wish to save and sustain sprang from spiritual ideals, Christian ideals. Let us have, then, at the peace conference which follows this war a religious committee with clerical and lay delegates representing the major communions in the various countries, an international religious advisory committee. Must not the forces of high religion be brought to bear if we are to hope for any large measure of justice in the forthcoming peace treaty? Must we not seek unity for our war-torn world in the righteousness which seeks justice, loves mercy, and walks humbly before God?

The suggestion that our friend makes is so simple, so sound, and the penalties so inevitable if we ignore the suggestion that I wonder that it has not been brought to the fore long ago. We must try religion, we must use religion. Religion must be brought to bear at the point where we can exert the greatest possible leverage on the future of mankind, at the time when to ignore moral principles and religious convictions would prove to be the most criminal folly. We have scores of peace plans, hundreds of utopian schemes, all manner of post-war blueprints, any number of committees and commissions, but here is a simple suggestion to bring the conscience and the vision of the Christian Church to bear on the most fateful issues of our day and generation. There is a time of extremity in the life of every man when he feels that he must call upon God for help. This is a time of extremity in the life of our civilization when, of all times, we should call upon God for guidance. Let the Church of Christ speak in the name of the God of Justice.

We can anticipate that certain objections will be raised in certain quarters. The practical men, the realists, will scoff at the idea of advice from visionary men like religious leaders. They will insist that we must deal with the facts in the case, we must deal with the realities of the situation, we must look out after our own national interests and let other nations look after theirs. They will question the ability of these same religious leaders to agree on what we want in the way of a settlement and they will assume that the less attention is paid to clerics and idealists the better.

Suppose we face some of these objections as frankly and as fairly as we can. Is it the visionary that men fear, or profess to fear? Let us look at the record at the end of the last war. Religion went unrepresented at the last peace conference, and will anyone contend that we got either a just or a wise peace? In those days it was Woodrow Wilson who was dubbed the visionary. It is true that the practical men, the realists, were too clever for him. Foreign realists like Lloyd George and Clemenceau outwitted him on many issues at the peace conference, and that little group of willful, stubborn, short-sighted men in the United States Senate prevented the ratification of the League of Nations Covenant. The practical men had a field day, a whole series of field days, after the First World War. They made their kind of a peace, the kind of a peace we may get this time unless the peoples of the world, the religious leaders of the United Nations, rise up and demand something better, wiser, more just, and more humane.

Gerald W. Johnson, special writer for the Baltimore Evening Sun, one of the keenest minds, one of the best informed men in this country, commented on the Wilson legend recently. He said, in part, "For 20 years this country had a grand time laughing at old Woodrow Wilson as a wool-gathering, fuzzy-minded Simple Simon who didn't know a hawk from a handsaw. The professor in politics, the impractical idealist, the man with the Messianic delusion, became our current descriptions of all that is undesirable in public life. But the laughter began to die down soon after one Adolf Hitler became Chancelor of the German Reich in 1933; and on December 7, 1941, it stopped completely. Today the evidence is incontrovertible that Woodrow Wilson had more hard, common sense in his little finger than most of his critics had in their whole bodies, skulls included."

Mr. Johnson recalls that "In 1924, just before his death, he wrote that the tragedy of the last 6 years was that America's refusal to accept responsibility made it inevitable that within 20 years the whole job would have to be done over again at '10 times the cost.' He underestimated the time. It was 17 years, not 20. He certainly underestimated the cost in money, for we have already spent 10 times what the war of 1917–18 cost, and we have hardly more than begun. Did he underestimate the cost in lives? That is for the future to reveal, as far as the Army is concerned, but the Navy has already announced losses for the first day of the war nearly 3 times as great as was the number of Navy personnel killed in battle in 1917–18. That man knew what he was talking about."

With a punitive, realist, practical man's peace, who did win the last war? Strange as it may seem, the ultimate victors proved to be Vladimir Lenin, Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, the Japanese militarists. These were the men who took full advantage of the opportunities offered by a peace that rewarded the imperialists among the Allies, confirmed America in a policy of political and economic isolationism, and invited aggressors to reap the rewards of international chaos and anarchy. "Without vision the people perish." Those men who were responsible for the Versailles Treaty were blind leaders of the blind. They sowed the wind with their realism and we reap the whirlwind of agony and slaughter.

Religion, the Christian religion, has a right to be heard. It will go ill with us and with the nations of the world unless moral principles are invoked, religious insights are given their fair weight, when the treaty of peace shall be written. What William Penn said long ago has been underscored by the history of the last 25 years, "Mankind will ultimately be governed either by God or by tyrants." Crass selfishness, flagrant injustice, brutal intolerance, open denial, and disregard of the moral law, lead as certainly to disaster in the family of nations as they do in the lives of the individual human family. Ten years ago Jan Christiaan Smuts, the philosopher, statesman, field marshal of South Africa said, "If you ask me what is wrong with Europe I should say that the moral basis in Europe, the bedrock of the Christian moral code, has become undermined and can no longer support all that superstructure of economic and industrial prosperity which the last century built up on it." What the field marshal said of Europe was true of the whole international world and no small part of the cause of the steady disintegration of international relations during the twenties and thirties was the realism, the cynicism with which the last peace treaty was written.

It is too much to hope that those who write the next peace will be animated by the purest possible motives and that they will give us perfect justice. What we do ask is a peace which will give us the larger measure of justice, that will sow as few dragon's teeth as possible, that will be essentially a

dynamic peace, a peace that will give us and all men some new hope and promise for the future. It has been pointed out by Sir Norman Angell that what we call the Treaty of Versailles was really the second Treaty of Versailles, the first having been imposed by the Germans on France at the end of the Franco-Prussian War. To all intents and purposes Hitler wrote a third Treaty of Versailles by successfully defying and flouting the provisions of the second treaty. Do we want another Versailles, written in the same temper of revenge or do we want to break the fatal chain and begin to write a new kind of a treaty? We cannot afford to punish Germany according to what might seem her just deserts in the light of the law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. We must think in terms of future justice and enduring peace.

Quite recently Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, made a plea for a spiritual second front. He began by saying that "the whole world cries out for clear-thinking leadership." He notes that we can perform miracles on the scientific and industrial front but that we need above all else a great moral and spiritual renaissance. "This is a war for men's minds," says Wendell Willkie in his epoch-making book, One World. "This is a war of the spirit," says General Smuts. How great then the danger if we are to leave it to cynicism, so-called realism, to determine what kind of a peace the peoples of the world are to have at the end of the conflict when they have paid the full price of devotion. These religious leaders, and I assume that they would be men of the type and stature of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the officers of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, would not attempt to dictate provisions or to make specific demands but rather to lay down broad principles of action, to point out certain essential elements of common justice, to voice the dreams and aspirations of the great masses of men and women who have given so freely of their very life's blood in the hope that freedom might be preserved and lasting peace might prevail. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University has said that "To speak of an independent nation and its government as sovereign is to use a legal formula. It is the moral law that is sovereign—and only that. This is true of nations and their governments as well as of individuals." In its essence this suggestion of religious aid and counsel is an attempt to bring the moral law to bear at the point where the destinies of 2,000,000,000 people hang in the balance and where old mistakes and cynical revenges will make countless millions mourn if the moral law is flouted.

Yes, I think religion has a right to be heard. We have no right to ask for a hearing at the peace conference if our purpose is to further the interests of our own denomination or communion. Churchmen have no special claim to a hearing if they speak as Catholics or Protestants but they have every right to be heard if they speak in terms of humanity, if they speak in the name of Christ. On the notice board of a church in Ohio there appeared these words: "This church has 33 members in the armed forces and 530 members praying for a just peace." Insofar as that is the spirit of a church, or a synagogue, its members have the right to be heard in the councils of state and at the conference table of the nations. Men say, "Why doesn't God stop this war?" or "Why don't the churches stop this war?" What can God do if men refuse to take account of His laws of justice and righteousness? How can men hold the churches accountable for failure to prevent war when statesmen refuse to take counsel with the churches or be guided by them except when war has already become a tragic reality?

It has been left to a refugee professor at the New School of Social Research in New York, one Dr. Eduard Heinmann, to point out that Abraham Lincoln's famous phrase about "government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth," is constantly and regularly quoted apart from its context and therefore misquoted. The familiar phrase is qualified, and fortified, by the clause preceding. This is what our great President said, "that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." The words, "under God," are the integral part of Lincoln's thought. He did not believe that democracy could be made secure except as under God. He did not believe men were immune from greed, nationalism, vindictiveness, moral and spiritual blindness except as under the guidance of Almighty God.

"Except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." At a time when we hope to turn a new and shining page in the history of man's life here on earth, our last, best hope is to be found in compliance with the will of God. How shall we make democracy secure, what will guarantee our "four freedoms," what can we do to heal the wounds of war and still the hot passions of hate and revenge if we cannot rely on other than human help? We have knowledge such as will remove material mountains, but we lack the wisdom and the faith that will break down the barriers that divide and curse our modern world. If there is any high Christian statesmanship available anywhere in this world, we need it and we need it desperately in these days.

The New York Times of March 27, 1943, reported the eyewitness account of the loss of four chaplains who went down with a cargo-transport torpedoed in the North Atlantic early in February of this year. The moving story of what happened is summed up in the words of a 19-year-old lad who was one of the survivors. This Daniel O'Keefe said, "Just before the ship went down the chaplains gave their life preservers to members of the crew. They were standing on the deck praying when our boat drifted out of sight." One of the chaplains was a Jew, one a Roman Catholic, two were Protestants. In time of tragedy religion finds a common denominator in sacrifice. In a time of crisis I believe religion can find a common denominator, a united voice, to speak justice and peace to the nations. Let us pray God that it may be so.

Congress and the Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the growing breach between Congress and the executive departments is an alarming condition which gives all of us much concern. The problem was ably discussed in a recent address delivered by William C. Fitts, Jr., general counsel of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to the Knoxville branch of the American Society of Civil Engineers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Fitts' address and commend it for your consideration:

At a time when unity and cohesion of effort are more important than at any time in recent history, an internal conflict is developing which has not received the public attention that it deserves. At a time when we can least afford bitterness and bickering, the effective functioning of the processes of government is being seriously threatened by a growing cleavage between the Congress and the so-called bureaucrats. Since many of us here are bureaucrats according to the accepted popular definition of that term, and since all of us have a substantial stake in the answer to the question of whether the machinery of government is geared to withstand the stresses and strains that must inevitably follow this war, this controversy is worthy of our serious attention.

In my opinion, this conflict is a senseless one and springs from a lack of historical perspective and an appalling ignorance of the basic framework of government established by the Constitution. There is a surprising lack of understanding on the part of administrators, the Congress, and the public of the proper division of authority and responsibility in the conduct of the public's business. At one extreme there is the type of administrator who insists that he knows what is best for the people, that it is his business not only to make the day-to-day administrative decisions that are his proper function but also to determine the long-range objectives and policies to be pursued, and that the Congress has no legitimate concern with the policy decisions that he makes even when those decisions affect the lives and welfare of large segments of the public.

This attitude of mind, which seems to me to be the negation of representative government, reaches its climax when we find administrators insisting that it is their prerogative to draft legislation and present it to the Congress for rubber-stamp approval and complaining that the Congress is making a nuisance of itself if it insists on scrutinizing the proposal, debating it, and amending it to bring it in accord with congressional policy. Those who would thus deny to the legislative branch its constitutional function of shaping and controlling policy decisions and who seek to create public contempt for the legislative process are guilty of a tragic error. The acceptance of such a theory would reduce the Congress to the status of the German Reichstag immediately prior to its permanent demise.

Fortunately, those who take this view are but a handful. They are either inept and inexperienced administrators who simply fail to understand the Government under which they live, or they represent that distinct minority who believe that representative government has outlived its usefulness and seek to ride what they conceive to be "the wave of the future." Most administrators today have a clear recognition of the limitations of their powers and are honestly seeking to strengthen—not to destroy—representative government. The tragedy is that the mistakes of the minority are now being attributed to the entire executive branch, and all administrators are lumped together under the opprobrious epithet "bureaucrat" and pictured as despots seeking to ride roughshod over the public and Congress alike.

To understand how prevalent is this misconception and how deep this bitterness has gone, it is only necessary to read the columnists in the daily newspapers or to glance at random at any issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As a result, the defenders of legislative power have taken an equally indefensible and destructive position at the opposite extreme. It now appears that the accepted position in Congress is that it is the

business of that body not only to legislate—that is, to lay down the broad framework of policy within which government is to function—but also to control the detail and minutia of managing the public business.

The manifestations of this view are everywhere. We find them in the extreme theory of the implications of the legislative power of control over the purse. As legitimately construed, that power is one of the bulwarks of free government. It was wrested by the Commons from the Crown after centuries of bitter struggle, and all of us recognize that our system of government depends upon retaining intact in the legislative branch the basic control over appropriations. But the legislative power is the power to determine and declare the broad policies and objectives for which Federal funds shall be expended. It is not the power to supervise the detailed method of the spending or to determine the personnel to be employed in the administrative branch. The theory of the Constitution is that the function of the legislative branch is to legislate; that is, to declare policy. The function of the executive branch, in the words of the Constitution, is to "see that the laws are faithfully executed," and that includes the details of management and the hiring and firing of personnel.

Yet that theory is today being nullified by the simple expedient of extending the power over the purse to the details of managing this vast and complicated business we call government. A few examples reveal the method.

The orthodox congressional theory of the status of the Comptroller General is that that officer is a special representative of the legislative branch set up for the express purpose of supervising and controlling the detailed manner and method by which appropriated funds are expended by the executive departments. This is bad theory and worse practice. If the control is not exercised, it is worse than useless. If it is exercised, it results in placing final responsibility for the faithful execution of the laws in one branch of the Government while vesting final authority over the manner of expenditure in the representative of another branch. Such a system stifles imagination and initiative in the administrative offices and makes for an administration of the people's business that is encased in a strait jacket of rules and regulations.

The auditing of expenditures by the executive departments is clearly an executive function. What is needed is a modern executive audit of administrative expenditures, with adequate provision for systematic reports of the results of those audits to the proper congressional committees. Under such a system the legislative branch would be in position to keep fully informed as to the manner in which appropriated funds are being spent and would have available the necessary information upon which to base performance of its constitutional function of laying down the policies to govern that spending.

Closely akin to this attempt to control the executive through the device of legislative policing of expenditures is the even more indefensible practice of writing into the various appropriation acts detailed regulations of the day-to-day decisions that must be made in the management of any business. This practice is a nightmare to administrative lawyers. Scattered throughout hundreds of statutes we find—if our eyes are sharp enough—funds appropriated with provisos that no part of the money appropriated by that or any other act may be spent for travel, or that no automobiles may be purchased, or that only typewriters of a certain make or model may be obtained. If this tendency continues, it would not be surprising to find a proviso that only people with red hair may be employed with appropriated funds.

The most recent legislation, resulting from the activities of the Dies and Kerr committees, shows how this extremist view of the power over the purse may be applied to vest in the legislature the purely executive power of the selection of administrative personnel. For several years the Dies committee has been conducting what is politely called an investigation of the social, economic, and political views of Government employees. When the committee reaches the conclusion that any employee has Communist sympathies or is a member of a subversive organization, it brings the information before Congress with a recommendation that a proviso be written into the appropriation act prohibiting the payment of salary for any government position to the suspect. On several recent occasions these recommendations have been written into law. Thus, by the simple expedient of withholding funds, the Congress is exercising the Executive function of passing on the qualifications of subordinate employees in the administrative agencies. We are not here interested in the question of whether the particular proscribed employees are in fact Communists, Fascists, radicals, or liberals. The point is that when the legislative branch attempts to arrogate to itself the power of determining the qualifications of individual employees in the executive branch, it is pursuing a course that can lead only to chaos in government.

There is another related practice, increasing in usage in recent years, by which the Congress in effect deprives the President of an important power vested in him by the Constitution. I am referring to the device of circumventing the veto power by attaching highly controversial legislation in the form of riders to essential appropriation bills. Under the orthodox view that the President is without power to veto particular items but must either accept or veto the bill in its entirety, he is thus forced to acquiesce in legislation to which he is opposed since, to exercise the veto power would be to jeopardize, and, in many important instances, to block essential Government activities. While this practice may be defensible on strict legal grounds, it is clearly contrary to the spirit of the Constitution in that it amounts to abrogation by legislative action of one of the Chief Executive's most vital powers.

This same tendency toward confusion and usurpation by indirection is reflected in the present trend toward legislative control over the power of appointment and employment. The theory of the Constitution, and historical precedent for 150 years, is clear to the effect that the selection of employees in the executive departments is an Executive function. The purpose of the constitutional provision for senatorial confirmation of certain officers was to give to the legislative branch a veto power over the appointment of a limited number of policy-making officers in recognition of the legislature's primary interest in all matters of policy determination. This provision was never intended to have the effect of transferring the effective power of selection to the legislative branch. Nevertheless, that is exactly what has happened with respect to a large number of Federal employees. The actual power of selection and appointment of United States judges, district attorneys, marshals, collectors of internal revenue, postmasters, and a large number of miscellaneous appointees rests with the Senators from the State of residence of the appointee or, in the case of postmasters, with the Representative from the district.

The President, in effect, merely rubberstamps the senatorial appointment. This has not always been true, and there is nothing in the Constitution or historical precedent that compels it. There can be no hope for a stable career service in Government until this trend is reversed and the Executive insists with Jackson, Cleveland, and Wilson that the senatorial power to confirm is merely the power to accept or reject an Executive selection and is not the power to appoint.

Unfortunately, the trend is in the opposite direction. There is now pending in Congress a bill that would subject the employment of thousands of professional, technical, scientific, and management employees of the executive branch to senatorial confirmation. This would be bad enough if Senate action were limited to approval or rejection of an Executive appointment by vote of a majority of the Senate. It is much worse when we understand that under the practice of senatorial courtesy it means, in practice, that the selection of these Executive employees will be placed in the hands of the Senator or Senators controlling patronage for the particular State of residence of the employee. Under such a system every employee will retain his position at the will of the Senator or Senators from his home State. Every decision that is made, every action that is taken, must be with full recognition that if it arouses the displeasure of the patronage dispenser, the employee responsible may be forced out of his chosen work. No one in the administrative service would dare act without considering the consequences. Thus final control over management is to be transferred to the Halls of the Senate.

This tendency toward legislative interference with the details of management is further illustrated in a different field by the proposals that have been pressed in recent years to deprive the T. V. A. of the right to use its power revenues in the payment of operating expenses and thus to place the Congress in control of the complicated business of managing a vast utility system. The enactment of any such proposal would mean that such business decisions as the making of contracts for new loads, the increase of substation and transmission facilities, and the repair or replacement of major items of equipment would be made in Congress and not by the managers of the business.

While many of these matters to which I have referred are of great public importance on their own merits, the major significance lies in the dangerous trend toward confusion of function and division of responsibility. This trend threatens to dislocate the machinery of government from two directions.

The successful conduct of any business requires that those charged with the responsibility for management should be clothed with sufficient authority and independence of decision to make the determinations upon which the results depend. If those determinations are inhibited by the fear of legislative reprisals or by the necessity for obtaining legislative approval in advance of action, the inevitable result will be a type of administration that follows the safe road, that does only those things that have been done before, and that rigidly adheres to the path of tradition and precedent. This is stultification at a point in time when there is a crying need for imaginative leadership.

Equally serious is the adverse effect upon the legislature itself. The job that has been assigned by the Constitution to the legislative branch—that of charting the course that Government is to follow—is of such paramount importance that it demands the undivided attention of the Congress. When that body diverts its efforts and energy to the details of administration, it, to that extent, disables itself from discharging the great obligations placed upon it by the Constitution.

Government today touches the lives of all of us. The welfare of each of us may well be affected if this misunderstanding of power and function is permitted to continue. It is time that a demand be heard for mutual respect and understanding—in short, for a re-

turn to the middle ground which is in essence the great compromise of the Constitution. To understand where we have gone wrong it is essential to realize that the system of government established by the Constitution was fashioned out of the conflict between two groups of extremists. On one side were those who, fresh from the struggle with the Crown, feared a strong executive and insisted upon placing the final power of sovereignty in the hands of the Legislature. Opposed to them were those who, like Alexander Hamilton and Gouverneur Morris, distrusted the people, feared what they called the tyranny of the majority, and demanded a strong central executive to keep in check what they feared would be the excesses of a popular assembly.

The doctrine of the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances that are grounded in the Constitution represent the middle ground between those two extremes. Thus, there was created a strong executive with broad powers to administer the laws but with only two methods of influencing legislation: First, the power to recommend and to appeal to the public for popular support, and, second, a modified veto. As an offset to this Executive power the complete power to legislate and to appropriate was lodged in the Congress, supplemented by the limited power of senatorial confirmation as a check on the Executive selection over what was intended to be a very limited class of policy-making offices. No one contends that this system is perfect. It has definite weaknesses, and it may well be that the parliamentary system which blends Executive and legislative power is preferable. But our immediate task is to make our present system work. It is clear that that objective cannot be accomplished by ignoring the legislative power or by substituting legislative control for management.

What is required is a cooperative endeavor to strengthen both the administrative and legislative branches and to provide the means for an effective working arrangement between them. To this end every responsible administrator in the Federal service should devote his efforts toward providing and keeping open channels of communication between himself and the Representatives of Congress. Instead of avoiding contacts with congressional committees and the reporting of the conduct of his business to the Congress, he should make a deliberate effort to find opportunities for informing the legislative Representatives of all aspects of his administration. In presenting appropriation requests, and in other appearances before congressional committees, the responsible administrators should at all times be willing to make a full disclosure of all of their activities and should avoid any indications of an attempt to conceal or a desire to deprive Congress of an opportunity to review the work of the administrative agencies and, where necessary, to legislate concerning their powers and responsibilities.

In all relations with the Congress it is essential that the representatives of the administrative agencies make clear their recognition of the final responsibility of Congress in the development and control of policy, while insisting upon the necessity of preserving to the administrators the right to make the detailed decisions upon which the efficient conduct of the agencies depends. Finally, it is essential that the Chief Executive begin now to regain that large part of the appointing power that has been whittled away and to insist on limiting legislative participation in the appointment and removal of employees to the boundaries contemplated by the Constitution.

On the other side of the picture there are adjustments both in thinking and procedures that seem to me to be essential. If I were in any position to give advice to the legislative branch, it would run somewhat as follows: Be realistic enough to recognize that modern government is a complicated business that requires the services of experienced and qualified management personnel. In performing your high constitutional function of declaring the policies that the management agencies are to follow, exercise care in defining the purposes and objectives that you desire to accomplish and then vest those managers with sufficient independence and discretionary authority to make it possible for them to accomplish those purposes. Make it clear that in carrying out your mandate those managers are responsible to you and to the people and be sure that they have sufficient authority to discharge that responsibility. Establish the necessary machinery in the legislative branch to keep fully informed as to the manner in which these managers are discharging their responsibility. One helpful suggestion toward this end is found in the proposals that have been made for equipping the Appropriations Committees and other special committees of Congress with expert staffs, qualified to obtain, analyze, and explain the data relating to the programs of the operating agencies. Preserve inviolate your control over appropriations and the general policies and objectives for which such appropriations may be spent. Avoid all attempts at controlling administrative personnel or the detailed business decisions through the device of minute appropriation restrictions.

It has been said that the great weakness of our Government as compared with the parliamentary system is the isolation of the Executive from the legislature. This is a valid criticism, but there is nothing in the Constitution that makes the defect irremediable. If there is a sincere determination to keep open the lines of communication and to perfect the machinery for doing so, there is no insurmountable obstacle to cooperation. If this Government is to succeed in meeting the conditions that will shortly confront us, such a spirit of mutual confidence and respect is essential.

America's Aviation Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts and quotations from an article entitled "America's Air Lines in the War":

Excerpt from President Roosevelt's annual address to Congress on the state of the Nation, January 6, 1942:

"Only this all-out scale of production will hasten the ultimate all-out victory. Speed will count. Lost ground can always be regained—lost time never. Speed will save lives; speed will save this Nation, which is in peril; speed will save our freedom and civilization—and slowness has never been an American characteristic."

Excerpt from address by the President of the United States to the National Aviation Forum on January 24, 1939:

"The country's welfare in time of peace and its safety in time of war rests upon the existence of a stabilized aircraft production—an economically and technically sound air transportation system, both domestic and overseas."

Excerpt from joint letter dated September 13, 1940, from the Secretaries of War and the Navy to the Secretary of Commerce, jointly stating the official Army and Navy policy with respect to the relation of the armed forces to the air transport industry:

"The War and Navy Departments consider that the air transport industry is a necessary adjunct to the national defense * * * it is both necessary and practicable to allocate available aviation personnel and matériel in such a manner as to insure the maintenance of air-line service without reduction in its safety and reliability."

On August 9, 1940, Secretary of War Stimson said to Congress:

"Air power today has decided the fate of nations."

Excerpt from a letter dated April 1, 1942, from the Secretary of War to the commanding general, Army Air Forces:

"Civil air transportation is of vital importance to the war effort. * * * Key air-line personnel should be encouraged to stay at their posts."

In the letter of Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, in paragraph 2 thereof, the Secretary said in each letter as follows:

"Continued uninterrupted service by domestic air lines is essential in the interest of national security."

Excerpt from letter dated November 6, 1942, from General George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, United States Army, to the president of the Air Transport Association of America:

"This job (transportation by air by America's air lines) * * * is essential to our business of getting on with the war."

By order of the Secretary of War, signed by General George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, War Department circular No. 211, dated July 1, 1942, directs:

"In the performance of its mission, both within and without the continental United States, the Army Air Forces will utilize to the fullest extent possible, the services, facilities, and personnel of the civil air carriers."

Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System, January 26, 1942:

"Air transportation is a vital and necessary adjunct to our defense and war effort. Almost daily the military services are calling upon the air lines to perform special missions in connection with the urgent and expedited transportation of personnel (including the transportation of troops and their equipment) and matériel necessary to our war effort. * * * The air lines are increasingly being called upon to perform vital maintenance, airplane assembly, weather forecast and communication. * * * Delay of above services will impede the war-production program, and in that sense will endanger the national safety."

At his press conference on January 8, 1942, Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, stated:

"Efficient transportation is just as important to the war effort as the furnishing of machine tools."

Excerpt from an address of the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, at the dedication of the LaGuardia Airport, New York City, October 15, 1939:

"The very existence of these air lines, with their excellent equipment and personnel, is a strong guaranty of the Nation's peace and safety."

The Honorable KARL STEFAN, United States Congressman from Nebraska and member of

the House Committee on Appropriations, in speaking to the Honorable William A. M. Burden, Assistant for Aeronautics to the Secretary of Commerce, said of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in its administration of the Federal Airways System and of the traffic over it (p. 125 of the printed hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations, Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1944):

"You are more in the war than the railroads."

During the debate in the House of Commons in London on February 25, 1942, Mr. Hore-Belisha, Secretary of State for War in the Chamberlain Government at the outset of World War No. 2, declared:

"There is inadequacy of machines of the kind to carry parachute troops, and not enough transport-carrying airplanes.

Excerpts from page 366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1943, from the speech of the Honorable CARL VINSON, United States Congressman from Georgia:

"Aviation, we all know, has advanced by leaps and bounds. It will continue to grow. After the war it may become the chief common carrier within and to points without our borders. * * *

"The Congress has established in recent years a Civil Aeronautics Administration and a Civil Aeronautics Board. That legislation originated in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce * * * and for it the country should be profoundly grateful to that committee's great chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and to his committee colleagues, for their wisdom and foresight. Its value in this war situation has proved to be immeasurable. * * *

"The civilian pilot-training program, the development of landing areas, the installation of air navigation facilities and the development thereof, including communications and directional guidance, and the accomplishments of the Civil Aeronautics Board, have all been of the greatest value to the country in the prosecution of the war, and every phase of the work of these agencies today is performed under the closest kind of cooperation with our military and naval air arms. In time of war, in fact, they may be said to be adjuncts of our defense arms, like the Coast Guard, for example, is of the Navy. They are part and parcel of the defense establishments."

Extract from New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1943, quoting Maj. Gen. Harold L. George, commanding general, Air Transport Command United States Army Air Forces:

"If it had not been for their (air lines in world-wide air transportation) wholehearted spirit of cooperation, it would have been as nearly impossible as anything can be impossible for us (the Army) to carry out the job in the way it has been done."

Antistrike Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today the conference report on S. 796, known as the Connally bill. I opposed the passage of this bill in the House for several reasons. Among them was that the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy has never asked for this legislation. Neither did the departments of Government having to do with the prosecution of the war; namely, the Navy, the Army, and the Maritime Commission. As a matter of fact, the representatives of these departments testified before the committee that in their opinion such legislation would retard our war effort. To whom must we look for guidance and leadership in such matters as this? The responsibility of the conduct of this war rests upon the Chief Executive as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and upon the Army and Navy.

There are also many vital defects in the bill as finally agreed upon by the conferees. No one can escape the conclusion that it is a direct slap at the millions and millions of patriotic, hard-working American citizens. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, said in a speech just the other day:

> When you condemn the few who strike do not forget that the great mass of the workers, and with rare exceptions, the leaders of organized labor, are doing as much as any of us, and more than many of us, to see that there is no interruption of war production.

He went on to say:

> Do not forget that during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strikes. The striker in war industry is almost as rare as the slacker in the Army.

These millions of workers have in the services of our Army and Navy upward of 1,000,000 boys, as well as many of their daughters. They are just as concerned and just as patriotic as any class of people in the United States. I think it goes without saying that this bill will do more to create industrial unrest than any other one thing.

I wish to state that I observed to one of the conferees in the course of the debate the following: Let us assume that this bill is before the House because of the so-called coal strike as production of war materials has reached an unparalleled peak, which assumption I think is fair. Now assume such to be a fact, are we not bypassing this bill deciding that the operators are without fault and that the miners are not entitled to their increase in pay? Such action on our part, in my opinion, is unfair.

If we pass this legislation, we not only condemn the miners for their action in stopping work but we also decide the issue against the miners. All of this, I am not prepared to do. I happen to know that the coal-mining occupation is a seasonal occupation. Seldom do these men work continuously during the year; that they are underpaid in view of living conditions, I do not think any fair-minded person will deny. Again, may I call your attention to the dangerous and hazardous occupation of coal mining. Just recently 79 dead bodies were removed from a coal mine in my district after several days of frantic work on the part of the rescuers. They came from Butte and every other place to rescue their fellow miners. I am not prepared by my vote today to decide against this group of patriotic Americans even though we may believe at the time that they are being misled by misguided and over-ambitious leaders and that their procedure in getting their rights is wrong. On the whole I think it is a vicious piece of legislation passed at a mighty dangerous time. England had trouble with her coal miners until Churchill came into power and he placed a Bevin at the head of labor. What we need in this country is a Bevin. In this over-all picture let us not forget the words of the immortal Abraham Lincoln uttered as far back as 1860 in discussing the Massachusetts shoemakers' strike when he said:

> Thank God that we have a system of labor where there can be a strike. Whatever the pressure, there is a point where the workman may stop.

Lower Production of Dairy Products Is Apparent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, whether a few individuals or groups are going to be allowed to ruin the war dairy food program should be of concern to every Member of this House and to every consumer in America.

The following official weekly report of the United States Department of Agriculture shows a decrease of 25 percent in cheese production in comparison to the same week in 1942:

Weekly American cheese production—Changes in production for week ending Thursday, May 13, 1943

Geographic divisions [1]	Percent of United States production	Change from same week year ago (percent)
North and South Atlantic	5.1	−64
East North Central (except Wisconsin)	15.2	−27
Wisconsin	50.8	−19
West North Central	8.5	−30
South Central	10.2	−28
West	10.2	−15
United States	100.0	−25

[1] Geographic divisions:

North and South Atlantic: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

East North Central (except Wisconsin): Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan.

West North Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas.

South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas.

West: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California.

American cheese production for the week ending May 13 rose 5 percent from the preceding week, the United States Department of Agriculture reports. Pasture growth has

been retarded this year due to cool weather and the shift from winter rations to pasture feed was delayed as a result. Production was 25 percent lower than the extremely high levels a year earlier.

The seasonal gain in Wisconsin was 6 percent. Compared with a year earlier, production remained 19 percent lower.

Gains in production from the preceding week occurred in all areas except the South Central, where declines in Texas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas caused a 1-percent decrease for the area. A 2-percent rise was shown in the North and South Atlantic States. The 11 percent increase in the East North Central States outside Wisconsin was reflected about equally in all States of that area. Production increased 5 percent in the West North Central area and 3 percent in the West.

Production by areas when compared with the corresponding week a year earlier, showed much the same pattern which had prevailed for several weeks. All areas were sharply lower, the decrease in the North and South Atlantic of 64 percent being particularly marked. A 27 percent decline was reported for the East North Central area except Wisconsin. Production of the West North Central area was 30 percent lower, which is the same level as last week. The decrease in the South Central's output was 28 percent, while in the West a 15 percent reduction was shown.

Mr. Speaker, the national butter production is still about equal to the 1942 production. The evaporated milk production for the first 4 months of 1943 shows a decrease of 28 percent in comparison to the first 4 months of 1942. The May 1943 evaporated milk (case goods) held by manufacturers was 114,000,000 pounds, or 48 percent less than May 1, 1942, stocks and 27 percent less than the 1937-41 May 1 average.

There was 14 percent less dried skim milk from the spray process and 25 percent less dried skim milk from the roller process produced from January 1 to May 1, 1943, than during the corresponding months of 1942.

The dried skim milk production by both spray and roller processes for the first 4 months of 1943 was 19 percent smaller than during the same months of 1942. There were 100,000,000 pounds of milk solids produced from skim milk January 1 to May 1, 1943. Of this 79,900,000 pounds were by the spray process and 21,100,000 pounds were by the roller process, part of which is used for animal food.

A summary of the dairy situation, then, would be that the total fluid milk production has not shown much change from last year; the butter production is fairly even in comparison to previous yearly production figures though less is available for domestic consumption; the Cheddar cheese production is 20 to 25 percent below the 1942 production; the evaporated milk production is 28 percent below the 1942 production for the first 4 months of the year; the storage stocks of evaporated milk are 48 percent below the May 1, 1942, stocks. The dried skim milk production by the spray process is 14 percent below the January to May production of 1942; the skim milk solids by the roller process is 25 percent below the January to May 1942 production.

In 1939 good Wisconsin cheese was selling in the Washington chain stores for as low as 14 to 15 cents per pound. Cheese was 11.7 cents per pound the first 6 months of 1939 in Wisconsin. This was a spread of only 3 to 4 cents per pound between Plymouth, Wis., price and consumer price in Washington.

December 1, 1942, the subsidy program was extended to cheese. The price was pegged at 23¼ cents per pound and the subsidy was placed at 3¾ cents per pound on the basis of helping the consumer. The present price of cheese in Washington is at least 38 cents per pound. We now have a spread, then, of 38 to 23¼ or 14¾ cents per pound or more than cheese sold for in Washington in 1939. I ask where did this subsidy keep the consumer in this particular article of food?

Since one article of an industry like cheese shows a 14–15 cents per pound spread that is supposed to enjoy a subsidy, and another article of the same industry, like butter, has had only a small spread, without any subsidy, it appears that there are more important factors to be considered in food prices than the imaginary benefits of a 10-percent roll-back in the price of butter.

I realize in some stores cheese has been 49 cents per pound, but I have tried to keep this comparison on comparable grades of cheese, and have given the opposition the benefit of the doubt.

It is regrettable that no one in the high places has ever had any practical experience in food production nor any training for food production. These food-production programs would be more effectively executed if we had representation in these bureaus from States that not only could and do feed themselves but are furnishing the food for the armed forces, lease-lend, and other foreign commitments. While Mr Harry Hopkins, with his copartners Messrs. Frankfurter, Cohen, and Rosenmann, may be past masters in the political approaches, their leadership on domestic issues, including food production, should be questioned by all interested in the war food program.

If the butter roll-back results in reduced milk production and in less milk-solids production, great harm will be done to the war dairy program. We must also take into consideration the fact that our 1943 production of dairy products is being shared with the people of many lands and that the amounts available for our domestic requirements is gradually becoming less and less.

What Is Freedom of the Air?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by L. Welch Pogue, published in Nation's Business for June 1943:

WHAT IS FREEDOM OF THE AIR?—THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD OFFERS A COMMON SENSE PROGRAM FOR INTERNATIONAL AIR COMMERCE

(By L. Welch Pogue)

In time of war, the airplane is a destroyer of civilization. But after the war, the airplane—if wisely used as a vehicle of trade and travel—may be our best means of keeping the world at peace.

Traveling at 300 miles an hour—a cruising speed which transport planes could attain shortly after the war—it will take less time to go from New York to Moscow by air than to go from New York to Chicago by train. It will take less time to go from Minneapolis to Tokyo by air than from Minneapolis to New York by train.

The airplane, by pulling the world closer together, will be a force for good. But, before it can be made to fulfill that purpose, certain peace-time problems of international air operations must be solved:

1. Problems concerning military aircraft: The extent to which military planes shall be permitted to fly outside their own countries.

2. Problems, in the nonmilitary field, having to do with the requirements each country lays down for the operation over its domain of its own and foreign aircraft: safety, customs, immigration, traffic control, public health.

3. Problems involving the rights of private and commercial aircraft of each country to fly over and to land in other countries.

Let us confine ourselves here to the rights of commercial aircraft. These problems are not only interrelated with many matters of national concern, but also inject new considerations into the international picture.

TERMS ARE LACKING

We make a mistake, therefore, if we assume that the future of aviation can be worked out more or less as an incident in relation to other issues. Hard, close thinking is necessary if the future of world aviation is to be soundly planned.

Heretofore, the field of international aviation has lacked even an adequate accepted terminology. Such terms as "air sovereignty" and "freedom of the air," for example, mean all things to all men. Without some agreement as to the meaning of such terms, cooperative effort among nations, the key to the solution of the major problems of international aviation, is clearly impossible.

But we cannot even begin with definitions. We must first analyze some of the problems which we are trying to define.

Today all nations must decide to what extent artificial barriers can and should be removed from the path of world aviation. This is an important issue to our own country because it will determine the extent to which America, for years to come, shall have the right to engage in air commerce, over the shortest routes and in the most economical way, with other nations.

Out of the past has grown a doctrine of international law under which each nation may legally exclude foreign commercial planes from the air space over its domain. Special permission—generally obtained through tedious negotiation—is now required before any commercial aircraft may enter or pass through a foreign nation's air space.

Special permission is also required to land on foreign soil, not only to discharge or take on passengers and cargo, but for the far more limited purposes of refueling, making repairs, or taking refuge from storms.

Oliver J. Lissitzyn, in discussing international aviation problems in his book International Air Transport, says:

The necessity to bargain for landing rights has exercised a retarding effect upon the development of world air commerce. Routes which are technically feasible and commercially promising have remained unopened. * * * Small but favorably situated countries have at times exacted conditions for the grant of landing rights that may have been financially burdensome to the foreign carriers involved.

Italy, at a time when Italian air transport was weak and highly unprofitable, refused to grant landing rights to the British Imperial Airways on their way to the East, unless the British company's receipts on a certain run were divided equally with the Italian company, which had much less traffic.

Iran compelled Imperial to shift its route to the southern shore of the Persian Gulf by insisting that, in flying over Iran, the company's planes follow an inland route over mountains and deserts that was found to be too difficult and dangerous for use.

Turkey barred all foreign air lines from passing over it in an east-west direction, primarily for military reasons and, as a result, European services to southern Asia were deprived of the use of the shortest route. Turkey's attitude redounded to the advantage of Greece, which, it was reported, required all foreign air liners passing over its territory to land at Athens and to coordinate their schedules with those of the internal Greek air services. Similar illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely.

YOU HAVE TO GET THERE

Obviously, before you can discharge and take on passengers and cargo at a foreign point, you must get there. In most cases, intervening countries must be crossed. The question of the right to get there is the first problem we meet in the international air riddle.

In the field of private flying, the right to pass through the air space of a foreign country is known as the right of innocent passage. In the field of commercial flying, this right to get there has no name. Let us give it one now.

We shall call it the right of commercial air transit. To assure common understanding of the term, let us define it as the right of commercial aircraft to fly through the air space of any nation, which has agreed to the international arrangement. It would include the right to land at agreed airports to refuel, to make repairs, or to avoid bad weather. It would not include the right to discharge or take on passengers and cargo.

The right to discharge or take on passengers and cargo might be called the right to a commercial outlet. This would not include the right to carry traffic between points in our own or in a foreign country, a right called cabotage. That right will normally be reserved, naturally, for a nation's own air lines.

Of course, commercial outlets at desirable points are what we want. Many nations will see commercial and possibly other advantages to themselves in becoming such outlets for foreign air transportation; and some nations, having their own foreign air transportation systems, will naturally seek reciprocal arrangements for commercial outlets.

The right of commercial air transit, as has been said, means the right to get there. Our own enlightened self-interest, and that of all other nations, requires that, as part of aviation's future international arrangements, aviation be generally granted this right of commercial air transit.

WORLD-WIDE FRAMEWORK

Such a charter, flexible like our own Constitution, would constitute a world-wide framework, facilitating the future establishment of commercial outlets at all points where future world developments may make them desirable.

When the Convention for the Regulation of Air Navigation was held in Paris in 1919, certain provisions affecting the right of commercial air operation through the air space of a foreign nation were not entirely clear. Some of the countries, notably England and the United States, favored interpreting these provisions as authorizing commercial aircraft of any of the parties to the convention to operate over the territories of the others provided only that they follow designated routes.

Other nations interpreted the original provisions as permitting such operations only after permission was obtained from each nation through whose air space any commercial operation would pass.

In 1929 an amendment settled the ambiguity in favor of the latter construction, 27 nations favoring the proposal and 4—England, the United States, the Netherlands, and Sweden—voting against it. The United States has never ratified this convention, either originally or as amended.

Twenty-one nations of the Western Hemisphere in 1928 completed and signed the Pan-American Convention for Air Navigation, known as the Habana Convention, under which each of the countries agreed to permit commercial aircraft of the others to pass through its air space provided designated routes were followed. However, only a few nations (the United States being one) have ratified this convention and it, of course, does not apply to the rest of the world.

So generally, throughout the world, the establishment of both the right of commercial air transit and commercial outlets requires the negotiation of agreements with each nation whose air space is used.

It is sometimes urged that we cannot permit foreign planes to fly over our territory and thus have the opportunity to see and photograph our entire country with all of its military and defense establishments.

That argument overlooks the fact that our own domestic air lines, covering many more routes than would ever be used for commercial air transit, are always available to anyone.

The United States lies on Canada's shortest route to Mexico, Central America, South America, and the Caribbean area. China occupies a somewhat similar position with respect to Russia's shortest route to southeast Asia. Alaska lies athwart Canada's probable route to all Asia. Canada, in turn, lies under our great circle courses to both Asia and Europe. And Russia extends along all the north and much of the west of China. Certainly these four nations should strongly support the right of commercial air transit on a world-wide basis.

New trade routes by air are inevitable. But if every nation is to control the air space over its own territory, the benefit of international operations may be lost. The problem, therefore, is what kind of common sense arrangements can nations make for commercial use of the air.

First, of course, they could continue the unsatisfactory practices of the past.

Second, they could, by a single agreement between nations, designate particular routes and airports for international air traffic. This suggestion assumes the ability to determine for all time the future map of international air commerce, a task obviously impossible now.

Third, zones of influence throughout the world could be assigned, one to each nation having extensive air-transport industries. Such a plan has an obviously limiting effect on the rights of smaller nations, as well as the inherent danger that overlapping of zones would create friction. Furthermore, any such arrangement is inconsistent with the operational characteristics of the airplane which knows no boundaries or barriers.

Fourth and more practical, each nation which is a party to the commercial air-transit agreement would grant each of the others the right of commercial air transit for nonmilitary aircraft over its domain, thus enabling the planes of each to fly to their commercial outlets.

Already we know something, but far from all, about the changes the airplane will bring. It has reduced the world to manageable proportions. Let us have the vision, and above all the courage, to give to aviation a charter equal to its need. That is common sense, and common sense eventually will and must win out in the solution of world aviation problems.

Dr. Lars W. Boe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, men of vision, Christian character, and perseverance, have made our country and its institutions worthy of the heritage for which freemen now struggle. Dr. Lars W. Boe, president of St. Olaf College at Northfield, Minn., was such a man. He died on December 27, 1942, at the age of 67.

Dr. Boe was one of the outstanding men from the Middle West. He will be remembered for his keen insight and understanding of the realities of life, and for his contribution in the field of education. Thousands of men and women graduates of St. Olaf College, and others who had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Dr. Boe, will treasure his memory and be guided through life by the example which he set for them. He was a builder of character in men.

Under leave granted me in the House, I am including a biographical sketch and other remarks by friends of Dr. Boe in tribute to his memory:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF PRESIDENT LARS W. BOE

(By Dr. C. A. Mellby)

Lars Wilhelm Boe was born on December 27, 1875, in Calumet, Mich., the son of Pastor Nils E. Boe and Anne Reque Boe. Four years later the family moved to Leland, Ill., where his father served as a pastor of several Lutheran congregations, and 10 years later to Silver Lake, Iowa, where his father had accepted another call.

His precollegiate training was taken at the St. Ansgar Seminary and at the preparatory department of the United Lutheran Church Seminary at Minneapolis. In 1894 he entered the freshman class at St. Olaf College and graduated from that institution in 1898. During the following 3 years he studied theology at the United Lutheran Church Seminary at St. Paul, graduating as a candidate of theology in 1901. After serving for 3 years as the pastor of several Lutheran congregations at Lawler, Iowa, he was called in 1904 to the presidency of the newly organized Waldorf College at Forest City, Iowa, a position which he held until 1915. During his incumbency of this office he showed the eminent qualities of leadership and the

breadth of interest which were to characterize his subsequent career by placing this young and struggling institution on a sound financial basis and winning scholarly recognition for it in the church and in the larger community. For many years during this period he also served as the pastor of the local Lutheran church. In the interest of better government, he entered the political arena and served as a member of the lower house of the Iowa Legislature from 1909 to 1911, and as a member of the State senate from 1911 to 1913. He was urged by many State leaders to become a candidate for the State governorship but preferred to return to his profession as an educator and churchman.

In 1915 he resigned from the presidency of Waldorf College to take over the position of financial and executive secretary of the board of trustees and the board of education of the United Lutheran Church of America, continuing in the same office after the church union of 1917 and the formation of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America.

At the early June convention of this church body in 1918 he was elected president of St. Olaf College and assumed this position in September 1 of the same year. The difficult war situation and the severe influenza epidemic which invaded the college population and caused many deaths was a severe test of the judgment and courage of the new leader, but gave equal proof of his ability to solve these as well as the difficult problem of the post-war period.

During the 24 years in which he was the head of the college the student registration rose from 650 to 1,150, a new group of modern buildings was erected at a cost of more than one and a half million dollars, and its various endowment funds greatly increased. The advance during these years in scholastic standing and teaching efficiency was equally impressive and could be credited as well to the vision and the enthusiasm of the president as to the cordial and wholehearted cooperative spirit existing between president, faculty, and student organizations. President Boe's deepest interest, however, went beyond those of scholarship and administration and centered particularly in the sound and rich development of the religious and spiritual life in the staff and student membership. The results of his care and his efforts in this field will surely be felt for years to come.

President Boe ranked high among the leaders in the former united church and in the later Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. He held numerous offices in important boards and commissions, his advice was sought on many important undertakings, and his voice carried authority in the annual church conventions. Some of the enterprises in which he took a leading part were the founding of the pastors' pension system, the launching of the Lutheran Men's Brotherhood and the centennial fund drive. He was one of the first promoters of the Norwegian-American Historical Association and served during the last 5 years as its vice president.

During the First World War he took a leading part in organizing the intersynodical plan for the Lutheran Soldiers' Welfare Service, which led to the organization of the National Lutheran Council, of which he was a member up to his death. He was one of the American representatives on the international committee of the Lutheran World Convention and for a number of years made an annual tour in Europe to consult and plan with other representatives in regard to Lutheran world and mission problems.

During the last few years his chief interest lay in the field of Lutheran church union. He participated in the formation of the American Lutheran Conference, was a delegate of our church to its annual conferences, and wrote and spoke vigorously for an extension of the union movement to all American Lutheran bodies. Much of the inspiration as well as the actual planning for this movement can be put to his credit.

President Boe was the recipient of many honors and distinctions. He received the honorary D. D. degree from Roanoke College and LL. D. and Litt. D. degrees from Wittenburg College. In 1924 he was decorated by the King of Norway with the Knighthood of the Order of St. Olaf and was raised in 1940 to the rank of Commander in the same Order. He was at one time president of the National Association of Lutheran Colleges, and from 1937 held the position of president of the State Council of Minnesota Colleges.

President Boe was married in 1909 to Helga Jacobson, at that time a member of the faculty of Waldorf College, who, with their two daughters, Esther and Margaret, both graduates of St. Olaf, survive him.

TRIBUTE TO DR. LARS W. BOE

(By Dr. J. A. Aasgaard, president of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America)

Although he received appreciation and honors and positions because of his ability and capacity for leadership, he was a humble man. These things meant very little to him. In fact they rather embarrassed him. His concern was only that things could be done and accomplished—as for the credit and the honor it never bothered him who got it.

Through his dealing with his students as well as others, there was ever a sense of fairness, understanding, and willingness to help that was remarkable. Even in his crowded life he was never too busy to listen to the need or the plea of someone who needed help and advice.

At the same time, having arrived at a conviction and understanding, he was fearless in his pressing it and working for it.

Today, his life among us closes and yet over all this land there are thousands who think of him with thankfulness to God, that L. W. Boe touched their lives in one way or another.

IN MEMORIAM—PRESIDENT L. W. BOE

Say not he left the city on the hill
Where once he dwelt, and which he helped to build,
As master workman in the chosen guild
Of God. He planned and toiled with utmost skill,
Wrought patiently and steadily until
He saw, before the mighty pulse was stilled,
The growing city as his dreams fulfilled,
The mirror of his mind and heart and will.
In memory his sturdy footstep falls
As once it fell on shaded walk, and broke
The sleeping silence; and his dauntless thought
Resounds in vibrant words through echoing halls.
The very walls intone the tongue he spoke.
Say not he left the city that he wrought.

—*George Weida Spohn.*

Hon. Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to take this opportunity to place therein an account by James D. White of one of the most distinguished Americans of our day. As I recall, my uncle, the late Admiral Richmond Pearson Hobson, was in Congress at the same time with this distinguished American. He was a great admirer and a devoted friend of Mr. Hull. It is therefore with a great deal of pleasure that I am privileged to insert the following in the RECORD:

SECRETARY HULL'S PATIENCE PAYS DIVIDENDS—PREPARED GROUNDWORK FOR NORTH AFRICAN SUCCESS

(By James D. White)

The last of our log-cabin statesmen prepared much of the groundwork for our success in French North Africa.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, son of a Tennessee logger, is to the rest of the world our outstanding example of the think-and-act-first-before-talking-about-it type of mind which has been a notable product of the American frontier.

He is the man who figured out when France fell that there was still much to be salvaged for democracy from the wreck.

The occupation of Algiers and Morocco climaxed 2½ years of difficult and often uncomfortable diplomacy directed by the white-haired mountaineer who guides our foreign policy.

Execution of such a policy, involving long-range vision and steadfast adherence to essential purpose, is the kind of job Cordell Hull likes and does best.

POLICY PAID DIVIDENDS

Results this time: Admiral Francois Darlan ordered all resistance to cease in French North Africa after 76 hours of American assault, and came over to the Allied side. Gen. Henri Honore Giraud, France's military Houdini and popular idol, was on hand to take over administration of this new base for Allied counterthrust against the Axis.

Still water ran deep in the hills around Olympus, Tenn., where Mr. Hull was born, and he never has been much of a talker.

Now just past his seventy-first birthday, he has been Secretary of State longer than any predecessor. Somewhere, during a lonely boyhood, he developed distinctive processes of thought which today make his name abroad synonymous with American keenness and integrity. Like Abraham Lincoln, he was born in a log cabin.

At his press conferences newspapermen see a frail man, stooped to a little less than his natural 5 feet 11 inches. More often than not Mr. Hull just asks for questions. He answers, in the drawl of his native Tennessee, with no hesitation—even when the boys have figured out queries with hooks in them. If Mr. Hull ever has given anything away, the newspapers haven't printed it.

GAVE UP POKER

He is no longer a poker player, and few people know he was a captain in Cuba during the Spanish-American War. But a regimental victim recalls:

"He could look sad and beautiful and humble while he held four of a kind, timidly and carefully betting against other soldiers' full houses."

He won three-quarters of all the money in the regiment, and then, he says, "I gave it all back."

What constitutes the right seems clear to Cordell Hull as it does to a few contemporary minds. His life is a round of adherence to carefully thought-out purpose.

As soon as he learned there was such a thing as democracy—call it politics, government, administration, or what you like—he made up his mind. He helped elect a Governor when he was 17, was admitted to the bar at the age of 19, and by 21 was in the Tennessee State Legislature.

Back from the Spanish-American War, he became "Jedge" Hull, then in 1907 went to Congress for 14 years.

In Washington he became known as an authority on taxes and an advocate of free trade. He helped draft the first income-tax bill, and his faith in his convictions resulted in his voting a tariff bill that would have enriched his own State. Ousted in the Harding landslide of 1920, he became chairman of the overshadowed Democratic Party for 2 years, and then returned to Congress as Representative from Tennessee.

DRAFTED BY ROOSEVELT

He was Senator Hull for 2 years before Franklin D. Roosevelt drafted him to become Secretary of State in 1933.

He was comparatively unknown and suffered a set-back when his particular pet, the London Economic Conference, came to nothing.

But Mr. Hull saw further and clearer than the men who scuttled that effort to remedy the world's ills and thereby to avert another war. Back in the State Department there was some talk behind closed doors. Other men went out; Cordell Hull stayed.

Unable to reform international economics wholesale, he attacked them piecemeal, and his success in carrying out our good-neighbor policy with the rest of America was due to a network of reciprocal trade pacts which Washington observers believe few others would have had the vision to conceive or the patience to carry out.

Mr. Hull early called the turn on the Axis. He branded the Japanese as "bandits" in 1937 when they attacked China, and was one of the first to realize that Germany, under Hitler, meant to conquer the world.

WORKED WITH PATIENCE

Foreseeing inevitable war, he concentrated on gaining time for national preparedness. The break with Japan might have come much sooner—and with Germany, too—had not the Hull patience, vision, and poker face been on our side.

On November 27, 1941, he informed the President that war with Japan was finally inevitable and might come at any moment. How he abandoned diplomatic language on December 7, and treated Japanese envoys Nomura and Kurusu to some native Tennessee verbiage as they scuttled out of the State Department is now legend around those musty corridors.

Many times branded as an appeaser of the despised Laval regime, Secretary Hull has worked with characteristic patience and foresight, since the fall of France, to use to the utmost the traditional bond between the people of that stricken republic and ourselves.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH FRANCE

He kept American diplomats at Vichy, long after it took nothing but German orders, to accomplish these things:

1. Obtain vital information in what was virtually German-occupied territory.
2. Keep the idea of freedom alive in France.
3. Keep French friends and encourage anti-Hitlerism.
4. Watch French collaboration with Germany.
5. Prepare the background for an invasion of the Mediterranean.

The world knows how that policy has benefited the United Nations.

Mr. Hull lives quietly in a Washington hotel. His health is not perfect, and in recent years he has taken two vacations to recover from the effects of the long hours he works.

Back of our foreign policy there is a Hull statement which runs:

"The first [lesson of history] is that man's innate striving for freedom cannot be extinguished. * * * The second is that liberty is truly won only when it is guarded by the same watchfulness, the same courage, the same willingness to fight for it which first secured it."

To one American, back after years in troubled foreign parts where our policy was on trial, "Mr. Hull is, with the exception of our President, one of our few high officials whose public statements and applied policy have invariably reflected the dignity and vision which I like to think my country stands for."

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much confusion has resulted recently regarding the distribution of gasoline throughout our country. The eastern coastal States and the adjacent area has taken the attitude that because they have experienced a shortage of gasoline, caused largely by limited transportation facilities, that the Midwest section and all other sections of our country should likewise be curtailed in their allowance of gasoline. In other words, those States have taken the attitude that if we cannot have gasoline then no other State should have it either.

I am quite familiar with the gasoline situation in the city of Washington, D. C., because I have been riding busses and streetcars for quite a long period of time. I know that the filling stations do not have the gasoline to sell. However, that shortage has been very largely caused by reason of the lack of transportation facilities and the inability to send the gasoline here. I am convinced that this same lack of transportation is the cause of the great shortage that now exists in this commodity in the various States which are now complaining so loudly because of their gasoline shortage.

Mr. Speaker, if the apparent unusual demand for gasoline, which would take it away from the various States at the present, is caused by the demand for it to go to the fighting fronts, then I am certain that there is no one who will complain. We want the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps to have all of the gasoline they need; we want to win this war; we do not want the supply diminished in any particular which is needed for the war. However, whatever the surplus may be of the commercial gasoline, that which is not needed for our war effort, we protest against any State or States, which is unable to secure gasoline in quantities because of limited transportation facilities, taking gasoline away from our States in the Midwest. Our farmers have the problem of producing the food for our war effort, and they require gasoline for that purpose; our businessmen need gasoline for the purpose of maintaining their businesses; our laboring men need gasoline in order to transport themselves, and those who ride with them, to the defense plants where the materials and supplies for war are produced. May I say that many of those defense plants are located quite a distance from the homes of those who are employed therein, and they have the serious problem of driving to and from their work each day. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there should not be any restrictions placed upon the people of the Midwest States—and especially upon the people of my home State of Indiana—simply because some other State is disappointed in the amount of gasoline it is receiving. Those are problems of transportation, and those problems must be solved by those who are in charge. The fact is, the distribution of gasoline has been mismanaged, and the proper allocation of the same has been bungled, so that the present dilemma has resulted.

Mr. Speaker, if the people in the great Midwest cannot have gasoline then the food production will be materially diminished. Yet, a few of the Eastern States have taken the dog-in-the-manger attitude that "if those Eastern States cannot have all the gasoline they want, then no one should have it." And, as a matter of fact, their serious problem has been one of transportation—that of getting the gasoline into their particular locality. It is my hope that Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and all other great food-producing States may not be limited in the necessary supply of gasoline, because we do not want the production of food to be diminished. It is my considered opinion that there will be a great food shortage this winter even under the most favorable circumstances for production. We must have food to win this war. This production of food must not be limited by the limitation of gasoline in those food-producing areas.

Mr. Speaker, in the further extension of my remarks on this subject, I wish to include herewith an editorial which appeared recently in the Indianapolis Star, of Indianapolis, Ind., on this same subject, which is as follows:

WIDENING GASOLINE BAN

Sharp restrictions on pleasure driving which have been effective in 12 Eastern States will be extended to cover the Middle West, perhaps over the entire Nation, according to reports from Washington. It was intimated that the ban on driving for other than essential business might be imposed before the end of the week. Admission that such moves are under way was made by Maj. J. R. Parten, transportation director of the Petroleum Administration.

Patriotic motorists are ready to accept any reduction which the urgent demands of war may impose. Vast quantities of high-octane gasoline must be shipped to the various fronts to sustain the repeated bombing raids that are spreading destruction through axis cities and bases.

Automobile owners in this section, however, are not entirely convinced that necessity has prompted the impending ban of petroleum agencies of the Government. The expected action savors strongly of efforts to

placate the eastern area which still clings to its dog-in-the-manger attitude. A special group of coast Congressmen has been organized under Representative HARTLEY of New Jersey, to prevent discrimination against the seaboard territory.

This bloc insists that if the East cannot have more gasoline, nobody shall have any. That narrow, selfish sectionalism reflects anything but credit on HARTLEY and his crowd, thinking not of war needs, but of their own desires. Liberal fuel supplies are available in the Central States and even more, of course, in the producing territory of the Southwest. Indiana does not envy the better fortune of southern motorists. No part of the land, however, is expected to profit from its ample gasoline stocks so long as the easterners do not share the benefits.

Food Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I feel justified in calling the attention of the House today to statements I made here on the floor 3 months ago. I called the attention of this body at that time to a threatened food shortage in 1943. At that time I gave many reasons for that statement.

Today, I read in the papers that Chester Davis, the food czar, has predicted that crop production during this year will fall far below 1942 production.

This is exactly what a few Members of this body and myself, who know the food situation, have been trying to tell this House and the country for some time.

This is what I had in mind 3 months ago when I started my war on waste, and coined the phrase, which is now nationally recognized, of "Lick Your Platter Clean."

Chester Davis yesterday issued a statement saying we must conserve every scrap of food. We must waste nothing. The food czar now recognizes the importance of saving food while we have it.

He warned that production of food in 1943 will be as much in some cases as 26 percent less than a year ago, and warned that the livestock production, in other words, our meat supply, will be based largely on our feed supplies and goes on to say that we will be short 26 percent in our production of wheat.

While it makes no particular difference now as to why we are going to be short of wheat and other foodstuffs, and while we have present shortages, but with the situation as it is, it might be well to let our minds go back just a few years when we were destroying wheat and when the taxpayers' money was being used to get wheat acreage out of production. I recall that the ever-normal granary was established with a guarantee that there would be no shortage for many years. These things have had their effect on the farmer who just naturally got careless about his wheat acreage and on many farms the acreage was reduced as much as 50 percent below what it was back in the 1920's.

The food czar reports further that we are going to be short 24,000,000 bushels of rye, as well as 310,000,000 bushels of oats. The shortage of barley will be 55,000,000 bushels. Peach crops will be 15,000,000 bushels short, and pears about 6,000,000 under last year.

The prospects for a good corn crop are not so good. We find that on June 1 we still had 15,000,000 acres of corn to be planted, or about 15 percent of the normal acreage to be planted. This means that we will have to have an extremely good growing season, with no early frosts next fall, in order to have an average yield of corn.

Due to late and wet weather in the Central States, many thousands of acres of our most fertile soils will not be planted to the crops to which they have normally grown.

The boast made earlier in the year by certain agencies of the Government that the crops of 1942 broke all records and that 1943 would be just as good, if not better, are now admittedly wrong. While these boasts were being made here in Washington farmers from all sections of the country were declaring that because of labor shortages, their inability to secure proper equipment, as well as repairs for equipment, it would be impossible for them to produce the Nation's needs and those of our allies, regardless of how anxious they were to do so.

One of the greatest contributing factors to our food-shortage threat is the confusion created by the Government agencies and bureaucrats who are trying to work out the details in every line of business as well as agriculture. I am one of those farmers who believes that no one knows as well as the farmer how to operate his farm. I believe, too, that businessmen know best how to conduct their operations, and if these various governmental agencies did not have the cockeyed idea that there are no brains in the country except in Washington we would not find ourselves with such an extremely alarming food situation on our hands.

Certain individuals in Washington have from time to time thrown up their hands in holy horror and thrown fear into the people because there were surpluses of corn lying around and urged less production. They could see nothing in it but corn. The farmers could see most anything in that pile of corn. They could see milk, butter, cheese, pork, lard, mutton, wool, eggs, and poultry. In fact, just about everything it takes to feed the world could be seen by the farmer in that corn, and that applies to other grains as well.

While there is apparently plenty of these grains on hand now, dairymen are unable to get the grain they need to keep up the production of milk. Now, I see in the morning paper that milk is to be placed on the ration list. God help us.

I know feed dealers who are manufacturing dairy feed who are unable to buy a bushel of corn, which is the basis for our best dairy ration. Poultrymen cannot buy the proper concentrates to make up the balanced rations for their chicks. The result is retarded development, and these pullets will come into production several months later than they ordinarily would. They will go into the winter not sufficiently strong and thrifty to guarantee good production throughout the year.

The turkey industry has in recent years become one of our most important suppliers of food. Everywhere they are complaining that they cannot get the proper feed. This is one line of production that is more seriously affected than perhaps any other.

And while the O. P. A. has interfered with prices and claims to have held down prices, after all they have failed miserably. Just this morning I have received a letter from a market gardener with a bill attached showing that he paid $102.15 for 75 pounds of spinach seed, or $1.35 a pound. A year ago this same seed sold for 16 cents a pound. This same gardener was compelled to pay $7.25 a bushel for onion sets on which the price ceiling was only $3.25.

These market gardeners are working 12 to 16 hours a day, trying to produce, and are producing. They take their products to the market and have little left after they have paid excessive prices for fertilizer and seed. The labor in most of these cases is done largely by the boss himself, and while he is complaining bitterly, I want to call to the attention of the House that he is not striking. He is willing to carry on and do everything in his power to supply this food so that the workers in our plants will be able to make the munitions of war that are so sorely needed by our armed forces.

The O. P. A.'s interference with the canning industry is certainly going to be the cause for a great shortage in food supplies this year. Because of this interference with the canning industry, one-third of the spinach crop in certain sections of the country remained in the field. Much of the crop that has gone into the cans has done so with no guaranty to the producer. Canning crops are known as cash crops. The producers plant with that in mind, and they not only want the money, but need it. The O. P. A. with its grade labeling and general interference with the industry is going to cause us to have probably the lightest pack that we have had in many years, when, by all the rules of the game, we should have the heaviest pack we have ever had.

Like every other farmer, I want my farm to produce to the limit, but do need the support of the Government. In other words, we should have a chance to do the things we know the country needs us to do. We want to help win this war. We want to back up our sons and daughters on the far-flung battle fronts. We want to feed the workers in every plant, the coal miners in every mine, the men, women, and children at home, so that this war effort is not hindered in any way whatsoever. We are not now blaming anyone for the unfortunate position in which we find ourselves. We want to

cooperate and get the war over so we can again live our lives in the American way.

But, gentlemen of the House, I believe the time has come for the Government to take a different attitude. To forget politics and social programs and get down to producing food and winning the war, and let's produce all we can and save all we can. Lest we get hungry.

The Connally-Smith Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers:

NEW YORK, June 8, 1943.—The Association of General Grievance Committees of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, representing practically all railroads in the United States, meeting here today issued the following statement respecting the Connally-Smith bill now before Congress:

"Through the press and over the air waves of the Nation many varied reports are being circulated as to the insistence of the Congress to enact legislation to curb the activities of the workers, all in the guise of a necessary adjunct to the stepping up of production and the early winning of the war.

"The proponents of this character of legislation, notably the so-called Connally-Smith bill, are either deliberately or unwittingly overlooking the over-all contribution being made by American workers in establishing unprecedented production records, or are guilty of fomenting treasonable hysteria to now achieve the utter stripping of the workers of every semblance of modern and democratic reform which safeguards them against social, economic, and industrial injustices.

"Our fight today against the forces of dictatorship and despotic rule is as much the concern of working men and women as it is of any other single segment of our Nation. The zeal with which they are performing their separate and varied tasks amply attests to that fact.

"Workers know too well the many horrors which have been inflicted upon the populace of subjugated nations by our common enemy. And they realize, too, that the freeing of those stricken people the world over and the preservation of our democracy here at home must be accomplished through our democratic way and as free people, not as shackled workers shorn of every right that is as traditionally American as the Bill of Rights itself.

"Is the Congress of the United States ready to concede that collective bargaining and the peaceful and orderly adjudication of labor disputes under its own statutory enactments, have broken down or are inadequate and unworkable in this present emergency? We think not. Neither do we think that the Congress, the administration, or the people of our Nation as a whole will accept as a prerequisite to the successful prosecution of the war any distorted or ulterior precepts which are founded upon anti-labor policies and promoted by traditionally anti-labor interests.

"To all of us it is a privilege to serve our Nation. No one shall dare challenge publicly the forthrightness with which that privilege is being embraced by workers generally—and this is all-inclusive as to those on the fighting front and on the industrial front.

"As Americans engaged in the vital task of keeping our rail transportation arteries open and the commerce of the Nation flowing smoothly and efficiently, we publicly challenge the patriotism of any group or individual who deems it essential or necessary to strip the workers of those traditional American rights which in a very large sense several millions of our associates under arms are fighting and dying to preserve.

"We call upon the fair-minded, free-thinking Members of Congress and of the Nation to continue our traditionally American collective bargaining processes for the settlement of labor disputes, and the defeat of any measure designed to destroy that monument of the free workers and American industry. If the time is now considered opportune by those in power to invoke worker-bondage then we must at the same time accept political dictatorship. That would not be democracy; that irrevocably would be Hitlerism, something which will never be accepted by the workers of the country while we remain a Nation of free people."

The Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETE JARMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama:

"Senate Joint Resolution 42

"Whereas there is now pending before the Senate of the United States a bill to abolish the poll tax; and

"Whereas since the formation of this Republic the qualifications of voters have been matters of State and not Federal control, and the maintenance of this State control is absolutely essential if any measure of local self-government is to be retained; and

"Whereas it is well understood in Alabama that this move to secure Federal control of elections is part of the attack continually being made on local self-government in the South, and is purely political in origin and intent; and

"Whereas it is clearly realized also that once the Federal Government secures control over the qualifications of voters, it will then proceed completely to dominate elections not only in Alabama, but in all other States as well, and use this power to destroy our Federal-State relationship, our remaining system of checks and balances, against arbitrary Federal authority and fundamental democracy itself; and

"Whereas in these times of desperate national danger from a powerful foreign foe, it is essential that there be no changes of our form of Government, no promotion of crack-pot reforms, and the individual or group which insists on such change, with its consequent loss of national unity, is of positive help to our enemies; and

"Whereas the States of the South which are under attack in this bill have for many years been loyal in their allegiance to the Democratic Party, and our people feel that they have every right and reason to expect this national Democratic administration and the Democratic Members of the Congress to assist in striking down this attack on them and their institutions; and

"Whereas throughout the years since reconstruction there has been an amicable and friendly relationship between the two races in the South, and the continuous agitation from outside sources is creating bitterness and hostility, greatly to the detriment of our people, both while and black, creating racial disturbances much to be regretted at any time, but particularly so in time of war, and is preventing the orderly solution of our problems in a manner assuring lasting justice to both races: Now, therefore, it is

"Resolved by the senate (the House of Representatives of Alabama concurring):

"1. That we urge our Senators to fight this bill with all the power at their command until its final defeat.

"2. That we deeply deplore the bringing up of this issue, with its consequent dangerous effect on the political structure of the South, and its serious disturbance of national unity in this time of national peril.

"3. That we caution the people of this Nation, Democrats and Republicans alike, that through the means of this bill there is being made an attack on State control of elections, with the deliberate purpose of destroying this local control and delivering our people over to the power of the Federal Government without the time-honored restraints found necessary throughout the existence of this Republic.

"4. That we remind our fellow Democrats in the Congress and the national Democratic administration, of the loyalty of our people in the past to the principles of the party, and urge that no attacks be permitted to succeed against us which would shake and destroy this loyalty.

"5. That we urge the Governor of Alabama to use his influence in the fight against this bill, and, on behalf of our southern people, to work with the other southern Governors in arousing our people to the danger presented to them and in assisting in any way the southern Senators in this fight to preserve democracy and local self-government; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Members of the Congress from Alabama, to the Governor of Alabama, and the other southern Governors and to the press."

The above resolution was adopted by the Senate of Alabama on June 3, 1943, and by the House of Representatives of Alabama on June 4, 1943.

J. E. SPEIGHT,
Secretary of the Senate.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE B. BATES
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, there are those who criticize the N. Y. A. because allegedly it has taken youth from farm areas and has sent them to war-production centers. Actually what N. Y. A. has done has been to take youth from areas where they were of little or no value to the war effort, trained them for war production, and placed them in industries that are manu-

facturing munitions of war. For my part I believe the N. Y. A. deserves great credit for what it has done in this respect and in general.

In the eastern section of the State of Kentucky, that part of the Nation which I know best and which is most dear to me, there are thousands of youth, particularly girls, in our small communities. Without the intercession of N. Y. A. these girls—and many of the boys—would contribute little to the war effort. From the mountain areas N. Y. A. has brought these youth to training centers at West Liberty, Prestonburg, Jackson, Hazard, Ashland, and other places in eastern Kentucky, where they have been trained as welders, as machine-shop helpers, as sheet-metal workers, and in other types of work upon which the building of planes, tanks, ships, and the other munitions of war depends. In the communities where these training and resident centers are located the citizens of those communities have lent a ready and willing hand because they know that the work they were doing represented a genuine and incontestable contribution to the war effort.

In connection with the foregoing, there has come to my attention the April 28, 1943, issue of the Labor Force Bulletin of the Department of Commerce, in which I find these startling statements which it would do well for all of us to take to heart:

In February 1943, after an almost uninterrupted decline of 7 months, the civilian labor force reached a wartime low of 52,300,000. This development is significant in view of the plans for increasing the production of war goods still further while raising the number of men in the armed forces. The decline in the labor force during the past year is the net result of a decrease of 3,300,000 men and an increase of 2,200,000 women. Thus the civilian labor force has decreased because of the failure of women to enter the labor market in sufficient numbers to balance the number of men leaving for the armed forces.

With such an ominous fact staring us in the face, there are some who cavil at N. Y. A. because it has done all that was within its legal power to do to help remedy this situation. It seems to me that it is high time that we face facts and let them and not our pet prejudices and peeves guide us in our thinking and in our decisions.

The Pay-As-You-Go Tax Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the President yesterday signed the pay-as-you-go tax bill recently passed by Congress. I voted for this measure with great misgivings. I am, and always have been, strong for pay-as-you-go tax legislation, but I had hoped that the administration's plan to require citizens to pay 2 years' taxes—1942 and 1943—in 1, in order to get current, would not prevail in any particular. It did prevail, for many of our taxpayers, to an extent of 25 percent. Of course, all legislation is by compromise. That is the democratic process of our Republic. I voted for this bill because I knew that it was necessary to have money to win the war and that this was the only measure we could pass. It was either this bill or nothing. Five months of arguing proved that. I also felt obligated to support the measure because of the overwhelming sentiment of my constituents in its behalf.

The measure in question has many desirable features. But it also will give rise to a great many headaches. It multiplies the red tape and regulations which are binding our taxpayers. It will make good business for the legal profession and accountants. Five tax returns per year are in prospect for many citizens. Employers will become Government tax collectors and bookkeepers without pay for their additional trouble and expense.

INCREASED TAXES

The President has indicated that Congress, having revised the method of collecting taxes, should now raise taxes. I am against any increase in taxes until I see some evidence that the administration intends to cut down useless nonwar expenditures. It has thus far shown no real disposition to retrench and save. Half the alphabetical agencies could be abolished and half of the 3,000,000 Federal civilian employees fired, and it would greatly strengthen the war effort and our national economy.

TAX-LAW SUMMARY

Without any attempt to go into detail or make a complete analysis, I am going to enumerate the important points in the new tax-collection bill for benefit of those who may be interested. A copy of this law can be obtained by any of my constituents who requests it of my office.

The new tax law will place the collection of our income taxes on a current basis, which it is believed will be advantageous to the average citizen. The plan of current collection of income taxes should protect those who are now making higher than normal wages against the possibility of being required to pay taxes on a high income year during a post-war depression year when incomes are low. Persons whose incomes fluctuate sharply from year to year, as is often true of our farmers' incomes, are also protected from the necessity of paying income taxes on income received in a prosperous year during a following year of crop failure or low farm prices. Too, delayed collection of taxes creates an illusion of high net incomes, whereas this method of collection will give each of us an opportunity to ascertain our exact net income not subject to taxes, and we may adjust our current living expenditures accordingly.

WITHHOLDING AND FORGIVENESS

The law provides for the withholding by the employer of 20 percent of the net incomes in the first bracket beginning July 1, 1943. Included in this 20 percent will be a 3-percent Victory tax, replacing the 5-percent Victory tax heretofore withheld. Taxpayers are required to pay their tax installment due June 15, 1943. Farmers, doctors, lawyers, clergymen, servicemen, and all nonwage or nonsalary groups will be exempt from the withholding tax and will pay their taxes currently on the present quarterly system, estimating their obligations in advance. Servicemen will be allowed a $1,500 exemption in addition to the regular personal exemptions which have been changed. The $500 exemption for a single person has been made $624 and the $1,200 for a married person is now $1,248.

Taxpayers owing $50 or less on their 1942 taxes will be completely released from their obligation and those owing between $50 and $66.67 will only have to pay the difference between the $50 and the amount they owe. Taxpayers owing more than $66.67 will be forgiven 75 percent of either the 1942 or 1943 taxes, whichever is the smaller, and the payment of the remaining 25 percent is apportioned over 2 years. An antiwindfall provision is included in the law to impose a penalty tax on those persons whose surtax net income in 1942 or 1943 increased by more than $20,000 above that of the highest surtax net income in any of the years 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940.

A return will be made at the end of each year at which time the taxpayer will include all of his exemptions, such as taxes, losses, excess medical expenses and deductible business expenses. He will either pay the additional owing or the amount he has already overpaid will be refunded.

All taxes owing by any person killed in our armed forces will be canceled. This is a further concession to servicemen and their dependents, demanded by those of us in Congress who did not want the widows of our men in the service burdened with any unpaid income taxes.

Renegotiation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from Newsweek for June 7, 1943:

RENEGOTIATION PROCEDURE IS ATTACKED ANEW AS CONFUSING AND UNNECESSARY

Ever since April 28, 1942, when Public Law 528 was passed as a rider on an appropriation bill, business and legislative sources have clamored for its repeal or modification.

Their arguments were two: (1) that authorization for the Secretaries of War and Navy and the chairman of the Maritime Commission to renegotiate the terms of war contracts and recover profits which in their individual judgments are excessive creates

too much uncertainty, and (2) that the law is unnecessary because high wartime taxes are an effective barrier to big profits.

Ferment: The law was changed once. Last fall a rider to the tax bill narrowed the time in which profits may be recovered to approximately 1 year after the end of the contractor's fiscal year, instead of any time up to 3 years after the end of the war. Last March the Truman committee made nine recommendations aimed generally at the establishment of uniform price-adjustment policies and at reducing the amount and extent of renegotiation. Then, a fortnight ago, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, armed with the results of a survey among 5,000 manufacturers, met with a bipartisan group of Senate and House Members who had been awaiting completion of the poll before considering further reforms.

This and other events all seemed shaping up recently as stage setting for further easing of the act and many businessmen thought the worst of their renegotiation troubles would soon be over. But last week they were rudely awakened from their dream: the Army suddenly announced that it would bear down still tougher this year in reviewing profits.

Maurice Karker, chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, said the allowable profits on 1943 business would be lower than for 1942. He explained that the War Department hoped to wind up renegotiation of 1942 contracts (82.6 percent incomplete as of May 22) this year, and get a flying start in 1944 at the 1943 income accounts.

SIGNIFICANCE

Karker, along with other proponents of renegotiation, defends it mainly with the argument that the initial emphasis for speed in production and in the letting of billions of dollars' worth of contracts for materials (The cost of which neither procurement agency nor manufacturer knew) had made the procedure desirable. This opinion was backed up by the Truman committee which, however, said that the act should be "writing its own death warrant by utilization of early war experience in late war contracting."

Such an objective, of course, cannot obtain if the procurement agencies and the manufacturers, after 3 years' experience in setting contract rates, suddenly find the renegotiators calling new signals. In other words, Karker, by stating that a point which was not excessive in 1942 may be excessive in 1943, wrote not a death warrant for the involved renegotiation procedure but a reprieve. And, in the meantime, businessmen who had been figuring reserves, dividends, capital expenditures, etc., for 1943 on the basis of what the boards allowed as a satisfactory profit in 1942 now have their plans thrown higher than the new superbombers will fly.

At this advanced stage of experience in war-goods purchases, and with the excess-profits tax at 90 percent, there is considerable doubt in many circles over the need for continuing renegotiation at all. The $2,539,000,000 of savings to the Government, reported by renegotiation boards as the result of their first year's activities, does not stand up as real savings when it is analyzed.

In the first place, by far the greater portion of it would have been eaten up by the 90 percent excess-profits tax. In the second place, if there is subtracted from the remainder the total cost of this renegotiation, not only to the Government, but to the companies involved, the relatively small amount left could be fairly stated as the net job done by the renegotiating efforts of the Government.

Coal, John Lewis, and the Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Thursday, June 10, 1943:

COAL, JOHN LEWIS, AND THE REVOLUTION

John L. Lewis is trying to get a contract without submission to Mr. Roosevelt, or what's the same thing, his War Labor Board. Mr. Roosevelt is trying to get coal for industry and transportation—he must get it—and also Mr. Lewis' head for himself. A contract thoroughly satisfactory to the administration would deliver the Lewis head as one of the first lumps. The quarrel started when Lewis said he had not paid $600,000 to eat crumbs from Mr. Roosevelt's political table. That was in the second term. Lewis made it good by bolting the third term.

The United Mine Workers' chief at one time may have thought that he was destined to take the radical movement in the United States away from Mr. Roosevelt, make it a farmer-labor dictatorship (workers and peasants; the hammer and the sickle) and be the creator of a new order. He's smart and strong-willed, but he forgot that Mr. Roosevelt had more than a labor-union treasury behind him. He had the Federal Treasury. He broke Mr. Lewis.

Seven years ago Lewis was the foremost revolutionary leader in the country. With the Congress of Industrial Organizations he marched out to meet the largest industries. He had Mr. Roosevelt's support. He was recognized as the head of the military action section of the New Deal. Big Steel capitulated. General Motors made its peace. Henry Ford resisted. So did Little Steel. The Government came down on them. Law was distorted to fit the need of Lewis' tactics. He welcomed in the Communists as experienced street and shop fighters. New Deal intellectuals backed him as the dynamic force of the revolution. He was the practitioner for the theorists. Government officials existed as his factotums.

Now Lewis is in a tough spot. He may have miscalculated his time when he undertook to supplant Mr. Roosevelt in the vanguard of the new order. He certainly miscalculated the comparative resources involved and was foolish to underestimate the system of privileges and profits which attached men to the administration and its head. In the uneven conflict he lost his intellectuals, his ideological friends, nearly all of his labor supporters, and all of the pliant Cabinet members, except possibly Harold Ickes, who in the present rough-water maneuvering has been a life line. Lewis was cast out as a ruined pretender. He had only his loyal mine workers. With them the falling Lucifer of the revolution is making his stand with no little skill. He'll need all he has. He confronts the New Deal with its own doctrines and its own side-show barking, demanding by collective bargaining a larger share in the money of the coal-production business.

Along this line he would expect to find himself correct, and the demonology would be all on his side. He is a legitimate son of the New Deal, although disinherited. The owners and operators, however, have been shoved to one side, and Mr. Roosevelt and the War Labor Board have stepped into their places, taking over the role customarily imposed upon the selfish few, the economic royalists, and the predatory interests, to tell the miners they will get what the Government says they can have, that they will like it and go back to work.

It is said that the operators and the miners were very near an agreement when the War Labor Board intervened to prevent a settlement. There are other things at stake than the production of coal. Unconditional surrender of Lewis is demanded. The miners must realize that they are in a hopeless position as hold-outs. The Government which once enabled their chief to bring great private enterprises to terms is now the hard bargainer across the table. Public sentiment is against them. Their attempt to get more pay is stigmatized as a crime against the Nation. Their contumacy is regarded as tantamount to treason, giving aid to the enemy. They know the mining of coal must not and cannot be stopped.

Mr. Ickes, as Administrator of Solid Fuel and by authority of Mr. Roosevelt in charge of the mines for the Government, has given Lewis tactical assistance enabling him to ignore the Chief Executive himself. Mr. Ickes also had something to say of the few unscrupulous owners. That slanted criticism in a familiar fashion away from the miners, but this time in the direction of the Government itself as well as the proprietors.

In its origins, in its ideas, and in its characters this is a New Deal family affair which has threatened the service of supplies to men on the fighting fronts. The formulas and the apparatus in the contest are stamped with the New Deal trade-mark of proprietorship. The Roosevelt revolution has run into the Roosevelt hierarchy. At that point revolution becomes rebellion.

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act. My reasons are that, in the first place, the Chinese are a great people. They have developed a civilization that is shot through with cultural elements that would be tremendously beneficial to our western civilization.

Secondly, they have demonstrated that as a nation they possess qualities that are closely akin to the qualities that we as a Nation prize most—a love of liberty—a love so intense that they are willing to sacrifice blood and treasure immeasurably to sustain that principle.

In addition to this, they are a reliable people. Though the number that have dwelt amongst us is small, it is sufficient, I believe, to demonstrate that they possess traits of character that are entirely consonant with our own ideals.

They are first of all honest. They have on innumerable occasions demonstrated that they are loyal. They are good citizens in every sense of the word and those born here and endowed with citizenship

rights by reason of birth have demonstrated that they are sound, sane, and patriotic American citizens.

Personally I have found that the Chinese with whom I have come in contact are splendid individuals worthy of confidence in all matters.

I have always felt that Chinese exclusion was a mistake. It has deprived us of a type of citizenship that would have been a real contribution to our body politic.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will promptly rectify this erroneous discrimination against a great people who, if permitted to enter on equal terms with other nations into our American body politic, I am sure the Chinese will make a distinct and tremendously valuable contribution to freedom as conceived by democracy.

While the proposed quota is very small its principal virtue is that it removes the stigma of exclusion from a great and friendly nation.

I hope the bill will pass. I shall be most happy to vote for it.

Honor to a Hero of Our Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the heroic service of the personnel of our merchant marine is all too often left unnoticed. I think it is deserving of attention that the Distinguished Service Medal has been conferred by the President of the United States upon Frederick James Mills, of the merchant marine, a resident of my congressional district in Detroit, Mich., for meritorious service under unusual hazards.

The citation is as follows:

Survivor of the sinking of his own ship, he was homeward bound on an Allied ship when it was struck by two torpedoes. The explosions wrecked all but one lifeboat which succeeded in taking off 70 survivors. Nearly 200 others were either thrown into the sea by the blasts, or were forced to jump from the rapidly sinking ship. When the ship went under, one of the damaged lifeboats floated free. It was swamped to the gunwales; peppered with many small holes; the rudder and part of the stern were gone; and a large hole, 20 by 40 inches, was blown through its side. But it meant hope, and some of the desperate men had already climbed into it even though there was momentary danger it would sink under them. Mills sensed the situation from a distance, and swam over. Persuading the men to leave the boat, he took sheets of lead from its emergency repair kit and shaped a patch over the large hole. With two men holding the lead patch against the outboard side, he and two others climbed back into the boat. These two held onto his legs while he went head down over the side to nail the patch to the planking. Over this he nailed a piece of salvaged canvas. Each time the men lowered him under, he could drive only one nail, then the two would pull him up for a gasp of air. Many times he did this until, little by little, the hole was closed and the planking caulked. He then took strips from the bottom gratings and repaired the shattered gunwale. The end of the canvas was stretched over the gunwale and made fast. With the largest leak thus stoppered, the rest of the men climbed back aboard and started bailing. Throughout the night Mills plugged the many small leaks as the boat slowly rose in the water. Daybreak brought to him the grim and heartbreaking task of picking from the many survivors still clinging to wreckage the few additional men his weakened lifeboat could carry. When no other aid seemed possible for those they were forced to leave behind, the lifeboat, now with 60 aboard, set out for land. Constantly bailing, and with only one pair of oars to keep headway, the survivors made a safe landing 8 days later.

His indomitable courage and practical leadership, so largely contributory to the ultimate rescue of his shipmates, are in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States merchant marine.

For the President:

EMORY SCOTT LAND,
Chairman.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Ulysses S. Guyer became a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities which was created in 1934. This committee, as you know, made an investigation, for the first time in American history, of Nazi and Fascist propaganda with a view of providing proper remedies and enacting legislation which would put an end to such pernicious activities on the part of the enemies of this Nation.

Judge Guyer was made a member of this committee and thereby afforded me the unusual pleasure and distinction of close association with him.

Now Guyer is gone. His views will no longer be heard in this Chamber. His friends and associates mourn his passing, and I feel that his untimely death is a very great personal loss.

Judge Guyer was one of the finest orators on the floor of this House. Not only by expressing his views in a very forceful and eloquent language, but in the depth of his very thorough knowledge of things, his expressions of opinion shown with unusual clarity and conviction. We who were privileged to listen to him as he addressed this House on the many subjects which engaged our attention through the years, cannot forget the fine speeches he made on matters involving our national welfare and the lot of the common man. His manner was convincing, his delivery entertaining, and his arguments unanswerable.

Judge Guyer was one of those Members whom we are wont to designate as nature's gentlemen. One of those who will leave a lasting impression on our colleagues with whom he has been associated for many years. His life was a life of untiring devotion and he had a varied public career. He was a lawyer and gained honors in this profession, being elected as judge of the city court of Kansas City early in his career. He was an educator of note and served as a high-school principal and superintendent of schools in his native State of Kansas. He was the mayor of Kansas City and he was an active fraternalist, being a Mason and a member of the Scottish Rite.

He was a grand gentleman of the old school and while progressive in his thought and progressive in action, he believed in the conservative principles of our Constitution and was opposed to any centralization of powers in Washington. He was thoroughly religious, devoted to the service of God and man, believing in immortality of the soul, and I am sure that by his death he has reaped the reward of upright and honorable life and the commendation of the Great Architect of the universe, who, in the words of the Bible, said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter now into thy reward."

Lincoln and the Kirkham Grammar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article entitled "Lincoln and the Kirkham Grammar," written by Mr. Bruce Wheeler, of Springfield, Ill., and which appeared in the February issue of Hobbies, the magazine for collectors.

The article follows:

LINCOLN AND THE KIRKHAM GRAMMAR

(By Bruce E. Wheeler)

"English Grammar in Familiar Lectures Accompanied by a Compendium: Embracing a New Systematick Order of Parsing—a New System of Punctuation, Exercises in False Syntax and a Key to the Exercises: Designed for the Use of Schools and Private Learners—By Samuel Kirkham—Sixth Edition—Enlarged and Much Improved—1828—Cincinnati—Published by N. & G. Guilford."

So reads the title page of one of the world's most famous textbooks, the grammar studied by Abraham Lincoln at New Salem in 1831. Kirkham's Grammar is not to be compared with the New England Primer, Webster's Speller, or the McGuffey Readers with respect to fame or popularity, but it is probably the only text on grammar studied by the man whose literary style was to become and remain the model for others in the use of effective English.

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Kirkham's Grammar appeared first in 1824 and had gone through 105 editions by 1841. Kirkham, a Scotchman, lived at one time in Fredericktown, Md. He was connected with some of the schools or academies of that time, but evidently spent a considerable amount of time in lecturing and instructing adult classes in various cities on a subscription basis. It is definitely known that he conducted such classes in Pittsburgh and New York City. As he says himself, he was in extremely poor health and, therefore, did not attempt to revise or improve his grammar as is now the custom before a new edition is presented to the public. Inasmuch as the one hundred and fifth edition appears to be identical with earlier ones, and still contains the preface to the eleventh edition, the assumption is that he did not offer any improvements or changes after the eleventh edition. It is not known how many copies were sold during these 16 years, but he says in the preface to the eleventh edition that 22,000 had been sold during the preceding year (1828–29) and that, altogether, 40,000 copies had been sold without any pecuniary benefit to the author. It is likely that some of the editions or printings were of an exceedingly small number of copies.

Kirkham's Grammar had considerable competition from other textbooks in grammar. The most popular and widely used book in this field was the English grammar of Lindley Murray. All of the writers of textbooks on grammar, including Kirkham, were indebted to Murray for guidance and fundamental principles and invariably acknowledged the debt in the preface or introductory statement in the various books as they appeared. Murray's book was quite complete and was of a difficult and complex nature. Kirkham, Bullion, Brown, Green, and others sought to simplify the study of grammar by making it less technical, more systematic, but with greater appeal. Accordingly, they brought out books with that avowed purpose. As Murray was an Englishman, it is probable that the trend away from his book was quite as much the result of a development of nationalism as of any discernment of superiority in textbooks written by American writers.

Kirkham's Grammar has been mentioned so frequently by the biographers of Lincoln that at least one writer has suggested that confusion may have arisen in the minds of many as to whether Lincoln made Kirkham famous, or whether Kirkham's Grammar made Lincoln famous. It is true that nearly all of the well-known writers on Lincoln allude to the Kirkham Grammar, and nearly all of them allocate to this book an important place in the education of the Great Emancipator. On the other hand, it is quite noticeable that Kirkham is mentioned by these same writers only in the most general terms. The inferences and conclusions drawn are probably the result of presumption, the result of a great respect for tradition, or have been copied from other writers. Perhaps Lincoln's well-known ability to use oral and written language may have prompted many to state that the study of Kirkham was the crucial factor in Lincoln's subsequent language usage. In view of the absence of a critical examination of Kirkham's Grammar by those qualified to evaluate its worth, it appears that many writers have erred in making such positive statements in its behalf without having valid data or appropriate criteria upon which to predicate such assertions.

The Kirkham Grammar is unimpressive in appearance. It is of small size, 12 mo and, like many other books of the early nineteenth century, is leather bound. The typography is similar to books of that period also. The type is small, closely spaced, and shows narrow margins. Now and then there is some attempt to relieve eye strain and monotony by using large or black-faced type. There are no illustrations in the form of cuts or pictures. In general, the book may be characterized as unattractive and more likely to repel than attract the student. In the front of the book are many pages given over to recommendations and testimonials. There are the most flattering extracts from the National Crisis, the Hesperus, and the Western Review, all influential publications of the day, Governor De Witt Clinton of New York sent the following recommendation:

"I consider the Compendium of English Grammar, by Samuel Kirkham, a work deserving encouragement and well calculated to facilitate the acquisition of this useful science."

DE WITT CLINTON.
ALBANY, *September 25, 1824.*

In a long preface, Kirkham half apologizes for presuming to offer a new book in an old field, but justifies his determination to do so because of the great excellence and superiority of his offering when compared to others then in use. He says:

"By this method, he (the teacher) can advance his pupils farther in the principles of this abstruse science in 2 months than he could in 1 year when he taught in the old way."

The remainder of the preface treats of the author's philosophy, his accomplishments, and his intentions for the future (health permitting). He definitely states that the book is suitable and well adapted for private learners. Kirkham is not lacking in verbosity. He states his case, including a lengthy reply to potential critics, in the characteristic and elegant language so frequently used by early writers, and well exemplifies the perspicuity which he hoped to inculcate in those who assiduously followed his system.

The Kirkham Grammar, which many claimed was studied by Lincoln, was published in 1828 and was then in the sixth edition. It is said that Lincoln was encouraged to study grammar by Mentor Graham, schoolmaster of New Salem. As no grammar was available in New Salem, he was obliged to borrow one from John Vance, about 6 miles away. The identical book (sixth edition) studied by Lincoln is now in the Library of Congress. This particular book has the following inscription on the title page: "Ann M. Rutledge is now learning grammar." As the story goes, Lincoln helped Ann with her grammar and then presented her with the copy which he had previously borrowed from Vance. The inscription in the book may or may not be in Ann Rutledge's handwriting; it certainly is not that of Lincoln. R. B. Ruthledge, a brother of Ann, in writing to Herndon in 1866 states, "Mr. Lincoln studied Kirkham's Grammar; the valuable copy which he delighted to peruse is now in my possession." In view of the fact that the date of issue (1828) appears to be about the time we may accept, that Ann Rutledge's name appears in it, and that R. B. Rutledge claimed to own it, we may assume that the book came down through the family and then to the Library of Congress and is fairly well authenticated.

In reality, it makes little difference which edition Lincoln studied; the similarity of all editions issued by Kirkham has been referred to. The writer has examined carefully four different issues, some before and others subsequent to the sixth edition, and has found them substantially the same in content. Emphasis is placed on parsing in all editions examined and, for the most part, the exercises are identical. The philosophical notes in the later editions are, as the author says, for the erudite and literary connoisseur.

As suggested by its title, the book purports to be a new order of parsing. In it the student is led step by step through the 10 parts of speech as conceived by the author to a complete parsing of the most complex sentences and long passages of poetry. It was often necessary to transpose the poetry into prose and supply the missing or understood parts. The student was then required to parse each word and write out the number, case, gender, and person, as well as the definitions and rules that applied. This was a long and laborious task and probably cost Lincoln many an hour of hard work. However, Kirkham contended, "Parsing poetry was more profitable because it brought more immediately into requisition the reasoning faculties than parsing in prose and will necessarily tend to facilitate progress more rapidly." There is scarcely anything else in Kirkham. Parsing is meant to be the core of the book, and only hints are given with respect to other grammatical principles.

How much value Lincoln received from the Kirkham Grammar is a matter of opinion. Having been supplanted many years ago by more modern and totally different books, it is likely that the only reason that it has not been forgotten is because of the association of Lincoln's name with it. On the other hand, a book which went through 105 editions or printings must have been in demand and probably had the approval of a large number of teachers. It must be said that Kirkham introduced some improvements in his book.

The book was organized in such a way that the teacher was not required to interrogate the pupil at all times, yet the pupil was required to work out the exercises and apply the rules and definitions as he did so. This method, new at that time, is the beginning of and approaches what we now designate as the laboratory method of study. Perhaps it would be better to classify it as more nearly like the supervised study plan which was in vogue for many years. Doubtless, many students of the education of Lincoln will contend that he learned much from Kirkham. Such opinions will probably be based upon the fact that Lincoln studied no other grammar, and, therefore, had no opportunity to learn it elsewhere. Perhaps they will inquire where he acquired his style. We might just as well inquire where Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Burns acquired their respective styles. None of these great writers ever saw a grammar, but the masterpieces of literature of such writers is no less appreciated because we cannot account for the development of the various styles used.

It is not intended to discredit the value of formal grammar, nor to contend that Lincoln did not profit by 3 weeks' intensive study of Kirkham's Grammar. On the other hand, the writer does not believe Kirkham was the sole agency whereby Lincoln became adept in using the vernacular employed in his political speeches and state papers. Most educators will agree that there is a place and a need for some functional grammar if it is accompanied by suitable exercises in language usage. Formal grammar is a science and is to be understood, memorized, and remembered. Language usage is an art and is to be practiced. Lincoln may have mastered Kirkham's Grammar in 3 weeks, as is sometimes claimed. If so, he studied it as a science and probably learned the rules, definitions, and the technique of parsing. Kirkham does not provide exercises in language usage, but only those relating to parsing; that is, the science of grammar. A series of patterns for language usage requires time for development. Lincoln had acquired the beginnings of a style long before this time, as he read from Addison, Hume, Blair, Weems, Paine, Volney, and others. Moreover, Lincoln was 23 years of age when he studied Kirkham at New Salem. Those who are familiar with the most elementary concepts of psychology will realize that there was little likelihood of Lincoln's language usage undergoing great modification by a rapid résumé of a textbook.

Reference has already been made to the fact that parsing is an analytical process. The procedure is, in reality, a taking apart or dissection of a literary unit. One who

wishes to speak or write is faced with a situation which is quite the reverse. Creating a literary unit, however small, is a synthetic process. What one says or writes is not ordinarily evaluated in terms of words, but in the excellence of the sentences, paragraphs, and the product en toto. It appears that the most noted and most acceptable writers are those who have developed facility in the choice of their functional words, the form of the words employed, and the order in which they are arranged. The Gettysburg Address when reduced to mere words is nothing. Another writer might have used almost identically the same words but in somewhat different arrangement and his product would have appeared grammatical, stiff, or stereotyped. When used by Lincoln, with his arrangement, a masterpiece is the result. This type of performance, which is far above the standard set by the rank and file of literary men, is possible because of discrimination, selectivity, and a refined sense of feeling for language. The rhythm displayed by Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address and other literary contributions come only after development of a more subtle conception of relationships and a deep and widespread appreciation of language as an art. It is to be noted that many students came in contact with Kirkham's Grammar, but only a Lincoln could so intelligently observe the style of others and adopt it for his own use.

As one of the most outstanding examples of an integrating individual, Lincoln consistently preserved, modified, extended, and improved his integration. In this way, he was enabled continuously to observe, appropriate, and adopt the work of others with purpose. Not only was he an extraordinary person in the matter of refinement of the contributions of others but, more important, Lincoln was a master in his ability to make use of his experience for improved performance in subsequent efforts. All of these desirable qualities which enter into and constitute the ultimate in style are to be found and evolved in situations and in conditions quite remote from a formal textbook. The only safe-and-sane conclusion that may be drawn is that such a refined and effective mode of expression of thought was largely independent of or supplementary to the study of Kirkham's Grammar. It is the thought of the writer that Lincoln may have gained quite as much from the admonition given at the close of the first lecture in Kirkham as from the skill he may have developed in parsing. Kirkham says:

"You are aware, my young friend, that you live in an age of light and knowledge; an age in which the arts and science are marching on with gigantic strides. You live, too, in a land of liberty; a land on which the smiles of Heaven beam with uncommon refulgence. The trump of the warrior and the clangor of arms no longer echo on our mountains, or in our valleys; the garments dyed in blood have passed away; the mighty struggle for independence is over; and you live to enjoy the rich boon of freedom and prosperity which was purchased with the blood of our fathers. These considerations forbid that you should ever be so unmindful of your duty to your country, to your Creator, to yourself, and to succeeding generations, as to be content to grovel in ignorance. Remember that knowledge is power; that an enlightened and a virtuous people can never be enslaved; and that, on the intelligence of our youth, rest the future liberty, the prosperity, the happiness, the grandeur, and the glory of our beloved country. Go on then, with a laudable ambition, and an unyielding perseverance, in the path which leads to honor and renown. Press forward. Go and gather laurels on the hill of science; linger among her unfading beauties; 'drink deep' of her crystal fountain; and then join in 'the march of fame.' Become learned and virtuous and you will be great. Love God and serve him, and you will be happy."

Perhaps there are many concomitant learnings that Lincoln acquired while studying Kirkham that we have not recognized. We may be inclined to minimize the value Lincoln received from a study of the formal portion of Kirkham's Grammar, but scarcely a person is to be found who would not admit that Lincoln went on to achieve a major portion of the objectives as outlined in the foregoing admonition.

Feed Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Feed Situation," by J. A. McConnell, chairman, Feed Industry Council, and general manager, Cooperative G. L. F. Exchange, Northeastern Farm Bureau Conference, New York City, June 9, 1943:

The livestock industry of this county and the nonagricultural population—this means people in cities and towns who must eat to live, that depends on it for a large proportion of its high-quality diet—are in a critical situation.

Following 5 above-average crop years plus a sixth miracle crop year in 1942, we find ourselves in a position of having insufficient grains to feed the hogs, the hens, the beef, and the dairy cattle of this country. We are not just looking ahead to such a situation, we are in it right this moment. The lack of balance between livestock and feed has been getting increasingly worse for the last 10 months.

It has been variously estimated that we lack from 15 to 25 percent enough feed to continue the present rate of feeding of our existing livestock and poultry numbers. In spite of this, expansion in hog and poultry numbers is still taking place at a rapid rate.

It is literally impossible to go to the regular market places of the country today and secure any sizable quantity of feed such as normally exist in abundance in these market places. The legitimate demand (not hoarding) has far outstripped the supply.

We have seen times before when, due to drought, a shortage of feeds has existed, but never have we seen the strange phenomenon in this country of deep-seated feed shortages, such as now exist, following years of heavy production of crops.

Rationing of feed, both by Government and by the entire feed trade, has been going on at an increasing rate for many months. The Government has by one means and another taken possession of large stocks of feed grains and soybean meal and doled it out here and there to prevent serious regional killing of livestock and poultry and the shutting down of industries depending on corn.

Since January of this year most feed manufacturers and producers of feed ingredients have been compelled, because of inability to get grain, to ration country dealers on the basis of the tonnage they took out in corresponding months of 1941 or 1942.

CORN

Corn, which under ordinary conditions comprises approximately 62 percent of the entire grain ration of the country, has ceased to move into the marketplaces. While there is perhaps something over a billion bushels, roughly a third of the amount of last year's crop still in the country, try and get it. The ceiling on corn stopped the movement from farms. While the Government estimates that we will have a carry-over October 1 of perhaps a half billion bushels of corn, most competent private observers, within and without the trade, believe this figure to be 300,000,000 bushels.

Vital food industries using corn for manufacture into human foods, livestock foods, and materials essential for war industries are on the verge of closing down because of inability to get corn. Although these industries are in the Corn Belt, where the present billion-bushel stock of corn is located all around them, they are not permitted to bid for it against the Corn-Belt livestock and poultry farmers because of corn ceilings.

WHEAT

Some people point to the large surpluses of wheat, here and in Canada, as a way out, but it must be remembered that these surpluses are large only in terms of flour needs. In terms of feed required by our livestock population, they are pitifully small and in view of the demand for human food in the world, it is a grave question as to whether or not they should be used, even in the present emergency, to sustain our unwieldy livestock population for a few more months. (If I were Mr. Lehman, I should be quite concerned as to the disposal of wheat for livestock which is now going on at a rapid rate.)

PROTEIN INGREDIENTS

Although we are producing high-protein feeds such as soybean and cottonseed products at the rate of about ten and a half million tons per year, under present conditions, we could easily use twice that amount, and we could do this even with an ample supply of feed grain.

From this stock of high-protein ingredients ordinarily used for livestock and poultry feed, the civilian population and lend-lease are drawing increasingly large amounts for direct human consumption.

TRANSPORTATION

The impression has gotten around that our livestock feed supplies in this country can be brought into balance by importation of Canadian wheat, barley, and oats; wheat from Australia; meat scraps, corn, and oil-bearing seeds from South America.

If the ships and boxcars were available to bring all the surplus feed commodities, which these countries would and could spare, into this country as needed, even then we could not feed our present livestock. However, the facts are that we cannot bring, according to the best estimates, over 100,000,000 bushels of grain from Canada and very limited amounts from other countries. The boats and the boxcars just aren't available. A hundred million bushels of grain from Canada will feed between 1 and 2 percent of our present livestock numbers.

There exist stocks of molasses today in the West Indies, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and others—equivalent to 65,000,000 bushels of corn. We haven't the tankers—or the policy-makers are unwilling to assign them to this job—to bring that molasses in. In the face of such transportation difficulties, it is foolish for this Nation to kid itself any longer with the possibility that we can import enough feed to keep on with our present fantastic livestock program. Even if the feedstuffs were available in other countries, which they are not in anything like sufficient amounts, shipping to get them here is not available.

ROUGHAGE

One shortage leads to another. As the heavy grain-consuming animals, hogs and poultry, bite deeper and deeper into the feed pile, there is less than the normal amount for the animals whose diet consists of a high amount of roughage, such as dairy and beef cattle.

There is but one answer to this: Cattle will be compelled to eat more hay and less grain. An acute national shortage of hay will likely develop by the spring of 1944.

LIQUIDATION OF LIVESTOCK

It is, of course, apparent to every thinking man that fairly heavy killing—particularly of heavy grain-consuming animals, such as poultry and hogs—will take place. If we take the drought years of 1934 and 1936—which were years when we had sufficient feed to carry out livestock—as a pattern, liquidation would take place in the following order: Hogs, poultry, beef, cattle, dairy calves and heifers, and last, dairy cows. In those years, the heaviest liquidation was in the western Corn Belt States and least in the dairy areas.

Planned economy in those days had not reached its present state of complexity so that liquidation took place naturally. Administration action may, and probably will, change this natural order. It will be difficult, however, for the administration to devise a policy that will do three things at the same time, namely: (1) be really in the Nation's interest, (2) meet the test of equality of sacrifice, and (3) be politically expedient.

In summing up the general situation, it is now apparent that our livestock and poultry production is gaited at a rate that will use up all of the carry-overs of grain from former crops, all of the grain that can be raised this coming year, even figuring a normal crop, which is doubtful, plus all of the grains which we can import from other countries, and still be far short of meeting the feed requirements of our livestock. If all of the feed grain available were allotted to livestock, first, on the basis of their needs, it would leave nothing for industrial use, such as grain for industrial alcohol, starch, sirup, cereals, and other vital necessities.

HOW DO WE EXPLAIN SUCH MALADJUSTMENTS IN OUR NATIONAL FOOD PROGRAM?

It is of the utmost importance that people interested in continuing to eat should inquire as to how, under planned economy, the food situation could have been otten into such a mess. They should make further inquiries as to what effect the continuation of such a policy will have on our war program. It must be remembered that the food policy of the United States Government determines not only the food supply of all the people of this country but also that of many other nations. The present food policy is a proven failure. A continuation of it spells national and world disaster.

There are many reasons for the failure of this Government to develop a food policy consistent with the needs.

First, there has at no time, since the war started, been included in the war-policy group anyone who has any fundamental conception of food production.

Second, the administration promised the industrial worker of this country, and particularly the organized worker, that this war would be fought without sacrificing any of the so-called social objectives of the New Deal. In layman's language, this meant that they would feed the industrial worker, not the same amount but increasing amounts of beefsteak, at no increase in cost. The attempt to make good on this promise is cloaked under the fight against inflation.

Third, this administration committed itself to deliver perfectly enormous quantities of meat, milk, and eggs to foreign countries without any knowledge of what the real capacity of this country is to produce these things.

Harry Hopkins is called Chairman of the Munitions Assignment Board. It would almost appear to the layman as if he is, in fact, just an order clerk for the governments of the foreign nations allied with us. The orders they send in he confirms.

As a result of these promises and commitments to labor and to other nations, even before Pearl Harbor, our Government adopted a cheap-feed policy in order enormously to expand the production of meat, milk, and eggs without giving the necessary feed supplies.

The Government is not to blame for the weather. We have, however, the right to expect that the Government will always take the weather into consideration when it takes on the commitment of feeding the world. Now, because of this ill-conceived policy, plus adverse weather, we are rapidly approaching an acute crisis in our food supply. Shortages of all kinds are showing up. The food industry, including farmers and distributors, are being weighted down with burdensome regulations which produce more shortages. Price policies, which are supposed to produce plenty and keep down the cost of living, are doing neither. Increasing shortages will make it necessary to extend rationing to an increasing number of essential foods.

The realization that we were in difficulty with our food supply broke upon this country a year ago this coming September. Still after almost a year no workable policy has been evolved. The blame for unworkable policies can be laid neither to the Food Administrator, the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, nor the Office of Price Administration. It must be laid on the doorstep of the former Director of Economic Stabilization—now promoted to a higher office—Mr. James Byrnes. Br. Byrnes has consistently closed his eyes and ears to the things that were happening on the food front of this country. In the face of constantly rising food demands and a steady decline in total food supplies, he has refused to act. He has persisted in continuing to adhere to an unworkable price and wage policy—a policy based on consumer ignorance of fundamental food problems—a policy brazenly designed to catch the city vote in 1944.

To illustrate this, let us take the corn price ceiling. It was apparent, within a few weeks after being put on, that the corn price ceiling was unworkable and would lead to freezing the entire stocks of corn on farms where it was produced, with the consequent shutting off of its flow to feed-deficient areas and consuming industries. In spite of the fact that this was demonstrated in a very short time, Mr. Byrnes, through the Office of Price Administration reaffirmed this politically expedient policy. Conditions have now become so bad that our whole feed economy and our industrial economy based on corn, is breaking down. The only excuse given for continuing this policy which is bringing about such dire results, is that to raise the ceilings would increase the cost of feed to dairymen, resulting in the necessity of raising the price of milk to the consumer. Contrary to that assumption, corn or its by-products in a dairy ration are fast becoming just a memory. The corn ceiling price is not helping the dairyman to keep down costs. Instead, it is creating such a scarcity of feed that it is actually increasing the dairyman's cost of milk production.

It is reported that price policy of this country is being determined by a member of that famous old team, Cohen and Corcoran, namely, Mr. Cohen. It is said, however, that Mr. Corcoran hovers close in the background.

Can it be that Mr. Byrnes is more interested in getting the 1944 Vice Presidential nomination than he is in a workable food policy under which this country and its allies can be assured of a maximum quantity of food at some price and not wholly indequate quantity of food at some lower price?

PRICE

It would seem that under the cloak of fighting inflation, Byrnes' Office is carrying on a political campaign looking toward the 1944 election. They are still telling the city consumer that he can have plenty of meat, milk, and eggs at no increase in cost. Every few days they reach into the hat and pull out a new rabbit. The latest is the roll-back on butter, meat, and coffee. Anyone who knows anything at all about food production knows that this is an impossible job of fulfillment and that the attempt to fulfill it can only result in a decrease in total food supply.

Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., had this to say in his broadcast on May 31, 1943:

"We've had Office of Price Administration programs in the past that were accused of being unsound, or unworkable, or impractical. On this one, ladies and gentlemen, the time has passed for any such terms. This one is sheer humbuggery. No shell game in a circus was ever designed more directly to fool, or mislead the public. It is dishonest government policy in its most simple form.

"The advertised purpose of this subsidy program is to roll back price to the consumer—roll-back being a polite Office of Price Administration term for reducing prices—and to prevent inflation. Let's take it apart and see whether it does either one of them:

"It's true, the dollars-and-cents price, which the housewife pays to the corner grocer for a pound of butter, will be reduced 5 cents. We'll say it has been 45 cents; it will be 40 cents in the future.

"That 5-cent reduction will be made up by the 5-cent subsidy, which the Government pays to cover the loss at the creamery.

"And the 5 cents that the Government pays comes out of the pocket of the same housewife, the same identical housewife who thinks she is paying five cents less. In reality, she's still paying 45 cents a pound, except that she now will be paying 40 cents a pound direct and the other 5 cents in taxes through the Treasury."

In addition, Mr. Lewis points out that a whole army of Government employees will have to be set up to handle this roll-back, all of which has to be figured into the final cost.

CONGRESS

Since it would appear that Byrnes is more interested in the outcome of the 1944 election than he is in a workable food policy, we might as well write off Mr. Byrnes' office, as far as getting any effective program which will look forward to filling the bellies of the millions of civilians of this country, the armed forces, and our allies. It is not a case of higher prices on farm commodities for profit; it is a case of having sufficient food of any kind to come anywhere near meeting our needs.

We must find some way of getting a workable food policy. There is no easy way out. It is obvious, however, that the food front of this country is right now an important, if not the most important, front in the war effort. This was not necessarily true a year and a half ago, but, because all the other fronts have been expanded at the expense of the food front, we have now reached the position where food has become our No. 1 problem.

Because Mr. Byrnes and his New Deal associates do not understand food in the first place, and in the second place are more interested in politics than they are in food production, it is time that Congress created a food administrator with sufficient power over all phases of food production, including price, so that as a nation we may deal with our food problem in an intelligent and effective way.

The formation of a workable food policy and its management is the biggest war job the country now faces. Since Mr. Byrnes has refused to deal with it, only congressional action is left. Secretary Wickard was sacrificed to the political objectives of the administration. Every succeeding food administrator will be similarly sacrificed, unless Congress acts.

The promises being made by the administration to the city consumer cannot be filled, that is, plentiful food at low cost. Further attempts will further jeopardize our war front and our home front. The New York City consumer, for instance, can even now assure himself of 10 percent less milk from the dairymen of the New York milkshed than he had last year, and there is no other place for him to get it. Dairymen will do all they can to produce the maximum amount of milk, but they cannot produce without livestock feed, without labor, without sufficient price to offset their rising costs. They are now lacking in all three.

The problem of food supply is more important to the city dweller than it is to the farmer. The people of the cities must no longer be misled by promises based on political expediency; they must insist on congressional action leading to a workable food-production policy.

The Late James Wilkinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is no name in all of Louisiana's glorious history more closely associated with the State than that of Wilkinson.

Long before Thomas Jefferson, with his great farsightedness, purchased from Napoleon that vast, fertile, and promising empire then known as the Louisiana Territory and from which has been carved so many great States now represented in this body, the name of Wilkinson was prominent in the development of this Nation.

When Louisiana was purchased from France the name of James Wilkinson was among the three commissioners who participated in the formal transfer from France to the United States.

From father to son down through the generations the heritage of the Wilkinson name has been cherished and embellished with the added luster of continued accomplishments in the civic and political life of the State.

Today Louisiana is in mourning.

The great grandson of Gen. James Wilkinson of yesteryear, James Wilkinson, the namesake of that fabulous character, is dead.

James Wilkinson of today has left his mark on the history of Louisiana in much the same manner as his illustrious forebear. He, too, will be long remembered after most of us have gone to our graves.

James Wilkinson, like his sire and his sire's sire before him has left behind an illustrious son of an illustrious sire to carry on the name of Wilkinson in the history of Louisiana which is yet to be written.

Hugh M. Wilkinson, who, with a brother and sister, survive James Wilkinson, already is a name to conjure with in the courts of Louisiana and in the civic and political life of the city of New Orleans.

When lawyers of tomorrow discuss the lawyers of today the name of Hugh Wilkinson will find its place among the great criminal lawyers of Louisiana. From his father Hugh Wilkinson has not only received his great legal talent but he, on his own initiative and ability, has brightened the star which shines over the name of Wilkinson in Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, as a boy I remember most vividly the first time I heard of the name of Wilkinson. It was during a sensational murder trial in the criminal courts of New Orleans in the district which I, in later years, was to have the honor to represent in the Halls of Congress. The defense was in the hands of the Wilkinsons, James and Hugh, father and son. It was a great combination; it was a most effective team; it was an inspiring sight which the crowded courtroom saw.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the defendant was acquitted because of the splendid work of his counsel. It was a great triumph for the Wilkinsons; it was a crowning victory for father and son.

In later years when I had grown to manhood I again saw the Wilkinsons in a courtroom. This time the situation was quite different. Not only were father and son present in that courtroom but still another Wilkinson, a grandson, was present.

The elder Wilkinson occupied a chair in the front row of the audience. He came this time, in his declining years, as a spectator, to witness a new triumph, a new victory for his son, Hugh Wilkinson, who during the span of years between that murder trial of years before and the present time, had risen to majestic heights before Louisiana's bar of distinguished lawyers. And alongside the elder Wilkinson sat a Wilkinson of still a younger generation, the son of the son, who came to hear his father carry on the name of Wilkinson in the courts of Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget that memorable day in the Federal courtroom in New Orleans.

A father watching his son, a son watching his father, the father and son fulfilling every hope, every dream, every ambition, every pride of father and son, while son and grandson sat proudly by in silent admiration of those Wilkinsons who had preceded him.

I describe these events, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate to you and to the ladies and gentlemen of this House what significance there is attached to the passing of a Wilkinson in Louisiana.

Now James Wilkinson is dead. He is among the last of a fast-dying era. Little more can be said at this time except to recite his life's history. That life's history speaks for itself, that life's history speaks more eloquently than anything I might say or somebody write about James Wilkinson.

In my humble and inadequate manner I have attempted to pay tribute to the name of Wilkinson in Louisiana. I leave more full tribute to the pens of the accomplished editorial writers of his own State, which I submit to you with the permission of the House.

Briefly the career of James Wilkinson is sketched here, after which I insert an editorial.

They tell the story of the career of James Wilkinson and the esteem and high regard in which he was held by those who knew him best, by those who were his neighbors and friends in his native Louisiana, which he loved so well:

James Wilkinson, who was 87 years old, was believed to be the oldest member of the Louisiana bar. He was admitted to the bar in 1881, and served as counsel for the Orleans Levee Board since 1912.

Born March 8, 1856, at Riverside Plantation in Plaquemines Parish, James Wilkinson was the son of Dr. Joseph Biddle Wilkinson and Josephine Osborn Stark. He was a great-grandson of Gen. James Wilkinson, one of two commissioners appointed by President Thomas Jefferson to receive the Louisiana Territory from the French Government in 1803. He took the role of his ancestor in ceremonies conducted at the Cabildo on the one hundredth anniversary of the transfer.

James Wilkinson began his career in 1884 when he was appointed district attorney for the judicial district composed of the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines in Louisiana. He served in that post for 13 years.

He was one of the few survivors of the White League, which participated in the battle at the foot of Canal Street on September 14, 1874, and restored white supremacy to Louisiana. He was an officer and member of the Louisiana Historical Society for many years. In 1935 he published a biography of General Wilkinson, titled "Wilkinson, Soldier and Pioneer."

He was the last survivor of seven brothers, all of whom were prominent in public life, including Theodore S. Wilkinson, candidate for Governor of Louisiana in 1908, and Horace Wilkinson, member of the legislature from East Baton Rouge Parish.

James Wilkinson studied law in the old Louisiana University, forerunner of Tulane University, graduating in the same class with the late Judge Hugh C. Cage. He established his residence in New Orleans shortly after the turn of the century and thereafter took an active part in the city's public affairs.

Appointed by Gov. Luther Hall to be attorney for the levee board in 1912, he served with that body under 10 subsequent Governors. Because of advanced age and desire for less responsibility, he served the board for the past 3 years in the capacity of associate counsel.

For many years he was a recognized legal authority on matters of flood control and riparian rights, and lectured on those subjects at Loyola University. He wrote much of the legislation under which the lake-front improvement, the industrial canal, the Rohemia spillway in New Orleans, and other like projects were organized. Interested in the development of Grand Isle, he built a hotel there which was destroyed by the hurricane of 1893.

He was named Louisiana representative in 1931 to the sesquicentennial celebration at Yorktown, Va., which was held to commemorate the termination of the Revolutionary War.

He is survived by three children, James Wilkinson, Jr., Hugh M. Wilkinson, New Orleans attorney, and Mrs. Walter E. Dawes, of Keesler Field, Miss. He was married to Miss Cecilia Peters, of New Orleans, who died in 1942. His first wife, the late Miss Mattie Sypker, of Plaquemines Parish, died many years ago.

He is also survived by six grandchildren, Lt. Hugh M. Wilkinson, Jr., United States Naval Reserve; Aviation Cadet James Wilkinson, III; Mrs. Leila Wilkinson Scheyd; Miss Sheila Bosworth Wilkinson; John Wilkinson, and James Wilkinson Dawes, and one great-grandchild.

[From the New Orleans States]

JAMES WILKINSON

Death yesterday wrote finis to the outstanding professional and political career of 87-year-old James Wilkinson, probably the oldest member of the Louisiana bar. His life had been always active, and sometimes turbulent in the heat of political battles and controversies of law or politics, or both. He has earned the rest, peace, serenity that come for such active characters only when life's labors are finished.

Mr. Wilkinson was reared, schooled, and began the practice of law in his native Plaquemines Parish. He was a practitioner for about 62 years, and his first public office came to him nearly 60 years ago. Thereafter, he has always been in public life, and for the last 30 years was continuously connected with the Orleans levee board as chief or associate counsel.

Mr. Wilkinson was one of the prominent leaders in the great political reform battle of 1912 when the late Luther E. Hall was elected Governor. That victory brought a great improvement in the quality of State government, and in the government of Orleans Parish, too, that was to last for many years, with many of the advantages and betterments continuing until this day.

Mr. Wilkinson was only 18 years old when New Orleans citizens fought and won the historic Liberty battle at the foot of Canal Street on September 14, 1874. He carried a rifle with them, being one of the youngest warriors of the day. At his death he was one of the few survivors of the clash that ended the evil oppression of "carpetbagism." Mr. Wilkinson was for many years active in the affairs of the Louisiana Historical Society, and a few years ago wrote a volume on the life and career of his great-grandfather, Gen. James Wilkinson, soldier, pioneer, and diplomat, who was one of the three commissioners appointed by President Jefferson to receive the new Territory of Louisiana for the Union.

He was a consistent supporter of many causes and movements projected for the welfare of New Orleans. The people of this city and State have many reasons to remember, with feelings of deep gratitude, the public services performed by James Wilkinson.

Hon. Christopher D. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1942, this House and this country lost a valued colleague and a devoted public servant in the death of Christopher D. Sullivan.

It is not given to many men in public life to devote the major portion of seventy-two years to the public good. Indeed, too, it is given to but a fortunate few to pass away in the midst of their labors and amid scenes familiar to their eyes, surrounded by their faithful and loyal friends. This was the blessing afforded to Christopher D. Sullivan, and none merited it more than he.

Representative Sullivan passed away in the executive office of his district where, for more than thirty years, he had presided over the political and personal affairs of his constituents with kindness and patience, with loyalty and understanding.

He had long been loved and revered in the downtown section of New York. Although his devoted services to the Democratic Party claimed his presence for over twenty-three years, both in the Legislature at Albany, where one of his colleagues was a young senator named Franklin D. Roosevelt, and in this House of Representatives at Washington, his heart was never far away from his beloved East Side. There he was born and there, every Monday and Thursday, he met with his constituents, to hear their grievances, to solve their problems, and to dispense benefactions.

As a Congressman, Mr. Sullivan served with distinction under Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Warren Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. During his service under these great men, Representative Sullivan filled many assignments on important committees and, at the time he decided to conclude his congressional service, Mr. Sullivan was a member of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Because of his many obligations and duties as leader of the Democratic Party in New York City and that he might be able to devote all of his time to the leadership of his party, the Congressman declined to stand for election to the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Representative Sullivan enjoyed the confidence of the officers who guided our ship of state under the command of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In the early days of the New Deal when many men of less strength of character and courage questioned some of the plans of the President, Christopher D. Sullivan stood four-square behind Mr. Roosevelt and worked and voted and succeeded in having enacted into law the legislative program of his fellow New Yorker, Franklin Roosevelt.

I am sure that during the period immediately following the inauguration of Mr. Roosevelt on March 4, 1933, and down to the very day the Congressman's services ended, the cooperation and wholehearted support of Mr. Sullivan must have been a source of inspiration and encouragement to the Congressional leaders and the President.

Upon his passing, the press of New York paid editorial tribute to the character of Mr. Sullivan, to his fine qualities as a man and to the unselfish service he had rendered to the people of his district, his city, his State and his Nation.

Nothing that I can say would add to the high esteem and genuine friendship that Mr. Sullivan enjoyed from his fellow New Yorkers and from his multitude of friends throughout the Nation. He was a true friend, a splendid citizen, and a devoted father.

I believe the following poetic lines best portray the character of our friend Representative Christopher D. Sullivan:

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie

Emory and Henry's Dr. James Shannon Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, down in my district, nestling among the blue grass hills of the Holston, is situated a venerable Christian college whose very name, Emory and Henry, symbolizes the mission for which it was established, the training of young men in the liberal arts under Christian and American influences and environments. Yes, Mr. Speaker; it would be hard to find an American who better symbolizes Christianity than did Bishop John Emory, and it would be equally as hard to find an American who better symbolizes Americanism than did Patrick Henry.

Established by the Methodists over 100 years ago, Emory and Henry has gloriously fulfilled its mission, ever living up to the Christian and American ideals of those whose names it bears.

This year marks the half century teaching record of Emory and Henry's best beloved and most outstanding teacher, Dr. James Shannon Miller. During his half century of teaching, 48 years of which have been spent at Emory and Henry, he has not only grounded hundreds of young men in the basic principles of mathematics and physics, but he has done something infinitely greater in that, by precept and example, he has led them along the path that leads upward, guided them in the true American way of life, and planted in them the urge to develop their talents and devote them to service.

Small Christian colleges, in some mysterious way, have ever been able to retain among their facilities at least one or two strong outstanding men. For 48 long eventful years, years filled with honor and glory, with genuine achievements, Dr. Miller has been Emory and Henry's strong outstanding man.

I used to marvel over what caused such men to remain with our small Christian colleges. What mysterious force, as it were, chained these strong, outstanding men to our small Christian colleges? Why should men of unusual talents, when larger institutions of learning would gladly pay them a wage commensurate with their worth, voluntarily

remain, ofttimes under adverse circumstances, with these small colleges? These were some of the questions that frequently entered my mind. At last I think I know the answer: These strong, outstanding men, I have observed, are all men of consecration and vision. Having consecrated their lives to service, their vision opened up to them the great field the small Christian college affords as a training ground for future Christian-American leadership. They have, one and all, been interested in developing men and not in accumulating dollars. And because of such men the small Christian college has become the bulwark of our Christian democracy. May the challenge to democracy that today is being made by the accursed dictators awaken us to a true evaluation of the important part the small Christian colleges have played in keeping alive the spirit of Christianity and democracy is my fervent prayer. If it does, then the future problem of keeping these wellsprings of Christian democracy alive will have been solved.

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the Associated Press carried a story on Dr. Miller. Under unanimous consent, I incorporate the story at this point in my remarks:

EMORY, VA., March 9.—Fifty years as a college professor—that's the record set by Dr. James Shannon Miller, professor of mathematics and physics at Emory and Henry College.

Although Dr. Miller taught the fathers of many of the present Emory and Henry students, he is still just as active as he has always been and doubtlessly belies his age. New courses are eagerly undertaken when the occasion demands; he operates a large farm in Pulaski County and also raises thoroughbred chickens as a hobby.

It was back in 1893 when Dr. Miller first came to Emory and Henry College, and his has been a period of uninterrupted service to the advancement of learning. Only 3 years of the 50 were away from Emory and Henry, these being spent at Hampden-Sydney College, 1919–22.

Dr. Miller received his B. S. and C. E. degrees in 1889 and Sc. D. degree in 1893, all from the University of Virginia. One year, 1891–92, he was a student at the University of Goettingen, one of the famous centers of science and culture of old Germany. In addition to his 50 years as a college professor, he also was an instructor in mathematics and physics at the University of Virginia for 6 years while he was a graduate student there.

The University of Virginia now has on its faculty a number of professors who received their basic scientific study under Dr. Miller at Emory and Henry College. Among them are James Miller, Jr., professor of electrical engineering; Dr. E. J. Oglesby, professor of engineering and mathematics; Dr. Joseph K. Roberts, professor of biology and geology; Dr. G. T. Starnes and Dr. T. R. Snavely, professors of economics, and Dr. John W. P. Graham, professor of French. Virginia Polytechnic Institute has Dr. George W. Tyler and Dr. O. W. Addington in its mathematics department, and also Dr. L. B. Tate, professor of rural sociology, and Dr. P. H. Farrier, professor of English, all Emory and Henry graduates. W. J. Young, professor of physics, and Sam W. Shelton, professor of mathematics, are two of Dr. Miller's former students who are now in his own department at Emory and Henry College. Other Emory and Henry graduates on the Emory faculty are President Foye G. Gibson; Dr. V. S. Armbrister, dean and professor of English; Woodrow Flanary, professor of English; T. L. Porterfield, coach and college treasurer, and Rev. Frank A. Settle, college pastor and professor of Bible.

One of Dr. Miller's former students discovered the last two elements, alabamine and virginum; he was Dr. Fred Allison, professor of physics at Alabama Polytechnic Institute. New York University has two professors of mathematics from Emory and Henry, Milton Maiden and Palmer Graham.

Some other outstanding men who studied under Dr. Miller are Dr. Joseph L. McGhee, professor of biochemistry at Emory University; Dr. John A. Kelly, professor of German at Haverford College; Dr. Claude Bruce, professor of mathematics, Wesleyan College; Rear Admiral Charles S. Butler, of Bristol; ex-Governor George C. Peery, Tazewell; Stanley Reeves, construction engineer, William A. Stewart, lawyer, and Dr. Harry M. Hayter, physician, Abingdon, and Hon. W. N. Neff, southwest Virginia businessman.

When Dr. Miller first came to Emory and Henry, Dr. R. G. Waterhouse was president of the college in its 55th year. There were only six professors on the faculty, among whom were Dr. Joseph L. Jarman, professor of chemistry, who is now president of Farmville State Teachers College.

Dr. Miller was married in Florence, Italy, in 1892 to Miss Sallie Board, of Bedford, Va., who died in 1936. They were the parents of two children, Juliet, who lives with her father, and James S. Miller, Jr., of the University of Virginia. There is one grandson, James III.

The service rendered by Dr. J. S. Miller during the past 50 years well illustrates the contribution of liberal arts colleges on the life of the Nation. Dr. "Mathey" Miller is a gentleman of keenest intellect and thorough preparation and personifies the highest attribute of small college professors.

Dr. Miller, on this your fiftieth anniversary as a teacher, personally and as the Representative in Congress of the people of the mountain empire, I salute you, and publicly express the hope and prayer that your years of usefulness and service may be extended.

Along the Milky Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, it has become a more or less popular pastime to criticize Congress. Perhaps we deserve criticism. However that may be, it is a heartening thing when the editor of an agricultural journal as well known as the Pacific Dairy Review in its issue of May 1943, gives an entire page to the development of an editorial which begins, "These are the days when we say most humbly and sincerely, thank God for Congress." The editorial appears under the heading "Along the milky way," which is the standing caption of the monthly editorial page, and perhaps we can appreciate the sentiments more than ever when we realize that the editor, Mr. Robert E. Jones, has spent a great deal of time in Washington this session, on matters affecting the milk industry, and therefore speaks from personal observation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks the entire editorial:

ALONG THE MILKY WAY

These are days when we say most humbly and sincerely, "Thank God for the Congress!" We say this because the framers of our Constitution had the foresight to set up the legislative branch in its present form as one of the checks and balances to safeguard this Republic. We say it also because of the general high average in character and ability of the men who are Members of our House of Representatives and the Senate. Most of these men are serving their country at a material sacrifice; they are in public service because they are able and it satisfies them to be serving.

It was fashionable a little while ago to belittle Members of the Congress. That fashion still exists in some quarters. Be suspicious that this fashion stems from those schemers who want to drive us into a centralized form of government, the European manifestation of which is so hateful to all Americans. The temper of the people is changing and there is a rebirth of realization of the vital place occupied by the Congress in our body politic. We are determined not to lose our liberties either to external enemies or to schemers within, and Congress is the anchor of these liberties.

Now everyone grants that during wartime, certain restrictions on liberties must be accepted. This editorial has no part in criticizing any legitimate restriction to individual liberty that will help successfully to finish this war. Like most everyone, our families are deeply and directly involved. Any sacrifice we as civilians can make until the war is won, we willingly make.

But the encroachment of the executive branch of government upon the liberties of the people is older than the war threat. The greatest single surge came in the years following 1933 when "brain trusters" had such a vogue and they swarmed from Manhattan and Harvard College into Washington.

We, the people, encouraged this because of our laziness in public affairs. We even asked bureaucrats to help run our businesses because we could not get along among ourselves. And there is no life unit in the animal or plant kingdom that grows more rapidly than a bureau once it has a diet of power. This is just plain nature asserting itself, the urge to do a job completely, power feeding on power, self-justification.

Well, here we might launch into a tirade on bureaucrats. But the trouble is you can't generalize. Noble things have been accomplished in this Government of ours by bureaucrats. Witness the great work of our Weather Bureau, the Forest Service, National Park Service, Geologic Survey, the Post Office Department, all now taken for granted. When we hotly denounce the bureaucrat we are not thinking of these people. But there are also fine quality men in other kinds of Government services. Those touching our economic life are most recent, and it is here that the restriction of liberties becomes most apparent. And it is this service in the economic field that attracts the kind of bureaucrat who fancies he can do a better job of government by regimenting people. Often he is the product of Manhattan, yet he may have an assignment that deeply affects the life of rural America. To such the farmer is a peasant, who has the gall to expect compensation equal to that paid industrial workers.

The bureaucrat's character is affected by his long tenure in office; exercising much power over long period with little restraint. As a famous Senator once said, the bureaucrats don't have to come up for election and answer to the electors for deeds done, but Senators and Congressmen have to answer. Bureaucrats may stay in office 10, 20, 30 and even 40 years.

Where can you find a human being that is good enough to occupy a position of power 20 years, let alone 30 and 40 years, unrestrained? The Congress, therefore, is our safeguard. It is the restraining power.

We've had a good deal of experience in recent months with the national legislators and have come to know many of them personally. This experience has been a happy one. It has renewed our faith in the framework of our Government. These Senators and Congressmen are the kind of people you like to know and trust. We have no hesitancy in saying that there must be two score in the Congress today who could creditably occupy the office of President of the United States. If you doubt this, consider how many generals and admirals there are doing great big jobs today; men you never heard of 2 years ago. Greatness exists in the Halls of Congress, even if it has not been called to service in executive work and so publicized.

A Senator or a Congressman by force of circumstances is most of the time a resident of Washington. But unlike the bureaucrat, he does not "live" in Washington. He "lives" in his home district. His office walls are adorned with pictures from his district, his desk is piled with letters from his constituents, and sometimes a thoughtful constituent will even send a cheese or a box of fruit from the home soil. There is nothing quite so gratifying to a Senator or a Congressman as word from, or better, the sight of the face of a constituent. Because he is directly answerable to the people at the next election and because he "lives" in his district, your Congressman and your Senator (with their colleagues) can save you from centralized regimentation.

Friends of the dairy industry, we are trying to paint the picture for you. There is no branch of agriculture more controlled than the dairy industry. So this means much to you. We make no partisan plea. We plead for the support of people who will adhere to the pattern that Washington and Jefferson framed for the American people. Your Senators and your Congressmen are your safeguard. Judge them. Support the worthy. See that they vote their convictions and the wishes of their people. Watch carefully to determine if they merely "take program" from the executive branch.

So, while giving the job of winning this war everything we have, let's not forget to watch our Government at home and support the Congress. In the language of L. S. Crawford, president of the National Manufacturers Association, "I'm all done criticizing Congress. I'm going to get in and help."

The Plant Seizure and Antistrike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on Senate 796, sometimes spoken of as the Connally-Smith bill, came up for consideration in the House today. The Senate some time ago passed S. 96. Its principal purpose was to provide for the seizure of plants, shops, and other production facilities. It came to the House, and instead of it being referred to the Committee on Labor, where it should have gone for investigation, it was referred to the Military Affairs Committee. The Military Affairs Committee, without holding hearings on that particular bill, struck out all of the Senate bill and adopted what is known as the May bill. The House struck out the May bill and passed the Harness substitute bill. It then went to conference and the conferees of the House and Senate brought in this report. It restored the principal features of the Connally bill and includes some provisions of the May and Harness bills. In other words, the bill has been rewritten and is included in this conference report, and if this report is adopted, the provisions of this report will be the law governing the seizure of plants, equipment, and materials and will also govern the conduct of owners of such plants and the persons working therein. After most careful reading of this conference report, I cannot give it my support.

We all agree that the important problem before the American people is to win the war. Every loyal American should be willing to do whatever is within his or her power to win the war at the earliest moment possible, so that the millions of fathers, sons, and brothers, including my own son, may return to their homes and loved ones, and our country be restored to its normal conditions and normal life once more.

The souls of owners and managers of every plant, shop, mill, and mine, and every farm, railroad, and other instrumentality of production, transportation, and communication, and the workers should be fired with the same patriotic zeal to win the war as our boys are on land and sea and in the air, and I might say that, in my opinion, 99 percent of those of management and labor are as loyal and as anxious to win the war as are Members of Congress. No one should do or say anything that would hinder our war effort.

WILL THIS MEASURE HELP OR HURT THE WAR EFFORT?

Mr. Donald M. Nelson, an experienced, hard-headed businessman, for many years identified with a very large business enterprise, and who is now in charge of our production activities for the war, and Admiral Land, who is in charge of our shipping production, have urged the Congress not to pass this type of legislation at this time, as it would likely slow up and hurt our war-production effort.

Secretary of War Stimson, a great lawyer, and identified with big business for many years, and Secretary of State during President Hoover's administration; and Secretary of the Navy Knox, who was for years connected with big business enterprises, say it will hinder and not help our war effort. This same position has been emphasized by other persons in high places in our Government and connected with our armed forces and the production of ships, bombers, planes, guns, tanks, shells, and other war equipment and supplies. These men, who have advised against this legislation, are in a better position to know what will be helpful and what will be hurtful to our war effort than perhaps any Member of the House and Senate. They have been in close touch with our war production, dealing with management and labor, and they should know our war needs and what progress we have made toward meeting these war needs. We have been voting them hundreds of billions of dollars and granting them extraordinary powers. If these persons in charge of our production and the direction of our armed forces are not doing the job as it should be done, and we are unwilling to follow their counsel, vigorous steps should be taken to have them removed and replaced by persons in whom the Congress could place confidence.

The Congress is not the executive branch of the Government. The enforcement of any laws we pass must depend on the executive branch of the Government. If they still hold to the view this is not a good law and that its enforcement will bring about discord and hurt our war efforts, will they enforce it?

I have said heretofore that the Congress could perhaps accomplish very little along these lines until those in charge of production and in charge of our armed forces come to the conclusion that such legislation is necessary and call upon the Congress to pass such legislation, and it will do so.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND LABOR

I am firmly of the opinion that many of the provisions contained in this measure, affecting both industry and labor, are clearly unconstitutional. While some part of management may favor this act on the idea it will do something to labor, they will find, after careful reading of this revised antistrike and plant-seizure measure that private enterprise will likely receive a much greater blow than labor. Before we entered into this war on a number of occasions, in the Congress and out, I expressed the feeling that if we became involved in this World War that we would find it the costliest, longest, and bloodiest war in which this country ever engaged; that it would disrupt our economic, social, and political life as it had never been disrupted before; that our standard of living would be greatly lowered; that our country would be driven almost to bankruptcy; and, greatest of all, we might lose our own liberty and freedom and whatever we might have expended in treasure and blood. I have tried to keep before my mind all the time the preservation of the freedom and liberty of the American people. I should like to see freedom for all the peoples across the seas, but I am more concerned with preserving it here at home.

When we destroy private enterprise in this country we strike at the very foundation of the growth, prosperity, success, and liberty of the American people. I do not want to take any step that would destroy private enterprise or would destroy the liberty and freedom of the

farmers, the workers, and the whole people of this country.

If the records are to be believed, private industry and labor in this country have done a great job of production. War Mobilization Director Byrnes, stated the other night, that we had built 100,000 planes and bombers; we have doubled the American Navy; we are building more than 1,000,000 tons of shipping a month; we have produced 2,225,000 machine guns; we have produced 44,830,000 bombs; 100,000 antiaircraft guns, millions of smaller weapons and great quantities of other war munitions. We are building merchant marine ships four times as fast as they are being sunk. In a single year we built more than 1,000 ocean-going cargo ships and 100 ocean-going tankers. In fact, man for man and tool for tool we are producing faster than Great Britain, Germany, Russia, Japan, or any other country. They all have so-called antistrike laws.

Let me say in passing, I am informed Great Britain has an antistrike law and she has lost in strikes more man-days per man since she has been in the war than have been lost in the United States.

Some managers and owners of plants have not always measured up to what they ought to have done. Some of them have made excessive profits on Government contracts but by and large they have done a great job of production and transportation. The no-strike agreements made by labor have been carried out more than 98 percent.

None of us wants to see strikes or stoppages on the part of management or labor. There should be no stoppage. Strikes or stoppage in production or transportation give encouragement to our enemies, and as I have said before owners or managers in industry and those toiling in plants, shops, mills, and mines or on the railroads or farms should feel and know these stoppages lengthen the war and will cost the lives of many of their sons and our sons.

I am glad to say the working people of my district are practically all native Americans. They love this country and, as a rule, are as loyal and patriotic as any Member of this House. We must not forget there are more than 40,000,000 men and women working in industry in this country in thousands of plants, both large and small, and we find persons on one side and sometimes on both sides who will not yield. Each one of us should be satisfied to sacrifice some of our personal interests and rights that our war effort may be held at its highest point and that our courageous, patriotic boys be equipped with everything necessary to protect them and win the war.

IS THE ANTISTRIKE BILL A THREAT TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP?

I have a great many coal mines and other industries in my congressional district. I have not heard a word from any of them urging me to support this bill. They may have seen in the bill what the New York Wall Street Journal saw in the way of danger to private enterprise, private ownership, and private control. On Friday, June 11, 1943, among other things, this conservative business journal has this to say in an editorial captioned "The antistrike bill":

For one thing, the whole scheme of the bill so far as it can claim to be called an antistrike measure depends on Government seizure of production facilities threatened by labor trouble. Its adoption as a general rule would certainly bring along another new chain of problems and perhaps destroy the effectiveness of plant seizure as an emergency action. Certainly it tends to perpetuate Government operation of war plants.

In speaking of the so-called cooling-off period this editorial says:

Of course, during the prescribed waiting period the Government could seize the property, but that only proves the major point set forth above, namely, that the enforcement really depends on Government operation. There are some labor groups which would be well content to use strike threats or almost anything else to extend the scope of Government ownership or operation of private industry. Such a law would play right into their hands.

Now, let us see how broad this act will be. We are told that this law applies only to munitions plants or plants producing ships, weapons, and other munitions of war under Government contract. Subsection 3 of section 2 of the act says that it includes a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

(B) any building, structure, or facility;

(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

This may include all contractors and everything in industry, agriculture, and transportation. It includes the finished product, or any material or part of any material, or any commodity or part of any commodity, or any tool or part. So the Government can take over almost anything in this ccuntry under this bill.

Section 3 provides that the President may take over any of these plants, shops, mills, mines, or facilities when the President claims that there is an interruption in the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as the result of a strike or other labor disturbance and that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed. I regret to say that we do have some people in many of our plants who do not believe in private enterprise or private ownership. In fact, they do not believe in the American way of life. Some of them are radical Socialists or Communists. As pointed out in the Wall Street Journal, such persons could start some labor disturbance in the plant and under this measure the President could take it over. But it is urged that the plant would have to be returned to the owners as soon as practicable. We find this language:

But in no event more than 60 days after the restoration of the productive efficiency thereof prevailing prior to the taking of possession thereof.

In other words, if the Government takes it over, the Government can hold it until the restoration of the productive efficiency thereof prevailing prior to the taking possession thereof.

Our plants are generally efficiently operated by trained and efficient management and these plants, as a rule, would be at their highest point of efficiency of production at the time they are taken over. Does anyone believe that these plants under Government control and operation would ever reach the point of productive efficiency they had before they were taken over? It is also urged, and as stated in the bill, that the authority to operate any such plant, mine, or facility shall terminate after the end of 6 months after the termination of hostilities. We are in a global war and no one can foresee how many years there will be some form of outbreak or hostilities after the war is really over. The President is the man who proclaims when hostilities have ceased. Under this bill it seems to me that plants could be taken over on slight provocation and held for many years. It is also urged that after the war is over these powers should cease by Congress passing a resolution terminating them. What if Mr. Roosevelt should realize his ambition and be elected to a fourth term and control Congress as he did for the last 10 years? This bill is as silent as the tomb as to the rights of the owners of these plants and facilities taken over by the Government. If they are managed as many Government plants are managed, the Government will, after a very few years, return them as empty shells. If the average mill, shop, mine, or plant was not owned and operated, as a rule, by patriotic men and women, and they had been loafing on the job instead of making the marvelous records they have made, we might give the Government this unlimited power to seize them and to hold them.

There is not a word in this bill to protect the honest, patriotic owner or manager of these plants, shops, mines, and facilities. He may have been doing a wonderful job, yet if some dissatisfied persons at his plant created some disturbance the bill provides for the Government to take them over instead of giving protection to the owner in operating his plant. No one deplores more than I do the recent trouble, but under the spell of this hysteria I am afraid that we have presented, and Congress will likely adopt, this measure that invades the constitutional rights of both industry and labor.

Subsection 2 of section 8 of this bill provides—

for not less than 30 days after any notice under paragraph (1) is given, the contractor and his employees shall continue production under all the conditions which prevailed when such dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or by the decision of the National War Labor Board.

So far as I have been able to learn, the highest courts of our States and the Supreme Court of the United States have held that Congress does not have the

power to prevent workers from striking, because it would be a violation of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits enforced labor. The fourteenth amendment does not merely cover the black man, it covers us all. No one can compel another to work against his will in civil life. He can be compelled under another provision of the Constitution to serve our country in our armed forces.

You will observe this provision in the bill says that the manager and employees shall continue production under all conditions which prevailed when such dispute arose. There may be a dispute about a matter that would destroy the owner's plant or there may be a dispute about working conditions that would endanger the lives and health of the workers, yet under this bill they must continue.

MR. ICKES AND THE COAL STRIKE

One of the most unfortunate things that have occurred in this country has been the coal strike. A situation developed that this bill could not and would not reach or solve. In the first place, there was feeling between the Labor Board and the representatives of the miners. They refused to go before the War Labor Board because they claimed that the War Labor Board had already decided their case in their own minds, and the members of the War Labor Board later signed a statement, as I recall, to President Roosevelt stating that under the restrictions that he had placed on them they could not pass upon the miners' case or other disputed labor cases. They were supposed to act as a fair and unbiased tribunal, but could not under the restrictions placed on them by the President.

After the miners went back to work the first time, the miners and operators got together to make further efforts to settle their dispute, at the suggestion of Mr. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior. The War Labor Board found out that the operators and miners were about to get together and this Board ordered them to quit and not confer about the matter among themselves—that they must come before this Board. I understand that the miners and operators had practically agreed and likely would have agreed but for the Labor Board's interference. A day or two ago it looked as if this matter would be settled amicably between the operators and the miners, and then Mr. Ickes breaks in and enters fines against the miners amounting to about $3,000,000 under the provisions of the contract made in 1941 that has long ago expired. At least it is doubtful if there is authority for Mr. Ickes to impose such a fine without any hearing. This has caused another flare-up. I wonder if the administration wants the coal trouble settled and return the mines to their owners.

It is known by all men that Mr. Roosevelt is a candidate for a fourth term, and a host of thoughtful, patriotic American people believe that he and many of those associated with him are deeply interested in the outcome of the election next year and securing election for a fourth term. He and his new dealers have been trying to regiment industry, labor, agriculture, and commerce for the last 10 years, and this host of people, including myself, believe in many instances they are using the war to further this purpose and to keep Mr. Roosevelt and his new dealers in power and continue their policies, and this is another reason why I am unwilling to give to him and his associates the power over industry, labor, and commerce set out in this bill.

My vote today against this conference report and this measure has the full approval of my conscience. I realize that we are in a war. My only son, who has been married a number of years and had built up a lucrative law business, volunteered and is in a combat unit of the Coast Artillery. Perhaps three-fourths or more of the boys who are today fighting for our country on the six continents and seven seas of the world are the sons of those who own, manage, or toil in the plants, shops, mines, mills, and on the railroads and farms of this country.

This administration is responsible for the chaotic conditions that we find in this country. The Government comes along and takes men out of the mines and pays them much higher wages on Government work than they were receiving in the mines, for doing much less dangerous work. The administration has carried on a program of scarcity of food and other supplies and have helped to increase the cost of living. Only those who know the drawbacks and hazards of operating a coal mine and those who know the dangers and hardships of working in the mines can fully appreciate this mine trouble. The operators and the miners must settle their differences. I helped to pass a law in Congress that permits the Government to provide such a price for coal as will enable the operators to make a fair return on their investments and pay to the miners a real living American wage under present conditions.

We must not have a stoppage of work in the mines or in our industries, on our farms or on the railroads. Each one of us must put forth our very best efforts to win this war, and if I thought that this bill would help my son and others to win the war more quickly, of course it would have my support.

I may be in error but it is my sincere conviction that Donald Nelson, Admiral Land and others in charge of our war production, and Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of the Navy Knox, and other leaders of our armed forces are right in their opinion that this measure will create suspicion and discord among the loyal owners and managers of our plants and other production facilities and the workers in these plants at a time when we should encourage those who are doing a real patriotic job. They have not only been producing, they have been buying bonds, stamps, and helping in every other laudable war effort. If the measure is adopted and approved by the President, I trust that it will be helpful and not hurtful.

Teamwork in a Troubled World—Address by Robert H. Hinckley, and Editorial From the Roswell (N. Mex.) Morning Dispatch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Teamwork in a Troubled World," delivered by the Honorable Robert H. Hinckley at the commencement exercises of the New Mexico Military Institute, at Roswell, N. Mex., June 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEAMWORK IN A TROUBLED WORLD

Today is June 1, 1943. In many ways this is the most momentous graduation ceremony in the history of the institute, and, as the years go by, you will remember this date. It will serve as a sort of meridian from which you will measure your life—something like B. C. and A. D. or A. M. and P. M. You may not remember much of what I say to you, but you must recognize the importance of this date to you. It is important that you remember the way you feel today. It is important that you do not lose the ideals, the ambitions, the urges toward achievement which you all have today. I know many men who could have achieved far more than they have if they had only kept these things in their minds and hearts throughout their lives; if they had not let disappointments, difficulties, disillusionments, and ill fortune take away their youthful enthusiasms, ambitions, and goals. That is why it is important for you to remember June 1, 1943.

It is also important for you to remember the condition of the world on June 1, 1943, and, in the years to come, it will be important to you if you can look back with pride on what you did about it after June 1, 1943—how much you did to win the victory that restored freedom to a world menaced by forces that endangered every ideal you had on this June 1. For you will never in your lifetime be able to live comfortably with yourself or with your fellows unless you can truthfully answer in the affirmative the question, "Did I do everything I possibly could to win the war an hour, a day, a week, or a month sooner?" For, from our experience in the last war, when many lives were lost as the last shots were being fired, we know that winning the war even an hour sooner will save thousands and thousands of lives, and, ironically enough, we never know whose lives they will be.

But we have not won that victory yet—and that is the first item on your list, the first step on the ladder of your career. Unless we do win, you will have no career, because the basic American freedom which allows each man to determine his future for himself will have been taken away. In that connection, they tell a story about Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest, the Confederate cavalry genius, who was very annoyed because his superiors had sent an officer who had been carefully schooled in the art and science of

war to work with him on tactics. This officer told Forrest that if they were going to make a certain advance at a certain point, the cavalry should dismount and they should leave every fifth or sixth man to hold the horses while the main body advanced on foot. Forrest, in so many words, said: "Hell, why do that? We just tie our horses to the bushes and all of us go ahead." The officer replied that the idea was to be able to regain the horses easily and get away if they had to retreat. Whereupon, Forrest replied, "Well, if we win this fight, we'll have plenty of time to untie the horses, and if we don't win it, we won't need them." Just so, if we don't win this fight there won't be any career.

Of course, in this man-to-man talk, we parents must be smart enough to realize that you, our sons, have an awareness of what is going on in the world and of your responsibility in meeting the world's problems far beyond anything that we parents have had, or at least have demonstrated, over the past years. On account of that awareness of present world problems, I feel very much like the father who decided that he should have a heart-to-heart talk with his adolescent son. He called his son to him and told him that he thought it was about time they were having a discussion of the facts of life, whereupon the son replied, "Fine, Dad. What do you want to know?"

That feeling of hesitancy on my part is in no way diminished when I consider that I want to talk about something today that you graduates have been taught every day of your lives at New Mexico Military Institute, something that has been a part of your daily existence here. That is teamwork. You may think it strange that I should attempt to tell you something about teamwork. But I want to talk about it because there never was a time in which the civilized world depended on teamwork so much as now. The President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, in his Flag Day Proclamation for 1943 has given us a timely reminder. He said: "Only by teamwork can we win the war and establish a lasting peace." How urgently this troubled world needs this teamwork is the question I shall discuss in the few minutes that it will be my privilege to talk to you.

Here at New Mexico Military Institute, your organization is composed of groups of teams, and these groups combine to make the whole school a team. There are thousands and thousands of such teams that make up the great American team. And right now the American team is joined with the teams of other countries to form the United Nations team.

No matter what kind of a team it is—squad, troop, battalion, city, State, national, or international—the basic purposes of the team are the same. Teamwork requires the merging of personal interests for the common cause and for the good of all, and in that way the personal liberties and freedoms and privileges of the group are preserved, and only in that way can they be preserved.

Teamwork is and always has been really the American way. The operation and organization of the home is on the basis of teamwork. Community governments are based on teamwork. State governments are teams. Political parties are, or should be, teams. Wage earners and wage payers are a team. The armed forces of the United Nations are the mightiest team ever assembled in the history of the world. The Federal Government is a great team composed of many other teams. The great American team is fighting for America and all the things that it stands for, just as New Mexico Military Institute teams fight for the institute and its glory.

But sometimes people think that our American team is not functioning as it should. People in our own country sometimes say that in time of war we have to give up some of our democratic principles in the interest of efficiency. I don't believe it. I think we can carry on a war more efficiently if we keep every single democratic principle.

Consider, for example, the maintenance of our national congressional system. We maintain it in Washington. The Germans maintain their analogous congress, the Reichstag, only as a fiction. A small group of willful and wicked leaders take over the functions of the Reichstag. They plan the war and carry it out without any veto or check. This small gang may discuss problems among themselves, but even within this group one man, one individual, thinks and speaks, without the slightest restraint, for 90,000,000 people. Thus the Axis pits its strength, decides its fate on the intuition of one man.

Democracy assembles its leaders by the choice of you and me. These leaders meet. They know they are there because you and I put them there. They know full well that if we don't like them we can kick them out and get somebody else who, we think, can do a better job. The Axis leader can't be put out. No matter how much the people may come to mistrust him, he can't be put out. Thus, the Germans, by this lack of political experience and sagacity, have permitted themselves to be engineered into a position where they stake their existence on one man against the combined wisdom and skill of the United Nations. In this way they have put their necks in a noose. They have tied their fate to him and must follow what he says and wants or turn to an internal revolution.

He issues edicts; there is not a word against him. He orders a war on Russia; no one dares say no. He orders the village Lidice destroyed. Who among his people dare protest? Now mark well what I say. His government has the appearance of a smoothly functioning team—no back-talk—no stresses, no strain, no debates in the Reichstag—just a sweetly, smoothly-running machine-like team. All this is a snare and delusion. The stresses and strains are there; the hatreds, the anxieties, the inefficiencies are all there—but buried. They are buried in an ominous silence, but they are there. When things go badly, there is the silence of the grave, but they do go badly and they will continue to go badly. They will grow worse and worse until all go down either in an explosion of revolution or the apathy of defeat. This I call the illusion of the dictator governments.

What of our own? What about our team? We talk and quarrel and debate. We discuss in committees, we hold elaborate elections. Our radios, our newspapers and our leaders seem to be telling one story of a never-ending confusion. People speak of the Washington madhouse. This, too, is a snare and delusion. Washington is not a madhouse; neither is any State capital; neither is any county or local government; neither are the United Nations a group of confused and bungling people. I am not a Government official. I do not live in Washington, but I have been a Government official for a good many years—local, State and national—and I give you my word that the seeming confusion is just as much of an illusion as the efficiency and smoothness of the totalitarian states is an illusion.

Did you ever see a man at a football game who didn't know the game? I have. To him it looks as if every one of the 22 men is running around in accordance with his own sweet will. After he has watched a few games, he begins to see that there is method in all the seeming madness.

It is the debates in Congress, it is the hearings that are held, it is the long considerations given by the legislative branch to the recommendations of the Executive together with the patient study and conscientious interpretations by the judicial branch that make us more efficient than the totalitarian states, because, before we act, we have the combined wisdom of many men.

After long experience in business and government, I urge you to believe me when I say that a true democracy, in which the principle of teamwork, the idea of working together, is the keynote, is always more efficient than a dictator government. And that is why I have such confidence in our victory.

But teamwork means more than the mere idea of working together. It also means discipline, leadership, and responsibility. No team can function without discipline; no team can function without leadership; no team can function unless each member discharges his responsibility to carry out his particular assignment to the letter.

Discipline has been the cornerstone of your education here at New Mexico Military Institute, and you know that discipline is the first requisite of a military organization. But it is no less important on the civilian front. Any organization, military or civil, without discipline, instead of a team becomes a rabble, each member clamoring for his own interests rather than the interests of the team. Right now, civilian discipline is just as necessary for the country's welfare as is discipline in the armed forces. The many wartime regulations and restrictions have imposed a restraint on normal civilian activity. As members of the American team, it is necessary for each of us to abide by the disciplinary effects of these regulations. It is necessary to cooperate with the draft boards, rationing boards, and other instrumentalities of the Government, for these regulations are the rules by which the wartime game is played.

Here at New Mexico Military Institute you have also been trained for leadership, and you know that a team can be ever so good, but if there is no leadership, the team will never accomplish what it should and could accomplish. Leadership requires knowledge, not just a collection of assorted information, but the background necessary to reach a conclusion from a given set of facts, an understanding of the problem and its implications. Leadership requires imagination. Imagination is the ability to project present facts into the future, the ability to foresee, the ability to plan, the force which has made possible every forward step in the progress of civilization. Everything that was necessary for human flight had always been present, but it took the imagination of the Wright Brothers to arrange these things in such a manner that man was enabled to fly. Leadership requires sound thinking and common horse sense. The ability to think through a problem and reach a sound judgment is one of the most important characteristics of the leader. Leadership requires initiative.

Many men have all the other requisites of leadership, but they will never be leaders because they are afraid to start their project moving; they wait for someone else to do it; they are afraid to lead. Finally, leadership requires hard work. Many people seem to feel that the leaders of business, labor, and government have the easy life; all they have to do is to tell someone else what to do. The fact is that these leaders are the hardest workers of all; the leaders are leaders and remain leaders because they outdo their fellows in persistent, serious application to the job in hand. All these, then—knowledge, imagination, sound thinking, initiative, and hard work—are required of the team captain, the team leader, and the better the leader the better the team.

Team play also means individual responsibility. It means that each member of the team, in addition to his rights as a team

member, has certain responsibilities, certain duties, and he must fulfill those responsibilities if the team is to achieve its objective. On the gridiron, each player has a responsibility to remove a certain opponent from the play, so that the ball carrier may run with the ball unopposed. If even one man fails in this responsibility, the ball carrier gets nowhere, and the team does not score. Similarly, each of us has certain responsibilities as members of the American team. I have often thought that our great Bill of Rights should have been accompanied by a bill of duties, because, under the American system, for every right there is a corresponding responsibility, and for every responsibility you evade you imperil the corresponding right. But whether they are written or unwritten, whether in peace or in war, our duties as citizens are clear and unmistakable.

You graduates of New Mexico Military Institute have even greater responsibilities than the average citizen, because of the advantages you have had in your training for leadership. In addition to the ordinary requirements of citizenship, you have the responsibility of exercising that leadership in order that the American team may function as a team should. You have the responsibility of using your military training to the end that our United Nations team can defeat our enemies in the shortest possible time. In the years to come it will be your responsibility to help establish that environment, the only environment in which our American way of life can flourish and grow—that continuous peace, which is the product of liberty and justice. Above all, you have the responsibility to be a strong member of the team, to see to it that the welfare and objectives of the team—the American team—come first.

There is danger in teamwork only when the team itself becomes the most important thing, instead of the things it is fighting for or the organization it represents. In other words, too frequently we have seen some political groups, members of the American team, put the interest of themselves above the welfare of America. Too frequently, and in fact since we have entered this war, various business and industrial groups have put their welfare first, the country's second. Some farming and agricultural groups have been for the farmer first, the country second. Some labor groups have put labor first, country second. Your coach would never have tolerated a quarterback who put his own interests above the objective of winning the game and bringing victory to New Mexico Military Institute. Similarly, the time has come when the members of the American team must be all out and completely all out for country first, regardless of what personal sacrifices may be made in merging or submerging individual or group interests for the benefit and welfare of America. Patriotism must come before profit.

America must be first. But when I say America first, let it be clearly understood that I am not, in any way, employing the obsolete slogan of those isolationists who so delayed our preparation against aggression. Of course, I appreciate the age-old conflict between the ideal of peace and the ideal of freedom. The isolationists believed that we could have both. They thought that, because of the great oceans on each side of us, we could remain at peace in a world at war, and in that way could keep our freedom. But the isolationists were not realistic enough to understand that the airplane had long since, for all practical purposes, dried up those oceans, flattened the mountains, and changed the method of reckoning distance from miles to hours. The world playing field has no more geographical boundary lines. It was this failure to understand the changes brought about by the airplane that was responsible for the Pearl Harbors of this war and for putting us three touchdowns behind in the first quarter.

And it is my opinion that we have not yet seen the full potential of air power. What is on the drafting boards of our great aircraft manufacturers today is so much more deadly and powerful than anything that has been in action that there is no comparison. We have never seen real air power in terms of numbers, to say nothing of size. Once we do see, as we undoubtedly will—perhaps in this war—we are all going to know that some kind of world-wide safeguard must be set up to develop their use in peaceful pursuits. And here again we come back to teamwork—a team of nations so organized and so functioning that never again will any pretender to the throne of world domination dare to raise his head.

The airplane has made each country in the world geographically a neighbor to every other country. Our post-war organization must be such that we will also be neighbors socially, economically, and politically—neighbors in fact. One thing we must get out of this war is an understanding of people all over the world, a tolerance of people whose customs are not exactly like our customs. I hope that when our boys come back from far places they will have an understanding and a tolerance, rather than scorn, for people who have not had the advantages that we have had. This is necessary because these people are going to be our teammates, and a team cannot function as a team should without unity and cooperation and understanding, for these are the bases of team play. Yes; isolationism is as dead as the buffaloes who once roamed the Great Plains now occupied by this and adjoining States.

Teamwork, not isolationism, not individualism, not nationalism, is the order of the day—for civilians, for soldiers, for business, for labor, for government, for nations. Teamwork won the First World War, just as teamwork will win this one. But the armistice that followed World War No. I was not a peace. Why? Because the team that won the war did not function to keep the peace. This time it is even more imperative that the United Nations team up to win and keep the peace. In the words of our President: "Our armies, our navies, and our air forces are now perfecting the teamwork with our allies which shall, under God, bring victory in this great cause to which freedom-loving mankind has dedicated itself. Made strong by our common bonds, we shall face the future with resolution and rededicate ourselves to the achievement of permanent collaboration among nations and security for all men. For only by teamwork can we win the war and establish a lasting peace."

Mr. HATCH. I also ask to have printed an editorial entitled "America—And Confusion," from the Roswell Morning Dispatch of June 3, 1943, commenting on the address of Hon. Robert H. Hinckley, which I have just asked to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA—AND CONFUSION

One of the main points, to our way of thinking, that was made by Robert H. Hinckley in his address to the graduating class at New Mexico Military Institute, was that drawing the contrast between the apparent order of the dictator nations, the apparent confusion of the democracies.

Underlying the order of the dictatorships, as pointed out by Mr. Hinckley, exists the insidious disorder and lack of teamwork born of distrust and hatred; a deep-rooted confusion and lack of teamwork that eventually dooms the dictatorships to destruction.

Underlying the apparent confusion of our democratic way of life lies the spirit of give and take, of good sportsmanship—the feeling that comes of being a "member of the team." The trust and confidence exists underneath all the arguments and bickering, the apparent confusion that comes with the democratic way of life.

Mr. Hinckley drew an excellent parallel there in his address. Only in a democracy will you find the people criticizing their government, the interdepartmental conflicts, the criticism in the public press and on the radio. But underneath it all exists the fundamental idea—we are all Americans. We are all, in our own way, working for and contributing to the common victory we want. It is democracy's way of working out its problems. But once the policy is set, once the task is undertaken, we are united 100 percent behind the enterprise at hand. There is no holding back, no "knifing in the back." That is one phase of democracy that the dictators just don't understand. They have taken the controversies of this Nation as evidence of weakness and division. Rather, it is our strength and our unity that is at work in solving the national problems.

The dictators are today beginning to realize their error. They thought they were fighting a disorganized people with the finest organization in the world. Instead, they found they were fighting an organized, united people, while sitting on the lid of an explosion among their own "united" people.

The New Current Tax Payment Act—Explanation by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John L. Sullivan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered last evening over the radio by Hon. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, dealing with the pay-as-you-go tax plan, which should be interesting to every individual who is a taxpayer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The new tax bill, popularly known as the pay-as-you-go tax, has just become law. It goes into effect July 1, just 3 weeks from today. Between now and then nearly 50,000,000 Americans will have to find out how this new law affects them; what they have to do to prepare for it; what new duties it places upon them; how it benefits them individually.

To help answer some of these questions we are bringing to you a round table discussion of the new tax between a high official of the Government, the Honorable John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and three typical American taxpayers—an employee of a business establishment, a woman war worker, and an employer. Now,

to start this discussion rolling, I am going to ask Mr. Sullivan to tell us what is the outstanding difference between this new pay-as-you-go tax and the old method of income-tax collection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think the first thing to understand is that this is not a new tax or an additional tax, but a new method of collecting the income tax. The new law does not change the income-tax rates. The big change comes in how a person pays the income tax. Under the old system he paid a year late. That is, on March 15 he paid, or began paying, a tax on the money he earned the previous year. Now, under the new pay-as-you-go method, he will be paying the income tax on his 1943 income during 1943, bit by bit, pay day by pay day.

EMPLOYEE. As I understand it, when you say I will pay that tax bit by bit, you mean that it will be deducted from my pay bit by bit.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is exactly correct. Your employer will deduct part of your pay every payday. He will turn that money over to the collector of internal revenue with his quarterly return, or if your employer has enough employees to make the aggregate deductions from all employees $100 or more each month, he will deposit that money monthly in a bank which will turn it over to the Treasury of the United States. In either event, this money stands to your credit as prepayment of your tax.

EMPLOYEE. That's all right, but what's worrying me is how much is my employer going to hold back. The papers have been talking about 20 percent. Does that mean I'm going to have 20 percent taken out of my $76 every week? How can I support a wife and three kids—

Mr. SULLIVAN. Just a moment—the deduction is not 20 percent on all your pay. It is 20 percent on your pay, less your exemptions—and you have a lot of exemptions. Are your wife or any of your children working?

EMPLOYEE. No, sir.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Then a good part of your pay is exempt from the withholding tax. Twelve dollars for yourself, another $12 for your—wife—that makes $24, plus $6 for each of your 3 children, makes $18 more. That's a total of $42 of your weekly pay that's exempt. The amount withheld is 20 percent of the balance. You said your weekly pay is $76, didn't you?

EMPLOYEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Then your employer will withhold 20 percent on the difference between your total pay of $76 and your exemption of $42—which amounts to $34.

EMPLOYEE. How much, then, would be taken out of my weekly pay?

Mr. SULLIVAN. $6.80, which means that you will receive just under $70, instead of $76.

EMPLOYEE. And the $6.80 I didn't get, is that my income tax?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; that is your income tax, and it also includes your Victory tax.

EMPLOYER. May I ask a couple of questions here?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Certainly.

EMPLOYER. You see, I'm an employer, the fellow who has the job of withholding this tax. You mean I don't have to make that 5-percent Victory tax withholding any longer?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Not after your last pay roll that begins in June. All pay rolls beginning on or after July 1 are subject to the new law, and the Victory tax is included in the 20 percent withheld.

EMPLOYER. Well, here's another question. My company has about 250 employees. I don't begin to know which of them are single, or which married, or how many children they have. How can I figure their exemptions and the amount I must withhold?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That's a very important question. You've got to have that information, and here's how you get it. There is a special form called a withholding exemption certificate. The collector of internal revenue in your district will supply you with as many as you need. It is up to you to give one to every one of your employees. And it is up to you others, as employees, to fill out those certificates, sign them, and then return them promptly to your employer. On this exemption certificate you tell him whether you are married or single and how many dependents you have. It gives the employer the information he needs so that he can exempt the proper amount of your pay from the 20 percent withholding.

EMPLOYEE. What happens if I don't turn in this certificate?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Until you hand one in, the law requires your employer to withhold 20 percent on all your pay—every dollar of it. In your case, it would mean he would withhold $15.20 each week instead of $6.40.

EMPLOYEE. Believe me, I'll get that certificate in.

EMPLOYER. And get it in early, because it's going to be a big job for us employers to get all those exemptions and rates figured by the 1st of July. It is going to be especially difficult for my company, because, due to piecework bonuses, most of our employees earn odd amounts, like $63.82 or $78.90. Mr. Sullivan, do I have to figure the exact 20 percent of each of those amounts above withholding exemptions?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No. Employers may elect to use the wage-bracket tables which are written in the law. These tables set definite amounts to be withheld from each pay. For example, in the case of a married employee with three dependents, whose weekly wage is anywhere between fifty and sixty dollars, the employer is permitted to withhold a flat amount of $2.60 per week, instead of requiring him to figure the exact amount for each individual employee. The law grants the employer this short-cut method in order to simplify the job of computing the amount to be withheld from each individual employee. The amount of tax withheld may be slightly different from an exact computation at 20 percent, but this does not hurt the employee any. If a little less than the actual 20 percent is withheld, he may have a small balance to pay when next March 15 comes around. If a trifle more than the exact 20 percent is withheld, the employee will have a credit coming to him.

WOMAN WORKER. I was working last year, too, and my income tax figured to about $60. I paid a quarter of it in March this year. What happens to that $15?

EMPLOYER. That $15 stands to your credit as a payment on your income tax for this year. Isn't that so, Mr. Sullivan?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; that is correct. The $15 you paid in March counts as a payment on your current 1943 income tax.

WOMAN WORKER. Well, do I have to pay another $15 this month—the June 15 quarterly installment?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. Nothing in the new law changes any person's obligation to pay the June 15 installment. It also will be treated as part payment of your 1943 tax.

EMPLOYER. That applies to everybody? Everybody must pay the June 15 installment?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; everybody who has been paying his 1942 tax in quarterly installments must make another payment on or before June 15.

WOMAN WORKER. Well, if we have to make these two quarterly payments, and then have 20 percent taken out of our wages, what is all this "forgiveness" there was so much talk about?

Mr. SULLIVAN. You are forgiven all or a large part of a debt which, under the old law, you owed to your Government. It is true that you will keep right on paying income tax. You get no holiday from that. But there are two differences. One difference is that you are paying your tax a little every pay day, as you earn your money, instead of having to save it up for 3 months to make quarterly payments. The other difference is——

EMPLOYER. That you are paying it against this year's income-tax debt instead of last year's—isn't that right?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is exactly right. For the majority of the taxpayers—that is, the people with low or average incomes whose tax amounts to $50 or less for either 1942 or 1943, the whole tax for the smaller year will be forgiven.

EMPLOYER. How about the rest of us with higher incomes? I figure that 75 percent of my own personal 1942 tax will be forgiven. I still owe a quarter of it. Does the quarterly payment I made last March clear that up?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No. That quarterly payment, as I have just said, will be credited against your 1943 tax liability. You still owe the Government one-fourth of your 1942 tax. Assuming, of course, that your tax for 1942 is less than for 1943, as will be the case for the great majority of all taxpayers.

EMPLOYER. When do I pay that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. You may pay half of it March 15, 1944, and the other half a year later in March 1945.

WOMAN WORKER. I would like to ask what proof I have that I have made these payments on my income tax through the money held out of my wages.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Shortly after the close of the year, or with your last pay if you stop working before the end of the year, your employer will give you a receipt showing the total amount of the tax deducted and withheld from your pay during the year.

EMPLOYEE. What do I do with that receipt?

Mr. SULLIVAN. You take good care of it. It is your receipt for the taxes you have prepaid.

EMPLOYEE. Suppose the amount withheld during the year amounts to more than the tax I owe for the year?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Any overpayment of taxes will be refunded or credited to you.

EMPLOYEE. What would happen if my receipt from my employer gets lost or destroyed?

Mr. SULLIVAN. You apply to the employer for a copy of the receipt.

WOMAN WORKER. What would happen if my employer withheld the tax from my wages but did not turn it over to the Government?

Mr. SULLIVAN. You are completely protected. The receipt you get from your employer is your proof of the fact that you have paid that much tax.

WOMAN WORKER. Do I have to wait until the end of the year to get a tax receipt for the money my employer has withheld from my wages?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; unless you change employment during the year. Then you get your receipt with your last pay.

EMPLOYEE. Suppose I change jobs several times during the year.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That does not make any difference. Each employer must give you a receipt showing the amount of the tax he withheld.

EMPLOYER. I have heard or read in the papers that some classes of employees don't have anything withheld from their wages.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is correct. There is no withholding from the pay of the personnel of the armed services. Ministers of the gospel are also exempt from withholding. So

are all persons engaged in domestic and agricultural service. However, all those people will be required to pay their income taxes out of their current income. They do this by filing a return showing their estimated tax and pay such tax quarterly.

ANNOUNCER. Our time is almost gone. Before we close, is there anything you especially want to emphasize, Mr. Sullivan?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. I wish to emphasize that nothing in the new law excuses anyone from making his or her June 15 income-tax payment. That is due next Tuesday. And finally I want to urge all employers to get those withholding exemption certificates into the hands of your employees right away. To all employees I want to say, "Please fill out and sign those certificates and return to your employer immediately."

Mission to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mission to Washington," by Frank C. Waldrop, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION TO WASHINGTON

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

When you run out of gasoline this summer in the course of some essential business; when you do without food that couldn't be harvested because of an idle tractor; and next winter, when you are cold because there is no oil in the house, remember the case of *Gilmore and Eben* v. *Ickes*.

Roy E. Gilmore and M. N. Eben have just retired from the Washington scene to their home town of Portland, Oreg., where Gilmore plans to write a book entitled "Mission to Washington."

It will be the story of their attempt to implant here with the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, an idea by means of which oil could be brought to the east coast in a hurry, cheaply, and in great quantity. The idea is so good it may interest you to know that the military authorities have grabbed it. More cannot be said about that because of security regulations—but to repeat, the idea is good enough that the military have grabbed it.

And what is the idea? Simply that some of the 400,000 gondola-type railroad cars in the United States be converted to oil tankers by the installation in them of thin sheet-iron and wood tanks.

Gilmore-Eben, and associates naturally are trying to sell their idea to the Government—that, probably, is why they are treated as public enemies around here.

They have designed a type of tank that will go into the gondolas in a hurry. What is more, they have found the materials and the labor and the manufacturers all ready and waiting.

Such nationally known metal-working companies as Allis-Chalmers, of Milwaukee; the Butler Co., of Kansas City; Sharpsville (Pa.) Steel Fabricators; and the Scaife Co., of Oakmont, Pa., have guaranteed delivery of a total of more than 100 tanks a day beginning 30 days from any given date of contract.

Equally responsible wood-working companies, such as the Aladdin Co., of Bay City, Mich., and Timber Structures, Inc., of Portland, Oreg., are ready with the wooden parts.

The names of these companies may not mean a great deal to the ordinary citizen, but in the manufacturing world they are gilt-edged. Every one of them is a tremendous producer of war goods and a proved performer in its field.

And they say they are ready to perform on demand without diverting men or materials from war work.

In fact, they want this additional business to take up slack in departments the war tides have left behind.

They guarantee the materials and labor to make these tanks—100 a day, each to hold 10,000 gallons of oil.

This means that if a contract for these tanks were signed tomorrow by the great Petroleum Administrator, one Harold Ickes, tanks would be ready by July 10, 1943, to start an additional 1,000,000 gallons of oil each day toward the east coast of the United States.

Think of that—1,000,000 gallons a day more than we are now getting—plus an additional 1,000,000 gallons each additional day for as many days as desired.

The materials are ready, the manpower to make them is ready. The tested and proved tank-car design is ready.

But in spite of all this Eben and Gilmore yesterday advertised in the papers offering their experimental tank for sale and adding:

"This tank (shown in the ad) was designed and built in Portland, Oreg., for the transportation and storage of oil. It has been tested in use and inspected. It carried 10,500 gallons of liquid successfully from Portland, Oreg., to Washington, D. C., a distance of 3,000 miles.

"The owners, finding no market for this product, are leaving immediately.

"This tank may be examined at Twelfth and D Streets SW."

Now the obvious question is why can these men not get results from the great Petroleum Administrator?

What is stopping the Government from the use of the Eben-Gilmore tank car?

The official story given Eben and Gilmore is that of the 400,000 gondola-type railroad cars in America not even 100 can be spared for this fuel relief.

Eben and Gilmore say this is boloney and quote railroad officials to prove it. They cite C. E. Smith, vice president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, as just one of a list of experts ready to testify there are thousands of gondolas ready for conversion to tank cars without hurt to the war effort any time the Government will say the word.

Eben and Gilmore have a proposition here which would relieve the gasoline shortage and yet not cause a shortage in any other direction. Yet they can't get Ickes to budge on it.

Is it really true the old man wants people to suffer so they will know there is a war on? It certainly looks that way.

But no matter what the reasoning behind it may be, the sort of fantastic public administration indulged in by Ickes is dangerous in the extreme.

This tank-car case is a matter that some committee of Congress had better investigate. Here is a cheap, quick method of solving the gasoline shortage, proved in field tests and accepted by the military—yet flattened out by Ickes.

Somebody competent to make intelligent decisions had better step in and take the matter out of his hands before it explodes.

The Mission to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Mission to Moscow," written by that beloved and distinguished editor of America, Hon. Josephus Daniels, for the News and Observer of Raliegh, N. C., under date of June 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSION TO MOSCOW

The close cooperation between Russia and the United States in this global war tends to confirm a prophecy made a quarter of a century ago. In his address at the Ambassador Theater in Raleigh on Tuesday night, in which a preview of the picture "The Mission to Moscow," was given to encourage the purchase of bonds, Josephus Daniels related an incident of a quarter of a century ago which showed that a noted engineer had the gift of prophecy.

The guests at a formal dinner at the Russian Embassy were present when the Russian Ambassador, pale as a ghost, received the news of the revolution in Russia which was to be followed by the killing of the Czar, the downfall of his autocratic regime and the coming Soviet control of Russia. But before that startling news shocked the Ambassador, one of the guests of honor related to other guests his conviction that the fate of Europe rested with the United States and Russia. As recalled by Mr. Daniels, this great engineer, who knew Russia and the United States perfectly and was a statesman as well as an engineer, had told the small group of diplomats and Cabinet officers that the destiny of the world would be shaped by the two biggest countries in Europe and America. According to the statement of Mr. Daniels, the engineer pointed out that Russia was the only self-contained country in Europe as the United States was the only self-contained country in the New World. They possessed all the resources, or practically all, needed for peace or war.

Other European countries, with all their jealousies, were dependent upon supplies from abroad. Moreover, he said, the large populations of the countries made them impregnable to attack from abroad. With this superiority in population and resources, Russia and the United States needed only to work in harmony to prevent wars and to insure the best interests of both hemispheres. The engineer added that the people of both countries were "fundamentally devoted to democracy." That statement was questioned by some of the guests who reminded the engineer that Russia was a one-man ruled country in which the people had no voice. The Czar was then in power. He countered by saying that already a parliamentary form of government was in the making and that the frustrated revolution was proof that one day the people of Russia would follow the example of the United States and be self-governed.

"And when that day comes," he said, "the policies of the world will be in the keeping of Russia and the United States."

At that statement the Russian Ambassador, who would have repudiated the prophecy because he adhered to the autocratic rule of the Czar and had helped to crush the revolution, approached the group with the startling and disturbing news of the outbreak of the Russian revolution.

That was a quarter of a century ago. The outcome of that revolution, bloody and destructive of all that existed in government in Russia, was the rise of the Bolshevists and Communists who formed the Soviet Government, the rise of Trotsky, who believed Russia should seek to spread the doctrine of communism throughout the world; of Lenin, a master mind, who saw in some measure the impracticability of converting other nations to the communism in which he believed; of Stalin, whose purge shocked mankind and whose annulment of the Comintern and brave fight against the Axis has heartened the democracies.

For a decade neither the United States nor Britain maintained diplomatic relations with the Soviet Government because they resented the attempt of the Bolshevists to propagate the doctrine of communism which would undermine economic freedom of other peoples. However, in 1933, the new American President felt we should reopen relations with the Soviet Government. He may have had the same belief to which the distinguished engineer gave expression in the Russian Embassy on that fateful night. At any rate, the Mission to Moscow has borne good fruit, for in the year 1943 the peoples of these two big countries on two hemispheres are partners in a great conflict to defeat the avowed opponents of the goals of the two peoples. Russians and Americans do not deceive themselves into believing they see eye to eye in all governmental or economic principles. But the peoples of both countries are persuaded that if the forces of nazi-ism win, the rights of people to self government and freedom will be destroyed and totalitarianism will curse the world and blight the hopes of all peoples who wish for a world in which the good things will be in the reach of all.

It is for the Russians to control their own destinies, for Uncle Sam to have no fear of Nazi infiltration, for all countries—great and small—to govern themselves that Russia and the United States are partners in the greatest war of history.

After the war, let us hope they will fulfill the prediction of the great engineer, that they will lead in the maintenance of agencies that will insure independence for all peoples and a world freed from war and imperialism.

Downy Mildew or Blue Mold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Downy Mildew or Blue Mold," written by Mr. William G. Holman, of Greensboro, N. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the past few years, a very destructive plant disease known as downy mildew or blue mold has been playing havoc with tobacco plants in the plant beds and causing great losses to the farmers. This disease attacks and destroys the plants in the beds before they are transplanted in the fields.

The March 1941 issue of the Southern Tobacco Journal of Winston-Salem, said that: "Tobacco blue mold is costing tobacco growers of the flue-cured area an estimated $5,000,000 per season, according to authoritative sources." I think this is an understatement. The farmers of this State sustain a loss each year of considerably more than half that amount. In fact, it is probable their losses exceed that amount.

Federal and State plant experts have been working on the problem for 12 years, and they are recommending two different treatments for blue mold today: 1, the spray treatment, and 2, the fumigation treatment. The spray treatment involves an extra cost to the farmer of about 3 cents per square yard, and the extra cost of the fumigation treatment is from 5 to 6 cents per square yard.

North Carolina planted about 511,000 acres in tobacco in 1941, and it takes 50 square yards of plant beds for growing the plants for each acre. So, the cost of the spray and fumigation treatments runs into money. Sometimes the farmers go to that extra expense and then fail to grow plants enough for their needs. When they obtain these plants from other farms, they frequently bring back other plant diseases in the soil around the roots of these plants: black shank and Granville wilt for instance. These plant diseases are more destructive than blue mold. Once the germs of these diseases get in the soil, tobacco cannot be grown on that land again for 5 or 6 years.

Dr. F. A. Wolf, of Duke University, who has been working on the problem with Government and State plant pathologists, said: "No sprays or dusts do more than decrease severity of attack." He also said that: "Sprayed plants can't be transplanted until they recover from attack, thus delaying transplantation from 1 to 2 weeks. This delay in about 9 out of 10 cases is sufficient to reduce very sharply the profitableness of the crop."

Dr. Wolf said this about fumigation: "It completely prevents or cures after an attack starts," but United States Bulletin No. 1799 said: "Mold may appear in gassed beds about a week after treatments are discontinued."

Thus we see that the spray does no more than decrease severity of attack and the fumigation will not prevent other attacks of the disease before the plants are drawn from the beds and transplanted in the fields. Obviously, neither of these costly methods prevent a delay in planting the crop which in 9 out of 10 cases is sufficient to reduce very sharply the profitableness of the crop.

Let's see what is happening today after 12 years of Government and State experimentation.

Mr. Tom Linder, Georgia's commissioner of agriculture, wrote me on March 23, 1943, saying: "Extreme cold; a blue mold has destroyed most of the tobacco plants in the Tobacco Belt of Georgia."

Several North Carolina and Virginia farm county agents have sent me written reports this year, as follows: (1) Rockingham County, N. C.: "Blue mold has affected practically every plant bed in this section. It has delayed the planting of the crop from 2 to 3 weeks." (2) "Blue mold on tobacco plants has done considerable damage in Columbus County and has delayed tobacco being transplanted in the field at least 2 weeks." (3) "Blue mold retarded the growth of tobacco plants in Johnston County about 10 days." (4) "Blue mold is doing considerable damage in Caswell County this year. It is causing a shortage of plants in some sections and delaying the planting in most cases from a week to 10 days." (5) Pittsylvania County, Va.: "Blue mold has done considerable damage in this county this year. I fear that the stand will be bad on account of this disease, making it necessary to replant considerable tobacco." (6) Halifax County, Va.: "Blue mold has done considerable damage and has delayed the planting of the crop around 10 days." Dr. Wolf says this delay in 9 out of 10 cases means a less profitable crop.

I have devoted a great deal of time and have given much thought and attention to the relation between the physiological condition of the plants and the incidence of plant diseases.

In 1941 I prepared a special fertilizer mixture that was intended to give the tender tobacco plant such a healthy growth that it would be less susceptible and more resistant to plant diseases. I conducted 26 plant bed tests of this mixture in nine counties of this State that year, one of them on Governor Broughton's farm and another on the farm of Sheriff Turner, of Wake County. At least half of these plant beds were located on farms near other plant beds on which other fertilizer had been used. In each instance blue mold attacked and did considerable damage to the plants on these nearby beds, but none of it was found on any of these 26 beds. The plants on my test bed were not only healthier and stronger than the plants in other nearby beds but they started off to growing in the fields faster than plants drawn from other beds and planted beside them in the same field at the same time.

Gov. J. M. Broughton said this: "Mr. Holman has given much thought and attention to this important subject, and with a little assistance he would undoubtedly be able to make a contribution toward the solution of this important problem. He has tried some experiments on one of my farms, on the farm of Sheriff Turner, and they have proved successful."

Sheriff Turner, of Wake County, said this: "The plant bed showed no signs of blue mold, and the plants were stronger and healthier than plants in other nearby beds that were planted 3 or 4 weeks earlier."

Dr. Earl H. Hall, professor of botany, the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, said this: "Mr. Holman has outlined his plan of work to me and I can assure you that his thesis is physiologically as well as logically sound."

Dr. W. D. Hoyt, professor of biology, Washington and Lee University, said this: "Your reasoning seems well founded."

Dr. F. C. Bauer, professor, soil fertility, University of Illinois, said this: "It is my personal opinion that there is justification for your point of view."

In 1940 Senators BARKLEY, BYRD, GEORGE, TYDINGS, and REYNOLDS thought that the progress I had already made entitled me to a little assistance from the Government. They wrote a joint letter to the President requesting him to give his approval and to request the Department of Agriculture to approve the enactment of a bill that would make a grant of $10,000 to me for the completion of my research work. This letter was referred to the Department of Agriculture, and this Department replied to it saying, "No evidence has been submitted to the Department which would justify the belief that any public benefit would accrue."

In 1942 I tried again to get a little help from the Government. Since it appeared that I was so close to my goal, I felt that $5,000 would enable me to reach it. I therefore asked for that amount and promised to make my formula public at the completion of my research work so that all growers might have the benefit of it. I called the attention of the Department of Agriculture to two things: First, the fact that my special mixture had been used with complete success on 26 plant beds in 9 counties of this State; and

second, the fact that 3 teachers of botany had expressed the opinion that my theory was sound. These things should have weighed heavily in my favor. Furthermore the Governors of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, the Commissioners of Agriculture of North Carolina and Virginia, and many others had recommended that this assistance be given. Gov. J. M. Broughton and Maj. L. P. McLendon, of Greensboro, able members of the North Carolina bar, expressed the opinion that the Government grant to Luther Burbank "to promote agricultural experimentation is a precedent for Government aid in the promotion of experiments deemed to be of probable value to agriculture." However, this strong array of facts made no impression on the Department of Agriculture, and this application was likewise rejected. Why? There must be a reason. Can anyone tell me what it is?

A Federal grand jury in the Middle District Federal Court of this State engaged in conducting a Nation-wide investigation of the fertilizer industry made the startling charge on February 10, 1941, that collusion had existed between the fertilizer interests and State legislatures and State law enforcement officials, and the defendants admitted that this charge was true and paid fines amounting to over a quarter million dollars. Do the facts stated herein warrant the conclusion that the influence of the fertilizer interests extends beyond State legislatures—to other and higher branches of Government? If so, has this influence been powerful enough to prevent the doing of things that are undoubtedly in the public interest?

I asked for the investigation of the fertilizer industry, and the late Senator Borah helped me to get it. The evidence that I furnished helped to indict 102 fertilizer firms and individuals for practices that have been harmful to the farmers of the entire Nation. At the conclusion of this investigation, Mr. John W. Aiken, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, said this in open court: "He wanted it known that Mr. William G. Holman had cooperated fully with the Government in the preparation of the case before the grand jury and had assisted in every way possible during the presentation before the court." It is easy to see that this made me persona non grata to the fertilizer industry, but it should not have operated against me—as it seems to have done—when I tried to be of further service to my country.

Dr. Earl H. Hall has not only said that my thesis is physiologically as well as logically sound, he has also said that when I prove this to be the case "it will revolutionize the preparation and sale of commercial fertilizers wherever used and sold." It will do more than that, it will result in the enactment of a national fertilizer law that will protect the farmers of the Nation from further exploitation. This undertaking is, therefore, Nation-wide in its scope, and ought to be deserving of the helping hand of any man who wants to put a stop to the exploitation of the farmers.

WM. G. HOLMAN,
Greensboro, N. C.

Hon. Ulysses Samuel Guyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the passing of our distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable U. S. GUYER.

He was an able, affable, learned, and eloquent representative of that great western commonwealth that has sent so many worthy and distinguished sons to the Congress of the United States.

The first time I ever heard him speak he made a lasting impression on me. It was during the memorial services for his immediate predecessor, Hon. Edward C. Little. Mr. GUYER ran against Mr. Little for the nomination for Congress in the Republican primary in 1916, and out of 21,000 ballots cast, Mr. Little was nominated by 1 vote. He was elected that fall, came to Congress and served with distinction until his death in 1924. Mr. GUYER was elected to succeed him, and during the memorial services to Mr. Little on February 1, 1925, Mr. GUYER paid him the following eloquent, inspiring, and enlightening tribute, which I should like to appropriate and dedicate to the memory of Mr. GUYER himself as my farewell expression on the life and character of a valued and cherished friend.

It reads as follows:

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen of the House, my predecessor, Col. Edward C. Little, was born 3 years prior to the beginning of the Civil War. His lifetime embraced all the great and stirring crises of the past three-quarters of a century.

Drawn by the magnet of the western sea, his parents joined that endless caravan that swept toward the frontier just at the close of the Civil War. That colossal conflict had set in motion energies we did not suspect we possessed, and created giants in both armies that have challenged the admiration of all the world. Those mighty energies that filtered out of the wreck and stress of that war, like electricity generated by some huge dynamo, had to be diverted into some adequate and engrossing channel to absorb the shock of the restless and reckless spirits born of that tumult of elemental passions.

Fortunately, at that time we had the richest and greatest frontier on earth, and the brawny arms that contended in that mighty struggle were bared to the shoulder to fling back the frontier toward the western sunset. At that time bluegrass, the symbol and signal of civilization, had then only timidly invaded the valleys of the Kaw and Marais des Cygnes. The embers of Lawrence were hardly cold, and its hatred still glowed with white-hot rage, when Edward C. Little, then a lad of seven summers, came to live in the district which he afterward represented with signal distinction for nearly a decade.

The soil of that historic district was stained with the first blood that was sacrificed in the great conflict, when the scenes of that struggle were shifted from the forensic battles in these halls to the plains and primeval forests of virgin Kansas. As far as Kansas and that district were concerned, the issues of the war were decided before the thunders of Sumter had awakened the smoldering fires of 1861. The question of nationality was settled there long before the guns of Gettysburg had justified the faith of Washington and Hamilton, and of Webster and John Marshall, in the indissoluble integrity of the Federal Union. The names of Lawrence, Lecompton, and Osawatomie were on the lips of the Nation when Shiloh and Chickamauga slumbered in the repose of obscurity.

The father of Edward C. Little, himself a Union soldier, settled on the very soil made historic in that brutal border warfare, at the juncture and blending of the Oregon and the old Santa Fe trails—the two most historic and romantic trails that ever mapped the frontiers of the earth. And thus it was that Colonel Little, then a child, saw the pageantry of the plains. With his childish eyes he beheld that winding, white-crowned caravan, under the protection of whose panoply the embryo of an empire was borne out upon the Great Plains. With his boyish feet he walked upon that dusty path over which Anglo-Saxon genius staggered out onto the great American desert to build an unshackled civilization. Here in the twilight he saw the blue campfire smoke rise like the sky in solution, and heard the pæan of the prairies—the hymn of the plains:

"To the West! To the West! To the land of the free,
Where the mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea;
Where a man is a man if he's willing to toil,
And the humble may gather the fruit of the soil."

At that time Kansas City was a guard at the gates of the wilderness, a sentinel on the fringe of the desert. Wichita had not yet surprised the desert, nor Dodge invaded the wilderness. The great wheatfields of the Kansas of today were the habitat of countless buffalo and the hunting ground of the savage. While eastern Kansas wore the aspect of organized society, just over the horizon to the west was the virgin prairie sea.

To that frontier, besides the Kaw, came James Butler Hickock, better known in the unwritten epic of the prairies as "Wild Bill." He settled near the Little homestead. He was a Scotchman whose ancestors came to Vermont a century and a half ago and fought by the side of Ethan Allen. He had been a Union scout in the Civil War; and so soon after Appomattox there was not that cordial relation between those who wore the blue and those who wore the gray which exists today between the gentleman from Ohio, General Sherwood, and the gentleman from North Carolina, Major Stedman. His Missouri neighbors burned his habitation twice, when he decided that farming was not a congenial occupation. So, finally, in after years, he settled down to the gentle art of keeping the peace when Wichita, Abilene, Hays, and Dodge City were engaged in a contest to decide which was the toughest town on earth—each in its turn deserved the title.

Colonel Little wrote a number of historical sketches concerning frontier life on the border in Kansas. One of these sketches, written about 20 years ago, was entitled "A Son of the Border." It is a spirited recital of that great frontiersman's career, and illustrates the skill of Colonel Little as an author. Permit me to quote the closing paragraph:

"Homer sang Achilles into 30 centuries of renown. The deeds of many frontiersmen excel the Greek's. David did his own singing and came out with a great reputation. Yet I doubt not that the McKandlas gang would have made Goliath look like an amateur. Ivanhoe in his iron kettle with his long lance killing the neighbors for love of God and lady never surpassed the courage and sacrifice of Wild Bill and his comrades. But the dime novelist has been their biographer and cheap notoriety their reward. They deserve a statelier history and a sweeter requiem. With all their faults they were brave and gallant gentlemen and made it possible for quiet men to bring decent women and establish American homes on the plains and in the mountains. Wild Bill's adventures should have come to the knowledge of that fine old Scotchman who delighted in the blare of bugles, the clash of arms, and the tale of chivalry. Walter Scott would have made this great scout and peace officer a hero of romance and a prince of the border."

This demonstrates that Colonel Little was really a gifted writer, and had he confined his efforts to literature he would no doubt have achieved a high place in the literary world. He was a traveler of note. His activities took him to the ends of the earth—as consul general to Cairo, Egypt, in 1892; to the Philippine Islands in the Spanish-American War; and over the American Continent in later life. Had he reduced to writing his varied experiences and published his literary

endeavors, I have no doubt that he would have immortalized his name in the world of letters. And what lives longer than a book? A Kansas bard, "Ironquill," expressed that thought better than anyone else:

"With granite once a genius bridged a stream;
A builder once a rugged temple wrought;
On canvas once a painter fixed a thought;
A sculptor once in marble carved a dream;
A queen once built a tomb, and in the scheme
Of gold and bronze the quivering sunbeams caught;
Then came oblivion, unseen, unsought—
Contemptuous of thinker and of theme.

"And someone wrote a book. Palace and hall
Are gone. Marble and bronze are dust. The fanes
Are fallen which the sungold sought. The rook,
At morn, caws garrulously over all.
All! All are gone. The book alone remains.
Man builds no structure which outlives a book."

Colonel Little's literary efforts were not confined to prose, for in his earlier life he wrote much superior verse. At the University of Kansas he was a leader in Greek-letter circles, being a member of one of the Greek-letter fraternities, and one of his poems of college days celebrates the fraternal ties of those college orders.

"THE GREEKS

"O college days that speed on wing so strong,
O college joys that last not long, not long,
O college friends from whom we soon shall sever.
O college friendships made for aye and ever,
O dreams of youth so sweet, so frail, so fleeting,
'Neath touch of time and care so swift retreating—

"To you the goblets clink,
Greek pledged to Greek we drink;
Eternal be the link
That binds our hearts in one.
Long mystic flames shall dance
'Neath warm fraternal glance,
Till life's last set of sun.

"From where the sunshine glistens
On mantle fair of snow,
To where old Ætna listens
To sullen depths below;
From where the morn's fair fingers
Throw ope the gates of day,
To where the daylight lingers
No more on crested spray;
O'er man and stream and hillside,
O'er all the shadows fall;
But the sunlight softly lingers
Round the dear old chapter hall.

"Aside our foes we fling,
Greek pledged to Greek we sing,
Till wall and rafter ring,
'Nor time nor space shall sever.'
The sparkling wine we quaff,
At fate and hate we laugh,
God bless the Greeks forever!"

Traveling in old Mexico he found an old temple in ruins over whose moss-covered portal was written:

"Haec est Domus Dei
Et Porta Coeli."

From this suggestion he wrote a most beautiful poem, entitled "Domus et Porta," which I will here quote:

"With moss and ivy grown,
It marks the sacred stone,
Let it stand.
It was carved by men of old,
Who have long been still and cold,
'Neath Mexic sand.

"For, you see, it's my belief
That the Domus is a reef
In the sea;
That the Porta is a dream,
Like the lights I thought did gleam
Through to me.

"I long had hope and faith,
Yet my hope was just a wraith—
For the hour;
And my prayers have gone to seed,
As a withered, ragged weed
Without flower.

"Yet still I feel the need
Of Domus, port and creed,
And a friend;
For I've neither fear nor hope,
While I sadly, blindly grope
Toward the end.

"When sinners throng the aisle,
I see them read and smile
At the shrine.
But each carries in his heart,
In a secret place, apart,
That old line:

" 'This is the house of God,
This, where sinners' feet have trod
O'er the floor,
And praise Him, 'tis Heaven's Gate,
Oh, weak one, be not too late,
At the door.'

"Though I do not enter in,
I dislike the scoffer's grin
At the scroll.
For perhaps the priest was right,
With his home and gate, so trite,
For a goal.

"Nor you nor I should sneer
At what is written here
In ancient bookish tongue.
Who knows, not I nor you,
If perchance the tale be true
That priest and martyr sung?

"What is graven on the stone,
Let us leave it, lads, alone
With its dead.
It, on souls that toil and grieve,
If they only can believe,
Hope doth shed.

"Once there came a learned priest,
Holy man from Spanish east—
With all uncovered head
Bore the cross of Christ as far
Through the smoke and flame of war,
As Cortez dared to tread.

"Laughed at famine, laughed in scorn,
At the fears from danger born,
His garments gray,
Led the boldest in the fight—
To armed soldier, plumed knight
Showed the way.

"He might have broken lances under beauty's witching glances,
Where, on an army's banners, the laughing sunshine dances,
O'er the plain.
He might have been the counselor of Castile's proudest king,
Or won the cloak of cardinal where ten thousand anthems ring,
In distant Spain.

"But he chose the sacred service
Of the Child of Nazareth,
Risked for Him his manhood's prime,
Poverty and death.
Here he built the great cathedral,
This his tomb:
His princely soul was crowned here—
Beyond the gate there's room.

"Here he rests, his task is done,
Here he lies, his peace is won;
Let him rest.
Who knows but 'tis of God's own,
And he's close beside the throne,
A welcome guest?

"Then bow low your Saxon head,
Softly speak and lightly tread,
'Neath words so grand.
To carve the line that stands above,
He gave up life and fame and love.
He believed it—let it stand.

"Haec est Domus Dei:
This is the House of God;
Et Porta Coeli:
This the gate His martyrs trod."

I am sure that all will agree that this poem displays no ordinary poetic gift. I regret that time does not permit me to speak of his gift of oratory, but Members of the House are familiar with that. Few men have had such a wide diversity of talent, and few have excelled in such varied lines. He was diplomat, poet, orator, soldier, lawyer, and statesman—preeminent in all. He drained life's brimming cup to its dregs in living his great and purposeful career, and is now gone to join that vast majority where the question of quorum is never raised.

Colonel Little had his faults, "Even as you and I," but his friends wrote them on the shifting, inconstant sands, where the forgiveness of wind and wave has washed them all away. He always retained something of the brutal frankness of the frontier, something of the brusqueness of the old border; softened only slightly by university training and masked but thinly by a highly cultivated mind. This abruptness of manner often withheld from him the credit that was due. Here in Congress he raveled out his life like a prodigal spendthrift in the service of his country, which a none too grateful Republic may never properly appreciate.

No eulogy of Colonel Little would be complete without a parenthesis including the heroic devotion of Edna Steele Little, the partner of all his triumphs, the comrade of his struggles, and the colleague of his labors. He has left to her and their son the priceless heritage of a good name and the record of a life full of devotion to his country, his family, and his friends.

What a pitiable little span is human life. When viewed from its troubled surface, what a strange and pathetic tragedy. Yesterday, the warm, sweet current of life; today, still in the chill of death. Yesterday, the thrill of preeminence and superiority; today, the democratic equality of the dust. For death, like love, levels all rank. There is no caste in the dominion of the sepulcher. Death is the universal decree. The earth itself is but one vast mausoleum. We touch it not without desecrating a myriad sepulcher. The very rocks that wall us in are but the archives of life that throbbed in long-forgotten ages. All that lives must die.

"The hand of the king that the scepter hath borne,
The brow of the priest that the miter hath worn.
The eye of the sage and the heart of the brave,
Are hidden at last in the depths of the grave."

But it is said that there is no life without death and that in nature death is the phophecy of life.

"Plato, thou reasonest well!
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?"

Bryant says of the migratory bird:

"There is a power whose care
Teaches thy way along that pathless coast—
The desert and illimitable air—
Lone wondering, but not lost."

* * * * *

"He who from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright."

The bird that sunward guides its flight does not know that eternal summer smiles beneath the tropic sun, but when the bird arrives there the summer is. The instinct with which we cling to life and which inheres in us is like the cosmic urge of the bird, and Nature does not deceive her children.

I know of no better manner of closing this faltering eulogy of your friend and mine than by quoting a little poem by that great dramatic critic, the late William Winter. Several years ago Mr. Winter was very ill and close to the gates of death. After his recovery he wrote this little poem, and in my humble opinion no sweeter honey of its kind has dripped from the hive of genius since Tennyson wrote The Crossing of the Bar. In the calm philosophy of Him who walked by the tideless sea I can well imagine Colonel Little facing death echoing the thought of William Winter as expressed in this little poem:

"One other bitter drop to drink,
And then—no more!
One little pause upon the brink,
And then—go o'er!
One sigh—and then the lib'rant morn
Of perfect day,
When my free spirit, newly born,
Shall soar away!

"One pang—and I shall rend the thrall
Where grief abides,
And generous death shall show me all
That now he hides;
And, lucid in that second birth,
I shall discern
What all the sages of the earth
Have died to learn.

"One motion—and the stream is crost,
So dark, so deep!
And I shall triumph, or be lost
In endless sleep.
Then onward, whatsoe'er my fate,
I shall not care!
Nor sin nor sorrow, love nor hate
Can touch me there."

And, finally, if I were to mark his last resting place out there beneath the sod of the prairies he loved so well, I would mark it as another great Kansan's grave is marked—with a granite boulder inscribed with a classic from his own pen.

Upon that rugged boulder I would let Colonel Little write his own epitaph, a stanza from his poem which I have just quoted:

"Here he rests, his task is done,
Here he lies, his peace is won;
Let him rest.
Who knows but 'tis of God's own
And he's close beside the throne,
A welcome guest?"

Address of Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, Before the Drug, Chemical, and Allied Trades Section of the New York Board of Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on March 12, 1942, at the annual banquet of the drug, chemical, and allied trades section of the New York Board of Trade.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America today is in danger. The boa constrictor-like coils of tyrannical dictators are closing tighter and tighter around the globe and around us. Sinister devilish forces have set out to conquer the earth. We are the chief obstacle in their path. Except they conquer us, they cannot succeed. If they conquer us, the world will be theirs. Between us and them stand heroic, mighty nations, brave, stalwart peoples who have given the world a glorious example of fortitude and fighting. But closer and closer to us have stretched the tentacles of these mighty octopuses. They have been scooping the ships almost from our shores. Our own soil has felt the sting of their strike.

These vicious foes are bent upon no halfway measures. It is with them, as it is with us—conquer or die. We shall utterly break their backs, or they shall break ours. This is a battle to the death. And long ago we entered into this contest with the spirit of those words:

"Lay on, Macduff;
And damn'd be him that first cries, 'Hold, enough!' "

They have thrown all into the battle—materials, money, morals, decency, men, women, and children. Nothing have they held back for the morrow, or the next year, or the next decade, or for peace.

They have been long getting ready, again holding back nothing in their preparation—thinking, working, spending, planning, living for naught but war—total war.

Theirs is a warrior's tradition; in one case to die a warrior is to go to heaven; in another case to live as a warrior is to have heaven on earth. Can we stand up against such foes? If so, how? Can we do it by quarreling among ourselves? Can we do it by members of the press, Members of Congress, and members of the country yapping at the heels of the President? Can we do it merely by slight inconvenience? Can we do it just by small sacrifices? Can we do it with business merely as usual? Can we do it and haggle over contracts? Can we do it and let businessmen fight for profits? Workers battle for wages? And farmers struggle for prices? While Members of Congress labor for reelection? Can we do it and not offend anybody in our own country? Can we do it and leave everybody as well off as he now is? Can we do it and not get mad? Can we do it without somebody, President or Congress, having the guts to tell the people of this country what they have got to do as their part and their place in winning this war, and seeing to it that they do it?

From the throats of the aroused millions of this Nation pour a torrent of noes. Assuming that we had the same weapons that the dictators have got, the difference between them and us is the difference between a fighting team on edge ready to give everything they have got to win and another team composed of a bunch of fine fellows but without the will to win at any cost. There are still too many similarities between this country and poor France. We have got countless noble, gallant spirits, but the Nation as a whole has not yet developed a fighting heart.

What is the trouble? It is not just one thing. It is many things. It is not just one person. It is millions of people who are responsible—to a degree all of us. We have been bred up on a tradition of isolation which has sapped our vitality. The red blood has been drained too much out of us as a Nation. Naturally, being a nation of peace, hating war, we have not prepared for it.

We have lost our resilience. We do not bounce even the way we did in the World War. We either do not seem to know what we are fighting for, or do not believe what they tell us, or do not care.

We have not yet convinced the average man that for us to win this war means he will have a better chance in life, a better job, a better house, more recreation, more security, that his children will get a better education and come nearer to reaching the high destiny of man. If the average workman felt that that was the stake, you could not make him strike. If the manufacturer felt that for us to win this war meant a better world, better trade, wider horizons, greater opportunity, he would not bother about profits. If the farmer really felt that for us to win this war means to open for him the windows of a new life, that all the dark shadows of his narrow horizons would melt before the golden rays of a new sun, he would not care so much about parity or prices. If politicians felt that victory for us meant the crest of a mighty mountain for the race of man, and beyond immeasurably green pastures of the promised land, he would not so much care who won the next election.

If we all were leaders consumed by our determination to enjoy the permanent blessings of liberty and freedom, who would count the cost of what we should give up in a few brief years? Who quarrels about the night when he knows that it is but a shadow across the fiery dawn?

America, wake up! The sand is running out in the glass. America, wake up! That is your destiny which is sinking. Wake up, America! That is your future which is dying. It is not some of us that there is something wrong with—it is all of us. It is the duty of all of us to right ourselves. All those who love democracy will today think not of enjoying democracy, but of saving democracy. The people of the United States are listening for the strong voice of another Andrew Jackson who commands them to their places—every man and woman to a place—tense, and determined to charge as one the enemy, swearing before their children and their God to gain liberty, or death.

Address of Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at Official Inspection of the Synthetic Rubber Plants at Institute, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the official inspection of the synthetic rubber plants at Institute, W. Va.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corporation and United States Rubber Co. have done a good job here at Institute, W. Va., as many others are doing in the 40 plants throughout the country in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

The first unit of this butadiene plant, which uses grain alcohol as a raw material,

was contracted for August 1941, and was one of the first in the rubber program. Its capacity was multiplied after Pearl Harbor. I am advised that the process is the result of many years of research and development by Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corporation here at Charleston.

There has never been any doubt in the mind of the President nor of industry but that we could produce synthetic rubber in large quantities within a reasonable time. I have shared this view.

When the question of synthetic rubber was first discussed in the latter part of 1940 and early 1941, it was the consensus of industry that plant facilities to meet all essential purposes could be built in less than 2 years if it should become necessary. This is being accomplished, notwithstanding that men and materials to build synthetic rubber plants have also been required for other important war activities.

The President's Rubber Survey Committee stated in its report September 1942, that, normally to develop an industry as large as this would require a dozen years, and to compress it into less than 2 years would be an almost superhuman task. I am glad to say that the task is being accomplished in less than 2 years; just as we are doing many other things necessary to the war effort in a surprisingly short time. Our country is equal to any task and any emergency, and I take pleasure in commending everyone who has part in the synthetic rubber program, as well as every other phase of our war effort.

Within a month following Pearl Harbor, the President, at my suggestion, approved a construction program for the manufacture of 400,000 tons of synthetic rubber annually, at an estimated cost of $400,000,000. After the fall of Singapore and the loss of the Dutch East Indies, the program, with his approval, was increased to 900,000 tons.

The synthetic rubber program is going forward as originally planned. The Rubber Director, Rubber Reserve Company, Defense Plant Corporation, and others connected with the development of this industry are doing an excellent job. I cannot speak too highly of William Jeffers' devotion to his responsibilities and his determination that construction of these facilities be carried through with all possible dispatch.

While fortunately we had accumulated a very large reserve supply of natural rubber, starting in July 1940, it has been necessary to conserve its use, just as we are having to ration and conserve many other things to which we are accustomed.

The demands of war are drastic, but we will be well repaid for all sacrifices and temporary inconveniences if we make certain that our fighting men have the weapons and supplies they must have to win the war.

I have a letter from President Roosevelt, which I will read to you:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 11, 1943.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have never had any doubt but that we could successfully manufacture synthetic rubber in any reasonable quantities if it became necessary, and I am glad to see the production getting under way.

I am advised that the plant you are inspecting at Institute, W. Va., today, is but 1 of 40 throughout the country that will be completed during the year. The establishment of an industry of this magnitude, in so short a period, is in full keeping with the tradition of our people in meeting any mergency.

All who have part in the manufacture of synthetic rubber have just cause to feel they are making a real contribution to the war effort.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Care of Children of Mothers Employed in War Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 12 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I request that the text of a statement made by Mr. William F. Montavon, director of the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, on June 8, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This statement was made with respect to Senate bill 1130, introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], which provides for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The administrative board of archbishops and bishops of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has among its functions that of coordinating and promoting social service and educational service by the Catholic people of the United States. This board has a profound and conscientious interest in the legislative proposals before this committee at this time.

These bills, through Federal grants-in-aid to the States and through the cooperation of Federal agencies with corresponding State agencies, seek to provide adequate care for children whose mothers are employed in industry and, in this way, "assure the availability of women for employment, where essential to the prosecution of the war."

As stated, the purpose of the bill is to provide day care, not for the children of mothers now employed in war industry, but for children of mothers who, by being spared the obligation of caring for their own children, may in this manner have their availability for employment assured, where their employment is essential to the prosecution of the war.

I find in the bill no definition or other procedure that is to be adhered to in determining in any specific case whether or not the employment of a mother is essential to the prosecution of the war. In its present form the bill seems not to compel any mother to enter employment. It seeks only to assure the availability of mothers for employment. It would make it difficult for the mother to plead the care of her infant children as a reason for not entering industrial employment. It seems to place the unemployed mother in an embarrassing position.

The induction and enlistment of great numbers of men and women into the armed forces and auxiliary services have depleted the manpower available for industrial employment precisely at a time when the vast expansion of industry requires the service of many thousands of additional employees.

The employment of mothers has been inevitable in some industries. In great numbers women have made themselves available by their voluntary action. They have found a means to provide for the care of their children through relatives and neighbors or through neighborhood facilities improvised for this purpose. The need for a Nation-wide program, financed in great part by the Federal Government, is not supported by any statement embodied in the bill.

The War Manpower Commission, entrusted with the high responsibility of administering available manpower, with true wisdom has promulgated, as a national policy, the principle that mothers of young children are not to be encouraged to seek industrial employment. In some instances it has not been practical to hold rigidly to this policy.

Whether or not there exists in the United States today a scarcity of manpower so acute as to justify the employment of mothers in great numbers is debatable.

Whether or not to refuse to employ a woman for no reason other than motherhood would be unfair discrimination may be debatable.

There is no room, however, for debate of the proposition that national interest is served best when the mother and the child remain in the home together.

There is no substitute for the mother or for the home in the life of the child.

Today we have to face a condition which seems to be unavoidable. Mothers of young children are employed in industry and children, as a consequence, are deprived of mother's care in the home.

That condition is a product of war.

The bill before this committee recognizes the fact that war results in a temporary, abnormal condition which will end with the termination of the present war. The bill provides wisely, therefore, that Federal appropriations for State plans for day care and extended school services will cease at the termination of the war. Experience with similar legislation in the past offers little assurance that this statement of policy will be adhered to.

Under the bill the Federal Government would provide substantial financial aid to State governments for services of two distinct kinds to children of working mothers in war areas:

Day care and extended school service.

Day care will be available, it appears, for all children from the cradle to the age of 16.

Extended school services would be available for all children from age 2 to 16.

That the care of the child and the direction of the child's education is the direct responsibility of the child's parents is sound Christian principle. That principle is in complete accord with our national institutions and traditions.

For Government to undertake, as it would under this legislation, to substitute official institutions, agencies, and personnel for the parents and the homes as instrumentalities through which day care and extended school services are to be provided for great numbers of children, would be hard to justify even in a national emergency. The problem which this bill would solve affects the intimate relationships of home and family life and calls for closest scrutiny, and careful examination and demands that adequate practical provisions be made to safeguard these relationships and to protect the enduring interest and welfare of the child.

As our cultural institutions have evolved, when, for any reason, a family is unable to discharge its full responsibility to the child, not the State primarily, but associations of a voluntary character, democratic in form and procedure, social, religious, cooperative in nature, are at hand to strengthen and uphold the distressed family. These voluntary agencies are an admirable product of our popular tradition and find in our political institutions the liberty and encouragement necessary for their successful operation. They are a true manifestation and expression of our American way.

Whatever duty government has in this field, that duty primarily is to uphold and strengthen the family using, in every way practical, these voluntary agencies and associations developed for that purpose.

Only where the family and the nonprofit voluntary agency, with proper aid and encouragement, are unable to meet the situation like that envisioned in this legislation, should government as such and directly undertake to substitute for the home and the family a public agency to provide for the care and training of the child.

An emergency period like the present is not a proper time for experimentation in the field of child care affecting the family and home life.

The problem of children deprived of home care because of the employment of mothers in war and defense industries long has been looked upon as entailing a Federal responsibility. Programs of child care have been developed locally in war areas under the Lanham Act. These programs are expanding.

The Lanham Act respects the principle that government's first entrance should be in the form of aid to agencies, to private agencies as well as to public agencies, already existing.

Until this method of meeting the problem of child care has been effectively and finally demonstrated to be inadequate, the final step of government care should not be taken.

The Lanham Act provides for Federal appropriations and authorizes grants and contributions on equal terms to every eligible agency, private or public, and under the Lanham Act the grant or contribution is paid directly to the operating agency under a contract.

These bills would authorize an appropriation and the making of grants-in-aid to eligible States "for expenditure in accordance with State plans, submitted and approved as provided in this act."

The State plan for day-care services must be submitted by the State public-welfare agency. Under it day-care services must be administered by or through public agencies, other than school systems. Services may be rendered by public or nonprofit private community agencies other than school systems. I emphasize the word "may" be rendered.

The plan for extended school services must be submitted by the State educational agency. The services must be administered by or through the public-school system but may be rendered or conducted by public or nonprofit private-school systems.

Both plans must provide for effective utilization of appropriate facilities and services of State agencies for administrative, advisory, and supervisory services, and of appropriate facilities and services of local public and nonprofit private agencies. Nonprofit private agencies may be paid on a per diem, per capita basis under agreements approved by the State agency.

The day-care plan is to be approved by the Chief of the Children's Bureau. The extended-school-services plan must be approved by the United States Commissioner of Education. Approving officers have authority to promulgate regulations.

We are of the opinion that these provisions, in their present form, do not assert clearly nor protect adequately the right of parents to care for their child and to direct the education of their child.

To be contrasted with these provisions of S. 1130 are the following provisions of the Lanham Act:

The Lanham Act provides for "defense public works." It defines the words "public works" as meaning, among other things, "schools, hospitals, and other places for the care of the sick, recreational facilities," and provides: "The Federal Works Administration is authorized" (sec. 202):

"(c) To make loans or grants, or both, to public and private agencies for public works and equipment therefor, and to make contributions to public or private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works, upon such terms and in such amounts as the Administrator may consider to be in the public interest. As used in this paragraph, the term 'private agency' means any private agency no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual."

"Section 208:

"(b) No department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended pursuant to this title, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this title relating to any lease, grant, loan, or contribution made under this title to or on behalf of any such school, prescribe or affect its administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials for instruction.

"(c) No department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any hospital or other place for the care of the sick (which is not owned by and operated by the United States) with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended under this title relating to, or any lease, grant, loan, or contribution made under this title. Nor shall any terms or condition of any agreement under this title to or on behalf of any such hospital or place, prescribe or affect its administration, personnel, or operation."

The Lanham Act provides for a simple program, obviously temporary in character, designed specifically to assist local communities in meeting the needs forced upon them by the war emergency.

In this law the Congress wisely adhered to the fundamental principle that the Federal Government should respect the autonomy of the local community in working out this problem on the local level.

The Lanham Act further clearly provides that public and nonprofit private agencies already engaged in the care and custody of children stand in a position of complete equality with respect to meeting the needs and providing services.

We respectfully recommend that before any favorable action be taken by this committee looking to the enactment of these bills that the bill be amended so that existing nonprofit private agencies continue to be accorded a status of equality and be not placed in an inferior or secondary position, and that these voluntary nonprofit private agencies be encouraged to continue rendering their services to the community.

This objective, we submit, can be obtained by making the following amendments to Senate bill 1130:

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

1. Page 2, section 2, line 5, after the words "public authorities", insert the words "or nonprofit private agencies."

2. Page 2, section 3 (a), line 25, before the words "School systems", insert the word "public." This amendment would make it possible for parochial school systems to render welfare services in parochial schools.

3. Page 4, section 4 (b) (2), line 13, after words "supervisory services", insert a semicolon; strike the word "and"; immediately following the semicolon and instead of the word "and" insert the number "(3)"; and after the number "(3)", insert the words "provide for the effective utilization." In line 16, after the semicolon, insert parentheses before the word "such", and close the parenthesis after the semicolon after the word "plan."

4. In line 23 (3) becomes (4) and all subsection paragraphs are numbered accordingly.

5. Page 8, section 7, line 17, after the words "public authorities" and within the parentheses, insert the words "or nonprofit private agencies." In line 24, insert the words "or nonprofit private agencies" after the words "public authorities" within the parentheses.

6. Page 9, line 1, strike the word "public" from the title of section 8. On line 6, after the words "public authorities", insert "or nonprofit private agencies" and in line 10 idem.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I sum up briefly?

In our American tradition and under our laws the local community does not function through political government alone. It functions through nongovernmental agencies, too—religious, charitable, fraternal, educational, philanthropic—and seeks to maintain proper equilibrium in a spirit of cooperation among all these agencies.

In this manner, private initiative, a quality which characterizes, invigorates, and gives form to the American concept of democracy, is preserved.

Voluntary associations, the chosen agents of the family, whenever necessary, have been organized to meet the social needs of the local community.

This is the true democratic and American way of dealing with community problems.

Government should not disturb these traditional procedures unnecessarily; every effort on the contrary should be made to adhere to and encourage this procedure especially in meeting the child-care problems which communities affected by the war effort are now obliged to face.

Flag Day Address of Hon. James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by me this morning in the auditorium of the Department of Labor under the auspices of the United States Department of Labor Post, No. 42, the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a fitting thing that we should pause here on this, the one hundred and sixty-sixth anniversary of the American flag, to pay homage to that flag and the principles which it symbolizes, for throughout the length and breadth of the world, a terrible wave of aggression is spending its mighty force in a determined drive to destroy those principles for which we stand, and to cast down our flag and trample it into the mire of defeat and derision.

Yes, this very flag, itself born of that noble and determined struggle which was the Revolution, stands imperiled at this very hour. This flag has always moved in the vanguard of those unconquerable legions of freemen who secured the rights of liberty and justice for all men in defiance of the oppressor and the sword. As these stars and these stripes were born in revolution, so, too, has this flag, symbol of eternal union, endured all those storms of doubt and dissidence which have broken on the rocks of this enduring citadel of freedom. Through the mortal pain which was 1812, with the conqueror bivouaced in this our own Capital City, the flag did not falter. Through the hell and fury which was civil war, with this Union of sovereign States threatened by an eternal schism of enmity,

this flag prevailed. In every crisis, foreign or domestic, that has risen up to vex this Nation, this flag and the principles which it symbolizes have always emerged with a newer, more compelling strength.

But all has not been crisis, war, and emergency where this flag has flown. In the years of peace and progress—of which these hours of strife and turmoil were but the more tragic, more activating interruptions—this flag and its people built up a great and enduring civilization. There was established here on this continent and in allegiance to this flag, a political and economic order which was new to the minds of men. Here no altars were raised to almighty kings, here no monarch sat upon exalted throne, here no tyrant rose up to dominate the land. Here, for the first time in the modern age, men—all men—were commissioned to govern themselves. Here in the very shadows of this flag, the most inspiring of all governmental documents, the Constitution of the United States, was inscribed—to establish a government where those who govern derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, where every man is endowed with certain unalienable rights, and where there is a government of laws and not of men.

Here also was born that economic system which has come to be known as the system of free enterprise—whereunder each man is entitled and encouraged to progress to the limits of his capacity; where ingenuity, ability and initiative are given full recognition and incentive, free from the stifling hand of governmental constraint and interference.

The inception of these systems of economic and political freedom marked a new era in the history of man, for they extended to all men an opportunity and a destiny which they had never before beheld. And it was here in these very circumstances that the right and majesty of freemen was forever vindicated—for never in all the history of the world has any people ever achieved so much in so short a time: Vast tracts of land, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Dominion of Canada, were reclaimed, populated, and developed. Natural resources were tapped, harnessed, and dug from out of the earth. Great and divers industries were created, their vast plants pouring forth the products of the age. Teeming cities, housing thousands upon thousands of people, came forth with amazing rapidity in every quarter of the land. Ribbons of steel and concrete were stretched across the country, and transportation became almost as rapid as the light of day. Yes, this land, America, following after the principles which this flag symbolizes, became at once the power and splendor of the world.

And this growth continues at the present hour. The standards of living attained by the people of this Nation continue to improve; the productivity and skill of our workers continue to increase; the industrial exploits and achievements of our productive genius continue to develop. And all these factors will continue to advance as long as our flag remains unsullied and as long as enterprise in America remains free.

But the growth which has come to America has not all been materialistic. Here, under the shadow of the flag, those freedoms of religion, speech, and press have brought advancements of quite another kind to our people. Over the years, America has become a haven for the troubled and the oppressed. Here all faiths are equally secure. Throughout the country, churches, representing virtually every religious denomination, can be found offering worship and sanctuary to God's people. Here the spirit of inquiry, encouraged by those two bulwarks of constitutional government—freedom of speech and freedom of press—have raised the standards of education in America to heights unrivaled by any other modern nation. And our enlightened public organs, unfettered by governmental restriction and control, have made and kept our people the most fully informed and competent people that the world has ever known.

It is such a nation as this, then, that is represented by the flag which we honor here today. It is such a nation as this, that must now call upon the combined strength of all its people to repel the challenge of those who would conquer and enslave the world. This scourge of aggression and tyranny which has twice been unloosed upon the world in less than a quarter century, now holds vast portions of the earth and countless millions of its people in its callous, galling grip of death. Twice in a quarter century, this flag and the men and women who support it have been called upon to redeem the world and repel the aggressor.

So it is that our flag will once again move across the earth. But it will move not as the symbol of slavery and servitude which identifies the swastika, nor yet as heralding the dawn of the day of eternal darkness as does the banner of the rising sun. The American flag will move across the world tolling out the liberation and the majesty of all men. It will proceed in power and in purpose as it has always done to strike down the tyrant and the usurper, and to restore the vanquished and the betrayed. In all the expanse of the world there is no flag more honored, and more esteemed than this, the American flag—for it bears legend to all men that in every recess where this flag is flown, right, justice, and human decency prevail. All freedom-loving, all right-thinking men the world over pay homage to this flag which stands today as an unfailing beacon of deliverance to a troubled and tormented world.

This flag will again fly over embattled Bataan, over conquered Manila, over bleeding Guam, and over restive Kiska. This flag will fly again over every inch of soil that is American; and no force, no power will ever say it nay. Those gallant men, living and dead, who carried this flag into battle shall see its every bastion restored and its every desecration avenged. This flag now flies in all the ramparts of the world—in Tunisia, in New Guinea, in Palestine, on Midway—and it flies there as a symbol of impending doom for the faltering Axis and all that it entails.

Those brave American men under arms, and those gallant, tireless Americans who labor long hours at home to produce the implements of war, working together in unshakable resolve and unity, shall be the means of carrying this flag on to ultimate, complete, and final victory. Indeed the day is not far distant when our troops shall be quartered and this flag shall be raised in those rotten cores of Axis debauchery—Rome, Tokyo, and Berlin. That shall be a day of deep thanksgiving for the world, for it shall make clear to all men that the principles of right, justice, and eternal progress which are woven into this flag are once again restored to all peoples of the earth.

But when this war is over, this flag should not remain long in foreign lands, for this is no flag of conquest, of imperialism, or plunder. This is a flag of peace, of freedom, and of equality among men. We should not use this flag as a means of ruling or administering the world. We should not permit this flag to become an instrument of international intrigue, no matter in what form such intrigue may be presented. This flag shall always represent us and the principles for which we stand. This flag shall always stand as the living example of just and righteous conduct to all the other nations of the world. They who revere this flag and the principles which it embodies, shall receive every encouragement from us in their struggle to attain unto our standards and our principles. But never should we use this flag as an instrument to dominate, compel, or remake the world. For if ever that course should be resorted to, the luster of this flag shall be forever lost.

And as this flag should never be used in conquest, so, too, should it never be abandoned for any other flag—no matter by what name or what description it may be called. The American people shall always remain free, sovereign, and independent. And they should never proclaim allegiance to any other flag. Down all the years of our history this flag and its principles have served us faithfully and well. The American people ought never to place any other flag before this. And may it ever be, down through all the centuries of our time, that when men inquire after our flag they will always be met with this same, this stirring answer: "'Tis the Star-Spangled Banner and long will it wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Flag Day Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent address delivered by the Hon. James A. Farley at the Flag Day exercises under the auspices of Meriden Lodge, No. 35, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Meriden, Conn., yesterday afternoon, June 13.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To add an occasion like this to the list of pleasant experiences I have enjoyed in my long and happy relationship with the people of Connecticut lends deep pleasure to my visit here today. Not infrequent as the vehicle of our mutual interest has been the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, who so kindly invited me to this present ceremony. As an Elk for over 30 years, I find a rich background of happy associations makes each renewal more pleasant than the last. And the prospect of again meeting with my many friends in the city of Meriden, with its 40,000 patriotic, industrious, war-working citizens, is an adequate invitation in itself. One cannot be active in political life without acquiring a supply of friends and acquaintances from Meriden, Conn. When one is desirous of knowing in what part of Connecticut its Governor and Senators reside, one can take a guess on Meriden and be right more often than not. Such is Meriden's contribution to the political life of Connecticut. This town has been a sparkplug of patriotic and political energy throughout the history of the State. Even today both your United States Senators, the Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY, and the Honorable JOHN A. DANAHER, are Meriden contributions. While they are in Washington helping in the plan of action, you people back home are fulfilling those plans in admirable fashion in the busy factories that crowd this community. So, if the

people of Meriden come together for a public dedication of the flag of their country, it is no empty gesture. No more fitting sponsorship could be given our national colors. I appreciate the honor you confer in asking me here today.

The dedication of an American flag in time of war is different from a similar ceremony in time of peace. In years past the dedication of an American flag has often been an occasion for social exhilaration and political oratory. We have all participated in what might be called this patriotic presumption.

But today we are at war. We are fighting it out on the battlefield with our enemy—fighting to make certain that we shall not live out our lives in the dark shadows of his flag but that our own shall forever fly above us in unbroken symbolism of the courage, the honor, the liberty, the opportunity, and the progress that have been America. It is under these circumstances, with a necessary degree of solemn restraint, that we must gather today.

We all thrill with pride at the splendid accomplishments of our armed forces in every theater of war, and every thoughtful and patriotic American must give all assistance possible to the Commander in Chief in our war effort to the end that this terrible conflict can be brought to a close at the earliest possible date.

In these times we cannot dedicate this sacred flag with trite or superficial reference to its meaning. Such a ceremony would be a mockery and our gesture would be better left undone. On this occasion each of us whose heart is genuinely gripped with pride and love for the flag we here display will find his mind filled with sober concern for the preservation of those values it has signalized for more than a century and a half.

We earnestly hope for their preservation, but hope is not enough. The flood of complex problems yet to be faced and the presence in our society of forces which feel that the solution of those problems is flatly incompatible with our constitutional guaranties may yet combine to impose upon our countrymen a test of moral valor more exacting even than the strenuous test of physical valor which we will have just succeeded in meeting with honor.

In such event, as throughout our glorious history, New England and Connecticut will be a prodigious source of that moral stamina that has made and, we trust, will continue to make America America. It was Connecticut, as you must know, that gave birth to the first constitution of an autonomous government ever adopted, when in 1639, your forebears made the so-called Fundamental Orders the basic law of this colony. Today Connecticut, still known as the Constitution State, is contributing more than its share to the struggle to keep the fundamental order of the world. The manufacture of firearms in this country had its beginning in this State. If all Americans can feel proud that this Nation is called the arsenal of democracy, the people of this State have the added commendation that Connecticut has long been recognized as the arsenal of the Nation.

I am told that it is this very spot upon which Connecticut's volunteers were trained and from which they left to join Washington's crusade that won us our liberty.

Let us dedicate this flag today with a humble prayer that from this spot volunteers will always be willing to march forth on behalf of that liberty and on behalf of the free enterprise that grew from it.

Modern history shows that the stifling of freedom of enterprise is a sure approach to the denial of the freedom of persons. Connecticut's interest in the defense of personal freedom is combined with a strong interest in free enterprise, for here you have built a great system of insurance, an industry that is a main artery at the heart of our economic system.

We are all eager to improve the lot of the American worker and to raise the standard of living of Americans generally. It happens to be the weakness of human nature that employees have not been able to obtain their just share of production except through organization. This is not to be lamented. As practical men we should welcome labor organizations as a contribution to a better society. Those persons or groups in this country who refuse to accept organized labor as an established part of our society are doing their fellow citizens a disservice and giving aid and assistance to those who would like to see the entire labor movement under the control of persons who would use it to affect our form of government. Let us be thankful that there are true American labor leaders in our midst who are willing and able to mold the efforts of our workers into that priceless ingredient of a perfect society that can come from labor alone. And let our educational system adjust itself to provide for the preparation of sound labor leadership in the years to come.

America need have no fear of its future if such simple, fundamental concepts are kept in mind. In this connection one cannot fail to notice the uneasiness and concern felt in many quarters over our alliance with Russia. It is contended that certain sections of American labor, as well as various political operators, are under the control of that ally, and interested in subverting the American system.

We should face this situation realistically. We should not hesitate to discuss these fears openly. For my part I do not think it becomes an American to fear that his country is incapable of protecting its interests when dealing with a foreign power, enemy or ally. America cannot, in charity or justice, reject the hand of friendship from any sister state. Indeed, the course of recent history makes the fullest collaboration with Russia a matter of compulsion. Our primary consideration must be the obliteration of the ruthless will to world conquest born of our enemy. That is the first prerequisite to the restoration of world order and peace.

Having accomplished that, we will find little dissent, I am sure, from the persuasion that some minimum arrangement must be made to prevent aggression in the future. It seems unfair to call such a minimum arrangement policing the world. History seems to teach that Europe's war becomes our war. If our military might is to continue to be obligated to put down aggression once indulged, who can logically forbid the threat of its use to prevent aggression prior to the fact?

This is little to ask in the name of our men who are dying in increasing number in the struggle, and indeed if it is not asked they must be said to die in vain. Such an arrangement does not compromise our souls or our way of life, but is a necessary consideration for similar obligations on the part of our allies. Russia will be one of those obligated. And by this simple device both those who have faith in, and those who have fear of, the ultimate aims of our Russion ally should be equally pleased.

It will, with justification, be alleged that this does not remove the internal danger. However, I am sure no group that is alien to our ideals can succeed within our midst without the cooperation, tacit or otherwise, of our own Government. So long as our Government remains subject to the will of the people at the ballot box we can be sure that there can be no such cooperation, for the mass of the American people are sound at heart and pure of motive and hold our constitutional system as precious as did our forefathers who founded it.

With this so-called menace, from without and within removed by the logical course of events, what remains hostile to us except an idea? And since when has America feared an idea? We Americans, without concession, will meet the competition of any new idea or old idea, with complete confidence in the superiority of free enterprise. In such a a spirit, whatever differences exist between nations can disappear in a peaceable solution, and men of courage will lead us to an era of greater accomplishment and prosperity.

We have a right to consider our flag a symbol of prosperity for it is this beautiful land and our great and free Government that have produced a more abundant material wealth for a larger number of persons than has ever before been accomplished by man. Americans in all 48 States, sound, honest, and patriotic Americans are proud of this record. They believe that it can be resumed after peace is restored to the world, and they are determined that their Government shall not inhibit it by the pursuit of policies inimical to that tradition.

There must be no synthetic conflict between political democracy and so-called economic democracy. These are not merely compatible, they are mutually complementary. The more political democracy given to the American worker, the more able will he be to guarantee his own economic rights. Indeed if he should offer up his political rights upon the altar of so-called economic democracy, he is at once bereft of the means to guarantee the latter, and he will one day rise only to find they are both a matter of past history.

If history proves nothing else, all will agree upon the one lesson that society never rushes with favors to him who has lost his political rights. This alone should answer the alleged dilemma. It is surprising that the question should have arisen. We should all know, and I am sure that nearly all of us do know that the success of this joint venture called America could not have been achieved without the hearty initiative, the unfettered adventure, the courage, and the genius of individuals, who began only with and could not have begun without their personal and political liberty.

The history of America is the history of free enterprise, and Flag Day is a fitting time to contemplate that fact, for our flag is as much a lesson in free enterprise as if the words were written across the red, white, and blue. The courage, the honor, and the liberty those colors represent are worth a moment's thought. If we have the courage to defend our own political rights, and the honor to respect our neighbor's political rights, then the liberty of all of us is assured. Just as our courage and our honor will guarantee us our liberty, that liberty will endow us with the economic freedom to earn our bread by the sweat of our brow, as nature has ordained, as our instincts advise, as our history teaches, and as our destiny demands.

Let us fail in this simply duty and the tragic tide will turn against us to deprive us not alone of our bread but in turn of the freedom to earn it and the liberty that is the substance of that right. Then will the courage and honor of which liberty is born slowly sap away, and the flag become a hollow abstraction. May God grant that such a fate shall never darken our shores. May God grant us always to be worthy to hold that flag aloft in full and genuine meaning of what we are and what we mean to be.

Shortage of Supplies for Corn Refineries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an article entitled "Corn Refineries Face Shut-Down as Supplies Dip," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 14, 1943; also an article on the same subject from the Journal of Commerce.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 14, 1943]

CORN REFINERIES FACE SHUT-DOWN AS SUPPLIES DIP—INDUSTRY SEES OUTPUT OF STARCH, SIRUP, AND SUGAR IMPERILED BY UNITED STATES POLICY

A sharp decline in corn shipments to the terminal markets of the country has put the corn-refining industry in danger of having to shut down a dozen or more large plants in the Middle West in the next 30 days, it was announced yesterday by the Corn Industries Research Foundation, 5 East Forty-fifth Street.

Two small plants in the Middle West closed in the last few days, it was learned from Pendleton Dudley, executive secretary of the foundation, who called the industry's situation appalling. The industry produces starches, sirups, sugars, and other derivatives of American corn, widely used in industry and for food purposes.

Normally, the industry's requirements are from 10,000,000 to 11,000,000 bushels of corn a month, Mr. Dudley said, but within the last 3 weeks the industry has received not more than 1,500,000 bushels. The decline in shipments began about 6 weeks ago, and has grown progressively worse, he said.

Nothing like this has happened in the 50-year history of the industry, the foundation said, and is the unexpected result of the corn-hog policies initiated by Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, some time ago. Current weather conditions are considered only a minor incident in the situation.

"To stimulate livestock production, the Government guaranteed high selling prices for hogs, price ceilings were set on corn, with the result that the farmers of the Corn Belt plunged on swine production, the marketing of corn in the form of pork proving highly profitable," the foundation said.

Accordingly, the swine census is now almost double the figure of normal years—and there is little or no corn for other users, notably the corn products manufacturer. The industry expected to use only a small fraction of the corn crop, about 130,000,000 bushels of the 3,000,000,000-bushel crop of 1943.

Executives of the 11 companies comprising the corn-refining industry have sent an urgent warning of the shortage to industries such as textile manufacturers, paper makers, aluminum and steel foundries, all of which are among the industries using large amounts of industrial starches in their operations. Warnings also went to the manufacturers of bread, sirups, and other foods, who use much dextrose and corn sirup.

"Since most of the industries using corn derivatives are heavily engaged in handling war orders," the foundation said, "it is believed that the Washington authorities must recognize the emergency that is developing, change certain of their policies, and thus avert what may rapidly become an industrial crisis."

[From the Journal of Commerce]

CORN REFINERY PLANT SHUT-DOWNS FEARED—STOPPAGE WOULD AFFECT MANY INDUSTRIES

With farmers diverting corn supplies to stock feeding, shipments of corn to the refining industry have fallen off to the point where refiners are in immediate danger of having to shut down their dozen or more large plants located at various points in the Middle West within the next 30 days, the Corn Industry Research Foundation revealed here last night.

Corn refiners who are producers of starches, sirups, sugars, and other derivatives of corn widely used in industry and for food purposes, are currently urgently warning such industrial consumers at textile manufacturers, paper makers, aluminum and steel foundries, and manufacturers of bread and sirups, that a serious supply situation is in prospect in the immediate future.

CORN-HOG OUTGROWTH

The cause of the situation, it was explained by industry executives, is the virtually complete stoppage of corn shipments to the Nation's terminal markets. This, of course, makes it impossible for the corn refiners to purchase the chief raw material required for their operations.

This is the first time in the 50-year history of the industry, it was said, that an over-all stoppage of operations has been threatened. The situation, it was added, is the unexpected result of the corn-hog policies developed by the Secretary of Agriculture some time ago, current weather conditions being only a minor influence.

The shortage of corn for refining purposes, industry spokesmen explained, arises directly from the effort to stimulate livestock production. As a part of this program, high selling prices were guaranteed for hogs, with price ceilings set on corn. As a result of these conditions, farmers in the Corn Belt have been concentrating on swine production, due to the fact that the marketing of corn in the form of pork is highly profitable. Accordingly, the swine census is now almost double the figures of normal years, and there is little or no corn remaining on the open market for other corn users, notably the corn-products manufacturers.

Due to the fact that most of the industries normally utilizing corn derivatives are heavily engaged in handling war orders, it is believed in industry circles that Washington must shortly recognize the emergency that is developing in the corn-refining industry, and change certain of the policies which have created this condition and thus avert what many feel may rapidly become an industrial crisis.

WAIT WASHINGTON ACTION

In this connection, it was pointed out that the corn refiners are using only a small fraction of the corn crop—approximately 130,000,000 bushels of the 3,000,000,000-bushel crop of 1943.

In the food field, it was pointed out, manufacturers of confectionery products would be particularly affected by any stoppage of corn refining operations, particularly in view of the current limitations on the use of cane sugar for industrial purposes. Interruption in the supply of corn products would also have important repercussions among commercial bakers, sirup processors and packers, and manufacturers of many other food products into the manufacture of which corn derivatives enter, it was said.

Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, no appointment the President has made has pleased me more than that of Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk to the position of Surgeon General of the Army. I know of his work at first hand during the war period and after the war period at Walter Reed Hospital. I know of his dynamic personality and of his eminent fitness and ability for the position. I would like to speak of his wide experience and training on this Flag Day, because I join with all the Members in the hope that the men following our flag will have the very best possible medical and surgical care no matter where they serve or in what country they are following the flag. Under General Kirk's supervision, I feel sure our hope will be fulfilled.

I saw General Kirk's successful work daily at the Walter Reed Hospital, when he went there in 1919. He had the confidence and devotion of his patients from the first.

I rejoiced when, on May 28, 1943, the United States Senate confirmed the President's nomination of Norman Thomas Kirk to be the Surgeon General, United States Army, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance. General Kirk accepted on June 1, 1943. I want General Kirk's experience to be a part of our permanent record.

General Kirk was born on January 3, 1888, in Rising Sun, Md. He was graduated from Tome School, Port Deposit, Md., in 1906, and received the M. D. degree from the University of Maryland in 1910. He served as resident physician at the University Hospital, Baltimore, and as clinical assistant at the United States Soldiers' Home Hospital, Washington, D. C., before being commissioned as first lieutenant in the Medical Reserve Corps on May 29, 1912. After a short period of active service, he was appointed to the Regular Army as first lieutenant, Medical Corps, on May 22, 1913.

His first service was at the Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C., in June 1912. The following September he enrolled in the Army Medical School, Washington D. C., and following graduation was stationed at field hospital No. 3, Texas City, Tex., from June 1913 to July 1915. For 7 months of this period field hospital No. 3 was stationed at Veracruz, Mexico, as part of the Punitive Expedition. He was then assigned to the Cantonment Hospital, Second Division, Galveston, Tex., as operating surgeon.

That same month he went to Fort Grant, Panama Canal Zone, for a brief tour of duty after which he was transferred to Fort Sherman, Panama Canal Zone, in October 1915. He returned to the United States for duty at the base hospital, Brownsville, Tex., in July 1916.

In September 1917 he was assigned to Camp Greenleaf, Ga., serving there until January 1919, when he was ordered to Walter Reed General Hospital, Washington, D. C., for surgical service. After brief tours of duty at the Johns Hopkins University Hospital, Baltimore, Md., and the Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass., he was assigned to the station hospital, Fort Sam Houston, Tex.—now Brooke General Hospital—in October 1925, as chief of the orthopedic section

and assistant chief and ward officer, surgical service. He became chief of surgical service in July 1927, and in February 1928 he was transferred to the Sternberg General Hospital, Manila, P. I., as chief of surgical service.

Returning to the United States in July 1930, he was assigned to Walter Reed General Hospital, Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., as chief of the orthopedic section. He entered the Medical Field Service School, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., in October 1931, and following his graduation from the advanced course returned to his duties at the Walter Reed General Hospital.

General Kirk became chief of surgical service at the station hospital, Fort Mills, P. I., in July 1934, and in February 1935 became chief of the surgical service, Sternberg General Hospital, Manila, P. I.

Upon returning to the United States in July 1936, he became chief of surgical service, Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco, Calif., serving in that capacity until January 1941, when he returned to Walter Reed General Hospital, Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C., as chief of surgical service. In July 1942 he was named commanding officer, Percy Jones General Hospital at Battle Creek, Mich.

Promotions in the service brought General Kirk the rank of captain on June 7, 1916, and major on May 15, 1917. On November 6, 1918, he was commissioned lieutenant colonel in the National Army, which rank he held until February 14, 1920. He was commissioned lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army on May 22, 1933, colonel on May 22, 1939, and on March 12, 1943, he was promoted to the temporary rank of brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

General Kirk is recognized as a general surgeon of extremely high capacity, being particularly well known for his work on bone and joint surgery. His volume on Amputations, Operative Technique, which appeared in 1924 and which was the result of large experience following World War No. I, is still a standard textbook. In addition to this book he has written a great many other articles on clinical and operative surgery.

General Kirk has been honored by membership in the most selective surgical societies of the United States, including the American Surgical Association, which limits its active membership to 150. He is a member and governor of the American College of Surgeons, and member of the American Medical Association, the American Orthopedic Association, the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, and Diplomate of the American Board of Surgery.

A dynamic personality, forceful and aggressive, his surgical skill is paralleled by his surgical judgment. He is looked upon as a man of sound and mature judgment which is based upon experience and which is always tempered with conservatism.

I wish for General Kirk the success I am sure he will achieve as Surgeon General of the United States Army.

Stop Coddling the Japs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 11, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, when we see the dangerous influences of the Black Dragon Society, camouflaged in "zoot suits," harassing our servicemen, and attempting to stir race riots throughout the country, we become more conscious of the Japanese menace to the future civilization of mankind.

The American Legion, which symbolizes American patriotism in every sense of the word, is awake to this menace and is demanding that Congress act to protect this country from it, now and for all time to come.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter from the Beppo Arnold American Legion Post, of Greenville, Miss., together with the resolution to which the letter refers.

I also have a similar resolution from the Lee County Post, No. 49, American Legion, of Tupelo, Miss., of which I am a member.

While our boys are fighting and dying all over the world to protect American institutions, the American Legion is determined to see that those institutions are protected at home.

The letter and the resolution referred to follow:

BEPPO ARNOLD POST, No. 32,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Greenville, Miss., June 5, 1943.

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: Enclosed herein please find copy of resolutions passed by this post at a special meeting June 4, which are self-explanatory.

We trust that you will agree with the contents of this resolution. If so, we feel confident that we can rely upon your support and influence toward seeing that proper legislation is enacted.

Assuring you of our appreciation for all the noble work you have done in the past, and are doing now, we make this appeal for the future.

Respectfully yours,

B. J. DOTTERY,
Post Adjutant.

Whereas the twenty-fourth annual convention of the American Legion, held in Kansas City, Mo., in September 1942, opposed the releasing of Japanese, both foreign- and American-born, from war relocation centers to attend colleges and universities in the United States and for other reasons, and the national executive committee of the American Legion at its November 1942 meeting reiterated opposition to such plans; and

Whereas the War Relocation Authority, the agency of the Federal Government charged with the responsibility of looking after interned Japanese, is continuing to release Japanese for the purpose of continuing their higher education and for other reasons; and

Whereas this same Federal agency has stated by letter to the office of the National Americanism Commission that all such Japanese now being released are thoroughly investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated in a letter to the office of the National Americanism Commission that such Japanese are not investigated by the Bureau under his supervision: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Beppo Arnold Post, No. 32, of the American Legion in a special meeting June 4, 1943, That the Congress of the United States be urged to enact legislation to immediately return to war relocation centers all those so released; and be it further

Resolved, That all such camps be placed under the control of military authorities; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion, both National and State, utilize all avenues of publicity in securing the cooperation of all patriotic Americans to urge Congress to take such action.

Gasoline Restrictions

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday Members of Congress from the States outside the eastern gasoline shortage area met in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building and organized a committee for the purpose of investigating the gasoline supply situation of the country, and to protect the interests of their constituents in connection therewith.

I have the honor of being named as chairman of this committee, with the gentleman from Iowa, Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM, as secretary. The executive committee representing this congressional group will consist of one Member from each State, who in turn will keep the membership of his or her State delegation advised as to developments.

Despite a few unwise statements to the contrary, this committee was not organized to fight any other group or to oppose the interests of any other section of the country. Instead its purpose is simply to prevent the imposition of any unnecessary further restrictions in the use of gasoline upon the people of the States represented by the committee membership.

Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes has advised that at the present time there is no need for additional restrictions to be placed on the use of gasoline by the people in the States outside the eastern shortage area. He has stated further that the imposition of such restrictions would not appreciably increase the amount of oil or gasoline reaching the Eastern States.

The people our committee represent are willing and ready to make any sacrifices or accept any hardships that will help win the war, or save the life of even one member of our fighting forces. If these ends can be accomplished by shipping gasoline from our area for use to

better advantage elsewhere, our people will find a way to get along without it. However, they will not be pleased with, nor will they gracefully accept, any unnecessary restrictions in the use of gasoline simply to satisfy the wishes of those who are unfortunate enough to be living in a shortage area and want the rest of the country to suffer on the basis of "misery loves company."

All members of Congress interested in the work of this committee are invited to join. The House group will meet in joint session with a Senate committee in the Caucus Room of the Senate Office Building tomorrow—Tuesday—morning at 11 a. m., at which time Petroleum Administrator Ickes, Mr. O'Leary of the Office of Price Administration, and Mr. Dow of the Office of Defense Tranportation, will be present.

Aviation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

AVIATION LEGISLATION

Several good arguments commend the Lea-Bailey bill, now under co. s'deration by a committee of the House of Representatives. Most important, perhaps, is its concentration and control of civilian flying in Federal hands under an independent authority. In addition, the bill recognizes the need of developing air transportation and provides means for doing so. The subcommittee which drafted the measure has adhered to the decision made in 1940, when Congress rejected proposals to follow a policy of attempting to coordinate regulation of air transportation with that of surface transportation. As the recent report of the Office of War Information pointed out, costs are still necessarily high for air transport and will remain so in direct comparison with other means of transportation, even under the hugely expanded programs which may be expected. The types of service and other significant factors bearing upon aviation's place in the transportation system are likely to remain in a state of flux for some time to come. There can well be a period in which civil aviation is encouraged to experiment courageously, devise new methods, and develop its talents before it is integrated, at least from a regulatory point of view, with surface transportation.

In the matter of safety, the proposed bill contains some important provisions. Specifically, it would zone areas about airports and abate such hazards as towers, smokestacks, transmission poles, windmills, and other structures which are a threat to takeoff and landing. Had these zone provisions been in force, the recent fatal crash at Chicago, which cost the lives of 12 members of our military personnel, would not have occurred.

Air transport is entering an era of great expansion. Now is the time for sober and well-considered legislation which will at once aid its growth and protect its services.

Office of Price Administration Policy Will Reduce Livestock and Farm Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to express my views on what I regard a dangerous policy on the part of the Office of Price Administration as far as food production is concerned. This cheap food policy, if carried to its conclusion, will mean greatly reduced food supplies for our people. This is yet the most serious and absurd move on the part of the O. P. A. The program is dangerous, vicious, and altogether unnecessary. The food producers of our Nation need encouragement instead of more regulations and regimentation from Washington. This is especially true of the livestock industry. I think it is time that our citizens have some facts in regard to what is happening to the livestock producers of our Nation. This present market policy and the roll-back on meat prices is going to greatly curtail production.

The following table was prepared by one of the livestock marketing specialists of Kansas State College and is based on a 100-day feeding period for steers. Certainly no one can expect the livestock producers and cattle feeders to produce increased quotas of beef on this basis. Let us face the facts, and the sooner we meet this problem the better it will be for our people. Food is essential for the winning of this war, and we need more instead of less:

Price risk in feeding cattle 100 days, or from June 1 to Sept. 8, 1943. (Kansas City livestock prices—Manhattan, Kans., feed and other costs.)

Feeder cattle prices, June 1, 1943

Good feeder steers, 735 pounds, at $15.50	$113.92
Interest at 6 percent for 5 months	2.85
Cost per feeder	116.77
FEED AND OTHER COSTS, JUNE 1 TO SEPT. 8 (100 DAYS)	
28.5 bushels of corn, at $1.12	31.92
0.05 tons of cottonseed meal, at $48 [1]	2.40
0.25 tons of alfalfa hay, at $15	3.75
Feed cost per head	38.07
Selling, shipping, and shrinkage costs per head (75 cents per 100 pounds) [2]	7.50
Feeder costs plus feed and marketing costs per head	162.37
Needed price to break even when marketed Nov. 1, 1943, assuming a 2.5-pound average daily gain and grade of good slaughter cattle	16.48
Current price, good slaughter steers	15.75

[1] Estimated local price.

[2] Does not include death losses.

Average price of good slaughter cattle that beef ceilings should reflect at Chicago according to Office of Price Administration	$14.50
Average seasonal price increase (1922-39) from June to September for this grade 10 percent	17.32

NOTE.—An average daily ration of 15 pounds of corn, 1 pound of cottonseed meal, and 5 pounds of alfalfa hay was used in the above calculations. The cattle were assumed to weigh 985 pounds at the end of the period.

I have just received a letter from Mr. Charles Bren, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce of Salina, Kans., in which he encloses a copy of the resolution approved by the board of directors of the Kansas City (Mo.) Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Bren advises me that the Salina organization wholeheartedly endorses this resolution. It reads as follows:

PRICE ROLL-BACK AND SUBSIDIES WILL REDUCE LIVESTOCK AND FARM PRODUCTION

The Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City agrees with farmers and agricultural leaders in this territory in their opposition to roll-back of prices and direct subsidies on meat, butter and other commodities. It also opposes the use of Reconstruction Finance Corporation or Commodity Credit Corporation funds for this purpose. Its position is based on the following reasons:

1. Prices for hogs and sheep last week reached the lowest levels of the year. Price ceilings on corn have virtually stopped movement to central markets. Farm labor is difficult to secure and much of it is inefficient. Scarcity of farm machinery and equipment tends to limit production. The demand for farm labor and machinery is the greatest ever known.

2. Prices of food have advanced 47 percent since 1939, when farm prices and farm incomes were very unsatisfactory, but now require the smallest percentage of wages of industrial workers since records have been kept. Coal miners, railroad employees, steel and other industrial workers have received advances in wages, hence are in position to pay prevailing prices for food.

3. If prices are rolled back and subsidies established, a reduction in production of farm products will follow. Farmers cannot be expected to meet all of their handicaps unless there is some indication that they will not suffer losses due to Government regulations, restrictions or elimination of market support. The ultimate result of a subsidy would be an extreme scarcity of foodstuffs, with even greater advances in cost to consumers or still greater subsidies from the Treasury.

This statement of policy adopted the 8th day of June 1943 by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City,

WARD C. GIFFORD,
President.
GEORGE W. CATTS,
Executive Manager.

The following letter was received from one of the large commission firms of the livestock market at Kansas City:

MARTIN, BLOMQUIST & LEE
COMMISSION CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., June 9, 1943.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The hog market was at a new low today, $13.80. Farmers, 100 percent strong, are bitter at the treatment they are getting. The writer had calls today from Pratt, Liberal, and Larned, Kans., and they are offering 25-pound pigs and thousands of

100-pound shoats at 12 to 13 cents that were bringing 16 to 20 cents 30 days ago. Can't something be done?

With best wishes, I am

Yours very truly,

C. E. BLOMQUIST.

The following two clippings were taken from the Kansas City Drovers Telegram. Mr. Julius Heptig, of Pottawatomie County, Kans., gives an analysis of his feeding operations for the past year, which shows that he suffered a loss of $1,039.60 on the feeding and handling of 113 head of steers. Mr. Heptig has had many years' experience in feeding cattle. His figures show that livestock cannot live on patriotism alone and there must be some prospect of profit to motivate cattle feeders:

Original cost 600 pounds, at $11.50	$69.00
Freight from market	.90
Commission charge	.75
Interest on above investment (6 percent)	2.25
Feed before grass:	
Cottonseed meal	1.25
Ensilage (1,350 pounds, at $4 per ton)	2.70
Hay (500 pounds, at $4 per ton)	1.00
Pasture (summer)	7.50
Total cost, off grass	85.35
(Steers were full fed for 145 days.)	
Hay (1,800 pounds, at $12 per ton)	10.80
Cottonseed meal (290 pounds, at $50 per ton)	7.25
Corn (3,200 pounds, at 93 cents per bushel)	53.00
Grinding of corn at 10 cents per hundredweight	3.20
Trucking (corn, at 4 cents per bushel)	2.28
Interest on investment	2.62
Freight and commission	4.50
Taxes (State and local)	3.10
Death loss	2.10
Equipment cost (not charged).	
Labor cost (not charged).	
Total cost after grass	88.85
Total cost to feed and market	174.20
Selling price 1,100 pounds, at $15	165.00
Net loss (per head)	9.20
Total cost of 113 head, at $174.20	19,684.60
Selling price 113 head, at $165	18,645.00
Total net loss for the year's operation	1,039.60

PROFIT IN HOGS TOO SMALL NOW—UNLESS CONDITIONS CHANGE FOR THE BETTER NEBRASKAN WILL QUIT RAISING PORKERS—MARGINS TOO NARROW TO WARRANT TAKING RISKS OF DISEASE, RISING FEED COSTS, AND POSSIBLE CROP FAILURE

Unless conditions change, Charles Wiggins, of Red Willow County, Nebr., is on his way out of the hog enterprise in which he has been producing more than 500 porkers a year. The reason—too much manipulation by men in Washington who don't know anything about practical hog-producing problems, he charges.

"Sure, there's still money in the hog business, provided everything goes well," Mr. Wiggins admitted. "But let disease get into that herd of more than 500 pigs I am raising this spring, and I could lose five to ten thousand dollars overnight. Such a loss, incidentally, would wipe out whatever profit I have made on hogs in the past 2 years, and I don't think it is fair to ask a hog raiser to take the risk for the small profit he has a chance to get this year if everything goes all right."

Right there is a good place to bring out the fact that Mr. Wiggins is no novice at the business of producing pork on the wholesale basis. When he was a younger man, his father used to raise up to 3,000 hogs a year on a section of land.

Just the Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, as early as January 12, I have called to the attention of this Congress the seriousness of the labor situation, particularly with respect to farm labor, and time after time pleaded with the selective-service officials to consider the depletion of the farms by inducting experienced and essential farm laborers in the armed forces, as it was clear to me, coming from an agricultural State, that in the call for increased food production for our own armed forces and our allies, if the physically able, experienced, and essential farm labor was taken from the farms, how in the name of common sense could food production be maintained, much less increased? While thousands and thousands of experienced and essential farm and dairy laborers were inducted into the armed forces and additional thousands leaving the farms to take employment in war industries paying high wages, others besides myself warned selective service and our Government officials of what might be expected by the continuance of this short-sighted policy, and notwithstanding all of this protest and warning in regard to this important matter, the policy has been continued. Foremost among those who have been warning to expect a food shortage in the United States has been former President Herbert Hoover, who, everyone knows, is an authority on this subject.

In a recent address before the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Hoover pointed out that in the 7 years, between the harvests of 1932 and 1939, 47,000,000 acres of land were withdrawn from the production of 17 leading crops, while only 9,000,000 acres of that total had been returned to cultivation by 1942. Mr. Hoover concluded that all the withdrawn acreage must be brought back into cultivation to enable us to meet the essential food demands of the armed forces, the civilian population and our allies. If there is no other means of averting a serious food shortage the outlook is grim, since it is altogether unlikely that we can muster the manpower and provide the machinery for the suggested acreage expansion. Shortages of farm labor and equipment are already so acute as to imperil the cultivation and harvesting of the crops now being grown. About the best that we can hope for is that the situation will not grow worse.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not an alarmist nor a pessimist, I am one of those who view this situation with apprehension. Early in the year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a prediction that unless Selective Service modified the policy of inducting experienced and essential farm laborers, that even with most favorable weather conditions, it was my opinion that nearly all farm products would fall at least 25 percent below the 1942 production, and that opinion is now borne out by recent estimates published by the Agricultural Department.

In an honest effort to make some suggestion or contribution to aid in the solution of this grave problem as far back as April 22, I introduced H. R. 2563, providing for the creation of an Army Agricultural Corps, copy of which was furnished to all of the departments and officials of the Government, and copy of which is available to any and all interested parties. This bill has been referred to the House Military Committee, but I have heard nothing from same. The creation of this Army Agricultural Corps would, in my opinion, go a long way to the solution of this serious situation, by giving our farm boys the same status as a man in combat service, and they would be contributing as much to the winning of the war as the man actually at the front. By making the necessary labor available to grow the food needed for our own armed forces and our civilian population and our allies, and the furnishing of the necessary farm machinery necessary to grow and harvest our food crops, I feel that this is the only way to avert what may be a catastrophe. Not only is our war effort affected but also our civilian population and our morale is affected if food is not available.

In addition, this country is not only concerned in this emergency with respect to our own armed forces and citizens but also we have made certain commitments to our allies and they are expecting us to carry out our obligations not only in the emergency but also when peace comes, and quoting from an editorial in the Washington Post:

> The leadership we have assumed in delivering mankind from want will be undermined, and our fair words will echo mockingly in our ears when the prostrated nations present them for redemption.

In support of my repeated warnings to this Congress and our governmental departments and officials, I beg leave to include the printing in the RECORD of an article published in my State, as follows:

LARGE BEAN CROP IS PLOWED UNDER—FLORIDA PARISHES FARMERS BLAME LABOR SCARCITY

(By Richard H. Tate)

BATON ROUGE, LA., June 9.—With Victory gardens sprouting all over the State to supplement the normal supply of farm produce, farmers in the Florida parishes section of Louisiana are plowing under hundreds of acres of the largest bean crop in the history of the "bean belt."

This ironical development is explained by agricultural experts who have just returned

from the area as being due to several related causes:

A shortage of labor which compelled many farmers in this section to sit helplessly by and watch their bumper bean crop mature, toughen, and dry up before anything could be done to salvage it; a surprisingly weak market which led to a price far below what was expected and on which plans for making and harvesting the current crop were based, and finally a bad break in weather which has been so hot and so dry as to hasten the maturing of the crop at a time when a much longer harvesting season was needed.

The parishes in which the heaviest loss has been taken are described by a United States agricultural inspector just in from a tour of the affected areas as Washington, St. Helena, Tangipahoa, Livingston, and St. Tammany. This observer reports having driven through hundreds of acres that are now being turned under to make way for another crop while additional hundreds of acres still are filled with yellowing bean bushes whose crop is already beyond the stage where any help can be expected.

Department of Agriculture officials state that the unusually heavy planting program this year was due to governmental request in line with crop program increases all over the country. A heavy demand was anticipated, they say, and a strong, unwavering market price was expected. However, neither the demand nor the price has come up to expectations and the result has been a heavy loss of money to the farmers, who in many cases failed to get enough to pay wage demands even where labor was available for picking.

The average price which beans have brought so far in this area is said by Department of Agriculture officials to be from $1 to $1.25 per 30-pound hamper, or approximately 3 to 4 cents a pound. This, in view of rising labor costs, where it happens to be available at all, they say is insufficient to pay the operating costs of the farmers and give them any return on their investment of time and money.

The loss has not been confined to farmers either, for buyers are reported in some instances to have suffered substantial losses on shipments to other parts of the country. One buyer shipped several carloads of prime beans to New York and sold them finally for less than he paid in the field, taking a net loss of approximately $15,000 on the transaction.

A Government agriculturist who has just spent several days in the area reports that most of the farmers who have lost money declare that they will attempt no fall crop as has been the custom in the past unless some definite price scale is guaranteed them. This applies only to the bean crop, however, which for years has been planted in two sections in this area, one in the spring and one in the fall. However, of the two the fall crop is said to be even larger than the earlier one under normal conditions.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the question of stripping labor from the farms involved in this manpower problem, but also many important industries contributing in an important way to the prosecution of the war, and as an evidence of this, I beg further leave to publish in the RECORD one of the many telegrams I have received. The telegram follows:

BASTROP, LA., *June 12, 1943.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

This company, and we believe our experience is no different from that of any other paper company in the South, faces immediate shut-down because of critical labor shortage in the procurement of pulpwood. This shortage is the result of several major causes, principal among which are the migration of labor from rural districts to essential war industries and the large number of this rural labor which has been drafted into the armed services. Farm labor which is left is only available for pulpwood production during the intermittent periods in which farm activities are at a standstill. If war prisoner labor can be allocated without delay for use in pulpwood production, this will not only provide relief to a serious situation but will be the means of producing such additional pulpwood as will be sufficient to keep our mills in continuous operation in order to keep our three operations going in your State, we not only beg for your assistance but urge as strongly as possible that you take immediate steps to impress the manpower commission with the importance of this situation and demand their assistance in securing this war prisoner labor relief from the Army or Director of Internal Security who can designate such authority to the internment camp commanders.

INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.,
J. H. FRIEND, *Vice President.*

Little Soldier, What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am incorporating as part of my remarks a very thought provoking editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Metropolitan News, published in West Hartford, Conn.

This editorial calls our attention to the importance of giving serious thought and study to the problem we will face when this war comes to an end in connection with providing an opportunity of completing the education of those youngsters who have interrupted their education to enter the armed forces. At the present time an effort is being made to control the courses of study to be made available during the war, to youngsters now in high school. Some plan must be worked out that will guarantee that those who have interrupted their education will be given an opportunity to return to school at the end of the war.

This program, I believe, should be separate and apart from the vocational training of those disabled during the war.

The editorial follows:

LITTLE SOLDIER, WHAT NOW?

If last year's graduation figures are any criterion, it can be safely estimated that some four hundred West Hartford students will finish their high school careers this month. To the great majority of these students, if better times were prevailing, this would mean going to college to complete the education so necessary to compete with the rest of the world for a livelihood.

This year's list of graduates will for the most part immediately enter the military service * * * and for most of them it means the end of their education for living and the beginning of their education for death. Most of these young men who have been called out of high school and college classes to the armed forces like to believe that they will continue their educational careers when the war is over. This is hardly likely if the last war is any barometer.

Many factors enter into the picture, chief among them being the fact that a vast majority will not have the means to pay for higher education. A large number will feel that, with jobs growing scarcer and years growing upon them, they must needs seek gainful employment to recoup their lost time and finances.

This problem not only affects West Hartford, but all the cities and hamlets throughout this wealthy Nation, it can be safely assumed that millions of our soldiers will not be released until more than a year after peace has been declared. An armistice can hold a soldier indefinitely and politics on a world-wide scale can disrupt the entire program for a long time.

It behooves both our Government and our people to look into the future and especially see just how our young men are going to regain the education that is part of the heritage they have been fighting for; experience after the last war indicates that those who did not wear the uniform of our fighting services were in a better position to grab all the good jobs, while the soldiers were awaiting the long process of demobilization.

There has been much talk in Washington about the necessity of reeducating the youth of Germany after the victory. It might not be a bad idea if we gave serious thought to educating our own youth, an education so necessary if we are not to repeat the bonus marches on Washington, bread lines, and another world war. Only through knowledge can we prevent world conflicts, and we should start spending our money for knowledge in America first.

The President has requested $100,000,000,000 more for the next year to finance this war. Certainly out of this vast sum, enough could be saved by more careful spending of the country's wealth to set aside a fund of five billion to guarantee the cost of a complete education for every man whose education was interrupted by his admission to the armed forces. The Government could well guarantee the cost of a college career to any one who has sacrificed everything for their country in its hour of trial.

Any citizen who now sits in comfort and comparative safety will not deny the right of the Nation's defenders to their education that has been so abruptly cut off. It behooves all of us to give this problem serious thought right now.

A Toast to the Flag

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this day is being celebrated throughout the country as Flag Day. I desire to quote a

beautiful tribute or toast to our country's flag by Mr. John Jay Daily, a member of the Press Gallery.

Here's to the red of it,
There's not a thread of it,
No, not a shred of it,
In all the spread of it,
From foot to head,
But heroes bled for it,
Faced steel and lead for it,
Precious blood shed for it,
Bathing in red.

Here's to the white of it,
Thrilled by the sight of it,
Who knows the right of it,
But feels the might of it,
Through day and night?
Womanhood's care for it,
Made manhood dare for it,
Purity's pray'r for it,
Keeps it so white!

Here's to the blue of it,
Beauteous view of it,
Heavenly hue of it,
Star-spangled dew of it,
Constant and true;
Diadems gleam for it,
States stand supreme for it,
Liberty's beam for it,
Brightens the blue.

Here's to the whole of it,
Stars, stripes, and goal of it,
Body and soul of it,
O, and the roll of it,
Sun shining through;
Hearts in accord for it,
Swear by the sword for it,
Thanking the Lord for it,
Red, white, and blue.

Office of War Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in asking unanimous consent to have an editorial from the most widely circulated newspaper in New England inserted in the RECORD I feel that I am being just as fair to the official who is being criticized as I am to any who may agree with the criticism itself. The question of bureaucracy gone wild is one which must some day come up for discussion in this body. We are entitled to know how all sections of the country feel about it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR MOBILIZER

It is difficult to understand why it has become necessary to create an Office of War Mobilization, which, in a rather vague description from the White House, appears to have dictatorial powers on the home front.

Former Justice James F. Byrnes, of the Supreme Court, who heads the new Office of War Mobilization, was presumed to have dictatorial powers as Director of Economic Stabilization, and was expected to control the Nation's economy and prevent inflation.

Now he is expected to develop unified programs and policies for use of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, effectively use manpower outside the armed forces, maintain and stabilize civilian economy and adjust the economy to wartime needs.

If the new job means that only Mr. Byrnes will tinker with the civilian economy, which includes price controls, rationing, wage controls, supplies of consumer goods, fuel supplies, gasoline and oil, and all the rest of the regulations cooked up by the dizzy Washington troupe of economic acrobats, perhaps some improvement may be effected.

At least the civilians will know where the next blow is coming from. They are today ducking blows from every direction, for they are caught in the middle of a battle royal of bureaucrats who are all trying to strike for victory and landing only on the punch-groggy public.

We have been at war for a year and a half. Aside from the necessary tightening of the belt, which is necessary in war, there has been a great deal of mischief done by poor planning and incompetency.

When Justice Byrnes left the Supreme Court to take the job as economic stabilizer he was hailed as the Mr. Fix-it who would bring order out of confusion. Now he has been moved along into a job which should have been started December 7, 1941.

If, as is promised, Justice Byrnes will exercise complete powers over all home front war efforts, millions of troubled Americans will say a fervent "Amen." But, if it is just another war bureau, from which will come directives setting up controls which neither direct nor control, War Mobilizer Byrnes can join the long procession of promising war czars who have risen to power and subsided in frustration within the space of 18 months.

O. P. A. Acting as Judge and Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the June 2, 1943, issue of the Butchers' Advocate. It is the editorial opinion of the Butchers' Advocate, a journal devoted to America's retail meat market:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION ACTING AS JUDGE AND JURY

With the national election for President but a trifle over a year away, and the campaign planning of the major parties now in the incipient stage, it would seem that the administration and, more particularly, the National Democratic Committee would look a bit ahead.

It would not suffice in the coming elections to have an international policy to obtain adequate votes to elect the President and a Democratic Congress. The administration can point to an international policy and the conduct of the war generally as an important administration achievement. But, they have to do a great deal better with our domestic planning and policy.

NEW DEAL A DISAPPOINTMENT

The Butchers' Advocate, of course, is concerned with the international policy because we must win the war, but as the representative trade paper for the meat industry and, more particularly, the wholesalers and retailers of meats and poultry in the Nation, it is quite difficult to reconcile the policies of the administration in the handling of our domestic economy, especially as applied to foods.

When the New Deal came into office as the friend of the little fellow in business it was expected that small packers, independent wholesalers, and independent retailers had at last found a friendly administration to solve their many problems. That was the chief topic of the President's campaign speeches before each election. It is therefore difficult to reconcile that policy with subsequent actions of the New Deal agencies, like Office of Price Administration, that sponsor regulatory measures that have driven independent packers, slaughterers, distributors, processors, wholesalers, and retailers of meats and poultry out of business, making it absolutely impossible for many of them to continue in business unless relief is accorded.

Further than this, the administration is alienating the people of the Nation whose incomes have not advanced in proportion to the cost of many necessities they are required to purchase for maintenance. The policy of the Office of Price Administration has curtailed production and dislocated the distribution of foods. They, and they only, can be charged with malfeasance in the handling of Office of Price Administration Act as set forth by Congress. They show on paper that they have rolled prices back, that they have set price standards, and rationed many food items without studying the underlying economic facts, and for this reason meats and poultry are not obtainable in adequate quantities through normal distributive channels. This has caused great losses to legitimate business and will ultimately cause a great loss in taxes to the Government.

It is quite difficult to understand the psychology and the reasoning of many of these New Deal college professors and so-called economists and lawyers who are acting as judge and jury in Office of Price Administration. They evidently are not concerned with the fact that there are approximately 2,700,000 small business units in the United States, and that a large majority have been adversely affected by New Deal Office of Price Administration "advance thinking." All of these people in the small-business category and their countless voter-relatives and dependents will be an important adverse factor in the next national election unless the present administration wakes up.

WORST EVER EXPERIENCED

If the administration wants to win the war quickly and thereafter write the peace, it is necessary that drastic action be taken in the handling of problems concerning our economic home front. The food situation is the worst ever experienced in the history of America. It should not have happened, but now that it has, we can no longer wait for more bungling by the incompetents of Office of Price Administration.

The present Administrator, former United States Senator Prentiss Brown, has inherited too many lame ducks and the situation has become so intolerable that it will be necessary to have our food picture transferred to an entirely different agency. The War Food Administrator, Chester Davis, and the nucleus he has surrounded himself with from a personnel standpoint should be able to do the job.

It has been brought to the attention of the Advocate that many responsible members of the Office of Price Administration have told small businessmen, particularly in the meat and poultry industry, that if they could not operate they should close up, and have inferred that they should let big business carry on. Rulings have been made by the Office of Price Administration, and this is a direct charge, that have favored big business to the detriment of the small independent merchant. These charges have been made from time to time and are too great in number to cite in this limited space.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION TO BLAME

Much of the difficulty that the Government is now having on the labor front can directly be charged to Office of Price Administration policies, because a large portion of the laboring man's income is spent for food. Prices on food have advanced more than the increase in the income of the average worker, even though Office of Price Administration statistics may not reveal this fact.

Office of Price Administration has set up beautiful price schedules theoretically and these price schedules at wholesale and retail have not forced livestock prices down, but livestock prices have increased. This is the crux of the situation that is bound to have political repercussions when the next national election rolls around.

It is still not too late to repair the bridges. Army engineers under fire have repaired and set up many bridges in Africa and in the Pacific area; the Administration, now under fire, not only from Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, must mend its bridges before it is too late if it hopes to regain the confidence of the public.

Thirty-two Lands of the Free—Thirty-two Homes of the Brave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this being Flag Day, June 14, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely, very appropriate, and very sensible editorial entitled "Thirty-two Lands of the Free—Thirty-two Homes of the Brave," appearing in this morning's Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY-TWO LANDS OF THE FREE—THIRTY-TWO HOMES OF THE BRAVE

Flag Day—June 14—is a strictly American invention; a day on which we are all supposed to pay some extra measure of respect to the flag of the United States, and, at least in wartime, habitually do so.

The national observance was first proclaimed by President Woodrow Wilson, during the other war, though before we got into that war. June 14, 1916, was the first National Flag Day. The date chosen was an anniversary of June 14, 1777, when the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as the official flag of the United States. The American Flag Day Association was incorporated in Illinois in 1894, as an organization dedicated to making June 14 a Nation-wide occasion for renewing loyalty and affection for the Stars and Stripes.

Flag Day this year, however, is supposed to be different.

The President last May 4 issued a Flag Day proclamation in which he urged that the flags of the other 31 Allies be honored in this country on June 14 along with the flag of the United States. This proclamation contained considerable talk about the United Nations, our brothers in arms, and so on and so forth.

Shortly thereafter, the Office of War Information came forward with a pamphlet telling us all how to carry out this suggestion for turning United States Flag Day into United Nations Flag Day.

We quote from the Office of War Information pamphlet:

"In order that the celebration of Monday, June 14, as United Nations Flag Day shall be given point and direction, the following suggestions might well be kept in mind:

"1. Maximum display of United Nations flags.

"2. Use of the term 'United Nations' whenever possible.

"3. Emphasis on the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter for which the United Nations are fighting.

"4. Emphasis on the importance of teamwork among the United Nations, not only in war but in the peace that follows."

OUR FLAG IS STILL THERE

We agree with George E. Sokolsky, the well-known columnist, when he derides this watering down of United States Flag Day as a perversion of the whole meaning and significance of Flag Day.

Aside from the belittlement of the American flag, there is a phony ring about this entire business of calling today United Nations Flag Day.

There is no such official organization as the United Nations, to which any of us owe allegiance. There is an association of 32 nations, some of which are actively and more of which are passively fighting the Axis. These nations are held together by the perils of the war; and will probably begin coming apart the moment the war ends.

Nor is there any such official treaty or binding agreement as the Atlantic Charter. This piece of paper was put together by Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt at a sea conference off Argentia, Newfoundland, in early August 1941. That was before we were even officially in the war. The piece of paper sets forth certain vague ideals which seemed good to these two gentlemen at that time. It has never been ratified by the United States Senate, and is therefore without force or effect as an international agreement on any American—or on anybody else, for that matter.

We have a strong hunch that this denatured Flag Day will not please most Americans. There are still some things which Americans regard as their own private, personal, and beloved property, and the flag of the United States of America is one of those things.

The United Nations Flag Day idea embodies the propositions that there are 32 lands of the free and 32 homes of the brave, that Columbia is not the gem of the ocean, that it takes 32 mandates to make heroes assemble and 32 banners to make tyranny tremble.

Few Americans are prepared to admit these propositions. In most Americans' hearts their flag is still there.

On top.

Forge No Shackles for Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, during the last several months there has been a great deal of public interest in the possibilities of post-war air transportation. There have always been enthusiastic disciples of aviation quick to predict that we would soon be a Nation on wings and that even the family automobile would become outmoded within the span of a few years. Recently, however, extravagant predictions have become so general and so popular, and such miracles have been performed by aviation during the last 18 months of war that the average citizen may be pardoned if he regards the most fantastic claims for aviation's future to be altogether reasonable and modest. Indeed, one sometimes wonders whether it is not positively unpatriotic to introduce a note of caution and of realism in connection with discussion of aviation's future.

In our extravagant enthusiasm for the accomplishments of aviation and in our confidence that aviation will open new worlds to be developed by the pioneering, inventive genius of our people, we disclose one of our most distinctive national characteristics. Americans are incurable optimists, never satisfied with anything but the biggest and best, and imbued with supreme confidence that no task is too difficult for our engineers and our business management.

Extravagant optimism can, however, like many other good things, be carried too far. It is never wise to become intoxicated. The trait of temperance which has been strong in our people for a hundred years or more should occasionally be applied to curb our optimism lest we suffer a hang-over of disillusionment which can do no good.

Specifically we must guard against assuming too readily that aviation, and especially the air-transportation phase of aviation, has suddenly reached an established position in our transportation economy enabling us to draw settled conclusions concerning its inherent advantages, its proper relationship to other modes of transportation, and the ultimate stature to which it should be permitted to grow.

Fortunately there have recently been sounded sober warnings against some of the excessively enthusiastic predictions concerning air transportation and its capacities. Practical and hard-headed men of experience in air transportation have warned us not to forget that the industry remains an infant despite all of the miracles being performed on wings on the far-flung airways of the world.

Within the last few days a most revealing survey on American air transport has been made available by the Office of War Information.

Undoubtedly our air lines made a remarkable record prior to the war, a record without any parallel anywhere else in the world. And, as the O. W. I. report states—

> This country is fortunate in having had such a high development of air-line planes and operations at the beginning of the war.

Undoubtedly, too, the air lines have made a most outstanding contribution to the war effort. As the commanding general of the Air Transport Command has many times stated, the accomplishments of that command, past and present, would be utterly impossible without the civil air lines and their organizations. And in continuing their regular commercial operations the air lines have

wrought wonders in the face of the most baffling barriers. The equipment of the domestic air lines in commercial operations was cut by approximately 50 percent within a few months after Pearl Harbor, to say nothing of the equipment they had turned over or released to the Army and our allies theretofore. Yet, as the O. W. I. report reminds us, the air lines were able so to increase the utilization and efficiency of their remaining equipment as to make this cut amount to only 29 percent in the number of schedules flown, and they are currently carrying only a few less passengers than their entire fleet transported prior to the war, and many thousands of pounds more of mail and express. From an average daily mileage of only about 1,000 for domestic air-line planes prior to the war, mileage has been increased to over 1,600 by March of 1943, and the figure is still increasing. This is a miracle of management, maintenance, and operations.

But when transportation by air is compared with transportation by surface means, it is apparent that it remains a "speck in the sky," to borrow the phrase used by the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the Transportation Act of 1940. Despite all of the increase in the transportation of express on our domestic air lines, air express amounts still to less than 1 percent of rail express alone—without consideration for the tremendous volume of cargo transported by rail freight, by motor-truck, by waterway, and by pipe line. Indeed the sober truth, as the O. W. I. report states, is that this war was begun without a single plane specifically designed for the carrying of air cargo and that even today the first such planes are still in the experimental stage. Not only in our Army and Navy cargo operations but also in such all-cargo commercial flights as are now conducted the planes used were never designed for the purpose. Again to quote the O. W. I. report:

> No planes originally conceived solely for the carrying of air cargo are yet in regular service in the Western Hemisphere. This is true even in Bolivia, Colombia, and Central America where inadequate rail transport resulting from difficult terrain has brought about what is probably the highest development of commercial air cargo transport in the world.

Furthermore the total volume of cargo which can be carried in our present transport equipment, even when augmented by the tremendous production of 1943, will remain insignificant. The O. W. I. report points out that more than one-fourth of all twin-engine and four-engine aircraft manufactured in 1943 will be transports. Yet, if all the cargo planes which will be delivered to the armed services during 1943 could be assembled in a single area, and were all to take off with fuel for a 2,000-mile flight, they could carry a total of only about 20,000 tons of cargo.

Why then, it may be asked, do we place such emphasis today upon air transportation in connection with the prosecution of the war? Why, with such relatively small carrying capacity, should we operate such fleets of aircraft at the tremendous cost which we know is involved? The answer is that in war the job must be done regardless of cost. Speed and mobility are all important in wartime, and when the U-boats make the seas unsafe for shipping, or where ships are nonexistent, a cost of millions of dollars may not be too much in order to assure the transportation of that essential bomb for that essential plane for that decisive battle, without which the war might be lost.

As our Commander in Chief recently said:

> Speed will count. Lost ground can always be regained—lost time never.

But when we look ahead to the return of peace, cost of air transportation and the availability of other means of transport will become extremely important. Here are the sobering comments of the O. W. I. report:

> Availability and expense of fuel are limiting factors in air transport today, and will continue to be so as long as airplanes fly on gasoline. Original investment costs are also still relatively high. Present planes and planes being developed along the lines of present types are not ideally adapted to carry heavy freight long distances. Flights technically possible are often, as a matter of actual performance, still out of the question because of want of navigation facilities along the way or lack of adequate airports and repair shops, as well as refueling facilities.

The report goes on to quote the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, who points out that even with our great transoceanic air clippers flying from New York to England it takes more than two surface freighter loads of gasoline delivered to Newfoundland and England in order to permit the air delivery of cargo which one 10,000-ton surface freighter could carry across.

This more than doubles the surface vessel cargo tonnage requirements.

And the Administrator goes ahead to comment:

> Even if air cargo costs could be cut from the present average of 40 cents a mile to 10 cents, that would still be enormously higher than those of the railroads and steamships which express their costs per ton-mile in mills, not cents.

Furthermore the O. W. I. report sets forth the general specifications of the principal types of aircraft now being used for transport purposes and at the present under development. Even the layman in examining these specifications will recognize that we have far to go in engineering development and in mastering the secret of cheap, light, and efficient aircraft before we reach a point where, under normal peacetime conditions, the skies will be filled with flying box cars coming anywhere near the cost of our most expensive means of surface transport.

In considering the future of aviation, and especially of air transportation, I have never been one to paint a gloomy picture. No one has a greater faith in the destiny of air transportation than have I. But because of my faith in that destiny and because of my intense concern in our national security and the future commercial strength of this Nation, I am solicitous that this body, in considering problems relating to air transportation, see them in their true light and without being deluded by false expectations that on the day peace comes air transportation will immediately succeed to a vast share of the passenger and cargo transportation now moving by surface means. In fact until there are revolutionary engineering achievements, there is no reason to expect that in the over-all cargo field air transportation costs can seriously compete to any substantial extent with surface means.

In short, there lies ahead for the air-transport industry, for the aircraft manufacturers, and for the Government a period of many years during which there must be intensive development, both technically and commercially, before we can begin to appraise the proper ultimate place of air transportation in our national economy. The air-transport industry is in a stage of such infancy that it will require extraordinary steps and long, hard, arduous work to develop it to the point which it should some day reach if our Nation is to maintain a position of eminence in the world aviation picture.

For these reasons our attitude in connection with pending civil aeronautics legislation must remain, as it has been in the past, one which emphasizes development rather than regulation or restraint or effort to coordinate or tie in with other means of transportation. In 1940 when the Transportation Act was before the Congress, strong representations were made in favor of pursuing a policy of uniting the regulation of air transportation with other modes of transportation under a common transportation policy. But the Congress rejected such a proposal firmly and positively. As the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, had said in 1938 in arguing against a policy of regulation of air transportation on a basis of coordination with other means of transportation:

> If we want real coordination, we must begin with the coordination of rates. The question of rate coordination is not now and for some years to come will not be an acute problem as between air and surface transportation. Air cost prevents that problem for the present.

The situation has not changed in the last few years. Indeed, developments during the war, and the sobering fact that, even with the tremendously accelerated advance of aviation under the stimulus of war, the costs of air transportation remain extraordinarily high, emphasize now as never before the wisdom of the decisions we twice made, once in 1938 and again in 1940.

No administrative agency today, no matter how wise and farsighted, could positively assess the proper place of air transportation in relation to other means of transport. When costs are not stabilized, when types of aircraft are in the midst of revolutionary change, when we have not yet even in the developmental stage a real cargo aircraft, when even the engineering minds in the industry have

not yet settled upon the types of aircraft best adapted for commercial purposes, when we do not yet know what will be the most economical types of service, while debate still rages, as it will for years to come, concerning the relative merits of exclusive cargo as distinguished from a combination passenger-cargo service, when an aircraft such as the helicopter, despite the most intensive developmental work, is not yet able to lift more than a few pounds, when no one has yet been able to demonstrate any truly practical use even for such a well-known device as the glider, when no substitute for weight-consuming gasoline has been conceived—no man can say what the proper place for air transportation should be 5 or 10 or 20 years hence. And with such uncertainty it would invite tragic mistakes to depart, in legislative policy, from concentration upon development or to suggest regulation on a basis of coordination with other means of transportation.

There is now pending a civil aeronautics bill designed to revise our existing civil aeronautics legislation and to prepare Government and industry for post-war aviation development. The bill has been redrafted by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, after a long and painstaking consideration, and copies were recently made available to the general public. In this bill the subcommittee has taken care to adhere to the fundamental decision in 1938, reaffirmed in 1940, that, as expressed by the President:

> Aviation is a special problem requiring special treatment.

The emphasis in the bill throughout is upon the need to develop the industry in all its phases. An effort to subject air transportation to some general over-all transportation policy applicable to other means of transport has been sedulously avoided. If the bill is adopted, as I hope it will be at this session, we may look forward with confidence to a continued development of an industry which in a few short years has become essential to our national security and to the future welfare of America's commerce.

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is Flag Day, proclaimed by the President of the United States, by the Governors of the 48 States, and by heads of municipalities throughout our great country. It is the final day of a week set apart to reaffirm our faith in our ideals for which the American flag stands, and our loyalty for the Nation, over which it has flown for a century and a half.

Because of the President's proclamation I have received many letters from my constituents throughout the Sixth Congressional District pertaining to Flag Day and its significance. In view of the questions asked, and for the further fact that the flag is more significant today to a liberty-loving people than ever before, I have chosen that subject for today's discussion.

Born of a right to self-rule, after years of oppression by a tyrant king, the Stars and Stripes are the history of a struggle by a determined people to be independent and free.

The Stars and Stripes symbolize 8 years of struggle and sacrifice to form a union of States. Each star is the history of a sovereign State. Their setting on a blue field signals to mankind that here is a Nation dedicated to personal freedom and religious rights, a sanctuary to oppressed men and women the world over, where they might have life and liberty and where they may pursue happiness.

The red stripes represent human sacrifice and the blood spilled by our Nation's heroes in winning the freedom which is ours; the white ones, the purity of purpose of a greater, nobler, and holier America. In the whole is crystallized all the hopes and fears of a Nation established on the righteous principle of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of worship.

During the years of trouble with England, all sorts of queer flags had been designed as standards for the Colonies, first by one colony and then by another, each, however, having a distinctive pattern and design all its own.

But of all the flags and symbols since the world began, there is none other so full of meaning as the flag of our country. That piece of red, white, and blue bunting, represents 5,000 years of struggle upwards: it is the full-grown flower of ages of fighting for liberty; it is the century plant of human hope in bloom.

General Washington, George Ross, the uncle of Betsy Ross, and Robert Morris constituted a committee of three to prepare a suitable design for the new American flag. After some study, they submitted their design to Betsy Ross, a widow, then 24 years of age, living in Philadelphia, conducting the upholstery business which her husband had previously run.

Betsy Ross, an expert seamstress, then drew a draft of the flag with 13 red and white stripes and five pointed white stars in a field of blue, which the committee accepted. They submitted the flag to Congress, but this flag was not approved until many designs were studied and discussed by the Members of the Colonial Congress.

Finally, Congress, on June 14, 1777, adopted for the Nation, the flag designed by Washington, Morris, and Ross, and made by Betsy Ross. The language of the congressional resolution was as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the flag of the 13 united States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a field of blue, representing a new constellation.

In 1794, with the admission of two new States into the Union—Vermont and Kentucky—two additional stars and two additional stripes were added.

The flag flying over Fort McHenry on September 13 and 14, 1814, when Francis Scott Key wrote the Star-Spangled Banner, had 15 stripes and 15 stars.

It was my privilege some time ago to visit the old historic Fort McHenry at Baltimore. As I wandered over that old battleground, it seemed to me that a panorama of my country's history came before me. I could vision Francis Scott Key, confined as a prisoner on one of the boats in the English fleet, waiting patiently during the 25 hours of bombardment, wondering whether at the beginning of dawn, the American flag would be flying; and I could feel the thrill that must have come to him when, with the first appearance of dawn, he found the flag still there. Then he put his whole heart and patriotic soul into the burning words of the Star-Spangled Banner, now our national anthem.

As the Nation grew in size it became impossible to add one new stripe and one new star for each State and still preserve the symmetry of the flag. So Congress in 1818 passed an act providing that the flag should be composed of 13 stripes, and a star to represent the admission of each additional State. Therefore in the flag today the 13 stripes signify the Thirteen Original Colonies and the 48 stars signify the 48 States of the Union.

I want to call your attention, particularly on this day, to the significance of the American flag. Our flag is emblematic of the sovereignty of our Nation.

It represents the ideals, aspirations, and history of our people and engenders a feeling of patriotism and respect.

It flies perpetually over the Nation's Capitol as a sign of national perpetuity.

It flies over the school houses of our Nation, signifying the Nation's endorsement of education and the Nation's protection.

It flies over the capitols of all our States and over our court houses signifying the administration of justice.

It is the symbol of every right enjoyed by the American people.

It represents the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

It reflects the wealth and grandeur and patriotism of this great land of opportunity.

It signifies the law of the land.

It stands for peace and goodwill among the liberty-loving nations of the world.

It believes in tolerance.

It is the badge of the Nation's greatness and the emblem of its destiny.

At a time like this, when European monarchies, kingdoms and republics are constantly changing or crumbling, our American Flag has a greater dignity, a greater significance, a greater purpose than ever before.

Let me call your attention to this paradoxical statement; that the United States is today the youngest of the great nations on earth and at the same time it

is the oldest continuing government on earth. Our Constitution and our Flag for more than 150 years have remained intact, and the principles that they guarded 150 years ago, they are still guarding with greater patriotism than ever before. So, our Flag today represents, in these critical times, our standard of national defense.

It is fitting, therefore, that today every patriotic citizen should give thought and attention to the American Flag. That Flag represents everything that you and I hold dear. It is the symbol of our country. It protects the home, the church, and the school. That Flag at this moment is with our 2,000,000 boys scattered throughout the world in their fight for liberty. Because of our 8,000,000 boys in military service today, and especially because of the 2,000,000 that are abroad, it is our great and patriotic duty to respect the Flag as never before at this crucial time when the destiny of the Nation is at stake.

The Black-out of Fair Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 14 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article relating to the WAAC's, entitled "The Black-out of Fair Play," by Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLACK-OUT OF FAIR PLAY

(By Evalyn Walsh McLean)

What a shocking, horrible, and stupid way we Americans are treating the WAAC's and other women in uniform by this filthy, open persecution now going around the country.

They have given up brothers, husbands, and sweethearts who are willing to die for our country—given up their all—and we are sitting back placidly throwing mud and worse at them. You can wash mud off, but this infamy sticks—once you begin to discuss a woman's virtue, she hasn't any.

Where are justice, tolerance, and fair play in this country of ours we love so dearly? Who would allow such condemnation of our womanhood, if we were stopping to think what it means?

Of course, there are weak girls in uniform, just as there are weak and tragic women everywhere and just as there are weak and worse than weak men scattered all over the world in all walks of life.

But let us not confuse these few with the great army of women who are giving their best for their country. If we true and loyal citizens who read and repeat the filthy condemnations of the women in uniform would only consider the real facts, then the slanders would stop.

Think of the hard and relentless grind these girls must go through to become WAAC's. Think of the classes they must attend, the subjects they must study and learn. Think of the strange cities and new worlds they are thrown into overnight and on their own.

It is a hard life these young women have chosen to live for their country.

They have not chosen it just so they could go to bed with a man. That is just about the easiest thing any woman can do. She doesn't need a uniform for that.

But consider, instead, the long hikes, the hard studies, and the entirely new rules of life the girl must subject herself to when she puts on that uniform and takes the oath of duty to her country as a member of its armed forces.

Now don't think for a moment I believe in, or that I do not condemn, the so-called single standard; that is, equal life for women and men in the physical sense. To me a woman always loses something she can never get back once she takes the jump.

I am not defending here any girl who has misbehaved or gone wrong, no matter whether she is in uniform or not, but I have always said that 99 out of 100 women are fundamentally decent, and I still think that.

I certainly don't think the people who started the false and malicious lies about the women in uniform are themselves decent, and I think that every time these lies are repeated or printed the responsible people should be fined—heavily.

Beauty, truth, and honesty have certainly been in eclipse for the last few years, thanks to that crazy man, Hitler.

And now if we begin to pull down our splendid young women just because a few of them may have been in error, or if we allow anyone else to pull them down, then in my honest opinion we are all of us just as cruel and selfish, just as vicious, as that fiend, Hitler.

I have watched many, many of these girls in uniform. They have dignity, and a serious, even a grim, determination to carry on their duty to their country and not fall down.

I want to say to their parents, wherever they are, that I know too many WAAC's and WAVES and SPARS and women marines to doubt them.

They are using their liberty from parental control like the ladies they are. Let us not worry about that. Let us remember that the way is always hard for crusaders in this world. These girls are blazing a new trail in history—a trail for their daughters and granddaughters to follow.

I want to repeat to the unthinking, these women do not have to go through these hardships just to get men. They could do that easier and simpler just by sitting in a night club or necking in the dark in a parked car with the doors locked.

No; that story is a lie.

I say, God bless all you wonderful WAAC's and you other girls in uniform. Remember, if a few do stumble and fall, just pick yourselves up and keep your courage high and know that God will help you, because He knows and understands and loves you all.

I know, too, that I am going to be criticized for what I have written here. "She's just a crazy old society woman with a double standard," they'll say. But I haven't any double standard in my own life, never have had. I try not to be my brother's keeper when it comes to blaming or condemning the other fellow, that's all.

But I do feel so deeply, sincerely, and honestly about these girls.

I feel they are really so grand, brave, and fine, and above all, so moral, and I have such complete faith in them, that I will take any disagreeable criticism that comes my way.

Girls, don't get discouraged, hurt, or angry, just because some of you must suffer for the very few. Remember, your great country is back of you. It is proud of you, and greatest of all—it needs you.

Japanese Internment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit resolutions adopted June 9, 1943, by the council of the city of Los Angeles:

Whereas certain elements within our country are endeavoring to remove foreign- and American-born Japanese from internment centers and return them to the Pacific coast; and

Whereas the internment of these Japanese was necessitated not only for the protection of our country and its citizens, but also for the safety of the internees themselves; and

Whereas the psychological reaction of our inhabitants after the Japanese slaughter of our American citizens at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, was such as to create a nervous tension held under control only by increased activity of peace officers and by the immediate internment of Japanese by Federal Bureau of Investigation agents and peace officers; and

Whereas the difference in race, religion, color, and thought of the Japanese from our American citizens is such that the ideologies of the Orient are inherently present and predominate to such an extent in the majority of all Japanese in America as to prohibit any Japanese from ever becoming a strictly loyal American; and

Whereas by actual survey it has been ascertained that 80 percent of the internees would, by their own admission, fight for Japan if given the opportunity, and the attitude of the remaining 20 percent is an unknown quantity; and

Whereas the brilliant and intelligent military strategy shown by Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt would be nullified were the restrictions placed upon the internees lifted; and

Whereas peace officer personnel has been reduced 25 percent through enlistment of members in the armed forces, thereby creating a shortage of officers with which to control the riots, mob violence, and sabotage which release of the Japanese would engender; and

Whereas recognizing the danger to our communities which would be aggravated by lessening of internship orders, the Peace Officers Association of Los Angeles County has appointed a committee consisting of Sheriff Eugene W. Biscailuz, District Attorney Fred N. Howser, John H. Hanson, Superintendent Plant Protection, Lockheed Aircraft Corporation; Los Angeles Police Chief C. B. Horrall and M. G. M. Studio Chief W. P. Hendry to oppose any lessening of internship restriction, and other organizations and associations are actively fighting the release of internees; and

Whereas the citizens of the west coast are strictly and unequivocally opposed to the infiltration of Japanese into their communities; and now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Los Angeles urge continued internment of Japanese, regardless of place of birth and further urge that no organization, group, or individual be permitted to engage in any activity which would tend to lower internment restrictions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to General DeWitt, to the California Members of Congress, to the Secretaries of War and Navy, and to the President of the United States.

Subsidy on Potatoes

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. was set up to control profits rather than prices. It provides a ceiling for farm prices and places a floor under the highest wages in history with an escape clause upward revision.

At Bennington, Okla., in the district I represent, the ceiling price on Irish potatoes today is $2.70 per hundredweight on car. In Washington, D. C., where I am residing during this session of Congress, last Saturday Irish potatoes cost me 8 cents a pound or $8 per hundred, a difference in price of $5.30.

In the Bennington Journal appears an open letter from Mr. W. H. Frank, head of the Bryan County Potato Growers Association, advising the potato growers of the ceiling price per car. The price does not mean in any sense that the farmer will receive $2.70 net for his potatoes—he will receive $2.70 gross. He has to make his deduction for seed, which was very high, commercial ferilizer, also high, sprinkling for insects, hoeing and plowing, gathering, loading, and transportation, which cost from 20 to 35 cents per sack of 100 pounds from the potato patch to the railroad car. Then between the cost of production and his investment for seed, fertilizer, spraying compound, sacks, hired labor, and transportation, the farmer receives a net pitiful sum for his long hours and days of labor and sweat. Yet the organized labor journals and press releases are "hollering" from the housetops to roll back the price of farm commodities. Not one word has been heard by me where they have said anything about too big a profit for transportation and distribution.

No criticism has been made about the high wages that will be paid that is chargeable to a sack of these potatoes. Organized labor takes charge at the car and organized labor will be in charge at the point of destination, organized labor will take their toll in delivering the potatoes from the railroad depot to the wholesaler, and organized labor will receive their portion of the sack of potatoes in delivering from the wholesaler to the retailer. Organized labor will receive their share in the industrial centers for putting them in a paper sack and delivering them to the final consumer.

Yet in the face of all of the fixed demands by organized labor and O. P. A. our citizens are patriotic and working upon a 24-hour shift to get these potatoes to the consumer. Mr. Green, Mr. Lewis, and Mr. Murray recommend a subsidy for the farmer. On the other hand, in many vital war plants demands are being made and strikes are being called for higher wages. Where is the point of meeting of minds between the farmer and the organized labor group if the farmer goes broke in his potato adventure and begins to look about for employment in some war industry? In most cases he is compelled to pay an unreasonable initiation fee and join the union and pay dues before he can even interview an employment agency. In at least one instance I know about, the U. S. E. S. said they would refuse to certify to the contractor any nonunion laborer.

I am fearful that too many not in sympathy with the farmer are writing the rules under which he must abide.

We wish to point out to organized labor that the following open letter from Mr. W. H. Frank to the potato growers rings with patriotism, not a threatened strike, but to the contrary appealing to his neighbors "to get your potatoes out and into the money," and he cautions not to expose too many potatoes to sunshine to prevent decay. The high point of his letter, contrary to organized labor's demands and O. P. A. unjust ceiling price in this locality, is wherein he says:

We will be operating for about 10 days, and will work night and day, if necessary, to get the job done.

If this slogan was the spirit of those of us backing up our armed forces, much more would be accomplished in this great global conflict.

The matter referred to is as follows:

POTATO LETTER FROM MR. FRANK

Hello, everybody; the grading and marketing of potatoes will start Wednesday, June 9, except for another lot of heavy rains.

It looks like the price is going to be $2.70 loaded on the cars for No. 1 grade. This is the price set by the Office of Price Administration at this time and will be the price for the whole season, unless the Government officials see fit to make a change. The price set was $2.50 per hundred, but the writer joined others to boost the price to $3.50, with the result of a compromise price of $2.70. I wrote to Prentiss Brown, the Office of Price Administration Administrator, and to Senator ELMER THOMAS, protesting this price of low ceiling, and mine along with thousands of other protests from all over the Southern States has been the reason for the small raise.

It is now the writer's opinion that the best thing to do is to get your potatoes out and into money, as the Government is going to regulate the price, and this is one year that it will be hard to keep potatoes long on account of so much moisture caused by so much rain. Then you must stop and think—this price is fully twice as much as we have been getting in former years, and is above the price that was guaranteed by the Government at planting time in the spring. We all went ahead and planted with the $2.25 price in mind. Of course, the shortage of potatoes right at this time makes us think that the price is too low, but there are many areas producing potatoes that will come on later and this shortage will be overcome, or oversupplied. The Colorado's have planted 75 percent more potatoes than last year, and the North has planted likewise.

I wish to warn you against holding your potatoes until later in the season for higher prices or other reasons. Would like to convey this actual experience to you. On numerous occasions, we have had a number of sacks to stay on the grader platform after the close of the season waiting for a truck, for a week or more, and always we have had to sell on reweights, which proved a loss of an average of 10 pounds per sack, and this year the shrinkage will be more. This amounts to considerable loss in money.

We will use the No. 2 potatoes at a price in line with the price of the No. 1 grade.

Again this year, be careful in gathering your potatoes. Do not plow up too long a row before picking up and getting into the shade, as this year sun scald will be much easier because of the high water content of potatoes due to the wet season.

We will be operating for about 10 days, and will work night and day if necessary to get the job done.

Pass this information along to your neighbor, as he may not get this letter.

Yours very truly,

W. H. FRANK,
For Bryan County Potato Growers Association.

No, Thank You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if a man bites a dog, that is news. It is news because it is a natural and frequent occurrence in reverse.

In these days of bigger and better subsidies flowing from the Federal Treasury to favored groups, blocs, and individuals, all the way from the cradle to the grave, it is refreshing to meet up with one of these proposed beneficiaries who realizes that all money in the Federal Treasury must come out of the pockets of the taxpayers, and that this bootstrap lifting of those benefited is fundamentally wrong and, if pursued far enough, will ruin not only the Government but the economy of our people.

Mr. Speaker, the thought I have in mind is well illustrated by an editorial appearing in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of June 12, 1943, which I am sure is well worth reading. It is as follows:

NO, THANK YOU

A bill has been introduced by Senator Bankhead, and a companion bill in the House, providing that the Government shall spend twenty-five or thirty-five millions a year in advertising in newspapers, to be divided equally between daily and weekly papers.

We do not believe that this is an attempt to bribe or control the press. We do not charge any bad motives to the authors of the bill, nor to those who favor it. But nevertheless the bill is bad—absolutely bad—and for a number of reasons.

In the first place it would have some of the effects of a subsidy, even if that is not its purpose. A newspaper publisher on the Government pay roll cannot possibly be quite as disinterested as he otherwise would be.

In the second place it is patently a handout. The equal division between daily and weekly papers is proof of that. Daily newspaper circulation is enormously greater than weekly, and daily advertising rates are higher. If the advertising were put out on a business basis a much larger share would naturally go to dailies. Can you imagine General Motors or Ford using all newspapers and dividing a million dollars equally between dailies and others? It would be just as absurd for the Government to do so. It would not be business. It would be politics, or something.

A third reason against the measure is that it is absolutely needless. What would the

millions of advertising be for—for bonds? for salvage? for rationing rules? The press furnishes all that advertising free. It has furnished ten times more than the twenty-five or thirty millions proposed. It has done it not only willingly but enthusiastically—getting behind every drive, and printing all information that could be desired. It will continue to do so. They do not need to be hired to perform that duty to their readers and to their nation. They ought not to want to be.

Important newspapers and newspaper organizations oppose the bill, some violently. Some organizations made up of smaller newspapers are reported to favor it. We think these publishers are in error, and that they will regret it if the bill ever becomes a law. The press of the country would suffer lasting harm.

Japanese Problem on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, more than 100,000 Japanese have been removed from the Pacific coast areas and are held in relocation centers. Recently a good many of these Japanese have been released. People of the Pacific-coast areas are very much concerned over this problem and are opposed to any of these Japanese being released and allowed to return to the Pacific coast.

It is a well-known fact that many of the Japanese, even though born in America, believe in dual citizenship and owe allegiance and loyalty to the Emperor of Japan. There is no place in America for divided loyalty in this critical hour when our own men in our fighting forces are giving their lives for the protection of our country. The dastardly attack of the Japanese upon Pearl Harbor should be a lesson to us not to lessen our vigilance, particularly on the Pacific coast.

It is well-known that the Japanese have as a part of their plan to attack the Pacific coast, and if these Japanese who are loyal to Japan are permitted to remain in that territory they will be in a position to further the plans and schemes of our enemies.

I include as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Gresham Chamber of Commerce on May 29, 1943, which is in my congressional district:

Whereas the people of the United States are engaged in a death struggle with the Japanese Imperial Government, and are engaged in a war to defend American homes and Christian ideals against Japanese agression; and

Whereas the experience of Oregon citizens with Japanese nationals and those persons who by accident of birth became vested with American citizenship, has provan that the Japanese people do not and cannot assimilate with the white Americans; and

Whereas it is impossible to determine which citizens of Japanese descent are loyal and which are disloyal to the United States and hold dual citizenship; and

Whereas it is significant that no citizen of Japanese descent warned the officials of the Nation of the preparation which preceded the infamous attack upon Pearl Harbor, with resultant massacre of innocent American citizens; and

Whereas the Japanese people have proven to be barbaric savages in war and are masters of deception in time of peace; and

Whereas in the past the Japanese have taken over small farm holdings and have gradually increased their holding until previous to December 7 they were or had about driven out all of the other growers of vegetables in this section and were, in various underhand methods, through births, buying up the best farms in this section. On farms that were rented they were run down to such an extent that it was impossible for others to make a living and were then bought up and rehabilitated. Living conditions were of the lowest and this brought the standard of living to such a point that they were able to corner this part of the country as a vegetable center.

Whereas the above chamber of commerce in session asked that a resolution be drafted that they never be permitted to return to this section; that the Congress of the United States take the necessary steps both for this country and their own well-being in that they never be permitted to return to this section. While here they mere given the best of education, and one member of their band became the biggest spy for the Japanese and he graduated from our local high school. Out of respect for the boys from this section who have been slaughtered, we insist that the necessary steps be taken for their removal from this section, as well as the United States.

The above action was taken by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Gresham and of Multnomah County, one of the sections that had more of this class of people to contend with, and their action was unanimous. Copies to be sent to the Oregon delegation in Congress, the Portland Chamber of Commerce, Walter Winchell, and to the Honorable Harold Ickes.

The Sweet Sweat of Honest Toil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Aeronautics for June 1943:

THE SWEET SWEAT OF HONEST TOIL

Sound legislation, like any other creative work, is one-tenth inspiration and nine-tenths perspiration. The revised H. R. 1012 is to the original fuzzy draft of the bill as sunlight is to canned heat. The latest edition shows the character of the work which the committee put on the bill.

The legislation first declares the sovereignty of the Federal Government over the air spaces of the United States and its Territories. All will recognize that this is essential before the Government can consummate those international air treaties which will form a part of the stability of world society in the air age.

The legislation next assures uniformity of regulations within the Nation and provides for reciprocal privileges for American aviators in foreign skies. Also, the bill directs the Commission and Administrator to cooperate with the States in their development problems and recognizes that the States of the Union each have a place and an inherent interest in the broad field of aeronautics.

The bill moves on into the subject of economic regulation where it provides for stabilization of air commerce as free enterprise, guards against interlocking interests of the trust variety, acknowledges the value of competition, suggests that even direct subsidy may be necessary upon occasion and limits control of air commerce to the capital directly invested in such commerce.

In numerous provisos the Commission is directed to perform essential promotional services such as research, education, airway and airport development, study of aviation insurance and reinsurance, cooperation with the Weather Bureau, establishment of qualifications for administrative personnel, and the furnishing of information to Congress and the public.

The administrative machinery of the Government is straightened out so that confusion should be eliminated. A director of accidents (really the good old safety board idea) is reestablished.

Not alone in the actual provisions of the legislation is H. R. 1012 now an admirable work but in the attitude and in the clarity of the wording. Weasel clauses are few and far between. The Commission is given that freedom of judgment which does not stifle the public interest behind red tape. The zoning provision has teeth enough to bite into any problem, and hold on.

The National Aeronautic Association has followed this bill with the keenest interest. We have sought to preserve the pattern of American Government, as we understand it, for American skies. We have sought an attitude of sympathetic understanding and cooperation between Federal and State interests. We have sought emphasis on promotion and development rather than regulation and red tape. We have tried to represent the best interests of the thousands of pilots and airmen who are essentially silent because in the armed forces. We believe the legislation as it now stands (committee draft 2) is constructive, sound in principle and expression, comprehensive in viewpoint.

Our conferences with the committee have been a pleasure. We found the Congress to be sympathetic to all problems, open-minded, and willing to listen to the stories of all. We want the personnel of aviation to know this for we pulled no punches in presenting the cause of the "little people."

Our warm appreciation goes to the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which the Honorable CLARENCE LEA is chairman, and the Honorable ALFRED BULWINKLE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation. To the Civil Aeronautics Administration for staying away from the hill both in fact and upon principle, we also wish to comment with high approval.

H. R. 1012 is not perfect, but it is an honest effort and it reflects mental integrity on the part of the committee.

War Bond Sales in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following press release:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
WAR SAVINGS STAFF,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1943.

Hawaii stands at the top of the list of all the States and Territories with an uninterrupted record of exceeding its monthly quota of War bond sales, Secretary Morgenthau announced today.

Citing statistics just compiled, Mr. Morgenthau pointed out that the people of Hawaii have headed the quota performance record in every month since the quota system was established in May 1942, and on a monthly per capita basis have bought War bonds at a rate from two to nearly four times above the average for the Nation as a whole.

"It is worth noting," the Secretary commented, "that the best record made anywhere in the United States in consistently exceeding War bond quotas has been made in Hawaii, where the people have suffered attack, have cheerfully undergone severe restrictions in their normal way of life, and have made an outstanding contribution to the war effort in every way.

"In the purchase of War bonds, Hawaii has set a record in which she can take great pride; her people have set an example for all of us."

In May 1942 War bond sales in Hawaii were 603 percent of quota. In subsequent months, with increased quotas, sales have ranged from 102.9 percent to 354 percent of the assigned figure.

Per capita sales in Hawaii last December were $20.16, as compared with $5.43 for the Nation as a whole, according to data prepared by the research staff of the Treasury's War Savings Staff.

Flag Day

REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is Flag Day in our country. The day has a deep and peculiar significance this year. We are engaged in a terrible war, and our flag is now on many battle fronts throughout the world. Our flag was born in the very midst of our struggle for freedom, when our Thirteen Original Colonies were struggling to throw off the yoke of oppression and gain their liberty; our flag was designed to denote the union of those Colonies in that great crisis. We were victorious in that titanic struggle, and our flag has endured throughout the years, and through every war, until it stands today as the emblem of liberty and freedom before the world.

Mr. Speaker, when this present war is over, and when our soldiers, sailors, and marines bring our flag back to us—still freedom's flag—millions of Americans will then have a new and unforgotten conception of the flag. In the military conception, the flag has almost a mystic significance—it flies from the flagstaff in the devout conception of duty to country and of sacrifice for our Nation and the preservation of our American way of life—and with the sense that we are willing to sacrifice our lives in order to aid in the preservation and perpetuation of our country.

To every American, our flag will hold the sympathetic touch of those great sacrifices which have been made throughout the years to make our flag respected by every Nation in the world—it will cause us to remember the valor and the sacrifices which have been made by our soldiers, sailors, and marines that our country may survive, and that our people may hereafter tread their way in paths of peace—it will cause a keener reverence for our national emblem by all the peoples of the world.

When we see our flag unfurled we will realize that sacrifice, suffering, and anguish have played their full part in making our flag—our country—the greatest upon the face of this ancient and kindly earth.

Long may our flag wave as freedom's flag. May we march forward through the ages, following our flag—the flag of liberty and freedom—the flag we love!

Fishery Problems in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech prepared by me and read for me at the convention of the Oyster Institute of North America, held in Philadelphia. I was prevented by business in the House from delivering it in person.

The speech follows:

In an unguarded moment, without complete realization of the congestion in my office and without knowing the matters to be considered in the House on June 2, I accepted the invitation of Dr. Radcliffe to speak on this occasion. I was impelled to accept for three reasons, first, my warm friendship for, and close cooperation with, Dr. Radcliffe, running through the 24 years and 11 months I have been in Congress; second, my appreciation of the splendid work he is doing, and the great assistance he has rendered, and is rendering, me in fishery matters; and third, my desire to render all the help I can to all branches of the fishery industry in these trying, perplexing, and confusing times.

WORK OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

For the past 20 years I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. During the last half of this period I have been chairman of that committee. I was born in Tidewater, Va., and, except while in Washington, I have spent all of my life there. Fishing has always been, and is, one of the principal industries of that section. I have known from my earliest days the trials, hardships, difficulties, handicaps, risks, and burdens of the fisherman and of the men engaged in the related industries. I have heard the calls and signals of those lost in the fogs, and I have stood by the bodies of those who died in the storms. I know the risks they take and the uncertainties they face. Some of my closest relatives, and my warmest friends, were oyster planters, oystermen, and fishermen. I think I know something of their hazards. I wish I knew definite answers to all of their problems. I do not. They do not. No one does. But one thing is as true as life itself and that is that we shall never know, and we shall never find solutions until there is more complete organization of all branches of the industry, more united approach to a proper solution of the industry's many problems, greater harmony among all groups, closer cooperation between all sections, and less disposition to blame others for those burdens for which we alone by our united efforts must find answers. An awakening consciousness to the existence of the fishery problems, and a greater determination to find appropriate answers, is evident. I welcome the present spirit of unrest, of criticism, of dissatisfaction, of inquiry, and of change. That spirit augurs well for the industry, I believe, and I hope it means the dawn of a new day. I should like to do my part in making tomorrow better than yesterday or today.

The efforts of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries found expression in some legislative proposals in recent years. I mention first H. R. 7147, which was a bill to extend to the seafood industry all benefits, privileges, aids, loans, or other advantages provided in laws enacted by Congress for the relief of persons engaged in the agricultural industry.

The bill was not enacted into law, but the hearings we held, the study we made, and the facts we obtained, laid the groundwork for various amendments to other existing laws which brought some benefits to the fishery industry. I wish to emphasize that all efforts to benefit the fishery industry had then, has had since, and has now, the sympathetic and intelligent support of the Federal fishery agencies. I refer to the Bureau of Fisheries and the present Fish and Wildlife Service.

Following the hearings on H. R. 7147, we secured amendments (1) to the act establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to authorize loans to the fishery industry; (2) to the Farm Credit Act to authorize loans to oyster planters; and (3) to the Merchant Marine Act to authorize construction of various types of fishing vessels. There was enacted a separate law authorizing associations of producers of aquatic products, and recently a law was passed authorizing the War Shipping Administration to dispose of requisitioned vessels, no longer needed for defense purposes, with preference to their original owners. Appropriations were secured for the fishery market news service which has also proved of increasing advantage to the fishery industry and should prove of greater future help in that the service assures reliable, unbiased information. Improvement in that service will be provided if, as, and when the necessary appropriations can be provided.

In addition, other bills to purchase fishery products were enacted and proved beneficial at a time when markets were difficult to find. Very small appropriations have been one of our greatest handicaps.

Other measures might be cited, and among other measures undertaken but which failed of passage there should be mentioned, bills (1) to provide for the inspection and grading of fishery products, (2) for the replacement of fishing vessels, and (3) on the Americanization of the fishing industry.

PRESENT CONDITIONS

The maze of legislation and regulation confusing the industry today far exceeds anything in the past and neither the fishery committees of Congress nor the Fish and

Wildlife Service are responsible for those conditions. The result is confusion worse confounded, but the same condition is incident to every other industry and to every individual. The cause is war and war is chaos. You recall the famous saying of General Sherman, "War is hell." With all reverence we must confess it is nothing less. There are and can be no blueprints for the work we now must do—no charts for the course we now must sail. We must coordinate our efforts with all other efforts and all must be directed to one objective—victory as speedily as possible. Regulations and restrictions apply to phases of the industry—production, processing, marketing, distribution, manpower, operations, and consumption. They transcend sometimes the limitations of State laws, and there is not a person in the industry, ashore or afloat, who is not directly affected by them, with no stability in their operation but always subject to rapid change. Every fishing boat, every fish-packing plant, and all persons in the industry are in the front-line trenches.

One example will suffice to illustrate what I mean. A directive issued from the War Production Board limiting the use of tinplate. It affected all canners of fishery products, all packers of fresh oyster, crab meat and other shellfish products, and all packers of fresh and frozen fish fillets in every part of the Nation.

Lost in this labyrinth of regulations and directives you ask "What can I do?" I cannot answer. There is no exact answer. However, by intelligent approach, by patient study, by diligent research, by careful discrimination, we may seek to adjust our differences, to coordinate our activities, to organize all branches of the industry even when apparently in hopeless conflict, and by our united and sympathetic cooperation seek on the part of each to promote the welfare of all. Each of us must give and take.

To this end the Bureau of Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of the Interior, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and others interested in the fisheries united to secure, and did secure, appointment by the President of a Coordinator of Fisheries who has done, and is doing, a great work for the industry. You must help. You must work with the Coordinator and his staff if the greatest good is to be obtained for all. We must use the agencies at hand for there is no time now to make drastic changes. The Coordinator and his staff must serve, as a trouble-shooter, and as a liaison agency between you and the other agencies fighting to win this war. I am assured of their desire to help.

REQUISITIONED VESSELS

Necessarily, your boats have been requisitioned, but that is not without precedent, for it is our proud boast, and an established fact, that such craft have helped to win every war waged by this Nation since our earliest colonial days.

Necessity is not only the mother of invention, but also of new practices, new economies, new policies, and new instrumentalities. The vessels not requisitioned, so far as possible, must be adapted to new uses. Vessels must be used more efficiently, and craft such as oyster boats, designed for particular needs, must, in slack seasons, if humanly possible, be turned to other purposes, and used for capture of other kinds of fish. I am told that there are probably hundreds of schooners, sloops, and other types of craft used in the oyster industry which are tied to docks today and which might with minor alterations be turned to other purposes.

I am told that in order to assist the fishery industry in the orderly construction and repair of fishing vessels, the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, under an arrangement with the War Production Board, now has in operation a program which is designed to maintain the fishing effort. Under this program an allotment of controlled materials (steel, copper, and aluminum) has been allocated to the fishery industry, and the construction of fishing vessels and engines is being scheduled. Tentative schedules provide for the construction of new vessels in every important fishery.

PRICE CONTROLS

The United States is trying to control prices and for this purpose has created the Office of Price Administration. This is a problem which requires detailed discussion, thoughtful consideration, and close cooperation. All must work together to save the Nation from this peril.

CRITICAL MATERIALS

Stock piles of many materials of which, in calmer days, we had practically unlimited quantities, both from our own production and from abroad have been consumed. It is necessary to conserve, allocate, and limit the use of many commodities, such as tin, iron, steel, copper, aluminum, rubber, cordage, and gasoline. Noncritical substitutes must be found. To this end funds have been appropriated, and the Fish and Wildlife Service is conducting technical studies to find substitutes. I am informed that this work is progressing and that already suitable fiberboard packages have been found to replace tin containers formerly used in shipping various fresh and frozen fishery products. Numerous tests under practical fishing operations have shown that nets and cordage made from certain types of substitute fibers are satisfactory and gels from domestic plants have been extracted. These gels will be available to industrial users as an alternate for imported agar. These studies are being continued to test newly developed products.

Experiments are in progress to determine the suitability of certain nontinned plate and lacquers to decrease the need for heavily tinned plate. These tests will determine if further economies in tin utilization are permissible insofar as wholesomeness of the food is concerned.

DEHYDRATION

Considerable progress has been made on the development of dehydrated fishery products. Surveys are being conducted to determine sources of fishery products suitable for dehydration, and recommendations for methods of commercial production are available to interested firms. If these products can be produced commercially it will greatly simplify the container problem since the finished product is susceptible of packaging in containers made of noncritical materials.

USE COORDINATOR'S OFFICE

I have found the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries most useful to our committee. Some of the problems you face today came before our committee at their very inception. In most of them we have consulted with this agency and it has supplied us with the facts gathered by its field force and from its files of fishery facts. Moreover, we have had the benefit of advice emanating from this agency and the Fish and Wildlife Service which combines the experience of many investigators and practical workers extending over some 75 years.

I urge you to submit your problems to this agency. With its contacts with the 22 other Government agencies concerned with problems of the fishery industry and with its personnel of various knowledge and experience it is usually in a position to advise and guide you.

Use the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries as a clearing house for your perplexities, and give it first opportunity to help on your problems. Those in the office may not have a solution to all your problems, they may not know all the answers since they are only human, but they at least have the broadest range of activities and contacts in the field and are the best sources of all-round help.

Write to the Coordinator of Fisheries, and, if no attention is paid your letters, then write your Member of Congress or Senator to find out why.

Many problems are susceptible of cure only by official action of some kind. Regulations may need changing or new legislation be required. For the former, go to them; for the latter, write me. An individual difficulty often receives scant consideration in a busy emergency agency, for it is often thought that the situation is unique and concerns only a few people. If, however, complaints can be cleared through one agency, such as the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, that agency is able to accumulate a mass of evidence that is uncontrovertible. Then the agency of final jurisdiction can be approached with a well-substantiated demand for relief. In many instances such relief has been obtained. For an example from my personal experience, the owner of a country store in my district was unable to obtain the gasoline with which he customarily supplied small fishing boats in his area. As a result, fishing would have come to a standstill in that area had not his complaint and others from as far north as Maine been centralized in the Coordinator's Office, so that they could make representations to the Petroleum Administrator for War on the basis of which arrangements were made for satisfying these needs. Similarly, in my own district fishing vessels had difficulties arising from the rationing of certain foods. These and other problems connected with obtaining fuel oil for the operation of trawlers were alleviated by the prompt intervention of the Fishery Coordinator with the governmental agencies involved.

There are many other subjects appropriate for this occasion, but there is a limit to your patience. I thank you very much and I wish you godspeed in all of your work.

Our first duty now is to win this war, and that we will do. We, too, must play our part in this great struggle. We must be brave. We must work, conscious as never before that—

"Every brave and strong endeavor
Helps heroic souls to rise
Unto higher heights of triumph
Nearer to the smiling skies."

How Servicemen Are Taxed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1943, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of legislation giving special benefits to citizens in the armed services and to their dependents. Since that date a new tax law has been enacted. Under leave to extend my remarks further I submit the following supplement to my statement of June 1 to show how this law affects these people:

HOW SERVICEMEN ARE TAXED

DOES A SERVICEMAN OWE ANY INCOME TAX FOR 1942?

The new law, in effect, wipes out the tax on income for the year 1942 for persons in active military service. Thus, as a rule, they

will not have to pay the equivalent of 25 percent on their 1942 income, in addition to a tax on 1943 income, that is required of many civilians in bringing them up to date on back taxes. However, this abatement for servicemen and women applies only to the tax on earned income, and income over $14,000 is considered for tax purposes as unearned. The abatement also applies to members of the military services of other United Nations who are subject to United States income taxes.

If you are a man or woman in military service and have paid more on your 1942 income than is needed to cover your 1943 tax, you will be entitled to a refund or tax credit next March. The abatement of the 1942 tax also applies to a man who is in active service for only part of 1942 or 1943. Thus it would apply to a man who does not enter active service until next December, but this man would be liable for a tax on his civilian earnings in 1943 up to the time he entered the service. If he finds that his ability to pay the tax has been impaired materially by his being in the service, he can ask for postponement of payment until after his discharge.

WHAT IS THE FIRST STEP THAT A MAN IN THE SERVICE MUST TAKE?

If you are serving with the armed forces within the United States, you are supposed to file with the collector of internal revenue for your district on or before September 15 an estimate of your income for 1943. If you are in the higher-pay brackets and your tax liability is above your exemptions, after you have paid quarterly installments on 1943 income on March 15 and June 15, 1943, you are supposed to pay by September 15 one-half of the tax still due for 1943. There is no withholding of taxes from pay of servicemen and women.

Persons in the armed services of the United States and of other United Nations get, in addition to their personal exemptions, an exemption allowance on $1,500 of their service pay. For a single man, this means $1,500 plus $624 for personal exemption, or $2,124, for a married man without dependent children it is $1,500 plus $1,248, a total exemption of $2,748. Thus, most enlisted men and lowest-ranking officers with no outside income would have no tax to pay for either 1942 or 1943.

MUST AN ARMY OR NAVY MAN WHO OWES NO TAX FILE AN INCOME TAX RETURN?

Technically, he is supposed to file by September 15 an estimate of his 1943 income, even though he is in the lowest grade. But the penalty for failure to do so is a 10 percent addition to the tax that is due. Where no tax is due, there could be no 10 percent addition to it. But Treasury spokesmen say it is important to file these declarations if a refund or tax credit is to be claimed later because of overpayment of taxes already made. Members of the armed forces serving overseas can wait till after their return home before filing returns and paying taxes on their incomes.

SUPPOSE THE WIFE OF A SERVICEMAN WORKS, WHAT MUST SHE DO ABOUT INCOME TAX?

She must follow the same rules as any other woman in filing returns and paying taxes on income. She and her husband can file a joint return; or they can divide the family exemption of $1,248 or either can take all of the exemption if the other claims none. A wife can claim exemption on the basis of dependent children if she provides their main support. But she cannot claim exemption from income tax on any of the additional $1,500 exemption that her husband in the service is allowed; that exemption applies only to his service pay and not to any income from civilian sources. No tax is collected on a serviceman's dependents' allowance.

IF A MAN DIES IN THE SERVICE, DOES HIS ESTATE HAVE TO PAY HIS INCOME TAX?

The new law provides that, in the case of any member of the armed forces of the United States or of other United Nations who dies while in active service, the income tax for the year in which he dies is canceled. There also is cancellation of all income taxes owing at the time of his death. Any taxes that are collected after his death are to be credited or refunded to the man's estate as an overpayment of tax.

The Late Robert W. Burns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Robert W. Burns, one of the outstanding young men in the city of Ironwood, Mich., lost his life in the armed forces last week. The high regard in which this young man was held by his townspeople is very well expressed by my friend, H. O. Sonnesyn, the able editor of the Ironwood Times, as follows:

ROBERT W. BURNS KILLED MONDAY

DEAR BOB: It just doesn't seem possible that today—1 week to the day from the time when we sat at the same table with you in the St. James Hotel and heard you talk about your work with gliders that we should be writing a story telling about the fact you were killed in flying service at Maxton, N. C., last Monday morning.

Your father with whom you were such a pal was at the Ironwood Association of Commerce meeting when he received the news which struck home with such vengeance in Ironwood because of the fact you were so well known in the city.

You received your education at the Luther L. Wright high school from where you were graduated in 1939 and continued at the Gogebic Junior College until you went away to prepare yourself for a career you were planning.

As we now look backward and review the many wonderful associations we had with you during the short time we knew you the thought comes to us that during the 10-day furlough you spent here that you celebrated your twenty-second birthday on May 31. You were born in the Lower Peninsula.

You were the type of boy who made friends easily. There was something about you that left an indelible impression on anyone you met. You looked like a soldier from the very first time you put your uniform on. You had a peculiar way of wearing your cap, but on you it looked just right.

Although we had known you casually, it was not until last summer when we rode to Stevens Point with you and your dad, so you could catch your train, that we really got to know you.

On every one of your trips home after that we seemed to become better acquainted with you until now it seems as if we had known you all your life.

You were looking forward to the time when you would be returning home to take over the Robert Burns Furniture Co. Although you were young in years, you were rich in mature judgment.

Ironwood rejoiced in your promotions and was glad when you became a Flying Officer, a rank equivalent to lieutenant. We remember you explaining last Tuesday that you were surprised that so few people really knew what that meant.

We remember, too, that you took time out to explain about gliders at that meeting last Tuesday. It seemed like fate that 6 days later a man should be talking about war from the very same table from practically the same spot as you stood when you gave your last talk. It seemed like fate, too, that the information about your death should come to your father in that very same room.

It's tough to get such news. Last week it was Bob Dunstan, killed in action in north Africa. A few days before it was Wayne Maki, killed in Texas. Dunstan's memorial services were held Sunday, and Monday the news about your death was received. The telegram stated briefly that you had died in flying service 10 miles northwest of Fort Bragg, N. C.

It's tough to offer consolation to your parents; your two sisters, Jean and Margaret, and your brother, Dorr.

You had so much to look forward to. In your brief 22 years you had accomplished much. There was every reason to believe that you would accomplish much more.

War is cruel and it is when it strikes home as close as this that we begin to realize things just a little more.

Last week you were home enjoying your furlough. One week ago today (Wednesday) you returned to your camp full of enthusiasm for the work you were doing, convinced that you could accomplish something for your country in this division.

Within a few days your remains will be returned to your home town. There will be memorial service as there was for Bob Dunstan.

Over at that home on 302 Arch street your memory will never be forgotten. There will always be a void there that will never be filled.

It's tough to say goodbye to a fellow like you, Bob. It's tough to realize that never again will that winning smile, so characteristic of your daily life, again be seen. It's tough to even think that a boy as fine as you were is gone.

Somehow or other we believe you know these expressions are sincere and that they summarize the feelings of your many thousands of friends on the Gogebic range.

So it's happy flying, soldier. You were loved and honored here, where your home folks knew you best. Your memory will help carry on. So long, soldier.

The Power of Harry Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and timely article which appeared in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., June 13, 1943:

THE POWER OF HARRY HOPKINS

(By Owen L. Scott)

The President is finding that he must delegate to others more of the responsibility

for running the civilian side of the war. This delegation of power is made necessary by the growing volume of strictly war and post-war problems that now must be dealt with.

Mr. Roosevelt has chosen two men to act for him on many domestic issues. Those two men are Justice James F. Byrnes, as head of the new Office of War Mobilization, and Judge Fred Vinson, as head of the Office of Economic Stabilization. The job of Mr. Byrnes and of Mr. Vinson is to keep the various war agency "czars" in line on matters of policy.

Some of these "czars," however, are noting what they regard as strange signs. They find that important national policies are being decided, in which they have a very direct interest, without consultation with them. In other words, an official who must execute a program under great difficulties discovers that he simply is told that this program is decided upon without being given a chance to give his opinion concerning whether that program is feasible or desirable, or even possible.

Then the "czars," who have very direct relations with Justice Byrnes, have discovered that he was simply carrying out orders in announcing, among other things, a price roll-back on meats and butter, or a broad program of food-price subsidies without consultation with the men who must finance and execute those difficult policies. Pursuing the matter further, some of the "czars" now have concluded that the real power in domestic-policy matters is traceable to Harry Hopkins and to a little group of officials associated with him at the White House.

Mr. Hopkins, as the most intimate aide to the President and as a result of his many years of experience at the White House, is better able than Justice Byrnes to know exactly what it is that the President wants. Then Mr. Hopkins has very close ties, directly and through his associates, that range all through the Government, while Justice Byrnes and Judge Vinson have very small organizations.

Ben Cohen, who is right-hand man to Justice Byrnes, has been a coworker of Mr. Hopkins for many years. Judge Samuel Rosenman, who handles matters of Government organization, writing orders that shift powers from one official to another, also is closely associated with Mr. Hopkins. Then there are many lawyers and other officials in key positions all through the Government who were selected by Justice Felix Frankfurter and who maintain their contact at the White House. Among them is Edward Prichard, who is to be right-hand man to Judge Vinson as Economic Stabilizer.

Then, Mr. Hopkins personally keeps a close watch on the War Production Board and he works with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Probably no person in the Government, not even the President, is so intimately acquainted right now with the functioning of the civilian war machinery through the various "czars" and their agencies.

Harry Hopkins and the group of top officials around him are taking a direct interest in several situations.

It is this group that has most to do with policies designed to combat inflation. Some of the decisions of greatest importance were made without any consultation either with the czars who must carry out those decisions or with the industries affected by them. Matters of wage policy and of farm price policy also are determined by this top group, with Justice Byrnes then acting to carry out the policies.

Likewise, Mr. Hopkins and the group he heads make the major decisions affecting the division of materials between civilians and the military. When there is a clash of interests that calls for decision by the White House instead of by Donald Nelson's War Production Board the decision is shaped often by Mr. Hopkins or his associates. The Army and Navy have been pleased by the trend of White House decisions in this regard.

More and more of Harry Hopkins' attention now is turning to fourth-term problems. It is from this group that the things are being dropped that Henry Wallace will not be second man on the 1944 Democratic ticket and that the field is open to other hopeful candidates. The purpose of this maneuver can be to win back support of some party politicians who have been straying but who are willing to come back if there is hope of reward. The President himself never has indicated that he would seek a different running mate in the event of a fourth-term candidacy.

The Hopkins group at the White House is being severely criticized at this time by many old-line New Dealers who have not been among those in the most exclusive inner circle. That criticism grows from the fact that the White House has been willing to sacrifice New Deal officials without standing back of them. Very many new dealers have been forced out of office lately under the fire of Congress.

Members of the Hopkins group explain, however, that war is not a time in which the White House can be expected to fight for individual officials who are not able to look out for themselves. It is a time, too, when new reforms have to be sacrificed in order to concentrate attention on strictly war issues. They point out that new dealers now being forced out may have their turn again when peace comes back.

Justice Byrnes, with no big organization of his own, is expected to direct the civilian side of the war. The men who must do the actual operating of civilian programs doubt that he can do that except in cooperation with Harry Hopkins, who has the organization and the contacts.

Gov. Earl Warren, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I attach two articles from the San Francisco Examiner of June 7, 1943. These articles refer to California's Governor, Hon. Earl Warren. The Nation is very much interested in Governor Warren's administration. These articles are particularly timely:

CALIFORNIA'S GOVERNOR EARL WARREN SINCERE, COURAGEOUS LEADER

Gov. Earl Warren, of California, has been in office but a short time, but long enough to organize an efficient, practical, and economical state government—which is a matter of definite national interest.

The war has made California very important to the Nation.

Billions of dollars are invested in its war industries, particularly in aircraft and maritime construction.

Thousands of American fighting men are being trained in its camps and cantonments, and millions of them will ultimately embark from its ports to the Pacific war zones where finally the fate of America must be decided.

So California, which was always more important to the Nation industrially and productively than as a playground, is now the grim spearhead of an armored and winged nation at war.

Its vast enterprises are vital national enterprises.

Consequently, the war has made it very important to the nation that California be well governed, in order that these vital national enterprises and vast national investments be made secure.

Otherwise, there would be unnecessary confusion and probably chaos, waste, and futility in the entire war program. And in even more sinister reality, there would be great national danger—because a chaotic and badly governed California would be vulnerable to enemy assault and an easy prey to enemy invasion and occupation.

Unfortunately, California was not a well-governed State in the early part of the war. It had an inept State administration, to speak charitably. The civilian defense organization and the State guard establishment were inadequate and virtually ineffective. Political and administrative inefficiency were rampant, and disaster was inherent in the situation—not ordinary peacetime economic disaster, but real and utter national disaster.

But most fortunately, the people of California corrected that situation by the election of Governor Warren.

Hence, there is Nation-wide gratification over the improved situation in California and Nation-wide interest in his views about government, and especially in his views about the policies of the national Government.

Governor Warren is deeply concerned and profoundly disturbed by many of the Nation's policies.

Addressing the Los Angeles Bar Association recently, he said:

"War times always breed centralization of power and sometimes, even in mortal combat, we are likely to imitate some of the techniques of a powerful opponent in an attempt to beat him at his own game and with his own weapons.

"There is danger in this national crisis that we, too, may make a fetish of centralized power. If we succumb to the temptation, however, it will be because we have wholly lost sight of the fact that there are but two ways of obtaining the compliance of people with governmental necessity.

"One is through the compulsion of totalitarianism. The other is through the voluntarism of democracy. * * *

"As I read history, democracy is the advanced result of man's struggle to find a method of staving off outside enemies and building needed protection with a minimum of sacrifice in personal liberty. Nowhere in history do I find that it is achieved by copying totalitarian methods or through compulsion. * * *

"We have witnessed many evidences of dislocations in war and domestic effort caused by attempts to regulate activities from a distance of 3,000 miles. * * * Either we cling to voluntarism or we yield to the force of a trend that can carry us first into a maze of bureaus which will insist upon further centralization of power and then into a strongly personalized government."

Obviously, California has not only a great Governor in Earl Warren, but a great American. The people of California will benefit from his sound administration of their affairs, during the war and long after. All of the American people will profit from his sincere Americanism in the augmented California war production which has already resulted from it, and in the security and welfare of millions of American fighting men and workers which cannot fail to result from it.

GENIAL GOVERNOR WARREN, AN ARDENT FAMILY MAN

Gov. Earl Warren, of California, has his natural attributes to thank for a greater portion of his political success.

These include hard work, tenacity, sincerity of purpose, unwavering honesty and integrity, and intestinal fortitude.

He won his present office as a nonpartisan.

And it was no easy task to convince voters that he, a lifelong Republican, and one of that party's outstanding leaders in California, would conduct a nonpartisan administration.

But he did it, mostly by converting skeptics. Warren is a convincing speaker.

No group in any city, hamlet, or crossroads was considered by Warren as too small for him to stop and give them a talk. He followed this practice in over 50 of the State's 58 counties.

Despite a 2-to-1 Democratic vote registration against his own Republican Party, when the ballots were tabulated Warren was the winner over his Democratic opponent, Culbert L. Olson, the incumbent, by more than 375,000.

Transforming campaign pledges into action comes easy to Warren, principally because he refuses steadfastly to make a promise he does not intend to keep, or which is improbable of fulfillment.

He never sets any vote traps.

What Earl Warren says he will do, he does. His enviable record as a public servant since 1919 bears out that observation.

During the recent gubernatorial campaign he promised to take old-age pension matters out of the realm of politics and place them in the hands of experts, to the intended benefit of the recipients.

He pledged the appointment of a nonpartisan committee to study the State's tax structure, the purpose being to learn which, if any, tax levies could be lowered or eliminated entirely.

In selecting appointees for administrative State posts, Warren promised that the best person for the job would be chosen, regardless of political affiliation.

Earl Warren already has made good on these promises.

On the subject of labor, Warren has expressed himself openly as being in sympathy with gains made in recent years by the rank and file of workers, but vigorously opposes racketeering labor leaders.

"I hope the time comes when every working man and woman has a collective bargaining agent," he said in a campaign address.

Such an arrangement, he explained, would eliminate most labor racketeering by dues-greedy leaders.

Earl Warren's graduation into a State-wide political figure—and it is likely to spread nationally—came the hard way.

That is how he likes things to come to him.

He established himself as a fearless prosecutor, while district attorney of Alameda County (Oakland), for 13 difficult years.

Unlike most district attorneys in metropolitan centers, Warren took on the tough cases, personally.

Convictions he won put an end to "bodies floating down San Francisco Bay," as the result of bitter water-front struggles between rival labor groups and radical organizations.

Coupled with his recognized political ability, Warren enjoys the good luck that usually marks the activities of a left-handed person, of which he is one.

Elected State attorney general in 1938, Warren went after the big league gamblers with characteristic vigor. He drove the palatial gambling ships off the southern California coast. He closed up scores of bookie joints. He put hundreds of slot machines out of operation.

But Earl Warren admittedly is not a crusader.

He dislikes illegal gambling because it leads to graft, bribery, and general corruption of public officials.

Born in Los Angeles on March 19, 1891, to the late Mathias and Crystal Warren, California's Governor served as a railroad callboy and sold newspapers while attending public school in Bakersfield.

There, he organized an orchestra, in which he played the clarinet, and of this unit formed one of the first American Federation of Labor musicians' unions in southern California.

Saving his earnings, Earl Warren put himself through the Berkeley campus of the University of California, from which he was graduated in 1912—though he had to cram for 3 days and nights on a previously unstudied algebra course, which he passed.

Admitted to the practice of law in 1914, Warren took time out to serve in the United States Army in World War No. 1.

He was honorably discharged as a first lieutenant of infantry.

His rise—and political start—came with the appointment in 1919 to the position of clerk of the judiciary committee of the California State Legislature.

From there he went to Oakland, in the city attorney's office, then into the district attorney's service.

By the narrow margin of one supervisor's vote, he was appointed district attorney in 1925, and served in that capacity, through successive elections, until 1938, when he won the State attorney generalship, which office he occupied when he was elected Governor.

In the meantime he had become chairman of the Republican State Central Committee in 1934, and later Republican national committeeman.

He led California Republican groups opposed to a delegation instructed to support Alf Landon for the Presidency in 1936, and won.

During that hectic struggle Warren became potentially a candidate for President.

The handsome, genial Governor is an ardent family man, and deeply sympathetic by nature.

And he has a sizable family—his charming wife, Nina, and six children, ranging in the order born from James, now in the Army; Virginia, Earl, Jr., Dorothy, Nina, and Bobby.

At one time the Warrens had a child in each of the six elementary grades at an Oakland public school.

Judge S. M. B. Coulling, Scholar, Lawyer, Philosopher, and Humorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago our section sustained an irreparable loss in the death of Judge S. M. B. Coulling of Tazewell, Va. He was really and truly a great personage.

Born in an age when individuality had time to develop, he had none of the sameness about him that we see in so many men today. In this machine age of hustle and bustle so many men reflect such a sameness that at times we wonder if they did not all come off of the same assembly line and bear the stamp of the same model. And because his life extended over into this age of models, his individuality, of course, became more pronounced and sparkling and refreshing.

Known far and wide for his deep learning in the law, his philosophical mind, his scintilating humor, his bigness of heart, and his innate urbanity, he was a Blackstone, a Plato, a Will Rogers, a Russell Sage, and a Lord Chesterfield all in one; and in addition, at times, gave evidence of having been at least remotely related to Bacchus.

His deep knowledge of the law commanded a clientele that numbered the wealthiest men in our section; and his bigness of heart brought to his office door the cases of the downtrodden, the destitute, and the helpless. And he gave to the cases of this latter class, few of whom could pay, if anything, but a pittance, the same painstaking care, the same conscientious consideration, that the more fortunate could purchase with their substance.

A lawyer friend sent me a few days ago a copy of an answer to a bill for divorce that was prepared by Judge Coulling years ago, which, in my opinion, is a legal classic. The parties to the litigation were Negroes; and the bill of complaint charged adultery on the part of the defendant some 20 years prior to the institution of the suit. Considered from either the standpoint of diction, legal lore, logic, or humor, the answer will rank high among the legal productions of man.

During these days of stress when we are all, more or less, working under tension, I believe it will do us all good to sit down and read a real legal literary gem; and so, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I incorporate the answer in my remarks:

To the Honorable W. J. HENSON,
Judge of the Circuit Court of Tazewell County, Va.:

The demurrer and answer of Anderson Taylor, to a bill in chancery exhibited against him in Tazewell Circuit Court by Agnes Taylor.

For demurrer he says that said bill is not sufficient in law. That the charges therein are not made and alleged with that certainty to a certain intent as in law required.

That condonement, laches and lack of equity on complainant's part despite the skilled manner in which her case is presented are apparent from the statement thereof.

For answer thereto, or so much thereof, as your respondent is advised that it is necessary for him to answer, he answers and says:

That the grievances complained of are so stale and musty that they are revolting even to the taste and ears of a village gossip. That they are long ago barred by the statute of limitations, or if not so barred, they are barred by good taste and come under the ban of sound public policy. Even if they were true, to lay down a precedent that equity and good conscience sanctions the resurrection either publicly or privately by the wife of errors buried more than 20 years ago, would be worse than to turn loose upon the body politic to haunt it, hundreds of ghosts, not one of whom would down at any man's bidding.

For the continuance of the holy state of wedlock, treaties of peace and general amnesty proclamations are frequently absolutely essential, and they are recognized and respected by courts of equity as shown by

relief being refused where the offense has been condoned.

The doctrine of presumption of condonement and treaties of peace and amnesty proclamations is here pro bono publico, invoked.

Without waiving the defense hereinbefore made, but relying and insisting upon the sufficiency thereof, your respondent for further answer denies each and every allegation of bill of complaint incriminating, censuring or reflecting upon his conduct as a man or a husband, and to show the injustice and erroneousness thereof he makes the following plain, concise, and unvarnished statement of facts.

Your respondent, by reason of the success of Federal Arms, Lincoln's proclamation, and the fourteenth amendment, had just become a free man, when he became a voluntary slave to complainant's charms and cheerfully placed upon himself the bonds of matrimony.

Your respondent here says that he does not deny that in his young days he has at times embraced license in the definition of freedom, but he denies that he ever had any monopoly or trust upon this definition of the word.

It is true that your respondent is not as dignified and sedate as became the husband of complainant and the father of sundry of her children, but respondent denies that he was ever in thought or act unfaithful to her.

There was no unpleasant friction or disturbance between your respondent and complainant until the children were reared to an age that they could be of financial benefit, and their house and lot was paid for and the legal title vested in complainant. And then, but not until then, did complainant realize that your respondent was uncongenial and altogether unreconcilable with her ideas of a good and true man.

Respondent does not charge or insinuate that any dormant mercenary instinct in complainant produced this change.

Frequently some object in common, to the accomplishment of which both husband and wife are working, produces such a true imitation of love, that it cannot be distinguished by the most learned alchemists from the real gem.

From other than mercenary reasons complainant's charge can be accounted for.

Since the marriage between complainant and respondent the world or the sun has moved on and respondent has been unable to keep in touch with advanced ideas to the extent complainant has.

After the absorbing thought of rearing their children and paying for their property was ended by the children coming to an age that they could be of financial aid and the property being paid for, it was found that there were some ideas and views of life they did not hold in common. About this time the pastor in charge of the church of which complainant was an honored and influential member, and complainant were, in church affairs, thrown together and found that their views of life assimilated and they became fast friends and joint workers in the moral vineyard without thought or intention, your respondent believes, of evil, but your respondent knew that platonic friendship with all its barriers and fortifications of solid philosophy had occasionally theretofore been scaled and taken by warmer if not stronger emotions, and therefore when, during the existence of these friendly relations between complainant and the Reverend Mr. Pettis, a child was born unto complainant respondent was not surprised at its marked resemblance to Mr. Pettis.

Children take, your respondent has heard, their appearance from environment as well as from heredity, but for more than a year complainant has required the relations between her and respondent to be so distant and formal that this theory your respondent did not consider applicable.

This offense, or at least violation of the conventionalities of life by complainant, respondent has long ago condoned theoretically, and would have practically done so, but complainant has persistently refused to allow any such condonement.

Respondent worked and labored with complainant to acquire a home and to rear their children, and in that home and with complainant, he now and ever has desired to live. He never abandoned her and her home, but was driven therefrom by complainant. Once when ill, she at the solicitation of others allowed him to return and stay until he had partially recovered, and then again she drove him away, but although away from home he has made frequent gifts of money and goods to his and her children. His heart and purse are now and have ever been open to them. He has not contributed to the extent he would have liked to their comfort, solely because he has not been allowed so to do. He made frequent efforts to help supply the table, but by complainant's orders the foods purchased and sent by him were returned.

Complainant has the love, aid, and assistance of her and respondent's children; has the modest home, the result of her and respondent's labor. She has all. Respondent has only the memory of past happiness. He is now old and feeble, his days are numbered, and his end fast approaching, and he humbly begs and prays that to his sadness there be not added the bitterness of seeing another enjoying the affections of his wife and the fruits of his labor.

And now having fully answered he prays to be hence dismissed, etc.

Mr. Speaker, the divorce was not granted.

Bombing Germany Out of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, an exceedingly able article has been written by Francis Vivian Drake, who is an authority on aviation. The article is entitled "Why Don't We Really Try To Bomb Germany Out of the War?", and was published in the Reader's Digest. It is one of the best and most authentic statements which have been made on the subject, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY DON'T WE REALLY TRY TO BOMB GERMANY OUT OF THE WAR?—BRITISH FIGURES SHOW THAT IT MIGHT BE DONE THIS YEAR, IF WE FREED AIR POWER NOW FOR OFFENSIVE ACTION IN ITS OWN RIGHT

(By Francis Vivian Drake)

Recent information from England discloses details of the actual damage inflicted on Germany by the Royal Air Force Bomber Command in 1942. This information provides for the first time an integrated picture of air power used as a primary offensive weapon against a whole nation over a given period.

The punishment dealt to Germany in 1942 was serious. And it was achieved by a very small bombing force, compared with America's present production.

Last year not a single United States Air Force bomber flew over Germany. The Royal Air Force Bomber Command did the whole job, although it comprised only 10 percent of total Royal Air Force strength. In order to pull off one of its rare 1,000-plane raids it had to scrape its hangars bare of everything that could fly, and borrow planes and pilots from reserve squadrons and bomber training schools. Nevertheless, the facts now released indicate that if the Royal Air Force had been able to sustain its 1,000-plane raids from June on, Germany might have been industrially paralyzed by last Christmas. They indicate that Germany could be knocked out before next Christmas, if the right steps were taken now.

The plan of destroying Germany from the air does not come from armchair strategists. It is the conviction of high air officers, and of the professionals who look at Germany night after night through their bombsights, analyze photographs after every raid, study Intelligence reports, assess actual destruction.

Air Marshal Sir Arthur T. Harris, chief of the Royal Air Force Bomber Command, has said: "If I could send a thousand bombers over Germany every night, Germany would not be in the war by autumn."

Maj. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, commanding the United States Eighth Air Force in Britain, summarized his view as follows:

"There are enough airdromes in the British Isles, now built and building, to accommodate the air forces needed for the destruction of Germany. By destroying the enemy's aircraft factories you can put an end to his air force. By destroying his munitions plants and communications you can bring his armies to a halt. By destroying his shipyards you can make it impossible for him to build submarines. There is nothing that can be destroyed by gunfire that cannot be destroyed by bombs."

These are the findings of British and American air chiefs. But little attention has been paid to them by top military authorities. There are still only a handful of United States bombers in England, and the Royal Air Force Bomber Command, far from being increased this year, has actually been reduced to support operations elsewhere.

Both Harris and Eaker are plugging the new military principle of vertical assault, which is based on the premise that modern mechanized war is best won by attack against the industrial generator that supplies the enemy front lines. The air commanders believe it is more effective—and cheaper and quicker—to eradicate the enemy by going after his heart with bombs than after his feet with gunfire.

In the vertical attack on Britain it was a beginner's mistake that barred the Luftwaffe from victory. The Nazis first exposed slow, relatively unarmed, small-load bombers in daylight to the full fury of British fighters. Their losses were so great that they then could not mount mass night attacks on a decisive scale. The Royal Air Force quickly learned from the Luftwaffe performance that decisive vertical assault depends on the ability to drop huge tonnages in concentrated areas without prohibitive loss. They revised their bombers and techniques accordingly, and Royal Air Force performance in 1942 demonstrated the tremendous potentialities of the new system.

A glaring example of the cost of lateral attack is the Russian conflict. Regardless of millions of casualties, the opposing sides are still locked in combat over approximately the same territory in which they were operating 16 months ago. Again, a successful north African campaign can represent only the first step toward German citadels. The southwest Pacific campaign has been necessary to kill off a Japanese offensive against Australia, but as an offensive itself it can be only the first of a series of stepping stones on the long road to Tokyo.

None of these fronts can hurt the essential war production of the enemy. On the other hand, the following table shows how the infinitely smaller and cheaper vertical bombing campaign of 1942 has already seriously impaired the German war plant:

Raids against Germany	221
Tons of bombs dropped on Germany	37,000
Estimated number of plants destroyed	2,000
Estimated number of houses destroyed or seriously damaged	558,000
Estimated number of people evacuated	750,000
Estimated portion of German war industry wrecked (percent)	7

This damage was inflicted by a handful of fighting men—fewer than participated in the Dieppe commando raid. They operated with less bombers at any one time than the United States now produces in a month. If this underpowered unit could destroy 7 percent of industrial Germany, what would it take to step up the destruction until Germany could no longer keep her front lines supplied?

Intelligence reports reveal that the 7 percent destruction caused by 37,000 tons of bombs has put terrific pressure on Nazi war plants already burdened with the strain of maintaining the Russian and north African fronts. Experts believe that with 40 percent destruction—the bomb equivalent of 225,000 tons—Germany probably could not continue the war. Some British authorities estimate that 33 percent destruction, or 180,000 tons of bombs, would suffice.

Airmen check these findings another way. Plotting the entire area of German war industry, about 1,000 square miles, they find that the critical parts occupy only about 400 square miles. About 600 tons of mixed block-busters and incendiaries demolish a square mile. This implies that 240,000 tons will smash the entire critical area by the Royal Air Force method of night bombing.

The American program of precision bombing by day, with its very high degree of accuracy, is presumably capable of inflicting greater industrial damage with less waste than the Royal Air Force method of area bombing at night. Should the American plan prove workable, the quantity of bombs required to demolish German war industry might be considerably reduced.

However, since the American method requires daylight and good visibility, our bombers are hampered by fighter attack and cannot penetrate the heart of Germany, as the Royal Air Force has been doing night after night, unless they are sent in sufficient force to overcome successive waves of German fighters.

With the tremendous armament carried by our Fortresses and Liberators, a force of several hundred could probably take care of itself. But so far the United States has not had enough bombers in Britain for such heavy raids. The large-scale precision bombing of Germany therefore remains untried.

It may well be that British and American methods can be combined. In any event, the real point at issue is the concentration of enough bombers, day or night, to drop whatever tonnage is necessary to paralyze German industry.

Bomb loads carried by American and British bombers range from 2½ to 8 tons. The average load is 4 tons at mean radius. Thus, to drop the 240,000 tons of bombs believed sufficient to cripple Germany, 1,000 bombers must fly over the targets 60 times. Because of weather conditions, an average of 10 raids a month is the best that can be counted on. It would take, then, a series of 1,000-plane raids a maximum of 6 months to deliver the decisive blow to Germany's heart.

Such continuous bombing requires a backlog of 2 planes on the ground for every 1 in the air, to allow for servicing and repairs. Thus, maintenance of 1,000-plane raids involves a permanent force of 3,000 bombers. The Royal Air Force 1,000-plane raids on Cologne, Essen, and so on, provided an encouraging figure on replacement costs. Prior to these raids the loss rate inflicted by the enemy averaged about 10 percent. The 1,000-plane raids, however, showed a combat loss rate of only 4 percent, due to the wholesale disorganization of enemy ground defenses.

Night bombing involves a probable additional write-off of 2 percent in take-off and landing accidents. This brings the total loss to 6 percent; with 1,000-plane raids it means 600 planes a mission or 600 a month.

Summarizing the evidence so far, it would require a maximum of 240,000 tons of bombs, delivered by a total force of 3,000 heavy bombers, with maximum replacements of 600 bombers a month, to smash German industry in 6 months.

Have we sufficient bombers for such a campaign?

United States and British production of heavy and medium bombers, complete with crews, armaments, and all essentials, now exceeds 1,000 per month. It will rise as the year advances. All of these planes are suitable for bombing any target in industrial Germany.

But this fact does not mean that enough bombers will be assigned this spring, this summer, or even this year to do the job. At present both the United States and British bomber commands are starved for planes. General Eaker described his outfit, in March 1943, as only "a token force." Allied air power is still being used as a defensive weapon, to prop up other fronts, instead of a great decisive weapon in its own right. It is dissipated throughout the world in lesser campaigns, none of which in itself can conceivably end the war.

This is because our military habits of mind are governed by the traditions of naval engagements and marching men. Victory is anticipated only in these terms, and air power is seen only as a weapon of support for great fleets and armies. If this mental approach can only be changed, a bombing force can readily be assembled—as the Allied air commanders wish—to go to work on the direct destruction of Germany. Without reducing allocation of long-range bombers necessary to maintain our other fronts, the following United States-British joint task force can be set up:

Total force (bombers)	3,000
Average force per night (bombers)	1,000
Replacements per month (bombers)	600
Percentage of joint production for period involved (percent)	60
Average flying nights per month	10
Average tons of bombs per night, depending on distance of target	4,000
(Coventry raid, worst night (tons))	210
Average tons of bombs per month	40,000
Tons of bombs per year	480,000
(Blitz on London, total for 11 months (tons))	7,500

Operating bases in the British Isles are already available. Ample fuel supplies are also ready, and task force consumption would be less than two tankers a month. Other surface-borne equipment is only a fraction of that required for a big land offensive, and can be moved through our shortest supply artery—that to Britain.

The whole operation would require less than half the total 1943 bomber production, and would leave many more bombers for China and Africa and other fronts than they have ever had. And let it be remembered that with such a task force we might win not just outlying campaigns—with it we might win the European part of the war before the end of 1943.

Early this year we read such headlines as: "United States Blasts Wilhelmshaven" or Royal Air Force Hammers Ruhr," or "Round-the-clock Bombing" of Germany. These headlines were entirely misleading in their implications of scale. The bombers took advantage of an unusual stretch of good weather to put in a series of savage attacks; but the individual raids were actually smaller than many undertaken in 1942, and mere continuity of bombing should not be casually confused with continuity of heavy bombing. Until we read "1,000 Allied Bombers Attack Reich," and read it several times a week, we shall know that no decisive air offensive is under way.

The plan of the Allied air commanders to smash Germany's war industries is more practical than any other possible program. Except for some miracle, some internal Nazi collapse, we dare not count on, there is no alternative for early victory. A vertical assault is the only great offensive that would not impose a dangerous strain on our already difficult shipping situation. The north African expedition, a minor campaign compared with the invasion of Europe, required 8,000,000 tons of ships. Shipping losses last year were 8,000,000 tons against our total production of 8,000,000 tons. This year our program calls for 16,000,000 tons, but Nazi submarines are being launched much faster than we can sink them, and the menace increases every day.

Compared with the enormous losses we should suffer in any great surface offensive, an all-out air attack would be cheap. The 1,000-plane Cologne raid, which cost the British 257 men, killed over 30,000 of the enemy. A 6 months' air campaign to bring about the end of German resistance would cost a maximum of only 30,000 men even if every man were killed in every bomber lost.

As things now stand, here are the military prospects for 1943: The President and the Secretary of War have prepared us for heavy losses in north Africa. Mr. Hoover has warned us that the war will last 3 years. Justice Byrnes has said, "We face an invasion of Europe which will involve casualties such as this Nation has never endured."

But do we have to resign ourselves to the heartaches of great land offensives? There is an alternative, and 1942 has proved it sound. The air commanders who have produced the proof and the public which must produce the lives have the right to ask that the air alternative be tried now—no matter how far the land-offensive plans have gone.

The Congressional War Parents Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a list of the officers and directors of the recently organized association called the Congressional War Parents Association; and I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a list of the Members of both branches of Congress and their sons and daughters who are serving in the armed forces of the Na-

tion. Many of these sons and daughters are serving in the active battle areas of the world; some of them have already given their lives for the cause of freedom; others have been wounded in action. It is an impressive list of fighting sons and daughters.

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name: The Congressional War Parents Association.

Officers: President, Congressman FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio; vice presidents, Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas; Congressman JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York; Congressman PAUL BROWN, of Georgia; Congressman JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona.

Secretary: Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Directors: Senator HATTIE W. CARAWAY, of Arkansas; Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia; Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan; Senator CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota; Congressman GEORGE J. BATES of Massachusetts; Congressman MICHAEL J. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania; Congressman J. BAYARD CLARK, of North Carolina; Congressman JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota; Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas; Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS, of California.

Members of Senate and House, with members of their families serving in the Armed Forces

	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank	State
SENATORS				
Aiken, George D	Harry L. Cleverly (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Vermont.
	Malcolm S. Jones (son-in-law)	Army	Private first class	Do.
Austin, Warren R	Edward L. Austin	do	Captain	Do.
Bailey, Josiah W	James H. Pou Bailey	do	Lieutenant	North Carolina.
Bankhead, John H	Charles B. Crow, Jr. (grandson)	Army Enlisted Reserve		Alabama.
Barkley, Alben W	David M. Barkley	Army Air Corps	Captain	Kentucky.
Bilbo, Theodore G	Theodore G. Bilbo, Jr	Army	Lieutenant colonel	Mississippi.
Bone, Homer T	Homer T. Bone, Jr	do	Private	Washington.
Brewster, Ralph O	Charles F. Brewster	do	Captain	Maine.
Bridges, Styles	Styles Bridges, Jr	Navy	Ensign	New Hampshire.
Brooks, C. Wayland	Russell A. Brooks	Marine Reserve	Private	Illinois.
Buck, C. Douglass	Paul E. Wilson (stepson)	Air Corps	do	Delaware.
	C. Douglass Buck, Jr	Navy Reserve	Apprentice seaman	Do.
Burton, Harold H	William S. Burton	Navy	Ensign	Ohio.
	Robert S. Burton	Naval Aviation	Second lieutenant, Marine Air Corps.	Do.
	R. Wallace Adler (son-in-law)	Army	Second lieutenant, Field Artillery.	Do.
Bushfield, Harlan J	H. J. Bushfield, Jr	do	Officer Cand date	South Dakota.
Byrd, Harry F	H. F. Byrd, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant	Virginia.
	Richard E. Byrd	Army	Corporal	Do.
	Beverly Byrd	do	Private	Do.
Caraway, Hattie W	Paul W. Caraway	do	Lieutenant colonel	Arkansas.
	Forest Caraway	do	do	Do
Chandler, Albert B	John P. Gregg (son-in-law)	Army Air Force	Major	Oklahoma.
Chavez, Dennis	D. Chavez, Jr	Marine Corps	Lieutenant	New Mexico.
	Stanley Miller (son-in-law)	Army Air Corps	do	
Connally, Tom	Ben Connally	do	Captain	Texas.
Danaher, John A	J. A. Danaher, Jr	Army	Second lieutenant	Connecticut.
	Robert Danaher	U. S. Naval Reserve	Seaman	Do.
Davis, James J	J. J. Davis, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Pennsylvania.
Ellender, Allen J	A. J. Ellender, Jr	Army	Second lieutenant	Louisiana.
George, Walter F	Heard F. George	Army Air Force	Lieutenant	Georgia.
	J. Marcus George	Navy Air Force	do	Do.
Glass, Carter	C. Glass, Jr	Army	Major	Virginia.
Gurney, Chan	John B. Gurney	Air Corps	Staff sergeant	South Dakota.
	Morgan T. Smith (son-in-law)	Army	Second lieutenant	Do.
	Deloss B. Gurney	Air Corps	Lieutenant	Do.
Hatch, Carl A	Stewart Hatch	do	do	New Mexico.
Hawkes, Albert W	Whitfield Hawkes	Army	Major	New Jersey.
Johnson, Hiram W	H. W. Johnson, Jr	Air Corps	do	California.
Kilgore, Harley M	Robert Kilgore	Reserve Officers' Training Corps	Lieutenant	West Virginia.
McCarran, Patrick A	Samuel P. McCarran	Reserve Medical Corps	do	Nevada.
McClellan, John L	Max E. McClellan (killed in action in north Africa Feb. 21, 1943.)	Army	Corporal	Arkansas.
Maloney, Francis	Robert Francis Maloney	Coast Guard	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Connecticut.
Maybank, Burnet R	B. R. Maybank, Jr	Army Air Corps	Cadet	South Carolina.
Mead, James M	James M. Mead, Jr	Army	Corporal	New York.
Millikin, Eugene D	Karl C. Schuyler (stepson)	do	Sergeant	Colorado.
Murdock, Abe	Daniel Beck Murdock	Navy	Ensign	Utah.
Murray, James E	Edward Murray	Army	Second lieutenant	Montana.
	Howard A. Murray	do	Private	Do.
	W. D. Murray	U. S. Naval Reserve	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Do.
Nye, Gerald	James P. Nye	Navy	Apprentice seaman	North Dakota.
O'Daniel W. Lee	Pat O'Daniel	Army	Corporal	Texas.
	Mike O'Daniel	do	Private	Do.
	Jack D. Wrather (son-in-law)	Marine Corps	Lieutenant	Do.
Overton, John H	J. H. Overton, Jr	do	Ensign	Louisiana.
Reed, Clyde M	Howard H. Reed	Army Engineers	Lieutenant colonel	Kansas.
Stewart, Tom	Tom M. Stewart	Army	First lieutenant	Tennessee.
	Lawrence F. Stewart	do	Lieutenant	Do.
	Charles S. Coffey, (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Do.
Taft, Robert A	Robert A. Taft, Jr	do	Ensign	Ohio.
	Lloyd B. Taft	U. S. Naval Reserve	Seaman	Do.
Thomas, Elbert D	Wayne C. Grover (son-in-law)	Army	Captain	Maryland.
Thomas, Elmer	Wilford S. Thomas	do	Private	Oklahoma.
Tunnell, James M	Robert W. Tunnell	do	Lieutenant	Delaware.
Vandenberg, Arthur H	A. H. Vandenberg, Jr	do	Second lieutenant	Michigan.
Van Nuys, Frederick	William L. Van Nuys	Navy Air Corps	Cadet	Indiana.
Wagner, Robert F	R. F. Wagner, Jr	Army	Captain	New York.
Wheeler, Burton K	Richard Wheeler	Navy	Lieutenant	Montana.
Wilson, George A	James H. Wilson	Army	Sergeant	Iowa.
	George A. Wilson, Jr	do	Private	Do.
REPRESENTATIVES				
Allen, A. Leonard	Harwell L. Allen	do	Major	Louisiana.
	Lyndon B. Allen	do	First lieutenant	Do.
Arnold, Wat	Sam M. Arnold	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Missouri.
Baldwin, H. Streett	John Streett Baldwin	Army Air Force	Captain	Maryland.
	Harry Wallace Baldwin	do	Lieutenant	Do.
Barrett, Frank A	Frank A., Barrett Jr	Army	Private	Wyoming.
	James E. Barrett	do	Corporal	Do.
Bates, George J	William H. Bates	Navy	do	Massachusetts.
	George J. Bates, Jr	do	Seaman, first class	Do.
	Raymond H. Bates	do	Midshipman	Do.
	Mary E. Bates (daughter)	do	Ensign	Do.
	James B. Ginty (son-in-law) (killed in action)			
Bates, Joe B	Joseph Rice Bates	Army	Officer Candidate	Kentucky.
Bishop, C. W	Jack H. Bishop	Coast Guard	Yeoman, third class	Illinois.
Blackney, Wm. W	William W. Blackney, Jr	Army	Sergeant	Michigan.
Bolton, Mrs. Frances P	Kenyon C. Bolton	do	Captain	Ohio.
	Oliver P. Bolton	do	First lieutenant	Do.

Members of Senate and House, with members of their families serving in the Armed Forces—Continued

	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank	State
REPRESENTATIVES—con.				
Boykin, Frank W	Riley Smith Boykin	Navy	Lieutenant	Alabama.
	James Robert Boykin	Army Air Corps	Cadet	Do.
	Richard Ainsworth Boykin (awaiting call)	Coast Guard		Do.
Bradley, Michael J	Raymond J. Bradley	Navy	Ensign	Pennsylvania.
Brehm, Walter E	Thomas Walter Brehm	Army	Private	Ohio.
Brown, Clarence J	Robert A. Haines (son-in-law)	Navy	Petty officer, second class	Do.
Brown, Paul	Robert T. Brown	do	Ensign	Georgia.
Bulwinkle, Alfred L	Alfred Lewis Bulwinkle	Army	Captain	North Carolina.
Burchill, Thomas F	John J. Burchill	do	Private	New York.
Cannon, Clarence	Harry B. Hackethorn (son-in-law)	do	First lieutenant	Missouri.
Carson, H. H	Leonard W. Snyder (son-in-law)	do	Private	Ohio.
Church, Ralph E	Ralph E. Church, Jr	U. S. Naval Reserve	Ensign	Illinois.
Clark, J. Bayard	Jerome B. Clark, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	North Carolina.
Clevenger, Cliff	John G. Clevenger	Army Medical Corps	Technical sergeant	Ohio.
Courtney, Wirt	Wirt Courtney, Jr	Army Air Corps	Sergeant	Tennessee.
	Richard Courtney	do	Private	Do.
Cox, E. E	Lemar P. Cox	Navy	Lieutenant	Georgia.
Creal, Edward W	James Grady Creal	Army	First lieutenant	Kentucky.
Crosser, Robert	Robert Crosser, Jr	Army Air Corps	Private	Ohio.
	Charles A. Sweeny (son-in-law)	Coast Guard	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Do.
Culkin, Francis D	Francis H. Culkin	Army	Second lieutenant	New York.
Cunningham, Paul	Edward P. Cunningham	Marine Corps	Private, first class	Iowa.
Curley, James M	Leo F. Curley	Navy	Ensign	Massachusetts.
	George J. Curley	do	do	Do.
	George Dennis (stepson)	United States Naval Reserve		Do.
Dewey, Charles S	Albert Peter Dewey	Army Air Force	First lieutenant	Illinois.
	Frederick M. Alger (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant commander	Michigan.
	Edward Byron Smith (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant	Illinois.
Dies, Martin	Martin Dies, Jr	V-7	Apprentice seaman	Texas.
Disney, Wesley E	Wesley V. Disney	Air Corps	First lieutenant	Oklahoma.
Ditter, J. William	J. William Ditter, Jr	U. S. Naval Reserve	Seaman	Pennsylvania.
Dondero, George A	Robert Lincoln Dondero	Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps	Apprentice seaman	Michigan.
	Stanton G. Dondero	Navy		Do.
	Glen Wilson (son-in-law)	do		Do.
Drewry, P. H	Patrick H. Drewry, Jr	Army	Captain	Virginia.
Dworshak, Henry C	Henry I. Dworshak	do	Second lieutenant	Idaho.
	Ward W. Dworshak	U. S. Military Academy	Cadet	Do.
Elston, Charles H	Robert P. Dietz (son-in-law)	Army Air Corps	Second lieutenant	Ohio.
Engel, Albert	Albert H. Engel	Army	Private	Michigan.
Englebright, Harry L	Harry Jackson Englebright	Navy	Ensign	California.
Fenton, Ivor D	James J. Kernan, Jr. (son-in-law)	Army	Sergeant	Pennsylvania.
Flannagan, John W., Jr	Francis W. Flannagan	Army Air Force	Staff sergeant	Virginia.
Furlong, Robert Grant	Keen A. Furlong	Naval aviation	Seaman, first class	Pennsylvania.
Gale, Richard P	R. P. Gale, Jr	Army	Private	Minnesota.
Gallagher, James	Wm. W. Fogarty, Jr. (grandson)	do	do	Pennsylvania.
Gillie, George W	John Tapp Strawbridge (son-in-law)	do	Captain	Ohio.
Gross, Chester H	Nellie Gross (daughter)	do	Nurse	Pennsylvania.
Hall, Leonard W	H. Wyndol Carroll (awaiting call) (stepson)	Navy	Aviation cadet	New York.
Hancock, Clarence E	John Shonk Hancock	Army Air Corps	Captain	Do.
Hare, Butler B	Robert Hayne Hare	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	South Carolina.
	James Butler Hare	do	do	Do.
Harris, Winder R	David S. Bill Jr. (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant	Virginia.
Hartley, Fred A., Jr	Henry Allan Hartley	Air Corps	Cadet	New Jersey.
Herter, Christian A	C. A. Herter, Jr	Army	Captain	Massachusetts.
Hobbs, Sam	Truman Hobbs	Navy	Ensign	Alabama.
	Rosa Miller Hobbs (daughter)	do	do	Do.
Hoffman, Clare E	Leo W. Hoffman (son-in-law)	do	Lieutenant	Michigan.
Holmes, Pehr G	George Everett Holmes	Army	Private	Massachusetts.
Hope, Clifford R	C. R. Hope, Jr	do	do	Kansas.
Izac, Edouard V	Edward V. Izac, Jr	Navy	Ensign	California.
	Robert Melvin Waller (son-in-law)	Army	Staff sergeant	Virginia.
Jenson, Ben F	Donald G Fitzpatrick (son-in-law)	do	First lieutenant	Massachusetts.
Johnson, Calvin D	John Bernerd Johnson	Air Corps	Lieutenant	Illinois.
	Calvin P Johnson	Engineers	Corporal	Do.
	Dean F. Johnson	Army	Private	Do.
Johnson, Leroy	William A. Johnson	Air Corps	do	California.
Johnson, Luther A	Luther A Johnson, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Texas.
Kean, Robert W	Robert W. Kean, Jr	Army	Officer candidate	New Jersey.
	Hamilton F. Kean	do	Private	Do.
	Edward L. Hicks (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign	Do.
Kearney, Bernard W	Joan Kearney (daughter)	WAAC	Auxiliary	New York.
Keefe, Frank B	B. F. Keefe	Troop Carrier Command	Flight officer	Wisconsin.
Kelley, Augustine B	Regis Kelley	Antiaircraft	First lieutenant	Pennsylvania.
	Robert V. Kelley	Marine Corps	Officer Candidate	Do.
	Richard B. Kelley	Engineers	Corporal	Do.
	J. Hilary Kelley	do	Second lieutenant	Do.
Kilburn, Clarence E	William B. Kilburn	Army	Private	New York.
Kirwan, Michael J	John Joseph Kirwan	do	Private first class	Ohio.
Lanham, Fritz G	John D. Head (stepson)	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Texas.
Lemke, William	Robert Lemke	Army	Second lieutenant	North Dakota.
Lewis, Earl R	Robert N. Lewis	Army Medical Corps Reserve		Ohio.
Lesinski, John	John Lesinski, Jr	U. S Naval Reserve	Petty officer, third class	Michigan.
Luce, Clare Booth	Henry Luce III (stepson)	U. S. Naval Reserve, awaiting call		Connecticut.
Lynch, Walter A	Walter A. Lynch, Jr	Army Air Force	Private	New York.
McCowen, Edward O	J. Lawrence Keller (son-in-law)	Army	Officer Candidate	Ohio.
	William L. Carter Jr., (son-in-law)	do	Private first class	Do.
McGregor, J. Harry	Monroe Horst (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign	Do.
McLean, Donald H	Donald H. McLean, Jr	Service of Supply, War Department	Captain	New Jersey.
	Edward R. McLean	On special mission directly connected with war effort.		Do.
Maas, Melvin J	Elmer J. Wood (son-in-law)	Marine Corps	First lieutenant	Illinois.
Martin, Thomas E	Richard C. Martin	U. S. Military Academy	Cadet	Iowa.
	Raymond H. Reiser (son-in-law)	Army	Second lieutenant	Virginia.
Michener, Earl C	Charles E. Quick (son-in-law)	do	Major	California.
Miller, A. L	Richard K. Miller	Army Enlisted Medical Reserve	Private	Nebraska.
Morrison, Cameron	James J. Harris (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant	North Carolina.
Mott, James W	John L. Sullivan (son-in-law)	Army	First sergeant	Oregon.
Murdock, John R	David N. Murdock	do	Lieutenant	Arizona.
	John B. Murdock	do	Captain	Do.
Murray, Reid F	Reid F. Murray, Jr	Navy	Pharmacist, first class	Wisconsin.
Norman, Fred	Harry Carlson (son-in-law)	do	Apprentice seaman	California.
O'Hara, Joseph P	J. P. O'Hara, Jr	Army	Private	Minnesota.
	Edward M. O'Hara	Air Corps	Cadet	Do.
O'Leary, James A	James A. O'Leary, Jr	Coast Guard	Ensign	New York.
	John D. Lucey (son-in-law)	do	do	Do.
	John K. Lucey (son-in-law)	Army	First lieutenant	Do.
Pace, Stephen	Stephen Pace, Jr	U. S. Military Academy	Cadet	Georgia.

Members of Senate and House, with members of their families serving in the Armed Forces—Continued

	Name of son (otherwise relationship noted)	Service	Rank	State
REPRESENTATIVES—CON.				
Patman, Wright	Connor Wright Patman	Army	Captain	Texas.
	James Harold Patman	Marine Corps	Staff sergeant	Do.
Phillips, John	Carl Phillips	Air Corps	Officer Candidate	California.
	Robert W. Phillips	Army Air Corps	Private	Do.
Pittenger, Wm. A	Richard W. Pittenger	Army	do	Minnesota.
Rabaut, Louis C	Vincent Charles Rabaut	U. S. Naval Reserve	Ensign	Michigan.
Ramey, Homer A	Bernard C. Ramey	Army	Officer Candidate	Ohio.
Ramspeck, Robert	J. R. Dunson (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant	Georgia.
	John Leedy (son-in-law)	Army Air Corps	do	Do.
Rizley, Ross	R. Q. Rizley	do	Corporal	Okla.
	Robert S. Rizley	Marine Corps	Private	Do.
	Melvin S. Camp (son-in-law)	Army	Lieutenant	Do.
	Paul Barrere (son-in-law)	do	Private	Do.
Robertson, A. Willis	A. Willis Robertson, Jr	Navy	Apprentice seaman	Virginia.
Robsion, John M	John M. Robsion, Jr	Coast Artillery	Captain	Kentucky.
Rockwell, Robert F	Robert F. Rockwell, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Colorado.
	Wilson M. Rockwell	Army	Private	Do.
Rohrbough, E. G	Edward G. Rohrbough, Jr	Canadian Army (Discharged for defective vision).		West Virginia.
Rolph, Tom	Henry Renton Rolph	Marine Corps	Major	California.
	John Robert Metcalf (son-in-law)	Army	Private	Do.
Rowe, Ed	Ed Rowe, Jr	Navy	Aviation cadet	Ohio.
Sasscer, Lansdale G	H. C. E. Claggett, Jr., (son-in-law)	Army Air Forces	Captain pilot	Maryland.
Satterfield, Dave E., Jr	Dave E. Satterfield, III	Naval aviation	Ensign	Virginia.
	Richard Benjamin Satterfield	do	Cadet	Do.
Scanlon, Thomas E	Edward A. Scanlon	Air Corps	Corporal	Pennsylvania.
Schiffler, A. C	Robert A. Schiffler	do	Private, first class	West Virginia.
Smith, Howard W	Howard Worth Smith, Jr	Army	Major	Virginia.
	Joe H. Tonnahill (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign	Do.
Smith, Joe L	Joe L. Smith, Jr	Army	Captain	West Virginia.
	Hulett C. Smith	Navy	Ensign	Do.
Smith, Lawrence H	John L. Smith	Medical Corps	Private, first class	Wisconsin.
Somers, Andrew L	Arthur S. Somers	Marine Air Corps	Lieutenant	New York.
Sparkman, John J	T. T. Shepard, Jr. (son-in-law)	Navy	Ensign	Alabama.
Starnes, Joe	Joe Starnes, Jr		Officer Candidate	Do.
Sullivan, Maurice J	Maurice J. Sullivan, Jr	Engineers	First lieutenant	Nevada.
Taber, John	Charles Taber (injured in service)	Navy		New York.
Thomas, J. Parnell	J. Parnell Thomas, Jr	Air Corps	Cadet	New Jersey.
	Stiles Thomas	Paratroops	Corporal	Do.
Thomason, R. Ewing	Wm. E. Thomason	Army	Major	Texas.
	Ben Decherd (son-in-law)	do	Captain	Do.
Tolan, John H	J. H. Tolan, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	California.
	William Gale (son-in-law)	Army Air Corps	Lieutenant	Do.
Treadway, Allen T	Royal W. Treadway (grandson)	Army	Officer Candidate	Massachusetts.
Vursell, Charles W	H. D. Vursell	do	Private	Illinois.
	Charles E. Vursell	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Do.
Wadsworth, J. R	Reverdy Wadsworth	Army	First lieutenant	New York.
Ward, David J	Howard P. Ward	Army Air Corps	do	Maryland.
	Albert W. Ward	Coast Guard Reserve		Do.
	David J. Ward, Jr	U. S. Naval Reserve	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Do.
Weaver, Zebulon	C. H. Hites, Jr. (grandson)	Army Air Corps	Cadet	North Carolina.
	Zebulon Weaver Hites (grandson)	do	do	Do.
Welch, Richard J	Garrett J. Welch	U. S. Naval Reserve	Lieutenant	California.
West, Milton H	Milton H. West, Jr	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Texas.
Whittington, Will M	W. M. Whittington, Jr	do	do	Mississippi.
Winter, Thomas D	Robert G. Winter	Engineers	Second lieutenant	Kansas.
Wolfenden, James	John J. Tomalino (son-in-law)	Navy	Lieutenant (junior grade)	Pennsylvania.
Wolverton, Chas. A	Donnell Knox Wolverton	Army	Major	New York.
Woodruff, Roy O	Devere H. Woodruff	Army Motor Transport	Captain	Michigan.
Woodrum, C. A	C. A. Woodrum, Jr	Marine Corps	Major	Virginia.

Our War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are Our War Aims?", which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of last Sunday, June 13, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE OUR WAR AIMS?

In his recent House of Commons speech reporting on his American and north African trip, Prime Minister Winston Churchill stressed the warm personal friendship which now exists between himself and President Roosevelt. He also expressed the hope that any world organization growing out of this war may be based on the fraternal relations and the deep understanding now existing between the United States and the British Empire.

The first of these two points must be agreeable, we think, to all Americans. Certainly this Churchill-Roosevelt friendship should persist to the end of the war, since our prime war aim must be to defeat Germany, Italy, and Japan.

About the second proposition—a world organization largely based on United States-British foundations—we feel as dubious as ever, which is pretty dubious.

It is at this point that the question of our longer range war aims rears its head. After the defeat of the Axis, what do we want to get out of this war for ourselves and our descendants?

WORLD STATE—FACTS OF LIFE

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat, Florida), frequent Roosevelt spokesman and trial balloon navigator, says his ambition is to nominate Mr. Roosevelt for the presidency of the United States of the World.

From this and other signs it is fair to assume that the Roosevelt war aim is to bring one world super state to birth out of this war, all the nations sinking their sovereignties in one pulsating pool of globaloney.

There are a few facts of life in today's world which stand in the way of this dream's coming true.

One of these facts is Stalinist Russia. Mr. Churchill in that same speech intimated that Mr. Stalin is still being coy about the Roosevelt - Churchill - Stalin - Chiang conference which Mr. Roosevelt so ardently desires. It seems a safe bet to us that Stalin, after an allied victory which he will have done so much to bring about, will come as far west into Europe as he pleases, and who can stop him? He'll probably want to come as far as the old Czarist boundaries.

Nor can Stalin be expected to surrender up any Russian sovereignty to some superstate. Russia's Bolshevik government since its birth has suspected all democratic governments of designs against communism. We can't imagine the Bolsheviks scrapping that suspicion and falling in love with democracy simply because a war has forced them into a wartime alliance with a couple of democratic nations.

Mr. Churchill, too, says that "we mean to hold our own," and that "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." That does not sound as if the British people were all afire with desire to give over their independence to a world state.

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS

It looks to us as if post-war regional federations are the biggest international setups the world-staters can reasonably hope for.

There will be difficulties even there, especially in Europe. Europe's small nations are all intensely nationalistic, and want to be restored with full independence after the Axis heel is blasted off their necks. Some of them are so small that an airplane can fly across them in 5 or 10 minutes, meaning they

are too small to keep full sovereignty intact in a barbaric and mechanized twentieth-century world. But try to sell that to a Belgian, Dutchman, Norwegian, Finn, Lithuanian, Estonian, or Latvian.

However, it does seem feasible for the big nations—Russia, China, and the United States—to be dominant in their parts of the world, and to protect their weaker neighbors. Britain and France between them might arrange somehow to run Europe west of Russia, with Germany somehow made militarily and politically impotent.

Of one thing we're convinced: That for mutual defense the United States and Canada should have a military alliance, going at least to the extent of a joint general staff and as far beyond that as the two nations might wish.

It is time, we think for the Allied war aims to be definitely stated. Just what are we fighting for?

We only hope the United States is not fighting to impoverish itself after the war in order to lift Chinese or Hottentot living standards an inch while dropping our own a yard. And we're sure that if we insist on meddling in other nations' affairs after the war, other nations will insist on meddling in our affairs—and how can we tell them to mind their own business?

Flag Day Address by Hon. James A. Farley at Cambridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Flag Day exercises at Cambridge, Mass., June 12, 1943, under the auspices of Cambridge Lodge, No. 839, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this birthday of our flag we are gathered here to renew our dedication to the cause of freedom for which it stands, and to draw from it strength and courage to conquer the totalitarian hordes which have treacherously attacked and would tear down these Stars and Stripes.

On this birthday it is fitting to observe that during this last year our flag has grown in recognition, power, and influence. We have carried it to new and strange beach heads and battlefields. In the Pacific, in north Africa, and in the Aleutians, brave men worthy of the finest traditions of this flag have by force of arms brought this Nation past another momentous turning point in its history—from stubborn defense to a world-wide attack upon our enemies.

The past year was not unlike the year 1777, which marked the turning point in our struggle for independence, and during which this flag, of red and white stripes, with pure white stars on a field of blue, was first carried by our forefathers in the pivotal victory at Saratoga.

We share this hour of honor to our flag with millions of strong and stout-hearted men and women who have followed it to far-away posts. There it floats over jungles, deserts, mountain ridges, and foreign cities, quickening courage and devotion to the highest hopes of mankind.

And there are those with whom we can only share this day in our prayers to Almighty God. They have given for the flag and for us their last full measure of devotion.

They, too, shared our heritage of peace and plenty; they, too, dreamed of the finer future that lies beyond this present horror. But when duty called, they answered. And now they are numbered in that magnificent color guard which is forever mobilized in our hearts, marching with us as we press on the fight against tyranny, brutality and godlessness.

Long before the days of trenches, tanks and fighting planes, this flag was carried in battles for freedom, for union, and for liberation. In those earlier battles the flag itself was carried in the charge. We well recall pictures of those actions with the flag-bearer driving forward in a hail of shot and shell. Part of every child's clear vision of heroism is the picture of the flag-bearer's death. He stumbles, wounded; the flag droops; but from the ranks behind another springs forward and catches the colors. He holds them high as the ranks go forward.

The hold that love of country has on men and women seems at times to ebb and then to mount again. But planted well and deeply in the rich soil of childhood is this ineradicable reverence for our flag. Each one of us knows that should that moment come, he, too, would spring forward to catch our flag lest it fall dishonored in the dust. This we would do without thought of self. In that instant the hero in each common man shines out.

No man who serves in khaki or in blue is for a moment forgetful of his duty to be worthy of this flag.

We have learned already that modern war cannot be fought and won by the armed forces alone. Behind these fighting men there must be mobilized all of the power, all of the patriotism, yes, all of the sacrifice of the 130,000,000 people.

Just so surely as we at home fail in any duty to this flag, so surely there will be American boys killed and maimed who, but for our failure, might have survived without injury.

We who are not in uniform must fight this war, too.

If we value our liberties, if we venerate the right to worship our God, if we mean to bring our fighting men safely home with victory at the last, then we, too, must pledge all that we have and all that we are.

Are we worthy of this flag—worthy in sacrifice, in unity, in determination? How are we judged—we who serve behind the lines? By what we have done to speed the mobilizing and equipping of 9,000,000 men? By what we have done to build the greatest Navy on the seas? By producing bigger and more devastating airplanes? These almost incredible accomplishments prove that millions of Americans have been hard at work. That America's practical genius has soared to new peaks. That its great wealth has been poured out unstintingly.

But the massing of these products of our brains and our hands do not alone prove that we here at home are worthy of this flag.

Only in the heart can that proof be found.

And we must ask: Do we find in our hearts unity and singleness of purpose? Do we find there willingness to sacrifice? Do we find there determination to do anything possible to bring victory nearer by even an hour, thus saving the lives that the 1 hour might cost?

He is truly worthy who can answer "Yes" to such a searching of his heart.

I know that he belongs to the overwhelming majority of Americans who are true to this flag and to our men risking all in the acrid smoke and shattering shellfire of battle.

Let me say to you with all of the sincerity of which I am capable, that everything that this flag means, every blessing that it confers upon us as a people, and every right that it protects, arose from one principle—the principle that a free people may choose those who will govern them. But it is equally true that, when the people of these United States have made this free choice, the Government so selected becomes the Government of all of the people and acts with all of the power of all of the people.

When a Congress elected by a majority of our people enacts a law, and that law is approved by the President, it is the law of the land. It is not a law to be respected only by those who voted for that particular Congress or President, but a law which must be respected by all.

When this national leadership, which is a leadership of majority selection, determines upon the course of conduct necessary for the successful prosecution of a war, every individual has a patriotic obligation to support that leadership.

It is true, we have a right to express our disagreement with a course of action which we believe to be wrong, in an effort to secure changes and betterments. But we have no right to weaken the hand of our National Government in the prosecution of the war. We have no right to sabotage the laws which our own Government has enacted in the effort to lead us to victory and to preserve our liberties.

Only a united nation can win in modern warfare. Disunity can lead only to disaster.

It will not do to salve our individual consciences by comparing our course of conduct with that of others less patriotic. It will not do to say that others are seeking gains from the war either through profit or preferment. We cannot excuse any individual failure on our own part by pointing out that mistakes have been made by our leaders. Every such mistake only creates a greater obligation and a greater necessity for individual sacrifice to save this Nation.

This conscience of America is a stronghold that must not be lost. It cannot be defended with guns or planes, nor even such a marvel as radar that "sees" an enemy plane a hundred miles away at night. No brilliant scientist can provide the counter to this blow. If this battle is to be won—and it will be won—the patriotism in the hearts of American men and women must win the victory. In a democracy every single individual is the keeper of the national conscience.

We have no greater challenge to meet. The foundations of our Government rest on the certainty that we who live under the Stars and Stripes know and will respect the laws of our own Government because it is our own Government. This is the genius and glory of this Nation.

No one can witness the petty compromises with the right course of action without fearing for the freedom of the individual which has been won and safeguarded here in the United States by all those who have gone before us.

Our prized personal freedom is circumscribed because compulsion is the only alternative to voluntary support of the steps that must be taken to win this war.

Every American family has felt the impact of some of these steps. Vacant places at the family dinner table are daily reminders. Rationing of scarce materials, a heavier burden of taxation, sacrifices of luxuries, and less-happy living conditions in war-production areas have brought difficult problems.

But there cannot be a point at which any American puts personal interest above the Nation's interest. This war is too big; the need of this entire Nation for the full

measure of cooperation from each individual is too great. These imperatives, I say again, leave only a choice between wholehearted support of our country and our flag, or the heavy hand of unwanted compulsion.

This is the choice for each one of us.

With millions of our men in uniform speeding up the long Victory march, we can see that by the free working of American democracy an incredible job has already been done. At the outset we had the tremendous urge of righteous anger. Through the early months we had not felt the necessity of scraping the bottom of the barrel for manpower, raw materials, and food.

But now, though the foretaste of victory banishes our recollections of the humiliations of Pearl Harbor and Bataan, we are coming into the period of greater personal losses and large and small privations. We must realize that these sacrifices cannot be avoided.

If we listen for the voice of conscience we will know what is the right thing for us to do. In this time of emergency we must not take the easy way of blaming others and excusing ourselves.

Yet unfortunately we are witnessing today the finest flowering of the art of excuse making. It has no place in wartime. Finding a reason for not doing what we do not want to do is one kind of resourcefulness which does no credit to Americans in fighting for their lives against the most ruthless, organized brutality that ever showed itself on this earth.

For men and women of all walks of life to shoulder loyally the sacrifices which are called for is no sign of meek submissiveness but, rather, the proof of the resiliency and determination of free America. If we press forward in this spirit, our institutions of democracy will remain intact. They will not be replaced by hasty tyrannies.

On the other hand, if we unthinkingly permit a lapse here and a break-down there, until at length we jeopardize this Nation's ability to throw its mighty power into the winning of the war, we as individuals will lose and may never again regain our freedom under law.

Today our problems, at the front and in our homes and mines and factories, loom almost too difficult for man's solution. And they will be, if we do not strike at them from solid foundations.

It is useless for us to wish that we were like that white-haired king of Browning's poem who—

"Lived long ago
In the morning of the world
When earth was nearer heaven than now."

In the earlier hours of this world's day, the United States, under this flag, carved a pathway through the wilderness of despotism to the fertile land of reasonable law where men could dwell together and enjoy a richer life. This arrival was not haphazard, and we can see the way we traced, the abysses we avoided, and the markings that helped us on this way.

So we have built here a great Nation and this flag is its symbol. As we look at this flag we can see the blood of those brave men who died to bring this Nation into being and of the myriads more who died to preserve it. We can see the respect that this Nation has won in all lands and from all people through the purity of our national motives. We fight no wars for the lands or treasures of weaker peoples. We fight no wars to impose upon others our creeds or our ideologies. We see in this flag the heavens where dwells a merciful God whom each man may worship after his own belief, and we see the stars that shed the light of peace equally on men and women of every race and creed and color who are privileged to live under this banner.

We, like those who have gone before us in creating and maintaining this privileged place, must be prepared to pay our fair share of the price of all of these blessings. Let us show to all the world that here is a united Nation, a people unswerving in their devotion to this flag and to this Nation. Let us demonstrate to all the world that as we have been equal in privilege and opportunity, so will we be equal in sacrifice and loyalty.

We have set in place here the solid foundations of a great nation. We are proud to have our children know them. In my lifetime of experience, one stands out, which is not mine alone, but which I share with millions of American mothers and fathers.

It is that time when the little boy or girl, with new and unfamiliar dignity, stands tall and straight and speaks these words:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In that moment we see patriotism as it must be, deep and clear and reverent. The pledge is given wholeheartedly, with no thought of personal reservation. Today in this hour of our Nation's crisis, I pray God that every American, from the highest to the lowliest, will, with the same sincerity and selflessness, reaffirm this pledge to the flag of our United States.

Sam Houston School, Pampa, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 14, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to bring to the attention of the House a good example of the wholehearted cooperation to win the war which all Texas fervently believes in. The following story carried in the Pampa Daily News is an illustration of how even the Texas youngsters are going all-out to win the war. We are all mighty proud of these youngsters:

SAM HOUSTON SCHOOL CREDIT TO NAMESAKE

(By Brownwood Emerson)

Sam Houston, commander in chief of the Texas Army and first President of the Republic of Texas, would not be ashamed at all of the Pampa School named in his honor.

In fact, he would be as proud of the school if he were alive today as all Texans are of the hero of San Jacinto, for pupils of San Houston School in Pampa, located at 900 North Frost, have set a mark that few schools in the Panhandle will equal.

With true Texas spirit they have responded to the patriotic call to purchase Victory bonds. They started on March 8 to buy enough bonds to buy two jeeps. They wound up their drive on April 21 by coincidence, San Jacinto Day, anniversary of Sam Houston's army defeating the Mexicans, with enough bonds and stamps sold to buy 14 jeeps.

There were 77 students who bought bonds, stamps, and bond sales grand total was $12,284.95. That is not all, either; the Sam Houston pupils are going right ahead and buying more.

All of the bonds bought at the school are in the names of the students.

Since April 12 the school purchased $10,684.95 in bonds and stamps. In the first week of the drive the total was $1,600.

There are 352 pupils enrolled at Sam Houston School, of which Aaron Meek is principal.

The total of $12,284.95, the grand total of all bonds and stamps bought by the students from March 8 to April 12, does not include bonds purchased by the teachers.

Denominations of the bonds purchased by the students and number of students purchasing in that denomination were:

$25 bonds, 40 pupils, total, $1,000; $50 bonds, 10, $500; $100, 16, $1,600; $500, 5, $2,500; $1,000, 6, $6,000.

Amount of stamp sales, by denominations: $5—$65; $1—$3; 50-cent, $10; 25-cent, $301.75; 10-cent, $305.20.

Bond purchasers were:

John Lee Welton, Ann Perkins, John Friauf, Gilbert Berry, Jan Dell Dickey, Donald Burns, Norma Gelson, Marilyn Fitzgerald, Danny Fitzgerald, Betty Fern Wilson, Jane Hampton, Patricia Dunn, Sam Dunn; Bernice Homer, Merdella Roberts, Joyce Harrah, John Lloyd Carruth, Jimmie Don Dorsett, Phoebe Ann Carter.

John Boyd Schoolfield, Dorothy Louise Mackie, Jimmie Howard, Hershel Langley, Eddie Ray Caldwell, Bobbie Porter, James Prichard, Mary Scott Daugherty, Molly Nelson, Jan Roby, Dan Gunn, Harrie Schwartz, Jane Prichard, Hugh F. Greinor, Barbara Maul, Janell Ewing, Don Farmer.

Billy Ed Morrison, Robert Kelly, Hubert G. Greinor, John Lee Bell, June Harvey, J. W. Harvey, Bobby Libby, Iva Libby, Garnet Reeves, Peggy Hukill, Jimmie Baldridge, Scooter Warner, Barbara J. Weidler, Norma Jean Manatt, Bobby Willingham, Jimmie Campbell, Etta Francis Haney.

J. C. Haggerman, Rachell Garcia, Gregory Keys, Greta Miller, J. L. Kaiserman, Janette Ethridge, Sid Mills, Don Hicks, Harry Hanks, John Meek, Laura Nell Berry, Yvonne Carruth, Jimmie Watts, Mary Katherine Jewell, Haldean Suttle, Jan Sanders, Rue Paula Davis, Betty Howard.

Jo Alice Franks, David Engle, Billy Brothers, Doris Mae Libby, Leroy Kretzmeier, Donald Merritt Sweazy, Tom Gries, James Ewing.

War Labor Disputes Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, restrictive laws are invariably written to curb the activities of the vacillating minorities. The vast majority of citizens sense their duties and responsibilities and perform them honorably. The chiselers and obstructionists are the ones who must be kept in line by throwing the fear of penalties into them.

Early in the twentieth century, we found that monopolistic corporations were becoming a plague upon our system of free enterprise and democratic living. Only a few corporations violated our American way of freedom, but Congress adopted trust-busting legislation covering all corporate bodies in order to eliminate these abuses. Early in the depression it was learned that some few corporations defrauded investors by selling bogus or greatly watered stock. Congress created the Securities and Exchange Commission, which brought all corporate financing under scrutiny and control.

In human relations voluntary cooperation brings about the most effective

results. Congress has been most anxious to retain the employer and employee relationship on a voluntary basis, particularly in view of labor's no-strike pledge.

Labor's record in keeping its pledge of no strikes has been remarkable. Labor's war production record surpasses all expectations. Labor and industry in my district have been doing a splendid job. They have been cooperating magnificently in supplying the men behind the guns. I personally believe that more Army and Navy E's have been earned in the Milwaukee metropolitan district than in any other similar area in the country. There have been no serious work stoppages in the Milwaukee industrial region since Pearl Harbor. Both labor and management deserve the highest commendation and recognition for this exemplary record.

In fact, labor and industry in general are not concerned about the War Labor Disputes Act; this legislation will in no way affect those who have cooperated and would and will continue to do their part in speeding the war effort and the day of final victory.

Within the past several weeks certain individuals and minority groups in various parts of the land have been violating labor's no-strike pledge. Most of these strikes were unauthorized and of brief duration, but each, regardless of extent, spelled a gap in the chain of our war production. In several cases it was necessary for our Commander in Chief to divert his attention from his arduous duties to get the strikers back to work. There would be no need for the War Labor Disputes Act if the record of labor and industry relations throughout the country were as good as Milwaukee's.

More recently the difficulty with Mr. Lewis and his mine workers has grown very acute and cast shadows of a real threat to our national security. It is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the merits of the differences existing between the miners and mine owners. In peacetime we might not grow so perturbed, but today, when we are engaged in a life and death struggle, we cannot allow any one willful man or group of men to jeopardize our war effort or commit any act that would prolong the war for even a moment.

We owe a responsibility to our men in the armed forces to assure them a smooth flow of machines of war with which victory is to be gained. As a Member of Congress, I owe a duty, under my oath of office, to give my Commander in Chief every tool necessary to assure this steady flow of goods.

Mr. Lewis has recklessly challenged the authority of his Government, imperiled the security of its people. If he is allowed to carry on his defiance of the Commander in Chief and of Government authority, the preservation of law and order on the home front, and the successful conduct of the war on the various fighting fronts will be greatly endangered. Undoubtedly, this would also bring about a complete violation of labor's no-strike pledge.

It is unfortunate that a War Labor Disputes Act had to be adopted by Congress under such circumstances. The resulting legislation inevitably is drastic. When this bill was considered in the House it was apparent that it would be rewritten by the conferees. For that reason, on June 4, I voted against it, in the hope that with a substantial number of votes against the measure, the conferees would take notice of some of the objections raised on the floor and revise the drastice provisions of the act. The conferees did make several changes. However, the bill still retains some undesirable features. But there is a crying need for legislation to give the War Labor Board statutory power to function and carry on its purpose. There is need for legislation that will prevent selfish, arrogant leaders, in either labor or industry, from defying their Government in time of war and thereby making more distant the day of victory. We cannot long continue to carry on the war under hair-trigger conditions according to the whim or mood of certain leaders in industry or labor. We must give our men in the front lines definite assurance that we are doing our part, that the goods will be there when needed and in sufficient amount.

For This We Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an essay written by Miss Betsy Heagy, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., which appeared in the Mechanicsburg Daily Local News. Miss Heagy is a senior at the Mechanicsburg High School, and she won the district American Legion essay contest with the following article entitled "For This We Fight." As one reward, Miss Heagy won a scholarship to Pennsylvania State College. It seems to me that this essay shows remarkable originality and a great ability to picture clearly those ideals for which we are fighting. I hope that it may be published in Stars and Stripes or the Yank, where it can be read by our men in the armed forces as an indication to them of the lines along which our young people of today are thinking:

FOR THIS WE FIGHT

(By Betsy Heagy)

MacArthur, Tokyo, Casablanca, Stalingrad, Timoshenko, Tunisia, and Bataan are common household words. The world is at war again. For what are we fighting?

I can think of so many things when I write these words, "For this we fight"—incidents that have happened during my lifetime which I can understand more clearly now; happenings, ideas, beliefs, and truths; things I've been told and things I've seen, things I've heard and things I've read. Volumes of closely written pages could never express all the little and big ideals we Americans are fighting for today.

Thomas Jefferson summed it up most ably when he wrote that statement in the heart of every true American: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Life—our body and soul—that which was given to us at the time of birth, is one of the things for which we are fighting. I've never thought very much about life being a right, and yet it is surely one of the most precious rights Americans possess.

In the Germany of today, children are often denied life by the killing of a woman's capacity to be a mother. In many cases, parents of unborn children are selected by the state, for biological reasons only, thereby destroying the right of all free people to choose the mate they desire. Certainly, even though the enemy may never bomb our cities or shell our shores, we, as a Nation, are fighting for our lives—for our children's lives.

Liberty—this is another right for which we fight. When I think of the word "liberty" I think of soapbox orators and church bells ringing in the evening, of people walking to church on bright Sunday mornings and of the people who prefer to play golf on those mornings; I think of the man who calls Roosevelt a d——— Democrat and of the man who believes the Republicans to be damned too; of my grandfather pounding his fist on the table and declaring that the big interests (monopolies I think he means) will bring this country to rack and ruin. And then, too, I think of bands playing and flags waving in the blue skies, of Churchill's voice when he talks of "blood, sweat, and tears," of smiles on happy children's faces; of those 8 men struggling in rafts on the treacherous waters of the Pacific—of the courageous and gallant Captain Rickenbacker.

Besides all these contemporary symbols, I think of past things when I think of liberty—things that in a sense are not past, but which will live forever in the hearts of men; that never-to-be-forgotten night, for instance, when Paul Revere, the silversmith's son, galloped into the little villages of Concord and Lexington to warn the townfolk of the coming of the British; Washington, tired and heartsick, kneeling to pray for his men in the snow of Valley Forge; Whitman's immortal poetry—the beautiful soul-stirring lines of his Lilacs; that great lonely man, sitting in his stone temple in the City of Government—slavery's emancipator; the heroic bravery of Sergeant York—of the men in the Argonne and Chateau-Thierry. Yes, all these and many more mean liberty to me—liberty for which our forefathers fought and for which we must fight to preserve.

Finally, we Americans have the right to the pursuit of happiness. Happiness is a lovely word. There's something glad and gay even about the way it sounds. I suppose everyone has his own individual ideas about the meaning of happiness. To me, it is an expression of all the best feelings, emotions, and thoughts in life. It's the way you feel when you smile at someone and that person smiles back; it's singing in the choir and watching a football game, playing tennis in the hot sun and walking in the coolness of a spring rain; it's the feeling you get when you've done a piece of work well and know it, and it's the way you feel when you're seated at the supper table and all the family is there—even though the way they are planning and the strategy of the present African campaign is not the way that you would conduct it.

Happiness is the way you feel when taking a long hike in the mountains—the moment supreme, when, after the long, hard climb, you reach the top; it's your first long party dress—the white and silver one, and the high-school prom; it's drinking "cokes" with the drugstore gang and dancing to the nickelodeon; saluting the flag and cheering at a basketball game; it's the smell of leaves

burning. Tchaikovsky's symphonies, Tommy Dorsey's music, and hot dogs with onion, all rolled into one.

Then too, happiness is the completeness of feeling that only one who has done an honest day's work and has received an honest wage for work well done can ever know or achieve.

Happiness is all this and more: it's having a faith and believing in it—not only a faith in God, but a faith in America, in the Allies, in the world. A faith so strong that we believe that no matter how hard the fight, some day, though we may not live to see it, there will be no more of the "blood, sweat and tears" of war. All men will have come to understand that wars have no place in the progress of civilization.

Our American faith and beliefs in "Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is being preserved now by men on all the battlefields of the world—from the blood-stained snows of Russia to the shell-torn jungle of Guadalcanal. It is for these inalienable rights that free men fight today, till they become not only American rights but world rights—monuments to the equality of all men.

Economists Do Not Raise Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, Congress must soon reflect the will of the American people, which is manifesting itself against the proposed rolling back of prices and the use of Federal funds to pay subsidies for the benefit of consumers. In Idaho, there has been a preponderance of sentiment on the part of processors, retailers, producers, and virtually every group and organization of citizens against the unnecessary expenditure of Federal funds to enforce a price-ceiling program.

The Idaho State Grange represents many thousands of farm families in Idaho, and it is interesting to observe the attitude of Mr. E. T. Taylor, State master, who has consistently pointed out that "to roll back prices onto the farmer in order to sell food to the consumer cheaper has in it the most dangerous possibility of curtailing food production right at a time when the more abundant production of food is considered more urgent than is the increase in the volume of ammunition."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial on this important subject, which appeared in the June issue of the Idaho Granger, official publication of the Idaho State Grange:

PARITY, INFLATION, SUBSIDIES?

Those who oppose the farmer getting a parity price for his products, have used as their argument that parity would cause inflation.

So if the farmer obtained a just parity price for his products our economic structure would be wrecked.

But this same group of economists turn around and with the next breath say, "we will subsidize" the farmer out of the Federal Treasury, to help make up for the unfair price paid him by the consumer.

By their reasoning they say that if the farmer was treated as all other business and labor is treated and given a fair parity price for his products, that inflation and chaos would sweep the land, but if the same number of dollars were passed out to the farmer from the Treasury under the name of subsidies, prosperity and happiness would reign, and the country be safe.

Such logic would be incomprehensible in any ordered society. But to those who are determined to keep the farmer under their control, it is necessary to subsidize him, right or wrong.

In connection with the question of subsidies it is well to remember that the United States Supreme Court recently rendered an opinion, stating "that the Federal Government has the right to regulate that which it subsidizes."

If the farmer was given a fair parity price for his products in the market place, he would be on the same plane as other walks of life, and he and his family could hold their heads up in honor.

But for subsidies, he must beg of the Government the funds rightfully due him from the consumer in the first place, in order to be able to maintain a reasonable standard of life.

And as a price to pay for subsidies, the Supreme Court says the Government acquires the right to regulate him.

With the financial difference between a dollar of parity money in a farmer's jeans, and a dollar of subsidy money, being just bunkum, the question arises as to whether the advocates of subsidy, instead of parity, do not have as their real purpose the keeping of the farmer under governmental control.

With the farmer getting a smaller proportion of the consumer's dollar than ever before, and with labor's wages and consumer income at the all-time peak, the question arises as to why the consumer should not pay for the food he buys.

Subsidies are not gifts to the farmer. They are payments made by the Treasury, in order to permit him to sell his products to the consumer for less than the cost of production.

Who is being subsidized?

Surely not the farmer.

Yet these selfsame beneficiaries of the subsidy will cry to high heaven that the farmer is robbing the Treasury, when in fact it is the consumer who is doing the plundering.

Let the learned critics of the farmer explain the profound difference in the chaos-making power of a parity dollar and a subsidy dollar.

The farmer is not to blame for inflation, and paying him a fair parity price for his products will not wreck this Nation. The failure to give farmers the same fair treatment given labor and business is one of the outstanding injustices causing farmers to sell out, quit, and leave the farm for the greener pastures, and featherbed jobs of industry.

Economists may supply ration books, but they do not raise food.

The Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the first and most important job facing the people of our country is to do everything within their power to win this war at the earliest possible moment. Any national program that tends toward disunity, creates animosity, or in any manner cripples our productive and distributive machinery should be immediately corrected or entirely eliminated.

The O. P. A. falls in this category. The entire organization needs an overhauling. Now is the proper time to clean the slate. Let this House move to eliminate every man in this organization whose philosophy would destroy our private business, personal initiative, and bring our national economy to complete destruction.

A letter I received this morning expresses in no uncertain language what food distributors are thinking back home. Make no mistake about this, this letter expresses the feeling of thousands of small business firms in our country accounting for more than 60 percent of the ordinary, everyday business activity of the entire Nation:

PIGGLY WIGGLY-WESTERN CO.,
Denver, Colo., June 9, 1943.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HILL: Piggly Wiggly-Western Co. has, up to this time, held its peace about the Office of Price Administration. Throughout many weary months of inept and inane administration by this wartime agency we have kept silent, because we recognized that some sort of food control was needed, and we wanted to remain tolerant while the Office of Price Administration was going through its birth pains.

When Leon Henderson was at the helm we disagreed with him frequently, but we did have the feeling that he was trying to do the right thing as well as he could. When Prentiss Brown—a political "lame duck"—took his place we suspected that the Office of Price Administration was being thrown to the political dogs. We still refrained from saying anything, on the outside chance that we were wrong. We were not wrong.

Today the Office of Price Administration is a sorry spectacle that would be comic if it were not so tragic. Undercover moves and countermoves at Washington are made for selfish, political ends, with apparently no thought given to the tragic results of the hit-or-miss rulings issued today, amended tomorrow and killed the week after. Chaos and confusion that can lead to only two things: The demise of the average food retailer and stark hunger for our children next year.

If there were ever a case of fiddling while Rome burns, this is it.

The professors of philosophy, the welfare workers and the others of their long-haired ilk must go. And those in the Office of Price Administration responsible for putting them there must go, too. This is war, and we don't have the time nor the strength to act as guinea pigs for a lot of crackpots. Politics in the Office of Price Administration must go. The Director must be a man with guts and with enough horse sense to pick others like him as subordinates.

We're not going to attempt to list the hundreds of silly rulings that have come out of the Office of Price Administration in the past 2 months. Every businessman, to his sorrow, knows what they are and what they have done. Every housewife knows a few of them, but she would cringe with fear if she knew what they may mean to her for the future.

This is the time to act.

May we request that not another cent be appropriated for the Office of Price Administration until it cleans house.

Please do your duty today. Help win this war, and help safeguard our business economy, so that our boys overseas will have something worth while to come home to.

Very truly yours,

PIGGLY WIGGLY-WESTERN CO.,
E. H. LAMBOTTE, *President.*

Springfield Armory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud today to insert in the RECORD the following article from the Springfield Daily News of June 10, 1943. I was present at the exercises held when the Army-Navy E award was presented to the employees of the Government armory at Springfield. This armory is producing nearly all of the Garand rifles used by our armed forces. This rifle has received unstinted praise from soldiers, sailors, and marines alike. It will go down in history as one of the great factors in the success of our fighting men in battle after battle.

Springfield Armory makes many other products which are essential to the winning of the war. Its employees have established record after record for loyalty, efficiency, and industry. They are doing a grand job and will continue to surpass their previous records.

The article follows:

ARMORY GIVEN WHITE STAR BY ARMY AND NAVY—SUPPLEMENT TO E AWARD RECEIVED BY LOCAL FEDERAL FACTORY

The huge garrison flag, reserved for ceremonial occasions, was hoisted atop the old arsenal building at Springfield Armory yesterday afternoon in celebration of the award of a white star for the Army-Navy E pennant that was conferred on the armory last September. The star is indicative of continued excellence in service on the production front in the 8 months since the original award was made. It also gives the right to all workers who were on the pay roll on May 22 to wear the E pin that was won by those of the working force who were accredited to the armory on September 5, 1942.

Word that the historic arsenal on the hill has distinguished itself for the second time in the production of rifles for the armed forces came in a letter from the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, to Col. Earl McFarland, commanding officer at the armory. The letter read:

"I am pleased to inform you that you, your staff, and your civilian employees have won for the second time the Army-Navy production award for meritorious services on the production front. You have continued to maintain the high standard that you set for yourselves and which won you distinction more than 6 months ago. You may all be proud of your achievement.

"The white star, which the renewal adds to your Army-Navy production award flag, is the symbol of appreciation from our armed forces for your continued and determined effort and patriotism."

In contrast to the colorful ceremonies of last September, formal exercises were omitted yesterday in accordance with Army policies governing the star award. A little extra effort on the production line was the chief contribution of the workers to the occasion. But Old Glory in the form of the billowing garrison flag, 20 feet by 38 feet and about 15 times the size of the storm flag ordinarily flown, was run to the top of the masthead with the new pennant and its gleaming white star just beneath.

In observance of the day, each armory worker on all three shifts was given a commemorative folder and a certificate in recognition of efforts contributing to the winning of the star. This folder contained facsimile reproductions of Under Secretary Patterson's award letter, a message to armory men and women from Colonel McFarland and a renewal of the armory pledge to keep the wheels turning night and day to produce the weapons needed for the defense of the Nation.

The commanding officer's message read: "Fellow workers—When the E award came to us last fall we accepted it with a deep appreciation of its meaning. And it at once became a challenge to us. Could we do even better? Our answer was immediate and cleancut: 'We can—and we will.'

"The passing months have justified that answer. * * * Your loyalty, your work, your firm determination that the men on the fighting fronts shall have the finest weapons hands can make has won for you a white star on the E flag. The star * * * becomes the full-measured tribute of fighting men who have looked on the work of your hands and found it good. * * * Set your eyes on higher goals and greater achievements. Let your energy never falter until the day when the American flag will be recognized the world over as the symbol of freedom on the one hand and of overwhelming power on the other."

Cum Privilegio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Dezauche, himself, publisher and editor, of Opelousas, La.:

I know what you'll say when you see this sheet, "Where in the h— has Dezauche been?"

I haven't been to Atlanta and I haven't been to Leavenworth, but just like all of you other produce fellows that thought you knew how to run your business after 20, 30, 40, or 50 years, I've been night and day looking over, reading and pondering, trying to understand what article P106 up to article PX1,000,000 tells me I must do in order not to be liable. Up to now I simply don't know a d—n thing about what I've been reading.

I did find out, though, after spending several hundred dollars on the phone talking to all parts of the country, why the ceiling price on white potatoes in south Texas and Florida was placed at $3.75 per hundredweight and the same potatoes in north Texas and Louisiana was placed at $2.50—you'd never guess—"historical data," my brother; yes—"historical data." That data that was gathered after spending thousands of dollars and many hours of laborious toil; that data revealed the startling fact that potatoes from those areas always brought more money than those from other points, including Louisiana. But what I tried to get over to these pencil and paper wizards was the fact that history also reveals that when a commodity is scarce and the demand exceeds the supply up goes the price. Oh, history, what crimes have been committed in your name!

I did find, too, an Office of Price Administration regional director that agreed with me that a sack of cabbage in Chicago was a sack of cabbage, no matter what State it came from. For a spell there, brother, they had that red-bird cabbage on a pretty low scale.

They tell me, too, around the country that there is a black market. That ain't nothing new—I've paid $5 per hundredweight for spuds and sold 'em at $3.25, and if that ain't a black market, brother, I don't know what is. Maybe those guys that talk about black market mean something else—just what I see in the press—that's all I know.

Looks like Frank really built himself a Frankenstein. He played with and pampered the Congress of Industrial Organizations and now it's about to argue with him. Course, nobody can help but censure the Congress of Industrial Organizations for walking out on the boys up front—those boys who can't and wouldn't walk out on us—and I'm surprised and shocked that those miners follow such vicious leadership—many of them with boys of their own "over there."

Something's out of gear in this United States of America—too much Washington with rules and regulations that don't help win the war. No manpower on the farm, not enough men to fill draft, but 160,000 folks on the Office of Price Administration payroll—Chester Davis gave me the figures—so must be so. Husky boys, instead of chasing Japs on Attu, chasing me and you as if we were criminals—I resent it and it makes me darn mad—so I'll quit now before I say something.

Oh, yes; shipping tomatoes now.

Sabotage by Rumor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Shreveport (La.) Times of June 11, 1943:

SABOTAGE BY RUMOR

A wave of rumors and insinuations reflecting on the morality of the WAAC's, the WAVES, the SPARS, and the women marines has gained such impetus throughout the country lately that it finally has been aired in Congress, and high officials of these organizations have had to take much time from their war duties to gather and make public proof that the vast majority of the insinuations are not only malicious gossip, but actual sabotage of the war effort.

These vicious rumors have hampered recruiting in the various women's auxiliary services and they doubtless also have brought much unnecessary worry to fathers, husbands, and brothers of the women in service—often to fathers, brothers, and husbands who are on battle fronts offering their own lives. This is just as much sabotage as if the guns of these men were spiked or the work which the women are doing was destroyed through some underhanded means.

We make no pretense that mere donning of a uniform makes a girl or a woman a saint,

any more than putting on a uniform puts a halo around the head of a man. But neither does changing from civilian work and garb to uniform and patriotic service for the Nation in time of war mean that a girl has turned to the primrose path. The members of these auxiliary services are cross-sections of American girlhood and womanhood just as the male forces of the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the marines are cross-sections of American youth and American manhood. They are the girls and women of New York, San Francisco, East Waterloo, Iowa, Shreveport, and San Diego, and of all the big cities and little crossroads of the Nation. They are the girls of our own homes and the homes down the street. The characteristics of such a cross-section remain the same whether clothed in evening gown, business clothes, or a uniform.

In Washington newspapermen and newspaperwomen, after investigation, have pointed out in recent days that many specific rumors spread about the WAAC's and other auxiliary organizations have been run down and proven untrue. This refers especially to such charges as the one that great numbers of WAAC's had been shipped back from Africa because of alleged immorality.

To what Washington investigators have brought out we can add some testimony of our own. In recent weeks we have investigated half a dozen reports concerning WAAC's or other similar organizations brought to us as supposedly "absolute truth." These did not all deal with morality, but they are typical of reports the gossip-mongering saboteurs spread. In every instance we were able to go to high and unimpeachable sources for information and in every instance we found the reports unfounded. In every instance where high-ranking generals or other officers were talked with they had nothing but praise and respect for the auxiliary services. That dealt with their efficiency in taking the places of soldiers so the latter cou'd go to the front as well as with the moral side of their conduct.

We know, for example, that in every Louisiana camp where uniformed women are stationed they are held in highest respect by the commanders of the male forces and that as a whole the conduct of the women groups has been of the highest order.

It is time to put an end to spreading of unfounded rumors and insinuations. Most of these rumors started innocently—as wisecracks on the stage, screen, and radio. What was spoken originally in proper language and as good fun often was repeated over and over until it became supposedly indecent fact. This source of rumor can be corrected overnight—and should be.

The Nation needs these young women to win the war. It needs them at posts to relieve men to carry guns. They are offering their services loyally and their desire to serve has brought pride in most cases to their families. They are serving their country at the time of its greatest peril since the first shot of the Revolution was fired.

How many who have been spreading the vulgar and unfounded insinuations are doing half as much?

And the Home of the Brave

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most powerful and virile editorials of the present World War has just come to my attention.

It is entitled "And the Home of the Brave" and appeared on the front page of the New Orleans Item of Friday, June 11, 1943.

I am particularly interested in this editorial because it has come from the fascile pen of a contemporary of mine before I became a Member of Congress and was an active newspaperman in Louisiana. Herman B. Deutsch, the author of this editorial, is one of New Orleans' ace reporters and enjoys a Nation-wide reputation as author and contributor to many leading periodicals of the country.

At the present time Mr. Deutsch is associate editor of the New Orleans Item. His editorial comes at a timely moment when many of us are wondering just what the whole thing is about and where do we go from here.

This editorial is typically American. It has the force, the understanding, the inspiration, the tenacity, the fighting heart of that which we know as America.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this editorial, "And the Home of the Brave," by Herman B. Deutsch, of the New Orleans Item, to you for perusal and study:

AND THE HOME OF THE BRAVE

Parts of the national picture are not very pretty. That touch of ugly red near the center, for example, shows soak-the-rich politicians clamoring that, despite the implacable demands of war on time, energy, and resources, we must give the dear pee-pul more than they ever enjoyed in piping times of peace. You can also see where black markets have darkened one corner; yet even there the picture is not as black as where industrial chiselers have palmed off defective cable or armor plate on the Government. That sickly pink blotch in the foreground represents gazelle-eyed dogooders, chirping contentedly about abundant milk for Hottentot babies while smoke and dust and flame yet rise where cities are being ripped apart.

An overcast of what appears to be mildew was left on the canvas by strikes. Big strikes and little strikes, a walk-out in a 10-man plant engaged on a defense subcontract over a matter of who should collect union dues; two stoppages of coal production by half a million miners; a strike in one of the most vital rubber fabrication centers—all while a secretary of labor smiles complacently upon the turmoil and objects to enactment of antistrike bills by Congress.

Over and about the scene lies a tangle of administrative confusion, a reluctance to let the chips fall where they may, an apparently sharper awareness that votes will be cast next year than that the Nation confronts a crisis today. Further obscuring it is a snarl of interdepartmental jealousies interl ced with a maze of red tape.

Zoot-suiters brawl with servicemen in some cities. Certain war plant employees demand ever more feather-bedding and absentees wander about shopping districts, querulously complaining that their gas ration won't let them spend the day in the country.

No, sir; not a pretty picture!

Yet highlighting it all is the shining record of a lad named Joe. We've come to call him that in our daily speech. Joe is any boy in the Nation's uniform, and Joe is really doing a job.

Joe is the little marine about whom General Eichelberger told us; the one in a Guadalcanal fox hole over which a Jap tank rolled. So Joe took a hand grenade, pulled the pin, jammed it into the tread of that Jap tank, and ducked as far down into his fox-hole as he could, content to be blown to glory, so long as he also blew the tread off that tank and immobilized it for his buddies. By the high grace of Providence he wasn't torn to shreds. He lived to get his medal and have his mother or sweetheart walk proudly beside him where all the neighbors could see that he really was the most wonderful boy in the world.

Joe is General Eichelberger, too. He is Captain Callaghan on the *San Francisco*, dying amid the shambles of that cruiser's bridge, but gasping: "Get the big ones first." Joe is New Orleans' Commander Gilmore, wounded on the deck of his submarine, directing his men to "Take her down." because that would save their ship and their lives, even at cost of his own. Joe is a pilot named Kelly and a bombardier named Levin, who dropped the bombs down the *Haruna's* stack. Joe is Lieutenant Mason, methodically ticking out "Sighted sub, sank same."

Joe is all the boys who came back at Kasserine Pass and took Long Stop Hill; all the boys who, with inadequate protection against the weather, cleaned the Japs out of Attu. Joe is Captain Foss bagging his twenty-sixth enemy plane and General McNair wounded in Tunisia and Private Doakes sweating through the entanglements of a Ranger course somewhere in the United States, with live machine gun bullets snapping along a few inches above him and umpires throwing sticks of dynamite into the mud beside him just to get him used to the thud and shock of nearby explosions.

Yes, and Joe is all our fighting men who, with their allies, only this morning received word from the Axis fortress of Pantelleria that its garrison could stand no more of the unremitting bombardment that rained destruction upon them from sea and sky for 19 days, while the land forces awaited their turn to close in for the final phase of assault.

Joe is keen and self-reliant and resourceful, and he rises to heights of splendid courage beyond belief. In the field he takes the good with the bad, and if his rations don't reach him he'll keep going without food, and if he's hopelessly outnumbered, as he was on Wake Island, he'll broadcast a message like "Send us more Japs."

He can turn his hand to almost any job, because he's the kid who used to fix his flivver with a bit of baling wire or twine, and in almost any emergency he'll somehow contrive to make strap and buckle meet. He knows how to do practically anything but quit. Not that he's a chest-thumper sounding off about the inferiority of other races and other ideas. He isn't. But what he starts he finishes. You'll never find him asking how to get to the place where you surrender, as did certain others, who had long been taught to sneer at the decadence of democracy.

That's an amazing thing, when you stop to think about it, because when he still wore civvies, Joe wasn't really such a much. Maybe he'd played a bit of sandlot baseball as a kid, but a good part of his interest in life after that lay in jitterbugging, strutting his stuff as a drugstore cowboy, squiring his girl to the movies, and bearing up patiently through the tedium of a Sunday sermon. He ate too many sweets, and he slept too little, and occasionally he drank a lot more than was good for him. He regarded the family car as his personal property and drove it with reckless disregard of all the laws of man and common sense.

As a civilian, therefore, he was often a nuisance and became the subject of many Jeremiads about the younger generation. Remaining a civilian, he might have held up his employer for as much pay as possible in return for as little effort as he could get away with; he might just as blandly have chiseled a couple of gallons of nonhighway

gas to supplement his A card, and he could have lent a ready ear to anyone who whispered: "Psssst! Buddy, I know a place where you can buy a good steak and no coupons asked."

But strip him of his bizarre zoot suit, take him out from behind the ribbon counter, the lathe, or the adding machine, put him into a uniform, and let a harsh-voiced sergeant push him around a bit, and behold: In place of the drugstore cowboy we have Joe. Our Joe. The lad who walked over the Owen Stanley Mountains all the way from Port Moresby to Buna Mission, and God help the Japs that tried to stop him. The lad that landed at Casablanca and wound up at Cape Bon singing the equivocal ballad of Dirty Gertie from Bizerte, and saying the Afrika Korps looked more like an Africa corpse to him. The lad that covered the ocean floor with the wreckage of Jap ships at the Bismarck Sea. The lad, who was severely injured in the crash of his doomed plane after the raid on Tokyo, but who kept his balance even when later he heard at one and the same time a surgeon's saw rasping through the bone of his thigh and the voice of a broadcaster telling the world that "not a plane was lost during the Tokyo raid."

So you see there's a very wonderful side to our national picture, too. And here is a heartening thought for the future. Joe is pretty strong. There will be 10,000,000 or more of him before this thing is over, and whether we like it or not (we, who griped about rationing, and caused stoppages in vital war work by our strikes, and played political ducks and drakes while Joe was fighting and dying; we, who tried to cover it all up by buying a few War bonds and making a lot of tub-thumping speeches) Joe's going to take over the management of this country of ours. From rear-rank buck to 4-star general, from seaman to admiral, Joe's been where he had to get things done quickly and right, whenever and wherever they needed doing. He's had to learn not to fall for booby traps, and he's taken no nonsense from those who tried to stop him, even though they had guns and grenades and ack-ack—and he'll take precious little nonsense when things need doing here at home. Therein lies our hope for the future.

No; the picture is not all dark; only some parts of it. As concerns the rest, Joe is on the job out yonder somewhere. One of these days—and under God's good providence may that be soon—Joe's coming back. When he does, a lot of dusty corners, cobwebbed garrets, and noisome rat holes are due for a cleaning. Having found himself, Joe knows how to get things done by doing them; not by sitting around and whining that somebody ought to do them for him. One of these days Joe, who is now on the job so magnificently out yonder somewhere, will be on the job here at home, and that will be a great day in the morning.—H. B. D.

Two Decisions This Country Must Make

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan of the Washington Post of June 13, 1943:

TWO DECISIONS THIS COUNTRY MUST MAKE

(By Mark Sullivan)

Very earnestly I ask readers to follow what is here set down. It bears doubly on two vital decisions about to be made by this country. I struggle to make it clear—for there is tragic lack of understanding of the principle involved.

We are asked to join some kind of union or federation of nations. The specific proposals vary, but of necessity all are alike in their fundamental structure. For convenience, as one out of many, I take the one proposed by former Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota. He calls his federation the United Nations of the World.

In any such union there must be, as a matter of course, a central governmental body—a parliament or congress. As Mr. Stassen puts it, "The key governmental device should be a single-house parliament."

The parliament, in Mr. Stassen's plan or any other, would be made up of representatives from the various nations. There would be representatives from the United States, from Britain, from Russia, from China—from all the nations, big or little, who now or later will make up the United Nation's congress.

HOW CHOSEN?

Then comes the next question, though this is not really a question at all—everybody knows what the answer must be. How shall the members of the United Nation's parliament or congress be selected? How shall the representatives from each nation be chosen?

The answer is, Representatives from each nation must be selected by that nation. We in the United States will select our representatives, Britain will select hers, Russia hers, China hers.

So far everybody is agreed. Each nation will select its own representatives.

But by just what method shall each nation choose its representatives? The answer is each nation would choose its representatives by the method it prefers.

Governor Stassen suggests one method, and undoubtedly this is the method we would follow. He says: "The representation in the parliament would be selected in each nation in general accordance with the means by which the people select the members of their own legislative body." We in America would select our representatives by popular vote, the same as we elect Members of our own Congress at Washington. But other nations might have other ways. Britain, no doubt, would choose her representatives the same way we would, by popular vote, the same as she selects members of her own Parliament.

ABOUT THE OTHERS

But some nations don't have parliaments or congresses and don't have popular votes in our sense—Russia, for example, and China. Russia might want to select her representatives by appointment, or on the basis of trades and occupations. In any event, whatever method Russia chooses for selecting her representatives would be O. K. with us. We would not dream of interfering. And the same as to other nations.

All we insist on—indeed, we don't insist on it, we take it for granted—is that we select our representatives to the United Nations congress in the way we choose here at home, free from interference or dictation by the United Nations congress.

At this point the reader may say I am making much of nothing. The reader may say, of course, we will select our representatives in our own way. Of course, the United Nations congress would never dream of denying us that right.

PARALLEL CASE

Very well, I now turn to a bit of American history, past and immediately before us. Here in America many years ago we set up a Union, a Federation of States, to be called the United States of America.

The founders faced the same problems that must be faced by those who propose a United Nations of the World—including this problem of how representatives from the States to the Congress should be selected. The founders settled this and wrote it into the Constitution in the following words: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen * * * by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." That is, each State was given the exclusive function of fixing qualifications for voters.

ATTACK ON STATES

Nevertheless, just last month in Congress was begun an attempt to take this function away from the States. The attempt is made in the form of a bill forbidding States to have a poll-tax qualification. And, of course, if Congress can forbid one qualification it can forbid all.

If this attempt succeeds, it forces us to consider a conclusion: This country ought never to join any United Nations of the World—because the time may come when the congress of that United Nations may tell us what shall be the qualifications of voters within the United States.

The better conclusion is to stop the attempt by our Congress to dictate to States the qualifications of voters. Thus we would respect the principle that every member of any federation—our own United States or the United Nations of the World—should have exclusively the function of fixing qualifications of voters.

There Is a Remedy To Avert Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an administration which insists we can fight a war all over the world and at the same time feed everyone except our enemies, is due for a rude awakening. Unfortunately, we here in America must pay and suffer for the foolish policies and acts of the new dealers. When they are hungry, we shall be hungry.

For 10 years and more, the President and his advisers have been in complete charge of the policy-making executive department, of the legislative department—the Congress—and to a great extent of the judicial department of this Government. He has had all the money and all the power for which he asked.

The farmers were told what and how much of this, that and the other they should grow, how many pigs they should kill, how many they should raise and what price they should charge for various farm products. President Roosevelt and his agents determine how much of this, that, and the other we give and ship to foreign nations. He says we are to free the world from want; that we are to feed the world. But he forgets that, to do that, our workers, our people, must first feed themselves.

A continuation of his policies means a food shortage. About that there is no doubt. Read this wire, which is typical of hundreds of protests:

Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN:

We use 1,000 bushels of corn in our two feed plants daily. Have less than 1 week's supply. Unable to purchase any corn. We furnish feed for approximately one-half million laying hens and other livestock. Michigan Elevator Exchange, with many carload orders on hand are unable to purchase any corn. Situation critical. Must have immediate release. Important you make every effort to have Michigan declared an emergency State to receive corn from Commodity Credit Corporation.

THE HAMILTON FARM BUREAU.

Telephoned Commodity Credit Corporation and was told that while there was plenty of corn in the country, they could not do anything for Michigan; that they knew of no way to get us corn. Was then advised that feeders of poultry and stock, including cows, were in no worse situation than were the automobile dealers who were forced out of business. My reply to that was that, while we might be able to do without automobiles as we did not eat them, we must have eggs, poultry, dairy products, and beef. The suggestion got a laugh and a few swear words but no corn.

So whether the Government, which has millions of bushels of corn and wheat, intends to let your poultry starve, create a shortage of eggs and poultry, the cattle of Michigan go without feed, I do not know.

Representatives of canners from all over the country, including many from Michigan, are here today. They are losing employees because higher wages are paid in war industries. They want to pay 15 cents an hour more, but to date have been denied that privilege by this administration.

In some instances, canners are given a ceiling price which does not equal the cost of production. In other cases, the administration refuses to name a ceiling price and the canners, not knowing at what price they may be permitted to sell the finished product, are afraid to enter into contracts to pay a fair price to the grower for his vegetables and fruit.

How much would you pay for, say, asparagus, or, later, cherries, strawberries, pears, or peaches to put into cans if you were told that the price at which you could sell the canned product might be less than what you paid for what went into the cans, to say nothing of the cost of handling it?

Knowing that hundreds of thousands of acres of formerly cultivated land are idle; that farm labor is almost nonexistent; that farm machinery is scarce; that the rains have held back the planting of crops, to me disaster on the home front, which will inevitably affect the fighting forces, is right on our doorstep.

THE REMEDY

But, you say, what can we do about it? This administration can kick out those incompetents who are fixing prices, rules, and regulations for rationing; who are responsible for excessive purchasing and hoarding by various Government agencies, and bring here to Washington and place in control of the Nation's civilian production businessmen and industrialists who have demonstrated—yes, I mean demonstrated—their ability to produce, and who can and will bring production.

Unless the administration gets rid of its professors, its New Deal planners, and returns this Government to representatives of the people who, in the years gone by, have fed and clothed us, our people will be hungry and without the food to satisfy that hunger.

One way to bring about that change is to quit pussyfooting; get rid of the notion that this administration can do no wrong; get the facts and then, on every possible occasion, demand that a change be made. If the protest is loud and insistent enough, you will get action, for even a New Deal planner may be brought to realize that, if the baby chicks cannot be fed, he will not get any eggs from them next December; that, if the cows go dry or are killed for beef, there will be neither butter nor meat at Christmas time, and a new dealer sure likes to eat.

A Letter From Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by David Lawrence, from the United States News of June 11, 1943:

A LETTER FROM DETROIT—HOW THE STRAIN OF WAR IS AFFECTING MANAGEMENT AND WORKERS—EFFECTS OF BUREAUCRACY ON WAR WORK—THE NEED FOR BETTER UNDERSTANDING AT WASHINGTON AND ALSO FOR NATIONAL RECONCILIATION

(By David Lawrence)

There came to hand last week a letter from a Christian clergyman in Detroit. He has an exceptional opportunity to know at first hand something about the personal or human problems that the war is creating. He knows of the irritations and strain that face management and workers. He looks sympathetically on all classes, and yet he speaks with the compelling urge of truth about the effect that the Washington red tape and bureaucracy is having on the actual day-by-day life of the men who must bear the huge burden of war production set for them. He writes:

"The death of Edsel Ford at the age of 49 is a sign of a danger to the war effort which may already be more serious than the great strikes in his home city Detroit and in Akron. Behind the professionally bare statements of his physicians, it would seem that the stark facts are that this head of the world's greatest industrial empire died of overwork. Pushing himself to high pressure work for 16 and 18 hours a day after a serious operation for ulcers of the stomach and carrying on despite the pleas of his physicians and family to stop was certainly unwise, but his death may bring to light a serious menace to our hope to victory. That threat is the overwork of management.

"I am a clergyman. I bury these men past 45 who literally die at their desks. I have a half-dozen of these executives on my sick list now. They are all men who are pushing themselves beyond human endurance. They all say the same thing: 'How are we going to get the stuff out?' They have forgotten about the normal working day. Nothing is in their minds about how long they should work. They all say another thing, too—'if it was not for the buck-passing and the bungling in Washington perhaps we could get something done.' And too many of these men are going down the valley. They are not saints. And they are not the only people who worry about the war. But their going will make a lot of the rest of us worry because they represent the shrewd, irreplaceable element of management—that hidden factor which is the secret of dynamic Detroit.

"To be sure there are many workers who are also going down from overwork. To these, too, I minister. Strangely enough their complaint is the same: 'How can we get the stuff out, and why doesn't Washington give us a break?'

"These men are usually the old-timers, the men who were brought up in the stern school of hire-and-fire. Strangely enough these men who have the greatest cause for resentment against the management have the least resentment and have the most personal drive for production. These oldsters who went through the seasonal lay-offs, the factory politics, the ruthlessness and uncertainty of the great production days in the auto industry, are the men who today are taking the war effort most seriously for the simple reason that they are the men who know what a priceless asset good management is.

"As for many of the new workers, well, they have not gone through the fire. They are confused not only by the newness and the vastness of life here but by the strange currents flowing about their feet. The recent strikes here are an indication of the thing that upsets a lot of the new workers and robs them of the fight to win.

"It should be noted that the strikes broke out here in Detroit less than 3 weeks after Browder's visit. He was pardoned by the President for the cause of unity but his visit here was certainly followed by anything else than unity. The strikes here are the attempt of the Communists to unseat the present Congress of Industrial Organizations' leadership, which, despite public opinion, is definitely not Red. Though Stalin dissolved the Comintern, the American Communist has definitely made his choice that between even the cause of his spiritual homeland Russia and the cause of world revolution he will be a revolutionist. We have the strange spectacle here of good Catholics pleading with Reds to increase war production and help Russia, and that is a matter of record in the reliable public press. Perhaps the Communists figured that Russia was going along so well that a slight interruption in production of war goods could be risked for the sake of control of the unions.

"What does the average worker think about the whole thing? Well, he is pretty much confused and a bit disgusted, too. You see, the average worker has had a hard time finding out what was cooking. The word was passed along to him that he had better not report to work or else—that the companies were double-crossing him and that there had to be a show-down. So he obeyed orders and went out, only to discover that the union did not want him to go out, after all. So he went down and flipped a few beers and worked in his Victory garden until the thing blew over.

"Confusion is the main strategy of the Communists, and they certainly got the workers confused this time. Hundreds of

union leaders are doing as Edsel Ford did, working day and night to get the men back to work. These leaders, too, find out that as managers of the destiny of labor they must forget the 8-hour day for themselves and must fight 'to get out the stuff.' It is strange to see the union leaders spending 18 hours a day fighting for the 8-hour day.

"So here we are in Detroit. The men in management are war casualties. The men who manage labor are overworked. The average worker is either working under pressure or he is waiting for somebody to make up their mind about some rule or other or to get some stuff to him. Meanwhile, the struggle goes on for the leadership of the labor movement and with it the domination of our Nation.

"Now, why doesn't Washington do something? Well, if you have got about four drinks under your own belt, the drunk will not take you seriously as you tell him the perils of alcohol. The child who knows his parents cheated on ration coupons will not take seriously the lecture of a parent about classroom cribbing. So it is with Washington. Some of the men there seem to be more preoccupied with personal power and privilege and with the advancement of political philosophies than they are with winning the war. So when they come on to Detroit—and they do come on in droves—the worker says 'baloney,' or words to that effect.

"The need is for two things—national honesty and national reconciliation. In this, Washington can lead. Perhaps the leadership will come out of labor. Perhaps it will come from management. But we can all hope that we have come to the high-water mark of confusion and that the forces of personal privilege and corrosive philosophies will be thrown back by Americans who say: 'Let's tell the truth, and let's get along with each other.' For a decade now we have been taught to hate each other, to suspect each other. Now we have got to be honest and work together for victory. America is what matters now, and a new national honesty is our most pressing need."

What a penetrating slogan! National honesty and national reconciliation! There we have in a sentence the crying need of our times.

Honesty is not just an abstract virtue—like a philosophy or dogma. It is a challenge to the individual—a test of his everyday behavior in anything and everything in relation to his fellow man.

Honesty for management is not merely a matter of keeping books straight, or obeying the laws governing fraud. It means appraising truly and fairly the requests and needs of workers. It means a suppression of selfishness and greed for management, directors, stockholders. It means more than that—an examination of conscience. For honesty is not a thing to be searched for outside. Every individual knows within his own heart what is or is not honest.

Honesty for workers and their union leaders is of the same pattern. To what extent is a labor union demand a mere expression of political desire for gain in holding a union office? To what extent is it a rationalized desire for self-aggrandizement at the expense of the public? The standard is not difficult to apply. Each individual knows that standard and can measure his conduct by it—provided he feels the urge.

How shall that urge be stimulated? The church can do much, but laymen within it can do more. In a crisis like the present when human lives are being sacrificed, the duty of all of us is to reexamine our own acts in the light of those sacrifices. Are we who remain at home doing what we should to make this a better world or, to put it more concretely, are we doing anything within even our own small orbit of action to spread the standards of honesty and unselfishness?

National reconciliation—how far-reaching that need is one can learn just by reading the headlines about events inside and outside of Washington. The bickerings of governmental executives with each other, the friction that comes from misuse of power for personal prestige or ambition, the conflicts of people with one another in the field of business and industry—these are all in need of a spirit of reconciliation.

Reconciliation can develop best if there is an atmosphere of spiritual responsibility. This is not simply a matter of ritual or religious observance but primarily a problem of individual regeneration. The goals may seem far distant. Passions and bitterness get the better of us too often. Resentments gnaw within us like cancers just because our precious possession—pride—is hurt. We strive to overcome this. We falter on the way. But it is better to falter, to stumble forward, than never to move at all.

Yes, there is great need for national honesty and national reconciliation. What Detroit needs every city and town in the United States needs, too. The task is up to the individual and his conscience.

Farewell to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, when a writer with the ability, the experience, the unquestioned patriotism of David Lawrence, publisher of the United States News, writes an editorial like the following, there is no need for Republicans or anyone else to offer apology for criticism of the New Deal, to any of the smear artists, the warmongers, or the money changers, who are so determined that we shall surrender our independence, forsake democracy, establish a dictatorship, and become a puppet in a superworld organization, who intend to play world politics at our expense.

Right here at home is a task worthy of the best efforts of every one of us. The editorial is as follows:

Overseas our boys were fighting last week. Some of them were killed. Some of them were wounded. More will be killed and wounded in the months ahead.

They have been told again and again that this is a war to preserve our freedoms—our liberties.

But last week six justices appointed by President Roosevelt, constituting a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States, took away a basic liberty—the right of every citizen to be governed by laws and not by the arbitrary power of a bureaucrat, the right of every citizen to know explicitly what are the punishments incurred for violations of a statute.

Our boys are not fighting to sustain the privilege of officials in any Government agency to fix whatever punishments they please for a violation of law.

Yet the Supreme Court majority decided, in effect, that a Government agency can fix any punishment it desires although not explicitly mentioned in the statute that is broken. The precedent is fixed. The die is cast. Only a constitutional amendment can abrogate a decision of the Supreme Court. Only a change in the membership of the Court over a long period of years can reverse it.

ENCROACHING ON FUNCTIONS OF THE CONGRESS

President Roosevelt didn't like the decisions of the Supreme Court, so in 1937 he openly tried to get rid of a majority of the members of the Court sitting at that time. He didn't succeed that way, but he did succeed another way—he "packed" the Court with administrative zealots when fate gave him the chance. And today those justices are taking away one by one the rights of the citizen. The Constitution today is what the New Deal says it is. Not only has the "packed" Court begun to tell Congress what it meant when it passed legislation, but it has begun to supply missing words to the statutes, as in the Phelps-Dodge case decided April 28, 1941. This is a vicious encroachment on the legislative function. And there is no redress except by explicit prohibitions, if indeed, the Supreme Court will not capriciously rule some day that these, too, are beyond the power of Congress.

The latest case minces no words. It frankly empowers a governmental agency to select whatever punishment it pleases so long as in the judgment of that agency the punishment "effectuates the policies of the act."

Again and again in legislative history Congress has put a paragraph or provision in its statutes giving an executive agency or commission power to write the necessary regulations to carry out the purposes of the law. This has always been inserted in routine fashion, and it has always meant heretofore that clarifying rules or regulations could be promulgated provided they conformed to the meaning of the law itself. Always the penalties, on the other hand, for disobeying a law were specifically stated, and it never was assumed that additional penalties could be created by mere regulations. Indeed, previous Supreme Court decisions, and an opinion of the Attorney General under the Roosevelt administration as late as 1935, persuasively contended that no executive agency has the power to create what is known as administrative penalties.

FIAT OF AGENCIES IS SOLE BASIS FOR PENALTIES

Encouraged, however, by the Supreme Court's recent decisions and precedents, governmental agencies are imposing penalties right and left. A special committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives headed by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, Democrat, is at present making a comprehensive investigation of these bureaucratic penalties, and the record already completed is a startling disclosure of the manner in which the citizen has been robbed of his rights—it is an amazing story of administrative tyranny.

Let us, however, note specifically the latest decision of the Supreme Court majority—Justices Murphy, Frankfurter, Reed, Douglas, Black, and Rutledge.

The case before the Court was that of a Virginia company which was adjudged to have interfered with the rights of collective bargaining of its employees by recognizing a union the formation of which was deemed to have been encouraged by the company itself. A contract with the so-called company union was entered into and the employees received various benefits, including a new wage scale. Dues were collected by check-off, deducted by the company from wages and paid over to the union in the customary way. Not content to disestablish the union, the National Labor Relations Board ordered the dues returned in full by the company to the men without regard to whether they received any wage increases or benefits while members of the union and in the face of the admitted fact that once the union was organized it functioned properly.

The majority opinion of the Court says:

"The instant reimbursement order is not a redress for a private wrong. Like a back-pay order it does restore to the employees in some measure what was taken from them because of the company's unfair labor practices. In this, both these types of monetary awards somewhat resemble compensation for private injury, but it must be constantly remembered that both are remedies created by statute—the one explicitly and the other implicitly in the concept of effectuation of the policies of the act * * * they vindicate public, not private, rights.

"For this reason it is erroneous to characterize this reimbursement order as penal or as the adjudication of a mass tort. It is equally wrong to fetter the Board's discretion by compelling it to observe conventional common law or chancery principles in fashioning such an order, or to force it to inquire into the amount of damages actually sustained. Whether and to what extent such matters should be considered is a complex problem for the Board to decide in the light of its administrative experience and knowledge."

IS "GENERAL AUTHORITY" ALL THAT IS NEEDED?

What language is this? Since when does Congress create penalties "implicitly" and let executive agencies determine within their "administrative experience and knowledge" what punishment to inflict on the citizen? Is this America where these things are happening?

Justice Frankfurter, in his concurring opinion, carries the fiction further. He says:

"Needless to say, we have nothing to do with the wisdom of the Board's requirement that the coerced dues be restored to the employees. Our decision can go no further than that, within the framework of the general authority given it by Congress, the Board is empowered to find that when men pay dues to a company-dominated union, upon pain of forfeiting their jobs, it is the company which has in fact commanded the payment of the dues and it is the company which must make restoration."

And what is meant by the words "within the framework of the general authority" given to the Board by Ccngress?

Is it sufficient for the Court to decide cases now on the basis of "general" authority? Wasn't it Hitler who told his courts to decide cases on the basis of the "general sentiment prevailing in the communities" where the victims were tried? Isn't that a system of government by men rather than laws?

Justice Roberts, Justice Jackson, and Chief Justice Stone, in their dissenting opinion last week say in part:

"The National Labor Relations Act gives the Board no power to impose liability for any supposed injury arising out of the compulsion of employees to contribute dues to the union. Nor can the order of restitution be grounded upon any theory that although the unfair labor practice constitutes a public rather than a private wrong, the power granted to effectuate the policies of the act envisages imposition of a penalty for wrongful conduct on the part of the employer. * * *

"All the facts found in this connection relate to a time anterior to the organization of the union. There is no finding, and no facts which would justify a finding, that subsequent to the organization of the union, the employer interfered with it, dominated it, or supported it in any manner."

WORDING OF LAWS SHOULD LIMIT IMPLIED POWER

It is interesting to note that the judges on the circuit courts of appeals from one end of the country to the other in 11 separate cases involving other companies decided the same issue against the National Labor Relations Board.

What can be done about it?

Congress should insert in every statute adopted hereafter involving any grant of punitive power to administrative agencies, and in all appropriation bills passed in the future, a simple clause in language like the following:

"Nothing in this act or in any other law of the United States gives any agency or official the power to impose upon any citizen a penalty, public or private, which is not specifically prescribed in the statutes."

The time has come to play fair with the boys overseas. Instead of worrying, as did our Vice President the other day, whether Russia might be double crossed in the post-war period, let's worry a little during the war about double crossing the American people who are today making the supreme sacrifice in giving the blood of their sons to fight a war so often sloganized as a war to preserve our "four freedoms."

Gleeful Mood of Opponents of Administration Evaporates When They See Result of Acts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Samuel Grafton:

I'D RATHER BE RIGHT—GLEEFUL MOOD OF OPPONENTS OF ADMINISTRATION EVAPORATES WHEN THEY SEE RESULT OF ACTS

(By Samuel Grafton)

A few months ago the opposition in Congress was in a gleeful temper. In fact, it was higher than a kite. During the first weeks of January the opposition fairly bubbled with plans for firing Government agencies, for cutting, dismissing, investigating, probing, blocking, and curbing.

I must report to you that a reaction has set in. In part, this is the opposition's own fault. It overplayed its hand. It hit on the device of tacking riders onto important bills, each one forbidding the use of public funds to pay the salary of a named individual, such as Robert Morss Lovett, Government secretary of the Virgin Islands.

This enabled the opposition, so long as it had a bare majority, to impeach without impeaching, without trial or formal charges. It quickly became obvious to men of good will—and there are many such in both Houses of Congress—that this bill of attainder device was extremely dangerous. If unchecked, it could some time be used even to remove Justices from the Supreme Court, or informally to dismiss a duly elected President. The Senate is making a fight against the practice, and not for love of Lovett alone.

TURNED TO AGENCIES

The opposition also turned its attention to whole agencies, as well as individuals. It led a bitter assault against the Farm Security Administration. For a time it tried to kill this bureau by the ingenious device of having the Appropriations Committee of the House refuse an appropriation, and then having the Rules Committee refuse to allow the House to restore the appropriation on the floor; thus killing the agency without debate or vote, a bill of attainder in spades. Representative LAMBERTSON, of Kansas, was active in this attempted blitz.

But again the hand was overplayed. The House Rules Committee is not exactly a rosebud, but it was shocked and refused the rule. Enough of the Farm Security Administration was saved in the House to permit the Senate to try to save the rest of it, which it is now doing.

THEIR HATE NOT SHARED

Let me once more call attention to the gleeful mood in which these blitzes were planned. These men, of whom LAMBERTSON is only an example, had so sold themselves on the theory that all America shared their hate for everything that has happened in the last 10 years that they passed far beyond the bounds of ordinary caution.

I firmly believe that they never even took a good look at the Farm Security Administration, or quite knew what they were attacking when they sailed into this agency, which helps America's farmers to buy and hold their own farms. Certainly much of Congress seemed dazed when such men as Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, and such organizations as the National Catholic Rural Life Conference sprang to the agency's defense.

The opposition had talked itself into believing that its own private language, about professors and frankfurters and what not, was the common speech of the country; that the mood of its own tirades was the public mood; that to win a fight it was no longer necessary to prove a case, but only to affix a label.

DIGNITY REAPPEARS

Yet there is a certain higher dignity in handling the affairs of this Republic, which perhaps we lose at intervals, but which has a way of reappearing in moments of genuine necessity. Certainly, the opposition seems to have misread the signs. That is a serious mistake on the part of an opposition. It needs to go back and do some more homework.

The gleefulness of last January is evaporating. Somehow, in the heat of early summer, it no longer seems like a reasonable plan to attack Mr. Roosevelt by taking farms from poor farmers.

There are undoubtedly going to be changes in many of our agencies. But the great congressional discovery of 1943 is that this is going to be serious and responsible work, not to be done by a man swinging a sledge hammer with a look in his eye showing that he is out of this world.

The Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable SAM HOBBS of Alabama, a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House, is a deep and intelligent student of our Constitution. His viewpoint is always worthy of consideration. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by George Rothwell Brown relative to Judge HOBBS' attitude toward the recent urgent deficiency bill:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The House of Representatives has not yet won the war of

nerves against left-wing radicalism in the New Deal bureaucracy

But it has the extreme leftists among these bureaucrats as jittery as Hitler as he tries to figure out where the next blow is to fall.

The lower branch of Congress at least is standing by its guns in the drive to rid the Federal service of the key-place radicals. Quite a number of them have resigned under fire.

DEFICIENCY BILL

When the urgent deficiency bill came back to the House from conference on Tuesday the House with grim determination insisted on its provision to oust from the payroll Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., of the Federal Communications Commission staff, and Robert Morss Lovett, of the Interior Department.

This put it squarely up to the Senate to face the issue thus raised on a roll-call vote.

But an incident occurred in the House of very great significance, which will be heard from later.

Representative SAM HOBBS, of Alabama, a member of the Judiciary Committee, offered an amendment to substitute for the House provision ousting these three men by name a provision of nine paragraphs designed to accomplish the same purpose without specifically mentioning any individual.

POINT OF ORDER

Speaker RAYBURN sustained a point of order against the substitute on the ground that it was not germane. But Mr. HOBBS had the satisfaction of having his amendment read in full to the House.

It was so sound and so strongly drawn that many of Mr. HOBBS' colleagues urged him to offer his proposal as a separate bill. As Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, said:

"That is a good thing and it ought to be on the statute books."

Mr. HOBBS said he would introduce his proposition as a separate bill and, in the opinion of this writer, when he does so the House of Representatives, in its present mood, will vote to enact it into law.

While the House is going after the radicals piecemeal it realizes that the process is not a perfect one. It is like trying to pick the eggs one by one out of a shad roe.

POLICY MAKERS

If the suggestion made to the House on Tuesday by Mr. HOBBS should become law, it would drive the New Deal left-wing policy makers, who are trying to destroy the American economic system under cover of the war, into wholesale flight from Washington.

Under the Hobbs plan it would be made unlawful for anybody in the Government service to employ any person known to have been engaged in activities subversive of the United States, or who entertained a philosophy that would be destructive of the American system.

But it goes a significant step farther. It would make it unlawful for any person who has been engaged in subversive activities or who subscribes to a philosophy destructive of the American system to accept employment in the Government service.

HIGH CRIMES

The last provision of the Hobbs bill, as outlined to the House this week, expressly provides that the offenses designated would be specifically made high crimes and misdemeanors within the meaning of the Constitution.

In other words offenders in the Government service, employers as well as employees, could be dealt with by Congress in impeachment proceedings.

If this plan should become the law of this land, New Deal left wingers who have been members of Communist organizations or associates of front groups or fellow travelers would accept places in the Government service in the Washington bureaucracy at their peril.

This would nip radicalism in the bud.

Mr. HOBBS has made a constructive contribution to the burning question of the day in Washington: how to save the American political and economic systems from those in high places who are trying to destroy them.

Where Does the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Get the Money?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been comforted in the thought that the Congress of the United States still had the power to appropriate money. However, we find that this power of the purse is not entirely retained by Congress. The vast delegation of power to the Executive in the years gone by has carried with it this constitutional power of the Congress and it is now being exercised by others.

The Congress of the United States has not authorized the program of roll-back of prices and the payment of subsidies. Neither have we appropriated money for that purpose. Yet the program proceeds.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States can change the Congress. Congressmen are elected by the people and defeated by the people. Consequently, that power which is exercised by the Congress is, in effect, being exercised by the people because the people have control of the Congress. That system of government is liberalism in the truest sense. A government by boards, bureaus, and agencies which are beyond the reach of the people and which issue regulations, edicts, and directives is despotism, and is a step backward in the science of government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which I have written to Mr. Jesse H. Jones, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

JUNE 14, 1943.

Mr. JESSE H. JONES,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: I am writing to ask you several questions in reference to the subsidies being paid in connection with the roll-back of prices of food products, such as butter and meat.

If I understand this subsidy business correctly, it is a sales tax in reverse. The plan in reference to butter calls for lowering the ceiling from 46 cents to 41 cents per pound. The maker of butter is to be paid the 5 cents represented by the roll-back by the United States Government. It is estimated that there will only be 12 pounds of butter per person available in 1943, so this plan can only save an individual 60 cents per year. It is not doing anything substantial for any consumer. The direct cost in subsidies will be about $90,000,000, but the cost in paying the subsidies, both to the Government and to the butter industry, will be terrific. I have not mentioned the meat subsidy plan, but the same principles are involved.

This subsidy plan is inflationary. At a time when the national income is at an all-time high and when the highest wages are being paid, this plan requires the Government to pay 5 cents of the cost on the butter that the consumer buys. This leaves more money in the consumers' hands and is definitely inflationary. To finance the plan, we must increase the national debt. That again is inflationary. Surely it was never intended that the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were to be used to finance those things which the Congress would not approve.

The Congress has not appropriated any money for this purpose, yet these subsidy programs are initiated. Does the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiary corporations furnish any money, funds, or credit for the carrying on of this subsidy program? If so, from what source do you get the money? What specific laws grant you the authority to provide funds for this purpose, if funds are being provided?

As I recall, about 6 months ago, a bill passed the House which would raise the borrowing authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation an additional $5,000,000,000, which has never been reported out by the Senate committee. The impression was clearly given in the hearings and in the debate on the floor of the House that this was urgent; that all of the borrowing authority that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had had been used up or obligated. It was stated that you must have this $5,000,000,000 authorization immediately. This additional authorization was not given by Congress and in view of the statement that all of your previously granted borrowing authority had been used or obligated, I am wondering where you are getting the money for the operations you have been carrying on the past 6 months and anticipate to carry on in this subsidy program.

Thanking you for an early reply to the specific questions I have raised herein, and with personal greetings, I am

Yours truly,

CARL T. CURTIS.

Peace Pattern—Western Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, peace is more than a theory—or a beautiful dream. It is a darned practical problem that you have to live with. Out West last week there developed a war between the States over water rights, and to the hearing held at Kalispell, Mont., went Rufus Woods, of Wenatchee, Wash. Woods is one of the Nation's well-known editors and publishers and a member of Washington State's progressive Columbia Basin Commission. He went to the meeting inspired with a determination to work some order out of chaos, to bring good will where division had been effected. He went, convinced that no man or peoples should exploit another.

He said:

We unite with you in the general policy that neither Idaho nor Montana should be despoiled in any way in the interests of those farther down the river.

Here is his colorful report, run in his own column in the Wenatchee Daily World:

THE CONFERENCE AT KALISPELL

(By Rufus Woods)

KALISPELL.—Here we are at the Kalispell conference called by the Bonneville administration and the United States Army engineers, to discuss the raising of the waters of Flathead Lake. I have never been in any meeting like it. The people of this community have been churned to a frenzy. I came over as a representative of the Columbia Basin Commission and so far as I know, I am the only man from the State of Washington.

I had just gotten here, and I went down to get a little something to eat, when two of the men turned on me savagely, as though every person downstream were an enemy.

I just heard in the hotel one man say: "You just as well get your guns ready." I thought he was joking, but I find now that some are ready to go to that extreme. Every man from downstream is looked upon as an enemy. The report has been put out that the Grand Coulee Dam is a flat failure. The Daily Missoulian is in this morning with an editorial entitled, "The Fight Begins." It says: "The Federal Power Commission, backed by the Bonneville authorities, has told us jus what price it expects Montana to pay to make good a tremendous engineering mistake."

There has been no engineering mistake on Grand Coulee Dam, but that report has been put around most assiduously. The charge is made here, too, to the newspapers, that the proposed storage is in behalf of a gang of speculators downstream.

What those of us in the State of Washington are most vitally concerned over is the attitude of the people of western Montana. Charges were made on the floor that the people downstream are trying to loot the Montana country in behalf of the country downstream.

The whole picture as it presents itself so far seems to have been an attempt to set the people of Montana against the people downstream and a successful job has been done in that regard. I do not know of anybody wishing to take anything away from Montana nor Idaho, for the benefit of the State of Washington.

All the business houses of the city are closed today, Thursday, and delegates are here from every important point in western Montana. Some of the bitterest words were hurled at Spokane. In order to be helpful to the people of Kalispell, a report was sent for the record that the raising of the water in Kalispell would befoul the domestic water supply of the Columbia. Instead of accepting it as an effort to be helpful, Winkler, chairman of the local committee, declared that they were cutting off Spokane as a wholesale point.

In 40 years of newspaper experience, I have seen some towns stirred up from time to time, but never anything compared to this.

Back of it all there is a tremendous battle against the Bonneville Administration. The Montana Power Co., which covers all this section of the State, is doing most of the engineering from outside points, as far as this conference is concerned. From an outside observer, I see little likelihood of the Army engineers raising the waters of the lake—at least not very much.

In fact, it is a real field day for the Montana Power Co. This company has taken a legitimate local issue, viz, that of opposing the raising of the waters of the lake, and organized all of western Montana against it into a blast that is being bannered in streaming headlines of the newspapers of Montana.

And Grand Coulee and the people of the States of Washington and Oregon are coming for their measure of castigation—none of which is deserved.

There isn't a ghost of show that the waters of Flathead Lake will be raised the 17 feet asked for, in the face of local opposition.

The idea of having a storage along the headwaters of the Columbia is to let that flow out in the winter time and level off the flow of the Columbia. The Grand Coulee is built with a knowledge and plan of development, approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts of firm or continuous and 1,000,000 kilowatts of summer or secondary power, due to high water in the summertime. The excessive demands for power, especially for electrometallurgical processing, has created an unusual demand for the firm power. Then there is another factor which enters the situation. This is the load factor. For example, the Wenatchee World uses 50 to 60 horsepower to run its big press, but this runs less than 2 hours a day, so the load factor is low, but for electro metallurgical processes, the load factor is 100 percent—day and night, month in and month out.

KALISPELL AND CENTRAL WASHINGTON

We have many things in common with Kalispell, Mont. They have the Rockies as their background—and the rivers run westerly to the Columbia.

We have the Cascades and our rivers run easterly to the Columbia.

They have a rich background in those Rockies, as we have a rich background in those Cascades of ours.

They have 60 lakes—and so have we, 200 of them in Chelan and Okanogan Counties.

They have irrigated land and nonirrigated land. So have we.

They have lumber. So have we.

They have livestock—cattle and sheep. So have we.

But most important for the future is this power of the Columbia and its tributaries.

The Columbia is the wildest big stream of the civilized world. It is the greatest asset of them all if we handle it right.

The power of the Columbia is one asset that we don't want to see mutilated. And when I say mutilated, I mean just that. For we have the most profligate nation in the history of the world.

We had heard of the prospective storage site in Montana, in Idaho, and in British Columbia—but we felt that the time for storage was a long time in the future.

Now we find that the power of Grand Coulee and Bonneville is being used at a rapid rate.

What is the proper relationship between these communities along the Columbia and those making up the upper branches of the stream? That is one of the questions which came out at the Kalispell hearing.

While not being authorized to testify at the Kalispell hearing, I did give out a statement to the Kalispell Interlake which was given prominent space. The editor had asked me to give a statement on the situation. This is what I gave the Daily Interlake:

"We unite with you on the broad policy that each of our northwest States should have some say regarding the development and subsequent control of their respective resources.

"We unite with you on the general policy that the States of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington should develop and control its dams and reservoirs. We have a marvelous region in this Northwest of ours if we properly handle these resources.

"We unite with you in the general policy that neither Idaho nor Montana should be despoiled in any way in the interests of those farther down the river.

"We challenge the report that the engineers made a monumental mistake in Grand Coulee. They didn't. Grand Coulee is something all of us may be proud of for the next 10,000 years. Under the comprehensive report by the United States Army engineers, Grand Coulee has approximately 1,000,000 kilowatts of prime or continuous power, and 1,000,000 of secondary or summer power. That has been borne out by actual experience. The demand for power in the Northwest has grown far beyond what could have been expected.

"We unite with you from Montana, Idaho, and Oregon on a general policy of decentralization. Not only should these dams be built back up in these mountains but there should be developed industrial plants to go with them."

While all the rest of the newspaper men of the Northwest have been sleeping on their arms, Ashley E. Holden in the Spokesman Review has gone gunning for the post-war capital of the world. And he is going to locate it in Spokane. And has he some good arguments for it? In the first place the post-war capital should be in the United States. In the next place China is to be a place of increasing importance.

But the trump card which he pulls from out of his accoutrement bag is the air map of the world, which shows that Spokane is right where it ought to be. Then the problems of tomorrow are going to be in the Pacific primarily. And Spokane is larger than Geneva.

Blast my britches, if Ashley Holden hasn't pulled a whopper this time! But remember that anything is possible in this amazing age. More fantastic things have happened than dreaming a world capital out of Spokane. I hereby enlist as a private under Ashley, commander in chief. We invite the balance of the newspaper gang to fall in.

Verily "your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions."

John F. Stevens, the man who found Stevens Pass, died the other day. He was one of the most interesting characters operating in the Northwest 50 years ago and more. He was one of the interesting men with whom I could never catch up. I wanted to know and talk with John F. Stevens. I tried to trail him down. I found he was in Baltimore and went there in order to have a visit. But I missed him. Now, at the age of 90 he has passed.

The survey for the Great Northern Railway from Montana west was headed up by John F. Stevens. There was no way to get through the Rockies except by going through Canada or through southern Montana where was located the Northern Pacific Railroad. But in 1889 Mr. Stevens discovered Marias Pass.

He was up against a hard proposition when they came to the wall of the Cascades. He covered 45,000 square miles before finding Stevens Pass.

He was chief engineer of Panama Canal for 2 years. It was he who laid out the program of construction for that canal. He was one of the builders of the Canadian Pacific. He was chief engineer for James J. Hill for many years. When the World War came, he headed a railway mission to help rebuild the railroads of Siberia. At the time the Great Northern 8-mile tunnel under Stevens Pass was opened in 1929, he was declared the greatest living engineer.

As I ruminate over the meeting in Kalispell, the whole scene opens out to me. I went to Kalispell the day before the conference over storing the water in Flathead Lake. How some of those men snorted at me as they found I lived down river.

In that Kalispell meeting we had most everything. There was public power and private power; there was anti-New Deal mostly, but some of the other—anti-Washington, D. C.; there was Bonneville, but nearly all anti-Bonneville; there was Montana and Washington State, but mostly anti-Washington and anti-Oregon; there was anti-Grand Coulee aplenty; that anti-Grand Coulee and Bonneville promoted by Montana power interests backlashed against the power companies while the folks cheered for reservoir sites back in the mountains and power sites to go with them.

As I say, in that meeting was just about everything. In it was the love of the folks for their beautiful lake and the thought that it might be taken from them.

In that meeting, too, was the call to leave that lake alone and go back up into the mountains and create a storage at Hungry Horse, or back up to some of the other creeks or to the lakes in the mountains and store the waters there, and the call to produce the power back in those canyons; they don't want Grand Coulee Dam power or Bonneville; they want their own power—to own and control it.

Then back behind the scenes was the Montana Power Co., and the men in that concern don't want any power except that produced by private money. But the owner of the radio in Kalispell got the most riproaring applause of any, and prolonged, when he called for the development of these water powers and these storages back in these mountains.

But the program was organized to lambast the Bonneville Administration and the downstream folks "who wanted to steal the water of Montana and Idaho" and use it to develop a power empire in Washington and Oregon.

Then that attack on Grand Coulee Dam—but the day before the meeting was opened, in came the Saturday Evening Post with that enlightening article about Grand Coulee Dam and Bonneville power, taking the wind out of the sails of those who had expected to demolish the big power plants below.

Over at Kalispell they have a man whom they call "Hungry Horse" Kelly. He is editor of the Kalispell Monitor, and he certainly does have the kind of a mouthpiece which every community needs. He has been hammering away on the Hungry Horse Reservoir and Dam now for years. Someday he will get it, but the building of these dams and reservoirs in the high country will come with cooperation between Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ECHO FARMS,
St. Joseph, Mo., June 8, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM C. COLE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The recently announced rollback price proposition under the subsidy payment procedure affecting meats and certain other products will be a great handicap to the food part of our war effort. That idea is just simply another imported "ism" and is strictly foreign to the American way of life.

I charge that those who instigated it are not even sincere about it. Instead of trying to prevent inflation by a procedure of common sense, they are putting into effect a plan that simply will not work.

The subsidy feature is a procedure whereby they pay the producer less for his production and then tax the taxpayer on a higher basis to raise funds with which to reimburse the producer. This increased activity merely increases pay rolls in its final result.

Indeed, these dream sisters are favorable to a system of subsidy payment because of its regimentation and communistic features. They prefer a system whereby, for example, in order for a farmer or the packer to exist, he must cooperate with their ideas and go to them technically on his knees in order to get the subsidy.

I am writing you as farmer-producer. I have a son and a son-in-law in the service. I am convinced that they will have plenty to eat. I am not convinced that the home public will have plenty. I am, in fact, convinced that with a few more subsidy propositions, home-front supplies, including those available to pampered racketeer union leaders that throw down their spades and shovels while our soldiers plead for supplies, will be inadequate.

As an example, I recently bought a carload of steers to grass through the summer and feed in the fall. This subsidy maneuvering will cramp the packers to the extent that they can't pay the prices for beef which they would otherwise pay. They will, therefore, be forced to lower the price to the feeder. We can't trust these outfits. They encourage us to increase production, then they come along with a fool ruling that wipes away any anticipated profit and, in fact, in many cases, subjects us to losses.

We farmers went along for years during the depression through drought and insect pestilence, low prices, pig slaughter, etc. Now when there is a chance to get back a small portion of these losses and at the same time patriotically service our war-food effort and our allies, why mess up everything with ill-connected, mischievous edicts which do great harm?

Washington, sooner or later, is going to find out that the only way to bring about the desired food production goals is to let the producer make a little money or at least break even.

Yours truly,

CECIL R. MARTIN.

The "Four Freedoms"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am inserting by request that portion of the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the evening of June 2, 1943, having reference to the "four freedoms":

Last evening, ladies and gentlemen, I told you that I would have something to say tonight that was far off the beaten track of the usual news on this broadcast, a radical departure from the regular policy of reporting news developments; that it was something that must be said in the best interests of the United States of America, I believe; that it has gone much too long unsaid, and that while some of the high figures in Washington unquestionably will criticize me very loudly for saying it and will be greatly displeased, nevertheless it was going to be said tonight on this broadcast, come what may.

For more than 3 months, now, I have been expressing this thought I am about to present to you from lecture platforms all over the Nation. It has been picked up by political figures in speeches here and there, but with some of the trends in planning in Washington for the post-war period, I feel very, very strongly that the time has come when circumstances and the welfare of the Nation and the preservation of the things that American soldiers and sailors and marines are giving their lives for all over the world, those considerations demand that it have the wider audience of this radio microphone rather than the mere audience of lecture halls, even though it is not news, but rather a matter of personal opinion and editorialization on my part. And I may say that I do not want to shock you with this; I don't want to appear to be trying to be sensational. Just please hear me through with an open mind as good human beings who love this country and everything that it stands for, and then see if you don't agree.

You have heard a great deal about the "four freedoms." They have been advertised and propagandized and ballyhooed to the four corners of the earth, translated into dozens of languages, as the principles for which we are fighting this war, and more particularly they have been advertised to the four corners of the earth as the essence of Americanism and American philosophy. With a very few exceptions, most of us here in this country have swallowed those "four freedoms," hook, line, and sinker. No one has stepped up publicly to analyze them or take them apart or see whether they really do represent American philosophy; no one has challenged them; no one has ever raised so much as a murmur about them. We just let it go on being spread over the world as the spirit of our United States of America, and I frankly don't believe that they are the spirit or the philosophy of America.

Let's take them up one by one. The first two of them, freedom of religion and freedom of speech, certainly, there is no controversy about that. The little clique of master minds who conjure up these ideas behind the scenes and these trick phrases behind the scenes and do it constantly, working for tighter and tighter Government control of everything by Washington, were not the ones who thought of those first two freedoms, freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Those date back hundreds of years to strong, courageous people who came across the ocean and settled this country. Those date back to Thomas Jefferson and the other founding fathers of this American Republic. They are axiomatic now. There is no one of all the millions who are listening to this broadcast who would live in a country that does not have both of them. But what comes, then, after those first two?

What are the other two of the "four freedoms," and the only other two, the complete remainder of American philosophy as expressed in this statement? They are freedom from fear and freedom from want—two very nice luxuries if you are able to afford them. But it wasn't freedom from fear and freedom from want that made this Nation what it is, or what made the American people the strongest people on the face of the earth. On the contrary, it actually was fear and

want themselves and the struggle of individual men to make themselves free of both things; that is what settled New England, settled Virginia, that is what sent men across the flooded lands of Ohio to settle the Northwest country and then cross the plains and the Rocky Mountains in covered wagons to California, and it was the work that they did trying to achieve that freedom from want and freedom from fear that produced strong arms and clear heads, and fine, strong children that carried on after them. It was not given to them by any government. Let me remind you that Joe Louis didn't become the most famous and the most powerful fighter in the world, or in world history, by lying in bed 24 hours a day and having a government of college economists in Washington serve him his meals on a tray.

If you want to consider these "four freedoms" to be a political vote-getting document, perhaps those last two are all right. If you want to represent them as real American principle, I am afraid not. They smack too much of a government pretending to be all things to all people. Frankly, they smack too much of the old Works Progress Administration hand-out system: You support my kind of government and that government will give you this, freedom from want.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a straight case of selling gold bricks. No government can give its people freedom from want, because the very people themselves are the Government, and the only place the Government can get the materials, the food, and the clothing and the shoes and the whatnot with which to provide that freedom from want which they promise is from the very selfsame people to whom they are promising to give it. That is a humbug game in the most virulent sense of the word, and if any private citizen were to practice a similar game on his neighbors he would be jailed for obtaining money under false pretenses.

But the real tragedy, the really frightening and tragic part of this expression of Americanism as represented by the "four freedoms," is that that is where the statement of American philosophy stops. The tragedy is that the minds in Washington who conjured that very catchy idea, that very catchy phrase, and sold the idea to the President for promulgation to the entire world, those people were not even sufficiently familiar with the true philosophy of this country to include what is the real American freedom, the only thing that has made this Nation what it is, the one thing that must make it what it is in the future if we are to continue to maintain our leadership and our greatness in the world, the fifth freedom, which is freedom of individual enterprise, freedom of initiative, freedom to work a little harder and longer than your neighbor does, and therefore to have a better home than he has; freedom to cut the lawn a little more often and have the lawn look better; freedom to climb up out of the level of the rest of the world and build a better standard of living; freedom to raise your children with more advantages, give them a better education than you yourself had; in other words, freedom to rise in the world if you are willing to do the work to achieve that rise.

And as a corollary, of course, there goes along with that always the obligation of every man to row his own weight in the boat, to do his share in the rebuilding of America, or if he refuses to do so, to drift aimlessly around in the middle of the ocean, washed by the tides.

That is the fifth freedom, ladies and gentlemen, freedom of individual enterprise. That is something that Government can give to its people honestly. Without it there can be no tomorrow for this country as we have known this country in the past. And to me it is shocking and frightening in the extreme that those in Washington who conceived the "four freedoms" didn't have sufficient acquaintanceship with real Americanism to have included in their list the most important and the most vital freedom of all.

We hear a great deal, ladies and gentlemen, recently, about Vice President WALLACE'S idealistic proposal for a quart of milk on every doorstep in Algeria and Morocco and everywhere else after the war is over. That's all very well, but I don't believe in my heart that that is what the 10,000,000 American men who are fighting this war for us are fighting it for. I know very well that that is not what the ones I know are fighting it for. The thing that they are risking their lives for on 10 different fronts throughout every corner of the globe, the thing that they are risking their lives for is the right to have a doorstep of their own right back here in their beloved United States of America after this war is over, with a wife and children that they love behind that doorstep and the right to have a quart of pasteurized milk or any other kind of milk on that doorstep every morning if they are willing to earn the money to pay the milkman.

Crackerland in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph Smith from the Atlanta Journal of June 13, 1943:

[From the Atlanta Journal of June 13, 1943]

CRACKERLAND IN WASHINGTON—CONFEDERATES USED FIRST LAND MINES

(By Ralph Smith)

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 12.—What is past is prologue. The verity of this oft-quoted epigram finds further confirmation in the records of the Union and Confederate Armies, as compiled by the War Department and consulted these days more often than usual—consulted by way of comparing war making 75 years ago with war making today.

A Georgia Congressman, given to research and study, Albert Sidney Camp, cites the records aforesaid in proof that the land mines employed by Rommel in his African retreat were first used by the Confederate Army in its attempt to check Sherman's march through Georgia.

"Yes," says this Cracker Congressman, "Rommel's land mines were but an improvement on the 'subterra shells' of the Confederates, manufactured at the Augusta Arsenal, the employment of which was counseled by President Jefferson Davis and Gen. G. T. Beauregard, on the eve of the resumption of Sherman's march to the sea, after the destruction of Atlanta.

"Let me read to you Gen. G. T. Beauregard's telegram to J. A. Seddon, Secretary of War of the Confederate States of America, filed at Corinth, Miss., at 7 a. m., November 18, 1864:

" 'I have just arrived on my way to Georgia. Please order immediately to General Cobb, at Macon, a large supply of Rains' subterra shells, with competent person to employ them.' "

The subterra shells were as ineffectual of their purpose as were the land mines employed by Rommel against the British Eighth Army. Sherman's army was slowed up by the land mines of those days, but he fulfilled his mission.

DAVIS URGED LAND MINES

It was perhaps on the strength of General Beauregard's telegram to Secretary of War Seddon, at Richmond, that President Jefferson Davis, on the same day—November 18, 1864—wired Gen. Howell Cobb, at Macon as follows:

"In addition to the troops of all kinds you should endeavor to get out every man who can render any service, even for a short period, and employ Negroes in obstructing roads by every means practicable. Colonel Rains, at Augusta, can furnish you with shells prepared to explode by pressure, and these will be effective to check the advance. General Hardee has, I hope, brought some reinforcements, and General Taylor will probably join you with some further aid. You have a difficult task, but will realize the necessity for the greatest exertion.

"JEFFN. DAVIS."

General Cobb was at Macon on the day the telegram was dispatched by President Davis from Richmond. Sherman's Army was at the moment in Atlanta, making preparation to continue its march to the sea.

SOUTHERN LEADERS ALARMED

The alarm revealed by President Davis' message to General Cobb typified the uneasiness of Confederate leaders over Sherman's plans, following his occupancy of Atlanta, which fell more than 2 months after the historic battle in which the Confederates won the initial victory.

The records of the period are enlightening, and are quoted herewith below:

Gen. Joe Wheeler, at Jonesboro, to Gen. John B. Hood, at Tuscumbia, Ala., November 14, 1864:

"Scouts report Fifteenth and Seventeenth Corps marched into Atlanta yesterday. Large fires have been seen in Atlanta for last 3 days. Prisoners say camp rumors are they intend marching to Augusta and Savannah; also, that Sherman is in Atlanta."

General Wheeler to General Hood, same date:

"Sherman, with Fifteenth and Twentieth Corps and Kilpatrick's Cavalry, is in Atlanta. Prisoners and citizens say camp rumors are that they will march to Augusta and Savannah. Scouts and prisoners report Sherman destroying railroad from Atlanta to Allatoona."

General Beauregard, at Tuscumbia, to Gen. S. Cooper, at Richmond, November 16, 1864, 3 p. m.:

BEAUREGARD'S PLANS

"Reports to General Wheeler indicate that Sherman is about to move with three corps from Atlanta to Augusta or Macon; thence probably to Charleston or Savannah, where a junction may be formed with enemy's fleet. The threatened attack on Wilmington in that event must be intended for Charleston. I would advise all available force which can be spared from North and South Carolina be held ready to move to defense of Augusta, or crossing of Savannah River, in conjunction with forces in State of Georgia. Should Sherman take Charleston or reach Atlantic coast, he might then reinforce Grant. General Taylor has been ordered to move with the available forces in Georgia, and assume command of all troops operating against Sherman should he move as reported."

Gen. Joe Wheeler, at Lovejoy's, via Barnesville, to Generals Bragg, Beauregard, Cobb, Hardee, Hood, Smith, Taylor, and Governor Brown, November 16, 11 a. m.:

"Scouts from enemy's rear report that Sherman left Atlanta yesterday morning with Fif-

teenth and Seventeenth Corps, and Twentieth Corps in two columns—one on Jonesborough, one on McDonough Road, cavalry on his flanks. Many houses burned in Rome, Marietta, and Atlanta; railroad bridge over Chattahoochee destroyed by enemy. Enemy advancing this morning."

BEN HILL'S STIRRING APPEAL

Confederate Senator Benjamin Harvey Hill to the people of Georgia from Richmond, Va., November 18, 1864:

"You have now the best opportunity ever yet presented to destroy the enemy. Put everything at the disposal of our generals; remove all provisions from the path of the invader, and put all obstruction in his path. Every citizen with his gun, and every Negro with his spade and ax, can do the work of a soldier. You can destroy the enemy by retarding his march. Georgians, be firm! Act promptly and fear not!"

The telegram bore the endorsement of Secretary of War Seddon.

And on the afternoon of the same day, General Beauregard, from Corinth, issued an appeal to the people of Georgia:

"Arise for the defense of your native soil! Rally round the patriotic Governor and gallant soldiers! Obstruct and destroy all roads in Sherman's front, rear, flank, and his army will soon starve in your midst! Be confident and resolute! Trust in an over-ruling Providence, and success will crown your efforts. I hasten to join you in defense of your homes and firesides."

CONGRESSMEN SPEAK, TOO

And from the members of the Confederate Congress, then in session at Richmond, to the people of Georgia, November 19, 1864:

"We have had a special conference with President Davis and the Secretary of War, and are able to assure you that they have done and are still doing all that can be done to meet the emergency that presses upon you. Let every man fly to arms! Remove your Negroes, horses, cattle, and provisions from Sherman's army, burn what you cannot carry. Burn all the bridges and block up the roads of his route. Assail the invader in front, flank, and rear, by night and by day. Let him have no rest."

The members of the delegation included Julian Hartridge, J. H. Echols, John T. Shewmake, Mark H. Blandford, George N. Lester, and James M. Smith.

Morrison Pays Tribute to Dr. G. H. Faget, Surgeon, Medical Officer in Charge of the National Leprosarium at Carville, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of visiting the Leper Colony at Carville, La., and was shown through by Dr. G. H. Faget. I wish to pay high tribute and praise to Dr. Faget and his competent staff who are in charge of this leprosarium and who are doing everything humanly possible for the comfort and interest of the lepers. They can have their own gardens and entertainment, and it is an institution of which the United States can well be proud. The thing that impressed me most was the cleanliness and efficiency and the remarkable manner in which the institution as a whole was conducted. It is truly all in all one of the great institutions of America. Our people of this great country can certainly point to it with great pride as one of our most cherished achievements for hospitalization of those who are unfortunate and find themselves in need of such care and treatment.

Leprosy is one of the oldest diseases of the human race, its origin lost in antiquity. Yet for centuries it has been one of the most misunderstood and dreaded diseases of mankind. Any person who became afflicted with leprosy was condemned to a hopeless life of isolation. Even to the present day an unjustified fear of leprosy lingers among the general public. It is admitted that the only certain means of eradicating leprosy is by segregation, but today this need not involve the hardships of former times.

The modern leprosarium such as that at Carville is a humane institution where every effort is made to permit the leading of a normal life. In 1894, the State Legislature of Louisiana passed an act creating a board of control, whose function was to provide a home for sufferers of leprosy. This body set up a leper camp on the Mississippi River, 80 miles north of New Orleans, which became the basis of the present-day leprosarium of Carville. Up until 1920, the Louisiana Leper Home was maintained by the State in conjunction with the Sisters of Charity. In 1921, the State property occupied by the leper home was purchased by the Federal Government, and the operation of the home was taken over by the United States Public Health Service. An enlargement program, completed in 1941, has made it possible to consider Carville the finest and most up-to-date leprosarium in the world.

The reservation of 350 acres is a self-sustaining community resembling a small town. A power plant generates electricity, manufactures ice, and operates a central heating system. A sand filtration plant with attached chlorinating apparatus furnishes over 200,000 gallons of drinking water a day, and both hot and cold water are available in all buildings. A large sanitary dairy with pasteurization facilities and cold storage produces 180 gallons of grade A milk a day. Cattle are also raised for beef. A well-equipped fire department is maintained. The sewage system, with its septic tanks and incinerator plant for the disposal of garbage, assures the complete sanitation of the community and protection of the neighboring public. All of the personnel are employees of the Federal Government, and there are 25 residences for doctors, administrative, clerical, mechanical, and other employees.

The hospital is a 2-story concrete building with 65 rooms and contains a first-class operating room, an X-ray department, a dental clinic, a bacteriologic and pathologic laboratory, a physiotherapy department, dressing-room clinics for men and women, offices, and examining rooms. The majority of the patients are domiciled in 16 two-story concrete buildings, each having 15 individual bedrooms on each floor as well as bathrooms, reception rooms, and front and back porches. Visitors are welcome and correspondence is unrestricted, except for the disinfection of all outgoing mail.

Occupational therapy is provided through the use of sewing rooms, music rooms, school rooms, and shops for barbering, tailoring, pressing, carpentering, shoemaking, bicycle repair, radio repair, and printing offices.

There is a spacious two-story recreation building, a motion-picture theater which gives three performances a week and a splendid ball and concert room. In addition there are smoking rooms, a canteen, and a fine library. There are two churches, one Roman Catholic and the other Protestant. Meals are served cafeteria style, with carefully planned menus since nutrition plays an important part in the fight against leprosy.

The medical, surgical, and nursing services are qualified to cope with the disease. The nursing is in the hands of 19 Sisters of Charity who are graduate nurses, some of whom have been retained by the Federal Government from the Louisiana State regime. The medical staff of 5 medical officers, 1 dentist, and 3 consultants maintains a library for research on leprosy and operates laboratories and clinics for research and treatment. The hospital serves as a center for the dissemination of knowledge on the subject of leprosy and as a postgraduate instructional center on leprosy.

During the period of State control, 338 patients were admitted. From February 1, 1921, when the Federal Government took charge, to January 1, 1942, 1,034 patients were admitted, making a total of 1,372 admissions. Of this number, 593 died in the hospital, 53 were deported, and 309 have been discharged as arrested cases and no longer a menace to public health. Fifty-eight of these have relapsed and returned for further treatment.

Patients may be admitted to Leprosarium voluntarily or by apprehension under authority of the United States Quarantine Acts, or they may be consigned to the Leprosarium by health authorities of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

It is felt that there is a need for a more general education of the public in order that the unwarranted popular fear of leprosy may be replaced by a more enlightened attitude. The fact that earlier institutional care and treatment at Carville will give leprosy patients a better chance of arresting the disease must be more widely realized. As achievements in treatment grow more important, the place of the Carville Leprosarium in the history of leprosy therapy will become increasingly evident and a greater source of satisfaction to all who have been in contact with or in the service of this most remarkable and humane enterprise.

Questions and Answers on the Pay-as-You-Go Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Members are being flooded with requests for information concerning the new pay-as-you-go tax bill. With a view to offering a general explanation of the bill, I have prepared the following series of questions and answers which I believe will be helpful in replying to inquiries:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

PART I. PURPOSE OF ACT

1. Question. What is the objective of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943?

Answer. Primarily its objective is to set up a new system of collecting the existing individual income tax, and in so doing correct certain defects in the present method.

2. Question. What are these defects which the new law seeks to overcome?

Answer. The two principal defects are: (1) The fact that the individual income tax is now based on the income of the past year, and not on the current income out of which it is in most cases paid, and (2) the fact that the collection of the tax is not timed with the receipt of income by the taxpayer.

Under the present method of collecting the income tax the year after the income on which it is based was earned, the taxpayer is always 1 year in debt for his tax, and if he suffers a reduction in income, or loses his job, or dies, the tax debt from the prior year becomes a serious financial burden. Moreover, under the present system of collecting the tax in a single payment, or in four quarterly installments, the great majority of taxpayers who are accustomed to weekly or monthly budgeting of their income find it difficult to meet the large lump-sum payments as they become due.

3. Question. How are these defects corrected by the new law?

Answer. By providing that the individual income tax shall henceforth be assessed against current income, instead of that of the past year, and by setting up a so-called withholding system for the collection of the income tax out of pay envelopes as the income is earned.

4. Question. Does the new current-collection system apply to corporations as well as to individuals?

Answer. No; it applies only to individuals, which of course includes members of partnerships. Most corporations are already on what might be termed a pay-as-you-go basis, since they generally follow the practice of setting aside a reserve for taxes out of current earnings.

PART II. SUMMARY OF CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT

5. Question. What are the principal provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act?

Answer. A detailed explanation of the act is set forth further on in this analysis. In broad outline, the principal provisions are as follows:

(a) Withholding tax

Commencing July 1, employers will be required to withhold from pay envelopes 20 percent of wages and salaries in excess of certain exemptions ($624 annually for single persons, $1,248 for heads of families, and $312 for dependents). The amounts so deducted will be credited against the current income tax and Victory tax liability of those to whom the withholding applies.

(b) June 15 installment on 1942 tax liability

Since the new act does not go into effect until after the June 15 installment on the 1942 tax is due, it must in all cases be paid. (See question 61, regarding application to servicemen.) Amounts paid on the 1942 tax will be credited against the current 1943 liability.

(c) Current payment of tax not withheld at source

Those whose current tax liability will not be fully discharged by the amounts withheld at the source out of their pay envelope during the year, and those to whom the withholding does not apply, must file on September 15 a Declaration of Estimated Tax on 1943 income based on the probable income for the year and the estimated deductions. For purposes of the estimated tax the usual personal exemptions of $500 for single persons, $1,200 for married persons, and $350 for each dependent are used. Credit may be taken against the current tax liability for the amount previously paid on the 1942 tax assessment; for the amount deducted under the Victory tax withholding up to July 1; and for the amount to be deducted under the new 20 percent withholding for the balance of the year. The remaining estimated 1943 current tax liability may be paid in two installments, one-half on September 15 and the balance on December 15, 1943.

For subsequent years, the Declaration of Estimated Tax for the year must be filed on March 15, and any estimated liability over the estimated amount to be withheld at the source during the year may be paid in four quarterly installments (March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15).

Amended declarations, showing increased or decreased liability over that previously estimated, may be filed on any of the subsequent installment dates during the year.

On March 15, following the close of each taxable year, a final and complete return must be filed, at which time any necessary adjustments will be made. The same return will contain space for the Declaration of Estimated Tax for the ensuing year.

(d) Higher liability of 1942 or 1943 to be basis of final 1943 tax

The new law provides that if the tax on 1942 income was greater than the tax on 1943 income the difference is to be added to the current 1943 tax liability. (This amounts to taxing the higher income of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, and is one of the two so-called anti-windfall provisions.)

An exception is made in the case of servicemen, insofar as the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax is attributable to wage or salary income (so-called earned income) up to $14,000. To such extent, the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax need not be added to the serviceman's 1943 liability.

(e) Abatement of 75 percent of lesser year's tax

In order to prevent an undue doubling up of taxes as a result of the change to a current collection basis 75 percent of 1 year's tax, or the first $50 thereof, whichever amount is greater, is abated. (This results in 100-percent abatement of amounts of $50 or less. On amounts between $50 and $66.67, a flat abatement of $50 is made, since this amount is greater than 75 percent of the tax in such case.) The abatement applies to the lesser tax liability of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943.

The unabated portion of the lesser year's tax is added to the final 1943 liability but may be paid in two installments, the first of which is due March 15, 1944, and the other on March 15, 1945.

(f) Special windfall tax

In order to prevent any abatement of tax on swollen war income, it is provided that there shall be collected as a so-called windfall tax so much of the tax otherwise to be abated as exceeds a hypothetical tax on a normal year's income. The taxpayer is permitted to use as a base for determining normal income the highest income for 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940, plus $20,000.

The amount due as a windfall tax is payable March 15, 1944, but at the election of the taxpayer may be paid in four annual installments, beginning March 15, 1945, with interest at 4 percent.

(g) Special provisions for members of the armed forces

In addition to the provision exempting them, under certain conditions, from having to pay a 1943 tax based on the higher income of 1942 or 1943, members of the armed forces are extended two other benefits under the new law: (1) All members of the armed forces, regardless of grade or rank, are permitted to exclude from gross income the first $1,500 of their service pay for 1943 and subsequent years. (This exemption is to be in addition to the regular exemption of $500 for single persons, $1,200 for heads of families, and $350 for each dependent); (2) any unpaid income-tax assessment against any member of the armed forces who dies in active service after December 7, 1941, and during the present war, is canceled.

(h) Assistant Commissioners of Internal Revenue

Section 9 of the new law provides for the appointment of two Assistant Commissioners of Internal Revenue.

(i) Extension of time for release of powers of appointment

Section 10 of the law extends until March 1, 1944, the time within which powers of appointment may be released without incurring liability for estate or gift tax.

PART III. WITHHOLDING TAX

To whom it applies

6. Question. To whom does the new withholding tax system apply?

Answer. To all employed persons, except the following:

(a) Members of the military or naval forces;

(b) Agricultural workers;

(c) Domestic servants;

(d) Casual labor not in the course of the employer's regular trade or business;

(e) Citizens or residents of the United States employed by a foreign government;

(f) Nonresident aliens, other than Canadians or Mexicans, who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals;

(g) Such Canadians and Mexicans who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals as may be designated under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

(h) Citizens or residents of the United States who are employed outside the United States if the major part of the services performed for the employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the continental United States, Alaska, and Hawaii;

(i) Ministers of the gospel.

(The covered and exempt classes are substantially the same as under the present Victory tax withholding.)

7. Question. Are self-employed persons, such as small businessmen, farmers, and professional people, subject to the withholding system?

Answer. They are not.

8. Question. Does the withholding system apply to officers of corporations?

Answer. They are treated as employees of the corporation, and hence are subject to withholding.

9. Question. Does the withholding system apply to officers and employees of the Federal, State, and local governments?

Answer. Yes; including elected public officials.

10. Question. How many persons will be subject to withholding?

Answer. Probably 50,000,000 wage earners and salaried persons having income-tax or Victory-tax liability.

Withholding tax merely a collection device

11. Question. Is the 20-percent withholding tax in addition to existing taxes on income?

Answer. No; it is not an additional tax—merely a collection device. Its purpose is to collect at the source, as the income is earned, at least the major part of the current income-tax and Victory-tax liability of most wage earners and salaried persons.

Full liability collected at source in most cases

12. Question. Will the new 20-percent withholding system result in the collection of the entire current tax liability at the source in many instances?

Answer. Yes; in most instances. The 20-percent withholding rate is approximately equivalent to the combined net normal tax, surtax, and Victory tax applicable to the first $2,000 of taxable income. Hence, where the wage or salary income for the year, after all exemptions and deductions, will not exceed $2,000, the 20-percent withholding will result in the collection of the full liability at the source. (This would include gross wage or salary incomes up to approximately $2,700 in the case of single persons, and up to approximately $3,500 in the case of married men without dependents, assuming their deductions for the year are roughly 10 percent of their income.) The Treasury Department estimates that 30,000,000 out of the present 44,000,000 income-tax payers will have their full liability withheld at the source under the new collection system.

Returns

13. Question. Will persons whose full current tax liability is collected at the source have to file any returns?

Answer. They will have to file a final return for the year, which will be due the following March 15. In most instances they will not be required to file a Declaration of Estimated Tax for the current year. (See question 38, as to who must file the Declaration of Estimated Tax). On their March 15 final return they will compute their exact income and Victory-tax liability, and take credit for the amounts withheld by their employer during the year. (For the first year, 1943, they will also take credit for what has been paid toward the 1942 tax.) The liability shown on the return will in most cases vary slightly from the amounts withheld. Where the withholding exceeds the final liability, the taxpayer will be entitled to a refund or credit. If the final liability is greater than the amount withheld, the taxpayer will make up the difference at that time.

14. Question. What must a taxpayer do under the law if his full tax liability is not withheld at the source, or if he is not subject to withholding at all?

Answer. This is discussed under part IV, beginning with question 35.

Portion of total tax liability withheld at source on various incomes

15. Question. Are there any figures showing the portion of the total tax liability which will be withheld at the source in the case of wage or salary incomes of various amounts?

Answer. The following table, prepared by the Treasury Department, gives this information with respect to a married man with no dependents. It shows that in the lower brackets the withholding probably will slightly exceed 100 percent of the liability, and that as the income increases the percentage of total liability withheld at the source under the 20-percent rate decreases, falling to 80 percent at the $10,000 level and 40 percent at the $50,000 level. It is assumed for purposes of the table that the income consists entirely of wages or salary. The table follows:

Income and net Victory tax liability, portion of liability discharged by withholding over a full year under the provisions of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, and liability in excess of amounts withheld, for selected levels of net income

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Estimated income tax and net Victory tax liability	Withholding over a full year		Liability in excess of amounts withheld	
		Amount [2]	Percentage of total liability	Amount	Percentage of total liability
$1,200	$21	$21	100		
$1,500	79	84	[3] 106.3	—[3] $5	(3)
$1,800	144	150	[3] 104.2	—[3] 6	(3)
$2,000	188	195	[3] 103.7	—[3] 7	(3)
$2,500	297	306	[3] 103.0	—[3] 9	(3)
$3,000	405	417	[3] 103.0	—[3] 12	(3)
$4,000	647	639	98.8	8	1.2
$5,000	894	862	96.4	32	3.6
$6,000	1,173	1,084	92.4	89	7.6
$8,000	1,780	1,528	85.8	252	14.2
$10,000	2,467	1,973	80.0	494	20.0
$15,000	4,533	3,084	68.0	1,449	32.0
$20,000	7,100	4,195	59.1	2,905	40.9
$25,000	10,035	5,306	52.9	4,729	47.1
$50,000	27,075	10,862	40.1	16,213	59.9
$100,000	68,584	21,973	32.0	46,611	68.0
$500,000	440,747	110,862	25.2	329,885	74.8

[1] Assumed to consist entirely of wages subject to withholding. Gross wages and Victory tax net income assumed to equal ten-ninths of net income, to allow for average deductions.

[2] The precise method of computation of amounts withheld is used, and it is assumed that the wage earner claims all of the personal exemption for withholding.

[3] Amount withheld over a full year exceeds total liability, as a result of the assumption that deductions for purposes of determining net income equal 10 percent of gross income.

NOTE.—For any stated amount of net income the actual deductions for any taxpayer will not necessarily be the same as the average deductions assumed in this table. Consequently, the amounts of liability withheld at source and the liabilities in excess of the amounts withheld will not necessarily be the same as those shown above.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, June 8, 1943.

Amounts exempt under withholding

16. Question. Does the 20 percent withholding rate apply to the total wage or salary?

Answer. No; only to the amount in excess of the special withholding exemption.

17. Question. What is the amount of the special withholding exemption?

Answer. It is $624 annually for single persons, $1,248 annually for married men and heads of families, and $312 for each dependent. However, these exemptions are only for the purpose of the withholding deduction. When a taxpayer files his tax return for the year he will compute his actual liability on the basis of the regular exemptions and deductions applicable in the case of the income tax and Victory tax.

18. Question. If a person is paid weekly, how is his withholding exemption figured?

Answer. The law contains a table of withholding exemptions by pay-roll periods, based on the family status of the employee. This table of exemptions is as follows:

Family status withholding exemption

Pay-roll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$12	$24	$12	0	$6
Biweekly	24	48	24	0	12
Semimonthly	26	52	26	0	13
Monthly	52	104	52	0	26
Quarterly	156	312	156	0	78
Semiannual	312	624	312	0	156
Annual	624	1,248	624	0	312
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70	3.40	1.70	0	.85

The table shows that if a person is paid weekly, his weekly exemption is $12 if single, and $24 if married, plus $6 for each dependent. If he is paid monthly, the exemption is $52 if single, and $104 if married, plus $26 for each dependent.

Exemption of husband and wife

19. Question. Where both husband and wife are employed, what exemption do they get under the withholding system?

Answer. One spouse may claim the whole married exemption, in which event the other spouse may claim none, or they may divide it equally between them, each taking half. No other division of the exemption is permitted for purposes of the withholding tax. (However, this does not preclude the husband and wife from apportioning the regular income-tax exemption on whatever basis they choose when they file their final returns for the year.) The exemption for dependents may be taken only by the spouse who furnishes their chief support.

Provisional allowance for deductions

20. Question. Is any allowance made for deductions, such as interest payments, contributions to charity, etc., in connection with the withholding tax?

Answer. Only in a general way, but on a necessarily arbitrary basis, since it would be impracticable under a withholding system to make exact allowance in advance for the varying deductions to which individual employees might be entitled when they file their final return for the year. The withholding exemptions are in excess of the average of the income-tax exemptions and the Victory-tax exemption, and this excess makes provisional allowance for deductions pending the filing of the final return for the year, at which time the full deductions authorized by law may be taken.

Exemption certificates

21. Question. Must employers make inquiry of each employee regarding his marital status in order to know the amount of his withholding exemption?

Answer. The responsibility is put on each employee to file with his employer a so-called withholding exemption certificate, showing his marital status. Forms for such purpose will be supplied by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and distributed by employers prior to the date the new withholding tax goes into effect. By reference to these withholding exemption certificates, an employer will know how much exemption to allow each employee in computing his withholding tax.

22. Question. What if the employee fails to furnish his employer with one of these

exemption certificates or gives false information thereon?

Answer. If the employee fails to furnish the certificate, the law requires the employer to withhold 20 percent of the entire wage or salary. Therefore it is to the employee's interest to see that the certificate is filed.

Any person who supplies false or fraudulent information on his certificate, or who fails to supply information that would require an increase in the amount to be withheld, is subject to a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Change in marital status

23. Question. What if the employee's marital status changes as a result of marriage, divorce, separation, death, the birth of a child, or a dependent child reaching the age of 18?

Answer. He is required to file a new exemption certificate with his employer within 10 days, showing his changed status. The new certificate takes effect with respect to the first wages paid on or after the first status determination date (January 1 or July 1) which occurs at least 30 days from the date on which the new certificate is furnished to the employer.

Effective date of withholding

24. Question. When does the new 20-percent withholding tax go into effect?

Answer. July 1.

25. Question. Will it apply to wages paid after that date but earned before July 1?

Answer. Under section 2 (d) of the act, the new withholding tax will apply to wages and salaries paid on or after July 1, 1943, even though earned before that date, with the following exception: If wages are paid during the calendar year 1943 with respect to a pay-roll period beginning before July 1, they are not subject to the 20-percent withholding, but remain subject to the 5 percent Victory tax withholding (sec. 2 (c)). Wages paid on Saturday, July 3, for example, covering the regular pay-roll period beginning June 28, would come within the exception.

Present Victory tax withholding absorbed in 20-percent rate

26. Question. What happens to the present 5-percent Victory tax withholding, which has been in effect since January 1, 1943?

Answer. Under the new law, it is discontinued as a separate withholding tax as of July 1 (except with respect to pay-roll periods beginning before July 1), and is absorbed in the new 20-percent withholding.

27. Question. Is the Victory tax liability changed in any way by the new law?

Answer. No; the only difference is that after July 1 the amount to be withheld at the source for purposes of the Victory tax will be 3 percent (the approximate net liability after allowance for the current credit) instead of 5 percent (the gross liability). The balance of the 20-percent withholding (17 percent) is to cover the minimum income-tax liability.

Minimum 3-percent withholding for Victory tax

28. Question. Is any provision made under the new withholding tax to make sure that married men with incomes too small to be subject to the regular income tax, but in excess of $624 annually (the amount of the Victory tax exemption) are subject to withholding to the extent of such Victory tax liability?

Answer. Yes. In order to make sure that the net Victory tax liability is withheld at the source, the law requires employers to withhold whichever of the following amounts are greater:

(a) 20 percent of the excess of the wage or salary over the regular withholding exemptions previously noted ($624 annually for single persons, $1,248 annually for married men, and $312 annually for each dependent); or

(b) 3 percent of the excess of the wage or salary over the Victory tax withholding exemption ($624 annually, whether single or married).

If, for example, a married man had an annual wage of $900, his exemption under the regular withholding would be greater than his salary and no withholding would result. However, his $900 annual wage exceeds the Victory tax exemption ($624) by $276, and 3 percent of this amount would be $8.28. Hence the employer would withhold on the latter basis in this case.

For the purposes of the alternative 3-percent withholding, the following table of Victory tax exemptions by pay-roll periods is used:

Pay-roll period:	*Victory tax withholding exemption*
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

Optional use of withholding tables by employers in computing wage deduction

29. Question. Are employers required to compute the actual amount of withholding tax for each employee?

Answer. No; they have the option of using the withholding tables which are set forth in the law. These tables show the tax to be deducted in each case, depending upon the pay of the employee and his marital status. There is a separate table for each of the different pay-roll periods.

The withholding tables make full allowance for the withholding exemption, and also automatically take into account the minimum 3-percent withholding in certain cases, referred to in connection with the previous question.

Where the withholding tables are used, the amount deducted may vary slightly from the amount which would be deductible if the exact computation had been made. This is due to the fact that the tax is determined for different wage brackets, and is based on the average wage within the particular bracket. This difference is shown in the following example:

Suppose the employee is a married man without dependents, who earns $50 a week. If the employer computes the withholding tax on an exact basis, he will subtract the employee's weekly exemption ($24) from his weekly pay ($50), and of the $26 difference 20 percent, or $5.20 would be withheld.

If the employer uses the withholding table applicable to weekly wage payments, he will find that the amount to be withheld in the case of a married man without dependents who earns $50 to $60 a week is $6.20. This happens to be $1 more than where the withholding is computed on an exact basis. If the weekly wage had been $55 (the average in the $50 to $60 bracket), the amount withheld would be the same under either method. If the wage had been $58, the amount withheld under the withholding table ($6.20) would be slightly less than if the exact computation were made (in which case the tax would be $6.80). No person is prejudiced by having a slightly greater or less amount withheld under the withholding tables since in any event the amount is credited toward the ultimate liability for the year.

Following are the withholding tables contained in the law, which are for the convenience of employers in performing their duties thereunder:

WITHHOLDING TABLE NO. 1.—*Weekly pay-roll period*

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly and the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
At least	But less than	Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for with holding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents				
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
		No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents				
		The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$10	$1.00									
10	15	2.50	$1.30	$0.10							
15	20	3.50	2.30	1.10	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.50	3.30	2.10	.90	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.50	4.30	3.10	1.90	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20	1.00	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20	3.00	1.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20	5.00	3.80	2.60	1.40	1.30
60	70	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20
70	80	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20
80	90	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20
90	100	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20
100	110	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20
110	120	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20
120	130	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20
130	140	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20
140	150	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20
150	160	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20
160	170	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20
170	180	35.00	33.80	32.60	31.40	30.20	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20
180	190	37.00	35.80	34.60	33.40	32.20	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20
190	200	39.00	37.80	36.60	35.40	34.20	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus									
		$40.00	$38.80	$37.60	$36.40	$35.20	$34.00	$32.80	$31.60	$30.40	$29.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $1.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

WITHHOLDING TABLE NO. 2.—*Biweekly pay-roll period*

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly and the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
At least	But less than					Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.60	$0.20							
30	40	7.00	4.60	2.20	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.60	4.20	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.60	6.20	3.80	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40	2.00	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40	6.00	3.60	2.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40	10.00	7.60	5.20	2.80	2.60
120	140	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40
140	160	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40
160	180	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40
180	200	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40
200	220	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40
220	240	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40
240	260	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40
260	280	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40
280	300	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40
300	320	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40
320	340	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40
340	360	70.00	67.60	65.20	62.80	60.40	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40
360	380	74.00	71.60	69.20	66.80	64.40	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40
380	400	78.00	75.60	73.20	70.80	68.40	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.60	$75.20	$72.80	$70.40	$68.00	$65.60	$63.20	$60.80	$58.40

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.40 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

WITHHOLDING TABLE NO. 3.—*Semimonthly pay-roll period*

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly and the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.40								
30	40	7.00	4.40	$1.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.40	3.80	1.20	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.40	5.80	3.20	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.40	8.80	6.20	3.60	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	18.00	15.40	12.80	10.20	7.60	5.00	2.40	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	22.00	19.40	16.80	14.20	11.60	9.00	6.40	3.80	2.50	2.50
120	140	26.00	23.40	20.80	18.20	15.60	13.00	10.40	7.80	5.20	3.10
140	160	30.00	27.40	24.80	22.20	19.60	17.00	14.40	11.80	9.20	6.60
160	180	34.00	31.40	28.80	26.20	23.60	21.00	18.40	15.80	13.20	10.60
180	200	38.00	35.40	32.80	30.20	27.60	25.00	22.40	19.80	17.20	14.60
200	220	42.00	39.40	36.80	34.20	31.60	29.00	26.40	23.80	21.20	18.60
220	240	46.00	43.40	40.80	38.20	35.60	33.00	30.40	27.80	25.20	22.60
240	260	50.00	47.40	44.80	42.20	39.60	37.00	34.40	31.80	29.20	26.60
260	280	54.00	51.40	48.80	46.20	43.60	41.00	38.40	35.80	33.20	30.60
280	300	58.00	55.40	52.80	50.20	47.60	45.00	42.40	39.80	37.20	34.60
300	320	62.00	59.40	56.80	54.20	51.60	49.00	46.40	43.80	41.20	38.60
320	340	66.00	63.40	60.80	58.20	55.60	53.00	50.40	47.80	45.20	42.60
340	360	70.00	67.40	64.80	62.20	59.60	57.00	54.40	51.80	49.20	46.60
360	380	74.00	71.40	68.80	66.20	63.60	61.00	58.40	55.80	53.20	50.60
380	400	78.00	75.40	72.80	70.20	67.60	65.00	62.40	59.80	57.20	54.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.40	$74.80	$72.20	$69.60	$67.00	$64.40	$61.80	$59.20	$56.60

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.60 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

WITHHOLDING TABLE NO. 4.—*Monthly pay-roll period*

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly and the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$40	$4.00									
40	50	9.00	$3.80								
50	60	11.00	5.80	$0.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	13.00	7.80	2.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	15.00	9.80	4.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	18.00	12.80	7.60	2.40	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	22.00	16.80	11.60	6.40	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	5.20	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	30.00	24.80	19.60	14.40	9.20	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	36.00	30.80	25.60	20.40	15.20	10.00	4.80	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	44.00	38.80	33.60	28.40	23.20	18.00	12.80	7.60	5.00	5.00
240	280	52.00	46.80	41.60	36.40	31.20	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	6.20
280	320	60.00	54.80	49.60	44.40	39.20	34.00	28.80	23.60	18.40	13.20
320	360	68.00	62.80	57.60	52.40	47.20	42.00	36.80	31.60	26.40	21.20
360	400	76.00	70.80	65.60	60.40	55.20	50.00	44.80	39.60	34.40	29.20
400	440	84.00	78.80	73.60	68.40	63.20	58.00	52.80	47.60	42.40	37.20
440	480	92.00	86.80	81.60	76.40	71.20	66.00	60.80	55.60	50.40	45.20
480	520	100.00	94.80	89.60	84.40	79.20	74.00	68.80	63.60	58.40	50.20
520	560	108.00	102.80	97.60	92.40	87.20	82.00	76.80	71.60	66.40	61.20
560	600	116.00	110.80	105.60	100.40	95.20	90.00	84.80	79.60	74.40	69.20
600	640	124.00	118.80	113.60	108.40	103.20	98.00	92.80	87.60	82.40	77.20
640	680	132.00	126.80	121.60	116.40	111.20	106.00	100.80	95.60	90.40	85.20
680	720	140.00	134.80	129.60	124.40	119.20	114.00	108.80	103.60	98.40	93.20
720	760	148.00	142.80	137.60	132.40	127.20	122.00	116.80	111.60	106.40	101.20
760	800	156.00	150.80	145.60	140.40	135.20	130.00	124.80	119.60	114.40	109.20
$800 or over		20% of the excess over $800 plus									
		$160.00	$154.80	$149.60	$144.40	$139.20	$134.00	$128.80	$123.60	$118.40	$113.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $5.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

WITHHOLDING TABLE NO. 5.—*Daily or miscellaneous pay-roll period*

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period and the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
At least	But less than					No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period									
$0	$1	$0.10									
1	2	.30	$0.15								
2	3	.50	.35	$0.15							
3	4	.70	.55	.35	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.90	.75	.55	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	1.10	.95	.75	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	1.30	1.15	.95	.80	.60	.45	.30	.15	.15	.15
7	8	1.50	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.65	.50	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.70	1.55	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.70	.50	.35	.20
9	10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.05	.90	.70	.55	.35
10	12	2.20	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.65
12	14	2.60	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.25	1.05
14	16	3.00	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.65	1.45
16	18	3.40	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.05	1.85
18	20	3.80	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.45	2.25
20	22	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.85	2.65
22	24	4.60	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.25	3.05
24	26	5.00	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.65	3.45
26	28	5.40	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.04	3.85
28	30	5.80	5.65	5.45	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.45	4.25
$30 or over		20% of the excess over $30 plus									
		$6.00	$5.85	$5.65	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$5.00	$4.80	$4.65	$4.45

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependent s shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $0.15 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05 to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

Taxpayer who paid 1942 tax in full

30. Question. Suppose a person paid his 1942 tax in full last March 15. In view of the fact that this payment is credited toward his 1943 liability, will the full withholding tax still be collected from him?

Answer. If he is otherwise subject to the withholding tax, it will be collected in full notwithstanding the fact that to do so may result in an overpayment of his tax. In such a case he will be entitled to a refund or credit on March 15, 1944, when his final return for 1943 is filed.

Responsibility of employers under withholding

31. Question. What are the responsibilities of employers under the withholding tax?

Answer. They act as collecting agents for the Government, making the deductions from pay rolls and turning the money over to the Treasury. Collection of the tax under the withholding provisions is mandatory on the employer, and penalties are imposed for failure to do any of the acts required under the law.

"Employer" defined

32. Question. Who constitutes an "employer" for purposes of the withholding provisions?

Answer. The term includes any person or corporation for whom an individual performs any service as an employee, excepting services of the nature referred to in connection with Question 6. An individual is an employee if the relationship between him and the person for whom he performs services is the legal relationship of employer and employee. If an individual is subject to the control or direction of another merely as to the result to be accomplished and not as to the means and methods, he is regarded as an independent contractor and not an employee.

Returns

33. Question. How often will employers be required to file returns and pay the withholding tax over to the Treasury?

Answer. Under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, returns must be filed and amounts withheld paid to the collector on or before the last day of the month following the close of each quarter of the calendar year. However, where the employer withholds more than $100 a month, he is required by regulation issued pursuant to the new law, to pay the money to a bank or trust company which is a depositary or financial agent of the United States within 10 days after the close of each calendar month. (All banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are eligible to qualify as Federal depositaries and financial agents.) Receipts will be issued by the authorized depositaries for withholding taxes paid to them, and these should be attached to the quarterly return when filed. Withholding funds collected for the last month of the quarter may be paid at the time of filing the return, rather than to the depositary, at the election of the employer. The purpose of the monthly payments to Federal depositaries is to relieve employers of the necessity of holding the withholding taxes for several months pending the filing of quarterly returns. Employers may obtain from their local bank the names and locations of nearby Federal depositaries and financial agents.

Receipts for amounts withheld

34. Question. Are employers required to issue receipts to employees covering the withholding tax?

Answer. Yes, but only one receipt a year. It must be furnished within a month after the close of the year. However, if the employment is terminated during the year, a receipt must be furnished the employee on the day on which the last payment of wages is made. Copies of such annual receipts may be filed with the collector of internal revenue in lieu of the regular information returns covering wage payments.

PART IV. CURRENT PAYMENT OF TAX NOT WITHHELD AT THE SOURCE

35. Question. In case a person's current tax liability is not collected in full through withholding at the source, what does he do about paying the remainder.

Answer. He pays it in quarterly installments during the year.

36. Question. Do persons to whom the withholding tax does not apply at all, such as self-employed persons, agricultural workers, and domestic servants, also pay their current tax in quarterly installments?

Answer. Yes.

Filing of declaration of estimated tax

37. Question. How do these persons ascertain their current tax liability?

Answer. They make an estimate of their probable income and deductions for the year, and compute a tentative tax. This Declaration of Estimated Tax is then filed with the collector of internal revenue.

Who must file

38. Question. Are any definite rules laid down as to who must file a Declaration of Estimated Tax?

Answer. Yes; it is required of the following persons:

(a) Those not subject to the withholding tax whose gross income for the year can reasonably be expected to be such as to require the making of an income-tax return (that is, those anticipating a gross income of $500 or more if single, or $1,200 or more if married).

(b) Those subject to the withholding tax, but whose wage or salary can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 if single, or $3,500 if married, or did exceed such amounts for the previous year.

(c) Those subject to the withholding tax, but whose income from sources other than wages or salaries can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 and whose gross income be such as to require the making of an income-tax return, or did exceed $100 in the previous year and an income-tax return was required to be filed, or would have been required if the marital status had been the same.

(d) Those required to make a return for 1942 whose gross wage or salary income in such year was greater than can reasonably be expected to be received from this source in 1943.

39. Question. How many of the 44,000,000 taxpayers will be required to file a Declaration of Estimated Tax?

Answer. Only about 14,000,000, since the remainder will have their full tax liability collected at the source.

When due

40. Question. When must this Declaration of Estimated Tax be filed?

Answer. For the year 1943 it must be filed September 15. For subsequent years it must be filed on March 15 of each taxable year.

Nature of declaration

41. Question. Will the Declaration of Estimated Tax be in the nature of a regular income-tax return?

Answer. No; it will simply state the amount of estimated income tax and net Victory-tax liability for the year, based on the estimated income and deductions and allowing for the current credit against the Victory-tax liability in case the taxpayer elects to take it currently From this amount will be subtracted the estimated amount which has been and is to be withheld at the source during the year, if any, both under the 5-percent Victory tax withholding and the new 20-percent withholding. The remainder constitutes the amount of estimated tax to be paid directly to the collector of internal revenue.

Crediting of payments on 1942 tax

42. Question. Are not the 1942 tax payments made on March 15 and June 15 of this year to be credited on the 1943 liability?

Answer. Yes.

43. Question. When is this credit taken?

Answer. The amounts paid on the 1942 liability are credited when the Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943 is filed September 15. (Those not required to file the Declaration of Estimated Tax will take credit for these payments on the 1942 tax when their final return for 1943 is filed on March 15, 1944.) Let us assume that John Doe had a 1942 tax of $400 and paid $100 on account March 15, 1943, and another $100 on June 15. Let us assume further that his estimated tax on 1943 income is $600, and that the amount estimated to be withheld at the source during the year under the 5 percent Victory tax withholding and the 20 percent withholding commencing July 1 is $300. This would leave a balance of $300 on the 1943 liability. Against this amount, the $200 paid on the 1942 liability would be credited, leaving $100 to be paid to the collector of internal revenue on account of the estimated 1943 income.

When estimated tax is payable

44. Question. When is the estimated tax payable?

Answer. For 1943 it is payable in two installments, one on September 15 and the other on December 15. For subsequent years it is payable in four installments—March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15 of each year. (See Question 48 as to special treatment for farmers.)

Amendment of declaration

45. Question. What can a taxpayer do if his income increases or decreases, or his marital status changes, after he has filed a Declaration of Estimated Tax?

Answer. Amendments or revisions of a declaration may be made in any subsequent quarter after the original declaration is filed. Thus, the Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943, to be filed September 15, could be amended on December 15. The Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1944, to be filed March 15, 1944, could be amended the following June 15, September 15, and December 15. When a revised Declaration of Estimated Tax is filed the remaining installment payments are to be ratably increased or decreased to reflect the increase or decrease in the estimated tax.

Filing of final return for year

46. Question. Is any final accounting made for the year, based on the actual income, actual deductions, etc.?

Answer. Yes; on March 15 following the close of each taxable year a final return is filed, as at present. At that time adjustments are made on account of any difference between the estimated tax and the final tax liability for the year as shown on the return. If the tax liability has been overpaid the taxpayer may get a refund of the excess amount or may credit it toward his estimated tax for the ensuing year. If the final tax liability is greater than the estimated tax paid during the year the difference must be paid in a lump sum March 15. This balance cannot be paid in installments.

Penalty for substantial underpayment

47. Question. Suppose a person estimated his tax for 1943 to be $100 and the final liability as shown on the March 15, 1944, return was $200, would he simply pay the difference in a lump sum on March 15?

Answer. A 6-percent interest penalty is imposed where the taxpayer substantially underestimates his tax, the purpose of which is to induce the making of reasonably accurate Declarations of Estimated Tax. However, a 20-percent tolerance is allowed, which means that the interest penalty does

not apply unless the amounts paid during the year were less than 80 percent of the amount finally shown to be due. The interest is imposed on the total amount of the underpayment, not just the amount below 80 percent. Thus, if the final tax was $200 and the estimated tax paid during the year was $100, the taxpayer would be charged 6 percent interest on the amount by which the $100 estimated tax fell short of the $200 final tax. Hence the taxpayer would have to pay on March 15 the $100 which was still owing, plus 6 percent interest on $100 (the amount of underpayment. As a practical matter, the penalty can be avoided in most cases by the filing of a revised declaration December 15, when the income and deductions for the year can be estimated with substantial accuracy, and by adjusting the final quarterly installment to take account of the change made.

Special provisions for farmers

48. Question. Is not some special provision made in the case of farmers?

Answer. Yes. It is recognized that farmers would have difficulty in estimating in advance their income for the year; also, that in many cases the farmer's income comes chiefly from the marketing of a single crop once a year. Therefore, farmers (at least 80 percent of whose estimated gross income is from farming) are permitted to wait until December 15 before filing a Declaration of Estimated Tax and paying their current liability. Also, they are allowed a 33⅓-percent tolerance on underpayments before the 6-percent interest penalty applies.

Joint declaration by husband and wife

49. Question. Can a husband and wife file a joint Declaration of Estimated Tax?

Answer. Yes; if they are living together. In such case, the liability will be joint and several.

50. Question. Can a husband and wife who file a joint Declaration of Estimated Tax file separate final returns?

Answer. Yes; in which case the estimated tax for the year may be treated as that of either the husband or wife, or may be divided between them on such basis as they may choose.

Extension of time

51. Question. May taxpayers secure extensions of time for filing Declarations of Estimated Tax and for paying the estimated tax?

Answer. Yes; up to 6 months, at the discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

52. Question. May an installment of the estimated tax be paid in advance of the due date?

Answer. Yes, if the taxpayer so elects.

Penalties

53. Question. Is there any penalty for failure to file a Declaration of Estimated Tax?

Answer. Yes; for failure to make the declaration and file it on time there is a penalty of 10 percent of the tax.

54. Question. Is there a penalty for failure to pay an installment of estimated tax when due?

Answer. Yes. The law provides that in such case there shall be added to the tax $2.50, or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is greater, for each installment in arrears.

55. Question. Are there any criminal penalties in connection with the filing of Declarations of Estimated Tax and the payment of the tax?

Answer. Yes, the same criminal penalties apply as in the case of regular returns where there is a willful failure to file the return or pay the tax (fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both).

Declarations by members of armed forces

56. Question. Are members of the armed forces required to file a Declaration of Estimated Tax?

Answer. As regards the filing of a Declaration of Estimated Tax, they are subject to the same requirements as apply to taxpayers generally, which are referred to under Question 36.

Number of returns required

57. Question. How many returns will a taxpayer be required to file each year under the new pay-as-you-go system?

Answer. Only one return a year will actually be required. The amended declarations, of which there may be as many as three, are filed at the option of the taxpayer to show increased or decreased liability as a result of changed circumstances.

58. Question. Are not two returns due next March 15, namely, a final return for 1943 and a declaration of estimated tax for 1944?

Answer. The final return for the previous year and the tentative return for the ensuing year will actually be made on the same form.

Fiscal year taxpayers

59. Question. When do taxpayers who are on a fiscal-year accounting basis make their returns and pay their tax?

Answer. In the case of a fiscal year beginning in 1943, the date for filing the Declaration of Estimated Tax is left to regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and will be announced later. In subsequent years the declaration must be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year.

PART V. JUNE 15 INSTALLMENT

60. Question. Why must the June 15 installment on 1942 taxes be paid if 75 percent or more of the 1942 tax is to be abated?

Answer. The old law remains in effect until September 1, which is after the date for payment of the second installment. Both the March 15 and June 15 installments are credited toward the 1943 liability, and in effect take the place of the two installments which would have been payable on the 1943 tax liability if the new law had been in effect during the first 6 months of this year.

Special rule in case of servicemen

61. Question. If a person will owe no 1943 tax because of being in the service, must the June 15 installment still be paid?

Answer. In accordance with instructions issued by the Army and Navy, with the sanction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, a member of the armed forces need not make the June 15 installment payment if he will have no 1943 liability for income or Victory tax, provided the collector is supplied with the following information: (a) That the taxpayer is a member of the armed forces; (b) that his estimated tax liability for 1943 will be zero; (c) that the tax liability for 1942, recomputed after excluding earned income not in excess of $14,000, is not in excess of the amounts already paid toward the 1942 tax; and (d) that the taxpayer will file a Declaration of Estimated Tax by September 15, and will at that time make such payment, if any, as may be required.

PART VI. FINAL 1943 TAX BASED ON HIGHER INCOME OF 1942-43

62. Question. Is the 1943 tax liability of individuals based on the 1943 income in all cases?

Answer. No. In order to prevent any advantage accruing to taxpayers by reason of the shift to a current collection basis, it is provided, in effect, that the current 1943 tax liability shall not be less than the 1942 liability. This means that if the tax on 1942 income was $2,500, for example, and the tax on 1943 income is only $1,000, the final 1943 liability shall be $2,500 rather than $1,000. For administrative reasons, what is actually done under the law is to tax the 1943 income in all cases, and then increase the 1943 liability by the excess of the 1942 tax over the tax on 1943 income. Thus in the above example, the final 1943 tax would be $1,000 (the tax on 1943 income) plus $1,500 (the excess of the 1942 tax over the tax on 1943 income), or a total of $2,500.

Higher year's liability included in Declaration of Estimated Tax

63. Question. Must this additional liability for 1943, where the 1942 tax was higher, be taken into consideration in filing the Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943?

Answer. Yes, it is considered a part of the 1943 liability for purposes of the Declaration of Estimated Tax.

Does not operate after this year

64. Question. It is true, is it not, that this requirement of paying on the higher of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, will not apply after this year?

Answer. Yes.

Applies regardless of amount of income

65. Question. Does this provision apply to all taxpayers, regardless of the amount of their income, and whether they have any income at all in 1943?

Answer. It applies regardless of the amount of 1943 income, but special treatment is given to members of the armed forces.

Members of armed forces exempt from paying on higher year under certain conditions

66. Question. What is this special treatment for members of the armed forces?

Answer. Members of the armed forces do not have to pay on the higher of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, with respect to that portion of the 1942 tax which is attributable to "earned" income (i. e. from wages or salary) not in excess of $14,000. Thus, if a soldier earned $3,000 in 1942 as a civilian, incurring a tax liability of say $300, and has no tax liability on his 1943 service pay, he would not be required to increase his 1943 liability by the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax. In effect, his 1942 liability is completely abated.

On the other hand, if part of the servicemen's 1942 tax was attributable to "earned" income, and part to "unearned" income (i. e., income from investments or wage and salary income in excess of $14,000), the 1943 tax will be increased by the amount by which the tax on the "unearned" portion of the 1942 income exceeds the 1943 tax. For example, suppose a single man had a civilian salary of $15,000 in 1942, and had income from rents, dividends, and interest amounting to $5,000, on which the total tax was $6,800. In 1943 he went into the Army as an officer, and receives a service pay of $2,400. His final 1943 tax liability would be computed as follows: He would figure the tax on his 1943 service pay, after excluding from consideration the first $1,500 thereof under the provisions of the new law. The resulting 1943 tax would be approximately $80. He would then add to his 1943 tax liability the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax, after deducting from such excess the amount by which the 1942 tax was increased by reason of the inclusion of the first $14,000 of the amount of the "earned" net income in 1942. He finds that the 1942 tax exceeds the 1943 tax by $6,720 ($6,800 minus $80). He recomputes the 1942 tax to see how much of this excess was due to the inclusion of the "earned" income (i. e. from wages or salary) up to $14,000. Subtracting from the 1942 income all salary income not in excess of $14,000 would leave $1,000 of the salary income and the $5,000 of investment income, or a total of $6,000, on which the tax would be approximately $1,200. This shows that the 1942 tax was increased by $5,600 (the excess of $6,800 over $1,200) by reason of the inclusion of the "earned" income up to $14,000. Therefore, the $5,600 is subtracted from the $6,720 excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax, leaving a balance of $1,120, which is the

amount to be added to the tax on 1943 income in computing the final 1943 liability of the serviceman in question. His total 1943 liability, therefore, would be $80 (the tax on his 1943 service income) plus $1,120 (the excess of the 1942 tax attributable to "unearned" income over the 1943 tax), or a total of $1,200. This is the amount he would include in his Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943. In this instance he still pays on the higher of the 2 years after eliminating from the 1942 income all wage and salary income up to $14,000. (The serviceman in question would also owe the unabated portion of the lesser year's tax, 25 percent of the basic 1943 liability of $80 in this case, or $20. See question 72.)

Special provision covering joint returns of husband and wife

67. Question. Where a man and wife file a joint return for either the taxable year 1942 or 1943, but not for both years, how is it to be determined whether the tax for 1942 was greater than for 1943?

Answer. It is provided in section 6 (d) (2) that for the purpose of this provision, the taxes of the spouses for the taxable year for which a joint return is not made shall be aggregated in such case. Furthermore, if the taxable year for which a joint return is not made is the taxable year 1943, any additional liability because of the higher tax for 1942 is to be joint and several.

PART VII. ABATEMENT OF 75 PERCENT OF LESSER YEAR'S TAX LIABILITY (OR FIRST $50, WHICHEVER IS GREATER)

68. Question. What provision is made under the new law to prevent an undue doubling up of taxes as a result of the change to a current collection basis from the present year-behind collection basis?

Answer. In effect, 75 percent of 1 year's tax, or the first $50 thereof, whichever amount is the greater, is abated or canceled.

68A. Question. What happens to the uncanceled portion?

Answer. The amount not abated is collected in addition to current taxes over the next 2 years, one-half being payable March 15, 1944, and one-half March 15, 1945. To this extent, there is a partial doubling up of tax payments during this period, which is roughly equivalent to a 12½-percent increase in taxes in 1944 and 1945 for most taxpayers.

69. Question. To which year's tax does the abatement apply, 1942 or 1943?

Answer. Since the current tax liability is based on the higher tax of the 2 years, the abatement is based on the lower tax of the 2 years.

70. Question. Suppose a man's 1942 tax was $100 and his 1943 tax will be $200, how does the abatement provision work?

Answer. Seventy-five percent of his 1942 tax (being the lower year) will be abated or canceled. The remaining 25 percent, or $25, continues to be a liability. It is payable as noted above.

When abatement exceeds 75 percent

71. Question. Suppose, in the case just cited, the 1942 tax was $60 instead of $100. How much would be abated and how much would still be payable?

Answer. In such case, $50 of the $60 1942 tax would be abated, since $50 is greater than 75 percent of $60 (which would be only $45). The unabated $10 would be payable as above.

If the 1942 tax had been $50 or less, the whole amount, or 100 percent of the tax, would be abated.

Abatement where 1942 tax exceeds 1943 tax

72. Question. Suppose the taxpayer had a higher tax in 1942 than for 1943, and therefore has to increase his 1943 liability by the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax. In that event does the abatement provision apply to the tax on 1943 income before being increased by such excess?

Answer. Yes. If the 1942 tax was $400, and the tax on 1943 income $300, the higher 1942 tax in effect becomes the 1943 liability. However, for the purpose of ascertaining the unabated portion of the lower year's tax, the original 1943 liability would be used as a basis. Thus 25 percent of the basic 1943 liability, or $75, would be the unabated amount of the lower year's tax. What actually happens where the 1942 tax is in excess of the 1943 tax is that the 1942 tax assessment is (for administrative reasons) fully canceled, but there is added to the basic 1943 liability (a) the excess of the 1942 tax over the basic 1943 tax plus (b) 25 percent of the basic 1943 tax, or the excess of such tax over $50, whichever is the lesser amount. The latter sum (being the unabated portion of the lower year's tax) is payable in two annual installments as previously noted.

Unabated liability not included in Declaration of Estimated Tax

73. Question. Must the unabated portion of the lower year's tax, one-half of which is payable March 15, 1944, be included in the declaration of estimated tax for 1943?

Answer. No; and it is therefore not reckoned with in determining whether the estimated tax comes within 80 percent of the tax shown on the final return for 1943, filed March 15, 1944.

Application to servicemen

74. Question. How do the abatement provisions apply in the case of a serviceman who is exempted from paying on the higher income of the 2 years?

Answer. In most cases he will, in effect, receive 100 percent abatement of his 1942 tax by reason of not having to increase his 1943 tax by the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax. The regular abatement provisions still apply to the lower liability of the 2 years, which would generally be 1943. If such lower year's liability was in excess of $50, he would be required to pay 25 percent thereof, or the excess of the 1943 tax over $50, whichever is the lesser amount, as the unabated portion of the lower year's tax.

PART VIII. SPECIAL WINDFALL TAX

75. Question. Is the so-called windfall tax of any concern to most taxpayers?

Answer. No; since it only applies where the lower income in the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, exceeds the pre-war income of the taxpayer by more than $20,000.

76. Question. What is the nature of the windfall tax?

Answer. Its purpose is to prevent the 75-percent abatement of a year's tax from applying to swollen war income. It accomplishes this purpose by limiting the abatement to that portion of the lower year's income representing normal income, and by collecting as a windfall tax the balance of the amount which would otherwise have been abated.

77. Question. What yardstick or base is used in determining so-called normal or pre-war income?

Answer. The taxpayer is permitted to use the highest annual income of the years 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940, plus $20,000, as a base.

78. Question. How is the windfall tax computed?

Answer. Let us assume that the taxpayer has a 1943 tax of $800,000 and a 1942 tax of $400,000. In such case, the 75 percent abatement would apply to the 1942 tax. The unabated 25 percent, or $100,000, would be payable over the next 2 years in addition to current taxes. The abated 75 percent, or $300,000, would be compared with a hypothetical tax, computed at 1942 rates, on the base year's income plus $20,000. Assuming that the income in the highest base year was $80,000, the addition of the $20,000 would make a total of $100,000 on which the hypothetical tax would be computed. On such an amount, the hypothetical tax would be approximately $64,000. This $64,000 becomes the limit of the amount to be abated, instead of $300,000. The excess of the $300,000 over the $64,000 ($236,000) is collected as a windfall tax. Thus of the total 1942 liability of $400,000, only $64,000, or 16 percent, is finally abated, instead of 75 percent.

79. Question. When is the so-called windfall tax payable?

Answer. It is added to the final 1943 liability, but may be paid in four annual installments, commencing March 15, 1945, with interest at 4 percent.

80. Question. How would this provision apply to a member of a partnership which operated as a corporation during the base period, and which therefore would have no base period income as a partnership?

Answer. Special relief is granted in such cases under section 6 (d) (5). In effect, the partner is permitted to use as a base his share of the corporation earnings.

PART IX. TAXPAYERS DYING IN 1942 OR 1943

81. Question. Suppose the taxpayer died during 1942. Is his tax liability affected by the new law?

Answer. No. In such case, no part of the 1942 tax is abated. It is to be collected in the same manner as if the Current Tax Payment Act had not been enacted.

82. Question. What if the taxpayer dies in 1943 instead of 1942?

Answer. In such case, the situation is different. The decedent's 1942 tax is abated to the same extent as any other taxpayer's. His 1943 return will be for the period up to the date of his death. If the 1942 tax exceeds the 1943 tax for the portion of the year during which he was alive, the excess is added to the 1943 liability. The windfall tax is applicable with respect to the abated year, as in the case of other taxpayers, if it represents swollen war income.

PART X. INCREASED INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR SERVICEMEN

83. Question. When does the increased income-tax exemption for servicemen become effective?

Answer. With respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1943.

84. Question. How does it change the present special exemption for servicemen?

Answer. Under the old law, servicemen were permitted to exclude from gross income the first $250 of their annual service pay if single, and the first $300 if married. Such exclusion of this part of the service pay was in addition to the regular exemptions. It had the effect of making the exemption of single men $750 instead of $500, and of married men $1,500 instead of $1,200.

Under the new law, servicemen will be permitted to exclude from gross income the first $1,500 of their service pay, and in addition will get the regular exemption of $500 for single persons, $1,200 for married persons, and $350 for each dependent. In effect, the new law raises the exemption of servicemen to $2,000 if single, and $2,700 if married, plus $350 for each dependent.

85. Question. Does the exclusion of the first $1,500 of service pay from gross income apply to servicemen regardless of grade or rank?

Answer. Yes. This is a change over the old law, which only applied to persons below the grade or rank of commissioned officer.

86. Question. Does it apply to an American who is serving with the armed forces of one of the other United Nations?

Answer. Yes, under the new law.

87. Question. Does it also apply to members of women's units serving with the military or naval forces?

Answer. Yes.

PART XI. ABATEMENT OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH

88. Question. What provision is made under the new law for the cancelation of any tax liability owed by a member of the military or naval forces who dies in active service?

Answer. Any tax liability which is unpaid at the date of his death is canceled.

89. Question. What if death took place before the enactment of the new law?

Answer. This provision is retroactive to December 7, 1941, and continues during the present war.

90. Question. What if the tax which was due at the date of the serviceman's death has since been paid?

Answer. It will be refunded.

91. Question. Does this cancelation of tax liability also apply to the estate tax?

Answer. No; only to income tax. Presumably most deceased servicemen would be exempt from any estate-tax liability because of the $60,000 exemption.

PART XII. HOW THE NEW LAW WILL AFFECT VARIOUS PERSONS

92. Question. How will the new law operate in the case of the average taxpayer?

Answer. This depends upon the amount of his income, the nature of his income, his family status, etc. Following are several hypothetical examples of how the law would work in practice:

(a) *Unmarried wage earner whose income for 1943 will be $2,600 ($50 per week) and who owed $320 tax for 1942*

If he did not pay his 1942 tax in full on March 15, he must at least pay the second installment on June 15. All amounts paid on his 1942 liability will be applied to his 1943 liability.

There will continue to be withheld from his pay envelope up to July 1, the present 5 percent Victory tax withholding.

Beginning July 1, there will be substituted for the Victory tax withholding a new 20 percent withholding for the collection of both Victory tax and income tax. The withholding exemption in his case will be the same as under the Victory tax withholding ($12 a week, or $52 a month), and the amount withheld will be $7.60 a week ($8.60 if the employer uses the withholding tables instead of computing the withholding exactly).

He will not have to file a Declaration of Estimated 1943 Tax on September 15 because his 1943 wage will not exceed $2,700 and he has no other income.

He will not have any installment payment to make September 15 or December 15 because his entire liability will be collected at the source (counting the amounts paid up to June 15 on the 1942 tax, which are applied to the 1943 liability).

On March 15, 1944, he will file a regular income-tax return on 1943 income and compute his 1943 income and Victory tax. He will take credit for amounts withheld at the source during 1943 and amounts paid on his 1942 tax liability. If he finds that the tax shown on the return is in excess of the total of such amounts, he will pay the difference in a lump sum at that time. If he finds that he has overpaid his tax, he will be entitled to a refund of the overpayment.

On March 15, 1944, he will owe 25 percent of his 1942 tax liability (or the excess of the 1942 tax over $50, whichever is the lesser amount). In his case, this would be $80. The remainder of the 1942 liability is canceled. The uncanceled portion may be paid in full March 15, 1944, or in two installments, one-half March 15, 1944, and one-half March 15, 1945.

If his 1944 wage is the same as in 1943, his entire 1944 tax will be collected at the source. His next return, which will be the final return for 1944, will be due March 15, 1945, at which time any adjustments for underpayment or overpayment will be made. On such date, he will pay the balance of the uncanceled portion of his 1942 liability, if it has not been previously paid.

(b) *Married man without dependents whose salary income for 1943 will be $3,000 ($250 a month) and who owed $300 tax for 1942*

His procedure under the new act will be substantially the same as in the prior illustration, but the amounts will of course differ.

His withholding exemption after July 1 will be $24 a week or $104 a month. Thus his withholding tax will be $29.20 per month ($31.20 if the employer uses the withholding tables instead of computing the withholding exactly).

He will not have to file a Declaration of Estimated Tax on September 15, since his salary as a married person does not exceed $3,500 annually and there is no other income.

He will file a final return for 1943 on March 15, 1944, and take credit for the amounts withheld at the source during the year and amounts paid on the 1942 liability. Any necessary adjustments will then be made on account of any overpayment or underpayment.

The uncanceled portion of the 1942 tax liability (25 percent of $300, or $75) would be due March 15, 1944, but could be paid in two installments, as noted under (a).

(c) *Married man without dependents whose salary income for 1943 will be $6,000 ($500 a month) and who owed $800 tax for 1942*

His procedure will be somewhat different than in the previous illustrations, since his full liability for 1943 will not be collected at the source.

Assuming he is paying his 1942 tax in installments, he will pay the regular $200 installment on June 15.

Beginning July 1, he will be subject to the 20-percent withholding on the excess of his monthly salary over $104, which would amount to $79.20 a month (whether computed on an exact basis or under the withholding tables). Up to July 1, he will have been withheld against to the extent of approximately $22.40 a month under the Victory tax withholding.

On September 15, because his income as a married man is expected to exceed $3,500 for the year, he must file a Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943. In computing his estimated 1943 liability, he takes account of his probable income, and his probable deductions, and arrives at a tentative figure of say $1,100, after electing to take currently his post-war credit against the Victory tax. From this tentative tax liability of $1,100 he deducts (1) the amount withheld at the source under the Victory tax withholding up to July 1 ($134.40); and (2) the amount estimated to be withheld at the source under the 20-percent withholding during the balance of the year ($475.20). This makes a total withholding credit of $609.60, which he deducts from the $1,100 tentative 1943 liability, leaving a balance of $490.40 not collected at the source. Since the amounts paid on the 1942 tax are to be credited against the 1943 liability, the $400 paid up to June 15 is also deducted, leaving a net balance of $90.40. This balance of his estimated 1943 tax is payable in two installments, one-half on September 15 and one-half on December 15.

On March 15, 1944, he files a final return for the year, and arrives at his actual liability, which we will say is $1,150, instead of the $1,100 estimated. Since the estimated tax is within 80 percent of the actual liability, there is no interest penalty for underpayment. The $50 difference would be payable in a lump sum March 15, 1944.

On March 15, 1944, the uncanceled portion of his 1942 tax liability will be payable (25 percent of $800, or $200). As previously noted, he may elect to pay half the amount March 15, 1944, and half March 15, 1945.

The final return for 1943 would also contain his Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1944. After computing his estimated liability, and making allowance for the amount estimated to be withheld at the source during the year, he would pay the remainder of his estimated tax in four equal quarterly installments on March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15. His final return for 1944 would be filed March 15, 1945, when any adjustments would be made. If during the year 1944 his income decreased or increased, or his family status changed, he could file an amended Declaration of Estimated Tax and adjust his subsequent installment payments accordingly.

(d) *Married man without dependents whose salary income for 1943 will be $3,000 ($250 a month), who has $2,000 of other income from dividends, interest, etc.*

This taxpayer will proceed as under example (c), since his total income as a married man exceeds $3,500 and his tax will not be fully collected at the source.

(e) *Single man who is not subject to withholding (self-employed person, agricultural worker, or other exempt class), who anticipates a 1943 income of $3,000 and who owed a tax for 1942 of $400*

In this case, the taxpayer will pay his second installment on the 1942 tax on June 15 if he has not already paid the 1942 tax in full.

He will not be subject to withholding July 1, being in an exempt class.

September 15 he will be required to file a Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943, based on his estimated income and deductions for the year. His estimated 1943 tax liability, including Victory tax, will be approximately $575 if he elects to take currently the post-war credit under the Victory tax (25 percent of the Victory tax in the case of single persons). If he has paid only the first two installments of his 1942 tax, totaling $200, he will credit this amount against the estimated 1943 tax. (If he had paid the whole $400 of 1942 tax he would take credit for the entire amount). This leaves $375 of the estimated 1943 tax ($575 less $200) to be paid in quarterly installments, one-half on September 15 and one-half on December 15.

Next March 15, he will file his final return for the year, based on actual income and actual allowable deductions, and will make any necessary adjustment for overpayment or underpayment. If at that time he finds that his actual tax liability for 1943 is $525, instead of the estimated $575, he will be entitled to a refund of $50, or may credit it against his 1944 liability.

At that time, the uncanceled portion of his 1942 tax liability (25 percent of $400, or $100) will be payable. As before noted, he may elect to pay this amount in two annual installments, one on March 15, 1944, and one on March 15, 1945. The $50 overpayment on his 1943 tax could be used to meet one of these installments.

On March 15, 1944, the taxpayer will file a Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1944, and will pay the estimated tax in four equal quarterly installments, on March 15, June 15, September 15, and December 15. His final return for 1944 will be filed March 15, 1945, and any adjustments made as before.

(f) *Married man with no dependents with an estimated business income of $4,000 for 1943 who owed $2,000 tax for 1942*

This man's procedure will be substantially the same as under example (e), since he is not subject to withholding, but with this difference: His Declaration of Estimated Tax, to be filed September 15, will show a 1943

liability of approximately $647 (income tax plus net Victory tax), which is less than his 1942 tax. Accordingly, in making his Declaration of Estimated Tax for 1943, he will increase the amount of tentative tax by the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax, or by $1,353, making a total liability for 1943 of $2,000 ($647 plus $1,353). In determining the amount of his installment payments to be made September 15 and December 15, he will first take credit for the amounts paid on his 1942 tax. If he paid his $2,000 1942 tax in full, he will have no installment payments to make. If he paid only the first two installments (or a total of $1,000), he will pay the balance ($1,000) in two installments—September 15 and December 15.

His final return for the year, filed March 15, 1944, would show no change in his liability since, in effect, the tax for the year was based on the known higher 1942 income. Any minor increase or decrease in the 1943 income over that previously estimated would not change the result.

On March 15, 1944, however, he would owe 25 percent of the basic 1943 tax (the unabated portion of the lower year's tax). This would be 25 percent of $647 (assuming that there was no change in the amount based on the final return), or $161.75. One-half of this amount could be paid on that date and one-half the following March 15.

On March 15, 1944, he would file his declaration of estimated tax for 1944, and pay the estimated amount in four quarterly installments, making any necessary adjustment on March 15, 1945.

(*g*) *Single man in armed forces whose service compensation for 1943 will be $600, and who owed a 1942 tax of $365 on his $2,500 income from a civilian job.*

As a soldier, he will not be subject to withholding on his service pay.

He will owe no tax on 1943 income because of the liberal exemptions applying to members of the armed forces ($1,500 plus the regular exemptions).

However, on September 15 he will be required to file a declaration of estimated tax for 1943 by reason of having had a gross income from wages in 1942 greater than the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received from wages in 1943.

In his declaration of estimated tax he will compute his 1943 liability, if any. Since his 1942 tax exceeds the tax on his 1943 service income, the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax would have to be added to the 1943 liability if he were an ordinary taxpayer. But being a serviceman, he is entitled to take advantage of the special provision allowing him to deduct from such excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax so much of the 1942 tax as is attributable to "earned" income, i. e., wage or salary income not in excess of $14,000. Since all of the 1942 tax was attributable to "earned" income of less than that amount, none of the higher 1942 tax need be added to the 1943 liability in his case.

Thus his Declaration of Estimated Tax will show no 1943 liability. There will, of course, be no September 15 or December 15 installments to pay.

On March 15, 1944, the serviceman will file his final return for 1943 showing no liability, but an actual overpayment, due to the crediting of the amount paid on his 1942 tax toward the 1943 liability. Thus, whatever amount he paid on March 15 and June 15, 1943, on his 1942 tax will be refunded.

There will be no unabated portion of the lower year's tax due March 15, 1944, since there is no liability for the lower year (1943).

(*h*) *Taxpayer who has no 1943 income but who owed a tax of $2,000 for 1942 on income from his business*

The taxpayer would have to pay his June 15 installment if he has not already paid the 1942 tax in full.

On September 15, he will be required to file a declaration of estimated tax for 1943 since he had a 1942 tax liability. His 1943 liability (zero) will be increased by the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax, or by $2,000. Against the $2,000 liability for 1943, he will take credit for the amount paid on the 1942 tax up to June 15. If only the first two installments were paid, aggregating $1,000, there will be a balance due for 1943 of $1,000, payable one-half on September 15 and one-half December 15. If the full 1942 tax was paid March 15, such payments will completely offset the 1943 tax and no further installments will be required.

On March 15, 1944, the taxpayer will file a final return for 1943, but no adjustments will be required since the 1943 liability was in effect based on the known 1942 tax.

There will be no unabated portion of the lower year's tax due March 15, 1944, since the lower year's basic liability (i. e. for 1943) was zero.

(*i*) *Married man with no dependents, with business income of $1,000,000 in 1943, $500,000 in 1942, and whose highest income in 1937 to 1940 was $80,000*

In this instance, the 1942 tax would have been $414,000, and it is assumed he paid the first two installments through June 15, 1943, or a total of $207,000.

On September 15, he will be required to file a declaration of estimated tax for 1943. On an income of $1,000,000, the 1943 tax would be $899,000. He takes credit for the $207,000 paid on the 1942 tax through June 15, which leaves a balance due for 1943 of $692,000. One-half this amount would be paid September 15 and one-half December 15.

On March 15, 1944, he would file his final return for the year and make any necessary adjustments for overpayment or underpayment.

At that time there would become due the unabated 25 percent of the 1942 tax (1942 being the lower year), and this amount ($103,500) could be paid in two annual installments, one-half on March 15, 1944, and the balance on March 15, 1945.

Since the abated year's income exceeds the highest base year's income by more than $20,000, the windfall tax becomes applicable, and is computed in connection with the final return for 1943. The abated amount of the 1942 tax (75 percent of $414,000, or $310,500) is compared with a hypothetical tax on the highest base year's income plus $20,000 ($80,000 plus $20,000, or $100,000), computed at the 1942 rates. The resulting hypothetical tax, which is supposed to represent (for comparative purposes) the tax on a normal pre-war year's income, would be $64,000. This $64,000 becomes the limit of the amount to be abated, instead of the $310,500 (75 percent of the lower year's tax). The excess of the $310,500 over the $64,000, or $246,500, is collected as a windfall tax. It is due March 15, 1944, but at the option of the taxpayer may be paid in four annual installments. If paid in installments, interest is charged at the rate of 4 percent, and the first installment becomes due March 15, 1945, and the remaining three installments are payable annually thereafter.

In the above case, the taxpayer's 1943 tax payments will be $899,000.

During 1944, he will pay currently his 1944 tax ($899,000 if the income is the same and there is no change in rates), plus the first installment of the unabated quarter of his 1942 tax ($51,750).

During 1945, he will pay currently his 1945 tax ($899,000 if the income is the same and there is no change in rates), plus the second and last installment of the unabated quarter of his 1942 tax ($51,750), plus the first installment of his windfall tax ($61,625), with interest.

During the next 3 years he will pay his current tax liability plus the remaining installments of the windfall tax.

Code of Canon Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the present code of canon law was promulgated by Pope Benedict XV on May 27, 1917, to become effective May 19, 1918, 25 years ago. It is the latest codification of canon law, the first since the end of the fifteenth century. Many early codes listed the decrees of Popes and the canons of councils in chronological order. Outstanding among them were the collection of Denys the Little—died between 526 and 555—and the collection sent to Charlemagne by Pope Adrian—772–795.

Following the discovery of the digest, Gratian compiled a systematic code, arranging the canons on a plan similar to that of the digest—between 1139 and 1151. Under the auspices of Pope Gregory IX, St. Raymond, of Penyafort, compiled the code known as the Decretals of Gregory IX in 1239. Later, two public and two private collections were added to the Decretals of Gregory IX, and the whole was known as the Corpus Iuris Canonici, closed by the end of the fifteenth century.

In the course of 400 years, numerous decrees issued from the Holy See. A code in which these would be inserted was desired; a code which would reenact all in the old law, whether in the Corpus Iuris Canonici, in the decrees of the general councils, or in the decrees of the Popes, to the extent that it was applicable to the needs of modern ecclesiastical government.

The task was begun under Pope Pius X in 1904, with the cooperation of two colleges of consultors functioning under a commission of cardinals. It was brought to a successful conclusion in 1916. The promulgation followed as already indicated.

I include a discourse delivered by Very Rev. James H. Griffiths, S. T. D., vice chancelor of the Diocese of Brooklyn, at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, on Sunday, May 16, 1943. This scholarly and significant sermon was delivered during a Pontifical Mass commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the enactment of the Code of Canon Law:

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE CODE OF CANON LAW, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 16, 1943

"Hearken unto me, O my people, and give ear to me, O my tribes: for a law shall go forth from me, and my judgment shall rest to be a light of the nations." (Prophecy of Isaiah 51:4.)

On the evening of January 4, 1919, the spirits of Catholic Americans from coast to coast rejoiced with legitimate pride as they read of the visit of Woodrow Wilson, the twenty-eighth President of the United States, to Benedict XV, Vicar of Christ and two hundred and sixtieth successor of Peter the Fisherman. On this occasion, the American statesman's triumphal procession across Eu-

rope had reached a new and unprecedented splendor.

In the Vatican palace where the leader from the New World was received with the medieval magnificance of the age-old papal court, there took place the momentous meeting of two men who during the long, dark months of carnage and devastation had labored incessantly to find the road to peace and to restore order to a world which had been ravished by hatred and lawlessness.

But there was another incident which occurred on the occasion of this visit of President Wilson to the Vatican, which understandably received less publicity. And that was his visit to the Cardinal Secretary of State in fulfillment of the requirements of diplomatic protocol. As Woodrow Wilson and Pietro Gasparri exchanged formal courtesies, the venerable Cardinal who had worked with truly herculean efforts during all these months to implement the Pope's peace plan, founded on the norms of eternal justice; who had been snubbed and slighted and even slandered by European leaders for his pains—gazed into the steel blue eyes of the angular American idealist—and wondered.

Wilson was on his way back to Paris; back to the Conference of world leaders from which the Vicar of Christ, the unselfish exponent of true peace, had been shamefully excluded by a pact hatched in ignoble secrecy. Almost like an "Innocent Abroad" he was on his way back to Paris where this same Gasparri had lived and brilliantly taught law for over 18 years; where Gasparri knew every cosmopolitan crossroad and every cross-current of international opinion and intrigue.

As the President rose to take his leave, the Cardinal-Secretary placed in his hands a token—an ominous token, one might say—of his visit to the house of Peter the Fisherman. It was a book beautifully bound in white parchment, on the cover of which there gleamed in golden letters the title "Codex Iurus Canonici."

Pietro Gasparri had indeed given Woodrow Wilson a significant gift to take back with him to the green baize tables of Paris and to the glittering Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. It was as though a father had given to him the son of his loins; as though Michelangelo had presented to him his Last Judgment, as though Tschaikowsky had offered his Symphonie Pathétique. As he delivered this code which less than a year previously had become the official law of the entire western church, Pietro Gasparri had given his own masterpiece, over which he had labored with countless other churchmen, night and day, during peace and during war, for 13 long years since that hour in 1904 when Pope Pius X had decreed the codification of canon law as an integral element in his sublime program to "restore all things in Christ." Indeed Van Hove says that Papa Sarto, the pious, the peasant, the parish priest Pope who had been providentially catapulted into the papacy through the caesaropapistic meddlings of the Hapsburgs, had enunciated to his familiars on the very night of his election his firm conviction that to restore ecclesiastical discipline in Christ it would be imperative to undertake immediately a redaction of the multiple laws of the church into a systematic, authentic, exclusive legal code adapted to the divine mission of the church in its modern ambient.

It was not to be a collection or even an official compilation, reproducing verbatim ancien' legislation and arranging it in logical order. Nor was it to be a mere unification of existing ecclesiastical laws. For with due consideration for custom, this code would abrogate all particular laws contrary to its content. It would be modeled on the unique legal structure bequeathed to civilization centuries before by the Emperor Justinian, but it would not be a stilted, static mimicry of antiquity.

In reports current at the time it was stated that Mr. Wilson had commented with admiration on the marvelous organic development in this new ecclesiastical legislation and had noted with discerning appreciation the elegantly concise canons, the succinct legal sanctions, and the simple and dignified latinity eminently worthy of the sacred majesty of Roman law.

As he made his way from the audience chambers through the courtyard of San Damaso and down to the bronze doors, Wilson, the historian, must have realized that he carried under his arm not merely a new legal code, aprioristically conceived and arbitrarily elaborated by a group of modern jurisconsults. All about him in those precincts were invisible witnesses to its complex historical and scientific heritage. In the shadow of the columns there was standing the regal spirit of another civil ruler, Charlemagne, who had come to Peter's house a thousand years before and had received from Hadrian the Pontiff the Codex Proprius of the Roman church, compiled by Denys the Little from the fearlessly orthodox conciliar legislation of ancient eastern Christianity. Contemplating the modern American statesman was the cowled figure of a Benedictine monk: The spirit of Gratian whose Decretum had blazed the trail toward systematized legislation and had heralded the glorious juridical renaissance of the twelfth century. He it was who had inaugurated a movement which would bear fruit in the following century in the Magna Carta of England and would thereafter undeniably influence all our modern laws, especially as they concern the fundamental rights of man. In every nook and corner hovered the spirits of those men of yore who had evolved the law of the church and had enriched humanity with their legal genius, now absorbed into the new Codex. Here there appeared the pontifical form of Gregory IX and beside him the white-robed Dominican, Raymond of Peñafort, holding the five Books of the Decretals. There outlined stood the majestic silhouette of the double-crowned Boniface VIII who admits that he passed sleepless nights in planning his "Liber Sextus" to guarantee accuracy and security in ecclesiastical discipline. It was indeed a pageant of Popes with John XXIX exhibiting the Clementinae and Gregory XIII pointing to the new "Corpus Iuris" and Benedict XIV displaying the "Bullarium." Mingling with them were the less renowned but no less able pontiffs and prelates and clerics who had made possible the disciplinary reforms of the Council of Trent and had painstakingly elaborated the jurisprudence of the church in the "Regulae" of the Apostolic Chancery and in the Decrees of the Sacred Congregations and Tribunals.

In very truth the American President was carrying with him in this compact volume the limpid, lucid distillation of 1,900 years of heroic pastoral solicitude, of unswerving infallible teaching, of delicate discerning government and of brilliant juridical genius. John Ruskin has remarked that Gothic architecture is frozen poetry. If this be admitted, then it is scarcely intemperate to declare that nearly every canon in the Codex Iuris Canonici is frozen history. In this monumental work all the ages of ecclesiastical history have given one another rendezvous. Here their various products may be seen all together; not confused but interfused; not heaped one upon another, as Livy had described Roman law, but correlated and integrated into a reasonable organic whole for the sole purpose of attaining more effectively the common good of the church of God.

But the chief purpose of the church in codifying her law was not to focus the attention of the world on its glorious historical background. She was not playing the role of the archeologist or the antiquarian dilettante. The church was not looking backward—she was principally looking forward. She was looking straight ahead at the supernatural goal of restoring all things in Christ. She was looking straight ahead into the eyes of the enemies who were threatening not only the flock of Peter but threatening as well the entire fabric of civilization. She was girding herself with adequate disciplinary legislation to meet the ever-growing challenge of Positivism and Naturalism and Agnosticism and Materialism. By the orderly codification of the legislation of centuries and by the independent promulgation of her law she was making it possible for the clergy and faithful to know the laws which they should obey and she was vindicating the role of lawgiver conferred on her by her Divine Founder when He said "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven." She was striking fearlessly at the canting Modernists who had denied her juridical personality; who had derived whatever puny power they had left her, not from the Christ, the eternal lawgiver, but from that intangible factor, designated as the collective religious consciousness of the faithful. She was repudiating by vigorous, positive action and not merely by oral confutation, the totalitarian theories of those who were already teaching—and be it noted, not without applause—that all her rights and all her powers are derived solely from the deified State and that consequently all her ministerial, legislative, charitable, and educational activities are circumscribed by and subject to the pleasure and whim of the civil power.

Like the householder in the Gospel parable, she has brought forth from her treasure house a code of law embodying new things and old. The old things emphasize her unique prudence and wisdom through the centuries and cursorily suggest her mysterious powers of endurance. The new things call the attention of the world to her ever-resurgent vitality and her traditional readiness to meet new maladies with new remedies. To those false seers who prophesied her disintegration and doom when the breach was driven at Porta Pia and she was stripped of the trappings of temporal domain, to those who deplored her stubborn refusal to adapt her very dogmas to the intellectual fluctuations of the moment, who jubilantly declared that her condemnation of modernism was punctuated by a death rattle, she held forth the most humiliating refutation in the form of a marvelously modern organic body of concise, unifying laws admirably suited to the efficient, sanctifying government of her millions of modern adherents scattered over the face of the earth. Indeed, it would appear almost too obvious to observe that such firm, wise legislative dynamism is not readily recognized by humanity as characteristic of a corpse.

Then again, it is quite proper to recall that the church courageously brought forth this masterpiece of her law-making genius precisely at an hour when all mankind was convulsed by the most horrible catastrophe which history had thus far recorded. At a time when arrogant nationalism had precipitated this universal desolation and was preparing the way for the more devastating blood myths and fantastic race fables, the church alone had the fortitude to affirm practically her loyalty to the principle of the universal solidarity of the human race. She promulgated a code of discipline which was so detailed that it actually told the individual Catholic what and when he might not eat, but which was at once so international, so supernational in its scope, that it intimately affected the lives and modes not merely of a few million men in western Europe, but of more than 350,000,000 human beings of every racial stock and nationality,

of every social class and condition working out their individual salvation in the throbbing heart of the streamlined metropolis or on the pin points of tropical islands which dot the ample bosom of the sea. This code of laws represented in a sense her profession of faith in the universality of Christ's redemption, in the precious dignity, the eternal value of one human soul, no matter where it might be found. This code was her answer to the dithyrambic ravings of the era regarding the Raubthier, the superman, the man beyond good and evil. It was a practical confutation of the insane hypothesis of ethical relativism which pretended to differentiate the slave morality from the master morality. This code applied with equity and without discrimination to every Catholic of the Latin rite in every corner of the world, constituted her invincible refutation of those astute adversaries who sought to neutralize her magnificent redemptive efforts in the mission field by identifying her with odious imperialism and by European cultural pattern and disciplinary system.

And now, after 5 and 20 years during which we Catholics of the world have lived under the ordered discipline of the code, we might properly inquire as to the manner in which this juridical experiment of the church has acquitted itself during the quarter century; whether this resurgence of juridical activity has made its anticipated contribution to the restoration of all things in Christ. This is a question which suggests itself to all of us this morning. But it is a question which may not be facilely answered. First of all, we are still standing so close to the masterpiece that we cannot properly appraise its grandiose proportions and tapering vistas. Since it has been in force somewhat less than a generation, we should realistically understand that it has barely begun to permeate the complex ecclesiastical structure and to radiate its white light throughout the mystical body. It has encountered the psychological impact of nova et vetera in the established mass of customs and practices, of decrees and resolutions which had grown up and become entrenched in the traditional ecclesiastical ambit during the long centuries since the last official compilation of law made its appearance.

But, on the other hand, though this new code, the vehicle of the church's juridical aspirations, has been in force for scarcely a generation, it has been submitted to a test such as no previous legal instrument of the church has undergone. For it has been a generation during which humanity itself has been uprooted. For at least two centuries society sentimentally and externally preserved some of the old decencies salvaged from supernaturalism. But during this generation the sham was terminated and the issue was joined. The enemies of immutable truth first began to oust God and the supernatural from the field of empirical science. In their laboratories they laid the foundations for the mercilessly efficient blitzkrieg which, with the fiendish accuracy of a dark angel, has seared and scorched and blackened the face of the earth. But, at its worst, all that godless natural science can do is to maim and cripple and ultimately destroy the life of the body. But the godless concept of justice and jurisprudence has proven a far more terrifying menace. For in the name of the even-handed goddess who holds the quivering scales, the godless jurist has blasphemously imposed the slavery of the spirit and has reduced man, made in God's image and likeness, to the status of a brute animal stripped of personal dignity, bereft of basic rights and led by the halter of terrorism to feed at the trough of the benevolent state.

In nations and among peoples who have been the traditional exponents of the juridical order, the reign of law has been perverted, subverted, and destroyed. In this regard, Pope Pius XII in his Christmas allocution warned that outside the church of Christ juridical positivism has reigned supreme, attributing a deceptive majesty to the enactment of purely human laws and effectuating the fatal divorce of law from morality. As civil codes have crumbled and the juridical order has been liquidated in the name of pseudomysticism and legalistic realism, the church of God, which has so often been patronizingly identified with a smug, static, mystical, and unrealistic approach to the problems of life, has labored serenely through her juridical norms in ordering practically the spirits of men to the attainment of true life, true liberty, and the pursuit of true happiness. During this era of turmoil and tyranny when men have so frequently sought to attain their objectives through the bloody instrumentality of the purge and the putsch, she has welded her far-flung organism into a marvelous new unity through the spiritual media and through the orderly process of law. While secular jurists, infected with the virus of naturalism, have striven futilely to isolate the ultimate determinant of justice either in a sentiment of fairness or in the decent fulfillment of decent expectations, or in the satisfactoriness of a thing to all socially tolerable persons, the church of Christ has fearlessly thundered against this perilous subjectivism and has heroically maintained the necessity of a divine sanction for law. In a relentless argumentum ad hominem she has reminded the statesmen and jurists that if there be no God to avenge justice; if the Ten Commandments are to be ridiculed as a collection of Hebrew taboos; if the Sermon on the Mount constitutes no positive, eternally true norm of justice; if the whole New Testament is but the visionary preachments of the effeminate apostles of a pallid Christ—then might is right and Hitler is right and communism is right and the purge is right and the concentration camp is right and sterilization and economic enslavement—all the abominations of totalitarianism are right—and democracy is an unrealistic farce.

While she has ever been the palladium of law and order during these last 25 years, the church has remained stanchly faithful to her guardianship of law. Within her schools and universities, within her administrative offices, in the rank and file of her ministers, there has dawned a glorious renaissance of juridical activity. Through the codification of her law, the study of canon law and of all law has received a new impetus, and interest in the law has percolated down through the masses of her organism, and yet one is constrained to confess with regret that within the very household of the faith there have been occasional figures who looked with misgivings on this quarter century of intense legal development in the church. Some of them have labeled it a period of sterile juridicism which is alleged to have dried up the well springs of piety and devotion and asceticism; to have mechanistically centralized and bureaucratically devitalized fervent Christian life and practice. Others have gone so far as to cry out that the code and legalism have become fetishes. One's prime impulse is to inquire whether these are the same persons who before the promulgation of the code expressed contempt for canon law because of its tortuous labyrinth of unrelated decrees and decretals and compilations and extravagantes. But history will bear unprejudiced testimony to the fact that in every age when the disciplinary law of the church has been clearly enunciated and equitably administered, even in circumscribed spheres, the deep spiritual life of the church has been correlatively enriched. There is nothing mysterious about this. It stands to reason; for, if order is heaven's first law, if the glorious populace of the celestial Jerusalem bow down in adoration before the eternal order contemplated in the beatific vision, then order which in this world is achieved only by law must of necessity constitute a primary requisite for the more effective fulfillment of the sanctifying program of Christ's earthly kingdom.

This morning as we are gathered here in the National Capital, with the glad tidings of desert victory still ringing in our ears, our hearts are yearning for the ultimate victory which will bring peace to all the world. If it is to be a lasting peace, it must be the peace of God; if it is to be a lasting peace, it must be the tranquillity of order; and there can be no international or national order—no social or economic order—unless the leaders of men reestablish the true juridical order. All the blood and sweat and tears will have been shed in vain unless the victorious architects will raise the temple of the "four freedoms" on the infrangible cornerstone of God's eternal law.

Deo Gratias!

F. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Sacramento Bee is one of the great newspapers of the country. It has battled for the underdog many years. No matter what one may think of the opinions of this newspaper, I can attest that they are respected by all thinking persons. I respectfully request permission to make a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Sacramento Bee under date of April 13, 1943, although I reserve the right to disagree with the Bee, should I be so disposed at the time the legislation regarding the F. S. A. comes up for our consideration.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

SENATE SHOULD RESTORE FUNDS TO SUSTAIN FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Another sample of the dominant temper in the present House of Representatives was given this week when that body passed the agricultural appropriation bill denuded of any appropriations for the Farm Security Administration and with the sum budgeted for the Rural Electrification Administration drastically reduced.

In one case, the sole agency devoted to the assistance of the so-called little farmer is put out of business, and, in the other, the agency which has done a marvelous work in bringing cheap electricity to the farms is handcuffed financially.

The program of the reactionary Republican-Southern Democratic coalition obviously is to smash everything which had its inception in the New Deal.

Facts and figures presenting the strongest kind of a case for the Farm Security Administration were given during the House debate.

It has extended aid to 917,000 farm families, most of whom otherwise would have lost everything they owned and hence would not be a part of the Army now producing food for victory.

The number of such families still being assisted with loans on easy terms by the Farm Security Administration is 417,000; and the food produced under Farm Security Administration supervision last year and the year

before in nearly every State was an appreciable percentage of the entire output.

Farm Security Administration has relieved a vast amount of depression distress, and that on a sound financial basis.

Representative Plumley, Republican of Vermont, reflected the prevailing sentiment when in a characteristic outburst, in reference to the Farm Security Administration, he declared:

"We have a lot of people in every State who have lived off the New Deal too long. Under the guise of and being classed as Republicans they have played ball with every New Deal team that had a dollar to spend on them. Bloodsuckers!

"And the largest group of bloodsucking barnacles on the ship of state is found in the Department of Agriculture."

But the Farm Security Administration is not dead yet.

Friends in the Senate are prepared to wage a vigorous battle in its behalf. Senator BANKHEAD, of Alabama, and Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, both members of the Senate Agricultural Committee, already have pledged their aid to the agency which has devoted itself to championing the cause of the poor farmer.

Yes, fortunately, the last word has not been spoken either on the Farm Security Administration or the Rural Electrification Administration.

Veterans' Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose any adjournment, or recess, of Congress until we straighten out the question of jurisdiction of veterans' legislation as between the various committees.

Today sticks are being thrown into the machinery which are injuring the disabled veterans. Bills are being introduced, for instance, bearing on insurance, which are referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means does not want that legislation, it should go to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. The Committee on Ways and Means would be in favor of the passage of the resolution that is now backed by by petition No. 8 on the Speaker's desk, to refer veterans' legislation to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. I hope every Member of Congress will sign that petition.

Let us settle this question now. This resolution is supported by the veterans organizations and it represents the best interests of the disabled veterans of this war. Let us stop this controversy.

If you do not want the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of which I am chairman to handle this legislation, say so; but let us stop this wrangling and get this matter straightened out and not let these veterans suffer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Most of the Members of the House who are veterans have signed this petition. I hope the other Members will sign it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial from the National Tribune, entitled "Committee Jurisdiction," which covers this proposition thoroughly.

It reads as follows:

COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

Needed legislation for war veterans and their dependents is being delayed in the House of Representatives by a difference in opinion over which committee should have jurisdiction. The fight broke out into the open last week when the chairmen of two House committees debated the question briefly. Elsewhere in this issue we are printing the colloquy because the time has come for the National Tribune to discuss the problem. The House is planning to take a 2 months' recess very soon and bills vital to men now being discharged from war service, as well as to veterans and dependents of earlier wars, are being stalemated. This jurisdiction issue must be settled.

Heretofore we have not stood up to be counted. We believed that the respective committee chairmen would reach an agreement or that the Rules Committee would decide for one or the other of the contestants. All signs now indicate a knock-down and drag-out battle which veterans can finish if they will. If they do not, no further legislation for veterans of this war and precious little for those of other wars will be enacted. Because action is essential, we have decided to choose sides. Both committee heads have done a great deal for servicemen and those they leave behind to be cared for by the Government. Both are our friends and veterans everywhere are grateful for their past efforts, but the existing situation is intolerable and a conclusion must be reached.

Let us first review the situation. The original pensions group of the House, formed in 1813, was the Invalid Pensions Committee, of which JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, is now chairman; he is contending for the right to oversee World War II legislation. As time passed other committees handling veterans' matters were established, among them the Pensions Committee, formed in 1880, which now controls only bills for the Spanish-American War period; Chairman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York, is not interested in the present controversy, but the committee fits into the whole picture. Bills relating to World War I benefits went to a half dozen committees until 1924 when the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was formed. Its chairman, JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, was a member from the first, its second chairman and has conducted its meetings for many years; he is also contending for jurisdiction of World War II legislation.

Existing House rules give LESINSKI jurisdiction over Civil War, Indian wars, and peacetime legislation, and RANKIN has supervision over World War I bills. For many years the LESINSKI group controlled Revolutionary War claims and Civil War pensions. After 1880 a change in House rules sent all other war-pension bills to the Pensions Committee, and private claims were distributed. World War I pension legislation went to the Pensions Committee. Adjustments became necessary, so, in 1939, the rules were again clarified. Civil War, Indian wars, and peacetime bills and private claims went to Invalid Pensions; Pensions kept only Spanish War bills; World War Veterans was assigned everything having to do with that war, including hospitalization for all wars.

That is how rules of the House were interpreted, and things went smoothly until 1941. Legislation covering the *Panay* incident of the Sino-Japanese War very properly came from Invalid Pensions because we were not at war with either Japan or China. When the *Reuben James* and *Greer* were attacked by the Nazis and peacetime conscription was in force, relief problems were considered by the same group. We were at peace.

As war approached, that committee very properly wrote a bill granting wartime rates to men injured in service simulating actual warfare and extending benefits in the event of war. That was in November 1941; no other group could have written such a bill because we were not at war. War came to complete action on the bill, both House and Senate passing it by December 15. It is Public Law 359, Seventy-seventh Congress.

On these events, Mr. LESINSKI makes his claim for jurisdiction. That Invalid Pensions was the first House committee of its kind is history, not argument, and it did not control the reference to his group of any World War I pension legislation. That a bill granting the first benefits to World War II veterans and dependents—not all benefits—came from his committee is not the precedent he claims; it is accident. The bill was prepared in peacetime and quickly voted in wartime because it was needed.

From December 12, 1941, both Mr. RANKIN and Mr. LESINSKI have been jockeying for the right to handle the new legislation, and lots of it will be introduced as time goes on. In both the last Congress and this one each has asked for changes in the House rules; action by the House of Representatives is required. The Rules Committee has held hearings but no decision has been reached. The Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion have sided with Mr. RANKIN and have asked their memberships to support the action. We agree that the World War Veterans' Committee should handle the new war veterans' legislation.

Most of it will be patterned after laws covering World War I. Almost exactly the same problems facing the new veterans and dependents followed the last war, and most members of the Rankin committee are thoroughly familiar with them. Their years of study will prompt simple modifications of existing statutes that originated in their midst. Those laws are complex, and intelligent action requires an intimate knowledge of their history and structure. Many thousands of veterans of the last war are serving in this one. Their younger comrades, not yet organized, look to them for leadership. It is logical sequence to follow through with the same group that has already had enacted almost identical measures. The Congress is fully disposed to follow this procedure, and the mere accident of rules that caused the initiation of one applicable law in another committee in time of emergency has no bearing.

There is, of course, the matter of political patronage involved. Assignments to the committee handling a coming mass of bills for the millions of veterans of this war will be sought after. So will the clerkships that are involved in this controversy, but this war was not even contemplated when the last rules giving jurisdiction were made. They do not apply at all to World War II.

As it is, maimed and shell-shocked men are being discharged to jails and poorhouses and are being returned to families unable to care for them. There is no rhyme or reason for playing politics with men disabled in war or with their needy widows and orphans. The veterans' organizations, experienced in such matters, have taken their stand. Every veteran of any war and every potential dependent must help them break this deadlock.

On the Speaker's desk is petition No. 8. It requires 218 signatures of House Members to bring the argument to the floor of the House for final action. So far it has only 119 signers. Write to your Congressman forthwith. Ask him to place his name on that petition if he has not already done so. This whole question must be settled right now, if any group of veterans or widows is to expect relief from this Congress.

We Are Now at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Post of June 6, 1943:

WE ARE NOW AT WAR

The concern which certain groups of our people are showing over the so-called plight of the Japanese interned for the duration, clearly is not the result of agitation on the part of the majority of Americans.

As far as the bulk of our citizens are interested, they feel that the Japs behind barbed wire in our western detention camps are much better off than the Americans in the jungles of Guadalcanal and the snow-mantled mountains of the Aleutians.

Even though the Japanese-Americans may be as loyal as other Americans, numbers of our people are not forgetting Pearl Harbor or the duplicity of the trusted, slant-eyed ambassadors.

The Japs in internment camps are well fed, well clothed, in fact, better off than a lot of Americans, particularly those in the northeast corner of our Nation who are bearing heavy rationing burdens. Maybe the Japs suffer from a loss of freedom of movement. But New Englanders, with gasoline curtailed and under orders to do no unnecessary traveling, are not exactly free as the birds.

This kindness which some of our Americans want to bear to the Japs is the pre-Pearl Harbor brand of sweetness and light that almost left us at the mercy of our oriental enemies. That it still persists, in the face of the execution of American airmen and the sinking of a hospital ship, indicates that Pearl Harbor and what has followed, taught some of us nothing.

One can understand the "goody-goodies" of our land being so bountiful to people of a race which has shown itself to be fundamentally barbarous. In a world in arms and at war to the death, they still believe that if you turn the other cheek, Tojo will not give you a crack on the jaw. The fact that these people are not sticking their jaws above any New Guinea foxholes may account for them still being so benevolent.

But when our Government gets concerned about these people and lets the National Youth Administration start to educate those detained for war work, the average man, with a son fighting in the Pacific, asks himself: "What is this? Is it the heat? Is it me? Who's wrong now?"

He might even go beyond that and ask: "What is the National Youth Administration and the 'goody-goodies' doing about the education or comfort of the children of our fighting men who died in the Pacific to prevent the Japs from invading America?"

Of course, the National Youth Administration can claim that it was just trying to help out the manpower shortage, training idle people to grind out weapons of war to destroy Japan. Such a defense might stand if an outstanding source of manpower in our Nation had not been overlooked, men who need no training, because they have long been experts.

For example, we have just completed a food conference, with world experts attending. Some 99 percent of Americans never heard of these experts, even the American ones. Yet Herbert Hoover, the greatest of all, was left out.

We have come to an impasse in oil. The task of solving it goes to Harold Ickes, who holds down a dozen other Government jobs and has proven that he is no oil expert. But Alf Landon, an oil man, for whom millions of Americans voted and in whom Americans have confidence as a practical man, is ignored.

Shipbuilding and ship manning is one of our greatest problems. Joseph P. Kennedy, outstanding as a shipbuilder and maritime director, sits idly by. Also idle are men of proven organizational caliber like Alfred E. Smith and James A. Farley, while the regimenting of the Nation is in the hands of college professors who still act as if they had a classroom of students, rather than a country of thoughtful and independent adults.

Our Government may have reasons for not making use of the talents of these men. But thoughtful and independent Americans think it should not use tax and bond money to train Japs. They feel that their dollars could be employed in a better way to defeat the fatherland of these Nipponese. This is no time for social experiments. We had a Pearl Harbor, and we are now at war.

Hearing of Congressional Food Study Committee at Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on last May 17 the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee held a most interesting and informative hearing in Philadelphia. Eleven members of the committee were present, including the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, chairman, and Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Distribution and Rationing of Food. Hearings continued all day and approximately 30 witnesses were heard or presented briefs. These witnesses included representatives of consumer groups, housewives, the fishing industry, wholesale and retail meat dealers, processors, wholesale and retail grocers, food brokers, poultrymen, bakers, confectioners, and representatives of trade and businessmen's associations.

Many witnesses testified to their gratification at being given an opportunity to inform the committee of the problems besetting them and a number of these witnesses expressed their full understanding and approval of the purpose for which the committee was formed; that is, as a study committee seeking information upon which to base recommendations for administrative and legislative improvements in matters touching the production, distribution, and consumption of food.

A regrettable feature of the hearing at Philadelphia should be brought to the attention of the House. A careful conspiracy was laid by certain unsavory elements, battened on the New Deal, who saw in the work of this committee threats of exposure of their activities. The Stern machine decided to prevent the hearing at all costs.

This self-constituted Philadelphia gestapo followed a now familiar pattern in seeking to prevent the holding of a full and free hearing. Timed carefully to appear in their New Deal newspaper, the stern "gestapo" instigated the delivery of certain speeches which were immediately published along with unfair and inaccurate editorial comment indicating that Members of Congress had no right whatever to invite the people of Philadelphia to attend a public hearing. This loud and indecent outcry continued for several days; the false charges were meanwhile duly ignored by the reputable newspapers of Philadelphia.

Wild and utterly untrue news was fabricated, including statements tending to indicate that the Food Study Committee had been appointed by me, that its purpose was merely to stir up the people of Philadelphia, that I was the chairman of the committee, and that I was holding the hearings without the approval of the Speaker—the particular implication here being that a minority study committee should have secured such approval; further charges were made that all of the members of the committee were imposters.

The unfortunate postmaster of Philadelphia found himself brought into the controversy by the Stern New Deal gestapo which by this time had lost complete sight of the guaranty in the Bill of Rights of the rights of free public assemblage and of petition for redress of grievances. This unholy gang, aided by sycophants and satellites without scruple, hauled in the postmaster of Philadelphia to clinch their plot for them.

The postmaster is an estimable gentleman, highly regarded as an individual, who found himself reluctantly involved in the middle of a plot to prevent the people of Philadelphia from reciting their grievances against the Stern New Deal "gestapo," who did not want public attention called to the difficulties connected with the rationing of food in Philadelphia or to the discrimination being practiced against Philadelphia citizens.

Permission had been granted by a Federal judge for the use—for the purpose of a public hearing—of a courtroom. This permission had been set down in writing by the Federal judge at the request of the postmaster and—I am reliably informed—had been approved by the postmaster. The Quaker City "gestapo" decided nevertheless to prevent the holding of the hearing.

They did not want Philadelphia housewives, working people, business-

men, to find out why they could not get food, which was available in other areas, and why they had to pay more for the food they did get. Like any gestapo, the Stern-Greenfield gang feared the truth. Their news organ loudly trumpeted that the hearing would not be held and that the postmaster would see that the permission was revoked.

Upon the committee's appearing for the purpose of holding the hearing it was found that the postmaster had finally given in to the gestapo gang, who aspire to complete control of the Philadelphia New Deal organization. Uniformed guards were posted at the doors, and permission was denied to members of the committee to enter the Federal courtroom, which room was available for use and had been set aside for the purpose by the Federal judge and which permission had never been revoked by him; nor had any word been sent by the postmaster or by the gestapo to the committee indicating any intention to revoke the permission granted, either by the Federal judge or by the postmaster.

Notwithstanding the fact that permanent offices in these Federal buildings are occupied by Democratic Members of Congress, the postmaster maintained his refusal to permit temporary use of the space, on the ground that the 11 Congressmen were Republicans, and therefore, in his view, did not appear to be entitled to recognition.

I telephoned him in the presence of a number of representatives of the press and asked whether he had received any instructions from the office of the Postmaster General upon which he based his action. He informed me that he had not, and that action was based upon articles he had read in the Stern paper and upon conversations with two Democratic Members of Congress, one of them an occupant of permanent office space in the same building. Incidentally, this same postmaster, upon the defeat of a Democratic Member of Congress who had occupied permanent space in the building, received and refused a request from his successor, a Republican Member of Congress, for the use of the same or equivalent space. I had never personally made any application to the postmaster for any space in the building, temporary or permanent, and was, therefore, much surprised to note the postmaster's unfortunate partisan attitude.

Members of parliament in Fascist-menaced countries of Europe, immediately prior to the war, frequently found it necessary to select alternative places of meeting when hounded out of their original selection of a meeting place. We, too, found that this was necessary in view of the operation of Philadelphia's budding gestapo; the committee, therefore, arranged to hold its hearings in the ballroom of a nearby hotel. Before doing so, it was discovered that the New Deal "gestapo" had caused notices to be given to every elevator operator in the Federal building that the Food Study Committee hearings were not going to be held at all anywhere, and witnesses were being steadily turned away at each entrance. Upon discovery of this, it was necessary to call upon friends to take positions at different parts of the building to counteract the activity of these Federal employees. Upon my vigorous insistence, the custodian of the building then personally corrected this falsehood, which had been mysteriously passed on to every elevator operator and doorman. The coincidence between the statements of the Federal employees and the information broadcast in the unreliable Stern news organ to the effect that the meeting would not be attended by any witnesses, if indeed it should be held at all, was too close to be a coincidence and was undoubtedly a part of the whole discreditable and shameful conspiracy.

The entire action of these gestapo imitators indicated early training in Germany and in German practices. It is, in fact, true that the principal instigator of the whole conspiracy was once a student at the University of Berlin and must have gotten his Prussian ideas there.

Now what were these conspirators so anxious to conceal? Can it be that some of their friends are interested in protecting the black market? Or, is it that their contempt for the people of Philadelphia is such that they did not think that Philadelphians can be trusted to learn the truth? Certainly their efforts failed miserably and the reputable newspapers of Philadelphia gave the widest possible publicity to the information furnished to the committee by the splendid witnesses who appeared. The plot, conceived in malice and perpetrated in violation of every decent American principle, failed miserably.

A very few people stayed away and some were approached the day of the meeting by representatives of the Gestapo, and asked not to testify. The representatives of hospitals and other public institutions were warned that their Federal aid might be in danger if they appeared, but to the everlasting credit of the people of Philadelphia, nearly all of the witnesses appeared in spite of threats, and the wide publicity attracted additional witnesses.

What, I ask, was it that the New Deal gestapo did not wish to have told?

Could it have been the testimony of two New Jersey witnesses that 10,000 fish per day were being dumped in one area of New Jersey because the ceiling price did not warrant marketing them?

Could it have been testimony as to the 100-percent increase in the cost of certain fish sold in the Philadelphia market?

Could it have been the testimony of a Delaware witness:

The rationing program has been the cause of making cheats, chiselers, and liars of most all businessmen. I say that knowingly. * * *

There was a time when a man was proud to be in business. He was proud to be an American. I think the average businessman feels that if this is America, then what is bolshevism and nazi-ism?

Congressman SCOTT. I think many of us have had some reason for concern on those lines—some of us recently.

Congressman ANDRESEN. According to what you have said, it seems to me that if a man in business wanted to be honest, he wouldn't stay in business very long.

Answer. He just can't.

One of the pinko columnists on the "gestapo gazette" airily dismissed this testimony with the comment that businessmen were "liars, cheats, and chiselers," anyway, and had not been changed by the rationing program. Such is the New Deal's estimate of the American businessman.

Could it have been the evidence of discrimination against Philadelphia in favor of nearby markets, as testified by a representative of the Wholesale Commission Merchants? Note his statements:

We have complained from the inception of the original price ceilings on potatoes and onions whereby competing markets in New York have been allowed—apparently with the sanction and blessings of the Office of Price Administration—to take a larger mark-up than we in Philadelphia have been allowed to take. * * * We are in a region in which the regional director is in New York and it has been a case of the local office—which I don't wish to criticize; who have done all in their power but their power is limited, even though Philadelphia is the third largest city in the United States—they must take these orders which originate in New York, and in most cases, we get them from 42 to 72 hours or a week later, which makes a big difference in the handling of perishable commodities.

So our main complaint, as receivers and buyers of the fruits and vegetables in the Philadelphia area is not that we disapprove of the idea of price ceilings. We do feel as though we are right in our claim that we should be in line with all markets, at least within our area.

We feel as though the city of Philadelphia, rather than work under these conditions, should, at least, have a regional director here, whereby a city of this size and type should have a chance to get rules first-handedly. This we have never been able to accomplish.

Congressman MILLER. I want to send you a regulation that authorizes the 21 percent without limiting it to the area.

Answer. We have not been able to enjoy it in Philadelphia.

Many people in Philadelphia believe, and I think with good reason, that the very people who sought to prevent a public hearing in Philadelphia are the same people who brought about the loss to Philadelphia of a regional office, because the Pennsylvania administrator was not sufficiently amenable to suggestions that appointments be made on the basis of political patronage primarily, and it was found that the regional administrator in New York would be more amenable to the sugegstions of the Philadelphia New Deal politicians. Evidence of this may be found in a letter to the regional administrator at New York from Russell H. Potter, giving the reasons for his resignation as acting district director of the O. P. A. This letter appears in the Appendix of the CONGESSIONAL RECORD on page A2865.

It may be that these apt pupils of Axis methods of suppression did not wish to let Philadelphians learn of the difficulties in obtaining prompt and adequate relief from O. P. A. As witness the testimony of Mr. George A. Casey, of the National Independent Meat Packers Association:

And Office of Price Administration—the trouble is they have assumed judicial powers not administrative powers, because the act

states—a memorandum that the President wrote and attached to the bill—your own bill—he said, "Anyone who wants a quick relief, if they make a petition to Office of Price Administration, substantiated by briefs, that Mr. Henderson, the Administrator, shall grant relief." "Failing to grant relief," the President said, "you have a speedy recovery; a speedy chance for adjustment of your troubles through the Emergency Court of Appeals." And there has never been a case yet before the Emergency Court of Appeals. And this just came in this morning where they deny our petition, and we cannot get into the court of appeals.

And you might tell your brother Congressmen that we took the back way and let them come in and confiscate our stuff, so we are going to be in the Court of Claims anyway.

Perhaps those who fought so hard to prevent witnesses from appearing feared such testimony as that of Charles H. von Tagen, representing the Pennsylvania Grocers Association, who said:

I would like to say first, Mr. Congressman, that the Pennsylvania Grocers Association, which I represent, was very happy to accept the invitation to attend this hearing, because we are and we shall be happy at any time anywhere to confer with either a Congressman or a group of Congressmen on any matters affecting food distribution in the State of Pennsylvania.

I want to say that we are not here under any misapprehension on the status of your committee, because I remember attending a luncheon meeting at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel on April 30, when you explained thoroughly the status of your committee.

Congressman SCOTT. Was there any question in the mind of any person there so far as you can ascertain that this was anything other than a Republican congressional food study committee?

Answer. Not that I know of, and if it is an unofficial committee, we hope to heavens that we can induce you to accomplish some of the things that we had hoped official committees would do before this, and they failed to accomplish.

It is evident that those who appeared before the committee were not under any misapprehension whatever as to the reason for its appearance in Philadelphia and its desire to be of service, constructively.

The New Deal "gestapo" evidently feared that the committee would receive and welcome constructive suggestions and that it would take steps to do something about the break-down in rationing. Such a constructive suggestion was received from Mr. von Tagen:

It is estimated that anywhere from 30,000 to 50,000 retail grocery stores have gone out of business since price control, rationing, and other governmental regulations became effective. As there are but 384,000 food stores in our country, it is not difficult to envisage the imminence of a complete break-down of the machinery of food distribution if the present pace of store closings continues.

We are now receiving reports that retail food stores are being closed by reason of their proprietors being drafted into the armed services. We recognize that in many instances this may be necessary, but we believe that the selective service law should be applied with more flexibility and with due recognition of the vital necessity to maintain our food distributive machinery.

In addition, the United States Employment Service in many instances has notified the proprietors of retail grocery stores that unless they close their stores and get into essential employment they will be drafted into the Army.

We know that the Employment Service has no authority either by law or otherwise to take such action, but unmistakable directives should be issued immediately prohibiting the practice, and if, as material received from our Government constantly sets forth, the maintenance of the home front, and principally that part of the home front which is engaged in war production, is essential to the maintenance of the fighting front, the business of food distribution should be immediately designated as an essential occupation.

Since rationing has become effective it has been impossible for food distributors to obtain sufficient foods in quite a few categories to supply the civilian occupation in accordance with the rationing regulations. Hence black market and other criminal conspiracies are interfering with orderly distribution.

And this:

Hence all branches of food distribution in the Philadelphia area and throughout the State of Pennsylvania are constantly in a state of flux, turmoil, and confusion, and there never will be an efficient administration of price control in the areas we have mentioned until a regional office is established in Philadelphia with sufficient autonomy to solve the problems arising in the area at first hand, subject, of course, to the jurisdiction of the Office of Price Administration in Washington and its action upon such of the more important problems that demand its attention.

Or was it the testimony of Mrs. Gustav Ketterer, chairman of the war service department, General Federation of Women's Clubs:

We are all fighting inflation, but sometimes the ceiling prices which have been set tend toward inflating the prices of certain articles * * *. The consumers do not want to see the small independent grocer put out of business. Can't some method be used so that he may be encouraged and able to still continue? We are in favor of the chain stores, undoubtedly, but also in favor of the little grocer.

As we depend to a large extent upon the farmer for our food, the consumer is interested in seeing that the farmer may continue to supply essential food products.

Another constructive suggestion was received from Mr. Charles Kingsland, representing the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council, who was asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN]:

Question. Do you think it would be feasible to set up a new food agency or put it into the Department of Agriculture to handle production, distribution, price, and rationing?

Answer. I certainly do. I recommend the Department of Agriculture above all. I do not claim to know too much about that part of it, but our relationships with them have always been good and always been instructive, and I don't feel that it should have been put anywhere else in the beginning.

This witness also testified that in his opinion 80 to 85 percent of all poultry in the area covered by his association is now sold through the black market.

Time does not permit the quotation of numerous other sound, carefully thought-out, constructive suggestions received from witnesses, but it should be mentioned that everyone who touched on the subject urged the establishment of a regional office at Philadelphia to avoid discrimination and inexcusable delays. A number of witnesses urged the establishment of a central administrative authority to control the entire food problem in all its phases.

Returning to the efforts to prevent the people's representatives from hearing the people of Philadelphia, some further report would seem to be in order. The postmaster, at my request, sent me a copy of the regulations under which he assigned temporary and permanent space in the Federal Building. In these regulations received from the postmaster it clearly appears that the 11 Members of Congress had every right to use temporary space in the building for holding hearings, and the regulations specifically state that the matter need not be taken up with the Post Office Department. A further letter from the postmaster, under date of May 28, graciously admits that I am a Government official and states that at any time the space is available he would gladly assign it to me. The postmaster's refusal seems to have been based not upon my status as a Government official but upon the fact that since I appeared in company with a number of other Members of Congress we were not, in his view, a congressional committee. In other words, as he now explains it, there seems to have been no objection to my holding the hearing individually, but the objection seems to have been to holding the hearing in company with other Members of Congress. While this does not make sense, it may have had some political reasoning behind it.

A letter from the Federal judge states that the postmaster advised him that, before giving his consent he, the postmaster, would have to take it up with certain officials in Washington. It will be recalled that the postmaster advised me that he had spoken to no one in Washington. The Federal judge goes on to say, "I explained that the Court had no desire to go officially over his head in the matter and I put the request for the use of the room in proper written form and he said he woud get in touch with Washington for its approval by long-distance phone so that there would be no embarrassment on Monday morning when you were scheduled to hold your hearing. Later, as you know, the whole matter took another turn and you know the rest."

By reference to the matter taking "another turn," the only inference is that pressure was put on the postmaster by J. David Stern's "gestapo," who desired not to avoid embarrassment but to create it, and it is significant that in spite of the assurance of the postmaster that request would be made for approval by long-distance telephone, the Postmaster later informed me that he did not make such a request, and not a word was said to me or to any member of the committee of any change of mind or of any decision to refuse the use of the admittedly available courtroom until the committee appeared at the time set for the hearing, to find uniformed guards posted in front of the doors.

In the matter of *In re Lyman* (55 Fed., p. 29) a New York court held that neither the Treasury nor the Post Office Departments had any authority whatsoever, as custodians, to interfere with the use of that part of a Federal building occupied by the Federal courts and that control over such space was under the Federal

courts and not in the postmaster or the Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Germantown Courier of May 27, a letter to the Germantown Courier under date of May 28, 1943, and an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer under date of June 5, 1943:

[From the Germantown Courier of May 27, 1943]

DONKEY SERENADE

It is too bad that Philadelphia Democrats, particularly certain vocal representatives of the party, find it occasionally necessary to launch into diatribes against the more innocent activities of the rival party. The way these boys laid it on much-beleaguered, hard-working Congressman HUGH SCOTT last week is a typical answer, and makes us all wonder if the Republicans are such a nice group of people that the opposition must scare up false, weak attacks of this nature in the absence of any real faults to criticize.

Though we have some definite Republican leanings ourselves, we hardly believe this true. Surely a little brain-cudgling would reveal some truly fundamental weaknesses in Republicanism more worthy of attack than the presence in the city of an all-Republican unofficial committee investigating the food situation. Regardless of who does it, we do feel that investigating the food situation is in itself a laudable activity.

Looking back a little further at the history of these recently recurring attacks of no importance, another aspect of the situation comes to the fore. Most of the attacks, you may have noted, have centered around Congressman SCOTT. Perhaps the Democratic situation is not merely a paucity of ideas about what's wrong with the Republicans. Perhaps, on the other hand, the Democrats have been forced to pay HUGH SCOTT the grudging compliment of their blows. No smart political organization—we grant the Democrats a degree of smartness—would waste its fury on the weak. It chooses to attack the strong, the focal point of a certain section's faith in the personnel of its party. If we may assume, from the nature and direction of their attacks, that the Democrats consider SCOTT a strong focus of Germantown and Philadelphia Republicanism, we concede the point. We would advise, however, against the futility and waste of such picayune cotton-stuffed clubbing that the Democrats have been dishing out.

Not being too familiar with the details of the internal situation, we hesitate to add this footnote But it seems true, on the surface of things, that Congressman SCOTT and his friends were not free from error themselves in their recent investigation here. The mistake they made was in establishing a partisan committee for the investigation of a nonpartisan situation. Democrats and Republicans both eat. And by failing to include Democrats on their committee—no matter how praiseworthy the committee's job may be—they left themselves open to Democratic pettifogging that took place.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1943.

GERMANTOWN COURIER,
Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: Your very fair editorial entitled "Donkey Serenade," in your issue of May 27 is very much appreciated and I am sure that the Food Study Committee will be glad to know that you took editorial notice of their work.

In expressing regret that the committee did not include members of both parties, it seems to me that your point was well taken, especially as the background incident to the composition of the committee was not explained in the published reports of the hearings.

On May 14 on the floor of the House, I publicly invited the Democratic Members of Congress from Philadelphia to sit with the committee and to take part in the examination of witnesses and in the committee's deliberations. I urged that they do so in the interest of a bipartisan investigation. At the same time, I challenged my Democratic colleagues from Philadelphia to join with me in introducing a resolution for the creation of an official committee, composed of members of both parties, to investigate the entire food problem. Neither invitation was accepted, which is regrettable. If you will refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4490, you will find the full text of my speech of May 14.

The Food Study Committee expects to continue its work in other cities, the next hearing being set for Minneapolis on June 1. It has received cordial cooperation from consumers' groups, trade associations, housewives, businessmen, and other groups wherever hearings have been held. A concrete result of its deliberations has been the introduction of the Jenkin's bill to consolidate all problems relating to food from production to consumption under a single administrative head. You may have noted the warm approval of this bill expressed by Walter Lippmann in his column of May 26.

The unfortunate discourtesy exhibited by the postmaster is, I am sure, a matter of regret to him since I have subsequently received from the postmaster a copy of the regulations concerning use of the Federal Building from which it clearly appears that his action in excluding 11 Members of Congress from the use of the building was in direct violation of these regulations. As to the political motives behind the attempt to break up the hearing or to destroy its effect, I shall have more to say on another occasion on the floor of the House. The Bill of Rights permits Americans to assemble peaceably and to petition for redress of grievances. The flagrant and inexcusable effort to set aside the Bill of Rights in Philadelphia (of all places) was contemptible. The little group who tried so desperately to perpetrate this wrong should not go unwhipped of justice.

Forgive me, if I have trespassed too long upon your time or space.

Cordially yours,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 5, 1943]

POLITICAL TERMITES IN THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

That Democratic politicians have been treating the Office of Price Administration as a grab-bag for jobs is hardly a secret. But the scandalous extent to which this agency has been turned into a giant dispensary of jobs for the faithful has only now been pictured in the explosive charges put out by the former district director of the Office of Price Administration in New York, Russell H. Potter.

Mr. Potter resigned after his displacement as director had been ordered by the Democratic bosses in New York. It is his blunt declaration that the conditions within the Office of Price Administration are "more insidious than the black market."

His testimony points to the conversion of the Office of Price Administration into another and bigger Work Projects Administration as a Government happy hunting ground for political spoilsmen. To say that an Office of Price Administration controlled by party bosses is worse than the black market is putting it lightly. The welfare of every man, woman, and child in the Nation is affected by this agency. If it spreads its administration of food rationing and price ceilings in the gutter of machine politics, it is betraying its trust and condemning itself as an unworthy instrument of government.

Mr. Potter is not chary with facts and figures. He says that Mike Kennedy, the head of Tammany Hall; Ed Flynn, leader of the Bronx; Frank Kelly, boss of Brooklyn; and Senator MEAD ganged up in ordering the regional administrator, Sylvan L. Joseph, to dismiss him to make room for a man of their own choice. He quotes Joseph as telling him that if he did not comply, the Office of Price Administration would not have the support of New York Congressmen when appropriations came up for a vote.

He tells of the incessant turmoil in the Office of Price Administration because of the demands for jobs by party leaders, and of the constant reminders given him as district director to "play ball" with certain Senators and Congressmen.

The maneuvering extended throughout the region, including Pennsylvania and Delaware. Mr. Potter recalls that Administrator Joseph complained of constant annoyance "because Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY insisted that his people be given jobs."

This is a noisome mess, and if the Office of Price Administration is not soon extricated from it, the consequences in mismanaged food and price problems and in the sacrifice of public confidence in the agency are bound to be appalling.

The Office of Price Administration is not the Work Projects Administration, no matter how some politicians and their stooges regard it. Food rationing and inflation resistance are not in the same class as leaf raking. Efficiency, not politics, must rule, or the whole program will collapse. The termites now eating it to dust must be driven out.

Meat Ration of Copper Miners at Butte, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress the serious situation which exists in Butte, Mont., because of the inadequate meat ration allowed to the copper miners there. I wish to assure my colleagues that this matter is of vital importance in connection with the conduct of the war. As a former Butte miner myself I feel I am in a position to speak for the men who work in these mines. I know it is extremely difficult for someone not acquainted with Butte to understand the real need for solid meat rations but I wish to assure the Members of the House that working underground at distances to 4,000 feet, as well as working under conditions of extreme heat and other disadvantages calls for an amount of energy which cannot be supplied by peanut butter and lettuce sandwiches, or other substitutes. The Butte miners are engaged in the hardest kind of manual labor and they need lots of meat to get the "rock in the box." The ration of

2 pounds of meat per week for these soldiers of production is wholly inadequate and as a result of this there is growing discontent and dissatisfaction among the men. I cannot too strongly urge that action to correct this situation be taken at once so that production for the war effort may not be impeded. These men require ample food and this is especially true of miners and craftsmen.

I have taken this matter up with the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Administrator of O. P. A.; Mr. John Madigan, head of the Meat Section, O. P. A.; Dr. Russell Wilder, Chief, Civilian Food Requirements Branch of the Food Distribution Administration; Dr. Roy F. Hendrickson, Director of Food Distribution Administration, and many others, but to date I have been unsuccessful in getting an additional meat allowance for the miners. I feel that some degree of differential rationing of meat can and should be worked out by the O. P. A. Surely if we can ration gas on an A, B, and C basis it appears logical that we could do the same with meat. We cannot depend too much on statements made by the experts of the National Research Council that alternate unrationed foods sufficiently high in protein are available and could be used in place of meat. It should be kept in mind by the Members of Congress and the administrators of O. P. A. that copper is the most important and most needed metal being mined at the present time. It is absolutely necessary that production be maintained at its present level and, if possible, increased, and to do this it will mean that the miners engaged in this dangerous and difficult occupation will have to be given the necessary amount of meat to supply them with the energy to carry on and to produce for our country.

I wish also to call the attention of the Congress to some of the hundreds of communications which I have received from my friends in Butte. I know many of these men and women personally, and I want to assure you that what they say is the truth:

More meat, please.

TONY R. NUGENT.

Can't mine copper on bread and water.

JOHN T. JOHNSON,
Butte, Mont.

More meat for more copper.

RAYMOND JOHNSON,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT.,
June 11, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We need more meat for the Butte miners.

Yours truly,

E. EDMUNSON,
Proprietor of Ed's Market.

More meat for my miners.

Mrs. GODBOUT.

BUTTE, MONT.,
June 11, 1943.

DEAR SIR: Not getting enough meat to work on; not enough red stamps.

R. O. SAUNDERS.

We can't work without more meat.

NICK GRMOLJEZ.

Can't eat just bread.

ELI BONORUCH.

BUTTE, MONT.,
June 10, 1943.

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD:

Please give this serious consideration. More meat needed for copper production. Cannot get work done on substitutes. Meat for hard manual labor; lettuce and peanuts for others.

MARY ORLICH.

We would please like to have more meat for my family.

ANJIE DAICICH,
Butte, Mont.

To Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD:

Do all in your power to get more meat for our Butte miners.

Thanking you in advance.

MAURICE J. KIELY,
Y. M. C. A., Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

HONORABLE SIR: Knowing Butte as you do, and the work of the Butte miners, no one needs to tell you a man working in the mines must have good food, especially meat, so we solicit your support in this drive to secure more meat for the heroes who work the mines.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. WM. MARTIN.

Less starch, more meat. Can't cut the buck on macaroni. I'm Irish, not an Italian or a vegetarian.

DENIS M. LYNCH,
Walkerville, Mont.

DEAR SIR: As I am one of the miners of Butte, Mont., I would be very grateful if our allowance of meat would be enlarged as we need it in the worst way.

FRANK DAVIS,
Walkerville, Mont.

DEAR MIKE: The copper miner has a big job to do in the war effort. Let's keep him in fighting condition by giving him the kind of food he is used to eating.

More meat—more copper production.

OSCAR HILLS,
International Representative,
M. M. & S. W., Butte, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Please allow us miners more meat. I am losing weight.

Yours,

EMIL HERMANSON.

DEAR SIR: Please use your efforts to get us some more meat.

NICK HUBBER,
Butte Miners Union.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

DEAR MIKE: No meat in the house. Please do your stuff.

Yours,

KYLE PUGH.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 11, 1943.*

We need more meat to stand the work in the mines. A miner needs plenty of meat daily.

AL BUCKMAN.

As a wife of a miner I know the miners need more meat.

Mrs. GEORGE SWIFT,
Butte, Mont.

In order to avoid absenteeism in the Butte mines, it is necessary that the Butte miners have more meat.

Respectfully,

GEO. SWIFT,
Butte.

Please do all you can to give our miners more meat. I know it is a necessity.

Mrs. ED. MOLTHEN.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 11, 1943.*

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Butte's miners need increased rations of meat to stay at their jobs.

Copper production is vital to the war effort. Surely the Office of Price Administration can devise a method for allowing Butte's copper miners the privileges accorded other miners and thus aid the production of a vital mineral.

Respectfully,

M. BAXTER LARSON.

DEAR SIR: I am getting just half enough meat and pay one-third more for it.

Round steak was 8 points. Now it is 12 points per pound.

EMIL CHRISTOFFERSON,
Butte, Mont.

We want more meat for copper production.

WALTER PRATT.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: If they want more copper mined in the Butte mines, they will have to give the Butte miner a lot more meat. The boys on the battle front need something to fight with, and the Butte miner has a big responsibility. Give us more meat.

P. MCSHANE,
Butte, Mont.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: We would like you to do all you can regarding of getting more meat for the miners. If we wish to get an all-out production, then it is necessary that we have the proper food.

Sincerely yours,

THEO. MURRAY.

CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: I am the wife of a miner and think you should put forth all the effort you can to procure more meat for the miners.

Mrs. MAY BRUNELL,
Walkerville, Mont.

DEAR SIR: As I am one of the miners of Butte I would be very grateful if you would do all you could to increase the meat allowance for Butte miners.

AL DAVIS,
Butte, Mont.

DEAR MIKE: Let's have more meat for the miner. The more meat, more copper.

Yours truly,

HENRY REED.

BUTTE, MONT.,
June 10, 1943.

Representative MANSFIELD,
Washington.

DEAR SIR: I am sending this request that you do whatever you can to obtain more meat for the copper miners of Butte, as my husband is one. It is very hard work, and they need all the meat they can get.

Mrs. H. M. VOSS.

More meat for the miners.

Mrs. M. SLOGAR.

I don't think the miners are getting enough meat.

A WELL WISHER.

More meat for the miners.
Mrs. E. LAUSEN.

More meat for the miners.
Mrs. CHAS. LAUSEN.

Meat goes good with bread.
ANTON BANEVICH.

Subsidies

REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that some time next week the so-called Commodity Credit Corporation bill, H. R. 2869, will be considered by the House. I call attention to section 6 of that bill which proposes to prevent subsidies being paid for the purpose of stabilizing prices to the ultimate consumer. I am placing in the RECORD today a proposed amendment which will strengthen that language and make more definite the intent of Congress in respect to subsidies.

I think it is rather deplorable that we have not given more consideration to the fact that subsidies for the purpose of stabilizing and maintaining prices is probably the most inflationary action which could be taken. I hope you will read this amendment which has been agreed upon by many Members of Congress, in the light of the controversy about subsidies, and in anticipation of it being offered as a substitute for section 6 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, H. R. 2869.

SUBSTITUTE FOR SECTION 5 OF S. 1108

SEC. —. Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments, other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payments on June 15, 1943: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use. The definition of the term "person" in section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

SUESTITUTE FOR SECTIONS 6 AND 7 OF H. R. 2869

SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Price Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to make such modifications of a maximum price or prices established on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, as may be determined to be necessary to secure adequate production of such commodity for war purposes.

Pittsburg County (Okla.) Bar Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburg County (Okla.) Bar Association has taken full cognizance of the shameful defiance of the leaders of organized labor in calling strikes during the most devastating global war in history. This association of lawyers in the largest city in the Third Congressional district, assembled together at a regular meeting and passed a resolution that fully reflects their stand against strikes and all other labor interferences.

McAlester, the county seat of Pittsburg County, Okla., and it so happens is the center of the great southeastern Oklahoma coal field, and many of these lawyers' clients are coal miners, but the time with them is ripe to assert themselves against the atrocities of strikes during this war. Many of the lawyers of the Pittsburg County Bar Association answered the call of their country just when conditions began to get tense with the Axis Powers and enlisted in the armed forces—long before Pearl Harbor—but their compeers at home are backing up those that entered the armed forces with their works and patriotism. They have rightly pledged themselves to relegate to private life public officials who do not do their duty in bringing to a close these acts nothing short of treason.

We know of no group of men better equipped to sense a wrong than the legal profession. Many a time during the dark hours of this country there has arisen from their ranks one who has brought us out of chaos, and when they meet in agreement and pledge themselves to such a resolution as did our forefathers in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence the country indeed has a more promising silver lining.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to you these distinguished lawyers that will measure in talent with those in any part of the country and their own resolution bespeaks for their patriotism and determination.

I still have faith that this Congress will redeem this Republic and render unto everyone his just due.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Bar Association of Pittsburg County, Okla., realizing the danger that besets us as a Nation and that especially endangers the lives of our boys in the armed service on land, in the air, and on the waters of the seven seas—because of the shameful conditions that hamper our war efforts through strikes; and

Whereas we feel that those who promote them and participate in them are guilty of nothing less than treason and are traitors to the memory of those who have died, and those who are willing yet to die, to save the country they love from those who would destroy it; and

Whereas we feel that John L. Lewis and his associates are clothed with infamy of deeper dye than blackens the memory of Benedict Arnold, and a guilt greater than him who is condemned to die because he offered aid and comfort to our enemy and his fellow countrymen: therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bar Association of Pittsburg County, Okla., demand of our Congressmen and Senators and those in authority, that immediate steps be taken to prosecute and suppress the treason now endangering us and to place organizations that have the power to make this condition possible, under the strictest ban of civil and criminal law; subjecting them to the same inquisitorial and visitorial powers that now surround corporations or other like bodies; and be it further

Resolved, That we each pledge ourselves to devote all of our individual energies to relegate to the obscurity of a shameful oblivion, any public servant who, because of political cowardice, is unwilling to urge and support legislation or judicial action, that will end this condition that fills us with shame and humiliation, or that is willing to allow to exist conditions permitting the necrotic egotism or the paranoiac illusions of grandeur possessing any man or set of men to feed upon the dangers and wounds and lives of the youth of our land; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to our local papers, the Daily Oklahoman and the Tulsa World, with request for their publication; and that copies further be sent to our representatives in the Senate and the Congress of the United States.

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the people I represent are threatened with additional gasoline rationing. If this additional sacrifice is necessary for the war effort, I am sure my people are

ready and willing, but we want to know the facts. We will protest, however, if the facts show that we of the Midwest are going to be penalized because a few Eastern States cannot get all they want—a situation dependent a great deal upon transportation, and not upon a lack of gasoline.

If it will help win the war and save the life of one single member of our fighting units, my people are willing to walk to work. If gasoline being used in my district can be shipped elsewhere and used to better advantage, we will applaud the regulations designed to secure that result. However, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to agree to any program which will subject my people to additional hardship, additional inconvenience in order to make eastern motorists feel better.

What we want, Mr. Speaker, is a decision based on sound economic and military considerations and not on politics.

Gas Rationing in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent of the House I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. George A. Kuhn, president of the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce, in regard to the proposal to place additional restrictions on the rationing of gasoline in Indiana. The Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce is a live and influential organization, composed of the leading businessmen of our city and State, and Mr. Kuhn, its president, is very eminent and outstanding in our business community. Mr. Kuhn's letter expresses, I think, the sentiments of just about 100 percent of our people in regard to reduced gasoline rationing. The citizens of Indiana have genuine sympathy for the people of our eastern seaboard, but with transportation difficulties and other obstacles preventing the transportation of gasoline to the East our people cannot see any reason or justice in reducing gasoline allowances for the Midwest. Such a denial to our citizens without any possibility of commensurate benefits to the East would be deeply resented. Mr. Kuhn's letter is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Indianapolis, June 14, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: By action of our board of directors, we desire to be placed on record as opposing any reduction in gasoline ration allowances for the Midwest, unless it is needed on account of military requirements.

The impression prevails in the Midwest that it is being proposed by some eastern interests, primarily because they have been placed under such restrictions. Much as we sympathize with them, we do not believe that any crippling of transportation in the Middle West would be of any benefit to them, unless it actually increased gasoline supplies for them. It seems highly doubtful to us that it would or could do so. Some of those in the East probably need to know that Middle West urban industrial centers do not have the extensive public transportation facilities that prevail in the East. We are much more dependent upon private transportation to keep the wheels of industry and commerce operating than is true in the East.

One point, however, has not been made clear to us. There have been some vague and general statements as to military requirements for gasoline. On this, we wish to make it very clear that if further reductions in the Middle West are needed to send just one more bomber over enemy territory, then we would accept the reduction gladly. We think, however, if such is the fact, we would be entitled to be told so by responsible military leaders, so that we could know that it was not just a part of some governmental department's propaganda to put over a program in another interest.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. KUHN,
President.

The Voice of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of today:

THE VOICE OF CONGRESS

After studying all of the plans introduced in both branches of Congress on the subject of the post-war foreign policy of the United States, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives decided yesterday in favor of a one-sentence resolution offered by a freshman Representative from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT. The resolution says:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

We congratulate the committee on its decision. The resolution which it has adopted seems to us to be ideal for the purposes for which it has been offered. It is brief. It is clear. It says what needs to be said at this time. It does not attempt to tie the hands of the Senate so far as any details of the forthcoming peace are concerned. It leaves the Senate the freedom of action to which it is entitled under the Constitution. At the same time, it tells the world that the United States recognizes and accepts responsibility for helping to prevent the outbreak of another war. In saying this, it goes straight to the main point—namely, the organization of peace on the basis of adequate power to enforce peace, with the United States sharing both in supplying that power and in exercising responsibility for its use.

This is the essential point on which our allies have been waiting for the voice of the American Congress to be heard. For the great and still unanswered question in the councils of the United Nations, the question which has hovered like a ghost in the background of every decision that is made from day to day, has been the question whether 1918 will repeat itself; whether the United States, having helped once more to win a war for the defense of civilization, will return again to isolation when this war is ended; or whether, this time, the United States will accept and fulfill the responsibilities which fall logically to it as a great world power.

In the answer given to that question every one of the nations now fighting at our side has a direct and inescapable interest. This is the question of which the Russians are thinking when they weigh in their minds which is the safer course for them to follow: Put their faith in a new system of international security or go their own way, relying on the acquisition of new territory to protect their western front. This is the question of which the British are thinking when they consider the two alternatives of counting on American assistance or of creating some new version of the old balance of power on the Continent. This is a question which will deeply concern the Fourth French Republic.

It is of paramount interest to the small nations of Europe, which have paid the full price of the failure to organize peace. It is a question of profound importance to our allies, the Chinese, as they look across a narrow sea toward Japan. It is of direct and major interest to our close neighbors in Latin America.

The resolution to which the Foreign Affairs Committee gave its approval yesterday would speak in the name of Congress, and, because of the very fact that it spoke in the name of Congress, would go far to resolve any doubts in the minds of our allies concerning the part that the United States will play in the post-war world. It is a cause for deep satisfaction that the resolution is supported by a unanimous committee, Democrats and Republicans alike. If it is adopted now by both branches of Congress with the overwhelming support of both parties the effect will be important. An action of this kind, taken now, would strengthen the ties that bind the United Nations. It would help both to shorten the war and to win a better peace.

Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today, with considerable pride, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that one of the great commanders of this war is a native of my home town. Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons was born and reared in Huntington, W. Va. His forebears came to that great section of the Ohio Valley shortly after the Civil War and made an important contribution to the development of that section of our State.

General Emmons was placed in command of the Department of Hawaii 10 days after the Japanese attack on Pearl

Harbor. In 17 months he has directed the building of defenses costing millions of dollars. He was recently decorated with the D. S. M. and it is rumored he will be placed in command of the western defense and Fourth Army. If that is true, I want to say to my colleagues of the west coast that you will have to guard your safety a West Virginian and a great soldier.

I submit an editorial by Clyde A. Wellman, editor of the Huntington Advertiser:

FELLOW TOWNSMAN, GENERAL EMMONS

Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, who has just been relieved of his command of the Hawaiian department of the Army for another important military assignment, is Huntington-born and Huntington-bred.

Huntington is proud of the brilliant and distinguished record he has made in fortifying the Hawaiian Islands and restoring order out of chaos after the shattering surprise raid the Japanese made on the great Pacific bastion on that tragic December 7, 1941.

Huntington rejoices that in recognition of his meritorious services in directing the defenses of the strategic island base the President of the United States has seen fit to bestow upon him the Distinguished Service Medal as a mark of appreciation of a grateful Nation for a job well done.

Wherever military duty calls him after his exceptional performance in the Hawaiians, we are confident he will continue to distinguish himself as an able, aggressive, and understanding leader of America's armed forces and rise in the affection and esteem of his countrymen.

The Advertiser salutes General Emmons as Huntington's most distinguished and illustrious son and wishes for him the fullest measure of success and opportunity in the progress of his military career. It is a proud distinction for Huntingtonians to be the fellow townsmen—many of them boyhood chums—of one who ranks among the world's outstanding military leaders of this day.

The Hand of Paralysis Grips Our Oil Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has exulted of late at the steady gains our fighting men are making in the several zones of combat. Our pride in their achievements is great and we know that whatever measure of high courage and resourcefulness may be demanded, it will be displayed in full keeping with the finest traditions of this great country of ours.

At the same time we, at home, are losing a battle; yes, more than a battle, an entire campaign. I have taken the occasion several times to direct attention to our failing ability to produce the crude petroleum which we now demand and which we will continue to demand in that period when this war will have ended and we shall be faced with the post-war readjustment and restoration of our entire economy.

We are losing that campaign for production because some in positions of emergency control have ignored facts. Intent upon their pursuit of a theory of price control, demonstrably paralyzing in its effects upon production—of petroleum as well as of other critical commodities, including our daily bread—these authorities have allowed an economic condition in the crude oil producing industry to grow steadily worse. I have no way of accounting for such willful disregard of vital necessities.

I recall that Mr. Leon Henderson, in his first report to the Congress, dated April 30, 1942, stated that:

At the time the defense program was launched the petroleum industry was depressed.

Note that he said that the depressed condition existed at the time the defense program was started, away back in the early part of 1940.

There has since been no correction of that depressed condition.

The Petroleum Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has heard much testimony on petroleum in recent months. Its latest hearings were completed in May. In the face of the testimony that was given then, by numerous men in the petroleum industry, by State officials who are close to the problem of keeping our oil production adequate to the needs, by men in Government charged with the responsibility of supply for Army and Navy, it is difficult to understand the seeming complacency with which Mr. Prentiss Brown dismissed on May 1 the petition of Petroleum Administrator Ickes. Mr. Ickes had found, on the basis of investigations made by his own staff that a serious situation existed. Mr. Brown seemed to believe that everything was well on the petroleum front and any little thing that might be wrong could easily be fixed with a subsidy or with some scheme yet to be devised. Any way would do except the straightforward way of increasing the price of crude oil—a simple, self-administering method that has always worked to stimulate production.

There are those who plead extenuating circumstances for Mr. Brown. I will not deny the difficulty of the job he undertook when he succeeded Mr. Henderson. But he is still following the advice of the people who guided Mr. Henderson. A few of the names are different, but you may have noted that each time a professor of economics drops out over there, another of the same profession cames in. The successor, judging from results, takes up the philosophy of the one he succeeds. So, the same policy continues. It is a policy that takes no account of the needs of the Nation and it is a policy of inertia and stagnation.

Mr. Brown's acquaintance with what is wrong in the oil industry would be greatly enhanced if he would merely spend a little time with some of the oil producers of his home State of Michigan. I fear that he has paid them no heed, if he knows them at all. I have had occasion, as a member of the petroleum subcommittee, to go rather fully into conditions in Michigan as well as those of all the other oil-producing States. The trouble is the same everywhere. It cannot be cured by trifling nickel and dime adjustments, affecting a few hundred barrels of oil, such as the O. P. A. has granted in a few instances and to which some of their spokesmen have pointed as evidence that they have been keenly alert to conditions.

The longer this condition endures, the greater will be the shock when the day comes for the oil famine on a national scale. The Petroleum Administrator has aptly pointed out—he has said it in his letter of April 7 to Mr. Prentiss Brown—that a reasonable price increase now that will put the oil producers to work finding new fields and improving the productive efficiency of existing ones, will avert the necessity of a huge increase in prices of crude oil and refined products later.

The O. P. A. has cited as basis for its stubbornness—that is my word for it—on crude-oil prices the fact that earnings of oil companies have been at satisfactory levels. It had before it only the earnings records of a few companies—those who have listings on stock exchanges and who are engaged in all phases of the business. As you, Mr. Speaker, so ably pointed out on April 12, when you addressed the House on this question, the large integrated company has 4 principal ways of making money. It can sell crude oil which it produces, earn money by transporting oil and products, refine the crude oil, and sell the products. The producer of oil, confined to that one field—and there are upward of 20,000 of them compared to some 20 of the large integrated companies—the producer has only 1 source of income. That is from the crude oil he produces.

Much has been said about the "stripper" wells of the Nation. That term is, I believe, fairly well understood. It refers to those wells which produce in such small volume that they are either at the break-even point in the relationship of cost to income, or are in the stage where part of the income is used to buy the red ink with which the accounts are kept. The O. P. A. seems to view the situation of these wells as one that constitutes no especial problem, and, indeed, there appears in their statements the implication that it makes no great difference whether such wells are abandoned or not.

Well, let us take a look at them. We have a recent factual statement about them. It was compiled by the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, an organization of petroleum-producing States whose purpose is to promote conservation of oil and gas, and cooperating in the survey of stripper wells was the National Stripper Well Association, whose purpose, broadly, is to try to keep alive this important segment of the Nation's petroleum resources.

The stripper wells of the country in 1942 produced nearly 15 percent of all the crude petroleum that was produced. Is that important? Think for a moment about what it would mean to try

to get along without that 15 percent right now.

In number, there were 293,000 of these stripper wells at the close of 1942, nearly three-fourths of all the wells in the United States. They produced 203,000,000 barrels. That is on an annual basis roughly one-third as much oil as it is expected to be supplied to the Eastern States when the program of increasing transportation methods shall have been completed. Is that amount of oil important?

These wells, though, represented something far greater than the daily amounts they produced in 1942. Underneath them, still to be produced, are many hundreds of millions of barrels of crude oil. The estimate of the authorities who made the survey was that the total reserves underneath these small wells was nearly 4,000,000,000 barrels. That is something near the equivalent of three times the amount the United States produced last year.

But, last year 10,500 of these stripper wells were abandoned. Why? Because they were losing money and the outlook was so discouraging that the owners preferred to sell off the equipment. It brought anywhere from $250 to $4,000 per well, depending upon the depth and the amount of steel and other material that could be salvaged. These wells were industrial soldiers that died because of an economic theory. That theory was that we can go on rationing in ever-smaller quantities and get along with what we had on hand when we went into war. Fortunately, that theory has not been applied to the military needs. If it had been, our soldiers would be trying to walk to Kiska to capture it by throwing rocks.

When the operators junked these 10,500 stripper wells last year, they went away and left 44,000,000 barrels of reserves behind. It is still in the sands and there it will stay forever. It will never be worth while to drill new wells to recover this oil.

It may be worth mentioning that the stripper wells of the Nation use the services of 52,000 workers and that the pay roll for 1942 for the persons engaged in operating stripper wells was in excess of $93,000,000.

I have dwelt at some length on this stripper-well question because the O. P. A. has attempted to treat them as of no importance. They are a part of the whole question of supply. Other parts are the discovery of new fields, the drilling of new wells in existing fields, the installation of methods of stimulating the production of the stripper-well fields, and the maintenance, in full and effective measure, of all the oil wells of the Nation. We will need all these things. We are not getting them. Drilling has declined away below what it was last year and last year was much below the previous year.

We had a backlog of producing capacity when we entered the war. We are burning it up rapidly. We are at an all-time high in production and soon we will start the decline in capacity to produce. We are holding the present rate of production at the expense of the future, for waste is being committed in some areas by flowing wells at a rate far beyond that which the operators and the engineers know is safe. The effect will appear—it is already appearing—in the form of quick exhaustion of pressure in the sands, encroachment of salt water into the producing formations, and a tremenodus addition to the number of stripper wells with serious falling off of the present daily supply of oil. For a quarter century, the industry, State and Federal Governments, have worked to create an effective conservation program. The attitude of one bureau is bringing a destruction of that program.

The producing industry is today more depressed than Mr. Henderson said it was back in 1940. It has been subject to the same economic forces that have advanced the cost of living, the prices of all commodities except crude oil, the sharp rise in operating expenses and the vast increase in taxes. The only factor that has stood still for the oil producer was income and that only in a relative sense, for generally most oil producers have lost in volume and total dollars taken in.

The result is that the producer is retiring from the field, defeated. He cannot pay out more than he takes in. So the large companies buy his best properties, he junks his stripper wells, and he turns to ranching or farming.

Is it to be a consequence of this bureau fiat that, in addition to a shortage of oil, monopoly is to be established? The statement has been made by the Petroleum Administrator that 2 years ago 20 companies owned 60 percent of the oil business and that the same 20 now own 70 percent. The producer who sells is not putting his money back into the search for new oil fields. He sells because he is discouraged and that discouragement immobilizes him in the war effort he is best fitted to exert.

A few days ago an informal committee of the House and Senate, representing the 12 States and the District of Columbia that are most greatly affected by the gasoline shortage, held some meetings. In the course of questioning a representative of O. P. A., they confirmed a point in the rationing policy of which they had heard. It was admitted that it is one of the rules that a man can get gasoline to drive to his summer home—where he owns one—for the purpose of closing that home. He must not stay there, though. He cannot drive there and use the place during the summer. He must drive there to close something that has not been opened, and return at once, thus taking all the gasoline allotment at once from the meager supply, instead of taking out half now and half 2 or 3 months from now.

The policy that has been followed on petroleum prices is as unrealistic as that bit of absurdity I have just recited. It has for 2 years been a policy that has ignored facts and national necessities. Even Administrator Ickes, who is by nature a calm, restrained man, indulged in a small outburst before that voluntary committee of the House when he said that we had been going along on this oil situation like "a lot of cheerfully ignorant children."

It is a policy that has ignored the fact that every barrel of oil that is leaving the wells today does so at less than the cost of replacing it through discovery.

It is a policy that has taken no account of the fact that with relation to other commodities, based upon the 1926 index as 100, crude oil is 62.2, all commodities are 104, bituminous coal is 120, labor cost is 170, and so on through the long list; petroleum has been stationary in the face of advances all along the line.

It is a policy that has ignored the alarmingly low rate of discovery of new fields; the rapid depletion of known reserves; the abandonment of stripper well reserves; the discontinuance of effort to stimulate production from the old fields through tried and proven methods.

It is a policy that has been intent only upon preventing the user of gasoline from paying slightly more, ignoring entirely the fact that such user wants gasoline and will cheerfully pay more for it, just as he is willing to pay more for his food, which he has done, just so he gets the food and the increase in cost is not excessive.

It is, in short, a policy that has put the oil producer into a Chinese boot and, apparently, that boot was made for the oil producer alone.

If the day comes that the spotlight of public wrath is turned upon the petroleum supply situation, I do not want it directed at the producer of oil, nor at the Congress. Both have done their best to correct the crude-oil price freeze; it has also been a freezing of productive effort.

But, Mr. Speaker, we must not wait for that day of public wrath. All the evidence that could possibly be summoned has been presented to the agency which has been given the power to retard or to stimulate production. That agency prefers to remain serenely inert.

The Congress is conscious of the necessities. It is conscious of its own responsibilities. It cannot refrain much longer from taking this petroleum situation into its own hands and repairing, belatedly, the damage that has been done. The inflexibility of bureau edict cannot be permitted to diminish further our fast disappearing capacity to produce.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a number of telegrams and communications I have received from various educational institutions throughout the country favoring the continuation of the N. Y. A.

In my estimation the National Youth Administration has been most beneficial and helpful to the youth of our country.

I am, therefore, heartily in favor of its continuation.

ELMIRA, N. Y., *June 15, 1943.*

JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge adoption National Youth Administration student program for next year. Extremely desirable in my opinion.

E. LUCILLE LYON,
Assistant Dean, Elmira College.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
Syracuse, N. Y., June 14, 1943.

The Honorable JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: The National Youth Administration is needed for students whose families are paying higher taxes and increased living costs, with no increase in salary.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. W. E. ALLIS,
Director.

NEW YORK STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Cortland, N. Y., May 4, 1943.

Mr. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: I am writing to you to express our need of continued Federal funds to aid a portion of our students to work their way through teachers college in preparation for teaching service.

All students admitted to our State teachers' college are selected on a competitive basis. We have found that approximately 10 percent of these capable students cannot go through college without help from outside their homes. Their college schedules of work are too heavy to permit many of them to go into the community for work, if such work can be found. Work which these students can be given on the college campus or near the college has the advantages of conserving the time of the students, providing increased professional experience for the student, and giving the college and service institutions of the community needed services which they otherwise could not have. Our National Youth Administration students earn their money and they have a wholesome appreciative attitude for having professional types of work provided for them.

It is my conviction that the National Youth Administration service should be continued, and we shall be grateful if you will lend your support to this needed legislation.

Very truly yours,

H. DEWITT DEGROAT,
President.

CANISIUS COLLEGE,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 14, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
Member, Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: As president of Canisius College, I write to ask you if you will do what you can to insure the continuation of the college work program of the National Youth Administration. Here at Canisius we find that some students are still in need of financial aid, and their only prospect of continuing their college career is the college-work program.

May I ask that you, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, do what you can to continue the college-work program for the coming year of 1943–44?

Very truly yours,

(Rev.) TIMOTHY J. COUGHLIN, S. J.,
President, Canisius College.

LORAS COLLEGE,
Dubuque, Iowa, June 14, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that the Committee on Appropriations might possibly discontinue direct aid to students through such agencies as the National Youth Administration.

We believe that direct aid to the student has been a fine way of equalizing opportunities and that it is more democratic to give it this way than through aid to designated institutions.

This college wants to go on record as being in favor of the assistance to individual students.

Yours very truly,

M. J. MARTIN.

SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE,
Bronxville, N. Y., June 1, 1943.

The Honorable JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FITZPATRICK: As the representative at Sarah Lawrence College in charge of administering the funds of the National Youth Administration, I should like to ask you to consider carefully the question of continuing grants of money to colleges for needy students.

It seems to me very important that nothing interfere with the training of able students who will be able to contribute their services in handling the many problems arising out of the war.

The students on our campus who were under National Youth Administration were all intelligent, serious girls consciously preparing themselves to be as useful as possible after they left college. I am sure that the type of students in all colleges concerned are of this kind, and it would be a great pity if, through lack of funds, they were forced to leave school and lose the opportunity of fitting themselves for the most worth-while role in the post-war world.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE M. BOVARD.
Director of Admissions.

HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION,
New York City, June 4, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House Committee on Appropriations,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Present information indicates that the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, now holding hearings on National Youth Administration, may not include in its recommendations any budgetary provisions for the continuance of the in-school program of the National Youth Administration in high schools. Will you permit me as chairman of the high-school advisory council for the New York City and Long Island area to submit the following results of a survey made during the past 10 days. The figures referred to are from 157 high schools in this area.

Number of students needing National Youth Administration aid in school year:

Sept. 1940–June 1941	14,302
Sept. 1941–June 1942	9,578
Sept. 1942–June 1943	3,025

Please note that these figures apply on the basis of 16 years as the minimum age for eligibility for National Youth Administration assistance. If students 15 years old were eligible, the number would be more than twice the 3,025 now receiving this assistance.

I am authorized to tell you that it is the practically unanimous conviction of the principals of these high schools that this provision should not be terminated at this time. Let me emphasize that I am pleading for the in-school program, the purpose of which is to enable poor children to get a high-school education. The administration of this program here has been intelligent, honest, and economical. We all know that the post-war need will be greater than now. Therefore, we urge, in the name of the democratic preservation of educational opportunity, that you recommend budgetary provision at least for the maintenance of the present much reduced organization so that it may serve the present need and be in position to help after the war.

The high-school principals in this area will be most grateful for an indication of your attitude toward this petition.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. LOUGHRAN,
President.

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY,
Brooklyn, N. Y., May 19, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FITZPATRICK: I have watched with interest and concern the progress of the National Youth Administration during the last 2 years. The value of the college-work program is to me most manifest and the suggestion that this assistance to needy and worthy students might be withdrawn is very disappointing.

However, I was pleased to learn of the proposal of the National College Work Council of the National Youth Administration to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission on the war training and work program for college students for 1943–44.

According to a recent survey St. John's University, of Brooklyn, N. Y., has found that without the aid of the National Youth Administration many students would be unable to continue their scholastic studies. The college-work program has enabled many of our students to attain technical knowledge which will relieve certain fields in which there is a shortage of trained workers.

I am convinced that the continuation of the work program of the National Youth Administration will work only for the general interests of the country at large.

We sincerely hope and trust that the proposal of the council may become a part of the training plan of the War Manpower Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. MAHONEY, C. M.,
President.

NEW YORK STATE INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Cobleskill, N. Y., May 4, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has been brought to my attention that a bill is being considered to continue National Youth Administration aid to students in college for the school year 1943–44. I believe this aid to students will be extremely vital to us next year. In view of the fact that this school is an agricultural and home economics technical institute, our graduates, at the present time especially, fill important places in those critical fields.

In this area we must compete for students with many industries which pay high wages to their employees. We believe training in agricultural production, training in management of institutions where food is planned for, prepared, and served, and training for the care of children in nursery schools, are all vital in peacetime but more especially in wartime. This school trains for these vocations.

However, we are not able to compete on even terms with most other training programs, because the financial returns to our graduates, particularly in wartime, are not as great as in many industries. If prospective students see that the public places enough importance on the training for these vocations to give financial aid and encouragement to the boys and girls while they are being trained, we will be better able to provide trained persons for these vital vocations.

I solicit your objective consideration of this proposed measure.

Very truly yours,

E. D. DAY,
Acting Director.

Post-War Rubber Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of June 16, 1943:

JEFFERS URGES RUBBER POLICY TO BENEFIT UNITED STATES—WARNS AGAINST RETURN TO CARTEL SYSTEM

(By Hal Foust)

CHARLESTON, W. VA., June 11.—An America-first post-war rubber program was advocated here tonight by Rubber Director William M. Jeffers in a speech before a chamber of commerce banquet.

"When peace comes," said Jeffers, "let's see to it that we Americans are looking after us Americans. Certainly we should be friendly with our present allies, but this does not mean that we should scrap hundreds of millions of dollars of our money invested in synthetic plants.

"It's up to you," he declared when an applause had subsided, "to tell your Congressman and your Senators how you feel about this."

OTHER PLANS AFOOT

In London is a mission led by the State Department which departed secretly from Washington, D. C., to discuss the future of western Pacific rubber plantations, owned by a British-Dutch cartel, but now held by the Japanese. In South America, Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE has hinted to Latin Americans that we will continue as a market for their wild rubber.

"Next year," said Jeffers, "we'll make 850,000 tons of synthetic, more rubber than was ever imported. It can be manufactured as cheaply as it can be imported, certainly more cheaply than it can be imported from distant Malaya and the Dutch East Indies. And we'll make synthetic as good as natural rubber.

"I've been a shepherd of the Government's rubber program and at times have had to use the crook," he continued, referring to his quarrels with other departments seeking the same materials. "And the use of the shepherd's crook was not in vain. The public doesn't yet understand just how close America came to collapse owing to a rubber shortage. The shortage will be ended by late 1944."

COMMENDED BY BARUCH

Jeffers' victories over military, naval and civilian opposition were commended in a letter from Bernard M. Baruch, read when the rubber director was introduced.

The banquet followed an official inspection of the world's largest synthetic rubber plant, at Institute, W. Va., 12 miles from here. In the group of a hundred industrial leaders and Government officials who came here this morning by special train from Washington were Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones and Senators RAYMOND E. WILLIS, Republican, Indiana, and GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican of Vermont.

The visitors saw a $56,000,000 investment of Government money in an industrial institution of giant columns, stills, stacks, and towers of steel, brick, and concrete spread over 77 acres. Here Carbide & Carbon Chemical Corporation, as an operator, is making butadiene at a rate of 80,000 tons a year. It will be mixed with styrene in another section of the lay-out by the United States Rubber Co. to make Buna-S rubber, the main type of rubber in the Government's program.

WILL INCREASE PRODUCTION

The visitors saw synthetics coming from the end of a series of chemical operations at a rate of 30,000 tons a year. They saw additional buildings which by the end of the year will boost this production rate to 90,000 long tons a year.

Jeffers, in his banquet address, said the plant was "a magnificent monument to the ingenuity of industry, technological research and progress and Government financing." He said it is "a miraculous congealing of American alertness which the Japanese could not foresee when they took from us our only major source of natural rubber."

At the plant, visitors were told that when the production reaches 90,000 tons a year the alcohol requirements will be 197,000 gallons a day. Made from corn, annual alcohol consumption would require more than 30,000,000 bushels, the average yield from 720,000 acres.

The Chicago Tribune, in a plant nearing completion at Thorold, Ontario, is pioneering an alternate source for alcohol that does not tap the Nation's reserve of foodstuffs. In the first modern plant of its kind in the western hemisphere, alcohol is to be made from sulphite liquor, a waste from wood pulp mills.

Good-Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1943, the Governor of Texas approved House Concurrent Resolution 105 of the Legislature of Texas with reference to the good-neighbor policy. I have been requested to have this resolution placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the Congress and, in accordance with the leave granted to extend my remarks, this resolution is herewith inserted:

House Concurrent Resolution 105

Whereas all nations of the North American and South American Continents are banded together in an effort to stamp out nazi-ism and preserve democracy; and

Whereas our neighbors to the south are cooperating and aiding us in every way possible; and

Whereas the citizens of the great State of Texas are interested in doing all that is humanly possible to aid and assist the national policy of hemispherical solidarity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas (the senate concurring), That the Forty-eighth Legislature of the State of Texas go on record as declaring the following to be the public policy of this State:

1. All persons of the Caucasian race within the jurisdiction of this State are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all public places of business or amusement, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law and rules and regulations applicable alike to all persons of the Caucasian race.

2. Whoever denies to any person the full advantages, facilities, and privileges enumerated in the preceding paragraph or who aids or incites such denial or whoever makes any discrimination, distinction, or restriction except for good cause applicable alike to all persons of the Caucasian race, respecting accommodations, advantages, facilities, and privileges of all public places of business, or whoever aids or incites such discrimination, distinction, or restriction shall be considered as violating the good-neighbor policy of our State.

Relief From Stringent Naturalization Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include copies of H. R. 996, and H. R. 998, together with correspondence I have had with the United States Department of Labor; Congressman DICKSTEIN, chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; Judge William Coleman and Judge Calvin Chesnut, judges of the United States District Court in Baltimore; and an editorial in the Baltimore Evening Sun, and also an article in the Baltimore Sun.

Some of these forgotten people, whom I mentioned above, came to this great America in the 1890's, young, honest, industrious people, who never really had the time or the opportunity to learn how to read and write. They married, had large families, and have given their best years in honest labor. Many are property owners and taxpayers. Many had sons and daughters who served our great country in World War No. 1 and are today giving their lives in the great battle in which we are now engaged for the preservation of our free institutions. The sons and daughters of others are today in the vanguard of America's progress. Yet these same clean-living people of America cannot become citizens unless they pass an examination that would probably flunk a high-school graduate or perhaps a college graduate. If the only requirements for citizenship were contributions to national wealth through honest labor and love for democracy, almost all of our noncitizens could easily become citizens.

There are thousands of people in the United States who have made application for their first and second papers,

but who failed to pass the examination. In making application they renounced allegiance to their native countries, and yet they are not citizens of the United States. They love America, they belong to America, they are willing to fight to defend America and keep it democratic and free, so why deny them citizenship?

I might add that the House took favorable action on two of these bills in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses and that this legislation is needed more now than ever before. What is needed as well as tanks and planes is a united people, and since the bills before the House today are bills similar to mine, I wish to state that I am heartily in favor of them and urge the Members of the House to act favorably on this legislation.

The matters referred to follow:

H. R. 996

A bill for the admission of citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924

Be it enacted, etc., That a new subdivision is hereby added to section 4 of the Naturalization Act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 596), as amended, to read as follows:

"Fifteenth. Any alien eligible for citizenship who is 50 years of age or more, who made a declaration of intention or filed a petition for naturalization prior to the enactment of the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 620; U. S. C., title 42), and who is lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence prior to July 1, 1924, and has ever since said lawful entry maintained a bona fide residence in the United States, may be naturalized upon full and complete compliance with all requirements of the naturalization laws, with the following exceptions: Petition for naturalization may be filed without regard for the 7-year limitation on the declaration of intention, and the applicant shall not be required to sign his petition in his own handwriting or to speak the English language and he shall be exempt from all educational requirements. Nothing herein shall be held to waive or in anywise relax the requirement for good moral character."

H. R. 998

A bill permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new title as follows:

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 801. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 326 (a) of this act, any person not a citizen whose son or daughter has served honorably with the land or naval forces of the United States at any time on or after December 7, 1941, and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that no declaration of intention shall be required.

"SEC. 802. The Commissioner, with the approval of the Attorney General, shall prescribe and furnish such forms, and shall make such rules and regulations, as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this title. No person who may be naturalized under the provisions of this title shall be designated as an 'enemy alien' in any form prescribed under the provisions of this section."

In reference to my inquiry as to the status of this bill, Congressman SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, received the following letter from you:

"Permit me to refer to the letter of the clerk of your committee requesting comment on H. R. 5228.

"The bill was introduced on March 22, 1939, by Mr. D'ALESANDRO and bears the title 'A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to November 11, 1918.'

"It proposes a new subdivision to be included in section 4 of the Naturalization Act of June 29, 1906, as amended. That section which prescribes the naturalization procedure contains 14 subdivisions, several of which authorize a short form of procedure as to particular classes of aliens. Bill H. R. 5228 would provide that any alien who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence prior to November 11, 1918, and has ever since said entry maintained a bona fide residence in the United States shall be exempt from all educational requirements provided that he has attended citizenship classes for at least 6 months.

"As this bill will expedite the naturalization of aliens who have resided in this country continuously for a period of 20 years and can prove good moral character and attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, I believe that it has considerable merit and may well receive the favorable consideration of the Congress."

In the meantime, while this bill is pending in committee, may I make a personal appeal to you in behalf of these people who reside in Maryland, that you permit Mr. P. J. Phillips, senior examiner, to give oral examinations instead of written ones, to eliminate the present hardship which the written examinations work on them.

I understand that this is permitted in many other States, and I would like to secure the same privilege for the people of Maryland.

Thanking you for your usual kind consideration, I am,

Respectfully yours,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., M. C.,
Third District, Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: I have your letter of October 25, 1939, in which you request me to instruct Mr. P. J. Phillips, of our Immigration and Naturalization Service, to give oral examinations instead of written ones to petitioners for naturalization in the State of Maryland.

I have been advised that the procedure you request is not subject to my control, but is entirely within the discretion of the judges of the United States district court at Baltimore, Md. (34 Stat. 599, U. S. C., title 5, sec. 398). The Federal court judges at Baltimore have expressly ordered written examinations because of their belief that persons who are unable to write the English language should not be naturalized.

Under the circumstances, it will be necessary for you to confer with the United States district court judges at Baltimore to obtain the reform you desire.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCES T. PERKINS.

DECEMBER 29, 1939.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr., M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: Further reference is made to your letter of November 13, 1939, concerning the type of educational examination in use in the various field districts of this Service.

An inquiry directed to the field officers of this Service brought reports regarding the practice followed in their respective districts which are summarized as follows:

A written examination is accorded in the United States district courts at Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, Md.; also in the Federal courts at Alexandria, Norfolk, and Richmond, Va.; at Asheville, N. C.; and in the third district court at Salt Lake City.

In the other districts the examination is oral, except in those instances in which the petitioner is unable to speak or hear. Where practicable, a written examination is given to such persons which facilitates understanding on the part of both the applicant and the examiner.

Cordially yours,
JAMES L. HOUGHTELING,
Commissioner.

FEBRUARY 8, 1940.

The Honorable W. CALVIN CHESNUT,
United States District Judge,
Post Office Building, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR JUDGE CHESNUT: As per your request, I am writing to you in reference to modifying the present method of handling examinations for citizenship. I am herewith enclosing a letter I received from Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, in this connection, which I would appreciate your returning to me after it has served your purpose.

Those persons who cannot read or write English are now unable to secure their citizenship papers in Maryland, while in other States, with the exception of Washington, D. C.; Alexandria, Norfolk, and Richmond, Va.; Asheville, N. C.; and in the third district court at Salt Lake City, they have the privilege of taking oral examinations.

By this time you will no doubt have received a letter from Congressman DICKSTEIN, chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, in regard to my bill—H. R. 5228. In the meantime, while this legislation is pending, I would certainly appreciate it if you and Judge Coleman would give some consideration to the matter of allowing the people of Maryland the same privilege accorded in other communities.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Member of Congress, Third District, Maryland.

JUDGE'S CHAMBERS,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
Baltimore, Md., February 10, 1940.

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'ALESANDRO: I have your letter of February 8, enclosing letter to you of October 31, 1939, from the Secretary of Labor, both relating to the practice in naturalization in this Federal district.

Your suggestion is that the practice of requiring the applicant for naturalization to take a written examination may be too rigid in some cases where the applicant can neither read nor write English. Your thought is that the judge of the court should exercise discretion in permitting an oral examination in cases where the applicant is otherwise shown to be qualified for citizenship, but is unable to read or write English.

As you probably know, the qualifications for admitting an alien to citizenship are prescribed by the act of Congress which is codified now as section 382 of title 8 of the United States Code, the last amendment of which was June 29, 1928 (ch. 819, 52 Stat. 1247). This section, in addition to making certain requirements as to length and place of residence, provides that the applicant must affirmatively show that "during all the periods referred to in this section, he has behaved as a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution

of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States."

The examination of the applicant is for the purpose of determining whether he has the prescribed qualifications. By the acts of Congress of June 8, 1926 (ch. 402, 44 Stat. 709), and June 10, 1933 (Executive Order No. 6166, sec. 14—now codified in title 8 of the United States Code as sec. 399 (a)), provision was made that the senior district judge of a Federal district court is authorized to designate an examiner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service "to conduct preliminary hearings upon petitions for naturalization to such court, and to make findings and recommendations thereon."

For a number of years past in this district the practice in naturalization has been in accordance with this act of Congress. That is to say, the examinations of the applicants are made by an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service who makes written recommendations to the court as to the qualifications of the applicant. In general these recommendations are followed by the district judge but it is to be noted that subsection (c) of the last-mentioned statute provides that "the court may, in its discretion, and shall, upon demand of the petitioner, require the examination of the petitioner and witnesses under oath before the court and in the presence of the court."

The number of applicants for naturalization in this district is very large and recently the number has been considerably increasing. By order of court the second Monday in each month, except July and August, is designated as the day for naturalization and on an average there are now about 100 or more applicants each naturalization day. It is, therefore, very important in the ordinary work of the court for the judges to have the advantage of recommendations of the Immigration and Naturalization Service authorized by the act of Congress referred to. Otherwise the work of the court would be very materially hampered by the length of time required for individual oral examination of each applicant in court.

With regard to the practice as to written or oral examinations by the examiner, there is no rigid and inflexible rule either of law or of practice in the district that absolutely and in all cases requires that the preliminary examination be in writing. It has, however, been a fairer and better test of the applicant's qualifications than an oral examination. One reason is that the applicant has more time to answer the questions and is able to give more thought to them if the examination is written than if it is oral. Therefore, in this district some years ago the examiner was informed that the judges of the court thought written examinations preferable.

However, as you will note from the above quotation from the statute itself, if the examiner recommends that the applicant be not admitted to citizenship, the latter, upon request, is entitled to have an examination in court and this may be oral as well as written and probably, in most cases, would be oral. It is not frequently that an applicant who is rejected by the examiner applies to the court for a personal examination in open court, but wherever this has been brought to our attention, the oral examination has been given in court.

I return the letter from the Secretary of Labor enclosed with your letter to me.

Yours very truly,

W. CALVIN CHESNUT,
United States District Judge.

JANUARY 30, 1940.

Hon. WILLIAM COLEMAN,
Judge of the United States
District Court, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR JUDGE COLEMAN: This committee recently had before it for hearing H. R. 5228 (Mr. D'ALESANDRO), for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to November 11, 1918.

H. R. 5228, among other things, would exempt such aliens from all educational requirements, provided said aliens had attended citizenship classes for at least 6 months.

It developed at the hearing that the committee had already reported a similar bill, H. R. 6381 (Mr. LESINSKI). This bill fixed the entry date prior to February 5, 1917; it also embodied the provision for the exemption of the educational test as contained in Mr. D'ALESANDRO's bill. H. R. 6381, having been reported and being now before the House, there would be no object in reporting the similar bill of Congressman D'ALESANDRO.

As the committee is in favor of the legislation contained in these two bills, it is hoped that early and favorable action will be taken by both the House and Senate.

The committee desires to call attention to this pending legislation to the judges of the courts and for that reason is acquainting you with the present status of the proposed legislation.

Very respectfully yours,

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, *Chairman.*

BALTIMORE, MD., *February 19, 1940.*

Hon. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: Replying to copy of your letter of February 8 to Judge Chesnut, which you have sent me, I beg to enclose copy of letter which I have today addressed to Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, which I believe fully sets forth my views with respect to the matter referred to in your letter.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM C. COLEMAN,
United States District Judge.

FEBRUARY 19, 1940.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on
Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DICKSTEIN: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 30 calling my attention to H. R. 5228, introduced by Mr. D'ALESANDRO, and H. R. 6381, introduced by Mr. LESINSKI, pending legislation, the object of which is to exempt from any educational test persons applying for admission to citizenship who have entered this country prior to a particular date named in the bills.

While you do not expressly ask for an expression of opinion by me with respect to this legislation, I take the liberty of saying that from my experience of some 12 years in the naturalization of aliens, I feel that to make any such exceptions as are proposed by the legislation above referred to would be undesirable, would be an arbitrary discrimination, and would tend to lower the standard of citizenship.

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. D'ALESANDRO, Congressman from the Third District of Maryland, under date of February 8, in which he refers to the same pending legislation and asks that Judge Chesnut and I give consideration to the matter of allowing applicants for citizenship in Maryland to become naturalized without proving that they are able to read or write English.

I have just written Mr. D'ALESANDRO that I am opposed to any such statutory change as would compel, regardless of the individual case, relaxing of the standards as now maintained in the Maryland district. Mr. D'ALESANDRO calls attention to the fact that the Maryland district is one of the few districts in the country where the privilege of taking oral examinations is not accorded to applicants for naturalization. While I am not conversant with the requirements throughout the country, I think the present standards are not only entirely consistent with the law but impliedly required, because I fail to see how one can indicate that he is "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States" or is able to understand the meaning of the franchise or to vote intelligently unless he has at least some ability to read and write simple English. The law leaves it to the discretion of the trial judge to determine the fitness of the applicant. In adopting the standards which we have here in Maryland, we believe that they are fair and reasonable, and entirely consistent with the present law. My experience indicates that a large number of applicants for citizenship not only remain in this country for a number of years before applying for citizenship, and preparing themselves to qualify, but as a matter of fact are not really interested in citizenship as such. That is to say, their primary desire is to use their citizenship for the purpose of obtaining exemption, for absent parents or other relatives, from the usual quota requirements before entering this country, or to obtain for themselves the advantage of old-age pensions, etc.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM C. COLEMAN,
United States District Judge.

[From the Baltimore Sun of June 7, 1940]

A proper exemption and naturalization law is needed at a time when military necessity requires that we keep a close watch on aliens who may be in sympathy with foreign powers. It is reassuring to remember that only a few aliens are an object of suspicion. A bill under which some of these loyal aliens may become citizens passed the House on Wednesday sponsored by Representative D'ALESANDRO, of Baltimore. This measure specifically provides for the naturalization of certain aliens who cannot pass the illiteracy test nor meet the educational requirements for citizenship. The benefits of the bill are limited to aliens 50 years of age or more who came to this country prior to February 5, 1917 (the date the illiteracy test for immigrants was imposed) and who actually applied for naturalization prior to August 14, 1935 (the date the Social Security Act became a law). All other tests required by naturalization laws remain in force and effect even as to these aliens; that is to say they must have entered the country legally and must have a record free from crime and disloyal action. Opponents of the bill charged in the House that its purpose was to permit some 750,000 persons not now eligible for places on the Work Projects Administration and Social Security rolls to qualify for benefits of that character, the same as citizens. Such objections are not particularly persuasive in view of the fact that the bill's benefits are limited to those who sought to become citizens before the social-security law was enacted. If we did not in most of the States have illiteracy tests for voters, whether native or naturalized, the admission of large numbers of would-be citizens incapable of reading or writing might be highly objectionable, but the naturalization law will in general prevent citizens admitted under this law from participating in election and their exploitation from political manipulation will thus be barred.

Illiteracy test is important as to voters, but it ought not to be allowed to stand in the way of citizenship for a large body of foreign-born Americans who came to this country before the illiteracy test for immigrants was introduced and who have shown by their conduct that they are decent, law-abiding, loyal residents of this country.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

ELDERLY MAN WORKS IN VAIN TO BECOME CITIZEN OF UNITED STATES—POLISH IMMIGRANT CAN SAY ONLY "I LOVE AMERICA" WHEN QUERIED ON HIS KNOWLEDGE

For 5 years 78-year-old Zielig Eisen has studied the English language and American history so that he might become an American citizen before he dies.

Yesterday, visibly disappointed, Eisen walked slowly out of the Federal court after he was denied his life's ambition to become a citizen of this country.

Eisen is forgetful, he admits, and he can't write English very well, but he had based his hopes on a special petition he filed with the court, hoping that he could give some reason why he should be allowed to assume citizenship even though he was unable to pass tests.

SAYS HE LOVES AMERICA

"My wife is a citizen, my children are citizens. I love America. I want to be an American citizen before I die," was about all the elderly man could say for his cause. But the court pointed out that precedent would not allow the special plea.

Mrs. Ruth E. Ollendorf, citizenship teacher at Public School No. 1, who has been Eisen's instructor at school and at private classes in his home, put in a good word for the alien from Poland.

TELLS OF EFFORTS

"I can swear to it," she told Judge William C. Coleman. "He certainly has made every effort. More than any student I ever taught."

Mrs. Ollendorf said that Eisen was dressed and ready for the special petition 6 hours before the scheduled hour. "He's been so nervous, just like a little schoolboy," she told the judge.

She said Mrs. Mary Eisen, his wife, also has tried hard to teach the Polish alien. Many times when she went to their home in the 3100 block Chelsea Avenue, Mrs. Ollendorf says she found notebooks filled with American history which the wife had dictated for her husband to write, the teacher said.

READS AND WRITES

Almost deaf, Eisen reads and writes Polish and Hebrew very well, she said.

Judge Coleman explained that he felt very sympathetic, but pointed out that citizenship requires, among other things, that citizens be able to read our laws and regulations and that Eisen would hardly be able to do so.

"We can't make exceptions except in a most unusual case," the judge remarked.

QUESTIONS HIM CLOSELY

The judge queried Eisen closely in an effort to determine the extent of the man's knowledge of English and American history, but Eisen was apparently nervous and could not be made to understand very well.

Eisen has been in this country 14 years. He was in the real estate business in Poland, but is now retired.

Judge Coleman said he would be glad to give Eisen another opportunity to try for citizenship, but said he could not grant the citizenship papers now.

A Doughboy Speaks to John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, some days ago Lt. Col. James B. "Pat" Murphy, one of the best friends I have in South Carolina, now serving somewhere in the jungles, wrote me, enclosing a very timely poem entitled "A Doughboy Speaks to John L. Lewis."

It is my understanding that the men in the Service, those serving in the United States, as well as on various foreign fronts, thoroughly understand the operations of John L. Lewis, and they along with the people of the United States seriously object to his Hitler attitude in telling the wage earners when to sit down and when to stand up, all of which is definitely operating against our war efforts as well as the morale of the men in the Service who are engaged in a life-and-death struggle.

The great majority of the Congress has been deeply concerned about the activities of John L. Lewis, and, regardless of the attitude of those at the head of the War and Navy Departments, the War Production Board, and the President of the United States, who have opposed all along any legislation that would tend to put an end to strikes, have put forth strenuous efforts to do something about it.

The Lower House during the last session of Congress passed a strong anti-strike bill, but because of the strenuous opposition just referred to, the bill died in the Senate.

Many of us have continued our deep interest in doing something about this serious situation, and just a few days ago a bill was passed by both Houses, and is now on the desk of the President awaiting his approval or disapproval.

In the meantime there are many people in the country who would hold Congress responsible and, even an individual Congressman, for the failure to put an end to the Hitler tactics of John L. Lewis.

During this great emergency the President, our Commander in Chief, has the power to put an end to strikes, and during all of the past months he has told the Congress, "Leave it to me."

If the President vetoes this bill that is his responsibility.

If the President signs the bill, perhaps, it could be so administered that we would not get what was intended by the Congress in the passage of the bill. If so, that will not be the responsibility of the Congress, in that Congress does not administer legislation passed by the Congress.

I am sure that this poem will be read with a great deal of interest, not only by Members of Congress, but the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and will meet with their hearty approval:

A DOUGHBOY SPEAKS TO JOHN L. LEWIS

I'm full of damned malaria,
  I shake the whole day long,
The quinine's ringing in my ears,
  I'm anything but strong,
Mosquito bites all over me—
  You'd think I had "the itch,"
My ears are full of 'Guinea mud,
  My bunk—a muddy ditch.

I'm living in a Jungle,
  It's hot as Merry Hell,
C rations is my menu,
  No cooking can I smell.
For this I get two bucks a day,
  And, a chance for a little ground,
That measures four by six by four
  And, a covered grassy mound.

My Pal who came down here with me,
  The lad was just eighteen—
Got him a bed he'll never leave,
  The coverlet is green,
Another one will see no more,
  Another lost an arm,
And hundreds more I do not know
  Are now safe from all harm.

But when I hear a bunch of guys,
  Are safe, and far away,
Refuse to work because they want
  Two dollars more a day,
I only wish we had them here,
  For just a week or two,
To live in 'Guinea junges,
  And there we'd let them stew.

We'd give them all malaria,
  Let mosquitoes have a feast,
We'd make them bury many a lad,
  From North, West, South, and East,
We'd make them sleep in fox holes,
  We'd feed them from a can,
We'd let a hot sun blister them,
  'Twould be "no Palm Beach tan."

We'd let them hear the wounded moan,
  We'd let them see them die,
With snipers' bullets whizzing close,
  With star-shells in the sky.
And then we'd send them home again,
  To their ten bucks every day
To tell the others what they'd seen,
  Way down New Guinea way,
I'll bet this guy would have enough,
  At home he'd gladly stay,
No strikes he'd start right soon again,
  For "two more bucks a day."

General Relief Provisions of the Revenue Act of 1942

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely importance and authoritative character, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD, as a part of my instant remarks, the text of an address recently delivered at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York, by the Honorable Randolph Evernghim Paul, General Counsel for the Treasury, before the New York Society of Certified Public Accountants.

Dealing, as he does, with the general relief provisions of the Revenue Act of 1942, an act with the writing of which he had a great deal to do, I am quite sure that that which he then had to say will be found not only helpful to those who are of the accountancy profession but highly informative to the membership of this body as well.

Mr. Paul's address follows:

I have been asked to speak to you tonight on the general relief provisions of the Revenue Act of 1942.

I am glad to be able to tell you that the regulations relating to section 722 have recently been issued, and that copies of them will be available within a few days. I know that the delay in their issuance has created difficulties for those of you who have already begun to prepare claims for general relief, and I regret that you have been caused this inconvenience. However, I am sure that you appreciate the difficulties which

confronted us in drafting these regulations, and that you will agree that it has been wise to make haste slowly in their preparation.

I am sure that you will also agree that the success with which the excess-profits tax will achieve the ends it was designed to serve will depend upon the success with which these provisions are administered. As the House Ways and Means Committee stated in its report on the 1941 version of section 722, "The success or failure of legislation of this type depends to a considerable degree upon its intelligent and sympathetic administration." The general intent of Congress in enacting section 722 is reasonably clear, but in providing "for the many unforeseen hardships which may arise under the excess-profits tax law" Congress was forced to express its intent in general, rather than in specific, terms. Hence, the task of interpreting the intent of Congress in those specific cases where the excess-profits tax is claimed to be excessive and discriminatory will devolve upon those whose responsibility it is to administer the tax statutes.

This is a responsibility which cannot be accepted lightly. If the relief which Congress intended to give taxpayers is arbitrarily denied them, the excess-profits tax law can become an instrument for the destruction rather than for the preservation of competitive enterprise. New and growing businesses, as well as businesses which were depressed during the pre-war years, will be deprived of the means with which to reestablish themselves in the post-war economy.

On the other hand, if the relief provisions are permitted to become instruments for widespread tax avoidance, we shall have failed in our efforts to eliminate profiteering and to achieve an equitable distribution of the costs of the war.

The line between eligibility and ineligibility for relief under section 722 will not be an easy one to draw. But "drawing the line is a recurrent difficulty in those fields of the law where differences in degree produce ultimate differences in kind." (*Harrison* v. *Shaffner*, 312 U. S. 579 (1941).)

Responsibility for the successful administration of the general relief provisions must also rest in part upon taxpayers. The greater the number of unreasonable and exorbitant claims filed, the more difficult it will be for the Government to administer relief fairly and fully to those who deserve it. It is, therefore, highly important that businessmen should understand the principles underlying section 722 so that they may better appreciate the character and the extent of the relief which these provisions were designed to afford. For this knowledge and understanding, businessmen will rely heavily on the men of your profession. I am, therefore, very glad to have this opportunity to discuss with you some of the more difficult problems which are likely to arise in the administration of section 722.

II. CLASSES OF TAXPAYERS COVERED UNDER SECTION 722

The general relief provisions, as set forth in section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, relate primarily to taxpayers which would ordinarily elect to use the average earnings method of computing the excess-profits credit. Under the general rule the average earnings credit is taken as 95 percent of the average earnings for the years 1936–39, with appropriate adjustments for increases or reductions in paid-in capital. For the most businesses these 4 years do provide a reasonably good standard of normal earnings. Taken as a whole, they were years of moderate prosperity; they included one very good year (1937), one poor year (1938), and two moderately good years (1936 and 1939). However, for some businesses the average income of these 4 pre-war years does not provide an adequate standard of normal profits. It was in recognition of this fact that Congress enacted the relief provisions in section 722.

The 1942 version of section 722 may be said to cover three general types of situations. First, there is the situation in which the occurrence of some abnormal event or circumstance has made the base period earnings of the taxpayer an inadequate standard for the measurement of normal profits. Under the 1941 act only physical events were in general recognized as the basis of a claim for relief from base period abnormalities. The 1942 act permits relief to be extended on account of abnormal economic situations as well.

Second, there is the situation in which the base-period earnings are an inadequate standard for the measurement of normal profits because the taxpayer's years of normal profits did not coincide with the years 1936 to 1939, which embrace a period of normal earnings for business in general. One example of this type of situation is found in the case of the industry which in the base period is in the low phase of its profits cycle, with the good years of its profits cycle not adequately represented during the base period. Another is found in the case of the new business or of the business which changed its character or capacity for production during the base period. In most such cases the average earnings of the years 1936 to 1939 could not be expected to reflect the earning capacity of the business after it had passed through its developmental stage.

Third, there is the situation of those taxpayers which commenced business after December 31, 1939. Such taxpayers have no 1936 to 1939 earnings which might reflect their normal profits. They would ordinarily be required to use the invested-capital method of computing the excess-profits credit, but under section 722 (c) certain classes of them are entitled to use a hypothetical base period net income as the excess-profits credit. These are (1) taxpayers with intangible assets not includible in invested capital which make important contributions to income, (2) taxpayers for which invested capital is not an important income-contributing factor, and (3) taxpayers whose capital is abnormally low. Only in these three special cases is relief granted to taxpayers which would otherwise compute the excess-profits credit by the invested-capital method.

III. THE CONCEPT OF NORMAL PROFITS

The fundamental concept underlying section 722 is that of normal profits. The statute makes it clear that no taxpayer entitled to use the average-earnings method of computing the excess-profits credit can obtain relief under section 722 unless it can establish that its average base period net income was not a fair measure of normal profits. Furthermore, once eligibility for relief is established, the relief afforded by the statute is the right to use a constructive average base period net income which justly represents normal profits. It is, therefore, important to know what Congress intended this term to mean.

A. The term "normal profits" is a subjective concept

The base-period approach to the measurement of excess profits refers to the individual experience of each corporate taxpayer, not to the collective experience of all such taxpayers. The 1942 amendments to section 722 have not altered the basic approach in this regard. They merely broaden the scope of the credit to embrace hypothetical, as well as actual, experiences of the particular taxpayer, and extend the credit to taxpayers which had no base-period experience. The constructive average base period net income which must represent normal profits still relates, not to the experience of business as a whole, or to that of any particular industry, but to the experience of the taxpayer claiming relief.

If, for example, it is established that unusual circumstances made the income of the base period years an inappropriate measure of normal profits, the constructive average base period net income must be determined with reference to the profits which the taxpayer in question could reasonably have been expected to earn under happier circumstances. Profits are not to be deemed abnormal merely because they were low. Taxpayers hoping to establish the abnormality of their base period earnings must be prepared to back their claims with an appeal to their own experience and demonstrated business capacity.

However, the essentially subjective character of normal profits does not mean that reference cannot be made to the experience or other taxpayers insofar as such experience throws some light upon conditions within the industry or trade of the taxpayer itself. Evidence of this sort may, indeed, be highly relevant to a determination of the reasonableness of the taxpayer's claim. In special cases, such as those of corporations which have commenced business since January 1, 1940, such evidence is an important factor in the determination of that fair and just amount which represents normal profits. In other words, although the base period experience of similar corporations cannot be freely substituted for the actual experience of a taxpayer claiming abnormally low base period earnings, it might be used in support of the constructive average base period net income claimed by the taxpayer. The taxpayer will, however, be expected to establish the reasonableness of the relationship assumed between its own earning capacity during the base period and that of such similar corporations.

B. When are profits not normal?

The concept of normal profits cannot be subjected to precise quantitative measurement; rather we should think of normal profits as a matter of more or less. When a businessman enters upon a new venture in the expectation of making a profit from it, his expectations will rarely be expressed in terms of an exact sum of money. Instead, he will be inclined to think of them as a range of possibilities. So long as actual profits fall within this range, they can be said to have come up to expectations. Similarly, the actual profits of the base-period years should be regarded as normal if they come within a reasonable range of the average profits which the taxpayer might be expected to earn under normal conditions. Slight deviations from the norm should not provide the basis for relief.

But what is the norm, significant deviations from which may provide the basis for such a claim? Under what circumstances should an event be regarded as an abnormal one? Under what circumstances does the average base period net income of a taxpayer become an inadequate standard of normal earnings? What factors can be taken into account and what factors must be disregarded in reconstructing base-period earnings? I cannot, of course, give you very precise answers to these questions here tonight, but I shall attempt to give you some general views of the Treasury on them. It will, perhaps, be easiest to consider them with reference to each of the three classes of cases covered under section 722.

C. Normal profits of taxpayers with base-period abnormalities

The mere fact that an abnormal event occurred during the base period does not provide the basis of a claim for relief unless it is also established that as a result of this event the average base-period net income is an inadequate standard of normal earnings. Not

only must there be some connection between the event itself and the earning capacity of the taxpayer, but it must also be established that there were no other equally abnormal events or circumstances which affected earnings in the opposite manner. An abnormally warm winter during the base period might well be regarded as an unusual event in the experience of a natural-gas company supplying fuel for domestic heating purposes, but the occurrence of such an event could provide the basis of a claim for relief only if there were no abnormally cold winters during the same period.

The question whether an event should be regarded as normal or abnormal is, of course, one which can be answered only in the light of the experience of particular taxpayers. A flood would generally be regarded as an abnormal event, but in the case of a taxpayer whose operations are usually interrupted by spring floods, it is doubtful if the occurrence of such floods during the base period could be accepted as the basis of a claim for relief under section 722. Whether an event is to be regarded as normal or abnormal is also a matter of time. Over a long enough period of time all events tend to become normal events. Taxpayers will do well to remember that section 722 operates within the framework of a 4-year period.

In the case of taxpayers depressed by reason of unusual temporary economic circumstances, earnings should be reconstructed not on the basis of the actual economic factor affecting the taxpayer's production, costs, and profits for the years in question, but upon the basis of such factors as existed in the taxpayer's industry. Account may be taken of the relationship of the taxpayer's sales, costs, and profits to those of other members of the industry in other periods of normal earnings for the industry.

In abnormality cases of both types the constructive base period net income will usually be arrived at by correcting the taxpayer's actual earnings experience for the year or years in which its earnings were affected by the occurrence of the unusual event or events. It should not be forgotten, however, that relief is limited to a fair and just amount representing normal earnings. Consequently, if adjustments are made in the earnings for particular base-period years affected by abnormally poor circumstances, adjustments must also be made for years affected by abnormally good circumstances to ensure a constructive average base period net income which can fairly represent normal earnings.

D. Normal profits in the cycle cases

One of the most widely discussed provisions of section 722 is that relating to the eligibility of a taxpayer which was depressed during the base period because it was a member of an industry with a profit cycle differing materially in length and amplitude from the general business cycle. A good many taxpayers appear to have the impression that this provision necessitates an excursion into the higher mathematics of business-cycle analysis. I do not believe that any such excursion will, as a rule, be necessary. It is my opinion that in such cases an ounce of common sense will carry more weight than a pound of statistics. It is not always true that "they do things better with logarithms."[1]

In considering the cycle cases, it must be recalled that in selecting the years 1936–39 as the standard of normal profits Congress selected a period of 48 months within which was embraced one complete profits cycle for business in general. For most businesses, therefore, the choice of these years provided a base period of moderate prosperity in which the normal fluctuation of profits which characterizes the general business cycle was averaged out.

However, it was evident that there would be some industries the members of which could not expect to average out good and bad years within these particular 4 years. The construction industry provides an example of an industry with a profits cycle longer than the customary 40 to 50 months' cycle. Not every period of general business prosperity produces a building boom; instead, it appears that such periods of high production and profits occur at intervals of from 12 to 20 years. Taxpayers in industries, the profits cycles of which follow this building cycle, for example, would, presumably, be eligible for relief under subsection 722 (b) (3), if base period earnings inadequately reflected normal earnings.

There are undoubtedly other industries which will attempt to establish eligibility under this subsection. Some of them will be able easily to establish their eligibility on the basis of generally recognized facts. Others may attempt to do so through the use of highly refined statistical techniques. I venture the suggestion that arithmetic will get better results than differential calculus and that if the techniques of the latter are deemed to be essential to the establishment of eligibility under this section, the industry is not one which Congress intended to relieve under this subsection. The mere fact that deviations from some general cycle of business profit can be established for a particular industry will not be accepted as evidence that the average base period net income is not an adequate standard of normal earnings.

The constructive average base period net income of a taxpayer in an abnormal cycle industry may be determined with reference to one or more prior periods in its experience when normal earnings were realized. However, the average income of any one such period will not be regarded as an amount representing normal earnings unless it is established that with respect to the taxpayer and the industry of which it is a member, this period bears the same relationship to the profit cycle of the taxpayer and the industry as the base period bears to the general business cycle.

E. Normal profits in the growth cases

The principal defect of the base-period approach to the measurement of excess profits is the fact that it provides an adequate standard of normal earnings only so long as the character or capacity of the taxpayer's business does not change from what it was during the base period. For the purposes of a war-profits tax this defect would not be serious as regards changes initiated during the war years since no account can be taken of such changes. But there is another difficulty that cannot be handled so easily since it relates to circumstances which prevailed during the base period. This difficulty relates to the new business, which was slowly building up its earning capacity during the base-period years. It also relates to the old business, which changed its products, its methods of production, or its capacity of production during that period and which was therefore in the process of establishing a new earning capacity bearing little or no relation to its previously established level of earnings.

In these situations it is obvious that the average base-period net income will rarely be an adequate measure of the normal profits of the new or changed business. To accept it as such would be to discriminate against the very businessmen who most need encouragement, namely, the newcomers and the innovators. But the determination of a fair and just amount representing the normal profits of such taxpayers presents a difficult problem, especially if the business of the taxpayer has not reached its normal earning capacity by the end of the base period.

In determining the normal profits of such growing taxpayers, it has been provided that a taxpayer shall be deemed to have commenced business or made the change in the character of its business 2 years before it did so. This assumption provides a more liberal allowance for growth than was provided in the 1941 version of section 722, but avoids the necessity of attempting to distinguish between increased earnings attributable to the abnormal influence of the war, and increased earnings which might properly be regarded as the continuation of the normal peacetime growth of the taxpayer into war years. Under the 2-year push-back provision it will be necessary to estimate the level of earnings which the taxpayer would have attained after 2 more years of growth under the general circumstances and conditions prevailing during the pre-war years. The earning capacity reflected in the last year of this extended growth period would then be used as the basis for the reconstruction of base-period earnings.

In some such cases, however, the taxpayer may not have reached its establishel level of normal earnings until after its first excess-profits taxable year. This may also be true of a taxpayer which was committed to a course of action to change its capacity for production or operation prior to January 1, 1940, but which consummated such change in a later year; it will necessarily be true of a taxpayer commencing business after December 31, 1939. In these cases it would appear that a fair and just standard of normal earnings for such taxpayers must be based not upon the full level of normal earnings, but upon the level of earnings which the taxpayer might have been expected to obtain in years prior to the time that it realized its full level of normal earnings.

The reason for this provision is clear. The purpose of relief is to establish a fair and just standard of normal earnings to be used in determining what portion of current earnings constitute excess profits. This standard of normal earnings implies a level or range of profits needed not only to furnish an adequate return on the capital invested in the business, but also to provide reimbursements for deficits or low earnings encountered in the early years of operations. Therefore, any unused excess-profits credit obtained as a result of the difference between constructive normal profits and the subnormal earnings of a taxpayer which had not yet reached its level of normal operations would, in effect, be a form of double relief. Moreover, to permit a taxpayer to compute an unused excess-profits credit in such a case would discriminate unfairly against competitive corporations which had realized normal earnings in comparable excess-profits-tax years since they would have no unused excess-profits credit.

F. Normal profits in the case of taxpayers with no base period earnings experience

Finally, there is the question of normal profits of taxpayers qualifying for relief under subsection 722 (c). Taxpayers of this class were not in existence during the base period; hence no appeal can be made to a pre-war earnings record. On the other hand, obviously, no account can be taken of actual wartime earnings.

In such cases the taxpayer, in establishing a constructive average base period net income, is allowed to refer to the actual earnings experience of comparable taxpayers during the base period. This is not the comparative standard of the First World War. It does not entitle a new business with abnormally low capital to use the average profits of representative firms in the same business. It does no more than give a taxpayer an opportunity to reconstruct an earnings

[1] Cf. Cardozo, The Paradoxes of Legal Science, p. 1 (1927).

experience on the basis of comparatives after he has established the fact that a comparison between his own earning capacity and that of such similar taxpayer is a reasonable one.

IV. RULES FOR THE COMPUTATION OF THE CONSTRUCTIVE AVERAGE BASE PERIOD NET INCOME

I should now like to discuss some of the specific rules which have been prescribed for the computation of the constructive average base period net income.

(a) First, there is the question of the relationship between the general relief provisions of section 722 and the specific relief provisions of section 713, i. e., the elimination of a deficit year, the 75-percent rule, and the growth formula. Briefly, the problem is this: Should a taxpayer be permitted as a matter of right to benefit from the provisions of section 713 if its base period earnings have been reconstructed under the provisions of section 722? For example, take the case of the taxpayer whose operations were interrupted by a fire which occurred during the early part of 1939, with the result that its earnings for that 1 year were abnormally depressed. Assume, further, that after adjusting the 1939 income so as to eliminate the effects of the fire upon base-period earnings it is found that the income for 1938 is less than 75 percent of the income of the other 3 years.

Should this taxpayer be allowed to substitute for its actual 1938 income an amount equal to 75 percent of the income of the other 3 years? Under the particular circumstances of this case it would appear to be inequitable not to permit it to do so. If this taxpayer were not allowed to use the 75 percent rule, it would clearly be placed in a less favorable position than a competitor which, except for the year of the fire, had a similar pattern of income during the base period.

On the other hand, take the case of the taxpayer whose average base period net income is found to be an inadequate standard of normal earnings because it is a member of an industry which is subject to sporadic and intermittent periods of high production and profits, and such periods were not adequately represented in the base period. In such a case, the actual earnings of no one or two specific years can be said to have been abnormally low. The adjustment called for under section 722 is an adjustment in the entire base period earnings, and no importance can be attached to the manner in which the taxpayer may choose to distribute such earnings over the four years comprising this period.

Clearly, this taxpayer should not be permitted to enjoy the benefits of the growth formula merely because it chooses to allocate the larger part of its constructive net income to the last two base period years. If it is established that the taxpayer was, in fact, growing during the base period, this should be taken into account in determining the constructive average. The use of the automatic growth formula would, however, be inappropriate in such a case.

The rule has, therefore, been adopted that the principles of the special relief provisions may be applied in the computation of constructive base period net income if the case warrants their application, but that no taxpayer coming under the provisions of section 722 will be permitted to apply the special relief provisions of section 713 as a matter of right.

If abnormally poor years in the taxpayer's base period are corrected under section 722, it is contemplated that years of abnormally high earnings will likewise be revised and corrected in order to determine the fair and just amount of a taxpayer's earnings. At first glance this position may appear to be inconsistent with the intent of Congress in enacting a general-relief provision. It is true that, taken as a whole, general relief is a one-way proposition. It provides a higher credit for those taxpayers whose earnings were abnormally depressed, but it does not reduce the credits of those taxpayers which were abnormally prosperous during the base period.

However, the relief afforded by section 722 is specifically limited to "a fair and just amount, representing normal earnings." Clearly, no such amount can be reached if account is taken only of those abnormalities in the experience of the taxpayer which had the effect of reducing its income. To ignore those abnormal circumstances which tended to increase actual base-period earnings would be equivalent to allowing a taxpayer an excess-profits credit greater than an amount representing normal earnings.

(b) A somewhat similar relationship exists between the general relief provisions and the specific relief provisions of section 711 (b) (1). In the latter provisions Congress has enacted specific rules to scale down abnormal or abnormally large base period deductions not usually experienced by a taxpayer. These rules are based upon the relationship between deductions in a particular year with such deductions in the preceding 4 years. If the deductions in any one year exceed 125 percent of the average deductions in other years, the deductions in the unusually large year are mechanically reduced to 125 percent of the average. As in the case of the relief provisions of section 713, the application of the relief provisions of section 711 may be unjustifiable if a fair and just amount representing normal earnings presupposes the absence of unusual and peculiar elements. The relief rules in section 711 cannot be used as a matter of right, but may be applied in principle if warranted in determining normal earnings.

(c) In addition to section 722, which is designed to correct the excess-profits credit, the excess-profits tax law contains various relief provisions which mitigate the effect of abnormally large income during the excess-profits tax period. Thus, section 721 levels off abnormally large income in any one year over the years to which such income is actually attributable. Section 736 (a) provides relief for taxpayers on the installment method of accounting which are hit by anti-inflationary regulations tending to bunch in one or two years income which normally would have spread over several years. Section 736 (b) grants a measure of relief to taxpayers which under the complete contract method of accounting must report in one year income from contracts which may have been in progress over a period of years. These sections and section 722 are complementary rather than mutually exclusive. As such, both may be used by the taxpayer. Congress has specifically said, however, that in the case of installment-basis taxpayers the base period shall not be recomputed under the method of relief provided for the excess-profits-tax years; contrariwise, in the case of long-term contract taxpayers Congress has provided that the base period should be recomputed under the accounting method provided as relief for such taxpayers. Although taxpayers using these relief sections may also use section 722 to correct a base period inadequacy, section 722 may not be used as an oblique means of avoiding these provisions to obtain a more favorable method of computation.

(d) The determination of what is excessive and discriminatory excess-profits taxation from which Congress intended to relieve corporations by section 722 is not based upon the consideration that the excess-profits tax consumes too large a portion of the taxpayer's taxable income or upon the consideration that a taxpayer pays a larger percentage of its income as tax than a competitor. It is based upon a finding of inherent inequity in the taxpayer's excess-profits credit. It is a logical consequence, therefore, that relief obtained in the form of a constructive average base period net income may be used in a proper case to compute an unused excess-profits credit for purposes of a carry-over or carry-back, as well as to diminish a tax liability for a particular year.

In this connection, an application for relief need not be filed for the taxable year from which it is desired to carry over an unused excess-profits credit based upon the constructive average base period net income. A timely application filed for the year to which the carry-over is to be applied is sufficient.

(e) Corporations comprising an affiliated group have the privilege of making consolidated income and excess-profits tax returns. The consolidated returns regulations provide certain principles of accounting which view the group, generally, as a business unit. Consequently, any relief requested by the group must depend upon whether such group, as it existed during any excess-profits tax year, satisfied the eligibility requirements of section 722.

(f) It would be a useless burde.. both upon a taxpayer and the Government to compel new applications for relief and reexamination of cases after a constructive average base period net income has finally been determined for the taxpayer. The regulations, therefore, provide, as did the regulations under section 722 prior to its amendment, that in certain instances a constructive average base period net income established for a taxpayer may be used in subsequent years without the necessity of additional applications. This does not mean that any error incurred may not be corrected in a subsequent year through a reexamination. Since the theory of section 722 is to establish a fair standard based upon the current character of a taxpayer in the framework of certain base period conditions, a constructive average base period net income determined with respect to a taxpayer cannot be used if the character of such taxpayer has changed.[2] Thus, if there has been any change in an affiliated group making a consolidated return, the new group must be examined to determine whether it satisfies the requirements for relief. Likewise, if a supplement A transaction has occurred, the nature of the base period experience of the acquiring corporation must be analyzed to ascertain whether it is entitled to relief.

All of you are, most naturally, interested in knowing how section 722 will be applied in the case of particular taxpayers. In the nature of the case, "it is practically impossible in laying down a general rule to anticipate and provide in specific terms for every case."[3] "The process of inclusion and exclusion, so often applied in developing a rule, cannot end with its first enunciation; there must be some resort to the trial-and-error method."[3] I have defined broadly some of the terms in which Congress has expressed its intent to prevent hardships from arising under the excess-profits tax law. To use the language of Justice Cardozo, "Definitions more precise must abide the wisdom of the future."[4]

---

[2] Cf. *Gorieb* v. *Fox* (274 U. S. 603, 607 (1927) (nontax)); *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 548, 591 (1937) (social security tax)).

[3] Brandeis, J., dissenting in *Washington* v. *Dawson & Co.* (26[4] U. S. 219, 236 (1924) (nontax)). Cf. Black, J., concurring in *Helvering* v. *Gerhardt* (304 U. S. 405, 425 (1938) (i. t.)).

[4] *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis* (301 U. S. 548, 591 (1937)).

In your practice of accounting you are concerned with the interests of particular taxpayers. But the interest of taxpayers can extend beyond the immediate case; indeed, every case has not only its immediate particular aspects, but its long-range general implications. The interest of no particular taxpayer in the specific application of general relief should be placed ahead of its fair administration in the interests of all taxpayers. Abuse of the statute would undoubtedly result in drastic modification. Everyone will remember the abuse of the cognate sections of the 1918 act. Accordingly, I hope that in your preoccupation with the cases of particular taxpayers, you will not lose sight of the principles which must govern the administration of general relief if the excess-profits tax is to function as an effective instrument of war taxation.

Give Retailers Credit, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the number of retail food stores declined over 33,000 in the past year. That is according to figures presented by the Progressive Grocer, the national magazine of the food trade. Lack of goods to sell and inability to meet Government regulations are assigned as the principal causes.

The passing from the picture of these independent businessmen is not only a personal tragedy to thousands of people; it constitutes a real menace to our individualistic type of government.

The place of the retailer in our system of economy is well set out in the following editorial from the June 9, 1943, issue of the Wellsburg Herald, published in Wellsburg, Iowa, which I include in this extension of remarks:

GIVE RETAILERS CREDIT, TOO

It would sound strange to hear Mr. Henry Kaiser stand up and argue that ships are essential to the war effort. Fortunately, he doesn't have to. Everyone knows it. But there are industries just as essential as shipbuilding, whose wartime operating difficulties are immensely aggravated because their essentiality has never been recognized.

Such an industry is retail distribution. The clothes on our backs, the shoes we wear, the food we eat, must be put within our reach by the distribution industry. No service is more essential. Speaking for the industry, David R. Craig, president of the American Retail Federation, has this to say of merchandising: "We are essential because we are the industry * * * upon which the public must rely in order to obtain the goods which it must have. We do not know of any other way in which the civilian public can get its goods. The retailer is the quartermaster to the civilian population. * * * The real question is whether the civilian population is essential."

If the civilian population is essential, then the industry which supplies it with necessities must also be essential. Since no reasonable person questions the need for a hard-working, highly productive civilian population in wartime, why should the job which the merchant must carry on be minimized? Why should the merchants, in addition to feeding and clothing us, be forced to argue the obvious—that efficient distribution of necessities is as vital as an adequate supply of necessities?

Address of Hon. Sumner Welles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the commencement exercises of the North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham, N. C., May 31, 1943:

I am deeply appreciative of the privilege you have granted me of delivering this commencement address to the North Carolina College for Negroes.

No citizen of the United States, who is afforded the opportunity, in these days, of speaking to a graduating class of one of our universities or colleges, can accept that honor without a very deep sense of gratitude, and without a very profound feeling of humility.

You who are graduating today will in one form or another now enter the service of our country. You will enter that service at a moment when the United States is engaged in the greatest struggle of its history—the struggle to preserve the liberty and independence of the American people, and the battle to make it forever certain that freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples like ourselves can in the world of the future live in happiness and in safety.

We are confronted by the most sinister and the most ruthless forces which our modern world has known. There is no brutality of which they are not capable—no machination, however despicable, to which they will not stoop. The Axis Powers have sought to obliterate from this earth everything which to us makes life worth living, and to reduce all of humanity other than themselves to the status of the slaves of a master race.

There could be nothing more perilous than to underestimate the strength remaining to our adversaries, nor to believe that we have not still before us many desperately sad and anxious days. But we are entitled to derive great hope and encouragement from the magnificent victories which the United Nations have recently inflicted upon their enemies. The beacon light of our war objective, the unconditional surrender of our foes, burns ever brighter as we advance toward it.

Millions of young Americans like yourselves, with a courage and a devotion which have never been surpassed, have dedicated themselves to the great cause for which our country and the other United Nations stand, the cause of human liberty.

Many of them from every section of this land already have laid down their lives for that cause.

Almost a quarter of a century ago Woodrow Wilson spoke these words: "It is our duty to take and maintain the safeguards which will see to it that the mothers of America and the mothers * * * of all the other suffering nations should never be called upon for this sacrifice again. This can be done. It must be done. And it will be done."

For many years these appeared to me to be very deeply tragic words. The failures, and the selfishness, and the criminal shortsightedness of peoples and of governments throughout the world during the decades that spent themselves after the end of the last World War, seemed to make infinitely remote the possibility of achieving the ideal for which President Wilson so valiantly fought, and for which he died. And yet, now that I myself have grown older, I can see clearly that those words were not tragic. They are filled with indomitable faith and with prophetic truth. What many of us perhaps have not realized sufficiently is that no great achievement in human progress has ever yet been realized until the sacrifices of men and women have paved the way for its realization, and until the conscience of mankind has refused to admit the possibility of any other outcome.

So has it been in our own history. We are wont to speak with devotion of our Constitution as the greatest instrument which the human brain has conceived. It is. But we do not so often remember that in the 150 years of our national life our Constitution has been, not a static, but a living thing—continuously adapted by the wisdom of our people to their changing needs as their material evolution and their spiritual growth have advanced.

Time and again in our history progress toward the great objectives set forth in our Declaration of Independence has been checked. Often we have fallen back. But eventually we have moved on, ahead.

And, in the new world of the future, which you, and those of your generation, will join in building, that same process must take its course. My generation has fallen back. Your generation must press forward. Without that vision, what we term modern civilization cannot survive.

The long-range problem which confronts us all is the achievement, through our victory, of permanent peace.

No one of us can afford to be so blind to his own self-interest as to pay any heed to those cynics whose voices we occasionally hear trying to tell the men and women of this country that just because there have always been wars in the past, there will always be wars in the future; that the surest way for us to save our own skins is for the United States to "mind its own business," and after this war is over once more to pretend that what goes on in the rest of the world does not affect every one of us here within the borders of our own country.

The people of this country have seen that policy tried out, and fail—utterly and miserably. The mothers and the fathers of today realize that if the United States had in reality seen clearly what its "business" was during the past 20 years, and had in fact "minded" it, by taking a hand in putting out the first flames which later lighted this world conflagration, their sons would not today be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice in the defense of the liberty and security of their native land.

The taxpayers of the United States also realize today that this crushing burden of taxation imperatively required of them in order that we may win the war, and this staggering debt which will have to be borne by our country to enable the United States to produce the armaments we require to equip our own armed forces and to strengthen the power of our allies, could have been avoided if their government had been empowered to assume its fair share of responsibility in the past for keeping peace in the world, and for seeing to it, together with the governments of other civilized and peace-minded nations, that international disputes

as they arose were promptly settled by pacific means, and that militaristic dictatorships bent on world domination were quashed before they had the chance to run amuck.

The people of the United States realize today, I am convinced, that what we have utterly failed to do in the past was, in the truest and most practical sense, "to mind our own business." They cannot fail to see also that, had we been willing to play our part in keeping the peace of the world since the last World War, the cost to us in life and treasure would have been but an infinitesimal part of the cost required of us today so that we can achieve that victory which we must gain, if the United States is to survive as a free nation.

This long-range problem of post-war policy is fundamentally a question of our own self-interest.

I know that men and women are thinking this problem through in every section of this country. The more opportunity which is given for public discussion of these vital issues, the more light which is thrown upon the specific aspects of the complexities which are involved, the more assurance will there be that the answer to be given by our democracy will be a wise one. It has always seemed to me that if the American people had had more time for study and discussion of the basic policy at stake in 1919, and if the issue itself had not become enmeshed in the web of bitter partisan politics, a more realistic and a more enlightened course would have been followed by this country during the past generation.

It is my individual view that it would be premature at this stage for this Government to attempt to define with precision and in detail any exact plan of international operation upon which the American people would be expected to pass.

We all of us must agree that certain conditions are going inevitably to obtain at the conclusion of the war.

For a number of years, particularly in Europe, social and economic conditions will be in a state of flux. In some of the presently Axis-occupied countries there will be political instability. Both in these countries, as well as in the Axis countries, millions will be starving, and other millions must be repatriated to the homes from which they have been driven. Throughout the world there will be a chaotic, and, in some areas, an anarchic, state of affairs.

During this period—and no one can today estimate how long it may be—order will have to be maintained by those of the United Nations which will have to assume these necessary functions.

It is during that transition period, as well as during the remaining period of the war, that the opportunity may presumably be afforded to the United Nations to undertake the more specific elaboration of the form of international organization upon which they may jointly determine.

We all of us remember that the agreements, which in their entirety comprise the inter-American understanding upon which pan-Americanism rests, and through which the regional solidarity of the American republics has had its being, were not brought into existence in a day. They were not achieved by means of an initial blueprint. On the contrary, the objectives sought were only achieved over a period of many years, and it required an actual act of aggression against one of the American republics, the United States, to bring about the final consummation of the regional understanding of the Western Hemisphere.

It may well be that the surest course for the United Nations to pursue would be the construction of an international organization by the same method of gradual evolution. By permitting sufficient elasticity of operation at the outset of the transition period, the practical experience undergone by the United Nations during the war, as well as after the victory is won, will presumably demonstrate clearly the type of organization which will most efficiently guarantee the securing of the basic objectives which they seek.

It seems clear, though, as a result of the tragic lesson which humanity has learned from the events of the past 25 years, that any form of international organization, in order to function successfully, must be premised upon the recognition of a few cardinal principles:

There must be, through international agreement, a combination of armed forces made available by the powers which are prepared to do so, which may be used regionally or on a broader scale, and which can, and will, prevent aggression, render international conflict impossible, and, in general, see to it that the peace of the world is maintained inviolate;

An international tribunal to which international controversies can be referred, and in which international confidence can be safely placed;

An efficient international method for the outlawing of certain kinds of armaments and for the inspection of all national armaments.

The creation of appropriate and practical technical organizations to deal with economic and financial matters, and to advise the members of the United Nations thereon, so that autarchic commercial and financial policies will not be pursued by individual powers, and so that the post-war period may be an epoch of economic cooperation and of rising living standards, rather than a time of cutthroat competition and of falling living standards for us all.

The recognition—not merely in words but in practice, as in the Western Hemisphere—of the principle of the equal sovereignty of all states, whether great or small. And together with this, the establishment of the principle that the path must be prepared for the freedom and self-government of all peoples who desire their liberty, as soon as they are able to assume that right.

Finally, in the kind of world for which we fight, there must cease to exist any need for the use of that accursed term "racial or religious minority". If the peoples of the earth are fighting, and dying, to preserve, and to secure, the liberty of the individual under law, is it conceivable that the peoples of the United Nations can consent to the re-establishment of any system where human beings will still be regarded as belonging to such "minorities". The equality of individuals, like the equality of peoples, cannot in fact be granted by fiat. Equality depends on their own achievements, and upon their own intrinsic worth. But to equality of human rights, and to equality of opportunity, every human being is by Divine right entitled. That is the essence of our democratic faith. If that cornerstone is laid in the foundation of the new world of the United Nations, the blot of the concept of minorities upon the fabric of our civilization will be erased.

In a cemetery, far from here, there was erected a monument to the memory of a group of American fliers who died in the last World War. On it were written these words of the Prophet Samuel:

"And in their death they were not divided; they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions."

To me these words apply to all of the countless defenders of the faith which we uphold. United in sacrifice for the ideals of freedom for which our country and its allies stand, they constitute a brotherhood which knows no divisions of faith or race. They are joined by the indissoluble bonds of their common love of liberty.

It is to you and to your comrades in arms that this sorely stricken world looks with confident trust for its redemption. If you, of this new generation, in all of the lands where the love of freedom is the supreme value, refuse to permit yourselves to be divided in war or in peace, you can forge that new world of which mankind has so long dreamed, a world which is free from war, and in which men and women can live out their lives in security, in happiness, and in peace.

The Bureau of Reclamation's Contribution to the War Food Production Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD a news release showing the tremendous contribution to the Nation's food supplies made by Federal reclamation projects in the West.

This is of especial interest at this time since in a few days the Congress will be considering in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill recommendations for increased appropriations to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to extend its irrigation facilities. The bill is now before the Senate with recommendations that have come to the Capitol since the measure passed the House. I do not believe there is any doubt about what this House will do with these recommendations.

I hope to see within a year or two the great San Joaquin Valley area to be served by the Central Valley project included in the agricultural regions served by the Bureau of Reclamation. The scope of the activities of this great food-producing agency of the Federal Government will be almost doubled by the completion of the Central Valley project. I commend the Bureau of Reclamation and its activities to the attention of the House.

The news release made by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, on the basis of a report by Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, is as follows:

Farmers on Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects in the West are striving to increase the 1943 production of critical war crops over the 1942 record, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today. The acreage planted to prime foods for the home and fighting fronts—potatoes, beans, and forage for beef and dairy products—indicate record outputs of these commodities.

Preliminary reports of spring plantings on reclamation projects were submitted to Secretary Ickes by Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, who also reviewed the completed reports on 1942 production. The latter also showed the highest gross crop values and the largest acreage irrigated in the history of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Crops from nearly 4,000,000 acres served by reclamation works were valued at more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

"These data show that if irrigation farmers have labor for harvesting, the 1942 production record will be exceeded this year, and that the

food output from these federally operated facilities will again materially aid in feeding the increasing military and civilian population of the West," Secretary Ickes observed. "The output of the reclamation farms relieves the transportation of needed food supplies from agricultural areas eastward and also aids in supplying overseas requirements.

"The projects in 1942 raised enough potatoes to provide yearly rations for more than 13,000,000 people and enough beans for more than 38,000,000. The beef and dairy herds, fed the alfalfa and grains grown on the irrigated land, supplied the equivalent of annual milk rations for more than 3,000,000 people, and beef rations for more than three and one-half million. Potato acreage this year on at least three major projects is double that of last year. The bean yield on all Bureau developments is expected to show an increase of more than 50 percent and the alfalfa production also a substantial gain."

The value of 1942's outstanding crop, made known for the first time, was $268,000,000, a 46-percent increase over the previous high, recorded in 1941, the Secretary said. The figures are based on reports from more than 3,800,000 irrigated acres on 41 projects in 15 Western States.

The reports show that Bureau projects last year produced 62,000,000 bushels of vegetables, including potatoes and beans; 3,000,000 tons of alfalfa and other forage; a billion pounds of fruits and nuts; 26,000,000 bushels of cereals (almost entirely for location consumption); two and one-half million bushels of clover, alfalfa, and other seeds; more than 200,000 bales of cotton, largely long-staple for war purposes; and two and one-fourth million tons of sugar beets—equivalent of an annual supply of sugar, as now rationed, for 21,000,000 people—for 1 out of every 6 people in the United States.

"In the 41 years since the Bureau was organized its projects have produced crops valued at three and one-fourth billion dollars—four times the Government's total investment," the Secretary pointed out. He also drew attention to the power output of Bureau multiple-purpose projects, adding: "Many of the bustling war industries of the West would come to a standstill but for Reclamation energy. In 1942 seven and one-fourth billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy—one-fourth of that generated in the far Western States during the year—came from Bureau projects as a byproduct through the double use of water."

Mr. Bashore informed the Secretary that the outlook for water supplies for irrigation and power production continued good in practically all western drainage basins. The major exception is in Arizona, where the irrigation situation will be protected to a large extent by the large amount of storage held over from 1941 and 1942.

Crop values per acre reached new highs on Bureau projects during 1942 averaging more than $70 an acre—an increase of 30 percent over the preceding year. Of the large developments, the Salt River project in Arizona and the Yakima project in eastern Washington showed greatest returns—more than $128 per acre. Next highest was the Rio Grande project in New Mexico and Texas, with a per-acre value of $116, followed by the Yuma project (Arizona-California), $113, and the Klamath project (Oregon-California), $108 per acre.

Bureau projects in 1942 irrigated a total of 3,972,000 acres in 15 States, of which 1,890,677 acres received a full supply. Of the remainder, 835,691 acres received supplemental supplies from storage works constructed by the Bureau and 1,245,752 acres were supplied under special contracts from regular projects.

Crop returns from the Imperial irrigation district in southern California, which is served by the All-American Canal, are included in the Bureau's annual totals for the first time. The Imperial Valley, which was transformed by irrigation from a desert into a highly productive area, formerly received water from a canal which looped 30 miles through Mexico. Beginning in February 1942, it received its full supply from the All-American Canal, which was constructed and is operated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on June 12, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, it is hard for me to describe the feeling to you of deep satisfaction which comes over me when I think of the last 2 week ends spent at home. It brings, also, a sense of homesickness and nostalgia which often overcomes me. Being in Washington has its advantages. As your Representative, I am close to the scene of action and can thereby get right to the meat of any problem you folks back home may want solved. But being in Washington also has its disadvantages: I am deprived of the daily observations and views which you people would ordinarily submit to me face to face; I miss seeing you and talking with you, which I would be able to do if distance did not separate us.

If any problem seemed uppermost in people's minds when I was home, it was the gasoline situation. There is a smoldering discontent and dissatisfaction at home over the way the East is being discriminated against by bureaucratic agents. I cannot find one argument to support their claim that the Atlantic seaboard should be deprived of gasoline while the rest of the country rides unchecked.

Everybody remembers a few months ago, I introduced a bill in Congress making it unlawful for the Office of Price Administration to take away gas ration cards and automobile licenses and to exact other penalties upon those who were accused of petty offenses in connection with pleasure driving. This bill prohibited the Office of Price Administration from setting up its own tribunal to judge people it accused and from carrying out other steps which it had no right to do.

The bill I introduced was unnecessary, because no executive agency or department of our Government has any right under the Constitution to make its laws, to enforce them, or to sit as a judge and jury over those it accuses. The whole course which the Government is pursuing is absolutely illegal. There is nothing in the Constitution which gives it the right to follow this course. Congress has never sanctioned these outrageous steps. The Supreme Court has never upheld them.

As I have many times pointed out, I believe that rationing of petroleum in America is probably necessary. We are all agreed that Americans should use this vital war material sparingly. But the ridiculous thing to me is, after a few gasoline coupons have been issued, to people, to have an army of snoopers descend upon our citizens and question their right to use that small allotment of gasoline as they see fit. Why give them the gasoline in the first place? What good is it if they dare not use it? I say it is people's own business how they use what little gasoline the Office of Price Administration allots them. They are getting less and less pleasure all the time. Why deprive them of the little that remains? Too much regulation, too much pushing around is going to hurt the war effort.

My remedy is to put the people in the East on the same basis as all the rest. If rationing of gasoline must be extended throughout the Nation in order to win the war, then let's do it. But don't endanger the food-for-victory program here in upstate New York by keeping gas away from farmers who need it for their trucks and tractors. Don't put any more obstacles in the way of defense workers getting to their factories. Give them all the gasoline they need. Then, if there's a shortage, place the rest of the country on the same basis we have had to operate on for the past year. What's fair for 12 Eastern States is fair for all.

May I read to you several recommendations expressed by my good and able friend, Congressman FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr., of New Jersey, who is doing a splendid job as head of a special committee in the House investigating the present gasoline dilemma. Mr. HARTLEY states:

"In order that the present situation in the Northeast States shall be neither dragged out for an unduly long period, nor suddenly occur a third time, we believe that certain steps should be taken at this time in a longer range program which will affect supplies next winter and next year.

"IMMEDIATE PROGRAM—MORE GASOLINE BY RAIL FROM MIDWEST

"In order to deliver to the Northeast the maximum quantities of motor fuel for the next 90 days in available tank cars and inland barges, the Petroleum Administrator should direct the movement of at least 200,000 barrels per day additional from district 2 to district 1.

"Mr. Ickes has already hinted that this move may be necessary. He was reported in the New York Herald Tribune of June 2 as warning that the effects of the shortage might soon extend inland to midwestern and other States, and that if diversion of midwest oil supplies to the East would help ease the crisis, that course would be followed. It should be started without delay.

"By reason of the shorter turn-around from storage tanks and refineries in district 2 (Midwest) as compared to district 3 (Gulf territory) total deliveries by tank car would be increased 50,000 barrels per day by drawing 150,000 barrels more by rail from the Midwest. The same tank cars can deliver 150,000 barrels per day of gasoline from the Midwest on a 12-day turn-around as against 100,000 barrels hauled from the Southwest on an 18- or 20-day turn-around. At present 80 percent of the total movement is from long-haul points in the Gulf territory.

"Gasoline stocks in district 2 are approximately double from those of district 1, even under the present rationing. They could be drawn upon at the rate of 200,000 barrels per day above present shipments from district 2 for 2 or 3 months and still not pull these stocks down below those on the east coast.

"Furthermore, an additional supply out of current production could be made available to the east coast if the restrictions on driving were equalized to a greater extent. At the present time the basic allowance in district 2 are three times those in district 1 and there is no pleasure ban on the use of the gasoline in district 2.

"We believe further that the administration of every phase of the petroleum problems, including rationing, price fixing, and

transportation, should be placed under the jurisdiction of the Office of Petroleum Administration. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the coupon system of gas rationing has proved entirely inadequate, and has in itself contributed largely to the development of a huge black market, we recommend consideration of rationing on the basis of dealer quotas.

"Furthermore, in view of the need for thorough study and the establishment of a long-term program, and in view of public confidence and approval of the study and recommendations of the Baruch committee on synthetic rubber, that that committee be called upon to make a similar study and recommendations in connection with petroleum problems.

"The United States more than any nation in the world is geared to wheels. The failure to be adequately prepared for the distribution of our petroleum products might easily result in the break-down of the war effort on the home front. Our people will make whatever sacrifice they know to be necessitated by the war effort, but it is our obligation as Representatives of the Eastern Seaboard States to make every effort to prevent any hardship which is the result of inadequate planning or inefficient and confused administration."

To my friends in greater Endicott, Vestal, Endwell, Hooper, Oakdale, and environs, I wish to say that I am greatly honored by an invitation from the Federated Men's Bible Classes to give the twelfth annual Flag Day address at Endicott tomorrow at 3 o'clock. I understand this ceremony will be held at the honor plaque on East Main Street. I assure the committee I anticipate being there and meeting with these patriotic citizens for the purpose of paying tribute to the countless hundreds of boys from there, the Endicott and Vestal areas, now serving Uncle Sam in the war. I look forward to this occasion because I greatly admire the lively interest which the people of greater Endicott and Vestal take in their boys in service.

While I am talking about Flag Day, let me remind you of the beautiful flag book I have which as you know is published by the United States Marine Corps. If you desire one or more copies of this attractive history of our flag, do not hesitate to write me in Washington and request me to send it. You will be intensely interested and will enjoy the book a great deal.

Remember that as your hired man in Washington, I expect you will submit to me your suggestions, views, and ideas whenever you see fit. I also hope you will call on me in the event I can be of service in helping you to solve problems which may come up in connection with this awful war. You have the right as Americans to look upon your Government in Washington, not as masters but as your servants.

I hope you will consider me as one who wishes to serve you and who is dedicated to preserving our American form of Government as well as the most glorious flag which ever floated in the winds of time.

Col. John M. Barr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest some days ago an article carried in the Columbia Record entitled "S. C. Flier Wins 3 Medals Simultaneously in India." This article referred to Col. John M. Barr, originally from Gilbert, S. C., Lexington County. His present home is San Antonio, Tex.

Some years ago I had the privilege of appointing this young man to West Point, where he was able to make a record for himself. He immediately went to Texas for the purpose of entering into training. He is now in the service at New Delhi, India.

This young man, who is now 34 years of age, was awarded three medals—the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Silver Star and the Air Medal—a record in that theater of Allied operations. He has been ordered to return to the United States immediately for a new assignment.

The awards were made by Maj. Gen. Clayton L. Bissell, commander of the Tenth Air Force, who said at the time of making the awards: "His record speaks for itself."

This article states that Colonel Barr received the Silver Star for carrying out 1,000-pound bombing missions in a P-40, the Distinguished Flying Cross for "extraordinary achievement" while participating in more than 50 combat missions, and the Air Medal for "meritorious achievement" while participating in more than 25 missions.

The Silver Star was won by Colonel Barr in making his initial test from an airdrome in upper Assam into enemy territory, each time with a 1,000-pound bomb on his P–40, during that period carrying out, with other members of his command, the development of technique of this type of bombing mission and its actual successful application under fire against the enemy.

These tests, according to the newspaper article, involved the carrying of twice the bomb-load ever before carried by this type of aircraft.

Colonel Barr has been in India since May 1942.

I am justly proud of the record made by this young man, he having made good under my appointment to West Point, being the type of young man that I have always been interested in in making my appointments to West Point and Annapolis, coming from a humble family, living in the country—the type of young man of which we have thousands, who will make good if only you will give them a chance.

Music—A Part of Our War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on this Flag Day, June 14, 1943, when we celebrate the anniversary of the adoption of the American flag in 1777, our hearts are filled with highest patriotic emotion. It is fitting on such a day that we should consider the place of patriotic songs in our war effort.

"Give me the making of the songs of a nation and I care not who makes its laws," said Andrew Fletcher, of Saltoun, 200 years ago in his Conversation Concerning a Right Regulation of Government for the Common Good of Mankind.

Mr. Speaker, many men who know the elements that make a strong people in wartime have called for great war songs.

We cannot overestimate the value of music to morale. Community singing is one of the most effective means yet found to build a wholesome, united, fighting spirit into men. This is true in the armed forces, and it is true in the army of the home front. Community singing sets people's spirits free. It stirs men's wills to action. It can rouse the soul of a nation. It can give men a sense of common destiny. It can inspire them to give themselves wholeheartedly to a great cause.

One of our difficulties today on the home front is that we have not yet fully mobilized the all-out will to sacrifice and win. We have not yet fully pictured for the American people the great cause for which we fight and for which we must give ourselves gloriously or die ignominiously.

To do that—to produce such a fighting faith—we need weapons. We need weapons for morale as effective as the General Sherman and the P–38. Just such a weapon is making its appearance today from coast to coast. This is the publication day of a new song book, "Songs From the Victory Revue 'You Can Defend America.'" Between the covers of this illustrated book are 10 lively songs—some catchy, some stirring—all proven morale builders in the barracks and on the assembly lines.

In a southern training base of the Army Air Forces a private last week got an advance copy of this songbook. Since then the songs have spread through the barracks and the camp. An officer said that if the Army and the civilians could all sing songs like these we could shorten the war by 6 months.

Because of the vital necessity to the war effort of such morale-building weapons, I bring this matter to the attention of the House today. I commend this songbook to every Member, and I urge that it be made widely known.

The lyrics and music were written by members of the Moral Rearmament group, which is composed of individuals who are striving to bring greater unity to our Nation during these times of trial.

The introduction to this songbook reads as follows:

America fights two wars: the war of arms and the war of ideas. To win both wars we need the force of arms plus the superforce of an unconquerable spirit.

These songs were written in the heat of world conflict to fire the heart of America to a reawakening of patriotism and sacrifice.

The victory revue in which they are featured has been playing to packed houses from California right across to Maine.

The revue dramatizes in 10 fast-moving scenes America's battle on the home front—the battle for sound homes, teamwork in industry, and a united Nation. It has been produced and played by a cast of 100 citizen volunteers who, long before Pearl Harbor, enlisted to bring about the moral rearmament of the Nation.

These citizen volunteers went on the road for national unity. They were invited to State after State by Governors, defense

councils, labor-management comittees, Army camps.

At every crisis in our history America has found songs to stir men's wills and rouse them to courageous action. Once again we Americans, for the sake of a new world, "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The spirit of the songs is epitomized in the Voice of America on the final page of the book, as follows:

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

I listened for the voice of America—
I listened at the busy intersection;
I listened to the roar of the machine and the shop,
To the tread of the marching feet,
To the whispered tale at the cocktail hour
And the strident call of the loudspeaker.
I heard a voice, voices that said,
"I am rich. Where can I buy happiness?"
"Strong hands are at the helm; but I have lost my course."
"Others get what they want; why should I sacrifice?"
"I'm so scared; I don't know what to do."
Are these, are these the voices of America?
Out of the darkness a whisper, almost a sob, a cry:
"Where there is no vision the people perish!"
Then the voice of the Past called to me,
Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, a hundred mighty voices rolled into one and calling:
"O America! We nurtured you, we loved you, we fought for you,
We founded you to be great, to be strong, to be free!
Great because you knew your strength,
Strong that you might be free,
Free to obey God."
I said, "Is this America?"
The voice of the Present answered me:
"We are the millions who work and long to work.
We go to our jobs, we return to our homes;
We long for a destiny, a greatness, a future,
A hope that is more than bread."
And I said, "Is this America?"
The voice of the Future answered me:
"I see an eagle striving, rising, soaring;
I see a Nation waking, stirring, changing,
Rearmed in spirit, humbly triumphant, a Nation united,
Fulfilling the hopes of its founders, the dreams of its people, the plan of its God,
A maker of peace for the nations."
And I said, "Is this America?"
And the mountains said, "Yes!"
And the seas said, "Yes!"
"Yes, yes!" cried the lakes,
And a million million voices from city and farm,
From factory and workshop, from the shore and the plain,
From the far North to the deep South,
Joined in one crashing, resounding, solemn affirmation,
"America!"

Louisiana "Firsts"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call attention at this time to some of the contributions being made by the State of Louisiana toward the war effort.

I am particularly proud of my district, the Seventh Louisiana District, which lies in the southwestern portion of the State.

Besides being one of the largest agricultural districts in the United States, producing a major portion of the rice grown in Louisiana, also sugarcane, sweetpotatoes, Irish potatoes, corn, cotton, hay, soybeans, truck, and many other agricultural products to furnish food which is so sorely needed, my district produces salt and sulfur, used extensively in many ways to provide chemicals for materials of war. Lumber and the livestock industry are important. Of the eight parishes in my district, oil is produced in every one. Evangeline Parish is a large producer with large refineries. All fields furnish natural gas for industrial and other uses. The largest production of oil is in and around Calcasieu Parish, of which Lake Charles is the principal city. Situated on a beautiful lake a short distance to the Gulf of Mexico, Lake Charles has a magnificent port and excellent harbor facilities, which are being utilized in the war effort due to its strategic position. The part that Lake Charles is playing in the war effort can best be visualized by pointing out the most important plants manufacturing high-octane gasoline, butadiene, synthetic rubber, alkali, magnesium, ammonia toluene, chlorine, and salt and salt cakes, all located at or near Lake Charles.

Other portions of my district are contributing in many ways in the war effort, as well as the entire State of Louisiana, and, since Louisiana is a large producer of oil from which comes high-octane gasoline and rubber, I am glad to include in the RECORD a copy of an editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune entitled "Louisiana Firsts," published on the occasion of the recent inspection trip of Rubber Administrator Jeffers and other Government officials:

LOUISIANA "FIRSTS"

An impressive list of "firsts" in rubber-gasoline efforts is posted on behalf of Standard Oil's Baton Rouge installations in connection with the harmony tour visit of Messrs. Patterson, Jeffers, and other high Federal officials. First in size in 100-octane gasoline production capacity; first in time in full-size buna rubber plant construction, in butyl rubber plant operation, in production of butadiene—these are characteristics of which all Louisiana may be proud.

No mention of aviation gasoline is strictly complete however without a reminder of Louisiana's position as a supply center of that lead-derivative fluid which assertedly brings to perfect punching trim fuels ordinarily relegated to purposes of lesser moment. The natural Louisiana components of this "punch juice," now restricted to war usage, are numerous, and a little bit of Louisiana rides in the tanks every time a new aerial blow hits the enemy.

This is a factor among many that have given American airmen not only the highest number in fuel efficiency but a supply that so far has met the expanding needs of combat operations. The supply, Under Secretary of War Patterson repeats, still isn't enough. As he has explained before, one of the things that expands combat needs is the highly favorable fact that more planes are available than was anticipated, due to smaller losses than were expected. He revealed at Baton Rouge that the consequent fuel deficiency is being taken up, not by restricting strategic bombing operations, but by curtailing pilot training in the United States. This shifting of the trouble spot represents only an emergency recourse.

Against the day when the natural solution—provision of more aviation gasoline plants—can be applied, the authorities must continue their hunt for methods of bottleneck breaking. It would seem that the haystack of gasoline production itself, from available plants, has been pretty thoroughly searched. The same scrutiny doubtless will be applied to synthetic rubber production as soon as it reaches a stage where there is something substantial to scrutinize. Effectiveness of the "punch juice" above mentioned seems, unfortunately, to stop at a certain number of octane points. But the extension of that number by research, so as to bring still lower ranges of octane ratings within its influence, certainly is a goal to be sought with all diligence.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALBERT E. CARTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT we have lost a colleague whose record of service to his district, his State, and his Nation, is worthy of emulation.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT was born at Nevada City, Calif., January 2, 1884, in the district he was later to serve with distinction. He was of a distinguished California family. His father, the late Honorable William F. Englebright, represented practically the same district in the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT'S education was acquired at the schools of Nevada City and the University of California. By profession he was a mining engineer and was actively connected with various mining enterprises in California. From 1911 to 1914 he was mineral inspector for the field division of the General Land Office, and later engineer for the State conservation commission.

Always active in fraternal affairs, he was a member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and from 1925 to 1926 was great sachem of the Improved Order of Red Men for the State of California. He also was a member of the American Mining Congress.

On December 14, 1912, he was married to Miss Marie Grace Jackson, of Nevada City. Their only son, Harry Jackson Englebright, is now a lieutenant in the Navy somewhere in the South Pacific.

The district he represented was the largest, in area, in California, and there

were very few of his constituents who did not know him personally. The esteem in which he was held by them is attested by his uninterrupted service in this body. First elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress, he was reelected to each succeeding Congress by increasing majorities and was reelected to the Seventy-eighth Congress without opposition.

His charming manner and friendliness that won him the unswerving loyalty of his friends at home brought about his selection as Republican whip of the House, and it doubtless will be difficult to find another to perform, with equal facility, the duties of this exacting office.

As a Member of the House he served on the Committees on Flood Control, Mines and Mining, and Public Lands, each of which was intimately concerned with the problems of his district and State, and to each he brought a wealth of information that materially aided the facility of constructive legislation.

One of the great projects of California in recent years has been the Central Valley project, embodying the conservation and use of water that had in earlier years run to waste. Great areas of the State need this water. This project enjoyed the material support of Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT from its inception and I think his last appearance before a congressional committee was when he appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, in behalf of this project.

Although he was ill for a long period, very few of his friends were aware of it. He preferred not to burden others with his troubles, but rather to bring happiness to those about him.

He was an able, courageous, and kindly man, always ready to help those who needed assistance, and tireless in doing good.

He spent himself and sacrificed his life for others, and when he passed the shores of the dark river of death he had the faith embodied in Longfellow's lines—

There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call Death.

Lt. John Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the tail of his Flying Fortress completely shot away on a mission over Pantelleria, Lt. John Holmes, the intrepid and skillful pilot, completed his mission over the island, took his plane safely back to north Africa, and landed without further injury to his ship or crew.

This was his third almost identical experience in battle.

The story of his exploits in his famous plane *Yankee Doodle* reads like a novel and had demonstrated his coolness and gallantry under fire long before he performed this latest impossible feat.

Born and reared in Selma, Ala., all Selma and Alabama rejoice in the history being written and the glory being won by this Selmian. The Nation thrills with each such story. Our pride in these boys who are writing America's epic of the air over the seven seas and in a thousand skies is as grateful and humble as it is profound.

Memorial Day at Magnolia Cemetery, Charleston, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under the great oaks in all the solemnity of Magnolia Cemetery, beneath the festoons of gray moss which waved as the gray battle streamers of the Confederacy, a procession wound its way from the gates of the beautiful old resting place of the dead yesterday afternoon to the Confederate lot. Here 1,100 soldiers of the Confederacy sleep their last sleep in spiritual tents "spread on fame's eternal camping ground."

To the inspiring strains of Beethoven's funeral march, known as Webster's funeral march since it was played at the funeral of Daniel Webster, rendered in great musical effect by the Citadel Band of 100 pieces, the procession made its way forward. Here the Ladies' Memorial Association of Charleston, one of the oldest of the South, presided over by Mrs. Roscoe Gerard Rackley, president, who is also South Carolina State president of the Confederated Southern Memorial Association, took charge of the exercises, which have continuously commemorated Memorial Day for nearly three-quarters of a century. The marshal of the day was Mr. Emmons Welch, and presiding over the exercises was Mr. G. L. Buist Rivers. Following the Citadel Band were the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts of Charleston. Under the able direction for years of Mr. Carl Metts, the Citadel Band rendered well the old hymn, Onward, Christian Soldiers, and following this the opening prayer was made by the Reverend Marshall Travers, rector of St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal Church, of Charleston. Again the noted band of the fine old military college of South Carolina made the stretches of woodland and marshland echo with the hymn, How Firm a Foundation. Then the following memorial ode, dedicated to the Charleston generals of the Confederacy and written by Maude Waddell, poet laureate general of the Confederated Southern Memorial Association, was presented by the Reverend Wallace Martin, of Charleston:

FORT SANDERS

(Inscribed to Gen. James Longstreet, C. S. A., and his corps)

Fort Sanders' holy heights,
Hallowed ground of Tennessee,
Like Calvary's hill, lifts heavenward o'er
The South's Gethsemane.
Upon this sacred sod
There died a gallant host
Of shining souls. Their God they loved,
Their God and country most.
As autumn's leaves were falling,
A bleak November day,
And autumn's sadness chilling
These gallant hearts in gray,
The season of the southern cause
Was in its autumn's sere,
And summer's hope was waning,
And death's chill winter near.
But southern souls undaunted dared
The awful charge to make
Upon Fort Sanders' bastioned heights,
These heights, to die, or take.
Nor hunger then, nor bleeding feet,
Nor e'en love's cause a plea,
They nobly offered up their all,
This flower of chivalry.
Three times they charged, nor shot, nor shell,
Nor pain, nor death, nor loss
Were aught, but through their fiery hell
They bore their lonely cross.
As Christ upon His bowed form bore
His cross up Calvary's hill,
Through shrieking shot and shell that tore
Their souls and limbs, they mounted still;
Until upon the parapet,
Within the fearful cannon's mouth,
O'er piles of slain, undaunted yet,
They placed the standard of the South.
On high they placed their country's pride,
To death alone they bowed their heads,
They could not hold the heights, so died,
These glorious, faithful, living dead.
'Tis well, O Daughters, that you raise
A stone to your dear dead on honor's field,
Your heritage, noblesse oblige,
Their life they gave, their trust they did not yield.
O, well these words you write in stone,
They greet the eyes of passers-by,
They lift in true harmonious tone,
They rise like incense to the sky—
"Nor wreck, nor change, nor winter's blight,
"Nor time's remorseless doom,
"Shall dim one ray of glory's light,
"That gilds your glorious tomb."

Following the memorial ode, well rendered by the Reverend Mr. Martin, the Citadel Band played the Bonnie Blue Flag. Then came the chief feature of the afternoon's exercises, the address by Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of Greenville, S. C., well known for his oratory.

BRYSON PRAISES MOTHERS OF THE CONFEDERATES

Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of Greenville, at exercises conducted yesterday in Magnolia Cemetery by the Ladies' Memorial Association of Charleston paid tribute to the noble part of the mothers of men, the women of the South, in the War between the States.

To his unending joy, he said their sons, the heroes of the Confederacy, are more and more honored as time goes on. The speaker said he had on two occasions recently taken part in celebrations held by the Federal Government under the dome of the Capitol honoring the Confederate dead. The birthdays of Lee and Jefferson Davis are celebrated in Washington with joy and appreciation, and General Lee is often spoken of in national circles as one of the greatest Americans of all times, he said.

Congressman BRYSON, who has two sons at Citadel, cited the "contribution which the

heritage of courage and adherence to duty of southern men is making in the present World War." This country has now the greatest number of men under arms in its history, and the nobility and valor of the soldiers of today are a credit to the Nation, he said.

Commending the heroism of the mothers and women of America, he praised the inculcation of principle in modern men. Of this city he said: "The whole State looks to Charleston for the charm of culture and refinement."

A memorial ode dedicated to the Charleston generals of the Confederacy, written by Miss Maude Waddell, poet laureate general of the Confederated Southern Memorial Association, was read by the Reverend Wallace Martin, rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Redeemer.

The procession marched from the gates of the cemetery to the Confederate lot, where the 1,100 graves of Confederate soldiers were decorated. There G. L. Buist Rivers presided over the exercises of the association, which has continuously commemorated Memorial Day for nearly three-quarters of a century. Its president is Mrs. Roscoe Gerard Rackley, who is also president of the Confederated Southern Memorial Association. Marshal of the day was Emmons Welch.

The processional, by the Citadel Band, under the direction of Carl Metts, was followed by Onward, Christian Soldiers. The opening prayer was offered by the Reverend Marshall Travers, rector of St. Philip's Protestant Episcopal Church. The band's other numbers were How Firm a Foundation, the Bonnie Blue Flag, Dixie, and Taps.

Congressman BRYSON substituted for Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, who was unable to address the exercises because of illness in his family. The Reverend St. John Patat, assistant pastor of St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, pronounced the benediction. Taps closed the ceremony.

After the inspiring address by Congressman BRYSON the Citadel Band played Dixie. Then the Reverend St. John Patat, assistant pastor of St. Patrick's Roman Catholic Church, pronounced the benediction. After which the exercises, the association's mark of respect for the dead, came to a beautiful close with Taps, sounding far in the distance and echoing sweetly across the river on the farther shore.

CONFEDERATED SOUTHERN
MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Charleston, S. C., May 27, 1943.

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BRYSON: I appreciated very much your kind letter of the 22d, and am sending you the information requested. In the name of the Ladies' Memorial Association and myself, I wish to thank you for your splendid address on Memorial Day, and hope that at some other time we may have the pleasure of hearing you again.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,
PAULINE LIVINGSTON RACKLEY,
President.

OFFICERS OF THE LADIES' MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

President: Mrs. Roscoe Gerard Rackley.

First vice president: Miss St. Clair Jacques.

Second vice president: Mrs. Emmons Welch.

Recording secretary: Mrs. T. Ritchie Simmons.

Corresponding secretary: Mrs. Fannie M. Muller.

Treasurer: Mrs. J. F. Porcher.

A Son Speaks to His Father

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter received by Mr. Daniel J. Murphy, clerk of committees of the City Council of Lynn, Mass., from his son John, who is serving in the United States Marine Corps and is at present stationed in the South Pacific.

Since this letter was written, the boy has seen considerable action at Guadalcanal, an island which has become almost a symbol of marine courage and fighting ability. I wish to direct your attention to this letter because it manifests so well the sentiment which inspires so many of our gallant youths who are in the armed forces. It is an expression of the basic and truest sentiments of faith, hope, and love.

The letter follows:

NEW RIVER, *June 2, 1942.*

DEAR PA: If you remember, I took you aside last Sunday at the airport, and told you I was going to write you a letter, and address it to the city hall. This is it. The reason I didn't send this home is because this is more or less a personal letter.

You know, Pa, the last two times I have been home I intended to have a heart to heart talk with you, and tell you just how much you, auntie, and Ed have meant to me. We may as well get down to brass tacks. We are at war and I am in the Marine Corps. I may come back alive, and then again, I may not. Once you happened to say to me, "It isn't hard to die." I believe you Pa, just as I have believed everything you have ever told me. I shan't be afraid to die, and if I do, Pa, I don't want you to grieve. After all you have had me with you for 24 years, and my mother had me for just a few days. I am sure she is looking forward to seeing me again, and I most surely am looking forward to seeing her. In the event of my death, if you look at it in the way I have just mentioned your heart will be, I might say, even gladdened instead of saddened. It's easy to say thank you for all the material things you have given me—my home, education, up bringing, etc., but it is more difficult to express my love for you in mere words.

I never wanted very much out of life in a wordly sense. I never really got much either, if you looked at it from a materialistic viewpoint. But really I have had a very happy life. I have had the love of you, Ed, and auntie. You three have been my entire world, and I wanted only out of life that we four should have a happy home, and a great love for each other. How many times has auntie said to me, "John, you have a good father, always love him, and be good to him. Sometimes I get impatient with him, but he is better than the average man." Auntie has had a pretty lonely life, she may not be an intellectual giant, a charming hostess, a brilliant conversationalist, nor any other quality that would mark hers as a woman's life successfully lived in the eyes of the world. But you know she has a heart of gold, and more important she has put the love and fear of God in my heart. I think my mother would consider that more important than the quality of clothing she has worn, or the important friends I might have if I was brought up by a more fashionable yet less morally good woman.

As for Ed, I am sure our affection for one another has been very great. We never had that affection lessened by anything that has happened during our lives. As the years have gone by my love for Ed has deepened.

Well, Pa, all I have written, I wanted to say to you in person, but I guess I lacked the courage. Whether I will see you again in this life, is up to God. If not, I am looking forward to that happiest reunion of all.

Love,

JOHN.

The Forgotten Men of Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "The Forgotten Men of Today," published in the Cumberland News, Cumberland, Md., June 11, 1943:

THE FORGOTTEN MEN OF TODAY

A Washington dispatch by the Associated Press reports Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, as saying that, although Americans are already taxed as heavily as the British and the Canadians, Congress is ready to go to work on a new tax bill "as soon as President Roosevelt has some suggestions."

Two things may be said as to the word from the White House. One is that neither it nor the Treasury had any positive constructive suggestions as to a tax bill when the present mongrel measure was for months on the fire and cooking. The other is that it is a sad commentary upon the duties and responsibilities of the Congress that it dare not take any step without first consulting the master's voice.

But as for the framing of a new tax measure, which, of course, would mean a further load of taxation, some very pertinent things may be said. Gabriel Heatter, the popular radio commentator, said some of them in one of his talks this week when he wondered whether any consideration is to be given to the citizens of this country who have been outrageously discriminated against in this grave matter of income taxation.

Heatter pointed to the taxpayers who are unjustly penalized by the effort to catch those who have received juicy increases in their incomes through work in war industries and through profits from those industries, for the declared purpose of closing the inflationary gap caused by their increased spendings. In order to reach these swollen incomes, it has been deemed necessary to penalize heavily the millions of taxpayers whose incomes have decreased by reason of the fact that their wages and salaries have remained static for several years while their incomes have at the same time actually been decreased by reason of constantly rising costs of living.

These workers, numbering into the millions, are the forgotten men of the present day. In the households of these millions, Heatter declared, and he was indulging in no fanciful exaggerations when he did so,

the earners are wondering how in the world they will be able to make ends meet after their wages and salaries are cut by 20 percent, beginning July 1, when the new income-tax bill comes into operation on their pocketbooks, and when they will subsequently have to pay part of the taxes based on the income of last year and are asked to contribute not the 10 percent hitherto requested by the 25 percent now urged for War bonds.

These oppressed millions can truly wonder and worry where the money is to be found to pay the rent, clothing, and food bills and the other inescapable bills, such as those for medicines, medical care, interest on debts, insurance premiums, and the like. They know they can reduce on some of these but they also realize, with dismay, that the most of them just can't be cut.

If a new tax bill is attempted, certainly the plight of these perplexed millions, which include thousands of families in the Cumberland area, should have some decent consideration if the tax load is to be shared equitably, as it should be.

Heatter wonders who is to speak for these unorganized, bypassed, forgotten men, and does his earnest bit in giving them some articulation. This newspaper has been trying to do so far some time, at the risk of becoming boresome. It is hoped that others will sense the rank injustice of it all and do likewise. These forgotten men comprise an important segment of the population, on whom the essential strength of the civilian economy, so necessary for supporting the war effort, so largely depends.

War Labor Disputes Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Representative FOREST A. HARNESS, Republican, of Indiana on the National Radio Forum, Wednesday, June 16, 1943, over station WMAL, Washington, D. C., on the subject War Labor Disputes Act:

Let me thank the Blue Network, the Washington Star, and you, Mr. Stoddard, for this opportunity to discuss the new War Labor Disputes Act and its significance in this period of wartime labor unrest. I believe this is one of the most important enactments of this Seventy-eighth Congress. I believe that with intelligent administration this act will do much to end wartime strikes and work stoppages, and will greatly help to restore the atmosphere of harmony and cooperation at home, which is so necessary for the successful prosecution of the war on a dozen battle fronts abroad. I am grateful, therefore, for this opportunity to help toward a national understanding of this new act and the purpose which Congress had in mind in its passage.

Calm, careful study of this measure is to be desired for we are here dealing with a highly controversial subject. Any time we start talking about national labor legislation we are prone to generate more heat than light. Witness the recent history of legislation of this type. When the National Labor Relations Act was written, the shock to ownership and management was such that we had an ardent group of legal advisers assuring employers in advance of any court tests that the law was unconstitutitional and could safely be ignored. We saw numerous controversies in which ownership and management gladly followed this injudicious advice.

This, please let me assure you, is not to deny that there were and are grave weaknesses and shortcomings in our recently written labor legislation. The history of labor relations during and since the enactment of this New Deal magna carta of labor proves otherwise all too clearly. The fact that the House of Representatives has repeatedly tried to write remedial legislation is recognition that this new field of law is still imperfect and incomplete. But it is not my purpose here to attack or defend these laws. I merely point out that the reaction they arouse has invariably been highly emotional.

Look what has happened since the enactment of these laws which labor described as its Magna Carta. Whereas ownership and management reacted bitterly to the laws in the first place, labor leadership has even more bitterly and acrimoniously fought every effort to alter these laws, even in the slightest particular. So far as labor leadership and the labor press are concerned, any person in or out of Congress who so much as proposes to dot an "i" or cross a "t" in any existing measure touching the privileges and advantages of labor organizations is flatly denounced as an enemy of labor.

Well, obviously that attitude is as foolish and shortsighted as the position of the Liberty League lawyers who refused to face the realities of those conditions which put this special group of labor laws on the books in the first place. It is just as unrealistic and unwise as the attitude of monopolistic and predatory business and financial interests which unyieldingly fought every effort at regulation.

It is well to remember the inescapable fact that special privileges and special immunities simply cannot exist for long under the American system. Wherever a national monopoly has existed, wherever special powers and priveleges have been vested in private individuals or groups, there invariably has developed a corresponding set of counterbalancing and restricting regulations. Business and finance have learned that lesson. Wherever business or finance became too big and powerful for control by open competition, a greater power—the sovereign power of the American people—has stepped in to impose controls upon it. Wherever special privilege has been vested in private individuals or organizations, it is granted only under special regulatory precautions. It is just taken for granted power and light companies, telephone companies, and transportation systems shall operate under laws which determine rates as well as other terms and conditions of service.

It is not my purpose here to discuss the wisdom or desirability of placing labor organizations in the position of monopoly or special privilege. That is a question which time and experience alone can determine. It is sufficient for this discussion to recognize the fact that American labor unions, or perhaps to state the matter more exactly, American labor leadership has been placed exactly in that position under the new laws and the prevailing policy which this administration has followed. Now, the question is, How shall this special privilege or monopoly be controlled and regulated in the public interest so long as it may exist?

Labor leadership will best serve the millions of common Americans it seeks to represent if it will abandon blind, bitter opposition to any regulation and sit calmly in conciliation on this question. For there is a safe, sane, reasonable middle ground which we must explore and occupy if we ever expect to reach a practical solution of this problem.

Let us examine this new War Labor Disputes Act which now needs only the President's signature to become law. Let us break it down to see actually what Congress has enacted. At the outset let me say that there is nothing new in this act. It merely incorporates proposals which have been repeatedly advanced within the past 4 years and which have been approved previously in either the House or Senate.

Principal Senate contribution to this measure is the provision which validates the seizure of property by the Executive in periods of labor disputes which interfere with, or threaten to interfere with, production essential to the war effort. This merely legalizes the course the President has been following upon questionable authority during the past 2 years when the ordinary machinery for collective bargaining and conciliation failed to settle labor disputes. This is the main provision of the Connally bill of 1941, as well as of the current Connally bill, both approved by large majorities in the Senate.

Of this validation of property seizure, I have had much to say since it was first seriously advanced in 1941. I shall say more of it later here.

In this act Congress has also given legal status and power to the National War Labor Board, an agency which was established by Executive order, and which has been functioning on inexact and inadequate authority delegated by the President from his very great and undefined emergency war powers. Hereafter the Board will have the power of subpena to compel the attendance of witnesses and to secure documents, records, and other material pertinent to the question before it. If anyone should seek to resist this authority, the Board may call upon any Federal court of jurisdiction to enforce its order, and the Federal circuit courts are specifically authorized by this measure to act in enforcement. These provisions put a legal foundation under the National War Labor Board which, in my opinion, will greatly enhance its effectiveness.

Principal contribution by the House and, in my own opinion, the vitally important part of this act, is section 8, which provides for a 30-day period of conciliation before any strike or work stoppage in a war industry may be undertaken; and which provides that there shall be no interruption of production unless the employees so decide by secret ballot in an orderly election supervised by the National Labor Relations Board and held at the end of this 30-day period if conciliation fails to settle the dispute.

I want to say, and with all possible emphasis, that this is the most important provision of this entire act. It ought to be immediately apparent that by this provision Congress has demonstrated its implicit faith in the rank and file of American labor not only to maintain an uninterrupted production for war but to order its own affairs within its own organizations. Violent objection has been raised to this provision, both by labor leadership and by officials within the administration. I shall, therefore, return to this provision later.

A penalty provision has also been made a part of this act. Any person who coerces, influences, or conspires with another person to interfere with the operation of a Government-owned or controlled plant or property, or who aids in any way with an activity interfering with the operation of such a plant or property shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for a term not to exceed 1 year, or both. There has been, and will be, considerable confusion and misunderstanding about this penalty provision, due, I might say, in no small measure to deliberate misinterpretation, so I want to make this provision perfectly clear. Please understand that these penalties apply only in case where a plant, a mine, or an industrial property has been seized already and taken over by the Federal Government. It has nothing whatsoever to do with a business or industry which is operating under pri-

vate management, and these penalties do not apply against any person in such a privately managed business or industry. Because this provision might mistakenly be interpreted to mean that an individual will be unable to quit his job if he so desires, let me assure you that there is nothing in this provision, or anywhere else in this act, that could possibly be interpreted to force an individual to work against his will.

Section 9 of this act will prohibit political contributions by labor unions by a very simple amendment of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

This assesses exactly the same penalties for violation by a labor organization now in effect against any national bank or corporation. The justice of this provision will be apparent to any fair-minded person. A labor union, just like a corporation, is made up of individuals of every political faith. The labor union can contribute to a political party only from the dues, fees, and assessments contributed by, and belonging to the membership. That money in a union treasury no more belongs to the union president than the funds of a corporation belong to its general manager; and there is utterly no justice in forcing an individual to contribute, at the whim of the men at the head of his organization, to a political party to which he personally may be opposed in principle.

This is a protection to the man or woman in the ranks of labor which I believe will be opposed only by the labor politicians who are reluctant to relinquish the tremendous power and influence they have wielded in recent years. In fact, no one who agrees with the sound principle of the Corrupt Practices Act itself can consistently object to this provision.

There you have the real meat of this War Labor Disputes Act. There are other important provisions, principally imposing restrictions and limitations upon this authority of the Executive to seize private property. Note, first, that the President shall return to its private owners any property seized under the authority of this act within 60 days after normal production has been resumed.

Note, too, that this act applies for the duration only, and that it shall cease to be in effect not more than 6 months after the end of hostilities in the present war. But if you want to understand how reluctantly Congress validated this practice of property seizure, please notice that Congress reserves to itself the right to kill this whole act by concurrent resolution. For those of you who may not be familiar with this legislative technicality, let me explain that a concurrent resolution, unlike the ordinary act of Congress, does not require the sanction of the President to become effective. If Congress desires to kill the ordinary law, it must have Presidential approval, or muster a two-thirds majority in both Houses exactly as when it passes a law over the President's veto.

In this instance Congress has carefully tied a string to the act by which it can readily withdraw this extraordinary authority any time a majority feels that the authority is being abused.

Much more important, however, than the limit of time, and the right to nullify which Congress has written into this act, is the fact that the principal limitation has been placed squarely in the hands of labor—not labor leadership, please understand, but the real rank and file of labor.

I mentioned at the outset that I would have more to say about the principle of property seizure, and I want to add now that it was who led the fight in the House which killed the original Connally bill, authorizing property seizure, after it had overwhelmingly passed the Senate in 1941. Again it has been my privilege to play an important role in the formulation of this present act; and again I have vigorously opposed this principle of property seizures. I have repeatedly pointed out that the principle is un-American; that it is no real solution of the problems which cause labor disturbances; that it is a serious danger to the American system of free enterprise; and that, above all, it is a direct and immediate threat to labor.

How then, you may properly ask, can I support a measure which specifically validates a principle of which I am so fearful? My answer is that in validating the principle, we have written in effective restraints which ought to insure that this extraordinary authority will never be used destructively.

And let me stress this, I have unlimited faith and confidence in the average man and woman who labors. I am perfectly willing to trust them to cooperate, to prevent interruptions in war production, to preserve American free enterprise, and to protect the right and privileges of the individual. That is, I trust them if they are protected from coercion, intimidation, and undue influence; and if they are given the opportunity to reach their own decisions calmly and judiciously—as they will be if the provisions of this act are fairly and courageously administered.

I have no way of estimating labor's opinion in advance, but I am willing to stake my reputation that the average working man or woman will welcome and applaud this act; and will arise in a way we can all be proud of to this responsibility and this opportunity we are placing in their hands.

We think of this act first in terms of our war effort. We do desperately want to submerge all personal and group interests to the all-important job of winning the war at the least possible cost in blood and treasure, and at the earliest possible date. So the first problem is to deliver our maximum effort to this purpose, no matter whose toes may be trampled in the process.

You can't make me believe that the man or woman in the ranks of labor feels any differently on this score than the farmer, shopkeeper, or banker, for labor's sons, brothers, fathers, and husbands are out there on the fighting fronts just like the kin of every other American group. When it comes to deciding between the things those fighting men need, and the special privileges and advantages and power of that little handful of men who are the labor leadership, you know as well as I do what labor's answer is going to be. There just aren't going to be any strikes or work stoppages if labor is given the positive assurance of a square deal, with an honest chance to write its own answer.

It is too bad that this legislation should have been written in a moment of stress, for high emotion is a poor guide to the solution of national problems. It will be unfortunate, also, if the American people look upon this act as intended to deal with a single situation, or with a single stubborn labor leader. True, it is temporary legislation, designed only for the war period; but I like to think of it as something more than that. I like to think of it as a sound first step toward the formulation of a definite, permanent code of just, fair, and understandable labor laws. When we approach that state of law and order, then we can look for labor statesmanship to replace the hodgepodge of labor politics which is solely responsible for our present problems.

I want to comment just briefly on the strong objections to this act which have been voiced for several sources. Administration officials warn that we are recognizing in this act the right to strike in wartime; or the right to strike against the Government. I would be the last to deny the individual the right to strike any time, in war or in peace, except against the Government. This act does recognize that individual right, as I think we always must, if we are not to descend into slave labor. I want to point out, however, that this act doesn't in any sense of the word alter the obvious fact that there are national rights which always supersede the rights of the individual. There is no private, personal right—and I am sure that every patriotic laboring man and woman agrees with me in this—to strike against our war effort, or to endanger our national security and welfare. I, for one, am willing to trust the average American citizen to recognize and admit these limitations upon every single one of his personal rights; and I am not greatly concerned that this act will set a precedent which any loyal American will seek to employ to the danger of his country.

As to the rights to bargain with, and strike against, the Government attributed to this act, I think they fall in the same category, and dissolve under the same assurances just mentioned. The fact is clearly established that no strike may be undertaken against government.

There is another group which says that this is a labor-coddling Government, which will use the property seizure of this act, not to regulate its political allies, the labor leaders, but to destroy free enterprise and private industry in America. To them I point again to the limitations set forth in this act. I want to say, also, that the rank and file of labor pretty well realize that every concession ever gained from this administration has been in exchange for definite political guarantees which its leadership so far has been willing to give. I think that the men and women in labor also know perfectly well that an all-powerful authority which can grant special privileges and immunities can just as well impose hardships and penalties.

Finally, there is that group of labor leadership which strenuously opposes this whole measure, condemning, among other things, the right of the individuals within the ranks of labor to make their own decisions in elections by secret ballot. Just one fact need be mentioned here to show how inconsistent this leadership is. There has been legislation in every recent session of Congress to outlaw State poll taxes which deprive the individual citizen of the right to vote in national elections. Certainly, a number of our States are guilty of abuses, against which I think labor has been absolutely right in protesting. I, too, have supported these proposals to outlaw poll-tax abuses.

But if labor leaders can cry out against these abuses by the several States which practice them, how can they consistently and reasonably oppose the provisions of this act which would give to every man and woman in labor a full voice in the conduct of his own organization?

There, my friends, may be the key to this whole situation. Possibly much of our labor problem arises from the ambitions for absolute power on the part of labor leadership. Possibly we have a labor problem at all only because the leadership insists that it, not the rank and file membership, shall rule and direct the destinies of labor.

I have steadfastly held that the Americans in the ranks of labor will quickly put an end to any labor problems if we will just give them the opportunity. I think that anyone who opposes this type of legislation either questions the intelligence of the average man and woman in labor, or deliberately tries to deprive them of their American rights merely to cling to his own special privileges and advantages.

Americans and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, frequently I have alluded to the outstanding patriotism of Americans of Slovak descent. Their contribution as a people to the war effort is an outstanding one deserving of the plaudits of all loyal Americans. As a people they are materially interested in the peace to follow this war. The Slovaks more than any other people were the first to suffer when the Republic of Czechoslovakia was established following World War No. 1. It behooves our Department of State and the liberal-thinking people of America to read the splendid statement of Msgr. F. J. Dubosh, president of the Slovak League of America, entitled "Americans and Democracy," contained in the June 1943 issue of the Slovak Record which I include herein as a part of my remarks:

AMERICANS AND DEMOCRACY

(By Msgr. F. J. Dubosh, president, Slovak League of America)

Approximately 25 years ago the last World War brought into being countries that were to be noted for their democratic spirit. We fought that war for "the preservation of democracy." Among the peoples who were to be beneficiaries of that sacrifice and bloodshed of the last war, we were to find the Slovaks, a little nation, that 10 centuries of persecution by stronger nations could not exterminate. Justice and human rights may be suppressed by a tyrant, but these will not remain suppressed, they will live on. And so the Slovaks, who were destined for extermination have lived on, although they have been walking a "Way of the Cross" to the present day. They have lived on because the Creator intended them to have human and national rights, which are inalienable.

These inalienable rights of the Slovaks were intended to be preserved, fostered, and defended in the Republic of Czechoslovakia, which a certain foreign politician called the "godchild" of this country, the United States of America. As is well known, godchildren do not always assume the character of the godfather: they may be better and they may be worse. In this case the "godchild" failed to measure up to the ideals and the principles of the "godfather." Instead of adopting the principles of democracy which call for "liberty, equality, and fraternity" toward all peoples, the government of Czechoslovakia applied these attributes only to one nation in the republic, whilst it tried to subjugate the others; among them were the Slovaks, of whom this well-known ex-official of Czechoslovakia said: "the Slovaks are Czechs." To this day he is acting on this false assumption, even though he knows that his denial of nationhood to the Slovaks had caused the rift that occasioned and helped in the division of Czechoslovakia by the arch-enemy of democracy, Hitler.

Faith was broken with the Slovaks by the Czechoslovak Government, headed by Thomas G. Masaryk, its first President. This man, dubbed "the great champion of democracy", had made a covenant with the Slovaks and Czechs in the United States, that, when and if the Republic of Czechoslovakia is formed, each national group would be guaranteed its national cultural and political rights; that the Slovaks would have their state rights, as have the States in our Unions. This covenant was written and signed by Thomas G. Masaryk and the representatives of the Czechs and Slovaks in this country. Because it was signed on the 30th of May 1918, in Pittsburgh, Pa., it received the name of the "Pittsburgh Pact."

Due to the nonfulfillment of the "Pittsburgh Pact" by the Government of Czechoslovakia, headed by Thomas G. Masaryk and later by Dr. Edward Benes, peace was not a virtue in that country. The Slovaks never ceased to fight for their national rights. The result being that the Slovaks lost confidence in the undemocratic government and finally opposed it. Hitler knew of this rift. Who of common sense is surprised that he took advantage of the rift?

Again we are warring for the preservation of democracy and freedom for all nations, "no matter how small." We Americans know the blessings of democracy with its concomitant virtues of freedom and equality and fraternity; for are we not all descendants of peoples who had to flee their respective countries to find and to enjoy freedom in the United States? We appreciate that size is not the measure for right. We accord to a child the rights with which it was endowed by the Creator, just because they come from God and not from the state. That is the reason for calling them inalienable: God never takes back what He once gave—only tyrannical governments do such things.

May this war not lead to a victory for stronger nations who will attempt to stifle the smaller nations! If that should occur, then would not democracy become a mockery? Such a subjugation would become a continuation of injustice and a deprivation of human rights. The results could be nothing more nor less than resentment, dissatisfaction, rebellion, and a renewed disturbance of the peace, for the preservation of which we are fighting. Oh, what a waste of blood, lives, property, and anguish!

This statement is presented with a view of guiding the world-leaders to a just peace. We Americans, whose ancestors hail from Czechoslovakia, consider ourselves to be better informed about conditions as existed in that unfortunate country—and naturally so. Hence, we who enjoy the sweet blessings of a true democracy, desire it for all nations as a safeguard for true peace; and especially do we desire it for the people from whom we stem. Our aim is to help to bring peace into this world, to help to prevent future wars, to save the lives of our boys and thus prevent anguish from gripping the hearts of our parents and friends. Let us guard ourselves against foreign politicians posing as representatives of peoples whom they, when in power, deprived of their natural rights.

Lt. Keene Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Keene Wilson, of Selma, Ala., has just been awarded the Purple Heart and an Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of the second Purple Heart.

He was wounded twice in the bitter fighting in Tunisia before the final victory in that theater was won.

In a letter home he speaks of his first wound thus: "But it was not serious enough to cost me a minute of the action."

As to his second wound he says: "In this action I sustained a slight wound from shrapnel, and again it was only very slight."

So do these gallant flag makers cause its stars to shine in the forefront of every battle for the freedom of the world, while minimizing their wounds.

There is glory enough for all, but thank God for the land that nurtures such heroes.

Poland Crucified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Dr. Waclaw Bitner, entitled "Poland Crucified," and printed in the June 1943 issue of The Sign, official national Catholic magazine, with headquarters at Monastery Place, Union City, N. J.

Dr. Bitner is an outstanding writer and thoroughly familiar with the subject matter of his article.

He is a member of a family which for centuries has fought in defense of Poland. Dr. Bitner for many years was a brilliant lawyer in his home city of Warsaw, and prior to the invasion of his country by the Nazis served with distinction in the Polish Parliament for 4 terms—a total of 12 years—and was chairman of the Christian Democratic Party of Poland. Prior to the fall of Poland, Dr. Bitner escaped with his elder son to France where both joined the Polish Army, and from which Dr. Bitner is now on leave.

He has always been very active in Polish Catholic organizations and is at present the director of the Polish Catholic Press Agency, located at 3 East Sixty-fourth Street, New York City.

His military and political backgrounds qualify him to offer in Poland Crucified an informative and authoritative discussion of the Polish-Russian question.

The article follows:

POLAND CRUCIFIED

(By Waclaw Bitner)

A fundamental objective of the Polish people is their profound desire that Russia should become a truly Christian state, and in consistency with this objective the Poles have done everything possible to achieve the friendliest terms with Russia. In spite of all these attempts, the record shows Russia's

participation in three separate partitions of Poland.

The twentieth century finds Russia continuing the same aggressive policy. In 1920 the Red Army invaded Poland, and it was only at the gates of Warsaw that the Polish Army defeated the Bolsheviks. The Battle of the Vistula saved Poland, and perhaps the whole of Europe, from the onrush of communism. Nevertheless, Poland not only signed the Treaty of Riga, but also concluded a pact of nonaggression with Russia. This pact was rendered worthless when, after Hitler's attack on Poland, Russia seized the opportunity to attack from the rear.

Following the occupation of eastern Poland in 1939, Russia deported some 2,000,000 Poles to the desert wastes of Siberia; they were left to their exile in the northern woods and marshlands. Somewhat later Poland demonstrated that she was able to look toward the future, as well as the past, and came to terms with Russia in 1941. It is significant that Russia has taken an early opportunity to abrogate that agreement with Poland.

For any real understanding of Polish-Russian relations, one must first know their historical background, as well as appreciate the cultural and psychical differences which distinguish the two nations.

Poland, as a nation, has been eternally devoted to the principles of freedom, and has always fought in defense of Christian ideals. The freedom of the individual to his rights as a citizen was guaranteed in Poland as early as the year 1430, by a charter which corresponds to the habeas corpus rights as proclaimed in England in 1679.

When religious intolerance in Europe led through persecution and inquisition to the ultimate murder and expulsion of Jews, Poland was practically their sole refuge; she alone enacted laws to establish religious freedom within her territory. In 1269 King Boleslaw the Pious guaranteed to the Jews the protection of their religion. These were later confirmed and clarified in the Code of 1365.

In 1432 King Wladyslaw Warnenczyk—the name was given to him after he had fallen in the Battle of Walna against the Mohammedans—proclaimed an edict in which Poland's Orthodox Church was secured the same rights and privileges the Roman Catholic Church enjoyed.

Politically, Poland's progress followed the same direction. The first parliament was organized in 1462, and this body, in turn, contributed to the first great federation of European states. The memorable union of Poland, Lithuania, and Ruthenia was achieved in 1385, and the original acts signed at Krewo were subsequently strengthened by other agreements until in 1569 the common parliament of the three nations was consummated in the so-called Union of Lublin. The commonwealth thus achieved bears the combined emblems: Poland's white eagle, Lithuania's mounted knight, and the angel Michael of Ruthenia.

Poland's struggle for the preservation of Christian ideals has been demonstrated in her many battles against the onslaught of Asiatic hordes. The Mongols, Tatars, and Turks were almost perpetually attacking Europe under the banner of the Crescent. While the Western powers were able to develop their cultures in peace, to cultivate the arts and sciences, the span of 5 centuries found Poland continually beset by the barbarians, and often provoked to large-scale warfare against the whole Mohammedan world.

Polish historians have estimated that during this period the Tatars accomplished nearly 10,000 separate incursions within Polish boundaries. The first time the Poles managed a really crushing defeat of these enemies was in 1241, at the Battle of Lignica in Silesia. After many subsequent battles, such as those of Chocim, Cecora, and Zorawno, the Poles, under the leadership of King Jan Sobieski, ultimately checked Mohammedan aggression at Vienna in 1683.

These wars, lasting 5 centuries, found the Polish knights going into battle singing the anthem, Mother of God, Holy Virgin. It was they who were profoundly responsible for Poland's great attachment to Christianity. And it was under the spiritual guidance of Christianity that was produced their characteristic veneration for the Blessed Virgin, who was, indeed, proclaimed queen of the Polish Crown by the whole nation. These ideals still inspire Polish fighting forces today—the patriots who fight for freedom and their Christian civilization with a faith comparable to that of the Crusaders.

If I have dwelt at some length on these military aspects of Polish history, it is because they have made such a deep impression on the Polish psychology; it does not mean, however, that the Poles are not profoundly attached to peaceful ideals, or that they do not dream of a long-sought opportunity to enjoy the benefits of peace.

Notwithstanding these violent shocks which have rocked the Polish State, the nation succeeded in producing more than its share of outstanding figures in the arts and sciences; I need only allude to three of them: Kopernik (Copernicus), who revolutionized astronomy; Father Peter Skarga, on of the greatest preachers in the Middle Ages; Jan Kochanowski, acknowledged as one of the greatest poets of the epoch.

While Poland was laboriously repelling invasions and building her own internal system on Christian ideals and the principles of freedom, Russia was completely subjugated by the Tatars. She was held under their yoke for some 200 years, and this bondage made an irreparable impression on the psychology of the Russian people, on their governmental system, and on their whole way of thinking and acting. The Tatars were cruel—the most cruel of Eastern tyrants. The only form of government of which the Tatars were capable was the tyranny exhibited by such chiefs as Tamerlan (Tamerlane) and Dzingishan (Genghis Khan), who could maintain authority only by terrorism and meeting all opposition with physical violence.

The Tatar bondage passed. But during the two centuries, there had been a great admixture of their blood with that of the Russian tribesmen, forming a new physical type and a community vastly different both in the physical and psychical domain from that of the old Slavs. The Russian nation was never entirely able to divest itself of the political forms implanted by the Tatars. Absolutism and tyranny remain as the characteristic patterns of Russian authority. The Czars, Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great, treated their people in the same manner as the Tatar chieftains; they acknowledged no individual or political rights; trials were unheard of; they met opposition with the death penalty.

There was not the slightest respect for human dignity. The boyars were spat on, or shaken by their beards. There were, indeed, no such persons as citizens in Russia; the Czar recognized only his serfs.

The revolution of 1918 overthrew this absolutism, only to substitute a new kind of tyranny—and the Red masters of the Kremlin continued to govern Russia with the same implements of terror: Firing squads, hangmen, and prisoners. Impartial experts have calculated that during the Bolshevik rule more than 2,000,000 anti-Communist Russians were killed for their differing convictions. These were for the most part social-revolutionaries, social-mensheviks, and democrats. It is well established that the Communists put down the opposition of the peasants only by the bloodiest of measures. Several millions of these Russian peasants were "liquidated"; at least 7,000,000 of the kulaks, the more prosperous peasants, were deprived of their property and deported to the wilderness of northern Russia or to the limitless expanse of Siberia.

These men were literally doomed; they were condemned to painful agony and certain death, that the ideals of communism might be served.

Many millions of Ukrainians who sought independence for their homeland to the south of Russia were persecuted and deported under the same trumped-up charges preferred against the kulaks and all counter-revolutionists. Only in this way was a Ukrainian national aspiration broken.

Those who were won over to the new tyranny saved their lives, but, for the sake of a crumb from the Communist loaf, they had to devote those lives to the exclusive service of the new occupants of the Kremlin. Thus, Russia has never in her entire history known a liberal or democratic form of government. As before, but under a new name, the people's destiny was to be that of all totalitarians.

The present conflict is simply an extension of the same predatory tendencies which Russia has exhibited consistently with regard to her western frontiers.

When Poland asked, through the proper diplomatic channels, for some explanation of the murder of 15,000 Polish officers and noncommissioned officers known to have been taken prisoner by the Russians, the Soviet Government seized this pretext to suspend diplomatic relations. It is only natural for the Polish people to be concerned over the fate of these prisoners. If they have not been murdered, and their remains are not in that mass grave near Smolensk, where are they? It has not been generally publicized that among these missing there were 12 generals, 300 colonels and lieutenant colonels, 5,000 majors, 2,500 captains, and 5,000 first or second lieutenants. Among those generals who, according to Soviet propaganda, must have simply vanished, there are names which are honored in Poland even as Americans honor the names of Eisenhower and MacArthur. There is General Stanislaw Haller, one of the commanders who proved himself against the Bolsheviks in 1920; to say nothing of such other noted generals as Skierski, Lukowski, Billewicz, Bohatyrewicz, Kowalewski, Minkiewicz, Sikorski, Skoratowicz, Smorawinski, and Vice Admiral Czermicki.

Would any other government in the world be asked to keep silent before its people and its army about the unsolved murder of more than 10,000 officers and men, a contingent able to form the command for a new army of half a million Polish soldiers and men? I hardly need add that such a potential army of deportees is still detained in Russia. Any government maintaining silence in such a situation would have been condemned by the nation it served as a government of traitors.

There have been insidious attempts to attach some special significance to the fact that the location of this common grave was disclosed by the German authorities. Such propaganda deliberately ignores the fact known to the Polish Government and all Polish emigrees for over 2 years—that these officers had disappeared in Russia and that repeated demands from General Sikorski himself were carefully left unanswered by the Soviets.

How, then, can it be charged that Poland went out of her way to create disunity between the Allies? One is impressed, on the contrary, by the fact that she maintained difficult, but respectful, silence for 2 whole

years on the suspected character of a terrible tragedy, probably the most grim mass murder known in the history of warfare for a thousand-odd years.

Upon the refusal of the International Red Cross to undertake a suitably impartial investigation, the Polish Government renounced for the time being further inquiry into the matter. It remains, of course, an issue which must be cleared up after the war, and due punishment will certainly be sought for the perpetrators of the crime, be they Germans or Russians, and regardless of their rank. For any and every such unpunished crime would contribute to the moral disintegration of the world, and would constitute an inescapable cause for future political and social dislocations.

With the political relations between Russia and Poland severed, the former now loudly insists that her claims to the eastern part of Poland be acknowledged. The alleged basis for these claims is that this area is inhabited by Ukrainians and Byelo-Ruthenians. For no conceivably relevant reason, the demand is accompanied by an accusation that the Government of General Sikorski is a group of Polish aristocrats and capitalists, who do not have the confidence of the Polish people and who are dealing sub rosa with Hitler and even conducting espionage activity on Russian soil.

These claims and accusations are a calumny, and calumny is a deadly poison for the minds of men. Truth is the only antidote. That is why I should like to examine critically and truthfully these unsubstantiated claims and false accusations.

The Russian claim that Poland ever occupied territory in which she had no ethnic establishment is completely absurd. Ukrainians, Ruthenians, and Byelo-Ruthenians in the disputed area are no more Russian than they are Polish. As is well known, they united with Poland of their own volition in the fourteenth century, and were separated only by the partitioning of Poland in the eighteenth century. It is inconceivable that these people should now seek to be incorporated within Soviet Russia, for they have seen millions of their fellow Ukrainians uprooted from the fertile and sunny lands where they were born to be shipped to barren reaches of Siberia. Moreover, the claims are at variance with the statistical constitution of the disputed population. The latest available records derived from free depositions of the citizens indicate the following national adherence in Eastern Poland:

Poles	5,274,000
Ukrainians and Ruthenians	4,529,000
Byelo-Ruthenians	1,123,000
Jews	1,109,000
Russians	134,000
Germans	89,000
Lithuanians	84,000
Czechs	35,000

It is significant, furthermore, that 90 percent of these 12,000,000 are Christians, deeply attached Christians, who hate the godless Communist ideology. And among these Christians, 90 percent again are of Roman Catholic or Greek Catholic denominations. One hardly expects the Polish Government to deliver over 12,000,000 souls as a sacrifice to the covetousness of imperial Soviet Russia.

To do so would be deliberately to destroy the faith in the hearts of these peoples, and by such an act the Polish Government would be renouncing not only its proper interests but its Christian duty.

Turning now to the accusation that the Sikorski Government consists of reactionary aristocrats, completely lacking the nation's confidence, we find such a charge ridiculous in the extreme. Here are the facts: The Sikorski cabinet includes two workers—Kwapinski, a farm hand, and Stanczyk, a miner. The former had been deported to Siberia by the Czarist regime. There are also, four professors or teachers: Kot, son of a peasant, Kukiel, Komarnicki, and Strasburger. There are two journalists: Popiel, the son of a laborer, and Seyda, the son of an artisan, who was deported by the Germans during the First World War. Then there are Mikolajczyk, known widely in Poland for his activities among poor peasants, and two soldiers, General Sikorski and Haller (not to be confused with the two who disappeared in Russia). The Premier has always been known for his liberal tendencies, and General Haller is equally a man of democratic views. To be exact, there is one aristocrat in the Government—Count Raczynski, the founder of a public library in Poznan, whose career has been one of cultural and philanthropic distinction.

You may be sure Poland will never subscribe to a rigid Communist demagogy which pretends that no one who was not born a peasant or a worker has any right to take part in the public life of his country. The terms of a Christian morality are such as to demand that a man's value be fixed from the personal or human viewpoint, not because of his class. In the Polish Government there will continue to be representative and selective men who do enjoy the confidence of the nation, whether or not it may have been their misfortune to be disliked by Russians, whether or not they have ever owned a country estate.

It is my considered opinion that Premier Sikorski has already made a maximum of concessions in his dealing with the Soviet Government, and I submit that there is no other suitably qualified Polish leader capable of creating a government which in its declared policies and general objectives could be more consistently friendly toward the Russian nation.

On the basis of this opinion I solicit a very careful analysis of the newest bill of particulars broadcast by Deputy Foreign Commissar Vishinsky. These charges that members of the Polish Government indulged in pro-Hitler espionage activities may be amusing to some, but are certainly repulsive to others. I feel sure that it would be a reflection on my readers' judgment if I were to discuss them at length.

It is much more important to see how the conflicts which lie at the root of the present Russo-Polish disagreement reach down to the depth of human relations. This means one must look into his own conscience when he finds himself confronted with an ultimate choice between the ideals of Christian Poland and Communist Russia.

A realistic facing of the future requires making just that decision, and each reader must make this decision in his own conscience. Then he will be better able to appreciate the enormous responsibility weighing on the conscience of political leaders who must make a decision for many others. On their sound judgment and moral sense depends the future of all Christian governments and of civilization itself.

From the political standpoint, the Polish people are naturally anxious to secure peaceful international relations with their Russian neighbors. In spite of all past wrongs, in spite of the renewed injustices of propagandist claims, some modus operandi that will serve their mutual interests must be found. Such a policy is clearly dictated by a realistic national interest. Our boundary with Russia, about 1,000 miles long, divides us from the weight of a power many times stronger. The Polish population of 35,000,000 is numerically no match for a Russia of 170,000,000; reduced to its simplest terms, it means 1 Pole against 5 Russians. The ratio, needless to say, has never intimidated Poland. Events of 1920 proved that the spirit of a nation may compensate to a large extent for the greater material strength of another. But in every such war with her mighty neighbor, Poland must expect to have her lands irrigated with the blood of her sons.

Thus it is folly to suppose that Poland would ever desire to wage war against Russia. This fact, taken together with due consideration of the objectives of our German neighbor—coldly determined to achieve the complete demoralization and eventual extermination of our people—makes it clear that Poland must seek a permanent understanding with Russia.

It is not wise to suppose that even the most realistic government policy to which Poland might adhere precludes any disposition to commit national suicide in Russia's favor, or to submit to any such dismemberment as Soviet expropriation of eastern Poland implies.

Two solutions present themselves:

First. Russia may, in the Lord's infinite wisdom, be brought within the framework of Christian society, and by some miraculous rebirth adopt a democratic form of government. She might thus abandon her struggle against God and become one of the family of Christian nations. This would at least present every prospect of an amicable solution of all controversies with Poland and enable Russia to participate in friendly relations with all other powers.

This, of course, is so improbable as to be hardly worth consideration. One need only realize that Russian youth has now spent 25 years in complete ignorance of the truth of the Christian doctrine. The Communist contention that religion is an opiate for the people may have succeeded in deadening these people's hearts to the love of God. Remember that thousands of churches were closed, bishops murdered, priests tortured. This fate was not visited upon the Catholic Church exclusively. Much the same treatment was meted out to the Orthodox Church; the Metropolitan Tichon was imprisoned and is presumably dead.

For 25 years the materialistic and atheistic philosophy has poured its poison into the souls of Russian youth. Such contamination means that an entire generation of Russians, at least those up to 45 years of age, is devoid of faith.

Just as Mohammedanism has lasted for over 1,000 years in Asia, we must assume that the roots of atheism can hold Russia in their grip for as long a time. It cannot be denied that Asia now has a penetrating anti-Christian culture which, backed by political and military might, could spread itself over a still wider area. The light of the Crescent has dimmed, but we find the Red Star shining in its place.

Second: What alternative is there for the Christian world to consider? It can meet force with equal force. It can forestall the spread of communism, and at least limit it to Russian soil, just as it once stopped the expansion of Mohammedanism. This does not necessarily mean a war with Communist Russia. It means only that Russia must be made to understand that any aggression will provoke the opposition of a united Christian world.

Surely the western nations will not duplicate the blunder they committed in trying to pacify Hitler by throwing sacrifices on his altar—sacrifices in the form of the Rhineland, the Saar, Austria, Czechoslovakia—the rest of the names we know too well.

Will the West adopt another Munich policy on behalf of Soviet Russia? Shall we submit new sacrifices: Finland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland?

Regarded from the standpoint of a Christian conscience, this second alternative is a compelling one. It seems to me to hold the only key to a practical relationship between Russia and the rest of the world. In other words, after we have defeated Hitlerism, Christian nations must create a new world, a world that is a united Christian commonwealth.

Eddie Gilmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Eddie Gilmore is another Selma boy who has made good in a big way.

About a month ago, the Birmingham Age-Herald had on page 1 three signed articles, and only three. Each one of them was written by an Alabama boy covering the news of the world as reflected from the three great war capitals of the United Nations world. Eddie Gilmore was writing from Moscow, Ed Ball from London, and Francis LeMay from Washington. The Nation's hat is off to each of these three men of the fourth estate who have won their spurs and many honors in the newspaper world where it takes much on the ball to succeed.

Eddie Gilmore has just come home for a well-earned vacation, after having covered with great credit to himself and the Associated Press two of the most important assignments that could come to a war correspondent. He was in London throughout the great German air blitzkrieg in 1940. He has been in Moscow since Germany invaded Russia. His news coverage on both these assignments has been excellent. He has served the news "hot," but seasoned with such restraint as to make his dispatches trustworthy without the sacrifice of interest. Selmians the world over have been proud of him and his work.

Born in Selma May 28, 1907, his first newspaper work was as a carrier-boy for the Selma Times-Journal. His writing career began with the Atlanta Journal and continued with the Washington Daily News and the Washington Post before becoming a member of the Associated Press Washington staff in 1936. Before going abroad he made a Nation-wide reputation as a feature writer. Leaving the Washington assignment to tell the world the news of the war from London and Moscow.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the definition of "acid test" is, what F. D. R. will do with an antistrike bill in his lap. He has had it 4 days.

Processors of corn are frantic because they cannot get the corn. One of them writes, "Why feed it to hogs, they can't vote."

The idea of having a super or centralized food control is hooted, yet super set-ups are as common in this New Deal as fleas.

If the Army and Navy did not know more about their stuff than the O. P. A. seems to know about its stuff, it would be a helluva war.

The long-haired professors and the long-horned steers have locked horns on the roll-back. The steers seem to be successfully bulldogged.

N. Y. A. leaves the House dead, like the other agencies have, but like Lazarus will rise to walk again over there—and we do not mean overseas.

There is one thing the House does not have to endure like the Senate, and that is to hear a Member on a busy day harangue for 4 hours about his own greatness.

It is now June 17 and the new fiscal year begins July 1, and of the 12 big supply bills, only 1 is a law. This situation is in the interest of spending, for hurried conferences never save. Freeze-outs save.

The administration seems determined to roll back Congress on its frequently expressed decisions against subsidies for food like it rolled back the Court a few years ago. Instead of the "three horse team" it is the ox now.

The overstocked or overstacked bureaus remain the unremitting crime of the past 10 years. The Byrd committee asks for a 300,000 reduction, or a cut of 10 percent. Think of the money it would save and how needed manpower would be helped.

The Difficult Meat Situation of the Butte Copper Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am once again calling the attention of the Congress to the serious meat situation which exists in Butte, Mont. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this situation because of its connection with the need for producing more copper. These soldiers of production working in the Butte mines under difficult conditions cannot produce the metal needed on 2 pounds of meat a week. Surely some system can be worked out whereby these men can be given a proper meat allowance to enable them to carry on the arduous task which is theirs. I am not asking for any special privilege for them, but I am asking that this matter be looked at in a sensible manner so that the copper needed for our tanks, guns, planes, and ammunition can continue to be produced in sufficient quantities to keep our armed forces supplied with the materials of war. I am again bringing to the attention of the Congress more of the hundreds of communications which I have received from my friends in Butte about this particular matter, and I sincerely hope that their wishes can be met at the earliest possible moment:

MINING ASSOCIATION OF MONTANA,
Butte, Mont., April 27, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: I am in receipt of yours on the 21st enclosing copy of a letter from Mr. Prentiss M. Brown, dated April 19, for which I thank you. Also many thanks for your good efforts in our behalf in trying to obtain more meat for the miners.

I note in Mr. Brown's letter that he asked for statistics on normal meat consumption of miners, and we have already sent these to Mr. Julian D. Conover, secretary of the American Mining Congress, Munsey Building, your city, who has presented them to the Government bureaus that have to do with meat rationing. Evidently Mr. Brown has not seen these figures, so I am repeating some of them.

In April I attended a meeting of the women's auxiliary of the Butte Miners' Union, No. 1, and obtained the following information:

CONSUMPTION PER WEEK

Mary Orlich, Meaderville: Cheese and meat for bucket 1½ pounds; 1 pound butter; 1 pint oil; 1½ pounds lard; 10 pounds meat for home consumption. This family consists of three, of which one is a miner.

Mrs. Bartlett, 400 West Park Street, Butte: Three-fourths pound butter; 8 pounds table meat; 1 pound lunch meat and cheese; 1½ pounds Crisco. There are two in this family, of which one is a miner.

Mrs. Anne Metully, 204 Cherry Street, Butte: 1½ pounds butter; 1 pint oil; 14 pounds meat; 2 pounds lunch meat; 1 pound lard; 1½ pounds cheese. There are five in this family, of which one is a miner.

Mrs. W. H. Stubly, 3107 Kennedy Street, Butte: 1 pound lunch meat; 1 pound butter; ½ pint oil; 8 pounds table meat. There are two in this family, one of which is a miner.

The women agreed that 6 pounds of meat a week per miner would be a fair ration.

Mr. Stanley Babcock, president of the Butte Miners' Union, No. 1, on April 2 informed me that the Mullin House at 944 North Main Street, Centerville, has been using 1,550 pounds of meat per month and boards 50 miners. This would be about 7 pounds of meat per man per week. The Mullin House is operated by Mr. P. D. Harrington.

On April 12 Mr. Babcock advised me that the Riipi Boarding House in Butte, the largest miners' boarding house here, in December 1942 used 6,329 pounds of meat and served 23,235 meals. That would be about 0.367 pound of meat per meal; for three meals a day about 1.1 pounds, or about 7.7 pounds per man per week.

Mr. John Hickey, of Philipsburg, president of our association, advises me that the meat consumption of miners in that district is about 7 pounds per man per week. You will find the above figures typical of institutional and personal meat consumption of miners in Montana, and all of these miners are producing much needed war metals.

* * * * *

Again thanking you for your efforts, with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CARL J. TRAUERMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Mining Association of Montana.

JUNE 11, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are very much interested in more meat for the miners as the Government looks on the miner as a soldier. We feel that we should get the same consideration as the servicemen.

JAMES BYRNE.

SIRS: I am a citizen of Silver Bow for 25 years, and I must say that my husband is working for 20 years, and have 7 children. He must have more meat for his dinner bucket, and oblige.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

JUNE 12, 1943.

I believe the Butte miners need more meat for the hard labor they are performing.

ED BRUNELL,
Walkerville, Mont.

DEAR SIR: Men in these deep mines need more meat to eat; the work is heavy and hard, energy expended great, and needs meat to replace it; can't be done on a sandwich for lunch. They are used to heavy food to do heavy work. Do your bit to help.

A FRIEND OF YOURS.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 12, 1943.*

Mr. MANSFIELD: We think the copper miners of Butte should get more meat as they do hard work and have to work in hot places. A miner needs more meat than a baby, and the people with children get more than a miner. There are only my wife and I and we can't get along on the meat stamps as we do not have the points.

Mr. and Mrs. F. P. JAMESON.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 12, 1943.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD: In the effort to secure additional meat rations for our miners who are in vital war production, we will appreciate the aid of yourself and colleagues. Butte miners must have additional allowance in order to produce properly.

Sincerely,

R. E. MURPHY.

JUNE 12, 1943.

Honorable SIR: There is no reason why our miners should not have more meat or substantial food than the rationing cards call for. I also like to have all the Japs moved out of our country.

Yours respectfully,

L. S. NELSON.

BUTTE, MONT.

DEAR MIKE: Do all you can in this meat rationing for our miners as they are the backbone of the war which must have the copper to proceed.

JAMES ROE.

JUNE 12, 1943.

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEAR SIR: I am a miner in Butte and the meat is not enough. I require more to handle this heavy timber here, so request your support in obtaining enough meat.

JOSEPH DEAN.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: You had better get rid of some of the boards or at least get Americans on them. We need more meat. I am taking a bucket today without meat; give us gas to go fishing if you don't want to give us meat.

C. P. LUNTZ.

It is too far to the river or stream and we have no gas or tires to get there. Hunting is out of season; where are we going to get any fish or meat?

WM. RIES,
Walkerville.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: In regards to the meat situation, we are short each week and have to substitute for Sundays. I feel that the miners are entitled to more meat.

Yours truly,

JOHN MANNINEN.

JUNE 10, 1943.

Congressman MANSFIELD:

I have been a voter in Silver Bow County for the last 20 years and I am one that helped put you in office. Seems you fellows forget us miners pretty soon. I for one am looking for some help about the meat. We miners are not getting enough of meat at all, so not only me, but hundreds more are looking for you to give us a hand.

ROBERT ELLENBURG,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE.

More meat for the miners and crafts union men in copper production.

J. J. HARRINGTON.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 11, 1943.*

The miners of Butte need more meat to give them the strength and endurance necessary to produce the vitally needed copper.

Mr. James Sullivan, secretary, get out and get us some bacon.

FRANK V. CANNON.

DEAR SIR: We would like to have a little more meat. It is very hard to get along with what we get.

JOE NOVACK,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 11, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I cannot get along with the meat I get so please see if we can do something about getting some more meat.

Yours truly,

MRS. STELLA J. PAVLOVICK.

More meat for Butte copper miners.

TOM TEASDALE.

DEAR SIR: I am in sympathy with the miners when they say they want more meat. This war requires the increasing efforts of the miners if they are to fulfill the demands of copper.

The men require full meals if they are to work steadily. We of Butte leave it up to you.

LIP PRINTS.

JUNE 12, 1943.

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Will you please try to increase the meat ration for the miners; they need extra meat for strength to work in these very bad places, and many of the general foods will not keep in their lunches—being so hot down there.

Sincerely,

MRS ANCELIAC EMINGER,
Butte, Mont.

JUNE 10, 1943.

Would like for you to get us hard-rock miners some meat. For God's sake, am working in a hot-box and can't cut the buck on old fish.

FRED GREEN,
Butte, Mont.

I am a backer of the campaign for "meat for the miners."

S. HOAR.

I agree that men working in Butte mines should have more meat.

FOLKS J. HARRINGTON,
Butte, Mont.

More meat needed for the miners.

FRANK SUTTEY.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: Please for more stamps so we can have more meat.

K. MIDDLEBROOK.

See that we get our portion of the meat out this way, MIKE.

JOE PRESTON.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 11, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I am a Butte miner and would like to get more red stamps, as I can't do the work on what I am getting.

Yours truly,

ROBERT MORRIS.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Butte miners need more meat because the strenuous nature of their work requires plenty of good substantial food. As you know fresh fruits and vegetables are not plentiful here and you can get very little of these canned goods on your ration stamps. A miner's bucket must consist of mostly meat and fruit. Therefore, we think we are entitled to more meat.

HARRY BAIRD.

We want more meat for our miners in Butte.

EDWARD J. LEARY.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We miners in the Butte mines feel (due to our greatest speed-up in these critical times) that if we are allowed more meat, production will surely increase.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. MAGUIRE.

More meat.

ALBERT J. STODDER,
Butte, Mont.

My family would like more meat.

Mrs. J. HOLLOND.

More meat for more copper.

EDITH SCOTT,
Butte, Mont.

More meat.

SUNDAY S. ALOISE,
Butte, Mont.

Meat for the miners.

Mrs. G. FACINCAM.

Not enough meat.

Mrs. E. J. ZIMPEL.

BUTTE, *May 10, 1943.*

What can be done to get Office of Price Administration to increase the meat allowance for our miners? Substitutes are not adequate for the protein necessary for miners. Help us to get an increase, won't you?

J. LUNCEY.

More meat for the miners.

FRANCES PHELPS, R. N.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 10, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our men who produce copper, a vital war need, require good substantial food in order to do the work required in this production. They should have ample meat in order to carry on. I hope you will do your utmost to see this is accomplished.

WM. T. O'REILLY.

Let's have more meat for copper production.

THOS. MARTIN.

Commander Howard W. Gilmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 16, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, another honor has just been deservedly paid to Commander Howard Walter Gilmore, a native of Selma, Ala., whose famous order "Take her down," and his heroism indicated thereby won for him the highest honor within the gift of the Nation—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

He already had had conferred upon him the Navy Cross, the Gold Star in lieu of a second Navy Cross, and the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp.

Now the Navy announces that the United States submarine tender *Neptune* has been renamed the U. S. S. *Howard W. Gilmore.*

Flag Day Address of Hon. Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and inspiring address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] at the Flag Day celebration at Hot Springs, Ark., on June 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress formally adopted the Stars and Stripes as the flag of the new Republic, then fighting for its establishment.

Today, therefore, we celebrate the one hundred and sixty-sixth anniversary of the birthday of the American flag, and rededicate ourselves to its silent emphasis as the emblem of our unity and strength.

At the beginning the number of stars and stripes was the same. But as new States were added to the Union, it became obvious that the flag would grow too cumbersome at length. On the 4th of July, 1888, therefore, a resolution of Congress became effective providing that thereafter a new star should be placed in the blue field for each new State admitted and that the number of stripes should remain at 13 as representing the Colonies which had struggled to found the Nation.

Thus it is that we have the flag as we know it today.

But interesting and thrilling as the history of the flag may be, linking as it does the personalities of George Washington and Betsy Ross, and beautiful as it is in the radiant sunshine of this day, we are concerned now more with its deeper significance and its holier mission in defense of our liberty and civilization than in any superficial recital of the steps by which it became our flag.

Today that flag floats above ramparts which we defend, and shall ere long float o'er ramparts which we shall assault and take in more widely scattered places throughout the world than ever before in the 166 years of its glorious history. And we who look upon it now with accelerated heartbeats realize that the great principles for which it speaks are being assaulted on more battle fronts than ever before in its history.

It has been planted on every continent and in every sea and on almost every island of the seas. It has brought to us familiarity with geographical names and places of which we never heard before. And we know that our hearts have followed that flag into all continents and all islands and all seas and into the air above them; and our hopes likewise have followed it. For we know that the profounder significance of that flag stirs other millions just as it stirs us; and we know that when that flag shall have accomplished its mission, not only we but other millions will enjoy a freedom not hitherto known to them.

The great Henry Ward Beecher said this about the flag: "A thoughtful mind, when it sees a nation's flag sees not the flag alone but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belonged to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it."

Nearly a quarter of a century ago, influenced by the events of another great war in which he was an illustrious figure, Woodrow Wilson said: "This flag which we honor and under which we serve is an emblem of our unity and our power and thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute its choices, whether in peace or war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the people, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it.

"We celebrate the day of its birth, and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbols of great events of a great plan of life worked out by a great people.

"Woe to the man or group of men that seek to stand in our way in this day of high resolution, whenever principles we hold dearest are to be vindicated and made secure for the preservation of the Nation. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born, and a new glory shall shine from the face of our people."

Those words are as eternally true today as they were when Woodrow Wilson uttered them. Let us beseech the God of nations that when this even greater and more universal struggle is over, we shall not turn our backs upon the obligations which freedom and world order place upon us.

We must not only win this war to the point of unconditional surrender. We must win the peace to the point of unconditional security for ourselves and our children and the great heart of humanity everywhere that longs for rescue and rest.

Woodrow Wilson referred to the flag as speaking to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of the records they wrote upon it.

But he might have said, and I desire to emphasize, that it speaks also of the present, of the men and women who are now among us and of the records they are writing upon it.

Each day's reports from the distant battle fronts over which our flag flies bring word of new records our men and women are writing upon it. And as we project our minds into the future, we know that the men and women—our children and grandchildren—who will then bear the responsibility of that day will write new records upon that flag.

We are called upon now to give up something of our normal lives in order to facilitate the earliest possible victory for the cause which that emblem symbolizes in this war.

We did not seek this conflict. We sought in every honorable way to avoid it. But it was inevitable. The forces which let it loose upon mankind were not to be dissuaded by persuasion or any sense of justice or Christianity or civilization. If it had not been Pearl Harbor, it would have been some other cowardly attack. And the attack on Pearl Harbor was according to the same pattern as Hitler's attack on Europe, Japan's attack on China, and Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia and France.

Whatever may have been any American's opinion of these nations before, we were forced into the war, there's no point now in arguing about it.

We have put our hand to the plow. We have mobilized our industrial power, our agricultural power, our financial power, our manpower, and our spiritual power and have created the most impressive momentum in their production and distribution which has occurred in the history of the world.

That we should turn back or hesitate or be satisfied with anything less than complete vindication and victory is unthinkable.

That we should permit jealousy or selfishness to divide our people or retard our total was impact is unthinkable.

That we should permit any part of our people to use this war to exploit any other part of our people is unthinkable.

That we should permit political ambition to warp our minds or judgments or the degree of our cooperation is unthinkable.

I recognize that any dislocation in the tenor and methods of our life is inconvenient. But war itself is inconvenient and brutal and ruthless. There is no inconvenience or annoyance or dislocation or hardship that will have to be endured at home by any of us that deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with those which must be borne by those who are to fight our battles in all parts of the world.

I have faith in the American people that fortifies my conviction that regardless of politics, religion, or color; regardless of origin, geography, or economic condition, our people know what produced this war; they know what it is going to take to win it, and they are enlisted in it until unconditional surrender shall be acknowledged by our enemies. Not unconditional surrender by one of them, but unconditional by all of them whether simultaneously or at convenient intervals on the installment plan as exigencies may require.

But what of the victory and what of the peace?

Our first obligation is to win the war by beating our enemies to their knees. Nothing can be allowed to reduce the certainty or the swiftness of that result.

But we cannot close our eyes to the tragic responsibility which will fall to all the United Nations, and to us with peculiar force when the fighting shall have been concluded.

It is not necessary to draw a complete blueprint of plans for the post-war period in order to look the future frankly in the face.

We must not allow ourselves to be as unprepared for peace as we and all the democracies have been for war.

Without attempting to draw a catalog of post-war obligations that are self-evident, I suggest only a few in the following outline.

1. We must demobilize the greatest armed forces ever gotten together in the history of America. We must redistribute the largest industrial force ever mobilized in our history. Both these catalogs include women as well as men. We must help to find jobs for these dislocated millions of men and women. Government and private industry must cooperate in the performance of this task.

2. We must provide for the post-war stabilization of the greatest public debt in the history of our Nation or any nation, and for its reduction and ultimate payment. This will make the reduction of taxation to the basis of pre-war levels impossible within our generation.

3. We must provide for the care and rehabilitation of those who are injured or incapacitated in this war and for their dependents.

4. We must provide for greater security from fear and want among the aged and unemployed not only as a part of a program of economic necessity but of justice and humaniantarism and social obligation.

5. We must aid in the speedy reconversion of our industrial structure from war to peace in order the more promptly to give employment to labor and fair reward to legitimate investment.

6. We must be ready and willing to help provide food and clothing and other essentials to the starved and depressed populations of occupied countries in order to prevent chaos and revolution, and in order that we may help reestablish real self-government among them.

7. We must cooperate in the reestablishment of international trade and international credit on a basis that will afford the necessary outlet for labor and goods and services among the nations of the world.

8. We must not only cooperate in rendering impotent from a military and war-making standpoint the nations which precipitated this cruel war; but we must at once share our full responsibility in bringing about a peace that will contain the germs of permanent justice among nations, and then assume our share of the responsibility of making the breach of that peace impossible.

9. There must be set up a tribunal to which aggrieved nations may bring their grievances with the conviction that justice can be secured from an international organization based upon equal treatment of all nations regardless of size or location.

10. We must convince ourselves that in this complex and highly organized world, nations go up or down together; and we must as soon as practicable let it be known that we shall not attempt to insulate ourselves from any of the burdens or the effects of world events which none can escape, and that in order that these events may be controlled for the welfare of mankind, we shall assume our full share of obligations in that control.

These are but an outline of some of the great human problems that call us to high accomplishment in the game that is played by nations and peoples.

God grant that we may not muff the ball.

St. Lawrence Waterway

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin just adopted a joint resolution, hereto attached, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon the termination of the present war. The resolution very clearly points out the sustained attitude of the State of Wisconsin toward this project, and while Wisconsin bows to the wishes of the President of the United States in the matter of carrying out the war effort, to postpone the completion and building of this waterway until after the war, the State of Wisconsin still insists that it must be ultimately built.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The money that was expended on the Shipshaw project would almost have completed the St. Lawrence project.

Senate Joint Resolution 13

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon termination of the war

Whereas the tortuous and hazardous shipment of submarines from Wisconsin to the gulf coast recently symbolized both the stupidity of the selfish interests that have opposed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and the tremendous potentialities of the Midwest as an oceangoing seaport; and

Whereas the President has indicated that such program of power and navigation development must be abandoned during the present emergency because of the critical and urgent war needs of raw materials and manpower which necessarily must be utilized in such project; and

Whereas one of the very first projects that should be undertaken upon the termination of the war is the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in order to ease the burden of readjustment from emergency conditions of the country to a peacetime economy with a full measure of opportunity to the returning soldiers for employment; and

Whereas the complete utilization and development of all inland transportation facilities will reduce shipping costs so as to permit the entire country to cooperate and to participate in the international competition for commerce in the post-war period on more than even terms; and

Whereas the exigencies of the war have imperatively illustrated that such seaway would grant the hydroelectric power necessary to an effective and expansive defensive effort and grant savings to consumers with lower rates and better living standards through a greater use of electricity; and

Whereas this waterway project will add value to the products of industry and agriculture, create new markets and business, and thereby stimulate employment and materially aid economic recovery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring) That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States and especially the Wisconsin Senators and Members of Congress to promulgate and initiate the adoption of such treaties or other necessary legislation for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project upon termination of the war; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

Finland Pays Her Debts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed article by Frank C. Waldrop in the Times-Herald for June 16, 1943, is informative and interesting and should have careful consideration by every Member of Congress.

As I pointed out in my remarks in the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 27, 1943, the problems of the small countries of Europe are real and vital to those little nations. One of the post-war questions will have to do with the fate of nations all over the world, Greece, Poland, Norway, Holland, Denmark, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and many others.

Now is the time for this country to impress upon its allies the fact that it has sympathy for these countries and that they must be treated fairly and the selfish desires of powerful countries shall not be permitted to deny them justice.

Mr. Waldrop's article is as follows:

IT MUST BE THE HEAT

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Finland paid the United States $168,945.56 yesterday. Actually, the order to transfer credits was given to Finland's bank in New York on June 14, but the transaction was completed around noon, yesterday, the due date for an installment payment on debts growing out of the World War No. 1, and so Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau now holds the money.

There are other nations which still owe us for money hired in connection with that war. They did not pay off yesterday any more than they have at any other time in the past 10 years, but of course politeness forbids mentioning that. Was it politeness that kept our Government yesterday from issuing a note of thanks to Finland? Or was it shame?

The Finns, these days, are not permitted to issue any kind of news releases or state their side of any case. Their legation here is on an almost day-to-day basis, and it is generally recognized around Washington that only luck and skill have saved the Finns from being tossed out of here entirely.

But regardless of all that, the debt installment due June 15 was paid. And if the Finns are still around here six months from now the next installment will be paid then, right on the dot.

What's the matter with our Government that nobody in it has courage enough to get up and say a word of thanks to Finland?

Isn't she entitled to a little notice for living up to her obligations in spite of all the nasty treatment we are dealing out to her? This inoffensive nation has never by any stretch of the imagination done us dirt. Except, perhaps, by demonstrating again and again its embarrassing determination to live up to its obligations.

But even so, the decent thing is plainly called for, and it is interesting to note that the silence toward Finland around the Treasury and the State Department is the silence of men who are heartily ashamed of themselves and know the country knows they should be.

Maybe when the hot spell has passed, somebody in authority will find enough courage and fair play in his heart to speak up. The Finns are not our enemies and no false construction of the facts can make them our enemies.

Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a telegram typical of the scores I have received from my State. This telegram shows that the people are justly alarmed by the President's policies, as carried out through O. P. A. They have good reason to fear hunger and cold next winter, if not sooner, and are demanding Congress assert its authority.

The telegram follows:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 18, 1943.*

Hon. MARION BENNETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplies of corn are vital to production of beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products. Unsound regulations of Office of Price Administration have handicapped feed manufacturers, farmers, and feeders now for many months. Feeders and feed manufacturers in this area are now virtually out of corn. Our firm has 205 bushels to get us through today, whereas our daily requirement is about 12,000 bushels. This means a loss in production for today alone of approximately 400 tons animal and poultry feeds, and 60 tons corn meal for human consumption. Office of Price Administration rules and regulations during the past 6 or 8 months have prevented my firm from manufacturing for feeders and consumers in need several trainloads of feed and food. Results of Office of Price Administration have gone from bad to worse. One bad situation corrected by Office of Price Administration usually has created 2 or 3 worse ones. Relief has continuously been promised during the past months but matters have gone from bad to worse further. The rollbacks proposed by the President plus subsidies for which the next generation of voters will pay appears to be merely a political stunt to get votes and to beat John L. Lewis. I have heard much unfavorable comment toward the President for his fight against Lewis. Many are disgusted with the President and most everyone with Lewis. The roll-back will not retard inflation but rather will leave money in the hands of the people to buy more nonessentials. The roll-back-subsidy plan appears as an obvious step toward inflation. How can well-paid workers better spend their wages than for butter, meat, and coffee? Must we continue to ask the next generation to pay for the undeserved ease of our generation? Shouldn't we pay as we go? May I respectfully urge that Congress again accept its responsibilities. Your powers have been delegated too much and too far to the administrative branch of our Government. If you don't get in and pitch some straight balls yourselves, this country is going to face famine, bankruptcy, and general demoralization. Just leave it to the immature bureaucrats, instead of exercising vigorously your own authority, and we shall have as a nation more grief than we have ever known to date. Why should the legislature of the best Nation in the world permit a bureaucracy to wreck us? I have faith in our legislature and its ability, but unused it is of no value. This Nation needs your services now as never before. I hope you will give your best attention and correct the many dangers that confront us here at home.

THOMAS W. STALEY.

The Real Significance to the American People of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture Held at Hot Springs, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article that I wrote for the Hearst newspapers and published by the same Sunday, June 13, 1943. The article I am inserting in the RECORD is substantially the same as that published:

Like many others, when the coming of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture was announced, I was interested in learning what was back of this move and the reason for holding the meeting in secret. The fact that members of the press and of Congress were to be denied the privilege of attending the conference caused apprehension throughout the country. Many Members of Congress without regard to party affiliation were fearful of this procedure.

I was greatly surprised when late in the afternoon on May 20 Congressman FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, who had just returned from Hot Springs, took the floor in the House of Representatives and stated, "I returned to Washington for the purpose of repeating to my colleagues in the House the warm assurance of Judge Jones (chairman of the conference) that all Members of the Congress were welcome at any time to attend any and all sessions of the conference and that nothing whatever will be kept from them."

In company with Congressman BRADLEY, I proceeded to Hot Springs that same evening, arriving there early the next morning. We were graciously received by Judge Jones and given every assurance that there was nothing secret whatever about the conference, that Congressmen could attend any and all meetings as well as receive the daily journal containing the minutes of all the committee meetings, press and other releases. However, when we mentioned that we would like to attend some of the meetings that day, we were casually informed by Judge Jones that all of the meetings that day were executive and that we could not attend executive sessions but might attend all others. After pressing Judge Jones for a definite reply as to just what meetings we could attend he reluctantly admitted that we could attend only one meeting, the final plenary meeting on the last day of the conference.

The daily journals containing the minutes of the committee meetings were furnished me only to and including May 22, and were then cut off.

Notwithstanding, I remained in Homestead Hotel where all the delegates were staying and all the meetings were held, for 8 days to learn what I could about this unusual conference. I talked with many delegates who always received me cordially. Indeed, many of them were surprised and showed concern that Congressmen were denied admission to the meetings. The opportunity afforded me by mingling with these delegates, attending press conferences, etc., together with the transactions of the conference as reported in the newspapers, and the complete report of the final plenary session, enabled me to obtain much information concerning the work of the conference and the subjects discussed.

One of the first things that exhibited itself to me at the conference was that it was dominated completely by the political planning cult. To the body composing the conference, the Old World was a failure consequent upon man's servility to natural evolutionary, economic and social processes, and the absence of planning. They seemed to lay much of the blame of our planetary woes upon what they called nationalism, and particularly upon the refusal of the United States to enter into some sort of global compact after World War No. 1. They, that is, the delegates from 43 foreign nations and of our own country, were of a mind that this must not happen again, that the United States must forthwith formulate a program of international collaboration and establish an international police force to assure its success.

One could not help but be struck by the faith the body of men assembled at Hot Springs had in their own wisdom and ability to give all the answers, the zealousness with which they pursued their cause, and the authoritarian spirit manifested by them. Illustrative of this attitude of mind was an outburst of emotionalism by one of the leading delegates when he said that the Old World was ruled by matter, but the New World, which the political planners are now creating, would be ruled by spirit.

While at first there seemed to be considerable confusion and indefiniteness in the minds of many of the delegates as to just what they were to consider at this meeting, all of them were dead sure that there should be formed a permanent international body to deal with whatever they were considering or were supposed to consider.

However, it was manifest within a few days after the convening of the conference that the current of thought among the delegates was toward assigning to that body such a vast variety of functions as to include practically all phases of the economy and to vest in it such great powers of control as to constitute what would amount to an authoritarian superstate.

Indeed, it was all too evident to anyone familiar with the work of the political planning cult's far-flung domestic and international scheme of collectivism, as well as the totalitarian thinking of most of the other countries represented at the conference, that consideration of food and agriculture could not have been the prime purpose for the calling of this international conclave. Food, because of its primordial appeal to our whole being was, in my opinion, used as a ruse to cover up the real purpose of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs.

How did it happen that the leaders of the conference had to make special efforts to keep the delegates from considering the question of immediate food relief, that the latter were greatly confused as to just what they were to consider, and that it was necessary for Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, to come to Hot Springs and hold a special press conference in order to placate the public and keep it from finding out too much about that situation?

How does it happen that the plans under consideration at Hot Springs fit in so neatly with the schemes of the New Deal political planners as exhibited in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board?

Both sets of plans envision the formation of a collectivist superstate to which our Nation would, of necessity, lose a great part of its sovereignty. Among other radical measures, both schemes propose the arbitrary shifting of millions of farmers from their farms to cities, and to lift bodily en masse town and city dwellers from their homes and transplant them to other regions, thus treating the farmers and wage earners as physical commodities, as mere chattels. Aye, the Hot Springs plan is suggestive even of the possibility of forced migration from one country

to another. It boldly speaks of "the problem of population shifts might be approached either by the method of relying on adjustments arising out of price and market changes or by direct measures such as retraining, transportation, housing, and the like." And this, mind you, from the section presided over by Alexy D. Krutikov, chairman of the Russian delegation.

The New Deal planning cult proposes to continue lend-lease after the war and make it a permanent institution. I did not find anyone at Hot Springs who objected to that. Incidentally, all but one or two of the countries represented at the conference were eligible for lend-lease, and it was significant to note that to most of the delegates "international collaboration" and Uncle Sam as Santa Claus to the rest of the world were largely synonymous expressions.

Both plans comprehend the ultimate liquidation of free enterprise, politically induced full employment with freedom from want, and the reduction of the standard of living of all the peoples of the earth to a common level. Both plans do away with all fellow-being exploitation except, of course, political and bureaucratic exploitation of such, the worst and only exploitation that has ever seriously interfered with the upward progress of the human race.

Much of the program concocted at the Hot Springs conference is patterned closely after the New Deal. It projects the same kind of political controls over the agriculture of the world as is embodied in the triple A and its adjuncts over our domestic agriculture. As now is the case in our domestic economy, there are to be international measures to provide agricultural credit, commodity arrangements, cooperative movements, an ever-normal granary (buffer stocks), price stability, soil conservation, subsidies to farmers, a surplus commodity agency, etc.

There is to be an international bureaucracy to tell our farmers and the farmers in the rest of the world when to sow and when to reap, just as the Agricultural Adjustment Agency bureaucracy now tells the American farmer when to sow and when to reap.

Whereas our farmers are now compelled to go to Washington to be told by the bureaucrats there what their produce is worth, under the Hot Springs scheme they may be forced to go to London or, perchance, to Moscow to be told what it must fetch.

There is to be an international Work Projects Administration and National Youth Administration, as their plan proposes, to "undertake programs of public works, develop sources of employment in public and private services, and recommend that occupational training should be provided."

The plans proposed at Hot Springs also fit in well with the Keynes-Morgenthau international bank scheme. The conference at its final session recommended "That governments and authorities here represented * * * affirm the principle of mutual responsibility and coordinated action * * * to maintain an equilibrium in balances of payments, and achieve the orderly management of currencies and exchange." This is a part of the very heart of the Keynes-Morgenthau plan, which proposal has been examined by numerous authorities in this country, notably Benjamin M. Anderson, and utterly condemned as being against American interests.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that the President in his address to the food parley, aside from including the entire economy in his scheme to plan a new world order, made point of the need of something like the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme, when he said: "Increased food production must be accompanied by increased industrial production and by increased purchasing power. There must be measures for dealing with trade barriers, international exchange stability, and international investment."

Certain it is that if there was a single representative of any nation, not excluding the United States, at the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs who had the least concern for our Constitution or for private enterprise, he failed to indicate as much. Though it is true that the delegates were unanimous in their praise of our splendid achievements, especially those pertaining to the military, and the great help this has been to the nations fighting the Axis Powers, yet none of them seemed to have the least concern in helping us to preserve the institutions and traditions that alone made these things possible. Not a voice did I hear raised by any of them in defense of the great principles that gave us the strength we now possess. On the contrary, I saw at Hot Springs only scorn for the economic processes that were responsible for the American production and might that is right now rolling back the enemy from the very hearths and homes of many of those delegates.

Are we to believe that it was a mere coincidence that Stalin gave his word to the world that he had ordered the dissolution of the Communist International at the precise moment of the convening of the Hot Springs Conference, where mostly collectivist-minded elements representing the governments of 44 nations were assembled for the purpose of planning a new world order, and where his own delegation was playing first fiddle?

Some took this pronouncement at its face value and tried to explain it as indicating a desire on the part of Stalin to bring about closer cooperation between himself and his fighting allies. May it not be possible that the real explanation for this move lies in another direction?

How does it happen the Soviet delegation played such a prominent role at the Hot Springs Conference that it stood head and shoulders above all the other delegations?

Alexy D. Krutikov, chairman of the Russian delegation, was second vice president among four vice presidents present at the conference.

He was a member of the executive committee of the conference.

He was a member of the steering committee of the conference.

He was chairman of section 2 of the conference which dealt with expansion of production and adaptation to consumption needs.

According to press reports, he was chairman of the drafting committee which was responsible for drawing the first outline of what, no doubt, the planning cult hopes will become the authoritarian superstate.

He was accorded the high honor of making the motion at the closing plenary session of the conference for the adoption of its recommendations.

Why was it the committee which was headed by Alexy D. Krutikov, chairman of the Russian delegation, was given such subjects as the following for consideration and to make recommendations relating thereto:

Existing agricultural practices.

Suitable farming systems and practices.

Government and group activities concerning:

(a) Credit or capital developments.

(b) Cooperative services.

(c) Land tenure.

(d) Other similar activities and education?

What kind of consideration would it be expected Stalin's agent would give to these questions as they relate to the United States? Is it thought he would consider our system of private ownership of land and other property good or bad according to American standards or Russian standards? Are we to believe Stalin sent his delegates to Hot Springs to persuade him to institute in his own country a system of private ownership of farms as we have in the United States, or that he sent them over here to persuade us to adopt his system which prohibits the ownership by any person of even a single foot of land?

Was not the answer to this question given when, according to a news dispatch from Hot Springs, Russian influence was detectable in a proposal that was made advocating community farming?

Finally, what of the grand climax of the whole affair when at the closing session of the conference the delegates, in wild excitement and apparently intoxicated with their own achievements, Judge Marvin Jones, chairman of the conference, "rushed over to Alexy Krutikov, head of the Soviet delegation, embraced him in a bearlike hug and thumped him on the back," which "was heralded as symbolizing the conference's great success." (Washington Times-Herald, June 4, 1943.)

President Roosevelt has succeeded in establishing for himself and the successors to the office he holds a crucially dangerous precedent. He has consulted in secret with representatives of foreign governments, not as Commander in Chief of our armed forces on matters pertaining to war, but as our President on matters of policy relating to the peacetime pursuits of our people.

This act of the President goes to the root of our traditional concept of good government. It violates its fundamental principle, common understanding between the people and their elected officials—mutual faith in each other.

In the perpetration of this deed the President has again set himself above the people and the Congress of the United States.

If he can do once what he has done in respect of the Food Conference, what is there to keep him from repeating the same act as often as he likes?

First the President called what was termed a conference of representatives of 43 foreign nations and of our own, ostensibly to consider something about food and agriculture, without consulting the Congress of the United States. The assemblage consisted of 153 delegates from 43 foreign nations, together with 6 from the United States, a proportion of 25 foreigners to 1 United States representative. They met in secret at Hot Springs, Va., from May 18 to June 3.

At that meeting it developed that problems of food and agriculture were not of primary importance. The agenda considered covered the entire economy, of necessity from an international standpoint because of the composition of the delegates there assembled.

Next the 153 foreign delegates and the 6 United States delegates proceeded on their own initiative, ignoring Congress completely, to form a permanent international body of some sort to carry out whatever program they might formulate.

This international body would not be formed at one stroke but would be undertaken step by step. Accordingly the United Nations' Conference on Food and Agriculture was transformed into the United Nations' Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture. This body is to meet in Washington by July 15 to continue its work. Just what the next step will be in completing the international ruling power we must wait and see.

Has not the President in this episode handed over to 43 foreign countries a degree of United States sovereignty? And, as a result of this, have not the 43 foreign countries already exercised a degree of sovereignty and control over our people?

Are any secret understandings involved in this movement? If not, why was this meeting held in such dark secrecy?

What, except an aroused public opinion, can now stop the 43 foreign countries and our President from making the Hot Springs conference into an authoritarian superstate with power to take from our Nation the greater portion of our sovereignty and our right to determine our own destiny?

The Hot Springs conference was a powerful blow to what remains of our Constitution and liberty and a triumph for communism and dictatorship.

The Times Test and Our Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very learned paper written by Mr. Paul B. Boyd, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Kentucky. The paper is entitled "The Times Test and Our Public Schools."

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From School and Society of May 29, 1943]

THE TIMES TEST AND OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Paul P. Boyd, dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Kentucky)

Just now the elementary and secondary schools are getting the lambasting. Stand in line patiently, if you do not belong to this group, and you will get yours in due time. The New York Times and Dorothy Thompson have passed sentence of guilty on the poor schoolma'am; and hosts of others who once went to school and so qualify as experts affirm the verdict. Eugene Field, didn't he, told of the man who was skilled in matters military because he had a cousin who married a man by the name of Gunn?

The latest furor is caused by a New York Times test given to 7,000 freshmen in 36 colleges, asking for facts on American people, places, events, legislation, the Constitution, and organizations. Some answers named Garner as World War No. 1 President, Thomas Jefferson as President of the Confederacy and the discoverer of electricity, Washington as President of the United States during the War between the States, Alexander Hamilton a maker of watches, Walt Whitman an orchestra leader, and William James a bandit. Many States were placed among the Thirteen Original ones. Cities were located all over the map. The Constitution was confused with the Declaration of Independence; Lincoln "emaciated" the slaves; the Constitution gave the right to "appease" the President and to "bare" arms.

The outcome of all this is that Congressmen talk about an investigation of history teaching, the Senate orders that the survey be made a public document, and demand is made that American history be required for admission in every college that is under public control.

The whole incident smacks of sensationalism, ignorance of what is being done in the field of American history, the human impulse to settle everything by passing a law, unfamiliarity with the nature of tests and conditions for their validity, bad logic, and lack of appreciation of the fun-loving facetiousness of the college student. The facts in the case are that virtually every secondary-school graduate has studied American history for at least 1 year, that a large majority of college students study the subject, that educators are the ones best fitted to cope with whatever the problem may be, that the Times test is amateurish and the conclusions unsound. The Times should apologize to the great body of freshman students and secondary-school teachers for the commission of libel. Perhaps, however, the Harvard Crimson has struck nearer the truth than the wiseacres who view with alarm and generalize without valid proofs. The Crimson pokes fun at them. Perhaps they have been the victims of a "mass of spontaneous kidding" by freshmen who spotted the superficiality of the test. It may well have been a form of sit-down strike which sometimes happens with the usual placement tests, on the basis of which freshmen are sectioned for the purpose of securing classes homogeneous in ability or attainment. In this connection we are told that many freshmen deliberately make low scores in order to gain placement in the lower, easier sections. Perhaps the gypper has been gypped. Can the reformer be reformed?

Our schools are easy prey to the journalist for various reasons. Everybody has had school experience, good and bad, and, from it, fixed opinions that lead to false generalizations. Many have good or bad, bright or slow, children in school. Papers must have copy of wide interest. They know publicity values and they are commercial enterprises first of all. The have sometimes indulged in propaganda, fair and unfair. They sometimes overemphasize to the point of sensationalism. They like to "stir up the animals." They must sell papers. Also, writers must write.

The schools are easy prey for the prowling journalist because of their admitted imperfections. Like all human institutions devoted to ideals of service and progress, the school is changing with its changing world, and, let it be admitted, lags in its changes behind those of its world. The lag seems to be unavoidable, for no one is wise enough to tell us with authority what the schools should be 10 years from now, or, at this particular moment, what they should be doing 5 years from now. The school is vulnerable also because new ideas and plans naturally lead to their initial overemphasis to the detriment of other phases that may be more fundamental. The schools are run by human beings who are imperfect. Poor and uninspired teachers, young and inexperienced teachers, low salaries and inadequate equipment, inertia, vested interests in the community, inadequate leadership, conditions in home and town, the spirit of the times, and so on, all can turn a potentially efficient school into a dismal caricature. The American school is, moreover, subject to invidious comparison with other systems in other countries where the problems, the setting, the inheritances, the needs are different.

We shall for such reasons always have the uninformed and unsympathetic critic after us to a far greater extent than he is after the doctors, the lawyers, and the members of other learned professions.

But more dangerous than such causes for harmful criticisms are amateurish tests and unsound interpretations of them. Like statistics, which follow from them, these tests are in the third category of liars, the lowest level of the statistical hell. More harm is done by untrained, half-baked educational statisticians than by all the quack doctors in the world. Statistics and Times tests are not foolproof, and they are likely to injure both tester and tested. They require expert handling. When will people refuse to accept conclusions as accurate, valid, and forever proved merely because they follow statistical tabulations?

The Times test is wholly factual in its content. It contains material that is not common to all secondary-school courses in American history, it jumbles into one mass facts that are important and facts that few will remember and few will care to remember. It covers material found usually in political science, American government, literature, and geography. It asks about men who are not yet historical. It measures memory and thus glorifies the World Almanac as the compendium of scholarship par excellence. It asks whether the first college for women was founded before the Boy Scout movement, what was the minimum price per acre of Federal public lands sold at auction before the passage of the Homestead Act, what was the first United States census in which railway mileage could have been reported, and to this last gives the wrong answer. If facts like these were the most important features of a history course, we should indeed need to be reformed.

I was curious to take the test myself, so I filled out the blank. I think I made a passing grade but some astounding skeletons came rattling out of my closet. For example, I wrote down the Thirteen Original States hurriedly, as any freshman would do, and what was my surprise to find that I had omitted the grand old State of Pennsylvania. To what a low level has our teaching of American history sunk when a dean of one of our State universities showed that he did not know Pennsylvania to be one of our Original States! How can we expect the schools to amount to much when the occupant of such a position displays such abysmal ignorance? Is this the outcome of the study of history?

I did not get the right order of the founding of the Boy Scouts and the first women's college. I missed the date of the passage of the Homestead Act. I got the wrong President during the Mexican War. I named the Scandinavians one of the two principal nationalities to migrate to the United States between 1845 and 1860. I missed the exact minimum price per acre of Federal public lands sold at auction before the passage of the Homestead Act.

I must admit that if the Times questions are valid tests of the proper outcomes of a course in American history, I am something of an ignoramus. And so is my friend the judge who presides with distinction over our juvenile court, for he didn't know when the Boy Scout movement started. No Quiz Kids are we. However, my head is bloody but unbowed! The test is not a valid one. It is not worth the time and trouble that it took to prepare and give it.

A valid test must always be based upon the recognized aims and objectives of the course. No one in his senses would say that factual information is one of the most important objects of the study of history. What are encyclopedias for? One of my colleagues, a historian of note, tells me that the three principal objectives should be: first, to give a picture of society as it has developed through the ages; second, to give the individual a sense of his place in society; and third, to open to the student the great storehouse of literature and other intellectual achievements that have come from great historical movements.

You will not be wholly satisfied with this statement of objectives for the teaching of history. You will wish to mention specifically such hard-to-measure outcomes as ideals, loyalties, patriotism, understanding, habits of critical thinking, culture, character. Certainly you will reject the idea that proper teaching consists of fixing in mind dates,

rivers, native States, and so on. Yet that is what the Times test means, and for that reason it is worthless, misleading, and vicious. The imponderables are the lasting valuable outcomes in education and they cannot be reduced to any sort of 1 to 1 correspondence with dates and places.

Does not the performance of our boys in this war strikingly refute the findings of the Times? They have been trained to a greater or less extent in our schools. They have studied American history and have squeezed the juice from the course. They may not know who was prominent in the early woman's suffrage movement but they do know what this war is about and they know what to do about it. They know what America stands for, they have experienced freedom, they abhor from the depths of their souls lack of sportsmanship, treachery, cruelty, slavery, and the unforgivable sins against the dignity of the human spirit. Who dares say that the teaching of American history has not contributed its part to this present magnificent American boy?

The test also fails miserably to make allowance for the natural fading from our minds of those facts, figures, principles, powers of all sorts, that we do not use. An old mathematics professor in one of our State universities was wont to remark in his classes that "the mind is master of that only which it uses." That is a profound fact, which, if learned thoroughly by all critics of education, would save much paper and ink and many hours of test making and so might solve the present labor-shortage problem.

This lost of mastery through disuse explains, or contributes to the explanation of, many apparent failures of our schools. A boy seems to know no algebra when he comes to college. But it has been, in some cases, from 4 to 6 years since he studied or used the subject. Should we be surprised at the small residue of algebra that remains? It has been years since he studied formal geography. Is it strange that he fails to remember whether Portland, Oreg., is on the Pacific Ocean or on the Columbia River? If you have taught school, you may remember how, when you began, you worked harder than any of your pupils to prepare your daily lessons. I recall how I had to study for the examination for a certificate to teach in an elementary school. After graduation from college I secured a country school with the understanding that I could teach for 2 months without salary while preparing for the examination. If I had failed in this examination, I should not have been able to pay my accumulated board bill. I studied. I should not have passed if I had not reviewed thoroughly. My teachers were in no way responsible for my ignorance. "The mind is master of that only which it uses!" But the imponderable outcomes remain because they are the warp and the woof of our daily living and thinking.

The fact of the matter is that in any test designed to rate the worth of a course or of a teacher we face the difficulty of dealing with human material and processes where many hidden conditions and variables are present. There are those already mentioned, aims and objectives that should determine the form of the test, imponderables that escape identification by the means employed. In any such inquiry we must ask whether the test can solve the problem proposed, what are the limits of probable error, what are the individual differences in ability and achievement among those tested, what pitfalls in thinking endanger a reliable conclusion. Insufficient data, hasty generalizations, incorrect casual relationships, conditional hypotheses, unknown variables that may affect the results or should condition the final answer: perils like these lie in wait for the unskilled. The chemist and the physicist know and appreciate the difficulties because they are scientists. May we hope that some day educators and would-be educators, alike, will master the scientific method, and that the public itself may finally attain an understanding of what is involved in a proof?

Our teaching problems have multiplied manyfold in recent times. Formerly, when the population was homogeneous and the aim was wholly academic and the curriculum was simple, the factual test was much more conclusive. But now, knowledge has increased so rapidly, the education of all youth through the secondary school has become such a universally accepted aim, our youth themselves differ so widely in ability and interests, antecedent home life, culture, economic status, and vocational aims that the old school is manifestly inadequate. The newer efforts to relate school life to community activities, to fit the student for happy and useful living in his community, to do for the large majority what is best for their future, rather than to run all through a college-preparatory course, these present a well-nigh impossible problem for the smaller schools. Especially is this the case while the ideas involved, though educationally sound, are still relatively new and undeveloped. Especially is this true when teachers are inexperienced, underpaid with insecure tenure and many of them are using teaching only as a stepping stone to married life or other professions.

Can our schools succeed in the face of these numerous handicaps, within and without? Can they adequately teach necessary facts and tools, prepare for college, and at the same time meet the obvious necessity for an education for citizenship and personal efficiency, and adapt their training to individual differences and needs? Can they solve the problem of the 25-percent rejection of high-school graduates by the Army for physical deficiencies? It is the educator's firm belief that his idea of what the school should be and do is not visionary but a long-term program that can and must be realized. Only with its realization will the American public school play its fruitful role of making Americans who are worthy of the founding fathers and of the freedoms they enjoy and of the opportunities for richer life that will be ever unfolding.

Global Alphabet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to call to the attention of the Congress the outstanding work that is being done by Hon. Robert L. Owen, former Senator from Oklahoma, in the formation and utilization of his global alphabet.

Senator Owen, you will remember, was one of Oklahoma's first United States Senators. He was one of the founders of our present Federal Reserve System, for, as chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, he introduced the measure that resulted in the formation of this system. He is a recognized authority on finance, but in addition is one of the Nation's leading scholars.

In devising and perfecting the global alphabet Senator Owen makes a great contribution to international peace and understanding, by making it possible to write any language in the world through the use of his alphabet.

I am submitting to the House a letter from Senator Owen more clearly outlining the details of the alphabet, and also one from Dr. Mario A. Pei of Columbia University, an international authority on languages, commenting upon the use and possibilities of the alphabet:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 12, 1943.*

Hon. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,

United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MIKE: Senate Document 49, a compilation explaining the methods and form of printing and writing the global alphabet is sent you by separate cover and for your special information I submit a brief commentary as to its objects and utility with the reasons why.

1. The world has never had an acceptable alphabet by which all languages could be written or printed and immediately read by an intelligent person knowing any particular language.

2. The global alphabet submitted can write any language in the world acceptably and sufficiently to read the context when one knows the alphabet. This means that Chinese, Japanese, or Spanish can be immediately read by a native who knows the language and takes the trouble to learn the 41 symbols, or letters, which comprise the present global alphabet.

3. This global alphabet can be learned by any intelligent person in 1 or 2 days so that within a comparatively few days of practice he can easily read a book or newspaper printed in his own language in this alphabet.

4. Books printed in this global alphabet giving parallel lines of Spanish and English can teach both the Spaniard and the Englishman to learn each other's language for practical conversational purposes within a very short time. At present, the Army is teaching some of our soldiers to converse in Japanese within 3 or 4 months by using a native teacher and phonograph records for pronunciation. This result could be multiplied many times over by using the global alphabet, which could enable the soldiers to teach themselves a desired foreign language because the substantially correct pronunciation can be given to him by the printed word through suitable booklets and because the printed word could be multiplied through modern mass production very cheaply and could reach the individual soldier everywhere. The task of teaching 30 foreign languages could be greatly simplified by furnishing our soldiers and sailors with a self-teaching system right on the ground where the foreign language can be heard every day by natives and by Americans who know the language and who are using the language in the areas where our armies have occasion to operate.

THE PHONETIC SYSTEM OF WRITING A SPOKEN LANGUAGE

When Moses wrote Genesis, he used a smaller number of letters than the global alphabet. These letters were sufficient by sound to make legible and intelligible the words as spoken, although such letters did not reproduce the sound with absolute accuracy but did indicate what the spoken word was and did so with such accuracy that the text of the Book of Genesis has come down to us through many centuries substantially unimpaired in meaning.

When movable types were discovered, as employed in the Gutenberg Bible, the scholars of the world attempted to write words in letters which should give the word greater accuracy in spelling. In doing so they used combinations of letters and vowels making certain letters silent but which have the effect of giving a different sound to other letters which preceded or followed. These

devices privately established by individuals of literary standing produced great confusion in spelling and in learning how to write and read spoken languages. At present, every modern language is compelled to have two systems of spelling; one, the inherited, scholastic spelling of writers long since dead and whose spelling could not be changed either by consent or decree. Webster's Unabridged Dictionary contains over 604,000 words with this scholastic spelling, but he was compelled to invent a simple phonetic alphabet of 41 symbols by which to phonetically spell with substantial accuracy the words of the English language. The words in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary which are unphonetically spelled following the scholastic, etymological, inherited system numbers about 500,000. With these 41 symbols, Webster gives a satisfactory pronunciation for every word in his dictionary. Other modern languages have the same necessity. The Spanish dictionaries require only 30 phonetic letters to spell Spanish words acceptably; the Russian language is now being taught English-speaking people by the use of 30 phonetic letters. The Turkish language is being taught English-speaking people by the use of only 29 phonetic letters, and so it is with other languages. The written text of visible signs can only give the dependable guide in pronunciation by the use of phonetic letters, each one of which has, or should have, an immutable sound. The letters of a phonetic alphabet should never be silent. The letters of a phonetic alphabet should never have more than one sound, although this is permissible where the context will invariably correct the departure from the rule.

It is surprising the extent to which the context of the printed word clarifies and corrects unphonetic spelling. In Webster's Dictionary he spells over 604,000 words with 26 letters, relying with confidence on the context to tell how such words should be pronounced, in spite of their spelling. Educated people in modern languages, in practically all modern languages, have the same experience. The context nearly always corrects the inadequacy of unphonetic spelling.

The global alphabet differs from all other alphabets in the world by using a new form for each and every letter employed. This is done for the reason that all other alphabets, including the English alphabet, employs letters having the same forms as those of the Roman alphabet. The letters of the Roman alphabet have, every one of them, multiple meanings as employed not only in individual languages but in other languages so that a student in using the letters having the form of the Roman alphabet finds himself hopelessly confused by letters having multiple meanings.

Because the new global alphabet can be learned in a single day and thereafter be employed with accuracy in writing any language, the global alphabet as here submitted contains a key to writing, reading, and printing any language and all languages for those who use it.

It has been said by respectable authorities that there is no right way or wrong way in writing words phonetically. What is really meant by this is that there is no right way or wrong way established by a competent authority for pronouncing any word because the common people, and educated people for that matter, pronounce many words of the same identical meaning with slight variations of sound, particularly in dealing with the vowels.

A simple example of this is the word "above." The dictionary makes the first syllable the letter "a" which may be pronounced by any one of the "a" sounds, and Webster gives seven different sounds for the letter "a," but most people pronounce the first syllable of that word as if it were the letter "u" in the word but.

The real point is that the phonetic spelling should correctly express what the spoken word is whether the spoken word be standardized on established authority or not.

However, when phonetic writing becomes established, the scholars of the world will decree what is the best pronunciation employed by the educated people of any country.

The fact that the global alphabet can be learned thoroughly within a day or two and immediately used as a means of writing, reading, and printing any language will save the children of the world untold billions of hours of labor in learning to read and write the languages of the world.

It will do more; it will open immediately the doors of knowledge printed in suitable books so as to make available to all mankind improved methods of production, the arts and sciences, and the comforts, conveniences, and luxuries of life. It can immediately make available to them the highest moral and ethical standards and the most serviceable methods of government and of social intercourse. It opens the door to a new world where all men will know at least one language which would be common to those they meet.

While there are literally thousands of languages and dialects, it is also true that only 30 or 40 languages are important and of these a half a dozen might compete for general acceptance.

One of the incalculable services which could be rendered to the United States and to the United Nations by the global alphabet is to immediately enable the citizens of each of the United Nations to understand, in addition to their own native tongue, several other of the great languages, including English as a matter of better international cooperative understanding and appreciation.

Few people realize how easy it is and how quickly a conversational knowledge of other languages may be achieved.

It only takes about 1,200 words with their derivatives to speak another language so as to be understood and so as to understand the foreign language. The Reader's Digest of May 1943, page 40, shows how ordinary soldiers of the United States can be taught to converse in and understand Japanese within 3 or 4 months. In a self-teaching book such as I have above described, a foreign language could be still more rapidly learned.

It is inconceivable that the intelligence of mankind should fail to utilize the global alphabet and the principles upon which it is founded, since it could and would immediately open the doors of knowledge to God's little messengers everywhere on the face of the earth and bring more abundant food and clothing and shelter and happiness to the people everywhere in the whole world.

With kindest regards believe me, as ever my dear friend,

Yours faithfully,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, June 11, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT L. OWEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OWEN: Yesterday I received the single copy of Senate Document 49 which you sent me under separate cover from the others. I imagine I shall find these today when I go down to Columbia.

Just as soon as the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs approves the method followed in the 2 sample lessons which I submitted to them yesterday, I shall go to work on the 52 English lessons. It will be a simple matter indeed to send you carbon copies of them as they are prepared. You may also be sure that you will receive copies of the replies of all my experts as they come in. In the case of some of them it may take months, as they are now away for the summer. The project, however, is a great and important undertaking, and its application to the world's 40 or 50 leading languages may be expected to take a full year.

It is possible that by this time you may have received the material from my forthcoming book, which my publishers sent you 2 days ago. As you go over this at your own leisure, it will be interesting for you to visualize the application of your alphabet to each individual language from the description of the sounds of that language, which I have approximated to English sounds insofar as it was possible to do so. It may be that after we succeed, with the help of experts in each tongue, in applying your alphabet to the languages I describe in my book, you will be interested in collaborating in the production of a second edition of that book, in which the individual characters of the various languages are discarded, and the language is presented throughout in global alphabet characters.

I should like to ask you whether you have any objection to newspaper or magazine publicity in connection with your alphabet. My work has attracted a good deal of publicity of that nature within the past year, and some editors have inquired whether I had any plans for an international language in mind. I had to tell them frankly that I had not; there are several auxiliary artificial languages already in existence, but they present grave difficulties of application. Your global alphabet, on the other hand, presents attractive possibilities of making the study of existing national tongues infinitely easier than it is at present; it also removes what has hitherto been by far the most serious handicap to the spreading of English as an international auxiliary language.

English, as you undoubtedly know, is an ideal international tongue in all respects but one, the tremendous spread between its spelling and its pronunciation. With this difficulty removed by the use of your alphabet, there is no reason why its use should not spread over the world at an infinitely swifter pace than it ever could or would in its present written form. Its grammatical structure is simpler than that of any other existing tongue; its vocabulary represents an excellent blending of the two most important linguistic group in the world, the Germanic and the Latin-Romance, with copious borrowings from Greek and other sources and an infinite capacity for assimilation of words from all sources. The next time a newspaper or magazine editor speaks to me of an international tongue, I should like to mention your global alphabet and its possibilities and implications, with your permission. Of course, in any article that might be written on the subject, full credit would be given you as the creator of the alphabet, and my own role would be truthfully described as that of one who is endeavoring to apply it to a group of world languages. If for any reason you object to publicity at the present time, however, I shall, of course, refrain, although it seems to me that the sooner the idea is brought before a world-public hungry for international understanding, the sooner it will come to fruition.

If you come to New York next week, I shall be more than delighted to meet you and discuss all these matters with you. It will probably be easier for me to go wherever you will be stopping than for you to come up to Columbia to see me, and if you will let me know in advance where you will be, I shall come to you.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

MARIO A. PEI.

P. S.—I was particularly interested in the opinions of the Government's oriental experts, which did not appear in the outline

you had originally sent to Columbia. They bear out my own conclusions as to the applicability of your alphabet. The Chinese expert's statements concerning his country's need for such a device is especially striking. Chinese illiteracy could fast be wiped out by this means.

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1943]

G. B. SHAW HAS ECONOMY PLAN

LONDON, June 10.—George Bernard Shaw explained in a letter to the Times, London, today how the Allies could save enough money to pay for the European invasion, and even the whole war, merely by simplifying spelling. Entering a controversy over the use of "fone" for "phone," he asked readers to consider how the elimination of one letter would conserve machinery, paper, and labor.

The Roll-Back and Subsidy Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an unusually interesting statement made by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on June 15, 1943, in which he discusses the roll-back and subsidy problem from the farmers' standpoint.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The pending measure relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation provides for changing the basis of taking inventories, for more operating funds, for extending the life of the corporation, and for audit by the General Accounting Office. We approve of the basis for taking inventories and the provisions for audit. We believe the Corporation has an essential purpose to serve during the war emergency; that its life should be extended for 2 years; and that it should have sufficient funds to carry out the purpose of Congress. We believe, however, that in some of its activities the Corporation has not been carrying out the purpose of Congress, and that it is the intention to use some of the funds sought in a manner which is in violation of the intent and purpose of Congress, and which will lead to serious trouble unless Congress makes it very plain what its intent and purpose is and expressly prohibits the use of any of the funds in contravention of such purpose. I refer particularly to the use of subsidies in lieu of fair prices for farmers. The Commodity Credit Corporation claims authority for such use is found in the Price Control Acts. Because of the wording of the acts and in view of the limitations later provided, we cannot agree with this claim. Since the Commodity Credit Corporation is largely relied on as a means of carrying out a subsidy program, we believe that in extending the life of the Corporation, Congress should state clearly how it is to be used, and in providing funds, Congress should leave no room for misunderstanding as to what should be done, and what should not be done with those funds.

We, therefore, wish to address our remarks to the general subject of the use to which the Commodity Credit Corporation and its funds will be put. Involved in the question are such far-reaching problems as the effect on our food supply, inflation, price ceilings, and subsidies. Much of what we shall say has been discussed before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate, but we believe the bill under consideration will largely determine whether or not a sound course is pursued, and merits some repetition.

FOOD SUPPLY

If properly used the Corporation can assist greatly in making it possible to maintain a maximum food supply. If used to bolster up any unsound price-ceiling program which would strangle production, the Corporation may prove a very real detriment in our efforts to produce food. An ample supply of food is one of our most difficult problems. If present policies are continued, food will soon be our No. 1 problem. In our judgment we have passed the peak of production and are well down on the declining side. Only by most vigorous action can the trend be changed, but almost every major policy of Government today is contributing to more serious shortages. It is time for some sound thinking and some farsighted statesmanship, instead of yielding to the excellent demand of those who are trying to make the people believe that by financial juggling they can increase the price to the producer and reduce it to the consumer. In our judgment our food situation is far more serious than any statistics yet released by the Department of Agriculture have revealed. For months all the reports we have been able to get from the field have indicated that the official crop outlook figures are much too optimistic, and we note that each month's revision tends to bear out the correctness of our observations. Much of this shortage is bureaucratically made and wholly unnecessary, but we are going right ahead with the same destructive policies unless Congress calls a halt.

In our judgment the time is past due when Congress should take a firm stand for policies which will assure a maximum food supply. These policies have to do principally with manpower, machinery and supplies, and price. Since the policies of the Commodity Credit Corporation affect price much more than manpower and machinery, we will not discuss that last two. We want to impress upon you as strongly as we can that the food problem is very serious.

INFLATION

The dangers of inflation are too well known to require discussion further than to say that because farmers are opposing the unworkable price ceiling-subsidy method of control, we have been viciously pictured as inflationists. Farmers are not inflationists. We lost our shirts following the last war and we have not forgotten. We are opposing a theoretical method which has never worked in all history over an extended period, and are insisting on a sound system even though it does involve the very practical though painful necessity of paying for what we eat.

Before we consider methods for the control of inflation, it would be well to consider the causes which bring it about. There are two chief causes of inflation. First is the pressure of surplus income upon an inadequate supply of consumer goods. Second is the loss of faith in the Government's ability to meet its obligations, or to pay its debts in dollars having the same value as the dollar it borrowed.

It is estimated that the total of individual income for 1943, after paying taxes, will be approximately $124,000,000,000. At present values the available consumers goods will amount to approximately eighty-two billions. This leaves an inflationary gap of forty-two billions. There are numerous estimates as to how much of this will go into savings varying from fifteen to twenty-five billions. This leaves an income in excess of consumer goods of from seventeen to twenty-seven billion dollars, all seeking an outlet.

There are two distinct schools of thought with reference to the control of inflation. One school favors establishing price ceilings, enforced by fines and penalties. The other advocates making use of economic forces by increasing production of goods and controlling purchasing power.

Those following the first school of thought, propose to erect a price-ceiling dam against this excess income, and thereby shut off the spending outlet. They reason that our economy was in fairly good balance on some given date, and they would freeze everything at that spot. They would thereby prevent any price rises in order to prevent inflation. This is fallacious reasoning, as all history has adequately demonstrated, for never have price ceilings prevented inflation over an extended period in the history of the world, although they have been tried hundreds of times.

The chief reason why price ceilings fail is that they ignore production costs and shut off the supply of goods. In wartime, there are many items of cost which arise from war dislocation that cannot be controlled by any price-ceiling method. On the farm we send our experienced young men to war and replace them with young boys and old men. We can control the wages by wage ceilings, but the substitutes do only half as much work and our labor cost is doubled. There are hundreds of uncontrollable war dislocation costs which force up the costs of consumer goods. When these costs bump into the ceilings, production is strangled, and the inflationary gap is increased.

Judge John D. Miller, long a student of attempts of price ceilings has put it very well when he said:

"We hold it to be self-evident that an effective ceiling on the price of any commodity will in due time restrict the production of that commodity to the quantity that can be produced at that price."

Various methods have been tried to prevent prices from rising. Of course if wages, services, and everything else are strictly controlled, the rise will be slower than where part of the economy is left uncontrolled, but such universal control leads to complete regimentation and even then it has always eventually blown up, not only because of the terrific cost and the unwieldiness of the bureaucracy which was necessary for enforcement, but finally because the production of food was strangled. The experiments in Rome about 300 A. D. and in France following the Revolution are classical examples. In the case of Rome, local autonomy disappeared and was replaced by a huge bureaucracy before the crash came. In the case of France, the historians tell us the attempt "Converted a scarcity into a famine."

We are well on our way toward making these same blunders. In fact, we have already made a lot of them. By bungling price-control methods we have already created a lot of unnecessary food shortages and driven many items into black markets, where the consumer is trimmed up right, and we are rapidly creating a bureaucracy which is constantly finding it necessary to seek more power and regiment more activities to offset the effects of blunders previously made. At first we attempted to control almost everything except labor, which was specifically omitted. Everyone knew it couldn't work, but we tried it. Later, an effort was made to include labor, but the issue has been deliberately evaded, while price ceilings have driven a steadily-increasing volume of consumer goods into black markets, and production of many lines has been strangled. It is now proposed to roll back prices, not wages, and hold the line. You are asked to approve an increased appropriation for

the Commodity Credit Corporation, an undisclosed portion of which would be used to bolster up this whole unsound program by the use of subsidies, to prevent strangling production.

WE OPPOSE SUBSIDIES

We are opposed to the use of subsidies for such purposes because they will not work, for reasons which I will discuss.

First, however, we want to point out two or three more fallacies in the price-control system as we have tried to operate it. There are 10,000 hamlets and crossroads in America, each with its own individual production and marketing characteristics. We go into the mountains of Montana, where costs are high, and we find miners and stockmen paying more for their food. The law of supply and demand has adjusted prices to costs. We go into the mountains of the Carolinas, where costs are low, and we find the people are paying low prices for their food. The law of supply and demand has again adjusted prices to costs. Both places are equally distant from the railroad. Under the Office of Price Administration, they are forced into a common mold. It is an extreme example, but to a greater or less degree, it is typical of what is attempted all over America. The production may not be large in an individual high-cost area, but in the aggregate it is enormous, and this production is largely curtailed or destroyed by rigid price ceilings. No system of subsidies can be devised to meet the tens of thousands of conditions which prevail, and the daily changes which are occurring by reason of dislocation costs.

We have pointed out the enormous inflationary gap we now face. These are not static figures. They will get progressively worse. Assuming that we could dam a $15,000,000,000 flood, we must not forget that it is accumulating; that it will be twenty billions by fall, twenty-five billions by winter, and forty or fifty billions a year from now. Holding it back by price ceilings and subsidies is a complete impossibility.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

In making use of subsidies we believe the intent and purpose of Congress is being violated. Section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942, authorizes the use of subsidies whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is being obtained but the subsidy payments are to be made to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof. It will be noted that the sole purpose is to get maximum production. There is no authority whatever for paying subsidies to reduce prices to the consumers.

This section also provides for paying subsidies for the production of strategic or critical material. The arguments for subsidy payment were largely based on the need for subsidizing high cost copper producers in order to get production without upsetting the markets. It was generally supposed that subsidies, if used, would be used in this manner.

After the bill had been in operation some time it became apparent that it was the plan to use subsidies to hold prices down to the consumer, rather than to increase production. When a bill was presented for providing an undisclosed amount to be used to pay subsidies, the Senate expressed its displeasure with the proposal so vigorously that the bill was withdrawn.

Nevertheless it continued to be apparent that it was the intent of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to use subsidies in lieu of a fair price. We discussed this with the President, presenting our reasons why we felt it would be a mistake to use subsidies in lieu of a fair price, but found that the plans for using subsidies were apparently pretty definitely determined upon. Therefore, when the price-control bills were introduced after the President's Labor Day message, we appeared before this committee and called attention to the danger. We said:

"Subsidies are not mentioned in the President's message. Subsidies are not mentioned in the bill, but all the powers are there for their use if the President so decides. Congress should not pass by such a vital issue without an understanding on it. We believe Congress should set forth the policy of meeting the costs of war dislocations now, by assuring enough flexibility in ceilings to meet these unavoidable costs.

"We recommend that this principle be written into the measure itself by adding the following words after the word 'President' in the second sentence: 'Shall adjust prices where necessary to maintain adequate production goals and.' "

We presented a number of reasons why subsidies should be avoided. Congress adopted the principle we suggested when it included the following limiting proviso after setting up the September 15 price level as a base:

"Provided further, That modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, etc."

This was a definite limitation of the powers granted and reaffirmed the productive purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act.

We felt this was a clear mandate to adjust price ceilings where necessary to obtain production, but various kinds of subsidies have been used in spite of this mandate. We believe Congress should now make its intent and purpose so plain in the pending bill that there can be no room for misunderstanding and that the use of the funds should be restricted to the purpose expressed.

REASON FOR OPPOSING SUBSIDIES

Now, to enumerate some of the reasons why we oppose subsidies and believe safeguards should be provided against their use:

1. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished.

(a) Subsidies are paid from Federal funds which must be borrowed. About 80 percent is borrowed from banks and directly increases the surplus income to the extent of such borrowing, thus increasing the inflationary gap.

(b) Nothing will cause a greater loss of confidence in the financial soundness of our Government than to follow a policy of unwillingness to pay our bills as we go, as far as we can. In the days of our greatest national income, if America refuses to pay its food bill, but passes it on to future generations, it is clear that we are deliberately pursuing a policy that leads straight to bankruptcy. Every thinking person knows that such a policy long continued must result in a financial crash.

2. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to post-war chaos. The goal of the present policy is to maintain a rigid price ceiling with the use of subsidies to meet the ever-increasing dislocation costs of production. As the war progresses, dislocation costs will increase and we will find it necessary to increase the subsidies. Thus our price structure will become more unbalanced day by day. If we are to avoid bankruptcy, when the war is over, we must balance our budget. When that day comes, subsidies will be the first thing to be cut off. Then, one of two things will happen. Either farmers will have to get higher prices to meet their costs, or quit producing.

If we do not have the moral or political courage to pay the cost of our food bill during these days of billions of dollars of excess income and full employment, what chance would there be to raise food prices when men come back from the Army hunting jobs, and when income starts down?

The answer is, none whatever, and the result will be farm bankruptcy and chaos worse than that following the last war, which was, at least, not complicated by subsidies.

3. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear. It is almost axiomatic that we cannot fight a world war and raise our standards of living at the same time. But that is exactly what we are trying to do. How many of us are worse off financially than before the war started? For most of us our incomes have gone up far faster than our outgo, and we know very well that somebody has got to pay for the enormous destruction going on. The President has repeatedly said we cannot expect to maintain our high living standards during the war. However, instead of facing the facts and paying the necessary increased living and operation costs—and you will note I am omitting actual war costs—we are insisting on passing these costs on to future generations, and are trying to live better today than ever. While millions of our young men are risking their lives at $600 a year, and we at home are enjoying the greatest income in history, we feel that it is thoroughly dishonorable to refuse to pay our food bill and pass some billions of it on to these young men to pay when they come home. What are they going to say about it? If there is anything which would invite repudiation, it is a subsidy program such as the administration is trying to launch.

4. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the state to support its people. There was never a time when it was more necessary for the people to support the state than today, but seldom if ever have more people been willing to dodge the responsibility and let the state support them by straining its credit to the danger point.

5. Subsidies lead to political control, and when once used, they are politically almost impossible to get rid of. They are another step toward authoritarian control. The Supreme Court recently expressed it well. An Ohio farmer refused to pay his overproduction fine, arguing that the law had been passed after his wheat crop had been planted, and he was denied the protection of the Constitution, which prohibits taking property "without due process of law." Pointing out that wheat prices were being maintained by subsidies, the Supreme Court said, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." No one can quarrel with the reasoning, but it should be a warning to avoid using subsidies unless we want more Government regulation.

6. Subsidy theorists try to make economic law work backwards. Normally rising prices encourage production, and discourage consumption. As the supply increases, prices come down and consumption goes up. Subsidies upset this normal process. To the extent that they are not dependable and do not get back to the producer, they fail to encourage production, but they do encourage consumption. As an example, we now have a 5-cent butter roll-back. This will encourage butter consumption, but the 5 cents does not get back to the small butter producer. He merely takes a 5-cent cut in price, and many can't stand it and are quitting. Incidentally, when we start messing with economic law this way we can never figure out all the complications which will result from it. A large part of our dairy products are sold under contracts based on butter prices. We have

rolled back the butter price 5 cents a pound thus cutting the price on a lot of other products without providing any subsidy to make up for the loss. In times like these with food so scarce it seems little short of criminal to permit the further destruction of our food supply in order to carry out the ideas of a lot of theorists or agitators who don't understand what they are doing.

Subsidies are a demagogue's paradise. Fine sounding arguments can be made for them because they will bring low costs to the consumer and high returns to the producer. Of course we cannot live on borrowed money long in any such blissful state, but pay day is conveniehtly forgotten except by some who are bold enough or frank enough to support subsidies as a means of redistributing the wealth of the people.

There are many reasons why subsidies are dangerous and should be avoided, but we will not encroach further on your time to enumerate them. If there were no better way, one might be excused for advocating subsidies, but there is a way which will work.

INFLATION CURE

The only way inflation has ever been cured is to bring supply and demand into balance. Where countries have been too weak to face the issue, and have tried a lot of expedients, to hold the support of the voters, economic law has eventually stepped in and solved the problem by reducing the purchasing power of money until there was little spending power left, and the supply then caught up with the demand. That is inflation. Inflation means making money so cheap it will not buy anything. It can be prevented by three or four constructive steps.

First, encourage the production of needed goods. There never was inflation where there was an abundant supply. As we have said we will not discuss labor or machinery at this time for in the consideration of the subject before your committee we are concerned chiefly with price. The price must be sufficient to secure as much production as can be reasonably expected. If it is too low to attain this end, a support price may be necessary. It may be pertinent to point out the difference between a support price and a subsidy.

SUPPORT PRICES

Years ago we found out that unlimited competition often destroy supply. We prohibited railroads from cutting rates to destructive levels. We set up controls for minimum premiums for insurance companies. In other words, we sets floors designed to prevent prices falling below cost in order to protect certain essential services from destruction. This was no subsidy. There was no element of gift in it. It was merely protection against a destructive practice.

When floors are placed under farm prices to prevent them going so low as to destroy production, the same principle is employed. This is a very different practice from paying out cash in order to hold prices down to the consumer. Usually a support price requires little expenditure. Its purpose is to bring prices into a reasonable economic balance or relationship. The very fact that the money is available frequently stabilizes the market at an equitable level. Even when it becomes necessary actually to buy the commodity, the market usually adjusts itself, so that when the commodity is sold no loss ensues. The purpose of a support price is to aid in bringing about a reasonable price relationship which may have been upset by unusual circumstances or some emergency. A support price does not develop an unbalanced price structure such as would lead to chaotic conditions following a subsidy program. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been used very helpfully in maintaining such support prices. To the extent that it has employed such principles, it has not cost the Government any money.

When a support price is used in connection with a ceiling which holds the normal market down, and thereby makes the support price necessary, or when a support price is used to buy a commodity and sell it for less than the cost, such a support becomes a subsidy and takes on all the dangerous characteristics of a cash subsidy. That is a practice which has been employed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and one which should be prohibited by law. If there are some commodities where such a policy is justified by reason of special or unusual circumstances, Congress should define or determine those circumstances, and not some one who might want to use the subsidy to bolster up an unsound price control experiment, or possibly for political purposes. A support price which is necessary to secure production and which is not used in connection with a ceiling or other device in lieu of a fair price is sound.

ADJUST THE DEMAND TO FIT THE SUPPLY

If, after all reasonable steps have been taken to encourage production, and the supply will still not meet the demand, then the remedy is to adjust the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways.

1. By syphoning off surplus income. Some of the surplus income will inevitably be syphoned off by paying the increased dislocation costs of producing the food and other commodities people demand. This means that we will all have to tighten our belts a little, but if there are no preferred groups allowed to dodge this responsibility, the cost will not be too heavy. Any excess income should be reached through taxation and forced savings. The savings should be such that the money stays saved until the war and the inflationary aftermath are over.

2. By rationing, so that all may share equitably in the limited supply. Rationing which fails to cut the demand to fit the supply defeats its purpose. It is possible to ration so as to have a surplus and thereby largely control price. Thus economic law takes the place of an intricate system of price ceilings, margins, grades, and differentials, and about 90 percent of the regulatory work of a price-control administration could be dispensed with. Price ceilings should be used only to prevent profiteering.

PRICE CEILING SUBSIDY HAS NEVER WORKED

Our statement that the price ceiling subsidy method of control has never worked over an extended period has been challenged. It is claimed that it is working successfully in Canada and England. These claims merit investigation.

Both countries have employed other methods which have had a very real influence in holding down inflation, and the results of those methods have wrongly been attributed to price ceilings. In neither country are the returns all in and will not be until the bill is paid. In neither country has the success been what is claimed for it.

CANADA

The advices we have from Canada are that production is going down fast, and the farm organizations say it is not working satisfactorily. Any system which maintains price temporarily at the expense of supply is headed for collapse.

ENGLAND

Before pointing out the difference in conditions between this country and England which make comparisons of little value, it might be well to ask ourselves if we want to model our country after England. Many of our people came here to escape from conditions which prevail in England, and we have built this country to suit ourselves. Our experience is that most Americans who go to England are mighty glad to get back.

Sixty percent of the Englishman's income goes for food, leaving but 40 percent for all other uses.

Twenty-two percent of our incomes goes for food, believed to be the lowest percent in the world.

England has had labor and industrial conscription for 3 years which requires all "persons to place themselves, their services, and their property at the disposal of His Majesty."

England's standards of living are far below ours. For example, an Englishman is allowed 23 cents worth of meat per week including the bone. Those who eat in restaurants are allowed one penny's worth of meat per meal.

We have great respect for what the English are doing but we see no reason for adopting English methods for this country. There are many reasons why the conditions are not comparable.

1. England is an industrial nation with a food deficiency. Only 7 percent of her people are farmers. Her interests lie in holding the world levels of food prices down to the minimum. The 93 percent could well afford to subsidize the 7 percent if she could accomplish such a purpose.

2. If England did not import 40 percent of her food, mostly from us, she would starve.

3. England does not have to borrow to pay her food subsidies and thus widen the inflationary gap. As a matter of fact, we are paying those subsidies. During the 2 years ending March 1, 1943, we shipped to England under lend-lease $1,449,064,000 in food. She sells this food to her people for cash, and during these 2 years she paid food subsidies estimated at $730,000,000, so she has had enough income from lend-lease to pay the subsidies nearly twice over.

4. England has largely closed her inflationary gap, and so does not have the surplus income which is responsible for bidding up prices. England is levying enough taxes to pay more than half its war cost. To indicate how drastically she has cut surplus income, 3 years ago there were 7,000 individuals who had an income of over $25,000 a year after paying taxes. Last year, that 7,000 had been reduced to 80. In addition to this, England has sales taxes ranging from 12 to 72 percent on the retail price.

Even with all these devices, England has not held her costs as well as claimed. Her food index contains only 14 items, largely those received from us, which are under perfect ocntrol. She omits from her index many home-produced foods such as all fresh fruit, all fresh vegetables, and all canned goods. The prices on these have risen sharply, have had to maintain production, but this actual increase does not show in their stable living figures.

On top of it all, the Englishman is buying a lot of his food through black markets at high but unrecorded prices. They have proved so serious that England has raised the penalties for violation up to 14 years in prison plus $20,000 fine. In spite of these extreme penalties, prosecutions have increased 320 percent during the past 2 years, and the Ministry of Food recently warned Parliament that black markets are becoming so serious "they are a danger to our cause."

Please do not misunderstand us; we are neither criticizing England nor complaining about lend-lease. England has done a wonderful job of holding the line. That point is not under discussion. We merely want to point out that the conditions in England are very different from here and that England's experience does not warrant our following in her footsteps.

REMEDIES

It has seemed to us that the purpose of Congress in rejecting subsidies in lieu of a price necessary to secure production is clear,

nevertheless we are faced with the fact that the law has not been interpreted or administered as intended. We believe all uncertainty should be cleared up. We recommend:

1. The inclusion of a definite statement of purpose setting forth that it is the intent and purpose of Congress to avoid the use of public funds to prevent agricultural commodity prices from seeking a level necessary to secure adequate production for war purposes.

2. No subsidies should be paid directly or indirectly either to support or roll back prices or to prevent prices seeking a level necessary to secure maximum production, unless Congress specifically so provides. Exception should be made in the case of existing contracts which have passed out of governmental control.

3. No direct or indirect subsidy should be paid to any producer, processor, or distributor of any agricultural commodity upon which any maximum price is in effect, except as may be expressly authorized by Congress.

4. Except as normal market conditions justify, no maximum price should be placed on any commodity below the support price so long as the Commodity Credit Corporation holds any such commodity either under loan or through purchase.

5. We have an impossible situation where the Office of Price Administration can slap on a price ceiling which will strangle production, or can let buying power run wild with no adequate rationing system to hold it in check, and the Administrator of the War Food Administration has no authority to adjust the price or influence the distribution. The War Food Administrator should have the complete control of all governmental functions connected with the production and distribution of food, including the regulation of price ceilings and rationing. If this is not done, at least the War Food Administrator should have the right of veto of any maximum price placed on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part therefrom.

To make these recommendations effective we propose the following amendment to take the place of section 5:

"SEC. 5. Whenever a maximum price or prices shall have been established for any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, no subsidy or other payments other than those which have accrued prior to the effective date hereof, shall be made either directly or indirectly by the Government or any agency thereof, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, to a producer, processor, manufacturer, or any other person engaged in the production, marketing, distribution, or handling of any such commodity either (1) for any reduction or roll-back of maximum prices so established as may have been or may hereafter be ordered, or (2) as a substitute for or in lieu of increasing maximum prices already or hereafter established, from any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose, except that the foregoing prohibition shall not apply until the end of the current crop season to any such commodity, other than milk and livestock and the products thereof, with respect to which the Government or any agency thereof was committed to the payment of such subsidies or other payment on June 15, 1943. *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent the payment of all or any part of the purchase price or adjusted purchase price heretofore or hereafter paid or to be paid for such commodities sold to any governmental agency for governmental use. The definition of the term "person" in Section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, shall apply to the term "person" as used herein.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Price Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to make such modifications of a maximum price or prices established on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and its products and livestock, under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, as the War Food Administrator determines is necessary to secure adequate production of such commodity for war purposes."

The Farm Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the cattlemen of this country are at the crossroads; they have reached the dilemma whether they shall continue to raise cattle or place their herds on the market this summer and fall.

We are agreed that beef is the lifeblood of our armed and civilian people and if some assurance by those in authority is not given the cattleman, guaranteeing sufficient protein feed for this winter, there is nothing left for him but to put his cattle on the slaughter block. Someone who understands the cattle business from the grass roots up should be put in charge of this all-important industry; no cattleman can afford to hold his cattle off the market with the coming of the winter months when there exists such an uncertainty as exists today as to whether he can have an allowance or allotment of feed. He should be told within a very short time the situation as to the availability for feed, and the amount he will receive. He should be told whether or not he should only place a certain percent or all of his cattle upon the market with a guaranty for sufficient feed if he is permitted to keep any of them.

August 1 will be the dead line for the cattleman to make a decision. The time is ripe for governmental agencies having control to give this question immediate and serious consideration. When once the small herds of the country are sold off, soon to follow will be a food shortage that cannot be rejuvenated in a few short years. It takes years to build up a herd of cattle, but, to the contrary, it takes but a short time to go out of the cattle business.

The farmer and cattleman are not pleased with the roll-back on beef price ceilings; they are all fed up on appeasing certain organized labor leaders who, to this good date, have received everything they have asked for at the expense of the farmer, cattleman, and small businessman. The difference between the farmer and the cattleman on the one side and organized labor on the other is simple. They are told the roll-back on farm commodities is to keep down inflation and an increase in wages is to meet the cost of living for the unions, which has a greater tendency to cause inflation, but organized labor get their demands.

Ferdie Deering, acting editor of the Farmer-Stockman of Oklahoma City, has written Mr. Chester C. Davis and given him a true and graphic picture of the small cattleman in southwest Oklahoma, and I trust Mr. Davis will read this letter and take immediate steps to stabilize the cattle industry.

Prompt action must be taken or we are going to be confronted with the greatest food shortage in history, and it will take many years to put us back in the cattle business to where we are today.

The letter is as follows:

THE FARMER-STOCKMAN,
Oklahoma City, Okla., June 11, 1943.

Mr. CHESTER C. DAVIS,
War Food Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: Yesterday at Mangum, Okla., the Farmer-Stockman conducted another one of its Farmer-Stockman forums. These meetings are of small selected groups of representative farmers who are not talked to by outside speakers but whose opinions are asked and who participate freely in a discussion. They are part of our program of going directly to the farmers for information concerning the farm program.

At this meeting we had a small group of representative farmers and ranchers from five southwestern Oklahoma counties. The gist of the meeting I consider very important and would like to pass on to you the information gained, for whatever value it may have to you.

To start the discussion I asked the hypothetical question, "In the light of present conditions and the outlook for the next 6 months as you see it, what is the best course for a man with 30 steers to follow?"

The first man to speak said, "That hits me exactly, because I have just 30 steers and the way things look now I am going to sell them." As the discussion went on, his idea and that of the other farmers and ranchers present, which included some who had more and some who had less steers, all of whom had heifers and cows, was repeated by others in the group. The discussion resolved itself into two important points upon which action must come within the next 45 days. Those two points are:

First, assurance that the roll-back on beef price ceilings will not be made effective so that farmers will be forced to suffer on prices as the hog men are. In other words, leave the price of beef alone. The ranchers consider the roll-back an appeasement policy for John L. Lewis and nobody believes that the subsidy offered will actually get back to the producers.

Second, the ranchers must know what to expect in the way of feed supplies. They do not expect to receive as much protein supplement or other feeds during the coming winter as they normally would use. They are willing to go along with a distribution plan which would distribute feed available on any fair basis, but the total absence of any definite policy by the Government regarding this feed prevents them from completing

their plans. August 1 was set as the absolute deadline for deciding what to do.

Without some definite policy on these two points, August will see a rush to market of livestock comparable to the drought marketings of 1934–35. Because of prices and other things, marketings this spring have been smaller than normal with more animals backing up on the farms and ranches.

It is true that the majority of our farms and ranches in this section, particularly the smaller units, are overstocked and some liquidation would be desirable. But unless farmers are given something definite on these points, this liquidation will go far beyond a desirable marketing and will cut deeply into our cow herds and breeding stock, which would be very harmful to our livestock production next year and in the years to come.

I note in your address to the cattle and beef industry advisory committee in Chicago on June 8 you recognized these problems. I feel that you have some appreciation of what the ranchers are up against. My purpose in writing you again is simply to convey whatever information I have, and to urge again immediate action so that the ranchers may complete their plans at the earliest possible date. Then if they are going to be forced out of the cattle business by circumstances, they can convert their operations to some other form of war production which is badly needed.

Very truly yours,

FERDIE DEERING,
Acting Editor.

America's Fighting Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 15 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, "America's Fighting Congress" is the title of an article appearing in the Washington Star of Sunday, June 13, by Dr. Will P. Kennedy.

It is gratifying that this record of the fighting Congress has been written by a man such as Dr. Kennedy, who holds a degree of doctor of literature and who, because of daily association with Congress for more than 30 years, is a dean of the press. His only son, John R. Kennedy, is now serving in the Navy.

This comprehensive article is a credit to the Congress.

Mr. President, on the last day the Senate was in session before the recess I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article written by Dr. Will P. Kennedy on the subject "America's Fighting Congress." The article was returned to me because it was longer than is allowed to be printed in the Appendix without obtaining special permission. I have ascertained that the approximate cost of printing the article will be $126, and I renew my request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"AMERICA'S FIGHTING CONGRESS"

(By William P. Kennedy, Litt. D., Dean of the Capitol Press Galleries)

This is a Congress of fighting men, women—and their children—hereditary fighters for American democracy. Exactly one-third of the present Senate (32 Senators) have seen armed service in four great wars—the Boer War, the Spanish-American War, the World War and this Global War; and nearly one-third of the present House (165 Representatives)—a total of 197 out of 531 Members of Congress.

They have set a noble example for those who sent them to Congress to represent them and to be their spokesmen—through them the voice of this country has spoken—militantly. They are not only making the laws of this Nation; they have risked their lives to defend—but when they declared war against the Axis Powers, passed the Conscription Act and extension of the Selective Service Act—they were sending their own sons and daughters and grandsons into that war.

This also is the best answer to occasional charges of nepotism by captious critics. If, now and then, here and there, throughout all the ramifications of government agencies, and throughout the years, the names of a few relatives of Congressmen are found on the Federal Government pay roll as civilian employees—such names can be found today, and at any time for a century and a half—multiplied—on the muster rolls of the military services in which they volunteered to risk their own lives in defense of that same Federal Government, which they are proud to serve in peace and war.

The Congress of the United States is not—and never has been—a "rubber stamp" Congress. It has been a Congress of men of steel and explosiveness, many chosen because of their military records, ready to fight for their convictions and American principles of government, and the self-governing law they enacted, on every battlefield from Concord and Lexington to north Africa, the South Pacific, Alaska, Iceland, Wake Island, Attu, Corregidor, Bataan, and the impending invasion of continental Europe.

The Congress today is fighting toward a "global" government "of the people, by the people and for the people"—for all time.

From George Washington, a delegate from Virginia, first commander in chief of the American forces and the first President of the United States—"First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen"—down through the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention, down to this Seventy-eighth Congress, the Congress has included a wholesome "leaven" of warriors, who have given supreme and distinguished service on all the historic battlefields.

CLOSE-UP EXPERIENCE

They have close-up experience of the wreckage of war in American homes.

More than one-half the membership of the Senate—50—and more than 26 percent of the House—133—have sons, daughters, grandsons, stepsons, and sons-in-law in the armed services to a total of 71 from Senators' families and 210 from the families of House Members; a grand total of 281. Some of these have already made the supreme sacrifice. Members of Congress have first-hand, personal, heart-wrenching knowledge of the toll of war.

Congress has also encouraged not only their own children, but congressional secretaries, committee clerks—right down the line in congressional service—stenographers, bookkeepers, doorkeepers, elevator men, guards, custodians, mechanics, messengers—to a total of more than 1,500 legislative employees, to do their bit in the war and essential industries, not only in buying bonds and subscribing for ambulances, but in enlistments.

The best information available shows that at least 400 employees of the Senate, since the beginning of war preparations, are now in the armed services. On the House side upward of 1,100 have felt the patriotic urge and been inducted. The boy pages of Congress have their own honor roll, on which are 28 who have gone into service.

From the Speaker's own office six have gone into service within 18 months: William Cantrill, captain in the marines; First Lts. Dan English and Ted Wright, in the Air Corps; and Billy Wilcox, Ray Roberts, and John Holton, ensigns in the Navy.

The sons of many veteran employees of the House have also enlisted or been inducted. As one example—the three sons of William J. Donaldson, Superintendent of the House Press Gallery, who has completed 30 years of service, are in the uniformed forces—William J. 3d, in the Coast Guard, and twins—Francis X. in the Coast Guard assigned to the Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., and Philip L., in the Army Air Corps, assigned to the Radio School, Scott Field, Ill.

Congress has sedulously refrained from asking any deferments from military service. Both House and Senate have set up committees to pass upon requests for deferment. These committees are cooperating. They have an agreement to pass jointly on any recommendation for deferment.

The Senate committee is composed of Senators THOMAS, Utah; MAYBANK, South Carolina—both Democrats—and LODGE, Republican, of Massachusetts. The House committee is composed of Chairman MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee; Representative ROBERT E. THOMASON, Texas—both Democrats—and Representative WALTER G. (Ham) ANDREWS, Republican, of New York.

While no requests for deferment have been approved—and many have been rejected by both Senate and House committees—three requests have been submitted by the House committee to local draft boards without recommendation. One of these was made by the Speaker—for a 60-day deferment in the case of a reading clerk of the House—and two by the Architect of the Capitol for employees of his office—for a matter of 30 days (which time has already expired). The Speaker's request was submitted without recommendation to the Arlington (Va.) County Draft Board, merely stating the facts as cited by the official in charge.

These Senate and House committees have no intention of requesting any deferment except in cases of absolutely essential employees, and have adopted a policy that none is irreplaceable.

MEMBERS SUFFER BEREAVEMENT

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, who was a first lieutenant in the World War, was the first Member of the Senate to be bereaved in this war. His son, Corp. Max E. McClellan, died from meningitis in North Africa February 21, 1943.

Representative H. STREETT BALDWIN, Democrat, of Towson, Md., has been notified that his son, Lt. Harry Wallace Baldwin, is missing in action on the African front. He is in the Army Air Service attached to the First Fighter Command. He was officially credited with having shot down one of the German Junker transport planes between Italy and Africa on April 14. He was reported missing in action on April 16.

Representative GEORGE J. BATES, Republican, of Massachusetts, one of the most active members of the House Naval Affairs Committee and one of the earliest to urge a two-ocean Navy, was officially notified that his son-in-law, a member of his own household, was killed in action in the Solomons area.

Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat of South Carolina, was notified that a nephew, 1st Lieutenant E. T. McMillan, Army Air Corps, with an extraordinary record for

blind flying, had been killed in a flight over the Rocky Mountains.

Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, of New York, ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, has been advised that his son, Charles Taber, was injured in naval service.

That's how close it has been "hitting home" to Congress.

Of the 232 offspring of Congress who have taken the oath in the fighting forces for the duration, 128 (55.4 percent) have commissions ranking up to lieutenant colonel in the Army and lieutenant commander in the Navy and Coast Guard and major in the Mamine Corps, and 103 (or 44.6 percent) are in the noncommissioned class; while one, the son of Representative DONALD H. MCLEAN, Republican, of New Jersey, Edward R. McLean, is on a special mission directly connected with the war effort. The Army has taken 145, the Navy 76, and the Marines 10.

Mothers in Congress, in both House and Senate, Democrat and Republican, as well as the fathers, have given their sons loyally to the armed services. Senator HATTIE W. CARAWAY, Democrat, of Arkansas, has contributed two sons to the Army, Paul W. and Forest, both of whom are lieutenant colonels. Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, president of the Congressional War Parents' Association, has given her blessing to two sons as they joined the Army, Kenion C., now a major, and Oliver P., now a first lieutenant.

Besides Mrs. CARAWAY, there are two other Senators whose sons are lieutenant colonels, Senator THEODORE G. BILBO, Democrat, of Mississippi, whose son, Theodore G. Bilbo, Jr., holds the rank, and Senator CLYDE M. REED, Republican, of Kansas, whose son is Howard H. Reed.

There are four daughters of Members sworn into the armed services—two WAVES, Mary E. Bates, eldest daughter of Representative GEORGE J. BATES, Republican, of Massachusetts, and Rose Miller Hobbs, daughter of Representative SAM HOBBS, Democrat, of Alabama; one a WAAC, Joan Kearney, daughter of Representative BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, Republican, of New York, and one an Army nurse, Nellie Gross, daughter of Representative CHESTER H. GROSS, Republican of Pennsylvania.

There are five grandsons—two grandsons of Representative ZEBULON WEAVER, Democrat, of North Carolina; C. H. Hites, Jr., and Zebulon Weaver Hites, both Army Air Corps cadets; one grandson of Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, Democrat, of Alabama, Charles B. Crow, Jr., enlisted in the Army; one of Representative JAMES GALLAGHER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, William W. Fogarty, Jr., an Army private, and one of Representative ALLEN T. TREADWAY, Republican, of Massachusetts, Royal W. Treadway, Army O. C. S.

SONS IN SERVICE

This "sons in the service" roster starts right at the Senate rostrum, for Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE has a son, Henry B., in Army Ordnance overseas.

Two House Members, Representative GEORGE J. BATES, Republican, of Massachusetts, and AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, have each contributed five to the armed services. Mr. BATES, for 7 years a most active member of the Naval Affairs Committee for upbuilding naval defenses and one of the earliest advocates of a two-ocean Navy, has had the gratification of seeing his entire contribution go to the Navy. This includes a son-in-law, who lived with him, Lt. James B. Ginty, fire-control officer on the U. S. S. *Vincennes*, who was killed in action in the Solomons area, and whose son, James Bartholomew, born 4 months after his father's heroic death, is now living in the Congressman's home. His eldest daughter, Mary E. Bates, is an ensign in the WAVES. His eldest son, William H., is a lieutenant in the Supply Corps; his second son, George J., Jr., is a seaman, first class, while his third son, Raymond H., is a midshipman in Annapolis.

Representative KELLEY has five sons in the service out of a family of nine children, three daughters and another son too young to be taken. The Congressman himself entered West Point in 1904 but developed an athletic heart and was honorably discharged. He is a life member of the Association of Graduates and the Athletic Association. When the House voted to extend the draft period 18 months to 2½ years by a vote of 203 to 202, Representative KELLEY cast the deciding vote, although it meant sending three more of his sons into the service.

His eldest son, Regis, 29, who attended Notre Dame University, is a first lieutenant, Three Hundred and Sixtieth Coast Artillery, antiaircraft service, in north Africa. He enlisted as a private in 1941.

The second son, Robert V., 27, is a graduate of Pennsylvania State College in engineering and is O. C. S. in the Marine Corps.

The third son, Richard B., aged 25, attended George Washington University and St. Vincent's College, and is a corporal in the Engineer Corps. J. Hillary, 23, the fourth son, is also a graduate in engineering from Pennsylvania State College and is a lieutenant in the Engineer Corps, stationed in Arizona.

The fifth son, Paul A., 21, attended George Washington University and is to enter West point July 1. Mr. KELLEY is himself helping the war effort, not only in Congress, but as president of the Old Basin By-Products Coal Co., and of the Mammoth Coal and Coke Co., both in Westmoreland County, Pa.

During debate in the House on the Connally-Smith-May bill, when attention was called to having five sons in the service, he said, "They all carry union cards, two of them in the United Mine Workers, two in the Steel Workers, and one in the American Federation of Labor."

TEN CLOSE RELATIVES IN SERVICE

Representative JOE STARNES, Democrat, of Alabama, has 10 members of his immediate family in the armed services—a son and namesake, three brothers, and six first cousins. He, himself, is a veteran of the A. E. F. in the World War. He served as Lieutenant, 53d Infantry, 6th Division of the Regular Army, in England, France, and Germany, and with the Army of Occupation. He won promotion to Captain, Major, and Lieutenant Colonel, and went on the inactive list as Lieutenant Colonel with the 167th famous Alabama Regiment in the Rainbow Division, serving for about 16 years after the war. He was eager to get into active service in the present war. His son, Joe, Jr., has had four years with the R. O. T. C., at The Citadel, and University of Alabama, graduating from both R. O. T. C. and the University before he was 21. He finished O. C. S. training at Fort Benning, Ga., on July 14, when Representative STARNES will deliver the address to the graduates. His three brothers are: Capt. Hardin Starnes, Air Interceptor Command, now taking a specialist course in the Air School at Orlando, Fla.; Capt. Gilbert Starnes, Army Signal Corps, for the past 18 months at the Signal Corps training and replacement center, Camp Crowder, Mo.; and Maj. John Starnes, Jr., assistant supply officer (S4), headquarters, 6th Air Force, Panama. His six first cousins, four with the Army and two in the Navy, are: Harold, Sergeant George, Technical Sergeant W. B., and Lieutenant Richard, who is in an overseas combat division; Harman, in charge of a gun crew on transports going into Murmansk, Russia, who has been cited for bravery in action, and S. R., barely 19, who has been for more than a year in the Aleutian Islands.

Two Democratic Senators, HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, and JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, have each given three sons to fight the Nation's enemies. Each has two in the Army and one in the Navy. Senator BYRD's sons are: Lt. H. F. Byrd, Jr., in the Navy; Corp. Richard E., and Pvt. Beverly in the Army. Senator MURRAY's sons are: Second Lt. Edward and Pvt. Howard A., in the Army, and Lt. (Jr. Gr.) W. D. Murray, in the Navy.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, has his son and namesake in the Marines; a son-in-law, Stanley Miller, in the United States Air Corps; a brother also in the service, and his sister has seen all four of her sons inducted.

Two Republican Senators, HAROLD H. BURTON, Ohio, and CHAN GURNEY, South Dakota, have each two sons and a son-in-law in the armed forces. Senator BURTON was a captain in the World War with service in France and Belgium. His sons are William S., an ensign in the Navy, and Robert S., second lieutenant (pilot) in the Marine Air Corps, and his son-in-law is R. Wallace Adler, second lieutenant, Field Artillery. Senator GURNEY served as a sergeant in the Engineer Corps in the World War. His sons are Deloss B., a lieutenant in the Army Air Corps, and John B., staff sergeant in the Air Corps. His son-in-law is Morgan T. Smith, second lieutenant in the Army.

TWO SONS EACH

Seven Senators have two sons each in service: Mrs. CARAWAY (whose two sons were previously mentioned); TOM STEWART, Democrat, of Tennessee, has Tom M., an Army first lieutenant, and Lawrence F., an Army second lieutenant; JOHN A. DANAHER, Republican, of Connecticut, who was a second lieutenant of Field Artillery in the World War, whose sons are John A., Jr., second lieutenant in the Army, and Robert, a seaman in the Navy; WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, whose son, Heard F., is a lieutenant in the Army Air Force, and his son, J. Marcus, is a lieutenant in the Navy Air Force; W. LEE O'DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas, Pat, an Army corporal, and Mike, an Army private; ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, whose sons are Robert A., Jr., an ensign in the Navy, and Lloyd B., a seaman in the Naval Reserve; and GEORGE A. WILSON, Republican, of Iowa, whose sons are James H., a sergeant in the Army, and his namesake, George A., Jr., an Army private. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, has two sons-in-law in service—Harry L. Cheverly, lieutenant, junior grade, and Malcolm S. Jones, private first class.

The dean of the Senate, CARTER GLASS of Virginia, "father of the Federal Reserve Act," former Secretary of the Treasury, adviser of the last 8 Presidents, and who holds the record of doctor of laws degrees from 14 great colleges and universities, has a son and namesake, Carter Glass, Jr., a major in the Army.

Senator TOM CONNALLY, Democrat of Texas, is an outstanding example of war service. He fought in both the Spanish-American and World Wars. His great-grandfather, Capt. Tom Connally, was in the Revolution. His father was a sergeant in the Confederate Army. He himself served as sergeant major in the 2d Regiment, Texas Volunteer Infantry during the Spanish-American War. He quit his seat in Congress, and gave up his pay, to go into the World War where he became a captain and adjutant of the 22d Infantry Brigade, 11th Division, U. S. Army, in 1918. Now, as Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he is holding an important wartime post in the Senate, and recently called for "The Vote Heard Round the World"—giving heart to the Nation's fighting forces—when the Congress led by

Senator CONNALLY and Representative WOODRUM, of Virginia, passed the Connally-Smith-May Anti-Strike bill over the President's veto—to prevent heroes overseas being deprived of essential munitions. His son, Ben, who was a lawyer, married, and with a child, went into the Army Air Corps. He was offered a captaincy in the Judge Advocate General's Department, but took instead a first lieutenancy in the air service. He has been promoted to captain.

SON OF THE SECRETARY

The Senate's right-hand man, its secretary, Col. Edwin A. Halsey, who recently celebrated his tenth anniversary in that position by unanimous election, and who in his forty-sixth year of continuous service since he was a page, December 6, 1897, has given a high-grade son to the service. Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Edwin A. Halsey 2d is a Phi Beta Kappa man, a graduate of Dartmouth, is a disciple of the hard-boiled Navy school at Miami, Fla. Young Halsey was colonel of the Washington High School Cadets.

There is only one Senator who had service—overseas' service at that—in the present global war—Senator and Maj. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, grandson of the famous Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, long chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is a major in the United States Army and served with the first American tank detachment in the British Eighth Army in Libya.

Senators "HAPPY" CHANDLER, Democrat, of Kentucky, who served in the World War and holds a commission as captain in the Judge Advocate General's Department, and SCOTT LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who served as private in the World War and was commissioned colonel and judge advocate general of the Illinois National Guard, attempted to return to active service, but were requested by the President and the Secretary of War to remain in the Senate.

Two House Members resigned from the House to give active war service—both from Ohio—Representative Robert T. Secrest, Democrat, who gave up the chairmanship of the Library Committee and who holds a commission as lieutenant in the Naval Intelligence, and Representative Albert D. Baumhart, Jr., Republican of Ohio, who was commissioned lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy.

HAWAIIAN DELEGATES IN SERVICE

Samuel Wilder King, Republican, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, in the 74th, 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses, a graduate of the U. S. Naval Academy at Annapolis in the Class of 1910, and who served in the Navy during the World War and until December 31, 1924, was in Congress when Pearl Harbor was bombed. He resigned, after being renominated in the primary election, in order to return to active duty with the U. S. Navy, with the rank of commander. He is now stationed "somewhere in the South Pacific."

He is succeeded in the House by JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Hawaiian Delegate, who was formerly a member of the Capitol Press Galleries, and who has the distinction of being the only person in Congress to have been an eye-witness of the Japanese treachery at Pearl Harbor. His home is in Honolulu and he was there on December 7, 1941, and from his home could see the enemy planes over Pearl Harbor. He lived there during the tense weeks that followed, remaining there with his family until they came to Washington for the opening of the present Congress. Mr. FARRINGTON saw service in the U. S. Army in the World War. He was commissioned a second lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Four other House Members in the Seventy-seventh did not seek reelection because they proposed to enter the armed services: Representative Vincent F. Harrington, Democrat, of Iowa; Robert K. Goodwin, Republican, of Iowa, now a lieutenant in the Navy; Representative Albert Y. Vreeland, Republican, of New Jersey, a World War veteran as ambulance driver, is now a captain in Military Intelligence; and Frank C. Osmers, Jr., Republican, also of New Jersey, who enlisted and earned a lieutenancy in the officers' training school.

Three others who were defeated in the last election are now in military service—Dudley White, of Ohio, who was an unsuccessful candidate for the Senate and is now commissioned as a commander in the Navy; William T. Pheiffer, Republican, who served in the Army during World War No. 1, and was defeated by 18 votes for reelection in the sixteenth John O'Connor "purge" district, New York, is now an Army captain; and Leon Sacks, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is also an Army captain.

At least eight present House Members served for a brief tour of duty in the present war.

Representative DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr., Democrat, of Virginia, who had been a commissioned officer in the Naval Flying Corps in the World War, and who has since held the rank of lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve Corps, was called back into active service October 16, 1941, was given an indefinite leave of absence by the House, and was sent to London as an attaché on the staff of Admiral R. L. Ghormley, Commander of the U. S. Naval forces in Europe. While on that tour of duty he visited every airdrome in Scotland, England, and Ireland. He was returned to inactive status December 16, 1941.

Representative WILL ROGERS, Jr., Democrat, of California, was in the Army when elected to Congress. Others called back to their legislative duties by the President are: Representative MELVIN J. MAAS, Republican, of Minnesota, ranking minority member of the Naval Affairs Committee, who served overseas in the aviation branch of the Marine Corps in World No. 1, and is a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, aviation; LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, also a member of the Naval Affairs Committee; EUGENE WORLEY, Democrat, of Texas; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, member of the Naval Affairs Committee; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who is credited with 2 years' overseas service in the Navy in World War No. 1, and a member of the Naval Reserve since 1919, and who holds a commission of lieutenant commander; and FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who served in the Naval Air Force in World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, now serving his tenth year in the House.

IN OTHER WARS

Four Democratic Senators—TOM CONNALLY, Texas; GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa; THEODORE F. GREEN, Rhode Island, and CHARLES O. ANDREWS, Florida—were in the Spanish-American War. All were also officers in the World War except Senator GREEN, who was engaged in many patriotic activities.

Six House members (five Republicans and one Democrat) also served in the Spanish-American War: Representatives FRANCIS D. CULKIN, Republican, and JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Republican, both of New York; EARL C. MICHENER, Republican, and ROY O. WOODRUFF, Republican, of Michigan; ROBERT L. RODGERS, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and COMPTON I. WHITE, Democrat, of Idaho. Representatives CULKIN and WOODRUFF returned to military service in the World War. Representative CULKIN has a son, Francis H. Culkin, a second lieutenant in the Army; WADSWORTH, who besides serving in Puerto Rico with a field artillery unit was chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee during the World War, has a son, Reverdy Wadsworth, a first lieutenant in the Army; MICHENER has a son-in-law, Charles E. Quick, who is an Army major; WOODRUFF has a son, Devere H., who is captain, Army Motor Transport.

Senator C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Republican, of Illinois, is the one present Senator who served with distinction with the Marines in the World War. He was wounded seven times in action and was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, American Navy Cross, and Croix de Guerre. He was advanced to first lieutenant in the front lines. His father and older brother also served overseas—the brother dying in the service there. A younger brother also served in the Marines. He has a son today in the Marines—Russell A., a private, who had been attending The Citadel, famous southern military training school.

Senator KENNETH WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, and Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, Democrat, of Connecticut, represented the present Senate in the Navy in World War No. 1. Senator WHERRY was in the naval flying forces. Later he was a licensed embalmer and funeral director for 20 years, and a leader in promoting annual agricultural fairs and stock shows.

Senator EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, Republican, of Wyoming, a native of Wales of Scottish parentage, served in a Welsh regiment in the Boer War, 1899–1902.

Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, went into the World War as an enlisted man, April 6, 1917, and served until June 1, 1919. He was promoted to lieutenant colonel. He was cited by Generals Pershing, Morton, and Upton. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Distinguished Service Cross.

Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican, of Colorado, enlisted in the World War as a private, was commissioned captain of infantry at the Fort Riley officers' training camp, served 16 months overseas in France and with the Army of Occupation in Germany. He graduated from the General Staff College at Langres, France, and was promoted to lieutenant colonel of engineers and colonel of infantry. He was cited by General Pershing for meritorious service. He has a stepson, Karl C. Schuyler, a sergeant in the Army.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, Democrat, of Missouri, is a graduate of Eastern High School, Washington, the University of Missouri, and George Washington University (D. C.). He had been parliamentarian of the House while his father, Champ Clark, was Speaker. He was commissioned captain at the Officers' Training Camp, Fort Myer. He was successively lieutenant colonel, assistant chief of staff, and colonel of infantry. He was one of 17 charter members and incorporators of the American Legion and chairman of the Paris caucus which organized the Legion.

Senate Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY has a son, David M., a major in the Army Air Corps, who has charge of operations at Randolph Field, Texas.

OTHER SERVICE RECORDS

Other Senators with service records themselves who have sons in the armed services today are: James J. Davis, Republican, of Pennsylvania, an immigrant from South Wales. As chairman of the Moose War Relief Commission, early in 1918 he visited the military camps of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada, and the American, British, Belgian, French, and Italian war fronts. Immediately after the armistice was signed he went with the troops into Germany, visited the battlefields of Belgium, Germany, and that part of France which had been in possession of the Central Powers. His son and namesake is now a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy.

Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Democrat, Utah, was a major, Inspector General's Department (National Guard, Utah, and United States Reserves). His son-in-law, Wayne C. Grover, is an Army captain. Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, Republican, Maine, has a son,

Charles F., who is an Army captain. Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER served in the World War, and his only son and namesake, a graduate from the famous V. M. I., from which General Marshall, Chief of Staff, also graduated, is now a second lieutenant in the Army. Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, Democrat, West Virginia, served in the United States Army in the World War from May 15, 1917, to March 13, 1920, and was a member of the West Virginia National Guard for 20 years. His son, Robert, is a lieutenant, Reserve Officers Training Corps. Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, Democrat, Connecticut, who served in the United States Navy in the World War, has a son, Robert F., who is a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast Guard.

Capt. Robert F. Wagner, Jr., son of the distinguished Senator from New York, was rapidly duplicating his father's rise in State politics. He was in the New York Assembly, but is now serving as a captain overseas.

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, Democrat, Missouri, was a major of artillery in the World War. Others now in the Senate who saw service in the World War are: Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, Alabama; CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Arizona, who was a major of infantry; ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, Arizona; JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, Democrat, Nevada, was commissioned major in the United States Army in 1917, advanced the next year to lieutenant colonel, was one of the incorporators of the American Legion and served as national vice commander; MON C. WALLGREN, Democrat, Washington, was commissioned in the Coast Artillery Corps and later was instructor in heavy field artillery and coast defenses of Puget Sound: CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, Republican, West Virginia, enlisted in the United States Army and served for the duration.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Democrat, of Montana, who has served in the Senate for 20 years and was last time elected by the largest vote ever given any candidate for office in the State, has a son, Richard, an honor graduate of Dartmouth, who is a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

Senator JOHN M. OVERTON, Democrat, Louisiana, who has three beautiful daughters, has also one son, his namesake, who is a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, Democrat, South Carolina, is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. His valiant son and namesake, B. R. Maybank, Jr., who is a cadet in the Army Air Corps, is one of the youngest, promising young men in the service. He is just turned 18, and is actively training for an Army air pilot, and with the fortitude of his father, who has been Governor and Senator from the State of South Carolina, is expected to make good in a big way.

Senator JAMES MEAD, Democrat, of New York, recent candidate for Governor by the choice and with the benediction of the President, had the honor of conferring the commission as lieutenant in the Army upon his son and namesake.

Other Senators who have sons in the service are Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican of Vermont, who has two sons-in-law in service—Harry L. Cleverly, lieutent, junior grade, and Malcolm S. Jones, private first class; Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN, Republican, Vermont, whose son, Edward L., is an Army captain; CARL A. HATCH, whose son, Stewart, is a lieutenant in the Air Corps; JOSIAH W. BAILEY, Democrat, North Carolina, whose son, James H. Pou, is an Army lieutenant; HOMER T. BONE, Democrat, Washington, whose son and namesake is an Army private; STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, whose son and namesake is a Navy ensign; C. DOUGLAS BUCK, Republican, Delaware, who has inherited his estate from John M. Clayton, coauthor of the Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Secretary of State under President Taylor, has a stepson, Paul E. Wilson, a private in the Army Air Corps; HARLAN H. BUSHFIELD, Republican, South Dakota, who started life on a Territorial homestead, has a son and namesake in an officer candidate school in the Army; ALBERT W. HAWKES, Republican, New Jersey, has a son, Maj. A. Whitfield Hawkes, in the Army Medical Corps.

The veteran Senator HIRAM W. JOHNSON, Republican, California, third-ranking seniority Member of the Senate, has a son and namesake, a major, in the Army Air Corps; GERALD P. NYE, Republican, North Dakota, has a son, James P., an apprentice seaman in the Navy; ELMER THOMAS, Democrat, Oklahoma, has a son, Wilford S., an Army private; JAMES L. TUNNELL, Democrat, Delaware, has a son, Robert W., who is an Army lieutenant; ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Republican, Michigan, has a son and namesake, a second lieutenant, in the Army; FREDERICK VAN NUYS, Democrat, Indiana, has a son, WILLIAM L., a cadet in the Naval Air Corps.

A summary of the military service of some Senators, whose record is not given above is:

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS, Democrat, of Florida, was captain, Company M. First Regiment, Florida National Guard, and volunteered for the Spanish-American and World Wars.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, served in the Army with the Seventeenth and Seventy-first United States Infantry Regiments during the World War.

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was commissioned lieutenant during the Spanish-American War, and commanded a provisional company of infantry. During the World War he was prominent in many patriotic activities.

Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, of Arizona, was discharged from service in the World War in the spring of 1919.

Senator BURNET RHETT MAYBANK, Democrat, of South Carolina, graduated from Porter Military Academy. He served in the South Carolina Naval Militia and in the United States Navy in the World War. He is a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, American Legion, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, Republican, of Maine, resigned from the Maine Legislature to enter military service. He was, successively, private, second lieutenant, captain, and regimental adjutant, Third Infantry, Maine National Guard. He was a private in Field Artillery in the Central Officers Training School, Camp Zachary Taylor.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, served in the Student Army Training Corps, University of Alabama. He is a member of the American Legion.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, served in the United States Naval Reserve Force in 1918.

Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS, Republican, of Indiana, during the World War served as chairman of the County Council of Defense for Steuben County, Ind.

Eight Members of the House have sons who are majors; Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, New Jersey, whose son is Donald Knox Wolverton, Army; HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, whose son and namesake is an Army major, and whose son-in-law, Joe H. Tonnahill, is an ensign in the Navy; A. LEONARD ALLEN, Democrat, Louisiana, whose son, Harwell L., is also in the Army; EARL C. MICHENER, Republican, Michigan, whose son-in-law, Charles E. Quick, is also in the Army; TOM ROLPH, Republican, California, whose son, Henry Renton Rolph, is a Marine Corps major; Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio, whose son, Kenyon C., is an Army major; R. EWING THOMASON, Democrat, Texas, whose son, William E. Thomason, is an Army major, and CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, Democrat, Virginia, whose son and namesake is a major in the Marine Corp.

There are 14 House Members whose sons have been commissioned captains: Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, whose son, Connor Wright, is an Army captain; H. STREETT BALDWIN, Democrat, of Maryland, who has two sons in the service, Capt. John Streett Baldwin and Lt. Harry Wallace Baldwin, the latter reported missing in action from his north African assignment; Mrs. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, whose son, Kenyon C., is an Army captain; Maj. A. L. BULWINKLE, Democrat, of North Carolina, is a World War veteran and his son and namesake is an Army captain; PATRICK H. DREWRY, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Democratic congressional committee, whose son and namesake is an Army captain; GEORGE W. GILLIE, Republican, of Indiana, whose son-in-law, John Trapp Strawbridge, is an Army captain; CLARENCE E. HANCOCK, Republican, of New York, whose son is a captain in the Army Air Corps; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Republican, of Massachusetts, whose son and namesake is an Army captain; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Democrat, of Arizona, one of whose two sons in the fighting forces, John B., is an Army captain and the other, David N., is an Army lieutenant; JOHN M. ROBSION, Republican, of Kentucky, whose son and namesake is a captain in the Coast Artillery; JOE L. SMITH, Democrat, of West Virginia, whose son and namesake is an Army captain, and whose second son is an ensign in the Navy, and R. EWING THOMASON, Democrat, of Texas, whose son-in-law, Ben Decherd, is an Army captain, while his elder son, William E., is an Army major.

Spending Tax Versus Sales Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, last summer the Treasury Department proposed to the Senate Finance Committee as a means of raising additional revenue a spending tax, which the Senate committee was unwilling to adopt, and it also defeated by a majority of one vote a general sales tax. As a compromise between those two methods of raising additional revenue the Senate committee adopted a 5-percent pay-roll tax applicable to earnings in excess of $624 per year. In view of the fact it is generally believed the Treasury Department is still favorably inclined to a spending tax and still opposed to a sales tax, the following discussion of the relative merits of these proposals by Dr. Paul Haensel, former professor of economics, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., may prove to be of some value. Dr. Haensel has had a wide and varied experience in the field of taxation dating back to the period when he was the economic adviser to the last Russian Czar. After the revolution in Russia in 1917, Dr. Haensel taught in several of the leading universities in Europe and then came to the United States to accept a position with Northwestern University, where he taught for a number of years and was

retired to an emeritus status at the end of the current school session.

The statement by Dr. Haensel is as follows:

It is usually feared that with the rise in cost of living a sales tax may considerably add to the tax burden of the lower-income brackets. This is a great exaggeration as far as present actual conditions are concerned.

No figures for the whole 1942 year on the expenditures of the city population for current consumption have yet been made public, but basing our findings on the figures for the first quarter 1942 and taking them on the annual rate we see no substantial change in comparison with the figures pertaining to the whole 1941 year (as they were published in the May 1943 issue of Taxes magazine, p. 291). The table for 1942 (based on the first quarter of this year) follows:

Average money expenditures of city families and single persons for current consumption by money income classes in 1942, the annual rate being based on the first quarter of 1942 (as computed from Bulletin No. 724, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1942, p. 14), and the amounts of a 10-percent retail sales tax, of a straight 5-percent income tax, and of a straight 5-percent spendings tax, which would have on the average burdened the various income classes in 1942 (in continuation of tables published by Prof. Paul Haensel in the May 1943 issue of Taxes magazine, p. 291, and in the January 1943 issue, p. 32)

Annual money income class	Average money income 12 months 1942	Total average money expenditure	Food	Housing, fuel, light, refrigeration	Household operation	Furnishings and equipment	Clothing	Automobile	Other transportation	Personal care	Medical care	Recreation	Tobacco	Reading	Formal education	Other items	Items generally liable to a retail sales tax (columns 4, 6, 7, 8)	1942—In 12 months of 1942			1941—In 12 months of 1941		
Money income 1942																		10-percent retail sales tax, per annum	Straight 5-percent income tax, per annum	Straight 5-percent spendings tax, per annum	10-percent retail sales tax, per annum	Straight 5-percent income tax, per annum	Straight 5-percent spendings tax, per annum
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Under $500	[1] $300	$421	$180	$108	$20	$8	$28	$12	$4	$8	$28	$4	$8	$4	$1	$8	$236	$23	$15	$21	$22	$15	$21
$500 and under $1,000	[2] 728	828	324	204	36	20	64	32	20	16	52	16	16	8	4	16	444	44	36	41	42	37	38
$1,000 and under $1,500	1,248	1,240	444	292	52	44	120	56	32	28	72	32	28	16	8	16	660	66	62	62	66	62	61
$1,500 and under $2,000	1,744	1,600	564	360	72	56	176	84	36	36	92	48	36	16	8	16	868	87	87	80	90	87	84
$2,000 and under $2,500	2,224	1,956	672	412	88	76	232	116	40	44	112	68	44	20	16	16	1,068	107	111	98	113	112	105
$2,500 and under $3,000	2,740	2,340	776	460	108	104	292	160	48	52	136	92	52	24	20	16	1,280	128	137	117	135	137	126
$3,000 and under $5,000	3,728	3,056	964	528	140	164	404	252	64	68	172	144	68	32	36	20	1,672	167	186	153	174	187	163
$5,000 and under $10,000	6,460	4,736	1,328	676	256	328	664	476	120	104	244	276	96	48	80	40	2,576	257	323	236	249	310	235

[1] In addition, this group received on the average in value of goods and services (without direct money expense) $160 per annum.
[2] In addition, this group received on the average in value of goods and services (without direct money expense) $128 per annum.

Comparing columns 19 and 22, we see that the amounts of a 10-percent retail sales tax in 1942 and in 1941 are almost identical, and so is the tax burden of a straight 5-percent income tax and of a 5-percent spending tax (compare the figures in columns 20 and 22 and columns 21 and 24 and for details see the table published in the May 1943 issue of Taxes magazine, p. 291, and in the January 1943 issue, p. 32).

This at first sight startling fact is due to the inclination of the people to adapt themselves to a definite level of expenditure commensurate to their purchasing capacity. As a matter of fact, a large number of wage earners got into the next upper income brackets, but the total amount of expenditures in the various brackets remained practically the same. The money income class of $1,000–$2,500 spent for current consumption $1,215 in 1941 and $1,240 in 1942; the $1,500–$2,000 class spent $1,671 in 1941 and only $1,600 in 1942; the $2,000–$2,500 class spent $2,103 and $1,956, respectively. It is only the number of taxpayers in each bracket that changed—with a trend up—and, in general, considerable tendency for saving prevailed.

Even if we take into consideration that the cost of all goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in large cities from February 1943 increased 7 percent (Monthly Labor Review, April 1943, p. 743), we have to infer that for them a 10-percent retailer sales tax would have meant only from $3 to $6 per annum increase in the amount of tax paid in comparison with the figures given in the table above. This, with the well-known fact that average wages have increased also, refutes the contention that the sales tax would be particularly destructive with the rise of cost of living. Naturally, greater revenue may be collected by the Treasury with the rise of prices, but that is possible only if the population has at the same time greater incomes to pay for increased prices. This is also the most beneficial consequence of a sales tax which follows immediately the increased spendings of the population without any delay and without the absurdly complicated technique of collection of a spending tax.

The foregoing figures show conclusively that a sales tax is a normal and rational substitute for an income tax in all the lower brackets up to the $5,000 level. Instead of trying to embrace the tremendous millions of taxpayers by means of a direct income tax it is technically much more advisable to raise the exemptions in the income tax and to replace the loss of revenue by a much simpler general sales tax. There is no need of repeating the arguments in favor of a wage withholding tax eliminating all returns for wage and salary earners up to the $3,000 or even $5,000 mark, as is in detail described in my article in Taxes magazine, May 1943, page 271.

Of course, the sales tax does not exempt anybody, as an income tax or a spending tax is providing for. But still there is no justification of exempting anyone from at least a 5 percent of total income contribution to the cost of war or social security. This is exactly what a 10-percent retail sales tax achieves in a simple way. It has also the great advantage over a spendings tax which technically is a nuisance for the lower brackets, where the cost of housing adds excessively to the burdens of the poorer classes, and which results mainly in an additional "soak the rich" measure already too much abused in our present tax system. Any exemption in the spendings tax contradicts its very substance and is absurd as a means of taxing the rich, who are already burdened with a highly progressive income tax. A sales tax is a much more effective means of checking people's expenditure during the war than a spendings tax is able to do; the consumption of necessaries by the comparatively few rich persons need not be artificially curtailed since their consumption (of some 300,000 persons having a yearly income over $10,000 with their families) is a negligible item in the total Nation's food balance.

A sales tax is badly needed if we really intend to improve our tax system and to increase the revenues of the Treasury in a fair and rational way. The alleged "spiral effect" of a sales tax is the most unreasonable argument ever offered in the public finance theory. If we expect mass labor remonstrations against a modest 10-percent sales tax, actually decreasing the purchasing capacity on the average by only 5 percent, and a demand for higher wages why should a 20 percent withholding income tax not encounter a much stronger opposition? The policy of keeping prices low is not undermined by a universal tax measure which the population is expecting in times of war. On the other hand, nobody can suppose the same standard of living during the war as was possible in peace times. Widespread rationing always has the bad effect that many are buying more than they ever did before, be it butter, meat, coffee, canned goods, or other articles.

Personally, I would prefer a universal turnover tax; that is, a pyramided sales tax (see my articles in Taxes magazine, May and June 1942) and a compulsory inclusion of the sales tax into the price (without the right to charge it as a separate item), but the technique of collection is not an important issue. Any complications in the collection of the sales tax (special coupons for low-income brackets, and so forth) are absolutely undesirable and frustrating the very idea of a general tax collected from the whole population for a most important cause of our age. Nobody is likely to go hungry simply because some of his expenditures will be charged 10 percent. A sales tax is a tax which taxes the whole population according to the amount of its spending, the rich more, and the poor less. The usual exemptions in the income tax (as well as in the spendings tax) are necessarily highly artificial and grossly unequal, since an exemption of $1,200 in New York, Washington, or Chicago is very small in comparison with a similar exemption in Alabama or Mississippi. For this reason alone we must have a universal sales tax. Casual and irregular receipts, now easily concealed in the income tax, will be caught by the sales tax as soon as spent.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a number of communications I have received from educational institutions favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration.

I know of no other agency connected with the Federal Government that has done and is doing so much for the youth of this country as is the National Youth Administration. I hope the Senate will appropriate the necessary funds for its continuation and the House will concur with the Senate.

The communications follow:

NAZARETH COLLEGE,
Rochester, N. Y., June 15, 1943.

Mr. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to recommend to your consideration the passage of the bill now pending which involves a continuance of the National Youth Administration student-work program. We feel this to be of vital importance to a number of our students and ask that you do what you can to make it possible for them to continue their education under this program.

Yours very sincerely,

SISTER TERESA MARIE,
Dean.

BARD COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y., June 15, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FITZPATRICK: It has come to my attention that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives is considering a bill to provide aid to needy students in the pursuit of their education. I should like to express my approval of the National Youth Administration program which has been in effect for a number of years, and which has provided much-needed aid to worthy students. The institutions have been able to allocate the funds allotted to them to students who might otherwise not have been able to complete their education and, in addition, to make certain that very necessary work was done by such students in return for the aid. It is my hope that if the student-aid program is continued, it will be conducted according to the same procedure.

I am sure that you will realize that aid to needy college students is more necessary than ever during the present period. Students are forced by the manpower situation to use the whole of the 12-month period for study. As a result they cannot earn any money during the summer to defray part of their educational expenses. At the same time, their parents, because of increased living costs and larger taxes, find it more and more difficult to provide the necessary funds for their children's education.

A student-aid program would do much to prevent unnecessary ill effects of the war upon the cultural development of the country. Because of the drafting of all men over 18 years of age, the number of students still able to continue their education in college is of course drastically reduced. We expect to have in college during the war only those who are declared unfit for military service and those whose superior abilities are prepared for college at the early age of 16 or 17. The student-aid program would prevent the loss to the trained manpower of the country of the younger students whose financial situation might not allow them to continue. I respectfully urge upon you the approval of a subsidy to these promising young people. The country cannot afford to neglect these human resources during a time when so much destruction of other resources is forced upon us.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. GRAY, *Dean.*

Victory Dinner Address of Hon. Harry S. Truman, of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent and able address by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], delivered at the Victory Dinner at Oklahoma City, Okla., on June 14, 1943, under the auspices of the Oklahoma Democratic State Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a pleasure for me to join with my fellow Democrats tonight in the beautiful capital of Oklahoma. In the midst of this great war we are waging against the powerful allies of evil we can all be thankful for the opportunity to be gathered here at this Victory dinner and to be able to discuss, amongst ourselves, the problems that affect each one of us. This meeting is truly American as it typifies the rights of a free people to meet together, at their own time, at their own will, in their own way, and to voice their own thoughts on any subject. This is representative of the traditional American principles of democracy and freedom.

Today the fighting men of the United States are offering their lives that those principles shall be maintained. On land, on sea, and in the air these fighting men of ours are carrying the war to our enemies wherever they may be. Americans are fighting—as they have always fought in the past—with honor and with glory.

To preserve our way of life we must today emulate the qualities of leadership shown by our forefathers so many years ago. It was men like Washington and Jefferson who brought into being our great Nation and showed to the world a cause united. We must take stock of what has been done and what still remains to be done. The Democratic Party has been entrusted by the American people with a solemn responsibility. As Americans and as Democrats we are proud of that trust. But like our forefathers who were blessed with the great leadership of Washington and Jefferson in their time of crisis, we may be thankful that our country is being led during this time of peril by our great Commander in Chief Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The foresight of men like Jefferson prepared our colonial fathers to meet their destiny. Their perseverance surmounted all obstacles. By their vision and courage, the strength and resources of the Thirteen Colonies were brought together to present a united front to our enemies. To accomplish this, our leaders then had to unite the patriots and overcome concentrated Tory opposition. In our day our great President, with the backing of most Democrats and some Republicans, overcame vociferous opposition, to forge again a united front and bring to bear against our enemies the mighty strength of this great country.

When it became apparent that Europe was to be swept by a vast conflagration and that the Nazis had embarked on a course to crush and conquer their friendly neighbors, our great leader and the majority Members of the Democratic Congress assumed the responsibility of preparing this Nation to defend herself against the aggressor. Our President early determined that adequate defense of this Nation against our enemies compelled us to institute a program of armament greater than the world had ever seen before. Through his efforts with the aid of the Democratic majority the construction of our two-ocean fleet was well on its way when the Nazis swept through France. While the Battle of Britain raged, large plants were manufacturing planes and guns and tanks and all the supplies of war. It could be seen then that America's lines of defense were not our shores bordered by the Atlantic and the Pacific, but were in Britain and China and wherever freemen were fighting the Nazi savages and their allies.

Long previous to the dastardly attack which was made on our country at Pearl Harbor the Democratic Party under the leadership of President Roosevelt had provided for the raising of an army by selective service to be trained in modern warfare. We may be thankful that we started this training of our men before we were compelled to meet the enemy on the field of battle. We also had built the camps and cantonments in which to house this new Army. We began converting our peacetime industry to war. We constructed numerous plants and facilities for the purpose of producing the weapons with which to equip the Army and Navy for war. We changed our airplane industry from one accustomed to building a few hundred planes for peacetime use to one capable of building many thousands of fighting planes. We also created a two-ocean Navy, and engaged in the greatest merchant shipbuilding program in history. Through diplomatic action we obtained the necessary bases from which to defend our shores against any possible attack. By lend-lease aid we made it possible to furnish sinews of war and foodstuffs to the gallant warriors who were then fighting against Nazi aggression.

All of this was accomplished over the bitter protests of the opposition.

We can be proud, indeed, that through these efforts Britain was saved from the blitzkrieg and today stands undaunted

against our common foe. Our valiant allies, the Chinese, have not as yet been supplied with all the guns and ammunition and planes that we would wish. We may be thankful, however, that with the aid of the supplies we have furnished they have succeeded in holding off the treacherous Nipponese.

When Russia was overrun by the Nazi hordes, munitions of war were already flowing from our factories into the hands of that brave ally of America.

All these responsibilities were assumed by the majority members of the Democratic Party and a few Republicans up to December 6, 1941. On December 7, of that memorable year, at Pearl Harbor and Manila, American blood was shed—American property destroyed—in that sneaking attack by the Japanese. As in peace we had assumed our responsibilities for possible war, so in war we assumed the responsibilities for ultimate victory.

As a result of this great program, no one today doubts that the war will be won. Moreover, it will be won sooner than it could possibly have been won had we listened to the contentions of the opposition that we were not in danger and should continue business as usual.

Great as was the program for the defense of this country, immediately after Pearl Harbor the Nation embarked upon the greatest undertaking for war the world has ever known. This calls for the construction of planes—swarms of planes—more planes than any other country in the world has ever constructed. It calls for the construction of ships—ships that would be necessary to carry men and supplies to the battle fronts of the world—wherever they should be. This Nation has to be the arsenal of the world with tanks and guns and all the supplies of war, so that through the assembled might of this Nation, and our allies, the ravages of the peace of this world will be subdued—and subdued quickly.

The praise and prayers of our citizens go with the men of our armed forces who are fighting our battles on land and sea and in the air. However, there is another great army of Americans who are striving for total victory against the foes of freedom. This is the army of the home front—that great portion of American citizens who make up agriculture, labor, industry, and the home. It is this army on the home front that must work and toil and sacrifice so that we may produce more food, more guns, tanks, planes, and all the supplies of war for the boys out there.

War is no time for partisan politics. President Roosevelt clearly recognized this when he called in leaders of the opposition party who, along with him, saw the danger and realized the necessity of taking action. The President gave the two most important war posts to prominent Republicans. Mr. Henry Stimson, who had been Secretary of State under President Hoover and Secretary of War under President Taft, was made Secretary of War. Mr. Frank Knox, who had been the Republican candidate for Vice President in 1936, was made Secretary of the Navy. Similarly, Mr. Robert Patterson, a Republican, was named Under Secretary of War and was placed in charge of the procurement program of the Army.

These men have sincerely tried to cooperate with the President in carrying out his program. Republicans have not been excluded from the war effort. Hundreds of them have been placed in important posts in the War Production Board, the Office of the Petroleum Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and in all other important war agencies. Many of them have performed valuable services; some have not.

I think that the record establishes beyond any question that the Democratic Party has realized the necessity of uniting the Nation behind the war effort and has given the opposition party full and complete opportunity to contribute suggestions and men.

Moreover, the Democratic Party has not pretended an infallibility in undertaking this gigantic task. When a great peace-loving nation changes its way of life for war—when industry and agriculture turn from usual peacetime production to that of war—when government necessarily expands its functions, some confusion will ensue and some mistakes will be made. Indeed, some of our problems can be solved only through trial and error.

We all know that it would be absolutely impossible to spend $100,000,000, let alone several hundred billion dollars, without some mistakes and without some dishonesty. Unfortunately, there will always be some chiselers. Realizing this, senatorial leaders of the Democratic Party advocated the creation by the United States Senate of a Special Committee to Investigate the War Program, of which I had the honor of being named chairman. The purpose for which that committee was created was to search out the obstacles that were hampering the war program and to see that they were removed without fear or favor. What is more, the investigation was to be a continuing one. The committee was determined to do the job assigned to it without resorting either to a whitewash or a smear. It originally consisted of five Democrats and two Republicans, and at present consists of six Democrats and four Republicans.

It gives me great pleasure, as chairman of that committee, to report to you that the members of the committee from both parties have cooperated harmoniously. We have never had, and I hope we never will have, a minority report.

None of us started out with any preconceived ideas that we desired to prove. We have all tried to the best of our abilities to make the committee's actions purely constructive.

Each individual in our land has a grave responsibility in this war. To fulfill it, all the facts must be known.

When we ask Government officials to explain their activities, we are asking on behalf of the whole country. The information which the committee gets is for every American citizen. The recommendations which it makes are made in the interests of the whole country.

During the past year, the committee has reported on light metals and aircraft, rubber, conversion to war production, manpower, gasoline and fuel oil rationing, lumber, barges, farm machinery, and steel.

More recently the committee has made reports on renegotiation of war contracts, labor, the faking of steel tests at the Irvin plant of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, and shipping and shipbuilding. It has investigated and studied many other subjects and specific complaints on which no public reports have been made. It has inspected numerous defense plants and military installations located in nearly every section of the country, including Alaska and the Caribbean area. Whenever possible, without in any way endangering the war program, the committee has held public hearings. In many other cases its hearings have been private. By and large, we are getting to the point where we can truthfully say that we have the basic elements of a real war program, so that our superior natural resources can and will be converted into war material that will enable our armed forces to be victorious. Much of the credit therefor must be ascribed to the loyal and able work of those participating in management in behalf of the Government. The extent to which they can continue and improve that work will be an important factor in determining when the war will be won. There has, however, frequently been unnecessary delay by the responsible Government agencies before attempting to make corrections.

For instance, though we are producing airplanes in very large quantity, far exceeding anything our enemies can produce, we are not producing to capacity because there are: First, frequent changes of Army and Navy specifications; second, difficulties in getting materials at the right times in the right amounts; third, lack of trained foremen, supervisors, and skilled workmen. In the future the Army and Navy must keep changes in specifications to a minimum or accept responsibility for smaller airplane production.

Turning to our building of merchant vessels, we have produced them at a rate that our friends and enemies thought impossible. Our shipyards should be well able to meet the goal for 1943—18,000,000 tons. But merchant ships alone are not enough. We must have escort vessels to protect them. For a long time the Navy paid too much attention to larger and more complicated naval vessels. However, progress is now being made.

Transportation is one of the biggest bottlenecks. The time when victory will be achieved is directly related to our ability to transport overseas the armed forces and the supplies which they will require. To do this we must (1) construct the greatest possible number of merchant ships; (2) protect them while en route; and (3) utilize efficiently all available shipping

The ship-construction program produced 8,090,800 dead-weight tons in 1942 and will produce in excess of 18,000,000 dead-weight tons in 1943. When it is considered that this was accomplished with yards that were newly constructed for the purpose and with workers who were trained on the job, the program must be considered a tremendous success. It is one of the best jobs that has been done in the entire war effort. The success was made possible because the design work had been completed prior to the war; because the components were simplified and standardized and obtained by central procurement; because new techniques were evolved and heavy machinery made available; and, finally, because American management and workmen evidenced great ability to learn and apply new techniques on work they had never done before.

The record which has been made compares favorably with the magnificent job accomplished by the British, who are the most experienced shipbuilders in the world.

It is also very encouraging to know that the losses sustained in shipping by the United Nations during April and May of this year have fallen off perceptibly from any other 2 months since the war began. With the new methods being devised by the Navy and with the vigor shown by them in combating this menace, we may look to the future with a great deal of confidence that this menace to the United Nations is being destroyed.

Almost from its inception, the committee stressed the need to expand facilities for the production of the basic raw materials such as steel, copper, and aluminum. There was a long delay in the expansion program, but the committee is glad to report that rapid progress toward alleviating the shortages has been made during the past year.

We still do not have enough of all the critical materials to supply all the needs under the specifications scheduled by the various claimant agencies. Consequently, if we are to obtain the number of airplanes, escort vessels, synthetic rubber plants, merchant ships, 100-octane gasoline and other products, that the high command has determined are necessary, there must be a coordinated effort not only to allocate fairly the scarce materials but to organize the production of all these competing articles.

Competing demands for productive facilities and products are tremendous. Too much of one thing at the wrong time is almost as bad as not enough at the time needed. Excess and unusable production means that vital materials have been improperly diverted either from military or essential civilian needs. In effect, what we must have above everything else is the delicate balance of production and use. We must plan to make the raw materials available as required, and then we must allocate them to the production of the items that we can use as produced.

The task of control and guidance is of utmost importance. Clear leadership in strong hands is required. The influence from above must be always toward unity. The precise balancing of these programs in point of quantity and of time is crucial. A serious error could spell disaster. The deciding agency must have the facts relating to all three programs before it. Its decisions must stick. Confusion in planning today will cut production a year hence. The persons in charge of each major program should meet together and discuss their problems together regularly and frequently. Each must be made to feel a great sense of responsibility for the entire program with no diminution of his responsibility for that part directly under his control.

Now the members of the committee and myself are very optimistic, as we believe the appointment of Mr. James Byrnes as Chairman of the War Mobilization Board is a long step in the right direction. The functions of this Board, as set out by Executive order of the President is for an over-all, strong deciding head of all of the home front's war demands. We believe that Mr. Byrnes is a strong, able man and is capable of adjusting the competing demands of the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and our essential civilian needs. And now that he has appointed Bernard M. Baruch, distinguished Chairman of the War Industries Board of the last war, as his assistant, the confidence of the country is established in the results to be accomplished by this team of able statesmen.

There are many manufactured articles used in essential civilian needs that are as important as guns or tanks. We must be so meticulous in keeping the delicate balance between production and use. The rule of first things first of course must hold, but extreme care must be taken so as to insure against unnecessary disallocation of essential needs on the home front.

At this time when the farmer is being asked to produce more and more food for our armies, our allies, and for our use on the home front, we must make sure that every implement that will help him in this stupendous task to be made available. Sufficient provision for food must be made and it must be regarded as vital to our war effort. We must produce more food of all kinds than we have ever produced in our history.

At the same time we must learn to live on less. This requires material adjustments in our usual way of living. Some persons might call these adjustments sacrifices. But we civilians are not really sacrificing—we are fighting. The adjustments are our weapons. We will make them willingly and cheerfully since they mean more food, more tanks and guns, more ships and planes and bombs for "the boys out there."

We must also be mindful not to impose unnecessary burdens on industry. Regulation merely for the sake of regulation is nonsense. The imposition of complicated rules by people who know nothing of the industry they are running cannot be tolerated. Complex regulations must give way to simple, fair, and easily understood rules.

Companies engaged in production must realize that it is absolutely essential to get the greatest production with the least possible use of manpower. Companies hoarding manpower which they do not absolutely need are just as guilty as workers who by absenteeism or otherwise desert their posts.

This Nation is fighting for its very existence and for the preservation of all our rights, including the right of labor to seek by proper means a fair and just share of the goods produced. In such a struggle, our Government has the right to expect that labor and those who represent it, and management and its representatives, shall not permit stoppage of work in essential industry.

Leaders of labor must now demonstrate that they are statesmen and patriots as well as paid advocates for worthy causes. Labor has come of age, and the country expects these leaders to recognize that labor has duties as well as rights. Labor must not repeat the mistake of arrogant capitalism, which forged the shackles that now restrict its every act.

One point I wish to make clear. The War Investigating Committee was not organized to tell the war agencies what to do or how to do it. The purpose of the committee is not to substitute its judgment for theirs. Its function is to insure that intelligent consideration is given to the important and difficult problems presented by the war program, so as to make certain that our victory is won with the least cost in human lives and property.

Our great President realized these many important and difficult problems presented by our war program, and some 2 years ago, on May 21, 1941, he declared that a state of "unlimited emergency" existed in this country. How well he foresaw the threat to America was proved 6 months later when the Japanese attacked us at Pearl Harbor and Germany with her satellites declared war on the United States.

Those nations dared to throw themselves against the United States because they could not believe that America, so long devoted to the ideals of peace, could mobilize our armies, our industry, and our spiritual resolve to meet the gigantic needs of global war. To the Axis nations, which for years had been sacrificing the welfare of their people to build up an offensive war machine, it was inconceivable that a peaceful people like the Americans could quickly leap out of peacetime habits and mobilize sufficient strength for war.

That was the great mistake made by the Axis. Today the Axis nations are paying dearly for that mistake and will continue to pay until they are vanquished. For America quickly recruited a citizens' army, an army of young men so devoted to the ideals of democracy and freedom that they fight like demons to preserve those ideals from an enemy which believes in tyranny and eternal war. The quality of our fighting men, whose zeal stems from their belief in the American tradition of democracy, showed itself gloriously on the battlefields of north Africa, where Axis troops, lacking this morale, surrendered despite Hitler's order to fight to the last man, to the last cartridge—some difference between Tunis and Stalingrad.

The quality of our fighting men showed itself against the Asiatic aggressor on Guadalcanal, in New Guinea, and on other soil where American soldiers and marines fought valiantly and successfully against the Japanese enemy.

With equal speed, America mobilized its industry. Today the United States, which has given its population the highest standard of living in the world, is now giving its armed forces the highest quality and volume of war material. This superiority in war goods was a major factor in the Allied victory in Africa and in the daily growing strength of our air arm over Europe.

The committee has never hesitated to criticize where it thought that criticism would serve some useful purpose. But when we find faults and criticize, then we have always suggested a remedy. This attitude presents a decided contrast to that of certain leaders of the Republican Party. I refer particularly to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, who recently made a most significant speech. Mr. MARTIN, on behalf of the Republicans, demanded that the war be fought efficiently. Democrats cannot quarrel with this. He then asserted that could be done only when we placed in key positions men and women selected on the basis of personal merit and not on the basis of partisan favoritism, wholly disregarding the fact that the Democratic Party has already done this to an extent unprecedented in our entire history and never approached by any Republican administration.

Mr. MARTIN stated that the Republicans do not intend to permit our system of "free, private enterprise to be displaced by some form of socialistic economy" or to have our "free representative government dominated by scheming, self-seeking bureaucrats." These are resounding phrases, but Mr. MARTIN did not name the bureaucrats to whom he is objecting, and I venture to say that if he did he would find that most of them are Republicans. Some of our greatest difficulties have arisen because we have attempted to operate this war program through dollar-a-year men. Many dollar-a-year men are patriotic, hard-working businessmen, but there are many others who have volunteered their services for the purpose of fostering their interests and the interests of the industries which they represent. I need not remind you that such men constitute the most dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries and are usually found in the ranks of the Republican and not the Democratic Party.

Mr. MARTIN objected to the so-called blank checks that have been given to the Government agencies without pointing out that most of them were given to the Departments of War and Navy which are headed by Republicans, and that he, like most other Republican Members of Congress, voted the blank checks.

It was the Democratic Party and not the Republican Party which first saw the necessity of investigating such expenditures. It was for the purpose of doing precisely this job that our committee was organized.

I mention these statements of Mr. MARTIN because he is well-known to us all as one of the firm of Martin, Barton and Fish, who are always ready to criticize, but who never have anything constructive to offer. His speech is important only as indicating the partisan character of the opposition.

Mr. MARTIN's speech was lengthy and he touched on many subjects—all of them in the spirit of carping criticism and without once making a specific and constructive suggestion as to how Republicans would do a better job. His speech indicates that Republicans of his type hope to capitalize on the mistakes and errors that unavoidably creep into a program as vast and complicated as the fighting of a modern war. Of course, Mr. MARTIN wants the Republicans to share the credit for the success of the war program due to the united efforts of the Democrats and those Republicans willing to render constructive assistance in the interest of their country instead of playing partisan politics. But, he also wants to impose upon the Democratic Party all of the blame for mistakes which would inevitably incur in any program so vast. Such sniping as this only indicates that the men who would head the Republican Party if it were returned to power have no constructive program. The thing for the Democratic Party to do is to go right on doing what it has done—that is, formulating and carrying out a constructive program to get the job done—

and so far as possible, obtaining the advice and assistance of those Republicans who are willing to lay aside partisan politics in the interest of their country.

The Democratic Party must continue to take the leadership in making the necessary investigations to keep the program efficient and honest just as they have in the past. We must continue as we have in the past to seek out mistakes and to force their correction. But we must at the same time take care that we do not allow the constructive criticism within the Democratic Party to be used as political thunder by a minority group in the Republican Party.

Even more important, however, is the responsibility which any majority party assumes constantly to check and recheck for the purpose of insuring that government is being carried on competently, efficiently, and honestly. The Democratic Party has willingly assumed this burden—that is the constant duty of the committee organized at the suggestion of the Democrats themselves to make investigations for such a purpose. So long as the people know that is the purpose of the Democratic Party, and that constant checks are being made by Democrats to assure competency, honesty, and efficiency, then the people are going to continue their confidence in us. If we bear in mind at all times the responsibility we have assumed, and if we keep our own house in order, the people of the country will regard for what it is worth the carping criticism of Mr. MARTIN and his violently partisan friends.

In the light of our achievements in our country's interests—accomplished through the program laid down and under way before Pearl Harbor, quickened in tempo and vastly expanded through the grim necessities of war after Pearl Harbor, let us keep faith with the American people—let us continue the good work, and let the record of the future, like the record of the past, show that the Democratic Party's one thought is the speedy winning of the war and the consummation of a lasting peace.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] over the Columbia System on Tuesday, June 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIES—THE OLD SHELL GAME

The President says that he is going to reduce the cost of living 10 percent. To accomplish this the Office of Price Administration has issued an order to roll back the retail prices on butter, meat, and coffee by 10 percent. To compensate the processors of these commodities the Office of Price Administration proposes to pay to the processors a 10 percent subsidy from the United States Treasury.

The Subcommittee on Food of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been studying this program since it was first announced. I am convinced, as are the other members of the committee, that these subsidies cannot be justified and should be prohibited unless specifically authorized by Congress.

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, testified before our committee recently. He stated that this subsidy program on the three commodities named will cost the United States Government $450,000,000 a year. When asked where he would get the money to pay the subsidies, he said that he had the money in his Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds and that he proposed to pay the subsidies upon order of the President whether the Congress approved it or not, and without the necessity of an appropriation from Congress.

Nearly everyone is opposed to this program except certain Committee of Industrial Organization officials and a small inner circle in the White House. Even official Washington does not approve of the program. Secretary of Commerce Jones, while declaring that he would follow orders, stated: "If you let the law of supply and demand take its course, no subsidies are needed. The subsidy plan will reduce production instead of increasing it."

Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, also appeared before our committee. He said: "I believe that a general dependence upon a broad subsidy program as the chief instrument in holding prices in line, or in expanding production, would be dangerous and would not accomplish the things we seek."

T. G. Stitts, Chief of the Dairy and Poultry Branch of Agricultural Marketing Administration, stated: "The proposal to roll back the price of butter has had an unfortunate effect. Prices—for the producer—have gone down. There is no provision to indicate that the subsidy would be passed on to the farmer."

Meat processors, dairymen, and farmers all oppose the program. Albert Case, national president of the Grange, testified before our committee, stating his opposition to the subsidy program thus:

"We are opposed to the use of subsidies for such purpose, because they will not work. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to postwar chaos. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the state to support its people. Subsidies lead to political control and when once used they are almost impossible to get rid of."

Under this subsidy proposed only butter makers making 1,000 pounds or more a month will receive a subsidy. Neither the small creamery nor the hundreds of thousands of farmers' wives throughout America who make a few pounds of butter a week for sale at the local store will receive a subsidy.

But what will be the effect upon producers? The retail price of butter is reduced by the order from 46 cents a pound to 41 cents a pound. The reasoning of the bureaucrats who advocate this program is that it will have no effect upon the price to the producer. Their theories are not supported by facts. The price of butter and of milk products are already reduced 5 cents. So that the farmer and small butter maker lose millions, because the processor does not and will not pass on this subsidy.

The roll-back program inflicts huge damage upon meat processors, too, because no subsidy is to be paid upon meat now in their hands. The American Meat Institute estimates their loss at $25,000,000. It will not help the consumer. It will increase the black market, and can be used as a club to enforce political obedience to those in power. Finally, this program will cause inflation.

I oppose this roll-back and subsidy program not only because of the huge losses to the producers, but because it is wrong in principle and is of questionable legality. To retain some control over this autocratic action of the Office of Price Administration I introduced in the Senate Senate bill 1143, which will, if passed, prohibit the payment of these subsidies unless by specific appropriation and authorization by Congress.

The subsidy has no legal standing. By the terms of the Price Control Act of 1942 the President, or the Administrator under him, is authorized to pay subsidy for one purpose only, and that purpose is to make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

There is no provision whatever in the law authorizing the President to roll back prices or to pay subsidies to processors, and instead of increasing production this roll-back actually decreases production. So I say if we are going into that kind of a program it should have congressional sanction.

Every witness appearing before our committee says the program will lower production of both dairy and meat products. Both the producer and the processor will lose, but the consumer—and that includes all of us—will lose, too.

Consumers are receiving higher incomes and wages today than ever before in our history, and they can continue to pay this small additional price for butter, meat, and coffee without loss worth mentioning.

Let me explain the actual facts. Under the rationing now in effect each consumer can obtain a quarter of a pound of butter a week, or 12 pounds a year. The 5-cent additional cost to the butter consumer without a roll-back for 1 year is 65 cents, to the coffee user 24 cents, to the meat eater $2. The entire cost to the consumer without the roll-back will be less than 1 cent a day. Isn't it better for the consumer then to bear that cost instead of dipping into the Federal Treasury.

Secretary Jones says that this program will cost about $450,000,000 a year. Members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations testifying before our committee demanded that Congress appropriate a minimum of $2,000,000,000 a year for this program. But whatever the amount required we consumers will pay it in taxes.

The Government does not have the money. It will have to be borrowed. Borrowed money requires the payment of interest. Whether the sum is $450,000,000 or $2,000,000,000, we will have to pay interest upon it by more taxes.

And do not forget the new army of thousands of job holders to be employed to administer and enforce the subsidy program. We then have the original cost, whatever it may be, plus the interest charge on the borrowed money, plus the cost of administration. You and I know that with the Government handling it, the cost will be from two to three times the total amount of the subsidies. And who pays this bill? The taxpayer pays it and the taxpayer is the consumer.

Ladies and gentlemen, this whole scheme of roll-back and subsidy is a cheat and a fraud upon the American people, conceived by the Roosevelt administration to fool the people into believing that the administration is reducing the cost of living. Are we gullible enough to stand for this fraud? I do not believe we are. The policy of bureaucrats in Washington thumbing their noses at the people and Congress is going to explode in Washington's official face one of these days and a lot of people on the Government pay roll are going to receive the shock of their lives.

The Functions of the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Functions of the Federal Power Commission in Relation to the Supply of Electricity and Gas for War Plants and Establishments," made by Basil Manly, Vice Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, on June 4, 1943, at a conference sponsored by the War Department in Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before taking up the topic which has been assigned to me, I want to congratulate the War Department on having initiated this conference for the discussion of the problems related to the supply of electricity and gas to those war plants and establishments for which that Department is responsible. We are thus enabled not only to review the very substantial results that have already been accomplished but also to consider what improvements are possible in the procedures and methods that will be used in the practical handling of the large number of contracts which are subject to future review.

The Federal Power Commission appreciates the opportunity to participate in this conference as a demonstration of the fine spirit of cooperation which has characterized the relations of the War Department and the Commission in all matters relating to utility services. The practical results that have been secured in rate reductions, adjustment of unreasonable facility charges and elimination of inequitable service clauses from proposed contracts are the best evidence of the value of such cooperation. It is noteworthy that these results have peen secured at relatively little expense to the Government and without the creation of additional agencies or the enactment of special legislation.

This is due in large measure to the fact that the Congress, in the enactment of the Federal Power Act of 1935, with remarkable foresight, wrote into the statute provisions conferring on the Commission exceptional emergency powers in the event of war. I would direct your attention particularly to section 202 (c) which reads, in part, as follows:

"(c) During the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged * * * the Commission shall have authority, either upon its own motion or upon complaint, with or without notice, hearing, or report, to require by order such temporary connections of facilities and such generation, delivery, interchange, or transmission of electric energy as in its judgment will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest. If the parties affected by such order fail to agree upon the terms of any arrangement between them in carrying out such order, the Commission, after hearing held either before or after such order takes effect, may prescribe by supplemental order such terms as it finds to be just and reasonable, including the compensation or reimbursement which should be paid to or by any such party."

While the Natural Gas Act does not contain a corresponding section, its authority to require and approve extensions, determine costs, and fix reasonable rates has proved to be entirely adequate, up to the present time. These acts also gave the Commission broad authority to secure, compile, and analyze the basic information necessary for the proper determination of all questions relating to the supplying of these utility services.

The functions of the Federal Power Commission in relation to the supply of electricity and gas during the war period are thus based upon its statutory authority, supplemented by certain Presidential directives designed to insure that electricity be supplied to war plants and establishments under reasonable rates and conditions of service and from the cheapest available source consistent with war requirements.

These directives of September 26 and October 22, 1942, in addition to establishing the general principles which should control arrangements for the supply of electric power involving Government approval or the assumption of any Government obligation, provided for the designation of a power procurement officer by each Federal agency having such responsibilities, and established a procedure under which all major power contracts are submitted to the Federal Power Commission for review and approval.

As you gentlemen are familiar with these Presidential orders and the procedure which they establish, no detailed discussion is necessary. I would like to comment, however, on certain aspects of these matters which have not been completely understood.

In the first place, these directives were directly in line with the informal procedure which had been voluntarily established, even before the declaration of war, on the initiative of the War and Navy Departments, Maritime Commission, Federal Works Agency, and other agencies concerned with the procurement of electricity and gas. For example, as early as June 1941, Lieutenant Colonel McCabe, of the Army Engineer Corps, came to the Commission for assistance in determining the reasonableness of gas rates for service to Army camps and establishments, and in the negotiation or renegotiation of those contracts, which were found to be unreasonable. As a result of this conference, cooperative field surveys were conducted by the Army and Commission staffs, resulting in large initial savings in rates and facility charges, which have since been materially augmented as a result of passing on general wholesale rate reductions for natural gas in certain areas ordered by the Federal Power Commission under its regulatory authority.

Similar cooperative procedures have been carried on by the Commission and its staff in connection with both gas and electric services at the request of the Navy, Maritime Commission, Federal Works Agency, National Housing Agency, Veterans' Administration and Defense Plant Corporation. Altogether it is estimated that, prior to the President's directives, through the cooperation of the Federal Power Commission with representatives of these several agencies annual savings of $466,900 had been realized in charges for electricity and gas and, in addition, $1,074,000 had been saved in connection and facility charges. These services were performed by the regular staff of the Commission, without extra expense to the Government—a result that was made possible only by curtailing and streamlining the Commission's ordinary activities.

The adjustments in utility contracts which were effected through this cooperative procedure were worked out in conferences participated in by representatives of the utilities, representatives of the procurement agencies and the staff of the Federal Power Commission.

While the President's directives have made mandatory review by and approval of all contracts for electric service involving demands of 1,000 kilowatts or more, the Commission has continued to follow substantially the same procedures of investigation and conference which had proved so successful in the earlier voluntary adjustment of gas and electric contracts. Up to the present time it has not been necessary for the Commission to exercise the authority conferred by the President's directive of October 22, 1942, to determine by order just and reasonable rates and other conditions of service.

It may be noted, however, that the General Accounting Office has recently taken the position that contracts for electric service coming within the scope of the President's directive must have the approval of the Federal Power Commission.

Let us now briefly examine some of the results that have been achieved and briefly appraise the situation that now confronts us. As of May 22, 1943, the procurement agencies have referred to the Federal Power Commission 664 war power contracts and proposals for service. Of these 253 were, when submitted, proposed contracts for service which required Commission review and approval prior to signature. The remaining 411 are executed contracts dated prior to the President's directives which may be subject to renegotiation or to approval prior to being renewed.

The scope and size of these power contracts is amazing. Altogether they involve an estimated demand of 5,375,000 kilowatts, an annual consumption of 37,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours and annual charges of $225,000,000 for which some Federal agency is directly or indirectly responsible. This indicates the magnitude of the task and its vital importance both to the utilities and the Government.

The Commission and its staff have, of course, given first attention to the pending contracts and proposals with a view to their prompt execution after necessary revisions and readjustments have been made. Many of these involve the most intricate and technically difficult provisions for the supply of electric service that have ever been formulated and their terms are complicated by uncertainty as to the periods for which they will be effective and which depend primarily on the duration of the war. All of these 253 pending contracts and proposals have been under active study or are now in process of negotiation. Of these, 96 have been carried to a point where we may appraise the results of the process of review. These contracts have demands aggregating 852,757 kilowatts, estimated consumptions of 6,256,800,000 kilowatt-hours and involve annual charges of $35,182,000.

This review and the accompanying conferences conducted by the Commission's staff have resulted in readjustments acceptable to the utilities supplying the service which will result in annual savings in rates of $1,560,000 and savings in facility charges of $1,983,000. Readjustments in rates, facility charges or other contract terms were found to be just and reasonable in 70 of the 96 contracts and, after conference, were agreed to by the utilities. In addition to these substantial money savings, various restrictive and otherwise undesirable clauses have been eliminated.

We recognize that all these contracts for power and gas were originally negotiated under heavy pressure and it is therefore no reflection on any of the parties participating in such negotiations that rate adjustments and other modifications have been found to be either necessary or desirable.

It is our understanding that there will be few new contracts for supplying electricity and gas to war plants and establishments. Our staff is, therefore, concentrating on cleaning up the pending contracts and will dispose of them as rapidly as possible. Some delays in the performance of these complex and onerous duties have been inevitable.

Some of the agencies have been slow in submitting contracts in accordance with the President's directives and some have, in fact, importuned us for clearance on contracts which have never been submitted for the Commission's consideration. Some of the utilities have been dilatory in supplying information and data which would justify a reduction of their rates and charges. Finally, our staff has been short-handed and, although we have scoured the country, we have been able to secure only a few of the highly specialized gas and electric rate men who are competent to analyze and deal with the complex and sometimes unprecedented provisions of these service contracts.

Another source of delay is inevitable under the procedure of investigation, conference, and negotiation which the Commission has chosen to pursue in the readjustment of these contracts. Under the broad emergency provisions of our statutory authority and the President's directives, we might, after proper investigation and determination of the facts, have proceeded to fix the rates and other terms of the contracts by appropriate orders. But we have chosen instead, in these days of supposedly rampant bureaucracy, to have our staff members sit down in conference with the utility representatives and seek to convince them of the justice and reasonableness of the readjustments which they believed to be necessary.

This takes time, but it produces sound results. We are not seeking to deprive any utility of a penny to which it is justly entitled for the service it performs. But, by the same token, we cannot approve any contract which contains discriminatory or unreasonable rates or which seeks to require the Government, during the war period, to pay exorbitant charges for the facilities utilized in rendering the service.

Our experience indicates that all but a small minority of the utilities understand this and, with continuing cooperation between the representatives of the procurement agencies and the Federal Power Commission, there is no doubt but that we shall achieve results of which we may all be proud. Our pride will be based not only upon the material savings which we have been able to accomplish, but also upon the practical demonstration that Federal agencies can cooperate, without substantial duplication of effort, in achieving results that are just and wholly compatible with the public interest.

Inauguration of Strato-Clipper Service Between New Orleans and Central and South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, on June 12 of this year there was inaugurated a strato-clipper service between New Orleans and the Central American and South American countries. The authorization of the project was owing largely to the unceasing efforts of the entire Louisiana delegation in Congress, and they were aided by other prominent citizens of Louisiana, as well as by civic organizations. The service connects not only New Orleans, but the entire Mississippi Valley with the Central American and South American countries. On the occasion of the celebration of that event an address was delivered at New Orleans by Mr. Juan T. Trippe, president of the Pan American World Airways. I ask unanimous consent to have his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pan American Airways are deeply honored to have been invited to New Orleans to meet the distinguished group of forward-looking men who are gathered here tonight.

When in 1718, Jean Baptiste Le Moine laid out and named the city of New Orleans, he foresaw its future greatness as a seaport for most of the Middle West. Tonight, two and a quarter centuries later, this ancient and beautiful city stands on the threshold of a new era—which could not have been foreseen by him, or for that matter by anyone, even 25 years ago.

Tonight at 1:50 a. m., the first four-engined clipper takes off from New Orleans to head south over the Gulf of Mexico. New Orleans will have taken the first step toward becoming one of the great international airports of the Western Hemisphere.

You who are gathered here together, and the associations and civic bodies which you represent, have been working for the attainment of this goal for several years. You see it now as a reality. You sense that it holds for this city and for the whole Mississippi Valley certain suggestions of great and historic importance. Pan American Airways shares that belief.

The old proverb says, "Everything comes to those who wait." Certainly New Orleans has waited since 1937 when the direct air route from New Orleans to Latin America was first considered. I would like to tell you why.

As far back as 1937 we were convinced, first, that New Orleans is the natural aerial gateway for the vast Mississippi Valley; and, second, that on the direct route across the Gulf four-engined land planes were needed. Geography, not man, is often the deciding factor in determining what kind of flying equipment should be used on a given route.

In that year, 1937, we placed orders for the construction of such aircraft. They were four-engined land type Clippers equipped with supercharged cabins to fly in the substratosphere. They were to be the first four-engined land transports built in the United States and the world's first commercial transports designed to fly in the substratosphere. In January 1940, some months before their actual delivery, we made application to the Civil Aeronautics Board for authority to operate out of the port of New Orleans.

In addition that same year Pan American placed orders for 57 considerably larger and even faster 4-engined, long-range land transports. Many of these we also intended to use, if authorized, on trunk services out of New Orleans. Most of them were to carry 57 passengers. They could fly from New Orleans to the Canal Zone in 6 hours; all the way to Buenos Aires in 23.

Then came war in Europe—and Pearl Harbor.

Rightly, our Government decided that the materials for some of these planes should go into bombers. Others, as soon as they were finished, went to work as transports for the United States Army. Their uniform is olive drab. Their insignia is the white star in a blue circle. They have enlisted for the duration and are serving our country.

But the problem of New Orleans and its overseas civil transport still remained. Fortunately, of these 60 four-engined land clippers originally ordered, 3 were still available to initiate limited commercial service out of New Orleans.

Then it was that men of vision in New Orleans, in Louisiana, and throughout the Mississippi Valley took off their coats and went to work. They knew that this service is important to the future of New Orleans and to the whole valley. Senators OVERTON and ELLENDER and your entire Louisiana delegation in Congress labored assiduously from the beginning for the establishment of an airways service between New Orleans and the Central and South American countries and their influence contributed materially to the inauguration of such a route. Your Gov. Sam Jones appeared before our Federal Regulatory Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington. He placed the air case for New Orleans before the Army and the Navy. Mayor Maestri of New Orleans and members of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, and New Orleans Port Commission put their shoulders to the wheel, as did also the Mississippi Valley Association. I wish that radio time would permit me to thank each of these civil-minded leaders as well as the heads of chambers of commerce throughout the Mississippi Valley, and the publishers of the Times-Picayune, the New Orleans Item, and the New Orleans States. The people of New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley will always be in debt to these leaders for their work in forging this new strategic link in a world-wide air-transport system.

Despite difficulties, and thanks to the vision and fairness of the Civil Aeronautics Board, your case won out on its merits. And what a grand case it is. This great valley which extends from mountain system to mountain system—from the Rockies on the west to the Alleghanies on the east—contains in a single river basin 1,200,000 square miles. To New Orleans, at the river's mouth, come steamship lines, railroads, highways, and three great domestic air lines.

The inauguration of the overseas air-transport route you celebrate tonight will help all of these already established transport systems. The clippers, like the communication system which speeds forward and coordinates a whole army division, will accelerate the movement of trade across the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea—and beyond to all South America.

What were days will become hours for businessmen and for their air mail. Air mail must always precede the shipment of goods in quantity. The bill of lading can go with the freight. The negotiation or sales contract must come before.

This is as true of Government business and lend-lease arrangements as it is of private business. The conference at Rio de Janeiro in 1941 preceded the great shipments of war materials to Latin America. Most delegates to that conference went by air.

Even though trade that normally courses through the port of New Orleans is $300,000,000 a year, this new air route connecting the Americas will increase that figure still further after the war.

Dynamic changes are taking place in midwestern industry. Decentralization is creating new plants, many of which will be pouring new post-war products down the Ohio and the Missouri and down the Mississippi and out through this great port of New Orleans.

Trade that builds lasting prosperity, however, is two-way trade. Latin America is opening new mines, developing new products, and expanding her tropical plantations. This new reciprocal trade, too, from a prosperous Latin America, will benefit New Orleans and the people of the entire Mississippi Valley.

And what of the increased tourist trade New Orleans should enjoy after the war by virtue of its mild and delightful winter climate? Many of the giant Pan American Clippers which will be serving Europe over the North Atlantic in the summer should operate out of New Orleans in the winter. They would provide frequent, low-cost, high-speed air service not only to Central America and the Canal Zone, but to other attractive Latin American countries where Pan American is established and is operating completely equipped air terminals. Many of the tourists will wish to linger here in the heart of the old South with your "vieux carre," your hospitality and your traditions—which no other city has to offer. The new triweekly service which begins tonight is not the opening of just another air-line route. The Clipper which leaves New Orleans goes only to the Canal Zone, yes. But at Merida; at Guatemala City; and at Balboa this new route connects with other already established Pan American routes. From the Canal Zone by Pan American-Grace, a part of our system, you can continue down the west coast to Peru and Chile—all the way to Argentina, and if you wish, you can also continue by air along the north or east coast to Venezuela, the Guianas and Brazil.

Throughout Latin America the Pan American system serves every important city—some 200 in all. In fact, New Orleans is now linked with a world transportation system which, in normal times, reaches the five great continents and is operating to Alaska as well.

We must think of the New Orleans service tonight as a man thinks of a tiny oak tree. We are planting it in the rich soil of the Delta so it may live beyond our own lifetime to the benefit of generations yet unborn.

The war has destroyed much. But it has also forced this Nation to create much that is new—particularly in aircraft design. This advance gives the people of the United States a solid base on which to build—a service which should truly link South America and North America to the lasting benefit of each.

Out through the great natural gateway of New Orleans will pour more than the products of industries. In through this gateway will pour more than tropical fruits and raw materials. We in New Orleans—we in the United States—have a better world to build.

This means that those of us who gathered here tonight must never forget, as we fly South, that Latin America has a deep and widely rooted culture from which we have much to learn; that Latin America has universities many decades older than even the oldest in the United States. Many of them had graduated hundreds of students before even Harvard or Yale had been founded.

With our "good neighbor" across the Gulf and the blue Caribbean we have rich stores of knowledge and culture to exchange—stores that cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

We must export on a far broader scale, for example, the findings of your great school of tropical medicine at Tulane University. Other universities must emulate Louisiana State's forward-looking program exchanging students with the grea Latin American universities and in this connection Loyola University's post-war program may well serve as a pattern. We must see to it, in short, that in the mind of the common man in many lands beyond the seas, New Orleans becomes synonymous with the very best that America has to give in commerce, in intellectual and cultural development, in good will.

If, in pursuing such an idea, Pan American Airways is able to help, as I firmly believe it can and will, then air transport will be worthy of the honor New Orleans has paid us tonight.

Government Purchase of Newspaper Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me from Ralph W. Pinkerton, publisher of the Ferndale Record, a newspaper published at Ferndale, Wash. Mr. Pinkerton states in a concise way reasons why a bill to require the Government to buy a certain amount of newspaper advertising each year should be passed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FERNDALE RECORD,
Ferndale, Wash.

DEAR SENATOR BANKHEAD: I want to congratulate you on introducing before Congress the bill to create an advertising fund for the Government to use in the war efforts of all kinds.

Ever since I bought this newspaper in 1924, I have learned that a newspaper is expected to support its Government while it is right. I have found that a newspaper should be patriotic and support its Government in the war effort, but why single us out to starve to death?

I commented to Senator BONE this afternoon in a letter that his profession, the law, is not being expected to work all during war days for nothing. But yet, 99 people out of 100 who walk into my front office, or 99 letters out of 100 I receive, are to talk over with me, or ask me, for some free publicity for the war effort. Now, granted that a newspaper should be patriotic, yet when the best printers have left newspapers because their salaries are not commensurate with war living costs, and when publishers and their families go out to buy and find that goods are from 60 to 100 percent higher than before the war, just where do the families of printers and publishers get off at? Can we live on patriotism alone?

Shipyards are paying big wages. Boeing reports $77,000,000 in wages paid this year, yet newspapers have lost 40 percent of their income, or more, in a period of rising and skyrocketing prices.

I say, Yes, the Government should pay for advertising. I had a very interesting conversation with a Canadian publisher a year ago, and then I talked with several when I was a guest speaker at the Canadian newspapermen's convention in Vancouver last September. Canadians couldn't believe that our Government was not spending any money for legitimate advertising. Canadians pointed out to me that the war-bond drives were a failure until the Government stepped in and started advertising. Too, I think the Canadian Government was a wee bit smarter at the start of the war than ours was, as it decided to spend money for advertising and keep all weekly and daily newspapers alive so in every community the newspapers would be financially able to publicize the war efforts. A starving, dying newspaper is not of much good to a country, but a live one in every community can do much good for our Government.

I think that war-bond drives will be a greater success when the Government itself advertises the drives, and really appeals to the people to buy. Seeing an ad from some shipyard does not have the appeal that a Government ad would.

Throughout the United States there has been a mortality of smaller newspapers since the war started. In some cases, the publishers have locked their doors as it was impossible or too hard a job to find enough money on which to live. Regardless of the alleged appeal of the radio or daily newspapers, yet in most small towns the appeal which produces the result is that published in the home-town newspaper, which has been read by families through the years.

Along that line, I wish to emphasize my point by saying that I am considering leaving my business immediately in the hands of my printer, and go out and get a war job of some kind. The tremendous loss of advertising volume makes such a move imperative. If this continues, publicity and support of needed war efforts will naturally be curtailed in this newspaper, as one man, of course, will not be able to run out the same size newspaper as two men could. The Government will be the loser.

I say it is not a subsidy, but merely buying space just as it would buy a ship, an airplane, or a tank, or for services for a doctor or lawyer. Buying advertising naturally means that the purchase of space does not buy a man's soul. I don't operate my newspaper that way. I try to call the shots as I see them.

I thank you for your cooperation in introducing the bill, and in closing wish to remind you that in England the Government there buys 17 percent of all advertising volume of newspapers.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH W. PINKERTON.

JUNE 1, 1943.

The Yardstick of Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have received a letter, from Mr. Wallace C. Speers, of New York City, which expresses a thought so in harmony with the principles of Christianity, and with what I believe to be sound public policy, that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES MCCUTCHEON & CO.,
New York, June 9, 1943.

Hon. RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLMAN: Close examination will show a very disturbing similarity between the present situation in our country and the one in France, which caused the downfall of that one time strong democracy—the same avidity of groups to gain for themselves at the expense of others, the same desire to soak another class, the same panic

attempts to patch the surface when basic matters are at fault, the same lack of complete faith in leadership and authority caused by more than a suspicion concerning the direction of their plans for our way of life, and so on.

No, I am not a reactionary, neither am I talking politics. I traveled in France on business trips for more than 20 years and saw it disintegrate. I do not want to see the same process follow on to its logical conclusion here. This is not entirely for selfish reasons, though I cannot forget the future of my 18-year-old son now in the Army Air Corps, my three little girls, and the host of other dear ones, friends and potential friends. It is primarily because I love this country of ours with a zeal that comes to those of us who have fought for it.

There is only one way that I know of to stop this spiral of disintegration and turn it into real constructive progress. That is by the use of practical Christianity. I do not mean the usual emotional or sentimental religionism, but a dynamic, real force of stupendous power. I am not naturally a religious man, but I do know from experience that practical Christianity is a conditioning force which makes our own specialized abilities more adequate in the service of mankind. You are in one of the key positions in the world to be of service to mankind.

It is very simple to apply this extra skill producing factor—just as simple as the application of a formula to a problem. Think of Christianity as a yardstick. Before taking any action, large or small, merely apply that yardstick to it. Say to yourself, "What is the Christian method of solving this situation?" Naturally, just as in the use of any other technique, this requires study and research. You would do this as a matter of course with problems of law, science, politics, or whatever, so there is nothing unusual in that.

But the results, they will be different and extraordinary. Why if labor and management, Democrat and Republican, rich and poor, colored and white, will sit down together as Christian individuals and apply this yardstick to their differences, every problem can be solved to the advantage of both sides as well as of the public at large, and consequently of the world and its future peace.

You as an outstanding leader in the affairs of a country which we are proud to call fundamentally Christian, can help enormously by taking that pride out of the hesitancy of embarrassed generalities and expressing it in the clear cut terms of your own belief in the actual real power of practical Christianity to make our Government the most adequate in the world in the service of all its people. "Christianity has not failed, it just has never been tried." Let's try it. May we hear from you on it?

Very respectfully submitted,

WALLACE C. SPEERS.

The Gasoline Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, recently there has been much discussion regarding the distribution and utilization of the limited amount of gasoline which the citizens of this country have available to them at the present time. One of the most plausible articles I have read insofar as suggestions relative to the utilization of gasoline are concerned, is an article by Mr. Igor Cassini, published recently in the Washington Times-Herald. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

THESE CHARMING PEOPLE

(By Igor Cassini)

In the opinion of all—except the Office of Price Administration officials, perhaps—one of the greatest national tragicomedies is the pleasure-driving ban. It is partly tragic because it touches such an important issue, and it is comic because it cannot work.

The Government has rationed gas because it was needed for vast military operations. The original allotments to civilians have been repeatedly cut down. In many areas, Washington especially, gas was not even available at times. Yet the public hasn't grumbled. The Army needs must come first, and I haven't heard anyone who ever complained or discussed that. All the gas and even automobiles could be taken away from the public if it were absolutely necessary for victory, and they would accept it.

But you cannot make Americans use the little gas they are given in the way dictated by a few Office of Price Administration officials. No more than you can coerce them into eating pork chops rather than lamb chops with the coupons they have. And no more than you can tell a good Irishman that he cannot touch his bottle of whisky until Sunday. You may sell him less whiskey, but you certainly cannot force him to drink it when you want.

The same goes for gas. Take the case of a businessman who works terribly hard all week long. He manages to get to his office by bus or by taxi, because he wants to save enough gas to drive to his golf club on Sunday. The golf club is quite far away, and there's no bus or trolley car that can drive him there. He cannot possibly find a taxi that'll drive him back to town from there. So he drives there in his car to enjoy his day of relaxation. But he's just at the third hole of his golf game when a cop, who has driven all the way there, comes and takes his number. The poor man tries to protest, but he's told that golf is pleasure, and that the Office of Price Administration and Mr. Ickes don't want him to get any pleasure out of life. Therefore he's guilty.

The consequence is that our man has had his Sunday completely ruined. He almost had a stroke of apoplexy and he had to drive to his doctor (which he was allowed to do, since it was not pleasure, but displeasure), who told him that he should take it easy for a while and it might be a good idea if he took some afternoons off and went to his country club instead of slaving in his office. So our poor man went back to his office grouchy and grumbling.

That's just one case. But it's rather typical.

What happens then is that people become annoyed with this bureaucratic display of power. And since they think that the law is stupid in this case, they find a way to get around it. It's like prohibition. It was the stupidest law that this country ever had, because it made America drink more than any other country in the world. There were plenty of ways to cheat the law.

If the pleasure driving ban was well regulated and made sense, people would adhere to it. Americans are patriotic people, and they are all eager to help in this war. But people won't stay terrorized by something they don't believe to be just. So the whole thing becomes a mess.

For instance I noticed myself that three cars were parked in front of the Rock Creek Club where the District tennis championships were being played. One of the cars belonged to the trainer, who works there. Another car belonged to a tournament official, and the third one to a newspaperman. All three were there for legitimate reasons. Yet the cops came and took their numbers.

The same afternoon I went to the Army and Navy Country Club. There were so many cars there you would have thought it was back in the good old days. And no cop in sight. Later I went by the house of a famous Washington hostess, who was entertaining at dinner, and there were at least 35 limousines parked in front. But no chance that anyone took the numbers of these cars. Mr. Harold Ickes' and Mr. Prentiss Brown's cars might have been among those.

Chevy Chase Club was the same way. There were more cars there than in the field days. And hundreds of vehicles were parked in front of the Water Gate concert.

It just shows that the people won't behave with the Office of Price Administration methods. If the gas situation is precarious, sell less of it, or cut down the coupons' value, if need be. Pass any rigid law you wish. But let the poor people enjoy the little gas they have in the way they best see fit. More gas is being used by police and Office of Price Administration to check who is driving for pleasure than the pleasure drivers could possibly use.

The American public is just as willing to cooperate to win this war as any of the Ickes or the Office of Price Administration "apostles of gloom."

Address by His Holiness Pope Pius XII to the Workers of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on June 13, 1943, His Holiness Pope Pius XII addressed the workers of Italy. The purport of the address is applicable to conditions in all countries. His warnings about the need for greater social justice for the masses "and fitting sharing by all in the goods of the country" come at a most appropriate moment in the history of the world, and it is to be hoped that they will be heeded by men everywhere.

The days and months immediately following the conclusion of the war will be fraught with danger, and it seems to me that no nation can afford to ignore the wise counsel of His Holiness to avert social disturbances and upheavals in the future by recognizing now, as Pope Pius said, that "The whole complex structure of society is in need of adjustment and improvement, thoroughly shaken as it is in its foundations." To institute the necessary adjustments and improvements, His Holiness urges in terms what should appeal to every man and woman of America:

These conditions of social security should be realized if we want society not to be

shaken at every season by turbulent ferments and dangerous uprising, but to become tranquil and go forward in harmony, peace, and mutual love.

This sound Christian philosophy expressed in the Pope's address is relevant to a measure pending before the Senate, Senate bill 1161, designed to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act. I ask unanimous consent to have the address of His Holiness Pope Pius XII inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your welcome presence, beloved sons and daughters, who spend your hours and days in toil to gain a livelihood for yourselves and for your families, brings before us a great thought and a great mystery: The thought that work was imposed by God on the first man, after sin, that he might seek his bread from the earth by the sweat of his brow, and the mystery that the Son of God, having come down from heaven to save the world, and having become man, submitted to this law of work and passed His youth laboring in Nazareth in the company of His foster father, so that he was considered and called "the carpenter's son." (Matthew, xiii: 55.)

SUBLIME MYSTERY

Sublime mystery that He should begin to work before He began to teach; a humble workman before being the teacher of all nations. (Cf. Acts 1: 1.)

You have come to us as to a father who has a greater delight in dealing with his children in proportion as their daily toil is harder and more continuous and the want and worries of their lives are more arduous and considerable.

You have come to us as to the Vicar of Christ who feels in himself, perpetuated by a sharing of God's power, that sense of tenderness and sympathy for the people by which our Redeemer was moved to cry out one day: "I have compassion on the crowd." (Mark, viii: 2.)

You have come to us as to the shepherd who fixes his gaze on you and extends it beyond you to that vastly greater section of his flock which the love of God has trusted to him; and in your love and devotion he sees faithfully represented the sentiments, the wishes, and the affection of so many of his absent children.

With all our heart we thank you for the great joy occasioned us by the opportunity of speaking a word of sincere benevolence and encouragement, a word which may serve to guide, sustain, and comfort you in these days disturbed by trouble and mourning.

WISE SOCIAL REFORMS

The weight of the present difficulties is felt by the mass of workers who are burdened and afflicted more than the others. But it is not felt by them alone. Every class has to carry its own burden, more or less painful and difficult to bear as it may be, and it is not only the social status of the workers, men and women, which calls for reconditioning and reform. The whole complex structure of society is in need of adjustment and improvement, thoroughly shaken as it is in its foundations.

But who is there who does not see that the labor question, because of the complexity and variety of the problems which it entails and the vast number of people it involves, is of such a kind and of such urgent importance as to merit closer, more watchful and more far-seeing attention?

It is a question of peculiar delicacy, the nerve center, one might call it, of the social body; but it is also at times a shifting and treacherous ground open to easy illusions and unwarranted, chimerical hopes for one who does not keep before the eye of his intelligence and the impulse of his heart the doctrine of justice, equity, charity, mutual understanding and adjustment inculcated by the law of God and the voice of the church.

THE CHURCH AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE JUST CLAIMS OF THE WORKING CLASS

You are certainly not unaware, beloved sons and daughters, of the fact that the church loves you intensely, and that it is not merely now that she has with material interest and love and a clear sense of the reality of things paid particular attention to the questions which regard you especially.

Our predecessors and we ourselves have not lost any opportunity of making all men understand by our repeated instructions your personal and family needs proclaiming as fundamental prerequisites of social concord those claims which you have so much at heart: A salary which will cover the living expenses of a family and such as to make it possible for the parents to fulfill their natural duty to rear healthily nourished and clothed children; a dwelling worthy of human persons; the possibility of securing for the children sufficient instruction and a becoming education; of foreseeing and forestalling times of stress, sickness, and old age.

These conditions of social security should be realized if we want society not to be shaken at every season by turbulent ferments and dangerous uprising but to become tranquil and go forward in harmony, peace, and mutual love.

Now, however laudable may be various provisions and concessions made by public authorities and the humane and generous sense that inspires many employers, who could affirm and maintain with truth that such ideals have been everywhere realized?

In any case, working men and women conscious of their great responsibility for the common good feel and appreciate their duty not to aggravate the burden of extraordinary difficulties under which peoples are groaning by representing their claims in this hour of universal and imperious needs in a noisy manner and through inconsiderate action. They continue their work and persevere in it with discipline and calm, thus contributing invalable support to the tranquillity and support of all in the social family.

To that peaceful concord we pay our tribute of praise and we beseech and exhort you paternally to continue in it with firmness and dignity. That, however, should not lead any one to think, as we insisted in our message of last Christmas, that all these questions are to be considered as solved.

THE FALSE PROPHETS

The church, guardian and teacher of truth, in asserting and defending courageously the rights of the working class on various occasions and combating error, has had to issue a warning against letting oneself be illuded by the mirage of specious and fatuous theories and visions of future well-being and against the deceptive enticements and seductions of false prophets of social prosperity who call evil good and good evil and who, boasting that they are the friends of the people, do not agree with those mutual agreements between capital and labor, employers and employed, which maintain and promote social concord for their common progress and advantage.

Such friends of the people you have already heard in the public streets, in clubs, in congresses. You recognize their promises on handbills. You hear them in their songs and anthems. But when have the facts answered to their words or reality to their hopes?

Deception and delusion have been and are the lot of private individuals and peoples who have trusted them and followed them along ways which so far from improving have worsened and aggravated the conditions of life and of material and moral progress. Such false prophets would have us believe that salvation must come from a revolution which shall overturn social order and assume a national character.

NOT SOCIAL REVOLUTION

The social revolution claims to raise the working class to power. An empty word and a mere show incapable of realization in fact, you see that the working class remains bound, yoked, and tied to the force of state capitalism, which restrains and subjects all, not only the family, but even the conscience, and transforms the workers into a gigantic labor machine.

Like the other social systems and orders which it claims to fight, it classifies, regulates, and presses all into a fearful war instrument which demands not only blood and health, but also the goods and prosperity of the people. And if the guiding spirits are proud of this or that advantage or improvement secured in the field of labor, making use of it for noisy, boastful propaganda, such material advantage is never a fair recompense for the renunciations imposed on each one which injure the rights of the human person, freedom in the ruling of the family, in the exercise of one's profession, in the conditions of citizenship, and especially in the practice of religion and even in the realm of conscience.

No, your salvation, beloved sons and daughters, does not lie in revolution. And it is against the genuine and sincere profession of Christianity to drift, thinking only of one's own exclusive and material advantage, which, however, always appears uncertain, toward a revolution which proceeds from injustice and civil insubordination and to make oneself unfortunately responsible for the blood of fellow citizens and the destruction of common property.

Woe to him who forgets that a true national society incorporates social justice and demands a just and fitting sharing by all in the goods of the country. Otherwise you understand that the Nation would end in a sentimental makeshift in a nonsensical pretense which would be an excuse for certain groups to withdraw themselves from the sacrifices needed to secure public equilibrium and peace.

And you would then realize how, when national society had lost the nobility given to it by God, internal strife and struggle would become a threat which all might fear.

BUT AN EVOLUTION THROUGH AGREEMENT AND GENEROSITY

Salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution but in an evolution through concord. Violence has ever achieved only destruction, not construction; the kindling of passions, not their pacification; the accumulation of hate and destruction, not the reconciliation of the contending parties. And it has reduced men and parties to the difficult task of building slowly after sad experience on the ruins of discord.

It is only a progressive and prudent evolution, full of courage and in conformity with nature, enlightened and guided by the Christian laws of justice and equity, that can lead to the fulfillment of the honorable desires and needs of the worker. Not to destroy them, but to build and consolidate; not to abolish private property, the foundation of family stability, but to work for its extension as the reward of the conscientious toil of every working man and woman, so that little by little may be diminished that mass of uneasy and rash people who, sometimes from taciturn despair, at others through broad instinct, allow themselves to be carried off by false doctrines or by the clever tricks of agitators who are bereft of all moral sense; not to dissipate private capital, but to promote its regulation under careful control as a means and help toward securing and increasing the genuine welfare of

the whole people; not to restrain nor to give preference exclusively to industry, but to procure its harmonious marriage to handicraft and agriculture, which exploits the multifarious and necessary production of the Nation's soil; not to aim in the use of technical progress solely at the maximum profit but also to avail one's self of the advantages which come from it, in order to better the personal conditions of the worker, to make his work less arduous and difficult, and to consolidate the bonds which hold his family together in the place where he dwells, in the work by which he lives; not to aim at making the lives of individuals depend entirely on the whims of the state, but to procure rather that the state, whose duty it is to promote the common good, may, through social institutions such as insurance and social security societies, supply support and complete all that helps to strengthen workers' associations, and especially the fathers and mothers of families who are earning a livelihood for themselves and their dependents through work.

FAITH IN CHRIST AND FIDELITY TO THE CHURCH THE DEEP ROOTS OF TRUE BROTHERHOOD

You will say perhaps that this is a beautiful vision of the true state of things. But how can it be realized and effected in daily life? We need above all a great righteousness of will and perfect loyalty of purpose and action in the course and regulation of public life as well on the part of the citizens as of the governing authorities.

We need a spirit of true concord and brotherhood animating all: Superiors and subjects, employers and workers, great and small—in a word, in all classes of the people.

Your gathering around us, beloved sons and daughters, with the added fact that there are assembled from your various spheres of activity here in the house of the common Father representatives of all the groups, is for us a test and a proof that you know, feel, and understand where are to be found the deep roots of the divinely genuine social sense of "brothers bound by a pact."

"All made to the semblance of One only, all sons of One only redemption." That is the holy religion which you hold in common; the same profession of faith in the redeemer of all, Jesus Christ; in the same fidelity to His holy church and to His vicar.

And we raise to God our fervent prayer that all the vast, measureless class of working men and women may share our faith so that Our Lord may open, in justice and charity, the road to the generous and peaceful progress so ardently desired by us which may make Italy prosperous and strong in an unshaken Christian framework.

A MONSTROUS CALUMNY

We are not unaware—and you yourselves will have been able to make proof of it—how, in these times so burdensome and difficult for family and civil life, human passions take occasion to lift their heads again and to foment suspicions and to garble words and facts. Hence it is that propaganda of antireligious inspiration is circulating among the people, and especially among the working classes, that the Pope wished the war, that the Pope supports the war and supplies money for its continuance, that the Pope does nothing for peace.

Never, perhaps, was there launched a calumny more monstrous or absurd than this.

Who does not know, who does not see, who is there that cannot ascertain for himself that no one insistently opposed the outbreak, the advance, and the spread of the war more insistently than we have in every manner allowed us; that no one has pleaded and exhorted more continuously than we have: Peace, peace, peace; that no one has sought to lessen its horrors more than we have?

The sums of money which the charity of the faithful puts at our disposal are not set apart for, nor do they go to sustain the war, but to dry the tears of the widows and orphans, to console families anxious and sorrowing for their dear ones far away or missing, to succor the suffering, the poor, and the needy.

Our heart and our lips, which do not contradict one another, are witnesses to all this, for we do now deny by deed that we affirm by word, and we are conscious of the falsity of what the enemies of God are insidiously circulating in order to disturb the workers and the people, and from the hardships of the life they endure draw an argument against faith and religion, which indeed is the sole comfort and hope which upholds man upon earth in the hour of sorrow and misfortune.

No one can blot out or pervert the purpose and content of our discourses and messages in their purpose and content. All have been able to hear them as a word of truth and of peace, as promptings of our soul to bring peace to the world and to enlighten those in power. They are undeniable proofs of the immense desires that spring from our heart that on this earth, given to man as a dwelling place on his journey to a better and imperishable life, there may prevail the perfect harmony of the whole human race.

The church does not fear the light of truth, neither for the past nor for the present nor for the future. When the circumstances of the times and human passions will permit or call for the publication of documents not yet published concerning the constant activity pursued during this terrible war in favor of peace by the Holy See, which feared neither rebuffs nor opposition, there will appear in more than midday light the stupidity of such accusations, which spring not so much from ignorance as from that irreligious spirit and that contempt of the church which takes root only in some human hearts more inclined and ready, alas, to pervert the right and kindly intentions with which the spouse of Christ is animated than to benefit the people, to smooth and ease the difficulties of life, to uphold souls in the midst of the serious conditions of the present hour.

Tell the church's detractors that the truth will shine forth as it shines forth today in your hearts for all those who pay reasonable homage to the good they perceive and who do not believe in lies and calumnies. When the truth of the facts and our work will have been revealed they will be confounded who maliciously try to throw on the Papacy the responsibility for all the blood that has flowed in the battle or land, in the air and in the sea, and in the ruins of cities.

STRENGTH FROM PRAYER

Let your thoughts and the feelings of your hearts quicken your faith, Christian working men and women, renew your life of faith and strengthen it by daily prayer. Let prayer begin to sanctify and close your working day. Let the thoughts and feelings of your hearts enlighten and inflame your souls, especially during the repose of Sundays and feast days, and let them accompany and guide you in assisting at the holy mass.

Our Saviour, worker like you in His earthly life, was obedient to the Father even unto death; and now, on the altar, the unbloody Calvary renews unendingly the sacrifice of Himself for the good of the world, completes His work of redemption, and becomes the almoner of grace and of the bread of life for those souls who love Him and in their weakness turn to Him to be restored.

Before the altar in the church let every Christian worker renew his resolution to labor in obedience to the divine command of work, whatsoever it may be, intellectual or manual, to gain by his toil and sacrifices the bread for his dear ones, to keep in mind the moral purpose of life here below and the happiness of eternal life, conforming his intentions to those of the Saviour and making his work a hymn of praise to God.

THE OBSERVANCE OF THE LAW OF GOD IN FACTORIES

In every circumstance and on every occasion, dear sons and daughters, uphold and defend your personal dignity. The material with which you work, created by God from the beginning of the world and in the laboratory of ages molded by Him on the earth and deep beneath the surface of the earth by cataclysms, natural evolution, eruptions, and transformations so as to prepare the best abode for man and for his work, let that material be for you a continual reminder of the creative hand of God and let it lift your soul to Him, the Supreme Lawgiver, whose precepts must be observed even in factory life.

Perhaps boys and girls join your company and work together with you. Remember that a great reverence is owed to children and the innocent and that Christ affirms that for the one who scandalizes them it were better that a millstone should be put about his neck and that he be cast into the depths of the sea.

Oh, fathers and mothers, how your hearts must beat with anxious fear as your sons and daughters go to the factories. Do you workers take their place in vigilant guard over the innocence and purity of those young workers constrained by employment and family needs to withdraw themselves from their parents' affectionate care.

On the older people and on their example, on the energetic and decisive will of the factory management, in insisting on decent discipline, depends the preservation of physical and spiritual health in the young workers. On the contrary, immorality, greed of pleasure and extravagance endanger as well the future generations. Let no word, no joke, no story that could offend your youthful listeners pass your lips.

Even in the daily life of the factory may the young workers enjoy the help of persons drawn from the ranks of the clergy, of the religious sisterhoods, and of Catholic Action, who in agreement with the management, will devote themselves with all their physical and moral energy to their interests. Let there never fail, however, between the workers themselves mutual affection and respect, good example, the word of warning and encouragement and even whatever little material help they can afford.

PETITION FOR DIVINE ASSISTANCE

And now let us return to the scene we presented at the beginning of our discourse and point out to you once more the divine model of the Christian worker. Christ the carpenter (Mark, vi: 3) in the workshop of Nazareth, Son of God and restorer of the lost grace of Adam. He pours out on you that power, that patience, that virtue which makes you great before Him, the most exalted image of the worker whom you can admire and adore.

In your workshops and factories, under the sun in the fields, in the darkness of the mines, amid the heat of the furnace and the cold of the ice factories, wherever the word of Him who commands may call, may there descend upon you the abundance of His favors, which may afford you help, safety, and solace, and make meritorious of another world happiness the hard work in which here below you spend and sacrifice your life.

Have no doubt: Christ is always with you. Imagine you see Him in the places of your work, passing among you, noting your toil, listening to your conversations, consoling your hearts, composing your disagreements, and you shall see the workshop changed into the sanctuary of Nazareth; and there will reign among you, too, that trust, that order, that concord which are a reflection of the blessing of heaven which increases here below

and conserves justice and goodwill among men who are steadfast in faith, in hope, in the love of God.

While, then, we invoke divine protection upon our beloved working men and women, upon your families, upon those who direct and guide you in your work, upon your workshops, that the Lord may preserve them from every danger and harm, with all our heart we bestow on you as a token of the choicest graces our paternal apostolic benediction.

Zoot-Suiter Termites

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 15, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, instead of critizing and abusing our servicemen for tearing "zoot suits" off a bunch of marauding criminals throughout the country, we may find that we owe them a lasting debt of gratitude; and if they just keep it up until they obliterate this bunch of termites, we might be justified in giving to each one who renders such services a badge of distinction, an increase in pay, or an extra furlough home.

From an article appearing in last Sunday's Washington Post, one would think that a degenerate society and a lawless element in our armed forces are responsible for this whole trouble. That article ought to be encouraging, not only to the zoot-suit rapists our brave men in uniforms have been taking care of, but it should be doubly encouraging to our crackpot promoters of "social gains," whose inflammatory activities, speeches, and writings have encouraged these Negro rapists and their cohorts in the Black Dragon Society, to carry on their criminal activities.

This article tells us that—

Everywhere the zoot-suiters are composed of underprivileged youngsters, or those who feel themselves to be such—a fact that must always be remembered in any attempt to deal with them.

This article also tells us that:

The uniform of this (zoot-suit) movement is fascinating—

Now hold yourselves down, do not get excited; but listen to this: It goes on to say:

The baggy trousers that narrow around the ankles give freedom of movement for jitterbugging—

Probably that is what is so fascinating.

And—

The writer continues—

the tail of the long coat swirls like the girls' skirts during a pirouette. The outfit is very expensive, costing $100 or more.

Chief features—

Says the writer—

are the broad felt hat, the long key chain, the pocketknife of a certain size and shape.

While the writer did not describe the knife fully, it is described in another publication as having "a long blade on one end, a hook on the other."

Now when a red-blooded American soldier, sailor, or marine sees one of these "underprivileged" objects of "social gains," or a group of them—they usually go in groups—he no doubt feels justified in yielding to his natural, patriotic impulse to exterminate such termites, or, to use the words of his oath, to defend this country against all enemies "foreign and domestic."

But the truth is that these servicemen were being attacked by gangs of these "underprivileged" zoot-suiters, dressed in these $100 outfits, and armed with stilletoes, or knives, with "a very long blade on one end, a hook on the other." One of these gangs, composed largely of Negroes, would slip up on a serviceman out strolling with his girl, beat up the young man and then rape the girl; and probably murder both of them.

Of course, those service men resisted those savage brutes, and retaliated in no uncertain terms; and when the facts are known they will receive the plaudits of all decent patriotic Americans.

But this article in the Washington Post says:

Let it be said at once that the gangsterism of our sailors in the Los Angeles area is no less alarming than the violent reactions of the zoot-suiters.

Is it "gangsterism" for our brave, patriotic soldiers, sailors, and marines to defend themselves and to defend innocent white girls from attacks at the hands of these brutal blacks and half-breeds?

It may seem so to one who is "fascinated" by a zoot suit, but red-blooded Americans who experience no such thrill of fascination will applaud our servicemen and thank them for the manhood and the courage they have displayed in stripping the masks, as well as the zoot suits, from these loathsome criminals and protecting innocent American girls from their beastly attacks.

Reduction of Federal Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, within the last few weeks, a great deal has been said about reducing Federal employment. I have personally received letters from constituents protesting top-heavy and overstaffed Federal agencies. One of these letters, I forwarded to the Honorable Paul McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, for his study and his answer. To this letter, he has replied in detail, giving new facts and a new angle for further thought to this highly important subject, and especially to the employment rolls of the War Manpower Commission over which he presides as chairman. I ask that his letter be reproduced in full at this point:

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1943.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOKS: This is in reply to your letter of May 31, referring to the letter which you received from Mr. E. C. Burris with respect to employment expansion in the Federal service, a copy of which he forwarded direct to me.

I note Mr. Burris says the statistics in question referred to employment by war agencies. The term "war agencies" is a pretty all-inclusive one, as you know. I assume Mr. Burris really refers to the War and Navy Departments, however, and not to what we in Washington think of as war agencies. The official employment figures for the War and Navy Departments, while not agreeing exactly with Mr. Burris' figures, are close enough.

I note Mr. Burris says "one would gain the impression from these figures that we were fighting the war with civilians." His implication is that this use of civilians is a reprehensible thing. If that is his implication, I must emphatically take issue with him. In a total war such as this the civilian stands in support of the troops; he is fighting this war just as surely as the man in uniform. The maintenance of a great uniformed army demands a tremendous army of civilian workers. The concept of sending soldiers to fight without guns, tanks, planes, equipment, food, and other necessaries is a most ridiculous one.

Possibly Mr. Burris fails to recognize that the vast majority of the civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments are engaged in the manufacture of guns (rifles, machine guns, naval guns, antiaircraft guns, etc.), and ammunition; repair and fitting of ships; repair and maintenance of airplanes; manufacture of various essential items of clothing and equipment for troops; the development, design, and production of new devices of war—radar for example. Does Mr. Burris realize that, included in this civilian personnel of which he is so critical, are the transport crews of Army transports, carrying troops and supplies to our bases abroad? Does he realize that it is civilian employees of these two Departments who maintain the Panama Canal, which is vital to our war plans? Does he know that it is civilian employees of these two Departments who did the repair and rehabilitation work in Hawaii following Pearl Harbor, and who continue to man the maintenance and repair yards there? Without these civilian employees the solders' families would have difficulty getting their just allotments to help meet expense.

Mr. Burris makes a point of the civilian employees of these two departments expanding at a faster percentage rate than the armed forces. This, it seems to me, is natural and to be expected. Certainly I suspect Mr. Burris would have been the first to complain if, due to scarcity of civilian personnel, young men had been inducted and left without uniforms, equipment, food, etc., for long periods of time. I do not claim there has been no wastage of men or money in our war effort. In any great and rapid conversion from peace to war there will inevitably be certain wastages of manpower. I do not, however, believe they have been as great or as blameworthy as Mr. Burris would have the country feel.

Few people consider the civilian worker in a private plant manufacturing guns or other munitions of war to be a slacker or unpatriotic; if he is employed by the Federal Government, however, in similar manufacturing activities he seems to become, in the

minds of many, a draft evader. It is a type of thinking that, frankly, puzzles and disturbs me.

Among the so-called nonwar agencies which Mr. Burris mentions is my own agency—the Federal Security Agency. Here Mr. Burris has figures which seem to show an increase of 68.5 percent. This apparent increase is not a real one, as the following figures will show:

Federal Security Agency

	June 1940	August 1942	October 1942	
			Agency	C.S.C.
Office of the Administrator	36	1,471	1,419	1,419
Social Security Board	12,164	14,056	13,525	13,525
Public Health Service	8,164	14,319	13,770	13,362
National Youth Administration	2,127	1,207	------	13,511
Office of Education	275	694	658	658
Civilian Conservation Corps	677	60	43	43
Freedmen's Hospital	345	(1)	(1)	408
St. Elizabeths	1,832	1,892	1,866	1,866
Food and Drug Administration	951	823	825	825
Employment Service	------	------	20,832	20,832
Total	26,571	34,522	52,938	66,449

[1] Included in Public Health Service figures.

Note that in the Civil Service figures for October 1942—which are the figures used by Mr. Burris—the National Youth Administration is shown as having 13,511 employees. The agency's own report shows none. The National Youth Administration was transferred out of the Federal Security Agency by Executive order of September 17, 1942, and consequently was not reported by the agency. The Civil Service Commission, however, did not receive detailed figures covering the transfer in time to correct its October figures. One other factor here should be emphasized, too, for clarification. The National Youth Administration is shown in 1940 and in August 1942 as having a relatively small number of employees. In October 1942 the Civil Service Commisison shows for National Youth Administration, 13,511, an apparent increase of about 12,000. This increase results from including as employees persons who had previously been technically called "project workers" and not considered as employees. There was no actual increase as these persons had been on the project pay rolls but, by an earlier ruling from the Comptroller General were not looked upon as "employees." Thus, the figures are really as follows:

June 30, 1940	Aug. 31, 1942	Oct. 31, 1942	
		Agency	C. S. C.
26,571	34,522	52,938	66,449
Subtract Employment Service		20,832	20,832
		32,106	45,617
Subtract National Youth Administration		----------	13,511
		----------	32,106

Thus the increase between June 30, 1940, and October 31, 1942, is really only 5,535 or 20.8 percent. All of this increase practically is in the United States Public Health Service, whose work has been greatly expanded by the war as you know.

I feel as strongly as anybody that we must make every effort to keep the size of the civilian branch of the Federal Government to the minimum consistent with the requirements of getting our job done. It is not possible, however, to stop dead on all so-called nonwar activities. There are many peacetime activities of the Government which must be continued in wartime; in fact, quite often the war lays an increased burden upon them. The work of the Department of Agriculture or the Civil Aeronautics Administration might be taken as illustrative of peacetime, non-war agencies whose work, under pressure of war's demands, takes on added importance and requires added staff.

I deplore any wastage of manpower of which the Government agencies may have been guilty; I wonder, however, if it is humanly possible to move from peace to war as rapidly as we have had to do without wastage.

I believe all responsible public officials are trying to do a sincere job. Effectiveness is not enhanced, however, by destructive attacks on the good faith of public servants. It is dangerous to draw conclusions from cold statistics unless the factors included in the statistics are thoroughly known.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see a returning interest in the matter of reducing Federal employment. I am glad to have the recent report of the Bureau of the Budget recommending a reduction of several agencies and departments of government by some 41,000 persons. Our colleague the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK, is to be highly commended for his recent report showing prospective employment is being reduced by some 300,000 persons; and now I am glad to report that sentiment is crystallizing in the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives for a reduction of the War Department by 100,000 persons.

It is true that Congress should not reduce Government employment to the point that the normal functions of government are crippled, and we should most assuredly not make reductions which will hurt the war effort. On the other hand, reductions in employment which will promote efficiency and economy in government should be encouraged and should be the goal toward which we in this Congress should drive. In such a time as this, it is most enlightening to have statements like the one set forth above from Chairman McNutt as a guide so that in our efforts to reduce, we will not hopelessly injure or retard the proper operation of any Federal agency.

Wings for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 18 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, for a number of years one of the great leaders in the crusade for adequate air power has been the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. A copy of Shipmate recently came to my office, and I read with very great interest an article by the able Senator entitled "Wings for the Future." It is an impressive, thoughtful article, and should be generally read. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINGS FOR THE FUTURE

(By Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada)

Development of aviation in the post-war world will involve changes more revolutionary than the change from the early horseless carriage to the modern high powered and streamlined motor car.

These changes probably will take place within a span of not more than 5 years, as compared with the more than 40 years required for the development of the automobile to its present high state of efficiency.

Immediately following the war, giant transport planes will come into general use; but these planes, with a probable ceiling of 35,000 feet, will be only the forerunner of the true stratosphere planes which will follow them. The speed and range of these stratosphere planes—primarily passenger carriers—will be such as to make a policy of economic isolation impossible for any country on the globe.

Huge cargo planes without bodies—true flying wings—will become the commonplace vehicle of international transportation for virtually all articles and commodities as to which the time factor between production and delivery has any considerable importance. Engineers already have prepared designs for such a flying wing, to have a loaded weight of 175,000 pounds, of which more than half will be useful load.

To feed main routes of transcontinental and transoceanic air transport, both helicopters and cargo gliders will come into major use. The Navy has been experimenting with helicopters in its antisubmarine campaign, and helicopters soon will be in large-scale production for lend-lease. The use of glider pick-up technique has been highly developed by the Army for troop-carrying purposes and this same technique will be adopted for commercial loads in the post-war era.

Domestic air lines in the United States will fly more than 6,000,000,000 passenger-miles in 1946, more than four times the distance flown in 1941, according to a prediction by William A. M. Burden, Special Aviation Assistant to Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones.

Transoceanic and intercontinental flying by American passenger planes will show a six-fold increase in 1946 over 1941, Mr. Burden predicts. Fulfillment of this prediction hangs on conditions likely to be largely affected by the outcome of the present world war.

Nationalistic interests will foster the major problem in expansion of global aviation during the post-war period.

United States air transport companies today are flying more than 60,000 route-miles through and between bases all over the world. However, these bases, mainly developed by American money, are precluded from use in post-war commercial aviation. They are for wartime purposes only, and not for civil aviation, so far as their use is now defined; and the routes now being flown probably are not in all cases the logical routes for post-war air commerce. Further, many of the bases now in use are on foreign soil, and many of the routes now being flown traverse, of necessity, the skies above foreign lands.

The need for some international understanding regarding post-war air travel and air commerce is very clear. As the basis for such an international understanding, we must have an integrated, coordinated, consistent plan and program for development of our own commercial aviation in the post-war world.

However, nothing should be done by this country that would for a moment release American sovereignty and absolute control of the air over and about American owned or controlled territory.

However Utopian may be our view of international relationships, post-war, the present world conflict has demonstrated, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that nationalist views and thoughts are prevailing in the minds of men, and will continue to prevail for a long time to come. In our thoughts and calculations for world harmony, we must not lose sight of our national welfare, and our patriotic concepts.

Commercial air transport officials are reported to be thinking along the lines of setting up an air transport czar with virtually unlimited powers over the destinies of commercial aviation, both domestic and international. While it must be apparent that unification of purpose, development, and direction is essential to our post-war air supremacy, serious consideration must be given to whether such unification is to be achieved through delegations of powers to a czar selected or agreed upon by aviation interests, or through a proper exercise of regulatory and other powers by an appropriate Government agency. Our form of government does not lend itself to the promotion of a czar of any kind, and no agency can be tolerated under our constitutional democracy that would for a moment transcend the power of control of the people through their Congress.

The British are in one respect better off than we are with regard to ability to plan for conversion of wartime flying to peacetime air transport. While virtually all flying in Great Britain today still is under the Royal Air Force, the British government is planning to extricate it from military domination solely; and the Royal Air Force Transport Command, while it completely subordinates civil aviation to military necessity, is being operated with a clear view to the need for civilian air transportation after the war, and to the desirability, from the British viewpoint, of assuring British dominance in post-war world aviation.

Capt. H. H. Balfour, British Parliamentary Under Secretary for Air, has warned that after the war "all bets will be off" on routes now being flown by American transports, for war purposes, in or over the British Empire.

Canadian policy on air transport has been officially summed up as follows:

"The Government sees no good reason for changing its policy that trans-Canada airlines is the sole Canadian agency which may operate international air services.

"Within Canada trans-Canada airlines will continue to operate on transcontinental systems, and such other services of a main line character as may from time to time be designated by the Government.

"Competition between air services over the same route will not be permitted, whether between a publicly owned service and a privately owned service or between two privately owned services."

In Mexico, according to Gen. Alberto Salinas Carranza, Chief of the Mexican Department of Civil Aeronautics, American aviation companies intending to own ground facilities must incorporate subsidiary Mexican companies. Mexico "looks with favor" on the growth of Mexican air lines doing domestic business and expanding into foreign fields, according to General Carranza.

Other countries which concern themselves with the post-war aviation problem approach it from similar nationalistic viewpoints.

When the First World War ended, the United States had within reach its greatest opportunity for sea power. It did not grasp that opportunity. American shipping interests saw the opportunity, but no one else did; the great American public was sick of all phases of internationalism.

After the present war we shall have a similar opportunity for establishing our power over the great ocean of the air. Whether or not we grasp that opportunity will depend in large part on public interest in or public indifference to the opportunity, and the problems which it involves.

Post-war air policy and post-war maritime policy must and will be closely tied together. Foreign trade has been our greatest industry for more than a generation. The dominant position in our national economy which has heretofore been held by our merchant marine will be held, after this war, not by our merchant marine alone, but hand-in-hand by our merchant marine and our merchant air force.

Just how far post-war naval policy and post-war air policy are to be integrated is a matter which should be, and undoubtedly is, receiving most serious consideration by our naval planners. This is a point on which I do not hold myself out as an expert; but I feel very strongly that, in resolving the issues involved, every effort must be made to avoid certain mistakes which have in the past been made with respect to naval policy.

The Navy today is spending lives to redeem the mistakes of its prewar critics.

The Navy is too busy fighting a war to take time out for recriminations—too busy to point out that it is fighting that war against odds foisted upon it by legislative errors during the past 20 years. But it is important that someone should point out this fact, for it must be clear that we shall face immediately after this war naval decisions equally as grave as those recently made clear by hindsight. These decisions, of course, will by no means be confined to matters affecting aviation. None of these decisions should be deferred through public or legislative apathy, nor allowed to suffer by quick disposal at a post-war conference without a long background of public analysis.

Each year the Navy submits to Congress its estimates of our naval needs—estimates representing the best thought on foreign naval developments, changes and trends in world political strategy, and technical advances. The Navy's recommendations, submitted in connection with these estimates, both grow out of and sum up analyses, made by the most highly trained specialists in the Department, respecting our position among the world powers, and respecting the type and size of Navy which we must maintain for minimum safety.

But until the outbreak of the present war each naval appropriation bill in its turn became a subject of varied onslaughts, ranging from sniping to mass attack. A parade of witnesses appeared at the congressional hearings to dispute item after item of the Navy's estimates and recommendations. These witnesses challenged what they inferred to be the Navy's foreign policy. They hacked at the size of the fleet. They quibbled over the proportions of its components. They even took issue with the caliber of guns.

Each annual inning in this contest of professional naval opinion versus civilian opinion exhumed an old problem for Congress: Whether to be guided by a multitude of laymen with a constitutional right to be heard or whether to accept the findings of professional naval authorities who have devoted lifetimes to the understanding of their specialties. The successive Congresses have shown no agreement on this basic problem, with the result that many a man who listened to wrong counsel in the year before the war is having troubled sleep after reading about the Herculean odds which his vote bequeathed the Navy.

The thread of this dilemma has run through every naval appropriation bill between the end of the last war and the outbreak of the present war. It colored our decision at the Disarmament Congress when Congress acceded to the mood of the times and concurred on the scrapping of tonnage in a fateful bet on world peace. It has slashed nearly every naval estimate submitted in the years between the Disarmament Conference and Pearl Harbor. And the conflicting opinions of laymen and experts flowered during the era when the issue took the illogical label of "airplane against battleship." Thus over the years was erected the structure which was in existence in December 1941.

Whatever the shape of the post-war world, and whatever the agreements of the United Nations, we shall insist that the defeated enemy be disarmed—completely, beyond possibility of circumvention, and for many years to come. When this has come to pass, we can expect the universal hunger for peace to overflow into the argument that, with the disappearance of an armed enemy, and conditional upon his remaining disarmed, there is no longer any need for a fleet. Bolstered by the post-war economy wave, this contention will have many adherents.

By the same token, we can expect many shadings of opinion on the question of whether our country shall participate in projects for Allied policing of the world; and, contingent on our decision to participate, the degree of naval participation and participation of the naval air arm, within such a military establishment. It may be that extremists will attempt to read an elegy to naval power, and to short-circuit naval evolution by advocating world policing by aviation alone.

Probably we may expect pressure not only for this doctrine but also for its corollary that if the police role should be shouldered by aviation, it should be performed by commercial air liners rather than by the armed services. This issue, of course, is a straw man because the record shows a highly commendable degree of harmony between the Navy and private transport auxiliaries. But while the naval air arm properly has shown no aspiration for the functions performed by private enterprise, there are indications that the role may be urged upon it.

Equally bound up in the skein of naval policy is the question of the number of overseas bases we should have, the nature of our sovereignty over them, and whether they should be conceived as joint bases or for the use of aircraft alone.

Ultimately, most of the argument probably will settle into two main lines of opinion: The nature and degree of our participation in a world concert, and whether our military role therein shall sacrifice naval power to air power. My own position, though based on many years of advocacy of air power, does not include the usual condemnation of ships which is common to air enthusiasts. To take such a dogmatic stand is to slur the Navy's brilliant role in every engagement between Midway and the present instant.

Ahead of us lie the normal and lusty disagreements inherent to a people whose national decisions are made by democratic processes. The issues will try the souls of whatever men in Congress must cast the portentious votes. But though we may see much contention between the partisans of aviation and the technicians who will design the new patterns of naval power, it is doubtful there will be any basic conflict. A safe guide to future thinking has been furnished by Admiral King, who recently said:

"I know of no sea-going naval officer who does not understand thoroughly that aviation is the sine qua non of almost every phase of modern warfare. Likewise, I know of no such officer who holds that aviation by itself will win the war. I think we all realize that it is coordination that counts, and that we must make the maximum use of whatever weapon will be most effective under a given set of conditions."

Aid for Resort Owners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention today to a very serious war casualty. This serious casualty exists not only in my district but in other districts in northern Minnesota and northern Michigan. In northern Wisconsin, in the past 20 years, hard-working and honest people have taken over lands near the lakes and have turned them into high-grade resorts. If it were not for the courage and initiative of these people, northern Wisconsin would be barren and cut-over wasteland. These resorts have fulfilled a very useful purpose in our national life. Vacationists from every part of America have flooded to these resorts during the summer months. Hundreds and thousands of hay-fever victims have used this area as their haven.

In the past 10 years these resort owners in northern Wisconsin have expanded and invested heavily in improvements in order to accommodate vacationists and convalescents. Many of these properties are heavily mortgaged. In northern Wisconsin alone the combined value of these A–1 resorts exceeds $20,000,000. This is a heavy investment and the largest single business in northern Wisconsin. The bread and butter of northern Wisconsin depends upon the welfare of these resorts. If they continue to exist, northern Wisconsin has a future. If they are driven into bankruptcy and lose their resorts, the future of northern Wisconsin is not very bright.

These resort owners, everyone of them, are great Americans. They have worked hard and they have gambled all their savings in that enterprise. We have a situation which has arisen now which has made this business a war casualty. A lack of gasoline and rubber has shut the doors to vacationists and convalescents. The desire of every American is to remain on the job for the duration and this has likewise made this enterprise a war casualty. For the duration the investments in the resort business are in a very critical state. It behooves the Government to come to the aid of this great American business as it has come to the aid of other classes.

In spite of the fact that these resorts, as a result of the war, will have little if any business, the taxes must be paid, the interest on the mortgage must be paid and the payments on the mortgage must be paid. These enterprising people have every right to expect that they be given aid to hold on to their business so that their sons who are fighting on every battle front in the world will have something to come back to. All these resort owners want for the duration is an honest opportunity to hang on to what they have. Our Government has come to the aid of other groups in such a crisis and I feel it should come to the aid of these people.

For that reason I have introduced a bill calling for an appropriation of $25,000,000 to be divided as follows: Five million dollars of this sum to be allotted to the Smaller War Plants Corporation enabling them to make loans at 3 percent interest to any resort owner who needs the money to pay his taxes, his interest, and his principal on the mortgage. This loan to be paid back within 5 years after the cessation of gasoline and tire rationing. This appropriation provides also that these loans be available until 6 months after the cessation of gasoline and tire rationing.

This bill which I have introduced appropriates $20,000,000 to the Veterans' Administration to be used in sending convalescent soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen to these resorts at rates to be agreed upon by the Veterans' Bureau and the resort owners. This $20,000,000 will also be available to the Veterans' Bureau for the leasing and purchase of any resort for convalescing purposes.

We already need, and we are going to need very soon, many more facilities for the adequate care of the convalescent veterans. Northern Wisconsin alone has facilities available to take care of more than 20,000 convalescing veterans. It would be unwise for our Government to turn its back at these facilities in northern Wisconsin already available. All that needs to be done is to provide the funds for that purpose. There is no need for the useless expenditure of huge sums of money for the building of huge hospitals especially when materials are as critical as they are now. We in northern Wisconsin already have the facilities available. They are already built. They are and will be idle for the duration. It is only good sound business judgment to make use of them.

And in our making use of them for convalescing purposes, our Government is not only meeting its obligation to the veteran but will also go down in history as saving the most important business in northern Wisconsin. I hope that the deliberations of this great body in this great hour of peril will find the time to give this bill honest consideration and wholehearted support.

War and Peace Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it recently came to my attention that certain large interests, inspired by selfish motives, have launched a campaign to hammer regulation W into permanent law. Regulation W, a Government order requiring heavy down payments on most purchases, is a worthwhile wartime measure designed to curb inflation. When, however, these interests start talking about it as a peacetime measure, I am going to oppose them. Its enactment into permanent law would cripple industry and would deny to the salaried working class the right to purchase when and how they please. It would deprive these people of both necessities and desired luxuries.

In this connection it is interesting to learn of the position taken by Mr. William J. Cheyney, executive director, Retail Credit Institute of America, Washington, D. C. Mr. Cheyney is an expert in the field of credit and his organization, while still young, shows signs of that progressive spirit and cooperation with the public that has made this country the greatest nation on earth. Mr. Cheyney's attitude toward regulation W as a peacetime measure warrants the attention of every sound-thinking American. His remarks should be studied by every Member of this House. A recent paper he prepared for a conference of retail credit managers is as clear, concise, and scholarly an exposition of regulation W as could be found anywhere. Following are some excerpts of the paper:

Here for the first time in 20 years, perhaps for the first time in all time, you, representing great retail establishments, are proposing a regulation by law which definitely and permanently restricts my right as a citizen to make a contract. Gentlemen—I cannot say it too emphatically—keep your hands off my right of contract.

May I put it another way? You may regulate yourselves as much as you please and until doomsday if you wish, but do not plan to regulate me after this war is over.

You may be my purchasing agent, but the contract between you and me—and I speak for millions of Americans, I am sure—gives you not one iota of authority to tell me by law what terms I may make with my retailer down on the corner. He and I, as long as this country lasts, will make our own deals, thank you.

The right of free contract is one of the natural rights of personal liberty and is also a property right, and is fully protected by the Federal and State constitutions. It is "one of the inalienable rights of the citizen, embracing the right * * * to acquire and dispose of property."

It is hardly likely that the Congress of the United States would touch this right in the absence of war or calamity. Certainly not to make profit come more easily. Even in the war emergency it is noteworthy that the administration did not see fit to ask Congress for authority for regulation W, but took rather the path more fraught with problems of legality and speculated upon the chances of passing time.

This plan is un-American. It deliberately and definitely leaves out of America's great markets the least fortunate of our people, economically speaking. It would make permanent the theory that those more affluent financially have first choice of all America's goods.

Gentlemen, if this plan had not been proposed for legislation or regulation; if to the contrary it had been suggested as a voluntary arrangement, you are aware that it would assume the proportions of the most gigantic monopoly to restrain trade ever seen in this country.

As you know, the authority for Regulation W does not rest upon legislation applicable to a peace era. Its continuation in peace without further legislation is obviously un-

constitutional. Legislation itself would be of doubtful validity.

Obviously the control of credit as you have outlined it will serve your ends. It will help to permanently rechannel business, not at all as it was channeled in the pre-war era, but this isn't so important to the Nation, is it. It will save you money. If the stores of America seek Federal regulation and legislation to cut down expense of operation, to say nothing of its headaches, then you will obviously agree that credit limitation is not the only one that fits into your program.

If you get the Government to help you refuse credit to certain people as it is proposed in this plan, then get the Government to regulate your advertising, prohibit your layaway, stop the return goods, streamline your delivery service, simplify and cheapen your gift wrapping and limit the amount you can charge the public for the decoration and embellishment of your stores and all the rest of these costly ingredients.

Be careful, I say, because there are broad ramifications of the problem you are tackling. Be careful because credit limitation by law or regulation can conceivably boomerang to the expense of the retail fraternity. Be careful, because if you once permit the public to feel that you are not truly its purchasing agent, years of advertising will not undo the harm that follows.

This right to contract: Do not underestimate it. I believe the public values it. Do not put retailing in the position of having to explain why it should have dabbled in a national limitation of one of the fundamental prerogatives of citizenship. It is these prerogatives that we insist upon here and that have become so cheap in Nazi and Fascist Europe.

Over there maybe a plan such as you are discussing would work fairly well. But even over there I have an idea that the post-war era will see unmistakable developments which would make it dangerous to its advocates despite these 20 years of training in the discipline of self-effacement.

We had better serve the people, gentlemen, if we want their dollars. We had better not try to make them over, reform them, tell them how to save, tell them under what circumstances they have a right to share in using the great developments of science in this age.

Bird Sanctuary for the Dove of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, after the war we can be certain of debt, death, and taxes. In addition, it is probable that there will still be a world full of people tired of strife. Once again we will talk of the millennium of peace as we have done so many, many times before. But in the past we have attempted to locate the wellsprings of world peace in the midst of the hotbed of war. It is time we thought of a real sanctuary for the dove of peace.

The following article from the Spokane Spokesman Review should be of interest:

(By Ashley E. Holden)

Spokane ought to be the capital of the United Nations, or whatever form of world federation is set up after the war. The seat of government for the secretariat of the United Nations, with its parliament and court, should be established here in this friendly atmosphere, far removed from Old World intrigues and isolated from the political and economic pressures of large industrial centers.

It readily will be agreed that the capital must be in the United States, for the success of future world security will depend upon the leadership of this Nation. On this point, Lin Mousheng, speaking at the Institute for Post-War Planning, at Temple University, Philadelphia, recently declared:

"The seat of the United Nations government, I think, should be somewhere in the United States. There are several reasons. First, and foremost, if the United Nations government is to be established, the United States is going to play the most essential and vital role. The United States must lead the way.

"The people in the Old World—especially we in China—look to American leadership in post-war world planning and reconstruction. In the second place, the United States is so happily located that she can look across both the Atlantic and the Pacific in proper perspective. Neither the Europeans nor the Asiatics are so happily located mentally or geographically."

Spokane is preeminently qualified, mentally and geographically, to be the future capital of the world. There are no deep-set racial or national animosities here; no color prejudice or labor antipathies to obstruct the course of justice. Spokane has been free from strife and would thus have the proper mental attitude necessary for the growth of a new world order.

Geographically, Spokane is ideally situated. Air transportation will be one of the cornerstones of the United Nations. Its capital must be readily accessible to the powers entrusted with the maintenance of peace. At the same time Spokane is far enough removed from Washington, D. C., to preclude any domination of the United Nations government by that of the United States.

Unquestionably the problems of tomorrow are going to center in the Pacific, and the commerce and political activities of the nations in the Pacific area are going to predominate in whatever form of cooperative government the nations of the world devise.

By air, Spokane is the hub of the world. Russia, China, Great Britain, and the United States are going to be the main spokes in the international wheel. From Moscow to Spokane by air is less than 4 days. London is no farther away. Chunking, or wherever the future capital of China may be, is closer to Spokane than to any city on the Atlantic seaboard. Australia is 40 hours by air from Spokane.

The landing fields and facilities for handling the air traffic of the world are here in Spokane. Spokane is centrally situated. Spokane has the right mental environment. Spokane is destined to be the light metals capital of the world and the capital of the greatest hydroelectric power empire on earth. Spokane ought also to be the cultural and political capital of the world.

Geneva, that picturesque city in Switzerland, the seat of the League of Nations, has a population of 124,121. Spokane is slightly larger. But Geneva is much harder to reach. Besides, Geneva belongs to the old order and never will serve again as an international capital. The Hague, where the World Court once sat, is a city of 436,568, but never again will it be the scene of international jurisprudence, for Europe may be prostrate after the war for years to come.

Spokane is young and fresh and vigorous. Its people look to the future, particularly to the west, across the Pacific. In man's groping for a better world order, with justice and amity ruling in the affairs of nations, Spokane would be an ideal location for the capital of the world!

Control of Organized Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, from an article which appeared in last night's Washington Evening Star it was reported that the President had decided on appointing a committee to attempt a solution of the war-born problems confronting organized sports. If the Government is suddenly aware of the health and morale of our people, why does it not take immediate affirmative action with the food situation? Surely nutrition is a factor of the first order in maintaining health and developing morale. The food supply is the responsibility of the United States Government, whereas, as I have stated before, sports should be left in the hands of sportsmen and under local control.

Even though the members of the contemplated committee may be of the highest caliber and serve without pay, there is bound to be an expense for the taxpayers, for surely this committee, in order to function, will have administrative, traveling, and organizational expenses.

I stand for freedom of American sports. Who knows but that Federal control will destroy this freedom. Let us direct the efforts toward the proper distribution of food, the basis of health, but do not create an agency for the regimentation of youth. I fear that under Government control records will be made by bureaucrats and not by athletes.

Shortage of Animal and Poultry Feeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

KANSAS CITY, MO., *June 18, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. COLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Supplies of corn are vital to production of beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products. Unsound regulations of Office of Price Administration have handicapped feed manufacturers, farmers, and feeders now for many months. Feeders and feed manufacturers in this area are now virtually out of corn. Our firm has 205 bushels to get us through today, whereas our daily requirement is about 12,000 bushels. This means a loss in production for today alone of approximately 400 tons animal and poultry feeds, and 60 tons corn meal for human consumption. Office of Price Administration rules and regulations during the past 6 or 8 months have

prevented my firm from manufacturing for feeders and consumers in need several trainloads of feed and food. Results of Office of Price Administration have gone from bad to worse. One bad situation corrected by Office of Price Administration usually has created two or three worse ones. Relief has continuously been promised during the past months, but matters have gone from bad to worse further. The roll-backs proposed by the President, plus subsidies for which the next generation of voters will pay, appears to be merely a political stunt to get votes and to beat John L. Lewis. I have heard much unfavorable comment toward the President for his fight against Lewis. Many are disgusted with the President, and most everyone with Lewis. The roll-back will not retard inflation but rather will leave money in the hands of the people to buy more nonessentials. The roll-back subsidy plan appears as an obvious step toward inflation. How can well-paid workers better spend their wages than for butter, meat, and coffee? Must we continue to ask the next generation to pay for the undeserved ease of our generation? Shouldn't we pay as we go? May I respectfully urge that Congress again accept its responsibilities? Your powers have been delegated too much and too far to the administrative branch of our Government. If you don't get in and pitch some straight balls yourselves this country is going to face famine, bankruptcy, and general demoralization. Just leave it to the immature bureaucrats, instead of exercising vigorously your own authority, and we shall have as a Nation more grief than we have ever known to date. Why should the legislature of the best nation in the world permit a bureaucracy to wreck us. I have faith in our Legislature and its ability, but unused it is of no value. This Nation needs your services now as never before. I hope you will give your best attention to correct the many dangers that confront us here at home.

THOMAS W. STALEY.

Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was received by me from the Gardner Advertising Co. of St. Louis, Mo. This letter also appeared as an advertisement in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under date of June 15:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 1943.*

DEAR SIR: Out of this wartime crucible, our way of life will emerge uplifted, united, and inspired—or be transformed in an aftermath of post-war confusion.

What can you do now to protect your stake in post-war freedom?

Let's look at the thing—instead of the name. What are the materials of this edifice we call our way of life? Who were the architects and builders? Who did the job? Who paid the bills? Who holds the mortgage now?

This title search takes you back centuries. Eager Europeans brought their families to this land of Indians and incredible hardships. Avidly they sought freedom, opportunity, a better way of life. They were the first to sanctify this land of ours with their blood and sweat and tears. America was founded by builders.

Our forefathers brought the wheel to this soil, though it was a bronze-age invention and a vital industrial tool 4,000 years ago. In the wheel you see the embryo of our way of life.

This Nation was cut, turned, and hammered out of a wilderness. The frail perished. The strong survived. They knew only necessitous invention, daring initiative, fanatical faith, and, by all current standards, insufferable work.

A few worked harder, thought longer, scrimped and saved with greater zeal. In time they built bigger log cabins, ate better food, enjoyed leisure. They reaped the ripened fruits of toil, the profits of a free, competitive community—the essence of so-called capitalistic economy.

Thanks to their efforts, and their opportunities to enlarge those hard-won profits, expansion came fast in America. They annihilated distance and gave their methods to the world. They took the pain out of work and paid higher wages. They outstripped the world in development of creature comforts and made available a standard of living no other nation can match. For all who would heed them, they lit the twin lamps of human liberty and human dignity. They gave the world progress.

The builders of this Nation knew no labor czars, no pressure groups, no paternal government as we know them. Their tools were few but true.

They built history's most imposing structure with burning desire, flaming courage—and productive money. Yes, our Nation is wealthy today—but not because it started that way.

America owes its industrial and financial prowess to the genius of ordinary men. Men of vision. Men who hammered ideas into useful goods. Men who risked life-savings on materials and machines—to put their goods in the market places. Men who faced competition—and thrived on it. Men who knew the evils of scarcity—and the blessings of abundance. Men who reinvested "profit" to build better products—sold them at lower prices—and made the cornucopia a symbol of American life.

Those are the materials, the bricks and mortar, of "our way of life." Today, as always, producers, men who get things done, are the men who give us our tempo, our direction, our destiny. Theirs is the responsibility—in common with millions of loyal workers—to create profits from production and keep this Nation in vigorous financial health.

Theirs is the shadow which stalks Hitler in his hideout. Conversely, theirs is the inspiration, the hope, the salvation of this embattled world. And come peace, theirs is the economic doctrine which must prevail—if we are to be strong—if we are to be free.

Freedom knows no distinctions. If America is to recapture her traditional freedom she must do so—across the board. Partial freedom for one group and full freedom for another won't work—socially, economically, or geographically. Every American must be free to earn, free to expand, free to match his talents against all men. That is the spirit of America.

There's the gist of "capitalism"—the time-tested foundation of "our way of life." It's the story to tell all America. It's the true story, the thrilling story, the crucial story which must be told—if you are to protect your stake in post-war freedom.

Tell it in these words or your own words. But tell it. That's one way to do your share in winning the peace—it seems to us.

Very truly yours,

GARDNER ADVERTISING CO.

Records of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the problem presented by the rapid accumulation of records of the Federal Government, a serious one even prior to Pearl Harbor, is becoming more and more acute as the months go by. The quantity of records in the possession of Federal agencies in the District of Columbia alone increased from about 3,000,000 cubic feet in 1935 to about 7,000,000 cubic feet in 1941. The creation of the various war agencies and the increased activities of most agencies of the Government because of the war have accelerated immensely the rate of production of Federal records. The Navy Department estimates that it now has an accumulation of more than 1,300,000 cubic feet of records and the General Accounting Office is accumulating records at the rate of about 92 tons per month. A comparable increase in the accumulation of records has been and is occurring in most other Government agencies.

Most people, including Members of Congress, take records for granted, assuming that in some magical way they plan their own fates. The administration of records, like most other problems, however, requires effective planning and a great deal of time and effort. The solution of this problem is often as difficult as it is important.

One essential phase of records administration is the elimination of ephemeral materials such as forms, routine correspondence, and the like, the continued retention of which would be of no administrative, legal, research, or other value to the Government. I am sure that most Members of Congress regard an accumulation of useless records as of minor importance, even though it may be stored in expensive and, at present, critical and almost unobtainable equipment and occupying valuable space. The fact that this type of materials constitutes a considerable majority of the total volume of Federal records should not be overlooked. The Navy Department, for instance, has stated that more than 90 percent of the records of the fleet and shore establishments eventually fall within this classification and that less than 10 percent of them have to be permanently preserved.

In the light of this situation, which emphasizes the importance of this phase of records administration, provision for the prompt elimination of materials that lack sufficient value to warrant further preservation is essential.

Even more important, however, is the safeguarding of those records that should be preserved either permanently or for a period of time because of their prospective value to the Government or to citizens for administrative, legal, research, or other purposes.

With a view to facilitating the solution of the acute and perplexing records problem now facing the Federal Government, particularly with respect to that phase of the problem relating to the disposal of records, I have introduced and the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers has favorably reported H. R. 2943. The bill is now on the Union Calendar and will, I hope, come before the House for consideration at an early date.

The need for this proposed legislation is aparent to everyone familiar with the existing records problem. I have reviewed briefly the existing situation in order that Members of Congress may obtain some realization of the seriousness of the Government's records problem and the importance of undertaking its solution by every proper means available. In order that Members of Congress may understand how essential the passage of H. R. 2943 is to efforts that are being made to improve this situation, I desire to make a brief statement concerning the general purposes of the bill, its effect on existing law, its benefits, and the estimated economies that might be effected thereby.

GENERAL PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this bill is to prevent the disposal of records of the Government of the United States having administrative, legal, research, or other value sufficient to warrant their continued preservation by the Government and to conserve space and filing equipment by facilitating the disposal of records lacking such value. The bill is also designed to reduce the clerical work involved in and the time required for obtaining disposal authorizations.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAW

The pending bill would take the place of the general disposal act approved August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1219–1221), and the act with reference to the disposal of photographed records approved September 24, 1940 (54 Stat. 958).

BENEFITS

In order to prevent the disposal of any records of value, provision is made that no records of the Federal Government shall be alienated or destroyed except in accordance with the provisions of this act. Under the provisions of the act agencies are not permitted to propose for disposal any records in their submissions to the Archivist of the United States that are needed in the transaction of current business and that appear to have, or that after the lapse of specified periods of time apparently will have, sufficient administrative, legal, research, or other value to warrant their further preservation by the Government. The Archivist of the United States, after appraising records covered by submissions made to him by agencies, is permitted to list in his submissions to Congress only records that do not appear to him to have such value. The joint committee of Congress, likewise, may report to Congress only such records covered in submissions referred to it as do not, or will not after the lapse of the period specified, have such value. Thus, no records of the Federal Government may be disposed of except records that by the unanimous opinion of the head of the agency, the Archivist of the United States, and the Joint Committee of Congress are deemed to lack sufficient value to warrant their further preservation by the Government.

The substitution in H. R. 2943 of the phrase "administrative, legal, research, or other value" in lieu of the phrase "permanent value or historical interest" used in existing law prevents records that obviously lack "permanent value or historical interest" but that do have temporary value to the Government from being proposed for disposal in lists or schedules. It is an additional safeguard to prevent the disposal of records that are of value to the Government.

Perhaps the most important provision of the bill is that for the submission of schedules proposing the disposal, after the lapse of specified periods of time, of records of specified form or character that may accumulate in the future. Present procedures permit approval for disposal only of records that are already in existence; the proposed procedure would give to the agencies authority to dispose of specified types of records as soon as they had been in existence for specified periods of time without obtaining any further approval.

These schedules are comon-sense plans for the regular clearance of noncurrent, valueless records without the need of repeated listing year after year of the same routine items. Several agencies, notably the Navy and Agriculture Departments, are preparing such schedules, based on surveys of existing records and procedures. Officials of the agencies know that certain forms, certain types of correspondence, certain copies of other records, will only be used during specified periods of time, and their usefulness for clearance of accounts, reopening of cases, protection against claims, and other administrative purposes will likely be restricted to a few years. Once lists are made, indicating the periods of probable usefulness, they constitute schedules which can be followed by those responsible for keeping the records. The general practice is to list all records of given operating units, showing in relation to each other the materials of permanent value that should eventually be transferred to The National Archives, those of value for a few years that should be stored temporarily by the agency, and those that can be eliminated regularly as soon as their current use is ended. The bill provides that the Archivist and Congress give their approval to these schedules insofar as they provide for actual disposal of records, and that the agencies proceed to carry them into effect continuously until changes in forms or procedures make them out of date. Disposal is therefore based on Congressional approval as under existing legislation, but great savings can be effected by reducing the time required for repetitious reporting and by the prompt release of equipment and space.

In the preparation of schedules, explanations of the types or forms of records are usually set down, indicating the use made of each item, what happens to various copies, and in what other records the information may be available. The use of schedules will often result in more intelligent planning than does the preparation of disposal lists long after the records have become noncurrent and information about them has been forgotten. Schedules are particularly adaptable to routine recurring forms, such as accounting papers, but can be used in connection with other kinds of records that are produced under continuing organized procedures. A sample schedule covering certain records of the Packers and Stockyards Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, appears at the close of my remarks.

Other provisions of the bill will clarify or simplify existing procedures or otherwise facilitate operations. The first section contains a definition of the word "records," which would aid the agencies in the preparation of lists and schedules and tend to eliminate therefrom the listing of nonrecord materials. Another section extends the present provision relating to records that are a continuing menace to human life or health or to property from records that have been listed for disposal to all records of the United States Government, but provides that the head of the agency that has custody of the records must join with the Archivist in determining that the records constitute such a menace. The proposed act also contains a new feature designed to provide some authority for the emergency disposal of records outside the United States in wartime.

ESTIMATED ECONOMIES THAT MIGHT BE EFFECTED

Potential annual savings of several million dollars in filing equipment and space costs, and of several hundred thousands in man-hours, are indicated in letters received by the Archivist of the United States from 34 Federal agencies commenting upon this proposed legislation. All executive agencies of the Government were given an opportunity to comment, and no one of them opposed passage of the bill. Their estimates of possible economies are impressive.

Savings can be estimated in several ways. The total actually estimated in the letters received was approximately two and a half million dollars, but actual figures were received from only a part of the agencies. Analysis of the formula used shows that if applied to the Government as a whole the total might, as a conservative estimate, exceed $10,000,000. Among the agencies having the most precise cost figures available are the Federal Housing Administration, the Navy Department, and the Veterans' Administration. They represent widely varied kinds and sizes of organizations, and thus their estimates are of particular interest. As in other agencies, their analyses indicate that the vast majority of paper accumulations are retained much longer than they need to be because of existing cumbersome procedures and lack of streamlined records administration planning.

The Federal Housing Administration, calculating that its annual cost of

additional filing equipment and space would be reduced by two-thirds, and having at hand its present expenditure figures, estimates savings of $19,186 a year. This agency has approximately 4,000 employees, compared with a total for the Government of over 2,900,000 civilians. Assuming that costs of records administration are roughly proportionate to numbers of employees, the figure reported by the Federal Housing Administration, if prorated to the Government as a whole, would amount to some $14,000,000.

The Navy Department has undertaken the most extensive program of records administration in the Federal Government, with notable results in economy and in efficiency of operation. This agency also has data on costs readily available, and has calculated the potential benefits of the proposed legislation on a different basis from that used by the Federal Housing Administration. The Navy Department reports that it has records accumulated occupying the equivalent of $6,200,000 worth of filing equipment. Had the expeditious disposal that would be made possible under this bill been in effect in past years 40 percent of that equipment, valued at $2,600,000, would not have been required. The Navy Department letter stated that as much as 90 percent of its accumulated records are of such temporary value that they are not kept on an average of more than 5 years, and doubtless that percentage would be approached in most other agencies. Procedures that cause materials of such temporary value to be retained longer than necessary are costly indeed. Calculations based on the personnel of the military services are likely to be misleading because of the large proportion not doing paper work, but there is reason to believe that the figures reported by the Navy Department would be multiplied several times if the same analysis could be applied througout the Government. One can speculate upon the same difference, 40 percent, in filing equipment required for the approximately 7,000,000 cubic feet of records indicated in the District of Columbia by a survey late in 1941, before the war agencies had reached peak production in paper work. The Navy formula applied in that way would show a potential saving of $14,000,000.

The Veterans' Administration, employing approximately 45,000 persons, estimated its annual savings in salaries alone through the streamlining of procedures that would be allowed by this bill at $4,000. If the ratio indicated, about 9 cents for each employee, is applied to all the Federal service excluding military and naval personnel, the annual savings would be more than a quarter million dollars. Economies in man-hours reported by various other agencies indicate that such an assumption would be a reasonable one.

These financial estimates are obviously rough approximations but they indicate that this bill would effect surprisingly great economies.

Perhaps the following portions from a resolution adopted by the Federal Fire Council, an official advisory agency in matters relating to the protection of Federal employees and property from the hazards of fire, urging the passage of the proposed legislation emphasize better than anything I might say the need for and the desirability of the proposed legislation:

The present procedure for the disposal of Federal records that are no longer useful is unnecessarily cumbersome, requiring as it does each agency to list all the records it proposes to dispose of each time a disposal list is submitted, regardless of the fact that records of identical character may have been listed and approved for disposal again and again on previous disposal lists. In the present emergency the agencies of the Government cannot spare or obtain personnel to undertake this repetitious listing, and, as a result, large masses of useless papers without permanent value or historical interest have accumulated in federally owned and leased buildings both in Washington and in the field. These accumulations are growing with a daily increasing rapidity due to the great expansion of governmental activity during the war.

This vast and increasing mass of useless papers not only occupies large areas of critically needed office space and tens of thousands of file drawers that could be put to effective use, but constitutes as well a serious and growing fire hazard to Federal buildings, employees, and property. The need for file cabinets to house the millions of current records of the Government is particularly acute at this time. The danger created by the storage in buildings often far from fireproof of tons of useless and inflammable papers is made more grave by the present hazards of bombing and sabotage.

The proposed legislation would simplify in several ways the procedures for the disposal of useless papers and in particular would authorize the approval of disposal schedules, under which specified types of records now in existence or that may accumulate in the future could be disposed of after a specified lapse of time without further listing or authorization.

The Federal Fire Council believes that the proposed legislation, if enacted, will do much to relieve the serious situation that now exists, and in view of its responsibility for the reduction of fire hazards in Federal buildings heartily endorses it in principle and strongly urges the passage of this or equivalent legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the enactment of this bill into law will help to prevent the disposal of valuable records of the Government that should be preserved; will reduce the clerical work involved in and the time required for obtaining disposal authorizations; and will make possible the saving of hundreds of thousands of man-hours and millions of dollars annually. I trust, therefore, that Members of the House will realize the urgent need for this proposed legislation and will assist in effecting its prompt passage by giving it their support.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE—PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS DIVISION

Form PS-2. Application for registration under Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921: All market agencies and livestock dealers operating at public stockyards are required by law to be registered by the Secretary of Agriculture. The application for registration submitted on Form SP-2 contains considerable information regarding the character and organization of the business firm submitting the application. The record is retained permanently in the Washington office. (Retain, Washington office.)

Form PS-3. Annual report (market agencies).

Form PS-12. Annual report (dealers and order buyers).

Form SP-13. Annual report (public stockyards).

Form SP-17. Annual report (packers).

Form SP-18. Annual report (brokers or clearing agencies).

Form SP-34. Annual report (live-poultry dealers).

These confidential annual reports made to the Washington office contain detailed statistical information as to the volume and character of the business done by the reporting firms. Data is also included on the salaries and wages paid and the profits and losses of the company.

In the Washington office a consolidated summary made of these statistics is retained permanently. In this summary the identity of the individual firms is lost. However, since the income-tax returns made to the Bureau of Internal Revenue duplicate the information in these annual reports and are retained permanently, the latter can safely be disposed of. (Dispose, after 5 years, Washington office.)

Form PS-5. Valuation form: These forms are used by valuation engineers to gather information in advance of hearings held to determine the reasonableness of rates at the various stockyards. These papers are filed permanently in the valuation office at Kansas City. (Retain, Kansas City office.)

Form PS-10. Scale test record form: These forms are used by weight supervisors to report on the testing of scales used at the stockyards. The record is of routine administrative value only. (Dispose, after 3 years, Washington office.)

Form PS-14. Scale-inspection record form: This is a form used by the weight inspector carrying detailed information as to the condition of scales tested. The record is of routine administrative value only. (Dispose, after 3 years, Washington office.)

Trust fund agreement: The Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 requires the posting of surety bonds or their equivalent by all market agencies or dealers doing business on a public stockyard. These trust fund agreements accepted in lieu of surety bonds are retained permanently by the Washington office. Form PS-24 is a sample form of trust fund agreement. (Retain, Washington office.)

Form PS-27. Untitled: This form is used to report information regarding the business of packers believed to be subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act. It is retained permanently by the Washington Office. (Retain, Washington office.)

Form PS-30. Sales sheet: These forms are used by the valuation engineers to obtain sales and price information preliminary to the establishment of reasonable rates. The records are retained permanently by the Kansas City office. (Retain, Kansas City office.)

Form PS-31. Application for license: As amended in August 1935 the Packers and Stockyards Act covers the marketing of live poultry in designated markets. Form PS-31 is the application submitted by poultry dealers for license to operate under the act. The form which carries detailed information as to the character and organization of the firm making application is retained permanently by the Washington office. (Retain, Washington office.)

Routine auditors' work papers: These are work papers accumulated by the accountants of the Packers and Stockyards Division during the routine auditing and analysis of the books and records of livestock market agencies. Final reports submitted by the auditors are retained as are the work papers

for rate cases or those involving hearings. (Dispose, after 5 years, Washington office.)

Annual report tabulation work sheets: These are work papers used by the Washington office to compile the information appearing on the annual reports submitted by livestock market agencies (see above under Form PS–3). The consolidated report resulting from these tabulations is retained permanently. (Dispose, after 5 years, Washington office.)

Stockyard and exchange tariffs: Stockyard owners and market agencies at stockyards are required to file with the Secretary of Agriculture and keep open for public inspection schedules showing all rates and charges for stockyard services. Changes in tariffs must also be filed with the Secretary of Agriculture. Copies of such tariffs accumulated by the field offices of the Packers and Stockyards Division have only a temporary administrative value. (Dispose, after 5 years, all field offices.)

P. and S. docket (formerly monthly record): This is a monthly report of action taken on cases arising under the Packers and Stockyards Act, reproduced for the benefit of livestock market agencies and other interested parties. Copies are supplied to all field offices and a permanent file is retained by the Washington office. (Retain, Washington office. Dispose, record copy, after 3 years, all field offices.)

Docket file: These docket files result from formal inquiries instituted on charges of unfair trade practices or as a result of the violation of regulations. The files include such papers as transcript of testimony, correspondence, exhibits, etc. The records are retained permanently by the Washington office. (Retain, Washington office.)

Our Peace Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have sought this time because I want to read to the House page 858 of the hearings dealing with the Office of War Information, as follows:

BROADCASTING THE PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to call your attention to the general language of your justification on page 130, under the heading of the Outpost Service Bureau. I should like to read this into the record:

"The objectives are to weld the Allied Nations more firmly to America, to bring the neutrals closer to understanding of and agreement with the American purpose, to encourage resistance in the occupied areas, and to dishearten the enemy.

"In general, the objectives are met by disseminating factual information concerning the United States, its war and peace aims, its ideals and institutions."

And so forth. I am one of those who believe that the end of this war might be hastened by judicious dissemination of the peace aims of the United States throughout the Axis countries. I note that that seems to be a part of your purpose.

Mr. ELMER DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I wonder if you could tell us just what has been done along that line, because I think that everything that is done along that line is all to the good.

Mr. ELMER DAVIS. We can make no promises for the future until our war aims and peace aims are more clearly defined. In the meantime, we do all that we can to try to break down the confidence of enemy peoples, to convince them that they are sure to be licked, that they can have no hope in any of their governments or any successor governments that they might get from the same people. We shall be more definite when we get a more definite statement of the policies of the United States for the future.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would not that be a very fine thing to do, showing the altruistic peace aims of the United Nations and their friendliness toward humanity, and our desire to make a better world; and to express that in concrete terms and to get it out all over the Axis countries? I think it would be doing a wonderful thing.

Mr. HAMBLET. There is nothing we would be more glad to have than an official statement of that kind that we could use.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that would be worth more than battalions and battleships toward ending the war, because I think it would create a revulsion of feeling in these Axis countries against their tyrannical rulers and would hasten the day of revolution and overthrow.

On March 8, 1943, I introduced a resolution to create a committee on peace aims, the function of which would be to draw up and broadcast to the world a forthright statement of the beneficent peace aims of ourselves and our allies; to reveal to all nations authoritatively and officially a vision of the better world that we confidently hope may be expected when the United Nations win.

We are coming to see that the only possible foundation upon which a peace that will last can be built is that of Christian brotherhood, and I believe it would be of tremendous advantage to the cause of the United Nations if we would let the world know that that is the kind of peace for which we stand.

I refer now to the resolution I have introduced to point out how admirably it fits in with the plans of the Office of War Information. Mr. Davis would be glad to have such a statement that he could use for propaganda, but up to date there is none such.

A great number of archbishops, bishops, ministers, and other men of thought and purpose have endorsed my resolution as being timely, and in their opinion vastly important. The cause of liberty is demanding a statement on peace aims. Mr. Davis needs such a statement to make his propaganda effective. Let us see that this statement is forthcoming and we will indeed be implementing the Office of War Information with something to throw at the enemy that will be worth more than battalions and battleships toward winning the war and bringing to the world the peace of justice for which all right-thinking persons hope and pray.

The text of the resolution I have introduced is as follows:

Joint resolution to create a committee on peace aims

Be it resolved, etc., That a committee on peace aims is hereby created, to be composed as follows: Three Members of the Senate to be chosen by the Vice President; three Members of the House to be chosen by the Speaker, and six Members at large to be chosen by the President. Of the six members to be chosen by the President, one shall be a woman, one shall be a representative of labor, one shall be a representative of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, one shall be a representative of the Catholic Churches of America, one shall be a representative of the Jewish religion, and the other shall be a representative of the State Department, trained in the field of foreign service.

SEC. 2. This committee shall prepare a clear, definite statement of what the United Nations are fighting for and the peace aims which they will faithfully execute when victory comes to Allied arms.

SEC. 3. When this statement is completed the Secretary of State shall transmit the text thereof to the Governments of Great Britain and British Dominions; Russia, and China. If those governments consent to become signatories no further negotiations will be required and the statement will be regarded as a finished document expressing the views and purposes of all of the United Nations. The statement shall also be submitted to friendly governments under Axis subjugation, whose adherence may be desired.

SEC. 4. If any one of the United Nations dissents to the statement or any of its provisions, the President shall invite the governments of the United Nations to send delegates to a conference to be held in the city of Washington to compose existing differences and agree on a modified statement which all can sign.

SEC. 5. When the statement is completed and approved it shall be promulgated as an official declaration stating the United Nations' peace aims and copies of it shall be widely distributed throughout the world.

Federal Unemployment Taxes and Real-Estate Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental intentions of the Congress in enacting the Federal program for protection against unemployment was that those persons who pay in contributions, or for whom contributions are made, receive the benefits provided under the act. No thought was further from congressional intention than that anyone should make contributions without obtaining corresponding benefits.

It has developed, however, that exactly that situation has occurred with certain groups, particularly real-estate salesmen. There appears to be no definite formula to determine when a real-estate salesman is unemployed and without this determination, it is impossible for the salesman to obtain the benefits of this tax. The determination of unemployment and of benefits to be paid is left to the States and the Federal Security Agency to establish a uniform policy on this question. The result is a difference of opinion among the various State unemployment commissions as to how

these benefits will be applied. As far as I know, there have been no cases of benefits paid by any State unemployment commission to real-estate salesmen.

The only alternative, other than having real-estate salesmen excluded from the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, would be to have the various State acts amended to provide for a uniform determination of unemployment and benefits to be paid. Assuming that a practical formula could be evolved, this would entail a long and tedious job requiring many years to get the States to adopt a uniform amendment. This, of course, would not solve the problem in the six States and the District of Columbia which now exempt real-estate salesmen from the State unemployment tax. In these States they are subject to the Federal tax but are denied any benefits due to their State exemption.

It is true that the burden of this tax is not heavy. Due to merit rating, many real-estate firms have reduced their State tax to as low as one-half of 1 percent. There is little objection among the real-estate profession to payment of this unemployment tax if they could be assured that the benefits would be forthcoming. However, it is the general concensus that no practical solution of how and when these real-estate salesmen could receive benefits can be found, and therefore it is only just that they be exempt from the payment of this tax.

Real-estate salesmen's work is of a character which makes them more of an independent contractor than insurance salesmen, who are exempt from the Federal tax. Most insurance salesmen continue to collect commissions on renewals and policy premiums for as long as 5 years after the policies are written. At the consummation of a deal a real-estate salesman collects his commission and has no further financial interest in the transaction. If insurance salesmen are exempt from the act because they are independent contractors, it only stands to reason that real-estate salesmen should be afforded the same exemption.

As far as I can determine, the officials of the Federal Security Agency believe that the only practical recourse for relief of real-estate salesmen is to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to grant them exemption from the making of payments. Accordingly, I have introduced H. R. 2974, granting this exemption by amending the act. The amendment will not, of course, affect the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and salesmen would continue to receive social-security benefits.

Real-estate salesmen perform a useful function. They have a peculiar stake in the stability of our economic structure. Upon their activities depends the steady and sound development of our cities, towns, and rural areas. They are as patriotic and hard-working a group as any in the Nation. Through their offices and through their State and national organizations, they have rendered unselfish and useful service to their Nation at a time when Federal agencies have entered into widespread real-estate operations.

The existing provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act work particular injustice upon the members of this group. It is their lot that while payments are made on their behalf, they are denied the corresponding benefits. This improper situation has been relieved for insurance salesmen, but not for the members of the real-estate profession. Since they are excluded from benefits, it is hardly fair for the Government to continue to make collections, and I therefore urge that H. R. 2974 be enacted to correct this condition.

The House Proposal on Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 17, 1943:

THE HOUSE PROPOSAL ON PEACE

While the august Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with one eye on the future world and the other on petty politics, has been dawdling with the Ball and similar resolutions, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has suddenly outflanked it with an incisive and effectively statesmanlike move. It has approved, by a unanimous vote of both Republican and Democratic Members a simple concurrent resolution:

"That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

This states the essentials. It represents a kind of least common donominator of the views of those who are convinced that the United States cannot again retreat into a perilous and parochial iisolationism after this war, that it must play its part in the organization of international security, and that it is importat, as a mater of practical present policy, to associate Congress now with this view.

The House resolution abandons some of the more advanced ground taken up by other proposals. It leaves open such specific issues as an international court, an international police force, and so on; as a concurrent rather than a joint resolution, it softens somewhat the extent of the moral commitment involved. This may be taken as an admission that American opinion is not yet as fully formed on these matters as some had hoped; but, at the same time, it rescues the essential issue from the confusions in which it threatens to be involved by debate on details, and so makes it possible to record the real strength of American opinion on the basic point—that this country is prepared to contribute to a just and lasting peace.

It is difficult to see what excuse could be found for burying such a declaration in committee, or how any intelligent legislator could vote against it. Certainly, those who accept in good faith Mr. Spangler's statement, made in announcing the formation of the Republican policy council, that "the problem of a lasting world peace must be met courageously and realistically * * * in a spirit of friendly cooperation with the other nations of the world," must be prepared to endorse at least this much. Here is a test of fundamental purpose which cannot easily be evaded.

Some Senators seem inclined to stand on their dignity, on the ground that the House has no business meddling in such lofty matters. The public is unlikely to be much impressed by that. What it wants from its legislators is the ability to act with sense, clarity, and decision; and it will respect either House which can do so.

Forest-Fire Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, because the House will soon have a chance to reconsider the agricultural appropriation bill, I want to once again bring to your attention the real and necessary needs of the Forest Service during the coming year. To people in the forested sections of the West—and this is doubtlessly true also as to people in the South, in the Northeast, in the Lake States, and in other forested parts of the country—any reduction in funds for forest fire protection during these emergency times is incomprehensible.

These people who live in forested country realize that C. C. C. boys were formerly available for fire prevention and suppression purposes. The C. C. C. is gone so the local people who realize what that means question, as I most decidedly do, this proposed cut in funds. Manpower will not be available for quick action when fires start. And without quick and hard action on fires whenever and wherever they start we are flirting with catastrophe.

Consequently crews of students and others must be recruited and trained in advance of the fire season, and then located just like small fire departments in central spots in fire danger areas where they will be immediately available to fight fires when they start. This was the method used last year. Results were excellent. By no means should it be discontinued. We cannot afford to let fires run.

I am not going to burden you with a detailed statement of the need for adequate forest-fire protection, especially during this wartime period. You are well aware of the damage that would result from uncontrolled fires in valuable stands of timber which are so badly needed in our war program; how logging operations could be disrupted for extended periods; how transmission lines, communication lines, railroads and other life lines could be put out of commission; and how other industrial and military

establishments and facilities are seriously endangered.

The danger to aviation resulting from heavy smoke blankets is well known to you. My friends from the coast have reported on the Jap bombings of last year. They did so then and could do so again, scattering fires for hundreds of miles through our western mountains. Military officials have expressed deep concern about forest fires which silhouette passing ships and make them vulnerable to submarine attack. Overlooked too often is the serious diversion of manpower from logging operations and other war industries when called upon to furnish men for fire-fighting crews. In the Northwest, for example, each time 200 loggers fight fire for three days, one less full trainload of lumber goes to war.

The drain on manpower at work on farming operations is equally critical. That is one of the main reasons why small stand-by crews should be employed in advance for fire-fighting purposes. The C. C. C. boys could have done this job, but since they are gone, they certainly should be replaced, in part, at least, for the relatively short season they will be needed. The full amount requested by the Department should be appropriated; by no means a less amount than was appropriated last year.

FOREST RESEARCH

I should like also to comment on the appropriation for forest and range research activities of the Forest Service. The House cut them some $625,100 below the Budget figure. The funds involved are used to support the work of the Forest Service in forest and range investigations, in studies of forest products, the forest survey, and investigations in forest and range economics and forest influences. I urge approval of the amounts proposed by the Senate. In Montana, lumber, livestock, and wool production rank among the most important industries of the State, and work under these appropriations is of inestimable value in the conservation of our forest, range, and water resources and making the best use of them.

The research work of the Forest Service bears directly on the war in many ways. For example, their range studies are aimed directly at stepping up the production of meat and wool from range lands. This work has been invaluable to livestock owners.

Forest-protection investigations, which apply especially to Montana, are extremely important to timber owners and to responsible State and Federal officials in meeting an increasingly critical forest-protection problem in Idaho and adjacent States. Wood is now as scarce as steel. The work in forest research is essential to proper and wise handling of the forest resources and related range and watershed lands both during the war and the critical period which will follow.

It would seem to me that reductions in these appropriations are not true economies but would result in curtailment which we can ill afford. It is this appropriation which is the chief support of work for one-third of the total area of the Nation. I urge retention, therefore, of the Senate figures in the forest research items.

Stove Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received a letter from the O. P. A. asking my advice about rationing stoves. I did not get in on the rationing of fuel oil. I wrote the Director as follows:

MAY 31, 1943.

Mr. JOEL DEAN, Re: 751:JD
Director, Fuel Rationing Division,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DEAN: Your letter of May 29, 1943, received. The first paragraph, as follows, struck me: "The suggestions of Members of Congress proved so helpful in developing next year's fuel-oil-rationing plan that I should like to have your help on another rationing program."

After I arrived here January 3, 1943, the first speech I heard was some Member dismembering the OPA, and Leon Henderson. From then on it has been one continuous round of roasts (without meat). I rather resented these speeches, not because I gave a damn for the OPA, or Leon Henderson, but I hated to see the rubber boat, that anchored me from private to public life, deflated. I want it pumped tighter as I may run again in 1944, if I don't starve or realize better than present prospects on my Victory garden. The poor land, frosts, freezes, snows, rain, bugs, worms, dogs, etc., are as great a menace to it as FDR is to the country. Both look sickly. I much rather take my chances on being re-elected on the past record of the OPA, and the new one proposed, than to share the ride to oblivion by helping to parcel out stoves. However, I suggest this wonderful thought to you.

First, put the wood stoves in wooded areas. Second, put the coal stoves in coal areas. Third, put oil stoves in oil areas. Isn't it astonishing that no one but a new Member of Congress had thought up that formula? Heretofore it has been "in reverse."

You say: "The suggestions of Members of Congress proved so helpful, etc." The double-crossing outfit, I thought they meant it. It must have been constructive criticism I heard all winter long when I was shivering in Berwyn, from lack of fuel oil and was trying to burn Maryland wateroak wood, cut 2 hours before, in a fireplace. Now you write, "I want your help on another rationing plan." Stoves? Yes, stoves, and nothing to burn in them. Either you are just plain dumb, dealing in sarcasm, or the meekest Christian of all ages. I can't say you are a Christian because that presupposes doing unto others as you would be done by. I know damn well if I was OPA, and you me, you would have gloried when some Congressman turned on the heat, twisted my tail until I squawked, and run me to Florida. I can't think you are dumb because the apparatus you headed "Confidential—Draft B," is such only one man could get up and no man could understand, so I conclude you are just dealing in a bit of satisfying sarcasm to see how many damn fools there are in Congress who were politicians last November, but are statesmen now. I haven't had time to read the 18 pages and don't intend to read them; would not understand them if I did.

I live in the Ozarks of Missouri, and own hundreds of acres of timber for firewood and won't freeze. Just keep 'er going Joel, until November 1944, when and where Americans will speak a language even new dealers can understand. It will be a damn site plainer than the enclosure with that 751:JD.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. ELMER,
Member of Congress.

The Little Steel Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, before we condemn labor in general for demanding an increase in wages we should be sure of the facts. The Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly, by a resolution, very properly sums up the reasons for labor's demands for increased wages. The resolution reads:

Whereas a daily newspaper published an article Friday, April 9, that originated in the office of the President of the United States, stating that a strict adherence to the Little Steel formula would be followed by the War Labor Board in establishing wages and ceiling prices on all commodities affecting the cost of living; and

Whereas on the same date in the same newspaper a news item from O. P. A. headquarters in Washington disclosed that prices on white potatoes for May and June had been increased 20 cents per hundred pounds and dry onions had been increased 20 cents per 50 pounds; and

Whereas a 15 percent wage increase limit as of January 1, 1941, is grossly unfair and inadequate to meet increased living costs since January 1, 1941, as figures can be obtained from reliable sources that living-cost increases vary from 21 to 35 percent; and

Whereas Congress has turned thumbs down on the proposition limiting salaries to $25,000 per year and freezing wages and not salaries based upon profit is discriminatory; and

Whereas, including the Victory tax, income tax, purchasing of War bonds, Red Cross donations, or other war agencies the workers' pay checks compare to depression years; and

Whereas to count additional hours worked per week as an increase in wages is a subterfuge and should be discontinued by all fair-minded citizens because additional hours worked means extra profit per manhour; and

Whereas wage increases should be figured on increased production as well as increased living costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly petition the Congress of the United States and the President to order the War Labor Board to abolish the Little Steel formula for adjusting wage issues: And be it further

Resolved, That the above instruct the War Labor Board in settling wage disputes that such settlements be based upon increased production and living costs statistics as provided by the United States Department of

Labor covering the area nearest the town or city in which the increase in wages is sought.

C. P. O'NEILL,
Chairman of Legislative Committee.

Adopted by the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly in regular session June 9, 1943.

B. M. RYAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly.

Concurred in by the following affiliated local unions: Motion Picture Operators, No. 231; Typographical Union, No. 238; Switchmen Union, No. 288; Musicians' Union, No. 485; Steam and Operating Engineers, No. 722; Building Service Employees, No. 104; Beet Sugar Refinery Employees, No. 21446; Meat Cutters Union, No. 377; Railway Carmen, No. 814; City and County Employees, No. 148; Machinists' Union, No. 810; Occident Mill Workers, No. 22569; Postal Clerks, No. 139; Pressmen's Union, No. 192; Fire Fighters' Union, No. 405; Carpenters' Union, No. 2023; Barbers' Union, No. 601; Bakery Workers, No. 400 Bartenders' Union, No. 598; Bricklayers' Union, No. 3; Electrical Workers' Union, No. B 949; General Drivers, No. 581; Mill Workers, No. 19177; Plumbers and Steam Fitters, No. 424; Railway Clerks, No. 488.

Four Soldiers Write to John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Washington Post of June 18, 1943:

JOHN L. LEWIS:

American unions have come a long way since the day of the Chicago massacre, yet when the union appears to have gained stature as a reputable organization, you toss it away without a thought as to the consequence either to your Government, its people or yourself. We who are out here have little in the way of comforts because of supplies and conditions. Our material strength is absolutely necessary for immediate victory. However, for the mighty dollar you wish to toss our chances away. We get no raise, but those dependent on us have to live through the same standard of living as you. Yet for a strike you throw out the whole future of labor and all freedoms.

We realize how hard it is to have income taxes and long days of work. Without hesitating there is beer when you want it, cigarettes at the corner and good entertainment now and then. We realize and feel sorry for the deep struggle that you have to endure. It is easy to be bombed, and hear of your buddies strafed with machine-gun fire. This is all well and good. We here can take it; can you at home bear up with us?

You have given your answer. Shall we accept it as final? Shall all our cause be thrown away because of the petty bickering between labor and capital? You are striking and we are fighting. Our enemies are drinking to it tonight and calling it a major victory of the war. All of us here believe in labor and are looking forward to it on our return. Yet you want to betray us. The right to strike may be all well and good. But is it greater than immediate victory over our enemy. The soldier has to compromise, can you?

So for the price of our Nation with freedom and democracy in the balance there must be an easier way to settle your differences, at least until after we can assure you of complete victory and that can't be done without your help.

JOHN J. SLATTERY,
DAVID M. HENDERSON,
Sergeants.
JAMES W. SMITH,
LEONARD M. ANKER,
Corporals.

SOMEWHERE IN AFRICA, *June 4.*

The McKellar Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Richard T. Frankensteen, vice-president and director of legislative department, United Automobile Workers of America, C. I. O., to the editor of the Washington Post, relative to the McKellar bill:

JUNE 15, 1943.

To the EDITOR, Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is one aspect of the McKellar bill which has not been discussed in Congress or in the newspapers. I refer to the effect such a bill will have on labor's relations with the Government.

During recent years, and particularly since the war, labor has had to deal more and more with the Federal Government. To a great extent, wages and conditions of work, as well as the cost of living, are determined in Washington. Probably a majority of the Government employees with whom labor deals earn from $4,600 to $7,000 per annum, and would therefore be subject to Senate approval under the McKellar bill.

Many of these people seem to feel a responsibility only to business lobbyists who might buy them expensive dinners and offer them the promise, directly or indirectly, of more lucrative employment in private industry. A large number of Government officials, however, recognize their duty to administer their jobs impartially for all elements of the population. They do not bow at the sight of a trade association executive, and they do not snub labor representatives. They try to do an honest job. It is these people whom Congress has been attacking through various investigating committees, who have been called Red, professors, theorists, impractical, in an effort to drive them out of the Government, or make them practical. The McKellar bill was evidently drawn up to keep such honest officials from ever getting into the Government.

Thus the bill becomes more than a patronage grab. It is another of the many steps which Congress has taken in recent months against the interests of the people as a whole and for the protection of small groups of vested interests. At a time when we are fighting for democracy such a development constitutes a mockery to our men and women in the armed forces. It strikes at the very root of democracy.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD T. FRANKENSTEEN,
Vice President and Director of Legislative Department.

Anniversary of Enactment of Reclamation Law of 1902

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a news release which notes an important event in the domestic history of the Nation, an event which has enabled the West to make greater contributions to the prosecution of the war than otherwise would have been possible. I refer, of course, to the forty-first anniversary of the enactment of the reclamation law of 1902, which was approved by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 17, 1902.

This law led to the establishment of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. The news release embodies a report by Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. It tells the story of the transformation of western water resources into useful channels for the production of food and power.

From the foundation that has been laid since 1902, the Bureau is making highly significant contributions to the prosecution of the war through electric energy to turn the wheels of industry and in food supplies that are vital to the armed forces and to the home front. Given the green light by the War Production Board and with additional funds for irrigation construction, the Bureau of Reclamation can do even more in supplying food which General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff, has emphasized as most essential of war materials.

To those of us in the West who have observed the evolution of the Bureau of Reclamation from a trail-blazing agency into an effective Federal activity of Nation-wide import, it is a pleasure to extend congratulations to Secretary Ickes, Commissioner John C. Page, and Acting Commissioner Bashore.

The news release is as follows:

The most productive year in the history of the Bureau of Reclamation, featured by tremendous increases in two war essentials—power and food crops—came to an end today as the Bureau celebrated its forty-first anniversary, Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore reported to Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes.

Mr. Bashore said that reclamation power plants served many of the major war industries of the West with increased quantities of electrical energy. The 4,000,000 acres irrigated by Bureau systems provided huge stores of potatoes, beans, beef and dairy products, sugar beets, and many other vital foods for civilian and military needs.

The reclamation law, which established the national policy of conserving western water resources for irrigation, was approved by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 17, 1902.

"Today, on its forty-first anniversary, the Bureau of Reclamation can look back on a most satisfactory year," Secretary Ickes said. "That it was able to keep pace with the sky-

rocketing demands for power resulting from the sudden burst of war-plant expansion in the West was no accident, nor was it purely a happy circumstance that food production on Bureau projects could be increased to record highs. For years the Bureau of Reclamation has been laying the groundwork for turning western water resources into the service of the Nation.

"When a shortage of power threatened to retard increased war production early in the international conflict, the Bureau was able quickly to enlarge its capacity to meet the emergency. Now that increased food production is the Nation's major home-front objective, Federal reclamation projects again have stepped into the breach. Large volumes of essential foods came from Bureau developments last year and even greater contributions are possible in the next 2 years. When permitted to proceed with proposed irrigation construction, halted by the diversion of materials to other war activities, the Bureau of 1945 can increase its service to nearly 1,500,000 acres."

The more significant achievements of the Bureau during the year ended today, as summarized by Mr. Bashore, are:

1. Produced on 3,972,000 acres of irrigated lands, formerly desert wastes, a record crop of critical war foods, valued at $268,000,000. This is a 46-percent increase over the 1941 valuation. From this land came 3,000,000 100-pound sacks of beans, 29,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and 2,500,000 tons of alfalfa. The latter, fed to beef and dairy herds, provided a potential 144,000,000 pounds of beef and 1,700,000,000 pounds of milk.

2. Generated more than 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power—four times the entire output of all plants in the United States in 1902—to keep war plants producing at maximum capacity.

3. Installed 500,000 kilowatts of new war power capacity—equivalent to the 1941 total installation of the State of Florida—and advanced installation of an additional 500,000 kilowatts. At the conclusion of this work the capacity of the 30 Bureau power plants in 11 States will be 2,500,000 kilowatts.

4. Provided supplemental domestic and industrial water for Los Angeles and other California cities where vital war factories are located. Three million people benefit from this service.

5. Planned construction programs to increase food production through resumption of construction on irrigation developments where work had been halted because of war conditions. As a result of these plans restrictions were lifted permitting installation of control works in Friant Dam and completion of the Madera Canal, both features of the Central Valley project in California. The War Food Administration has recommended that work be resumed on seven other projects.

6. Through provision of domestic and industrial water and power the Bureau made possible the establishment in isolated areas of air bases and other military centers and industries linked with the war.

Through its irrigation, power, and municipal water service, the Bureau is serving more than four and one-half million persons in the West, about one-fourth of its entire population.

As its contribution to a post-war public works program for providing employment for discharged servicemen and war workers and later settlement opportunities for these men, the Bureau is accumulating a large shelf of new or uncompleted projects on which construction can be launched promptly after the war. These developments would bring either a full or supplemental supply of water to 7,800,000 acres of land and make possible the installation of 3,300,000 kilowatts of power.

The Bureau of Reclamation had a humble beginning. During 1906—the first year it made water available—only 22,300 acres were irrigated. Crops raised that year were valued at $22,900. In 1942 nearly 4,000,000 acres on 41 projects in 15 Western States are being served, and crops were valued at more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

The steady growth of Federal reclamation in the West is evident from the following table showing yearly increases in acreage:

	Acres
1906	22,300
1910	471,423
1915	810,649
1920	2,205,420
1925	2,339,470
1930	2,790,856
1935	2,935,616
1940	3,391,070
1942	3,972,000

Lands irrigated through Bureau facilities have produced crops valued at more than $3,250,000,000, four times the cost of constructing the project works. The developments have created actual values in farm lands and improvements of $500,000,000.

Production of power by Bureau plants also began on a small scale. In 1906 the Bureau built a small powerhouse on the Salt River project in Arizona to generate electric energy to drive the machinery used in constructing the dam. Today the Bureau is the Nation's largest Federal power producer. Its plants have an installed capacity of more than 1,600,000 kilowatts. When fully equipped two of its powerhouses, Grand Coulee and Boulder, will be first and second largest in the world. Boulder, with about three-fourths of its installations in place, now holds that distinction.

The following table, listing the year-by-year power output of Bureau plants since 1937, graphically illustrates how production has increased to keep pace with the demands of the expanding West.

	Kilowatt-hours
1937	1,056,757,865
1938	2,457,644,625
1939	2,212,568,189
1940	3,501,820,077
1941	4,343,697,483
1942	7,193,495,233
1943 (estimated)	12,299,000,000

The ultimate capacity of Bureau plants in operation, under construction, or authorized is 4,793,262 kilowatts, and their potential output, 25,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, twice the production forecast for 1943.

U. S. Q. M. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a splendid and deserving editorial appearing in the Boston Globe of June 16, 1943, entitled "U. S. Q. M. C.," giving proper recognition to the important, but oftentimes forgotten Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army:

UNITED STATES QUARTERMASTER CORPS

On June 16, 1775, the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army was created by the Continental Congress. Soon thereafter Maj. Gen. Thomas Miffin was appointed the first Quartermaster General and, with one assistant, was expected to supply food and clothing for General Washington's Army.

Since then the Army has had a Quartermaster Corps of some sort continuously, but usually in years of peace, and sometimes in times of war, the corps has been cast in the role of orphan stepchild. The American Government and the American people, in spite of the frequency of our wars and of the vital necessity for supply, have been slow to recognize the essential function that the Quartermaster performs in the prosecution of a war.

Today, the Quartermaster Corps, under the command of Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, as a part of the Army Service Forces, has come into its own. Incredible as it may seem, until this war began we had never trained officers and men specifically for quartermaster duties. Hitherto, at the outbreak of war, we have hurriedly thrown a Quartermaster Corps together by using the skeletonized peacetime force as a nucleus around which to improvize a hodge-podge organization.

This system never worked very well, though it functioned better than anyone had any right to expect. We were slow to appreciate truths about supply that were long since accepted by history's greatest soldiers. The Germans, who are probably the world's most astute militarists, have for years kept the quartermaster corps as the most elite branch of their military service. Napoleon considered an efficient quartermaster as the first requisite for military success. But we have thought of our supply system as an appendage attached to our Army whenever we happened to remember it at all.

The present global conflict has changed our ideas. Fortunately, the importance of supply was realized even before we were attacked. We had begun to bring our quartermaster corps up to the size and efficiency needed for the maintenance of armies in all climates and sections of the world before we were engaged in war. Because we did we have been able to move rapidly and effectively.

Today the Quartermaster Corps has its own officer candidate school at Camp Lee; its own training camps for its own soldiers; its own schools for noncommissioned officers and specialists of many kinds. The corps is proud to assert—without fear of contradiction—that this is a quartermaster's war, and, further, that the quartermaster is a combat soldier as he has never been in other wars.

Charged with the duty of feeding and clothing the troops, with much of the responsibility for sheltering them and transporting them, the corps has a job of immense size and variety. Merely to state that the corps buys, stores, and distributes more than 70,000 items of food, clothing, general supplies, and equipment gives an idea of the variety of the material handled. To state that the corps must buy 20,000,000 pounds of food per day for Army consumption in this country alone, or to mention that since Pearl Harbor the depot here in Boston has purchased 40,000,000 pairs of shoes of 240 different sizes, indicates the dimensions of the task.

The stuff needed must be sent as surely to the smallest fox hole on Attu as to the great warehouses at Fort Devens or Camp Edwards.

The quartermaster not only buys and distributes food, he also teaches the Army cooks and bakers how to prepare it. To clothe one soldier for 1 year requires the wool from some 26 sheep. Salvage of material; maintenance of supply; transportation by sea, air or land for both men and supplies; design of the clothing and shoes, all these are quartermaster functions, and there are others too numerous to mention.

The quartermaster feeds and clothes the troops, bathes them, does the laundry, takes care of motor transport, runs public utilities, conducts experiments. Without the quartermaster the Army could not move, eat, or fight.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

O. W. I. Portrays Economic Dictatorship in Germany—What About America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include sections of an O. W. I. release of March 30, 1943, which is taken word for word from the actual release of that agency:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION.

The following release by the Office of War Information tells the story of the elimination by decree and compulsory "rationalization," of the small German businessman by the Nazi regime and a coterie of economic dictators.

"The Nazi swastika has become the symbol of a 'double cross' for scores of thousands of German businessmen, retailers, and middle class enterprises, the Office of War Information reported today on the basis of information from authoritative sources in neutral countries.

"The German total-mobilization program launched January 29, 1943, has grown from what appeared to be simply an emergency wartime measure to a social and economic landslide in which the small businessman and the German middle class are the conspicuous victims.

"Disguising their action as a total mobilization program, the Nazi Party finally has betrayed middle-class German businessmen and has delivered them into the hands of the Nazi-controlled trusts, monopolies, and giant combines, Office of War Information information indicates.

"Since 1942, when the Nazis introduced a compulsory price system based on the costs of the lowest-cost producers, the smaller enterprises in Germany have been progressively forced to operate on the very margin of loss, or have been forced to close down, or have become outright subsidiaries of giant corporations and monopolies.

"One institution after another in the economy of Germany has been crushed by Nazi decrees and regulations designated to turn competition into monopolistic collusion. The Nazis have openly favored and promoted enterprises with the most highly 'rationalized' equipment at the direct expense of the small and medium-sized businessman, shopkeeper, and employer. Large German industry has been organized into compulsory or semicompulsory cartels under the supervision of the State and the Nazi Party. These cartels were entrusted with the task of 'rationalizing' German industry.

"The process of 'rationalization,' executed by a coterie of Nazi-approved economic overlords in the armament industry led by Albert Speer, Minister for Armaments and Munition, has resulted in the closing of thousands of small enterprises. Commodity markets have been regimented by arbitrary laws. The entire industrial apparatus of Germany has been converted to ruthless centralization which ignores the interests of both middle-sized and small business as well as consumers.

"This process has sealed the Nazi Party plan to tranform the entire German economy into a regimented and centralized apparatus working full-time under Nazi political leadership."

Mr. Speaker, I request Elmer Davis' agency to find any substantial difference between the economic dictatorship that they condemn in Germany and the current operating policy of the O. P. A. and associated agencies in this country. This request is made in good faith and with an earnest desire for enlightenment. This House should have reasonable assurance that our economic policies are not leading us toward the betrayal Elmer Davis has portrayed in Germany. The natural laws are the same here as anywhere else on the globe. The effects of the law of gravity are the same everywhere. Policies which seek to evade or avoid the effects of breaking the law of supply and demand have always resulted in disaster elsewhere.

Unfair O. P. A. Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials which graphically express local sentiment on O. P. A. enforcement. The first, entitled "This is Democracy" is from the Stoneham (Mass.) Independent of June 11, 1943, and the second, entitled "Salute to Stoneham" is from the Wakefield (Mass.) Daily Item of June 10, 1943. I can assure the Congress that the people of Stoneham constitute a community which is marked for its civic enterprise and which would never yield to any other in any patriotic movement. Confidence, however, is always an essential for cooperation, and I call upon the Congress to witness that there is set out here ample justification for failure to have such confidence.

This Stoneham incident bears out the view I have been expressing for some time, that the sooner gasoline rationing is taken away from O. P. A. the sooner will we have a better contented people to face the troublesome problems of sacrifice and privation that lie ahead.

The editorial follow:

THIS IS DEMOCRACY

Stoneham was treated to the sight of a fine bit of bureaucracy and despotism this week. It so closely resembled Hitlerism that we are fearful for the welfare of our liberty-loving country if it continues.

This is the story.

On Sunday, Office of Price Administration inspectors came to Stoneham, at the request of a local citizen, to catch people driving to the monthly organ recital and concert at the town hall. Even though there were 500 people in the hall, a much smaller audience than usual, there were only 13 flagrant violators recorded by the inspectors. The statement was made that they would be made examples of.

On Tuesday night, members of rationing boards from 16 cities and towns in this area came to this same town hall where the inspectors had operated on Sunday. Also, there came the State director of Office of Price Administration and some of his staff. There were 64 cars parked around the town hall area, most of them transporting people to this meeting.

The Office of Price Administration director spoke, and the audience listened to the organ—the same organ which gave the concert on Sunday.

There was just as much other transportation available for those rationing board members and State directors as there was for the residents of Stoneham. The people of Stoneham took full cognizance of that fact. But the Office of Price Administration didn't attempt to live up to the laws that the rest of us must live by.

It was not democracy or fair play.

The selectmen, in meeting that same night took note of the situation and issued a written order to Captain of Police Nelson to refrain from cooperating with the Office of Price Administration in enforcement of the gasoline driving ban. At the same time they ordered the police to take the registration numbers of every car parked in the area of the town hall.

In addition, this reporter took time to check every one of the 64 cars in the area to see what type of stickers they showed. In evidence were 25 C stickers, 19 B stickers, 10 A stickers, one truck, one T sticker on a sedan, and 1 car with no sticker at all.

That record speaks for itself.

In Monday's metropolitan newspapers, the Stoneham Town Hall Organ Concert (mistakenly termed opera by the papers) was classed along with the two local golf clubs, and still later with the Wonderland dog track, Revere Beach, Norumbega Park, and movie theaters.

Fair play?

Several months ago this newspaper accused State Director Lawrence J. Bresnahan of not playing fair in removing the chairman of the local board because he was running for political office while permitting two Belmont citizens to remain on their board. Mr. Bresnahan had neither the courage nor the right answer to reply.

Stoneham citizens by the score have asked for action on this matter—direct violation by the State and local boards of this area on Tuesday of the very thing they operated against on Sunday. There is no excuse for the Tuesday night affair.

Until we American people take the bull by the horns and tell these political appointees what we think of their actions—and that they are not privileged characters, we will be approaching a totalitarianism and regimentation that will shock every one of us some day.

Stoneham and New England will give every bit of cooperation it can give to the war effort—it is not sacrifice to give up things which will aid our 1,000 men and women in service. But we refuse to submit to such unfair tactis as this in future. And the town officers and townspeople feel 100 percent the same way.

SALUTE TO STONEHAM

The action of the Stoneham selectmen in advising the Stoneham police to refrain from aiding the Office of Price Administration gasoline snoopers brings the issue out into the open but is not out of line with sentiment and virtual "action by nonaction" which has taken place elsewhere.

Hardly had the no-pleasure-driving order been issued, with accompanying intimation that the Office of Price Administration inspectors would accompany police, than the doughty chief of police of Clinton expressed himself in no uncertain terms, while Boston's then acting police commissioner virtually said his men had other fish to fry.

It is not because the people want to deprive the armed forces of a single drop of gasoline that the resentment against the Office of Price Administration snooping has risen. It is because the people have been deceived so long that they no longer believe, and in the Stoneham case, because, no doubt,

they rightfully resent having 12 of their citizens tagged at a concert and then see 100 or 200 rationing officials arrive in the same town for a meeting which according to their own preaching (to others) they could have reached by other means.

It seems sometimes as if this administration and its supernumeraries went out of their way to be dumb. There is not much point in telling people that driving even to a Sunday night concert is "taking the life of somebody's son" and then seeing those entrusted with enforcement of that theory blithely drive around on the same kind of gasoline to listen to platitudes from administration henchmen. Neither does it help public morale to know that many of these henchmen are ex-WPA'ers politically provided for.

Hats off to Stoneham! Her "Home Front Movement" now really means something.

Lumber Division of War Production Board Should Have Additional Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the War Production Board section of the National War Agencies Appropriation bill, as presented to the committee, had an item of $1,000,000 for the stimulation of the production of logs and lumber needed to satisfy military and essential civilian requirements. I hope this item may be included by the Senate.

As a member of Representative PATMAN'S Small Business Committee, I was honored, in company with Representatives JACKSON, of Washington, and STEVENSON, of Wisconsin, in being appointed on a subcommittee to investigate our national defense program in its relation to small business as affecting the lumber industry. In response to a large number of complaints this subcommittee last month held a hearing to investigate why thousands of small sawmill operators, contributing material essential to our war effort were being forced out of operation. At this hearing representatives of various Government agencies concerned with our production effort relative to lumber, as well as a spokesman for the industry, were heard. My colleagues and I had the time and opportunity therefore, to make a more detailed analysis of our lumber-production problem, and its place in our war effort, than may have been possible for the members of the committee who studied this bill.

There is little, if any, question as to the very serious condition of our log and lumber production. Lumber stocks are the lowest on record. Present production, especially in the East, is not only low but is still dropping. As the Under Secretary of War stated last November, and I quote:

> We are not getting enough lumber to fill all the needs of the armed forces. Our requirements are going up; our production is going down.

And he added—

> Lumber comes close to the heart of our whole war problem. There are 1,200 items of military and naval equipment that can use lumber.

Lumber today is considered by W. P. B. along with steel, aluminum, and copper as a critical war material.

The bulk of the lumber produced in the East, where it is most needed for boxing and crating of materials for our overseas forces, is produced by a multitude of small woods and mill operations which form the backbone of the economic life of many forest communities and regions. Today I understand over 9,000 of these mills are shut down and more are closing daily, just when their production is most needed. This is out of an approximate total of 30,000 mills throughout the Nation.

Why are these small mills so essential to our production job closing down? Our fundamental problem is a shortage of logs, bolts, and pulpwood caused by a shortage of manpower in the woods and mills and of locally available timber. They are closing because operators and timber owners do not understand the multitude of Government regulations relative to the procurement of labor, equipment, and food, or those relative to the marketing of their output. The operators are confused and discouraged. The larger operators have their association and advisers to furnish information, legal opinion, and assistance, while the smaller operators struggle on unassisted until they give up. They will continue to drop out unless we aid them—aid them to provide essential material for our Nation's war effort; material for our farmers to pack and ship their produce, for the construction of our ships, for the boxing of munitions, and for boxing or crating of almost any article of war you care to mention.

Unless we secure this additional production almost immediately, our committee has been advised by the military procurement offices that essential war equipment destined for transoceanic shipment will have to remain in factory warehouses for an indefinite period, this at a time when these supplies are vitally needed.

The $1,000,000 appropriation requested was to supply these small sawmill and stumpage owners and operators with the information and assistance which would aid them to understand and to comply most readily with those regulations necessitated by the war; to aid them in locating and obtaining needed stumpage, labor, and equipment; to furnish that touch of Federal guidance in their hour of need which will keep them producing those materials the Nation now urgently demands.

It is the responsibility of W. P. B. to maintain log and lumber production. To meet this present situation two procedures may be followed either to build up its existing skeleton force of lumber expediters, a time-consuming and costly operation, or to utilize available facilities of other Federal and State agencies experienced in lumber-production problems. It chose the latter. It will utilize not only the experienced field personnel of the United States Forest Service, but also available services of foresters in the Extension Service, State services, and those members of the industry able and willing to participate. Throughout the effort the W. P. B. will retain its sole and legal responsibility for maintaing production.

The requested appropriation, which might be considered a drop in the bucket, is a drop which would repay tenfold the investment through reviving and maintaining the life of thousands of our small lumber and log producers in their job of producing the sinews of war.

What this $1,000,000 item would provide in technical services and assistance was explained to our subcommittee and our committee as a whole and has been approved unanimously by it and by the Hardwood and Softwood Advisory Committees of the War Production Board. I have not even heard one criticism of the proposed project from members of the lumber industry. I wish to emphasize this, as the project is not to be confused with the so-called Forest Products Service program which the industry did oppose, and which I fear some Members of this House may still confuse with the present proposed project.

The requested appropriation to stimulate the production of lumber and logs for our war effort by furnishing information, advice, and assistance to those owners and operators needing this help is not only essential to the welfare and continued operation of thousands of small sawmills and to the welfare of many of our forest communities in the East but it is a valuable—and a vital—spoke in the wheel of our Nation's war effort.

Farmers Are Faring Better in Many Ways on Prices Than During World War No. 1

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last when I was addressing the House on the question of inflation, the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, interrupted me to say that he was in favor of repealing the price- and rent-control law and that he believed we should go back to the program followed in the First World War when we had no price controls. He also suggested in an extension of remarks, which was filed the same day, that farmers should be getting 40 cents a pound for cotton and $2.50 a bushel for wheat, as they did during World War No. 1, and that this would be in the interest of the farmers and the country.

I will not take issue with the gentleman on the statement that the farmers' plight is not a happy one. In fact, farmers are working very hard for the money they receive. Having been a farmer myself, a tenant farmer at that, and having worked with my hands on the farm, and knowing the type of labor that must be performed and the small amount received for this labor, I know that farmers are not getting as much as they are entitled to in comparison with wages, prices, of goods, supplies, and costs of services generally. However, as bad as one may feel the farmer price situation is today, it has improved over the farm situation that existed during World War No. 1.

FARM PRICE SITUATION THIS AND LAST WAR

Congressman RANKIN correctly pointed out that during the last war the farmer was getting 40 cents for cotton and $2.50 per bushel for wheat, whereas under price control today he is getting 20 cents for cotton and $1.23 for wheat. During the last war, between 1915 and 1918, wheat rose from 96 cents to over $2, cotton from 11 to 29 cents, fat steers on the Chicago market from $8.40 to $14.65. In the period from July 1914 to March 1918, farm prices rose by 93 percent.

IS THE FARMER BEING BADLY TREATED?

You would think that the farmer was being very badly treated at this time. As a matter of fact, farm prices have risen 110 percent since the outbreak of the war in August 1939, a substantially larger percentage rise than that which occurred during a comparable period in the last war. The farm price of 58 foods has increased 121 percent since the war began, compared to an increase of 72 percent in the corresponding period of the last war:

	Aug. 15, 1939, price	May 15, 1943, price	Percentage increase
Cotton, per pound ..cents..	8.7	20.1	131
Eggs, per dozen.....do....	17.5	34.2	95
Butterfat, per pound cents..	22.4	50.6	126
Wheat, per bushel ..do....	54.5	122.8	125
Beans, per 100 pounds dollars..	2.63	5.6	112
Corn, per bushel...cents..	45.7	103.4	126

WITH 40-CENT COTTON WE HAD 30-CENT SUGAR AND 60-CENT COFFEE

What is even more important, while the prices that farmers received in the past war went up, the prices that he paid went up just as fast and even faster. The farmer was getting 40 cents for cotton for a brief period, but during that period he was paying 30 cents for sugar and 60 cents for coffee. This time he is paying 7 cents for sugar and 29 cents for coffee. In the last war the price of steel product increased from 200 to 800 percent. This reflected itself in the prices that farmers paid for machinery and equipment. Farmers will remember that nitrate of soda to fertilize their land rose from $48 to $94 a ton, that a cultivator which in 1915 could be got for $5 in 1918 set them back just twice that amount. And the farmer's wife will remember, I may say, that overalls which in 1915 cost 75 cents cost $1.57 in 1918; that a pair of shoes jumped in price from $2.10 to $4, and they were not the same shoes by a long shot. During the last war all the prices that farmers paid rose an average of 105 percent. This time the increase has been held to 30 percent.

SOME COMPARATIVE PRICES

Commodity	1910–14 price	Peak price	Year
Commercial fertilizer	$23.32	$43.40	1920
Corn planter	42.80	76.50	1919
Grain drill	85.96	149.27	1919
Nails	3.45	7.39	1920
Rubber boots	4.15	5.33	1918

Commodity	September 1939 price	Approximate present price	Percentage increase
Harrow, spike tooth	$11.45	$12.75	11.4
Rake, hay	53.10	58.20	9.6
Cream separator	88.20	95.70	8.5
Corn planter	87.00	94.00	8.0
Disk harrow	68.60	73.70	7.4
Manure spreader	176.00	187.00	6.3
Plow, walking	21.90	23.15	5.7
Grain drill	171.00	180.00	5.3
Ensilage cutter	330.00	334.60	1.2
Cultivator	9.20	9.24	.4
Incubator 250 eggs	26.98	26.98	0

In the case of equipment and supplies these figures tell the same story:

Commodity and unit	September 1939 price	Approximate present price	Percentage increase
Barbed wire, galvanized	$3.40	$4.20	23.5
Horse collars	4.90	5.97	21.8
Milk cans, 10-gallon	5.07	5.85	15.4
Manila rope, per pound	.24	.27	12.7
Lead arsenate, per pound	.187	.210	12.3
Poultry netting	4.99	5.45	9.2
Brick, per 1,000	21.42	23.15	8.1
Hoe	.89	.96	7.5
Gasoline, per gallon	.184	.197	7.1
Outside paint, per gallon	3.00	3.20	6.7
Pitchfork	1.22	1.27	4.1
Cement, portland, 94 pounds	.739	.756	2.3
Kerosene, per gallon	.134	.133	−1.0

The price of fertilizers has also been kept within bounds. Witness:

Commodity and unit	September 1939 price	Approximate present price	Percentage increase
Commercial fertilizer:			
3-8-3, per ton	$24.00	$25.48	6.2
4-8-7, per ton	30.35	35.79	17.9
2-12-2, per ton	28.85	29.69	14.9
Acid phosphate, per ton	17.69	20.74	17.2
Nitrate of soda, per ton	36.15	41.34	14.4
Nitrate of potash, per ton	41.00	45.92	12.0
Ground limestone	6.70	7.15	6.7

SOME PRICES OUT OF LINE—OTHERS HELD DOWN SUCCESSFULLY

The prices I have listed represent costs of production in farming. Here, I am sure you will agree, the record is clear. The record is equally clear in the case of prices which represent cost of living to the farm family. Farm wives are paying—on the basis of the latest comprehensive cost-of-living data for farmers that we have—26 percent more for food, 21 percent more for furniture and house furnishings, and 38 percent more for clothing than they were paying before the war broke out 3 years ago. Some items have risen sharply; muslin is up from 9½ cents to 16 cents per yard, an increase of 67.5 percent; overalls are up from $1.14 to $1.75, an increase of 53.5 percent; women's house dresses from $1.01 to $1.50, an increase of 48.5 percent. On the other hand, most prices have been held down successfully.

Commodity and unit	September 1939 price	Approximate present price	Percentage increase
Rubber boots	$2.73	$3.71	36
Kitchen cabinets	27.00	36.30	34
House brooms	.477	.66	38
Women's shoes	2.48	3.19	29
Dressers	18.00	22.70	26
Blankets, cotton, double	1.55	2.11	36
Wash boiler	2.81	3.39	21
Union suits, heavy winter	1.06	1.39	31
Laundry soap, per bar	.0472	.05	11
Fruit jars, per dozen	.790	.83	5
Laundry starch, per box	.101	.10	3

PRICE CONTROL HAS SAVED FARMERS $4,000,000,000

Would the farmer be better off if he were getting 40 cents for his cotton and $2.50 for his wheat if at the same time he were paying the same prices for the things he buys as he did in the last war? The answer is "No." Let me put it to you this way: If the commodities that farmers buy had risen in the first 3 years of this war as much as they did during the same period in the last war, it would have cost the farmers $4,000,000,000 more than they have actually spent. Price control of the items that the farmers buy has saved the farmers $4,000,000,000 to date, according to Government records. By the end of this year, this saving will amount to $7,800,000,000.

FARMERS' PRICES AFTER LAST WAR TOOK NOSE DIVE

What is perhaps more important, every farmer remembers what happened to his prices after the last war. Between 1920 and 1922, farm prices dropped by 41 percent. On the other hand, the prices of machinery and all of the basic items farmers buy dropped only 19 percent.

SUPPORT PRICES UNDER FARM COMMODITIES DURING WAR AND FOR 2 YEARS AFTER WAR

This time we have done things more wisely. We have placed a support price under hogs, long-staple cotton, beans, vegetables, peanuts, and many other commodities. This guarantees to the farmer that no matter what the crop conditions may be, the bottom cannot drop out from under his market during this war. We have gone far beyond that, however. We have placed a floor under farm prices not only for the duration of the war, but for 2 years thereafter, so that the farmer may expand his investment and increase his acreage with the assurance that for 2 years after the war he is guaranteed a favorable price. I might say, that so long as a democratic administration remains in power, the Government will never draw that support out from under farm prices.

NET INCOME OF FARM OPERATORS

Let us look at the position in terms of net income of farm operators. This is

the most significant figure of the war, because it represents what is left for the farmer after all his expenses. During the last war net income of farm operators rose from an average of $3,800,000,000 in 1910–14 to $8,600,000,000 in 1919, the peak of the inflation. Did the farmers retain that, however? The answer is "No." By 1921 net income of farm operators had dropped to $3,000,000,000, that is, below the pre-war level. In this war, on the other hand, net income of farm operators rose from $4,500,000,000 in 1939 to $10,200,000,000 in 1942, an increase of 128 percent. This is the highest level of net income of farm operators in our history. It stands a billion and a half above the peak level reached in 1919. What is most important of all, the buying power of this net income is vastly greater than it was in the last war. The index of prices that farmers pay stands today 20 percent below the peak of the last war, and that means that every dollar of farm income will buy 20 percent more of the things farmers need than it did in 1920.

To put it all into a nutshell, we have in this war not only brought the net income of farm operators to the highest level in all history but by providing a guaranty of a fair support price, not only during the war but after the war, have provided the farmer with assurance that this high level of net income will continue.

In this reply I am not making an effort to cover all farm problems, and there are many, such as manpower shortage and machinery shortage, or the very high wages paid in war plants in comparison to farm prices.

Vast Range of Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, within the next few days it is expected that the House will consider legislation which will deal specifically with the subject of subsidies on food products and other necessities. I doubt very much if the average well-informed person in this country has any idea of the extent to which subsidies have already been employed. Most of them are on food or on products entering into the production of food, directly or indirectly, but included also are some of the metals and fuels.

Most of the subsidies applicable to food are in connection with the loan and price support programs on agricultural products. These programs will not in all cases necessarily involve the payment of money out of the Treasury. In some cases the support prices announced by the Department of Agriculture are lower than the existing market price or price ceiling as fixed by the O. P. A. While that condition prevails as to any particular commodity no subsidy payments are necessary. In every such case, however, there is a potential subsidy involved because the O. P. A. may fix price ceilings below the support price, as has happened in numerous cases, or the market price may go below the support price.

The various types of subsidy programs now in existence might be described under six headings:

First. The loan and price support program on basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. These loans are to be made at 90 percent of parity (or at the discretion of the President at 85 percent of parity on corn and wheat) to farmers who cooperate in the programs of the Department of Agriculture and at lower percentages of parity for those who do not cooperate.

Second. The price support program on nonbasic commodities whenever the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production. This can be done through C. C. C. commodity loans, purchases, or other operations in order to support prices to producers which are not less than 90 percent of parity. Under the terms of many such price support programs on nonbasic commodities, farmers are eligible for loans only if they plant at least 90 percent of their individual war goal acreages, and usually such price support is not available on the output of acreage in excess of 110 percent of the goals. Such price support programs have been announced so far—on either the 1942 or 1943 crop—for the following nonbasic agricultural commodities: Rye, barley, grain sorghums, dried beans, dried smooth peas, dried wrinkled peas, hogs, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, vegetables for canning, cabbage for kraut, soybeans for oil, flaxseed, castor beans, olives for oil, shell eggs, whole dried eggs, dairy products—butter, skim milk, cheddar cheese, evaporated milk, fluid milk; truck crops for fresh markets, chickens and turkeys, pecans, dried fruits, sugar beets, hay and pasture seeds, seed and hemp fiber, strawberries.

Third. Subsidies paid to the processors on processed foods. These programs have been set up for the reason that O. P. A. ceilings have been established on processed foods at a price lower than the support prices established by the Secretary of Agriculture, plus the cost of processing. The procedure used in such cases is for the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase farm commodities from the processors at the price which the processor pays the farmer and then reselling the same commodity to the processors at a price enough lower to permit him to sell the finished product at the O. P. A. ceiling. These arrangements involve true subsidies for the purpose of securing increased production of raw material on the one hand and at the same time preventing an increase in the price of the finished product to the consumer. Such subsidy plans have been carried out in the past or have been announced for the future on the following: Feed wheat and corn, grain alcohol, dry wrinkled peas, vegetables for canning, cabbage for kraut, various edible oils—cottonseed, peanut and soybean; olives for oil, cheddar cheese, fluid milk, sugar beets.

Fourth. Other subsidy programs in effect on food products. These include coffee, sugar, tea, and cocoa.

Fifth. Non-food-subsidy programs. These include copper, lead and zinc, petroleum, bituminous coal.

Sixth. The new program recently announced designed to roll back prices on certain food products to the level prevailing on September 15, 1942. Up to date this includes butter and meats. There is practically no limit, however, to how far this program might be extended. The President recently estimated that such a program would cost from a billion and a half to two billion dollars but there are many who believe that its eventual cost might run to four or five billion dollars annually. Already labor organizations are demanding that it be extended to all food products and that the roll-back be extended to the May 1942 price level. It is obvious that there are scarcely any limits to what might be demanded under such a program. The method used in carrying out this subsidy is to pay processors in cash the amount represented by the reduction of ceiling prices. In consideration of this processors are expected to maintain existing prices to producers.

LIST OF VARIOUS PRICE SUPPORT AND SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

The following is believed to be a complete list of subsidy and price support programs in operation on June 18, except possibly it does not cover some of the activities of the Board of Economic Warfare:

Copper, lead, and zinc: The Metals Reserve Company has agreed to pay special premium prices for copper, lead, and zinc produced in excess of designated quotas—in cents per pound:

	Premium price	Ceiling price	Subsidy
Copper	17	12	5
Lead	11	8¼	2¾
Zinc	9¼	6½	2¾

To aid small mines the quotas were set at zero so that their entire production would command the premium price. The basic quotas are established by mines or groups of mines rather than by companies.

Petroleum: The Defense Supplies Corporation is subsidizing the higher distribution costs attending the shift to tank cars to bring gasoline and other petroleum to the eastern seaboard. Prior to the adoption of this subsidy, the price of gasoline had been increased 2½ cents per gallon. This increase was canceled when the subsidy program was adopted.

Bituminous coal: The Defense Supplies Corporation has been authorized to spend up to $40,000,000:

First. To pay transportation costs in excess of normal rates of transportation prevailing prior to January 1, 1942, on coal received on and after May 18, 1942,

in and around New York Harbor area and in New England.

Second. To pay transportation costs in excess of normal as indicated above on inventories accumulated by coal dealers in the above area between January 1 and May 17, 1942, and not disposed of by May 17, 1942.

Coffee: C. C. C. absorbs increase in shipping cost over December 6, 1942, and also 75 percent of excess rail shipping charges caused by need for diversion of ocean steamers. Also expects to build up a $75,000,000 stock pile with probable losses when liquidated.

Sugar: Since the first of the year C. C. C. has imported about 1,070,000 tons of sugar and has also arranged for direct shipment of about 250,000 tons to the British. C. C. C. has also negotiated for the purchase of the entire 1943 Cuban sugar crop with few exceptions. Sugar imported by C. C. C. is sold to the trade approximately at cost, but in the interest of price stabilization post-Pearl Harbor increases in ocean freight and transportation differences due to the necessity of diverting shipments to various ports have been absorbed.

Tea: C. C. C.'s 1943 tea program involves the purchase of about 65,000,000 pounds from the British from India and Ceylon. Tea is sold to the trade for distribution at a price within the limits of O. P. A. ceilings which insures a reasonable profit to the trade and no loss to C. C. C. By means of the tea program the market has been stabilized.

Cocoa: C. C. C. extended economic aid to Brazil by guaranteeing to the Brazilian Government the sale of 1,300,000 bags if it developed that shipping should be unavailable. Fortunately, the entire quantity guaranteed was sold by Brazil to the United States trade and it has all been shipped to the satisfaction of the Brazilian dealers, producers, and American importers and manufacturers without the necessity of C. C. C. being forced into the market.

Corn: C. C. C. loans, on 1942 crops, to farmers who comply with agricultural conservation program, plus 6 cents per bushel on corn stored until August 1, 1944, and delivered to C. C. C. in payment of loan. Average amount advanced—as of April 30, 1943—was 77 cents. Nineteen hundred and forty-three program yet to be announced, but law says support prices must not be less than 90 percent of parity at beginning of marketing year.

Wheat: Commodity Credit Corporation loans on 1942 crop to growers complying with allotments. Full loans on regular crop and one-half loan on volunteer wheat. Noncooperators eligible for 60 percent loans on wheat which would be subject to penalty if marketed, with no loans on quota wheat. Nineteen hundred and forty-three program still to be announced, but subject to law that prices must be supported at 90 percent of parity at beginning of marketing year. Average amount advanced, with loans outstanding on 299,705,708 bushels on April 30, 1943, was $1.13.

Rice: On 1942 crop, average farm price to be supported by C. C. C. loans and repurchases. Some prices now above parity, no program contemplated for 1943, but law requires support at not less than 90 percent of parity at beginning of marketing year.

Peanuts: C. C. C. to support market for 1943 crop at prices which will average $140 per ton on Virginia and Spanish types and $130 per ton on Runners, or 90 percent of parity.

Rye: C. C. C. loans on 1942 crop to producers complying with soil conservation program. Nineteen hundred and forty-three program not yet announced.

Barley: C. C. C. loans on 1942 and 1943 crops at specified rates, 1943 being 15 to 20 cents higher than in 1942. To be eligible farmers must plant 90 percent of goals.

Grain sorghums: C. C. C. loans on 1943 crop at rates—which must be at least 90 percent of parity—not less than 85 cents a bushel against 50 cents last year. To be eligible farmers must plant 90 percent of goals.

Feed-wheat program: C. C. C. has sold about 181,000,000 bushels at substantial losses. Result has been to support mill feed price at $1.50 per ton below O. P. A. ceilings.

Grain-alcohol program: C. C. C. has sold about 59,000,000 bushels since July 1942, with some losses.

Dry beans: C. C. C. support prices, on 1943 crop, for 13 varieties, also loans on thresher run; $6.50 per bushel on pea, Great Northern, and similar varieties; $7.50 on lima and kidney beans.

Dry smooth peas: By F. D. A. purchases, 1942 crop at $5.50 per hundredweight for United States No. 1; 1943 crop at $5.65; also loans on thresher run at $4.50 per hundredweight.

Dry wrinkled peas: By F. D. A. purchases. Nineteen hundred and forty-two crop at $5.25 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1. Nineteen hundred and forty-three crop at $4.25, but only for peas grown under contract for canning purposes but not used.

Hogs: By Government purchase and other means, through September 30, 1944, so as to insure $13.75 average, Chicago basis, for good and choice butcher hogs weighing 240 to 270 pounds.

Dairy cattle conservation program: To prevent dairy cattle from being sold for beef, C. C. C. purchased 21,329 head and resold at dairy cattle prices at a loss of $270,000. Since then prices of dairy cattle have advanced.

Irish potatoes: By direct purchases, loans and diversions on 1943 crop. Grower must have planted 90 percent of his goal. Support prices average about 92 percent of February 15, 1943, parity prices or about $1.76 per hundredweight. In addition, producer will be paid 50 cents per bushel on normal yield of acreage in excess of 90 percent of goal, but not over 110 percent.

Sweet potatoes: By F. D. A. purchases of 1943 crop in States having established goals, at $1.15 per bushel from August to November, $1.30 in December and January, and $1.45 in February, March, and April, for U. S. No. 1. Average 1942 price, 90 cents.

Vegetables for canning: Price-support programs will assure growers 20 to 50 percent higher than last year. For example: Snap beans, $80 to $110 per ton, compared with an average price in 1942 of $75; tomatoes, $22 to $27 per ton, or $3 to $8 above last year. Processors participating in the program will pay growers not less than the 1943 support prices. On vegetables processed for civilian consumption the Commodity Credit Corporation will buy the raw material from processors at the support prices and will resell the raw product to the processor at prices equal to the raw material costs allowed by the O. P. A. in establishing price ceilings for the finished product. This program will enable canners to process the pack at fair margins between cost and ceiling prices. For quantities processed under Government reservation orders, the O. P. A. will provide separate prices reflecting the increased costs of vegetables used in canning, as well as other known increased costs. This program has recently been extended to include increased labor costs.

Cabbage for kraut: On 1942 pack F. D. A. pays packers $1 for each 45 gallons sold in commercial channels, provided farmers are paid $7.50 per ton for cabbage. Will also purchase supplies in packers' hands after March 1, 1943, at 14 cents per gallon.

Soybeans for oil: C. C. C. support price at $1.80 per bushel for 1943 crop plus 7 cents for farm storage under a C. C. C. loan to growers planting 90 percent of goal.

Flaxseed: On 1943 crop, C. C. C. support price on loan at $2.85 per bushel for U. S. No. 1 to any producer planting 90 percent of goal, plus 7 cents storage under a C. C. C. loan. Will be adjusted upward if necessary to reflect 90 percent of parity as of June 1, 1943. These rates now higher than 90 percent of parity.

Castor beans: C. C. C. will purchase at 6 cents per pound for purpose of making increased seed supply available for 1944.

Olives for oil: C. C. C. on 1942 crop to pay—or loan—$3.75 per gallon to crushers if they pay growers' prices which would average about $123 per ton.

Oil refining subsidies: Oil refiners agree to purchase crude oil at ceiling prices, sell to C. C. C. at same prices, but buy it back at one-half cent per pound lower price. Total losses from 1942 crops of cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans expected to be about $15,000,000. Similar program of purchase and resale between soybean farmers and processors covers 100,000,000 bushels at average loss of 12 cents, or total of $12,000,000. Freight absorption program on flaxseed will cost about $200,000.

Fats and oils: World-wide purchases of fats and oils are being made by C. C. C. for allocation to the trade by F. D. A. Ceylon copra, Brazilian babassu and cashew nut shell oil, all of them of strategic necessity, are being distributed through trade channels under allocation for use in the war effort. C. C. C. absorbing part of the unusual expenses due to the war.

Shell eggs: Through June 30, 1944, F. D. A. will support egg prices at not less than 30 cents in spring and early summer and 34 cents annual average. Actual purchases not likely to be heavy because of heavy buying for lend-lease.

Southern shell eggs: In 12 Southern States, during heavy producing season, buyers under contract with F. D. A. will pay producers specified prices, around 33½ cents in most of these States for large grade A.

Whole dried eggs: Prices specified through January 31, 1944, by grades and delivery dates.

Dairy products: F. D. A. will purchase through Dairy Products Marketing Association, through June 30, 1944, at following prices, which are based on 90-percent parity equivalent. Butter, at ceiling levels but not less than 46 cents for 92 score at Chicago; dry skim, roller process, 12½ cents; dry skim, spray process, 14½ cents. Cheddar cheese, C. C. C. payment of 3¾ cents per pound to make up difference between O. P. A. ceiling of 23¼ cents and 27 cents, Wisconsin Cheese Exchange. This has cost about $6,000,000 since December 1942. Evaporated milk, $4.10 per case.

Milk subsidies: To maintain milk production in New York, Chicago, Duluth, Baltimore, Washington, and Philadelphia areas has cost C. C. C. about $2,500,000. Contracts are on purchase and resale basis.

Truck crops for fresh market: Payments of $50 per acre in excess of 90 percent of goal, but not over 110 percent, of carrots, snap beans, lima beans, beets, tomatoes, cabbage, onions, green peas.

Chickens and turkeys: By F. D. A. purchases through June 30, 1944, at prices averaging nationally not less than 90 percent of parity. Currently prices are above 90 percent of parity, so no purchases being made.

Pecans: Growers to get nonrecourse loans to provide not less than 75 percent of parity for 1942 orchard run.

Dried fruits: Packed and processed, through June 30, 1944, will be supported by F. D. A. purchases at O. P. A. ceiling prices for Government purchases.

Sugar beets: Increase of $1.50 per ton over 1942, or about $11 in 1943. Will resell to refiners at a loss, as well as absorbing part of excess freight.

Seeds, hay and pasture: Basic loan values specified for various seeds, at principal markets.

Seeds and hemp fiber: Support prices, Kentucky growers, based on 264 pounds for grade A-line fiber. Hemp seed will be purchased at $10 per bushel, against $8 in 1942. Hemp straw in other States will be bought at $30 to $50 per ton.

Strawberries: Purchase program in Southern and Southwestern States of sulfur-dioxide packed strawberries from packers; contract to specify prices packers must pay farmers.

Butter: A subsidy of 5 cents per pound on butter. This is to compensate for a reduction of the same amount in the retail price.

Meat: A subsidy of 2 cents per pound on the wholesale carcass of beef, lamb, and mutton, and 1.85 cents per pound on the wholesale carcass of hogs. This is accounted as being substantially a 10-percent price reduction and is paid to the processor.

War-risk insurance: Administered by War Shipping Administration for the purpose of maintaining, with some exceptions, ocean shipping rates in effect on January 1, 1942.

Henequen and sisal: This program is administered by the Defense Supplies Corporation for the purpose of increasing importation of these commodities.

Copper scrap: This subsidy is administered by the Copper Recovery Corporation to cover a loss of about 1 cent per pound in the recovery of copper.

Chilean nitrate: This is administered by the Defense Supplies Corporation to cover increased cost of freight, war-risk insurance, and increased Chilean price.

Puerto Rican food: This is administered through the Department of the Interior and the Agricultural Marketing Administration to compensate for increased shipping and other costs.

Jute: Administered by the Defense Supplies Corporation for the purpose of encouraging importation.

Bleached sulfite wood pulp: Administered by the Defense Supplies Corporation to increase production and avoid disruption of price ceilings.

Secret Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the class of 1918 of the University of Minnesota held its twenty-fifth anniversary reunion. It was essentially a war class in the First World War and most of its male members saw service in the conflict to make the world safe for democracy. Today, members of that class are witnessing the Second World War. Some members of that same class are in the armed forces. Many have sons who now serve in the cause of freedom.

It was an interesting experience to foregather with those who were on the campus of the University of Minnesota 25 years ago, to observe the impact of time and fortune upon their various personalities, and to relive the gracious and sweet experiences of long ago.

Two things happened in the course of that reunion which are worthy of comment. The first was the establishment of a memorial fund in the name of the class of 1918 to aid worthy needy students who require assistance. The other was the popularizing of a sentiment which is eminently worthy of publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is an objective contribution to the problems and responsibilities on the home front and constitutes a great apostrophe to that one essential spiritual quality which Congress cannot vote, and which dollars cannot buy—the quality of morale. This timely message from the University of Minnesota war class of 1918 to the Nation in this time of global conflict is as follows:

THE SECRET WEAPON THAT WILL WIN THE WAR AND SECURE THE PEACE

Congress can't vote it. Dollars won't buy it. It's your job to build it—morale.

Put unity into your community. Unity starts with U. To win the war, stop private wars at home, on the job, with the neighbors. Honest apology ends friction—starts teamwork. If we all pull together, we'll all pull through.

Be a rumor-stopper. Rumors help the enemy. Trace the facts. Face the facts. Don't exaggerate. Make your community gossip-proof, smear-proof, panic-proof, fear-proof. Every patriot shoots a rumor dead on sight!

Meet shortage by sharing. Use all of everything. Don't hoard. If everybody cares enough, and everybody shares enough, everybody will have enough. No waste in your icebox, cash box, brain box!

Keep the moral standards of the Nation high. Don't weaken the home front by wangling something for yourself on the side. Dishonesty and indulgence in you saps the Nation's fighting strength. A decent world tomorrow depends on how you live today!

The secret of steadiness and inner strength is on every penny: "In God we trust."

Telephone wires may be cut, radio stations off the air, but no bombardment can stop us from being directed by God. To listen to God and obey wherever you are is your highest national service!

Class of 1918; twenty-fifth anniversary; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Resolution of Nebraska Stock Growers Association

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the annual meeting of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in Gordon, Nebr., the week of June 7, 1943, passed some excellent resolutions, copies of which are being forwarded to the administrative heads of the several bureaus to which the resolutions pertain. I ask unanimous consent to insert these resolutions in the Appendix of the RECORD.

These resolutions reflect the considered judgment of the Midwest producers of livestock. These men are on the firing line and know the needs and how to produce the livestock needed for meat. They are far enough away from the turmoil and confusion in Washington to see clearly and think through sanely some of the problems that confront this Congress and the several bureaus of Government.

I trust the Members of Congress and the bureaus concerned will read carefully these resolutions. The Members of Congress and the bureaus concerned should stop, look, and listen to these resolutions because they reflect the thinking of the folks back home.

The resolutions follow:

We believe that Midwest producers should be enabled to ship their livestock, either processed or on the hoof, without discrimination,

to the west coast, as well as to the east coast. We believe further that livestock should be processed as near the source of supply as possible in order to encourage the industrial development of the Midwest.

We therefore urge a reduction in the freight rates of fresh meats and packing-house products from midwestern points to the Pacific coast, and we ask the Nebraska Railway Commission, on behalf of the people of Nebraska, to join in the complaint filed before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TRADE TREATIES

We commend our Senators and our Representatives in Congress for their opposition to granting to the executive department of our Government the right to make treaties and trade agreements with foreign countries without the consent of the United States Senate. By their opposition they have shown their determination to maintain the rights of the people and to preserve the American form of government.

We also most heartily commend Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, for his splendid efforts in this direction.

RUEBER PROGRAM

We commend Hon. William Jeffers, of Nebraska, for the efficient and patriotic service which he has rendered in the conservation of rubber and we endorse his program for the establishment of synthetic rubber plants so that America will not again be dependent upon any country for its total needs of so vital a commodity.

BEEF CEILING

We believe that the ceiling on fresh beef creates in practice a ceiling on the live animal, and we believe further that any attempt to establish definite ceilings on the prices that may be paid for live animals will be most harmful to our country. No enforceable order can be written to fix ceilings on the various grades of cattle. Such an attempt would seriously retard livestock production and thereby diminish the supply of meat in this very critical time. The administration of such an act would be clearly impossible and would only add to the present confusion. Black-market activities would be increased by such action.

PROTEIN FEEDS

We believe that an efficient and prompt allocation of protein concentrates is essential to an adequate beef supply, and we therefore urge the United States Department of Agriculture to advise the livestock growers promptly as to the probable available supplies and to strive for a better distribution than was accomplished last year.

SUBSIDY

We believe the proposed program to roll back the price of meat by the use of a Government subsidy to the processors of livestock is an effort to regiment all of the people in American agriculture. We believe the program had its birth in the bureaucratic ambition to control the lives of the people rather than in sound economic procedure, and we believe that such a program will have a tendency to destroy production at its very source at a time when our country at war is so vitally in need of beef.

Regardless of the fact that everywhere around us we see the products of cost-plus industry, prodigious wages, governmental waste, and some of the most fantastic prices ever paid for ordinary building, we still don't want a subsidy or time and a half for overtime. And the members of this association pledge themselves to a greater production of beef.

MUNICIPAL MARKETS

A definite allotment of meat for each member of the civilian population has been made by the Office of Price Administration. Due to a faulty and inefficient distribution system, the people of our large cities are unable to secure their just and proper share, and we urge the proper authorities of our great cities to give thoughtful consideration to a program for the establishment of a system of municipal slaughtering and marketing so that the workers in our large cities shall have their allotted share of America's production.

RANCH MACHINERY

The ordinary need for hay tools, ranch machinery, and windmills must be supplied.

The demand is highly seasonable, and there is little time to follow bureaucratic procedure and appeals. We urge the War Production Board to take immediate action in order to meet a very critical situation.

TAXATION

The income-tax laws should more evenly distribute the cost of the war. Corporations cannot pay increased rates without reflecting the tax back to their customers in higher prices for their products, nor will the production of cattle be increased by the levying of higher taxes.

Therefore, we feel that every means should be found to distribute the burden of income taxes more equitably, and we feel the cooperatives should pay income taxes on their income the same as individuals and corporations.

DRAFT AND RATION BOARDS

We are appreciative of the unselfish service of the members of the various selective-service and ration boards who are performing a necessary and a difficult task well and without compensation. We further believe that an adequate supply of experienced ranch labor is essential to the maintenance of an adequate beef supply. We therefore urge the various selective-service boards to take serious recognition of the claims of agricultural workers who have been erroneously inducted into the service at the expense of food production, and we urge the release of these men when the facts disclose the necessity for the maintenance of agricultural production.

INFLATION

Inflation during this war has not come from the price of farm commodities, nor did it come in the First World War from the prices paid to farmers. The farmer does not set his price but has always been forced to accept what others give him for his products at the market place. While this price may inflate the farmer's income it deflates the income of others, who are much more numerous.

The present inflation has come in part from the very high labor costs and the governmental waste that can be seen everywhere around us. Another cause of the present inflation has been the devaluation of gold which took place during the early days of this administration. Prices and wages were slowly rising because of this devaluation before the present war and since the declaration of war this process has been accelerated.

Pay-as-you-go taxes or any other device will not have any great effect upon the present inflationary trend so long as wages continue to mount or even remain at the present levels.

We believe in good wages, but realize that wages through industry and agriculture must tend to balance with each other. Whoever sells his labor must give a fair performance for a fair day's pay. As wages in industry and transportation mount, so must the price of things that labor produces also mount and in the exact proportion to the increase in the cost of their production.

PRODUCTION

Production of beef is the business of the members of this association. Our desire is to produce plenty not only for our armed forces and our allies, but also for our civilian population. We believe that this can be done and would have more nearly been done at fair prices if we had not had the withering influence and stupid interference of the Office of Price Administration.

Increasing the speed of meat production is not like doubling production in the factories. There an increase in volume brings a reduction in the unit cost of the article produced. Production of beef is exactly the opposite. If we increase the tempo of growth we do it by better "wintering" and greater care of our animals. Our feeders and ranchmen could furnish this Nation and its armed forces all the beef they could consume if they were given the opportunity. But this is not being done, nor will it be done until there is less governmental interference with our business.

Beef production is one activity which the Office of Price Administration should have encouraged, because it more than any other meat utilizes the grass and thus requires less grain feeding than other types of meat.

The Office of Price Administration and the other governmental agencies involved should use every effort to increase the production of beef and every regulation that they propose should pass this one test first, Will this produce more beef?

State and Federal Prisons—Some Suggested Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Nation are proud of the good facilities and excellent administration of our Federal penal institutions. Also a number of valuable reforms in prison administration has been made during the last few years. Mr. J. Pope Dyer, who is connected with the Central High School of Chattanooga, Tenn., is one of our foremost students and authorities on criminology and penal institutions. Recently he delivered an address which gives some valuable information on the way our prisons are conducted. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include this address:

It is a genuine pleasure to speak briefly to the students of this great institution on the subject of our prisons. It has been my good fortune to read extensively on the prisons of this Nation—both State and Federal—and to travel thousands of miles throughout the various sections of the country to inspect intimately the organization, workings, and activities of many of the various prisons of our Nation.

The crime problem in our Nation is a big one. Over 1,500,000 crimes are committed in our Nation annually. Over 10,000 murders, 700,000 larcenies, 300,000 robberies, and 200,000 burglaries are perpetrated each year. Crime costs each person in the United States yearly about $120 and our crime bill reaches the astounding figure of $15,000,000,000 every 12 months.

Obviously, with such a tremendous number of crimes each year, there will be a great number of persons convicted and sent to prisons. Our State and Federal prisons receive yearly approximately 70,000 persons. It is a matter of common interest to know that Alcatraz, which is located in the bay

at San Francisco, is the most famous of all American prisons because it is isolated and the most dangerous "big shot" criminals are imprisoned there. Alvin Karpis, "Machine Gun" Kelley, and others, are some of the famous inhabitants of that institution. It is, contrary to popular belief, a comparatively small prison in numbers. There were only 284 prisoners there in 1940. The small number of prisoners makes the per capita maintenance exceedingly high, which was in 1940 approximately $1,144 per person per year. It might shed some light on the issue when it is expressed that the per capita cost of the United States penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., in 1940 was $350; at Leavenworth, Kans., $341; at Lewisburg, Pa., $481 and at McNeil Island, Wash., $555. The largest of the Federal prisons is the one at Atlanta with a population of over 3,000. No nonpartisan person can inspect these prisons without feeling that they are being scientifically and firmly operated. Nothing is spared or overlooked to provide progressive opportunities for personal rehabilitation of the prisoners. The people of our country may well be proud of the excellent facilities and the progressive administration of our Federal penal institutions under the direction of Hon. James V. Bennett. On the whole, the efficiency of our Federal prisons far surpasses that of the State prisons.

The largest State prisons in the United States in 1940 were those of San Quentin in California with 5,283 prisoners; Huntsville in Texas with 6,687 (which includes some farms). The Michigan State Prison at Jackson with 5,675 persons, and the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet with about 5,940 inhabitants. In the summer of 1942, the Michigan State Prison claimed that they had the largest prison in the world.

The smallest State prisons from the standpoint of population are those of New Hampshire at Concord with 262; Nevada at Carson City with 270; Wyoming at Rawlins with 307; and North Dakota at Bismarck with 308.

The per capita cost of maintenance of prisoners in Maine was the highest of any State in 1940 with $657 per prisoner annually. It was lowest in Mississippi with $113, followed closely by Arkansas with a $132 expenditure per person per year.

There are a great many things of interest (most of which I have seen), as one surveys the various State prisons, he cannot forget the great program of industries at the Michigan State Prison. The gymnasium at Sing Sing is one of the best to be found anywhere. The whipping post at the New Castle County workhouse at Wilmington, Del., is the only one in the United States. The rodeo at the Huntsville, (Tex.) Prison is an annual event of great interest to Texans. The annual field meet at the San Quentin Prison is very unusual.

The program of the Wallkill Prison in New York probably comes nearer approximating a rehabilitation program than any other State institution. It is certainly different to stroll over the prison farms in Arkansas conscious that the guards and lookouts are armed trusties. The Catholic chapel at the Ohio Prison at Columbus, built by prisoners, is one of the most beautiful to be found in our country. These are but a few of the high lights that cannot be forgotten after visiting a number of our State prisons.

The average citizen sometimes asks questions about the inhabitants of the prisons. The prisoners are about the same physically as the persons on the outside. They are about three grades lower educationally and they have had, generally, little or no moral training. Very frequently they are victims of broken homes.

When I visited Sing Sing Prison a short time ago, I was told that the only person to ever eat his last meal there out of some 400 persons executed, was "Two Gun" Crowley. He was a ruthless young killer of New York City. The story goes that he said when asked what he wanted for his last meal: "I want turkey with all the trimmings, ice cream, and so forth." He went on to say, "When I was a child we were too poor to afford turkey; when I had the money, I was too busy dodging the officers and now that I can eat a decent meal I'm going to do it."

Recently, while visiting the Tennessee State prison at Nashville, I was allowed to interview an intelligent but frequently recalcitrant prisoner, Lonnie Taylor. The records show that he has considerably more than 200 years of time to serve. I asked him to write me his beliefs on why men commit crimes. Here is his letter in part:

"DEAR SIR: Yes; you are quite right in what I call this common-sense theory of yours. It is ignorance—and ignorance alone that causes a person to commit a crime. Therefore, if society is really interested in solving her No. 1 problem, crime (this war, however tragic and costly it may be, is forced to take a No. 2 place), then let her substitute 'education' for her present methods of antiquity, which, incidentally, and despite all the claims and the counterclaims to the contrary, are based exclusively on the thorns of retribution rather than a constructive system of rehabilitation. (I allude of course to the oft-denounced system of American penology). The proper place to start using this 'weapon' however, is in those areas and districts where poverty proves almost an insurmountable barrier to education: For it is in these poverty-stricken places that the seeds of crime are allowed to grow. Here one gets the impression that one is born into a cold, heartless, hostile world, where laws are instituted merely for the protection of the favored few, where jails and reformatories and prisons are nothing but instruments of torture and persecution used only against the poor whose poverty is their biggest crime, one that keeps them in a state of perpetual 'darkness' and causes them, by virtue of adverse circumstances to which it (poverty) gives birth, to commit all sorts of antisocial acts.

"Incidentally, I only have a fifth-grade education; the only chance I ever had to learn anything has always been behind the 'white line'—where, by no other light than the light of learning I have seen (and for the first time in my life) the futility of crime, notwithstanding the fact that I have virtually nothing to look forward to. If, however, I can encourage you to take a progressive initiative and thereby become the means of being able to help prevent other souls from falling into pitfalls of crime, then my efforts will not have been in vain.

"Sincerely yours,

"LONNIE TAYLOR."

The question is often asked what lies ahead in prison administration?

Firstly, I am convinced that brief periods of vacation may inspire improvement in the conduct of prisoners. A Governor of Alabama gave brief Christmas vacations or furloughs to worthy prisoners a few years ago. The results were successful. Naturally a few convicts did not return from these leaves. This is true today of some soldiers. It would be true of any group. These leaves, for meritorious cases, are a step in the right direction. I feel that they can be given too often and must be carefully recommended.

Secondly, married men must be permitted to visit their wives privately at intervals in prison.

There should be places in prisons where the wives of men can be with their husbands. This privilege can be abused, but prison authorities may well experiment with this idea.

Thirdly, the reformatory must be improved so that it will cease to be a recruiting school for the prison. A high percentage of adult prisoners got their early training in State reformatories. If we hope to permanently improve prison conditions we must improve conditions in the reformatory. Our State reformatories, in general, are a national disgrace. There are a few good State reformatories, but, as a rule, they are rotten. Reformatories should not be places of brutality, nor places where the mentally weak with vicious habits should be placed.

Fourthly, every State should experiment with a prison much like the Wallkill Prison of New York, where there are no walls to the prison, where a limited number of persons inclined toward reformation are fitted to reenter society.

Numerous other suggestions could be offered. Many progressive persons are now at work on prison improvement in our Nation. Some of them are: Father Flanagan, of Boys Town, Director James V. Bennett, Warden Johnson, of Alcatraz, Warden Chapman, of Florida, Warden Jackson of Michigan, and Warden Duffy of California. Others could be appropriately mentioned.

Our prisons have decidedly better facilities today than a few years ago. Our prison population is on the increase. Prisons can never be eliminated. The task of reducing the incoming population is a challenge. This task is big enough to tax the brains of our best thinkers and is a situation that every citizen must help improve, and this includes you, the boys and girls of our public schools.

St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the clerk of the Senate of the State of Wisconsin, and a resolution adopted by the State legislature:

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Madison, June 14, 1943.

The Honorable THADDEUS F. B. WASIELEWSKI,
Member of Congress, Wisconsin,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WASIELEWSKI: I am transmitting herewith an enrolled copy of a joint resolution adopted by the 1943 Wisconsin Legislature entitled "Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon termination of the war."

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk, Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 13

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation for the procurement and construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway upon termination of the war

Whereas the tortuous and hazardous shipment of submarines from Wisconsin to the Gulf coast recently symbolized both the stupidity of the selfish interests that have opposed the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and the tremendous potentialities of the Midwest as an oceangoing seaport; and

Whereas the President has indicated that such program of power and navigation development must be abandoned during the present emergency because of the critical and

urgent war needs of raw materials and manpower which necessarily must be utilized in such project; and

Whereas one of the very first projects that should be undertaken upon the termination of the war is the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway in order to ease the burden of readjustment from emergency conditions of the country to a peacetime economy, with a full measure of opportunity to the returning soldiers for employment; and

Whereas the complete utilization and development of all inland transportation facilities will reduce shipping costs so as to permit the entire country to cooperate and to participate in the international competition for commerce in the post-war period on more than even terms; and

Whereas the exigencies of the war have imperatively illustrated that such seaway would grant the hydroelectric power necessary to an effective and expansive defensive effort and grant savings to consumers with lower rates and better living standards through a greater use of electricity; and

Whereas this waterway project will add value to the products of industry and agriculture, create new markets and business, and thereby stimulate employment and materially aid economic recovery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States, and especially the Wisconsin Senators and Members of Congress, to promulgate and initiate the adoption of such treaties or other necessary legislation for the construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project upon termination of the war; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

CONRAD SHEARER,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Our Greatest Post-War Problem—A Direct Question and a Simple Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is inserted herewith a letter from a New York paper and my answer thereto:

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE,
New York, June 18, 1943.

The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Is punishment of the Axis leadership—Hitler, Mussolini, Goebbels, Himmler, etc.—more important than the reeducation of the peoples now dominated by Axis philosophy? What do you consider the most important and significant of the post-war problems, international and domestic, which so many of us are now studying and working to solve?

As a guide for its new weekly department, The World Ahead, which is devoted exclusively to studies of post-war problems, the New York Herald Tribune is asking all Members of Congress to assist in the survey covered by the attached questionnaire. You can help greatly by checking through the list of subjects and indicating those which you consider most important. It will take only a couple of minutes and we will appreciate it.

Sincerely,

EMMET CROZIER,
Editor, The World Ahead.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1943.

Mr. EMMET CROZIER,
Herald Tribune, New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CROZIER: The answer to the inquiry made in your letter of June 18 is simple.

The most important post-war problem is money. International exchange has shaped the destiny of the nations of the past—and it will shape the destiny of the nations of the future—Carthage, Rome, Venice, Spain, the British Empire, were built on the control of money and international exchange, and the greatest democracy of them all—the United States—has been built upon the broad, liberal policy supported by a sound and stable monetary system.

The greatest contribution to the service of mankind will be the establishment of a sound, adequate, interest-free international monetary system.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Southern Policy Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, some years ago the then Congressman LISTER HILL from Alabama, now Senator, with other southern Congressmen, Senators, and Government employees formed a voluntary organization styled the Southern Policy Group. This group has met each Thursday night through the years at which time some prominent speaker has addressed the meeting followed by questions relating to the problems of the day.

It has been my privilege to serve as chairman of the Southern Policy Group this year and, needless to say, I am much indebted to my colleagues for the splendid cooperation they have given in making the meetings so outstandingly interesting and profitable. At our meeting next Thursday night the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, will address us and on the following Thursday night, July 1, the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director and Chairman, Economic Stabilization Board, will deliver the last address of the current season.

Last Thursday night it was our privilege to have one of my own constituents with us—Dr. William P. Jacobs, of Clinton, S. C.—who spoke to us, in part, as follows:

I speak for no group or organization inside or outside of the Government. My words are only my own personal expressions, are not necessarily the words of an expert or authority on the subject. They are presented as a last-minute spontaneous substitute for the distinguished guest who could not be with you this evening. This speech is intended merely to be thought provocative as a somewhat different approach to subjects which we are all daily pondering.

Have you not many times wondered what this great world conflict is all about? What are we really fighting for? What is America's chief objective? Is there some common purpose behind this world effort in which we unite? And as we unite in our wondering do we not all reach the conclusion that it is the American way which we seek to preserve? And what is this American way?

What are its chief recognizable characteristics? Is there a single essential element which can be identified as typically American? If we have about as many definitions of Americanism as there are Americans, where do we find a common characteristic?

I submit that one essential and typical characteristic of the American way is found in the element of competition.

We in America accept competition as one of the earmarks by which the American way may be recognized. It represents the one essential difference between an American approach to life and foreign attitudes.

Our forefathers have striven for freedom and we seek the same ideal. In the midst of all the freedoms suggested we seek in general the freedom in thought, word, and deed which enables the American to aspire, initiate, create, produce, and preserve free from superficial obstruction or other unnecessary hindrances and restrained only by the regulations which are prompted by common sense and decency. So long as we observe the spirit and the letter of the law in the rules of the game and respect the umpire we win the freedom of action which comes with personal initiative.

In this objective we are aided by free competition limited only by the American conception of fair play.

We attribute to the element of regulated competition the sharpening of our wits, the toughening of our physiques, the strengthening of our stamina, the establishment of our independence, the stirring of our initiative, the development of our creative spirit, and the increasing of our individual skills.

We are constantly reminded by nature that competition is vital in every phase of life. The pelicans which fed on the bounty of a sardine factory before the war, faced starvation when the factory was closed, and having lost the art of fishing under a superficial aid they starved when they were forced to do their own fishing. The elk in the Jackson Hole country, after years of protection found themselves unable to meet competition and when the hay supplied by human hands failed them they found that they no longer possessed the resistance for a vigorous Northwestern winter. The deer in Canada protected by human ingenuity lost their cunning, became lazy, and were the easy victims of the wolves. Live decoys, wild ducks domesticated, are seldom killed by the hunters as they mingle with the wild birds for the hunter knows they are fat and slow and he adopts the single expedient of shooting the leading birds. So it is in all life. Competition is the essential tonic needed to develop life's cunning.

The American way has thrived on competition, for it is primarily the competitive way. You gentlemen thrive on competition. Every few years you must be alert to the dangers and ward off this competition. It is the American way, and you would not have it otherwise. The opportunity and the will to win with the typical American philosophy, may the best man win.

Our pioneering forefathers competed with the Indians and the elements for their land, their livelihood, and their security, and they won because of their American ingenuity and their hardiness.

American business, supported by American labor, has built the American way on competition. Our famed American standards of living are the direct result of the fact that we have, under the stimulation and pressure of competition, developed brand names for our products through advertising that more of them may be sold, that more may be employed in their production, that mass methods may be employed in their production, that the unit cost of production may be reduced, that an ever-increasing number of people may afford to purchase and consume the products, that more of them may be advertised and sold and produced and so on ad infinitum. That is the American way. The great American circle which awards, protects, and provides for all, stimulated by competition.

In other walks of American life we find the same force of competition building the stanch, unique American spirit. Take our armed forces for instance. It is the friendly competition between corps that has built the famed esprit de corps of the American Army.

The typical attitude of the American soldier or sailor that "my outfit is the best damned outfit in the Army or the Navy" is thoroughly American; in fact, it has made the American doughboy the marvel of the world. His pride in the corps insignia on his collar keeps him constantly striving and the more he strives the more proud he becomes and the keener. We should preserve at all costs this friendly rivalry between corps in our armed forces, this American esprit de corps. It is vitally essential to victory. It is the heart of the valor of the Air Corps. It is basic in the unusual efficiency of the Quartermaster Corps. It is the all-important urge which has established the values of the engineers, the ordnance, the medics, and the many other separate identities in our armed forces. We are strong, smart, efficient collectively because each of our separate component parts vie with each other to attain that strength. Competition is the life and strength of our armed forces.

Take American sports for instance. Calisthenics have never appealed to us even when well organized on a mass physical-fitness program. Under the urge of the will to win, the do or die spirit, we Americans must have competitive sports. Our games, in competition, give us the incentive to exercise and exercise we must have if we are to be strong enough to meet all of our emergencies. Games we must have also for morale in the armed forces and in civil life as well as for physique. That is why our boys play games, almost in the sound of the big guns in Europe, Africa, and Asia. They are keenly interested not only in their own games at the front but also in the national sports program back home. They eagerly seek the sports news. It is the same typical American spirit of never-ending struggle, the competitive spirit. We have found that a well-organized program of competitive sports is vitally essential at the front and at home in toughening our people as well as in keeping their spirits up. Americans will not have it otherwise. For the success of our efforts they need and demand competitive sports.

Even in our religion the same spirit is paramount. We call it the crusading spirit, but it is the same competition applied to the battle of conflicting beliefs. Our forefathers fought and died for the privilege of selecting their own beliefs and we still stand solidly upon our rights to competitive beliefs. Religious freedom we call it, but it is the same essential typical American element working, and undoubtedly the same competitive spirit with its keen vigor has served to bring us nearer to the truth, to the art of proper evaluation, of putting first things first—another good reason why we are strong.

Destroy, unnecessarily restrict, or discourage competition and you strike a blow at the American way. Many of our superficial programs of subsidy aimed at the coddling and protecting of mankind serve to eliminate competition for him and make him soft and lazy. Too much protection will produce a nation of drones and ultimately lead to the destruction of the American way.

Furthermore, competition is our principal weapon for combatting monopolies and all America abhors a monopoly. This is a thought well worth remembering as Congress considers the many suggestions for maintaining the American way in its various intricacies.

If in our attempted social and political reform and if throughout our military emergency we can hold firmly to the conviction that Americans, to be true to their spirit, must have freedom of competition in thought, word, and deed, we will not go very far astray from the element which has made America great.

Views of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Paschall in the Atlanta Journal of June 9, 1943:

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By John Paschall, editor of the Atlanta Journal)

Some weeks ago this broadcast was devoted to a discussion of what I called the anti-Roosevelt, anti-New Deal phobia that has so obsessed some of our best citizens that they have been unable to see any good in anything emanating from this administration. In an effort to show that the country had not gone to the dogs under the Roosevelt administration, I quoted the figures on the national income for the past 10 years. The broadcast inspired an unusual number of letters, some of them from as far away as New England. The critical letters all made the same point: "Why didn't you discuss the national debt?" To all these critics I replied:

"In regard to the national debt, it never occurred to me to mention this, as I was not discussing the Government's solvency, but our national economy. The national debt is of common knowledge, mentioned almost every day in the newspapers. While it was heavily increased under the Roosevelt administration for social and rehabilitation purposes when private enterprise had bogged down, the billions spent for this purpose are small compared to the staggering increase because of the war. The pre-war debt would look pretty good to almost any businessman now. Most businessmen are even willing to cancel $10,000,000,000 of the Nation's assets in taxes. I don't know how we are going to pay the war debt, but I do know we are fortunate to be able to finance a war for our liberty with it."

After further consideration it has seemed to me that perhaps the critics had a good point, and that we cannot get a fair view of our national economy without due consideration of the solvency of the Government. With this thought in mind, I asked our Washington correspondent, Mr. Ralph Smith, to interview Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and get his views about the national debt. This interview was published in Mr. Smith's Crackerland column in the Journal last week. I hope some of Senator GEORGE's observations may prove interesting and enlightening to this audience.

If any man in public life can speak with some degree of experience and authority, it should be the senior Senator from Georgia, an able lawyer, a student of business, government, and finance, the former chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the present chairman of the Finance Committee, and the author of the compromise pay-as-you-go tax plan just adopted by the Congress. Senator GEORGE is not frightened by the prospect of a $300,000,000,000 national debt, which he envisions at the end of the war. He believes the debt can, should, and will be paid, and he scorns the contention of the new school of economists, who look on deficit financing as a blessing in disguise. But the Senator offers no comfort to the Roosevelt haters, who hold the President responsible for the Government's huge unbalanced Budget.

"The Federal Budget was out of balance," says the able Senator, who survived the President's effort to defeat him for reelection, "when Roosevelt entered the White House. During the last year of the Hoover administration Government spending exceeded Government income. The era of deficit financing reached Washington before Roosevelt. The unbalanced Budget was one of the lesser problems confronted by the Democrats."

The Senator recalled that a multitude of pressing problems confronted the Nation, and that while the Democrats were in control of the Government the Republicans very generally supported a program designed to relieve an acute situation. A banking holiday was declared, large appropriations for agriculture, for relief loans for States, cities, counties, benefits and bonuses were voted by Congress, often without a roll call in either branch. But even so, says Senator GEORGE, "There was a brief period along about 1936–37 when the situation showed definite signs of improvement. Unforseen emergencies, however, arose to necessitate continued deficit spending. The net result was that when the war crisis came in 1939 the national debt was $40,000,000,000."

Let us consider these figures. The national debt was $22,000,000,000 in June 1933, the first year of Mr. Roosevelt's incumbency, and by June 1939, when the war had almost enveloped us and there had already been much spending on account of the crisis, the public debt had climbed to $40,000,000,000. Discounting the well-known fact that these funds were voted by heavy majorities, including both Republicans and Democrats, we may figure the cost of the peacetime New Deal at $18,000,000,000. That was a lot of money in those days, but it is just pocket change now, when the Congress is voting two and three times this amount in a single appropriation bill. Only a short time back the House passed a bill appropriating $30,000,000,000 for the Navy Department. The appropriation for the operation and maintenance of the Army this next fiscal year approximates seventy billions. Of course, this is war and we are fighting for the Nation's life, but the crisis that confronted this country when Mr. Roosevelt first took over in 1933 was admittedly one of the gravest ever faced by this democracy. Mr. Roosevelt met it. The cost was large, but who will say that it was not worth every penny that was spent?

Senator GEORGE reminds us that Mr. Roosevelt did not inaugurate deficit spending by the Government. May I remind you that business itself set the precedent for deficit spending? What was the bonded debt of the Nation's greatest industry, the railroads, at the time the New Deal was adding $18,000,000,000 to the national debt? Well, it was just about what it has been for the past 20 years. Moody's Steam Railroads for 1942 informs us that the bonded

indebtedness of the class I railroads of the United States was $10,000,000,000 in 1920, that it was $11,000,000,000 in 1929, and that in 1941 it was still $11,000,000,000. This debt of the railroads, which has gone unpaid for over 20 years, was one-fourth of the national debt at the end of the New Deal's peacetime spending. I cite this not as criticism of the railroads, but as something businessmen may well think about when denouncing so-called New Deal financing. Also, it may be pertinent to remember that the total amount spent on the Work Projects Administration from its inception in 1935 to June 30, 1942, was less than $10,000,000,000, an amount not in excess of the tax assets that would have been canceled under the original Ruml plan, generally favored by business.

With these unorthodox asides, I gladly turn the national debt back to Senator GEORGE for retirement. The able and conservative Senator tells us that the country still is not broke, despite the staggering deficit that confronts us on account of the war.

Notwithstanding the magnitude of the debt, Senator GEORGE foresees its liquidation, provided the executive and legislative branches of the Government chart and pursue a sane and sound course. He believes that the debt can be paid at the rate of $20,000,000,000 a year, without working undue hardship on the people or upsetting the economic structure of the country.

But "there are those in this country," says Senator GEORGE, "who believe the debt makes no difference because it is wholly internal. We owe it to ourselves, they argue, and so we do, but deficit financing continued, as they would continue it, could but result in collapse. The obligation must be satisfied."

It is heartening to know that President Roosevelt also holds to this view. In presenting the 1944 Budget, the President declared that "a debt of $210,000,000,000 can and will be repaid. The Nation is soundly solvent."

Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, also says "the financial integrity of the Nation must be maintained." This sound and traditional point of view was voiced by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee in 1941.

"The defense program is an absolute necessity," said he. "It must be paid for. Insofar as possible, it should be paid for now. Borrowing should be kept to a minimum to maintain our fiscal strength. The rise in the federal debt means merely that the taxpayer's burden is being postponed—that both principal and interest must be paid later out of higher taxes collected at a time when they may be harder to pay and less willingly paid than now. * * * An all-out tax program will build public morale in an all-out defense program. By reducing the necessity for borrowing, it will strengthen confidence in the impregnable fiscal position of the Government."

These are words of wisdom. If we will but follow them, the outlook is not disheartening. "The normal, ordinary expenses of the Government amount to around six and one-half billion dollars a year," says Senator George. "These expenses aren't likely to increase materially after the war, if the authorities exercise sound judgment, and adhere to sane policies. We are now raising annually by taxation over $35,000,000,000."

"That pictures the possibility, the probability," continues the senator. "Obviously we could meet post-war regular expenses and apply $20,000,000,000 to the debt annually, yet substantially reduce taxes. No thecrizing is necessary to appreciate the full outlines of the picture. All that is required, all that will be required when peace comes, is for the country to consider the situation calmly and reasonably.

"Given a favorable balance of trade and fair treatment, the commerce and industry of the United States will continue to hum for many, many years, and the national income will support taxes that will take care of the national debt."

The words I have just quoted are not those of an impractical dreamer or a wishful thinker. They express the measured views of a legislator of long experience and great ability, who will have much to do with shaping the Government's future financial policy.

Truly, "It is good news, worthy of all acceptation; and yet not too good to be true."

Food Production in Arkansas by F. S. A. Borrowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following letter and summary of Farm Security production figures sent to me by Mr. John G. Pipkin, a highly respected citizen of my State, a former State commander of the American Legion, and at present the commissioner of public welfare:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Little Rock, June 16, 1943.

Hon. BROOKS HAYS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROOKS: I have noted with considerable interest that the Senate recently approved the agricultural appropriation bill which included $160,000,000 for Farm Security Administration, by a vote of 66 to 12.

I believe the next step will be for this bill to go back to a joint committee of the House and Senate in order that any differences might be ironed out.

I am enclosing herewith a brief summary of what the Farm Security Administration has meant to Arkansas the last 2 or 3 years in the way of increased food production and help to the low-income farming population of our State. As a student of the economic and social conditions of Arkansas, and more recently as commissioner of public welfare, I have been in a position to realize the great value the Farm Security Administration has been to our State. No doubt a few mistakes have been made in certain projects but they in no wise should prejudice this fine organization in its main program of rehabilitating the low-income farmer. No agency, in my estimation, has done a more worth-while job in our State. We are enclosing a brief résumé of facts which are very significant. Both the continued welfare of our State and the production of food for the war effort demand that the Farm Security Administration program be maintained and strengthened in every possible way.

We trust that you will be able to support the continuation of this agency.

Very sincerely,

JOHN G. PIPKIN.

During 1943 the Farm Security Administration provided planned supervision for 25,164 families. Up to March 31, 1943, 2,733 original rural rehabilitation loans and 20,415 supplemental rural rehabilitation loans have been made to increase wartime food production. Since 1937 the Farm Security Administration has helped 1,859 tenant farmers and farm laborers to purchase farms, and they are making substantial repayments with the income from the land.

Rural rehabilitation loans cumulative to Mar. 31, 1943

Total sum loaned to individuals through rural rehabilitation loans	$36,121,865.27
Matured principal due on or before Mar. 31, 1943	$24,348,861.18
Total collected against principal, including prepayments	$19,868,405.15
Interest payments to Mar. 31, 1943	$2,341,465.75
Total collected, interest and principal	$22,209,870.90
Percent matured principal and interest collected as of total matured principal	91

Tenant purchase loans cumulative to Mar. 31, 1943

Total number of tenant purchase loans since 1938	1,859
Total loaned to purchasers for farm purchase and development	$7,391,190.59
Total repayments due, interest and principal	$917,134.91
Total collections, interest and principal, Mar. 31, 1943 (prepayments not included)	$914,043.89
Percent of schedule collected Mar. 31, 1943	99.7

1942 production of essential crop and livestock products and increases over 1941 made by Farm Security Administration borrowers in Arkansas

Product	Unit	1941 production	1942 production	Increase	Percent increase
Milk	Gallons	18,444,300	24,433,300	5,989,000	32
Eggs	Dozen	5,637,510	7,579,100	1,941,590	34
Chickens	Pounds	3,622,360	4,835,030	1,213,670	34
Pork	Pounds	12,464,600	16,973,900	4,509,300	36
Beef	Pounds	5,161,420	8,215,950	3,054,530	59
Soybeans	Bushels	71,253	225,116	153,863	216
Peanuts	Pounds	4,815,630	13,114,000	8,298,370	172

These 25,164 families canned an average of 425 quarts of fruit, vegetables, and meat for home use in 1940, and 447 quarts in 1941.

Farm Security Administration borrowers have increased their net worth from an average of $407 per family for the year prior to making their Farm Security Administration loan to an average of $709 per family. The average net family income for each Farm Security Administration borrower amounted to $728 as compared to an average net income of $349 per family before engaging in the Farm Security Administration-supervised loan program.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Detroit Free Press of June 1, 1943:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Clifford Prevost and Radford Mobley)

WASHINGTON, May 31.—Can Washington be charged with responsibility for the lawlessness that now pervades the Nation? Or must it be laid at the door of unpatriotic strikers, greedy merchants, racketeers, and chiselers? We think Washington must take a great part of the blame.

The situation in the food market can only be described by the word "lawless." The Office of Price Administration admits rather frankly that it cannot control food prices. People are being gouged more and more daily. One official check shows that 80 percent of the stores investigated in 50 large cities were openly selling meat at above legal Office of Price Administration prices in recent weeks. Fuel Administrator Harold L. Ickes made his investigation in the coal-mining towns and found the miners wern't able to touch anything at Office of Price Administration ceiling prices. They would be laughed at if they flashed an Office of Price Administration price list.

Certainly the fault lies to a great extent with administration of the law. The Office of Price Administration statute is not an unpopular prohibition law but a measure to prevent the people from being subject to extortion in wartime. The Office of Price Administration law should be popular, and in every town there should be a demand for compliance. But there isn't.

The consumer voice in most cities has been killed by the Government itself. Consumers' divisions in Federal agencies have been cashiered or rendered impotent. If ever there was a time for a strong consumer voice in what is going on, now is it. But the Office of Price Administration and other agencies aren't making the strong, effective appeal to the consumer that should be made. An aroused consumer public would help tremendously. All the public gets is a confusing, highly technical list of ceiling prices of various grades, brands, and cuts. Only the grocer or the butcher can interpret this stuff, to his own profit. That is all the consumer gets, that and the black market.

The Office of Price Administration is asking for another 1,400 or so investigators to enforce its regulations. If these were turned loose on the black market and the dishonest food merchants, it would be all right. But they probably will be posted on the highway to ask where you are driving and why—as if anybody but a fool wouldn't conserve all the gasoline he could now, as a matter of selfish interest.

The War Labor Board and its policy, at times vacillating, at times unreasonably dogged, are partly responsible for the "flash" strikes that have been occurring. The Board is a bureaucratic group of not-too-strong men attempting to assert authority and expand power. It is waterlogged with paper work and precedent. Give us a strike to settle, and any time of the week we would pick Dr. John R. Steelman, of the United States Conciliation Service, to handle it rather than the Labor Board. If Congress would give Steelman a little authority, he would be the Nation's No. 1 manpower chief. He has the confidence of labor and management. He is a conciliator in the best sense of the word. He can inspire men to work during an emergency. He doesn't give a darn about his own political fortunes.

Washington's chief plaint is the cry-baby talk that the people won't cooperate. They won't go back to work or they won't stamp out the black market. They won't quit asking higher wages or they won't comply with Office of Price Administration price lists. Well, those who have something to gain by encouraging the black market or violating the price lists, and ambitious labor leaders who advance themselves by fomenting strikes after promising not to do so—these people know they will not be hurt in Washington.

In fact, they usually get away with it. They have only to turn loose their powerful lobbies against the administration and Congress if necessary. Their pressure groups will becloud the issue, muddy the water get away with it. Until someone rises up in his wrath and kicks a few of these people and these groups right in the face things will go on in Washington as usual. We shall have inflation, and strikes, and lawlessness of other kinds, and, we are forced to add, continue to muddle along toward a victory that could be much cheaper.

The Lawyers of Nebraska Are Making a Great Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a news article from the Nebraska State Journal of June 16, 1943, published at Lincoln, Nebr., which says that one out of every six of the lawyers of Nebraska are now in the armed services of our Nation. That news article is as follows:

Nebraska attorneys have gone to war in a big way. A new directory of members of the Nebraska Bar Association, just issued by Secretary George H. Turner, shows that 505 of them are now part of the armed forces of the Nation.

As there are 2,804 licensed attorneys in the State and members of the association, this means more than 1 in 6 is in the conflict. Some of these are holding commissions that call for duties of a legal nature, such as judge advocates, but the great bulk of them are in the fighting forces.

Membership of the association is divided into active and inactive. Of the total of 2,804, there are 2,090 who have been in active practice and of these 366 are listed as gone to war. There are 714 who retain membership but who are not practitioners, and of these 139 are in service.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this unusual record merits the attention of this Congress. I am proud of this record of the lawyers in Nebraska. It is true, as stated by the Tennessee poet, John Trotwood Moore, that "The lawyers' blood has been the ink that flowed from freedom's pen." It is also true that great lawyers make great soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to conclude my remarks by inserting in full the tribute to the lawyers, written by John Trotwood Moore and furnished to me by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS]:

We wrote the Magna Carta, we wrote the Bill of Rights,
The path of human progress is lit with legal lights;
We wrote the Declaration with an eagle pinion quill—
It globed the world where force and hate fell powerless and still,
We wrote the Constitution, we codified the page
That made the great Republic the wonder of the age.

Our shrine is loyal service and our reward the flame
That lights the path of knowledge in the temple of our fame,
Say not our fame is nameless, say not our race is won,
Say not our Declaration pales in a setting sun;
Forever, and forever, in God's great code of men
The lawyers' blood has been the ink that flowed from freedom's pen,
And when time's day has ended and midnight hath no star,
We will plead for truth and justice before the judgment bar.

Minnesota Farm Operator Plants Self-Service Victory Gardens for Busy People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, during these days of national crisis every American worthy of the name is working harder at his given task than ever before. His hours are longer and when he arrives home he is ready for a few hours of earned rest. The farmer and his wife and son and daughter even work longer hours and have little time for rest or recreation.

The boys and girls in most city families are either in the armed forces or in a factory. Even the mother is working outside her home in many instances.

As a result, many of these families will not have Victory gardens. Many have not the soil to plant a garden.

A friend and constituent of mine has conceived a plan and idea whereby these busy people nevertheless can have their own Victory garden. He is Mr. Henry (Hank) Peterson, vegetable grower, farmer, and member of the City Council of Moorhead, Minn.

The plan is simple. Mr. Peterson made a survey by means of newspaper advertising of the vegetable needs of the people in his community who were not able

to plant gardens and then planted a great garden on his own land.

Just before the vegetables are ready for harvesting, he notifies those fellow citizens who have joined the self-service Victory garden project, and they, with members of their family, bring their own containers and pick as many vegetables as they can use.

This type of self-serve garden has many advantages other than the time and labor saved. The garden is cared for by experts who know their business and get the most out of the seeds. In addition, there is little or no waste, as the participants in this plan pick only what they need in their own baskets and containers, and pay a very reasonable amount for the vegetables they take away.

In my opinion, I think Mr. Peterson has made a splendid contribution to the war effort in his home community. Food is and will continue to be one of our major problems for the duration.

I hope this idea of self-serve Victory gardens spreads throughout the entire country.

Personnel Activities, Army Service Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Commanding General, Army Service Forces, before House Committee on the Civil Service, Tuesday, June 15, 1943:

At the outset, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to appear before it and discuss the civilian personnel policies and activities of the Army Service Forces. I know that the purpose of this inquiry is to examine into the facts concerning the administration and operation of the civil-service laws, in order that they may be made to function properly and confer the benefits upon Federal employees for which they were designed. With that purpose I am in hearty accord.

No employer, big or little, can expect to obtain loyalty and efficiency from his workers unless he gives them a square deal all around. Right now the Army Service Forces happens to be the largest single employer of civilian workers in the Nation, either within or without war industry. As a Government agency having approximately 1,000,000 civilian employees on its pay rolls, therefore, all of whom are engaged in but one objective—the winning of this war—we have a management responsibility second to none in the Nation. With only 5 percent of this total employed in the Washington area, it is a management obligation as extensive in geographical scope as it is in numbers.

No matter how far short of our aims we may fall, this responsibility for establishing and maintaining good personnel relations and working conditions is recognized and accepted. We all know that our fire power abroad is utterly dependent upon our manpower at home. That means we have got to do better than our enemies on both fronts.

This hearing also gives me the opportunity, equally welcome, of saying something about the Civil Service Commission that has been on my mind for a long time. I am glad of the chance to state for the official record that the Commission has been of inestimable and never-failing help to us in meeting the problems of Government employment brought on by total war.

The principal difference between this war and all others we have fought lies in the vastly increased importance and variety of the services rendered by civilian workers. These war services, of course, have never been merely incidental to military success; obviously, no army can function in the field without being supplied and supported by somebody at home. But never before has it required the services of the entire employable population of America to perform this task. In the present conflict, with virtually the whole economy of the Nation converted to war-making purposes, the role of the civilian worker has assumed a completely new significance.

For the first time in any war it may be said that his responsibilities in the defense of the Nation are comparable to those of the fighting man. By this I do not mean to imply that he undergoes the same hazards or makes the same sacrifices as the man who offers his life for his country on the battlefield. There is a wide difference between a job in a factory and a job in a fox hole; but in this machine age and in this gas-engine type of warfare, both jobs are essential to ultimate victory.

They may vary in the degree of danger but not in dignity. Even this observation regarding physical risk must be made with reservations, for after all it applies only to this continent. We all know what has happened to the war workers and civilian populations of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia. Bombs are no respecters of persons, whether you wear a uniform or overalls.

It is against this background of world-wide conflict and an American supply line that encircles the globe that I believe we should weigh the contribution to the war program being made by the civilian personnel of the Army Service Forces. If it were not for their faithful and capable services and those of the millions of civilians employed in other war agencies and activities, our troops would not now be in Tunis and Guadalcanal and Attu, as well as participating in round-the-clock bombing missions over Germany and Italy.

The true worth of their services is not to be gaged entirely by the risks encountered, but also by the results achieved and by the relationship of each individual's efforts to the maximum utilization of the Nation's total manpower. Our task is to see that this maximum utilization is obtained from the civilian workers in the Army Service Forces, through the creation of conditions conducive to the greatest possible continuity of employment and volume of production.

Moreover, we have still got to hurry. The hardest fighting is still ahead of the United States in this great struggle. With thousands of our able-bodied men going into the armed services every day, it becomes more and more imperative that we not only provide replacements for the jobs they are leaving, but obtain more output per worker in order to furnish them with the things they need.

* * * * *

The Army Service Forces came into being March 9, 1942, under the name of the Services of Supply. The Army Service Forces is one of the three main components of the Army, the others being the Army Ground Forces and the Army Air Forces. The reorganization of the Army into these three branches was for the purpose of relieving the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff and the other officers responsible for military strategy and operation from the details of supply and administration.

All the varied agencies and services of the Army not included in the Army Ground Forces and the Army Air Forces were consolidated under the Army Service Forces. They include several staff divisions, seven technical services, and the nine Service Commands, or former corps areas, into which the Army divides the United States. Last September a tenth, called the Northwest Service Command, was established for the purpose of handling American military and construction activities in the region in Canada traversed by the Alaska-Canadian military highway. This command also reports to the commanding general, Army Service Forces.

Thus, the Army Service Forces, by reason of this grouping of all supply and administrative services under one head, became at once an immense holding company for the War Department, with central control over extensive and diverse activities which formerly reported to scattered authorities. The practical effect, as I have previously indicated, was to transform it overnight into the largest single employer of civilian labor in the United States.

To sum up, the Army Service Forces feeds, fuels, clothes, houses, and equips the Army. It devises and produces many of the weapons of war. It transports the Army and its supplies all over the globe, and operates its communications. It builds the camps, cantonments, munitions factories, bases, roads, and military installations, and maintains and repairs all camp utilities. It manufactures the gases for chemical warfare, pays the Army, provides for its medical needs, supervises its religious observances, carries the Army mail in all its forms, does all the bookkeeping and maintenance of records, furnishes recreation for the troops, sells the soldiers commodities at low prices at post exchanges throughout the world, protects their legal rights, maintains the military police, establishes plant protection, buys and leases all real estate, trains both its own soldiers and civilians, sends them to school, and performs innumerable other tasks designed to make the American Army the best equipped and serviced in the world.

The Army Service Forces also plays a vital part supervising the procurement and handling of military supplies to the British, Russian, Chinese, and all the other armies fighting shoulder to shoulder to defeat the Axis hordes on two hemispheres.

In the performance of its duties, I wish to point out here, the Army Service Forces is not operating wholly behind the lines, by any means. Army Service Forces officers and men are fighting side by side with combat troops in all combat areas. The Army Service Forces services and repairs tanks, guns, and combat vehicles in the battle zones and keeps the supplies moving to the front in a never-ending flow that spells the difference between victory and defeat. Nor are all the members of the Army Service Forces in uniform who undergo the risks of direct enemy fire. In fact, there are more than 12,000 Army Service Forces civilian workers employed on the Army transports that brave the U-boat menace on the five oceans and seven seas, in order to carry men and matériel to the far points of the earth.

Owing to the diverse nature of its duties, virtually all occupations and professions are represented in the activities of the Army Service Forces in the present conflict.

* * * * *

I cite the foregoing facts on organization and duties for two main reasons: First, that the committee may obtain a perspective of the Army Service Forces as a whole; second, to scotch for the record any fallacious idea on the part of the public in general that the civilian personnel of the Army Service Forces is massed in the headquarters offices in Washington and consists of a large group of clerical workers engaged in paper pushing.

We have plenty of paper-pushing in the Army, as is the case in all large organiza-

tions, public or private, but we have been doing something about that from the very beginning and I shall have something to say on the subject a little later. We are trying to push a lot of papers off the desks instead of over the desks, and have made considerable progress. But the popular impression that Washington is the center of all War Department civilian employment is far from being the truth.

The fact is that 95 percent of all civilians in the employ of the Army Service Forces are located outside the Washington metropolitan area. As of May 1, 1943, our total civilian strength for the country as a whole, on the pay roll of the Army Service Forces, stood at 1,026,154 men and women. Of this grand total 974,428, or 95 percent, are employed at more than 3,000 different stations throughout the continental United States.

These stations include service command headquarters, camps, cantonments, Ordnance arsenals and manufacturing plants, Quartermaster depots, Signal Corps depots and plants, various other kinds of depots, staging areas, ports of embarkation, reception centers, reconsignment areas, and other military reservations, posts, and installations. Most of these civilian employees are engaged in production and servicing occupations to supply the men at the front with weapons, ammunition, and matériel of all kinds.

In the departmental service, as of the same date, there were 37,012 civilian employees of the Army Service Forces or 3.6 percent of the grand total. In this area, naturally, the bulk of the work is of an administrative or clerical nature.

The obligation to establish sound personnel policies for such a widespread organization, as I emphasized at the beginning of this statement, was recognized as a responsibility of command and management when the Army Service Forces was created.

As we see the job, it embraces the following six major objectives:

1. The maximum utilization of the highest skill or ability of every employee.

2. The provision of adequate processes for ascertaining the skills of each employee.

3. The improvement of present skills or acquisition of higher skills.

4. The employment of the minimum number necessary.

5. The reduction of the employment of men, otherwise available for military service, by means of substitution of women and older men.

6. Creation of working conditions and relationships which will tend toward the retention of workers and the reduction of unnecessary turn-over.

In the development of the civilian personnel program and the attainment of these objectives I wish to call attention to the fact that constant emphasis has been placed upon the responsibility of command, no matter what the rank, in establishing sound personnel relations throughout the organization.

This is a basic requirement. Energetic leadership and a sympathetic attitude toward the aims in view are essential if we are to be successful in dealing with human beings. For that reason we have sought at all times to make our officers and officials conscious of the importance placed upon good management and good supervision.

* * * * *

Early this year it became evident that the manpower situation was becoming acute. To meet this problem in the Army Service Forces, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styer, Chief of Staff, Army Service Forces, on March 1, 1943, was appointed chairman of a board to institute a program for the more effective utilization of our manpower.

This program has eight basic objectives, as follows:

1. To develop and utilize adequate personnel data.

2. To establish an effective control over the numbers of personnel.

3. To replace certain types of personnel.

4. To expand, refine, and speed up the program for personnel management.

5. To eliminate all nonessential activities.

6. To improve the organizational structure.

7. To decentralize activities and authority to act to the greatest extent possible.

8. To increase the efficiency with which essential activities are performed.

Staff planning on this program has been completed and execution is proceeding throughout the organization, with results which we expect will be highly beneficial in terms of efficiency and production along the lines specified.

Already in fact, much unnecessary activity and red tape have been abolished, with a consequent reduction in the work load and personnel requirements. On the score of simplifying work procedures, for instance, we have scheduled around 4,000 surveys throughout the Army Service Forces. About 40 percent have been completed. They are producing heightened efficiency, better speed in the handling of business and a greater capacity to absorb the ever increasing work load without substantial additional employment. In the work simplification surveys thus far completed, we estimate that we have been able to reduce the number of steps formerly involved about 18 percent and to reduce the personnel requirements an average of approximately 10 percent for the particular procedures involved.

In the project to eliminate nonessential activities and duplication and to decentralize authority to act, we have requested recommendations from all levels of the Army Service Forces organization and from all ranks of officers and civilians. In requesting these recommendations we have gone to great pains to see that no suggestions are "killed" on the way up. Intermediate headquarters were asked simply to express comment on recommendations which passed through their hands and forward the basic suggestions to Washington without change. In this way we made sure that no ideas were suppressed or smothered because some higher officer or executive might not agree with them.

To date, we have received around 3,000 recommendations along these lines, of which approximately 40 percent have been acted upon. In two-thirds of the cases, I am happy to state, the action has been favorable and the suggestions are rapidly being put into effect. The result is a decrease in personnel requirements for the particular activities covered by this survey, further enabling us to absorb the growing volume of business with no material increase in employment.

* * * * *

Red tape, of course, is an enemy we must fight at all times, war or no war. We have been cutting it right and left in the Army Service Forces for over a year now and we are still, as you can see, applying the shears. It masquerades under the imposing name of procedure. A certain amount of systematic procedure, naturally, is necessary in any orderly and well-managed operation, but when it interferes with business, when it fastens the dead hand of obsolete forms and practices upon a living, growing, vital organization, defying the canons of common sense and good judgment, it should not merely be cut, but should be torn out by the roots. That is what we are trying to do in the Army Service Forces through these surveys I have touched upon.

The over-all results I have mentioned show we are making headway, but let me give you a few examples of actual accomplishments.

If I explained that we had revised Army Regulation 58-150, for instance, it would not mean anything. But this revision enabled us to eliminate an Army form which was an acknowledgment to the consignor that a shipment had been received. By this one unscrupulous stroke we effected an annual saving in time and labor involving the preparation of 21,500,000 of these cards.

Formerly, it was necessary to mail two copies of each shipping ticket furnished for auditing purposes to Service Command Headquarters. By knocking this requirement out, the preparation and mailing of 6,000,000 copies of shipping tickets each month have been eliminated.

A year ago one of our agencies required 112 different reports from posts, camps, and stations. Since then we have added 19—but we likewise eliminated 103. By the first of July 1943, the remaining reports will all be reduced or consolidated so that but 2 will remain.

One labor data report has been killed that consumed 30,000 man-hours per month to accomplish. A forage report has been improved so that it is now required from only 12 sources instead of 600. In another instance we have entirely done away with 3,000 individual contractual delinquency reports on one subject. A lot of paper work was discarded when permission was secured from the Comptroller General to permit automatic renewals of real-estate leases for the duration, instead of once a year. We have helped the newspapers by eliminating the necessity of applying to Washington for clearance of unclassified information; now the service commander in his region has authority to approve it.

Examples might be multiplied of the revisions effected in outworn regulations and practices no longer in harmony with the tempo not merely of wartime, but of ordinary modern business procedure. All these improvements in methods have a bearing upon the maximum utilization of manpower by doing away with unnecessary time- and labor-consuming operations.

* * * * *

So much for some of the paper-pushing aspects of our general problem. As this committee is well aware, dealing as it does with all phases of civil-service employment, the problems of personnel and procedure are so closely interlocked as to be inseparable. You cannot get the best out of any individual if he is hopelessly entangled in red tape; neither can you obtain efficiency if he lacks proper supervision. We tackled both these handicaps at the same time just as quickly as the Army Service Forces got under way. I desire to say just a few words on this subject.

The War Department, in the production plants under the Army Service Forces, was faced with the same emergencies in plant and personnel expansion as those which bothered private industry. It was apparent at once that poor or inadequate supervision meant inefficient workmanship and unsatisfactory production schedules. Borrowing the invaluable aid of the Training Within Industry Division of the War Manpower Commission, we inaugurated a program of job instructor training courses for Army Service Forces supervisors, both men and women. Let me say a word of appreciation at this point of the constructive services rendered in this task by the T. W. I. Like 10,000 or so operators in private industry, we were happy to take advantage of it.

The Army Service Forces program began last August. It consisted of a course in job-instructor training, one in job-relations training, and one in job-methods training. The first was designed to train supervisors in instructing employees on new jobs; the second was for the purpose of improving the supervisor's relationship with the people under him; and the third was to instruct supervisors in methods of work simplification and technique.

Up to the present time the Army Service Forces has given the job-instructor course to approximately 75,000 supervisors, as a result of which the breaking-in time for new employees has been appreciably reduced. The

other courses are now being applied. Equally good results are to be expected.

The example of Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey illustrates the benefits that flow from these training courses. Following the completion of the job-methods course at that ordnance plant, suggestions from workers were received which will effect an estimated saving of 437,500 man-hours of labor and $341,200 in money, when applied at that installation alone.

It was a genuine pleasure for Major General Campbell, Chief of Ordnance, and myself to write letters of praise and congratulation to the employees of Picatinny. They are helping to solve this manpower problem right in their own back yard. It is proof that the time and money spent on in-service training of this sort pays big dividends.

These courses are by no means restricted to civilians, although most of them are taught by civilians. At the Seattle port of embarkation recently, the commanding general and 11 colonels enrolled in the job-relations training course and are "going to school" regularly with second lieutenants and civilian supervisors and foremen. I say with utmost sincerity, democracy is working in this Army. Moreover, none of us is too old or too important to learn.

I have stated also that both men and women receive this training program. I cannot tell you what proportion of the supervisory force is composed of women but I can tell you what proportion of our entire civilian personnel is made up of women. It is a figure that gives us much pride, a figure that we are going to increase by a well-defined and coordinated program to recruit more women in our war industries.

Of our entire country-wide civilian personnel, 379,300 are women. That number represents 37 percent. It makes the Army Service Forces the largest employer of women labor in the Nation. Outside the Washington metropolitan area, women constitute 33.6 percent of the total field strength.

These women, may I stress, are performing important and essential manual labor that men used to do. I know that the committee has seen some of them at work at the Frankford Arsenal and the quartermaster depot in Philadelphia. It is an inspiring sight. We are proud of them, just as we are proud of the women who make up approximately 67 percent of the Army Service Forces civilian personnel in the Washington metropolitan area.

When you see women running lathes and drill presses and stamping machines, or repairing automobiles and tires and shoes, at Army plants or installations, you begin to appreciate the magnificent contribution they are making to the winning of this war. Every woman who relieves an able-bodied man for combat duty is in this war by proxy; and in addition, she keeps up production in the job he left.

The Army Service Forces honors its women workers, no matter in what capacity they may serve.

It is unnecessary to state before this committee, familiar as it is with our employment conditions in Washington and at some of the installations it has visited, that the Army Service Forces has made real use of minority groups and handicapped workers in its war program. Strict adherence has been followed to the policy laid down by the Secretary of War that there shall be no discrimination whatsoever with respect to race, sex, color, religion, creed, national origin, or political or other affiliation, except as may be required by law. At the present time, Negroes make up 13.7 percent of the total civilian personnel of the Army Service Forces and 22.1 percent of its Washington departmental civilian personnel.

* * * * *

By this recital of examples of action taken by the Army Service Forces to improve personnel conditions and work methods, either on the broad front of general policy or in the effort to streamline procedure, I do not wish to imply that we have even measurably attained all our goals or created satisfactory conditions everywhere. We have succeeded in some instances; we are still far short in others, but we are trying all the time. The general picture will at least serve to apprise the committee of the extent and magnitude of the problem and the sincerity of our efforts.

We in the Army Service Forces are intensely proud of the accomplishments of our civilian personnel. It should be remembered that top-ranking civilians, drawn from the field of experienced industry, business, public administration and professional life, share with commissioned officers the leadership and guidance of this large army of workers.

In a democracy, as I have stated before other congressional groups, we in the Army itself are but civilians in uniform. There is no room in this country for a militaristic philosophy. That is one of the ideologies against which we are fighting, as well as that of the superrace and its domination of the world. Except for the demarcation between chains of command and authority, there are no distinctions in the rank and file of the Army Service Forces between men in khaki and men in coveralls. We are all working at the same job.

After all, we are in a desperate struggle, with time still our most relentless foe. The real test is whether or not we deliver the goods on time, every time, everywhere.

Last February I returned from a trip to the theaters of operation in north Africa, the Middle East, and India. I saw at first hand what the element of supply means to our fighting troops who are now distributed all around the world and whose lives depend upon the kind of job we do here at home. I was happy to report that they had the supplies; that the essential articles for combat turned out by our civilian workers were being delivered where they were needed; and that the equipment they were getting was the best in the world. But we have to do even better. We have a gigantic war on our hands, we and our allies, and we have a gigantic job to do in fulfilling the virtually insatiable needs of total warfare.

You do not indulge in any rationalizing or fine-spun theories on absenteeism, work stoppages, or jurisdictional disputes on the home front, when you crouch in a slit trench in Tunisia or crawl through a Japanese-infested jungle in Burma. You know without anybody's telling you that the assembly line is the life line to the firing line.

Supreme Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, press releases indicate that those Members of Congress who voted for the Connally-Smith bill to prevent strikes in defense industries and to keep a steady flow of war materials going to our fighting forces overseas are now marked for political slaughter by that element of irresponsible labor leadership which is now fomenting strikes in those industries vital to the success of our Army and Navy and to the safety of our Nation as a whole.

The people who have sons in our armed forces, whose lives depend upon the prompt and continuous production and delivery of implements of war on many fronts will settle this issue, raised against those who voted for the legislation in an endeavor to stop strikes in war plants.

Under leave to extend, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of July 19, 1943, entitled "Supreme Test":

SUPREME TEST

President Roosevelt is about to make one of the most momentous decisions of his long career in the public service. He must veto the Connally-Smith bill or permit it to become law. He must assert the determination of the Government to move forward with the war effort in spite of minority obstructionists, or he must yield to the sophistry of professional labor leaders who would deny the Government the means of dealing effectively with saboteurs on the home front. Only the blind can fail to see that the fate of the Nation will be greatly influenced by the way in which the President meets this test.

It would be idle to pretend that this is not a Gethsemane for the President. The union leaders who are begging for a veto of the so-called antistrike bill are his friends and political associates. Apparently they are applying every known pressure to prevent the Government from asserting its power to carry on the war without further interference from little dictators like John L. Lewis. They are slandering as a "slave labor bill" a measure which specifically reserves to workingmen their right to work or to leave their jobs, even in wartime. They are threatening to withdraw from the War Labor Board if the bill becomes law. No President who has stood for the cause of labor as stanchly as has Mr. Roosevelt could be unimpressed by this importuning.

But the clamor of organized labor for a veto is not the only stir in the land resulting from passage of this bill to suppress uprisings against the authority of the Government to carry on the war. The voice of the people is also being heard. Millions of workingmen who are making airplanes, tanks, munitions, clothing, and other equipment for the armed forces are sick of the treasonable conduct of John L. Lewis and his ilk. They are crying out to their Government to end this cat-and-mouse game with obstructionists who lay greater store upon raises of $2 a day than upon the blood of American boys fighting in Europe and Asia. With firm determination to win the war and only contempt for those who try to provoke industrial war on our own home front, they are looking to the President to prove that he is leader of the Nation and not of any one faction.

In their fox holes, at their gun stations on land, sea, and in the air, several million American men in uniform are also waiting to see whether the President will let them down. These men cannot understand why any group that is safe at home, holding good jobs at high wages should slow down war production by going on strike. And as for a traitor who would lead an industrial revolt to prevent operation of a plant or mine which the Government has been forced to take over, a mere fine or jail sentence such as the Connally-Smith bill provides seems much less than he deserves. The men at the front know that they will be helpless unless the Government keeps a constant stream of weapons and supplies flowing to them, and that these supplies cannot possibly be forthcoming unless coal is mined, steel is made, and finished products are turned out from thousands of plants. So it is not surprising that the mere thought of leaving the operation of our military machinery at home at the mercy of ruthless fanatics of the John Lewis type is incomprehensible to them.

In short, these men in soiled and often bloody uniforms expect their Commander in Chief to do his duty with the same selfless

devotion to the national welfare that he asks of them. They expect their Commander in Chief not only to accept the weapon Congress has given him against obstructionists but also to use it whenever the authority of the Government to carry on the war is challenged. These men will be heartened by the courageous decision of the War Labor Board in the coal case. But that gain and much more would be lost if the President should yield to the tornado of propaganda designed to keep the Government weak and helpless in facing the demands and the threats of reckless labor minorities.

It is true, of course, that the War Labor Board may have to be revamped as a result of the Connally-Smith bill. Heretofore it has been an instrument of the White House in carrying out the agreement between labor, employers, and the President. With the Connally-Smith bill on the books, it will become a statutory body that ought to represent the public rather than special-interest groups. Basically that is an argument in favor of the bill.

More important than anything else, however, is this bill's assertion of governmental power to fight the war to a successful close regardless of minority obstruction. For the President to throw down that principle would be nothing short of a calamity. We do not believe that he will do so. We believe that his sense of responsibility to the men and women who are fighting and working to bring this war to a successful close will guide him to the right decision. It is true that he needs the strength of Hercules. But the loyal devotion of millions of Americans who expect the Commander in Chief to do his duty regardless of how painful it may be can and will give him that strength if he leads the way.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a number of communications I have received from educational institutions throughout the country favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration:

PIEDMONT COLLEGE,
Demorest, Ga., June 18, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: It is impossible for me to overemphasize the value of the National Youth Administration student aid program. May I urge you to do all that you can to preserve and extend this vital program. I trust that you will vote to reconsider and to reverse the recent action of the House of Representatives.

Very sincerely,
MALCOLM BOYD DANA,
President.

THE CAZENOVIA JUNIOR COLLEGE,
Cazenovia, N. Y., June 15, 1943.

Mr. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May we make clear to you the fact that we are very interested in having the National Youth Administration assistance continued to college students as a means of helping them continue their education in the college in which they are enrolled.

We are not interested in having the National Youth Administration become a separate educational system run by the Federal Government but rather as an agency to help students secure their education in colleges already established, by giving them direct aid.

Sincerely yours,
ISABEL D. PHISTERER,
Dean.

CALVIN COLLEGE,
Grand Rapids, Mich., June 15, 1943.

The Honorable JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have been informed that there is a possibility that direct aid to students via the National Youth Administration may be eliminated and that student aid grants may be allotted directly to the institutions.

Calvin College hereby wishes to express its disapproval of any such method of fund distribution. It will mean in all probability that the liberal arts college, already hard hit by the exigencies of the war, will be discriminated against.

Liberal arts colleges are making vital contributions to the war effort and to the plans for reconstruction after the war. Unlimited millions are spent for the military training on college campuses equipped for such education. The war situation should not be allowed to interfere too seriously with the training of civilian students whose services are equally needed by our Government today and in the reconstruction period after the war.

Any contribution that you may make in distributing available aids directly to the needy student will be in line with the spirit of democracy, will be a distinct service to your country, and will be highly appreciated by the church-related colleges.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY SCHULTZE,
President.

LUTHER COLLEGE,
Decorah, Iowa, June 15, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attempts are being made, it seems, to destroy direct aid to students through the National Youth Administration.

In my opinion this aid to college students is in many instances more necessary than ever, because the students on accelerated programs cannot earn money during summers and parents have a hard time assisting them on account of the high cost of living.

The liberal arts colleges are making an important contribution to the war effort as well as to the post-war problems. The plight of their students must not be overlooked. Where we are necessarily spending millions in training men and women in military organizations on college campuses we should not deny a mere pittance, in comparison, for the training of civilian students in colleges, whose services will be equally needed by our country both now and in the future.

Direct grants to institutions have been proposed. I take for granted that we are all in favor of equal educational opportunities for our boys, everywhere. This equalization of opportunities does not come through institutions. It comes through aid given to the individual student worthy of assistance.

If students want an education they should be free to seek this in institutions of their choice. Some will choose a church related college. But if grants are to be made to institutions it is reasonable to suppose that church related colleges will be out of the picture. Hence the student worthy of and in need of aid is compelled to go to an institution of a different type for his college training, if he wants to benefit by the grant. This is not the democratic way. The National Youth Administration, or direct aid to college students, is democratic. It has not worked out 100 percent, but it has, as I see it, by and large, worked out more perfectly than most programs of that magnitude. I can point to many a worthy student to whom it has been a godsend, a means of keeping him in college and of making him a real leader in our own America where our national strength and real greatness rest largely on the education of the masses and a liberal education of a large reservoir of potential leaders, men of Christian character, keen minds, broad training, good judgment, clear vision, and unswerving loyalty to American ideals.

It seems to me that no boy who has the capacity and the ambition to profit by educational opportunities should be denied the privilege because he is poor. National Youth Administration has been the hand that lifted up many a boy who was sinking in despair. I want to speak for such boys in writing you this letter and asking you to continue the National Youth Administration.

Sincerely yours,
O. J. H. PREUS,
President.

THE COLLEGE OF THE OZARKS,
Clarksville, Ark., June 14, 1943.

MR. JAMES J. FITZPATRICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FITZPATRICK: I am writing you in behalf of the continuation of the National Youth Administration program on such foundation as to make it helpful to the individual students rather than to the colleges and universities. In other words, it seems to me that there are thousands of boys and girls who would like to enter college or continue their studies in college if they could finance their education. Under the accelerated program, these students are urged to attend school 12 months in the year. This deprives them of the 3-month period which they formerly had in which to earn money to supplement such help as comes to them from their parents.

Again, these students are between two urgent appeals. One is for some type of military service and the other is for war-industry work, which pays very high wages. Doubtless many should go into both of the services mentioned above. On the other hand, there are many who cannot qualify for military service and who might better spend a few more years in college rather than being lured into industry because of wages. We are going to need as many trained men and women as possible in the post-war period. If the youth of the land are lured away from college in order to earn high wages, the Nation will pay for this in a lack of leadership in the future. My hope, therefore, is that our Government, which is rightfully spending so many billions to train men and women for the Army and Navy, may lso spend a lesser amount to make it possible for these other young people who cannot serve in the Army and Navy to prepare themselves for positions of leadership in a post-war world.

There are hundreds of boys and girls who should be in college but who lack the money with which to pay their expenses. They are among the finest youth in the land, and if trained would be efficient leaders tomorrow. It seems to me that a revitalized National Youth Administration program where the money is given to the individual students for study purposes in such institutions as can serve them would be very important reconstruction legislation.

Some of our colleges do not have Army and Navy programs. If the students who want to attend college could in some way secure

the funds with which to complete their training they would enroll in increasing numbers. The colleges which are not overrun with candidates for the Army and Navy have their faculties and equipment intact and can give young people the training which is so vital for tomorrow. If your judgment convinces you that it is proper to give National Youth Administration assistance direct to students for their adequate training, I hope you will use your influence to this end.

Yours very sincerely,

WILEY LIN HURIE,
President.

Farmer McGregor's Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing, as a part of my remarks, an article that recently appeared in the editorial columns of R. A. Clymer, editor of the El Dorado Times, El Dorado, Kans., entitled "Farmer McGregor's Wheat." The article, I believe, is rather timely. It reads as follows:

FARMER M'GREGOR'S WHEAT

Despite the optimistic view in Washington of the farm manpower situation, hired hands remain almost as scarce as hen's teeth on the farms, and the average farmer over the Nation is apt to find himself in pretty much the same situation as John Gould says, in the New York Times, exists in his part of the country, when Farmer McGregor, after many difficulties, gets his wheat planted and ready for the harvest. Priorities kept McGregor from getting a binder, so he decided to look about for a hired man to help him cradle it by hand. From here on we quote the Gould article:

"Who will get me a hired hand?" asked McGregor.

"Not I," said the Employment Service. "We are having trouble locating welders at $140 a week, and precision-tool jiggers at $23 a day, and we don't know a soul that can cradle wheat."

"Not I," said the local draft board. "You better find a school kid."

"Not I," said the high-school principal. "This week we're helping the grocery stores paste ration coupons."

"Not I," said the county agent. "We are busy now teaching women to make plum jam without sugar, sirup, molasses, or plums."

"Not I," said the local defense plant. "We are on a cost-plus basis, and absenteeism costs $10,000 a minute."

"Not I," said the Manpower Commission. "We are working on your problem, but just at present there is a shortage of stenographers."

"Not I," said the War Production Board. "You haven't made the proper applications."

"Not I," said the Food Coordinator. "I will issue a directive soon."

"Not I," said the Lend-Lease authority; "we are powerless to act under existing regulations."

"Not I," said the congressional delegation. "Without fear of successful contradiction, we may infer that democracy is at the crossroads, and the flag of freedom must be unfurled from the pinnacle of the globe with sweat, blood, and tears until man can again bask in the freedom we fought so valiantly to perpetuate."

"Not I," said the neighbors; "we are working in the shipyards."

So Farmer McGregor, with the assistance of his grandmother, harvested his wheat.

"Now," said Farmer McGregor, "who will help me eat this nice clean wheat?"

"I will," said the county chairman, the dealers, the machinery people, the employment service, the draft board, the county agent, the defense workers, the school teachers, the Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the welders, the shipfitters, the Lend-Lease authority, the neighbors, the Army, the Navy, Coast Guard, marines, airplane spotters, WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, WAAF's, Russians, British, Chinese, South Americans, Hindus, Eskimos, Mrs. Roosevelt, Congress, the Maritime Commission, the United Service Organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, Secretary Ickes, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and everybody else from Sitka to Casablanca, from Istanbul to Vladivostok, from Maine to California, until the hubbub was unanimous.

The Antistrike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, all America is directly interested in eliminating the atrocities of racketeers on our labor front. The people of America are also interested in the antistrike bill that has recently passed the Congress and is now lying on the President's desk, awaiting his approval or disapproval. It is the hope and desire of all patriotic Americans that the President will do what they see as his duty and what is his duty as I see it, and courageously approve that bill.

A former Member of this House on June 3 addressed a letter to our President, explaining fully this situation and showing the necessity for action to be taken immediately in order to stop the un-American activities on our labor front. To my mind, the Honorable Thomas L. Blanton, who served as a Member of Congress from the Seventeenth District of Texas for many years, clearly portrayed the desires of patroitic Americans at this time in his letter of June 3 to the President, and for that reason I have asked unanimous consent that a copy of his letter be printed in the RECORD:

BLANTON & BLANTON,
Albany, Tex., June 3, 1943.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am completely out of politics. I aspire to no public office. What I say comes from my heart, hoping to suggest something constructive.

During this great emergency every loyal, patriotic American will support and stand behind you 100 percent in efforts to win this war. Any man who throws a monkey wrench into the machinery is a dirty, infamous traitor more despicable than Benedict Arnold or Judas Iscariot.

The people are impatiently tired of having John L. Lewis and other selfish, avaricious labor leaders shut down vital factories, stop mining needed coal, stagnate production of necessary war munitions, defy our institutions, flaunt to the winds the orders of our Commander in Chief, and twist a stranglehold tourniquet around the throat of our Government to force compliance with every kind of unreasonable demand.

I have recently returned from the west coast and have talked with people in all walks of life from New York to Los Angeles, and they vehemently state that they are sick and tired of it, and that unless Congress promptly passes a law that will prevent all strikes during this emergency, they will never vote again for any Member of the present Congress.

What is there so sacrosanct about labor unions? Are they more sacred than the rights and conveniences of our men in the service? Are they more sacred than the lives of our several million Americans in our military forces who daily risk their lives for their Government? If any man in the service even murmured he would be shot at sunrise. If any man in the service made a demand for higher pay or better treatment, he would be shot.

The people can't forget that there were 6,000 strikes against the Government during World War No. 1. They can't forget that when President Wilson asked Congress to pass his work-or-fight amendment to the Draft Act, labor unions finally forced it to be thrown into the wastebasket under threat that 50,000 would march upon the Capitol.

The people can't forget that the railroad brotherhoods threatened that unless they were paid increases of $754,000,000, with the raises dated back 6 months, they "would tie up every railroad in the United States so tight not a train could run," and Director General McAdoo was forced to pay them increases of $754,000,000 and date them back 6 months. Then as soon as he was succeeded by Mr. Hines as Director General of Railroads for the United States, these same railroad brotherhoods under a similar demand forced Director General Hines to pay them additional increases of $67,000,000.

For their own selfish protection Congress passed a law preventing the members of the Metropolitan Police Department and the Washington Fire Department from striking or belonging to any labor union that had the right to strike. And for 25 years no policemen or fireman in Washington has had the right to strike, or to belong to any organization that strikes. If, for the protection of Washington, Congress prevents policemen and firemen from striking at any time, peace or war, why can't Congress, for the protection of all American people, prevent strikes during war?

In view of the fact that both Madam Perkins, Secretary of Labor, and Mr. Secretary Ickes, are friendly to, and sympathetic with, labor unions and their right to strike, may we respectfully ask on behalf of the American people, that when taking over any industry, which is just what John L. Lewis and his kind of selfish labor leaders are trying to force the Government to do, that others who will stand firmly for the rights of the people be placed in charge of such businesses.

With great respect and sympathy, Mr. President, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS L. BLANTON.

Food Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if Adolf Hitler had been permitted to set up the O. P. A. as a means of creating confusion and frustration among the producers of our Nation, he could not have done a better job.

Every attempt of our loyal farmers to meet their full responsibility in producing the food necessary for our fighting forces and for our civilian population has been thwarted by a mass of uncoordinated and, in most cases, senseless regulations of the O. P. A., the ultimate effect of which has been to weaken our war effort, and, if continued, will prolong the war and result in unnecessary suffering and loss of lives.

The stubborn resistance of the O. P. A. to any change in its destructive program is heading this Nation for a major disaster in the field of food and of fuel production.

The New Deal's program of scarcity by means of subsidies for not producing food may have served its partisan political purpose in times of peace, but a continuation of such a program of wholesale political bribery through subsidies in time of war is only adding fuel to the flame of inflation.

The historical evidence is overwhelming that when a Government initiates a program that reduces the production of food, and then attempts either by penalties or by subsidies, or both, to hold down the price of foods to the consumers the prices, nevertheless, have continued to soar. There goes with such a program also an ever-increasing drastic governmental control over the farmers in the use of their farms.

Even when the death penalty was imposed in times past by some countries in an effort to keep the price of food at or below the ceiling price fixed by dictatorial edict, there was no noticeable compliance with the law. It is a matter of recorded history, also, that with every flash of the bright blade of the guillotine by which the heads of violators of price ceilings were severed, the price of the ever-diminishing food supply increased. No law has ever been drastic enough to overcome price inflation where food production has been curtailed and subsidies applied. I ask the crystal gazers and political manipulators how or where in all history a government subsidy has reduced the cost of living or has in any way prevented price inflation?

Can it be successfully denied that when the people are taxed to provide the funds for food subsidies they are indirectly paying higher prices for their food?

But the most vicious aspect of the New Deal subsidy plan is the political control over the producers and processors of foods. Under such a system of economic dependence, imposed by the will of government, the farmer and processor of his products find themselves driven to surrender their rights as sovereign, independent citizens, and, instead, forced to become the abject slaves of a totalitarian bureaucracy. It is a sad spectacle to see the farmers of this country, upon whom rests the burden of feeding our armed forces, our civilians, and who, moreover, are also expected to feed the world, made the victims of the stupidity and folly of men in the O. P. A. who have long since demonstrated their unfitness to fill any office of responsibility in time of war.

This global war in which our boys are fighting cannot be won without the aid of the farmers. Every farm is a war industry. The food supply in this war bears the same vital relationship to the effectiveness of our armed forces in the field as ammunition bears to the effectiveness of our artillery at the front; a shortage of either can lose the war. It is important for the people to see to it that no bureaucratic stubbornness or inefficiency sacrifices the lives of our fighting forces or endangers the winning of the cause to which our Nation is committed.

It is because of the failure of the Office of Price Administration to act that the farmer has been deprived of the gas to operate his farm machinery. The quota system has developed into a National scandal. Such gas as has been allotted to the farmers has, in many instances, been used up in driving to and from the regulatory bodies to get the gas. Gas coupons have been stolen by hundreds of thousands, so that no accurate record has been available to show to what extent there has been a fraudulent consumption of gasoline. Both gasoline and rubber have been needlessly sacrificed because farmers have been forced, in some instances, to drive more than a hundred miles in an effort to get spare parts for their tractor or truck and other essential farm machinery.

A shortage of gas and oil is claimed by the O. P. A. as an excuse, especially in New York State and in the East generally for their rationing system. Yet the O. P. A. has refused to grant the request of the Petroleum Administrator, Hon. Harold Ickes, for an increase in the price of crude oil to insure the production of more oil in district No. 1, which comprises western New York State, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, an oil-producing field within easy access to the area in the East where the people are desperately in need of gas and fuel oil. Every day that O. P. A. refuses to grant this demand, vast quantities of gasoline and oil in New York and Pennsylvania are being lost, not temporarily but forever, because producing wells have to be abandoned by their owners.

At this point, under leave to extend, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Herald Tribune of New York, June 19, 1943, entitled "Food Facts":

FOOD FACTS

Governmental policies over a period of 10 years created artificial scarcities. The Agricultural Adjustment Agency crop-reduction program threw three and one-half million tillers of the soil off their jobs. There was no longer room for them. They produced too much. Yet our people have never had enough to eat.

In 1929, when our farmers produced the most food until 1942 (approximately 10 percent higher), we still needed 77,000,000,000 pounds of milk, especially for our children. We still needed 2,300,000,000 pounds of butter. We still needed 7,000,000,000 pounds of vegetables and 20,000,000,000 pounds of fresh fruit. We still needed 13,000,000,000 eggs and 2,000,000,000 pounds of beef. We needed all this for simple health. We needed all of it, and we did not have it. The figures given above are based on the Department of Agriculture's famous minimum adequate circular No. 296.

Yet our Government adopted a policy of scarcity. The first of the United Nations food conferences brought forth this ironic note: "It was the sense of the conference that it was untenable in the future to permit the plowing under of crops or the slaughter of little pigs." Reference to this in the declaration of principle was eliminated because it might reflect on the Roosevelt administration, which initiated the conference.

More than 2 years ago experts advocated a rapid expansion of food production. They advocated rationing of food after Pearl Harbor. Yet our Government haggled and boggled as it did on our arms program; and now we are faced with crop prospects less promising than in any time during the last 3 years. To add to the woe of mother, trying to figure out the points for the family, there is the mess and muddle of the Office of Price Administration.

May we suggest clear-cut action. First, the Nation must make more use of Mother Earth, known from the time of Abraham as the mother of wealth, the mother of life. There must be more acres put into production. Second, the country needs centralized authority, a food administrator with power. This centralized authority should control the decentralized operations of pricing and distribution. The farmers themselves know what they can produce on their land. They need little guidance if the needs of the Nation are explained to them. Let us have the leadership of the President on food. Let's stop mouthing words and move into action. Again, with due humility, we ask the President to move at once for the good of the country.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZEBULON WEAVER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three short editorials, one from the Asheville Times of May 28; one from the Charlotte News of Wednesday, June 16, 1943; and one from the Durham Sun of Tuesday, June 15, 1943.

These editorials call attention to the valuable work which has been done, and is being done, by the National Youth Administration. In view of my own great interest in the continuation of an adequate appropriation for this agency, I

wish to bring the attention of the House to these decided expressions indicating the views of the people of North Carolina.

The editorials follow:

[From the Asheville Times of May 28, 1943]

LET NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION ALONE

Senator BYRD and his committee acting as watchdogs of the United States Treasury against nonessential expenditures have accomplished much good; but there are exceptions. The committee's present effort to abolish the National Youth Administration and transfer its war work to other Government agencies, is a splendid illustration of a supposed reform that would miss its goal.

The most easily available evidence with regard to National Youth Administration's work in the Nation is a statement from the records of what it has done and is doing in North Carolina, and, more particularly, at the Asheville National Youth Administration War Production Training Project located at Newbridge.

Since July 1, 1942, and through May 15, 1943, 2,174 boys and girls (of both races) between the ages of 16 and 25, were trained in the National Youth Administration training centers of this State. Of this number 1,112 received training at the Asheville center and placed as skilled workers in war industries, chiefly aircraft and shipbuilding. The 2,174 trainees came from 17 western North Carolina counties.

The Asheville projects operates with three 8-hour shifts a day in machine shop, aircraft woodworking, radio shop, sheet metal, welding shop, and others.

That National Youth Administration is doing essential war work Senator BYRD's committee does not deny. The committee simply proposes to demobilize a trained personnel, shift its activities to other agencies, or would try to persuade overworked war plant managers with no training schools of their own to take over the National Youth Administration classes.

Who knows that this plan would save money? It seems more probable that it would, in the midst of the war effort, disrupt a going concern with effective results to its credit since last July.

National Youth Administration has been the answer to the question, asked by hundreds of western North Carolina youth not called by the draft, "How can I best serve the Nation in the war against the Axis?"

[From the Charlotte News of June 16, 1943]

AN ERROR—HOUSE COMMITTEE SPURNS NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION BECAUSE IT KNOWS NO BETTER

When the House Appropriations Committee, by a one-vote margin, turned thumbs down on the National Youth Administration and threw it to an uncertain fate on the floor, the national war effort suffered a definite setback. The result of ignorance of National Youth Administration's present program and blind partisan politics may well be that a most valuable New Deal agency will go out of existence at the end of the month.

If that comes to pass, the committee will have been guilty of a national disservice (by a vote of 17 to 16) merely because it disdained to investigate. The committee doubtless has the same outdated idea of National Youth Administration as that held by the general public; it was, in fact, clearly stated by Representative GRANT, a Republican from Indiana, who declared: "National Youth Administration is an agency that has outlived its usefulness and become another tool in the hands of New Deal social experimenters."

We believe no man can be certain of the actual value of a sprawling agency like National Youth Administration to the Nation, but we are morally certain that the House committee had it all wrong, that it dealt with the problem carelessly. Investigation would have shown, for example, that some 450,000 highly trained boys and girls (welders, woodworkers, metal workers, smiths, machine operators) have gone or will go to war industry this year.

National Youth Administration has not been a relief agency since war came, not at all. It has been, of its own volition, a war agency, and has operated as such. If Representative GRANT can picture the pouring of some 800 trained young workers into war industry every day as social experiment, he's too much for us. Even if the cost of training and placing workers from National Youth Administration is high (estimated at $200 per trainee) it must be recognized that to halt the program now and turn it over to busy industry itself would cost far more.

[From the Durham Sun of June 15, 1943]

NOT SO SMART

Among the measures taken by the House Appropriations Committee in framing its version of the Labor-Federal Security-War Manpower Commission money bill, was the elimination of the National Youth Administration. The committee has ordered its liquidation not later than January 1, 1944.

The committee may endeavor to justify the action on the ground of economy. The truth seems to be that there is a great deal of clamor against Federal aid for youth from those who fear socialistic tendencies will be created. The proponents of the move and the established critics of the Roosevelt administration, who seized on the National Youth Administration just as they seize on anything else that lends itself to their purpose as politicians hostile to the Democratic leadership or tories hostile to anything which seems to smack of paternalism are quite smug about it and are smirkingly pointing to themselves and saying, "Look what we did to F. D. R."

They may not be so smart, after all. We doubt they have done Franklin Delano Roosevelt any harm. The public will not be in the least doubt who killed cock robin. That, however, is the trivial aspect. The significant question which Congress must ask itself before it accepts or rejects the committee's proposal is, What effect will this provision scuttling the National Youth Administration have on the development of our American young people?

It may be worth something to recall that the might of Nazi Germany, misused though it is, has its roots in the development of German youth. Russia's amazing strength today is the direct outgrowth of the elaborately comprehensive program of physical and mental education for all Russian youth.

The National Youth Administration has given thousands of young men and women technical training for war production jobs. That is an important work, not only for the war emergency but for the future, since it fits a portion of our youth for recognized trades and gives them stable places in life.

Among other things, the National Youth Administration has assisted many intelligent and promising young people who were willing to work for their schooling, an opportunity for higher education. That is important, too, since it is a step in the direction of educating youth in accordance with diligence and aptitude rather than simply sending to college those who happen to have the money to go, regardless of whether they possess the brains.

There are other activities of the National Youth Administration which are not performed by any agency yet which probably should be provided by some organization. If there is any field of activity in which Federal intervention might be accepted and approved, it would seem to be the field of youth guidance and training. That is something Congress may want to consider more receptively than the House committee seems to have done.

New York Times Analyzes the Part of the House in Post-War Declarations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of June 18, 1943:

IN THE NATION—THE HOUSE'S PART IN POST-WAR DECLARATIONS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 17.—Senators were quick to point out, after the post-war resolution by Representative FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, was adopted by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, that the Senate alone has the power to approve or disapprove treaties. This is the constitutional fact. But the senatorial comment revealed no consideration of these other elements which will make much more binding and important a declaration of the post-war policy of the United States in which the House is associated:

1. To carry out numerous aspects of the pledge proposed by the House committee—the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world in the making and operating of which machinery the United States will play its full part—agreements as well as treaties will be required.

2. The nature of these agreements will be such as to require action by the House as well as by the Senate, since they will involve the appropriation of funds, the disposition of air forces, and so forth, in all of which the House has authority equal to that of the Senate.

3. The House is the popular legislative body in this country, and every Member of it is obliged to face the voters every two years. Only one-third of the Senate is elected at the same poll, and those chosen have terms of 6 years instead of 2.

A STRONGER ASSURANCE

4. To convince our allies in this war that the United States will do what is outlined in the Fulbright proposal, a concurrent resolution by both branches of Congress is desirable. It does not require the President's signature, being purely a congressional act.

5. A full congressional expression to this end carries more assurance than one by the Senate alone for the further reasons that (a) House resentment over being disregarded would quickly be reflected in the Senate, since House Members are on more constant terms of familiarity with the voting public, and (b) the House has numerous powers with which to block the carrying out of treaties accepted by the Senate.

These are among the reasons which induced advocates of such a simple declaration as that offered by Mr. FULBRIGHT to urge it be made concurrent and that, unlike the leap-before-you-look proposal of Senators Ball, Burton, Hatch, and Hill, it be simple and undetailed. There will be time enough later to fill in details. Events and conditions

in each country will fix their terms and their limits.

It is also obvious that a simple declaration will not arouse the volume and character of opposition in Congress which the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution would be sure to produce if it should reach the floor stage. All the Hollywood tactics which the four Senators and their families were foolishly persuaded to adopt to publicize their product have not and cannot change this fact.

The type of opposition that would be provoked by an effort to pass a resolution offering to the world a blank mortgage on an unknown future, and signed by this Nation, would surely embitter the debate and probably range more than a third of the Senate against the expression. To have the desired and necessary effect abroad any pledge of post-war cooperation must carry by two-thirds or more because it requires a two-thirds Senate vote to ratify treaties, and the mustering of less than that majority in the House would encourage Senate fence sitters to vote "no."

MR. CHURCHILL'S VIEW

The Fulbright resolution takes these considerations into full account. The folly of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill declaration is that it ignores them all. Furthermore, there are more than a dozen declarations before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, addressed to the common end, and the attempt to ballyhoo one of them as unique has been a threat to achieving that common end. The only really unique aspect of the resolution by the four Senators is that it is a political amateur in a professional performance.

The Senate committee has been very slow in coming to a conclusion on the resolutions before it, but there are good reasons for this. The administration, Chairman CONNALLY, Senator GEORGE, and others concerned earnestly desire a sound post-war system of collective security to which the American people can be induced to adhere. They do not want to stir up a destructive controversy and muster less than a two-thirds vote because the effect of that abroad would be worse than to have no resolution at all.

This is the consensus of informed and responsible opinion. When Prime Minister Churchill was here he said as much, in response to questions by Senators, and urged that nothing be attempted that could in any way be used to break the anti-Axis front. The effort would quickly be made by Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo if less than two-thirds of Congress should affirm a pledge of post-war cooperation by the United States. The Fulbright resolution, or something like it, has the best chance of avoiding that perilous result.

Elmer Davis Spanked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well-deserved reportorial spanking administered to Elmer Davis of O. W. I. by Malcolm W. Bingay of the Detroit Free Press in his column Good Morning of June 17. It is worth reading:

GOOD MORNING

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

MORE ABOUT ELMER

The more I think of that attack by Elmer Davis on the Washington newspaper correspondents as incompetent the more irked I get. And, when it comes to Elmer Davis, I irk easy.

Davis, at the Newspaper Guild Convention, charged that the Washington reporters were inadequate to cover such news as the war, that they were more interested in reporting rows between various administrators than they were in telling of battles between American and Japanese Navies.

The only answer to this puerile vaporing is that under the voluntary censorship of the American press—never once violated—military news cannot be printed unless O. K.'d by the censor. We print the news when it is officially handed us, even if it is from 6 months to a year old.

In all the annals of a free press there never has been displayed such a sense of responsibility and fidelity to a pledge as has been offered by the American newspapers.

Elmer ignores all that.

Charlie Michelson has moved back into the picture to prepare for the Presidential campaign of 1944. Machiavellian Charlie has won for himself the dubious reputation of being the most cunning smear artist in the history of American politics. His job is to rob men of their reputations if they dare oppose Roosevelt—no matter how honorably. It begins to look as though he had taken over Elmer's funnily named "Office of War Information" as an adjunct to his activities.

The Office of War Information seems more interested in winning an election than it is in winning a war.

I see where Senator STYLES BRIDGES has answered Elmer's onslaught on the American press on the floor of the Senate and suggested a congressional investigation of the whole weird set-up of that organization.

"Perhaps," he said, "Davis' real objection is that the reporters have uncovered news in Washington that does not look well outside of Washington."

Last February I went down to Washington to attend the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. We were told by Elmer Davis that we would be given the real inside low-down on the war and all other matters pertaining to its progress, in a series of off-the-record meetings. The only lasting impressions we got were those left by the cane-seated chairs.

We were told nothing. And every day in every way our intelligence was insulted by a parade of brass hats in carefully deleted speeches, going through the motions of pretending to tell us. All direct questions were evaded. But we got something out of the convention. We learned what the reporters on the Washington firing line are up against in trying to get the truth.

The gist of the whole matter is that American newspapers through their correspondents have refused to surrender their independence to the politicians.

This, Elmer Davis naturally resents.

The Administration does not want the public to know how it has fallen down on the job.

It wants all the silly disputes between the quarreling factions of the Government suppressed.

It does not want the people to know that it is because of these fights for power, because of utter lack of any organization sense, because of playing politics, we are not further along with the war effort.

It was these hard-headed reporters who kept harping on the derelictions and mismanagement for war production under Office of Production Management, the Manpower Commission, the Office of Price Administration—and all the other dizzy outfits—that brought about such reforms as have been accomplished.

By their barrage of exposure they made it possible for such efficient groups as the Tolan committee to move and make official factual reports on what was going on.

These reporters first called attention to the way contracts were being piled up in regions where there were critical shortages of both housing and manpower; they let the world know that the handling of agricultural and industrial manpower was being bungled; they exposed the fact that small business was being crushed to the wall.

They have shouted from the housetops that there has been no over-all planning for the mobilization of our resources to fight a war. And they are still yelling. Only 3 weeks ago—after 18 months of fighting—did the administration get around to the creation of a mobilization board.

Those reporters called attention to the fact that Barney Baruch has been telling the new dealers for 2 years what to do. Every move they have made since has been along the lines he laid down and the only element of order in Washington has come about as a result of that.

And now Elmer Davis has the gall to suggest that they are not competent!

Listen, kid, they'll be there on the job when you are back on the radio, rolling your r's and telling the world what you've just read from their dispatches.

Anniversary in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, June 20, 1943, entitled "Anniversary in Russia":

Although the actual anniversary date is still 2 days off, it was on the corresponding Sunday morning in June 2 years ago that Adolf Hitler and his armed hordes broke forth like thieves in the night to launch their assault on Russia. At the time they thought that this assault would bring a quick end of the war and make the German "master race" the master of the earth. Two years are a short period in history, yet what a change 2 short years have wrought. Today, Hitler's hopes for victory lie buried under the Russian steppes, and the voice of retribution is thundering into the Nazis' ears as Allied bombs crash in their midst and Allied armies prepare to storm the ramparts of their fortress. That this is so is due to many factors. Among them are British steadfastness, the American production miracle, and the unexampled heroism of the Russian armies and the Russian people, which surpassed all Nazi calculations and all expectations of the world.

It has often been said that in attacking Russia Hitler made his great mistake. He did make a mistake in calculating Russian strength, but the attack on Russia was a mistake only in the sense that his whole scheme of world conquest was a mistake. For in that scheme, Russia, France, the British Empire, the United States, and Hitler's own allies, Italy and Japan, were all his prospective

victims, to be conquered by guile if possible, by force if necessary. A greatly different story would have been written if the grand alliance of the United Nations had confronted Hitler before the war. The division of these nations, carefully nurtured by Nazi propaganda, presented Hitler with his opportunity. It permitted him in the beginning to crush the continental nations one by one, and at such a small cost that it merely whetted Nazi appetities. And Russia was to be the main prize. For Russia was the "heartland" of Nazi geopoliticians, and the control of its natural riches and vast land masses by a conquering land power was to wipe sea power off the face of the earth and initiate the Germanic age under the domination of the Third Reich. Once Hitler began his war he became prisoner of the dynamics of the system he had built up. He might wish to end the war with any one power as quickly as possible, but he could never end his war until his ultimate objective of world conquest was attained.

The miscalculation Hitler made, therefore, was not the attack on Russia itself, which was part of his original plan, but his belief that he could beat Russia quickly before Britain and America could either aid Russia or rise as a menace in the west. Yet in the beginning his scheme seemed to be working out as planned. German military experts expected to crush Russia in 2 months. That proved too optimistic, yet by October the Germans were before Moscow, and on October 3, 1941, Hitler announced that Russia "is already broken and will never rise again." Then came the miraculous turn. Not only did the Russians save Moscow; they launched a winter counteroffensive of their own and unhinged the whole German plan of conquering Russia by conquering the Bolshevist capital. Yet Hitler's confidence was still such that he did not shrink from following Japan, in declaring war against the United States, for he still counted on knocking out Russia before American aid could become effective—by a smaller but even more intensive drive against the Russian oil fields, whose capture would stall the Russian armies and the whole Russian economy. That drive led him to Stalingrad, and on September 30 last year he announced that the Germans were there to stay and "that no human being shall ever push us away from that spot." But it was at Stalingrad that German hopes died, and only by a supreme effort did the German armies escape a complete catastrophe. Hitler's bid for victory had failed, and now Great Britain and America are on the battlefield with armies and air forces that are making Hitler dizzier than ever as to where the "military idiots"—as he called them—will strike.

Many reasons have been ascribed for the German defeats in Russia. The Russians themselves have credited their victories to Hitler's own "military idiocy," and so have the German generals. American and British aid in the hour of direst need helped much. But the main credit will ever go to the heroic Russian armies and the Russian people. They rose as a united nation in arms and thereby earned the gratitude and the respect of the civilized world.

Bank of America

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, already by far the major portion of the banking business in the State of California and some adjoining States is controlled by the Bank of America. One by one the independent banks of our State have been bought out and absorbed by it. We now find that the Bank of America has very frankly and avowedly embarked upon a program of acquiring 124,000 shares of the stock of the Citizens National Bank out of a total outstanding issue of 250,000 shares of that banking institution.

And the Citizens Bank is one of the very few substantial competitors which the Bank of America still has in the southern part of California.

Not only does the Bank of America control a major portion of the banking business of our State but it has also, in conjunction with the holding company, Trans-America, branched out in recent years and acquired vast industrial properties, and constitutes one of the greatest financial empires in the whole Nation.

The method now being employed to attempt to get control of the Citizens Bank is, briefly, to offer $33 per share for its stock, which is quoted on the market at only $23 per share. Stockholders naturally hesitate to refuse an opportunity of this kind, but one cannot help wondering what arguments are used in attempting to induce the stockholders of the Citizens Bank to sell their stock. Resources of the Bank of America are so great that if $33 a share does not do the trick it can start offering $43, or even more.

There are laws on the statute books which require one bank to get the permission of governmental agencies before it can establish a branch bank. Certainly this is as it should be. But where a bank holding company is carrying on the operation of eliminating competition, there is nothing, I am informed, that any governmental agency can do until after actual control has been acquired and has become an accomplished fact.

It would appear to me that this is a matter not only to cause deep concern among all those who still believe in the healthy influences of competition and who fear monopoly but also to call for consideration by the Congress of some legislative action which would make it possible to do something to prevent an unhealthy expansion of bank holding companies to at least the same extent that action can now be taken with regard to branch banking. We ought to be able to lock the stable before, not after, the horse has been stolen.

Office of War Information

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the Sunday Times-Herald of June 20, Director of War Information Elmer Davis, refers to Dr. Joseph Goebbels, Propaganda Minister, as follows:

> That is one of the major differences between myself and my distinguished colleague.

I conclude he means Goebbels.

So, when Director Elmer refers to Goebbels as colleague, I want to arise on this occasion as Representative of the State of Pennsylvania with its 11,000,000 of people and over a million men in the armed forces of the United States, to offer my sincere congratulations and applaud the remarks given last Friday, the 18th, by my distinguished colleague, JOE STARNES, of Alabama, on the Office of War Information and to say that I know if these million boys from Pennsylvania who are in the service now were with me they, too, would applaud JOE STARNES' efforts.

I certainly think that Director Elmer Davis left himself out on a limb when he referred to Goebbels as his distinguished colleague, because the only thing that Goebbels is distinguished for is his madman characteristics, his slaughtering of innocent people, his criminal and scurrilous treatment of God's unfortunate people. So if Elmer Davis wants him for a colleague, he can take him, and we should throw in a few crackpot bureaucrats such as this Doxey A. Wilkerson, former associate professor at Howard University who, according to the Washington Post, resigned his position as educational specialist with the O. P. A. yesterday to become the Communist Party organizer here in Washington.

He remained in the O. P. A. a few weeks past his thirty-eighth birthday. He had waited until he passed the present maximum age limit for military service to resign and seek employment with the Communist Party. So much for that.

Now along comes Director Davis and he threatens to resign unless Congress restores the funds to the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information. If he wants to resign, he can resign, and I know that the press will be only too pleased to record it under the heading of "Public improvements."

At this point permit me to compliment the men and women of the press here in Washington and everywhere else throughout the Nation. We should be thankful to God for the courageous and fearless group and the work they are doing. It deserves the heartiest commendations of the Congress and the people of the country for their honest, impartial treatment of the news.

In this press ball game I would rather have the representatives of the press here in Washington calling the strikes on me rather than the Office of War Information. These men and women represent one of the bulwarks of democracy, doing a great job in an honest, fearless manner, keeping the public informed. With this competent group on the alert there is no further need for the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information.

Our Alabama friend and colleague, JOE STARNES, deserves our wholehearted thanks for so ably bringing it to the attention of the Congress.

Broadcast by Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the radio voice of Edward R. Murrow, who has been one of our outstanding radio reporters from Great Britain. On yesterday at 6 o'clock over the Columbia network from Philadelphia Mr. Murrow delivered the broadcast that I desire to insert in the RECORD. It is such a forthright statement and so timely that I think it deserves being made a part of the RECORD.

A few weeks ago I heard two Englishmen talking about anti-British sentiment in this country. One of them remarked: "We really shouldn't be disturbed when the Americans say harsh things about the British. After all, they say some quite frightful things about each other." For the last week I've been listening to voices and looking at faces in Washington and here in Philadelphia. We certainly haven't lost our habit of plain talk. And we're a friendlier people than we were—riding in crowded busses, sharing taxicabs, doing without several things we thought were essentials, but which we discovered were, in fact, luxuries. It doesn't seem to me that we're complaining very much about rationing, but some of the talk you hear in Washington is a little confusing. The first couple of times I heard someone say "We'll win this in 1944" I thought they were talking about the war. Anyone who does a little listening in Washington these days is liable to get the impression that we're fighting two wars. No one who has seen what's happened to Europe, even before the shooting war began, could deplore the continuation of political discussion, but, whatever our domestic political differences may be, there can be no doubt that the enemy of this people is to be found on foreign soil—not in Washington.

That city is a bewildering place, all right. There is some border warfare in the uncharted "no man's land" between administrative agencies. There are people who will tell you that the whole thing is a mess—no clear-cut definition of function or authority—three agencies trying to do the same job. A lot of personal jealousies in high places. Some of those things may be true, but they can't all be true. It just isn't possible. For, if Congress is stupid and our administrators incompetent, then how is it that we've trained and equipped huge armies, whipped the Axis at their favorite game of economic warfare, and geared our whole economy to war production? I've seen some of the things we've done abroad—the flood of weapons and supplies pouring into north Africa, the great military establishments in Britain and Iceland and Newfoundland. It is the outpouring of a great, strong Nation and at the end of the day it will produce victory, but that victory may be delayed, its fruits soured, if our domestic political war takes precedence over the war against our enemies.

That city of Washington is filled with hard-working people. To this reporter it's the hardest working capital in the world. They tell me there are a lot of bureaucrats down there. That's probably true but bureaus are needed to run a war and men and women are required to man the bureaus and that's how they become bureaucrats. Whatever name we choose to call them, they're a lot of hard-working Americans down there trying to help win this war.

The House of Representatives has decided to abolish the domestic activities of the Office of War Information. If the Senate concurs, that organization will fold up. Maybe it should—but there ought to be a reason, and claiming that Elmer Davis is another Goebbels isn't a reason—it's ludicrous. As I understand it, the Office of War Information was established to help win this war. Its success or failure at that job ought to determine its future. No one can be sure what part propaganda and psychological warfare has played so far, but there can be little doubt that the time is coming—and soon—when the Germans will be vulnerable to a sustained campaign designed to weaken their will to fight. If that job is done well, it might shorten the war by months and shortening the war by months means the saving of a great many American lives.

Next winter in Europe will be a terrible winter. As it closes in the German people will be weary and wondering. If we have anything to say to them that will be the time to say it. Optimism and courage are pretty hard to hold on to when you're cold.

I'm not competent to speak of the domestic activities of the Office of War Information, but I can tell you that if that organization is wrecked our campaign of political warfare against the enemy will suffer, and I can report that in the opinion of every competent observer, military and civilian, that I have seen in the course of considerable traveling we are not so near to winning this war as to be justified in discarding anything that might help win it.

There are those in Washington who see in this effort to fragmentate the Office of War Information the opening gun in the 1944 campaign, the Presidential campaign. It's difficult, almost impossible, for one recently returned from the fighting fronts to accept that explanation. Healthy political controversy is one of the safeguards of democracy, but it just can't be that any of us are confused about the relative importance of the 1944 campaign and the bloody, bitter campaigns of the winter of 1943.

In Britain, ministers of information came and went with surprising speed. They once talked of forming a club for ex-ministers of information, but the principle of political warfare was never seriously questioned, because it was agreed that it might help win the war. If the Office of War Information can't do anything to help win the war, then we would all agree that it should be abolished, but if it can, then those who destroy it for reasons of politics or personalities are assuming a considerable responsibility.

Yesterday Mr. Robert P. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, said that Army production was considerably below schedule for the month of May and the first 10 days of June weren't much better. Mr. Patterson was worried about complacency and overconfidence—the belief that the war is as good as won. It's part of the Office of War Information's job to combat such complacency. Maybe what they need is more money, more time to get on with the job—free from threats of liquidation.

There's been a fair amount of optimism noticeable during the past week. The closing of the Syrian frontier has served to remind us of the existence of the well equipped Ninth and Tenth British Armies, but their use depends upon Turkey's actions and, while the opening of the western Mediterranean has encouraged the Turks, there is no reason to think that they are any nearer to active participation in the war. The problem that confronts them is one of timing. Their interests demand that they insure their peace, their place in the post-war settlement. Their interests also demand that they enter the war at a time when they can achieve their objective at the smallest cost. And one of their main objectives must be to make it unnecessary for the Russians to come too far into the Balkans.

There have been reports, reeking with optimism, coming out of Stockholm—one of the most unreliable news centers of the world. There have been more stories of Italian peace feelers, but they originated in Algiers, and the climate there seems to be peculiarly suited to the growth of rumors.

The time may come when the Allies can settle with Italy, if they are prepared to accept a fascism that would be favorable to us instead of favorable to Germany, but that time has not yet arrived. When it does we shall see the second great test of Allied policy. The prospects * * * so far as one can judge them from talking with responsible people in London and in Washington * * * seem to be encouraging. I have heard many assurances that we will have no dealings with Badoglio, the House of Savoy, or Grandi, or anyone else who is a good Fascist so long as he thought it would pay.

Today the Berlin correspondent of the Swiss newspaper Baseler Nachrichten was permitted to send an interesting dispatch out of Berlin. He says the Germans have altered their basic strategy and will not now attempt a major campaign in Russia * * * that they have decided to conserve their strength to repel an Allied invasion from the west. It's just possible that that is what's happened. Certainly most military observers in London expected the German attack to get under way something like 3 weeks ago, but, then, London military men have not always been correct in their assessment of the position in Russia. I remember when Germany first attacked Russia the estimate was generally given as 6 weeks.

We are engaged in a campaign of nerve warfare against the Axis, and in a campaign of that kind, attempting to mislead them, we're in some danger of misleading ourselves and the conquered people of the continent. If the Germans have in fact decided to follow a purely defensive strategy it is certain that they hope to hold us off until the Allies fall to quarreling amongst themselves. Exaggerated hopes * * * optimism about an early and cheap victory * * * might form good ground for quarrels and disappointments later on. I don't know any more than you do about how long this war will last, but I have had the opportunity of talking with a lot of men who will be in charge of the fighting and every last one of them talked in pretty solemn terms about the price we shall have to pay and the time it will take to do the job. I have yet to meet one who expects the conquest of Europe to be either easy or quick.

One of the problems that confronts the British and ourselves is the simple one of communications. Consider the present labor crisis here. The other day I noticed a story by an able journalist, Raymond Clapper, he was writing from London, and he reported that it was quite impossible to explain the coal dispute to British people. That's certainly true. But that isn't because the British journalists here have done a bad job in reporting it. Their dispatches have been good reporting.

There are plenty of people in Britain disposed to sympathize with the claims of the miners. The record in Britain has been one of prolonged bitterness between miners and management. But the principle of collective bargaining and industrial arbitration has long been accepted. There is wartime labor legislation in Britain, and I suppose it would be called restrictive. It simply

gives the Government the right to tell all workers in essential industries where they shall work, and for how much and for how many hours. They can't quit—they can't be fired unless the representative of the Minister of Labor agrees.

Labor is under the control of Ernest Bevin, an old-time trade-union leader who enjoys the respect of the workers, and labor is conscripted, and that includes women. Single women may be called up and sent from the south to the north. They may be taken out of textile factories and directed to go and work in ammunition factories. These regulations are sweeping and they tie the worker to his job. Persistent absenteeism is punished by fines or imprisonment, and some of the fines and some of the terms of imprisonment are heavy, indeed.

But it was realized at the beginning that legislation to control only labor simply would not work. So along with the labor legislation went what was called the excess profits tax, which just meant that business profits above the pre-war level would be taxed 100 percent. Then, if prices of food and essential goods were not the force of demand for higher wages, something had to be done about that. So there was established a system of government subsidies designed to keep prices down. The system doesn't work perfectly. Much of it probably wouldn't work at all here, for our problems are different and in many ways more complex, but it is based on one principle and that is that sacrifices, whether of money or personal liberty, must be made as equal and as universal as possible. And it was based on something else, too—the realization that unless labor and business gave up some of their freedom of action they stood in mortal danger of losing it all. In those days the danger was apparent. It came down out of the night sky. You could go down to Dover and look across the Channel and see it. Our danger may not be so apparent, but that doesn't make it less real.

Seven Million, Eight Hundred and Twenty-Nine Thousand, Seven Hundred and Thirty-Seven Workers Will Receive Training in 1943 Through Some Government Agency, Not Including N. Y. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when the Labor-Federal Security Agency subcommittee reported the appropriation bill providing appropriations for the Labor Department, Federal Security Agency, War Manpower Commission and other departments to the full committee, it contained an appropriation in the sum of $44,000,000 for the continuation of the National Youth Administration. $40,000,000 of this sum, including a reappropriation of $5,000,000 from the unexpended balance, was for youth work and the remainder of $4,000,000, including a reappropriation of $1,000,000, was for student aid.

As stated by my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee by a vote of 5 to 2, my motion to strike from the bill having been defeated in the subcommittee. When the bill came before the full committee I made a motion to strike the item from the bill, reappropriating $3,000,000 of the unexpended balance to liquidate the National Youth Administration and providing that the liquidation must be completed by January 1, 1944. As stated by the gentleman from Georgia on the floor of this House, this motion carried in the full committee by a vote of 17 to 16.

I desire at this time to give some of the reasons which impelled me to make this motion. In doing so, I shall refer briefly to the testimony on this subject, which is rather lengthy, covering 110 pages of the hearings. See pages 297 to 408 of part 3 of the hearings.

While there is undoubtedly a great deal of duplication of effort between the National Youth Administration and the Office of Education, which has been pointed out by numerous educators, departments of public instruction, and people in charge of public-school vocational training, I did not base my opposition upon the question of duplication of effort and shall not discuss that question. The following are pertinent facts:

First. The number of workers that have to be trained during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, to meet the needs of war industry.

Second. The number of such workers who will be trained by and through Government agencies.

Third. The number of workers who will be trained under this bill by Government agencies, excluding the N. Y. A.

Fourth. The number of trainees the N. Y. A. would have trained had the appropriation remained in the bill.

Fifth. The actual cost of training under the N. Y. A. last year.

I expect to make further observations pertaining to the subject matter.

NEED FOR TRAINEES

Governor McNutt testified briefly to the following facts:

First. We will have 63,200,000 men and women in industry by July 1, 1943.

Second. We will require 64,400,000 men and women in industry by July 1, 1944.

Third. The difference of 1,200,000 workers will have to be added to the working force to meet this requirement.

Fourth. The armed forces on July 1, 1943, will stand at 9,200,000.

Fifth. To reach the officially announced net strength of 10,900,000 by December 31, 1943, a total of 1,700,000 men must be inducted into the Army.

Sixth. No figures regarding the requirements of the Army beyond December 31, 1943, have been issued, but Governor McNutt estimates that it will require 700,000 more persons to represent necessary replacements for attrition and such increase in the net strength as may be approved to July 1, 1944.

Seventh. According to the above, 2,400,000 persons will be taken from the labor forces of the country for military and naval purposes.

Eighth. Our labor requirements according to Governor McNutt for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, will be 1,200,000 persons required to increase the force from 63,200,000 to 64,400,000 workers plus 2,400,000 to replace the number which will be taken from the workers' column and inducted into the armed forces during the fiscal year, or a total requirement for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, of 3,600,000 workers.

This number of 3,600,000 workers includes skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers on the farm, cities, and elsewhere. They can be classified as follows:

First. Straight labor such as sweepers, janitors, and day workers. This class, I believe, will constitute the larger part of the above and will require no training.

Second. Skilled workers such as tool makers, tool designers, electricians, carpenters, expert machinists, skilled farmers, and so forth. It is conceded, by both the N. Y. A. and the Office of Education, that it is impossible to train such skilled workers in a 7 weeks' course by the N. Y. A.

Third. The third group and also a part of the 3,600,000 workers are semiskilled workers such as riveters, welders, one-operation machine workers, and so forth. This class can be trained in a period covering from 2 to 6 or 7 weeks.

Fourth. Workers to be trained for agriculture. While a farmer has to be a well-informed worker, it is impossible to train that kind of a worker in 7 weeks.

While it is true, common farm labor requires some sort of training, this training can best be given on the farm by the farmer. The farm worker has to have a real cow to learn how to milk. No one has, as yet, suggested that the N. Y. A. or the Office of Education should go into the cow or dairy business. Neither has any New Deal farm labor educational professor as yet suggested a synthetic cow with a tin udder and rubber teats upon which a synthetic farm laborer can practice synthetic milking. To those of us who have lived and worked on a farm, any attempt to teach people how to milk cows, plow, husk corn, build fences or do any other similar unskilled or semiskilled farm labor anywhere else except on the farm is a joke. Give the farmer a good class of labor at a price which he can pay and he will look after the training.

Fifth. It is my considerate judgment that the major part of the 3,600,000 workers which Governor McNutt says must be added to the working force to bring it up to the required strength, will be either farm labor, common labor, or of a skilled character of a class that cannot be trained by any N. Y. A. training.

This leaves only a part of the 3,600,000 workers to be trained.

Sixth. In addition to the above, we will, of course, continue training workers within plants as we always have done and are doing now either by plant management itself, through the Office of Education or jointly.

HOW MANY WORKERS ARE WE TRAINING NOW?

Before we continue any training agencies we should take inventory of our training facilities and determine just how many we are training now and how many people we expect to train during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. The

following shows the number of trainees who will be trained for industry in 1944 and the cost. Labor is doing a magnificent job of production, and it is my conviction that our present method of training workers is entirely adequate and will fill every industrial need without the N. Y. A.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

I. Defense training program:	
Number of trainees furnished:	
(a) Through preemployment training	800,000
(b) Supplemental training	2,000,000
Cost	$90,000,000
II. Rural training program:	
Number of trainees	600,000
Cost	$12,500,000
III. (a) Engineering, science, management training in technical and professional fields: Number of trainees	800,000
(b) Cost	$25,000,000
(c) Visual aid training	$2,000,000
(d) Salaries and expenses—national defense	$1,100,000
IV. Vocational rehabilitation:	
(a) Cooperative program	$3,200,000
(b) Vocational rehabilitation of persons in Hawaii	$5,000
(c) Vocational rehabilitation, District of Columbia	$25,000
(d) Administrative expenses	$95,000
V. Vocational education: Number of trainees	[1] 2,629,737
(a) Vocational education, further development	$14,200,000
(b) Hawaii	$30,000
(c) Puerto Rico	$105,000
(d) Salaries and expenses	$362,680
Total vocational education and rehabilitation appropriation in this bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944	$148,622,680
VI. In addition to the above this bill provides for training within industry:	
Number of trainees (estimated)	1,000,000
Amount appropriated	[2] $2,091,000

[1] This number was enrolled in June 1942, p. 157 of hearings.

[2] This is an increase of $946,000 over this year's appropriation.

Five hundred thousand supervisors will have been trained during this fiscal year at a cost of $1,145,000. The increased amount allowed over 1943 should train 1,000,000 persons.

In addition to all of the above, this bill contains for apprentice-training service $465,500, and for apprentice training—national defense—$550,000. This makes a total appropriation for training in this bill, excluding the N. Y. A., of $151,739,380.

SEVEN MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVEN WORKERS TO BE TRAINED NEXT YEAR BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, NOT INCLUDING THE N. Y. A.

Thus we find that Government agencies of various types will train during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, not less than 7,829,737 people. This number does not include the vocational-rehabilitation program set forth hereinbefore in paragraph IV. It does not include the regular apprentice training program for which we are spending over a million dollars this year. It does not include the workers who are being trained in Army arsenals by the Army, in navy yards by the Navy, nor by the Maritime Commission. Neither does it include the tremendous number of workers who are being trained by private industry without any Government agencies whatsoever. Hundreds of thousands of workers are being trained by industry without the help of anyone. I personally found 7,000 workers being trained at Willow Run alone, and General Motors trained more than 15,000 in the Detroit area.

Army officials testified before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that they were training 105,000 workers in Army arsenals this year and expect to train 80,000 more workers this year. The Navy informs me that they have trained so far this year 50,000 workers in the navy yard. While some of these workers were trained with the assistance of the Office of Education, I was informed that none of them were trained through the N. Y. A. Thus we find that 7,829,737 workers, or more than 12 percent of the 64,400,000 workers Mr. McNutt says will be required at the end of the fiscal year 1944, will have received some sort of work training by some sort of Government agency by the end of the coming fiscal year.

WHAT THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES TO DO

Let us see what Mr. Aubrey Williams with his National Youth Administration proposes to do. Mr. Williams testified that if he were given this $55,304,000 appropriation he could train on an average of 1,000 workers a day. If we credit him with 1,000 a day for every day in the year including Sundays and holidays, Mr. Williams would have trained at the end of the year 365,000 workers. Mr. Williams further testified that he made a check and that 350 trainees out of every 1,000 trained got into industry. This would be 35 percent. He thought 150 more out of every thousand would find their way into industry.

If we take the percentage that Mr. Williams says he can actually trace into industry, industry would then benefit to the extent of 127,750 trained through the N. Y. A. If we add the 150 out of every thousand synthetically trained workers that Mr. Williams thinks get into industry and credit him with 50 percent, then approximately 182,500 trainees will get into industry. Mr. Williams said he could do all this if we gave him the full appropriation of $55,304,000. The subcommittee, however, cut him to $40,000,000 for actual war training not including student aid. This would be a cut of $15,000,000 or approximately 27 percent. So if the bill were passed as drafted by the committee, we would have to deduct 27 percent from the above number of trainees. Using last year's experience as a basis, this would cut the actual number of trainees who got into industry from 127,500 to 93,075. If we add the 15 percent synthetic trainees that Mr. Williams thinks we got into industry, we would have to increase the number of trainees to 134,225 at a cost of $40,000,000.

The number the N. Y. A. might add to this 7,829,737 trainees which will be trained in 1944 by other Government agencies would not help the defense program to any extent. From all indications that program is passing its peak. Certainly it would not justify asking the public to buy $55,000,000 or even $40,000,000 worth of bonds to continue that agency.

ACTUAL COST PER TRAINEE

Mr. Williams testified that it costs $66.91 per month per trainee; that the average trainee stays 7 weeks; therefore it costs $108.44 per trainee for a 7 weeks' course. Let us see just how near this is right. On page 300 of the hearings, Mr. Williams testified as follows:

With the $53,000,000 we received for war-production training, we were able to train 303,000 separate trainees in 1943, July to February.

He further testified that they trained last year approximately 1,000 per day. As stated hereinbefore, if we counted 1,000 for every day in the year, including Sundays and holidays, this $53,000,000 trained 365,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943. I think you and I will have to agree that only those trained who actually got into war industry can produce. Synthetic or hypothetic trainees do not turn out war material.

If, according to Mr. Williams' testimony—page 342 of the hearings—only 350 out of every thousand can be traced to industry, then only 127,750 trainees actually got into industry at a cost of $53,000,000, or $410 per trainee, for a 7-week course. If we include the 150 out of every 1,000 synthetic or hypothetic trainees that Mr. Williams thinks got into industry, then, as stated heretofore, 182,500 actually got into industry last year at a cost of $290 per trainee. It doesn't take any certified public accountant to figure that one out.

N. Y. A. EMPLOYEES IN 1943

To get these 127,500 trainees into industry this year Mr. Williams had 11,201 employees. To spend the $55,000,000 in 1944 Mr. Williams wants a total of 12,250 civilian employees whose pay roll will aggregate, according to his statement, $23,331,000. The total pay of the trainees would be $22,848,000 under the program as presented by Mr. Williams for 1944. These are not civil-service employees and will make up a nice little patronage list. The N. Y. A. now has a total of 11,201 employees, including 669 regional office employees, 213 in the Washington office, 4,215 supervisors, 2,000 employees at resident work centers, 3,119 project managers at work centers, 985 in property and transportation work. On May 5, 1943, they had 51,454 trainees, so they actually had one employee for every 4.6 trainees.

AGE OF ENROLLEES

According to a table furnished by Mr. Williams giving the entire summary as of April 14, 1943, he had 51,576 enrollees as of that date, 27,133 males and 24,443

females. Of the males, 67.2 percent were under 18 years of age, while 40 percent of the females trained were under 18 years of age. In fact, Mr. Williams admitted that, as far as the National Youth Administration training youth was concerned, they were out of the picture unless an amendment is inserted which would permit the training by the National Youth Administration of persons regardless of their age. I quote from page 301 of the testimony:

Mr. TARVER. I note you are requesting that the age limit be removed to include persons possibly 40, 50, or 60 years of age. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would permit that, provided the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission should grant an exemption based upon a critical shortage area in which it would be desirable for us to train such older persons.

If the National Youth Administration is going into training infants of 16 years of age and then take people off the old-age pension list who are 60 years of age or older, we ought to change the name. We should not sail under false colors. We should call it the N. I. and O. P. A.—the National Infants and Old Peoples Administration.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION TESTIMONIALS

I want to apologize humbly to the N. Y. A. Administrator. I almost made a fatal error and committed a grievous sin. I forgot to mention the many, many letters of endorsement which Mr. Williams has submitted to the committee. I have considered these endorsements carefully. The N. Y. A. apparently does have many of these testimonials, but so has Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound, and the N. Y. A. endorsements, like Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound testimonials, have undoubtedly been solicited, and in all probability for some sort of consideration. To be real frank, I was disappointed. I expected to see some sort of endorsement by Queen Marie, of Roumania, who had been in the habit of endorsing rouge, face powder, lipstick, and any other commodity if the consideration was large enough. I was disappointed until I happened to remember that the Queen was dead. I use the phrase "for a consideration," because I have in mind an instance where an N. Y. A. administrator offered a chamber of commerce an N. Y. A. concession if it could get its Congressman to support the N. Y. A. If Aubrey Williams' field men worked and lobbied as hard in the field—and apparently they did—as he himself lobbied on Capitol Hill during the past 2 weeks, he ought to be able to have a few endorsements and telegrams sent down here. I, myself, have discussed N. Y. A. training personally with the plant managers and superintendents of practically every one of the 47 plants I visited during the past 4 months. I found no "Castoria" baby cry for the N. Y. A.

CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that we will train during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, by various Government agencies more than 7,829,000 workers for various purposes, the result of adding or deducting the N. Y. A. proposed trainee would not cause a ripple. For instance, if we added the whole 365,000 that N. Y. A. proposes to train, 65 percent of whom never get into industry, at a cost of $55,000,000, we would be adding 4.6 percent. If we added the 182,500 trainees that he thinks might get into industry, we would be adding just half that number or 2.3 percent. If we added the 127,500 which with a 27 percent cut in the appropriation would have to be cut to 93,000, we would only be adding approximately a little over 1 percent of the total number of 7,829,000 that will be trained. A year ago when the supporters of the Civilian Conservation Corps opposed continuance of that agency, they argued we could not get along without it. The agency was discontinued. I wonder just how many Members of both Houses of Congress would vote today to reinstate it. With the attempted discontinuance of the N. Y. A. we can again hear, "We can't get along without it," slogan. In view of the above facts, I am wondering just how many votes the N. Y. A. would get in either House of Congress a year hence if it were abolished as it is proposed to do. This is a good chance to save $44,000,000 that will have to be raised by taxes levied on taxpayers whose exemptions we have lowered in some instances to $500; $44,000,000 less to be raised either by taxes or bond purchases.

Lack of Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country there is a growing lack of confidence in this administration, its plans, and its policy makers. The following letter is a typical one. It comes from a man I know personally. He is a good, sound, patriotic American but he is growing weary, he is becoming indignant at the foolish, arbitrary actions of our bureaucrats. The letter reads:

I had occasion to mention a few of enclosed arguments against subsidies to members and Co-op managers in a Berrien County meeting of Farm Bureau at Benton Harbor last week. The president of the organization stressed the point that 3,000,000 of 12,000,000 agricultural workers were in army and war plants—and these the best—that it took two or three replacements to fill each vacant spot. As a canner, I was asked to comment on certain labor problems. At the conclusion of my remarks, I stated that we could somehow get by if markets were free, but that we would lose our form of Government if we allowed such rank injustices as subsidies to be fastened on us. I stated that one-third of the war was being paid for—two-thirds left for these same tough soldier sons to pay for in the future, after their present sacrifices—that weekly factory wages up 68 percent, with cost of living up 24 percent did not fully account for fact that in many families, three are now working 48 hours or better, where one worked 40 hours in 1939—over a 300-percent family increase. Boys and girls from 12 to 17 are making 40 to 85 cents an hour, where 35 cents paid for many tough workers producing two and three times as much work in 1939. The remarks of members of this group of some 40 intelligent farmers were enlightening. They see the dangers, and I believe over half of labor is not sold on hypocritical demands of their leaders. In their hearts they know their real weekly income per family has completely outrun many times over any cost of living raise. My final statement that subsidies were 10 times more dangerous than court-packing bill was heartily applauded.

These facts should be publicized through Congress, radio commentators, the press. We small businessmen do not dare to speak out the facts we know. There are too many ways of penalizing us with Government snoopers of one kind or another.

As canners, we dropped canning green beans, another nearby canner dropped spinach, another 100,000 cases of lima beans, etc., all because of a one-half to 1½ cents a can to be saved by O. P. A. at the expense of less food—a gradual cut-down on the hard to produce canned items to bring an eventual creeping cut-down of 20 percent or more over all. A swell reform theory to have low-cost operators produce everything. Only thing wrong is that we need more than all can produce—even with marginal producers at top speed. Some more of us will drop out completely next year. Asparagus prices were supposed to be named on December 13—none yet. Our costs for May were above indicated prices, account more loss from tough material (the weather), and using 14-year girls and old women, many of whom produce only 50 percent of the work of our tough, active younger women who last year had an incentive to work. Factory labor slow-downs are encouraging a 20-percent less work attitude or move on to another job.

The effect of putting the canners out of business is, of course, to make surpluses greater seasonally—prices lower, and encourage consumption, and higher prices in the winter, with less fresh, and when canned good are not then available.

I am a member of the American Legion, was wounded in both legs in the Argonne in 1918, 14 months in the hospital. I say to you that what I fought for, and what these 11,000,000 fighting men are supposedly fighting for will be lost if our Representatives in Congress don't break this subsidy program now, and by investigations, publicity, and withholding of appropriations, methodically kill one useless department after another. You in Washington have a more important job than soldiers or food producers. You are fighting to hold our freedom, the soldiers for the world's—guess United States better come first because most of the world don't want freedom anyhow—we do. Glory will be reflected by overwhelming votes to our Representatives who are most vocal now in killing the bureaucrats and subsidies who are the effective tools of the union labor minority that is trying to enslave this country, and coming damn close to doing it. Please do not mention my name.

Sincerely.

Another worker expresses his ideas as follows:

DEAR SIR: In April 1942 I went to work for the Kingsbury Ordance Plant and was employed by Todd & Brown, Inc., of La Porte, Ind., who operate the plant. In August of 1942 the union organizer represented that there was going to be a closed shop at the plant and if we did not join the union we would be out of a job. I joined the union under such representations. We were supposed to get a chance to vote on the question of the union on the assembly line where I worked, but we never got a chance to vote whether we wanted the union or not.

About June 3, 1943, Merle Thomas, steward for the American Federation of Labor union, called me off the assembly line and told me that if I did not pay up $18 dues in 5 days I would be discharged. Soon thereafter I was again called off the assembly line by Fred M. Kasler, Jr., who is connected with the management of the plant and I was told the same thing and that I was not able to quit the union. I do not believe that half of the employees belong to the union.

On the 14th day of June 1943 I was discharged by the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant for the reason that I did not pay union dues. At the time I was discharged I was working on the assembly line loading shells on a defense job. At the present time they are short of help at the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant and they are in need of men on the assembly line to load the shells for our boys who are fighting on the battle fronts. I am 53 years of age at the present time and I want to help out all I can with the war effort, and it looks to me that such a course of action is sabotaging the war effort for private advantages and is treason to my country and, if it is so, Congress should pass a law to put a stop to it.

Respectfully yours.

Throughout the country knowledge of the practices of certain union leaders, of their demand that no man shall work until he pays tribute to them, is spreading and the individual workers are becoming more and more determined that the day of a soldier's return will be a day of reckoning; when after the battle is won abroad, freedom from want and freedom from fear will be restored here in America.

A copy of a wire from a constituent reads as follows:

Fifteen months ago I left a good job to work at Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, La Porte, Ind., when they were asking for experienced help. I am being terminated June 26, 1943, because they are cutting down the force. Is it fair to terminate World War veterans and keep inexperienced help who are able to get selective-service deferments on account of essential war work? There are no marks against my record or will they take into consideration seniority or experience. This whole thing stinks. As long as we have to play politics in order to help in our small way to win this war, will you please give this matter your immediate attention. Letter follows.

Congress can sit tight until it is too late to take effective action.

The Roll-Back and Subsidy Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COUNCIL BLUFFS SAVINGS BANK,
Council Bluffs, Iowa, June 19, 1943.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

FRIEND BEN: * * *

There is a real serious situation out in this country that needs attention. That is the way the livestock markets are being handled. Since winter the hog prices have been dropped 2½ cents a pound or more and are now below the Government guaranteed ceiling bottom of $13.75. The cattle market is absolutely demoralized. The stockyards people are advising everybody to hold their cattle back until something is done to clear the situation. The roll-back prices has been more than met by the sharp decline of the prices the packers are offering. In fact, the offering prices are a full 10 percent on cattle and more than that on hogs; less than they were 2 weeks ago, and their talk is still lower prices. It is impossible for a man to get anywhere near the ceiling price out of corn, based on the fat-cattle prices now and the feeder-cattle prices. The farmers are just not taking out feeders.

This subsidy deal is all bunk, as the workers' wages are being raised to meet the increased cost of living, and then they say they are not going to charge the fellows who eat the meat as much as he has been paying for it, but you are going to pay the processors a subsidy. The packers have already cut down the price more than enough to offset any subsidy that be paid them, and if they are then paid a subsidy in addition, they will be paid twice for it or more. This is sure a muddle that has to be straightened out. Kindly give this a thought.

Very truly yours,

B. A. GRONSTAL, *President.*

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. KERR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1943.

The Honorable JOHN H. KERR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN KERR: Pursuant to your inqury, I am attaching hereto a partial list of firms engaged in essential war production for the armed services, which have written letters commending the work of the National Youth Administration in training persons for employment in their war production work, and who ask for the continuation of the National Youth Administration in order to further the war effort.

Sincerely yours,

AUBREY WILLIAMS,
Administrator.

Aetna Steel Products, Pottsville, Pa.; Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.; American Locomotive Co., Auburn, N. Y.; Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.; Brandt Warner Manufacturing Co., York, Pa.; Carrier Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; C. G. Conn Ltd., Elkhart, Ind.; Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex.; Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Elizabeth City, N. J.; Crucible Steel Co. of America, Harrison, N. J.; Culver Aircraft Corporation, Wichita, Kans.; Curtiss-Wright Corporation, St. Louis, Mo.; Dravo Corporation, Wilmington, Del.; Fansteel Metallurgical Corporation, North Chicago, Ill.; Fellows Gear Shaper Co., Springfield, Vt.; Ford Instrument Co., Long Island, N. Y.; General Electric X-Ray Corporation; Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co., West Springfield, Mass.; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.; Higgins Industries, Inc., New Orleans, La.; Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.; International Harvester Co., St. Paul, Minn.; J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.; Jones & Lamson Machine Co., Springfield, Vt.; Richmond Shipyard No. 1, Richmond, Calif.; Keuffel & Esser Co., Hoboken, N. J.; Liberty Aircraft Products Corporation, Farmingdale, N. Y.; Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, Minn.; North American Aviation, Inc., Dallas, Tex.; Parachute Co. of Utah, Manti, Utah.; Pioneer Parachute Co., Inc., Manchester, Conn.; Piper Aircraft Corporation, Lock Haven, Pa.; Pitney-Bowes Postage Meter Co., Stamford, Conn.; Precision Engineering Co., Duluth, Minn.; Precision Tool & Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; Schneider Machine & Tool Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation Savannah, Ga.; Standard Heater & Oil Equipment Co., Jersey City, N. J.; St Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Studebaker Corporation, South Bend, Ind.; Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.; United States Air Conditioning Corporation, Minneapolis, Minn.; United States Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; Walsh Holyoke Steam Boiler Works, Inc., Holyoke, Mass.; Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; William Bros. Boiler & Manufacturing Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., Holyoke, Mass.; York Corrugating Co., York, Pa.

Air King Products Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. B. Equipment Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Ardco Manufacturing Co., North Bergen, N. J.; Associated Manufacturers, Inc., Waterloo, Iowa; B. & C. Machine Shops, Worcester, Mass.; Barclay Manufacturing Co., Inc., West New York, N. J.; Banthin Engineering & Manufacturing, Inc., Bridgeport, Conn.; R. H. Bouligny, Inc., Charlotte, N. C.; Brown Shipbuilding Co., Houston, Tex.; Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis.; Century Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans.; Chicago Electric Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Charles F. Clark, Chicago, Ill.; Clinton Square Auto Supply Co., Newark, N. J.; C. A. Coffey, Yerk, Pa.; Cone Automatic Machine Co., Inc., Windsor, Vt.; Columbia Aircraft Corporation, Valley Stream, N. Y.; A. Dalkin Co., Chicago, Ill.; The David Bell Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Louis F. Dow Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Ford Bros., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Gardiner-Warring Co., Inc., Florence, Ala.; Albert Given Manufacturing Co., East Chicago, Ill.; David Goldberg, Uniontown, Pa.; D. Grandinetti Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., Buffalo, N. Y.; Charles Harris Plumbing & Heating Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Herzog Iron Works, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.

Alfred Hofmann & Co., West New York, N. J.; Jerald Sulky Co., Waterloo, Iowa; A. A. Johnson Machine Tool Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; K-H Machine Works, Union City, N. J.; Kieley & Mueller, Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; James A. Kiley Co., Somerville, Mass.; Knapp Brothers Manufacturing Co., Joliet, Ill.; L. O. Koven & Brother, Inc., Jersey City, N. J.; Laister-Kauffmann Aircraft Corporation, St. Louis, Mo.; Jacques Kreisler Manufacturing Corporation, North Bergen, N. J.; M & L Motor Supply Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Mall Tool Co., Chicago, Ill.; Midwestern Tool Co., Chicago, Ill.; Miele Iron Works, Union, N. J.; Models, Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; New Monarch Machine & Stamping Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.; Pneumatic Drop Hammer Co., Braintree, Mass.; Pneumatic Scale Corporation, Ltd., North Quincy, Mass.; Rankin's Tent & Awning Co., Waterloo, Iowa; Research & Engineering Co., Agawam, Mass.; Rockford Bolt & Steel Co., Rockford, Ill.; Savannah Machine & Foundry Co., Savannah, Ga.; Robert L. Stedman, Oyster Bay, N. Y.; Tirrell Silk

Co., Phillipsburg, N. J.; West Duluth Business Men's Club, Duluth, Minn.

PARTIAL LIST OF LETTERS RECEIVED BY THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION FROM COMPANIES ENGAGED IN WAR PRODUCTION

We wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you on the fine work that the National Youth Administration has been doing to the training of girls. The girls we have employed whom you sent up here, have worked out excellently and we only wish, if it were possible, that you expand your operations so that you might be able to give us more girls between the ages of 18 and 30 of the same caliber as those whom we have received.—American Locomotive Co., Auburn, N. Y.

We have hired and are continuing to hire a large number of young women who have been trained by the National Youth Administration and feel that this is one of our best sources of supply.—Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex.

We have received 726 who have come to us as trained welders, machinists, and sheet-metal workers. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on this fact and express the appreciation of this company for the splendid work the National Youth Administration is doing in the war effort.

I would like to inform you that we have a greater need for welders, electricians, and sheet-metal workers than we do for machinists. I am quite sure that we can use all of the trainees in the first three crafts that you can send us.—Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.

This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet-metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train.

We have found a definite shortage in skilled men within these crafts and, with the anticipation that we will hire approximately 20,000 additional employees within the next 3 to 4 months, we believe the shortage will become still more acute. This figure might also be enlarged by the inroads made on our personnel because of Selective Service, enlistments in the armed forces, etc.—Richmond shipyard, No. 1, Richmond, Calif.

This National Youth Administration training has fitted these employees for duties much more advanced than is usually the case with inexperienced help.

I feel that any extension of training similar to the National Youth Administration, particularly for women or for older men, will be very beneficial to the industry and war effort of this country and should be encouraged.—Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Since September of last year we have at various times earmarked trainees for training in the National Youth Administration machine shop, and have today four or five of them in our plant. We feel that you might be interested to know that although we have made use of various other training sources, the girls whom we secured from your school were trained to a much greater degree than those secured from other sources.

While for some time we have had under consideration a training program within our plant, we feel that continued operation of the National Youth Administration Training Center as well as continued efficiency therein would save us the headaches and trouble that any within-the-plant training program would entail.—Alfred Hofmann & Co., West New York, N. J.

National Youth Administration trainees are enabling us to do a good job in the war effort as the enclosed photostats show.

Demands upon us are increasing and we have taken contracts based upon receiving National Youth Administration trainees when needed.

It is therefore essential to our program that National Youth Administration be kept in operation. Your assistance to this end is very respectfully requested.—Research & Engineering Co., Agawam, Mass.

Rehearsal for V-Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a speech by Mr. Richard H. Stout, president of the Morris Plan Bankers Association, at St. Louis, Mo., June 15, 1943. It is well worth reading and preserving:

REHEARSAL FOR V-DAY

You must learn to make your bed. And, you must learn to dust beneath it. You must know how to wash a window, and iron a shirt, and turn out a meal. I am not speaking to you in parables or riddles. I am stating plain, hard, unvarnished truths, unpleasant as they may be to bay-windowed businessmen who have come to associate calluses with golf clubs and to expect to tuck cares and minor irritants into a folder and leave them on the office desk. You might just as well face it and make the most of it; in the world of the post-war tomorrow you will be as vulnerable to house-maid's knee as you are now to ailments of the heart, stomach, and liver.

Furthermore, I am not talking to you about any social revolution, any coming of communism, any rapid flourishing of super New Dealism. You are not going to be driven into the kitchen and under the bed by a man in the White House, or a man at the head of a labor party, or a march of embattled racial minority. You are coming to this state of affairs which will make you feel as much at home in an apron as in a waistcoat, through your own scheming, your own planning, and your own prayers. If this metamorphosis of the tired businessmen does not take place, you will be one of those most disappointed and undeniably the one worst hurt.

No wonder you look at me as though you think I am crazy. Yet the point is probable and prove it I will. A few of you have domestic servants left, but darn few of you. More of you have a wife or daughter left on whom you can wish the chores for which domestic servants can no longer be obtained, but the number of you who are in this position is on the decrease and just starting. On the other hand, take a look at England. Domestic servants are not to be had for love and the money is not available for bidding against war plants and war activities.

The sweet little homemaker has put on overalls and gone into a welding job. She did it because of patriotism. She will stay with it as long as she can because she has found it good, good to have a pay check of her own, good to see a different set of faces and hear a different set of tales in the daytime from those she hears at night, good to know that she can stand on her own two feet if need be, good to get away from single-handed drudgery with the household chores. She does not do them alone any more. The old man and all the members of the family have to pitch in when the day is done to do their shares. When mama went into daytime overalls, papa was elected to the night-time mop bucket. It's amusing to think of the bemonocled Limey in that predicament, but, like most of his plagues, the thing is spreading to this country and spreading fast. We will be with him when we have reached the same production tempo, and with that will come these same aches, pains and embarrassments of his.

And they will stay on in the post-war world. They must stay on and we might as well take off the rose-colored glasses with which we have viewed that period after V-day. It is not going to be the unsullied land of milk and honey, of ease and unbridled security, or freedom from everything unpleasant except death that we are leading ourselves to visualize. It will be a better world for more people. But it will still be a human world, with human ills and frailties and shortcomings.

And again I say, you as business men, are primarily interested in seeing that it is a world in which you bear your share of the drudgery. There has been much talk about "must" legislation in the past 10 long years. When we look toward the peacetime tomorrow, there is a must on which even greater emphasis has to be placed. It is an economic must. We must have continued full employment and full production.

The alternative; there is none. We cannot go back to a $35,000,000,000 annual income and to fractional employment, bread lines, and doles. This is not 1919 or even 1932. This is the enlightened fifth decade of the twentieth century. Alert, educated, socially conscious, articulate masses have had adequate demonstration in the past 2 years that full employment is a possibility, not just an economist's dream.

They have seen that it can be materialized when there exists the decree of self-abnegation for the common good which hitherto has been a phenomenon of war, and usually of defensive war. They will demand of someone that, if these accomplishments can be thrown onto the altar of Moloch, they be produced for the more worthy purpose of enriching man's happier years of peace. Business, you as businessmen, the American enterprise system, capitalism—all survivors of the yesterday which will be brooked no more—shall find yourselves in the position of either producing full employment and full production and distribution or being wiped off the slate by the powerful surge of tomorrow's society.

Youth, which has been put into the harness of gainful employment during this war before it was old enough to be off the playground, will not again be told that it must emerge from the halls of education to find a world of enforced idleness and deprivation. Women will not again be returned to dependence and domestic drudgery. Domestic servants and others in the low-paid categories will not topple from the pedestal of wartime pay without violent struggle. The soldier and the sailor and the marine know what they want; they know they have the power to demand and get it, and they intend to do just that. The cash bonus will not satisfy them this time; they intend to have a job and a living wage. Business, the consumer, government will confront a united movement, will not be saved by a struggle between the returning soldier and the war worker for the same job, the one to get it, the owner to retain it. They move as one and they are irresistible. It is abundantly obvious that full production and distribution are a necessary concomitant of such a measure of full employment as the fulfillment of these demands requires.

But there is another, a financial reason, why you as businessmen must take the position which I have been emphasizing. We have a national debt which is climbing into astronomical figures. The present guess is that it will be $300,000,000,000 by the end of

1945, with another $50,000,000,000 to be added for tapering off. It is generally conceded that this would be nothing about which to get hysterical if we could maintain the $130,000,000,000 annual income which we expect to chalk up this year. It will require that much to service the huge national debt which is our heritage from social experiment and war; that is, if we are not to levy such a tax on business and enterprise that it must be killed by the tax poison alone. Now, it follows that you and your business and your property are jeopardized unless this problem is met. You lose out if the tax is heavier than your business can bear. Nonetheless, certainly you lose out if the debt is not serviced and if some default occurs. In other words, we must have approximately $130,000,000,000 annual income in the post-war years to get by. In order to have $130,000,000,000 annual income we must have employment, production, and distribution at the hitherto unprecedented level which it has reached in this year of conflict and lend-lease.

That this objective can be realized is no idle dream. There is altogether too much disposition in this country to dismiss this logical solution of our problem with the cry of "impossibility," based on the argument that such income could have come in this year only under the spur of war. I want to say to you that this income and the national wealth to support it would shortly have been realized in spite of the war. In substantiation of that statement I want to show you a chart which projects our national wealth and income on the basis of the scale of growth achieved in the period from 1850 to 1930.

Time does not permit of my going into great detail about this most interesting chart, for which I am indebted to Mr. T. C. Boushall, President of Consumer Banking Institute. I would only call your attention to two points: first, that that income historically grows at a far faster rate proportionately than national wealth and that both wealth and income multiplied far faster than population; and, second, these figures do not even give credit to the vast stimulus of the war effort and they cannot, of course, reflect the as yet unrealized upward recoil in relief from the repressing influences of the 1929–33 depression and the 10-year effort to impose a false philosophy of a static American economy. Even so, this graph proves the point that the national income and the level of employment which are necessary for the post-war years are obtainable and retainable. So, we shall not be stumped by a trite "can't be done."

The next question becomes, "Who shall take the lead in seeing that this primary must is fulfilled?" There are two perfectly obvious possibilities. One is government, the other is business. Though there are elements in the government of today that would like to undertake the job whether or not business is willing and able to do it, they seem to be minority elements. I think we can take it for granted that there is still enough sanity, enough dislike of government interference, in this country to insure that if business is prompt, determined, capable, and successful in carrying out the job, government will lay off, in so far as it can, and will fall in with any intelligent pattern laid down by business. But unless it is an intelligent and comprehensive plan, be sure that government must and will step in. That, from our standpoint, would be tragic. It would mark further surrender of the system which has made America great; further leveling of the ambitious and energetic and thrifty with the incapable and shiftless; further surrender of our liberty to the political yoke.

But, I do not need to catalog all of the things it would mean to you. You know them all too well. Suffice it to say that all for which you have worked and all that you have accumulated would be lost if Government stepped in, set the pattern which it would have to set to insure full post-war employment, and followed the line of development which such a pattern would encourage. Business must not and shall not, through its failure to plan and to provide, thus put the noose about its own neck.

So, we say the job will be done by business and Government will be relegated to its proper role, the minimum possible role. And next, we must ask ourselves, "What does it take to do this tremendous job?" And there again I would look to the past, not into the rambling mind of some brain truster for the answer. You will note that I agree with Paul Hoffman when he says that the motto of post-war planners should be: "Take your hat off to the past, and your coat off to the future." Looking back, we find that American business has demonstrated that it knows the answer to the problem of production. It has given an overwhelming answer to that, this very year. It can and does produce when it has the demand and it can and does give the requisite employment when it sees about producing. The weakness, the sore spot in the American economy, has been that there is too much production at times, in other words, that production outstrips the market, which is another way of saying that the distributive system is at fault and that, given the answer to the riddle of distribution, the solution to the economic outrage of want in the midst of abundance, business can maintain full employment and all that it implies.

It is at this very point of the break-down in the distributive machinery that consumer credit, the consumer lender, the consumer vendor step into the picture. Here is their responsibility to the purified and Nazi-less world. This is the groove into which they must fit in the post-war planning, this is the point at which they must focus with concentration in looking toward and beyond V-Day America. The nearest answer to the riddle of distribution is consumer credit.

Let me make myself clear. I do not concede that it has ever been demonstrated that consumer credit has any appreciable effect on cyclical trends. But, through cooperative planning with other elements in the economy it can be implemented in setting the tempo for the trends. Consumer credit may then become the powerful factor which government now seems to think it, a catalyst of production and employment, the important key to the distribution bottleneck.

The necessary full employment calls for the purchase of goods by individuals and corporations, or by government. It has been demonstrated that you cannot put cash on the counter to buy such expensive items as homes, automobiles, extensive modernization, airplanes, refrigerators, air conditioning, television, bathrooms, dairy barns, farm machinery, etc. There are exceptions but, as a rule, we do not accumulate enough money in advance to pay for any of these articles. If it were not for installment credit, we would not have them; the men who make them would not have the employment; those who supply the men who make them with the materials from which to make them would not have the demand, and so on down the line. You have only to look at what has happened within the span of our lives to prove that point.

In the country town in which I was raised there were in the year of the demise of Mark Twain and Edward VII about four snazzy privately owned carriages, "glass fronts" as we called them. There were 300 or 400 other vehicles, including a half dozen wheezing EMF's. The rest of the 5,000 inhabitants rode Shank's mare. Now look at the place. With population just about where it was then, you can't get a parking space on the main drag. There are fully three thousand automobiles, every one of them costing more than the vehicles and the whole succession of horses which wore themselves out pulling them. Why? Didn't the Edwardians want vehicles or were they restrained because of the limited range of Dobbin's activities? They did want them, and they felt that his range was super. The answer is that the buggy and the horse required cash on the barrel head; the cars can be bought on credit. The horse breeder had a limited market, and the buggy maker the same, simply because the distribution system could not be adequately developed without the proper type of credit. You got distribution in automobiles, not only at home but abroad. You got distribution in sewing machines, but only in the make that provided installment credit. You got saturation in radios. Why? Because they were fitted to the chariot of consumer credit. The sensational rise in the volume of consumer credit which came in the few years leading up to 1941 was accompanied by the greatest progress in the distributive system that the country has ever known. All these things make the answer too obvious. If consumer credit is not the answer to the distribution problem, it comes close to being the chief stone of the arch.

No study is required to realize that if consumer credit is the key to the distribution bottleneck, a prime responsibility for planning an orderly business aftermath to the war devolves upon those to whom the public has entrusted the business through its patronage, the consumer vendors and the consumer lenders. Insofar as the consumer lenders are concerned, we are witnessing an awakening realization of that responsibility, though they have been slow in moving, by comparison to many trades.

It has been reasoned by some that there is plenty of time, that there is ample reason why consumer credit need not hurry with its post-war planning as manufacturers, for instance, need to hasten. These people take two tacks. Some of them argue that the end of the war will find us with a lengthy lag in which the shift from war manufacture to those of peace must take place. These dilly-dalliers say that there will be plenty of time for planning then, without the need for the continual change in the plans which is a necessary counterpart to early planning. This too is an unlikely eventuality. This global war will not end all at once. The gap between the close of the European engagement and the close of the Asiatic one will permit the American economy to move back into peace-time production gradually and to be about ready to shoot when peace returns to the Pacific and the boys start mustering out.

The other group who would postpone the making of plans by the consumer credit trades now point out to you that we are building up such a vast backlog of pent-up buying power in the form of war savings bonds that there will be no need for consumption credit until long after the struggle ends and the country has returned to peacetime pursuits and peacetime business. It is true that the people of the United States are saving more now than they have ever saved. There are abundant reasons. Incomes are at a new high, the purchasable goods are near a low, and there is the tremendous patriotic appeal to save, to mention only a few. Much of this present saving is enforced by conditions. Most assuredly its volume will decline when peace is restored and there will be some buying from accumulated surplus for the purpose of satisfying pent-up demand.

Some War bonds will be presented for redemption prior to maturity, but there is every reason to believe that the great majority of bondholders will hold on to them. That has been the finding of the United States Chamber of Commerce survey even among the people who are most enthusiastic planners for a post-war buying spree in heavy durables. Reason supports this finding. If the post-war period is characterized

by full employment, the War bonds will constitute that measure of protection which people have always sought through saving. It is our observation that people have always saved for a definite purpose. Usually that purpose has been security. All the people have wanted this security backlog, but only a comparatively small segment had been able to attain it up until the present time. Now that they have it, they will want to swing with it. Even if the post-war period should bring reduced industrial activity (which we must not permit it to do), bondholders will hold them to the last extremity. They then become the last margin of safety in a dissolving economic structure and the painful experiences of the depression decade are still vivid in the public mind.

Most certainly, it is to be devoutly hoped that the public will hold onto its bonds. They overhand the markets in such quantity as to be the greatest inflationary threat of all. Then, too, a run on the Treasury for these demand deposits would throw the country's credit and the whole economy out of gear. Consumer credit interests should join in whatever Treasury propaganda is directed against widespread cashing.

So common sense tells us that the post-war activity which we have visualized as a necessity must have credit to give it life, must have consumer credit.

Furthermore, all the signs point to the time being ripe for consumer credit trades to be about the business of drawing the blueprints of how they will do their share toward insuring full post-war employment through putting their shoulders to the breaking of the distribution problem. That problem will be aggravated by the need to shift from one big customer to the millions that make up the consumer public.

But, important as its role is to be, that of consumer credit is only one of those in the play. Furthermore, it is a role which will put the actor under such searching lights that all flaws must be eradicated before he takes the stage. This means that all the abuses which abounded in the 1920's must disappear. Such things as kick-backs, rebates, and exploitable tricks between the distributor and the finance agency will not be brooked by the enlightened consumer public of the late 1940's, and they are certainly no foundation on which to build super effort to save free enterprise from the yawning maws of bureaucracy, socialism, and communism.

It will not profit this actor of ours to take the stage alone. He cannot pull it off alone and he must know how his role fits that of others who must be in and of it. These are the manufacturer or producer, the merchant or distributor, and the grantors of commercial credit. All of them must plan together and they must rest assured that, though they cannot safely permit Government to have the leading role, it must have a major one. The national finances have reached such shape that Government must henceforth inevitably collect, direct, and control 25-percent, more or less, of the national income. Thus it will hold the balance of power and will undeniably influence the whole pattern of both production and distribution to such an extent that no plan can be made without it.

If these parties which I have mentioned do not get together and lay their plans cooperatively, there can be no hope of success in the major premise. For instance, the manufacturer, not knowing that credit will be available or that sales will be pushed, may plan to produce only 30 percent of maximum output in the year following the war's end, to play on the safe side. Hearing of this, the merchant may decide to reduce sales force and likewise "play 'em close to his tummy." The consumer lender, hearing of what these two have done, may put or keep the bulk of his credits in governments, leaving it to utilize them as it sees fit. Thus we have manufactured depression and unemployment.

On the other hand, if they sit down together now to compare notes, the picture can be reversed. Hearing that abundant credits will be available and that finance forecasts great things for the morrow, the manufacturer will be inclined to go whole hog and plan for production at peak level, absorbing more workers. Hearing of what the manufacturer plans, the merchant will plan new store outlets, increased sales force, all in tempo. Thus we have full employment, prosperity, the victory of the home front.

Without this type of rehearsal of the actors, they may be called on the stage to perform, will fail for lack of coordination and will have the Government step forward to confiscate all the parts to please an impatient audience.

Now, that it may not be said that this is talk and no action, I am going to make an announcement and throw out a challenge to the trades. The Consumer Banking Institute plans to call such a conference, to sponsor a meeting of the top-flight thinkers in this field, to pool the knowledge of all and correlate the planning of all. Such a conference, such a shoulder-to-shoulder march of the manufacturers, the merchants, the bankers, and the Government is, I firmly believe, the lifeline to all and to the country itself. The institute will urge each group in the cast to study its part and to meet again and again for rehearsal until we shall find ourselves ready when the curtain goes up on the post-war world. We must be sure to please the audience or when we pass from the stage we shall take with us all hope for capitalism, the system of free enterprise, the American way of life.

Resolution of Fremont (Nebr.) Livestock Producers and Feeders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

JUNE 19, 1943.

DEAR SIR: For your information the following wire was sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt June 18, 1943:

"The following resolution was passed in Fremont, Nebr., June 17, 1943, at a meeting of 700 livestock producers and feeders, representing many thousands more: 'In order to guarantee an adequate supply of pork, beef, and lamb for (1) armed forces, (2) the civilian population, and (3) lend-lease, that they demand that James Byrnes, Director of Office of War Mobilization, rescind his order, which is effective Monday, June 14, 1943, rolling back wholesale prices and ordering subsidies to be paid on beef, pork, and lamb, and if it is not immediately rescinded, the producers and feeders of the Corn Belt States will request all feeders and producers to withhold the marketing of slaughter animals effective Monday, June 28, pending compliance with their demand; and further, that the feeders of the Corn Belt States demand that the reflected price on meat animals be sufficient to cover the cost of production.'

"During the last week, because of the break in prices of live animals marketed, the producers and feeders have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. The request to withhold the marketing of slaughter livestock would be made to save the producers from these losses during this period of uncertainties. Further, the Corn Belt producers and feeders of livestock stated in a resolution: 'We, the livestock feeders and producers from 28 counties in Nebraska and 9 in Iowa, oppose the roll-back and subsidy program on meat, butter, and coffee as un-American, inflationary, and discriminatory.' The livestock producers and feeders of the country, at the request of the proper authorities in charge and at your personal request, have increased the production and marketing of livestock to the highest levels in the history of this country. The decision to keep slaughter livestock off the market would not mean a strike in production because the production of meat tonnage would continue on animals now in feed lots. Many feed-lot operators, however, already have been discouraged from buying additional livestock and have ceased making replacement purchases with the result that thousands of feed lots already are empty or are rapidly being emptied. In this they are influenced not only by price roll-backs recently announced but also by the fear of further price reductions by the same method in the future.

"The apparent lack of understanding on the part of people in Washington as to the seriousness of the food situation and their unwillingness to request and accept the counsel and advice of people with knowledge and practical suggestions for solution, gives them no choice but to take drastic action and insist that this whole problem have your personal, immediate attention.

"HARRY GARDNER,
"Oakland, Iowa,
"HERMAN DINKLAGE,
"Wisner, Nebr.,
"Resolution Committee."

Fly, Uncle Elmer, Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald:

FLY, UNCLE ELMER, NOW

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

It is just a matter of brief time until Uncle Elmer Davis, our kindly, white-haired Director of War Information, retires to the shadows in company with other such former brilliants as Archibald MacLeish, Lowell Mellett, and Robert Sherwood. Herewith a friendly effort to get Uncle Elmer away peacefully without the usual outcry and shattered feelings.

The House of Representatives has just taken a vote of positively no confidence in Uncle Elmer. Friday night, it ended the domestic activities of the Office of War Information following a debate in which one of the leading Democrats in the Congress and a master of the Office of War Information's appropriation declared we "want no Goebbels here." That kind of talk is fatal to continued success for Uncle Elmer, even though he seems still to hope that the Senate will force restoration of the money taken from him by the House.

True, the House action is not a final decision to kill off the domestic activities of the Office of War Information, but an experienced Washington reporter will be glad to explain to Uncle Elmer that it is an absolutely final verdict in his own personal case.

Uncle Elmer said recently that the corps of Washington correspondents does not cover the real news of this city. In a wishy-washy way he almost called the Washington correspondents incompetents and crooks, but didn't quite have that much nerve.

Well, if Uncle Elmer now had any friends left in said corps, they would firmly advise him to start packing away his autographed pictures of famous men and begin a quiet, but steady, clearing out of private papers in his public office.

Uncle Elmer, the time has come to say get going, old pard. You're through around this town.

Away, Uncle Elmer, away. The House of Representatives never forgets. If it has socked a bureaucrat your size once it will sock him again and again and again, until he is liquidated. Having voted no confidence it cannot retract, or it would lose face with itself. And you've been socked, Uncle Elmer.

So now save yourself from being sacked, too. After all, you've got to live tomorrow as well as today. Don't stick around here after you've been trampled on or you'll be worthless to everybody, including yourself.

The downfall of Uncle Elmer was inevitable, come to think about it. The public's fear that an American Goebbels would be fixed on us in the name of war security has been inflamed by not only his own conduct in office, but by many provocations from a series of characters like him in spirit and behavior.

First, there was the Office of Government Reports, commanded by the afore-mentioned Lowell Mellett. Office of Government Reports was founded by Executive order in November 1933, and did heavy duty propagandizing for New Deal domestic planning.

In July 1939 it was established by act of Congress and was the first foghorn of the administration in the critical pre-war years.

By its nature and character it was bound to draw the fire of all who fear an American Goebbels, and so in time Mellett was no longer a useful front man, having been shot through with too many arrows of public condemnation, therefore he was retired to the shadows as Uncle Elmer will be if he doesn't fly, now, while there is yet time.

Following Office of Government Reports, there came a glittering moment which called itself the Office of Facts and Figures, commanded by none other than Archibald (the Poet) MacLeish.

Office of Facts and Figures was created by Executive order of the President on October 24, 1941. It brought to town a strange and wonderful stable of poets, novelists, political theorizers, and plain Communist Party-line hacks, who proceeded to embroil it at once in all kinds of trouble.

Archibald, the poet, was no man to master this weird company. In fact, he was the worst of the lot at wanting to use the war to make America over.

And so, under the fire of public condemnation, he, too, was chased away. Then, on June 13, 1942, there came into being this famed Office of War Information, headed by our wonderful Uncle Elmer.

Uncle Elmer pledged in a rich, rolling basso that he would keep out of politics, leave propaganda alone, and devote himself to giving the public all the truth about the war effort that military security would allow.

Well, Uncle Elmer, you're a flop. The House of Representatives says so. The public distaste for your services says so. Your record says so. Uncle Elmer, get going, now.

Future of the Missouri Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I place in the RECORD this statement on the Future of the Missouri Valley, by M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of South Dakota and chairman of the Missouri River States Committee, before the American Planning and Civic Association Citizens' Conference on Planning, at Omaha, Nebr., June 16, 1943:

The future of the Missouri Valley can be predicted with some accuracy by reference to its past.

Like many of the great river valleys in the temperate zones, the Missouri furnished the natural highway and also the security of water, fuel, and food, which caused pioneer settlement to extend gradually from its mouth to its source; and likewise from the mouth to the source of its many large tributaries. As a result of this you find throughout its entire length from its headwaters in Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana, to its confluence with the Mississippi at St. Louis, and along its tributaries, many fine cities of various sizes, with industrial, educational, and cultural establishments and organizations of all kinds. None of these has ever reached the size nor the development which its geographic location, climate, and natural resource conditions indicate that it could reach; nor has the surrounding country and trade territory reached such development.

It is a conservative statement at this time to say that the Missouri Valley today would support, on a high plane of living conditions, and without crowding, at least twice the population it now has.

The natural environment of the Missouri Valley corroborates the above statement. It is one of the largest valleys in the world.

Its length and its general northerly direction are such that there is a perceptible change in its climatic conditions as you proceed to the upper latitude. In the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming, the latitude is such that during the growing season of the year sunlight is visible from 16 to 18 hours per day. This produces remarkable growth of vegetation of all kinds when moisture conditions are sufficient.

With a uniform fall of about 1 foot to the mile the altitude rises greatly from St. Louis to the headwaters. The climate of the valley is salubrious and energizing.

In the lower river States of Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska, is found one of the richest loam soils known anywhere in the world. Yields of 100 bushels of corn to the acre, and other grains in proportion, are not uncommon.

In parts of the upper States, the two Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming, is found a much heavier soil, commonly called gumbo. While the name gumbo is thought by some to indicate a rather poor quality of soil, the fact is that the soil is one of the most potent known anywhere in the world; and with proper moisture conditions it produces year after year, without requirement of fertilization, abundant yields of the finest milling wheat in the world, and like yields of other grains, corn, and feed crops. Native grasses from this same soil, upon the ranges and prairies, were long ago classified by the United States Department of Agriculture, as being among the most nutritious wild grasses and hay found any place in the world.

The valley is a natural habitat for livestock, and from the earliest times when it was literally teeming with numerous herds of buffalo, to the present when it is teeming with herds of cattle, sheep, hogs, horses, poultry, and useful animals of all kinds, it has produced a wealth of food and clothing raw materials.

An attempt to enumerate the various food, clothing, and industrial materials of all kinds which the valley produces today would extend this address considerably, and would in fact be merely a catalog of most of the raw materials of animal and vegetable origin which make up the bulk of the industry and commerce of the whole Nation.

The valley is a natural habitat for timber and some of the finest forests of the Nation lie within its watershed. Since the prairie fire has been largely eliminated by settlement, fine groves of timber are gradually forming in most of the ravines and low spots, and in the valley bends of the river.

Within the watershed are found coal, oil, iron, aluminum, tin, manganese, feldspar, mica, bentonite, gold, silver; and in fact practically all the useful and precious metals in substantial quantities. The sum and substance of it is that the Missouri valley comes as near to offering all the elements of a self-contained industrial economy as any place in the world.

With the foregoing general description in mind it seems reasonable to predict that the valley will eventually be developed into one of the great population and industrial areas of the world. To this date very little development of the river for the purpose of utilizing all its available benefits has been made.

The Fort Peck development in Montana and the navigation improvement and some flood control structures from Sioux City to St. Louis have been the only important development. These present developments, however, furnish visible proof of the great possibilities of the future. The Fort Peck development alone shows that control of the river flow may be maintained by properly constructed and located storage reservoirs.

The geography of the river, with its narrow flood plain and high banks in the upper States, gradually changing to a broad flood plain with low banks in the lower States, shows plainly that utilization of the numerous reservoir sites in the upper river can furnish the benefits of flood control, irrigation, navigation, and power development for the entire valley.

Twice in each year—once during the spring break-up and run-off, and again during the June run-off from melting snow in the mountains—the river rises to flood proportions and literally oceans of water run off into the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico, swelling an already dangerous flood problem. Such water, after accomplishing its biannual damage to life and property along the river, is lost forever so far as benefit to the valley is concerned.

With such natural and geographic conditions, coupled with the already existing occupation and development of the valley, it is reasonable to predict that the American propensity for development and expansion and the opportunity for post-war readjustment will carry out a plan of large-scale development of the entire river valley. This could produce a future condition approximately as hereinafter next described.

A series of dams in the upper reaches of the river could be so spaced as to impound all the water which now runs off and is lost during flood stages. Each of these dams could be

adapted to the multiple purposes of aiding navigation, flood control, irrigation, and power development.

They could impound enough water so that during the entire navigation season the channel could be kept constantly at the desired depth.

They could be so connected with other streams and lake-bed sites in the valley that sufficient water could be diverted to insure flood control, and at the same time benefit the sites now lacking sufficient water, and always insure to the main river system all its natural water condition, with a surplus for navigation and irrigation.

Each of the dams could also contain a power development installation.

Each could also be adapted to irrigation of lower lands by gravity and also, when practicable, to irrigation of higher lands from water raised to the necessary height by electrical energy furnished by the dam. All these are entirely feasible and practicable. Most of the engineering data have already been gathered and most of the plans have been drawn by capable engineers.

The results of such a plan are of national importance. Soon it should be submitted to the Congress of the Nation for consideration and execution. The developments in the Tennessee Valley, the Colorado River Valley, the Columbia River Valley, and elsewhere are all existing evidence of the feasibility and benefit of such development. The prospects of its being self-liquidating are plain.

The impressive possibilities of economic and sociologic results from such a plan are so great that one is prone to exaggeration in considering them. It seems reasonably plain, however, that the pouring into the national economic pool of the vast quantity of electric energy which the dams would provide would tend to raise the standards of agriculture and industry at all places within reach of the transmission lines. It would simply add that much new-found power to the national total, and thereby should decrease the cost of the total. To a considerable extent it would be a conservation movement, saving coal, gas, and other fuels now used for power purposes.

So much available power would attract industry to process and manufacture from the abundance of raw materials which the valley can produce. The cities now along the river and its tributaries would all grow and improve.

The irrigation possibilities would provide numerous new home sites, each with a dependable production. They would furnish some available land vent for an increasing population and for a population returning from war industries and military service.

The navigation possibilities would furnish a supplemental transportation system, adaptable especially to slow-moving freight, and would connect practically all the industrial regions along the Tennessee and Ohio and other rivers with those of the Northwest, thereby aiding in the interchange of the different kinds of agricultural products of the Southern States and the Northwest States.

The flood-control possibilities are a very important item and can be calculated with reasonable accuracy. The security afforded to the large cities and the valuable farm lands of the lower river States would add greatly to their future development and would save property losses running into millions of dollars annually. This item alone would contribute substantially to the liquidation of the construction and maintenance costs.

These results are all possible and practicable.

Therefore, it can reasonably be expected that they will be obtained. They should not be expected immediately. A project so vast must come methodically and conservatively. As it does come, the conditions in the valley will be always ascending. The population, standards of living, education, economic, and sociologic conditions will all grow and improve. These are the grand and attractive possibilities.

It is time to start working for their accomplishment.

The Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, June 19, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, some sentimental and thoughtless people are endeavoring to secure the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act—a law that has proven to be the greatest bulwark in protecting our American way of life, and particularly the welfare of the people of our Pacific Coast States.

I have recently had occasion to explain the need for and defend this law in a letter I have addressed to a lady in New York, which is inserted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

JUNE 21, 1943.

Miss ROWLAND,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MISS ROWLAND: The issue of Chinese exclusion raised in your letter of June 17 gives food for thought. No doubt you have some knowledge of long and sustained fight of the people of our Pacific Coast States to secure the passage of legislation to prevent the importation of cheap Asiatic labor and must know something of the reasons presented at the time in support of this legislation. We can best judge the future by the records of the past.

In formulating and maintaining our national policy, we should be guided by past experience.

In considering the effect of Asiatic immigration, I am sure you will be interested in a few quotations from the book of Brooks Adams entitled "Law of Civilization and Decay," describing the effect of Asiatic immigration on the stability of the Roman Empire presented herewith.

"When the Romans first emerged from the mist of fable."

"The husbandmen who tilled this land were of the martial type."

"Rome's strength did not lie in her generals, but in her farmers, who could not be crushed by defeat."

"The vigorous mind and the robust frame which made him victorious in battle were his weakness when at peace. He needed costly nutriment, and when brought into free economic competition with Africans and Asiatics he starved."

"By conquest the countries inhabited by races of a low vitality and great tenacity of life were opened both for trade and slaving, and their cheap labor exterminated the husbandmen of Italy."

"The great estates stocked by capitalists with eastern slaves, who, at Rome, undersold all competitors."

"Competition grew sharper among the Italians (Romans) themselves. As capital accumulated in the hands of the strongest, the poor grew poorer and pauperism spread."

"By the year 400 distintegration was far advanced; the empire was crumbling, not because it was corrupt or degenerate, but because the most martial and energetic race the world had ever seen had been so thoroughly exterminated."

"In the seventh century Asiatic competition devoured the Europeans in the Levant, as 300 years before it had devoured the husbandmen of Italy."

"The population sank fast, and by 717 the western blood had run so low that an Asiatic dynasty reigned supreme."

In view of the demonstrated effect of Asiatic competition on the well-being of our race in the past, it is apparent that the people of the Pacific coast, in securing the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act, were right and we cannot now afford to open our gates to Chinese immigration.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the United States News of June 25, page 44, comes the following:

Strikes: Significant facts that stand out from a study of final figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on strikes that occurred in 1942:

The first year of war brought a 31 percent decline in number of strikes compared with 1941, a preparedness year. In number of workers involved, the decline was 64 percent from 1941, and, in man-days of work lost, the drop was 82 percent.

Also: Strikes in 1942 were concentrated largely in highly industrial States; the average number of workers involved in each strike was small; most strikes were settled without much delay; about one-half of the strikes affected war work; wage increases were the principal issues; Government agencies played a more important part in settling strikes than in previous years.

Preliminary figures for 1943 show that, in every one of the first 4 months, the number of strikes was greater than in comparable months of 1942. The following figures show the trend:

Month and year	Strikes	Workers involved	Man-days of idleness
January 1943	195	90, 000	450, 000
January 1942	156	26, 929	330, 567
February 1943	210	42, 000	170, 000
February 1942	181	58, 122	357, 333
March 1943	260	72, 000	230, 000
March 1942	234	67, 292	401, 739
April 1943	395	200, 000	675, 000
April 1942	277	56, 038	367, 400

An even sharper increase will be shown for May 1943, when the Bureau of Labor Statistics gets the figures compiled. This increase was due to the coal strike and large walkouts in the rubber and other war industries.

Papal Pronouncements on Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun of June 21, 1943:

PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS ON PEACE PUT IN BOOK—LAST 5 POPES COVERED IN 894-PAGE VOLUME PREPARED BY BISHOPS' COMMITTEE

Dedicated to Pope Pius XII with the prayer that "peace, the work of justice, may be realized in our time," an 894-page volume containing the pronouncements of the last 5 Popes on peace, war, and human rights will be released today, Archbishop Samuel A. Stritch announced yesterday.

The volume, entitled "Principles of Peace," was prepared by the Bishops' Committee on the Popes' Peace Points, of which Archbishop Stritch is chairman. It contains Vatican documents dating back to 1878, which were collected for more than 3 years and compiled during the last year.

FIVE POPES INCLUDED

The peace pronouncements of Popes Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI, and Pius XII are included in the work.

Archbishop Stritch contributed a preface to the book and the Reverend Harry C. Koenig, librarian at St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, who acted as editor, has written an introduction. The National Catholic Welfare Council published the book.

The keynote of the volume—that the next peace must be a lasting peace—is struck by Archbishop Stritch in his preface.

LASTING SECURITY URGED

"This time," the archbishop writes, "we must make a peace that will give lasting security to all nations and peoples. It is hard to contemplate what would be the consequences of a failure at the peace table when victory comes."

Quoting the statement of Pipe Pius XII after the first aggression of the Axis Powers that "the international problems involved were by no means insoluble," he continues:

"Despite all efforts to preserve peace, the Nazi party went to war. It did not conceal its objective of setting up by force a new world order in which a single nation would dominate and the other nations would be mere tributaries to its wealth and power.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" CITED

"Let any student in full calmness and impartiality examine the proposal of the Axis and study the philosophy which inspires it and he will be compelled to conclude that it holds no promise of world peace."

Contrasting Axis aims with the peace objectives of our own country, namely, "defense of the 'four freedoms' and the making of them the basis for neighborly international collaboration," Archbishop Stritch observes that this is "the language of honest peacemakers."

"History has bestowed on us a great, grave world responsibility," he says. "We shall be a mighty force at the peace table. Men everywhere are looking to us to give them a good peace. We dare not fail. Even in the midst of war we are trying to make the plan of a peace which will offer lasting security. To us men look for a genuine peace and we must leave no stone unturned to give it to them when victory comes to our arms. * * *

"There must be a deep understanding of the ills which afflict our world, a right evaluation of the problems of nations and peoples, a frank admission of past mistakes, a willingness to sacrifice seeming national advantages beyond even the limits of justice. Antecedent to all this there must be a deep humility in the nations, particularly the powerful nations, a humility which is inconsistent with sordid national interests and frees the mind to discover reality in its full proportions. * * *

"Nowhere," he adds, "do we find a clearer statement of the truths, facts, and principles which are postulates in the making of a good peace than in the statements of the Popes of our times. * * *

"These statements strongly defend native human rights, assert the dignity of man, inculcate the social derivations from human personality, defend against racists and tribalists the unity of the human race, vindicate the moral law in all human relations, social, political, and international; denounce the usurpation by the state of authority to dominate all human behavior under the tyrannical claim that it is the sole source of all rights, call for the freedom and dignity of the family, and postulate Christian brotherhood in our dealings with all peoples."

Jap Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written by Robert L. Norton, which appeared in the Boston Post on June 16, 1943:

ROBERT L. NORTON COMMENTS

The most effective way of countering enemy propaganda is to recognize its essential truth, if and when the truth is apparent; then do something about it. There isn't any doubt but that the Japs have a powerful weapon at their command in fomenting discord between this country and China, when they emphasize the Chinese Exclusion Act in our immigration laws.

JAP PROPAGANDA

Typical of the propaganda which the Japs are using in the Orient is this widely distributed leaflet which reads:

"America is China's ally. Americans say they love and admire the Chinese. But can you go to America, can you become citizens? No. Americans do not want you. They just want you to do their fighting. Their Exclusion Act names you and says you are unfit for American citizenship. If Generalissimo Chiang really has influence in America, why has he not had this stigma erased from American law? There will be no such discrimination against you in the greater east Asia coprosperity sphere."

No sound argument has been offered in Congress against the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

All that is sought under the present proposal is to amend the laws so that China shall be given a yearly quota of 107.

The figure of 107 for China is arrived at by exactly the same formula as the figure of 65,000 for England is arrived at, based on the Census of 1890. China does not care how small her quota is as long as the stigma against her is removed.

It is of the highest importance to strengthen the determination of China and her people to keep fighting until the United Nations, and more particularly the United States, are able to provide decisive military assistance.

As Admiral H. E. Yarnell, retired, cogently points out, the main attack on Japan must come from the mainland of Asia. This area is the only one from which air power adequate to inflict serious or decisive damage to Japanese arsenals and munitions plants can operate and from which forces for the invasion of the main Japanese islands can be based.

Russian bases cannot be relied upon since these would probably be occupied by Japanese troops very soon after war between Russia and Japan began. This is due to the exposed position of the Vladivostok area with reference to the position of the powerful Japanese army in Manchuria, which renders the successful defense of this area a very difficult operation.

TEST OF SINCERITY

The repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws would supplement the annulment of treaties affecting extra territoriality and special privilege. Taking this action would benefit the Allied cause just as did the dissolution of the Third Internationale.

There can be no peace in the post-war world unless there is a strong and stable democratic government in China and unless the traditional friendship of that country with the United States is maintained.

This friendship will not survive if the exclusion laws are not removed. And if for no other reason, they should be removed in recognition of the splendid bravery and endurance of this great people who for six years have fought America's most dangerous enemy.

Old Glory and the New

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Harold J. Wilson, of Burlington, Iowa:

OLD GLORY AND THE NEW

Today "Old Glory" still is flying,
Proud in ancient story,
But with every soldier's dying,
There must come new glory.

Then we'll see a league of nations,
World police and courts of law
Based on global-war relations,
Things our fathers never saw.

Youth is young, but we are aging,
Youth will lead this future stride
Forward through new law and order,
Casting selfishness aside.

Freedom then from desolation,
Freedom from all war and fear,
Freedom—where men work together,
Freedom—which all men revere.

So I shout this ringing challenge,
With a pledge of consecration,
Down with future wars forever!
Down with futile isolation!

—*Harold J. Wilson.*

Free Speech and a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of June 18, 1943:

FREE SPEECH AND A FREE PRESS

"The Supreme Court of the United States, on May 10, 1943, gave to the Federal Communications Commission full authority to determine what shall be broadcast over any radio station, whether it be news, drama, music, comedy, or politics. The result is that a Government agency may now abolish freedom of speech for radio.

"Whether or not freedom of the press shall be endangered by radio's loss of freedom of speech is a matter for the press to decide."

The above paragraphs are taken from a letter addressed to the newspaper editors of America by the National Association of Broadcasters, which seems to be of the opinion that this decision endangers freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

We do not think the Supreme Court had such intention. There is nothing in the Bill of Rights that guarantees freedom of radio.

The broadcasters of America have received from the Government, or the people, priceless privileges which should be used with the utmost discretion. Having granted those privileges, the Government has every right to supervise their use and to protect the public from their abuse. The air does not belong to the broadcasters. It belongs to the people of the United States. The right to use it is not inherent in any individual or group. It is a license granted by the Government.

Once an individual or group becomes the owner of such license it begins to capitalize this public monopoly. In the dissemination of news the broadcasters have brazenly commercialized a field filled by responsible newspapers since the birth of the Nation. Until this court decision was handed down there was little if any consideration by the broadcasters for the freedom of the press.

The Government, which is the people, has every reason to be jealous of the radio power it grants. It is a right to use the facilities of the American people to reach the ears of millions. The possibilities of radio for good or evil are tremendous. The Government has every right to know that the news being broadcast is true or false. It has a right to make sure that the music, comedy, or drama is clean and constructive instead of filthy or destructive. Radio should play no favorites in politics. It should be as legally responsible in cases of slander as newspapers and magazines are in cases of libel. The Government is simply protecting the public from what, if willfully used, could be capable of untold damage. This is a commission function.

It is the absolute right of any individual or group to publish a newspaper. It is the absolute right of any individual or group to address the public indoors or outdoors. We do not think the Federal Communications Commission, acting in the interest of the public, has any urge or intention to limit free speech or a free press. This is a fundamental American right. But when the Government grants a radio license to one individual or group and denies it to other individuals and groups who may seek it, it creates a property right in that license which the licensee proceeds to exploit for his own benefit and profit.

In Great Britain and Canada this power of exploitation is granted sparingly. Only a small portion of their radio time is permitted to be commercialized. In the United States the broadcasters, unless the Government needs its radio facilities for the time being, do as they please with them. It is high time the Government protected its own rights, which are those of the people. It has created tremendously valuable public privileges with no charge. If these privileges are to be granted to a few and denied to the millions of people who really own the air, the licensees have no right to question the public regulations to which these privileges are put.

In fact, commercialization of these privileges should be severely curtailed and fairly and intelligently regulated. In pursuance of this it is not the freedom of speech or freedom of the press which is jeopardized but freedom of the air, which is owned by the public but exploited by a few licensees.

Destruction of Narcotic Ring Accomplished by Bureau of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSI OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I include the following statement by the Treasury Department relative to activities of the Bureau of Narcotics:

Commissioner of Narcotics H. J. Anslinger today called the conviction of George and Elias Eliopoulos in Federal court in the eastern district of New York a significant accomplishment in the world-wide fight against illicit traffic in narcotics.

Mr. Anslinger branded the brothers, who are Greek nationals, the No. 1 narcotics smuggling combination of all time. He expressed gratification that the Treasury's Bureau of Narcotics and Customs had been able to assemble conclusive evidence against the pair when at last they came into United States jurisdiction, more than a decade after their international crime empire began to crumble.

The Eliopoulos brothers were convicted late last night by a jury in the court of Judge Mathew Abrusso in Brooklyn on an indictment growing out of a large seizure of morphine landed from the steamship *Alesia* in 1930. The shipment consisted of 25 cases labeled "furs," but actually containing 17,500 cans of narcotics, worth a substantial fortune in the traffic of that day; and, at prices prevailing in the underworld of today, millions of dollars.

The prosecution was directed by United States Attorney Harold Maurice Kennedy and his assistant, James G. Scileppi.

International police annals contain no more fantastic story than that of the rise and fall of the Eliopoulos brothers. The "drug barons of Europe" reached a position of virtual world monopoly in illicit narcotics traffic during the years 1929, 1930, and 1931.

Mr. Anslinger says:

"The resurrection of this case from the comparatively distant past is particularly interesting in that it affords a striking contrast between the prodigious quantities of narcotic drugs at that time readily available to the illicit traffic as compared with the relative scarcity which has existed during the past several years.

"It is an eloquent testimonial to the marked progress which, up to the outbreak of the present World War, had been made through international cooperation in the suppression of this traffic."

In volume and extent of operations, the Eliopoulos brothers have never been approached, in the opinion of Treasury narcotics officers. Veritable tons of opium were smuggled into China from their European factories, in addition to the vast traffic directed at the United States through the machinations of the pair, who maintained a "front" as businessmen and bankers.

By the expedient of sending to prison one after another of the Eliopoulos agents and distributors in this country, and by seizure after seizure of costly contraband by customs, the Treasury officers undermined the foundation of the smuggling conspiracy; but the two principals remained far from the jurisdiction of American courts.

In the meantime, world public opinion was crystallizing into a crusade against this nefarious business, and international cooperation in its suppression was developing through the medium of the League of Nations with the United States taking a leading part.

The drug barons, who boasted of the friendship of kings and princes, finally felt the heat. They began a flight across international boundaries, at first attempting to take their drug factories and their smuggling technique with them. Finally their hegira became a quest for sanctuary only, and as World War No. 2 spread across Europe their plight became desperate.

The Eliopoulos brothers had been too closely associated with European politics, as well as crime, to feel any emotion except terror as the German hordes swept over most of the continent.

Their trail had led from France to Germany, from Germany to the Balkans and Greece, and finally from Greece to north Africa. There they found an unfriendly haven, and the then potent Afrika Korps made it a hazardous one. Apparently the possibility of prosecution on almost forgotten charges in United States courts held less terror for them than the uncertainties of war-torn Europe and Africa. They fled to the United States in 1941; and the Treasury officers promptly learned of their presence and proceeded to assemble their evidence against them.

Treasury officers said the list of American associates, distributors and connections for the Eliopoulos brothers constitutes a substantial "directory" of American criminals. Included are such notorious figures as the Newman (Neiditch) brothers; Louis "Lepke" Buchalter, Samuel Bernstein, August Del Gracio, "Legs" Diamond, Arthur Flegenheimer ("Dutch" Schultz), and many others.

Bernstein, now serving a 10-year narcotics sentence and facing another 7-year term at the conclusion of his present imprisonment, was a major witness for the Government in the current trial, and several other convicted traffickers also testified. Bernstein testified in detail as to how the conspirators used trans-Atlantic steamers to transport their contraband cargoes, through such devices as false-bottomed trunks and falsely marked packing boxes. He told of various trips to Europe on which he conferred personally with the Eliopoulos brothers, and was entertained at lavish dinners.

Treasury officers said evidence obtained in the Eliopoulos and related cases disclosed numerous instances of double-dealing, double-crossing, and even blackmail among the principals of the narcotics traffic of the early thirties. The Greek brothers did not hesitate

to see that authorities were tipped off on shipments projected by American traffickers who appeared to be growing too powerful in the trade, even when the Eliopoulos combine itself had sold them the drugs.

Both brothers testified in their own defense in the trial just concluded, George denying any part in the narcotics trade, while Elias contended he dealt only with the Orient, which, he contended, was not illegal. An interesting point in the case was the successful contention of the Government that the statute of limitations did not prevent the long-delayed prosecution of the pair, since they had remained outside the United States.

Tribunals of justice are no novelty to the brothers. They were expelled from France following lengthy hearings more than a decade ago, and Elias had another brush, subsequently, with the law in Germany, when a large narcotics seizure seemed to point to him. Significant of the potency of international cooperation was the work of French, British, Netherlands, and German authorities in keeping Elias Eliopoulos under surveillance during a journey from Paris to London, thence to Rotterdam and on to Mannheim, Germany, where he was arrested in March 1932. Released on bail, Elias skipped to Athens.

There, late in 1932, apparently feeling secure from prosecution so far beyond the jurisdiction of United States courts, and wishing to clear George of the charges in France, Elias made voluntarily to Egyptian and American officers an amazingly frank disclosure of his operations. He told of making a trip to China with an associate in 1928 to make a survey of the narcotics traffic; of learning that there were large profits to be made; and of drawing up a business agreement with a confederate in Tientsin. He returned to Paris, expanded operations and amassed a fortune in a few years. This statement was introduced as evidence in the Brooklyn trial.

It remained for a second World War to force the brothers into the jurisdiction of the country whose laws they had flouted, and last night's verdict in Federal court in Brooklyn suggests that the amazing story of the Eliopoulos brothers may have its finis written within United States prison walls.

The Federal jury, after hearing evidence for 2 weeks, returned its verdict at 11 o'clock last night. Both brothers were found guilty of violating the Harrison Act on two counts, and in addition, Elias was convicted of conspiracy.

Sentencing of the pair probably will be delayed pending disposition of defense motions.

Our Relations With Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman from the Boston Herald of May 30, 1943:

Any article on the Soviet Union published today in American books or magazines aids or injures the cause of Allied victory. For this reason the cavalier canard, the careless half-truth, or the deliberate effort to divide the existing friendship between our people and those of Russia can as surely play into enemy hands as sabotage in the factory or black markets in our commerce.

Today we as a people know that the American newspaper can speed the day of victory for all the democratic nations united against aggression and fascism. It can also, by the circulation of prejudice, distrust, and fear of our own allies impair our unity, weaken our morale and if not stopped by public opinion lose us the war.

In order to live with any success in a world of international relations, millions of Americans are learning that you can gain an appreciation of other countries without diminishing in the slightest your loyalty to your own traditions. This problem appears in all its sharpness in our relations with China, with Britain, with Latin America, and Russia. Rooted in the tradition of Jefferson and Tom Paine, we are planning to cooperate wholeheartedly with other nations in war and peace as an essential condition for citizenship in the new world which will replace the old one of primitive savagery, war, and suspicion.

To deny the reality of the alliance we have with Russia, to weaken our sense of fraternity with her millions of proven heroes on battle front and behind the line is to play the game of Goebbels, even though we do it unconsciously.

Those of us who have traveled across America and seen her power in factories, on farms and timberlands, who talk and live in friendship with her common people in shops, in union halls and churches, have no need to fear another democratic nation and her growing might. One reason, it seems to me, that the people of the United States in recent months have stripped themselves of long-cherished prejudices about Russia has been the sense of natural friendship we can afford to have with a nation of 193,000,000 people stretching across one-sixth of the globe and speaking 150 languages and dialects; a nation efficient in her industry, united in her domestic will, firm in her pursuit of people's institutions for the common good. Not just Mr. Joseph Davies and Mr. Wendell Willkie have discovered the vigor and youthfulness of the Soviet peoples, but millions of Americans in Kansas, California, New England, and elsewhere who through their newspapers, their radios, and their personal contributions of medical supplies and clothing to the Russian citizens feel a new bond of unity and good will. Happily, to most of us in this country it is not self-abasing to admit and rejoice in such an ally. It is the mark of maturity as a people that we Americans can correct yesterday's misinformation and rejoice in truth long withheld.

I have seen the recent movie Mission to Moscow. The picture is controversial because it deviates from a previous impression which had become fixed in our minds at a time when far fewer of the facts were known. Ambassador Davies recorded at the time of his residence in our Embassy in Moscow that the trials had established the guilt of the defendants beyond reasonable doubt, and he recorded at that time how a foreign ambassador in Moscow, equally convinced that the trials were genuine, nevertheless told him that it would be just as well if they could be considered spurious abroad. It was the "just as well" version of the foreign ambassador which was published abroad so effectively that a film embodying Mr. Davies' original recorded observations now seems so surprising that it is considered controversial. The controversy followed a familiar pattern. The simple utterances of Soviet leaders, the simple act of the fifth-column activities terminated by the trials do not appear sophisticated enough for some foreign observers. Hidden meanings have to be imagined. Riddles must be manufactured. Unlike other countries, Russia cannot have had ordinary Quislings. Similarly, today Russia cannot be thought to have reasonable statesmen making considered statements of policy.

When Stalin says "The policy of bestial hatred is alien to the Soviet people," he must not be thought to mean what he says. That would be too simple. We must seek a secret meaning in his words until Stalin becomes no longer a responsible political leader of an Allied nation, but, rather, an oriental sphinx simmering in an inscrutable hatred.

It is a sign of growing maturity that we are getting away from the twin evils of spineless appeasement and unreasoning hatred. Some of our American columnists on alternate days still credit Russia with a desire to make peace with Germany and a desire to slaughter all Germans. After all, we in our own country not long ago alternated between a feeling that we could do business with Hitler and that all Germans should be sterilized. Both of these extremes are too foolish to be adopted by either Russians or Americans, but on a reasonable middle road there are two points that stand firm.

First, crimes remain crimes and are not covered nor excused by the wearing of a Nazi uniform. The demand that punishment be visited on war criminals is common not only to the Russians but to all the people of Europe and America who have suffered Axis cruelties from the massacre of Rostov to the execution of American airmen in Tokyo. It is not a demand for revenge but for implacable and indispensable justice.

Second, the Fascist policy of plunder has seen to it that the destruction of food, clothing, medicines, and shelter have been concentrated outside of Germany. Our armies of liberation will meet shivering multitudes whose food and blankets have been taken for the service of the German Reich. They will demand physical restitution of the stolen goods, of the ruined homes and factories from France to Russia, not as a demand of revenge but of survival and justice. It is just and right for Christians to plan for the relief of German populations. We must never forget after the war our moral obligation to send for every ton of goods going to Germany several tons to the areas of German devastation. These are world problems calling for the strengthening of world good will on a basis of justice. Discussing them in terms of hatred and revenge ascribed to our allies, or in secret designs imputed either to the people of Britain or Russia would weaken our pursuit of the goal.

For all our differences in politics, in economic practice, and in social custom we talk a common language of democracy. Americans have long since learned the need for give and take within our own Nation between sharply divergent social and economic habits represented in the different sections of the United States.

Nothing is more of a disservice to United Nations unity and swift victory, to say nothing of post-war understanding, than perpetuating the myth of Russia's secret war aims, often described as "the Oriental enigma of Josef Stalin." Many Americans today profoundly wish our own war aims had been as clearly stated as the Soviet Union's. For those who choose to find them with but a modicum of searching, they stand clear and bold. Probably the clearest is Stalin's order of the day in 1941: "We have not nor can we have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories or the conquest of other peoples, irrespective of whether European peoples and territories or Asiatic peoples and territories, including Iran, are concerned. Our first aim is to liberate our territories and our peoples from the German Nazi yoke.

"We have not nor can we have such war aims as the imposition of our will and our regime on the Slavic and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are waiting for our help. Our aim is to help these people in their struggle for liberation from Hitler's tyranny,

and then to accord them the possibility of arranging their lives on their own land as they think fit, with absolute freedom. No interference of any kind with the domestic affairs of other nations.

"Russia's first aim is to free her own territory, and the second aim is to free the enslaved peoples of Europe and then allow them to decide their own fate without any outside interference in their internal affairs." National survival and integrity, the right to order their internal society as they choose to do under their own constitution, is their basic war aim for him who runs to read at will.

It has been said that hatred is the key to Russia today. Hatred of the Fascist invader there is in Europe today—not only in Stalingrad, but in Antwerp, Prague, Paris, and The Hague. It is the inevitable creation of a total war and only the swift cessation of this war in democratic victory can possibly end its growth. Division between allies postpones and jeopardizes this victory. A failure to build now confidence and normal international relations with Russia will bring the war to our own shores where the same pestilence of hatred will infect us—and to the same degree. Hatred is one key to Russia, Greece, France, Britain—but to none more than another. War breeds hate as every front-line soldier knows, and it is for this reason that our President and the other leaders of the United Nations seek by every possible device the termination of the war in unconditional surrender as soon as flesh and blood can bring this end to pass.

Premier Stalin has stated very pointedly, "Occasionally the foreign press engages in prattle to the effect that the Red Army's aim is to exterminate the German people and destroy the German state. This is, of course, a stupid lie and a witless slander against the Red Army. The Red Army has not and cannot have such idiotic aims. The Red Army's aims are to drive out the German occupants from our country and liberate Soviet soil from the German Fascist invaders.

"It is very likely that the war for the liberation of the Soviet land will result in ousting or destroying Hitler's clique. We should welcome such an outcome. But it would be ridiculous to identify Hitler's clique with the German people and the German state. History shows that Hitlers come and go, but the German people and the German state remain."

There is no clear reason for interpreting this into meaning the opposite than there would be for interpreting the clear statements of our leaders at the Atlantic Charter and Casablanca conferences.

In the United Nations today, and after the war also, religion will serve as a bond or a barrier according to our own use of intelligence and imagination. The day of religious monopolies is over if the eleven living religions in the world are to exist side by side without strife and bloodshed. The second freedom, that of religion, includes the freedom to define and practice religion in a great variety of ways. I for one agree with Dr. Frederick May Eliot, president of the American Unitarian Association, in his judgment that in Russia "what we failed to understand was that religion is a much bigger thing than any of its particular manifestations, and that a people could reject all the ideas, theories, customs, and forms of organization which either they or we had associated with religion without rejecting religion itself. All men tend to identify religion with their particular forms through which their own religion has been transmitted and nurtured, and it is true that religion necessarily has to make use of such particular forms. But it is erroneous to let ourselves believe that any forms have a monopoly of religion." But whether he be correct or not, the Russian people must share the same right we in America possess, that of taking or leaving religion according to our private judgment and to keep it out of statecraft. The Russians learned this rule from our own Thomas Jefferson. In an open encounter Christianity can take care of itself and the testimony of Miss Bourke-White, Miss Curie, Mr. Albert Rhys Williams, Mr. Davies, and many others is united: Russians are free to practice their religion without interference so long as it does not encroach upon the freedom of others to reject it.

The World's Largest Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House of Representatives, H. R. 2996, is, without doubt, the largest single appropriation bill ever presented to a legislative body in the history of the world. It is an astronomical sum, so colossal as to be beyond human comprehension. We are asked to appropriate $72,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment of the Nation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. This gigantic sum is four times the total expended by the War Department for all purposes in World War No. 1. It represents approximately one-quarter of the assessed valuation of all property in the United States in 1938. It is nearly three times the amount of all invested capital in the railroads of the country. The figures are almost unbelievable. They stagger the imagination and forecast the heavy burden which this and succeeding generations must bear. The cause for the major part of this enormous expenditure is the relentless god of war.

It is estimated that the national debt at the end of this war will be $350,000,000,000—an all-time world's record. This is equivalent to and more than the entire national wealth in 1940. In this year of 1943 we expect 62 percent of our national income will be spent for war. We are engaged in a global war as colossal as the sums of money we appropriate to wage it. It is a life-and-death struggle. The destiny of our country is at stake. The effort of mankind to be and remain free is in issue. All for which we stand as a nation will survive if we win and perish if we lose this terrible conflict. We must not lose, we will not lose, the war. United we stand and united we shall win no matter what the cost may be. Stupendous as this sum is, I shall support it and vote for the passage of the bill, and I believe that it will have the unanimous support of the entire membership of this House. Let our enemies understand that the American people are united and determined to preserve, protect, and defend home and country and every sacred principle of justice and freedom under which we live.

What a contrast our day and age presents in the financial history of the Nation. Fifty years after the Revolutionary War and the birth of the Nation, the Federal Government paid a dividend to the States out of a surplus in the National Treasury. Every man, woman, and child will owe $2,650 to the Federal Treasury as his or her share of the anticipated national debt. This means that the average American family of four will owe $10,600 as its proportionate share of such debt.

Be that as it may, the statement of the Committee on Appropriations appearing on page 4 of the report on this bill, I believe, represents the unanimous opinion of the membership of the House and the people of the country, namely—

> Everyone is determined that the armed services shall have every dollar essential for the early attainment of an unconditional surrender of all of the Axis Powers.

In 2 years the Army has had an unprecedented growth from 1,350,000 men on June 30, 1941, to 6,500,000 in June 1943. Before the end of this year it is expected to reach 7,500,000 men. This represents but one arm of our monstrous war machine, but it also indicates the vast sums of money required to support the war effort of the Nation.

Let us pass this bill today and give Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo to understand that the people of the United States are ready and willing to make any sacrifice necessary to maintain our country, our institutions, and our American way of life.

Our Soldiers and the Sporting News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, we all know that most of our men in the armed forces of our country love sports, and they yearn for news about American sporting events. The War Department states that our boys overseas have made a demand for short wave broadcasts of baseball and football contests back home, and for more news publications relating to sporting events. This is a great morale builder for our servicemen. To accommodate our boys overseas and still comply with postal regulations, Mr. J. G. Taylor Spink, manager of The Sporting News, an international sports weekly of St. Louis, Mo., has compiled an overseas edition that is distributed by the Special Service Division A. S. F., War Department, to our boys in all parts of the globe, and from various polls taken, we find our boys digest every word of The Sporting News. We salute Mr. J. G. Taylor Spink and The Sporting News for the splendid contribution in time of war. This is another boost for sports and helps prove that it is a vital factor in our all-out war effort.

Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week the Government of Finland paid another installment of its World War No. 1 debt to the United States. This might be construed as a gesture of wartime expediency were it not for the fact that it is and has been the consistent and established policy of Finland to pay up this debt ever since the date it was incurred. A policy, incidentally, which has made the position of Finland unique among the World War No. 1 debtors of the United States.

The American Finns are outstanding in their loyalty and patriotism to the United States but at the same time they have every reason and justification for being proud of the honesty and integrity of their mother country. Finland, through no fault of its own, has been in a desperate situation all through this war, besieged as she has been from all sides by forces determined to destroy her national existence. She has been the innocent victim of European political intrigue.

It is sincerely to be hoped by the people of this country who have such basic admiration for the people of Finland that our mutually friendly relationship will continue; and that time will enhance the historic friendliness which has always existed between our Governments.

I think I voice the opinion of the great majority of Americans, Mr. Speaker, when I say that Finland is entitled to a fair and just peace. And I think it is the moral duty of our Government to intercede in Finland's behalf at the peace table to the end that her democratic government may remain free of encroachment at the hands of any other nation.

As evidence of the loyal and patriotic feeling of the Finnish people of this country, I include in my remarks a statement received from the Suomi Synod Conference of Michigan, recently held at Marquette, Mich.:

SUOMI SYNOD, CONFERENCE OF MICHIGAN,
Ishpeming, Mich., June 7, 1943.

Hon. JOHN B. BENNETT,
Congressman, United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Delegates assembled at the annual convention of the Michigan district of the Suomi Synod (also known as the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America) at Marquette, Mich., May 28-30, 1943, representing 65 congregations with a total membership of approximately 13,000, decided to send you an expression of their sincere satisfaction concerning the sympathetic and friendly relations of our country with the Republic of Finland in these trying times, and, further, an expression of their deep desire and humble prayer that, in spite of the difficult present situation and much agitation to the contrary, our country would continue to retain peaceful relations with this little democracy of the North, which has been forced into the position in which it now is through circumstances beyond its control. We will appreciate your efforts and influence in this matter.

CARL J. TAMMINEN,
President.
JOHN E. HATTULA,
Vice President.
ALEXANDER G. TAMMINEN,
Secretary.

Legislation by Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1943:

LEGISLATION BY HYSTERIA

Because Mr. Elmer Davis made some ill-considered remarks in a speech last Monday was certainly no adequate reason why the House, in its long and superheated session on Friday, should vote impetuously to smash the domestic division of the Office of War Information and so go far to wreck the whole machinery painfully created to bring some kind of sense and order into news and publication policies in wartime. This is legislation by hysteria, not headwork. The gentlemen seemed to have only a very confused idea of what they were doing. "The American press needs no Dr. Goebbels," one of them exclaimed; another hotly declared that Mr. Davis is "not the man to coordinate the press and radio of the United States if he has come to the conclusion that they are incompetent." But Mr. Davis is not even remotely a Dr. Goebbels; it is not his function to coordinate or control the press of this country, and he would certainly not succeed if he should try it. The American press can very well take care of itself. But it cannot regard without dismay some of the other consequences of this drastic destruction of his Office.

The domestic division of the Office of War Information has done some foolish things, it has made some mistakes and it has manifested some tendencies which may lend color to the congressional suspicions and hostilities. It has also done valuable work in damming the former floods of unregulated Government press-agentry, in controlling the outpourings of conflicting and confusing speeches by vocal public officials, in generally reducing the original information chaos. Its field offices have avoided duplication and more local confusion among the clashing governmental agencies. It has an essential function in providing domestic news for its own overseas branch. And, most important of all, it has by patience and good sense done a great deal to inculcate into the military services an understanding of the vital importance of keeping the public informed and a better idea of how to do it. The steady improvement in the news policies of the services is largely the result of the fact that the Office of Price Administration was created and a man of Mr. Davis' integrity and knowledge placed at its head.

Most of the press supported the establishment of the Office of War Information because the need for these things was so urgent. For the same reason, to kick this all out of the window in an afternoon can scarcely be regarded as an act of statesmanship. Neither, perhaps, can one so regard some of Mr. Davis' irritated replies to the preemptoriness of the House. Ultimately, the Office of War Information and its head must stand or fall by their ability to retain the country's confidence in their impartiality and common sense. But that is no reason for treating this very important aspect of our organization for war as if it were a piece of hot-weather politics. The whole episode is only another example of that impatience, ill temper, pettiness, and inability to keep the great ends clear from which the country seems, in this moment of comparative pause upon the battle fronts, to be suffering. It is an unworthy example, and the Senate should by all means rescue the House from its haste. If the Office of War Information needs amendment it should be done with far more care than this.

Office of Price Administration Removes Pleasure-Driving Restriction for Kingston Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed when I picked up the Saugerties (N. Y.) Daily Post under date of Friday, June 11, 1943, to see published therein this notice:

RESTRICTION REMOVED FOR TRIP TO KINGSTON

The Office of Price Administration has issued an order removing the pleasure driving restrictions for those from Saugerties desiring to attend the ceremonies at Kingston on Saturday afternoon. The removal of the ban applies for the occasion only, and the Office of Price Administration instructs those using cars to go to Kingston Saturday, to carry as many passengers as their car will accommodate. Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and other dignitaries will be at Kingston tomorrow to deliver an address at the unveiling of the Kingston Treasury flag.

I know that Ulster County is one of the important agricultural counties and one where the farmers have been terrifically hit by the gasoline restrictions. The fact is that it is one of the counties where the failure to get sufficient gasoline for farm machinery is greatly handicapping the farmers in their effort to produce for the war. The employees in the defense industries have been held to strict accountability for every ounce of gasoline used by them in going to and from work. Yet it appears from this article in the Post that the O. P. A. does not hesitate to lift the restrictions when, by so doing, it will serve a political purpose.

I am not surprised that indignation on the part of the public should rise to white heat at such a display of New Deal arrogance in the improper use of its dictatorial power through the O. P. A. The citizens of this country may not be

saying much, but they are doing a powerful lot of thinking, and sooner or later they will demand an accounting from the new dealers, who feel that they are the masters, and not the agents, of a free people.

I resent the charge constantly made by the administration that the honor system will not work, so far as the American public is concerned. I maintain that the honor system will work in every demand that is made to prosecute this war to a quick and final conclusion if, and when, this administration will set the example.

Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the pending civil aeronautics bill, now being considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, contains many provisions of extreme importance to the post-war welfare of America's civil aviation.

It is to be hoped that the bill may be speedily adopted in order that the industry may know as soon as possible what will be the legal conditions in accordance with which it must make its post-war plans.

With each day in the development of our wartime aviation it becomes clearer that civil aviation will grow to be one of our largest and most important industries after the war. Whatever its size, however its significance in terms of both national defense and commercial prosperity will be far in excess of the numbers of people employed or the capital invested in the industry.

Beyond any question, civil aviation will open a new domain having an effect upon our national habits and way of life just as important as were the effects flowing from the opening of the West in the days of the pioneers.

Whether the full development of the industry takes ten or twenty or a hundred years, the domain which it will open is, in physical terms alone, far greater than the area laid open to our forefathers by Lewis and Clark or any other of the great explorers. For that domain literally is as broad as the continent itself and reaches higher into the heavens than the eyes of man can see even in a cloudless sky. The domain is nothing less than the entire air space, three dimensional in measure, limitless in extent.

For all that we now know there may one day be great floating hotels between which commerce can be conducted without ever setting foot on earth. Such a possibility is no more fantastic today than the possibility of floating airdromes in the ocean may have seemed a decade ago. Within the last few weeks we have seen seriously proposed a trans-Atlantic air line based upon great floating seadromes at convenient points in mid-Atlantic. We may not, in our lifetime, see air terminals in the air space, but the possibilities of aviation's development are so limitless that we need not close our eyes even to figments of the imagination.

In civil aeronautics legislation it has been the habit of the Congress to act with an eye to the future. It is true that we cannot now hope to formulate a body of law which we may be sure will fit conditions a hundred years hence. But we can and should look forward to the extent of our humble ability. We did so in 1926 with extraordinary success. We did so again in 1938 with even more success. But at no time than the present has it been more important and more timely that we take another look forward for civil aviation. Aviation is moving so rapidly that unless we make necessary revisions in our legislation today for the industry's immediate future this body may suddenly find that it has lagged behind the forward march of the art.

Furthermore we owe it to our country to take steps promptly to provide for aviation the necessary legislative adjustments. As I said, the industry must be informed at the earliest possible moment concerning the legislative conditions to be laid down for it in order that it may proceed to plan with confidence for its post-war expansion. We cannot wait until the end of the war—we cannot wait until next year—we must do our part now so that the administrative agencies of government on the one hand, and private management on the other, can begin immediately to lay their plans for the task ahead of them.

There is no question but that after the last war our Government lagged in the development of aviation. An enemy nation, vanquished and seemingly prostrate, blessed with none of the resources of our own people, was able by our inaction, to leap ahead of us. Hardly had the armistice been signed in 1918 than eager and scheming minds beyond the Rhine set to work to find in civil aviation an outlet for their national aspirations. Through glider clubs and other similar organizations, private flying was encouraged and grew rapidly in Germany as early as 1920. Commercial aviation ventures were immediately projected with reverberations which soon were felt in South America. We must never forget that the extremely strong place which had been won by Axis aviation interests in South America by the time this war broke out was the result of foresight and diligent, persistent work on the part of the Germans which began almost before the Versailles conference had been assembled.

In the post-war world to come we cannot afford to lag. We must be ready to move forward purposefully and energetically without delaying for a single instant.

But our economy based on American principles calls for initiative on the part of private management. In the last analysis, as long as we adhere to the cherished principles of our forefathers, it must be private enterprise which develops our civil aviation. The role of government is to provide the conditions under which the job of private management can be done most effectively.

That is why the Congress must act and act soon to provide the necessary legislation. That is why private management must be enabled soon to make its plans for the days to come. If after this war America is not to be guilty of the delay and the vacillation occurring after the last war, private management must be afforded at this session of the Congress with the legislative foundation upon which it is to build.

I do not now have the time to review all the provisions of the pending civil aeronautics bill. But illustrative of the foresight which has gone into its preparation is the very important provision for airport zoning. No problem cries more loudly for foresighted action than does that of assuring the proper protection to airport approaches. Unless means are afforded to assure that the aerial approaches to airports will not be unreasonably obstructed by adjacent structures, and unless those means are provided now, we may very well find that a few years hence we will be faced with a problem of such staggering proportions as to be well nigh bankrupting. For if we continue to leave unregulated the erection of structures in the vicinity of airports throughout the land we may soon have a condition which it will cost billions to correct. Prudent action today, moreover, will not only save us the expenditure of staggering sums in the future but will also protect the life and limb of you and me and of our children who in the air age of tomorrow will be using aviation as an ordinary means of travel.

There recently occurred, near the great Chicago airport, a tragic accident, horrible in its proportions. An Army bomber coming in to land at the airport ran squarely into a huge gas tank rising nearly 500 feet into the air on the approach pathway. That bodies were burned beyond recognition as a result of the fearful explosion is only a gruesome detail which underlines the urgent need for preventing any such senseless tragedy in the future.

Prior to this accident the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had already inquired into this very condition and had drafted the provision for airport zoning which will be included in the bill soon to be offered for the consideration of this House.

In the testimony before our committee one witness predicted the happening of this very accident under the very conditions which did in fact occur. In rereading the testimony before our committee in the light of what happened, one is struck by the coincidence between

the prophecy made and the horrible event. At the end of my remarks I am inserting a newspaper item telling of the accident and quoting from the testimony I have referred to.

This unfortunate tragedy illustrates the point I wish to make, the need for speedy adoption of legislation looking forward to building constructively for the future of civil aviation. With each new load of bombs transported through the flak-pierced night over German cities, new developments occur which will be applied when the destructive force of aviation is harnessed in the furtherance of peacetime commerce. Our airmen and our aviation industry are learning fast the lessons which they will be ready to utilize in the cause of America's commercial prosperity when peace returns. There remains only one thing to assure America's future in the air. There remains only action by the Congress to provide the legislation necessary for aviation's growth.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of May 24, 1943]

FLIERS SEEK END OF DEATH TRAPS—GAS TANK IN CRASH THAT KILLED 12 CITED

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Commercial aviation officials today offered the deaths of 12 Army fliers in a bomber crash last week as an argument for action by Congress on the Lea-Bailey bill. This bill would amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide for Federal regulation of flight and zoning in the vicinity of airports.

The huge gas tank against which the Army B-24 bomber was wrecked was 2 miles from the Chicago Airport. Its location had been referred to with apprehension by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, before the House Interstate Commerce Committee more than 2 months previous to the accident.

PAINT HAS LOW VISIBILITY

Colonel Gorrell said:

"There is a gas tank about 2 miles from the Chicago Airport. It is repainted every 5 years. The people who own the gas tank have just recently repainted it and spent $18,000 to do so. Yet, it has been painted in a way that does not help the pilots properly to see it.

"Were there some method of handling this situation, the rules and regulations might possibly specify the color of the paint or some other marking to help the pilots avoid the object."

Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, California, pointed out at that time:

"The tank extends into the overcast when the overcast is down to a minimum. It is absolutely impossible for any pilot to see it until he first comes out under the overcast."

PREDICTED IT WOULD BE HIT

Colonel Gorrell added that commercial pilots' fear of hitting the tank had kept them from "closing in" in its vicinity during overcasts, as if foreseeing last Wednesday's tragedy. He said:

"That is a hazard, adjacent to one of the most important airports in the United States, and, as I understand it, it is largely the fear the pilots have of closing in in the vicinity that has kept them clear of the tank, and thus aided them in avoiding accidents. Some military pilot coming in there who does not know about that hazard may very easily run right into it. That could happen to military pilots or private flyers who are not in and out of that port frequently."

Halibut Fishing in the North Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an inquiry regarding the increasing of quotas of halibut fishing in the north Pacific. This query was referred to the International Fisheries Commission which, in a letter to me, set forth a very sound policy relative to halibut propagation and fishing. Inasmuch as this is one of our most important food supplies, I deem it advisable to place in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members a complete outline of this policy as given to me by Edward W. Allen, chairman of the International Fisheries Commission. I am sure that after the Members read the enumeration of these principles by the Commission, they will be convinced that the halibut fishing industry as between Canada and the United States is in sound hands, and that the preservation of the halibut fisheries of the north Pacific are being adequately watched and taken care of. Following is Mr. Allen's statement on behalf of the Commission:

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION,
June 9, 1943.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WARREN: Through various references, there has come to me your letter of March 25, 1943, concerning the letter of the Fishing Vessel Owners' Association (of Seattle) to the War Production Board, urging that the quota of halibut which may legally be caught this year in the North Pacific Ocean be increased.

Many years ago, halibut was very abundant along the coast and in the salt water channels (including Puget Sound). The halibut is a slow-growing fish, not reaching maturity until the tenth to twelfth years. They are to be found in abundance only where the water temperatures on the bottom are from 3° to 8° C., and the depth of water is not too great (they inhabit the continental shelf of our North Pacific Coast). Because of slowness of growth and limited habitat, halibut are easily susceptible to serious depletion, and once the supply is badly depleted, restoration may require many years.

Because much of the halibut fishery is located more than 3 miles offshore, many of the grounds were frequented by both Canadian and United States vessels. In the absence of regulation, international or national, overfishing took place until the supply of fish upon the banks had become so scarce that fishing became unprofitable. At last, at the urgent solicitation of everybody involved, fishermen, vessel owners, and dealers, Canada and the United States agreed upon a treaty creating the International Fisheries Commission, first to investigate the situation and then to provide regulations which, when approved by the Governor General of Canada and the President of the United States, have the force of law as to Canadian and United States fishermen and vessels, both in national and international waters.

In 10 years of regulation these north Pacific banks have been transformed from a state of sad depletion to the finest halibut fishing grounds in the world. And this has been done, not only without closing the banks for any fishing season but without even reducing the annual catch below that being taken the year before regulation commenced. Not only that, the authorized catch has gradually been increased until it is now 9,000,000 pounds more than when the Commission took hold. And the fishermen are catching this increased amount of poundage with 31 percent less of fishing effort than was required for the smaller amount 10 years ago. Moreover, the price has gone up so that, in spite of short seasons, the fishermen are doing very well.

The accomplishments of the Commission have been hailed throughout the fishery world as an outstanding exhibition of practical conservation—incidentally, the first in its field.

From the outset it has been the practice of the Commission to act in closest cooperation with the fleet. After each season representatives of the unions and vessel owners from Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska assemble to discuss the situation in an informal and friendly manner. The Commission never makes any substantial change in the regulations without taking into consideration the sentiment of the fleets toward such modifications.

Last December, after thorough discussion with the fleet and with its scientific experts—and I may say that the Commission is very proud of its staff, both those who have left to join our military forces and those whom it is desperately trying to retain—the Commission increased the catch limits 1,000,000 pounds. This increase was granted with some apprehension, but because the Commission felt that the need for the wholesome food was so great that the Commission should not be too conservative, but should go just as far as possible without impairing the basic stock and again imperiling the perpetuation of a recurring supply. The Commission recognized that the increase would delay the attainment of its final objective, the rebuilding of the supply of halibut to the point where the greatest yield that the banks are capable of producing will be obtained each year.

In addition, the Commission liberalized the regulations with reference to halibut taken in fishing for other species of fish. This action was taken to encourage fishing for such other species and will increase the catch of halibut as well as of such other fish. This step was also taken in an effort to increase the war supply of food as well as to make fishing more attractive to the fishermen.

Past history has repeatedly shown that to permit the catch to become greater than replacement by spawning and growth immediately starts the banks downward toward depletion. The temporary gain by such overfishing is followed by reduced catches obtained with increased effort and consequent waste of manpower and fishing gear, as well as reduction in food supply.

In view of the present acute manpower shortage and the greater and recurring need for food as long as war lasts, the Commission believes that the best interests of Canada and the United States are served by authorizing a catch at the highest level (but no higher) which it believes can safely be maintained from year to year. Adherence to this policy will assure obtaining the largest overall production in the next few years.

When the request for a greater increase was considered at the Commission meeting,

the Commission was of the opinion that the increases requested would be detrimental to the public interest as well as to the fishermen themselves and should not be granted.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD W. ALLEN,
Chairman.

Flag Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Flag Day address by William E. Leahy at exercises conducted by Washington (D. C.) Lodge No. 15, B. P. O. Elks, on June 13, 1943:

This is a thought-impelling occasion upon which we gather. The significance of this celebration is heavy with present import. The dedication of a day to honor the flag of our country is an appropriate demonstration of our American patriotism. It serves to stimulate and perpetuate those mighty, spiritual principles for which the founding fathers fought and upon which they built so solidly the massive edifice of our republican form of government. It constitutes the visible expression of the consecration of a united people and of their devotion to the ideals that emblem represents.

Today it is America's way of hurling back into the teeth of an embattled and maniacal enemy the assurance of the truth that God still reigns in His heaven and that, out of this holocaust and this agony, peace will come again, a just peace, a good peace, under the Stars and Stripes of that banner, that men and women may be free once more and children play in laughter. It is America's way of thundering to despotic and unprincipled aggressors that over the hiss of their shells, the crash of their bombs, and the shriek of the dying, there still screams defiant our eagle of liberty, that eagle which has flown triumphant over a thousand fights and over the ruins of a thousand battlefields, always symbolic of victory—victory in honor, victory in justice. It is America's way of once more fitting the bayonet to the rifle, the grenade to the hand, of sacrificing, upon the land and on the sea and in the air, the flower of her young manhood and her young womanhood, if need there be, that posterity may drink again out of pure fountains and breathe anew in the righteous happiness of living as freemen in a world of decency and of honor. It is America's way of girding herself once more to the frightful task of war, this time to the end and in the deadly earnestness of this awful carnage, that the purity of those ideals in which her institutions were conceived may continue on under the God of our fathers as they came down to us, a blessed heritage of inspired freedom in a land of plenty and a haven of peace.

Old Glory is our flag. We love it. We cherish it. It is the grandest flag that ever flew over a nation or a people. Not a drop of blood, spilled in an unholy cause, has ever incarnadined the red or splotched a stain or stigma of disgrace upon the white of its stripes, and the blue of its field is still ethereal in hope as its stars shine gloriously in the pride of their unsullied firmament. Let us here and now, in the murmur of its folds as it flaps in the breeze or languidly falls lazily around the standard which supports it, swear again our firm allegiance to the country, our country, which it represents and to the ideals for which it stands, and let that oath be without reservation or restraint so that it shall never be said of us that, when our country called in its hour of sorest need, we proved unworthy to bequeath to our children the greatest gift of life, which we received without struggle from those who went before.

The obligation is a serious one. The past is secure. The future lies with us. For a century and a half that flag has watched over the destiny of this Nation. It has seen strong men and courageous women dare the rigors of the cold to drive deep into the trunk of the forest the axe of civilization to build the log cabin and the school and struggle through savannahs of disease and heat that plantations might grow green where swamps once languished. It has guided the vigor of sinew and brawn to build in sweat and toil bridges across our rivers and ships upon our lakes and seas, to span our continent with roads and lay gently upon its breast the weight of many towns and great cities. It has protected a sturdy people while they grew big in their franchise to speak freely and of right within the law their thoughts of good government and the proper way of life, or to drop piously to their knees in the sorrow of supplication or the gratitude of thanks, to pray to their God, each as he in his conscience believed he should. It has encouraged industry and thrift, individualism and individuality. Under it factories and mills have risen to manufacture what an enlightened people needed and farms have produced in the heavy heads of their bountiful harvests food for a strong and a gracious Nation.

That flag has fostered the growth of our universities and colleges, the fine arts and education, that freemen might know the true value of liberty and in the enjoyment of its blessings not be forgetful of the responsibilities of its possession. It has drooped in sorrow over the wounds of its sons and daughters and hung at half mast over its dead done unfortunately to death in the gallant defense of those principles which its colors have always proclaimed. From the dawn of our independent freedom to this, our hour of the present crisis, that flag has flown, always in honor. Today all civilization looks to it for deliverance and preservation. If we stand to its defense, it will continue to fly. Should we fail, history will record it as the last flag that ever flew over a free people or nation.

It is not an easy task to become or remain a free people. Liberty is not a gift graciously presented by man to his fellow man. Liberty is for the strong, the determined, for those trained to esteem the value of its worth and who have become experienced in its exercise. It can be lost as easily as it is won, often only in travail. Freedom is the consummation of life which a liberty-loving people prize so highly that they are willing to die to attain it and then die to maintain it. The blood and suffering of 8 long years, the hunger, defeat, discouragement, but the unsurpassed resolution which our forefathers displayed proved to us the pricelessness they placed upon the vindication of those heroic and resplendent campaigns which they won for us in order to set up this form of government under which we have been privileged to live. They knew in the mandate of its denial the sweetness of liberty as the leaven which makes living rise to the worthiness of living at all. They willingly laid their lives and all their earthly possessions upon the common altar of a common sacrifice, knowing full well that, if the sacrifice were in vain, then life itself would become of small avail. But if a benign heaven saw fit to accept the offering which they made, then they foresaw a new expanse of satisfying happiness spread before them, for themselves, their children and their children's children, in the dignity of life as God ordained it should be lived but which the greed and ambition of man so often prevent or destroy in his selfish avarice or lust for power.

Of all peoples of this earth we Americans should treasure our liberty most. Most of all should we have that thorough comprehension of the extreme and almost unsurmountable barriers which they were compelled to overcome from Lexington to Yorktown in order to achieve its fruition. Ours is the duty of an unceasing and jealous vigilance. That alone will guarantee the preservation of its enjoyment. There is not a stream or river in this country, as it flows on its way to the sea, which does not re-echo the ripple of Runnymede. Every American boy and girl know that Magna Carta was wrung from the unwilling and resisting beneficence of a tyrannical John only in the spear ring of a stubbornly persistent and courageously uncompromising soldiery. Only he who is unafraid to look into the mouth of the cannon can see the grandeur of freedom beyond its breech. Only such can taste of the efficacy of that sacrifice so great but of which the right to be free is so worthy. The crown of freedom was never wrought to fit the head of the craven or the armor of liberty the body of the weak.

Heavy then is the obligation resting upon us today. That flag can never be kept flying by the utterance of sweet sounding phrases or the singing of patriotic songs alone. Action is demanded. North Africa was not just won by wishing. America will never be saved by dreaming. Overconfidence and inaction never passed on to future generations anything but despair and regret.

If we on this home front desire to see come out of this war a continuation of the way of life we have known; if we wish that our children may enjoy that way of life in the days of their maturity; if we desire that those who are now giving their lives to protect that way of life may still have it on their return, then we must become a bit more realistic; we must begin to think in terms not only of a full and complete appreciation of what our freedom means to us but what it takes in us and out of us to keep it. It is no idle terrorism to assert that every one of the liberties which we now enjoy, which too often we think are ours without possibility of loss, are marked for destruction by our enemies in this critical conflict.

The clash of ideals is so direct and absolute in this global war that annihilation of the one must follow the survival of the other. This world cannot be both slave and free at the same time. And it is going to be free But in that battle to make it free each and every one of us must do his part. Each and every one of us must make of himself a guard at the portal of every one of our freedoms. Each and every one of us must always be on the alert. Each and every one of us must fight and fight, ever and always, on and on, must give, contribute, in every way and in whatever way, fight—till we have cleaned from the face of this earth, in the peace of God and man, this despicable and disreputable scum of crazed and infamous men who would make of this world a shambles and destroy everything which good men and women hold worth while or beautiful or holy.

The tremendous impact of Bunker Hill or the blood upon the snows of Valley Forge shall not fade in our memories. America is moving on. Uncle Sam has his jaw set. His will has been forged, held in the vise of a righteous anger. His eye is hot with a burning, insuperable, invincible wrath. The command has gone down Our men are moving on every front, in every land, on every sea, and in the air. We of the home front! Fall in

behind. The dead of Wake and Bataan must not have died in vain. The ships of the Coral and Gilbert Seas must not have sunk ingloriously. The planes over Guadalcanal, the South Pacific and Alaskan waters must not have crashed unnoticed. Already, out of the East the rim of a new sun is rising, not the hideous segment of the perimeter of that rising sun of our enemy, but the bright, pure rim of a newer sun, of freedom and of liberation, and, rising in grandeur, it will take on the fullness of the glorious orb of justice and liberty to light again the darkness of these awful years and brighten a world made sad by the madness of gross ambition and deluded lust. And over that brighter and newer world our flag will fly.

In the forefront of the peace, as in the battle, the hands of brave men will again hold high and aloft the stars and stripes of the hope of humanity now, the promise of freedom always. May God, in his omniscient pity and justice, hasten that day in order that once again we may know that Government of the people, for the people and by the people has not perished from this earth, but rather, moving on in majestic victory, has once again taken its place among the people of this earth, that they, in the quiet of peace and the security of freedom, may live once more in the happiness which all men love and pray their eternal God to attain.

Resignation of John K. Westberg from the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news story from the Washington Evening Star of June 9, 1943, relative to the resignation of John K. Westberg, a price executive in the Office of Price Administration:

CINCINNATI, June 9.—John K. Westberg, a price executive of the Office of Price Administration, said yesterday he was resigning, effective July 3, "because I was not permitted to do a fair, honest, and complete job."

In a speech before the Ohio Grain and Feed Dealers' Association, Mr. Westberg said:

"Office of Price Administration was forced to do many things we knew were not right, because somebody at the top did not have guts enough to cross a political bridge. I have resigned and am leaving Washington July 3 because I was not permitted to do a fair, honest, and complete job, which means fixing equitable ceiling prices at every level of production and distribution."

Mr. Westberg halted consideration of a proffered resolution which sought to have him reconsider.

The association then adopted another which commended him and put members on record as saying the Office of Price Administration needed more men of Mr. Westberg's type.

Asserting that "price control has received less support than anything in this war," Mr. Westberg said, "People are ready to criticize hell out of it. In such control there should be no listening to pressure groups, to John L. Lewis and his gang, and not even to the farm bloc."

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on June 19, 1943.

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, since returning to Washington after a crowded week end of speaking engagements, I took up my duties once more in the Capitol with a much better idea of conditions at home. I talked with several hundred people, and I can assure those in authority in the executive agencies of our Government that the public is becoming more and more dissatisfied with the gasoline situation.

In the first place, there isn't a person back home who wouldn't gladly put up his car for the duration if it should become necessary to do so in order to win the war. There isn't a person back home who wouldn't gladly dispose of his car if victory depended upon his so doing.

But I find the public is a bit skeptical of all these drastic measures to curtail private automobile driving. They are asking themselves if all this rough treatment the Office of Price Administration is giving them is necessary. They are wondering why, all of a sudden, thousands of snoopers came from nowhere and started spying on them while they are busy contributing to the war effort. They tell me they do not think this action is helping morale at all. They feel that Office of Price Administration snoopers would be helping win the war a great deal more if they took jobs in defense plants and began turning out weapons of war.

The American people do not need to have their patriotism questioned or their honor besmirched. For my part, I am indignant that the folks I represent are submitted to petty insults from those who should be their servants instead of their masters. I don't believe the people are deserving of such treatment. They are straining every fiber, exerting all their strength, and making great sacrifices. They are winning this war by backing up their sons and brothers and fathers on the fighting front. They are only too willing to do everything they can to win the war.

But we in the East who have undergone the strictest supervision from the Office of Price Administration for over a year, cannot help but wonder why we should be picked on while the rest of the country rides comparatively unchecked. We want to know why we have to account for the use of every gallon of gasoline allotted to us. We feel that the Office of Price Administration is transgressing upon our American rights by demanding to know how we use our meager gas allowance. I will say to the high officials in Washington I don't know how much longer the people back home will take this arbitrary attitude lying down.

Let me repeat the suggestion I made on my program last week. Let Washington treat us all alike, whether we come from the East or West, North or South. We all need gasoline to keep on wheels. To keep on wheels is to win the war. To be kept off wheels and deprived of cars unless it is absolutely necessary is to retard the war effort—retard it by wasting our people's valuable time, retard it by diverting their attention from winning the war. Efficiency is the real secret of war production. To aid efficiency, let the people retain their cars, their rubber, their gas. They will not forget there is a war on if things are made a little easier for them. God knows they realize there's a war on only too well, by the toll it has already taken of them of blood and sweat and tears.

The way to win this war, and I hope the Government finds it out before it is too late, is through cooperation instead of compulsion. One would think our citizens did not realize what it will mean if we lose. No; you will find the rank and file are the ones who are awake to the dangers.

Probably the most persistent complaint I received on the gasoline subject was about the high-handed method the Office of Price Administration is using in taking away gasoline ration books and coupons as penalties for pleasure driving. I have never condoned pleasure driving, but I abominate a ruthless act of this kind. There is far less pleasure driving than these bureaucrats would have you believe. The streets of the Triple Cities are practically deserted of traffic except for trucks and war workers. The average driver is not abusing his privilege or going back on his patriotic duty of saving all the gas he can.

Since I talked about the gasoline question last week, I have received a number of letters commending my statement. The writers felt that I should repeat what I said about the penalty subject. I will gladly do so.

I say the Office of Price Administration is proceeding illegally and without any authority whatsoever when it takes away gasoline ration books from drivers as a means of punishing them. Congress created Office of Price Administration. Congress never gave Office of Price Administration authority to sit as a judge and jury to condemn its victims for breaking the laws set up by Office of Price Administration. This whole procedure is unconstitutional. It resembles a government by edict; not by legislation passed by representatives duly elected by the people. Congress falls down on the job when it allows the people to be kicked around in this manner. If an army of Government officials can get away with illegal enforcement of the gasoline ban, it will extend this authority, which it has usurped from Congress, to every other line until the people are entirely subjected to dictatorial control. This isn't what they are working, striving, bleeding, and dying for. They are fighting to preserve America, the American flag, the freedom and liberty which their forefathers established. By God's will, they are going to be victorious.

While the turmoil and strife goes on here at home, with elements of our society alining themselves against each other, capital against labor, bureau against bureau, section against section, the boys in our armed forces struggle on against our real foes. These soldiers, sailors, and marines, are out there in the Pacific, in Africa, in the Aleutians, everywhere there is real danger to America's wellbeing. They are the ones we are letting down if we let our internal bickering get serious. These men are making more genuine sacrifices for our great cause than anyone else.

We must not fail them. We must look out for their welfare by supplying the fighters with weapons, by succoring the wounded, honoring the dead. We must go further. Their loved ones back home—their wives, mothers, fathers, and children—will have to be provided for. As your Representative, I have tried to promote legislation to raise

the allotments of dependent parents to $50 a month. I have urged Congress to double the allowances for servicemen's children from $12 to $24 a month. Our consciences will be clear if we take such action. I don't know of a soldier or sailor or a marine who won't be able to fight a lot harder when he knows his wife and children are being taken care of while he gives up all he has for his country. The elderly people also deserve consideration. Now is the time to press for pensions and social security because jobs are plentiful, and after the average American buys his quota of War bonds he wants to put away a little for later years. Why not take out a small percentage for a reasonable pay-as-you-go old-age pension?

As you know, I have devoted a great amount of time lately to the task of straightening out allotment matters for soldiers' wives and parents and children. This service is one which I have insisted be performed by my Washington office even though doing it keeps my already overworked staff busy practically every evening in the week. I consider it as important as any duty I perform. It is sad, indeed, to find so many people back home who haven't been successful in contacting the proper sources in order to obtain their allotments.

This is no reflection upon the Office of Dependency Benefits. They are doing a magnificent job. My good friend, Gen. H. N. Gilbert, recently advanced from the rank of colonel to his present high post, is deserving of the highest praise for his prompt, efficient work in handling one of the toughest jobs ever assigned to anybody. He has been of particular aid to me by taking immediate action upon all requests I have made of his department.

Therefore, I suggest to you people in my district who are dependent upon any man in the armed forces and who are encountering any difficulty in receiving your allotments that you please let me know about it. I can and will help you. You are doubtless entitled to money from Uncle Sam. Don't let anyone tell you differently until you have written to me to determine this. Remember, we are living in America, one of the last great strongholds of human liberty and fair treatment in the world. We shall survive to show the rest of the nations that such a country is able to continue.

Early this week, there was held an important gathering in Binghamton by the Eastern Feed Dealers Association. As you know, this influential group consists of feed distributors all over the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. They gathered in what they appropriately called a feed-shortage conference. These men represent the backbone of American private enterprise and it is my belief the Government should give ear to their demands.

I was greatly honored by an inviation to speak at the Arlington Hotel before these feed merchants, which I accepted. I was introduced by their president, Mr. Austin Carpenter, of Sherburne, who obviously understands what we are all up against.

Several standing votes during this conference convinced me that the majority of feed distributors in the East find their granaries empty of more than 2 weeks' supply of corn and wheat. Such a condition is serious, indeed, but it is in line with the prophecy I made last winter. Chickens are now coming home to roost. The disastrous policy of drafting everybody off the farms, of refusing farmers adequate machinery, and of imposing asinine regulations upon him, are bound to bring about chaotic conditions. They are here, and now we must try to see what can be done to save the pieces.

All of which makes it most timely at this moment for me to read from a fine poem submitted to me some time ago by an American mother of a boy at the front.

"AMERICA, TO YOUR KNEES

"America, to your knees!
Your only hope is prayer.
The world is filled with strife,
Confusion, and despair.

But God is still in heaven,
His power is over all.
America, to your knees!
In supplication call.

"America, to your knees!
Night shadows lengthen fast:
Soon judgment will descend,
The day of mercy past.
Our only hope is God,
In Him we must rely,
America, to your knees!
He still will hear our cry.

"America, to your knees!
Your forefathers of old,
Loved God and served Him faithfully,
For righteousness were bold;
They read and lived God's word,
Honored the Sabbath Day.
America, to your knees!
Confess your sins and pray.

"America, to your knees!
Now is no time for pride;
In humble pleadings call,
'O God, be on our side,
We've sinned and disobeyed,
We've wandered far astray.'
America, to your knees!
Return to Christ today."

The Moving Finger Writes, and Writes Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration misses the bus when it regulates production out of existence.

The following news story from the Spokane Spokesman-Review should give us reason for real concern:

PACKING FIRMS FORCED TO CLOSE—CHAOS OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION RULES CAUSES NORTHWEST PLANTS TO QUIT

YAKIMA, June 14.—Unable to carry on business in what he calls the chaos of rules and regulations announced by the Office of Price Administration, the Gibson Packing Co. closed today at least temporarily, President Henry Coffin announced. The company has been a business factor here for 40 years and employs 80 people to aid its task of sending about 10,000,000 pounds of meat and meat products to market annually.

PACKERS PUZZLED

"We are closing," President Coffin says, "and I do not see how any packer in the State can operate during the present muddle. Dealers in the city have a supply of fresh meat for about 12 hours. After that I do not know what will happen. No packer knows where he is at present.

"The meat industry of the Nation has tried to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Government, but it cannot operate under present chaotic conditions."

Coffin said the plant would stay closed "until Office of Price Administration rulings are clarified or the Government takes over. We will not operate under present conditions." He added employees would be paid for a time.

AT ELLENSBURG, TOO

ELLENSBURG, WASH., June 14.—Ed Schaake, president of the Schaake Packing Co., announced the closing of the company's plant here "pending clarification of the price roll-back and subsidy program" which was put into effect today.

Asserting that packers have been given no guaranty that the subsidy will be paid and pointing to the current fight in Congress over the program, Schaake said the plant already is operating at a loss in some operations and that the roll-back would result in a "terrific loss" if the plant were unable to collect the subsidy.

He said that the plant's 40 employees would be retained for a week or so, but if the program were not clarified satisfactorily within that time, the men would be released. Such an action, he said, probably would mean permanent closing of the plant.

OTHERS SUSPEND

Other Washington State packing companies announced suspension of slaughtering, and their officials said the action resulted from confusion over prices, subsidies, and roll-backs. The Acme and James Henry Packing Cos., at Seattle, reported they would stop slaughtering.

In Spokane meat packers continued operation, but Roy Hathaway, of the Lewis Packing Co., said: "We don't like the situation and are not clear on Office of Price Administration regulations."

President Morris Gordon, of the Acme Packing & Provision Co., said: "We'll wait a day or 2 and then liquidate. We just can't operate this way." O. B. Joseph, of the James Henry Co., said future plans were uncertain.

Henry B. Owen, Seattle, assistant regional Office of Price Administration director, said he was informed subsidy payments were to be made on the basis of forms obtained from the Defense Supplies Corporation, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary, for livestock slaughtered after June 7.

Let us hope that the House action on O. P. A. last Friday will cause our productive American to regain faith in government.

American Labor Unitedly Petitions the President To Veto the Smith-Connally Antilabor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of a joint memorandum submitted to the President of the United States by President Philip Murray of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, President William Green of the American Federation of Labor, and President David B. Robertson of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in sup-

port of their request that the Smith-Connally bill, S. 796, be vetoed:

The following memorandum was today submitted to the President of the United States by President Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and President David B. Robertson, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, in support of their request that the Smith-Connally bill (S. 796) be vetoed:

The War Labor Dispute Act is a wicked, vicious bill. It is the worst antilabor bill passed by Congress in the last hundred years. It is born of revenge and malice. It is the very essence of fascism. It destroys the philosophy of voluntarism on which free trade unionism is founded.

Its enactment follows the tactics of the Fascists who, as a forerunner to totalitarianism, first attacked and destroyed free trade unions in Germany and Italy.

It does more—it destroys the foundation on which the principles of collective bargaining rest. In the last 10 years the Government has caused to be enacted a number of measures, all of which were designed directly or indirectly to establish and maintain the principle of collective bargaining through representatives chosen by workers.

All that has been built up during these past 10 years is now being rendered ineffective and virtually destroyed by limiting, circumscribing, and prohibiting the normal functioning of trade-unions through this vicious enactment.

Compulsion, civil damage, and criminal penalties are the unholy trinity by which this act accomplishes its evil purpose.

It is not necessary to direct attention to all of the evil effects of all of the provisions contained in this bill. It will suffice to point out the gross injustices contained in the more important sections.

(A) Section 5 denies to minorities the fundamental right of applying to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in plants, mines, etc., of which possession is taken under the act. This section permits the "Government agency operating such plant, mine, or facility, or a majority of the employees of such plant, mine, or facility, or their representatives (to) apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment."

It is highly unjust, unfair, and discriminatory to deny to a minority group of workers or their representatives the right to make such application when such workers have a just grievance respecting employment conditions.

The right accorded the majority and denied to the minority will inevitably produce unrest and dissatisfaction. The National Labor Relations Act specifically permits an individual employee to present any grievance he has to his employer, and this is not considered an interference with the rights of the exclusive representative to bargain collectively and enter into an agreement on behalf of all the employees.

It may well be that there is no exclusive bargaining agent, and in such circumstances minority groups, under the National Labor Relations Act, have the right to present grievances and bargain with the employer respecting wages, hours, and working conditions.

But, under section 5 of the bill, only majority groups of employees, or their representative, may apply to the War Labor Board, and unless the Government agency operating such plant, etc., makes application on behalf of minority groups such minority groups have no way of presenting their grievances or having them considered by the Board.

(B) Section 6 is highly offensive. It reestablishes the reprehensible doctrine of conspiracy which employers and antilabor judges used for 50 years prior to enactment of section 20 of the Clayton Act to curtail and prohibit labor unions in their efforts to organize and to obtain the right to bargain collectively.

Both section 20 of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act removed the doctrine of conspiracy in labor cases. Government by injunction was possible only under this doctrine.

Section 6 of the present act reestablishes the doctrine by providing that "whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere by lockout, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility."

The law does not stop with the above-quoted broad provision. It goes further and provides that it shall be illegal "to aid in such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption, or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof, or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein."

A Machiavellian twist is given to the section by providing that "no individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or accept employment."

With the doctrine of conspiracy reestablished it requires little imagination to perceive the total worthlessness of this guarantee. Individuals having just grievances do not cease work singly. Even if they did, the fact that two or more quit at the same time would be evidence of a conspiracy upon which a conviction could be had.

The provision, viewed as a whole, establishes involuntary servitude so forcefully condemned by Justice Brandeis in his famous dissent in *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeymen Stone Cutters' Association*, 274 U. S. 412. Justice Brandeis said:

"If, on the undisputed facts of this case, refusal to work can be enjoined, Congress created by the Sherman law and the Clayton Act an instrument for imposing restraints upon labor which reminds of involuntary servitude."

Significant, too, is the broad language used by which many innocent persons may be caught in the dragnet of conspiracy. The words "induce," "encourage," "interfere," and so forth, words which were productive of so much mischief in the days when government by injunction flourished, are likewise reestablished and made the basis of criminal conviction.

Indeed, a discussion of grievances at a union meeting or, for that matter, a discussion of them in the public press can, under the terminology of this section, constitute crimes. Likewise, giving direction or guidance is susceptible to broad construction so as to convict one who is indeed endeavoring to be helpful in avoiding labor strife.

If a union voted to grant relief, such as the furnishing of food, to wives and children of workers who ceased employment, the officers and members of the union could be sent to prison. The section clearly violates the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech, because a union worker or, for that matter, any citizen is prohibited from even stating that the demands or grievances of the union are just.

(C) Section 7 (4) (e) provides that—

"No member of the Board shall be permitted to participate in any decision in which such member has a direct interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party to the dispute."

We are of the opinion that under this section officers and representatives of the American Federation of Labor cannot participate in any decision involving a dispute between an American Federation of Labor affiliate and an employer. Officers and representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations cannot sit upon and decide any dispute of a Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliate. Certainly, these officers have a direct interest in the decisions affecting their affiliates. When sitting on the Board these officers are true representatives of the affiliates who are parties to the dispute.

Although no criminal penalties are provided for a violation of this provision, nevertheless the decision will be subject to challenge by anyone adversely affected by it because the labor union's officers or representative participated in the case and in the making of the decision.

It affords a splendid opportunity to hamstring the functioning of the Board by attacking decisions in which union officials participated. We seriously question whether the American Federation of Labor or Congress of Industrial Organizations officials can remain on the Board, since they could not participate in any case involving one of their affiliated organizations.

By remaining on the Board and participating in these decisions, the labor representatives will merely encourage court attacks upon the decisions and encourage disobedience on the part of employers, on the claim that the decision of the Board is a nullity.

(D) Despite the fact that the sponsors of the bill vociferously proclaimed against strikes in wartime, the bill expressly encourages strikes. Comparison should be made between section 8 of the bill and the no-strike pledge given by labor. The no-strike pledge on the part of labor holds good throughout the war, and in all plants and under all circumstances.

This bill, however, with the exception of plants taken over or possessed by the Government, permits striking, provided a notice is given the war contractor with whom the workers are in dispute, and to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board and the National Labor Relations Board, and provided 30 days are permitted to elapse from the time of the giving of the notice, and that a secret ballot is promptly taken by the National Labor Relations Board.

Thus here is substituted for the no-strike pledge for the duration of the war a brief cooling-off period, after which a strike may be called.

Note the fact that a majority vote against the strike does not prohibit striking. The 30-day notice and the ballot are merely conditions precedent to striking; it does not provide that in the event the ballot is negative as to striking a strike may not be called.

(E) The principal features to be found in legislation seeking to destroy collective bargaining consist of interference with the internal affairs of labor unions, the necessity to conduct ballots as a condition precedent to striking, and the recovery of damages from unions and their members in civil suits. The last two are contained in section 8.

Not only does this section provide for the ballot as a condition precedent to striking, but it provides that any person who violates this section "shall be liable for damages resulting from such failure or refusal to any person injured thereby, and to the United States if so injured."

It must be remembered that this provision is applicable to any strike or stoppage of work in any plant other than those taken over or possessed by the Government. It imposes a tremendous civil penalty which can destroy the treasury of any union in the United States, provided the plant is a large one and involves a large number of workers. Even one-half

day's stoppage of work may bring about a penalty of hundreds of thousands of dollars, and it may be imposed upon individuals as well as upon their union.

One need but recall the testimony brought out before the La Follette committee investigating activities of employers in labor disputes to know that some employers are not averse to the employment of agents-provocateurs to stir up strife, and this bill certainly encourages such employer activities.

(F) Section 9 makes it unlawful for a labor organization to make a political contribution. Labor unions are put in the same class with national banks and corporations. No similar prohibition is provided as to fraternal organizations, church organizations, farm organizations and other nonprofit organizations.

Recent history in connection with antilabor legislation establishes conclusively that employers have been able to induce reactionary farm organizations to foster and promote antilabor legislation and antilabor candidates. Thus these farm organizations would willingly act as stooges for other corporations and would find ways and means of making political contributions since they are not prohibited from doing so by law.

But it is a well-known fact that large and wealthy individuals and their families, the major source of whose income is from corporate dividends, do make political contributions, the purpose of which is to influence favoritism for the corporations which they control.

To permit these individuals to make political contributions and to deny the same right to organizations of workers is highly discriminatory, unjust, and unfair.

This provision most eloquently presents the true purpose behind the bill, namely, to weaken and destroy trade-unions, for it is not conceivable that prohibition of political contributions has any relation to production for war.

(G) It was contended by the sponsors of the bill during debate that by section 7 (2), which provides that "In making such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the * * * National Labor Relations Act," the War Labor Board is prohibited from granting a maintenance of membership or closed shop to any group of workers or their organization in dispute with an employer.

Because of the ambiguity created by the language of the section and the statements made by the sponsors of the bill in debate, it is quite likely that reactionary judges will so hold. If the War Labor Board should take a different view of the provision, it will open up court attack upon the War Labor Board's orders and decisions.

Although it is difficult to foretell what the courts will finally hold in such cases, nevertheless it affords an excellent opportunity for employers to "hamstring" the Board by involving it in considerable litigation respecting orders granting maintenance of membership.

We are of the opinion that many district judges who are opposed to labor will take jurisdiction and grant injunctive decrees against labor decisions granting maintenance of membership.

Thus, we will again witness the spectacle of a concerted legal attack upon the War Labor Board similar to that which was launched against the National Labor Relations Board when it was first created, and which hampered its functions for a period of 2 years.

The United States Gypsum Co., whose leading official is Mr. Sewell Avery, also the head of the Montgomery Ward & Co., in a Nationwide advertisement this week advised the National War Labor Board that it will not accept a decision of the Board directing the company to incorporate in its collective-bargaining agreement with the union, a maintenance-of-membership provision.

This must be marked as the opening gun in the attack that will be initiated by those antilabor companies against the Board and its operations as a result of the new legislation.

(H) We have specifically refrained from discussing the constitutionality of the provisions contained in this bill. Many of them are patently unconstitutional in that they deny to workers freedom of speech and impose upon them involuntary servitude. However, the foregoing discussion demonstrates quite clearly that this bill, instead of promoting the war effort, will be conducive to hampering and restricting the war effort. If any person believes that war production would be increased by passage of the bill, or that the morale of the American worker would thereby be raised, he is seriously mistaken.

Existing procedures have not only proved sufficient but have operated to make possible the greatest production record in the history of this or any other country. The American worker neither expects nor merits legislation such as this for his reward.

We therefore most earnestly request that the Smith-Connally bill be vetoed.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

DAVID B. ROBERTSON,
President, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Co-ops and the World's Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 15 of this year I was privileged to deliver the following address, which I ask to include in the RECORD, before the Food Forum, sponsored by the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association at the Hotel New Yorker in New York City:

The principle of cooperation is as old as the first family, as old as the first group of primitive people who gathered around a fire and agreed—by sign language, no doubt—that instead of fighting one another they would work together at keeping that precious fire going.

The cooperative method of doing business stands today as a tried and tested means of solving the problems of modern men and women. And that method constitutes in my opinion the most solid single hope we have for a better future world after this war is won.

But the particular subject I am to deal with is how cooperatives can aid in the solution of the world's food problem. Perhaps it will help if we start out with a quick glance at what co-ops have done to help solve this problem in the nation where their greatest progress has been made, namely, in Sweden. In a recent article about Sweden, Marquis Childs had these things to say:

"But it is the cooperatives that have made the most important contribution. With 750,000 consumer families they have a close-knit organization that extends into every phase of wholesale and retail trade. Nearly half of Sweden's 6,500,000 people are a part of an organization dealing directly with consumption. Almost without exception Sweden's farmers belong to marketing cooperatives. This is a big reason why almost no black market exists.

"As early as 1933 Albin Johansson, head of the cooperative movement, had begun to warn of the coming war and the need to lay in reserves of strategic materials. At his urging a special commission was formed to prepare the country for the coming crisis. The entire policy of the cooperative movement was altered to meet the threat.

"Until that time the cooperators had bought in the smallest possible amounts, in order to take advantage of price changes. Large-scale buying was a new order. Thousands of tons of rubber were bought and put in reserve, which has helped carry Sweden through the present crisis. Working with the Government, all-important cattle fodder was acquired and stored in special silos built by cooperatives. Faced with a German-dominated vegetable fat industry, cooperatives had built a refinery which has been a salvation in the face of the present blockade.

"In 1939 cooperatives bought an additional $12,000,000 worth of strategic war materials on the world market. Also they bought foods that could not be obtained after the start of the war. The irony has been that under wartime laws, they have had to share these reserves with private retailers. Of the cooperative reserve of coffee, one-half was turned over to private merchants. Likewise a warning against the coming storm and the necessity to prepare for it was made by venerable Prof. Gustav Cassel. This dean of world economists never ceased stressing the peril of world economic domination by Germany. This, incidentally, is a feature of Swedish life. Professors are listened to respectfully and often make their own way actively in politics.

"Cooperatives made an equally important contribution in experts loaned to the Government to handle food rationing and widespread controls over economy. Minister of Supply Axel Gjores is one of the cooperative leaders. He has pioneered in working out a food supply that keeps the consumption level comparatively high. Under this system the butterfat content is reduced in milk, cheese, and butter consumption is greatly reduced, and cream is forbidden. As a result, milk production is increased 100 percent and milk is unrationed. The great increase in milk consumption supplies essential minerals and vitamins."

Here then is the sort of thing that can be done by the people and for the people in a country where the cooperative movement is big enough to be an important factor in the economy.

But what about our own country? Well I wonder what would have happened here had there been no farm cooperatives when the war came. In the first place we would have had an agriculture so distressed, so at the mercy of the middleman that few of our farmers would have been in a position to produce abundantly. We would have had the Department of Agriculture organizations, such as those set up under Agricultural Adjustment Agency. But the fact is that the best and most vital thing about Agricultural Adjustment Agency consists of the fact that it has enabled farmers to act together in certain respects. Without the example and pattern of our true cooperative organizations, the best things about the agriculture program of the Government would have been impossible. And anyway the real strength of American agriculture is to be found not in the pattern of organization fostered by the Government, but in the cooperatives built without Government aid, assistance, or direction by the farmers themselves. For there we find

the true economic expression of the spirit of a free and democratic people.

Without the cooperatives it would have been necessary for every individual farm producer to have been individually contacted in order to get our war food production program going. But where farm cooperatives existed; where men had already learned to work together for the common welfare of their own group—there it was possible not only to reach the whole producing group through one organization, but it was possible to draw upon their training and experience of mutual loyalty and to bring it to bear for the benefit of our country's cause and through it for the benefit of all the future of mankind.

The fundamental economic importance of a cooperative is this: It can protect people who act generously, who do their duty well. What I mean is this: To the extent that all the farmers producing a given commodity are organized into a cooperative they need have no fear of abundant production, no fear of supplying completely the demand for their product. For they are in a position to prevent that abundance from driving prices down and ruining the very producers who have made the abundance possible for others. Without the cooperative, every producer must fear abundance. For being at the mercy of a few people controlling a narrow bottleneck to the market, they know that the greater the supply the lower the price will be. I need not go into detail. All the history of American agriculture proves what I have just said.

It is true, I think, that only true cooperatives can be consistently relied upon to seek abundance for their fellow men. This is my first point and I believe it is probably the most important one. Cooperatives can help solve the world's food problem because through them producers of food can and will produce an abundance and still and at the same time be in a position by means of loyalty to one another, to prevent that abundance from harming the men who brought it forth.

Monopoly power stands at the very opposite pole from cooperatives. Already we have seen, in connection with our attempt to fight an all-out war against our enemies, that monopoly power standing firm and unfortunately all too successfully against the development of sponge iron to increase our steel production against the expansion of magnesium production, and at least until very recently indeed, against the expansion of any copper production except that controlled by the Big Three copper companies upon whom we are now dependent for 85 percent of our total supply of that all-important material. Likewise we have seen monopoly interests gaining more and more of a strangle hold on the avenues of trade through which the farmer's crops must pass to the consumer. Farmers have had to do the best they could to combat the fertilizer trust. They have been up against overcharges for the oil they have bought from the oil monopoly and they have been told through the years by the power trust that it was just not possible to get electricity into rural areas at a cost of less than somewhere in the neighborhood of 36 cents or 50 cents per kilowatt-hour.

So far only cooperatives have succeeded in meeting monopoly power on its own ground and defeating it. Only cooperatives—with all due respect to the vast importance of a vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws—can break the grip of monopoly on our economy and keep it broken. And monopoly power is the one most important obstacle to a truly free world and to abundant production. This is true in the field of food distribution as it is in any other field.

I call your attention briefly to the fact that cooperatives are now producing, refining, and selling to their members gasoline and other oil products at substantial savings. I call your attention to the fact that through the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, farmers actually are getting electricity at reasonable cost, electricity without which our present farm labor shortage would have been completely disastrous, instead of only severely crippling. I call your attention also to the highly beneficial results which have been achieved by such farm cooperatives as those existing in Ohio, Virginia, and Vermont in producing their own fertilizer and other necessary products for the farmers and compelling the monopolistic forces formerly controlling the supplies of these products to themselves reduce their prices. Most important of all, however, is the fact that through cooperatives of farmers as producers it becomes for the first time possible for them to increase their production to the limit of human need without running the risk of facing financial ruin themselves because of their very efficiency in the bounty of nature.

And so as we look forward to meeting the food problem of the world, both now and after this war—a problem far greater than any the world has ever faced before in this field—our one most solid hope, as I have said before, lies in the cooperatives.

There is another phase of this matter upon which I shall touch but briefly. In the quotation from Marquis Childs it was pointed out how effective the cooperatives of Sweden had been in preventing black markets. I should like simply to suggest that if consumer cooperatives in any country were in control of even as much as 25 percent of the distribution of food products, you would have a means of price control as well as control of quality of products far more effective and far better than any government agency can supply.

Finally, as we view the world problem as a whole and consider what must be done in devastated nations after peace is finally restored, where are we to turn? What means are to be taken for the fair and just distribution of medical supplies and food? What form of organization is to be employed to enable the people of those nations to get back on their feet economically and to become once again self-sustaining? Are we to rely upon military dictators? Or upon those who have betrayed their fellow men to the conqueror? Or upon those who have entered into business relationships with him? I trust not. On the other hand, in most of the nations that have been overrun by Hitler there were before the war at least, cooperatives existing among the people of those countries including the farmers thereof.

Through these cooperatives it would be altogether possible to provide both a fair and just solution of the problem of administration in the true public interest of productive properties title to which will be in complete confusion but also to bring about the rehabilitation of the economies of those nations with a minimum of distribution of necessary things on a basis of pure charity. For the cooperatives could be supplied with necessary food and medical supplies and all able-bodied people, at least, could receive these things not on the basis of charity but as payment for constructive labor which they might do in the rehabilitation of their own countries. For the sick or distressed, of course, outright help would be necessary. Over a period of time these cooperatives could by such a method not only rehabilitate their own lands, but also make repayment of a considerable amount of what had been given to them. This suggestion I realize has only been briefly sketched. But I know no other kind of group of people than the cooperatives through whom such a constructive program could be carried on.

There are other things we need to do, of course. One of them which in my judgment is a central need is outlined rather carefully in my own book entitled "Out of Debt, Out of Danger," which was recently published by the Devin-Adair Co., of New York City. In this book I set forth what ought to be the answer to the problem of our national debt and certain constructive changes which in my opinion should be made in the monetary system of this Nation, so that we may achieve a truly stable price level through the years. My appeal is that instead of the present system of borrowing every dollar of the medium of exchange into circulation at interest to private creators of money, the Constitution of the United States should govern this field and Congress should create the money of this Nation and effectively regulate the value thereof.

A sound monetary system coupled with a strong and vigorous cooperative movement cannot only be the key to a solution of the world food problem but can open the door to a future world in which abundant production will be possible, full employment reasonably assured, and in which these things can be achieved without increases in governmental power or authority over the people but by the free exercise of the genius of the people themselves.

Now, why do I believe so strongly in cooperation?

I believe in them because I know the economic problems that have been destroying democracy and freedom in other countries must be solved. Because I know free government cannot live where there are no free farmers. Because I know that the unemployment problem has not been solved in any fundamental sense and that it must be solved before constitutional democracy as a form of government will be safe. Because I know that men, in an age that they know could be an age of plenty, are not for long going to endure the misery and humiliation of joblessness again; especially not when they have just returned from defending their Nation in the front lines of war. Because I know that private monopoly in industry and especially in finance means the end of free enterprise and has been the very basis upon which dictatorships have been built in other countries. Because I know that the solution of all evil things must ultimately be found in methods that are good, in methods that partake to a considerable extent at least of eternal laws of God.

Therefore, I believe I am interested in cooperatives because they can and they have restored to farmers in this country and in many other countries the control over their own economic destiny. I believe in them because they offer a way to make the dollar of the workingman buy more of the products he and his fellows produce. I believe in them because they can and they have met more than one entrenched monopoly on its own ground and beaten it. I believe in them because the more business they do the better they prosper, because never can they be successful by a restriction on production or distribution or exchange. I believe in them because they are the only means I know of whereby these problems, which must be worked out if democracy is to live, can be solved without a vast control over the lives of men by government. I believe in them because they can only succeed as they increase the welfare of others besides themselves or their own members; because the success of a cooperative therefore accords perfectly with the eternal principle of the Golden Rule.

I believe in cooperatives because they are the one means that I know of whereby I am sure our problem of poverty in the midst of plenty can be solved—and what is more, solved without resort to governmental dictatorship or to the development of a dependence of millions of people upon governmental support. Cooperatives are true democracy

in the practical field of economic life because each member has one vote whether his financial contribution be large or small. If we believe in democracy sincerely we just have to believe in cooperatives.

And last of all I believe in them because they offer to the common people something they can do for themselves now with their small resources, a great and sound idea, a willingness to study and to work, and a deep and abiding loyalty. These resources every group of people in all the world possesses. And therefore the message of the cooperatives to a distressed world is more fundamentally a message of hope than any other message I know.

Address of Dr. James Burnette Eskridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM McCORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the address delivered by Dr. James Burnette Eskridge, Ph. D., prominent educator and author, to the graduating class of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., on June 7, 1943.

At one time in the history of this Nation it is said that there were more representatives in Congress who were graduates of Cumberland University than of any other university in the land. I do not know that this statement is correct, but I do know that there is not a finer university anywhere in the world than Cumberland University and I am glad, therefore, to submit the baccalaureate address of Dr. Eskridge delivered on that occasion.

Education, both general and specific, has for its objective the welfare and uplift of the human race. Society long ago came to the conclusion that a trained mind was more useful than an untrained one, and that the happiness of humanity depends, in a large measure, upon an enlightened mind and a sensitive conscience. The earliest civilizations were established upon this conception, in part at least, especially that part which affects the intellectual development of mankind, if not the moral and spiritual. Moreover, whatever intellectual or moral, social or political lines the world has established, were due to the force of that doctrine which demands that whatever is good for the individual should be apportioned, as much as possible, to the entire human race.

In remote times only a very small class, favored and select, had access to what little higher knowledge or skill there was in existence; simple and elementary, as it may now appear to have been. This class or fraternity guarded it jealously in order to retain whatever power or influence its possession might command. Present day civilization, on the other hand, is demanding that education, and the consequent skill developing therefrom should be as universal as possible, and, furthermore, that it ought to be of such type and character as will insure civilization's own protection.

It is almost axiomatic that education and liberty are companions and that ignorance and slavery are equally inseparable.

When der Fuehrer endeavored to enslave the world, he induced and ordered the destruction of great libraries and millions of books, retaining only those which portrayed his doctrines. Ignorance and superstition almost inevitably lead to slavery. Suppression of information or news leads to ignorance. However wrong our opponents may be, we should stand firmly for their right to freedom of expression lest ours, in turn, be taken from us.

The safeguarding of civilization or society means the perpetuity of government. The higher and nobler the form of society or civilization, the more stable and enduring government is likely to be. The rise or fall of nations is nothing more nor less than the rise or fall of their respective societies, for they stand or fall together.

Now, the state has long recognized the value of public education and it has made astounding progress therein. Institutions of all kinds, for the dissemination of knowledge, have been established in all parts of the civilized world. They have been maintained at colossal public expense. Furthermore, the state understands that for government to endure, and democracy to abide, all the people must be educated, for "we must educate or we perish by our own prosperity."

Enlightened public opinion, also, is awake to the fact that it is of the first importance to safeguard our institutions, both of State and Nation, and to protect our fanes and firesides from the enemies who would pollute and destroy. The time was, and that not very long ago, when education was confined almost exclusively to those who could afford it. Now we see on every hand educational institutions of every conceivable kind and character, for the training of the youths of the land, and it is the sacred mission of those who would construct well for posterity to pass these ideals forward, strengthened and solidified for all time. Our public schools, colleges, and universities, schools of law and medicine, technical and vocational schools of all kinds, bear eloquent testimony, not only to the demands of human aspiration and its longings for knowledge and understanding, but to society and Government, which recognize the fact that the most splendid achievements of humanity consist of these finer and nobler accomplishments. All this, too, in the name, and for the sake, of a great democracy, to the end that it "shall not perish from the earth."

Nations have risen, flourished, and fallen; civilization, whose contributions to the race are amongst the most valuable possessions of mankind, has in the end perished; all because they had departed from the traditions of the fathers and the noble intuitions of the human heart.

The lover of history revels not only through the realms of noble achievements of dead centuries, but through their charnel houses as well; and seared indeed must his conscience be, if he be not brought to bay by the terrible realization of a terrible truism, that nations, like individuals, reap as they sow, and that "where there is no vision, the people perish."

It has always been true, and shall ever be, that nations, like individuals, that "walk uprightly, walk surely." It seems to be high time, in these days of laxness and growing contempt for law and order, together with the recognized rights of well ordered society, that institutions, secular as well as religious, should take their bearings and sound their waters, in order to ascertain whether it is in the direction of danger, or safety, that they are sailing.

Reverence for law, order, and properly constituted authority, a chivalrous regard for the virtue and personal purity of the race, an undying devotion to the sanctity of our fireside altars, a cheerful willingness to give our lives, if need be, to uphold the standards of righteousness, and the flag of our country, should be inculcated in our children from the time they leave their cradles until they receive the most august degrees from our greatest colleges and universities.

Immediately before you lies the real adventure of life. That which has gone before was merely preparation for a real and absorbing venture. You now enter an adult life under conditions which never before confronted young men and women.

There have been other wars. There have been others who went from universities into battle lines. But not into such a war: world aflame; liberty, civilization, and the future of humanity all at stake; the efforts of all humanity devoted to war—some to preserve freedom, others to destroy; with the means of destroying life many times greater than ever before.

With the world in turmoil, the old order is gone. The new order is forming, but has not arrived. As someone has said: It may appear that we are "wandering between two worlds—one dead, the other powerless to be born."

In the world which you enter today you will need all that you have learned here and more. Except for training in exact sciences, all that a university can do for us is to teach us how to learn. With that exception, what we have received here is not all that there is.

If all human reactions were identical in given circumstances, life could be made an exact science. Such, however, is not the case. In real life reactions are as varied as faces are individually different; yet to a degree they are of the same general character.

Today, with the world aflame, the individual needs and requires more than at any other time in modern history, the ability to analyze and reason to logical conclusions. Only this ability will enable us to see beyond barriers, beneath appearances, and through clouds which surround today's problems. For the art of living, all that this or any other university can give to us is the ability to learn from experience to think clearly and logically.

This is not a day for fear or pessimism. Cowardice is unbecoming. "In quiet and confidence shall be their strength," but to these, one must add the discerning and thoughtful mind. We must think through the complications and the details of these extraordinary and anxious days. Understanding and comprehension must have as many facets as a diamond in order to meet as many varying circumstances.

A thinker must not neglect any significant factor or influencing circumstances; such neglect might render invalid any conclusion. To see what may come in the future may be accomplished, in part, by a thorough knowledge of the past.

Prejudice hampers judgment and destroys the power of analysis. One of the purposes of education is to enable one to lay aside natural prejudices and to weigh all factors fairly. In a world crazed with war, this becomes difficult for all of us.

If one has acquired the ability to reason, to analyze, and to weigh with care, to lay aside prejudice in passing judgment, university training is a great success. Therefore, as to a university course, one cannot hope or expect to learn a great volume of facts, as compared with those required in life; but if you have these abilities, which we have mentioned, you will discover the facts. Even though you may not yet have acquired that ability in full, if you have only learned how to know yourself, education is nevertheless a success.

The hard and sometimes bitter facts of life are soon to meet you, face to face. You may be due to have a rude awakening in some of your theoretical conclusions. Practical everyday life will, in the years to come, become your real university—if you have made the most of your training here; and if you are prepared to encounter, analyze and benefit by new experiences.

No university can furnish a curriculum in the short period of 2, 3, or 4 years, which

will actually finish the education of an individual. It may remove the rough places. It may open long vistas with light in the distance. It may till the ground or even plant and sow the seed, but it is you who must cultivate, remove the weeds, help the growth, and harvest the crop.

It is not unusual for young graduates, under the influence of youthful energy, to feel that they have become very wise and that they have found the open sesame of life. He is wise who knows what he does not know. Knowledge is infinite, and experience is the great master. Theories often fail, for life has a rude way of crushing theories, and following practical lines.

There is something more which we hope that you have gained from your university life: Friends and the ability to make more of them. Many lives are changed entirely by associations. On your highway through life you will find that the way is often made smoother, stones are often removed from your path, and opportunities cast in your way by friends. We have known many such circumstances in life. At the moment we are thinking particularly of one man, who is now past 60 years of age. He has served Tennessee as a Senator, a colonel in World War No. 1, and has been prominent in civic affairs. Since the day of his graduation he has never lost an opportunity to make a friend, or to serve one. The list of his small, and sometimes insignificant, favors to others would be long, indeed. He never lost an opportunity to perform a friendly act. Do not understand us to say that he was careless with his money, or profligate with gifts. Life is not made of such paltry things. It is composed of finer stuff. Most of these friendly acts cost him nothing, but they brought much to him. Today, his friends are legion. They are to be found in many places. All of this he obtained for himself. Incidentally, this man is a native of your State, but that is not the crux of our story. Life is made up of humanity. The great adventure is living; and we cannot venture alone.

John Stuart Mill had a great knowledge of human society, probably most greatly contributed, as he himself admits by the education and training which he received in early years from his father, who believed that education was the science of human life and living, which required understanding and sympathy for human frailities. Mill commenced his education under the care of his father, at the age of 3, when he began to learn Greek, quickly followed by other languages. He was trained to think when others were only beginning to learn. His greatness was due in large part to this rigorous training. However, he noticed one weakness in himself. He had an inclination to lean upon his father, whose senses and mental faculties were always alert. His training was too much on the mental side. He was not taught physical or manual dexterity, which eventually led to slackness and inattention. He later realized that he had not been provided with the practical view of life. This he had to acquire from experience. The point is that he succeeded because he learned how to learn.

Life is to be learned day by day. Perhaps we may call it a play, one where there are rules, as in any sport, which one must follow if one expects to receive the most benefit therefrom. This is true whether in sports or in actual life. One may violate these rules at times and not be punished for the infraction, but the penalty is there although one may not be conscious of it at the beginning.

The greatest obstacles which face us now, in the days of our years, are the changing rules of a whirling world. When the roll of this war has ended, the results of the development of science in wartime will call for astounding changes. Changed economic conditions will force greater changes in the mode of living. Principles of government will be revised until they shall have become almost beyond recognition. The new order will come into being; new standards will be adopted and old ones abandoned. The world moves on. Omar Khayyam has said:

"The moving finger writes, and having writ
Moves on: nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line;
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

With new modes of living, new principles, new standards, your ability to learn and to stand squarely on the ground will be your compass through life. Education is like a vaccination: It must "take or it is worthless." You must know how to apply it in the practical affairs of life. You cannot recapture the past. The days of slavery are gone. Feudalism is dead, and both are forever in the past so long as the world remains educated, and her stalwarts alert.

We must confess that we were very near to the brink. One Der Fuehrer for the moment appeared to be driving the world back to slavery and to the Dark Ages; but the inexorable law of life is overtaking him, and will in the end crush this monster. The end is certain, though the time is not. No one can ever succeed in turning back a wise and educated world. Thus the pen is mightier than the sword.

The greatest example of inability to read, analyze, and appreciate the scope and effect of the written word is the failure of civilization to appraise properly Der Fuehrer and his Mein Kampf, in which he outlined, step by step, and promised to accomplish the very thing that he has been doing. His only mistake was his inability to appraise and understand an educated world with a fixed and unalterable determination to remain free, and his failure to establish a proper value on the strength of a free pepole.

Leaving this university, you will assume, gradually, as the years advance, the responsibility, along with others of your class, to safeguard the future of our country; to help retain our American freedom, and to rededicate this Nation to the principles upon which it was founded by our forefathers. When you shall have done all this, you should give thanks to the university that taught you how to live by showing you how to learn from experience.

The Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 18, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the result of what has been attempted by the Office of Price Administration has not been satisfactory to the consuming public, although some move was necessary to stop the skyrocketing of the price of food. The talk is now going around the Capitol, and I presume in the country at large, that the O. P. A. should be scrapped. In this debate there is no secret about what cuts in the appropriation are intended to do.

To scrap the O. P. A. would be a mistake, but the correction of its mistakes is imperative. Here are some of the mistakes that have been made and must be stopped.

First, a ceiling price was placed on the retailer, and in many cases the retailer could make nothing on the set prices and in some instances, many instances, could not afford to handle the particular article of food. Potatoes are one of this class. When the consumer kicked on the price he was compelled to pay the retailer, the producer was blamed, and the public along the eastern seaboard took to this slogan and spread it to such an extent that the farmer is blamed for everything.

Let me give you the steps from production to consumption in a few of the staple necessaries. Beef will be the first article.

The steps are: Growing of the cattle, shipping of the cattle to the packers, packers handling, shipping from the packer to the wholesaler, handling by the wholesaler, shipping to the retailer, and finally the retail distribution to the consumer.

When the consumer pays 68 cents for steak the farmer is condemned. But there is quite a spread between 14 cents per pound to the grower and 68 cents to the consumer. Instead of putting a ceiling price only on the retailer, the O. P. A. should have put a ceiling all along the line from the farmer to consumer. There is a bolt loose somewhere in this long line of business. The following are facts:

The farmer is not getting too much for his cattle.

The railroads have been carrying freight and express without any sudden and overnecessary rise in rates. There is left therefore the following stations, who must answer to the charge of the unnecessary rise of prices to the consumer. The processor—in this case the packers—the wholesaler, and the retailer.

The conclusion, therefore, is unescapable that the O. P. A. erred in fixing a price for the retailer only.

Instead of scrapping the organization it should be strengthened and absolutely fix the price all along the line from the pastures to the restaurant table.

Where we have abundance of any article like sugar, it should not be rationed, but on all articles of which there is a scarcity rationing should be put into operation.

I have traced the history of the handling of beef, but this example can be carried in the same way as applying to butter, cheese, eggs, poultry, pork, wheat, rice, mutton, fruits. In these cases we shall find the same situation as applies to beef.

The rolling back of prices is not justified. It will not help the producer, and a subsidy will not make up the loss, for in case of beef the farmer helps pay the tax exacted to generate a subsidy. The rolling back process will go to the middleman just as the tax on hogs went to him. The packers admitted they benefited by millions from this tax, but claimed they did not know to whom to pay it. You can wager one thing—that

in any rolling back of prices, the growers will be injured because the transaction is the rolling-back process which assumes that the producer, the railroads, the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer are all benefiting alike from present prices. They are not now benefiting alike. The middlemen are getting the best of it, and in the rolling-back process he will still be getting more for his efforts. In this rolling back program, it is proposed to give the producer just enough to keep him quiet—a subsidy, which he himself pays in part. It is taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other pocket of the same individual.

I do not believe the growers want a subsidy. They want a fair price and that fair price can be fixed and the trouble will be over if fixed clear down the line. It cannot be fixed by merely stopping up the ends. It cannot be fixed by fixing a price for food which the farmer cannot meet; it cannot be remedied by fixing the retail price, for the retailer has not a chance when all elements of cost attached to the product he sells have not been fixed as well as his price.

The Army is not rationed with points and those who work in factories and the mines should not be rationed either. A miner cannot operate under the food point system set in motion by the O. P. A., and that food situation has much to do with our labor troubles.

You can imagine a miner coming up out of the ground at night and getting meat to the extent only of those who have been sitting around an office or sitting in Congress. To make everyone alike in the purchase of meat without regard to the kind of work in which the consumer is engaged is a stupendous blunder, and it should be corrected at once.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to scrapping the O. P. A., but I am in favor of our giving it more power as soon as it demonstrates that it knows what it is doing. The job can be done—it has been done. It must be done now. Herbert Hoover did a pretty good job as Food Administrator in the First World War and his experience should be called into action now.

The attack on this bill by way of cutting appropriations was intended to cripple the O. P. A. or put it out of business. No substitute was offered for O. P. A. Nothing was said as to correcting mistakes of the O. P. A. There was nothing in the arguments except the magnifying of mistakes alleged to have been made by college professors who happen to work in this organization.

I was not in sympathy with this attack on the organization. Those who are so certain O. P. A. does not know what it is doing ought to outline a better plan and give us the benefit of their superior wisdom. Knockers are plentiful—a bumper crop, right here in Congress—but builders are few. Criticism is a good thing, but the critic should submit a constructive program to replace what he asserts to be a wrong solution.

A man who operates the best plan available to him in an emergency is doing an admirable job as compared to the man who says the plan is no good but has no ideas of his own to substitute for that which he would destroy.

Ulysses Samuel Guyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the eulogy delivered by Hon. CLYDE M. REED, United States Senator from Kansas, at the funeral services for our late colleague, Ulysses S. Guyer, at St. John, Kans., on Tuesday, June 8, 1943:

Senator REED. It is the custom of the Congress of the United States to do honor to those of its Members who die while in service, and the custom is that Members of both Houses shall accompany the mortal remains of the departed Member to the place of his final interment. And so, I come here in company with your own Congressman, CLIFFORD HOPE; with the Congressman from the Emporia district, Mr. REES; the Congressman from Oklahoma, to the south of you, Mr. RIZLEY; the Congressman from Colorado, Mr. CHENOWETH; and my colleague, Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska. We brought back the remains of your friend, who was once your close neighbor.

There must be a something about communities as there is about individuals. Communities have individuality and characteristics as like and as unlike each other as humans are like and unlike each other. Judged by appearance and contact, and our knowledge of Mr. GUYER, St. John must be an unusual place, a community with its own individuality. In all of the years that I have known him I can't recall a conversation with him of more than, we'll say, 10 minutes, but that he mentioned St. John and his years here in St. John. I think that is a common experience among his friends. He didn't live here many years, yet the years that he did live here seem to have left a deeper impression upon his character and personality, and certainly upon his thoughts, than the years he lived in any other place.

It must be an unusual community that can do that to any man.

I believe this town was named after a former Governor of Kansas, John P. St. John. Governor St. John came to fame and remained in memory principally because of his vigorous advocacy of that one principle in Kansas from which there has never been any formal and official variation in the last 60 years. That is the principle of prohibition. It was his favorite subject. As the town of St. John was the favorite conversation piece for Mr. Guyer, prohibition, perhaps, was his favorite subject for public addresses. I don't think he ever missed an opportunity to talk about prohibition. So, again I think of Mr. Guyer in his career, in his individuality, coming back to Kansas, to St. John, and to the individuality of a different community.

We brought back your friend, a kindly man. I should say kindliness and friendliness and sincerity were his distinguishing characteristic. There are those of us who may have been, and are, impelled by motives of combat or self-interest or ambition, but here was a man whose guiding qualities of life were friendly services. He never was too busy to be friendly. He never forgot to be kind. These qualities are, I think, rather distinguishing characteristics of the community of which he was so fond, and of which he so proudly claimed to be a part.

In the last two days, his colleagues, including myself, have traveled half across a continent to bring him back to you. We left a pulsing crowd, a tense city, the Capital of this country, and by virtue of that, the Capital of the World. The Capital of this country is the stage on which there is being hammered out the destiny of the world. It is a crowded, tense, forum across whose steges are walking the most powerful characters in current history. In these two days, my colleagues and myself, with what is mortally left of Ulysses Samuel Guyer, have come to this peaceful place; quiet and lovely; a land of far horizons where the landscape continually unrolls until it meets the bending sky, a contrast in every way, mentally, spiritually, and in the physical aspect, from those scenes we left two days ago. A modern master of English has described that contrast in language, which so well befits the occasion, and the man we brought back to you, and the difference between these two worlds, that I shall repeat these words of Kipling:

"The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart:
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Elmer Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Malcolm W. Bingay, from the Detroit Free Press of June 16 and 17, 1943:

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 16, 1943]

GOOD MORNING

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

WHERE'S ELMER?

Elmer's popping off again! Yeah, Elmer Davis, Elmer, the dead-pan study in chiaroscuroistic physiognomy with his white hair, gray face, bootblack eyebrows and long black bow tie to synchronize the movements of his Adam's apple with his thought processes. Yeah, boy! Elmer was born to be an actor and that is the role he is playing now—with plenty of ham.

Elmer, as you know, is the chief of that weird hydra-headed monstrosity of governmental mismanagement known as the Office of War Information. No organization was ever so completely misnamed. Information is what you don't get from Elmer's vast army of heterogeneous press agents—the greatest collection of intellectual curiosities ever gathered under one roof.

Last month 14 of the best known and fully accredited newspaper and magazine writers in America resigned in a body from the Office of War Information because, they publicly

proclaimed, it was impossible for them to write the truth.

Well, Elmer at Boston Monday told the Newspaper Guild that Washington news is "less adequately covered than any other news in the world." What he really meant is that the hard-boiled, altogether objective reporters covering the Washington assignment refuse to take hand-outs from the bureau heads as the voice of God coming from Mount Sinai.

What they want are the plain unvarnished facts—as in that international food conference—and they refuse to act as mere messengers for the "bunk" peddlers.

Elmer said: "The war has suddenly compelled these reporters to cover an immensely complicated story quite outside their familiar field. * * * It is not surprising some of them still feel that a battle between a couple of administrators is bigger news than a battle between the American and Japanese Navies."

All right, Elmer. Be specific. When did any American newspaper consider a battle between your chums down there more important than a battle between the American and Japanese Navies? When was any such story made secondary to bureaucratic rows?

The answer, of course, is never. Why, the newspapers even played up the story of Pearl Harbor after you kept it bottled up for 1 whole year to spring it on "the anniversary." We had to wait 365 days for the facts that the Japs already knew—like little children not quite bright in the head.

Elmer continues: "A row between two administrators would have been big news in 1938, but it is conceivably of smaller relative importance in 1943."

Elmer, have you forgotten how you got your job?

As a radio commentator—not as a reporter out on the firing line getting the information which radio commentators read in the papers—you yourself dwelt on the mad muddle in Washington, with Cabinet officers openly contradicting each other on important war news, with every bureau stacked with press agents boosting the ambitions of their little czars. Don't you remember?

There was your chum, the starry-eyed poet, Archibald MacLeish, running the Office of Facts and Figures, and Lowell Mellett's Office of Government Reports, which became familiarly known as Mellett's Bug House. Your criticism was so sharp and sound that F. D. R. blithely merged them—as he does so many other bureaus when they become a laughingstock—and put you in charge of the merged mess.

Your job, we were told, was to clean house and to make sure that the newspapers got information about the war.

Well, where is it?

You were going to be absolute and all the boys and girls in key positions in the administration were to submit to you all the speeches written for them. There would be no more contradictions because everything was to funnel through your office.

Yes, the reporters have been dwelling on the rows between administrators. That is news from the home front.

It was this very reporting—cold, hard, accurate journalism—which forced the administration to reorganize the whole war production program—from the Office of Production Management to the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board to the War Production Board and now to the latest alphabetical shake-up of the same old gang: The O. W. M., which means the Office of War Mobilization.

If all these other bureaus were running right, why, then, all these changes? Why 18 months after the war has started, do we finally get a "war mobilization board"? Because the nasty, mean, unkind newspaper reporters of Washington have kept on the job night and day—never letting up in keeping the American people informed as to the blunders and stupidities of it all.

They have forced, by the power of public opinion, some slow emergence of a semblance of order on the home front.

The newspaper reporters have been winning the war at Washington.

And they are not devoting their time, as so many in your Office of War Information seem to be, in forgetting the war and boosting that fourth term.

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 17, 1943]

GOOD MORNING

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

MORE ABOUT ELMER

The more I think of that attack by Elmer Davis on the Washington newspaper correspondents as incompetent the more irked I get. And, when it comes to Elmer Davis, I irk easy.

Davis, at the Newspaper Guild Convention, charged that the Washington reporters were "inadequate" to cover such news as the war, that they were more interested in reporting rows between various administrators than they were in telling of battles between American and Japanese navies.

The only answer to this puerile vaporing is that under the voluntary censorship of the American press—never once violated—military news cannot be printed unless O.K.'d by the censor. We print the news when it is officially handed us, even if it is from 6 months to a year old.

In all the annals of a free press there never has been displayed such a sense of responsibility and fidelity to a pledge as has been offered by the American newspapers.

Elmer ignores all that.

Charlie Michelson has moved back into the picture to prepare for the Presidential campaign of 1944. Machiavellian Charlie has won for himself the dubious reputation of being the most cunning smear artist in the history of American politics. His job is to rob men of their reputations if they dare oppose Roosevelt—no matter how honorably. It begins to look as though he had taken over Elmer's funnily named Office of War Information as an adjunct to his activities.

The Office of War Information seems more interested in winning an election than it is in winning a war.

I see where Senator Styles Bridges has answered Elmer's onslaught on the American press on the floor of the Senate and suggested a congressional investigation of the whole weird set-up of that organization.

"Perhaps," he said, "Davis' real objection is that the reporters have uncovered news in Washington that does not look well outside of Washington."

Last February I went down to Washington to attend the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. We were told by Elmer Davis that we would be given the real inside low-down on the war and all other matters pertaining to its progress, in a series of off-the-record meetings. The only lasting impressions we got were those left by the cane-seated chairs.

We were told nothing! And every day in every way our intelligence was insulted by a parade of brass hats in carefully deleted speeches going through the motions of pretending to tell us. All direct questions were evaded. But we got something out of the convention. We learned what the reporters on the Washington firing line are up against in trying to get the truth.

The gist of the whole matter is that American newspapers through their correspondents have refused to surrender their independence to the politicians.

This, Elmer Davis naturally resents.

The administration does not want the public to know how it has fallen down on the job.

It wants all the silly disputes between the quarreling factions of the Government suppressed.

It does not want the people to know that it is because of these fights for power, because of utter lack of any organization sense, because of playing politics, we are not further along with the war effort.

It was these hard-headed reporters who kept harping on the derelictions and mismanagement for war production under Office of Production Management, the Manpower Commission, the Office of Price Administration—and all the other dizzy outfits—that brought about such reforms as have been accomplished.

By their barrage of exposure they made it possible for such efficient groups as the Tolan committee to move and make official factual reports on what was going on.

These reporters first called attention to the way contracts were being piled up in regions where there were critical shortages of both housing and manpower; they let the world know that the handling of agricultural and industrial manpower was being bungled; they exposed the fact that small business was being crushed to the wall.

They have shouted from the housetops that there has been no over-all planning for the mobilization of our resources to fight a war. And they are still yelling. Only 3 weeks ago—after 18 months of fighting—did the administration get around to the creation of a mobilization board.

Those reporters called attention to the fact that Barney Baruch has been telling the New Dealers for 2 years what to do. Every move they have made since has been along the lines he laid down and the only element of order in Washington has come about as a result of that.

And now Elmer Davis has the gall to suggest that they are not competent!

Listen, kid, they'll be there on the job when you are back on the radio, rolling your r's and telling the world what you've just read from their dispatches.

Commencement Day Address of Hon. James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania, at Mooseheart School

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on Saturday, June 12, 1943, I had the distinct privilege of delivering the commencement address at Mooseheart School, in Mooseheart, Ill.

It was an occasion of great pride and reborn confidence to learn with what faith, with what preparation, and with what determination the youth of this school and the youth of our land go forward to meet the problems of the hour. The fate of America is dependent upon the spirit and ability of its youth; and every indication is that the youth

of America will not falter in these hours of doubt and trial.

Graduates of Mooseheart have, over the years, gone forward into virtually every walk of life. Today the graduates of this school are serving in our centers of war production, in our armed forces, on our farms, and in that vast number of other activities concerned with the successful prosecution of the war.

During my visit at Mooseheart, I learned of the heroic exploits of one of its graduates, Seaman (1st cl.) James Birtcher, who, having seen his ship torpedoed and sunk in the broad Atlantic, was cast adrift on a life raft for 42 long and trying days.

Mr. President, it is such courage and stamina as this, reflected by the youth of our land in all quarters of the globe, which will insure the day of our final victory, for victories are fashioned not by weapons alone, but by the hearts of men. The heart of America is sound and indomitable. It shall prevail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the address of commencement which I delivered at Mooseheart School on June 12, 1943, and a brief article which appeared in the Aurora Beacon News on Thursday, May 13, 1943, which describes the harrowing experiences of Seaman Birtcher while he was adrift in the Atlantic, his ship the victim of a submarine attack.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commencement day has again come to Mooseheart—that proud and sad day when, with a task well done, we turn our eyes upon a waiting world and leave behind us, for a time, the ties, the contacts, and the friendships we have nurtured here.

Those who leave this school go forward into a world which needs the preparation and ability they possess. Today the world is troubled; it needs all the ability, the preparation, and the strength of youth that it can muster. The problems of the hour loom large and menacing. Somewhere in the depth of him each youth must come forward with the right, the enduring answer if this world of man and God is to go forward.

You who leave this school today take with you the best of training, the best of culture, and the best of character that it lies within our province here to offer you. You have seen and known the community life of the city, the town, and the farm. You have performed almost every manner of productive work with hand and brain. You have known the friendship and the guidance of wise and helpful teachers. You have learned many of the lessons of life, not only those that are written in the books for all men to see, but those other lessons which come only to those who labor with their hands, either at the sowing and cultivation of crops, or at the learning and application of an honored trade. Those of you who leave here today have mastered both of these, and they will serve you well throughout all the years of your lives.

Here at Mooseheart your welfare and development have always been uppermost in the minds of those who were around you. You have had—as all young people should have—the essential benefits of good, wholesome food; skillful and effective medical care; exercises to develop the body and the brain. You have been taught respect and social responsibility. You have learned the honor and humility of honest toil—of a task well done. Each of you has been reared in the religious teachings of your father. You have learned reverence toward and sincerity in the works and teachings of Almighty God.

You have learned the principles of brotherhood. These are such teachings as all men must have if they are to go forward into a full and successful life with their fellows. These are such teachings as all men must have if the values in the world are to be sustained, and the evil mockeries of wayward men destroyed. You go forth into the world equipped to live and prosper as freemen. You understand the word of God. You understand the functioning of our modern life—both in its political and economic span. You have learned the rich heritage of American history, and of the men and principles which made it great. You know the honor and the need of labor. And each of you possesses the skill to work productively and well.

In a word then you are equipped to take up your station in life; you are equipped to go forward, and to make your contribution to society and the world. Your paths may be divergent and take you far afield, but no matter where you are or what your position may be in this world, your thoughts at divers times will turn back to Mooseheart, and the many things which you knew and learned here. Indeed it is quite probable that the older in years you become the more vivid and touching your memories of this place will become.

And in your travels through life, many of you will no doubt want to see this institution enlarged and provision made for the establishment of a junior college here, so that a beginning might be made toward training for the various professional fields which are increasing at a rapid rate and offering extensive opportunities to young people throughout the land. Indeed, it seems that some such development as this will not be long in coming, for the real import of such training will be brought home to us all with new and accelerating force at the war's end.

But now you stand ready to make your own way in the world, to plot your own journey on the highways of life. Here at Mooseheart we have done everything possible to fit you for a successful life's journey. It remains for you to apply the teachings and experiences you have received here to make that journey a successful one in fact.

Many there are who will tell you that the way is harsh and inhospitable. Many there are who will tell you that the doors to opportunity and progress are seldom opened. Many there are, indeed, who will tell you that honest work brings with it no reward. They are the dissenters, they are the shiftless, they are the wreckers. I know that you will find no company in such a lot as that.

You are freemen, and the progress of freemen never dies. Here in America, here in her very mills, industries, and her vastness, there is and shall always be work for every American generation. And every individual is free to say just what type of work he shall do. Freedom is the greatest single blessing that can come to any man or any people; and here in America the growth of freedom has been encompassing and strong. The possession of freedom must never be lightly regarded or cast aside. It is such a possession that no man can really live without it. It is such a possession as requires the eternal vigilance of every man to hold it inviolate and sure.

You are a part of a new American generation. You were born and reared in a free society. The freedom you have is yours to destroy or strengthen as you see fit. I cannot say how you might live. I can only say that if you live in accordance with the principles of God and Americanism your freedom will remain unsullied. If you will but abide by these principles of Americanism—of constitutional government, of divided powers, of individual privilege and responsibility, and of the lives of those honored dead who made this society possible, and of the enduring principles which they propounded and gave to the world—you will have lived the life of a truly great American.

And if you but abide by the principles of free enterprise in America—of the worth and dignity of honest toil, of individual initiative, of ever-widening horizons of human growth, and of the truth that productive effort is the only effort worthy of the name—you will have sustained yourselves and protected all your followers from the black pits of slavery, where peoples of all races and all creeds now grovel in other lands across the seas.

In such emergencies as this, when war or the threat of war looms up to plague the Nation, we must all stand as one to beat back the challenge. Those whom we have made our leaders must have our undivided support, until the hour of peril is past. We must not dissipate our energies or becloud the issue with private, petty ills. We must wait until the proper time to vent our wrath and disillusionment—if any there remain with the hours of crisis past.

The necessity for such a procedure has already been recognized in this our own organization. In the periods between conventions we have learned to trust the Supreme Governor in his exercise of power. We have watched the developments, and brought our complaints and suggestions to the convention floor. There the policy was adjusted in accordance with popular demand, and the organization strengthened and empowered to carry on. From the mechanics of our own organization, we must realize that support of our leaders is essential to the successful prosecution of any policy—especially in times of emergency and war.

Today our country is engaged in a great struggle, the fronts of which extend to all the ramparts of the world. Many millions of young Americans have been called to the service of their country. Among these gallant souls are a number who have come from Mooseheart. Possibly before the battles have ended some of you will be called into the fray. This war represents the greatest effort at human decency and justice that this Nation and the world have ever been called upon to make. As such, that effort is worthy of your constant and continuing support. No real American will let any issue, any question, or any doubt allay his support from that effort—even for a split second. In every task you are called upon to do, give it the fullest possible attention, for there is scarcely a task left in the world today that does not bear some definite relation to the war in which we are now engaged. It remains for us to be resolute in purpose, unified in undertaking, and unrelenting in effort until the day of our complete and final victory is at hand. And that victory, lest we forget, will not be ours until our troops are quartered in Rome, Tokyo, and Berlin.

The peace that shall follow upon this war must be built of the most durable material and the most enduring principles known to man. It must be such a peace as will, in part at least, compensate for the suffering, the sacrifice, and the sorrow that shall be spent in its pursuit.

No peace, however valid its economic and political bases, can possibly endure unless it is cemented together with the spirit of kindredness and brotherhood. Brotherhood not only among the individual members of one nation, but among all the individual members of all nations, and among all those nations themselves. This does not mean that the aggressors shall not be punished, nor that the oppressor shall not be called to account.

The tenets of civilized procedure demand that this be done.

But when the vermin which carry and infect the world with the awful malady which is war, have been isolated and dispatched, we must turn toward the tremendous task of rebuilding the world along those lines which will bring to all men the maximum of good and the minimum of evil. These are such steps as men must take if the world is to survive this destructive ordeal in which it is now engulfed. These are such steps as must be taken if man is to remain a creature of dignity and growth, persevering always to that higher plane. This is such a task as will be realized if we but abide by the principles of brotherhood and fraternity which—as they have served us nobly and well within our own circle—shall serve all men no less nobly and no less well in that fateful epoch which lies ahead.

TELLS STORY OF 42 DAYS ABOARD LIFEBOAT AT SEA—JAMES BIRTCHER, SEAMAN, FIRST CLASS, AND MOOSEHEART BOY, LUCKY HE'S ALIVE

There was a gold star beside the name of James Birtcher on Mooseheart's honor roll of former student wards with the colors until yesterday.

As Birtcher, seaman first class, stood before the illumined panel with Supt. W. L. Leinweber of the Moose City of Childhood, he said simply: "I'd like to have that star when you take it off," and pinched himself as he grinned, all 6 feet 2 inches of him. And well he might.

For Birtcher had come back from Davy Jones' locker, a nautical way of saying he had been snatched from the dead, after a living hell of 42 days and nights with 22 shipmates aboard a 22-foot lifeboat which sailed more than 2,600 miles across the vast expanse of the south Atlantic.

NEVER LOST HOPE

It was an epochal voyage in which gnawing hunger and parching thirst faded into a numbing ache. But before the endless panorama of sea and sky and an eternity of battling storm-tossed waves, and broiling in tropical calm the men never quite lost hope.

When it seemed at last that their prayers would never be answered, the morning of the forty-second day Birtcher sighted land on the distant horizon. It appeared as a mirage of cloud lying low on the wide stretches of the ocean.

The 26 men huddled into the cockleshell of the boat cheered lustily, a few malted milk tablets conserved against a greater need were broken out and oars were dipped for the pull to the haven of port—which meant, first, full bellies and, second, clean sheets and soft beds.

PICKED UP BY STEAMER

A Brazilian steamer not long after picked up the starved crewmen and their boat and put them into refuge of a South American port. Some went berserk when it was all over and babbled in delirium or wanted to fight or cry in anguish lest it be but another dream turned nightmare.

As Seaman Birtcher, big and blond, and looking rather fit in navy blues told his story quietly in the office of Superintendent Leinweber yesterday, it seemed as far away as the Robinson Crusoe fables of childhood, or perhaps a movie seen and almost forgotten. But Birtcher won't forget it until his dying day.

The deep pain of remembering was reflected in his eyes as he narrated how his Liberty ship had been torpedoed and sunk on its way home with an empty bottom from delivering vital war supplies to the Near East, which helped the Allies drive the Nazis and their Italian satellites from north Africa in the first great victory of the war.

SHIP'S NAME SECRET

Since the Navy has not yet officially reported the loss of the vessel, he was admonished not to reveal its name, destination, or the port to which he and his shipmates were taken after their rescue.

But these are but unimportant fringe in the rich tapestry of a tale woven by another to go down to the sea in ships.

Hell-May-Care Attitude of People at Home Flayed by Flier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Mobile Press Register, Mobile, Ala., under date of May 16, 1943. This article contains a letter from Lt. James M. Nettles, Jr., of Butler, Ala., to his father. Lieutenant Nettles is a fighter pilot in the United States Marine Air Corps stationed in the Pacific theater of war. I also include an affidavit of Mrs. M. F. George, sister of Lieutenant Nettles, that the letter referred to is a true and correct copy of the original received from the soldier by his father:

"DEAR POP: I'm still at a rest camp with nothing much to do but lie around. However, we go back into the combat area shortly and I've been doing some leisure thinking. So I thought I'd drop you a line and tell you some of my thoughts since there's no news at present.

"I read an article in a 2-month-old magazine that discussed things back in the States. That's one thing that started me thinking. When we out here read things and hear news about strikes and the likes back home, it gives us a sort of sick feeling in the pits of our stomachs."

JAPS ARE BEASTLY

"I don't believe the average American knows what we're up against. The Japs are just as beastly, if not more so, than painted. They're ruthless and cunning, not men, but animals. When they shoot a marine through the elbows and leave him in the jungle for insects to kill, then you have a small example of what they are capable of.

"The news, I know, sounds encouraging. But I'm here to tell you that this war isn't even beginning to be won. I'll tell you this: We'll never, and I repeat, never, win this war until every last American works and suffers plenty. We hate the Japs more than you can imagine, and we'll beat hell out of them if the home folks will back us up."

NO FRESH MEAT

"I don't believe there's a man here who won't give up his life, so it seems to me, that the damn strikers and few others would give up something. They think they're suffering hardships. Bull. One day out here would change some of that. We don't get fresh meat, even three times a week. We get canned food—and fight on it. The very thought of the way some people in the States are acting burns me up. We should give those people to the damn Japs—and good riddance, I'd say.

"I'm willing to fight and, if necessary, die. But I'd like to know that I'd accomplished some object. We can't win without all-out effort at home. If I do get killed I'd like to know it wasn't in vain. So I say, damn the slackers and the sooner they're drafted and made to work the better.

"We had an incident out here that I'd like to tell the folks at home. We were in combat area. We hadn't had fresh food for weeks and the Japs raided us some. A ship came into the harbor with supplies. Well, the seamen on the ship (men from civilian life and union members) refused to work overtime unloading. They quit promptly after an 8-hour shift. Marines had to do the unloading. Marines worked all night—men who had slept in foxholes the night before—such sleep as they could get. Some of these men had seen the most terrible part of the fighting. And they made less than $100 per month. The seamen get much more, plus a juicy bonus for sailing into combat areas. If that's not a hell of a note, tell me what it is."

WE HATE THE JAPS

"Well, enough of this. I just wanted you to know a few of the things I'm thinking. Just remember this: I know the kind of family I have and I'll fight to the last to keep you safe. I'll do what little I can. All of these boys are the same way and we hate Japs.

"Tell Aunt Rosa I'll send her some Jap teeth if I can. That's the only thing good about them. We're all well and healthy.

"Lots of love,

"JAMES."

Lieutenant Nettles enlisted in the Navy in July 1941, at Atlanta, and was stationed at Pensacola before enlisting in the marines in the fall of 1942 at Miami, Fla., being stationed next at Quantico, Va., then at San Diego, Calif., before being sent overseas. He was commissioned while at Miami.

He is a graduate of the University of Alabama Law School, and practiced law in Butler and Linden. He is unmarried and is the son of J. M. Nettles, ex-lumberman of Butler and Linden. He is known as Jimmie. Two brothers-in-law are in the service. They are Capt. W. G. Little, Linden, who is in charge of medical supplies in Karachi, India, and M. F. George, club director of the American Red Cross, stationed in north Africa.

A sister, Miss Fabrice Nettles, is employed in Mobile.

I, Shirley George (Mrs. M. F. George), do hereby certify that the copy of letter hereto attached is a true and correct copy of the letter written by my brother, First Lt. James M. Nettles, Jr., Marine Air Corps (fighter pilot), in Guadalcanal, and received by his father on May 6, 1943.

SHIRLEY GEORGE.

Sworn to and signed before me this the 7th day of May 1943.

GENE THOMPSON,
Notary Public, Choctaw County, Ala.

The Food Problem

REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, an article in today's New York Times suggests

that Chester C. Davis, War Food Administrator, must be given the authority he needs if the food problem is to be brought under control. He has asked for control over food-price policies and food-rationing policies now lodged with the Secretary of Agriculture and the O. P. A. He has asked to be put on a level whereon he can settle his problems with the President directly instead of filtering them through the Office of Economic Stabilization. I agree that it is obvious that Mr. Davis cannot do the task assigned to him unless price and rationing policies are made in his office or in the office of a single administrator and that direct contact with the President is also essential.

The food situation is ominous. Under normal conditions the average per capita consumption of meat in this country was 131 pounds annually. Under rationing it is 104 pounds annually. Actual statistics showing the real consumption under rationing, quota, and zoning, is 87 pounds annually. In the Philadelphia area, our cupboard is bare, and our consumption does not even compare with the average minimum in the rest of the country. It is certainly true that under present policies, supplies will continue to diminish, not because of Army and Navy needs, but because of gross misadministration; black markets will increase and turbulence will arise in the seaboard States within a year unless the food problem is firmly coordinated and competently handled.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of June 22, 1943:

IN THE NATION—MR. C. C. DAVIS MAKES THE INEVITABLE DISCOVERY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 21.—On good authority, Mr. Bledsoe of this newspaper's Washington staff has reported to its readers that Chester C. Davis, War Food Administrator, plans to resign soon unless he is given essential authority to deal effectively with the serious food situation which he was directed to improve. Mr. Davis found—as so many other administrators and "czars" have found, and as it was freely predicted he would find—that he was given a paper sword to fight a dragon.

As always in the New Deal dispensation, the paper sword was tricked with gilt to make it appear strong and keen. As always, it revealed its flimsiness as soon as it was put in play. This has happened so often under the President as to justify the fear that the procedure is congenital and incurable.

When Mr. Davis was appointed as part of a diffused authority over food it was written in this space:

"How the great difficulties affecting food production and distribution can be overcome by setting up another subdepartmental agency with limited powers and many bosses was not explained today in the Executive order that put Chester C. Davis in charge of these matters in the Department of Agriculture. * * * What most men who are informed on the food situation have been calling for is a statutory administrator of Cabinet rank—but not the Secretary of Agriculture (Mr. Wickard)—sitting in a War Cabinet, with the President settling jurisdictional quarrels on the spot or before they arise. Neither in form nor in substance has this recommendation been followed."

SURPRISE AT ACCEPTANCE

Mr. Davis' appointment came at a time when Congress seemed bent on passing the Pace and Bankhead bills which would have pushed up the price cycle again, starting with agricultural products. It was taken as a device to dissuade Congress from taking that action, and, if that is true, it was temporarily successful. But general surprise was expressed that the Food Administrator, an able and sincere man who was deeply familiar with the problem placed in his hands, would consent to serve under so limiting a grant of authority. And some belief existed that he must have had with the President a private understanding that the conflicting powers of Secretary Wickard and the Office of Price Administration would soon be assigned to him.

This has not been done, however, and now Mr. Davis is reliably reported to be insisting that it must be if he is to remain at his post. He has asked for control over food-price policies and food-rationing policies, now lodged with the Secretary and the Office of Price Administration. And he has asked to be put on a level whereon he can settle his problems with the President directly instead of filtering them through the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

It is obvious that Mr. Davis cannot do the task assigned to him unless price and rationing policies are made in his office. Direct contact with the President is also essential, though doubtless the Food Administrator would be content to join the board of the Office of War Mobilization headed by Chairman James F. Byrnes if he could periodically deal with the President as a member of a war cabinet made up of that board and others.

The deft hands of Mr. Byrnes and of his official adviser, B. M. Baruch, are now reported to be engaged in working out a solution that will be satisfactory to Mr. Davis. His reputation is such that, unless this solution is one that will enable him to perform the task to which he has been assigned—if it merely produces another stick with which to beat the devil around a stump—Mr. Davis will have none of it. That remains to be seen, and it is less certain since the Food Administrator accepted responsibility in the first place on faulty terms which should have been as plain to him as they were to numerous observers.

SETTLEMENT BY COMPROMISE

Under Mr. Roosevelt solutions of difficulties such as this one nearly always disclose the same old devil being beaten around the same old stump, with some doubt as to which is the pursuer. That repetition was indicated at the President's last press conference when he discussed the plight of Mr. Davis. He said that to delegate to the Administrator complete powers over food would enable him, for example, to give vegetables priority over munitions in transportation. Since Mr. Davis has not and does not seek control of food transportation, or for power to allocate critical materials for the production of food, it seemed probable that the President was knocking down a straw man to divert attention from a very suspicious inhabitant of the woodpile. This induces the conclusion that he does not intend to police the woodpile, which is unfavorable to the kind of solution Mr. Davis has insisted on.

But events crowd the most determined of public men into courses they have long opposed, and events on the food front are ominous in fact and in prospect. Disinterested experts predict that supplies will continue to diminish, black markets will increase, and that turbulence will arise in the seaboard cities within a year, unless the food problem is firmly coordinated and ably dealt with. Mr. Davis, given the authority, can do both things.

The Reformers Get Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 27, 1943, issue of the Clarke County Democrat, published at Grove Hill, Ala.:

THE REFORMERS GET RESULTS

From Mobile comes reports of a clash between the races. Without knowing any of the causes leading to such a clash, we want to counsel moderation and cool-headedness on the part of our people, white and colored. There is no reason for, no excuse for, ill feeling or violence between the races in this country. A spirit of understanding and friendly cooperation has been built up here by patient and intelligent leadership on the part of both races. It would be little short of tragic if we should allow these relations to be upset by a hot-headed or foolish act by a member of either race.

It is extremely unfortunate that at a time of national stress, strain, and high tension, professional reformers and political opportunists should be making capital of the race situation in the South. However, the fact that they are dabbling in and helping to agitate and aggravate an already tense situation is all the more reason why southerners must keep cool and not allow these selfish factors and self-seeking individuals to disrupt the friendly and sympathetic relations which we have so painstakingly built up.

We, for one, look forward to the day when the political intermeddlers can be retired to the oblivion which they so richly deserve and we of the South—leaders of both the white and colored races—can take up without outside interference the solution of the many complex problems with which the races are confronted.

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a copy of a splendid, inspiring letter sent by Lt. J. R. McLean, Boston, Mass., a veteran of the battle of New Guinea, to his father, Frank C. McLean. This letter was carried in a prominent newspaper in Boston, Mass., and properly entitled "Soldier Finds God":

The Good Lord, when He made this jungle country and ordained that white men must fight in it, was not entirely merciless.

He realized that war is an unpleasant game and that the combination of long combat, punishing climate and barbaric living conditions could cause men to lose interest in life as a worth-while possession.

As a result, when the world seems sunken in hell; when humanity takes on the drab colors of a lost cause, and life doesn't seem worth "ha'penny" a dozen, He, in His quietly dramatic way, sets us back on our feet.

There have been days when disaster frolicked in our midst, food was scant and lacking in appeal, irritations in mass had beset our bodies, minds, and souls.

The world seemed black; hope and desire to meet the future had gone.

We were sorry creatures, viewing the end of the world.

Then, when hope, faith, and our hearts had deserted us, we would look up of an evening, look up and stand speechless, struck dumb by the beauty of the sky. All our past worries, frets, and fears would bleach before that blazing panorama that a jungle sunset often displays.

Colors in harmonious riot would chant soothing hymns into our souls. Slowly, timidly, and then strongly, smiles would ease the tension of our faces.

Our eyes would open before that heart-warming, God-painted sky; open, once again, and see the world as if for the first time as a glorious place in which to be.

Blood would flow again to the newly awakened heartbeat; life would return and straighten weary bodies; again we were ready to go on.

Then, His work done, God would dim His sign of hope and faith; slowly, so as not to shatter the illusion, He would lay His blanket of night over us and allow us to ponder in quiet His works.

At other times, we would labor and sweat all day in the searing sun, drive ourselves to further effort when human endurance had long been surpassed. Those flaying rays would crucify our flesh, melt our bones to liquid and leave us lying helpless in their wake. Our eyes would ache, our heads swim far above our bodies and our feet drag with the weight of death.

Toward the day's end we would shuffle to the river.

"This is our last day," we would think, "our strength is gone. We're licked."

Then the clear, cool waters of the stream, sent by Him above for our salvation, would shock the life back into our frames.

We'd lie lifeless in the current, feeling its healing fingers ripple over scorched skin.

In its luxurious coolness our melted bones would become firm again.

Our heads would shrink to normal and rejoin our bodies. Our eyes would relax and come out from the depths of our skulls.

Our minds, cooled, calmed, and rested miraculously in the stream, would again feel the joy of life and offer silent thanks for mercies granted.

It is moments like these that cause us to acknowledge that there is a kindly God, that religion has substance.

Contrary to accepted doctrines, it is not the moments of strife, fear, or despair that drive us on our knees to God.

When they are predominant we have no time to ponder over a spiritual being; our minds are too full of matters at hand.

We do not pray during long nights when enemy planes menace us overhead and enemy soldiers skulk just beyond reach in the black jungle.

Prayers are forgotten while we crouch in fox holes as the earth shudders under the hammering of high explosives.

It is not the whispering of flying shrapnel fragments that tells us there is an Almighty God.

No, none of these things makes us pray.

Rather, on clear nights when there's a hint of breeze, when nature smells pure and clean, when crickets, katydids, and frogs pour their choral concert into the dark, when stars wink, the moon smiles, and light, silvery clouds rest in the sky, when the illusion of peace surrounds us, we acknowledge a kindly, beneficent, and Almighty God.

You wanted to know if there were really "heathens in fox holes."

This is my answer, based on 7 months of uninterrupted experiences of life in its most elemental phase.

Absenteeism in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am presenting a very interesting comment on Absenteeism in Congress, written by Hon. W. D. Jamieson in his column The Window Seat, for June 23, 1943. Mr. Jamieson represented the Eighth Iowa District in the House of Representatives in the Sixty-first Congress, 1909 to 1911. He was an editor prior to his coming to Congress, and he has practiced law in Washington since completing his service in Congress. He has written The Window Seat for many years, and because of his splendid background and understanding of governmental affairs his special column, The Window Seat, has enjoyed an unusual distribution in the newspapers throughout the Nation. Mr. Jamieson is especially well qualified to portray accurately the functioning of Congress, and I know that Members of Congress will particularly be interested in reading what he has to say on the subject of congressional duties:

CONGRESS ABSENTEES

B. H. Shearer, who has the Gazette at Columbus Junction, Iowa, a paper each of us—my father, mother, and myself ran at different times—and who is one of the best country editors in that State, has an editorial squib in which he notes with amazement the number of House Members who are absent on roll calls. He says maybe I can tell something about it.

The fact is, Friend Shearer, voting in the House is only a small part of the almost unbearable work Congressmen have to do, and it isn't fair to accuse them of absenteeism because their names do not appear on all the roll calls.

They have heavy committee work, thousands of letters to answer, department matters without limit for their districts and States, people from home who come to see them on personal matters, bills to study, speeches, next election coming, and a thousand interruptions.

MANY LITTLE BILLS

Thousands of votes come up in the House that are of little consequence, and often Members are paired with other Members who would vote on certain matters the opposite way from them. Then many times they know in advance whether certain bills will pass or not if they are not present. On some important bills there is someone on the floor to notify them if their votes are needed.

I know from experience it is often hard to tell where a Member should be—voting on the floor or outside doing other work. Of course, a Member should never dodge.

Most Members put in long hours at hard work, many of them die from overwork, and the average of them are conscientious.

It's hard to be a good Congressman, but easy to criticize them.

CLEAN FELLOWS

Everyone I know is hard working, clean living, and takes his job seriously.

A Tribute to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Tribute to Russia", delivered by the distinguished and erudite senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] at Newark, N. J., on the 21st of this month, before a meeting under the auspices of the Russian War Relief, Inc., as a tribute to Russia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the evening of June 21, 1941, one can safely assume, somewhere in the rear of the 180 German divisions poised along the 1,800-mile Russian border, there was a conference between Herr Hitler and his most eminent generals. The Fuehrer probably said something like this:

"At 4 a. m. tomorrow you will strike at the Soviet Union while its people sleep. Move swiftly. Push the panzers through the Bolshevist ranks. Stop at nothing. In 3 weeks we will meet in Moscow."

Some such monolog as this undoubtedly occurred.

But on that same evening, by one of the sardonic quirks of which fate is capable at high moments in human destiny, the opera company of the Moscow Art Theater was presenting to a packed house Shakespeare's comedy, A Midsummer Night's Dream. Because the Russian people universally like Shakespeare and his salty commentaries on human foibles, the audience undoubtedly chuckled, as American and English audiences always do, when Puck cried:

"Lord, what fools these mortals be!"

By nightfall of the next day thousands of Russians had died before the onrushing Nazi legions, but it was not the Russians who had laughed with Shakespeare who were the fools. The fools were they who thought that in the Soviet Union they would find the weak leadership which undid France, the Quislings of Norway, the divisions within a people which had brought nation after nation to slavery.

For the Soviet people and their leaders have exhibited to an increasingly astonished world in the 2 years which have elapsed since that night such unity, such heroism, such willingness to die rather than surrender their freedom that the whole course of human destiny has been altered by it. None among us can say certainly what might now be the condition of Britain, China, and America had Hitler been right, and Puck

wrong. But I think there is not one of us who will not, if he but contemplates for a minute the awful probabilities had Russia fallen, thank God for the leadership and the fighting spirit of the Russian people.

America by her Lend-Lease Act, by opening with Britain the African campaign, by her many other aids, but above all by her decision to make the support of Russia a major, if not the major, war aim until Germany is beaten has displayed all the appreciation a friendly ally can. Above all the American people applaud the Russian women and the Russian youth who in their new-found freedom have added a new epoch of man's advancement to world history.

So it is appropriate for us today, as our Soviet allies enter with undiminished determination the third year of the struggle which Hitler expected to last only 3 weeks, to pay to them the public tribute which is the purpose of this meeting and scores like it being simultaneously held throughout the United States, in Canada, and in many other countries.

Some persons like to insist, with what seems to me to be a pointless synicism, that no thanks are due our Russian friends because, so the argument goes, the Russians are fighting in defense of their country not ours. To which I reply, "We Americans are fighting for our country not theirs." Of course, Russia is fighting for herself and America is fighting for herself, and so are the other United Nations, but whoever beats Hitler, the benefit goes to all. It is a fundamental of the concept of freedom and liberty that although they are gained for one, all profit. Freedom and liberty cannot be clutched selfishly by one. If it is, it is lost. It is with liberty as it is with love: The more you give, the more you get. Russia can't keep the victory to herself, neither can we. Our victory, like theirs, when it comes, is for the world.

Why bother with cynics? The American people pay tribute to Russian heroism and they are happy in doing it. We are not "thanking" them, although I think we properly and gracefully could. We are giving recognition to courage and sacrifice, to a great achievement made possible only by characteristics which we recognize as noble in an entire nation of 180,000,000 persons. It is in what we like to think of as "the American tradition" to give applause to the traits which the Soviet people have so abundantly evidenced in the last 24 months.

It is good for our own souls as well as for the morale of our allies to pay this tribute even if there were no other reason for doing so. But I think this Tribute to Russia Day has a greater utility than the achievement of either of these purposes.

Twenty-one years ago our boys of that generation began coming home from Europe after winning the war for democracy. We had won or could have exacted easily the unconditional surrender of Germany which today is again our immediate war goal. That we made some awful error in the days that followed is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that so short a time later we are again fighting the same enemy.

I think our public tribute to one of our allies today is an activity of a sort that can help to prevent a repetition of at least a part of our former grand error.

What was our error? I do not pretend to wisdom that would enable me to weigh infallibly all of the complex factors that went into the making of the last peace and the precipitation of the new war. But one thing I do know, had the Allies who defeated the Kaiser hung together after their victory and cooperated as friends, we would not now have Hitler to defeat. And, in that event, we probably would not be worried by Japan either.

The last 20 years prove the verse which the ancient Greek dramatist made his character wail, "Men unite for war and destruction but divide for peace and construction." If our allies are useful and beneficial in war, they can be made even more useful and beneficial in peace because there are actually more peace problems than war problems and much more can be done for the men, women, and children of the earth through peaceful activities than through war. The same amount of energy given to peaceful pursuits which we are now giving to the war would make the earth a paradise. Look what 20 years of peace has done for Russian youth and women! What a lesson for the people of the earth if they would but learn it!

So sure am I, and I think most men share my opinion now, that both the chance of winning a decisive victory in the war and that of insuring a just peace rest upon the establishment of a solid friendship, trust, and community of interest among the United Nations, that I rate efforts in that direction as equal to our drive for the production of arms and food.

It is for this reason that I feel the national tribute to Russia and the work of the organization which sponsors the tribute are exceedingly important.

Our Russian allies need our friendship, trust, and aid. We need theirs. A sound basis for this relationship is being laid in the war, but friendship and trust are tender plants. They need to be watered and cultivated. We know that our understanding, respect for, and liking of the Russians has grown greatly in the last 2 years. We know that we Americans are determined to fight the war to unconditional victory.

But how can a Russian John Jones know how we feel unless we tell him?

Our Russian allies count 10,000,000 dead during the 2 years of their war. Nearly 40,000,000 Russians have been driven from their homes by the invaders. They are actually face to face with famine. They are desperately short of clothing and fuel. Tens of thousands of them are struggling to keep their children and themselves alive in caves and dugouts and dreading the return of the 50°-below-zero weather next winter.

Although future historians may mark it down as one of the decisive battles of the world, our great African campaign was but a minor engagement when compared with the warfare being waged along the 1,800 miles of the Russian front where daily more and more of Russia's sons and fathers are slaughtered.

Is it not understandable that John Jones of Russia, the Russian worker and farmer who is so like ourselves, needs to be told and have it proved that the Yanks are coming?

I think it would be superhuman of our Russian allies not to require such assurance.

So today we and millions of other Americans are saying to the people of Russia:

"We, the inheritors of the tradition of the men who stayed with Washington through the cold and snow of Valley Forge, are committed to fight with you to the limit of our ability until Hitlerism is destroyed and the world freed from its outlaws.

"We admire, beyond our power to express our feelings, your courage and achievements in the last two years.

"We understand how greatly your indomitable fighting spirit has benefited us and our country.

"We pledge ourselves to produce, to fight, as hard as we can, until victory is won.

"And we are determined that after this war is over the unity which war has forged shall not be destroyed by the peace."

Our Russian allies have said all that they need to say with blood. We pledge them our friendship. If we execute our pledge in good faith, our world will be far advanced toward peace, justice, and the insurance of the rights and dignity of all mankind. Britain, Russia, China, and America allied in war, united in peace, can insure a new world. They with their associates in the United Nations have varied experiences, differing traditions—so much so, in fact, that in them may be found the great universals essential to world organization. The dream of a united world can be made to come true if we will but appreciate the sacrifices already put forth and which must be made yet before the terrible scourge now in the earth is put down. Those sacrifices must be made to bear fruit. Men and women must cease to die in vain. If it is simple to die for a purpose, it must be made simple to live for one. We are fighting to bring peace. Let's make it a real peace. I repeat the words of our President, "The war must be won and it must stay won." The Russian people can contribute to that as they are contributing to the war. Let's make friendship work.

Address of Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, at Touchdown Club Luncheon

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] at the Touchdown Club luncheon on June 22, 1943, at Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sports have become part of the American way of life, and unless in some particular case they affect the war effort adversely, they should continue. Elmer Layden, prior to the recent meeting of professional football, stated that since football makes a definite contribution in peacetime, there is no reason why it can't make the same kind of a contribution during the war. That same reasoning applies to baseball as well as other sports. Both of these sports furnish recreation and relaxation for thousands of war workers and service men and women. Two baseball teams or football teams, with squads of about 50 men entertain crowds of 50,000 in the stands and thousands more over the air waves.

The same reasoning applies to the other popular sports. Both from the spectators and the competitors standpoint, they are an integral part of our war effort.

Our servicemen recruited from the sports world maintain an active interest in their own specialties while in the service. The National Amateur Athletic Union track and field championships held this past week end in New York had the largest entry of servicemen in the 55 years of its existence, with representatives from 32 service posts participating. Most of those men were on furlough.

The men who have stepped from the sports field to the armed forces are legion, and they took with them the physical prowess, the initiative, and the leadership which competitive sports inculcate in the athlete. Some of those men have already paid the supreme sacrifice. The whole Nation mourned the loss of Niles Kimmick, honored but a short time ago by this group for his outstanding ability.

Competitive sports produce the heroes whom our American boys emulate. Thousands of embryo Sammy Baughs, Tommy Harmons, Babe Ruths, and Walter Johnsons, are to be found in the country today. These boys are our leaders of tomorrow. The freckle-faced kid of yesterday who went through 4 years of practice with the high-school squad, is a leader of men today on the field of battle.

Maj. Gen. Francis B. Wilby, Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point, denied last week that there is a movement on foot to stop athletics at West Point. He said that the authorities at the Academy feel that competitive athletics is one of the finest things in the training of a soldier; and that the training and morale of the whole cadet corps will suffer if that is omitted.

Both the Army and Navy recognize this need for an athletic program which will provide continuous sports activities for all the men, to keep them physically fit and to give them wholesome, healthy activities in their leisure time. A well-rounded sports program helps make a good soldier. Athletic equipment is a "must" for our armed forces both at home and abroad.

We can perform a vital function on the home front in fostering athletic programs for our youth, and spectator sports for the recreation of our war workers and servicemen on furlough.

Our concept of morale is far different from the Nazi approach. Himmler has stated that "enforced discipline and intimidation is the best means of preserving civilian morale during the war." Our morale is based on intelligent understanding and wholehearted cooperation.

Morale is a rather general term and has as many definitions as there are people who define it. One of the definitions which seems to sum up the subject is that morale is a spiritual condition—it is more than physical condition; it is more than mental condition.

It is something greater than these two put together, and yet it grows from both of them. Morale is an important element in warfare—on the battle front and on the home front—it is a connecting link between those two fronts. The greatest armament output is worthless unless complemented by a fighting force which will brook no interference, backed up by a loyal citizenry at home fired by a fierce determination to let no sacrifice be too great if it will help the men on the fighting front.

In addition to the morale features of the spectator sports, sports events of all kinds have stimulated the sales of War bonds and have raised funds for the Army and Navy relief societies and Red Cross activities. Baseball has just made a notable contribution of this respect. The War Bond Baseball League, started in New York 2 weeks ago, promises to account for War bond sales totaling $500,000,000 before the end of the season.

One of the greatest sports spectacles in normal times is the annual Army-Navy football game. Last year the authorities saw fit to deemphasize this service event by staging it at Annapolis, where only a small crowd could view the event. I can think of many reasons for restoring this event to a large stadium, where it can provide wholesome entertainment for thousands of civilian war workers and servicemen. It will prove a source of revenue for our service institutions in the financing of their much-needed athletic activities. It can be localized to eliminate strain on our transportation agencies. The men on our far-flung battle lines are eager for broadcasts of sports events from home. They thrill to the breathless accounts of a tight world series struggle or a desperate last-minute aerial attack on the grid-iron. Sports should continue so long as they help and not impede the war effort.

The Alabama Incident—Long-Haired Washington Theorists Reap What They Sow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the May 28, 1943, issue of the Mobile Labor Journal, Mobile, Ala.:

THE ALABAMA INCIDENT—LONG-HAIRED WASHINGTON THEORISTS REAP WHAT THEY SOW

(By Stanton Dann)

The regrettable incident at Alabama is significant.

Theory cannot thrust aside a cold fact.

Philosophies imposed upon communities in the holy name of the war effort are setting back the cause of minority groups many years. The professional "do-wellers" of this country would be well advised if they let practical, responsible labor leadership apply their practical methods to a subject loaded with dynamite.

The imposition of the doctrine of social equality is a thing that the thinking Negro leader does not want. If he would advance the cause of his people he would and does apply himself to the economic field with the idea in mind that he raise the economic standing of his people within their own group. The American Federation of Labor has long recognized the right of men to earn equal pay for equal work—to obtain better housing facilities irrespective of color or creed and generally that the problem of minority groups is one that needs fair and honest approach based upon experience.

As a practical proposition we all know that social equality is simply a phrase. Do you feel that it is your responsibility to invite everyone to your home? Are you offended if others preserve to themselves the right to choose who shall or shall not be their associates? Certainly not—the problem is that simple.

This Government cannot by edict over night change a condition of fact based upon human emotions. The exploiters of those who toil have deliberately, in times past, capitalized on the illiterate and blind animosity of the white man toward the negro and vice versa. That spirit of animosity has been built up over generations. It cannot be changed over night.

Liberal and progressive southerners are trying—by the process of evolution—to bring about an honest evaluation of the colored workers contribution to the progress of this section of the country and the Nation as a whole. They feel that that effort and contribution should be rewarded. The problem will never be solved on the basis of compulsion. Those who believe otherwise are needling the citizens of the South and in truth are hurting the cause of the Negro to a greater extent than do all those who exploit the Negro, or any minority group.

The matter or incident might be justified if there were a shortage of jobs here in Mobile but the cold fact is that—

There are thousands of jobs here for competent and capable Negro workers. These jobs are available and do not come in conflict with established union contracts or customary working arrangements. The employment on these jobs available would not and could not open old sores nor would they deliberately create friction between workers on the basis of color distinction. The whole incident in the face of this fact was so silly that it questions the intelligence of those who would deliberately create a race issue in a vital war connected center.

I seriously doubt that the professional do-wellers are sincere in their protestations—if they were they would be in part guided by those who live here and are intimate with the problem and not try to cram their half-baked ideas down the throats of our southern citizenry.

At all events cool heads are needed now and true leadership is needed from both white and colored if we are to work in unity to prosecute the big battle of beating off Hitler and Tojo. Let's for God's sake get the big job done and then work on a common sense basis to better the lot of the Negro. Too many philosophies are being imposed upon America's citizens in the name of the war effort. It's time to call a halt.

Post-War Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on Friday last the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made one of the ablest speeches I have heard in my time. He was dealing with the realities of America's post-war relationship. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorials commenting upon the able address delivered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 19, 1943]

REALISTIC APPROACH TO PEACE

Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, has suggested a "fruitful" approach to peace for this country. His plan differs from others which have been advanced because it frankly and realistically declares that the United States should be prepared to state its own needs when peace is made. He places emphasis on what the United States is to get out of this war. The emphasis in other peace proposals has been upon what this country is to contribute to the rest of the world.

In one respect, however, the Lodge approach to peace is on all fours with other plans. He puts permanent security against war—the adoption of a workable plan to assure peace—first on the list of this country's needs. Without some instrumentality to maintain peace, once the war ends, there can be no assurance that any of the needs of any of the United Nations will be filled.

The Massachusetts Senator, quoting from the experts who have looked into the situation, showed in detail that essential minerals are fast being used up in this war—among them lead, copper, iron, and petroleum. The Nation, he said, will have to import these and other necessary materials after the war. The country will not be self-sufficient, as many have believed in the past. It will be necessary, therefore, that steps be taken to assure

the United States proper supplies—which will no longer be available within its own territorial limits.

Further, among the needs listed by Senator LODGE, are means of using the huge merchant marine which is now built and building, the proper participation of this country in the great field of commercial aviation which is expected after the war, and the use of all kinds of international communication services.

Frankly, Senator LODGE does not have too much faith in what he calls the "cosmic" or "transcendental" approach to peace. It has its place. But in a realistic world in which our allies, Great Britain and Russia, both know what they hope to get out of this war, it would be folly for the United States not to be prepared to say at the proper time what it will require in a material way. During and after the last war, it was repeated many times that the United States wanted nothing out of the war—except to make the world safe for democracy and the maintenance of peace. The United States got nothing out of the last war. Not even a long-maintained peace.

To the idealists, Senator LODGE'S demands for a realistic approach to peace may come as a shock. And, indeed, should the United States proclaim today what it intended to demand at the peace table, the effect might easily be to encourage other nations to make even larger demands than they intend to make and to focus attention on conflicting aims at a time when the whole effort should be the winning of the war. However, it should not be amiss for the United States to give due consideration to its needs when peace is made and to be prepared to make such demands as may be necessary.

It was the contention of Senator LODGE that a more definite and realistic program—or the proposal of such a program—would go further toward uniting the American people than a more idealistic and altruistic program, in which this country is visualized as an international Santa Claus. It may be that he is right. Certainly there is far less agreement in this country that Uncle Sam is to assume a Santa Claus role once the war is over than there is beyond American borders.

[From the Boston Post of June 19, 1943]

LODGE'S PEACE POINTS

Senator LODGE'S statement outlining some of the material things the United States should insist upon in a peace settlement will at least have an appeal to the large element in the community who realize that we shall face some very practically minded gentlemen among our allies at the peace table. These men will allow our world brotherly love dreamers talk to their hearts' content, but the realistic fellows will take home the bacon as they did at Versailles after the last war.

Senator LODGE says we are becoming a Nation of "have nots" by the dissipation of vital natural resources in the war and that we should insist upon access for our fair share of these. Also that we should have equality with other nations in communications services, radio for example; free competition in international aviation, a matter which is sure to be of immense importance after the war; a "real chance" for our merchant marine in a world which will have an enormous oversupply of ships; and, surely as important as all else, military bases to guard the approaches to our shores.

Britain, the Senator says, has already announced that the British Empire will be maintained intact, and Russia has given the world notice of her intentions about several of the small countries adjacent to her borders that were taken away from her after the last war.

Whether it is necessary or expedient to go into much detail about our aims now, with the possibility of creating a rift in allied unity, is a question. But there have been so many proposals set forth by visionary enthusiasts about our need to play Santa Claus to restore the post-war world that Senator LODGE'S recommendation to keep an eye on some of these material factors is not untimely.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 19, 1943]

MINERALS AND GOOD WINDS

Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, has projected the interesting question whether the United States could, even if it most ardently wished to, return to a pre-war type of isolationism. His discerning correspondence with Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, confirms his opinion that the war, with its immense drains on American resources may very likely leave the United States in the position of a "have not" Nation insofar as several strategic minerals are concerned.

Of course, as Profs. C. K. Leith, Dr. Cleona Lewis, and J. W. Furness recently pointed out in their Brookings Institution study World Minerals and World Peace, all nations, without exception, are interdependent in one degree or another for mineral supplies; but Senator LODGE carries the thesis into practical perspective, asking what shall the picture be in the immediate post-war period when the foreseeable exhaustion of some vital American resources will make active trade, if not world exploration and development, mandatory? What, then, shall be the American foreign policy?

It is true that minerals are the keystone upon which rests industrial power. And it is true that the headlines daily tell us this is an industrial war. But the Axis' claim that war became inevitable because they were denied sufficient mineral imports does not bear analysis.

Looking back, it is clear that in the 10 years before the war any nation or individual having exportable surpluses of minerals was only too glad to find a foreign market. The profit motive took care of that. Prewar criticism of American shipments of the sinews of war to Japan, Italy, and elsewhere bear evidence to what happened.

The shortage, as the Brookings report makes clear (and Senator LODGE does not), really resulted because many have-not nations lacked foreign exchange. Moreover, once they had determined on war as the method for adjusting their deficiencies, their needs for minerals became inordinate and could only be filled by thrusting domestic and external economy further awry.

What the Axis countries really needed, indeed what all nations needed and will continue to need for peacefully expanded living, is an easy exchange of one another's goods. And that was what the United States and others by trade restrictions and isolationism, partly denied their neighbors.

America could sustain such an awkward economy because it required few strategic imports and had plenty of money with which to buy what it did need. But if in this leaner post-war world that Senator LODGE sees, the United States should acutely need oil, copper, bauxite, and other essential and industry-dominating minerals, a less complacent and considerably more realistic approach to the problems of international trade might easily result.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of June 19, 1943]

SENATOR LODGE'S WARNING

While America races headlong toward what could prove to be a Pyrrhic victory, a remonstrating voice is raised in the Halls of the United States Senate by HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, who appeals to his Government for an immediate and forthright definition of post-war plans and an inventory of our resources and stores of vital raw materials.

Idealists who are shouting about one world and the amalgamation of all nations into one society after the war have made no impression upon the intelligence of the Massachusetts statesman, whose theories on the adjustment era are not warped by international enthusiasms of the moment.

Senator LODGE bluntly told his colleagues that our allies, England and Russia, have definite admitted ambitions—England with the preservation of her empire in toto and Russia with territorial enlargement in eastern Europe. Meanwhile, America, the arsenal and bread box of the democracies, purrs contentedly in response to the soothing attention of other nations, but failing the while to plan practically for the future in the light of expectant needs, needs that will grow out of the war. Commenting upon this smug self-satisfaction which is leading America into the category of "have-not" nations, he says:

"It has become plain as day and it is common sense to recognize that our British and Russian allies are not only dedicated to the broad purpose of crushing nazi-ism and fascism, but that they have a number of very definite and very practical national aims which have been frankly revealed to the world. These great nations are not only committed to defeat of the common enemy and to cooperation for peace thereafter; one of them—Britain—frankly intends to maintain the Empire and the other one—Russia—has clear intentions regarding eastern Europe.

"We in the United States, on the other hand, are committed to speedy victory and to effective measures to preserve peace thereafter. But in the field of definite and practical aims there seems to be a vacuum. Why this vacuum exists, I cannot say. But I do suggest that it is not because there is any lack of matters lying outside our borders in which we have a vital interest. And I further submit that the clear statement of these aims is not only in our own interest, but that it is also a frank act to which our allies and our own people are entitled and an essential step—nay, the most fruitful approach—toward discharging the overshadowing obligation of effective post-war collaboration."

Production, production, and more production. That is the very proper philosophy of wartime America, and that is one of the vital reasons for the Senator's appeal on behalf of post-war planning in the interest of America—beyond the national borders.

America's great wealth of natural resources, heretofore considered to be without limit, are being tapped so heavily and so speedily—for the benefit of all the United Nations as well as for our own war effort—that serious thought must be given to our natural riches of tomorrow.

Thus, as the Senator said:

"It will come as a surprise to many Americans to be told that we are actually facing the prospect of an America materially depleted of some of its magnificent natural resources. The great demands of our own fighting forces and those of our allies have cut deeply into our reserves of vital, basic materials. We are not in the habit of regarding the United States as a 'have not' Nation—and now is the time to think of steps to avert such a catastrophe."

There is ample documentary evidence to substantiate the Senator's remarks, not the least of which are letters addressed to him by the Director of the Bureau of Mines in which the possible depletion of natural stores of minerals and even of petroleum is forebodingly mentioned.

The future of our domestic economy is being jeopardized, yet the administration is too engaged to do anything about it. It may even be too engaged or too stubborn to heed Senator LODGE'S warning.

The Senator calls for a sharply defined declaration of "beyond the border" relations after the war, pooh-poohing the cosmic approach theory which has found so much favor with the professors in Washington. He says:

"Mr. President, I have very little faith in what I call the cosmic or transcendental approach to the question of American foreign relations. I cannot see why it is necessary to treat the relations between peoples of different nationalities on a highly theoretical, political, and emotional basis when the relations between peoples of the same nationality are not treated that way. True, the airplane has changed commerce and revolutionized military science; it has not, however, automatically created a universal state of brotherly love."

Summarized, this clarion call to the people of the United States urges them to wake up before it is too late; by inference, it charges our Government with having lost sight of the necessity for safeguarding American economy in the post-war era.

Without name calling or any other display of viciousness toward our allies, it tells plainly and simply of their far-reaching plans after hostilities have ended. It scoffs at ethereal thinkers who speak in terms of a cosmic society, and it issues a warning to America that unless positive arrangements are made now for beyond-the-border dealings, the depletion of our natural resources may leave us high and dry—prey in later years for new and stronger aggressors that may come over the horizon.

This is one of the most convincing commentaries that has originated in Washington since the war began, and the American people owe Senator LODGE a debt of gratitude for speaking in defense of America of the future and coming generations of Americans.

Let's forget "globaloney" and do some progressive, practical thinking.

Post-War Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a thoughtful article entitled "American Planners Study Freedom From Want" by Msgr. John O'Grady, appearing in the magazine America, May 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sir William Beveridge's Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services in England has aroused widespread interest in social insurance in this country. Many people are saying that what America needs is a similar document based on conditions in the United States.

In this connection, it should be noted that social insurance has long been regarded as a method of providing a certain minimum of protection against such hazards as accidents, sickness, invalidity, unemployment, and old age. After all, as Sir William points out in his report, "in three-fourths to five-sixths of the cases studied * * * want is due to interruption or loss of earning power." During the past 40 to 45 years, Great Britain has made great progress in protecting its people against the hazards that cut off their earning power. The problem now is to improve the methods of protection.

For more than 30 years, in this country, the various States have been developing workmen's compensation. This does give a certain amount of protection against industrial accidents to some 40 percent of our wage earners. But due to a lack of interest in some States, workmen's compensation has failed to reach the expectations of those who promoted it. It is limited in the number of workers covered; in many places the concept of industrial accident is too narrow; occupational diseases are frequently excluded; most of the State laws are voluntary.

The Social Security Act of 1935 laid a foundation for a more extensive social-insurance program in the United States. It gave us a national system of old-age and survivors insurance; it gave us a Federal-State system of unemployment compensation; it provided grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance for the aged and for the care of dependent children in their own homes and the homes of relatives, up to the second degree of kindred.

Social insurance, therefore, is not a new venture for us. We have not gone as far as the British, but we have made a substantial beginning. We now need to study our present programs in the light of possible future developments. Nobody is fully satisfied with our present system of old-age and survivors insurance; it should have a wider coverage. Nor are people satisfied with the scale of benefits provided by unemployment compensation in most States; they want better standards.

When the Social Security Act was being debated, there was question of extending old-age and survivors insurance to cover invalidism. As it stands, it covers only persons of 65 years and over. How about the large number of persons who become disabled before they reach that age? How about those whose incomes have been cut off by temporary disability due to sickness? Is not this just as important as unemployment? Should there not be some method of providing insurance against it?

After the people of the United States had been studying the Beveridge report for a few weeks, the President took from the drawer of his desk a report on security, work, and relief policies made by the National Resources Planning Board and sent to the White House under date of December 4, 1941. With this, the President sent to Congress a report on post-war planning and program, made by the same Board under date of December 16, 1942. The latter report contains only a very brief résumé on social security, written by Eveline Burns, who served as Director of Research on the technical staff of the Board making the original report on security, work, and relief policies. This earlier report, based on a study made over a period of about 3 years, bears many of the earmarks of depression psychology. We were still in the midst of the depression when the report was made. It emphasized grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance; pointed out that all employable persons have a right to work; and urged the extension of existing social-security benefits, including unemployment compensation and old-age and survivors insurance.

The National Resources Planning Board's report is highly academic; it brings together a great volume of material—weighing over 5 pounds—in regard to programs that directly or indirectly are concerned with the relief of human needs. On the whole, it stands out in striking contrast to the Beveridge report, which is clear-cut and concise, and which looks ahead to a society in which all workers, including the self-employed, would be given, as a matter of right, a certain minimum of protection against all the hazards of life.

The reports of the National Resources Planning Board must not be confused with the program that is being developed by the Federal Social Security Board. During the past year the Security Board has been studying ways and means of improving and extending the existing systems of social insurance in this country; it has also been considering the possibility of adding new forms of insurance for hazards not yet covered.

One of the problems to which the Social Security Board has given much attention is the extension of coverage of old-age and survivors' insurance to self-employed persons, agricultural workers, and employees of religious, educational, and charitable organizations. There is no good reason why all these groups should not have the benefits of protection against want in their old age. Ordinary wage earners do not look to old-age assistance with any feeling of security; they still regard it as a form of relief; they prefer a form of protection which they have earned and which is theirs on the basis of right.

In the extension of old-age and survivors insurance to additional groups, there would arise some problems. Many religious, educational, and charitable agencies have questioned the desirability of their inclusion under a plan that is clearly revenue in character. If we had followed the British plan of having the contributions from employers and employees paid into an insurance fund entirely separate from revenue, this question would not have come up. There was a historic reason, however, for making the contribution really a tax; it was doubtful whether the courts would permit the Government to exact a contribution for social insurance. This difficulty has since been removed by the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases involving the constitutionality of the Social Security Act (*Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis; Guy T. Helvering and William M. Welch, The Edison Electric Illuminating Co.* v. *George P. Davis*).

For some time before the act was passed there was a division of opinion as to whether we should have a Federal system of unemployment compensation or a Federal-State system. Since the law went into effect, in February 1938, a great many questions have arisen in regard to the Federal-State system. For instance, some 40 States have what is known as merit rating. If employers have a favorable employment experience during a previous year, the tax can be reduced to almost zero.

There is now a good deal of competition among the States with regard to tax reductions for unemployment compensation benefits. If this competition keeps up, there is a probability that the funds may not be adequate at some time for a crisis.

Unemployment should be considered a national industrial problem. As the late Justice Cardozo of the United States Supreme Court wrote in the case of *Helvering and Welch, The Edison Electric Illuminating Co.* v. *Davis:* "Unemployment spreads from State to State" (No. 910, October term, 1936); and again in *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis:* "The problem of unemployment had become national in area and dimensions" (No. 837, October term, 1936). During the depression we had to deal with it as a national problem through a national work program. Any plans or policies that Government makes for handling such a problem in the future should be national in scope. It may be asked

therefore, why should our unemployment compensation system be a State system?

In appraising unemployment compensation we must not think of it as a means of taking care of those out of work for an indefinite period; it is essentially a method of taking care of temporary unemployment; it is designed to keep the members of the industrial army, as long as they are able and willing to work, in proper condition. There should be some methods of taking care of those out of work for long, indefinite periods, but unemployment compensation is not the answer.

The only sensible method of taking care of those unemployed for long periods of time seems to be through a work program. In planning a work program we should not merely think of public works; we should explore very carefully the experience we have gained during the war in governmental aid to private industry. We now have a combination between industry and Government that might be far more useful than any public-works program in providing employment opportunities. Our experience between 1933 and 1935 showed clearly that no large-scale public-works program will create the number of jobs necessary in a depression; it must be a flexible public-works program like the Work Projects Administration.

One of the greatest mistakes we have made in unemployment compensation is in relating it too closely to the worker's earnings. This has made for a very complicated system that workers do not understand. It probably would not be practicable for us to have a flat benefit system like Great Britain, but we could have at least flat benefits for workers in certain wage groups. We do have this now in legislation covering railroad workers (Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act). Moreover, when people have a right to benefits under unemployment compensation, those benefits should be given for a uniform duration. A number of States now have a uniform duration in benefit provisions.

Extending old-age and survivors insurance to cover invalidity would involve, first of all, a definition of permanent disability. If we have a rigid definition, it would mean an addition of 0.5 percent to the pay-roll tax; if a liberal definition, it would mean an addition of 1.5 percent. To extend the Social Security Act to include temporary disability and costs for sickness would call for a new section in the act. A cash benefit for temporary disability would mean an addition of 1 percent to the pay-roll tax. Costs of hospital care, if included, would mean another 1 percent; the inclusion of medical care would call for a 2 percent addition to the pay-roll tax. The whole extension program, as it has been considered up to date by the Social Security Board, would call for a pay-roll tax of 12 percent, to be divided equally between employers and employees.

In providing social insurance for temporary disability, we should be confronted by many highly debatable questions. There is the cost of hospital service. Will the Government be willing to pay the full cost, or will it pay only a mere pittance, as has been the case so frequently in workmen's compensation? Then, too, the medical profession objects to what it calls socialized medicine. The objection of the doctors, however, might not preclude the payment of a cash benefit.

In discussing protection of workers against industrial hazards, we shall naturally emphasize benefits based on rights, benefits that grow out of the wage system. We shall naturally want to look toward the objective that Sir William Beveridge set before himself in his report, namely, a system of social insurance that gives the workers a certain minimum of protection against all the economic hazards of life.

We shall think of these in terms of minimum benefits; we shall want to leave a wide area for private social service. We know that what the Beveridge report contemplates, namely, the provision of a minimum amount of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, will still leave a large field of needs to be provided by private agencies. We shall want to see private agencies associate themselves with the administration of social insurance; we shall want them to supplement it; we shall want them to cover the problems to which it has not been extended. And we shall only be taking a realistic approach when we say that the field left over will still be too great for even the best efforts of private agencies, and that there will therefore be need for a well-organized public-assistance program. But we shall look forward to a diminishing need for a public-assistance program as social insurance expands.

For the ordinary wage earner, social insurance provides a form of protection for which he has paid; it is his own; it is really a continuation of his wages. It does not give the State any control over him; it does not empower the State to investigate his family situation, to tell him how he should live or how he should bring up his children. Social insurance is entirely different, therefore, from public assistance or relief administered by State or Federal Government.

Since we are basically interested in protecting the ordinary wage-earner against the hazards of life that reduce him to poverty, we should therefore be interested in the possibilities of extension of social insurance. We shall want to consider these in an objective way. It is to be hoped that we shall not be guided by any mere shibboleths in discussing these programs; that we shall not be led astray by leaders who regard these programs as visionary. The same people have always regarded efforts to lift up the masses as visionary. It is to be hoped that we shall discuss these programs in our study clubs, at the meetings of our various organizations; that we shall consider their significance for us; that we shall study them in the light of our Christian teaching, in the light of the social doctrine of our church.

World State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "World State," written by S. W. Bryant, of Clay, W. Va.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD STATE

We have world wars, why not a world state?

I may be bold, but please do not consider me a crackpot if I try to sell all the oceans, belonging to no one, no man's land, to a government that does not exist. This can and should be done, though no one in official position in any of the principal states can now afford to advocate such action.

If someone has something big to develop, a big corporation is organized to take it over.

An international government, or world state, supreme and self-sufficient, external from the internal affairs of all other states, should be organized to assume dominion of all the open waters of the world.

This world state would be formed just as our Federal Government was organized by the Original Colonies, and would grow and develop just as our National Government has grown and developed.

The first step in the organization would perhaps be taken at the peace conference and a constitution be provided and submitted for ratification. The constitution would provide a basis of representation, perhaps providing that in the final distribution, representation should be apportioned about one-third to each—the American Continent, Europe, and Asia; and that no less than 10 percent be allotted to each—England, Russia, China, and the United States—in the final distribution of representation; that each of said four states have equal representation until further allotment; and that the world state be effective after ratification by these four states.

At present certain amenities are recognized, but there is no law of the seas, but the world state would make such laws, and police the waters of the world. The world state would be a buffer state separating the masses of the world. The world state would outlaw submarines except for their use in policing the waters, taking over all such craft as exist for such purposes. It would maintain an army and navy for police work.

Japan has never cared much for the freedom of the seas, which they enjoyed, and has long had the idea of making the Pacific Ocean their lake.

"There is nothing free," Emerson said, "have what you will, pay for it, and take it." We drove the pirates from the seas in our early history as a part of our contribution to the freedom of the seas.

Hitler, to justify wars of conquest, in his book, cited examples to show that all governments in their inception were usurpers, but to gain dominion of the seas after this war is over, will require no conquest, but just the assertion of dominion. There will be no one to oppose. This will be an unselfish and benevolent usurpation, and the best security for ourselves and all others against recurrent wars. It will isolate local wars. Nations must learn to trust and to cooperate or continue in recurrent wars.

FINANCE

The world state can finance itself by the sale of license flags, just as our State sells license plates for automobiles. Our roads have no toll gates, but those who use the roads and those who get goods transported over the roads pay. Nothing is free. The Japs have long had the advantage in water transportation by reason of their slave or pauper labor and disregard for the health and life of their mariners.

This advantage will, in a measure, be removed by a tax on water transportation. A toll, or tax, or restriction on maritime commerce will not be a subsidy to the railroads because water transportation, where it can be had, will still be the cheaper, but if in instances business be thrown to the railroads, it will help keep down rates.

Such a tax will in a measure afford protection to domestic industries. It will regulate international commerce.

The world state should have a court to hear and adjudicate controversies and a currency system. Its money will be the money of commerce and exchange. The world state will stabilize post-war conditions.

S. W. BRYANT,
Clay, W. Va.

Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on Sunday I clipped from the Washington Star a very interesting article descriptive of General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. The article, which is entitled "The Achievement of General Marshall," was written by Mr. Owen L. Scott. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF GENERAL MARSHALL

(By Owen L. Scott)

The new American Army now is proving itself in action on every count. Its infantry, artillery, and armored forces showed themselves superior in Africa to the best the Germans possess. Its leadership outsmarted Hitler's best generals. Its air forces now are crashing through with proof of the wisdom of the concept of daylight precision bombing as the key to successful use of the bomber as an offensive weapon.

American tanks are credited by the British with turning the tide in Africa. American artillery weapons stood up with the best. American fighter planes, which were much criticized early in the war, ran up a score of better than two to one against the Germans. American bombers all along have been in a class by themselves.

All of this is the basis of very much satisfaction to Gen. George C. Marshall, United States Chief of Staff. The reason is that General Marshall set out 3 years ago, starting from scratch, to build an American Army and his has been the primary responsibility for that building ever since. In that time he has seen created what probably is as powerful a military force as there is in the world. It is on the basis of experience that the decisions made by General Marshall, in the face of great pressure, now can be seen to have been very wise.

One of the first decisions was to give full recognition to the air forces. He accepted Gen. H. H. Arnold on a par in rank with himself. He agreed to allot nearly one-third of the Army's personnel to the air forces. He allowed air officers to give full play to their idea of how an air war should be fought. When there was much effort to force the American air forces to give up their idea of daylight use of bombers, operating as a separate offensive arm, and capable of fighting their way to a target for precision bombing, General Marshall refused to listen.

In another decision, General Marshall, despite strong pressure in Congress, refused to give undue emphasis to the armored forces in building a ground Army. Experience now shows that the tank is far less of a decisive weapon than it had appeared to be in France. The infantry and artillery are back in their old roles and the American Army is well balanced in all of its arms.

When it came to selecting a general to lead American forces in their offensive operations, General Marshall jumped over the heads of very many generals and chose a man who not long before had been a lieutenant colonel. His choice of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was much questioned at the time, but it is no longer. Having selected General Eisenhower, General Marshall backed him in some tight situations with the full force of a very strong personality.

In Africa, French politics became a problem for the American general who was no politician. He made his decisions on military grounds and General Marshall backed him to the limit. In Africa, too, it was almost logical that a British general should hold the top command after British forces had chased the Germans half way across the continent. General Marshall thought otherwise and now the British join in praising General Eisenhower as a genius in modern warfare.

There all along has been a natural British thought that London rather than Washington should be the staff headquarters for Allied forces. On many occasions there have been rumors that General Marshall would become the generalissimo of the British and American Armies and would have headquarters in Great Britain. It may be that the American general will later be given an increase in rank and responsibility, although he asked for none, but it is quite certain that headquarters will remain in Washington. It is here that the over-all war planning is done.

In another field of controversy, that of a division of forces between the Pacific and the Atlantic war theaters, General Marshall has insisted all along that one of those wars had to be a holding operation while forces were gathered to deliver a knockout punch in the other. The knockout could not come from dispersed forces. When the Roosevelt-Churchill decision was to treat Hitler as enemy No. 1 then the division of American military strength was on a basis designed to stop the Japanese and to punish them, but to concentrate on a blow at Germany and Italy. That blow is beginning to be delivered.

At the same time the American people have reason to be pleased with General Marshall on another count. The reason is that the General is a man who is willing to change his mind. At the time when it appeared that Russia might not be able to stand successfully against Germany the United States made plans for an army of 15,000,000 men. However, when the situation changed as a result of Russian successes General Marshall was quick to agree that a force not much more than half that size would be adequate, with one-third of the smaller army devoted to the air forces.

Every sign is that this country is fortunate in having General Marshall as its Chief of Staff in wartime. He is a military leader who harbors no political ambitions and who does not seek the limelight. His ability and stature are such that it is easy for commanders of the Allied armies to turn to him for leadership. And through it all the people of this country can know that General Marshall will plan to win this war with a minimum of casualties.

Thomas Jefferson Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address made by Ambrose O'Connell, executive vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at a Thomas Jefferson dinner held on Monday evening, June 21, 1943, at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, under the auspices of the Democratic National Committee and the Democratic State Committee of New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee recently offered the recommendation that all political hostilities be deferred in favor of a unified program of concentration on the more vital hostilities of the war.

The chairman of the Republican National Committee rejected the proposal; and in rejecting it took advantage of an opportunity to publicly launch his campaign of 1944.

In launching the campaign at this time and under these circumstances, the opposition brought into sharp focus the significant contrast in the present attitude of the two major political parties in connection with the next election.

The Democratic Party looks upon the election as a chance to win the war.

The Republican Party looks upon the war as a chance to win the election.

By making the election, rather than the war, their first objective, by deciding for themselves not to let a thing like our world-wide war distract them from the eternal business of politics, the Republicans have sought to gain a special advantage for themselves.

Armed with this program, the opposition has expanded into a frenzy of wordy criticism and has paraded its seeming success in the last election with a minimum of modesty and a maximum of self-exploitation.

The Democratic Party stands by its own sound suggestion of a late and short campaign. It refuses to be lured into a politics-as-usual diversion. This does not mean, however, that we are idle. Idleness doesn't win battles, campaigns, or elections.

The Democratic National Committee is preparing for use in the next campaign a record of the accomplishments of the administration, a description of the sordid mess the President took over in 1932, and the upward trend of business since that time.

It is preparing a list of the Government and war agencies with an account of what each does and its record of achievement. It is also compiling a chronology showing how Republicans in Congress voted against practically every defense measure, thus severely handicapping the fight for freedom, and showing the strategy and the activities of the opposition in the present war Congress.

It is important in this grim time in our Nation's history not only that the right side wins the next election, but also that wise leadership directs its entire effort toward the alleviation of bitterness within the country, and toward the creation of greater national unity with which to face the hard, troubled days of making the peace and handling our serious post-war situation.

Republican claims, accusations, exaggerations, and fantasies must, it seems to me, be answered in a way different from the traditional no-holds-barred technique of the political arena. They must be answered by a clear, definite, and concise presentation of the naked truth; the truth as to the objectives, the program, and the genuine achievements of the Democratic administration.

The purpose of the Democratic Party, in relation to the election of 1944, is to present a campaign of education; one that will clarify the whole conduct of the war and throw the clear white light of truth on the activities of both the fighting front and the home front.

The truth can only reveal that any shortcomings are heavily outweighed by the accomplishments, that mistakes are the exception, not the rule, that competence leads our war effort and wisdom guides our decisions.

The Republican Party in the next campaign has nothing to offer but words. The Democratic Party has nothing to offer but deeds.

So far the good works of the Republican Party have been confined to words and they show a tendency to believe that the recognition of a problem is also its solution. Actually, the road is long and hard and heartbreaking between the recognition of a great national question and its solution.

The Democratic administration has proved that it knows this, and further knows how to travel each road and overcome the many obstacles encountered on it. The reciprocal trade treaties, the destroyer deal, lend-lease, social security, and other humanitarian enactments are specific demonstrations of this knowledge and ability.

In the face of vast, concrete Democratic accomplishments, the Republicans can point only to words; words that recognize certain problems but never suggest how to solve them.

The New Deal is still deplored and denounced. Yet everybody knows that the New Deal is now too well proven to be anything but a positive issue. The worth of its achievements is so fully accepted by such a large majority of the American people that the attempt once more to parade it as a menace is bound to fall flat.

There is a new note in the Republican strategy which is of a sinister character. This is the definite campaign to smear, discredit, and render powerless the work of the various war agencies. There is plenty of evidence that this is a planned campaign, shrewdly conceived to muddle people's minds on the work of the agencies and the proper conduct of the war.

The doubts, fears, and confusion that such a campaign raises can only retard victory and jeopardize peace. Such a campaign could descend into the business of one party attacking and the other defending the war agencies, the war moves, and the over-all strategy. This thing could result in the whole war becoming a political football and the American people becoming the baffled spectators to its being kicked around.

Everyone knows of the dominant place of civil service in our Government, of the nonpolitical status of most of the so-called bureaucrats, of the inevitability of a large number of bureaus, no matter who is elected or what party is in power. Everyone knows also that the war agencies are headed, and, in many cases set up, by the pick of American business brains, frequently men put forth by business itself. Practically every last one of these men wants to get back to the business he came from as soon as the war is won.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee has no illusions about the size of the job of conducting a national campaign of education and enlightenment. It's big and it's tough. It will take a lot of courage. It will take a lot of people, a lot of work, long grinding hours.

It will take a stubborn will to refrain from answering irresponsible Republican accusations, dire prophecies, and misstatements, and from jumping into the excitement of a good, old-fashioned political brawl. It will take patience and skill to promote the success of this program of education of the chairman of the Democratic National Committee—but it can be done.

In every community in this country there are men who are Republican by birth, habit, or inertia, but who cannot be anything but unhappy with what their traditional party now stands for.

The purpose of the Democratic National Committee in connection with the next campaign is to bring to the minds of the people a realization and understanding of the enormity of this war. It would prepare them for the task and privilege of writing the world's first peoples' peace. It would show them why the day that peace comes must either be the dawn of the century of rule by the people, or the beginning of a century of woe and distress.

The Democratic National Committee is assembling the facts that will bring out in bold relief the aims of our war effort as against the sordid aims of the Axis. The public is pretty well aware of the methods by which the dictators came into power—the taking and holding of power by force, the liquidation of the opposition, the elimination of the ballot box, the chaining of a free press, the throttling of free speech, and the shackling of religion.

The people know that not one of these things has happened in America.

The reactionary press, the frequently recalcitrant Congress, the presence in the Cabinet itself of the opposition, the obvious fact of a free election, are all living, visual, vocal proof that a working democracy is still the guiding principle and philosophy of the Democratic Party.

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered in Martinsburg, W. Va., May 16, 1943, by Robert Nelson Anderson, Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, and former President of the Federal Bar Association, at an I Am An American Day rally, under the auspices of the Martinsburg Bar Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today we have gathered at the suggestion of the Congress of the United States, made in its public resolution of May 3, 1940, and pursuant to the proclamation of President Roosevelt under date of March 12 last for the purpose of recognizing all citizens who have attained their majority or who have become naturalized during the past year. As we meet we should be inspired and stirred at the thought that throughout this broad land on this same day the attention of thousands upon thousands of other citizens is being centered upon "the duties and opportunities of citizenship and its special responsibilities in a nation at war."

It is a great privilege for me to be here and have a small part in your observance of I Am An American Day, and to be introduced by your distinguished fellow citizen, the Honorable Clarence E. Martin, former president of the American Bar Association. I am not at all surprised that Martinsburg is included among those American cities and communities that today will celebrate specially I Am An American Day. This city was laid out by Adam Stephen in those trying days of 1778 when a struggling people were endeavoring to throw off the shackles of a foreign tyrant. The experiences of those years have left an indelible imprint upon the life and character of its citizenry. Your patriotism and love of country is evidenced by your presence here.

And in this connection I wish to commend the local bar association and its president, Hon. Hugh S. Byrer, for the sponsoring of this important affair. The American Bar Association and its constituent bodies throughout the Nation, under the leadership of its accomplished president, George Maurice Morris, and through a special program of activity headed by Hon. Robert E. Freer, member of the Federal Trade Commission, has done much this past year to keep before the American public the meaning of American citizenship. The American lawyer, having out of his specialized knowledge and experience contributed so much to the creation and preservation of our great democratic institutions, probably senses above all others the irreplaceable treasure inherent in American citizenship. It is for this reason that he gladly lends his heartiest support to any effort that will tend to emphasize and exalt the significance of that citizenship.

When this Nation was established it was not just another nation that saw the light of day. There can be no doubt but that Providence had a hand in its appearance among the peoples of the earth. Did you ever stop to ponder why this hemisphere with its fabulous wealth and marvelous natural beauty should have remained hidden from an inquisitive mankind centuries after the dawn of history? There can be but one answer—a divine plan preordained that man should first prove himself worthy to inherit it. Out of the crucible of war and turmoil in Europe, Asia, and Africa, out of exploded theories concerned with the divine rights of kings and that the sovereign could do no wrong, out of the miseries of the oppressed and tortured, a new and chosen people set their faces to the west in the search of a new freedom and a new liberty. Made strong by their trials and tribulations—of many races, yet under the skin all brothers—they came to fulfill a new destiny in history: to some day assist those they had left behind in the dark corners of the world to also find the light.

The Revolutionary fathers, and I like to call them just that, fought and bled and even died for what they deemed sacred principles of personal liberty. Patrick Henry, in immortal words that will live down through the ages, demanded of George III that liberty, or, in its place, death. In penning the Declaration of Independence and thereby proclaiming the birth of the Republic, Thomas Jefferson solemnly announced that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." In short, the objective of the Republic was to point out to mankind the pathway of freedom and mutual helpfulness. Equal opportunity was to be accorded all citizens. The common man was to be raised from the sloughs of discouragement and hopelessness and his feet placed upon solid ground, untrammelled by those who would deprive him of a happiness he was justly entitled to. Special favor and special privileges were to be done away with. All forms of tyranny over the minds, bodies, and souls of men were to be eradicated. A man's progress was to be made dependent upon his own moral qualities, his physical prowess, and his intellectual attainments. These were the ideals for which our forefathers struggled

and without them America would have been no advance over the nations about her.

On October 17, 1781, Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown and the War of the Revolution, for all practical purposes, was over. The soldiers of freedom had gone hungry and ragged, their land was laid waste and their homes desolate, some had shed their blood, some had laid down their lives. Those who remained were determined that they should not be deprived of the things for which they had fought.

The forefathers' complaint against the British Government reached much deeper than the concrete grievances and injustices they had openly expressed. There was a feeling in the heart of each revolutionist that the British Crown had deprived them of the rights of freemen. For the first time in the history of the world men dared to think in terms of human rights that could not be changed and which could not be taken from them. It was a new and exciting idea which thus pervaded the thoughts of these pioneers of freedom. The idea, however, was not a creation of the hour. No doubt the germ for its appearance was laid in the Magna Carta wrested by the barons from King John in the thirteenth century, and a document called the Bill of Rights passed by the English Parliament in 1689, immediately after the glorious revolution and a century before the American Government was formed.

Then, too, the colonists had not failed to assert certain rights during their dealings with the mother country. For instance, in General Fundamentals, published at Plymouth in 1636, there was set forth for the Massachusetts colonists the "free liberties of the free-born people of England," while 3 years later the General Assembly of Connecticut adopted a declaration of rights. During the same century Virginia, Maryland, and New York also asserted rights against the British Government based upon what they deemed the English common law allowed them as British colonists.

But the specifically stated rights of the colonists were a long cry from the broadly outlined "inalienable rights" of freemen which occupied the thoughts and attention of the participants in the American Revolution. As the breach between Colonies and mother country widened, Americans came more and more to state their demands, not as the grievances of colonists appealing for justice in this and that situation but as the declarations of freemen asserting the freedoms with which they were endowed.

It is the English and French philosophers like John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau and our own American statesmen of the Revolution we must thank for the idea that man has immutable and inalienable rights. This idea reached its highest level in the immortal words of Jefferson to which I have already referred. "To secure these rights," said Jefferson, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Later he pointed out that he "turned to neither book nor pamphlet" in his preparation of the original draft of the Declaration. Nor did he need to. While the genius of the language was his own, the ideas he used were all about him—they were a part of the common thought and conversation of the day.

When the forefathers sought language with which to clothe these liberties, they found them in the idea of natural rights which are a part of "nature and nature's God." These rights, John Locke and others had argued, could never be surrendered by the individual to his government, even if he wished. He could not strip himself of them. They were inalienable.

It was not surprising that the philosophy of these sages of the Revolution showed up to a degree in the Declaration of Rights adopted on October 14, 1774, by the First Continental Congress. In the spring of the following year actual fighting between outraged colonists and the British Government took place. Then, in 1776, came the complete break with the Crown. The Continental Congress adopted a resolution advising the Colonies to provide for themselves new governments. Virginia, the oldest colony, was the first to act and in the same memorable year it adopted a new constitution. But before Virgina took this far-reaching step, significantly the Virginia Convention meeting at Williamsburg on June 12, 1776, adopted a Declaration of Rights which men came to speak of as the "Virginia Bill of Rights." This order of events was of great importance and is well worth noticing—it was a way of saying for the benefit of all mankind that inalienable rights came first and that the powers of Government were merely secondary.

George Mason, a Virginia planter, wrote 14 of the 16 clauses of the Virginia Bill of Rights. He was a close friend of Thomas Jefferson who was at that time in attendance at the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, and it is reasonable to assume that Jefferson's theory of the rights of man was reflected in the tenets of this famous document. The example set by Virginia was followed by the constitutional conventions of other States. Under the leadership of the venerable Benjamin Franklin the Pennsylvania Convention in July 1776 also adopted a declaration of rights. Maryland was next with a bill of rights containing 42 articles. In 1780 John Adams sponsored and secured the adoption of a bill of rights by Massachusetts.

Peculiarly enough, however, approximately 15 years were to expire from the date the Virginia Bill of Rights was formulated to the adoption of a Bill of Rights for the Nation as a whole. But the very temper of the Revolutionary fathers and the lessons their long struggle taught them made the establishment of a national Bill of Rights inevitable. The delay was due not to any lack of interest or desire, but to mere circumvention of events.

It is well known that the Central Government under the Articles of Confederation was far too weak to require even a hint of curbing. Naturally, therefore, it was not until the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 that the importance of adopting a Bill of Rights came again to be a matter of daily conversation. This convention, it would seem, would have presented a wonderful opportunity for establishing a new charter of liberties and the adoption of such a charter was specifically urged. But the members of the Constitutional Convention were concerned with the immediate and pressing problem of bringing order and system out of the chaos into which the Articles of Confederation had thrust the new-born States. These men had experienced the uncertainty and devastating effects of a weak government. Uppermost in their minds, therefore, was the creation of a strong government that would insure stability, both politically and economically. Therefore, their immediate concern, attributable to the necessity of the moment, was the strength of the government they were forming rather than the guaranties of the freedom of the individuals who were to be governed by it. But this does not mean that they left the government they planned completely unchecked. The drafting fathers willingly furnished certain guaranties against arbitrary government; among other things they placed certain limitations upon the power of Congress, provided for the writ of habeas corpus, forbade ex post facto laws, and defined treason. This, however, was as far as they were willing to go. The Constitution therefore went into effect upon the ratification of nine States, but no Bill of Rights had been incorporated therein.

The matter, however, was not to be thus shelved. Hundreds of amendments to the Constitution were offered, many of them having to do with a Bill of Rights. Feeling again ran high, and above the noise of debate and controversy could be heard the pleas of Thomas Jefferson for the immediate adoption of a Bill of Rights for the Nation. In Paris during the sittings of the Constitutional Convention, Jefferson made no secret in his letters to his friends that his deepest anxiety was the absence of such a document. "A Bill of Rights," he wrote after he had received a draft of the proposed Constitution, "is what the people are entitled to against every Government on earth."

The first Congress under the new Constitution convened in April, 1789. It undertook the difficult and important task of putting the mandates and directives of the Constitution into actual practice. But along with the manifold problems arising from this tremendous undertaking, the lack of a national Bill of Rights was constantly brought to its attention. President Washington referred to the matter in the inaugural address which he delivered on April 30, 1789. A friend of Jefferson, and a member of the Constitutional Convention, James Madison, finally determined to insist upon affirmative action. On May 4, he rose in the House of Representatives and announced that he would bring in a set of amendments to the Constitution in 3 weeks. Delayed a few days, on June 8 he carried out his promise and submitted 9 proposals which were destined to form the basis of our Bill of Rights or the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—on December 15, 1791. Virginia, as the last State necessary for adoption, on that day ratified the Bill of Rights and it became a part of our supreme law.

One would have thought that the final ratification of this bill would have been accompanied by celebration and festivity. But curiously enough the great historical event made little noise in its day. The newspapers of the period did not even mention it. The Virginia Gazette and General Advertiser of Richmond, accustomed to print legislative notices and statutes passed by the State legislature, failed to mention the adoption of the Bill of Rights because no doubt the ratifications of the legislature were in the form of a series of resolutions rather than in the form of statutes. Likewise, the news of the ratification was not carried in the newspapers of Philadelphia, which was at that time the National Capital. But even though the adoption of a Bill of Rights for the Nation with its guaranty of freedom of religion, speech, and the press, and trial by jury, and with its due-process clause and other precious safeguards of the rights of man, was not accompanied by great acclamation, nevertheless it was a "shot heard round the world." This Bill of Rights is our great American heritage. Truly it can be said in the words of the poet John O'Reilly as written in his Pilgrim Fathers:

"Here * * * on this soil
Began the kingdom, not of kings, but man!
Began the making of the world again;
Where equal rights and equal bonds were set;
Where all the people equal-franchised met;
Where doom was writ of privilege and crown;
Where human breath blew all the idols down;
Where crests were naught, where vulture flags were furled,
And common men began to own the world."

Under this unique system of government, fostered and nurtured by the founders of our Nation, our growth was stupendous. Out of a purchase by Jefferson in the early days of the Republic, a great western empire was built. Impelled by the great spirit of freedom that prevailed in the breast of every American, and with a desire for new fields to conquer, step by step our national frontier

was pushed across the continent and our domain soon stretched from sea to sea. Our great national resources became manifest. The inventive genius of man was called into play by the opportunities the new fields presented. The combination of these two soon produced great captains of industry and huge commercial enterprises sprang up here and there over the entire Nation. Out of it all America merged a mighty people whose achievement became the wonder of the Old World. A few struggling States in the short span of 150 years had become the most powerful and richest nation upon the earth.

But it was not destined that America should live apart from her brothers in the rest of the world enjoying the greatest blessings that had come to all mankind. The very things our scientific geniuses had produced destroyed the barrier that nature had erected about us. The radio and the airplane had made the world one community. It was inevitable that in 1917 under the gallant leadership of the immortal Wilson we should fight a war to make the world safe for democracy. Many of us here were engaged in that terrific struggle. But, alas, when the peace had been concluded and prosperity once more returned, many Americans failed to grasp the true significance of our struggle and we as a nation settled back into a foolish and ostrich-like complacency behind 3,000 or more miles of ocean front.

But again we find ourselves involved in a titanic struggle that has shaken the very foundations of the world—this time to the end that the principles for which our forefathers fought and died shall not perish from the earth. Vividly the poet, Duane Edwin Fox, has described the hour:

"Four million men, intent on their own life
Of work and play, were called upon one day
To throw it all into a foreign strife
That liberty upon this earth might stay.

"Their valor won but in the very hour
Of victory their hand was held, ere yet
The chains were riveted on evil power,
By statesmen knowing only to forget.

"Now sons of those who fought must fight again
Against the selfsame beast their sires had tamed;
God save them from the curse that comes to men
Who grope in darkness where the torch has flamed."

We and our allies fight for the "four freedoms"—for the Bill of Rights of all mankind which has its roots in the Bill of Rights written by our forefathers of the Revolution—which stems from our own American heritage—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

As our great President has said:

"The 'four freedoms' of common humanity are as much elements of man's needs as air and sunlight, bread, and salt. Deprive him of all these freedoms and he dies—deprive him of a part of them and a part of him withers. Give them to him in full and abundant measure and he will cross the threshold of a new age, the greatest age of man.

"These freedoms are the rights of men of every creed and every race, wherever they live. This is their heritage, long withheld. We of the United Nations have the power and the men and the will at least to assure man's heritage.

"The belief in the 'four freedoms' of common humanity—the belief in man, created free, in the image of God—is the crucial difference between ourselves and the enemies we face today. In it lies the absolute unity of our alliance, opposed to the oneness of the evil we hate. Here is our strength, the source and promise of victory."

It is thus a fine thing on this Sabbath Day to take notice of the significance of our citizenship. It is a day of dedication, not without its religious meaning. Providence has earmarked us a Nation of destiny. It is a splendid thing to be a part, no matter how small, in this wonderful movement. We know our armies will be victorious on the field of battle. When the smoke has died away and the peace has come, it is the duty of each American citizen to do his utmost to see to it that the rights of man are made available to all mankind. In this way our American heritage will become the heritage of the world. Let me conclude with this salute to freedom in the stirring words of Joseph Rodman Drake:

"When Freedom, from her mountain-height,
Unfurled her standard to the air,
She tore the azure robe of night,
And set the stars of glory there.

"She mingled with its gorgeous dyes
The milky baldric of the skies,
And striped its pure, celestial white
With streakings of the morning light.

"Then from his mansion in the sky
She called her eagle bearer down
And gave unto his mighty hand
The symbol of her chosen land.

"Forever float that standard sheet!
Where breathes the foe but falls before us,
With Freedom's soil beneath our feet,
And Freedom's banner streaming o'er us?"

The Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of June 22, 1943, with reference to the so-called meat shortage, but revealing that there is actually a surplus.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VAST CATTLE SURPLUS PILES UP AS MEAT FAMINE INCREASES—IF HALF THE EXCESS WERE SLAUGHTERED, IT WOULD SUPPLY 200,000,000 PERSONS WITH BEEF FOR A YEAR, RANCHMEN SAY

(By Jefferson G. Bell)

As the meat famine deepened both in New York and Chicago, center of the packing industry, spokesmen for the Nation's livestock industry declared here yesterday that the country was building up a huge surplus of cattle. The surplus, it was estimated, would increase by next January to 15,400,000 head as the result of restrictive regulations by the Office of Price Administration. Slaughterers' quotas and subsidy roll-back of prices are blamed.

The surplus of cattle is rapidly becoming a national problem, according to representatives of the cattle growers. If just one-half of this huge surplus were slaughtered, they pointed out, it would be sufficient to supply normal quantities of beef for a year to 200,000,000 persons, including the entire population of the United States and 74,000,000 others.

Meanwhile, Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia and Frank Russell, district Office of Price Administration director, disclosed that they planned to submit to Washington immediately plans to ease the local meat famine. The mayor hopes to induce Washington to set up a definite quota of meat for civilians and to guarantee it from raids by agencies purchasing for the armed forces, lend-lease, etc. Mr. Russell will submit a plan for district control and supervision of meat allocation and distribution.

The colossal backing up of livestock through the country is a matter of common knowledge in the West, according to livestock industry spokesmen, who hope to bring this phenomenon to the attention of the East.

This gigantic accumulation of livestock, which will present an increasingly difficult problem later, as the feed shortage becomes worse has been called to the attention of Office of Price Administration authorities in Washington without avail, according to livestock industry representatives. They declared that all they had got out of Washington was theoretical plans for production and distribution.

CATTLEMEN DISCLOSE SITUATION

The amazing situation in the livestock industry was disclosed here by the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, an organization of 4,430 active ranchmen operating ranches that range in size from 10,000 to several hundred thousand acres.

Through its counsel, former Judge Joe G. Montague, of Fort Worth, this organization, headed by C. K. McCan, of Victoria, Tex., prepared a statement of the livestock situation as they know it first hand. They submitted their findings to representatives of 113 other livestock organizations throughout the country, according to Robert J. Kleburg, manager of the Kings' Ranch of Kingsville, Tex., and a director of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association.

"Without one single exception, as far as we can find," Mr. Kleburg explained, "they are all in accord with the sentiments expressed in our statement."

Mr. Kleburg then emphasized that he thought "black market" was a misnomer for the thousands of small slaughterers and customers who are determined not to be deprived of beef artificially by Office of Price Administration regulations.

"Throughout the West," Mr. Kleburg explained, "an increasing number of individuals are buying and storing in freezers whole carcasses of beef, and these people are not comparable with the members of the old prohibition bootleg trade. They are patriotic, but they are determined that they shall not go hungry."

SUESIDY PROGRAM DISCUSSED

Discussing the proposed subsidy program, the association's statement said:

"The feeling is so strong throughout the entire industry that the subsidy is unsound, that the industry wishes to take this opportunity to refuse to accept responsibility for the consequences of the subsidy program, as we feel that it will result, first, in a reduced supply of meat, and second, in the liquidation of a great many small packing concerns, and the two will greatly impede the war effort."

A memorandum showing the colossal surplus of meat that is being built up as a result of Office of Price Administration restrictions, was submitted by the association, showing that in 1939 the total number of cattle slaughtered in the United States was 17,201,000 head. In pounds that year's slaughter represented 7,049,000,000 pounds of beef and 934,000,000 pounds of veal or a total of 7,983,000,000 pounds of meat from cattle, according to the statement. The memorandum further read:

"From Government estimates we know we will have by January 1, 1944, a surplus of 15,400,000 head of cattle. This represents a surplus in poundage of 7,700,000,000 pounds.

"If we slaughtered one-half, or 3,850,000,000 pounds of the surplus, we would produce enough meat to feed 74,000,000 people in addition to supplying our own armed forces and our civilian population with this normal supply of beef, and these additional people would be supplied as bountifully as are our fighters and civilians. In fact, the use of this surplus would be a genuine service, since it would relieve our ranges and our feed lots of a severe strain on their resources

"As far back as August 1942, the announcement of the intention of imposing price ceilings on livestock had so disturbed the confidence of the livestock producers that by the time the quota and ceilings had been imposed the effect of this lack of confidence in livestock producers was strongly in evidence in the lack of cattle ready for immediate slaughter in January and February 1943.

"When the consequences of these regulations became apparent the representatives of the various groups comprising the livestock industry asked for immediate removal of the quota system. The industry was met by the assertion that all would be worked out as soon as the ration-card system was also in effect. The industry again patiently waited to see the results of this system."

INCREASES SINCE 1922

The association's statement then pointed out that the Nation's livestock had increased from 68,000,000 head in 1929 to 74,000,000 in 1932, when the Government stepped in and through purchase and subsidy had 8,000 head killed.

"The Department of Agriculture now estimates that the cattle population will reach 82,500,000 head by January 1944," the statement continued. "To plan for the food of the beef industry and to avoid similar overstocking conditions to those that prevailed in 1932, these numbers should be reduced during the next few years, so that at the end of the emergency our ranges and farms will not be overstocked.

"By planning to increase the Bureau of Animal Industry slaughter by 6,000,000 head for the next 2 years we would have enough additional slaughter in the country to provide for the total supply of meat needed for the Army, Navy, and lend-lease, plus a surplus over and above normal of around 1,000,000,000 pounds of beef per year for the civilian counter."

The livestock spokesman pointed out that the industry's Livestock and Meat Council had submitted to Washington last spring a corrective program to guarantee adequate meat supplies. This plan, according to the statement, had the approval of Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss M. Brown, War Food Administrator Chester C. Davis, and Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, Quartermaster General.

The plan calls for the recognition of the fundamental law of supply and demand, according to the livestock producers' spokesmen, and determines the available supply and the demand among the armed forces, lend-lease, and civilians, the needs of the latter being controlled through point rationing.

FEAR VOICED FOR PLAN

"Following the endorsement of the plan by the above-named officials," the statement continued, "the Government has attempted to put it into operation. The War Meat Board has been set up in Chicago with all essential details of the plan adopted, but unfortunately, and in spite of the opposition from the entire industry and from the Office of Food Administration, the roll-back and subsidy plan has been hung on the neck of the plan and it is seriously feared that such an impediment may cause the failure of the entire plan. Certainly it can and will do no good, and only added confusion will result."

After making the first forecast of the possible collapse of the War Meat Board, from which so much is expected, the livestock industry statement assailed the roll-back program, saying:

"There is prevalent a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the effect of the roll-back and subsidy program insofar as it affects meat. Under normal conditions the average per capita consumption of meat in this country was 131 pounds annually. Under rationing the maximum per capita consumption of meat is 104 pounds annually. Actual statistics show the real consumption now under rationing quota, and zoning, is 87 pounds annually.

"It is clear that the maximum per capita saving to be effected by the roll-back and subsidy plan, under rationing, is $2.08 and the actual reduction in per capita cost, based on actual consumption, is $1.74, which is less than 15 cents a month, or less than half a cent a day.

"In order to effect this infinitesimal per capita saving, the Government's announced plan proposes to spend several hundred millions of dollars of public money that must be raised by taxing the people to whom this saving is supposed to be beneficial."

Conditions Among Cattle Feeders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram I have received from Gordon Labree, mayor of Casselton, North Dakota, with reference to conditions among cattle feeders.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASSELTON, N. DAK., *June 19, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Meeting held this morning representing a fair cross-section of the county. Many feeders out of business and many more to follow. It would appear that price of fat live cattle the three top grades is approximately a dollar and a half per hundredweight too low on live cattle compared with cost at time of purchase. You are well informed on beef cattle production in this area and will be surprised to learn that out of about 85 to 100 feed lots there isn't over 500 to 600 head of cattle where normally there would be thousands at this time of year. Many of the feeders unloaded and took their loss; the remainder of the fellows are caught with 12½ to 13 cent cattle and at the present ceiling will sustain a considerable loss. It is needless to say what effect this will have on the feeder situation here and this territory supplies a considerable amount of cattle as you know. The situation is deplorable. I raised the question of a subsidy similar to butter and received a storm of protest.

The butter subsidy apparently is not meeting with approval since the small dealer cannot carry the load when the time and prospect of payment is so uncertain and as a result the farmers do not receive any temporary benefit.

LABREE.

Report of West Oakland (Calif.) Carmen's Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the West Oakland Carmen's Investigating Committee.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The general membership of the car men should know of the impasse of violations that have occurred at West Oakland. In the spirit of cooperation and sacrifice in our eagerness to help out in the war effort and support the brothers at the front a train of violations have occurred, culminating in the Southern Pacific Co.'s local management suspending from service our local chairman, Robert Donnachie.

In defense of Local Chairman Donnachie this committee has been authorized by an action of Local 40, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, West Oakland car men, to warn the carman of the system federation of this unlawful challenge to our long-fought-for and hard-earned rights and on the most basic fundamental proposition of unionism that an injury to one is an injury to all we are asking the support of every local.

For 9 years the company's local management has had everything their own way, and many car men have left the service in disgust. The responsibility fell upon the local to elect a chairman who would dare to represent the rank and file and not the local management, so in the last election we elected Brother Robert Dannachie, a man of character, courage, and ability, our local chairman. In characteristic disrespect for law and agreements, the company's local management has heaped upon our local chairman threats, coercion, intimidation, and abuse, in flagrant violation of the agreement and the Railway Labor Act.

Now after a dispute between the company's local management and Chairman Brother Donnachie over the interpretation and application of certain rules in the agreement, the local management, with usual disrespect for working agreements and contempt for the Railway Labor Act, proceeded to take the law in their own hands and for punishment suspended Brother Donnachie from service. By a crude distortion of facts Rule 801 of the Transportation Rules was invoked to bring up a lot of unjust charges against Chairman Donnachie, and every carman knows it is a frame-up. Right here we can say that it would have been mighty lonesome for the master car repairer if it had not been for the self-sacrificing loyal and patriotic efforts of Brother Donnachie to keep the men working. But his reward has been further humiliation and now, about 10 days later, we have the spectacle of a star chamber rehearsal performing to endeavor,

in violation of article V to compel a man to be a witness against himself. And to clinch the frame-up that as local chairman he actually conspired to protect the rights of the overworked brothers in the car department—and in so doing "he was trying to run the company's business."

Such reversion to medieval justice and jungle law might seem amazing but to a carman. Our hand has been forced in this matter by the local management: we do not welcome this fight, we were disposed to patiently suffer the chain of violations, but when the local management unjustly and unlawfully attacked Local Chairman Donnachie, our elected representative, for daring to represent the membership, they violated every principle of our organization and are jeopardizing production of transportation at this point, because such undignified muddling hooliganism on the part of the local management will not be tolerated.

It is intended to fix the responsibility on the individual company official responsible for all these violations and to cause them to be corrected. We have abundant data and mean to prosecute this case of violation of the National Railway Labor Act and of the rights of our elected representative Brother Robert Donnachie. This is a question of whether we are going to have representatives of our own choosing or local management domination of unions. They say "This is just a test case," and we are appealing to every local and all carmen to support us.

By INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE FOR
LOCAL 140, B. R. C. A.,
West Oakland.
WALTON A. PHILLIPS, *Chairman.*
APRIL 18, 1943.

American Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a dispatch by the Associated Press, entitled "Demand Heavy on Resources," appearing in the Baltimore Sun on May 24, 1943.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "American Resources," from the Daily Press of Newport News, Va., on May 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the dispatch and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of May 24, 1943]

DEMAND HEAVY ON RESOURCES—SENATOR REVERCOMB CITES GREAT DRAIN BY MODERN WAR ON ORE AND METALS—RUMORS HOLD UNITED STATES MAY NOT BRING BACK METALLIC EQUIPMENT SENT OVERSEAS

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Concerned that this country's metal and oil resources may be depleted to the danger point by our war commitments abroad, Senator REVERCOMB (Republican, West Virginia), urged today that the United States be practical and insist that our allies furnish their full share.

"One of the great dangers of modern war is its vast demand for irreplaceable natural resources, such as iron ore, petroleum, copper, zinc, and other metals," he said. "Once removed, those things don't grow back.

"We must use the wealth we have to win the war; I hope it won't take too much of it, I also hope that we will be generous, and, at the same time, be practical and ask that our allies furnish their full part."

UNITED STATES OUTPUT INCREASES

By the end of this year, Mr. REVERCOMB told his interviewer, the United States will be furnishing more of the things needed to win the war than all our allies together.

"If we become a nation in need," he said, "if our people ever reach the time that they are in want, there isn't going to be any world peace. The American people, under such circumstances, then would be on the march to get what they feel they need.

"We'll be a peaceful people as long as we have the goods that we need to make us live in comfort. Right now we want to see that future generations of Americans won't be impoverished."

MAY ABANDON ARMAMENTS

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, the West Virginia Senator has an opportunity to appraise the number of tanks, guns, trucks, shells, planes, and other metallic equipment being shipped abroad to our own forces and on lend-lease. Already, he said, he has heard talk that it might not be practical or wise to bring the stuff back after the war.

"After the last war," he recalled, "thousands and thousands of American vehicles were left abroad. Some people then thought that the Army trucks and cars should be brought back and sold to the public, but they were junked because it was claimed that selling them would ruin the automobile market.

"I hope at least that sufficient war equipment is brought back to maintain a strong Army in this country from hereon, and it is my intention to do all I can to see that it is all brought back. I never have been able to see any good in the destruction of anything of value."

[From the Daily Press, Newport News, Va., of May 25, 1943]

AMERICAN RESOURCES

Senator REVERCOMB, of West Virginia, sounded a note of warning that American resources are not inexhaustible. Concerned with the tremendous drain being placed now upon such resources as iron ore, petroleum, copper, zinc, and other metals, he pointed out that "once removed, those things don't grow back." The plan of conservation suggested by him was the distribution of the drain by asking America's allies to furnish their full part.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, REVERCOMB is in close touch with the vast shipments to our own forces, and on lease-lend commitments. He pointed out that by the end of the year the United States will be furnishing more of the things needed to win the war than all our allies together.

REVERCOMB believes that overconfidence in limitless resources may lead to want. Profligacy now instead of wise distribution of the burden of furnishing needed materials may exhaust what we have and lead the American people directly to war in the future, in order to obtain elsewhere that which has been drained out of our own land.

The basis for REVERCOMB's remarks is laid in findings from scientific investigations. A careful study has been made of our resources and the normal use to which they may be put. Estimates likewise have been made of the length of time these resources will last.

Recurring wars all over the world for centuries have been laid in the background of dire need of people for things which were not at hand, and without which prosperity could not attend.

The American Revolution was generated directly by restrictions put upon trade of the Colonists by the mother country. The threat of ruin which faced the prosperous colonial merchant through the imposed navigation acts threw the Colonists into a mood for independence.

The high tariffs instituted in America through the control of the protectionists in Congress prior to the Civil War faced the South with possible ruin. Planters in Southern States felt keenly the discrimination against them imposed by the tariff. The South sought to escape an inevitable domination by seceding. Slavery became the popular issue, but was not the underlying cause of the war.

Protection of the newly found means for world trade led the United States into the Spanish-American War. The trade-mark Made in Germany underwrote World War No. 1. And, so, it has been with us and others.

Our futures as individuals and citizens of nations is so inextricably bound up in goods, that we cannot afford to neglect the full meaning of resources in our struggle to uphold certain ideals seemingly unrelated to the material.

Strategy and Conduct of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We Don't Know How," appearing in the Carrollton (Ill.) Patriot of June 18, 1943.

The article is very interesting, and was originally published in the Lion Magazine. It contains about the only commendation which I have seen of college professors. I doubt if there is any group in America which has been more severely criticized than college professors. It is stated in the article that a college professor was asked for an expression on the conduct of the war, and his reply was, "I am just a college professor. I don't know how to win a war." Armchair strategists who are advising how to win the war should read the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE DON'T KNOW HOW

When one of the numerous United States commissions was about to open its sessions to consider the conduct of a Government activity, newspapermen asked one of the members, the president of a famous university, for an expression on the conduct of the war.

"In this matter," he replied, "I am just a college president. I don't know how to win a war."

That is one of the finest bits of wisdom anybody has uttered since this war began. Here is a man in the prime of his intellectual life, highly educated, at the head of a noted institution for educating young men, profoundly read in the history of the world and all the wars it ever waged. But he has not had military training, he is not skilled in strategy or tactics. He confesses that he does not know how to win a war.

Yet on every street corner, in every store and saloon and barber shop and country postoffice, in every place where men gather, are those who know all about how to win the

war. And they tell how. The strategy of the Allied Nations is all wrong—it should have taken an exactly opposite course to that it has pursued. Our plans for organization are weak. Our armies and our navies have been mishandled. Our relations with our allies are on a mistaken basis. We should do this, that, and the other thing which we have not done. They know how to win the war.

Let us pray for a modicum of the common sense which that college president showed. Let us realize that the conduct of the war is in the hands of men whom the various Allied Nations have chosen to handle it. They alone can know all the facts in all their relations. They alone have the responsibility. They alone should have all the authority, and all the backing of us who remain at home.

Let us give them that backing without stint. Let us confess that we don't know how to win a war.

New Strategy Speeds War on Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 31), 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Strategy Speeds War on Japan," by David Lawrence, one of America's ablest commentators on public affairs, which appears in the Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW STRATEGY SPEEDS WAR ON JAPAN—UNITED STATES AND BRITAIN APPARENTLY JOIN IN DUAL VICTORY PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

Little by little the facts about some of the decisions made at the Roosevelt-Churchill conferences here last month are coming out. At least the news indicates changes which must have been decided on by the President and the Prime Minister and which quite properly can come out now, since enough time has elapsed to permit the necessary rearrangements. They concern vitally our war against Japan.

The facts that have come out are these:

1. Field Marshal Wavell has been made Viceroy of India and General Auchinleck has been made military commander in the Indian area, but a separate East Asia Command is being created and London dispatches significantly remark that an American is being considered for the post.

2. David Lloyd George in a public speech says that the Casablanca decisions now have been superseded by the Roosevelt-Churchill decisions at Washington and that Japan is no longer to be considered a No. 2 enemy but a No. 1 enemy alongside of Germany. This is the first intimation of a program that looks toward the simultaneous defeat of both Japan and Germany instead of the beat-Hitler-first idea with its suggestion of a partial demobilization thereafter of British forces.

HOPE FOR CHINA

Apparently Great Britain and America, with an unexampled comradeship and with a unity of purpose that no amount of mutual criticism can shake, have through their chosen leaders decided on a strategy that satisfies them both. It is no secret that our high Army and Navy officers have felt Japan is a first-class military and naval power and must be dealt with effectively as circumstances demand and not as if the choice were solely in our hands.

It is no secret, too, that our military men have been distressed because the building of air bases and the carrying out of the ground operations necessary to recapture Burma and thus open up a supply line to China did not materialize before the monsoon season set in this month. Apparently the measures urged by America have been adopted in collaboration with our British allies and in due time China, with her immense manpower and air fields, will be properly mobilized and equipped to deliver death blows against Japan.

Evidently since America has been a critic, America is to be given a large responsibility in reopening the Burma Road, but Americans are eager to try their hand. Once the road to China is opened and air bombing hits directly at Japan's mainland on a day-by-day basis, the American Navy will be in a position to strike hard from the mid-Pacific even as our forces of the South Pacific gain air bases coming north and the United States air bombers move southward from the Aleutians toward Japan—the whole thing making a four-sided pincers movement that spells the doom of Japan.

What has happened to make a possible beginning on even a part of this conception, though the consummation of it may take 2 years or more? The answer is that two big events of the most profound military and naval importance have occurred. One is the discovery of ways of cutting down merchant shipping losses heretofore suffered in U-boat attacks, and the other is the reopening of the Mediterranean through the capture of north Africa and control of the Straits of Sicily.

Both these steps mean that the figures on available shipping tonnage suddenly have taken an enormous leap upward. It is as if we had increased our shipbuilding capacity manyfold. For ships are the key to this war. Planes need supplies and air bases, and the latter can't be built without the ordinary tools, machines, and materials which can be transported in great quantity only in surface ships. Shortening the route means a gain in time and thus in tonnage, for if ships can turn around faster on voyages due to shorter distances their utility is increased thereby.

PRESS TOWARD VICTORY

What Senator CHANDLER, of Kentucky, and others clamored for before the decisions were made at the Roosevelt-Churchill conference may not all be achieved right away, but it begins to appear that Britain's statesmen now see eye to eye with us on the importance of defeating Japan at the earliest possible moment without relaxing one bit our pressure against Hitler. The belief is that with a $70,000,000,000 Army appropriation bill and sums almost half that size for the Navy and with billions for shipbuilding, we should be able to lick Hitler and Hirohito at the same time.

Again it may be said that American impatience to get the war over within not less than 2 years more—and with certain breaks in our favor perhaps even much sooner—is being translated into global policy. Japan and Germany both may be on the defensive before the summer is over despite the recurring rumors of attempts on their part to try some offensive operations so as to thwart our progress and gain time. The situation as a whole looks decidedly better.

Interference With Freedom of Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Clement T. Malan, state superintendent of public instruction of the State of Indiana, which constitutes, I think, a professional educator's competent discussion of one phase of the question of the Federal Government's interference with the freedom of American schools.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, June 17, 1943.

Hon. RAYMOND E. WILLIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIS: I wish to register my vigorous protest against the proposal now before the Congress of the United States to establish a federally controlled and federally operated system of public schools under the National Youth Administration. I note the proposal calls for a general program costing $55,390,000, of which $3,314,000 would be spent for administration and $60,000 for printing.

Obviously this would build up a powerful group of Federal employees, not responsible to local communities or to State systems of public schools, who would duplicate the work of public schools developed over a period of more than half a century or more. This Federal system would seek to do the things the schools have done and are doing and are in an excellent position to do better in the future than any new agency, because of the experience, personnel, and accountability to the local communities of the long-established public-school system.

Those of us who as school administrators or patrons have had experiences with various agencies of this nature, controlled from Washington, believe strongly that the National Youth Administration and the Work Projects Administration, both created as depression emergency remedies, should be liquidated in fact as well as in name. Constant vigilance is needed in guarding against the creation of agencies of like nature and purpose, under the guise of new names, which would continue to seek to gain the same throttlehold of power and pay roll, for political purposes. Persons formerly on Work Projects Administration should not be employed by newly created agencies merely to go about carrying letters some three or four blocks in the role of public welfare or social service work.

Needless sapping of the public purse to set up a dual system of public education with undue advantage to the Washington-directed agency not responsible to local or State control, while paying students to attend and thereby draining the regularly constituted schools, is indefensible. Such camouflage is incompatible with all ideals and traditions of the free schools of America, governed as they are by their own local communities and coordinated by their own State departments of education. Our American democracy is founded upon free education.

The proposal would exploit boys and girls of our Nation for political purposes, create a paternalistic set-up in Washington with power to indoctrinate all schools of America with any given philosophy; violate the fundamentals of our type of government, wreck the fine system of balances and coordination now existing between local school corporations (1,145 in Indiana) with their home-rule privileges, and the State department of education. At present, our local communities are given the choice in many things which are to be taught to their own boys and girls.

Again I say, I wish to register a vigorous protest against this needless, heedless exploitation of the taxpayer, the children, and the fundamental principle of government vested in States' rights. If citizens of our land do not beware, they will lose their blood-bought rights by sheer apathy and suffer the fate of other nations which have allowed usurpers to wrest the power from the people by fair means or foul. Let's protect our schools against a pseudo system of public free education under the National Youth Administration.

Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT T. MALAN,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Riots in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Riots in Los Angeles," from the Chicago Sun of Friday, June 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIOTS IN LOS ANGELES

The riots in Los Angeles' notorious Skidrow district must be charged up to the laxity and inefficiency of its public officials and police.

They failed to quell gangs of zoot-suited hoodlums who had attacked, robbed, and stabbed soldiers and sailors. It appears that the police actually encouraged bands of servicemen bent on revenge to invade the section. Once the rioting started, the police took a hand, but certain of them explained quite jovially that "some of the servicemen were just raising a little hell."

The "little hell" of Skidrow has expanded to alarming proportions. Other sailors have been slashed, a policeman has had his back broken, rioting has spread to more communities and Navy authorities have declared Los Angeles out of bounds for sailors.

Worst of all, racial animosities have been heightened. Because many of the grotesquely clad toughs were Mexicans or Negroes, innocent members of these two groups, with or without zoot suits, have been assaulted, stripped, and beaten by invading servicemen. Fascists accordingly are chuckling in glee.

These happenings are hardly the customary hi-jinks of servicemen on leave. They are race riots, ugly manifestations of anti-Mexican and anti-Negro feeling. Their basic causes are not stuffed cuffs and reat pleats but discrimination of many years' standing against these minority groups. Resentful, some of those unable to secure decent jobs or wholesome living conditions have become belligerent or criminal.

The public officials who allowed these tendencies to flare into terror, and the Army and Navy authorities, confronted with an emergency, must clean up this ugly state of affairs, and clean it up fast. We cannot afford such outbursts of hatred while we wage war against the very thing that thrives on them—fascism.

United Nations Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Marvin Jones, President of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, before the House Committee on Agriculture Tuesday, June 22, 1943:

The United Nations Food Conference was the first step in an effort to get the nations of the earth to work together in time of peace as necessity compels them to work together in time of war.

As separate nations we would be in danger of losing this war. As united nations we have found in unity an irresistible strength for winning it. Everyone now knows, even the Nazi and Japanese tyrants, that if we continue to work together we shall win, and their power and domination will be utterly destroyed. They know that their only chance lies in the hope that they can divide us, destroy our unity, and caus us to fail.

We stood together in World War No. 1, and won the war. Then we fell apart and lost the fruits of that victory. In doing so we permitted the seeds of another war to be sown.

As I read history, nations, in settling their difficulties and disagreements, have dealt largely with boundaries, frontiers, commerce, trade, geographical areas, and political control. They have paid little attention to human beings—to men, women, and children. Little attention was paid to their needs and yet these needs are the basis of civilization. I hope that when this war is over those who gather at the peace table will give some attention to these basic facts.

The subject matter of the recent conference was food and agriculture. We began with that. We believed somehow, somewhere, conditions can be so fashioned that every able-bodied person will have a chance to earn what he needs to eat, and be able to secure enough of the right kind of food for life and health. That is a very simple idea but it has never been realized. The most important thing in the world is to make it a fact.

The food conference dealt with the strange paradox of hunger in the midst of plenty. In the long years of the past there have been, nearly always, many forms of food going to waste in some parts of the world while at the same time human beings were hungry and even starving in other regions and in other countries.

The conference recognized as a premise that each nation's interest will be best served and the foundation of an enduring peace will be laid when the production, transportation, interchange, and use of food are not left to blind chance, but when reasonable effort is made to cause it to flow into the streams of consumption and use.

The representatives who attended the meeting were concerned with winning and maintaining the peace of the world. Many of their recommendations can take effect only after the war has been won. They dealt with the longer range problems that must inevitably follow the ending of the war. They did not undertake to treat directly the relief for the people of the war-torn areas. This did not mean that they were insensible of the hunger and suffering of those millions in the countries temporarily occupied by the Axis—those millions who are keeping the flame of freedom alive in spite of untold persecution and hardship. Those are immediate, pressing problems which call for the action of the times. That action is being taken. It will call for everything that nations and individuals are able to do. I am sure the elemental justice of humanity will cause those needs to be met.

The conference made a number of recommendations. Naturally at this time they were limited to basic fundamentals that are applicable anywhere—everywhere—at all times. Enduring peace cannot be won by simply ending the battle strife. We must build peace step by step.

Let it be understood at the beginning that these various recommendations do not carry with them the idea of any nation playing the part of Santa Claus. No nation is wealthy enough to do this, and, besides, it is not a sound method of building a strong people. It was therefore recognized in the Declaration that the building of its own resources and the taking care of the needs of its people are the primary responsibility of each country. But it was also recognized that by exchanging information, lending a helpful hand, treating each other as neighbors rather than as hereditary enemies, and by working together along common-sense, practical lines, we can all help each nation to help itself. What people want is not a free ride but a free opportunity—the chance to work and help to build.

A part of the action of the Conference may be summarized as follows:

1. It was recognized that the world needs to take advantage of the knowledge that has been accumulated in recent years by those who are skilled in the science of nutrition, as well as by those who are skilled in methods of production. The men who presented their facts were practical men of experience in their fields. They know the soil and they know the needs of the human body. They brought with them a vast fund of information. They are not dreamers. They are men of science who respect facts and who deal with facts as they are. They know that disease follows lack of adequate food. They know that from the hunger of undernourished people economic tides have arisen that swept away a nation's hope.

I believe in research and I am sure the members of the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate and the House do also. They have made vast provision for that research in the different sections of our country.

Many wonderful things have been made from the forces of nature by the ingenuity of man, but we have only scratched the surface. The Creator has placed many rich resources at our feet. In the earth, in the sea, and in the air He has planted secrets that are a challenge to the human race. These are only waiting to be discovered, harnessed, and put to use. What has been done, therefore, is but faintly typical of the possibilities for the future if we work together in the right direction.

2. It was recommended that each nation pay particular attention to the conservation and rebuilding of its soil and the proper use of water as linked to that soil. More than one-third of the tilled land of the earth has

been seriously eroded by washing away in the watered areas and by being blown away in the drier regions. Those who have studied the soil tell us that there are less than 5,000,000,000 acres of fertile, productive, tillable land to support the more than 2,000,000,000 peoples of the earth. Each and every country and every man, woman, and child down the long lane of the future is interested in the preservation of the soil's fertility. Once it is wasted it takes generations to rebuild it.

3. It was recommended that a freer exchange of commodities is desirable for all nations. It was recognized as a practical matter that this objective cannot be attained all at once, but systems of ever more rigid restrictive trade barriers and retaliatory measures tend not only to stifle production and distribution and use, but also sow the seeds of future misunderstandings and even conflicts.

4. It was recognized as a long-range desirable objective that expanded production for expanded use, rather than limited production for limited use of the products of both farm and factory, is desirable from every viewpoint. This will not injure any nation, but by creating wider markets will further the interests of all. Better interchange methods can make the surplus production of any nation available for use on a fair basis, and will mean gain for every nation.

The farmer will be infinitely better off if these results can be achieved. Because of a lack of market, the surplus-producing farmer in many countries has been forced to adjust his production of needed crops. This has not been a matter of choice; it has been a matter of necessity. The same course has been found necessary by the manufacturer and industrialist in many countries. They did not wish to reduce their production, but conditions which they faced left them no choice. The manufacturer, laborer, and consumer are better off when full capacity production can be disposed of on a fair basis. Likewise, the farmer will be better off when there is a wider and full market for all he can produce to meet the essential needs of human beings. Our methods of trade and distribution can and must be improved.

It is recognized by all thinking people that in securing full production it is necessary that the producer receive a fair return for his products; that provision be made in each country for credit for individual producers at low rates of interest; and that proper steps be taken to preserve the soil in order to assure continued productivity.

This should be followed by adequate provision for full-time employment. Industry and agriculture are the twin evangels of modern civilization. They should work to a common purpose. In this way a fair return can be had for all those who work in the different groups.

5. It was also recognized that in any country the development of decentralized industry is wholly desirable. In this manner, the raw material and the finished product can go hand in hand, thus developing a balanced economy, helping to solve labor problems and preventing a lopsided development.

6. It was also recognized that by all nations working together in hard-headed, practical manner, each nation would help every other nation to help itself, that the development in any nation, that raising of its standard of living, the increase of its purchasing power, will furnish a wider market for the products of all nations, and, in addition, will enable each nation to produce what it is best suited to produce.

The conference was charged with the duty of assembling data, exchanging views, finding facts and making recommendations to the respective governments. Much information was assembled that will be of great value to the peoples of each nation; information as to the dietary needs of people, food shortage, and reasonable goals; better production methods; the conservation of natural resources; better methods of interchange of commodities; assembling of facts in reference to the commodities which the various nations are best suited to produce.

It was recognized that many of the specific problems could not be determined at that time and in a short conference. It was therefore recommended that an interim commission be established to give further study and make recommendations for a permanent commission. I hope the members of the committees before which I am appearing today will be willing to advice and counsel with whoever is selected to represent the United States in the preparation of that recommendation. The recommendation will be submitted to the Congress and to the proper authorities of each nation for approval. Our past experience in war and in peace makes it desirable that it be worked out along the most practical lines.

In a world grown small by courtesy of science—the airplane, the radio, the telephone, the wireless—the peoples of the earth must get acquainted with each other; they must deal with each other. It is far better that they deal as friends and neighbors.

In one of McGuffey's Readers was the story of a man with six sons who were always quarrelling. One day he called them together, showed them a bundle of sticks bound together and offered a prize to any one of them who would break the bundle. They all tried and reported that it could not be done. "That is easy," said the old man, who then unbound the sticks and broke them one by one. "Anyone could do it that way," the boys replied. "So it is with you, my sons," declared the father; "if you stick together no one can hurt you, but if you continually quarrel and fight among yourselves you can be broken separately."

If the United Nations remain bound together by the voluntary ties of mutual interest the peace of the world can be kept.

In a world torn with battle scenes it was inspiring to see the flags of 44 united and friendly nations floating side by side at the conference. It gives hope for the future. Sixteen hundred million people—three-quarters of the population of the earth—were represented. We worked together. We must continue to work together.

I have never seen a finer group. They were earnest. They were sincere. They were able. Many of them have given a lifetime to study and research with little thought of their own interests. They worked early and late as did all who had a part in the conference. From north, south, east, and west, from every part of the earth, strong men met face to face and came to a common understanding.

We hope the foundations have been laid for better living conditions in all countries, and that the action taken will tend to promote enduring peace for the nations of the world.

War conditions have shown that full employment can be had. There is no reason why that cannot be continued in a world of peace. Through expanded production, full employment, and complete use, world conditions can be built in such a fashion that for the first time in history every man, everywhere, will know that he can earn enough to eat. If we can win security from hunger for all men, we can win for freemen security from the rise and aggression of tyrants. If we can win freedom from want, we can make all men strong enough to be free.

If the peoples of the earth can be better fed and enjoy better health; if we can provide full employment and full production and distribution of the products of both the farm and the factory; if we wisely use and truly conserve the natural resources of the earth—if we do these things we will not only provide the highest standards of living the world has ever known, but we will lay the foundation for a lasting peace.

Some Food Problem Fundamentals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by War Food Administrator Chester C. Davis at the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association annual meeting in New York City, N. Y., June 17, 1943:

In the national over-all food problem there are some very important details that are immediately pressing. Last month there were others. Next month there will be new ones.

As of today, the part subsidy should play in food pricing is one important question under discussion. Price policy is another. Feed supply for our livestock is a current and long-time problem of unsurpassed interest to this organization.

These and a dozen other gigantic details are on the fire at this moment. You saw them there this morning—alongside a host of old ones that simmer there regularly. The list is long.

One detail is that of food for our armies so they can destroy our enemy. Another is food for the British and the Russians, who are destroying our enemy even faster. Another is food for American civilians, the claimant for the biggest part of our food supply, who in 1941 and 1942 enjoyed the greatest feast period in all our history and have the purchasing power to continue their record demands for food. Another is the important detail of farm labor and machinery so our farmers can continue to produce up to their present amazing records.

Each of these is vastly important in its own right. To various groups each is the most important part of the whole problem.

But each is in fact only one part of the whole national food problem.

And if all these problems were solved this week, we would have a whole new set of detail problems on the doorstep next week.

But there are some steadfast verities in a sound national food policy. There are some fundamentals that persist as detail problems come and go. These are the things to watch.

I will try to confine this discussion to some of those fundamentals, rather than ponder here any of the current administrative problems—important as many of them are as details.

One fundamental is this: No matter how much food our resourceful farmers produce no matter how good the weather, or how much farm labor and machinery are available, or how high our mountains of reserves are piled, or how soon the war is over, we won't have enough food to satisfy all the claimants for all the kinds of food they want.

There are some plain, cold reasons for this. One is that our civilians, the largest food claimant, still have unprecedented purchasing power and they demand more and better food than ever before.

Let me repeat here a fact I have often stated because it is such a persistent factor in any realistic appraisal of the food problem. It should be noted, checked, and pondered long and thoughtfully by every American today. It is this: In our first full year of war the American civilians ate more food than in any other year in our history, except 1941, which was only a fraction higher. The last 2 years have been our greatest feast period.

The number of coupons which have always limited the civilian purchases before—and I mean by that the number of dollars he has had to spend for food—has increased as the national income has soared to its all-time peak, while he was unable to spend for autos and other such things in short supply. He has more of the dollar food coupons with which to buy food than ever before and, being human, wants to spend them.

This unprecedented demand for more and better food, thus creating the appearance of shortage, will continue until these extra dollars, now burning in the civilian's pockets, are drawn off into other investments, such as investment in his government through higher taxation and heavier buying of government bonds.

I mentioned the American civilian first because he is the biggest food claimant. Last year he ate more than 85 percent of all our record-breaking production. The rest—less than 15 percent—went to our armed forces and for lend-lease to our allies.

But the proportion for military and lend-lease will be greater in the future. It is a paradox, but a realistic fact, that with every military success the correct management of food becomes more important and difficult. Our food is the chief reliance for encouraging the liberated people to help us in the final assaults against the Axis gates. Correct use of food is the cheapest way we can hasten the end of the war. Our food must continue to help keep the British and the Russians swinging prodigious blows against our enemy. That small 6 per cent of our last year's production which went for lend-lease was vitally important to our allies. Without it, Britain might have collapsed. With it the Royal Air Force, the British Army, the British Navy and their huge merchant shipping fleet are fighting more strongly hour by hour.

And we must have food for the liberated areas, such as north Africa, to enable them to get back into production. That former food surplus area must be helped back to that status with all haste.

The second fundamental principle in a sound national over-all food policy emerges from the first. It is this: Because of the number of food claimants and the nature of their demands, all our genius must be used to produce not only the most food possible but in the proper balance to get the maximum amount of human nutrients from our soil and labor resources.

In the interest of good nutrition and high morale the diet of our armed forces, civilians, and our allies should include the maximum possible amount of milk, meat, and eggs. What the maximum is, for all those who must produce and fight for us, is the problem. Our feed resources and land resources determine the amount of meat and milk and eggs we can produce. When wartime demand puts on the pressure for the maximum nutrients from our resources this fact must be considered.

We are endeavoring to expand production of foods that are high in nutrients relative to the expenditure of farm land and labor. Emphasis is being placed on stepping up output of such foods as whole milk, cereals, potatoes, peanuts, soybeans, dried beans, which make the most efficient use of our farm resources, instead of other commodities which require greater use of land and labor, but which are more in demand because of swollen wartime incomes.

Our effort will be to maintain milk, egg, and meat production at the highest possible level our feed supplies will permit, and we will produce and market much more meat in the coming 12 months than in the past 12 months.

But our civilians will demand more food because of their purchasing power. Our armed forces would take more. So would our allies and the liberated people. Since we can't meet all these food claims with animal products we must increase production of bread grains and dried beans and peas, and potatoes and the oilseeds. That is the only way to provide adequate nourishment for all the people who must get it from us if they are to keep on producing and fighting for us most effectively.

I have mentioned this tremendously important detail—the livestock-feed ratio—because it illustrates how even it is only one detail of the over-all food problem, and must be examined, and faced on that basis, whether we want to or not.

While on this subject let me describe briefly our efforts to bring in feed wheat from Canada. Two months ago the Commodity Credit Corporation bought 7,250,000 bushels of Canadian wheat for feed, to supplement the feed supplies her in New England and the Middle Atlantic area. The big problem in bringing in wheat from Canada is transportation. It has to compete for space on the boats with heavy traffic of other essential goods. So far we have unloaded about 1,000,000 of the seven and one-fourth million bushels brought, at Georgia Bay ports, awaiting shipment to New England, and additional cargoes of 750,000 bushels will arrive shortly at other bay ports or Buffalo.

In addition to this Commodity Credit Corporation wheat, about 17,000,000 bushels of domestic and Canadian feed grains have moved by boat into the Northeast from the opening of navigation to June 10.

This week the President signed a bill providing for the sale of an additional 50,000,000 bushels of feed wheat by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This will help relieve the feed problem in eastern, southern, and western deficit areas.

The third fundamental is closely related to the second I have just discussed. It is that a sound national food policy demands that every aid possible be given to the farmer to help him produce. The full resources of the War Food Administration have been pledged to that end result—production. I renew that pledge today.

The ingredients to production are farm labor, farm machinery and equipment, weather, and encouragement in the form of price support and credit. If the American farmer has these his genius will do the rest.

The farmer has proved this on his record. Last year he broke by a full 12 percent the amazing all-time food production record of the year before. He has had to use his limited supply of labor and machinery and equipment to the utmost of his ingenuity, but it has been adequate for him to make records.

Let me digress from fundamentals to discuss briefly one detail in this connection, the recent developments in increasing the amount of farm machinery. The War Production Board issued a new order on June 15 which controls farm machinery production at an average of 80 percent of the high machinery output in 1940. This new machinery program, in which War Production Board and the War Food Administration have cooperated fully is geared to our war food needs.

The outlook on machinery is encouraging, but farmers should not expect new equipment to show up immediately on their dealers' floors. War Production Board has assured us that steps will be taken to see that steel and other materials are delivered to manufacturers in time so that they can make and deliver the goods to meet the seasonal needs. But time is needed to put the machinery on the market, complications are involved in the manufacture of parts and transportation is not as fast these days. In other words, much progress has been made and the outlook is good, but farmers must not expect to find all the machinery they want in their dealers' yards tomorrow morning.

During the quarter beginning July 1 special emphasis will be put on manufacture of harvesting equipment for use this year, and after that period the emphasis will be on equipment needed by farmers next spring.

Now these fundamentals of a sound national food policy that I have discussed so far lie in the field of production. Those come first. But there are others. I will mention them only briefly.

It is fundamental to a sound food policy that the available supply be allocated equitably among all the claimants. I want to emphasize here that the civilian supply is not just what happens to be left over after the military and lend-lease have taken theirs. The civilian supply is calculated for in advance and is set up to be nutritionally adequate to maintain health and efficient production at a wartime tempo.

Then there is the problem of management of the civilian food supply; of rationing in certain commodities where demand exceeds supply; of reducing some distribution expense so as to keep farm prices high enough to induce production and yet hold the line on retail prices; of the relationship of rationing to price control and to the whole economic stabilization policy.

Finally we come to one of the most important fundamentals of all in a successful national food program. It is the responsibility of the public to learn and apply the principles of nutrition to get the most out of what is available. He must learn and apply methods of eating right for health and strength and methods of stopping waste.

How shall we bring it to pass that every American mans his battle station on the food front—plays his part in making food fight for our side in this war? The answer is obvious. Americans will play their full part on any front once they are convinced that by so doing they are helping to bring victory—and bring it sooner.

Here are some of the facts I hope every American will keep before him as he thinks about food and acts to produce it, save it, share it, use it wisely, and adjust his habits to the changes of wartime.

1. Food doesn't just happen; it can't just be taken for granted. Food has to be produced by work and planning and conserved by genius and care.

2. Our allies actually do depend in large measure on the food supply from which we eat so freely and the success of the Royal Air Force and the Russian Army are a part of our direct responsibility in food management.

3. Our armed forces must plan with a margin of safety and for rapid replacement of supplies that are sunk at sea. The Army is prudent in its takings of food.

4. The civilian supply of food will be large enough for health and strength for all, but not for waste.

5. Rationing of some foods is necessary; it is difficult to administer a rationing program perfectly, but some rationing system must be relied upon to assure fairness in dividing the supply among all; without it there would certainly be less fairness.

6. Never during the war, no matter how long it lasts or how wise and skilled we become—never will we get all the problems solved and all the difficulties overcome. Never during this war can the consumer or producer settle down to assurance that all

the food-producing and food-using habits can stay the same from here on out. There can be no such hope. He must expect change, which is inherent in war. Neither the production nor the needs can be completely prophesied. The only thing constant about war is that there will always be change.

Citizens must know the vital importance of food in the war. They must understand the total food program. They must know the increase that could be made in the effective food supply if waste could be eliminated. They must know the cumulative effect on the usefulness of food as a weapon if each individual played his full part.

I conclude on this point because it is, after all, one of the most important fundamentals of all in a successful, over-all national food program in time of war. No food program can be made to work solely by rulings and orders and devices and directives.

But this national food program of ours can be made to work by an informed citizenry. An informed citizenry must not only be sufficiently aware of the importance of food in the war effort but of the everlasting importance of individual action. Right there is where we will succeed or fail.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation today faces a third coal strike in as many months. Should this strike materialize and become widespread, production of vital war materials will be drastically curtailed. We have heard many condemnations on the floor of the House toward those who are considered responsible. Various recriminations have been made toward John L. Lewis, who, as leader of the miners' organization, is charged as being responsible; also we have heard criticisms of the operators for their refusal to make concessions.

Let us, however, pause for a moment and analyze conditions under which all negotiations have been carried on. A hold-the-line policy or Little Steel formula, which many of us feel is outmoded, has been adhered to by the War Labor Board. On the other hand, the operators find it impossible to grant a wage increase without the assurance of the Bituminous Coal Commission and the Office of Price Administration that price increases will be permitted, as the Bituminous Coal Commission is responsible for recommendations as to coal prices and the Office of Price Administration is the agency that regulates price ceilings. Thus no increase in wages can be granted by the coal operators until assurance is given them by these two Federal agencies that they will be permitted to increase the price of coal; otherwise bankruptcy is inevitable. The bitterness between the War Labor Board and the mine workers' union representatives has reached a point where it is merely a matter of personal enmity and animosity, from which bitterness the Nation suffers and which will make it impossible to bring about an amicable solution of this problem.

Very few persons question the fact that the mine workers are underpaid. As proof I hold in my hand an advertisement from the San Francisco News, promising women $214 per month during a short training period, then $270 per month when the training as welders is completed. These women are to be paid with Federal funds, on shipbuilding projects; think of it, $214 per month while they are learning to do the work for which they are employed. I doubt if there is a miner in America who makes that much money for performing the most hazardous work in the industrial field.

This coal strike must be settled and can be settled by the simple application of sanity and an earnest effort to win a settlement. I do not condemn the War Labor Board, as it has been instructed to stand by a policy which I frankly believe the members of the Board itself feel is unjust. I cannot blame the miners for demanding that which they feel is their just due, but while these two parties remain at odds, the Nation suffers. It is time that action was taken. I, therefore, make the following suggestion:

That the President take the entire matter of settlement from the War Labor Board and place it in the hands of Fuels Coordinator Secretary Ickes, in whom the miners and operators have expressed their confidence. This can be done without a violation of the Little Steel formula as portal-to-portal pay is not an hourly wage increase, it is an allowance for travel time within the mine and would be based upon a national average, not on an hourly or daily prevailing rate. I then suggest that a meeting be called and the attendance of representatives of the miners, the operators, the Bituminous Coal Commission and the Office of Price Administration be present. Should the Office of Price Administration and the Bituminous Coal Commission grant to the operators an increase in price ceilings sufficiently high to meet the added operating cost, I am of the opinion that the operators will immediately grant a portal-to-portal allowance and the strike will be settled.

I live with both miners and operators in my district. I have witnessed the closing of 50 mines out of 60 which operated there within the past 10 years and I have seen employment shrink by 90 percent among the miners. I know these miners to be loyal, patriotic American citizens. Their sons are in the armed forces along with yours and mine. I know the operators who owned the 50 mines that have closed and I know that many of them are virtually bankrupt today because they could not obtain a price sufficiently high for their coal to keep those mines in operation.

As to this increase, this is war and we must pay for it, and personally, I would rather try to justify an increase in coal prices to pay coal miners than to try to justify the purchase of underwear for Arabs with lend-lease funds. This strike can be settled within 48 hours if the effort is made to settle it. Let the President, therefore, remove this strike case from the War Labor Board forthwith, and as time is of the essence, place its settlement in the hands of the one man in whom both miners and operators have expressed their confidence, and coal production will be back to normal before the end of this week. Should the miners be forced back to the pits under Government order, production will not be of the quantity that it was when they were working as free men, for no man is at his best when he feels that he has been wronged.

Sinews of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, an example of the fact that the people of this country are not only thinking of the past and present conditions but of the future, is best illustrated by a paper prepared by one of my constituents, Mr. Frank E. Watts, a farmer living in my district. This thought-provoking paper follows:

FELLOW AMERICAN: Unwise policies of today make wars tomorrow. On Armistice Day I said the war with Germany would have to be fought over. Ten years ago in Los Angeles, standing beside a great vessel loaded with scrap iron for Japan, I predicted the Jap-American war.

Let's look into this war and avoid another.

Yours for world peace,

FRANK E. WATTS.

SINEWS OF PEACE

Peace is the rightful heritage of the most humble in every land. It is vital to his prosperity and happiness. Yet the broadest pages of history are written in blood. History is a story of rebellion, revolution, and conquest. These are bald, hard statements, yet they, too, truly record the failure of the race thus far, to bring about a lasting peace.

Twice in our generation the world has been forced into a war that threatened all free government. When the First World War broke nations were better prepared to resist. Even small nations could claim some slight protection of international law. This, in spite of the overrunning of Belgium and Germany's disregard for a "scrap of paper." Hitler's regime was far from being entirely new. It was built into the warp and woof of the ideals and motives of German world domination, dear to every German long before Hitler. The deceit, treachery, and stealth, employed by Hitler, had been a part of German preparation in 1914. Nor did the armistice put a stop to these practices. At the end of two decades they broke the bonds of their recent victors with plans and preparedness that startled the world. This time with an all-out effort to achieve the overthrow and subjugation of all nations opposing world domination of Hitler Germany.

Any approach at the question of obtaining a lasting peace will fail unless it rightfully considers the factors which made these wars possible. Behind all facts and figures will be found the ever-present elements of

human nature. Not all the causes therefor will be found leading to Berlin, Rome, or Tokyo.

The common freeman will declare that the cause of war is greed. The student of economics and political economy may say it is ambition. When the Axis nations wreaked death and destruction on those neighbor nations it was greed. And back of it all was a people moved by national ambition to sack the world and build a Greater Germany, another Roman Empire, and an All Over Power of the Rising Sun. But the plot was not perpetrated without the depraved ambition of political leaders given over to the philosophy of greed, plunder, and destruction. Free peoples do not wage such wars. Thus it will be observed, that dictatorships were set up, who took over the powers of government. Self-government was safely removed from the people, who were reduced to abject slavery and fear.

Far be it from the truth to permit the impression that all the dirty work done by dictators and gangsters was unknown to the world. True, much was done under cover. World capitals, however, were not in the dark. For 5 years before Pearl Harbor Japan waged war on China. During this time and 5 years before that Japan built almost her entire strength from war materials secured from the United States. Nor was Washington without warning of Japan's attitude toward the United States as far back as Hoover's administration, when Stimson warned of the serious intentions of the Japanese Government. Notwithstanding this, the policies continued through the years in which our agent, Grew, persistently warned Washington.

Before Hitler's steamroller rolled into Austria Mussolini pushed over into Ethiopia. This, while England debated "appeasement" in the League of Nations. Even worse, while Mussolini loudly proclaimed his aim to "gather up the fragments of the British Empire." The League also watched the insidious meddling and the final overthrow of the Spanish Government. It has been commonly reported that war factories in Germany never stopped at the end of the First World War. Be that as it may, Hitler and Roosevelt came to power at about the same time. While some have professed not to know Hitler's plans, the most common reader could guess pretty accurately. And although each offensive was beclouded in falsehood and deceit, the truth was first printed and published.

In seeking about for safe ground for an enduring peace at the close of this war, it will be wise with care and without bias to look into the attitude of the nations, large and small, toward this oncoming struggle. It is doubtful if there has been a time in history when such fear and tension existed in the capitals of Europe. Nations were warned of the power and cruelty of the German war machine. Diplomatic connections were carefully laid in every land to touch German agents and fifth columns. One small nation at a time was invaded and warned of the death and relentless cruelty that awaited opposition to German war demands. Hitler's convenient and faithless promise that no other nations would be overrun failed to allay their fears. None dared join in any united resistance.

As to larger nations, however much they may have been responsible for Germany's power, all could see that a demon had broken loose. In connection with fear, appeasement, and delay in controlling the Axis war machine, it is important to consider the fifth column. In the First World War the German minority played an important part. At Munich Hitler called on all German minorities everywhere to "adhere to and defend the Reich." Highly organized fifth columns in Norway and other countries only too plainly proves how far reaching this policy may be in undermining all government everywhere. Short-wave radio carried propaganda, not only to German minorities, but to populations everywhere. Every aspect of public opinion in every country was card-indexed. No medium of influence was overlooked. The Bedouin of the desert was secretly taught to distrust British rule. Strongholds of German sympathy and trade were established in South America. A thousand crafty tricks were practiced in the United States, through personal contact, radio, and college professor.

Since we are at war, and it is a world war, it becomes a pertinent question just what the aims of the Allied Powers may be. Frankly, common people anywhere and everywhere are not sure. Is it because of the cloud that hangs over Pearl Harbor? Or could it be laid to the fact that the people were not "let in" on the Atlantic Charter? It has been hinted that some of the very elements of the "four freedoms" were violated by the authors. Americans, by nature, object to freedom being administered in capsule form by force. And now, over a year after Pearl Harbor, we find that this is the kind of freedom we are fighting for. We, whose ancestors threw off the shackles of monarchy and made it right to debate charters, declarations, and a constitution.

However far we may be from a peace conference, it is certain that a number of hot spots threaten on the home front. Problems unsolved now, may become worse at the close of the war. There is a decided feeling that after the war there must be change in the opportunity offered the man without money. The labor problem, crying for settlement at the close of the century, is still unsolved. Added features make it more complex. Half a century ago two-thirds of our population was rural, one-third metropolitan. Today the ratio is reversed. At the same time labor-saving machinery has made industry less dependent on manpower. At the end of the war, millions, free from service, will be jobless. Organized labor, now in paying jobs and Government favored, will hold tight. It is one thing to say the unemployed shall be fed. It is another to offer an opportunity to make an independent living and a home.

Defeat of the Axis Powers can hardly bring a solution to such as the above problems. Admittedly, a policy of temporary support for soldiers will be a public duty. There will, however, be a positive demand for a more substantial and fundamental adjustment. With business of the country organized to the teeth and all the wealth in the hands of its operators, the expression "equality of opportunity" will sound like an idle joke to a penniless soldier. It will be wise for the interests of wealth to coinsider this question before being compelled by force of events.

Leaders, ambitious to hold high office, will make this a political football to amuse the sidelines and reach the goal of power, or retain it. An added 4-year administration of radical policy may launch the Nation on a system that will revolutionize our economic structure. It will set up a planned economy and inaugurate such regimentation as will be unbearable to all who hold to Americanism. It will intrench the Federal administration behind a block of office holders Nation-wide, from township to White House, making it next to impossible to unseat a virtual dictator. No dictator will ever stabilize human rights and freedom in America. Any government that forces its opinions on the people by political intrigue, if left unchecked, will wreck the western freedom, brought forth in '76. But dictatorships rise out of disorder and injustices. We are but 10 years away from the evasive preachment of rugged individualism, which the people repudiated with disgust. The amount of it all is that one individual, with a family, penniless and jobless, makes about as much impression on a modern capitalist as a Norwegian coffee party resisting the Gestapo. The refuge of cheap land is no longer in the picture. It is plainly a matter of government aid for the unemployed.

Logically, the problem is not confined to unemployment. It includes all classes not in control of finance and organized business. For business is so organized as to squeeze out all the profits of labor and production at both ends. The loud call, so long unheeded, is for a new attitude toward possession of wealth. For human greed is no less a factor in the field of economy than in war. How many are there who live in luxury without labor by an unearned fortune, while millions labor without luxury, and always close to the breadline? Morally unfair, and continued only by pressure, this system is on the way out. It is part of the industrial revolution which is going on in war and in peace. Banker and businessman may aid in its solution. He may oppose, he cannot prevent.

The pendulum has swung 10 years away from "rugged individualism." Millions have tasted food from the New Deal "grab bag." This, however, is but the interim of makeshift, the period of soliloquy. To go further, with the endorsement of the American people, will be to follow ancient Rome, whose industrial fiber rotted out on handouts from the public crib.

As a government appeases the people, it usurps their prerogatives of opinion and power. Many recent and current cases might be cited in evidence. The ultimate objective of such government may be found in Wallace's recent statement that "We are moving away from democracy, and toward communism." America's strong background of freedom lulls us into the dream that free government cannot slip from us. For a decade, too many policies in Washington have indicated a contempt for sacred and blood-bought documents, framed by patriots to safeguard free institutions of America. Now we have the proclaimed policy. He says, "we are moving away from democracy." Americans understand democracy to be government by the people. And he says, "Moving toward communism." Americans understand communism to be some sort of government control under a dictatorship.

Popular government in America can be displaced only by emasculation of the ballot. Hitler's election was made unanimous by casting out all negative ballots. Evasive methods are more likely here. Weakness in our nominating system makes it possible for a party organization to force a weak or otherwise objectionable candidate before the people at election. A bureaucratic system makes this alarmingly true. Even more so, when the dominant party in Congress and the executive are in the same organization, as the purge becomes a whip.

Any political party facing the people in 1944 will have to prove fit to be placed in trust. The problems of the people must be faced squarely and honestly. Leaders opposing radical Government must not attempt to deceive the millions and give them A stone when they cry for bread. Great questions are at issue. Must millions vote away freedom to obtain bread?

POSTWAR SECURITY

Basic in the life of the common people in every land is the love of peace. Only when sorely oppressed, attacked from without, or incited by ambitious leaders, do the rank and file of any nation favor war.

Whence do wars come? Alexander the Great, master of military formation, led the Macedonian Phalanx to world conquest, and then wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. Then in turn, warriors of the Roman Empire subjected and enslaved the proud and literary Greeks. Rome and Carthage maintained a standing feud for war practice. Finally, All roads led to Rome, where jealous triumvirates held sway over a decadent empire that rotted under

the oppulence of conquest. English history is the story of wars that for over a thousand years, soaked British soil with blood. Regardless of the advent of the Prince of Peace, the valleys and plains of Europe have been strewn with the bones of men who fought the useless wars of ambitious monarchs.

Why these wars? For the most part, to establish power and supremacy. To overthrow one crown or dynasty and establish another. With William the Conqueror came the bloody Tower of London, historic dread of all who displeased the Crown. The reforms of Magna Carta were wrested from the limp hands of King John. Henry the Eighth established a free English church in order to free himself from the papal antidivorce decree. Under the theory of divine right of kings, it cost the head of Charles the First to restore Parliament to the people. A tenacious feudal system, right hand of royalty, built up English aristocracy, that mighty class of privileged rich, whose hand of exploitation reaches out into mighty India, the diamond fields of South Africa, and the most remote parcel of the Empire.

The hand of realism has swept the ridiculous and mythical "Divine right of kings" away like witchcraft. Yet selfish leaders, seeking to emulate the Caesars, the Charlemagnes, and Napoleons, have circumvented the milestones of freedom in the Bill of Rights, the Preamble and Constitution. Today the peoples of the civilized world are either under absolute dictatorships or threatened with the downfall of free government.

We are in the surges of a mighty world war. There can be no peace, no security, until the enemies of freedom are vanquished. Questions still unsettled forbid final judgments as to penalties. The utter cruelty and abandon of this onslaught staggers the mind. Figures fail in computation of lives or property destroyed by these outlaws. Most guilty in all history, these nations and their leaders must face the bar of justice. Lives of the gangster's victims cannot be restored nor fully avenged. But in the name of the helpless, the innocent, and the dead in two wars, there must be restitution. Millions of peace-minded men, forced to fight in this holocaust, will demand full penalties for the guilty.

Paramount over all post-war issues will be the disarmament of all gangster nations. These world conquerors have held a gun on the world long enough. They have forfeited their rights among nations. Each must be dealt with separately as the case requires. Italy alone could hardly become a world menace. Yet her geographical position renders her an enviable ally in any combination aiming at control of Europe and Asia. And her corrupt and ambitious leadership has staked everything in the vilest play for power. As to Germany there must be no mistakes. The repetition of attempts at world conquest puts this nation in the class of dangerous criminals. Their deep-dyed sagacity would turn any loose probation into an opening for treachery. Indeed, dismemberment would seem the only safe plan of control. Regardless of time or method required, the people must be turned from the devilish doctrine of a German superrace. In the Orient Tokio must be disarmed and kept so until China holds the balance of power. China must be rehabilitated without exploitation.

This program will meet with bitter opposition. Hardly a question can be raised with more divergent opinions. Allied Nations fought the first World War, little realizing the deep-seated complicity of the German people in the war plot. That the same appalling ignorance prevailed two decades later was fully attested by the Chamberlain appeasement at Munich. Up to Pearl Harbor a popular college round-table theme was "Unfair treatment of Germany at the peace table." Another class bewailed "Lack of room for Axis expansion." And there is the fetching plea of the haves and the have nots, which may be more genuine after the war than during the fabulous expenditure for armament. Racial minorities, under cover for the duration, will at the peace raise their ugly heads. It will then be well to bear in mind that business and politics respect neither race nor creed.

The day of unconditional Axis surrender will be one of the most critical in history. This day will have been bought with the lives of millions. Decisions rendered on this day will go far in determining the future course of civilization. Whether peoples shall be free to govern themselves and to do so without fear of aggression. On this day all nations will be on trial. For as the free nations acquit themselves in this victory, so shall a new freedom advance for all the world. Utopian in ideal, this freedom must end all exploitation and oppression, until every man who lives by the "sweat of his brow," shall also enjoy the "fruits of his labor." These ideals call for men. Men loyal to truth and fearless in its defense. Caesars and business magnates or theorists may wreck this peace.

A LEAGUE TO PRESERVE PEACE

There is no argument as to temporary control of Axis powers after the war. Some in Government circles favor a permanent world league. They argue that American membership in the League of Nations would have averted the present war. The common people do not share this opinion. They hold that the dominant nations in the League, as well as America, knowingly armed the Axis Powers for this war. Free peoples of the world are tired of wars "to end war," while active causes of war run rampant. Chronic sufferers ever seek a panacea for their ills. Peace clinics are today hailing "Dr. Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations" as the greatest peace preserver on earth. The common man, the conscripted man who fights the wars, is slow to turn down the advice of "trusted physicians" in the "Government household" for a century and a half, against such "nostrums." A subtle nationalism grips America. Its adherents cry for more power of the executive and perpetuation in office. Union of this regime with British imperialism and Russian totalitarianism could form only an international dictatorship. A league like this could hardly be expected to extend the four freedoms to the subjugated nations of earth. It would certainly not promote peace.

Motives of United Nations are negative and incohesive. They wage war on a common enemy today. Their intersts diverge tomorrow, perhaps oppose. The new wine of advanced freedom cannot be put in the old skins of imperialism or the much-courted system of communistic totalitarianism.

It should not be overlooked that a world league offers within itself grave dangers to world peace. With Germany silenced, domination of Europe will fall to London and Moscow. Statements by Churchill and Stalin belie substantial indorsement of the principal of freedom for all peoples. Added to the wide divergence in the philosophies of these two nations, lies the menace of the smaller states of Europe. Jealousy, treachery, and secret diplomacy have made every capital a tinder-box, threatening European equilibrium and world peace, for over 2,000 years. Yet none of these nations has power to resist conquest. While these conditions permeate Europe, further outside intervention is futile. Only when a new spirit is conceived will a new freedom be born in Europe. Cooperation and union toward a common peace must replace discord and division. A definite stride in this direction would be the organization of a union under some such name as the League of European States for Peace. This would land the problem of European peace in Europe where it most properly belongs. Americans have fought in two European wars. The common people of United States will not underwrite a third.

The fact that Japan made war on China with American weapons and then turned them on the United States, carries sober warning to foreign policy in Washington. Is it possible that the irritability of the State Department is due to congressional reluctance in the indorsement of policies bitterly opposed by the people? A new China will emerge from the war. Oriental mysticism will give way to industrial development. Fabulous resources, torn from Japanese grasp, will attract world finance. Any post-war program that smacks of exploitation will cheat the boasted "freedoms," and pave the way for more conscripted foreign wars.

CAN PEACE BE ASSURED?

Present trends of warfare can but darken any outlook into the future. The worst is yet to be enacted. Axis failure to use gas, disease germs, or any more deadly weapon, has not been due to any inhibitive reflex of conscience. A more powerful alignment of nations may one day wipe out the life of an enemy overnight. This preview, however vivid or truthful, offers no deterrent to the warmakers' lust for glory, power, or profit. Wars will not cease unless and until the champions of right and peace stop the warmakers.

Petroleum Price Increase Again Recommended by Secretary Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a copy of a letter from the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, to the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, relative to the price of petroleum. It is self-explanatory:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, June 10, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I regret that I am unable to subscribe to the views expressed in your letter of May 1 in answer to mine of April 7 recommending a general adjustment in price ceilings on crude oils. For although I note with satisfaction that we seem to agree on the importance of maintaining adequate reserves of petroleum, apparently I did not stress sufficiently either the imminence of a shortage in our daily productive capacity or the practical urgency of a price increase if the risks of such a shortage are to be minimized.

For me, it is no answer to an imminent shortage to say that the rate of exploratory drilling is now "approximately the same as last year" when neither that rate nor the rates prevailing since 1938 have led to sufficient discoveries to replace what we have consumed. This decrease in discoveries is of far greater import than that of a mere loss in total reserves. It is from new fields and fields only a few years old that we procure

flush production. It is upon flush production that we have always depended for over half of our current production. A shortage of crude oil occurs when demands exceed current productive capacities—it cannot be postponed by statistical calculations of theoretical reserves producible over half a century.

Had we not been fortunate enough to enter this war with a large excess of daily capacity to produce from flush fields developed in the thirties, we would have been compelled to pay more for crude oil long before now. So substantial was this excess that proof of any erroneous decision relating to oil production was almost impossible to establish. Was price too low? Did we drill too few exploratory wells? Did we fail properly to conserve? Underlying trends were hidden by unobserved replacements from then-existing excess capacity. But now that excess capacity is virtually gone. Only in certain areas in Texas does it remain and even there, both because of increasing demands and continued natural declines common to all oil fields, this relatively small remaining excess will have largely disappeared by the end of this year unless practical remedial action is taken immediately.

No one, least of all the Petroleum Administration for War, would deny that there are "other factors than price" which have "a distinct and direct bearing on the problem" of current crude oil supply. You mention manpower, spacing restrictions, proration, material and transportation difficulties. Each of these we had already recognized and for each appropriate action had been instituted before we turned to you for such additional assistance in the price field as only your office has the present power to provide.

With manpower we have created a special division which, in collaboration with selective service authorities and the petroleum industry, is endeavoring to find constructive solutions. Spacing restrictions have been and continue to be relaxed. Allowables in virtually all States have been raised and, save for a relatively few fields in Texas, have already reached the approximate limits of efficient capacities beyond which neither we nor the State regulatory authorities dare go without precipitating that rapid deflationary spiral in both reserve and current productive capacity described in my previous letter. As to materials, we have claimed and received from the War Production Board additional supplies, and that Board has approved, after months of intensive work by this office, revised orders to simplify the acquisition of such materials. In addition we have established special pools of materials reserved for exploratory activities and located at convenient points throughout the country. Finally, the efforts and accomplishments of this office in the field of transportation are so enormous and so well known as not to require further review.

To my mind little can be gained by debating whether price or a combination of some or all of these other factors which you have mentioned and with which we have sought to deal, is most important. The term "most" as thus applied is as nebulous and conjectural as you fear would be the results of a price increase. Is it not enough that price is admittedly an important factor? Do not the results of recent actions taken in relation to California illustrate the point? Confronted there with large prospective increases in the demand for heavy oils and declines in heavy crude production, this office relaxed spacing restrictions and yours permitted price increases. Immediately, and I stress the rapidity with which it occurred, drilling operations rose 52 percent above the levels of the previous year.

You state that a general increase in crude-oil prices cannot be justified on the basis of increased costs. But that depends on how costs are computed and which costs are deemed important. Those experts of the United States Tariff Commission who compiled the reports from which your figures on costs and margins were derived would be the first to admit that their cost figures are largely historical.

These cost figures are an index of current costs only to the extent that in their calculation are included present day out-of-pocket expenditures for operating existing wells plus such exploratory outlays as companies with production may elect to charge against that production. All of the balance of these computed costs of production consist of capital amortization charges representing the much lower costs of lease acquisitions, labor, materials, and drilling of years gone by and into which are averaged tens of thousands of naturally cheap wells in fields like East Texas which we cannot reasonably hope to duplicate today. What is worse, as those in the oil industry curtail their exploratory efforts, the cost of current crude as thus computed declines so that, paradoxically enough, the greater the decline in needed exploration, the less the justification for a price adjustment.

It simply must be recognized that the producing branch of the petroleum industry is divided into two more or less distinct groups—a relatively few integrated companies which, in addition to production, engage in the transportation, refining, and marketing of petroleum and its products, and some 10,000 smaller companies and individual operators, so-called independents who engage only in production. The integrated company is a great manufacturing and merchandising organization as well as a producer of oil. To achieve these ends, it is compelled to explore or buy proven crude oil properties. But the independent is under no such compulsion. There is never a day when he is not free to put his business on a liquidating instead of an expanding basis. His decision will not be based upon historical costs—rather it will be governed by current and forward costs in their relation to prospective prices. When a barrel of oil brings less than 10 pounds of steer on the hoof or 4 pounds of green beans in the market, he naturally concludes that we want beef and beans more than oil. This is not mere figure of speech. Hundreds of experienced and skillful independent oil producers have in fact already withdrawn from activities to devote themselves to more profitable farming and ranching. These are the men who have discovered one-half to two-thirds of our total number of oil fields. As such, the independent operator is critically important.

I do not believe that any complicated patchwork of subsidies extending from exploration to stripper wells to marginal drilling and secondary recovery can possibly be drafted, introduced, financed, and administered with sufficient speed and adequate safeguards to minimize, in any substantial degree, the effects of the shortage we face.

However useful a subsidy to obtain marginal production by or through a relatively few producing units, the complexities of its administration and its cost are staggering if applied virtually throughout the entire band of producing effort in the Nation's second largest industry. How many geophysicists, geologists, petroleum engineers, lawyers, cost accountants, auditors, clerks, field officers, collection agents, and general administrative officials must be added to governmental pay rolls to determine forecasted costs, location, and actual expenditures for thousands of exploratory holes; to segregate from hundreds of thousands of existing wells those that should be classified as "strippers"; to decide where, when, and how Government funds shall be invested in technologically complicated secondary recovery operations; and to pass upon the propriety and amount of governmental aid for thousands upon thousands of potential marginal drilling locations? We have no such staff nor has any other governmental agency. To employ such a staff would siphon off a whole host of skilled manpower from the very industry in which they are now more than ever needed for finding and producing oil in the fields and at the wells as opposed to preparing, checking, and reading papers and reports in either industry or governmental offices.

On the one hand, if you are prepared to recommend individual advances only after careful scrutiny and adequate subsequent administration by a necessarily large staff of governmental experts, the manpower consumed and the time required will render the plan valueless in providing necessary productive capacity before our present slim margin of safety has been exhausted. If, on the other hand, you are prepared to recommend that subsidy funds be advanced with a lavish hand without such scrutiny and subsequent careful administration, the whole plan will inevitably degenerate into a promoter's paradise in which the drilling of dry holes becomes a profitable business and the number of barrels of oil found and produced per dollar invested and per ton of material used far less than if such productive effort were stimulated automatically by the moderate price increase which I have proposed.

The so-called self-sustaining features of the subsidy plan you have proposed are almost wholly illusory. To the $150,000,000 exploration bill which you would have the Government pay, there must be added the cost of subsidizing stripper wells, marginal drilling and secondary recovery, together with inevitably large administrative expenses and interest on funds, furnished over an indefinite period of time, and much of which will never be repaid. No historical ratio of producers to dry holes will hold since the Government will inevitably be asked to risk its funds in the lemons, not the plums. Indeed, in the end the Government would be able to liquidate its investment only by permitting a rise in crude oil prices sufficient to permit a few of its successful projects to pay off its losses on innumerable purely promotional ventures. Under either the subsidy plan you have proposed or under any theoretically more perfect modification, I fear we shall search in vain for a system of economic perpetual motion by which an increase in crude prices can be avoided if essential military and civilian demands are to be supplied.

Whether such a price increase as has been recommended is regarded as inflationary or as increasing the cost of living depends, in the last analysis, upon the point of view of the individual observer. Upon the side of excess purchasing power made available for the purchase of consumer goods as opposed to expenditures for exploration and development, an oil price increase is unlikely, on balance after taxes, to result in any larger windfalls than those which are certain to be pocketed by promoters under any set of subsidy proposals capable of operating quickly on a broad enough front. Moreover, a price increase, to the extent that it fails to induce expenditures for new productive capacity, increases Federal tax revenues while a subsidy works precisely in reverse. On the side of consumer costs, an increase in the price of that gasoline still used for nonessential purposes can hardly be deemed inflationary, and where rationing has curtailed nonessential uses, the gasoline bills of consumers in general are today lower than ever before. With fuel oils, as I have already pointed out, competitive price levels ought not to continue to be such as to encourage continued excessive consumption of our exceedingly limited supplies of oil as against coals and other fuels of which we have an abundance. For every barrel thus consumed we shall have to pay unnecessarily large sums either to transport oil from distant lands or to mine or manufacture, synthetically, liquid fuels for which there are no abundant substitutes.

Ever since the wartime responsibility of supplying petroleum and its products was placed upon me by the President over two

years ago, I have deemed it my duty to sponsor plans whereby the dangers and hardships of clearly forseeable shortages of petroleum products might be mitigated. First it was oil transportation shortage which this office foresaw and endeavored to meet well in advance. Then it was 100-octane gasoline manufacturing capacity. Later it was rubber. Now a prospective crude oil shortage impends. Because this is so completely the age of oil, because not only all military operations but the whole of our civilian economy is absolutely dependent upon oil, I feel I would be doing less than my clear duty now if I did not urge and reurge that not only some, but all possible steps, including the price adjustments which I have recommended, be taken to minimize those dangers and those hardships which a severe shortage of oil and its necessarily more stringent civilian rationing are bound to impose.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

Amendment of the World War Veterans' Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering H. R. 2703, a bill to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay, payable by the Veterans' Administration.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Briefly, the bill is designed to correct inequalities arising under existing law, with a view to simplifying adjudicative practices and administrative procedure by establishing uniform provisions wherever possible.

Sections 1 to 8, inclusive, define or modify existing definitions, the terms "widow of a World War No. 2 veteran," "child," "parent," "father," and "mother"; provide for uniform application of section 21, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, which pertain to safeguarding of estates of veterans derived from benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and the administrative and definitive provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the Veterans Regulations, as amended, including provisions for renouncement of compensation or pension; provide for forfeiture of certain benefits as to persons found guilty of certain offenses; and authorize termination of awards in favor of persons in enemy-controlled territory with provision for apportionments to their dependents who are in the United States.

Sections 9 to 13, inclusive, contain provisions applying to World War No. 2 veterans the presumption of soundness and rebuttable presumption of service connection for chronic diseases to be applied uniformly to veterans of World War No. 1 and the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection under part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; giving recognition to service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy, as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war, as active service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; clarifying the exemptions from the income limitation in Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and extending entitlement to a child or children, otherwise eligible where the widow's rights are barred by the income limitation; regulating payments of accrued benefits due and unpaid at death; establishing uniform application of the limitations on payments in hospitalized and domiciled cases of veterans without dependents, increasing the reduced amount of $15 per month to $20 per month, and increasing the reduced amount for non-service connected disability under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, from $6 to $8 per month.

Section 14 simplifies and adjusts the rates of wartime service-connected death compensation or pension by elimination of the differentiation in rates to the widow or children based upon age, adopting the higher rates for all ages. These adjustments result in increased rates and will facilitate adjudicative actions. The increase of the widow's rate from $45 to $50 per month and the payment of that rate regardless of age (now $38 if under 50 years of age) is believed to be a conservative and more appropriate recognition of the Federal obligation in these cases. In order that no inequality may result and that the rates of death pension based upon service other than in period of war may simultaneously be adjusted, this section adjusts those rates to the recognized 75-percent ratio to wartime service-connected rates. The estimated cost of the wartime service-connected adjustment under this section for the first year is $4,026,000 and the adjustment of death pension rates based upon service other than during a period of war is estimated at $510,000 for the first year.

Section 15 governs the receipt of concurrent payments, removing certain inequalities in existing law and providing more equitable rules for uniform application.

Section 16 relates to the effective date of the act and of certain adjustments or benefits authorized thereunder and provides that no payments authorized by the act shall be made for any period prior to date of its enactment.

Section 17 provides that pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

I am glad to find such unanimous sentiment in favor of this legislation because as a matter of patriotism, equity, and justice it should become law.

Address of Hon. Paul V. McNutt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Paul V. McNutt at the Memorial Service for those employees of the Federal Government who have lost their lives in the service of their country during the present war, Sylvan Theater, May 30, 1943:

It is a privilege to preside over this meeting and to pay a well-deserved tribute to those in the Federal service who have given their lives for their country.

On the program which you have received is a page upon which are the names of fellow workers who have died or are missing. That is a list which will grow, for we are engaged in a war which will be both long and hard, and costly in human life.

I hope that you will keep that list and study it. Though you may know personally few or none of those whose names appear upon it, it will serve as a reminder of the devotion and patriotism of those with whom you served.

I would have you note especially that nearly half that list is the names of those who were engaged in civilian services. It is the first such list that I have seen, and I found some difficulty in obtaining further information about the actions in which these men lost their lives, and deeds of valor which they performed. Their stories remain untold.

Government administrators have not recognized—as private industry has recognized—the human value of making such records known. For the sake of the whole Federal service, there is an obligation which should be met.

I think it is important that these human stories be told, just as I think it is important that we meet here today to pay our tribute to these dead. For despite the outcry which clouds the public's understanding of its civil service, Federal employees have a record to be proud of. Both in the total and in the military age group, they have contributed more than the national average to the military service of their country.

More than 250,000 Federal employees are already in the armed services.

And with the application of deferment policies which are more rigorous than those generally applied to private industry, that leadership will be maintained.

On this Memorial Day of 1943, when Americans are fighting in the skies of Europe, in the rocky fastnesses of the Aleutians, in the jungles of New Guinea, it is well to remember these things. It is well to scan this list of dead and to remember that the public service is a calling that requires courage and idealism in civil as well as military service, in peace as well as war.

And if I may call for inspiration upon mighty words which are chiseled into the nearby memorial of Abraham Lincoln, "From these honored dead we take increased devotion."

It is a devotion to victory in this war.

It is a devotion to building after this war the kind of peace, the kind of public service that they fought for here and on the field of battle.

Hot Springs Conference on Food and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Judge Marvin Jones, who was chairman of the Hot Springs so-called Conference on Food and Agriculture, this morning made a report to the Committee on Agriculture of the House on the work done at that conclave.

The truth is he told the committee practically nothing of the real work that was done at the Hot Springs meeting. His statement to the Committee on Agriculture was representative of the tactics he pursued all through the conference to shield in secrecy its activities.

Just as Judge Jones took great pains to give the Committee on Agriculture the impression that the conference was almost wholly interested in food, so he also tried to give this same impression to the public throughout the session of the Food Conference.

The facts are, as written records will show, the Hot Springs conference considered practically every phase of the entire economy—all production and consumption, full employment and cradle to the grave security for all the people of the world, a reduction of the standard of living of all the peoples of the earth to a common level, and so forth. Furthermore, it considered setting up a world bank and a world new deal with such devices as W. P. A., triple A, and so forth.

Above all, the dominating thought of the delegates collected together at Hot Springs was to form an international body to which it would give functions and powers so great as to constitute what would amount to an authoritarian superstate.

It was noteworthy to observe how Judge Jones shied away from answering a question asked by one of the committee members relating to land ownership. He tried to give the impression that whatever consideration the conference gave to this question was of a general nature and in no way important.

The fact is directly to the contrary, as the record will show. Serious consideration was given to land tenure, and this was done under the direction of Alexy D. Krutikov, chairman of the Russian delegation. He was chairman of section 2, which was given the following agenda to consider:

Existing agricultural practices.

Suitable farming systems and practices.

Government and group activities concerning:

(a) Credit or capital developments.

(b) Cooperation services.

(c) Land tenure.

(d) Other similar activities and education.

According to press reports, Krutikov's committee actually recommended community farming as they now have in Russia.

Why did not Judge Jones tell the Committee on Agriculture of the outstanding position occupied by the Russian delegation at the conference, namely, that Alexy D. Krutikov was second vice president out of four vice presidents at the conference; a member of the executive committee and of the steering committee; also chairman of section 2? Furthermore, according to press reports, Krutikov was also chairman of the drafting committee.

Finally, according to a press release, Krutikov was accorded the high honor of making the motion at the closing plenary session of the conference for the adoption of its recommendations.

Judging from certain records of the Food Conference which I have in my possession, Judge Jones failed utterly in telling the Committee on Agriculture what really took place at Hot Springs.

Subsidies That Are Now Being Paid by the Government and an Explanation of the Plans Used in Certain Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement showing the estimated amount of subsidies for selected commodities for the period mentioned, and also statements prepared by the Office of Price Administration disclosing how the different plans for subsidies work on certain items. They are self-explanatory.

Estimated amount of subsidies for selected commodities for calendar 1943, estimated on basis of information obtained June 1, 1943

[In millions of dollars]

Item	Paying agency	Calendar 1943 estimated as of June 1
War risk insurance	War Shipping Administration	44-54.5
Sugar	Defense Supplies Corporation	58.5
Fats and oils	Commodity Credit Corporation	15.0
Copper, lead, and zinc	Metals Reserve Corporation	53.0
Bituminous coal	Defense Supplies Corporation—War Shipping Administration	40.0
Coffee	Commodity Credit Corporation	1.5
Fibers	Defense Supplies Corporation—Commodity Credit Corporation	5.0
Petroleum	Defense Supplies Corporation—War Shipping Administration	144.5
Metals (imported)	Metals Reserve Corporation	25.0
Copper scrap and other scrap metals	Copper Recovery Corporation	27.0
Nicotine sulfate	Agricultural Marketing Administration	1.8
Alcohol	Commodity Credit Corporation—Defense Supplies Corporation	16.0
Chilean nitrate	Defense Supplies Corporation	7.0
Cheddar cheese	Commodity Credit Corporation	30.9
Puerto Rican food	Agricultural Marketing Administration	(1)
Canned goods	Commodity Credit Corporation	25.0
Bleached sulphite wood pulp	Defense Supplies Corporation	(1)
Milk, fluid	Commodity Credit Corporation	(1)
Total		494.2-504.7

[1] Total of these items is less than $10,000,000.

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research, June 18, 1943.

The Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc

By using a subsidy to obtain high-cost production of copper, lead, and zinc, the Government has been able to make sensational savings. In order to mine high-cost copper, producers needed a return of 17 cents a pound. Most copper, however, was produced very comfortably under the ceiling of 12 cents a pound. Instead of raising the ceiling for all copper to 17 cents a pound, the Government buys the high-cost production at 17 cents a pound and sells it to the users at the ceiling price. This 5-cent premium cost the Government $10,000,000 in 1942. But if, instead, the ceiling had been raised to 17 cents for all copper, the additional cost of copper would have been $280,000,000. Since all of the supply was to be used in the production of war goods, the net saving of $270,000,000 accrued to the benefit of the Government.

In the case of lead the Government spent $4,000,000 in 1942 in order to save $72,000,000. In zinc it spent $11,000,000 in order to save $65,000,000. Thus the total expenditure for copper, lead, and zinc of $25,000,000 saved $417,000,000, a return of about $16.70 for every dollar spent.

This program will be expanded in 1943 because of increased costs in the mining industry as a whole, because poorer ores will have to be worked, and in special cases prices higher than those established in the original premium payment plan will be paid. The subsidy for the three metals may reach $78,000,000 but, if the ceiling price were increased instead the cost of the three metals would rise by about $980,000,000. Thus the net saving will be over $900,000,000.

Mechanics of Premium Price Plan

The premium price is paid on tonnage in excess of quotas fixed by a joint committee of War Production Board and Office of Price Administration. These quotas are fixed on a monthly basis and they are fixed to include all output that could reasonably be produced at the established ceiling of 12 cents a pound for copper, 8¼ cents a pound for zinc, and 6½ cents a pound for lead, taking account of the quality of the ore, past production records, costs of production, depth of mines and other relative factors. In most cases mines which had no production during 1941, or which produced less than 200 tons during that year have been assigned zero quotas. For output in excess of the quota, the Metals Reserve Company, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pays 5 cents a pound for copper and 2¾ cents a pound for zinc and lead. These amounts are expected to cover the additional costs involved in developing new mines and in mining ores of low-metal content, costs which would not be covered at the ceiling prices. In some cases, where it is necessary to mine inordinately low-grade,

high-cost ores, additional payments are made.

To obtain premium payments the mine operators must file a certified affidavit of production data monthly. These affidavits are filed by the mining operator with his smelter who in turn forwards copies to the Metals Reserve Company. Payments are then made by the Metals Reserve Company to the smelters for all mines qualifying for the premiums. The smelters, acting as agents for the Metals Reserve Company, pay the mining operators.

COMPENSATORY ADJUSTMENT PLAN FOR EXCESSIVE TRANSPORTATION COSTS OF PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

By payment of a subsidy amounting to $100,000,000 in 1943 and by averaging cost increases through a pooling arrangement, the Government is saving east-coast consumers of petroleum products $290,000,000 this year. About 45 percent of the savings, or $130,000,000, accrues directly to the Government on its purchases of petroleum products, and 25 percent, or $73,000,000, is saved by industry, which in turn passes on a considerable part to the Government through lower costs of war goods. The remaining 30 percent, or $87,000,000, represents a direct saving to consumers on cost-of-living items.

Beginning in the summer of 1941, the increased use of tankers for international rather than coastwise shipments, as well as the sinkings along the Atlantic seaboard, necessitated an almost complete shift from the low-cost tanker method of transporting oil to high-cost railroad tank cars. It costs, on the average, about $1.20 more to bring a barrel of petroleum—or petroleum products—from the Texas fields to the east coast by tank car than it used to cost by tanker. If prices had been raised to the full extent necessary to get in these high-cost supplies, it would have meant an increase in the total cost of east-coast petroleum supplies amounting to $606,000,000 in 1943.

Office of Price Administration first attempted to solve the problem of this tremendous increase in the costs of one form of transportation by shifting part of the costs to petroleum still coming to the east coast by normal means of transportation—chiefly pipe lines—and to petroleum produced in the East. This was done by permitting a moderate price increase on major petroleum products consumed on the east coast, regardless of their point of origin or the method of transportation used. The additional revenues accruing to petroleum sellers were earmarked for a pool; this pool was drawn upon to pay the additional cost of tank-car transportation.

Total claims against the pool will amount to $316,000,000 in 1943. Of this amount $216,000,000 will be met by pool revenues. The deficit of $100,000,000 will be paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation on the basis that additional costs of wartime transportation should not be borne entirely by east coast consumers, but that the Nation as a whole should bear a share.

It is expected that payments under this subsidy program will rapidly decline as new pipe lines replace the high-cost tank cars as a means of transporting oil.

In addition, the War Shipping Administration is absorbing a part of the current unusual freight and insurance rates on the small amount of oil that is still moving by tanker. This amounts to $45,000,000 a year.

MECHANICS OF THE PLAN

This subsidy is paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation to east coast importers of petroleum and petroleum products on their purchases originating in district 3, and, to a lesser extent, in district 2. The importers file a claim with Defense Supplies Corporation for the excess of their actual transportation costs over the pre-war costs of importing from a normal source of supply. If they elect to do so, importers may retain additional revenues which they have received on account of the special price increases, as a verdict against their claims.

SUBSIDY ON INCREASED TRANSPORTATION COSTS FOR SUGAR

By subsidizing unusual wartime transportation costs and by ruling out the necessity of increasing all sugar prices sufficiently to cover the added costs of bringing sugar in by the most circuitous emergency route, the Government has kept refined sugar prices from advancing by as much as 79 cents per hundred pounds at wholesale. This is equivalent to a saving of a cent a pound at retail. The total cost of the subsidy in 1943 will be $43,500,000; this compares with a potential price increase amounting to $103,000,000, of which $21,000,000 would have to be paid directly by the Government on its own sugar purchases. Industrial users are saving $30,000,000, and consumers as a whole are saving $52,000,000 directly on the cost of living.

The need for this subsidy arises from the fact that wartime transportation dislocations made it necessary to import sugar from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii not only at unusually high-cost shipping rates to normal port of entry, but also to use abnormal ports of entry involving much higher overland transportation costs to the refining centers. For instance, much of the sugar destined for Boston now is shipped by water to Florida, where it is transshipped by rail up the coast at a cost equivalent to 79 cents per hundred pounds of refined sugar in excess of normal costs. A price increase of this amount would be more than enough to meet the additional transportation costs of 75 percent of all sugar.

This subsidy applies to unusual transportation costs on all sugar, whether imported or domestic. All shipments of sugar, both beet and cane, are made pursuant to War Production Board General Preference Order M-98; because of this order, movements of sugar to refineries have been altered from their normal course.

MECHANICS OF THE PLAN

The Defense Supplies Corporation sends checks directly to refiners to cover the following charges:

1. The difference between the ocean freight rate to the port of entry and the rate which existed during December 1941.
2. Any increased rail or barge freight resulting from a diversion of shipping from normal routes.
3. Extra handling costs at transportation points.
4. Losses resulting from a reduction in weight by reason of transshipment.

In cases where it is customary for the sugar producer to pay the shipping charges, Defense Supplies Corporation makes reimbursement to the shipper rather than to the purchasing refinery.

CHEDDAR CHEESE

A subsidy program was adopted in Cheddar cheese manufacturing to obtain sufficient production to meet unprecedented military, lend-lease, and civilian demand without raising prices to consumers above the October 1942 level. The subsidy technique has permitted the holding of prices in accordance with the President's hold-the-line order, and in addition has meant a net saving to the Nation. For every $1 of subsidy expended, $1.40 is saved in retail prices to consumers.

This saving arises from the fact that wholesalers' and retailers' mark-ups are on a percentage basis and amount together to 40 percent of costs; thus any primary price increase results in a 40 percent greater retail price increase. For 1943 the subsidy will cost approximately $26,000,000. With the Government taking 50 percent of output during the first 5 months of 1943 and 70 percent thereafter, the net cost to the Government of the subsidy program as an alternative to a price increase will amount to only $10,000,000. This expenditure will save consumers $14,000,000.

In the fall of 1942 it became evident that milk was being diverted away from Cheddar cheese production, since it was less profitable for farmers to sell milk to Cheddar cheese producers than to sell it for other dairy manufactures or as fluid milk. The subsidy program was arranged to enable Cheddar cheese producers to pay higher prices to farmers for milk, and thus to maintain the high level of production necessary to meet wartime needs.

The Commodity Credit Corporation subsidy, which went into effect December 1, 1942, enables cheese processors to pay farmers for milk on the basis of a 27 cents per pound price for No. 1 American Cheddar cheese, but at the same time to sell such cheese on the basis of 23¼ cents per pound. Producers receiving the subsidy are required to pass on to the farmers all payments received by them from Commodity Credit Corporation. These payments are in addition to the payments farmers would otherwise receive for their milk; thus the continued flow of milk in Cheddar cheese production is assured.

MECHANICS OF THE PLAN

The technique of the subsidy is essentially a buy-sell operation. The Commodity Credit Corporation buys the cheese from producers at 27 cents per pound and resells to them at 23¼ cents per pound. Claims are filed monthly with the Commodity Credit Corporation by producers.

COMPENSATION FOR INCREASED RAW MATERIAL AND WAGE COSTS FOR CANNED VEGETABLES, 1943 PACK

The wage and raw material subsidy for canned vegetables will absorb both recent wage increases permitted by War Labor Board and the increases in vegetable support prices announced by the Department of Agriculture.

If the increased cost to canners had been passed on to the retail price, consumers would have had to pay 43 percent more than the primary cost increase. This is because prices charged by canners, wholesalers, and retailers are based on percentage mark-ups. In the aggregate these mark-ups amount to 43 percent of canners' costs. Thus every dollar of subsidy prevents a retail price increase of $1.43, and the total subsidy of $25 million saves consumers nearly $36 million.

There will be a further saving, which cannot at this time be estimated exactly, due to the fact that all prices will not have to be raised sufficiently to compensate marginal canners for their increased wage costs. Only those canners who are making a less than reasonable profit as determined by Commodity Credit Corporation and the industry will be eligible for the wage subsidy. This compensation, therefore, will make it possible for marginal producers to remain in the industry, even though the dollars and cents ceiling prices on canned vegetables remain at the approximate level of the 1942 pack.

The cost of producing tomatoes, peas, beans, and corn has increased approximately 25 percent above the 1942 level. The new support prices announced by the Department of Agriculture compensate the growers for this increase and make possible the maintenance of acreage. The growers are assured that this increase in prices will be paid to them, since no canner will be able to sell his raw vegetable pack to Commodity Credit Corporation unless he can show that he has paid the higher prices. If he can prove this, Commodity Credit Corporation will purchase his raw vegetables at 1943 season average prices and resell them to him at 1942 prices.

Address of Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, before conference of Governors at Columbus, Ohio, June 21, 1943:

It has seemed advisable as the war develops that public statements by the Chief of Staff of the Army should be restricted to a few special occasions. A conference of the Governors, the leaders of the various States, is such an occasion. Furthermore, this is a most critical summer both for us and in the history of the world. We have passed through the period of military adolescence, our initial deployments have been completed and lines of communications solidly established. Quantity production of both men and matériel, the former in as exact a pattern as the latter, is now in full blast, the enemy's initial advantage in men and guns, and in ships and planes, has been overcome. We have seized the initiative, the most vital factor in war.

The past 2 years of preparation have been a trying period, especially the prolonged strain of German and Japanese successes during which we struggled to meet the surge of power which they had carefully accumulated during the past decade. The change in the attitude of the public essential to the furtherance of the necessary legislation and appropriations presented many complications. The establishment of our industries on a full war basis had its multiplicity of troubles, and the building of the full war military machine entailed a stupendous task of a wide variety of problems, invariably arousing pronounced individual reactions of our people.

Today we stand squarely on our feet in all these respects. Initial strategic problems involving hectic application of piecemeal tactical actions—anathema to a soldier—are things of the past.

Furthermore, and probably most important of all, we have secured a basis for unity of action as to strategy, operations, shipping, matériel, and virtually every phase of this warfare, in a manner without precedent in history.

The pattern for victory is clear. If we had set the stage we could not have provided a more sharply defined picture than that offered by the battle of Tunisia. There we had:

A perfect example of coordinated leadership for Allied action.

An assemblage of overwhelming military power—air, land, and sea.

The explosive effect of the skillful application of that power.

Incidentally, the psychological by-products of that battle are proving of immense importance. There has been a rebirth of the French Army with a splendid example of courageous and aggressive fighting power. The observing nations have seen selected German troops humbled by an extension and improvement of the technique that brought about the downfall of France. The Allies have gained great confidence in each other, and in the Allied fighting men, and the scales have so tipped that those nations who have been maneuvering merely to be on the winning side can no longer escape the conclusion that there is no victory in prospect for Germany. The superman has had his day. The democracies have called his bluff.

Tunisia gave us an invaluable pattern for the future. But the tasks will be increasingly difficult, usually with the great hazard of an overwater approach and a heavy battle to be maintained beyond the beaches. The way will be far from easy, the losses heavy, but the victory certain.

The recent battle in Attu has special significance. There we encountered probably the most difficult of fighting conditions. An amphibious operation in uncharted waters over a stormy sea, deep snow, and high mountains, with a complete absence of roads and trails; an enemy dug in with complete cover and communications, and our own troops transferred through necessity directly from the pleasant climate of California to a battle with the elements over extremely difficult terrain, against a desperate enemy. It was a severe test of the American soldier, but today we hold Attu, with more than 1,900 Japanese graves as a memento of their previous occupation. More than 3 Japs were killed for each American soldier lost.

The fighting in the Tropics of the south and southwest Pacific has also presented great difficulties of climate and terrain. It has been vicious throughout but we have been successful in each operation since the initial offensive move into the Solomons.

One of our great puzzles is how the Japanese can stand the beating they are taking in the air—no other word adequately describes the situation in this respect. Judging from our own reactions, particularly those of the press, when we have a moderately heavy loss in planes, it is hard to visualize the state of mind of the Japanese command when their ordinary air losses run from 30 percent to 75 percent, with very moderate losses on the part of the American pilots. In the recent air battle in the Solomons we destroyed 94 out of 120 planes and lost but 6. Furthermore, the Japanese suffer continuous losses of planes on the ground. We find the usual average is one destroyed on the ground for every one lost in the air, and in addition probably a training or operational loss outside of combat at the same rate. Evidently our equipment is excellent, and our pilots, gunners, bombardiers, and navigators are superb.

The daylight precision bombing out of England has had a tremendous effect on the air operations of the German army. The losses inflicted on German fighter planes during these daylight bombing expeditions had a direct and important bearing on the victory in Tunisia and a similar bearing on the German air power on the Russian front. The fact of the matter is, the Germans must check this precision bombing, and they have assembled their best pilots in large numbers in an endeavor to halt these staggering blows at vital installations, delivered with constantly increasing frequency and mass.

Measured by the losses in planes and installations suffered by the enemy, our own losses have been surprisingly small.

While on this subject I think it proper to express a word of caution against hasty conclusions or impromptu conceptions regarding the utilization of air power or any special weapon in the conduct of this war. I am convinced more and more each day that only by a proper combination of war-making means can we achieve victory in the shortest possible time and with the greatest economy in life. Pantelleria was an experiment, for which there appeared to be, and proved to be, a sound logical basis. However, the situation there was unique as to the character of the island, the quality of the garrison, the complete naval control of the surrounding waters, and the proximity of Allied airfields. The victory of Tunisia was favored by overwhelming air power, but the result would have been a stalemate without aggressive ground and naval action.

Your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knockout blow is delivered by the ground army, with infantry and artillery as important as tanks and antiaircraft, and engineer and signal troops vital to the whole.

The encouraging aspect of the situation today is the fact that we have the men trained, the guns and tanks, the ships and planes in constantly increasing numbers; that the Russian forces grow steadily more formidable and present a constant and terrible threat to the bulk of the German Army; and that there is a steady improvement in the equipment and training of the Chinese forces to sustain them in their fixed determination to expel the Japs from China. There can be but one result unless the enemy succeeds in creating internal frictions among the Allies, divisions of one against the other and misrepresentations leading to public loss of confidence in our war effort.

We are engaged in this war to maintain the democratic form of government. We fight to destroy dictatorships, to guarantee freedom of speech and of the press. Yet sometimes I am discouraged by the democratic processes in a great and critical emergency like that of today.

For example, I returned from Africa 2 weeks ago to find the most atrocious, if not subversive, attack being directed against an organization of the Army, one of the finest we have ever created. I refer to the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. There was no foundation for the vicious slander, though it was given wide publicity. Some seem to be intent on the suicide of our own war effort, not to mention the defamation of as fine an organization of women as I have ever seen assembled. Such a procedure to me appears inexcusable. If we can't be decent in such matters we at least should not be naive enough to destroy ourselves. I very much hope you gentlemen will take the lead in building up a public opinion which will suppress actions of individuals who abuse our liberties by propagating such outrages.

There is another phase of the present situation for which I would solicit your strong support, and that is a check against sudden waves of optimism leading the public to feel that we have made our great effort and the end is in sight. This is far from the case. We are just getting well started. The great battles lie ahead. We have yet to be proven in the agony of enduring heavy casualties, as well as the reverses which are inevitable in war. What we need now is a stoic determination to do everything in our power to overwhelm the enemy, cost what it may, to reduce him to a supplicant under the impact of aroused and determined democracies.

The failure today to surge forward with every ounce of power and effort we possess would be to write a tragic page for history. The temptation to ease up after initial and relatively minor successes seems difficult to resist. The Axis nations probably count on this as a weak element of Allied psychology. Their opinion has been contemptuous of our soft way of living, of our toughness, and our military stamina. The most forbidding prospect with which we can now confront the enemy is the continuation in full measure of methodical, ruthless preparations to overwhelm them in the same manner that the Army of von Arnim was eliminated in Tunisia. The allies have unified their military effort. We must all do the same at home.

Two things we must guard against:

There must be no divisions among the allies.

There must be no let-up in our preparations.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
June 9, 1943.

Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The National Youth Administration program for this fiscal year consists of (a) the war production training program and (b) the student work program. In Iowa all of the colleges and the majority of the high schools are participating in the student work program. In the 5 States of the region of which Iowa is a part, National Youth Administration is currently assisting 2,799 college students to stay in college and 5,268 high-school students to continue their education. A monthly average of 700 Iowa high school students and 900 Iowa college and graduate students are being thus assisted.

During the first half of this fiscal year in these 5 States, National Youth Administration has given war-production training to 13,365 youth, 4,238 of them from Iowa. This program provides training for war industries, in the following fields: Machine shop, aircraft mechanics and woodwork, aircraft and general sheet metal, radio, and welding. National Youth Administration is also operating a number of agricultural units wherein high-school students and other youth are trained in the repair and operation of farm machinery.

National Youth Administration shops are producing items for many local cosponsors. However, the largest part of the production work this year has been done for the Rock Island Arsenal. The first 6 months of this fiscal year 2,963,315 items of value in the war activity have been produced. In this region we have produced more than 50,000 M–5 chests which are used in the Army tanks, 108,726 gun slings, and 360,000 rifle cases.

The estimated value of these products which have gone directly in the war effort is over $2,000,000. This figure may be compared with the total cost of all National Youth Administration in this region for the same period of time, which was $2,946,509.

The following excerpts are from a letter received recently from Brig. Gen. N. F. Ramsey, of the United States Army, Rock Island Arsenal:

"All other training centers have been utilized in recruiting our machine operator trainees. The fundamental training you have been able to give them * * * has obviated much of the preliminary training we would have to give with our own equipment and personnel.

"I hope that the arsenal work projects and the Clinton Training Center can be continued."

The National Youth Administration has during the past several years rendered a distinctive service on the health front of America. For example, since the inauguration of the health program in the fiscal year 1942, 40,064 youth have been given thorough physical examinations by competent physicians. Eighty-nine percent of the sampling of 11,000 youth in this region were found to be either temporarily or permanently unfit for war work before receiving remedial treatment. Eleven percent were physically fit. In the last 6 months alone in one State of the region more than 200 presumably unemployable youth of a handicapped classification have been rehabilitated and placed into defense industries.

The National Youth Administration, through its war-training program, its production work, and its health-program activities, has been a significant factor in furthering the war effort.

Sincerely yours,

C. B. LUND,
Regional Administrator.
By THEODORE P. ESLICK,
Regional Director of Operations.

House Shuts Purse on Abuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

HOUSE SHUTS PURSE ON ABUSES—USES OLD POWER TO CHECK PUNITIVE REFORMS OF RADICALS

(By David Lawrence)

The power of the purse is the oldest parliamentary power in the long history of the people's struggle for self-government. And the power of the purse is just now being exercised with unmistakable vigor by the House as a check against misuse and abuse of power by the executive agencies.

When our forefathers wrote the Constitution, they imposed a 4-year tenure on the Executive and they gave him, through the veto power, a controlling judgment over the acts of both Houses of Congress equal to the votes of two-thirds of one House and just one vote less than two-thirds of the other House. The people can speak at the polls on Presidential policy only once in 4 years. The Canadian and British people can force an election at any time.

This means that the American legislature, unlike the British Parliament, does not possess an overnight check against arbitrary or autocratic action by executive agencies of government—a fact which the radicals who have been patterning their administrative law on British practice by means of Executive regulations have overlooked.

So when the radicals in Government agencies introduce social reforms and punitive measures, taking as their cue some vaguely worded phrases in a statute, Congress can do nothing about it except to exercise the power of the purse. And that's what is happening today.

INTRIGUE AGAINST BROWN

Specifically, the Office of Price Administration started out to be an innocent looking agency to help ward off inflation by imposing price ceilings on various commodities. Leon Henderson, who is a member of the original New Deal group of economists, picked for his staff professors and lawyers who saw eye to eye with him in his economic philosophy—an understandable and logical approach from his standpoint. But when Mr. Henderson left the Office of Price Administration, his advisers and policy makers didn't go.

Prentiss Brown, who took over, was faced with the necessity of putting in new personnel. He was vehemently fought on this by the powerful intrigue of the radicals who have access to the White House, where in its outer offices sits another group of radical advisers at the elbow of James F. Byrnes, once Director of Economic Stabilization and now War Mobilization Chief.

For weeks the press was filled with left-wing criticism about the wobbly Office of Price Administration and how Mr. Brown wasn't functioning effectively. Actually he was facing an internal war—one of those things Elmer Davis wishes the press wouldn't report. It turns out that Mr. Brown still has the advisers who believe that the war can be used to achieve reforms, especially the control and regulation of the profit system by Government.

BLOW AT BUSINESS UNCOVERED

Within the last week a special House committee under the chairmanship of Representative SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, has uncovered some amazing evidence of how the so-called policy makers in Office of Price Administration twist the phrases of law into regulations that strike into the very heart of the American system of free enterprise.

Harold Allen of New York, counsel for the committee and one of the ablest managers of a congressional investigation who has appeared on the horizon in some time, has revealed through the files of the Office of Price Administration policy makers themselves confidential memoranda and policy programs, which clearly show that the American businessman not only must face excess profits taxes by the Treasury under law but an additional system of profit control—evasively termed "price control" by the Office of Price Administration staff—which actually regulates profits irrespective of the principle of efficiency in production.

Thus if a company finds a way to lower costs per unit through expansion of output, it must lower its price to suit the Office of Price Administration. Congress has never voted that policy, and it is contrary to the whole development of American industrial production. Large companies are penalized on the profit side on such vague basis as the need for controlling inflation. It was brought out, too, that the Office of Price Administration acts even when no price rise has occurred or is threatened in a particular article, but when there is a sort of inflationary tendency in the air in other commodities. The justification given is admitted to be to appease labor groups and prevent demands for wage increases.

ARBITRARY BASE SET UP

The Office of Price Administration officials on the stand have conceded that their rollback in prices or their freezing of prices can mean a reduction not only in profits but in taxes due the Federal Government. Also they concede that their moves sometimes increase purchasing power and widen the "inflationary gap." Nowhere has Congress authorized 1936 to 1939 as the base years for determining profits in connection with price control but the Office of Price Administration radicals nevertheless selected that base.

What remedy is there for Congress when "laws" are made in star-chamber sessions by Office of Price Administration officials? To repeal or prohibit such regulations? But the President has the veto power which means he can overrule the majority of both Houses, something that cannot happen in Canada or Britain, where the people have a closer check on their executive agencies.

The only defense which the people have in America when bureaucrats become arbitrary and insist on writing laws that never were passed by Congress—as for instance in the matter of subsidies—is to deny the executive agencies funds for operations. It's a severe form of redress but it's the only one left that can be used against radicals who are using war for social reform and are breaking down business and industrial morale.

O. W. I. and the Motion Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following extracts from an article written by Mr. Walter Wanger, president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and president of the Motion Picture Society for the Americas. Mr. Wanger is one of our most distinguished motion-picture producers. As much as any one man he has attempted to advance the motion picture as a serious medium of expression, notably in the case of Blockade, Foreign Correspondent, and Eagle Squadron.

Mr. Speaker, the complete article by Mr. Wanger, which appeared in the Public Opinion Quarterly for spring of 1943, discusses fully the set-up of the O. W. I. as it refers to the motion-picture industry. Everyone interested in this question of motion pictures contributing to the war effort should read this article by Mr. Wanger. After discussing the present set-up of the O. W. I., Mr. Wanger makes some recommendations, naming names and making concrete suggestions. The concluding part of his article is as follows:

Were I in government and wished to obtain maximum results, in war morale and home-front stimulation, here in the Office of War Information set-up I would draft for liaison, planning, and full responsibility for execution:

Over-all director: Y. Frank Freeman, president of the Association of Motion Picture Producers, Hollywood chairman of the War Activities Committee of the Motion Picture Industry, vice president in charge of production, Paramount Pictures, Inc. Mr. Freeman has viewed pictures from the public's angle since he opened a theater in a vacant room over a general store in Greenville, Ga. He has successfully administered all three branches—exhibition, distribution, and, now, production. At Paramount, a studio which had retired several executives, Mr. Freeman promptly changed the ledger from red to black—big black. In Hollywood, a town ordinarily clannish, Mr. Freeman's character and ability were so outstanding that he was elected president of the producers' association 2 years after he arrived. He has been reelected three times.

Production liaison: Edgar J. Mannix, of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. The record of that organization scarcely needs elaboration. Mr. Mannix is one of the industry's most seasoned experts.

Distribution liaison: Spyros Skouras, president, Twentieth Century Fox, Mr. Skouras went to his present position from years spent in building Fox West Coast Theaters (now National Theaters, Inc.) to one of the most successful exhibition circuits in the country.

Exhibition liaison: Karl Hoblitzel, president, Interstate Theaters, Dallas, Tex. Mr. Hoblitzel's name is synonymous throughout the industry with accurate advance appraisal of exhibitor and public reaction.

Only the broadest indication of policy would be necessary to these men. For example, with Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's arrival in this country, Mr. Freeman, tipped by the State Department, might have told Mr. Mannix, "We want a really dramatic short subject, centered around Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and thus-and-so is the picture's purpose." Mr. Mannix would know just which director to pull off his regular work for that picture. The director and Mr. Mannix would agree on the best fitted writer. Mr. Skouras would prepare all distribution companies to clear a spot for the picture. Mr. Hoblitzel would "sell" it to exhibitors. Most important—the picture would come out right; it would interest and thrill theater goers.

PLACE OF THE MOTION PICTURE IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Since such an idyllically practical set-up as the officials and advisory board here put forward seems unlikely, I have a definite recommendation to present to current Office of War Information contacts. Before doing that, here are some general observations. They may be of use in the thinking of anyone seriously studying motion pictures in relation to the world today and tomorrow:

1. Despite recurrent criticism, among the super-intellectuals, of the motion picture because it "does not accurately portray American life" (someone should take a course in drama), the first move of every dictator, Mussolini, Schickelgruber, or Tojo, is to bar American motion pictures. If those totalitarian lords of all utterance thought American pictures accomplish anything but good in "selling" the United States, they would be eager to have our movies shown. Only the other night, a high-ranking journalist, who was in Berlin when the news broke, "America is in the war," told me: "Then the German morale began to crack. Germans know America through American motion pictures. The youth, the vitality, the amazing industrial productivity, the hustle and bustle of business, the let's-go-and-do-it of America, have all been vividly impressed on Europe—by our movies. The German people said to themselves: 'Nobody can defeat a people like that.'"

2. Most dangerous of all theses is that we should present to the world, in motion pictures, only what the consciously high-souled (and middle-aged or elderly) idealists consider "the better side of life in the United States." In the first place, any such attempt would devitalize the American motion picture, and destroy its usefulness. Our pictures would no longer be world box-office. Moreover, this criticism derives from a superman complex. We must show ourselves, argue some, clad only in the light of our virtues. Shades of Hitler! Reports indicate to me that one of the most impressive proofs of democracy at work, to the European mind, was the frank picture, Grapes of Wrath. One commentator put it this way: "Only a real democracy can produce Grapes of Wrath, make it commercially possible, and then go on and get something done about the conditions exposed."

3. Who is going to run the world of the future? The middle-agers, who did little to save their own generation, the oldsters, who thoroughly wrecked theirs, or the young people? And to whom does the American movie most appeal? The young! Better let it keep the vigor, lack of stuffiness and sense of gayety and life that now inform the screen. Otherwise, the most vital avenue we have through which to talk to the young will be avoided by them. They wonder what right we have to preach.

4. I must repeat this again: The movie is the most democratic means of expression—unsubsidized, existing only through doing its job effectively. It makes mistakes, but it responds to the most valid automatic corrective in human experience—the reaction of the people. And—freedom of the screen is every whit as cogent as freedom of the press.

Here is my final suggestion to the Office of War Information in its relations with motion pictures. Change, for the benefit of the results you want, from a take-over attitude to one of cooperation. You will find in your files, from motion picture leaders, suggestions for specific pictures far more powerful, toward the ends of victory and understanding, than any suggestions that have come to Hollywood from Washington. We really do know something about our business. We wish to make an even larger contribution to winning the war and achieving good will on earth than motion pictures already have made. The industry is not jealous of prerogatives, nor of personal standing; it has proved its willingness to waive profits in war-necessary film-making. Give the industry the broad lines of policy and leave the committees within the industry the task of producing results.

The real issue at stake is the one thing of which the industry is jealous. You should share that concern—the unimpaired entertainment power of the American motion picture, which constitutes its great strength and which is absolutely indispensable if the medium is to be of round-the-world value after the war.

The Problem of Rising Prices in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely necessary that we hold prices down and this can be done. Our individual welfare, as well as our national welfare, depends on a strong national program of economic stabilization.

The danger of a serious price rise is great in wartime. The war has created a huge supply of spendable income and at the same time has reduced the supply of goods and services available for civilians. The resulting volume of excess purchasing power exerts an intense upward pressure on prices, as buyers bid against each other for scarce goods, sellers seek higher prices and profits, and workers seek higher wages. As this pressure causes price rises to occur, they in turn force up the prices of other goods, tend to push up wages and business costs, and can set in motion a mounting spiral of price and wage increases.

If prices were to get out of control—and they have not—economic disorganization could result which would lengthen the war, cause hardships for nearly every one—now or later—and make difficult the attainment of many of the benefits of the peace to come.

The pressure of excess purchasing power must be met in two ways:

First. It must be reduced by diverting it into channels other than the purchase of goods; for example, higher taxes, buying War bonds, savings, life insurance, and so forth.

Second. It must be met directly—by Government controls on prices and wages and by voluntary civilian action.

In other words, all unnecessary spending must be avoided and group or individual pressures for higher prices and higher wages must be resisted.

Too Many Cooks; Some Poor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norwich (N. Y.) Sun:

TOO MANY COOKS; SOME POOR

An excellent illustration of conflicting authority and overlapping jurisdiction is afforded in the case of gasoline, threatened scarcity of which is creating Nation-wide uneasiness.

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, who serves the Nation in the dual capacity of Petroleum Administrator and Hard Fuel Administrator, clearly has broad powers over the distribution of gasoline and other petroleum products, but they are rationed by the Office of Price Administration.

Ordinarily this newspaper would not look with favor upon a proposal to increase and extend the authority of the Secretary of the Interior in any direction. But it is indeed more than a little anomalous that the office charged with the responsibility for the Nation's petroleum policy—one of the most important both on the military and the home fronts—has little or no authority as regards the rationing of petroleum products. A similar situation exists in relation to foods. In that important field Chester C. Davis presumably is the boss in matters both of production and distribution, but, as in petroleum, rationing is administered entirely by the Office of Price Administration.

The purpose of this editorial is not to suggest that the Office of Price Administration has served its usefulness and should be liquidated as recently proposed and its functions be distributed among other agencies, such, for example, as the Food and Petroleum Administrations. It is rather to point out that too many cooks are likely to spoil the broth and that one of the tasks confronting the recently created Office of War Mobilization is to see to it first that there are not too many cooks and that the cooks who are on the job shall be up to it as well.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce:

NEWARK, N. J., June 22.—The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce recommended here today that the defense training program now being carried on by the National Youth Administration be discontinued.

The recommendation was based upon a survey of the National Youth Administration training program in New Jersey, made by the State chamber's department of governmental research, of which Alvin A. Burger is director.

Originally 19 in number, the National Youth Administration training centers in New Jersey have been reduced to five because of decreases in enrollments. The five centers now operating are located in Jersey City, Newark, Trenton, Camden, and Phillipsburg. The National Youth Administration program provides for the training of young men and women, between 16 and 24 years of age, in courses designed to equip them to take positions in war production industries. The courses include machine shop, welding, sheet metal work, and industrial sewing. Trainees now receive 25 cents an hour, or a maximum of $40 for a 160-hour month.

Conclusions reached by the survey and released here by the State chamber are as follows:

"1. The National Youth Administration defense-training program in New Jersey is a weak, ineffective, and costly duplication of the training programs which are much more extensively and competently carried on by New Jersey's public vocational-school system and by the Training Within Industry Service of the War Manpower Commission.

"2. Most of the National Youth Administration training centers in New Jersey have been grossly mismanaged, with resulting wastage of manpower, equipment, materials, and public funds. The only existing National Youth Administration training center which is reported to be giving satisfactory service is that located in Camden. In this center, however, the training is actually supervised by the Camden County vocational-school system, although financed by National Youth Administration.

"3. Most of the New Jersey National Youth Administration training centers have been manned largely by poorly trained, incompetent supervisory and teaching personnel.

"4. In order to build up enrollments in some of its training centers, the National Youth Administration in New Jersey has engaged in widespread proselyting activities among students in public high and vocational schools.

"5. Some records kept by the National Youth Administration, such as those dealing with enrollment, trainee attendance, and so forth, appear in many instances to be incomplete and inaccurate.

"6. The relationship between the National Youth Administration and the public school systems in this State has deteriorated, thus creating a situation which is harmful to the general war production training program.

"7. New Jersey's war industries generally have found the results of the National Youth Administration training program to be unsatisfactory, and they almost unanimously favor its discontinuance."

On Tuesday, last, a majority of the House Appropriations Committee struck from a Federal Security Agency supply bill a recommendation that the National Youth Administration be given $40,800,000 to carry on a "limited program" during the fiscal year starting July 1. Supporters of the National Youth Administration program are now attempting to have this appropriation reinstated.

Further observations contained in the State chamber's survey follow:

"There are 24 well-managed public vocational schools and training centers in New Jersey which are giving the same training courses offered by the five National Youth Administration centers operating in this State. The vocational schools are adequately prepared to take over the entire National Youth Administration training activity in the event that the latter is discontinued, and by virtue of superior teaching personnel and facilities, to do a much better job of fitting the trainees for war-industry jobs.

"Our survey disclosed that in many of the National Youth Administration training centers quantities of tools, machinery, automotive equipment, and other materials and supplies have been subjected to neglect and misuse. Much of this equipment has been broken and left in a state of disrepair. Installations made at great expense were subsequently torn down or abandoned as a result of poor planning or inept management.

"There is evidence that essential war materials have been carelessly cut up, placed in the hands of inexperienced operators, ruined and subsequently discarded with utter disregard of value. Machinery, in many instances, was installed in buildings, but never placed in operation. Trucks and other automotive equipment provided for the use of National Youth Administration personnel and trainees have likewise been abused and neglected.

"The majority of National Youth Administration supervisory and teaching personnel lack training or experience in teaching, guidance, and planning. It is apparent that many positions have been filled on some basis other than that of general competence for teaching work. This condition has resulted in a low standard of teaching effectiveness in general, and in a break-down of classroom discipline in many cases.

"It has been found that in an endeavor to build up and maintain enrollments in the various training centers, the National Youth Administration has approached many regularly enrolled public school students, directly or through the mails, offering not only free training for 'big pay' positions in industry, but also the inducement of wages while learning. Complaints have been registered by school superintendents that this practice has materially affected the classroom work of many public school students and has resulted in the withdrawal of others before graduation."

Price of Virginia Lee Cut Green Beans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from J. J. Simon, of Thompson, N. Dak., relating to the price of Virginia Lee cut green beans.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMPSON, N. DAK., *June 6, 1943.*

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: February 1943, I purchased some Virginia Lee cut green beans. I paid $3.19 for a 24-can case—No. 2 cans. Today I can purchase them—same year crop—for $2.59. Who got my 80 cents?

I cite above as an illustration of many such.

Respectfully,

J. J. SIMON.

The Consumer and White Collar Man

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] who called attention to letters which he received with respect to the corn shortage, may I say that only a half hour ago I directed the attention of the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who appeared before the Committee on Rules to urge the granting of a rule for the consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, to the fact that we have tremendous quantities of corn and other products that I feel should be disposed of and not held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We were informed that the Corporation has served notice on hoarders of corn, as well as farmers who are holding their corn for higher prices, that it will call the loans the first of next month. This action was intended to effect the release of millions of bushels of corn to relieve the existing shortage. My real interest and what I urge is that the Corporation should not continue to withhold from the markets tremendous quantities of accumulated surpluses of farm products and foodstuffs, but to release any products whenever their scarcity becomes apparent in the market. Since the meeting of the Committee on Rules this morning, I have been informed by members coming from the corn sections that the calling of the loans will not place the corn on the market or overcome the shortage because the farmers are holding the corn and will refuse to sell due to the fact they are obtaining from $1.30 to $1.40 in the black market, such diversion for hog-feeding purposes commanding a higher price than on the market.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the farmers in such practice, for whom so much has been done by our Government, should take advantage of conditions as they are doing now. I feel that with hogs and cattle bringing such extraordinarily high prices that a ceiling should be placed on livestock, notwithstanding the opposition of hog and cattle raisers. They should be satisfied with receiving prices ranging from a 300- to 500-percent increase over that which they obtained 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit idly by and permit the consumers of this Nation, and especially the 21,000,000 white-collar workers and the unorganized small-wage workers, and their families, to be the suffering victims of the ever-increasing cost of living. They cannot be ignored any longer and should not be a prey to unscrupulous speculators and black-market farmers to be enriched at the expense of those people whose wages and salaries have not been increased and who, today, are obliged to pay nearly 100 percent more for their food. Compare the present living costs of the white-collar worker and the unorganized small wage worker with the fare of the farmer today. In that connection, I wish to direct attention to a speech delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on Saturday, June 19, appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A3097, in which he gave figures and statistics showing that since August 1939, the increase in the price of farm products to the consumer approximates 110 percent. On the other hand, the figures show that since 1939, the increased cost of farm equipment, implements, machinery, clothing, shoes, boots, and other farm necessities is not quite 15 percent. So the increased cost of living to the consumer worker is about 8 times greater than what the farmer is obliged to pay for his farm needs.

Missouri Senate Wants Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Senate Resolution 68:

Senate Resolution 68

Whereas Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN and the Senate investigating committee did during last week conduct an investigation concerning the alleged waste, graft, and incompetence in the construction of the Sunflower Ordnance Works of De Soto, Kans.; and

Whereas witnesses were brought before said committee who testified that 150 truckloads of good lumber were burned each day while said plant was under construction; that tons of steel intended for the construction of the roofs of buildings was covered with dirt; that a great amount of electrical equipment was uselessly wasted by being covered with dirt; that unskilled workers were issued union cards whereby they were paid from $100 to $150 per week; that clods of dirt and other foreign substances were mixed with the concrete so that much of the concrete work had to be redone; that many men were hired to work only on Saturday and Sundays in order that they might receive premium pay for overtime work; and that inefficiency, mismanagement, and graft was prevalent everywhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Missouri, That the Federal Government of the United States, through the Department of Justice, is hereby respectfully requested to ask for a Federal grand jury investigation to determined the correctness of said accusations, in order that those who are responsible for said malicious waste, mismanagement, and graft, if any, may receive just punishment for said violations of law; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Attorney General of the United States, one copy to each of Missouri's United States Senators, and one copy to each United States Congressman from Missouri.

War, Peace, and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following address delivered by Dean H. H. Schroeder of the Illinois State Normal University at the Illinois State Normal University commencement exercises held on June 14, 1943. The address is noteworthy because of its contents, and also because it is Dean Schroeder's farewell address to a great institution he has served so well during the past 30 years. As an alumnus of the university, the oldest normal university west of the Allegheny Mountains, I recommend the address to the attention of my colleagues:

Life involves a constant interplay of conflicting forces. The life of man is an unceasing struggle to secure the satisfaction of his wants, the achievement of his purposes, the realization of his aspirations and ideals. Living for human beings is more than making a living. It is more than satisfying our physical wants, such as our needs for food, clothing, and shelter. It includes the enjoyment of life in its fullness, the gratification of our love of recognition, of achievement, of security, the satisfaction of our love of truth, of beauty, of goodness. This tremendous life urge in its various aspects is the inevitable source of conflict and strife, for human beings do not live in isolation, as hermits. Men must learn to live together. Primitive man fights just as do the lower animals. Experience teaches him the costliness and folly of internecine strife, for blood feuds weaken his own clan or tribe, making it the easy prey of a rival clan or tribe. Thus primitive courts and law originate; government is established to safeguard the interests of the group. And so with the nation in modern times, aiming through government to promote the general welfare within the nation.

In its early beginnings civil government was essentially the application or the threat of the application of physical force to compel compliance of individual members of the whole group to what the governing group demanded as desirable behavior. Furthermore, all civil government, even in its most democratic form, to this day must provide, on last analysis, actual or implied application of physical force to bring recalcitrant individuals into conformity with the demands of the law.

But government is not the only means of social control; it is not the only agency to help to make it possible for all members of the group to satisfy their own wants without interfering with the same desires of others. Public opinion, custom, tradition are similar aids. The inevitable tendency is in the direction toward the development of inner pressure as a means of control to take the place of outer pressure. True self-government is better than any form of government imposed from without. The education of the child provides the basis for this self-government as a more effective means of control than that which is provided by courts and the police power of civil government. Because some parents in rearing their children would keep in mind only the latter's interests, utterly

ignoring the interests of others, and because the church does not reach all the children, society finds it necessary sooner or later to assume the responsibility for educating all the children of the state. When a person's education has enabled him to make a living and to enjoy his leisure in a wholesome manner without trespassing upon the rights of his fellow citizens, policemen and night watchmen are not needed to protect society against possible depredations on his part. On the other hand, where education has failed to do its work, or where undesirable conditions have undone the work of education we have the problem of crime and its treatment on our hands. This truth has been recognized by our courts; for example, the Supreme Court of Tennessee said in a decision rendered in 1899:

"We are of the opinion that the legislature, under the constitutional provision, may as well establish a uniform system of schools and a uniform administration of them, as it may establish a uniform system of criminal laws and of courts to execute them. The object of the criminal laws is, by punishment, to deter others from the commission of crimes, and thus preserve the peace, morals, good order, and well-being of society; and the object of the public-school system is to prevent crime, by educating the people, and thus, by providing and securing a higher state of intelligence and morals, conserve the peace, good order, and well-being of society."

The following interesting analysis of the connection between Government and education is found in a decision of the Supreme Court of Louisiana in 1915:

"Education is one of the functions of government and the public school system is a department of the Government. Education insures domestic tranquillity, provides for the common defense, promotes the general welfare, and it secures the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

If government is to "promote the general welfare," if it is to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity" it must of course be something more than negative. Its function must be that of protecting the weak against the strong. A mere "hands-off" policy, merely permitting a "free-for-all" contest between the weak and the strong reminds one too much of Dickens' famous paraphrase of a familiar saw: "Every man for himself and God for us all, as the elephant said when he danced among the chickens." Instead, government must provide conditions that will enable willing, honest, and capable men to make a living and to live worthy human lives.

Where, on the other hand, conditions are permitted to come about in which large numbers of willing, honest, capable men cannot make a living or can only barely exist, there is always the danger that the resulting restiveness may end in revolt or revolution. Several centuries before the beginning of the Christian era Aristotle called attention to the truth that great disparity in wealth among men who yet feel that they are equals is sure to breed dissension and revolution. Centuries before the days of Aristotle the ancient Chinese proverb pointed out the same profound truth: "When the rich grow too rich and the poor too poor something happens." And that is just as true of nations as it is of individual men.

The promotion of the general welfare includes the need of providing for defense not merely against dangers from within but as well against dangers from without whether this be done directly through the State department and the diplomatic service or indirectly through education. If the relations with other countries are such as to engender friction and serious differences it is the business of Government to guard against the danger of a breakdown, for once that occurs there is usually no recourse but to the stern arbitrament of war. It is as Napoleon said: "For the maintenance of peace nations should avoid the pin-pricks, which forerun cannon-shots." In the same way it is the business of Government to keep a watchful eye on the internal conditions of other countries—of course, without meddling or without interfering with their sovereignty—for those conditions may become a menace to the rest of the world. This is most especially true in regard to those economic factors that lie at the base of all human welfare. Where whole nations find it impossible to live reasonably comfortable lives the resulting dissatisfaction easily provides the opportunity for demagogues to establish dictatorships and to drag their people into wars of conquest. Other nations, thus attacked, then have no choice left them but to defend themselves.

And that is where we are today. However much we revolt at the horrors of war, however much we may be convinced that this war could have been averted had the proper steps been taken by the statesmen of the world years ago, we are confronted by the hard, simple, undeniable fact that we now are actually at war. For every good, loyal citizen that means first of all that it is his duty to do all that lies in his power to help bring this war to a successful issue. And let us remember that when we civilians do our utmost it is little indeed in comparison to the deprivations and hardships experienced by the men at Pearl Harbor, at Bataan, at Guadalcanal, in Africa, and elsewhere.

However anxious all of us are that we win the war we are just as much concerned with the hope that this may be the last war. From time immemorial man has been enabled to endure the horrors of war largely because of the hope that the given war would be the last one. He has ever hoped for the day "when nation shall not lift up sword against nation" and when men "shall learn war" no more. The desire for a universal and lasting peace is probably stronger today than ever before, for the present war involves the whole world with all the heartaches and suffering for untold millions of human beings.

In spite of the universal desire for permanent peace there is good reason to fear that the time for such a consummation of man's fondest wish has not arrived. Permanent peace implies the abolition of war and the abolition of war implies the overcoming or the controlling of the causes of war. However great the diversity of these causes they can all be subsumed under one head: The striving of human beings to secure the satisfaction of their various wants, usually, in the great international wars of modern times, their basic economic wants. The selfish interests of nations or perhaps more truly the selfish interests of the groups controlling the governments of such nations ordinarily make amicable settlements impossible. For ages wars have been the commonest ways of settling international difficulties. One of the greatest authorities on war said a generation ago: "An analysis of the history of mankind shows that from the year 1496 B. C. to the year 1861 of our era—that is, in a cycle of 3,357 years (there) were but 227 years of peace in 3,130 years of war. In other words, there were 13 years of war for every year of peace." It is no wonder that so great a statesman as Jefferson said: "I hope it is practicable, by improving the minds and morals of society, to lessen the disposition to war; but of its abolition I despair."

Perhaps any serious student of the history of wars and the many various ways of attempting to prevent their recurrence is likewise inclined to be skeptical about any hope to abolish war. The most primitive way of assuring peace for the future is that of putting the defeated enemy into slavery, crushing him, reducing him to impotency. Unfortunately, the history of such attempts demonstrates their ultimate futility. The crushed enemy somehow refuses to remain crushed.

Treaties as a means of assuring peace for the future are at best rather unreliable, even where they are not imposed by force upon the defeated. They are probably signed with certain mental reservations even where there is no conscious intention to deceive as was the case with the ancient Locrians when forming a treaty of alliance with the Siculi, swearing that they would keep the faith "as long as these heads are upon our shoulders and this soil is beneath our feet," having first taken the precaution to place some heads of garlic upon their shoulders under their togas, and to put some earth in their sandals. Where a treaty is signed freely, not under duress, both sides to the pact probably believe that their own national interests will be furthered by the terms of the treaty, conditions being what they are. But conditions change and change rapidly and in unexpected ways, so that no signatory to a treaty possesses the power of divination with reference to these kaleidoscopic changes. And so it is not surprising to find, in the history of every nation, ancient and modern, instances of violations of such agreements.

Still less reliable than treaties have been the attempts, by means of unilateral agreements, to secure respect on the part of other nations for the interests of the Nation issuing such promulgation and by this means to maintain peace.

What about international law as a means of safeguarding peace? Unfortunately the mandates of international law are likely to be observed by powerful nations, in times of peace and of war, only when it suits their wishes to do so. Weaker nations find it necessary to confrom while stronger ones do so at their pleasure. A well-known writer on the subject, Maj. Stewart L. Murray, put it this way a generation ago: "There is no such thing as international law. What is wrongly called by that name is nothing but international usage. If a nation is sufficiently strong, it can add a new usage at any moment. It cannot be stressed too much that international law merely protects the strong and that the only laws recognized by the Great Powers as binding are those of might and military preparedness." How that reminds one of the incident related by Thucydides regarding what the Athenians said during the Peloponnesian War, to the inhabitants of the island of Melos, a Spartan colony which had remained neutral during the war: "Well, then we Athenians will use no fine words; we will not go out of our way to prove at length that we have a right to rule, because we overthrew the Persians; or that we attack you now because we are suffering any injury at your hands. We both alike know that into the discussion of human affairs the question of justice only enters where there is equal power to enforce it, and that the powerful exact what they can, and the weak grant what they must." How up to date that sounds!

Considerations such as these naturally induced tribes and nations to form leagues and alliances, for when the weak combined they could meet the strong on terms of equality. Such were the different leagues in ancient Greece and the various schemes to preserve the peace propounded during the Middle Ages and up to modern times. In the main these schemes aimed at perpetuating the status quo, the maintenance of established imperialisms, instead of attempting to remove the fundamental causes of war.

To control the forces making for war there must be a still stronger organization of force or forces making for peace. Until by means of education the whole human family has been brought to that stage of development

where all are willing to refrain from doing injury to others—in other words, until we have reached the millennium, the only way to secure such control is through the medium of civil or political government in some form. Just as crime and revolution within a nation must be met by physical force through government, so provocative acts by one nation against another would have to be taken care of by some form of international control. Furthermore, just as the government of any nation must try, first of all, to prevent crime and revolution by dealing with the causes lying back of them, so any form of world organization would have to try first of all to prevent wars by dealing with the causes that are likely to lead to war. It is for these reasons that the philosopher Kant said in 1784: "The greatest problem for the human species is the establishment of a universal civil society administered on the basis of justice."

That very year Josiah Tucker, the dean of Gloucester, perhaps the foremost authority in England on the relations of the American colonies with the mother country, in discussing the possibility of the unification of these colonies under one government, said:

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical in its form, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever; a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains."

Yet what seemed chimerical to the dean of Gloucester became a reality within 3 short years, and the union then effected has lasted for more than a century and a half in spite of some of the severest strains to which any government could be subjected. So might it not be possible for an organization of all the nations of the earth to come about in time in some form, in spite of the even greater diversity of conflicting interests of a great multiplicity of nations and of powerful groups unduly influencing the governments of such nations?

Many of us do not realize to what extent governments are influenced by the selfish interests of powerful commercial or industrial organizations. After having gone through an experience of terrible disillusionment, Woodrow Wilson said in his famous speech at St. Louis, on September 5, 1919:

"Why my fellow citizens, is there any man here or any woman, let me say is there any child here, who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? The real reason that the war that we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry."

It would be a mistake to assume that imperialistic attitudes are a thing of the past. The publisher of three of our most popular weekly and monthly publications has indicated that the twentieth century must be the American century, that America must be the dynamic leader in world trade, that America must be first in the councils of war and first in the policy of the world. Similar sentiments have been expressed by the president of the executive board of the National Manufacturers Association and by others. It ought not to surprise us to learn that within a week after the recent conference between the President of the United States and the President of Mexico a prominent labor leader, Señor Alejandro Carillo, warned the Mexican Congress in these words: "There is profound uneasiness in all Latin-American countries about the threats to the good-neighbor policy on the part of the United States imperialists." Over in Europe Stalin has intimated that he expects to hold that part of Polish territory which was part of Russia before World War No. 1. Churchill has indicated that the principle of self-determination announced in the Atlantic Charter is not to apply in the case of India and Burma, that instead they will be helped to obtain free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth. Colonel McCormick is perhaps more generous when he suggests, rather facetiously, that England and other members of the British Commonwealth be accorded the privilege of applying for statehood in our country.

Such considerations alone would indicate that the statesmen who are to draw up the terms of peace at the close of hostilities will be confronted by almost insuperable difficulties in the attempt to provide for a lasting peace. For a peace to be lasting, for a peace to be durable, it must be endurable. It must be a peace of justice, a peace that will make it possible for the people of all nations to live on the level of decent human living and according to their own ideas and wishes so long as they do not interfere with the same rights of others. None must be treated as though they were God's stepchildren. Washington, in writing to a friend in France, in September 1785, put this thought in these words: "My first wish is to see the blessings of peace diffused through all the countries, and among all ranks in every country, and that we should consider ourselves as the children of the common parent, and be disposed to acts of brotherly kindness toward one another. In that case, all restrictions of trade would vanish. We should exchange produce with other countries, to our reciprocal advantage." With this same thought in mind Sumner Welles, the Assistant Secretary of State, said recently: "So long as any one people or any one government possesses a monopoly over natural resources or raw materials which are needed by all peoples, there can be no basis for a world order based on justice and on peace."

The bringing about of such a peace will be the more difficult because of the animosities and hatreds engendered during the war. How powerful a factor such emotional attitudes may become is well illustrated by an incident related by Sir J. Basil Thompson, former chief of the British intelligence service, who guarded the statesmen at the Versailles peace conference. He says in his memoirs, published a few years ago, that when Wilson suggested that France should have nothing to do with the Saar, Clemenceau sprang up and jumped at Wilson's throat, shook him, called him "Boche, Boche," and spat in his face.

Hatred will probably be an even more powerful factor to deal with after this war than it was after World War No. 1 because of the greater and more widespread suffering caused by ruthless persecution and cruel oppression in the countries that have been overrun. It is a rare person indeed who has attained the lofty nobility of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek who said in a broadcast last March: "All nations, great and small, must have equal opportunity of development. * * * Then, too, there must be no bitterness in the reconstructed world. No matter what we have undergone and suffered, we must try to forgive those who injured us and remember only the lesson gained thereby." Most of us probably find it difficult under present circumstances to live up to the eminently sound religious injunction to "hate the sin without hating the sinner."

It seems rather more probable that the bitterness engendered by the war will induce the victors to impose a police control over the vanquished that will not be devoid of the element of revenge. A control of some sort will undoubtedly be necessary but such control should be motivated by the spirit of justice, which is a very different thing from one prompted by revenge or even the desire for wielding authority. History demonstrates the futility and mischief of the latter. Our own "carpet-bagger" policing of the South after the War Between the States still rankles in the memory of Southerners more than does the memory of the "lost cause" itself. To humble a defeated enemy is sometimes necessary; to humilitate him always a grievous mistake. There can be no amity in the family of nations if some are to be branded as pariahs. Furthermore, policing alone can never bring about a lasting peace. Vice President WALLACE said very truly last January: "I am sure that, unless continuous, strenuous, and united efforts are made to attain economic justice, it will be impossible to prevent military war by any type of force."

When one gives serious thought to the profound difficulties standing in the way of any attempt to get all nations to agree on a world order which would aim to secure the welfare of all, one can easily see why so many statesmen have assumed that nations are actuated only by purely selfish motives.

One would like to believe that nations are sometimes moved by more idealistic considerations. There is no question that the masses of our people subscribed to the sentiment expressed by Woodrow Wilson in his speech of May 17, 1915, when he said: "The interesting and inspiring thing about America is that she asks nothing for herself, except what she has a right to ask for humanity itself." But no one knew better than Woodrow Wilson that the masses of our people were not in control at the peace conference after World War No. 1. The masses throughout the world welcomed Wilson's 14 points most enthusiastically, but their governments were largely controlled by powerful selfish interests.

Had Wilson's idealistic program been carried out it is highly probable that there would be no war today. And would not that have been to the real benefit and advantage of all nations? Was it a mistake for Grant at Appomattox to allow Lee's defeated men to keep their horses so that they might return to their homes to till the soil? Was it a mistake for Lincoln to make it his chief concern to heal the wounds made by the war? Was it a mistake for us to return the indemnity paid us by China after the war following the Boxer Rebellion and the similar action taken toward her at the end of the great war a generation ago? Would it be a mistake on the part of any nation to forego a number of minor interests if by that means the interests of all peoples could be furthered and the danger of a recurrence of war be averted or at least reduced?

Perhaps mankind is not ready to accept the doctrine that the good of one nation should not be gained at the expense of some other nation, and that the real, ultimate welfare for any nation cannot be secured without promoting the welfare of all nations. Human beings learn through experience, too often only through their own bitter experience. What is learned thus is probably learned best, but we need to remember what a famous French essayist said to the effect that the wisdom gained through experience is like a comb which we come to possess after we are baldheaded.

It is a significant thing that the history of all nations shows that their wars come about a generation apart. Men's memories of the hardships and suffering endured in one war seem to fade away and when they are

thus weakened they no longer serve as effective deterrents to keep men from again engaging in war. It seems then that humanity must suffer more and still more before this most important lesson will be effectively learned. Horrible and revolting as it sounds, it is probably true that untold millions of men and women throughout the world, in all nations, will have to experience suffering so acute and agonies of mind so excruciating as to be almost beyond human endurance before all will be ready to make concessions in order to make possible a lasting peace and thus spare future generations the horrors of war.

Nations are too much like headstrong individuals who learn only through bitter experience. It is as St. Thomas Aquinas says: "Good is better known in contrast with evil; and while evil results come about, we more ardently desire good results; as sick men best know what a blessing health is." Greater good, it would seem, cannot be expected until there has been even more and greater evil. Perhaps when mankind has suffered enough mankind will finally be convinced that Chiang-Kai-shek was right when he said: "There will be neither peace, nor hope, nor future for any of us unless we honestly aim at political, social, and economic justice for all peoples of the world—great and small."

Whatever the settlement of difficulties at the close of the war, the work of education must go on, for it is only by means of education that those spiritual values that constitute the essence of civilization can be maintained or preserved and improved upon to be transmitted to the next generation and the next. In the very forefront of these values is the great truth in that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence: "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Let every human being learn through his education that what rights he justly claims for himself he must be willing to recognize as belonging equally to all other human beings; that every real right is accompanied by a corresponding duty or responsibility, the obligation to respect the same right of every other human being; that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness cannot take care of itself in this world of conflict, that rights must be fought for to be maintained and that therefore it is the duty of everyone, not merely to refrain from interfering with these rights of others but the equal duty to promote them on behalf of those who cannot maintain them for themselves, the weak among us and the disinherited throughout the world. If all the people of all nations could be imbued by education with this great fundamental truth of the equality of all mankind as regards their rights the problem of lasting peace would be well on the way toward solution.

Unfortunately there is to be found, perhaps in every nation, a false sense of their own superiority over all other nations. Nearly a century ago a French sociologist, Gobineau, propounded the doctrine of the superiority of the Aryan, more particularly the Germanic or Teutonic race. Half a century later Houston Stuart Chamberlin, an Englishman, glorified this same idea. Still later an Austrian with a rather limited education, chafing during his imprisonment after an unsuccessful attempt to establish a new government in the country of his adoption and obsessed with the fanatical idea that he was to be the savior of the German people, carried this same misconception to the absurd and ridiculous length of looking upon the Teutonic race as the master-race, with the disastrous results with which we are all familiar.

Unfortunately every people is likely to be convinced of its own peculiar superiority over others. We are no exception. The great majority of our own high school graduates and even college graduates are imbued with the idea that we are superior to all other races or peoples. One of our best known and most highly respected editors commented as follows some years ago:

"The best blood of the earth is here—a variated blood of strong, indomitable men and women brought here by visions of wider lives. But this blood will remain a clean, Aryan blood, because there are no hordes of inferior races about us to sweep over us and debase our stock. We are segregated by two oceans from the inferior races, and by that instinctive race revulsion to cross-breeding that marks the American wherever he is found."

What the world needs is, in every country, an appreciative understanding of all other peoples and races in order that misunderstandings and resulting friction, animosities and hatreds may be prevented from arising. Lincoln truly said: "The man I don't like is the man I don't understand." This is just as true of nations or races as it is of individual men. A better knowledge of the conditions under which other nations live and have lived will enable us to understand them the better. A marine who went through some of the worst fighting in the southwest Pacific and who helped bury some of his best friends said in a letter recently: "Maybe I'm just not much of man, but I feel no personal grudge against the Japs. I like to think that we are combating an idea. I would feel no higher than the animal we must become in combat if I were fighting individuals." He speaks of the need of bringing the Japanese up to our level and adds: "In the case of the Japanese, that is going to be difficult. From what I have seen of them they don't seem to be exactly human. Of course, when I observed them I looked and acted like an animal myself. They might be different under different conditions." How that last sentence of this marine reminds one of a remark attributed to John Wesley upon seeing a criminal being taken to a public execution: "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

In thinking of education as a means toward international reconciliation and of promoting good will it is apparent that the education of children and of young people today will exert little, if any, influence on the outcome of the present struggle, whatever its influence in such matters a generation hence. On the other hand the present conflict will profoundly affect education in the immediate future, in ways that cannot well be ignored by the school, the home, or the church. There is bound to be an undermining of religious and moral standards. Just now too many people are overoptimistic because the war is undoubtedly providing a helpful stimulus to religion.

They forget the aftermath that always follows war. After World War No. 1 Dr. Arthur T. Guttery, speaking of conditions in England, said: "The nation has swung from self-control into wild excesses of self-indulgence. We have mortgaged our resources and live upon our capital, with no thought of the morrows. We endured scant rations under military necessity, but with relaxation we crave luxuries of which we had little experience in pre-war days. Prudence and thrift are out of fashion; extravagance and waste know no bounds. Churches decline in membership, Sunday schools decrease year by year, and if we except great preachers with personal magnetism, our congregations are small. They who were driven to worship in days of fear desert the altar now that safety permits sensual indulgence."

Recently the Archbishop of Canterbury in a broadcast to the British Nation mentioned similar phenomena already in evidence although the war is by no means over. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has called the attention of the American people to the startling increase of juvenile crime in our own country during the past year, some sex offenses having increased more than 100 percent in a single year.

Such and other grave and serious problems are sure to confront us in ever-increasing number and magnitude in the coming days and weeks and years. The burdens of war are sure to become even more onerous, the suspense greater, the trials more distressing, suffering more acute and reaching greater numbers of people. Throughout it all there will be only one thing for us to do—to bear up and carry on until it is all over.

And if when it is all over it should be found that again mistakes shall have been made in permitting conditions to remain or to arise that will throw the whole world into still another holocaust of war a generation hence, man will still continue to hope for a future better than the past and better than the present. He will still cling to the faith that this is a world of jusice, that there is in this world a "Power not ourselves which makes for righteousness," a Power which works itself out in us and through us by means of the ideals engendered in our nature. Man will ever entertain the dream and the hope that some day men will "beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." He will continue to hope against hope and in spite of all disappointment that sometime the day will arrive that is pictured in Tennyson's vision: "When the wardrums throbb'd no longer and the battle flags were furled in the Parliament of Nations, the Federation of the World."

To make this possible it will first of all be necessary for the statesmen and the people of all nations to subscribe to the doctrine promulgated by some of the most prominent church heads of England in December 1940, namely, that the "resources of the earth should be used as God's gift to the human race." It will be possible only when we are ready to render more than mere lip service to the ideal of the "universal brotherhood of man."

Thus and only thus can there ever be realized the dream of the dreamer, the vision of the seer, the hope of the statesman; yes, the fondest wish of every human being who has ever given serious thought to the enormity of the horrors of war.

"It's coming yet, for a'that,
That man to man, the world o'er
Shall brothers be, for a' that."

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address dealing with the bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business, delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the Congressional Record of the Air program over station WHN, New York City, Tuesday, June 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is pending on the Senate Calendar S. 883. This bill provides for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. The bill has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Commerce of the Senate.

It has the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, and has the approval of businessmen generally.

The bill calls for no appropriations. It would create no additional bureau. It would not add materially to the overhead of Government.

How then, you may ask, will the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business look after his job?

We have often heard it said that behind every great accomplishment is the lengthening shadow of a great man. Behind every great human effort there is the energy, vitality, and vision of a man or a group of men. All history repeatedly illustrates this truth.

Small business does not want a bureau in Washington which would increase bureaucracy. It does not want an organization with tentacles reaching out into its communities and into its businesses. What it wants is an articulate voice here, someone who understands its language and who recognizes the importance of small business in the economic, social, and political life of the Nation, someone who can head a great cooperative effort, utilizing the small businessman in his community, so that small business will be prosperous and the community's economy healthy.

What, then, it may be asked, could an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business accomplish? He could be the liaison man in Government, representing the small businessman. He could preach cooperation between small business and big business. He could reach out into the highways and byways of the Nation and utilize groups of small businessmen to the end that there may be cooperation and building for the Nation. There are innumerable chamber of commerce groups and civic association groups. There is the United States Chamber of Commerce which is now studying this problem. The Assistant Secretary of Commerce would cooperate with the C. E. D., known as the Committee for Economic Development.

When the war is over, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business could have throughout the Nation a working organization of small businessmen who are not on the pay roll of the Government, but who are interested in maintaining the vitality and the character of their own little business concerns.

These men realize the tremendous job which will have to be done in getting the millions who are now engaged in the war service or in war production back into industry and the economic life of the Nation on a peacetime basis. All the men and women thus employed and all those in the armed services must be transferred to civilian production work as soon as possible after the war is won. On this front small business and big business will be collaborating with labor. Through collaboration private enterprise will again demonstrate its vitality, as it has in this war enterprise.

The point is that we want for small business, someone, here in Washington, who recognizes the importance of small business to the economic and political life of the Nation. We want someone who will not simply talk, but who will see to it that small business obtains recognition. Recognition means a place in the economic sun of America.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business would begin now to think this problem through as to how each company and each little business interest in every little community could help and be prepared to do its part in the post-war period.

Small business is concerned with the post-war problem of public works in city, county, State, and the Nation and, of course, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business could render assistance in that direction and could assist and advise with existing business agencies and individual companies.

The initiative of the individual is what built this country, and it is not the purpose of the bill to interfere with such initiative. Rather, if an Assistant Secretary of Commerce is appointed, and the bill provides that he shall be appointed by the President, one of his objectives would be to add impetus to the initiative and invention which has made America great. His purpose would be to aid and assist small business in tackling its own post-war problems and the problems of the Nation.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce would stay out of politics. He would have no part in politics. His heart and soul would be in the high purpose of strengthening the economy of the Nation by doing all he could to make small business strong.

Small business recognizes that the Nation will need homes, food, radios, autos, clothing, air conditioning, and a thousand other articles when the war is over. Small business recognizes that there is now a terrific deficit in machinery on the farm and that this deficit will grow greater, and that there will be in the post-war period a deficit of machinery for supplying the Nation's needs. The outside world will need our help and this will call for expanded facilities. There will be new methods of production and new products to manufacture. We will have to build new schools and highways, and we will undoubtedly think in terms of great international highways both in the air and on the land. Small and big business is in that picture.

Small business wants to play its part in these great developments and adventures. Individuals will have huge economic savings in banks and trust companies to aid in the accomplishment of the job which the Nation will be called upon to do. With its Assistant Secretary of Commerce, small business would have the cooperation of economists and scientists in studying the policies of government and fostering maximum productive employment.

Small business is a relative term. It includes nearly everyone except the very large business institutions. The perpetuation of small business means, as one great American said to me, the perpetuation of the American way.

The Department of Commerce estimates that in 1939 there were 2,758,272 small business establishments in the United States. These establishments, consisting of manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, servicemen, that is, establishments which sell services rather than commodities, such as laundries, barbers, etc., construction men, hotel operators, and owners of amusement places, employed 8,364,971 persons.

Secretary of Commerce Jones, in expressing his approval of my bill, S. 883, said:

"Small business numerically embraces 9 out of every 10 business establishments. It accounts for over one-third of the dollar value of goods and services. It employs approximately 45 percent of all wage earners."

The statement "45 percent of all wage earners" was confined, of course, to personnel of these specific industries—manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, service establishments, hotels, construction, and places of amusement.

Small business has always stood on its own feet, and it will continue to stand on its own feet.

We are living in a changing world. It has been contracted. It has grown much smaller. All of this calls for careful planning. It calls to labor and management, small business and big business, government and the citizen—all segments of our society—to practice cooperation. It calls for more cooperation on the home front as well as on the international front. We are all one—we Americans—and in a sense we are each our brother's keeper.

If we pass this bill, it will have a great psychological value. Whether its operations will be successful will depend upon the vision of the man who is appointed. Passage of the bill will notify the small businessmen of America that Congress has at last—at long last—taken cognizance of their situation. It will give the small businessman a shot in the arm and will make him feel that he has someone in Washington who is thinking about him, who is concerned about his affairs—someone to whom he can go, or to whom he can write, and to whom he can submit his individual problems.

When peace comes all business, big and small, must be ready to do the job that will then be necessary; ready to back up its Government in its effort for international collaboration; ready to take its part in employing those who come back from the services and those who come out of the war plants.

Only by thinking this problem through now can that result be accomplished. What a great job the proposed Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business will have if he will make it great.

A Competent Observer's Conclusions in Regard to the Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Maurice Early, distinguished staff writer of the Indianapolis Star, has made a most interesting contribution to the discussion concerning the value of the Farm Security Administration. Mr. Early, who is a discriminating observer and analyst, chose Clinton County, Ind., one of our best midwestern agricultural counties, as the field of his observations. He went in person to that county and interviewed all who could throw light on the subject. His conclusion is that the Farm Security Administration really does help the small farmers and by its assistance it does much good in making it possible for worthy persons to get established on farms who otherwise would gravitate to already overcrowded and congested centers.

Mr. Early's observations and conclusions are set forth in the following communication to his paper from Frankfort, the county seat of Clinton County:

FRANKFORT, IND., June 15.—Has the American food supply been made more secure through the efforts of the Farm Security Administration to help little farmers to get on their feet and stay on the land? The National House said "No." The Senate said

"Yes." So the fate of the Farm Security Administration hangs in the balance.

Perhaps the answer lies in a close-up view of the operations of the Farm Security Administration in this typical Hoosier county. What is going on here in Clinton County is being repeated in most of the several thousand counties of the Nation.

During the last 5 years Farm Security Administration has provided funds for 14 Clinton County families to own their own farms. In no instance did these farm purchasers have any appreciable amount of capital for a down payment in order to obtain a commercial loan. The supervised Farm Security Administration loan at 3 percent interest was the only vehicle available which could settle them on land of their own.

Otherwise these families would be chained to the land as tenants or the head of the house would give up as a tiller of the soil and drift to the city as a factory worker.

Arthur J Mosson, one of the group of purchasers, with his wife and five children now are well on the road to rural affluence because of the lifeline tossed out by Farm Security Administration. He had owned a small farm in Orange County, but abandoned it as worthless 13 years ago to come to Clinton County as a tenant farmer.

Four years ago today Farm Security Administration provided $9,600 for him to purchase 120 acres of good farm land west of Frankfort. Of course, prices have been good in recent years, but his advance toward complete ownership has been startling. His contract with Farm Security Administration gave him 40 years to repay the loan. He has paid half of it already and has livestock and crops in prospect this year to enable him to pay in full and burn the mortgage.

When the war came he decided to milk 13 cows instead of 8. He increased the number of brood sows 40 percent. Mrs. Mosson increased her flock of chickens this year from 500 to 600. This sort of increased production, which means working from dawn to dusk, is typical not only of the farm purchasers, but of the tenant farmers who have been given Farm Security Administration chattel loans.

This instance is not exceptional. Most of the farm purchasers are paying far in excess of the required payments. Most of them have substantial equities in the land. Only six of the group have had loans for 4 years. Another six have loans made in 1940 and 1941. Nothing is yet due from the two loans made last December. Yet out of a total of $154,000 advanced to the purchasers to become landowners, a total of $23,344 had been repaid up to June 7. When this year's crops are marketed another big dent will be put in the mortgages.

Paul H. Teal, Clinton and Boone Counties Farm Security Administration supervisor, and Mrs. Ruth Van Camp, home management supervisor of the area, explain that these character loans, while not sound from a commercial banking point of view, are actually rather secure.

Every member of a family to get a loan must be in top physical condition. They must be passed on by a local farm committee, which in this county consists of Clarence Beisel, Earl A. Good, and Warren Brant. In addition an expert appraiser and an engineer study the property the purchaser wants to buy to determine whether he is getting his money's worth.

Five percent of the farmers of Clinton County have been given either farm-purchase or rural-rehabilitation loans. Out of 143 tenants given chattel loans in order to enable them to make a go of it on the land, all are toeing the line in interest and principal payments except 14. Ten of these are attempting to pay the loans. Four have been dropped from the books as losses.

Tenant loans are not made to the shiftless. Some are youngsters just starting on their own. Others are hard workers who have had tough luck. A typical instance is one tenant borrower who was wiped out 3 years ago when industrial impurities in a creek killed all his hogs. The Farm Security Administration loan gave him a new start. Otherwise he would have moved to a city. He has stepped up production from 5 to 10 milk cows and increased his sows from 8 to 13. His wife added 100 chickens to her flock. They have an only son in the Army and have a hired man to take his place.

The Mysterious Disappearance of the Potato

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, fortunately we are slowly recovering from a national affliction nobody would have thought possible even under the most extreme conditions. I refer to the recent sudden, mysterious, and complete disappearance of the most common item of food—the potato.

To my knowledge no one has yet satisfactorily explained the unannounced retirement of the lowly spud from the American scene. And, although the new crop is relieving the situation, no one has come forth with assurance that a similar drought will not occur again. But, with time to recover from the shock of the recent dilemma, responsible officials should consider methods of avoiding another potato shortage. One solution could have been considered during the late loudly lamented shortage, and can well be kept in mind in the event of another potato disappearance in the duration. I suggest the application of lend-lease in reverse about which we have heard so much.

According to reliable reports England has a surplus of potatoes, and has had. An Associated Press dispatch from London not long ago told of how English scientists had perfected a method of making synthetic cork from potatoes—and at a time when we were using about everything but cork for a substitute in our diet. A more recent account told of the surplus of potatoes in England, so great that quantity lots were being sold at a ridiculously low price to farmers for feeding hogs.

That bottoms for shipping potatoes this way from England are plentiful is evidenced by the statement of a Government official before a committee of Congress some time ago. This official stated that cargo ships returning from Russia were coming back empty, while many returning from England were loaded with Scotch whiskies and some textiles. Now it is reported that whiskey and textiles have given way to sand and other ballast for returning convoys. Why has not the English potato surplus been employed in a twofold purpose? A month ago the strongest devotee of Scotch whiskey on this side of the Atlantic would have traded his daily scotch and soda for a potato, and many an American would have gone without a suit of imported cloth, cuffs or no cuffs—or, in effect, given the shirt off his back—for a serving of fluffy whipped potatoes.

In an experience such as we recently went through nobody would stop to debate the relative value of American and British potatoes. In such dire circumstances a potato is a potato regardless of its origin, race, creed, color or previous condition of servitude.

Unless there is another "hold the line order" between seasons our domestic potato supply may remain adequate—we certainly hope so. But, should another shortage occur from any cause, and our allies have a potato surplus, then lend-lease in reverse should be applied. Ballast for our returning convoys and potatoes for our tables.

We Should Quit Talking About What We Expect To Do to the Japanese While the War Is on, in Order to Protect Our Innocent Men Who Are Prisoners of the Japanese

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, every day almost we see in the newspapers and we also hear on the floor of the House attacks upon the Japanese that are interned in this country. It occurs to me that such attacks may possibly cause harm to our prisoners of war who are now confined by the Japanese on the islands in the Pacific and on the mainland of Japan. Under the Geneva Conference a nation at war is obligated to treat prisoners humanely, to pay them for work according to certain rules and conditions, and to provide them with living quarters and food. Our country expects to carry out the terms of the Geneva Conference.

The charge is often made that the Japanese prisoners that we have in the United States are enjoying better food than the civilian population. That is very true, because under the Geneva Conference we are obligated to give these prisoners of war the same food that we provide our own soldiers, and since our own soldiers receive better food than civilians, the soldiers coming first, it is true that Japanese prisoners are receiving better food than the civilian population of our own country. The same is true as to the German prisoners. Other countries are under the same obligations to our servicemen who are prisoners of war.

We are all hoping that our American boys who are prisoners of war of the Japanese will be treated humanely and properly in every way. If we so viciously attack the Japanese in this country now and leave the impression with the Japanese people that they have been treated too well in this country and cause the Japanese people to come to the conclusion that we are not going to treat them so well in the future, and possibly cause them to believe that the Japanese prisoners of war here will be treated unfairly, it is likely to cause the Japanese to mistreat our American prisoners of war which they have in their possession. It is certainly my hope that we will not do anything that will give them any possible excuse to ill-treat or torture our fine American boys who are now confined in Japanese prisoner camps or any excuse to retaliate in any way.

It is my belief that we should treat the Japanese prisoners and those Japanese citizens who are interned according to the humane rules of warfare in the hope that it will save our men who are their prisoners from any undue suffering or mistreatment.

I imagine that if the 25,000 or more American servicemen who are now confined by the Japanese and who are suffering enough by being compelled to live upon Japanese rations, could send a message back to us here in Congress or to the American people, they would advise us to not do anything that would cause the Japanese to be harder on them there. I am also sure that is the fervent prayer of every mother, father, and other loved one of these prisoners of war that we be very careful what we say in this dark hour of warfare, when innocent men, their loved ones, are confined in foreign countries in enemy prisoner camps.

Roll-Backs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the principal argument advanced in support of the roll-back on the prices of meat and butter is that wages were stabilized last September while prices were not stabilized. No facts have been submitted by the advocates of subsidies and roll-backs in support of this contention, no doubt for the good reason that there are no such facts. It is true that there has been an increase in the cost of living since September 1942. What the proponents of the roll-back do not mention is the substantial increase in wage payments and in wage rates since that time. The proponents of price roll-backs take the position that they want to stabilize both wages and prices as of last September. If that is done, then we must roll back both prices and wages to what they were at that date.

I am including herewith three tables prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress which show respectively the average hourly earnings, average weekly earnings, and average hours worked per week in all manufacturing industries, May 1942 to April 1943; total manufacturing pay rolls May 1942 to April 1943; indexes of cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers for large cities of the United States, May 1942 to May 1943:

Average hourly earnings, average weekly earnings, and average hours worked per week in all manufacturing industries, May 1942 to April 1943

Month and year	Full-time hourly earnings		Straight-time hourly earnings		Weekly earnings		Average hours worked per week
	Average (cents)	Index January 1941=100	Average (cents)	Index January 1941=100	Average	Index January 1941=100	
May 1942	83.5	122.3	78.8	118.7	$35.82	134.5	42.9
June 1942	84.5	123.7	79.7	120.0	36.25	136.1	42.9
July 1942	85.6	125.3	80.9	121.8	36.43	136.7	42.6
August 1942	87.0	127.4	82.0	123.5	37.38	140.3	43.0
September 1942	89.2	130.6	84.4	127.1	37.80	141.9	42.4
October 1942	89.3	130.7	83.9	126.4	38.89	146.0	43.6
November 1942	90.5	132.5	84.8	127.7	39.78	149.3	44.0
December 1942	90.7	132.8	84.7	127.6	40.27	151.2	44.4
January 1943	91.0	134.6	85.9	129.4	40.62	152.5	44.2
February 1943	92.4	135.3	86.3	130.0	41.12	154.4	44.5
March 1943	93.4	136.7	[1] 87.3	131.0	[1] 41.75	157.1	[1] 44.7
April 1943 [2]	94.4	138.0	88.0	132.5	42.48	----------	45.0

[1] Revised. [2] Preliminary.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Total manufacturing pay rolls (both wages and salaries)

[Unit: Million dollars]

1942:	
May	2,429
June	2,490
July	2,573
August	2,685
September	2,752
October	2,839
1942—Continued.	
November	2,936
December	3,006
1943:	
January	3,057
February	3,119
March	3,192
April	3,236

Source: Department of Commerce, national income unit.

Indexes of cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers for large cities of the United States

[1935-39=100]

	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Fuel, electricity, and ice	House furnishings	Miscellaneous
1942							
May 15	116.0	121.6	126.2	109.9	104.9	122.2	110.9
June 15	116.4	123.2	125.3	108.5	105.0	122.3	110.9
July 15	117.0	124.6	125.3	108.0	106.3	122.8	111.1
August 15	117.5	126.1	125.2	108.0	106.2	123.0	111.1
September 15	117.8	126.6	125.8	108.0	106.2	123.6	111.4
October 15	119.0	129.6	125.9	108.0	106.2	123.7	111.8
November 15	119.8	131.1	125.9	108.0	106.2	123.7	112.7
December 15	120.4	132.7	125.9	108.0	106.3	123.7	112.8
1943							
January 15	120.7	133.0	126.0	108.0	107.3	123.8	113.2
February 15	121.0	133.6	126.2	108.0	107.2	124.1	113.6
March 15	122.8	137.4	127.6	108.0	107.4	124.5	114.5
April 15	124.1	140.6	127.8	(1)	107.5	124.6	114.8
May 15	125.1	143.0	127.8	(1)	107.6	124.7	115.1

[1] Rents figured on a quarterly basis.

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Cost of Living Division.

Race Riot in Detroit

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it may not be out of order to say to the Members of Congress, who signed the anti-poll-tax petition and who supported that measure which was designed to stir up race trouble in certain Southern States, that their chickens are coming home to roost.

Detroit, Mich., has suffered one of the most disastrous race riots in history. This trouble has been hastened by the crazy policies of the so-called Fair Employment Practices Committee in attempting to mix the races in all kinds of employment, as well as by individual uplifters who are constantly fanning the flames of discontent with their misguided efforts to promote what they call social gains.

There is only one way in which Negroes and whites can live together peaceably on the same soil, and that is on a basis of complete segregation. The sooner everybody connected with this administration realizes that fact, the better it is going to be for all concerned, and the fewer innocent white people and innocent Negroes will pay with their lives in disasters of this kind.

The Scarcity of Meat

REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received today a resolution and telegrams from the farmers in my district, who have been feeding cattle and producing meat for many years. Unless some program upon which they can depend is inaugurated immediately, they predict, and I agree with them, that millions of pounds of meat heretofore produced in my State alone will not be produced. We are going to be faced with a meat famine. I have made appeals for help at the departments. I include these resolutions and telegrams in my remarks, in order that those of you who are interested may see the side of this meat question as it comes from the meat producers of the country. These producers appeal to Congress now for immediate help.

JUNE 19, 1943.

DEAR SIR: For your information, the following wire was sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, June 18, 1943:

"The following resolution was passed in Fremont, Nebr., June 17, 1943, at a meeting of 700 livestock producers and feeders, representing many thousands more:

" 'In order to guarantee an adequate supply of pork, beef, and lamb for (1) armed forces, (2) the civilian population, and (3) lend-lease, that they demand that James Byrnes, Director of Office of War Mobilization, rescind his order, which is effective Monday, June 14, 1943, rolling back wholesale prices and ordering subsidies to be paid on beef, pork, and lamb, and if it is not immediately rescinded the producers and feeders of the Corn Belt States will request all feeders and producers to withhold the marketing of slaughter animals effective Monday, June 28, pending compliance with their demand and further, that the feeders of the Corn Belt States demand that the reflected price on meat animals be sufficient to cover cost of production.'

"During the last week, because of the break in prices of live animals marketed, the producers and feeders have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. The request to withhold the marketing of slaughter livestock would be made to save the producers from these losses during this period of uncertainties. Further, the Corn Belt producers and feeders of livestock stated in a resolution, 'We, the livestock feeders and producers from 28 counties in Nebraska and 9 in Iowa, oppose the roll-back and subsidy program on meat, butter, and coffee as un-American, inflationary, and discriminatory.' The livestock producers and feeders of the country, at the request of the proper authorities in charge and at your personal request, have increased the production and marketing of livestock to the highest levels in the history of this country. The decision to keep slaughter livestock off the market would not mean a strike in production because the production of meat tonnage would continue on animals now in feed lots. Many feed-lot operators, however, already have been discouraged from buying additional livestock and have ceased making replacement purchases, with the result that thousands of feed lots already are empty or are rapidly being emptied. In this they are influenced not only by price roll-backs recently announced but also by the fear of further price reductions by the same method in the future.

"The apparent lack of understanding on the part of people in Washington as to the seriousness of the food situation and their unwillingness to request and accept the counsel and advice of people with knowledge and practical suggestions for solution, gives them no choice but to take drastic action and insist that this whole problem have your personal, immediate attention.

"HARRY GARDNER,
"Oakland, Iowa.
"HERMAN DINKLAGE,
"Wisner, Nebr.
"Resolution Committee."

HARRY GARDNER.
HERMAN DINKLAGE.

HASTINGS, NEBR., *June 22, 1943.*

KARL STEFAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Ninety-eight livestock feeders of Cedar County, Nebr., met tonight and bitterly opposed the roll-back subsidy program.

These feeders will produce more than 11,000,000 pounds of meat this year.

Unless a stabilized Government policy is adopted at once, meat production will be drastically reduced.

We have no intention of quitting while we have sons and brothers on the fighting fronts. We only ask a square deal, and we expect you to get it for us.

CEDAR COUNTY LIVESTOCK
FEEDERS ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE HIGGINS, *Secretary.*

GENOA, NEBR., *June 21, 1943.*

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.:

As operators for the past 50 years of a substantial cattle-feeding business, we wish to report directly to you that the situation is now such that cattle-feeding operations can only be carried on at a loss. Fat cattle prices do not reflect cost of production, particularly since the recent roll-back, and can only result in rapidly squeezing cattle feeders out of business. After being encouraged to increase production, we are now in grave doubt whether the Government of the United States desires us to continue making grain-fed beef. Because we want to make the greatest contribution we can to the war effort, we take the liberty of calling this regrettable condition to your attention. Granted some encouragement and the assurance of cost of production, we will do our full share in producing meat for the Nation. If our product is not wanted, we would like to know it so we can endeavor to produce what is wanted. We know that our attitude is shared by many loyal cattle feeders of the Middle West.

KENT & BURKE CO.

Soldiers Speak Out Against Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith insert a statement from a local issue of the Stars and Stripes, the daily newspaper of the United States armed forces in the European theater of war. It is an editorial presenting the serviceman's views on prohibition:

They're at it again in America, and even as in the days of World War No. 1 we may yet hear that America is dry.

Most of us in the United States armed forces could not be classed as violently opposed to liquor control, for most of us believe in moderation. On the other hand, there are a few of us who could be included in the group of Americans who felt "the noble experiment" was a huge success.

It is with alarm, therefore, that we learn of the growing political strength of the anti-liquor crowd in the United States.

Taking advantage of wartime conditions and restrictions, the new prohibition group is working night and day for legislation which will give America prohibition in fact if not in name. Using the tactics of the farm bloc, the antiliquor crowd is tacking on amendments to practically every military appropriations measure in a desperate effort to secure prohibition or the nearest thing to it they can force through Congress.

Rationing is playing into their hands and gives them a good excuse and no opportunity is missed to use this excuse in their effort to limit the production and distribution of liquor of all types.

We can remember the days of prohibition, when moonshine whisky made quick fortunes for bootleggers, crooked politicians, and dishonest police officials. As a result, we claim we know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control.

It is interesting, also, to submit an editorial which appeared in the Lowell, Mass., Sun on June 14, 1943. It is the type of editorial that is appearing in the enlightened press throughout the country:

OUR SOLDIERS SPEAK

Though they are scattered over the face of the globe, our fighting men must not lose their identity as citizens of this country, privileged to express their opinions on national issues in the true democratic way.

There are geographic limitations to the securing of a collective opinion on matters of moment pertaining to civilians, and it seems only fair that positive action on any issues which might be of paramount interest to our soldiers and sailors should be deferred until after they are home.

As much as possible, our fighting men are trying to keep informed of affairs at home, and right at the moment most of them are disturbed by the machinations of prohibitionists who would again throw this country to gangsters, criminals, and bootleggers through the adoption of antiliquor legislation.

Our experience in prohibition was such a ghastly reflection upon law, order, and decency that our fighting men have a natural right to object.

Proposed Repeal of Certain Immigration Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio speech which I have prepared on the subject of immigration and some of the current proposals to repeal essential restrictions in the present Federal immigration laws.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are now a number of bills before the Congress which propose to relax the present restrictions on immigration; one of the most far reaching of which (H. R. 2428) has been introduced by Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, of New York, who is chairman of the Immigration Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Immigration, I am opposed to Mr. DICKSTEIN'S bill and all other measures intended to repeal or relax present restrictions on immigration. For the duration of the war, I would stop all aliens from entering our country for permanent residence.

My conviction is that while our soldiers, sailors and marines, and those who aid them, are away from home and are sacrificing their youth, health and opportunities for happiness, and while many of them are forfeiting their lives in battle-areas and in foreign lands, is not the time to relax our immigration laws. Some day this war will be over and then more than 10,000,000 American boys and girls now in the uniforms of our combat forces will return to what? If we now open wide the gates and permit and encourage the hordes of foreign peoples of many nationalities, diverse races and confusing cultures, to occupy and possess their vacant places.

Moreover, after the war, more than another 10,000,000 Americans now profitably working in war industries will be thrown out of employment by the reduced, or discontinued, operations of these industries. Where will they then find employment if we now add to that job-seeking army, the impoverished and job-taking multitudes of all the war-weary countries in Asia, Africa, and Europe?

In addition to these two groups of approximating 20,000,000 Americans who will be seeking jobs and employment after the war, there are possibly more than 10,000,000 youths now in our public and private schools who also will be seeking then their chance to get on in the world.

The welfare of these 30,000,000, or more, Americans, and their dependents and loved ones, is my first consideration. I am their Senator. If I, and other Members of the Congress, do not now protect their interests, who can, or will?

I am opposed to any person claiming, or enjoying, dual citizenship—allegiance to two different and separate governments—if one of those governments is our own. I have introduced legislation in harmony with this thought.

An intelligent and constructive approach to a discussion of immigration requires that we set aside any prejudices, or antagonisms, we may have and consider with an open and fair mind only the welfare of the American people.

I believe it is unfortunate when large numbers of two or more distinct races, which are not readily assimilated, try to occupy the same area simultaneously. It has often led to violence, persecution, cruelty, and, quite recently, to bloodshed and death. It is an unhappy situation for all concerned. It is not a question of superior or inferior race. It is not a question of good people or bad people. Who is to judge? There is not a best race nor a best people, in my opinion. We are all God's children and I would try to simplify, rather than to complicate, one of our many serious social problems. I would not perpetuate and increase the confusion initiated at the building of the Tower of Babel, or augment the smoldering animosities which now seethe beneath the surface of public expression.

Already there are now nearly six million aliens in this country; people whom we have not yet assimilated and many of whom we can never assimilate. That is about as many people as are in the combined populations of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico. That is an awful lot of aliens to have on hand at one time. And there are those among us who now want to increase this number.

About the middle of the last century (1857) Lord Macauley, the British statesman, historian, and essayist, then discussing the American form of government as an experiment in the government of a great people, observed, in effect, that when the time came that America no longer had free lands on which her excess population could settle, and there should be large congested urban populations, then the American form of government would be put to the test. He doubted if our Federal Constitution could survive the discontent which agitators and demagogues would excite under such conditions. That time and those conditions are now present.

He remarked further that when such conditions prevailed in our country, our Republic would be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals, who ravaged the Roman Empire, came from without; while our Huns and Vandals will have come from within our own country; providing some Caesar or Napoleon had not, by that time, seized the reins of government.

Was he a prophet? I hope not, and I shall resist the possible fulfillment of his direful prediction to the utmost; but we cannot now sit idly by while hoards of aliens with subversive ideas and by sinister activities despoil us and wreck our Government under subversive leadership. "Forewarned is forearmed."

Let us beware whom and how many we permit now to enter our country to augment the discontent and turmoil already discernible to all well-informed and observant persons. Should we not settle some of the most vital internal problems affecting the Government of the people already here, before we open wide our gates to the immigration of millions of more people, with entirely different racial and cultural backgrounds than those which are traditionally American?

During the past 4 years, even under the difficult conditions incident to the war, possibly as many as 200,000 aliens have entered our country for permanent residence. This is a lot of people. Do you think we can assimilate aliens in such large numbers so rapidly, or that they can be absorbed into our schools and by our pay rolls without creating a number of unhappy conditions and difficult problems—unhappy for them and difficult for us?

If our present restrictions on immigration are repealed now we may witness the very vessels which convey our troops overseas, transporting to America on the return trip, refugees whose adult male members are unwilling to fight for the homes which our boys in foreign combat service are expected to save.

By the turn of the century a multitude of immigrants were coming to America every year; the peak was reached in 1910 when nearly 1,000,000 aliens came to our shores for permanent residence.

For many years this country had no Federal laws restricting the admission of aliens. We had no serious immigration problem for the first century after independence, because of the vast expanse of unsettled territory and the fact that most immigrants came from northern Europe and were readily assimilated into our domestic and political economy.

Improved and safer facilities of ocean-going transportation, the solicitation of tourist business by trans-Atlantic steamship companies, the efforts of some employers of large numbers of unskilled workers to obtain cheap labor, unhappy conditions in foreign countries, and other factors, have caused an ever-increasing number of aliens to seek our shores. To protect the American interests the Congress has, from time to time, placed restrictions upon immigration.

While such restrictive laws were being enacted to safeguard the American interests an attempt was made to meet the problem arising from the migration of Chinese laborers, particularly to the west coast, by a treaty with the Chinese Government concluded in 1880. By the turn of the century the immigration of Japanese began to increase and it was feared that they would rapidly supplant the white population on the west coast. An unofficial agreement, known as the gentleman's agreement, was concluded with Japan, and under this agreement the Japanese Government was to refuse to permit laborers to emigrate to the United States.

Our present quota law, the Immigration Act of 1924, permits a maximum of approximately 150,000 aliens of all kinds to enter this country every year. This number does not include, however, nonquota immigrants. This law prevents the immigration of Japanese aliens and completes the statutory restrictions against the admission of orientals.

There is a rising tide of alien propaganda in this country which is directed toward the repeal or relaxation of these long-established immigration laws. The forces behind this undercover campaign have long been awaiting the arrival of what they conceive to be a favorable opportunity to repeal some of the barriers which Congress has created against the admission into our country of vast hordes of foreign elements which would flood this country while millions of our soldiers, sailors, and marines have been sent into foreign combat service to carry on the war to maintain American conditions at home and establish similar conditions elsewhere.

Strong and sinister forces are now at work, with the encouragement of persons in the highest places of Government, to make us more conscious of our racial differences, more sensitive to the diversity of our religious views, and more active in various political thoughts.

The attempt to capitalize the popular admiration of the Chinese people because of their heroic struggles against the Japanese forces of aggression and destruction is an effort to force an entering wedge into our immigration restrictions by this sinister group of propagandists who have more far-reaching purposes in mind than appear on the sur-

face. This is a misuse of the Chinese popularity rather than an act of real service to the Chinese people. The Chinese themselves were the very first of existing peoples to exclude aliens from their own country. More than 2,000 years ago they built the great Chinese Wall for that purpose. In harmony with that tradition of exclusion of aliens the Chinese in the year 1900 engaged in what is known as the Boxer Rebellion, when members of the Boxer Society committed outrages upon Europeans and Christian converts. This reign of violence and bloodshed culminated in the siege of the foreign legation in Peking.

The United States did not enter this war in order to break down our immigration laws. The United States has not appropriated billions of American dollars for the aid of our allies in order to be repaid by demands that our immigration laws be relaxed. If this war ends in a break-down of our long-established restrictions upon immigration, we shall have been defeated in the objectives we have fought to preserve. It is my understanding we are fighting to preserve our American way of life. Our restrictive immigration laws constitute a most important factor in that purpose. No man, no group of men, no nation, no group of nations, must be permitted to force our people to recede from our traditional position and established policy regarding the regulation of immigration. No Government in this country which seeks to recede from that position should survive a national election.

The subject of regulating immigration should be thoroughly canvassed and openly discussed now.

"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely."

The Value and Importance of the Congressional Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, evidently many people fail to appreciate the real importance and value of the material contributed to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and printed in the Appendix—a record of the expression of public sentiment that exerts a powerful influence on the Members of Congress in shaping the policies of our Government.

The subject of a recent letter, in answer to a criticism of the RECORD suggesting a surgical operation to remove its Appendix. My letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1943.

Mr. W. H. MACKELLAR,
Department of Public Speaking,
University of the South,
Sewanee, Tenn.

DEAR MR. MACKELLAR: Let me assure you that it is a pleasure to receive your letter of June 18 and have an opportunity to exchange views with you on national issues.

As the policy of the Congress in publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is at issue we need not go into the money question, a subject to which I have given considerable attention and on which I have presented my views at some length, as your familiarity with the RECORD may have disclosed.

Your estimation of the value of the material printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be compared to that of the great Turkish general that conquered Alexandria when asked by his subordinates what should be done with all the books in the library. The general is reported to have said, "If they disagree with the Koran they must be destroyed and if they agree with the Koran they are not needed, therefore let them all be destroyed."

Coming to the old Latin maxim "Vox populi vox Dei," or in other words, public opinion, is the greatest power on earth. There is the possibility that the expression of current public opinion, as presented in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be as important, if not more important, to the historian and students in future periods in discerning and evaluating the events and influences that shaped national policies and the trends of national development in our time as the bare record of the proceedings of this greatest deliberative body on earth, if you will agree as to the importance of the legislative branch of our Government.

May I suggest to you, as an educator, that in conducting your researches in your study of the influences that have shaped the course of the development of our country and its Government, you may with profit consult the chronicle of events and the expression of public opinion as revealed by editorial and civic opinion recorded in the Extension of Remarks appearing in the past issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Future generations may be indebted to this record for the happenings and influences of our day, just as we are indebted to the chronicles of Pliny, Cicero, and Atticus for the record of the events and influence that moulded the destiny of the governments of their day.

Let us agree that the material in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will have its place in guiding the students of the future in evaluating the influences that are shaping our destiny.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Fight of Agriculture for Economic Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Missouri Farmer is a journal published by the Missouri Farmers' Association, one of the greatest agricultural cooperatives in the United States. The Missouri Farmer is one of the greatest farm journals published in the United States. Sometime ago, at the request of the editor of the Missouri Farmer, I wrote an article entitled "The Fight of Agriculture for Economic Equality," which was published in the Missouri Farmer for June 1, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the editorial comment which accompanied it. I ask that the editorial comment be published preceding the article.

There being no objection, the article and editorial comment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missouri Farmer of June 1, 1943]

LET'S GET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

During the past 12 months or so there has been at lot of misinformation disseminated by the daily press, radio, and other mediums concerning agriculture, the farm bloc in Congress, the farm organizations, and various farm legislation. It is important that farmers understand what has been done and why. For unless we do understand the situation we become confused, and as an organization we become ineffectual. This is why we asked Senator CLARK of Missouri to write the accompanying article. From time to time we expect to ask other competent legislators to write on the same subjects.

Senator CLARK, by the way, has been one of agriculture's stanchest friends in the United States Senate during the trying times through which we have been passing. He has steadfastly supported measures which he believed were in the farmers' best interest. On one occasion he stood out until the last with three other Senators on a proposal to definitely fix prices on everything—including farm prices, wages, profits, and transportation charges—as was recommended by President Heinkel. Another time he was willing to get up out of a sick bed, against his doctor's orders, to confer with Frank Young, who was sent to Washington to represent the Missouri Farmers' Association on a price-fixing bill. These instances and others, we feel sure, the Missouri Farmers' Association membership will appreciate.

THE FIGHT OF AGRICULTURE FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY

(By Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK)

Among the strangest phenomena of these tragic times is the persistent and relentless effort on the part of many great metropolitan newspapers and particularly of newspaper columnists and radio commentators to discredit the farmers of the United States and hammer down the price of agricultural products. In this short-sighted and un-American attitude it is a fact, regrettable but true, that in recent years these efforts have apparently had the connivance and assistance of some of the highest administrative officials of our Government.

These efforts upon the part of the great metropolitan press are the more remarkable in view of the fact that in the passage of the price-fixing and stabilization bills, the newspapers of the Nation sought and obtained for themselves a specific provision exempting newspapers from price limitations. Nearly every large newspaper in the country has freely and properly availed itself of the right to raise its own prices to cover increasing cost of production. Yet the right which they have claimed for themselves of raising prices to cover cost of production—including increased labor costs—plus a reasonable profit on their investment and for their efforts, they have been the first and loudest to deny the farmers. The farmers themselves and those of us in Congress who regard agriculture as a fundamental and essential American industry which must at all hazards be not only permitted to survive but encouraged and stimulated to maximum production for the supply of those most vital war necessities of food and clothing, have been assailed and

abused in the public press and over the radio, and accused of every crime from callous selfishness to downright treason. No more unfair campaign has ever been waged against any great section of the Nation's population.

No sensible man or woman can have the slightest doubt that one of the most desperate and pressing needs of the United States and its allies in this war emergency is the greatest possible production of agricultural foods and fibers. We must supply our armed forces around the globe with food to eat and clothes to wear. We must supply our own civilian population with sustenance in order to keep production of other essentials at the maximum in order to support and maintain our armed forces at highest efficiency. We must to a large extent supply the needs of our allies and of friendly neutrals in order to prevent a complete breakdown in the combined effort so vitally necessary to win the war. Without the very greatest possible production in this country of these vital essentials our war effort must inevitably collapse and disaster beyond any possible calculation might follow.

FARMERS ARE PATRIOTIC

Yet while all admit these salient facts, many high officials and many editors and commentators apparently have not had the wit to see what is necessary to bring about this maximum production of these essential requirements. Many of them have apparently never realized that the mere writing of a quota or an allotment on a piece of paper and the noisy trumpeting of aims for agricultural production through the press and over the radio does not of itself bring the needful production.

The average American farmer is as patriotic, as industrious, and as self-abnegating as any citizen of any nation in the history of the world. He has been the very bone and sinew of our Nation from the very beginning. But he cannot perform miracles and he should not be expected to do so. To use a Biblical expression, the farmer "cannot make bricks without straw."

Too many of our professorial and editorial economists—who so often feel themselves entirely competent to speak as the last authorities upon agricultural problems about which they know nothing and care less—have completely overlooked the most rudimentary requirements for adequate agricultural production.

This may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. A price which will enable the farmer to pay his costs of production, including labor, plus the carrying charges on his investment in his land, improvements, and equipment, plus at least a living wage to the farmer and his family for their own labor and efforts. This is absolutely necessary because no matter how patriotic a farmer may be, the vast majority of farmers do not have sufficient resources to continue to produce at a loss even if they were willing to do so. Furthermore, when industry engaged in war work is being awarded cost-plus contracts insuring them cost of production including labor costs in addition to a reasonable profit, and when under the Little Steel formula wages have been stepped up to meet the increased cost of living, there is no reason on earth why the farmer should be asked to operate at a loss.

2. Sufficient farm labor to at least prevent wanton wastage of the agricultural resources of the Nation. It should have been recognized long ago that the man who is engaged in producing the materials for food and clothing for our armed forces is certainly engaged in no less essential an effort than the man engaged in producing munitions and that his occupation, though less hazardous, is no less essential than that of the man who carries a gun. But the farm has been steadily depleted of its manpower for production by drafts of farmers for military service and even more dangerously by high wages offered in munition factories with Government sanction and encouragement.

MORE MACHINERY NEEDED

3. Adequate farm machinery to make up the deficiencies in farm labor due to the foregoing causes. Since it was inevitable that a vast number of young men would leave the farms to enter the military services or be attracted by the disproportionately higher wages of munition plants, some provision should long ago have been made for filling this loss in farm manpower with an adequate supply of farm machinery.

These requirements are so plain and simple that he who runs may read. It is amazing that there should ever have been any dispute about them among men and women who recognize the absolute necessity for the greatest possible production of the vital agricultural products. Yet early all of the controversies with regard to agricultural production which have taken place in the last 2 years have revolved around these very points.

When, nearly 2 years ago, a few of us in the Senate and in the House began to point out the danger to agricultural production by the curtailment of manpower on the farm both from the operation of the draft laws and from the steady drain on farm labor by the ruinous competition with the higher wages of munition factories, as well as the imperative need of supplementing the farm labor remaining available by liberal allocation of farm machinery, if necessary financed by the Government, we were voices crying in a wilderness.

THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT

It should have been clear as crystal from the beginning that if maximum production of foods and fibers was to be maintained, the available supply of farm labor must not be unduly depleted either by the draft or by competition of munition factories and that the only way in which any such depletion could be made up was by additional farm machinery. But it was impossible to obtain any action on deferment of essential farm labor until adoption of the Tydings Amendment which was forced on to the last draft act by a militant group of Senators last October. Even then the spirit of this amendment was largely flouted by the Selective Service System and its effect largely nullified. The Senate at last took drastic action and over bitter administration protests, passed an act for the blanket deferment of bona-fide essential farm workers. This act has apparently been salted away in the House Committee on Military Affairs with little hope of passage but its adoption by an overwhelming vote in the Senate has had the effect of forcing the Selective Service to carry out the spirit of the Tydings Amendment. The situation has been thereby much improved but the improvement came so belatedly that as I stated in the Senate it was a good deal like locking the barn after the horse was stolen. The suggestion seriously advanced as a substitute by the War Department of using military units as organizations to work the farms is of course ridiculous. It would be interesting to know what possible use such a fine military organization as the old 77th Division, exclusively from Greater New York, would be on the farms of Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa.

The situation with regard to farm machinery has been equally slow and difficult in improvement. For a long time the War Production Board stoutly resisted all efforts to obtain an allocation of the necessary material for agricultural implements. Even with the substantial reduction in the critical materials necessary for the use of tanks, and certain allocations were made for farm machinery, a quota system was set up based upon the extent to which the farms of the various States were already mechanized. Thus, States like Iowa which were already mechanized to the extent of 85 to 90 percent were given quotas of the available supply on that basis, while States like Missouri and Oklahoma, mechanized to the extent of only 13 or 14 percent, were restricted to that basis, despite the fact that their need was undoubtedly greater. This situation has been much improved and is likely to be further improved in the immediate future. Only a few days ago, Chester Davis, the new Food Czar, who really knows something about the farm situation, notified the War Production Board that the most pressing necessity for agricultural production at the present time is additional farm machinery. This will in all probability bring about great improvement but too late to be of great effect in this season's crops.

It can scarcely be denied by anyone that taking the 10-year administration of President Roosevelt as a whole it has been notably friendly to agriculture and has brought about a vast improvement in farm prices, farm credits, and farm conditions. One has only to compare conditions at the outbreak of the war with the unforgettable disastrous situation existing when President Roosevelt took office in 1933 to be convinced of that fact.

I was not one of those who favored the plan of the original Agricultural Adjustment Agency bill. I believed with William Hirth and many other distinguished farm leaders that the preferable plan was to determine the amount of agricultural production needed for domestic consumption, guarantee the farmer a fair price for his production and then permit him to produce anything else he pleased to be sold on the markets of the world for whatever he could get for it. But when the theory of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency became the policy of the Government, in company with other friends of agriculture I accepted this principle and voted for every measure to make it work to the best advantage. Whether or not the Agricultural Adjustment Agency was the best possible plan which could have been adopted at that time, it can scarcely be denied that the over-all results of that measure and its accompanying and succeeding legislation was greatly to the advantage of agriculture until the outbreak of war conditions.

I do believe, however, that since the development of war conditions, the handling of the whole price situation has been unfortunate and has worked unfairly on the farmers of the country in comparison with other great sections of the population. A very strenuous and sincere effort is now being made to correct these inequities.

Everyone recognizes the necessity for stabilization of economic conditions during this war if inflation which would be disastrous to all classes alike is to be prevented. Everyone realizes that all must make sacrifices—desperate sacrifices—if we are to win the war without precipitating calamity at home. But there should be—and should have been from the beginning—insurance for equality of sacrifice and insurance that all should be treated alike in an economic sense. There should have been over-all control from the outset—control of profits, wages, and prices as well as control of agricultural commodities.

When the first price-fixing bill—largely written by Mr. Leon Henderson—was before the Congress, it was strongly urged by a few of us that the plan would not work unless it did include over-all control. The sponsors of the bill, however, were unwilling to include control of profits or wages. By reason of this refusal, it was necessary to provide that prices of agricultural products should not be fixed at less than 110 percent of parity. Now, no one had any idea that this provision would bring about an over-all price of farm products above parity. The limit of 110 percent of parity was inserted because of the sponsors of the price-fixing bill refusing to

deal with profits or wages and on the theory that a general floor of 110 percent of parity would actually in practice permit about 100 percent of parity on the average.

Some of us in the Senate pointed out the dangers of such a system and insisted on an over-all system which would protect agriculture against a repetition of the calamitous experiences of the last war, when with high prices on agricultural products, the farmer was whipsawed as to his actual returns—his real prices—between exorbitant profits and abnormal wages. We were overruled by the majority. I predicted then that the system would not work and that further legislation would speedily be necessary to correct the very evils that we were then creating. As far as I was then advised—or for that matter so far as I am still advised—the farmer was perfectly willing to submit to Government price control so long as it did not upset the essential balance between commodity prices, wages, salaries, profits, and transportation charges, any one of which being out of control might be calculated to throw the whole system askew.

In September of last year, the President made his Labor Day speech. With the substance of this speech I was not in accord. He used the farmer as a whipping boy. He attributed the dangers to the safeguards against riotous inflation to the limit in the previous act to 110 percent of parity. While not denying the possible efforts of exorbitant profits and of wage increases, he placed the blame squarely at the door of agriculture. His suggestion was that he would take care of profits and wages by Executive order, but his demand was that unless Congress should act by a day certain to reduce the limit on farm prices, he would proceed by Executive action to exercise powers which few competent lawyers in the United States believed him to have and reduce these limits by Presidential decree.

When the stabilization bill, drafted in accordance with the President's instructions, came before the Senate it followed this outline. I pointed out in the Senate that this really meant that the control of commodity prices would be put in the hands of Mr. Leon Henderson, already notably and publicly hostile to agriculture, while the control of wages would be put under the control of the War Labor Board, openly and notoriously committed to an increase of wages at least to the extent of 15 percent. It seemed to me that such a system could not possibly work in the direction of stabilization because the act itself was setting up contending forces to pull in opposite directions. After consultation with Mr. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, and other farm leaders, I introduced and supported a substitute for the administration bill which eliminated the discretion between contending governmenal agencies and definitely fixed prices, wages and salaries at the highest point reached between January 1 and September 15, 1942. This substitute was defeated in the Senate. It would have had the effect of treating all alike and definitely stabilizing economic conditions. It is in effect the exact provision recently put into effect by the President's Executive order. Whether he has waited too long for it to be really effective, only time will tell. In September 1942, it could have easily been made effective.

During the consideration of the last stabilization bill, an amendment was offered by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, providing for consideration of the increased costs of farm labor in fixing the prices of farm commodities. The proposition seems to me so simple that the farmer should be placed in a similar position to every other producer of essentials in the United States that I have never been able to understand the bitter opposition to this proposal. Nevertheless it did meet with bitter opposition and was supplanted by a compromise amendment, which I denounced on the floor of the Senate as a fake compromise, which indeed it proved within a week after its enactment. I will always be proud of the fact that I was one of four Senators—and the only Democratic Senator—who voted against its adoption.

During the consideration of the stabilization bill in the Senate, any suggestion that the powers conferred in the measure could be used to apply benefit payments under soil conservation or other governmental acts was either denied or pushed off. In my opinion, if it had ever been stated that it was the purpose to apply these payments to a reduction of parity prices, the bill would never have been passed. Such intention was specifically denied on the floor of the Senate by Senator BROWN, who was in charge of the measure. Everyone recognized that these benefit payments had to do with advantages to the whole people through soil conservation, etc., which had nothing to do with parity. After the passage of the act, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement never read or delivered on the Senate floor which put a construction on the provisions of the act to authorize the deduction of these benefits in fixing parity.

My information is that this statement was written by Mr. David Ginsburg, at that time general counsel for the Office of Price Administration. By what chicanery it was introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as representing words spoken in debate I have never been able to determine. Certainly, the Senate had no intimation that the bill contained such powers. Indeed, it was specifically denied on the floor by those in charge of the measure.

Shortly thereafter, an Executive order proceeded to put into effect the exact provisions foreshadowed by Mr. Ginsburg's memorandum, clandestinely slipped into the RECORD after the passage of the bill. Congress promptly passed the Bankhead bill to correct this situation by an overwhelming majority in both Houses. The bill was vetoed. The Senate referred the question to the Committee on Agriculture with a view to watching subsequent developments as to wages and profits to see whether further action was necessary. The measure providing for the consideration of labor costs in fixing parity is in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and will probably be acted on at an early date.

My conclusion is that it behooves every American farmer and every friend of agriculture in Congress to watch every step of the road to insure that the experience of the last war may not be repeated. That is to say, that agriculture should not again be the first to suffer restriction during the war and the first to feel the heavy hand of deflation after the war. That was what had paralyzed agriculture in the United States long before the official date of the depression in 1929. That resulted from unfairness of treatment during the war. It must not be permitted to occur again. Otherwise we will have no effective farming industry in the United States.

Installation of Madam Wei Tao Ming as a Member of Kappa Beta Pi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on the 16th of May in the city of Washington, Mme. Wei Tao Ming, wife of the Chinese Ambassador, herself a Chinese jurist, was installed as a member of Kappa Beta Pi, international legal honor sorority. On that occasion very appropriate remarks were made by Mr. Justice Rutledge, of the Supreme Court of the United States; Hon. Florence Allen, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals; and Mme. Wei herself. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the introductory remarks and the remarks of those to whom I have referred. I think they will be found interesting, particularly at this time, when our friendly relationship with China are vital.

There being no objection, the proceedings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Miss BORCHARDT. We are met today to install Soumé Tcheng Wei into Kappa Beta Pi as a recognition of her service as a jurist and a student of the law, and as one who has sought through the law to contribute to the promotion of better relations among men and among nations. It is a particularly happy occasion to bring Mme. Wei into our intimate fellowship, not only because our association with her will greatly enrich us, but also because she, to us, will represent China; China and her cultural heritage and her serene philosophy; China and her dauntless courage and her heroic determination to fight for freedom.

I am particularly happy that this ceremony should take place after our country has denounced its Treaty on Extraterritoriality with China. Today we recognize that a respect for the political, economic, and cultural autonomy of each people is the basis of the collaboration among all peoples for the common good.

It is, therefore, particularly at a time when we are growing closer to our Chinese ally in spirit and in fact, that we are even more happy to welcome you, Mme. Wei, for your achievements and you as a Chinese woman, into our sisterhood. The first tribute to Mme. Wei, today, will come from Judge Florence Allen. We are happy that one of our own Kappas, who is the ranking woman member of the bench of the United States, has come on from Cleveland to help install Mme. Wei. Judge Florence Allen is a jurist who can think clearly and deeply, and yet whose opinions express not only profound knowledge but a fine deep feeling as well. We are, therefore, particularly proud and happy to have Judge Allen present the pin of Kappa Beta Pi to Judge Soumé Tcheng Wei. Ladies and gentlemen, the Honorable Florence Allen, judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge ALLEN. As I said to Justice Rutledge, I have the appropriate tremors as I see in this audience my very superior officer, a member of the Supreme Court, the Chinese Ambassador, Judge Harold Stephens, my friend of a lifetime, and so many others of the distinguished life of Washington. I count it a great privilege to be here this afternoon.

In many ways this celebration has significance even at this crisis when we are engaged in global war. Even now while our men of the armed forces are giving their lives on the battlefield, certain principles are discernible through the fighting, and there are certain achievements which it is well to recount in order that we may know what we have gained in this country and why it is worth while that America should continue to exist.

Only within our lifetime has sisterhood really been born, and it was made possible by the freedom extended to women in America. Mme. Wei, through induction into this sorority, is a symbol of this sisterhood. There have always been in the world the great forces of human brotherhood, fatherhood,

motherhood, love of parents for children, the love and affection and comradeship of wife and husband, the affection of man for man, their cooperation together, their comradeship, their great friendship, but never until our time has there been sisterhood. While there have been brilliant, gifted women in the past, for the most part their spiritual power has been confined to their immediate circle. Now we join hands the world over, freed by the right to go to school, to vote, to work professionally, and to organize together. Women in this critical hour are a great potential force, and so this ceremony has real significance.

We are honored by the presence among us of Mme. Wei and by her membership in our legal sorority. It is an honor to us that a woman who has held the scales of justice for a number of years in a great city like Shanghai, who has helped to prepare one of the progressive codes of the Chinese Republic, should be a member of our order. It is altogether fitting and proper also that we should recognize here our friendship to and our appreciation of the progressive ideals and staunch devotion to those ideals shown by the Chinese Republic.

Kappa Beta Pi in its very existence is a symbol of the fact that in this country women are permitted to share in the establishment of justice. The comembership of Mme. Wei in this sorority is likewise a living symbol of the liberal treatment afforded to women in modern China. And all of this signifies more than the mere right of women as human beings to engage in any professional calling they choose—important as that right is.—It recognizes the fundamental right of all human beings to help to mold the justice administered in our courts, established and sustained, as under the American system, they must be, by the people themselves.

It is also a particular joy to aid in conferring this membership upon a woman from China, a state long our friend, and one from which we can learn so much of the truest culture and philosophy. Not long ago we were provincial in America. In the very absorption of the fascinating physical task of opening up the West, crossing the mountains, digging the mines, felling the forests, we withdrew from other nations and deprived ourselves thereby of the illuminating contacts which would have enriched our every experience. It is only recently that we have begun to be acquainted with the philosophy and literature of China through such books as those of Lin Yutang and Pearl Buck, that quaint old novel, All Men Are Brothers, translated by Pearl Buck, the translations of Chinese poems by Arthur Waley and others.

If it be really true, and I think it is true even in these days, that a thing of beauty is a joy forever, then from our sister Republic of China we derive joy in great measure because she has opened to us many avenues of beauty; but there are other phases of our relationship with China which today seem to me even more significant. Perhaps we do not quite understand the ingrown, the inner, the inherent democracy of China, a democracy expressed not in form of organization, but a democracy of spirit which has made it possible in that country for men of the lowest origin, by intellectual power and by learning and endeavor, to attain to the very highest posts. Essentially, China never has presented the spectacle of domination or tyranny that we see so well exemplified in the totalitarian system.

And, lastly, today we do honor necessarily to the matchless courage of China. I heard the distinguished English preacher, Maude Royden, speak after the first terrible bombings of London. She thanked the American people for their understanding of that crisis and for their sympathy with the British will to resist and endure. Then she said, "But we haven't begun to take it like the Chinese." My friends, that is true. The time will come when Germany and Japan will be defeated, and then we will understand that the story of China has been a story of resistance unequaled in all history. I yield to no one in my admiration for Russia's dauntless power of resistance; but compare the situation between China and Japan and between Russia and Germany. China has held Japan just as the Russians have held the Nazis, and has held her with bare hands. While Japan has many more material resources than China, she has not had the mastery of chemicals and mechanical processes that the Germans have had, and so that means that she has not been mechanically as well equipped as the Germans. Yet in comparison with China, Japan was far superior, and much more superior than the Germans to Russia. I think that is a fair statement by a lay person who at least reads the papers. The material preparedness of Russia growing out of the masterly establishment of her various plants, her industrial plane which astounded the world, made the Russians more able to compete equally in the air and on the ground with Germany than China was with Japan, and the matchless spirit of Russia made up the balance. Have I made it plain that I think that Russia has done a magnificent thing? Now I am saying to you that the thing that China has done is so magnificent that we can never describe it, because she has fought airplanes and mechanized equipment with her bare hands, and fought for 5 years.

Not only have the Chinese held back the flood of oriental tyranny, but they have achieved the stupendous transplanting of 70,000,000 of people, men and women and little children, bearing on their backs the crude industrial equipment, the very libraries of the schools and universities, from invaded China into free China, and set up there their own free nation. When history is written, that will stand out as a matchless accomplishment. The reason we have not known about China's struggle is that until Pearl Harbor Japan was not our enemy, in fact we were still lately selling her scrap to be used as munitions against China and ourselves.

I was prepared, of course, for almost any brutality after we knew of the execution of the American flyers who went to Tokyo, but not even that prepared me for what I have learned of the terrible malignity shown to the Chinese by the Japanese. I will give you only one instance: They have resorted to wholesale taking of blood from the Chinese children to be used in blood transfusions among the Japanese. And so, my friends, I say to you that when we honor the Chinese women, we endeavor to honor the great spirit of China, our ally, our friend, who with unbreakable spirit has held back the blood of Japanese tyranny.

Today, then, we welcome Mme. Wei to our membership not only as a distinguished professional woman and judge, but also because she comes from a country whose devotion to liberty is unsurpassed, whose friendship we prize, and from whose serene philosophy and dauntless courage we drink in new faith.

Miss BORCHARDT. When the President of the United States named Justice Rutledge to the Supreme Court, we were happy to know that a scholar and a great jurist had been named. But we were also happy to realize that the President had named a man who devotes his life to the service for his fellow men. Justice Rutledge and Mrs. Rutledge are citizens among us who serve with us for the common good. We feel it is particularly fitting and proper that a man like Justice Rutledge should be asked to pay tribute to Mme. Wei and to China.—Mr. Justice Rutledge.

Justice RUTLEDGE. It is especially appropriate that a distinguished American jurist should welcome into this fraternity of yours a distinguished Chinese jurist. I can't define for myself, and I shall not attempt to define for you, what is the particular bond that has so long existed between China and the United States. We know it exists. We are of different ancestry, different customs, and different laws, we live in different parts of the world, we live in different geographical environment; nevertheless, for almost the entire period of our national existence, at any rate, during the latter half of it, the two nations have had a synthetic bond that has, I think, not characterized the relations of this country to any other nation in the world.

Now, I think we can rationalize somewhat more than we have and say that though their form of government is different from our own, the differences, the similarities of ideals, similarities of aspirations, which draw us even closer than we were when this great relationship began.

I think it is appropriate too that the women of China and of the United States unite to strengthen that bond, through Kappa Beta Pi, an international legal sorority. Today I think you symbolize most appropriately and perhaps in the best possible way you could, those three things; internationalism, law, and sisterhood.

Your distinguished new member could not from anything I say this afternoon add to her achievements or to her record of service. Many of you may know that she was at the first Peace Conference as a member of the Chinese delegation. I am almost tempted to say that I hope or wish that at the next peace conference we shall find the treaties made with women participating in their writing, particularly women lawyers. I have this suspicion which I wish to say to you in confidence, that if the women of the world might replace the men of the world in making and keeping the peace, we might have longer and better peace. I, for one, am hopeful that out of the struggle in which we are now engaged, will come a foundation of peace for the maintenance of law and with it both brotherhood and sisterhood which will not terminate within another score of years or some twoscore, but which may offer the opportunity for a perpetual foundation of legal institutions within which those things which we cherish in the relation of brethren and sisters may go on without interruption from armed strife. As for me, I know of no way of doing that, other than by the establishment of institutions with the strength to accomplish the task, and that means eventually the formation of some sort of international constitution which will give the world an opportunity to achieve the common objectives of China and the United States.

Mme. Wei, today you have received the pin of Kappa Beta Pi from a noted American woman jurist. She, like you, has written an interpretation of the basic law of her land. She, like you, would wish to devote our law, as you would yours, to promote welfare among men and peace among nations, and so as a symbol of that expression, I present to you, Mme. Wei, this copy of a work which is entitled "This Constitution of Ours," written by Judge Florence Allen. Your work on the Civil Code of China we should like to make available to our people for their study. We hope that from Judge Allen's work as from yours, we may each gain from our own and from the other's experience something which is valuable either for China or for us so that we may contribute each our share, but together, for our mutual good.

Miss BORCHARDT. We should now welcome a message from you, Soumé Tcheng Wei. A message from Mme. Wei Tao Ming.

Mme. WEI. I wish to thank you for the privilege of becoming an honorary member of this distinguished sorority.

As a member of the legal profession of China, I am indeed happy to join this close circle of friends, who are members of the same profession.

We of the United Nations are today engaged in a great struggle, and we are bound together not only by mutual good will, but by a common destiny. Our aim is not merely to destroy the evil enemies, but also to fight for an ideal: the ideal of justice and freedom, which is the firm foundation for an orderly progress of civilization as well as the basic requirement for peace and human happiness.

The realization of these hopes and aspirations will require the fullest cooperation and faith among the peoples of the world.

In this work, members of the legal profession have their particular duty to perform. It is to contribute their utmost to the building of a better world, in which the rule of law will prevail. Because only through law and order can freedom be made secure.

Our two countries have indeed enjoyed the best and longest tradition of friendly relationships. This is no mere good fortune. It is because we cherish the same ideals. Your respect for the rights of others, your abhorence of violence in all its forms, your spirit of democracy—these are the things which first touched the responsive chord in our hearts and which have since drawn us closer together each day. The talk here today by Judge Allen so beautifully told of that close bond between your people and mine.

It is certain that just as we are fighting shoulder to shoulder in this war, so we will be working together in the peace to come, to the end that our common ideal be realized not only for ourselves alone, but for all peoples throughout the world.

The Synthetic Rubber Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and informative address on the synthetic-rubber situation by Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., a recognized authority on rubber. The successful development and production of synthetic rubber in the midst of the war emergency constitute one of the outstanding accomplishments of American industry.

In the achievement of that record, Mr. Firestone gives due credit to the leadership of Rubber Director William M. Jeffers, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, and the other able men associated with them in the synthetic-rubber program.

Mr. Firestone's address was delivered over the radio on the program Voice of Firestone, on June 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, friends, far and near; during the past year and a half since Pearl Harbor I have talked to you upon several occasions about the rubber situation. Until recently the problem has been most serious and the outlook has not been very encouraging. However, this evening I am glad to say that we are beginning to see brighter skies ahead. And the credit for such remarkable progress in so short a time must be given to American foresight, skill, and ingenuity, and to the leadership of Rubber Director William M. Jeffers, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, and the able men who are associated with them.

Twenty years ago my father became convinced that the United States should take steps toward making itself independent with regard to its rubber needs, and he took the leadership in this cause under the banner, "Americans should produce their own rubber." He believed that there were three ways by which this country could try to accomplish this objective: First, by establishing rubber plantations in countries under American control or protection; second, by obtaining rubber from domestic plants; and, third, by making rubber synthetically.

He determined to pursue all three courses, and as a first step he started me out upon a survey of the rubber-producing countries of the world to determine where Americans could best grow their own rubber. After the most careful consideration, the West African Republic of Liberia was selected. At the present time we have more than 100,000 acres under development there and this year we expect to be able to bring out of Liberia 35,000,000 pounds of rubber. This is one of the few remaining sources from which the United States is still obtaining natural rubber.

In his crusade to establish an independent source of rubber for the United States, my father was joined by his close personal friends, Thomas A. Edison and Henry Ford. During the last 6 years of his life, Mr. Edison devoted much of his time to seeking plants that could be grown and harvested in the United States and which would be capable of producing rubber in practical quantities. This was the forerunner of the intensive research which has been carried on to this day by our laboratories and those of the Department of Agriculture.

The Firestone organization also turned to the development of man-made rubber and its uses. In 1933, Firestone built the first synthetic rubber airplane tires for our armed forces. In 1934, we made synthetic rubber passenger-car tires and in 1940 we went into factory production on these tires. That same year, we also began to make our own synthetic rubber, which we call butaprene, and which is the same type of synthetic rubber that was later adopted as standard by our Government.

In 1942 the Firestone organization had the distinction of becoming the first company to produce synthetic rubber in a Government-owned plant, and this year that same plant became the first to make synthetic rubber with butadiene made from grain alcohol.

During these years of experience and experiment, Firestone technical men originated new and unique methods of processing synthetic rubber, designated special machines to increase production, and developed new materials to improve the durability and strength of synthetic-rubber compounds. And with our country at war we have made all of these developments available to our Government and to the rubber industry without royalties or compensation of any kind.

Now, let us take a look at the prospect for additional rubber, both natural and synthetic, in 1943. At the beginning of this year we had on hand about 443,000 tons. It is estimated that we can obtain new supplies of synthetic and natural rubber amounting to 308,000 tons this year, making a total of 751,000 tons. When we consider that the requirements for 1943 are estimated at 609,000 tons, it will be seen that by the end of the year we may have a balance in the stock pile of only 142,000 tons, which is very close to the 120,000 tons set by the Baruch committee as a dangerous minimum.

As to natural rubber, the only important sources left open to us are Liberia, Ceylon, and Central and South America. As I have said, we expect to be able to bring out of Liberia 35,000,000 pounds of rubber this year.

Nearly all of the rubber produced in Ceylon will be sent to Russia, England, India, South Africa, and Australia. At the present time the quickest new source of additional rubber is South America. No one really knows how many rubber trees are growing wild in the Amazon valley and other parts of the continent, but there is a likelihood of getting 30,000 tons of rubber from South America this year.

Under the forceful and intelligent leadership of Rubber Director William M. Jeffers, the synthetic rubber program has made exceptionally good progress and by the end of this year there will be in operation synthetic rubber plants with an annual capacity of 850,000 tons. This production, plus the importations of natural rubber that we may expect next year, will give us in 1944 nearly twice as much rubber as this country consumed in a normal peacetime year.

Recently Mr. Jeffers reported that 12,000,000 passenger car tires will be released for civilian use this year. Of this total 7,000,000 are on hand and the remaining 5,000,000 will be made with synthetic rubber. Next year, it is expected that 30,000,000 synthetic rubber passenger car tires will be available for civilian use.

From these facts it is apparent that the Government will not permit essential civilian vehicles to cease operation because of lack of tires. Our public transportation systems alone cannot take care of wartime requirements and the privately owned motorcar must share the load.

Further evidence that the Government recognizes the need for keeping every available car in service may be seen in the recent lifting of the restrictions on the recapping of passenger car tires. Ration certificates are no longer necessary to have these tires recapped. Furthermore, quotas for the purchase of new tires have been substantially increased and the Government has already released synthetic rubber to help fill these larger quotas. However, Mr. Jeffers has made it plain that car owners cannot expect new tires for nonessential driving for a long time to come and that all of us must continue the conservation measures which have proved so effective in reducing tire wear.

I believe I am not unduly optimistic when I say that the rubber situation presents a much brighter picture today than it did only a few months ago. This is just one more indication of the progress which is being made all along the line, both on the home front and on the battle front. Our war production is now in high gear and our armed forces are moving forward. The initiative has passed into our hands and that is the beginning of the road to victory!

Russian Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech

delivered by me on Tribute to Russia Day, sponsored by the Russian War Relief, Inc., in New York City, on June 22, 1943:

On March 16, 1942, the No. 1 degenerate, the arch madman of the world, the painter who uses the blood of human beings as his medium of expression, had this to say: "The Bolsheviks will be defeated by us, the Germans, in the coming summer."

On this June 22, 1943, Russia is still valiantly and successfully fighting the German invader, and so once more a German boast is not made good.

For 2 years, Russia has borne, almost single-handedly, the full onslaught of the enemy. The mighty wall of her unity, patriotism, and courage has been as strong as iron in its amazing achievement of holding back the German armies. The Russians have shown to all of us that it was not impossible to defeat a German army, that German invincibility was purely a myth.

I wonder what would have happened to the freedom-loving people of the world if Russia had not stood her ground at Leningrad, Sevastopol, Odessa, and at Stalingrad. What would have been Russia's history today, and what would have been the history of the world? Russia's resistance has given the United States time to arm herself and to gather her strength so that we too could fight valiantly at Guadacanal, Bataan, and now in Tunisia. We have shown ourselves worthy partners in heroism.

I have heard fifth columnists, propagandists, and others of their type, both in and out of Washington, say that Russia could not fight, that Russia could not possibly withstand the German onslaught and that Russia had no leaders who could carry on the fight. In answer to this, all I can say is that this propaganda spread around the country by a number of groups of so-called citizens is based upon prejudice even at the sacrifice of our own country. One has only to follow the story of Russia's great fight to find the answer to this propaganda.

To the enslaved, persecuted, oppressed peoples of Europe and Asia, Russia has given fresh strength and new hope. The remnants of the Jewish people in Europe, millions of whose brethren have been murdered, whose wives and children have been destroyed by the Nazi executioners, find in Russia's valiant fight, a source of new faith and hope, a new desire to live and to fight. Russia stands today as the immovable barrier between them and other destruction.

As an American, and as a Member of the great body of Congress, I say that we are proud to be Russia's allies and we have affirmed this alliance with blood in order to bring the four freedoms back to the suffering people of the world.

"Mighty Russian people, today we greet you again, stronger in hope, firmer in our determination to win and win soon—secure in the belief that the mighty coalition of the United Nations, forged in battle and sealed in blood—will prove even greater in peace than it has been in war."

Much has been said about the fact that Russia might make a separate peace. From my observation and from my knowledge of the Russian people, I say that Russia has the best record of any of the major nations in keeping her word, and I have every reason to believe that Russia is in this war to the finish, and that no separate peace will be made by her against the Allied Nations fighting the common enemy for the freedom of the world

When speaking of Russia, one must not forget our other great ally who protects Russia's back door, China. China is now asking for the repeal of our Chinese exclusion law and is asking to be put on an equal basis with the other Allied Nations. I am wholeheartedly in support of such a program. China has carried on a valiant struggle against our common enemy for 6 long years. We need China now, and we shall need her after the war. We must show our friend that we mean business and remove the stigma against her. We must put her on an equal basis with our other allies and extend to her the respect and consideration to which she is rightfully entitled.

Think Before You Destroy Any Food Program That Will Increase Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration rehabilitation loans and tenant purchase funds, I should like to urge this House to vote for the amendments as offered by the Senate.

The amendments containing these two provisions will do more to insure additional production of food, feed, and fiber for our essential war, civilian, and lend-lease program than any other appropriations.

In our anxiety to effect economy, let us not practice false economy. Remember that if you fail to provide the full amounts contained in the Senate provisions you will live to regret it, and if you do vote to reduce the amounts then you should not complain when the blame for a probable shortage of production exists in the near future as a result of your actions.

Federal Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BRANDON, WIS., *June 19, 1943.*

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We hear so much over the radio about the debate in Washington as to whether or not to continue the Farm Security Administration.

Permit me, as one of the many farmers in Fond Du Lac County, Wis., to voice my opinion and tell my story of how I was helped by the Farm Security Administration.

Seven years ago our family of seven moved from Wood County, Wis., to Fond Du Lac County to seek a more prosperous farming community in which to raise our growing family.

We began by share-renting on a fine dairy farm, where the owner furnished all the cattle. So we sold what cattle we had to purchase more machinery with which to operate this farm.

As our children were too young to be of much help in operating this farm, we were obliged to hire help 7 months of the year.

Then the unforeseen happened—sickness, operations, hospital bills, extra help was needed, and to top it all off we were obliged to move after a 2-year tenancy on this farm.

We were at a loss where to go. We had most of the needed machinery—horses, hogs, etc.—to share-rent a farm, but most owners demand that half the cows be furnished by the tenant.

After vainly searching for a place to call home and an opportunity to earn our living at the only occupation at which we are skilled, we finally heard of a farm for cash rent. This place, although somewhat run down, could be rented for $550 a year. We were desperate. It would either make or break us. But we took a chance and rented it.

We applied to several lending agencies for help so we could borrow money to buy cattle and pay our debts, so we could get on our feet. But, alas, they all turned us down because we lacked the main source of income and their best security, cows.

At last we turned to the Farm Security Administration for help. They heard our story and promised to do everything in their ability to help us.

At first there was a tiresome wait and we feared that they, too, had turned deaf ears on our earnest plea. But a Mr. Henry Danes, of New Holstein, Wis., became interested in our case, and when Mr. E. Freund, who is still regional supervisor of the Farm Security Administration in Fond Du Lac County, took charge of this branch of the Farm Security Administration, the horizon became more clear for us, and before long we were granted a Farm Security Administration loan and were able to buy cattle and pay our debts.

We worked with a determination to make a success of this venture. During the winter months the wife and family did the farm work while I was employed in a nearby hemp mill.

That was in the spring of 1939 that we got our first loan. We paid off every month with a milk assignment and whatever other money we could spare. Our debt began to decrease.

In 1941 we applied for an additional loan to purchase a tractor and other power machinery, so we could more efficiently operate this farm, which was slowly yet surely coming back into productibility. This loan was immediately granted and we were able to accomplish our farm labor more quickly and easily.

That was in the spring of 1941. Now it's summer, 1943. The loan is paid and we are debt-free—and we are happy.

We own between $6,000 and $7,000 worth of property—cattle, horses, hogs, sheep, chickens, machinery, and feed, etc.—and for the past year we have been able to lay aside a few dollars. Yes; we are happy, but not quite satisfied.

Our family is growing up. We have all the help needed to operate a good farm, but we're only renters. All the improvements we put on this farm are for the next renter to enjoy. We'd like to keep our family together. We'd like to buy a farm, and, of course, we've turned to the Farm Security Administration for help. They'll help us if and when Congress appropriates funds for tenant-purchase loans. We hope this will be granted Long live the Farm Security Administration.

I am,

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. TJEPKEMA.

Campaign Contributions in South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "South Dakotans Find Out Whom Their Senator Serves," published in the Huron (S. Dak.) Huronite, of June 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH DAKOTANS FIND OUT WHOM THEIR SENATORS SERVE

Last week's events in Washington should have made clear to everyone in South Dakota a fact which has long been apparent to many. In one of the most brazen admissions in the political history of the nation, Senator HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD conceded that his advancement in office had been financed in a large measure by rich eastern interests which haven't the slightest concern in the internal affairs in South Dakota nor in the welfare of the people of this State as citizens of this commonwealth. BUSHFIELD's startling admission, coupled with others of his statements and actions of the last few days, should serve as convincing proof to those who still require it that by the election of BUSHFIELD to the Senate, the State of South Dakota lost half of its representation in the upper chamber in Washington and that it turned half of its influence in national affairs over to the entrenched interests of the East.

Last week's admission by BUSHFIELD was a spectacle indeed. Senator BUSHFIELD, who went to Washington after two scandal-crowded terms as Governor of South Dakota, stood on the floor of the Senate as the charges were hammered at him. The charges were that in 1 year alone the Mellons of Pennsylvania, the du Ponts of Delaware, and the McCormicks of Illinois contributed thousands upon thousands of dollars to the campaign in South Dakota which paved the way for BUSHFIELD'S election to the Senate. BUSHFIELD, before the forum of the United States Senate, did not deny the charges. Instead, he said that he was happy to have friends in the East who would "help us in the campaign to save the American system of government."

There is only one deduction that can be drawn. BUSHFIELD, as the Senator from du Pont, Mellon, and McCormick, is out to save the American system of government as conceived by du Pont, Mellon, and McCormick, his benefactors and political backers.

Of course, it may be possible that the du Pont-Mellon-McCormick interpretation of the American system of government, the American way of life, is identical with that of the average voter of South Dakota and that BUSHFIELD might be able to serve both his entrenched eastern friends and his South Dakota constituents at one and the same time. Let us glance, then, into the way of life of these "friends." Let us take Bertie McCormick, the multi-millioned head of the McCormick family of Illinois and the owner of what might be termed in understatement as the arch isolationist Chicago Tribune, a newspaper which occupies a unique position in American journalism because of the coloring it adds to both its comics and its news. Let us look in at Bertie on a day off, a legendary gala day which he has set apart to entertain his minions on the Tribune payroll. The workers have been invited to spend the afternoon among the feudal splendors of the McCormick estate near Chicago. But Bertie, the lord of the manor, is not at home to greet his guests. Suddenly a huge moving van rolls up into the estate's grounds. The rear doors are opened, a ramp is let down. Astride a giant steed, Bertie rides down the ramp and onto the lawn among his guests. Majestically he waves them greeting. Grandly he rides among them. They are still gaping, when Bertie's horse mounts the truck ramp. The doors are closed. The van moves away, the horse and its rider in lonely splendor in the dark interior.

Ah, the American way of life. How dear it is to the neurotic, feudal heart of Bertie McCormick. If BUSHFIELD can save it, maybe one day Bertie McCormick will bring his van and his horse and make a personal appearance among the peasantry of South Dakota. What a day to look forward to.

But there is much work to be done before that day can come. BUSHFIELD will do his part, but others must help. South Dakotans have helped with their votes in the past. They will be called upon again. The great day cannot come until South Dakotans are truly peasants. They were nearly in that class several years ago when the structure of privately controlled economics in America collapsed. But the Federal Government stepped in over the vigorous protests of BUSHFIELD and his friends. Thousands of South Dakota farmers were given assistance which permitted them to regain their independence and self-respect.

But Senator BUSHFIELD is out to halt any further endangering of his friends' concept of the American way of life. Last week on the floor of the United States Senate he repeatedly attacked various and sundry portions of the Federal appropriations which would permit the continuance of farmer control over farm production, and farmer say in farmer affairs, and Federal assistance to farmers in South Dakota. On Friday BUSHFIELD attacked Federal crop insurance, an admittedly imperfect but nevertheless basically worthy attempt to stabilize agricultural conditions in an unstable area. In a choice between the interests of South Dakotans and those of his rich eastern benefactors, BUSHFIELD chose to champion those of the latter.

"It seems to me," he declared, "that any business venture on the part of Government is wrong. The Government has no business to compete with private institutions which carry on the same character of business."

BUSHFIELD explained that that was my personal philosophy. By strange coincidence it is the personal philosophy of the entrenched interests which have contributed so generously to making it possible for BUSHFIELD to serve in the United States Senate.

Legitimate business, large and small, has a reasonable interest in the maintenance and encouragement of a fair and healthy attitude toward private enterprise in this country. But there are those of the well-entrenched who go far beyond that which is reasonable. Let business alone to solve all of the Nation's problems, is their swelling cry. Keep the Government out of our affairs. It is wrong for the Government to interfere. It is a cry that is growing in America, a cry that is carefully McCarthyed by many well-meaning but shortsighted persons identified with lesser enterprise. It is a cry that was at its full volume in the 1920's before the system of unrestricted private enterprise all but collapsed.

Carried to its ultimate conclusion the turning over of America to its large corporations can destroy rather than save the American way of life, not as exemplified by Bertie McCormick but the American way as it is and can be for the millions and millions of little people, the independent, self-respecting people such as we who live in South Dakota. fascism in Italy, nazi-ism in Germany, and the new order in Japan can trace their ancestry directly to an illicit union between corporations and power madness.

The concentration of wealth in the form of business or in any other form is power. Unrestricted, unleashed to rule without question or control, it is power potentially out of hand. It does not have to answer to the people: And government of the people, by the people, and for the people is by-passed.

And when does private enterprise and private wealth become dangerous? It becomes dangerous when it has the power and it makes use of that power to reach out from the east into the sovereign State of South Dakota, in which it has no conceivable concern, and make possible the advancement into the great and honorable forum of the United States Senate a political opportunist who brazenly admits the favors and acknowledges the help and who goes about to perform the duties of his office, not in behalf of those whose votes elected him but in behalf of those whose money was accepted to make that election possible.

The American way of life as envisioned by BUSHFIELD'S benefactors may have been advanced by the events of last week. That great day when Bertie McCormick shall ride his charger into South Dakota as a treat for the fawning populace may have been drawn a bit nearer, but the cause of government of the people, by the people and for the people received a foul and nasty slugging.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which reflects the sentiments of the people of my section of the country with respect to American foreign policy, published in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of June 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINE SPEECH

Commander J. C. Alderman of the Brunswick Airport made to a graduating class in Brunswick the other day an address which those who heard him will never forget. They will not forget the illustrations of American valor which he used; illustrations culled in part from his own fighting experience in the southwest Pacific; illustrations which could but have had his hearers breathless with interest. They are not likely to forget, either, the application of them that the speaker made; the fine and deep philosophy which gave his words a clarity and meaning that ought to be perceived by everybody.

Commander Alderman spoke quietly of the era following the last war when disillusionment and lawlessness and cynicism were the

order of the day among those who went forth to fight for a better world and were let down. He said:

"We drew back from contacts with the world; we disregarded the efforts of those who were trying to set up machinery to prevent wars; and this war is the result. We must not have your children in another 25 years marching off to war. It seems to me that you can avoid the mistakes of a generation ago—the lost generation—only by hitching your wagon to a star; by having as a guide for your conduct something bigger than yourselves. The lost generation was lost only because it had no guide, no loyalty, no anchor. Down through the centuries it has been proved that no man is sufficient unto himself; that he cannot stand alone; that happiness is too elusive a thing to be sought directly. A man without a purpose in life is like a ship without a rudder.

"Right now you have a purpose in life. It is to defeat the enemy and to save our way of life from the forces of evil which beset it. May I suggest that, when this war is over, you not lose the loyalty which you now have but that you transfer it. We must always be loyal to the United States of America; but we should also think about the whole world. Think of the world, and resolve that when at last the time comes to die, the world will have been a better place because we have lived."

That was no mere graduation stuff. Commander Alderman would have his hearers, and all the rest of us, "set up, after the war, a world government to stop this silly business of certain inhabitants killing, torturing, and degrading other inhabitants"; he would have us start repairing the ravaged areas of the world, and build a new one based on the "four freedoms." This from a distinguished naval officer who has been under fire and seen death strike down his men.

We are actually at the beginning of a new era, and some of us do not yet realize it. Before and after the last war, many, perhaps most, of the officers in our armed services were cynics; they believed that wars would always occur; that such things as leagues to enforce peace or leagues of nations were just obsessions of starry-eyed visionaries. It took the experience of the last 25 years, the outbreak of a greater war than any yet known to the world, to bring about a saner outlook. We have it now. We find it not only amongst ethical leaders, churchmen, confirmed pacifists; we find it all about us, even in the Army and Navy. A quarter century ago we did lip-service to ideas of a better world and relapsed into selfishness, carelessness, contempt for what was termed idealism, but which was, in fact, practical self-interest as well.

We must not do it again after this war. Perhaps we have learned our lesson. Those must have learned it who heard Commander Alderman at Brunswick. It means something when a naval officer advocates a course which can but have the effect of making the Navy less important as an instrument of force.

Governmental Bureaucracy at Its Worst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item appearing in the newspaper published at Weyauwega, Wis.:

MAYBE WE'LL MAKE IT A CITY CELEBRATION—INTERNAL REVENUE OFFICE WILL SEND A MAN HERE TO DESTROY 2 GALLONS OF ALCOHOL

There may be a war on over in Africa and New Guinea, in Russia and on the high seas, a war in which American boys are losing their lives and in which every individual in Weyauwega, in Waupaca County, in Wisconsin, and in the Nation has a particularly high stake, but that doesn't mean that bureaucrats still don't use any excuse to hold a soft job, that red tape still doesn't unwind, or that useless expenditures don't continue to pile up on a burdened taxpayer.

The latest petty example occurs right here at home. For the past 12 or 15 years, ever since the chemistry course was instituted in Weyauwega high school, a small supply of alcohol has been kept in the building and used at one time or another in the physics or chemistry laboratory. Tom Gerlach, instructor in these classes, states that about 3 or 4 quarts are used each year.

Alcohol in the amount of less than 2 gallons is stored in a fireproof vault, a small room that adjoins the office. It has been stored in the same container in this vault for many years. Nobody paid any attention to it because it was used so seldom, and Mr. Gerlach was about the only person who ever handled the container.

One day last week an inspector from the internal revenue service of the Treasury Department arrived in Weyauwega, puffed up with importance like a toy balloon. He took note of the 2 gallons of alcohol stored in the vault and practically burst his seams in indignation and horror. Didn't anyone know that it shouldn't be stored in a vault where other supplies are also contained? Did not the school realize the error of its ways? Did not the board of education understand that a new and inspected storeroom would have to be constructed to store this 2 gallons of alcohol? Just what was the world coming to, anyway? Two gallons of alcohol, indeed.

Superintendent of Schools A. H. Koten pointed out to the outraged inspector that it would be inconvenient, unnecessary, impossible, unreasonable, extravagant, visionary, wasteful, absurd, fantastic, grotesque, ridiculous, and a plain "damphool" stunt to spend the time, effort, money, and materials to build a separate storeroom in which to place 2 gallons of alcohol, but the inspector said it had to be done—or else.

"Or else what?" queried Mr. Koten.

"Or else you'll have to destroy the alcohol," the inspector replied with a steady glint in his eye.

"Well, that's easy," the superintendent agreed. "We'll just throw the stuff in the river."

But it appeared this apparently satisfactory way out of the dilemma was altogether too simple. Before that 2 gallons of alcohol can be made to disappear forever and ever, it will be necessary for Weyauwega high school or its official representative to file notice with the Treasury Department of discontinuance of the use of tax-free alcohol, in the form of a letter, in triplicate. If the alcohol on hand is to be destroyed, such information should be embodied in the notice, fully stating the reason therefor.

But here's the prize of the whole arrangement. Upon receipt of notice of discontinuance an inspector will call at the high school to witness the destruction of the alcohol and assist in the preparation of the final report.

Imagine that. A chap is coming here all the way from Chicago or Washington or some such place just to watch the destruction of 2 gallons of alcohol. It is to be hoped that the date for his appearance will be set some weeks in advance, so that a proper civic celebration can be made of the affair, so that the band will be out in full uniform, so that Mayor Walter Kamp can prepare a speech, so that—oh, hell—what's the use?

And if you think this newspaper is kidding you about this little episode, just read the following letter from E. C. Yellowley, district supervisor, district No. 9, Alcohol Tax Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department:

CHICAGO, ILL., *May 29, 1943.*

WEYAUWEGA HIGH SCHOOL,
Weyeuwega, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: A recent report of inspection reveals that the vault in which you store tax-free alcohol does not meet the requirements of regulations in that other supplies are also stored therein.

Mr. Arlie H. Koten, who was interviewed by the inspector, stated that the small amount of alcohol used by the school would hardly warrant the construction of a proper tax-free alcohol storeroom, and that you would therefore prefer to surrender for cancelation your basic permit authorizing use of alcohol free of tax.

In this connection it will be necessary for you to file notice of discontinuance of use of tax-free alcohol, in the form of a letter, in triplicate. If you wish to destroy the alcohol which you have now on hand, such information should be embodied in the notice, fully stating the reason therefor.

Notice should be signed by Arlie H. Koten, who, according to the records of this office, is the only person authorized to sign for your school.

Upon receipt of Notice of Discontinuance an inspector will call to witness the destruction of the alcohol and assist in the preparation of final report, on Form 1451.

Your Basic Permit, No. TF-Wis-230, should be retained by you until proper disposition is made of all alcohol on hand.

Very truly yours,

E. C. YELLOWLEY,
District Supervisor.

Food Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Samuel Grafton, from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of June 22, 1943:

(By Samuel Grafton)

There is something shameful in our excessive national concentration on the food issue. We sound like a nation of fishwives on this point. Why don't we stop the vulgar screaming? The plain truth is that we have eaten better, these last 2 years, than ever before in the history of the country. Statistically, we have been packing it away; on the record, we have more to burp about than to bellow for.

I have just seen a London dispatch to the New Yorker, telling how the great house of Fortnum & Mason could find nothing but a few sticks of rhubarb for its "fruit" display. Berries are gone, in England; citrus fruit is unknown; even "variety" meats, or the common ordinary liver-and-lights, have disappeared from the butcher shops.

One might imagine there was terrific discontent in England on the subject. (They

even have those hated subsidies, to control prices.) But no, there is tremendous satisfaction. Lord Woolton's tough, hard food administration is one of the most successful and popular of ministries.

Our lamentations on food have risen to the sky, this last year; now perhaps the moment has come to ask ourselves what, precisely, we are crying about.

NO "MUDDLE" SEEN

We hear a great deal about the "food muddle." This term has achieved the dignity of a proper noun. One says "food muddle" as one says "Pike's Peak," or "Radio City." If we had a genuine food muddle, one of the signs would be lower food production. But we broke all records for food production in 1941. Then, in 1942, we broke the new record by a rousing 12 percent. The American farmer did this while he was being depicted by some of his professional and kept spokesmen as down and out.

We have muddled our way to the greatest output of food in the history of America. And we have eaten it, too; for only 15 percent of this record supply went to the services and to lease-lend last year. One has the feeling that many of the essays about the food muddle have been inspired by steak luncheons.

Now, at last, there are going to be some real shortages. Well, isn't that a marvel! What do we expect during war? Has there ever been a war without shortages? When segments of the press sail off into a nonstop tizzy because of the discovery that there are going to be food shortages, I am approximately as impressed as if it had made the equally astounding discovery that there is going to be some fighting in this war.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Some of the plans for solving the "food muddle" seem to be based on the shocking theory that shortages during war are somehow scandalous, and can be avoided. Yes, they can be, by not fighting the war, and that is what Mr. Hoover's pet plan for demobilizing part of the Army comes to. Anybody could solve the wartime food problem by not fighting the war. Mr. Roosevelt is trying to do it while fighting the war. That is a problem of a different order.

The persistent yowling for an all-powerful "food czar" is also a solution-by-not-fighting. How powerful is all-powerful? Would the food czar have the right to stop munitions trains to let food trains go by? As the President has asked, Would he have the power to take steel from gun foundries and beat it into harvesters? First things first, and who ever said belly came first?

LIKE A FEVER

I have the feeling that 6 months from now we shall be eating less and talking about it less, too. This is one of those hysterical peaks with which we ought to be familiar by now. England has been through the whole business, about a year ahead of us; 6 months of furious concentration on absenteeism, then 6 months on transportation troubles, then 6 months on food. It is like a fever, and it passes.

The final chapter will be subsidies, which we shall come to (as did England) whether we like it or not. For subsidies really are the last word. They give the farmer a bit more without letting prices or wages rise. That is why subsidies are so hated. They announce that the party is over. The moment subsidies enter the picture producers get more money only if they need it, and when they need it. Price regulation becomes a fact-finding process. The system of economics by oratory comes to its end.

The current food debate is so hot because some of those involved in it know that, once subsidies are established, the debate will be over. This is the last chance to go to town on a good scream.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with the National Youth Administration, published in Portland (Maine) Press Herald of June 21, 1943. The editorial expresses the sentiment of the people in my section of the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The perennial troubles of the National Youth Administration are in the limelight again—or should the word be "still"? The House Appropriations Committee last week frowned upon it, though by the narrowest possible margin. This week the Senate committee, the last chance, will virtually decide whether National Youth Administration, which has been supplying nearly 2,000 trained workers a week to the war production with a total at present in training of 50,000, will be permitted to live.

That sounds like something that ought to be preserved, to be increased in scope of program rather than harried and suppressed. Here in Maine, so far as we have been able to learn, National Youth Administration has done a superlative job. The Quoddy Center has graduated into industry more than 6,000 youngsters; at the moment, 700 are there in training. At the Dexter Center, more than 1,200 young workers in machine, welding, foundry, and other metal-trade operations have been passed through into industry. The Maine National Youth Administration has an admirable record of accomplishment in various aviation activities and in radio, it built Maine's short-wave State police radio system, and sent into the Army itself trained radio engineers and technicians.

The National Youth Administration says, quietly and with proper pride, that it is carrying on, doing its usual consistent job, sending between 60 and 100 aircraft mechanics monthly into the armed forces and into industry. It has recognized and adjusted itself for the training of young women. As many young men in the past have obtained training in industrial pursuits, so will the young women now needed in the war effort receive work experience in these fields while fabricating useful items needed by the armed forces; they will receive training in aircraft, welding, riveting, engine mechanics, instruments, machine shop, radio, auto mechanics and drafting.

Naturally enough, there is growing resentment in the Congress against the prodigality with which the New Deal has tossed around funds. The terrific drain that war entails upon the Treasury reinforces the demand for economy. When we read of a single appropriation for one branch of the service totalling 71 billion dollars for a single fiscal year, the need for economy becomes more pressing. There is a limit upon the ability of even this Country to spend and spend. Currently, Senator Byrd and others are proceeding with their economy effort and are to be praised for it.

But it appears to us, and must appear to many others, that a blind devotion to retrenchment is just as bad as a blind disregard for sane spending. All programs must be put under scrunity; economy should be practiced in everything. But is it true economy to scrap completely an organization like the National Youth Administration which, provably and admittedly, has been contributing to our success in war? We believe the Congress should go slow in adopting so drastic a procedure.

Supreme Court Quorum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 23 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, several days ago Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate, identical bills providing that a majority of the members of the Supreme Court shall constitute a quorum. The bill introduced by me was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. There appeared in the New York Times of June 21 an editorial endorsing this measure. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT QUORUM

Last year and again this year the Supreme Court was unable to act in cases of high importance for want of a quorum. The required quorum is six. Three members of the Court have held the office of Attorney General, one that of Solicitor General. The Associate Justice just appointed comes from the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and so will have to disqualify himself if cases come up on which he has ruled in the lower court. Illness is a summary disqualification liable to any member at any time.

The Court consists of 9 members. Why is a majority not a quorum? Why 6 instead of 5? In a letter to this newspaper Charles Warren, the learned and impartial historian of the Supreme Court, showed that from the beginning of the Court a simple majority was a statutory quorum. A quorum was 4 out of 6, 4 out of 7, from 1837 to 1863 5 out of 9. In the latter year, there being no transcontinental railroad, Justices found it hard to reach the circuit courts of Oregon and California, and a tenth Justice was appointed. In consequence the statutory quorum had to be raised to 6. Without going into minutiae, it is enough to say that in 1869 the Court was brought back to its membership of 9, but by a lapse of memory or inadvertence for nearly 75 years the quorum for 10 has been retained as the quorum for 9.

This absurdity, discovered by Mr. Warren, has had too long a run. Representative SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has introduced into the House, and Mr. O'MAHONEY into the Senate, an amendment of the Judicial Code:

The Supreme Court of the United States shall consist of a Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, a majority of whom shall constitute a quorum.

If passed, as it should be, this will be not merely an apology to insulted mathematics but an end to certain unnecessary delays of justice.

The Program To Hold Down Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the program to hold down the cost of living revolves mainly about the seven points stated by President Roosevelt before Congress on April 27, 1942. Its principal elements are:

First. Taxing individuals heavily.

Second. Taxing corporations heavily and holding profits down.

Third. Diverting excess purchasing power into the purchase of War bonds.

Fourth. Holding down consumer buying by discouraging installment purchases.

Fifth. Holding down prices by ceilings on prices and rents and by stabilizing farm prices.

Sixth. Rationing scarce goods as a means of reinforcing price controls.

Seventh. Stabilization of wages and salaries.

Thus far the program has worked with a considerable degree of success, but many experts, both in and out of Government, believe that stronger controls are necessary. It should be remembered that the program is two-sided, involving both Government and civilian action. Only by civilians supporting Government measures and by practicing prudent patriotic self-restraint can the Government program be made fully effective.

Here is what civilians can do in the battle against inflation—to hold down prices:

First. Buying and holding as many War bonds as they can afford.

Second. Paying willingly any taxes, including increased taxes, their country needs.

Third. Providing for their own and their family's future by adequate life insurance and savings.

Fourth. Paying off debts and avoiding making new ones.

Fifth. Paying no more than ceiling prices and supporting rationing.

Sixth. Buying only what they need and making what they have last longer.

Seventh. Not asking any more in prices or wages than they absolutely must.

The Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the food situation by Frank Gannett:

The food crisis is so real, so serious, that those who have specific knowledge of it cannot be silent.

Last September I saw the food crisis coming. In November, on a broadcast, I warned: "Unless our farm policy is changed, we face disaster." Disaster is now here.

In the last 6 months I have devoted much of my time to obtaining facts on the subject. I sought opinions from farmers, processors, and editors in every State. I made inquiries of 30,000 individuals and 12,000 editors. My conclusions are based on their replies and the statistics from every reliable agency I could consult.

We face an inevitable food shortage at home, needless prolongation of the war through lowered national morale and slowed production of war materials by ill-fed workers.

The people of America are looking to you and the Members of Congress to save this country from one of the gravest threats which it has ever faced. I mean, of course, the mishandling of our food problem and the adoption of a subsidy program as a substitute for fair food prices.

The proposed subsidies will not increase our food supply nor make any more of our food available for consumers. On the contrary, this subsidy plan will discourage food production. The food producers of the Nation are vigorously and almost unanimously opposed to it.

Subsidy is a political Juggernaut that never rolls backward. The first $1,000,000,000 of subsidy, without a doubt, would grow to whatever peak vote-seeking bureaucrats figured necessary to perpetuate their rule. Any subsidy plan is sure to add billions to our taxes and national debt. Administration of a subsidy plan will be enormously costly. It will add countless thousands more to the Government's pay rolls.

In my opinion, the public sees through this attempt to deceive them in regard to the cost of their food.

The 3-day food conference in New York, which has just closed, furnished abundant evidence that we face an alarming food shortage, as I predicted. There simply will not be enough to feed our men in uniform, our allies, the people whom we may rescue from Nazi rule, and our own people at home.

It is too late now to increase food production for this year. The blame for the present shortage must be placed where it belongs—on President Roosevelt, who not only failed to heed the repeated warning, but who now is choosing to play fourth term politics with proposals which will endanger food production in the coming year. Now, when unity is most needed, he is arraying class against class, arousing bitterness between food producers and consumers; particularly, President Roosevelt hopes, by doling out unlimited funds, to win the support of labor. Workingmen, however, must realize that they will suffer most from this costly and destructive program, the subsidy plan. You can't solve an economic problem merely by spending billions of dollars.

Before Pearl Harbor, representatives of agriculture appealed to the President to regard food as important as planes, ships, and guns and to encourage maximum food production. Not only was nothing done to give us more food but the policies adopted restricted and discouraged production and brought about the present alarming situation.

Fred Sexauer of New York, representing over 30,000 milk producers, warned that there will be a milk shortage in our large cities next winter. Policies now being followed have brought about the slaughter of vast numbers of milk cows that cannot be replaced in 3 years. The wrath of mothers who, as a result, may not be able to get milk for their children can be foreseen.

The alleged pretext for subsidies is that they will prevent inflation. Nothing could be more absurd or ridiculous. As Mr. Sexauer said, "The threat of inflation is being used as a bogeyman to induce the Nation to accept social reform, regimentation, limitation of opportunity and incentive. Before the war ends, it will be used to hide social and economic mistakes and to conceal from the public the sad state of economic affairs into which the Nation has been thrown."

High prices are the result and not the cause of inflation. Again, quoting Mr. Sexauer, "To date, the Government has done much to promote inflation, including propagandizing it, and nothing to prevent it. Forcing down prices by regulation discourages production and depresses morale among producers. The present system of price fixing on food products has all the elements of a national scandal and the making of a ghastly tragedy."

When the supply of any product is decreased by low-price ceilings, prices are forced up by the law of supply and demand, creating unlimited black markets.

Attempts to roll back prices not only must fail but they make the situation worse. Consider, please, as one example, the outrageous injustice of the butter roll-back as exposed by Senator AIKEN. The announced 5 cents a pound subsidy is denied to every farmer and little creamery producing less than 1,000 pounds of butter a month. Thus, the subsidy reaches only big producers whom the bureaucrats favor and the roll-back depresses the prices, throttling production of the hundreds of thousands of small farmers with four cows or less, who, however, actually produce 68 percent of the Nation's butterfat.

Dispatches yesterday from Chicago said that the attempt to roll back butter prices under a subsidy had brought about the sale of so much butter to Government agencies, the cold-storage warehouse stocks on June 1 totaled 82,000,000 pounds—almost three times the 30,000,000 of a month earlier. Thus, the supply of butter for the public has been drastically cut by the roll-back method. Today, when there is a shortage of meat, practically all the packing and slaughtering plants in Cincinnati are closed because, as they say, they cannot operate under the Office of Price Administration price ceiling regulation.

Our food supply is of vital importance to everyone. It must not be manipulated by politicians for the purpose of winning votes. Food production and distribution must be divorced from New Deal politics in all its phases and be placed in the control of one competent man whose sole purpose will be to give us more food at fair prices. He must know food production and distributing problems, and merit the confidence of our farm population. He must be free from the restrictions and interference of New Deal theorists and have real authority to do the job.

The people look to you men in the Congress to deal with this great problem vigorously and immediately. The programs of our impractical bureaucrats, who know nothing about food production and prices, are hourly making the situation worse. There must be a complete change in policy and a thorough house cleaning of those who have helped to bring about our present sad plight. Without a doubt, the country will rise up in overwhelming protest against any effort to cover up the administration failures in regard to the food situation by granting any subsidy.

Emperors of ancient Rome subsidized their populaces with free bread. That must not happen here, and I hope that you will do your full part in stopping this threatening disaster and help check this further step toward a totalitarian government.

FRANK GANNETT,
Rochester, N. Y.

They're Gaining On Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of June 21, 1943. I believe it is especially significant since it is a harbinger of the very serious problem to be met in the not too distant future:

THEY'RE GAINING ON US

Among the indictments which the framers of the Declaration of Independence drew against George III was this one:

"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

Scan that again, then read the article on page 1 by Senator HARRY F. BYRD. Ponder the startling figures which the Virginia Senator brings to light—

Ohio runs its State government with 25,000 employees, but the Federal Government has 90,000 employes in Ohio; 44,500 Pennsylvania State employees, but 215,000 Federal pay rollers in Pennsylvania; 1,100 working for Wyoming's State government, but 6,200 Federal workers in that State.

The figures tell graphically what we have permitted to happen to our once proud concept of home rule. Washington sends out among us from three to six times as many people to tell us how to run our business as we employ to govern ourselves. Not counting the Army and Navy, there are more people on the Federal pay roll than on the pay rolls of all the 48 States, plus all county and municipal governments, which includes all our policemen, sheriffs, deputies, firemen, and public-schcol teachers.

Not so long ago most Americans had no contact with the central government except through the Congressmen, postal employees, the Federal judge, and the United States marshal.

Now we have Federal offices and officers everywhere, telling us when to reap and sow, telling us what to buy and sell and at what price, how long to work and at what wage, what to eat and how to cook it, what to wear and how to make it.

This is a larger and tougher war than the last one. We have to have a much larger Army and Navy, but do we need one civilian Government pay-roller for every two and one-half men in uniform, when in the last war the ratio was one civilian employee to five in uniform?

We have 2,700 lawyers working for the Office of Price Administration. Britain has only 10 lawyers in its price and rationing agency. Maybe that helps explain why Britain's price control is succeeding where ours isn't.

Well, the Government still belongs to the people. Every 2 years, through the ballot, we have something to say about it. We elect the Congress, which controls the purse strings and provides the tax money for hiring all these "swarms of officers." If we don't elect the kind of Congress that will cut down the tax eaters to a controllable size it will be our fault that they take our Government away from us.

The number of taxpayers still exceeds the number who are making a career of being on the Government pay-roll. We cannot be sure how long that will be true. Senator BYRD discloses that since 2 years before Pearl Harbor the number of pay-rollers has increased 50 percent every 6 months. They're gaining on us.

Overconfident and Complacent War Production Board Admits Guilt and Waste of a Million Tons of Steel—Big Steel in War Production Board Deliberately Deceives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, several days ago while reading the Washington Evening Star I was sorely disappointed to read that due to the steel shortage allocations of that material fell 15 percent short of what the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission said would be required to complete their third quarter schedules. Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, as well as other military and naval officials, expressed alarm over the steel situation.

This shortage of steel is not new. I was not surprised to read about it, because we have known about the situation for some time now and have done our best to make the matter known to the Nation. In my remarks of June 3 to this House I decried the complacent attitude of the War Production Board and their concerted attempt to issue news releases that would keep the public deceived into thinking there is plenty of steel to meet all the demands of our war effort.

The best example of this was to be found in the article carried in the Washington Post the same day the Star ran its story on the shortage of steel. The headline read as follows: "'Find' of steel seen averting supply clash." I hastily read this article marveling on such a find. I devoured the words eagerly wondering where such a load of steel could have been misplaced or inadvertently stored, but to be my amazement they had not found any steel at all. I was misled—the public was deceived. Do you know where the War Production Board found a million tons of steel without finding either the steel or any of the elements that go to make it up? Well, here is the W. P. B.'s story—

The extra steel will be produced, W. P. B. officials hope, by straining our production capacity to the utmost, by closer scheduling of production, by tighter controls over inventories of the metal, by shifting production in the interests of efficiency, and by an all-out management-labor drive for more production.

Interesting, Mr. Speaker, to say the very least. We have been at war for over a year and the War Production Board now speaks of straining our production capacity to the utmost—close scheduling of inventory—becoming efficient and finally launching an all-out drive. What have they been waiting for? What have they been doing for the past 18 months? Do they mean to tell the American people who are giving their lives on the field of battle that they have not been straining themselves, nor been efficient, nor watched their inventories, nor made an all-out drive? To top the whole business off, you find that the War Production Board only hopes to find this steel as it is set forth in the Post. Mind you, they only hope to find this steel by doing the things I have just described to you. Then why should the subhead line read: "'Find' of steel seen averting supply clash"? Why should the lead line of the article repeat the import of subheadline by saying that "'A find' of approximately 1,000,000 tons of steel for use during the next 3 months probably has averted another show-down battle between the War Production Board and the armed services, it was learned yesterday"?

Who in the War Production Board is feeding that type of propaganda to the press? Who in that agency is attempting to deceive the American people? Who in that agency is trying to stifle the truth of a steel shortage?

Who in that agency is preventing the development and establishment of independent steel plants in war-production areas?

Who in that agency is stifling the production of a sufficient quantity of steel to hasten the winning of this war?

The Corn Crisis—The Need for Action at Washington Desks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, when the President created the Office of War Mobilization and appointed James F. Byrnes as its Administrator, I hoped that now, at last, the merry-go-round of emergency-agency government at Washington was brought under a single directing hand which would prove to be effective in action so that all the riders on the merry-go-round would drive toward victory on the home front while our servicemen overseas are continuing their push to triumph on their many fronts.

But, when I presented the subject of the corn crisis to Mr. Byrnes, who must know as I do that soon the effects of the corn shortage will be felt seriously throughout the Nation, Mr. Byrnes told me: "This is not a matter for my consideration. I presume the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator will get together and consider this situation."

I have awaited a reaction to my presentation of the situation, from the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator, but when a response came to me yesterday it came neither from Chester C. Davis nor from Prentiss M. Brown.

I now am told by William McArthur, Director of the Grain Division, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, that "it must be recognized that the market supplies of corn available at this time are not sufficient to provide all users with the quantities they require, and, while it is hoped that corn will be available in larger volume as soon as planting is completed, all users of corn and corn products will have to spread their supplies as far as possible."

"We realize," said Mr. McArthur, "that corn processors and manufacturers are experiencing difficulty in securing sufficient supplies of corn from normal sources. Limited quantities of corn are being received daily by warehousemen, but these supplies are not large enough to meet the demands of all users. Farmers in the Corn Belt holding stocks are reluctant to release these quantities until the prospects of the new crop can be more accurately determined."

The War Food Administration, Mr. McArthur explained, "has acted to promote a more equitable distribution of available supplies of corn through the calling of Commodity Credit Corporation loans, and the limitation of purchases by those having ample stocks. We have taken further steps to aid manufacturers and processors in securing minimum supplies of corn by the movement to users of some corn owned by Commodity Credit Corporation now in bin storage in the Corn Belt."

I trust that such action as has been taken by the W. F. A. will keep corn processing plants supplied for war-production needs.

However, I have spoken the case of war plants, and also of bakeries, confectionery manufacturers, wholesale grocers, medical-formula concerns, and breweries. All these and every home in America will be affected by the shortages which have now become critical not only in corn but also in wheat.

The Administration, simply, has not gotten down to essentials in dealing with these shortages. To this date nothing has been done to provide an over-all food administrator. No attempt has been made to requisition all corn stocks for proper distribution. The price of corn for the farmer was fixed below parity, and so the farmer is feeding his corn to the hogs, which will bring him a better return for his efforts; either the price of hogs will have to be rolled back, or the price of corn advanced.

If the Washington administrators are expecting that the next corn crop will solve their problems for them they might best abandon that hope right now, because the crop prospects are poor, after floods, unfavorable weather, and the shortages of manpower and machinery.

When you talk with the men in Government about corn and wheat shortages you find that those who would act do not have the authority to act, and that those who could act place blame upon the weather, and so forth, rather than accept their responsibility.

Last year when the fall grain was being planted, the theorists still had in effect their subsidy program whereby the farmers were to be paid for a percentage of their land which they left idle and were to be fined so much per bushel for all grain produced over and above their quota. They cannot deny these facts, and we all are going to suffer this year because of their short-sighted program.

Washington must yet learn that there is a battle front here on our own American shores, and that we must wage a winning war, too, on this home front. We have need for Eisenhowers and MacArthurs of action at the desks in Washington.

Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one year ago today, June 23, 1942, the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 became law. There is no doubt that the supreme goal of our armed forces is the destruction of the enemies of the United States. In this war we have seen that the entire earth constitutes a single battlefield. Our troops must everywhere meet and overcome the enemy in the air, on and under the sea, and on land. To accomplish this mission, our troops are being supplied with the finest equipment American engineering and productive skill can provide, transported speedily where most needed, and safeguarded in health. And finally the "house must be kept in order" and the welfare and morale of those troops, as well as the folks back home, must be maintained at the highest possible level. The first of those objectives is the most important. In one sense the last two are only necessary in order that the first may be successfully accomplished.

With the passage of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act by the Seventy-seventh Congress, a great step forward was taken in achieving the third objective, that of maintaining welfare and morale at home. Today, 1 year after the passage of this act, family allowance and voluntary allotment of pay are now being administered for about four and one-half million soldiers on behalf of more than seven and one-half million dependents of men in the Army. The War Department, Office of Dependency Benefits is now doing business at the rate of about $2,000,000,000 a year.

It must be remembered that, when the act was first passed, an organization of both military and civilian personnel had to be set up. The Adjutant General of the Army created the Family Allowance Division, later the Allowance and Allotment Branch, A. G. O., obtained a two-story temporary building, which is located at Twentieth and B Streets NE., Washington, D. C., and designated as executive officer of this division, Col. Harold N. Gilbert, now brigadier general, When this division began to function in June 1942, the clerical staff numbered seven. Through the vision, foresight, and executive ability of General Gilbert, as the size of the Army increased to the millions of men we now have, this organization set up on a production system, was and is able to absorb the applications from dependents of the millions of men who have been inducted into our Army to date, and the many more who will be inducted in the future. This was no small task.

In October 1942 the Allowance and Allotment Branch was merged by order of the commanding general of the Army Service Forces, with the Allotment Division, Chief of Finance, and a new agency created, War Department, Office of Dependency Benefits. Today this is one of the most important agencies of the War Department occupying an 18-story building in Newark, N. J. From Newark, N. J., the Office of Dependency Benefits has mailed over 20,000,000 family allowance checks to wives, children, mothers, and other dependent relatives of Army men. These checks, too, are the tools of war because they mean security and freedom from want for soldiers' dependents and relieve the soldier of worry. There is probably not a single post office in the country to which the checks do not go. They go to places like Portland, Dallas, Baltimore, Cherokee City, Tennessee Pass, Shade Valley, and Six Mile Run.

At this time I wish to express my commendation of the efficient, courteous, and sympathetic manner in which Brig. Gen. Harold N. Gilbert, holder of the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, and the Order of the Purple Heart, has administered the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act, passed by Congress.

The work of this agency is of great importance to millions of persons throughout the country, men in the United States Army and their loved ones. I know this agency will act as quickly as possible on all matters that come before it for consideration and action. Early action on each individual application has a vital, favorable relationship to the morale of our men of the armed forces and their families who are interested in any application pending in this agency.

Steel Shortage—Over 20,000,000 Tons—Due to Domination of W. P. B. by Big Steel Dollar-a-Year Men Who Block Erection of Independent Steel Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NAT PATTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled by the recent admissions which

now officially indicate how serious is the Nation's shortage of iron and steel.

I need not emphasize that iron and steel are the basic metals of both peacetime and war. Because of the shortage of the master metal the war program has labored under, our Army, Navy, the shipbuilding, and other essential production for war must repeatedly be cut back. Though the War Production Board has been finally compelled to admit that the total requests for steel made by these agencies are actually needed, and seriously, and that they are not overstatements, but are the bare requirements for these different agencies—overconfidence and complacency characterize Big Steel's executives in W. P. B. as they continue to repeatedly block the efforts of independent small business to increase the Nation's steel output.

Think of it. The total requests for steel for the 16 claimant agencies exceed 21,000,000 tons of finished steel for a single quarter of 90 days' production; and all that the War Production Board $1-a-year men have been able to assure delivery of is 15,000,000 tons. This means a plain shortage of 6,000,000 tons. On that basis about 25,000,000 tons a year. In the face of such shortage they are permitted to block new plants when sponsored by firms outside Big Steel's exclusive ring.

This steel shortage stands like a mountain between victory and defeat, between life and death, between freedom and slavery. Only with steel and plenty of it can an army and navy fight their way to final victory. This is a war of machines. I need not present more facts, for it is common knowledge that the shortage of this basic metal—iron and steel—advances the day of our final victory.

An examination of the personnel records of the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board shows that it is an easy matter to understand, for policies are determined by people whose interests appear in need of inquiry. Here high-priced executives of Big Steel are, and are found entrenched in every position of importance—not at the modest salaries paid Government employees. While they are listed on the W. P. B. pay roll at $1 per year, they still continue to receive the same big salaries directly from their regular peacetime employers. Inquiry, no doubt, would reveal that they are large holders of stock. Many are officers of the large steel corporations. As soon as the war is over, they will, of course, return to their former companies whose interests they have been ever mindful of. Regularly they are so reminded by the big salary check they periodically receive from their employers during their comfortable stay at Washington.

Why do I call your attention to these startling facts? Simply because W. P. B.'s Chairman, Donald M. Nelson, must in the final analysis rely upon such individuals for association and advice in making W. P. B. decisions. It is my firm conviction that to entrust such individuals for counsel is to assure the Steel Trust that when there is a difference of viewpoint, Big Steel is there in the saddle. When a new firm is to erect a new plant in this industry, the interest taken by these executives is not unbiased. The fact is, though they are under oath of office, they get offensive and angry and connive to discredit and to otherwise undermine the faithful efforts of those who would so increase the Nation's output of steel. What dominates their mind appears to be the fear of another competitor whose independence may upset the comfortable lucrative base point price system and the monopoly control of market conditions which the Steel Trust has been permitted to build up over the industries of this Nation in the past 40 years.

Effect of Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from today's New York Times:

EFFECT OF SUBSIDIES—ABSENCE OF BRITISH INFLATION IS AIDED BY LEND-LEASE FOOD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 22.—The argument by those in favor of food subsidies that they will not be inflationary in the United States because they are not in the United Kingdom has been examined by opponents of the plan and found wanting in a fundamental particular. The flaw is that British food subsidies, in the amounts current and those which prevailed in 1942, are more than cancelled by the value of foods obtained from this country through lend-lease.

According to British Price Control, a pamphlet issued late in 1942 by the British Information Services for distribution in this country, Lord Woolton, the Food Minister, announced in July of that year that net food subsidies were running at the rate of $508,000,000 annually; and it is not much more now. According to testimony before a congressional committee recently by E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, and one of his assistants, lend-lease food constitutes 10 percent of Britain's food supply, and in 1942 about two and one-half million tons, with a dollar value of $797,000,000, were delivered for shipment.

LEND-LEASE FOOD DISCUSSED

This lend-lease food is sold by the Ministry to the British food trade and in 1942 it disbursed about $289,000,000 less than the value of the food in subsidies to stabilize prices. Conceding some variations, also that some of the food delivered for shipment was not shipped and that some was sunk, there still remains a margin in the British Treasury over the amount paid out for subsidies there. Whatever that margin is—something less than $289,000,000 in 1942—it is not inflationary but deflationary to that extent. Even if the lend-lease dollar value of food delivered and sold were exactly the amount of the food subsidies the result would be noninflationary.

In the United States the situation is completely different. Whether food subsidies could be held under $1,000,000,000 annually, as Price Administrator Prentiss Brown thinks, or at one and one-half billions, as the President believes, every penny would be inflationary because the Treasury which paid it out would receive no compensating sum, as the British Treasury does, and the money would go into circulation. The fundamental difference between the two situations is held by those who have stated it to dispose of the argument that, since the British can keep food subsidies from being inflationary, the United States can also.

BRITISH ECONOMY STABILIZED

During 1942 the British economy was effectively stabilized and the cost of living was kept stationary by close control over all rents, prices, and wages. The control was particularly effective through the use of food subsidies, which maintained bread unrationed, plentiful, and now priced; kept the prices of essential foods low enough to enable all citizens to buy their full allowances and by these measures discouraged demands for wage increases. The Food Ministry is the sole food importer and the sole purchaser of home-produced meats, sugar, and creamery butter. It also buys eggs, bacon, and many other commodities. The foods it does not subsidize the Ministry sells to wholesalers and retailers at cost, thus fixing wholesale and retail prices. The rest it sells to the trade at a loss to keep down the prices.

This is the loss that, in over-all Treasury bookkeeping, was more than wiped out by the dollar value of the lend-lease food in 1942 for which no payment is required. And in 1943 the indications are that lend-lease shipments are rising at least as much in dollar value as the rise is British food subsidies.

The noninflationary effect of these subsidies, in contrast to what would be the inflationary effect here, is not being pointed out as a criticism of lend-lease, as a suggestion that it should be stopped or reduced or that the British should be required to pay for it. The point is made merely to demolish the attempt to prove by the British experience that United States food subsidies would be noninflationary.

Proposed Establishment of Schools Under N. Y. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 16, 1943.

Hon. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I wish to register my vigorous protest against the proposal now before the Congress of the United States to establish a federally controlled and federally operated system of public schools under the National Youth Administration. I note the proposal calls for a general program costing $55,390,000, of which $3,314,000 would be spent for administration, and $60,000 for printing.

Obviously, this would build up a powerful group of Federal employees, not responsible to local communities or to State systems of public schools, who would duplicate the work of public schools developed over a period of more than half a century or more. This Federal system would seek to do the things the schools have done and are doing and are in an excellent position to do better in the

future than any new agency, because of the experience, personnel and accountability to the local communities, of the long-established public-school system.

Those of us who as school administrators or patrons, have had experiences with various agencies of this nature, controlled from Washington, believe strongly that the National Youth Administration and the Work Projects Administration, both created as depression emergency remedies, should be liquidated in fact as well as in name. Constant vigilance is needed in guarding against the creation of agencies of like nature and purpose, under the guise of new names, which would continue to seek to gain the same throttle hold of power and pay roll, for political purposes. Persons formerly on Work Projects Administration should not be employed by newly created agencies, merely to go about carrying letters some three or four blocks in the role of public welfare or social-service work.

Needless sapping of the public purse to set up a dual system of public education with undue advantage to the Washington-directed agency not responsible to local or State control, while paying students to attend and thereby draining the regularly constituted schools, is indefensible. Such camouflage is incompatible with all ideals and traditions of the free schools of America, governed, as they are, by their own local communities and coordinated by their own State departments of education. Our American democracy is founded upon free education.

The proposal would exploit boys and girls of our Nation for political purposes, create a paternalistic set-up in Washington with power to indoctrinate all schools of America with any given philosophy, violate the fundamentals of our type of Government, wreck the fine system of balances and coordination now existing between local school corporations (1,145 in Indiana) with their home-rule privileges, and the State department of education. At present, our local communities are given the choice in many things which are to be taught to their own boys and girls.

Again I say, I wish to register a vigorous protest against this needless, heedless exploitation of the taxpayer, the children, and the fundamental principle of government vested in State's rights. If citizens of our land do not beware, they will lose their blood-bought rights by sheer apathy, and suffer the fate of other nations which have allowed usurpers to wrest the power from the people by fair means or foul. Let's protect our schools against a pseudo system of public free education under the National Youth Administration.

Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT T. MALAN,
State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a communication from the Automobile Club of Rochester, N. Y., which will, I am sure, be of interest to those who wish to compare the Canadian system of gas rationing with our own system.

In view of the discrimination of the O. P. A. in the rationing of gas in different States and in various sections of the United States of America, the uniform system of distribution in Canada presents a picture of uniformity and fairness in distribution, regardless of the purpose for which the gasoline is to be used, quite contrary to the hodge-podge rationing policy pursued here.

Under leave to extend I insert the report from the Automobile Club of Rochester, N. Y., as follows:

REPORT OF GASOLINE RATIONING INVESTIGATION IN CANADA FOR THE EASTERN BLOC CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF ROCHESTER, INC.,
Rochester, N. Y., June 18, 1943.

After holding a conference at Toronto on the gasoline situation in Canada with Douglas Robinson, assistant to the oil controller, and G. M. Davis, executive assistant to the oil controller, I wish to pass along to you a few statements which I believe are important.

1. That the oil controller of Canada has full power over the production, distribution, consumption, and rationing of gasoline.

2. That 17 percent of the gasoline used in Canada comes from their own wells, and they receive gasoline from South America as well as from the United States, therefore, the rumor that all gasoline used in Canada is from the United States is erroneous.

3. All A ration books are issued to all passenger-car owners upon application and all receive the same amount of gasoline for the 12-month period, namely, 120 Imperial gallons, and this may be used in 1 day, 1 week, or 1 month, but no more gasoline is issued during the year to that owner.

4. The Canadian system of rationing does not include any provision for "snoopers" or the Gestapo, because there is no need for inspectors, as holders of A ration cards may use the 120 gallons in any manner in which they see fit.

5. Car owners are permitted to make a supplementary application for additional gasoline but such applications are carefully studied as to use and necessity. After one supplementary application is granted, regardless of error, no more gasoline is permitted for a period of 1 year to a B or C applicant.

6. Taxicabs are permitted 5 gallons of gasoline a day or 150 gallons a month, and salesmen, regardless of the extent of their territory, have a 300-gallon limit for the year, with the recommendation that but two trips be made throughout the year.

7. If the supply of gasoline for the month is short it is the plan of the Canadian authorities to lower the value of the coupon, rather than to curtail the use of gasoline.

8. With reference to the report that Canada is urging American motorists to go there for the summer and intimating that they would receive a plentiful supply of gasoline, I was assured by Deputy Oil Controller Robinson and Assistant Davies, that all car owners driving into Canada will receive 12 imperial gallons, which may be used in 1 day or in 1 year, but he assured American motorists that no one will receive more than the 12 gallons in the 12-month period.

It is my recommendation to your committee that all the functions of gasoline rationing be turned over to Mr. Ickes as Fuel and Oil Administrator, so that he will have full control over production, distribution and rationing of gasoline, and bring about a greater supply at an early date to the eastern seaboard.

I herewith enclose printed rules and regulations which the Oil Coordinator of Canada gave to me to be forwarded to your committee. He did say that the Chief of the Rationing Division of the Petroleum Administration for War has much material on the gasoline situation in Canada.

In conclusion, may I urge upon your committee that steps be taken to discontinue the pleasure ban on passenger automobiles at an early date.

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF ROCHESTER, INC.
GEORGE C. DONAHUE, *Secretary.*

Selling the Farmers Down the River

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America are aroused and rightly so; they are being ignored and forgotten by the agencies of our Government who have been given the authority under the law to regulate and regiment their affairs.

The president and secretary of the Oklahoma State Farmers Union have forwarded a message to the Oklahoma congressional delegation, through our chairman, with respect to existence of outrages in selling their potato crops, which are now under way. They state that No. 1 potatoes are selling for $1.40 per hundred pounds, which is only 70 cents a bushel.

At Spiro, in LeFlore County, Okla., the farmers have been mistreated far greater. A telegram from four citizens reveals that there is no market at all for their potatoes. These people cannot understand why they have been encouraged to grow a crop and find that there is no market. Why does not the Commodity Credit Corporation or some agency with authority take immediate action on this matter? Sufficient money is available to pay these farmers at least floor price for their crops, and within a short time a shortage will occur and the Government will not lose anything.

The slowness or incompetence of our governmental agencies is indeed appalling, possibly due to the exposé recently made on the floor of the House in not having an executive head with any practical experience in many of O. P. A.'s administrative posts and other agencies possibly due to the length of time consumed in making a study in rendering a decision.

We have no time left to debate this issue. If the agents of Government responsible cannot or will not meet this emergency, the last living one of them should be discharged, and while we are considering this bill is the time to put on a limitation as to action as well as to qualification.

One of my friends, Mr. Walter Adair, of Moyers, Okla., has just advised me by letter that in Pushmataha County, in the city of Antlers, where I reside, the same situation exists. This man does not make wild statements, but under the

scheme now in vogue the trader is and has an advantage over the producer and farmer that we must not overlook.

One other thing we must never overlook is the fact that it was the farmers and planters of America who rebelled against the atrocities of the mother country and made possible the freedom we enjoy today.

I represent the middle class. I am typical of the citizens who have appealed to me. Their problems are my problems and for 20 years I have kept faith with my promises to them as a member of the Oklahoma Legislature and I would be derelict were I, in their distressful moments, to fail them or be unwilling to sponsor their cause.

With all the consideration given John L. Lewis and his gang, the failure of our Government to respond to this emergency is an issue that will have to be answered.

Millions of dollars are being appropriated under the provisions of H. R. 2481 which we now are considering for the relief of agriculture, yet it appears that those in authority have no more knowledge of this emergency than a man cosmetologist would have in the many technical phases of piloting one of our superbomber airplanes.

Our policy has been a policy of agreement, but when failure is evident we know of no course but to be honest and bring it in the open, and when we see and know of a bunch of nonchalant Government agents sitting in the peace of their self-content, then it is time to bring it to the attention of Congress.

It has always been our policy to get along wherein public weal was a consideration of making a decision but when we are told by those in authority who cannot be reached by telephone or letter they will have to delay action, we are of the opinion that a general housecleaning should be had. Regardless of those on the public pay roll the people who are the final judge are becoming very conscious of our failure to keep faith with our commitments and the cold letter of the law.

Mr. Speaker, the following three telegrams portray and depict an unanswerable indictment of those who are charged with the responsibility of meeting this emergency:

Mr. Speaker, the telegrams to which I have referred are as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 22, 1943.*
Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Chairman, Oklahoma Congressional Delegation, Washington, D. C.:

Oklahoma potato producers being robbed potato buyers. Selling No. 1 potatoes low as $1.40 hundred gross. Joe Scott, president Board Agriculture, Washington today, joined by Farmers Union with message from potato producers. Government should immediately take steps buy these potatoes. Keep faith with Victory Garden producers, at least floor price $2.25 hundred.

OKLAHOMA FARMERS UNION,
TOM W. CREEK, *President.*
J. H. LAWTER, *Secretary.*

SPIRO, OKLA., *June 22, 1943.*
Hon. PAUL STEWART,
United States Congress:

Please also call attention of Senator ED. MOORE that there is no potato market in Spiro, Okla., bean market port. Why do people need farm products or are we being misinformed. This protest of such conditions is sent by Russell Overstreet, Tom Overstreet, John Collins.

MARGARET OVERSTREET.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 22, 1943.*
Hon. JED JOHNSON,
Chairman, Oklahoma Congressional Delegation, Washington, D. C.:

Due to recent storms, Oklahoma farmers need carload of shingles ordered more than month ago of Western Lumber & Shingle Co., Seattle. Contents buildings being damaged due to no roofs. Thanks for your usual prompt consideration.

OKLAHOMA FARMERS UNION,
TOM W. CREEK, *President.*
Z. H. LAWTER, *Secretary.*

Does O. P. A. Expect To Roll-Back Harvest Time?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. G. ROHRBOUGH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration speaks much of its accomplishments in holding back the tide of inflation, and seeks the appropriation of large sums of money wherewith to continue its regulatory efforts. I believe it has helped to curb inflation. I believe regulation as to essential things is necessary. In view of the many regulations issued, it would be strange indeed if some of them were not worth while. However, if so many things were not attempted by this organization, there would not be so much delay, so much procrastination, so much confusion; and some necessary regulations could be promulgated and applied with dispatch and common sense.

It seems to me that, judging from the many things left undone by O. P. A., it might well be called the Official Procrastination Administration. This is clearly illustrated by a form letter recently mailed by C. A. Sayler & Son, of Clarksburg, W. Va., merchandise brokers and wholesalers of that city, to its customers, which reads as follows:

C. A. SAYLER & SON,
Clarksburg, W. Va., June 21, 1943.

To Our Customers—Important:

We have today received a circular letter from one of our largest canned-goods packers, from which we quote below—giving us the picture on prospects for several items from the 1943 vegetable pack. Please note the comments regarding the Office of Price Administration, and the effect their maladministration is having on the food industry. This situation is serious, and we ask your cooperation in doing everything you can to help alleviate present conditions.

We quote as follows:

"We are now at the height of our pea pack and if conditions today are any criterion of what we may expect throughout this summer, we can now definitely say to you that you can look for a very substantial reduction in our pack. Labor is the big problem, and we were notified on Thursday, June 17, that we could advance our mail labor to 60 cents per hour, provided the Office of Price Administration would approve it. We immediately that day called the Office of Price Administration on long-distance telephone and, after talking with three different people in that agency, could find no one who could give us approval or who knew just what action to take; so what our increase amounts to is that, after 3 months, the War Labor Board approves it. But we are still waiting for the Office of Price Administration to act, even though the Office of Price Administration was notified well over 2 months ago that the increase in labor rates had been applied for and what these increases would mean in dollars and cents insofar as ceiling prices are concerned. They still are not prepared to give an answer.

"It has become quite apparent to us that the Office of Price Administration is not qualified to do the job that they have before them and that their bungling is going to seriously affect the production of food which will be seriously felt by you and your customers next winter.

"We feel that the handling of food problems should be taken out of the hands of the Office of Price Administration and have so advised our Senators and Congressmen, suggesting that in any appropriation made for the Office of Price Administration that none of that appropriation should be used in regulating the food industry, and we feel that it is the patriotic duty of every person connected with the producing or distribution of food to put before their Congressmen their experiences so as to allow those Congressmen to be in full possession of facts in deciding the action that they will be called upon to take on the appropriation now before the Houses of Congress. A wire today telling your representatives your feelings may save a lot of headaches later on.

"Quite a few of our regular customers on spinach have been writing us for quotations, and we regret to have to advise that we will have no spinach to offer our trade this year as our pack is now completed and because of price ceilings we could not operate and recover our cost, and our total pack this year is considerably less than the quantity that we were required to deliver to the Army."

You can see from the above information that the Office of Price Administration's tactics is certainly crippling food production and will continue to do so unless some drastic action is taken. We urge you to contact your Congressman immediately.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the question of removing control of the food industry from O. P. A., it is apparent from the foregoing example, as well as from hundreds of others which have been called to our attention, that the administrative officials of O. P. A. do not know their business. They may be theoretical experts, but they lack practical knowledge and experience. It occurs to me that a practical definition of such a theoretical expert would be one who knows a great deal about one subject, but whose knowledge of anything else is insufficient to enable him to apply what he does know.

Clearly, the House action of last Friday relative to O. P. A., which requires those engaged in the formulation of any price policy, maximum price, or price ceiling to have had not less than 5 continuous years of actual business experience in the particular field of business, industry or commerce to which the same shall apply, was sound and constructive. I sincerely trust that the House will not

recede from its position in that particular. The people whom we represent both expect and demand that we take definite action to insist on practical and common-sense regulations promulgated and applied by practical and experienced administrators who are earnestly striving to win the war and provide food and shelter for the American people, and not by theorists who seek to effectuate experiments in regimentation.

Certainly, the O. P. A. cannot hope to roll back harvest time for peas or any other crop.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. James A. Farley, at a luncheon of the Rotary Club of Reading, Pa., Tuesday, June 22, 1943:

We have heard a great deal in these past few years about the American way of life. I certainly have no quarrel with those who have so ably and eloquently discussed that subject. But I have wondered sometimes if, in our glorification of the American way of life, we have not forgotten that a way of life is, in the last analysis, the product of human beings. It is not a social or a political philosophy that someone has thought out and handed to other people as a guide for their activities. It is, rather, a name that we give to the habits and methods and characteristics of men acting in their relation to other men. In short, the American way of life is the product of a human being which we call an American. Today I would like to consider for a moment that average American who has created the American way of life, who, in doing so, has built a great nation, and, in the name of that nation, is impressing his character upon a wide and distracted world.

It took a good many things to create the average American. In the first place, he was the product of a problem that may be with us as long as men live upon this earth. He was the product of a continent called Europe, which has suffered for centuries from the fact that it could produce more people than it could feed. In these days, as we get into the habit of looking at the map of the world, we see in true perspective exactly what Europe is It is a peninsula thrust out to the west and the south from a great continent. In many places its land is poor and its capacity for the production of food is low. Its natural resources are, and have always been, scarce and of doubtful value. For the most part, its coast line, especially in the north, is forbidding, and, in many months of the year, almost inaccessible. Its rivers, in spite of the exalted songs and stories that have been written about them, are not great rivers. Its mountains, with a few exceptions, are not supremely great mountains. But its population has, at least in modern times, been excessively great. That population has been stricken time and again with indescribable calamities. It has been ravaged by disease; it has been beset by hunger. And because of these factors of inadequate resources and superabundant population, it has been cursed with the most bloody and continuous wars that have marked the history of the earth.

Those who made America, were the product of that background. They left that barren and unfruitful continent for many reasons; some because they were hungry; some because they sought religious consolation; some because they disagreed with the political life of Europe; others because they sought adventure; and others because for many reasons they were persecuted and injured at home. They came to America at various times, in various ways, and for various purposes. Here they found the answer to the bitter necessities that they had experienced in Europe. They found that while there were hardships in the wilderness, those hardships were nevertheless capable of being surmounted by courage and hard work and fortitude and patience. Unlike those of Europe, our hardships in America were not manmade. Nature in America, while it exacted a price, was an honest merchant because when men invested their labor and their courage, Nature paid them a fair and ample wage. This was all early Americans asked for, and this they were able to get. They brought with them the elements of culture, and constitutional government, and the instinct of workmanship, and technical skills, for in spite of its limitations, Europe at least provided that much for its children.

But Americans found it possible, because they were in a land of promise, to build upon these beginnings and to build better than they had known before. The culture that they imported expanded in America. Constitutional government found new ways of enabling men and women to live together. They multiplied their technical skills because they found ample resources to which they might apply that skill. And in the long years after they had founded a civilization upon the narrow ledge of this continent, they discovered that whenever the curse of overcrowding impeded their movements, they could move farther into the continent and find freedom all over again. And so the growth of America for four centuries was a process of endless new discovery. They went west because the West eternally satisfied their necessities.

It is out of great experience that great men are born, and it is out of great enterprise that a great people is born. As the boundless vistas of American opportunity opened and the population grew and prospered, so did each individual expand in his own views. For, in the last analysis, America was built upon individual men and women. They found in the beginning, as they struggled for self-determination and independence, that in spite of the fact that they had sought refuge from the jealousies and conflicts of Europe, that the source of those jealousies and conflicts had, like evil angels, preceded them to this continent. They found, even before national independence was created, that greedy empires had sought, through military power, to preempt the great American domain, and that on the south and the west and the north, and in the great sea at the east, they were surrounded by the encircling armies of European imperialism.

One of the most heartening things that we can recall, as in this war we are beset by aggression on the east and aggression on the west, is that when we were, so far as population is concerned, only a fraction of what we are now, we were beset by the same dangers. In spite of our precarious position, we fought and won a war for independence. We established ourselves as a nation, 13 States, in total area only a fraction of what we are now, by uniting in a desire to be free. By the courage of our men and women, by our enterprise, by our power to expand, by purchase, by diplomacy, and, when all else failed, by war, we set about the task of freeing this country of the threat of foreign dangers. From the Thirteen Colonies, Americans moved to the West and created new States out of the wilderness. They skillfully played the ambitions of the French, the Spanish, and the English in such a manner as to acquire a vast territory beyond the Mississippi. And as they acquired territory, unlike the practice of imperial Rome, they made each acquisition of territory truly their own by settlement and development. These were not men who made compromises with forces that threatened them. They were men who destroyed those threats by their own indomitable strength and courage.

If the American Nation has, in its resources, in its political institutions, and in its culture, preeminence in the world today, it is because strong men found three circumstances that favored the growth of a great nation.

The first of these circumstances was the great area of the country and the richness of its resources. No nation, truly great in every way, can be created without natural circumstances that favor its growth. There have been nations great in a spiritual sense which have grown in a small area and with a small population, but from time to time they have been the prey of physically stronger neighbors. The United States avoided that eternal threat of danger by the happy circumstances of its own position and size.

The second circumstance that favored our growth was the wise policy, inherent in the pioneers who settle this country, of creating, as they grew, political institutions that preserve individual freedom while they offer the broadest protection from selfish influences. They created a constitution sufficiently flexible to afford for all generations to come the possibility of change and growth.

The third circumstance that favored the growth of a great civilization was the fact that America was a meeting place of many cultures, many ideals, and many diversified points of view. It has been the genius of Americans to accept immigrants of many sorts, to permit them to make their contribution to our common life, and at the same time to assimilate them and their descendants in a truly unified American tradition. We have stretched out our hands to the unhappy people of Europe. We have offered them opportunity for a better life than they had at home, and all we have asked is that they have strong hands and loyal hearts.

In the course of our growth we have, in general, avoided interference in the affairs of other countries. We have not been anxious to make others as we are. We have generously contributed whenever we could to permit other countries to live their own lives, to be free of oppression and to grow as God and nature intended that they should. But we have not sought to impress our own culture upon others. We have learned this hard lesson from our own experience, because as we grew as a nation, we asked no help from others; we merely wanted the privilege of freedom to grow as we could.

A few years after the establishment of this Nation as an independent republic, our statesmen conceived that our duty, in fact that our safety, demanded that we, as the strongest nation in the Americas, should assert leadership in the two Americas in permitting other small republics to grow as we had grown. Out of this arose the most specific American statement of foreign policy that we have ever created, the Monroe Doctrine. The development of this policy with reference to the Western Hemisphere required, on our part, not only great strength but great forebearance, for we did not conceive it to be the destiny of the United States to create an empire in the Western Hemisphere. The wisdom of our policy of living at peace with our neighbors, while at the same time we offer them the broad protection of our power, is witnessed by the fact that in this war we have the friendship and solid support of all

those countries but one, and recent events indicate unanimous cooperation.

But all of this national greatness comes back fundamentally to the American as an individual. Only sound men can make a sound nation. It has been the habit of pessimistic people to speak of the disintegration of American character. When at times we have seen evidence here and there that wealth and security have made people careless and pleasure-loving, there have been those who have claimed that the fiber of America has become soft and that the inner integrity of our people has been destroyed. But these evidences of weakness were, after all, superficial and passing. Fundamentally, the American remains as he has always been. In this war we have the proof of this inherent soundness. It is not alone that Americans in uniform have upheld in every corner of the world the finest traditions of courage and skill. It is the fact that on the home front Americans have maintained order, have willingly accepted sacrifice, and have turned with incredible industry and skill to the task of production.

There have been nations, like Germany and Japan, that exalted their efficiency. But the test of 1943 has shown that efficiency is not created by the mere proclamation of an intention to be efficient. Efficiency rises from the strength of free people. In spite of many unfortunate failures of foresight, our American industrial life is adding glories to its achievements. American women in the homes, on the farms, in the factories, in the hospitals, and in the armed forces themselves are proving themselves to be the worthy successors of those women who stood loyally beside their kin in Washington's army. American States and cities are making their contribution to the national effort. Everywhere we find a spirit of cooperation and of loyalty to the cause of victory.

Our task, as we look to the future beyond this war, will be to uphold in spite of the suggestions of those who have formulas for security and happiness, to bear in mind that the United States was not built upon formulas; it was built upon the individual. We shall retain the power that is essential to the maintenance of America's responsibilities in the world only so far as we retain the spirit of the pioneer in each individual American. The door of opportunity must be kept open. The American boy must be taught from experience that whatever he attains depends upon his own inner integrity. We have won the past by hard work and honesty and self-reliance. There is no better formula through which we can win the future. The greatness of the past, in its achievements, lights the way for progress that is assured if no man-made shadows blur the road. It is for us to preserve for our posterity what our forefathers created for us, a Nation of free people, ever helpful to others, but always selfish for the continuance, within our own domain, of the American way of life.

Students and the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Phi Beta Kappa installation address delivered by me at the University of Florida on February 18, 1938.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When Dr. Tigert referred to the number on the program that "challenged all sleepers to awake," I thought it was a very courteous thing for him to make that request of you so early in the evening. And I thought of the appropriateness of a statement that I once heard of as having been addressed by a lady to a gentleman who confessed that during each day he drank some 12 cups of coffee. The lady, very solicitous about his welfare, said, "Well, doesn't it keep you awake?" And he said, "Well, it helps."

Doctor, I need not tell you and the University of Florida that my sentiments toward you are pretty much those I heard of in the anecdote of a minister in Washington the other day. It seems that down on the front row at each service there was one of the faithful of the church who regularly fell asleep and after about 15 minutes the fact that he was asleep became audible to all. On one particular Sunday morning the minister decided that he would see if he could not do something to impress, in rather a shocking way, upon this good brother that he should not do that. And so this particular morning the minister interrupted his service and said: "All those in the congregation who would like to go to heaven, arise." And all those in the congregation, with the exception of the sleeping brother in the front row, arose. They all sat down. And the minister said, "Now, all those who want to go to hell, arise." The gentleman, awakened by that time, jumped up and looked around, and seeing no other in the congregation standing, said, "Parson, I just want to tell you that it looks like you and I are the only two fellows going on this trip."

You do me a very great honor, Mr. President, to permit me to be the voice of this great audience gathered here this evening to pay our tribute to this occasion, and to those in whose particular honor this occasion is held. I refer to the student body of the University of Florida, both present and past, and to those who are engaged, either as instructors or administrators, in the promotion of the educational process. I am glad that the time has come when we have such a thing not only as a great university but public education. We know that education is not a new thing upon the face of the earth, that there have been honorable and ancient schools and universities, but we know also that never in the world's history has public education existed to the extent to which it exists today. And we are proud to know that our State and its citizenry honor this institution, and that we have not only gratitude for its past but we have great dreams for its future. And we are glad that it is possible for this institution to gather within its folds men from varying parts of this State and from varying positions in society—the rich and the poor.

And I, personally, am very hopeful, Mr. President, that in some way it is going to be possible for more poor boys to come to this institution. That is not only for the sake of the poor boys, that is for the sake of society. And in saying that I am merely quoting the words of President Conant, of Harvard, in making a report for the year 1936-37 to his own board of overseers; and I am referring to the pride that he expressed that Harvard, by fellowships and scholarships, was making it possible for a cross section of the United States to find instruction at Harvard University. "We all know very well that if we restrict the class which receives special education only to the homes of the well-to-do, that we shall deny both this and succeeding generations a yeast which they can ill afford to lose."

A little while ago I attended one of the most interesting dinners that I think I ever attended. The president of Stevens Institute was sitting at dinner in Washington with about 15 of the heads of the leading bureaus and departments in Washington, and after the dinner was over he pushed his chair back and crossed his legs and said, "Gentlemen, I want to talk to you just a little about what we are doing at Stevens Institute. I came here to advise with you about it. Of course, you know we have a college there, and we have students, and we have a curriculum, and we have buildings, and we have a faculty. Now, what I am trying to find out is what we should be doing there, and how we may more effectively do that which we may do there. I remember, a few years ago I was called upon rather suddenly to read a paper of a very learned man; and this learned man in this paper referred to two things of the business world, to two classes of business executives. 'One of them,' he said, 'is responsible for the management of a factory or a business. He engages personnel, he assigns that personnel to the performance of various duties. He is responsible for output, for distribution, sales and credit, and collections.'

"And then he said, 'I should call that management, perhaps, in thinking of the category into which those functions in business should fall.

" 'Now,' he said, 'there are others who perform other functions in the business world. They are those, as it were, who make large business policies, the ones who determine the scheme of things, and where that particular business should fit in in the scheme of things. They are those who discern from the multiple social forces that play upon the horizon the direction of events, and try to ascertain the appropriate relationship between that institution and those events.' "

"Now," he said, "I should call that 'administration.' "

"The thing that I am troubled about, however," he went on, "is this: How can I fit that one, out of a hundred, that may have an opportunity to get into what I call the 'administrative' class, to be able to appropriately and effectively perform the important functions of that class? I realize there are problems in relation to management, problems of human temperament—not putting a square peg in a round hole; but I think we have come more perfectly to a mastery of those problems than we have of the other problems.

"Now, before you gentlemen begin to make your suggestions to me, I may just suggest an idea or two of my own. In the first place, the student, in order to be fitted for that one chance out of a hundred, or to be an 'administrator' in the sense in which I have mentioned the term, should know something about economics. And," he said, "singularly enough, I should like for the one who teaches him something about economics to be not merely an economics professor; we prefer at Stevens that our economics professors shall have been physicists before they became economists." He said, "The reason why we suggest that is that there always seems to be a sort of quizzical quality, an insistence on the factual, about the mind of a man who has dealt in a physical realm or world, that is not found in a man who has dealt with only theoretical problems. And," he said, "in addition to that, I know that I shall want these seniors who I know some day will sit in the administrator's chair, to have sat under a philosopher. I mean by that, the kind of a philosopher who tells us not about the ancient but about this world, and about the world in which those seniors, as men, will live.

"I am very sure that since we live most of the hours of our day inside the walls of a business, this wise philosopher of mine would

want to tell those boys how they may get the most out of those hours of the day when they labor with the work of the world."

And he had other things to say. But he set us into one of the most interesting discussions I think I had the pleasure of participating in in quite a while.

He was troubled about the question of education. There was the president of a great institution in whom was reposed a great responsibility for the direction of human lives, and not only the lives of those seniors but the lives of men and women in the work-a-day world of thereafter; and he was making inquiry of friends, because he had doubts about this process that we call education. Fortunately, he knew enough about it to have doubts. The most learned professor under whom I ever sat was the first one who shocked me almost out of my seat by saying for the first time, "I don't know." And so he was inquiring into the educational process.

I want to say just a few, and a very few simple words, to the student body of this college, and, by analogy, to all college institutions.

I don't know of anybody who is more deserving of sympathy than a student body; not because of the pains and penalties which may be inflicted upon you by a faculty, but by the circumstances in which you find yourselves. Most of you are now approaching maturity—a dare say, between the ages of 16 and, we will say, 22, 23, or 24. You have come together in a rather strange society, where you dwell and live more completely with men of your own kind than you ever have before, or you ever will again You have been thrust into a new geographical environment, into a new mental and spiritual atmosphere. Some of you have come here at the instigation of stern parents; others, because the social life of this great institution was an attraction to you; others, because it was the acceptable and traditional thing in your family, or your community, for you to do; and others, because you had nothing else to do; and a few—I hope a large number—who wated to get something out of books to which they didn't at home have access; and a few more—and I hope a large few—because they wanted to live in the atmosphere of learning, and they wanted to drink deep at the fountain of knowledge. They wanted to sit at the feet of men who not only knew how to tell others; who gave information as a guidance for their footsteps; and who, while they gave information, gave inspiration. Men who were the signposts, as it were, of life; pointing in the direction in which men's footsteps should go in the future.

And then, all of a sudden, you found yourself thrown upon this campus.

Some of you lived in dormitories, some in fraternity houses, and some in private houses in town, and some of you made some peculiar residence of your own, perhaps. You were thrown into contact with men of your own class, men of other classes, men of the college of liberal arts, men of the graduate schools; and after a while you found yourself living pretty well in a general sphere within this institution—eating, talking, playing to a large degree, with a more or less limited circle of men. Without being quite aware of it, you had, to a considerable extent, chosen the kind of life you would thereafter live by the way you associated yourself with people and things. You had already indicated what was on the inside of your heart by the friends you made and the professors for whom you developed a real and genuine affection, and you had already pretty well indicated whether you were to be tolerant or dogmatic or a doctrinaire, and whether you were temperamental or cooperative in your mental and temperamental and spiritual make-up. Whether you had dreams, whether your horizon extended beyond that day's life was, to a very large degree, making itself appear by what you did day by day.

I don't know just how much attention you have given to the constituency of this institution. I don't know whether some of you have been deeply gratified by what you found here—whether you have the satisfying consciousness that you found something for which you yearned a long time.

I remember how, as a little tot, one afternoon I stood on the porch of a country home, and I happened to be looking toward the West—it was the setting sun. Somehow or another I thought of California because that was far to the west, and I thought of it as the land of the setting sun. I always had an aspiration to go there. I have never been able to gratify that aspiration, but when I do I shall think of the little boy standing on the porch of a farmhouse in far-away Alabama.

And I know there must have been times in your lives when you've yearned for the fellowship that you found here, and when you've yearned for the comradeship of kindred minds that you found here, and when you've yearned for that stimulation that somehow made you walk whistling down this campus, and made you look perhaps, in the springtime, out at the sky and the green grass, and feel something of the satisfaction of being an intimate part of life—this vibrant, buoyant life of your own generation.

Well, the college, of course, is very vitally concerned in making you the very best "you" you can possibly be. I suppose the saddest experiences that any of us have are two. The first is when we come to be aware of our own physical and intellectual limitations; find there are men who are better than we are up here, who run faster than we with their legs, lift more than we can, exert ourselves as we will. That, I suppose, is one of the first great shocks that comes to each one of us. And then the other, the other great shock that comes to us, is the fact that there isn't anybody who can answer the riddles of life for us.

I remember—perhaps you do—when the years of your youth crept away and you kept looking for some perfect man—some man who had solved life's riddles, who had achieved life's enviable equilibrium, who had found out how to balance and to compensate and to adjust the controversial and conflicting factors of life, who had in the proper relationship the things of the outside and the things of the inside. And how you looked into face after face, into faculty member after faculty member, into loved one after loved one, friend after friend, and after a while, before you found that perfect model, you found already that you had grown to such stature that other men, perhaps, were looking at you for their own guidance and their own model. And then the consciousness dawned upon you that you, to a very large degree, almost completely had to answer life's riddles from your own experience, out of your own mind and heart.

And so then a great many began to wonder what was, after all, the object of an education. Some of you, no doubt, thought it was to teach you how to be more productive economically—and it does have that very important aspect. And some of you thought that perhaps it offered you amusement and entertainment with its store of knowledge. And then some of you thought of it as giving you the tools for a great service which your own qualities aimed to achieve. And then some of you thought of it as fitting you into a complex order into which you were born so that you would be able to find your place as a cog in a machine, and not interrupt its progress but contribute your share to its smoothness and continued effective operation.

Well, perhaps, all of those things are the answers to your questions. Maybe some of you want to know if education is going to teach you to be happy, or how to be happy. Well, there were some very wise men that expressed an opinion about what of permanent value the college could give. One of these men was a doctor—Dr. Kelly, who, out of a rich medical background, wrote a treatise of what men live by; because he had gained the impression that in all the patients that he had visited there were certain yearnings which he observed to be common to them all. And so he said there are four things that are permanent values in human life: First, work; second, play; third, love; and fourth, worship.

Then there was another very wise man, Dr. Eliot, of Harvard. He said in the "Happy Life," which he wrote in a very simple way, that there are nine things which give men abiding satisfaction. He said: "First was sight; then sound; outdoor life; family life; physical exertion; reading; natural or mutual service and cooperation; good name and good reputation; judicious selection of belief and faith.".

Then there is another who wrote long ago to a group of inquiring people in a little community at Corinth. He wrote them upon the important subject that agitated their minds, about the relative values of life. And this man who had once lived in Tarsus, no mean city, and then had become Paul, said to those inquiriers at Corinth: "There abideth faith, hope, and love—these three; and the greatest of these is love."

And so to this student body Phi Beta Kappa has now come.

What is Phi Beta Kappa's significance? For a-hundred-and-fifty-odd years this fraternity has tried to emphasize in the colleges of America the abiding qualities of life, and to stimulate an appreciation of those permanent values. It has placed emphasis upon scholarship—not that it indicates a learning of books and aquisition of factual contents—but it indicates an appreciation and assimilation of life. And so this chapter of Phi Beta Kappa is to join the ranks of all Phi Beta Kappa tradition, emphasizing the permanent abiding values of life.

Phi Beta Kappa can't solve the problems for you. It is not the answer of riddles. It tries to recognize progress in the right direction. I don't know of anyone that can answer your riddles for you. I can quote, merely to refresh it in your minds, perhaps as good an ideal of a liberal education which Phi Beta Kappa does appreciate as was ever given to anyone—the one given by Huxley: "I consider that man to have had a liberal education whose body has been so trained in its youth that it does with ease and pleasure the work that as a mechanism it is capable of; one whose intellect is a clear, cold logic engine with all of its parts of equal strength and in smooth running order; ready like the steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work, to spin the gossamers as well as to forge the anchors of the mind; one whose mind is stirred with a knowledge of the vast and fundamental laws of nature and the laws of her operation; one who has studied aesthetics, is full of life and fire; but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; one who has learned to love all beauty, to put away all selfishness, and to respect others as himself."

Now a word to your faculty and to your administrators. I want to express to you the appreciation that society has for you. And I want those to be understood as words from the bottom-most parts of my heart, and the hearts of all of those men and women out there, busy with the work-a-day world. I know what you are doing, you who have set yourselves apart in the professor's laboratory, in the quiet walks of the university life. I know how inextricably the destiny of the society of which you are a part is interwoven with what you do; because if you withdrew yourself from it, it would dry up and die in a little while. Because history teaches me that you have made it what it is. You kindled in men's souls an appreciation of the

beautiful; you aroused in their minds an understanding of the complicated and the complex. You unfolded to their minds an understanding of life. You invented the great inventions; you made the great discoveries. You have held up high the torch of learning, of wanting to learn, on your meager little salaries. You have contributed richness that is almost the equivalent of the assets of the world.

A few days ago in Jacksonville, I was at a dinner one night. A great pulpmill had just been established over at Fernandina, the like of which has been established all across the northern part of this State, and turned waste cut-over land off of the tax books into an asset for which those great companies scramble for their source of raw materials. And you know the honor guests of that evening. Here was a roomful of 200 men, probably representing nearly $200,000,000, because they were some of the great businessmen of this country—come to do honor to the founder of a great invention. Here was a quiet man sitting at the table. That day a plaque had been unveiled in his honor up at Fernandina, and I had seen this quiet little man walk over and look at that plaque on the wall with the amazement of a child looking at a new toy, and almost burst into tears to think that anyone could honor him, a humble man, so signally. He had made little for himself in all his life, giving his secrets free without royalty or recompense to commerce and trade. And here sat presidents of banks, heads of great manufacturing corporations, able salesmen—but the fellow that invented the process that made it possible for all of them to be there was quiet, simple, little Dr. Herty, an honorary alumnus of this university.

And so it occurred to me that evening when I saw a representative of the University of Florida and of the Florida State College for Women in that audience, the thought occurred to me, well, maybe—maybe the people who play music, who sing songs, who write poems that soften the heart, that lift us up out of sordidness into unselfishness—maybe after all they too are pulp makers; because had it not been for what they created, all this other would not have come. And I can prove that all through our history. They have made the world what it is—the thinkers, not always like Rodin's, with his chin in his hand, but thinkers with materials and an experiment station and a laboratory that a grateful Government, Mr. President, ought to make available to you for every bit of research your men will do. I say advertise for students to invent the most complicated thing under the sun, and they will come here inventing it for you, because it is a challenge to their scholarship. Give them a few simple tools and a little place for them to work, and they will make things that will make you a new world.

And so I do want to say to you members of this faculty, you Phi Beta Kappa members everywhere who have devoted your lives to creative scholarship, not only through the lives of men and women, but in the laboratory, and thereafter in the channels of trade, how much we do appreciate it when we stop to reflect upon what you are doing.

And so it follows, Mr. President, that you are vitally important to us, us who are out in the outer world. We don't have time to pull back the curtains and see, as is were, the horizon and the sky. We can't sit quietly; we can't get away from the telephone that long. We can't disscciate our minds from the ordinary routine of the day; we don't have the genius for it if we did. You are the social scientist. You tell us what should be done; let us select from your recommendations those we deem to be feasible. We in Government can't create; we do well if we merely execute your own suggestions.

Take your complicated modern world. Why, Mr. President, if there are graduate students here who think that they have already climbed the summit of human knowledge, tell us, pray thee, how to stop a mad race of international armament that will lead to a destruction of a very considerable part of our civilization within the next few years; and the heart of the world stands aghast; and her brain knows not how to stop it. Take these machines that have been created since Watt's day, and have taken many from the home into the factory, and from the factory into the great city, and then into the slums; and tell us how we can keep these great machines that lighten the burden of toil on the backs of men, and not have these millions of unemployed. Tell us how we can adjust our complicated economic structure so that all should have enough; all should have at least that which is reasonable. Why, Mr. President, our problems multiply so rapidly that we stand in the vortex of it, simply aghast at the complicated nature of the society of which we are an infinitesimal part. And where can anybody go, save to the students, who make the times what they are?

So, Mr. President, to this university, I want to extend my greetings; to this faculty, my kindly good wishes, to these visiting members of Phi Beta Kappa, our cordial greetings and our gratitude that they have come to us; because they made us Phi Beta Kappa members. They have given us the yeast of the Phi Beta Kappa spirit.

And so to this institution may I give what you have heard called the fishermen's benediction. The fishermen in the Scandinavian countries, when they are about to depart on their long and dangerous voyages, are seen at the water's edge, with the hands of the village priest stretched over them, while he says:

"May the Lord bless thee and keep thee; grant thee favoring winds, a prosperous voyage, safe harbors, and stout hearts for the storms."

War Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "War Mobilization," delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] on June 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad that Richard Harkness invited me to come here tonight to discuss war mobilization.

This Nation has been at war for 18 months. American men have given their lives. The domestic economy has been seriously dislocated. Hardly a family has escaped some serious interruption of its normal living. But we are yet far from the total mobilization necessary to win this war.

There has been a stubborn persistence in business as usual, in and out of Government, which has retarded our war effort. We are not striking at the enemy with all our strength. We are not using to the full the great ingenuity and productivity for which this Nation is so famous. Our tremendous national abilities are "under wraps."

Although I have done it, it does not contribute anything to say that we have produced well, that our people are thinking and acting in the interest of the war effort. I concede that we have produced great quantities of war goods. I concede that our soldiers have fought magnificently. I go further and say that we have shown a strength as great as that of any other world power. But I say that we could show very much more strength if we were totally mobilized. We could produce more arms and munitions, more food, more ships, more of everything needed. We could bring this war to a conclusion much sooner, and that should be our consuming purpose. Every day closer that we bring peace means that much less suffering and death, that much more time to build a new civilization.

A group of Senators, of which I am one, more than a year ago adopted a premise upon which to base our actions. We decided that this war must be ended by unconditional surrender and that meant to us a complete and total conversion of the national economy to the needs of war. We cast aside all doctrines of half-way measures. We pressed for abolition of all customary practices in business, politics, labor, government, or any other category of American activity where maintenance of such customary practices would contribute to the prolongation of the war.

Today we are still advocating the same general doctrine. Today we see even more clearly that this is the only way. Total mobilization must be effected if we are to win this war in time to salvage the tattered remnants of civilization. We have seen deterioration of the home front grow as the preservation of customary practices persisted, as full mobilization was delayed.

In a report to the Senate of the United States, five of us, the majority of the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, have pointed to the problems confronting the Nation, to the reasons for the state of crisis in which we now find the domestic economy. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [HARLEY M. KILGORE] is chairman of the group. We have offered suggestions for the solution of these problems and the removal of the causes of crisis.

The war effort may be divided into three main parts: production, manpower, and economic stabilization. These are all so interrelated that the problems of one become necessarily the concern of the others.

Each of the major symptoms of the threatened disintegration of the home front can be traced to some fault in the administration of production, manpower, or economic stabilization. Gasoline shortages in critical areas are the result of production shortcomings; distribution facilities have been inadequate or mishandled. Food shortages are the result of ills in production, in distribution, in manpower utilization, and in an unbalanced economy.

The new Office of War Mobilization was set up by the President along general lines advocated by the committee. It is our feeling that this Office has the necessary authority to effect total mobilization. We hope Mr. Byrnes will exercise every iota of the authority which has been granted him and that he will not permit this new agency to degenerate to the status of an umpire of disputes.

The Office of War Mobilization cannot but fail if it refuses to use its directive powers. It must lay down programs for the constituent agencies and correlate those programs into a grand strategy. It must supervise closely the agencies charged with carrying out those programs. The problems it faces are legion; not one of them can be evaded or passed over lightly.

The great crying need in this country today is a unification of all groups in the common interest. We are at war and cannot afford the luxury of internal fighting. If we

divide ourselves we cannot face our enemy with our full strength. And we need that full strength. Our military leaders know it too well. If we divide ourselves how can we hope to hold our allies as a unit?

The Office of War Mobilization can be the focal point for unifying the Nation. It can set up a coordinated, cohesive program for conducting the war, giving every group, every segment of American society and the American economy a job to do in concert with the others. It can do all this—but only by laying careful plans and pushing them through with vigor, disregarding of the divisive attacks which are bound to follow adoption of such a procedure.

If we are going to have unity there must be no discrimination by those acting for our Government, and Government must intercede where discrimination arises.

There can be no doubt of the need for unity when evidence of disunity dominates the national scene. Strikes are acts of disunity. The uncivilized race riots in Detroit, Beaumont, and Mobile; the zoot-suit riots in California—these are acts of disunity. The continuous intra-Government bickerings and the snipings at Government by outside groups—these, too, are disconcerting acts of disunity. And the snipings backed by unwise administrations are also acts tending toward disunity.

These disunities result in more strikes, more riots. They result in civilian and military unrest. They result in conditions which lead to black markets and chiseling on price ceilings. They result in a confused and unbalanced economy which sooner or later must give way to uncontrolled inflation.

It does not help to heap criticism on the so-called bureaucrats—they are victims of a faulty system bigger than themselves. It does no good to curse labor leaders in general because a few have been able to lead innocent, deserving workers into a damaging position. It helps none at all to berate the zoot-suit wearer or the Negro, or even to attack those who have succumbed to the mob spirit and precipitated the race riots.

Solution to these problems lies in attacking the root causes. If we remove the economic and social evils and political inconsistencies, there will be little reason for these outbursts.

A prime example of how not to solve the problems of disunity is the Smith-Connally antistrike bill, which recently passed both Houses of Congress and is now awaiting the President's action. If this bill becomes law, we will move one step further away from the voluntary system for labor and the voluntary system for industry in our country. Rather than prevent strikes, the bill I'm afraid will stimulate labor unrest to such an extent that war production will be seriously impaired. And this would be only the beginning of a series of results in disunity. As stated in the War Mobilization Committee report, recent strikes are more significant as a symptom than as a cause of disintegration of the home front. In 1942 and in the first 4 months of 1943, one-twentieth of 1 percent of total labor time was lost through strikes. Inefficient control and direction of production cause manpower losses several hundredfold greater. It is, indeed, treasonable for any group—labor, industrial, or government—to willfully retard production of critical materials. But threats of compulsion cannot substitute for rational organization. Legislated penalties cannot take the place of removal of the causes. If we continue to have high living costs, poor living facilities, inadequate transportation, needless migration, increasing delinquency, and other strains on workers we cannot expect to keep production at a high level by simply legislating away their rights as men. Unhappy workers cannot work well; will not work long.

Unity, then, is prerequisite to doing the jobs of war properly and on the huge scale necessary to win the war soon. Unity is necessary to do the jobs, and it is necessary that these jobs be done if we are to have unity. This sounds like a vicious circle. It sounds like the old question: "What came first, the chicken or the egg?"

But if we work in the direction of unifying our activities, we cannot but bring about those conditions which will assure a solid unity now and after victory is won.

The immediate jobs to be done are three: First, increase war production and balance it with the civilian economy; second, use manpower more efficiently and intensively; and, third, stabilize the domestic economy. These are big jobs, and they require that industry, labor, agriculture, government, and the consuming public work together in their performance. That is why the Committee on War Mobilization recommended, in its report today, that the new Office of War Mobilization establish a War Mobilization Board consisting of representatives of management, labor, agriculture, and the public to advise the Director and consult with him on all major policies. That would be a step toward unity, a step toward good management of the war program.

Increasing war production is a necessity. Judge Patterson, of the War Department, has announced that production has fallen off 5½ percent, and our committee studies reveal that it never reached the desired peaks. Maximum output of military and essential civilian items, we found, can be had only by advance planning and scheduling designed to assure that all military and civilian items are in balance with one another and with shipping potentialities. Current below-capacity output results from maintenance of peacetime practices, which preclude unified production direction.

There has been less planning and integration in the field of manpower than in any part of the war effort. Piecemeal and groping measures, unrelated to strategic and production decisions, have characterized manpower administration since the war began.

But, above and beyond the failures in manpower and production, are those in the field of economic stabilization. It is here that we have floundered most. There has been no clearly defined policy. The line has not been held. Inflation has all but crept in the back door while each problem was treated singly and weakly as it arose. Meat shortages, fuel shortages, failure to enforce price ceilings, the steady increase in prices, the freezing of wage ceilings—these are only a few of the well-known shortcomings of stabilization policy which have eaten at the vitals of the American people.

The faults in production, manpower, and stabilization cannot be laid solely to the Government agencies responsible for their administration. There are groups which have driven dividing wedges into the country. The agencies have worked under attack at all times. Their main fault has been that they have listened to the conflicting voices, have cringed before the whip of those who prefer customary practices now to early winning of the war.

It is important that the American people understand that there are forces which seek to divide the country, forces which obstruct unity. That is why I am here tonight. If the American people will raise their voices against further disruption, against acts of disunity; if they will plead for united action and participate in it, then, and perhaps only then, we will go forward unitedly to victory. It is all too easy to sit back and criticize destructively. The Nation needs more constructive critics—critics who will demand that the root causes be attacked and not the results of ill-managed business, labor, Government, and agriculture.

With the American forces ready for an offensive against the enemy in Europe, we at home must bend our every effort toward unity—for only through unity can we give them the support they desperately need and richly deserve. And when the enemy in Europe is finished we'll move against Japan with a unity of action that will cause the whole world to realize the almighty power of liberty-loving people aroused to a sense of fighting for the men, women, and children of this world.

The National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in view of the notable record of the National Gallery of Art, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The National Gallery—War Boom in a Museum," by A. D. Emmart, published in the Baltimore Evening Sun for June 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GALLERY—WAR BOOM IN A MUSEUM

(By A. D. Emmart)

WASHINGTON.—An art museum isn't the first place, or even the second or third, that you would look for a war boom. Rather at a time when leisure and transportation are both reduced and energies and attention are so intensely focused on the war one would expect to find museums in something of a slump.

No over-all figures are available, but it is more than probable that attendance records would confirm that expectation. Certainly in the case of many museums there has been a decline from the peak of pre-war years. Those that have managed to hold their own are in all likelihood a lucky—and a small—minority.

There is, however, at least one conspicuous and preeminent exception. Moreover, it is an exception which, for excellent reasons, will rejoice and encourage the boards, directors, and patrons of all other museums. It is the new National Gallery in Washington.

At the present time the gallery is enjoying a remarkable success, a war boom. Every month its attendance figures are rising, and rising sharply. According to some estimates the visitors are entering its rooms at a rate about four times that of the London National Gallery's pre-war attendance, and nearly six times that of the Louvre. National galleries cannot be fairly compared with municipal and private museums, to be sure. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the Washington museum's attendance now runs to twice the size of that of the next largest and greatest museum in this country.

This record becomes all the more impressive when certain things are remembered. The National Gallery is a new institution in this country—it was opened to the public in March 1941. Hence it has not yet had the time to acquire a tradition and the place in the country's life commensurate with those of the national museums of Europe. On the other hand, it has already run through the first phase of mere superficial curiosity.

Crowded as it is, Washington is still a small city in point of population by the standards of London and Paris. And then, of course, the war has restricted a very large part of the normal tourist traffic to the Capital.

In spite of these conditions the Gallery flourishes. In its first year, from March 1941 to March 1942, attendance ran to something over 2,000,000. In the main that was a pre-war year and one that worked off the first rush of sightseers. From March 1942 to March 1943, there was a falling off in total attendance, for this second period brought with it the first full impact of the war. The number of visitors dropped to just slightly under 1,300,000—still a remarkable total.

But since January of the present year the trend has been consistently and steeply upward, from roughly 130,000 in that first month of 1943 to more than 183,471 in May. In the first 5 months and 1 week of this year the attendance has mounted to 790,000, and it is apparent that if the rate of increase is maintained throughout the summer, fall, and winter, then the Gallery's figures for its third year will far surpass even those of its first.

Probably no effort to single out, weigh, and rank the various factors contributing to this astonishing growth of public favor would wholly succeed. Certainly the Gallery has attempted nothing in the way of spectacular stunts or bandwagon advertising. Its popularity is a natural, not a forced, development of interest.

One would have to begin with the basic things, in the first place the exhibits, in the second the setting of those exhibits, the building itself. The Gallery's exhibits are not by any means the largest in the country, but they are exceptionally fine—the Mellon paintings, the gifts of Samuel H. Kress and Joseph E. Widener, and the Chester Dale paintings on indefinite loan are the rich and splendid core of the exhibits. On the ground floor of the Gallery, however, a place is found for special exhibitions of contemporary work of current interest.

The building itself, like the collections, has often been described at length. At present, it is not necessary to do more than recall certain aspects of the gallery. First, and probably most important, it is an astonishing comfortable building, friendly to the eyes and body, and an amazingly efficient one in design. Despite its great size and monumental exterior, no museum in the world could be—few, if indeed any, are—less forbidding to the visitor. For one thing it is almost impossible to lose one's way in it. Nowhere does it present any discouraging vistas of long corridors and endless series of exhibition halls. The individual rooms, so beautifully contrived to show the objects they contain to best advantage, are light in color, invitingly small, informal, and cheerful. The resilient floors are specially sprung so as to make for easy walking. The lighting is superb. The seating arrangements are numerous and convenient; it is easy to rest in the galleries. The east and west garden courts are full of growing green things. The air of the building is washed.

All of this adds up to an appealing combination of seemingly contradictory yet actually complementary elements. The gallery is so spacious that it can, and easily does, absorb a host of visitors. For soldiers and war workers in Washington that means a welcome change, a relief from cramped quarters and crowded offices, streets, restaurants, and movies. It is big enough to accommodate a variety of activities without any of them interfering with the others. But the rooms are so proportioned that they do not overpower or chill. They do not confront the visitor with a confusingly large array of objects. Nothing is pressed upon him. It is quite easy for him, in fact, to avoid exhibitions altogether if he prefers simply to rest. The whole atmosphere of the place is reassuring. Nothing of the dreadful museum hush born of "grandeur" and dutiful respect haunts it. No unusual restraint, explicit or tacit, is laid upon the manner in which one talks, walks, or behaves.

The building is inseparable from its operation, the way it works. For actually it is a gigantic machine running as smoothly and unobtrusively in every detail as a well-made watch, from the great basement devices controlling temperature and air to the elaborate system of lighting concealed beneath the roof. Visitors are never aware of these things, always of their effects.

An outstanding part of this mechanism is the services provided of the gallery—ranging from an excellent cafeteria to what are probably the handsomest, almost surely the least expensive, color reproductions and catalogs produced by any museum in the country.

It is against this background of attractions, comforts, and services that the National Gallery has been geared by its director, Mr. David E. Finley, and his staff to wartime Washington. Today, in the absence of the former armies of tourists, the bulk of the visitors are men and women in uniform and Washington's wartime staffs, and this fact is one of particular, and happy, significance.

The gallery has arranged its program of activities—as indeed all of the country's museums have done—to meet the needs and interests of these two great groups, and, of course, especially the servicemen. The big, oak-finished Founders' Room has become a servicemen's room, equipped with writing desks, magazines, newspapers, free stationery, postcards, and so on. Here visitors in uniform can read, write, or, if they desire, simply rest and sleep undisturbed.

Each Sunday evening a special concert is given in one of the garden courts by distinguished musicians and musical organizations, among them service orchestras and artists now in the Army or Navy. Last Sunday, for example, it was Albert Spalding who appeared. Not long ago the Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo made a trip to Washington in order to give a Sunday night performance at the gallery for wounded men from the Washington hospitals. On Sundays, when the crowds frequently run to 20,000 or more, members of the museum staff select at random some 30 to 40 men in uniform and their companions for invitation to supper in the gallery cafeteria's private dining rooms as guests of the gallery and the persons whose gifts make up a fund for this purpose.

The gallery is keenly aware of the war workers, too, not least those who regularly use its cafeteria. The corridor leading to the restaurant has become a display space for some of the gallery's fine prints, and a 10-minute lecture is given each day at the lunch hour as well as a 45-minute concert of recorded music. These are not forced upon the diner—they are there for him to take advantage of if he wants to do so. A very great number do.

The success of this approach is manifest in many ways. The most outstanding is certainly the popularity of the gallery with soldiers and sailors. They come to it, it appears, not out of any dutiful wish for improvement but because it offers so much in the way of enjoyable relaxation. Those who are already interested in painting, sculpture or ceramics will find what they want. Those who are not greatly interested in art at the outset find their way to it indirectly through cool, restful rooms and courts, music, and good food.

That they like the Gallery is evident enough not only in the comments which some of them put down in the visitors' book in the servicemen's room but, even more markedly, perhaps, in the steadily increasing number of them who make a point of going to the Gallery even when they have only a little time to spend in Washington. It is clear that they have heard of it from others and that what they have heard has recommended it. It is evident, too, in the surprising number of requests the Gallery receives from soldiers in far-away places for some of its admirable reproductions in color of pictures that have lived in their memories.

The effects of this popularity of the National Gallery are not to be underestimated. One might properly surmise that now in wartime it is completely fulfilling its function as a national museum precisely because it is attracting to itself men and women from all over the country. And for a great number of them, it is becoming the symbol, the fortunate representative, of all museums. Many of the present visitors have never entered a gallery before, never thought of looking at paintings. Their experience in Washington, casual though it may be at first, serves as introduction into a new world of interests—so agreeable and friendly an introduction that they will henceforth think of all museums as inviting places.

Quite apart, then, from the important role the National Gallery plays in the country's life as a great national repository of cultural riches, the services of its director as an expert adviser on the use of art and artists in the war effort, and the contribution it makes to the recreation and happiness of Washington's swollen population and the thousands of visitors from Army camps, it is helping to build a new public for museums and galleries throughout the country. A considerable proportion of the men and women who have found their way to it will carry warm recollections of it with them when at some later time they return to their homes. In that respect the amazing development of the Gallery is the gain of museums—and ultimately art and artists—everywhere in the land.

Where Easy Money Is Not Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, as follows:

WHERE EASY MONEY IS NOT WANTED

The Legislature of Pennsylvania has passed laws and Governor Martin has signed them, providing for an 80-percent tax on estates unsettled after 7 years. The primary purpose was to get at the $20,000,000 fortune left by Mrs. Henrietta Garrett, of Philadelphia, who had disposed of only $62,250 of it by will when she died in 1930.

In all, some 20,000 claims to the rest of the money were entered by persons who asserted they were relatives of the old lady. A German gentleman seems to have murdered his uncle and aunt to get the right to sue for their shares. Claims came in from all the States in the Union save two. And which were they? One guess should be enough. They were Vermont and New Hampshire.

There is a kind of honesty bred in the New England hills that is as incorruptible as the hills themselves. It goes far beyond the mere paying of obligations incurred. These people have a positive distaste for getting something for nothing. Maybe it's because nobody who

wanted an easy living would waste his time on those fields with their thin soil and their boulders. The depression didn't get these people down and neither did the floods and the hurricane that followed them by a few years. The Yankee farmers went right ahead, asking no favors and taking mighty few of those that were offered.

One spring, ten or a dozen years ago, there were devastating floods at about the same time in the lower Mississippi Valley and in northern New England. Every Congressman from the valley was howling for relief and more relief, and they were getting it. Vermont wouldn't take a nickel. The hill people said they guessed they could take care of themselves and they did, as they always have.

Some years ago Mr. Mencken, of Baltimore, after earnest researches, reported that in proportion to population, Vermont leads all the States in the number of its sons who have made "Who's Who." Vermont is also rock-ribbed Republican. In both these particulars New Hampshire is only a step behind. We draw no conclusions. They draw themselves.

Beliefs Are Personal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of today:

BELIEFS ARE PERSONAL

Mr. Dooley's famous dictum that the Supreme Court follows the election returns may be given even wider application. Apparently the Court also follows the course of foreign affairs. This is no more than to say that the Court is aware of the significant social currents which dominate our times.

In the opinions delivered on Monday respecting the Government's right to revoke the citizenship of the Communist, William Schneiderman, both Mr. Justice Murphy, who expressed the majority view denying that right, and Chief Justice Stone, who spoke for the minority, took pains to assert that "our relations with Russia, as well as our views regarding its Government and the merits of communism are immaterial to a decision of this case." However, the judgment of the Court was tinged to some extent by the contemporary concept that our basic freedoms must have universal application. And that is neither unwise nor unfortunate.

This was a difficult case to decide, since it involved a question of attitude, rather than of action. The dissenting arguments were exceedingly persuasive. But the verdict evidently turned upon an old judicial principle, reiterated by Justice Murphy: "* * * Under our traditions, beliefs are personal and not a matter of mere association. * * * Men in adhering to a political party or other organization notoriously do not subscribe unqualifiedly to all of its platforms or asserted principles."

Here is a doctrine which Congressmen DIES and KERR and other inquisitorial patrioteers might well commit to memory. If this has relevance in the case of an admitted member and official of the Communist Party it must apply with even greater force to the case of an individual whose affiliation with the party is at most a remote one—that is, through some organization regarded as a Communist front or allegedly dominated by Communists. The establishment of guilt by association is a procedure wholly alien to our traditions.

"Nowhere in the world today," Justice Murphy asserted, "is the right of citizenship of greater worth to an individual than it is in this country. This does not mean that once granted to an alien, citizenship cannot be revoked or canceled on legal grounds. But such a right once conferred should not be taken away without the clearest sort of justification and proof." A man's reputation as a patriotic and loyal American is no less precious to him and should be taken away no more lightly.

The chief significance of the decision in this Schneiderman case would appear to be its reinforcement of the Court's emphasis on the rights of individuals. Once more, as it did in the Jehovah's Witnesses cases, the Court has acted to curb the power of the State to enforce conformity. This is also the emphasis of the Bill of Rights. It does not seem impertinent to suggest that the Court is what the Constitution says it is.

No Check-Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

NO CHECK-OFF

John L. Lewis has made another conditional surrender to the authority of the Federal Government. He will allow the members of his union to return to work in the coal mines until the end of October, provided that operation of the mines remains in governmental hands. It may or may not be considered desirable to return these mines to their private owners within the next few months. That is something which the Government will have to determine in the light of future developments. We do not know. But we do know it is wholly undesirable to have the Government's action determined by John L. Lewis.

Mr. Lewis is in a position to dictate conditions today for the sole and simple reason that he succeeded in imposing his will upon the Government in the past. The blustering arrogance with which he recently defied the War Labor Board enabled him to overthrow the National Defense Mediation Board in 1941 when it refused to enforce a closed-shop contract upon the coal mining industry. With the demise of that agency and the imposition of a closed shop through the subterfuge of unofficial arbitration conducted by John Steelman, Lewis found himself empowered to control the working life of virtually every coal miner in America.

This control is reinforced by the check-off system of collecting union dues. Mr. Lewis plainly expects the Government, as operator of the mines, to continue this system. What he asks, in short, is that the Custodian of Mines shall collect dues and turn them over to the union treasury in order to enrich a strike fund which will enable the union to defy the Government again when its magnanimously granted truce has expired.

The check-off has its useful place in normal relations between management and labor. But it has no place in the relations between the Government and its employees. If it were to be continued now in the coal mining industry, it would indicate merely that the Government operation was purely pro forma—that is, a concession to Mr. Lewis' whim. Either the Government should take over the mines in fact, imposing its own conditions of employment, or it should return the mines to their owners and tell the miners to go to work under the terms of the existing contract.

It is curious that this contract seems entirely satisfactory to Mr. Lewis under Government operation and yet is viewed by him as an "infamous yellow-dog contract" so long as the mines are in private hands. He is scarcely entitled to have it both ways. The fact is that Lewis is demanding Government operation as a device to save his own face, since he has not been able to bludgeon the full measure of his wage demands out of the War Labor Board. But the Lewis physiognomy is not now so universally beloved that the saving of it can be considered a national necessity.

What is a national necessity is the saving of the Government's authority and prestige. It may be more difficult to settle the coal crisis on the Government's terms than on John Lewis'. But it is worth the extra trouble, even at a temporary cost to the war effort. Any concessions to John Lewis at this time will make the price of getting coal mined, in the long run, higher than this Nation can afford to pay.

The Battle of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article written by Mr. Max Lerner on June 23, 1943:

THE BATTLE OF DETROIT

I have been looking through the pictures of the battle of Detroit. They are not pretty, and they are nothing for Americans to be proud of.

I don't mean just the blood and the pain that you see on the faces of the men. Nor do I mean just the more than a score dead and the hundreds of wounded in the hospitals. Pain and suffering and the fact of death itself are less important than the cause for which they are endured.

But this cause is so meaningless, so deformed.

The key to the tragedy of Detroit is the fear and hatred that you can read on the faces of the men and women in the pictures. It is the mask of Caliban enveloping a mob that is wreaking its cruelty upon the helpless and the innocent. This hatred—not of the common enemy, but of our own American brothers—is a twisted emotion that shows up all the ugliness of the American soul.

What dolts we are, to dehumanize ourselves. And in what cause? In Hitler's, as far as immediate consequences go. The men who set these riots off, whether they be Bundists or Ku Klux Klanners, followers of Paul Joseph Goebbels or Gerald L. K. Smith, are doing Hitler's work here. That much is simple.

Hitler would be foolish if he did not use this weapon, especially at a time when he is desperate. It is as if he were to send saboteurs among us—only instead of destroying bridges they destroy our sense of decency,

and instead of disrupting communications they disrupt our living and working together.

But I say these things mainly to point to the very minimum of action we must take—Federal and local action against the known groups who spread violence in our war centers. I do not say them to absolve the American people of blame.

It is too easy to find alibis that wash the guilt away from those who took part in the riots, and from the whole American Nation. We cry: "Nazi instigators." We cry: "Kluxers." We create something fancy and objective, like race tensions and race prejudice that we discuss in a detached way.

The Kluxers and the bundists undoubtedly lit the match in every instance. But in every instance our America furnished the inflammable material.

What have we done to ease the daily crucifixion of the Negro in our midst, which leaves in him a smoldering bitterness? What have we done to give him fair employment in our war industries and elsewhere? What have we done to break down Jim Crowism in the armed forces? What have we done, by word and deed to make him see that he has a share in this war and in the world?

And what have we done, in turn, to cleanse the hatred and ignorance from the whites among us? What have we done to make them see that we are in a war against fascism, and that the essence of fascism is to treat some men as submen because of color and creed? What have we done to teach an understanding of the creative contribution of our minority groups toward the total American culture? What have the Government and business and the trade-unions done to develop going experiments in which white and black alike can work and live side by side?

Our spokesmen talk of reeducating Nazi Germany, of liberating Europe. We have some reeducating to do at home. The liberator must liberate himself.

Look in your own hearts, Americans. These men in the Detroit streets—these men splattered with blood, cowering in fear, their faces bashed in, their homes looted and burned, their spirits broken—these men, whatever their color may be, are bone of your bone. And these other men and women who have done the destruction, their faces bestial and fury-driven—these are also of your own America.

American men and women: this is your task. The suffering is yours, and the guilt is yours. You must learn what the facts are, but the facts will not themselves set you free. You must set yourselves free of hate and discrimination, of blindness and inaction. No one can do that for you—not even the Federal Government. It can help, but you must not lean entirely on that help.

The papers say that the Detroit riots have cut down war production. True. But what a curious way of putting it. Negroes are not just machines for turning out planes and ships. Negroes are human beings and Americans. What the riots have cut down is the stature of America.

Post-War Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in Time magazine for June 28, 1943, giving an interesting and accurate résumé and opinion of the speech recently delivered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR REALIST

One Senator also took a positive step toward the future last week, and the Senate watched him with respect. Massachusetts' handsome young Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE Jr. made a post-war speech remarkable in two important respects: (1) it took for granted that the debate about United States participation in the post-war world had proceeded from the whether to the how stage; (2) it stressed national self-interest in the clearest terms yet used.

Senator LODGE based his speech on a simple fact which many Americans are unaware of: At the rate natural resources are being used up in World War No. 2 the United States may be a have-not Nation after the war, in such once-plentiful basic material as oil. To Republican LODGE, this fact alone had forever ended any thought that the United States could remain isolated from the rest of the world. It also provided a simple, realistic foundation for post-war agreements. Said Senator LODGE:

"It has become plain as day, and it is common sense to recognize, that our British and Russian allies are not only dedicated to the broad purpose of crushing nazism and fascism, but that they have a number of very definite and very practical national aims which have been frankly revealed to the world. * * * One of them—Britain—frankly intends to maintain the Empire, and the other—Russia—has clear intentions, regarding eastern Europe.

"We in the United States, on the other hand, are committed to speedy victory and to effective measures to preserve peace thereafter. But in the field of definite and practical aims there seems to be a vacuum."

DEBT AND DEBTORS

"As a fervent believer in the pressing need of effective intenational collaboration after the war, I submit that the United States owes it to the world as well as to herself to define her needs. * * *"

"We must develop a policy based on national self-interest guided by justice, which will bring people together as Americans regardless of racial differences. Such a policy can be based on those things which we must have from outside our borders to maintain our democracy, our military establishment, and our influence for peace in the family of nations. Some of the things which should be the objects of international agreement are:

"Vital natural resources which we either lack completely or of which our supply is growing scarce.

"Equality with other nations in international radio, telegraph, and telephone.

"An opportunity for free competition in international aviation.

"A real chance for our new, big merchant marine.

"Equitable arrangements in the field of international exchange.

"Naval, military, and air bases to safeguard the approaches to the United States.

"Agreement on these practical matters will make agreement easier on the great political problems. It is a fruitful approach which will unite the people."

NATURAL DEATH

Senator LODGE is the grandson of the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, the great World War No. 1 arch foe of Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. In the days of the prewar, interventionist-isolationist debate he was often on the side of the isolationists.

Last week his bell-ringing speech, with its realistic mixture of self-interest and global thinking, won applause in the hardened Senate and praise from men who had stood on both sides of the old debate. Speech maker and applause were one more proof that the old cartoon figure labeled Isolationist, which some pundits are still busy beating to death, had long since died of natural causes.

The Government Must Act To Smash Attacks on Negro Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include herewith a copy of a letter I sent to President Roosevelt on June 16. Since that time there has occurred a shameful anti-Negro riot in Detroit, costing the lives of more than 30 Americans, the large majority of them Negro, and seriously crippling production in vital war factories. This riot, carried out by domestic Fascists, has been a direct aid to the Axis enemies of the United States. It makes even more urgent the suggestions I made to the President in my letter. It makes imperative effective action by Congress to prevent the possibility of the recurrence of similar incidents. The letter to which I call the attention of the Members of this House is as follows:

JUNE 16, 1943.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I call your attention to a series of outbreaks of violence against Negro people and other minority groups in this country which have developed in various sections of the United States. Today's newspaper reports of the lynching of Cellon Harrison in Mariana, Fla., and of a riot of 10,000 whites against the Negro population of Beaumont, Tex., are but the latest in a mounting series of grave incidents of a similar nature, which includes the so-called zoot suit-sailor war in Los Angeles, the strikes against upgrading Negro war-production workers in Detroit, Mich., and Mobile, Ala., the pitched battles between Negro troops and white military police at Camp Wheeler, Ga., the slaying of 3 Negro soldiers at Camp Van Dorn, Miss., the clash of Negro soldiers and civilian police at Collins, Miss., the shooting of 4 Negro soldiers at Riverside, Calif., and numerous other instances of riots, lynch mobs, police terrorism, and incitement to anti-Negro strikes, all occurring within the short span of the last few months.

There is a peculiar Hitler-like pattern running through all these occurrences which in my opinion is more than accidental. It is significant that anti-Negro outbreaks have been stimulated precisely in those areas which are keys to successful war production and in and about military training areas. It is significant that immediate use of these outbreaks is made by enemy short-wave broadcasting agencies to spread distrust of

American democracy among peoples of darker races in India, China, Africa, and Latin America who are our allies.

The total effect upon our war effort of these incidents is, of course, to retard industrial production, to impair the morale of our armed forces, and to injure national unity so vital to the successful prosecution of America's war of survival.

I am well aware that nothing I have said thus far is new to you. It serves, however, as the basis for suggestions I would urge upon you as Commander in Chief. I am deeply convinced that effective steps to thwart the designs of enemy agencies to create racial strife in the United States must be taken by you personally. The actions of the Department of Justice in investigating all cases of lynching since the outbreak of the war at your direction, while commendable, have not had the desired effect. While in no sense suggesting abandonment of such activity, I must point out that in no case involving a lynching has a conviction been obtained. Indeed, while recognizing many problems confronting the Department of Justice, it seems fair and objective criticism to state that it has not made the accomplishment which must be made if this hideous problem is to be solved. In no case involving the murder of a Negro soldier has the Department of Justice—either indirectly through State prosecutions for murder or directly through Federal prosecutions for violations of the Civil Rights Statute (title 18, sec. 51)—secured the punishment of a person or persons responsible for this crime. In no case involving conspiracy to deprive Negro citizens of their civil and constitutional rights has the Department of Justice action been successful. Strikingly enough, indictments secured in Detroit over a year ago against known pro-Nazi individuals have yet to be prosecuted. And in consequence we observed the renewal of anti-Negro activities by the same forces one year later in the disastrous anti-Negro strike at the vital war factory of the Packard Motor Co.

Similarly, while the War Department has been prompt to investigate reported cases of violence and mistreatment of Negro soldiers, it has in the large majority of these cases failed to accomplish either punishment of the guilty persons or a plan to prevent the repetition of these assaults. In consequence it must be said that in transit to training areas, in civilian communities around training areas in certain sections of the country, Negro soldiers are subjected to unjust and brutal treatment without cause, to the harm of their own morale and to the great distress of their parents and loved ones who live in constant fear of the lynching or shooting of their soldier relatives.

Your cordial reception of a group of outstanding leaders of the Negro church recently, your reaffirmation in Executive Order 9346 of the Federal principle of no discrimination in employment in war industry, your recognition of the great heroism of our Negro troops through awards of the Navy Cross to Negro sailors, and of other medals of valor to Negro soldiers are all tokens of your determination not only to mete out justice to all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, but as well of your firm determination as Commander in Chief to tolerate no act which will retard our war effort or jeopardize the security and independence of the American Nation. In these actions you have the love and respect of the whole American people.

The time has come, Mr. President, when you, and only you, can strike a blow against those Nazi-influenced forces within our borders who strike at the very heart of our democracy at a time when it fights for its very existence. Only your voice, Mr. President, as the Nation's Commander in Chief has the authority necessary to rally every decent force in American life against those influences that seek to undermine our national unity.

It is with high seriousness of purpose that I urge you to go before the people of America and the people of the world and speak out against those forces attempting to tear the fabric of national unity. I urge you to make a historic fireside chat dealing specifically with the events mentioned in this letter. I urge you to place your high office back of guaranties that Negro people and other minority groups will be freed from every hindrance which prevents their full participation in our war effort; that every member of our armed forces will be given full and adequate protection by the Federal Government wherever he may be. And I urge you to effectuate these vitally necessary declarations with proper directives to the various agencies of government under your direction.

Such action will sustain the morale of 13,000,000 Negro people and millions of other minority groups whose labor and devotion are essential to victory. Such action will extend its influence to hundreds of millions of people of darker races throughout the world, without whose support the war cannot be won. Such action, I believe, will win the deepest understanding and response of all the American people.

Respectfully yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

Operation of the Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 22, 1943.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washintgon, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Newspaper and radio reports indicate that Secretary Ickes is preparing organization and procedure for governmental operation of coal mines for the duration. This is a most serious matter to the country at large and to the coal industry.

It is our opinion, which is borne out by the record, that the coal industry has done an excellent job. It has served every private and public need without Government subsidy. It is now supporting the economic policy of the administration, and the law governing, by refusing to agree to subterfuge wage increases; and its action has been approved by the War Labor Board.

You will recall the terrible experience of the Government during the last war with the operation of the railroads contrasted with the fine performance of the railroads in this war under private operation.

If the Government takes over wartime operation and control of the country's coal mines, it will be permitting John L. Lewis to determine fundamental Government policy and will be punishing the coal industry and the country as a whole for the misconduct of one individual.

Government operation of the coal mines, in our considered opinion, will defeat its own end by causing smaller production, higher costs, lower quality of production, depreciation of plants, loss of coal by improper mining, general confusion in a well-stabilized industry. If the Nation wants coal in large quantities, such as private management has been furnishing, it should arrange through its present executive branch that the mines are profitably operated by those who know how and who are economically interested—their present operators.

If, to accomplish this end, firmness must be shown in dealing with Lewis, then let the Government be firm with him.

Unless the present situation is dealt with on a basis of fairness to the industry, then every union in every other industry will be pulling the same tactics to force Government operation in the selfish hope of improving its economic status at the expense of the Nation. The time to call a halt has been reached and your active help will be greatly appreciated.

We take the liberty of writing you as we have served for 20 years the industrial and domestic coal consumers of your State.

We wired you today of the urgent responsibility outlined above and we are keenly hopeful that such action will be taken as is necessary to properly handle this matter.

Yours very truly,

KIRKPATRICK COAL CO.,
L. M. KIRKPATRICK,
President.

Congress Coming Up To Popular Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor, Gary Post-Tribune, Gary, Ind., on June 22, 1943:

CONGRESS COMING UP TO POPULAR OPINION

The Fulbright resolution calling for the "creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world" should pass the lower House of Congress without much contention. The resolution has been accepted unanimously by the Foreign Affairs Committee, a formula having been reached upon which Democrats and Republicans could agree.

The die-hard isolationists are opposed to the resolution on the ground that no action should be taken binding this country until the war ends and we see where we stand. But Congressmen have brushed aside this criticism for what it is—the last wail of the confirmed isolationist.

The action of the committee indicates that Congress is finally trying to catch up with popular opinion. Now that so many evidences show the trend of that opinion toward cooperation in international affairs following the war, Congressmen are screwing up their courage back of the scenes to breast the fury of those who are still more interested in hating England and Russia than in taking the essential steps toward world cooperation.

The Fulbright resolution is a much smaller step than the Ball resolution in the Senate. This plan calls for a world organization and an international police force. However, the two resolutions are not incompatible, and the passage of one, or both, will tell our allies that we do not intend to run out on them when the war ends.

That is the chief need for an expression of our intent now. Neither England nor Russia nor China can work out its own peace plans unless they know whether the United States intends to cooperate in keeping the peace.

State Assistance in the Military Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. Ellis Arnall of Georgia, delivered at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Governors' Conference, Columbus, Ohio, Monday, June 21, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, my fellow Governors, and friends, the responsibility of the States to support the military training effort of our National Government has been met and is being met. Our achievement has fortified the faith of the American people in a dual form of political institution as exemplified by our representative democracy. The contribution of the States toward this titanic accomplishment surpasses all expectations. We have met the challenge of the crisis. We have demonstrated how perfectly the forty-eight States composing this Union are adjusted to serve as forty-eight bulkheads to buoy our Ship of State as it sails on toward Victory while "humanity is hanging breathless on its fate."

The States have given fresh proof that democracy can be made to work, even when disaster threatens.

By this superb example the States have given a new guaranty that the light that guides freemen shall continue to shine for us and our children and for the generations yet to come.

From the instant that "the drumming guns that have no doubts" first unloosed this furious war against humanity; with the first stroke of the President's pen that proclaimed a national emergency—our State governments have formed an unfaltering phalanx of strength behind our Commander in Chief.

We have been realistic, too, in our knowledge that the potential power of any nation to wage modern warfare is measured by the size, skill, and utilization of its total population, while anything short of that is to court national suicide.

The States have vindicated what their council of State governments pledged as their paramount objective in a resolution adopted at its fifth general assembly in January 1941, in which it was declared:

"That in furtherance of the national defense program each State should immediately take all necessary steps to promote total defense and * * * to this common end, all the States pledge to each other and to the Nation their full resources."

Not only have the States been true to that promise to use their full resources in the united national effort, but we have continued to maintain strong and efficient State government as a safeguard for the future liberty of our people despite the great concentration of power in the Federal capital necessitated by the crisis of war.

As our industries swung into all-out production of armaments and our military forces commenced their enormous demands on the young men of the Nation, the problem of the full utilization of our resources to a degree of maximum effectiveness we little dreamed could be attained, has been the constant impulse dominating not only the 48 States, but pervading also the 165,000 local subdivisions of government which represent the structure and essence of American democracy; and whose autonomy and integrity we have preserved.

This concerted all-American effort has not been one merely of marshalling and delivering the weight of our military prowess upon the battlefield. Great as that has been, the efforts of the States have transcended purely military aims. They have been the instrumentalities through which all of the administrative controls essential to the war effort have been exerted and accepted by the 135,000,000 individuals in this land whose future is now at stake.

Indeed through no other channel could this have been done. Not only is it impossible to deal with 135,000,000 citizens throughout our Nation, but legal theories of quality of government have existed undisputed in this Nation since Mr. Chief Justice Marshall said "* * * no political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines that separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common mass * * *." Under this doctrine, enunciated so long ago in the case of McCulloch against the State of Maryland, there was no other resource—yes, no other recourse—save the combined efforts of the States, upon which the National Government could rely in this hour of emergency.

Three simple examples illustrate what I mean. First was the administration of the Selective Service System—set up entirely through the Chief Executive of each State from among citizens who volunteered their services to the Governors. Second was the complicated plan of rationing—whereby our soldiers would have enough food to eat in camp and on the battle front, and planes would have enough gasoline to hurl their thunderbolts from the skies. Third was the elaborate program of civilian defense. While the procedures in each instance had to be standardized and rendered uniform through regulations emanating from the seat of government at Washington, the execution was in the hands of local officials designated through the exclusive instrumentality of the States and removable by them.

Not only was the responsibility for these things a natural and inherent prerogative of the States, but the financial burdens incident to carrying them out were borne largely from State treasuries.

How extensive these expenditures have become, I can illustrate best by reference to the figures anticipated for Georgia in the coming fiscal year. Of our total receipts from all sources, except dormitory fees of civilian college students, 38 percent will go directly into the war effort. If our Georgia figures are adjusted to include the direct loss of revenues due to the nonuniform gasoline rationing, somewhat more than half the tax receipts of Georgia and virtually all the funds obtained as grants from Federal agencies are being expended directly to further the war effort.

Nor do these figures on disbursements take into consideration any expenditures from our educational establishments, either colleges or common schools, both of which have been enlisted 100 percent behind the campaign for victory.

I do not know precisely, in percentage and amount, how these compare with each of the other 47 States. Since Georgia not only is in the southeastern area where training is concentrated, but on the seaboard where additional problems including gasoline rationing, are posed for State administrators, some of our expenditures may be somewhat above the national average. On the other hand, I have no doubt that expenditures in some of the States with heavy readjustments of industrial population will exceed those of my State.

Certainly it is conservative to say that at least a third of the taxes paid to State governments are now being expended for national defense, in a period when they have assumed increased responsibilities for the normal services of government and have lost, in many instances, Federal grants and assistance in personnel to an important degree.

I think that the best summation that I can give of the part played by the States in the war effort is through a brief outline of what Georgia has done. Every State has done its share, and, in general, the pattern of participation in our united effort is much the same.

On the strictly military field Georgia has an efficient State guard, replacing for the duration the National Guard men called into Federal service. It is a regularly equipped force, comprising 11,108 officers and men. It is not merely a group of uniformed but untrained civilians. At the peak, 5,000 of these guardsmen relieved Regular Army forces in protecting vital installations. This emergency has passed, for the time at least, although several hundred are still so assigned.

The State legislature appropriated for the support of the State guard and the State civilian-defense agency the sum of $420,000 for the coming fiscal year.

The Adjutant General's Department maintains a complete record of each of the 5,300 members of the Georgia National Guard now in Federal service. These documents will constitute the basic military record of these men for all future years.

Over a quarter of a million Georgians have volunteered with the Citizens Defense Committee for some form of essential service. Excluding those who have enrolled for more than one activity, there are 52,277 volunteers in the service corps alone. There are 80,000 in the defense corps. I will not enumerate all the categories, but, as an example, I can tell you that we have over 4,000 assigned to emergency food and housing services, over 10,000 in the emergency medical services, over 3,000 in the emergency road service, and almost as many in the utility repair units.

The organization of this multiplicity of services, necessary to safeguard the public in the event of an incident, has been an obligation of the State, and the overhead has been provided exclusively from the State's budget.

I suppose the men administering the Selective Service Act in the States and in the local communities have done one of the most unthanked jobs that had to be done during the war. The 188 local draft boards in Georgia, served by 603 medical volunteer officers, and the six appeals boards with their 81 medical advisory members have done a splendid, a fairly and equitably administered job in our State, unobtrusively and patriotically. This has been wholly a State function.

These duties which I have mentioned are performed by wartime emergency agencies. Nor have the regular agencies of the State been behind. Our colleges have been turned over almost entirely to the War and Navy Departments. They house thousands of young men training for the armed services. Our common schools, through the 105,000 students that make up the Victory Corps in 508 high schools, have been training for usefulness in the war, with emphasis throughout our high-school curriculum upon those subjects that will have wartime utility either in the services or in civilian capacities.

Our health department, in addition to supervising 6 emergency base hospitals and 216 first-aid and evacuation centers and emergency medical service with 541 doctors, 649 nurses, and 982 orderlies and other aides prepared to meet any danger that might come in the wake of another sneak attack, has

performed enormous services to the Federal Government in the establishment of the vast training program in our State. I would not undertake to estimate the diversion of the department's resources, in manpower and budget, from usual activities, to those designed to safeguard the health of the soldier, the sailor, the men of the merchant marine, and the worker in defense plants. All of the department's resources have so been used and will be used until the war ends.

Our highway department's existing work is 95 percent upon defense access roads. In setting up the anticipated current budget for the new fiscal year, only $14,000,000 worth of new construction is provided. Every dollar of that money will be spent for roads essential to national defense. I may add that a great many of those roads will have very scant value when peace comes. In addition, the department will expend $2,500,000, almost all its maintenance budget, on keeping military and defense highways in condition for traffic. To add to this, the penal agency of the State has made available 700 prisoners for maintenance of such roads.

This current cost, although almost 100 percent of Georgia's contemplated highway expenditures in the next 12 months, is the smallest item. The damage done to the roads of the State by the heavy traffic incident to their military use will cost the State at least $100,000,000 for reconstruction after the war, a sum exceeding the total Federal grants to Georgia in the last 10 years.

The diversion of half of the State's revenues, directly or indirectly, to the war effort and the concentration of every agency's activity upon war work has been necessary. It has been duplicated in nearly every State.

On this record I feel that the institution of State government, as a component of the most powerful community in the world, can be proud of its support in the military training program. It has been a noble test of the apparatus of democracy in these "days that try men's souls."

Those who have borne the leadership in State government, unlike many contemporaries in private walks of life, have placed winning the war ahead of business as usual. The people's State governments were in the vanguard in buckling down to fight the war while others were content merely to talk the war.

This has been the token of our loyalty to American institutions and our determination that those institutions shall not perish from the earth.

I have described for you, as briefly as the details themselves permit, some of these activities in wartime America that are common to all of our States. If I have referred to the figures for Georgia, it is because Georgia is typical of the effort of all 48, and is that one with which I am intimately familiar.

I am confident that these 48 States, expanded from the Thirteen Original Colonies that linked themselves by an indissoluble bond "to form a more perfect Union, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty" will continue through mutual trust and mutual sacrifice to lead mankind from darkness to a brighter day. Thus will be fulfilled the prophecy that America was God's last chance unto His children to make a world here below.

Because much of the personnel engaged in training units for combat are stationed here for the duration, they have brought with them their families. The congestion in our school systems is serious. Very large sums have been spent by the State and even larger sums by local units of Government in meeting this problem as best we can. The assistance given by the Federal Government has been wholly inadequate, and the selfish resistance to proposals for Federal help for the common schools throughout the Nation to provide equal educational opportunities, is to me quite beyond understanding.

Our colleges have been taken over for training purposes. The cost to Georgia, it has been estimated, will approximate half a million dollars each year. Other States have contributed the facilities of their educational institutions, but none has surpassed those of the Southeast.

Finally, Georgia is being called upon to make a contribution of a million dollars each month to the war effort through loss of taxes. I refer to the inequitable handling of gasoline rationing. This is not an administrative detail. It is an affair for the Congress, which, thus far, has failed to provide for our reimbursement.

Although this burden falls, in a measure, upon all the States of the Atlantic seaboard, its effect upon the Southern States is most critical. The tax rate on gasoline is highest in our section, because we do not have the resources and income upon which to rely for other forms of taxation and must, of necessity, resort to excise taxes. It has not been offset by increased yields from the income tax, such as have solved the problems of the Middle Atlantic and Eastern States, which have seen their treasuries swell their surpluses, in many instances, from the income taxes made possible by the huge new industries created in their midst for war production.

I have examined with some care the reasons for locating new war plants in congested industrial areas instead of in the South.

I approach that examination with an open mind.

I did not assume that there was some sinister plot against Georgia and the other Southern States.

I am glad to report that there was no sinister plot. I am compelled to tell you that, had I been the head of one of these great enterprises, I most likely would have rejected a southern site for my new plant. I would have done so as a matter of business profits, for I would have found that the freight-rate differential against the Southeast made it expensive to locate a plant there, unless I was going to build airplanes and send them flying through the skies so that no freight agent could levy tribute before they got away.

The dignity of the States must resume its rightful and primary place as vitamin A on the national diet.

It is because I am not unmindful of the possibilities of tragedy that I urge this course.

I ask you to imagine a gallant ship returning to its harbor. Its flag is bright in the sunlight—a proud banner for all the free. It has withstood the buffetings of tide and tempest—of wave and wind. It has prevailed over the enemy upon the waters, lurking in their depths, and in the skies above.

Then, in the calm of its own anchorage, before all those gathered with eyes yet moist with victorious tears to welcome its homecoming, our ship sinks. It sinks because the 48 bulkheads that should have sustained it were rat-gnawed, decayed, and rotten.

If our ship of state thus goes down, carrying with it mankind's one brightest hope, because its bulkheads of 48 sovereign States prove unsound, the tragedy will be America's and all mankind's. But the responsibility will be ours and the shame and the odium will be ours also.

Let us, like a worthy crew, keep watch, not only in darkness but in day, not only upon the high seas but in the harbor. This is the lesson of eternal vigilance we need if we are to preserve our priceless heritage of freedom.

Farmers Oppose Subsidies and Roll-Backs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD, copies of telegrams received today from constituents and farm organizations regarding this matter of subsidies and roll-backs on food commodities. The telegrams speak for themselves:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 23, 1943.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of Midwest farm bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted: The subsidy and price roll-back on foods proposed by the administration is a subterfuge for increasing wages and other consumer incomes already at inflationary levels. It will be expensive to administer, benefits will be small in proportion to total cost, it will continue the already existing ruinous confusion, it contributes to rather than controls inflation, it will decrease rather than increase both agricultural and industrial production, it will impose further regimentation of production and distribution, and will aggravate our post-war price and income problem. For these and other equally important reasons this conference of Midwest farm bureaus, representing 12 States and 300,000 members, respectfully petitions our Federal administrative authorities to cease their effort to inflict this program upon us. We call upon our Congress to enact legislation which will prevent any general continuance or revival of this ill-advised experiment. Copies of this resolution shall be sent each Senator and Congressman from these Midwest States and also to all proper Federal administrative authorities.

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

BELOIT, WIS., *June 23, 1943.*

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Not in favor of roll-back or subsidies. Conditions for agriculture plenty tough for the farmer now.

FRED H. EDDY.

MADISON, WIS., *June 23, 1493.*

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

In interest of livestock producers of Wisconsin your support of Wolcott amendment to Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

J. SCOTT EARLL,
President, Wisconsin Livestock Breeders Association.

JANESVILLE, WIS., *June 23, 1943.*

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building:

Agriculture looks to you to hold inflation. Refuse all subsidies.

PAUL E. TAYLOR.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *June 23, 1943.*
Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organization, representing 40,000 farmers in Wisconsin, strongly urges you support Wolcott amendment to Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

C. F. CLAFLIN,
Manager, Equity Cooperative Livestock Sales Corporation.

MADISON, WIS., *June 23, 1943.*
Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin Council of Agriculture urges your support Wolcott amendment prohibiting subsidies. All our livestock dairy groups deeply concerned.

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives.

ROCKFORD, ILL., *June 23, 1943.*
Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Asking you to support against roll-back and subsidizing of food prices. This will not help but react unfavorably in near future to all; very unfavorable to Wisconsin farmers, as well as Nation-wide. We need sound business in government and not politics.

HARRY WIELAND,
President, Rock County Farm Bureau.

EVANSVILLE, WIS., *June 23, 1943.*
Rep. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Don't wreck the biggest industry in our country by discouraging the farmer. Cut out those subsidies and leave the farmer a living wage. Farmers are now putting fall brood sows in fattening yards.

C. S. FRANKLIN.

Government Lending Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Missouri Bankers' Association at its fifty-third annual convention, St. Louis, Mo., June 10, 1943, as follows:

Competition from Government lending agencies threatens the soundness of the smaller banks in rural communities in that it deprives thousands of country banks of a substantial amount of their income derived from loans made to farmers, their major source of income. City banks also suffer from Government competition.

We believe the activities of Government lending agencies should be limited to that credit which is substandard for banks, the borrowers should be required to exhaust their efforts to secure financial assistance from banks before Government agencies are permitted to extend credit. Commercial banks are able, ready, and willing to meet the credit needs of the communities which they serve. A reexamination of the entire field of Government socialized credit should be made at this time.

It is recommended that in the interest of simplicity and of economy and for the purpose of curbing nonessential Government spending, the various Government farm-lending agencies be consolidated into one corporation. The Missouri Bankers Association is not opposed to a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled credit agency so long as the Federal Government does not subsidize it.

Banks have cooperated fully with the Treasury Department in selling Government bonds, they have made a contribution to the food-for-freedom program they have only recently made available their facilities for handling the Government's rationing system, they have dedicated their services to every movement for winning the war.

In view of their importance to the communities which they serve and to our entire national economy, it is imperative that some plan be worked out whereby banks shall be given the opportunity to take care of all sound credit needs.

It is recommended that a copy of this statement be forwarded to every Member of Congress from the State of Missouri.

The Tolan Committee in the Office of War Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 22, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the thoughtful weekly Catholic publication, America, for June 12, 1943, comments on the establishment of the Office of War Mobilization and points out what others have neglected, namely, that the Office of War Mobilization is the work of the House Committee Investigating National Defense Migration, more than of any other committee of either the House or the Senate.

I believe that the comment of the publication, America, which ends with the question, "What is holding up the Tolan committee?" is of immediate interest to this House. I offer it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TOLAN COMMITTEE

The designation of Mr. Byrnes as czar of all czars, and the establishment of another alphabetical agency to end all alphabetical agencies, is a long overdue acknowledgment of the excellent work of one of the most efficient congressional committees within recent memory. Originally established by the House to investigate defense migration, the Tolan committee soon realized that the chaotic conditions it encountered were inextricably connected with the procurement policies of the armed services, the decisions of the old Office of Production Management, the work of the War Manpower Commission, and the Office of Price Administration. It pointed out that housing and manpower were necessarily linked with the size of the armed forces and the letting of war contracts. It found, for instance, that war contracts had piled up in regions where critical shortages of housing and manpower existed; that other regions had a surplus of both but little or no war work; that the problem of industrial and agricultural manpower was evidently being bungled, because it had not been coordinated with the plans of the military; that the facilities of small business had been ignored; that, in short, there existed no over-all plan for mobilizing our resources. It warned of impending break-downs, of conflicts between competing war agencies; and its warnings have all proved well-founded. As a result of its criticisms, Office of Production Management eventually became the War Production Board; the United States Employment Service and Selective Service were placed under the War Manpower Commission. Now the solution it proposed months ago—an Office of War Mobilization—has been adopted in its main lines by the President. Office of War Mobilization stands, therefore, as a tribute to the Tolan committee. Yet, by one of those exasperating ironies characteristic of Washington at its worst, the Tolan committee has up till now be denied funds by the new Congress to continue its constructive work. At the moment of its greatest triumph, it remains stalemated for reasons which cannot stand the hot light of publicity. What is holding up an appropriation for the Tolan committee? The House leadership owes the country an explanation, and the country is waiting for it.

What Our People Want of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by our colleague, Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, from the June issue of National Republic:

WHAT OUR PEOPLE WANT OF CONGRESS

(By Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW, Representative in Congress from Indiana)

My experiences as a newspaperman and a Member of the Congress of the United States have convinced me that, although the general situation may at times be clouded and difficult for them to visualize, the citizens of the United States always, in the final analysis, are sound in their judgment and their will. Starting with this conclusion I am convinced now that the American people, our neighbors and our friends who go to make up this great free commonwealth and whose efforts, prefaced by the sacrifices and efforts of their fathers and mothers, have made this great land what it is today—I firmly believe that these people are desirous that their Government, of which the National House of Representatives is an important part, shall chart a course of the most rigid economy in nondefense expenditures. I am convinced further that they want Congress to place effective curbs on the overgrown and vigorous bureaucracy, which has become such a dominant force in our national life and which is threatening to stifle free enterprise.

The one outstanding lesson of the 1942 elections, a warning as I conceive it to Democrats and Republicans alike, and which ought to sink deeply into the consciousness of every Member of Congress, is that the people know, even if we may not, that this Government of ours is getting too far away from the

Constitution and that there needs to be a change of direction and a return to fundamental moorings; that the people are deeply stirred by glaring evidences of waste and extravagance and that they are alarmed by seeing the long outstretched arm of bureaucracy reaching out into every community, every business, every home, and exercising ever-increasing authority over the American way of life.

They find that in the period from January 1, 1941, to December 9, 1942, just 659 Executive orders were issued—mostly orders originating in the bureaus at Washington—and thus we are witnessing the metamorphosis from the Government of our fathers in the direction of a government by bureaucrats, a lethal process which, unless checked, could easily transform our Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" from its original form and mold to a great Washington superbureaucracy.

During the last 10 years—January 1, 1933, to December 9, 1942—3,556 Executive orders have been issued, many of which, drafted in the bureaus, have had the effect of law and thus have substituted the will of bureau chiefs for the will of our legislative branch of government that was established to make the laws. During the same 10 years only 4,300 public laws have been enacted by Congress. Think of it. The number of Executive orders issued during the past decade almost equals the number of public laws enacted by Congress. Congressional authority, which means the authority of the people, is weakened and paralyzed to the extent that the country is governed by bureau-inspired orders.

I do not desire to conduct any post mortem to fix the responsibility for this great bureaucracy that has been built up in Washington. If the executive establishment is to blame for excessive zeal in bureaucracy, Congress, by the same token, must be condemned for ignoble complacency in too easily surrendering its powers. I do not desire to blame anybody but I do maintain that a situation is being created that must be corrected, if constitutional government, founded on rule by the people, is to survive.

As a Member of the present House of Representatives at Washington, I may say that the people are looking to this Congress now in session as never before to see that these untoward trends are corrected; to see that the operations of government are brought within the four corners of the Constitution and kept there; to see that the rights of the States, localities, and individual citizens are made secure—and this wish of the people is a challenge to all Congressmen, Democrats and Republicans alike. I do not believe that Congress will fail the people in this time of crisis. This is not a partisan question, and partisan politics should not be allowed to enter into it. It is a fundamental question of what is best for America now and for our children, and children's children down through the ages.

The people of America everywhere are turning away from the Tugwell bureaucratic type of thinking, with its ideas of killing little pigs and converting them into soap grease, plowing under every third row of cotton, and paying farmers for what they do not raise. That kind of thinking is not Democratic thinking. It is not Republican thinking. It is an exotic brand of thinking which can never successfully be transplanted to American soil. More and more—and I can sense it everywhere—the people of America, Democrats and Republicans alike, are turning to the sound thinking of Thomas Jefferson, who dwelt upon economy in government as a primal virtue and who asserted that "the government is best that governs least."

From out of the background of history comes Thomas Jefferson to aid us in the solution of the paramount problems of this tragic era. As to Congress, I feel that we Members will do well if we will sit at the feet of Jefferson and gain inspiration from his ideas of economy and constitutional government.

In the reconstruction of thought and procedure which must take place if we follow last year's election returns, I believe that this Congress is destined to have its important part. That is why I have asserted and do assert that if there was ever a time when Congress should rise to the height of its responsibilities as a defender of constitutional government against the encroachments of bureaucracy, that time is now, and I have faith to believe that this present Congress is going to make itself both known and felt as the instrumentality of government closest to the people. Indeed I believe we have already made a good start in that direction.

In this evolution the Appropriations Committee, of which I happen to be ranking member, presided over by Representative CANNON, of Missouri, an able and resourceful member, which has initial control of the purse strings, is in position to assert a wholesome and effective leadership, and I am sure that in the manner of its discharge of its heavy duties and responsibilities at this crucial time our committee will justify itself.

We will vote to the Commander in Chief every dollar needed to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. There will be no niggardliness about war appropriations. But we will be watchful against waste in war as well as civil expenditures; and if I correctly sense the situation, nondefense, nonessential estimates will be cut as never before. Blanket check appropriations are out of the window.

At this important moment in our history the problem of food is an all-absorbing one. It is, of course, tied in with the manpower and the distribution problems. The farmer is confronted with a situation which is unprecedented in our national history. Nobody yet has found a golden formula to produce enough food at the same time for our brave soldiers abroad, and in our camps, for our allies and for the American citizen on the home front.

Many phases of the situation have come before us in the Appropriations Committee. The problem is still a most difficult one. The one outstanding fact that has hit the members of our committee squarely in the face is that there is an acute shortage of farm workers. The farmer must be given more help, and efficient help if he is to produce the food we need. It must be in the form of workers, of new machinery, and of fertilizer.

Between the fall of 1941 and the fall of 1942 a total of 1,600,000 workers is estimated to have left agricultural pursuits. The Secretary of Agriculture says that 60 percent of the labor that has left the farms has gone into industry and 40 percent has entered the armed forces. He also states that as of February 1 there were actually 200,000 less workers on the farms than there were on the same date a year ago.

I had a letter from my home city of Indianapolis the other day stating that in one big defense plant there were 6,000 farm boys employed. My correspondent also stated:

"I was asking some of these young farmers why they came to Indianapolis instead of staying on the farm. The answer from them all was that Dad couldn't pay them more than one or two dollars a day and that they were out after big money."

If we undertake to raise the price ceiling on farm products so that the farmer could pay higher wages in competition with defense plants we encounter the obvious fact that this would increase the cost of living, followed by a demand for higher industrial wages and that would create a vicious circle.

In fact nearly every proposal advanced before our committee carried more or less its own negation. It was hoped that 50,000 laborers might be brought from Mexico to work in the production of this year's crops but that hope is diminishing due in part to opposition of the Mexican government which holds that the labor is needed at home.

I believe the President has made a wise move in calling Chester Davis to take over-all charge of the food program. Mr. Davis is a man of vision and sound judgment who seems to have, and to deserve, the confidence of everybody.

I think myself it is too late to do very much for the farmers in 1943. The time we should have done it was when we passed the draft bill. Among others I worked for months trying to get a modification in the act but all in vain. Farmers were drafted right and left and now farms have been abandoned and herds of a lifetime sold. The fault lies with Congress which did not have the vision to look ahead and see what was going to happen.

If there is to be farm labor supplied in any quantity for the crop year of 1943 it must be done by local communities calling upon businessmen, professional men, children and after-hour workers to lend a hand in the necessary production of food.

But while I may criticize Congress for failing to foresee what would happen with the agricultural situation, this does not belie the fact that in Congress and throughout the country there is a wholesome disapproval of bureaucracy's attitude toward the farmer.

Jefferson said: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

Yet the American farmer has been the world's prize guinea pig. In an effort to make him feel better, he has been salved and poulticed by bureaucratic panaceas until there is not a spot on his anatomy that is not red and blistered and inflamed. His pigs have been snatched from a normal and useful course of life and converted into soap grease, his cotton has been plowed under, and he has been told how many acres of this, that, and the other crops he can raise, and how many acres he cannot raise under the dire penalty of the law. He has been bossed and regimented and goosestepped by beardless boys in Washington who never saw a plow, and when his load of grief was heaviest and it seemed that he was the chosen goat of punishment, he has been miraculously rewarded by being paid for crops he did not raise. He has been caught in a maze of bureaucratic entanglements, directives, and ukases until he did not know whither to go or where to turn. When I see what has been doen to him by the boys in Washington, I cannot help exclaiming "God help the farmer" and I wonder whether the academicians who spend their time practicing their remedies on him will even come to realize that the very best way to help the farmer and to enable him to perform his full part in the Nation's economy is to lift him from under the mass of governmental restrictions and orders, cut down his taxes, and leave him alone. All of this is said without any impeachment of Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. The irrational policies of the Department of Agriculture were formulated before he became the head of that establishment.

Finally, let me say that temporary measures must be and will be found to sustain us in the present food crisis. America has never yet failed, and will not fail now. But in my opinion, the things which are fundamentally wrong with our present economic program will not be made right until bureaucracy has been trimmed to its bare and legitimate functions and we have returned to the constitutional principles upon which this great Republic was founded.

The Navy Department Strikes Out Against Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing into the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between officials of the Navy Department and myself. As a direct result of this correspondence the Navy Department has issued an official directive to all ships and stations, ordering all commanding officers to pay particular attention that no subject matter is used in service publications that will in any way offend the sensibility of any racial or religious group. This directive is aimed at anti-Semitic and anti-Negro utterances which have crept into these publications. The letters speak for themselves:

LETTER NO. 1

MARCH 9, 1943.

Hon. FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy,
Navy Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY KNOX: I call your attention to page 3 of the enclosed copy of The Bluejacket dated December 31, 1942, and published by the United States Naval Training School (Aviation Maintenance) at Memphis, Tenn. There is to be found on that page the following: "The first American to get 4 new tires was—Nathan Goldstein."

It will interest you to know that this statement is a part of a vicious campaign of anti-Semitism propagated by Nazi-influenced organizations in this country. It is surprising to me that such pro-Nazi propaganda could find a place in a paper published under the sponsorship of officers of the United States Navy.

I will appreciate hearing from you what action will be taken in this case.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

LETTER NO. 2

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1943.

DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: In the absence from the city of Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, your letter addressed to him under date of March 9, 1943, has been referred to this office for reply.

It was indeed unfortunate that some young bluejacket, while doubling as a station paper editor in between his chores of Navy training, was so thoughtless as to insert in the servicemen's paper of the Memphis, Tenn., United States Naval Training School the item in question. It was definitely an instance of individual thoughtlessness, in which connection, a clipping from page 2 of the publication is enclosed, stating the policy under which all such papers are published by the men at the various stations. The policy: "Statements made in the news columns of this publication under no circumstances are to be considered officially as those of the United States Navy. Articles submitted by officers and enlisted men represent personal opinion only, unless otherwise designated."

Station publications are issued at the discretion of, and with the permission of, the respective commanding officers. There is no central clearance for the numerous papers printed at the various centers of naval activity. For this reason the letter which your matter broaches is being referred immediately to the commanding officer of the United States Naval Training School at Memphis for his investigation and whatever action is deemed appropriate.

Thank you very much for calling the matter to the attention of the Navy Department, and be assured that it will be called to the Secretary's attention on his return.

Sincerely,

LELAND P. LOVETTE,
Captain, United States Navy, Director.

LETTER NO. 3

MARCH 27, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: Reporting further on the subject of your letter of March 9, 1943, addressed to Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, the commanding officer at the Naval Air Technical Training Center at Memphis, Tenn., has submitted an explanation of the printing of the particular item in the station paper, The Bluejacket.

The commanding officer explains that the article was printed good humoredly and with absolutely no ulterior motives. He expresses regret that it should have caused concern and reports that the personnel assigned to the work of publishing The Bluejacket have been instructed to guard against publication in the future of any items that may be misinterpreted or misunderstood.

It is hoped that the above explanation will convey to you that the incident was entirely without design on the part of the personnel involved.

Very truly yours,

LELAND P. LOVETTE,
Captain, United States Navy, Director.

LETTER NO. 4

MARCH 29, 1943.

DEAR CAPTAIN LOVETTE: I acknowledge your letter of March 27 reporting further on the subject matter of my letter to Secretary Knox under date of March 9. As I stated in this letter to Secretary Knox, the material complained of has its direct source in the propaganda agency of the Nazi government, an enemy of the United States. Consequently, regardless of absence of design or bad intent on the part of naval personnel responsible for its publication, the fact remains that this action gave aid and comfort to the enemy. Moreover, the admitted absence of over-all control of such publications makes me fearful lest there be repeated occurrences of a similar nature which will impair the morale of the men of our armed forces.

For the above reasons I most urgently suggest that a statement be issued in the columns of the offending journal apologizing for this pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic utterance and that the Secretary of the Navy issue an order explicitly directing all such publications to refrain from publication of any matter tending to degrade persons because of race, color, creed, or national origin. May I suggest that you bring this exchange of correspondence to the attention of the Secretary.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

LETTER NO. 5

MAY 5, 1943.

DEAR SECRETARY KNOX: On March 9 I addressed a letter to you indicating that The Bluejacket, a publication of the United States Naval Training School, Aviation Maintenance, Memphis (Millington), Tenn., had published an anti-Semitic statement, disruptive of national unity and tending to impair the morale of men in our armed forces. I further called your attention to the fact that the particular statement had been widely circulated throughout the country in such a manner as to justify the suspicion that it had Nazi origin. You referred my letter to Capt. Leland P. Lovette, who replied on March 13 indicating that there was no central clearance for the numerous papers circulated throughout the country among naval personnel, and that matters contained in such papers are under no circumstances to be considered as those of the United States Navy. To this letter I replied expressing concern at such a state of affairs whereby it was possible for anti-Semitic utterances to appear in papers published by men in the United States Navy and to be broadly circulated among naval personnel. I urged that a general order be issued by you which would completely prevent the recurrence of such a situation, and asked further that a reprimand be given to those responsible for the statement published in the Bluejacket. To this letter I received a telephoned reply from Captain Lovette suggesting that the objectives sought in my letter could be achieved by instructions to Navy public relations officers at a meeting he was holding on April 26. I requested, and he agreed to send me, a copy of such instructions. Since then, Commander Berry has informed this office that no such transcript as promised me by Captain Lovette is available.

I cannot take, as lightly as Captain Lovette appears to have taken, this serious matter. I must, in consequence, renew my specific requests to you to issue a public order to all naval personnel directing them to refrain henceforth from publication of any derogatory comment against the Jewish people, or any other religious or racial group, in this country, who, with all other Americans, are giving such a clear indication of their patriotism; and that a reprimand be issued to those responsible for the publication in The Bluejacket. May I have your reply as soon as possible?

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO, M. C.

LETTER NO. 6

JUNE 16, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: The Secretary of the Navy has directed that I reply to your letter of June 1, in regard to matter that was published in The Bluejacket issued by the United States Naval Training School, Memphis, Tenn.

You are informed that in a forthcoming issue of the Navy Department Bulletin an official directive will go to all ships and stations, ordering all commanding officers to pay particular attention that no subject matter is used in service publications that will in any way offend the sensibility of any racial or religious group. I believe that this directive will achieve just what you have in mind.

It is regretted that the semimonthly publication had already been printed, or it would have gone in the current issue. We will send you a copy of this restricted bulletin for your files.

Very truly yours,

LELAND P. LOVETTE,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director, Public Relations.

Importance of Sports in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Evening Star there appeared an excellent article by Grantland Rice. In the article Mr. Rice quoted a British naval officer to the effect that spectator sports in Great Britain are vital both to the soldiers and to the war workers, and that experience has shown the value of sports in Great Britain.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN RATES SPORTS BIG FACTOR IN TURNING TIDE IN WAR—REGARDED VITAL TO SOLDIERS, WAR WORKERS ALIKE—VALUE OF ATHLETICS, ONCE SPURNED, CITED BY NAVAL OFFICER

(By Grantland Rice)

NEW YORK, July 22.—In order to get a better line on how Great Britain handles her sporting arrangement, we looked up our young friend Lt. Jock Buchanan, of Glasgow and the British Navy.

Lieutenant Jock, now over here on official work, is a chunky Scot who knows and loves his sport, no matter what the game is. He is just in from north Africa, the Mediterranean, and a few other sections of the Seven Seas.

"I'll tell you how it is," Jock said. "When the first blitz blitzed us we thought we had to give up sport. We tried it. It didn't work. So we picked up about where we'd left off. Not quite. But not so bad, either. And what a difference it has made to us on the war-winning side.

"In the old days in football we had national leagues with divisions consisting of the best 22 teams in division 1, the 22 next best in division 2, and so forth. No limits to traveling. Of course, that has been all changed."

PLAYERS ARE SHIFTED ABOUT

"The wartime organization is different, although we have crowds up to 150,000. Now, our regional leagues consist of some 20 teams from each district. All players either are in the armed forces or defense work. We have an arrangement where any player under contract to a team can play for another team in the new district where he now lives.

"Training is arranged so that the player trains at the football park nearest his home or station with traveling cut to the minimum. This keeps them in good football shape. Interforce games and international games for the Red Cross and other war funds are extremely popular.

"The heads of the services realize the great value of football as a morale builder to the defense workers, who nearly all average a 72-hour week. I don't mean a 40- or a 48-hour week. I mean 72 hours. These welcome the relaxation that football and racing bring.

"Our games are broadcast and recordings made of the broadcast and played to our forces overseas. It is what our soldiers, sailors, and flyers want. Football games between the Air Forces and the Army teams are especially popular.

GREAT MORALE BUILDER

"The continuance of football and sport in general has been a great contributing factor to the high morale of the British people.

"I only wish America could realize how much it has meant. Four years of wartime football have not reduced the public's love of the game, despite the fact that their teams change constantly and often consist of 75 percent of players from other teams, even bitter rivals.

"By rearranging the competitions as above with mutual and free interchange of players, the standards of play have been lowered very little. Much new talent has also been discovered.

"I have heard rumors here in America that football will be discontinued at many places. I hope this isn't so. I know how much football and other games have helped the war effort in Great Britain. It would be a great pity over here if the authorities should make such an ill-timed decision against football, in particular. Body-to-body contact is a leading essential of modern warfare, as you can learn from the veterans who reach from Guadalcanal to north Africa."

Reverse Lend-Lease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of June 22, 1943:

REVERSE LEND-LEASE

When, several years ago, President Roosevelt declared that America would serve as the arsenal for the democracies, and later when lend-lease was established, it was probably generally believed that lend-lease would be a sort of one-way street, through which all the goods would flow from America to the Allies, and that little or none would be received by us until a settlement was made after the war.

Even on that basis probably most of our people were satisfied so long as we could thus help destroy the Axis war power. But it has not worked out that way. On the contrary, what is described as reverse lend-lease, that is, reciprocal and we have received from our allies, has already run into very large amounts and will tend to increase from now on.

In the First World War the United States War Department spent more than $2,000,000,000 in Britain and France for supplies, equipment, and services for our troops. Now, in the present war, similar supplies and services are being furnished our troops, not for cash but as reciprocal payment for lend-lease aid furnished to our allies. As the number of our troops sent abroad increases the amount of these reciprocal payments in goods and services to our men will increase.

As an example, in the last 6 months of 1942, New Zealand and Australia furnished our troops with 235,000,000 pounds of food. Last year these two countries actually furnished us with more beef, veal, and mutton than we exported to all lend-lease countries.

In the last 6 months of 1942, Britain saved us an enormous amount of shipping through the dangerous submarine zones by furnishing directly to our forces in Britain a greater volume of supplies than we sent our troops from here. In addition, Britain supplied our men with new facilities costing over $500,000,000 in the form of airfields, barracks and hospitals, and, besides, most of our troops were transported across in British ships.

This year, 1943, Mr. Stettinius, lend-lease administrator, estimates Britain will furnish our men 44,000 tons of potatoes, 45,000 tons of fresh vegetables, 74,000 tons of flour, 27,000 tons of sugar, and so on through a large list of other items.

It is not implied that our Allies are by any means matching dollar for dollar the supplies we send them. This would be impossible under the war conditions and, of course, was not expected. We set out to aid them with materials in every way possible pending the building up of our own armed forces.

We sent 30 out of every 100 bombers we produced, 38 out of every 100 fighter planes, 28 out of every 100 light tanks, 33 out of every 100 medium tanks, and enormous amounts of other motor vehicles.

That these munitions, in addition to huge quantities of food, aided greatly in defeating Hitler at Stalingrad last fall and Rommel in north Africa this spring, there is, of course, no doubt. To that extent we have cut down the job our own boys would have to do at a cost in casualties we should hardly dare to estimate.

Telephones and Radios Are a Necessity in Rural Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to submit for the consideration of the Congress the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Illinois General Assembly on March 13 and concurred in by the senate of said assembly on April 14, 1943:

House Joint Resolution 24

Whereas telephones and radios in rural and farm communities are not only a great convenience and time saver but are absolutely necessary in securing information relating to farm work, markets, and community affairs related to the war effort; and

Whereas the restrictions and priorities placed on the various materials necessary to keep these utilities in repair by the Federal Government have resulted not only in a great inconvenience but an actual loss in valuable time, thereby retarding the war effort and food production: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge and memorialize the Congress of the United States to foster the change of such priorities and restrictions insofar as they relate to batteries and other necessary material in order to keep such rural radios and telephones in an operative condition; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to each United States Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Illinois and the War Priorities Board at Washington, D. C.

Adopted by the house March 31, 1943.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate April 14, 1943.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD W. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

After This War Is Won, Which Way Lies "Our Way of Life"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following advertisement, published by the Gardner Advertising Co., 915 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo., in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Tuesday, June 15, 1943:

AFTER THIS WAR IS WON WHICH WAY LIES "OUR WAY OF LIFE"?

Out of this wartime crucible our way of life will emerge uplifted, united, and inspired—or be transformed in an aftermath of post-war confusion.

What can you do—now—to protect your stake in post-war freedom?

Let's look at the thing—instead of the name. What are the materials of this edifice we call our way of life? Who were the architects and builders? Who did the job? Who paid the bills? Who holds the mortgage now?

IT DATES BACK TO AMERICA'S BEGINNINGS

This title search takes you back centuries. Eager Europeans brought their families to this land of Indians and incredible hardships. Avidly, they sought freedom, opportunity, a better way of life. They were the first to sanctify this land of ours with their "blood and sweat and tears." America was founded by builders.

Our forefathers brought the wheel to this soil—though it was a bronze age invention and a vital industrial tool 4,000 years ago. In the wheel you see the embryo of our way of life.

CAPITALISM FOUNDED ON HARD WORK

This Nation was cut, turned, and hammered out of a wilderness. The frail perished. The strong survived. They knew only necessitous invention, daring initiative, fanatical faith—and, by all current standards, insufferable work.

A few worked harder, thought longer, scrimped and saved with greater zeal. In time, they built bigger log cabins, ate better food, enjoyed leisure. They reaped the ripened fruits of toil, the profits of a free, competitive community—the essence of so-called capitalistic economy.

Thanks to their efforts—and their opportunities to enlarge those hard-won profits—expansion came fast in America.

They annihilated distance—and gave their methods to the world. They took the pain out of work—and paid higher wages.

They outstripped the work in development of creature comforts—and made available a standard of living no other nation can match.

For all who would heed them—they lit the twin lamps of human liberty and human dignity. They gave the world progress.

NATIONAL WEALTH IS THE PRODUCT OF MANY FORCES

The builders of this Nation knew no labor czars, no pressure groups, no paternal Government—as we know them. Their tools were few—but true. They built history's most imposing structure with burning desire, flaming courage—and productive money. Yes, our Nation is wealthy today—but not because it started that way.

America owes its industrial and financial prowess to the genius of ordinary men.

Men of vision.

Men who hammered ideas into useful goods.

Men who risked life savings on materials and machines—to put their goods in the market places.

Men who faced competition—and thrived on it.

Men who knew the evils of scarcity—and the blessings of abundance.

Men who reinvested profit to build better products—sold them at lower prices—and made the cornucopia a symbol of American life.

FROM ALL THIS HAS COME OUR WAY OF LIFE

Those are the materials, the bricks, and mortar of our way of life. Today as always, producers, men who get things done, are the men who give us our tempo, our direction, our destiny. Theirs is the responsibility—in common with millions of loyal workers—to create profits from production and keep this Nation in vigorous financial health.

Theirs is the shadow which stalks Hitler in his hideout. Conversely, theirs is the inspiration, the hope, the salvation of this embattled world. And come peace, theirs is the economic doctrine which must prevail—if we are to be strong, if we are to be free.

FREEDOM NOT THE PROPERTY OF ANY SINGLE GROUP

Fredom knows no distinctions of group or class. If America is to recapture her traditional freedom, then she must do so across the board!

Partial freedom for one group and full freedom for another won't work—socially, economically, or geographically. Every American must be free to earn, free to expand, free to match his talents against all men. That is the spirit of America.

HERE, THEN, IS AN ANSWER FOR EVERY AMERICAN

This is the gist of "capitalism"—the time-tested foundation of "our way of life." It's the story to tell everyone we know. It's the true story, the thrilling story, the crucial story which must be told—if we are to protect our stake in post-war freedom.

Tell it in these words or your own words. But tell it. That's one way to do your share in winning the peace.

GARDNER ADVERTISING CO.,
St. Louis, New York, Kansas City.

California Zoot-Suit War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the June 21, 1943, issue of Time magazine:

CALIFORNIA ZOOT-SUIT WAR

For 2 nights the mobs of soldiers and sailors had found poor hunting. In long caravans of cabs and private cars they had toured the Mexican sections, armed with sticks and weighted ropes, crashing into movie houses, looking for zoot-suited pachucos, the little Mexican-American youths. But they had found only a few dozen, and not all of them even wore zoot suits. They had broken the jaw of a 12-year-old boy. Said the boy, in the hospital:

"So our guys wear tight bottoms on their pants and those bums wear wide bottoms. Who the hell they fighting, Japs or us?"

One panzer division of the cab-and-car attack had rolled down a Mexican district side street, past the rows of mean, ramshackle frame houses. But they had only found a few victims to beat. One of them was a 17-year-old Russian boy, Pete Nogikoss, talking on a street corner to two Mexicans. The Mexicans fled. Pete stood still. The sailors beat him to the ground.

Scores of Mexican youths had been stripped of their pants (some of them on the stages of movie houses), beaten and then arrested by the Los Angeles police for "vagrancy" and "rioting." (The police practice was to accompany the caravans in police cars, watch the beatings and then jail the victims. Their orders apparently were to let the shore patrol and the military police handle the rioting sailors. The service police were futile.)

But now the rioting seemed to be diminishing. The zoot-suiters lay low, the sailors and soldiers had seemingly wreaked sufficient revenge for the several occasions when zoot-hoodlums had attacked and robbed them.

HEARST MOVES IN

But then the press took up the story. The Hearst newspapers, the Los Angeles Examiner and the Herald & Express, and Harry Chandler's Los Angeles Times began to blaze. Late-afternoon editions printed black-faced leads about a purported anonymous call to headquarters: "We're meeting 500 strong tonight and we're going to kill every cop we see." The Hearst Herald & Express bannered: Zooters threaten L. A. police.

THE MOB MOVES IN

That night all Los Angeles stayed downtown to see the fun. When darkness came to the fog-chilled streets, the sidewalks and streets were jammed with expectant servicemen and civilians. Shore patrol cars, military police and police and sheriffs' cars patrolled in force.

Scores of cars loaded with soldiers and sailors poured into the area. Soon after dark a mob formed, surged down Broadway, crashed into the Orpheum theater, went down the aisles shouting for "pachucos" to stand up. In the balcony the mob found 17-year-old Enrico Herrera, sitting with his girl. He and others were dragged downstairs to the street; the citizenry pushed back to give them room while he was beaten and stripped naked. The crowd howled. When the sailors had finished, the police dutifully edged up, took Herrera to the hospital.

The mob went happily down Broadway, repeating in every theater, the Rialto, the Tower, Loew's. Others stopped streetcars, pulled off zooters, Mexicans, or just dark-complexioned males. On went the mob, ripping pants, beating the young civilians, into the Arcade, the Roxy, the Cameo, the Broadway, the Central, and the New Million Dollars theaters. The mood of officialdom (the shore patrol, the military police, the city police, the sheriff's office) seemed complaisant.

HOODLUMISM

The mob split all over Los Angeles, to Watts, Belvedere, Boyle Heights, El Monte, Baldwin Park, Montebello, San Gabriel—anywhere that Mexicans lived.

Hearst's Examiner kept pounding: "Police must clean up Los Angeles hoodlumism." The first paragraph of an editorial said: "Riotous disturbances of the past week in Los Angeles by zoot-suit hoodlums have inflicted a deep and humiliating wound on the reputation of this city."

California's zoot-suit war was a shameful example of what happens to wartime emotions without wartime discipline.

Some of Los Angeles' young Mexicans organized into zoot-suit gangs that were the equivalent of boys' gangs almost anywhere that had got out of hand. They had robbed and used their knives on some lone sailors on dark side streets. But probably the trouble could have been ended right there. One who thought so was Eduardo Quevedo, a plump, cigar-chewing, shock-headed amateur sociologist, president of the Coordinating Council for Latin Americans, member of the Citizens' Committee on Latin-American Youth.

Eight months ago, Goodman Quevedo went to work to stop youthful hoodlumism started a kind of grown-up boys club for the zooters. He knew that they represented a basic American problem—the second generation. Their fathers and mothers were still Mexicans at heart. They themselves were Americans—resented and looked down on by other Americans. Jobless, misunderstood in their own homes and unwelcome outside them, they had fallen into the companionship of misery. They dressed alike, in the most exaggerated and outlandish costume they could afford: Knee-length coats, peg-top trousers, yard-long watch chains, "ducktail" haircuts.

If the pachucos had asked for trouble, they got more than was coming to them last week. The military authorities were notably lax (all shore and camp leave could easily have been canceled), the Los Angeles police apparently looked the other way. The press, with the exception of the Daily News and Hollywood Citizen-News, helped whip up the mob spirit. And Los Angeles, apparently unaware that it was spawning the ugliest brand of mob action since the coolie race riots of the 1870's, gave its tacit approval.

Market Basket Too Vital for a Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram of June 20, 1943:

MARKET BASKET TOO VITAL FOR A POLITICAL FOOTBALL

Folks standing in a potato line jostling its way in a grocery store where empty shelves mutely tell their own story of a national food shortage must be wondering these days just what is the trouble. Their minds are confused by a veritable tangle of reports, counter-reports and lofty thought of patriotism carefully nurtured by Government press agents to make them think they're really doing something for the boys by going without food. This they'll gladly do, but it's only a psychological step from a good-natured bantering potato line to a food riot if they begin to think they and the boys could both eat if the Washington politicians hadn't used the market basket as just another political football.

The pastoral vision of the United States as a giant cornucopia pouring out food in an endless flow is being dissipated in a fog of political incompetence, a "planned economy" which didn't work and a strange division of bureaucratic authority. Food will win the war. Food will follow the flag. Feed the world. Come and get it.

Feed the world indeed. Folks are beginning to wonder if we can feed ourselves.

Look at the headlines last week. Huge quantities of potatoes rotted en route from the South because of lack of refrigeration ordered by the Office of Defense Transportation. A Rhode Island farmer plowed under 800 bushels of spinach because of lack of help to harvest it. A dozen corn-processing plants may close because of the stoppage of corn shipments caused, a spokesman said, "by corn-hog policies of the Secretary of Agriculture." Canning crops off 10 to 76 percent as a result of "unworkable ceilings and differentials, doubts as to Government policies and inability to decipher various regulations." The Department of Agriculture reports crops to be even further behind last year's total than estimated. Bad weather blamed. Eastern milk and poultry producers faced with labor shortage, inability to get farm machinery and high grain costs closing down farms.

These stories of shortages and threats of shortages and ineptitude on the part of officials cannot be lightly dismissed. Government propagandists may work overtime trying to convince people the food is going to the Army; it is going to our allies; it is going to highly-paid war workers at home and it's going to newly-seized territories, but these stories do not shut out the grim fact of home-front bungling which would have done much to alleviate the food shortages now faced. After all, the 10,000,000 men or more in the armed forces did not suddenly rise from nowhere to be fed from our larder. They all existed 2 years ago with hungry mouths, and had to be fed then as civilians. Perhaps the reports that 20 percent of the food sent to the Army is wasted might account, in part at least, for our difficulties.

When the public first showed signs of impatience at food rationing, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, said a loud "Not me" when it was suggested our food was going abroad to "Feed the English, to feed the Russians." Writing in a magazine—the usual formula by which many officials have released important news in this war—Mr. Stettinius said only six percent of our food supplies went to allies. Of 9,000,000,000 pounds of beef produced in 1942, he said, only 18,000,000 pounds went abroad.

What then is the trouble? The plain truth is that our agricultural economy, which should be the basis of our fighting strength, has broken down. The country is still suffering from the early Tugwellian theories of a planned economy. Nurtured in the ideas of an economy of controlled scarcity, the New Dealers in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration have scarcely yet discovered how to transform their thinking into a planning of abundance. Mark Sullivan, the writer, discovered that Texas farmers were still plowing under crops to collect Agricultural Adjustment Administration checks after the war started.

The food crisis offers a case history, well-documented, of the New Deal ability to plan the domestic economy. Joseph L. Weiner, former director of War Production Board's Civilian Supply Division, ordered the 80 percent slash in farm machinery. He sponsored also the concentration order dividing farm equipment makers into three sizes. The largest were stopped from making equipment except for tractors, combines, hand tools, and a few others. The smaller producers were then forced to convert their facilities to machines they had not previously made. The result was delay and general chaos. This month, alarmed by the wearing-out of farm machinery and the inability of farmers to get new machines, the War Production Board suddenly doubled the machinery quota. An Illinois farmer said: "It is too late."

It may be too late for 1943, but even Mr. Roosevelt must admit that a better 'ole for 1944 may be found in considering the food problem on a nonpolitical basis. Democrats as well as Republicans must eat. If there is Republican Congressman LANDIS declaring there may "be no canned goods at all for civilians next year unless administration methods are changed," there is a Democratic Congressman FULMER, chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, who, urging a real food czar, says: "Every administrator is still going his own way, pursuing his own racket, and agriculture is being treated like a stepchild."

There was general rejoicing in the land when Chester Davis was named Food Administrator by the President last March 25. Mr. Davis soon found he might be a czar in the headlines, but he was just another of the long list of administrators without power or well-defined authority in Washington. Herbert Hoover was certainly well-intentioned when he suggested Mr. Roosevelt make Mr. Davis a genuine agricultural czar to coordinate the loose ends of administrative inefficiency, but it is likely that any endorsement by Mr. Hoover may well mean a kiss of death for Mr. Davis as far as the White House is concerned. Mr. Davis even has accused the administration of bungling food.

Mr. Roosevelt's curious allergy to any outside interference should not for a minute blind him to the fact that Mr. Hoover is on sound ground when he discusses our food situation. Even Mr. Hoover's bitterest opponents concede his experience in food administration. Mr. Hoover's idea that food control—production and distribution—now scattered among nine departments, all working at sixes and sevens, should be concentrated in one is, of course, sound common sense. Yet Mr. Roosevelt is adamant in opposing a food administrator with power, is insisting on subsidies in the face of congressional opposition, and is inclined to let things drift along generally as they have been. This attitude is encouraged by the diverse pressure groups representing cattlemen, wheat growers, and what-all who have political power in their respective sections.

Agriculture last Fall estimated at least 30,000,000 more acres would be needed to provide the foreseeable food requirements. Whether it is to be through a czar, or through subsidies, or what, it is high time that adequate attention was paid to the job of producing more food. It would seem that concentrated power in one man, even at the risk of offending important groups and other administrators, might be able to commandeer enough farm machinery, allocate crops and labor, and produce some food. The 1943 food production battle has been lost. It is time to get going if 1944 isn't to be another year of defeat.

Pork Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE,
Lockeford, Calif., June 15, 1934.

Hon. A. J. ELLIOTT,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AL: I am writing you just to give you just one point, a fact that some of us are not going to continue in the production of pork.

Sometime back Secretary Wickard gave us to understand that the Federal Government

wanted a 12 percent increase in pork over the 15 percent increase that I am sure that we met, and also gave us the assurance that a floor price could be expected up to June 1944.

The floor price is all right and perhaps too high for the consumer public, but the industry started out to meet the 12 percent increase, grain prices started to rise, and if grain had been in the hands of the farmer, the producer, it wouldn't have been so bad, but grain was in the hands of the speculators, and with Government buying mids, protein, and other hog and dairy feeds, the prices went beyond a price where we can feed our hogs to the weight that the Government wants, or even to bring them to a finished animal at any age. So younger and unfinished hogs are being disposed of, useful sows are going to the market, and yours truly, for one, has been unable to continue and must sell the 70- to 80-pound feeders at a much lower price than we were offered a months ago.

I heard Dr. Tom Slatts say just last Thursday that conditions such as taking over some 20,000 prisoners in Africa, and that we may have to practically take over and feed all Italy, make conditions change at Washington.

If we have more people to feed we must produce more, and that's our job, but Al, when they deliberately lie to us, and now offer roll-backs and subsidies, I tell you our farmer is not able to go ahead.

No labor and skid rows in our cities are filled with men who should be drafted for agriculture. No farmer can pay the wages that industry pays, and until we have a cost-plus I'm telling you that the dairy, poultry, and livestock industries are going to fall down on the Nation's food supply. I haven't had a man for over a month, and I can't get one short of $100 per month and board. The hog game won't stand this, at the price of grain, as feeding hogs only requires real work a few hours in the morning and evening, so I am doing my own feeding.

I should be planting corn or milo, but I can't get equipment, so I'm in a h—— of a mess, and it just looks like I've got to get out, just when I should be hitting the ball all over the lot, everyone of us should, but how can we when these spitball artists are pitching as they are.

I have never been afraid of work, and hard work, but now, at my age, I'd rather be in the front line than to try to do the impossible asked for by the bureaucrats in Washington.

I'd like to send a letter like this to all our California Members, but I just haven't the time, as I'm working about 16 hours a day, feeding and irrigating, and when I write letters it comes out of my time to sleep.

Sincerely yours,

JIM THORP.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the U. S. A. goes on, but the F. S. A. goes out.

Only 1 more year till a national Republican convention. Be patient.

It is just 3 years since we rolled out the first billion under the national emergency.

When the snow flies is when the miners' work agreement ends—a more effective time to strike.

BELL, of Missouri, made one of the best speeches against $50,000,000 for school lunches in wartimes.

Last year Congress voted one hundred and forty billions, so far this year only one hundred and five billions, but still half of the year is left.

Unless subsidies prevent, Congress will soon recess. Certainly nothing else will keep us, not even the lifting of the noncombat draft age to 65.

Weather, roll-backs, and labor shortage may make us a low-crop year. There is not much we can do about the weather and the labor now.

The last W. P. A. funds approved are for Puerto Rico, only through October. This will give Mr. Tugwell time to think up bigger and better ways of spending.

N. Y. A. lost in the House committee 16 to 17 and in the Senate committee 8 to 9. No effort was made to restore it on the floor of the House. Watch the Senate floor.

Twenty-six blocks of broken windows in Detroit and 23 dead could reasonably be said to be the second inning of the 6 months of National and State idle sanction of the sit-down strike.

It is 9 o'clock Thursday night and in 27 hours we will know for sure if the antistrike bill is signed. He should have O. K'd. it the minute it reached his desk. The other thing will never become a law, and is not intended to become a law.

Our Campaign Against Run-Away Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a radio address delivered by me last night, June 24, 1943, 10:30 p. m., over a Nation-wide hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject Our Campaign Against Run-Away Inflation.

It is as follows:

The patriotic service of the Columbia Broadcasting System permits me to bring to you the first in a series of warnings against runaway inflation. Its threat is of such vital concern that I propose to speak to you with the same directness that I would if you and I, in your home, were wrestling with the problem.

ALL WILL SUFFER

One thing we both know with certainty is that inflation is preventable. We know also that if it is not prevented, all of us will suffer. We will suffer in varying degrees depending upon what we earn and what we buy—but no one will escape. If inflation is not kept under control, its ravages for most of us will be terrible.

One great advantage of our generation in dealing with war problems and the threat of inflation is that we can benefit by past experience. Our successes and failures during and since the last war are so fresh in our minds that they should instruct and benefit us.

WHAT IS INFLATION?

Inflation is an overworked word. In fact, for more than two decades, there probably has been no word in the dictionary more abused or less understood than this word inflation.

In its effect on you and me, inflation is just one thing—higher prices. Higher prices for things—the things we eat, the things we wear, the things we use. Higher prices for shelter—for rent, if you are a renter; for fuel and taxes and repairs if you are an owner. Higher prices for transportation, for luxuries, for services, for everything. In short, a higher price level brought about by pressure of many dollars competing for an inadequate supply of goods.

INFLATION NOT NEW

Although inflation is little understood, it is not new. In almost all wars during the last century and a half, every one of the principal belligerents have experienced serious inflation. The widespread inflation of the period of the last war and the years immediately following is still a tragic memory for many millions of people in Europe. In Germany, Hungary, and Austria, inflation carried the cost of living to astronomical heights. There it took a wheelbarrow load of money to buy a loaf of bread.

At home, too, in our earlier wars we felt the ravages of inflation. In the American Revolution the cost of living rose to great heights. It rose 150 percent during the War Between the States. During the last war and to the peak of the post-war inflation in May 1920, the cost of living rose 140 percent.

THREAT OF INFLATION

The threat of inflation is here again. About one month before Germany invaded Poland, prices began to climb. Between August 1939 and May 1943 our cost of living went up 25 percent.

Daily the threat grows stronger. Today it has reached such proportions that it is absolutely necessary for the welfare of the people and for the national well-being as a whole that we combat it with all the power at our command.

Various controls to keep prices down are already in effect, for example, most of our essential foodstuffs and shoes, oil and gasoline are rationed and prices have been fixed. Rents in many areas are under Government supervision.

Why then, you may ask, should we be in danger of runaway inflation?

The reason is this country has been turned into an arsenal—the arsenal of democracy. It is training soldiers and producing planes, tanks, guns, and ships in staggering numbers. The production of war materials means the production of less civilian goods. In plants producing war and essential civilian goods, more people are now working for more money than ever before. This increased volume of money competes for scarce civilian goods. Prices are forced up. This, in turn, shoots up the cost of living, requiring workers to seek higher wages to meet increased living expenses.

Higher prices and higher wages mean increased cost for businessmen. They try to meet these higher costs by charging still higher prices. The danger of inflation, therefore, grows out of the gap between the money the people have to spend and the limited quantity of goods.

GOVERNMENT SITTING ON THE LID

Your Government has already taken action by imposing certain controls. It is sitting on the lid in the way of rationing and price fixing. This sitting on the lid at least has been partially successful in spite of great difficulties.

However, the tremendously increased supply of purchasing power continues to exert pressure from beneath the lid and this pressure must be relieved.

COST OF THIS WAR

You and I know that already this war has cost more than the whole of the last war. The latest compilation shows we are spending at the rate of $235,000,000 a day, or about $8 every 24 hours for the average American family of four persons. During the fiscal year ending in the next few days, we will have spent $77,000,000,000 for war. For the next fiscal year the spending is expected to rise to at least $100,000,000,000.

One hundred billion dollars is a colossal sum. It means we will bridge the seas with transport and supply ships and dot the skies with winged forts. But it also means a colossal amount in individual incomes on the home front. In this respect, the Treasury has let me have a glance at its records. In them I found that the latest estimate of the sum total of individual incomes for the calendar year 1943 is $141,700,000,000, as compared with $115,500,000,000 for the calendar year 1942.

EXCESS PURCHASING POWER

Speaking in round figures, for the calendar year 1943 it is estimated the national consumer income will be $140,000,000,000. Not all of this, of course, will be used to buy things. Fifteen billion will probably be deducted for the payment of individual taxes. But the people will still have about $125,000,000,000 to buy an estimated $80,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. This difference of about $45,000,000,000 between the supply of goods and the money in people's pockets is the crux of the economic danger confronting the country.

This $45,000,000,000 in purchasing power is bound to exert tremendous pressure from beneath the lid unless we take almost immediate steps to drain it off.

This siphoning can be done by diverting a large portion of the 45,000,000,000 of excess dollars into channels which will help pay directly for the war and help to ensure a sound, stable America for our boys to return to when peace comes. Taxes, the payment of old personal debts, the purchase of War bonds, life insurance, and savings are the principal weapons to accomplish this. This is of primary importance. If prices are allowed to sky rocket, available goods would go to a few. On the other hand, millions of workers and members of the families of fighting men and others with fixed incomes would have to draw their belts still tighter.

INFLATION MAY LENGTHEN WAR

And let me be frank with you, a serious rise in prices and wages would increase the cost of war and could easily help to lengthen it. To the extent that we pay as we go through taxation and hold down on borrowing, our economic structure will be sounder after the war. We will have less of a burden of indebtedness to carry. Thus by taxing heavily now to draw off excess spending power, we make it easier to finance the war, we fight rising costs, and help build a sounder peace.

MANY MISTAKES MADE

We have made many mistakes in this war. One of the greatest was made several years before our entry into the war when we failed to help China; another when we failed to prepare ourselves against Japan. Some of those who blocked our aid to China and who prevented our preparation for war are now loudest in their criticisms of the conduct of the war. Although we should admit our mistakes of the past and try to avoid them in the future our No. 1 problem right now is winning the war; our No. 2 problem is preventing runaway inflation here at home.

CONGRESS HAS NOT DONE ITS PART

Frankness compels me to state that Congress has not done what it should have done to prevent runaway inflation. First, we have not passed laws that would help to siphon off excess purchasing power. That is necessary to any effective price control in our country. During the two most critical years so far, 1942 and 1943, an average taxpayer in the United States will individually pay only one-third of the amount of income taxes that a taxpayer in Canada will pay or a taxpayer in England will pay. In other words, a taxpayer in either Canada or England will pay 300 percent more taxes during the years 1942 and 1943 than a taxpayer in the United States will pay. Price control is much easier in Canada and England because the excess purchasing power in these countries is siphoned off in the form of taxes. Our Congress is to blame and we must accept the responsibility for not correcting this situation. Not only have we as a Congress not corrected it, we have even crippled the only agency of our Government, the Office of Price Administration, that is charged with the duty of keeping down inflation through price control. The House of Representatives recently reduced its appropriation and thereby made it less able to keep prices under control.

Congress has also done another thing to cripple the Government in its fight to prevent runaway inflation. Only recently the House of Representatives voted to eliminate entirely that division of the office of War Information which is charged with the duty of informing the people of the dangers of inflation through a campaign for that purpose. If that appropriation is not restored, its well-planned campaign against inflation will have to cease. Therefore Congress has in three ways not only failed to help in the fight against inflation but has actually contributed to a runaway inflation. First, by not siphoning off excess purchasing power through taxes; second, by crippling and hamstringing the Office of Price Administration which is charged with the duty of preventing inflation through price and rent controls; and third, by absolutely eliminating the only agency that is making the proper campaign to inform people of the dangers of inflation for the purpose of getting their support in this important fight.

INFLATION REDUCES VALUE OF MONEY TO FEW CENTS ON DOLLAR

Doubtless, some of you within the sound of my voice have suffered a financial sacrifice by reason of the enforcement of the laws on price and rent control. Some may find it difficult to pay increased taxes, but those who have suffered or will suffer most by reason of such controls are much better off than they would have been without such controls. They are less severe than a runaway inflation which makes dollars worth only a few cents.

WIN WAR AND PREVENT INFLATION

Ruinous inflation means reestablishing the four greatest evils that ever existed in our country—poverty, ignorance, disease, and crime. Runaway inflation means the destruction of the three greatest institutions on earth—the home, the church, and the school. Around these three our civilization is built. Without these we can be destroyed. It is our duty to uncomplainingly endure hardships and inconveniences to win the war and prevent the loss of our priceless possessions. There is a lot of grumbling, griping, growling, and gossiping, but we should not let these things divide us, we should not let these things distract us, we should not let these things deter us from winning this war—our No. 1 objective—and from preventing inflation here at home—our No. 2 objective.

One Explanation of the Detroit Riot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Washington Times-Herald of this morning comes the following:

GOVERNOR KELLY LAUNCHES PROBE INTO DETROIT DISORDERS

(By David Charnay)

DETROIT, June 23.—A blueprint for collective racial behavior, designed to eliminate race riots and their underlying causes, will be made available to official Washington as a pattern for sociological peace throughout the Nation, Governor Harry Kelly revealed in an exclusive interview tonight.

The first step in creating the blueprint was taken today at a conference of State, city, county, and military officials in the Governor's emergency headquarters in the Book-Cadillac Hotel.

FIVE-MAN COMMITTEE

A governor's fact-finding committee to channel and coordinate for expeditious use all information relating to the outbreak of Detroit's bloody Sunday was created. The body, the Governor announced, will be composed of five men: Robert Rushton, attorney general of Michigan; Oscar Olander, commissioner of the Michigan State Police; William E. Dowling, prosecutor of Wayne County; John H. Witherspoon, Detroit police commissioner; and a military member to be assigned by Brig. Gen. William E. Guthner, of the Sixth Service Command.

"This conference was called," the Governor said, "for the purpose of ascertaining the best procedure for inquiry into the cause of the recent riot and for the bringing to justice in the speediest manner all persons responsible for or engaging in any inciting, planning, or active participation in the riot."

IMPARTIAL BODY

The broader sociological approach to the problem will be launched shortly, the Governor said in the interview, with the creation of an impartial committee composed of white and Negro leaders to investigate thoroughly and objectively all the elements involved.

"I am thoroughly cognizant of the expansion that has occurred in our city. This is the key city in the Arsenal of Democracy and it is naturally one of the first places to feel the congestion. There are many factors such as housing and recreation which are contributing factors to mass irritation.

"I do not intend in a short period of time to put my finger on the nub of the problem, but intend to have several complete and exhaustive studies made.

"The fact-finding committee will help me determine whether a grand jury investigation is necessary. The bi-racial sociological committee should help furnish remedies for the collective behavior problem."

COURSE OUTLINED

The Governor divided his course of action into three categories:

"1. Order must be established and maintained. This is the first step to be taken. Our industries must be kept rolling at high speed. Anything which defeats that, no matter how prompted, must be crushed. I intend

to crush any further outbreaks. I believe we have order now.

"2. The law must be enforced. The scores of cases being taken to court today are no criterion. The people in court are those who played minor parts in the disorders. The real inciters and the assaulters are the ones we are after. They will be found by sorting out more than 1,000 prisoners we have, and by seeking out the others in their hiding places. And when they are found their punishment will be fully commensurate with their crimes.

AXIS ROLE SEEN

"The fact-finding body, I trust, will be able to put its finger on the immediate cause of the riot. There have been many ugly rumors called to my attention. If this is Axis-inspired, I shall move every facility at my disposal and call upon our military to assist in ferreting out the fifth column in our midst. Reports that this was a planned riot have come to me. This report shall be tracked down thoroughly.

"3. Collectively behavior in all its sociological aspects will be studied. This is not a local problem. It is a national problem and will be treated as such. The biracial sociological committee will look into that problem."

Labor and civic leaders seemed to be agreed that the problem had been festering here for some time, the Governor declared. He indicated that he would seek the cooperation of labor and industry in coping with the racial question.

HOUSING PROBLEM

"There have been mass migrations of workers from one part of the country to another," the Governor said. "Certain groups have been thrown together in a manner which is entirely foreign to their social existence heretofore. Detroit facilities for living are being strained to the utmost. Fortunately it is a large city or the situation might have been worse."

"The feeling has been echoed here that these riots will spread throughout the country. I hope that I can ascertain the cause and, if I do, present my findings to those officials who can use it effectively to prevent a recurrence of this shameful outbreak which has profoundly decreased our war production."

This reporter, in a one-man survey, found Detroit today a city of frayed nerves, barked shins, and minor irritations. An inquiring reporter's tour of the no-man's-land of the riots, Paradise Valley (the Harlem of Detroit), and Washington Boulevard (the Fifth Avenue of Detroit), shed much light on the precipitating incidents.

The causes for irritation were abundant on both sides. The Negroes presented the following case for their side:

THE NEGRO EXPLAINS

The housing facilities in Detroit were inadequate to take care of the rising Negro population. The Negro was making more money than he ever made and he was willing to spend it in an attempt to better his living conditions.

In the Paradise Valley sector a number of swank "Harlem" clubs were operating at full blast with an equal patronage of whites and Negroes. There are several clubs, however, which do not admit white persons. A number of whites tried to break this ban with resultant clashes.

The Negro population eventually found itself seeking recreational surcease in white haunts. Ingrained resentments and prejudices made themselves apparent. These prejudices, the Negroes averred, were evident on trolley cars and in restaurants, night clubs, the factories, and around their homes.

THE OTHER SIDE

The white populace presented this case:

The better shops were frequented by Negroes, who arrogantly displayed new-found wealth. They paid as much as $65 for imported handbags, $15 for shoes, $100 for suits and dresses, and the highest prices asked for luxury items. At counters there were flare-ups between white and Negro women seeking the same exclusive Schiaparelli.

In the transportation facilities, strained to capacity, Negro men would rush aboard trolleys or busses, grabbing seats before white women could reach them. This situation resulted in daily fights aboard the conveyances.

The more fashionable night clubs found Negroes calling up for reservations and, when later they were refused admission, created disturbances.

"OKIES" BLAMED

Native Detroiters called attention to the influx of a white element better known as the "Okies and the Arkies." They are called hillbillies here and in some quarters are blamed for the flare-up. These, with an ingrained hatred for the Negro, resented most, Detroiters say, the arrogance of the southern Negro in his new found northern emancipation.

In contrast to the mass hysteria which permeated the city on Sunday and on Monday, there was a contemplative air here. The question uppermost was: Who and what caused the trouble? Some say the hillbillies, some say the Negroes, some say the Ku Klux Klan, some say teen-age hoodlums, and others say it was a fifth-column inspiration.

Governor Kelly said he intends to find out.

Coordinators' Cyclopedic Tax Service

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I made a statement on June 15, 1943, on the floor with reference to a circular put out by a man named William KixMiller, indicating that he was urging banks to subscribe for a tax service known as the Coordinators' Cyclopedic Tax Service and which was supposed to have been authored in part by Randolph Paul, the general counsel of the Treasury, and James Mertens, Jr.

Mr. Paul has denied that he has any connection, financial or otherwise, with the publication of the so-called tax service. He has sent a telegram to Mr. KixMiller dated June 15, 1943, saying that a representation in the circular that he had some connection with, or interest in the authorship or publication of the so-called tax service was misleading, unwarranted, and untrue. Mr. Paul also demanded that Mr. KixMiller immediately discontinue further distribution of the circular and promptly take adequate action to retract its misleading representations. Callaghan & Co., the law publishers of a book that many years ago was written by Paul and Mertens state that the entire basis of Mr. KixMiller's circular "is wrong and misleading and it seems to have been expressed in such language as to convey the impression that both you and Mr. Mertens were supporting KixMiller in his publication and that we, as publishers, were also in some manner connected with it," and state that it was a venture of KixMiller without any support on the part of Paul or Mertens in connection with it.

I am satisfied that Mr. Paul was not in any way connected with the KixMiller circular or the so-called Coordinators' Cyclopedic Tax Service, but frankly I feel that Mr. Paul owes it to the banks and all other recipients of the circular to do everything in his power to see that a circular is sent out by KixMiller advising them that Mr. Paul is not involved in any way. These things Mr. Paul has agreed to do. Many banks, when they received the circular, felt that pressure was being put on them by Mr. Paul to buy the service and he owes it to them to clear himself with them now. Frankly, the circular put out by KixMiller has done great injustice to Mr. Paul and I hope that Mr. Paul will now take all possible action in every possible way to see that KixMiller's misrepresentation is thoroughly discredited.

Mr. Mertens, while there has been no criticism of him in connection with this situation, I understand, has nothing whatever to do with the KixMiller project, and undoubtedly his name has been used without authority and entirely without justification.

Stamp Commemorating Poland's Resistance to the Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily Times and an address delivered by the Honorable Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General of the United States, at the main post office, Chicago, Ill., on Tuesday, June 22, 1943, formally placing on sale the stamp commemorating Poland's resistance to the Axis:

[From the Chicago Daily Times]

COURAGE OF POLES PRAISED BY WALKER IN DEDICATING STAMP

Stressing the spiritual kinship between all men who fight for the dignity of humanity, Postmaster General Frank C. Walker dedicated a postage stamp today commemorating Poland's resistance to the Axis.

In ceremonies at the new post-office building at Canal and Van Buren, the new issue was placed on sale, marking the first time in history that the flag of another nation has been represented on United States postage. Similar ceremonies were held in Washington.

A 5-cent stamp, it contains the flag, the name of the country, an engraving of a

phoenix symbolizing renewal of life and a kneeling woman from whose outstretched arms shackles have fallen, representing release from oppression.

Poland was chosen to be honored in the first of a series of new stamps dedicated to members of the United Nations because, Walker said, "she is in a sense the mother of the United Nations. It was Poland who took the initial blows of the enemy, faced him without flinching, and fought him alone while her friends were powerless to intervene."

Walker praised the contributions of Americans of Polish descent to the advancement of this Nation and remarked that the Poles' hardihood and their almost incredible courage compel the admiration of the world.

Carol Ripa, consul general of Poland, accepted the first stamp from Walker on behalf of his country, while Francis X. Swietlik, president of the Polish National Council and dean of the law school at Marquette University, served as master of ceremonies.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE FRANK C. WALKER, POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Here in Chicago, our greatest center of Americans of Polish blood, we are gathered today in an act of homage without precedent in our history.

Today, when we dedicate the stamp in tribute to Poland, as the first of the overrun countries of the United Nations we are honoring, we make it the official paper of the United States. From this moment on, wherever the authority of the United States is recognized, the flag of Poland, as engraved on this new issue, will pass through our mails. Never before has the unfurled flag of another nation been represented on the postage of the United States.

We do this, not grudgingly, but with pride and assurance that what we do is right. Simple gratitude for what Poland and the Poles have done for America and for humanity has inspired this recognition.

Here in Chicago today, our hearts and minds are filled with the knowledge of what is happening thousands of miles away—as the aggressor who overran the peaceful hills and pleasant farm lands of Poland attempts with ruthless cruelty to break the hearts and the spirit of a people who refuse to submit to him. If he knew history, he would spare himself the pains. Sensible men who have read the record of the past know that some peoples cannot be vanquished—the flower of their youth may be cut down in battle, their cities may be reduced to rubble, but their spirit will survive the tyrant and emerge strong and vigorous when he has been overthrown.

Such a people are the Poles. Time and again throughout the ages their land has been occupied by invaders. Time after time Poland has broken her chains and taken her rightful place with her sister nations.

America long has had cause to be grateful to Poland. When we were engaged in our own struggle for independence she sent us two of her sons, Pulaski and Kosciusko. Pulaski gave his life in the Battle of Savannah. Kosciusko, hero of our Revolution and friend of Jefferson, returned to fight for the liberation of his own land.

There was spiritual kinship between all of these men who fought for the dignity of humanity. There is such a kinship today between all who fight the people's war for liberty.

Pulaski and Kosciusko epitomize what Poland has done for America, and, in stressing the glories of these heroes, we bring into focus the great achievements of the Poles who followed them to America.

Sprung from the stock which gave to the world Kopernicki and Mme. Curie, Chopin and Paderewski, they, with their achievements in the arts and sciences, have enriched the culture of America. In Chicago, and in the Nation, men and women of Polish descent have achieved places of distinction in every sphere of the community's life.

They came to us in great numbers. By the sweat of their brows and the goodness of their lives they paid America back in full measure for the freedom America gave to them. Thriving farms bear witness to their toil. Great manufacturing centers stand in testimony to the fact that no work proved too hard for the Poles. Theirs was one of the foremost parts in the industrial development of America.

This Nation has been blessed because so many races brought us the gifts of their homelands. The Poles brought us the rich traditions of a people who have known suffering through the ages, and yet are noted for their buoyancy of spirit. Poland is old in tragedy and sorrow, but she is forever young with new hope and new life. Poland is the land of the rainbow—the rainbow of hope after storms, the rainbow of living color and romance.

Many here today have sons in the armed services who have distinguished themselves in battle. The War Department recently honored two young Chicago flyers for meritorious achievements with the Eighth Air Force in England. All of you know other men of Polish descent who are fighting in the cause of humanity and worthy of all the honor that we can give them.

There is a world of symbolism in the stamp we dedicate today. Poland is selected as the first nation of the group to be honored because it was Poland who took the initial blows of the enemy faced him without flinching, and fought him alone while her friends were powerless to intervene. Poland is honored today because, in a sense, she is the mother of the United Nations. Poles typify the common cause as they fight side by side with the freedom-loving men of all nations, and their hardihood and their almost incredible courage compel the admiration of the world.

There is classic symbolism in the phoenix represented on the stamp. The ancients believed that this bird, after living for centuries, would be consumed by fire, and would rise in youthful freshness from its own ashes. At the right side of the stamp, there is a kneeling woman, with outstretched arms from which the shackles have fallen. It is between these figures representing immortality and liberation that the emblem of Poland waves.

My fellow Americans, let us draw inspiration from what we do here today. Let us, from the contemplation of the heroic deeds of the Poles, draw courage for the tasks we are called upon to perform for our country. Let us learn from Poland some of her faith in the triumph of right, and boldly face trials until that triumph is achieved. Let us learn from Poland, and from the Poles who fight for humanity wherever they can find a gun, a destroyer or a plane, that the struggle in which we are engaged is everyone's struggle. Having learned that, we will stand together as United Nations, remove the pall of fear that hangs over our homes and our shrines, and be worthy of the freedom which we have won.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Raleigh, N. C.:

Whereas the Farm Security Administration is one of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture, and as such is charged with the specific responsibility of providing supervised credit for those farm families, tenants, sharecroppers, renters, and laborers who are unable to secure adequate financing from any other source, such as local banks, Production Credit Association, etc.; and

Whereas the program of the Farm Security Administration is based on supervised credit, which means that funds are lent to farm families on the basis of a sound farm and home management plan prepared by the families in consultation with technically trained field personnel of the Farm Security Administration, and the loans are secured by mortgages on crops and livestock and are still further secured by the technical advice and guidance given the borrowers by the local representatives of the Farm Security Administration; and

Whereas during the present emergency the Farm Security Administration has pointed its entire efforts toward increased food production through employing sound farm and home management practices, which result not only in increased production, but in conservation of the land and of the families on the land; and

Whereas the home-management phase of the program has resulted in the conservation of millions of quarts of home-produced foods, and more adequate and better-balanced diets and the general improvement of family health; and, in addition, the medical-care program has brought adequate medical services to thousands who previously were unable to provide such services for their families on an individual basis; and

Whereas the Farm Security Administration administers the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act through which worthy farm families are enabled to purchase family-size farms and pay for them over a maximum period of 40 years; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Raleigh Business and Professional Women's Club go on record as endorsing the program of the Farm Security Administration, particularly as it relates to the home-management practices, and increased food production and conservation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Raleigh Business and Professional Women's Club respectfully petition the Congress to continue the activities of the Farm Security Administration, at least for the duration of the present emergency.

Women in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of June 10, 1943:

WAAC'S IMMORAL? POLICE HERE CALL 'EM PERFECT

(By L. P. Patterson)

"What's all this fiddle-faddle about immorality in the WAAC?" Atlanta police demanded Thursday with a spirited leap to the defense of service women of all branches.

A survey of police records of the past 12 months, Chief M. A. Hornsby reveals, shows

that the ladies of the armed forces have proven themselves gentlewomen of the old southern school in every respect. Not a one, he adds, has been arrested for any offense whatsoever, or even as much as warned to leave a disreputable place.

And as for disturbances on the streets, why, it's ridiculous, the chief avers.

BEHAVIOR IS PERFECT

WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and Lady Marines abound on the streets of Atlanta, Chief Hornsby notes, but regardless of what the scandalmongers would have you believe, their behavior has been nothing short of perfect.

Chief Hornsby's observation is seconded by Maj. James H. Hogan, the Army's provost marshal for Fort McPherson and Atlanta. Should any of the service girls be accused of misconduct, Major Hogan's corps of military policemen would be called upon to handle the situation. But Thursday the military police staff stationed at police headquarters said they have not even formulated plans for handling feminine prisoners at the downtown station.

Major Hogan believes that the WAAC's and other servicewomen have maintained such a marvelous law-abiding record because they know that they are in the military spotlight and that any indiscretion on the part of any one of them would bring more notoriety to their corps than if the same offense was committed by 100 male soldiers.

ALWAYS IN A HURRY

Atlanta's policemen on duty at train and bus terminals have also noticed the unimpeachable conduct of servicewomen. Their neat appearance, businesslike attitude, and always hurried pace were first to attract their attention.

"Whenever you see a WAAC around Atlanta," one officer said, "she gives the impression of being bound for somewhere in a big hurry. They don't hang around to kill time like the men do sometimes."

Atlanta's beer emporiums, policemen on the beat report, have never been much of an attraction to members of the Army Auxiliary.

Of course, military authorities concede, an organization as large as the WAAC cannot escape recruiting a few unsatisfactory members, but Atlanta's police department will testify that none of these have reached this city. And with a determined vice and public-drinking drive under way, it would be impossible for all of them to escape detection if the things some people say about them were true.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
Raleigh, N. C., June 18, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: Ever since Chester Davis asked me to serve on a committee to study the Farm Security Administration I have been trying to digest and assimilate long and formidable compilations of statistics, data, official findings, expert opinions, reports to congressional committees, etc.

A few days ago, however, I decided to do something I wish every other investigator would do. I decided to forget statistics for the time being and go out and talk with the real flesh-and-blood men, women, and children right around me, here in Wake County (all within a few miles of my own farm home) who have received Farm Security Administration assistance through the tenant purchase program. I sat down with them in their surprisingly neat, cleanly, and attractive and economically built cottages, walked over their crops, visited their barns and outbuildings, saw their cows and chickens and children.

In all my experience in agricultural investigations I have seldom had a more exhilarating and inspiring experience.

There was something in the light on the faces of these men and women, something of their new faith in themselves and their future, that mere statistics can never capture or reveal but which on the contrary made all Farm Security Administration statistics and reports seem definitely cold and lifeless by comparison. I was reminded of Walt Whitman's famous poem, "When I Heard the Great Astronomer"—when the great scientist made Whitman dizzy with a maze of theories and figures—" 'til I went out and looked up in perfect silence at the stars."

If the fine faith in themselves and their future was the deepest impression I got from seeing these Farm Security Administration clients, then the next deepest was the downright good neighborliness of these people. "We couldn't live in a better neighborhood" was an expression repeated by nearly every farmer; * * * and I have all my life observed that when a man says he lives in a good neighborhood, he is practically always himself a good neighbor. Nor can I escape the feeling that in part at least these people are good neighbors because they feel that the United States Government itself has played the part of a good neighbor to them. It has not coddled them or regimented them, according to the information given me, but it has given them a chance—a chance to help themselves—and they have responded in a truly noble way.

To the wives of these men especially it seemed to me that the opportunity to own their homes had brought a transforming inspiration. "That man has a smart wife," I found myself saying as I left almost every home. For women in preeminent degree are concerned about their children, the future generation, and to be able to lift their children from tenancy to home ownership seemed to raise the whole level of life for all these women. All are hard working, but of not one did I have the feeling that she was a drudge or felt her daily work to be drudgery. Hope lightened and brightened their labors. Perhaps their neat, cheery, compact, well-planned little kitchens—built or remodeled under Farm Security Administration plans—had much to do with it, the surprisingly bright, cheerful, airy living rooms, and the paint which colors and cheers every house. But even deeper than all this is the inspiration of being able to plan confidently for the future. As the wife said in the last home I visited:

"I wish everybody could have the chance Farm Security Administration has given us. It's the grandest thing in the world to have your own home and be able to plan for it as long as you live. When you are renting from somebody else you cannot plan anything ahead—not even a fall garden."

Of course, the impressions received on this trip to my own Farm Security Administration client neighbors may not be wholly typical, Mr. COOLEY, but in estimating for Farm Security Administration as a whole you could discount by 25, 30, 40, or even 50 percent the findings based on this sample near my own home and still have an overwhelmingly powerful argument for continuing Farm Security Administration. If the folks who are so much concerned about preserving "the American way of life" and "our system of free enterprise" only had sense enough to see it, they would realize that America's best safeguard against communism or any wild radicalism is by encouraging thrift and home ownership by the masses of our people.

I do not wish to prolong unduly my report of what I saw on this visit to Farm Security Administration clients and so will conclude briefly with these other things that impressed me:

1. "Live at home" practices including good gardens, milk cows, poultry.
2. Soil-improving practices.
3. Healthy children.
4. Careful record keeping.
5. Shrubbery around houses.

And finally this remark of one client: "A neighbor came to me at the week end and said, 'What are you going to do this afternoon?' 'Well, I have caught up with my work and had planned to go fishing.' Then I learned that if he didn't get help about cleaning out his cotton right away, he'd lose a lot, so I was glad to pitch in and help him."

My conclusion: The very best of all the fine things the Farm Security Administration is doing is something that can't be caught in statistics and official records. It is building good citizens.

Yours sincerely,

CLARENCE POE,
President and Editor.

Distribution of Petroleum

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly asked that Mr. Ickes be given complete control of the petroleum situation in order to fix the responsibility, but that has not been done. I am very glad to note that Mr. Nelson has set up committees to let people know, and have the O. P. A., the P. A. W., and the O. D. T. know, what is going on in the different departments handling petroleum, and to bring about a more equitable distribution of that commodity.

Mr. Nelson, in answer to a question I asked him at a meeting of the east coast Members of Congress the other day, said that he had the power to straighten out this situation. He speaks of people on the east coast having to wear hair shirts. Certainly we on the east coast have worn nothing but hair shirts for months and months and months. We have had the rankest discrimination against us. I am overjoyed that Mr. Nelson has stated that this condition will be changed and that there will be a more equitable distribution. We are fighting very hard in our section of the country to help win the war. We are glad to do our share in every way, but there is no reason why we should be made to suffer unduly in comparison with the rest of the country. No other nation has discriminated against one section of the country in rationing of fuel. It is thoroughly undemocratic and completely unjust.

The article referred to is as follows:

IN THE NATION—MR. NELSON IMPROVES PETROLEUM CONTROLS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—More equitable, effective and fewer hair-shirt methods of dealing with the supplies of motor and heating fuel that can be spared to civilians without harm to the military program can at last be reasonably expected. Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, has set up a coordinated system of distribution and allocation which will permit the left hand of Petroleum Administration for War to know at all times what the right hand of the Office of Price Administration is doing and enable Mr. Nelson to unify the movements of the two hands of Government.

The committees he has set up—one on petroleum requirements and the other on petroleum rationing—are intended to serve as clearing houses for the whole activity, exchanging information constantly and promptly appealing differences of policy to Mr. Nelson. By the terms of his commission he has the power to settle such differences and he has decided to retain it instead of turning it over to Secretary Ickes, in the latter's capacity as Administrator of Petroleum Administration for War.

What has been lacking is not an official with responsibility to match authority at the head of the petroleum program, but coordinating machinery for distribution and allocation that is workable, flexible, and ready at all times for service. The two committees should provide this machinery. And hope for more equitable and intelligent functioning springs from the fact that the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration are to be represented.

PUNISHING FARM FOLK

One of the basic blunders of the off again-on again pleasure-driving ban has been the stubborn refusal of the Office of Price Administration to make any distinction between the uses of A cards allowed in the towns and in the country. Undiscriminating enforcement of the ban has condemned the farming population, producers of the essential war supply of food, to imprisonment on the farms. It has denied to them the normal and morale-sustaining recreations which are available to dwellers in the towns and cities and to those who live near adequate public means of transportation to sources of recreation.

Suggestions to the city-minded rule makers at the Office of Price Administration that country people should be put on some rationing plan that would open to them some of the privileges of the urban population have gone unheeded. But Mr. Nelson is both aware of and sympathetic to the inequality, and he believes in the tonic value to the war program of removing it. That is one reason why he has arranged for agricultural representation on the committees.

He does not propose—nor does anyone who has pointed out the discrimination—that any gasoline should be transported or used that will in any way slow up the most vigorous possible prosecution of the war. But, unlike Mr. Ickes, he thinks it may be possible to remove inequalities and devise a better system than the present one of issuing coupons for which no gasoline is available, or, when it is, of refusing to permit those who obtain the gasoline to use it as they wish. Fewer coupons, based on the amount of gasoline allocated, extinction of the black market, and more freedom of use is Mr. Nelson's basic policy.

WHAT IRRITATES THE EAST

An aspect of the situation which has set up resistance in the East to the rationing program is the immunity of the Midwest from the pleasure-driving ban and from the cut in coupon value. Not a traveler returns from that region to the seaboard who does not feel, express, and often carry out resentment against the discrimination. He is suspicious of the arguments advanced for its necessity, the more so after Governor Dewey recently drove a horse-and-wagon of fact through several of them.

One angry traveler brought to this department the following dispatch from Lansing, Mich., to the Detroit Free Press of June 15.

"Rumors that State police have been stopping Detroit and other motorists bound for northern Michigan vacations (taking up their ration books) and turning them back on the grounds that they were pleasure driving were branded untrue in every particular, Monday, by Capt. Laurence Lyon, head of the State police uniform division. * * * Captain Lyon said the rumors * * * became so prevalent among Ohio residents planning Michigan vacations that he wrote a letter denying the story to Ohio police authorities."

It takes more reasons than Mr. Ickes and others have been able to give thus far to bring persuasion to the East that A cards may not be used there without damage to the war program, but that Midwest motorists can drive 300 miles to vacation points without inflicting damage. And very few citizens in any part of the country are better reconciled to the various bans when they read (Joe Williams in the World-Telegram), "You see Mexico City, an ally, teeming with motor cars on the loose. There is all the gas, oil, and fuel you can handle. The libre, or taxi, will take you anywhere, literally from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean and back again. * * * How can you help asking yourself why one country at war must practice self-denial and another country engaged in the same war is subject to no restrictions?"

Mr. Nelson's intention is to gain respect and adherence to petroleum rationing by making it coherent and equitable.

Women in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of June 11, 1943:

WHAT ABOUT WAAC'S AND WAVES?—WHAT SORT OF MEN ARE OUR SOLDIERS?

(By Vida J. Williamson)

These questions have been heard by everyone. They are, to put it bluntly, dumb questions.

Our soldiers are the same sort of people as our American youth and young men—because they are these; and almost all of them at that. They are good, they are bad, they are indifferent. Mostly through a long period of propaganda we kind of idolize them in a way—but that doesn't make them any different; they are still just all of our American men.

Then what about the WAAC's and the WAVES? Well, the same holds true; they are our American women. Not what women used to be—they are modern American women. Better? Worse? Well, who knows? But whether better or worse they are still our women, and no different in uniform than out, except that they have more careful training there, more careful supervision and much harder work.

"But I heard * * *" "You know they say * * *" "Have you heard * * *?" "Buzz-buzz-zzz * * *."

Yes, we've heard; and, yes, we know they say * * *. We also know that all such sayings and rumors should correctly close with a click of the heels, an outstretched arm, and a guttural "Heil."

Women of known bad character are not accepted in these organizations—but then neither are women of known bad character accepted in our clubs, schools, or colleges—yet in all of these there are the circumspect, the careless, and even the daring—the good, the bad, and the indifferent.

These same women are in our country's uniform; that you or I—any of us—should repeat a rumor that would besmirch the honor of that uniform is thoughtless treason. That any of us who are women should do this is double treason—treason against the uniform of our country and treason against our sex.

Certainly there will be isolated cases of indiscretion; I don't personally know of any and have not personally heard of any except the "propaganda type" described above; but, to quote our own editorial of a couple of weeks ago, the WAVES and WAAC's "are not God A'mighty." A woman must be 21 years old to join the WAVES. If you want to know what sort of women belong, then look about you at the women 21 years old and above; vision them with a little more energy, a little more vitality, a little more ambition, a little more love of country perhaps than most; add a lot of training, a lot of discipline, the effect of a lot of daily hard work on character, and you'll know what sort of women make up our "women in uniform."

Did you stop last week and pick up a soldier boy, ask him about his folks, and think, "Such a fine fellow, so far away from home; I just want to do something for him"? If you did, that was fine.

Did you see a lovely young woman in uniform walk down the street last week, and did you step back a little, stare curiously, and whisper to your companion—maybe snicker a little? If you did that—especially if you yourself are a woman—then shame!

Most of us in Carroll County have seen only a few women in uniform—occasionally at a patriotic meeting, in a railroad station, a bus station, or some eating place—but have you noticed the dignified bearing, the orderly appearance, the correctness of behavior that always characterizes them?

That's training—it's good training. We could stand a little of it for ourselves.

Irrigated Lands in Support of the Nation's War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, water is the lifeblood of agriculture and industry in the western third of the United States, and the recent announcement by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes that a good water year is in prospect for irrigation and hydroelectric power is definitely good news.

More than 70 percent of the food produced in the West for the sustenance of

more than 15,000,000 civilians and the increasing military population comes from irrigated land. The Bureau of Reclamation, under the Department of the Interior, is a major operator of irrigation projects in 15 Western States.

Better than 80 percent of the power that is turning the wheels of war industry on the Pacific coast and in the inter-mountain States is produced from the water resources of the region. The Bureau of Reclamation is the largest Federal operator of hydroelectric power facilities and last year produced more than 20 percent of the electric energy generated in the West.

Under these circumstances, the report on water conditions in the West by Commissioner John C. Page, of the Bureau of Reclamation, to Secretary Ickes is of prime importance.

A news release of the Bureau of Reclamation on the report as to the outlook for water in 1943 and one on the Bureau's contribution of the power requirements of the West are as follows:

GOOD WATER YEAR IN PROJECT

A good water year unquestionably is indicated for Bureau of Reclamation power and irrigation projects in the West, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today. The forecast was based on summaries by Reclamation Commissioner John C. Page of snow surveys in the drainage basins of western streams which feed the Bureau's reservoirs, major suppliers for food and hydroelectric energy in the area.

In some basins, the run-off will be the greatest in a quarter of a century, Secretary Ickes declared.

"The Bureau's storage capacity of 61,600,000 acre-feet of water is more than 70 percent of the total capacity available for power and irrigation in the West," Mr. Page advised the Secretary. "Bureau projects are making major contributions to the prosecution of the war. They generate huge blocks of power and provide dependable supplies of water for industrial plants and military establishments costing more than half a billion dollars, and, in 1942, produced irrigated crops valued at $250,000,000. Adequate supplies for Boulder Dam in the Pacific Southwest and Grand Coulee Dam in the Pacific Northwest will insure in 1943 the largest power output by 70 percent in the Bureau's history.

"The snow surveys and irrigation forecasts definitely come under the heading of 'Good news,'" Mr. Page added. "This year more diligently than ever we are striving to expand the production of food for the armed forces and civilians and the generation of power for war industries. Maximum utilization of the high water content in the mountain snows will help reach the goal. Every acre of irrigated land and every kilowatt of power will be of greater importance this year than at any time in the Nation's history."

The run-off of the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest is expected to equal or exceed that of the highest years on record. The Bureau's giant power plant at Grand Coulee Dam, as well as the plant at Bonneville Dam, depend on this stream. They serve aluminum plants producing more than one-fourth of the Nation's output of this important light metal. The run-off of the Yakima River may reach a peak surpassed only once in 24 years. A tributary of the Columbia, the Yakima River supplies the Yakima project in Washington, a heavy producer of food crops. The mountain snows of another tributary, the Umatilla River in northern Oregon, feeding the project of that name, are nearly 50 percent heavier than normal.

The accumulated precipitation of the Clark Fork in western Montana, which also discharges into the Columbia, is 57 percent above average. Irrigated lands of the Bureau's Bitter Root and Frenchtown developments receive their water from this stream.

Never in 25 years has the water content of the snow along the upper Snake River and tributaries, the Owyhee, Boise, and Payette, been as high as this year. These streams serve the upper Snake, Minidoka, and Boise projects in Idaho, and the Owyhee, Vale, and Burnt River in Oregon. The Minidoka and Boise projects are also important power producers in the inter-mountain region.

Present conditions indicate that the run-off of the Missouri and its tributaries will be much above normal. Snow cover on the Yellowstone is more than double that of a year ago, and on the Milk River, one-third above last year's figure. These streams in the Upper Missouri supply the Riverton and Shoshone projects in Wyoming, the Buford-Trenton (North Dakota), Belle Fourche (South Dakota), and the Montana projects of Sun River, Milk River, Huntley, Buffalo Rapids, and Lower Yellowstone (the latter also partly in North Dakota).

The outlook is very favorable for this season's run-off of the North Platte River and tributaries, from which the North Platte (Nebraska-Wyoming) project is supplied with water for power and irrigation, and the Kendrick (Wyoming) project for power. Principal reservoirs of the Bureau on the North Platte contain the largest carry-over since 1929.

The Elephant Butte reservoir on the Rio Grande will be full at the start of the irrigation season. It serves the Rio Grande project (New Mexico-Texas), a producer of food crops, cotton and power. On the Pecos River, serving the Carlsbad development in New Mexico, the snow cover is less than a year ago.

The water content of the snow on the headwaters of the Colorado above Grand Junction is 20 percent greater than last year at this time. In the headwaters of the Green River, a tributary of the Colorado, it is the greatest in many years and about two and one-half times that of 1942. The Gunnison project in Colorado, will be about average. The Grand Valley (Colorado) irrigation and power project is served by diversions from the Colorado. The Moon Lake, Strawberry Valley, and Sanpete irrigation projects in Utah are served by tributaries of the Colorado River where the indications are of a fair run-off.

The run-off in the headwaters of the Colorado, which is expected to be above average, is an important factor in power and food production in the Pacific Southwest. Lake Mead, the largest storage reservoir in the world, is fed from the Colorado and supplies Boulder power plant, the world's largest, which provides power to the war industries in Nevada and California. Water releases from Boulder Dam also produce power downstream at Parker Dam and on the Yuma project in Arizona. Boulder releases also assure an adequate irrigation supply for the highly productive areas of the Imperial Valley, California, and the Yuma Valley, Arizona.

POWER FROM WATER RESOURCES

The carry-over in the reservoirs of the Salt and Verde Rivers, Ariz., which provide water for the Salt River reclamation project, may be sufficient for this year's operations even though the snow coverage in the headwaters of these two streams is disappointing. Power from Parker Dam and stand-by plants will protect the power needs of that area in even water is not adequate.

Accumulative precipitation in the northern half of Utah assures an abundant water supply in 1943 for the reclamation projects served by that drainage area, the Hyrum, Ogden River, and Weber River.

An increase of 57 percent over last year is expected in the run-off of the Klamath Lake Basin. The Klamath project in Oregon and California, an outstanding potato-producing area in the West, will benefit from the additional supply.

BIG POWER CONTRIBUTION MADE

Bureau of Reclamation power plants provided 70 percent of the generating capacity added in 1942 to speed war production in the 11 far Western States, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today. The greater part of the power capacity was installed at Grand Coulee Dam in Washington and at Boulder and Parker Dams in the Pacific Southwest. The statement was made on the basis of information just compiled and submitted to the Secretary by Reclamation Commissioner John C. Page.

Commissioner Page reported that the Bureau installed 393,500 of the 557,000 kilowatts added in the West last year. In 1943 the agency will contribute 500,000 of the 825,000 new kilowatts scheduled for installation. Bureau power is generated as a byproduct of multiple-purpose projects having as their primary function the conversion through irrigation of arid lands into productive farms.

"Farm lands in the West irrigated by reclamation systems are providing a substantial part of the war food requirements for the increasing civilian and military population which has resulted from the war," Secretary Ickes observed. "Commissioner Page advises me that the outlook for the 1943 contribution of food supplies is greater than that in 1942 if the farmers on reclamation projects can secure labor and machinery. I understand that transcontinental railroads are experiencing a heavy increase in the westward movement of foodstuffs to meet the growing demands for food."

In his report to Secretary Ickes, Commissioner Page stated: "Seven billion of the 31,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours generated in approximately 700 western power plants in 1942 came from Bureau projects, further emphasizing the war values of our facilities. Western generators produced 5,000,000,000 more kilowatt-hours in 1942 than in 1941, and 3,000,000,000 of this increase was delivered by Bureau plants. This year the Bureau's kilowatt-hour output will reach 12,000,000,000, 5,000,000,000 above the 1942 record.

"American industry, I am told, produced three and one-half times as many aircraft in 1942 as in 1941, six times as many guns, tanks, and ammunition, nearly three times as many naval vessels, and five times as many merchant ships. These are remarkable gains. The Bureau of Reclamation, through its multiple-purpose projects planned under your administration, was able to supply nearly one-fourth of all the electric energy generated in the West in 1942 and used in war industries.

"Reclamation installations today total 1,718,362 kilowatts, which by June 1944, will be increased to nearly 2,500,000 kilowatts, equal to the installation of all power plants on the Pacific coast in 1925. Further additions that would bring the capacity to 3,200,000 kilowatts by 1945–46 have been halted by the War Production Board.

"The increased power supply in the West has brought an unprecedented industrial growth there. According to the data of the War Production Board and the National Industrial Conference Board western industries have been granted Government war contracts totaling $14,000,000,000. The area's development, stimulated by the war, is expected to continue at the end of the hostilities when the vast facilities now devoted to filling war orders are converted to the production of peacetime necessities. Bureau generators will continue to serve these plants after the war.

"As a further contribution in the post-war period, the Bureau is prepared to provide employment and settlement opportunities for workers released from war plants and for ex-servicemen. If the Bureau of Reclamation is not permitted to start work sooner to add to war food supplies, it can resume construction at the end of the war on 20 irrigation projects now halted by the War Production Board, and begin work on 9 others authorized but deferred at the start of the war. Production of food on the irrigated lands of new and existing projects will continue to be as important at the conclusion of the war in meeting the needs of the United Nations as it is today."

The Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent which, in my opinion, strikes at the heart of this subsidy program:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *June 16, 1943.*
Congressman C. NORRIS POULSON,
Member, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POULSON: Strange as it may seem, I have never before written a letter to a Congressman. Many times I have felt the impulse to do so, but human inertia had its way, and the letter was never written.

I am not one of those dyed-in-the-wool foes of the present administration. Some things seemed right, and others wrong. The Supreme Court bill was an evil thing—and Congress so declared it and crushed out its life, and the American people gave a sigh of relief.

I believe that the present and impending subsidy program for wholesalers, and so forth, is likewise a very evil thing, and likewise presents a fight or die challenge to Congress which cannot be ignored. I say this in all sincerity. The manner in which this program was brazenly announced by the administration—the obvious contempt for public opinion on the subject—and the evil concomitants and end products of such a program now being forced upon the American people—all present a challenge to our American way of life.

We cannot roll back prices by bribing price fixers. Human greed, once fed and encouraged, becomes insatiable. This seems so obvious that the existence of some evil, ulterior motive behind such a program seems undeniable. So far as I am concerned, I would rather pay food prices twice or three times as high as those now prevailing rather than see such a program carried to its inevitable conclusion. And there are many defense workers and common laborers earning more money today than myself. Such a program, expanded to its natural limits, will soon result in socialism. I would rather see the money thrown into the Pacific ocean than go to food profiteers.

Food profiteers are today's greatest saboteurs of our wartime economy. Yet not one word is said against them, but instead I am told that constantly increasing prices—increasing every day—are inevitably the result of high wages and too much money in circulation. This is undoubtedly true, but there is a limit to all things. And when I discover that barracuda, a common local salt water fish, is purchased from commercial fishermen at Newport and Santa Monica for 12 cents and 15 cents a pound already cleaned, and sold for as high as 45 cents a pound by the same concern that purchased it from the fisherman—and then sold by the butcher to the public at 52 cents a pound—I don't need a Harvard economics professor to tell me that the wholesaler is in the same class as a robber. Yet, under the subsidy program, we are supposed to pay off the wholesaler so he will see his way clear to reduce his prices without affecting his 300-percent profit.

My sympathies in this matter are all with the farmer and the fisherman—the man who is doing the producing and who is providing us with our food supply. If this subsidy program could be of benefit to him, however, I still would not support it—nor would any proud American farmer ask or accept financial gratuities from the Government in exchange for his own economic independence. Some have, I admit, in the past—but always to their ultimate regret.

In writing the foregoing, I am thinking of actual cases which have come to my attention, as a lawyer and public servant. Evil as these things have been, I still believe that it is up to the American farmer, and the American fisherman too, to work out his own economic salvation to the ends that justice shall be done, and to the end that he shall receive a fair price for the product of his own hands. That is what builds men and that is what America stands for.

Respectfully yours,

CLARENCE OGG.

Address of Hon. Jack Nichols, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK NICHOLS
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by me May 28, at Muskogee, Okla.:

NICHOLS ANNOUNCES INTENTION TO QUIT FOR TRANSCONTINENTAL WESTERN AIR, INC., POSITION—DATE NOT SPECIFIED; MAKES NO ATTEMPT TO "PLACE HIS MANTLE"

Representative JACK NICHOLS of the second Oklahoma district last night officially announced his intention of resigning his seat in Congress to become vice president of Transcontinental Western Air, Inc.

The announcement was made at the conclusion of a dinner meeting in the Officers Club at the Hotel Severs at which approximately 100 of the key men in Nichols' political organization were his guests, and provided official confirmation of a report that had gained wide dissemination earlier in the week, climaxed by Thursday's announcement by Trancontinental Western Air, Inc. officials of his election as vice president.

The Congressman mentioned no specific date for his resignation, although previous reports had it as July 1—and he made no attempt to select his successor.

MATTERS TO CLEAR UP

After addressing his guests for more than an hour, during which time he lauded their loyalty and constancy and traced the building of the organization from the first day he announced his candidacy back in 1934 down to the present, the Congressman said:

"And now I come to perhaps the most difficult moment that ever has confronted me. Believe me when I say my heart is heavy as I tell you that it is my intention to tender my resignation from my seat in Congress.

"That I will do as soon as a certain election contest filed by a 'political accident' is disposed of—and I am confident that it will be disposed of within a short time—and as soon as the machinery has been set in motion to alleviate the great suffering caused in this district by the worst flood in history. (The first reference obviously was to the election contest filed by E. O. Clark, Stigler Republican, now pending before a House election committee.)

NO "CROWN PRINCE"

"To you, my loyal friends—and you are the faithful—I say this in all sincerity: This could only be bearable to me because I go, resting secure in the belief that most of you find yourselves in a position that offers you at least temporary security.

"There are no crown princes. There is no crown prince. I place my mantle on no one. If I were to attempt to select one to take my place, I would have to make that selection from among you. That I could not do, for I hold each one of you in equal high esteem; not one of you holds a higher place in my affection or in my regard than the other. It would be impossible for me to choose from among you.

"I will say this to you: You, as an organization, can elect anybody to Congress you choose to elect. I don't care who it is.

LITTLE TO SAY OF NEW JOB

"Whether or not I have any further political ambitions we will discuss at a later date. But I do have one last favor to ask of you, if you feel that you can grant it. I would like to be named a delegate to the 1944 Democratic national convention. I want to keep my finger on the political pulse of the Nation, of the State, and of the district, for this will ever by my home."

For the record, NICHOLS said only that his duties as vice president of the Transcontinental Western Airlines would have to do with the place of commercial aviation in both the present and post-war economy of the Nation. "Off the record" he elaborated slightly on that statement.

After the dinner the Congressman was presented to this "gathering of the faithful" by Kelly Brown, his close personal friend and political advisor, who acted as toastmaster.

NICHOLS began his address of farewell by declaring that never had he found himself given to hesitancy in any situation, under any circumstances, but "tonight I want for words."

FRIENDS PUT TO TEST

"This is a most difficult assignment," he said. "There is nothing stronger or bigger than friendship, and I feel very humble in the presence of all of you who have done what you have done for me—electing me to Congress and keeping me there for five terms.

"This is not the parting of the ways, but in a sense I feel that I am letting you down. I feel it the more deeply because I realize how fortunate I have been to have had friends like you as I climbed life's pathway. Ours has been a common alliance. Nobody could have put his friends to the acid test more times than I have you. Nobody could have responded each time more loyally. And even though I feel I am letting you down, my hope is that you will not feel that I am quitting in the middle of the stream. A desire to discharge a responsibility has always moved me, and I have come to my decision, which I will announce tonight, after long consideration and with the conviction that in accepting this new assignment I am

discharging a real responsibility to my country."

OFFERED SERVICES

NICHOLS then made direct reference to two pledges made in previous campaigns and revealed for the first time something he said "I never have told even you before"—the fact that he was within a few days of receiving a reserve commission as lieutenant commander in the intelligence department of the Navy.

"Back in 1938 I said I would never vote to send American boys to fight on foreign soil to settle a local quarrel; that I would never vote to send American boys to fight on foreign soil unless this Nation were attacked or in imminent danger of attack. I reiterated that statement in 1940. I was never more serious in my life, nor was I ever more serious than when I said if I ever did vote for war I would offer my services to my country in its armed forces.

"On December 7, 1941, when the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor I was in Muskogee and was given the privilege of speaking over KBIX on that black Sunday afternoon. I said then that when I got back to Washington I would offer my services to my country in the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Marines, if my Government felt that I could be of more service there than in Congress. I was never more serious, although I was accused of making that statement for purely political purposes.

F. D. R. AGAINST RESIGNATION

"Early in 1941 I had been recommended for a reserve commission as lieutenant commander in the Navy. I passed all the physical and other examinations. Just a few days before I was to receive my commission, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz issued an order that no more reserve commissions should be issued to any Congressman.

"As soon as I got back to Washington after the Pearl Harbor attack, I went to see President Roosevelt. That was on December 10. I told him I wanted to resign from Congress to become part of the Armed Forces. He said, 'Jack, perish the thought.'

"I told him my very word was at stake; that I had promised my people that the minute we voted for war I had said I would offer my services for combat duty. He replied, 'Jack, everything now has to be measured by the yardstick of service. In my opinion, you can be of far greater service as one among 435 Members of the Lower House of Congress than you can as one among several million soldiers. Don't for a moment entertain such a wish.'

"I wrote to Chief of Staff Marshall. I wrote to the Secretary of War. But to no avail, and for a time I was sustained by the words of the President.

BROTHER TALKED "BRUTALLY"

"Then, several months ago, I was approached by an official of the Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc. He said that I had gained certain valuable knowledge of aviation and its ramifications. That I had been the outstanding champion in Congress of maintaining for the United States the supremacy in the air we had always held. He said I could be of great service both to his company and to the United States if I would put that knowledge to use in private activities with his company.

"Again and again I was importuned. Finally I had a long talk with my brother, Clark Nichols. He was as brutal with me as only a brother can be. He told me that I thought I was a great patriot; that while I thought I was doing the patriotic thing by trying to enter the armed forces, actually I was doing little more than indulge my own selfishness, that it was the glamor of the uniform that was appealing to me more than patriotism.

"That was pretty rough. But it set me to thinking. I had spent 9 years in constant study of aviation. The last 6 of those years had been spent in the study of the geographics of the world, and more recently to a study of the part aviation would play in this Nation's recovery from the shock of the war. It finally dawned on me that this was the thing about which I knew the most, and that, while it hasn't the glamor of an Army or Navy or Coast Guard or marine uniform, perhaps it was after all the medium through which I could best serve my country.

LEAVES FOR WASHINGTON

"So I tell you now that it is my intention to resign my seat in Congress to become associated with the Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc. I am telling you, my loyal friends, the people who put me in Congress and have kept me there, first, as I said I would. Circumstances over which I had no control let the rumor out before I could tell you as I had planned. I am sorry. But I know you would not have had me tell any one of you, individually, before I could tell you all at the same time. If I had told a single one of you, I would have been unfair to all the rest. I know you will agree and understand."

Congressman NICHOLS left last night for Washington to attend a meeting Monday of the entire State delegation to formulate plans for immediate relief to the flood victims.

Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE
RAILROAD CO.,
Louisville, Ky., March 15, 1943.

Hon. SAM H. JONES,
Governor of Louisiana,
Baton Rouge, La.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR JONES: When I had the pleasure of a short visit with you in New Orleans a little while back, I mentioned the fact that Commissioner Jewell had brought to my attention the Saturday Evening Post of March 6, in which was printed your interview under the heading, "Will Dixie Bolt the New Deal?" I had not read the article at the time and could give no expression thereto. You remarked that perhaps I would agree with much of it, and perhaps disagree with some of it. That surmise is correct.

First, I want to say that the article is presented in a very interesting style and, no doubt, has held attention to the very end of every person who started to read it. Again, with one exception, which I shall mention later, I go along with you practically all the way. I was raised as a Democrat, and my father served in the Confederate Army. My mother was very bitter because of the things which happened during the war and in the reconstruction period and, for the reasons so admirably given by you, southerners took refuge in the Democratic Party. Too many of them still reside there because of the holding power of the mere name. The Democratic and Republican Parties have almost changed their position in the three essential matters you mention, and while I do not now class myself as a Republican, I have long since registered as an Independent and vote my convictions as I see them.

The matter upon which I do not agree with you is that the southern freight-rate structure constitutes an odious barrier which causes a discrimination of swindling proportions against the South and in favor of the industrial East, much to the detriment of the southern territory in developing industry. I do not question your sincerity of purpose in believing and saying that this is so. I do question whether you have fully mastered the intricacies of the situation so as to justify you in the strong statement you have made. I am hoping that you yet have an open mind, and that your conclusions have been based on information and presentations only by those who entertain the view now seemingly held by you.

I am attaching a memorandum from our traffic department dealing with your reference to some specific rates and situations. You will find it interesting and instructive.

It is not the purpose, however, of this letter to enter into a detailed discussion of the many things involved in the subject in question, because the essentials have already been ably expressed by both sides in the controversy. These discussions are embodied in a conference held under the auspices of the Southern States Industrial Council in Birmingham on December 10, 1941. A copy is sent you under separate cover. These proceedings present views which are worthy of a very careful reading, and even to a person not skilled in rate matters may now and then appear confusing. On the whole, however, the conflicting views are fairly well expressed, although I naturally lean to the arguments of those who present the views I personally hold. I am going to ask, therefore, that you read these proceedings carefully, and, even if you have read them, that you read them again.

Like you, I am, as stated, a son of the South, and my inherited sympathies and prejudices naturally incline me to a southern viewpoint, although I have long since tried to view our country as a unit, rather than as divided into sections, realizing, of course, that very different conditions prevail in the different regions, and that many of these, to the disadvantage of the South can be traced to the harmful effect of the War Between the States. More from the effects of this war than for any other reason, I feel the South has not measured up to the development in the East, but that during the last 25 years it has made remarkable progress, and bids fair to ultimately take its rightful place in a country of unparalleled technological and industrial development.

As the head of one of the great corporations which, in my judgment, has contributed tremendously to the South's development, I shall not herein claim for myself any motives prompted by my affection for the South, but merely those arising out of an effort to build and maintain the railroads for which I have served and am now serving. I hope you will give me credit, therefore, for having as keen an interest in doing the things which will be helpful to the South, and not doing the things which will be hurtful to it, as you and the other public representatives who occupy an entirely different field from a corporation head. I, therefore, shall say I want to build the South industrially, commercially, culturally, and otherwise, because I believe it is good business for my company to do so. This being true, would it not run at cross purposes to such a policy if I favored any arrangement which, through freight rates, would retard industrial development in the South?

Will you, therefore, not give me credit for sincerity, and believe that we both have the

same intent and purpose, namely, to do the helpful thing for the South although we are honestly in disagreement as to one of the methods?

If the present war has demonstrated one thing to a greater degree than another, it is that the railroads of this country are essential for defensive purposes in times of war and, consequently, they should be kept strong. Prior to the present war certain conditions existed which threatened the solvency of the entire railroad industry, and kept its managers from progress and improvements which they should have made. Whatever the rate scales in the different regions were, they did not produce a sufficient return to keep a number of railroads solvent. This was particularly true in the Southeast where a number of them were in bankruptcy, including one or two of the larger systems. Two or three more of the larger systems in the Southeast were very near to such a catastrophe. Now, since management has demonstrated its ability, it is reasonably clear that the volume of traffic and their net revenues had much to do with the poor condition of the railroads prior to the war. We cannot accept the oft-repeated statements by those not responsible for results that a general lowering of the rate scale will produce a better net result.

Whatever may be said of the cost of operation of the railroads in the different regions, and admitting, only for the sake of argument, that their operating costs are relatively the same, yet, the net financial results in moving a train, or from the railroad's entire operation, depends not only on the cost of operation but on the number of trains as well as on the volume of traffic handled in each train. This principle holds true in any business. Eliminating coal and some of the heavier tonnage of a few of the southern railroads, which is not common to many of them, traffic density of the southeastern lines is much thinner and the proportion of low-grade freight greater than in much of the industrial East. Hence the average level of freight rates must be higher in the South to produce a solvent return. Perhaps the most important consideration to the southern railroads of this entire question of rates is that they must have a level of rates which will permit them to remain solvent. They have never taken the position that rates in southern territory should be higher than or in anywise measured by rates in the North or East merely to maintain a differential, but solely because a higher level of rates in southern territory seemed necessary to maintain solvency. Even with this general principle adhered to, southern railroads have favored and made such specific rates as were necessary to enable a southern producer to market his wares in the North and East.

Neither do I agree with the premise that a freight rate is generally the controlling factor to locating an industry in the South. I say this from the experience of a manager of railroad properties, and with the practical experience and judgment of traffic officers who have an extensive organization and are continually engaged in undertaking to, and in actually locating, industry in the South. There are many reasons, some even more controlling than freight rates. First, there is the local market, then there follows, not necessarily in the order named, raw materials, labor and its attitude, climatic conditions, the cost of living, taxation, the attitude of public authorities with respect to corporate enterprise, and other reasons.

There is generally a lower scale of merchandise class rates in effect to and from points in the East than there is in the South. This condition is largely influenced by the traffic density above referred to. The rates to and from points in the South are generally higher than in the industrial East because of thinner traffic density.

The rates from the South to the North are generally lower than from the North to the South, as relates to tonnage actually moving. This statement has reference to all normal rates and movements, and takes into consideration that the South has many commodity rates which are included as class rates in the North and East.

It is true that in many instances rates from a point of production in the East to a point of consumption in the East, are lower than paper rates from a point of production in the South to a point of consumption in the East. These situations are, however, met by southern railroads where, in specific and individual instances, an equalization of the rate seems necessary to promote industry in the South. This does not mean, however, that southern railroads approve an intra-territorial rate scale in the South as low as that in the East, or that they are willing to adjust rate schedules to the East where it is not proven essential to promote southern industry. To do this would merely subtract from the revenues of the southern carriers without compensating advantages.

The decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the first southern Governors rate case (and in a few preceding cases) established the principle of satisfactory competitive rates from points of production in the South to consuming territory in the East, as compared with rates between such points in the East. Of the large number of rates first under consideration by the southern Governors, only 20 were presented to the Commission on which favorable decision of 10 was issued. It should be significant that the managers of much important southern industry were largely absent from this hearing. The hearing did establish, however, the precedent that satisfactory competitive rates can be had from the South to the eastern consuming territories where convincing representation is made. The southern railroads have always supported such a view, and will continue to do so. This does not mean that the southern railroads will always yield to a particular industry as to what rate the situation requires, or that they will support every effort of every southern applicant to obtain rates on an eastern level. The railroads cannot make their experience and informed judgment subordinate to the expressions or belief of a particular industry seeking such rates. They do, however, carefully consider each situation on its merits and act accordingly. Such a course is necessary for the preservation of revenues and solvency of the railroad industry in the South.

Much has been said in the press about the intraterritorial class rates in the South being 39 percent higher than similar rates in the East. In arriving at this conclusion, the lower commodity rates in the South have not been taken into consideration. If all traffic were similarly classified in the two regions, the average level of rates in the South would not be a large percentage higher than that prevailing intraterritorially in the East. In this connection, note the statement of Mr. E. L. Hart, secretary and traffic manager of the Atlanta Freight Bureau, on page 69 of the proceedings of the Birmingham conference, above referred to, where he says: "I know that the rate level in the South today as a whole is not much greater than maybe 5 percent, 6 percent, or 7 percent higher than it is in the North." Mr. Hart does not support the railroads' position in the controversy. I understand he is one of the traffic advisors of the Southern Governors Conference.

In one paragraph of your interview you make the statement that South American merchant ships find it cheaper to sail all the way up to the ports of the eastern seaboard rather than to land goods at New Orleans, behind the freight rate barrier. I take this to mean that you believe the freight rates from the Gulf ports to and from the interior points, are, mile by mile, higher than the prevailing rates to and from the eastern ports, mile by mile. If such is your thought, you have been given incorrect information, as inland rates to and from the southern ports are as low or lower than from and to the eastern ports. This does not mean that export and import rates to and from southern ports are sufficiently low to deprive any community of its nearer location to the seaboard. No one could reasonably expect that. On the whole however, Gulf ports are in a favorable situation with respect to export and import rates, distance considered.

The present rate case now under consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission will, perhaps, determine the relation which shall exist between intra-territorial rates in the South and intra-territorial rates in the East or other territories, and inter-territorially between such territories. The southern railroads will, of course, undertake to show that to put the eastern scale in effect in the South will be detrimental to the continued solvency of southern carriers, and will protest against any such scale. We frankly believe that the establishment of similar scales in the East and the southern territories may ultimately cause a reclassification of some of the commodity groups and cause an increase in the existing rates on certain commodities, and that the general effect of such a leveling of rates will be harmful rather than helpful to southern industry and to the location of new industry therein.

Another feature is that the rates from both the northern and southern producing points to destinations in southern territory are substantially the same, distance considered, but are on the higher level in effect on southern railroads. Generally, the hauls from the northern producing points to southern consuming centers are longer, thus making the aggregate freight charge greater than that accruing against the southern producer because of the shorter distance to the same consuming territory. Reducing the level, therefore, would make the spread in the aggregate charge less and consequently favor the northern producer insofar as the freight rate influences the southern buyer and consumer.

The crux of the whole controversy seems to be whether it is just to southern railroads and helpful to southern industry to establish the general rate level as sought by certain elements in the South, or to adjust southern rate scales only when necessity and desirability arises, and thus protect the solvency of the southern carriers, as advocated by the southern railroads. Since it is the desire of both the southern Governors and the southern railroads to do the thing which will accomplish the most beneficial results for the South, then the controversy seems to resolve itself merely into a difference of opinion as to method. Naturally the railroads feel that expert opinion is on their side.

After all, is it not probable that other competition with railroads will ultimately have much to do with fixing all rate levels, both intra- and inter-territorially, in and between all sections? Highways and waterways seem to favor such a probability if these continue to be permanently favored by laws and regulations, subsidy and taxation.

I believe you and other southern Governors could profit much in a better appreciation of this entire question if you would seek the advice of the best informed traffic men of the larger industries in the South who, for the most part, I believe, represent a view not in harmony with what seems to be your own.

Frankly, it is my opinion that the wide dissemination of the statement that southern freight rates are seriously detrimental to the welfare of southern industry is very harmful advertising for the South. It will

take us some time to overcome the false impressions and misunderstandings which arise from such publication.

I realize this has been a very long letter, but it shows the difficulty of concisely discussing even just a portion of the problems involved. I do think, however, the matter is of sufficient importance to have the most careful consideration and a correct understanding. I attribute to you high integrity in the views you hold, but I also retain for the executives of the southern railroads an honest desire to build industry in the South because, if for no other reason than that it is good business to do so.

In all of this I invite your thoughtful consideration because only the truth will make us free. I have no means of knowing what the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission will be growing out of the present hearing. I do believe, however, that that body is probably better qualified to pass upon the major merits of the case, than either interested side to the controversy which may have prejudiced views.

Now, my dear Governor, permit me to advance one more thought, only a phase of which is partially included in the freight-rate question. The general situation with the railroads prior to the p esent upsurge in war traffic was in many instances precarious. That the public views their future with uncertainty is indicated by the market price of their securities in this period of abnormal traffic. Railroad managers dread the day when the traffic shall again fall, when the greater competition by waterway, highway, airway, and pipe-line carriers comes again to the forefront. They believe railroad managers have proven their ability in the present emergency; that the industry has made a highly creditable contribution to the war effort; that it has been demonstrated that the railroads are absolutely essential in wartimes and therefore in peacetimes should be permitted to remain solvent and progressive. Railroad managers seek no favoritism as to laws, regulations, subsidies, or taxation. They ask only an opportunity under equal conditions, willing to swim or sink accordingly. We are not in politics, locally or nationally, except as defense against injustice or unfairness requires it. And I believe I speak for all southern railroad executives, whom I know well, that we have a high purpose to upbuild the South to its rightful place in the Nation. Our contribution thus far has been unmatched and our hope for the future is yet unshaken.

I am sending a copy of this letter to other southern Governors and some other interested persons.

With high good humor, good will, and assurances of esteem, I am,

Yours cordially,

J. B. HILL, *President.*

Farmers and Veterans Would Benefit Under Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to three major bills of vital importanc e that were placed in the hopper by me on June 22, 1943.

One bill seeks to provide a fund of $500,000,000 to be known as the Veterans' Farm Mortgage Insurance Fund to provide 30-year loans at 3 percent to any person who has served with the military or naval forces of the United States, its possessions or territories, during any war. Ninety percent of the cost of the farm would be advanced by the Government under the terms of the bill.

Another bill, if enacted, would guarantee to the producers of agricultural commodities a minmum price of not less than cost of production and further insure to farmers and livestock raisers an amount equivalent to the best price received therefor during the emergency. The bill seeks to guarantee this minimum for at least 5 years after the war to prevent a crash.

The third bill introduced by me provides that any Army materials determined by the Secretary of War to be surplus shall first be offered to farmers for sale or lease before such items are disposed of to tax-supported organizations or sold in domestic markets, foreign governments, or donated to counties and States.

Pap, Pie, and Patronage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gladstone Williams, from the Atlanta Constitution of June 22, 1943:

WASHINGTON PARADE

(By Gladstone Williams)

"PAP, PIE, AND PATRONAGE"

WASHINGTON, June 21.—The best evidence that the Senate was out on a "pap, pie, and patronage" rampage when it passed the McKellar bill, requiring confirmation of all Government employees receiving $4,500 or more a year, is found in the vote on the measure itself.

Democrats supported the bill overwhelmingly, while the Republicans opposed it in a like ratio. Of the 42 Senators voting for passage, 34 were Democrats, and of the 29 recorded in the opposition, 20 were Republicans, with 1 Independent.

Now the reason for this more or less clear division along party lines is apparent. Ordinarily the Republicans would have seized upon the opportunity to support a bill which the administration was against. If for no other reason, they would have done so merely for the purpose of embarrassing the President, who has set his foot down firmly against the McKellar proposal.

By the same token, the Democrats ordinarily would be expected to vote against a bill which the administration opposed.

The fact that the vote was scrambled up the way it was is evidence enough the Democrats were more bent on patronage and pap than anything else. Republicans voted in the opposition because they were not counted to share in the patronage.

The effect of the legislation, if finally enacted, would be to give the Senate a voice in the selection of some 27,000 Federal workers who are not now subject to Senate confirmation.

Power to appoint

The power to reject is the power to appoint. Hence, if the bill were made a law, the Senate could insist on the right to be consulted over every one of the offices filled. Under the present system, the appointments are made either by the Civil Service Commission, the heads of the various departments and agencies, or by the President himself.

But even if Congress legislated to itself the authority to pass upon the appointments, the Republicans would have nothing to gain so long as the Democrats are in control. All of the patronage might be expected to go to the majority party.

That is the cold, unvarnished truth about the Republican attitude. The Democrats were out for a patronage grab and the Republicans were against it because they weren't scheduled to get a cut of the cake.

McKellar eye on Tennessee Valley Authority

As for Senator MCKELLAR, the sponsor of the legislation, he is credited with having his eyes on some 400 fat jobs in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority, which operates mainly in his State. If he could throw out the present officeholders and put his own henchmen in those lucrative jobs, he would have the foundation for a highly effective political machine.

That, also, would be a good way to wreck Tennessee Valley Authority—filling it up with personal political appointees.

But, regardless of the Senate action, there doesn't seem to be much chance of the bill ever becoming a law. The lower House is against it on pretty much the same grounds as Senate Republicans. House Members realize they don't stand to share in the patronage, whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

Giving the Senate veto power over appointments clothes the upper Chamber with authority to demand a greater voice in the selection of Federal workers, but little of it seeps down to the House. The lower body would not be affected by the change.

House Members know all of this too well, of course, which explains the marked lack of enthusiasm for the bill in the lower Chamber. To pass the measure would merely be to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Senate.

Veto certain

Finally, if the bill should pass both Houses it is certain to meet a Presidential veto. Mr. Roosevelt has stated his opposition in no uncertain terms. Last February, when it was first brought before the Senate, he denounced it as "the very antithesis of the merit system," declared it would "sweep away years of civil-service progress," and "would lay all of us open to the charge that we are playing politics with the war program."

There is little likelihood of Congress passing it over the President's threatened veto.

Under the circumstances, all of the time spent by the Senate in considering the bill seems to be wasted effort. It is difficult to understand how the leaders could have made themselves a party to the program, unless it was they were only going along with Senator MCKELLAR to make him feel good.

Club ethics

The Senate is like that sometimes. It has a club atmosphere about it that makes it go along with individual Members at times when they are known to be wrong. Many a highly qualified Government appointee has been sacrificed on the altar of a "personally obnoxious" complaint filed by some Senator with no more than a personal grievance to square.

Senator MCKELLAR, long an enemy of the Tennessee Valley Authority, had his head set on putting through the present grab bill. His Democratic colleagues didn't feel like voting against him.

Patriotic and Loyal War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, we frequently listen to a tirade in this Congress against unwarranted strikes of an isolated group of war workers. We often hear certain Members of Congress condemn war workers because of their legitimate demand for increased wages to meet the increased cost of living. Now an occasion arises for us all—and in particular the aforementioned Members of Congress—to take time out to pay real tribute to the war workers of the McKeesport, Pa., industrial district.

A bus strike was on. The strike was a last minute affair with no advance notice to the public, but nevertheless the district's soldiers on the production line got to their jobs. They crowded into street cars and taxicabs. They thumbed rides; squeezed into their neighbors' cars. Most of them actually "hoofed" it. They all got to their work. They permitted no obstacle to interfere with their part in turning out Uncle Sam's fighting tools. This was truly the ideal answer to the plea of our soldier boys all over the universe during the recent coal strike not to let them down. The patriotism and loyalty of the war workers of McKeesport, Pa., stands out as a shining example to the people of America. A superintendent of one of McKeesport's war plants said:

It's marvelous—that's what it is. There's the answer to crepehangers' moans about absenteeism. We have very little at our plant, and I think that applies to the other McKeesport industries as well. Our men and women are getting here—and on time. I don't know how they do it, but they are here.

As your Representative in Congress, I salute you war workers of this great industrial district.

The splendid achievement by McKeesport war workers was a topic of discussion among outstanding leaders of our community and throughout the Pittsburgh steel industrial district. Full recognition of their accomplishment was given in an editorial which appeared in the McKeesport Daily News, leading newspaper in this district, and which I am happy to include as a part of my remarks.

THEY GOT TO WORK

McKeesport war workers so successfully met a test in patriotism, imposed by the bus tie-up, that a plant manager declared yesterday:

"It's marvelous, that's what it is. There's the answer to crepehangers' moans about absenteeism. We have very little at our plant, and I think that applies to the other McKeesport industries as well. Our men and women are getting here, and on time. I don't know how they do it, but they are here."

How did they do it? Some doubled up in automobiles and others got lifts at street corners. But the majority met the emergency the hard way. They walked.

Sidewalks along Walnut Street from the Christy Park Works were crowded at the turn changes. One stream of tired, hot, weary workers would flow from the plant and merge into the stream of workers moving toward their jobs. Occasionally a car stopped, picked up a load and cut into the stream. But there were not enough cars.

The same was true at the National Works and the other industries that together make McKeesport one of the vital industrial communities in wartime America.

The production drop that a stop in public transportation would normally entail failed to materialize. There was no lessening of this community's great contribution to the cause of victory. And it wasn't easy.

Four National Works employees were met by a reporter on Walnut Street. They were walking the 4 miles to their jobs. The street cars on Evans Street which run down town on the Glassport run served as a magnet, drawing workers from all sections of the Hill District. Down the streets to the plants marched the employees.

One hot mill worker who didn't miss a minute at work during the bus tie-up had this to say yesterday:

"It's not easy for a man of my age. In fact, after putting in 8 hours in front of a white-hot furnace, to be faced with that long walk home is just plain hell. But I have a boy in New Guinea, and he's been going through a little hell himself. I can't afford to let him and his buddies down."

He could have been talking for practically all of the foot-weary workers who today, with the strike over, deserve the praise of a Nation and the thanks of the boys at the fighting front for meeting a local company with such spirit that not one ton of steel was lost and not one shell held back.

Better Late Than Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Detroit Free Press of June 23 comes the following editorial on race riots. By inference it charges that those riots are in part at least the result of panty-waist politics. Unfortunately, the Detroit Free Press and other papers have advocated the same kind of conduct which the Free Press now deplores.

Many of us remember that, when the sitdown strikes and the accompanying violence flared in 1937, the Free Press warmly praised Governor Murphy for what it now calls and condemns as the kid-glove policy of Detroit's police commissioner. Down through the years, the Free Press has either lacked the courage or the inclination to insist that pickets refrain from violence, permit peaceable citizens to proceed about their lawful business.

One cause of the recent riots is, as the Detroit Free Press intimates, the leniency of public officials, who, had they acted with greater firmness, had they forced strikers and goon-squads, imported from other States, to obey the law of Michigan, would have lessened the opportunity for the recent riots.

The Free Press thought Governor Murphy did a wonderful job when he practiced panty-waist politics. Now it condemns Detroit's Commissioner for similar conduct. The editorial reads as follows:

PANTY-WAIST POLITICS AND RACE RIOTS

Two months ago everybody in Detroit familiar with the situation knew that race riots were inevitable. Events were rushing toward a climax. The Free Press then asked Police Commissioner John H. Witherspoon what provisions were being made to meet the outburst of lawlessness.

The commissioner declared that all plans were made. He spoke with the optimism of a young and inexperienced officer. He was asked what moves were being made to prevent such an outbreak. His answer was:

"We have given orders to handle it with kid gloves. The policemen have taken insults to keep trouble from breaking out. I doubt if you or I could have put up with it."

With all due respect to a sincere young man, it is just such a philosophy as the commissioner expressed which is the root of our troubles, locally and nationally.

This is not time for kid-glove treatment of law violation.

This is no time for panty-waist politics.

In the inexorability of all-out war the majesty and dignity of the law can only be upheld by exercising the power of the law.

The very moment that a police officer accepts the insult of a hoodlum he has established in the evil heart of that rat a contempt for the law.

That officer is not John Smith, citizen.

He is the law.

And when he is insulted the law is flouted. A hole has been made in the dike of public morale.

You will notice that none of these gangsters who swarmed over our streets all Sunday night and all day Monday passed on any insults to the soldiers of the United States Army when the troops rumbled into town at midnight. Instead, they scurried to their holes in keeping with their rattish nature.

It is the policy of the politician to avoid trouble, to soft pedal on principle so that votes will not be lost.

But, as day follows night, kid-gloving criminals leads to anarchy.

A good policeman who knows that he has the faith of his city behind him, who knows that he will be supported wholeheartedly in maintaining the dignity of the law, can keep his beat orderly. The lawless element knows he means business. That is why the murderers ran for cover when the Army came. They knew the soldiers meant business and would shoot to kill. A mobster is always a coward.

This newspaper holds no brief for Ed Kelly, mayor of Chicago. We do not approve of his political methods nor his boss rule. But this much can be said for him: Chicago's hoodlums know he means business.

He decreed, when this war started, that there would be no rioting of any kind in Chicago, either through strikes or racial discord. When rioting did start he gave orders to shoot to kill. There has not been any noticeable unrest in Chicago since. What few strikes there have been in that most unionized of all American cities have been orderly. There have been no racial disturbances.

One does not need to mention Napoleon's "whiff of grapeshot" which ended the reign of terror in the French Revolution. We have before us the cold, calm courage of the altogether nonmilitary Grover Cleveland, who boldly asserted the dignity of the law in the rioting of his day and his memory is still cherished for his courage.

Instead of being ready for the inevitable, Mayor Jeffries gave forth a statement that sounded like the pleadings of a frightened Sunday-school teacher: "I appeal to all citizens of Detroit to insist on maintaining our orderly routine. * * * These fights accomplish nothing except to upset our war efforts. Remember your country needs you."

That was like quoting "now I lay me down to sleep" to a man in a delirium. You cannot appeal prettily to mob-mad men turned into fiends. They know no reason. They have sneered at the law for so long, and have insulted the police as a daily exercise to such an extent, that the lust to kill is upon them unrestrained.

Only when they see a symbol of the law with all the majesty of its power rampant do they run for cover.

This situation is not peculiar to Detroit. It has grown into a national neurosis. When a lawbreaker sees one of his kind get away with it he follows suit and, as in the prohibition era, there develops a contempt for all law.

So we see John L. Lewis making a sucker out of the United States Government for the past 2 years and getting away with it. More, he has been idolized as a hero for doing just that, even as the prohibition era gangsters were lionized by American boyhood—until J. Edgar Hoover and his valiant G-men fought the outlaws to a standstill and restored some semblance of dignity and respect for law enforcement.

What America needs above all else is men of courage who can see beyond politics, who stand for fundamental principles and hold them inviolate.

The Nazis and the Japs are not using kid-glove methods in fighting our sailors, soldiers, and marines. Nor are our men in the death grapple thinking of votes. It is a bowelless conflict, without pity unto the end.

That is the disinterested, high-visioned courage we need on the home front—in Washington, in Lansing, in Detroit.

Then our streets will never again be stained with the blood of the innocent.

Cattle Raising in Oklahoma

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, down in Oklahoma the enterprising citizens are now planning for the peace after the war. One very distinguished citizen, Mr. Roy Turner, who owns and operates one of the largest ranges of registered herds of Hereford cattle in the Southwest, near Sulphur, Okla., will this year, as he has for many successive years, entertain the F. F. A. and 4–H Club members at a field day. He will divide $500 among the boys and girls who are best able to tell a good type Hereford animal when they see one.

The public treasury has not been the only source to create the incentive to raise better Herefords in Oklahoma, we have other citizens who encourage with their own money better breeding, better types, and above all, a better market.

It is indeed sickening to have in charge of the price ceiling of cattle, officials who do not believe in encouraging a better breed of cattle by our youths. I learned this lesson back on March 25, 1943, when it took all the power of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress to get an amendment to M. P. R. 169 to exempt F. F. A. and 4-H Club animals from the custom slaughtering provisions of paragraph 1364.491 of MPR 169. After an appeal by the friends of the 4–H and F. F. A. boys and girls was turned down by the group of the so-called "professors and theorists" before their representative had an opportunity to present the case, a direct appeal was made to Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of O. P. A., by the entire Oklahoma delegation, joined by Congressman MILTON H. WEST and Congressman RICHARD M. KLEBERG, of Texas, and it was then that Mr. Brown took jurisdiction and issued an amendment to MPR 169 which exempted 4–H and F. F. A. Club cattle from the custom slaughtering provisions of the above order.

Not until the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill has Congress had an opportunity, and then it was an amendment, adopted to replace these "professors and theorists" in O. P. A. pricing set-up with men having at least 5 years' business experience in the industries concerned.

An editorial appearing in the Daily Ardmorite commending Mr. Turner for his good work, is as follows:

ROY TURNER

For the fourth successive year, Roy Turner, owner of the Turner Hereford ranch east of Sulphur, will entertain Future Farmers of America and 4–H Club members at a field day. Turner has invited members of these two organizations to be his guests and to compete for cash prizes and appropriate trophies in club and individual judging of six clases of Hereford cattle.

He will divide $500 among the boys and girls and they don't have to do a thing to get part of this money but be able to tell a good type Hereford animal when they see one

Turner has done much to encourage youngsters on farms and ranches in Oklahoma to take keener interest in the production of better cattle. He realizes that the club members today will be ranch owners in the near future and he wishes every one of them to produce the kind of cattle that are found on his ranch.

If they approximate his own goal, they will have gone a long way in the Hereford cattle business.

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a radio address of Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN of Ohio.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience. I am grateful to the Washington Star and to the Blue Network for this opportunity to join with my colleague, Representative HARTLEY, of New Jersey, in discussing the general subject of gasoline rationing, and the specific proposal that further limitations on the use of gasoline be placed upon the people of the States of the Union outside the eastern shortage area.

The present gasoline controversy results from the formation of a congressional bloc representing the 16 States along the east coast, where a real gasoline and oil shortage has developed as the result of transportation difficulties. Soon after its creation the press and radio carried stories of demands being made by the eastern group for the imposition of further restrictions on the gasoline users of the country. Public officials were called before Mr. HARTLEY's committee and urged to ban pleasure driving and reduce gasoline ration allotments all over the Nation. As a result motorists throughout the country became alarmed and apprehensive, and those of us in Congress from the States outside the eastern area were compelled to organize to protect the interests of our constituents.

Our group has in its membership practically every Representative in Congress from every State west of the Atlantic seaboard. So in discussing this problem with you I speak as the chairman of a committee representing a majority of the membership of the House of Representatives.

I agree with Mr. HARTLEY as to the situation which exists in the 16 Eastern States. I, too, regret and deplore the shortage of oil and gasoline that exists there, making necessary the ban on pleasure driving, the reduction of A card allotments to 1.37 gallons per week, and the cutting of B and C coupon values to 2½ gallons each. Now, as I understand it, Mr. HARTLEY and his colleagues want to make the rest of the country, regardless of the oil and gasoline available, accept the same strict rationing.

I am sure Mr. HARTLEY and the people of the East will agree their present troubles are almost entirely due to the lack of transportation necessary to convey oil and gasoline to them. Prior to the war practically all petroleum products used in these Eastern States were delivered by ocean tankers; a cheap form of transportation permitting the people of the East to enjoy gasoline prices much lower than the rest of the country. Incidentally, while this condition existed, I heard nothing from Mr. HARTLEY as to the wisdom or desirability of equalizing gasoline prices throughout the Nation by having eastern consumers pay a little more, and westerners a little less, for their motor fuel.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House—of which I am a member—long ago realizing such tank ship deliveries would be endangered in case of war, authorized the construction of cross-country pipe lines to supply the East. This legislation was enacted by the Congress long before Pearl Harbor. Secretary of the Interior Ickes, now the Oil Administrator, urged the prompt building of these lines, but for some reason delay after delay ensued. However, I do not recall any eastern bloc being created at that time to hasten construction of these pipe lines. Seemingly, our friends were not interested as long as they were getting their gasoline delivered more cheaply by tanker.

Incidentally, two gigantic pipe lines to supply the East are now being rushed to completion at the expense of all the taxpayers of all the States. The Government is also paying—from tax money paid in by all of us—the increased cost of shipping gasoline by rail and truck to the eastern area. We are glad to help you bear the cost of meeting your emergency.

But war came, and the German submarines struck. The East was forced to look for other means by which to obtain needed gasoline

and oil. A frantic effort began to supply the eastern area by rail delivery. There were but 107,000 tank cars in the country, practically none of which had previously been used for hauling gasoline or oil to the East. Fourteen thousand of these cars were being used for transporting products, such as asphalt, which made them unfit for hauling oil and gasoline. Out of the 93,000 tank cars remaining, 74,000 are now busy hauling oil and gasoline to the East, and 6,000 more are distributing the precious fluid within the eastern shortage area. Only 13,000 usable tank cars remain to serve all the rest of the country. So, when you stop to consider that we have given to the eastern shortage area, which used practically no tank cars before the war, 80,000 out of the 93,000 tank cars we had available for our own use, I believe you will agree we have not been selfish—especially when it is remembered that many of the tank cars we have left are used for transporting vital war liquids other than gasoline. Today practically every drop of gasoline that moves from the refineries to distributors and consumers in the Midwest is hauled in tank trucks, and not in railroad tank cars.

Secretary Ickes, head of the Petroleum Administration for War, has flatly turned down the demand of the eastern group for the imposition of further restrictions on the rest of the country. He insists that further limiting gasoline use elsewhere would not increase the amount that could be sent to the eastern area and therefore no good could come from such an order. The only possible result would be unnecessary injury to the rest of the Nation, without any benefit whatsoever accruing to the people of the Eastern States. We must not forget that gasoline rationing was ordered in the East far ahead of the rest of the country simply because of the transportation shortage. When rationing was finally made applicable to the rest of the Nation it was explained as necessary to conserve rubber, not gasoline. There has never been any contention at any time by any public official that gasoline rationing is necessary outside the eastern area in order to save gasoline.

Why, bless your hearts! The ordinary type of gasoline used by motorists in these days is nothing more or less than a byproduct from the refining and distilling processes used in obtaining many vital war needs from crude oil. While our general crude oil reserves have been dropping, and the long term outlook is not good, reserves of gasoline outside of the eastern area have thus far actually been increasing, not decreasing.

For instance, Petroleum Administration figures show that gasoline stocks in the Indiana, Illinois and Kentucky area stood at 13,467,000 barrels on November 28, 1942, just 2 days before gasoline rationing went into effect in that section; and that by June 5, 1943 these stocks had risen to 18,372,000 barrels; an increase of approximately 38 percent in the gasoline reserve in these three States since rationing began. The same is true elsewhere throughout the country.

Let us use common sense. What good can possibly come from further restricting the use of gasoline, where such heavy increases in gasoline reserves have accrued under present rationing allotments, if the gasoline saved thereby cannot be transported to the eastern shortage area?

If transportation had been available, refineries in the Middle West would have gladly shipped to the East at least those 5,000,000 barrels of gasoline by which our reserve has been increased under rationing, rather than to place it in storage. Oil refiners are not philanthropists. They are always interested in selling, rather than in storing, their gasoline.

Further restrictions on the use of gasoline in the Midwest at the present time would not help the East in any way, but would simply increase our gasoline reserves, overflow our storage facilities, and eventually bring a reduction in refining operations, with resultant loss in the production of needed war requirements; or force the wasteful dumping of gasoline for lack of storage.

I cannot understand why some of the eastern spokesmen take such a dog-in-the-manger attitude as to say, "Inasmuch as we are suffering from cruel gasoline restrictions as the result of a shortage in transportation, the rest of the country must be made to suffer, too, regardless of the supply of gasoline available."

Why bless Mr. HARTLEY'S soul. The people who live out in the Middle West were glad to accept restrictions on the use of fuel oil last winter to help keep the people of the East from freezing. We have always been ready to share our all with our fellow countrymen. We will accept any restrictions that may be necessary or beneficial to the war effort. We will gladly give up all of our gasoline if it will save a single American boy's life to do so.

Oh, yes, Mr. HARTLEY, while we were not anxious to get into this war, we are out to win it, and we are giving our blood and treasure toward victory. We are also ready to give up every drop of gasoline and oil we have or can produce if such be helpful to the winning. But, Mr. HARTLEY, we refuse to accept unnecessary restrictions in the use of gasoline simply to satisfy those who are in misery and want company. We are willing to make sacrifices if it will help you to recover from the gasoline sickness with which you are suffering. But if we cannot help you, we refuse to listen to your plea that we crawl into bed with you and take the same disease ourselves.

No wonder every Government official to whom you have appealed for the imposition of further restrictions upon our people has turned down your plea. I predict the President will do likewise if you go to him. It is not the American way to drag others down to your level. Instead let us bring the East up to our level, as far as gasoline and oil are concerned. Devote your efforts to that cause, Mr. HARTLEY, rather than to attacking us, and we will cooperate and work with you—for that will be the American way.

Immigration Quota for Chinese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce:

The San Francisco Chamber of Commerce has never questioned the policy of rigid restriction or exclusion of oriental aliens. The chamber has, however, questioned the method, and since 1924 has been committed to grant of quota.

Except for entry of students, merchants, and a few other classes, Chinese entry into the United States has been forbidden since 1882.

In 1924 Congress passed an act which reduced annual immigration to 2 percent of the number of foreign residents in 1890. Quota, however, does not apply to immigrants from Canada, Mexico, or the independent countries of Central and South America. During the depression the annual immigration from quota countries was further reduced to 10 percent of the 2 percent. Quota, however, was not granted to aliens ineligible to citizenship—Asiatics.

Were quota granted to Chinese aliens, only 105 would be admitted over and above those now excepted from exclusion—students, merchants, professionals, and a few other classes.

When the 1924 quota law was passed, with Asiatics debarred from quota, at least three other methods of exclusion were available:

1. By treaty.

2. As regards Japan, a tightening of the gentlemen's agreement.

3. By placing China and other Asiatics on a quota basis.

None of these three methods was used, and by qualifying immigration to those eligible to citizenship, offense was given to China and other Asiatic countries. Had restriction by quota been effected, 105 Chinese would have been admitted annually, 185 Japanese, and a minimum of 100 from other Asiatic countries. (Since March 24, 1934, the Philippines have been given an annual quota of 50.)

Our unfortunate method of restriction is being exploited by Japan in its approaches to China. China is conscious of the stigma our nonquota grant has placed upon her nationals. Not only for the war effort, but for the post-war period of reconstruction and trade development, nongrant of quota will be a barrier to best possible United States-China relations.

It is respectfully recommended, therefore, that the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce reaffirm its traditional position in favor of grant of quota, and specifically recommend to Congress that the basic quota of 105 be granted to China.

Respectfully submitted.

WM. L. MONTGOMERY,
Manager, World Trade Department.

Accepted and approved June 10, 1943 by the board of directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce thereby placed on record.

Food Versus Feed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert for the benefit of my colleagues an excellent editorial taken from the Washington Post of Thursday, June 24, 1943:

FOOD VERSUS FEED

Every day brings new evidence of the serious dislocations caused by the Office of Price Administration's bungling efforts to control food prices. Although meat is fast disappearing from retail stores, representatives of livestock growers assert that Government estimates indicate a surplus of 15,400,000 head of cattle by the beginning of 1944. Despite this immense potential meat supply, cattle are not being shipped to market in normal quantities. Moreover, many small packers are going out of business or threatening to quit because, they say, they lose money on

each pound of beef sold. Hogs likewise are being produced in great quantity, with a heavy increase in numbers in prospect, to be added to greatly increased existing supplies.

The explanation of this paradox of superabundant supplies of livestock coincident with a dearth of consumable meat is simple. The lack of a ceiling on livestock prices has led to heavy production of meat animals, while the imposition of ceiling prices on processed meats has discouraged slaughtering and limited sales of meat. Meat shortages, however, are not the only unfortunate consequence of the Office of Price Administration's mistakes of judgment. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, called attention to another serious maladjustment in a recent address to the annual conference of Governors. The Office of Price Administration, he remarked, had "developed a theory that it would be a good idea to repeal the natural law of economics that corn and hog prices are tied together. The result is a ceiling price on corn of $1.05 at Chicago. Meanwhile the farmer can get $1.45 for the same corn right on the farm just by throwing it over the fence to his pigs." Consequently the New York dairy cow, dependent upon corn bought at the ceiling price of $1.05 per bushel, has a very poor chance of survival against an Iowa hog fattened on the farm.

Governor Dewey concludes that the Midwest ought to slaughter more pigs and use the released feed to aid New York's dairy and poultry producers, thereby making our limited grain supplies go further. He warned that meat animals are "eating into the precious food reserves which must be increased if we are even to begin saving the undernourished people of a rescued Europe." This is substantially the same sort of appeal as that put forth by former President Hoover in his criticism of the administration's food program.

Another significant indication of the disruptive effort of the Office of Price Administration's failure to link feed prices to livestock prices is supplied by the closing of a large plant manufacturing starch and dextrose sugar at Pekin, Ill., because of inability to obtain corn at ceiling prices. Any widespread closing of such plants will, it is said, have serious consequences, since many essential industries, including war industries, are dependent upon corn products. Here we find another paradox—an important industry compelled to close for lack of corn, although farmers are known to be hoarding large amounts of corn or feeding it to their high-priced hogs.

The dislocations already caused by setting ceiling prices for corn without imposing corresponding ceilings on livestock are minor calamities compared to what may lie ahead. If the dairy and poultry industries, for instance, are deprived of necessary feed supplies, shortages of milk, cheese, and poultry will ensue. For that matter, some cattle and hog producers complain that they, too, face a crisis for lack of feed and that wholesale slaughter of cattle and hogs not yet ready for market impends because of the inability to feed them. Nevertheless, the suggestion that corn ceiling prices be eliminated causes grave misgivings, because that would doubtless send prices of corn skyrocketing.

The basic issue confronting the Food Administration and Office of Price Administration was raised by Governor Dewey when he urged less meat production as a means of making our grain supplies go further. The Government must first decide whether its meat-production plans need revision before taking action to adjust feed prices and to arrange for the allocation of feed supplies. To continue the present policy of drift is to court disaster. Meantime, New York is turning to Canada for grain to feed her dairy herds and her poultry because, Governor Dewey says, "we cannot wait forever for Washington to discover the laws of economics. We have to get feed wherever we can find it."

Men Who Want a Free America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press including resolutions passed by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States at a recent meeting.

These young men are becoming conscious of what is happening to their United States and the principles of individual freedom and opportunity on which the country was built.

The editorial follows:

MEN WHO WANT A FREE AMERICA

What are the young men of the Nation thinking in respect to the position they are to occupy in the United States after the war?

What kind of a place is it going to be for ambitious, willing chaps whose future lies before them? Are they going to be regimented within an inch of their lives, or is free enterprise still to endure?

The men who make up the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce came to some conclusions at their annual meeting in Chicago last week.

There are 135,000 of these bright young fellows of which number 55,000 are in the military service. They are profoundly concerned with the problem of freedom—as they may well be. They want a normal opportunity for themselves and their members in the war and all other men, when peace has been established.

The following resolutions which were passed at Chicago give a quick insight into the doubts and fears that are filling the minds of young Americans. Their statement of principles follows:

We believe that in addition to the "four freedoms," we have a fifth freedom—the opportunity of enterprise—by which America has grown great and through which we can insure her future greatness.

We believe this freedom requires:

The right to an unfettered start in the race of life with no artificial handicaps.

The right to work as hard as we like and enjoy the fruits of that work as our own.

The right to go as far as we can, developing according to our capacities as individual American men and women.

We recognize that the fifth freedom—opportunity of enterprise—is limited by the similar right of others and that there is an obligation to extend these opportunities to all people who are willing and able to work.

What these young men are saying is that they want constitutional government in the United States, such as we had while we were making the Nation great and prosperous. They want the right to run their own affairs in their own way. They want the right to work as hard as they like, and they expect to be protected in the right to enjoy the fruits of that work. They don't want any over-all blanket which reduces all to a common level. They expect to develop according to their capacities as individual Americans.

These shrewd young men already have discovered what was going on in the United States, or they would not feel the need for this declaration. All they have to do is to stand firm on these aspirations and follow their inclinations seeking such political assistance as will help them to attain these laudable objectives.

In Providence Is Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

Bless ye the Lord, all ye His hosts; ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure. (Ps. 103:21.)

IN PROVIDENCE IS OUR DEFENSE

O God, Thou art the light,
To earth's remotest bounds—
Thou makest day to follow night
On its recurring rounds.

When we trust and obey,
At night sweet is our rest,
And to the duties of the day,
Dear God, we give our best.

We know all that we need
To know of God's unknown—
Yea, when it's darkest, He will lead—
With Him no one's alone.

O God, in these dark days
Of trouble and despair,
Tune Thou our hearts to sound Thy praise
Through sermon, song, and prayer.

With statesmanship endow
These servants of Thine who
To Thy will in submission bow,
That their dreams may come true.

Our warriors sustain,
Beyond the frowning foam—
O God, may these not die in vain,
Because we've failed at home

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

(Tune—Blest Be the Tie That Binds, 416.)

(Suggested by the prayer in the House by Navy Chaplain, Rev. Flynn Humphreys.)

Butter Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks

in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. J. C. Morrison, publisher of the Morris Tribune, of Morris, Minn. One of the outstanding editors of the Northwest, Mr. Morrison's views on the subsidy question is worth reading by every Member of the House:

SUBSIDY IS ALL WRONG

The latest scheme to hold the badly shattered line against inflation is to pay a subsidy to the processors of butter of about 5 cents a pound in order to recompense then for the difference between the ceiling price of butter and the price paid farmers for butterfat. The same quackery is slated to be applied to the price of meat, and how can it possibly end there? Certainly the price of coal will be a likely candidate for attention as soon as the consumer has to bear the cost of the recent wage boosts granted to the coal miners. Ceiling prices on lumber and unsatisfactory wages in the woods have affected the production of logs and so here is another field for subsidy fertilization. Paper is another candidate. In fact the possibilities are endless, extending into every kind of production and distribution.

But now back to butter. As soon as the ceiling price of butter was lowered—the loss presumably to be made up by a subsidy, and presumably without disturbing the price paid to the farmer for butterfat—in spite of all this the price of butterfat began to sag. The full effect of the subsidy plan has not yet become apparent, but there is something happening that suggests that the processors are aiming to collect the subsidy from the Government in cash and from the farmer in reduction of price. It is only natural that the processors should attempt to protect themselves against the vagaries of the market on the one hand and the regulations and red tape of the Government on the other, but that isn't the way the scheme is supposed to work.

But why all this fuss about butter? The butter ration is 1 pound per month per person, and a saving of 5 cents a pound means an annual saving of 60 cents a year, which is the smallest kind of small change in the increases in the wages of industrial labor. For any sensible person, let alone a Government expert economist, to consider this a roll-back of inflation makes the folly of King Canute to sweep back the tide with a broom just a playful pastime.

Inflation cannot be rolled back. It cannot be stopped without stopping the cause and the cause has been the administration laws which have permitted industrial labor to hold up the country by demanding and demanding and demanding. The brave words in which the President has indulged have been meaningless, because wages do not freeze and the vicious circle of rising wages, more money to spend, and rising prices continues to whirl.

And the beautiful experiment of meeting the whole problem of inflation by granting subsidies is going to cost $80,000,000 for butter alone, and an additional $300,000,000 or more for meat, and the President estimates the total cost at from one and a half to two billions of dollars. All this is to be added to the already heavy tax burden. Then add the millions or billions which will be necessary if the subsidy plan is to be applied to hold the line in clothing, shelter, and scores of other consumer wants, and the subsidy method will fall of its own weight and is itself inflationary.

The subsidy method only saves the consumer money in one place, and gives him more money to spend in another place, which is inflation all over again.

Don't License This Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the foregoing captior, the Washington News of June 23 has the following editorial:

DON'T LICENSE THIS RACKET

The other day the National Labor Relations Board came right out and told the truth—that the war production program has been "perverted" by a "most lucrative labor racket."

Other Government agencies have been excessively coy about this matter. In the last 2 or 3 years hundreds of thousands of citizens have been compelled to pay many millions of dollars to closed-shop unions (principally American Federation of Labor unions) for the privilege of working on defense and war projects. The union initiation fees have been, and are, outrageously high. And in innumerable cases those who paid them obtained no more than temporary "work permits." But, beyond gentle appeals to the unions to be reasonable, the Government has done nothing.

The National Labor Relations Board asserts that this racket would be immunized by an American Federation of Labor-sponsored amendment, passed by the House, which would bar the Board from considering complaints arising from management-labor agreements that have been in existence more than 90 days.

The American Federation of Labor's immediate object is to prevent interference with closed-shop contracts between its metal-trades unions and 3 Kaiser shipyards in the Pacific Northwest. These yards, which had only 264 employees when the contracts were made, now have about 90,000, all paying the American Federation of Labor unions. And, according to the National Labor Relations Board, just one of the local unions concerned now enjoys an annual revenue of some $3,000,000. The Congress of Industrial Organizations wants to displace the American Federation of Labor unions, and the Board has been giving sympathetic consideration to Congress of Industrial Organizations charges that the American Federation of Labor contracts are illegal.

Without attempting to discuss the merits of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations jurisdictional row here involved, we agree with the National Labor Relations Board that the House made a serious mistake when it passed the American Federation of Labor's amendment. Its effect, as the Board says, would be to sweep away all restrictions on closed-shop contracts. Such contracts, made with company-dominated unions, or as a result of collusion or fraud, and even though a contracting union had no members at all among the employees affected, could easily be kept secret for 90 days. Thereafter they would be beyond the reach of any Federal agency, and employees would have no protection against discharge or other penalties if they refused to pay whatever fees, dues, and assessments the unions might demand.

This would amount to a license for racketeering labor organizers to prey on individual workers. Instead of that, we think, Congress should give individual workers at least a small measure of protection against the "most lucrative labor racket" by requiring all unions to file public reports of their fees, dues, and other financial affairs.

Mr. Speaker, for something like 7 years from the well of the House an effort to end the racket referred to above has been made by me. Perhaps some day one of the four freedoms—freedom from fear—will be restored to the American workingman and he will be permitted to accept and work at a job without being required to buy a work permit of a political ally of the administration.

Some Sound, Homespun Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a quotation from an address delivered by Mr. Frank Tripp, chairman of the Allied Newspaper Council, before the International Circulation Managers' Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on June 23, 1943.

The statements in this address are contrary to the new philosophy preached and advocated in this land. It is not yet too late for the American people to awaken to a realization that no one has invented a substitute for work or created a government superior to simple arithmetic. Social gains and the demanding of more wages for doing less in a shorter time was not the philosophy or principle on which our forebears established an empire in the wilderness.

Let the youth of the land understand that only through work, perseverance, ambition, and the right of the individual to better himself can real freedom from want and freedom from fear be realized.

Mr. Tripp gave the youth of the country to understand that America's next generation would be a servile, spineless race of dependents if it seeks only freedom from want and personal security. He did not hesitate to say that the newsboys of today will be the men of tomorrow on whom the future of America depends.

If that type of boy comes to think that all to which he aspires is the bunk and that freedom from want and personal security are the sum total of American life, then the jig is up and our next generation will be a servile, spineless race of dependents, no better off than the pitiful peoples for whom we fight.

Mr. Tripp asserted the Nation would return "to that day when public servants worked for the people and not the people for the public servant; when a pauper was just a pauper and not an able-bodied man leaning on a Works Project Administration shovel by the roadside; when 2 out of 10 people do not live off the public till half of them putting fool figures into fool books; when school teachers teach school and don't try to tell practical men how to do something they have spent their lives learning to do efficiently and well; when the workers' dollar will not be raided by indirect hidden taxes in order that millions of the faithful

may remain on the public pay rolls; when the newspaper boy of today may become the captain of tomorrow but knows that it can never be except by his own sweat and perseverance.

TRUTH WILL LEAD US BACK

We will go back to that day because the truth will lead us back. The truth of our own times the story of our folly revealed to us by that daily visitor to our fireside—the newspaper. That will lead us back because there never will be a Hitler who can muzzle or suppress it.

Facts the Bureaucrats Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a practical farmer and canner comes the following letter, which I hope Members will read and, when they have read it, join in doing something to the bureaucrats that will enable farmers and processors of food to produce to their fullest capacity. The letter reads:

THE BURNETTE FARMS PACKING CO.,
Hartford, Mich., June 23, 1943.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: There are certain facts which every Government official who is interested in agriculture should know. I submit for your consideration certain conditions which prevail in this section of the country.

First, on our own family farms of more than 1,000 acres we have had four complete failures in our large orchards, namely; cherries, apples, pears and peaches. Nevertheless we must continue to cultivate and spray these orchards.

Regarding the other crops, we have had to prepare the soil two or three times before we could do our seeding on account of weather conditions. We have had to seed some of our crops on the lowlands twice. We have also had to revise our normal program of planting and put forth double the normal effort to get our crops under way.

You are doubtless very familiar with the muck soils around Decatur where great quantities of vegetables are grown. I made a personal survey of that section last Sunday. I would judge that at this time only about one-half of the muck soil has been seeded. Around Dowagiac it seems to me that about three-fourths of the muck soil is out of production this year because of the weather conditions, lack of farm workers and other unusual difficulties which the farmers are meeting in these times.

I think the drive of the administration for the subsidy program is extremely discouraging to most farmers on top of the other difficulties. The farmer knows that the processors will not venture to pay him more than they will be able to get out of his product. The cost of producing farm crops has increased greatly because labor is higher and less efficient than in normal times. Likewise, the cost of processing is higher for the same reasons.

There are many little things which enter into the cost of processing which the Government administrators will not be able to grasp in figuring out subsidies. The processors know this. For example, last year the price of cartons for canned goods were quoted at $52.50 a thousand. We cannot buy those cartons this year for less than $71 a thousand, and we are not sure of getting sufficient quantities at those prices.

I want you to know that I am giving you this information mostly for the good of the cause and not necessarily for my own personal benefit. We are in a better position than most farmers and processors because we grow the majority of crops we process and can get by through the interchange of labor and by holding down the quantity to what we can handle without taking risks that are too hazardous. Another big point in our favor is that we have an aluminum foundry where we can furnish work the year around to the breadwinners of the large families while their wives and children live in the community and can stand by for helping in the harvest of our crops. But these are advantages which other farmers and other processors do not have.

If the committees who are interested in the farm program will get authentic information from each section of the country they will be convinced that it would be dangerous to saddle the subsidy program on the farms and processors of this country for the purpose of pacifying the city workers or even for pacifying the consumers. Unless you give the farmers and the processors an incentive to put forth extraordinary effort to produce the food which the country needs, you will not get that food. It is not because we wouldn't do it, but because we couldn't.

I doubt if the average industrial worker and city dweller realizes that it takes a farmer about 4 years to add a milk cow to his herd. First he must breed his cow. Then wait for the calf to be born. Then the calf must be fed for at least 2 years and then bred and fed another year before the young cow freshens and begins to produce. That is 4 years from the time the farmer makes up his mind to add a new cow to his herd.

When I put out an apple orchard I know that it will be from 10 to 12 years before that apple orchard will begin to produce. Therefore, I have to plan to take profits from the other crops to invest in that apple orchard for 10 years.

I wonder if the Government administrators who are goading the farmers to get more food produced realize that the farmer must make these 4- or 10-year plans to produce what the Government wants? Do the subsidy advocators realize that it is going to cost the farmer more to plan and produce a new milk cow and a new apple orchard under the present conditions than it did in the past? If they don't, it will be just too bad to wake up like Rip Van Winkle a few years from now and discover what has been done to undermine the fundamental principles of farm planning and production. The farmer must have a profit to keep up his production from year to year, and from one generation to the next, just as a manufacturer must take into consideration the wear and tear replacement and obsolescence of his machinery and equipment.

It would be tragical for our elected representatives who are in a position to get the facts to apologize to this country some time in the future by saying that their intentions were good, but they simply made mistakes in judgment. Our resources of agriculture would be just as depleted, and the people of the world just as hungry as if that had been the intention of the men in position and power at the present time.

I know that you know the agricultural problems because you live in an agricultural district. I know that there are many other elective representatives who have this fundamental knowledge. I am rather proud of the fact that you and certain others in Washington have the courage to express your convictions. I believe that the people throughout the country appreciate this courage and that it gives them hope for the future.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM A. BURNETTE.

Salvage and Scrap Collection in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when Pearl Harbor galvanized this Nation into action and it became necessary to marshal every resource in the victory effort, the cry went forth for vast quantities of scrap so that steel mills might continue to supply maximum quantities of steel for the instruments of war. But the scrap which had accumulated on farms and in fields, in attics and cellars was of little value unless it was collected and delivered to shipping points from which it could find its way to the mills. Scrap collection had to be organized. It required direction and publicity. It required the organization of counties and communities into militant collection units. It required the coordination of schools, clubs, and societies. It required the development of enthusiastic scrap campaigns. It required vigorous and unselfish direction.

The State of Illinois performed outstanding service in the field of salvage and scrap collection, and, in fact, lead the entire Nation in results. This achievement is due to the patriotic and enthusiastic way in which citizens and groups responded to the call of country and to the brilliant and energetic direction which was given to the work. I take pleasure in paying tribute to Nathaniel Leverone, of Chicago, who served as salvage director for the State of Illinois; to Ben Regan, who served as executive director for the State; and to William L. McFetridge, of Chicago, who served as salvage director for the metropolitan area of Chicago, for their remarkable accomplishments in this field, for the tireless way in which they served the cause, and for the patriotic service which they rendered on the home front in supplying scrap and salvage so that the weapons of victory might be kept rolling and flying. The editorial comment on their service by the Chicago American on June 24, 1943, is richly deserved:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

Nathaniel Leverone, resigning as Illinois salvage director, and Ben Regan, as his assistant, leave Illinois and the Nation in their debt.

These men, in cooperation with William L. McFetridge, salvage director of the Chicago metropolitan area, shaped the pattern for the Nation in methods of getting in vitally needed scrap for the war plants.

Under their leadership Illinois set the salvage pace for the States, leading in per

capita collection of some items and rolling up highest tonnages in others.

The organized patriotism of Illinois, millions, channeled skillfully, bore fruit in a tremendous flow of materials into the war industries and in a quickened response throughout the country, inspired by Illinois' example.

Because the Messrs. Leverone and Regan labored as they did, with enthusiasm and insight and tireless devotion, American fighting men and on fronts around the world got more weapons sooner than they would have had them otherwise.

It would be hard to imagine a finer service to America than that.

Nationalism Versus Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk made by me last night, June 25, over the national network of the National Broadcasting Co. on the subject of American nationalism today, with the introductory remarks of the station announcer.

There being no objection, the address and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, United States Senator from North Carolina, speaks to you from Washington on the subject I Am a Nationalist. Senator REYNOLDS holds membership in the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Territories and Insular Affairs; and he is chairman of the important Military Affairs Committee.

Ladies and gentlemen, Senator REYNOLDS.

Senator REYNOLDS. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure this evening to talk with you concerning nationalism, a subject which should find interest with every American, native-born or naturalized, who has at heart the welfare of the United States.

Prior to our entrance into the present World War the outstanding question before the American people was isolationism versus intervention. I was an isolationist. I voted against the lifting of the arms embargo, the repeal of the neutrality laws, and the passage of the Lend Lease Act, knowing that all of them were steps toward war. The interventionists contended that they were steps away from war.

Today the question of the hour is nationalism versus internationalism.

What is nationalism? Nationalism is the law of self-preservation, nationally applied. The first law of nature is self-preservation as applied to man. The first law as applied to an individual nation should be self-preservation. Therefore, being interested in the preservation of the Constitution of the United States and the welfare of America, I am proud to declare to you that I am a nationalist.

Real nationalism must at all times be distinguished from fictional or bogus nationalism. The seizure of control over a people by a piratical group, such as the Communists over the Russian people, the Fascists over the Italian people, the Nazis over the German people, or the Black Dragonists over the Japanese people, may result in setting up a fictional or bogus nationalism, but never a real nationalism. A real nationalism must truly represent the people and have a real ideology which deserves the enthusiastic support of the people. Instead of real nationalism causing wars, no greater safeguard of peace, order, and prosperity can be conceived. Its people want neither war nor aggression, because any real ideology is necessarily opposed to both. Moreover, there is no proper place in any real nationalism for nonassimilable persons or groups. Fictional or bogus nationalism is usually a disguise for internationalism which requires the destruction of real nationalism, and, therefore, defames the latter as being responsible for the wars which are caused and manipulated by internationalism. Deliberate confusion of real nationalism with fictional or bogus nationalism in propaganda emanating from the camp of internationalism has been chiefly responsible for the recent progress of the superstate advocates toward the destruction of civilization. No nationalist can be an intrusionist or interventionist into the affairs of any other nation, nor can he be an isolationist in the sense of wanting his nation to have no relations with other real nations. If any such isolationism were a part of Americanism, the United States Constitution would not contain express provisions for treaties with other nations.

Regardless of the fact that we are at war, engaged in combat upon the seven seas and in every quarter of the earth, is no reason why we who are interested in the future of our country should not speak out boldly in the interests of our country.

We are winning this war. We are going to experience final victory. We shall triumph, and while our sons and the sons of our friends and neighbors are dying upon foreign fields we should here on the home front now carry on in the interest of those heroes who fight and bleed and die abroad.

Prior to Pearl Harbor I voted for every national defense measure. I insisted upon making America impregnable to the assault or assaults of any enemy. I not only voted for every defense measure, including the selective-service system and approval of unlimited appropriations totaling billions for the development of our national defense, but as early as 1938 I visited Alaska and the Aleutian Islands and then insisted upon the development of our fortifications and the installations of others in that area. I then proposed the construction of the Alaskan Highway. If my proposals had been carried out, there would be no Japanese on American territory today, and the highway leading to Fairbanks could have been constructed at one-fourth the cost when finally our Government took that step.

In the interest of national defense, I introduced a bill in the Congress of the United States providing that the hundreds of thousands of boys in the C. C. C. camps be given basic military training; and if my suggestion had been carried out then, at the beginning of this war we would have had as a civilian basis for national defense more than 1,300,000 young men who had been through the C. C. C. camps.

During the course of those days prior to Pearl Harbor I advocated the acquisition of islands in the Caribbean and the North Atlantic, from Trinidad (British) to Miquelon and St. Pierre (French). In other words, I strongly recommended and urged the welding of a band of steel around the Western Hemisphere, from the Panama Canal to the Arctic Zone, that would make our section of the world secure against attack of any enemy or enemies.

Now that we are in the war we must win the war, but little will we have gained to have won the war if we lose the peace. Therefore, I am firmly convinced that we should inquire of our friends and allies, those of the United Nations, as to our war aims. At a time when we are pouring millions of men into uniform, distributing billions of dollars throughout the world, and making the greatest sacrifice in the form of expenditures of time and wealth that any nation upon the earth ever made in any war or wars, we have a right to know for what we are fighting.

We have a right to know just who will get what and where, when victory has been won. As a nationalist, one who is interested in the welfare and the future of his country, I think it would be well now, while our allies need us, to find out from each of them their respective objectives.

Heretofore, I have felt that while the war is in progress we should devote our entire time and energy to the winning of the war, and not in the consideration of post-war matters, but I have changed my opinion. I believe that the leaders of all the United Nations should be brought together for the purpose of finding out just what is going to take place when the war has ended. In other words, after victory is won and the Japanese reptiles have been driven from Hong Kong, China, will we return Hong Kong to the Republic of China, now under the direction of our allied leader, Chiang Kai-shek, or will it be returned to the British who, seized it from China during the second opium war in 1856.

When we will have driven the treacherous Japs from the Dutch East Indies, Java, and Sumatra, and adjoining islands, probably at the cost of thousands upon thousands of American lives, will we deliver those islands over to the Javanese to administer as they see fit—since we fight to redeliver the Philippines to the Filipinos—or will this territory be turned back to the Netherlands?

When we will have succeeded in driving the vicious Japs from the Malay States, will this land be turned back to the British or will it be given to the natives thereof for their own administration?

When we have crushed the might of the German hordes and the Russians have overrun Finland, Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, and Poland, will the people of those countries be forced into the Soviet Union against their wishes, or will the peoples of these separate nations be provided the guaranty of freedom and self-government as enunciated in the Atlantic Charter?

To repeat, instead of awaiting the end of the war and settling these matters at the peace table, I am of the opinion that it is our duty to ascertain now the objectives of the United Nations. In other words—what are our war aims? As American citizens interested in the welfare of our country above the welfare of any other country, we should give consideration to these matters now.

I declare that many groups are taking advantage of the fact that we are at war to advance their own selfish motives and interests. There are those who are taking advantage of these critical hours to advocate the repeal of the Declaration of Independence, the dissolution of the United States of America, and to make our country a part of a world nation, thereby destroying our sovereignty for which our forefathers fought, bled, and died. There are those who are advocating "union now," a world-wide Work Projects Administration, and half a hundred other ideologies, all of which would tend to destroy our national sovereignty and reduce the standard of living of the American laboring man to the level of the coolies of China or the peons of many of our sister republics to the south. To all of these I am opposed.

Since the beginning of the present war in Europe in September of 1939, more than 480,000 aliens of all classes were admitted to the

United States from foreign countries, amongst whom were 324,000 who entered this country as temporary visitors, as transients, or students, etc. I protest these admissions. I criticize the admission of nearly half a million aliens into this country since the war began, at a time when we are sending our sons to their lands to fight their battles. While our men are on foreign shores, in uniform, in more than 70 different places throughout the world, those for whom they fight leave their battle zones and come to America to bask in the sunshine of safety and prosperity.

War or no war, the time has arrived when the citizens of the United States, native-born or naturalized, should look after the interests of their own country, and conserve, protect, and guard well here the "four freedoms" for which we are fighting in every part of the world.

When World War No. 1 ended, the national indebtedness was only 28 billion dollars, with 11 million of our citizens unemployed. When this war will have ended, the total indebtedness will probably exceed 500 billion dollars, with 15 to 20 million Americans walking the streets seeking employment, and with millions of American youngsters returning from foreign lands to be hospitalized, pensioned, and cared for.

With this picture before us, we should give consideration now to the future and the welfare of America, before considering a world-wide Work Projects Administration, a quart of milk every day to each of the 2,000,000,000 people upon the face of the earth, the admission of untold numbers of immigrants—Europeans and Asiatics—to compete with our millions of unemployed, and probably the policing of the entire world, at the expense of the American taxpayers.

When this war is won it seems to me that before we can make much progress in reshaping the destiny and future of the peoples of the world we shall have to put our own house in order and rid ourselves of all this confusion and mess of affairs within our Government, and come back to the fundamental principles of honesty and integrity, without regard to political expediency.

Yes; I am a nationalist, or, if you prefer, an American-Firster; and I am glad to be able to state that in this country, despite the smearing and the unlimited propaganda over the air and through the press, I share the opinion of millions upon millions of Americans who believe in saving America for Americans, be they native-born or naturalized.

To you who have done me the honor to listen in, may I say that if you should care to secure a copy of my talk, I shall on request be glad to send you a copy or copies thereof for your file or for distribution.

ANNOUNCER. You have heard the address, I Am a Nationalist, by the Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, United States Senator from North Carolina and chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

Senator REYNOLDS spoke from Washington.

Tribute to Louis D. Brandeis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very eloquent and able address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], at Chicago, Ill., before the Memorial Association of Chicago, in tribute to the late Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Louis D. Brandeis.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a happy occasion when I can leave the manifold responsibilities of government in the Nation's Capital and associate with my friends in my native State. The legislative problems today are fourfold, and it is only through the return to the State for inspiration that we are able to get the answer to the many situations which confront us. I am doubly happy tonight in knowing that I could accept this kind invitation to come to the city of Chicago and speak before a group of citizens interested in forming a colony for refugees in Palestine as a perpetual tribute to the illustrious name of the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis.

Recently the President of the United States appointed me as one of the American delegates to attend the refugee conference on the island of Bermuda. After 10 days of constant labor in conjunction with the delegates from the British Isles, we made our findings, drew up our report, and submitted it to our respective Governments as a confidential document. The appointment of this delegation by the President of the United States grew out of the fact that in 1939 he called together certain world powers for a conference at Evian, France, the result of that meeting being the creation of what was known as an intergovernmental committee for the purpose of helping the Jews in Germany, Austria, and the Sudetenland, who were then being cruelly persecuted by Adolf Hitler. It is eloquent testimony to our President's humanitarianism and passion for justice, that even though he is the busiest man in the world he could find time, both before and since the war, to give his personal attention to this complex problem.

I should like to say to my friends in the city of Chicago and throughout the Middle West that the Bermuda Conference made substantial progress under the agenda as outlined by the American and British Governments. It must be thoroughly understood that this delegation appointed was one with limited jurisdiction. We had no power to make commitments for our governments. The best we could do was to make the findings and recommendations after the evidence had been submitted. Because of military implications involving neutral countries and the problem of shipping, I am unable to give to the country the total results of that historical gathering, but, suffice to say, the delegates examined the refugee problem in all its aspects, including the position of those potential refugees who are still in the grip of the Axis Powers without any immediate prospect of escape. Nothing was excluded from our analysis and everything that held out any possibility, however remote, of solution of the problem was carefully investigated, thoroughly discussed, and rendered available for our respective governments. We agreed upon a number of concrete recommendations, some of which already have become effective, and yet which I am unable to tell the public because of the military implications involved. The Palestine question was discussed pro and con with the English delegates. They, too, were more than sympathetic with the great refugee problem in Europe as the result of the savage and barbaric policy adopted by Adolf Hitler.

It is well for you to know that Palestine has absorbed over 40,000 refugees since the outbreak of the war, and it is no secret that the British Government is willing to take 39,000 more into Palestine between now and March of next year, if they can find the shipping capacity, or the available ways and means to do this humanitarian work. My earnest hope is that the terms of the white paper may be indefinitely extended by the British Government. My fervent hope is that all oppressed peoples everywhere may speedily find a place of haven and sanctuary.

A colony in Palestine in memory of the late Louis D. Brandeis will materially aid as another link in the chain of the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine. However, before this can be made a permanent shrine, we all agree that Axis tyranny must be destroyed.

I would be sorely derelict in my duty here tonight if I did not emphasize the fact that America in this struggle fights for her very existence. Long have our enemies prepared for this all-out conflict. They thoroughly believe that they are supermen. The fury of their wrath remains unabated in this eventful struggle. It was on Monday of this week before leaving Washington that I learned that it is the consensus of opinion of the men who fought and captured Attu that this island was fortified and inhabited by Japanese soldiers long before their treacherous stab in the back at Pearl Harbor. This clearly indicates their well-defined plan of preparation which was in the making many years before the battle started.

This fight, my friends, is not on a one-way street. While at this moment our armies in the air, on the land, and over the sea are winning brilliant and glorious victories over the enemy, yet these victories should not be acclaimed by the American people with the idea that the end of the war is near.

It should be remembered that Germany, Italy, and Japan are fighting, too, for their existence. They realize as we do that if they are defeated in this war it will mean the end of their military and despotic powers forever. Their slogan is "Victory or destruction," and with that kind of propaganda constantly being broadcast over the air to their people, you can readily understand how much they will endure and the hardships they will suffer before they agree to unconditional surrender. Whether it is a long war or a short one will depend primarily upon the kind of high patriotic work the American people do here on the home front. The quickest way to alleviate the suffering of the remaining Jews in the conquered countries is the complete defeat of Adolf Hitler and his cruel clan.

The assurance that the Louis D. Brandeis colony will become a permanent fixture in the land of Palestine lies directly in the total defeat of the Nazi, the Fascist, and the Jap armies.

I think you will agree with me that if Rommel and his panzer divisions had been successful in conquering General Montgomery and his army, overrunning Libya, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and the rest of the Middle East, and ultimately joining hands with the Japs coming in from the west, we probably would not be here tonight discussing the memorial for this great man, because today Palestine would be under the domination of the despotic and tyrannic rulers, who would have persecuted the Jews and the other people of Palestine as they have in other conquered countries. Yet, my friends, because Rommel failed, because we have driven the Nazi and Italian armies out of this territory, because we have been successful in taking a few islands in the Mediterranean, because the great Red Army of Russia has been able to hold the Hitler hordes on the Russian front, it does not mean that Hitler and his armies are finished.

For the first time Hitler and Mussolini are really on the defensive. It may be a short route to Italy but it is a long journey to Germany from any direction except through the air.

My plea tonight is that Americans forget their optimism when thinking about the end of the war. While this is bound to come, yet whether it comes sooner or later depends upon the cooperation of the American people at home in an all-out effort, of service, sacrifice, and unselfishness. Our young men have done and are doing their share. They have entered the service, seized arms, undergone physical training, learned to march, to shoot, to fly, in fact everything that has been asked of them—and done it with a magnificent thrilling spirit. One day last week I was privileged to listen to a speech in Washington off the record by a man who had come direct from one of the principal battle zones on this war. This officer said that the morale of the men in the Army was excellent, that they were willing to sleep in swamps, fight in the jungle, lie for hours in a wounded condition on the desert sands, and take it all with a smile. Nevertheless, these same soldiers were beginning to have their doubts as to whether all was well on the home front.

It is well to state that we have done a marvelous job of production. We have produced munitions and war machines and material at a pace that warps anything in history. To the manufacturers and to the laboring men in those plants, I take off my hat.

It was the great Samuel Gompers, revered by all organized labor, who said that war is essentially a contest between the tools and the tool makers of the respective countries involved, and at this point of my address I want to sincerely and wholeheartedly commend all loyal labor of this country who have done so much to give us the tools that have made it possible for us to now take the initiative in this global conflict. Loyal labor has given us the best tanks, the best airplanes, the best ships and guns in all history. Without the continuation of such loyalty of the men and women in the ranks of labor, America cannot win this war, America cannot survive.

The farmers produced more in 1942 than at any time in all of our history. To them I give great credit. The white-collared man, and the salaried individual, even though his lot is difficult, he has complained but little. And yet, with this record, there is still something radically wrong. We still aren't mad enough at our savage foes. We spend too much time in condemnation of one another instead of viciously lashing out at our enemies, who seek to destroy us all. We must back our heroic soldiers and sailors without stint or limitation; no profiteering, no strikes, no black markets, no hoarding, and the immediate elimination of much quibbling and quarreling in Washington. We must remember that while our individual problems are important, if we are to be successful in the end, we must view the national picture in its entirety and not from the selfish eyes of any single individual or interest. We must be able to give and take; we must be able to compromise; we must realize that the winning of the war is the primary purpose, and that unless we are successful, our problems now will be no more because we become slaves under the tyrannical rule of dictators. We must build behind our soldiers a wall of morale that will make each and everyone of them feel that all is well back home.

My friends, it is something to conjure with when we see and realize the sacrifices that our soldiers are willing to make in order that liberty may live. Representing the State which produced Lincoln, Douglas, and Grant, I plead with the American people, regardless of their station in life, regardless of what their annoyance may be, regardless of what their suffering is at this moment, to compare, if they will, their troubles with the hardships, suffering, and trials of the American boys in every part of the world. If Americans will do that, it should not be a difficult task to adjust themselves to a spirit of national unity that knows no bounds, in sacrifice, compromise, and service. I should like to see an era of good feeling come to the home front, which you and I know does not exist at this moment. We have gained the initiative in this war. We will soon open a second front in Europe. The time will not be long when we shall make an all-out assault against the unspeakable Japs. When all of this happens, the casualty list will be long. When that happens, the home front should be burning with a patriotic desire to back these soldiers to the very limit. It would be a sad day for America, indeed, if, while our armies were winning these brilliant victories on every front of the world, our conduct at home were such that it would impair or jeopardize the national economy and the national spirit of victory to the end that this same chaotic, semidefeatist spirit, might reach those who are doing the fighting, and the dying.

My friends, believe me when I say that, day after day, I am confronted with gigantic problems of legislation, but I refuse to look at any of these through the microscope of selfishness, or the microscope of one political party or the other. I am trying to follow the philosophy of the great liberal Justice Brandeis as I view these American problems in a crisis that means the continuation of this Republic or the destruction of it forever. You will agree with me that political parties and individual interests which have upheld the traditions of a free nation, would have no standing if the so-called Hitler new order became effective throughout the world. America, as we understand her, must live. Politicians may come and politicians may go, but the basic and fundamental principles upon which the country was founded and has prospered for a century and a half must live on. Her ideals must never die, even though we recognize at this moment that the blood bath of European torture and barbarism is literally shaking the pillars of civilization throughout the world. America must win in order that she may remain the living symbol for all the oppressed peoples throughout the world. America must win in order that she may play the leading part in winning the peace.

If Justice Brandeis were alive today, he would be fighting at the side of our Commander in Chief in the winning of the war. He would be at the side of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the winning of the peace. We must be ready and unified and certain in our minds and action the minute that the Nazis and Nipponese lay down their arms to set up international machinery that will prevent those savages from rising again. Their heavy industry must be curtailed; all of their machinery by which the weapons of war are fashioned must be removed from their lands; embargoes must be laid upon critical materials; their armament works must be dismantled, their airplane factories stripped, and watchmen put to police them for years to come, if we are to avoid another war in the next 15 or 20 years. I am certain that if the great jurist were alive today he would unequivocally approve of the basic principles of a policy that means to keep the peace. In conclusion, let me say that I was personally acquainted with this great jurist. I have read many of his opinions. He was one of those Americans who could take it in his stride. He was tolerant. He was patient. He was fair. He was generous. His opinions which he wrote during the 23 years he was on the bench have left their permanent imprint upon our national jurisprudence. As everyone familiar with the Zionist organization knows, he was deeply interested in that movement. He had great love for his fellowmen; a passionate sympathy for little children, the weak, and the oppressed. He had a true concept of basic humanitarianism. He displayed this trait in his public and private life. He was forever protecting the rights of the individual under the welfare and commerce clause of the Constitution. He thoroughly believed that the Constitution of our forefathers was made for man, and not man for the Constitution. If he were alive today, he would be a tower of strength to this country because of his noble traits and character. My prayer is that so long as America shall live the memory and the deeds of Justice Brandeis shall also live.

Transportation of Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on or about May 25, according to my recollection, members of the Military Affairs Committee visited the city of New York, at which time we were provided the opportunity of making a tour by boat around the port and terminals. We were joined by a number of Members of the House and several Members of the Senate, who are not members of the Military Affairs Committee. It was a very enjoyable and informative trip. One of my fellow North Carolinians, Col. K. W. Thom, delivered a very interesting talk, which I should like to have permission to have published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Port Transportation Division is charged with the movement of all supplies, troops, impedimenta and individuals traveling under orders into the port by all means, and with the movement of in-bound freight and personnel returning from overseas, including prisoners, wounded, captured material and salvage.

General Goodman has explained how supplies are made available for movement overseas—you have observed the ships and method of loading for the movement from the port. You have seen a staging area where troops are temporarily placed for final check-up and issue of last minute requirements, how they are moved into these areas and how they are moved out. I should like to explain briefly how our part of the job is done.

In order to make plain, I must make comparisons; each of the ships you have seen takes cargo involving the use of from 300 to 600 carloads of freight, depending upon the class of freight—we will use as an example a convoy of about 38 ships recently handled through this port; on account of the peculiar characteristics of the freight, we could not use freight cars to capacity, the average carload for this movement ran 17½ tons per car, requiring a train of cars which would reach from New York to a point about midway between Washington and Richmond—or Fredericksburg. These cars originate at perhaps 20 or more points of origin, and in order to coordinate their movement into the port, we must know where, when, and what freight is

desired at each particular ship berth, therefore, immediately upon learning the design of ships assigned to the port, we confer with the Army Transport Service and work with them, preparing loading and berthing plans. On account of the characteristics of this port, which involve a large movement by water, after reaching the port area, the movement of every pound must be coordinated in order to get it alongside the ship or available on the piers in the order that it goes into the ship. If the ship is not properly loaded it cannot be properly navigated.

On receipt of movement orders by the troop-movement division at this port, we confer as to where it is planned to billet the troops and when they should move to make designated convoy. The actual movement from home station takes place on order from the port commander following this conference, and the movement must be coordinated in much the same manner as the movement of freight. From staging area to ship gangplank is a distinct move. A recent move of 60,000 troops involving use of 71 trains moved in 36 hours, requiring much planning and coordination. On recent move of approximately 30,000 troops, more than 100 units were involved, moving from as many points of origin, ranging from Fort Lewis, Oreg., over through Minnesota and Michigan and the Mexican border, Florida, and several points in the lower Mississippi Valley. The organizational equipment cannot always move in the same trains with the troops. Troops may move across the continent in 4½ to 5 days, while their equipment requires 7 to 10 days. It is obvious that considerable planning must be done in connection with each movement.

In handling the movement as defined, we cannot lose sight of the fact that a gun without a carriage, a hospital without beds, or a telephone line without wire or telephones is no good. This division checks each shipment carefully and sees to it all units are "married up," also inspects each package for proper markings, packing, and crating—obviously the supplies must reach the user in usable condition. Through an intensive campaign for proper marking, packing, and crating, irregularities in this connection are being reduced to a minimum, resulting in saving of much time, money, and "paper work" at the port.

One word about records: General Goodman's people must know the status of their supplies at all times in order to efficiently use our facilities for the movement of essentials; also, you gentlemen will want to know lots of things after this affair is over. Therefore, careful essential records are kept, mostly by women. More than 50 percent of our entire force is composed of women, and, as you have seen, we are using women—and I hope using them well—in freight handling and as operators of heavy and light freight-handling equipment. Our clerical force is composed of more than 90 percent women, our entire force comprising 161 officers and 5,400 civilian employees.

We have a very cosmopolitan group of women in our division; for instance, a classmate of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, dancers, school teachers, department-store clerks, waitresses, wives of professional men, and wives of servicemen who are "hell bent" on doing something for the war effort. All of them are doing a fine job, and I must admit the records are in their favor. Accidents and damage to personnel and property have been reduced to a minimum and the freight moves according to plan.

To sum it all up: The policy of this division, approved by the commanding general of the port, is to move the men and supplies, and we try to move the freight promptly, get it where it is wanted, when it is wanted, and in usable condition, and move the troops as comfortably as possible and get them where they are wanted, when they are wanted, and in condition to fight when they get there. So far we have been able to accomplish our mission, and I would be amiss if I did not say that we could not do our job properly without the wholehearted support and cooperation of the railroads who serve this port. In our group of more than 150 officers, I am the only professional soldier. Our officers are doing the job now which they have done remarkably well in civil life. The idea that we have tried to carry through here is that we know our job. We know what is desired and what is required. The railroad people know that we know, and also know that we will not request the impossible of them. However, they have performed the apparent impossible on several occasions since December 7, 1941.

Address by John A. Reilly, President of the District of Columbia Bankers Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. John A. Reilly, president of the District of Columbia Bankers Association, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the association on June 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This year marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of annual conventions of the District of Columbia Bankers Association. In happier days such an occasion would call for a silver jubilee program at either Hot Springs or White Sulphur. In former years our programs were planned just prior or subsequent to graduations. Happiness, peace, and contentment filled the atmosphere. Today we witness a far different scene.

Total global war has disrupted our economy and has left broken hearts and broken homes in its wake. As the shadow of this horrible conflict lengthens, its impact is felt by every household. When our boys reach the age when they would normally enter upon their business or professional careers they must leave for the battlefields. They are off to save America and our system of free enterprise.

I feel confident that, if we were to put the question to them tonight should our association suspend such meetings until victory has been achieved, their answers would be definitely "No." They would ask us to carry on and do our best to protect and preserve what they are fighting and dying for.

With this thought in mind, our council of administration decided to have this annual meeting. The program has been streamlined and all recreational events have been eliminated.

The year that is about to come to a close has been one of the most eventful in the history of our association. This was to be expected, because it was our first full year as a nation at war.

Our staff of officers, our council of administration, and the members of all standing and special committees have given generously of their time and talents during the year. They have brought prestige to our association and have been progressive and successful in increasing the usefulness of the private banking system to our community and to our Government.

Perhaps everyone within the hearing of my voice has heard the statement made that the private banking system is on the way out. The Government is about to move in. I challenge anyone to justify such a conclusion.

The private banking system is so close to the hearts and the happiness of our people that, like the air we breathe, we pay little attention to it, much less appreciate its importance and indispensability.

When Hitler marched into Poland in 1939 and thousands of our most important citizens were stranded, who facilitated their journey home? The banks of America.

When business executives desired to respond to the call to arms and found their enterprises and personal affairs involved, whom did they consult? The trust officers of our banks. By being prepared to take over in a fiduciary capacity immediately, we made these valuable men available to our armed forces. They also left for the battlefields of the world serenely confident that their interests would be protected and their loved ones taken care of.

When the economy of our country had to be transformed from peacetime pursuit to war production, many serious and perplexing problems were presented. Thousands of businessmen were confronted with expanding their modest plants. They neither had the money nor the experience for such a program. Our bank executives were wise and prudent counselors and not only gave advice, but backed the program with loans and took the leadership in negotiating for their customers with the Government for supplemental financing.

There are nearly 15,000 financial institutions in America and over 3,750 branch banks. These 18,750 units were sufficient to cover the banking needs of our country during normal times. After Pearl Harbor war plants and camps were being built in many outlying sections of our Nation. Our institutions installed bank facilities at these places, thus further aiding the war effort by a tremendous saving of time.

As Hitler pursued his murderous program, reducing one nation after another to slavery, serious questions arose concerning the title to assets belonging to foreign nations and foreign nationals in this country. The effectiveness of the program of freezing foreign funds was increased tremendously, due to the splendid service of the banking fraternity.

A war like the one we are waging can never be successful unless it is properly financed. The financing to date has been skillfully handled. The part played by American bankers in this phase of the war effort is too well known to bear repetition tonight.

The fundamental design for a rationed economy is to make available the fruits of the earth provided by God's graciousness to man to all of our people on an equal basis. Some have compared the black market now to the prohibition era. They will say, "What harm if I can get away with it?" There is no comparison, ladies and gentlemen. Violators of the eighteenth amendment may have denied the Government of some revenue, but they didn't take food from our soldiers or milk from our babies. The greatest threat of inflation today is provided by the black market. The excess purchasing power is finding its way into that market instead of going into War bonds. The bankers of America received one of the finest compliments possible when the Government of the United States designated our banks as its

agents to clear ration coupons and checks. We relieved the Government of the accounting complexities so essential to successful rationing. As a result Uncle Sam will have more time to police the black markets.

So that wherever we turn, the private banking system has responded in every phase of our war effort. It's the thread that ties together the destinies of all the United Nations.

These are a few of the high lights of our war activities. How may we expect to fit into the picture when victory is ours?

With the war yet to be won and the huge canvas of peace still to be painted, our thoughts naturally turn to the possibilities which will confront American banking during the post-war period.

We all recognize that immediately following the cessation of hostilities there must be a period of relief and rehabilitation. For a while, we must police the world and probably give away large quantities of food and medicine. Some may say, let's forget this and take care of our own people. Those who take this view are fortunately but a very small minority. Most Americans have proven beyond doubt that they are humanitarians at heart. From a purely business standpoint, however, any thinking person will see sound reasons for such a program because it is clearly to our interest to smother the flames of international anarchy.

The post-war period will bring new and powerful incentives in two directions.

FOREIGN TRADE

The greatest domestic market of all time. A market that has been unable to purchase the necessities and some of the normal luxuries of life for years.

I have placed them, as I believe, in the order of their importance. Some may disagree with this conclusion.

When the total and complete victory is won (any other outcome being unthinkable) what will we find:

An industrial machine, though temporarily dislocated by the magnitude of its conversion to military purposes—please God spared from physical destruction on our own soil—the mightiest instrument of production in the history of mankind.

The best equipped labor force on earth and managerial talent of the highest order.

Our young men—fresh home from all continents—supersalesmen of the American way of life, will advise us of the great markets overseas. They will know and understand the people of other lands and their desires and needs. They will want to help them achieve a higher standard of living.

The pressure of total global war has compressed into the space of months scientific and technological developments that may have taken generations to realize.

It took more than a century to bring crude rubber production of the world up to a million tons a year. Our country alone is now undertaking to accomplish this same feat in less than 2 years by the manufacture of chemical rubber from oil, alcohol, coal, and limestone.

ALUMINUM

The experts tell us that in 1943 our production of aluminum will be seven times greater than 1939. We will be recovering from brine, sea water, and other sources a hundred times the amount of magnesium that was produced in 1939, notwithstanding the fact that this industry in America is nearly a quarter of a century old.

Ever since childhood we have heard that the freedom of the seas has been essential to the life of any nation. Tomorrow it will be the freedom of the air that will be all-important. Our aviation industry is establishing facilities for the manufacture in 1 year of almost double the number of planes throughout the 37 years of its history prior to defense and war production. Meanwhile, largely as a result of chemical advances in fuels, plastics, and light metals aircraft engineers are designing planes capable of flying to Europe and back nonstop.

We must not forget the petroleum industry. As the petroleum chemist now sees it, all existing motors will be out of date in a few years. We will have gasoline that will yield 125 miles to the gallon.

Plastics were of sensational promise before Pearl Harbor. The newest and most versatile of plastics will be available after the war on a scale beyond all previous conceptions. The development of chemical fertilizer will revolutionize the farming industry. We will have glass that won't break and wood that will not burn. They tell us we will have shoes without leather, screens that contain no wire, and bearings with no metal.

All of these new inventions will have a direct bearing on our standard of living. The oncoming generation will be superbly challenged to the fullest use of its vision and initiative. With our people enjoying the highest per capita purchasing power in the world and a readiness to buy—a desire for new and better things—we should have business activity that knows no parallel.

If the private banking system of this country has the ingenuity that I think it has, and with a future of such tremendous possibilities, we as bankers can carve out anything that our imagination can picture.

This is an appropriate moment for the executives of our banks to take stock clearly and objectively of their responsibility in restoring the fabric of our civilization that the Axis Powers have attempted to destroy.

A warning may be in order at this point. America with all these possibilities may become selfish in its approach to post-war problems. Selfishness is not merely fundamentally wrong, eventually it destroys those who practice it.

While our people may not be internationally minded, they must realize that unless we think of our neighbors, we will not continue to be a top-flight nation. The oceans today are obsolete from a transportation standpoint, and our approach to international affairs will determine how well qualified we are to be the leader of the united victorious nations.

The industrial machine of our great country has grown entirely too big to be healthy within the confines of the United States. Many of the banking executives here this evening remember the problems of a decade ago, when a deathly silence enshrouded our factories. We must be big enough to lead and big enough to help others. We must have an enlightened self-interest toward the reduction of international trade barriers. We must turn to the seven seas—we must widen the scope of our activities. If not, we will suffocate in our own abundance.

May I make this final observation? Many have said that this war is different from previous wars in history. Most surely the machines are different, and the planes, guns, and tanks are more modern. It must be remembered, however, that courage, fear, and pain are present in an even greater degree and do not change.

The helmets may have changed, but not the heads and hearts of our boys under those helmets. They are out there giving their all and how little they are asking of us. It should be our proud privilege to do all within our power to prepare for them a real economy when they return.

As your retiring president, I can think of no more appropriate resolution for this annual meeting to adopt than to resolve to do our utmost to first and most important win the war and then preserve and develop our economy and our system of free enterprise so that the boys who are fortunate enough to return may proudly take their places in the business or professional world with a knowledge that their efforts will be rewarded in the normal wholesale functioning of a true representative democracy.

And to my associates in the District of Columbia Bankers Association, I should like to say that my appreciation of the honor that you conferred upon me 1 year ago transcends expression. I wish to assure you that so long as I live I will treasure the friendships that I have made and the loyalty that you have so generously provided.

It is needless for me to say that the experience and the knowledge that I have gained will always be available to the association and its members in the dark and uncertain years that may lie ahead.

International Investments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a letter under date of June 18, 1943, addressed to me by Hon. William J. Goodwin, attorney at law, of 233 Broadway, New York City, in regard to international investments. I am thoroughly of the opinion that the contents of the letter will be of interest to American laboring men, and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *June 18, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: History shows us that a great many reform and humanitarianism movements have been smoke screens for power or money grabs. The broad campaign being waged at the present time for post-war improvement of other nations may be sincere or it may be a gag to cover such a similar grab for money or power.

The development of China, for example, on the surface, is a very laudable objective. On the other hand, it may be that China's four hundred millions of cheap labor and the absence of taxation have proved appetizing lures for those whose love of money exceeds their love of their native land. One does not have to have much imagination to visualize what would happen to the United States if China, with its hundreds of millions of 5- to 10-cent-a-day labor, and no taxation, were to be developed industrially (and ironically enough with our own money) to an extent where she could compete with us in the world's markets and, through the free-trade policy of Mr. Hull, in our own markets.

It does not take much imagination to visualize the impossible problems that would present themselves to American manufacturers to compete with this low-cost and tax-free production. Not only would it be impossible for American manufacturers to make any money under such conditions, but wages and the standard of American living would both be forced down relentlessly by the combination of this competition and the taxation necessary to pay off our tremendous debt. The impoverishment of the English people which resulted from Britain's free-trade policy, and from which the only beneficiaries were a few wealthy owners, would find a greatly magnified parallel in the United States.

Are we being conditioned for this, first, mentally, by the smoke screen excuse of humanitarianism; and secondly, physically, by regimentation and rationing? Mark you, no one objects to rationing during war, but when it becomes evident from current exposures that the world planners are determined to continue after the war such measures as regimentation and rationing, it does look as if we are being deliberately so "conditioned" for a much lower post-war standard of living.

Of course, international speculators and others, who move freely from one country to another, do not feel so distressed over this. They can move their money to, and take up citizenship in China, but for those who love and desire to remain in the United States of America, it is a very unpleasant prospect.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. GOODWIN.

Opening of Synthetic Rubber Plant in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to know of the great strides that America has made in the restoration of its rubber supply. We are all conscious of the dastardly attack made, without notice, by the Japanese upon Pearl Harbor, thus eliminating our contact with the natural rubber resources.

Through the enterprise of the great State of West Virginia which I have the honor in part to represent, there has been constructed at Institute, W. Va., a synthetic rubber plant of momentous size which materially aids by its production the demand for rubber for essential uses. The managers of the factory at Institute, W. Va., are much to be commended. This plant has been established on one tract of land. By this fact it is essentially well fitted to rapidly produce the much-needed commodity of synthetic rubber.

Before I ask that an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "Rubber—It's Coming at Last" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, may I comment upon the fact that probably more gasoline will be needed now that we are getting reestablished as to the supply of rubber. Not to express any extended eulogy of my State at this moment, I may say that if restraints are lifted and full cooperation of all concerned is given, West Virginia, as a source of supply, can very substantially, if not quite completely, aid in the furnishing of rubber, gasoline, and coal—three of the most needed of all commodities. The natural resources of West Virginia lend themselves very materially to aid the country in this national crisis.

Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., a recognized authority on the rubber industry, has recently, on a Nation-wide hook-up, commended the outstanding work of Rubber Czar Jeffers and the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, in aiding in the production of rubber plants generally throughout the country; but West Virginia is the first to meet the emergency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUBBER—IT'S COMING AT LAST

(Condensed from the Christian Science Monitor)

(By Roger William Riis)

Our first rubber factory is in production and it is the world's largest. At Institute, W. Va., a superb plant 77 acres in area is turning out rubber at the rate of 90,000 long tons a year. That is almost one-sixth as much as we used to need in normal times—and as much as 100,000 Malay natives gather from 18,000,000 rubber trees. Other plants are coming in—at Louisville, Pittsburgh, Baton Rouge, Los Angeles. By August we shall be making rubber at the rate of 435,000 tons a year; by January we shall be making 750,000 tons a year—one-fourth more than we used to buy in pre-war days from the plantations of the Far East. (War's appetite for rubber, however, appears virtually insatiable and even now the outlook for tires for private use is uncertain.)

It is hard to visualize the magnitude of this achievement, described as the greatest industrial program ever undertaken. The United States set out to create within 2 years a brand-new industry which would produce enough rubber for swollen wartime needs. (Even in peace we used half of the whole world's rubber output.) It was much as if we had decided to create the automobile industry in 2 years instead of 40.

Staggering project though it was, we had no choice. Every Flying Fortress needs more than half a ton of rubber, every tank almost a ton, a battleship, 75 tons. We had to have rubber, or we should lose the war.

Now we know we're going to have it. We've succeeded because (1) the Government and the rubber industry had begun to study the problem long before Pearl Harbor; (2) American technical skill, the finest in the world, went "all out" into the struggle; and (3) contrary to the general impression, Government and industry cooperated to the full, despite intermittent squabbles.

Is this new rubber of ours as good as natural rubber?

"Yes," exclaims a young chemist at the West Virginia plant. "In many ways it is better. The tree can make only one kind of rubber. We can make many kinds. We have, not rubber, but rubbers.

"Manufactured rubber is improving so fast that one should not memorize any statements about it, because tomorrow they will be out of date. Already it is better than tree rubber in automobile tires at speeds over 60 miles an hour. It's better in airplane tires, too. The 30,000 items now made from rubber call for all sorts of different characteristics, and we are building into man-made rubber the characteristics we want, not just those the tree gives us."

Neoprene, thiokol, butyl, Buna S and Buna N, and their trade types such as perbunan, hycar, and chemigum are as diverse in properties as are the innumerable plastics. Some are much more resistant to air, to oxidation, than tree rubber is. Or they are more resistant to oil—the gasoline-station pump hoses have long been made of synthetic rubber.

"The chemists are cocky about it," says John P. Coe, head of the synthetic division of United States Rubber Co. "They are justified. There are better rubbers in the test tubes than any we now make. We have learned more in the last 30 months' research on synthetic rubber than in the last 30 years' research on natural rubber."

So far as the man on the street will know when he buys a tire, this new substance is rubber. In molecular construction, the chemists say, there is a slight difference, but neither eye nor hand can detect it. Rubber was so named by the English chemist, Joseph Priestley, when he found that it would rub out a pencil mark. By that symbolically important test, this product, too, is rubber.

The Institute plant makes Buna S—bu for butadiene, na the chemical abbreviation for sodium, and s for styrene. Butadiene and styrene are chemical cousins of philgas, the familiar tanked commodity. Styrene is made from benzine. The process used at Institute happens to make its butadiene out of alcohol. The alcohol now comes from corn. It takes about one and three-quarters bushels of corn to make rubber for one automobile tire, and 27,700,000 bushels a year used at Institute consume hardly 1 percent of our normal corn crop. But the chemists don't care what they make it from—molasses, potatoes, sugar, wood, coal tar, natural gas, or petroleum. Any or all of these may in time furnish us with our rubber tires and heels and golf balls and hot-water bottles. The chemists foresee such abundance of man-made rubber that they are even now speculating on many new uses for it, to add to the long list already known.

Nothing makes our triumph in rubber clearer than the plant at Institute. Having first decided to manufacture Buna S rubber out of alcohol, because that woud provide the most rubber quickest, the Defense Plant Corporation instructed the Union Carbide & Carbon Co. and the United States Rubber Co. to speed ahead, together, on the West Virginia site. The chemical company was to make the two essential ingredients, butadiene and styrene, in unheard of quantities; the rubber company was to make them into rubber.

First Government plans were for a 10,000-ton-a-year butadiene plant. Before the blueprints were finished came Pearl Harbor, and Washington ordered the project doubled. Then, as realization of the emergency grew, it was doubled again—and again. Each change meant starting a new set of plans.

The plant was built in 11 months, against unimaginable obstacles. A hundred draftsmen wrinkled brows over 35 acres of blueprints. The engineers had not only to think into being a plant which would be 5,000,000 times the size of the laboratory process—which was all we had to work from; they had also to design and buy or build all the thousands of items of equipment. When needed materials could not be obtained, they devised substitutes; when machinery could not be bought, they ordered the parts and put them together themselves. Young chemists (all these men are absurdly young) averaged a 70-hour week for a year.

Even the nature of the raw materials fought against the engineers. The tamest chemical to be handled was alcohol; the butadienes and styrenes and others were extremely violent and tricky.

In the severe cold of the first winter, the chemicals froze in the new pipes. The steam lines, installed to keep them warm, also froze. Insulation was unobtainable.

All the material factors were against success. But the invincible human factors insisted on success. Therefore we have today at Institute a superbly ordered plant. And a mammoth one. Its water supply would service Los Angeles; its electrical energy equals half that generated in all Delaware. The plant is outdoors; it is too big to be prisoned within walls. Its vistas of towers and pumps quiver and hum with a strangely elemental—and appropriate—intensity.

Institute, remember, is only the first rubber plant to come into production. Eighteen

months ago there were farms along Paddy's Run outside Louisville, where one of the four other plants is located. Today Paddy's Run has disappeared in a maze of chemical plants. Goodrich, Goodyear, Koppers, other big companies, are working together, sharing all their know-how among themselves and with the Government—to make rubber.

Japanese papers please copy.

The "Four Freedoms" Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, someone several days ago sent me a clipping from the New York Sun of the issue of June 21, 1943, which contains an article entitled "The Four Freedoms Flag," by George E. Sokolsky. The article impressed me greatly, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE "FOUR FREEDOMS" FLAG

The other night I was in the Radio City Music Hall and they put on an act that was prepared by the War Writers Board in honor of Flag Day and all the time the band was playing and a narrator was narrating and the sopranos and tenors were vocalizing—but there was not an ounce of inspiration in the whole business. It was well staged but not stirring. There were lots of flags but I have seen just one flag arouse greater human emotions. And when the curtain came down on that act, I thought that maybe they would play the Star-Spangled Banner or even Yankee Doodle or Dixie. But nothing doing. When the curtain went up again it was to a delightfully played Rachmaninoff concerto. The Star-Spangled Banner came long after the acrobats.

I was not really surprised because I had been listening to the radio for a couple of days and all the acts had apparently been instructed by the Office of War Information to plug the United Nations Flag Day and not the American Flag. Occasionally, somebody sneaked in a nice word about Old Glory but I heard nothing about Betsy Ross, for instance. I thought that the Cavalcade of America might have put on the Betsy Ross episode, but instead they told the story of Mary Putnam Jacobi, which was a fine tribute to a brave and daring American woman but it fitted the occasion like the eating of a ham sandwich on the steps of a synagogue on the Day of Atonement.

Now I see by the papers that a new flag is being projected. It is the "Four Freedoms" Flag, symbolic of the United Nations. It has four upright bars against a white background. I suppose the four bars represent the "four freedoms," although the Constitution of the United States provided dozens of freedoms. According to the United Press account:

"The two-flag system was arranged in unofficial discussions between Chairman Brooks Harding of the Four Freedoms Committee and representatives of all the United Nations. In ceremonies overseas, the United States will be represented in a "four freedoms" flag flown beside the standard of the nation in which the event is held."

The flag of our people was chosen by Congress on June 14, 1777. It was carried in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and since then has been hallowed in peace and war by the love of our people. It will not be replaced. It shall not be replaced.

Americans of old and new ancestry will rally round the flag and will permit no other flag to equal it. It is for our flag that lives are today being expended—the precious and irreplaceable lives of our children. The red on that flag is symbolic of the sacred blood of Americans that was and is being poured into making and keeping our country, our people, our land, our institutions the pride of our people, the hope of the world. We shall not forsake that flag. We shall not merge it. We shall not permit it to be assimilated. There will be no substitute. It shall become to us as the Ark of the Covenant, a cause, an ideal, a call to action—an eternal emblem of adoration.

There is no time to waste about this. The Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all the patriotic organizations of the American people should band together to protect the honor and dignity of the American Flag. The time to do it is now. And Congress must act now. A resolution should be passed by both Houses of Congress in defense of our flag. Let it be done before the Fourth of July—and let it be done to assure all the world that no four-barred flag will in any manner or by any authority take the place of the Stars and Stripes.

"Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the heav'n rescued land
Praise the Pow'r that hath made and preserved us a Nation."

Mr. Lewis and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able analysis of the Connally-Smith bill by Walter Lippmann, appearing in the Washington Post of Thursday, June 24.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

MR. LEWIS AND CONGRESS

We must begin by recognizing the fact that in all respects but one the terms on which Mr. John L. Lewis has acted conform with the war labor policy laid down by Congress in the Connally-Smith bill.

The policy declared in that bill is to have the Government take possession of any plant to insure operation in the interest of the war effort. Mr. Lewis has now said that, at least until October 31, he will permit the miners to work provided the Government continues in control of the coal mines. The bill passed by Congress says that during the period of Government control the terms of employment shall be those in effect at the time possession is taken. Mr. Lewis says that the terms of employment shall be those now in effect; in other words, that Mr. Ickes shall not rescind the benefits he has granted since he became custodian of the mines.

The only point at which Mr. Lewis' action diverges from the principles of the Connally-Smith bill is in his implied assumption that he would resume the strike on October 31. According to the bill, he would go to jail if he connived at a strike while Mr. Ickes is custodian of the mines. On the other hand, if the Government had before October 31 returned the mines to the private operators, Mr. Lewis would be entitled under the bill to have the miners vote on whether they wished to strike. If after 30 days' notice, they did vote to strike, the only remedy the Government has under the bill to prevent the strike is once more to have Mr. Ickes take control of the mines.

Thus we find Mr. Lewis agreeing with majorities in both Houses of Congress, no doubt to their astonishment at finding that they are bedfellows, that strikes may be outlawed in war industries only when the Government takes possession of the war industries.

The first question we have to consider, therefore, is whether the Connally-Smith-Lewis war labor policy is a remedy for the defects of the Roosevelt-Green-Murray policy. That consists of a voluntary agreement not to strike in any important plant whether it is private or Government controlled. The Roosevelt policy is obviously inadequate. Mr. Lewis set out to prove it was inadequate by calling a strike, and having called the strike, it is plain that the voluntary agreement is not enough. But can the country be satisfied with the congressional substitute which authorizes strikes in war plants except when the Government takes possession of them? The answer is no. If the congressional policy were allowed to stand by itself, we should soon run short of Ickeses to be the custodians of our war plants.

Thus the question to which we have to find the answer is how to reinforce the general Roosevelt-Green-Murray no-strike agreement without being compelled by Mr. Lewis, or by anyone who chooses to imitate him, to take Government control of every threatened war industry. This will not be easy to do, and we shall need cool heads, and much more courage and wisdom than have yet been applied to this difficult and delicate problem.

By snapping up the terms which the Connally-Smith bill offered him, Mr. Lewis has exposed the weakness in the position at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. This is the refusal to face the fact that in a war of national survival every man's life and every man's work and every man's property is dedicated to the Nation.

All of the parties concerned shy away from the absolute prohibition of all strikes in war industries, and from the compulsory arbitration of all disputes. All of them either oppose or hesitate to accept a universal service act to back up the Selective Service under which men are conscripted to fight.

Yet the bold policy is the wisest policy—we should grasp the nettle firmly and it will sting us much less. We should enact the Austin-Wadsworth National War Service Act. We should also enact compulsory arbitration, preferably, it seems to me, under a new war labor tribunal which does not represent labor or industry, but is composed of judges who represent only the Nation as a whole. Mr. Lewis has acknowledged that he will not and cannot strike against the Government. Then the thing to do is to make it unlawful to strike during wartime, once every man and women is by law in the service of the Nation.

I know this policy will not commend itself quickly to the leaders of labor or their political friends. But they should stop and look and listen. They should keep an open mind when candid observers tell them that organized labor is riding for a fall. They are not

seeing clearly what is going on in this country, and they must, before it is too late, be willing to listen to those who can tell them the disagreeable but necessary truth.

The fact is that under the recent laws the labor unions have acquired rights, just rights, but without accepting the corresponding duties. At the same time they have acquired enormous economic power because there is an overwhelming demand for labor, and the Nation is absolutely dependent upon their work. The truth which they must face is that they now occupy a privileged position, not as compared with their employers, but as compared with the mass of small farmers, of white-collar employees, and above all as compared with the men in the armed forces.

The labor leaders and their firm friends—foremost among them the President—will be perilously blind to the realities if they refuse to see the elementary wisdom, indeed the sheer prudence and expediency, of putting the house of labor in order before there is an explosion of popular feeling.

Therefore, instead of resenting the reforms which are inevitable, they should initiate them. No one likes to be reformed. But the reforms will be more workable and more generous if the leaders of labor and their friends have the unusual good sense to participate in working them out.

Finally it must be said summarily, though its overwhelming importance is obvious, that no war labor policy, however constructive and comprehensive, will in the long run work if the stabilization of the cost of living with assured rations is not resolutely carried out.

Address by Governor Griswold, of Nebraska, at Governors' Conference, Columbus, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, June 26 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, at the Governors' Conference, Columbus, Ohio, June 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This conference of Governors, meeting in a war year, is very properly concerning itself largely with two matters. One has to do with finding new means of assisting with the winning of the war while the other relates to planning for the days of peace. My remarks have to do with the latter problem primarily.

In discussing planning I would like to quote a remark recently made by Mr. Charles Kettering, head of the Research Department of General Motors Corporation. He believes in planning but cautioned that much of what is now designated as "planning" is merely "wishing." He then went on to describe the difference between the two. "If," he said, "you are expecting human nature to change, that is merely wishing." I am one who agrees with him. I feel that the present is the time when we should be planning for the days to come, but I feel that this planning should be done by those in a position to know something of human nature, with all its strengths and with all its weaknesses.

I am also inclined to the belief that too much of our planning is restricted entirely to the post-war period. There is a tendency to proceed on the assumption that we can go on indefinitely as we are today and that suddenly there will be a declaration of peace—something like the coming of Christmas morning, when somebody turns on the lights and shouts, "Merry Christmas." There seems to be a feeling that there will be a signal like that and then we will all bustle around and open our packages of plans and begin living by them.

Actually, the facts are that this anticipated post-war era may be several years away and one of our great needs today is for better planning for what very well may be a long, drawn-out war. I think we should adjust our planning to be of immediate use in this current period—this period that begins now and continues until the day peace comes.

The young men who are fighting this war are anxious to finish their job so that they can return to the United States they love, the United States that offers them opportunities and all the hundreds of little freedoms and liberties they think of as a part of home in a peaceful democracy. But if we do not solve our manpower and inflation problems now, these young men will take off their uniforms and make the bitter discovery they have fought for a mirage.

I believe it is the first desire of our men in service, once this war is done, to return to a Nation whose domestic life is founded upon individual effort, whose economic system is based upon the working premise that private industry is able and eager to supply men and women with the material things they need for enjoyable, constructive living. In other words, I cannot believe that our returning soldiers want a jingle-jangle-jingle existence fed by synthetic work on a governmentally glorified Works Progress Administration program.

As we look about us today, we see that the war is being won, not because our Government is doing a good job of handling our domestic economic problems, but because our boys are proving to be valiant and courageous fighters and because private industry is producing the armament that is needed to win this kind of a war. In recent years no two groups have been so criticized and maligned as have been those engaged in business and as have been our young people, and yet during the past year and a half it is these two groups which have proven to be our country's real dependable source of strength. In spite of obstructions that have been placed in th path of business, our industrial leaders have gone ahead and done a splendid job, and today they are producing war goods at a peak above anything of which we ever dreamed.

But we need better planning for the financing of this war, with more of the necessary money raised by taxation and the balance raised by long-time bonds in the hands of individuals. Bonds, due virtually upon demand, can wreck our economy when the war is over, and bonds held by banks are directly inflationary.

We need to have demonstrated—as we have been told so often—that the people must sacrifice here at home. Up to date, our only financial sacrifices have been to pay back, in the form of taxes a portion of the increased pay and increased profits that the war has brought to us. There are very few civilians whose standard of living has really been lowered because of the war.

We need to fight inflation with a holy hate. We need higher taxes, lowered incomes; we must learn that we can't fight a world war and a war against inflation—and both successfully—without straining both our economic and our philosophical resources. But if we do not win this war against inflation, this war on the home front, then the country to which our victorious fighting men return will be one of defeat and desolation.

We need better planning today for the fighting of this home-front war. Our leaders must act as statesmen, not as demagogues, they must preach a life of individual responsibility, not of ease—and if they do not so act, they will be faithless to the trust our fighting men have left in their hands.

But it is proper also that we are—and should be—thinking of the special problems that will face us when the men are mustered out and turn into the paths of peace. Perhaps the word "planning" is overused, but there are some facts we had better face realistically.

Never has man seen such a large portion of the world completely torn from its previous standards as it has seen during the past few years. This very disruption of our way of living and of our habit of thinking forces us to do some planning for the future. Never before has there been a war which has caused such terrible physical destruction, but at the same time allowed science and technology to advance so rapidly. Peace will bring to the world the greatest problem of physical reconstruction in history, and just as mobilization for war here in our country has caused terrific readjustment, both of men and minds, so by the same token will a readjustment from war to peace bring other monstrous problems.

And we had better be realistic in our contemplation of this post-war future and recognize that deep as is the faith of the majority of our people in the doctrine of free enterprise, that sincere as is the desire of our young men for individual achievement, they will never again permit another period of terrific unemployment without demanding that the Government take control. Let us not blind ourselves, either, to the fact that a minority of our citizens already feels that socialism, or communism, or complete Government control in some form, is better than a system of private enterprise, and that its members are working to see their beliefs inaugurated. Another serious depression would recruit millions for their ranks. In short, the free enterprise system, the mighty champion of our present struggle for survival, may be pounded to pieces before it has a chance to catch its breath, may be tumbled to ruin by the shock of post-war adjustment. At least, such a danger is evident to me.

I am sure that no system of government operation can produce goods and raise living standards as does a system of private industry, but the political situation is such that we who feel that way, must see that private industry is prepared to furnish employment to people when this war is over. It requires some planning right now in order to make sure that the 10,000,000 men taking off their uniforms and the 20,000,000 men and women coming out of war plants shall have some place to go to work. I thank God that the leaders of American business are planning—planning now—to do this very thing. The Committee on Economic Development, the Manufacturers Association, the National Chamber of Commerce, and other groups are working constructively to meet readjustment problems that will arise.

Every element will be present in this country for a tremendous boom. New processes, new devices, new gadgets will be coming onto the market as a result of war development—thrilling stories are even now coming to us from modern industrial laboratories. The development of new alloys, especially the light metals, the use of plastics, new synthetic products—all of these scientific changes are going to bring onto the market new products—and they are going to bring into the market new demands. We will have available in our labor supply several million new

mechanics while people with money saved are going to be present with a large list of desires. They are going to want to buy new automobiles, airplanes, homes, home heating and cooling devices, tractors, farm machinery, jewelry, furniture, everything which they have been unable to buy during the war. One prominent banker told me a few weeks ago that he expected the 5 years following this war to be the biggest boom period this Nation has ever seen. He predicts instead of unemployment, a period when it will be impossible to find people to do the work that will need to be done.

But if industry following this war is to have a chance to make good, then certainly industry must have proper laws under which it can function. It needs tax laws which are written before the taxing period starts. It needs tax laws which are intended to help, not punish, and which permit industry to make a profit and use some of it for new developments. Our statutes must be in accord with economic law if our Nation is to prosper.

And private industry must also observe economic law, it must steel itself to reject the soft way of life, that of depending on the Government. If anyone is about to go broke because of some new development which promises threatening competition, he should not rush to the Government to keep this new product off the market. If the buggy makers of this Nation had kept the automobile builders from ever developing their machine, they would have only held back the progress of the world. We need the constant development of new products, perhaps making other items worthless, but it is all part of the great competitive industrial system that makes us strong.

We all realize that we will be living in a changed world. We are not going back to the good old days. In my judgment, we will have social-security laws, laws protecting the rights of employees; many kinds of Government regulations will be continued.

In connection with these regulatory laws, however, I call your attention to one matter the importance of which is often overlooked. It is this: that the general attitude and desire of the person administering any law can be a tremendous influence. I have found that if a person wants to do a certain thing, he will easily find excuses why it should be done. If he wants to find excuses why it should not be done, they are just as easy to discover. My wife even says that the same rule applies when I talk about going on a hunting or fishing trip. Under certain conditions, I can always find that I am not particularly busy and that anyway I have some business in that section of the country. By the same token, the attitude of the agency administering regulatory law is tremendously important. We need those in charge who are trying to use these laws to assist private industry to function more effectively. We do not need those who are looking for reasons why private industry must fail.

I have said that we must plan to give industry a chance to operate. Our statutes should recognize that he who makes a profit can be a good citizen, that in fact a reinvested profit is the source of new employ-

If we are to care for, perhaps, a million disabled veterans, if we are to provide a social-security program and freedom from want for those who do not work, then it means that those who do work must carry that load of expense. We will need to stimulate new industry, new processes, and new inventions. We will want to urge the development of better equipment and better machinery. We will need to provide for the selling of more items at a more rapid and continuous pace than ever before. In other words, there will have to be more business and it will need to be more dependable. Our lawmakers will need to be friendly toward industry, and our tax laws and other enactments must encourage and reward industrial growth.

Too many of the organizations now making plans for the post-war period are merely planning for the spending of wealth, and there is not enough attention to the creation of new wealth for everyone to share.

By now it should be an accepted truth that you cannot have more to divide among people when less is being produced. I am told that the decade from 1930 to 1940 is the only 10-year period in our history when this Nation made no net gain in wealth. Scarcity and an increase in our standard of living do not go hand in hand.

Following a war, it is natural that people should seek relaxation from its strain by desiring to return to the peaceful days they knew in the past. But if there be some in this country who expectantly look for a return to normalcy, to them I convey my condolence. The normalcy they thought they knew will not be back. Progress is a stairsteps of change, each step followed by a plane of new normalcy. The task we face is not one of return. It is rather to take from our past the things we feel certain will be most useful in the new normalcy ahead.

No statesman, and no political party, seeking added power, should advocate a policy of merely being against what has been done or what is being done today. What the people want, and must have, is an opportunity for better days than they have ever known. To merely oppose what has been done has no appeal. It holds no hope for future years. It is too abundant in sterility.

Is it not time for a clear-cut pattern of domestic enterprise? The rush of war postponed a climax in the festering problem of governmental control of business and industry, but let no one mistake, that problem is still with us. There is need for planning that has the courage to reach out and grip this issue—to take the firm position that private enterprise is not a whipping boy but is an asset vital to democracy and is to be treated as such. By now, certainly, it is evident that the American people expect their Government to insure them against acute want. It must also be made clear that the premiums for this insurance are to be treated as an expense to be paid out of the profits of private citizens. Business, and resulting profits, must be encouraged. We must meet this challenge, not by following a demagogue, but boldly by refusing preferment to those who desire authority so that they may hamstring our system of free enterprise.

And what of the distorting affliction that has attached itself to the labor movement? Why must our planners accept the premise that to say "No" to the scowling demands of a minority in the ranks of labor constitutes a vicious attack upon labor any more than saying "No" to the bigoted insistence of a minority in the ranks of management constitutes a vicious attack upon our industrial system? There is a middle ground, a fair ground, and it must be found or the laborer will be knocked down the long flight of stairs he has climbed so painfully.

To speak of "planning" is to speak of advancement. It is impossible, of course, to step forward and stand still at the same time. But elementary as is this natural law, it is the first realization that we must obtain if we are to pilot the course to lasting achievement in the years ahead.

In contemplating this change it is vital that we carefully safeguard those elements essential to retention of democratic fundamentals. I believe that individual rights should head this priority list of American possessions.

No matter how academic we make it sound, we cannot escape the final conclusion that the essence of our way of living lies in our insistence that in this country the individual is the important entity. It is the individual who is to have the right to control his destiny so long as he acknowledges the same right for others.

If the time ever comes when, through change, we alter this basic conception, we will no longer have the democratic life that we are fighting to preserve. It is important, then, that we keep the individual in mind as we plan for the solution of the tremendously complex problems we face. I am not one to contend that regulation of the individual to some extent can be entirely avoided. Surely, we must admit that such great problems as transportation, the integration of labor and industry, marketing and price controls—to cite a few—can be successfully attacked without sweeping regulations. But I insist that the way in which the regulation is applied is highly important. Many of these problems are so extensive that States cannot cope with them alone but it does not follow that we can successfully apply complete Federal regulation. The point is, We must take care lest the regulation rides roughshod over the individual and the best way to insure against this is by keeping the controlling authority close to the people. What is needed is a plan whereby the Federal Government will be the general director and the local levels of government the administrators.

Let us never forget that much of this Nation's greatness springs from our insistence that the hundreds of little desires of the individual have an opportunity for expression. Trivial as some of these desires seem—the urge to boo the umpire, to go fishing, to "tell off" the boss, to write the editor—trivial as they seem, the satisfaction of them, and hundreds like them, is the ingredient that gives our American life its zest, its flavor, and its desirability.

Our need is for men who appreciate that democracy is not a mechanical vehicle to be streamlined with engineering proficiency to transport its people with the greatest possible speed to some coldly efficient never-never land where living is done by national rote.

We can well afford now to fully grasp the plea of the poet:

"God give us men, a time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and will;
Men who love honor; men who will not lie."

Our planning must include the demand for leaders who recognize democracy as a thing of beauty, of local color, gracious and decent and understanding. For it is within democracy that can be found our firesides and our families; for it is on every continent our men fight today; for its continuance we here at home have the duty to plan and work and pray.

The Danger of a Serious Rise in Prices Is Great in Time of Total War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, total war demands such a huge amount of goods and services that a large part of our productive capacity must be converted from the production of peace-

time goods to producing the materials of war.

The astronomical growth of total war's demand for goods and services is illustrated by the following figures:

Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine: We spent one and four-tenths billions to buy goods and services for war purposes—2 percent of our gross national income.

Nineteen hundred and forty: We spent two and seven-tenths billions—$3 out of every $100.

Nineteen hundred and forty-one: We spent twelve and five-tenths billions—$10 out of every $100.

Nineteen hundred and forty-two: We spent forty-nine and one-tenth billions—$32 out of every $100.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three: It is estimated—on the current rate of expenditures—that we will spend about ninety billions, or about $50 out of every $100.

Thus, in 1940, the year before Pearl Harbor, we spent only $1 out of every $33 of our national income for war purposes, $1 out of $10 in 1941, $1 out of $3 in 1942, and, according to present estimates, we will spend about $1 out of every $2 of our national income for our war against the Axis in 1943.

Obviously, such a huge diversion of our productive capacity to the war effort requires the conversion of a large percentage of our industry to war production. Such conversion also reduces the amount of available consumer goods and services.

Even Federal, State, and local nonwar expenditures were affected, as Government units converted to a wartime basis. In 1939 expenditures for this purpose were fourteen and six-tenths billions; in 1941, thirteen and one-tenth billions; and, in 1942, twelve and five-tenths billions.

But more people are working than ever before—working harder and working longer.

Thus, in 1939, there were 29,800,000 civilians employed in nonagricultural work; these figures exclude proprietors, self-employed persons, and domestic servants, military and naval forces, and emergency workers. But by 1942 this figure had risen to 37,000,000. Of these, 8,200,000 were engaged in manufacturing in 1939, as against 12,400,000 in 1942, the increase being due almost entirely to the war effort.

Not only were more people working, but they were working harder and for longer hours. In 1939, the average hours worked per week in durable manufacturing industries was 38 and in 1942 an estimated 45 hours. In 1939 the average workweek in nondurable manufacturing industries—textiles, foods, paper, chemicals, petroleum, rubber, and so forth—was 37.4 and in 1942, an estimated 40.3 hours.

Moreover, like the supply of goods, the supply of labor also is scarce; so that there is a pressure for the "upping" of salaries, wages, net income for farmers and business.

The results of this upward pressure are illustrated in the following figures:

In 1939 the average hourly earnings in durable manufacturing industries were 69.8 cents—in 1942, 94.7 cents.

In 1939 the average hourly earnings in nondurable manufacturing industries were 58.2 cents—in 1942, 72.3 cents.

Farm wage rates were 104 percent of the 1935–39 average in 1939—they were 158 percent of that average in 1942.

The net income of farm proprietors was $4,300,000,000 in 1939—$9,700,000,000 in 1942.

Net corporate profits—before taxes—amounted to $5,500,000,000 in 1939—to $19,700,000,000 in 1942. Net corporate profits after taxes rose from $4,200,000,000 in 1939 to $7,700,000,000 in 1941, and then remained comparatively stationary.

All of this means a tremendous increase of the amount of money in the possession of the public.

Thus, in 1939 income payments to individuals in this country amounted to $71,000,000,000; in 1941 to ninety-two billions; and in 1942, to one hundred and sixteen billions. The estimated income payments to individuals for 1943 is about $140,000,000,000.

People desire various kinds of goods and services and have plenty of money to pay for them. Thus they will want to use their portion of this huge supply of money to bid competitively for the limited supply available. In consequence, prices are forced up.

Compare the income of individuals with the available goods and services and you can see the pressure which is being exerted on prices even after taxes have been subtracted:

[In billions of dollars]

	1942	1943 (estimated)
Income payments to individuals	116	140
Personal taxes, etc	7	[1]15
Disposable income	109	125
Consumer goods and services	82	[2]80
Excess of disposable income over consumers' goods and services in 1942 prices	27	45

[1] Under present laws.
[2] In 1942 prices.

This pressure was so strong that, despite partially successful efforts to resist it, the cost of living was pushed up in 1942 to 18 percent above the August 1939 level; by May 1943, the increase was more than 25 percent.

Thus underlying conditions of an extensive price rise exist today in this country. Control of prices, therefore, is imperative.

The price structure of the country is complex and closely knit. A rise in the price of one commodity increases the cost of making or distributing other commodities and creates a pressure for raising the prices of these goods. Thus a mounting flood of price increases can be generated.

In discussing price we frequently forget that increased wage rates exert a heavy pressure on other prices. Wages are a part of cost. When they rise costs rise. If higher wages force up prices, the cost of living is increased and there is a pressure for even higher wages. This, too, helps to swell the mounting flood of price increases.

Therefore controls must be imposed on—

Prices of all products and raw materials.

Manufacturers', wholesale, and retail prices.

Wages and salaries.

Rents and the prices of services, such as transportation, power, and so forth.

PROFITS

Direct controls—ceilings on prices and wages—are not enough in themselves to hold down prices and the cost of living over any period of time.

Direct controls are "sitting on the lid." Meanwhile the tremendously increased supply of purchasing power continues to exert pressure from beneath the lid.

This pressure must be relieved by draining it off into channels which will help pay directly for the war—taxes and the purchase of War bonds.

This is of primary importance; for it relieves the pressure at the source and thus makes the task of price control easier.

Therefore, two means must be used to hold the line against a rise in prices.

First. The pressure of excess spending power must be reduced by putting these dangerous dollars to work in winning the war—by putting them into taxes and War bonds.

A large portion of the 45,000,000,000 of excess dollars, over and above the value of estimated available goods and services for civilians must be diverted into these channels if the pressure on prices is to be minimized.

Second. Prices and wages must be controlled.

How To Keep Country From Run-Away Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, should we fail to hold prices down, most serious consequences can ensue.

(a) A serious rise in prices and wages would increase the cost of the war and could easily help to lengthen it.

If prices doubled it would raise the cost of the war from $250,000,000 a day to $500,000,000 a day—all of which would have to be paid out of taxes and the increased sale of War bonds.

If prices rose rapidly and unevenly—as they would if uncontrolled—the weekly wages of some 50,000,000 persons would have to be raised time and time again. That adjustment would take place unevenly, would create much confusion and conflict, would foster labor disputes and hurt morale; would impair the war effort.

Every business unit in the land would face such maddening uncertainties in every item of costs from a rapid upsurging in prices that businessmen would not know how to plan their operations. Confusions would result. The war effort would be slowed up.

(b) Few, if any, would benefit from a serious rise in prices; and practically all would suffer in the end.

Those with relatively fixed incomes—teachers, white-collar workers, veterans' families living on pensions, widows living on insurance payments, families of the men in our armed services—would suffer at once.

(c) Those who received increases in wages or prices would live in a fool's paradise for which the final day of reckoning would be swift and certain.

There would be no more civilian goods to buy than there are now. It merely would take more dollars to buy those goods—dollars which, if prices had not risen, could be put away to buy greatly improved goods after the war.

Prices usually start rising faster than wages, so that consumer purchasing power lags behind rising prices. Business also would have begun to stagnate under the weight of increased costs and mounting uncertainties of operation. At this point, it would take very little to knock down the house of cards which uncontrolled price rises had reared.

Material curtailment of Government expenditures for war production—once the war is over—would reduce business activity unless the manufacturing plants and their labor could be diverted to the production of peacetime goods.

However, with purchasing power squeezed by the high prices, the civilian market only could absorb these goods at reduced prices. Consequently prices would start to fall.

Once prices started down, they would come tumbling. The whole price structure would collapse like a house of cards. There would be panic and depression.

After the last war, inflation was followed by drastic deflation. From early 1920 to 1921 wholesale prices fell an average of 45 percent. The collapse following the last war brought industrial production and factory pay rolls down 30 percent, created widespread business losses and unemployment.

Such a rapid drop in prices would mean untold suffering for many.

For wage earners it would mean serious cuts in wage rates, reduced working hours and actual unemployment. There would be less money to pay off mortgages on houses bought at high prices; less money to meet insurance premiums on policies bought when prices and wages were high.

After the last great war employment fell by 5,000,000, wage payments in manufacturing industries fell from $13,600,000,000 to $8,300,000,000; average earnings in manufacturing fell from $1,464 a year in 1920 to $892 a year in 1921. In the great depression of the thirties the collapse was even worse. Salaries and wages in private industry fell from $47,500,000,000 in 1929 to $24,500,000,000 in 1933; about 15,000,000 people were thrown out of work out of a total of less than 50,000,000 who were employed in 1929. In manufacturing alone, pay rolls fell 65 percent.

For farmers it would mean less money coming in to pay for farms and equipment bought during the period of high prices. It would mean failure and foreclosure. Raw-material prices tend to drop even faster and further than do the prices of finished goods.

Farmers went through the same tragic experience. After the last war the prices they received dropped from 244 percent of the 1909–14 average in May 1920 to 113 percent in May 1921, a fall of 54 percent; the prices they paid, including interest and taxes, fell only 20 percent, while the debts they had incurred at high prices remained constant. In the great deflation of the '30's prices farmers paid, including interest and taxes, fell 33 percent, but farm prices fell 64 percent. Net income of farm operators, which was $5,200,000,000 in 1929, shrank to $1,500,000,000 in 1932. In the years from 1930 to 1933, 650,000 farms went under the hammer—distressed sales other than tax sales.

For businessmen—many of them—it would mean severe losses and financial readjustments; often receivership or bankruptcy.

In both deflations the businessmen suffered along with everyone else.

After the last war production fell 30 percent and corporate profits, which were $5,900,000,000 in 1919, crashed to $400,000,000 in 1921. Again, after 1929, production fell over 60 percent. Corporate profits in 1929 were $7,200,000,000; by 1932 not only had they been completely wiped out but they had been converted into losses of $3,600,000,000.

(d) A serious rise in prices and consequent later price collapse could rob us of many of the benefits of the peace to come.

The complete collapse of prices would bring business stagnation that would eat up all the savings of the high-price period and would rob people of the freedom from want for which we are fighting.

Interest charges on War bonds and the bonds themselves still would have to be paid. But the volume of these payments would be much greater than would have been necessary if prices had not been allowed to rise. These payments would require large amounts of taxes, involving much heavier sacrifices for those that paid them, now that prices, incomes, and wages had dropped.

All of this would take money and national energies which, if prices had not been allowed to rise in uncontrolled fashion, could have been used to build a strong, stable, prosperous nation.

The pressure of rising prices will not stop immediately after the war but will continue, because war production will not stop at once; because a large supply of consumer goods will not come on the market at once; because people will have large supplies of savings and bond investments which they will want to spend immediately for goods and services.

The more we do now to hold down prices the easier it will be for us to make the shift to peacetime.

Good for the Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington News:

GOOD FOR THE SOUL

To us, the only really refreshing thing in a hot and tense week of war on the home front and abroad was to see a Cabinet member admit a mistake. After all, there is a lot in the old saying that confession is good for the soul—for the soul of the confessor and for the souls of those who are given the rare privilege of observing a human being who can walk humbly and not claim all the tricks.

Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, who incidentally has quite a few things to worry about besides oil leases, appeared before the House Public Lands Committee to testify regarding that Elk Hills contract with Standard of California.

Washington literally crawls with officials, high, low, and medium, who, despite obvious "bickerings, muddlings, and confusions," would rather die than to say they were wrong in even so much as one slight instance. Hence the refreshing quality of what Knox did. He simply told the committee, "I muffed it."

Elk Hills has exuded an unpleasant odor since the days of Denby, Doheny, and Fall. Knox said his mistake was in not realizing that the case had a long history with unsavory connotations—and therefore should have been passed around to all who might want to raise an eyebrow.

Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior, who was the first to challenge the Elk Hills contract which Knox had agreed to, goes on record to say that there is "absolutely no basis for suspicion or charges of collusion or improper conduct"—merely a serious question of business judgment.

As to that Knox says, "I muffed it." Which, in the privacy of our consciences, we must concede we all do, frequently.

And that is why, in this era of experts and professors and slide-rule artists all of whom have all the answers, we find ourselves uplifted, as Diogenes would have been if he had ever found that honest man.

Recess of Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am asking unanimous consent to

proceed for 1 minute and to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald. The editorial expresses alarm relative to the President's request for blanket authority over all the industries and individuals in America.

This Congress has expressed itself on several occasions relative to the further extension of powers to the fanatical bureaucrats. The President was ill advised in his veto message. He and his left-wingers should keep in closer contact with the American people.

Along that line, Mr. Speaker, I would advise that this Congress accept a recess during a part of this summer. There are men in this House who have been constantly on the firing line without proper rest and relaxation for the past 5 years. I cannot help but note that some of the men who carry the big burdens are beginning to look worn, haggard, tired, and even a little anemic. Tempers are becoming frayed, irritations develop which does not make for good legislation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; we should recess, not adjourn, go home at our own expense, mingle with and talk with the folks at home. We will all get a certain amount of rest and change of scenery. We will understand what our folks are thinking about and what they expect of Congress. We can then come back on the proper call with new vision, courage, and new understanding of what our constituents and America desire.

Had the President and his advisers kept their ears to the ground this Congress would not have been called upon to cast a vote of no confidence in the decision of the President in his veto of the Smith-Connally labor bill. The bill was not perfect but should have been signed and then the imperfections corrected. It is unfortunate that the overriding of a veto, the first in wartime, was necessary. The people back home were disturbed about departing too far from our American system of government and demanded that there be a curb on the direction Government was going and are further demanding that their voice and wishes be reflected by their elected Representatives in Washington. There will be more head-on collisions unless this administration pays more attention to the wishes of the American citizen.

The editorial referred to follows:

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE

It is an ingenious antistrike plan which President Roosevelt now advances. It may have considerable appeal for people who are weary unto death of strikes and rumors of strikes—as who is not.

Yet there are certain aspects of the plan that will cause thoughtful Americans to wonder—to ask themselves serious questions.

The President's words are worth rereading:

"I intend to ask the Congress to raise the age limit for noncombat military service to 65 years. I shall make that request of the Congress so that if at any time in the future there should be a threat of interruption of work in plants, mines, or establishments owned by the Government, or taken possession of by the Government, the machinery will be available for prompt action."

The last clause is particularly interesting. "The machinery will be available." That would seem to indicate that the President has in mind another permissive act, "A bill to authorize the President of the United States" to do thus and so, when and if the spirit moves him.

In recent years the American people have wandered, or have been led, or have been driven, into ways far removed from the orthodoxy of the Republic.

And we believe they are beginning to yearn for a return of the old-time religion.

For a return to government by law. Law that it is the business of the Congress to enact; law that it is the province of the Supreme Court to interpret, if its meaning or constitutionality is disputed; and law that it is the duty of the Executive to administer and enforce, impartially and with even-handed justice, without distinction as to groups or classes, political friends, or enemies, and without regard to the effect on the next election.

Permissive enforcement of law isn't that at all. It is authoritarian. It is government by men who can do with law about as they please, construe it this way or that, apply it here, fail to apply it there. It leans more toward Stalinism, Hitlerism, than toward Jeffersonianism.

Government by men rather than government by law leaves the people always in a fog, always uncertain, for they can't read the law and conclude this is what it means. It may hit them—and it may not, according to a personal decision to be reached sometime later. Conflicting rules and regulations tread on one another's heels, and fears breed in great confusion.

Often these regulations, issued by inexperienced and impractical men without benefit of public consideration, backfire badly. That is one of the chief reasons why the Kilgore committee was obliged to bring in the sorrowful report that our civilian economy is beginning to come unstitched.

Yet now the President appears to be asking another grant of power—to enable him, as head man in the Republic, personally to grapple with and solve the most distressing problem now before the people.

That would be bad government, in defiance of the traditional creed of this representative Republic.

It would be bad government to make strikers subject to penalty, not according to the clear letter of congressional law but according to the will of Executive power.

If this be indeed what the President is to ask for, Congress should, and we believe will, deny the request. For Congress, like the people, is becoming weary—and frightened—of the consequences of too frequent and too far departures from the American system of government by law enacted and administered within the framework of the Constitution.

Is the Farmer Responsible for the High Cost of Living?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, for many months the farmer has been held up to the American public as some kind of heartless profiteer who is responsible for the threat of inflation. Every day we hear the cry that wages must be increased in order that the laboring man might meet the increasing cost of food. We all realize that the cost of living is bearing heavily on everyone, laborer, farmer, clerk, and Congressman. I am just as anxious as anyone to make this burden as light as possible. Inflation profits no one. It should be avoided, but the fact that all citizens are being called on to accept a lower standard of living in order to win the war is not an evidence of inflation. Neither is it proof that our farmers are Shylocks. In fact, I know of no way whereby we can maintain our high living standards during the war without actually inviting inflation. We must be willing to sacrifice if we are to win the war and we should sacrifice equally.

I do not want the laborer's toil to buy less than the farmer's, but neither do I want the toil of the farmer to earn an unduly small share of the national income. It seems clear that the thing that is really important in determining whether the farmer is receiving an unfair price for food products is this: Does the farmer now demand and require that the laborer pay the wage earned from an unreasonably large number of units of labor in exchange for the goods he buys? For instance, the coal miners have complained that beef and butter are too high. Beef and butter are high in terms of dollars, and it would undoubtedly shock many Members of this House, as well as many labor leaders, if I were to suggest that the farmer who produces butter was more deserving of an increase in price than is the coal miner of an increase in wages, but when we calculate the number of hours the miner must work in order to buy butter, we find that he can today buy a pound of butter with less than half the effort he was compelled to exert 30 years ago. In the 1909–14 period—which period is generally taken as reflecting a reasonably normal and fair relationship—1 hour's work in the coal mines could be exchanged for 1.2 pounds of butter. Today 1 hour's work in the mines can be exchanged for 3 full pounds of butter. Who is justly entitled to an increase, if anyone, the farmer or the miner?

The example of the purchase of butter by a coal miner is but one illustration. I am inserting herewith a more detailed tabulation recently prepared by the Department of Agriculture showing the amount of various farm products that can now be purchased with 1 hour's wage in various industries as compared with the amounts that could be purchased in 1909–14. In almost every case an hour's work will buy twice as much of food or fiber as it would in the base period. In many cases it will buy several times as much. The only agricultural product that cannot be purchased with much less labor is tobacco, and it can hardly be classed as a necessary food.

The tabulation follows:

Estimated amount of respective farm products that could be purchased with average earnings from 1 hour's labor in selected industries, 1909–14 average and 1942

Industry	Cotton, pounds		Wheat, pounds		Corn, pounds		Dry edible beans, pounds		Potatoes, pounds		Peanuts, pounds		Rice, pounds	
	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942
All manufacturing	1.7	4.5	14.4	47.9	18.4	53.0	6.3	16.4	18.2	44.2	4.4	14.3	11.7	23.8
Cotton manufacturing	1.2	2.9	9.8	30.3	12.5	33.5	4.3	10.4	12.4	28.0	3.0	9.0	7.9	15.1
Iron and steel	2.3	5.0	19.4	52.8	24.9	58.3	8.5	18.0	24.6	48.7	6.0	15.7	15.8	26.2
Woolen	1.4	3.9	11.6	41.9	14.9	46.3	5.1	14.3	14.8	38.7	3.6	12.5	9.5	20.8
Bituminous coal	2.5	5.6	21.3	59.5	27.2	65.8	9.3	20.3	26.9	54.9	6.5	17.7	17.3	29.6
Clothing	1.8	3.5	15.5	37.0	19.8	40.9	6.8	12.6	19.6	34.1	4.7	11.0	12.6	18.4
Slaughtering and meat-packing	1.6	4.3	13.1	45.3	16.8	50.1	5.7	15.5	16.6	41.8	4.0	13.5	10.7	22.5
Boots and shoes	1.9	3.5	15.6	36.9	20.0	40.7	6.8	12.6	19.8	34.0	4.8	11.0	12.7	18.3
Lumber (sawmills)	1.6	3.4	13.1	35.7	16.7	39.4	5.7	12.2	16.6	32.9	4.0	10.6	10.6	17.7
Hosiery and knit goods	1.3	3.1	10.7	33.1	13.6	36.6	4.6	11.3	13.5	30.6	3.3	9.9	8.7	16.5

Industry	Tobacco, pounds		Hogs, pounds		Beef cattle, pounds		Butter, pounds		Milk, pounds		Eggs dozens		Chickens, pounds	
	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942	1909–14	1942
All manufacturing	2.1	2.4	2.9	6.5	3.9	8.0	0.8	2.4	13.2	33.2	1.0	2.9	1.9	4.5
Cotton manufacturing	1.4	1.5	2.0	4.1	2.6	5.1	.6	1.5	9.0	21.0	.7	1.8	1.3	2.9
Iron and steel	2.9	2.6	3.9	7.2	5.3	8.8	1.1	2.7	17.9	36.5	1.3	3.1	2.5	5.0
Woolen	1.7	2.1	2.4	5.7	3.2	7.0	.7	2.1	10.7	29.0	.8	2.5	1.5	3.9
Bituminous coal	3.1	2.9	4.3	8.1	5.8	10.0	1.2	3.0	19.5	41.2	1.5	3.5	2.7	5.6
Clothing	2.3	1.8	3.1	5.1	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.2	25.6	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Slaughtering and meat-packing	1.9	2.2	2.7	6.2	3.6	7.6	.8	2.3	12.0	31.4	.9	2.7	1.7	4.3
Boots and shoes	2.3	1.8	3.2	5.0	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.4	25.5	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Lumber (sawmills)	1.9	1.8	2.6	4.9	3.5	6.0	.8	1.8	12.0	24.7	.9	2.1	1.7	3.4
Hosiery and knit goods	1.6	1.6	2.2	4.5	2.9	5.6	.6	1.7	9.8	23.0	.7	2.0	1.4	3.1

Source: The computations are based on (1) prices received by farmers as published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; (2) hourly earnings as reported in Real Wages in the United States, 1890–1926, by Paul Douglas, for the 1909–14 average (with some series adjusted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics level); and (3) 1942 hourly earnings as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Farm prices are those received by farmers for the period August 1909 to July 1914 and the season average for 1942. The 5-year average for hourly earnings is the calendar years 1910–14.

There will be those who will properly ask, "Even though the laborer has received an increase in purchasing power, is not the same thing true of the farmer?" This is a fair question, and if it were true, as many undoubtedly believe, that the farmer's buying power had increased in the same proportion as the buying power of labor and industry, the farmer would have no right to complain. Surely, we do not complain that the average weekly factory earnings are now 371 percent of what they were during the base period. The farmer would not object to the good fortune of the factory worker if his own prices had enjoyed a like advance; but on May 15, 1943, farm prices were only up to 187 percent. Unfortunately, I do not have available a very comprehensive tabulation of the amount of farm products required to purchase the things farmers must have, but I have been able to get a rather limited tabulation which was recently prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics. It shows a much more rapid rise in the cost of manufactured articles than in the price of most farmer's products. For example, in spite of the high price per bushel today, it takes nearly twice as many bushels of wheat to buy a binder now than it did in the base period. Here are the figures:

Quantities of farm products required to purchase specified commodities, United States, 1910–14 and 1942

Commodity	Unit	1910–14	1942
Grain binder, 7-foot	Bushel of wheat	156.1	280.9
Corn planter, 2-row	Bushel of corn	66.0	118.4
Cream separator [1]	Pound of butterfat	263.1	239.0
Overalls	Pound of cotton	7.1	9.5
Cultivator, 1-horse	Pound of cotton	38.5	49.7
Shoes, work [2]	Pound of beef cattle.	40.2	31.0
Hoe, 7-inch blade [3]	Pound of cotton	3.9	5.2

[1] 250-quart capacity, 1910–14; 500-pound capacity 1942.
[2] Shoes, brogans, 1910–14; shoes, work, 1942.
[3] Hoes, each, 1910–14; hoes, 7-inch blade, 1942.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

I did not make these figures. I am not responsible for the conditions that create these figures; neither are the farmers of this country. We did not even collect the figures. We do not claim to be economists, but I know, and the farmers know, what these figures show. I believe that the labor leaders of the country also know. In view of the fact that no one can continue to produce food no matter how much he desires to unless he can hope to get his costs out of the undertaking, I wonder just how much service the experts and the organizers are doing to the consumers of America when they insist on a wage-food price relationship that on its face will not enable the farmer to meet his costs of production. Do we want food at a fair price, or do we want "directives" without food?

Airplanes for Certain Officials and Our Secret Weapon, the O. W. W.—"One World Willkie"

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, from my viewpoint the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] criticizing us for providing bomber planes for certain officials was rather unkind, coming from the Republican side of the House. Does the gentleman not know that we have just furnished a bomber plane for a candidate for the Republican nomination for President to fly around the world? I know you will say that was for the O. W. W., our secret weapon against the Republicans, "One World Willkie."

We beat your ears down with that weapon in 1940, and it looks as if we might have to do it again.

The Navy-Standard Oil Contract

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much righteous indignation among Members of the House about the so-called contract between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. relative to the Elk Hills Naval Reserve since the Navy subcommittee, of which I am a member, made its report showing the unbelievable terms of this contract.

Since I largely developed the evidence with regard to the unfair and illegal features of this contract, pointing out the identical provisions on which the contract was held to be illegal, and brought out before the Naval Subcommittee on Appropriations the matters which have been the substance of the comment of my colleagues and of the press, for the benefit of the House I am placing in the RECORD today the evidence which I developed before the committee in April this year and which was reported to the House in our committee report in May, this year. On this evidence the subcommittee with the following Democratic membership, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], and myself

refused to make an appropriation which according to the testimony before us was necessary to consummate the contract. It was testified before our committee that the contract would be held pending consideration of the Justice Department as to its legality and pending an appropriation which my committee refused.

Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of the Government this contract is atrocious. Doubtless those signing it on behalf of the Government acted upon advice. In my humble judgment they must have had terribly bad advice. As shown by the evidence I brought out in cross-examining Rear Admiral Harry A. Stuart, Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves, while this is purportedly a contract for the conservation of oil, it would permit the Standard Oil Co. to withdraw 15,000 barrels of oil per day from not only its part of the land in the reserve but Navy's as well, for 5 years, or more than 27,000,000 barrels of oil.

Claiming to provide an equitable division of oil between the Standard Oil Co. and the Government, the contract would give the Standard Oil Co. 36 percent of the oil obtained from the field, whereas Standard Oil Co. owned only approximately 18 percent of the land.

While the contract provided for repayment after 5 years to the Government for Navy's 64 percent of the total oil which would be taken by Standard in the first 5 years, such payment was to be at the rate of 90 barrels per day without interest and it would have taken approximately 450 years for the Government to have been repaid for its oil taken by Standard in the first 5 years.

While the contract was said to be in line with the act of Congress of June 1938, Public Law No. 786, which provided for the acquisition of the Standard Oil lands "by purchase or condemnation," in reality if made effective it was a partnership agreement between the Federal Government and the Standard Oil Co., and I might say under the terms of the contract the Federal Government was to be the "partner" while the Standard Oil Co. would get the "ship" because the Standard Oil Co. would get twice as big a percentage of the oil as it had land, and the exclusive right to handle the oil produced from the reserve from "here on"—a partnership in perpetuity, between the Federal Government and a private corporation.

The first I knew of this contract came in February of this year, when the Naval Subcommittee on Appropriations was requested to appropriate the sum of $1,750,000 to consummate the contract which had been agreed upon and signed by the Secretary of the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. This was at the time when we had up before our committee the supplemental appropriation bill for Navy. We refused the appropriation and continued the matter until we could investigate it, since it was said the contract would be inoperative without the appropriation and pending an opinion from the Justice Department.

Before we began our hearings on the regular Navy appropriation bill in April this year, I secured a copy of this contract. To my mind it was not in line with the authority granted in Public Law No. 786, and was so unfair to the Government as to be illegal for that reason. I developed the matter thoroughly before our committee in April of this year and this evidence was reported to the House in our report in May of this year when we again refused an appropriation.

For those Members who did not read our report, I submit the evidence I developed in April this year when cross-examining Rear Admiral Harry A. Stuart, Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves. I asked the following questions and the following answers were given by him, as is shown by copy of the hearings before the naval subcommittee on the regular 1944 naval appropriation, pages 675 to 685, and reported to the House in May this year:

Mr. WHITTEN. Admiral, I believe you stated, did you not, that this question of trying to work out the situation which faced the Navy Department, by reason of having certain lands within the naval reserve owned by other persons, has been pending for a number of years.

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. And the act of June 30, 1938, was passed in an effort to permit you to work out some kind of arrangement or agreement to preserve the oil under that entire reserve?

Admiral STUART. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, your statement that you knew of no reason why the Attorney General or others could question this contract would not be intended to remove any question that might be raised as to whether the contract which you say was entered into was within the provisions of the act of 1938? In other words, you do not claim to be enough of a lawyer to determine whether that contract is authorized under the terms of that act?

Admiral STUART. No, sir. That is my opinion as a simple layman.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Then you subscribe to the view that any law passed by Congress must be and should be interpreted by the Attorney General or some other person having the relation of attorney for the Government before it is actually entered into?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir; that is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you know of any reason why the Standard Oil Co. would not be advised that a contract of that sort would have to be approved by the Attorney General?

Admiral STUART. I do not know why it should be approved by the Attorney General; but as I say, I have no objection to the Attorney General passing on it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, in addition to that, was it not understood in your relationship with the president of the Standard Oil Co. that an appropriation would have to be made before this contract was finally and completely executed?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is set up in the contract, is it not, that a sum of money should be paid by the Government as part of that contract?

Admiral STUART. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. And in your conversation with the president of the Standard Oil Co. and in your relationships with the company it was understood that the contract was dependent upon your ability to get the appropriation from Congress to put this contract finally into effect?

Admiral STUART. Well, I do not know exactly about putting it into effect because the agreement is in effect now. Before it was finally consummated; yes; we would have to have an appropriation of some sort.

Mr. WHITTEN. And that was understood and accepted by both parties?

Admiral STUART. I think it was mutually understood; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, getting back to the terms of the contract—and that is what I want to go into to some extent—I believe the Government's oil reserve includes lands in fee, including the lands within the confines of the reserve which are owned by the Standard and certain other folks?

Admiral STUART. The Standard is practically the only fee owner on it. There is only one other piece there of about 322 acres which is owned in fee. The rest of the parcels are public lands, either owned by the Navy, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Navy, or under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. WHITTEN. The all-over acreage of that land is around 43,000 acres, is it not?

Admiral STUART. A little over 43,000; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which includes all the Standard's land also?

Admiral STUART. That is right. Inside the reserve the Standard owns 7¼ sections, and outside about 6, or approximately 13 sections.

Mr. WHITTEN. How many acres is that?

Admiral STUART. The Standard owns about 8,300 acres.

Mr. WHITTEN. And the all-over limits, or the amount of it, is around 43,000 acres?

Admiral STUART. That is correct; 43,793 acres.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which gives the Standard approximately 18 to 20 percent of the lands involved in the whole reserve?

Admiral STUART. Of the whole reserve, yes, sir; but only the eastern part of the reserve has been developed.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will get to that. I am just trying to develop this as we go along. They own about 20 percent of the oil reserve that you are hopeful of getting for the Navy?

Admiral STUART. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, this contract that you mention is in reality a set-up whereby the Government and the Standard will jointly own the oil under the ground out there, and it is a working agreement and a partnership, more or less, between the Government and the Standard Oil Co.; is it not?

Admiral STUART. I would not call it a partnership; no, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us say a joint ownership.

Admiral STUART. You are a lawyer, and I do not want to put myself on record that it is a partnership from a legal point of view.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, let us see what it does. It is a joint property so far as the oil is concerned. One of the parties owns a certain percentage of the oil if the contract becomes effective, and the other owns the remainder of it. Do they have a certain agreement whereby the oil will be taken out, handled and sold, and in all particulars handled under this agreement between the Standard Oil Co. and the United States Government?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir. Under the agreement we get title to all of the land.

Mr. WHITTEN. You get title to the land, but I am talking about the oil.

Admiral STUART. The general idea of the contract was that we would get the oil belonging to us and the Standard would get the oil that belongs to them, but we would have the control as to when the oil would come out, and we were interested in the control. Roughly speaking, under this agreement we keep all of our oil in the ground, and after this 5-year period we control the time of taking out three-quarters of the Standard's oil.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is what makes it hard to understand some of the provisions of this contract, Admiral—your statement as to what your intention was. Now, the Standard, owning about 20 percent of the entire acreage, under the terms of this contract, got 36 percent of the oil, did they not?

Admiral STUART. No, sir. You must remember that all of the western half of this reserve is undeveloped land.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right; but when it is developed what percentage of the oil will the Standard get?

Admiral STUART. As we own practically all of the undeveloped portion, our proportion will go up.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are not answering my question, though, Admiral. I am asking you when that land is developed what percentage of the oil will the Standard Oil Co. get?

Admiral STUART. It depends on the development. We cannot tell until it is developed.

Mr. WHITTEN. But the percentage operates even if you get only 1 gallon of oil. You can calculate how much or how little oil will come out.

Admiral STUART. No, sir. It depends upon whether that land proves productive. If it is productive, our proportion will go up and the Standard's will go down.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, that is true only if the Government explores it at its own expense?

Admiral STUART. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have a copy of that contract?

Admiral STUART. No, sir. I did not think I was going to discuss this just now. I did not bring it along.

Mr. SHEPPARD. You are entitled to discussion.

Mr. DITTER. Go ahead. You are doing a swell job, Admiral.

Mr. WHITTEN. Nobody is after the Admiral. We want to find out what this contract means, though, and what is involved in it.

Admiral STUART. Did you get a copy of the memorandum that I wrote to Mr. SHEPPARD?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, after all, the contract is the best evidence of its contents.

Admiral STUART. Of course, you have to have a background to understand it fully.

Mr. WHITTEN. What section of the contract is this percentage division in?

Admiral STUART. That is section 4 (c) and (d).

Mr. WHITTEN. What is your statement, then, with reference to exploratory wells that the Navy may have placed on this undeveloped part of the property?

Admiral STUART. Under the contract we may direct the Standard to drill any exploratory well, and if it proves unproductive the Navy pays all of the cost. The Standard has the same right and privilege under the contract, but if the well proves commercially productive it will be placed under the proportional ratio as regards cost.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, the Navy will pay 64 percent, approximately, and the Standard will pay approximately 36 percent?

Admiral STUART. Yes; but as we develop farther to the westward our proportion will increase, and it may be that the proportion will shift from 64–36 to 75 or 80 percent to us and 25 percent to Standard, depending upon developments.

Mr. WHITTEN. What percentage of the land that belongs to the Standard and what percentage that belongs to the Navy has been developed already?

Admiral STUART. The developed area (surface area) is approximately 3,200 acres of which 55 percent is Navy's and 45 percent Standard's. However, there is no direct relation between the surface acreage and the subsurface acreage which contains the oil. Current estimates show that 64 percent of the remaining oil in the shallow-zone sands is under Navy acreage, and 36 percent is in sands under Standard's lands.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, the reason for getting this right is to conserve the oil that is under the ground?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. And from that we may take it that the present wells will draw oil from under that undeveloped section of the naval reserve; will they not?

Admiral STUART. Which one are you thinking of?

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean that part that the Standard has now developed, and that part that the Government has developed; the wells on that property will draw oil from under the undeveloped sections of this naval reserve, and that is your whole reason for getting this land; is it not?

Admiral STUART. To a certain extent that is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. And the Standard gets 36 percent of that oil; does it not?

Admiral STUART. The Navy gets 64 percent and the Standard 36 at the present time.

Mr. WHITTEN. So under this contract Standard gets 36 percent of such oil as may be drawn from under the undeveloped section of the naval reserve, does it not?

Admiral STUART. No; because the drainage lines have been pretty well set up. But you must also remember, Mr. WHITTEN, that unless you have some sort of agreement, the Standard is perfectly at liberty to go ahead and drill all those wells.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right; but the real danger is that they will draw all the oil out from under the naval reserve land?

Admiral STUART. That is right; a large portion of it.

Mr. WHITTEN. And you are coming in with a contract permitting them to draw it out and paying them 12 percent to draw it out?

Admiral STUART. No, sir. Prior to this contract we had a production of roughly 4,000 barrels a day from Navy leases, and the Standard had a production of 8,000 barrels. Now it is just the reverse. We are getting two-thirds and the Standard is getting one-third.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, of course, whether this contract is an improvement over the way you are handling it now I have no way of knowing. Certainly you would know more about that than I would.

Admiral STUART. Certainly it is. It is far superior.

Mr. WHITTEN. I cannot take issue with you on that. But under this contract you give to Standard all the oil that is drawn off at the rate of 15,000 barrels per day for 5 years, do you not?

Admiral STUART. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Wait a minute. They get control and have the use of it for the first 5 years—15,000 barrels a day?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which amounts to approximately 27,000,000 barrels of oil which will go to the Standard?

Admiral STUART. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Then at the end of 5 years the production under the terms of the contract is reduced to 750 barrels a day?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. And you provide that Standard shall repay the Navy for 18,000,000 barrels of Navy's oil which they have gotten, during this first 5 years?

Admiral STUART. It will only be actually about 12,000,000 barrels, because you have not taken out the cost of producing and developing. That will come to about 6,000,000 barrels.

Mr. WHITTEN. What percentage do you pay Standard for producing oil?

Admiral STUART. It is produced at cost, and the costs of drilling and producing will amount to about 30 cents a barrel.

Mr. WHITTEN. Then you provide that at the end of the 5 years, after it has been reduced to 750 barrels, under your present rate of division of 36 and 64, one-third of the Standard's 36 percent shall go toward repaying the Navy for its oil?

Admiral STUART. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. How many years would it take to repay that?

Admiral STUART. It will take a long time. But it does not make any difference. We want to save the oil. We want it in the reserve.

Mr. WHITTEN. All right. What is your purpose in providing at the start that 15,000 barrels of oil shall be taken out every day, if it is your purpose to conserve the oil in the reserve?

Admiral STUART. The Standard owned one-third of it. They had a stake in it. They get the use of that oil.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. What evidence do you have that there is any more than 27,000,000 under the Standard property?

Admiral STUART. We have a great deal of evidence; the evidence of all our geologists and petroleum engineers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Then you are in a position to show what oil the Standard has under the ground?

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir; to a limited degree—only an estimate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Why can you not take that into court, then, and arrive at the value of it?

Admiral STUART. What have we got to do that with?

Mr. WHITTEN. You have got a court to determine what the Standard's property is worth, and what the Government should pay them for it.

Admiral STUART. Also, they may have a better story than we have.

Mr. WHITTEN. And they may have a better contract here than you have, Admiral.

Admiral STUART. I do not think so. I do not agree with you on that, and I have not found anybody yet that does—anybody that knows anything about it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, with 20 percent of the land here belonging to the Standard and the whole purpose of entering into this contract being that you want to prevent the Standard from drawing oil out from under the naval reserve, when you come in here and give the Standard Oil Co. 36 percent of what you both get from under the naval reserve, it makes it very apparent that there might not be so much conservation in it.

Admiral STUART. No, sir. You must remember that at the end of 5 years we conserve it all.

Mr. WHITTEN. You conserve it all; that is right. But the Standard has gotten their part and gone.

Admiral STUART. No; not at all. They have only gotten about a quarter of theirs. The Standard has over 150,000,000 barrels anyhow. And another thing, Mr. Whitten, you should realize that this deeper sand—which we do not know any too much about, but know there is a lot of oil there—under this agreement they cannot touch that at all. There is not to be a well drilled in this deeper sand without the Navy's permission—not a single well.

Mr. WHITTEN. But in addition to the terms of this contract that we have mentioned, you provide that the Standard Oil Co. shall be the sole agent of the Federal Government from here on in handling all the oil under this 43,000 acres of land?

Admiral STUART. That is true only to a certain extent.

Mr. WHITTEN. To what extent?

Admiral STUART. For the first 5 years.

Mr. WHITTEN. For the first 5 years, they would get all of the oil. I am talking about after that; who else can the Government permit or bargain with or employ to develop the Government's property?

Admiral STUART. We have a clause in there whereby, if we do not like their price, we can call for bids.

Mr. WHITTEN. Call for bids for development?

Admiral STUART. No, sir; for the sale of oil, not for the development.

Mr. WHITTEN. Not for the development?

Admiral STUART. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. How much gas is involved? I notice 50 percent of the gas shall go to Standard Oil. Is this a gas field?

Admiral STUART. No, sir; there is very little gas. But you are mistaken about 50 percent of the gas going to Standard.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is the provision?

Admiral STUART. The provision is, if it is processed in a plant on the reserve, that we share that according to our relative proportions; but if for any reason it should be processed off of the reserve in a plant entirely owned and operated by Standard, then and only then is Standard to get 50 percent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Admiral, the real reason or the real purpose for entering into this contract is conservation, is it not?

Admiral STUART. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. That being true, there would be no desire or present intention on the part of the Navy to develop this undeveloped part of your reserve, would there?

Admiral STUART. No, sir. The only reason would be to find out if we have got oil there. We hope there is, and I think there is.

Mr. WHITTEN. If you sink wells, you would not sink a well for the purpose of finding out and then close it up, would you?

Admiral STUART. I would not; no, sir.

Mr WHITTEN. It is rather an expensive process and, if you do that, it is for the purpose of drawing out oil?

Admiral STUART. Yes.

Mr. WHITTEN. So that we may reasonably expect you to keep that undeveloped land undeveloped?

Admiral STUART. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. So that we could anticipate your percentage division to continue approximately 36 and 64?

Admiral STUART. That is for the present; yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Getting back to what I said awhile ago, it provides if there is any danger of drawing oil out from under the undeveloped part of your reserve, which is the sole purpose of your trying to get Standard's land, Standard would draw 36 percent of such part as was drawn out from under the undeveloped part of the naval reserve?

Admiral STUART. Yes. But you must remember that Standard owns 36 percent of the oil in that area.

Mr. WHITTEN. No; they own 20 percent.

Admiral STUART. Oh, no, sir; not at all, not of the developed part here.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know, but we are talking about the oil that flows out from the undeveloped part.

Admiral STUART. We know it is not going to draw oil from away off there.

Mr. WHITTEN. But it is going to draw some oil out from under this portion out there under the oil reserve?

Admiral STUART. I do not think they will draw a barrel of oil out of that western part of the reserve. It is 5 or 6 miles away.

Mr. WHITTEN. Then, after you find Standard is drawing out 27,000,000 barrels of oil, when they start repaying you one-third of their 36 percent, it still leaves them as big a percentage as they have in the entire land area, does it not; approximately 24 percent will be left to Standard after they pay you one-third of their 36 percent?

Admiral STUART. After they pay one-third.

Mr. WHITTEN. Which amounts then to you paying Standard a premium of 64 percent of the oil taken out in the first 5 years?

Admiral STUART. No, sir; they owe us that oil they are paying us for.

Mr. WHITTEN. They owe it to you and they pay for it to you in approximately 450 years?

Admiral STUART. No; if we are keeping it as a reserve, we do not care whether it ever comes out or not.

Mr. WHITTEN. You do not care whether they do, but some might.

Admiral STUART. All right, if we desire to produce it they will pay us back.

Mr. WHITTEN. All right, but what I am getting at is that the one-third they will pay you is the difference between 20 percent of the land they have and 36 percent of the oil you give them under this contract.

Admiral STUART. I do not follow your reasoning.

Mr. WHITTEN. The point I am getting to is you are giving them a permit to draw out 27,000,000 barrels, and when they take out the one-third of their 36 percent that they will pay you, they still have left a larger percentage than Standard has in the reserve?

Admiral STUART. No; they only get their proportion of the oil—we get our proportion of the oil. The only thing is we loan it to them for 5 years. If they produce at the end of the 5 years, they will start paying us back, and the more they produce the more they will pay.

Mr. WHITTEN. But under the 750 barrels per day—it will be 27,000,000 barrels—that is what Standard gets. Have you figured what the interest on that 27,000,000 barrels less approximately 9,000,000 barrels that the Standard would own, will be during the 450 years?

Admiral STUART. You will have to offset that interest on this basis—that we are not allowing them to produce at the end of the 5 years. We are keeping that oil in the ground.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are keeping it all in the ground except the amount they get in the first 5 years.

Admiral STUART. Which is one-quarter; it is less than a quarter of the oil they own. The other three-quarters we keep in there indefinitely, if we do not want to produce it. In addition to that, we keep all of this oil in this lower sand, which is 100,000,000 barrels, or more.

Mr. WHITTEN. This matter is not being delayed, so far as you know, for the purpose of providing this initial payment of approximately $1,750,000 can be paid in oil rather than your coming to Congress and getting an appropriation?

Admiral STUART. Oh, no. I think it is up to Congress. I have no idea of keeping this thing from Congress. It is wrong in principle to take that much more oil out. We would have to take out approximately 2,000,000 more barrels.

Mr. WHITTEN. If that is wrong in principle and your purpose in this thing is to conserve the oil, what is the excuse—I won't say reason—but what is the excuse for taking out 27,000,000 barrels?

Admiral STUART. Standard wants the oil. They are in the oil business and they own a third of the oil there—that is our estimate—and they have some rights in the matter. They own a third of it and, in making a contract like this, you have to give and take.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, we have the right of condemnation in the courts.

Admiral STUART. You have the right of condemnation and going through litigation.

Mr. WHITTEN. And the reason you have not resorted to that is because Standard does not want you to do it that way?

Admiral STUART. Of course it is not. Naturally they do not want and we do not want litigation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, if this was some little farmer out here who had a strip of land and you wanted to put a naval station out there, you would not be disturbed about going ahead and condemning, would you, Admiral?

Admiral STUART. That is hardly a good analogy.

Mr. WHITTEN. The point I am getting to is if you pay Standard what it is worth, and that is the only way I would justify taking any property, I cannot see why they would have a right to complain, can you?

Admiral STUART. Yes; I do. They are in the oil business. They want the oil, and it is awfully hard to find that, too. You would get different estimates; you would have a battle of experts running over the years.

Mr. WHITTEN. And the only way to keep out of a battle of experts is to give Standard the kind of contract they want; and apparently they want this one, do they not?

Admiral STUART. I do not know. We want it; we wrote the contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. If you relied on your experts in this contract, why cannot you rely on them in a court of law, where they would pass on what it is worth?

Admiral STUART. We know what we have here; we do not know what the courts are going to do.

Mr. WHITTEN. You do not mean to intimate that the courts will be unfair to the Federal Government, do you?

Admiral STUART. No; I do not mean to intimate they would be unfair, but it would take a long time and then we would be tied up again.

Mr. WHITTEN. Now, there is certain other property in that field that you take by condemnation, do you not?

Admiral STUART. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITTEN. How about the 322 acres?

Admiral STUART. We are under negotiation with them now to make a similar contract to the one that Standard has. We did condemn it, but we are holding up condemnation proceedings to see if we can come to an agreement.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are holding it up to see if you can justify this contract with Standard?

Admiral STUART. Not at all; no, sir. We want to come to some agreement with them.

Mr. WHITTEN. To keep the record straight, though, wasn't it that, Admiral?

Admiral STUART. No, not that; but because we would save the Government money. They asked $2,000,000 for it and, under this agreement with them, we would only pay $30,000 and give them a proportion of the production if and when produced. And it is in the deep sands only, so we hope it will never be produced, or at least in the distant future.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, it is not your purpose here to defeat the property owners from anything that is theirs; you want to pay what it is worth?

Admiral STUART. That is right. They say it is worth $2,000,000; we do not think so. We are pretty far apart on the actual value.

Mr. WHITTEN. By this series of questions I may have asked you, I do not mean to intimate that everything is not open and aboveboard. So far as I know, it is.

Admiral STUART. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Also, may I add, apparently you are giving Standard 36 percent of the oil produced, whereas they have approximately 18 to 20 percent of the land area, and the purpose in doing it is to prevent them from drawing oil out from under your reservation?

Admiral STUART. Yes. It goes further than that. At the present time, Standard gets one-third of the oil that is being produced——

Mr. WHITTEN. But Mr SHEPPARD has called attention to the fact that you have ample law if the Government wants to go into the courts. And I know what they did in my country when they wanted a forest reserve—they went out and took it.

Admiral STUART. This would cost you something over $200,000,000. I think we have saved some money by not making an appropriation of this size.

Mr. WHITTEN. Taking the verbiage of this contract, it reads like the Government pays $1,750,000, but all of that money ($200,000,000) is tied up in this same contract.

Admiral STUART. What contract?

Mr. WHITTEN. This contract involves some amount of property and some amount of money, but it is just kind of a sugar coating and it really does not protect the Navy's reservation.

Admiral STUART. No, sir; under the contract we get the oil that belongs to us and they get the oil that belongs to them.

Mr. WHITTEN. And if the oil is ever taken out, they will get their $200,000,000, won't they?

Admiral STUART. Yes; they get whatever its value is, and we would know what the value is.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. But if you would go out and condemn, we would know what you are paying for it, but the way you are paying under this contract, you, nor I, nor nobody else can tell except that Standard gets the first 27,000,000 barrels.

Admiral STUART. Certainly; you can tell more about it this way than by guessing at the contents.

Mr. WHITTEN. We are paying them for 36 percent of the oil, whereas they have but 18 percent of the land.

Admiral STUART. No, sir. They have 36 percent of the oil in the part developed right now, and that is what they are getting.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right, and you want to stop them because they are drawing oil out from under the naval reserve?

Admiral STUART. That is the general idea.

Mr. WHITTEN. And hereafter any oil that is drawn out under the Navy's reserve they get 36 percent of it?

Admiral STUART. They are still getting just what belongs to them, and we are getting what belongs to us, and they are paying a part of that cost.

Mr. WHITTEN. If we sign this contract, we are giving them that percentage, though?

Admiral STUART. No, sir; we are giving them nothing.

Mr. Speaker, it was testified by Rear Admiral Harry F. Stuart, Director of Petroleum Reserves, before my committee that this contract would be held up pending an opinion from the Justice Department as to its legality, and further that an appropriation was necessary before this contract could be or would be consummated. My committee refused such appropriation and, I am sure, has no intention of making such appropriation in the future. When the committee report was filed showing the evidence and facts, the contract was called to the attention of the several legislative committees.

From the press it appears that certain persons have stated that the contract was in operation. If this be true, it is in direct conflict with the testimony of Rear Admiral Stuart before our committee. He, as Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves, testified that the appropriation which we refused was necessary before the contract would be or could be consummated. If the contract was in effect and operation, we would like to know it, that we may take proper action with regard to witnesses who appeared before us and testified to the contrary. I hope the legislative committees may determine just what is behind the signing of such a contract.

Mr. Speaker, I make no comparison between this contract and the so-called Tea Pot Dome contract. In my humble judgment, the present contract is bad enough in its own right without comparison with anything.

If there be need for securing the Standard Oil lands within the confines of the naval reserve for the purpose of conserving the oil—and apparently there is good reason to obtain such lands—the Government should proceed to purchase or condemn them as it would if the lands were owned by an individual and as was provided by Public Law No. 786, act of June 20, 1938, as I pointed out to the Navy Department in February and April when the appropriation was refused.

Would Have Voted "Nay"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I was on the Pacific coast in the performance of official business of the House of Representatives. At that time the President's veto of the Connally-Smith bill was, without notice to the leadership, presented to the House for the constitutional action of determining whether this House, upon reconsideration, would agree to pass this bill, notwithstanding the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary. If present, I would have voted "nay." I have consistently paired against this bill during my official leave and would have been so paired Friday if the pair clerk had not overlooked the pair requests I left with him prior to my departure with the Subcommittee on Production in Shipbuilding Plants. As you know, Mr. Speaker, this committee is presently concerned with the matter of increasing the production of ships to hasten the winning of this war.

Lea-Bailey Aviation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon of June 20, 1943:

AERIAL FUTURE RESTS HEAVILY ON MEASURE

(By Betsy Jager)

WASHINGTON, June 19.—Wichita's aviation future for the next 7 or 8 years depends greatly upon the speedy passage of the Lea-Bailey bill which proposes post-war legislation affecting aviation development, Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, asserted here last week.

The bill is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for consideration.

Stressing the need for speedy passage of this bill designed to prepare the United States to meet the challenge of international air transport after the war, Colonel Gorrell warned in an interview:

"Unless it is enacted, and enacted wisely, there is grave danger that private flying will be crippled, the aeronautical training schools of the country will go bankrupt and close with the signing of the armistice; the aircraft manufacturers will be practically out of business for 7 or 8 years subsequent to the war; the air lines of the country will be subject to destructive competition; our Nation's largest industry of today will be headed for the rocks of destruction; and our returning pilots, mechanics, and other skilled heroes will be destined to walk the streets jobless."

NO GREAT CHANGES

The alert-eyed, agile-moving aviation leader leaned back in his desk chair, there in his office in the large gray stone air-transport association building, and explained that the bill proposes no great changes in the matters dealt with by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Twisting the spectacles he was holding, Colonel Gorrell added that what the bill mainly does is to extend the act to persons and into areas not now covered, and adds to the legislation affecting the industry certain new provisions dealing with matters which demand attention.

The bill proposes that Federal regulations be extended to all air commerce whether between points within a single State or between points in different States.

"Few steps to assure the sound development of aviation are as essential as this," declared this man who was largely responsible for the plans worked out for the work now being done by America's air lines in connection with the war.

Adding that the assurance points to a strong aircraft manufacturing industry was of vital importance now and in the future, Colonel Gorrell pointed out that the Lea-Bailey bill contains a provision for the substantial encouragement and promotion of private and miscellaneous flying—a new and important departure from Federal legislation in the past.

"The bill provides for the continuation of a flying educational system. Flying will continue to be taught in the schools, so that our new generation will be air-minded.

"So far as our air lines in domestic and foreign commerce are concerned, it is to be earnestly hoped that they will come out of this war with sufficient financial resources readily available so that they can immediately begin giving large-scale orders—important to a proper transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy for the manufacturing industry," he declared.

Colonel Gorrell asserted that the importance of the Lea-Bailey bill to the expansion of Wichita's commercial aviation in the future could not be overestimated.

He praised the interest Kansas' Representative, TOM WINTER (Republican), member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has taken in aviation and the support he has given the Lea-Bailey bill, which is still being considered by the committee.

Wichita is a city with which Colonel Gorrell is well acquainted. He remembers with pride that he was in the party which, on what is now the Transcontinental Western Airlines, made the first landing at Wichita's newly opened airport in 1929.

Representative CLARENCE LEA (Democrat, California), chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has

said of Colonel Gorrell: "I think no man in the United States, over a long period of years, beginning before World War No. 1, has been more intimately in touch with and has had more to do with the wise planning and execution that has led to the splendid cooperation with and work the air lines are doing for the branches of the armed services today."

Born in Baltimore, Md., in 1891, he was educated at Baltimore City College and Military Academy. He later received degrees from Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Norwich University, Northfield, Vt.

From 1912 to 1914 he served as a lieutenant in the Infantry, and then transferred to the aviation section, Signal Corps, in 1914. He joined the First Aero Squadron as lieutenant at San Antonio, Tex., in 1916, and participated in the Punitive Expedition to Mexico under General Pershing. Then detailed to Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he went from there to headquarters at Washington, D. C., where he was promoted to a captain in 1917. He was one of the first men to go to Europe in World War No. 1, and was sent there by President Wilson as a member of the Bolling mission, to visit the Allies to determine what aircraft material should be produced in the United States and what purchased in Europe.

He served as a chief engineer officer of the Air Service, American Expeditionary Forces, and became a colonel in the Air Service in October 1918, and later Assistant Chief of Staff. He has represented the United States at more than 200 international conferences.

Having participated in campaigns on all fronts during World War No. 1, he was eventually promoted to Chief of Staff of the Air Service, American Expeditionary Forces, with rank of colonel.

In March 1920 he resigned from the Army and became associated with the automobile industry, being director and president of the Stutz Motor Car Co. from 1929 to 1935.

Since January 1936 he has served as president of the Air Transport Association of America

Since April 1940 he has also served as president and director of Air Cargo, Inc.

The air transport industry, which Colonel Gorrell so well represents, today has three vital roles in America's war effort. The industry (1) is under contract to the United States armed forces to transport arms and ammunition, men and essential supplies to any military stations wherever they may be; (2) trains pilots and ground personnel for the Army and Navy and performs other vital military and naval services; (3) continues operations as common carriers with schedules serving the important war production centers.

Furthermore, the Air Transport Association continues its peacetime roles, such as promoting aviation safety in general, promoting closer relations among the members and with the public, improving transportation service rendered by the members, promoting establishment of necessary terminals, and connecting schedules.

One-Thousandth United States Liberty Ship Named for Pioneer Judge Lowry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette, concerning the naming of the one thousandth United States Liberty ship after the late distinguished Robert Lowry, former Congressman from the Fort Wayne district.

Congressman Lowry served as a member of the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses, 1883 through 1887, under President Garfield and President Cleveland. Prior to entering Congress, he had a brilliant career as a jurist and public servant.

Congressman Lowry was a friend of my late father, James Gillie. As a young lad I delivered milk to his home, and I recall to this day the high regard and beloved esteem in which he was held by all whom knew him.

Citizens of Fort Wayne and the Fourth Indiana District are proud of the honor which has been bestowed upon the memory of this great Hoosier and splendid American.

The article follows:

ONE-THOUSANDTH UNITED STATES LIBERTY SHIP NAMED FOR PIONEER JUDGE LOWRY—VESSEL'S MASTER AND CREW INTERESTED IN HISTORY OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN

The name of one of Fort Wayne's distinguished early residents is now sailing the seven seas on the bow of the steamship *Robert Lowry*, the one-thousandth Liberty vessel to be launched.

The ship has been named after Judge Robert Lowry, former Congressman from this district and father of Mrs. H. Brooke Sale, of this city.

In order to find out just who the man was that was famous enough to have a ship named after him, M. J. Fleckenstein, captain of the vessel, himself a native of Fort Wayne, wrote the Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce for additional information.

"The entire crew, including myself, would be interested in hearing more of the man who was celebrated enough to have a vessel of the Liberty class named for him," Captain Fleckenstein wrote to Clare L. Johnson, secretary of the chamber. "People in foreign ports always question us about the names of ships and we want to give intelligent answers."

CAPTAIN A FORT WAYNE NATIVE

The master of the ship wrote that he is more than interested since he himself was born at 524 Riverside Avenue, Fort Wayne, August 3, 1898, the youngest child of Henry and Ellen Fleckenstein.

Captain Fleckenstein lived in Fort Wayne until he joined the Army in 1917. After his return from the war he wandered around the country and finally settled in Galveston, Tex., where he started his sea career. More than that he was bound for foreign ports on the *Robert Lowry* with supplies for the Army and Navy, he could not say.

"Since our combined merchant crew and Navy armed guard numbers about 70 men, it can readily be understood how well the fame of Robert Lowry could be spread if we knew more about this famous man."

The information obtained on the pioneer resident "will be the main topic of our discussion at sea when we return to our quarters after long hours of watching for enemy subs and planes," he wrote.

Captain Fleckenstein's sister, Mrs. Thomas Gordon, still resides in the old family home at 524 Riverside Avenue. A brother, Robert H. Fleckenstein, died last September, but the wife resides at 1306 Taylor Street with eight sons, five of whom are in the armed forces. After the death of his brother no further word was heard from the Liberty ship captain, at that time master of a tanker. Another brother lives in Pontiac, Mich.

Captain Fleckenstein's letter has been referred to Mrs. Sale, who will provide him and his crew members more information about her father, who died here on January 27, 1904.

JUDGE LOWRY CAREER COLORFUL

Judge Lowry had an outstanding career in Fort Wayne and Goshen. He was born in Killeleigh, County Down, Ireland, April 2, 1824, and emigrated to the United States and settled in Rochester, N. Y. He was educated in private schools and had partial academic courses. He served as librarian of the Rochester Athenaeum and Young Men's Association. He studied law and moved to Fort Wayne in 1843.

Judge Lowry was city recorder in 1844 and 1845 here. In 1846 he was admitted to the bar and started practice in Goshen. He continued in public service and served as auditor of Elkhart County in 1852 and was also named circuit judge in the same year.

Active in Democratic politics, he was president of the Democratic State convention, and served as delegate to the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore in 1860 and 1872. He was again circuit judge from 1864 until January 1875, maintaining his headquarters in Goshen until about 1867 when he moved back to Fort Wayne, according to Mrs. Sale. He resigned as circuit judge and in 1877 and 1878 was judge of superior court here. As a further honor he was named the first president of the Indiana State Bar Association in July 1879.

Judge Lowry was elected as a Democrat to the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses, March 4, 1883, until March 3, 1887, and was unsuccessful as a candidate for reelection in 1886 to the Fiftieth Congress. Following this campaign, he resumed the practice of law here.

Besides Mrs. Sale, there are two other members of Judge Lowry's family living. They are two nieces, Mrs. Lloyd Ballard, of Beloit, Wis., and Mrs. Benjamin Bristol, of Foxboro, Mass., daughters of Mrs. Sale's sister, Mrs. Lida Lowry Branon.

Post-War Planning—A World Monetary System—Morgenthau Versus Keynes Versus Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there is submitted herewith for the consideration of post-war planners and the students of money and international finance the recently proposed plan for an international monetary system by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and the so-called Keynes plan of the Bank of England, together with the earlier plan adopted by the statesmen in the Congress of the past and placed upon our statute books in a declaration of monetary policy. With these plans there is submitted the monetary plan of the European convention of 1865—the so-called Latin Union—which was in successful operation until destroyed by the act of Germany after the defeat of

France and the organization of the German Empire in 1870:

THE MORGENTHAU PLAN

I. PURPOSES OF THE FUND

1. To stabilize the foreign exchange rates of the currencies of the United Nations and nations associated with them.

2. To shorten the periods and lessen the degree of disequilibrium in the international balance of payments of member countries.

3. To help create conditions under which the smooth flow of foreign trade and of productive capital among the member countries will be fostered.

4. To facilitate the effective utilization of the abnormal foreign balances accumulating in some countries as a consequence of the war situation.

5. To reduce the use of foreign exchange controls that interfere with world trade and the international flow of productive capital.

6. To help eliminate bilateral exchange clearing arrangements, multiple-currency devices, and discriminatory foreign exchange practices.

II. COMPOSITION OF THE FUND

1. The fund shall consist of gold, currencies of member countries and securities of member governments.

2. Each of the member countries shall subscribe a specified amount which will be called its quota. The aggregate of quotas of the member countries shall be the equivalent of at least $5,000,000,000.

The quota for each member country shall be determined by an agreed-upon formula. The formula should give due weight to the important factors relevant to the determination of quotas, e. g., a country's holdings of gold and foreign exchange, the magnitude of the fluctuations in its balance of international payments, and its national income.

3. Each member country shall provide the fund with 50 percent of its quota on or before the date set by the board of directors of the fund on which the fund's operations are to begin.

4. The initial payment of each member country (consisting of 50 percent of its quota) shall be 12.5 percent of its quota in gold, 12.5 percent in local currency and 25 percent in its own (that is, Government) securities. However, any country having less than $300,000,000 in gold need provide initially only 7.5 percent of its quota in gold, and any country having less than $100,000,000 in gold need provide initially only 5 percent of its quota in gold, the contributions of local currency being increased correspondingly. A country may, at its option, substitute gold for the local currency or securities in meeting its quota requirement.

5. The member countries of the fund may be called upon to make further provision toward meeting their quotas pro rota at such times, in such amounts and in such form as the board of directors of the fund may determine, provided that the proportion of gold called for shall not exceed the proportion indicated in II-4 above, and provided that a four-fifths vote of the board shall be required for subsequent calls to meet quotas.

6. Any changes in the quotas of member countries shall be made only with the approval of a four-fifths vote of the board.

III. POWERS AND OPERATIONS

The fund shall have the following powers:

1. To buy, sell, and hold gold, currencies, bills of exchange and government securities of member countries; to accept deposits and to earmark gold; to issue its own obligations and to discount or offer them for sale in member countries, and to act as a clearing house for the settling of international movements of balances, bills of exchange, and gold.

All member countries agree that all of the local currency holdings shall be free from any restrictions as to their use. This provision does not apply to abnormal war balances acquired in accordance with the provisions of III-9, below.

2. To fix the rates at which it will buy and sell one member's currency for another and the rates in local currencies at which it will buy and sell gold. The guiding principle in the fixing of such rates shall be stability in exchange relationships. Changes in these rates shall be considered only when essential to correction of a fundamental disequilibrium and be permitted only with the approval of four-fifths of member votes.

3. To sell to the treasury of any member country (or stabilization fund or central bank acting as its agent), at a rate of exchange determined by the fund, currency of any member country which the fund holds, provided that:

A. The foreign exchange demanded from the fund is required to meet an adverse balance of payments on current account with the country whose currency is being demanded.

B. The fund's holdings of the currency of any member country shall not exceed during the first year of the operation of the fund the quota of that country; it shall not exceed during the first 2 years 150 percent of such quota; and thereafter it shall not exceed 200 percent of such quota; except that upon approval by four-fifths of the member votes the fund may purchase any local currency in excess of these limits, provided that at least one of the following two conditions is met:

(1): The country whose currency is being acquired by the fund agrees to adopt and carry out measures recommended by the fund designed to correct the disequilibrium in the country's balance of payments, or

(2): It is believed that the balance of payments of the country whose currency is being acquiredby the fund will be such as to warrant the expectation that the excess currency holdings of the fund can be disposed of within a reasonable time.

C. When the fund's net holdings of any local currency exceed the quota for that country, the country shall deposit with the fund a special reserve in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the board of directors. This provision does not apply to currencies acquired under III-9 below.

D. When a member country is exhausting its quota more rapidly than is warranted in the judgment of the board of directors, the board may place such conditions upon additional sales of foreign exchange to that country as it deems to be in the general interest of the fund.

E. A charge at the rate of 1 percent per annum, payable in gold, shall be levied against any member country on the amount of its currency held by the fund in excess of the quota of that country. Abnormal war balances acquired by the fund (in accordance with III-9 below), shall not be included in the computed balance of local currency used as a basis for this charge.

F. When the fund's holdings of the local currency of a member country exceed the quota of that country, upon request by the member country the fund shall resell to the member country the fund's excess holdings of the currency of that country for gold or acceptable foreign exchange.

4. The right of a member country to purchase foreign exchange from the fund with its local currency for the purpose of meeting an adverse balance of payments on current account is recognized only to the extent of its quota, subject to the limitation in III-3 above and III-7 below.

5. With the approval of four-fifths of the member votes, the fund in exceptional circumstances may sell foreign exchange to a member country to facilitate transfer of capital, or repayment or adjustment of foreign debts, when in the judgment of the board such a transfer is desirable from the point of view of the general international economic situation.

6. When the fund's holding of any particular currency drop below 15 percent of the quota of that country, and after the fund has used for additional purchases of that currency—

(a) Gold in an amount equal to the country's contribution of gold to the fund, and

(b) The country's obligations originally contributed,

the fund has the authority and the duty to render to the country a report embodying an analysis of the causes of the depletion of its holdings of that currency, a forecast of the prospective balance of payments in the absence of special measures, and, finally, recommendations designed to increase the fund's holdings of that currency. The board member of the country in question should be a member of the fund committee appointed to draft the report. This report should be sent to all member countries and, if deemed desirable, made public. Member countries agree that they will give immediate and careful attention to recommendations made by the fund.

7. Whenever it becomes evident to the board of directors that the anticipated demand for any particular currency may soon exhaust the fund's holdings of that currency, the board of directors of the fund shall inform the member countries of the probable supply of this currency and of a proposed method for its equitable distibution, together with suggestions for helping to equate the anticipated demand and supply for the currency. The fund shall make every effort to increase the supply of the scarce currency by acquiring that currency from the foreign balances of member countries. The fund may make special arrangements with any member country for the purpose of providing an emergency supply under appropriate conditions which are acceptable to both the fund and the member country. The privilege of any country to acquire an amount of other currencies equal to or in excess of its quota shall be limited by the necessity of assuring an appropriate distribution among the various members of any currency the supply of which is being exhausted. The fund shall apportion its sales of such scarce currency. In such apportionment, it shall be guided by the principle of satisfying the most urgent needs from the point of view of the general international economic situation. It shall also consider the special needs and resources of the particular countries making the request for the scarce currency.

8. In order to promote the most effective use of the available and accumulating supply of foreign exchange resources of member countries, each member country agrees that it will offer to sell to the fund for its local currency or for foreign currencies which it needs all foreign exchange and gold it acquires in excess of the amount it possessed immediately after joining the fund. For the purpose of this provision including computations, only free foreign exchange and gold are considered. The fund may accept or reject the offer. To help achieve this objective each member country agrees to discourage the unnecessary accumulation of foreign balances by its nationals. The fund shall inform any member country when, in its opinion, any further growth of privately held foreign balances appears unwarranted.

9. To buy from the governments of member countries abnormal war balances held in other countries, provided all the following conditions:

A. The abnormal war balances are in member countries and are reported as such (for the purpose of this provision) by the member government to date of its becoming a member.

B. The country selling the abnormal war balances to the fund agrees to transfer these balances to the fund and to repurchase from

the fund 40 percent of them (at the same price) with gold or such free currencies as the fund may wish to accept, at the rate of 2 percent of the transferred balances each year for 20 years beginning not later than 3 years after the date of transfer.

C. The country in which the abnormal war balances are held agrees to the transfer to the fund of the balances described in (B) above, and to repurchase from the fund 40 percent of them (at the same price) with gold or such currencies as the fund may wish to accept, at the rate of 2 percent of the transferred balances each year for 20 years beginning not later than 3 years after the date of transfer.

D. A charge of 1 percent, payable in gold, shall be levied against the country selling its abnormal war balances and against the country in which the balances are held. In addition a charge of 1 percent, payable in gold, shall be levied annually against them on the amount of such balances remaining to be repurchased by each country.

E. If the country selling abnormal war balances to the fund asks for foreign exchange rather than local currency, the request will not be granted unless the country needs the foreign exchange for the purpose of meeting an adverse balance of payments not arising from the acquisition of gold, the accumulation of foreign balances, or other capital transactions.

F. Either country may, at its option, increase the amount it repurchases annually. But in the case of the country selling abnormal war balances to the fund, not more than 2 percent per annum of the original sum taken over by the fund shall become free, and only after 3 years shall have elapsed since the sale of the balances to the fund.

G. The fund has the privilege of disposing of any of its holdings of abnormal war balances as free funds after the 23-year period is passed, or sooner under the following conditions:

(1) Its holdings of the free funds of the country in which the balances are held fall below 15 percent of its quota; or

(2) The approval is obtained of the country in which the balances are held.

H. The country in which the abnormal war balances are held agrees not to impose any restrictions on the use of the installments of the 40-percent portion gradually repurchased by the country which sold the balances to the fund.

I. The fund agrees not to sell the abnormal war balances acquired under the above authority, except with the permission or at the request of the country in which the balances are being held. The fund may invest these balances in ordinary or special government securities of that country. The fund shall be free to sell such securities in any country provided that the approval of the issuing government is first obtained.

J. The fund shall determine from time to time what shall be the maximum proportion of the abnormal war balances it will purchase under this provision. Abnormal war balances acquired under this provision shall not be included in computing the amount of foreign exchange available to member countries under their quotas.

10. To buy and sell currencies of nonmember countries, but shall not be authorized to hold such currencies beyond 60 days after date of purchase, except with the approval of four-fifths of the member votes.

11. To borrow the currency of any member country, provided four-fifths of the member votes approve the terms of such borrowing.

12. To sell member-country obligations owned by the fund provided that the board representative of the country in which the securities are to be sold approves. To use its holdings to obtain rediscounts or advances from the central bank of any country whose currency the fund requires.

13. To invest any of its currency holdings in government securities and prime commercial paper of the country of that currency, provided four-fifths of the member votes approve, and provided further that the board representative of the country in which the investment is to be made approves.

14. To lend to any member country its local currency from the fund for 1 year or less up to 75 percent of the currency of that country held by the fund, provided such loan is approved by four-fifths of the member votes.

15. To levy upon member countries a pro rata share of the expenses of operating the fund, payable in local currency, not to exceed one-tenth of 1 percent per annum of the quota of each country. The levy may be made only to the extent that the earnings of the fund are inadequate to meet its current expenses, and only with the approval of four-fifths of the member votes. The fund shall make a service charge of one-quarter of 1 percent or more on all exchange and gold transactions.

16. The fund shall deal only with or through—

A. The treasuries, stabilization funds, or fiscal agents of member governments;

B. The central banks, only with the consent of the member of the board representing the country in question; and

C. Any international banks owned predominantly by member governments.

The fund may, nevertheless, with the approval of the member of the board representing the government of the country concerned, sell its own securities, or securities it holds, directly to the public or to institutions of member countries.

IV. THE MONETARY UNIT OF THE FUND

1. The monetary unit of the fund shall be the Unitas, consisting of 137½ grains of fine gold "equivalent to $10 United States." The accounts of the fund shall be kept and published in terms of Unitas.

2. The value of the currency of each member country shall be fixed by the fund in terms of gold or Unitas and may not be altered by any member country without the approval of four-fifths of the member votes.

3. Deposits in terms of Unitas may be accepted by the fund from member countries upon the delivery of gold to the fund and shall be transferable and redeemable in gold or in the currency of any member country at the rate established by the fund. The fund shall maintain a 100 percent reserve in gold against all Unitas deposits.

4. No change in the value of the currencies of member countries shall be permitted to alter the value in gold or Unitas of the assets of the fund. Thus if the fund approves a reduction in the value of the currency of a member country (in terms of gold or Unitas) or if, in the opinion of the board, the currency of a member country has depreciated to a significant extent, that country must deliver to the fund when requested an amount of its local currency equal to the decreased value of that currency held by the fund. Likewise, if the currency of a particular country should appreciate, the fund must return to that country an amount (in the currency of that country) equal to the resulting increase in the gold or Unitas value of the fund's holdings. The same provisions shall also apply to the government securities of member countries held by the fund. However, this provision shall not apply to currencies acquired under III-9 (abnormal war balances).

V. MANAGEMENT

1. The administration of the fund shall be vested in a board of directors. Each government shall appoint a director and an alternate, in a manner determined by it, who shall serve for a period of three years subject to the pleasure of their government. Directors and alternates may be reappointed. In all voting by the board, the director or alternate of each member country shall be entitled to cast an agreed upon number of votes. The distribution of voting power shall be closely related to the quotas of member countries, although not in precise proportion to the quotas. An appropriate distribution of voting power would seem to be the following: Each country shall have 100 votes plus one vote for the equivalent of each 100,000 unitas ($1,000,000) of its quota. Notwithstanding the approved formula for distributed voting power, no country shall be entitled to cast more than one-fourth of the aggregate votes regardless of its quota. All decisions, except where specifically provided otherwise, shall be made by a majority of the member votes.

2. The board of directors shall select a managing director of the fund and one or more assistants. The managing director shall become an ex officio member of the board and shall be chief of the operating staff of the fund. The managing director and the assistants shall hold office for two years, shall be eligible for reelection, and may be removed for cause at any time by the board.

The managing director of the fund shall select the operating staff in accordance with regulations established by the board of directors. Members of the staff may be made available, upon request of member countries, for consultation in connection with international economic problems and policies.

3. The board of directors shall appoint from among its members an executive committee to consist of not less than 11 members. The chairman of the board shall be chairman of the executive committee, and the managing director of the fund shall be an ex officio member of the executive committee. The executive committee shall be continuously available at the head office of the fund and shall exercise the authority delegated to it by the board. In the absence of any member of the executive committee, his alternate shall act in his place. Members of the executive committee shall receive appropriate remuneration.

4. The board of directors may appoint such other committees as it finds necessary for the work of the fund. It may also appoint advisory committees chosen wholly or partially from persons not employed by the fund.

5. The board of directors may at any meeting by a four-fifths vote authorize any officers or committees of the fund to exercise any specified powers of the board. The board may not delegate, except to the executive committee, an authority which can be exercised only by a four-fifths vote. Delegated powers shall be exercised only until the next meeting of the board and in a manner consistent with the general policies and practices of the board.

6. The board of directors may establish procedural regulations governing the operations of the fund. The officers and committees of the fund shall be bound by such regulations.

7. The board of directors shall hold an annual meeting and such other meetings as it may be desirable to convene. On request of member counties casting one-fourth of the votes the chairman shall call a meeting of the board for the purpose of considering any matters placed before it.

8. A country failing to meet its obligations to the fund may be suspended, provided a majority of the member votes so decides. While under suspension the country shall be denied the privileges of membership but shall be subject to the same obligations as any other member of the fund. At the end of 2 years the country shall be automatically dropped from membership unless it has been restored to good standing by a majority of the member votes.

Any country may withdraw from the fund by giving notice, and its withdrawal will take effect 2 years from the date of such notice. During the interval between notice of withdrawal and the taking effect of the notice, such country shall be subject to the same obligations as any other member of the fund. A country which is dropped or which withdraws from membership shall have returned to it an amount in its own currency equal to its contributed quota, plus other obligations of the fund to the country, and minus any sum owed by that country to the fund. Any losses of the fund may be deducted pro rata from the contributed quota to be returned to the country that has been dropped or has withdrawn from membership. The fund shall have 5 years in which to liquidate its obligation to such a country. When any country is dropped or withdraws from the fund, the rights of the fund shall be fully safeguarded.

9. Net profits earned by the fund shall be distributed in the following manner:

a. Fifty percent to reserves until the reserves are equal to 10 percent of the aggregate quotas of the fund.

b. Fifty percent to be divided each year among the members in proportion to their quotas. Dividends distributed to each country shall be paid in its own currency or in unitas at the discretion of the fund.

VI. POLICIES OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

Each member country of the fund undertakes the following:

1. To maintain by appropriate action exchange rates established by the fund on the currencies of other countries, and not to alter exchange rates except with the consent of the fund and only to the extent and in the direction approved by the fund. Exchange rates of member countries may be permitted to fluctuate within a specified range fixed by the fund.

2. To abandon, as soon as the member country decides that conditions permit, all restrictions and controls over foreign exchange transactions (other than those involving capital transfers) with other member countries, and not to impose any additional restrictions without the approval of the fund.

The fund may make representations to member countries that conditions are favorable for the abandonment of restrictions and controls over foreign exchange transactions, and each member country shall give consideration to such representations.

3. To cooperate effectively with other member countries when such countries, with the approval of the fund, adopt or continue controls for the purpose of regulating international movements of capital. Cooperation shall include, upon recommendation by the fund, measures that can appropriately be taken:

A. Not to accept or permit acquisition of deposits, securities, or investments by nationals of any member country imposing restrictions on the export of capital except with the permission of the government of that country and the fund;

B. To make available to the fund or to the government of any member country full information on all property in the form of deposits, securities, and investments of the nationals of that member country; and

C. Such other measures as the fund shall recommend.

4. Not to enter upon any new bilateral foreign exchange clearing arrangements, nor engage in multiple currency practices, except with the approval of the fund.

5. To give consideration to the views of the fund on any existing or proposed monetary or economic policy, the effect of which would be to bring about sooner or later a serious disequilibrium in the balance of payments of other countries.

6. To furnish the fund with all information it needs for its operations and to furnish such reports as it may require in the form and at the times requested by the fund.

7. To adopt appropriate legislation or decrees to carry out its undertakings to the fund, and to facilitate the activities of the fund.

In comparison with the Morgenthau plan there is inserted herewith the plan proposed by the economist John Maynard Keynes for the Bank of England:

THE KEYNES PLAN—PROPOSALS FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CLEARING UNION

PREFACE

Immediately after the war, all countries which have been engaged will be concerned with the pressure of relief and urgent reconstruction. The transition out of this into the normal world of the future cannot be wisely effected unless we know into what we are moving. It is therefore not too soon to consider what is to come after. In the field of national activity occupied by production, trade, and finance, both the nature of the problem and the experience of the period between wars suggest four main lines of approach.

1. The mechanism of currency and exchange.

2. The framework of a commercial policy regulating conditions for exchange of goods, tariffs, preferences, subsidies, import regulations, and the like.

3. Orderly conduct of production, distribution, and price of primary products so as to protect both producers and consumers from the loss and risk for which extravagant fluctuations of market conditions have been responsible in recent times.

4. Investment aid, both medium and long term, for countries whose economic development needs assistance from outside.

If the principles of these measures and the form of institutions to give effect to them can be settled in advance, in order that they may be in operation when need arises, it is possible that taken together they may help the world to control the ebb and flow of the tides of economic activity which have, in the past, destroyed security of livelihood and endangered international peace.

All these matters will need to be handled in due course. The proposal that follows relates only to the mechanism of currency and exchange in international trading. It appears on the whole convenient to give it priority, because some general conclusions have to be reached under this head before much progress can be made with other topics.

In preparing these proposals care has been taken to regard certain conditions, which the groundwork of an international economic system to be set up after the war should satisfy if it is to prove durable.

(1) There should be the least possible interference with internal national policies, and the plan should not wander from the international terrain. Since such policies may have important repercussions on international relations they cannot be left out of account. Nevertheless, in the realm of internal policy, the authority of the governing board of the proposed institution should be limited to recommendations, or, at most, to imposing conditions for more extended enjoyment of the facilities which the institution offers.

(2) The technique of the plan must be capable of application irrespective of the type and principle of government and the economic policy existing in the prospective member States.

(3) Management of the institution must be genuinely international, without preponderant power of veto or enforcement lying with any country or group. And the rights and privileges of smaller countries must be safeguarded.

(4) Some qualification of the right to act at pleasure is required by any agreement or treaty between nations. But in order that such arrangements may be fully voluntary so long as they last and terminable when they have become irksome, provision must be made for voiding the obligation at due notice. If many member States were to take advantage of this, the plan would have broken down, but if they are free to escape from its provisions if necessary, they may be more willing to go on accepting them.

(5) The plan must operate not only to the general advantage but also to the individual advantage of each of the participants, and must not require a special economic or financial sacrifice from certain countries. No participant must be asked to do or offer anything which is not to his own true long-term interest.

It must be emphasized that it is not for the clearing union to assume the burden of long-term lending which is the proper task of some other institution. It is also necessary for it to have the means of restraining improvident borrowers. But the clearing union must also seek to discourage creditor countries from having unused large liquid balances which ought to be devoted to some positive purpose. For excessive credit balances necessarily create excessive debit balances for some other party. In recognizing that the creditor as well as the debtor may be responsible for a want of balance, the proposed institution would be breaking new ground.

I. THE OBJECTS OF THE PLAN

About the primary objects of an improved system of international currency there is, today, a wide measure of agreement:

(a) We need an instrument of international currency having general acceptability between nations, so that blocked balances and bilateral clearings are unnecessary; that is to say, an instrument of currency used by each nation in its transactions with other nations, operating through whatever national organ, such as a treasury or a central bank, is most appropriate, private individuals, businesses and banks other than central banks, each continuing to use their own national currency as heretofore.

(b) We need an orderly and agreed method of determining the relative exchange values of national currency units, so that unilateral action and competitive exchange depreciations are prevented.

(c) We need a quantum of international currency, which is neither determined in an unpredictable and irrelevant manner as, for example, by the technical progress of the gold industry, nor subject to large variations depending on the gold reserve policies of individual countries; but is governed by the actual current requirements of world commerce, and is also capable of deliberate expansion and contraction to offset deflationary and inflationary tendencies in effective world demand.

(d) We need a system possessed of an internal stabilizing mechanism, by which pressure is exercised on any country whose balance of payments with the rest of the world is departing from equilibrium in either direction, so as to prevent movements which must create for its neighbors an equal but opposite want of balance.

(e) We need an agreed plan for starting off every country after the war with a stock of reserves appropriate to its importance in world commerce, so that without due anxiety it can set its house in order during the transitional period to full peacetime conditions.

(f) We need a central institution, of a purely technical and nonpolitical character, to aid and support other international institutions concerned with the planning and regulation of the world's economic life.

(g) More generally, we need a means of reassurance to a troubled world, by which any country whose own affairs are conducted with due prudence is relieved of anxiety, for causes which are not of its own making, concerning its ability to meet its international liabilities; and which will, therefore, make unnecessary those methods of restriction and discrimination which countries have adopted hitherto,

not on their merits, but as measures of self-protection from disruptive outside forces.

2. There is also a growing measure of agreement about the general character of any solution of the problem likely to be successful. The particular proposals set forth below lay no claim to originality. They are an attempt to reduce to practical shape certain general ideas belonging to the contemporary climate of economic opinion, which have been given publicity in recent months by writers of several different nationalities. It is difficult to see how any plan can be successful which does not use these general ideas, which are born of the spirit of the age. The actual details put forward below are offered, with no dogmatic intention, as the basis of discussion for crticism and improvement. For we cannot make progress without embodying the general underlying idea in a frame of actual working, which will bring out the practical and political difficulties to be faced and met if the breath of life is to inform it.

3. In one respect this particular plan will be found to be more ambitious and yet, at the same time, perhaps more workable than some of the variant versions of the same basic idea, in that it is fully international, being based on one general agreement and not on a multiplicity of bilateral arragements. Doubtless proposals might be made by which bilateral arrangements could be fitted together so as to obtain some of the advantages of a multilateral scheme. But there will be many difficulties attendant on such adjustments. It may be doubted whether a comprehensive scheme will ever in fact be worked out, unless it can come into existence through a single act of creation made possible by the unity of purpose and energy of hope for better things to come, springing from the victory of the United Nations, when they have attained it, over immediate evil. That these proposals are ambitious is claimed, therefore to be not a draw-back but an advantage.

4. The proposal is to establish a currency union, here designated an international clearing union, based on international bank money, called (let us say) bancor, fixed (but not unalterably) in terms of gold and accepted as the equivalent of gold by the British Commonwealth and the United States and all the other members of the union for the purpose of settling international balances. The central banks of all member states (and also of nonmembers) would keep accounts with the international clearing union through which they would be entitled to settle their exchange balances with one another at their par value as defined in terms of bancor. Countries having a favorable balance of payments with the rest of the world as a whole would find themselves in possession of a credit account with the clearing union, and those having an unfavorable balance would have a debit account. Measures would be necessary (see below) to prevent the piling up of credit and debit balances without limit, and the system would have failed in the long run if it did not possess sufficient capacity for self-equilibrium to secure this.

5. The idea underlying such a union is simple, namely, to generalize the essential principle of banking as it is exhibited within any closed system. This system is the necessary equality of credits and debits. If no credits can be removed outside the clearing system, but only transferred within it, the union can never be in any difficulty as regards the honoring of checks drawn upon it. It can make what advances it wishes to any of its members with the assurance that the proceeds can only be transferred to the clearing account of another member. Its sole task is to see to it that its members keep the rules and that the advances made to each of them are prudent and advisable for the union as a whole.

II. THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLAN

6. The provisions proposed (the particular proportions and other details suggested being tentative as a basis of discussion) are the following:

(1) All the United Nations will be invited to become original members of the international clearing union. Other states may be invited to join subsequently. If ex-enemy states are invited to join, special conditions may be applied to them.

(2) The governing board of the clearing union shall be appointed by the governments of the several member states, as provided in (12) below; the daily business with the union and the technical arrangements being carried out through their central banks or other appropriate authorities.

(3) The member states will agree between themselves the initial values of their own currencies in terms of bancor. A member state may not subsequently alter the value of its currency in terms of bancor without the permission of the governing board except under the conditions stated below; but during the first 5 years after the inception of the system the governing board shall give special consideration to appeals for an adjustment in the exchange value of a national currency unit on the ground of unforeseen circumstances.

(4) The value of bancor in terms of gold shall be fixed by the Governing Board. Member States shall not purchase or acquire gold, directly or indirectly, at a price in terms of their national currencies in excess of the parity which corresponds to the value of their currency in terms of bancor and to the value of bancor in terms of gold. Their sales and purchases of gold shall not be otherwise restricted.

(5) Each member State shall have assigned to it a quota, which shall determine the measure of its responsbility in the management of the Union and of its right to enjoy the credit facilities provided by the Union. The initial quotas might be fixed by reference to the sum of each country's exports and imports on the average of (say) the 3 pre-war years, and might be (say) 75 percent of this amount, a special assessment being substituted in cases (of which there might be several) where this formula would be, for any reason, inappropriate. Subsequently, after the elapse of the transitional period, the quotas should be revised annually in accordance with the running average of each country's actual volume of trade in the 3 preceding years, rising to a 5-year average when figures for 5 post-war years are available. The determination of a country's quota primarily by reference to the value of its foreign trade seems to offer the criterion most relevant to a plan which is chiefly concerned with the regulation of the foreign exchanges and of a country's international trade balance. It is, however, a matter for discussion whether the formula for fixing quotas should also take account of other factors.

(6) Member States shall agree to accept payment of currency balances, due to them from other members, by a transfer of bancor to their credit in the books of the clearing union. They shall be entitled, subject to the conditions set forth below, to make transfers of bancor to other members which have the effect of overdrawing their own accounts with the Union, provided that the maximum debit balances thus created do not exceed their quota. The Clearing Union may, at its discretion, charge a small commission or transfer fee in respect of transactions in its books for the purpose of meeting its current expenses or any other outgoings approved by the Governing Board.

(7) A member state shall pay to the reserve fund of the Clearing Union a charge of 1 percent per annum on the amount of its average balance in bancor, whether it is a credit or a debit balance, in excess of a quarter of its quota; and a further charge of 1 percent on its average balance, whether credit or debit, in excess of a half of its quota. Thus, only a country which keeps as nearly as possible in a state of international balance on the average of the year will escape this contribution. These charges are not absolutely essential to the scheme. But if they are found acceptable, they would be valuable and important inducements toward keeping a level balance, and a significant indication that the system looks on excessive credit balances with as critical an eye as on excessive debit balances, each being, indeed, the inevitable concomitant of the other. Any member state in debit may, after consultation with the governing board, borrow bancor from the balances of any member state in credit on such terms as may be mutually agreed, by which means each would avoid these contributions. The governing board may, at its discretion, remit the charges on credit balances, and increase correspondingly those on debit balances, if in its opinion unduly expansionist conditions are impending in the world economy.

(8) (a) A member state may not increase its debit balance by more than a quarter of its quota within a year without the permission of the governing board. If its debit balance has exceeded a quarter of its quota on the average of at least 2 years, it shall be entitled to reduce the value of its currency in terms of bancor provided that the reduction shall not exceed 5 percent without the consent of the governing board; but it shall not be entitled to repeat this procedure unless the board is satisfied that this procedure is appropriate.

(b) The governing board may require from a member state having a debit balance reaching a half of its quota the deposit of suitable collateral against its debit balance. Such collateral shall, at the discretion of the governing board, take the form of gold, foreign or domestic currency or government bonds, within the capacity of the member state. As a condition of allowing a member state to increase its debit balance to a figure in excess of a half of its quota, the governing board may require all or any of the following measures:

(i) a stated reduction in the value of the member's currency, if it deems that to be the suitable remedy;

(ii) the control of outward capital transactions if not already in force; and

(iii) the outright surrender of a suitable proportion of any separate gold or other liquid reserve in reduction of its debit balance.

Furthermore, the governing board may recommend to the government of the member state any internal measures affecting its domestic economy which may appear to be appropriate to restore the equilibrium of its international balance.

(c) If a member state's debit balance has exceeded three-quarters of its quota on the average of at least a year and is excessive in the opinion of the governing board in relation to the total debit balances outstanding on the books of the clearing union, or is increasing at an excessive rate, it may, in addition, be asked by the governing board to take measures to improve its position, and, in the event of its failing to reduce its debit balance accordingly within 2 years, the governing board may declare that it is in default and no longer entitled to draw against its account except with the permission of the governing board.

(d) Each member state, on joining the system, shall agree to pay to the clearing union any payments due from it to a country in default toward the discharge of the latter's debit balance and to accept this arrangement in the event of falling into default itself. A member state which resigns from the clearing union without making approved arrangements for the discharge of any debit balance shall also be treated as in default.

(9) A member State whose credit balance has exceeded half of its quota on the average of at least a year shall discuss with the governing board (but shall retain the ultimate decision in its own hands) what measures would be appropriate to restore the equilibrium of its international balances, including—

(a) Measures for the expansion of domestic credit and domestic demand.

(b) The appreciation of its local currency in terms of bancor, or, alternatively, the encouragement of an increase in money rates of earnings.

(c) The reduction of tariffs and other discouragements against imports.

(d) International development loans.

(10) A member State shall be entitled to obtain a credit balance in terms of bancor by paying in gold to the Clearing Union for the credit of its clearing account. But no one is entitled to demand gold from the Union against a balance of bancor, since such balance is available only for transfer to another clearing account. The governing board of the Union shall, however, have the discretion to distribute any gold in the possession of the Union between the members possessing credit balances in excess of a specified proportion of their quotas, proportionately to such balances, in reduction of their amount in excess of that proportion.

(11) The monetary reserves of a member state, viz, the central bank of other bank or treasury deposits in excess of a working balance, shall not be held in another country except with the approval of the monetary authorities of that country.

(12) The governing board shall be appointed by the governments of the member states, those with the larger quotas being entitled to appoint a member individually, and those with smaller quotas appointing in convenient political or geographical groups, so that the members would not exceed (say) 12 or 15 in number. Each representative on the governing board shall have a vote in proportion to the quotas of the state (or states) appointing him, except that on a proposal to increase a particular quota, a representative's voting power shall be measured by the quotas of the member states appointing him, increased by their credit balance or decreased by their debit balance, averaged in each case over the past 2 years. Each member state, which is not individually represented on the governing board, shall be entitled to appoint a permanent delegate to the union to maintain contact with the board and to act as liaison for daily business and for the exchange of information with the executive of the union. Such delegate shall be entitled to be present at the governing board when any matter is under consideration which specially concerns the state he represents, and to take part in the discussion.

(13) The governing board shall be entitled to reduce the quotas of members, all in the same specified proportion, if it seems necessary to correct in this manner an excess of world purchasing power. In that event, the provisions of 6 (8) shall be held to apply to the quotas as so reduced, provided that no member shall be required to reduce his actual overdraft at the date of the change, or be entitled by reason of this reduction to alter the value of his currency under 6 (8) (a), except after the expiry of 2 year. If the governing board subsequently desires to correct a potential deficiency of world purchasing power, it shall be entitled to restore the general level of quotas toward the original level.

(14) The governing board shall be entitled to ask and receive from each member state any relevant statistical or other information, including a full disclosure of gold, external credit, and debit balances, and other external assets and liabilities, both public and private. So far as circumstances permit, it will be desirable that the member states shall consult with the governing board on important matters of policy likely to affect substantially their bancor balances or their financial relations with other members.

(15) The executive offices of the union shall be situated in London and New York, with the governing board meeting alternately in London and Washington.

(16) Members shall be entitled to withdraw from the union on a year's notice, subject to their making satisfactory arrangements to discharge any debit balance. They would not, of course, be able to employ any credit balance except by making transfers from it, either before or after their withdrawal, to the clearing accounts of other central banks. Similarly it should be within the power of the governing board to require the withdrawal of a member, subject to the same notice, if the latter is in breach of agreements relating to the Clearing Union.

(17) The central banks of non-member states would be allowed to keep credit clearing accounts with the union; and, indeed, it would be advisable for them to do so for the conduct of their trade with members states. But they would have no right to overdrafts and no say in the management.

(18) The governing board shall make an annual report and shall convene an annual assembly at which every member state shall be entitled to be represented individually and to move proposals. The principles and governing rules of the union shall be the subject of reconsideration after 5 years' experience, if a majority of the assembly desires it.

III. WHAT LIABILITIES OUGHT THE PLAN TO PLACE ON CREDITOR COUNTRIES?

7. It is not contemplated that either the debit or the credit balance of an individual country ought to exceed a certain maximum—let us say, its quota. In the case of debit balances this maximum has been made a rigid one and, indeed, countermeasures are called for long before the maximum is reached. In the case of credit balances no rigid maximum has been proposed. For the appropriate provision might be to require the eventual cancelation or compulsory investment of persistent bancor credit balances accumulating in excess of a member's quota; and, however desirable this may be in principle, it might be felt to impose on creditor countries a heavier burden than they can be asked to accept before having had experience of the benefit to them of the working of the plan as a whole. If, on the other hand, the limitation were to take the form of the creditor country not being required to accept bancor in excess of a prescribed figure, this might impair the general acceptability of bancor, whilst at the same time conferring no real benefit on the creditor country itself. For, if it chose to avail itself of the limitation, it must either restrict its exports or be driven back on some form of bilateral payments agreements outside the clearing union, thus substituting a less acceptable asset for bancor balances which are based on the collective credit of all the member states and are available for payments to any of them, or attempt the probably temporary expedient of refusing to trade except on a gold basis.

8. The absence of a rigid maximum to credit balances does not impose on any member state, as might be supposed at first sight, an unlimited liability outside its own control. The liability of an individual member is determined, not by the quotas of the other members but by its own policy in controlling its favorable balance of payments. The existence of the Clearance Union does not deprive a member state of any of the facilities which it now possesses for receiving payment for its exports. In the absence of the Clearing Union a creditor country can employ the proceeds of its exports to buy goods or to buy investments, or to make temporary advances and to hold temporary overseas balances, or to buy gold in the market. All these facilities will remain at its disposal. The difference is that in the absence of the Clearing Union, more or less automatic factors come into play to restrict the volume of its exports after the above means of receiving payment for them have been exhausted. Certain countries become unable to buy and, in addition to this, there is an automatic tendency toward a general slump in international trade and, as a result, a reduction in the exports of the creditor country. Thus the effect of the Clearing Union is to give the creditor country a choice between voluntarily curtailing its exports to the same extent that they would have been involuntarily curtailed in the absence of the Clearing Union, or, alternatively, of allowing its exports to continue and accumulating the excess receipts in the form of bancor balances for the time being. Unless the removal of a factor causing the involuntary reduction of exports is reckoned a disadvantage, a creditor country incurs no burden but is, on the contrary, relieved, by being offered the additional option of receiving payment for its exports through the accumulation of a bancor balance.

9. If, therefore, a member state asks what governs the maximum liability which it incurs by entering the system, the answer is that this lies entirely within its own control. No more is asked of it than that it should hold in bancor such surplus of its favorable balance of payment as it does not itself choose to employ in any other way, and only for so long as it does not so choose.

IV. SOME ADVANTAGES OF THE PLAN

10. The plan aims at the substitution of an expansionist, in place of a contractionist, pressure on world trade.

11. It effects this by allowing to each member state overdraft facilities of a defined amount. Thus each country is allowed a certain margin of resources and a certain interval of time within which to effect a balance in its economic relations with the rest of the world. These facilities are made possible by the constitution of the system itself and do not involve particular indebtedness between one member state and another. A country is in credit or debit with the Clearing Union as a whole. This means that the overdraft facilities, whilst a relief to some, are not a real burden to others, for the accumulation of a credit balance with the Clearing Union would resemble the importation of gold in signifying that the country holding it is abstaining voluntarily from the immediate use of purchasing power. But it would not involve, as would the importation of gold, the withdrawal of this purchasing power from circulation or the exercise of a deflationary and contractionist pressure on the whole world, including in the end the creditor country itself. Under the proposed plan, therefore, no country suffers injury (but on the contrary) by the fact that the command over resources, which it does not itself choose to employ for the time being, is not withdrawn from use. The accumulation of bancor credit does not curtail in the least its capacity or inducement either to produce or to consume.

12. In short, the analogy with a national banking system is complete. No depositor in a local bank suffers because the balances, which he leaves idle, are employed to finance the business of someone else. Just as the development of national banking systems served to offset a deflationary pressure which would have prevented otherwise the development of modern industry, so by extending the same principle into the international field we may hope to offset the contractionist pressure which might otherwise overwhelm in social disorder and disappointment the good hopes of our modern world. The substitution of a credit mechanism in place of hoarding would have repeated in the international field the same miracle, already performed in the domestic field, of turning a stone into bread.

13. There might be other ways of effecting the same objects temporarily or in part. For example, the United States might redistribute her gold. Or there might be a number of bilateral arrangements having the effect of providing international overdrafts, as, for example, an agreement by the Federal Reserve Board to accumulate, if necessary, a large sterling balance at the Bank of England, accompanied by a great number of similar bilateral arrangements, amounting to some hundreds altogether, between these and all the other banks in the world. The objection to particular arrangements of this kind, in addition to their greater complexity, is that they are likely to be influenced by extraneous, political reasons; that they put individual countries in a position of particular obligation toward others; and that the distribution of the assistance between different countries may not correspond to need and to the real requirements, which are extremely difficult to foresee.

14. It should be much easier, and surely more satisfactory for all of us, to enter into a general and collective responsibility, applying to all countries alike, that a country finding itself in a creditor position against the rest of the world as a whole should enter into an arrangement not to allow this credit balance to exercise a contractionist pressure against world economy and, by repercussion, against the economy of the creditor country itself. This would give everyone the great assistance of multilateral clearing, whereby, for example, Great Britain could offse favorable balances arising out of her exports to Europe against unfavorable balances due to the United States or South America or elsewhere. How, indeed, can any country hope to start up trade with Europe during the relief and reconstruction period on any other terms?

15. The facilities offered will be of particular importance in the transitional period after the war as soon as the initial shortages of supply have been overcome. Many countries will find a difficulty in paying for their imports, and will need time and resources before they can establish a readjustment. The efforts of each of these debtor countries to preserve its own equilibrium, by forcing its exports and by cutting off all imports which are not strictly necessary, will aggravate the problems of all the others. On the other hand, if each feels free from undue pressure, the volume of international exchange will be increased and everyone will find it easier to reestablish equilibrium without injury to the standard of life anywhere. The creditor countries will benefit, hardly less than the debtors, by being given an interval of time in which to adjust their economies, during which they can safely move at their own pace without the result of exercising deflationary pressure on the rest of the world and, by repercussion, on themselves.

16. It must, however, be emphasized that the provision by which the members of the clearing union start with substantial overdraft facilities in hand will be mainly useful, just as the possession of any kind of reserve is useful, to allow time and method for necessary adjustments and a comfortable safeguard behind which the unforeseen and the unexpected can be faced with equanimity. Obviously, it does not by itself provide any long-term solution against a continuing disequilibrium, for in due course the more improvident and the more impecunious, left to themselves, would have run through their resources. But if the purpose of the overdraft facilities is mainly to give time for adjustments, we have to make sure, so far as possible, that they will be made. We must have, therefore, some rules and some machinery to secure that equilibrium is restored. A tentative attempt to provide for this has been made above. Perhaps it might be strengthened and improved.

17. The provisions suggested differ in one important respect from the pre-war system because they aim at putting some part of the responsibility for adjustment on the creditor country as well as on the debtor. This is an attempt to recover one of the advantages which were enjoyed in the nineteenth century, when a flow of gold due to a favorable balance in favor of London and Paris, which were then the main creditor centers, immediately produced an expansionist pressure and increased foreign lending in those markets, but which has been lost since New York succeeded to the position of main creditor, as a result of gold movements failing in their effect, of the break-down of international borrowing, and of the frequent flight of loose funds from one depository to another. The object is that the creditor should not be allowed to remain entirely passive. For if he is, an intolerably heavy task may be laid on the debtor country, which is already for that very reason in the weaker position.

18. If, indeed, a country lacks the productive capacity to maintain its standard of life, then a reduction in this standard is not avoidable. If its wage and price levels in terms of money are out of line with those elsewhere, a change in the rate of its foreign exchange is inevitable. But if, possessing the productive capacity, it lacks markets because of restrictive policies throughout the world, then the remedy lies in expanding its opportunities for export by removal of the restrictive pressure. We are too ready today to assume the inevitability of unbalanced trade positions, thus making the opposite error to those who assumed the tendency of exports and imports to equality. It used to be supposed, without sufficient reason, that effective demand is always properly adjusted throughout the world; we now tend to assume, equally without sufficient reason, that it never can be. On the contrary, there is great force in the contention that, if active employment and ample purchasing power can be sustained in the main centers of the world trade, the problem of surpluses and unwanted exports will largely disappear, even though, under the most prosperous conditions, there may remain some disturbances of trade and unforeseen situations requiring special remedies.

V. THE DAILY MANAGEMENT OF THE EXCHANGES UNDER THE PLAN

19. The Clearing Union restores unfettered multilateral clearing between its members. Compare this with the difficulties and complications of a large number of bilateral agreements. Compare, above all, the provisions by which a country, taking improper advantage of a payments agreement (for the system is, in fact, a generalized payments agreement), as Germany did before the war, is dealt with not by a single country (which may not be strong enough to act effectively in isolation or cannot afford to incur the diplomatic odium of isolated action), but by the system as a whole. If the argument is used that the Clearing Union may have difficulty in disciplining a misbehaving country and in avoiding consequential loss, with what much greater force can we urge this objection against a multiplicity of separate bilateral payments agreements.

20. Thus we should not only obtain the advantages without the disadvantages of an international gold currency, but we might enjoy these advantages more widely than was ever possible in practice with the old system under which at any given time only a minority of countries were actually working with free exchanges. In conditions of multilateral clearing exchange dealings would be carried on as freely as in the best days of the gold standard, without its being necessary to ask anyone to accept special or onerous conditions.

21. The principles governing transactions are, first, that the Clearing Union is set up, not for the transaction of daily business between individual traders or banks but for the clearing and settlement of the ultimate outstanding balances between central banks (and certain other supernational institutions), such as would have been settled under the old gold standard by the shipment or the earmarking of gold, and should not trespass unnecessarily beyond this field; and, second, that its purpose is to increase freedom in international commerce, and not to multiply interferences or compulsions.

22. Many central banks have found great advantage in centralizing with themselves or with an exchange control the supply and demand of all foreign exchange, thus dispensing with an outside exchange market, though continuing to accommodate individuals through the existing banks and not directly. The further extension of such arrangements would be consonant with the general purposes of the Clearing Union, inasmuch as they would promote order and discipline in international exchange transactions in detail as well as in general. The same is true of the control of capital movements, further described below, which many states are likely to wish to impose on their own nationals. But the structure of the proposed Clearing Union does not require such measures of centralization or of control on the part of a member state. It is, for example, consistent alike with the type of exchange control now established in the United Kingdom or with the system now operating in the United States. The union does not prevent private holdings of foreign currency or private dealings in exchange or international capital movements, if these have been approved or allowed by the member states concerned. Central banks can deal direct with one another as heretofore. No transaction in bancor will take place, except when a member state or its central bank is exercising the right to pay in it. In no case is there any direct control on capital movements by the union, even in the case of 6 (8) (b) (ii) above, but only by the member states themselves through their own institutions. Thus the fabric of international banking organization, built up by long experience to satisfy practical needs, would be left as undisturbed as possible.

23. It is not necessary to interfere with the discretion of countries which desire to maintain a special intimacy within a particular group of countries associated by geographical or political ties, such as the existing sterling area, or groups, like the Latin Union of former days, which may come into existence covering, for example, the countries of North America or those of South America, or the groups now under active discussion, including Poland and Czechoslovakia or certain of the Balkan states. There is no reason why such countries should not be allowed a double position, both as members of the clearing union in their own right with their proper quota, and also as making use of another financial center along traditional lines, as, for example, Australia and India with London, or certain American countries with New York. In this case, their accounts with the Clearing Union would be in exactly the same position as the independent gold reserves which they now maintain, and they would have no occasion to modify in any way their present practices in the conduct of daily business.

24. There might be other cases, however, in which a dependency or a member of a federal union would merge its currency identity in that of a mother company, with a quota appropriately adjusted to the merged currency

area as a whole, and not enjoy a separate individual membership of the Clearing Union, as, for example, the States of a federal union, the French colonies, or the British Crown colonies.

25. At the same time, countries which do not belong to a special geographical or political group, would be expected to keep their reserve balances with the Clearing Union and not with one another. It has, therefore, been laid down that balances may not be held in another country except with the approval of the monetary authorities of that country; and, in order that sterling and dollars might not appear to compete with bancor for the purpose of reserve balances, the United Kingdom and the United States might agree together that they would not accept the reserve balances of other countries in excess of normal working balances except in the case of banks definitely belonging to a sterling area or dollar area group.

VI. THE POSITION OF GOLD UNDER THE PLAN

26. Gold still possesses great psychological value which is not being diminished by current events; and the desire to possess a gold reserve against unforeseen contingencies is likely to remain. Gold also has the merit of providing in point of form (whatever the underlying realities may be) an uncontroversial standard of value for international purposes, for which it would not yet be easy to find a serviceable substitute. Moreover, by supplying an automatic means for settling some part of the favorable balances of the creditor countries, the current gold production of the world and the remnant of gold reserves held outside the United States may still have a useful part to play. Nor is it reasonable to ask the United States to demonetize the stock of gold which is the basis of its impregnable liquidity. What, in the long run, the world may decide to do with gold is another matter. The purpose of the clearing union is to supplant gold as a governing factor, but not to dispense with it.

27. The international bank money which we have designated "bancor" is defined in terms of a weight of gold. Since the national currencies of the member states are given a defined exchange value in terms of bancor, it follows that they would each have a defined gold content which would be their official buying price for gold, above which they must not pay. The fact that a member state is entitled to obtain a credit in terms of bancor by paying actual gold to the credit of its clearing account, secures a steady and ascertained purchaser for the output of the gold-producing countries, and for countries holding a large reserve of gold. Thus the position of producers and holders of gold is not affected adversely, and is, indeed, improved.

28. Central banks would be entitled to retain their separate gold reserves and ship gold to one another, provided they did not pay a price above parity; they could coin gold and put it into circulation, and, generally speaking, do what they liked with it.

29. One limitation only would be, for obvious reasons, essential. No member state would be entitled to demand gold from the clearing union against its balance of bancor; for bancor is available only for transfer to another clearing account. Thus, between gold and bancor itself there would be a one-way convertibility, such as ruled frequently before the war with national currencies which were on what was called a gold exchange standard. This need not mean that the clearing union would only receive gold and never pay it out. It has been provided above that, if the clearing union finds itself in possession of a stock of gold, the governing board shall have discretion to distribute the surplus between those possessing credit balances in bancor, proportionately to such balances, in reduction of their amount.

30. The question has been raised whether these arrangements are compatible with the retention by individual member states of a full gold standard with two-way convertibilty, so that, for example, any foreign central bank acquiring dollars could use them to obtain gold for export. It is not evident that a good purpose would be served by this. But it need not be prohibited, and if any member state should prefer to maintain full convertibility for internal purposes it could protect itself from any abuse of the system or inconvenient consequences by providing that gold could only be exported under license.

31. The value of bancor in terms of gold is fixed but not unalterably. The power to vary its value might have to be exercised if the stocks of gold tendered to the union were to be excessive. No object would be served by attempting further to peer into the future or to prophesy the ultimate outcome.

VII. THE CONTROL OF CAPITAL MOVEMENTS

32. There is no country which can, in future, safely allow the flight of funds for political reasons or to evade domestic taxation or in anticipation of the owner turning refugee. Equally, there is no country that can safely receive fugitive funds, which constitute an unwanted import of capital, yet cannot safely be used for fixed investment.

33. For these reasons it is widely held that control of capital movements, both inward and outward, should be a permanent feature of the post-war system. It is an objection to this that control, if it is to be effective, probably requires the machinery of exchange control for all transactions, even though a general permission is given to all remittances in respect of current trade. Thus those countries which have for the time being no reason to fear, and may indeed welcome, outward capital movements, may be reluctant to impose this machinery, even though a general permission for capital, as well as current transactions reduces it to being no more than a machinery of record. On the other hand, such control will be more difficult to work by unilateral action on the part of those countries which cannot afford to dispense with it, especially in the absence of a postal censorship, if movements of capital cannot be controlled at both ends. It would, therefore, be of great advantage if the United States, as well as other members of the Clearing Union, would adopt machinery similar to that which the British Exchange Control has now gone a long way toward perfecting. Nevertheless, the universal establishment of a control of capital movements cannot be regarded as essential to the operation of the Clearing Union; and the method and degree of such control should therefore be left to the decision of each member state. Some less drastic way might be found by which countries, not themselves controlling outward capital movements can deter inward movements not approved by the countries from which they originate.

34. The position of abnormal balances in overseas ownership held in various countries at the end of the war presents a problem of considerable importance and special difficulty. A country in which a large volume of such balances is held could not, unless it is in a creditor position, afford the risk of having to redeem them in bancor on a substantial scale, if this would have the effect of depleting its bancor resources at the outset. At the same time, it is very desirable that the countries owning these balances should be able to regard them as liquid, at any rate over and above the amounts which they can afford to lock up under an agreed program of funding or long-term expenditure. Perhaps there should be some special overriding provision for dealing with the transitional period only by which, through the aid of the Clearing Union, such balances would remain liquid and convertible into bancor by the creditor country whilst there would be no corresponding strain on the bancor resources of the debtor country, or, at any rate, the resulting strain would be spread over a period.

35. The advocacy of a control of capital movements must not be taken to mean that the era of international investment should be brought to an end. On the contrary, the system contemplated should greatly facilitate the restoration of international loans and credits for legitimate purposes in ways to be discussed below. The object, and it is a vital object, is to have a means—

(a) of distinguishing long-term loans by creditor countries, which help to maintain equilibrium and develop the world's resources, from movements of funds out of debtor countries which lack the means to finance them; and

(b) of controlling short-term speculative movements or flights of currency whether out of debtor countries or from one creditor country to another.

36. It should be emphasized that the purpose of the overdrafts of bancor permitted by the Clearing Union is, not to facilitate long-term, or even medium-term, credits to be made by debtor countries which cannot afford them, but to allow time and a breathing space for adjustments and for averaging one period with another to all member states alike, whether in the long run they are well placed to develop a forward international-loan policy or whether their prospects of profitable new development in excess of their own resources justifies them in long-term borrowing. The machinery and organization of international medium-term and long-term lending is another aspect of post-war economic policy, not less important than the purposes which the Clearing Union seeks to serve, but requiring another, complementary institution.

VIII. RELATION OF THE CLEARING UNION TO COMMERCIAL POLICY

37. The special protective expedients which were developed between the two wars were sometimes due to political, social, or industrial reasons. But frequently they were nothing more than forced and undesired dodges to protect an unbalanced position of a country's overseas payments. The new system, by helping to provide a register of the size and and whereabouts of the aggregate debtor and creditor positions respectively, and an indication whether it is reasonable for a particular country to adopt special expedients as a temporary measure to assist in regaining equilibrium in its balance of payments, would make it possible to establish a general rule not to adopt them, subject to the indicated exceptions.

38. The existence of the Clearing Union would make it possible for member States contracting commercial agreements to use their respective debit and credit positions with the Clearing Union as a test, though this test by itself would not be complete. Thus, the contracting parties, while agreeing to clauses in a commercial agreement forbidding, in general, the use of certain measures or expedients in their mutual trade relations, might make this agreement subject to special relaxations if the state of their respective clearing accounts satisfied an agreed criterion. For example, an agreement might provide that, in the event of one of the contracting States having a debit balance with the Clearing Union exceeding a specified proportion of its quota on the average of a period, it should be free to resort to import regulation to barter trade agreements or to higher import duties of a type which was restricted under the agreement in normal circumstances. Protected by the possibility of such temporary indulgences, the members of the Clearing Union should

feel much more confidence in moving toward the withdrawal of other and more dislocating forms of protection and discrimination and in accepting the prohibition of the worst of them from the outset. In any case, it should be laid down that members of the Union would not allow or suffer among themselves any restrictions on the disposal of receipts arising out of current trade or invisible income.

IX. THE USE OF THE CLEARING UNION FOR OTHER INTERNATIONAL PURPOSES

39. The Clearing Union might become the instrument and the support of international policies in addition to those which it is its primary purpose to promote. This deserves the greatest possible emphasis. The union might become the pivot of the future economic government of the world. Without it, other more desirable developments will find themselves impeded and unsupported. With it they will fall into their place as parts of an ordered scheme. No one of the following suggestions is a necessary part of the plan. But they are illustrations of the additional purposes of high importance and value which the union, once established, might be able to serve:

(1) The union might set up a clearing account in favor of international bodies charged with post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. But it could go much further than this. For it might supplement contributions received from other sources by granting preliminary overdraft facilities in favor of these bodies, the overdraft being discharged over a period of years out of the reserve fund of the union, or, if necessary, out of a levy on surplus credit balances. So far as this method is adopted it would be possible to avoid asking any country to assume a burdensome commitment for relief and reconstruction, since the resources would be provided in the first instance by those countries having credit clearing accounts for which they have no immediate use and are voluntarily leaving idle, and in the long run by those countries which have a chronic international surplus for which they have no beneficial employment.

(2) The union might set up an account in favor of any supernational policing body which may be charged with the duty of preserving the peace and maintaining international order. If any country were to infringe its properly authorized orders, the policing body might be entitled to request the governors of the Clearing Union to hold the clearing account of the delinquent country to its order and permit no further transactions on the account except by its authority. This would provide an excellent machinery for enforcing a financial blockade.

(3) The union might set up an account in favor of international bodies charged with the management of a commodity control, and might finance stocks of commodities held by such bodies, allowing them overdraft facilities on their accounts up to an agreed maximum. By this means the financial problem of buffer stocks and "ever-normal granaries" could be effectively attacked.

(4) The union might be linked up with a board for international investment. It might act on behalf of such a board and collect for them the annual service of their loans by automatically debiting the clearing account of the country concerned. The statistics of the clearing accounts of the member states would give a reliable indication as to which countries were in a position to finance the investment board, with the advantage of shifting the whole system of clearing credits and debits nearer to equilibrium.

(5) There are various methods by which the Clearing Union could use its influence and its powers to maintain stability of prices and to control the trade cycle. If an international economic board is established this board and the clearing union might be expected to work in close collaboration to their mutual advantage. If an international investment or development corporation is also set up together with a scheme of commodity controls for the control of stocks of the staple primary products, we might come to possess in these three institutions a powerful means of combating the evils of the trade cycle, by exercising contractionist or expansionist influence on the system as a whole or on particular sections. This is a large and important question which cannot be discussed adequately in this paper; and need not be examined at length in this place because it does not raise any important issues affecting the fundamental constitution of the proposed union. It is mentioned here to complete the picture of the wider purposes which the foundation of the Clearing Union might be made to serve.

40. The facility of applying the clearing union plan to these several purposes arises out of a fundamental characteristic which is worth pointing out, since it distinguishes the plan from those proposals which try to develop the same basic principle along bilateral lines and is one of the grounds on which the plan can claim superior merit. This might be described as its "anonymous" or "impersonal" quality. No particular member states have to engage their own resources as such to the support of other particular states or of any of the international projects or policies adopted. They have only to agree in general that, if they find themselves with surplus resources which for the time being they do not themselves wish to employ, these resources may go into the general pool and be put to work on approved purposes. This costs the surplus country nothing because it is not asked to part permanently, or even for any specified period, with such resources, which it remains free to expend and employ for its own purposes whenever it chooses; in which case the burden of finance is passed on to the next recipient, again for only so long as the recipient has no use for the money. As pointed out above, this merely amounts to extending to the international sphere the methods of any domestic banking system, which are in the same sense "impersonal" inasmuch as there is no call on the particular depositor either to support as such the purposes for which his banker makes advances or to forego permanently the use of his deposit. There is no countervailing objection except that which applies equally to the technique of domestic banking, namely, that it is capable of the abuse of creating excessive purchasing power and hence an inflation of prices. In our efforts to avoid the opposite evil, we must not lose sight of this risk, to which there is an allusion in 39 (5) above. But it is no more reason for refusing the advantages of international banking than the similar risk in the domestic field is a reason to return to the practices of the seventeenth century goldsmiths (which are what we are still following in the international field) and to forego the vast expansion of production which banking principles have made possible. Where financial contributions are required for some purpose of general advantage, it is a great facility not to have to ask for specific contributions from any named country, but to depend rather on the anonymous and impersonal aid of the system as a whole. We have here a genuine organ of truly international government.

X. THE TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

41. It would be of great advantage to agree to the general principles of the Clearing Union before the end of the war, with a view to bringing it into operation at an early date after the termination of hostilities. Major plans will be more easily brought to birth in the first energy of victory and whilst the active spirit of united action still persists, than in the days of exhaustion and reaction from so much effort which may well follow a little later. Such a proposal presents, however, something of a dilemma. On the one hand, many countries will be in particular need of reserves of overseas resources in the period immediately after the war. On the other hand, goods will be in short supply and the prevention of inflationary international conditions of much more importance for the time being than the opposite. The expansionists tendency of the plan, which is a leading recommendation of it as soon as peacetime output is restored and the productive capacity of the world is in running order, might be a danger in the early days of a sellers' market and an excess of demand over supply.

42. A reconciliation of these divergent purposes is not easily found until we know more than is known at present about the means to be adopted to finance post-war relief and reconstruction. If the intention is to provide resources on liberal and comprehensive lines outside the resources made available by the Clearing Union and additional to them, it might be better for such specific aid to take the place of the proposed overdrafts during the relief period of, say, 2 years. In this case credit clearing balances would be limited to the amount of gold delivered to the union, and the overdraft facilities created by the union in favor of the Relief Council, the International Investment Board, or the Commodity Controls. Nevertheless, the immediate establishment of the Clearing Union would not be incompatible with provisional arrangements, which could take alternative forms according to the character of the other relief arrangements, qualifying and limiting the overdraft quotas. Overdraft quotas might be allowed on a reduced scale during the transitional period. Or it might be proper to provide that countries in receipt of relief or lend-lease assistance should not have access at the same time to overdraft facilities, and that the latter should only come available when the former had come to an end. If, on the other hand, relief from outside sources looks like being inadequate from the outset, the overdraft quotas may be even more necessary at the outset than later on.

43. We must not be overcautious. A rapid economic restoration may lighten the tasks of the diplomatists and the politicians in the resettlement of the world and the restoration of social order. For Great Britain and other countries outside the "relief" areas the possibility of exports sufficient to sustain their standard of life is bound up with good and expanding markets. We cannot afford to wait too long for this, and we must not allow excessive caution to condemn us to perdition. Unless the union is a going concern, the problem of proper "timing" will be nearly insoluble. It is sufficient at this stage to point out that the problem of timing must not be overlooked, but that the union is capable of being used so as to aid rather than impede its solution.

XI. CONCLUSION

44. It has been suggested that so ambitious a proposal is open to criticism on the ground that it requires from the members of the union a greater surrender of their sovereign rights than they will readily concede. But no greater surrender is required than in a commercial treaty. The obligations will be entered into voluntarily and can be terminated on certain conditions by giving notice.

45. A greater readiness to accept supernational arrangements must be required in the post-war world. If the arrangements proposed can be described as a measure of financial disarmament, there is nothing here

which we need be reluctant to accept ourselves or to ask of others. It is an advantage, and not a disadvantage, of the scheme that it invites the member states to abandon that license to promote indiscipline, disorder, and bad neighborliness which, to the general disadvantage, they have been free to exercise hitherto.

46. The plan makes a beginning at the future economic ordering of the world between nations and "the winning of the peace." It might help to create the conditions and the atmosphere in which much else would be made easier.

In contrast to the monetary schemes proposed in the Morgenthau and Keynes plan, we have on our statute books the monetary plans of the great statesmen of the past.

THE DECLARED POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

As a result of the long-sustained effort to establish an international monetary system by a series of international monetary conventions during the period following the close of the Civil War and the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act of 1893, the Congress enacted and placed upon our statute books a declaration of monetary policy embodied in section 311 of the United States Code:

SEC. 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts. (Nov. 1, 1893, ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4.)

THE MONETARY CONVENTION OF 1865

On the 23d day of December 1865, France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland united in the monetary treaty "to regulate the weight, title, form, and circulation of their gold and silver coins," whereby they agreed to coin of gold only the pieces of 100, 50, 20, 10, and 5 francs in eight, standard, tolerance, and diameter, and of silver only the 5-franc pieces of standard weight and fineness, with unlimited coinage and legal tender for such coins; and further agreed to coin in amounts as herein prescribed for each State, silver coins of 1 and 2 francs, 50 and 20 centimes, of reduced fineness and limited in legal tender to 50 francs; and that any nation could join the convention by adopting its monetary system in regard to gold and silver coins, and that the convention should remain in force until January 1, 1880.

Senator F. M. Cockrell, in presenting the record of this International Monetary Convention and the subsequent negotiations to have the United States join the convention and standardize its money with coinage of the European nations, has this to say in his famous speech on money, recently printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Here was a bimetallic system (of money) upon the ratio of 15½ to 1 maintained by France since October 30, 1785, and all we had to do was simply to subscribe to it. There was no international complication connected with it; nothing to do but simply subscribe to it, and agree that we would coin certain coins. In order to come to that, we only had to strike out about 12½ grains of our standard silver dollar, reduce it to 400 grains, and thus bring it down to the ratio of 15½ to 1.

Here was a standard perfected, tested for nearly a hundred years, already agreed to, with an open clause, with an open door for any nation to join in it.

That was the only time the United States was ever offered an opportunity to become a member of an international bimetallic union.

If the monetary metals, gold and silver, are to be used at all in our post-war monetary system, then some plan must be devised and put into operation that will provide for the standardization of the relative value of the monetary units of the several nations to the value of basic money—money of ultimate redemption—the kind of money that will conform to the provisions of economic law and have a stable value, by increasing evenly with the growth of population and commerce. The experience of the ages teaches us that this kind of money can best be obtained by the adoption of international bimetallism. The production of gold and silver taken together at their natural ratio automatically increases in volume with the growth of population and commerce.

Time for Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with a threatened shortage of food; with more and more businessmen being forced out of business; with the tax burden ever growing larger; with those who follow the administration's orders, as did the operators of the coal mines, being deprived of their property by the Government, while the miners, who disobeyed those orders, are being rewarded with increased compensation; with Government bureaus putting forth penal regulations which the Supreme Court now says have the force of laws, it is time—yes, long past time—for the people to insist that their Representatives in Congress give us a government under law, do away with a government by men who have no authority to create law.

The lower branch of Congress has endeavored to cut appropriations, eradicate the Reds from Federal jobs, but the other part of the legislative branch still balks. The only exception to the upper branch's consistent compliance with organized labor's demands was when it overrode the President's veto of the Smith-Connally antistrike bill. The people should direct some of their criticism toward the upper House.

In years gone by, the people took Congress more or less as a matter of course, regarding it as the insurmountable, ever-existing barrier between them and the loss of their liberties.

With the advent of the New Deal and the subservient yielding by what came to be known as a rubber-stamp Congress, to the demands made by President Roosevelt for additional powers, those functions formerly exercised by the Congress alone fell one by one within the grasp of the Chief Executive and those subordinates appointed by him and acting under his control.

Gradually at first, under the guise of one emergency and then another, the President succeeded in gathering into his own hands greater powers, more authority, than had ever been exercised in peacetime by the Chief Executive. Then came the war and the final excuse for further demands fell to the use of the President. Only at the risk of being charged with impeding the war effort, of aiding the enemy, dared a voice be raised in opposition to any demand made by the administration for money or authority.

That great American, Lincoln, once said:

There is an important sense in which the Government is distinct from the administration. One is perpetual, the other temporary and changeable. A man may be loyal to his Government and yet oppose the peculiar principles and methods of the administration.

Forgetting or intentionally disregarding that truth, the New Dealers have endeavored earnestly and unceasingly to build up in the minds of our people the belief that the terms administration and government are synonymous, and that the administration is all-wise, all-good, and can act only in the best interests of these United States and its citizens.

That horde of bureaucrats which promulgates the multiplicity of orders, rules, regulations, and directives which are governing every phase of the lives of our people have presumed to take solely unto themselves the prerogative of interpreting the intentions of the Congress; of reading into its enactments meanings never even thought of by the Congress when those measures were adopted into law.

The extent to which the power to control has been taken over by the Executive and those acting under him, the extent to which we are now governed by men rather than by law, and the necessity for Congress without delay recovering that power unto itself is clearly and ably set forth by that eminent writer, David Lawrence, in an editorial appearing in a recent issue of the United States News, a publication which bears an enviable reputation for fair reporting. Permit me to quote a few pertinent paragraphs from Mr. Lawrence's article:

Overseas our boys were fighting last week. Some of them were killed. Some of them were wounded. More will be killed and wounded in the months ahead.

They have been told again and again that this is a war to preserve our freedoms—our liberties.

But last week six justices appointed by President Roosevelt, constituting a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States, took away a basic liberty—the right of every citizen to be governed by laws and not by the

arbitrary power of a bureaucrat, the right of every citizen to know explicitly what are the punishments incurred for violations of a statute.

Our boys are not fighting to a sustain the privilege of officials in any Government agency to fix whatever punishments they please for a violation of law.

Yet the Supreme Court majority decided, in effect, that a Government agency can fix any punishment it desires although not explicitly mentioned in the statute that is broken. The precedent is fixed. The die is cast. Only a constitutional amendment can abrogate a decision of the Supreme Court. Only a change in the membership of the Court over a long period of years can reverse it.

* * * * *

The latest case minces no words. It frankly empowers a governmental agency to select whatever punishment it pleases so long as in the judgment of that agency the punishment "effectuates the policies of the act."

* * * * *

The time has come to play fair with the boys overseas. Instead of worrying, as did our Vice President the other day, whether Russia might be double-crossed in the post-war period, let's worry a little during the war about double-crossing the American people who are today making the supreme sacrifice in giving the blood of their sons to fight a war so often sloganized as a war to preserve our "four freedoms."

If Congress adjourns or takes a summer recess without restoring this Government to the people, there may be little left of a representative republican form of government when Congress reconvenes in the fall.

It is time that the people make themselves heard.

The O. W. I. Is Helping To Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and illuminating address entitled "The O. W. I. Is Helping To Win the War," delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Saturday, June 26, last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have come here tonight to tell you a personal story about one of the ways in which the United States is fighting this war. For security reasons, I cannot tell you all I would like to. But what I can tell you is something I think the wives, mothers, and fathers of our fighting men, our workers on farms and in plants—in other words, you who are listening to my voice right now—will be interested to hear.

It saddens me to have to open my story by saying that in spite of the military advances our forces have made on various fronts during the past 10 days, the United States has suffered one definite set-back in the war. The leaders and the people of Japan, Germany, and Italy are gloating over it. Their newspapers and broadcasting stations have been telling them about it, bringing a ray of hope to the discouraged Axis populations, and casting doubt in the minds of the peoples of occupied nations.

You, too, have heard of this set-back, which is the attempt to cripple the work of the Office of War Information, popularly called the O. W. I. It is because of the chance that the attempt may produce ruinous results that I am speaking to you tonight.

Let me quote to you some of the happy words which Tokyo has been broadcasting all over the world. Last Tuesday the Tokyo radio said, and I quote: "There's a wide divergence of views between the elected representatives of the American people and the salaried appointees who wield so much power in the Government. Thus, over the week end, the House of Representatives cracked down on a budget for domestic propaganda which was submitted by the Office of War Information. * * * Almost any way you look at it, the whole thing looks bad, smells bad, and is bad. The propagandists disagree with the elective representatives of the American people who, in turn, disagree with the elected and appointed leaders. Everybody is out for the selfish gratification of his own desires and to heck with the American people who are paying for all this with blood, sweat, and tears."

Those are the exact words with which we were taunted and other people were told of this action.

I have had the privilege of participating actively in the work of the Office of War Information and its predecessor ever since the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Due to the fact that I lived in Japan for a number of years, and that the Far East has been one of my main interests for nearly 40 years, I was asked to address messages to the people of Japan for short-wave broadcast. Not less than once a month I have done this ever since. What the effect of this and other messages may be I cannot tell. We can judge, to some extent, by the beatings, the jailings, the torture, and the death sentences that are inflicted by the Axis nations upon their citizens and people of occupied countries who dare to listen.

Last March Kiwao Okumura, Vice Chief of the Japanese Board of Information, said in an address, and I quote: "There is no need to mention the importance of the mission of the radio broadcast used as propaganda for overseas countries and against enemy countries. All belligerent nations in the world are now relying on radio. * * * It is especially necessary to wipe out the false propaganda of America and Britain, and every effort is being concentrated toward this end."

My own feeling in the matter I expressed in my very first message, as follows: "I do not know how many of you are listening to this message to the people of Japan, because the repressions which your Government practices on you keep you, as far as it can, from knowing the truth. But if only one Japanese hears my words and learns the tragic story of the way in which you have been betrayed by your war lords, who have sold themselves to Hitler, then it will be worth while to speak."

To continue my personal story, beginning with the messages to Japan, I was asked to address messages to many other nations. What I have written has gone into the newspapers of countries all over the world and has been heard by radio in many lands across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Numerous colleagues of mine in Congress have done the same. The messages from Members of Congress and other individuals have gone forth in a stream and form an important part of the work of the Office of War Information.

I tell you this because these efforts of mine have naturally made me well acquainted with the Office of War Information, with its staff, with its methods, with its purposes, and with its earnest zeal. And I can say to you, on the basis of my personal knowledge, that the Office of War Information is a real part of the war and is helping to win the war.

I can say more than this. It is my belief that everyone who really knows the O. W. I., who is really close to its work, approves and endorses its work with the possible exception of a few individuals in whose case private antagonisms may be involved. That is why, since the vote in the House of Representatives which would abolish a vital part of the O. W. I., there has been a veritable flood of protests, without exception, from everyone of the private information groups of the United States who actually work with the O. W. I. day in and day out. The very people and organizations who are alleged to be suffering because of the O. W. I. are the ones who are demanding that it be continued and made even more strong in its work.

My personal contacts with the Office of War Information have not been restricted to its work overseas. Some confusion has arisen in the minds of many people because the Office of War Information has what is called an overseas branch and a domestic branch. The impression has been given by the enemies of the Office of War Information that these two branches are separate organizations which happen to be under the same roof and headed by the same chiefs. In this way, it is possible to say with apparent innocence: "The overseas work of the Office of War Information is all right, but let's cut out the domestic branch. That won't hurt the overseas work at all."

The fact is that the overseas branch and the domestic branch are not two separate groups working along parallel lines. Their work is integrally connected. To abolish or curtail the work of one branch is to abolish or curtail the work of the other automatically, for the domestic branch is the main source of information which feeds the overseas branch with the raw material out of which the overseas branch fashions its finished product.

To abolish the domestic branch or to cut down its work is exactly the same as cutting off or shortening one wing of a flying fortress on the theory that it can get along very well with the other wing.

Moreover, it is not only the material which the domestic branch obtains for use by the overseas branch which is important in this matter. That same material is the story of what the United States Government is doing in this war, and the American people, through their radios and their newspapers, are entitled to know that story. It is unthinkable that the Congress of the United States will tell the people, who elected its members, that from now on they forbid the American Government to inform the American people of what is being done to win the war.

We Americans already know the value of the Office of War Information to us. I know much more today and you know much more today about our military efforts and about every other phase of war activity than we knew a year ago, when the Office of War Information was founded. And it is conceded by all media of news that the Office of War Information is largely responsible for this.

I have said that those who know the Office of War Information and who work closely with it are in favor of it. Here in Washington there is an organization called the War Agencies Correspondents Association. It is made up of the newspapermen and radio reporters from all over the United States who

cover the Washington war news. Last Monday they passed a resolution saying in part:

"It has been the experience of members of the War Agencies Correspondents Association, who have daily contact with the Office of War Information, that the agency has consistently tried to get the facts about the home-front war operations and to present them in a fair and competent manner. A more vigorous, not a dead, Office of War Information is needed."

What does the radio industry think about the Office of War Information? Besides the many commentators like Maj. George Fielding Eliot who have come to its defense, the radio stations and the networks are speaking in vigorous tones. Radio Daily, the newspaper of the industry, carried this headline last Wednesday: "Industry for domestic bureau. Trade executives favor radio branch as clearing house for Government shows."

The same thing is true of the motion-picture industry, which has endorsed the Motion Picture Bureau, of magazine and book publishers, and so on down the line.

Newspapers all over the United States have carried editorials endorsing the Office of War Information in the last 10 days. The New York Times wrote that it has "done much useful work. It has succeeded in making available to the public much more information much more promptly, about the activities of the military and naval services than was available before Mr. Davis went to work. It has eliminated a good deal of the duplication and confusion which formerly prevailed in the public announcements of the Government."

I want to say to the American people what you already know, that this is a war we are fighting and not a game we are playing. War means killing people. Some of those people are the enemy. Others are our sons and brothers and husbands whom the enemy kills. When we discuss the Office of War Information we are talking about life and death. Today there are thousands of American soldiers alive who would be dead had it not been for Office of War Information operations. There are many more thousands whose life or death hangs in the balance today, depending on whether or not the Office of War Information continues its work.

If Adolf Hitler, Premier Tojo, and Benito Mussolini should make up a list of the 10 Americans whom they would most like to see done away with, it is my belief that Elmer Davis would stand high on that list.

Reduction of Appropriations for the O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Movie Industry Backs the O. W. I." written by Peter Furst and published in PM of the issue of June 23, 1943, and also an article entitled "A War Service in the Balance" written by Bosley Crowther and published in the New York Times of June 27, 1943. Both articles relate to the proposal to reduce appropriation for the Office of War Information.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From New York PM of June 23, 1943]

MOVIE INDUSTRY BACKS THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

(By Peter Furst)

HOLLYWOOD, June 28.—Movie people have long denied that stranger things happen in Hollywood than anywhere else, but the fact that the entire movie industry has come vigorously and bravely to the defense of the Office of War Information, now that its very existence is threatened, is certainly the surprise of the year.

Many times since the Office of War Information's film bureau was created last year, the big producers have started campaigns against it, trade journals have blasted it, studios have screamed "interference" and "propaganda" and "we won't be dictated to by a bunch of bureaucrats who have never been nearer film production than an orchestra seat in a movie theater."

The Hays office in particular was often said to be one of the chief enemies of the Office of War Information's film bureaus in Washington and here.

Now, Congress has so drastically cut funds for the Domestic Bureau of the Office of War Information that unless the Senate reverses the House action, all the Office of War Information activities in this country, including its Hollywood film office, will be suspended.

Will Hays, president of the Motion Picture Producers Association (Hays office), and thus the spokesman of the entire film industry, has sent a wire to Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee protesting the cut and declaring that "We have been greatly pleased by the understanding shown by the picture bureau and the complete lack of effort on its part to dominate our operation. I know the industry's feeling is one of genuine appreciation for the service being rendered."

The industry, judging from Will Hays' wire and general comment in the studios on the House sabotage of the Office of War Information's activities today, would like to keep the Office of War Information's movie advisors—all former newspapermen, incidentally—in Hollywood and on the job.

[From the New York Times]

A WAR SERVICE IN THE BALANCE—CONGRESSIONAL THREAT TO THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION PLACES IN SERIOUS JEOPARDY OUR SOLE COORDINATING AGENCY FOR FILMS

(By Bosley Crowther)

When the gentlemen of the House of Representatives killed the budget the other day for the Office of War Information in all its domestic activities, they put a potential quietus on a sizable wartime service of the screen. For the blow, if it proves to be mortal, would entirely eliminate the Bureau of Motion Pictures, among others, of the Office of War Information—and that is an eventuality which even the industry's least receptive view with pause. As these lines are being written, the matter is still in doubt; the Senate may make up the budget which its neighbor across the Capitol withheld. The Office of War Information's domestic torso may be saved. But bedside watchers are predicting that, at best, its movie arm will be in a sling. They say that any economies which Congress may compel will first be made, most likely, in the outsidish bureau of films.

It is well that the general public should understand exactly what this means and know how such a curtailment would affect what we see on our screens—for the public, after all, is the body which the screen, in one way or another, serves. In the first place, the film producing unit of the Office of War Information would be cut, if not completely abolished—which means that such information films as this unit has been making over the past year would henceforth be out or curtailed. It means that the Hollywood office of the Office of War Information would be dropped, this being the office which gives producers advice on the tone and content of war films. And it means that the numerous activities of the bureau in organizing the use of films for their most effective impact on the public with war information would be scotched. In short, it means that the making of motion pictures with war purpose would depend entirely upon the individual producers (or service units) with no coordination at all.

GENERALLY AGREED

Unless a lot of people are saying things they don't mean, this is not a situation which the industry desires. And it is certainly not a situation which, in wartime, is logical. There has been a lot of criticism of the Office of War Information's performances in this field—criticism with which this writer has frequently agreed. There have been those persons who have felt that Lowell Mellett, the chief of the bureau of films, has been too bold in his efforts at persuasion; others have felt he wasn't bold enough. Some have maintained that the production of information films was not a Government job; others have argued that the Government should be the sole executor of this task. And a great deal of shifting and adjusting has been going on for the past year. But no one (except the men in Congress) have come out flat-footedly against a film coordinating agency, with the sentiment holding for a Government one. Will H. Hays wired to Congress shortly after its action the other day that the industry has been "pleased by the understanding shown by the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information and by the complete lack of any effort on its part to dominate our operation." And when Mr. Hays made such a statement, he spoke for the coolest element.

A SIGNIFICANT FUNCTION

No, there is every reason to view the action of Congress with concern, and the possibility of the film unit's abolishment with undisguised alarm. For this writer, after careful observation, has noted that the Office of War Information's short films have fulfilled a very significant function in their place on the Nation's screen programs. Such films as "Mission Accomplished," "Doctors at War," "Right of Way," and "Troop Train"—freely distributed and played in thousands of theaters on the pledge of the exhibitors—have slipped a real informative 10 minutes into many an otherwise frivolous show. And although they have not been the best films in every case by far, they have shown a very realistic concept of wartime problems which has had its influence on commercial films.

Right now, the peremptory abolition of film production by the Office of War Information would toss a tremendous responsibility for war-conscious shorts upon the industry—which, from present indications, it is not prepared to assume. There are some excellent pictures currently being made by straight commercial producers. The "This is America" series of two-reelers, made by Pathe, is one of the best and most dependable reality series of the day. The March of Time is an old war horse in the factual-informative line, and the World in Action series from the Canadian National Film Board offers good, consistent two-reelers. Warners, Metro, and Paramount turn out occasional sharp war shorts, and the British Information Services pass some good ones along at intervals for commercial release. But the fact that all

these films are commercial means that their distribution is thereby limited. And many of the Hollywood-made war shorts have been atrociously bad. From the purely numerical standpoint, the Office of War Information's films are covering the land. Furthermore, they are being released far and wide in the non-theatrical field—in schools and granges and factories—which would miss them if the Office of War Information went.

—OR ELSE

Of course, there is still that marginal element which, for reasons of its own continues to agitate loudly that the screen is no place for cold reality and facts. This is the element which wishes it could go into the theater and shut out the world. And that might be partially accomplished by the elimination of the Office of War Information. But the greatest majority, as indicated by the public response to good war films, wants, along with entertainment a visual contact and conception of things as they are. It wants to get through motion pictures, which reproduce actuality most vividly, the feeling and knowledge of what is happening in this tremendous world. For the screen to serve that function there must be point and coordination toward that end. This is as obvious in the field of motion pictures as it is in the production of arms. If the Office of War Information should be abolished, another agency would have to be formed to do the job it is now doing. And it's pretty late to start all over again.

Blood on Her Hands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of June 22, 1943:

BLOOD ON HER HANDS

It is blood on your hands, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

More than any other person, you are morally responsible for those race riots in Detroit where 2 dozen were killed and fully 500 injured in nearly a solid day of street fighting.

You have been personally proclaiming and practicing social equality at the White House and wherever you go, Mrs. Roosevelt.

In Detroit, a city noted for the growing impudence and insolence of its Negro population, an attempt was made to put your preachments into practice, Mrs. Roosevelt.

What followed is now history. Streets ran red with blood until the President of the United States, who happens to be your husband, declared martial law and sent troops to the scene.

No sort of camouflage or false claiming can hide the ugly facts of what happened in Detroit.

It isn't pleasant to say this concerning the First Lady of the land. It isn't pleasant for millions of people to be living in daily fear of being killed or injured in racial clashes, either.

Claim of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was the result of Axis propaganda isn't even decent nonsense. Axis propaganda had nothing whatever to do with it.

It was inevitable that something of this sort should happen. Authorities in scores of our large cities, especially industrial centers, have been for many months in hourly fear of such outbreaks. There is some melancholy gratification in the fact that it happened in one of our northernmost cities, just across from the Canadian border, and not in the deep South or even the middle South. Down this way we have tried to use patience, tolerance, and forbearance in dealing with all phases of the race problem.

Blood on your hands, Mrs. Roosevelt! And the damned spots won't wash out, either.

Valedictory Address by Charles S. Russell at the Capitol Page School Graduation Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Charles S. Russell at the Capitol Page School graduation exercises in the New House Office Building, on June 16, 1943. Personally, I am proud of the excellent address which was made by one of the former pages of the Senate, and I hope that every Senator will have the opportunity and take the trouble of reading this remarkable address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is perhaps to be expected that these words convey a message of farewell, of farewell to Capitol Hill, to school life and to the warmest of friendships. Indeed, we feel all of this, together with the noblest of sentiments toward this citadel of freedom in which we have worked and dreamed of our futures.

And yet, to step beyond these thoughts, there appears a goal so shining that its brilliance almost obscures anything else of which we might think at this moment. For indeed, this must be to us no mere farewell, but a dedication of our very lives and of every spark of energy in our beings to victory in the struggle which confronts us all.

Within a very short time most of the members of this class will be in the armed forces of the United States. We go forth into an anguished and chaotic world from a school which has striven to develop in us those qualities which best fit us to fight the battles of tomorrow. Our never-to-be-forgotten contacts with the world's great and near great bring to us most forcibly the tremendous task which lies before us. And so we are challenged by this thorough training and by the sacred heritage of our homes and families to render our true account as members of a rising generation.

Yet, if we are not to betray this trust we must remember that to win a war and lose the peace is but a hollow victory. We are now mainly concerned with defending the principles of democracy on the battlefield. But in the years which follow, when we will have matured in strength and wisdom, it will become apparent to us that the responsibility does not cease when the world, bleeding and exhausted, settles back once more to peace. Then we will find that these principles which have been saved only by the sacrifice of so much blood, are ours to defend. And so the struggle must go on through the years until our forefathers' dreams are realized and until those shining ideals are secured.

The love we bear our country has not been inspired by flag-waving and by what we read in the newspapers or hear on the radio. We the members of this class, stood silently, scarcely breathing, while the President addressed the joint session of Congress December 8, 1941. We have seen history made, step by step, each day. And so we do not look behind us as we step into the flame. Our course is clear and our cause is just. We have no fear of what tomorrow brings; ours is a rich heritage and with faith and courage we dedicate our lives to its protection.

Salute to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a resolution of the Leo R. Farmer Post, No. 19, of the American Legion, Department of Iowa. This post is located at Sigourney, Iowa, one of the important county seat towns in Iowa, in the heart of the Corn Belt. This post is made up of outstanding patriotic citizens who served in the First World War. In addition to supporting every war effort, this post has performed outstanding service for the community. It was instrumental in erecting one of the finest community buildings in Iowa, which is occupied jointly with other organizations of Sigourney. Some of the members of the post are leading citizens of the State of Iowa.

The following resolution was adopted by this post on June 16, 1943:

Whereas on the 15th day of June 1943, it has been brought to the attention of Leo R. Farmer Post, No. 19, Sigourney, Iowa, American Legion, that the Supreme Court of the United States has delivered an opinion and made a ruling that the members of the Jehovah Witness sect shall not be required to salute the flag even though it may be required of others; and

Whereas it is the belief of the members of this post of the American Legion that no one should be exempted from the salute of our flag; and

Whereas upon motion it was unanimously voted to protest this ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States; and

Therefore formal protest is hereby made.

HOWARD I. SHEPHERD,
Commander of Leo R. Farmer Post, No. 19, American Legion.

SIGOURNEY, IOWA, *June 16, 1943.*

Livestock or Cash Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the late Virginia conference some of the food specialists advised plowing up the grass on the plains of the Southwest and planting—among other things—soybeans and peanuts. They advocate as a better diet for the hardy people of the plains peanut butter, soybean oil, and corn flakes—rather than juicy beef steaks.

I doubt very much whether the professors at Cornell and Columbia will be able to sell their idea to the people of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and other sections of the country to which they would apply their philosophy.

I include as a part of my remarks, a very interesting article written by the editor of the Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman, which appears in the July issue:

TALKS WITH OUR READERS

LIVESTOCK OR CASH CROPS

If you are forced to sell out your beef-, dairy-, and pork-producing herds and poultry flocks in the next few months you may well ask: "Is this a deliberate policy on the part of the Government to force us out of livestock and into cash crop production?"

There are many influential groups whose thinking and planning apparently is aimed in that direction. The theory advanced is that we can feed more people by growing vegetable and cereal crops than we can by converting grass and grain into the luxury form of meat.

Nutritionists and economists at Cornell University, New York, have found that a human can utilize more calories from a bushel of soybeans or peanuts if he eats the peanut butter or roasted soybeans than if he feeds the crops to a steer and eats the steer. They say that 1 acre cropped for soybeans produces as many calories as 11 acres devoted to henfeed for eggs.

So, they argue, let's grow more soybeans and less beef, more calories and fewer eggs, plow up the grass and plant peanuts.

Many Washington officials are listening to the argument. Fortunately, some are not yet convinced, so there is some hope. Lt. Col. Jay L. Taylor, Deputy War Food Administrator, recently told the new nine-man War Meat Board at Chicago:

"I want to bring you assurance direct from Administrator Davis that there is no intent to make drastic cuts in output of animal products and replace them in large part in the American diet with vegetable foods."

DANGEROUS SPECULATION

Obviously, the speculation and type of planning Lieutenant Colonel Taylor referred to is being done mainly by theorists from back East who seem to consider any place this side of the Hudson River to be way out west and who think Corn Belt farming and livestock production is typical of the entire country.

Fortune magazine, widely circulated among influential eastern industrialists, recently emphasized: "The point does come clear that in a wartime emergency the economic superiority of vegetable foods over livestock products should be major considerations in planning the pattern of our agriculture."

How would that affect the southwestern range country?

It would be disastrous if such a scheme were put into effect, either directly or indirectly by such means as price juggling to wipe out profits of livestock, dairy, and poultry producers and subsidize price increases for vegetables and cereals.

OUR LIVESTOCK COUNTRY

When the Southwest was settled, farmers brought with them from all directions the crops and farming systems they used back home.

Slowly and painfully and with tremendous loss of soil and fertility, we have learned that the successful farmer in this country must build his operations around livestock in one form or another.

After a thorough study of the Great Plains country, the Soil Conservation Service published a bulletin in 1939 called "Land Facts on the Southern Plains." This bulletin pointed out that to hold our soil, we should put more land to grass, which everybody knows can be utilized only by livestock.

In classifying some ninety-seven million acres for proper use, 65,000,0000 acres of which was already in grazing and forest land, the Soil Conservation Service proposed retirement to grass of an additional six and one-half million acres of cultivated land.

Farmers have found the trend to grass to be the better way for southwestern agriculture, as evidenced by the greatly increased acreage of grass and larger numbers of livestock of all kinds, ready to be turned into meat and other food products if regulations will permit.

GRAIN GOES WITH GRASS

The nutritionists argue that an acre of corn is more valuable as corn than if converted to beef. That might be true, if you had only one acre on which to produce your food. Then you should plant corn or other crops. But when you have many millions of acres of grassland and a few million acres of cropland, it doesn't add up that way.

To clarify this point I obtained the following information from Louis E. Hawkins, vice director of Oklahoma agricultural experiment station:

"The acreage requirement for maintaining a breeding beef cow and the production of a market calf from calfhood to 2 years old under range conditions, varies widely, increasing from east to west.

"A common allowance for a cow and calf for 12 months in central Oklahoma would be 10 acres, mostly grass but including necessary minimum of hay or other winter roughage. Allow 5 acres for the calf the second year as a yearling and 7 acres the third year as a 2-year-old, sending him to the feed lot in the autumn of that year.

"Allow 20 to 25 bushels of corn to put this kind of steer into such slaughter condition that the beef would be usable. This would mean a carcass grade of commercial to good, not choice and certainly far below prime.

"Assuming that 1 acre of good corn would yield 60 to 75 bushels and finish 3 such steers, this would mean that one 1 such acre would be required to make good use of the produce from 65 to 70 acres of range land.

"Without the acre of corn, this range land would contribute very little to the food program since grass and feeds grown thereon could not be utilized for human consumption and since the range steer would not be in slaughter condition until he received this minimum of grain finishing.

"Certainly the 70 acres of range land plus the one acre of corn would yield much more food in the form of beef than the one acre of corn land possibly could yield in such foods as soybeans, peanuts, dried beans, edible cereals, etc."

DANGEROUS SHIFT

Maybe Cornell nutritionists don't know it but every person familiar with southwestern agriculture knows that most of the cultivated land in Oklahoma and Texas cannot be used to grow soybeans, peanuts, or other favored cash crops without laying it bare to wind and water erosion and robbing it of fertility. Plowing up grass land would be worse.

To make such a change would be a shift from livestock farming to cash crop farming, the system that has been tried and proved undesirable. Without cattle, hogs, poultry, and sheep, we would have no need for our large acreages of grain sorghums, no need for the acres which can grow only grass, no way of utilizing our small grain pasture.

Moreover, where would we get the labor and machines it would take to convert to the kind of cash crop farming proposed?

We do not condemn the growing of increased acreage of wheat, peanuts, soybeans, or any other needed crop on land suited to them but we are opposed to any steps which would force southwestern farms to quit producing beef, milk, pork, mutton, wool, poultry, and eggs. Those are commodities that our farms are equipped to produce and we must keep on producing them along with the variety of vegetable crops that also are needed.

FERDIE DEERING.

Address of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Army Service Forces, before the Women's National Advisory Council to the Women's Interests Section, War Department Bureau of Public Relations, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Friday, June 25, 1943:

It is a most welcome opportunity and a privilege for me to talk with you ladies today. This gathering of the leaders of the great national women's organizations makes it possible for me to fulfill a twofold mission. Through you I want first to make a report to the women of America, and secondly, as you probably have suspected, to ask for your help.

The duties that I am charged with as the commander of the Army Service Forces in a sense have placed upon me and my command an obligation to fill the needs that in times of peace are rightfully yours.

Your men who have joined the Army must still be fed, clothed, housed, taken care of when they are sick, and their spirits lifted while they are well.

I am not fool enough to tell the women of America that we are doing as well as they have at this task, but we've done the best we can. That best, I can report to you in all sincerity, is the best that has ever been known in military history.

The best food, the best clothes, and the best medical care of any army in the world is being given to our great new citizen Army. They are armed with the best guns, planes, tanks, and equipment that any nation has ever produced, and we are grimly determined

that this shall continue to be so. Without your help we shall fail.

Don't mistake me, and think that I say this in any spirit of flowery courtesy and flattery. It is the unvarnished truth.

You women hold the power to make or break our national morale. You represent one of the most essential factors on the home front and of our soldiers on the fighting front. The nature of this war is such that it has wiped out the separate problems of manpower and woman power. They have become inseparably fused into the single will of our Nation to fight our way toward a victory that will free this earth forever of the terror of the Nazi and the Jap.

It is useless for us to train and equip fighting men and transport them to the battle lines over the globe if within our own borders that they fight to hold secure we are not united with a resolve to match their sacrifice.

The first bomb that was dropped on December 7, 1941, didn't declare war on only the eligible males between the ages of 18 and 38. That bomb imperiled the lives, the hopes, the futures of every man, woman, and child in America.

Hundreds of thousands of American women have faced that fact. Obviously, by your presence here today you have faced it and are doing something about it. In industry, in the homes where the men have gone, in the great volunteer organizations, and in the armed services themselves those women are serving in countless ways to carry us through.

Under the pressure of war you have discovered new strengths, new outlets for your skills and talents. Fields of activity have opened to women that always before had been regarded as solely man's province. The production lines over the Nation give daily proof of the new and vital part they are taking.

Aircraft production, manufacture of small arms and artillery ammunition, communications, electrical machinery, even tank, truck, and shipbuilding activities. All have opened to women, along with farming, lumber milling, oil refining, and many others. You could safely say there are practically no fields of endeavor in which women have not proved their ability to carry out a man's job and do it well. The Army Service Forces is the largest employer of women in the United States today. Among a total of a million civilian employees on our books May 1, 1943, 379,300, or almost 38 percent, were women. Among our personnel here in the Washington area 67 percent are women. In the field, outside of Washington, in essential manual labor formerly done by men, women constitute 33.6 percent of our employment strength.

Let us consider for the moment a woman's organization that is making a record of sacrifice and service. I prophecy that it will win the deserved recognition as one of your greatest contributions to your country. I speak of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, known to us all as the WAAC's.

From their modest beginning shortly over a year ago they have grown to a corps 65,000 strong. The Army is asking you individually and collectively today to do everything in your power to help them grow to their allotted strength of 150,000 and then to multiply that over and over again.

Why do we ask that you give this splendid organization your support? I'll tell you why. And it is an answer in which you can all take pride.

When the WAAC's came into being they asked to serve as motorcar drivers, secretaries, telephone operators, cooks, and bakers. That's all. Simple jobs they knew they could do as well as men. Through their efficiency, their proved capabilities, they have been pushed by their own sheer competence into more than 140 different Army occupations. There is no evidence that they have any intention of being stopped. Do you realize what that means to the Army that frankly wondered a year ago how it would all work out? It means that 65,000 combat troops have been released by these WAAC's. More than four full divisions can carry our fight to the Axis. The vital work that had to be performed by these men before is now in the firm hands of capable women.

The WAAC's today are engaged in a drive for more recruits. You can help them immeasurably. Meet them, talk with them, learn to know them and what they are doing. No web of lies spread by the crafty, malicious tools of our enemies will ever again be given a moment's credence.

The other recruiting drive that you can help with is that for the Army Nurse Corps.

The Army Medical Department needs nurses and it is unnecessary for me to tell you that wounded men are going to need the ministering that only a woman nurse can give. Please get behind the Red Cross organization that is charged with the recruitment of nurses for the Army. As individual citizens in your communities, spread the awareness of this need. Convince your friends and neighbors and your organizations that private duty nurses of this country are going to be needed by the men who will fall in battle. If we cannot make small sacrifices in this problem and by our attitude release these women, the magnificent structure of the Army Medical Department will be endangered. Your men are receiving care that is the wonder of the world of medicine. Thanks to the development of the sulfa drugs and the miraculously efficient system of evaluation of casualties from the moment they fall in battle, back through the whole network of medical care, the dangers from infections and complications have been brought to unprecedented lows. The loss of life from shock is being counteracted everyday and many of you have become blood brothers of these stricken men in the great work of the collection of blood plasma. Carry on with renewed intensity and lend a helping hand in forging the Army Nurse Corps link in this medical chain. It means so much to you and your men in the armed forces.

We hear much on every hand of morale. In these past months that word has been used in so many ways to cover so many things that it has almost lost significance. Morale for a soldier is a simple thing. It is his attitude toward the job that he has to do. It can be only good or bad.

We know that your husband's, your son's, or brother's morale cannot be good if he is worried about those he left back home.

The Office of Dependency Benefits is a little known activity of tremendous importance in offsetting this worry. Here is a huge bureau, entirely hidden in one of our departments, which clears all allotments and allowances to the families of soldiers. Every month millions of checks are cleared. Every effort is made to see that not a single allotment check among the millions handled is delayed for so much as an hour. The soldier's mind is freed from worry about this detail. More than two million soldiers are helping to provide for their families through the family allowance plan. Financial worry would impair the work of the soldier at the front and weaken the morale of the family at home. The Army has circumvented both of these dangers successfully through the efficient work of the Office of Dependency Benefits.

Army insurance is another morale factor of the utmost importance. More than 90 percent of the men in the Army have taken advantage of the protection offered by Government insurance. The generous provisions of the policy have given the soldier added confidence that the Army really is looking out for his welfare. The total value of the insurance being carried exceeds $52,800,000,000.

In great measure these provisions have helped but there are many more or less tangible factors that influence the morale of a soldier.

The news that filters through to him from home counts for so much, and it is there that you can in many womanly ways shape and mold the nature of that news.

Your influence on the grumblers, the chiselers, and the cheaters who selfishly undermine the efforts to gear this Nation to a total war, should be used every hour of every day.

Through your organizations you are in a position to render valuable service to the Army and to our whole war effort by spiking false rumors. Many of these lies that work like termites destroying confidence are deliberately planted by our enemies. However, there are men and women who consider themselves patriotic and loyal citizens who daily contribute to the Axis cause by repeating and elaborating on dangerous drivel. Mrs. Blank, who tells you confidentially that the Army is taking all your food and just letting it rot away in warehouses is not only sowing seeds of dissension, but she happens to be lying as well. The extra food required to sustain our Army is a small factor in our Nation's food supply. The Army will require about 2,750,000,000 pounds of fresh and canned meats of all kinds during 1943. This will amount to approximately 12 percent of the total 22,500,000,000 pounds of meat available to the whole Nation for this period. This will provide slightly more than eight-tenths of a pound of meat per day for each soldier in the Army, and includes proper allowance, for loss from cargo ship sinkings and other war action, shrinkage, and reserves along the line of supply. Those reserves are vital to insure uninterrupted flow of food to our soldiers in the theaters of operations as well as at home. Mr. Nitwit, a very solid, but misguided citizen, will tell you how he saw some of our supply points as he was going by on the train. To his misunderstanding eye there were acres of war equipment backed up, piled up, just being wasted. He didn't notice that they had vanished when he passed again, if he ever did, before he started talking. He has no conception of the incredible vastness of operations of supply and transport that go on day and night to move men and arms to our battlefronts. He looks and draws his own conclusions and then proceeds to spread them. If later he sees that he was in error, how many of you have heard him admit that he was wrong?

Rationing, curtailment, sacrifice are all necessary if we are going to win this war. The sooner we stop measuring our sacrifice against that of the cheat who is getting away with something and individually measure ours against the boy down the street who is now standing grimly waiting for the order to move against the artillery fire of Europe and Asia the sooner we will bring an end to this struggle. Make it your mission to seek out the truth and nail these lies before they go on their destructive rounds.

There is a dangerous tendency throughout the Nation to look on this war as practically won. On every side evidence of this belief is apparent. A slacking off of effort and dissension rising from the scuffle to grab a soft seat in the bus back to peaceful prosperity is one of the greatest dangers we have ever faced.

This war is a long way from over, a way filled with sacrifice. Say so, think so, act so in every thought and deed if you would keep faith with the men who have to fight it through to the finish.

Japanese Resettlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following representations and recommendations of California State Senate fact-finding committee on Japanese resettlement:

Whereas the California State Senate on May 2, 1943, adopted Senate Resolution No. 122 relative to appointment of a Senate fact-finding committee on Japanese resettlement under which the members of the State senate whose names are attached to this resolution were regularly appointed as members of such committee; and

Whereas under the terms of said resolution this committee is empowered to make representations and recommendations to the Federal Government as it may be advisable on any subject relating to the subjects of its investigation during such times as the legislature may not be in session; and

Whereas the committee has held meetings whereat many witnesses have testified before the committee and evidence has been introduced relative to the subject under investigation from which this committee has formed definite conclusions which impel the committee to forward to the Federal Government the result of such investigation and its conclusions therefrom, insofar as such investigation pertains particularly to the inadvisability of allowing the return to the Pacific coast area of any Japanese during the period of the war with Japan; and

Where we find from such evidence the following facts to be true:

1. The return of any Japanese, alien and native-born, to the Pacific coast area would be dangerous to our military safety because (a) there is no test by which the loyalty to our Government can be determined in the case of any individual Japanese; (b) to permit Japanese to return enables the infiltration of alien enemy Japanese, who would be indistinguishable from such returned Japanese; (c) practically all alien-born Japanese and a large percentage of American-born Japanese residing in California prior to their evacuation gave their primary loyalty to the Japanese Government and to the purposes and practices of that Government, and that the menace determined by the military authorities, enunciated by Gen. John L. DeWitt, to our security because of the presence of these people in our midst that led to their concentration and evacuation would be recreated by their readmission into this Pacific coast area;

2. That within the last few months there has grown among our people such a strong antagonism to all Japanese because of the treachery, barbarities, and inhumanities practiced by Japanese soldiers that to permit the return of any Japanese to this area will undoubtedly result in riots and breaches of the peace;

3. That the drains upon the manpower of our police forces have been so heavy and the extra burden caused by the war upon our undermanned police forces that they will be greatly handicapped in the added work of maintaining law and order and guarding against sabotage and espionage that would result from the reintroduction of any Japanese in the Pacific coast area during the period of this war: Therefore be it

Resolved, (1) That this committee is unalterably opposed to the reintroduction of any Japanese into the Pacific coast area; (2) that this committee strongly recommends to the Federal Government that all Japanese now in relocation centers be retained therein until the termination of the war; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the California delegation in both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to D. S. Meyer, Director of War Relocation Authority, Washington, D. C.

HUGH P. DONNELLY, *Chairman.*
HERBERT W. SLATER.
GEORGE J. HATFIELD.
IRWIN T. QUINN.
JESS R. DORSEY.

Statement of Harry Farr Before Annual Meeting of National Meat Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Harry W. Farr, chairman of the National Livestock and Meat Board, made at the annual meeting in Chicago, Ill., June 17, 1943:

[From the Record Stockman, Denver, Colo., of June 24, 1943]

STATEMENT OF HARRY FARR BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING OF NATIONAL MEAT BOARD

Following is the statement of Harry W. Farr, chairman of the National Live Stock and Meat Board, made at the board's annual meeting in Chicago, Ill., June 17 and 18.

"With America participating in a global war, the outstanding role of the Nation's livestock and meat industry in helping to win this war cannot be overestimated.

"Meat is a weapon of war. Army men tell us that it is a number 1 food in the meals of America's fighting men. All branches of the livestock and meat industry, livestock growers and feeders, livestock marketing agencies, the meat packers and the Nation's retail meat dealers have stepped up their efforts to fill the wartime demand for more and more meat.

"Meat is needed to supply three major groups, our armed forces, our civilian population, and our fighting allies overseas. In order to fill the needs of these groups, we are producing meat in record-breaking quantities. From a production of about 19,000,000,000 pounds in 1940, our meat output rose to 19,500,000,000 pounds in 1941 and last year our estimated production of 22,000,000,000 pounds. This is 6,500,000,000 pounds more than was produced in the average year of World War No. 1. We produced meat last year at the average rate of 60,000,000 pounds per day, 21 tons per minute.

"The shipments of meat to our allies overseas under the Lend-Lease plan were greater than the shipment of any other food. About three-fourths of our meat went to England and about one-fifth to Russia. In recent months, however, shipments to Russia have been increasing. Figures for the first 3 months of this year show that the shipments of meat to our allies are somewhat greater than in the first 3 months of 1942. They indicate, for example, that we shipped 5 times as much beef, 48 times as much lamb and mutton and 13 percent more pork than was shipped in the same period of a year ago. Lard, a major product of our industry, is playing an important part in the war effort. Shipments of lard overseas have been heavy.

CATTLE SLAUGHTER DECLINES

"I have just been checking United States Department of Agriculture reports on livestock slaughter at federally inspected plants for the first 5 months of this year as compared to the same 5 months of 1942. I find that cattle slaughter is 9 percent and calf slaughter, 23 percent below a year ago. Sheep and lamb slaughter is 1 percent above a year ago and hog slaughter shows a gain of 9 percent. The slaughter of meat animals has thus far this year fallen far short of anticipated slaughter.

"I am frank to say that I don't know whether or not the meat production goal of 25,700,000,000 pounds for 1943 will be reached. There are certain handicaps as far as production on farms is concerned, including shortages of certain feeds, labor, machinery and other essentials to maximum production. The weather is of course one of the unknown factors and a very important one. Floods this spring in some of our major meat-producing sections have delayed the planting of corn and other crops necessary for feeding livestock.

"The National Live Stock and Meat Board, which represents the entire industry, has geared its activities to serve in this war emergency. I would like to refer to some of these activities. First, the meat program in the Army."

TEACH ARMY PERSONNEL

"The work we are doing for our armed forces is one of our outstanding contributions to the war effort. This program has been under way for more than 2 years. It includes instruction in all phases of the subject of meat as it relates to Army use—cutting, cooking, carving, conservation and food value. The work also involves the training of the Army's meat specialist personnel.

"In connection with this program, the board has written and produced eleven meat publications for use in the Army in the training of its mess personnel.

"The board has cooperated with Quartermaster Corps during the year in supervising the production of six meat-training films which will be used at Army posts throughout the country. These films are now ready for distribution and they cover all phases of the handling and utilization of meat in the Army.

"We have also been working with the Navy in helping to solve its meat problems. Navy meat problems are somewhat different than those of the Army. We have conducted as many meat lectures as time would permit.

"Our part in the national fat-conservation the national nutrition program is one of our major activities. The Government asked for our help in this program. So far as I know, no other food industry was in a position to assume similar leadership in this worthy effort."

PREACH PUBLIC HEALTH

"Through our nutrition program we have assisted educators, professional groups, and others in the public health and nutrition field who are carrying on national activities. We have reached the Nation with a program in which the importance of meat and other food products in the well-balanced diet has been emphasized. We have published meat and nutrition literature and given it national distribution.

"Our part in the national fat conservation program is worthy of special mention. Fats are recognized as of vital importance in America's war effort. When the Government announced the need for fat conservation, the board enlisted the services of its various departments in the national program. This fat-conservation program has been carried on among civilians as well as in the Army.

"The launching of the national share-the-meat program afforded the board a most excellent opportunity to serve the industry, the Government, and the consuming public. We have used every possible facility in an educational campaign to explain this program. We have emphasized to consumers the need for their cooperation."

HOLD FOOD DEMONSTRATIONS

"In connection with the share-the-meat program, a representative of the board served on a committee which was appointed to draw up plans for conducting food demonstrations throughout the Nation. The purpose of these demonstrations was to teach the conservation, preparation, and utilization of food. Since the share-the-meat program had just been launched, the committee decided that the meat demonstration which it developed should be used as the pattern for all food demonstrations.

"It is fortunate that results of meat research which the board has conducted in past years have been available in this time of emergency. I am thinking, for example, of our research in the field of vitamins. When the National Research Council was searching for facts on the vitamin B content of various foods, we had these facts about meat as a source of the B vitamins. We were able to present the results of studies showing that meat is one of the richest sources of this important vitamin.

"We were also able to give them this information regarding cooked meats. And we can take some credit for the fact that the board was one of the pioneers in the food field in discovering the B vitamin content of its product on a cooked basis.

"We have been able to make valuable use of the figures on the vitamin B content of meat in our new nutrition yardstick. This yardstick, as you know, has won national popularity in the nutrition field. It gives a more complete story on the nutritive value of meat than for any other food."

INFORMATION ON MEAT

"In reading the reports which we received from time to time I have been impressed with the fact that so many governmental agencies have come to us for help in this wartime emergency. In my opinion this speaks well for the standing of the board as a source of information about meat.

"These are some of the major activities we have carried on in the interests of giving meat its rightful place in the war effort.

"I do not know what the coming year holds in store. We must put forth every effort to help win the war. Our board has a big responsibility in that it represents an industry which is producing food vital to the war effort—on the battle front and on the home front. We must be ready to solve new problems as they may arise and to meet new emergencies. We must serve the industry in every possible way, now as well as in the days that lie ahead. I am sure that as an organization we will measure up to our responsibilities."

The Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by a prominent and patriotic citizen of Marion, Ind., under date of June 22, 1943, relative to our home front. This letter is just one of many illustrating the disappointment of patriotic American citizens in the lack of a firm domestic program, which is interfering with the war effort. These people desperately want to win the war as quickly as possible and with the least loss of blood and treasure and are alarmed and disturbed at the inefficiency and bungling of the national administration. The letter follows:

MARION, IND., *June 22, 1943.*

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FOREST: I am writing this letter to you not as a friend, not as a Republican or Democrat, but as a citizen of this great Republic who is represented in the Halls of Congress by you. I listened with horror to the reports coming from Detroit this morning of bloody revolution within our own country. I listened with equal horror and disgust to the reports coming from the labor front, and tried to make myself believe I am still living in America. But I must realize, as many millions of other citizens of this country must, that we are now beginning to reap the crops that have grown from the seed so widely and so wildly broadcast during the past few years.

As a citizen who respects his country and his flag, who believes in law and order and the functioning of legal and constitutional authority, I am embarrassed by and ashamed of an administration that bows to an ultimatum and accepts a deadline set by an individual or group without governmental authority. I try to find reason or excuse for the head of the greatest nation in the world humbly bowing to the demands and orders of an individual, and am forced to concede that this humiliation is the product of a sale made a few years ago involving a half million dollars and a political term in office. To the recipient of the office this price may be satisfactory, but to a patriotic American it is beyond all calculation.

We are on the verge of a victory years in advance of original expectations. United power and effort and enormous production, plus the dedication of millions of lives of young men, forecast this earlier victory. Our lives, our homes, our future, our national honor, everything we have or hope to have, depend upon these men who represent us on the field of battle. And yet we have a man, and a group of men, willing to sacrifice all that, willing to lose country and honor, willing to sacrifice thousands of precious lives needlessly, willing to do all that for a dollar a day additional pay. And we see an administration accepting ultimatums, granting truces, appeasing, conciliating, hoping to retain a few votes no matter what the cost. What a spectacle.

When we see all that has come from the un-Godly New Deal, total economic collapse of everything to which the name has been applied, we have a right to ask, Shall we sacrifice the Nation as a whole merely to preserve such a thing? Shall we ape and imitate everything that has ruined the Old World and expect to do other than ruin the new?

And now, in Detroit, we see horrible dividends coming from the new social order and we see bloody revolution in our midst. What a gory price we have paid for votes to give and maintain power. What must our sons overseas think of us at home?

Sincerely,

RALPH ROESSLER.

The Meat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include in my extension the following recommendations of representatives of 60 livestock-producing counties in Nebraska and Iowa regarding our meat situation for the information of the membership of the House:

The critical emergency confronting the livestock producing and feeding industry has grown rapidly more acute day by day, threatening not only the continued existence of the industry, but also the Nation's supply of its No. 1 wartime food—meat.

Due to continued failure of the Office of Price Administration, and other Government bureaus, administrations, and officials to work out a price structure which will cover cost of production of beef, the Nation faces an increasing beef shortage, despite the fact that total cattle numbers are the greatest on record.

Instead of protecting the consuming public, the Nation, and our allies by insuring an adequate supply of meat, the policies adopted to date have resulted in scarcity that threatens an actual Nation-wide meat famine in the very near future. Moreover, they are rapidly forcing the producing interests, on which future supplies depend, to the point of quitting business entirely.

This threatened meat famine is not due to any lack of willingness on the part of producers to continue their functions, but is the result of handicaps that have been placed upon them by regulations issued without knowledge, or at least without consideration, of producers' needs.

In order to rectify this situation and to restore the confidence on the part of producers that is necessary to prevent a collapse of the livestock industry and encourage future production, we, the representatives of 60 livestock producing counties in Iowa and Nebraska, offer the following recommendations:

1. A simple, positive, informed and forthright policy on the part of the Government on the production of beef is at least 12 to 15 months over-due. The present chaotic conditions in the livestock and meat industry results largely from the negative, confused, and indecisive policies followed since Pearl Harbor.

2. The uncertainty in the cattle market, aggravated by the illegal subsidy roll-back program, continues. The light receipts of the past 2 weeks have protected the feeder to some extent. In order to promote stability in the cattle industry and to insure a regular, adequate supply of beef, it is imperative that cattle be carefully marketed as long as this uncertainity continues.

3. The first step toward improved conditions in the livestock industry is the restoration of confidence among producers in the ability of men directing Government agencies affecting the production and distribution of meat and animal products, and in their integrity and loyalty to fundamental American principles and institutions; confidence that they will use their necessarily great powers fairly and honestly and to promote the production and distribution of food in harmony with our war needs, and not to

secure a stranglehold on the livestock industry. The recent unfortunate proposal to use subsidies has created more confusion and still further lessened confidence in the purposes back of Government control as they affect the livestock industry. We are, unalterably, opposed to the subsidy roll-back program as proposed for the meat industry, but if we must have the roll-back we are still opposed to the subsidy.

4. We recommend that a single agency be charged with the responsibility of directing the national production, distribution, and price policies as they affect food. That the War Meat Board be given full authority to carry out its program. That every possible action be taken by the Government to keep legitimate packing plants operating and to stamp out the illegal slaughtering of livestock and marketing of meat.

5. Government policies should be directed toward the production of meat and animal products in keeping with the most efficient use of our feed resources for the prosecution of the war. A frank statement of the kind and relative amounts of meat and other animal products needed and within our probable productive capacity should be made and the reasons back of the decisions given. It is recognized that some errors may be expected, conditions may change, and modification of the program from time to time may be necessary.

6. It appears probable that our supply of feed grains in relation to our use of them has been overestimated and that it is a physical impossibility to maintain livestock production at present levels, if this is correct the country should be apprised of the fact fully, frankly, and promptly and not forced to readjust livestock production under the pressure of artificially manipulated prices. If readjustments in food production programs are necessary it should be remembered that present programs are the result of policies initiated and supported by Government agencies and because of this fact the Government is obligated to protect the interests of producers in connection with livestock now in the process of production.

7. Consequently, changes in policies should be planned and announced far enough in advance that producers who have cooperated with the national war food production program will not be penalized nor those who have refused to cooperate benefited.

For example, the Government has an obligation to support the prices of hogs, including heavy hogs, until the fall of 1944. If feed conditions require the marketing of hogs at lighter than contemplated weights, say at lighter than contemplated weights, say 220 pounds, then common honesty requires that swine producers be given the facts present holders of heavy hogs be given time to market them; and swine producers told that after a certain date the price of hogs above a certain weight will no longer be supported by Government agencies.

If beef-cattle prices prior to the decline caused by the subsidy-roll-back program were higher than justified by Office of Price Administration ceilings, the higher prices were possible because of failure of Government regulations to function as planned or anticipated. Cattle feeders who have cattle fed on the basis of actual existing conditions should not be penalized by arbitrary, abrupt reduction in prices. Any reduction by decree in prices paid for cattle should be announced some months in advance of their effective date.

8. If available feed supplies require further modifications in cattle-feeding methods, as may very well be the case, then that fact should be made public. Holders of the current crop of cattle should be protected until the cattle are marketed or time given to modify feeding methods on cattle not too far along. The weight of carcass and degree of finish desired should be stated, and the price level at which carcass beef of the desired weight and finish will be supported, together with ceiling prices, should be made known some months in advance of effective date of such prices.

9. If beef must be produced on relatively larger amounts of roughage and relatively smaller amounts of concentrates, this should be announced as a production policy and the State experiment stations, extension services, and cattle feeders called upon to suggest possible production plans adapted to their respective States.

10. If, as seems probable, it is desirable to reduce somewhat the degree of finish of slaughter cattle, we recommend that the Office of Price Administration AA grade of beef be eliminated and the price of A grade increased to the present price of AA grade with corresponding increases for other grades and the price reflected back in the price of slaughter cattle.

11. Government officials and the consuming public should come to understand that it is only through beef cattle that a large part of our agricultural production can be made available for human needs and that governmental policies should encourage the maximum utilization of such production. This is essential if we are to be reasonably well fed.

12. The beef producer should recognize that the primary function of beef cattle is the conversion of roughages and grass to human use and that he can produce a tremendous amount of beef and other products by the proper use of grass and roughages plus a limited amount of concentrates, if the war effort requires it and if Government policies permit it.

Further, that the supply of beef can be increased and the producer kept in better position by closely culling nonproductive and long-age cows, and by the replacement of older animals of poor quality by younger animals of good quality, the use of good sires, extreme care in guarding against disease, and the efficient use of feeds.

13. The Government should take the initiative in selling all classes of the American public on the idea that we are now at war; that when we divert a large part of our total production to war, normal living standards can no longer be maintained; that there are many reasons why what we buy, including food, is costing and will cost more; and that the prices of agricultural products were relatively low at the beginning of the war and should be expected to increase more than the prices of other products which were relatively higher in price at the beginning of the war.

14. Our supply of beef during the emergency depends upon the total number of cattle, available feed supplies, and Government policies. The total number of cattle is the largest on record. It is important that Government policies encourage the use of feed supplies available for cattle production to their maximum efficiency and encourage the marketing of cattle. This will insure a maximum supply of meat during the emergency and a reduction in the total number of cattle in the United States by the end of the emergency.

HERMAN DINKLAGE,
Wisner, Nebr.
PAUL KRUGER,
Fort Calhoun, Nebr.
ALEX LEGGE,
Fremont, Nebr.
PARR YOUNG,
Murray, Nebr.
WAYLAND HOPLEY,
Atlantic, Iowa.
JAY COLBURN,
Harlan, Iowa.
HARRY GARDNER,
Oakland, Iowa.

Policies of the Government as to Resident Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions which demonstrate fully the position of the California delegation in Congress, the California State Legislature, and the people of that particular section of California where the per capita population of Japanese had its highest ratio.

The people who know the treacherous characteristics of the Japanese best are almost unanimous in their opposition to the return of the Japanese to the Pacific coast area. These resolutions reaffirm the stand taken by General DeWitt with reference to the Japanese.

POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT AS TO RESIDENT JAPANESE

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 14, 1943

Whereas the California delegation in the House of Representatives in January 1942 initiated its effort to secure the evacuation from critical areas of all enemy aliens and their families whether or not aliens; the internment of such evacuated aliens; that no evacuated aliens be permitted to return to critical areas without a special license; that such critical areas be enlarged to include the three Pacific Coast States and Alaska:

Whereas Gen. John L. DeWitt, commanding the Western Division, subsequently put into effect a protective plan of evacuation and internment consonant with the plan urged by this delegation:

Whereas an effort is being made to remove and relax some of the provisions made under General DeWitt's administration for the protection of the public against subversive enemy efforts:

Therefore, the California delegation in the House of Representatives recommends: That in order to guarantee the security and continued safety of all persons of Japanese ancestry residing in the United States, and protect against any sabotage, espionage, or disruption of our efforts to destroy the war machine of the government of Japan, which so ruthlessly attacked the United States,

1. That should the War Department continue to recruit Japanese for military service—

(a) Such Japanese troops should not be utilized anywhere in the Pacific theater;

(b) Such Japanese troops should not be admitted into any areas where the Government of Japan might attempt the landing of any saboteurs or invasion forces; and

(c) That no Japanese women should be recruited for use in any of the women's organizations attached to or a part of the armed services.

2. That all known subversive Japanese be immediately segregated and removed from existing relocation camps and be confined in special detention camps for the duration of the war with Japan.

3. That such Japanese as can be utilized, be employed in agriculture and industry in areas outside the defined restricted zones, but that only such Japanese shall

be so employed who are reasonably believed to be loyal to the United States after having been investigated and so certified by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That all Japanese so employed shall be subject to the direct supervision and to such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

4. That all remaining Japanese, whose loyalty to the United States cannot be definitely certified by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall be retained in war relocation camps for the duration of the war with Japan.

5. That no persons of Japanese ancestry, whether in the military service, related to persons in the military service, or formerly resident within the existing restricted areas of the Pacific coast, shall be permitted to enter any such designated restricted area without the direct individual authorization in writing of the commanding officer of such area.

6. That every effort be made with the Government of Japan to exchange all interned Japanese, subversive and disloyal Japanese, and such other Japanese desiring such exchange, for American citizens now interned or held as prisoners of war by the Government of Japan.

Clarence F. Lea, J. Leroy Johnson, Thomas Rolph, Richard J. Welch, Albert E. Carter, John H. Tolan, John Z. Anderson, Bertrand W. Gearhart, Alfred J. Elliott, George E. Outland, Jerry Voorhis, Norris Poulson, Thomas F. Ford, John M. Costello, Will Rogers, Jr., Cecil R. King, Ward Johnson, Chet Holifield, Carl Hinshaw, Harry R. Sheppard, John Phillips, Ed. V. Izac.

Report on Taylor Grazing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago I reported to this House on the progress of the Taylor Grazing Act approved June 28, 1934. As my personal interest is in the livestock industry, I have an opportunity to keep in touch with events in the range country with respect to the program of the Grazing Service. I desire at this time to commemorate the birthday of the act which brought new vigor and purpose to the public domain.

The Taylor Grazing Act put an end to certain injurious range practices, stopped the threat of ruin to the range livestock industry, laid a firm foundation to what is one of the most hazardous yet one of the most essential of human pursuits. That was 9 years ago.

In my own State of Colorado, as well as in the other Western Range States, there is a fine spirit of cooperation in grazing districts. The livestock business is slowly but surely getting on a sound footing and much has been accomplished toward making the range more useful and productive, although the war has caused many new problems which make the livestock man's business more difficult than ever before. The Grazing Service is driving steadily toward the goal that Congress had in mind and in so doing is working with the people and getting a good understanding of their problems.

Stabilization of the livestock industry dependent on the public lands is viewed from the standpoint of successful cooperation with livestock operators in an attempt to remove as far as possible the uncertainties from their year-to-year operations. That seems like good business not only for those who produce meat but also for those who consume it. To determine the highest use of the private and public lands requires a study of local conditions, customary practices, and an analysis of the results of this joint effort between government and industry. It likewise requires a search for new and better methods that may be introduced or stressed to get the most out of the land in the face of shortages of manpower, tires, gasoline, and operating equipment brought about by the demands of war. It places into practice a concept of conservation with use and enlists the producers as partners in a natural effort to preserve the range for present and future generations. It recognizes that the use of the public domain is so tied to the life of the West, is such an integral part of the livestock industry that the stock-ranch and the range allotment must be considered together in the over-all plan of public-land management.

During the present world crisis our main strength lies in our ability of producing plenty of wholesome food for our own troops, our allies, and our civilian population. Today the range is producing more meat and wool per unit of livestock and area than ever before.

Although there has been some reduction in the numbers of livestock that used the range formerly, the over-all production of meat and wool has been increased in the last few years by millions of pounds. Sample statements from stockmen in each of the grazing districts indicate that death losses on the range have been reduced by about 3 percent. Calf crops have been increased 15.3 percent, lamb crops by 9.2 percent, wool clips one pound per animal, marketing weights are heavier; all of which means more meat on the butcher's block. A permittee in one of the Colorado grazing districts had this to say:

> The Grazing Service policy of subdividing the range into individual allotments which can be fenced and used by the operator at a designated time has been responsible for a decrease in the loss of stock from straying and has assured a supply of meat during the period when it is most needed. Increased production with less operation cost will permit more time to be devoted to taking better care of the stock and to devote more time to raising food crops, an acute situation due to the labor shortage that confront every farmer and stockman.

The Department of the Interior has announced a program inaugurated by the Grazing Service that aims to serve the Nation's food-for-war program by:

First. Authorizing a 10-percent increase of stock on the range under temporary war emergency licenses.

Second. Intensifying range improvements to promote increased calf and lamb crops and heavier weights of animals.

Third. Reducing death losses from predatory animals and poisonous plants.

Fourth. Diverting to meat production all excess game animals and unclaimed horses on the Federal range.

The production from 11,000,000 livestock on the Federal range in 1942 totaled about 800,000,000 pounds of meat and 80,000,000 pounds of wool. By good husbandry and other features now operating on the range, 80,000,000 more pounds of meat and 8,000,000 more pounds of wool can be added to the Nation's larder. We need every pound of meat, wool, and hides to meet military and civilian demands.

In placing the open public domain under administration, the Grazing Service was in much the same position as the individual who, upon acquisition of a tract of undeveloped land is confronted with the need for certain facilities such as water, fences, and trails to make his land more useful and productive. Nine years ago it is conservatively estimated that less than 50 percent of the public range was supplied even superficially with stock water. Many stockmen had to depend on winter snow, a hazardous venture to say the least. Approximately one-fifth of the 142,000,000 acres of public domain afforded little or no use by cattle and sheep because it was unwatered or inaccessible. This is one factor that led to overuse and abuse of areas adjacent to water. Two alternatives of policy faced the Grazing Service at that time, either to reduce livestock numbers to the actual carrying capacity of the usable range or to accept the condition as it existed at the time and push a program of range development to provide for gradual redistribution of livestock over all parts of the range. Since great and sudden reduction in numbers would have been disastrous to the livestock industry the second alternative was chosen. By pushing the improvement program along with the elimination of tramp-sheep outfits and by encouraging good husbandry practices, this policy proved sound and farsighted in the light of subsequent world events.

On the basis of present indications, the demand for increased production of livestock and livestock products will remain acute for some time. The Grazing Service has anticipated this problem and has considered ways and means of how this could be accomplished without overstocking the range and without detriment to the soil and forage resources. Already there have been encouraging results through improved care and management of stock and range; but there are other ways in which the Federal range can contribute more to the immediate high demands for livestock products. Due to water development and other improvements, along with better moisture conditions, certain areas of

range can stand increased stocking without detriment; in others there would be no increase, and in still others, it may be necessary to decrease the stocking. The entire matter is being worked out carefully with the local advisory boards, unit by unit, aiming at the broad general objective of producing more while the need is so great. By encouraging better range practices, individual carcass weights can be increased in some instances as much as 10 percent. The unclaimed useless horses on the Federal range can be removed and diverted to channels of trade, thus affording additional range for herds and flocks. The removal of these horses, which has already started in a big way, will make room for other animals whose products are so important in the everyday life of us all. The surplus big-game animals can be harvested without seriously depleting the game herds or endangering conservation gains already made.

The original intent of this act, giving the policy-making decision to local boards elected by men who know and use these ranges, was outlined and promulgated by my very good friend, Farrington R. Carpenter who resides in my congressional district. His policies have been continued and developed under the liberal policies of Harold L. Ickes and the able direction of Richard H. Rutledge.

Resolutions of the Montana State Association of County Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD two resolutions received from the Montana Association of County Commissioners, now in session at Billings, Mont., one of which favors the enactment into law of Senate bill 73, under which the Government of the United States would pay to the counties wherein Government-held lands are located some taxes upon these lands, and the other favoring the passage of H. R. 2426, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and supplementing the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, as amended.

The resolutions follow:

Resolution 4

Whereas in Montana there is between 38 and 50 percent of our landed area which is held by the Government in proprietary or trustee capacity for Indian reservations, forest reserves, wildlife refuge, grazing lands, and other governmental purposes and objects, none of which lands contribute very much in the form of taxation to the school districts, counties, and State government, which furnish services to such lands and their occupants; and

Whereas such areas are increasing, and the taxation burdens upon sparsely settled communities of our State are becoming more serious; and

Whereas these areas should bear some part of the tax burden comparable to that imposed on lands of our own taxpayers; and

Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States a bill known as Senate bill 73, under which the Government of the United States would pay to the counties wherein Government-held lands are located some taxes upon these lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Montana State Association of County Commissioners, in convention assembled, do hereby heartily and unqualifiedly endorse the provisions of Senate bill 73, now before the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States, and respectfully request of the Congress the enactment of this legislation and its approval by the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That this association do hereby oppose any further transfer of privately or corporate-owned lands to the Federal Government except under the terms and provisions of Senate bill 73 above, unless such transfer is absolutely essential for the successful prosecution of the war effort; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator MCNARY, the author of the bill, with the request that he present it to the Senate of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That each member of the Montana congressional delegation be sent a copy of the resolution, and be earnestly requested to use their best efforts to assist in passage of the same.

BEN ZIMMERMAN,
President.

Attest:

B. H. MCCARTY,
Secretary.

Resolution 7

Whereas there is now pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States, H. R. 2426, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and supplementing the Federal-aid Road Act of 1916, as amended; and

Whereas the purpose and design of this measure is not only to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy but is likewise a forward step in the direction of providing an adequate highway system for all the people; and

Whereas section 4 of this measure provides that 50 percent of the sums apportioned shall be available to urban areas and feeder roads in the proportion which the population within cities of 10,000 or more shall bear to the total population of the State, according to the latest available Federal census; and

Whereas the definition of urban areas in the measure is limited to cities and the area immediately surrounding the same with a population of 10,000 or more, which results in a fair and equitable distribution of Federal-aid highway funds made available under the measure; and

Whereas the measure makes available the sum of $1,000,000,000 for each of the 3 years immediately following the war, which will mean that Montana's share will be $16,564,000, which, in turn, will aid our State and our counties in providing employment for our men in service when they return, and thus aid in the rehabilitation of our citizens; and

Whereas there is a real and urgent need for more and better feeder roads in Montana, which this measure will provide for our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Montana State Association of County Commissioners, in wartime conference assembled, That we endorse H. R. 2426 as introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States, and request that it be enacted in its present form without amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Representative ROBINSON of Utah, its author, the Public Roads Administration, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing Montana in the Congress of the United States.

BEN ZIMMERMAN,
President.

Attest:

B. H. MCCARTY,
Secretary.

Rationing in Lucas County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from Aloysius A. Konczal, chief clerk of rationing board 34-48.7, Indiana School, Detroit and Indiana Avenues, Toledo, Ohio, June 25, 1943:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Toledo, Ohio, June 25, 1943.

Hon. HOMER RAMEY,
Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

FRIEND HOMER: It was nice to talk to you the other day and in response to your request, here is a true picture of the situation of ration board 34-48.7.

The board has a population of approximately 68,000 people, and the paid help in the office numbers 13. There are 18 board members, and we have an army of approximately 110 volunteers, upon whom we call for help at various times. This is the force that handles the rationing and everything now on the rationing list.

We have approximately 15,000 B and C applications which are constantly being worked on. We have at present approximately 23,000 A books to renew 4,000 fuel-oil applications to renew, the truck gasoline renewal, and a constant stream of miscellaneous matters to handle. As for instance, yesterday we took care of approximately 150 soldiers who were home on furlough, dealing out gasoline stamps and food checks to them, in addition to the regular civilian business which we have daily. We have approximately 250 to 300 requests daily from civilians alone for some sort of rationing service. So this will give you a rough idea of the volume of work that daily goes through our board. We have been hampered by lack of equipment of every kind and up to a month ago, a considerable portion of our filing was done in orange crates because of the inability to procure files. The bulk of the furniture which we have at the board is borrowed from either board members or other volunteers who assist the board.

I have been recently very much astounded by the opposition noted in the newspapers to increase the funds for the Office of Price Administration, and due to the experience I have had at the board, it is to me amazing that Congress does not realize the magnitude of the job which the Office of Price Administration has to do. The clerks who work with me have for months worked overtime. I myself have averaged approximately 14 hours a day since I began on this job and many of the

under clerks have averaged 12 hours. Of course, there is no time and a half or overtime of any kind. It is merely the desire to accomplish the job that prompts most of them to keep on. However, they have reached the point, most of them, where the work is too tough I, therefore, wish you would use your good offices to present the real picture to the Congress, because there is a real need for at least a large increase of the present paid staff at this board. The volunteer help which we have is very helpful. However, it is undependable, and many times we have found that when we most need it we were unable to get any. This is especially true in warmer weather. The only remedy is to increase the number of employees.

A further reason for this is rationing is, of course, becoming tougher each day as the shortages increase and the public, of course, are now becoming ration conscious, and when they come in to the board it is necessary to give good reasons for any cuts in either gasoline or other items which are rationed. There is an entirely different atmosphere at the board now than there was even 2 months ago. It is becoming increasingly difficult as people are becoming more and more resentful of further rationing. I know of no single other thing which so profoundly effects civilian morale as rationing. It is something that should be given every possible assistance by the Federal Government because of this. There is under the circumstances under which we are working no possibility of administering in the efficient, prompt manner which it should be. We have neither the number of high-class employees nor the number of other types of employees and it may be well possible that unless steps are taken to correct this that civilian morale may further ebb to a dangerously low ebb. This would, of course, have a profound effect upon our war effort and should be religiously guarded against, and one of the best ways that we can assure of a sound home front merely is by expertly handling the rationing program.

In conclusion, may this serve as an invitation for you to personally contact me when you are next in Toledo, and I will give you a larger and more detailed picture.

Yours truly,

LUCAS COUNTY WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD 34-48.7,
ALOYSIUS A. KONCZAL,
Chief Clerk.

Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by one of my constituents:

OUR FLAG

Made of bunting with stripes and bars,
A field of blue with assembled stars.
Colors—red, and white, and blue,
Our national emblem to be loved by you.
Every stitch in it firmly sewn,
Binding together the flag we own.
Each star a State in its proper place
Pledging freedom to the human race.
Back up this banner with power and might,
Revere it always both day and night.
Prize your heritage—you must, you can,
It's an honor to be an American.
Floating high in its heavenly dome,
It represents you, your loved ones, home.
Betray your flag you will live in shame,
Always be true and play the game.

Raise Old Glory on halyards high,
Keep it floating 'neath God's blue sky.
Show your patriotism with might and main,
Help bring peace to our world again.
Bac' up our colors on land and sea,
Do your full share for victory!
Made of bunting, red, white, and blue.
Keep it flying says I—says you.

—*J. C. Glassford.*

H. R. 2837—To Provide for Central Responsibility for the Production and Distribution of the Nation's Food by Establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial carried in the State paper, Columbia, my district, South Carolina, concerning my bill H. R. 2837, which has for its purpose giving absolute and definite power to the Food Administrator in connection with production, distribution, rationing, and price fixing of food.

Section 2 of my bill provides as follows:

SEC. 2. The War Food Administrator is authorized and directed, notwithstanding any other provision of law (including title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941), exclusively and finally to exercise on behalf of the United States, either directly or through such other officers or agencies as he may designate, all powers, functions, and duties conferred or imposed upon any officer or agency of the United States by any law, order, regulation, or directive with respect to the Nation's food program in the United States and its Territories, including the production, processing, distribution, rationing, procurement, requisitioning, allocation of, priorities, storage, exportation and importation of, provisions of labor and facilities for, and the establishment, maintenance, and adjustment of prices for food and food facilities.

The editorial follows:

MAY BE A BEACON

Congressman FULMER'S measure calling for the creation of an all-powerful food czar may be a beacon light in a dark and threatening night.

The State congratulates the gentleman from South Carolina on what has all the earmarks of a constructive idea concerning a critical problem.

Everywhere there are evidences of food shortages in a Nation whose potentialities for production should be unlimited—and where they are. The indications are that mismanagement is largely the cause of the trouble. Food is still plentiful, but it is not where it is needed and in some cases is going to waste, due, to all appearances, to the jumbled policy of the Government which has dispersed the problem among nine agencies.

Straws in the wind are the statements of Fred H. Sexauer, president of the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, and Farmer-Author-Thinker Louis Bromfield. Sexauer said that so far as milk is concerned city people will learn that the Office of Price Administration is their enemy No. 1, because the present system of food price fixing "has all the elements of a national scandal and the making of a ghastly tragedy. * * * Subsidies are the tangled net in which a free people become * * * helpless pawns of a dominating centralized government," and inflation is an administration bogeyman aimed at "social reform, regimentation, and limitation of opportunity and incentive."

Mr. Bromfield, whose opinions are sufficiently well thought of to be quoted regularly in commentary periodicals, declared: "They haven't any real farm policy down there in Washington. One word can describe the one big mess they've made: Bedlam."

A war-food administrator, such as described in Mr. FULMER'S bill, with all powers, functions, and duties relating to production, processing, distribution, rationing, procurement, allocation, and so on, if permitted by the administration to carry out his duties and powers should go far toward straightening out the tangled situation. There certainly must be a man in this country with sufficient understanding and executive ability to make a vast improvement on what has been done up to now. And it is devoutly to be hoped that the act will become law and put to a trial at the earliest possible date. For present barometrical readings point to a very rough national voyage from now on out.

Mr. Speaker, I highly appreciate this editorial, and the many letters, telegrams, and newspaper articles that are coming into my office, backing me and my committee in our efforts to put an end to the disastrous situation confronting farmers, various lines of business, as well as our war efforts, because of the manner in which the food program is being administered.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on June 26, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, for the past month there have been whisperings in Congress about a recess. As the typical Washington summer, with all its oppressive heat and humidity descends upon the sweltering membership of the House, everybody

begins to get the yen to go home. But since 1939 Congress has stayed in the boiling Capital in continuous session because the folks they represent expected them to remain on the job. Every year at this time we whisper about a recess but nothing is ever done further than that. Some dutiful Member always raises an objection and the idea is dropped.

But this year many of my colleagues feel they owe it to their people to go home for a few weeks, look around their districts, talk with their friends and constituents in order to get a better slant on the way the country is feeling. They realize Congress has been in session steadily 4 long years. A lot of water flows over the dam in that length of time. Changes take place at home; changes in living and changes in thinking. Members of Congress want to keep abreast with this new living and new thinking. In order to accomplish this they must mingle with their fellow Americans back home. They must listen to their reactions, opinions, and advice upon vital questions. They will get a liberal education by listening to the people. After all we in Congress are simply the people's hired men. We owe it to our boss, namely, the people, to follow their instructions.

So perhaps we will take a recess after all. Certainly it will be a good thing for Congress, and if it makes for better representation by the reasons I mentioned, it will be well worth while.

Personally, I would welcome a recess. I want to accomplish a lot of things back home this summer. First, I want to investigate the agriculture situation. I would like to visit several hundred farms in my district for the purpose of getting information from my farmer friends. They have a great deal to tell me I am sure. The farmers of my district are working harder than they ever worked before. Their wives and children are doing a man's work in most cases. I am anxious to know just how much cooperation my farmers are receiving from Uncle Sam. My investigation will be first hand and will be accurate because I will go straight to the farms of my district. I loo' forward to an enlightening experience.

I also wish to spend a time this summer visiting the defense plants and war industries of the triple cities, of Norwich, and also of Chenango and Madison Counties.

When one observes the gigantic amount of war work being done in the Triple Cities and elsewhere in my district, is it small wonder that I swell with pride when I realize what a patriotic body of Americans I have the honor of representing? There is no limit to the productive power of the Southern Tier. When we consider the capacity of Endicott Johnson, International Business Machines, Agfa, Remington Rand and a hundred other similar plants in the Thirty-fourth District, it is not hard to visualize what would happen if our locality were not included in the present scheme of American war enterprise. I am not far afield in saying our Nation's production would be crippled without the Southern Tier's mighty contribution in manpower and materials.

Therefore, I intend to make an extended tour of these war plants. I want to see the men and women I represent in Congress at work in these great war factories. I want to have the pleasure of meeting the management of the plants which are turning out weapons of war with such amazing speed.

At this time, I would like to pay a special tribute to the workers and entrepreneurs of our local war industries for the magnificent job they are doing toward winning the war. We are second to none in the whole country here in the Triple Cities, here in the Thirty-fourth District. We are responding to Uncle Sam's call to arms and we are united in our efforts.

As you well know, I am deeply concerned over the serious food shortage which has threatened all America for the past several months. I have repeatedly asked the Government to take some positive action. Further words of mine seem unnecessary at this time but I received a letter recently from my good friend Mr. Frank Gannett, the new and able publisher of the Binghamton Press which describes the food situation better than I can. Mr Gannett says:

"The food crisis is too real, so serious, that those who have specific knowledge of it cannot be silent.

"Last September I saw the food crisis coming. In November on a broadcast I warned: 'Unless our farm policy is changed, we face disaster.' Disaster is now here.

"In the last 6 months I have devoted much of my time to obtaining facts on the subject. I sought opinions from farmers, processors and editors in every state. I made inquiries of 30,000 individuals and 12,000 editors. My conclusions are based on their replies and the statistics from every reliable agency I could consult.

"We face an inevitable food shortage at home, needless prolongation of the war through lowered national morale and slowed production of war materials by ill-fed workers.

"The people of America are looking to you and the Members of Congress to save this country from one of the gravest threats which it has ever faced. I mean, of course, the mishandling of our food problem and the adoption of a subsidy program as a substitute for fair food prices.

"The proposed subsidies will not increase our food supply nor make any more of our food available for consumers. On the contrary, this subsidy plan will discourage food production. The food producers of the Nation are vigorously and almost unanimously opposed to it.

"Subsidy is a political juggernaut that never rolls backward. The first billion dollars of subsidy, without a doubt, would grow to whatever peak vote-seeking bureaucrats figured necessary to perpetuate their rule. Any subsidy plan is sure to add billions to our taxes and national debt. Administration of a subsidy plan will be enormously costly. It will add countless thousands more to the Government's pay rolls.

"In my opinion, the public sees through this attempt to deceive them in regard to the cost of their food.

"It is too late now to increase food production for this year. The blame for the present shortage must be placed where it belongs—on the present regime, which not only failed to heed the repeated warning, but which now is choosing to play fourth term politics with proposals which will endanger food production in the coming year. Now, when unity is most needed, it is arraying class against class, arousing bitterness between food producers and consumers; particularly, it hopes by doling out unlimited funds, to win the support of labor. Working men, however, must realize that they will suffer most from this costly and destructive program, the subsidy plan. You can't solve an economic problem merely by spending billions of dollars.

"Before Pearl Harbor, representatives of agriculture appealed to the President to regard food as important as planes, ships, and guns and to encourage maximum food production. Not only was nothing done to give us more food but the policies adopted restricted and discouraged production and brought about the present alarming situation.

"Fred Sexauer, of New York, representing over 30,000 milk producers, warned that there will be a milk shortage in our large cities next winter. Policies now being followed have brought about the slaughter of vast numbers of milk cows that cannot be replaced in 3 years. The wrath of mothers who, as a result, may not be able to get milk for their children can be foreseen.

"The alleged pretext for subsidies is that they will prevent inflation. Nothing could be more absurd or ridiculous. As Mr. Sexauer said, 'The threat of inflation is being used as a bogeyman to induce the Nation to accept social reform, regimentation, limitation of opportunity, and incentive. Before the war ends, it will be used to hide social and economic mistakes and to conceal from the public the sad state of economic affairs into which the Nation has been thrown.

"Our food supply is of vital importance to everyone. It must not be manipulated by politicians for the purpose of winning votes. Food production and distribution must be divorced from New Deal politics in all its phases and be placed in the control of one competent man whose sole purpose will be to give us more food at fair prices. He must know food production and distributing problems, and merit the confidence of our farm population. He must be free from the restrictions and interference of New Deal theorists and have real authority to do the job.

"The people look to you men in the Congress to deal with this great problem vigorously and immediately. The programs of our impractical bureaucrats, who know nothing about food production and prices, are hourly making the situation worse. There must be a complete change in policy and a thorough house cleaning of those who have helped to bring about our present sad plight. Without a doubt, the country will rise up in overwhelming protest against any effort to cover up the administration failures in regard to the food situation by granting any subsidy.

"Emperors of ancient Rome subsidized their people with free bread. That must not happen here, and I hope that you will do your full part in stopping this threatening disaster and help check this further step toward a totalitarian government."

In reading Jim Ottaway's column, Heard About Town, in the Endicott Bulletin, I ran across an interesting poem written by Corp. James H. Lainhart, of Endwell. It sounds a little like Rudyard Kipling's Road to Mandalay. However, its title is "Somewhere in New Guinea." I will repeat it now:

"Somewhere in New Guinea where the sun is like a curse
And each dull day is followed by another slightly worse;
Where the brick red dust blows thicker than the shifting desert sands
And the white man dreams and wishes for the greener, fairer land.

* * * * *

"Somewhere in New Guinea where the mail is always late,
Where a Christmas card in April is considered up to date,
Where we never have a pay day, we never have a cent,
But we don't miss the money, 'cause we never get it spent.

"Somewhere in New Guinea, where the ants and lizards play,
And a hundred fresh mosquitoes replace every one you slay;
So take me back to Frisco, let me hear the mission bells,
For the God-forsaken outpost is a substitute for hell."

Once There Was a Carpenter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I am inserting a very timely article written by Dr. Montgomery, the Chaplain of the House:

"ONCE THERE WAS A CARPENTER"

(By the Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain, House of Representatives)

On my study table this morning is an old scrapbook. As I open the thumb-marked pages, memories begin to crowd my thoughts; on one page my eye is arrested. I read a brief note of a young carpenter, an applicant for the Christian ministry. He was without standing or learning, but was deeply sincere and thoroughly industrious. He was examined by the church council, and when he learned their decision he was pained to hear that he had been rejected on the ground of his lowly station and lack of influence. As he looked back on the members of the council he remarked: "There was once a Carpenter!" His simplicity and lowly spirit drove into their hearts; he was recalled and accepted.

It is not conformity that always works successfully in the art of human redemption; as to the outcome there is but little difference between a groove and a grave. The human spirit must be rescued from certain artificialities which are often cloaked in the garb of respectability. This young man had a credential from almighty God. His memory lingered long as a beautiful song in the lives of those he had enriched. It is no further to heaven from a peasant's porch than from a king's palace. The council lacked the common touch; greet the poor man without making him conscious of his poverty and the unschooled without reminding him of his ignorance.

"Once there was a Carpenter." He was born in a borrowed stable, refused lodging in a neighbor's inn, died on a felon's cross, and was buried in a borrowed tomb. These words echo in my thought like soft waves on a sandy shore, as comforting as though the mellow moonlight had found a voice. There is no work so lowly that a lofty soul cannot transfigure it from drudgery into a divine mission; when one lives in this spirit, labor loses its bitterness and becomes glorified by a high and lofty purpose.

I wonder if there is not in many lives today the tendency to identify usefulness and happiness with some prerogatives of wealth or station, unmindful that character is an achievement rather than an endowment. To underestimate the plain, simple gifts of life which the world so much needs and for which it is appealing, is a grievous blunder and a thoughtless illusion. We are a selfish, spoiled people; since the beginning of our fair land we have never been compelled to pray for our daily bread; the manna has fallen into our laps without sacrificial effort, and we failed to say, "Thank you, Lord." When young and old gather about the tables of plenty and security, which have been purchased by some midnight vigil, perhaps by tears and striving, I would have them feel the stupendous worth of sturdy character, honest toil, and the value of the man with an unwritten and uncalendared name. His is the fortitude of the endless ranks of privates in the battle lines, of the myriads of toilers of earth, sea, and air. Upon them rests the very foundation upon which our Republic must forever stand.

Today, I look straight into the soul of this young man and hear his words: "Once there was a Carpenter." He is a symbol, a living type of what we should be in our daily lives. O America, let us stop complaining, make lean the daily waste and emanicipate ourselves from false pride and self-indulgence. When we stoop to serve, every hardship, every pain will be registered, remembered, and honored. I recall the words of a distinguished gentleman when he said to me: "Chaplain, when I first came to Washington, I had two ambitions—to become great and get rich. Long since these have been replaced by two others: To conform my will to the will of Almighty God and to serve my country to the best of my ability." The good Lord forgive the absurdity of our complaints and let us reckon ourselves as debtors to a stained and crippled world. We have tarried at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and looked about where was bivouacked the army of the dead and the very earth seemed hallowed. Who was he? I do not know; but I do know that he was some mother's boy who had loved the things a boy loves—to play ball, to swim, and climb the hills. His country called and he answered; he was "lost in action"; his is not a name, but a memory. Like the lowly Carpenter, may he live in the heart of America.

We men of earth have here the stuff
Of Paradise—we have enough.
Here on the paths of every day,
Here on the common human way
Is all the stuff the gods would take
To build a heaven, to mold and make
A new Eden.

The Forestry Bureau Audits Its Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the somewhat unusual appropriations, that is unusual so far as the amount of money is concerned, which are now in the process of going through this Congress, I am sure the Members of Congress, on both sides of the House, will be interested in a letter I have just received from a constituent of mine. It is always encouraging to know that agencies of the Government are on their toes and that even though we deal in large figures today, small figures are not being overlooked.

My friend, Mr. Raymond T. Forbes, who now owns the largest motor court in my home city, Banning, was appointed as a forest clerk, in the Dixie National Forest, on May 26, 1917, at a salary of $1,100 per year. Eleven months later, on April 16, 1918, he was recommended for a promotion to $1,200 per year, effective as of that date. He was paid for the period from April 16 to April 30, 1918, at the $1,200 rate, plus increased compensation allowances. Unfortunately, actual approval of the promotion did not become effective until May 1, 1918, and Mr. Forbes was therefore technically overpaid $4.38.

Under date of April 30, 1943, he has received a letter, by registered mail, from the Regional Fiscal Agent of the Forest Service, asking him to forward his remittance in the amount of $4.38 to reimburse the United States for this overpayment of 25 years ago.

As I say, I am sure the Members of Congress will be pleased to learn that there are agencies of the Government which do not overlook the pennies as well as the billions, and I know we are all glad to learn that the Forest Service audits its books at least once every 25 years.

Get the Communists Off the Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, after 6 months of hard grind, the Seventy-eighth Congress is about to take a brief recess so that Members can return to their home districts and report to their constituents. I think that this will be a good thing for the country. The Congress should keep in close personal touch with the people. In no other way can it hope accurately to reflect their needs and desires in legislation.

I am glad that I will be able to tell my constituents I have been on the job each day from early until late and have often worked on Sundays. There are no time clocks or 8-hour days on Capitol Hill. I have not only been on the job in my office but have attended to my duties on the floor of this House. The record will show that I am recorded on the roll call votes. I have supported each and every measure to hasten our victory in this war. I have lost no opportunity to strike against boondoggling and extravagance in nonwar expenditures. I have attended all of the meetings of my Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and am proud of what we have done through that committee for the soldiers of this and the last World War. I have also been active in support of all legislative attempts to simplify, ease, or abolish red tape restrictions on American private enterprise and small business, as imposed by the bureaucrats in the executive department. Although I expect to return to my district for this recess, my office in Washington will remain open and my able staff will continue to serve any constituent who addresses a letter to me at Washington or who requests me in person, in the district, for service which can be obtained for him only in Washington.

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. Speaker, some of the victories won on the congressional front are just as important to the people of this Nation as victories won on the battle fronts abroad. After all, if we do not preserve at home the principles for which we fight abroad we will have lost the war and victories on the battlefield are empty ones. One of our greatest responsibilities as Members of Congress is to see that our men in the service return after this war to the same free land they left. We have been losing one of these battles on the congressional front the last few months. This battle is the one to get the Communists off the Government pay roll. The House of Representatives has repeatedly refused to make appropriations to pay the salaries of some of these Communists. But, the United States Senate will not concur in our action. To paraphrase the words of Gen. U. S. Grant, "We should fight it out on this line if it takes all summer."

There are many good citizens who think we should not criticize the American Communists. With this I cannot agree. If it embarrasses the Russian Communists I cannot help it. Russia is a valuable ally in this war but she is not fighting for us. She is fighting because she was invaded by our common foe. I am for America first, just as Russia is for Russia first. I don't object because Russia will not allow anybody but Communists on her government pay roll. That's her business. But, I do disagree with the argument of those who say we should not take Communists off of our own pay roll because it might offend Russia. I believe that those men and women who love this Government of ours, and who believe in its legal and constitutional powers, should have the responsibility of running it and that those who foster and associate with any organization, whatever its name, which has for its purpose the overthrow of this Government and our free institutions, should have no official responsibility and draw no pay from the American taxpayers.

Of course, communism is legal in our country. If a Communist is elected to office he can espouse his theories in government and that is all right. But, Communists will not be elected in important numbers if the people know the truth about them. It is evident, therefore, that Congress has a responsibility of making public all information which can be obtained about them. Also, Congress should refuse to make any appropriation for salaries for these people who, filling jobs by appointment, seek to overthrow our form of government, just as would the Nazi enemy. The people have no opportunity to vote directly for or against these appointees.

How can these bureaucrats overthrow the Government? They would seek to do it just the same way Hitler did. They create distrust of parliamentary procedure and of all free institutions. They are smear artists. They spread lies, sometimes through newspapers they can bribe, about their opponents in Congress whom they have the nerve to accuse of disloyal sympathies. In important positions of public trust they gather information of value in sabotage and so weaken the structure of government from within that it is ultimately ripe for revolution or will collapse when hit by a strong military power from without.

CONGRESS INVESTIGATES

Congress has appropriated since 1938 over $800,000 for investigation of subversive activities. The House of Representatives established a special committee to make these investigations. Recommendations of this committee have caused us to refuse to make appropriations for the salaries of several Reds it has investigated and about whom we have been furnished with detailed information. Of course, the President should fire them. They work in the executive department, of which he is head. Congress should not have to take time to single out individuals from among the 3,000,000 civilians working for the Government and fire them by the indirect method of cutting them off at the pockets. But that is all we can do under the circumstances. Each Member of Congress took a solemn oath to defend the Constitution against enemies, foreign and domestic."

Mr. Speaker, recently this House authorized appointment of a second committee from this body to investigate the subversive characters previously investigated by another committee of this same House. While this is a duplication of effort, it certainly would appear that when these two separate committees independently arrive at the same judgment with respect to those being investigated, we should follow their advice. This goes for the Senate too, for it has not been curious enough to make its own investigation. I am not going to take up the time of the House or space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to enumerate the long list of highly paid revolutionaries working for Uncle Sam and attempting, under cloak of the war, to undermine the Republic. Their names and salaries already appear in the RECORD. That RECORD is available to any citizen who asks his Congressman for it. I stand by my votes against keeping these Bolsheviks on the taxpayers' backs. I will not surrender in this fight, regardless of what they and the front organizations behind which they operate, try to do to me in my district at succeeding elections. The people I have the honor to represent are—to use the vernacular of western Missouri—Americans, straight out, and they will continue to stand behind me on this issue.

Connally Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Coshocton (Ohio) Tribune:

CONNALLY BILL

The Senators who passed the Connally antistrike bill, and the Representatives who are strengthening it, must expect to be subjected to bitter attack on the theory that they are enemies of labor, and therefore of the working people.

That may be true of some individuals. But the measure's supporters include a substantial number of labor's truest friends—men who realize that there is no surer way for unions to destroy themselves than to interfere, by strikes, with the winning of this war.

We are not going to lose the war because of the proportion of time lost thus far in strikes, slow-downs, vacations, and other disruptive activities. But already our victory has been delayed by these. Everyday added to the war costs hundreds—perhaps thousands—of American lives. The vast majority of workers who are sticking to their jobs will profit by having the dilatory minority forced to keep at work.

War Cabinet Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD today an article by Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, which in my opinion points up a crying need of our Government right now, to wit, a war cabinet.

I earnestly urge the Members of the House to read this article, because it not only emphasizes with remarkable clarity the gross mistakes which have been made, before and during this war, by the present powers that be in our Government, but it presents what I consider a most constructive solution for most of the problems which beset us. I have had occasion before, and I repeat it here, to laud the ability and especially the clear thinking of Mr. Goss. I believe he is a man to whom all Members of the Congress, and emphatically of this administration, also, can listen with profit.

The article follows:

WAR CABINET NEEDED TO PREVENT CHAOS IN GOVERNMENT—NATIONAL MASTER GOSS REVEALS THE FACTS

Washington has been aptly called the national center of confusion. During wartimes more or less disorder can be expected, but the confusion has existed since long before the war. Much of it comes from failure to follow well-established administrative procedure.

Our Government is divided into three branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. The legislative establishes the policies and makes the laws. The executive branch administers the law and carries out the policies so established. The judicial interprets the law when the constitutionality is challenged. The executive branch is the largest, for there all the activities of government are centered, under the supervision of the President.

These activities are too many for any man to handle individually, so they are divided into 10 departments, each under the supervision of a Cabinet member. These Cabinet members comprise the President's operating staff or advisory board.

In addition to this machinery of government, experience has shown that some activities are a combination of executive and judicial responsibilities, so certain commissions have been authorized by law, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Tariff Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

On the whole, our Government is intended to be a rather clean-cut, not too complicated, organization. The trouble has arisen from failure to follow the pattern. When the Department of Labor failed to function smoothly, instead of correcting the trouble at its source, a commission was set up to take over some of the activities rightfully belonging within the Department. Working under the handicap of divided authority, it was inevitable that the commission would fail, so another was set up, then another. Most of the new agencies have been superimposed upon the others. Now problems of labor are spread among the Department of Labor, the War Manpower Commission, the

National War Labor Board, the Management-Labor Policy Committee, the Agricultural Labor Division of the War Food Administration, the National Labor Relations Board, and how many more it is hard to tell.

So it goes in the other departments. Where one authority begins and another ends is a subject for continual doubt and controversy. Instead of 10 departments, each headed by a responsible Cabinet member, we have some 60 or 80 boards or commissions operating outside of Cabinet departments, most of them responsible directly to the President. We have had 4 reorganizations of Government in as many years, most of them adding to the number of agencies instead of replacing them, but none of them getting back to the basic policy of straight-line authority.

For example, as Chairman of the Food Requirements Committee, Secretary Wickard could issue directives, but many of them had to be carried out by agencies which were not under the Department of Agriculture, and over which he had no supervision. If his orders were not carried out he could do nothing about it, unless possibly complain to the President.

When war came to Europe, the confusion led to the appointment of William S. Knudsen as chief coordinator, or over-all boss, but he was not given full authority. To satisfy labor, Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, was given concurrent powers with Knudsen, so in all matters involving labor—which was practically everything—there was divided authority and the President had to decide. Then came Leon Henderson to control prices, and Donald M. Nelson to control production through priorities, not supplanting any existing agencies, but in effect superimposed on them.

For a while Henderson seemed king of the roost. His technique was to run to the President with a program and get a decision before any Cabinet member or head of any independent division had been consulted, so he usually had his case won before the battle opened. This and other activities led to such complete confusion that Justice Byrnes was brought in to head a new over-all organization known as the Office of Economic Stabilization, with authority over almost everyone else.

Thus there have been many men in places of major responsibility but they have failed to coordinate our various activities. It is not their fault, for they have been some of the ablest and most sincere men in the whole Nation. The trouble has been in the limited authority under which they worked.

Divided authority had resulted in placing restrictive price ceilings over foods which the Food Administrator was trying to get produced in abundance. Congress had tried to give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to approve ceilings, but technical rulings prevented such operation, and the Secretary was left with insufficient authority to match his responsibilities. Finally the office of War Food Administration was set up under Chester Davis, to be responsible directly to the President. One of the first basic decisions made in cooperation with the Office of Price Administration Administrator Brown was to use rationing instead of ceilings to control meat supply and prices. The decision had hardly been made when still another reorganization took place, creating the War Mobilization Board under Justice Byrnes, which is another over-all authority board, and the meat decision was reversed.

This last over-all authority has been called a war cabinet. A war cabinet is exactly what is needed, but this is nothing of the sort. The vital industry of food production is not even represented on this board. If the total resources of the Nation are to be mobilized in the most effective way to win the war, all branches of our economy must be represented in a war cabinet, and the decisions must be made as to the merits of conflicting interests. Manpower, materials, food, and transportation must all be used where they will best serve the over-all cause.

Those responsible for the various activities of government (and this should be mostly Cabinet members) should be brought together and their problems worked out jointly. Where conflict cannot be settled otherwise, the President should decide, and when the decision is made, each should adjust his plans to fit. That is a war Cabinet. Unless the President sits in on the final discussions and hears all sides of the question, he is not able to decide intelligently. Without such a Cabinet he hears only one side and makes his decisions without the advantage of seeing all the facts.

That is what a Cabinet is for. That principle is followed in all successful business as well as in governments. It means straight-line authority, with the President as final arbiter, and all responsible heads having an opportunity to present their cases fully.

Lincoln had such a Cabinet. All decisions were discussed with his Cabinet almost daily. Most issues were resolved in the discussions; at times Lincoln took the responsibility, but not without full discussion. The Emancipation Proclamation was such a decision.

Wilson had such a Cabinet. They met every morning during war days. All problems involving the coordination of departmental activities were brought up and decided upon. Where agreement was not reached in discussion, President Wilson decided; then all went to work under the decision.

President Roosevelt needs such a Cabinet. He cannot decide all questions himself. Neither should he try to delegate this responsibility to someone else. It belongs to him. Instead of nearly a hundred agencies with overlapping authority, there should be few, if any, not under the supervision of his Cabinet members, and the Cabinet should be his advisory and operating board. If he feels that his Cabinet members are not qualified to handle the job, he should get men who are qualified. Then, and not until then, will the various departments know what the others are doing, and all our resources be properly coordinated and mobilized to win the war.

Fraternally,

A. S. Goss,
Master, National Grange.

Retention of Japanese in Relocation Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas by reason of the present war between the United States and Japan, all persons of Japanese ancestry have been removed from the area of the Pacific coast and placed in relocation centers distant therefrom; and

"Whereas there has been evidenced in the press a movement in the United States to release certain of said persons of Japanese ancestry from the said relocation centers; and

"Whereas many such persons of Japanese ancestry resided in the Pajaro Valley and near Watsonville, Calif., and by reason of which fact the citizens of this locality have had occasion to deal with and understand the characteristics and nature of such persons: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That all persons of Japanese ancestry be retained in relocation centers for the duration of the said war and that none be released during the duration except upon approval of and under the supervision and control of the military authorities of the United States, and only then if such release is deemed to be in the furtherance of our war effort."

This resolution adopted this 25th day of May 1943 by the board of directors of the chamber of commerce of the Pajaro Valley, at Watsonville, Calif.

EARL G. CALLENDER,
President.
FRANKLIN LOWNEY,
Secretary.

Proposed Subsidy and Roll-Back in Food Prices Is Economically Unsound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter which I recently received from Leo V. Horton, one of the representative businessmen of Mount Vernon, Ill.:

JUNE 11, 1943.

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEIDINGER: To my mind, a very dangerous trend has started in the Office of Price Administration principally, but signs of this same trend are noticeable in other departments of our Government. I refer to the matter of subsidizing certain businesses and commodities. It is my opinion that 90 percent of the businessmen in America despise the idea of being subsidized by government.

It is further my opinion that a great number of us would rather pay the price necessary to produce our commodities than to pay a price to the retailer or wholesaler, as the case might be, knowing at the time of purchase that part of the cost of this commodity has been paid for indirectly by taxation.

Irrespective of the fact that we have the finest government on earth, it is an indisputable fact that inefficiencies exist. It is absolutely essential for any subsidizing Government agency to collect a greater amount of money from the American people through taxation than the amount of subsidy. Such a practice is absolutely nonsensical and serves no good purpose, in my opinion.

It is far better to pay 45 cents a pound to a grocer for coffee if that is the cost than to pay 35 cents a pound, knowing at the time you pay the 35 cents that your Government has taxed you for the other 10 cents, plus an additional amount to offset the cost of administering the subsidy.

Cordially yours,

LEO V. HORTON.

New Deal Star Gazing and the Food Subsidy Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, strangely reminiscent of the late but unlamented Alice-in-Wonderland days when New Dealers were thinking up leaf raking projects and sponsoring the indiscriminate slaughter of little pigs is the latest demonstration of the perpetual unwillingness of President Roosevelt and his galaxy of New Deal star-gazers to face the facts of economic life in these United States. I refer, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the starry-eyed proposal that we meet the food crisis which New Deal bungling has produced in this country by the bland formula of rolling back prices and providing food subsidies in the form of Government checks to producers whom this administration seems unalterably opposed to have receive either the cost of production or fair parity prices for their labor and products. This latest suggestion from the realm of fables and fairyland seems destined to set a new all-time record in New Deal failure to support practical proposals for meeting specific problems in the field of our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, reduced to its basic realities, the food-subsidy program is nothing more nor less than a bare-faced and unconscionable attempt to foist upon future generations the cost of feeding ourselves during this war emergency. Even worse, Mr. Speaker, it is a thinly disguised attempt to load upon the servicemen now fighting this war a tremendous additional tax burden caused by the huge subsidies President Roosevelt is asking Congress to provide so that today's civilians can purchase butter, meat, and coffee at a few cents less per pound, while war workers are receiving the highest wages in American history. It is, in fact, a nicely worded but nasty scheme to load upon tomorrow's taxpayers the costs of today's grocery bills, and if it succeeds with butter, meat, and coffee, the New Deal schemers will doubtless call for its extension to clothing, gasoline, flour, and perhaps even cigarettes and liquor. Carried to its logical conclusion—if the word "logic" can conceivably be used in relationship to such a nonsensical policy—it might mean that about the time the fourth-term Juggernaut really begins loading in the votes, it would provide free meal tickets and clothing rations to all citizens with the stipulation that the Government would pay for the purchases out of taxes to be collected in the dim and distant future. Mr. Speaker, it is time we quit kidding ourselves and that we notify those in high places that the honeymoon with the Wizard of Oz is over.

Certainly the very least we can do today on the home front is to pay for our own groceries and our own clothing and not engage in any New Deal hocus-pocus in an endeavor to shift these costs across the years so that the returning veterans of this war will find them added to the colossal tax burdens which they already will be called upon to bear.

Yesterday Chester C. Davis rendered a great public service when he dramatized his opposition to such lack-wisdom proposals as the food-subsidy program by handing in his resignation as America's War Food Administrator. Even the President's own personal appointment, in this case, could not compel himself to support a food-subsidy program which, in an effort to cater to a few vociferous eastern labor leaders, would shave a few cents off their grocery bills by saddling millions of dollars of new debt upon the taxpayers of tomorrow. It is hoped that the patriotic and courageous action of Chester Davis in resigning from the position which he was so well qualified to fill will awaken the New Deal high command from the dreams in which it had been dozing and stimulate the President to cooperate with Congress in discarding the whole food-subsidy witchery for a program of production and price regulation which is more nearly in conformity with American ideals and traditions.

At most, the maximum savings which any individual could enjoy from the President's food subsidy program for butter, coffee, and meat if he bought all of these supplies to which he was entitled would be $3.92 per year. I doubt if there is a single loyal citizen in this country today, Mr. Speaker, who so begrudges this $3.92 to the producers of foodstuffs that he would want to shift that payment to the shoulders of some soldier, sailor, or airman now fighting in north Africa or New Guinea. Furthermore, the history of New Deal bureaus and agencies is such that if the food-subsidy program is continued it will probably mean that another $3.92 per individual would be charged up in the administrative overhead and the innumerable political appointees needed to enforce, audit, regulate, check, counter-check, and supervise the payments of food subsidies, thus actually costing the taxpayers perhaps twice as much in the long run as would be the case if we follow the ancient and honorable practice of paying for what we eat as we eat it.

Mr. Speaker, the food-subsidy program is the most inflationary single proposal yet to come from the classroom economists who now and always hold the key positions in the planning sections of the New Deal political wigwam. If we store up purchasing power now by refusing to pay for our own grocery bills, we store up along with that purchasing power the most dynamic force for inflation that the mind of man has yet conceived, and we do it without rhyme, reason, conscience, conviction, precedent, or principle. The time has come to put a fast and final end to such economic perversions and to get on with the real problem of gearing food production and the costs of living to the other factors involved in our war effort on a basis of genuine parity which will provide equity for all and privilege for none.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very sound and sane editorial appearing in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader, and written by Mr. Ralph O. Hillgren, whose political observations are well known to thousands of readers in the Middle West. The editorial is entitled "No Compromise":

NO COMPROMISE

Not for a long time has the Nation been so stirred as it is now over President Roosevelt's plan to compensate food processors for coffee, meat, and butter price reductions by payment of subsidies.

There have been tremendous repercussions in the Farm Belt, where the food processors weren't sure of getting the subsidy and for that reason passed on the price reduction to the farmers. Hit by uncertainty themselves, several packing plants have closed their doors. Farmers' marketings declined and civilian meat supplies in many areas have been sharply reduced.

In connection with consumer supplies, the Government made no provision for payment of subsidies on butter in transit or in warehouses, and when a cry arose that millions would be lost to the wholesalers and processors by the price roll-back, the Government decided to buy up such supplies. It bought butter to the extent of 100,000,000 pounds, according to the American Dairy Association. When this large amount was removed from the domestic market there were many consumers who had to get along without butter.

The subsidy plan is an example of economic bungling that just about takes the cake.

Reasoning of Roosevelt and his followers is that unless the prices were rolled back there would be new demands on the part of labor for wage increases, and with such demands the danger of inflation would be heightened.

As a matter of fact, the Roosevelt subsidy plan represents the real inflation danger. The estimated total of subsidies is $450,000,000, and added to that is another $50,000,000 for administration. The butter-meat-coffee plan, however, was only a starter. Plans were being formed for the expenditure of perhaps a couple billion annually. Labor leaders who campaigned for the subsidy plan mentioned these figures. If you want to know how much a billion dollars is, just recall that all the expenditures of the Federal Government in 1916 were less than this amount.

By the price roll-back, of course, milady would save some money in buying the weekly grocery supplies. How much? Representative AUGUST ANDRESEN of Minnesota has calculated that fullest possible savings per individual, if he bought all the butter, meat, and coffee he were allowed under the ration plan, would be $3.92 per year.

It must be remembered, however, that the Government would have to borrow money to pay the subsidy. Representative ANDRESEN estimates that if the Government bonds are paid off in 50 years, the subsidy plan will cost the average taxpayer approximately three times what he saves, in subsidies, interest, and administrative expense.

The American people can well afford to pay the former prices on coffee, butter, and meat. There is no lack of money in their pockets. The only trouble is that there's too much money. Too much money in consumer's hands, with too little goods to be had, brings rising price trends, which is inflation.

Then there's the inflation danger, too, in excessive Government spending. Remember Germany and her experience after the last war, when issuance of printing press money led to a decline of the mark until it was 1,200,400,000,000 times as valueless as in 1914.

Senator ROBERT TAFT of Ohio proposed a compromise, with less money than the squandering Roosevelt would spend. To our way of thinking, if something's wrong in principle it isn't a subject for compromise.

In Answer to an Editorial in the Wichita Beacon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I sent to Louis Levand, publisher of the Wichita Beacon, Wichita, Kans., in reply to a letter he sent me on April 12, 1943, and an editorial which he printed in the Wichita Beacon.

Mr. Levand made numerous unfair and untrue statements in the columns of his newspaper relative to me and a bill I introduced in Congress, and as far as I have been able to learn has refused to publish my reply setting forth the facts.

It is an established custom of all responsible newspapers to publish replies or retractions when misrepresentations and unfair attacks such as has been made by Mr. Levand are made on a person in public life. Since Mr. Levand has not had the courtesy to print my reply or answer my letter, I feel it is my duty to insert my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that the facts as set forth will be available to the fair-minded American public.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1943.

Mr. LOUIS LEVAND,
Publisher, the Wichita Beacon,
Wichita, Kans.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter in regard to my views, I am opposed to all communistic Americans and their fellow travelers who seek to destroy our American system and constitutional government. I am in favor of placing the interests of America ahead of the British Empire, Soviet Russia, and any and all foreign Nations.

The British and the Soviets always put their interests uppermost, for which I commend them. It is about time for us in this country to place our own welfare first, last, and all the time. If this be treason make the most of it.

I served in the last war and was decorated by our own Government and the French for gallantry on the battlefields of Europe against the Germans. I have no use for Hitler or the Nazis, but that does not mean that I must embrace communism or the New Deal in America or refrain from criticizing both.

I stand with Thomas Jefferson for free speech and a free press, and against peacetime sedition laws that would set up a Gestapo and prevent criticism of the administration, the New Deal bureaucracy, President Roosevelt, communism, or even the conduct of the war. Without free speech a free America ceases to exist.

I am in favor of punishing direct attempts to create disorders and mutiny in our armed forces in peacetime, but only upon substantial evidence of the fact and proof of willful intent, in the district where made. My proposed amendments are merely intended to reassert the Bill of Rights, and to prevent any American citizen from being deprived of his Constitutional rights. My proposal would help to prevent the persecution of all minority groups in peacetime, and has nothing whatever to do with sedition or treasonable acts during war.

I do not know anything about you, but when I receive such an intemperate and hysterical letter as yours I am led to inquire, How long have you been an American citizen, and what nation did you come from?

My family left England over 300 years ago to escape from civil and political persecution, and that is why I oppose its revival here. My ancestors have lived in America ever since, and have served in all our wars, and know no other yardstick except what is best for America.

It would be interesting to know what wars you have fought in, and what right you have to impugn other peoples' motives, who have served their native land loyally in peace and in war.

I voted for war, and have supported all war measures since Pearl Harbor, and have consistently urged a total war of service and sacrifice until final victory.

Very truly yours.

P. S.—I trust, in all fairness, that you will publish this letter in the columns of your newspaper, in view of the misrepresentations contained in your editorial under the title "Proposes Immunity for Our Enemies." My amendments are aimed to safeguard the rights and liberties of American citizens under the Bill of Rights, and do not apply to wartime.

H. F.

Immediate and Positive Action Is Required To Meet the Critical Food Problem in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress, the following resolution recently adopted by the Conference of Midwest Farm Bureaus of the American Farm Bureau Federation:

JUNE 24, 1943.

To United States Senators and Representatives from the Midwest States,
Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of Midwest farm bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted:

"Immediate and positive action is required to meet the critical food problem in this country. In order to avert disaster on the food front, it is our considered opinion that all necessary authority over the food problem must be centered in one individual. A clear-cut, understandable, and effective food policy in this country now is an indispensable factor, without which the war cannot be won. We therefore urgently recommend that all control over production and distribution of food, including pricing and rationing policies, be given our capable and courageous Food Administrator, Chester C. Davis. Continuation of the present muddled food policy will jeopardize the food supply and will incur the just condemnation, not only of farmers but of all patriotic Americans."

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

Andrew Jackson Higgins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS HONORED—RECEIVES HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS FROM THE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY

On Thursday morning, May 14, the Creighton University of Omaha, Nebr., conferred upon Andrew Jackson Higgins, president of Higgins Industries, Inc., the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

The citation covering the degree was presented by Dean Walsh, of the College of Commerce. It read:

"Andrew Jackson Higgins, is a native son of Nebraska, an alumnus of the Creighton University, a former officer in the Nebraska National Guard, a naval architect and inventor, a master of industry and mass production of ships to save democracy. Tradition honors the men who go down to the sea in ships. Today we honor a man who sends ships down to the sea. By his daring and courage and inspired leadership in our fight for freedom, he is no longer a citizen of any one city or State but of all America, and merits from his alma mater the degree of Doctor of Laws honoris causa."

This was followed by a special citation presented by the old instructor of Mr. A. J. Higgins, Rev. F. X. Reilly, S. J., A. M., professor of English. This special citation and real tribute to our chief follows:

HONOR TO WHOM HONOR IS DUE

"On the heights of great endeavor,
Where attainment looms forever,
Pass the victors, many gifted,
Where the heavens open wide."

The annals of the race are the record of man's achievements. What man has accomplished is traceable to the vision and leadership of individuals. They are remembered long and favorably because of the service they rendered to their country and their fellow man. Such a man is Andrew Jackson Higgins. His life and his deeds are his eulogy. No words of mine could add a cubit to his stature.

As in the case of other men like him, we find the secret of his success in his readiness to give to his little world the benefit of the acquisitions of fruitful years. These men may have made the opportunity, or they may have seized it; at any rate they recognized it for what it was and made the

most of it. They had prepared themselves efficiently for the task ahead of them and were ready when the time came. In some instances successful careers may look like the workings of chance; in other cases, fortune, family, or favor may seem to be the ready answer, but investigation will show that it was largely a matter of aptitude of mind, plus the requisite knowledge and power. This is as it has always been, for life is what we make it; it is never a thing of chance.

"The boy is father of the man. If in youth he has been a dreamer, he will not fail to catch life's sweetness and richness; if he has projected himself into the future and has been himself accomplishing the things he dreamed of, he may well hope to get out of the future all that he longs to attain. He may be shooting his arrows at the moon, or hitching his wagon to a star, but he will go faster and get farther for all that.

"Men who have done any notable work in the world have felt the consciousness of its importance as fire in their bones. It carried the soul at white heat to the perfection of the work in which it was engaged. We may well marvel at what men have accomplished when they brought enthusiasm to their work; when they would rather be doing that particular job than anything else in the world. Enthusiasm enables a man to accomplish the seeming impossible, because it will not permit him to see anything ahead save success. He aims straight, shoots straight, with no thought of allowing himself to wander, or his purpose to flag. As to ways and means, ingenuity is begotten of enthusiasm, for it makes him equal to any struggle against circumstance."

Like love, it will find out a way and obstacles will melt or vanish. Achievement is the record of enthusiasm. Thus it has been with Andrew Jackson Higgins. The boy was father of the man, in youthful vision, in sincerity, in initiative, and in courage. For these, we honor Andrew Jackson Higgins, the man.

The honorary degree of doctor of laws was also presented to Arthur James Lowman, of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

On completion of the presentation at the commencement exercises, Mr. Higgins together with the graduates recited the Creighton pledge, which is as follows:

THE CREIGHTON PLEDGE

The faculty of the Creighton University are met here today to welcome you into the company of learned men and women.

Throughout your undergraduate years this university has endeavored to inspire you with a zeal for truth, an appreciation of beauty, and a love for virtue in philosophy and letters, in arts and science, in religion and law.

From the ancient groves of Athens and Alexandria, from the medieval halls of Bologna and Paris, Salamanca and Oxford, from all our modern seats of learning your predecessors have gone forth marked by culture, filled with zeal for truth, trained to lead their fellow men.

When you are granted the degrees that admit you to the honor roll of graduates of the Creighton University you are entering that select company of men and women of all ages of all countries who have enjoyed the privilege of university training and who bear before the world the duties and responsibilities of men and women of scholarship and culture.

In their name I charge you to be true to the ideals you have learned and in particular to the supreme principle of your training:

ALL FOR THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD

In this, the hour of your graduation, it is fitting that you declare your purpose in life by repeating this solemn pledge:

I pledge myself:

To hold this degree as a sacred trust.

To keep my honor without stain.

To be loyal to my country and my flag.

To serve God and my fellow men.

To be true until death to the Creighton Ideal.

May the Lord direct you in all your works and further you by His help and grace; that all your actions may begin, continue, and end in Him to the greater glory of His holy name—the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

As a youngster, Andrew Jackson Higgins attended The Creighton University. His student days at Creighton influenced his later life. The Creed of Creighton has ever since been the creed of Andrew Jackson Higgins.

The Creighton University refuses to subscribe to the doctrine that academic freedom may be used as a pretext to teach systems which destroy all freedom. We proudly boast that it has always taught and always will teach the following creed:

We believe in God.

We believe in the personal dignity of man.

We believe that man has certain rights which come from God and not from the state.

We, therefore, are opposed to all forms of dictatorship holding that the "total man" (totalitarianism) belongs to the state.

We believe in the sanctity of the home—the basic unit of society.

We believe in the natural right of private property, but likewise that private property has its social obligations.

We believe that labor has not only rights but obligations.

We believe that capital has not only rights but obligations.

We are vigorously opposed to all forms of "racism"—persecution or intolerance because of race.

We believe that liberty is a sacred thing, but the law, which regulates liberty, is a sacred obligation.

We believe in inculcating all the essential liberties of American democracy and take open and frank issue with all brands of spurious democracy.

The Home Guards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, from time to time anonymous communications reach me from persons in my district but none of them have ever received serious consideration from me until the one which has just arrived from a resident of Corning, N. Y., who sends a poem composed by an American soldier a short time before he was killed in action.

In these days of selfishness and strife by those of us who have stayed home, when we moan and complain about our rationed allowances and the fact that we cannot drive our car to attend a movie, or when we strike on the job that we are doing which will produce the things those boys out on the fronts need to defend themselves and bring victory to our flag, it is well for us to give heed to this expression from the pen of one who died unhonored and nameless in defense of his country and whose lips are forever silenced by the awful hell of war. He was some mother's son, the object of her life and sacrifice and love. He was but one of thousands who are out there suffering unspeakable pains and hardships, all in the name of America, and for us.

It is well for us to give an attentive ear to the innermost thoughts of that boy who volunteered to die for his country.

The poem follows:

THE HOME GUARDS

I'm pulling all my punches, I've flung my "weeks" away.
I think it's been two months at least since I drew my pay.
I'm tired of being a dogface, so help me God, I am,
Of eating molded biscuits, with margarine or Spam,
Of fighting dirty, stinking Japs in the bushes on my own,
When I think of "Dear Old America" and my pals who stayed at home.
I can see them walking down the street, their chests puffed out with pride.
Hear them talking to the girls, as they save their precious hides.
While I'm here in New Guinea, not even safe to show my head,
For fear some skulking Jap might fill it full of lead.
Back when I told the folks at home that I volunteered to fight,
They said, "God bless you, son, and return you home all right."
They called me a chocolate soldier, a $21 tourist too.
They said, "You'll never see the front or even get a view,
What's more, you'll have a picnic across the ocean foam."
But they made damned sure they didn't go—they preferred to stay home.
You know those guys, not bad shots when they trailed a rabbit track.
But, hell, there ain't no danger, see, for a rabbit don't shoot back.
They shine among the "stay at homes" and brag of our United States,
But dance halls, bars, and poolrooms are where they meet their fate.
A cue stick is their rifle, and their beer rich with foam.
They have no bullets there to dodge—my pals who stayed at home.

The Japanese Problem on the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I have heretofore pointed out to the House, there are thousands of Japanese in the three Pacific Coast States and a large number in my own State of Oregon. Many of these Japanese who were removed from these States and placed in relocation centers have been released. The people of my district are opposed to the releasing of Japanese and permitting them to return to the Coast States.

Portland Post No. 1, American Legion, on June 21, 1943, carefully considered this matter and passed unanimously a resolution setting forth the views of the organization. In accordance with authority heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks this resolution, which is as follows:

Whereas a state of war exists between the United States of America and the Japanese Empire; and

Whereas there are at present many thousands of Japanese who are at present domiciled in Relocation Centers in the far Western States which Relocation Centers are at present under the supervision and authority of the War Relocation Authority and are not under the direct control of the Army of the United States; and

Whereas the members of Portland Post are firmly of the belief and opinion that more adequate and effective supervision and control of all Japanese in the country can be had and obtained by placing the responsibility for their control, custody and supervision upon the military authority of the United States; and

Whereas the membership of this post is also of the opinion that the native born loyal Japanese of American citizenship should be given the opportunity of demonstrating their loyalty to the United States and should not be indiscriminately classified as alien enemies, merely because of racial ancestry; and

Whereas in our opinion loyal American citizens of Japanese ancestry by reason of their ancestry and racial characteristics and knowledge of the Japanese language are best qualified and in a position to render unusual and exceptional service to the entire world in the reorganization and rehabilitation of Japan upon the conclusion of hostilities and in the education of native Japanese in the principles, form and procedure of representative government to the end that a democratic form of government be established and perpetuated in Japan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That immediate action be taken and the control, supervision, and maintenance of all relocation center be transferred from the War Relocation Authority to the War Department.

2. That upon such transfer, immediate action be taken to segregate loyal American-born Japanese and that they be transferred and assigned to separate relocation centers outside the States of California, Washington, and Oregon, where under the supervision of competent instructors and in general accordance with the operation of an American Legion boy State they may elect their own officials and organize such center as an American community governed by representative government.

3. That upon the conclusion of hostilities the graduates of these American communities be enlisted or inducted for emigration to Japan and established in positions of authority, according to their qualifications and abilities, to form a nucleus and to pioneer democratic government in Japan and to act as teachers in the schools of that country so that a democracy may be established and perpetuated in Japan and all her possessions.

4. That foreign-born and/or enemy Japanese and such others as investigation may show to be disloyal to, or unsympathetic with a democratic form of government, be confined in concentration camps and there remain under such proper military guards as will adequately confine and control them and protect the lives and properties of American citizens; that at the conclusion of hostilities such enemy aliens shall be deported to some locality where they will not be a handicap, detriment, or obstruction to the rehabilitation of Japan proper, or impair the establishment of a democracy in Japan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith to our Senators and Representatives at the Nation's Capitol so that their support be enlisted and they may exercise their best efforts to secure the immediate passage of such legislation as is necessary to accomplish the intent of this resolution, to wit, to provide for the eventual elimination of all Japanese residents in the United States by due and orderly process of law.

PORTLAND POST, No. 1,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Portland, Oreg.

Congress Revolts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the comment of the press throughout the country is indicative of the general feeling of the people, then the recent action of the Congress in asserting its prerogatives is most timely.

During the last 10 years most of the important legislation passed by the Congress has been based on emergency requirements. Much legislation has been enacted that would not be given passing consideration by the Congress were it not for these alleged emergency necessities. The people are perfectly willing to meet emergencies, yet they are very much opposed to this type of legislation becoming a habit on the part of the Congress. Little by little more power has been concentrated in the administration and its administrative bureaus in Washington; indeed, this practice has gone so far that the daily lives of our people everywhere throughout the land are regulated and controlled to some extent from Washington. The country is now demanding that we return to constitutional government at the earliest possible date and Congress is charged with the responsibility of bringing this about.

A typical editorial giving expression to these views appears in the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News, and I am including it herewith. It is as follows:

CONGRESS REVOLTS

The issue is growing ever more sharply drawn between bureaucracy and representative government. It has been a long time coming. This Congress, which took office in January, was elected with a fresh mandate from the people to reduce government by edict and administration by theorists. It fumbled around for a while, not knowing how to use its new power. Republican and Democratic Members could get together on no common ground from which they could strike at entrenched bureaucracy or lessen the power of administration pressure groups. It looked as though Congress was going to get sidetracked indefinitely on a financial issue that became a partisan issue and widened the previously narrowing gap between Republican and Democratic concepts of how the war should be won.

But with the tax question at last out of the way, Congress has begun to find itself, and is sniping shrewdly at the aspects of government the people wanted brought within bounds. At first it only pecked away ineffectually at appropriations for feeble, run-of-mine bureaus such as the Farm Security Administration, and at individual bureaucrats in a few agencies who had incurred its displeasure. These took on an appearance of merely spite work, the kind of political backlashing that does Congress no good and certainly was contributing less than nothing toward the major issue which the people had directed Congress to attack.

But in the last few weeks the Congressional machine has begun hitting on all six. In the course of a few days it enacted a strike-control bill which marked the first turn in the tide since 1933 in labor legislation by imposing restrictions on union activities. This is evidenced in the violence of union reaction to the bill, but neutral observers see in the measure an opportunity for labor to redeem itself from its pitifully feeble attempt to curb spontaneous and undisciplined strikes and find nothing in the bill harmful to sound labor practice.

Next the House took it upon itself to write some exceedingly shrewd manifestations of the people's will into appropriation bills for the Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Information. No one expects all these restrictions on the two bureaus to travel intact the long road to enactment, but in their first full impact they certainly gave pause to the bureaucrats in all agencies and some features of them are bound to be written into law.

One of the shrewdest, and one that must appeal for popular support is that written into the Office of Price Administration appropriation requiring any administrator to qualify for his position by at least 5 years' experience in the field which he is assigned to regulate. This cuts the ground out from under the theorist and if it can be made to work restores government regulation to the hands of men competent to deal with practical problems.

Office of War Information probably not be vivisected as the House bill now stands. Elmer Davis says that cutting the domestic division off means no Office of War Information will be left. There is also a question as to which phase of Office of War Information's activity has been more mismanaged, its domestic or foreign branches. But certainly the fourth term zeal of Office of War Information's bureaucrats will have less chance for free play at Government expense when Congress gets through with the appropriation.

These are hopeful signs. They indicate that Congress has at last got its feet on the ground and is not suffering from the same Washington complex that animates the bureaucrats. It is beginning to think, and to act in some measure of unison. It has taken a long time, but at last the people's representatives seem to be on the right track.

Congress of Industrial Organizations Investigation of Absence of Members From Vote on Antistrike Bill Veto

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the Washington Post carried an Associated Press story with a New York date line that stated that the C. I. O. is sending 500 representatives here to query Members of Congress and investigate the absence of certain Members last Friday.

I want to say to my colleagues who were not present, "I would not have any fears." I wish they would send their whole delegation to see me. I would like to entertain them and tell them what their greed and unfairness have done to them. I would not be alarmed over that at all because I think the trend of the country is that the leaders of the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the United Mine Workers are going to take a back seat henceforth. The people are going to run the Government. High pressure and threats are going to make it possible for us to return to constitutional government, and this country is wide open and begging for it.

Congress has shown its steel in calling William Green's bluff and the issues are made up and we predict that this Congress will follow the will of the people and the people are for cleaning up all this racketeering and the unlawful charging of fees to work on a Government project and all-out against strikes. Americans are more hopeful today than they have been at any time since the convening of this Congress; they have more faith in their legislative branch of government. After all the greatest sacrifices we might make are but secondary to what our brave boys are doing in battle and it makes me sick when these labor leaders and news commentators try to leave the impression that the workers of America, especially the organized labor groups, are the only ones that are making possible our successes. We farmers, sawmill workers, cattlemen, small businessmen, many times greater in majority, never come in for favorable consideration. Possibly I have been more outspoken in my opposition to the disloyal acts of some labor leaders than the most of you. May I add, aside from passing good and wholesome laws we must look into the administration of these laws and see that they are properly executed and obeyed.

The majority of the people are entitled to a majority representation on each and every board and commission created, and we must demand such recognition. When the truth is known we will learn, in my opinion, that in a majority of cases the unions will or have had the final word in the making of decisions and promulgating policies. The unions should account for their many millions of dollars acquired by the wrongful charging of exorbitant fees for the right to work for our Government and made pay an income tax. It is indeed a bad day when our Government employees reach the point where they feel they have to join a union in order to receive favorable consideration. I am all out against such practices and shall not cease to let it be known. A new day is at hand, and we must call the enemies' hand upon the least intimidation, and encourage our soldiers and their loved ones at home. I propose to bring to your attention every threat of unfair play. The union leaders should not be self-appointed and self-styled; we are a democracy and should let the majority speak. We are prone to believe that the farmer, unorganized worker, and the businessmen are going to be on the alert in 1944, and every move on the part of these strike callers will be open for public discussion. When any group is given more power than is guaranteed under the Constitution, it is time to change the laws. A few more threats and a few more attacks will make us all conscious, and we can meet the enemy face to face. Remember this: You can go along with organized labor a thousand times, but if you have one thought contrary to their demands you are everlastingly branded as an enemy, and since the most of us have been thus branded, now is the time to legislate for the great masses and remove the yoke of oppression. The article in the Washington Post is as follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS SENDING 500 TO QUERY LEGISLATORS

NEW YORK, June 26.—The Greater New York Congress of Industrial Organizations Council announced today it would send a 500-man delegation to Washington Tuesday to demand "full explanations" from 13 New York City Congressmen who were absent from the House when the anti-strike bill veto was overridden.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations group said its delegation also would demand:

1. Immediate enactment of President Roosevelt's price roll-back and subsidy program.

2. Restoration of cuts in appropriations for the Office of Price Administration, Office of War Information, and other agencies.

3. The outlawing of "all forms of racial discrimination."

Given out with the announcement was a joint statement in which the Congress of Industrial Organizations Council's secretary, Saul Mills, and Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union and national Congress of Industrial Organizations vice president, called overriding of President Roosevelt's veto of the Smith-Connally anti-strike bill yesterday "ill-tempered and insulting."

The Tulsa (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce Favors Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by inserting a letter that I have received from the Tulsa (Okla.) Chamber of Commerce, bearing date of June 22, 1943, which letter is as follows:

TULSA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tulsa, Okla., June 22, 1943.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
Member, House Immigration and Naturalization Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The board of directors of the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce in regular session today, Tuesday, June 22, by unanimous vote expressed themselves in favor of grant of quota to Chinese nationals, qualifying 105 of them as immigrants annually to become naturalized United States citizens.

As one of our directors expressed it, "One of the greatest crimes ever committed by a so-called Christian nation was the Chinese Exclusion Act." The Chinese have proved themselves loyal and valuable American citizens and are entitled to admission to this country under a fair ratio or quota system. The figure 105, of course, is over and above those now excepted from exclusions: students, merchants, professions, and a few other classes.

When this measure comes before you, either as a committee member or as a Member of Congress, we respectfully request your favorable consideration and your vote in favor of it.

Very truly yours.

R. K. LANE,
President.

The Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County, Oreg., Urges Continuation of the National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from Geraldine Judge, Secretary of the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County, a resolution adopted by that organization on June 23, 1943, urging continuation of the National Resources Planning Board. I include the resolution as a part of my remarks, which is as follows:

"Whereas the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County has a sincere and continuing interest in the welfare of absent young people of this State and Nation engaged in military service; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of said organization to instill and promote in the young people of Oregon an interest in government and governmental affairs; and

"Whereas it is our conviction that continuation of the functions of the National Resources Planning Board is essential in the formation of governmental plans concerning the welfare of all of the people of this State and Nation: Now, therefore, be it hereby

"*Resolved*, That we petition the duly elected representatives of the people of the State of Oregon serving in the Nation's Capital for immediate action effective toward the continuation of the National Resources Planning Board for the accomplishment of the purposes here and above stated."

This will certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at the regular meeting the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County, held in Portland, Oreg., on June 23, 1943.

WILLIAM BARTHOLOMEW,
President.

GERALDINE JUDGE,
Secretary.

Gen. C. S. Adams Makes Interesting Address on Army Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. C. S. Adams, Director of the Army Postal Service, recently delivered a very interesting address at the Officer Candidate School of the Army at Fargo, S. Dak.

This address contains some information that will be of interest to every Member of Congress. I am inserting this address in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that it will be widely read both by Members of Congress and others.

The Army Postal Service is performing an outstanding job in the enormous task of handling the Army mails all over the world.

The huge volume of mail to be transported and delivered to all corners of the earth makes the work of the Army Postal Service one of the most difficult in the entire Army. General Adams and his associates are meeting this responsibility with an ever-increasing efficiency.

The address of General Adams referred to follows:

It is a genuine pleasure for me to have this opportunity of talking to you on the subject of the Army Postal Service.

While used by every man in the Army in varying degrees, both officers and enlisted men alike, it is amazing to find how few there are, even within the Army, who have any conception of the functions and operations of the Army Postal Service.

I do not believe it an overstatement to say that the morale of the Army, particularly those men in overseas and combat areas, is to a large degree dependent on the success of the Army Postal Service and the manner in which it discharges its obligations to the individual soldier.

In considering the Army Postal Service we must not overlook the fact that the Army of the United States is primarily a citizen's Army. It is composed for the most part of plain, everyday citizens who have taken up arms in the defense of their country. It is not in any sense a professional Army.

The Army of the United States is therefore comprised for the most part of men who will one day again return to civilian life—to their old jobs, to their families and their friends.

For this reason it is only natural that they desire to maintain the closest possible link with these home ties until that day following complete and total victory when they receive their honorable discharges from the Army.

This is true in your cases here as individuals. It is equally true with the American soldier in the southwest Pacific, in Iceland, in north Africa, in England, in India, in fact, everywhere where American troops are serving.

Recognizing this fact from the very outset of the war, the Army activated its own Army Postal Service immediately following our entry into the war.

The pattern and plan of operations for the conducting of this Postal Service by the Army exclusively for Army personnel was set back in 1940 when a joint operating plan was drawn up by the War and Post Office Departments to which the Secretary of War and the Postmaster General respectively were signatories.

This plan was developed out of the experience gained by the civilian postal establishment in handling the Army mails during the first large-scale maneuvers in 1939 and 1940, following the rapid expansion in the size of the Army which was taking place at that time.

With the movement overseas of the first contingents of American troops shortly after our entrance into the war in the winter of 1941–42 the Army Postal Service immediately set about the task of setting up an overseas Postal System to serve these overseas forces.

From that small beginning the Army Postal Service has expanded to the point where it is now operating several hundred Army post offices in all overseas theaters in addition to handling the Army mails at domestic posts, camps, and stations within the continental United States.

To give you some idea of the enormity of the task involved in handling the overseas mails alone, it may interest you to know that we are now handling some 20,000,000 individual pieces of mail a week through the several ports of embarkation.

This mail is destined to the far corners of the earth, for the proudest boast of the Army Postal Service is that no American soldier is out of reach of an Army post office. In many instances American soldiers are today receiving mail regularly in areas which never before had postal service of any kind.

In providing this mail service to our overseas troops, the Army Postal Service is utilizing every transportation method employed by the Army, both surface and air, including the latest and most modern of postal facilities, the V-mail service.

Complete postal units of the Army Postal Service have accompanied our combat troops to and within all theaters of operations, and the goal of the Army Postal Service—the providing of mail service right up to the front-line combat troops—has been attained in every active theater thus far. Plans have been made to operate a similar front-line service in every theater throughout the war.

From the very outset, the Army Postal Service has been confronted with two major problems, problems which will be present in varying degrees throughout the war. One of these relates to a factor over which you and I have no control, but the other is one which we definitely can alleviate to a great degree by exercising more care in using the Army Postal Service facilities.

The first of these problems, and the one over which we have no control, is that which relates to the loss of mail on the high seas through ship sinkings. The second pertains to the vast volume of incorrectly and insufficiently addressed mail which is causing the Army Postal Service great difficulty at ports of embarkation and also at overseas Army post offices.

This latter factor can be attributed in many instances to carelessness on the part of the soldier in supplying his folks back home with his latest and proper address.

The man-hours lost at ports of embarkation in giving directory service to this misaddressed mail is appalling, and despite urgent pleas by the War Department the public and the soldiers are still guilty of laxity in addressing overseas mail. At the present time some 13 percent of all overseas mail must receive directory service owing to improper or insufficient addresses. This, naturally, seriously delays these letters as delays in any mail service are cumulative and this is particularly true in the case of the overseas Army mails.

Overseas Army mail should always include the soldier's full name, rank, Army serial number, unit and service organization, and Army post office number, together with the proper port of embarkation postmaster

Recently I returned from a 35,000-mile overseas inspection trip of Army postal installations in the north African, Middle East, and Indian-Burman-China theaters. Everywhere I went, at the front, behind the lines, in hospitals and in areas far removed from active fronts, the one thing I heard was the importance of mail. All the general officers I talked with, all the commanding officers down the line and the enlisted men to a man stressed the importance of mail to them. To those men, mail is as vital as food and I regret to say that it is not until some men actually get oversas that they realize the vital necessity and importance of the mission of the Army Postal Service.

I had battle-hardened American troops at the north African front tell me in April that they would gladly forego a mess call for a letter from home; I had company commanders tell me that their men's spirit was at a peak immediately following the arrival of mail from home.

It is with these thoughts constantly in mind that we in the Army Postal Service are today exerting every effort to see that these men get the best possible mail service under any and all circumstances.

We have made available to American troops overseas the same postal facilities with which they were accustomed back in their own home to us prior to their entrance into the Army. We are according them surface, air, and V-mail service in addition to complete money order facilities both to and from every theater.

While the Army Postal Service never does publicize relative time schedules in the movement of the mails to and from the various overseas theaters in an effort not to mislead the public into believing that there are regular schedules, it is a fact nevertheless, that 8-day mail service from the southwest Pacific and 1-week service from the north African theaters are not uncommon, services which are several weeks faster than the civilian-mail schedules between these points prior to the outbreak of the war.

In closing, I want to say that I have enjoyed this opportunity of meeting with you and I wish you continued success in your Army careers.

O. P. A. and the Food Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, of course the uppermost thing in the minds of the people of this country today is the winning of the war. The battle is raging on the far-flung fronts of the

world. There is a battle also raging on the home front. In that battle on the home front there is a diversified opinion as to its solution; I have reference principally to the functions of the O. P. A. and that phase of our economy that it is supposed to control.

The O. P. A. started off out of step. Of course, we could expect nothing else when, initially, it was headed by one Leon Henderson, who I now understand is back on another job with his hand in the taxpayers' pockets. Henderson will muddle anything he is connected with because his ideologies are un-American. Prentiss Brown, the present O. P. A. Administrator, is no doubt trying to straighten out the difficulties under which he accepted the place, but the entire set-up is infested with a bunch of people in key positions who have had no practical experience in the line of endeavor they are now trying to control. Mr. Speaker, until there is a cleaning of house and people with some common sense backed by practical experience head the different divisions of the O. P. A., the fight on the home front will continue until it reaches such proportions it may be more disastrous than the loss of two or three battles on the battle front.

I just want to call attention of the Congress to one or two phases of it. We know how they have bungled the situation relative to the price of logs, and so forth, to the extent that about 33 percent of the sawmills have closed down. Of course, there are other contributing factors in this—the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor and its bungling also.

The matter I want to specifically call the Congress' attention to is this, that is, relative to the handling of the meat situation. According to statistics as given by our Government on June 1, 1943, there were 78,170,000 cattle on the ranges of the country, an increase of 3,000,000 head over January 1, 1942, and it is estimated by January 1, 1944, there will be 82,400,000 head. This represents a population of 8,000,000 head more cattle than the pre-war record of 74,000,000 reached in 1934 when our theorists and Utopia boys launched their slaughter program.

Before the war the average cattle population was around 67,000,000 head, and now, with the war on, furnishing our Army, our lend-lease demands, and our allies, there will be, on January 1, 1944, 15,400,000 more cattle on the ranges than our pre-war average. It is said this represents a surplus of 7,000,000 cattle.

Mr. Speaker, this same situation exists in practically all other of our livestock. Hogs increased in 1942 by 13,000,000 head. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimated in 1943 the pig crop at 125,000,000 head; the 1942 crop at only 105,000,000, or an increase of 20,000,000 head this year. It further estimated the weights of hogs running 10 percent above normal. This Bureau further states at the beginning of this year there were 55,890,000 sheep in the pastures and 540,000,000 chickens on the farms, or 14 percent above the 1938 record.

The alarming thing to me is that the O. P. A., by reason of their manner of fixing price ceilings, restricting production, the manner in which they have handled the meat situation, has caused literally hundreds of small meat packers and slaughterhouses to close, and the people of the cities cannot secure meat. It is rationed to the extent of a small piece a week, and yet, in the livestock and fowl named, there is being a gradual increase of each.

What does this mean? It means in the event of the cessation of hostilities, if there remained on the farms 82,000,000 head of cattle and the number of hogs there is today, the market would break to the extent it would bankrupt practically every cattle and hog raiser. Yet the people of this country, especially the wage earners who are receiving the highest wages at any period in the history of the country, with curtailment of production of civilian needs, have the money to purchase food, yet are being deprived of it by the bungling of the O. P. A.

How can we expect anything else when we are told that our price roll-back on meats was the work of Edward Prichard, 27 years of age, a former aide to Justice Frankfurter. The United States News says that he is the "final word on many of the Nation's wage policies. He is supreme court on who can and who cannot get a raise." This subsidy plan that the Congress has turned down so many times we are informed is the work of one Richard Gilbert, and that he consults Mr. Prichard and one Mr. Cohen of the Corcoran-Cohen team. It is also said that Mr. Cohen is the adviser to Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Prichard and that this group work closely together.

Mr. Speaker, we know what Mr. Corcoran and Mr. Cohen have done to the people in legislation prepared by them and passed by the Congress in the early days of this administration. They are both young upstarts, they have no practical experience in any line of endeavor, and I take it that Gilbert's only practical experience has been a Government job, with his hands in the taxpayers' pockets for his sustenance. How can we expect any more than that which is happening today to bring on turmoil and strife on the home front when the policies are formed and all the orders regimenting the life of the American people are formulated by those with a background of those gentlemen I have named?

Mr. Speaker, if there is not a cleaning out of the personnel of a lot of these departments and some sensible recommendations made by the administration that the Congress can follow, how can the people of the country continue to bare their breasts on the home-front line so to give every aid to their sons who are on every battle front of the world?

The Growing of Food and Feed Should Not Be Restricted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have great confidence in the ability of Judge Marvin Jones to handle successfully the many food and feed problems which he now faces as a result of his appointment yesterday to the position of Director of War Food Administration; he has the needed experience and background to do this important job. However, it is my sincere belief that this country cannot feed its population and take care of its other far-reaching food and feed commitments as long as a program of restriction, particularly as the program relates to the small family size farmers, is in effect. The program of restriction of the efforts of farmers to produce feed and food not only precludes maximum production on the part of those farmers who remain on the farm, but such a program has been conducive to the exodus of many farmers from the farms to the cities where they seek, obtain, and engage in work other than farming. The plow of an unrestricted farmer is to successful agriculture what the fire of a free man is to successful military engagements. My contention is that no farmer—especially the small farmer—who will grow food and feed in this serious day of food and feed shortages should be deterred by restrictions on his efforts.

To one very important segment of our agricultural population not enough credit for producing food and feed has been given, in my opinion. I refer, of course, to our small family-size farmers. These families usually have several children in them. These children must be fed and they likewise constitute an effective farm labor supply if unhampered. When this type of farmer has fed his family, he has done a rather good job, but when given freedom to pursue his work to the fullest extent he will do much more. I can illustrate this by an example with which many of you are familiar. When one sees a large truckload of chicken coops filled with chickens headed for one of the larger cities, it is a mistake to assume that the chickens came from some one large chicken farm. The chickens came ordinarily not from one large poultry farm but from many small farms. The farmer himself or his wife sold the slight surplus of chickens found on the given farm to obtain money with which to buy cloth, coffee, kerosene, or some other necessary commodity needed for the home. What is true of chickens is true of every other commodity grown on our small farms—even cotton. How fallacious a policy it is to restrict our small

cotton farmers in the growing of cotton. If permitted to grow a little more of this, their money crop, they would do it without additional hired labor. They would, because of the money incentive, work a little harder. With the surplus money, if perchance there were a few surplus dollars in the farm home, the farm family, being highly patriotic, and in 99 cases out of 100, having one or more of its members in the armed forces, bonds and stamps would be bought or overdue financial obligations would be taken care of. We know there would be none of the money wasted. As I see it, there is or will be a genuine need for all the lint cotton and still more need—yes; a very immediate need—for all the products obtainable from cottonseed, for from cottonseed cow feed of several types and vegetable oil of a fine type are procured. Nothing of a nonutilizable nature comes from cotton.

It is obvious that the dangers of this unwise policy of restriction of farmers are being daily recognized. At this juncture I wish to include a short excerpt from an article which appeared in the Washington Post Sunday, June 27, 1943:

ALL-OUT FOOD OUTPUT MAPPED FOR NEXT YEAR

(By Ovid A. Martin)

Food Administrator Chester C. Davis is expected to announce soon the general outline of an all-out food-production program for 1944 removing virtually all acreage and marketing restrictions, even perhaps abolishing Agricultural Adjustment Administration allotments.

Few pieces of legislation have conferred on bureaucracy more complete and total power than that conferred by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act. In the name of conservation of one character or another, the authorities of the Department of Agriculture have felt they have the power to promulgate any type of regulation the theorists might contrive. We all are in favor of soil conservation and other types of conservation, but there is much difference in conservation and regimentation.

Lately I have been serving on the subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee investigating the effects and probable results of certain rules and regulations of the O. P. A. on businesses and businessmen. It is my candid opinion that the rules and regulations promulgated by the O. P. A. applicable to business are little more binding and restrictive, if any, than those under which the small family size farmers of our country have been compelled to work since the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

In a democracy it is a backward step to fix the economic status of a great number of people who are on the ground floor of our economic structure as are our small family size farmers. The American way is to give a man who is down a chance to get up. It is my firm belief our family size farmers work harder than, and have the least, of any other group in our society. As I have heretofore pointed out, according to the enclosed tables, in the case of the cotton farmers one-eighth of the cotton farmers receive approximately 50 percent of the income from cotton and the other seven-eighths of the cotton farmers receive the other 50 percent of the income. I submit such inequity is not conducive to good government and ultimately will not endure. The smaller farmers must unquestionably have a square deal.

The tables referred to follow:

TABLE III.—*Farms reporting cotton harvested—percent distribution of farms, acres harvested, quantity produced, and value of farm products; yield per acre; value of farm products per farm; and percentage of value of farm products; by States; census of 1940*

[All items are for 1939 from census of 1940 taken as of Apr. 1]

State and number of bales produced	Percent distribution of—								Yield per acre (bales of lint cotton)	Average value of farm products sold, traded, or used by households (dollars)	Percentage of total value of farm products in each bale group represented by value of—									
	Number of farms reporting cotton harvested		Acres of cotton harvested		Quantity produced (bales of lint cotton) [1]		Total value of farm products				Livestock and livestock products sold or traded					Crops sold or traded			Farm products used by farm households	Forest products sold
	Percentage	Cumulative percentage	Percentage	Cumulative percentage	Percentage	Cumulative percentage	Percentage	Cumulative percentage			All livestock and livestock products	Dairy products	Livestock	Poultry and poultry products	Other livestock products	All crops	Field crops	Other crops		
United States total [2]	100.0	------	100.0	------	100.0	------	100.0	------	0.5033	827	14.5	3.6	7.6	2.9	0.4	63.1	60.3	2.8	21.8	0.6
1 bale or less	14.7	------	5.0	------	1.6	------	7.5	------	.1646	423	15.3	3.7	7.1	4.0	.5	45.3	42.5	2.8	38.1	1.3
1½ to 2 bales	15.5	30.2	7.2	12.2	3.9	5.5	8.9	16.4	.2724	475	15.7	4.1	7.2	4.0	.4	47.1	44.2	2.9	36.1	1.1
2½ to 3 bales	12.9	43.1	7.5	19.7	5.1	10.6	8.2	24.6	.3407	527	15.6	4.1	7.1	4.0	.4	50.3	47.5	2.8	33.2	.9
3½ to 4 bales	10.6	53.7	7.2	26.9	5.7	16.3	7.5	32.1	.3952	578	15.0	3.9	6.9	3.8	.4	53.6	50.9	2.7	30.7	.7
4½ to 5 bales	8.3	62.0	6.4	33.3	5.6	21.9	6.4	38.5	.4404	631	14.3	3.7	6.5	3.7	.4	56.8	54.3	2.5	28.3	.6
5½ to 6 bales	6.6	68.6	5.8	39.1	5.4	27.3	5.5	44.0	.4696	689	13.9	3.6	6.4	3.5	.4	59.4	57.1	2.3	26.1	.6
6½ to 7 bales	5.0	73.6	4.8	43.9	4.7	32.0	4.5	48.5	.4940	755	13.7	3.5	6.5	3.3	.4	61.8	59.4	2.4	24.0	.5
7½ to 8 bales	4.6	78.2	4.8	48.7	5.0	37.0	4.5	53.0	.5264	813	13.6	3.5	6.8	3.0	.3	63.9	61.6	2.3	22.0	.5
8½ to 9 bales	3.1	81.3	3.6	52.3	3.9	40.9	3.3	56.3	.5386	880	13.5	3.8	6.4	3.0	.3	65.0	62.9	2.1	21.1	.4
9½ to 10 bales	3.2	84.5	3.9	56.2	4.4	45.3	3.6	59.9	.5593	941	13.2	3.4	6.8	2.7	.3	67.4	65.4	2.0	19.0	.4
10½ to 12½ bales	4.0	88.5	5.7	61.9	6.3	51.6	5.0	64.9	.5598	1,056	13.3	3.5	6.7	2.8	.3	68.4	66.4	2.0	17.9	.4
12½ to 15 bales	3.6	92.1	6.1	68.0	6.9	58.5	5.4	70.3	.5647	1,246	14.1	3.9	7.2	2.6	.4	69.8	67.7	2.1	15.8	.3
15½ to 20 bales	3.2	95.3	7.1	75.1	8.0	66.5	6.1	76.4	.5629	1,554	14.4	3.8	7.8	2.5	.3	71.9	69.3	2.6	13.3	.4
20½ to 25 bales	1.4	96.7	4.2	79.3	4.6	71.1	3.5	79.9	.5585	1,978	15.7	3.8	9.1	2.4	.4	72.8	69.9	2.9	11.3	.2
25½ to 30 bales	.9	97.6	3.0	82.3	3.4	74.5	2.5	82.4	.5665	2,419	16.4	3.8	10.1	2.0	.5	73.7	70.3	3.4	9.6	.3
30½ to 35 bales	.5	98.1	2.1	84.4	2.4	76.9	1.8	84.2	.5673	2,806	16.6	3.7	10.5	2.0	.4	74.4	71.2	3.2	8.7	.3
35½ to 40 bales	.4	98.5	1.9	86.3	2.1	79.0	1.6	85.8	.5782	3,198	15.9	3.7	10.1	1.7	.4	76.2	72.5	3.7	7.6	.3
40½ to 45 bales	.2	98.7	1.3	87.6	1.5	80.5	1.0	86.8	.5927	3,531	16.0	4.3	9.8	1.6	.3	76.3	73.4	2.9	7.3	.4
45½ to 50 bales	.2	98.9	1.2	88.8	1.4	81.9	1.0	87.8	.5938	3,905	15.6	3.5	10.4	1.4	.3	77.3	73.6	3.7	6.8	.3
50½ to 75 bales	.5	99.4	3.1	91.9	4.1	86.0	2.8	90.6	.6593	4,952	15.3	2.9	10.8	1.1	.5	78.9	75.2	3.7	5.6	.2
75½ to 100 bales	.2	99.6	1.8	93.7	2.6	88.6	1.8	92.4	.7241	6,994	13.9	2.9	9.9	.7	.4	81.4	76.9	4.5	4.5	.2
100½ to 125 bales	.1	99.7	1.1	94.8	1.6	90.2	1.1	93.5	.7760	8,803	13.9	2.6	10.3	.7	.3	82.3	79.2	3.1	3.6	.2
125½ to 150 bales	.1	99.8	.8	95.6	1.2	91.4	.8	94.3	.7860	10,254	12.6	1.9	10.0	.5	.2	83.8	81.4	2.4	3.5	.1
150½ to 200 bales	.1	99.9	1.0	96.6	1.7	93.1	1.1	95.4	.8563	12,913	9.9	1.5	8.0	.2	.2	87.0	82.3	4.7	2.8	.3
200½ to 300 bales	.1	100.0	1.1	97.7	1.9	95.0	1.3	96.7	.8947	19,638	11.7	2.3	8.8	.3	.3	85.8	77.0	8.8	2.3	.2
300½ to 400 bales	(3)	100.0	.6	98.3	1.2	96.2	.7	97.4	.9747	25,006	9.4	1.5	7.6	.1	.2	88.8	86.7	2.1	1.8	(3)
400½ to 500 bales	(3)	100.0	.4	98.7	.8	97.0	.5	97.9	.9712	30,675	8.2	1.7	6.2	.1	.2	90.1	88.8	1.3	1.7	(3)
Over 500 bales	(3)	100.0	1.3	100.0	3.0	100.0	2.1	100.0	1.1276	71,371	12.8	.9	9.1	.1	2.7	86.4	83.6	2.8	.7	.1

[1] Running bales of lint cotton, counting round as half bales.
[2] Does not include 17 cotton-growing farms in Aransas County, Tex., as data were insufficient for classification.
[3] Less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

Classification of cotton-growing farms, by number of bales produced, farms reporting, acres harvested, and bales of cotton produced, United States census of 1940 [1]

Number of bales produced per farm	Number of farms		Number of acres		Production of cotton		All farm products		Livestock and livestock products sold		Crops sold				Used by farm family		Forest products sold	
											Total		Cotton and cottonseed					
	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative	Actual	Cumulative
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
	Number	*Pct.*	*Acres*	*Pct.*	*Bales* [2]	*Pct.*	*Dollar.*	*Pct.*	*Dollars*	*Pct.*	*Dollars*	*Pct.*	*Dollars*	*Pct.*	*Dollars*	*Pct.*	*Dollars*	*Pct.*
1 bale or less	234, 108	14. 73	1, 130, 043	4. 95	186, 009	1. 62	99, 022, 208	7. 53	15, 117, 674	7. 95	44, 889, 934	5. 41	10, 096, 335	1. 62	37, 738, 767	13. 16	1, 275, 833	16. 84
1⅛ to 2	245, 715	30. 20	1, 650, 542	12. 19	449, 650	5. 54	116, 831, 872	16. 43	18, 300, 098	17. 61	55, 071, 880	12. 05	24, 406, 438	5. 54	42, 143, 201	27. 85	1, 225, 693	33. 03
2⅛ to 3	204, 459	43. 06	1, 704, 270	19. 67	580, 625	10. 60	107, 651, 072	24. 63	16, 763, 876	26. 42	54, 172, 300	18. 59	31, 515, 597	10. 60	35, 794, 257	40. 33	920, 639	45. 18
3⅛ to 4	169, 312	53. 71	1, 650, 555	26. 91	652, 374	16. 28	97, 887, 995	32. 08	14, 654, 087	34. 13	52, 458, 959	24. 91	35, 410, 043	16. 28	30, 061, 856	50. 81	713, 093	54. 60
4⅛ to 5	132, 751	62. 06	1, 465, 795	33. 34	645, 482	21. 90	83, 776, 308	38. 45	11, 932, 575	40. 40	47, 566, 337	30. 64	35, 035, 954	21. 90	23, 737, 889	59. 09	539, 507	61. 73
5⅛ to 6	104, 869	68. 66	1, 311, 552	39. 09	615, 892	27. 26	72, 287, 413	43. 95	10, 025, 834	45. 67	42, 974, 400	35. 82	33, 429, 845	27. 26	18, 866, 794	65. 67	420, 385	67. 28
6⅛ to 7	78, 834	73. 62	1, 097, 990	43. 90	542, 378	31. 98	59, 514, 808	48. 48	8, 168, 207	49. 97	36, 749, 727	40. 25	29, 439, 598	31. 98	14, 307, 745	70. 66	288, 629	71. 09
7⅛ to 8	73, 416	78. 24	1, 100, 254	48. 72	579, 177	37. 02	59, 688, 507	53. 02	8, 134, 726	54. 25	38, 120, 012	44. 84	31, 437, 001	37. 02	13, 121, 272	75. 24	312, 497	75. 22
8⅛ to 9	49, 899	81. 38	823, 732	52. 33	443, 692	40. 88	43, 887, 995	56. 36	5, 923, 971	57. 36	28, 559, 571	48. 28	24, 083, 045	40. 88	9, 239, 440	78. 46	165, 013	77. 40
9⅛ to 10	50, 617	84. 56	896, 084	56. 26	501, 188	45. 25	47, 621, 183	59. 98	6, 281, 484	60. 66	32, 106, 528	52. 15	27, 203, 856	45. 25	9, 049, 198	81. 62	183, 973	79. 83
10⅛ to 12½	62, 808	88. 51	1, 291, 792	61. 92	723, 135	51. 55	66, 295, 743	65. 02	8, 833, 129	65. 30	45, 328, 555	57. 61	39, 250, 861	51. 55	11, 873, 327	85. 76	260, 732	83. 27
12⅝ to 15	56, 577	92. 07	1, 398, 888	68. 05	790, 014	58. 43	70, 497, 709	70. 38	9, 902, 645	70. 51	49, 232, 277	63. 54	42, 880, 969	58. 43	11, 123, 853	89. 64	238, 994	86. 43
15⅛ to 20	51, 145	95. 29	1, 621, 658	75. 16	912, 886	66. 39	79, 478, 090	76. 43	11, 440, 571	76. 53	57, 136, 736	70. 43	49, 550, 307	66. 39	10, 611, 213	93. 34	289, 570	90. 25
20⅛ to 25	23, 054	96. 74	952, 291	79. 33	531, 816	71. 02	45, 610, 087	79. 90	7, 163, 770	80. 30	33, 206, 536	74. 43	28, 866, 306	71. 02	5, 130, 678	95. 13	109, 103	91. 69
25⅛ to 30	13, 814	97. 61	687, 674	82. 34	389, 583	74. 41	33, 414, 353	82. 44	5, 469, 355	83. 18	24, 630, 186	77. 40	21, 146, 077	74. 41	3, 204, 947	96. 25	109, 865	93. 14
30⅛ to 35	8, 214	98. 13	480, 931	84. 45	272, 815	76. 79	23, 047, 083	84. 19	3, 824, 311	85. 19	17, 147, 799	79. 47	14, 808, 056	76. 79	2, 005, 468	96. 95	69, 505	94. 06
35⅛ to 40	6, 356	98. 53	421, 691	86. 30	243, 810	78. 91	20, 326, 019	85. 74	3, 228, 222	86. 89	15, 482, 707	81. 34	13, 233, 701	78. 91	1, 543, 011	97. 49	72, 079	95. 01
40⅛ to 45	3, 886	98. 77	283, 556	87. 54	168, 077	80. 37	13, 723, 267	86. 78	2, 197, 500	88. 05	10, 466, 699	82. 60	9, 123, 009	80. 37	1, 002, 589	97. 84	56, 479	95. 76
45⅛ to 50	3, 381	98. 98	276, 226	88. 75	164, 021	81. 80	13, 201, 789	87. 78	2, 061, 821	89. 13	10, 199, 028	83. 83	8, 902, 854	81. 80	898, 762	98. 15	42, 178	96. 32
50⅛ to 75	7, 528	99. 45	713, 166	91. 88	470, 182	85. 90	37, 279, 066	90. 62	5, 717, 526	92. 14	29, 391, 535	87. 37	25, 520, 889	85. 90	2, 093, 809	98. 88	76, 196	97. 33
75⅛ to 100	3, 356	99. 66	412, 656	93. 69	298, 801	88. 50	23, 473, 207	92. 41	3, 275, 372	93. 86	19, 100, 133	89. 67	16, 218, 544	88. 50	1, 052, 643	99. 25	45, 059	97. 93
100⅛ to 125	1, 643	99. 76	213, 447	94. 76	188, 908	90. 15	14, 462, 526	93. 51	2, 005, 180	94. 91	11, 895, 618	91. 10	10, 253, 689	90. 15	526, 135	99. 43	35, 593	98. 40
125⅛ to 150	1, 010	99. 82	179, 562	95. 55	141, 139	91. 38	10, 356, 168	94. 30	1, 299, 959	95. 59	8, 678, 327	92. 15	7, 660, 848	91. 38	362, 835	99. 56	15, 047	98. 60
150⅛ to 200	1, 093	99. 89	226, 646	96. 54	194, 072	93. 07	14, 113, 768	95. 37	1, 405, 572	96. 33	12, 281, 599	93. 63	10, 533, 985	93. 07	390, 374	99. 70	36, 223	99. 08
200⅛ to 300	891	99. 95	249, 961	97. 64	223, 652	95. 02	17, 497, 422	96. 70	2, 046, 736	97. 41	15, 021, 513	95. 44	12, 139, 550	95. 02	394, 493	99. 84	34, 680	99. 54
300⅛ to 400	382	99. 97	139, 790	98. 25	136, 247	96. 21	9, 552, 305	97. 43	892, 343	97. 88	8, 485, 481	96. 46	7, 395, 316	96. 21	171, 061	99. 90	3, 420	99. 59
400⅛ to 500	204	99. 98	95, 657	98. 67	92, 905	97. 02	6, 257, 752	97. 91	510, 862	98. 15	5, 638, 928	97. 14	5, 042, 767	97. 02	105, 107	99. 94	2, 855	99. 63
Over 500 bales	385	100. 00	303, 429	100. 00	342, 160	100. 00	27, 477, 827	100. 00	3, 511, 990	100. 00	23, 751, 916	100. 00	18, 572, 016	100. 00	185, 794	100. 00	28, 127	100. 00
Total [3]	1, 589, 706	100. 00	22, 809, 870	100. 00	11, 480, 700	100. 00	1, 314, 233, 602	100. 00	190, 179, 896	100. 00	829, 745, 221	100. 00	623, 158, 000	100. 00	286, 736, 518	100. 00	7, 571, 967	100. 00

[1] All items are for 1939 from census of 1940 taken as of Apr. 1.
[2] Running bales of lint cotton counting round bales as half bales.
[3] Does not include 17 cotton-growing farms in Aransas County, Tex., as data were insufficient for classification.
Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from special tabulation of the Bureau of the Census.

Not Power, Not Pelf, But Purpose!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1918, the following address was delivered by a Mr. E. W. J. Hearty, who was in charge of perishable fruits and vegetables in the Food Administration under Mr. Hoover, in the First World War. The speech was delivered at Houston, Tex. At that time, as is so well known, our Food Administration had a single responsible head who realized the basic patriotism of productive America.

This speech, in the light of our present confusion, is so full of food for thought that I am having it reprinted in the RECORD at this time:

I was very much pleased to note from your program that your convention was to be essentially patriotic. Were I gifted with the ability to coin new phrases, I doubt if they would serve to kindle in you any new sparks of patriotism. Response to the inborn impulses within you has already developed a fervor which words of mine could not intensify; yet we must not pass over lightly that as individuals following our daily pursuits, we are apt in a crisis like this to temporarily forget what we owe to the citizens of the world, temporarily forget that war necessitates great sacrifices and unusual consideration of others. At such a time as this, institutions like yours serve us well in that they do not have the distraction of the individual, and are sure not to overlook the big and the fine things of life.

Self-denial and sacrifice for the benefit of others, due regard for life and health in the distribution of the products you handle, are the two things that should engage your daily thoughts and determine your course.

It is well within the range of probability that food will be the determining factor in winning this war. The United States Food Administration believes that the great international emergency problem confronting this country is to give to our Allies an adequate supply of nonperishable foods, our stores of which are not sufficient to give them what they need, and also to take care of our own normal consumption of them. It is imperative that we feed our soldiers in Europe, the soldiers of our Allies, and also contribtue to the civil population of Europe. What would be the effect on the morale of the fighting forces in Europe if they were underfed, with the added realization that their loved ones at home were suffering for lack of proper nourishment? Logically, therefore, the solution lies in America consuming less of the nonperishable foods, and more of the perishables of which there is greater relative supply.

As one of the important factors it is your duty to assist in this Nation-wide obligation. It is your duty to free the channels of distribution from needless motion. It is your duty to eliminate waste in the products themselves from inefficient handling and wasteful methods. It is your duty to protect the products that you handle into the homes of your own fellow citizens without creating hardship, without causing distress, and without provoking social unrest. The Food Administration asks you to do this, not gratuitously, but for compensation compatible with services rendered.

The creation of the Food Administration should stand in the history of all food-product industries as an important event in the relation of producer, distributor, and consumer. What will it mean? An over-reaching of one by the other, or an honest understanding based on good will and bound by good faith? The Food Administration stands as a big umpire. Rules and regulations have been created governing the gain of business. The Food Administration wants to be helpful to all industries, and does not want to do anything that will develop industrial structures.

This is evidenced through its appeal to the various trades for interpretation of trade problems, and further emphasized by its selection from industry's ranks of men who it believed were capable of handing the problems and situations as they arise. The attitude of the Food Administration toward the fruit and vegetable industry was reflected through a document which was published in all the trade papers, and which I believe every member of your organization has seen. That document was a public one, which could be defended by anyone at any time and at any place. It not only conveyed a message to you as distributors, but to producers and consumers as well. The message that document conveyed to you is, that the Food Administration understands your problems and recognizes that they are different from practically all other lines of business. It realizes the impracticability of fixing prices on perishable commodities or attempting to define what is a fair and reasonable profit on any individual transaction.

I do not have to tell you the various conditions that would militate against any other course than the broad one adopted by the

Food Administration; but the Food Administration does require that you aim to make only a reasonable profit on your year's business. The Food Administration grants the reasonableness of storing a season's requirements. To oppose such a means of conservation would be an economic tragedy. On the other hand the Food Administration will oppose with all of its might hoarding, manipulation, harmful speculation, wasteful and unfair practices. The message to the producer is that through its rules and regulations, he is afforded all protection within the power of the Administration to grant, on shipments that he might take on consignment, and what is more, the Food Administration seeks to keep the channels of trade open and unobstructed so that the producer may receive for his product the natural market. The message to the consumer is perhaps less understood by them than by all other classes, and is this not natural? The public has not the time to study the problems in their fullness, and I am sorry to say that some individuals are not inclined to do so. If I were to make one statement to the consumer and ask him to accept it as gospel truth, it would be that what is good for the producer, and good for the distributor, is good for him, and percontra, that which works a hardship on the producer and the distributor would be a mighty unfortunate condition for the consumer.

I sometimes feel like putting two hypothetical cases before the consumers. In one case, where the consumer pays a price that compensates the producer, what is the result? He is encouraged to continue production and even to plant a heavier acreage, all of which reacts to the benefit of the consumer, inasmuch as it more nearly insures a sufficient supply for his table. In the second case it would be a reversal of the first. The producers do not receive adequate compensation. All the patriotism in the world will not stimulate production at a loss, and what would be the result? It would mean the curtailing of the tree of production, and then what would face the country? The consumer would be staring into famine's face. What the Food Administration seeks is a union of forces. But it is desirable that all forces should have some understanding of the problems of production, distribution, and conservation. I am really very hopeful that the creation of the Food Administration will make a truer and more wholesome and clearer understanding between producers, distributors, and consumers. Distrust and suspicion should now find their graves. Strict obedience to the rules and regulations will bury distrust and suspicion quicker than any other method I know of.

I sometimes feel that if we could view all these problems that arise from the basis of economics that much of the cloud that sometimes envelops us would disappear. The accepted theory from time immemorial is that value depends entirely upon final utility. In other words, the only thing that gives rise to value is a concrete want for a commodity or service. Value attaches because of the presence of two things—demand and the limitation of supply. The ratio between the two makes the high and low price, and price, which is the measure of value, varies with the ratio between demand and the limitation of supply. This is true of labor as well as merchandise. As the demand for labor increases or the supply decreases, wages advance. If there is no work for labor to do, labor has no value. So, as demand rises, prices rise. But I might go even further and say that if there is no artificial interference with supply, supply also tends to expand. Man's unconquerable mind finds some way of meeting the demand, even if it is a substitute for the thing in demand. So supply spreads and instead of a shrinking we have a growth and expansion. Demand has a double power and a double function. It not only touches value, but it carries within itself a creative power, the power to call for supply as it goes along. Supply, or increased consumption, springs up to meet demand. I find I am getting into the fields of economics but to prove up what I have just said, have you not found in your experience that in instances where values have reached certain levels, supplies are forthcoming from sources that you little realized? And have not substitutes appeared to take the place of the article in demand?

As a concrete illustration, last year under the heavy demand for onions there was shipped from Spain 150,000,000 more pounds of onions than were imported the previous year, a striking illustration of what demand will do in calling forth supplies, and is it not also invariably true that increased production follows a season of high values?

I bring up all these points to bring out forcibly what I think we are all seeking, which is abundance, material expansion, and creation as opposed to scarcity, sterilization, and contraction.

Rights of the Foreign-Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of June 23, 1943:

RIGHTS OF THE FOREIGN-BORN

Seven million naturalized citizens of the United States are more secure in their rights, and the principles of the Constitution are more firmly established, because of a decision handed down this week by the United States Supreme Court. Dividing 5 to 3, the Court held that the naturalization of William Schneiderman, of California, could not be revoked because he was a member of the Communist Party when he became a citizen in 1927.

The law on revocation of citizenship says it may be taken away from a foreign-born citizen who attempts to overthrow the Government. That law was not even invoked. Instead, the Department of Justice attempted to convert the naturalization law itself into a sweeping denaturalization law by charging fraud and insincerity in Schneiderman's application for citizenship.

This fraud charge, based on the claim that he concealed his Communist beliefs from the naturalization officer, faded away when it was brought out that he had not been asked about them. That left the charge that the naturalization was invalid because Schneiderman belonged to a party which advocated the violent overthrow of the Government, such persons not being eligible to naturalization. Also, it was said, since he belonged to such a party he could not have sworn in good faith that he was "attached to the Constitution."

Justice Murphy replied for the Court that the platform of the Communist Party in 1927 could be interpreted either as advocating or opposing violent constitutional change, depending on remote and hypothetical future conditions. It was neither just nor lawful, he contended, to condemn a man without evidence that he supported a policy of violence, or that he had ever done anything which created "a clear and present danger" of it.

Justices Rutledge and Douglas, in a concurring opinion written by the former, emphasized the tremendous importance of this case to the general security or foreign-born citizens. Had the Court ruled that citizenship could be torn away from a man because of doctrines ascribed to political parties of which he was a member, there would be no limit to the excesses that might be perpetrated in periods of emotional unbalance. There is something grotesque, anyway, in this legal action against a man who has lived in the United States since he was 3 years old, and whose political activities would be unchallenged if he had been born 3 years later and therefore in America. Wendell Willkie performed a notable public service in twice arguing Schneiderman's case, without pay, before the Supreme Court.

Are We To Educate the Children for Future Rationing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter from the O. P. A. and a list of the staff of the Educational Service Branch, Department of Information of the O. P. A.

Dairy firms in Iowa have recently protested the O. P. A. educational program in regard to butter and oleomargarine. The O. P. A. has made enough senseless rulings without holding them to account for anything they did not do or are not doing. For that reason I include the following answer to my inquiry by Mr. George J. Burke, general counsel of the O. P. A., as well as the list of the staff of the Educational Branch:

JUNE 25, 1943.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURRAY: In reply to your letter of June 19, I have very carefully checked again and find that our Mr. Edward L. Sard has not made any speeches in Des Moines or elsewhere on the subject of oleomargarine or related topics. Your informants did not have correct information or Mr. Sard has been confused with someone else.

Permit me to say again as I did in my letter of June 9 that the Office of Price Administration has no program concerning the relative merits of butter and oleomargarine. Neither Mr. Sard or any other employee of the Office of Price Administration has ever been assigned or will be so assigned to teaching children the superiority of oleomargarine over butter.

I am attaching as per your request a list of the staff of the Educational Services Branch.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURKE,
General Counsel.

STAFF OF THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES BRANCH, DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Walter D. Cocking, chief of the branch, $6,500; James E. Mendenhall, principal research specialist, $5,600; Marcus Rosenbaum,

assistant research specialist, $3,800; Julia Teasley, junior research specialist, $2,600; Roy W. Morrison, principal higher educational specialist, $4,600; Clarence Schettler, associate higher educational specialist, $3,800; William B. Brown, head secondary educational specialist, $5,600; William H. Morris, secondary educational specialist, $3,800; Edward L. Sard, secondary educational specialist, $3,800; J. Cecil Parker, liaison officer, $5,600; J. Brewton Berry, principal adult educational specialist, $4,600.

The staff of this branch work with the 48 State departments of education, 122,000 school districts, 1,850 colleges, 28,000 secondary schools, 250,000 elementary schools, adult classes of many kinds. These various schools and colleges are taught by more than 1,000,000 teachers and enroll more than 30,000,000 students who come from homes in every neighborhood of America. The branch also works with National and State educational associations. The job of the branch is to assist in bringing about understanding of wartime price control and rationing.

Dannelly Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. GRANT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 1, the city of Montgomery, Ala., will dedicate its municipal airport and honor it with the name of Dannelly Field in memory of Ensign Clarence M. Dannelly, Jr., United States Navy.

This field will stand forever as a memorial to this intrepid young flyer who, even before his country entered this present conflict, had the vision to see this global catastrophe in its terrible, all-engulfing proportions and who courageously entered the Nation's service to be prepared to do his full duty when the call came. He lost his life while in service as a naval pilot.

Dannelly Field was sponsored by the Board of Revenue of Montgomery County, the City Commission of Montgomery, the Chamber of Commerce of Montgomery. The city of Montgomery possessed one of the finest municipal airports in the Nation at the time we entered the war, Gunter Field, named in honor of Montgomery's beloved long-time mayor. It was offered to the Government to be used as a training field. This offer was accepted and today Gunter Field is an important unit of the Southeastern Air Training Corps. This field, with Maxwell Field, which is headquarters for the Southeastern Air Corps, serves to make Montgomery one of the leading air training centers of the Nation.

When the city turned Gunter Field over to the Government, plans were made to establish another municipal airport, with the result that on July 1, Dannelly Field is being dedicated. No more appropriate name could have been selected for it than Dannelly Field Ensign Dannelly's father, Dr. Clarence M. Dannelly, is superintendent of the Montgomery city and county schools. His paternal grandfather, the late Dr. J. M. Dannelly, was a beloved Methodist minister.

What greater love can one have than to give his life for his country.

As I think of gallant Ensign Dannelly and the gift laid by him upon his country's sacred altar—his life—I am reminded of that lovely poem by Dr. George M. Maxwell, commemorating a similar sacrifice by another fine American youth, the doctor's son. So in tribute to Ensign Dannelly, I give you Dr. Maxwell's poem entitled "Our Sky Pilot":

They say that he's gone;
But I know that he swings
On up to God's throne
On his heavenly wings.
And I hear his clear call
To the station up there
To give him the beam
That his landing be fair.

They say that he's dead,
But I know that he's not,
For the words that he said
I have never forgot.
"If I crash in my plane
Do not sorrow for me,
For I'll fly on again
Through the heavens," said he.

"When you're crying down here
(Maybe doubting God's love),
I'll be laughing up there
In the heavens above;
And some day, when you come
In your plane, soon or late,
I'll be laughing up there
At the heavenly gate."

So I feel every night
As I look at the stars
That I see him in flight
Around Venus and Mars,
And on out into space
Through the Pleiades (seven),
With a smile on his face—
A sky pilot of heaven.

Avery and Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include excerpts from an editorial in the Washington Daily News, issue of Friday, June 25, 1943:

AVERY AND LEWIS

Sewell Avery, president of Montgomery Ward and chairman of United States Gypsum, seems determined to play the role of industry's John L. Lewis. He is again defying the War Labor Board.

The Board has ordered a Congress of Industrial Organizations maintenance of membership contract at Gypsum's plant in Warren, Ohio. Mr. Avery refuses. He contends that maintenance of membership is a long step toward the closed shop by Government compulsion, that the Board had no authority to order such a contract, that only Congress has constitutional power to impose anything of the kind. Other industrialists have raised the same objections, but the War Labor Board has undertaken to make maintenance of membership a wartime labor policy of the Government, and other industrialists have accepted it.

We think Mr. Avery is wrong—just as wrong as John L. Lewis. However, it seems to us, there is one distinction. There is a way to compel Mr. Avery's compliance with the Board's order. When maintenance of membership was ordered in a Montgomery Ward case, Mr. Avery finally complied—grudgingly, to be sure—after being twice commanded to do so by President Roosevelt. Presumably he will comply in the United States Gypsum case, if the President commands. Or, if he still refuses, the President can seize the gypsum plant and even, as War Labor Board member Morse has suggested, "put the company out of business, if that is necessary to protect the no-strike policy."

Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the grave and growing confusion created by jealous authority and blind partisanship, it is necessary for each and every one of us to redefine our responsibilities and rededicate our energies to the single-minded conception of our task—the welfare of the Nation and the winning of the war. I call the earnest attention of Congress to the leading editorial in the New York Times of June 29, because I consider this editorial an admirable statement of the dilemma and a sound clarification of our duty in resolving it:

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

The lightning vote by which Congress overrode the President's veto of the antistrike bill last week was merely the culmination of a congressional rebellion against the President's domestic policies. It had been preceded, all within recent months, by a vote to nullify the President's $25,000 salary limitation, a vote for a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan originally opposed by the President, a vote for a bill to force senatorial approval of minor as well as major officials, a vote to cut the appropriations for the domestic branch of the Office of War Information, as well as to eliminate entirely several administration agencies, and by votes to prevent the administration from carrying out its food roll-back subsidies.

A few short-sighted persons, long opponents of the President and his domestic policies, have greeted this situation with transports of joy. But thoughtful Americans, even if they strongly disapprove some of the President's policies, can hardly be happy about it. It cannot be a matter of rejoicing to any patriotic man if the President of the United States is "put in a hole." For he is not only the Commander in Chief in wartime but he remains also the Chief Executive on the home front. No one else can be the Executive in his place. If he cannot act, the Government cannot act. If he is in a hole, so far as the ability to put domestic policies into effect is concerned, then the whole country is in a hole.

But this is only one horn of the dilemma that now confronts us. The second is one to which some of the bitter-end supporters of the President are as blind as those who

welcome his embarrassment are to the first. They talk as if the sole duty and function of Congress was to act as a Presidential rubber stamp. They denounce Congress for every failure to see eye-to-eye with the President, for every refusal to do exactly as he suggests. Some of the labor leaders, for example, have been reckless in their discussions of Congress. Philip Murray, the head of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, denounces the vote of Congress overriding the President's veto as a "treacherous sneak attack upon the administration." This is to treat an explicit constitutional right of Congress as if its exercise were not merely illegal but equivalent to sabotage. This is to talk as if Congress were a self-constituted body, instead of the direct representatives of the people. This is to forget that part of the Senate and the whole of the House was elected less than 8 months ago, and that its mandate from the people is 2 years fresher than that of the President. This is to ignore, above all, that the public itself—by the overwhelming majority of 81 percent, according to the most recent Gallup survey—has been in favor of banning strikes in all war industries. What is treacherous, what is sneak, about Congress' action?

We seem to be confronted here with an insoluble dilemma. Under our constitutional system of division of powers the President cannot force Congress to adopt a policy that he considers vital. Congress, on its side, can prevent the President from doing what he wishes but cannot make him do what it wishes. Congress can pass a law, but cannot compel the Executive to put it into effect in the manner in which Congress thinks it should be. The President, for example, has the power of making the Connally-Smith antistrike law seem better or worse than it is by the manner in which he enforces it. Congress can pass a law saying that the President must appoint a food administrator with such-and-such powers; but it cannot force him to appoint a good, a strong, or an independent administrator. Congress can block an administration policy, good or bad, by voting against one element of it. But in exchange for preventing the President from having his way, Congress also furnishes him with an alibi. Thus administration spokesmen are already saying that if Congress kills the roll-back subsidies they cannot enforce any effective price control. Under such conditions it becomes impossible for the public to fix responsibility for the situation which results.

The grave possibility that we now face is a country divided between blind partisans of Congress and blind partisans of the President. Those who boast that Congress is now "in the saddle" forgot that Congress can block plans but cannot execute plans. It cannot exercise executive power. It is not even remotely organized to do so. Blind partisans of Congress forgot that in wartime, when prompt action is vital, executive power must necessarily be enlarged. The blind partisans of the President, on the other hand, including many organs of the left, deprecate any independence whatever on the part of Congress. They seem to think that the President should be treated as a dictator, with the right to act without consulting Congress; or that, what is the same thing, it is the duty of Congress to approve everything he proposes.

In a parliamentary government of the British type, the kind of stalemate, the kind of dilemma, that seems to confront America today could not exist. A Prime Minister like Mr. Churchill has great executive powers; but he must submit major policies to Parliament. Parliament must either accept or reject those policies. If it rejects a major policy, one of two things must happen. Either the Prime Minister must resign, in which case Parliament can then proceed to choose an executive to carry out its wishes; or the Prime Minister can dissolve Parliament and force it to go before the country for a new election, to decide whether the people themselves support the policy of the parliamentary majority or the policy of the Prime Minister.

Each of these outcomes has already occurred among our allies who have the parliamentary system. Because he did not get a sufficient vote of confidence, Mr. Chamberlain was forced to resign in May, 1940, at the very height of England's peril. As a result of a vote of confidence a few days ago, in which Prime Minister Curtin of Australia was supported by a margin of only one vote, he has announced that he will seek dissolution of the Australian Parliament, probably this week, and submit the issue of confidence to the country in a general election in August.

It is obvious that under a system of this sort the executive and the legislature cannot remain long at loggerheads. The resolution of differences of opinion between them need very seldom be resolved by the ultimate dramatic alternative of resignation or dissolution. The mere fact that these reciprocal weapons exist keeps executive and legislature in agreement. If these weapons had existed in our own case, the President would not have been so cavalier in his disregard of the opinion of Congress on leading issues. Congress, on its side, would not have opposed the President's labor or subsidy policies without considering, first, whether it thought enough of the President's record as a whole to be willing to accept with it some policies that it would otherwise object to. Both Congress and the President, in short, would have had weapons to force each other toward agreement on every point not considered vital enough to risk their political futures on.

The very absence of such a system under our Constitution requires a greater self-restraint and a greater self-imposed responsibility on the part of both the President and Congress if we are to avert a stalemate or a bitter domestic struggle in the midst of the greatest war in our history. The President must take Congress (or at least a group of its recognized leaders) much more into his confidence than he has in the past. He must constantly aim to secure its advice and consent. His domestic policies must be the result of consultation and compromise. Congress, on its side, cannot continue wantonly to kick over the traces. It cannot afford an attitude that is merely negative. It must invite Executive initiative on leading issues. It must compromise wherever compromise is reasonably possible. Finally, it must reorganize itself internally if it is to have any coherent or unified policy to propose to the President when it cannot accept a policy proposed by him.

Both the President and Congress, in brief, must put aside mere partisanship and political maneuver and rise to the unparalleled responsibilities of the present crisis. Such a course is the only alternative to a political tragedy of incalculable dimensions.

Prevention of Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Reporter, of Independence, Kans., entitled "A Salute to Congress." This editorial expresses approval of the action of the Congress in passing the Connally-Smith antistrike bill over the President's veto.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO CONGRESS

An aroused, indignant Congress, surfeited with the continuous knee bending by the Executive to unpatriotic labor leaderships and responsive to the insistent demands of an overwhelming majority of the people, rallied to the cause of American democracy yesterday.

In a surge of patriotic fervor it courageously overrode the President's veto of the Connally-Smith bill to outlaw Government-operated war plant strikes and put a damper on strikes in all war industries.

By this forthright action Congress demonstrated that the will of the people is stronger than the will of one man, and sent a heartening message to the boys on all the battle fronts who are facing machine guns or torpedoes in defense of liberty for ourselves and the nations of the world that we have not forgotten them.

A grateful nation salutes its national representatives for this lift which it has given to the people's will to victory.

Fear Expressed Nationalization of Coal Industry Is Contemplated; Secretary Ickes Denies Plan; Representative Randolph States View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, according to news stories, Secretary Ickes told the House Ways and Means Committee yesterday that the Federal Government has "no desire and no plans for the nationalization" of the coal industry. He further stated that it was hoped the mines could be returned to private ownership as quickly as possible.

In connection with this controversy, I set forth my feeling on this subject, as contained in a letter replying to a telegram from coal operator James D. Francis. This correspondence follows:

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *June 22, 1943.*

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,

House Office Building:

Papers indicate movement on part of Ickes to permanently take over the coal industry for the duration of the war. As you know, no industry has done a better job in the war effort than the coal industry. It has cooperated with the Government 100 percent in every direction. The Government has not had to either finance or subsidize this industry. It is not to blame for failure to have wage agreement. It acted within the rules set out by the Government. I hope you and group of your associates who are interested in private enterprise will do everything possible to see that the coal industry is not shackled and destroyed as a result of its effort. Our

State is a key State, and you and your associates from this State can do a tremendous amount with Congressmen from other States to protect not only the coal industry but protect America's supply of coal by preventing it from getting in the same position American railroads were in during the First World War. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

JAMES D. FRANCIS.

JUNE 25, 1943.

Mr. JAMES D. FRANCIS,
President, Island Creek Coal Co.,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR MR. FRANCIS: I appreciate your telegram of June 22. I am in agreement with you that the Federal Government should not attempt, under the impact of war, to take over the coal mines. This, in my considered opinion, would be another wedge driven into the philosophy which is held by some persons that we should have nationalization of the industry. It would be just as sensible to say that our petroleum business should be taken over by Federal officials, and it would follow that soon the mineral resources of this Nation would be a part of the over-all plans for governmental operation and control.

It is difficult to ascertain just what is contemplated by Secretary Ickes in connection with his statement on policy. I am fearful that there may be a real threat to private industry if certain developments are allowed to go unchallenged. I can assure you of my interest in this matter and of my opposition to policy of Government ownership.

Corrective action must be forthcoming to prevent the strangling of private enterprise in the United States. We cannot tolerate a permanent saddling of unwarranted bureaucracy and unnecessary regimentation of legitimate and patriotic business. Under guise of an emergency we must ever be alert against the invasion by Government of the rightful field of private enterprise. Americans do not subscribe to the theory of socialized and corporate government.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Marvin Jones

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time for the purpose of paying a brief tribute to our former colleague and my esteemed friend, Hon. Marvin Jones. It has been my pleasure to have been closely associated with this distinguished gentleman since I came to Congress in 1934. He was at that time chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture to which committee I was assigned as a humble member.

I know of no man in America who is better qualified to discharge the complex duties of the job of War Food Administrator than our friend and former colleague. Very few men in the public life of America have had the well-rounded experience that Marvin Jones has had. He served for a great number of years as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch of the Government. He served here with great distinction and he left here with a splendid record. While serving as a Member of this House he was appointed to a judgeship and immediately entered upon the discharge of his duties as a member of the Court of Claims, and upon the bench he has served with great dignity and great learning. Even before he came to Congress, back in the horse-and-buggy days, he was one of the superior court judges of the State of Texas. By background, education, training, and experience he is extraordinarily well qualified for the position to which he was on yesterday appointed. Everyone who knows him, and certainly all of us know him well, knows that he is basically and fundamentally sound. He was a just and a fearless judge. His background is founded in American agriculture. He loves the good earth and those who till the soil and, with his great and wide experience, his grand character and true integrity, and with loyalty and devotion to the ideals of this Republic, he will do a splendid job in his present assignment.

Marvin Jones was a soldier in the last World War and he is no less a soldier today. He knows the life of the buck private in the United States Army, for he served as a buck private during the last war. He knows the hardships and the problems of being a good soldier. I believe that I am safe in saying that no man in America has done more to make the farm homes of our country a healthier and a happier place in which to live than the new War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones.

He has initiated and sponsored more valuable farm legislation than any man living in America today and the farmers of America never had a truer friend. He was born on a farm and he was once, himself, a tenant farmer. He knows what it is to dig a living out of dirt. He learned his lessons in the fields of toil and he learned them well. He knows the problems of the cotton farmer and of the wheat farmer and of the cattle farmer, and of the farmers of every section of this country. For more than a quarter of a century he has devoted his time and his talents to the problems of agriculture. I know of no man in America who is more devoted to American agriculture than Marvin Jones. If the Congress and the country do not have faith and confidence in the ability and in the integrity of Marvin Jones, pray tell me where on God's earth could the President find a better man?

Agriculture has not in America a more loyal friend or a more gallant champion than Marvin Jones. Had I been charged with the responsibility of appointing a War Food Administrator in this emergency I would have on yesterday named Marvin Jones. He may not be able to discharge the duties of his new position in a manner which will be acceptable and satisfying to all of the people but, certainly, no one who knows him will question the sincerity of his purpose. I congratulate the President and I extend to the new War Food Administrator my best and cordial good wishes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Korean Cherry Trees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I introduced a resolution to change the name of the so-called Japanese cherry trees in this city to that of Korean cherry trees on the grounds that these trees originated in Korea.

In support of that contention I am inserting the address of Dr. Syngman Rhee, chairman of the Korean commission here in Washington, delivered at the American University on April 8, 1943, during the celebration commemorating the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Korean Republic.

The address follows:

Dr. Douglass, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, on behalf of the people of Korea, whom you are honoring today, I wish to thank Dr. Douglass, the president of American University, for the privilege he has accorded me by inviting me to be present and to plant these Korean cherry trees.

This historic occasion to me and the 23,000,000 Koreans who are my fellow countrymen will forever coincide with another anniversary enshrined in the hearts of Koreans.

For it was 24 years ago at this time that the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea, born of the blood of patriots in our March 1919 revolution against the Japanese, came into being. That Government still endures. It is the oldest government-in-exile in the world. It functions now in the wartime capital of China, the bombed and battered but unbeaten city of Chungking. And from Chungking, as well as other parts of China, have gone tens of thousands of Korean men to fight side by side with the Chinese and to help in the defeat of the scourge of Asia—the Japanese.

We have seen, since December 7 of 1941, the spread of the scourge of Asia. Your fellow nation-to-be, the Philippines, has fallen within that cancerous area. So, too, have the proud outposts of the British Empire in Malaya and elsewhere. So, too, have the fabulous Dutch East Indies. So, too, has North American soil—the island of Kiska in the Alaskan Aleutians

I do not wish to say in any recriminatory way that we Koreans—the first victims of Japan's insane march of conquest—told you so, but we did.

And these very cherry trees today represent, in some measure, our efforts to warn you of the beast of the Pacific and his designs on civilization. For years, you have called them Japanese cherry trees. We knew they originated in our country. We knew, like many another treasure robbed from us by the Japanese, they were our rightful property. And when Pearl Harbor happened, a group of our American friends—the members of the Korean-American Council—asked if they might use the proof we had.

The proof of the origin of these trees may be found in the great Japanese encyclopaedia. Our American friends submitted this proof to the Secretary of the Interior. That gentlemen, in turn, submitted it to a recognized horticultural society, and that society—after having accepted silently for some 30 years the name Japanese cherry trees—solemnly considered our evidence * * *

evidence from the great Japanese encyclopaedia that these very trees had originated in Korea.

The society then thought it might take action. It did. It produced a new name. Americans now are supposed to call these Oriental flowering cherry trees.

My dear friends, this would be trivial were it not symptomatic of the manner in which Japanese propaganda influences continue in this great country. You do not know the Jap. We Koreans do. Our murdered men, our raped women, our mistreated children, call out to us.

Will you forgive me, when I turn the first spadeful of dirt for the planting of these Korean cherry trees, if I say: "Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again." I thank you.

The Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram and my reply thereto:

JUNE 24, 1943.

To United States Senators and Representatives from the Midwest States, Washington, D. C.:

At a conference of Midwest farm bureaus, meeting in Chicago today, the following resolution was adopted: Immediate and positive action is required to meet the critical food problem in this country. In order to avert disaster on the food front, it is our considered opinion that all necessary authority over the food problem must be centered in one individual. A clear-cut, understandable and effective food policy in this country now is an indispensable factor, without which the war cannot be won. We therefore urgently recommend that all control over production and distribution of food, including pricing and rationing policies, be given our capable and courageous food administrator, Chester C. Davis. Continuation of the present muddled food policy will jeopardize the food supply and will incur the just condemnation, not only of farmers but of all patriotic Americans.

CONFERENCE OF MIDWEST FARM BUREAUS OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION.

JUNE 28, 1943.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This is in acknowledgment of your telegram of June 24, and I presume that the Farm Bureau Federation is promoting its own interests, and is seeking to have men placed in charge of agriculture who are friendly to it.

While I feel that it is the duty of everyone, including organizations to safeguard and protect their respective interests, it is to be regretted that you and other leaders of agricultural organizations refuse to see or take into consideration the position of the consumer and, especially, the 21,000,000 of those persons whose wages or salaries have not been increasing, notwithstanding that the prices of agricultural products have been increased in the last 3 years alone by 110 percent.

Very truly yours,

ADOLPH J. SABATH.

The Part the Farm Women of Iowa Are Taking in the Food-Production Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in the Columbus Gazette, published at Columbus Junction, Iowa, Thursday, June 17, 1943, there appeared an article written by one of the outstanding farm women of my congressional district, Mrs. Marie Wheeler Cornic, of Morning Sun, Iowa. In this article Mrs. Cornic very clearly and effectively describes the part the farm women of Iowa are taking in our great food-production program. I know that the Members of Congress will appreciate having an opportunity to read this splendid description, and to learn or to add to their information of the great spirit of cooperation, sacrifice, and service of the farm women of America. Mrs. Cornic's article follows:

YOURS TRULY

(By a Louisa Farm Woman, Marie Wheeler Cornic, of Morning Sun, Iowa)

There were a couple of weeds in the garden last week and I stopped to pull them and missed the mailman. It beats all how 1 hour of sunshine will give you courage anew and how extremely low you go with every morning shower. There are just seven acres of beans left to plant here at Green Pastures and said ground has been prepared three times but the beans are still in the sack.

The alfalfa needs cutting, part of the corn has been plowed and the potatoes need spraying The truck patch needs a thorough working and we want to put in a patch of late potatoes and sweet corn this week. The new strawberry bed is yelling for help and the brooder house should be moved—Dad enumerated those all for me at the breakfast table this morning as if I didn't know them as well as he did. I refrained from mentioning my jobs, but they would double that list.

But the housework can go when the crops need attention and any farm woman I know worth a fig will agree with me. Our immediate job at all times is to produce what is needed. There have been times when there was little needed here at home or for world trade. Now everything we can raise will be used and even more than we can raise could be used. We have taken off the brakes and are stepping on the gas. The results are not in the hands of farmers.

Yet, with our best efforts and the hardest kind of work, there are plenty who sit in air-cooled offices and who have never been nearer to a farm than an air-conditioned train or a car, that will condemn us, our farm program, and everything else in general. How thoroughly I would enjoy putting one of them on a tractor at 5:30 in the morning and keeping him there until 8:30 at night. Time off for meals. Chores before and after.

As our greatest teacher said: "Forgive them, they know not what they do." Neither do they understand or know. They know nothing about our ever-normal granary above the soil or the granary we have built up below the soil by conservation. They little stop to think that it was that reserve of grains ready to convert into much-needed meat, milk, and eggs that make possible the feeding of our Nation and Army today. They little consider that the farm program was farsighted enough to go into high gear on hog production almost a whole year before Pearl Harbor. Could be the farmers looked at the sky and foretold a storm.

They yelled about our idle acres. Little did they think that they were being rested, built up, had they not been they could never have produced the record-breaking crops that we have been producing the past 5 years.

They said much about us plowing under crops. Don't they know that from such death comes life? And maybe it's high time we plowed under some of their loose talk about our farm program. The farm program can adjust for more or less and does so as we need it. Just like any other factory, what is the use of producing when there is no market? When we have that market we'll try, God willing, to meet it.

They need to know too that we farmers are planning for tomorrow. We are taking into consideration the kind of farms our youngsters are going to have 50 years from now. We have a forward looking aspect on the whole thing. We are striving for security through a sensibly planned conservation program—the pity that I can't say this to such people's faces rather than scribbling away on paper.

Notice that our paper says Louisa is low on junk. As you ride along the road, or poke around alleys, or are on various farms, look! I just ask you to look. We've got it but in our rush with other things we haven't really got to the junk. It might pay us farmers to give a little thought to it these rainy mornings or we may not have any new farm machinery next year. We can't fool ourselves—no scrap to the mills of our country means no new machinery, and how we do need a hay loader.

I have made it my duty to save the little pigs this year. So far I have five that are going good. It's a worth-while job when you consider what every pig raised to marketing age means in the way of saved feed and food for the world. Figure say that a farrowed dead pig means the loss of 140 pounds of feed, if he dies at weaning time add on 120 pounds more, and if he dies at say 4 months add on another 100 pounds. There goes 360 pounds of feed—and no hog to show for it. They are messy things to care for but once started not half the work that chickens are.

I see a little blue sky in the west. Good. Perchance by noon I can mow the yard, work in the garden, and trim the shrubbery.

That A Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me I am inserting two editorials—one from the Hartford Courant of June 23 and the other from the Hartford Times of June 22, both dealing with the A gasoline ration.

Last Friday I conferred with representatives of the O. P. A. and P. A. W., and I have been assured that they will hand down a decision, not later than next Wednesday, on the question of using A gasoline rationing for one vacation trip. For the life of me I cannot

see why a citizen should not be allowed to decide just how, when, and where he will use his one and one-third gallons of gasoline per week that is now available to him, as a holder of an A book.

A reasonable liberalization of the O. P. A.'s restriction will help a lot toward improving the morale of the thousands of citizens who are upset because of the recent restrictive regulations.

The editorials follow:

[From the Hartford Courant of June 23, 1943]

THAT A GASOLINE RATION

Secretary Ickes, who among many other things is Petroleum Administrator for War, informs the Governors' Conference that the East can expect "only essential requirements of petroleum products for the duration of the war." If the East were assured of having all its essential requirements met, the situation would not be too bad.

The Washington authorities differ widely among themselves as to what is and what is not essential. They rule one way today and another tomorrow. They reduce the value of the basic A ration from 6 gallons to 4, to 3 and finally on a weekly basis to what they call a gallon and a half, although actually it figures out a gallon and a third. Then they undertake to restrict the use that may be made of that limited quantity, as if any restriction were needed beyond what the amount itself provides. When they talk about "pleasure driving" in such circumstances they simply talk nonsense. Yet the Office of Price Administration sends its snoopers about to report all who seem not to be observing the edicts of the bureaucrats. Such violations as are found pertain chiefly to those who have been granted supplemental B and C rations for occupational driving, but the A drivers are also picked up.

Whatever course may seem to be required toward the B's and the C's, the A's should be left free to use what little gasoline they are allowed in any way they see fit. If they want to save their gallon and a third a week until they have accumulated enough for some special purpose, such in Connecticut as driving to the shore, that should be their privilege and they should not be molested in their exercise of it. This is beginning to dawn on Prentiss M. Brown, the high factotum of the Office of Price Administration, who has announced that he expects to review the order banning use of gasoline to and from summer cottages. If he finally sees the folly of telling the rationed consumer—and we are now talking about the A's exclusively—how he shall use his pitiably small allotment he will remove a source of wholly unnecessary irritation.

It contributes nothing to the winning of the war to grant everyone a basic gasoline ration and then lay down hard, fast, and even idiotic rules governing its use. There is no getting away from the fact that the individual feels that this gasoline, however little the quantity may be, is his, that its ownership has passed to him, and that it is no longer the business of Government to say what he may or may not do with it. The general resentment at this Office of Price Administration ban on pleasure driving, as applied to the A's is well expressed in a letter we have just received from one of our readers. From it we quote:

"Few Americans are so blind as not to see that the tyrannies of the 'new order' are put over on them in the name of patriotism. Step by step the people are persuaded to give up their little freedoms to be patriotic. The technique seems to be as well understood by our bureaucrats as by Hitler, but it doesn't inspire anybody to fight Hitler.

"I have a son piloting a torpedo bomber off the Pacific coast. I have another son who is a torpedo man on a destroyer on the African convoy route. I have a daughter who is wife of an Army flyer in Texas. I have another daughter employed in the Philadelphia Navy Yard. I want to back up those kids, but I resent being told that I can do it by giving up free use of the last gallon and a half a week. And strange to say, they resent it too.

"Everyone knows that somebody has blundered. A lot of somebodies have blundered in gasoline distribution. We know we are asked to pay for their blunders with the last gallon and a half of our gas."

Does Mr. Ickes, does Mr. Brown, does anyone else in a seat of authority at Washington suppose that the wirter of that letter is not just as patriotic as any one of them; is not just as desirous of winning the war in the shortest possible time as the best of them? His patriotism actually seems to go deeper than theirs. It is the kind of patriotism that finds expression in our Declaration of Independence. Without the continued maintenance of that independence a victory over Hitler and the other dictators will prove pretty empty. There is little use in fighting for liberty and freedom on the battlefronts only to lose it on the home front.

[From the Hartford Times of June 22, 1943]

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION POLICY IS WRONG

There is good reason for the indignation which so many autoists are expressing with reference to the Office of Price Administration's procedure regarding pleasure driving. Holders of A cards, in particular, forbidden to do any so-called pleasure driving, loudly complain, and rightly, against what verges on a campaign of petty persecution.

The A card holder is the average citizen, a decent person whose sons are in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and who is buying War bonds. He wants the war to be ended in the quickest possible time. He is willing to make any sacrifice to that end. If his Government were to say flatly that the demands of the American forces overseas are such that absolutely no gasoline can be spared for civilian use at home, other than to provide for transportation of men and materials to keep the stream of war supplies moving toward the scenes of fighting, he would be willing to let his car stay in the garage until the end of the war.

But his Government does not say that. It does not declare there is no gasoline to be had by the average citizen. It lets him buy an average of 1½ gallons a week. Few are the cars that can make more than 30 miles an a gallon and a half. Little is the pleasure driving the A card holder can indulge in. For the Office of Price Administration to insist that the A card holder shall not go to his cottage at the shore, shall not make use of his property in the hills, except to make repairs or to close it, is a ridiculous and unnecessary bureaucratic interference with the inalienable rights of Americans to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence.

Not 1 gallon of gasoline which the Government wants will be diverted from military use if the Office of Price Administration were to forget its silly drive against A card holders. Few indeed are the A card holders who have any coupons left for use before July 22. Why persecute those who save their coupons, legitimately, to use on trips to the shore or country? In the case of the A card holder the Office of Price Administration antipleasure driving crusade is not intelligent.

If holders of B and C cards (who also have basic A cards) can be convicted of misusing their B and C rations, that is a different matter. Gasoline allotted for driving between homes and war plants should be used only for that purpose. Human nature being what it is, there may be need to check B and C holders' use of their rations. But there is not the slightest justification of denying the A card holder the privilege—yes, the right—to use his pitifully small allowance as he sees fit.

Chester Davis

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, back in the early thirties I met Chester Davis for the first time in an agricultural convention in Chicago. I liked him then, and I like him yet. He is sympathetic to the agricultural interests of the country. He is just as good an executive as I know of in the Government anywhere. He understands the food situation. He has resigned because it was his job to do an impossible thing at the direction of the Chief Executive. I have a very high regard for Marvin Jones, but feel sorry for him, because he, too, is going to be sacrificed on the altar of the New Deal. I think Mr. Davis was showing good sportsmanship in not walking out on the President when he found that the program he was expected to put across was not only impossible but impracticable, and, what is more, the country did not want it.

I feel sure that the President owed him the courtesy of permitting him to come to the White House and discuss the matter as he had requested. After all, Mr. Davis had served long and well and did enjoy a great deal of confidence throughout the country, and knew that subsidies were being opposed by farm organizations and individual farmers throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I know of no one individual who wants food subsidy. Mr. Davis recognized clearly the fact that the food situation was becoming more serious daily, and was very fearful that the crops produced this year were going to be short of our needs. He also knew that so far as producing was concerned there was nothing that could be done to boost it during the present season, that we would have to do with the crops planted and the harvest we are going to reap, which, at this moment, are not too promising. It was this information which prompted him recently to declare that unless we save every scrap of our food we are likely to get hungry before another crop season comes around.

I recently outlined to the House the many agencies dealing with the food program. It appears to me that the President by this time should see clearly that there is only one way to handle our food problem and that is to accept the program laid down by Herbert Hoover, who knows more about it and how it should be handled than any other one man in America.

It is just too bad that so far this season there has been so much waste in gathering the crops which have matured because the administration would not heed the advice of farm leaders who understand this problem, if anyone does.

Robbing Peter To Pay Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley, from the Wall Street Journal of June 28, 1943:

ROBBING PETER TO PAY PAUL—THE PRESIDENT WOULD PUNISH THE WORKERS FOR WHAT HE SAYS IS THE UNION LEADERS' OFFENSE

(By Raymond Moley)

If the President intended his work-or-be-drafted policy to be a substitute for the anti-strike legislation, he overlooked a number of essential differences. Or did he?

The threat to draft men who strike is not an attack on the union which starts the trouble. The President's proposal bypasses the union. It is a proposal to attack individual strikers. It does not contemplate putting the heads and employees of unions in the Army. Lewis, to take a conspicuous example, will not be subject to the draft because he has not quit work. He is working long hours every day as a union leader. The President's statement says the action of the "leaders" of the mine workers has been intolerable. But then it goes on to threaten not the leaders, but the men.

That brings us to another inconsistency in the President's plan. The workers have not promised individually not to strike. So far as this reporter knows, they made no such personal pledge. Green, Murray and the leaders made that promise. So the President would crack down on individuals for doing something they have not promised to refrain from doing, while he does nothing whatever to those who did make the promise. Apparently he does not want Congress to hold those leaders responsible either, whether for their promises or for anything else.

The President's proposal, as many have pointed out, would permit him to use the power to draft for something quite unlike its original purpose. It makes punitive something which the Government has said is an honor. It is no tribute to military service.

But more ominous still, if the power should be given to the President in terms that would allow him to discriminate in drafting without reference to an organized body of which the offenders are members (and it goes without saying that the draft properly cannot take note of men's union memberships), the granted power would be almost limitless. He might use it for all sorts of purposes beyond coercing striking mine workers. Certainly, that would be said if Congress tried to give him power over the leaders under such a plan. Any attempt to translate his scheme into legislation might even give him the power to draft all kinds of offenders against his own notions of what is essential to the war effort, such as critics and dissenters generally.

Under Government operation, the Government will presumably take the union dues from workers' pay envelopes and give them to the leaders. Thus, after saying that the leaders, not the miners, are to blame, the Government takes the miners' money and gives it to the leaders. This is merely a further extension of the absurd predicament into which the Government has got itself.

Obviously, the President is determined to do anything except to recognize that the unions themselves, as distinguished from their dues-paying members, should be held responsible for their acts. Apparently, he is willing, for example, to have the union leaders take the dues money which the Government takes from the men and gives to the union contributed by the leaders to political campaigns—even his own. What kind of self-government is that? It would mean that the beneficiaries of governmental power exact tribute from workers, pass it through the union treasury, and then use it to elect themselves to office.

More Meat—More Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my campaign to raise the ration of meat for the miners of Butte, I am inserting in the RECORD more communications from my constituents. To date I have received in excess of 5,000 letters and cards from Butte on this subject. More meat—more copper. Truer words were never spoken or written. These soldiers of production are entitled to every consideration and the least we can do is supply them with the energy to produce:

DEAR MIKE: Suggest every employee of the people—that is, officeholders and their aides—give up their meat allowance so that the miners can get enough energy to continue digging out the copper for the war effort.

BILL HAKALA.

More meat for more copper.

Mrs. E. J. GILBERT,
Butte, Mont.

The Butte miners are fully behind their Government. Let's have more meat ration, because, after all, they need guts, too.

JOE KANE,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEAR SIR: Do we need more meat? Yes; we have to do real labor ir these mines, as you know. Can't do it on hay.

J. H. JACOBSON.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We must and should have more meat to produce the vital metals so urgently needed on the home front.

A miner from Butte.

MATT FLANICK,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 19, 1943.*

MR. MANSFIELD: This card is a request that you use your utmost influence to obtain additional meat supplies for the miners and other working people of this community. This is very vital.

Yours very truly,

J. J. MCNAMARA,
Justice of the Peace,
Courthouse, Butte, Mont.

GENTLEMEN: For a speedy victory give the miners more meat.

MRS. J. BOYLE,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT.

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your help in obtaining more meat for the Butte miners will be greatly appreciated by me.

Yours truly,

MAYME KELLY.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The meat situation in Butte is serious and has a tendency to undermine morale of miners. I trust some relief will be possible.

CHAS. W. GARDNER,
Butte, Mont.

MEADEVILLE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The miners are our first line of defense. Without the metals they produce, war effort would be useless. The present allowance is not substantial for such hard workers.

Sincerely,

FRED BUTORI.

BUTTE MONT., *June 17, 1943.*

DEAR MIKE: We need more meat for the miners of Butte. We are counting on your help to get it for them.

Yours ever,

GLENN D. MYERS.

DEAR SIR: I have two sons working in the mines, and it sure hurts me when after a hard day's work they come home and I haven't the meat or enough of it to feed them. Please can we have more meat for our men?

MRS. ELIZABETH PAJNICH.

BUTTE, MONT.

Butte miners can't work without meat to produce copper. We've got to have more meat or we can't work steady. Four thousand feet underground is hard work.

JACK L. HEINZ.

WALKERVILLE, MONT.

DEAR MIKE: If any worker in the world is entitled to a meat diet it is the miners in the hot mines in Butte.

Sincerely yours,

J. J. HARRINGTON.

BUTTE, MONT.

DEAR MIKE: Please add my endorsement to the "more meat for production workers of Butte" campaign. I do appreciate your past effort but urge you to demand insistently that heed be given to this appeal.

W. J. MCMAHON.

BUTTE, MONT.

SIR: Do your utmost in the matter of getnig more meat to the men who go down into the mines. To them it is a vital necessity.

Yours very truly,

MRS. EVELYN M. BALKOVETZ.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

Linnea Lodge, No. 174, Order of Vasa, is lending her wholehearted support to "more meat for miners" campaign, and we sincerely hope something may be done to give us more points or more meat for points.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. ANNA T. JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

BUTTE, MONT., *June 22, 1943.*

Please use whatever influence you command to get enough meat for underground workers in Butte.

Yours truly,

MILAN FOLJAN.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 24, 1943.*

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: My husband is a miner and has been working for the Anaconda Copper Mine 27 years. Don't you think that the miners should have more meat? Please try and see what you can do for us. Thank you.

MRS. GEORGE MIKICH.

Please do all you can to obtain more meat for copper miners.

CATHERINE DONOVAN,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a white-collar worker, asking nothing for himself, I appreciate what you are doing in trying to secure more meat for our miners, and feel that you will need no urging to continue your efforts.

Yours truly,

P. J. DRISCOLL.

More meat for the miners of Butte, Mont.

MRS. S. SHEEHAN.

JUNE 22, 1943.

DEAR MIKE: Now is the time to do something for the miners. The Government needs more rock in the box and the miners need more meat in the solar plexis. Their cause is just and it should prevail. Best regards.

Yours truly,

HARLOW PEASE,
Butte, Mont.

We need more meat.

JOE LYNCH,
Butte, Mont

Get more meat for the Butte copper miners.

EMIL HERMANSON,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 18, 1943.*

Please help the miners to get more meat. They need it to be able to produce more copper.

Respectfully,

MRS. EMMA TONKIN.

Keep him working. The miner must have more meat.

J. J. TANSEY,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT.

I believe that any man working in the copper mines not only needs, but is entitled to, more meat.

FRED HARVEY.

BUTTE, MONT.

I want more meat.

GLEN BARDEEL.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 18, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our country needs copper for victory and must have it. Our miners want to get it out of our mines as loyal citizens should. All of us on the home front want them to work hard to this end. They must have meat for strength to enable them to produce this much needed metal. Our miners need more meat. Please see that they get it.

Yours respectfully,

HENRY F. PISSOT.

BUTTE, MONT.

DEAR FRIEND MIKE: Would gladly appreciate if you could get us Butte miners more meat rationing.

EDWARD TYVI.

BUTTE, MONT.

Get more meat for copper miners for more copper production.

ROSE M. BROZOVICH.

BUTTE, MONT.

More meat for copper miners for production.

MRS. TOM GERGURICH.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 18, 1943.*

DEAR MIKE: Please do all you can toward getting a larger allotment of meat for the copper producing miner of Montana.

The best of luck to you and success in this especially.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MR. and MRS. ARTHUR RASOR.

MEADERVILLE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The miners are entitled to same amount of meat as our soldier boys as they are the first line of defense. No war can be won without the miners' production.

Sincerely,

TONY SUTEY.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 22, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: Being an ex-miner yourself you should realize that peanut butter and jelly sandwiches do not stick to a miner's ribs. Therefore I wish you would do all in your power to get the miners more meat.

MRS. JOHN HARRINGTON.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 23, 1943.*

DEAR MIKE: Keep up the good work. We heartily endorse the movement for increased meat for our miners. Good luck, good health, and kindest personal regards.

BILL RILEY.

BUTTE, MONT.

Please lend your efforts in helping to secure more meat for the Butte miners.

TOM CONNELLY.

DEAR SIR: It is necessary that the miners have more meat. If we are expected to do the work that is asked of us here in the mines. And copper is sure needed these days.

ROY E. MCKINNEY,
A Copper Miner.

JUNE 23, 1943.

DEAR MIKE: We want extra meat for the miners, please.

HELEN AND TOM TOBIN.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 24, 1943.*

DEAR MIKE: With my fellow townsmen I am writing this note to ask you to do all in your power to effect some change in the meat rationing regulations as they affect Butte and Silver Bow County.

Help our war workers maintain production. Enough meat is the answer and the only answer.

D. F. MCGONIGLE.

MEADERVILLE, BUTTE, MONT, *June 22, 1943.*

Hon. CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD:

Miners slowing down on production, visibly, undoubtedly due to lack of meat. Urge you to do your best in procuring more meat for the miners. Thanks.

Your constituent,

AL GIECEK,
Member, Editorial Staff, Miners' Voice.

BUTTE, MONT.

More meat for the Butte miners.

H. SCANNELL.

DEAR MIKE: I hope that you will do all in your power to secure more meat for the miners in Butte.

This is a worthy request, as the miners must have meat in order to mine the copper which is essential to win this war.

Yours truly,

WILL TIDDY,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, *June 18, 1943.*

A Government man can get along on a light diet, but digging out copper is a man's job, and he needs plenty of meat.

SAM COCKELL,
Butte, Mont.

BUTTE, MONT.

MR. CONGRESSMAN: My husband is a miner and there's just the two of us, which allows us only 32 points a week. That doesn't allow us enough meat for meals and his lunches, too, besides butter and such things we need. There aren't many substitutes that can be put in a pail for meat. I think the miners should be given more points for meat.

MRS. CHARLES MCFARLAND.

The work is heavy and hot.

SIDNEY A. DONEY.

MR. MANSFIELD: Miners need more meat in order to produce more copper.

TED CAVANAUGH,
Butte, Mont.

DEAR SIR: I think that the miners here in Butte should be entitled to more meat. I have fed many a miner and I know only too well what they can eat after a hard day's work.

Mrs. B. MCNULTY.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 19, 1943.*

HONORABLE SIR: Kindly accept this as a plea for more meat for miners in the Butte district to further the war effort.

MR. AND MRS. RICHARD STODDEN.

BUTTE, MONT., *June 19, 1943.*

Congressman MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: Please consider our Butte miners. We all know how necessary meat is to a copper producer. More meat for the Butte miners.

Very truly yours,

MARY E. MICHELOTTE.

I am a miner in the Butte mines, and I need more meat.

LORENZO ROLANDO,
Meaderville.

Auto Use Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the A. A. A. Club of New Jersey presents a timely and just appeal in the telegram below. Those who have been denied the use of their cars for almost every purpose are at a loss to understand the imposition of a new use tax at this time.

TRENTON, N. J., *June 28, 1943.*

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge the adoption of joint congressional resolution extending validity of present $5

Federal auto use stamp by 4 to 6 months, or until gasoline situation permits greater car use. Current Federal use stamp expires June 30. Therefore quick action necessary if car owners now limited by restriction are to receive benefit of this measure. We urge your support of this resolution.

A. A. A. AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF NEW JERSEY,
K. D. SULLIVAN, *Secretary.*

Floods in War and in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered before the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., Monday, June 28, 1943, as follows:

Floods have harassed man in all ages and in all countries in both war and peace. The Chinese found it necessary to control the floods along the great rivers of the Celestial Empire from the earliest times. The records of floods in China extend over a period of 4,000 years. The levees along Chinese rivers were first constructed while Europe was still a wilderness. Some of China's greatest legendary heroes are her engineers. One of them is Li Ping. A beautiful temple has been erected to his memory. There is inscribd in letters of gold at the entrance of the temple his command: "Dig the bed deep and keep the banks low."

As civilization in all countries advanced, man attempted to improve and control rivers. Sometimes he undertook to control the ravages of disastrous floods by keeping the high waters within the banks and between the levees supplementing the banks. Again he utilized diversions and constructed floodways. At other times he stored the excess waters in rainy seasons for use in times of scarcity. Dams were constructed to detain the flood waters to prevent the overflow of the valleys.

Floods are not more frequent than formerly. There were floods long before De Soto discovered the Mississippi, and long before the Ohio Valley was settled. Deforestation has little to do with the frequency of floods. Soil erosion has been going on through the ages; it is responsible for the alluvial valleys of the United States.

Rivers and seas are among nature's best contributions to the progress of man. But man must supplement nature. Impediments to navigation must be removed. Canals must be constructed, channels must be deepened, harbors must be kept open, and barriers must be removed. Transportation by water is the cheapest form of transportation, and the denser the population the greater the need for cheap transportation.

Rivers have always contributed to the advancement of mankind. The lack of navigable rivers has hindered the development of many countries. Cities in ancient and modern times located along the great rivers have grown and prospered. What would London be without the Thames? What would New York be without the Hudson? What would St. Louis be without the Mississippi? While rivers are among nature's greatest contributions, they must be improved, they must be controlled.

"And the waters prevailed and increased greatly upon the earth; and the Ark went upon the face of the waters."

In this passage from the Book of Genesis we have the oldest record of the relationship of floods and navigation.

I know of no history that does not deal much with rivers. I know of no legend or fable that does not include rivers. There is a charm and majesty about rivers. As the ocean awes with its resistless power, so the river thrills and delights. The river is the most human and the most companionable of all inanimate objects; it has a voice of its own; it is full of good fellowship and of delightful companionship. It can be friendly and helpful or it can be threatening and destructive; it can be gay or it can be grave.

A drop of water could tell a wonderful story. It has made the long journey from the river to the ocean millions and millions of times. It has been lifted by the blazing sun from the sea or gulf, carried by wind and storm across the plains, the hills, the valleys, and the mountains to fall as rain or snow and to join other billions of drops of water to form the little brook that ultimately finds its way into the great river that flows ever onward to the sea.

In his attempt to improve and control rivers, what can man do about them? He cannot prevent floods, but he can control them. He cannot prevent, nor can he change the amount of rainfall, but he can alter the rate at which it will run off. He cannot prevent or change the amount of snowfall, but he can delay the snow by dense foliage and by other means from reaching the ground, and he can hinder the snow when it has reached the ground from being converted into rapid run-off. He can check the ravages of disastrous floods by keeping high waters within the banks and between levees supplementing the banks. He can hold back the rains and the snows by dams along the tributaries of the headwaters. He can detain the floods by larger dams below the headwaters. He can supplement the levees by diversions and floodways. He can straighten the channels and thus hasten the discharge.

Flood control prevents rivers from being destructive enemies and makes them useful friends. It is only a few years ago that flood control was adopted as a national policy by the United States. The first act was passed in 1936. It was followed by the acts of 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1941.

All of the principal rivers of the United States have been surveyed and studied by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Reports have been submitted to Congress. Levees, flood walls, and reservoirs have been constructed in all of the principal river basins of the country. Local protective works along the Connecticut and reservoirs along the tributaries of the Connecticut have been constructed in New England. Flood walls have been constructed along the Ohio, and reservoirs along the tributaries of the Ohio. The levees along the lower Mississippi River are the strongest, highest, and most massive earth structures ever constructed in any country. Authorized flood control works have been constructed by the Corps of Engineers from New England to California and from Seattle to Jacksonville. No country in the world has made more rapid progress in the control of floods than the United States.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

There is a reason for the unparalleled progress in flood control in the United States. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is entitled to the credit. Congress authorizes no projects unless recommended by the Corps of Engineers. No projects are recommended unless the benefits exceed the costs of the improvements. Both theory and experience are essential in the construction of the works. The highest type of engineering is required. The improvements must be sound. They must be justified. All of the Flood Control Acts provide that the planning and the execution of flood control and river and harbor projects is the function of, and shall be under the supervision of, the Corps of Engineers. By common consent, they are the most accomplished flood-control engineers in the world.

ESSENTIAL IN WAR

Flood control is essential in peace; it is more essential in war. River transportation is important in peace. It is more important in war. Inland waterways are needed in peace. With coastal and coastwise traffic eliminated by the submarines, they are imperative in war. The English, Russians, and Germans utilized their rivers in peace, but they are utilizing them more in war. The more fierce the war, the more widespread the use of inland waterways. The great battles between the Russians and the Germans have been fought along the rivers of Russia. We should profit by the example of the English, the Russians and the Germans. We should remember that during the First World War it was necessary for the United States to use everything that would float, as has been said, from a bateau to a battleship. Ships are important, barges are necessary, but improved waterways are fundamental. Flood control and navigation are as essential to the war in the New World as they are in the Old World.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1941

A sound program of national flood control requires annual authorizations and appropriations The fall of France in 1940 and the necessity for national defense delayed and prevented the consideration and passage of a flood-control bill. However, after exhaustive hearings the Flood Control Act of August 19, 1941, authorizing approximately $275,000,000, in addition to previous authorizations, was passed. This act is outstanding among the flood-control acts. It authorizes projects in all the principal drainage basins of the United States It provides for multiple use projects, especially in Arkansas and along the Missouri River. The policy adopted in 1936 was continued and expanded. Only projects that had been carefully studied and favorably reported by the Chief of Engineers were included in the bill.

THE FLOODS OF 1943

On the home front 1943 will be remembered for excessive floods along the Wabash and the Sangamon Rivers and for record floods along the Illinois River. There have been two maximum and successive floods along the Arkansas River One of them was a record flood. There have been three successive floods along the Missouri, one of them being a record flood. There has been a record flood in the upper Mississippi, the flood heights at St. Louis were only about 2 feet lower than the previous record gage. Large areas have been inundated. Many deaths have occurred. The Corps of Engineers estimate that along the Wabash, the Illinois, the Sangamon, the Arkansas, the White, the St. Francis, the Missouri, and the Upper Mississippi Rivers approximately 9,029,000 acres were inundated with estimated damages aggregating $96,234,000 in the floods of 1943. Sixty-two deaths were reported. Food and feed crops were destroyed. The floods came later than usual, and replanting is hazardous.

FLOOD-CONTROL HEARINGS

The Committee on Flood Control during the present month conducted exhaustive hearings for 2 weeks. The program was to provide for emergency authorizations for the repair and restoration of flood-control works damaged or threatened by the floods of 1943 and to report a bill to provide for additional flood-control works for post-war construction on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the Flood Control Act of August 19, 1941.

Congress has previously adopted in the major flood control acts of 1936, 1938, and 1941 projects on which favorable reports have been submitted but authorized only a part of the funds required for the construction of the projects. Additional authorizations to provide for projects previously approved are planned in the flood control act under consideration for post-war construction.

The Committee on Flood Control has reported favorably an allocation of $10,000,000 to provide for emergency repair and restoration work necessary as a result of the damages of the floods of 1943. The committee plans to report later a bill to provide for flood-control works in all the principal basins of the United States so that there may be available sound projects to protect the lives and property of the people of the United States from disastrous floods following the conclusion of the war.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

The total authorizations for general flood control amount to about $930,400,000. There have been appropriated for construction a total of $526,300,000. In order to complete the works already under construction or definitely planned for construction, additional appropriations will be required in the amount of about $243,000,000. The appropriations to date plus those required to complete the present construction program amount to about $770,000,000. This would leave an apparent backlog of projects yet to be considered amounting to $160,000,000.

These amounts are based largely upon prewar estimates. It is probable that the amounts to complete the present program after the war will be increased. The estimates do not contain full allowance for the cost of suspending work on many projects in accordance with the recent War Production Board stop order.

The total cost of projects which have been authorized by Congress but which have not yet received any appropriations for construction amounts to $288,000,000. It will be noted that this amount exceeds the backlog of $160,000,000. This is due to the fact that our present construction program includes projects falling within the comprehensive basin plans for which only partial money authorizations have been provided. As I have indicated, the authorizations for those basins will have to be increased in order to provide for the completion of those particular projects.

In addition to the authorizations and appropriations for general flood control, Congress has appropriated for the lower Mississippi Valley, including the St. Francis and the Yazoo, approximately $472,153,424 under the acts of 1928, 1936, and 1938.

While there was devastation along the upper Mississippi River and tributaries, the floodwaters moved placidly from Cairo to the Gulf. Old Man River has been harnessed by the Army engineers. Massive levees, floodways, and cut-offs enabled the floods of 1943 to be carried along the lower Mississippi River with a stage slightly in excess of flood stage. Cut-offs have shortened the river by a distance of 137 miles. Diversions have been eliminated. Flood heights as a result of cut-offs have been reduced some 10 feet at Arkansas City, 8 feet at Greenville, and 5 feet at Vicksburg. The project flood, which is 25 percent in excess of the flood of 1927, has been provided for.

If enough dirt is put into levees they can be made safe. Levees can be made as strong as Fort Peck Dam or the Gatun Dam in the Panama Canal. Levees for flood control are feasible if they are strong, constructed of proper material, and high and broad enough. They are the most economical and efficient means of flood protection. Soils are to be taken into consideration. Berms are to be constructed. Foundations are to be made secure.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

It is evident that many important projects for which comprehensive plans have been approved by Congress cannot be constructed without additional authorizations. Other important measures recommended by the Chief of Engineers cannot be begun. Appropriations for new works for general flood control have not been made for the next fiscal year. Such appropriations should be renewed at the earliest practicable opportunity. Often projects must be constructed consecutively. Works should be coordinated and they should be prosecuted at reasonable rates to prevent damages and to prevent calamities and overflows. Reservoirs require long periods to construct Authorizations should be made in advance. Benefits do not accrue until the reservoirs are completed. It took 6 years to build Fort Peck Dam. Projects should be initiated years ahead of expected completion, and authorizations should be made early, as delays in construction due to high waters make river improvements slow.

The demand for electric power in the war effort is growing. Authorizations for reservoirs for multiple purposes are in order. While I believe in multiple-purpose reservoirs, it must always be kept in mind that full reservoirs are essential for the generation of power and that empty reservoirs are imperative for the storing of flood waters.

The floods of 1943 have demonstrated that the Corps of Engineers are sound in their recommendation to the Congress of the United States that ample provision must be made for flood control before additional provision is made for the generation of power in multiple-purpose reservoirs. The people must not be deceived. They have relied for flood protection as a result of the construction of dams and reservoirs, but when such dams and reservoirs are used entirely for power, there is no space for the storage of flood waters when the floods come. It must be kept in mind always that dams unless made high and large enough for power and for flood control are incompatible.

THE WAR EFFORT

Destructive floods can easily jeopardize the war effort. They can halt industrial production by shutting down power plants, by crippling railroads, by destroying highways, and by interrupting communications.

Food is essential in war. The United States is being called upon to feed and clothe the Allied Nations. It has become apparent as a result of the floods of 1943 that food and feed can be destroyed by floods and that the war effort can be hindered by destructive floods. Floods not only jeopardize communications and war plants, but they jeopardize the bread-basket of the Nation. A partial overflow may not only interrupt postal services and interstate commerce, but it may seriously reduce the production of feed and food. The Mississippi River divides the continent. Economy will be promoted and great floods prevented and controlled by the immediate completion of the adopted projects in the lower Mississippi River and by the completion of the adopted projects along the upper Mississippi and tributaries. Authorizations therefore must be followed by appropriations in war, for projects what are essential to the prosecution of the war.

MULTIPLE-USE PROJECTS

Plans for controlling devastating flood waters should wherever practicable provide for their use and for their conservation for the benefit of the people. Water is probably the most valuable of natural resources. It should not be polluted. It should be conserved and not wasted. Power should be generated where practicable in connection with flood control. Multiple-purpose dams wherever feasible, and with adequate flood storage, should be constructed. Both firm and secondary power are needed and should be generated. Water power is not only valuable, but it contributes to needed public improvements that might not otherwise be constructed for flood control, navigation and irrigation. The best possible multiple-use projects should be authorized now so that they can be prosecuted in an orderly manner to meet urgent needs for flood control, irrigation, and navigation and to satisfy the growing demands for electric power.

NAVIGATION

The Mississippi River and its tributaries have been carrying during the war more freight than ever before in their history. Gasoline, oils, and sulphur are transported to industrial centers in the Chicago area, the Ohio Valley, and the Pittsburgh district. Steel and coal are shipped from the Pittsburgh and Kentucky areas. It is estimated, however, that the Mississippi River will carry less tonnage in 1943 than in 1942. I trust that the greatest of all navigable rivers will be utilized more and more during the war.

An ever increasing number of vessels which are being constructed on the Great Lakes for war use are traversing the Lower Mississippi River, and shipments from the Port of New Orleans are increasing in importance in the national war effort. Coastal and intercoastal waterways have been almost eliminated by the menace of submarines during the war. Navigation on the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Missouri Rivers thus assumes a more important part in the war effort. Railways and highways are being overtaxed. Greater use should be made of navigable inland waterways in war transportation.

BACKLOG

We recall the depression following World War No. 1. We are apprehensive of another debacle following the present World War. It is difficult to arm; it is more difficult to disarm. Post-war employment will be a major national problem. While we are defending our freedom and our way of life, we must not fail to take stock of the problem of full employment which we must face again when the war is over.

We must profit by the experience of 1920, and we must profit by the experience of 1930. A reservoir of projects should be adopted. Backlogs should be provided, and they should be real backlogs. Many wasteful and extravagant activities to provide employment were adopted in 1933. Haste and speed were imperative. There was hunger in the land. Unemployment was widespread. There must be no repetition of waste and extravagance. There are Federal activities and there are public works that will promote the general welfare. Flood control is among the most satisfactory of public works. I know it is essential to win the war before we win the peace, but we must plan for peace and the problems of peace as we win the war. I shall therefore continue to advocate flood-control authorizations to increase the backlog of sound projects and to enlarge the reservoir of useful public works following the World War.

After all, the real problems of war never come until the war is over. Peace is really more difficult than war. Jobs must be provided for those now in the armed forces. Sound planning and scientific research are involved. Only worthy and sound projects should be promoted. Post-war planning must not be too theoretical. It must not be extravagant; it must be practical; it must provide for public works where the benefits exceed the cost. I know of no more satisfactory public works for the peace that must follow the war than flood-control improvements.

REDUCED EXPENDITURES

We are at war. I favor the reduction of nondefense expenditures. I advocate the curtailment of the normal expenditures of the Government, but I maintain that flood-con-

trol works which are vital to national defense or to the production of food and feed cannot be eliminated. I assert that improvements imperatively needed to control floods that interrupt communications and disrupt transportation, delay the manufacture of munitions, interfere with the manufacture of war materials, and destroy food and feed crops should be completed not only as a matter of economy but to aid in providing the supplies and equipment urgently needed for the prosecution of the war.

I know that war comes first. I am for all-out war. While generally flood-control works and other public improvements must stand aside to provide for the war effort, there are flood-control projects that are essential to the war effort. These projects are entitled to priorities.

I have advocated the abolition of depression agencies, including the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Work Projects Administration. I have insisted upon the elimination of all social experiments. I have advocated the reduction of all appropriations not essential to the prosecution of the war. I have insisted upon the reduction of Federal employees heretofore engaged in nonessential activities. I have advocated taxes and more taxes. I have urged the support of war measures. I have insisted from the beginning that it is impossible to win the war on a 40-hour week. I have urged a suspension of the 40-hour week for the duration. I have opposed the war profiteer and the labor racketeer. I have resented the administration coddling labor while using the whip and spur upon the farmers of the country. I have supported legislation for the liberalization of the National Labor Relations Act to provide for better cooperation between employers and employees. I have opposed profiteering in labor and in industry. I have insisted that there must be no strikes in war plants and munition plants.

Following Pearl Harbor I was among those who congratulated the representatives of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations upon their promise that there would be no strikes for the duration. I have repeatedly condemned strikes in violation of the solemn pledge of the labor organizations. One jurisdictional strike has followed another. The situation has gone from bad to worse. Production is being delayed. As a result of one coal strike after another the manufacture of steel that is imperative for war has been halted. It is easy to denounce. The time for name calling has passed. We have had enough of coddling. We have had enough of shadow boxing. It is time for a showdown.

The Smith-Connally bill is intended to prevent strikes in defense plants and to prohibit strikes in plants taken over for operation by the Government. I believe in collective bargaining. I believe in the rights of labor. We might as well face the issue. When the coal miners' strike was called and the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, took over the operation of the coal mines, John L. Lewis contemptuously and insultingly said to the American people, "Now, we will bargain with our new employer, the United States of America." What is the issue involved? It transcends the rights of labor. The issue is the right to strike against the flag. The issue is the right to strike against the Government of the United States.

If men are to be drafted to go overseas, if men are to be conscripted to die for their country, I know of no good reason why labor should not be drafted if necessary. I know of no good reason why capital should not be drafted if necessary. Man is more important than property. We are either for our Government or against our Government.

When the Smith-Connally bill was before the House the president of the American Federation of Labor threatened to defeat Members of Congress if they voted for the bill. It is time for dictatorial labor leaders who demand that Members of Congress vote as they are ordered, or else, to be emphatically rebuked. It is time for the Congress of the United States to pass, and for the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy to enforce, legislation that will prevent dictatorial labor leaders from promoting or calling strikes in war plants and from aiding or abetting strikes in any plants under the operation of the Government.

It is said that the proper solution of our labor problems is voluntary cooperation, but labor has heretofore admitted that voluntary cooperation was ineffective. The labor organizations appealed to Congress to enact labor legislation. Labor itself abandoned voluntary cooperation in asking for the passage of the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. If statutes are necessary and essential to protect labor in its rights, statutes are essential to restrict and to prevent strikes in war plants during the war. It is time for action. It is time to either work or fight.

SACRIFICES

The people are willing to make sacrifices. They know they cannot do business as usual. They know that increased powers in the executive department of the Government are essential in the war. They are willing to be taxed and taxed to the bone, but they resent unnecessary burdens that are imposed upon citizens in business, often by those who are theorists without any practical business or commercial experience. We are fighting for freedom. We are not slaves. The people knew there was no reason for the multiplied questionnaires and reports with respect to rationing. They were glad when Congress curtailed such activities.

The problems of war are difficult. Selfishness crops out. It is often evident. Tried and true leaders are essential in executive places. It is imperative that the people have confidence in those who are vested with war powers. The people know that increased powers in the hands of a good and a great man make him humble, but they know that such powers in the hands of a little man lead to impositions. Vast powers in a Robert E. Lee or a U. S. Grant inspire them to serve, to fight, to sacrifice, to deny, and not merely to rule. While dictatorial powers are essential to the prosecution of the war, the people resent little dictators in Washington. They resent autocratic bureaucracy. While being taxed and while they are being called upon to deny, while they are asked to buy bonds, the people insist that the normal functions of government be not impaired. They insist that waste and extravagance be eliminated. They bitterly resent the policy of the Administration in coddling special groups, whether they be labor groups or social planners. They insist that America be saved before America is reformed.

The people know that they live in the greatest hour in history. These are greater days and greater nights than when Washington with his ragged men was at Valley Forge. Washington had courage. Lincoln had courage. Washington and Lincoln both had faith, but life today is greater. The world will never forget the Torpedo Squadron Eight which destroyed the Jap carrier at Midway. War always means sacrifie. The people are willing to cooperate. They are willing to endure. They want their sacrifices to count. They are asking that only the true and tried leadership of the Nation be placed in charge of the vast war powers in all of the departments in Washington. War means crises. Every crisis means an opportunity. The people need faith and they need thrift. So does the Government. It was faith and thrift that built America. America can only be rebuilt with faith and thrift. Faith has sailed the uncharted seas. Only faith can rebuild what war has destroyed.

MORALE

Morale is essential on the battle front. It is equally essential on the home front. We have evidences every day of the heroism of our soldiers on land, of our sailors on the seas, and of our men in the air. There is morale on the battle front, but morale on the home front is essential to sustain morale on the battle front. The boys in the hellholes of Guadalcanal, on the burning sands or in the mudholes of Africa are not howling and complaining of the sacrifices they are called upon to make. They are not continually complaining and grouching. They are not salting down everybody who will listen to them with their tears and with their complaints What about the morale of the home front? Often it is the fathers, sometimes it is the mothers and sisters, who speak by the hour about the mistakes of the Army and the Navy and about the mismanagement of the war effort at Washington. The boys at the front are not grouching. The tragic part of it is that the people who complain without cause do not realize the harm they are doing. Optimism is essential on the battle front. It is essential on the home front. Pessimism on either front is just as catching as the measles, and when it becomes an epidemic it is as fatal as any plague. It is just as patriotic for women to be cheerful as it is for them to knit sweaters. It is just as patriotic for fathers not to be selfish, not to complain without cause, as it is for their sons to fight on the battle fronts. It is equally as important for men and for women not only to endure, but to cooperate and to be unselfish. It is time for all to deny and to sacrifice.

EMERGENCY WAR FLOOD CONTROL APPROPRIATIONS

As I have indicated, no appropriations are being made for general flood control for the next fiscal year, but there are emergency works and these works should be constructed. There will be other emergency works during the progress of the war. Heretofore emergency works have been confined to war plants and to protect war munitions, but food and clothing are as essential as guns. Cotton, corn, wheat, and sugar must be produced. Cattle and hogs must be grown. The United States is being called upon to feed and clothe the armies of the United Nations. Munitions, tanks, and guns are needed during the war, but food and feed are essential.

I emphasize another thought. Following the war with its hunger and desolation, food will be more essential in all probability than during the war, and by food I mean American food. It is therefore imperative that sound projects to provide for greater flood protection for the valleys that produce the foods of America should be adopted now, and that plans should be made for their prompt construction with the coming of peace. The farmers of the United States are being called upon to produce more for the war effort than ever before, but after the war the demands upon the farmers of America will be greater. The productive areas of America are in the valleys. There must be control of devastating floods to provide for the protection of the bread baskets of the United States.

CONCLUSION

We are engaged in the greatest war in history. As I have said, war means sacrifices. It means sacrifices that hurt. It means taxes and more taxes. It means deaths and more deaths. The fate of the Republic is at stake. No nation ever fought for a nobler cause. We face the gravest hour our country has ever known. America is the last hope of democracy. As Abraham Lincoln said, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last great hope of earth."

Freedom is not something to be handed down from father to son or from generation to generation. Every citizen is the architect of his own freedom. Freedom must be achieved. Freedom is not in retreat. Democracy is on the march. Justice and righteousness will prevail. Victory is assured.

Neither Hitler nor Japan can stop the march of freedom or the victory of democracy. The road may be long and rough, but whether long or short, whether rough or smooth, we mean to go all the way, and we know that the road to victory will lead to a better United States and a better world.

Government Operation of the Coal Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram and my reply thereto:

CHICAGO, ILL., *June 25, 1943.*

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports that National Fuel Administrator Ickes contemplates Government operation of coal mines for the duration are most disturbing.

The disastrous experience in last war of Government operation of railroads is sufficient reason for urging continued private operation of coal mines. Consider railway private operation this war for proof. We feel that coal industry under private operation has done outstanding job to date by serving private and public needs without Government subsidy.

In our opinion act of taking over and operating mines under Government control would so disrupt coal output as to seriously impair war production of entire Nation for prolonged period. Also would establish precedent whereby union heads in many industries could seek Government control in order to improve economic condition at expense of the Nation.

We seek and urge your active help in investigating situation and in advocating continued private operation of coal mines.

SIMMONS BOARDMAN PUBLISHING CORPORATION,
Publishers of Railroad Age and American Builder.

JUNE 28, 1943.

SIMMONS BOARDMAN PUBLISHING CORPORATION,
Publishers of Railway Age and American Builder, Chicago Ill.

GENTLEMEN: Your telegram stating that the contemplated Government operation of the coal mines is most disturbing, received.

You state that the disastrous experience of the Government in the last war in its operation of the railroads is sufficient reason for the continued private operation of the coal mines. While I am generally opposed to Government operation of the coal mines I feel that your statement is unjustifiable and unwarranted. You are well aware of the fact that the railroads were on their knees to the Government to take them over because of the shortage of rolling stock, labor, and their inability to handle the increase in freight.

You should also know that within 3 months after the Government had taken the railroads over conditions changed for the better. Due to the interchange-of-car plan between the railroads, and the Government's ability in obtaining more engines, cars, as well as labor, which cost the Government nearly $2,000,000,000, the railroads were tremendously improved and were put on a paying basis. After this and immediately after the war the same gentlemen who clamored and pleaded for the Government to take them over started a campaign for their return, charging inefficiency, improper administration, and every other conceivable charge which they propagandized in every form of publicity.

Notwithstanding this past experience I am not for Government operation of the coal mines. However, in view of what the Govment has done for the mining industry the operators should be more helpful in eliminating strikes and refrain from forcing strikes and unloading controversies on John L. Lewis, as the operators have been doing. By this I do not mean to defend Mr. Lewis.

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPH J. SABATH.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Fulbright resolution, reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is unfortunately accorded a broader scope by a great many people than its plain phraseology indicates or permits. The construction and interpretation seems to cover a wide latitude and ranges all the way from a recommendation of a league of nations to a federation of world governments.

Its brevity and simplicity of language was intended to be, and should have been, a guaranty against just such misinterpretation. It reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

It is not an expression which recommends, commits, or pledges the Congress to any particular kind of machinery whatsoever, nor is it even an expression which recommends, commits, or pledges the Congress to finding the machinery most appropriate and most adapted to the establishment and maintenance of a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world. Congress merely expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate machinery.

In other words, the resolution, if passed, in no way encroaches upon the treaty-making powers of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; it in no way indicates what kind of machinery may be appropriate for the attainment of the desired ends, and it in no way binds the American people to any course of action whatsoever. It perhaps would be no violation of the rules pertaining to an executive session, and would at the same time clarify this point, to say, that an amendment favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery "by the United Nations and such nations as might become associated with them" was, by a close vote, rejected in the committee as a step beyond the appropriate scope of action by the House on the subject or objective of a just and lasting peace between the nations of the world.

Or, to drive home this idea from a negative viewpoint, a Member of Congress, to vote "no" on this resolution, would thereby say that he did not favor a just and lasting peace between the nations of the world; that he did not favor the creation of appropriate international machinery with power to effect that objective, and that he did not favor the participation of the United States therein, even though it could be done without impairment of our national sovereignty and without violating the prerogatives of the Senate in the making of treaties by and with its advice and consent.

On the other hand, the resolution is something more than the mere restatement of an ideal, something more than the voicing of a sentiment, something more than the expression of wishful thinking. It is a first and necessary step toward the goal of world peace. That step is the conviction and principle that collective action among the nations of the world is necessary in future international relations for protection from criminal nations, just as we have learned that in community life collective action is necessary for protection against criminals and gangsters. It constitutes the crystallization of this unanimity of thought, as a basis, without which no intelligent and organized effort would be possible.

If approved by the American people and by other nations of the world, it crystallizes this concept in antithesis to the confused and conflicting theories which heretofore have negatived it in practice at least. The mere establishment of this principle in lieu of and as against the hereto prevailing differences of thought and opinion on the efficacy of independent power of so-called isolationism, bilateral treaties, balance of power, and group alliances for protection against attack, will be a long step in the right direction.

It is also true, that inasmuch as it forms the first step or basis necessary for a just and lasting peace between nations under any plan, it furnishes the first step for undesirable plans as well as for those which are feasible; for a World Federation of Nations as well as for a League of Nations. On the other hand, it is equally true that it does not necessarily or even by implication mean that it is adopted for or adapted only to the former of these, any more or less than to the latter, or to any intermediate plan between the two. This basis is just as necessary for the building of whatever peace plan may be evolved as a piece of land is necessary for the erection of any building of whatever design, although in neither case need that underlying support determine the nature of the structure to be built thereon.

There is a well-grounded apprehension that in the administration are forces primarily seeking world power and position; that, therefore, this step or any step toward world cooperation is to play into their hands for their grandiose plans. The conclusion is that we must do nothing; must not take this step or any step for fear of being caught in a trap from which there will be no escape. Such reasoning and fear can only lead to complete inaction and paralysis of popular government. It is precisely for this reason that Congress, being most representative of the people, and with faith in their capacity for self-determination, cannot do other than take the first step and explore the possibilities for a just and lasting peace between nations. Congress, as such, has no direct treaty-making power, and therefore cannot say what shall be done for the American people, but it can, as their voice and representative, say what evil shall not be done to them. If we confine ourselves to that objective, seeking the desired end by the simplest means, there might be abundant justification for the opinion by the President, the Congress, and the people that it can be best attained by the United Nations building on a League of Nations plan.

Time and again has it been said by the foremost proponents of world peace that had the United States joined the League of Nations and the World Court we would now have no Hitler and no militant Japan, but world peace. If they are intellectually honest and have the courage of their convictions, why abandon that plan or something similar after the first failure? That first failure was under the most adverse circumstances, with no precedent to guide the nations or their leaders, with little or no analysis or knowledge of the dynamics causing war, and still less attempt to eliminate them.

The times and conditions for the success of a League of Nations are far more propitious than at the conclusion of the last war. Already we have made some of those slow, laborious evolutionary steps which spell real progress. In that war we fought as the allied nations, now we are fighting as the United Nations. In the first war, although the United States sought no territory or indemnity, it was each nation for itself and each holding the other accountable, if not grabbing all it could lay its hands on. Even the United States, although it sought no territory or indemnity, insisted on repayment for its outlay, and little Finland was the only nation observing the Golden Rule. In this war these United Nations have pooled all their resources in the common aim to win the war, and if any Americans think lend-lease is not pure fiction they had better become disillusioned, for we not only do not but cannot expect repayment.

We now are committed to the principle that the United Nations cannot win the peace unless we win the war by a complete victory and by an unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers. In the last war we tried to win the peace without victory and after a stalemate. If this war is won by the United Nations, how can we exclude any of them from participating in winning the peace?

We do not know what simplification of the problem may be affected by regional grouping within the larger group. This especially as concerns the possible necessity of our soldiers remaining overseas after victory. Nor do we know what simplification of the problem may be affected by the use of air power. On February 4, 1941, I said in the well of the House:

> We may well wonder if aviation may not yet prove a factor in the ultimate goal of universal peace. Because, after all, the greatest preventive for a war is sufficient power to discourage or stop the aggressor.

I still believe that to be true.

We have, since the formation of the League of Nations, learned much by bitter experience. We know more about neutrality legislation, reduction of naval power, the failure of economic sanctions, and the weakness of a covenant failing to provide for combined military force to squelch any aggressor or threats of aggression.

We know that the weakness of the League of Nations covenant was that, while it provided nonaggression assurances, it provided little more than sanctions for violation of those covenants. The United Nations covenants could be made to provide that an attack or threatened attack on one nation should be considered an attack on all nations. The covenant could further provide that on complaint that such attack was threatened or that war was threatened by any nation, the other members would immediately call a convention to either acquit or convict such nation, and if convicted, use their collective strength to crush such an outlaw nation. It would seem that in some such manner we could provide the machinery to reasonably insure world peace.

Under the proposed Fulbright resolution, much exploratory work along this line could be accomplished without in the least interfering with an all-out united effort to win the war.

And of prime importance, under this resolution the American people through the Congress can separate the impracticable, disaster-laden schemes from those which have promise of merit and feasibility; can distinguish the impossible dreams of bringing in something in the nature of the millennium from the at least more practical objective of preventing future wars.

In this respect it is high time that just as Prime Minister Churchill, speaking for his people, said, "Think not that I became the King's Prime Minister to liquidate the British Empire," that the Congress, speaking for our people, say, "Think not that we came to Congress to liquidate the United States."

In my opinion the Fulbright resolution is a wholesome measure and should be passed by a unanimous vote of the House.

Address by Major General Cramer, Judge Advocate General of the Army, at Commencement Exercises at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of a commencement address delivered by Maj. Gen. Myron C. Cramer, Judge Advocate General of the Army, to the graduating class at Wesleyan University, in Middletown, Conn., on May 30, 1943. Major General Cramer is himself a distinguished alumnus of Wesleyan University and was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws during the commencement exercises:

A commencement speaker in 1943 has little difficulty in the selection of a proper theme We are engaged in a grim and devastating war for survival. The full force of world events overshadows our every thought It makes any discussion not in some way related to the war decidedly untimely. To an Army officer who has seen military service during and continually since the First World War, a subject unrelated to the war is wholly unlikely, of not impossible. Quite naturally you are vitally concerned with the present world conflict, its meaning and its aftermath. You are inescapably involved in its significance and purpose and if we must have war, you would not have it otherwise It affects your future, frustrates your personal plans and ambitions that must now be postponed, yet holds for you the challenge of the ages.

It is doubtful whether the finite mind can answer the puzzling questions of the future that well up within you. But one need not be a prophet to observe that your future is inextricably interwoven with the future of our Nation in winning victory and moulding peace in the post-war world. A thoughtful student of international affairs has pointed out that: "The challenge to the United States in the present war is two-fold: On the one hand it is a challenge to our strength; on the other hand to our way of life. The former calls for war, the latter calls for war and something more." This is the challenge confronting you today.

America is successfully meeting the call to its strength. An Army officer is under definite and wise limitations concerning what he may say with propriety concerning the course of our arms. But we have had increasing and abundant public evidence of the prodigious striking power of the armed might of America and its allies which is beginning to overpower our enemies on the far-flung battlefields of the world. A lawyer likes to quote authority and the Army lawyer is no exception. The Commanding General of the Army Service Forces of the United States Army, in an address delivered at the time when our enemies in Tunisia were licking their wounds, had this to say about the future of our arms:

"Let the record speak for itself. In 12 months we have shifted from defense to offense. We have turned the tide of battle. We are pressing the war to our enemies. We

will continue to march forward. We will not stop until we have utterly destroyed Hitler and Hirohito and all they represent."

These are indeed fighting words of well-founded confidence, heart warming to Americans still smarting with memories of Dunkerque, Pearl Harbor, Corregidor, Bataan, and Burma.

We face the future with justified confidence in the ability of American might to meet the threat to our national existence, but we must at the same time beware of the evil effects of a somewhat alarming spirit of exaggerated optimism which must never gain prevalence. Our ranking military leaders have repeatedly warned us that, while there is ample reason for confidence in the ultimate triumph of the cause of the United Nations, there is no room for overconfidence; that rosy predictions of "victory just around the corner" may be the fruit of carefully sown insidious propaganda designed by the cunning of the enemy to snarl the war effort. Just as Hitler originally sought to terrify his enemies by that horrifying phrase "total war," he may now try to lull many of us in the belief that Germany is about to collapse, and it is oftentimes easy to convince men of what they want to believe. Let us not forget how much territory Germany and Japan have conquered and how much food, how much material, and how many workers have come under their dominion. The instinct of self-preservation is strong in the breasts of those totalitarian leaders who would destroy the individuality of men and beat him into an international slavery hitherto unknown to mankind. They realize full well that subjugated peoples who have known the yoke of forced labor, and oppressed minorities who have experienced the horrors of the concentration camp, anxiously wait to repay them in kind. In this knowledge they find reason for sustained determination and we, for our own part, must be constant in our vigilance and unrelenting in our resolve to boldly execute every measure designed by our incomparable leadership for winning the war.

This is no time for smug complacency. We shall win this war, but the road to victory is still long and arduous and will exact heart-rending sacrifices. We may rejoice much in recent successes of our arms and experience satisfaction in the avenging of Dunkerque, but let us all frankly realize that there must be no undermining of the working morale of the American people. We must steel ourselves to persistent work until the last of our enemies has unconditionally surrendered and the challenge to the strength of a strong America has been fulfilled and answered by victories on all the battlefronts of this global war.

At the recent dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial in Washington our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, said:

"Thomas Jefferson believed, as we believe, in man. He believed, as we believe, that men are capable of their own Government and that no king, no tyrant, no dictator can govern for them as wisely as they can govern for themselves."

Our treacherous enemies would thrust upon us a very different conception of the role of the individual. In Japan the individual is considered of no importance. He is a mere pawn of the state. The religion of the Japanese is distorted to the strengthening of the state. When the Jap makes obeisance at the Shinto shrines, to the Shinto spirit world, composed of national gods and goddesses, former rulers of Japan, all national heroes, he worships no universal God interested in individuals as such, but acknowledges a spiritual world interested only in Japan. He fully accepts the doctrine that as an individual he does not count.

Turning from our oriental enemy to Germany, the insignificance of the individual, and its larger component the family is well engrained when children, with a sort of fanaticism, inform against their parents, when they know that these parents will be taken by the Gestapo and will never be heard of again, although they may have done nothing morally or legally wrong.

In my capacity as The Judge Advocate General of the United States Army it was my responsibility to participate in the prosecution of the eight Nazi saboteurs who last year landed on our soil bent on their mission of death and destruction. I can personally testify to the amazement of the defendants in this case at the fact that such elaborate safeguards were maintained to protect their rights as individuals in the proceedings before the military commission. They were accorded every possible means of defense, including special consideration of certain legal aspects of their case by the highest judicial tribunal in the land, the United States Supreme Court. This was a living example of the ideals for which we fight, of our respect for the rights of the individual.

The American form of government divided into the legislative, executive, and judicial branches was conceived by the founding fathers as the political system most conducive to the perpetuation of the rights of the individual and the preservation of his civil liberties. This in order that man might be made free and that his individuality might find its most effective expression in the political, social, and economic life of the Nation. This ideology is rejected by our enemies.

The challenge to our way of life overflows in opportunities for your generation. Your most cherished opportunity is the task of maintaining that common understanding among men which will come following the reestablishment of peace. It is the challenge to prevent a repetition of this global debacle.

An illiterate boy once gave this definition of education. He said, "To be educated is to be able to read the signs at the crossroads and tell which way to go." Once again, repeating the opportunity that came to our Nation following the First World War, the United States will stand at the crossroads of destiny. In the post-war world two paths will be open to the men of your generation. If the lesson of history has been well learned, your generation will not be permitted to withdraw from a rightful place of participation and leadership in international affairs. But if that lesson has not been learned, you may turn, as those before you turned, to isolation and its ugly twin, unpreparedness, a course that could hardly fail to bring in its train a repetition of the tragic aftermath of World War No. 1. The generation which you represent must struggle to find the answer to these tangled problems of peace. Yours will be the role of discovering ways and means of international economic intercourse so that the principles of our way of life may become a vital influence, accepted by men not only by virtue of our might but also by virtue of our ability to enthrone these ideals in the hearts of men throughout the world. Upon you will fall the task of discovering effective means to avoid the tragic role of a victory without peace; of adapting the knowledge and scientific advancement of this and future generations to the benefit of mankind; of diverting men from the paths of war, death, and destruction; of leading men to a way of life conducive to liberty and happiness. Yours will be the mission of achieving the practical idealism of that former Wesleyan professor who, as President of the United States during the First World War, dreamed the dream of a world peace founded upon justice.

"The future of the world," says Winston Churchill, "is left to the highly educated races who alone can handle the scientific apparatus for preeminence in peace or survival in war. * * *" To which President Conant, of Harvard, wisely adds, "* * * science alone, untempered by other knowledge, can lead not to freedom but to slavery."

The service to be required of your generation will be great. It demands a new era of leadership and an understanding of and genuine good will in international affairs, now and later.

I am confident that you men of Wesleyan will serve these causes in keeping with your abilities and education. It is not our way to bury our talents. You of the class of 1943 are graduating into the battle. Your country needs your ability, the strength of your convictions, and your youthful enthusiasm. We greet you as you come to joint us. We know that you can be relied upon to fight hard, to do your job whatever it may be, in short, so to conduct yourselves that your country and your university will be proud of you.

In closing, I can think of no better advice that the words of Phillips Brooks when he said:

"Do not pray for easier lives—pray to be stronger men; do not pray for tasks equal to your powers—pray for powers equal to your tasks."

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a most enlightening and what appears to me to be a most constructive and thoughtful letter from Mr. Ralph B. Starkey, chairman, legislative committee, the Cooperative Marketing Associations of New Jersey, Inc., and I am glad to have this opportunity to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so my colleagues may read it, and I hope derive some benefit from it:

THE COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS IN NEW JERSEY, INC.,
TRENTON, N. J., *June 26, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AUCHINCLOSS: The board of directors of this association, representing 14 member associations with over 12,000 farmer members, has just discussed at some length the chaotic conditions in food production that threaten the Nation with an extremely serious food shortage. Production in 1943 will be materially below 1942; 1944 will be less yet, unless a drastic change is made.

The directors have unanimously voted that a letter be sent to every Congressman from New Jersey expressing the universal dissatisfaction of our farmers with administration food policies.

You realize of course that the criticism is not prompted by political motives. We should be just as critical of a Republican administration as we now are of certain policies of the present administration. From your association with New Jersey agriculture you know that we never let politics play any part in our farm organizations.

However, we must express our strong convictions that present policies of the executive branch of the Government will most certainly result in an extremely critical food situation by late 1943 and 1944. It would not appear possible that food shortages in this country can approach those existing in many

European countries. On the other hand it appears that present shortages and rationing will be very mild in comparison with those we shall have to face in the not too distant future.

Lately the Department of Agriculture has released production estimates that have been somewhat pessimistic. This is a distinct stange. The tendency of the Department has been to gloss over true conditions. It is our opinion that the true situation today is even more serious than indicated in these late crop releases. These forecasts stress the unfavorable weather that has seriously reduced the crop prospect this spring. It is true that this has been of importance. Not indicated, however, was the reduction that has been brought about by the inability of farmers to plant normal acreages due to governmental manipulation of the labor market, unfavorable price ceilings, and even more important, the threats of price ceilings and roll-backs that have been hanging over us for months.

You are familiar with the peculiar ability of the Office of Price Administration to select the one wrong way to do anything they attempt. They have driven over 75 percent of our poultry meat business into black markets. If left to their own devices, they will probably do the same with eggs. All policy decisions are made with no knowledge of the business they attempt to regulate. No information or advice is wanted from those who know the business. The whole attitude of the Office of Price Administration is in the words of one official, "it doesn't make any difference whether it works or not, we got it to do and we're going to do it." Needless to say it usually doesn't work.

The troubles of the dairyman and fruit and vegetable grower are no less than the poultryman. The vegetable growers have been threatened with price ceilings and roll-backs for the past 6 months. In the face of enormous increases in production costs and the uncertainty of being able to meet them, growers are not justified in attempting normal production. Such planting are further out of the question on account of the absolute impossibility of getting skilled labor, and the doubt of being able to secure sufficient harvest labor.

None of us doubt the vital need for increased food production. Neither does anyone familiar with conditions, doubt that production will be materially decreased. Moreover, if conditions are not changed, 1944 production will be less than 1943. Farmers are not doing this willingly. We are given no choice. There is no prospect of improvement so long as control of policies is in present hands.

The attempts to institute subsidies look to us like merely an extension of some of their asinine policies. There is no doubt in our opinion that subsidies will discourage production. We do not believe they will prevent inflation. They may do just the opposite. They will increase purchasing power which is inflationary. They are increasing Government debt which is likewise inflationary. If they are put into general effect and the subsidies are large enough to both stimulate production and hold or reduce retail prices the cost will be enormous.

Paying for your food on your tax bill instead of your grocery bill does not make good sense.

There appears to be two ways to remedy the situation. We can let it drift from bad to worse until it gets bad enough to cure itself. That is a very serious procedure in wartime. The other remedy would seem to be strong action by Congress. This action should among other things look to the following:

1. Steps to prevent impractical theorists from playing with the Nation's food supply, particularly in time of national crisis.

2. Placing production and distribution of food under one control in place of various agencies working at cross-purposes.

3. Setting of prices that will meet production costs without resort to subsidies. These can never be less justified than at present. If consumers cannot pay for their food in boom times, how can they do so during average or depression times?

4. Decide on a policy and stick to it. Unfortunately this is one of the principal brakes on farm production today.

We feel certain that we can count on your support for constructive action along these lines.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH B. STARKEY,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

Some Sound and Solid Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress has been receiving innumerable plans on how to conduct a post-war world and the part which the United States is expected to take in bringing to the world the "four freedoms" and a utopia unknown before.

That we as a nation must take a proper part in obtaining a just peace after the war, we all recognize. That we must surrender our national sovereignty, yield the fundamental principles of our Government, and commit ourselves to furnishing the rest of the world with what it has never had before is a program to which no sensible American will subscribe.

I offer for the RECORD the following editorial from the Pontiac Daily Press, of Pontiac, Mich., which exhibits a sound and sensible approach to the problem facing us when this war is over. Let every citizen ask himself whether or not 6 percent of the population of the world can furnish the other 94 percent with the necessities of life. I commend the reading of this editorial to every Member of the House and to every individual who has not lost his power of reasoning:

LET'S GET DOWN TO EARTH

Evidence continues to accumulate showing there is a considerable group in Washington fully convinced that the job of directing the affairs of the world is going to rest squarely and almost exclusively on the shoulders of the American people, after peace has been established.

We are being told that the whole Japanse Empire is going to be dumped in our lap. Untold millions in Asia are going to turn to us for guidance, counsel, assistance, and their daily quart of milk with cherry tarts on Sunday.

It appears that in the minds of certain sophomoric planners who are fairly oozing altruistic aspirations, fashioned in the grand manner, the nations of the earth with one accord will come hopping out on the international stage shouting in one voice:

"Well, Sammy, here we are."

It never seems to occur to these impractical dreamers that we have only a little over 6 percent of the total population of the world in the United States. But what of that in the mind of the royal distributor of favor? Their benevolence is without limit. They appear to look upon the other 94 percent of the people who inhabit this old globe, as incompetent, unfit, and more or less incapable of running their own affairs. They insist with a straight face that the United States must assume charge when the last gun has been fired.

With a philanthropy that is as high as the skies, as deep as the ocean, and as broad as all known dimensions, if we follow the counsel of big league international we are to step into the breach with a horn of plenty. From good old Uncle Sam all blessings flow. At least that is the hope and aspiration of starry-eyed planners who find it a most delightful sensation to peddle out the savings of other men.

The fact that the United States is going to salute the day of peace with a National Treasury so badly dented that it is quite sure to look as if it had been hit with some of the 4-ton block busters does not concern the boys who are getting ready to tap the North American Cornucopia.

Of course, the people of this country want to do their proper share to help put the world back on its feet. They are anxious to give liberally of their wisdom and experience, and to advise and suggest But there will be great need for proper restraint. The first thing that some of the large-bore distributors will need to learn is the simple fact that we are going to have some rather impressive needs at home. We cannot plaster the whole world with a thin dime nor make wine out of water.

In our anxiety to be of service to mankind we shall need to maintain a sane program and to proceed with an intelligent understanding of our own position in the world. We are not the beginning and end of two hemispheres. This is still so in spite of the lofty talk of making over the world after Hitler's pistol has been taken away from him and after we have shown the Japanese people that Hirohito is a mere man, with no divine powers and utterly devoid of transcendent or holy attributes.

To listen to some of the peace planners strut their stuff we might conclude that they intended that no one should sit at the conference table but a group of bank tellers adept in counting out money at high speed. Furthermore, dearly beloved, just keep in mind the rather impressive truth that this money was earned by those who toil and who may have some notion that they are entitled to a word respecting its confiscation, as it is being scattered hither and yon.

Congressional Medal of Honor to Lt. Mitchell Paige

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest recognition for military achievement, has been awarded to a McKeesport district marine lieutenant for one of the most heroic deeds recorded in the present war. Lt. Mitchell Paige, age 27, a former McKeesport High School student, received his temporary citation in

the name of the President from Admiral Chester W. Nimitz at Guadalcanal. His home is in Morton Plan, Mifflin Township.

The award is one that has been bestowed upon but a select few since its authorization by Congress in 1862. It recognizes an act of valor outside the limits of mere obedience to duty. It is for bravery outside the regular call of duty, an act no one expected him to do or no officer would have commanded him to do. The deed of Lieutenant Paige as described in the editorial of the McKeesport (Pa.) Daily News, which I am happy to include as a part of my remarks, is one that will be recorded among the deeds of the great heroes in American history. America salutes Lt. Mitchell Paige.

The editorial follows:

LIEUTENANT PAICE

The McKeesport district has produced one of the greatest heroes of the war in the person of Lt. Mitchell Paige, who yesterday was revealed as the recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest recognition of military achievement within the gift of the United States Government.

According to the citation, Paige won his high honor by a feat in battle that can stand with those of the Yorks, Morelocks, Hobsons, and the other American fighting men who through exceptional courage have brightened the pages of our military history.

The feat, as described in the citation, is in the cold, terse words of Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. Paige was in command of a machine-gun section on Guadalcanal. The Japs attacked, killing or wounding every man in the section except Paige. Alone, he moved from gun to gun under continuous heavy enemy fire. As one gun was destroyed he moved to another and kept up the retaliatory fire until reinforcements arrived.

When help came Paige organized a counter charge. This he led, with bayonet fixed, and drove the enemy back. And as the citation concludes:

"He prevented the enemy from breaking through the marine lines and contributed greatly to the success of the operation."

In other words, one man, alone on a blood-stained field, saved the day on Guadalcanal. No war has produced a more inspiring demonstration of sheer personal bravery or a greater individual contribution, on the part of the man on the line, to his nation's cause.

Guadalcanal, one of the most difficult military conquests so far recorded in this war, has produced several heroes. Many of them have received columns of praise in the American press, praise based principally upon the number of Japs they killed. But here at this late date emerges the story of a McKeesport district youth, another Sergeant York or Sterling Morelock, to capture the gratitude of his country.

Somewhere out across the broad Pacific, Paige spends today in a rest camp, probably unaware that the time has come when the folks at home know of what he has done and of the exceptional honor that he has won. He, like so many men who have earned glory in battle, may have hoped that he could be overlooked, that his recognition could rest unnoticed except by himself as a souvenir of his greatest day.

He apparently is that kind of young man. He sent his citation home, for safekeeping, and it wasn't until his father, unaware of the greatness of the honor, came to The Daily News with "an item" for publication that the news came out. We are glad indeed that we served as the medium through which the district and the Nation learned of what appears to be a leading story of individual courage in the heroic battle of Guadalcanal and that Lieutenant Paige now takes his place in public acclaim with those heroes who have achieved their nation's highest honor by valor above the call of duty and beyond the commands and expectations of their superiors.

"Listen, Son"—A Veteran Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, an article, entitled, "Listen, Son," appeared in Columbia magazine of June 1943. The article is a direct, frank, and realistic talk by a father, a veteran of World War No. 1 to his son, soon to be a veteran of World War No. 2. It is an excellent talk drawn from experience and realistic understanding. But the article is of greater interest to me, to my constituents, and to all Members of Congress who remember my well-beloved and admired predecessors, Billy and Larry Connery. For the veteran who speaks in these pages recalls these fellow veterans of his in France and with their example demonstrates not only how the war can be won but the peace thereafter. He says "You have heard those brothers' names. In the years after, we vets and our neighbors sent them to Congress. That did not change them. They stood up for the veterans, for labor, for a decent United States. They are dead now, those two. Not the work they did, not their memories. Men like me still brag we knew them. Those are just two of the Yankee Division."

I know of no better example a father could choose in urging his son to be a good soldier and to come back ready to build constructively than this veteran has chosen in Billy and Larry Connery. The article to which I refer follows:

LISTEN, SON—A VETERAN SPEAKS

Good for you, son. You looked all right up there on the platform. And you got a big hand, going up for your diploma. Your grandma said right out loud, "That's our boy." And your Ma was clapping and crying. Kind of embarrassed me. Not that I blame her. It's no fun for the mothers, this June.

Yes, sir. A big day. That commencement speaker was smooth, too. A nice talker. The "four freedoms" and no more wars, and the bright new world that's coming up. Beautiful, like poetry, sort of.

But now 'till dinner's ready it's my turn to talk. Your dad's commencement address. If your Ma don't come in. Grin all you like. But listen, son.

The war's what we're thinking about this June, all of us, mothers and fathers and you boys who must fight it. How long?

I heard a man just the other day, at the lunchroom down at the plant. Ten to ten he was offering, that the war would be over by Christmas. Not my ten. The more I read, the less I know.

But one thing is sure—the Axis is licked. After Dunkerque they had a chance. Maybe after Pearl Harbor. Not now. It may take a long time, all we've got, but their number is up. We all know that. O. K. The United States, the United Nations will win this war. What's bothering me is—will you?

No, I don't mean will you live. No use worrying about that. I tell your mother, from day to da: no one knows. All it takes any day is a blowout, or a germ too small to see. There'll be men killed at the plant this year. Any time, anywhere, asking how long you'll live is the weeds. Say your prayers and forget it. That's all you can do. But what I do mean is up to you. You can win in this war, but there's others who won't.

THE KID AT THE PLANT

I mean—well, look. There was a kid at the plant last year, in my department. A nice kid and smart. Not a good mixer. The boys used to ride him some, till I made them lay off. After that we ate lunch together, but he never talked much. Till one noon—I don't know, it just came up—I happened to mention I had a son, and I showed him that clipping about you winning the debate. This kid, Ernest, he opened up after that. The next noon he brought a paper to show me. A night school exam he'd taken, 90 percent it was marked. One of those university extension courses, theory of gas engines, or something like that. I told him when he got to be a big boss, remember me, and you ought to have seen him grin. But I was only half joking. He was going places, that kid. He had it all figured out, what he wanted and how to get it. He was started up, too. In 6 weeks he got a raise, and they took him into the drafting department. I didn't see him then for awhile. Last week I did.

Over at the South Station, when I went to meet your grandma. The train was an hour late, so I went into the lunchroom for a coffee and hamburger. I'd have had me a beer, but you know your grandma. I sat next to a soldier. Took another look, and it was this lad, Ernest, from the plant. The place was jammed with sailors and soldiers, but he was by himself, and—well—the look on his face wouldn't go to sell War bonds. But glad to see me. Kind of lonesome, I guess. We chinned of the plant, and this and that; and going out, nothing would do but he'd take both checks.

"Nothing doing," I told him. "Save your dough, kid. It'll come in handy. It'll cost you jack to get your schooling."

"What schooling?" he said. And smiling wise, "There's a war on, Mister."

"And so what?" I says. "You have to live, too, when it's over."

"The Government can worry about that," he said. "They took us off our jobs. They'll have to see that we eat."

"And they will," I told him. "But what's happened to you? You wanted more. You were going places, remember?"

He thought that over, watching the crowd, and his mouth like he'd tasted something he didn't like. Then—"Don't get me wrong," he said, "I didn't try to duck out. We've got to do this job. I know it. I'm not crying." It was hard to hear him there in the noise of the station. He went on. "But not kidding myself. Any private life I had, any personal ambition is gone, out. In a war like this one, only a fool would plan his own future." Two M. P.'s came along, and he stopped till they passed. "I've got me a future," he said, "till Monday morning, till I get back to camp. Then I'm a dog tag again, a service record. A buck private," he said, "like a pebble on Revere Beach." He grinned his wry grin. "Till the tide goes out. Any day now."

Your grandma's train was coming in. All I could say was, "Keep your chin up, kid. Stay in there pitching." But all the way home on the streetcar, listening to your grandma, I was thinking, too. If he doesn't snap out of it, that boy is licked. He can never see action, never have a day's sickness, and come home washed up, disabled inside.

And I wondered, too, was there many like him? Young lads down deep feeling lost and helpless, thinking the war is the end of their personal living. Maybe not. Maybe this Ernest is just one in a million. I hope.

Listen, son. I'm a veteran. And I'd go again if they'd take me. Your ma knows that. What I can do, I will, and no kicking. This black market now—I don't want any part of it. Nor your ma. We'll take beans.

There's a kind of black market of talk, too. Rumors and complaining. Like a guy was telling me down at the plant, how pretty the Canadians were sitting, how nice they were having it at our expense. Then after that bad business at Dieppe, the same lad was wisecracking, "The British will fight to the last Canadian." Know what I told him? "Listen, mister. All this talk that Hitler would love to hear, I don't want any part of it." And I don't, son. But there's other talk I'm fed up with, too. We won't win the war with pipe dreams either.

Talks like that college professor was making today to you graduates. No more wars any more, freedom for all from want and fear. Oh, it's noble all right. It just ain't true. It can't be, till human nature changes, till greed is licked, and hate, and all men keep the Ten Commandments.

Look, son. You could say that professor today had a vision; a well-meaning man, I'll grant you that, but there can be dangers in visions. Hitler had one, too. And so did Marx. Trouble is, men get drunk on that kind of thinking. Their visions so big, they get to feeling so big, and everyone else so little. Pretty soon they're saying, "You take my vision—I'll save the world or else." Trouble is, no vision of a better world can come true till greed is licked and meanness and hate. And greed and hate aren't geographic. They're things that live in single people. That brings us right back to me, Bill Murphy. You and me and the corner grocer, we're where a better world starts, if any.

Honest, I sometimes think one good cop on his beat, keeping his one street safe and decent; one little mother keeping her babies clean and fed, is getting more done for a better world than all these profs rearranging the hemispheres now.

WHAT GOVERNMENT CAN'T GIVE

There'll be no heaven on earth, son, not in your day nor mine. There'll be no global peace nor hemisphere happiness. After the war, like before the war, there'll be good men and bad. And you, son, you'll have to work out your own salvation. Our Government will give you hospital care, the best, if you need it, work if you'll take it. I'm a hundred percent for our Veterans' Bureau. But, son, no Government bureau ever has, or ever will, give 10,000,000 men the things that matter, that make men happy. What makes a man like you or me happy? Fame? Big money? We'd sure be out of luck. No, sir. Not to be scared of your next confession, nor the cop on the corner, nor your boss on the job. To wake up in the morning and smell the food you've earned cooking; to hear your own kids laughing, and your own wife scolding them not to wake dad. That's enough. But you'll have to get it. No government has it to give. Wars can protect that kind of happiness, but they can't make it.

Honest. Sometimes I think these radio statesmen and college prophets, they're getting a kind of elephantiasis. I guess it's what that man today called the "time spirit." I guess it affects us all. We're talking of men now by millions, of dollars by billions, of hemisphere defense and global strategy, till Ernest thinks he's a pebble on Revere Beach. But each single pebble is what is important. Communism will pass, and fascism, and all the nations. But not one pebble. Once a human soul is, it is for keeps. That's what I should have told Ernest that day in the station. But I don't think quick. Likely some chaplain will tell him. Better, too.

What makes it hard, son, is this—these great visions and plans, they're not all false; there's truth in them, too. It's good that we're finding out now that the world is one place. Like one living body, if it gets sick in one part, it gets sick all over. We're finding out now in blood and tears that men must be brothers, or fighting enemies. Like Cain said, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Yes, sir. You are. That's the new wisdom they're coming to now. And it's all in your catechism. But too simple. No $5 words.

I don't know. It's a cockeyed world. Me, too; I'm getting this globitis. I start with you going into the service, and here I'm having my say on civilization. Like in any bar today, the boys at the end of the bar getting loud, are maybe settling India, and giving China a few more billions. Two beers and around the world! And I'm as bad.

Look, son. What I want to get over is simple enough. War or no war, your first job is you. There may be 10,000,000 American soldiers, but no other you. Buck private or not, you're important. St. Peter won't ask, "Was this man commissioned?" Nor let the boys in by Army divisions. One by one.

So don't get that feeling it's so easy to get these days, that you're a grain of sand on the beach, that you're not in the driver's seat. A shingle off the roof in a hurricane, just carried. You're no more helpless in the Army than down at the corner. Both places you can do what would please your Ma, or the gang. Marching in the biggest United States Army, you're walking alone, too, to your own winning or losing.

Don't get impatient, son. Let me get this told, and when you're away I'll feel better. I can't put it in $5 words. But I know it. I lived it. I've bunked in one tent with the winners, and the losers.

You know me, I'm not talking of beer or penny ante. I never was strong myself for group singing and ping-pong. In a camp in Africa or down at the corner, nothing is wrong but meanness, real sin.

What I'm trying to get at is deeper. It's that letting go. Thinking all bets are off now. Standards are down till the war is over. The War Department and the generals will take care of today, and the future will take care of itself. Don't you believe it. There are just two numbers coming out, son. Look at them both. You'll live—or you won't. If you're not coming home, you've got to be ready. You can't be sure of confession after the shell hits. If you're going to live, and please God you will, how you live in the Army, that's how you'll live after. A good lad, on the level and pulling your weight. Or else. You know. On every corner there's one. Not you. Not your Ma's son.

Here's what I mean. There was a lad in my tent, on the border that was, in 1916. A tall rookie, soft-spoken, with a bony and sensitive face. And an awkward soldier. That made us pals. And something else, there was a gentleness in him, a kind of shy kindness Set in his ways though. No wisecracks could make him do anything, go places he didn't want to. He lived in Texas in an Army tent as he lived in his home. At home, down at the corner, he liked the corner gang, played ball with them, and shared their jokes, but not their pints. At home on Sundays he went to communion. He'd be there on the border, under the cottonwoods, every Sunday the chaplain's altar boy, kneeling nervous, with one eye for scorpions.

No saint, my pal. I've seen him duck under the back of the tent when the top kick came for a work detail. I've seen him mad, but not often. Pay day nights he'd be the one to get the battlers quiet, and lights out at taps. And the week before pay day, if he had a buck, you had four bits. He was a company clerk for a while, then sergeant, bossing men who could have licked him and didn't want to.

When we sailed to France, his brother came with us, an older brother and married. Skinny, too. In a high wind you'd put a brick in his pocket to keep him down. But game. Canned willy and cooties, gas, and the ashcans exploding; he took it all smiling. I knew both those brothers well. And I know in those days they weren't planning shrewdly their future. No one did that in the boxcars jolting up to the Argonne. Those brothers just took the boxcar as if it was home. Said their prayers to themselves, and sang to us. My pal was best with the ballads, the hearts and flowers; but Bill had songs to make an M. P. laugh. And all the regiment knew them, colonel to cooks.

That was a war, too, while it lasted. But we stayed in there pitching, as you will. We came home, most of us And the brothers sang on the troopship, two years older, their bodies weakened, their hearts unchanged. Good lads, undefeated.

You've heard those brothers' names. In the years after, we vets and our neighbors sent them to Congress. That didn't change them. They stood up for the veterans, for labor, for a decent United States. They're dead now, those two. Not the work they did, not their memories. Men like me still brag we knew them.

Those are just two of the Yankee Division. I could sit here and tell you all night of others. A few big names, and in the money; most of them not. But good men. They won that world war, and the other one, the war you've got to fight for yourself. And you know how. You've got your heads.

Take the car tonight, son, and the rest of the coupons. Take your girl to the movies. You know at that—your Ma and you and you and your kid sisters—I won, too. O. K. son, I won't talk no more.

The Alaska Military Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, since most Alaskans join in the opinion that the name "Alcan" given to the highway to Alaska is completely inappropriate, it gives me pleasure to quote below the order and accompanying statement announcing that the highway, by instructions of Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, commander of the Northwest Service Command, will be designated as "Alaska Military Highway." General O'Connor, whose energy, capacity, and foresight have contributed so largely to the building of the highway, is to be commended for having given it a suitable name.

HEADQUARTERS, NORTHWEST SERVICE COMMAND,
Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, Canada, June 10, 1943.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 24

I. ALASKA MILITARY HIGHWAY

1. The official name of the military road now known as the Alcan Military Highway is announced as the Alaska Military Highway.

2. All previous instructions to the contrary are rescinded.

II. COMMAND JURISDICTION FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH QUARTERMASTER REGIMENT (TRUCK)

The Four Hundred and Seventy-seventh Quartermaster Regiment (truck) is assigned to the Alaska Military Highway.

By command of Brigadier General O'Connor.

K. B. BUSH,
Colonel, G. S. C., Chief of Staff.

Official:
J. W. FRASER,
Lieutenant Colonel, A. G. D.,
Adjutant General.

WHITEHORSE, YUKON TERRITORY.—The 1,630-mile highway from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, henceforth will be known officially as the "Alaska Military Highway," Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor announced here today.

General O'Connor said that the name "Alcan," as the famous road originally was called, had never gained wide acceptance.

"We called it the 'Alcan' Highway," General O'Connor explained, "because we wanted to include in the name of the road some mention of our Canadian allies, on whose land much of the highway was constructed. Yet the Canadians themselves took the lead in urging us to name the road the 'Alaskan Highway.' From members of Parliament, from Canadian newspaper editors, from average citizens of Canada, I have received letters advocating that the road be simply named the 'Alaska Military Highway.'"

General O'Connor pointed out that Delegate DIMOND, of Alaska, and many newspapers in both the United States and Canada had urged that the name "Alaska" be substituted for "Alcan."

"Public opinion in this respect seemed to be nearly unanimous in both countries," he said, "so from now on the highway will be officially known as the 'Alaska Military Highway.'"

The Housewives of America Should Know That the O. P. A. Is Not Their Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the happenings of recent months leave no doubt in the minds of any thoughtful person that various Government agencies, including the O. P. A., are infiltrated with enthusiasts for economic reform, who are setting prices, making rules and regulations under the guise of war measures, but which in fact are economic reforms and steps toward state socialism.

The housewives of America should know that the Office of Price Administration has permitted new brands of pancake flour to be put on the market which retail from 17 cents to 20 cents per 20-ounce package, and have denied other processors a 12-cent ceiling for the same article. In other words, in their tangle of rules and regulations, they have refused to raise the ceiling to 12 cents on an article for some processors, thereby closing those plants, and they have at the same time permitted other processors making a similar, but inferior, product to sell for as high as 20 cents for the same size package.

It is very important that the housewives of America realize that the O. P. A. is not their friend.

I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter which a mill in my district has sent to Mr. Prentiss Brown, of the Office of Price Administration. The letter is as follows:

JUNE 22, 1943.

Mr. PRENTISS BROWN,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: What further action has been taken in regard to the new pancake flour price ceiling order now on file in your office?

With replacement costs of materials and supplies 25 to 30 percent above our present ceiling basis we have been forced to close our plant entirely until relief is secured.

We understand the intent and purpose of the Office of Price Administration is to make essential commodities available to the consuming public and prevent, as much as possible, any increase in the cost of those commodities. Now, while the delay in releasing the new pancake price order has forced practically all competitively priced pancake flours off the market, the Office of Price Administration has permitted new brands of pancake flour to be put on the market which retail at 17 to 20 cents per 20-ounce package. If the Office of Price Administration would give the established pancake flour manufacturers the relief for which we are asking, we could immediately provide high quality pancake flour to retail at 8 to 12 cents for the same size carton. The Office of Price Administration would therefore effect a saving of 5 to 12 cents per package. Since competitive pancake flour cannot and will not be produced without relief, this surely would not establish an unfavorable precedent for other important commodities.

It all seems most inconsistent to us to let this practice continue, when, by allowing the requested price increase, the Office of Price Administration, could provide the consuming public with such a tremendous saving on pancake flour products.

Furthermore it is necessary to work several months in advance in the pancake flour business. Sales of pancake flour for early fall delivery should be made in June and July. With June gone by it is most imperative that the pancake order be approved and released without further delay.

For the benefit of all concerned, isn't there some way in which immediate action can be secured?

Yours very truly.

Muscle Shoals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Max Hall:

MUSCLE SHOALS PLANT, 1918 FAILURE, MAKES GOOD ON SECOND WAR

(By Max Hall)

WILSON DAM, ALA., June 26.—Here in the Muscle Shoals area of northern Alabama is the war plant that got a second chance—and made good.

Most people remember Muscle Shoals, the immense chemical plant built by the Government to produce nitrates for explosives in the first World War; few recall that the plant never produced a spoonful of chemicals for use in that war.

After 1918, the plant lay idle for 15 years, sprawled like a mile-long white elephant near the south bank of the Tennessee River, until the Tennessee Valley Authority took it over and began making fertilizer.

Now, in the second World War, the plant has vindicated itself. Its ammonium nitrate, mixed with TNT to form deadly amatol, has gone into shells and bombs in vast quantities, and, now that the Army doesn't need any more ammonium nitrate from Muscle Shoals for a while, the compound is being shipped out as fertilizer to increase food production.

Ammonium nitrate is only part of the story. The Muscle Shoals plant today is turning out phosphorus for incendiary bombs, highly-concentrated phosphatic fertilizer for lend-lease shipment to England, and calcium carbide for making synthetic rubber.

THE STORY OF AN OLD PLANT

Recently, I went through the smoky, smelly conglomeration of buildings connected by black pipes curving like great snakes over the Alabama landscape. I stood cringing in front of a row of electric furnaces a third of a mile long, out of which roared satanic masses of flame and yellow smoke.

I heard the story of this old plant that made a comeback, from a couple of cool, precise young chemists, Dr. R. L. Copson, chief of the Research and Development Division of Tennessee Valley Authority's Department of Chemical Engineering, and Dr. Grady Tarbutton, senior chemist of the division.

The plant, still known by its original name of "United States Nitrate Plant No. 2," is managed by Arthur Miller, chief chemical engineer of Tennessee Valley Authority. Copson and Tarbutton are two of his lieutenants.

The story goes back, they said, to 1914, when a German named Fritz Haber, helped by two others named Nernst and Bosch, developed a process for "fixing" nitrogen.

Nitrogen exists in limitless quantities in the air, but it can't be used in explosives unless "fixed," or forced into a compound with certain other elements.

Nitrogen isn't a good mixer, but Haber "fixed" it, and they say his ghost screams every time a bomb packed with explosives made by his process crashes on a German war factory.

FIRST PLANT WAS A FAILURE

Haber's work is supposed to have made World War No. 1 possible for Germany. The United States at that time was making its explosives from sodium nitrate shipped from Chile, where it was found in natural form. in 1916 German submarines and raiders were interfering seriously with those shipments, so the United States decided to develop a nitrogen fixation industry.

The first plant begun was "Nitrate Plant No. 1," near Sheffield, Ala. It was a failure, the Tennessee Valley Authority chemists relate, because "we in this country just didn't know enough about the Haber process at that time." This plant, or its shell, still stands idle.

Meantime the Government, not wanting to risk all on the new process, had authorized nitrate plant No. 2, the present Tennessee Valley Authority plant. This was to use the old, complicated, expensive and unsatisfactory cyanamide process of making ammonium nitrate. The Armistice was signed before the plant was ready. A tiny amount was produced after the Armistice, just to show it would work. Then the doors swung shut.

POWER MADE AVAILABLE IN 1933

Wilson Dam nearby had been started during the war in connection with the plans for

the nitrate plants. It was not completed until 1925. Power from Wilson Dam first poured into the great electric furnaces of nitrate plant No. 2 in 1933, when Tennessee Valley Authority was created.

Tennessee Valley Authority decided the greatest fertilizer need of the region was phosphates. The old type of phosphatic fertilizer, Dr. Copson said, was only 16 percent plant food. Tennessee Valley Authority, he said, produced two types of phosphatic fertilizer: Triple superphosphate (now going to England under lend-lease), which is 48 percent plant food, and calcium metaphosphate, a brand new product, which is 64 percent plant food.

He explained that Tennessee Valley Authority makes these fertilizers by first producing elemental phosphorus through the electric furnace method. It was not the first time phosphorus had been produced in this way but it was considered an expensive process, and it had never been used as an intermediate step in phosphate fertilizer production, Copson said.

"It was a good thing this method was adopted," he remarked, "because Tennessee Valley Authority happened to be in a position to produce phosphorus for incendiary bombs, when the war broke out."

AMERICANS LEARN GERMAN'S PROCESS

As for ammonium nitrate—the original reason for the Muscle Shoals plant—by the time World War No. 2 arrived, American chemical engineers knew a great deal more about the Haber process than they did in 1916. Tennessee Valley Authority was able to make ammonium nitrate in great quantities, using the original equipment plus a brand new synthetic ammonia plant.

The first step in making ammonium nitrate under the Haber process is to make ammonia by forcing nitrogen and hydrogen together at high pressure. The Tennessee Valley Authority then makes ammonia into nitric acid, combines this with more ammonia and ammonium nitrate is the result.

In both phosphorus and nitrogen there are terrible powers of destruction and at the same time beneficial powers of soil building. There is only a delicate shading between.

Ammonium nitrate, the Tennessee Valley Authority chemists say, never before had been used as fertilizer in this country except in solution. Starting a couple of weeks ago, shipments went out to farmers for application as top dressing in powdered form.

Cattle and Beef Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following information with reference to the cattle and beef situation in the United States. Following is a statement made on the march of time program of the National Broadcasting Co. on Thursday, June 24, by Joe G. Montague, Esq., attorney for the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association. No one in the United States is better informed on the cattle industry than Mr. Montague. His views on this all-important subject are worthy of the attention of all:

This opportunity is welcomed to tell the American people a few pertinent facts concerning the cattle and beef industry.

Everything that will be said is supplemental to the primary idea that the armed forces will be adequately supplied with beef. The statements referring to civilian supplies presuppose and allow for that first requirement, which is also the desire of all Americans.

We have a most incomprehensible situation in the cattle and beef business. While, under Government regulations and restrictions, we can get little beef for our tables—and I literally mean "we" because this applies to producers as well as other consumers—the herds of cattle running on the ranges have been increasing at an astoundingly dangerous rate. During this emergency the number of cattle in the country has grown from a normal of 67,000,000 head to 79,000,000, and the Government estimate shows this will further increase to 82,400,000 by the end of this year.

Then why can't the civilians get meat to eat? There is only one answer. The answer is supplied by the unintelligent impositions of poorly conceived theories in the form of restrictive regulations on slaughter, distribution, and prices. There was no shortage of beef before the Government stepped in and built an unnatural restraint on the industry. Since these regulations have been imposed we have developed an excessively high surplus of live cattle and a deficiency of meat for civilians. The anomaly will be aggravated with another experiment now being tried out in the form of a so-called roll-back and subsidy.

Cattle producers are worried. We know that we have more cattle than we can economically carry on our ranges. We just don't know what to do with bureaucratic control exercised by theorists and with a maze of regulations to comply with. A drought would get rid of our cattle, but you people would not have the meat to eat. The buzzards and coyotes would get fat.

The situation would solve itself if only Government officials would let the unrepealable law of supply and demand work without regulatory interference. There is little hope for such ideal solution. Then, next best, the Government should adopt fully the plan recommended by the entire industry—and not impose on that plan the impediment of the subsidy. No one in the industry wants it, neither producers nor processors.

The excuse for the subsidy is silly. It is supposed to reduce living costs, but when interpreted in terms of beef, the maximum saving would be less than 10 cents per month per person. Government officials plan to effect the saving by spending over $300,000,000 annually. In addition there would be a substantial administrative cost.

Truly, all the loco weed does not grow in the West. Fields of it flourish and are consumed on the banks of the Potomac.

Congress Calls a Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial taken from the Coshocton Tribune of Coschocton, Ohio, which is the county seat in which I live. I firmly believe this editorial speaks the sentiment of the people I represent:

CONGRESS CALLS A HALT

Congress took a vigorous step toward restoring the majesty and dignity of the United States Government Friday night when it enacted the antistrike law over President Roosevelt's veto.

We don't like the law. It should never have been necessary and it casts an unwarranted slur on the patriotism of American working men and women, the great majority of whom are supporting the war effort 100 percent.

But the shameful fact remains that such a law has become necessary in recent weeks, with John L. Lewis and his powerful mine workers' union openly flouting the authority of the Government and jeopardizing the Nation's fighting forces.

Most labor unions have kept their pledge that there would be no strikes in war industries for the duration. Lewis and a few other union leaders have broken the promise whenever they saw fit.

President Roosevelt, with his eye on a fourth term, seems to have had his own political ambitions uppermost in mind, rather than the welfare of his country in a desperate war, when he vetoed the antistrike bill.

His proposal that strikers up to the age of 65 be drafted was a distressing alternative. Is the draft a means of punishing traitors? We had understood that it was a democratic method of selecting men for the great privilege of defending their country—that, and nothing more.

The millions of men in our fighting forces whose very lives depend on the uninterrupted flow of war materials—these men, their parents, wives, and other relatives—will note well how their Congressmen and their Senators voted on this measure.

Legislators who in time of national crisis are willing to play politics at the expense of their country's safety are likely to realize next year that such tactics were shortsighted indeed. Mark well the record of these men in this grave situation on the home front.

General MacArthur Praises General Brereton and Small American Air Force in Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday June 28, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Washington Times-Herald of June 25, 1943, by Gen. Douglas MacArthur defending the conduct of Maj. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton, in command of the Air Forces in the Philippines, and the use of that small Air Force of 107 planes until virtually destroyed by overwhelming Japanese air attacks.

It is very apparent that an attempt is being made to belittle and smear General MacArthur in an effort to place the blame and responsibility upon him for the loss of our airplanes in the Philippines and to ignore the fact that there

were only a handful of American planes there. The fact is that the small Air Force under General Brereton continued to fight, although vastly outnumbered, until the remnants were ordered to Australia. The record of our Air Force in the Philippines, although small in number, is a heroic one, and upholds the finest traditions of American bravery and of our gallant air forces in this war.

The article follows:

M'ARTHUR LAUDS GENERAL BRERETON, PRAISES HANDLING OF PHILIPPINE AIR FORCE

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS, AUSTRALIA, June 25.—Gen. Douglas MacArthur, defending Maj. Gen. Lewis H. Brereton's handling of American air forces in the Philippines, revealed tonight that United States combat forces in the islands totaled only 107 planes when the Japanese attacked in December 1941.

In a formal statement issued to counter what he called allegations that Brereton had been guilty of neglect and faulty judgment in the Philippine campaign, MacArthur declared that only 35 bombers and 72 fighters were available at the outbreak of the war.

"This tiny force," he said, "was crushed by sheer weight of numbers. Its combat crews fought valiantly but were hopelessly outnumbered." MacArthur said part of Brereton's small combat force was destroyed on the ground while the planes were landing to refuel and be serviced. "But it was never the result of negligence on the part of Brereton or his subordinates," he said. "* * * The air forces in the Philippines planned carefully and executed valiantly, and any attempt to decry their record can spring only from a complete lack of knowledge of the facts involved."

MacArthur also revealed that the entire command in the Philippines "was placed on a full war basis 2 weeks before the break of the war and had taken up defensive positions" when the Japanese launched their attack

The 53-year-old Brereton, now commanding general of the United States forces in the Middle East and commander of the Nineteenth Air Force, was commander of the Army's Far Eastern Air Force, with headquarters in Manila when the war began.

He directed the operations of his little air squadron over the island of Luzon until Christmas 1941, when he was ordered to take the remnants of his force to Australia.

En route to Australia he took command of American planes on the island of Java in a vain attempt to halt the Japanese invasion tide. Shortly before the fall of Java he was transferred to New Delhi, as commander of Army air forces in India.

Last summer he was ordered to Cairo to take over the Middle Eastern command, replacing the late Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, subsequently killed in an Iceland plane crash.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the program of subsidy payments the President has inaugurated in his effort to roll back prices is, in my opinion, unsound, ill-advised, and inflationary. It is not sanctioned by any of the provisions of the price control bill. Its effect will be to reduce rather than to increase our production of food. The President issued his Executive order for subsidy payments against the advice of such men as Chester Davis and Jesse Jones.

In considering the program of subsidy payments we should first ask, "Where is the money coming from to make these payments?"

When President Roosevelt promised the miners he would roll back prices, did he mean that he had a subsidy program ready to accomplish that objective? If so, how does he expect to by-pass a Congress that has definitely turned thumbs down on further subsidy payments of any kind? If the President's "hold-the-line" order is based upon a subsidy program of price control, it will cost at least $5,000,000,000 per year to operate it. The President can get this money only through an appropriation passed by the Congress, and it must come out of the taxpayers' pockets. Subsidies are inflationary, because by artificially holding down the cost of living they increase the excess purchasing power of the public. The law of supply and demand cannot be circumvented so easily.

Herbert Hoover says we need one strong man to handle the food problem and that the food director should logically have charge of the Department of Agriculture. At present there are 14 different agencies of the Federal Government dealing with various angles of the food problem, with much duplication, overlapping, contradictions, rivalries, and confusion as a result. Congressman JENKINS, of Ohio, has introduced a bill that would carry out the consolidation of these various food activities under one head, the Secretary of Agriculture. If the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, is not big enough—and no one seems to think he is—the President should select a man who is big enough. Herbert Hoover would make an excellent man for the job. The trouble has been that this Administration has from the first sought to restrict farm production and now it is trying to make a right about face. It cannot be done overnight. You cannot get 20,000,000 farms changed over night from an economy of scarcity to an economy of plenty. Because of the difficulty of making this change, millions of people are going to be short of food both here and abroad.

New Deal planners count that day lost in which their fertile minds do not bring forth some new plan for making over our economy. One of the latest brain childs is the so-called roll-back, which, in effect, is a subsidy to the consumer. Numerous agricultural products are scheduled for treatment under the scheme, including butter. The city consumer will get the benefit of this subsidy and the country producer will have to help pay for it. The Illinois delegation in Congress, assisted by the delegations from other dairy States, has vigorously protested the new program, but without success. The long-haired boys are going right ahead willy-nilly, and if it does not work they will try something else. They have all kinds of plans up their sleeves for future use. In the meantime, the 125,000,000 guinea pigs will be expected to pay and pay for the privilege of being experimented upon.

The administration seems determined to pay food subsidies regardless of the opposition of Congress. It seems determined to use the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the funds of the R. F. C. to carry the subsidy program until next fall when it is hoped the program will be so firmly fixed in our economy that there will be no way to remove it. If food subsidies would stimulate production, there might be some argument in favor of paying out such subsidies, but the producers, processors, and feeders are unanimous in their testimony that food subsidies will reduce rather than increase our food production. Why then does the administration insist upon the payment of food subsidies? The answer, in all probability, was given by a Congressman who formerly opposed subsidies but who now favors them. His answer was, "There are more consumers than farmers, so subsidies will bring in more votes."

O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from the reports back home that a vast majority of our people are well pleased with the action of this House in reducing the appropriation and limiting domestic activities of the O. W. I. I am of the opinion that the time has come to investigate its foreign policies and stop its political activities overseas. The veil has been lifted from this so-called information agency and the people see it in its true light—a New Deal propaganda machine.

I submit to you a statement on this subject by Hon. Robert H. C. Kay, of Charleston, W. Va.

CHARLESTON, June 18.—The people of this country, and especially the fathers and mothers of America, have never been more callously insulted by New Deal bureaucrats than by the proposal of Propaganda Minister Elmer Davis, of the Office of War Information, to send a batch of assorted new dealers to England to convince the British that Americans are not what books and the movies sometimes paint them, a plan revealed in a news dispatch of the United Press published in a local newspaper," declared Robert H. C. Kay, Republican State chairman, here today.

"We have several hundred thousand American fighting men in Great Britain right now. They are the pride and pick and flower of American youth and young manhood. They are a true cross-section of this Nation. In their character and conduct, they portray the real American. In their boastless bravery, they typify the finest this country of ours has produced.

"THEY'LL NEVER KNOW

"They show by day and by night, in action against the enemy and in arduous preparation for that action, the traits of character on which this Nation has been built and has

grown great—honor, courage, honesty, faith, fidelity to ideal, love of home and country and freedom.

"They show the strength and hardiness of their pioneer forefathers, the sympathetic understanding of their mothers, the skill and ability of democratic education.

"Neither Mr. Elmer Davis nor his anointed New Deal ambassador can gild that lilly. If the British don't know what Americans are like now, they never will know. Our young men and women in the uniformed services are the finest crops of national salesmen ever assembled anywhere. It is an insult to suggest that a few new dealers blest of the brass hats in Washington could do better the job these boys and girls of ours are doing."

HAS FAILED IN JOB

"Mr. Davis was given a specific job to do in Washington—that was to keep the American public informed about the progress of the war, truthfully, factually, nonpartisanly. He has failed in that job," Kay asserted, "probably because he has constituted himself a propaganda minister for the New Deal and devotes too much of his time and our money to the fourth term, to New Deal bureaucracy which he vigorously defends, to the scourging of Washington newspaper men and women who don't bow down and worship blindly at the Roosevelt altar, and to trying to hide or gloss over the tragic confusion and conflict in the National Capital which jeopardizes needlessly the lives of American men and women on the fighting fronts.

"Mr Davis had better keep his New Deal propagandists at home. The real, typical Americans abroad in uniform today will do the selling job just as effectively as they are doing the fighting job without any help from Mr. Davis' emissaries.

"This is certainly one time when the fathers and mothers, the sisters and brothers of men and women on the firing line in defense of America should rise up in their wrath and write their Congressmen exactly what they think of this proposed political junket."

Big Ten Official Approves Sports During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, leaders in all walks of life have joined the parade endorsing sports in wartime. The British Government saw fit to declare a wartime sports program for the sake of morale and to develop the physical fitness of everyone within the Commonwealth. American sports leaders favor the same kind of a sports program in America.

Recently on the floor of Congress my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable LA VERN DILWEG, former all-American football player at Marquette University and later all-time professional end for the Green Bay Packers football team, gave a most intelligent presentation of the sports picture in America and its relation to the war effort. Mr. DILWEG, an able young attorney, presented a strong argument to the American people. I dare anyone to challenge its logic. Sports editors and leaders throughout the Nation have endorsed his address, Sports in War, as a masterpiece. This week, H. G. Hedges, better known as Cap Hedges, outstanding football official in the Big Ten Conference, and the father of three sons in the service of Uncle Sam, endorsed DILWEG's address. I am happy to include as a part of my remarks Cap Hedges' letter to Congressman DILWEG:

THE HEDGES CO.,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, June 26, 1943.

Mr. LA VERN DILWEG,
Member of Congress from Wisconsin, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAVVIE: I read your article, Sports in the War, in the Athletic Journal and was very much interested in what you told Congress. I think you are absolutely right, and I am glad that there is someone in Congress to uphold the principles to which the American youth has been accustomed, and which has built him into such a sturdy young man and a good citizen. You, HAM FISH, and others, are to be commended for your fight for athletics. No one knows better than we men who have continued our interest in athletics that both interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics in all forms are as necessary in these wartimes as is the training which young men receive in the Army camps, in the Navy preflight schools, and others. Again I say, I am glad that you are there to represent and champion the interests of the young people of America.

I presume that being in Congress may prevent you from officiating next fall. Of course, being in Congress is more important than any football game in these wartimes, and the rest of us left to do the job will do the best we can It must be a very interesting experience, and being in Congress at the most critical time in the history of our country is a service and experience that only a few men have the opportunity to take part in.

I have three sons in the service, two in the Navy and one in the Army. One boy was on a destroyer and took part in the invasion of the African coast last November and has been back and forth to Africa several times.

My convictions as expressed herein are not my own prejudiced emotions but are formulated by what my own boys tell me and what dozens of other boys have confided in me, boys who have been in athletics and who are now in the armed forces.

With every good wish and many kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CAP HEDGES.

Radio Address of Mr. Raymond Gram Swing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio address delivered by Mr. Raymond Gram Swing on June 22, 1943:

It may be helpful, and it certainly should be interesting, to discuss the crisis of the American home front, not as one American to another, but as an American to an imaginary ally. How would any one of us go about telling an Englishman, or a Brazilian, or a Russian, or a Chinese, what really is happening in this country and why? For the ally, reading headlines in American newspapers, is sure to be both frightened and perplexed. The race riots in Detroit, the coal crisis, the fight in Congress over subsidies, the gas shortage, the food problem—they seem to point to approaching disaster. And then there are the speeches of American leaders telling about decline in production, about complacency, and overconfidence. If a frightened and perplexed ally sat in your home, and asked you what it all meant, and whether, as seemed probable, America is disintegrating, and might lose the war and the peace on the home front, lose it for him as well as America, you would, I believe, try to reassure him But you could only do so by explaining first of all what is being done well, and then by explaining something about the nature of this America, which always hitches forward by a progress of extemporization, and makes a habit of letting things become bad before producing the effort to make them better.

American affairs are like an iceberg in that only a fraction of them are visible, and that fraction is usually unsatisfactory. The things that go well are out of sight. But an estimate of the iceberg must be of the whole of it. Thus the American war effort, its planning and its performance, is a stupendous achievement. The Army, Navy and Air Force have been created and shaped into might in incredibly short time, and with consummate ability. Production for the armed forces flows to them in phenomenal volume. The industrial apparatus of America has been transformed with miraculous speed, and is functioning in gigantic measure. Behind the armed forces, American opinion about the war is firm. The rank and file American, the Nation as a whole, understands the issues of the war, is ready to make any and every contribution necessary to win it, and ready, too, for America to bear its full share in the peace. That is the unseen part of the iceberg. There is a great war achievement and it is motivated by sound public feeling and thinking. No ally need feel fear about America. This country is not going to let itself down on the battle fronts, or in the post-war world, and let down its allies in the process.

Then what is the meaning of the home front? The Englishman, or Russian, or Chinese with whom you may be talking, will have to be told that he needn't be frightened, but he has every right to be perplexed. Never since the Civil War was there such a perplexing spectacle as the American home scene today.

Several statements must be made to help an outsider begin to come to grips with American affairs, though they won't explain much. For one thing, this country is the only one in the world—and perhaps in any war on a large scale—which has actually improved its standard of living in wartime. However much the talk of sacrifice, or indeed the genuine readiness to sacrifice, there is mighty little sacrifice of living standards by the majority. That is not a reproach. If there were need for sacrifice, undoubtedly it would be made. But the physical peril, the impoverishment and stresses of other nations, simply don't operate on thinking and living here. One can't understand America in terms of Britain or Russia or China. It is something apart.

And then one must understand too that America is approaching an election. This election affects everything, for everything, in the last analysis is politics. The tone of the country is set in Washington. That is where unity would have to be expressed first of all, and where the impetus to unity would have to begin, if we were to settle the home-front

problems with unity. But Washington is dedicated to the coming election. An outsider might wonder about that, and he would have to be told, never mind whether or not this is reasonable or wise, it is the way America behaves. The tone of factionalism is set in Washington. It is highly respectable, indeed highly patriotic, to be disunited, to turn and twist issues into partisan shapes. Congress itself is the center of this factionalism. There is plenty of it in most Washington bureaus. The newspapers are full of it. And the spirit of party strife reaches out to every nook and corner of the land. This is America before an election. Most other countries cannot afford an election now, they cannot risk the heat and friction and falsifications of extreme partisanship. The outsider must understand that America thinks it can afford it.

Then the outsider would need to have it explained that what America is going through just now is a great, fundamental, and obscure economic struggle, of which the coal strike, and the battles over the Office of Price Administration and subsidies are only evidences. This economic struggle is quite rightly ascribed to a want in firm decision at the top. The failure in keeping the economy of America stable is due in part to the President not having used the powers he possesses himself, or not delegating them to someone else. The outsider may be startled at this. For listening to partisan conversation, he may assume that the President clings to power for the sake of exercising it, whereas he now is shown as not exercising it, and not passing it on for someone else to exercise. The outsider should be given to understand that one reason so much power can be entrusted to our Chief Executive is that traditionally the man in that office is circumspect about using it, for that is the tradition of American statesmanship.

But it would be hard to clarify to the outsider the complexities of the economic problem we now are wrestling with, which is to stabilize prices, there is a struggle for and against subsidies. The one alternative to subsidies is to let prices rise. That would automatically reduce the American incomes. That would hurt almost everyone, but hurt most of all those with fixed incomes, though the white-collar people don't seem to realize their urgent interest. The outsider should know that one reason for the objection to subsidies is their political effect.

People who receive subsidy money in theory are influenced in casting their votes at election time. So there is bound to be political opposition. Besides, subsidies need to be most skillfully used, if they are not to become extravagant, and ineffectual. The British regulate the price level by subsidies, but exert control back at the beginning. The Government buys most of the essential products from the producer, and resells to the processor, if need be, at a loss. It is easier for the British to do this than for us, for so many of their essentials come from overseas. In this country, for the Government to buy direct from the producers on a large scale would be a colossal operation. Even so, that would be the safer way to handle subsidies. In that way the producer could receive his incentive to increase production, and the price level could be stabilized for the general benefit at the minimum cost. But it is easier said than done. It takes a monumental effort. And Americans don't have much experience in genuinely controlling their economy. It is the kind of recourse that is not accepted unless and until things get pretty serious. Just now they are getting serious. Presumably, an effort will be evoked that measures to the need. But if not, things will get still worse, then there will be a still greater effort. That is the way things get done in this country. Too much planning means using too much authority to suit most people. We prefer to solve our crisis the messy way.

It is going to be difficult, too, to explain the coal crisis to an outsider. He won't be able to see that unless and until the price level is stabilized, wage rates can't be stabilized. If the outsider is an Englishman he will know that the coal industry is the stepchild of modern industrialism. It always seems to be living on the borderline of poverty, it never pays satisfactory wages, and the coal miners as a group have to fight hard for concessions, and in fighting for them, have to challenge the community more directly than any other union. But he should see that John L. Lewis is one man, and the miners number half a million. To lash out at the half million to express passions against the one man might reduce the economic power of many more millions of workers.

The case against the behavior of John L. Lewis may be strong. But the democracy of America would be weakened if the rights of workers were clipped in the process of putting Mr. Lewis in his place. The outsider, if he has been about much in America, will be sure that the great majority of Americans ardently wish Mr. Lewis put in his place. But if he can get a glimpse of the submerged part of the American iceberg, he will see, too, that the American war achievement has had the contribution of American workers given with both spirit and restraint.

As to the riots in Detroit, they will be a riddle to most outsiders, and if one is put to giving an explanation he can quote the editorial in today's New York Times. "Local conditions," it says, "brought to the breaking point a tension which exists in many other communities. Detroit is desperately short of housing. Thousands of new residents have congested all the public facilities. Opportunities for wholesome recreation have been deficient, as they are likely to be in a community trying to cope with a temporary population. Gangs of hoodlums, both white and colored, have grown up, as they always will under such circumstances. Sinister individuals and organizations, doing the work of the Axis, if not actually allied with it, have taken advantage of the situation." It is serious. Indeed, it is. But it is not the collapse of a nation. It is a painful sore, and no fatal disease.

All told, America is indeed a perplexing land. Washington is a perplexing capital. Congress is perplexing. The President is perplexing. But the truth remains that the American war effort, the American Nation loyally behind it, is the paramount need, and it is being met. It is the submerged, unseen part of the iceberg. And it is the dominating part. The coal strike has been called off tonight. That reveals the real motive center of the country. One can hope that now the problem of economic stability will be solved in our eleventh-hour American way. The solution will have to come from the top, for the problem is too complex to be solved by a plebiscite. But one can believe that this leadership will be produced both by the President and by Congress.

Strikes From a Soldier's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter to Mr. J. I. Hoffman, secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association of Coatesville, Pa., from a soldier serving in the armed forces of the United States, expressing their reaction on the subject of strikes back home while they are giving their all on the battle front:

A. P. O. 7, CARE OF
POSTMASTER, NEW YORK,
June 6, 1943.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Sir, I have something on my mind, and I would like to get it off so I thought of writing to you.

It is about those coal miners back home, the men that call themselves Americans.

I was a healthy man when I came into the Army. Now I can't walk right. My feet are in bad shape from long hikes with heavy loads. My eyes are bad from so much night fighting. I am run down physically from living in insect-infested foxholes, from lying in muddy trenches, going without hot food and plenty of water for days. This campaign here is over, but it certainly left its mark on us fellows. Every one of us is somewhat shell shocked. We can hear still the screams of shells and the dying screams of our buddies who got their heads, arms, and legs blown off, who gave their lives for their country.

Yes; we have been through a living hell and aren't finished yet. And we went through everything for $60 per month. So for my buddies and myself please tell those coal miners that we will gladly trade places with them any time and work for nothing just to be in the country we love, near the ones we love.

I know there are two sides to every story, and if the coal miners have a better one than this it will surprise me, but I will be glad to listen to it.

Nothing would give me more pleasure than to make a speech to these men that are always striking. I could tell of something to strike for. My outfit landed at ———— November 8, 1942, and we have fought from there to Tunis. Myself and several other Yanks were captured by the Germans. But we took that all in the day's work. Coal mining might be tough, but what we call 88 fever is 10 times worse. The machine-gun jitters is also another bad ailment.

Life is mighty sweet when you expect to die any minute. We have stared death in the face many times; that is our duty as United States soldiers, but it is very disheartening to receive news of strikes back home when we would give anything just to be there, to have a bed to sleep in that wasn't full of ants, to sit down to a table, to see our loved ones smiling at us.

The war doesn't look so bad in print, but to a front-line soldier it is a living nightmare of hell that never seems to end. One attack is over, you get ready for another one; one battle over, you get ready for another one; one campaign over, you get ready for another one.

Well, I guess I have eased myself sufficiently so I will bring this letter to a close. I have been receiving your letters pretty regularly and thanks again. Best wishes to you and all my friends in and near Coatesville.

Sincerely yours,

JOHNNY REA.

Discontinuance of National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Alan C. McIntosh,

publisher of the Rock County Star-Herald, of Luverne, Minn. The Rock County Star-Herald is one of the outstanding newspapers of southwestern Minnesota. Mr. McIntosh, its publisher, reflects the feeling of most of the people of Minnesota toward continuance of N. Y. A.:

A DEAD BRANCH ON THE NEW DEAL TREE

Just as regular as the appearance of the robins and the grasshoppers you can periodically expect some representative of the National Youth Administration to drop into the office seeking a "publicity plug" urging student enrollment in the National Youth Administration training centers.

None have appeared in print and none will because personally we are a bit hostile to the National Youth Administration. Not because we always thought that the National Youth Administration from its inception was headed and manned by mostly "left wingers," the "let's make over America" brigade. And not because we think a much better job of vocational training is being performed by the public schools in their various, in school and out of school, programs.

OUTLIVED ITS USEFULNESS

Our opposition to National Youth Administration results from our belief that here is a Federal agency that has long ago outlived its original, if any, usefulness.

Some of the spending brigade, forgetting that our World War No. 1 debt was only $27,000,000,000—and what an enormous sum that seemed in those old-fashioned days, are now glibly talking about a national debt of $300,000,000,000.

Such a debt means only one horrible aftermath—ruinous inflation. We have to make a start toward debt reduction and that can only be done by ruthlessly chopping off money-wasting agencies. And if ever there was a dead branch on the "New Deal tree" that should be lopped off then that is the National Youth Administration.

There's nothing new about this big front that the National Youth Administration is putting up or its frenzied recruiting. It's the old, old, story all over again that once you get a tax-supported agency set up the bureaucrats will fight to the death to justify their existence on public pay rolls, long after the original need has been served. For the National Youth Administration, which has cost the public over three quarters of a billion dollars, is now in the waste stage.

Critics charge that it is duplicating functions performed by six other Government agencies. The waste of manpower and equipment—and some of that equipment is desperately needed in war factories—is staggering.

ALMOST "INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTION"

The personal ratio of instructors to students far exceeds that of the most exclusive and costly private finishing schools in the East. On October 28, 1942, the National Youth Administration had 11,806 paid employees and only 53,000 students taking instruction. And of that list of paid employees only 44 percent were actually teaching, the 56 percent remaining were administrative job holders. This is a ratio of one instructor to every four and one-half students. (If a private business was maintained on such a basis it would be broke before the first month's pay roll had been met.)

Because of the war developments in recent months, the demand by the armed services and private employment, enrollment has dwindled to the vanishing point and the National Youth Administration recruiters are even trying to sign up 16-year-olds to bolster enrollment. This is so the agency can present a good "showing" in its reports.

MORE INSTRUCTORS THAN STUDENTS

We have heard of one National Youth Administration center in this area where at times the instructors outnumbered the students. At Clinton, Iowa, the training center equipment (and this didn't include the building) was valued at $275,000. There were 11 students bouncing around there at last report, or an investment of about $27,000 per student. At Newark, N. J., the National Youth Administration was reported to have much idle and unused equipment and 25 supervisors and foremen to 75 students. Down in Coffeyville, Kans., two big 48-passenger buses were used to transport students in luxury, but the regular high-school students found walking most satisfactory. At another spot in Kansas two of these big 48-passenger buses were observed burning gas and rubber on a 30-mile haul of students. Yet each bus carried only five passengers.

If you ask us—and it's a certainty the National Youth Administration won't—we would say that here was one Federal agency overripe for the tax-pruning knife.

Where Are We Headed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of June 23, 1943:

WHERE ARE WE HEADED?

On Monday, General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, told the Conference of Governors at Columbus, Ohio:

"This is the most critical summer both for us and in the history of the world."

No leader of the military war effort is more qualified to make such a pronouncement. He accompanied it with this warning:

"The way will be far from easy, and the losses heavy."

The American people have patently not prepared themselves for that travail.

On the day that General Marshall addressed the Governors of the 48 States there was going on, in Detroit, hoodlumism and rioting of such proportions that they eventually led, within a few hours, to a declaration by the President of the United States that a "state of insurrection" existed in Detroit, and to the issuance of an order sending Federal troops into that city to restore law and order.

The score was 25 dead, more than 200 injured, more than 1,200 in jail.

This on a day when the United States was engaged in a global war from which it will either emerge victorious or in which it will be destroyed as a free Nation.

A state of domestic insurrection; think of it.

On that same day the soft and hard coal mines of the United States were idle for the third time within a month and a half. Those mines are in the possession of the Government of the United States. A governmental agency had stipulated economic conditions under which the mine work was to continue. Yet the miners walked out.

The President issued no manifesto covering the mine fields, but that, too, was insurrection against the Government and the people of the United States.

When the miners stopped work they became participants in a rebellion.

Here—there—everywhere—throughout the length and breadth of this land there were work stoppages; there is complete confusion over food supplies and food prices; there is complacency; there is a lack of war-needed civilian leadership.

What in the name of heaven has come over us?

Where are we going as a people?

How can we hope to win a total war if this continues?

Only last Saturday Under Secretary of War Patterson, whose job it is to see to it that the fighting land and air forces get whatever is needed by way of supplies, warned that May production had fallen 5½ percent, chiefly because of national complacency, and that if production did not meet planned schedules not even the basic military needs would have been supplied by the year's end.

It is ridiculous and fallacious to accuse foreign enemy agents of instigating the Detroit rioting. The time, place, and circumstance of origin is known.

The underlying causes are, too, known. They do not seem from foreign intervention. The inspirational source is domestic and as subversive as anything which any enemy could conceive.

Nor is the mine stopping the result of enemy-agent activity, although enemy agents will delight in what John L. Lewis and his followers have achieved.

Nor are our enemies ill served by the Government's own lack of forthrightness in dealing with the situation immediately and effectively.

Once again Lewis has called the tune and the miners will go back to work toward another deadline, which again will enable him to continue his role in a drama that is costing a war-torn Nation far too much so that his vanity and ambition might be gratified.

We, as a people, are going to have to come soon to our senses or it is going to be too late. Every participant in the Detroit rioting, white and Negro, struck a blow to this country by his or her hoodlum behavior.

Every idle miner strikes a continuing blow at the country so long as he remains idle, or continues to threaten further interruption of the war effort.

Every packer who closes his plant strikes a blow at country.

And the Government strikes the most grievous of all blows when it fails to face up to all the complex domestic issues with courage and practicality, and with complete absence of partisan political consideration.

This country, domestically, is on no road to victory. It is on the road to anarchy, and it must change its direction.

Gasoline for Driving to Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Times-Union

and the Catholic Courier, Rochester, N. Y., of June 24, 1943:

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of June 24, 1943]

BLOCKING THE OIL

Harold Ickes, petroleum administrator, again insists there will probably be no improvement in gas and oil rationing in the East for the duration.

That is a defeatist attitude. It is not an American attitude, for Americans believe their problems can be conquered by effective methods. It is not an attitude to be tolerated by the public. Either Ickes should drop it or else his problem should be entrusted to someone who thinks he can handle it.

Facts and trends challenge Ickes. Other Federal agencies are planning to shift 9,000 tank cars to the eastern runs, raising to 81,000 the number on those lines.

It will be remembered that in 1941 Ickes thought the railroads could not carry eastward 200,000 barrels a day. They are now carrying over 800,000 barrels daily and soon will increase that total.

If 9,000 extra tank cars are dug up for the eastern service, Ickes will be challenged with the question, Where were these cars while we walked and froze all these months?

Mr. Ickes' position is becoming untenable, for Donald Nelson, head of War Production Board, promised Monday in Washington that squabbles of overlapping divisions would be ironed out and that relief would be had in the oil situation.

Nor will the Ickes attitude answer the dynamic letter Governor Dewey has written him, demanding to know why the barge canal is not being utilized.

The Governor recalled that last March the Ickes outfit said more petroleum could be moved through the canal and, on the strength of this promise, the State voted funds and improved the canal to facilitate the traffic. But the waterway is not being used even to the extent of last year.

Mr. Ickes has contended all along that all available means were being used to get oil east, yet the facts and his own associates show this is not so.

Surely his position that improvement cannot be had is untenable in the face of this evidence that more facilities are available than are being used.

Mr. Ickes' attitude does not suit a people who demand action.

[From the Catholic Courier of June 24, 1943]

PERMIT DRIVING CARS TO CHURCH SERVICES HERE

Without fear of inciting the ire of the local Office of Price Administration, holders of A gas ration books may drive their cars to church on Sunday.

Admitting the comfort and inspiration which comes from attendance at religious services, Joseph D. Paterson, district director of the Office of Price Administration, announced that permission had been granted by the regional office for driving to religious services between the hours of 6 a. m. and 1 p. m.

A careful check was made with the other diocesan chancery offices of the State last week to determine if a ban had been placed on the use of private cars to attend church. In every case it was discovered that no such prohibitions had been enacted except in Rochester.

This matter was referred to the attention of Senator JAMES M. MEAD on his visit to Rochester Sunday. He expressed surprise and said that any such order should be immediately rescinded for it was in contradiction of one of the "four freedoms," the freedom of religion.

REASONABLE PLAN

George C. Donahue, secretary of the Rochester Auto Club, has submitted a proposal governing the ration of gasoline which would seem to eliminate many of the disagreeable features as they exist at present. Pointing out that shoes, sugar, and other items are so rationed that the purchaser can use them without fear of policing. Donahue recommends that gas be distributed through regulation of the gallonage value of ration coupons.

In such a plan, copied after that which is being followed in Canada the consumer would know exactly how much gasoline he can have in a given month and its use would be within the discretion of the individual. In any emergency the value of the A, B, or C coupon could be reduced to conform to the needs of our mechanized forces overseas.

Donahue's plan does away with some of the present policing methods of the Office of Price Administration, many of which smacked strongly of Gestapo practices. It puts the matter of conservation of gasoline squarely up to the individual consumer and it is entirely the individual's fault if his supply of gas does not cover his essential needs.

[From the Catholic Courier of June 24, 1943]

DRIVING TO CHURCH

The decision of the Rochester office of the Office of Price Administration to permit driving to church on Sundays between 6 a. m. and 1 p. m., will relieve the minds of thousands of church-goers. The past few Sundays have been a nightmare to them: some undertook walking that was beyond the capacity of their years and physical condition; some sought with varying results to ride the bus; some took a chance and drove to church; some felt they could not face the threats of the Office of Price Administration local officials, and remained away from church.

Now the nightmare is over. Rochester becomes like other cities in the State. Religious people can begin to take advantage of the general rule of the Office of Price Administration that permits driving to church.

But one is bound to ask, why the limitation by the local office to the hours between 6 a. m. and 1 p. m.? The general law makes no such limitation, but permits driving to church. Religious services are not confined to these hours. Earlier hours for mass are scheduled at many churches, the noonday mass may send the congregation away about 1 p. m., and afternoon and evening services should have the same consideration in regard to permission to drive that other services have.

Religious people find great consolation in going to church, in assisting at Holy Mass, in joining with their fellow-parishioners in common supplication for the welfare of our boys in service, for the blessing of God on our President and all who assist him in directing our armed forces on land and sea and in the air, for the souls of those who have died for their country, for God's blessing of timely solace to the sorrowing hearts of their parents. America has been and is the friend of religion, America places no hindrance to its free exercise.

The latest Office of Price Administration pronouncement is a step in the right direction. It will become entirely right when it removes the time limitation. Encourage American people to go to church at any time and in any place their religious faith and devotion may suggest.

What the Folks Back Home Think of O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following comments from various newspapers and commentators:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of June 22, 1943]

ONE WORD MORE

(By Ralph McGill)

NATIONAL SICKNESS

Coal strikes and race riots occupy a part of the day's news. Both indicate a national sickness. Both indicate certain national tensions to which it must be admitted we have for years given a mixed attitude of emotionalism, indifference, and lack of understanding.

No one has any sympathy for John L. Lewis. There is some sympathy for the miners themselves, and yet millions of American people have a very grave view of the fact that some 500,000 men feel they owe allegiance to their union greater than that they owe their country.

The miners deny this. They assert they are ready to work for their country on almost any sort of basis within reason. In the same news one reads that in England a number of coal miners went to jail to serve sentences rather than pay fines imposed for work stoppages. It cannot be that miners the world over are unpatriotic. It means there is a sickness in the coal industry's work relations which has not been cured.

The miners state, with some supporting evidence, that some operators are refusing to participate in any settlement because of their opposition to the President. Their attitude is, "This is Roosevelt's baby. Let him sweat it out. His chickens are just now coming home to roost. We will sit tight and let Roosevelt have the headache. At long last we have got him in a corner."

This factor is undoubtedly one reason why settlement has been so difficult. It will be another reason why the Government may be forced to operate the mines for an indefinite period.

Both miners and operators must bear part of the blame.

Neither, I think, realize that the great mass of American people who don't own mines or who don't belong to the United Mine Workers, are shocked and dismayed by the spectacle of the miners and the stoppage of work.

Too few of us are willing to try and study the causes and effects. There is too much jumping up and down and too little thinking. The cry of "lynch him" has about drowned out the plea for common sense.

A TIME TO BE GRIM

It is a time to be grim, all right. But it is not a time to lose tempers or perspectives. I have grown into almost a recluse insofar as conversations are concerned.

It doesn't alarm me too much, because history teaches it always is difficult to restrain emotions in time of war. But it is dismaying to see otherwise calm and intelligent men

grow red of face and pound tables in arguments about the strikes, the race problems, the Roosevelt policies.

It is very obvious, of course, that some few of our anti-Roosevelt men hate Roosevelt so much they put his destruction ahead of the war effort. It is just as obvious they are as unpatriotic and as dangerous as John L. Lewis.

You see some of the same emotions in Congress where the House vents its anger in bills it knows the Senate won't concur in. Yet the House votes them just to ease the tempers and emotions of the House.

You see them, for example, strike out the domestic features of the Office of War Information. They should have been busy urging that enough money be given the Office of War Information to carry on a national selling job on the new withholding taxes which are to go into effect next week and the week following.

The job could have been done. It was to show to each man drawing a salary that this was his contribution to the cost of the war; that it was paying each week what he otherwise would owe at the end of the year. You will see great discontent in July and August. The domestic job for Office of War Information is almost as important as the propaganda job it must do abroad. Even that job had its appropriation halved. The domestic job is to be abolished altogether if the House has its angry way.

The House voted against all subsidy payments to roll-back prices, yet failed to submit a substitute plan.

It is plain that the House is merely letting off steam instead of doing a calm, intelligent job. The people look to them for leadership. Instead the House is simply joining in the confused angers of the people.

The House is passing the bills on to the Senate, knowing the Senate will do at least some of the job of maintaining a sane basis. The record of the House is not too good. Americans can thank God for a Senate that is made up of sounder stuff.

THE RACE RIOTS

All the false stories, all the inflammatory agitations, are bringing on troubles between the races. Overcrowded cities, overcrowded working areas, overcrowded transportation lines, lack of housing, lack of recreation, all have their part in it.

It is something which has been going on for a long time. We got by with it because it was stretched thin. Now we have it concentrated in certain areas.

The worst trouble is in Detroit, where there were housing riots some months ago.

It teaches one thing which ought to be a lesson to the agitators who constantly hold up the South as the place where trouble and tensions are worst. The problem is a national problem and can be solved only on a national basis.

There again we see the examples of an old, national sickness for which there is no specific.

Meanwhile, bad as the confusion is in the war and on the domestic war front—these facts remain—we are doing a better job in the war than we did in 1917-18. We are doing a better job holding down prices.

In the race riots we are again doing a better job than in 1917-18.

Don't let emotions so sway you as to make you believe the times are the worst we have ever had and that we are doomed and lost

That isn't true. We are doing a better job in all fields than ever before. The finger points to continued and greater effort.

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald of June 21, 1943]

THE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION HOME FRONT

The action of the House of Representatives in voting to abolish domestic operations of the Office of War Information is an evidence of the fact that whereas few persons will admit to being military experts, many of them think they are experts on the propaganda front. Apparently feeling that it is having too little influence upon the conduct of the war, the House has proceeded to vent its spleen upon the Office of War Information.

The Office of War Information probably has run into this situation because it has tried to steer a middle course between the two extremes of Government information—the one extreme being represented by practically all other warring countries, with a ministry of information as the sole authoritative voice of the government, and the other being the extreme attempted first in this country by the Office of Facts and Figures as a mere coordinating agency.

In this middle ground, the Office of War Information has both coordinated news from all governmental agencies and has also served as a central news-issuing agency. Individual governmental departments retained their separate information staffs, but Office of War Information undertook to lay down general policies for their guidance, and to act as a clearing house. At the same time, Office of War Information sought itself to prepare and issue information about the war.

With such a middle ground, no sharp lines could be determined. There was bound to be some overlapping and resultant confusion. This situation appears to have been utilized by some Congressmen as an excuse for a general attack upon the domestic operations of the Office of War Information.

The fundamental error lies in the assumption that the work of the Domestic Division of the Office of War Information is concerned with propaganda and not with the dissemination of news. It overlooks the fact that it can well be the duty of a Government to see that the people are correctly informed and as completely informed as possible, always, of course, with the provision that no restrictions be placed upon the private gathering and publishing of news.

If the effort to abolish the domestic branch of the Office of War Information succeeds, among the functions that will be abolished are several of value and importance to the war. For one thing, the domestic branch is charged with assisting and stimulating campaigns for such public drives as bond sales, scrap-iron collections, blood-bank contributions and the like. It also checks on enemy radio reports, analyzing them and giving to news services anything of public interest. It channels news to weekly paper and specialized papers of various sorts that are not served by regular news agencies.

The Office of War Information Domestic Branch has the duty of informing the American people so that they will be invincible against the lies and distortions of enemy propaganda.

The Germans call their nearest approach to the Office of War Information the Ministry of Propaganda. Upon this they spend, by latest unofficial estimates, $600,000,000 a year. The Office of War Information emphasizes information. The Budget Bureau recommended a total of $47,342,000 for the Office of War Information, an increase of around $12,000,000 over this year's expenditures. The present cuts in the House reduce the appropriation to $28,972,504.

Fundamentally, of course, the issue is whether the Office of War Information is limiting itself to information or is distorting information. Apart from the fact that some mistakes can be expected, the Office of War Information has hewed closely to the line of information. The reputations of Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, and of Gardner Cowles, Jr., retiring director of the Division of Domestic Operations of the Office of War Information, are sufficient to justify confidence in its work. This is also true of Palmer Hoyt, Cowles' successor. They are men thoroughly imbued with the concept of news as a basis for democratic procedures. In their hands the domestic work of the Office of War Information could not become an agency for distorted propaganda.

This war could be lost on the home propaganda front. It could be lost by the people losing confidence in Washington. The action of the House is gravely disturbing when such realities are considered.

[From the Chattanooga Times of June 20, 1943]

TOO MANY FIELD MARSHALS

The Senate and House should take turn about calming each other down, lest their cumulative efforts place an obstruction on America's war effort which will make that of John L. Lewis seem tame by comparison. The Senate must now do a lot of curbing to counteract the action of the House of Friday when it threw a Mark IV monkey wrench into the Office of Price Administration program and practically sought to sabotage the Office of War Information.

Representative STARNES, of Alabama, led the battle to cut off funds for the entire domestic Office of War Information program, leaving only the appropriation for the foreign service. He appointed himself to speak for the American press in moving the drastic proposal, although the impression of the Chattanooga Times is that the American press thinks highly of Elmer Davis, head of the Office of War Information, and is cooperating wholeheartedly with Mr. Davis.

The reply yesterday of Mr. Davis was characteristic of his forthright frankness. "If the Senate concurs with the opinion of the House, there will be no Office of War Information, and that is that," said Mr. Davis.

As to the statement by Mr. STARNES, echoed yesterday by Senator NYE, that the American people do not need to be "sold" on this war, there may be a difference of opinion. There is a good basis for the belief that the American people and especially many members of Congress do indeed need to be "sold" on the war.

But Mr. Davis made a reply to one section of Mr. STARNES' House speech. Said Mr. Davis in answer to Mr. STARNES' remark that this country needs no Joseph Goebbels or Virginie Gayda: "There is quite a difference between me and Goebbels, as Mr. STARNES would discover if he read the order by which President Roosevelt created the Office of War Information, or followed our activities. For one thing, Dr Goebbels does not have to go to the Reichstag for his appropriation."

JOE STARNES has been a progressive worker for the interests of the Tennessee Valley. He is popular in north Alabama. But Washington seems to do things to some of our southern Congressmen. They don't make good soldiers in Washington, though JOE STARNES made a good soldier in France in 1918. They seem to want to shout back to the Commander in Chief: "Right shoulder arms your own self!"

[From the Star of Anniston (Ala.), June 20, 1943]

CONGRESS RUNS AMUCK

The present Congress of the United States reminds one of the proverbial roaring lion running around seeking whom it might destroy. On last Thursday it had a genuine field day striking out recklessly at the Office of Price Administration, the Office of War Information and the National Resources Planning Board, which likely will be killed completely insofar as the power of the purse which the Congress exercises is concerned.

Congress is supposed to be a deliberative body, but more recently it seems to have been activated more by prejudice than by calm intellectual consideration. It has ignored completely the experience of Canada and of England with respect to the use of the subsidy as a mechanism of inflation control and has denied any further funds for that purpose without proposing any tested alternative.

Moreover, it is made mandatory that the Office of Price Administration cannot employ any policy making official hereafter in even a minor capacity unless he has had at least 5 years of business experience. That, however, may not be a bad precedent, as the same rule of thumb might well be applied to the Congress itself, which now is composed largely of lawyers who could not make a living in private practice. Would it not be equally fair hereafter, therefore, for the people to insist that no man could offer for Congress until he has proved that he could make at least $15,000 a year—about what a Congressman's salary and perquisites amount to annually—in his private business or profession?

As for the Office of War Information, we were sorry to see our good friend Joe Starnes liken the brilliant and patriotic Elmer Davis to Joe Goebbels and Virginio Gayda, the German and Italian propagandists. "I think it's an insult to the intelligence of the American people," roared this young Dietian, "to have foisted upon them the kind of propaganda put out by the Office of War Information. They are trying to tell us, like we were 6-year-old children, why we are at war," stated the Alabamian.

Purist that he is in the use of the English language, Mr. Davis probably will be shocked that so learned a person as a Congressman should use the word "like" in this connection in place of "as"; but the longer he lives in Washington he will learn that Congress is a law unto itself, linguistically and otherwise. Seriously, however, we doubt if there is another man in the United States who could have done a better job as dispenser of public information than has been done by Mr. Davis; nor are there many men in Congress who are making a greater financial sacrifice to serve the people in this great crisis.

It might be stated further that "our Joe" would be enlightened with respect to the people's knowledge of the war issues if he would read a recent article in the New York Times magazine by Drew Middleton, who says that even the boys at the front have no clear idea as to the stakes involved in the war. The English and the Russians are much more enlightened, as they carry their schools to the front and keep their fighting forces informed daily as to the causes and objectives of this titanic struggle for freedom. America would profit by doing likewise—and a few lessons in economics and history might also be of help to "the greatest deliberative body in the world"—our Congress.

But, on the other hand, Congress is not solely to blame for its shortcomings. Constantly beset, as its Members are, by pressure groups, by self-seeking constituents, by forced entertaining of visitors, in addition to a voluminous correspondence, the average Congressman has no time to reflect or to read a book. And when they are forced to stay in session month after month in such circumstances it is no wonder that their nerves get frayed and that they frequently make egregious mistakes.

Be this as it may, however, Mr. Davis says that if the Senate sustains the action of the House in regard to its action respecting his position, abolition of domestic propaganda, he will resign his office and return to his private affairs in New York. That would be a national loss, as Mr. Davis unquestionably is one of the clearest thinkers and speakers ever to appear on the public scene in this country.

[From the Louisville (Ky) Courier-Journal of June 20, 1943]

GOVERNMENT BY WANTON IRRESPONSIBILITY

In light of events in our national House of Representatives as reported yesterday, it does not seem fantastic to think that if the preceding day's menu of the House restaurant were scanned, we might find as one item "the insane root that takes the reason prisoner." No sorrier spectacle of government by passion and irresponsibility, by prejudice linked with partisan intent to destroy for the wanton and self-serving joy of destruction, has come in a long time than that which was presented in the action to punish the Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Information and which cut deep into the vitals of orderly inflation control and general effectiveness of war on the home front.

The fury of political outcry against "bureaucracy," meaning anything which smacks of technical public service and particularly of service by the present administration, reaches its height in the typical action to require "at least 5 years' business experience" for all Office of Price Administration price policy officials (excepting Administrator Prentiss Brown, although he would qualify anyhow). The disservice to consumers, meaning all of us, which has marked most of the attitudes and actions of the House in the matter of price control, is demonstrated in the refusal to support programs involving grade labeling or standardization of foods, clothing, or other civilian commodities. The surrender to the price lobbies which consistently has colored the behavior of the House is seen again in the stipulation that price roll-backs will be denied for foods which have not reached parity figures.

In voting to abolish domestic operations of the Office of War Information and to reduce that agency's appropriation by 40 percent, the thundering House majority vented its spleen on a program which had been instituted at request not only of most newspapers, but also of Congressmen who had themselves inveighed against Government press agents and demanded coordination of public information activities for the sake of clarity and coherent direction in this department.

The day's record of sabotage was accomplished by coalition of almost solid Republican strength generally with rebellious southern Democrats whose spokesmen held forth with distortion, or with downright ignorance of facts in the case. An example was the attack of Representative ALLEN of Louisiana upon the Office of War Information pamphlet on Negroes in war work, which he said had incited race prejudice in the South. Actually, this document, addressed to Negro workers, was an appeal to them to take pride in their efforts, to take glory in the opportunity to serve their Nation in its extremity. That even the most expeditious panderer to inflammable prejudice should cavil at such a word of encouragement for Americans working to help save America is all but incomprehensible at this time. "The ruling passion conquers reason still."

It is hardly credible that the Senate will allow these actions to stand, but in any case it must be in the eyes of reasonable citizens, a great harm has been done to the prestige of Congress as an agency representative of the single-minded ardor of the bulk of American people, the consecration of a people, to hold the line against destructive forces at home and abroad Nothing could be more demoralizing than the spectacle of national leaders betraying the responsibility with which they are vested, fanning discord, playing with disillusionment, indulging a bitterness and an expediency of politics while the clouds hang heavy.

[From the Asheville Citizen of June 21, 1943]

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION AT HOME

Elmer Davis believes that the domestic and foreign activities of the Office of War Information are bound indissolubly together. If the Senate persists, as the House has done, in cutting out the appropriation for the Office of War Information's domestic operations, Mr. Davis says he will resign.

As the Office of War Information chief should know by now, this is not the way to win appropriations and influence Congressmen. Nevertheless, we forgive him his personal exasperations. Congress could not very well extinguish the whole Office of War Information program, which is integrated so securely with military operations. To Mr. Davis' credit he has acknowledged that Office of War Information's overseas work is "frankly propaganda." And most everyone knows, or should know, its necessary uses in wartime.

Domestic Office of War Information activities are a different matter. All things considered, The Citizen for one finds much to commend in the way the Office of War Information is gathering and disseminating information about the war. It has provided the nation's newspapers with material beyond the reach of ordinary news gathering facilities. Particularly in the States it has served to channel news of local and regional war measures and regulations into the proper hands for popular consumption.

Mr. Davis' mistake, if indeed he is guilty of error, is in failing to inform Congress of the usefulness and necessity of this type of activity. It is not propaganda. It is information. We have need of more rather than less of it. The Office of War Information's $5,000,000-$8,000,000 expense account is cheap at the price. The Senate should restore it.

RADIO COMMENTATORS

(Edward R. Morrow, Columbia Broadcasting System, June 30, 1943)

Anyone who does a little listening in Washington these days is liable to get the impression that we're fighting two wars. No one who has seen what's happened to Europe, even before the shooting war began, could deplore the continuation of political discussion. But whatever our domestic political differences may be there can be no doubt that the enemy of this people is to be found on foreign soil, not in Washington. That city is a bewildering place all right. There is some border warfare in the unchartered no-man's land between administrative agencies. There are people who will tell you the whole thing is a mess, no clear-cut definition of function or authority, three agencies trying to do the same job, a lot of personal jealousies in high places. Some of those things may be true but they can't all be true. It just isn't possible. For if Congress is stupid and our administrators incompetent then how is it that we've trained and equipped huge armies, whipped the Axis at their favorite game of economic warfare, and geared our whole economy to war production.

I've seen some things we've done abroad—the flood of weapons and supplies pouring into north Africa, the great military establishments in Britain and Iceland and Newfoundland. It is the outpouring of a great, strong Nation and in the end of the day it will produce victory. But that victory may be delayed, its fruits soured if our domestic political war takes precedence over the war against our enemies. The city of Washington is filled with hard-working people. To this reporter it's the hardest working capital in the world. They tell me there are a lot of bureaucrats down there. That's probably true. But bureaus are needed to win a war and men and women are required to man the bureaus. And that's how they become bureaucrats. Whatever name we choose to call them, there are a lot of hard-working Americans down there trying to help win this war.

The House of Representatives has decided to abolish the domestic activities of the Office of War Information. If the Senate concurs that organization will fold up. Maybe it should. But there ought to be a reason and claiming that Elmer Davis is another Goebbels isn't a reason. It's ludicrous. As I understand it, the Office of War Information was established to help win this war. Its success or failure at that job ought to determine its future. No one can be sure just what part propaganda and psychological warfare has played so far but there can be little doubt that the time is coming and soon when the Germans will be vulnerable to a sustained campaign designed to weaken their will to fight. If that job is done well it might shorten the war by months and shortening the war by months means the saving of a great many American lives.

Next winter in Europe will be a terrible winter. As it closes in the German people will be weary and wondering. If we have anything to say to them, that will be the time to say it. Optimism and courage are retty hard to hold on to when you're cold. I'm not competent to speak of the domestic activities of the Office of War Information, but I can tell you that if that organization is wrecked, our campaign of political warfare against the enemy will suffer, and I can report that in the opinion of every competent observer, military and civilian, we are not so near to winning this war as to be justified in discarding anything that might help win it. There are those in Washington who see in this effort to fragmentate the Office of War Information the opening gun in the 1944 campaign, the Presidential campaign. It's difficult, almost impossible, for one recently returned from the fighting fronts to accept that explanation. Healthy political controversy is one of the safeguards of democracy, but it just can't be that any of us are confused about the relative importance of the 1944 campaign and the bloody, bitter campaigns of the winter of 1943. In Britain ministers of information came and went with surprising speed. They once talked of forming a club for exministers of information. But the principle of political warfare was never seriously questioned, because it was agreed that it might help win the war. If the Office of War Information can't do anything to help win the war, then we would all agree that it should be abolished. But if it can, then those who destroy it for reasons of politics or personalities are assuming a considerable responsibility. Yesterday Mr. Robert Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, said that Army production was considerably below schedule for the month of May, and the first 10 days of June weren't much better. Mr Patterson was worried about complacency and overconfidence—the belief the war is as good as won. It's part of the Office of War Information's job to combat such complacency. Maybe what they need is more money and more time to get on with the job, free from threats of liquidation.

VERY HARD TO UNDERSTAND

(Alex Dreier, National Broadcasting Co., June 19, 1942)

Another domestic issue is whether the Office of War Information, handled by Elmer Davis, should continue its work in this country. The House has voted "no." If the Senate concurs with the House, then as far as Davis is concerned his days are over as Office of War Information Director. When Davis took the directorship, he was charged with the task of facilitating the development of an informed and an intelligent understanding of the status and progress of the war effort, of the war policies, activities, and aims of the Government. It was also the function of the Office of War Information to coordinate the war information activities of all Federal departments and agencies. These departments never have liked this delegation of authority. Let alone this, the implication has been made by Representative STARNES of Alabama * * * that Davis was another Goebbels. If that is so, then Davis is a very poor counterfeit. He is neither unscrupulous nor dishonest, he has a passion for the truth. Goebbels has a passion for the lie. Goebbels admittedly tries to mold the thinking of Germans; Davis gives the unvarnished facts. Davis is not beyond control and not safeguarded against contradiction, and as Davis himself expressed it—Goebbels doesn't have to run to the Reichstag to get appropriations. Representative STARNES certainly has every right to criticize the Office of War Information and its Director. We feel, however, that it was unfortunate, to say the least, that he chose to make this superficial and insulting comparison, for that's what it is. If the Senate now upholds the decision of the House denying the Office of War Information domestic funds, few people would blame Davis for resigning. The Nation stands the chance of losing not only a valuable information agency but also a Director whose capabilities are far beyond those which any replacements might have.

(Walter Winchell, Blue Network, June 20, 1943)

The fight in the House of Representatives against the Office of War Information and Mr. Elmer Davis has not been fully told. Stopping of Federal money for the Domestic Branch of Office of War Information will naturally put it out of business, and you—the public—will pay for this very personal vengeance. In the first place, Representative JOE STARNES, who led the fight against Elmer Davis, was peeved at the Office of War Information over a recent pamphlet which showed the Negroes' part in the war. Congressman STARNES is from Alabama. In the second place, if Elmer Davis is ousted with his Office of War Information, every Government agency will have to hire a public-relations man—meaning an additional expense of many millions of dollars per year paid for with new taxes by you—the sucker.

(George Hamilton Combs, Jr., June 17, 1943)

A gentleman whom I am proud to claim as a friend (although that friendship may be unilateral) is having his troubles down in Washington. His name? Elmer Davis. His offense? Frankness and candor. His detractors? Gentlemen who just don't like to be reminded that the "four freedoms" have some validity. Then Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, says the Office of War Information Chief is trying to silence the press to cover "sins of maladministration."

The gray-haired Hoosier, Mr. Davis, has a very nice sense of proportion and knows that the war will not be won by picayune criticism of the occasional delinquencies of some of our Washington bureaus. But the most ludicrous charge ever brought against him is that he was trying to silence the press and radio.

Now I know something about that. Among my other duties, I happen to be the news editor of this station. I get every release, memorandum, and request issued by the Office of War Information. I have never received one single line from the Office of War Information asking me to color, delete, deform, or omit any item of news of either local or international aspect.

Such informal censorship as has been imposed on radio and the newspapers is concerned solely with consideration of military security. Elmer Davis is a decent fellow. He would no more try to tell me what to say on the air than I would try to tell him that we would like him back in radio as one of the finest reporters on the air. Such a request from me would be impertinent and any suggestion of his as to either the quality or import of my news broadcasts would be unthinkable and presumptuous.

For once, we have a real guy doing a public information chore in Washington. Anybody who attacks him is assailing a level-headed and broad-visioned man. The Indiana Hoosier, with his inimitable mid-western twang, comes very close to being the pin-up boy for anyone who has worked in a radio station or a newspaper city-room.

In the words of some forgotten Senator, the criticisms of his work "are about as relevant as a steam whistle on a silo."

(Bob Trout, Columbia Broadcasting System, June 19, 1943)

The United States is a long way from the battle front, and entering the United States from a war zone these days is a little like stepping into a gloom world. The sounds of battle are louder around New York and Washington than they are in London on a night with the full moon only the battles here don't seem to have much to do with the war—disputes over meat, over air-raid warnings, coal miners' wages, the rate of war production, and whether some of the United States Government war agencies should have any funds on which to operate. Some of those disputes are still making the news today, and as we can see reports of what John L. Lewis thinks and how much the war is costing seem to overshadow the reports from the places where the guns are firing and the bombs are exploding. You can bet that today's news looks very different to the people who live in Chungking or London and to the boys who are flying over the South Pacific and the Mediterranean.

In Britain most people I know are talking about the probable length of the war in terms of years, whereas some friends on this side of the Atlantic are talking in terms of months. I hope you are interested in some of these things which the British are thinking. They're interested in what America is thinking. And the British believe that to win the peace all of us will have to get much more interested in what our neighbor countries are thinking. Helping in such an interchange of ideas is only one of the functions of the Office of War Information which Elmer Davis says today will dissolve if the United States Senate follows the House of Representative's lead in abolishing the Office of War Information's domestic branch. It's a little difficult to think of a British comparison for this situation. In Britain, Brenden Bracken, the Minister of Information, is a minister in His Majesty's Government. Members of the House of Commons, the people's representatives, don't try to abolish parts of Mr. Bracken's Ministry of Information by withholding funds. It just isn't done. As a matter of fact, after several false starts, Britain's Ministry of Information is now

working in a quiet, efficient way at its essential job of fighting the war with ideas and words as well as guns. The Germans have given such reluctant testimony to the effectiveness of the British Ministry of Information in this war, and the American correspondents in London could testify that at this point in the war what the Office of War Information needs is a bigger program on a more ambitious scale. Elmer Davis today pointed out for the benefit of Congress a few differences between himself and the German Propaganda Minister Goebbels. One difference Mr. Davis did not point out is that if the Office of War Information disappears, the loudest cheers will come from Joseph Goebbels.

(Jay Franklin, June 21, 1943)

The latest moves in Congress suggest that our national legislature is still hunting around for a safe and popular way of hamstringing the war effort. The latest victims of the Congressional search for its lost sense of importance are the Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Information. As E. Palmer Hoyt arrived in Washington to take over his duties as director of the Office of War Information's domestic branch, Elmer Davis faced Congressional elimination of this unit. Incidentally, the domestic bureau of War Information was set up and operated by rockribbed Republicans. The Office of War Information appropriation was cut so drastically by the House of Representatives last Saturday that the agency's future is in doubt, according to its director, Mr. Elmer Davis. Mr. Davis pointed out that the responsibilities of his organization are 10 times as big as those of the committee on public information in the last war. Short wave radio is one new complication, as is the fact that this war is being fought all over the world where the last one was confined to France so far as America was concerned. Mr. Davis has offered to resign if his agency is forced to abandon its attempt to inform the country of what its taxes are paying for in the way of the war effort. The charges against the Office of War Information are, of course, 1944 politics. It is said that political propaganda crept into some of the agency's news releases. It has been charged further that the Office of War Information is busy promoting a fourth term for President Roosevelt. Elmer Davis has denied these charges. Last week Mr. Davis gave a speech before the American Newspaper Guild in Boston in which he stated that he believed the newspaper coverage of war news was better than the newspaper coverage of Washington news. For this, too, he has been wrongly condemned.

(Richard Eaton, June 21, 1943)

The home front is particularly violent today, in fact during the past week end, which must, indeed, discourage our fighting men on the seven seas. First of all, we had last week the inexcusable attack upon Elmer Davis with no more justification than that upon Leon Henderson.

In the case of Elmer Davis it is just another effort not to reach Elmer Davis but to reach the President, our Commander in Chief, through one of his favorite aides. The Office of War Information, of course, may not be perfect. The number of resignations taking place in the last few weeks is perhaps the best proof, although many of them perhaps have taken place because the men were discharged after criticism. But I can tell you this much, the Office of War Information renders precious service to the home front through its domestic service without any effort whatsoever to influence newspapermen or commentators. But let me give you a few examples * * * the uncontrolled and poorly organized releases of each Government department (are centralized by the Office of War Information) and sees to it that every newspaperman or radio commentator receives them speedily and synchronized. In the same manner all the foreign broadcasts collected by the Federal Communications Commission listening posts are digested for our convenience.

No effort is made, and that's a very important point, in any way to influence our opinion but on the contrary we have at our disposal information * * * with far more thorough a background. If the Office of War Information didn't exist we would have to have a vast personal staff, even the agencies, the Associated Press would hardly do as efficient a job as the Office of War Information is doing. I haven't the time to go into all the details now of the work done by the Office of War Information, but I can say that this attack on Elmer Davis is a bad example of the sort of lack of unity in the effort to gain individual political success which characterizes the news from the home front.

(NOTE.—Due to the very poor recording of this program it was practically impossible to transcribe Mr. Eaton's comments of Office of War Information.—J. G.)

(Claude Mahoney, Blue Network, June 19, 1943)

The Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information is asking its seconds what hit it following the refusal of the House to vote any appropriations yesterday.

I suspect the Office of War Information this morning is wondering why the engineer didn't blow his whistle before he came around the curve. The action of the House in cutting off the appropriation for all domestic operations was as complete as anything I've ever heard. When I forecast yesterday morning that Mr. Davis would have his head in his hands before the day was over I didn't have any idea that he was going to get it chopped off. I want to get out into the open on this matter. Up until he made that Boston speech I was pretty much of an Elmer Davis man. Well, I still am for that matter, and I think that speech was ill-advised, just as something I might say would be called ill-advised. It's evident that there are a great many people in Congress who have little sympathy with Mr. Davis or perhaps more particularly with the work his organization is doing. You can't laugh off a 218 to 114 vote. Republicans in the past have charged that the Office of War Information was issuing fourth-term propaganda for President Roosevelt, but yesterday Representative STARNES said the organization had a distinct socialistic tinge. He said that Davis was a member of the American Labor Party, and Mr Davis has admitted that. He admitted that he was at one time, at least. Now, of course, there are many folks who would say that was no more sin than being a Democrat or a Republican. The Foreign Branch of the Office of War Information is left, but the 1,500 people in the Domestic Branch will go out at the end of the fiscal year if the Senate upholds the House. I suspect that Mr. STARNES laid himself open on one count, however, in his speech against the Office of War Information. He said it was an insult to the American people to say they don't know what they're fighting for until what and why by the Office of War Information. Well, it's a sad fact that both the Army and the Navy find it necessary to have heavy classes on just that subject. And I know whereof I speak on that, because I've got two personal friends who are teaching classes in what are we fighting for. Of course, those are Army and Marine classes. The Office of War Information has nothing to do with them. But the fact remains that a great many people are pretty fuzzy about the war aims.

(Claude Mahoney, Blue Network, June 21, 1943)

The Office of War Information seems to have as many lives as a cat, and I didn't let the House bill put it out of existence at all. The Office of War Information came through with a story of 9 statistics today probably gotten up by somebody who didn't know he was being legislated out of a job. The Office of War Information has this paragraph of explanation of the importance of coal in our lives. There are more than 60,000,000 consumers of bituminous coal. It supplies industry with more than one-half the power and energy required to produce the weapons of war [continues quoting Office of War Information's statement]. That's a nice little summary for which I'm indebted to them, and I'm indebted to that very branch that was voted out of existence by the House. How, I ask you, am I going to get my statistics if they kick that thing out of existence?

(Eric Severeid, Columbia Broadcasting System, June 21, 1943)

These are dog days in Washington. Political life in the capital seems to have reached a new low in wisdom, tolerance, and dignity. We are in a period of savage tempers, of violent statements, and sheer irresponsibility to a degree which this correspondent has not witnessed in the last 2 years. In the same frenzied afternoon the House slashed away all funds for the domestic information program of the Office of War Information. Some Representatives in the process compared Mr. Elmer Davis' position with that of Joseph Goebbels in Berlin. Well, that was just confusion compounded.

(Upton Close, Mutual Broadcasting System, June 20, 1943)

Now there is not a newspaperman that will feel that Elmer Davis in no way deserves the comparison made by a Congressman with the propaganda ministers of Germany and Italy or that he deserves anything save sympathy for having tackled what in the nature of America is an impossible job.

(John B. Hughes, Mutual Broadcasting System, June 19, 1943)

The home front has reached a state of disintegration which threatens to undermine the military advantages. The situation is underlined by the fight over the Office of War Information, the fight over the subsidy program and the soft coal situation, by any of a dozen symptoms of self-interest and national myopia.

(Carey Longnire, National Broadcasting Co., June 21, 1943)

A man from Mars could hardly be blamed if he dropped in here today if he decided that we Americans certainly do things the hard way. The man from Mars would find us faced with the toughest war in our history, a war in which everyone of us would presumably drop factionalism and petty jealousies and be pitching in with just one thought unanimously—victory. Last Friday Congress saw a sight which might have made the man from Mars think he was really visiting some sort of dream world. Everybody ought to know by this time that stability and confidence here on the home front is vital to winning the war. Two of the biggest needs on the home front are, first, a stable cost of living, and, second, honest information about the progress of the war. Not only did the House seek to chain up the Nation's price-control agency, it also voted to wipe out the issuing of war news on the home front by Elmer Davis' Office of War Information. One Representative inferred Mr. Davis tried to act

like Dr. Goebbels. Now, that presumably means Office of War Information threatens to tell newspapermen and radio commentators what to say. I can testify right here and now that neither Mr. Davis nor anyone else in Office of War Information ever tried to tell me what to say in any way.

(Calmer and How, Columbia Broadcasting Co., June 18, 1943)

The vote of the House of Representatives to give no money to the Office of War Information to continue its domestic operations appears to be a purely political move. It may be doubted that the mass of the American people regard the Office of War Information as primarily a fourth-term propaganda organ. It may further be doubted that the Office of War Information has any such purpose in mind.

(Samuel Grafton, Mutual Broadcasting System, June 20, 1943)

My second topic is the legislative riot which broke out in the House of Representatives on Friday and Saturday. The Members of the lower House are taking appropriations away from executive agencies of the Government with something of the spirit in which soldiers and sailors in Los Angeles recently snatched clothes from the zoot-suiters. They're showing just about as much discrimination and just about the same degree of calmness. In less than 24 hours the lower House wiped out the entire domestic appropriation of the Office of War Information. This is a true legislative crisis. It is so serious that it is up to the cooler, wiser, more statesmanlike heads in Congress—and there are many in both Houses—to take instant control. We cannot do the public business of this Nation in wartime to the tune of this kind of legislative snake dance.

[In discussing outbreak of race riots recently:]

In one of these riots—one at Mobile, Ala., the true facts were finally laid before the public only by the Office of War Information. That may account in part for some of the bitter hostility shown toward that Office in some sections of the political arena last week. It is an amazing thing that this Government, which is so often attacked for not telling people enough of the truth, should now vote to have its chief agency for disseminating the truth cut off. As one studies this wonderful and obscure pattern one sees to what a height political irresponsibility has lately risen. We can only hope for a reaction against all this—trusting in the good sense of the American majority which wants, first, to win the war, and, second, to reform without wrecking.

(Arthur Hald, National Broadcasting Co. June 22, 1943)

A Washington listening post advises that the newsmen in the Capital are going to bat for Elmer Davis and the Office of War Information. The House of Representatives, you know, voted to put the Office of War Information's Domestic Branch out of business following protest from Alabama's Congressman STARNES. The fate of the Office of War Information now rests with the Senate. The listening post reports that even the representatives of newspapers who have been critical of the Office of War Information are letting the Senate know that the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information plays a vital role in America's wartime information set-up. Many writers and commentators have criticized the Office of War Information for some of the things that it's done, and Office of War Information Chief Elmer Davis would be the first to admit that his organization is not perfect. Nevertheless, without the Office of War Information the difficulties of news coverage in wartime Washington would be multiplied many times. Much of the work done by the Office of War Information escapes attention, but Elmer Davis has done a swell job in loosening up Army and Navy policies on giving out news, in preventing conflicting releases from various agencies, in coordinating Government messages broadcast by the radio industry, and in a number of other ways. The public, not Davis, will be the loser if Congress forces the Office of War Information head out. He can always go back to the $100,000-per-year radio job he gave up for reasons of patriotism when the President asked him to become head of the Office of War Information at $12,000 a year.

(Johannes Steel, June 22, 1943)

Congress last week in a mood of abandon, apparently, cut down the entire domestic branch of the Office of War Information on a moment's notice. Now it should be observed here that it was the Office of War Information that stopped race rioting in Mobile, Ala., by daring to tell the public the truth and there can be no doubt that if the people of Detroit knew the full economic and social and political factors behind the race rioting that took place there, they themselves would stop it. There would be nothing like it. These facts, however, they can only get from an unbiased Federal agency like the Office of War Information. Yes; Congress continues to complain about the inability of the executive (department) to cope with problems of this kind. Last week's routine record, however, certainly doesn't set an example. The slashing of the Office of Price Administration practically made inflation a certainty. And that at a moment when the coal miners are on strike because they say that Congress is doing nothing to prevent the rise of prices.

(Roy Porter, Blue Network, June 22, 1943)

There may be some hope, after all, that the current confusion inside othe Office of War Information in Washington may be corrected. A new ray of light has been shed on the future activities of the Office of War Information and while the majority of the active newspapermen and radio reporters will agree on the general terms of the proposal, it's one thing to say what you are going to do and another to actually do it. All this arises from the new assignment accepted by Palmer Hoyt as director of the Office of War Information's Domestic Branch. Hoyt took over his new job yesterday and in the course of getting down to the job he said a few things which gives us the impression that perhaps the Office of War Information can really begin to function as a straight news-dispensing organization

---

(Report to the Nation, Columbia Broadcasting System, June 22, 1943)

Edwards: This week the home front became a first-class battleground. A rebellious House of Representatives voted to cut the Office of Price Administration budget by $35,000,000, as well as hamstring it with unprecedented limitations. The House also decided that the public knew enough about the war and denied funds to the domestic branch of the Office of War Information. All over Washington it became clear that too many minds were centered on the election campaign of 1944 instead of the military campaign of 1943. In fact, there seemed to be Nation-wide confusion as to the identity and whereabouts of this Nation's enemy.

[Telegram]

JUNE 24, 1943.

Mr. ELMER DAVIS,
Director, Office of War Information, Washington, D. C.:

National war committee for visual education earnestly believes Bureau of Motion Pictures has rendered great service in nontheatrical field showing war plants as well as thousands of communities without theaters, clubs, lodges, etc. Have indicated this belief to Senators concerned offering our personal testimony supporting this view if helpful.

O. H. COELLN, Jr.,
Chairman, National War Committee for Visual Education and Publisher for Business Screen Magazine.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NEW JERSEY PRESS ASSOCIATION, MARCH 8, 1943

"Whereas the weekly newspapers of New Jersey have been requested to save newsprint and printing papers wherever possible, and

"Whereas these newspapers are now receiving a tremendous amount of publicity materials from Government agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the weekly newspaper division of the New Jersey Press Association requests the heads of Federal agencies to do all in their power to lessen the amount of publicity stories, leaflets, booklets, etc., sent to weekly newspapers by Federal agencies both from Washington and other cities; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That these Federal agencies be requested to clear their material through the Office of War Information in the interest of greater economy and to save time and labor in the small newspaper office."

A copy of this resolution shall be sent to the head of each Federal agency and to Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information.

Adopted March 8, 1943.

———, ———,
Vice President for the Weekly Newspaper Division of the New Jersey Press Association.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LOUISIANA PRESS ASSOCIATION AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION AT OPELOUSAS, MAY 7–8, 1943

Whereas the United States Government, through the War Production Board, has asked the newspapers of the United States to cut consumption of newsprint at least 10 percent; and

Whereas the multitude of Federal agencies, bureaus, etc., have clamored for publicity in the said newspapers, and used tons of mimeographed sheets for this purpose, and

Whereas many duplications of efforts resulted prior to the establishment of the Rural Press Section of the Office of War Information; and

Whereas the establishment of said Rural Press Section has resulted in the elimination of the said duplication of effort, brought order out of chaos, saved many thousands of tons of paper and given the "rural" or so-called "country weeklies" and small dailies a concise statement of essentials for publication each week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Louisiana Press Association in convention assembled; This 8th day of May, 1943, in the city of Opelousas, Louisiana, that the Rural Press Section of the Office of War Information be commended for its achievements and that the thanks of the publishers of the State be, and are hereby, extended to the said Rural Press Section of the Office of War Information for the many

hours of work saved the country editors, the elimination of the duplication of effort and the saving mony tone of paper and; be it further

Resolved, That the Louisiana Press Association does hereby further extend its thanks for the short and concise bulletin of essential news forwarded them each week by the Rural Press Section of the Office of War Information.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MICHIGAN PRESS ASSOCIATION AT THE SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, JANUARY 23, 1943

Resolved, That the Michigan Press Association register its appreciation of the presence on its program of Mr. Charles L. Allen, Chief of the Rural Press Section of the Office of War Information, and for the splendid and revealing information he gave relating to the Office of War Information's current plan to cooperate more fully with the Nation's thousands of weekly and small daily newspapers. The Michigan Press Association expresses its confidence in Mr. Allen's abilities, and pledges its aid to the success of the Office of War Information program. We instruct the executive secretary to send copies of this resolution to both Mr. Allen and to his superior, Mr. Elmer Davis, head of the Office of War Information.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The Domestic News Bureau of the Office of War Information is performing an invaluable service for the ,000 industrial publications of the country. It has supplied them with a condensation of factual Government information suitable to their publications.

The industrial publications—and that includes the plant publications, the house organs, and the other papers and magazines that go to the men and women in the plants, shops, and stores of the Nation—are dedicated to the winning of the war. They are publishing the facts that are inspiring the men and women in our plants, mills, and shipyards to turn out more weapons with which to smite the Axis. They are publishing the facts that are encouraging their readers, the 40,000,000 men and women in the plants and their families, to do more with less, to make the sacrifices necessary to win the war.

These publications need those facts from responsible Government sources and the Office of War Information has been supplying them. The industrial editors have not been swamped with hundreds of releases from scores of Government offices. Instead they have been receiving a single release once every 2 weeks. This release has contained only information of value to their publications.

We do not know what will happen if the Office of War Information Domestic News Bureau is rendered inoperative. Whatever happens, certainly the industrial publications of the country will continue to do everything they possibly can to win the war. But they foresee grave difficulties.

None of these publications have sufficient funds to maintain bureaus in Washington. Few have funds with which to hire editors to read, evaluate, and rewrite press releases from multiple Government agencies.

Therefore, it is with the plea to keep these publications in the fight that we petition your committee to make certain that the Office of War Information gets sufficient funds to keep war information coming to the industrial press of America.

MERRICK JACKSON,
President, National Council of Industrial Editors Associations.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY GEORGIA PRESS ASSOCIATION

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by Georgia Press Association at closing session to be forwarded to Elmer Davis:

"The newspapers of Georgia are increasingly aware of the need of conveying to the public information from governmental agencies which is necessary to the war effort. Our space is limited and our time and personnel inadequate, but we wish to do everything humanly possible in this emergency. To most effectively attain this end the board of managers of the Georgia Press Association has authorized me to make the following requests:

"1. That all material from governmental agencies be cleared through one central source, the Office of War Information.

"2. That news stories be clearly designated, or listed, in the order of importance as seen by the Office of War Information.

"3. That the contents of this letter be transmitted to every bureau of Government dispensing information.

"4. That every newspaper in Georgia be placed on the mailing list of the Office of War Information for regular releases, based upon a reasonable determination of the space requirements.

"With the granting of these requests, we pledge to the Government the fullest possible cooperation of Georgia newspapers in carrying to the people as complete information on the war and home fronts as is possible."

OTIS A. BRUMBY,
President, Georgia Press Association.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

The American Newspaper Guild, with a membership of 20,000 working newspaper men and women, believes that the Office of War Information is an essential war agency doing a vital war job.

We believe that the American people are entitled to get as much information as it is possible for them to get. We believe that now more than ever—in this critical summer of 1943—a strong Office of War Information is imperative to help the reporters get out the facts to the American people—to help get the news of developments at home and abroad to all Americans. We believe that the Office of War Information has been of great service to the Nation in helping to obtain information about the war, in helping to eliminate confusion, and in helping reporters get the facts.

On behalf of the members of the American Newspaper Guild, I request that full appropriations be voted for adequate operation of the Domestic Branch of Office of War Information, at least to the extent proposed by the Budget Bureau.

MILTON MURRAY,
President, American Newspaper Guild.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Executive committee Washington Newspaper Guild asks Senate Appropriations Committee restore funds which Budget Bureau found necessary for operation domestic branch Office of War Information.

Office of War Information operations have aided reporters and other newspapermen in complex task of covering greatly expanded governmental war agency activities. Washington news bureaus and correspondents would find it extremely difficult to get all war news without such a central source. Channelizing of war agency news through Office of War Information is necessary to avoid interagency confusion. Recent Newspaper Guild national convention unanimously adopted resolution stating Elmer Davis as Office of War Information Director is best guaranty Nation could have freedom of the press.

By order of the executive committee.
WASHINGTON NEWSPAPER GUILD,
By MARY KOVNER, *Administrative Officer.*

WAR AGENCIES CORRESPONDENTS' ASSOCIATION,
Wshington, D. C., June 22, 1943.

Mr. ELMER DAVIS,
Director, Office of War Information, Washington, D. C., June 22, 1943.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: The War Agencies Correspondents' Association yesterday unanimously passed the following resolution, which might be of some interest to you:

"An Office of War Information should be in business on the home front.

"It has been the experience of members of the War Agencies Correspondents' Association who have daily contact with the Office of War Information that the agency has consistently tried to get the facts about the home front war operations and to present them in a fair and competent manner.

"True, the Office of War Information's efforts have not been wholly effective. We have criticized it in the past and may in the future, but our criticism would revolve around a demand that it do a more effective job along its present lines of effort.

"A more vigorous, not a dead Office of War Information is needed."

Yours sincerely,
DOROTHY ROCKWELL,
Philadelphia Inquirer, Secretary-Treasurer.

We Should More Fully Appreciate the Importance of Food Production

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the inflationary spirit—hold-the-line program—is only heard when the people in low-income brackets are concerned or when the American farmer is in the picture.

First. There is nothing phenomenal in the fact that the C. C. C. can show a profit as claimed. Why should they not? They have ample Federal funds to buy at the low-price periods of the season and sell at the higher price season of the year. They pay no taxes, income taxes, or general business expenses. They acquire the stocks off the farmer at below cost of production or parity prices and hold them for a higher market. The C. C. C. has made its profits off the American farmers at subnormal prices.

The C. C. C. may have made money on cotton they could get off the cotton farmer at half the cost of production, but after they obtained the cotton the Agriculture Department used section 32 funds to dispose of it, as is shown by

the following paragraph from an official letter from the United States Department of Agriculture. It is as follows:

The Department of Agriculture paid an export subsidy on raw cotton ranging from 1½ to one-fifth of a cent per pound during the 1939–40 cotton season. Payments were made on a total of 5,787,559 bales of cotton, amounting to $37,868,918. There was no export subsidy on raw cotton during the 1940–41 season, and an export subsidy of 2½ cents per pound was paid on raw cotton shipped to Canada during the 1941–42 cotton season. This subsidy was paid on 232,542 bales of cotton, and amounted to $3,044,943.

All of the 1941–42 subsidy was paid from section 32 funds, and most (possibly 90 percent) of the 1939–40 subsidy was paid from section 32 funds. The remainder of the 1939–40 subsidy was paid from funds appropriated for the conservation and use of agricultural land resources and allotted in accordance with section 12A of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The C. C. C. might not have shown any loss itself, but evidently the Federal Treasury was out over $37,000,000 in 1 year as an export subsidy. The cotton might have been taken off the C. C. C. without loss to the C. C. C., but evidently the United States Treasury is not so fortunate. The cotton farmers also received during 1939–40 over $200,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury for growing or not growing cotton, and received over one hundred and ninety million in additional payments because it did not bring enough in the market place. With these huge cotton subsidies, the cotton farmers may be able to continue to let the C. C. C. speculate on their cotton and show either a profit or loss on its activities, as the case may be. Second. The facts on the cheese situation. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] appears not to have all the facts about Cheddar cheese. Here is a short sketch of the prices of this product. In April 1941, cheese was 16+ cents per pound; Secretary of Agriculture appealed for increased production for lease-lend; production and price increased to January 1942, when it had risen to 24–25 cents per pound; Agriculture Department had made promises as to prices, but in 1942 refused to pay but 21 cents per pound for Federal purchases; prices rose to 23¼ plus by the fall of 1942; December 1942 saw the price of 27 cents per pound provided by order; 23¼ cents per pound was the price and 3¾ cents per pound subsidy. Cheese production has been from 20–25 below the corresponding weeks of a year ago. This proposed roll-back on butter will possibly divert milk to cheese production, but I do not want any of my colleagues to show how this subsidy on cheese increased the production of Cheddar cheese.

How about other than Cheddar cheese? Swiss cheese was about 30 cents per pound (September 1942), but the O. P. A. let the ceiling price be advanced 2 cents more. Result, the Swiss cheese is bringing its price in the market place without asking future generations to pay for it.

Third. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said today that the average income in New York was $40 per week, or $1 per hour. Of course, it is much more for many groups. Here today you want to roll back the price of butter where the producer does not get 40 cents per hour to produce it. This is just a scheme to get someone else to slave to produce food for you at less than 40 cents per hour—the guaranteed minimum rate provided for all nonagricultural groups. Is it any wonder that only 40 percent of the farmers have electric lights, and only 1 out of 10 have a bath tub?

The people in Washington in 1942 received 28 percent more per capita income than in 1941. You recently voted the people on the Federal pay roll obtaining from $2,900 to $12,000 a year an increase of $328 in salary. Do you want to now pay their grocery bill?

The principal cause of high food prices is the O. P. A. approach whereby food is not to be funneled through the normal trade channels.

Master of National Grange Presents Plan to President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, when someone objects to an administration program, the general New Deal retort is that no one has proposed a better plan. A large majority of farmers and consumers object to the roll-back and subsidy program. All of the large farm organizations are fighting to prevent the payment of subsidies. They want no part of them.

Mr. Albert S Goss, master of the National Grange, has submitted a definite plan to the President for the prevention of inflation and for the handling of the food problem. Since I feel that the ideas proposed by Mr. Goss are sound, I want you to take the time to read his letter to the President on the subject of inflation, roll-backs, and subsidies.

Letter to Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt:

JUNE 22, 1943.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the winning of the war and the establishment of a sound and enduring peace depends so largely upon an adequate food supply, any policy that restricts or stifles production should not be tolerated. The situation with which we are confronted calls for the maximum production of foodstuffs.

It is also our duty to do all in our power to halt the drift toward inflation. If we are to prevent inflation we must remove the cause instead of treating the symptoms. There are two chief causes of inflation. The first is the pressure of excess income on an insufficient supply of consumer goods, and the second is the loss of confidence in the Government's ability to pay its obligations in dollars having the same purchasing power as the dollar it borrowed.

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as we can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

On the basis of today's prices, we have an annual income of approximately $40,000,000,000 in excess of the consumer goods available. Assuming that half this sum will go into savings, we still have the serious problem of an excess income of some $20,000,000,000, all seeking something to buy. It is impossible to dam this rapidly increasing surplus income by price ceilings. It is increasing at the rate of a billion and a half to two billion dollars per month, and history proves that it cannot be dammed.

Whenever rising production costs bump into price ceilings, production is strangled. These production costs vary greatly in different sections of the country, and local markets have normally adjusted themselves to these different costs. With inflexible ceilings, the high-production-cost areas are put out of business.

To overcome this difficulty we began the use of subsidies. Nevertheless, no system of subsidies has ever been devised which is effective enough to reach only these high-cost areas. Any subsidy system which is effective in maintaining production must be flexible enough to keep the high-cost producer in the field. Under such a plan the low-cost producer would receive an unwarranted profit.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are the direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high-cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

Thus it will be seen that the ceiling method increases the inflationary gap by reducing production. On the other hand, when used in connection with subsidies, it increases the gap at the other end because the Government has to borrow the money paid in subsidies, and most of this is borrowed from banks. This increases our national spendable income. The subsidy, therefore, defeats itself. The present plan attempts the impossible by putting economic law into reverse. Higher prices encourage production and discourage consumption. The subsidy program encourages consumption, and to the extent that the subsidies fail to reach the producers they discourage production.

After everything reasonable has been done to increase production, including a compensatory price, if the supply will not meet the demand, the next step is to reduce the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways. First, by increased taxes and increased savings, or both. Second, by rationing. Where goods are scarce, rationing should be applied so that the supply will be divided equitably. Commodities can be rationed to produce a surplus which can be used to hold prices at reasonable levels without the use of ceilings; although ceilings to prevent profiteering may be necessary in some instances. Ceilings should be used for no other purpose.

If we do not take practical steps to close our fast-increasing inflationary gap, plain economics will do it for us, as has always occurred in the past. More and more goods will flow through black markets at higher prices, reducing the purchasing power of the dollar until it comes into balance with the supply. That is inflation.

If this Nation is unwilling to pay the cost of its food bill during these years of record income largely based on Government outgo,

how can we ever expect our price structure to become balanced? In launching upon a subsidy program in our efforts to hold down the cost of living, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there is only one basis upon which any government can endure, and that is that the people must support the government. Any attempt to reverse this principle, asking the Government to support the people cannot fail to have disastrous results.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound, butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan which was employed during the late thirties. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply

England has been cited as an example for us to follow in the matter of price ceilings and subsidies. However, the English economy is almost the reverse of our own. England is an industrial nation, with only 7 percent of her population engaged in agriculture. Her interest lies in maintaining a low level of food prices, and the 93 percent of her people can well afford to subsidize the other 7 percent to keep food at the desired level.

In England the consumer pays 60 percent of his income for food, as contrasted with 22 percent in America, believed to be the lowest on earth.

In England they have practically closed the inflationary gap, largely by taxation. Three years ago there were 7,000 people with a net income in excess of $25,000 after paying taxes. Last year this group was reduced to 80. At the other end of the line, England has sales taxes ranging from 12 to 72 percent of the retail price.

England pays a subsidy, but in effect the United States pays it for her. During the 2 years ending March 1, we exported to England under lend-lease $1,449,064,000 in foodstuffs. She sold this food to her people and out of the proceeds paid subsidies estimated at approximately $730,000,000, with a tidy balance left over. Thus England did not increase her inflationary gap by borrowing the subsidy money from banks.

The English figures do not tell the whole story. In her food index she uses only 14 items, largely those received from America, which are under complete control. She does not include such home-grown products as fresh fruit, fresh vegetables, or any canned goods. The prices on these items have risen sharply. They have had to go up in order to maintain production, but this increase does not show in the food index which England exhibits as proof that food prices have not been allowed to advance.

It should also be noted that England is having a serious time with black markets. She has had to increase the penalty for the sale of food above ceiling prices to 14 years in prison, plus $20,000 fine, yet with these severe penalties, prosecutions have increased 320 percent in the last 2 years and the Ministry of Food has recently reported that black markets are endangering the successful prosecution of the war.

We therefore feel that it is not wise to try to follow in England's footsteps, but rather that our course should be based upon the sound economics necessary to maintain a maximum food supply, for we have no one but ourselves to look to for aid.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
By ALBERT S. GOSS, *Master.*

Mr. Woll States His Position

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, to the editor of the New York Times and published in the New York Times for June 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. WOLL STATES POSITION—CHARGES IN COMMUNIST ORGAN DENIED ON BASIS OF HIS RECORD

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES: In your issue of June 18 you carry a dispatch from Moscow quoting a Soviet publication, purporting to speak for the Russian workers, in which I am characterized as a "reactionary" labor leader who is "misleading" workers into "unpatriotic, antiwar strikes." I am charged in the dispatch by the alleged organ of the Russian workers (head of the Russian Communist Party) with "inciting strikes" and "generally favoring isolationism." The charge is also made by the Soviet publication that I belong to those American labor leaders who "apparently place personal motives and the desire to retain their posts and serve the needs of certain political groups above the labor movement."

Together with the false allegations that I have incited unpatriotic antiwar strikes, the statement is made in the dispatch that "we should not be at all surprised if the real initiators of this suspicious strike campaign were found in Berlin," etc.

The Communist International has been ostensibly abolished, but the Russian Communist Party and the dictatorship it represents continue, with the aid of their agents in America, to pursue their old policy of character assassination against the leaders of trade-unions in the democratic countries. This policy is reflected constantly in the pages of the Daily Worker, official organ of the "American" Communist Party, and other Communist publications in the United States.

STANDS ON RECORD

I need not contradict the libelous charges. My record is known to 6,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor and to the American people in general. I am writing this solely with the purpose of helping to make clear the fact that the Communist leopard has not changed its spots or its objectives.

The fact is well known to all informed Americans that at the time when Foreign Commissar Molotoff was telling the Russian people and the organized workers of the world that "fascism was only a matter of taste," and Joseph Stalin was sending birthday greetings to Adolf Hitler, I was in the forefront of those who demanded active intervention by the United States against the aggressions of the Axis Powers.

I have never altered my attitude. There is no dividing line marked "June 22, 1941," in what I have advocated with respect to our Nation's foreign policy, and the utmost possible cooperation of organized labor with our Government in the implementation of that policy, a policy which the American Federation of Labor has steadfastly espoused and to the formulation of which I have made my contribution.

Why, then, do the ruling Russian Communist Party and its agents in this country continue to wage their poisonous campaign against me and other leaders of American labor, against all representatives of American democratic society actively opposed to all forms of totalitarianism? Why, as another example, do they assail men like David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and others like him, in language similar to that applied to me in the afore-mentioned Moscow dispatch in the New York Times?

CAMPAIGN AGAINST LABOR

Where would America be today, where would Russia be today, if the representatives of American labor, whom the Communists still seek to destroy, had followed their policy?

But why do the Russian Communist Party and its agents here continue to wage their campaign against us? They do it because the zigzags of the Communist line, such as the dissolution of the Comintern, have never for a single moment diverted them from their main and sole objective: Capture and destruction of the democratic labor movements wherever they continue to exist, and by any and all means available. To this end they persist in their campaign of character assassination against the duly accredited representatives of the trade unions in this country, or sowing distrust and dissension among the organized workers everywhere. They cling to the belief that establishment of Communist dictatorship requires, first and foremost, the destruction of the free labor movement, a lesson Hitler learned from them.

I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of American labor will know how to evaluate this pogrom agitation. Filled with admiration for the magnificent conduct of the Russia people and their heroic armies in the war, and eager to help them in the greatest possible measure, American trade-unionists will nevertheless remain uncompromisingly opposed to communism and to its agents in the United States.

MATTHEW WOLL,
Vice President, American Federation of Labor; President, Labor League for Human Rights-United Nations Relief.

NEW YORK, *June 23, 1943.*

Pre-War and Post-War Positions of Hon. Robert R. Reynolds, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 29 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, there is published in Rutherfordton, N. C., the Rutherfordton News, a weekly newspaper. Mr. R. E. Price is the editor and publisher. In the issue of June 3, 1943, there was an editorial criticizing my pre-war position and making comment upon what naturally my position would be as to post-war matters. Having read that

editorial, I took exception to what he had said, and addressed a communication to him. He was kind enough, and exhibited sufficient fair play to publish my letter. I therefore ask that the article, entitled "Senator Reynolds Replies to Editorial in the News," published in the Rutherfordton, (N. C.) News of Thursday, June 24, 1943, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR REYNOLDS REPLIES TO EDITORIAL IN THE NEWS

Senator REYNOLDS last week replied to our editorial and requested that we publish his statement. We believe in fair play, and hence publish his reply, as follows:

He quotes the first paragraph of our article:

" 'Senator REYNOLDS opposed American aid to the Allies before this country entered this war. There is nothing in the record of Senator REYNOLDS since Pearl Harbor which would make one believe that he favors America's post-war cooperation with other nations for the establishment of a stable and peaceful world society, or that he would be disposed to do anything to further such cooperation. Rather we would be inclined to think that he would try to obstruct it, just as he tried to obstruct our proper self-defensive cooperation with the Allies before our country was involved in this war.' "

"In answer to the above, I shall state very frankly that I did oppose America's aid to Great Britain and France before our country entered this war. By that I mean that:

"1. I voted against the lifting of the arms embargo. In other words, I opposed our manufacturing arms for Great Britain and France because I felt that such would make us an ally of Great Britain and France and thus would unquestionably be a step toward war.

"2. I voted against the repeal of the neutrality laws. These laws had been enacted by the Congress of the United States on the recommendation of President Roosevelt at a time when they stated that we needed the enactment of the neutrality laws to keep us out of the war. Then later the administration recommended the repeal of the very laws it had insisted that we enact in order to keep us out of the war. I voted against the repeal because I wanted this country to stay out of this war or any other war.

"3. I voted against the passage of the Lend-Lease Act which would supply France and Great Britain with everything they desired at the expense of the American taxpayers. I felt that the passage of the lend-lease bill was such a long step toward war that I declared at the time that its passage would be nothing more or less than a declaration of war.

"Those who voted for the lifting of the arms embargo, the repeal of the neutrality laws, and the passage of the Lend-Lease Act declared that all of these measures were steps away from war, whereas, on the other hand, I declared that they were steps toward war

"As an isolationist and an American Firster who wanted to keep America out of this war or any other war, I voted against all these measures, believing that the passage of each and every one of them were steps toward war, whereas the interventionists were declaring that they were steps away from war. Well, the interventionists won.

"Answering your particular statement quoted above, to the effect that 'he tried to obstruct our proper self-defensive cooperation with the Allies before our country was involved in this war,' I wish to advise that those of you who insisted upon our lifting the arms embargo, repealing the neutrality laws, and passing the Lend-Lease Act stated that unless we did so Germany would attack us on our own shores. Well, of course, that, in my opinion, was a lot of propaganda aimed at frightening the American people. The British Isles are separated from Hitler and his hordes by only a little strip of water, the English Channel, and after almost 4 years of war they have not succeeded in invading the British Isles. I argue that if they could not cross a little strip of water like the English Channel, what chance would they have had of crossing the Atlantic Ocean, 3,000 miles of turbulent waters, and attacking us here.

"I dislike bringing these matters to your attention, but you have occasioned me to do so by the statements set out in your editorial.

"In reference to your statement to the effect that I would not be disposed to do anything to further world peace, but on the contrary that I would be inclined to obstruct it, I wish to say that there you are in error.

"I believe in peace with all nations on earth. I was opposed to getting into this war, while you and those who shared your views evidently approved of our participation long before Pearl Harbor and long before Germany declared war against us—and may I add right at this point that it is my opinion that those of you who were yelling the loudest in demanding our participation in the war before Pearl Harbor and before Germany's declaration of war against us, are the very ones who are today demanding peace for all time.

"I think we should cooperate with any nation or nations for a lasting peace, but I do not want this cooperation to be of a nature that would place all of the responsibility upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of America or destroy the sovereignty of the United States of America. We all want peace. In World War No. 1 we were told that we were fighting that war to stop all wars for all time. Well, we did not succeed. In World War No 2 we were told that this was a war that would stop all wars for all time—and I hope and pray that this particular objective will be accomplished.

"In your editorial you stated that: 'America can no longer remain in isolation after this war.' I shall not go into this subject, but I wish to say that if our becoming internationalized is going to destroy the American way of life, lower the standards of the American working men, and place our workers in direct competition with the coolie labor of Asia and the peon labor of South America, all to the disadvantage of the American working men, then I am opposed to it; just as I am opposed to a bill which has but recently been introduced in Congress to admit Chinese under the immigration laws to this country in competition with the American laboring man; and just as I am opposed to, and now condemn, our administration for having permitted more than 480,000 aliens and refugees from Europe to enter this country since the war began in Europe on September 3, 1939. These more than 480,000 people have been permitted by the administration to enter this country as students, tourists, travelers, and businessmen. For these very people our own American boys are dying on foreign battlefields. I take the position that they should have joined up with the fighting forces in their respective lands against the murderous aggressors against whom we fight today, instead of their coming here to bask in the sunshine of a safety zone, while our own native sons are sent to their portions of the world to fight for their freedom. As I recently stated on the floor of the Senate I not only was an isolationist prior to Pearl Harbor, but I am now more of an isolationist than ever before, and in defining isolationism I mean by that that I believe firstly in looking after the interests of American people. I believe firstly in looking after the interests of our United States of America. I believe firstly in doing that which is best for the people of our Nation. I believe in maintaining friendly relations with all the people of the earth, if at all possible, and I believe in trading and encouraging trade with all the nations of the earth."

Address by Hon. Jesse Jones to the Made in America Rubber Luncheon, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and telephoned to the Made in America Rubber luncheon in Houston, Tex., on June 28, 1943, and broadcast over a Texas State network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Texas Rubber Day—I salute you, and wish with all my heart that I could be at home for this occasion.

Texas has long been first in cattle, first in cotton, first in petroleum, and first in natural gas. These commodities constitute a large part of the everyday life of America. Now comes rubber, which is of equal importance in our present-day economy. Because we in Texas have more of the necessary raw materials, which can be produced at the lowest cost, Texas will be first in rubber.

The war forced us to move with top speed in the manufacture of rubber, going from the laboratory stage to building an entire industry.

By the end of this year we will have our own rubber industry, capable of meeting all essential needs, both for war and for civilian requirements.

What you see today at Baytown and Houston is only part of a $700,000,000 rubber industry, with 40 plants throughout the country, built in a period of 2 years, starting from scratch in early 1941. Originally, plans called for only 100,000 tons annually—sort of a learn-how procedure.

The goal after Pearl Harbor was to build facilities for the manufacture of synthetic rubber which would keep our transportation economy in motion, and provide for the war, and to do it as rapidly as possible. It became necessary not only to manufacture rubber for our own use, but for that of our allies, who, before the fall of Singapore and the loss of the Dutch East Indies, has produced and controlled 90 percent of the world's supply of natural rubber. By December this year we will have a manufacturing capacity in excess of 800,000 tons a year, which is more than we have ever used, and sufficient for all our essential purposes.

With the exception of a few small refinery conversions, our program for the production of rubber—from raw materials to the finished product—is being completed under the direction of Rubber Director William Jeffers, in

accordance with plans and contracts developed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

The task has not been an easy one. Those in charge of the program have had to overcome not only such problems as shortages of material and manpower but also the confusion created by critics, who sought, and not always unselfishly, to question means, methods, and procedure without knowledge of all the facts.

Now that the storm of words has subsided, and government, together with industry, has been allowed time to do the necessary work, we have what we set out to get when we were forced into the war; that is, a completely integrated synthetic-rubber industry.

It had to be on paper before it could be built, but it is on paper no longer. It stands at Baytown, Borger, Corpus Christi, Houston, Ingleside, Port Neches, Texas City, Velasco, Lake Charles, Baton Rouge, in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, California, Ohio, Arkansas, and Connecticut.

It is the industry which the men at Reconstruction Finance Corporation with the approval of the President, brought into being, and they take pride in its approaching completion. They share that feeling of pride with many others, particularly the rubber industry, the petroleum industry, the distilling industry, the chemical industry, the machinery industry, engineers, and workingmen. Without their help, government could not have done the job. All have labored long and hard to overcome the loss of our natural-rubber supply.

Too much credit cannot be given to the Rubber Director and his staff. His insistence and determination that construction materials be made available, that all phases of the program be thoroughly checked, and that speed be the watchword have been responsible for the early completion of the plants. He drove the program through.

Although we are today celebrating another step, toward security in rubber from the exigencies of war, by the creation of the synthetic industry, it is but one phase—although a most important one—of the rubber situation that threatened us after Pearl Harbor.

About this time in 1940, 18 months before we were drawn into the war, your Government began protecting our rubber supply. In July 1940, President Roosevelt asked the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to build up a stock pile of rubber. Between that time and the capture of the Dutch East Indies by the Japanese, we bought every pound of rubber we could possibly get.

As a result, when we entered the war, we had accumulated the largest rubber stock pile the world has even known. We have been drawing upon that stock pile for all our own essential needs, as well as for those of the United Nations, and we still have several hundred thousand tons. We have been stimulating the production of natural rubber in South and Central America, and in Africa, by every possible means, and we are getting some natural rubber from these sources.

Because of all these activities, we have been able to keep that part of American transportation going, which is dependent on rubber.

True, we have had to conserve rubber, and it is still necessary to conserve rubber, but it is only one of many products and commodities which the demands of war have drawn upon so heavily, as to force rationing and extreme care in their use.

Our problem in all these scarce commodities is, first, to make certain that we have enough for our fighting men. Then, we must also have enough at home to produce the things our Army and Navy need and to meet essential requirements of the civilian population. That we are doing, and will continue to do.

In clothing, let me repeat what President Roosevelt said in a letter to me only a few days ago, at the dedication of another synthetic rubber plant:

"JUNE 11, 1943.

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have never had any doubt but that we could successfully manufacture synthetic rubber in any reasonable quantities if it became necessary, and I am glad to see the production getting under way.

"The establishment of an industry of this magnitude, in so short a period, is in full keeping with the tradition of our people in meeting any emergency.

"All who have part in the manufacture of synthetic rubber have just cause to feel they are making a real contribution to the war effort."

The Bermuda Conference and After

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday June 30, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, sufficient time has now elapsed to make possible a fair appraisal of the Bermuda Conference. Every unprejudiced observer will admit that the Bermuda Conference accomplished nothing. It has not indicated what it proposes to do nor how it intends to solve the refugee problem.

The newspapers carry stories of the continued destruction of Jewish people—and in lesser measure, other racial and religious groups—in all of Hitler-controlled Europe. In one way or another, thousands are being slaughtered every day and in spite of Hitler's preoccupation with the war, or perhaps in furtherance of his far-reaching plans to conquer the world, the policy of extermination is very real and will continue until there will be no victims left for further slaughter and all of Europe is overrun by modern barbarians who will seize everything and entrench themselves in power. There is no question that the wholesale destruction is part of a well-organized plan of conquest.

We of the twentieth century, particularly those of us bred in the philosophy which believes in the right of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, find it difficult to comprehend the doctrine of destruction which Hitler unleashed with full fury upon the European continent. The word, "Liebenstraum," which we are apt to interpret as a mere desire to obtain territory for the development of a nation, has a sinister meaning when employed by Hitler and his gang. It means the acquisition of territories occupied by others, not for development by the Germans but for enjoyment by the Nazi hordes, reaping where they have not sowed. Such has been the policy of Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels. Let the others build, we will eat their substance and enjoy the fruits of their labor, and we will not toil or spin for a living.

It was in that spirit that the new German Government began to function under Hitler. One of our trade representatives in the American Embassy in Berlin, Douglas Miller, then coined the famous phrase "You can't do business with Hitler" and wrote a book in which he showed how Hitler has "cashed in" on the entire economic life of Europe. Of course, Hitler, who is not historically minded, but an opportunistic third-rate politician, does not know that this is not a new philosophy of government but was tried in ancient Rome almost 2,000 years ago, and it was this policy which ultimately brought about the downfall of the Roman Empire. No, Hitler never studied history and does not know that he is headed for a fall.

But until he collapses and crumbles into dust, Hitler is dragging to destruction countless human beings and he will continue to do so unless he is stopped before it is too late.

Are we, the people of the United States, going to become the unwitting accomplices of this blood-thirsty guttersnipe, as Winston Churchill so aptly called this modern Hun? Must we fold our arms and profess our inability to check this unbridled killing and destruction? I cannot accept such an attitude. It may be well and good for well-meaning gentlemen to say "We are sorry, but all we can suggest is, Let us win the war." Of course, we want to win the war. It is because we are fighting a war and sacrificing our lives that we cannot view with indifference the killing of human beings whose saving would mean help to us in our war effort. The aid which the people of this country and of Britain give to the victims of Hitler's persecution mania, is a step toward the winning of the war and as much a part of our war effort as the fight on the battlefields of the world.

Hitler-dominated Europe is a battlefield. Innocent and helpless victims are being rounded up and killed in cold blood. Hitler's example is catching. At first his satellites, Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, were satisfied with labor camps and concentration camps. Now they also follow the footsteps of the master. Even Bulgaria, a country which could not exist for one day but for the generosity of our people in the last war, when mainly through the efforts of Henry Morgenthau, Sr., we organized a relief program to feed and clothe this nation. I say even Bulgaria has now become infected with the Hitler poison. A few days ago, the statement was made that all the Jews in Sofia, its capital, have to leave the city "or else." It is always "or else." Where they could go is, of course, nobody's business. Get out, and we will not tell you where. Even Hitler deports people to some destination. But the present rulers of Bulgaria go him one better and simply order them to leave the country. The Jews are expelled from Hungary, what was Czechoslovakia, Rumania, what was Yugoslavia, and all the countries surrounding Germany are gradually liquidating

their Jewish inhabitants. When they cannot find another place to go, and they cannot, they are liquidated.

There are only two countries in the world that can offer any solution at all to the immediate problem of saving these victims, the United States and Great Britain. Neither of these countries did anything to solve the problem or to help in its solution.

At the very outset of the Bermuda conference, it was decided that neither the question of American immigration quotas nor the question of a settlement of refugees in Palestine could be taken up by the conference. Without either solution, the problem cannot possibly be attacked. There is no other place for them to go. If they cannot go to Palestine and they cannot come into this country, there remains nothing but death. Hitler and his satellites were busy while the Bermuda conference went on in aimless discussions. Why should the enemies of our Nation wait until we decide what we will do?

Hitler and the dominated countries know well that their Jewish citizens are in the front lines of those fighting for freedom and democracy. They know that the Jews will never compromise for the enslavement of the human race.

Hitler sees a solution of the Jewish question only through the extermination of the Jews because he knows that the love of freedom and hatred of tyrants exhibited by the Jews throughout the years of their history will be the weapon by which he is destroyed and democracy and liberty re-established in Europe.

We derive our love of freedom from the deepest roots of the human race, and the dictators of Europe can succeed only while mankind is not looking and the world is asleep. When public opinion is thoroughly aroused, the doom of the dictator is sealed.

The rulers of the Axis countries can even now sense impending doom. But supreme gamblers that they are, they will not yield until they are thoroughly beaten. They fear the spirit of freedom and so seek to enslave those who, on the soils of Europe, represent the best element of American tradition. Unless we act and act quickly, innocent lives will be snuffed out forever.

While we work and fight toward the day when Hitler will be beaten, he is not marking time. He is busy with his work of slaughter. He goes on with his destructive activities while we of the democracies sit idly by and allow him to exterminate a whole people.

I say it is our duty as representatives of the American people to urge our Government to do everything possible to prevent the completion of Hitler's program. I say it is our duty as representatives of the American people to give such help to men and women who believe in our ideals and who are always in the forefront in the fight for the preservation of democratic principles. If this is a war to make the world safe for democracy, it is likewise a war to preserve those people who will be the fighters for democracy in the years to come.

I can only repeat the words of General MacArthur when he emphasized the fighting quality of the Jews, so many of whom have already given their lives in our cause. He said:

> The Jewish heritage has been one of suffering and sorrow. Jews have always fought against oppression, seeking freedom for themselves and for all peoples. Today the whole civilized world fights against history's greatest tyrants and oppressors. We are proud to have Jews in our ranks. Their deeds furnish unshakable proof of their courage and loyalty to our common cause—the world-wide preservation of freedom.

Is it not worth while to save such people? Will not our democracies be enriched by the people whose heritage makes them forever supporters of freedom and liberty?

For a long time now, the Jews of Palestine have been pleading for the opportunity to raise and organize a Jewish army. Such an army could be the spearhead of an effective military effort to liberate victims of Nazi cruelty. To aid and assist in such a task, we should bend all our efforts and lack of equipment is a poor excuse for inaction. When Britain claimed that she could not provide adequate military equipment for a Jewish army, she stressed nonessentials in view of the enormous task confronting us. Allow the organization of a Jewish army and you will see how courage and bravery will overcome many technical obstacles. The example of the brave Greeks and Yugoslavs shows how love of freedom can spur mediocre armies to win victories.

When the enemy sees our faint-heartedness and muddling, when we display a reckless lack of interest, no wonder the forces of evil go on in their unbridled ways. We cannot remain indifferent and expect success. Lip service is inexpensive and ineffective. Deeds and actions are necessary. We cannot leave the victims of persecution and tyranny to their own fate if we want to preserve peace and justice in the world.

Why Blame Congress?

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, every Member should resent the effort being made to make Congress responsible for the failure of the price-stabilization program. The program is wobbling. It gives promise of failure. Someone must be found to blame it on, and there is a studied effort to put the responsibility on the Congress. The latest blast comes from the President himself.

On Monday Mr. Chester C. Davis resigned as Food Administrator. He said he could not stand it any longer because the duties he was supposed to discharge were being exercised elsewhere, and because he did not believe in the program of broad general subsidies announced by the President on June 15. In his letter accepting the resignation of Mr. Davis the President indicted Congress. This is what he said:

> I agree with you that we cannot fully or effectively enforce our price or rationing programs or fully or effectively stabilize the cost of living without an adequate tax and savings program to drain off excess purchasing power. I have emphasized that fact in my Budget message, in my statement on the hold-the-line order and on other occasions. But because the Congress has not yet provided the tax legislation I have requested, I cannot sit back and fail to advocate other measures, such as limited consumers' subsidies, which I am convinced can help to prevent the cost of living from getting completely out of hand. Of course, you know that I also favor and have advocated such support programs and incentive payments to producers as will enable us to obtain the necessary war production.

So the foundation is laid to make Congress responsible for the failure of the Price Stabilization Program. The fact is that the fault lies with the President and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, Jr. They have failed to recommend a tax program beyond that already adopted by Congress, and have been unwilling to recommend compulsory savings, and have resisted the enactment of a retail sales tax.

Last October the House of Representatives passed the Revenue Act of 1942. Most of the year had been given to the preparation of the measure. Mr. Morgenthau was dissatisfied with it and criticized it because he thought its yield should be larger, and he said that a bill to raise $6,000,000,000 in addition would be necessary. He said further that he "had the way to do it and was prepared to present the program to them"—meaning Congress—"as soon as they are ready to receive us."

This statement was made on October 5. On October 6 I directed attention to the statement of the Secretary, and suggested that any ideas he had concerning additional taxes should have been presented before we embarked upon the stabilization program because, as a result of taxes that were not then in contemplation, the whole job of stabilization might have to be done all over again. I also said that, if the Secretary of the Treasury had knowledge that additional taxes were needed and the means by which they could be provided and did not come to Congress and make the facts known, he was guilty of conduct akin to misfeasance.

I did not advocate delay in the preparation of the pending bill in order that the Secretary's new program might be included in it, but I did offer the suggestion that it should be taken up immediately so that it could be done with reasonable continuity, and the pending bill and any necessary supplements could be as one and the same.

No word was received from the Secretary of the Treasury as to additional taxes for revenue purposes, to prevent inflation or as an aid to the stabilization

program, in spite of the fact that on the 5th of October he had said he had the way to do it and was prepared to present the program to Congress. Neither by their own volition or by request to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was anything done toward initiating a supplemental tax program.

In the latter part of January 1943, when there appeared to be no activity looking toward a new tax bill, the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee issued a joint statement demanding that some progress be made. This brought about the consideration by the Ways and Means Committee and the enactment of the pay-as-you-go program and the withholding method of collection. This was a bill to modernize the method of collection of income taxes and did not have any purpose of increasing revenue or stabilizing purchasing power.

Since this act was passed there has been much talk of a tax bill to raise additional revenue to drain off purchasing power, but nothing seems to be done about it.

Congress has not heard from the Secretary of the Treasury on the subject of additional taxation as a price stabilizer. Through the public prints it would appear that his time has been taken up with other matters. He has visited England where reports indicate he lunched with the merchant princes, discussing a financial program for after the war. He spent a considerable time in Bermuda, and reports of the recent drive indicate that he made an extended tour throughout the West to aid in the selling of the bonds.

Sometime in April it was announced that the Secretary of the Treasury would meet with the Finance Committee of the Senate and the members of the Ways and Means Committee in joint session. I anticipated some reference to the tax situation, but it turned out to be nothing more than a publicity stunt incident to the bond-selling campaign, and the publicity given out was entirely at variance with what actually occurred, but nothing was said about taxes. The professional high-pressure bond salesmen and publicity experts had the floor.

The Secretary of the Treasury said on October 5 that $6,000,000,000 in additional revenue was needed. In his Budget message the President said we would have to raise $16,000,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury in his latest statement has reduced the amount to twelve billion. This statement was made for last Sunday morning newspapers, but has not been communicated to Congress.

Maybe there is confusion as to the purposes of taxation. Some may look upon it as the means for raising revenue for governmental needs. Others may take the view that it is to be invoked for social purposes and regulating people's habits of life. Whatever the purpose may be, the Secretary of the Treasury on October 5 last told the newspaper reporters he had the answers. But Capitol Hill seems further from the Treasury Department than London, Bermuda, or the Pacific coast. So why blame Congress?

Congressional Recess

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday June 30, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, from the press we learn there is a movement on foot to have the Congress recess for 2½ months. I want to serve notice now that I shall oppose any such movement. Of all times when the Congress ought to remain on the job, it is now, when we are not only in the midst of the greatest war of all times, but involved in so much confusion at home. If you want to take individual leave, or even a recess, for 30 days, that is different; but for Congress to leave here now and go home for 2½ months with the unfinished tax business, and other unfinished business we have pending, is unthinkable to me. We might as well give the boys on the battle-front a 70-day furlough. I, for one, shall oppose any such extended recess.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why should we not stay in session until some of these administrative agencies finish their quarrels? How can the President expect unity among the people while the members of his official family are quarreling publicly?

Mr. RANKIN. I am in favor of remaining in session until we finish our quarrel with Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

In the Interests of Honesty and Accuracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the attached news clipping from the public press is self-explanatory. It is a bluntly worded condemnation of the propaganda techniques employed in trying to sell Mission to Moscow to the American public as a factual film, and it comes from a group of critics and writers who could not even remotely be considered as unfairly antagonistic to Russia.

It is important, however, that deliberate propaganda be labeled as such and that the intelligence of Americans be not insulted by attempting to feed them fiction under the label of facts. The strained and labored effort of Mission to Moscow to convince gullible movie-goers that red is white is not only poor entertainment but it is in extremely poor taste and indicates a failure on the part of its sponsors to appreciate the native sales resistance which American citizens have to the force feeding of propaganda and piffle. The writers' war board does well to call the attention of the country to the fact that this picture deserves "an unfavorable rating of three duds."

Mr. Speaker, the country and the Congress will be interested in the following news item from the daily press:

MISSION TO MOSCOW MOVIE FALSIFIES, WAR WRITERS SAY

Warner Bros. controversial film, Mission to Moscow, falsifies facts about Russia, the Writers' War Board has informed its 2,000 members who comprise most of the country's professional writers, it was learned today.

In its current report the board, semi-official agency through which the writers contribute their talents to the Government, gave the movies an unfavorable rating of three duds. The board is headed by Rex Stout, Franklin P. Adams, Pearl S. Buck, Russel Crouse, Clifton Fadiman, and Paul Gallico.

The report declared:

"Giving Mission to Moscow three duds was a difficult decision. We are aware that the picture does a valuable service for a trusted ally, but we feel that the deepest principle of human liberty is involved—the necessity of telling the public the truth.

"The true case for Russia is excellent. It is not necessary for Hollywood to falsify facts to make it slightly better

"Every movement for appeasement is based on the idea that an untruth or a distortion is excusable if it serves a greater good. We cannot subscribe to such a doctrine, however desirable the immediate effect."

The board operates through the Office of War Information and serves such agencies as the Army, Navy, Office of Civilian Defense, Treasury Department, and War Production Board.

Women's Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday June 30, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over station WHN, Tuesday, June 29, 1943:

Congressional Record on the Air! From Washington, D. C., ladies and gentlemen, WHN brings you the thirty-second weekly program in a public service series featuring outstanding leaders of the United States Congress. Tonight, we're privileged to have as our guest the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. Congressman CELLER, a top-ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, will discuss with you tonight the question of women's equal rights amendment.

Congressman CELLER. For 20 years now, the controversy concerned with equal rights for women has been raging on Capitol Hill. As inevitable as the seasons of the year, each congressional session sees introduced an equal-rights amendment for women. The present session is, of course, no exception. As it stands today, the proposed equal-rights amendment to the United States Constitu-

tion reads as follows: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

So there it stands, with innocent countenance and forthright, to all apearances on the side of the angels. The well-intentioned have rallied under its banner with an emotionalism and ostrichlike refusal to face facts and consequences that bid fair to circumvent rational legislation based on rational thinking.

Let it not be assumed for a single minute that those of us who are opposed to the equal-rights amendment necessarily countenance or sanction discrimination against women, economically, politically, or socially. For example, I was the successful sponsor of the bill to commission women doctors in our armed forces. If otherwise qualified, sex should be no bar. With the most fervent and fevered adherents of the proposed amendment, we would away with the barriers raised against women's advancement solely on the ground of sex. We agree that we can never achieve the full measure of the democratic way of life without eradicating the idea of the subservience and inferiority of women. Why then this opposition to a seemingly open sesame to equality?

If the overheated proponents of the so-called equal-rights amendment would put some of their ardor into mature reflection of what the tendered bill really means, and not willy-nilly wrap themselves in the folds of a vague, mischievous, abstract proposition, they might better serve the progressive march of womankind.

What all-embracing magic formula is this that will erase prejudices, change standards, conform the ideology of the North with that of the West and that of the East with the South? This is a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution, be it remembered. Does it mean that all of the 48 States and Territories shall have uniform laws, that if, for example, one State—and there is such a State—makes the legal age of consent to marriage that of 12 for women, that all States and Territories shall do likewise, or shall it be throughout the Union that of 16 as in other States or 18 as some States have it? Who is to say? Will Congress have to legislate further so that the respective States conform to what the Federal notion of equal rights may be? Will interpretation of the statute rest in the State courts or in the Federal courts? What are equal rights? How will rights be distinguished from duties, and duties from obligations? Who will write the definitions?

Very well, then, suppose the other interpretation is accepted and the amendment means simply that within each State women shall have rights equal to men and that Rhode Island need not concern itself with what Texas believes equal rights are. There still remains confusion worse confounded. You'll have 48 pretty kettles of fish.

In that same State where the age of consent to marriage is 12 for girls and 14 for boys, would the equal-rights amendment increase the age for both boys and girls to 14 or lower it to 12? A host of such similar questions must follow, and I for one, will be extremely grateful if some sage soul can show me how aught but chaos can grow out of a blanket law that seeks to cover every phase of human relations. It reminds me of the doctor who cheerfully chirped, "The operation was successful, but the patient died."

Who will tell me what effect equal rights will have in those States where the husband's failure to support his wife is grounds for divorce? Would the shoe be on the other foot, giving the husband the divorce if the wife did not support him? A husband is obligated to support his wife. The wife in turn is obligated in one State at least to turn her pay envelope (if she has one) over to her husband, and it is customary for her to render services in the home without pay. Certainly these rights and responsibilities of husband and wife are very different. But are they therefore unequal? What is equality? Does it mean that the husband should be freed from his obligation to support his wife? Or that the wife should be forced to support her husband? Or should support be a joint affair, and if so; on what terms? Then, again, how about the wife's wages and services? Should she be allowed to keep the pay envelope or perhaps even to receive wages when she cooks her husband's dinner? On the other hand, what about his pay envelope? What about his cooking the dinner? Lastly, doesn't it make any difference if it is she and not he who bears and principally rears the children? These questions are not asked in a spirit of levity; rather, in honest concern for the social structure.

In some States the woman reaches the age of majority at 18. The man must wait until he is 21. Under the so-called equal rights, does the majority for a man become 18 or the majority for a woman become 21? This is so in recognition of the accepted fact that women mature earlier than men. You can't change that fact by law. How would the question of contract rights be affected? What, then, would be the legal age for voiding contracts entered into while a minor? Again, in most States, the estate of the deceased husband is liable until administration is completed for the support of the wife, regardless of will or anything else. The estate of a deceased wife is not liable for the support of the husband. What would happen in such cases under equal rights?

Some States prohibit night work for women. Would that mean that women will be permitted to work nights or that men will not be permitted to work nights? What of the draft act? Could a man refuse combat service unless women joined them in battle? Many State constitutions provide that all able-bodied men are part of the State militia. Is this a right that women shall assert or is it an obligation with which men alone are burdened? Would the men get the "rights" of women, or women those of men, or neither, or both? The equal-rights amendment would be like giving a shotgun to a blind man. Certainly he could shoot, but whom would he hit?

Because of the physical nature of the differences between man and woman, because of the manifold roles she perforce plays in life—wife, mother, worker, and citizen—we must keep in mind that legislation not consonant with the laws of nature can but lead to chaos and, yes, inequality. Certainly, much injustice can result to women in the enactment of such ill-considered legislation. The mind reels with the number of questions that must necessarily arise with an honest and fearless examination of the equal-rights amendment. Those concerned with social and human welfare can ill afford to ignore the implications and interpretations implicit in the blanket equal-rights amendment. The framers of the proposed amendment have apparently forgotten that the majority of women are homemakers, rearing children, and adhering to the marriage bargain of men providing the livelihood and women serving the home. Because of this inability to be economically independent, protective legislation has been enacted to bring women to a more certain economic security. How will the equal-rights amendment affect these just legal guards I have mentioned in addition to many more, such as mothers' aid, homestead rights, widows' pensions? In the event of divorce, shall we do away with any preference that is now given to the mother as to the custody of children? Again, what about maternity protective laws? Naturally, they cannot as well apply to men, so off the statute books they must go. Consider the statutory rape laws. Would the equal-rights amendment mean that at the age of 12 or 14 a female can give consent to illegal cohabitation? Such legislation is not discriminatory but a just recognition of the biological and social differences between men and women. The questions multiply. They pop up one after another and disclose the chaos, the confusion, the injustices that must follow in the wake of so ill-advised a slab of legislation. Where the burden of support of illegitimate children is placed on the father, shall it now rest on the mother? What of alimony laws? What happens to whom and who pays?

Who is moved up or who is pushed down? It hardly seems possible that the smooth-sounding, high-scunding, just-appearing "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex" can harbor such seeds of mischief or be a breeding ground for actual discrimination against women.

We come to the role of woman as a wage earner. In addition to the all-important fact that the welfare of the Nation and its future generations depend upon the health of women that prompted protective labor legislation we must remember that women are not so unionized that they have the power of organized bargaining as have the men. It was years of investigation and the insistence of social-minded citizens that resulted after a long, hard struggle in the minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws for women, that resulted in the passage of laws prohibiting night work and working in dangerous employment such as quarries and mines. It was this legislation that aimed for and succeeded more nearly in "equalizing" women. Yet this so-called equal-rights amendment would destroy, would deprive women of this protective legislation and introduce again the sweat-shop conditions for women, substandard pay, and unlimited hours of work. All the hard-gained victories dismissed on the ground of "equality." I could almost believe that the proponents of the equal-rights amendment are mocking our credulity, were I not convinced of their unredeemed naïveté.

The proposed amendment, remember, authorizes Congress to enforce "equality" by appropriate legislation. Does this mean that Congress must act in fields now reserved exclusively to the States in matters having to do with marriage, divorce, support laws, property laws, etc. That would constiture one of the most extreme and one of the most extensive changes in the relation of States to the Federal Government and in the relation of Federal Government to the States. Whether or not contemplated, to institute such a change by indirection is highly absurd.

Thus it can be seen what court actions must follow in the interpretation of the statute. I fear me the courts will be so busy deciding what's right for women that all other matters will have to be set aside until the rights of boy and girl, wife and husband, maid and bachelor are clarified.

We cannot deny that discrimination against women is present. No ideal by any means has been reached. Laws do exist preventing women from serving on juries, from holding certain offices, preventing married women from holding property without the consent of the husband, laws that prevent the wife from setting up a separate domicile, and so forth. It is not in defense of these laws that makes for opposition to the proposed amendment. It is the method that is decried. Let the energies be turned in curing a specific ill by specific legislation within the States where such discriminatory laws exist, rather than to throwing the whole Nation into a turmoil of definition-seeking men and women. Using the Constitution for a

broom with which to sweep away discriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior. It is as absurd as destroying a forest to uproot some unwanted trees.

Finally, the earnest proponents point with conclusive argument to the suffrage amendment. The analogy they seek to establish is, unfortunately for them, the revealing weakness in their logic. The nineteenth amendment met a specific ill with a specific remedy. It merely states that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. It did not attempt to legislate on the whole sphere of human endeavor.

Should the equal-rights amendment through some mischance pass, then it needs must collapse as did the eighteenth amendment. We have some very bright fellows in the Halls of Congress, but even they, it has been discovered cannot amend the laws of nature.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Congressman CELLER. From Washington, D. C., ladies and gentlemen, you have been listening to the thirty-second broadcast of Congressional Record on the Air, a public-service program, presenting each week an outstanding leader of the United States Congress. Our speaker tonight was Congressman CELLER, of New York, who spoke to you on the question of women's equal-rights amendment. Congressional Record on the Air is arranged by Leo J. Paulin.

Can We Do Less for Hitler's Victims Than for Hitler-Hun Prisoners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, nations have declared war on Germany, and their high-ranking officials have issued pious protestations against the Nazi massacre of Jewish victims, but not one of those countries thus far has said they would be willing to accept these refugees either permanently as as visitors, or any of the minority peoples trying to escape the Hitler prison and slaughterhouse.

Goebbels says: "The United Nations won't take any Jews. We don't want them. Let's kill them." And so he and Hitler are making Europe Judentun.

Without any change in our immigration statutes we could receive a reasonable number of those who are fortunate enough to escape the Nazi hellhole, receive them as visitors, the immigration quotas notwithstanding. They could be placed in camps or cantonments and held there in such havens until after the war. Private charitable agencies would be willing to pay the entire cost thereof. There would be no expense to the Government whatsoever. These agencies would even pay for transportation by ships to and from this country.

We house and maintain Nazi prisoners, many of them undoubtedly responsible for Nazi atrocities. We should do no less for the victims of the rage of the Huns.

In this connection, a very splendid editorial appeared in the New York Post, June 21 last, Can We Do Less, as follows:

CAN WE DO LESS?

There's soda pop and beer and a minimum of 10 cents a day for the 40,000 Fascists whom we hold prisoners of war in 17 States. No one fusses about this except a few stiff-necked Nazi prisoners who bellyache that they don't have enough room in their barracks or that the valet service is poor.

These men were taken in battle and they're going to stay here until the end of the war—in well-built barracks, with good food and adequate clothing. But how about some of the men, women, and children whom these Fascists have been killing?

Are we willing to give them shelter, feed their hungry bellies, and clothe their naked limbs? Are we ready to soothe their wounds and maintain them decently until the war is over and Europe returns to peace?

We mean are we willing to take a thousand or even 40,000 Jews from Hitler's Europe and keep them here at least in the fashion in which we keep Hitler's prisoners of war?

WE'VE MUMBLED AND TALKED

Both Rumania and Bulgaria, to cite two cases, have offered to surrender a number of their Jews to us if we would taken them. At this point our State Department has always gotten very technical about visas and passports and documents. We've mumbled and talked and even held a conference on an inaccessible island to discuss as quietly as possible this business of saving people from slaughter.

And with all the seeming good will in the world we have so far been unable to come to any other conclusion than that it's just too bad, but the Jews' papers aren't in order, and so they'll have to get along the best they can. Getting along the best they can has come to mean a gas chamber in a Polish forest, or maybe a bite from a typhus-infected louse in the Warsaw ghetto.

In the face of pleas to do something, Anthony Eden has told Parliament that the only answer to Hitler's slaughter of Jews is a United Nations victory. That sounds real nice, but at the rate they are being killed there will be no Jews left to rescue by the time we march into Berlin.

We want to save some lives. We would settle for a little less than perfection. If Bulgaria and Rumania are willing to surrender just a few thousand of the 4,000,000 Jews still alive in Europe, let's take them.

If there is no other way of bringing them in, let them be brought in as prisoners of war. Let them be shut up in a prison camp just as we shut up Nazi prisoners of war and let them be kept there until the close of the war.

OUR ALLIES

It is barbaric that we should thus treat a people who are allied with us against the common enemy, but we feel that some Americans who have feared to allow Jews to emigrate into the United States even to save their lives, might be willing to see them come in as prisoners of war, kept under lock and key.

No one shouts that he is afraid that the 40,000 Fascist prisoners are going to stay here permanently. Everyone knows they're going back after the war.

Let us look at Jews admitted as prisoners of war in the same manner. They will also go back after the war is over and the Nazi-sponsored anti-Semitism has died down. We would simply be giving them temporary haven.

The perfectionists who will tell us that this isn't the right way are forgetting that, while they plan and debate, men and women die. The search for a perfect solution has been an easy formula for doing nothing at all.

The Post asks the congressional delegation from New York City to propose this plan in Congress. The Post asks the Emergency Conference to Save the Jews of Europe which convenes in New York on July 10 to take this plan up.

Can our conscience allow us to do any less for the unfortunate victims of fascism than we do for the Fascists themselves?

The Forgotten Peace Aim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from the Progressive, of Madison, Wis., for June 7, 1943:

THE FORGOTTEN PEACE AIM

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Amid the fanfare of schemes for giving a quart of milk to every Hottentot, providing Patagonians with electric light, and making sure that no country, not even remote Ethiopia, misses the benefits of lend-lease, one simple and fundamental peace aim has been pretty well lost from view. This is the restoration and improvement of the American standard of living.

There has been little audible thinking along this line by our leaders of public opinion. And what thinking there has been is of the cart-before-the-horse variety. There has been some theoretical discussion of the desirability of social security, along the lines of the British Beveridge plan. But there has been uncommonly little recognition of the fact that true security is to be measured not in the paying out of dollars to the individual in this or that emergency, but in the stability of those dollars in terms of goods and foodstuffs.

Before getting down to positive proposals for insuring a reasonably good life for our people, it is necessary to cut through a jungle of misconceptions that have obscured our thinking and led to some false conclusions and assumptions that are only gradually being dispelled by the increasingly hard realities of a total war economy.

THE DEVELOPING FOOD CRISIS

One of the gravest of these misconceptions is that America is a land of unlimited abundance, where the only problem to be solved was distribution, not production. The swift, unmistakable deterioration in the food situation during the last few months, a deterioration that, in the opinion of some experts on the subject, is likely to become catastrophic within another year, is the best comment on this fallacy.

Here we must be on guard against the soothing sirup that is being ladled out in large quantities from the Office of War Information and from individual self-appointed boosters of national morale. It is worth remembering that 15 employees of the Office of War Information recently resigned, with the suggestive remarks:

"We are leaving because of our conviction that it is impossible for us, under those who now control our output, to tell the full truth. * * * The promoters who are now running the domestic information policy of the Office of War Information * * * are

turning this Office of War Information into an office of war ballyhoo."

It was undoubtedly naive of these 15 disillusioned spirits to believe that a war propaganda agency could or would permit them "to tell the full truth." But a sharp point was added to their criticism by the coincidence that on the day of their resignation Office of War Information published a statement of the food situation which carried its own refutation in the everyday experience of millions of American families. This statement coyly conceded that there might be as much as a 6-percent reduction in food supply in 1943 as against 1942.

Six percent indeed. Sixty percent would be much closer to the actual reduction in supply and availability, during the last few months, of such staple items in the normal American standard of living as meat, butter, canned goods, and fresh vegetables. A detailed report from California for 1942, a year when weather conditions were extremely favorable, gives the following figures of crop losses: apricots, 15 percent; tomatoes, 25 percent; peas, 25 percent; asparagus, 20 percent; vegetables, 30 percent, both in planting and in harvesting; slaughter of dairy cows, 46 percent above normal.

SPIKING A THEORY

One must also set down as unreal ballyhoo the constant Pollyanna prattle about how good rationing has been for the British and how their health has improved on their meager diet. Now it would be easy to take what the Briton can get on his food and clothing ration and show that an unemployed person in the United States or in Great Britain could have duplicated it on his dole during the depression.

Should we, then, look to the standard of living of the unemployed as the ideal for the future? An individual, if he chooses, may live on orange juice, raw carrots, tree bark, or any queer substance that he regards as helpful to his health or disposition. But the restoration of a decent American standard of living presupposes that all consumption goods will be as accessible to the consumer, without rationing restrictions, as they were before the war.

Another illusion is the "quart of milk a day for everyone" theory. Anyone who can seriously believe that an unprecedentedly destructive war will be or could be the prelude to a world flowing with milk and honey, is indeed gifted with an optimism so extravagant as to be slightly touched with irrationality.

It has already been proved, and it will be proved with increasing finality as the war goes on, that we cannot even feed ourselves adequately under war and lend-lease conditions. The idea that we possess so much abundance that we could easily spread our surplus food production over the entire globe deserves to be spiked for the fantastic nonsense, the "globaloney" that it is.

A NEW TYPE OF CRISIS

Another illusion that will be disposed of long before the war is over is the belief that jobs are everything, irrespective of the value of the real wages that go with the jobs. The naive belief that all that matters is to put everyone to work has led to some very cockeyed uncritical overestimates of the success of the collectivist economy in Russia and in Germany.

Having lived for more than 15 years under various forms of collectivist economics, in the Soviet Union, in Germany, and in Japan, I am often impressed by how exclusively American economic thought is concerned with the defects of an individualist economic system. This is natural. We have never known any other system; and it is the defects and weaknesses of the individualist system that must bear the responsibility for the tragic economic crisis that began in 1929.

Yet at the very lowest point of the American economic crisis, in the winter of 1932–33, I received a vivid illustration of the fact that collectivist dictatorship does not know all the answers to the eternal problem of giving everyone a decent standard of living. I had been in the city of Milwaukee and a friend who was in charge of relief administration gave me a list of the foodstuffs which the unemployed received at home. I took the list back to Russia and showed it to a Russian friend. He gasped in amazement.

"There isn't an employed Russian worker who gets such a variety of fruits and vegetables," he exclaimed. "Why, a high party official would be glad to be sure of this kind of a ration. And our newspapers tell us that your unemployed are all dying of starvation."

Of course the scandal of mass unemployment, of poverty in the midst of plenty in the United States was in no sense excused by the fact that at the same time in Russia, where almost everyone was employed (quite a number in prison camps, under the control of the political police) there was a terrific shortage of foodstuffs and manufactured goods.

But this incident shows that there can be more than one kind of economic crisis. Most of our critical thinkers can only conceive one type of crisis, a crisis of widespread unemployment. We will know a good deal more about another type of crisis, a crisis of full employment, even of labor shortage, but accompanied by serious shortage of food and manufactured goods, by a drastically lowered value of money, before this war is over.

The Russians, who are among the wittiest people in the world, summed up the essential features of this type of crisis in two conundrums that were popular in the years 1929–33, when the amount of money in circulation exceeded very markedly the amount of goods to be purchased: "Who are the richest people in the world?"

"The Russians, because they don't know what to do with their money."

"What people in the world eat the most?"

"The Russians, because they can easily eat up a week's rations in a day."

ESSENTIALS OF UNITED STATES POLICY

To realize the forgotten peace aim, to achieve the best possible American standard of living we must, in the post-war world, avoid both types of crisis. We must avoid both unemployment and empty shelves in our stores. As conditions for an American standard of living that will reach and surpass the pre-war level I would suggest the following as essential conditions:

1. Avoidance of policies that will lead us into wars, whether in pursuance of a hard-boiled American Century imperialism or in line with a fuzzy-minded internationalism that would cause us to fight the quarrels of other nations in remote parts of the world.

2. Emphatic repudiation of the idea of placing other parts of the world on a Work Projects Administration, of depleting our own resources and lowering our standard of living in order to finance grandiose reconstruction projects for the benefit of other peoples. This does not exclude necessary humanitarian relief activity. But it does rule out any reckless squandering of our resources in line with the "quart of milk for everyone" theory. Specifically the Lend-Lease Act should be repealed the moment the war is over.

3. The swiftest possible elimination of all rationing restrictions, and of the vast parasitic network of bureaucratic agencies required to administer and police an all-out rationing system. It will be a happy day for the American standard of living when the last ration booklet goes into a huge bonfire along with the last questionnaire from the aforesaid agencies.

4. Placing our economic relations with foreign powers on a reasonable give-and-take basis. Recognition of the obvious economic axiom, so dismally forgotten during the twenties, that international trade must be a two-way street, that we cannot sell goods and lend money all over the world unless we are prepared to accept goods and services of a roughly equivalent amount in return.

A BRAKE ON BIGNESS

5. Our principal reliance for an indefinite future period should be on internal development, with a secondary interest in hemisphere trade. We should not place too great hopes on the extensive development of trade with parts of the world which will be so terribly shattered as Europe and east Asia will be before the end of the war.

6. Forethoughted effort to level off both speculative booms and disastrous slumps by intelligent application of such weapons as taxation policy and public-works programs. We should have a pretty good start in bridging over the difficulties of transition from war to peace economy in the starvation of the market for automobiles, refrigerators, radios, many other objects of civilian consumption, in the demand for new housing, rehabilitation of rolling stock, machinery and equipment, etc. Taxes should be heavier in periods of high profits, tapered off in times when business is slow. Public works should be carefully studied so as to ban leaf-raking projects and to create genuine assets to public health, well-being, and economic prosperity: Power development, soil conservation, slum clearance—here is certainly a big and necessary job—recreation and health facilities, etc.

7. In economics as in politics recognize to the limit the implications of the American tradition of freedom and voluntariness. Be suspicious of too much bigness, whether in private corporations and banks or in State agencies. No excessive concentration of power, either in public or private hands. Let democratically organized trade-unions and cooperatives serve as checks and balances on the excesses of private initiative.

8. Maintenance and improvement of the existing Social Security System to be financed primarily by employers and workers, with the Government in a secondary role.

The Republican Party's Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on the afternoon of June 27 the able junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] delivered a speech before the Republican convention held at Appleton, Wis., which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Republican Party of Wisconsin, the Republican Party of the entire United States, is dedicated to a great and imperative task in this time of crisis.

As the name affirms, the Republican Party is dedicated to the task of preserving the republican form of Government in this country. It is dedicated to the imperative task of perpetuating that balanced system of Government under constitutional law which assures the individual the socially possible maximum of freedom.

It is dedicated to the great task of preserving the American Republic as a republic, as a republic in fact as well as in form.

Republicans are now joined with all Americans in fighting a great war to make secure from foreign aggression the United States of America. In this war there are no party lines. There is instead a united people dedicated to a single purpose.

We will win this war. We will win it decisively, totally.

International outlaws who would destroy the institutions of free men and free women must be dealt with as outlaws.

But we are not fighting merely to preserve our country during the war. We are not fighting merely for immediate and total victory. We are fighting to preserve it after the war, to preserve it for all time.

Nor are we fighting to preserve our country only. As American citizens who are conscious of our birthright, Republicans of Wisconsin, Republicans of all America are fighting to preserve the American Republic and those freedoms and institutions of freedom it champions.

As Republicans who know our birthright, we realize clearly that the battle to preserve the Republic will continue after this war has been fought and won.

As Republicans, dedicated to the task of preserving the Republic in fact as well as in form, we realize that the real battle of the post-war period will be to win an orderly return to duly constituted authority. We realize that the real battle will be to compel an orderly elimination of the semidictatorship imposed on us by the necessities of war and loyally accepted by all of us for the duration of the war.

Let me make one point clear—

Here in America we have two major political parties. We have the Republican Party and we have the Democratic Party.

In neither major party is there any deliberate purpose to destroy the Republic. On the contrary, there is in both parties only the sincerest determination to maintain it. This is true not only of the rank and file; it is true of perhaps a majority of the leaders.

But we all know that a small but powerful group of men and women who have worked themselves into places of high authority in the present Federal Government are openly scornful of both the form and the substance of our historical political system.

We know they insist openly and noisily that our historical system is a horse-and-buggy system—that it has outlived its usefulness.

We know they insist that it must be replaced by some highly centralized and streamlined new system—some all-embracing and all-demanding master plan—to be imposed on us by the master planners.

And we know that their continued presence in places of power is a threat and a challenge to the American Republic.

Let me offer an illustration: There are now, exclusive of the armed forces, nearly 3,000,000 persons on the Federal pay rolls. The significance of this vast new civilian army is not alone in its added cost. Its deeper significance is in its thirst for power—in the insistent struggle of each of the host of Federal agencies to expand its own functions, its own privileges, its own authority, at the expense of the other, and at the final expense of the States and the people.

The result of this interagency strife, of these feuds and rivalries, and of this brazen lust for power is a paralyzing confusion, which is obstructing beyond all need or reason the splendid and forthright war effort of the American people.

It is upon this foundation of confusion and thirst for power that the master planners hope to build their own version of a new America. It is within its framework that they expect to solve the profound and pressing problems of the post-war era.

It is all part and parcel of what they call the administrative process. It is an attempt to gather into the administrative function of government all the power previously held by the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches.

It is to further this continuously expanding process that the planners have so vigorously resisted all congressional attempts to limit their authority. It is to feed their thirst for power that they resist not only congressional attempts carefully to limit and define necessary administrative functions, it is for this same reason they resist so vehemently all congressional attempts to compel judicial review.

The administrative process, as they understand and attempt to use it, is government by the whims of men. It is most obviously and beyond any question an attempt to substitute something new for the historical American Government by law.

In January 1936 in his message to Congress, President Roosevelt said: "In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government, this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy, such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people * * *."

The people have learned, in the intervening years, that such power is neither wholesome nor proper in any hands. They have learned that a political autocracy can provide shackles for the liberties of the people even much more effectively than any political puppets of economic autocracy.

They have learned and they now realize that their great problem, after this war has been fought and won, will be to rid themselves of the political autocracy which has already fastened itself upon them under a combination of necessary war restraint and sheer love of power for its own sake.

And while it is scarcely necessary to point out that the rank and file of the Democratic Party no more welcomes shackles than do the rank and file of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party as now constituted has been so completely taken over at the top by the master planners that it is in no position to strike off any shackles, not even its own.

The inescapable fact is that of the two major political parties in this country, only the Republican Party has the necessary freedom and the necessary determination to strike off the shackles and keep them off.

And the Republican Party is fully conscious of its profound responsibility.

Let me make another point clear:

There are Americans who still stubbornly insist that after this war we are going back to the "good old days." Not a few of these are Republicans. Not a few of them are Democrats.

But we are not going back to the "good old days." We are going forward to a splendid future. "They conquer who believe they can." Those Republicans who believe otherwise are out of step with the times; out of step with the real spirit and purpose of their party.

The Republican Party, the real party of the rank and file and the overwhelming majority of the leaders, looks forward with lively appreciation of the grave problems which will confront us in the post-war world. But while we realize the gravity of these problems, we have enough faith in the abiding good sense of the American people and in their final devotion to traditional American principles to look forward with confidence. Minds set on great objectives become great.

The Republican Party recognizes that there will be a huge public debt at the close of this war. But aside from the wholly unnecessary extravagances which have helped swell the debt all through the last 10 years, the Republican Party insists that the debt was incurred for value received. It bought the preservation of our liberties for us. Because it did, we propose to see to it that it will be repaid.

The Republican Party insists that America can move forward to new material and spiritual triumphs in the years after this war. It proposes to insist on the proper coordination of management and labor, of industry and agriculture, of public and private enterprise, so that we may know fully the abundant America of our hopes and dreams. With vision and cooperation this people will go forward.

This party proposes to do all this, not through some master plan, but through the established processes of that Bill of Rights democracy which some New Dealers insist we prize too highly.

Moreover, in the field of world affairs, the Republican Party proposes that never again will the American people be caught napping and compelled to face with so few weapons such deadly danger as struck out at us on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor.

The Republican Party proposes that never again shall the United States undertake any international commitment without the necessary Army and Navy and Air Force to make the commitment good.

Let me make this point clear: The Republican Party will continue to lend its influence to any real program of world disarmament. This is in the American tradition. The American people have never and do not now love armament for its own sake. But we do love this land of ours. We do love our freedom. We do love our children. That is why we must never again invite such deadly risk as we invited a year ago last December. That is why we must never again send out our sons as gallant "expendables" to buy time for us on some future Bataan, Corregidor, Wake Island, or Guadalcanal. Yes, eternal vigilance is the price of freedom and the maintenance thereof.

And, finally, the Republican Party recognizes that as one of the major nations of the earth the United States must accept a major share in helping to restore and preserve international law and order in the post-war period. This is the way to world peace.

The Republican Party proposes that the people of this country stand ready to join all like-minded peoples in seeing to it that never again shall any gang of national savages and international outlaws be permitted to destroy the peace of the world in a lethal challenge to every standard of human decency which the nations of the earth have raised up through 3,000 years of slow and painful and persistent effort.

The Republican Party proposes that a strong America shall be a strong champion of international justice; that a purposeful America shall help weave the pattern of durable international peace and order; that an America, aware and confident of her own great future, shall help relight the lamps of freedom for all the groping nations of men.

The Republican Party insists that all this can be done without the sacrifice of any vital American interest or the undue expenditure of any American wealth or the yielding of any sovereign American right.

Only men of good will and nations of good will can build a world of good will. Our fighting sons have proven to us that with proper will and purpose a way can be found, no matter how beset with hazards. We must prove to them in turn that we are worthy to be their fathers and their mothers. God helping, we will not fail them or the Nation.

Commander Gaines, of Charleston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the West Virginia Review, a well-known magazine published in West Virginia, commenting upon the activities of Commander Richard K. Gaines, of the United States Navy, who has won distinction for his courage as a leader in this war. Commander Gaines is a son of the Honorable Joseph Holt Gaines, of Charleston, W. Va., who for years was a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A short time ago a Chicago newspaperman, Elgar Brown, of the Journal American, interviewed a Charleston boy in the Ambassador Hotel. This boy was Commander Richard K. Gaines, son of former Congressman Joseph Holt Gaines, of Charleston. Mr. Brown described him: "He looks like a naval hero of the movies. But if that's all he was, thousands of dead Japs would be live Japs today. He is 39 years of age, 6 feet 3 inches tall, and wears four campaign ribbons and three stars for as many major sea battles.'

Commander Gaines is wing commander of a flying team and operates from an unidentified aircraft carrier somewhere in the Pacific. In less than 1 year of active duty, here is his record which he does not talk about: One battleship sunk, cruisers sunk (number unspecified), destroyer sunk, transport sunk with 12,000 Japs on board, 100 airplanes shot down. That much is official record, but there are other accomplishments which Commander Gaines does not discuss. Time after time he led a squadron into the air, directed each plane's activity by radio, and took a lively part in a remarkable series of victories. He modestly disclaims credit by saying: "I was surrounded by wonderful fliers. The Jap Zero is a good plane; but I want to tell you that the spunk and morale of American pilots just burns 'em up."

One Hundred and Fourteenth Anniversary Day Parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union. During this month of June 1943 some 85,000 members and friends paraded in 28 different sections of the Borough of Brooklyn in the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union.

The parade commemorates the founding of Sunday schools in Brooklyn in 1816. The first parade was held in 1829 with 4 schools and 400 marchers. It has grown through the years until now 300 schools participate annually in this unique demonstration, which is not to be found anywhere but in Brooklyn.

Last year over 100,000, including all races and colors, took part; but because of the many members now serving in the armed forces, this year's turn-out was smaller by 15,000. Many of the service people were represented in line by proxy marchers who wore service badges bearing the name of the service person for whom he or she was marching.

At the suggestion of Borough President John Cashmore, each service person received a letter advising that the anniversary day parade was held as usual, and was sent his proxy-marcher badge.

The public schools in Brooklyn are closed on anniversary day to enable the members of the Sunday schools—teachers and scholars—to participate in the exercises held in the churches, as well as to march in the annual parade.

This year, as for many years past, former United States Senator and Mrs. William M. Calder were luncheon hosts in the Montauk Club, Brooklyn, to the distinguished reviewing party of about 100. Former Senator Calder was a Member of the House of Representatives for the same district which I now represent, before he became a Member of the United States Senate.

In addition to Senator Calder, many Supreme Court Justices and representatives of religion, education, and business were in the reviewing party.

Every year through 1932 the Federal Government has been represented by either the President, Vice President, or a Cabinet member. In recent years President Taft, President Coolidge, and Mrs. Herbert Hoover—representing President Hoover—were the chief reviewing officers. The Governors of neighboring States frequently are to be found in the reviewing party.

Each year the marchers rally around an appropriate theme. This year's theme was "Victory With Christ."

Maritime Commission Shipbuilding Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a transcribed broadcast delivered by me June 27, 1943, over radio stations WMAM, Marinette, Wis., and WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.:

During the past week out here on the west coast in San Francisco, our committee has heard some very interesting testimony from those various individuals, from industry and labor and the Government, who are charged with the emergency construction of about 56 percent of our Maritime Commission shipbuilding program. There have been many headaches and growing pains experienced in putting this over-all program into action.

I will tell you about some of them in later broadcasts based on direct testimony given to our committee.

Today, however, I want to give you a typical example of the miracle that has been accomplished by men from other fields of industry in America and who, prior to Pearl Harbor, were entirely foreign to the shipbuilding industry.

As an example of typical American ingenuity, when the chips are down in this all-important and world-wide struggle for existance, let me quote from the direct testimony given our committee by Mr. K. K. Bechtel, president of the Marinship Corporation, just across 'Frisco Bay in what had become almost a ghost town, Sausalito:

"On March 2, 1942, Admiral Land wired W. A. Bechtel Co. (which was one of the famous 'Six Companies' that pooled their resources to build the famous Boulder Dam) asking that it make a proposal to build and operate a new Liberty shipyard in a west coast port where our organization could operate to best advantage. He stated that he was relying on us to contribute our organization for the purpose of securing completed ships in 1942, and that the emergency demanded all within our power to give our country ships.

"Admiral Land's request was unsolicited. We have always seriously considered our new undertakings realizing the organization and responsibilities entailed. We knew that this project, if undertaken, meant drawing on our already busy organization. We decided on patriotic grounds that we would do as requested if we were really needed. We wired Admiral Land that we were studying alternate plans and he could depend upon us to do our part. We immediately set about a study of available sites, tentatively decided upon the Sausalito location because of its favorable community conditions; it was uncongested, was assured of additional housing if needed, and the favorable physical conditions.

"On March 8, 6 days after Admiral Land's wire, we were in Washington with a proposal. We told Admiral Vickery that although we were already very busy with other defense undertakings, we were ready to go forward with the new yard if they really needed us. Our proposal stated that we would build and operate a new yard under the then standard EC-2 conditions. We recommended the Sausalito site, stated that we would draw key personnel from our other activities, and presented a cost estimate of $10,250,000 for a 6-way yard. We estimated that 3 Liberty ships could be delivered by the end of 1942 and 31 additional ships in 1943.

"On March 8 Admiral Vickery gave us the verbal go ahead, and we immediately started preliminary organization and yard design work. On March 12 the Commission awarded us a contract to 'in the shortest time possible subject to the terms and conditions of this contract, design and construct the facilities.' (That was on a cost basis plus a fee of $2.) On that same day the Commission awarded us a contract to build 34 Liberty ships by the end of 1943. Admiral

Vickery expressed a strong desire for speed, so instead of waiting until the contract was signed we went ahead with our preliminary preparations immediately. We started to build the yard on March 28, 1942. We subcontracted as much of the work as possible in order to spread the work, get the benefit of other firms' management, equipment, and material sources. Subcontracting the work this way speeded it up and increased the efficiency.

"We invited Raymond Concrete Pile Co., J. H. Pomeroy Co., MacDonald & Kahn, and Morrison-Knudsen Co. to participate with us in this project in order to get the benefit of their organization, equipment, and judgment help. (These were others of the 'Six Companies.')

"We started to build the office building on May 12 and moved in on June 17. In order to build the yard we had to level a hill and fill in tidelands. On May 20 we started to build the first way and laid the first keel on June 27.

"The Maritime Commission wanted ships as fast as they could get them. In July we told Admiral Vickery that if they wished to increase the size of the facilities we felt the yard was capable of building between 60 and 70 Liberties by the end of 1943 instead of the original 34 contracted for. On July 9, 1942, the Maritime Commission authorized an increase in the investment on facilities to $16,400,000 and we agreed to a 50 percent reduction in the shipbuilding fee because the additional Government investment would permit a greater output, therefore, fee reduction was fair.

"The first few ships were fabricated at Calship (at Los Angeles) because Calship Yard, under the same sponsorship as Marinship, had an existing plate shop which could fabricate this steel faster and cheaper and thereby speed up our early shipbuilding operations. We started subassembly at Marinship on June 1 with temporary shipbuilding facilities. We laid our first keel on June 27, 107 days after the facilities contract was awarded. We started shipbuilding on partially finished ways as soon as possible, using construction equipment to erect steel sections pending the arrival of the permanent yard equipment such as whirleys. We knew this was the way to get speed, but we recognized it was more expensive.

"Admiral Vickery visited our yard on July 27. He was pleased with our progress and the ingenious use of construction equipment to build ships. He then first announced his decision to build tankers in this yard, so we started preliminary planning for tanker construction

"We launched our first ship on September 26, 1942, 92 days after the keel was laid, 199 days from the date of the facilities contract. This was the fastest record of any yard now building Liberty ships. We then had 11,800 men on our pay roll. We delivered the first ship on October 31, 1942, 51 days ahead of contract, 234 days after the facilities contract. We then had 16,400 men on our pay roll. By the end of 1942 we had delivered 5 ships compared to our contract calling for 3. These 5 ships were 127 ship-days ahead of contract. By March 17, 1 year after ground breaking, we had delivered 12 ships, 463 ship-days ahead of contract. These ships were delivered so much faster than the record established by the former record-holding shipyard that the Government got the use of 1,139 ship-days compared to the next fastest shipyard.

"To date we have laid 15 keels, launched 14, and delivered 13. In the first year from ground breaking this yard delivered 2 ships per way and did a great deal of work on other ships, including tankers. The fastest other yard record in the first year from ground breaking was eight-elevenths of a ship per way. Our first ship took 126 days to build from keel laying to delivery. Our fifteenth ship will take about 50 days, so between the first and fifteenth ship we have reduced the time of construction by 60 percent and the man-hour cost by 50 percent. At about the time Marinship started there were 5 other six-way Liberty shipyards getting started. Two of these other yards had delivered ships by the end of February 1943. One of these yards took 266 days to build its first ship compared to our 126 days on the first ship. The man-hour cost of our first ship and this other yard's first ship was about the same.

"Among other things that have contributed to our speed and ship cost were—

"1. Fabrication of first ship steel at Calship saved time and cost.

"2. The fast start and construction of our yard helped our speed greatly but increased the cost. Knowing that speed was paramount we used improvised methods pending the arrival of the permanent equipment.

"3. All costs increased between 1941 and 1942, estimated at least 15 percent increase.

"4. Ninety percent of the people who went to work in our yard were inexperienced in ship work or the craft work. This meant that these people had to be trained before they went to work or on the job. We anticipated this and worked additional people in order to offset the inexperience. As time went on the experience of these people increased their man-hour efficiency. On October 31 we had 16,400 people on the pay roll. This went up to 19,500 by early December. It is now back to 16,500 and we estimate that our man-hour efficiency is up at least one-third.

"5. Last autumn there was a shortage of tanker material and machinery. We were just starting, going fast, and these shortages hurt our progress. Other yards that were started before ours, started slower with a better supply of materials.

"6. Conversion of our yard from Liberties to tankers meant that during a considerable period of time we were building both Liberties and tankers. We had to do the engineering and production planning work to get ready for the tankers. Had we stayed on Liberties we would by now have delivered at least 36, and would be delivering 6 or more per month with the same or a lower total pay roll. Had we stayed on Liberties our Liberty ship cost would have been 40 percent lower. Tankers were sorely needed; this yard was selected to build them and we are building them, but the cost effect of conversion must be recognized.

"On October 9 the Commission awarded us a contract to build 22 T-2 tankers. We laid our first keel on December 7, have launched 5, and have 5 now on the ways under construction. Our average time for construction on the ways for the first 5 ships is considerably lower than the way time for the first 5 ships built in any other yards now building the same tankers. The quality of our workmanship and especially of welding sequence, have been very carefully laid out and approved by the Maritime Commission and the American Bureau of Shipping. Our basic problem now is to secure adequate tanker machinery. This has delayed delivery and increased the cost of our ships substantially. We are now working 15,650 people on 3 shifts a day; 50 percent work on the day shift, 30 percent on the swing, and 20 percent on the graveyard. Our force is almost constant, although our total pay roll may increase slightly as the supply of tanker machinery improves. We have had no serious problem in supplying our manpower needs. People in this area have been attracted to our yard because of its favorable transportation, housing, and pleasant working environment. We have had no strikes or official threats of strikes.

"Some time ago, realizing that continuous operation with a constant rotation within crews of the men's day off had a harmful effect on their daily work, we put into effect, with the Maritime Commission's approval and knowledge of the labor union, the 7-day balanced work program under which most of the men have the same day off on Sunday. This keeps the crews intact, avoids changes of leadership within the crews and increases teamwork. It gives us a better chance to do balancing work on Sundays, such as maintenance, material planning and any other critical work. This plan has worked out successfully and we understand is under consideration in other defense industries.

"The labor turn-over is now 8½ percent, down considerably in the last 6 months. Our absentees run at the rate of 6¼ percent. About 70 percent of our absentees are caused by illness or nonindustrial accidents.

"We have an ideal transportation set-up at our yard. Special busses serve the yard both from San Francisco and areas north of Marinship. Special ferryboats run from San Francisco right to the yard. Several thousand of our men walk to work from a housing project near the yard site. Many of our men drive to work across the Golden Gate Bridge in private automobiles using the pool-car set-up.

"Originally there was a slight housing shortage, but we had been assured by the housing authority that if needed they would furnish additional houses, and they did. The National Housing Authority built Marin City which houses 1,200 single men in dormitories and 1,500 men with their families in family units.

"Marinship was conceived, designed, built, and has been operated primarily by men formerly in the construction industry, although some of our best supervisors were available at Calship and some have come from other yards. When Admiral Vickery first visited the yard he was pleased with our progress but said maybe we were just good starters. We asked him to come back in 6 months to judge our results. He did come back 6 months later and on January 27 awarded us our first M-flag for making the fastest record of any of the six-way shipyards. Our second M-flag was awarded to us on March 29.

"We have found the Maritime Commission fair and able; they are splendid to work for. Admiral Land and Admiral Vickery are great leaders and are an inspiration to all of us. They recognize that we are building ships at Marinship primarily to help the war effort. They are hard drivers and expect results, and we give them results."

So testified Mr. K. K. Bechtel, president of Marinship Corporation. I congratulate Mr. Bechtel, his staff, and all of his personnel on their remarkable contribution to our war effort.

The Antistrike Bill Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star:

BLOW DEALT PRESTIGE OF ROOSEVELT—VETO IS BLAMED ON STUPIDITY OF LEFT-WING ADVISERS

(By David Lawrence)

There is only one real basis for indignation today as a consequence of the overriding of President Roosevelt's veto by Congress. It

is an indignation that should drive from Washington the smart-aleck group of left-wingers who have misled and misinformed the President about the state of public opinion on the strike issue.

There was no sound reason why in the midst of war both Houses of Congress, by a two-thirds vote, should have found themselves compelled to register a vote of lack of confidence in the judgment of the President. Such a vote with all its implications to the outside world—for in parliamentary government it would mean the ousting of the executive or else a general election—need not have occurred.

The so-called group of advisers who keep the President from knowing the facts about what is happening in the country have done him a disservice and perhaps a disservice to the prestige of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Whoever wrote that veto message for the President—for it seems incredible that he would write such an illogical and contradictory document himself—did more to break down the position of the President before Congress and the country than any political opponent ever has done or could do.

PRESS GAVE WARNING

Mr. Roosevelt was forewarned by the press, but he has developed a cynicism toward the press which warps his judgment. Still there must have been other advisers in his entourage who could read and analyze what has been happening since John L. Lewis began playing fast and loose with the prestige of governmental agencies.

There was only one way out—a law that would require Mr. Lewis to come before the War Labor Board and testify, a law that would prevent the encouragement or calling of strikes when the Government seized a property or plant. The country wanted such a law. The troops in our camps and our men overseas wanted such a law—they wanted authority exercised promptly and without fear of political consequences.

Men in Congress read newspapers. And, above all, they read letters from constituents—the mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters of the boys in our armed services. War is a serious business and politics has no place in it, or the wrath of the country will take its toll of Congressmen and Senators.

WEIGHTY DISAPPROVAL

Mr. Roosevelt, confident that he can do as he pleases without law, still nurturing the illusion that an Executive order is a command—something Mr. Lewis challenged and proved to be fallacious—and still believing that Congress wouldn't override a veto on such a delicate subject as labor legislation, now has a bitter defeat on his record. It is the most vehement expression of disapproval ever registered against the President since he came into office. It may even shake badly the confidence of his group of worshippers who up to now have taken for granted that a fourth term was inevitable and a walk-away.

Where the President made his mistake was, first, in listening to the labor lobby who asked him to veto the bill. Then he made his next mistake in the language of the message. After first reciting that labor had kept its no-strike pledge so that 99 95/100 percent of the work went forward without strikes, he declared that "laws are often necessary to make a very small minority of people live up to the standards that the great majority of the people follow."

But later on in his message, without any explanation whatsoever, the President turns about and says that some other innocently worded provision "would stimulate labor unrest and give Government sanction to strike agitations."

VICTIM OF ADVISERS

Just why the patriotic labor leaders of America who have given their solemn pledge not to strike should suddenly feel compelled to strike just because a law says they must give notice if they want to strike was beyond the comprehension of anybody in Congress, and so they tossed the argument out the window as specious and as merely the raising of a far-fetched interpretation just as an excuse for a veto.

It is admitted by the President that there is more good than bad in the law. He has signed many a law under those circumstances. He should have signed this one with a request for the repeal of what he considered unwise provisions. But he evidently was told he could not afford politically to antagonize labor and that Congress would surely sustain a veto His advisers guessed wrong, and Mr. Roosevelt is the victim of the stupidity of his own left-wing group of advisers. He should get rid of them all and get in tune with Congress and the country. He should forget politics and expediency—men are dying and homes are being saddened. This is no time for left-wing or right-wing.

Congress saw the point. And the morale of our troops overseas and in the camps will be stimulated as never before. On the subject of prohibiting strikes in wartime, the Nation is virtually unanimous.

Address of Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, Before Wisconsin Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE before the Republican State Convention at Appleton, Wis., on June 27 1943:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, every Republican is fully aware of the great part the State of Wisconsin has played in the history of Republicanism. We know that our party was born at Ripon in your State, almost 90 years ago. Here, then, as the clouds of the Civil War gathered; it was born with the word "freedom" twice on its lips: Free Soil and Free Men. And from the beginning, Wisconsin had the deathless love of freedom in its heart. To achieve that freedom, Wisconsin gave the Union over 8,000 of its young lives, sustaining then—one sparsely populated State—more casualties than all the United States today have had in taking North Africa. And the long political legends of your fighting farmers and fighting legislators who have made Wisconsin one of our most liberal States within the framework always—always within the framework—of constitutionality, is also known to every student of political history. And the harmony which exists today among your dairymen and farmers, businessmen, and laborers, in their war effort, is a matter of national attention and pride.

Therefore, simply as an American, as well as a Republican, I am proud and honored to be here.

But I am doubly honored as the first Republican woman to keynote a Wisconsin convention, though I take this compliment as I know you meant it: to all the Republican women of your State and of my State, who have fought in recent years quite as hard as the men to bring back good government to our land.

But now I must make a confession to you. Happy as I was to accept the honor of keynoting the convention of a State as great as Wisconsin, glad as I am to do here my pleasant Republican duty, proud as I am as a Connecticut woman to meet the women of Wisconsin—none of these was the true reason I came here today. I came to discharge a personal debt of gratitude to the State of Wisconsin itself. It is a debt incurred long ago, when I was a small girl. I lived on a lake called Turtle Lake in Barron County, in a town that was not really a town, I suspect, but a shopping appendage to a lumbering camp. How this happened to be so can be of no particular interest to you. But that it was so is today, and always will be, to me a matter of importance. For may I tell you that, with the great exception of my own tight little State of Connecticut, no other part of this Union is to me so much America as Wisconsin. Memories of childhood remain always the deepest and the most activating ones. It seems to me now, as it has time and time again in the past 20 years, that some of that quality of self-reliance, which we Americans are prone to think of as peculiarly American, I was lucky enough to learn here as a child.

I was instinctively aware then, in a childish way, of what I know as an adult to be a certainty now: That the air of Wisconsin, 30 years ago, was indeed the very air of freedom, breathed by free men, living and laughing, planning and building, saving and spending in a free and expanding land, a land in which there was still great opportunity for them and their wives, and even greater opportunity for their children.

In 1775, a year before the War of Independence, Edmund Burke rose to his feet in the House of Commons to make his great speech on Conciliation. He based his plea for peace with the American Colonies largely on his evaluation of the true nature of this new man in history, the American. Our pioneer pursuits, he said had largely influenced our characters: "Abeunt studia in mores." To the men of the Old World, he described the men of the New World as "men acute, inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defense, full of resources." "In other countries," he said, "the people, more simple, and of a less mercuria cast, judge of an ill principle in government only by an actual grievance. In America, they anticipate the evil, and judge of the pressure of the grievance by the badness of the principle. They augur misgovernment at a distance, and snuff the approach of tyranny in every tainted breeze."

Burke might well have been describing the Wisconsinites I knew 30 years ago. Are the men of Wisconsin, and America, too, still like that? The account American soldiers are giving of themselves on the battle fronts of the world heroically attests to their ability to cope with foreign tyrants, to augur foreign misgovernment at a distance. For Americans today are fully aware of the badness of the beastly principles of Nazism and Japism, They are determined that these evil principles shall not triumph.

But what of the ability of Americans to judge of the pressure of a grievance by the badness of the principle, to augur misgovernment here at home? Are our farmers and workers, today, as quick as Burke said they were to "snuff the approach of domestic tyranny in every tainted breeze"? Is the air of

America today as free as the Wisconsin air of my childhood? Fundamentally, yes.

But let us face it. In past years, many Americans have not been like their pioneer forefathers, so quick to anticipate domestic evils in their Federal Government, or so shrewd to judge the pressures of their domestic grievances by the badness of the principle practiced in Washington. For their failure to do so, in our time, our Nation has paid dearly.

Now what is the principle by which we demanded as American revolutionists we should be governed? And by what principle have Americans always demanded to be governed? By the democratic principle of justice, to every individual, and to all groups in our land. It was in large part the failure of the Old Deal to give equal justice to every individual and group, above all the farmer and the laborer, which finally overthrew the Old Deal and brought the New Deal to power. The people had judged the badness of the Old Deal's failure to abide by the principle of justice.

But, my fellow Republicans, did the New Deal restore the democratic principle of justice in government, for the conspicuous and acknowledged injustices of the Old Deal? It did not. It substituted instead another principle, a hitherto unknown principle in American political philosophy, completely strange to the self-reliant American pioneers and farmers whose spirit had long informed it. The principle by which the New Deal sought to govern and stay in power was the aristocratic principle of charity. And what is the difference between justice and charity in government? Well, I think it is this: Justice is what you get when you receive exactly what you have a right to get as an honest citizen of a great democracy: a good steady job, with the chance of advancement; a farm on which you can produce and plant, and sell your produce in a fair market; a career or business in which you can make headway as fast as your talents and industry warrant; above all the opportunity freely, according to your abilities, to open or enter more fruitful fields of enterprise. This was the essential economic justice which Thomas Jefferson proposed when he said "equal opportunities for all, and special privileges for none." This is the justice which encourages spirit in every material undertaking.

Charity is what you are given when you don't get justice. Then you get doles, handouts, WPAism, special subsidies and special privileges and special benefits to favored and special groups within the economy. It is my belief that the American people are now sick unto revolt of the New Deal principle of charity as government, and government as charity. For they have seen at long last that this principle, however much in the beginning it may have served to bind the wounds inflicted by the old economic injustices, when applied wholesale for a long time to a nation, discourages self-reliance, frustrates ambition, curtails production, and stultifies all the processes of democracy. Today the badness of this principle of government has, after 10 years of application, resulted in a terrible pressure of national grievances: Of prodigious taxes and a public debt of a size that staggers a mathematician's imagination. These taxes, this debt, must be borne by us, and our children. We know that now. We see quite clearly at last what the aristocratic charitymongers in Washington had begun to do to our economy. Before the war our economy was rapidly contracting instead of expanding. For charity, instead of justice, in government had spawned confusion in business policies, confusion in agricultural policies, confusion in fiscal policies, and confusion, confusion, and confusion.

Today we have in the aristocratic New Deal an extraordinary paradox: It is beyond any doubt the most charitable Government in the world. It has gone in, on a prodigious scale, for "do gooding" and "Lady Bountifulism." Its countless administrators tirelessly emulated Robin Hoods. And every other clause in every other law the New Dealers sought to pass was a "Santa Clause." And yet insensibly this Government has become one of the most unpopular and tyrannical this Nation has ever had. Why? Because we see at last that charity as government in the end makes men poor, but it never can make poor men rich. Only justice as government can do that.

Today the war itself, with its insatiable demands on American resources, has exposed to every eye and mind the long folly and shame and the incredible danger to our national security, our national economy, and our very way of life—of the old New Dealers' attempt to substitute charity for justice. Our Nation of fiercely self-reliant, dexterous, acute people, who are naturally great producers on farm and in factory—as who should know better than you of Wisconsin—had almost been turned into a Nation of frustrated, doubting, helpless people, who sat mournfully and idly in factory and on farm, with no other hope for the future except the long holding out of millions of tin cups for Government doles, Government benefits, and Government subsidies. Today, what all Americans want from the cradle to the grave is real opportunity, not the New Deal's false security. Today, what all Americans will demand of victory is a post-war America which, governed by just men and just laws, will guarantee us the free and ever-expanding economy of which this greatest of nations is surely capable. This is the challenge offered to the Republican Party, and, I believe, in 1944 the Republican Party will meet it. It will become the majority party in the Nation, as you are in this State already.

Fellow Republicans, after I had accepted your invitation to keynote your convention, I sought the opinions of my very able Republican colleagues who come from your State. Naturally, I wanted to say here things that would interest you and perhaps even be profitable to you. My colleagues were almost unanimous in advising me to bring you the unhappy tale of what this false New Deal principle of charity has made of your Government in Washington. They urged me to bring you, as a reporter rather than as a legislator, the grim picture of the New Deal bureaucracy, which has grown to such prodigious proportions in our time.

They suggested that I excite your justifiable anger, arouse your honest indignation with—to quote one of them—descriptions of the many New Deal coordinators, and coordinators of coordinators, who again and again in the very nick of time have brought organized chaos out of regimented confusion; of the New Deal professors appointed to tell farmers and their wives how to solve the problems of life which they themselves cleverly avoided by becoming professors; of the New Deal statisticians who draw mathematically precise lines from unwarranted assumptions to foregone conclusions; of the New Deal "efficiency experts" who know less about your business than you do, but who are getting paid more today for telling you how to run it than you could make out of it after taxes, even if you ran it right, instead of the way they tell you to run it; of the countless New Deal executive agencies, staffed with hundreds of men who individually can do nothing, but who gather in impressive headline groups in order to decide that nothing can be done; of the fog of orders that command but do not produce; of the hundreds of directions that have no direction. I was urged to remind you of the New Deal czars piled on czars, of bureau heads on bureau heads, in mounds that look on Capitol Hill like nothing so much as the pyramids of skulls Tamerlane left on his march of conquest. I was counseled to trace for you the vicious New Deal circle of rising wages, rising prices, overtopped by wages that rise still more, and prices that mount again above them in the inexorable spiral of inflation; to mourn and lament with you over the New Deal's muddled rationing plans, its Alice in Wonderland efforts to roll-back prices which are all too likely to result in such a sharp curtailment of food production that hunger, that word so strange to America, may yet become a familiar one; to review the history of the New Deal's vacillating relations with organized labor, which have let loose the New Deal Frankenstein, John L. Lewis.

Above all, I was cautioned to tell you that this powerful New Deal bureaucracy is very much like a giant octopus. Its tireless tentacles have wormed and slid into the smallest crevices of our economy. And while it is a very wise thing—indeed, a vitally necessary thing, for patriotic legislators to hack off a tentacle here, when it gets around our war-production diaphragm, and a tentacle there, when it gets around our financial windpipe, and perhaps another tentacle which has fastened itself on our civil liberties, that does not dispose of the many-tentacled octopus itself. For there is no way, no way at all, to get rid of the old New Deal until Mr. Roosevelt is voted out of office. That is the truth and the whole truth and there isn't a person in the United States who doesn't know it. He is the author of the philosophy of charity as government, and right there lies the well-spring of all our domestic confusion. Now we have augured the misgovernment at Washington, defined the badness of the principle, and flatly stated that there is no way of correcting these evils and grievances but to turn the New Deal out of office.

How then shall we Republicans seek to accomplish this? Or, to put it another way, how will the new dealers, who are powerful and vocal, try to prevent us from accomplishing it? In what terms will the new dealers launch their attack, and in what terms couch their defense? Let me tell you then, although I think you already know it: The new dealers will not make their fight on domestic issues. For that fight is already lost. There is not a new dealer in Washington who will not admit freely that Mr. Roosevelt cannot be re-elected for a fourth term if the issues can be confined to a discussion of Mr. Roosevelt's 12-year-old domestic policies. Now what ought we to deduce from that? Nothing could be more simple: The new dealers will not make their fight on domestic issues. They will make the fight on foreign issues.

And because I wish to be utterly frank with you, I must tell you now that they will succeed; yes, they will succeed, in making this the paramount issue of the next election. For there is no question, absolutely no question, after the actual achievement of military victory, more important to the whole American people than the question of what America's foreign policy was, what America's foreign policy is, and what America's foreign policy ought to be. Americans know that in this ever shrinking world America stands no chance, no chance at all, of working out a prosperous domestic economy and of preserving her way of life, unless peace can be preserved over wide areas of Europe and Asia. They feel that our inevitable military victory will be utterly meaningless and all the brave young lives dedicated to it wantonly wasted, if, afterwards, this Nation does not vigorously seek the mechanism and procedure by which we may hope to prevent a third world war in our children's lifetime. If this is the New Deal argument for fighting the election of '44 on foreign issues—and I think it is—then the New Deal argument is right. And the people know it. So our party will stand unprepared

to battle the New Deal on the question of foreign policy at its own peril.

As I told you, many of my colleagues suggested what I might talk to you about out here in Wisconsin. But one cautioned me what not to talk about.

"Don't," he said, "talk about foreign policy in Wisconsin." And when I said, "Why not?", he said, "Well, because Wisconsin has been considered something of an isolationist State—intervention isn't popular out there." Now, I don't know exactly what most people mean any more by these words "isolationist" and "interventionist." If an isolationist is, or was, a man who wanted to stay out of war, then I was and am an isolationist. And so, I believe, was everybody in the United States before Pearl Harbor. For a wan who wants to get into a war he can stay out of is either a fool or a knave. Certainly, the people of the State of Wisconsin did not want to get into this war any more than did the people of Connecticut. So if the word means just having wanted to stay out of war, then as a smear word it is, even to new dealers, useless. Well, then, is an isolationist a man who believes that his country shall have no trade relations and no cultural relations with any other nation when the war is over? If isolationist means that, surely there are no isolationists in Wisconsin nor in the rest of the country. Then, what, precisely, does "isolationist" mean as the New Deal uses it and will use it with increasing frequency as the election approaches? May I tell you? An isolationist will sooner or later be defined by the new dealers as a man who refuses to accept, from here out, what will be called from here out "Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy." Now, if we Republicans are going to be smeared because we refuse to accept Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy, we had better discover quickly what it is we are being smeared for not accepting. In short, we had better examine Mr. Roosevelt's foreign policy closely and at once, because, as I say, if the New Deal is reelected this is the issue it will be reelected on.

First, with your kind permission, I shall have to give you certain definitions of my own of what I believe isolation really is. Isolation, as we have come to know it in our country since the turn of the century, is, I think, the widely held belief that America can live in peace and prosperity in an ever shrinking world, without developing a positive, forceful American foreign policy, a policy based, as every nation's should be, on our own self-interest, and self-defense. Now every American knows that we do have such a policy toward Canada, Mexico, the Central American countries and South America. And he knows that for many years we have, with a considerable degree of success, pursued it. Because of this up-and-down, North-to-South foreign policy of ours, there has been long peace and increasing prosperity in and among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

But today the average American must also be aware that for almost 40 years, we have had no such vigorous and positive procedure, based on our own self interest, our own conceptions of the defense of our shores, the expansion of our trade, the communications of cultural ideas, toward Europe and Asia. We have had in short, no side-to-side, East-to-West policy. The belief that we did not need one in the past, that we will not need one in the future, is what I call "isolation," and will continue to call it, so long as the belief prevails. In short, an isolationist is a man with few or no ideas in his head about what he thinks America should do to safeguard our national interests in relation to Europe and Asia.

Now what is an interventionist? For this is also used as a smear word by some Republicans. If an interventionist is a man who wants to give every blessed thing America has away to the rest of the world, and who wants to mess into the internal affairs of other nations, then I am not an interventionist, and I don't believe there are many, outside the ranks of the New Deal, in America. So let me define the word interventionist, too. For, by my definition an interventionist is a man who has been an isolationist—that is to say a man without an American foreign policy at all—who, when he finally sees that his country is unavoidably threatened by war, adopts, at the last moment, the foreign policy of another nation, or even of several other nations.

Now that description fits the administration perfectly. History is history. Shortly after Mr. Roosevelt came to office in 1933 he scuttled the World Economic Conference. Just such a conference, I may add, as he will one day be suggesting as a post-war necessity. At the time, this act was recognized by every chancellery in Europe, and by every thoughtful American, as the most violent act of economic isolation ever committed by an American President. From then on, until the year 1938, Mr. Roosevelt grew in stature as the world's outstanding isolationist. That is to say, although he was the leader of the greatest country in the world, he propounded and practiced no positive American foreign policy for Europe and Asia. To be sure, he had inherited a policy of European isolation from the Republican Party of the middle twenties, but by scuttling the World Economic Conference, which had been set up by President Hoover, he brought isolation to a peak of perfection never before matched in America.

But if Mr. Roosevelt had inherited no American foreign policy for Europe from the Republicans, he had inherited one for Asia. Under years of Republican leadership, this country had developed a policy toward the Orient which was based on the territorial integrity of China, the right of all nations to trade there on equal terms and the preservation of our defenses in the Philippines.

It was under Woodrow Wilson, who had also been a great isolationist, later converted to intervention, just like Mr. Roosevelt, our foreign policy in the Pacific began to go to pot. Flying in the face of every dictate of our national self-interest at the Versailles Conference, the Democratic administration gave the Japanese the mandated islands in the Pacific whose possession have since cost us, and will yet cost us, so much American blood. In later years, when the Japs marched into Manchuria, Henry Stimson, a Republican under Hoover, protested violently. But his protests were buried in the New Deal landslide. He was the last American in high office to protest Japanese conquests in the Orient for many years. The fact is that all through these years Mr. Roosevelt's isolationist no-policy toward Asia allowed our defenses in the Pacific to deteriorate, our prestige in the Orient to wane, and the Japs slowly but surely to set out on their conquest of our only potential allies, the Chinese. Meanwhile, this administration sold them the scrap and iron for the war machine which they were doing it with.

Thus, under Roosevelt, we had the unchecked growth of Hirohito in the East, and in Europe the unchecked growth of Hitler and Mussolini. Even as late as 1938 Mr. Roosevelt was an avowed isolationist. He warmly congratulated Chamberlain—a matter of public record—at Munich. Even after the war broke he offered no serious opposition to the passage of the Neutrality Act, which was even a more insane piece of isolationism than the scuttling of the Economic Conference. Imagine the leader of a great nation favoring the passage of a piece of legislation which could only help his country's enemies and hurt its friends, and not staking everything, even his high office, on pointing this fact out to the people. And "but me no buts" about the Republicans being behind the Neutrality Act. For years Mr. Roosevelt had Congress in the hollow of his hand. He had the great respect, even adoration, of the American people. If he had taken the lead at this crucial point to shape an American foreign policy designed to discourage the rising dictatorships in Europe and Asia which ultimately meant danger for us, the people surely would have followed.

He did not do so because he had no American foreign policy; in short, he was an isolationist. But what happened, you ask, what happened to change him over? Well, I shall tell you. Slowly but surely the bad news out of Europe and Asia began to pile up in the State Department. News, I may say, that the administration and the State Department never shared fully with the American people. It had an unhappy way, you see, of pouring in around election time. If you do not believe that the mountains of bad news were not shared with the people, read Mr. Hull's White Paper on Japan. But in the end the news was so very evil in what it augured for the ultimate economic and physical safety of the United States, should the Axis Powers ultimately overwhelm the British Isles, that no man fit to be President could any longer ignore it. Carefully and cautiously Mr. Roosevelt became a European interventionist. That is to say, having no foreign policy of his own, slowly he began to adopt the foreign policy of the British Empire. I do not hesitate to say, thank heavens, he adopted something and that that something was the foreign policy of our greatest and friendliest neighbor, the British. But history also forces me to note that Mr. Roosevelt, the budding interventionist, never even adopted British policy wholeheartedly and forthrightly. It was rather thrust on him by the German declaration of war upon us and his awakening to the complete deterioration of our Far East policy was thrust upon him, as on all of us, by the horror of Pearl Harbor.

Today, I say, this administration still has no American foreign policy. There is not one human being in Washington, who knows what the administration's foreign policy is towards any of the United Nations. Would it, for instance, approve of a permanent nonaggression pact with the British Commonwealth? Do you know? Le me tell you right now that I would. I have eyes, and I can look at the map. I can see on the map, my fellow Republicans, that the British Empire and its components are the natural buffer state for the United States of America. Go look at your globes when you get home and check this. In order to get at our enemies, where are we fighting? Everywhere on British soil. What would our enemies, today or tomorrow, have to do to get at us? Name the country or countries and look at the map. To get at us they would first have to go through, pass over or subdue all or parts of the British Empire. Does not this immutable geographical fact suggest to you, as it should to the administration, that perhaps a cardinal principle of a wise American foreign policy would be to extend the Monroe Doctrine to include our natural buffer state? Another example: What does the administration think our policy should be towards France? I'll tell you again what I think: that the restoration of a strong, democratic France in Europe and in Africa would be a splendid thing for the peace of Europe—and the defense of the United States. A vigorous American foreign policy ought to be utterly and forthrightly dedicated to restoring France, which was and will be again one of the greatest forces for peace and democracy on earth. Or let us take still another example: What is the administration's policy toward Russia? Do you know? Does anyone? Again I do not hesitate to say: American policy

should vigorously seek to keep Russia our friend after this war is over. It should not thrust her, by the threat of recurrent isolation, into preying on her neighbors for the territory she will then demand, in order to protect herself from a third German aggression.

Believe me, the administration has no coherent policy, or, if it has, it is keeping it as secretly to itself as any dictator ever kept his. And let us get this clear: The four freedoms are not a policy; they are simply the expression of principles and sentiments, principles and sentiments which are totally incapable of application to the whole world. Indeed, they are only capable of application to parts of the world on the condition that our Nation embrace a foreign policy vigorous enough to implement them, if need be, by force. Windy, high-flown talk of world councils, regional federations, world federations, world government, world police forces, or even another league of nations—indeed, talk of any machinery for so-called collective security—is meaningless unless our statesmen first collect their wits and decide how America can best secure herself. These are all dazzle-dust terms, thrown into the people's eyes in order to be able to complain that the people do not see, so we may come to think that nobody but the New Dealers know how to manage our foreign affairs for us. I tell you quite simply that no form of collective security is possible until we Americans, with open minds and open eyes, are willing to enter into clear and wise, binding and honorable, non-aggression pacts, first with the British and thereafter as soon as they will, and we can, with other of the United Nations. Only on such common-sense foundation stones can you erect, in this epoch of history, the sound edifice of collective security, and add what further machinery may be necessary to integrate international cooperation. When we have faced up to this very simple fact, that binding agreements with our neighbors whom we trust, is the first step in any foreign policy which will safeguard this Nation, we can then debate the issue of foreign policy with the administration—and win on it.

Now you have heard a great deal about a mission to Moscow, undertaken by a New Deal diplomat. Like so many of the New Deal's missions, that one was also done with mirrors. For while Mr. Davies' memory of that mission has made excellent celluloid fiction, the fact remains that historically the mission failed. For when Mr. Davies left Moscow, he left a Moscow which shortly afterwards fell into Hitler's arms, diplomatically. And if that wasn't bad news for us, I don't know what was. If things have turned out rather better than Mr. Davies left them, it is not because this administration's agents were to be trusted with making a sound foreign policy for the United States of America in Russia, but because Adolf Hitler himself betrayed Stalin's trust.

Now, I would like to talk about another mission; a mission which did not fail. And I like to talk about it, because I am in the State of Wisconsin. This mission was undertaken by a man who certainly never considered himself a diplomat, or a statesman, but whom history has proved to be both. For history has shown that when he undertook his mission he had clearly in mind an American foreign policy, or a great part of such a policy, at any rate. And it was more than 10 years ago that this man foresaw the shape of things to come for America. He foresaw that America would have to go to war, and that America would be attacked. He identified the enemies. He said what had to be done about them, and he undertook to do as much of that as he could, all by himself. I have myself talked long and earnestly with this man in days gone by, and I can attest to the agonizing, heartbreaking clarity with which he looked into America's unhappy future.

His mission was a Mission to Manila. I am speaking, of course, of the son of one of Wisconsin's great sons—Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Let us review the history of a Wisconsinite who was neither an isolationist nor an interventionist—but a patriot. And believe me, I only mention this because surely it must be a matter of pride to you here, in Wisconsin, that one of your own sons saw perhaps more clearly than any American living the menace growing in Asia and Europe.

General MacArthur spent 5 years, from 1930 to 1935, in official Washington as Chief of Staff. Winston Churchill's compilation of his own unheeded warnings to the Empire, "While England Slept," could be matched in military value by a compilation of MacArthur's own warnings during those years to the Senate, the Congress, and the public, while America was sleeping. For MacArthur saw not only the inevitability of war, he also foresaw the kind of highly mechanized war it would be, and he projected in exact specification after specification, the sort of equipment and training, the sort of mobile instruments and air force we would need to win such a war. But neither the administration nor Congress nor the Nation would heed him. They felt that only statesmen, not soldiers, could know anything about the shape that international affairs would take. When the time came to retire as Chief of Staff, MacArthur refused to give up his long fight to protect America from the enemy that he knew so well would one day strike. At his own request he undertook his mission to Manila to build there, as field marshal of the Philippines, the army of defense that he knew must one day protect the United States in the Pacific. This son of your State was thus the first important American, not only to recognize an international peril of enormous magnitude, but one of the few Americans to try to do something concrete about it. When he arrived in the Philippines, he embarked on a frantic race against time. Until as late as 1940, isolationist Washington denied him again and again the material and men he again and again begged for to build his bastion against the Jap. But he did what he could, in spite of that. And what Americans and Filipinos lacked in equipment, MacArthur made up for in part by inspiring a deathless love of freedom in their hearts. On Bataan, Americans for the first time took the measure of the enemy. And the Filipinos' loyalty to America—their belief in America's honor and strength that MacArthur had so carefully nurtured, so carefully and tirelessly that at times he was accused of being a better statesman and politician than a soldier—was worth more to us as a nation than we will ever be able to count or repay. Though Corregidor fell after 6 bloody months of heroic defense, none can say that MacArthur's was a mission that failed.

MacArthur's vision of what must happen to America in the Pacific, if our foreign policy out there continued to deteriorate; his single-handed determination to build up America's defense on those far-flung islands, and his heroic defense of them when the inevitable hour of attack had come, gave time to America and the United Nations to recover from the deadly wounds of Singapore and Pearl Harbor, and it saved another great democracy—Australia.

As I say, I mention all this only to remind you that your State has produced the prototype of the Americans we need so badly today—"men acute, inquisitive, dexterous, prompt in attack, ready in defense, full of resources." Men who anticipate the evil, and can judge of grievances to come by the badness of the principle. Men who hold their Nation's safety and honor, and power so dear, they are not afraid to sacrifice life or fame even to go into long exile, if need be, to safeguard them. Men who can formulate a clear American foreign policy, and act upon it, without waiting for the enemy to give it hideous shape when it is almost too late. Men who realize that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that free men will always think clearest and fight hardest for victory and for peace. And may I say, I believe there are many such men in positions of leadership in the Republican Party.

And now, fellow Republicans, let me very briefly review my argument. The New Deal is dead, so far as its reputation on the home front goes. It can only survive if it can convince the people that its foreign policy was and is sound. This it cannot do because the New Deal had no positive foreign policy before Pearl Harbor, and has none now, except as it has borrowed one, temporarily, from our British cousins, and while that is better than nothing, it is still, for the United States, second best.

For the rest, let us for once and all face this fact: The same philosophy of charity as government which has inspired the New Deal at home will inspire the New Deal abroad. W. P. A. at home will become W. P. A. abroad, Washington bureaucracy will become world bureaucracy, and all will be run overseas with the same juggernaut inefficiency with which it has been run at home.

Above all, I have said that the time has come for the Republican Party to stop defending itself against the name "isolationist" by developing a strong, realistic, common-sense American foreign policy, which will then become the foundation of a world peace policy that all the nations can embrace, because they can understand it. In no other way can our party keep faith with the boys who are dying, dying every day on the fronts. In no other way can we justify in the eyes of history all that they have suffered and are yet to suffer, all the heroic sacrifices that they are making for us. This, my fellow Republicans, is our Mission to America.

The Battle of Midway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every Member here today would join with me in a feeling of regret if we were to allow the month of June to go by without commemorating a date which might well become one of the most important in our history. On this last day of June, I feel you will all join with me in preventing this oversight.

When the final score of the war in the Pacific is posted it might well be found that the turning point in this conflict occurred on the dates between June 3 and June 6, 1942, just a little over a year ago. The action on those dates has come to be known as the Battle of Midway.

Although there has not yet been time to view this battle in its proper perspective, of one thing we can be sure. The crushing defeat suffered by the Japanese at Midway marked the last serious invasion attempt—the last major offensive—by our enemy in the Pacific. Since that crushing defeat the Japanese have been for the most part on the defensive.

The Battle of Midway did more than that.

It provided history with the first major naval engagement in which one great fleet was defeated by a far smaller fleet, and without the ships of either coming within range of surface gunfire.

It definitely established as a pattern for this war the fact that air power is an integral part of sea power, just as air power is an integral part of our striking forces on land.

It dealt the Japanese Empire a jarring loss of face which is without parallel in Japanese history, and it taught the Japanese a costly lesson from which I hope they may never fully recover.

Finally, our glorious victory at Midway gave our own Nation new confidence—new proof that America's fighting equipment and America's fighting men are without superiors in all the world.

The story of the various maneuvers in the battle of Midway have been told too many times to need retelling here. But, for those who have shouted that the Pacific was being treated as a minor theater, here is an interesting fact:

Far more forces, on both sides, were engaged in this great battle than took part in the Battle of Jutland. And the Japanese lost more tonnage in combatant shipping than the Germans lost in the battle which, up until this war, was considered one of the greatest naval encounters in all history.

Our enemy in the Pacific sent one of the world's mightiest and strongest invasion fleets at us. Exactly what their objectives were we will probably not know until the war is over. Most naval strategists believe, however, that the Japanese were trying to rectify a mistake they made on December 7 when they did not invade Pearl Harbor and the Hawaiian Islands. Others believe they were headed for the mainland. In any event, had their plans been successful we would have been deprived of the Hawaiian Islands and would today be fighting this war from west-coast naval bases in the United States.

All told, the Japanese lost four mighty aircraft carriers—the *Kaga*, the *Akagi*, the *Soryu*, and the *Hiryu*.

Three Japanese battleships were either sunk or so heavily damaged that they were knocked out of the fight for months thereafter.

Two heavy cruisers were blasted to the bottom of the Pacific. Three other heavy cruisers were severely damaged, two so badly that they may never have reached Japan.

One light cruiser was damaged.

Three destroyers were sunk and several were damaged.

At least one heavily loaded transport was sunk, and two others were so badly damaged that they may not have remained afloat.

Almost 300 first-line Japanese aircraft were destroyed, and approximately 5,000 Japanese were killed or drowned.

Against this heavy toll, own our losses were 1 carrier, 1 destroyer, and less than 500 officers and men.

Although Midway was under naval command, the Japanese were met and defeated by fighting men of our Navy, our Army, and of our Marine Corps. The cooperation between the three services, I am happy to say, was nothing short of superb.

Our great Army lost one of its best air tacticians in the heroic death of Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, whose bomber was forced down at sea.

The Navy lost many brave men, among them all but one member of the immortal Torpedo Squadron Eight. The sole survivor, one of the bravest of the brave, was a young lad from Texas, Ensign George Gay.

But both Army and Navy united in praise of the heroism of the United States marines.

Maj. Lofton Henderson was the Marine Corps aviator—mentioned in an address by the President of the United States—who deliberately flew his dive bomber onto the deck of a Japanese carrier after his plane had been so badly damaged that there was no chance of escape. In the true spirit of the marines, Major Henderson determined to make the enemy pay the utmost.

The United States Navy at Midway was heavily outnumbered in ships, planes, and men. But in two things we were superior. One was our ability to plan ahead, anticipating the enemy's move even before he made it. Another was that fine character of loyalty to service, of courage in the face of seemingly crushing odds, and of determination to uphold this Nation's honor no matter what the personal risk or personal cost. These qualities typify our Navy, our Marine Corps, our Coast Guard, and our Army. With these qualities, we shall go on to final victory.

The Antistrike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Congress passed an antistrike bill over the Presidential veto with a speed unequaled in the history of our Federal Government, a speed indicative of the strong feeling in Congress that previous methods used to deal with strikes which cripple the war effort were insufficient, and that firmer measures and greater governmental authority were required in view both of present conditions and future probabilities with regard to labor in our war factories taken over by the Government.

It is regrettable both that Congress was forced to pass the bill in the first place and that it had to override the President's objections, but it would have been more regrettable had Congress refused to do so. The American people have but one all-important job: To win this war as quickly as our total productive resources and fighting powers can win it. That is also the all-important job of every group of Americans, whther they represent labor, management, capital, or government, and it far transcends the interests or objectives of one of those groups.

There is nothing in the act to which any patriotic American can conscientiously object. It prohibits nothing which a patriotic worker wants to do; it requires nothing which a patriotic union member will not willingly do; it violates no one's wartime rights. The act is necessary as a protection against the willful mischief of ignorant or unprincipled labor leaders and strike instigators. It is no more directed against the vast majority, who are patriotic workers and union members, than is a law against embezzlement directed against every honest banker or cashier.

The act prohibits anyone, whether affiliated with a labor union or not, from instigating a strike in a Government-operated war plant on the principle that no one has a right to entice the Nation's defenders from their posts of duty. Anyone attempting it with members of the armed forces would be shot for treason. War workers are no less defenders of the Nation than are soldiers and sailors, because without their production, victory would be impossible. Yet, unlike the fighting man who cannot quit his wartime job, the war worker is not required to fill a certain place in the war effort. Nothing in the new act prohibits him from quitting—but it will not let him so forget his duty to his country as to entice others workers to leave with him.

Neither does the act prohibit the right to strike except in those comparatively few plants which the Government operates. It safeguards that right, however, from being misused by irresponsible union heads who call their men out on strike without the latter's expressed consent, and it protects the right of patriotic men and women to continue their war jobs even though an unpatriotic minority (who may be in control of the union) would force them to strike. The act does this by requiring a 30-day "cooling-off period" after which, under Government supervision, the workers shall secretly ballot whether or not to strike. A majority will determine. By that time, it is hoped, the machinery for conciliation and arbitration of industrial disputes will operate to remove the threat to uninterrupted war production.

A distinction has been made in the act between the Government-operated plant and the privately owned plant. Workers in the former are denied the right to strike at all. Those in private industry may strike only after a majority votes to do so 30 days after notification of the dispute has been given to the Government. In neither case, however, is a worker denied the right to protest against working conditions or to demand a higher wage. In fact, making such demands and protests is still the proper function of the union acting as the authorized representative of the workers.

Neither does the act in any way enforce a status quo with regard to any intolerable working conditions or inequitable wage rate. Such matters will continue to be adjusted by the proper governmental agencies concerned with management-labor relations, hours of work,

and wages. If those agencies cannot do their jobs satisfactorily, there is still no justification for a strike which will cripple our war production and which will be paid for in the lives of our young men on the battlefields. If the Government agencies fail in their functions, the administration is responsible, not our soldiers and sailors, and such administration should be changed for one which can assure equity and peace on the home front so long as we require shells and guns for the fighting fronts.

Congress has been accused of "taking a slap" at labor by passing the Anti-Strike Act. Nothing could be further from the truth. Congress realizes that the overwhelming majority of American working men and women are as patriotic and as anxious to do their best for victory as any soldier or sailor. Unfortunately, however, we have seen a comparatively few workers induced to leave their jobs three times in recent months by a particularly power-hungry self-seeking man, and we have seen the results: Thousands of workers in other war industries forced to quit producing because of lack of materials. It is against such irresponsible leaders and their misguided followers that this act is directed; it is because of their lack of either intelligence or patriotism that it had to be enacted. Such leaders and workers are a small percentage of the total American working force, but they are often in positions where, as in the coal industry, they can effectively slow up the whole war-production machine.

Clipped Wings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Washington Post:

CLIPPED WINGS

The young men of our Navy have learned to fly. They have learned that the striking range of a ship can be tremendously extended by planes. They have added a new dimension to naval warfare. But the older men of the Navy, their feet planted firmly on the decks of battleships, have clipped the flyers' wings.

Naval strategy is wholly in the hands of the battleship men. They are men who, in many cases, wear wings—earned by virtue of a brief carrier cruise or an indoctrination course at a naval air station. But the surface vessel remains their first love. They are prone to see naval warfare in terms of fleet engagements, the big guns booming as opposing battle lines move against one another in stately procession. They are good men and true. But they do not love planes or believe in them.

Yet they are the men who sit in high council with our allies. General Arnold, of the Army Air Forces, is at the side of General Marshall in meetings of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, while the Navy is represented by Admiral King alone. Few flyers are on the staffs which help Admiral King and Admiral Nimitz formulate plans for the defeat of the enemy. Even the few admitted to such high conclaves are subordinate in rank and discreetly silent. The men who actually fly the Navy's planes, who have faith in naval aviation, who believe fervently that it can be employed to revolutionize the winning of the war at sea, have no voice in shaping battle plans.

This dominance of the battleship men goes down the line. It applies to tactics as well as to strategy. A naval task force, even when its principal components are carriers, and its mission mainly aerial, is generally under the command of some stout blue-water sailor. The flying men simply carry out orders—the orders of men whose knowledge of aviation at best is theoretical and who are somewhat disposed to write off the plane as just another new-fangled gadget.

Under such conditions it is unlikely that the full potentialities of aviation will be realized in naval warfare. No lay critic, to be sure, is competent to declare that the Navy's air arm has been mishandled or that great opportunities have been missed through a failure to utilize it effectively. But to the ordinary layman this subordination of flying men is inescapably disturbing. We have seen the Army push its flyers forward to posts of great influence. We have seen the Army Air Forces given virtual autonomy. And the results in the air over Europe and north Africa and New Guinea and Guadalcanal—on every front—have abundantly vindicated the men who had faith in the air weapon.

The Army learned that aviation could not be used with full effectiveness if it were kept as a mere subsidiary to the ground forces. Dispersion of planes among a number of tactical ground units prevented the concentration of power to be achieved by unified air strength. In north Africa, accordingly, a stragetic air force composed of British and American elements was created under Maj. Gen. James Doolittle. Its share in our Tunisian triumph was of utmost importance. The Army learned from experience.

But the Navy has learned little and forgotten less. It has developed nothing comparable to the Army's strategic air force. Its planes are parceled out among units of the surface fleet without either the coordination or concentration essential to real power. They have been treated as nothing more than a subordinate element in an organization designed and dedicated to fighting on the surface of the sea. It is time for the Navy to take note of the fact that its airmen have grown up, time to give them a voice as adult members of the naval family.

Memory Monday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I beg permission to include a resolution of the O. B. Nelson Post, No. 3 of the American Legion, Department of Iowa. May I say that this post is one of the largest in the State of Iowa, owns its own building, has many thousand dollars of resources, and in addition to its splendid record of the past, this post is taking a leading part in war activities. Many members of the post who served heroically in the last war are back in uniform in this war. Others are leading citizens of the community. The resolution is on the subject of Memory Monday, and is as follows:

Resolution proposing the designation of each Monday as "Memory Monday" in honor of those who gave their lives in military and naval service of the United States

In times of peace, the American people have set aside one day each year to be known as Memorial Day, to decorate the graves and pay respect to the honored dead who have given their lives in the service of their country. This, of course, is entirely fitting and proper, but during a war when so many lives are sacrificed in the fields of honor from day to day, we, the members of O. B. Nelson Post of the American Legion, feel that it is the patriotic duty of every good citizen to pay frequent and timely tribute to the memory of those of our armed forces who have laid down their lives for their country during this terrific struggle for freedom and democracy. A grateful thought toward Heaven is of itself a prayer. We feel that such an homage should be paid to every fallen hero within a week after he has made the supreme sacrifice, and that an appropriate method should be adopted to express the gratitude and appreciation of the American people for these gold star heroes. Every gallant American who lays down his or her life in this great cause, whether on the battlefield, on the high seas, or while in training for military or naval service merits an immediate and grateful recognition by the American people. In wartime, the names of all deceased members of the military and naval service who have passed into eternity during the preceding week should be enshrined in memory's light on every Monday, by proper expression, with the undying gratitude of the living for whom they have laid down their lives: Therefore be it

Resolved by O. B. Nelson Post, No. 3 of the American Legion of Ottumwa, Iowa, That commencing June 28, 1943, every Monday during the period of the present world conflict be dedicated and set aside as Memory Monday, and that the flag of our country be flown at half staff on all public buildings, and elsewhere, until noon each Monday, out of respect and in memory of those who have given up their lives in the military and naval service of their country during the preceding week: Be it further

Resolved, That we lend our support to the Memory Monday bills introduced in Congress by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE and Congressman CHARLES B. HOEVEN, said bills being Senate No. 1110 and H. R. No. 2732, and urge their passage to the end that our war dead will be honored by our National Government, with all Federal buildings, parks, and posts observing the day each week: Be it further

Resolved, That we urge that a similar resolution be adopted by every American Legion post; that the Governors of all the States, and the mayors of all the cities and towns, be requested to issue proclamations designating every Monday as Memory Monday for this purpose; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators Guy M. Gillette and George A. Wilson, Congressman Charles B. Hoeven, Congressman Karl M. LeCompte, of our district, Gov. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Mayor David A. Nevin, Iowa Department Headquarters, Iowa Legionnaire, American Legion Monthly, and the press of this county.

Food Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday June 30, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas our wages were frozen in March 1942; and

Whereas cost of food has continued to rise steadily even under Office of Price Administration regulations and is the largest single item in the family budget; and

Whereas Canada, faced with a similar problem, began a system of government subsidy payments to producers of foodstuffs in order to compensate them for increased costs instead of allowing them to pass these costs along to the ultimate consumer; and

Whereas this plan in Canada has actually resulted in keeping food cost increases down to less than 1 percent per year; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration is now planning a similar subsidy program for this country using funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose, and also plans to roll back prices of most foodstuffs to help make the balance between the cost of living and wages more equitable; and

Whereas it appears that a strong block is now forming in Congress to fight this subsidy plan: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, That we strongly urge Members of Congress to allow this subsidy plan to be carried by the Office of Price Administration.

LOCAL 2213, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Chester Davis Is Victim of Divided Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial in the Toledo Times by that fearless editor, Harold Hartley, who has stood as a Watchman on the Tower for civic righteousness in the Buckeye State for years:

CHESTER DAVIS IS VICTIM OF DIVIDED AUTHORITY

Chester C. Davis has resigned as wartime Food Administrator.

In his letter of resignation, which President Roosevelt accepted yesterday, there was one paragraph that every American who is perturbed by Washington confusion should read:

"I find that I have assumed a public responsibility while the authority, not only over broad food policy but day-to-day actions, is being exercised elsewhere."

There is meat for many hours of thought in that sentence. Last March 26, when Davis was appointed, he was considered a perfect choice. His background is that of an agriculture expert and his knowledge of economics and business principles is attested by service as president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis.

It is apparent, then, that a man whose knowledge and ability are unquestioned started a big job with little chance for success because of overlapping spheres of authority.

To this Mr. Roosevelt had an answer:

"I set up the Office of Economic Stabilization and authorized the Director, among other things, to resolve disagreements which might arise between the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator and to issue to them policy directives. * * * The country realizes that stabilization applies not only to food but to many other things, such as rent, clothing, and wage decisions."

That use of language can be regarded as Mr. Roosevelt's defense of the Office of Price Administration. It is clever in supporting the implication that Mr. Davis had to go because he could not cooperate. That may be unfair implication. It might have been more sporting for the President, who speaks of the essentiality of teamwork, to admit that effective cooperation is becoming impossible in the confusion engendered by overlapping bureaus and agencies.

Mr. Davis admitted that he found it difficult to cooperate with the administration in its proposed program of food subsidies. His opposition apparently was based on good economic logic. Almost the same views are held in Congress, for expansion of the subsidy program has been forbidden.

In selecting Marvin Jones, former Representative from Texas, former chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and former agricultural adviser to James F. Byrnes, the President may have found a more cooperative person. Mr. Jones should know something about the food problem. He also should know how to mesh in the administration's peculiar interpretation of government for, of, and by the people. Mr. Jones was chairman of the recent international food conference from which the American press was barred.

In candor, however, it is sincerely hoped Mr. Jones succeeds where Mr. Davis failed. The food situation in this Nation is grave. Shortages are becoming alarming and the country knows that bickering, mismanagement, and bitter jealousies are keeping good men from doing their best work.

How Wisconsin Congressmen Voted on Connally-Harness-Smith Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal of June 29, 1943:

WISCONSIN CONGRESSMEN ON VETO

Three Wisconsin Republican Congressmen, SMITH, KEEFE, and O'KONSKI; and one Democrat, WASIELEWSKI, voted to override President's veto of the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

One Republican, STEVENSON; two Democrats, MCMURRAY and DILWEG; both Progressives, SAUTHOFF and HULL, voted to sustain the veto. One Republican, MURRAY, was not recorded.

The pressure for the veto came from labor organizations on the ground that the bill dealt too harshly with labor. This contrasted with the reason given by Mr. Roosevelt for his veto—that one section providing for a 30-day cooling off period was not strong enough or was inappropriate.

Until there is explanation by the Congressman, no one can assert that those who voted to sustain the veto accepted labor's view or the President's view. It is reasonable to suppose that, since Senator LA FOLLETTE also voted to sustain the veto, there was agreement among the Wisconsin Progressives. The votes of STEVENSON, Republican, and DILWEG and MCMURRAY, Democrat, must be explained by themselves.

Here in the Milwaukee districts, our two Congressmen were on opposite sides in the voting Congressman WASIELEWSKI voted, with a majority of Democrats in the Senate and the House, to override. This throws the spotlight on a conviction Congress had reached. The conviction was that proper support of the war and the men whose lives are daily risked in the war called for stronger action to end the sapping on the home front.

Congressman WASIELEWSKI has a record, not only of supporting the war but of supporting the President on all important policies. He is known as a liberal, as friendly to labor. But he has shown independence. In the present instance, he clearly believed that the veto of the President was not the voice of the Nation. He voted to send word to all our forces that Congress opposes undermining on the home front.

Congressman MCMURRAY, serving his first term, has a record of voting "Yes" to everything the President says. The present emergency, which the country faced by recurring strikes and notified each time by John L. Lewis how long it has to meet his terms, did not call forth independence from Mr. McMURRAY. Though he won election because of the failure of his opponent to support the war effort, he was supporting the President when it seemed that the opposite action was necessary to give the war effort its chance.

With Congress voting by more than two-thirds that it was time to end a situation in which John L. Lewis could "stand up" the Republic, Mr. MCMURRAY'S judgment was otherwise.

Subsidies, the Great Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith some excerpts from the radio report I give to the people of my congressional district each Sunday over KGBX, Springfield, Mo., at 12:15 p. m. and again the same day at 5:30 p. m. on KWTO, Springfield, Mo. These remarks pertain to the proposed subsidy program which has been rejected by Congress and by all citizens who are informed on the inflationary dangers inherent in such a proposal:

SUBSIDIES

Price Administrator Prentiss Brown made an interesting radio speech the other day. Here are some of the exact words he used. I quote: "The roll-back subsidy program on meat and butter will save consumers between

two and three dollars for every dollar paid, and the Govenment at least will save $2. This program will pay off in hard dollars and cents at the rate of 4 or 5 to 1." That is what Mr. Brown said. It is the most interesting arithmetic I ever heard. It is not the kind I learned in school. Now, this food-subsidy program is quite a problem.

I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to gather for me some authentic figures on the question. The Library, of course, has no ax to grind. It is impartial, even though its employees are appointed by the President. The Library estimates that the $450,000,000 subsidy program on coffee, meat, and butter will cost another $50,000,000 to administer. The Government must sell War bonds to raise the money. It is estimated that at least $750,000,000 in interest will accrue in addition to the cost of the subsidy. This breaks down to a cost of $9.15 per year for each individual who saves $3.92 in 1943 on his grocery bill as a result of Uncle Sam paying part of it through subsidies from the Treasury.

Of course, most of this will have to be paid by future generations. But Mr. Brown, no doubt, got his figures from the same man or men who figured out that a national debt doesn't make any difference anyway, since we owe it to ourselves. Of course, the ultimate plan calls for an annual $5,000,000,000 subsidy. The sum I have been talking about is only to start it off.

The reliable figures on the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate that American consumers are on the average now paying 21 percent of their incomes for food. In England consumers pay 60 percent of their income for food. England is using the food subsidy plan.

Since March of this year the average income in the United States has increased $129. The per capita cost of food has gone up during that same time only $30.

When this is boiled down we see that the cost of food is only one item in the cost of living. If we want really to roll back the cost of living we will have to roll back taxes and the other items which make up most of that cost. We probably would have also to roll back wages for unless we did we would be increasing the inflationary gap which brings inflation nearer and nearer. Nobody would relish that prospect.

There seems to be a great hue and cry that the Government should do something to help citizens whose cost of living is going up. "Do something," they cry, "to prevent or cushion the sacrifice required on the home front." I don't want to be gloomy but I'm afraid we cannot avoid sacrifices on the home front. We can't have our cake and eat it, too. We can't fight a war and maintain a high standard of living. We can't pass a law which will alter this fact. Don't look for Congress to saddle the soldier boys with part of your grocery bill to pay in taxes on an increased national debt when they get home from the battle fronts where real sacrifices are being made. Don't look for Congress to give Government more control over private business through subsidies which could make or break it at the will of some Washington bureaucrat.

WE NEED A JOSEPH

It is arithmetic that bothers me in this situation. Did you know that during the last 25 years the population of the United States has increased about a third but during the same time our total production of food and feed crops increased only one-seventh? Did you know that the United States has in every year since 1923 imported more food into this country than we exported to others? We have had a few favorable growing seasons which gave us temporary surpluses, but we did not have a Joseph to lead us in saving these crops for lean days. Now, due to a combination of factors—floods, war, farm-labor shortages, restrictions on plantings—we are face to face with famine at a time we are called upon not only to feed ourselves but most of the rest of the world.

AN ALTERNATIVE

Subsidies are an illusion. They are a deferred tax which must be paid. The farther we get away from our competitive-price system of our good old-fashioned American free economy the deeper we sink in the mire of restricted personal liberty, debt, black markets, inflation, and other troubles. There is an alternative to subsidies. It does not fit in very well with the plans of those who are seeking under cloak of war necessity to remodel our way of life. What is the alternative? We have only to look back as far as the last war to find it. In that war we had no black markets, no local famines. We were shipping more food to our Allies than we are now. Prices rose less, and even after the armistice we were able to ship 30,000,000,000 pounds of food to Europe. Maybe we would do well to call in some of the people who ran that food program for us. We are in war and must call upon our best men for public service regardless of their politics.

COLD AND HUNGER

Congress has before it a bill to strip the Office of Price Administration of its powers over the food supply of the Nation and to give this power to the War Food Administrator. The wisdom of such a measure is apparent. The Office of Price Administration, by its bungling, its confusing regulations, its incompetent leadership, and preoccupation with the 1944 campaign, has brought our Nation to the point where the people are now faced with hunger and next winter will likely be cold as well as hungry. But, this proposal will not solve the situation. War Food Administrators come and go. The best one we have had left his job because he was being made scapegoat for a calamity he was not responsible for. The administration has an interesting habit of meeting new problems by appointing a new front man, printing new letterheads, but leaving in control underneath the same crew which merrily continues to scuttle the ship of state.

It is difficult if not impossible to improve bad administration of a good law by passing another law. It is impossible to improve bad administration of a bad law by reshuffling letters of the alphabet. What this country needs is a new shuffle in the office of Chief Executive. The White House is infested with too many gremlins. We may not win the war on the home front but we can very well lose it on the home front. The situation in Washington has simply progressed from planned confusion to organized chaos.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate, in my opinion, acted wisely in saving the National Youth Administration. While, perhaps, many of the criticisms of the N. Y. A. in the past were justifiable, the work carried on by the agency at this time should appeal to all who are deeply interested in the welfare of our country because it is bringing education to a class that our educational set-up heretofore failed to reach. Let us face the facts: Our poorer boys and girls, prior to the advent of the N. Y. A., had a slim chance of bettering their condition. Being without financial support there was very little chance for them to equip themselves for life's work.

I have always thought, and as I grow older the conviction grows stronger, that the life blood of democracy is an educated citizenry. Yes, my colleagues, the hope of continued liberty and freedom depends upon educating the masses. Ignorance, the food upon which tyranny feeds, is the poison from which democracies die.

We are met with the challenge that during these days of stress we cannot afford the outlay of money necessary to continue N. Y. A. I answer, that even in war there are some things so fundamental that we cannot afford to neglect. While I believe in thrift, especially when our exchequer is being drained by the demands of the present conflict, in war or peace, I am against any mistaken form of thrift that would weaken the foundation stones of our Republic and thereby threaten us with a greater ruin than a little profligate spending.

Having indulged in these observations, let me tell you what N. Y. A. is doing today. I am afraid that very few of our people realize the important part it is playing, not only in bringing education to the masses, but in our war effort.

As our attention is more or less fixed today on the war, let me first tell you the important part N. Y. A. is playing in our war effort. I do not think I can bring the matter home to you in a better way than to take the N. Y. A. record in my home State. And before I present the record, let me state to you that none of these boys are of military age, unless they have been turned down due to some physical disability or unless some special arrangement has been made with the Army or Navy for their training, and that before a boy or girl is accepted for N. Y A. training a certificate has to be first obtained from the county agent that he or she is not needed agriculturally in the county. After training the boys and girls are directed into positions in war industries by the United States Employment Service.

Here is the record:

Since July 1, 1941, there have been 7,904 youth trained on N. Y. A. projects in the State of Virginia, and of this number 6,586 have obtained jobs.

These boys and girls have been trained in the following trades: Electric, radio, woodworking, welding, sheet metal, machine, auto mechanics, foundry, power sewing, clerical, aircraft mechanics, aircraft sheet metal, and aircraft woodworking.

The average wage earned by these youth is $5.36 per day.

I have a statement showing the placement of Virginia youth from July 1, 1942, to April 30, 1943, which, I am sure, will be revealing to many. It shows that during this period 3,627 boys and girls were placed, and of this total, the break-down shows that there were 2,793 boys and 834 girls. The statement further shows that these 3,627 boys and girls went into 138 industries directly or indirectly connected with our war effort. Let me mention a

few of these placements so you will see where these boys and girls are going:

	Boys	Girls	Total
Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co	710	7	717
Naval air station, Norfolk, Va	111	124	235
Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth	1,158	226	1,384
Langley Field	27	24	51
Military services	84	0	84
Port of embarkation	0	30	30
Patterson Field	40	0	40
Marine Corps air station	0	95	95
Naval torpedo station, Alexandria, Va	6	18	24
Hercules powder plant, Radford, Va	4	10	14
Crawford Manufacturing Co	0	20	20
Glen Martin, Baltimore, Md	60	6	66
Engineering Research Corporation	36	17	53

These figures clearly show that the N. Y. A. trainees are really playing an important part in our war effort. No one familiar with the facts can challenge the statement that these N. Y. A. boys and girls are playing an important part in our war effort not only in turning out war materials but in releasing men for combat service. Moreover, at the same time, their training will equip them after the war to make a better living. Hence, the N. Y. A. program serves a twofold purpose: it aids the war effort, and, at the same time, gives young men and women a better chance to fight life's battles.

The N. Y. A. program has been endorsed by the Navy Department and also by the War Department. Moreover, it has the endorsement of practically every industry holding war contracts.

Now, let me read two or three letters showing the appreciation of the boys and girls of the service:

APPALACHIA, VA., *March 8, 1943.*

Hon. J. W. FLANNAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I think the National Youth Administration project is one of the grandest projects I know It gives the poorly educated people an opportunity to make something out of themselves which therefore they might have been knocked out of, on the account of a high school education. It also gives the poorer class of people an opportunity to get the training and pay them for the training in which the take, therefore they would have paid to take their sufficient training.

The National Youth Administration project also gives us an opportunity to help the war effort.

Transportation is also given us free, although we walk from one-half a mile to 3 miles before they catch the bus.

I hereby gladly appreciate the National Youth Administration project's efforts for helping the poor and uneducated people in America.

Yours truly,

OPAL HILL.

WISE, VA., *March 9, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I haven't been on the National Youth Administration but a short time but I like it just fine. I have learned a lot and hope I can get to finish what I have taken. There are a lot of us girls needed now to take the places of the ones who are fighting for us, and I hope to be of some help to those who need us. I think this training is a very good thing to help us get started.

Yours truly,

BESSIE L. SALYERS,
National Youth Administration Student.

APPALACHIA, VA., *March 10, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN W. FLANAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am now employed at the National Youth Administration training school at Wise, Va. I have been employed there for 6 weeks. I will soon have my machinist course finished and I hope to go to some defense plant to work.

The National Youth Administration training school is a nice project because it prepares young boys and girls to take the places of men and boys in our armed forces.

It also gives boys and girls an opportunity to get jobs which they wouldn't have been able to get if it hadn't been for the National Youth Administration. I really think it is nice project and it will be a help to boys and girls who will take it in the future. I hope you will do all you can to keep this organization running and I know it will be appreciated by all on the National Youth Administration.

Sincerely,

LOTTIE COLLIER.

Just a few words as to the other phase of the program. The program is enabling thousands of boys and girls to continue their education in our liberal arts colleges. Without the N. Y. A. assistance these boys and girls would be denied a college education. The investment the Government is making in these boys and girls through the N. Y. A. is, in my opinion, one of the finest and most worth-while investments the Government ever made. I do not know of a single Government investment that will pay greater dividends.

Permit me to read two letters received from the heads of two of our great educational institutions, and a letter received from one of our great division superintendents of schools. These educators tell the true story.

STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Farmville, Va., May 12, 1943.

Congressman JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: The enrollment at the college has decreased at least 200 in the last year or so and the decrease will be even more than that for the next session. A great many high-school students are going into defense work.

The National Youth Administration program has been working well with us for the past 4 or 5 years. We have more applications for work scholarships under the National Youth Administration than we can give. As a rule students who enter college with the idea of becoming teachers do not have very much money During the session of 1941–42 we assisted approximately 100 students. This year on account of the decrease in appropriation we are assisting 45.

I understand that there are two programs being considered. Personally, I like the present National Youth Administration program as it has worked well and is a good going organization.

I sincerely hope that you will support some program for assisting the teachers colleges. At this time there is a great shortage of teachers, something like 2,500 in Virginia, and it is important to have as many students as possible enter our teachers colleges.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours truly,

J. L. JARMAN,
President.

VIRGINIA INTERMONT COLLEGE,
Bristol, Va., June 11, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to urge you to remember the students in our liberal arts colleges and junior colleges. It is my judgment that the National Youth Administration aid to students is money wisely spent. But for this aid many could not be in college, and it is, in my opinion, more necessary today than ever.

The comparatively small amount necessary to aid these students is most necessary to the building of strong men and women so vital in civilian life after the war is over.

There are forces at work to do away with this aid which I consider very essential to the future of our country.

Cordially yours,

H. G. NOFTSINGER,
President.

LEE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Pennington Gap, Va., June 15, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Congressman, United States of America,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND JOHN: I do not know how you feel about the national-youth program in Virginia, but for Lee County where our youth know nothing concerning employment other than the teaching profession, and now since the requirement has been set to 4 years of college work as a minimum for any teacher, the poorer class of people are at a loss to know where to turn to find anything, and they have been enrolling in National Youth Administration and the greater percent have found training and the chance of work in our industrial plants a real lifesaver. I could name family after family who have sons and daughters who are carrying on in a big way with the help of the National Youth Administration. Many of our high-school graduates are now training and will be found, I think, better equipped for military training or work in our industrial plants than if they had remained at home and found nothing.

If you can will you please support the allocation which will soon be asked for in this work, and assuring you that the good people of Lee County will stand behind you.

Best wishes, I am,

Respectfully,

S. J. SHELBURNE,
Superintendent.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to concur in the Senate amendment restoring the N. Y. A. appropriation. If we do not, our failure is going to blast the hopes of thousands of our young boys and girls. Let us do the right thing, the noble thing, and give these boys and girls a chance. In doing so we will not only be extending to these boys and girls a helping hand, we will be building a greater America.

What Did You Do Today for Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a poem recently written by a war worker in a Tennessee ordnance plant after seeing the widely circulated

war poster showing an American soldier's helmet, with a bullet hole through it, hanging on a rude cross over a hastily made grave on a distant battlefield:

WHAT DID YOU DO FOR FREEDOM TODAY?

(By R. L. Nicholson, war worker in an ordnance plant in Tennessee)

"What did you do for freedom today?
A Marine on Guadalcanal,
Through a hail of lead and jungle hell,
Crept out to a wounded pal;
And he dragged him back through the slime and muck,
Then, with never a thought of rest,
Back over that deadly route he went
And smashed a machine-gun nest.
It wasn't much fun—the bullets—the mud—
He may have been scared, but he hid it;
He only knew of a job to do
And he didn't quibble, he did it.

"What did you do for freedom today?
'All that you could.' Think well—
One-millionth as much as that leatherneck did?
They buried the boy where he fell.

"What did you do for freedom today?
A gob on a rubber raft
Drained the last wet drop from his water-flask
Then threw it away and laughed.
For 18 days on an endless sea
In a torment of pain he lay;
Drenched and chilled to the bone at night,
And burned to a crisp by day.
He wanted to live, but he knew in his heart
That the odds were a thousand to one;
But he drifted and hoped, consoled by a prayer,
And the thought of a job well done.

"What did you do for freedom today?
'All that you could,' you declare.
But when you say it, remember the gob
Who died on the raft out there.

"What did you do for freedom today?
Nine lads in a B-17
Ran into a flock of Messerschmitts
And died in their wrecked machine.
Oh, they didn't do bad with what they had,
But they flew through hell to do it;
They had smashed Berlin and a dozen 'one-ten's,'
But their number was up and they knew it.
They were full of holes, with no controls,
And their ship was a comet of flame;
But they stuck to their guns and the useless stick
And battled on just the same.

"What did you do for freedom today?
'All that you could.' O. K.
But if those nine boys in the B-17
Were to ask you, what would you say?

"What did you do for freedom today?
I think they've a right to ask.
You're in this fight just as much as they,
And with just as important a task.
Were you at your desk, or bench, or press,
And at work at the starting bell?
Did every minute of this day count?
And the job—did you do it well?
Did you buy a bond or a stamp today?
Or collect any scrap for the pile?
Did you save your grease or throw it away?
Did you drive just an extra mile?
Have you been down to the Red Cross Bank
And given a pint of your blood?
Did you send that V-mail letter today?
Did you hoard any rationed food?
Before you begin to complain and gripe
That life is all work and no fun—
Would you trade your dinner for ration K?
Or your overtime pay for a gun?

"Just stop every once in a while today
When your lot seems hard and lean,
And think of a gob, and a leatherneck,
And nine boys in a B-17."

Draft of Fathers for Military Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT CANNON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by the Hon. Philip Keyne-Gordon over the Mutual Network, Tuesday, June 15, 1943:

The War Manpower Commission today extended a reprieve to draftable American fathers.

In a formal statement the Commission spokesman said that there probably would be no fathers drafted until October 1, and that even then probably fewer than one-sixth of the draftable men with children would be inducted.

This has been made possible, the Commission's spokesman said, by a combination of things. The Navy has lowered its physical requirements, and that has admitted to service many men who otherwise would have been barred. A re-examination of industrial deferments is expected to stave off induction of fathers yet further.

There is quite obviously a commendable desire on the part of the Manpower Commission to delay the draft of men with children as long as it is convenient for the Commission.

This 60-day reprieve for the fathers is good news for America's family men. But it doesn't provide the final answer. The War Manpower Commission still assumes the power to call these men to service despite the clear intent of the draft law to work neither social nor financial hardship on any of the children of America.

A few days ago a young man came to see me. He had traveled a long way—clear from Florida. He was en route to Washington. He was headed there for the purpose of discussing his draft status with his Congressman and with other Representatives of his State. He presented what was, to me, an unbelievable set of facts. A man of much personal initiative, he has built himself a pretty fair little business by dint of hard work and individual effort. He has gathered a few dollars, a home, and three youngsters. His job is that of an advertising salesman for an agency which he owns and operates. He is a canny sort of young man, an Alabama country boy grown up and on his own. He was ordered to service. He found that he had no basis for deferment whatever, but that if he had been a printer for a newspaper, an engineer in a radio station, or even a grouper fisherman off the shores of his home town he could have been granted an industrial deferment. He found that such a position as either of these outranked in importance as his position as the father of three fine kids and their breadwinner.

He said to me—I quote him:

"I'd be honored to serve this country as a soldier, and I might be a good soldier. But I've another responsibility—the responsibility to those 3 children. If the time comes when the draft of fathers is a conceded necessity—when 19 other fellows and I must march off to war and leave 60 children behind—I'll go willingly and proudly. I do not want to leave my family to scramble for themselves or encounter the risk that my children must grow up as wards of the State while other men are deferred for industrial reasons, on jobs which I help to make for them."

He's in a kind of difficult position. If he talks too loudly, some of the professional patriots will call him names. If he doesn't talk up, he goes to war and helps to socialize America by contributing to a situation which is going to make us as a nation provide for the regimentation of war orphans.

I have been wondering about him and the thousands like him ever since that day when he called. I know he isn't a draft dodger, a slacker, or anything of the sort. And I don't think he ought to have to go to war. I think he'll do more for the America we're trying to keep if he stays here and provides us with three good future citizens who will protect the ideals of the American home, the American social structure, and the great Republic we love.

Nor do I think that his future status should depend upon the willy-nilly whims of the War Manpower Commission. For 18 months of war, those fellows have been giving us a daily demonstration of the evils to be found in authoritarianism. The "directive" for him and men like him ought to come from the Congress of the United States in the form of a clear-cut draft law which goes back to the people for its source of power. The Government of the United States has undergone some strange changes with the development of administrative power. The Manpower Commission is a pretty good example of them. It started out with a peacetime draft law which said, quite simply, that men of good physique and of certain age could be taken into the armed service of the United States. Then it said that if taking them caused hardship, they should not be taken. From that rather simple law there has grown the mountain of administrative orders which today baffles every draft board in the country.

The Kilday bill which would have sought to place fathers last on the list of drafted men was an effort to clarify this situation. It probably isn't a perfect law. At any rate the Senate Military Affairs Committee didn't think so and tabled it after it had passed the House. But whether it was good or bad, it did give these men with children some measure of economic and social certainty which permitted them to lay plans for the big job of raising and training the next generation. The Senate committee thought the bill was a bad one, because—they said—it tended to restrict the military. Maybe it did; I don't know. But if it was a bad bill, there was a way to write a good one that would still achieve the good purposes it would have encompassed—a way to put the administration of the selective service under the basic direction of the people rather than in the hands of appointed officials who bear no direct responsibility to the voters.

The young fathers of the Nation have been on the tenterhooks of the War Manpower Commission's indecision for months. The Congress—which is as yet no tool for the State Socialists and the Washington warriors—could do well for the Nation if it took this draft law in hand.

Office of War Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, before the Office of War Information was set up, Government information was in a state of tremendous confusion. Publicity services were multiplying at an increasing rate, the cost of these services

was mounting and our daily newspapers and radio were filed with the conflicting statements of the Government agency.

The press, the public and many Members of Congress clamored for the establishment of a central agency like the O. W. I. and we finally got it.

It is difficult to understand why any Member of this House should want to vote to cripple a valuable war agency like the O. W. I. Where does the demand to curtail arise? I have looked into the statements of those who are affected by O. W. I. and I find the record to be an extraordinarily good one. The motion-picture industry finds it valuable and wants it continued. The radio industry has stated that O. W. I. is essential if the radio is to be of assistance in the war effort. The working newspapermen have stated that what they need is a vigorous O. W. I., not a dead one. The book-publishing industry has come out for it, the magazine publishers want it continued, and the advertising industry's representatives say that it has done one of the best jobs of any war agency. Nearly 100 leadings newspapers have supported it editorially within the past week.

Where will you find another Government agency which is supported by all who do business with it? How many Government agencies have the support of both industry and labor, as does the O. W. I.?

In my own State and in the Pacific Northwest as a whole it has been of great service and warmly supported. I quote from an editorial which appeared in the June 19 issue of the Tacoma Times:

NORTHWEST OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION DOING A GOOD JOB

We decry the growth of the Federal bureaucracy, as these columns often have made plain, but in fairness and appreciation we must say a good word for at least the Pacific Northwest section of a Federal bureau. The urge to do this arises from Friday's action of the House of Representatives, which voted to deprive Office of War Information of funds for its work within the Nation. We do not know just what motivated the House, but we do know this: Office of War Information is the first Federal Government press bureau which, from the standpoint of the press and the public, has been worth its keep. It has consistently distributed information properly prepared concerning activities of Office of Price Administration, War Manpower Commission, Office of Production Management, War Labor Board, and a host of other new Government agencies, all fitted into a complex pattern, but all vital to the war effort and affecting the daily lives of all citizens.

If Office of War Information had not done this job well the public confusion by now would have been monumental. If Congress really wants to lop off Government press agent expense we invite it to turn its attention to the scores of special bureaus and the several thousand such employees attached to the regular Government department. Most of them the press and public would never miss, but let Office of War Information continue its good work. As never before the people need information, and Office of War Information supplies it concisely, accurately, and objectively.

Mr. Speaker, we need an Office of War Information. That has been abundantly demonstrated. We need it to protect the rights of all of us to know what is going on in the war. We need it to make sure that the many war agencies and the military services do not withhold news and information that the country ought to have.

If we curtail the funds for the O. W. I., these functions will quickly find their way back to the various departments and agencies where they will once again be beyond control, where they will cost more and where they will serve the public less.

This is no time to hamstring O. W. I. Its appropriation is insignificant compared to the vast sums the Congress is constantly called upon to appropriate. There are few agencies that can show as big a return for a small expenditure. It is an investment which the country cannot afford to give up. I strongly urge that we give the O. W. I. as much of its requested appropriation of $8,800,000 as possible.

The Late Mrs. William Brown Meloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt from the Washington Daily News of June 29, 1943:

MY DAY—THE FIRST LADY PAYS TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF MRS. MELONEY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK, Monday, June 28.—I have waited to add my small tribute to the tributes of many other people who knew and loved Mrs. William Brown Meloney, because I felt that many others had known her longer than I have and had a right to speak first. I have known her well only since she had begun her extraordinary fight against pain and illness, so always to me she will be the flame of a spirit which nothing, not even death, can extinguish.

Many a time when I went in to see her, the words of a poem written by my aunt, Mrs. Douglas Robinson, about her sister, Mrs. William Sheffield Cowles, kept running thru my mind, for Mrs. Meloney was a soldier of pain.

"Facing each day, head high with gallant laughter, anguish supreme;
What accolade in what divine hereafter shall this redeem?
"Thru the long night of racked, recurrent waking, till the long day,
Fraught with distress, brings but the same heartbreaking front for the fray.
"In a far land our Nation's patriots, willing fought, and now lie,
But you—as brave—a harder fate fulfilling, dare not to die!"

One never came away depressed from seeing "Missy" Meloney. One always felt that the world was so full of interesting things that there was something important for everyone to do and she was urging you on to do your share. I know that even in the future, if I am sometimes wearying and think that perhaps there is no use in fighting for things in which I believe against overwhelming opposition, the thought of what she would say, will keep me from being a slacker. She believed that women had an important part to play in the future. She not only helped such women as Mme. Curie, who was a great woman, but she helped many little people like myself to feel that we had a contribution and an obligation to try to grow.

I do not want to think of Mrs. Meloney as dead. I want to think of her vivid spirit living on in those who loved her, giving them strength to conquer bodily ills and courage to achieve more than they believed themselves capable of achieving. Most of her messages and letters finished with the same sentence. She used it to me and I am sure she did to all her other friends, and so I say "God love you," Missy dear.

Mayor LaGuardia Urges Roll-Backs and Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith an important address by the mayor of the city of New York, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, together with my remarks introducing him at a conference to protect consumers attended by more than 50 Members of this House and several hundred representatives of organized labor, consumer, and farm groups in the old caucus room of the Old House Office Building on June 25, 1943:

INTRODUCTION BY CONGRESSMAN VITO MARCANTONIO

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a significant and historic meeting. It is, I believe, the first time in history when Members of Congress on their own initiative have called in representatives of labor, farm, and consumer organizations to hear from them their opinion as to what should be done on the vital problem of rising living costs, threatened inflation, and the serious problem of ineffective production and distribution of our steadily dwindling food supply.

This is a problem which requires the best thinking of all of us, if we are to avoid the extreme misery and hardship which is inevitable unless there is a real rallying of all the American people to support all aspects of President Roosevelt's economic stabilization program, especially his demand for roll-back of prices and for subsidies absolutely essential to accomplish that roll-back.

As one of the members of the steering committee which convened this conference, I have the pleasant task this morning of introducing my predecessor from the Twentieth New York Congressional District. I know that in the seven terms he served in the House no man did more to bring about harmony between the farmer, who produces our food supply, and the city worker, who is the food consumer. He constantly sought to make plain that there was an identiy of interest between these two great groups of American people and that attempts to play off the farmer against the industrial city worker were intended to becloud the issue—the real issue of assuring to the farmer his cost of production and to the city worker a

standard of living sufficient to guarantee his family a healthy existence.

Since he has left the House he has continued his efforts to bring about collaboration between the consumer and the farmer. As mayor of the city of New York, he is spokesman for the largest consumer unit in America. I give you, His Honor, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, mayor of the city of New York.

ADDRESS OF HON. FIORELLO LA GUARDIA

I fear I misunderstood the character of this meeting. I was under the impression that we were going to confer as to the parliamentary situation in connection with the subsidy and roll-backs rather than to address a mass meeting. I wanted to give some of my younger colleagues my experience of the past in legislation of this kind, for I think I came to Congress before any of these handsome young men here.

What I fear more than anything else is the sinister motive back of what may become a split between consumers in the cities and the producers on the farms.

As my successor stated, I spent 14 years here in Congress seeking to bring about an understanding between the producers and the consumers because we really have so much in common. Now I can understand Mr. Philip Murray's righteous indignation, but if he is mad now, I can tell him unless there is a drastic change in the administration and control of food immediately I would hate to hear him or see him 6 weeks from now. Gentlemen, you can tell your colleagues in the House that unless Congress gives immediate and effective action to this problem of food, its production and distribution, the whole administration of food control is going to bog down and there will be no enforcement and hell will break loose in this country.

In my town we are enforcing price regulations and when I say "we," I mean the city government. Office of Price Administration has not the personnel to do it. And there is no use having ceiling prices, laws, rules, and regulations if you do not provide the machinery to enforce them. Here's the situation. I have been with it from the very beginning because I have the responsibility of looking after the welfare of seven and a half million people. For when it comes to food, it is the metropolitan area that's involved, and that takes in a total of 10,000,000 people.

You find that the retailer, the grocer, the butcher, the wholesaler, the processor, as a rule want to do the right thing. They are not asking for exorbitant profits. They do not want to profiteer. All that they ask is the possibility of remaining in business without a per-pound money loss. Under existing conditions, they cannot do it. The retailer cannot sell at ceiling prices if he cannot buy at ceiling prices. The wholesaler cannot sell to the retailer at ceiling prices if he cannot buy at ceiling prices. We have issued and served in the last 6 weeks about 5,000 summons. Over 96 or 97 percent were pleaded guilty or were found guilty and were fined, and some were jailed. Now what? How can we continue to bring a retailer into court and fine him or jail him if he can demonstrate that he has paid more for food than he is permitted to sell. And yet we must have food. It's gotten so far, gentlemen, that we have been criticized for enforcing the law. And yet I cannot permit conditions to become in New York as they are right here in the Capital City of Washington. I wouldn't permit it.

Therefore, it boils itself down to this. Let us assume that the retail ceiling prices are just in effect and we can adjust ourselves to the ceiling prices as written in the regulations. There is sufficient margin in the difference between the producer or slaughterhouse price and the retailer that could be absorbed provided we can get the supplies. The margin allowed to the retailer is sufficient and perhaps a little more but it does him no good because he cannot get the supplies and has to go in the black market to buy. Therefore, if the retailers could get all of their supplies through legitimate channels, there is some margin and that can be applied to the original cost of the animal on the hoof or to the manufacture process that would reduce the estimates now made on the amount needed for subsidies.

If it is the policy of Congress, and I am not discussing that at all, to put no price level on the livestock, then fix the price as it is now from the packer or slaughterhouse to the retailer and pay that differential, which is what some call a subsidy; if you do that and license your slaughterhouses, we won't have a black market in 48 hours. Then the packers and the slaughterhouses can sell to the wholesalers at the ceiling price, they can then sell to the retailer at the ceiling price, and the consumer is protected.

Now what's going on? There are two methods employed that puts the retailer at a disadvantage and thereby increases the price to the consumer. One is, the packers, the large packers, have a slight advantage in that they use all of the byproducts and can make up some of the losses. There is a distinct loss on every animal between the price paid to the livestock man and the price that the packer must sell to the wholesaler on his dressed meat. The independent slaughterer cannot continue very long because he hasn't the resources and therefore the honest independent slaughterhouse is going out of business and the bootleg slaughterhouse is coming in.

Two ways to get away from it—the slaughterhouse says to the wholesaler, we will give you so much meat but you must buy other things along with it. The wholesaler in turn requires a tie-in sale. That is considered legitimate although it defeats the purpose of all of your price-ceiling regulations.

The other way is, the wholesaler will bill the retailer on an upgraded price. He may bill him for double-A grade and give him A grade. Or he bills him for more than he delivers. Or he will bill him right and weigh him right and take the payment in a check through regular channels and get the rest in cash. Then, of course, there is the black market which is nothing else than a bootlegger, and he sells for cash above the ceiling prices.

Don't permit anyone to tell you, gentlemen, that this subsidy is new. That's just a lot of junk. It was invented by the very people who now oppose it. I have lived through it—cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco. All during those terrible days of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations the farmers were down and we had to pour in and pour in money. The consumers didn't get the benefit of that. It wasn't un-American then to provide subsidies. And after 1932, when Roosevelt came in, gentlemen, you know what you voted for all these years. Why, before the war broke in Europe, we had every warehouse in the country full of wheat, cotton, and tobacco belonging to the Government. So you can meet the argument when it is presented that this is something that is going to disturb the economy of the country. No such thing.

And you can also tell your colleagues that with proper management in controlling the market, because the Government is the biggest single buyer with its requirements for the armed forces and lend lease; if prices slump it can buy up, and if they get too high, it can release food because it has over 9 months' supply on hand.

It will not cost the Government 50 percent of what is now estimated if there is proper management. You just leave it to old "6 percent" Jesse Jones and he will save money—he will make money out of it.

I don't think you will have any trouble at all in getting the votes in August. The trouble is, I fear, that we can't hold out until August. But wait until your colleagues commence getting letters from home as people get the first taste of the withholding tax. With a withholding tax you must have a releasing subsidy. When you take 20 percent of the taxable salary of the average wage earner and that housewife has that reduced from her pay envelope and goes out to try to buy food in the black market, she just can't do it. This thing is too serious. Mr. Murray understated the gravity of the situation. We're holding out in New York City; I don't know for how long. Food is attractive to all; there's no limit; and in some of your towns, you will see prices brazenly displayed in store windows far above the ceiling prices, and nothing is done about it.

Now, provide the differential so that there will be no loss, out-of-pocket loss, provide a system of licensing the slaughterhouses and the processors, and we will have no black market. And of course we have got to get a little more sense in the Office of Price Administration. In the first place, gentlemen, put prices of meat on one sheet of paper. Now you have to look through 27 sheets to find out the price of bacon. We can't get posters on ceiling prices to pu in each store although the regulations call for this. The city of New York had to pay for its own posters.

Let's get some sense into the coupon business. I had this trouble 24 years ago. Most of you men have families. You can't feed your children on a pamphlet. There is the most elaborate pamphlet out on substitutes for meat. Most mothers and most housewives and homekeepers know the substitutes for meat. I submit what good is it to have all this elaborate literature on substitutes for meat if we can't buy the substitutes? If meat is scarce, as it is right now, lift the coupons on beans, peas, and other protein-containing foodstuffs, and the market will naturally go to those commodities. It's so simple.

Take butter. No matter what you do there is going to be a scarcity in butter. For the last 35 or 40 years we have been driving against the use of oleomargarine. Every State in the country has a law against oleo. We have Federal laws against oleo. Oleo, fortified with vitamin A, is just as good as butter. True Office of Price Administration has lowered the coupon value of oleo, but it should be lowered even more or perhaps lifted entirely and that would in a great measure solve our butter problem. If any of you boys have a mixed district don't take my advice on this. There is a prejudice and a great fear the farmers and dairymen naturally feel that same day this war will be over and they dread to think that perhaps people will get to use oleo. But we are in a crisis.

At this time we have plenty of pork. But there is a prejudice about using pork in summer which is not justified any longer, and I recommended to Mr. Brown yesterday to lower the coupon value of pork so that we can encourage the consumption of pork particularly in the next four to five weeks because beef is going to be very scarce. There is a shortage of beef on the market but not of livestock. When the roll-back on meat was announced there was no announcement of how the roll-back would be met. So the raisers of livestock waited to bring their animals in. Here we are in the cities informing the people of the roll back and yet nothing has happened. When you will assure the livestock man that he will get the cost of his animal, and guarantee the original buyer at the slaughterhouse against any out-of-pocket loss, you will see how the beef starts to roll.

If the Government takes 45 percent of all slaughtered meat for the armed forces and lend-lease, that's all right. Any amount they want, that's all right. We will adjust

ourselves to the remaining quantity. But there must be allocation according to population. Take our situation on the eastern seaboard. Forty-five percent includes all of Government requirements but it does not include the requirements for the Maritime Commission. And therefore that comes out of our civilian quota and sometimes it digs in very deep.

My specific recommendation is this. First, you simply have to get together with the boys on the Agriculture Committee and talk sense to them. I know it's hard. I have been through it. Someday, sometime, this war will be over. And they are going to be the first ones to be stopped. No one seeks to take from the farmer anything he is entitled to. And yet the consumar is required to eat less than he needs because the money isn't there to buy the amount or kind of food the family needs, particularly after the withholding tax. The farmer should be guaranteed his price to cover his cost. And then the Government should guarantee to the slaughterhouse and to the original processor the differential. Then give the Government the lend-lease powers to the American people. Nothing original in that idea, is it? If the Government can buy to sell at a loss in a foreign country, to give, to take anything in exchange, surely it is not asking too much to give that same Government the power to buy and sell in order to support the market and in order to guarantee a continuous, uninterrupted, systematized flow of food to the American people.

Congress has given the Commander in Chief full and complete support in all matters military. And what's the result? The result is that we have got the best fighting force the world has even seen, and we are licking them everywhere. Now, let Congress give that same Commander in Chief, as President of the United States, the same support in protecting the morale and the health of the American people, and we will have no black market.

I hope the next invitation I get will be from the Committee on Agriculture. If they see the proposition, I don't think we will have any trouble. But it is the worse kind of politics in seeking to drive a wedge between the farmers and consumers. Who profits by it? The speculator in food. If we get farmers and consumers together, you will see how quickly all this trouble will disappear.

Just one last word. We must have action. The retailers are getting wise to the coupon bogeyman. During the first few weeks up to now, he conscientiously took his coupons, put them in an envelope, marked it, and handed it in to his bank. Now, he knows that nobody counts those coupons. You can see what's going to happen. That is just going to make the black market that much more effective, and with no control over prices. In my town we'll jail them, but New York City is not the entire United States. The retailer ought to make his purchases by the delivery of his coupons to the wholesaler and the wholesaler to the processor, and they can be weighed and counted in that manner.

When the farmer sells, let the additional cost come from the consumer. What will that mean? That will mean that only a small percentage of people who can afford to buy food will have food. And that is not to the interest of the farmer. Point that out to them. Why have we the rationing system? So as to make it equally possible for all Americans to get food. The coupon business has to be reinforced. And that assures to every American, regardless of whom he may be, just how many pounds of any rationed commodity he can get. I want to assure you that I think the interest you have displayed is very helpful. We must have a proper distribution of food and the only way to hold the line, as Mr. Murray said, is to hold the line.

One of the greatest authorities in this country on the question of inflation—every man around this table knows him—told me that he fears the situation is out of control, and when we go to inflation, who is it that gets it in the neck? The wage earner, the small businessman. I have provided in my government for meeting the present ceiling prices, and that took $12,000,000, and only provided for those having a salary to $2,500. Take the other people getting fixed salaries, small businessmen. There is just a limit. And when you take $3,000, you are above the average salary of the average person in the United States. Take from that $3,000 the withholding tax plus rent, housing, clothing, and you will see that that family can barely make both ends meet. Unless that wife is a good housekeeper, they are going to get into serious trouble. This involves success of the war just as much as providing planes and ammunition to the soldiers and should not be neglected. Gentlemen, you have got to fight if it is necessary. You have got to invoke every rule of that House to get action. You have got the American people back of you. Go to it.

Pittman-Robertson Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I offer for the RECORD a letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service which sets forth the legislative history and an interpretation of the so-called Pittman-Robertson Act relative to the character of funds available for appropriation under its terms, by the Comptroller General of the United States. In view of the pending conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the questions that arose in the House over the funds available for appropriations, this matter has considerable importance, and should be a part of our legislative records. The matter follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., May 31, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASE: I have just returned to the office to read the testimony in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering the passage of the Interior Department appropriation bill in the House, on May 20. I was interested in your statement on page 4717, relative to the availability of Pittman-Robertson funds for other activities of the Government.

The Pittman-Robertson Act fully intended that these funds be set aside in a special fund and used for no other purpose but the Treasury did not accept this philosophy and held that the balance in the fund was largely to be construed as a general credit, against which the Congress might appropriate from time to time.

Not being satisfied with this interpretation, we finally secured an opinion from Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, on July 3, 1942, a copy of which I am attaching for your information. While this is rather long, the pertinent points of this opinion hold that "there is commanding evidence that the intent of the Congress was (1) to set apart and 'earmark' sums equal to the firearms-tax receipts subsequent to 1938, (2) to appropriate annually certain portions of that fund for the restoration of wildlife, and (3) to limit expenditures from the amounts thus appropriated to the aggregate of the amounts set apart from the tax collections.

"Therefore, upon establishing the special fund, and crediting thereto the amount of these tax collections for 1939 and subsequent fiscal years, the corresponding appropriation should be charged to the same fund.

"It is to be understood, of course, that the special fund authorized to be established is not to be an appropriation account and no expenditures are to be made therefrom. It is to be in the nature of a holding fund from which the appropriations authorized under the act of September 2, 1937, are to be made by the Congress from time to time in such amounts as it may deem necessary or proper and all amounts heretofore appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in section 3 of said act are to be regarded as having been made from such fund."

Under this interpretation, there appears to be no question but that the funds must be held for the purposes of the act alone and that they are not available for any other use.

I appreciate your continuing interest in the Federal aid program as well as the other activities of the service. Incidentally, we have completed our study of the eligibility of the State of South Dakota following the passage of the State tithing law. We are now studying the data carefully and will be able to advise you very shortly of the decision as to whether your State may continue to participate in these Federal aid funds. From the wording of the law as well as the excessive amounts being directed from the game department under the tithing law, the situation does not look too good.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. DAY,
Acting Director.

JULY 3, 1942.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There has been considered your letter of April 17, 1942, in which inquiry is made whether there is any objection to compliance with the request contained in letter of February 25, 1942, from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Treasury, reading as follows:

"The act approved September 2, 1937, entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes' (50 Stat. 917), provides in part as follows:

" 'SEC. 3. An amount equal to the revenue accruing during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and each fiscal year thereafter, from the tax imposed by section 610, title IV, of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 169), as heretofore or hereafter extended and amended, on firearms, shells, and cartridges, is hereby authorized to be set apart in the Treasury as a special fund to be known as "the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund" and is hereby authorized to be appropriated and made available until expended for the purposes of this act. * * *'

" 'SEC. 11. The Secretary of Agriculture (now Interior) shall make an annual report to the Congress of the sum set apart in "the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund," giving detailed information as to the projects and expenditures therefor.'

"On August 25, 1941, a letter was addressed to you requesting advice regarding the aggregate receipts covered into the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund and the unappropriated balance as of June 30, 1941. Reply dated September 10, 1941, by Mr. L. L.

Collie, Chief, Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants furnished the total receipts covered into the account '200117 tax on firearms, shells, and cartridges, section 3407, Internal Revenue Code' and the total appropriated by the Congress under the account '14X1954 Federal aid, wildlife restoration, Fish and Wildlife Service (receipt limitation).' The letter did not furnish the information specifically requested, namely, the total receipts covered into and the unappropriated balance of the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund as authorized by the Congress to be established.

"It is understood that your Department has taken the position that the act only authorized the setting apart of a special fund, and that therefore no action toward establishing a special fund was taken. It appears that this position may be technically correct when section 3 of the act is considered alone. However, it appears that other sections of this act and other enactments of the Congress definitely contemplated that a special fund would be established, and the fact that this has not been done complicates compliance by this Department with its provisions as a whole.

"Section 11 of the act which is quoted above requires the Secretary of the Interior to make an annual report to the Congress of the sum set apart in the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund. This is not possible since such a fund has not been established.

"Section 4 of the act authorizes not to exceed 8 per cent of the revenue covered into said fund (the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund) in each fiscal year for administration and execution of this act and the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. Here again administration is complicated by reason of the fact that a special fund has not been established.

"The Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1942 appropriated $2,750,000 for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Act with the proviso that expenditures should not exceed the aggregate receipts covering into the Treasury under the provisions of said act. The setting apart of the receipts under section 610, title IV, of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, is necessary for the proper accounting for funds under this proviso.

"In view of the foregoing and in the absence of other objection, the Department desires that a special fund be established as authorized by the act. Your early consideration and a prompt reply will be appreciated."

Your letter furnishes the following table of the receipts (since 1938) from the tax on firearms and of the appropriations annually made for Federal aid to wildlife restoration.

Fiscal year	Receipts—"200117. Tax on Firearms, Shells, and Cartridges, sec. 3407, Internal Revenue Code"	Appropriation—"14X1954 Federal Aid, Wildlife Restoration, Fish and Wildlife Service (receipt limitation)"
1939	$2,976,019.80	$1,000,000
1940	3,707,843.68	1,500,000
1941	5,535,773.25	2,500,000
1942 (as of Feb. 28)	3,201,065.20	2,750,000
Total	15,420,701.13	7,750,000

The establishment of the special fund as authorized by the above statutes seems to have been under consideration at various times, and a letter of your acting administrative assistant, dated March 27, 1939 (as printed in the hearings on the Department of Agricultural appropriation bill for 1940 before the Senate Appropriations Committee at p. 460), explains why it was formerly determined not to establish the fund. The letter reads, in part, as follows:

"This section (sec. 2 of the act of Sept. 2, 1937, supra) was given careful consideration upon approval of the act of September 2, 1937, and inasmuch as the legislation did not specifically direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a special fund to be known as the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund, but only authorized the setting apart of such fund, and authorized the appropriation for expenditure for the purposes of the act, no action toward establishing a special fund was taken by this Department. It was believed that under the authority contained in the foregoing section Congress would doubtless proceed to give further directions or specifically appropriate funds to carry out the purposes of the act."

The significance of the request to segregate amounts equal to tax receipts into a "special fund" derives from the usual characterization of a special fund as one "to be expended for objects or purposes specified at the time of establishment" (Gen. Regs. 67, sec. 4, 7 Comp. Gen. 870, and of 19 Comp. Gen. 791), which might be thought to suggest that the entire fund would be available for expenditure, without further appropriation by the Congress. On the other hand, the repeated use in the statute of the term "authorized" suggests otherwise, since, under a rule of interpretation enjoined by law (31 U. S. C. 627), the customary authorization of an appropriation is enabling legislation only, and an actual appropriation act is required before the funds may be paid out. (16 Comp. Gen. 1007; 19 id. 961.) That anomaly apparent, the legislative reports and debates are admissible as evidence of the congressional intent. (20 Comp. Gen. 81; 21 id 805.)

Section 3 of the original bill (S. 2670, 75th Cong.) required the fund to be set aside and appropriated the deposits for expenditure. But the final enactment came from the version reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture, in the following form:

"SEC. 3. An amount equal to the revenue accruing during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and each fiscal year thereafter, from the tax imposed by section 610, title IV, of the Revenue Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 169), as heretofore or hereafter extended and amended, on firearms, shells, and cartridges is hereby authorized to be set apart in the Treasury as a special fund to be known as the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund, and is hereby authorized to be appropriated and made available until expended for the purposes of this act. So much of such appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof is authorized to be made available for expenditure in that State until the close of the succeeding fiscal year. Any amount apportioned to any State under the provisions of this act which is unexpended or unobligated at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure on any project is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of Agriculture in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act."

The language added by amendment, the committee report thereon (No. 1572), and the remarks appearing at Eighty-first CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 9351, leave no doubt but that the change from an actual appropriation to an authorization to appropriate was intended, but they leave in considerable doubt the effect of the first insertion, authorizing amounts equal to the tax revenue "to be set apart," etc. As the District of Columbia Court of Appeals said in *Red Canyon Sheep Co.* v. *Ickes* ((1938) 98 F. (2d) 308, 313), "Whether authorized is to be construed as mandatory or permissive is a question which must be determined in the light of the context and purpose of the particular statute in which it is used." In view of that doubt, and, in any event, as the section was not to come into operation until the following July 1 (1938), the Treasury's determination not to set up the fund at once appears to have been correct as of that time.

Several months later an appropriation item for this purpose was included in the 1939 appropriation bill (H. R. 10238, 75th Cong.) for the Department of Agriculture, where the act of 1937 was then administered under the former Bureau of Biological Survey. As disclosed by the published hearings (p. 675), the understanding was clear and unchallenged that the tax collections for 1939 and subsequently were intended to be "earmarked or authorized" for the purposes of the act of 1937, supra, but the committee members indicated the view that the actual appropriation of the amounts thus set aside should be postponed a year, until the amount of the collections should be known. For that reason, according to the chairman of the subcommittee (83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5423), the item was eliminated by the committee (House Rept. No. 2130, 75th Cong.). Upon consideration of the bill by the Committee of the Whole, an amendment was offered to be inserted as follows (including a slight subsequent correction):

"FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

"For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife restoration projects, and for other purposes,' approved September 2, 1937 (50 Stat., 917), $1,000,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury under the provisions of said act."

This amendment was supported upon the ground that the previous act of 1937 had "earmarked" or set aside the taxes on firearms beginning July 1, 1938, had declared that the sums so collected from the sportsmen of the country at large were expressly reserved for the wildlife-restoration program, and were to be held separate and unavailable for any other purpose. The amendment was opposed upon the ground that the act had merely authorized, not required, the setting aside. (See 83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5423–5426 and 5430–5432.) In other words, the very question left in doubt by the same Congress in a previous session became the point then at issue. The amendment was adopted (83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5432), was carried verbatim into the appropriation act (52 Stat. 736), and the identical language—changing only the amount appropriated and the statutory citation (16 U. S. C. 669–669j) has appeared in the act for each subsequent year (1940, 53 Stat. 965; 1941, 54 Stat. 454; 1942, 55 Stat. 356; 1943, H. R. 6845, which went to conference on June 4, 1942). It is noteworthy that the proviso to the amendment so adopted and repeated each year refers to the receipts covered in under the provisions of said act, i. e., the act of 1937, which language can have no other literal referent than the special fund considered to have been set up under the authority of that statute.

Accordingly, whether or not the basic act of 1937 itself required the fund to be set aside, the language of the appropriation and the history of its enactment make manifest that the two statutes, taken together, do direct that action; and it follows that the account should be established, crediting thereto the equivalent of the collections under the excise tax in question accruing subsequent to June 30, 1938.

But the question does not end there. The special fund being inexistent, necessarily the annual appropriations have been charged to the general fund of the Treasury. With the establishment of the fund, as of 1939, the correctness of that action becomes open to question. Referring again to the first appropriation—the amendment added by the House to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for 1939—the language is, "For carrying out the provisions of the act

[of September 2, 1937, supra]." The 1937 statute authorized such an appropriation, but only from the special fund. Thus, it is not possible to carry out the provisions of the act of 1937 without charging the expenditures, then authorized and thereafter appropriated, to the special fund thereby reserved for the special purpose named.

It is true that each appropriation act was prefaced with the customary wording, "the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated * * *," which ordinarily, of course, anticipates a charge to the general fund. But, by the very negative nature of the words employed, special cases were left open for special treatment. In this particular connection, the legislative background again is significant. Under Rule XXI (2) of the House of Representatives, the amendment in question would not have been in order unless the expenditure had been previously authorized by law. The only previous authorization was a charge to the special fund, and if the amendment had in fact contemplated a charge to the general fund, it could not have been enacted over a point of order by a single Member. However, as noted, the amendment was debated on its merits and adopted. In the legislative references cited above, and in those arising out of the subsequent appropriation acts, there is commanding evidence that the intent of the Congress was (1) to set apart and earmark sums equal to the firearms-tax receipts subsequent to 1938, (2) to appropriate annually certain portions of that fund for the restoration of wildlife, and (3) to limit expenditures from the amounts thus appropriated to the aggregate of the amounts set apart from the tax collections.

Therefore, upon establishing the special fund, and crediting thereto the amount of these tax collections for 1939 and subsequent fiscal years, the corresponding appropriation should be charged to the same fund.

It is to be understood, of course, that the special fund authorized to be established is not to be an appropriation account and no expenditures are to be made therefrom. It is to be in the nature of a holding fund from which the appropriations authorized under the act of September 2, 1937, are to be made by the Congress from time to time in such amounts as it may deem necessary or proper, and all amounts heretofore appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in section 3 of said act are to be regarded as having been made from such fund.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

O. W. I. Motion-Picture Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the genuine alarm with which the motion picture industry views the threatened elimination of the O. W. I. motion-picture bureau is spread through every phase of that industry. It is not simply that the newsreel people are sorry to lose the invaluable aid they have had from O. W. I., or that producers are worried about the help they have had. Theater owners themselves—the portion of the industry in the best position to know what the public wants and needs in film entertainment—are also worried.

Below is a portion of a Washington column written by Will Sheridan for The Independent, issue of June 26, 1943, a trade paper which speaks for the independent theater owners of the country—owners of theaters not controlled by the large circuits attached to Hollywood studios:

Exhibitor leaders as well as producers have come to value the work of Lowell Mellett and his crew, even though it is by no means perfect. They're worrying plenty right now about how they're going to deal with Government hereafter. Without Office of War Information there's no control agency which can function as liaison between the industry and the myriad Government departments. Some makeshift organization may be arranged, either by the Government or the industry, but it is difficult to see how it can function with anything like the authority Office of War Information was finally obtaining insofar as Government is concerned. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Friday contains the following wire from Will Hays, head of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, addresed to Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee:

"I note in the report on the hearings of your committee on the War Agencies Appropriations bill the inclusion of certain criticisms of the Office of War Information as they relate to the motion-picture industry. The effect of this is to suggest that Office of War Information has attempted to unduly influence the content of American motion pictures.

"I speak from the best of information when I say that this view is not that of the industry. We have been greatly pleased by the understanding shown by the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information and by the complete lack of any effort on its part to dominate our operation. The industry on its own initiative offered to cooperate completely with the Government in the war effort, and the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information has aided our efforts to make our cooperation 100-percent effective.

"I know the motion-picture industry's feeling is one of genuine appreciation for the service being rendered to the industry."

What it all boils down to is that Lowell Mellett's office has been unique in that it served as an aid to the industry—a vitally important aid, while aside from an occasional misunderstanding it was not attempting to "take over" the industry. We won't dip into past quarrels—the fact is that whether or not Mellett had other ideas when he began his job he now knows that the industry will do the best possible job for the war effort only if it retains its complete independence. Both he and the industry have learned that there is a definite place for a Government office such as his, providing service of real value. Industry-wise, we think a major casualty was registered last week.

In addition to the wire of support from Will Hays, other wires were sent the Senate Appropriations Committee, including these from the War Activities Committee of the Motion Picture Industry and the major newsreels of the country:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 24, 1943.*

Hon. LOWELL MELLETT,
Chief, Bureau of Motion Pictures,
Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the War Activities Committee of the Motion Picture Industry representing all branches of the industry including over 16,500 theaters I wish to register my hope that the work of the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information will not be curtailed to an extent that will reduce the excellent service it is performing in coordinating the activities of all Government departments and in making available valuable information to millions of theater patrons.

GEORGE J. SCHAEFER,
Chairman, War Activities Committee.

JUNE 23, 1943.

Senator JIM MEAD,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

The Bureau of Motion Pictures of Office of War Information has been of great help in assisting the newsreels in disseminating to over 100,000,000 people weekly motion picture news of the war and of Government activities pertaining to the war. In our opinion abolition of this motion picture bureau would be a serious loss at this time.

WALTON C. AMENT,
Pathe News.
M. CLOFINE,
News of the Day.
THOMAS MEAD,
Universal Newsreel.
EDMUND REEK,
Fox Movietone News.
A. J. RICHARD,
Paramount News.

Here is another editorial from a motion picture trade magazine—the Motion Picture Herald, issue of June 26, 1943:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION AND THE SCREEN

Despite the much that has been said, and much of it in these columns, about the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information, it is an institution of earnest wartime service with which the motion picture industry has reached a generally competent working relation. Also, Mr. Lowell Mellett, Chief of that Bureau, has impressed this industry with his sincerity of purpose.

The movement in Congress, pending at midweek between House and Senate, to wipe out the Office and along with it, incidentally, the Picture Bureau, is to be viewed as a process of abandoning the horse in midstream.

The functions at which the Office of War Information Picture Bureau has been addressed are essential to the war cause of the Nation and to the conduct of the motion picture in wartime. Relations must be maintained by some agency. The existing relation enjoys the benefit of a deal of experience, and the cause is not to be served by waiting for a new arrangement and organization to acquire working experience.

A very important aspect of the work of the O. W. I. Motion Picture Bureau—one that is frequently overlooked—is the distribution of important war information pictures for showing in schools, rural churches, clubs, and so forth. Millions of Americans have been able to see these nontheatrical showings who would otherwise not have seen many of our best short pictures on the war and how the

people of America—on the farms and in the factories—can do their part for victory.

The following communications give some idea of the support for this phase of the O. W. I. program:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 24, 1943.*

LOWELL MELLETT,

Bureau of Motion Pictures, Office of War Information, Washington, D. C.:

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers representing 2,600,000 members respectfully urges the continuance and strengthening of the motion-pictures program of the Office of War Information and especially that part which provides war information films for schools. There is continuing need for authentic, effective film material dealing with war aims, the United Nations, Victory gardens, conservation of home equipment, child care, work of schools and colleges in wartimes, inflation, and other topics. Films already available have been widely used in classrooms and in parent-teacher meetings.

Mrs. WILLIAM A. HASTINGS,
President,
Mrs. MALCOLM MCCLELLAN,
Chairman of Legislation,
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

COPY OF WIRE SENT SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The National Association of Visual Education Dealers, representing the major resources of the visual-education industry, with membership in 39 States and Hawaii, urges adequate appropriation for the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information so that 25,000 16-millimeter sound projectors will continue to be used for war information purposes by clubs, schools, churches, industrial plants, and others.

Two hundred and thirty film distributors, including educational film libraries as well as our members, are now distributing Office of War Information films without profit. This activity makes it possible for over 7,000,000 Americans monthly to see films and be better informed about the war effort.

This association considers this motion-picture project an essential part of the civilian war effort and should be extended rather than curtailed.

This association pledges its continued active cooperation to aid the Government in this motion-picture program. If a hearing is to be held, we request the privilege of being heard.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF VISUAL EDUCATION DEALERS.
D. T. DAVIS.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, one out of every three persons employed in Massachusetts is engaged in war production. Nevertheless, today, manpower is still our greatest problem. Today, 73,000 more war workers are needed in Massachusetts war industries. There are 73,000 production battle stations idle, battle stations that should be producing daily for our fighting men. Given these skilled workers, Massachusetts can increase its war production by 12 percent.

I dwell on this background material to give emphasis to my astonishment at opposition to the continuance of any agency which has been devoting its every effort to increasing the country's supply of skilled manpower for war industries. At a time when industries in Massachusetts, and throughout the country, are unable to produce to their fullest capacity through a shortage of skilled manpower, what is the basis for criticism of an agency which in 1 year added over one-half million new skilled workers, which is today adding 1,700 new skilled workers every day.

I refer, of course, to the National Youth Administration, which is at present a part of the War Manpower Commission. Permit me to review the record of this agency in my own State, where I am acquainted both with the struggle of industry to produce enough, soon enough, and the contributions of the N. Y. A. to their efforts. What is the record of the N. Y. A. and what are the criticisms of it?

Presently the N. Y. A. operates 22 training units in Massachusetts in 10 different industrial cities. In addition, two resident centers—one for boys and one for girls—are maintained in the Springfield area. These N. Y. A. programs can train 750 youth at any one time. During the past 10 months an average of 1,500 Massachusetts youth have been in training for a period of 8 weeks each. Over one-third of this number have been women.

It is estimated that the N. Y. A. in Massachusetts has, since the inception of its war-production training program in 1939, trained some 75,000 Massachusetts youth. It is known that an average of 75 percent of all N. Y. A. trainees obtain war employment upon leaving the N. Y. A. There are now 600,000 war workers in Massachusetts. This means that at least 10 percent of all war workers in the Commonwealth are N. Y. A. trainees. The present daily manpower contribution of N. Y. A. former trainees is 450,000 hours—enough to build 25 attack bombers every day. I believe the question as to the quantity is answered satisfactorily.

What has the N. Y. A. contributed to Massachusetts' manpower problem qualitatively? Let the Massachusetts industrialists speak for themselves:

We have found them to be satisfactory employees. * * * We shall certainly continue to be receptive to any others who may come to us. (Raytheon Production Corporation, Newton, Mass.)

We have been well satisfied by the work done by these young women. * * * We have found these girls to be much more valuable to us than the few who have come to us without any previous machine-shop training. (Pneumatic Scale Corporation, Quincy, Mass.)

We have taken contracts based upon receiving N. Y. A. trainees. (Research & Engineering Co., Agawam, Mass.)

We have found them to be very well trained considering the length of time spent at the school; some, who had a little more time in training, are, in our estimation, exceptional. (Manning, Maxwell & Moore, Boston, Mass.)

We have been pleased in the past with the training received by the National Youth Administration students and they have proven to be very satisfactory workers. (American Bosch Corporation, Springfield, Mass.)

Additional evidence of the quality of N. Y. A. trainees is available in the list of thousands of firms who have continually hired these youths. Allow me to cite a small portion of the list, firms which are making solid contributions to our production battle, firms which have a reputation far beyond the borders of Massachusetts:

American Bosch Co., Atlantic Parachute Co., Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, Boston Gear Works, Boston (U. S.) Navy Yard, Crompton-Knowles Co., Florence Stove Co., General Electric Co., Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co., Hood Rubber Co., Hygrade-Sylvania Lamp Co., Independent Lock Co., Indian Motorcycle Co., Lawley Shipyards, Manning, Maxwell & Moore, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northeast Airlines, Norton Abrasives Co., Pneumatic Drop Hammer Co., Precision Tool Manufacturing Co., Raytheon Manufacturing Co., Remington Arms Corporation, Savage Arms Corporation, Simplex Wire Corporation, Simpson Drydocks, Springfield (U. S. A.) Armory, Stone & Webster Corporation, Tubular Rivet & Stud Co., Union Twist Drill Co., United Shoe Machinery Corporation, United States Rubber Co., Walsh Boiler Works, Watertown (U. S. A.) Arsenal, Westinghouse Electric Co., Westover (U. S. A.) Air Field Base, Worthington Pump Co.

I believe no more effective reply could be made to any questions as to the quality of the N. Y. A. product than this list, a blue book of war production plants in Massachusetts.

Any fair appraisal of the N. Y. A. requires mention of one of its most important byproducts, production of essential items in its shops. The N. Y. A. training program is based on the proposition that one learns by doing. Thus, each trainee works on actual production, scaled to his or her level of progress. Thousands of minor jobs which would throw the production schedule of a large plant out of alinement have been performed by N. Y. A. trainees at their benches for the Army, Navy, civilian-defense agencies, and city and State departments. In each case the sponsor of the work provides the raw materials, and the N. Y. A. trainee, as part of his training, fabricates the required item. Massachusetts shops alone have fabricated items for the United States navy yards at Portsmouth, N. H., and Brooklyn, N. Y., valued at almost 100,000 man-hours.

What then are the criticisms of this program, for, surely, no man or woman knowingly seeks to undermine a program which is adding to our war strength, to our production power.

The most common criticism is why continue a relief agency in time of a manpower shortage. This is a sorry criticism resulting from failure on the part of the critics to ascertain the facts. Eight years ago, when there was a surplus of manpower, the N. Y. A. was initiated as a relief agency. Over 3 years ago, and incidentally long before the majority of the agencies and public had aroused themselves to the urgency of

war, the N. Y. A. was transformed into a war industry training program. For years it has not functioned as a relief agency. For years it has been providing war industries with skilled workers. Critics on this score should visit one of the 1,500 work training units throughout the Nation and inform themselves whereof they speak.

Another frequent criticism is that the Nation must economize. Let us economize by eliminating nonessential activities, but not by eliminating an agency turning out 1,000 workers skilled for war production every day while machines stand idle waiting for workers. The total yearly cost of the N. Y. A. is less than that of a battleship. Yet without the product of the N. Y. A.—skilled workers—no amount of money would permit us to build any ships.

In Massachusetts, for the first 6 months of the fiscal year, the cost of training the average N. Y. A. youth over a period of 8 weeks was $91, of which $28 was paid to the youth. Is $63 a high price to pay for a pair of trained hands that will produce fighting equipment? This figure includes all costs of supervision, training, equipment, transportation, and rentals. Would that Massachusetts today could, by the simple expedient of paying $63 each for 73,000 men and women, acquire trained workers. Not an industrialist would hesitate.

Another charge is that the N. Y. A. is a Federal program imposed upon the cities. This charge, common among professional lobbyists, fares badly in the face of the facts. Such facts as the cooperation of municipal authorities in Massachusetts authorizing expenditures for rentals, heat, power, light, and services for the N. Y. A. that the program may be strengthened; such facts as letters of wholehearted commendation from heads of Massachusetts' outstanding industrial cities such as Boston, Springfield, New Bedford, Quincy, Worcester, and so forth, and other overt expressions of support clearly give the answer to this charge.

Failing to challenge the solid basis of the N. Y. A. work, critics resort to another method of attack. Some other agency could do the work better. It has not been an American custom to reward meritorious service with dismissal, but let us examine the assertions.

Industry can train its own workers. This is only partially true. Small plants have neither the staff nor room to organize training programs. They are wholly dependent upon the public training facilities. Large plants can and do train their own workers. With what results? The cost, which is borne by the tax-paying public, is four times that of the average N. Y. A. cost. In addition, valuable equipment and skilled men who would be otherwise at work on production are thus diverted to training. Is it not sounder to allow the N. Y. A. to train new workers when it can do it more cheaply and without disturbing the production schedule of private industry?

Let our regular educational programs train the workers. In the first place, in Massachusetts at least, industry will need more than the total trained worker output of both the N. Y. A. and the regular vocational school programs. Secondly, the N. Y. A. has been able to exhibit a flexibility that the vocational school program, operated by local school authorities, cannot duplicate. Vocational schools are permanently established in certain cities. The N. Y. A. can and does move from city to city. Labor shortages hit now one city, now another. The N. Y. A. has effectively filtered workers from labor surplus areas in other States in Massachusetts' Springfield Valley area. The N. Y. A. has established resident training centers caring for youth through all of New England. The city of Gardner, Mass., experienced a rising demand for war workers. Within 2 months a complete war training unit has been established there. I say, gentlemen, we need both training programs. Each fulfills a separate and distinct function.

The Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, I speak on the Fulbright resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein.

I am a nationalist. I am not an internationalist or interventionist. I believe in the principles of the American Government. You may call me an isolationist if you please if that term means adhering to and practicing the principles enunciated by our founding fathers and under which we have operated a successful Government for 150 years.

As derisively defined by those who seek advantage, I declare there are no isolationists in this country, and no political party of consequence has ever declared for isolationism. Nor has any such party declared for internationalism. The declarations of party platforms have been nearer to the isolation idea than to the international one, and will be in 1944. No party dares to declare for internationalism. The membership of this House dare not so declare. Some will play around in the shallows with milk-water resolutions like this one to test out the sentiment of voters, with the illuminating thought if it fails it doesn't mean anything anyway. If this resolution is right in the minds of its proponents; if it means military force to police the world; if it means internationalism; the change in our form of government in any way; the surrender of some of our sovereignty; the abolition of our national life or any part of it, why not come out in boldness and say so? Why not set out the plan in detail and advocate its immediate adoption? If it is so good and beneficial, why delay till the war is over? Maybe its beneficient effects will convert our enemies, for they say, like us, they are waging the war for eternal peace.

Surely we do not want to creep up on the American people with an olive branch in one hand and a stiletto in the other to slit their throats. Let us declare for political nationalism or political internationalism so the people will know whither we are trying to lead them. Let the issues be clear cut and not be clouded. I have talked to and read letters from hundreds of soldiers, some here, some from abroad, and they have never seen anything yet worth fighting for in any foreign country. One wrote: "I am in the land where Christ was born; I wish to Christ I was in the land where I was born." When these boys return home—if they do—they will be full to overflowing with national patriotic spirit and they will start a crusade of America for Americans that will sweep aside all the other isms and schisms from our way of life. It will be the death knell of that internationalism whose main objective is world trade at the sacrifice of national sovereignty. The same thing will be true of all nations. Even China will have a national spirit after this war ends.

Yet this has never meant and does not now mean we or any of these nations are living in a state of isolation, or that we are housing ourselves within a shell. That illustration is often used by those who have run out of reasons. It is just an excuse to silence the fearful and ridicule the patriot. The rule has ever been to assume our place in the galaxy of nations in every way except to tie our destiny with theirs. Between isolationism and internationalism we have plowed our course of national Americanism; it has kept us free from wars and preserved our peace. It was the deviation from our true course that involved us in two world wars.

This resolution violates our national rule. Walter Lippmann in his new book on this subject, United States Foreign Policy, says isolationism is misnamed. That it really means insolvency. That we never have had and do not now have a national or international policy. That our Monroe Doctrine is incapable of performance and defense, by us. That it would bankrupt us to fulfill its obligations. All of this because of the international urge. May I ask if we had no policy, national or international, by what chance have we grown to stature? How did we become the richest and best Nation of the earth? If the form of Government we adopted is wrong why so long in discovering it?

Why did it come with two world wars, the origin of which is so far hidden in the remote background of history, we can only speculate as to their cause?

Would it bankrupt us to enforce the implications of the Monroe Doctrine? We have done so since 1824, by virtue of national prestige until it is now an accepted international fact. It has cost us little and saved us much. If we could not enforce the Monroe Doctrine without insolvency, how can we then enforce all the implications of this resolution to cover all the world and still remain solvent? Can we by uniting with the insolvent nations of the world—and all of them broke—better our political and financial condition over the more limited sphere of our present commitments?

The questions, without argument, give the answer. We are the only nation now solvent but we are fast approaching that dismal abyss. We constantly solace ourselves by talking about our great natural resources, our national income, and cite them as to our ability to finance, police, and govern the whole world. Yet we cannot enforce the Monroe Doctrine and could not defend ourselves without an alliance with Britain. This war is depleting our natural resources; discouraging our people in the production of wealth. We are taxing and borrowing, mounting our national debt, spend it and call it income. The extravagances it produces we call prosperity. We are at our lowest ebb, but will go lower, in real national wealth.

Have we spent this money to defend the Monroe Doctrine or to save the British Empire from destruction? How much will we spend to uphold and maintain that Empire if we adopt the international policy of forever weaving our destiny with that of Britain and all other nations? That is just the international policy Lippmann writes about and this resolution contemplates. It means insolvency and destruction for us. How different is this idea from that of Churchill. He said the greatest day's work of his life was getting America on their side of this war. And it was. That was said when his country was gasping for breath. Later, when India was gasping for her independence, he said he was not appointed Prime Minister to liquidate the British Empire. I admire him for both statements. Both are patriotic, national; they exalt the welfare of his country, above all others. That is why I am an American nationalist.

Where did this resolution come from? It is not native-born. It doesn't have the birthmarks of Americanism. It is not inspired by our system of national life. It is born across the sea, but not in a manger. It is a foreigner, steeped in a mixture of marxism, fascism, nazism, and world-wide commerce. Its application would render us a subservient and subaltern nation. The action of the committee in bringing the resolution to this floor has been described as "vastly important and historic." I say it is vastly destructive of American ideals. If you want to see it in detail read Eli Culbertson's book where he plans and maps the super government down to the office of justice of the peace and constable.

If you want to read a synopsis of the Culbertson plan, without commitments, read "Roosevelt's World Blue Print," in the Saturday Evening Post, April 10, 1943. The basic idea of the League of Nations and of this resolution and all other similar schemes is power and force that was the heart of the covenant of the League. It meant then, and means now, the establishment of an international army powerful enough to enforce peace by coercing or subduing any other combination of nations. No other nation shall maintain an army for defensive or offensive purposes. The direction of this force will have to be vested in the whole League, else it is a mere balance of power. This means the surrender of sovereignty by the individual nations. No reservation can save it. The government of Washington and Jefferson will be merged in a super government of the world. It is the United States of America or One World.

We often hear: "We won World War No. 1, but lost the peace." That is just a saying without foundation. We won nothing in World War No. 1 except debt, destruction, and death. After the war we intermeddled unofficially in the affairs of Europe; directed their commerce; loaned money to and financed the politicians on both sides; tried social experiments; loaned to foreign governments; supplied foreign corporations with money and machinery to rehabilitate themselves; and rebuilt her cities. This was not isolationism; it was interventionist meddling where we had no business. We were helping them keep out that dreaded monster, Russian communism. Then they traded with everybody else but us. American-loaned money was used to pay German indemnities and the Allied Nations used this money to pay us on the war loans. They really paid nothing. They have paid nothing yet.

In South America we loaned money, bought worthless government bonds, so they could trade with Europe. We did everything but join the League of Nations and back it with our military power. The failure to do this is the basis of that cry, "We lost the peace." That is a false cry, too. The League of Nations was composed of the victorious Allies who were the preferred powers. They had complete control and the military power to coerce Germany. They had the peace. Our signing the covenant would only have added our unneeded wealth and power to the League. When it was completed there existed the same old balance of power that had troubled Europe for centuries. Our joining the League would not have changed it. Just made the balance of it a little more unbalanced without changing the peace terms.

The same old jealousies, hates, rivalries, selfishness, and double-crossings took place as of old. England double-crossed France and finally permitted Germany to rearm. All of them watched Italy ravish their sister member, Ethiopia. England, France, and Russia secretly took sides in the civil war in Spain, and England never protested the use of military aid by Germany and Italy to Franco. Litvinoff told the League the invasion of Ethiopia meant another world war, and demanded it stop. But England wanted to see Italy and Japan become world powers; Germany, a buffer state between her and Russia; Spain a menace to France. What peace did we lose in this set-up? We merely lost a chance of getting into this maelstrom of hell 2 years earlier than we did. If the powers had so decreed, these tares of war could have been uprooted, and they did not need our help to do it. Each one distrusted and sought advantage of the other.

Today we are allied with England in World War No. 2. England is hated with venomous hate by more people on this earth than any other power. She lost her East India possessions to Japan, and has to hold India down by the sword because of this hatred. Even the Chinese rejoiced when the English were jailed by the Japs. I believe the present strife in north Africa between the French generals is partly due to England's covetous eyes on north Africa as a colonial possession. She knows France cannot resist, and the others will not. She has double-crossed all nations—even us. Do we want to cast our lot into this inferno? With all of this as known history what can we hope to gain by joining in a world-wide league, assuming more obligations and expense, with a surrender of sovereignty?

What is our formula for peace? We have the best one ever devised. And that is to stay at home and mind our own business. It worked for 130 years, and would work today if we observed it. Our Constitution says in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings and liberty to ourselves and our posterity, we established our Government. It has done these things. We never have needed an international alliance to carry out these beneficent ideas. We have done it by a national policy. I know some now regard our founding fathers as fossils; their principles worn out; that the world is in a new era and needs new governments. But a compass is still used on the modern ship and its needle points to the North Star; an anchor is still used to hold the ship steady; a loyal crew is necessary to insure a safe voyage; the well-known and tried routes are the safest. We know who laid the keel of our ship and we know the material of which it is built. I am not in favor of sabotaging it to embark in a new boat built by unknown workmen without plan or design, with no compass or anchor, with a mixed crew of jabbering internationalists on a strange sea and on untried routes with a lot of co-owner nations who have heretofore, if not now, been international pirates, schemers, oppressors, and exploiters of weak people. The Bible says, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set." That is good advice to us as a nation.

I know it is argued times have changed; modern inventions have made the world small; distances have been annihilated; we cannot rely on old doctrines and principles. Our own power is not enough to save us. We need alliances—even world-wide—not with all nations—just with those whom we want to share this power with us to boss the

world. This argument is fallacious. The oceans are just as wide as ever.

When our Colonies rebelled the people were shocked one morning to see English battleships in American harbors. In 1814 English soldiers marched to Washington and burned this very building. Our Government, in terror, fled. No one knew or thought the enemy was at our gates. They came as a thief in the night. We had no defenses; nothing to fight with. No means of knowing they were here. Today our coasts are defended. We have the guns, ships, planes, submarines, and millions of men. We can detect enemy ships, submarines, and planes on the distant high seas. Not a one of them could come within 500 miles of our coast without detection and destruction. All the ships in the world cannot land an army and equipment on our shores and invade us if we are not asleep. There would have been no Pearl Harbor if we had been awake. If we can fight an aggressive war where the first battle line of defense is 3,000 miles from our shores, I know we can defend our homes. If we cannot, we are unworthy of the name we bear and our country will fall. I verily believe the airplane is the greatest security of the ages against cross-sea invasion. With planes, submarines, and coast defenses, no enemy can land ships. We can still thank God the "land was divided" and the oceans bound us on either side.

I know there is an insistent demand for world-wide coalition. We want peace. It is so desired we are apt to close our eyes and grab for it. But the words of Patrick Henry should ring in our ears. We established and saved our country by war at home. The only real menace we ever had was in 1861–65, when we divided ourselves.

This was the only real war ever fought. Hand to hand, man to man, with a bravery and ferociousness in battle never equalled in world history. Many of us in this House are descended from those men who fought that war of division. Now we stand united under one flag and for one purpose—to defend our common country. No one could object to world agreements for peace. Our country has had them from the beginning. The objection is in tying ourselves through political alliances with other nations and putting our reliance for national safety in an armed force, controlled by them. That is a loss of sovereignty and would soon lose our independence and safety. World commerce and even world peace are not worth it. We have already heard the utter abjectness preached here, that we must join with England to "save ourselves." That was a cowardly and false doctrine. It was preached as an excuse to enter the war to save England, not ourselves. That abjectness was not shared by all, but if our national safety depends on superpower world force then abjectness becomes a national policy and spirit. Nationalism would be dead. It is a disturbing thought that world peace is always linked by internationalists and interventionists with world commerce, the cause of most wars.

Our national policy in dealing with foreign nations was firmly established by our first five Presidents. We have followed their advice in its true sense. Washington spent 4 years in writing his farewell address and submitted it to all the leading statesmen of his time. It is a chart for our foreign policy. He said:

> Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; * * * the greatest rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connections as possible; * * * it is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

That is a definite foreign policy.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all; entangling alliances with none.

That is a definite foreign policy.

Monroe promulgated another foreign policy which in effect said: We will not meddle in European affairs and they shall not meddle in ours, or America for Americans. We have woven this foreign policy inextricably with and as a part of our national policy. It is not isolation, intervention, or international. It is American, a distinct policy, separate from all world politics, and intended so to be.

The Republican national platform of 1940 said:

> The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war. * * * The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace * * * and also to efficiently uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine.

The Democratic national platform of 1940 said:

> We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, Navy, or Air Forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.

These are declarations of foreign policy. There is no internationalism in them. Objectors to this policy mean they want national alliances in peace and war instead of American policies. Regardless of all ingenious theories, plans, and schemes, and arguments made to undermine or overcome, it is the fixed policy and sentiment of the American people. Unscrambling entangling alliances, as once proposed, or alliances made with one or more countries for physical security, as now proposed, are not American. They are byproducts of war diseases.

I am an American. I am proud of it. It means something. When the old Apostle Paul was tied to the post and the soldier was ready to lash him he said; "Is it lawful for thee to scourge a Roman citizen uncondemned?" The whip fell from that soldier's hand and he ran to the captain and said: "Take heed what thou doest, this man is a Roman citizen." The captain of the hosts ran, he did not walk, and said to Paul: "Art thou a Roman?" The little, old, baldheaded, weak-eyed, epileptic, hunchback straightened himself up to the full stature of his chains and proudly said: "I am." The centurion said: "With a great price bought I that freedom." Paul said: "I was free born." In that day it was greater to be a Roman than to be a king. Today it is greater to be a free-born American than to be a king. Shall we lose that birthright of kingship? Shall we trade it for a miserable mess of international peace pottage steeped in the viciousness of world politics? Or shall we preserve it for ourselves and transmit it to our posterity to live by and, if need be, to die for? We are Americans. We are nationalists. We are not internationalists. We do not want the flag to come trailing back some time after we have tried this fallacy. We don't want the flag to leave here.

Labor Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 30 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, recently there was held in Eugene, Oreg., a meeting or convention of labor leaders which issued a public statement purporting to represent my views on the subject of labor relations. The meeting also adopted resolutions which were in harmony with its purpose to discredit me before uninformed citizens of my State. In order to make of record a truthful and accurate statement of my views on the subject of labor relations, I addressed a letter on the subject to an old friend who has devoted the best years of his life to the protection and welfare of the workingmen of Oregon. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1943.

Hon. —— ——,

Salem, Oreg.

MY DEAR MR. ——: On account of your lifelong interest in the welfare of the American workingman, as well as on account of the long friendship which has existed between us, I would like to receive your reactions relative to my convictions about labor relations which I shall try to express accurately in this letter.

Contrary to the statement of the convention of the racketeers of labor, recently held in Eugene, Oreg., I have no desire or intention to "misstate facts or to influence the public against labor"; nor have I done so. On the contrary, the American workingman, who works and maintains the peace, has no better friend or ardent supporter than I am and always have been, in both my private life and in my public career, as the historic facts demonstrate. I have been a laborer, myself; as my pioneer father and grandfather were before me.

In the interests of the American workingman and as a protection to him and his family in his rights as an independent citizen to

go and to come, to work and to speak freely, I am opposed to all forms of force and violence, exercised without legal authority, which control and intimidate him in his freedom, liberty, and independence. The use of force, violence, and intimidation in an effort to enforce the will of some men upon other men is the method of dictators and the destruction of democracy. I recognize as a fact that my liberty ceases where yours begins and I expect all others to observe the same rule of conduct.

I am opposed to the collection of any funds whatever from the workman's earned wages, by deduction or otherwise, which are made against his will, by any person or persons, not lawfully and officially connected with the Federal, State, or municipal government and unauthorized by constitutional law; as I am opposed to all other forms of piracy and highway robbery.

I am opposed to any person, or persons, other than those acting with the warrant and badge of governmental authority, interfering with the traffic of citizens or of their vehicles on the public highways, or any part of them, as I am opposed to all other criminal practices and acts which curtail the freedom of innocent and peaceable citizens minding their own business.

I am opposed in time of war to the planned and deliberate interruption of production and delivery of anything which our Nation needs in the conduct of the war; as I am opposed to all other traitorous acts against our Government and its efforts to win the war and to supply our soldiers, sailors, and marines with all those things which they require now to defend themselves from the vicious attacks of our treacherous enemies in the global conflicts where our combat troops are fighting valiantly for the protection of all of us at home.

It is my conviction that the American workingman, as well as his employer, is entitled to enjoy, and his Government under the Federal Constitution is obligated to guarantee to him, domestic tranquillity, the blessings of liberty, the right to be secure in his person, house, papers, and effects; the freedom of religion, speech, and press; and the right to assemble peaceably to petition his Government for a redress of grievances, and other lawful purposes.

As a United States Senator I have taken a solemn oath to give him this protection; consequently, I am morally bound to do so. I am, and shall continue to be, faithful to my oath. Therefore, I am opposed to what I consider the subversive policies and acts of John L. Lewis, Bill Murray, William Green, and such gentry and all their satellites, who for their own personal advantage and profit cause American workmen to be intimidated by beating up those who resist their racketeering practices, who have destroyed the property of owners and have threatened operators of industries with the destruction of their businesses. Moreover, the racketeers of labor have seriously retarded the war efforts of our Nation in time of war.

I am for the American workman who works, and I am against the racketeers of labor who exploit him and by force and violence intimidate him as cruelly as the most heartless employer ever has imposed upon him and his family. For many years I was a pay-roll worker before I became a pay-roll maker, and I know how cruel and vicious some selfish employers can be; just as from personal experience I know how kind, just and encouragingly helpful some other employers are. There is a need for labor unions and a legitimate function for them to perform in the protection of the interests and welfare of the workingman, but that need and function is neither met nor served by exploiting the workman; nor in retarding the war effort; nor in betrayal of our soldiers, sailors, and marines in combat service all over the world who now depend upon the maximum possible production of all kinds of supplies and equipment.

Are those in our combat forces going to be betrayed by those at home who foment and engage in strikes, slowdowns, and other subversive practices in war industries and other essential services, as our troops which surrendered to the Japs at Bataan were betrayed? I am willing and prepared to face this issue. Our country must be preserved regardless of my own political fortunes. Unless we win this war now there will be only defeat and slavery under a foreign master, or by a dictator at home, for all of us. Only united, patriotic action now by employer and employee alike can win this war and aid and protect those whom we have sent to foreign lands to fight for us.

The paramount issue in the next election is not how its result may affect my own political fortunes or anything relating to me personally. The vital issue before the voters of Oregon and all other American citizens is now and will be then, Are they going to support our soldiers, sailors, and marines in combat services and our Government in the prosecution of the war, protect the patriotic, loyal, and diligent workmen of our country in their employments and constitutional freedoms, and are the citizens of Oregon going to insist that the "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth"?

Very truly yours,

RUFUS C. HOLMAN.

Daily Prayer for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have called attention to the very fine loyalty of the Indian people in the war which now engages the energies of the Nation. They have the highest percentage of volunteers of any racial group in America. Their per capita subscription to War bonds bears the highest proportion to their per capita wealth of any of our people. I now wish to call the attention to a very beautiful, a very inspiring contribution that comes from the Indian people. It is the custom of a daily prayer for victory.

The custom was introduced in the St. Francis community of the Sioux Indians, on the Rosebud Reservation by a member of the tribe, Alice S. Compton. She does not claim originality for it, but gives credit to an ancient Mayan custom which observed united prayer in times of great importance.

Believing that the prayer will inspire and help many Americans in these days, and be, of itself, a great aid to victory, remembering as Tennyson said, that—

More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of—

I wish to place the St. Francis proposal for daily prayer in the RECORD at this time.

SAINT FRANCIS, S. DAK.

A MOVEMENT FOR 1 MINUTE OF CIVIC UNITED PRAYER DAILY

To all members of Saint Francis community:

I propose that everyone, no matter what he or she is doing, stops doing it for 1 minute at the stroke of 7 p. m. Central Standard War Time and offer up a prayer for the protection of our dear ones, all the men and women in the service of their country, wherever they may be. A prayer for that, and for a Christian victory. A tremendous good is bound to flow forth upon such an effort, blessing our dear ones facing unknown peri , blessing such a community, and our country.

Yours for victory,

ALICE S. COMPTON,
Chairman St. Francis Community.

Paper Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, it is a happy privilege to rise to express a word of commendation for faithful public service well performed.

The War Production Board has done an excellent job in instituting policies that have already effectuated a vast saving in the use of critically short paper and resulted in considerable savings to the Public Treasury.

Under the direction of House Resolution 98, your committee made a study of newsprint and print paper and as a result of that study made recommendations for curtailment in Government use of paper. The War Production Board vitalized that recommendation. The Board's relationship with the Congressional committee has been an example of cooperation that could well be adopted as a pattern by all departments. Their expeditious actions merit the highest commendation.

In this brief moment, I will make no effort to report in detail what has been accomplished, but it has been a real task handled with wisdom and results, and I invite the attention of the Congress to what the W. P. B. and the Inter-Agency Committees have done. It merits your full approbation and appreciation.

Waste and Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from American Aviation of July 1, 1943:

(From American Aviation of July 1, 1943)

WASTE AND ABUSE

The strain on the Nation's various transportation systems is reaching unprecedented proportions this summer. Especially in the South, the Midwest, and the far West, transportation conditions verge on the unbelievable.

One transportation executive remarked the other day, with a combined note of sarcasm and facetiousness, that the high command must have its signals mixed. While we are blasting Germany's transportation and industrial resources in order to stop her war effort and destroy her civilian morale, we have let our own transportation systems creak and groan under burdens they were never meant to carry. We are reaching a dangerously low point on transport efficiency.

To the credit of the railroads, they are lumbering along under strains and handicaps that one would have believed impossible a few years ago. Conflicting statements issued by a multitude of diverse Washington agencies as to whether the American citizen should or should not take a vacation that requires travel, and the vast uncontrolled and largely needless travel by servicemen and their sweethearts and families not justified by foreign duty or rigorous training, has tended to throw United States transportation into bedlam.

Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson has just complained that the war output is lagging. One way to hold back war production is to permit transportation to bog down. No recital of example is needed to bolster the obvious fact that shipments of precious war cargoes and vital air-mail communications are being seriously delayed. Those who are actively engaged in war work are finding it increasingly difficult to accomplish their missions or to obtain shipments when needed.

One very important bottleneck should be relieved right now. More transport airplanes should be allocated without delay to commercial air lines. These air lines willingly gave up half of their equipment when lack of foresight in the War Department caught the Army without sufficient transport and cargo planes at the beginning of the war. But transport-plane production has now risen to impressive proportions and there is now no rhyme or reason for any further delay in returning to the air lines the planes given up earlier in the war.

As a matter of fact, an investigation would reveal some healthy abuses in the utilization of Army transport airplanes. If high Government officials and certain other brass hats had a string of individual Pullman cars sitting at Union Station in Washington for the exclusive use of each person when and if he wanted to go some place, there would be a terrific outcry. Such waste of equipment in wartime would not be tolerated.

But, if anything, a 21-passenger transport plane is more useful as a unit of transportation than a Pullman car and yet there are enough Army and other Government transport planes sitting idly by, or little used, to operate an entire air-line system capable of performing millions of passenger-miles during the course of a year. There are even surplus 21-passenger transports tied up in training units. The Army-transport-plane utilization per day is so much lower than that of commercial air lines as to bring up serious questions about the Government's attitude toward commercial air transportation in the war.

Is it right for a single medium-rank Army officer to take a 21-passenger plane, with full crew, on a cross-country trip for a conference which could easily have been handled by telephone, or when he could have hopped on a domestic Army cargo plane bound for the same destination? Is it right to have 21-passenger planes providing luxury transportation for 1 or 2 officers when the remaining space is needed for cargo and other passengers? If Pullman cars or Greyhound busses were used with such extravagance the officers would be ripe for court martial. But we are tying up planes and crews right and left so certain officials can "go home" over the week-end. The utter waste of transport airplanes is a sorry phase of the war, especially when transportation is so badly needed throughout the country.

If the railroads used their coaches and Pullman cars only 3 hours a day they would be accused of gross negligence. If the commercial air lines used their planes only 3 hours a day they would be inexcusably derelict in their responsibilities. Then why should vitally needed transport planes of the Army be so wasted as to be used on an average of 3 hours or less per day?

When former President Herbert Hoover was "bounced" from a commercial air line by a priority pilot at Denver a few weeks ago, Lee Casey, editor and leading columnist of the Denver Rocky Mountain News, was moved to point out that the military necessity by which the air lines gave up airplanes to the Army at the start of the war no longer exists. Especially in time of war, he said, it is necessary to maintain the commercial carriers for production and transportation efficiency. "Return of an adequate number of planes to the commercial lines would be an important contribution to the war program."

The crux of the whole problem is simply the lack of recognition in many quarters that a transport airplane is a unit of transportation. It is not a personal air buggy for individual transportation, any more than a Pullman car or Greyhound bus would be so considered in wartime. It is capable of performing a great and vital transportation job for cargo, for mail, and for wartime passengers. There is nothing more useless than a transport plane sitting idly on the ground. Any transport airplane not being utilized at least 10 hours per day over a period of time should be turned over to men who know transportation and who know how to utilize, operate, and schedule these vital units of transport.

The load factors on all vital commercial air routes is as close to 100 percent as is practically possible. Commercial planes are being used to the very top limit of efficiency. Even so, the fight for space is chiefly among priority passengers with lower classes of priorities "bounced" constantly. Air mail and air express is suffering.

Let's cut out the monkey business in air transportation and let a transportation medium and transportation specialists do the job. The air lines must have more airplanes, and there is no longer the slightest shred of a reason why they should not have them at once. This is no time for amateurs, personal privileges, and waste.

Realism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Realism," which I delivered last night over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This evening I am privileged to talk with you concerning matters of vital interest to the American people. May I say in this respect that the time has arrived when we must become realistic; in other words, we must become more nationalistic. That is to say, we must consider the national and international matters with a view to strengthening the position of the United States, our country in which we are all interested firstly.

Today the American flag is flying high at 70 places outside of the United States. Today our soldiers are fighting in every part of the world. Today we are stripping our forests, depleting our mines, pumping dry our oil wells, and emptying our pockets in a supreme effort to do our utmost to bring about the defeat of the Axis Powers and to restore order to the world at the earliest possible moment.

We are pouring millions of men into uniform and have made the greatest expenditures of money that any nation has ever made in the history of the world in any war or wars. Fact is, this Nation during its brief participation in the present World War No. 2 has actually made expenditure of more money than the total expenditures of the combined Axis and Allied powers. Only yesterday the Congress of the United States appropriated an additional $71,000,000,000 for war purposes. Last year we appropriated more than that amount, and the probabilities are that we will be called upon to appropriate additional amounts this year for war purposes. These sums are stupendous. They are beyond the comprehension of human computation.

In view of the fact that we are rapidly becoming a "have not" nation in the form of raw materials, and in further view of the fact that our financial situation is yearly becoming more strained, we must now begin to look after the future interests of our own country.

We must remember that World War No. 1 cost us only a few billion dollars in comparison with the amount of money we have already spent during our participation in this war. We must further bear in mind that in World War No. 1 we advanced to our allies in the form of loans only approximately $22,000,000,000. We must further remember that during the last war we had only 52,000 men killed and approximately 250,000 wounded.

When this war is ended a different story will be told. We will have advanced to our allies, in the form of lend-lease gifts many, many more billions than we did in the last war. Instead of having 50,000 men killed and 250,000 wounded, the unfortunate and sad probabilities are that we shall have several hundred thousand killed and perhaps a million wounded or affected by tropical diseases. All of these will require hospitalization over a period of years. When we entered the present war, a quarter of a century after the close of World War No. 1, it is regrettable to note that we did not have sufficient beds in our hospitals to accommodate the veterans of World War No. 1 who were entitled to hospital treatment; and now, with millions of diseased and wounded to be returned from the fighting fronts of the world, we must immediately complete hospital facilities for the treatment of our wounded heroes who are being returned daily from all parts of the world.

In addition, we must now consider well the fact that when this war will have ended we will be called upon to make payment of bonuses, pensions, and compensation to the millions who will be entitled to these benefits

as a result of military service. These payments will require the expenditure of additional billions of dollars.

With this sad picture before us, I repeat that the time has arrived when we must become more realistic, more nationalistic, and more thoroughly interested in the future of our own country—now.

At a time when we are cooperating fully with our allies in the furnishing of millions of men and with the lend-lease-giving of billions of dollars to nations throughout the world, we should call upon them now to consider some of our post-war requirements, at a time when they acknowledge their great need of our services.

We are told that we are fighting to provide more security for ourselves. The only additional security that we can provide for ourselves of a realistic nature is to acquire now, while our allies need us, additional security in the form of island and territorial possessions in this our Western Hemispherical section of the world.

Years prior to our becoming involved in this war I suggested by way of legislation which I introduced in the Congress of the United States the acquisition of certain island possessions of the French and the British, to be credited upon their debts of World War No. 1. I felt that we should acquire these islands in the Caribbean and some in the North Atlantic for the purpose of welding a band of steel around our section of the Western Hemisphere which would make our position impregnable against any attack or attacks of enemy or enemies.

Unfortunately, my pleas fell upon deaf ears. Nevertheless, some months after the introduction of my legislation, the administration traded 50 so-called old-age destroyers for the mere privilege of building air bases on their property leased to us.

It is all very well to talk about policing the world, bringing about international peace and order, but where there is no guaranty of that now and probably no guaranty of it in the future, we should become realistic and practical. We should guarantee our future security by welding for ourselves a band of steel around our portion of the world that will make impregnable our shores against any attack or attacks of any enemy or enemies. Without relying upon any promises now or future treaties, we should look toward our own security.

There are times when the sense of public duty outweighs the natural, personal dislike to present facts of this nature. This is such a time.

Friends of today may become enemies of tomorrow.

Our allies are looking out after their own interests. Why shouldn't we look out after ours? Russia is defending gloriously her own soil from her soil. Her spokesmen are demanding that as a result of her part in this war that she be given all the territory she had at the beginning of the war and more. England is looking out after her interests, and that fact is best evidenced by the statement made by the Honorable Winston Churchill when he became Prime Minister of the British Empire, when he said that he did not become Prime Minister for the purpose of liquidating the British Empire.

To repeat, at a time when our allies acknowledge that they need us is the time for us to begin thinking about what we are going to get out of this war for the security of our Nation and for the benefit of its people. I call to your attention the British Gallup poll held several weeks ago, at which time the British people gave their opinion as to which country had so far made the greatest contribution toward the winning of the war, Russia, Britain, the United States, or China. Their very frank and blunt answer was that Russia had contributed 50 percent; Great Britain, 42 percent; China, 5 percent; and the United States, only 3 percent—this in the face of the fact that the United States has spent more money during its brief participation in this war than the combined expenditures of all the Allied Nations and the Axis Powers, as well as furnishing millions of soldiers.

I advocate and insist upon the acquisition of vital Atlantic and Pacific islands and territories for defense purposes, as well as critical raw-material-producing areas, in return for war loans and war damages for the United States.

We should consider the acquisition of French, Dutch, and British Guiana, just north of Brazil; French and British islands in the Caribbean; Curacao and Aruba, which belong to the Netherlands and are located just off the coast of Venezuela; British Honduras; St. Pierre and Miquelon, French islands off the coast of Newfoundland; Greenland and Iceland, to be purchased, which were occupied by American and British troops before our entrance into this war; and Wrangell Island in the Arctic, claimed now by the Russians and occupied by the Russians, regardless of the fact that it was discovered by American explorers.

In the Pacific, of course, we should take from Japan whatever we deem necessary for the protection of our Pacific ship and air routes. We are entitled to take from Japan the Marshall and Caroline Islands, which the Allies handed over to Japan as a prize for the Japs' aid against Germany in the First World War. The Pacific should be bolstered, the Hawaiian Islands given further defense by the acquisition of other Pacific islands in the South Pacific.

The war will teach us exactly what islands and what bases are necessary for our protection in any international upheaval that might come in the decades following this war. Our first duty should be to protect our own country and not rely upon promises or treaties. Our goal is greater security for our own people.

In conclusion, let me repeat, as I stated in the very outset, that we must become more realistic; we must become more nationalistic; we must become more conscious of the needs of America. American nationalism must prevail at this critical hour when our Nation is becoming rapidly a have-not nation, and when our future is becoming imperiled as a result of our desire to plant the four freedoms in the four corners of the earth, without due regard to the fact that we might lose those freedoms on the home front and thereby destroy the very things here at home that we are seeking to implant in every part of the world.

While we are fighting to restore freedom throughout the world, let's not lose it at home. Above all, the citadel of freedom must be preserved.

The Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from New York, Hon. SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, made on the National Radio Forum, conducted by the Washington Evening Star, station WMAL, Wednesday June 30, 1943:

The concurrent resolution unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives is a declaration of national policy by Congress. It looks to the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace; and it favors participation by the United States in this effort.

Of course, the United States alone cannot undertake to establish and maintain world peace. If that is to be accomplished, this country must cooperate with others, as it is doing now in prosecuting the war.

I want to point out that this is a concurrent resolution. It is solely the expression of the Congress as representing the people. It is not proposed by the administration nor submitted to the administration. It is a declaration of national policy, which if adopted will be the guiding rule of all the authorities of the Government in steps looking to a lasting peace.

What are we fighting for, if it is not for the right kind of peace? A just peace requires the destruction of the powers that work injustice. We cooperate gladly and wholeheartedly with other nations in fighting for a just peace. What this resolution does is to declare that the United States will cooperate as wholeheartedly for a lasting peace as it now cooperates for a just peace. It is recognition of the fact that peace may be just but short-lived unless fortified against warmakers. Only a lasting peace, as well as a just peace, will now satisfy the United States and the world. This resolution makes such a peace the aim of the United States.

If we are willing to shed our blood and pour out the Nation's wealth to achieve a just peace, we certainly are willing to cooperate with other free peoples to make it a lasting peace. We are not fighting for a 25-year peace, no matter how just it might be. We do not intend to have our boys killed in another war. For that reason we are striking down everybody who started this war, and we intend to hold down powerless anybody who might start another war. But we must also destroy the termites who undermine peace. The most pestilent evil that afflicts mankind, next to war, is a treacherous peace, a counterfeit peace that cheats you into a sense of security and then betrays you to the enemy. That was the peace the world had after the last war. "Never again," we say. Against traitorous war and traitorous peace we stand with other free nations and say, "Never again."

Why was this resolution voted unanimously? Because all men of all parties long for just and lasting peace. They differ as to methods of approaching the goal, as is shown by the many bills and resolutions now before Congress and referred to committees dealing with foreign affairs, commerce, finance, ways and means, military affairs, education and labor, and rules. This diversity of approach is evidence that everybody in Congress is groping for the same thing—the achievement of a just and a lasting peace.

Why should this resolution be adopted now? Because the world ought to know that the United States means "never again" when it deals the blows that are putting an end to this war. Friends and enemies must be assured that this is the last world war. The United Nations will fight better if they realize that the coming peace will be lasting as well as just. The enemy will know that this war means their doom; that they need not hope to renew this war after a season of counterfeit peace. As a declaration of peace this resolution is as significant as our declarations of war. It expresses the determination of the world to be and to remain

free. It is a weapon that blasts the hopes of the enemy. It says to them, "Leave hope behind, ye who have taken up the sword; for you shall perish, and we who destroy you will shatter forever the sword arm of your nation."

It should be noted that this resolution is not a commitment in support of any particular peace plan or treaty. The United States, always free, remains free to pass judgment upon any plan to achieve world peace. We declare that what we are doing in the field we are willing to do in council. We are not bound by any war treaty, yet we cooperate. So we are not bound to any peace plan, but we will cooperate in drawing up one that we can approve.

When we declared war we pledged all the resources of the Nation to the successful prosecution of the war. That pledge will have been made in vain if the peace is not just and lasting, for we shall have failed to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. Fumbling of the peace would be as disastrous as defeat in the war—indeed, it would mean the same thing. Instead of real peace, we would have agreed to a breathing spell preceding another and bloodier war.

The pending resolution gives notice that the United States intends its warfare to be successful and final. The war will not end with victory unless victory is crystallized into just and lasting peace. This resolution, therefore, is part of the war effort. It aims at making forever secure what we are fighting for, so that we shall never have to do the job over again.

Humanity is fainting under the strain of oppression. The stoutest heart weakens when hope is too long deferred.

Now that we see the glimmer of victory, let us hasten to tell those in bondage what victory means—that it will be followed quickly by a just and lasting peace. Our declaration, coming from the greatest of all nations, will hasten both victory and peace. It will stiffen the arm of every fighter under liberty's flag and refresh the courage and endurance of all who are in chains.

As the smile of Almighty God lighted the pathway of our forefathers when they dared to strike for liberty, so we will feel the Divine blessing when we march forward under Old Glory toward the goal of universal, just, and lasting peace.

The Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, on the National Radio Forum, conducted by the Washington Evening Star, WMAL, Blue Network, June 30, 1943:

On Wednesday, June 16, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House voted unanimously to report out for consideration by Congress the Fulbright resolution which is worded as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress hereby express itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

I voted to report out this resolution and am strongly in favor of its adoption at the earliest practicable date by the Congress.

Personally, I have long been convinced that adherence in principle and practice by our American Congress and people to the objectives embodied in this resolution is absolutely essential for the security, peace, progress, and general well-being, not only of our own country but of the entire world in the post-war era.

I am even more profoundly convinced that failure of our Congress and country to take their proper place of leadership and responsibility as defined in this resolution, in establishing a just and lasting peace when the war is won, would be a national and international calamity more disastrous to mankind in its evil consequences than the war itself.

The reasons why our Congress and country ought to announce now that we will participate with all other free peoples in setting up adequate machinery with power to insure a just and lasting peace are as obvious as they are compelling.

We are now fighting a world war to destroy forever a world menace whose avowed objective is to conquer and enslave all free peoples. Our Government and people are united in an invincible determination to win this war at any cost. To this end we are cooperating to the fullest extent with our fighting allies and, in fact, with more than 30 associated freedom-loving nations.

When the war is won it would be the acme of political folly and moral madness for the United States to quit and refuse to finish the job of setting up, along with our fighting allies, a world peace which shall be just and permanent.

If such an irrational and immoral abandonment of our present place of recognized leadership and responsibility among the nations of the world were even conceivable, why should we continue to lay upon present and future generations of Americans a burden of public debt unparalleled in history? Why continue our almost miraculous production of war matériel? Why keep on aiding our allies, without stint, through lend-lease and other governmental agencies? Why send the flower of our young manhood to the far corners of the earth to face wounds and death on land and sea and in the air? Why permit millions of our American homes to become enshrouded in the bleak and somber shadows of personal uncertainty, sacrifice, and sorrow?

Our full and complete participation in the war is the first reason why we must participate to the same degree and with the same authority in the ensuing peace.

A second and increasingly urgent reason why Congress should promptly pass the Fulbright resolution lies in the growing uncertainty among our fighting allies as to the participation of our Government and people in setting up the peace. Unless this uncertainty is speedily and completely dispelled the whole problem of world peace will become dangerously affected.

We are now allies of, and in full participation with, Britain, Russia, and China in fighting the war. If we do not continue to participate on equal terms with these nations in establishing the peace it will be necessary for Britain and Russia to prepare now to take over the European situation and for Russia, Britain, and China to assume full responsibility for the oriental peace set-up. Since we will have paramount interests to protect in all of these spheres, it is our plain duty to announce now that we propose to join with our fighting allies in the peace settlement without abandonment in the slightest degree of our present position of leadership and responsibility in world affairs.

There is a third supreme reason which includes all others why the American people through their Congress should announce now their fixed determination and purpose to take the same decisive part in the peace that they are taking in the war.

This war is a cosmic catastrophe affecting, directly or indirectly, for good or ill, every human being in the world. Its end will mark at the same time the end of an age and the beginning of a new age unlike any known to history. For the first time every nation and group of men everywhere will be in complete and continuous contact from which there can be no escape. We shall, in common with all mankind, have entered upon a world age. Every problem of life—racial, economic, social, political, and spiritual—will be in essence a world problem. Unless political and spiritual leaders everywhere learn to think and act in world terms and upon a world scale their thinking and acting will end in inevitable failure.

Henceforth no nation can live or die unto itself. The new world age will constitute the greatest challenge to the spiritual resources of all mankind ever known. Unless all races and nations can find a common moral standard and a common spiritual impulse by which to measure and upon which to foundation their relations with each other, the new age will mark the end of civilization and the beginning of national and international chaos.

To meet this supreme challenge it is too soon for detailed blue prints of organization and action. It is, of course, reassuring to know that groups in and out of public life here and in other countries are studying and preparing concrete programs of national and international organization and policy. But meanwhile the pressing present need is for the American Congress and people to let the world know that, in setting up the new world order it is their purpose to discharge every obligation which is inherent in their possession of unparalleled power and influence.

For myself I expect the evolution of this new world civilization will be a long, slow, and difficult process. It will take at least a century of time and possibly several centuries to complete. It will involve at every step problems complex and difficult almost beyond human wisdom to solve.

I venture to express the conviction that the first duty of the associated nations, when the war is won will be to set up with full American cooperation appropriate machinery for insuring a just and lasting peace. Coincident with this will be the immediate task of saving from starvation the stricken peoples of the world.

After that, a little at a time, I hope to see the adoption of a few simple but universal principles of international law with necessary judicial machinery for their interpretation and enforcement. Then, of course, will come the long and arduous grapple with national and international, economic, and political problems. All with the purpose of finally establishing everywhere on earth a relationship between men of all breeds and conditions which shall be based upon justice, honor, and free cooperation for the common good.

Address by Hon. Joseph E. Davies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address

delivered by the Honorable Joseph E. Davies, former United States Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Belgium, before the Governors' Conference, Columbus, Ohio, June 21, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, Governor O'Conor, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinction and a privilege to address this gathering of the Governors of the 48 States of our Union.

There is no body more representative of our people. You are each distinctive of the section in which you live. You have retained the virtue of that distinction but are characterized also by a broad-brimmed mental horizon of national unity and interest. You have all reached leadership the American way. There is no easy way to scale the heights you have achieved. Strong men, you represent different political convictions and interest; yet each grants to the other the respect and tolerance which is due from one honest man to another. In an atmosphere of friendship, of mutual respect, you have gathered for common counsel to cooperate for the national good. It is democracy at its best in a republic.

You have asked me to tell you something about my trip to Moscow. I am honored to do so.

I appear before you as a postman. I was charged with the responsibility of carrying a letter to Moscow, and a reply to Washington. My mission, the President has said, was entirely successful. The plain inference from that fact, distasteful as it may be to the Axis, is that there is unity and agreement with reference to matters military, and otherwise, between our great leaders, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Stalin, and Mr. Roosevelt.

What was in these letters are, for the protection of all of us, exclusively the concern of Mr. Stalin, Mr. Roosevelt, and the leaders of the United Nations.

There are things of possible interest, however, which I can properly tell you about. But please understand that I speak for no one but myself. I take the words out of no man's mouth, either Soviet or American official, when I speak to you this evening. I appear simply as a private citizen. My mission was completed.

At the outset, I should like to say that the experiences of th's trip gave me renewed confidence in our ultimate victory, and in a better and more peaceful world, which will lie beyond victory.

I went back to Russia after 5 years. There are great changes. Moscow itself has been greatly improved. It shows little of the scars of war. Outside of an atmosphere of great activity, it gives little appearance of a city at war.

The army looks well clothed. The uniforms of the officers with their new epaulets are smart. The morale appears to be very high.

There are many indications of a severe wartime shortage of food stuffs. Generally, however, the people look sufficiently fed. The rationing is strict. It is graded according to the importance of the worker in the war effort. Those not so engaged have a harder time of it. I am told that many subsist on cabbages and potatoes, which they grow themselves.

Everywhere there are evidences of sorrow and grief. The casualty lists run into the millions of both soldiers and civilians. Every family in Russia has lost some loved one. The resulting bitterness has been intensified by the savage, wanton destruction of their cities, and the horrible brutalities of the Nazi troops. Every man, woman, and child is at war, and is personally the bitter enemy of Hitler.

The sufferings of the people, as well as the determination of their leaders, in my opinion, will be satisfied with nothing short of absolute victory, and unconditional surrender.

I had long talks with their great leaders, Marshal Stalin, Foreign Minister Molotov, Marshal Voroshilov, and other old friends. They are all working long hours and at top speed. Somehow they manage to keep themselves fit.

Marshal Stalin looked well, strong, and unworried. I was again impressed with the modesty, practical common sense, and wisdom of this extraordinary man. In my opinion, he is primarily the man responsible for the creation of the Red Army and the industrial power of Russia, and the welding of them into the machine which was able to resist and stop Hitler. He is, above all else, a quiet man; but he reflects an immense fortitude, courage, and innate power.

I also had visits with old friends who were not of high position. They are not interested in post-war problems. They have only one thing in their minds—to win the war, and to win it quickly. This means to them more sacrifice, more suffering, and even starvation; but they are grim about seeing it through.

Generally there is a belief that this summer Hitler will make a supreme last effort to smash the Red Army or take the Baku oil fields. They do not underestimate the power which they think the German war machine still has. They watch it with anxiety, but without fear. They have confidence in their Red Army and in themselves.

They all spoke with gratitude of Britain's aid, and of lend-lease, and the aid from the United States which is now coming through in a substantial manner. They speak with enthusiasm of our victory in Tunisia as a contribution to the common cause. They are looking forward with natural anxiety and hope, however, to the imminent western land front in Europe to relieve the pressure on their own western lines.

From my trip generally there are some outstanding impressions left in my mind. You might like to hear them.

I. From what I saw, traveling by way of Trinidad, Brazil, Dakar, Nigeria, Khartoum, Egypt, Baghdad, Iran, Moscow, and from Nome to Washington, this stands out perhaps above all others: It is what our war effort has accomplished.

Our Army has done a really great job. It is a great man's army. Practically around the earth, under the most difficult and trying conditions, in Tropic heat and Arctic cold, we find our men putting in gigantic installations in record-breaking time, literally doing the impossible. Vast camps have been built within a few months on square miles of land that had to be cleared out in the jungle, or created out of the swamps, morass, and tundra of the Arctic. Malaria, fever, vermin, cold and heat—all were overcome. Great highways, vast airways were built almost overnight. Hundreds of steel buildings were erected by men handling sheet metal in the bitter cold of 50° below zero. Whether in the heart of Africa or Alaska, our officers and men were doing miracles; but with great modesty as "all in the day's work." But let me tell you that what I saw is a monument to American genius, capacity, and courage, and to the American soldier.

II. During my stay in Russia 6 years ago, I traveled thousands of miles over White Russia, the Ukraine, Caucasus, and the Donets Basin, inspecting industry and agriculture in a region where it was reported 60 percent of the industry of Russia was located. This time I wanted to see more of the Urals and the Siberian country for myself, so I came back via Alaska.

In one Ural city I saw plants which had been transported bodily from Kiev and Kharkov. With these plants families were transported by thousands of freight cars. Hundreds of large two-and-a-half-story brick houses in whole subdivisions for miles on end, in 18 months had been erected for these workers. I had heard of it and read of it, but to see it gives one an appreciation of the terrific job these people have done.

III. As for Siberia, I shall never forget the impression which it made. For hundreds of miles it is one vast expanse of beautiful rolling country, dotted with lakes, groves of trees, traversed by wide sweeping rivers, and ridges.

Flying over this country at an altitude of a thousand to fifteen hundred feet, I saw a tremendous agricultural region. There were hundreds and hundreds of square miles of great fields, bigger than our townships, in different colors of grain, all planted with precision, and, from the air, looking orderly and well kept. The agricultural wealth east of Moscow in Siberia could feed an empire. And all along in this frontier, which corresponds to our West, I saw great cities—boom cities, laid out in squares like our prairie towns, dotted with factories, huge plants and chimneys all over the place—one small Pittsburgh after another; cities that a few years ago did not have a population exceeding a few thousand, now with a population in the hundreds of thousands.

I saw one plant which was turning out fighting planes, the designs of which were unknown in June 1941, and the factories for which and machine tools for which did not exist 2 years ago.

The impression of power, innate strength, vigor, and pioneer energy which one gets from this great section is extraordinary.

This hinterland of wealth, resource, and power, guarded by natural barriers of high mountains and great distances, and these developments are the cornerstone of Soviet military strategy. Both their army and their war plans are undoubtedly based upon this fact. They have an unconquerable new world behind them into which, if need be, they can always retreat. Never need the military authorities of her allies fear that the Red Army will be destroyed. Their strategy will be, if necessary, to fall back again and again, into the big, new bases of agricultural and armaments production, while the German lines grow longer and longer and more easy to bomb or sabotage, and more vulnerable. Napoleon reached Moscow to be smothered in the fastnesses of Russia. There remain still thousands of miles of the Russian featherbed to destroy the German Wehrmacht, if Hitler penetrates it. If you were to see this country it would convince you, I think, that Hitler, and no one else for that matter, could conquer this land and this people.

IV. Another fact that impressed me greatly was that in the leaders of the Soviet Government, I found an extraordinary quality of unspoken confidence and quiet strength. They apparently have found that their Army can take all that the Germans have to give; that they can trade punches toe to toe, and that they can still come back and carry the fight into the enemy's corner. This they have done for 2 years. Apparently they believe they can continue to do so. Their Army's morale is stronger than ever; the stubborn resistance and support of their people is everywhere apparent. Their ace in the hole is their inner bastion of defense, which ensures that they can never be conquered. They have suffered bitterly. They seem to me like men who have withstood the worst, and who have found themselves, and who believe that through their Army, their people, and themselves, they cannot be beaten.

V. In 1938, in Europe it was commonly said that Hitler was on a bicycle; that he had to keep going; that he could not stand still. He is in that position in Russia. In my judgment, what Hitler failed to achieve in 1941 and 1942, he will fail to achieve in 1943. But,

If he fails to attack, he is in constant danger. The Russian Army has never lost its capacity for initiative. It is their supreme virtue. It is Hitler's constant menace in the east.

VI. There is still another outstanding fact which I think you will find pride in. It is briefly this:

Throughout my trip about the earth, from Brazil to Siberia, there was one name on the lips of all the people as one of the great leaders of the earth, and one upon whom the hopes of multitudes of men and women were pinned in this crisis in world history. That was the name of an American—Franklin Roosevelt—your colleague the former Governor of the State of New York. Every American, I am sure, must feel a thrill of pride in that fact.

VII. The impression that I had 5 years ago has been confirmed, namely, that the Soviet people and their leaders desire, above all else, a peaceful world. They believe in Great Britain, the United States, and the United Nations. They demand respect and confidence in their good faith. If they, in turn, have confidence in the good faith and the will of the four great powers of the earth, and the other United Nations, to create a community of nations in the world where law and order will be maintained, in my opinion, they will go the whole way as high-mindedly, as altruistically, and as unselfishly as any of the nations of the earth.

VIII. There is one impression which perhaps was the most vivid and strongest of all, and that was Stalingrad.

Stalingrad stretched along the river for about 45 miles. Practically all of the central and northern part of the city is utterly and completely destroyed. Nothing remained but gaunt, bare walls, roofless and windowless, which seemed to stretch up like twisted, white arms to the sky, or black, charred, huge spaces where fire had burned everything down to the very roots. There were many, many blocks—whole districts—where there remained nothing but an occasional chimney, with all the rest rubble. All around the city for miles—and, in fact, in the city itself—the ground is pockmarked with trenches, shell holes, dugouts, wrecked tanks, crashed airplanes, and evidences of battle.

Words are not adequate to describe the horror of that scene.

All in all, it was the most terrible, horrible, and damnable thing that I had ever seen. It was unbelievable that such a blot on our civilization could possibly be perpetrated by so-called civilized men. It made every one of our party burn with anger.

But it also had another effect: It gave rise to a feeling of veneration for and pride in the manhood which enabled that gallant band of men to stand with their backs to the river, cut off from all retreat, and fight their way up from the verge of annihilation, foot by foot, to victory, and the annihilation or capture of 400,000 of the enemy.

In conclusion, may I say that, after all, it is the simple truth—that without Russia to aid us in this war we would have been in desperate jeopardy. Without Russia, we cannot plan a secure peace. Russia, like the British Empire, China, and ourselves, is too big to be left out of a peace community.

Civilization owes an enormous debt to the British Empire and its immortal Dunkerque, to China, to the valiant Dutch, the gallant Norwegians, the brave Belgians, Czechs, and Yugoslavs, and all those people who are still fighting Hitler in the occupied territories. But we should not forget the tremendous debt we owe to the Soviet Union.

It is, I believe, not an overstatement to assert that but for the resistance of the Red Army and the Soviet Union, the Germans might have overrun Africa; might have made Tunisia impossible, and might have made junction with the Japs in India and on the Persian Gulf. Had that happened, our enemies, and not we, would today be dictating the global strategy.

Of course, it is true they fought for their own liberties and their own homes. But it is also true that they saved our civilization.

If there is to be peace in the world, it must be based on an agreement between Great Britain, Russia, China, the United States, and the other United Nations. That agreement is no better than the confidence which each has in the other. The confidence of Russia in us is as vital as the confidence of the United Nations and ourselves in Russia. We should not forget that.

There are a few in our country who still bicker at Russia; who still carp at Russia; who still quarrel at the way in which they live and conduct their own Government, which is exclusively their own business. To do this is to play Hitler's game. Every possible thing that Goebbels' propaganda machine can do to make us fear and hate Russia and make Russia fear and hate us, Hitler's machine is doing. It is the only thing which might save the skins of the Nazis.

It is neither sensible, wise, nor right to encourage criticisms of the good faith of the Soviet Government or attacks upon its leaders. The conditions under which our children's children will live may depend upon what we do now.

To you, Governors of our great Commonwealth, whom I know to be all lovers of peace and great Americans, I know I can address with confidence the thought that we should all join in a constructive effort to create a public opinion at this critical time when both the war and the future peace is in jeopardy, which would fortify our confidence in our allies and their confidence in us. Russia, Britain, China, or any of the other United Nations, should not be alienated by intolerances or little criticisms of one against the other. That is very vital to all of us. Divided, our nations would perish. United, we can win the war, save the future for our children, and keep faith with our fighting men.

Facts About Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Answering Max Eastman," published in PM of today's issue. The article is an answer to Mr. Eastman's article entitled "To Collaborate Successfully We Must Face the Facts About Russia," published in the July Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWERING MAX EASTMAN

Having written a series of seven pieces on America and Russia a few months ago, I had hoped to keep off the subject for some months more. But the July Reader's Digest is out, with a 14-page article by Max Eastman that is bound to irritate and anger many Americans, confuse more, and confirm millions in their hatred of Russia by giving it plausible reasons to feed on. Eastman gives his attack the title "To Collaborate Successfully—We Must Face the Facts About Russia."

I brush aside the usual amenities with which the article starts, like all attacks on Russia—admiration, gratitude, etc., for the Russians. I am on a search not for protestations of affection but for the facts about Russia which the title tells us we must face.

But before I can reach them I have to wade through pages of attacks, not on Russians but on Americans. The principal targets are Vice President Wallace, Wendell Willkie, and Joseph E. Davies. They are described as "apologists for communism." It is not quite clear whether Eastman charges them with deliberately misleading their countrymen about Russia or whether he regards them as bewitched and deluded softies who talk drivel about Russia.

In either case he is wrong. When the history of American foreign relations in this crisis period comes to be written, Wallace and Willkie and Davies will be shining names in it. Two of them are men of the right in politics; as applied to them, Eastman's statement that "many Americans are fooling with communism just to be on the left" simply makes no sense.

The present "line" of those who write as Eastman does is that the liberals and conservatives who are working for close relations with Russia in the war and the post-war are soft-headed and sentimental, and that "realism" is the monopoly of those who attack Russia.

WHO ARE THE "REALISTS"?

But who are the realists? Are they those who said before the war that Russia is so deeply a dictatorship that there is no difference between it and Germany? Are they those who said that Russia is so rotten internally that the first external attack will cause it to crumble? Are they those who said that the Russian Army was so shattered by the purges that it was incapable of a major war? Are the realists those who say now that the ally fighting on our side is a wicked herd state and slave society between whom and us there stretches a flaming gulf as between hell and heaven?

It is Wallace, Willkie, and Davies who are the realists. What they have done represents the triumph of historic events over past prejudices. They know the faults of Stalin and of the Russian system fully as well as Eastman does. Davies and Willkie have seen Russia at first hand during the past year, while Eastman was there from 1922–24 and has not seen it for close to 20 years.

But they are men of action who are thinking of the battles of the future, rather than embittered doctrinaires who are preoccupied with ancient wrongs. And they know that the war cannot be won unless America and Russia win it together, and that the peace cannot be organized unless America and Russia organize it together. That is why they put Russia's strength and its qualities as a going concern in the foreground, and communism's sins in the background.

Why assume that these men, and others like them, are fools, dolts, gulls? Why not conclude rather that they are triumphant proof of a democracy's capacity to save itself from class-blindness and national suicide?

But the case of American-Russian accord rests not on anyone's opinion, but on the mutual interests of both nations, and on Russia's own accord.

RUSSIANS AND NAZIS

But Eastman proposes to wipe all this off the slate at the very start. "Let us remember," he writes, "that the stubborn resistance of the Russians no more justifies communism than the stupendous assault of the Germans justifies nazi-ism."

This is a curious statement. In the first place, none of the people Eastman attacks

have ever said that Russian resistance justifies communism. They have said that it is a basic argument for our cooperation with the Russians.

In the second place, the admiration of the English and the Americans for the Russian achievement was all the greater because they had been led to believe, by men like Eastman, that Russia was rotten to the core, would not fight, and could not resist.

And finally I am appalled by the cynical way in which, in the sentence above, Eastman tricks the reader into concluding that nothing in their war record distinguishes the Nazi system from the Russian. Is there no moral difference between a nation that makes a stupendous assault upon another, and a nation that offers stubborn resistance to it? Is there no political difference between a nation whose life and aim are war and a nation that wants to build its own social system and, to do so, requires to live at peace with the world?

Is there no difference, finally, to a poet and a humanist like Eastman, between the mask of sadism of the attacking Nazi soldiers and the image of firm and bitter defense by Russian soldiers and civilians?

I thought of the way the Russians were fighting while I was reading the heart of Eastman's article—the "facts" about Russia. They are basically three. One is that Russia is politically a vast concentration camp. A second is that it is, in economic terms, an impoverished and a slave society. The third is that the Russian leaders hate and despise the democracies, and that they plot international revolution against us.

I don't pretend to know, as Eastman does, the final truth on these issues. But I try to use reason on them.

Take the question of international revolution. Eastman quotes learnedly from the theoretical writings of Lenin and Stalin. Yet we all know that a politician's words, especially for home consumption, are less important than his deeds. By quotation, Eastman, in effect, makes Stalin out to be a Trotzkyist, with a hunger for permanent world revolution. Yet if you look at the record of Russia's deeds, you find that, under Stalin, Russia abandoned the tactic of world revolution and used the Comintern mainly for its own safety. And if you look at the record, you know that Russia's so-called Communist plotting has not caused us in a quarter century to add a single soldier to the American armies.

DO SLAVES FIGHT?

On the economic issue, no one has denied the poverty of the Russian people in the last decade when they were arming for a struggle that was to absorb everything but the barest necessities. But what is crucial is that the Russian people know that their total national income is greater than ever, and that when they can live at peace it will mean higher living standards for the people. Lower than ours? Of course. But before you speak contemptuously of the Russian economic achievement, measure the rate of progress in the national income of the two countries in the past quarter century.

As I read Eastman on Russian poverty and the subjection of the people, I kept thinking: If these people are slaves, why do slaves fight so well? Why do starving people form themselves not just into a nation with an army, but a nation in arms? Why do Russian children, as Maurice Hindus described them in Mother Russia, die for their country with a deep joy that would do honor to grown and mature men? Why do Russians have the sense that they are fashioning a new world, with new meanings—a sense that we in America seem sadly to have lost?

If this were all, I should be more enthusiastic about the Russian system than I am. But there is also political suppression, the single-party system, the police state. Eastman quotes enormous figures about people in concentration camps in Russia. Although I don't trust his figures, I am willing to believe that the true ones are large. But the figures are not crucial. What is crucial is that Russians lack freedom of thought. The lesser punishment is absorbed in the greater—the imprisonment of the body in the imprisonment of the mind.

It is because of this lack of freedom in Russia that we on PM have opposed the Russian social system, and opposed all who advocate it for America.

But what follows from Eastman's argument on this score? Does he want us to demand of Russia that she change her social system as the condition of collaboration? Imagine what the Russians could say about our distribution of income, our treatment of Negroes, our class system of education.

Or does he want Roosevelt and Churchill, each time they make speeches, to include denunciations of their Soviet ally?

Or does he want us to break off relations with Russia now, and try to get along without her in the post-war world?

HIS TWO SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

He doesn't come out openly for any of these things. His only specific suggestions are two: That America ban the Communist Party; and that we should not "passively allow our schools, newspapers, radios, book and magazine publishing houses, cinema studios, Office of War Information, to be permeated with the agents and apologists of communism."

That is to say, he proposes Stalinist suppression of American political and intellectual freedom. He proposes that we take over from the Russians the one big thing that scars their record, and refashion ourselves in their image.

As for myself, I have more faith in America than that. I have faith in our democratic institutions—so much faith that I believe they can compete in the world with those of a totalitarian socialism—and without our having to resort to suppression.

We need freedom from external attack; and we can get that best by working with Russia. We need internal economic and social justice—and we can get that best by concentrating on our own inadequacies. And we need national stature and moral greatness. But we can get that best not by hating the ways of others but by measuring our strength against our own tasks.

Organized Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. CURLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, that there is a definite and well-defined movement to liquidate organized labor, using as a basis the actions of a small group affiliated with the labor movement, must be apparent to every thinking American. There are many persons who complain about the spots which occasionally appear on the surface of the sun, yet no thoughtful individual would say do away with the sun because of the spots that occasionally mar its surface, and as it is in the case of the sun, so it is in the case of organized labor. Under the circumstances it is well to consider at this time when feeling runs high, the contribution made to the welfare and happiness of the American people through organized labor, so that we may present, if possible, those who would seek to destroy this essential asset to American progress and happiness from the accomplishment of their purpose. In his veto message President Franklin Delano Roosevelt sets forth as follows, and I quote:

I am unalterably opposed to strikes in wartime. I do not hesitate to use the powers of Government to prevent them. It is clearly the will of the American people that for the duration of the war all labor disputes be settled by orderly procedures established by law. It is the will of the American people that no war work be interrupted by strike or lock-out. American labor as well as American business gave their no strike no lock-out pledge after the attack on Pearl Harbor. That pledge has been well kept except in the case of the leaders of the United Mine Workers. For the entire year of 1942 the time lost by strikes averaged only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-hours worked. The American people should realize that fact—that ninety-nine and ninety-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the work was not delayed by strikes. That record has never before been equaled in this country. It is as good or better than the record of any of our allies in wartime.

Little did the handful of men dream or visualize even by the broadest stretch of the imagination some 50 years ago when organized labor came into existence in the United States, that as a result of their efforts and a consequence of their contribution there would be created in this Nation of ours what really represents not only an adjunct of government but a contribution to the serenity of the American home.

The theory of our Government has always been that there should be three separate divisions: The executive, the judicial, and the legislative. But without the contribution of organized labor I sometimes wonder just what would be the lot of the ordinary individual worker in the United States of America, and just what would be the conditions that might obtain in the land itself. Organized labor for more than half a century has struggled to better the condition of the worker in America, and through bettering the condition of the worker in America has made life more pleasant and more wholesome for every individual citizen and for every family in the entire Nation.

In the early brave days theirs was indeed a hard lot. Not only obliged to contend with the power and the force of money, but with what was known in those days as company unions, but required in addition to combat the forces that money can always array against any cause which represents social advancement and the promotion of the welfare of the individual worker. So that they were required to combat without funds venal legislature, corrupt judges, corrupt public officials, and not infrequently paid emissaries in the ranks of labor itself.

It remained for a clear message from the seat of Christian morality at a crit-

ical period more than half a century ago to give to organized labor the dignity and the character and the place in the sun that a movement of this nature required in order to succeed, in the encyclical delivered by Pope Leo XIII nearly half a century ago, in which was pointed out the obligation of the employer as well as the obligation of the employee.

In those early brave days there was no limitation except the exhaustion of the individual which governed the number of hours which the worker was required to work. Likewise there was no general system of payment or remuneration for the labor performed by the individual, so that a 12-hour day and a daily wage of a dollar and a quarter for a laborer and employment then only when weather permitted was usually the lot of the worker in America.

It was little better than the system of serfdom which obtained prior to 1865 in the United States and throughout the world. I sometimes wonder if the life was as desirable as actual slavery, where the mind was free but the body was never free. In the old days the slave represented a potential value and it was an obligation and duty, as well as good business investment, for the owner of the slave to see not only that he was properly fed and properly clothed and properly housed and to receive medical attention when it was deemed necessary. On the other hand, the worker rarely lived under conditions that made life inviting or that were in conformity with an honest or clear interpretation of the constitutional guaranty of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness on the part of every individual living under the American flag.

But organized labor proceeded with its task and changed the 12-hour day to an 11-hour day, and the 11-hour day to a 10-hour day, and the 10-hour day to a 9-hour day, and the 9-hour day to an 8-hour day, and then an almost universal Saturday half-holiday.

There was no provision made in the early days, not even 30 years ago, for the protection of the worker in industry. I can very well recall, 32 years ago as a Member of Congress, making many visits to the Bureau of Standards in Washington, then presided over by Dr. Stratton, later head of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and discussing with him various devices for protection of the limbs and not infrequently the life of the worker. Then began the movement in America and throughout the world for the conservation of the limbs and the life of the worker in industry.

Then came the Workmen's Compensation Act, and later the Maternity Benefit Act, adopted, however, in this Nation of ours only in 1913 by a majority of States. So organized labor has made definite progress, and at the present time we are beginning to think in different terms of our responsibility not only to the worker but our responsibility to every element of society.

Of course, we are all familiar with the second Divine Commandment which sets forth we should love our neighbor as ourselves. And we are likewise familiar with the old Biblical saying that "I am my brother's keeper," but little of the brotherly love was evidenced in the treatment of the workers, and were it not for the work of organized labor I question very much if any of these humane laws we love to conjure with and in which we take real pride at the present time would ever have been placed on the statute books of any State in the entire Union.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt summed up the situation and its application in his message to Congress of June 8, 1934, in which he set forth:

> Our task of reconstruction does not require the creation of new and strange values. It is rather the finding of the way once more to know, but to some degree forgotten, ideals and values. If the means and details are in some instances new, the objectives are as permanent as human nature. Among our objectives I place the security of the men, women, and children of the Nation first. This security for the individual and for the family concerns itself primarily with three factors. First, people want decent homes to live in; second, they want to locate them where they can engage in productive work; and third, they want some safeguard against misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this man-made world of ours.

Subsequent to this message the President created a committee on economic and social security and this committee, after interviewing many hundreds of citizens, including representatives of organizations in all parts of the country, disclosed the following existing conditions:

In 1935 there were 18,000,000 people, including children and aged, who were dependent upon emergency relief for a subsistence, and approximately ten millions of workers out of employment other than relief workers. Many millions more had lost their entire savings and there had occurred a very great decrease in earnings. The ravages of probably the worst depression of all time have been emphasized by greater urbanization, with a total dependence of a majority of our people on their earnings in industry.

In the slack year of 1933, 14,500 persons were fatally injured in American industry, and 55,000 sustained some permanent injury. Each year, above one-eighth of all workers suffer one or more illnesses which disable them for a week and the percentage of the families in which some member is seriously ill is even greater.

The National Social Security Act which provides among other things protection to aged persons; second, protection for persons who are blind; third, dependent and crippled children; fourth, maternal and child welfare; fifth, public health; sixth, administration of their unemployment compensation laws; seventh, establishment of social security boards nationally and in the State; eighth, the raising of revenue for all of these purposes.

Incredible as it may appear, the fact remains that in a short period of 8 years more social reforms have been adopted in America for the welfare of all the people than in the entire century and a half preceding, and no group of people in America made a greater contribution to the adoption of these social and economic reforms so essential to the welfare and happiness of the American people than did organized labor.

That certain leaders have been guilty of treasonable acts that jeopardized the lives of our boys and that tended to serve as an estoppel of the production of war materials essential to an early conclusion of the war is accepted by everyone, but to condemn organized labor as a whole for the acts of a limited number who have been clearly guilty of treasonable conduct is not justified. The statement that less than one-half of 1 percent of the entire war work was conducted in the year 1942 without interruption and which constituted the greatest wartime record in the history of the Nation is sufficient justification for clear and considered judgment upon the contribution of the organization as a whole, rather than a general condemnation because of the acts of a few.

The Work of the O. W. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on June 29, 1943:

My fellow Americans, Executive Order No. 9182 dated June 13, 1942, established the Office of War Information within the Office fo Emergency Management in the Executive Office of the President. The existing agencies handling foreign and domestic information which were consolidated to form the Office of War Information were:

3. The Office of Facts and Figures and its powers and duties.

b. The Office of Government Reports and its powers and duties.

c. That part of the former Office of the Coordinator of Information which related to the gathering of public information and its dissemination abroad.

4. The Division of Information of the Office for Emergency Management.

The chief purpose in establishing the Office of War Information was to gather and disseminate information at home and abroad concerning the war. Specifically the Executive order outlined its purpose in the following language in section 4:

"Consistent with the war information policies of the President and with the foreign policy of the United States, and after consultation with the Committee on War Information Policy, the Director shall perform the following functions and duties:

"a. Formulate and carry out, through the use of press, radio, motion picture, and other facilities, information programs designed to facilitate the development of an informed and intelligent understanding, at home and abroad, of the status and progress of the war effort and of the war policies, activities, and aims of the Government.

"b. Coordinate the war informational activities of all Federal departments and agencies for the purpose of assuring an accurate and consistent flow of war information to the public and the world at large.

"c. Obtain, study, and analyze information concerning the war effort and advise the

agencies concerned with the dissemination of such information as to the most appropriate and effective means of keeping the public adequately and accurately informed.

"d. Review, clear, and approve all proposed radio and motion-picture programs sponsored by Federal departments and agencies, and serve as the central point of clearance and contact for the radio-broadcasting and motion-picture industries, respectively, in their relationships with Federal departments and agencies concerning such Government programs.

"e. Maintain liaison with the information agencies of the United Nations for the purpose of relating the Government's informational programs and facilities to those of such nations.

"f. Perform such other functions and duties relating to war information as the President may from time to time determine."

The Office of War Information for administrative and functional purposes has been divided into an overseas operations branch and a domestic operations branch. Wide use of press, radio, and motion-picture facilities has been made to carry out its program.

Certainly there is need for an overseas operations branch to let our allies and the neutral countries know what we are doing and can do to win this war. Furthermore, the psychological warfare of President Wilson used so successfully in World War No. 1 in breaking the morale of the German people and paving the way to an early peace was well worth while and we hope the Office of War Information can successfully emulate it in this war. Recent history has shown that the press, radio, and motion picture can be highly successful in breaking the morale of governments and their people. Hitler and Hirohito have gained easy and spectacular victories by their use in disseminating propaganda in the Balkans, the Low Countries, France, and the Far East. We would be foolish indeed if we failed to employ the same weapon against Germany and Japan. Recent signs show that our campaign in Germany and elsewhere in Europe is bearing fruit. It may help to shorten the war appreciably if we continue to tell the German people how destructive our air raids have been to their industrial facilities and how we are prepared and determined to use this effective instrument of destruction to blast their industries, their arsenals, and their submarine lairs to dust.

No effort was made by the House recently to reduce the amount of expenditures from the overseas operations branch below that recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

The Domestic Operations Branch has not functioned as well as the Overseas Branch. Instead of collecting, coordinating, and channeling factual information on the home front, it has provided a subject of debate and controversy within its own group, in the press, and over the radio, as well as in the public forum.

The Director of the Office of War Information is Mr. Elmer Davis, a member of the American Labor Party in New York City. Mr. Davis enjoys a splendid reputation as a writer and radio commentator. He is a man of pleasant personality and undoubted personal integrity. However, he is one of the first to admit mistakes have been made in the Domestic Operations Branch and that poor administrative work has been of no help. Furthermore, he admits some of the pamphlets and publications of the Office of War Information have dealt with domestic problems in other than a factual manner. Their admission justifies that it was indulging in propaganda or a colorization of news on the home front.

The consolidation of the four agencies bringing into being the Office of War Information has not resulted in noticeable efficiency of operation and on the contrary has increased the cost of operation.

In the last year of operation of the four constituent agencies they cost approximately $10,400,000. Under the first year of the Office of War Information this amount was increased to $35,847,292, or more than three times the amount originally spent. The Domestic Operations Branch rather than effecting a reduction in cost or personnel increased both. The monetary increase was over 100 percent, or from approximately $4,000,000 to more than $8,000,000. The personnel increase requested raised the number from 3,253 to 4,407. In the fiscal year 1944 the Office of War Information asked for $47,342,000 and an increase of personnel to 5,438.

The sum of $8,265,900 was requested for the Domestic Operations Branch in 1944, which was a sizable increase over the amount available for 1943. The House Appropriations Committee trimmed the over-all request by $12,869,496. The amount recommended by the committee for the Domestic Operations Branch was $8,500,000, or a reduction of 37 percent. The amendment which I offered from the floor struck this amount from the bill.

Exhaustive and searching hearings on every phase of the Office of War Information were held, covering several days in time and almost 400 pages of printed testimony. The House, when presented with the facts, adopted my amendment by a roll-call vote of 218 to 114.

The chief objections and criticisms leveled against the Domestic Operations Branch of the Office of War Information may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Poor administration, resulting in an increase of personnel and expense of operation.
2. The employment of too many aliens.
3. The failure to properly collect, coordinate, and channel information so as to eliminate confusion and uncertainty over conflicting statements being issued by the Office of Price Administration, the Petroleum Administration for War, and other agencies.
4. The issuance of propaganda on strictly domestic issues.
5. Colorization of news by improper analyses and interpretation.
6. Attempts to censor and control press releases.
7. The unusual number of requests for deferment from military services of eligible men—more than 50 percent of the male employees of Office of War Information being between the ages of 18 and 38.
8. The failure to reduce personnel to help relieve a critical manpower shortage for the armed services, war industries, and food production.

Certainly we could not sustain our population at home and our fighting forces abroad on the mental diet furnished by the propaganda of the Office of War Information on domestic issues.

The American people know why we are at war. Their Congress has appropriated over $300,000,000,000 for war purposes since July 1, 1940. Their sons are fighting on the seven seas, on far-flung battle lines which encircle the globe, and in the skies over every continent. Unprecedented taxes have been levied upon them to finance this war. Sacrifices, service, sorrow, and travail is our lot until we have finished the task of destroying the military power of the Axis which threatens all we hold dear. The American people are determined that nothing shall deter them from this task. They know who we are fighting, why we are fighting, and for what we are fighting. They need no ministry of propaganda to censor press releases on domestic programs. They need no group of propagandists to preach state socialism at Government expense. I challenge any listener or protagonist of the administration of the Domestic Operations Branch to cite a single worth-while contribution made to our armed forces or to our people on the home front by the character and context of the domestic propaganda foisted upon us by pamphlets and publications printed and distributed at Government expense. Much of this work is an affront to our intelligence and our patriotism.

A free, untrammeled press is one of the most potent arms of a democracy. It is a tower of strength for a free people. We have a free press which can be relied upon to faithfully, accurately, and fairly report upon the doings of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government. The people can be relied upon to act intelligently when facts are fairly presented. Censorship of the press and colorization of the news on domestic policies by a centralized Government agency will blanket the fires of freedom burning on the hearthstones of our people. I repeat, America needs no Goebbels sitting in Washington to tell the American press what to publish or the American people why we are at war. America needs no Virginio Gayda sitting in Washington to hand down tinged news on domestic policies or to influence our thoughts and actions.

Second Anniversary of Attack on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, an open-air meeting over which I presided was held on the evening of June 22, at the courthouse plaza in Baltimore, on the second anniversary of the brutal attack by Hitler on Russia. The meeting was in the nature of a tribute to Russia. A very interesting program was presented, emphasizing the magnificently heroic stand of Russia against the powerful and ruthless forces seeking her destruction.

The chief speaker of the evening was my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. His address was one of the most eloquent and convincing to which I have ever listened. Historians will bear witness to the fact that the defense by Russia on the longest battle lines of which there is any record in history will always be an inspiration to people who will fight to preserve their independence.

Most assuredly, the magnificent and successful defense by Russia against military power greater than the world had ever before conceived of has not only been helpful to Russia, but has been invaluable to the cause of liberty throughout the world.

It gives me pleasure to request that the highly informative and valuable speech delivered by the Senator from Montana be printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDAUNTED RUSSIA

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, 2 years ago yesterday, Russia was

at peace with the world. Men and women were at work on farms, in mines and in mills, in factories and stores, and in all the various activities of a great nation. Millions of happy children were at school or on playgrounds. A great war was raging elsewhere, spreading death and desolation—a war started by a people obsessed by a superiority complex, under the leadership of a group of ruthless militarists. They were determined to set up a new order in the world—an order which would enslave all their near and distant neighbors.

Russia was not a warlike nation. She wanted peace. She wanted only an opportunity to develop her resources and work out a better way of life for her people. Indeed, she had a solemn treaty of peace with the German Government, a treaty which would permit her to escape the deadly ravages of war while devoting herself to the welfare of her people. But Hitler had willed it otherwise.

On the evening of June 21, 1941, one can safely assume, somewhere in the rear of the 180 German divisions poised along the Russian border, there was a conference between Herr Hitler and his most eminent generals. The Fuehrer probably said something like this:

"At 4 a. m. tomorrow, you will strike at the Soviet Union while its people sleep. Move swiftly. Push the panzers through the Bolshevist ranks. Stop at nothing. In 3 weeks, we will meet in Moscow."

A few hours later, at the dawn of June 22, 1941, they struck, and by evening, thousands of Russians were dead, maimed, or prisoners of war at the hands of the German military machine and its regimented hordes. Their solemn pledge not to violate Russian territory, given in August, 1939, had become another German scrap of paper familiar to history.

Two years have elapsed since that treacherous day—2 years of tears, of agony, and of death in Russia. Millions of Russians meanwhile have died in the defense of their soil and the cause of human freedom. It is, of course, expected of soldiers to die on the field of battle, but now we are witnessing a war of extermination of civilian populations as well. Wherever German troops have set foot, they have waged a cruel and bloody warfare against innocent men, women, and children in occupied areas as well as on the battle fronts. Their campaign of ruin and desolation has been relentless and complete. That is why the casualties have been so vast and the tragedy so grim. That is why the indignation of civilized people everywhere is today burning so fiercely against the perpetrators of this unparalleled barbarism.

As I sat down to draft this address, there lay before me three clippings containing photographs brought out of Russia by American correspondents. I am unequal to the task of giving you an adequate word picture of the horrors they depict. A long row of dead bodies of men and women, civilians, mind you, mutilated and left to rot in the fields. Nearby, a group of Russians are digging out of a shallow grave the bodies of other civilians.

The second picture shows wives and mothers crying over the corpses of their loved ones, and nearby are fear-shocked little children weeping and wondering why their fathers and brothers should be so cruelly murdered. Under those two photos an incensed American editor gave vent to the feelings which such scenes always arouse in the hearts of Americans in the following caption: "Not war, but sadistic butchery!"

I turned to the third picture from Russia. As far as the eye could see there was not a house left in the vast area—destruction and death everywhere. Near the ruins of what was once their humble home, a little girl was sitting on the ground gazing in bewilderment at her wailing brother and the background of war-torn territory. He, a bit older than she, was no doubt bemoaning the fate which had befallen him. Bereft of his father and mother, he and his baby sister were left alone in a territory overrun by these cruel invaders.

That, my friends, gives a picture of the theaters of war where Hitler's legions have penetrated. That is the menace which threatens the peace and security of our own people as well. That is what heroic Russian soldiers and guerrillas are fighting to end. For the past 2 years they have been giving their lives by the millions in a heroic effort to block Hitler's road to victory.

My friends, these scenes could be multiplied by the hundreds of thousands, and yet we could not have a true picture of the horrors which have been visited upon the Russian people, who only 2 short years before were unaware of the tragic events soon to engulf them.

Why, we may ask, is all this taking place? In one of his outbursts of candor, Hitler gave the answer when he said:

"If our hearts are set on establishing our great German Reich, we must, above all things, force out and exterminate the Slavonic nations. Twenty million people must be wiped out. From now on this will be one of the principal aims of the German policy."

Hitler has been making good his pledge, but, my friends, he will never overcome the vast heroic armies of Russia. They have weapons in their hands, and they know how to use them. They now have faithful allies in the governments and the peoples of the United States and other members of the United Nations. They know what they are fighting for. They are selling their lives dearly. They are exacting a terrific price from Hitler's legions by their extraordinary courage and superhuman sacrifices. That is why the fanatical Nazis, seeing the handwriting on the wall, are now feverishly waging a war of extermination against the defenseless civilians of Russia. More than 40,000,000 Russians have fallen into their hands in the occupied areas. When the Red Army recaptured some of the cities and villages during last winter's campaign, they found whole populations either exterminated or driven off into slavery.

An American eyewitness, Mr. Edgar Snow, who visited some of those towns, recently wired the Saturday Evening Post:

"It is an experience that we Americans and the British and any people lucky enough to remain uninvaded will never quite understand or fully share. No one who is getting his impressions of this war from photographs, news reels, or simply words can emerge from it with quite the same outlook as those who have been through the ordeal."

England is lucky enough to remain uninvaded because, thank God, the prophecies of some of the so-called war experts that the Red Army would quickly fold up did not materialize. Why? Because in the Soviet Union, the old and the young, the men and women, united under the Soviet flag, are determined to achieve the only goal now before the civilized world—the destruction of our common enemy—the Axis powers.

No quislings, no fifth-columnists, no whispering campaigns, no black markets, no groups sowing the seeds of division and confusion, no disseminators of race or religious hatreds interfere with their united purpose.

My friends, we are gathered here tonight to honor these heroes, the martyrs who have fallen in battle, as well as those who are still fighting in defense of their motherland and for the success of our common cause. We are here to honor the heroes of Stalingrad who smashed Hitler's time table last summer by refusing to yield that strategic sector, irrespective of costs in life and property. We are here to honor the heroes of Sevastopol, Rostov, Kharkov, Moscow, and the many other strategic points on the 1,800-mile Russian front, too numerous to mention here, the heroes who have disposed of the myth of German invincibility.

We are here, as are countless thousands of Americans in other cities of our land, to pledge to the Russian people our wholehearted support and to assure them that we shall stand with them in this struggle until the menace of Nazi Germany has forever been eradicated from the earth.

For 2 years American merchantmen and naval units have been braving the submarine-infested oceans with precious cargoes of American bombers and fighter planes, with American tanks and guns, ammunition, and food for the heroic Russian soldiers and civilians. Our Russian friends have been making good use of the weapons forged by American workers and paid for with our taxpayers' money. Our contributions to the strength of the Russian armies are mounting with each day. We shall continue to share with them our planes and tanks and ammunition; we shall share with them the very bread and butter and other foodstuffs we have in order to achieve our common purpose—the unconditional surrender of our enemies.

This is the only appropriate manner in which we can show our appreciation of her sacrifices; this is the only practical way in which we can give encouragement and inspiration to the men and women of Russia who are today bravely facing more than 200 savage Nazi divisions on the longest battle front ever known in history.

Two years ago yesterday the grains were ripening on the Russian fields, the meadows were green, and the cattle were grazing peacefully. That picture is still true in our own country, thank God. But it is no longer true in the Ukraine, in White Russia, in the Crimea, and in the northern stretches where the brutal forces of the invaders have laid waste to all that was once in bloom.

Our patriotic farmers have responded most enthusiastically to the call of the Russian War Relief Agency with generous contributions of seeds. It is estimated that this summer Russian farmers in the recaptured areas will raise about a million tons of food with seeds received from America. I am happy to say that a son of my own State of Montana, Dr. M. L. Wilson, of the United States Department of Agriculture, an American well known in Russia, is chairman of the emergency seed campaign committee.

It is indeed good for the Russians to know that they have genuine friends in America who are eager and willing to help them through this critical period of their history. Let us beware of those sinister elements which would create division and distrust of our ally because of differing economic and political ideologies. Time will take care of those differences. Let the present bond of friendship, born in the heat of battle against a common enemy, be strengthened so that we may sooner dispose of our enemies and remove from the human family these recurring tragedies. Russia is a great potential partner of the United States and Great Britain in laying a foundation for a just and lasting peace.

The peace and happiness of the world demands that we understand better our Russian allies. There are certain sinister voices whispering around us in America. They must be silenced. Periodic arrests of German agents and their dupes by our Government is an indication that a fifth column is still at work in our midst. The safety and security of our people demand that they be ferreted out and the unity within our Nation and within the family of the United Nations be maintained at the highest level possible.

Our Russian allies must have our fullest friendship and trust and aid, and we need theirs. A sound basis for this relationship

is being forged in this war. We know that our understanding and respect for the Russian people have grown greatly in the last 2 years. Let no one dare to hamper the growth of this long-neglected and much-needed friendship for our mutual benefit.

We Americans, who have always been quick to come to the aid of the needy, regardless of race, religion, or place of abode, will not forget the Russians after victory is won. We are proud of the relief our people had rendered to the Russian famine sufferers after the First World War. We are proud of the technical aid rendered by our engineers and scientists and workers in the industrialization of Russia prior to this war. Those efforts are now paying the cause of humanity good dividends. Without the technical knowledge acquired by the Russians and the great industries they established before the outbreak of the war in 1941, the Soviet Union would have been overrun by the Nazi legions long ago. England, too, might have fallen under German domination, and our own security and our own liberties might well have been in mortal jeopardy.

It is indeed fortunate that the Russian leaders had foreseen this catastrophe long before it began to assume alarming proportions following Hitler's rise to power. While the democracies were being lulled to sleep by Hitler's clever and unscrupulous propagandists, the Russians were more realistic. They were building tractors which could easily be converted into tanks for combat duty; they were building commercial planes which could be converted into bombers; they denied themselves many comforts and necessities of life in order to safeguard their country against designing aggressors. That foresight now stands us, too, in good stead.

It was Russia's great statesman and Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Maxim Litvinoff, who had repeatedly warned the democracies, from the platform of the League of Nations, that safety lies in collective security. The world ignored him and his Government. And now, the world is paying for that failure in blood and in accumulated treasures of past centuries.

We are duty-bound to avoid such mistakes in the future. We would be unworthy of the faith and trust reposed in our present generation by the men who are doing the fighting and the dying at the front, if we fail to learn from the sad blunders of the past.

Statesmen everywhere are now alive to the mistakes made by them or their predecessors in the international arena during recent decades. They are earnestly trying to devise instrumentalities which would avert future conflagrations.

The unanimous resolution, adopted by the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 15, 1943, a resolution calling for "the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein," is conclusive evidence that America too is fully awake to its duty and is determined to benefit by the sad lessons of the past.

This will prove heartening news for our Russian allies on the second anniversary of their struggle against her implacable and merciless Nazi foe. This will convince them that not only are we with them heart and soul in the present struggle against our common enemy, but that we will cooperate with them in the future to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies.

At the same time, it should serve to assure the people of Russia that in the peaceful world to follow the present conflict, our two nations will once more be able to release their great creative energies in the realms of art, science, industry and commerce, music and literature, and cooperate to the full to make the lives of our people richer, healthier and happier.

Although the battle still rages on the numerous fronts, the dawn of the happier days is already discernible. The day of victory is on the horizon.

I thank you.

Effects of Disposal of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able address made by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on the subject, Effects of Disposal of Surplus Property. This address was delivered at the thirty-first annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in New York before the National Chamber War Council, on April 29, 1943. I am certain that what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said will be found interesting by all who may have the opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Johnston, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very thankful for the remarks of Mr. Hoffman, your chairman, and if he were a candidate for office I would say even more flattering things about him.

If we wish to keep the safeguards, liberties, and the privileges which are guaranteed our people in our National Constitution, to maintain our system of private business and free enterprise, and adhere to our traditional American way of life there must be a keen understanding of, and a ready plan and purpose to deal with, those post-war problems which are beginning to loom on the domestic horizon.

POST-WAR PROBLEMS

What are these great problems which will confront the Nation when the last shot is fired in this tragic war? Here they are:

1. Of the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, approximately 9,000,000 will be discharged and will be hunting for positions in private employment. To these 9,000,000 must be added the major part of the 20,000,000 workers in the war plants, most of whom will be laid off overnight. They, together with the returning soldiers, will make a temporary unemployed army of between twenty and twenty-five millions of persons now employed.

2. The national debt will likely be $250,000,000,000. That is $7,500 a family. The total assessed value of all property in the United States is approximately $140,000,000,000. Thus, the national debt will be nearly twice as large as the assessed value of all property in this country.

3. It is estimated that in June 1944 the total bank resources of our Nation will be $160,000,000,000. Seventy percent of these resources, or about $112,000,000,000, will then be invested in the bonds of our National Government. The capital assets of all our banks are estimated at $8,000,000,000. A decline of eight points in our National Government bonds would entirely wipe out the capital assets of all the Nation's banks.

4. There will be about $75,000,000,000 worth of outstanding governmental war contracts. These will be canceled overnight. That is 10 times the amount of the outstanding war contracts that existed at the end of World War No. 1. Until these outstanding war contracts are negotiated, adjusted, and settled, hundreds of business institutions will be unable to go ahead. They will not know where they stand. It will be difficult for them to borrow until the lending agencies know what the financial position of these companies is with their unsettled war contracts.

It seems apparent to me that businessmen will have a very difficult time in the post-war effort unless these contracts are promptly settled and fairly settled by our Government, for until they are settled, obviously, businessmen will have a hard time to borrow money from private sources, because private banking institutions will feel that until these contracts are settled they cannot tell with any degree of certainty what the financial position of the applicant for a loan is likely to be.

5. It is estimated that on the date of the armistice the National Government will own $60,000,000,000 worth of materials ranging all the way from ships to machine tools, hotels, shoes, munitions, food, clothing, trucks and hundreds of other items too numerous to mention. Much of these materials the Government will no longer need. The fact that the Government has them and will likely sell them from time to time will hang over the domestic market, create uncertainty, and tend to depress the revival of private business.

6. During the war the National Government has acquired vast amounts of land. It now owns about 47,000 square miles. This is little short of the entire area of the six New England States. The Government will no longer need all of this land. Such land as it does not need will have to be resold.

On the brighter side of our post-war picture, there is the back-log of the unfilled needs of the masses of people for automobiles and tires and gasoline, refrigerators, furniture, clothing, shoes, farm machinery, utensils, railway equipment, housing, and many other articles which it has not been possible for our people to get during war times.

The above, the good and the bad, is an outline of the reasons for our post-war action on the day following the cessation of hostilities.

I agree thoroughly with the remarks of your chairman, who quoted an economist who said that the manner and the speed and the justice with which these post-war problems are dealt with by our National Government will determine the pattern o the United States for the next 20 years in our domestic economy field. We must prepare to solve every one of these problems, not when the war is over, but now.

We must prepare to meet each and every one of these problems, not when the war is over, but now. The whole machinery of orderly and noncompetitive liquidation must be made ready during the war, and the vast work of directing the country from a war to a peace economy must start as suddenly as war itself usually starts.

Everyone in this Nation has a gigantic stake in this whole endeavor. Every manufacturer, every industrial worker, miner, and farmer, every white collar worker—indeed, every citizen in this Republic will experience depression or prosperity according to our ability to deal speedily and successfully with every one of these great problems.

GOVERNMENT'S JOB

What must our National Government do in order to discharge its part in the peacetime rehabilitation of the public life of our Nation, so that the channels of trade may be as free as as humanly possible, so that business may go ahead with a certainty of what future gov-

ernmental policy will be, so that the twenty or twenty-five million unemployed following the armistice may find positions again in private industry at good pay, and so be able to provide for themselves and their families.

Here are the things that Government must do before the war is over:

1. It must set up a liquidating agency, which will study all the factors and plan to resell that part of the national domain which our Government will no longer need.

2. It must set up another liquidating agency to sell, in an orderly fashion and with a minimum interference to private business, the $60,000,000,000 worth of varied materials which the Government now owns. Some of these things, like clothing, shoes, and food, can be utilized by our Government to soften the hardships of the unemployed until private industry can offer them employment. This will lessen any increases in the national debt in taking care of the unemployed during the transition period. Much, however, of the remaining material can only be sold in competition with private business which will then be struggling to readjust itself to our peacetime economy. Some hardship to business cannot be escaped, but a wise liquidation of the vast holdings of Government-owned materials should reduce this hardship to its irreducible minimum and should not seriously impair operations for production and for work.

3. We must have another governmental agency set up with its plans ready to go to work at once in settling the $75,000,000,000 of canceled war contracts. This will be one of the most delicate and important functions of the post-war operations of our National Government. Until these contracts are settled there is bound to be an atmosphere of uncertainty, rumor, hardship, and even suspicion. The Government has a tremendous investment in and ownership of many of the plants with which it has made contracts. Our object should be to get the Government out of these plants and out of private business at the earliest possible moment. Unless these war contracts are settled equitably and speedily, many businesses, already in debt to the National Government for plant expansion, will be unable to borrow from private sources during the transition period. They will look to the Government for additional capital with which to carry on. If that should happen, the Government will get more deeply into private business than it is. This would be unfortunate. It might conceivably change our entire traditional policy. Unless wisely tackled and administered, this problem might not only put the Government farther into business than it now is, but could lead to a governmental totalitarian economic status. After the last war it took 3 years to adjust many of the $7,500,000,000 of canceled war contracts. With that experience behind us, there is no sound reason why each one of these contracts cannot be satisfactorily adjusted within a year after hostilities cease. That can only be done if we plan to do it now while the war is still going on.

4. It is not unlikely that the National Government will have to take some measures to deal with unemployment during the transition period. Most States, cities, and counties have reduced their indebtedness in recent years. The contribution of the Federal Government toward unemployment should be less than it has been in the past. The contribution by local government hereafter should be greater in view of the changing debt status of the Nation and the local governments. Moreover, every large city and many of our States should now be looking into projects, such as roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, sewers and water supply, and the like, as a part of this unemployment program. The things built should be useful things—things so far as possible which the local governments would have to build anyway. There should be as little waste of manpower in this program as is possible.

5. The President and the Congress, through the medium of national laws, should announce to the people of the country that its primary post-war objective is the complete withdrawal of Government from private business and that all governmental measures will be directed toward the complete and speedy restoration of our system of private enterprise as we have known it in this great Nation.

As in the past this will at least declare our national policy and give some encouragement and assurance to businessmen who will be struggling to readjust themselves.

POST-WAR SURPLUSES

Now, to deal specifically with the estimated $60,000,000,000 worth of materials which the Government will own; let us see how that can be treated in general outline. It should be broken down in the following categories:

1. Those things which the Government has acquired during the war which the Government still needs, such as some critical materials, munitions, and supplies for our armed forces, office space for regular peacetime operations, and the like. These things can be removed from the list of materials remaining to be disposed of.

2. Those things which the Government now owns but which can be sold back to private concerns without depressing private enterprise. In this category would be hotels, office buildings, some aircraft, shipways, synthetic rubber plants, war chemical establishments, some machine tools and machinery, and the like.

3. There will be the quantities of materials which cannot be disposed of by the Government except in direct competition with private business which will be producing in whole or in part the same thing. Here is where good judgment must prevail. There should be representatives on this Government liquidating board of concerns that are producing the things the Government is selling so as to feed these things back into the market with as little hardship to private business as is humanly possible. This is going to be a delicate operation. It will require time. Everything the Government sells will, to some extent, depress employment. Business, the workingman, and the farmer will all be affected, favorably or adversely, depending on the wisdom with which this program is carried out. There will be a paradox of administration. On the one hand the Government should dispose of all these materials at the earliest possible moment. On the other hand, it should dispose of them only as it can do so with the minimum of competition with private producers of the same articles.

4. By national law the administration then in power should declare that the proceeds and receipts from the disposal of all properties owned by Government should be applied to reducing our national debt and for no other purpose whatsoever. If this is done not only can the national debt be reduced in the post-war years many, many billions of dollars, but by this reduction our reduced national income, certain to follow the close of the war, will offer the best prospect of keeping the finances of the National Government in a sound, healthy condition, a treatment which would not be out of place, I assure you.

5. And finally, of transcending importance, we should provide either by constitutional amendment or otherwise, that in times of peace the Congress of the United States cannot spend more money than it takes in in any one year without providing for increased taxes to completely wipe out such annual deficit within a period of not more than 20 years from the time the deficit is created.

CONTROL OF DEFICITS

You cannot continue to run this Government, or any other business in the world, on borrowed money, living on the future. That is the path of ruin. Deficits should not be permitted in peacetime unless taxes are provided which, when collected in the future, will wipe out such deficits. That is the easiest way, in the long run. The other way is the hard and ruinous way, in the long run.

This policy should have been adopted long ago. From 1930 to 1940 the National Government spent $27,000,000,000 more than it took in, an annual deficit of $2,700,000,000 a year. In the early thirties this was understandable. In the late thirties it was shortsighted. Now, in the face of all our other war debts we must pay off this $27,000,000,000 of national debt incurred from 1930 to 1940.

And do not suppose that this $27,000,000,000 national debt from 1930 to 1940 was caused by preparations for war. For the 10 years from 1930 to 1940 the entire cost of our Army and Navy, in every particular, amounted to only $11,000,000,000 for the 10-year period. Thus, if we subtract the total cost of the Army and Navy during this period, which was $11,000,000,000, from the $27,000,000,000 of national debt incurred during these same years we see that the Government spent $16,000,000,000 more than it took in during this 10-year period, without a single penny of this sixteen billion remaining being spent in any respect for our Army or Navy for preparedness.

A pay-as-you-go policy must be adopted if we are to have business security in this Nation.

This policy should stop, and must stop completely if our constitutional system and our traditional private business enterprises are to endure. There is no other solution. This country must be put on a pay-as-you-go basis, and when borrowings are necessary there must be the taxes accompanying said borrowings which will pay them off in a period of not more than 20 years in peacetime.

A SUGGESTION TO BUSINESS

Now, a respectful suggestion to the United States Chamber of Commerce: If you find yourself in general agreement with the conditions I have outlined, if you feel that my humble suggestions are worthy of your consideration and action in the main, then do not wait for the President and the Congress to make these matters effective. Do it yourself. Create committees out of your own membership now. Prepare your policies and plans now and have them introduced in the Congress for consideration and study and for appropriate action thereafter. Congress is busily engaged, in the main, with the war. It does not have, and cannot have, the clear understanding, the wealth of detailed information, which many of you gentlemen have concerning the matters which I have discussed. It is imperative, not only in your interests but in the interest of every working man and woman, every farmer and urban dweller in the land that you gentlemen make suggestions to the National Legislature now for the appropriate consideration of our post-war problems.

I believe your suggestions will be sympathetically received. We can have hearings on the suggestions you make. We can perfect these tentative laws to do the job which lies ahead. We can set up the liquidating agencies so they can be studying these problems and so they will be in a position to act the minute the war is over.

By doing so, we can help to save the constitutional system which we love. We can give to private enterprise its greatest opportunity. We can cut the army of unemployed to the minimum. We can have the smallest measure conceivable of Government interference with business. We can furnish the greatest market for the products of the plants, the mines, the forests, and the farms. We can keep down the national debt. We can provide the greatest volume of governmental income. We can the more speedily reduce the

national debt. In a word, we can save in all of its great glory and historical beneficence the traditional America we love, and keep it in the highest place among the nations of the world. Only by doing these things can our Government and you, the leaders of business, aid best our fellow men, keep the door of opportunity open to all, and say to the returning soldiers and sailors, who come back from the battle fronts: "Here is the America you went forth to defend, basically unchanged, basically strong, with its Government as the servant and not the master of the people, with a fair chance for youth to climb the ladder of success, prosperity, and contentment, as millions of Americans have been climbing it ever since our constitutional form of government was adopted by the Thirteen Original States."

Let us resolve here and now not to shrink from any of these looming difficulties, but to go forth in the firm faith that we can and we shall overcome them, that we who stay at home shall keep the faith during the war, and that we will keep it faithfully thereafter.

Address of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Republican Women of Appleton, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the able junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] before a breakfast meeting of Republican women, at the Hotel Conway, at Appleton, Wis., on June 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, fellow Americans, there is no group I would rather address than a group of American women. You are the wives, the sweethearts, and the mothers of our fighting men on the home front and on the battle front.

Your stake is the greatest stake in the war. This war means the survival or the annihilation of everything you hold near and dear.

The bright-eyed youngsters who once looked up from their cribs at you—they are fighting for us. The home you made for your family may be sadly empty today.

The decent God-fearing self-respecting virtues for which American womankind has always fought, are being ravaged elsewhere. Decency is despoiled in other lands where the sanctity of the home and the sacredness of motherhood and the family are only a hollow mockery in the bloody torch-lit shambles of ravished ideals.

Here in Appleton, this beautiful city of homes, it is particularly appropriate for us to think on these things. My four children attended Lawrence College in this city and my daughters are now grown women. All I ask of life for them is that their children have preserved for them the same opportunities and the same great values which have always marked our land.

Politics has been defined as the science of government. All through history women have been a tremendous influence in the nations—giving direction to government. It was Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, who secured from King David the kingdom of Israel for Solomon. It was the Queen who brought Daniel to King Nebuchadnezzar to interpret the dream that the King had had.

At no time in American history has the American woman been confronted with as great a challenge as today. Manpower is moving onto the battle fronts and women are taking over more and more of the load not only in factories but in the home.

In the days that are up ahead, the women of America will be great interpreters. They will have in their hands (for probably eleven or twelve million of our boys will be temporarily disfranchised because of their being in service) the destiny of this great Nation. Their votes in November 1944 will be the decisive factor.

In the tremendously important position that you now hold and will hold, I am sure that you women will play your part well. The most important quality for a man or woman to possess in any position is mental poise—judgment.

History, I am sure, will pay high tribute to the pioneer courage and the resourcefulness of the women of this day.

I am reminded of an incident that occurred in my office several years ago. A friend came in to see me and he was obliged to remain in the outer office for a while because I had others already in my office to talk with first. When he did come in, he said: "How can you sit there so calmly?" I said to him, "You remember, of course, Abraham Lincoln * * *," and before I could finish my sentence he said: "No; I never knew the gentleman. What has that to do with being calm?"

I replied that when Lincoln lived in this man's town he was confronted for many months with a condition of affairs that contributed to a lack of poise in many people. In fact, his own Cabinet members were so filled with fear that when he would appear at the meetings he would see his associates with knitted brows and absolutely unfit to meet the situation. What did he do then? He would tell a funny story. Sometimes there was a punch in it and he would seek to make the minds of his Cabinet members function smoothly. His story would cause them to laugh and they would find release for their taut muscles and their inoperative brains.

Lincoln had another safety valve besides that of humor—that of faith and prayer. He said that when he knew of no other place to go, he would go to his knees. He sensed that there was direction and guidance in an ever-available God if man sought Him out. Lincoln had a third safety valve—he returned good for evil and he had faith in the destiny of his country and in the common man.

I then took my friend to the window and showed him a view that I look at daily. I pointed out to him the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and beyond that, across the Potomac, the Lee-Custis home where General Lee lived before he took command of the armies of Virginia; I pointed out, to the northwest, the cathedral where lie the bodies of President Wilson, Admiral Dewey, and other famous admirals. And I said that these sights brought to my mind the saying of an ancient philosopher who said, "This, too, will pass."

"Yes," I continued, "time solves many problems, and the worries and problems of the present will become like the worries and the problems of these great men whose monuments we here observe. And the other thought that comes to my mind," I said, "is out of the Book of Books—'The battle is not yours but the Lord's.'"

As I quoted the last, my friend said, "Alex, the devil himself can quote the Scripture," and I could see the humor return to his eyes and with that sense of humor he was calm again. He had come to Washington and had been given the merry-go-round or the ring-a-round and had gotten nowhere, and he was very much agitated and upset. But in getting into that condition he had made himself unfit to solve the very problem for which he was seeking a solution.

This incident illustrates the situation about which we must all be very careful. With the tremendous impacts upon all of us—with the changed conditions that have come into our personal life, into our economic life, our family life, and our national life, if we are wise we will maintain our balance and reach out for the solutions to the problems that are here.

I could speak to you specifically of many problems—domestic and international—our enormous expenditures, over a hundred billion a year; the muddled and critical food problem—feeding our forces, our allies, ourselves, and our stock; our extended bureaus with their incompetency; the threat of inflation; our manpower problem involving the farms and the food plants; our tax problem; strikes; lavish spending of our natural resources like oil and minerals; our transportation problem at home and abroad; meeting the requirements of our allies; planning on the home front for the impact of victory, involving reconversion of our whole economy and life to peacetime pursuits and providing shock absorbers needed; seeking the way to meet the obligation that will be ours when peace comes as a leading nation of the earth—defining a world policy.

I could speak to you of mistakes and misplanning and the lack of planning, but in this swift-moving world I haven't time for that. It is true that the past is prologue, but our job is to make the present a greater prologue to a greater future.

Over against these mistakes and the lack of planning in the past, we can register much that is constructive and worth while. I enumerate from such a magnificent production record—a miracle; a united people dedicated to victory; many efficient public servants rendering yeoman service; the best fighting forces in the world, with the best equipment; a nation made safe on land and sea and air; a nation filled with an awareness of its responsibility; the highest standard of living still unimpaired; a national income near $135,000,000,000 a year.

We have much, my friends, for which to be grateful. A changed world demands a changed outlook and a new appraisal of our individual and our national position in the world.

The future of the Nation and of the world is in the hands of America. We face it confidently. Our boys on all the continents and seas of the earth are facing their duty with courage, sacrifice, and wisdom, hoping and praying that this generation will have the vision to bring about a peace that will mean doing away with war for all time to come. Those boys and ourselves are jointly engaged in destroying tyranny and it is our hope that peoples in all lands will attain freedom and that nations will be able to find the ways and means to enforce peace and settle by methods of peace the disputes which would otherwise be determined by war.

In my opinion this does not mean that nations will now attempt to form a superstate. It does mean that the nations who have a common purpose and are like-minded will unite for collective security.

This war will not change human nature. Human beings will have to undertake a crusade in church, in school, and in the home that will result in setting the things of the spirit above material values, placing right above mere self-interest, and starting a march in the direction of the regeneration of mankind.

All of us here were born free, possessing the great values of American citizenship, and it was difficult for us to believe that those freedoms could be lost, but when we saw

peoples who had lived in freedom as we had—saw them shackled and enslaved—then we became aware of the fact that eternal vigilance is the price of the maintenance of liberty.

We are awake from our apathy, but we must make sure now that while we are alert and while we are worsening the enemy we do not permit, because of the tremendous internal and external problems, discouragement and the sense of futility to enter into our souls. With the aid of Him who is ever present to aid, we can down these enemies of peace and happiness.

This is the Sabbath. To get rid of any sense of defeatism, of any sense of hopelessness or helplessness, or any sense of discouragement, let us follow the injunction that we were taught as children: "Put on the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit."

Out of these critical times, these challenging times, these world-racking times, I believe there will come a new dignity to the individual and to this beloved country. Men and nations grow through overcoming limitations and solving problems. Out of this war period we are learning the lesson of cooperation. Labor and management have done a tremendous job in that direction. Nations are cooperating as they never have before. I refer, of course, to the United Nations. They are getting rid of those forces which would nullify man's efforts to learn the art of living and working together. They are getting rid of bigotry and misunderstanding and jealousy. Yes, we are learning through the hard course in war to work together. We must not lose that learning when peace comes. United, we must face the problems of peace and find the way to get rid of war.

If we do that, we will not only rebuild a new world enlarging the opportunities of mankind to produce and enjoy new wealth, but life itself will expand and it will have new meaning.

Learn to cooperate is the call that comes to all of us—to labor and management, to farm and city folk, to young and old, and to nations.

The right kind of thinking will bring about the right kind of politics—science of government—which will result in the creation of jobs, of new wealth and healthy communities where industry, enterprise, and virtue dwell.

The O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 16, 1943, headed "In Fairness to O. P. A."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

IN FAIRNESS TO O. P. A.

Mr. Roosevelt yesterday defended the Office of Price Administration, and said flatly he had no intention of taking away its food-pricing function. This is opportune, since Office of Price Administration lately seems to have become a favorite whipping boy of virtually all comers.

Even if it worked perfectly, the agency would not be popular; and if very many people ever got around to liking it that would probably be a good sign that it was doing its job very badly indeed.

It will harm no one, however, to give this ugly duckling of public administration its due. All of us depend on Office of Price Administration, desperately. It is all we have to perform a task so large as to bog down the imagination. We look to it to keep us from depriving the armed forces of any food and supplies, and to save us from being swamped by rising prices.

A great deal is heard of black markets, violations of gasoline rationing, spiraling prices of foodstuffs, and other points of failure. It should be remembered that there are also many points of success, and that so far they outnumber the failures markedly.

Gasoline rationing is saving tremendous amounts of vital rubber and fuel. Most markets are white markets, where regulations are observed and controls are functioning smoothly. Rent control is working reasonably well, and has earned the inarticulate but sincere gratitude of the people. Food price controls, unsatisfactory as they are, have put a brake upon inflation, provided a measure of protection for the housewife's purse and saved billions of dollars, reflected in tax savings to the public, for the largest food purchasers of all—the Army, the Navy, and lend-lease.

In view of the magnitude of the task and the obstacles that have been put in the way, the remarkable fact is that Office of Price Administration has not made more mistakes, that it has been able to achieve so much.

Office of Price Administration is seriously handicapped by a shortage of investigators and enforcement agents. It must depend to a large extent upon volunteers, many of them untrained. Large staffs worked day and night, with no compensation for extra work over 48 hours a week, to prepare the recent lists of ceiling prices on foodstuffs.

Our country has never before had to do anything like what Office of Price Administration is having to do now. By contrast with the present system, rationing in the United States in the First World War was of small consequence. So far, Office of Price Administration has done a pretty good job, all told—has done, in fact, much more for the public than the public has done to uphold Office of Price Administration's hands and increase its effectiveness.

Public Opinion Polls Support Post-War Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD polls from various sources endorsing an expanded social-security program for post-war America.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of June 20, 1943]

UNITED STATES PUBLIC BACKS SOCIAL SECURITY GOAL

DENVER, June 19.—While Congress considers the American Beveridge plan, providing for cradle-to-grave social security, a large majority of the American public expects there will always be some poverty in the United States, a national opinion research center survey shows.

"Exactly 84 percent of a typical national cross section believe there will always be people in the United States who do not have the kind of food, clothing, and housing they need," said Harry H. Field, director of the center. "One percent qualify their answers, 12 percent think poverty will be completely eliminated, and only 3 percent voice no opinion."

SECURITY FAVORED

The same survey indicated, however, that the public is in favor of the principle of social security. Ninety-four percent of the cross section approved the old-age insurance provision of the present law, 84 percent favored the unemployment insurance provisions, and 85 percent would favor similar legislation to cover health insurance.

Strong majorities also favored extension of social security to cover all workers in all occupations—a proposal similar to that provided in a bill before Congress. Eighty-one percent believed that old-age protection should be universal, and 74 percent took this view on unemployment insurance.

OPINIONS DIFFER

Sharpest differences in opinion on the subject of social security occur between new dealers and the anti-new dealers. On every point involving the need for social security and its extension the New Deal group favored the proposals by a very substantial majority. The anti-New Deal group favored the measures by smaller but still significant majorities.

For the purposes of the survey persons who voted for President Roosevelt in 1940, said they approved the New Deal before the war and wanted more Government control of business after the war are termed new dealers. Persons who voted for Wendell Willkie, disapproved of the New Deal before the war and want less Government control of business, are called anti-new dealers for the analysis.

A summary of the results follows:

"Question. It has been said that there will always be people in the United States who do not have the kind of food, clothing, and housing they need. Do you think there always will be or not?"

	Total	New dealers	Anti-New dealers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Will be	84	80	93
Qualified answer	1	3	1
Will not be	12	16	4
No opinion	3	1	2
	100	100	100

"Question. As you may know, under the present social security law, workers in certain occupations have to save money so when they are too old to work they will receive money from the Government, like insurance.

Do you think this is a good idea or a bad idea?"

	Total	New dealers	Anti-New dealers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Good idea	94	98	88
Qualified answer	1	(*)	1
Bad idea	3	1	9
No opinion	2	1	2
	100	100	100

(If "good idea" to previous question:) "Do you think this plan should cover all workers in all occupations or not?"

	Total	New dealers	Anti-New dealers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	81	91	70
Qualified answer	(*)	----------	(*)
No	10	6	15
No opinion	3	1	3
	94	98	88

Question: "The social security law also requires some workers to save money so they will get money from the Government in case they lose their jobs. Do you think this is a good idea or a bad one?"

	Total	New dealers	Anti-New dealers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Good idea	84	93	73
Qualified answer	4	1	6
Bad idea	8	4	18
No opinion	4	2	3
	100	100	100

(If "good idea" to previous question:) "Do you think this plan should cover all workers in all occupations or not?"

	Total	New dealers	Anti-New dealers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	74	87	59
No	7	5	11
No opinion	3	1	3
	84	93	73

Question. "Do you think there should be a plan like this to take care of working people while they are sick?"

	Total	New dealers	Anti-New dealers
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	85	91	73
Qualified answer	2	2	3
No	10	6	22
No opinion	3	1	2
	100	100	100

The survey sampled a typical miniature of the population of the United States, with the proper proportion of rich and poor, young and old, men and women, and various minority groups.

[From Woman's Home Companion of June 1943]

WHAT PRICE SECURITY?

(By Anne Maxwell)

President Roosevelt's proposed "cradle to the grave" social security plan—similar to the much-discussed Beveridge plan for England—raises two important questions: Do Americans want such a plan? How much would they be willing to pay to carry it out?

Our reader reporters have given us their answers to these questions. And because our reader reporters represent a cross-section of all of our readers—they were selected to be representative—we can accept their answers as an approximation of what most Companion readers think today. That is:

"They are for the President's plan."

"But it must not cost too much."

The reader-reporter majority in favor of the plan could hardly be described as overwhelming, however. The margin was too slight for that. And from the tone of the minority's comment, we foresee many hot arguments before the questions are settled. Here are the specific questions we asked, the results and some reader-reporter comments:

ARE YOU FOR OR AGAINST THE IDEA OF AN EXPANDED FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY LAW TO PROVIDE FOR ALL EMERGENCY FINANCIAL NEEDS FROM "THE CRADLE TO THE GRAVE"?

Fifty-six percent of our reader-reporters said "Yes," 39 percent said "No," and 5 percent didn't know or wouldn't answer.

That's the straight result. We had an opportunity to make an interesting analysis of the answers on political lines because of a poll we took recently to see how many of our reader-reporters were Roosevelt supporters, how many were for Willkie in 1940. The same reader-reporters were questioned on the security law. Comparing the two results we found that 72 percent of Roosevelt's 1940 friends were for the plan, only 44 percent of Willkie's.

Another interesting way of looking at the answers is to consider the financial status of the voters, their age and where they live. Most in the middle income group were in favor of the plan. Most of those who make $5,000 a year or more were against it. The young were enthusiastic, 66 percent said "Yes," as against the "No" of 53 percent of the women over 45. Voters who live in the Eastern and Northern States were lukewarm; those in the Southern and Western States were favorable. In fact, the West was enthusiastic—63 percent said "Yes."

Those in favor of the expanded Social Security law gave as their chief reason the belief that it would mean insurance against poverty. A frequent observation was: "There should be forced saving as so few people ever give the thought of the future any consideration."

Many voted "Yes, with reservations." Namely: The plan should not be so extensive as to destroy all ambition; it should be properly handled and administered without graft. These voters also would like some assurance that the money would not be spent for something else; want it kept separate from other governmental expenses.

And they want benefits effective immediately. One reader-reporter said: "A good idea if the payment would be immediate. The need for extra money is often desperate as in cases of sickness, accidents, or death."

Further comments: "Am in favor of this if it applies to all workers of every class and a sane government is in control." * * * "This is the sort of post-war planning that makes the war doubly worth fighting for." * * * "Approve for educational purposes only." * * * "Freedom from want, freedom from fear are worth paying for."

Those who are against such a law are ag'in it hard. They show a lack of trust in use of moneys already controlled by the Government; they have no faith in the way present social security is run and resent having the Government control their insurance. * * * "I want to be a part of the Government, not a ward of it."

Some against the law were, however, for compulsory insurance—maybe. But again, please no Government control. Many thought that insurance companies would be able to take care of the problem. "Almost everyone has his own insurance and is able to meet his obligations. Roosevelt is just looking for more money for the Government's pocket."

This law would be a threat to incentive and thriftiness, say many of the women. "Roosevelt's administration has done more to help the lazy and tax the thrifty than is good for any government." * * * "While security is comforting it is enervating and offers no incentive to thrift and foresightedness."

More comment from those not favorable: It tends toward socialism or communism. Some said fascism. Farmers and civil and State employees would not benefit or be covered by this plan. It offers an opportunity for graft and the evil doings of politicians. There's too much taken out of salary already; too much red tape. A wish for less Government control, especially by present administration, was prevalent on both sides of the fence, as a matter of fact.

Other ag'inners: "This would be just another 'pork barrel' for the bureaucrats—more Government employees living off the taxpayers' money." * * * "If any more deductions are taken from salaries at present they should be for more Victory tax. We need to win this war." * * * "I was always taught that security was something you worked for. Now I find you just vote for it!"

WHAT WOULD BE THE LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF YOUR INCOME YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO DEVOTE TO SUCH BENEFITS?

Seventeen percent of Roosevelt's admirers are willing to devote 10 percent of their income to this plan. "The greater percentage the greater the benefits." But the largest group of women (44 percent) feel that 5 percent is sufficient. They said they would like to give more if possible but with so many deductions now they feel 5 percent would be fair for everyone. Perhaps more after the war.

"The amount of income devoted would depend upon the benefits to be received." * * * "Why not continue the 5 percent Victory tax after the war for this purpose?"

[From Fortune magazine of July 1942]

EXCEPT FROM THE FORTUNE SURVEY

To provide which of the following things do you think the Federal Government should and should not collect enough taxes after the war?

	Should	Should not	Don't know
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Medical care for everyone who needs it	74.3	21.0	4.7
An old-age pension for every citizen over 65	73.8	21.7	4.5
Jobs for everyone who is able and willing to work but cannot get a job in private employment	67.7	25.2	7.1
Compensation for everyone unable to find work until he can find work	57.8	34.4	7.8

On the first 3 propositions there is not a single dissenting majority in any income or occupational group or section of the country. On the fourth—a Federal job insurance—only executives, the prosperous, and the upper middle class object, by majorities of 54.5, 53.6, and 50.4 percent, respectively.

Dangers in Anti-Inflation Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Haney Cites Dangers in Anti-Inflation Drive" written by Lewis Haney, professor of economics in the New York University, and published in the New York Journal-American of Tuesday, June 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANEY CITES DANGERS IN ANTI-INFLATION DRIVE

Last week I analyzed the battle now going on between the anti inflationists and the inflationists. I showed that they differ merely in the way they would deal with the growth of inflation, the antis, led by Mr. Roosevelt, seeking to use the inflation scare as a basis for fixing upon us a completely managed economy.

The arguments of Roosevelt, Byrnes, Brown, and Eccles are that by fighting inflation by Office of Price Administration methods they can (1) reduce the cost of the war, (2) keep fixed incomes from suffering, and (3) prevent an eventual deflationary crash.

If they could and would really stop further inflation, these arguments would be good. But they do not propose to stop inflation. What they propose is to keep right on borrowing and spending, merely adding Government subsidies to the bill. They are not interested in the relatively few people with fixed incomes, but concentrate on keeping wages up by gearing them to the cost of living.

What they want is a completely managed economy. To this end they would destroy the price system of free markets by the roll-back and subsidy scheme, with all its great cost, bureaucracy, and political abuse. This scheme would be rigid and arbitrary. It would deprive us of the advantage of incentive pay and automatic adjustments between demand and supply.

It would be used to destroy individual saving and private investment.

In short, the anti-inflationists would plunge us into an immediate and lasting deflation of democracy and private enterprise.

On the other hand, the defenders of inflation want to retain the price system, and allow an automatic stimulation of production and adjustment of consumption.

This would be democratic and call for no bureaucracy. They would allow a free coordination of commodity markets, money markets, and investment markets.

As to the costs of the war, they say that we might as well use the excess currency and bank deposits already created. And they argue correctly that what is really needed is economy in production and consumption. They would at least save the waste of Government subsidies.

The danger in the inflationist case is that it may be pushed too far in the way of laissez faire. It might let extreme maladjustments develop that would cause a deflationary crash eventually.

Thus the true solution, as usual, lies in between the two extremes. The inflationists are right in their criticism of the Office of Price Administration, and the scheme to manage the economy under the guise of fighting inflation. They are right, too, in proposing to keep prices in line with the value of money, which just now would mean a higher price average.

But the first step in solving the Nation's problem should be to stop any further inflation beyond what is absolutely needed for war purposes. We should recognize the existing inflation and let prices become adjusted to the depreciated currency. But we should return to sound money and credit policies, so as not to add to the existing inflation.

And everything possible should be done to keep markets open and free from manipulation, so as to hasten automatic adjustments among different prices, and between wages and prices.

We don't want more inflation than we already have. But above all, we don't want any more "managed economy" or "social planning," and the anti-inflation racket must not be used to fool the people.

Subsidies Are Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from today's Washington News entitled "Subsidies Are Inflation."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIES ARE INFLATION

What is the basic reason for the threat of inflation? The fact that the Government is spending so much borrowed money.

How does the administration propose to deal with high food prices, which are one symptom of inflation? By spending some more borrowed money in subsidies to roll back the prices.

Does this plan have merit? It has political merit, for the big labor organizations are demanding these subsidies.

Will the subsidies really reduce prices? No, but the Government will be paying part of everybody's grocery bill and putting the cost on the cuff to be repaid, with interest, by everybody later on.

If the Government pays part of everybody's grocery bill, won't everybody have that much more money to spend now? Yes.

Will the subsidies create more groceries for everybody to buy? No.

But doesn't the administration contend that prices are being forced up because the public has too much spending power at a time when the supply of merchandise that can be bought by the public is sharply restricted? It does.

Won't such subsidies add to the threat of inflation? Yes, to the extent that they increase surplus spending power.

Then, isn't the administration's subsidy policy inconsistent with the administration's professed desire to prevent inflation? Yes, but by this time inconsistent administration policies oughtn't to surprise anybody.

Our Appalling Manpower Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Appalling Manpower Waste," from the Christian Science Monitor of June 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR APPALLING MANPOWER WASTE

(By Millard B. Holland)

We are wasting at least a billion man-hours a year in our war industries. It may well be two, three, or even four billion man-hours. Let me tell you my experience as a ship worker. Then judge for yourself if my startling estimate isn't really a gross understatement.

And remember, please, that a billion hours of manpower will build 596 destroyers or 961 submarines. What wouldn't we give for a third of these in the Battle of the Atlantic.

And remember also, please, that this year we expect to have 20,000,000 persons in war work. Even if everyone of these workers wastes as little as an hour a day, on a 300-day-a-year basis the waste would be billions of man-hours. Enough to sweep the seas of every German submarine, enough to sink the entire Japanese fleet.

And now let me tell you how, on the average, we war workers waste far more than an hour apiece a day.

Yesterday 6 husky Negroes slowly pushed a heavy cart into the shop where I was working and laboriously proceeded to unload its fantastically light freight for me to coat with aluminum paint—28 thin strips of metal—each 10 inches long and 1 inch wide. It took these 6 men 20 minutes to unload this absurdly trifling cargo, and 20 minutes more before they slowly and industriously began to push their cart back to the building they came from—a distance no more than 10 paces. At the gait they were going, it surely must have taken them another 20 minutes to load their cart before bringing it over to me. I could have stepped across to their building, loaded this metal on one arm, and returned in 5 minutes. It took these 6 men each an hour. That manpower waste cost the yard (and hence the Government) $5.22, for their rate is 87 cents an hour.

Last week I had to clean and paint a number of weldings in manholes cut out of steel plates. These steel plates were small, about 4 by 4 feet, and were not very heavy, as steel plates go; moreover, they were resting in V-shaped racks, which made it easy to turn them over. Nevertheless, a Negro laborer was assigned as a helper to turn them over for me. So every half hour he turned one over as I finished it, and then he waited patiently another half hour until I had the next one ready for him. I didn't need him to turn over that metal any more than you need someone to turn the pages of a book. I could have used him to help clean the plates. But that would have entitled him to a higher rate of pay—a skilled craftsman's rate—and so he was forced to be idle. He "helped" me for 3 days, at a sheer waste of 24 man-hours and $20.88. Yet this "helper" and the six

Negroes who manned the cart all professed their willingness to work. There simply wasn't enough work to keep them busy. They could do nothing else but stall.

It is a common sight in our yard to see six or eight Negro laborers idle nearly all day waiting for something to do. Our white crane crews read papers or doze by the hour. Welders are in a class by themselves. They are mostly young, independent, undisciplined by long application to work, and much in demand. Any number of them make no pretense of working, with all sorts of work for them at hand. On board the ships they rest even more. For there are endless places in the bowels of our great ships difficult of access and where vigilant supervision is next to impossible. In our many shops, such as our electric shop, pipe shop, copper shop, tin shop, there is a leisurely stride unknown in outside industries. I have heard many men say they didn't do a tap all day long. Some say it with a grin, others with chagrin. That man surely would be an optimist who affirmed that in our yard over the year we all averaged 6 hours' good work a day.

Nor is our yard different from other shipyards or other defense work. I have a friend, a master mason, who helped in the erection of a magnesium plant. He and his fellows had a special large costly brick to lay; if my memory serves me right, each brick cost $7. He could lay one of these large bricks every 20 minutes. The spirit of the place—or the lack of it—decreed that one should be laid every 2 hours. For this "work" he was paid over $100 a week. Being a man of character and restless energy, he quit and took a lesser job in another defense plant. Here he had so little to do that he took, in addition, another job elsewhere to keep busy. So now he has a swing shift by night in defense work and another job in nondefense by day. Holding two jobs, one in defense work where the task is light or inconsequential, and another in nondefense work, is becoming no uncommon thing.

The management blames the men for this almost universal stalling, and the men blame the management for not laying out enough work to keep them busy. Sometimes, when they get tired of blaming each other, they unite to blame Washington for not allocating enough materials to make their jobs worth while. And Washington, chary of offending labor, ends by blaming management. So each passes the buck. Necessarily there must be some surplus of men on hand. We are attempting to rush ships and arms through regardless of cost. We need some surplusage to take care of any sudden emergency. But somehow, in the process, vast armies of workers, even the most willing, stall and loaf a good deal of the time. And now the hurrying of women welders to the scene to help save the day seems so far mere additions to the army of underworked.

We talk too much about our shortage of manpower. And with a confusion of thinking. We are enormously, incredibly overstaffed in proportion to what we turn out. What we are really short of is production. And this shortage of production is due in no small part to our enormous wastage of manpower. Said President Roosevelt, January 17, 1943, in his message to Congress on the state of the Union: "We must not forget that our achievements in production have been relatively no greater than those of the Russians and the British and the Chinese, who have developed their war industries under the incredible difficulties of battle conditions. They have had to continue work through bombings and blackouts."

It was an unconscious rebuke to all of us. Under conditions of safety, the achievements in production of the greatest industrial nation in the world are relatively no greater than our allies under fire. In pre-war times we could outstrip them all together. Relatively in war our achievements in production should be 200, 300, even 400 percent greater. We could, we can, we must achieve that now.

Our dazzling achievements in production, so highly publicized, are, of course, tremendous in volume. But they are achieved by an overstaffing of personnel whose engineering curve would show a disproportionate rise in the number of men employed to the number of ships or what not turned out. The real unit of individual achievement has alarmingly fallen. Our tremendous increase in the number of things turned out has only been accomplished by having many more men do a thing than were formerly required.

Are there no remedies we can apply in this disquieting situation? I think there are. But they should work automatically, as impersonally as the cash register and modern auditing work automatically to deter petty pilfering and financial manipulation. The almost endless numbers of movie and other celebrities who visit us to urge us to higher efforts are good as far as they go. But we need other things more relentless if no less insistent. Here are some:

1. Fire every man who won't work—and fire him fast. Then see to it that he does not get back on war work again with its higher wage. This includes those who go through the slow motions of work as well as those who loaf. Incidentally, stop blaming the unions for our loafers. The unions have much to answer for. Washington has tens of thousands of clerks who do little more than draw their salaries—and they are not unionized. Both unions and defense management inherited hordes of idlers from the Work Projects Administration. It is now their joint and patriotic duty to get rid of them.

2. Keep every man busy at something useful all the time. If he hasn't enough to do in his own job, let him help some other man in another job. Forget about the different scales of pay in these temporary changes. This is war!

3. Not all manpower waste is due to labor. Stripped of their legal verbiage, many war contracts break down to a cost-plus or percentage basis. That means the more men management hires the more money it makes. When it is clear that management, for profit, deliberately engages in a policy of hiring far more men than it actually uses, the penalty should be the same as for loafing labor. This penalty should be imposed by Washington, replacing management with more conscientious men.

4. There must be better allotment of materials cleared through Washington. Unless materials arrive, men will either have to stall or be laid off. And with a shortage of millions of workers, the Nation cannot afford to have men on jobs either idling or laid off.

5. There must be real cooperation between management and labor in saving wastage of man-hours. Even if it hurts, management should accept criticism of antiquated methods wasting man-hours.

6. Our card distinctions between Congress of Industrial Organizations and American Federation of Labor waste hundreds of thousands of precious man-hours. For greater efficiency, Washington should abolish these card distinctions for the duration. If both the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor are getting the wages, hours, and conditions they want, why should we union men care which card the other fellow carries? It is our union leaders with their possibilities of more and more offices, who care for these distinctions, and not the rank and file of the memberships.

Those of us who were formerly engaged in the building industry think war industries could learn something from our practices. One of the reasons why we are able to rush up buildings so fast is because we have a foreman for every five or six men. A building trades foreman gets about $1 a day more than his crew members, and as everybody wants that extra dollar and the prestige that goes with it, they all step on it to make the higher grade. Good foremanship doesn't necessarily mean sweating the men. On the contrary, the foreman is often the squarest and most popular man in his squad. He finds work for his men, sees that no precious man-hours are wasted.

We think the shipbuilding practice of a foreman for every 18 or 20 men less efficient. He can't get around to each of his men often enough. And from the viewpoint of his men, there's so little chance of 1 man rising among 20 that few try. But with 1 chance in 5 or 6, we think their atttiude would change.

There is finally a warning (but not a threat) that if time and a half for Saturdays is abolished (as some Congressmen advocate) it will cut production. For better or worse, Washington included time and a half for Saturdays in most war contracts, following common practice in prewar agreements between labor and industry. Actually, this time and a half for Saturdays in war industries acts both as a reward and as a penalty to the worker. He must work the full 6 days of the weeks in order to receive it. If he fails, his Saturday's work is reduced to an ordinary day's pay. The incentive, then, to get the extra half day on Saturday keeps down absenteeism, and so makes productive millions of precious man-hours. Even with this incentive, however, absenteeism in shipbuilding alone runs 52,000,000 man-hours a year. Remove this incentive now for 20,000,000 war workers, and it staggers the imagination to contemplate how many extra billions of man-hours will be lost.

The extra cost of the labor bill for time and a half on Saturdays runs about 8 percent. The extra cost of the labor waste in our present set-up, due to idleness, bad management, and poor Government allotments, runs at times in some departments of war industry as high as 75 percent. Isn't it wiser to concentrate on this real waste, reduce it as low as is humanly possible, and then see to it that every man earns his money.

There are millions of highly skilled, patriotic men in our war industries. They never needed a war to find them jobs or wages. They will applaud every effort to cut down man-hour waste, even their own, in order to increase their plants efficiency, for their stake is their country.

Rickenbacker Nets $236,000 in Stock Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Sherrill Hillman entitled "Rickenbacker Nets $236,000 in Stock Deal," published in today's issue of PM.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, follows:

RICKENBACKER NETS $236,000 IN STOCK DEAL—MAN WHO OPPOSES ALL OVERTIME CLEANED UP BY BUYING UNDER QUOTED PRICE

(By Sherrell Hillman)

(This story is about the man who on February 14 said: "In times like these, I do not approve of overtime pay except for the men in the foxholes, the swamps, the deserts—those making the supreme sacrifice. "There is little reason why those back home should not expend every effort and energy, if for no other reason than that our own skins are at stake.")

Eddie Rickenbacker, who opposes overtime pay for the 48-hour week, has made a profit of $236,000 through the purchase on April 15 of 8,000 shares of Eastern Airlines, Inc. stock at $10 a share—$29.50 less than the present market value.

Rickenbacker, president and general manager of Eastern Airlines, exercised an option granted several years ago to buy the stock.

Securities and Exchange Commission officials said today the shares were purchased April 15, but did not know what Rickenbacker paid for them.

Company representatives admitted, however, that the price—to Rickenbacker—was $10. Eastern Airlines common stock is now selling on the open market for $39.50. The stock has boomed as a result of the company's wartime prosperity. Its high point for 1941 was $34.

The ex-automobile racer and flying ace of World War No. 1, now in Moscow for the War Department, gets a $25,000-a-year salary from Eastern Airlines. He was a leading advocate for repeal of President Roosevelt's limitation on net salaries to $25,000 a year.

"Initiative," said Rickenbacker, "is one of the great American cornerstones."

Rickenbacker's $236,000 profit on his stock purchase—which increased his holdings in the company to 20,000 shares—has not yet been realized. Eastern Airlines representatives said they believed Rickenbacker has no intention of selling the stock.

Officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue said that if Rickenbacker sold the 8,000 shares within 18 months, he would be required to report 100 percent profit or loss. They estimated he would realize about 40 percent net gain after taxes.

But if Rickenbacker retained the stock until the 18-month period had elapsed, they pointed out, he would have to report only 50 percent profit or loss.

Eastern Airlines officials willingly explained Rickenbacker's wartime financial profit, asserting that it was not inconsistent with his proposal that union dues and initiation fees be discontinued for the duration or turned into War bonds.

They said that when Rickenbacker obtained funds from two Wall Street firms in 1938 to purchase Eastern Airlines from North American Aviation Corporation, he was granted a 5-year option by the two houses, which underwrote Eastern Airlines' stock.

The option to buy the company's stock at $10 a share meant little at the time, they said, because "nobody realized how it was going to boom."

Rickenbacker, they said, also allowed the company's employees to buy stock.

Rickenbacker announced March 13 in a report to stockholders that his company made a net profit of $1,885,503, or $3.28 a share, in 1942. This sum, he said, represented a profit of 16.7 percent over 1941 earnings.

In the first quarter of 1943, Eastern Airlines made a net profit of $757,296.24, as against $619,261.30 in the same period a year ago, the company reported today.

Government Arsenals

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, 80 years ago today on July 1, 1863, in the farming community of Gettysburg, Pa., commenced the greatest battle ever fought on American soil. Just as the men in the armed services of the United States today are equipped with a shoulder weapon superior to any produced by any other nation in the world, friend or foe, the men in the Union Army of 1863 carried the best Army rifles ever produced up to that time. Then as now these rifles were the products of the Springfield Armory at Springfield, Mass. The rifles manufactured in 1861–63 were muzzle-loading, caliber .58, weighing slightly less than the new Garand which is caliber .30 and is loaded by clips. Then as now, the armorers were a highly skilled group of men. Many of them worked an entire lifetime at their trades.

Americans generally will be interested in the speech made by Congressman ENGEL on June 29 last in which he pointed out that the employees of private plants making munitions of war are much better paid than the employees in the Government arsenals. While many of the private plants are, for all intents and purposes, Government-owned and the production is entirely for the Government's war program, yet because the plants are operated or managed by General Motors, Chrysler, Ford, or General Electric, or some other large company, employees receive an average of $2,725 per year in wages as compared to about $2,130 per year at arsenals. The precision work performed at the Springfield Armory is more difficult by far than the average work done in these newly established war plants. Yet the pay of employees in the two types of plants varies greatly. The men working in our private plants receive more than 25 percent better pay on the average than the men in the arsenals. The Government employees actually producing rifles and parts for machine guns have their wages fixed after wage surveys conducted in accordance with Federal laws. Obviously, the surveys must always follow increases in wages in other surrounding plants. One might expect to find that the Government employees were receiving somewhat less pay than the average in private plants, but it is difficult to explain the discrepancy disclosed by Congressman ENGEL's investigation.

It is particularly difficult to understand why armorers at the Springfield Armory, who in many instances are working on parts for machine guns, should be receiving less pay than the employees of the Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co. at Hartford, Conn., only 27 miles away. Some of the men in both plants are doing exactly the same work and they should receive the same pay. Congressman ENGEL reports that "the highest paid labor I found was in the plants of this company." He referred to the Colts Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co.

In order that an explanation may be given to the country of the varying wages being paid in industrial plants engaged in the same line of work and for the most part on Government contracts at Government expense, I have requested the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, to cause an investigation of the situation to be made. I believe that the employees in the Government arsenals should be given the same pay advantages which the Government, through other agencies and other boards, is in fact giving to the employees of private plants.

Lawyers in the Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which appeared in the New York Times on June 30 entitled "Senator LANGER Is Disputed," signed by Thomas I. Emerson, associate general counsel, Office of Price Administration, and my reply thereto, which appears this morning in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 30, 1943]

SENATOR LANGER IS DISPUTED—HIS STATEMENT ABOUT OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION ATTORNEYS IS REGARDED AS INCORRECT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the Times of June 28 Senator LANGER is quoted as saying that "the Office of Price Administration alone has 2,700 lawyers, while in England they only need about 7 attorneys to do the same job." This statement has been made on other occasions. The fact is that both the figures mentioned are seriously incorrect. The number of lawyers employed by Office of Price Administration is by no means out of line with the legal staff used by England.

There are not now and never have been 2,700 lawyers employed by Office of Price Administration. The correct figure is 1,788. This could have been readily ascertained through an examination of the recently published hearings before the House Appropriations Committee.

These 1,788 lawyers serve not only the national office of Office of Price Administration, but nine regional offices, 106 district offices, and 355 defense rental areas. They handle all the legal work on price, rent, and rationing regulations, including drafting, interpretations, amounting to 150,000 a month, adjustments, litigation in the emergency court of appeals, and all enforcement activity.

As the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee reveal, Henry E. Bodman, well-known Detroit lawyer brought in by Mr. Brown to survey the size of the legal staff, came to the conclusion that it would not be "prudent or safe at this time to plan upon any reduction in the number of attorneys." George Burke, likewise an experienced and able member of the bar and now general counsel of Office of Price Administration, reached this same conclusion.

FIGURES HELD INCORRECT

With reference to England, the figure of 7 attorneys refers only to those stationed in the main office of the Ministry of Food. The correct number is 10. There are 4 other agencies in England which handle price and rationing: The Board of Trade, responsible for clothing and household goods; the Ministry of Supply, in charge of industrial materials; the Ministry of Health, with power over rents, and the Ministry of Fuel and Power. The number of attorneys employed in these other agencies is not available. Furthermore, the figure of 10 does not include a very large number of attorneys employed in the field offices of the Ministry of Food, as well as of the other agencies, upon a part-time or fee basis.

In comparing the English figures with the American it is important to note a number of factors which reduce the necessity for a large legal staff in England.

In the first place, British industry is relatively compact, well integrated and uniform. Secondly, the British wartime controls are far tighter and more direct than the American. Thus virtually all food in England is purchased by the Government and distributed under its direct control; clothing is regulated through a high degree of standardization; gasoline for nonoccupational purposes does not exist. This enormously simplifies the formulation, administration and enforcement of regulations. Thirdly, the constitutional, statutory, and judicial limitations under which Office of Price Administration operates are, to a large extent, not present in England. Add to this the fact that England's population is less than one-third that of the United States.

COMPARISON NOT UNFAVORABLE

Even so, the comparison, as I have said, is not unfavorable to Office of Price Administration. If the 10 attorneys in the Ministry of Food are multiplied by three to account for the difference in population, the 30 may be compared with the 88 assigned in the Washington office of Office of Price Administration to the much more extensive and difficult legal problems of food control in this country.

In the field offices the Ministry of Food in 1942 handled 33,811 enforcement proceedings through attorneys retained for each particular case in accordance with British custom. Assuming that each case required 8 hours of time, the total number handled would involve the services of 108 full-time attorneys. Multiplied by three, it would appear that on a comparable basis the Office of Price Administration should have 324 attorneys assigned to food enforcement. Actually, the number is not more than 225.

We are informed that in England there are 800 investigators assigned to food enforcement. On the basis of three times the population, the United States should have 2,400. Actually, not more than 1,200 are available under the present budget.

Thus, putting aside the wholly different legal background in England, the Office of Price Administration legal staff is not substantially in excess, and in some departments is less than in England.

THOMAS I. EMERSON,
Associate General Counsel, Office of Price Administration.
WASHINGTON, *June 28, 1943.*

[From the New York Times of July 1, 1943]

SENATOR LANGER CITES RECORD—TAKES ISSUE WITH OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION COUNSEL ON LEGAL STAFF OF ADMINISTRATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the Times of June 30, Thomas I. Emerson disputes the statement I made in New York on Sunday that "the Office of Price Administration alone has 2,700 lawyers while in England they only need about 7 attorneys to do the same job," and Mr. Emerson states the fact to be that both the figures are "seriously incorrect." He further states that there are not now and never have been 2,700 lawyers employed by the Office of Price Administration. The correct figure, he says, is 1,788. Mr. Emerson's statement simply is not true.

At the hearing by the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on June 12, 1942, Leon Henderson was asked the following question by Congressman JOHN TABER of New York: "I still do not feel that you have given any explanation that justifies the employment of 534 lawyers in the District of Columbia. I am going to give you a little more opportunity to talk about that. There are some things here I cannot quite follow.

"You have 2,222 lawyers in the field. That is an average for the 48 States of about 46.3. I assume that Nevada and Arizona, New Mexico and the Dakotas probably will not have 46 in each; that perhaps New York and Pennsylvania and Massachusetts and Illinois and Ohio and Michigan would have a few more. Not that I want to recommend any, I do not. I would hate to have the job of recommending any. But it looks to me as though that was mostly window-dressing unless you are planning to do things that go beyond the pale."

To which Mr. Henderson replied: "May I give you my assurance, without any reservation of any kind, that there is no part of this Budget request that has to do with going beyond what the authorization of Congress and the directives of the President are."

UNDERSTATEMENT CLAIMED

Thus you will note that instead of employing 2,700 lawyers the Office of Price Administration employed 2,756 and not 1,788 as was stated by Mr. Emerson.

Also, at the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations dealing with the national war agencies apropriation bill for 1944, on page 197, under subhead "Legal Department, attorneys only," is found the following: "For 1943 total attorneys Washington and field and legal investigators 4,427." and for 1944, believe it or not, 1,700 more have been added, making a total of 6,127.

I note from Mr. Emerson's letter that he now claims some of these legal investigators are not lawyers, but I respectfully call attention to the fact that when the Office of Price Administration wanted money from the Congress for themselves they listed the request "Legal Department, Attorneys Only."

BYRD SPEECH RECALLED

Further, I call attention to the radio speech delivered by Senator BYRD, Democrat, from Virginia, on June 22, when he stated that "the Office of Price Administration has been supporting 2,700 lawyers—500 of them in Washington to devise the regulations and 2,200 throughout the country to see that they regulate."

But, as you will note, Senator BYRD missed 56 of them, and that there are 2,756, testified to by Leon Henderson, then head of the Office of Price Administration, on page 118 of the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1943.

Frankly, I feel there are several thousand too many, just as there are now over 3,000,000 civil employees, whereas in the last World War we had approximately 1,000,000, and this wasteful squandering of funds should be noticed by the taxpayers and protests lodged with every Representative and Senator.

The very weakness of Mr. Emerson's ill-advised letter to you is demonstrated when he says I stated that England had but 7 attorneys. He states that my statement was "seriously incorrect," because England has 10. What a travesty some of this horde of taxeaters attempt to make of the real facts when they try to fool the taxpayers.

WILLIAM LANGER,
Senator from North Dakota.
WASHINGTON, *June 30, 1943.*

Lt. Maurice I. Bloch, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM HOBBS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, one of the grand boys of my native city, Selma, Ala., Lt. Maurice I. Bloch, Jr., serving in the Infantry of the United States Army, in Hawaii, made the supreme sacrifice recently, while his outfit was cooperating with a tank battalion.

Selma loved this stalwart son.

It gives me pleasure to present and call your attention to this letter:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *May 29, 1943.*
Mr. MAURICE I. BLOCH,
Selma, Ala.

DEAR MR. BLOCH: This letter is very late in being written, and my one hope is that it doesn't add flames to an already ebbing ember. True, the light that is created by a person as fine as your son could never die out, but I do not want to add to that hardship that you must certainly have been under this past few months by continually reminding you of his untimely end. I am writing this letter to you for three reasons, and I sincerely hope that they will be clear to you.

First, I attended school with your son and I knew him very well. We were always the best of friends, and so I felt that it was my duty to give this letter a try. As you will see as this letter goes on, I have not mastered the art of composing a letter, but in some small way I shall try to make myself understood.

War is a terrible thing. To learn the art of warfare one must run risks of all types. An officer must always lead his men no matter what the risk might be, and it was in this line of duty, I regret to say, that your son met his end. Certainly you must have a sour feeling for these tanks of ours—big, powerful, guns from every angle, and as deadly as a cobra. However, to try to use these tanks without the support of the infantry would be useless. So training and actual combat calls for the infantry to be so close to these ironclad monsters that at some times they actually ride the backs of the tanks. Your son was training for a task, as we all are, a task so great that lives are lost even while not under actual combat conditions. These lives are not lost in vain, as some people think. No; these men deserve medals as does any man serving on the front lines. From each mistake or accident a lesson is learned. This lesson will save the lives of many hundreds of men in the future and teach officers, as well as men, what to do when their lives are at stake in the field of combat. So don't feel that all of the years of loving, worrying, and expense have been for nothing. No; because your son is as great

a hero as any one of the hundreds that have gotten awards from the President. A man who, with utter disregard for his own safety, sees that his own men are safe before thinking of himself will never die in vain. I have visited the grave with those thoughts in my mind, and if it is your wish, and God permitting, I would consider it an honor to accompany the casket carrying the body of one so loved by us all to your home after this war has ended. In the meantime, if you will send me the dates of the days that you want flowers to be placed by the cross, I would again feel honored to be allowed to do that much for him and for you.

Best of luck and wishes for a speedy ending of the war.

DONALD M. BRATTAIN,
Captain, Seven Hundred and Sixty-third Tank Battalion.

Justice to Retired Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Admitted Injustice," published in the Boston Globe of May 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADMITTED INJUSTICE

Whenever Congress finally finds its way out of the mess into which it has got itself in making a new tax bill, it may get around to doing justice to some 7,500 retired Federal employees—no small number of them resident in New England—who were admittedly eased out of approximately $21,000,000, collectively, because Congress failed to make retroactive the revised contributory pension scale of 1942.

This revision canceled the $1,200 maximum and, thenceforth, retiring contributors to the system began to get what it was intended should be theirs for faithful service. But in omitting to make the measure retroactive, Congress denied proper compensation to those long in the system who had before been slighted. Advancing living costs have made this omission the more grievous.

Today there are in the Committee on Civil Service three bills aiming to correct this wrong, all of which somehow strangely continue to be pigeon-holed. If any one of them were reported, it is quite certain to be passed with a whoop. It seems high time that one were.

Couplets for a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, among the many literary people who have contributed to the folklore of the Southwest, is a cowboy poet, S. Omar Barker of Tecolotenos, N. Mex. Mr. Barker has written a number of books dealing with the Southwest, but he is probably best known for his Buckaroo Ballads.

For months he has been writing me protesting about the delay of Congress in passing anti-strike legislation. I have pleaded with him to be patient and have told him that it was the considered judgment of many, if not most of those in direct charge of the war effort, that legislation could safely be postponed as long as labor kept its "no strike" pledge.

Recently Congress moved with speed on the question of strike legislation and Mr. Barker celebrated the occasion by sending me some "Couplets for a Congressman." I believe that his sentiment would interest the Members of the House and I therefore insert them into the RECORD:

COUPLETS FOR A CONGRESSMAN

The Congress can do things—and fast!
Look how that anti-strike bill passed!

If that don't work, why can't you sages
Legislate control of wages?

We don't find paying taxes duro—
Except to support some useless bureau.

If naught but subsidies can do it,
Then pay 'em—but I think you'll rue it.

—*S. Omar Barker.*

Letter from Zygmunt Zygielbojm to Premier Sikorski of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Zygmunt Zygielbojm, the Polish Socialist Deputy, who committed suicide in London last week. The letter was written in his own hand and addressed to Premier Wladyslaw Sikorski of Poland.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I take the liberty of addressing to you my last words, and through you to the Polish Government and the Polish people, to the governments and the peoples of the Allied States—to the conscience of the world.

From the latest information received from Poland it is evident that the Germans, with the most ruthless cruelty, are now murdering the few remaining Jews in Poland. Behind the ghetto's walls the last act of a tragedy unprecedented in history is being performed. The responsibility for this crime of murdering the entire Jewish population of Poland falls in the first instance on the perpetrators, but indirectly it is also a burden on the whole of humanity, the people and the governments of the Allied States which thus far have made no effort toward concrete action for the purpose of curtailing this crime.

By the passive observation of the murder of defenseless millions and of the maltreatment of children, women, and old men, these countries have become the criminals' accomplices. I must also state that, although the Polish Government has in a high degree contributed to the enlistment of world opinion, it has yet done so insufficiently. It has not done anything that could correspond to the magnitude of the drama being enacted now in Poland. From some 3,500,000 Polish Jews and about 700,000 other Jews deported to Poland from other countries, according to official statistics provided by the underground bund organization, there remained in April of this year only about 300,000, and this continuing murder still goes on

I cannot be silent—I cannot live—while remnants of the Jewish people of Poland, of whom I am a representative, are perishing. My comrades in the Warsaw ghetto took weapons in their hands on that last heroic impulse. It was not my destiny to die there together with them, but I belong to them, and in their mass graves. By my death I wish to express my strongest protest against the inactivity with which the world is looking on and permitting the extermination of my people.

I know how little human life is worth today, but as I was unable to do anything during my life perhaps by my death I shall contribute to breaking down that indifference of those who may now—at the last moment—rescue the few Polish Jews still alive from certain annihilation. My life belongs to the Jewish people of Poland and I therefore give it to them. I wish that this remaining handful of the original several millions of Polish Jews could live to see the liberation of a new world of freedom and the justice of true socialism. I believe that such a Poland will arise and that such a world will come.

I trust that the President and the Prime Minister will direct my words to all those for whom they are destined, and that the Polish Government will immediately take appropriate action in the fields of diplomacy. I bid farewell herewith to everybody and everything dear to me and loved by me.

Z. ZYGIELBOJM.

Strikes—Wages—Living Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I think that the following articles throw some light on the present situation in regard to strikes, wages, and living costs.

The first article is from the Washington Star of June 28, 1943. It gives the undoubted source of the figures concerning time lost by strikes in 1942. It also shows that in 1942 there were 2,968 strikes involving 840,000 workers and 4,183,000 man-days of idleness. I presume there is no positive way of measuring how much production was affected in plants where no strikes occurred but which were subsequent to the struek plants in the chain of war production.

The article from the Star follows:

ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE QUOTED STRIKE DATA OF LABOR STATISTICS UNIT—1942 FIGURES COLLECTED BY FEDERAL BUREAU PUBLISHED IN MAY

In the message accompanying his veto of the antistrike bill, President Roosevelt told Congress that the time lost by strikes in 1942 averaged only five one-hundredths of 1

percent of the total man-hours worked in the United States in that year.

Though not specifically cited in the message, the authority for the President's statement was, of course, the Bureau of Labor Statistics. According to the Bureau's figures, contained in an article in the May issue of the Monthly Labor Review, idleness during strikes in 1942 amounted to about a twentieth of 1 percent of the time worked in industry, or less than one-fifth of the time lost by strikes in 1941.

During the year there were 2,968 strikes, it said, involving approximately 840,000 workers, and 4,183,000 man-days of idleness. About 28 workers out of every 1,000 employed, the article explained, were involved in a strike at some time in 1942.

DATA COLLECTED FROM 1914

How does the Bureau obtain its strike statistics, and how does it compute the time lost by work stoppages?

The bureau has been collecting and publishing strike statistics since 1914. During the 8 years between 1906 and 1913, no Federal agency was assigned the job of collecting such information, though earlier, from 1881 to 1905, the commissioner of labor had collected strike data.

Compilation of strike statistics is one of the duties of the bureau's industrial relations division, which has been headed since 1934 by Miss Florence Peterson, who studied labor economics at the University of Wisconsin. Prior to entering the Federal service here, Miss Peterson was State director of unemployment relief in Wisconsin. About a dozen of the division's employees at present are assigned to the work of collecting and analyzing strike statistics.

GIVE MAN-DAYS INVOLVED

The three basic measures used by the Bureau in compiling strike data are the number of strikes, the number of workers involved and the man-days idle. Since it incorporates the two elements of number of workers and the number of work days these persons lost during the work stoppage, the number of man-days idle is regarded by bureau experts as one of the best criteria of the magnitude of a strike.

The man-days idle during a strike are arrived at by computing the calendar days idle minus holidays and any other days these employees would not have worked had there been no strike.

For statistical purposes, the bureau defines a strike as a work stoppage due to a labor dispute involving 6 or more workers that lasts for one day, or one shift, or longer. No attempt is made to collect data on stoppages involving lesser amounts.

Daily newspapers, labor and trade journals, and reports from Federal labor boards provide the Bureau with its principal "leads" with respect to new strikes. It receives clippings from more than 700 daily, weekly, and monthly papers and journals, and Bureau officials believe that few, if any, strikes escape their attention. The Bureau also receives information from half a dozen industrial States that maintain strike-reporting services.

SEND FOR INFORMATION

On the basis of leads from these and other sources, the Bureau sends out schedules to employers and unions involved, asking for specific information. In some instances, when unable to obtain a reply to its questionnaire, the Bureau sends out into the field its own agents.

In large strikes, the Bureau often takes special measures to assure the collection of authentic statistical and other data, including the dispatch of field agents. In the present stoppages in the soft coal mines, the Bureau receives from the Government managers in each mine regular reports in the number of workers idle, etc.

The coal stoppages are reflected in the Bureau's May strike figures, released yesterday, which show that idleness during strikes amounted to about 0.16 percent of available working time in industry as compared with 0.08 percent in April, 0.03 percent in March, 0.02 percent in February, and 0.06 percent in January.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I present an article from a publication known as Greater Los Angeles Labor, under date of June 15, 1943, page 14. This article quotes figures presented by J. C. Gotschall, said to be an expert in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It does not state that these figures are "official" figures of the Department of Labor, except inferentially. As it is a Los Angeles County publication, the references are to conditions in that county.

The article from Greater Los Angeles Labor follows:

PURCHASING POWER OF WORKER IS UP 37.7 PERCENT HERE REPORT SHOWS

Purchasing power of Los Angeles workers employed in manufacturing is up 37.7 percent. After allowing for the rise in the cost of living, it is stated in a statistical report prepared by J. C. Gotschall, Bureau of Labor Statistics expert.

Arthur G. Coons, Office of Price Administration consultant, discussed the report before Office of Price Administration's labor advisory committee, in a meeting joined in by Office of Price Administration officials including David Barry, Jr., Rent Director; Howard Freeman, regional rent representative; Robert Pettengill, assistant district price officer, and Samuel Leask, Jr., Office of Price Administration director, acting as chairman.

Gottchall's figures disclosed that in the 3 years and 8 months of the present war, the cost of living has increased 25.2 percent in Los Angeles, as compared to 25.9 percent for the Nation.

In World War No. 1, cost of living had soared 39.9 percent over an equal period of time.

"Thus," Coons said, "the cost-of-living rise at this time is only 65 percent of what it was for a similar period during the last war. In addition, of the 25.9 percent national cost of living increase, 17.6 percent, or about two-thirds of the present increase, was prior to the birth of Office of Price Administration.

Coons outlined a chart showing the Los Angeles area cost of living for the 11 months before and 11 months after Office of Price Administration was organized, showing that Office of Price Administration has done a great deal to slow up the ascension of the cost-of-living balloon:

	11 months	
	After O. P. A.	Before O. P. A.
All items	6.5	11.8
Food	14.1	18.9
Miscellaneous	3.7	7.3
Clothing	1.3	21.1
House furnishings	.4	12.7
Rent	0	3.1
Fuel, electricity	0	10.0

It was further pointed out that Office of Price Administration's authority in May 1942, its birthday, covered less than 60 percent of foods. In October, the remaining 40 percent began to come under control, and by December Office of Price Administration's authority took in 90 percent of the food items. Then when fresh fruits and vegetables were added in March, 98 percent of all foods in the family budget were protected.

The national average weekly pay check of the worker employed in all manufacturing industries is up 73.1 percent, the figures disclosed. In the last war, the wage increase was 53 percent for the same period of time.

The Los Angeles industrial area wage increases for all manufacturing industries is 72.4, according to the State division of labor statistics and law enforcement comparison to last war figures was impossible, because Los Angeles had no great manufacturing industries at that time.

The cost of living increase was compared to the enlargement in the manufacturing worker's pay check, revealing a 37.7 percent difference in the worker's favor. However, a good portion of this increase is taken care of through income taxes and the fact that the worker has now bettered his standard of living. He now buys better quality goods.

There are 438,200 persons in Los Angeles, listed as manufacturing workers in April of this year, according to the State report.

Of great interest was the chart showing the increase in the cost of living since the war started 3 years and 8 months ago. Food has shown the biggest jump, while rent shows only a 2 percent increase. Utilities, such as fuel and electricity, have decreased 4.7 percent in Los Angeles against a national increase of 10.3 percent.

	Los Angeles	National
All items	25.2	25.9
Food	54.5	50.4
Clothing	27.2	27.4
Rent	2.0	3.5
Fuel, electricity down	4.7	10.3
House furnishings	18.5	23.9
Miscellaneous	13.6	14.3

No Time To Recess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

NO TIME TO RECESS

Congress is beginning to look forward to a 2-month recess this summer, from mid-July to mid-September.

Under present plans, it could be called back into session by the President, by the Vice President and Speaker of the House, by the majority leaders of Senate and House, or by the minority leaders of the two branches of the National Legislature.

Those safeguards would seem to cover any conceivable emergency which might come up during the 2-month recess. But they do not take into consideration the emergency that exists now, with respect to the chaotic food situation which the resignation of War Food Administrator Chester C. Davis has just emphasized. Congress has done substantially what is necessary to reinforce the war front. But the home front requires attention before Senators and Representatives lock up their desks and go home.

The wide chasm between the views of the President and those of Congress on stabilization of food prices, use of subsidies and centralization of control over food production, distribution, and costs needs to be bridged. Congress has taken tentative steps to block the administration policy of using subsidies

to roll back the price of food. If, before it recesses, these steps are completed, Congress will have rejected one policy without providing another to take its place. If the steps are not complete, it will have abandoned its post for 2 vital months during which the kind of subsidies to which Congress objects may become entrenched in the economic system.

Congressional leaders have expressed the belief that wartime food powers should be more greatly consolidated; while the President insists upon the present looser system of partial controls, with Economic Stabilization Director Byrnes as the impartial arbiter between the various agencies concerned with food. This conflict of views, also, should not be permitted to go by default for the next 2 months. If changes are warranted in the system, it is none too soon to make them.

Under our system of government, the determination of domestic policies rests with Congress. It cannot adopt the negative attitude of merely rejecting or hampering administrative activities without establishing some more acceptable system. Granting that it is hot in Washington in the summer, and Congress has kept its nose to the grindstone for a long time, the fact remains that a serious issue has arisen between the President and Congress and it is imperative that it be settled one way or the other before Congress rests. If Congress leaves its post in the middle of a home front battle, it will deserve and receive public disapprobation.

MacDonald White Paper Must Be Set Aside—Suggested Conclave Between Arabs and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Bermuda Conference called to consider the rescue of refugees from Nazi oppression, the conferees were precluded from giving consideration to Palestine as a haven of refuge.

On the 21st day of September 1922 the American Congress approved the promulgation of the now famous Balfour Declaration of 1917, which established Palestine as a Jewish homeland. The resolution adopted was as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected.

That resolution favored creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine under a British mandate. Fifty-three nations, including the United States ratified the Balfour Declaration. Speeches in the House and Senate specifically instructed Britain as a mandated power to facilitate the setting up and furtherance of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Over and beyond the universal acceptance and approval of the Balfour Declaration, on December 23, 1924, a convention was signed by the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Austen Chamberlain, and our then Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg, concerning the rights of Britain and the United States and their respective nationals in Palestine.

Article 15 and subarticle 7 of article 28 are as follows:

ARTICLE 15

The mandatory shall see that * * * no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the ground of race, religion, or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of his religious beliefs.

SUBARTICLE 7 OF ARTICLE 28

Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States.

The above clearly indicates the interest of the United States in the British mandate over Palestine and operations thereunder.

What has been the attitude of Great Britain? It has been one of open defiance of such convention. There has been a continual violation of the aforesaid article 15 since persons are excluded from Palestine solely on racial grounds.

Eugene M. Kulischer, of the Research Institute on Peace and Post-War Problems of the American Jewish Committee, states in Jewish Migrations while discussing Palestine:

The times of greatest need for new homes, the immigration of Jews has been grudgingly limited by the British administration and was strictly controlled at the ports of entry; that of the Arabs is neither supervised nor controlled. In their efforts to limit the immigration of Jewish workers, the British employed the excuse of "economic absorptive capacity," while at the same time they greatly diminished Palestine's possibilities of absorption of immigrants by cutting off the vast area of Transjordan, the western part of the Holy Land. In contrast to the workers, Jewish capitalists were admitted more liberally. Under these conditions, the investment of capital by Jews has in some ways worked against Jewish colonization of Palestine. It could not stimulate the immigration of Jewish workers which was arbitrarily limited. It therefore stimulated the influx of Arabs. The greater the Jewish economic activity, the larger the Arab proletariat.

In 1939 there was promulgated the so-called MacDonald White Paper, limiting the entrance of Jews into Palestine to 75,000 within a 5-year period. Of those 75,000, roughly, only 29,000 certificates of entrance remain unused. This repudiated the Balfour Declaration and violated subarticle 7 of article 28 of the 1924 convention since the MacDonald White Paper modified the terms of said convention to which both Great Britain and the United States were signatories.

Our Government has been derelict in its failure to protect the violation of the Balfour Declaration and of the aforesaid Kellog-Chamberlain Convention. Opportunity was presented at the Bermuda Conference to reopen the question of immigration, but our delegates were instructed not to raise the question since the British Foreign Office had removed Palestine from the agenda as a possibility for a haven for the Jews. We are not blameless because of our silence and lack of remonstrance.

It is interesting to note that Prime Minister Churchill in 1939 had designated the so-called MacDonald White Paper as a "breach of faith." We can do no less than emphasize the words of Prime Minister Churchill and broadcast them generally to our people.

In view of the aforesaid, it seems incumbent upon our Government through the State Department in the light of the urgent need for finding havens for the hapless victims of the Nazi scourge to call to the attention of the British Foreign Office its failure of observance of its solemn obligations and that our State Department petition the forthcoming Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees which will stem either from the Evian Conference of 1938 or the Bermuda Conference that Palestine be reconsidered as a refuge for persecuted Jews. Such a homeland as contemplated in 1919 is doubly needed today. The Nazi atrocities have doubly accentuated such need.

On the 18th day of March 1943 in endeavor to impress on the conscience of free men the vastness and ghastliness of the Jewish tragedy, Congress passed a concurrent resolution which was originally offered by the esteemed majority leader of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY of Kentucky, which is in part as follows:

Whereas the American people view with indignation the atrocities inflicted upon the civilian population in the Nazi occupied countries and especially the mass murder of Jewish men, women and children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the dictates of humanity and honorable conduct in war demand that this inexcusable slaughter and mistreatment shall cease.

That resolution clearly reflects American public opinion and indicates its all embracing sympathy that the Americans have for the plight of the Jews and, furthermore, manifests an earnest desire to aid the Jews in finding escape from oppression.

Moreover, the Legislatures of Connecticut, California, Illinois and Pennsylvania, by unanimous vote, have allied themselves with eight other States—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Missouri, New York, South Carolina and Texas—which have recently adopted resolutions condemning the extermination of the Jews by the Nazis and demanding the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine after the war.

It is hoped, therefore, that the good offices of the United States might be used to the end that the cruel conditions of the MacDonald White Paper be set aside and that the doors be opened to Jewish immigration in Palestine and that the Balfour Declaration be restored to its original purposes.

Furthermore, the prestige of the high office of our Secretary of State might well be used to the end that the British Ministry and our Department of State call a

conclave of representatives of the Arabs and Jews so that those two races might settle whatever differences might exist between them in Palestine by resolving in conciliatory resolutions their conflicting activities and that that conclave be held under the joint auspices of Great Britain and the United States.

This method of arriving at a peaceful and amicable solution is quite apparent. When left to their own devices, and not subject to the pressure of selfish groups and interests, the Arabs and Jews agree. A worthy example of this ability to agree is exemplified in the convention or treaty entered into by His Royal Highness Prince Emir Feisal, representing and acting on behalf of the Arab Kingdom of Hejz and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, representing and acting on behalf of the Zionist organization at the time of the Peace Conference at Paris. It was agreed among other things that all relations and undertakings between the Arab state and Palestine shall be controlled by the most cordial goodwill and understanding and that accredited agents shall be established in the respective territories, and that all measures shall afford the fullest guarantees for carrying into effect the Balfour declaration and that all necessary measures shall be taken to encourage and stimulate immigration of Jews into Palestine on a large scale and as quickly as possible.

Common humanity dictates that we in the United States take some affirmative action.

The Job Color Line in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which recently appeared in the Socialist Monthly Bulletin of the Washington Local of the Socialist Party.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It so happens that with exceptions so rare that they can be counted on the fingers of one hand, the District of Columbia government has a lily-white hiring policy.

We are told that when committees of citizens went to the District Building to remonstrate and to ask that applicants for jobs be hired according to merit and not color of skin, Commissioner Guy Mason told them that Negroes had no right to ask for jobs on the basis of merit or on the basis of their proportion in the population, which is something like a third.

Whites have a special claim on jobs, he said, because they are the major owners of property in the city, and therefore, pay the taxes that support the municipal government. Negroes, much less than supporting the government financially in proportion to their number are nothing but an expense to it, since the major incidence of indigency is among the colored and they have high rates of crime which raise the city's police bill.

Besides, the Commissioner said, Negroes are known to be petty thieves and can't be trusted in office jobs.

We think this is brazen talk from what is supposed to be a responsible public official conducting his office in the interest of all the people—"all" meaning white and black.

JIM CROW IN THE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT

We'll start with the District government. With the exception of the Jim Crow school system, a few police and firemen, some case workers on the Welfare Department and juvenile court staff, and a few others, Negroes are barred from clerical, administrative, and supervisory jobs in District agencies from Assessor to Vehicles and Traffic.

As a sop, one administrative post traditionally has belonged to the Negro—the Recorder of Deeds. It is significant that one-third of the staff of this office is white.

Negroes are hired practically exclusively as laborers, custodial workers, elevator operators, garbage-truck workers, and in other menial capacities. Even on the garbage trucks, the truck driver, who supervises the truck crew at a higher wage rate is usually white.

If you're black you can't be a water meter reader, a building inspector, a weights and measures inspector, a guard in the penal institutions, a librarian, or a host of other things.

The District won't break down its Jim Crow hiring practices, even when the lives of the city's residents is endangered by failure to do so. There's a shortage, for example, of firemen and many fire stations are understaffed. There are applicants on the civil-service lists, but they're black, and there's a surplus of men at the District's single all-colored Jim Crow fire house No. 4 in the 900 block of R Street NW., but the department refuses to appoint Negroes to other stations than this, so a good many of the other stations go undermanned.

JIM CROW IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Government now has a somewhat more enlightened policy. Before the war, of course, it was only the occasional courageous liberal administrator in the Government service who would hire a Negro secretary and the only other Negro office workers were the few race relations officers and their small staffs.

When the war came and the supply of whites was drained, the expanding agencies had to resort to the Negro labor supply even for office workers. Many agencies that did hire Negroes continued to practice more subtle forms of discrimination. Negroes were segregated from white workers; they were given more onerous jobs; they were put on night shifts; they were assigned to pools rather than to individual secretarial jobs; they were taken on as clerks and put to work operating mimeograph machines.

Some agencies continued to refuse to hire Negroes in clerical capacities. True the civil service application form no longer asks the applicant to indicate his race. But some agencies send to persons certified to them by the Commission their own application forms, and these do ask "what race?" Or other agencies detect the color of the applicant by looking at his previous place of employment.

The highly skilled craftsmen jobs in the so-called Government factory agencies are white monopolies. If you're a Negro, you can't be plate printer at the Bureau of Engraving (you may pass the civil-service exam for apprentices, but you won't be appointed); you cannot be a pressman at the Government Printing Office; you can't be a mechanic at the navy yard in smelting or brass or tin or gun assembly or molding or blacksmithing or welding or bombsight.

If you're a white woman and are hired by the navy yard, you may be doing gun wiping, electrical work, or gun assembly or inspection or checking. If you're black, you won't do anything but pack and stamp cartridges which is dirty work at low pay.

JIM CROW IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

If anything, the door to jobs is shut even tighter in private industries, and it grieves us, as Socialists, that a major share of the responsibility for this situation lies with the local trade-union movement.

One of the city's most important industries is building construction. All of the big Government building projects are closed-shop jobs and so are most of the big private construction projects. Negroes are barred either openly or covertly from many of the building-trade unions. Negro craftsmen, consequently, are compelled to work on small residential construction and building-repair jobs which are open-shop at lower wage scales.

Because materials shortages have compelled the retrenchment of private residential construction, many of these workers are now unemployed, but are barred from the larger jobs—even though the unions are having difficulty supplying workers for them.

Even in peacetime, when Negro building craftsmen were able to find jobs on small projects, they were disadvantaged. It was only on the large projects that new building methods and materials were employed. Negroes, relegated to small-house building, could learn none of the skills connected with concrete construction, air conditioning, ventilation, cable splicing, power-plant work, modern heating and plumbing-system installation.

Negro youths who want to learn building craft have to learn it catch as catch can, on open-shop jobs or in the schools. They have none of the opportunities of white boys to acquire an all-around skill through apprenticeship training because the unions won't appoint Negroes as apprentices.

UNIONS DISCRIMINATE

Some of the unions, as we've said, don't admit any Negroes at all. The mechanical-construction unions don't, for example, nor do the plumbers, electrical workers, elevator constructors. Some admit a few Negroes to membership and then bypass them when they make assignments to jobs, even though they're supposed to make assignments in rotation. This is true, for example, of the bricklayers and carpenters. Negro union members will be assigned from union headquarters to jobs designed for Negro occupancy. When these jobs are completed they have to fend for themselves. The common practice is for them to take open-shop jobs—a practice for which a white brother would be penalized by the union—at low wage rates.

Negroes who have traditionally held some of the building construction jobs either have been or are now being squeezed out. Twenty years ago, for example, most of the steel rodmen's jobs (they set rods to reinforce concrete) were held by Negroes. At that time the work was considered to be dirty and reinforced concrete construction wasn't very popular among contractors. When more and more builders began to use this process, however, and the work of the structural iron workers was cut into, whites began to squeeze out the Negroes by replacing the older Negro craftsmen when they died with younger men. The union is now almost entirely white.

Negro drivers of pre-mix concrete trucks are being squeezed out of their jobs because they are high paying, the drivers being classified as mixing engineers.

Negroes are being squeezed out of hoisting engineers' jobs. They operate elevators on construction projects.

Some of the unions will admit Negroes, but only in inferior status jobs. The stone setters, for example, will permit Negroes to work as helpers to journeymen stone setters, but won't let them be promoted to journeymen status, although the helper frequently does stone setter's work.

Relegation of the Negro to nonunion work results in this kind of a discriminatory wage situation: Union carpenters get $13 a day, nonunion $7; union bricklayers get $1.75 an hour, nonunion $1; union painters get $1.40 an hour, nonunion 70 cents; union electricians get $1.40 an hour, nonunion 75 cents.

Normally in peacetime the white union workers worked about 9 months a year, the nonunion Negro worked 3 or 4 months. In other cities Negroes have been admitted to building trades' union locals and the white and black members have worked cooperatively on their jobs without friction.

The barriers to Negro employment in the public utilities are widely known in at least one of its aspects because of the wide publicity given to the Fair Employment Practices Committee proceedings against the Capital Transit Co. In spite of the Fair Employment Practices Committee cease and desist orders, aroused public opinion and shortages of manpower that the company can't make up in spite of newspaper ads as far south as Charleston, S. C. and as far north as New York, Negroes are still not hired in streetcar and bus operating capacities. One reason according to Capital Transit's president, E. D. Merrill, is that "Negroes, unlike whites, don't have the historic experience and cultural background of taking fares from the public"!

The other utilities companies also practice discrimination. No Negro, for example, is employed as a meter reader, although this a simple transaction job that Negro householders, themselves, are frequently asked to do if they are out when the reader calls on his rounds.

Jim Crow doesn't even stop working at the private professional level. Negro doctors have no opportunity for specialist training in pediatrics or psychiatry, because they're not admitted to the staffs of Children's Hospital or St. Elizabeths Hospital. Because they are barred from membership in the District Medical Society, they have to do without the services rendered white doctors—lectures on current medical developments, a library of up-to-the-minute medical literature, a referral agency that tells persons looking for a doctor whom they might see.

We present all of these facts to highlight a situation that prevails throughout the whole field of employment in the District of Columbia that we think is shocking. One-third of the population of this city is, to all intents and purposes, condenmned to economic serfdom—locked in jobs that are menial, nasty, or fatiguing.

If you look at the census figures you'll find that in 1940 Negro men made up 91 percent of utilities laborers; 92 percent of the charmen, janitors, and porters; Negro women made up 90 percent of the women elevator operators: 82 percent of the charwomen; 85 percent of the cooks.

On the other hand, you'll find Negroes almost completely barred from some white-collar office and professional jobs and from skilled craftsmen jobs in industry. For example, there are no Negro mechanical engineers out of a total of more than 1,000; 9 designers and draftsmen out of almost 1,100; no railroad conductors; no boilermakers; 1 telegraph operator; 30 male bookkeepers out of 5,100, and 41 male stenographers out of 2,300; 3 railroad brakemen, 44 machinists out of 3,000.

Negro women are also kept from the better and cleaner jobs. There were 218 Negro female stenographers out of a total in the city of 22,000, and 554 other clerical workers out of a total of 20,000 in this category.

If you look at the picture from an industrial, rather than an occupational angle, you'll find that either Negro men or Negro women are hired in limited numbers by industries like telephone and telegraph, banks, radio broadcasting, retail stores, and that they're hired in great numbers in trucking and warehousing, eating and drinking places, hotels, laundries, and cleaning and dyeing establishments, and in domestic-service work.

You'll also find that the jobs that Negroes hold are low-paying jobs, and the ones where they're not hired are high-paying jobs.

If you check back through the census records, other facts about Negro employment in Washington come to light. You find, for example, that in the late 1800's, Negroes held near monopolies of jobs like barbers and waiters and waitresses, and that they are being effectively squeezed out of these jobs, larger and larger proportions of persons in these jobs being white. In 1890, 9 out of every 10 barbers were Negro. In 1940 this was reduced to only about 3 in 10. In 1910 over one-half of all waitresses were Negro; by 1940 less than one-quarter were Negro.

Well, now what can be done about all this? What can be done to permit Negroes to rise out of their poverty? To let them acquire skills on a basis equal with whites? To let them practice these skills freely? To give them opportunities for employment from which the color of their skin now keeps them?

We don't know the whole answer because part of the problem is to uproot intolerance that is planted deep in the soil of men's minds. But we think we know part of it.

We think that procedures should be set up to make effective the nondiscrimination policy in Federal employment and to prevent circumvention by all manner of subterfuges. We think that the District government should begin hiring its personnel exclusively on the basis of merit. We think it should be made unlawful to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or color. We think there should be legislation particularly making it unlawful to discriminate in hiring by public utilities and in employment under public utilities and in employment under public-works contracts. We think educational facilities for teaching Negroes production and office skills should be expanded.

We think there ought to be a standing commission in the city empowered to hold hearings and subpena witnesses and records, to compel private employment agencies to disclose their records, to prevent discriminatory want ads, to conduct a full-fledged educational campaign to wipe out color prejudice and to assist in the integration of Negroes into industry, and to expose discriminatory situations.

The other day we came across an article in a 1929 issue of Factory and Industrial Management called "The Southern Negro; An Excursion Into the Psychology of Making Men Like Work," in which a cotton-compress manager said, among other things: "What types of work do they fit most admirably? Certainly not jobs that require initiative or independent action. A Negro needs a white boss close at hand to tell him what to do and see that he does it. A white man who works alongside his Negroes sinks in their estimation. A Negro has to think of his bosses in respectful terms. * * * Every Negro must obey any white man who gives him an instruction. No questioning or arguing is allowed."

These are the notions that go with job discrimination. We want to wipe them, once and for all, out of the life of this city.

Mrs. Anna Walker—A War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, "I think that if we all do our part we will win the war." We hear these words frequently and it is well that we do, for they express a deep and abiding confidence in ourselves and in our country, a confidence that hastens victory. Such confidence is a good thing. But very few people have as much justification and right to make this statement as this person concerning whom I desire to make these remarks. And if we all meant what this patriotic woman means by doing our part, victory would be more swift and sure. But we are not all heroes.

There is more than one kind of hero, and Mrs. Anna Walker, 139 Howe St., Methuen, Mass., is most certainly one of the finest kind. Her outstanding contributions have been called to my attention frequently which indicates, by the way, that her efforts never tire, that she persists courageously. In the first place she persists at her work day in and day out in the Shawsheen Mills, Shawsheen Village, Andover, Mass., one of the textile plants that is working for Uncle Sam.

But this alone is not what marks Mrs. Anna Walker as a hero. Consider this, that she is the mother of six children. Moreover, three of them are nurses, one is in the Air Corps, one in training, and another assisting the Red Cross. A son served in the armed forces until his recent medical discharge. This is a fine record for a war worker and mother.

But Mrs. Anna Walker did not consider that even this was "doing her part" sufficiently. Consequently, she began a personal campaign to increase purchases of War bonds and stamps. Her efforts have been untiring; her patience has been remarkable. Day after day she reminded her coworkers of the urgent necessity that we all buy bonds and stamps to the utmost of our ability. And what were her results? In less than a year, Mrs. Anna Walker has sold over $7,000 in stamps, not to mention, as she says modestly, quite a few bonds. This is the day-by-day quiet heroism which we associate with women, and which Mrs. Walker demonstrates to an extraordinary degree. If this can be termed "doing our part," as our heroine modestly calls it, then I wish that we all were doing our part. But times of emergency and crisis always cause the greater ability and greater courage of some men and women to rise above the others to be a help and an inspiration to all others. And Mrs. Anna Walker of Methuen, Mass., has been a help and an inspiration to all who know of her efforts and her success, and she is one of America's foremost citizens.

A Senator Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in the Atlantic Monthly for July, written by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The article is headed "A Senator Looks at Congress." It is a most interesting article. I hope all Members of this body will read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR LOOKS AT CONGRESS

(By ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.)

I

Wars and dictatorship have swept aside all but the merest vestiges of representative government elsewhere in the world. It should come as no surprise that representative government in the United States is on trial for its life.

Probably no other Congress in recent history suffered so much abuse and public derogation as did the last one, which served the Nation throughout the grim and difficult days of 1941 and 1942. James Bryce many years ago observed that Americans "are fond of running down Congressmen." There never has been any doubt that they are; criticizing Congressmen has always been one of the precious liberties of democracy, second only to perhaps to the privileges of voting for them.

The unjustified attacks which have been made upon Congress during the last year or two, however, are of a different character. They strike a note which has sinister consequences for the future of Congress as an institution of democracy. When a newspaper columnist makes the reckless and unsupported charge that "the ignorance and provincialism of Congress render it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government," more is involved than the ancient and honorable pastime of "running down Congressmen."

The hullabaloo raised in the press and on the radio over "X" cards for Congressmen, and the despicable misrepresentation of the law enacted to broaden the Federal Government's retirement system, were parts of the campaign to undermine the faith of the public in their elected Representatives in Congress. In some quarters the misrepresentation was deliberate; in others it was more or less unconscious as newsmen sought to pander to the mood of the moment. The net effect, however, was the same. Congress was pilloried over every radio in the country and verbally was hanged in effigy on most front pages of the press for "politics as usual" in time of war.

Attuned to this rising crescendo of public criticism, the President used the tone of a dictator on Labor Day to charge, in substance, that Congress by its inaction had brought the country to the brink of a disastrous inflation. He threatened that, if it did not repeal certain legislative restrictions in the price-control law which were objectionable in his judgment, he would do so himself.

Without attempting to set forth all the errors in these attacks, suffice it to say that the delays with which the President charged Congress were caused as much by the indecision and confusion of the executive branch as by the legislative. The particular restrictions in the price-control law to which he referred had been put there only a few months before with the full support of the Secretary of Agriculture. The X cards were not a special and exclusive congressional privilege. Under the initial and temporary gasoline rationing plan, Office of Price Administration gave out thousands of X cards to Government officials. Of the 15,000 issued in the District of Columbia alone, only 200 went to Members of Congress.

The truth about the alleged pension grab is equally instructive. Actually the legislation so termed was designed to bring under the Federal Government's long-established retirement system a great number of employees not previously eligible. Coverage for elected officials was made optional, subject to certain required minimum periods of service. So far as benefits were concerned, they were to be exactly the same, in proportion to length of service and the amount of the individual's contribution, as those enjoyed by any other Federal employee taken into the system, from the lowest-salaried clerk up to employees in the Executive branch receiving higher salaries than those paid to Senators or Congressmen.

When the President of the United States can seriously propose to repeal an act of Congress by Executive order, it is time for the American people to take stock of the situation—war or no war.

II

What is wrong with Congress? There certainly is no dearth of volunteers to answer that question. If criticism alone could make for perfection, Congress would by this time be one of the most perfect of all human institutions. From Publius to Pegler it has been a favorite target for the disgruntled, the disappointed, the intellectual snobs, and the doubters of democracy alike.

But most of this criticism is not constructive. It springs from personal prejudice, political bias, and above all from an utter lack of knowledge of the workaday problems with which a great legislative body must deal.

The current critics who accuse Congress of lacking political courage can for the most part be divided into two groups. Those who have complaints against the President's policies uppermost in their minds charge it with being a rubber stamp and are vehement in their demands that it reassert itself and show the Executive who is boss. Those who want to overpower all opposition to his policies make loose charges that Congress yields to pressure groups—the farm lobby, the labor lobby, local interests—and other accusations of venality too numerous to mention. Seldom does anyone express aloud the idea that Members of the House and Senate, like other people, may be following their own best judgment and sincere convictions.

It is always easy to attribute the shortcomings of Congress to the fact that it no longer has men of the caliber of Clay, Calhoun, and Webster among its Members. But even when those eminent statesmen were alive Alexis de Tocqueville, writing upon his visit to the United States, complained: "The race of American statesmen has evidently dwindled most remarkably in the course of the last 50 years."

This type of criticism lumps the sins of Congress under the head of personal ignorance and political timidity. There are many critics who would have the public believe that the average Congressman is a pusillanimous ignoramus who looks under the bed every night to see if there is a voter there waiting to lop off his political head on election day.

Those to whom the simplicity of this analysis appeals would do well to ponder a statement coming from the eminent American historian, Charles A. Beard: "As a more than casual student of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I venture this opinion: It is possible to pick out of the RECORD for the past 10 years addresses (not orations) which, for breadth of knowledge, technical skill, analytical acumen, close reasoning, and dignified presentation, compare favorably with similar utterances made in the preceding century by the so-called great orators. * * * Considering the complexity of problems before Congress today, and taking account of the distractions which now beset Senators and Representatives, the quality of serious speeches in both Houses is amazingly high. There is, to be sure, more trash—bad poetry, demagogic claptrap, and clotted nonsense—in the RECORD of the past 10 years than there was in the Annals of Congress from 1789 to 1799. Yet after studying the operations of the first Congresses of the United States and the operations of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I am convinced that for disinterestedness, absence of corruption, and concern with the public good, the present body is of higher order."

III

The role of Congress in time of war is a difficult one. Sweeping powers must of necessity be concentrated in the hands of the Commander in Chief so that he may direct with dispatch and decision the striking power of the Nation. In total war the home front is an integral part of the fighting front. Therefore it is not easy to define the limits of authority that should wisely be delegated to the President.

To preserve independent judgment where the people's interest requires it, to protect them from the excesses of a relatively irresponsible bureaucracy operating under vast delegated powers, and at the same time to avoid the pitfalls of blind obstructionism that would impair the Nation's strength for total war is a task that is bound to be thankless and often misunderstood.

The record of Congress in this grave crisis, if it were known and appreciated, would be sufficient defense against the common types of criticism. Breaking all records for speedy action, the last Congress provided appropriations and authorizations amounting to $240,000,000,000 to win this war. In the delegation of essential powers to the Commander in Chief, it has unhesitatingly cooperated. Where some individual Members or congressional committees took issue with the administration's judgment on manpower, aluminum, steel, agriculture, inflation, and rubber, events have shown that they were right and the slide-rule artists who advised the President were wrong.

But those who wish to see representative government preserved in America cannot afford to let the matter rest there. Whether the customary criticism of Congress is justified or not, whether it is constructive or not, the fact remains that it is symptomatic of a growing belief that Congress is not adequate to the "needs of modern government."

The tasks confronting Government are tremendous. The problem of mobilizing and coordinating the efforts and resources of 130,000,000 people toward a common goal staggers the imagination.

It is estimated that in the next fiscal year the Federal Budget will total $120,000,000,000, more than three-quarters of the expected national income. The fate of almost every individual, certainly every business enterprise, is wrapped up in the problem of how that money is raised and spent.

The Federal Government is now an organization of almost two and a half million employees, excluding the armed forces. A multitude of agencies are reaching into the homes and lives of each and every citizen, affecting what he shall eat, what he shall wear, how warm or cold his house shall be, where he shall work, how he shall do business, what prices he shall charge, or, if he is a

farmer, what he shall raise and what he will get to do it with.

It is comparatively easy to sit back and deal with these problems in their broad aspects. For example, if it is finally demonstrated that military requirements demand an additional 5,000,000 men in the Army this year, it is easy to calculate that it shall be recruited at the rate of 400,000 per month through Selective Service out of certain estimated reserves. But when it becomes translated into 400,000 individual cases every month, each with its problems, the needs of modern government come to light in their true proportions.

IV

A successful government must be able not only to formulate broad policies but also to apply them fairly in the individual case. The true aim of government should be to serve the individual.

In the early days of the Republic the problems of government were simpler because the economy of the Nation was expanding and was to a great extent self-propelling. The vast resources of the frontier opened by Government to exploitation and use offered great opportunities to those individuals who were threatened with oppression from capitalistic excesses. Except for questions of tariff, monetary policy, internal improvements, and public lands, the Federal Government was left free to devote its energies to matters more strictly political.

The legislative process accordingly was more leisurely. The problems themselves were more general, except for the tariff. Consequently it was possible to draw legislation, as the separation of powers theory of the Constitution assumes, to provide in advance for most contingencies.

That is no longer true. The phrase delegating to the President or some one of his recognized agents the power to "issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act" is now one of the indispensable and most significant portions of most policy legislation adopted by Congress.

The constantly growing body of Executive or administrative law has become both a necessity to the operation of modern government and a threat to the constitutional function of Congress as the legislative, policy-making branch of the Government.

As the function of government has become more and more technical, the administrative problems have become more significant in the formulation of legislation. Consequently there has been a growing tendency for Congress to turn to the Executive for guidance in drawing new legislation—not out of any lazy desire to avoid its responsibility, but rather out of conscientious effort to frame good legislation that will prove workable. The administrators of the Government are for the most part responsible to the Executive, and as a result the Executive's function in proposing and drawing new legislation has been tremendously enlarged.

With this growing emphasis upon the day-to-day application of laws, the policy-making function of government is drifting away from the point at which the laws are passed.

Basically, the present weakness of Congress lies in its failure to meet this problem. To check on an administrative agency's appropriation after it is spent is a crude discipline at best—a negative approach, capable of crippling an agency and its offending program, but incapable of putting something positive and constructive in its place.

The special investigative committee technique, currently exemplified by the Truman committee of the Senate, is one significant advance in the direction of such a relationship between the legislative and executive branches. Its success in exposing administrative errors already committed and preventing others, through constructive recommendations embodied in its periodic reports, together with the ever-present possibility of exposure and censure, has been spectacular.

The weaknesses of this technique in the long run are that it is not sufficiently continuous and that it is not applied to all phases of the Government's program.

If the control of governmental policy is to remain with the people's elected representatives, as the framers of the Constitution intended it should, and not drift into the hands of a relatively irresponsible bureaucracy, Congress will have to streamline its organization. At the same time it will have to devise new instrumentalities and methods which will afford a positive, constructive liaison and high-policy relationship with the administrative arm of the National Government.

V

The committee organization has long been the backbone of the lawmaking machinery; therefore streamlining efforts should begin with drastic reorganization of the committee structure. There has never been any rhyme or reason governing the establishment and growth of the present committee set-up in either House of Congress. Many committees were originally established to attend to specific problems of a particular period and have later been made standing committees, sometimes active, sometimes not.

Until comparatively recently, Congress provided its Members with clerical assistance only when they were chairmen of committees. This complicated the committee organization because it encouraged the continuation of a number of useless committees solely for the purpose of providing necessary office staff for their chairmen.

At the present time there are 33 standing committees of the Senate and 10 special committees. The House has 45 standing committees and 7 special committees. As a result of the large number of committees in the Senate, more than half the Senators serve on 6 or more committees. One Senator is serving on 10 different committees.

This diffusion of energy and responsibility among a large number of groups, many with overlapping jurisdiction, is not conducive to the formulation of coherent and continuous legislative policy. Neither is it conducive to developing a well-recognized and continuing relationship with executive agencies administering the laws.

The confusion is evident in the efforts that have been made to keep a watchful eye on the Executive departments and agencies directing the war effort. While the special Truman committee has taken the leadership with a sustained and energetic review of many phases of the war program, the committees on Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Agriculture, Appropriations, and various special committees have likewise been delving into various aspects of the war program. The renegotiation provisions of the law regarding war contracts, for instance, originated in the Senate Appropriations Committee but later were revised and amended by the Senate Finance Committee in connection with the tax bill.

The Congress cannot expect to cope with the complex problems of today unless the number of committees is drastically reduced and unless their jurisdiction is so defined that they can deal continuously with homogeneous segments of national policy corresponding roughly, at least, to the main outlines of administrative divisions in the executive branch.

Taking the Senate for example, it would be possible to reduce the number of committees to 10 or 12 in the interest of greater efficiency.

One committee on armed forces could better serve in guiding the Senate's actions in the sphere of war and national defense than can the divided counsel of the two present committees—the one on Military Affairs and the one on Naval Affairs. The day when the Army and Navy could safely be considered is independent and not necessarily coordinate arms of the military service has long since passed. Moreover, the unified approach of a single committee would be more likely to give air power the consideration and standing it deserves than do the present committees tied up traditionally with the Army and Navy. This committee should also take over the jurisdiction of the Pensions Committee and the veterans' affairs jurisdiction now exercised by the Finance Committee.

In the field of business and the regulation of commerce one committee could do a much more intelligent job than is possible under the present division of responsibility and jurisdiction among such committees as those on Interstate Commerce, Commerce, Manufactures, and Patents.

A committee on the interior, natural resources, and public works could combine the limited jurisdictions of a host of present committee, such as those on Post Offices and Post Roads, Public Lands and Surveys, Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, Territories and Insular Affairs, Interoceanic Canals, and Public Buildings and Grounds.

A committee on labor and public welfare could well take over the present jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Immigration, and the subject of social security now under the Finance Committee.

The Finance Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee should be merged. It is recognized that the fundamental problem of the business cycle, inflation, and deflation, is closely related to tax policy and monetary and credit policies. At present the Finance Committee is charged with responsibility for the one, and the Banking and Currency Committee for the other.

Such committees as those on Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Printing, Enrolled Bills, Privileges and Elections, and the Library could very properly be combined with the present Rules Committee, which has the responsibility already for much of the administrative business of the Senate.

The committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Agriculture already have clear and unchallenged jurisdiction over their respective spheres and should retain it.

The Claims Committee should be abolished. Congress should set up an organization to hear and dispose of all claims against the Government, thus relieving the members of the burdensome task of investigating petty claims and of invoking the cumbersome procedure of passing private bills through the House and Senate.

Congress should pass a model city government statute for the District of Columbia and quit doing a poor and time-consuming job as its common council.

In the vital field of appropriations Congress has already recognized the necessity of bringing all appropriations before a general Appropriations Committee with an over-all familiarity with the entire National Budget.

In 1899 the Senate Appropriations Committee was given jurisdiction over some of the appropriation bills, but others of great importance were considered by the committee that had jurisdiction over the enabling legislation authorizing it. Thus, for example, appropriations for rivers and harbors were passed on by the Commerce Committee.

In 1922, when the Appropriations Committee was given jurisdiction over all appropriations bills, the logic of securing the assistance of members of the committees under whose jurisdiction the various activities fell was recognized by providing that three members of the Commerce Committee, to pursue the illustration, would sit ex officio with the appropriations subcommittee designated to

consider the appropriation for rivers and harbors, and one member of the Commerce Committee would serve on the conference committee representing the Senate.

A Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments should be brought to life to perform the functions now being discharged by a special joint committee.

VI

Simplification of the committee structure would afford a greater opportunity for each individual Senator or Congressman to concentrate his energies on one or, at the most, two committees. He would become more expert in his chosen field, and the service and effectiveness of the committees would improve accordingly.

Reduction in the number of committees should be accompanied by a drastic reduction from their present size.

Reorganization would also pave the way for more collaboration between the two Houses of Congress through the instrumentality of joint committees, such as the present Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This committee, with its staff of experts, has proved of great assistance to both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in the highly technical, detailed, and intricate task of formulating tax legislation.

The question of adequate and expert staff is of vital importance. Undoubtedly one of the great contributing factors to the shift of influence and power from the legislative to the executive branch in recent years is the fact that Congress has been generous in providing expert and technical personnel for the executive agencies, but niggardly in providing such personnel for itself.

One of the traditional powers of Congress over the Executive is supposedly control over the purse strings. Obviously, that control cannot be exercised intelligently unless Congress has the facilities and the expert staff to appraise and evaluate appropriations just as the Budget Bureau does. Yet the annual appropriation for the staff of the Bureau of the Budget is 13 times as large as the appropriations for the staff of the Senate and House Committees on appropriations combined.

In the next few months Congress will be facing such far-reaching and intricate problems as renewal of reciprocal trade agreements and lend-lease legislation, price control, and the over-all manpower program for military, agricultural, and industrial service. Practically all the committees before which these great problems will come for legislative determination of one kind or another will have the usual staffs of five or six employees. In most cases the top salary paid to any member of those committee staffs will be $3,900. Positions of similar responsibility in the executive agencies would afford salaries almost double that amount.

The Congress should establish at once joint committee staffs made up of competent and well-paid personnel for each of the major streamlined committees as outlined. Thus an efficient and well-informed group of independent experts would be available to the various major committees of the House and Senate. With this vital aid supplemented by the excellent legislative counsel's staffs now serving the respective bodies in drafting legislation, with Members able to devote their time to only one or two committees, Congress would be in a position to render the people more efficient and constructive service and to reestablish a better balance of power with the executive branch.

Each individual Senator and Congressman is in the same position as the Congress as a whole, insofar as staff is concerned. Their responsibilities have multiplied over and over again in recent years. As the Government has stepped into the individual lives of each and every one of their constituents, the demand for assistance in all sorts of problems has descended upon them in an increasing torrent.

Yet when the proposal was made 2 years ago that each Senator should be allowed the services of an executive assistant with a salary of $4,500 per year, it was defeated. The administrative assistant in countless district offices of the Office of Price Administration or any other Federal agency gets that salary, but a United States Senator, representing a constituency of millions of people, is denied this necessary assistance simply because of the unwillingness of Congress to spend the money that is necessary to equip itself to do its job.

VII

Reorganization of committee structure, concentration of members' time on fewer committees and subjects, and development of adequate staffs, although vitally important, will not alone serve to meet the major problem presented by the necessity, in war and in peace, for the delegation of vast legislative powers to the executive arm of the Government. Despite all protestations to the contrary, by the "outs" seeking to be made the "ins," the complexity of our economic life now and after the war will force the Congress to continue the process of delegation of power in order that government may function with a reasonable amount of satisfaction to the people. To meet this necessity and at the same time to preserve democracy will test the genius of the American people for self-government as never before. In the compass of this article there is only space to suggest methods by which the legislative branch of the Government can discharge its full responsibilities without undue interference with the Executive's power.

Congress could establish a joint legislative and executive council made up of a small number of Members of the House and Senate selected by ballot or by the majority and minority in both Houses, to confer regularly with the President and the heads of departments and agencies. The council should only consider the broad questions of policy and not those related to purely administrative functions.

Thus the Congress, through representation and with the cooperation of the President, would be in a position to make certain that the delegation of its power in various fields of government action was being exercised as the Congress intended. It would save the executive branch of the Government from many a mistake and relieve it from the justifiable charge of usurpation and abuse of power.

This device, like any other human institution, will depend for its effectiveness upon cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of government. I have confidence that it holds out real hope of success in meeting one of our most pressing problems in the preservation of the American democratic structure.

Another means of holding the Executive to a stricter and current accountability in the exercise of the vast powers placed in his hands would be to require the attendance of Cabinet officers and heads of agencies for questioning before the House and Senate, respectively, at stated intervals This idea was advocated by my friend the late Senator Bronson Cutting. It has great possibilities in the solution of our present problem of preserving the balance of power and at the same time enabling government to function efficiently and adequately.

Many people are looking to their representatives to reassert the power and independence of the legislative branch.

If this resurgence is to express itself in a positive, constructive way, rather than in a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward the President, Congress will have to overcome its inferiority complex, provide a staff with the best experts money can hire, reorganize its outmoded committee system, and seriously set itself to the job not only of passing better laws but of working with the executive departments constantly to see they are made to produce the results intended.

Congress has an opportunity now to show what it can do. If it fails to be constructive, there is no telling how long an impatient people will support representative government in America.

The Fresh Beef Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Billings Gazette, of Montana, which was sent to me by Mr. B. L. Surface, of 322 Park Street, Bismarck, N. Dak. The article is entitled "Says Fresh Beef Rots on Tracks." I also ask that Mr. Surface's letter be printed.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISMARCK, N. D., *June 25, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM H. LANGER,
United States Senator North Dakota,
Washington D. C.:

The enclosed is self-explanatory.

Will you try and find out why shipment is not or was not diverted to the west coast, and turned over to the west coast packers, for distribution, we have no decent meat in the markets here.

Understand this was caused by no refrigerated boats available at coast points, even so why let it rot, when the whole country is short of meat.

Yours very truly,

B. L. SURFACE.

SAYS FRESH BEEF ROTS ON TRACKS—ASSERTS MEN NEEDED FOR REICING CARS

HELENA, June 23.—More than 20,000 tons of fresh beef is spoiling on railroad side tracks from eastern Montana to Seattle while Federal war agencies do nothing to obtain labor for reicing refrigerator cars, James D. Graham, president of the Montana Federation of Labor, charged Wednesday.

Movement of the meat, bound for overseas under lend-lease contracts, has been delayed for several weeks due to a traffic jam between Chicago and Seattle, Graham said, and appealed to the War Manpower Commission and the War Labor Board to take immediate action.

"At least 1,000 refrigerator cars loaded with dressed beef are strung out on side tracks along the Milwaukee railway from Miles City, Mont., to Spokane, Wash., a distance of 750 miles, awaiting shipping orders and rotting while they wait," the Montana labor leader declared.

Information received by Graham revealed that cars are stranded at Miles City, Harlowton, Alberton, and at Avery, Idaho, he said.

Communistic Influence on Racial Disorders

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said a moment ago that they ought to seize the farmers' meat and cattle in order to feed the people in New York. Now, if he will send that gang of communistic Jews and Negroes that came down here day before yesterday and tried to storm the House restaurant, and went around here arm in arm with each other in this Capitol, if he will just send them down into Texas, or out into the West, or anywhere else in the cattle-growing belt, to do the seizing of those cattle, they will not have so many people to feed in New York.

It is dawning on the American people who is creating and promoting this race trouble and these race riots throughout the country.

I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that when they dig into those race riots in Detroit and elsewhere, they will find that the same element promoted them, and they will find the same element stirring up race trouble here in Washington.

When those communistic Jews—of whom the decent Jews are ashamed—go around here and hug and kiss these Negroes, dance with them, intermarry with them, and try to force their way into white restaurants, white hotels and white picture shows, they are not deceiving any red-blooded American, and, above all, they are not deceiving the men in our armed forces—as to who is at the bottom of all this race trouble.

The better element of the Jews, and especially the old line American Jews throughout the South and West, are not only ashamed of, but they are alarmed at, the activities of these communistic Jews who are stirring this trouble up.

They have caused the deaths of many good Negroes who never would have got into trouble if they had been left alone, as well as the deaths of many good white people, including many innocent, unprotected white girls, who have been raped and murdered by vicious Negroes, who have been encouraged by these alien-minded Communists to commit such crimes.

They are spreading their poisonous doctrine of hate among the Negroes and thereby making it impossible for them to live in peace with the white people around them.

Communism is dying in Russia, or rather it is being run out of Russia by the Russians themselves, but it is still active in this country, as the records of these race riots show.

I have before me a letter written by a patriotic American soldier from Detroit, Mich., in which he tells of these Communists stirring up trouble among the Negroes in Detroit. He said that one night in August 1942 he went into "Paradise Valley" and witnessed a big Communist turn-out, attended very largely by the Negroes of Detroit. The Communists, he said, set up loudspeakers and in a short time a large crowd had gathered, and in 10 minutes those Communist agitators were spreading their doctrine of hate and revolution among those Detroit Negroes. One of these speakers, he said, shouted, "The party of the Negro people is the Communist Party." They told them, "If you want to be free and happy, you should join the Communist Party of Michigan as soon as possible." They also shouted, "If you want good homes, you must fight for them." One of the speakers said, "The rich capitalistic white people of Detroit have robbed you of the good homes and schools that you should rightfully have. The Communist Party is your only hope of getting back what is yours."

He said the Communist Party sponsored meetings of this kind almost every week in Detroit, and had the Negroes there stirred up almost to the point of revolution—"after some of these crafty Communist orators had finished their outpouring of hate." He said that all these meetings were designed "to turn Negroes against whites," and that "This latest bloody outburst is just the beginning, if communism is allowed to continue its revolutionary program in Detroit and the United States of America."

This young man says further: "'I am preparing to lay down my life on a distant battlefield for my country. There are millions of us who are now training for war against the Jap and Nazi aggressors. In the name of God, in the name of our Constitution, in the name of our Republic let us destroy that horrible beast known as the Communist International."

He says in conclusion, "If it is not done now, we will do it when the mess is cleaned up over there."

Mr. Speaker, that young soldier expresses the views of millions of our brave boys who are now in the service, as well as those of a vast majority of the people at home. If these Communists are able to stir a race war in America, it will have the most demoralizing effect on this country, and especially on the men in our armed forces, of anything else that could possibly occur.

The disgusting spectacle we saw here in this Capitol on the day before yesterday ought to be enough to arouse the most complacent individual to the dangers that confront this country here at home.

While our boys are fighting and dying to protect our country from without, let us see to it that our sacred institutions are not destroyed from within.

Opinions of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the successful working of democratic government depends upon the closest possible relationship existing between a Representative in Congress and the people of the district which sends him there. It is part of the duty of a Representative to keep in as close touch with the people of his district as possible. And it is particularly important for him to have as much knowledge as possible with regard to the thinking of the people on important problems and questions of the day.

With this thought in mind, I prepared a short time ago a list of questions covering a number of the more important matters requiring decision or solution by our National Government and sent them to some 30,000 people in my district with a request that they answer the questions and return them to me in order that it might be more possible to gage the sentiment of the people of the district on these matters. It is, of course, true that every conscientious Member of Congress confronts from time to time the dilemma as to what he should do in cases where his own profound convictions impel him to cast a vote contrary to what appears to be the majority opinion of the people of his district. And there will always be times in the career of every Member of Congress when he must do the thing he himself believes to be right even though it will be likely to cost him his reelection. It is nevertheless extremely important that Members of Congress develop all possible means of keeping in the closest possible touch with the people of their districts, particularly in these days when it is so seldom possible for them to be at home for any extended period of time.

Better than a 10-percent response has been received from this questionnaire, and they are still coming in. This response was an extremely good one, particularly in view of the fact that 33 questions were asked, some of which required answers other than a simple yes or no, and in view of the further fact that those answering the questionnaire had not only to spend many hours in making it out but also to address and pay postage upon their replies.

More than 3,100 answers to the questionnaire have now been tabulated and the trend of the answers is so clear and so unvarying that I think it is time that they be made public for such guidance and benefit as they may be. I want to say further that in my judgment the answers given by the people of the Twelfth District of California to this questionnaire indicate a most earnest

and intelligent interest in the problems of their country.

The first question read as follows:

What single action by the Government do you believe would do most to strengthen our war effort and hasten our victory?

Obviously no "yes" or "no" answer was possible and the answers given included an extremely wide variety. Indeed, it is quite impossible to indicate any consensus of opinion with regard to this first question. The main result obtained from this question was to indicate clearly that there is no one thing upon which people generally agree as being the main need of our country from the standpoint of strengthening our war effort and hastening our victory. It is at least interesting, however, to observe that about 10 percent of the answers contained one or another of the following six ideas as the opinion of the person as to what single action by Government would most strengthen our war effort:

First. Eliminate politics on all sides for the duration of the war.

Second. Total conscription of all manpower, property, and wealth for the period of the war.

Third. Outlaw strikes.

Fourth. Give more complete news to the people regarding all phases of the war effort.

Fifth. Eliminate all profits for the period of the war.

Sixth. Reduce overlapping of governmental agencies and simplify governmental action.

These six answers presented in various forms comprised, as I have said, about 10 percent of all the answers received to question No. 1. There were, in addition, however, a variety of other answers, including "prevent inflation," "closer international consultation with our allies," "draft of capital," "draft of labor," "Government control of industry," "more support for the President," "more constructive opposition to the President," and many more.

Questions Nos. 2, 3, and 5 all had to do with the development of closer collaboration among the United Nations for the successful prosecution of the war. In every case an overwhelming majority favored the formation of the war councils projected in these questions, though a significant number, approximately 10 percent of the people in each case, declined to answer the question on the ground that it was a matter for military decision. Question No. 2 read as follows:

Do you favor the formation of an Atlantic war council composed of representatives of Britain, America, and Russia to develop overall strategy for the European theater of the war?

Eighty-nine percent of the people answered "Yes."

Question 3 read as follows:

Do you favor the formation of a Pacific war council composed of America, Britain, and China to develop over-all strategy for pressing the war in the Pacific?

Ninety-two percent of the people answered "Yes."

Question 5 read:

Do you favor a supreme war council to include official representatives of all the United Nations and to plan war strategy?

Eighty-seven percent of the people answered "yes."

All of which would seem to add up to the fact that people of the Twelfth District of California are in favor of the closest possible cooperation among the United Nations.

The fourth question was one in which west coast people have a peculiar interest and it is perhaps not to be wondered that it received the second highest percentage of "yes" votes of any question that was asked, namely almost 96 percent. This question read:

Do you believe material aid to China should be sharply increased and greater emphasis placed on the war against Japan?

There were a significant number of people who qualified their answers by stating that they were ready to leave even the matter of aid to China and increased emphasis on the war of Japan to the decision of military leaders. It is, of course, however, very natural indeed that the people of the west coast are tremendously concerned to see the war in the Pacific prosecuted with all possible vigor. And they said so.

Question 6 was divided into six parts. It was prefaced by the following statement:

One of our major problems is that of food supply. Already some supplies are short. In order to increase food production, would you favor—

There then followed five specific proposals. The first of which was—

Exemption of agricultural workers from the draft.

Eighty-four percent of the people answered "yes."

Next, it was asked whether the person answering favored—

Higher prices to farmers for some of their crops.

Sixty-seventh percent of the people answered "yes."

Third, people were asked whether they believed food production would be increased by providing—

Complete control by the Food Administration over farm prices, farm machinery production and distribution, recruitment and transportation of farm workers, and all other matters affecting food production.

About a third of the people declined to answer this question and a number of the answers to this question were qualified by the words "if necessary" but 90 percent of the people who answered said that they did believe such a centralization of authority and responsibility would help. On the proposition of the—

Formation of a victory land army of volunteer workers to be enlisted for 6 months of a year and to be moved about the country into areas of agricultural labor shortage.

Ninety-one percent of the people indicated they would support such a program and believed it would help.

I then asked whether it was believed that it would be helpful in promoting food production if Congress were to—

Repeal the Soil Conservation Act.

A considerable number of people declined to answer this question on the ground that they were not familiar with the terms of the act. But those who did answer it comprised more than two-thirds of the 3,100 people who answered the questionnaire.

Sixty percent expressed themselves as opposed to repeal the Soil Conservation Act.

And in the case of some of those who said they favored repeal, the answer was qualified in such a way as to indicate that they were confused between the operation of the Soil Conservation Act as such and some other phases of the governmental agricultural program. It is obvious, however, that in answering a questionnaire of this sort particularly in view of the large percentages of "yes" votes on all the preceding four questions, the majority against repeal of the Soil Conservation Act is significant and important. The final subsection of this sixth question on food production asked:

What other measures would you suggest?

Here again, there was no considerable unification of opinion and the answers varied widely indeed and included all manner of proposals. Approximately 8 percent of the answers, however, could be fairly grouped under one or another of the following heads:

(a) More equitable price ceilings as between different products.

(b) Provision of more adequate supplies of labor and machinery.

(c) A greater degree of local control over the food production program.

(d) Let farmers make more of their own decisions.

(e) A judicious use of subsidies to encourage increased production.

The twenty-eighth question really belongs with the ones I have just discussed having to do with food production. It reads as follows:

Do you favor the passage of the Pace bill which would provide for including the cost of farm labor in determining parity prices for farm crops?

I believe the answers to this question are very significant, particularly in view of the fact that my district is three-fourths urban and only approximately 25 percent agricultural. Approximately one-fourth of the people declined to answer this question on the ground that they did not have sufficient information. But of those who did answer it, comprising better than 2,200 people.

Eighty percent said that they would favor passage of the Pace bill. And this included a substantial majority of those who indicated on their questionnaire that they were members of labor organizations.

The seventh and eighth questions had to do with war contracts. They were asked largely because of the very great number of communications which I have been receiving protesting against inef-

ficient use of manpower and equipment in connection with cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. The seventh question therefore asked:

Do you believe the Government should stop letting contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis?

Here again a significant percentage, namely, about 20 percent, declined to answer on the ground that they did not have sufficient information. But of those who did answer, 71 percent said they did believe that we should now stop letting contracts on cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

The eighth question then read:

If your answer to question 7 is "Yes," what other system of letting contracts would you propose?

In this case there did not exist the wide variety of answers which marked the reply to the first question and the final subsection of question 6. On the contrary, over 50 percent of those who answered this question declared that they believed that competitive bidding should be used.

The next most frequent answer was that—

The Government should take over all industry during the war.

But only 1 person gave this answer for every 10 that advocated competitive bidding. A third answer which was given by a considerable number of people called for "flat-price contracts."

And this answer was generally qualified with some such statement as—

There should have been enough experience by now to enable contracts to be let on a flat-price basis.

The ninth question asked:

Do you favor a general draft of manpower?

Sixty-two percent said "Yes" and 38 percent said "No."

The tenth question then asked whether the person answering believed a draft of manpower "could be justified unless plants and factories in which people worked are likewise drafted and profit eliminated."

Upon this question, which is closely associated with the previous one, 34 percent said "Yes" they did believe that a draft of manpower could be instituted without drafting plants and factories. But 66 percent said they did not believe this could be justly done.

Approximately 40 percent did not answer this tenth question for the obvious reason that they were only requested to answer it in case their answer to the ninth question was "Yes."

Questions 11 and 12 had to do with democratic control of labor unions. The eleventh question asked:

Do you favor a law limiting the amount of initiation fees a labor union can charge?

Ninety-one percent said "Yes" to this question.

On this question and the twelfth one as well, I segregated from the other questionnaires the ones which came from members of labor unions. Even in their case, however, 54 percent answered "Yes" to question No. 11.

In the case of question 12 which asked:

Do you favor a law requiring regular secret ballot elections for labor union officers and regular financial reports by labor union officials to their membership?

Ninety-three percent of all those answering the question said "Yes," and even 70 percent of the members of labor unions did so.

The significance of the answers to these two questions seems to me to lie in the fact that they indicate a broad support for measures calculated to assure democratic control of labor organizations but which do not deprive the unions of any of their fundamental rights or freedoms. It is, however, I think significant that there was comparatively much more opposition from the ranks of labor itself to attempts at regulation of the amount of initiation fees by law than there was to provisions for regular election of officers or financial reports to membership. And no doubt the reason is that, as pointed out by many of the labor union members, the best of the labor organizations already do follow the practices indicated in question No. 12.

The thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth questions all had to do with the matter of rationing. Question No. 13 asked:

Should local rationing boards have more or less power to make decisions with regard to individual and local problems?

A considerable number, about one-third of those sending in questionnaires, did not answer this question. Of those who did answer it 71 percent thought local boards should have more power and 29 percent thought they should have less.

On question No. 14 which asked:

Do you favor rationing of scarce commodities during wartime?

There was the largest affirmative vote that was cast on any question in the whole questionnaire, namely, 96 percent of the people said "yes."

Not so much, of course, because they like rationing particularly as because they recognize clearly that it is the only fair way to bring about an equitable distribution of scarce commodities under present circumstances. The fifteenth question asked:

What other method would you use to assure an equitable distribution of scarce commodities, if your answer to question 14 is "No?"

Not only, however, was there absolutely no agreement among the few answers made to question 15, but in view of the overwhelming affirmative vote on No. 14 there were only a negligible percentage of people who were called upon to express their opinion on the fifteenth question at all. Question No. 16 was asked because of a proposal made over the radio by Commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., concerning which I received a considerable amount of mail. This question read:

In cases where a commodity is rationed, do you favor the removal of price ceilings so far as that commodity is concerned?

The answers to this question are interesting, particularly in view of the fact that I received a number of letters from my district urging that this procedure be adopted. But the result of the questionnaire indicated only 14 percent of the people in favor of Mr. Lewis' idea, and 86 percent opposed to it.

Questions 17 and 18 had to do with preparation for the problems of the post-war period. The seventeenth question read as follows:

Do you believe that it is too early for the Congress and the people of the country generally to consider and work out a program for meeting the problems which we shall face within our own country, and also the problem of establishing a permanent peace throughout the world when the war has been won?

Eighteen percent of the people said "Yes."

That is, they did believe it was too soon for us to consider a program for meeting the problems of post-war period and that we should not devote time or thought to such problems, but that the war should be won first. However, 82 percent said "No," that they did not believe it was too soon.

The eighteenth question asked:

Do you favor the formation of a national commission for this purpose now?

Eighty-four percent answered "Yes."

This was naturally encouraging to me, since I have been advocating such a national commission for the past 3 years. It seems to me, furthermore, that this is a matter which the Congress cannot, if it is to do its duty, neglect further, especially since it voted virtually to abolish the National Resources Planning Board.

The twentieth question had to do with a matter upon which there is a very great deal of public discussion and obviously a tremendous amount of popular interest. The question read:

Do you favor America participating with other nations in some sort of international organization or international police force which would be effective in preventing future aggression from getting started and for the maintenance of peace after this war has been won?

As to this question there was a smaller number of people who failed to answer than was the case with any other question, excepting only the fourteenth question about rationing. This indicates a high degree of popular interest in the question. Furthermore, 93 percent of the people said "Yes" and only 7 percent said "No."

It will be observed, therefore, that the people answering my questionnaire voted 93 to 7 in favor of practically the same proposition as is contained in the Fulbright resolution recently reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Question 22 dealt with the continuation of reciprocal trade agreements. And while this has now been settled by the Congress, it is encouraging to those who supported an extension of the trade agreements program to observe that 78 percent favored extension of the trade agreements program.

Questions 23, 24, and 25 all dealt with the security of the people in the broadest sense of that term. The twenty-third question asked:

Do you favor an expansion of the school-lunch and penny-milk programs for American children?

And 87 percent of the people said "Yes."

Furthermore, only a negligible number failed to express an opinion on this question. This is interesting, I believe, in view of the very wide support which it indicates for further emphasis on a phase of wartime rationing which has so far received little consideration in this country though great emphasis has been placed on it in England. I refer to the principle that rationing should operate not only to limit purchases in order to make certain that an equitable distribution takes place but also to see that those groups from the population who have the greatest need for certain things actually obtain them. And certainly this principle applies to the school children of the Nation, who at least should receive as much milk as they actually need for a healthy diet before milk supplies are used for other less important purposes. The twenty-fourth question asked whether the person answering favored "a broad expansion of the social-security program."

This, of course, was a general question but the answer to it showed 79 percent of the people saying "Yes" and only 21 percent opposed to that proposition.

This, I think, is interesting in view of the negative if not hostile reception which has been accorded by the Congress to proposals for such an expansion of our social-security program. It is important to remember that such a measure could be a very effective means of combating inflation during the war period and also of working effectively against deflation after the war has been won. The twenty-fifth question had to do with old-age pensions and received one of the largest affirmative votes of any question. It asked:

Do you favor enactment of a general national old-age pension law?

To this 89 percent said "Yes" and only 11 percent said "No," with hardly anyone refraining from expressing his opinion. I then asked whether they believed such a national old-age pension system should go into effect now or after the war, and on that proposition 63 percent said it should go into effect now but 37 percent believed it should wait until after the war; a significant percentage, it seems to me upon the whole.

The twenty-sixth question read:

Do you favor Government purchase of the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks?

This was one in connection with which I was especially interested in observing the outcome. And it is useless for me to attempt to conceal the fact that I was profoundly encouraged to find that 75 percent of those answering this question said "yes." That is, three-quarters of the people said they did believe that Congress should purchase the capital stock of the 12 central Federal Reserve banks.

Question 27 was directed at the problem of providing for a continuance of education and training for people now in the armed services of the country. It read as follows:

Do you favor enactment of a law which would provide educational grants to men in the armed forces to enable them to continue their education after the war?

As might, I think, have been expected, 89 percent said "Yes" to this proposition. Incidentally, there are sound seasons why the matter of some such provision of educational grants should be taken up now by the Congress. For an increasing number of men will be coming back from the fighting fronts with varying degrees of disabilities and in view particularly of the difficult time which many of our colleges and universities are having it would seem the part of wisdom for some action on a matter of this kind would be taken in the very near future.

Question 28 has already been discussed above.

The twenty-ninth question asked:

Do you favor restrictions on the use of liquor during wartime?

And as to this approximately 30 percent of the people declined to answer. But of those who did answer 80 percent said "Yes" and only 20 percent said "No."

The thirtieth question then asked those who had voted affirmatively on the twenty-ninth question to indicate what type of restrictions on the use of liquor during wartime they would favor. Of those who answered this question, which, of course, included only those who had answered affirmatively to the twenty-ninth question—

(a) Twenty-five percent favored outright prohibition.

(b) Twenty percent favored some form of rationing of liquor.

(c) Eight percent favored restriction of the use of liquor as to men in the armed forces alone.

(d) Five percent suggested that control be exercised simply by curtailing production and devoting the materials which otherwise would go to liquor manufacturers to other purposes.

The last three questions on the questionnaire were directed toward a problem which Congress has now acted upon, namely, that of pay-as-you-go taxation. Question 31 asked:

Do you believe it is important to put tax payments on a pay-as-you-go basis?

And as to this 91 percent said "Yes," indicating a wide support for pay-as-you-earn tax system.

When, however, the same people were asked in question 32 whether they favored—

Accomplishing this by excusing all taxpayers of the total amount of the taxes on their 1942 incomes—

Sixty-nine percent said "No" and only 31 percent said "Yes."

The final question said:

If your answer to question 32 is "No," what general plan of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis would you favor?

As might be expected, the answers to this question varied widely. But the most frequent answer was the suggestion that one-half of the 1942 tax liability be forgiven. The next most frequent answer was that none of the 1942 tax liability be forgiven, but that taxes for both 1942 and 1943 be collected together in one year. Next in line came an answer which proposed that the Robertson-Forand bill be adopted, and fourth came the suggestion that 1942 taxes be spread over a number of years. The action of Congress, in forgiving approximately 75 percent of the tax liability for 1942 and all of it as to taxpayers whose liability was less than $50, would seem therefore to have been somewhat more generous than the people in my district might have asked for, but nevertheless not seriously out of line with their opinions.

In conclusion I want to express to each person who went to the thought, effort, and trouble of making out this questionnaire my sincere gratitude. It was not an easy task, but I am convinced that it was a worth-while one both from the standpoint of the people from the Twelfth District of California and from the standpoint of their Representative in the House.

Address of Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold Before Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., on last Monday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is more than 18 months since it was my privilege to address the Mississippi Valley Association, and I am glad to be with you again. Since that occasion, our whole mode of living has changed. From mild indifference to the threat of war, we have passed to the stern reality of prosecuting war, war of a character and magnitude hitherto unknown to the world.

Here in the Mississippi Valley, you are in no way strangers to this change. This area, in keeping with the historical examples of other important river valleys, has thought in terms of progress—of production for peacetime uses. In recent months, however, you have seen the systematic flow of peacetime goods transformed into a mighty flood of materials of war—a flow of such a volume that it has extended all transportation facilities to the very limits of their capacity. You have seen large areas in fertile valleys taken out of their normal production of food and feed and changed almost overnight into great training camps, or airfields, or ordnance

plants. Here in the very heart of our country, you have seen the transformation of men, machines and materials from the multiple objectives of peace and progress to the all-embracing purpose of winning a struggle against those who threaten the existence of our national and personal ideals.

This intricate and difficult change has strained the machinery of Government and private industry alike; but we have proved equal to the task, and we have come a long way. Defects have been corrected and adjustments have been made as rapidly as experience has indicated the required remedies. Methods and procedures that were at first, by necessity, largely empirical have been swiftly and steadily improved by applying thereto the skill, science, and genius with which the men and women of this Nation are so bountifully endowed. The results have far exceeded the expectations of everyone. By reason of this success, our armies spread all over the world are growing continually in numbers, equipment, and effectiveness. They may even now be poised to strike mortal blows where the enemy least expects them.

Our growing strength must, at all costs, be maintained, and once the major offensives are begun, we must redouble our efforts. Manifestly, if we are to do this, we cannot totally disregard the hazards of nature on the home front. Such hazards, as we know too well from recent experience, can slow down war production and reduce yields of farm crops. No one must expect or look for waterway improvements during the war on anything like a normal peacetime scale, but critical flood situations should be taken care of and complete plans should be ready for prompt initiation when the war is ended.

Uncontrolled rivers are terrible threats. Remembering the Mississippi flood of 1937 and our mutually successful efforts in the lower valley against that flood, we are taking every precaution to be fully prepared in the future for any extraordinary flood waters that may flow down the Mississippi River.

The Congress has recognized the destructive power of floods and it has recognized the national responsibilities with respect to flood control. Under the Flood Control Acts of 1936, 1938, and 1940 total authorizations of more than $900,000,000 have been made for nearly 500 projects in the United States, exclusive of the $660,000,000 project for the lower Mississippi River. Thirty-eight reservoirs and 92 local protection projects have been complettd. This is a substantial beginning, but there are hundreds of millions of dollars needed for additional work that should be constructed as rapidly as is feasible.

Temporarily, the war has brought flood control construction to a virtual halt. The administrative policy that no new projects should be undertaken during the war has prevented the initiation of much new work, including that authorized in the 1941 act. A directive of the War Production Board suspending all projects except those needed for the war has resulted in the stoppage of a large amount of our work that was actually under way.

Let me recount briefly the period between May 1942 and May 1943 which has been an unusual flood year. In late May 1942 the floods in the headwaters of the Delaware River caused damages in several cities of Pennsylvania and New York. June 1942 found the lower Mississippi out of its banks, inundating tens of thousands of acres of fertile Missouri bottom lands. Many of the levees built by local interests were overtopped and severely damaged. Later in the summer of 1942 record-breaking floods occurred in the upper Allegheny and Susquehanna basins, and floods again visited the tributaries of the Delaware River, disrupting transportation and some war industries. The old year ended, and 1943 began with the New Year's Eve flood on the upper Ohio River. Six flood-control dams were in full or partial operation above Pittsburgh when the rains came, and although the storm did not center over the controlled areas those six reservoirs reduced the crest stage at Pittsburgh by 3 feet and prevented property damage estimated at over $15,000,000. Furthermore, the reduction in the flood crest downstream made it possible for war industries to continue production without interruption. Below Pittsburgh and including Wheeling, the estimated benefit of this reduction in flood crest was an additional $14,000,000, making a total in the Pittsburgh-Wheeling area of $29,000,000 of damages prevented in one flood. Other benefits, for which I do not have monetary values, include the full protection behind completed flood walls of Ceredo and Kenova, W. Va., and Ironton, Ohio, and the protection of Huntington and Portsmouth by successful emergency closures of gaps in their nearly completed flood walls. At Johnstown the completed concrete flood channel carried the flood flow without spilling a drop over the banks. In fact, Johnstown people hardly knew a flood was roaring past their steel mills. During the past fall and winter floods of considerable magnitude occurred on the Pacific coast, and at Washington, D. C., there was a high water of almost record proportions.

Finally, in the parade of the last 12-month period, we come to the April and May 1943 floods here in the Midwest. Excessive rains forced the Missouri, Illinois, Upper Mississippi, Wabash, Verdigris, Grand-Neosho, Arkansas, White, and St. Francis Rivers out of their banks and, as you know, river stages reaches unprecedented stages in a number of locations. The meteorological conditions associated with these floods were similar except for seasonal modification, with the conditions that caused the record flood of January 1937 in the Ohio Valley.

On the Missouri River the first flood was critical above Kansas City only, and the second flood was serious below Kansas City. But Kansas City was not allowed to escape unscathed, since a third flood in June centered in that reach of the Missouri River and exceeded flood stage by some seven feet. On the Illinois River stages on the lower river exceeded all previous records by several feet, although the discharge was about the same or only slightly in excess of the flood of 1844. On the Upper Mississippi River from Keokuk downstream to Cape Girardeau, Mo., the tributary and local inflows were excessive, resulting in stages only slightly less than the maximum recorded in 1844. In the Wabash Basin new record stages were established in some of the smaller tributary watersheds and the 1913 and 1937 records on the main stem were exceeded at several locations. The recent flood flows out of the Verdigris and Grand-Neosho Rivers were double the previously recorded maximums. It is therefore not surprising that the floods on the middle Arkansas River were unprecedented. The flood on the White River in Arkansas, though major in classification, produced crests from 1 to 5 feet lower than the established high stage records of 1927 and 1915. On the St. Francis River, the Wappapello Reservoir reduced the flood flows to the safe capacity of the leveed channels below the dam. A peak inflow of 88,000 second feet into the reservoir was reduced to an outflow of about 6,000 second feet.

The critical areas in those recently flooded basins are being examined in the light of the 1943 flood in order that the experience gained may be incorporated in the ultimate plans of development. However, in the meantime, we are going ahead with repairs as rapidly as practicable and to the maximum extent possible with funds available for that purpose.

Mention of the word "war" associates our thinking with the outstanding activity of our troops in the recent flood fights. I would indeed be remiss if I did not speak briefly of their fine work in cooperation there with the Coast Guard, the Red Cross, and our own personnel and with the local people generally. When it became evident from weather reports and headwater stages that serious floods would occur, warnings were given, and the prearranged flood-fighting plans of the Department were immediately put into operation. Experienced officers and civilian personnel quickly formed effective working organizations, specified the areas where flood fights might reasonably be expected to be successful, arranged for ample supplies of sand bags to be where wanted, and coordinated the work of our own forces, troops, labor volunteers, and local interests. The work of the troops in particular was magnificent, and in order that you may have an over-all picture, I will briefly summarize the extent of their use. In all basins, over 23,000 officers and men worked with the Corps of Engineers, using Army trucks, amphibious jeeps, assault boats, and landing barges in evacuating thousands of people and tens of thousands of livestock. They saved levees and walls at points where the flood crests exceeded the tops of the structures. They worked around the clock when necessary. At one point they worked 28 hours continuously in knee-deep mud. Records were established for filling and placing sand bags. The soldiers did their job and did it well with the help of over 10,000 pieces of their own equipment.

Many of these same soldiers will soon be on their way to fight for all of us on active fronts all over the world. There they will fight with as much determination against their Axis enemies as they fought with against the surging waters along the flood fronts of this country.

Let us never forget that our Nation is waging a war not on one front, not on two fronts, but on many fronts—from the Aleutians to Australia, from Britain to Buna, from India to Iceland. There is now no major field of operations which does not find either American men or American equipment either fighting or in place ready to fight. The military situation has improved steadily as the wheels of production, the program of training, and the strategy of actual operations have been meshed into a powerful machine of modern warfare. Our enemies played for a quick and cheap victory. They expected the democracies to falter and fail in the face of dramatic initial defeats. Their strategy of war is failing, just as their estimate of the psychology of democratic people has failed.

Today the Allied forces are moving ahead with confidence—sure of their mission. The long battle of the Atlantic is being won, and the Nazi submarine is becoming less important as a menace to our overseas shipping. The security of our convoys in the Mediterranean has been materially enhanced through recent victories.

American and British bombers from England continue to add to the jitters of Hitler with their incessant and effective bombing attacks on German industrial areas. The bomber commands in that theater are rapidly gaining in experience and strength and are delivering air blows on a round-the-clock schedule. In addition to the destruction of installations, these roads are diverting German fighter planes from the Russian and other fronts.

In the southwest Pacific, Army and Navy flyers are reporting spectacular victories in their raids on Japanese installations and shipping. Almost without exception, the Japanese efforts at retaliation have resulted in heavy losses for them. Within recent weeks, against exceptionally adverse weather conditions, our forces have retaken the westernmost outpost of the Aleutians, clipping another of the grasping arms of the Empire of the Rising Sun. In another part of this globe-encompassing conflict the Chinese

Army has taken full advantage of American air support to drive the Japanese from some of their richest rice-producing areas. The powerful Russian Army is maintaining its stand against Germany's panzered might. The eventual outcome of such exploits will be victory for us and our allies, just as surely as there is a God on high.

But never for a moment let us forget that we are waging a "coalition" war and that certain dangers are inherent in this type of warfare. When confronted with such a coalition, it is always the aim of the enemy to breed dissension and distrust among the Allies. Already too many people are interpreting our initial gains to mean that the end of the war is just around the corner. The overconfidence and complacency resulting from such beliefs can seriously hinder our vital struggles for production on the home front. Through overconfidence or through criticism of our leaders and our allies, we can serve the Axis' purposes almost as effectively as if we had furnished them a piece of valuable military information. We cannot, we must not, falter now. We have just begun to fight on a substantial scale. Through united and unfailing purpose, we must continue to fight on through shell fire and hell fire to a complete victory for the everlasting good.

There can be no lack of incongruity, however, between a complete devotion to our primary job of winning the war, and the hard-headed desire to win the peace. Although long months of effort and heartache are undoubtedly ahead, this was is not going to last forever. We can well devote some time to planning for our post-war activities.

The control of floods and the conservation of water for agriculture, for the development of hydroelectric power and for other purposes are important subjects to which the intelligent people of this country, should apply their best mental energies. Just because problems of this character have not been solved in the past, I refuse to admit that they cannot be solved. If the training, education and development of civilizations is not used to improve our natural resources for the betterment of mankind, then we are failing in civilized procedures. All experience teaches us that the education of human beings has resulted in the solution of problems which were considered unsolvable by preceding generations. I visualize the lands of the entire Mississippi watershed made more fertile and productive by the waters that will be conserved by man. Transportation will be improved and expanded by the same waters, which will also be used for the production of hydroelectric power that can and will lighten the burdens of farm labor. The floodwaters that have devastated the valleys of the streams in this great region must and will be controlled and stored to be used by man for his own benefit rather than to be allowed to destroy his property.

We must plan with vision but we must also make practical plans. In recent years there has been much talk of planning reservoirs for the full utilization of each site. This, of course, should be the ideal plan to be visualized, but such idealism should not prevent or delay interminably the prosecution of a practical plan. There is not enough surplus capital, either governmental or private, in this country to permit the immediate prosecution of all the improvements that we would like to have and that can be used by the people. In many instances, we should plan to execute first the less expensive practical plans with the purpose of converting at some later date these practical plans into ideal plans. This is the kind of planning procedure that has been followed in the alluvial Valley of the lower Mississippi, and the results there demonstrate the soundness of such a procedure.

For many years your association has led the way forward and has refused to recognize defeat. Let us formulate our plans in a practical way with the idealistic ultimate viewpoint ever before us. Let us look forward to a Mississippi Valley that is free from floods and free from drought—a vast region here in the Midwest where every drop of rainfall is saved, and where it is used to increase the output of farms and to decrease the labors and hardships of the people.

Statement of Judge Marvin Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Judge Marvin Jones:

In accepting the responsibilities of the Office of War Food Administrator, I do so with the firm belief that nothing is more important to the war effort and our domestic economy than a sound and acceptable food production and distribution program.

The wide variety of foods we produce and use; the growing amount needed for Army, Navy, and lend-lease; the increased purchasing power of our own people, combine to make the problem difficult. And yet it must be met and solved.

This war is bringing home to the American people the importance of the farmer in our economy and the value of the products of his fields. Our farm people are doing a magnificent production job in this national crisis. Through long hours of hard work, and in spite of shortages of implements, repair parts, and labor, the farmer has stepped up production all along the line.

As I view the present picture, several things are needed.

First. A full allotment of materials for new machinery, supplies, repair parts, shelter, and storage as well as processing facilities. This is being done but must be followed through and continued allocation assured.

The Food Administrator has the authority to present the farm-machinery equipment needs to the War Production Board and if these needs are not met the Food Administrator has the right to appeal to the President. I intend to exercise that authority.

Second. Farm labor has been and will continue to be a problem. There is a shortage of labor in all production lines but much has been done to keep sufficient help on the farms to produce and harvest our crops. I am confident this problem will be cared for. We must keep in mind, however, that war always creates a manpower shortage.

Third. Production requires seed, feed, fertilizer, and credits. These essentials must be planned for well in advance of planting time.

Fourth. A fair return must be assured the farmer for his production. This must be related to other prices in fairness to all.

There are other steps that need to be and will be taken. I expect to counsel with the representatives of farm organizations and also with representatives of industry as to the food program.

Full use should be made of State, county, and community organizations. Food is not produced in offices in Washington. It is produced in the far stretches of this big country. No program can be effective unless it has the support of the American people on a wartime basis.

There is talk about food shortages. This has created fear on the part of some of our people that they and their children may go hungry. We may not throughout the war have all we want and everything we prefer but we will certainly have enough to assure a healthful diet.

Too little emphasis has been placed on one important fact—the American people today are eating more and better than ever before. Our civilian population is consuming 10 percent more food than during the 5-year period prior to Pearl Harbor.

There is a limit to our capacity to produce. The demands are great. First of all, we must supply those in our armed services. Our civilian population must be provided with an adequate diet; and to assure equal distribution, rationing of essential commodities must be maintained. We must bolster the food supplies of our allies.

I have great faith in the patriotism of the American farmer and his determination to do his part in winning the war. I have spent the best years of my life in working for what I conceived to be the best interest of those who live on our farms. As War Food Administrator I expect to do the best job I can with the tools at hand. Conscious of my own limitations, I ask the cooperation of all. I hope that those who are disposed to criticize will make their suggestions and then join the team.

If we work together, plan properly, and recognize the production and marketing problems of the farmer and the processing and distribution problems of the food industry, I am confident we can supply the necessary demands for food, provided, of course, that God in His infinite wisdom blesses us with good weather.

I have the highest regard for Chester Davis. We worked together on farm questions for a number of years. He is an able administrator and I regret that he resigned. I appreciate his assurance that he will cooperate with me in this work.

I am familiar with the splendid staff of the War Food Administration. I am asking the keymen to remain with me and I am sure the entire organization will continue to function in its important work without interruption.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are looking for another veto tomorrow, something to make explosives for the Fourth.

Henry Ford, the rugged American, is 80 today. He is a beacon light in a foggy world.

The two Houses have refused to rise above principle and compromise on Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, but they may.

When BEALL, of Frostburg, Md., leaves the District of Columbia, driving home, he is in his own congressional district all the way.

The Upper Body seems to be the immovable force which met head on with

the invincible object, the House, on the three professors.

A delegation from what was Poland sat in the House Gallery today. They are the true object of pity. What would they be in the "One World?"

Crop insurance hangs on the longest of all the items of difference between the two Houses on Agriculture. It may outlive the N. Y. A., which seems to be sinking at this writing.

Everybody knows that HENRY WALLACE would never have dared to jump on Jesse Jones without first talking it over with his Chief. His humble obedience got him where he is.

Two Joneses, Marvin and Jesse, particularly from one State, even if it be Texas, seem to be too heavy. Chester and Elmer Davis were too much. The ones will stay longest who stay nearest, regardless.

The father of scarcity, Marvin Jones, however, no Joseph who saved from the surplus of the 7 good years for the 7 lean ones, has the Nation and the world to feed now. Feeding, after all, is the important thing.

When you call the Navy Department and ask for Mr. Draper he answers his own 'phone, and has for 14 years at least, courteously and definitely. He is what Elbert Hubbard wrote about in the man Rowan who carried the message to Garcia.

National Youth Administration's Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday June 30, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of the titanic world war in which we are now engaged I have adopted the policy, in respect to furnishing manpower and implements of war, of following the recommendations of those in the positions of management and leadership on whom rests the primary responsibility of winning the war. I believe it is a sound and patriotic policy. Their knowledge of such matters with which they are in intimate contact should be comprehensive and complete. They are our chosen leaders in the desperate business of making war. If we cannot trust them, whom can we trust?

I have followed this policy in determining what my vote should be in reference to the continuation of the National Youth Administration's training program. My first impression was that the time had come when the National Youth Administration and all of its works should be liquidated and closed out. I was thinking of the old National Youth Administration as we knew it when it was a relief agency and I could see no more reason for its continuance, if as much, as for the continuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps. But knowing that the question would come up for a vote I have made a thorough investigation during the past week which has somewhat changed my viewpoint.

I find that the old N. Y. A. as we knew it and understood it has been streamlined into a training agency. Its overhead has been drastically reduced and it has been shorn of the features that brought about so much criticism. The old N. Y. A. already has been liquidated and in its place we have the N. Y. A. training program which is now in the very midst of training thousands upon thousands of persons for work in war plants and essential industries and which is doing a really important part toward winning the war on the industrial front. I find that there is no other going training program that is just like it; that it enters into a different field and taps a potential source of timber for skilled manpower and womanpower that is not reached by any other training agency. To attempt now to transfer the N. Y. A. trainees to other training activities would hold up and dislocate the entire training program at a time when training should go full speed ahead and it probably would be more costly in the long run. The entire cost of the N. Y. A. training program is less than one-half of the cost of a battleship.

We have one of these N. Y. A. training units in Indianapolis and as a sort of thumbnail picture of what all of them are like I submit for printing in the RECORD part of a letter I have received from Mrs. Ollie M. Weeks of our city, who is much interested in the unit. She says:

As per request in your letter of June 19 relative to information I submit the following concerning the Indianapolis projects of the National Youth Administration: There are 750 young persons receiving training in arc welding, radio, machine shop, aircraft, sheet metal, foundry, pattern making, clerical, and power sewing. All receive 160 hours of training per month. The shops are operated on 2- and 3-shift bases. Despite the great effort and resourcefulness there are still not facilities to take care of youths who need and request training for war industry. This program has been especially beneficial to colored persons who are anxious to accept every avenue that will contribute to the war effort. If your investigation goes far enough you will find that the National Youth Administration has offered us the greatest opportunity for training in vital industries and for making a greater contribution to the national defense and general welfare than any other agency in the history of our country.

Over 600,000 persons are being trained throughout the country in units similar to the one at Indianapolis and in addition to the skills that are being created and developed by this training program the trainees are producing materials for the armed forces worth untold millions of dollars. The trainees, when their period of training is over, are going into the war plants at the rate of 700 a day.

The conclusion I have reached is that the N. Y. A. should be continued as a training program until the emergency is over and should then be abolished outright. If it were possible to offer an amendment to the pending bill I would propose that a provision be written into the bill ending the life of the N. Y. A. at the close of the present emergency.

I submit a letter from Chairman Donald M. Nelson of the War Production Board which is convincing as to the value of the N. Y. A. training program as a contribution to war production:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: This is in reply to your request of June 19 asking my opinion of the value of the National Youth Administration training program in helping production of war materials and implements.

I believe that the National Youth Administration has done satisfactory work in training young men and women for work in war production plants. It has some 35,000 training stations in the country and last year trained over 500,000 persons, which is a substantial contribution to our manpower needs.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

In seeking light on the need of continuing the N. Y. A. training program for the present I quite naturally asked for the views of War Manpower Chairman Paul V. McNutt, whose responsibility is to see that manpower is furnished to meet the exigencies of the national emergency and I submit for the RECORD the following exchange of letters on this subject:

JUNE 18, 1943.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Federal Security Administrator,
Social Security Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR MCNUTT: I was reminded today that the National Youth Administration now belongs to your family of activities.

In anticipation of a vote on the proposition of the continuance of N. Y. A. when the bill returns from the Senate, I would value your opinion and such information as you can send to me in regard to the wisdom and practicability of closing out this agency at this time. I want to do the right thing, and I need more information.

I take it that we have a duty to cut out duplication and overlapping wherever possible, and I am sure you will agree with that policy. We are told that there are several agencies—perhaps half a dozen—that are training men and women for services in connection with the war effort. If by a consolidation of agencies and the reduction of overhead the same training can be obtained at less expense should it not be done?

I am deeply conscious of our obligation to cut down the terrific expenses of the Government whenever and wherever it is possible to do so.

I know your broad-mindedness, and from your over-all vision of the requirements of the Government in the broad picture, is it not possible for other training activities to take over and complete the National Youth Administration training program, so that the National Youth Administration trainees may proceed to finish their course, and would not this be a saving and in the public interest? Or is the National Youth Administration training program so differentiated from other training programs that this would not be practicable?

I am conscientiously seeking light about this matter, and I would like to know more about the National Youth Administration training program. I would like especially to know what effect the abolishment of National Youth Administration at this time would have on the training program now being carried on by the National Youth Administration. If you can take time to advise

me, I will be appreciative. I would have come down to see you, but I am so interminably busy it is difficult for me to leave the Hill.

With best wishes, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,
June 28, 1943.

DEAR LOUIE: I am in receipt of your letter in which you ask my opinion and such information as I can send with respect to the wisdom and practicability of closing out the National Youth Administration at this time.

I am very glad to have the opportunity of writing you with respect to the values which I believe the National Youth Administration possesses in relationship to the war. I shall forego any expression of the loss which I believe would be involved in the meeting of the long-range obligations of the Nation to its young people in the destruction of this agency and will confine myself entirely to its services to the war.

As you have repeatedly heard, I am sure, this agency has been training during the past year approximately 1,000 persons a day in critical skills needed by the war effort. Of this number, between 650 and 700 find their way each day into the war production plants of the Nation. It is inconceivable to me that any question could even be raised with respect to its value, especially so since I, as Chairman of Manpower and supposedly in a position to speak for that segment of the war effort, have repeatedly stated that this agency was needed and filled a place which no other agency in the training field filled and which no other training agency was in a position to fill.

In Indiana alone the National Youth Administration has turned out more than 10,000 young men and women trained in some particular skill during this past year. If, after you have had these facts presented to you, there still remains in your mind any question with respect to the desirability of continuing this agency, I am submitting letters from one or two war production concerns in Indiana, who state unqualifiedly that they desire the National Youth Administration to continue based upon its service to them.

The Hoosier Lamp & Stamping Corporation, of Evansville, writes:

"We wish to take this opportunity to express to you our appreciation of the training program which you are conducting at the National Youth Administration center here in Evansville. We heartily endorse any preemployment training, especially with reference to war needs. We feel that the training which you are giving your people is especially related to this end. You are aware of the nature of our work, which is devoted 100 percent to the war effort, and we feel that you are qualified to give this type of training which will fit the prospective employee for work in our plant. We wish to assure you of our cooperation in your program, and we hope that you will be able to help us in our employment and training program."

C. G. Conn, Ltd., received a letter from the Navy recently which said that "instruments produced by the men and women of C. G. Conn., Ltd., played a significant part in America's great north African invasion." The personnel director of C. G. Conn wrote the following:

"We are particularly proud of the work we have been doing manufacturing binnacles and compasses, and we would like you to know that the greater portion of the persons employed in these departments are former National Youth Administration trainees. These girls who have taken training at the National Youth Administration center, Route 4, South Bend, Ind., have without exception been excellent in the work performed here, and their training shows an aptitude for precision work that is outstanding. Every foreman who has had National Youth Administration trainees in his department is very enthusiastic about the effectiveness of those persons both as to job attitude and training ability."

And here is what the M. Fine & Sons Manufacturing Co. of Jeffersonville writes:

"For your information we might state that we have taken from the Jeffersonville National Youth Administration shop no less than 30 people who have proved highly satisfactory, and if we were able to reach out today and obtain another 30 to 100 people from your project, you would have our undying thanks. Should you happen to be in this territory we would be glad to have you call and give us the benefit of your knowledge and advice."

Sincerely,

PAUL V. MCNUTT, *Chairman.*

Alaskan Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, as this House well knows, for many years, along with others, I have been a very vociferous advocate of building a highway through Canada from the United States to Alaska. We had pretty tough sledding in this matter until the war broke out—now a military highway to Alaska is an accomplished fact. I have also been chairman, for many years, of the Alaskan International Highway Commission. This Commission, prior to the war, made exhaustive studies regarding the feasibility of such a road. Although the present military road does not follow to Whitehorse the route recommended by the Canadian and American Commissions, it is acting as a definite and important connection between the United States, Canada, and the vital frontier that is Alaska. We are hopeful that as soon as practicable a connection will be made to the present road from the so-called Prince George, British Columbia, area to the present military highway, somewhere near the conflux in the Whitehorse area. This, of course, would give the Pacific coast and British Columbia a real Pacific highway—something we in the West have been seeking for many years. I am sure that all this will be done and, of course, until it is done the Commission, myself, the able delegate from Alaska, Mr. Dimond, the Foreign Affairs Committee, and others, will continue our strenuous efforts to accomplish the purpose.

But further than that, Mr. Speaker, we believe these conversations with our northern neighbor, in view of present world conditions, should be broadened to include not merely highway routes but rail connections and air routes. All these will be increasingly important when peace comes to the world.

After all, the most cursory examination of the problems and possibilities of the Pacific give rise to the inevitable conclusion that there will exist a north Pacific empire. Its proper development will be mainly contingent upon how deep and how intelligent Canadian-American relations become.

The airways issue, for example, is already an integral part of the highway problem. Certain military airfields exist in the interior of Canada which provide the main reason for the establishment of the Alaska Military Highway, and incidentally the only reason, so far as we can learn, for its interior location. No commitments have been made on the part of the Canadian Government for the availability of these fields by both countries after the war. Both countries have spent a great deal of money upon them. I maintain it would be to the best benefit of our two great and friendly nations that these fields and these roads be maintained after the war. It may be that the importance of the interior road will lessen when peace returns, but nevertheless it will still have a great value. If a connection is built along the more convenient and practical route, north from British Columbia, it will increase in value with airfields also along its route. All these things are going to be a vital part of the airways proper when you consider it on a global basis.

Canada and the United States should have no fear of each other. The international boundary of over 3,000 miles, unfortified for more than a century, should provide eloquent testimony to this. We are sure that a satisfactory solution of these international problems will be had, but we know that they only can be had by constant attention to the great importance and possibilities that are now looming large for the future of the North Pacific area. In my opinion, it is to be the great development in the world to come.

People and industry are fast revising their concepts regarding the economic and strategic importance of this area to world trade. Polar project maps change all thought with respect to trade routes of the future. Alaska and the North Pacific region could easily become a way point for much of the commerce of the world, and definitely for all of Asiatic commerce.

In order that there be as complete an understanding as possible of this situation I would like to point out to the membership, through the medium of the RECORD, some succinct and intelligent observations on this question. They are resolved in two articles. One on the North Pacific region, and the other relating to the same subject by Charles Lucrin Shaw, an able student and observer of this section for many years. I wish I could also insert the maps accompanying these articles. They are revealing and startling. Both articles, as well as many others, have appeared in the trade magazines through the instance of one of the ablest observers of the Orient and the North Pacific region, Mr. Miller Freeman, of Seattle.

Mr. Freeman has been a pioneer in these matters. Had his far-sightedness been heeded much of our difficulty with the Japanese Empire might have been averted. Long before others even gave it a thought, knowing the Japanese as he

did, he advocated the theory of this North Pacific development as a buffer and a mailed fist in the face of Japan. Had this been done Japan would not have dared to attack us.

The new outline of international development for the North Pacific region has been intelligently blueprinted by Mr. Freeman and his associates. The articles are provoking food for thought. Both eastern United States and eastern Canada know too little and understand less about this great area. The decent and logical development of the same in the post-war world makes it necessary that they do know now what we are fighting about in the Pacific and what Japan covets, as she coveted the southwest Orient.

These articles, as strategic in peace as in war, are as follows:

OUTLINE OF AN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE NORTH PACIFIC REGION

The outbreak of war has changed overnight the comparative isolation of the North Pacific region to a key position in the world. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being expended for defenses, the construction of highways, airways, and pipe lines traversing the immense stretches of western Canada and Alaska. While this development work is now being rushed through to meet the immediate threat of invasion, there will be much of permanent benefit in opening up heretofore inaccessible areas.

The two Governments of Canada and the United States have just created a joint economic committee to undertake a cooperative study of the North Pacific area—Alaska, Yukon Territory, northern British Columbia, and the Pacific Northwest States. This region embraces about 1,000,000 square miles. Early in April, a permanent office to direct the study was established at Victoria, British Columbia, in charge of Russell K. O'Dell, assistant to Dr. Charles Camsell, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources for Canada. O'Dell emphasized that the present activity is concerned with research, not development—that there is no question or thought of joint administration of any territory.

A statement previously issued by B. H. Kizer, who was first authorized by the Washington State Planning Council to explore the possibilities of collaboration of the United States and Canada in the study based on memoranda by J. C. Rettie, J. L. Fisher, George Sundberg, and R. F. Bessey, gives an outline of the proposed joint international research program.

The region to be studied is one of the large undeveloped sections of the world, in which we find a challenge to resource development and settlement; where a strong community of interest has already provided a framework and habit of cooperation, and where results may be expected that will serve as a demonstration of the fields, methods, and possibilities of international collaboration.

From the standpoint of specific development projects of a physical character chief interest will be centered at present on Alaska, Yukon Territory, adjoining parts of the Northwest Territories, and Alberta, and that part of British Columbia north of the Canadian National Railway. Blanket development is not contemplated—only certain strategic areas are likely to be considered for intensive development. In the study of overland transportation problems, however, a rather wide area of the western part of the North American Continent, both in Canada and the United States, will be considered.

A prime essential in the study is the active leadership of our own western citizens. We should ourselves join in dealing with the problems of the region, rather than to have our destiny ordered for us by governmental agencies and private organizations located on the other side of the continent.

If Captain Vancouver, on his voyage of exploration along the North Pacific coast in 1792, had sailed into the Columbia River instead of into Puget Sound, all of the Columbia Basin, the Willamette Valley, and perhaps as far south as the California border and east as far as Salt Lake might well have become a British dominion. Certainly, the entire Pacific Northwest area would have been under one flag. There would have been no boundary bisecting this region along the forty-ninth parallel, with its economic, political and social restrictions of what is otherwise so largely a geographical unit with common problems which should be dealt with for the good of the whole area. The United States-Canadian boundary is unfortified. Said to be the only boundary between nations in the world that remains without fortifications; this in itself is evidence of mutual trust and confidence, symbolizing the aims of the two peoples to live in peace. But, it should not be assumed that because the boundary does not bristle with guns, there is no boundary there. It has been a real barrier, in some respects gradually increasing its restrictions, until the outbreak of war, when there has been some temporary liberalization of the application of tariff, exchange, and other barriers. The practical effect has been to stifle trade, free movement of the peoples and cooperation directed to the sound maximum development of the whole region. Where there are little more than 3,000,000 people in the Fraser River, Puget Sound and Columbia River areas there should be a population of 20,000,000.

The major political divisions of the region, with their areas and population, are:

	Area in square miles	Population (1940)
Alaska	586,400	[1] 72,524
Yukon Territory	207,076	[2] 4,687
British Columbia	366,255	[3] 809,203
Washington	68,192	1,736,191
Oregon	96,981	1,089,684
Total	1,324,904	3,712,289
Adjacent area:		
Alberta	255,285	[3] 788,393
Idaho	83,557	524,873
Montana	147,138	559,456
Grand total	1,810,884	5,585,011

[1] 1939 figures, comprising about 41,000 whites and 31,000 aborigines.
[2] 1941 figures, comprising about 3,100 whites and 1,600 aborigines.
[3] 1941 figures.

Sources: Census of Canada (preliminary); U. S. Census.

Within the area the population is concentrated in relatively small sections: In Oregon, the Willamette and lower Columbia Valleys; in Washington, the Puget Sound district, Spokane, and the Yakima Valley; in British Columbia, the vicinity of Victoria, Vancouver, and the lower Fraser Valley; in the Yukon Territory, the Whitehorse and Dawson districts; in Alaska, the southeast coastal strip and the central railroad belt. The remainder of the area is either sparsely settled or totally uninhabited. At present, over one-third of the area's total population lives in the five cities of Seattle, Portland, Vancouver, Tacoma, and Spokane. The strip of land from Vancouver and Victoria south, including Puget Sound and the lower Columbia and Willamette Valleys, includes about 70 percent of all the people in the whole North Pacific area.

This leaves the largest land area of the region almost vacant. Let us point out that Alaska and Yukon Territories have between them nearly 800,000 square miles and only about 75,000 population (of which 32,000 is aboriginal). The Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark—located in a position on the European continent corresponding to that of our territories on the North American, contain 450,000 square miles and 17,000,000 population. In other words, our country is almost twice as big but contains only one-half of 1 percent of the population of Scandinavia. We should, of course, quickly add the caution that we cannot expect Alaska-Yukon ever to be as thickly populated as their European counterpart in the same general latitude.

Of all the great quarters of the continent the Northwest has been explored and settled most recently, and even now the process is nowhere near complete.

During the period 1860 to 1930 people were attracted to the Northwest by the substantial natural resources of the region—the furs, the forests, the fish, the gold and other minerals. In the depression years of the 1930's a large number of farm families from the drought-stricken Great Plains migrated into the Pacific Northwest States and into British Columbia in search of better land. A flow of workers to the war industries and military base construction jobs in the Northwest began in 1939 and has accelerated right up to the present time. Shipbuilding in Portland, Seattle, Vancouver, and Prince Rupert; airplane construction in Seattle; port improvements in Prince Rupert; aluminum manufacture in the Columbia Valley; Army and Navy base construction at many inland and harbor points in the area; and road building and airfield construction on a large scale are among these activities. The War Production Board order that all gold mining cease except for very small operations, will cause a considerable depopulation of interior Alaska. If Canada adopts a parallel policy, the same thing will happen in the Yukon and in northern British Columbia unless these men can be absorbed in other approved mining operations.

At the present time the North Pacific area is going through a period of remarkable change. From a region in terms of war strategy. In order to defend the populated parts of the North American Continent against enemy thrusts from the far side of the Pacific Ocean and in order to lay the groundwork for purposes of offense across the North Pacific, Canada, and the United States have embarked on a program of constructing vast improvements in the transportation facilities of the area.

The old problem of this northwest frontier will remain. There will still be insufficient capital for full development. The area will still depend on the industrialized Midwest and East of the continent for many of its industrial materials. The high dependence on extractive industries, such as mining, timber, and fisheries, will not disappear. The climate will continue to impose sharp seasonal fluctuations in industry and the population of the area will for a long time still be small. Large amounts of wealth will continue to be drawn off to other parts of the world which are more mature economically. Freight rates, whether by railroad, truck, ship, or plane, will remain relatively high because of the natural difficulties of distance, mountains, and climate. The transportation problem which so long handicapped the economic growth of the area, will not be completely solved by new construction.

However, the needs of the war are resulting in millions of dollars being invested in improvements to the transportation routes of the area. These may be sufficient, if put to effective use in the post-war period, to bring in their wake a considerable development of many of the resources all the way from the Columbia River to Alaska. If the northern part of the area has been held down in a vicious circle of underdevelopment (scanty population, inadequate transportation routes, high cost of living, etc.) then

it is entirely possible that the circle will have been cut by the provision of a vastly more adequate transportation system.

The post-war world in all likelihood needs relatively undeveloped areas in which demobilized families can settle. The post-war world will need also vast opportunities for profitable public and private investment. The vigor and forethought which go into laying plans now for post-war development, in areas such as the North Pacific, will in some degree determine the whole future of that world. Courageous policies embodying international cooperation are an obvious necessity.

Almost all the large problems of the North Pacific region are common problems of Canada and the United States. On both sides of the international boundaries are wild, vast, undeveloped, and inaccessible areas. These are almost unoccupied and because of their characteristics can be considered as forming one of the truly "backward" areas of the earth. This is particularly true for the more northerly sections—Alaska, Yukon Territory, northern British Columbia, and adjoining parts of the northwest Territories and northern Alberta.

The general problem of this area is one of reasonable use of its resources for the benefit of both nations, for the benefit of the area itself and for a general increase in wealth and standards of living, not only in these nations but throughout the world.

Security against foreign aggression is one of the dominant interests of this area. The efforts to achieve security have already wrought great changes there. In the present struggle Alaska has been recognized as a key to the security of both the United States and Canada. The effectiveness of the key depends upon the strength of the whole North Pacific area. An answer to the problem of security lies in bringing about a degree of exploitation of resources, occupancy of land, expansion of industry and improvement of transportation to make this strategic area stronger economically, considerably more self-sufficient and more readily accessible. This last must be achieved through providing means of transportation suited to all the kinds of traffic likely to develop in the area.

In the North Pacific area transportation is distinctly an international problem, whether sea, air, rail, road, or pipe-line transportation is involved. The problem is not only one of regional transportation but of world routes. The North Pacific, and especially Alaska, is the hub of newly developing airways on the main line between the United States and two of our most important Allies, Russia and China. The airplane is emerging as an important commerce carrier and courier just at the time we begin to realize that our destiny is linked most closely with that of these people to the west of us. History, geography, and invention conspire to make the North Pacific a place of supreme importance in the new day which is dawning. It is obvious that North Pacific transportation is an international concern of the first order and that the international cooperation now being demonstrated there with respect to transportation lines for prosecution of the war should be continued for broad aims and high rewards after the struggle is won.

It is probable that plans and policies that may be worked out for colonization and settlement in the North Pacific area will have demonstrational values in the anticipated world-wide problem of resettlement of dislocated people. The end of the war is certain to find large numbers of people determined to get away from Europe, where two wars in one generation have destroyed resources, homes, millions of people, institutions, human values—in some sectors everything but the soil. For the Dutch, French, Belgians, Poles, Czechs, Finns, and Scandinavians, possibly for others, the urge to leave will be stronger than it has been at any time in history. Many of these people will be in desperate condition. In the countries overrun by Germany the people have seen their equipment, livestock, seed—everything—stolen from them or destroyed. They will have nothing but their skills and a desire to build new homes in a new land.

While the opportunities for colonization and settlement in the north Pacific region are not vast, they are tremendously important from the standpoint of resources development and security. The problem involves development of a policy and plans for immigration, settlement, and land development. These policies, while not letting down all the immigration barriers, should permit rational settlement by foreign groups on the basis of assimilation into the regional and national economies of both nations. Obviously parallel policies on the part of Canada and the United States would be very desirable.

Industry, too, should be developed with an eye to improving the security of the area through the attainment of some better degree of self-sufficiency, to provide strong local support for the military establishments, for bases, for the transportation system, and so forth. Industry also would contribute strategic and essential materials—known to exist in some quantity—to national industry and the national economies. Local industries will be based primarily on the mineral wealth of the area—the extent of which is not at present known—and on services to enlarged local establishments and activities.

Answers to the industry problem lie in the fostering of optimum development of the area and use of its resources. In industrial fields the pooling of raw materials and markets—in contrast to destructive competition, duplication of effort, and blanketing of development by trade barriers—are important international aspects.

Since the North Pacific front affords the closest approaches from America to Asia by land, sea, or air, the significance of the area from a trade standpoint and the opportunities in this field are very great. Potential advantages await both of our Nations in the cooperative use and development of this front and its terminal facilities in connection with world reconstruction of physical facilities, industries, transportation, and commerce.

Looking at the more regional aspects of the trade problem, the area is one in which physical and political boundaries and barriers have in the past played a large part. The war has helped wipe these barriers away, at least for the present. An unparalleled opportunity will exist after the war for demonstrating that there can be amicable and natural solutions of such problems between nations. Better access across Alaska, to the Yukon Territory, and to northern British Columbia from the sea, will be advantageous to Canada, and access to Alaska by way of western Canada will be advantageous to the United States. This suggests the increased use of free ports and shipments-in-bond, as well as a reduction of the formalities for persons wishing to cross the borders. In this last resspect the United States might well conform more closely to Canadian practice.

The broad problems of the North Pacific break down into a number of important major phases—transportation, settlement, industry, agriculture, trade, travel, and recreation, and so forth—in all of which parallel, harmonious action on the part of both nations in exploration, research, planning, development, and trade policies is absolutely essential if this area is to realize its potential development. International cooperation of a high order will be called for. There are a number of excellent examples of collaboration between the two nations, including the international halibut and salmon commissions; the fur seal convention; international control of boundary waters; and overland transportation. In the latter field the military highway built last year through Canada to serve Alaska has been an impressive achievement.

Pacific North America—Strategic in Peace As in War

(By Charles Lugrin Shaw)

A friendly tide is rising in Pacific North America.

It is a warm, invigorating tide bearing the happy burden of good will and collaboration between the people of the United States and Canada.

You can glimpse the effects of this smooth-flowing development in countless ways and places—in the perfectly functioning program for joint defense of the West coast, in the readiness of both countries to share their human and material resources to mutual advantage, in the realization by many businessmen and industrialists of British Columbia and the West coast States that the road to tomorrow's wealth and security lies in the expansion of trade between North and South rather than in dependence on transportation routes, markets, and sources of supply across the mountains between West and East.

You can see the spirit of teamwork being transformed into action in the building of air bases across British Columbia and the Yukon primarily for the service of American war planes roaring north for the protection of Alaska and in the construction of the Alaska highway, largely across Canadian territory, for a similar objective. You can see it, too, in the improvement of British Columbia harbors for the handling of American military and naval supplies, in the laying of a 400-mile pipe line from the Norman wells in Canada's Mackenzie River ocuntry to Whitehorse in the Yukon to relieve the pressure on California's oil fields in meeting the north's wartime needs.

And these things are only the beginning.

It is just as well to recognize the existence of this influence now and to appreciate its full significance, because no other force possesses greater potentiality for shaping the future destiny of the Northwest on a constructive pattern; no other instrument can so easily guarantee the fullest and most profitable realization of the area's natural assets.

The events of the past year or so in this northwestern empire are stimulating and encouraging to us, but to the war makers of Japan they are very bad news indeed, and it must be poor consolidation to the little brown men of Hirohito's military clique to realize that they themselves are largely responsible for the speed with which this new situation has been brought about.

When Tokyo allied itself with the Axis early in the war Canada received its first tip-off of happenings to come, and so did the United States. While Congress appropriated funds for the fortification of Alaska and the establishment of military bases there, Canada put into motion plans for the reinforcement of her own western shores. Both the western nations fortunately realized, in time, the strategic value of Alaska in offensive action against hostile powers in the Far East, just as they appreciated, in grim reality, the vulnerability of that northern frontier to attack. Military men in Canada and the United States remembered the warning uttered in a more complacent age by the late Billy Mitchell that Alaska held the key to victory in the inevitable conflict in the Pacific.

Canada moved boldly in defiance of Tokyo's protests when she set about the job of establishing a chain of air bases across the wilderness of British Columbia and the Yukon to Alaska. Japan interpreted this as a warlike move in a time of peace, but Canada knew that her security was as much bound up in

the safety of Alaska, isolated except from the sea approaches, as was that of the United States. Canada ignored the yammerings of Tokyo's diplomats and newspapers and got on with the job.

Those air bases, carved out of the forest in a country previously known only to Indians and the occasional trapper and prospector, wrote a new page in history for Pacific North America and in the friendly relations of Canada and the United States. To engineers and surveyors who charted the way by dog team across the snow, and the tough bulldozer drivers and swampers who followed them by tractor, it was probably just another task of blazing a trail into the unknown, but in reality they were rolling back the frontier of tomorrow's peaceful commerce.

By early December 1941 Canada had air bases in operation at such remote and almost unheard-of places as Dawson Creek, Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, and Watson Lake, and huge transport planes and bombers were winging across the snows to the land of the midnight sun. The people of Alaska could breathe a little easier. Their period of overland isolation was ended.

Then came the near miracle of the Alaska Highway. There had been talk of such a project for years. In the Puget Sound country it was discussed usually as a tourist enterprise. In the early 1930's the late Premier Simon Fraser Tolmie, of British Columbia, had envisioned such a road as a means of encouraging the settlement of the undeveloped north. His successor, Premier T. D. Pattullo, had regarded the Alaska highway as a way of making his dream of Yukon annexation come true. A grizzled sourdough mushed overland to the Chicago exposition with his team of malamutes to prove that the route was passable, and Alaskans began campaigning for the highway, because it would provide an alternative to the slow and sometimes hazardous journey by boat along the foggy west coast. But it still seemed a far-away prospect.

The threat of war suddenly made the road to Alaska a vital necessity. There were those who said it couldn't be built; so-called experts who claimed the muskeg swamps of the north would be impassable, who said the heavy snows would paralyze traffic most of the year. But they had discounted the resourcefulness of the United States Corps of Engineers and B ig. Gen. Bill Hoge who were assigned to the job. Within a year the engineers had punched through a passable road to Alaska, while a group of Canadian contractors proceeded with the construction of a wider, more durable highway along the same route. The skeptics were silenced. The Alaska Highway had passed from the dream world to reality.

The air bases and the highway were important steps, but others were to follow. Already considerable progress has been made in the laying of a pipe line from the Mackenzie River to Whitehorse and from there the oil from the northern field will be transported to Skagway and thence to Alaska—another daring enterprise which in peace would have been considered impossible but in wartime an undertaking of first-rate importance.

Expansion in the international Northwest is really rolling now. Every big construction project seems to be merely the curtain raiser for another. The air bases, for instance, preceded the highway. Then came the pipe line, and largely because of the pipe line and the main highway to Alaska a new network of connecting roads is under construction. The public hasn't heard much about these new roads because most of them are in virtually unknown country and because military precautions make it advisable to shroud a good deal of such developments in secrecy.

With so many seemingly impossible things already accomplished, even a railroad to Alaska no longer seems such a remote prospect. The proposed route of such a line has already been surveyed by a group of engineering parties under the general direction of Frederick Delano, the spry 80-year-old uncle of President Roosevelt. Men who know that stretch of country say that railroad construction there would not be costly; the tracks would be laid along a natural trench extending almost to the border of Alaska, a series of lakes and rivers providing easy transportation for construction supplies.

If such a road is built, steel ripped up from abandoned mountain lines in some Western States may provide the rails, and old but still serviceable locomotives now gathering rust in roundhouses across the country may come out of retirement. The railroad to Alaska, built for an emergency, may not be a crack, streamlined proposition in its early years, but it would get the freight through and that's the factor that counts.

The line would probably run north from Prince George, the war-booming little town in central British Columbia through which the Canadian National transcontinental passes to Prince Rupert. This connection would provide the needed link with the west coast and the Middle West, but long-term planners in Pacific North America look forward to another development that will add immeasurably to the value of the proposed railroad to Alaska—the extension of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway which would have the effect of giving Seattle, Vancouver, Portland, and other Northwest cities straight-line rail connection with the far north.

The Pacific Great Eastern, operating wholly in British Columbia and owned by the Government of that Province, was originally conceived as a means of opening up the potentially wealthy area between the Canadian National's Prince Rupert line and the Canadian transcontinental roads through the southern section of British Columbia. The line now runs from Squamish on Howe Sound in the south to Quesnel in the north—a situation which has prompted some critics to say it has neither beginning nor end. But even at that the little 340-mile railroad is more than paying its operating expenses. To make it an effective link in the north-south chain it would be necessary to complete the road from Quesnel to Prince George and provide a feeder line from Clinton or some other town along the southern section of the road to tie in with the transcontinental services into Vancouver.

Premier John Hart, of British Columbia, a resolute believer in the desirability of expanding business between north and south, and a champion of collaboration between all sections of the Pacific Northwest regardless of political boundaries, hopes that the Government's railroad may serve in the manner outlined to weave the interests of the international northwest into closer harmony. Mr. Hart, like many other British Columbians, feels that the great barrier of the Rocky Mountains has fostered a kinship between British Columbia and the coast States that may have tremendous benefits for the entire area. Fast transportation, he realizes, is one of the surest instruments for accomplishing that end.

If the railroad is not built, there is a good prospect of a highway being built north from Prince George to connect with the Alaska road; in fact, such a project is essential if the Puget Sound country and the Coast States as well as southern British Columbia are to avoid being by-passed by traffic to and from Alaska and other northern points now routed via Edmonton and the Alaska highway.

Development of airways will make it easier to maintain contact with the north in future years, and giant transport planes will carry on the job pioneered during the past decade or so by Canada's bush pilots. Aircraft, combined with the other agencies of transport, are hastening settlement in one of the continent's richest regions—a region neglected since the dawn of time but now a field for broad cooperative study with a view to long-term economic development.

The two nations are working together on this project that may have a vital bearing on future development of the whole Northwest, even though the area directly affected is northern British Columbia, the Yukon, Alaska, and a part of the Northwest Territories. No one knows the North more thoroughly than Dr. Charles Camsell, Canada's deputy minister of mines and resources, who, with Dr. W. A. Macintosh of Ottawa, will head the Canadian committee. Dr. Camsell, indeed, was born at Fort Liard in the Northwest Territories, and he has covered thousands of miles by dog team and airplane in the north. Dr. Alvin H. Hansen of Harvard university, and James C. Rettie of Portland, Oreg., the American representatives, are similarly well informed on the resources of the million-mile area to be studied.

They know that this vast stretch of land comprises an area double that of Norway, Sweden, and Finland combined, and that the general nature of the country and its resources is similar to that of Scandinavia, although the population—barely 100,000—is less than one-hundredth that of the three European countries.

They know that the fertile sweep of the Peace River Valley, to mention only one section, has grown grain fine enough to win the world's championship at Chicago; that there are enormous deposits of high-grade coal there; that the geological formations suggest the presence of several major oil fields.

Fur attracted the first white men into that little known land, and gold—the Yukon alone yielded $200,000,000 in its peak years—brought the second advance. Fur and gold may continue for some time to be important products there, but future statistics will have more to tell about production of oil—from Peace River, the Norman field now serving the pipe line to Whitehorse, and the fabulous tar sands of Athabaska; grain and other farm produce from the valleys of the Peace and other mighty rivers; coal from the mountainous seams of Hudson Hope; lumber and pulp from virgin forests that extend to all horizons.

Here indeed is a vast new world for peaceful conquest by commerce and industry and British Columbians have learned to depend on American capital and resourcefulness to help them in the mighty undertaking that lies before them.

One of Canada's greatest provinces, with an area greater than that of Oregon and Texas combined, British Columbia, with a population of barely 800,000, has welcomed the cooperation of Americans in developing an annual industrial revenue of more than half a billion dollars.

Up to the present time probably the most important factor in the development of interior Alaska has been gold mining, but it is the belief of many that in the future greater significance will be attached to its other minerals.

While the amount of prospecting for metals other than gold has been relatively small, substantial reserves of industrial raw materials are known to exist throughout Alaska. The fabulously rich copper deposits of the Copper River country are said to be worked out, but numerous other prospects are reported in southeast Alaska. Likewise, substantial deposits of iron are found in various areas, notably on Prince of Wales Island, subject of a most encouraging report by the United States Geological Survey in 1941.

In the Fairbanks district tungsten is being produced in increasing quantities. Quicksilver operations are underway in the valley of the Kuskokwim, and there have been chrome developments near Seldovia on the Kenai peninsula. The vast nickel deposits on Yakobi Island have been under study, and

antimony mining will likely become of considerable importance in the Kantishna Hill and Tok River areas.

Not to be overlooked are the possibilities for tin mining in the Cape Prince of Wales region, as well as at various placers in other regions—some of which would probably be in production today if more favorably located. Oil reserves such as those at Yakutat will likely aid in the over-all development of the Territory.

The Douglas fir recognizes no international boundary, nor does the sockeye salmon, and Americans have not hesitated to cross the border to help British Columbia build her forest industry to the point where it yields more than $100,000,000 a year and her fisheries more than $25,000,000, and Americans have played their part in the creation of a $75,000,000 mining industry in a Canadian Province probably endowed more lavishly by a diversity of metals than any other.

This unity has been strikingly exemplified in the history-making developments of the past 2 or 3 years—the hastening to reality of aspirations that might otherwise have waited generations for fulfillment. The speed with which so many of these events have come to pass during the emergency of war suggests the rapidity with which other phases of northwest expansion may be realized if the people of both countries are not lacking in faith and determination.

The fact that must not be ignored—the fact that carries with it the most promise for tomorrow—is the comradeship that has prevailed among Canadians and Americans working together toward a common objective. Here in Pacific North America we have seen the rich fruits of a realistic good-neighbor policy among people speaking the same language and upholding the same ideals—the classic example of what two nations in practical cooperation can achieve.

In the years to come it will be our opportunity to prove that what can be done under the stress and pressure of global war can be duplicated, extended, and improved by the same spirit of constructive teamwork, blessed by the influences of peace.

Radio Address of Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. O. BURGIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following radio address made by Edward R. Murrow over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Philadelphia on June 20, 1943. Mr. Murrow is chief of the European staff of the Columbia Broadcasting System and has been stationed in London for the past 6 years. His reporting of the events prior to the war and during the war has interpreted to America the war situation in all of its ramifications. It might be well for Congress and the American people to ponder seriously the suggestions and comments made by Mr. Murrow on this occasion:

A few weeks ago I heard two Englishmen talking about anti-British sentiment in this country. One of them remarked: "We really shouldn't be disturbed when the Americans say harsh things about the British. After all, they say some quite frightful things about each other." For the last week I've been listening to voices and looking at faces in Washington and here in Philadelphia. We certainly haven't lost our habit of plain talk. And we're friendlier people than we were, riding in crowded busses, sharing taxicabs, doing without several things we thought were essentials, but which we discovered were, in fact, luxuries. It doesn't seem to me that we're complaining very much about rationing, but some of the talk you hear in Washington is a little confusing. The first couple of times I heard someone say "We'll win this in 1944" I thought they were talking about the war. Anyone who does a little listening in Washington these days is liable to get the impression that we're fighting two wars. No one who has seen what's happened to Europe, even before the shooting war began, could deplore the continuation or political discussion, but whatever our domestic political differences may be there can be no doubt that the enemy of this people is to be found on foreign soil, not in Washington.

That city is a bewildering place, all right. There is some border warfare in the uncharted "no man's land" between administrative agencies. There are people who will tell you that the whole thing is a mess—no clear-cut definition of function or authority—three agencies trying to do the same job. A lot of personal jealousies in high places. Some of those things may be true, but they can't all be true. It just isn't possible. For if Congress is stupid and our administrators incompetent, then how is it that we've trained and equipped huge armies, whipped the Axis at their favorite game of economic warfare, and geared our whole economy to war production? I've seen some of the things we've done abroad—the flood of weapons and supplies pouring into north Africa; the great military establishments in Britain and Iceland and Newfoundland. It is the outpouring of a great, strong nation and at the end of the day it will produce victory, but that victory may be delayed, its fruits soured, if our domestic political war takes precedence over the war against our enemies.

That city of Washington is filled with hard-working people. To this reporter it's the hardest working capital in the world. They tell me there are a lot of bureaucrats down there. That's probably true, but bureaus are needed to run a war and men and women are required to man the bureaus and that's how they become bureaucrats. Whatever name we choose to call them they're a lot of hard-working Americans down there trying to help win this war.

The House of Representatives has decided to abolish the domestic activities of the Office of War Information. If the Senate concurs, that organization will fold up. Maybe it should, but there ought to be a reason, and claiming that Elmer Davis is another Goebbels isn't a reason—it's ludicrous. As I understand it, the Office of War Information was established to help win this war. Its success or failure at that job ought to determine its future. No one can be sure what part propaganda and psychological warfare has played so far, but there can be little doubt that the time is coming and soon when the Germans will be vulnerable to a sustained campaign designed to weaken their will to fight. If that job is done well, it might shorten the war by months, and shortening the war by months means the saving of a great many American lives.

Next winter in Europe will be a terrible winter. As it closes in the German people will be weary and wondering. If we have anything to say to them that will be the time to say it. Optimism and courage are pretty hard to hold on to when you're cold.

I'm not competent to speak of the domestic activities of the Office of War Information, but I can tell you that if that organization is wrecked our campaign of political warfare against the enemy will suffer, and I can report that in the opinion of every competent observer, military and civilian, that I have seen in the course of considerable traveling we are not so near to winning this war as to be justified in discarding anything that might help win it.

There are those in Washington who see in this effort to fragmentate the Office of War Information the opening gun in the 1944 campaign, the Presidential campaign. It's difficult—almost impossible—for one recently returned from the fighting fronts to accept that explanation. Healthy political controversy is one of the safeguards of democracy, but it just can't be that any of us are confused about the relative importance of the 1944 campaign and the bloody, bitter campaigns of the winter of 1943.

In Britain, ministers of information came and went with surprising speed. They once talked of forming a club for ex-ministers of information, but the principle of political warfare was never seriously questioned, because it was agreed that it might help win the war. If the Office of War Information can't do anything to help win the war, then we would all agree that it should be abolished, but if it can then those who destroy it, for reasons of politics or personalities, are assuming a considerable responsibility.

Yesterday, Mr. Robert Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, said that Army production was considerably below schedule for the month of May and the first 10 days of June weren't much better. Mr. Patterson was worried about complacency and overconfidence. The belief the war is as good as won. It's part of the Office of War Information job to combat such complacency. Maybe what they need is more money, more time to get on with the job—free from threats of liquidation.

There's been a fair amount of optimism noticeable during the past week. The closing of the Syrian frontier has served to remind us of the existence of the well-equipped Ninth and Tenth British Armies, but their use depends upon Turkey's actions and, while the opening of the western Mediterranean has encouraged the Turks, there is no reason to think that they are any nearer to active participation in the war. The problem that confronts them is one of timing. Their interests demand that they insure their peace, their place in the post-war settlement. Their interests also demand that they enter the war at a time when they can achieve their objective at the smallest cost. And one of their main objectives must be to make it unnecessary for the Russians to come too far into the Balkans.

There have been reports, reeking with optimism, coming out of Stockholm—one of the most unreliable news centers of the world. There have been more stories of Italian peace feelers, but they originated in Algiers, and the climate there seems to be particularly suited to the growth of rumors.

The time may come when the Allies can settle with Italy, if they are prepared to accept a fascism that would be favorable to us instead of favorable to Germany, but that time has not yet arrived. When it does we shall see the second great test of Allied policy. The prospects, so far as one can judge them from talking with responsible people in London and in Washington, seem to be encouraging. I have heard many assurances that we will have no dealing with Badoglio, the House of Savoy, or Grandi, or anyone else who is a good Fascist so long as he thought it would pay.

Today the Berlin correspondent of the Swiss newspaper Baseler Nachrichten was permitted

to send an interesting dispatch out of Berlin. He says the Germans have altered their basic strategy and will not now attempt a major campaign in Russia, that they have decided to conserve their strength to repel an Allied invasion from the west. It's just possible that that is what's happened. Certainly, most military observers in London expected the German attack to get under way something like 3 weeks ago, but, then, London military men have not always been correct in their assessment of the position in Russia. I remember when Germany first attacked Russia the estimate was generally given as 6 weeks.

We are engaged in a campaign of nerve warfare against the Axis and in a campaign of that kind, attempting to mislead them, we're in some danger of misleading ourselves and the conquered people of the continent. If the Germans have in fact decided to follow a purely defensive strategy it is certain that they hope to hold us off until the Allies fall to quarreling amongst themselves. Exaggerated hopes—optimism about an early and cheap victory—might form good ground for quarrels and disappointments later on. I don't know any more than you do about how long this war will last, but I have had the opportunity of talking with a lot of men who will be in charge of the fighting and every last one of them talked in pretty solemn terms about the price we shall have to pay and the time it will take to do the job. I have yet to meet one who expects the conquest of Europe to be either easy or quick.

One of the problems that confronts the British and ourselves is the simple one of communications. Consider the present labor crisis here. The other day I noticed a story by an able journalist, Raymond Clapper; he was writing from London, and he reported that it was quite impossible to explain the coal dispute to the British people. That's certainly true. But that isn't because the British journalists here have done a bad job in reporting it. Their dispatches have been good reporting. There are plenty of people in Britain disposed to sympathize with the claims of the miners. Their record in Britain has been one of prolonged bitterness between miners and management. But the principle of collective bargaining and industrial arbitration has long been accepted. There is wartime labor legislation in Britain, and I suppose it would be called restrictive. It simply gives the right to tell all workers in essential industries where they shall work, and for how much and for how many hours. They can't quit * * * they can't be fired unless the representative of the Minister of Labor agrees.

Labor is under the control of Ernest Bevin, an old-time trade-union leader who enjoys the respect of the workers, and labor is conscripted and that includes women. Single women may be called up and sent from the south to the north. They may be taken out of textile factories and directed to go and work in ammunition factories. These regulations are sweeping, and they tie the worker to his job. Persistent absenteeism is punished by fines or imprisonment, and some of the fines and some of the terms of imprisonment are heavy, indeed. But it was realized at the beginning that legislation to control only labor simply would not work. So along with labor legislation went what was called the excess-profits tax, which just meant that business profits above the pre-war level would be taxed 100 percent. Then if prices of food and essential goods were not the force of demand for higher wages, something had to be done about that. So there was established a system of government subsidies designed to keep prices down. The system doesn't work perfectly. Much of it probably wouldn't work at all here for our problems are different and in many ways more complex, but it is based on one principle, and that is that sacrifices, whether of money or personal liberty must be made as equal and as universal as possible. And it was based on something else, too, the realization that unless labor and business gave up some of their freedom of action they stood in mortal danger of losing it all. In those days the danger was apparent. It came down out of the night sky. You could go down to Dover and look across the Channel and see it. Our danger may not be so apparent, but that doesn't make it less real."

Thirteen-Point Peace Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WIRT COURTNEY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert, by request, a certain peace plan as outlined by Mr. Frank E. Vanderhoof of this city:

VANDERHOOF 13-POINT PEACE PLAN TO ELIMINATE FUTURE WARS AFTER VICTORY

1. An organization or association to be formed among the United Nations, and those others which will have been freed from the bondage of Germany, Japan, and Italy.

2. These nations large and small shall be permitted to set up their own form of governments, without influence or demand.

3. These nations shall set up a new code of international law.

4. Present enemy nations shall not be barred from membership in such organization or association.

5 Each nation in association, to be acceptable to membership must adopt or write a constitutional amendment, waiving all right by power of their government to declare war, unless attacked by forcible arms. The association to decide what constitutes forcible attack.

6. All power to so declare war must rest with the people of each respective nation, by popular vote.

7. The armament of each of these nations shall not be in excess to that which will be necessary to maintain internal order. Size of each respective army to be determined by the assocation or union.

8. An international chamber of commerce to be organized with equal representation among these United Nations, to create markets and guide in the fair distribution of raw materials and manufactured goods. The main object of such chamber is to eliminate competition among nations as much as possible. Tariffs of each member nation to be regulated by the association.

9. The principal of freedom of religion must be a point of adoption among these nations. This to be the constitutional right of all the peoples of these respective nations.

10. The principal of freedom of trade, of the seas, and in the air must be adopted.

11. Any nations not joining this association or union, by adoption of agreement as set forth in paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 shall be cut off from international trade, postal exchange, and diplomatic relations with all nations of this association. Citizens of the outlawed nation will not be permitted to enter the boundary of any of the associated nations.

12. Each nation of these United Nations, both large and small shall have only equal representation in this association. Territorial claims and boundary disputes to be settled by the association.

13. A sizable international police force or army to be maintained in readiness to occupy any aggressing nonmember nation. Also to see that the laws of this association are justly maintained.

O. P. A. Price Regulations on Farm Food Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, the following report of a meeting of farmers living in Howard County, Mo., provides the Congress what I believe to be an up-to-date picture of problems facing the average rural community in my State:

FAYETTE, MO., *June 19, 1943.*

A REPORT OF A MEETING OF HOWARD COUNTY FARMERS

A group of Howard County farmers studying transportation problems met in the court house at Fayette, June 15, 1943, and out of this meeting came the idea that there are more serious problems affecting the farmers personally and directly than those of transportation. The much more serious problem is that of forced liquidation of livestock caused by uncertainties from—

1. The threats of price ceilings on live animals.

2. The price roll-back on meats.

3. The inability to secure feed—either grains or proteins.

4. The lack of sufficient labor for crop and livestock production.

The situation is bound to become worse as long as the Office of Price Administration insists on holding farm prices down during a period of rapidly rising costs of production and labor shortage on the farm. This is certain to reduce food supplies, which in itself creates an economic tendency to inflation and black markets because of the unavoidable condition of an inadequate supply of food to meet an ever-increasing abnormal demand.

The tendency of farmers is to liquidate unfinished animals and, in disgust to let down in all lines of their farming activities. Farmers are attempting to conserve capital, earned the hard way, and to avoid losses on future operations. This situation exists in spite of the fact that patriotism had spurred them to unusual efforts of production in the past.

The Government's present attitude will unquestionably result in the conditions outlined by the Doane Agricultural Service as listed below:

"1. Livestock will be rapidly liquidated.

"2. Farmers' financial losses will be heavy.

"3. The Nation's food losses will be serious."

The committee feels justified in making the following recommendation:

Prices of farm food products will have to be increased if farmers are to produce the needed supplies.

GUY E. JAMES, Glasgow, *Chairman.*
W. W. HARVEY, Armstrong.
JULIUS JOHNMEYER, Fayette.

N. Y. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WIRT COURTNEY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Hon. Gordon H. Turner, manager of Nashville master project of the National Youth Administration, together with a report by Dr. S. L. Smith, chairman of the Tennessee National Youth Administration advisory committee, for the fiscal year just closing:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
NASHVILLE MASTER PROJECT,
Nashville 3, Tenn., June 29, 1943.

Hon. WIRT COURTNEY,
Representative from Tennessee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COURTNEY: Dr. S. L. Smith, of Peabody College, and chairman of the Tennessee National Youth Administration Advisory Committee, suggested that I send you a copy of the report of our work for the year recently prepared. I am attaching one herewith.

Regardless of the future of National Youth Administration, I think we have done a good job and a very necessary job on this master project. I hope you will take the time to read this report. I am sending copies to Mr. PRIEST, Mr. MCCORD, Mr. GORE, and both of our Senators. Since so much has been said for and against the National Youth Administration, and since much of our middle Tennessee work is located in your district (Dickson, Columbia, and Lawrenceburg) you might like to insert this report in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Practically all people in this section who know about our program are strong for it.

Our job has been to train young people for employment by private industry, mostly in defense plants holding war contracts. It is very gratifying to me to know that from this one master project alone approximately 2,000 young people have been sent into private industry during the fiscal year now closing, more than 1,400 of whom have gone directly into war jobs. I honestly believe no Government agency has a better organized and operated program than has my unit of the National Youth Administration. Our supervisory personnel are the best we can find, skilled in their trades and selected because of their ability to lead, direct, and inspire young people, and because of their moral character. There has been no scandal in connection with our program, no grafting, no embezzlement, and, I believe, no extravagance. We have the finest group of young people in training, morally, educationally, and physically, that we have ever had, and our project units stand in the highest favor of the best people in the communities where we operate. Whether we are "dead" by the time this letter reaches you or whether we continue I am sure you will appreciate this information.

If you care to use any of the above statements, with or without my signature, please feel free to do so. I appreciate your high regard for the facts and I believe the great mass of the American people, even the Members of Congress, are still impressed by facts.

Very sincerely yours,
GORDON H. TURNER,
Project Manager.

ANNUAL REPORT OF NASHVILLE WAR PRODUCTION TRAINING PROJECT, NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

(By Dr. S. L. Smith, chairman, Tennessee National Youth Administration Advisory Committee)

As another fiscal year closes, a general report is in order covering the year's work of the National Youth Administration. The Nashville master project has served the 35 counties commonly referred to as middle Tennessee. Project headquarters is located at 434 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. Work locations are:

(1) Dickson, Tenn.: A project training white girls and boys, housed in a modern facility built by the National Youth Administration in cooperation with the city of Dickson. Modern dormitories, supervised by capable counselors, provide living quarters for the youth. Training is offered in welding, sheet metal, and machine shop.

(2) Columbia, Tenn.: A project serving white girls in the Columbia Institute property. The girls live in the dormitory and are offered training in sheet metal and machine shop work.

(3) Cookeville, Tenn.: A training program in connection with the Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, where training is given in welding, sheet metal, and machine shop, the college furnishing board and room to youth who live out of town by contract with the Federal Government.

(4) Lawrenceburg, Tenn.: A single unit training shop serving local girls and boys in sheet-metal work.

(5) Nashville, Tenn.: (a) Raines School—A power-sewing unit for white young ladies offering training preparatory to employment by needle industries in Nashville working on war contracts. (b) Agricultural and Industrial State College—Multiple shops for Negro girls and boys, offering training in welding, sheet-metal and machine-shop work; Negro youth accepted on a State-wide basis and housed and fed at the college by contract with the Federal Government.

During the fiscal year now closing the National Youth Administration has been training young peoples in shops for employment in war industries. At the work locations on June 9, a reporting date, youth were in training as follows: Dickson, 102; Columbia, 80; Cookeville, 76; Lawrenceburg, 22; Nashville: Raines School, 44; Agricultural and Industrial, 182; total 506. Of the 506 youth in training on the Nashville master project, 324 were white, 182 Negro, and of the 506 youth in training, 256 were male and 250 were female.

It is interesting to note that on June 16, another reporting date, young people were assigned for training at the various work locations of the Nashville master project from 52 Tennessee counties extending from Knox County in the east to Shelby County in the west. Ninety-three young people were in training at the various work locations from Davidson County; 36 from Lawrence County; 24 from Maury County; 21 from Putnam County; 20 each from Madison, Rutherford, and Giles Counties; 19 from Hamilton County; 18 from Dickson County; 17 each from Hardin and Shelby Counties, etc.

The age limits for trainees on our program begin at age 16 and extend through age 24. Reports indicate that approximately half of all trainees are under 18 years of age. Most of the male trainees are under 18, those over 18 years of age being either draft deferred or physically handicapped. All trainees are, however, employable. No boys are accepted for National Youth Administration training who are essential farm workers.

Since the purpose during this year of the war production training program of the National Youth Administration has been to train workers for direct employment in war jobs, it is interesting to observe the actual results obtained. From October 1, 1942, through April 30, 1943, a 7-month period, 820 young people have gone to war jobs from the Nashville master project, distributed by shops as follows:

Dickson: From 98 work (training) stations, 210 youth were sent directly to war jobs.

Columbia: From 45 work stations, 104 youth went to war jobs.

Cookeville: From 74 work stations, 111 youth went to war jobs.

Lawrenceburg: From 25 work stations, 80 youth went to war jobs.

Nashville: (a) Raines School—from 30 work stations, 68 youth went to war jobs.

(b) A. and I.—From 58 work stations, 144 youth went to war jobs.

From shops formerly operating in Nashville and Murfreesboro, 103 youth went to war jobs. By operating some training units 2 and 3 shifts per day, the 330 work stations of the Nashville master project trained and sent into war jobs 820 young people. At this rate of training for the fiscal year ending on June 30, more than 1,400 young people will have been trained by the middle Tennessee projects of the National Youth Administration and sent directly into war jobs—approximately 61 percent of whom are male and 39 percent of whom are female.

The power-sewing training unit for white girls has done an outstandingly good job. From this unit 209 young ladies have been trained and placed in private industry this year, 88 percent of them going directly to garment manufacturers holding war contracts. This is a typical example of how the various units of the National Youth Administration have been geared to meet the demands of the War Effort.

Another interesting thing about the National Youth Administration program this year is the fact that the percentage of female trainees has constantly increased, indicating that the plans of the War Manpower Commission are being realized as more women enter industrial occupations.

Mr. Gordon Turner is director of the Nashville (middle Tennessee) war production training projects of the National Youth Administration, and President Everett Derryberry, of the Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville, is chairman of the advisory board of this area. Judging from reports of this year's activities and personal visits, I feel that the work has been honestly and efficiently administered and supervised, contributing substantially to the War Manpower Program. Reports from east and west Tennessee are not at present available, but I understand they, too, have done good work.

Meat Price Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. H. CARSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

WOOSTER, OHIO, *June 25, 1943.*

At a Wayne County mass meeting of farmers, consumers, packers, processors, and retail meat dealers, held in Wooster, Ohio,

on June 25, 1943, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas a condition of chaos exists in the meat industry in Wayne County, Ohio, causing injury and threatened greater injury to the consumers, the farmers, the processors and packers, and the retail meat dealers; and

"Whereas this condition is due to the present price regulations and to the roll-back system and a proposed insufficient and improper subsidy, which is obviously not designed to meet the variance between costs and selling prices under the present conditions; and

"Whereas this acute emergency is forcing the independent packers and processors in Wayne County, Ohio, out of business, and will so limit the supply of retail meat dealers as to render it absolutely impossible for them to serve the consuming public, and is forcing black-market operations to an unheard-of volume, beyond the enforcement power of any organization or of any number of enforcement officers; and

"Whereas in the present and proposed condition it is economically impossible for the farmer to buy feeder livestock and sell at any price at which they can be slaughtered and sold under the present system; and

"Whereas the natural result of present price ceiling and roll-back policy has been the disruption of the feeding of livestock by farmers, the commercial marketing of livestock, and the packing and processing operations of the entire meat industry, and the practical effect is an unnecessary and dangerous shortage of meat to the armed forces and to the consumer: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Government be urged to abandon the roll-back policy; that the Congress be urged to defeat the insufficient and inequitable proposed subsidy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the expressed intent and purpose of Congress, as contained in existing laws, to provide for and allow an adequate and fair margin of profit to the farmer, to the packers and processors of meat, and to the retail meat dealers, be made effective and be enforced."

COMMITTEE OF FARMERS, PROCESSORS, RETAILERS, AND CONSUMERS,
GUY RICHARD, *Secretary*.

New Deal Alphabetical Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the bureaus and commissions brought into existence under the Roosevelt administration have become so great in number that it is doubtful whether anyone in or out of the Government could compile a complete list of them. These agencies have not only usurped the functions of the Congress through regulations, so-called, and curtailed the activities and constitutional rights of our people, but have also placed upon them a burden of expense which can never justify their existence.

However, Mr. Speaker, an incomplete list has been compiled by Mr. E. M. Biggers, of 100 Sabine Street, Houston, Tex., and in order that the people may have an opportunity to see for themselves who and what is responsible for the present confusion in administrative activity and the enormous increase in the cost of the civil arm of the Government, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. Biggers, four short quotations from Franklin D. Roosevelt, a list of 103 of the alphabetical set-ups, and a quotation from the Land O' Lakes News.

The matter referred to follows:

ALPHABETICAL AGENCIES CREATED UNDER THE ROOSEVELT NEW DEAL PARTY

File this away. It will be prized in years to come as an index to the "goofiest" period of America's history; as the decade during which we were governed by bureaus, bureaucrats, and "crackpots"; governed by those who were never elected by the people, never accountable to the people, but derived their power by appointment, decrees, and directives.

This list was secured by reading newspapers and magazines, and is as nearly complete and accurate as I could get. There was no list available, and a clipping agency in Washington replied: "The task is too great for us to undertake at this moment, and the cost would make it prohibitive to you."

I also endeavored to get the total annual appropriations of all of the bureaus, but met with the reply that it would "take several months and cost many thousands of dollars" to dig up the financial cost.

I have sought to name only the parent bureaus, no attempt having been made to list the offspring, which would run into the hundreds.

To list the bureaus and departments having the right to undertake real estate transactions alone developed to a research project. The report covers 80 typewritten pages and shows 96 such bureaus in the present Government set-up. Most of them, tax-exempt, are competing with each other and with tax-paying insurance companies, banks, building and loan companies, and private capital.

Additional copies may be had by addressing F. M. Biggers, 100 Sabine Street, Houston, Tex.

"I know something of taxes. For 3 long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that government—Federal and State and local—costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching."—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Chicago, July 1932.

"I accuse the present (Hoover) administration of being the greatest spending administration * * * in all our history. One which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayers."—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sioux City, September 1932.

"The people in America demand a reduction of Federal expenditure. It can be accomplished by reducing the expenditures of existing departments; by abolishing many useless commissions, bureaus, and functions, and by consolidating many activities of Government."—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Brooklyn, November 1932.

"But, remember well, that attitude—the way we do things—is nearly always the measure of our sincerity."—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Butte, Mont., September 1932.

C. E. A.—Commodity Exchange Administration.
S. M. A.—Surplus Marketing Administration.
F. S. C. C.—Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation.
F. F. C.—Foreign Funds Control.
P. R. P.—Production Requirements Plan.
C. R. M. B.—Combined Raw Materials Board.
C. M. B.—Combined Munitions Board.
C. S. A. B.—Combined Shipping Adjustment Board.
C. P. R. B.—Combined Production and Resources Board.
C. C. S.—Combined Chiefs of Staff.
F. W. A.—Federal Works Agency.
N. R. A.—National Recovery Act.
N. I. R. A.—National Industrial Recovery Administration.
U. S. M. C.—United States Maritime Commission.
H. O. L. C.—Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
A. A. A.—Agricultural Adjustment Agency.
C. C. C.—Civilian Conservation Corps.
N. Y. A.—National Youth Administration.
S. S. B.—Social Security Board.
B. W. C.—Board of War Communications.
F. D. I. C.—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
F. S. A.—Federal Securities Administration.
N. A. C.—National Archives Council.
T. N. A.—The National Archives.
N. L. R. B.—National Labor Relations Board.
N. H. P. C.—National Historical Publications Commission.
N. M. B.—National Mediation Board.
U. S. H. A.—United States Housing Authority.
U. S. E. S.—United States Employment Service.
F. D. I. C.—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
C. W. A.—Civil Works Administration.
R. A.—Resettlement Administration.
F. P. H. A.—Federal Public Housing Authority.
F. H. A.—Federal Housing Administration.
C. C. C.—Commodity Credit Corporation.
F. C. I. C.—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
F. S. A.—Farm Security Administration.
S. C. S.—Soil Conservation Service.
A. M. A.—Agricultural Marketing Administration.
F. R. E. B.—Federal Real Estate Board.
C. E. S.—Committee on Economic Security.
W. P. A.—Work Projects Administration.
F. C. C.—Federal Communications Commission.
O. B. C. C. C.—Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers Counsel.
R. R. B.—Railroad Retirement Board.
S. E. C.—Securities and Exchange Commission.
T. V. A.—Tennessee Valley Authority.
B. I. R.-T.—Board of Investigation and Research-Transportation.
C. A. A.—Civil Aeronautics Administration.
N. I. C.—National Investors Council.
D. P. C.—Defense Plant Corporation.
R. R. C.—Rubber Reserve Company.
M. R. C.—Metals Reserve Company.
D. S. C.—Defense Supplies Corporation.
W. D. C.—War Damage Corporation.
D. L. C.—Disaster Loan Corporation.
F. N. M. A.—Federal National Mortgage Association.
R. A. C. C.—Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
C. F. B.—Combined Food Board.
A. O. A.—Administration of Operation Activities.
E. I. B. W.—Export-Import Bank of Washington.
E. H. F. A.—Electric Home and Farm Authority.
C. P. A.—Council of Personnel Administration.
P. R. A.—Public Roads Administration.
E. P. C. A.—Emergency Price Control Act.
F. P. A.—Food Production Administration.
O. E. S.—Office of Economic Stabilization.
P. A. W.—Petroleum Administration for War.
S. W. P. C.—Small War Plants Corporation.
P. I. W. C.—Petroleum Industry War Council.
N. R. P. B.—National Resources Planning Board.
L. O. P. M.—Liaison Office for Personnel Management.
O. E. M.—Office for Emergency Management.
S. S. S.—Selective Service System.
N. W. L. B.—National War Labor Board.
O. C. D.—Office of Civilian Defense.

O. C. I. A. A.—Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.
O. D. H. W. S.—Office of Defense and Health Welfare Services.
O. D. T.—Office of Defense Transportation.
O. L. L. A.—Office of Lend-Lease Administration.
O. S. R. D.—Office of Scientific Research and Development.
O. W. I.—Office of War Information.
W. M. C.—War Manpower Commission.
W. P. B.—War Production Board.
W. R. A.—War Relocation Authority.
W. S. A.—War Shipping Administration.
O. P. A.—Office of Price Administration.
B. E. W.—Board of Economic Warfare.
N. H. A.—National Housing Agency.
F. C. A.—Farm Credit Administration.
R. E. A.—Rural Electrification Administration.
S. A.—Sugar Agency.
P. C. D.—Petroleum Conservation Division.
O. P. C. W.—Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War.
W. E. P. L.—War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc.
B. C. D.—Bituminous Coal Division.
P. R. R. A.—Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
B. P. A.—Bonneville Power Administration.
N. P. P. C.—National Power Policy Committee.
O. C.—Office of Censorship.
F. R. C.—Facilities Review Committee.
P. W. R. C. B.—President's War Relief Control Board.

TEN POINTS—THEY COST SO LITTLE. THEY ARE WORTH SO MUCH

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

—*Land O' Lakes News.*

America's Fighting Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "America's Fighting Congress" by William P. Kennedy, Litt. D.:

PART II. COMPLETING THE RECORD OF HOUSE MEMBERS WHO SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES, AND OF MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILIES WHO HAVE GONE INTO THIS GLOBAL WAR

The women in Congress, as well as the men, have given important war service. Today each woman Member has an important post on the major committees engaged on war-emergency legislation. Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, Democrat, New Jersey, is chairman of the House Labor Committee; Mrs. EDITH N. ROGERS, Republican, Massachusetts, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, Ohio, are on the Foreign Affairs Committee; Mrs. MARGARET C. SMITH, Republican, Maine, is on Naval Affairs; Mrs. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican, Connecticut, is on Military Affairs; Miss JESSIE SUMNER, Republican, Illinois, is on Banking and Currency, considering inflation, price fixing, etc.; Miss WINIFRED C. STANLEY, Republican, New York, is on Civil Service and Patents.

Outstanding among the women Members for important work in the World War is Mrs. ROGERS. She is a member of the Women's Overseas League and the American Legion Auxiliary, by good rights, for she served overseas in 1917. She was with the American Red Cross in charge of the disabled, 1918-22. She was appointed personal representative in care of disabled veterans by President Harding in 1922, reappointed by President Coolidge in 1923, and by President Hoover in 1929. Mrs. BOLTON also was active at that time in public health nursing and nursing education and social service. Mrs. NORTON and Mrs. SMITH did important work on the home front during the World War period.

In the House the war-service records run all the way down from House Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who is an Army veteran of the World War. The House whip, ROBERT RAMSPECK, Democrat, Georgia, who is also chairman of the Civil Service Committee, has eyewitness and family participation in the supreme act of treachery by the Japs that brought prompt declaration of war. His daughter, Dorothy, was in Pearl Harbor when it was bombed and has since married Lt. Jarrel R. Dunson, who was on a destroyer in the battle of Pearl Harbor and is now a submarine officer. His second son-in-law is Lt. John S. Leedy, Army Air Corps.

The House has daily, conspicuous testimony of the calamities of war in the person of Representative WILLIAM J. MILLER, Republican, Connecticut, who attends sessions in a wheel chair, with both legs amputated, having been shot down in an airplane crash in 1918. He had enlisted as a private in the aviation section, United States Army, and served in France for 2 years, where he received flying training and qualified as a military aviator, and was commissioned with flying status. As a result of being shot down, both legs were amputated. He is past national executive committeeman of the American Legion and department commander for Connecticut.

Representative BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, Republican, New York, whose second daughter, Joan, joined the WAAC's, has a distinguished military record. He advanced from private in the New York National Guard, later in the Cavalry, with 9 months on the Mexican Border, was commissioned Captain in the 2nd Officers Training School, served overseas at St. Mihiel and the Meuse-Argonne, advanced to Colonel, was commissioned Brigadier General and retired in 1940, due to "physical disabilities incurred in line of duty," with the rank of major general. He was decorated by the French Government with the Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre. He was commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1936.

There are 13 House Members whose sons, or sons-in-law, are First Lieutenants: Representatives A. LEONARD ALLEN (Democrat Louisiana), who has two sons in service, both overseas, Maj. Harwell Leonard Allen and Lieutenant Lyndon Blaine Allen, both in the United States Army; Mrs. BOLTON (Republican, Ohio), whose son is Lieutenant Oliver P. Bolton; Chairman CLARENCE CANNON Democrat, Missouri), of the Appropriations Committee, whose son-in-law is Lieutenant Harry B. Hackenthorn; FRANK W. BOYKIN (Democrat, Alabama), one of whose three sons in the service is Lieutenant Riley Smith Boykin, United States Navy; EDWARD W. CREAL (Democrat, Kentucky), whose son is Lieutenant James Grady Creal; CHARLES S. DEWEY (Republican, Illinois), who was a volunteer in the World War, served on the *U. S. S. Mississippi*, was promoted to Senior Lieutenant, and was later Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, whose son Albert Peter Dewey is First Lieutenant in the Army Air Forces, and whose two sons-in-law are Frederick M. Alger, lieutenant commander in the Navy, and Edward Byron Smith, a Navy lieutenant; WESLEY E. DISNEY (Democrat, Oklahoma), whose son Wesley V., is First Lieutenant in the Air Corps; BEN F. JENSEN (Republican, Iowa) whose son-in-law is Donald G. Fitzpatrick, Army; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania, whose son, Regis, previously mentioned, is in Anti-Aircraft service in north Africa; MELVIN J. MAAS, Republican, Minnesota, whose son-in-law, is Elmer J. Wood, of the Marine Corps; JAMES A. O'LEARY, Democrat, New York, one of whose sons-in-law is James K. Lucey, Army; whose son and namesake is an ensign in the Coast Guard and whose other son-in-law, John D. Lucey, is also an ensign in the Coast Guard. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Republican, New York, whose son, Lieutenant Beverly Wadsworth, previously mentioned, is an Army Lieutenant; and DAVID J. WARD, Democrat, Maryland, whose son, Howard P. Ward, is a First Lieutenant in the Army and his second son, and namesake, David J. Ward, Jr., is a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

One of the outstanding war heroes, "Swede" Larsen, is the nephew of Representative KARL STEFAN, Republican, Nebraska, who was with the Telegraph Division of the Philippine Constabulary during the Felizado campaign in the Philippines. Lt. Harold "Swede" Larsen was in command of the United States Torpedo Squadron 8 at Guadalcanal. "Swede" Larsen was one of the heroes decorated several times for effective sinking of numerous Japanese fighting craft, and was the subject of Ira Wolfert's stories which ran in the Washington Evening Star. Lieutenant Larsen is again somewhere in the South Pacific. His detail of the Navy Torpedo Squadron 8, with other flyers, are credited with halting the Japs' attempt to take important positions in the South Pacific. "Swede" reorganized Squadron 8 and helped the marines hold Guadalcanal. He was born in Omaha, Nebr. Another nephew of Representative STEFAN is Lt. Karl M. Stefan, also a flyer with the United States Navy. He also was born in Omaha, Nebr.

Representative FRED A. HARTLEY, Republican, New Jersey, has a son and one brother in the service. The son, Henry Allan, is an Army aviation cadet; one brother, Alfred, is a Navy ensign, now somewhere in the South Pacific.

Other House Members with sons or sons-in-law in the service include: Representatives WATT ARNOLD, Republican, Missouri, whose son, Sam M. Arnold is lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy; JOE B. BATES, Democrat, Kentucky, whose son, Joseph Rice Bates, is in the Army Officers Candidate School; C. W. (Runt) BISHOP, Republican, Illinois, whose son, Jack H. Bishop, is a yeoman in the Coast Guard; WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, Republican, Michigan, whose son and namesake is an Army sergeant; FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, Alabama, whose son James Robert is a cadet in the Army Air Corps, and Richard Ainsworth is going into the Coast Guard; MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania, whose son, Raymond J., is an ensign in the Navy; CLARENCE J. BROWN, Republican, Ohio, whose son-in-law, Robert A. Haynes, is a petty officer in the Navy; PAUL BROWN, Democrat, Georgia, whose son Robert T. Brown, is a Navy ensign; THOMAS F. BURCHILL, Democrat, New York, whose son, John J. Burchill, is an Army private; HENDERSON R. CARSON, Republican, Ohio, whose son-in-law, Leonard W. Snyder, is an Army private; RALPH E. CHURCH, Republican, Illinois, whose son and namesake is an ensign, United States Naval

Reserve; J. BAYARD CLARK, Democrat, North Carolina, whose son and namesake, is a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy; CLIFF CLEVENGER, Republicen, Ohio, whose son, John G. Clevenger, is a technical sergeant in the Army Medical Corps; WIRT COURTNEY, Democrat, Tennessee, whose son and namesake is a private in the Army Air Corps; E. E. Cox, Democrat, Georgia, whose son, Lemar P., is a Navy lieutenant; ROBERT CROSSER, Democrat, Ohio, whose son and namesake is a private in the Army Air Corps, and his son-in-law, Charles A. Sweeney, is a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast Guard; FRANCIS D. CULKIN, Republican, New York, whose son Francis H. Culkin is a second lieutenant in the Army; PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Republican, Iowa, whose son, Edward P., is private, first class, Marine Corps; JAMES M. CURLEY, Democrat, Massachusetts, who was a House Member 30 years ago, later mayor of Boston and Governor of Massachusetts, has two sons and a step-son in the armed forces—Leo F. and George J., both ensigns in the Navy, and George Dennis, United States Naval Reserve.

Representative CHARLES S. DEWEY, Republican, Illinois, besides having a son first lieutenant in the Army Air Forces, has two sons-in-law, Frederick M. Alger and Edward Byron Smith, in the Navy, the former lieutenant commander and the latter lieutenant. Representative MARTIN F. DIES, Democrat, Texas, chairman of the special committee investigating subversive activities, has a son and namesake who is an apprentice seaman, V 7. Representative J. WILL DITTER, chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, has a son and namesake who is a seaman in the United States Naval Reserve.

Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO, Republican, Michigan, has two sons in the armed services, Robert Lincoln, an appprentice seaman in the Reserve Officers Training Corps at the University of Michigan, and Stanton G. in the Navy as an ensign at Harvard University. Representative HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Republican, Idaho, has two sons in the service, Henry I., second lieutenant in the Army, and Ward W., United States Military Academy cadet. Representative ALBERT J. ENGLE, Republican, Michigan, who was commissioned first lieutenant in the World War, served at the War Department and in France and Germany for 23 months, and promoted to captain, has a son and namesake a private in the Army. The late Representative Harry L. Englebright, Republican, California, minority whip, had a son, Harry Jackson Englebright, an ensign in the Navy. Representative IVOR D. FENTON, Republican, Pennsylvania, who was lieutenant and captain in the Army Medical Corps in the World War and served 20 months overseas, has a son-in-law, James J. Kernan, Jr., who is an Army sergeant. Representative JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr., Democrat, Virginia, has a son, Francis W., a staff sergeant in the Army Air Forces. Representative ROBERT G. FURLONG, Democrat, Pennsylvania, who served with the Two Hundred and Eighteenth Ambulance Company, Twentieth Division in the World War, has a son, a first-class seaman, Keen A. Furlong, in naval aviation. Representative RICHARD P. GALE, Republican, Minnesota, has a son and namesake who is an Army private. Representative LEONARD W. HALL, Republican, New York, has a stepson, H. Wyndol Carroll, a naval aviation cadet. Representative BUTLER B. HARE, Democrat, South Carolina, has two sons, Robert Hayne and James Butler, both of whom are lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy.

Representative SAM HOBBS, Democrat of Alabama, besides having a daughter in the WAVES, also has a son, Truman Hobbs, a Navy ensign. Representative PEHR G. HOLMES, Republican of Massachusetts, who was born in Sweden, has a son, George Everett Holmes, a private in the Army. Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Republican of Kansas, who attended the first officers' training camp at Fort Riley, Kans., and served with the Thirty-fifth and Fifty-eighth Divisions in the United States and France in World War No. 1, has a son and namesake, an Army private. Representative ED. V. IZAC, who graduated from the Naval Academy in 1915 and served on various men-of-war. During World War No. 1, for service above and beyond the call of duty he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor and was decorated by foreign governments. Because of wounds received as a prisoner of war in Germany he was forced to retire from active service in 1921. He is a member of the Legion of Valor, past commander of the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Legion and national aide-de-camp of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. His wife's father was an Army general. His son and namesake is a Navy ensign, and a son-in-law, Robert Melvin Waller, is an Army staff sergeant.

Representative Ross RIZLEY, Republican of Oklahoma, has contributed two sons and two sons-in-law to the war, R. Q. Rizley, a corporal in the Army Air Corps; Robert S. Rizley, private in the Marine Corps; Melvin S. Camp, Army lieutenant; and Paul Barrere, Army private. Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican of Iowa, attended officers' training school and was commissioned second lieutenant during World War No. 1, and is a past commander in the American Legion. His son-in-law, Donald G. Fitzpatrick is a first lieutenant in the Army. Representative CALVIN D. JOHNSON, Republican of Illinois, comes of pioneer stock who landed at Jamestown in 1635. He has three sons under arms today, Lt. John B., Air Corps; Calvin P., Engineer Corps; and Dean F., an Army private. Representative J. LEROY JOHNSON, Republican of California, was a pilot in the One Hundred and Fourth Aero Squadron in World War No. 1. He participated in the St. Mihiel and Argonne drives, and received the Silver Star medal. His son, William A., is now a private in the Army Air Corps. Representative ROBERT W. KEAN, Republican of New Jersey, after graduation from Harvard served in World War No. 1 with the Second Division, American Expeditionary Forces, as a first lieutenant, Fifteenth Field Artillery and was awarded the Silver Star medal and the Distinguished Service Cross. His son and namesake is an Army private. Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, Republican of Wisconsin, has a son, B. F. Keefe, who is a flight officer in the Troop Carrier Command.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), after receiving his law degree from Cumberland University, was in the United States Army, 1917-19. His three sons are Capt. Connor Wright Patman, United States Army, aged 23, who enlisted December 10, 1941; James Harold, aged 21, staff sergeant in the Marine Corps in the South Pacific, who enlisted December 18, 1941, and William Neff, aged 16, an Eagle Scout attending Kemper Military School, Bonnville, Mo. Representative PATMAN is a member of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, although not privileged to serve overseas during the war by reason of a service-connected disability, and an honorary member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA (Republican, Minnesota) served 27 months in the World War, including the American Expeditionary Force, and is past State commander of the American Legion. He has two sons in service—his namesake an Army private and Edward M. a cadet in the Air Corps. Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN (Democrat, Ohio) has a son, John Joseph, an Army private. Representative FRITZ G. LANHAM (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the committee that has handled all the war housing legislation, has a stephson, John D. Head, who is a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy. Representative WILLIAM LEMKE (Nonpartisan-Republican, North Dakota) has a son, Robert, who is second lieutenant in the Army. Representative EARL R. LEWIS (Republican, Ohio) has a son, Robert N., who is in the Army Medical Corps Reserves.

Representative JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, Michigan, during the World War and for 13 years thereafter headed up Polish efforts, helped to recruit the Polish Army known as the Haller army that was sent to France. He was also in charge of the sale of Polish bonds and was honored by the Polish Government. He has a son and namesake who is a petty officer in the United States Navy. Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, Republican, Connecticut, has a stepson, Henry Luce III, who is awaiting call to the United States Navy. Representative WALTER A. LYNCH, Democrat, New York, has a son and namesake, a private in the Army Air Forces. Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Republican, Ohio, served in the Field Artillery in the World War. His son-in-law, Monroe Horst, is an ensign in the Navy. Representative DONALD H. MCLEAN, Republican, New Jersey, who was a Senate page 46 years ago, has two sons in the service—Capt. Donald H. McLean, Jr., Service of Supply, War Department, and Edward R., on a special war mission.

Representative MELVIN J. MAAS, Republican, Minnesota, ranking Republican on the Naval Affairs Committee, served overseas in the aviation branch of the Marine Corps during the World War. He is now a colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve, Aviation. His son-in-law is a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps. Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, Republican, Iowa, graduated from the First Officers Training Camp, Leon Springs, Tex., and received a commission in the United States Regular Army. He served throughout the war with the 35th Infantry, and after his honorable discharge was professor of military science and tactics at the University of Iowa. His son, Richard C., is a cadet in the Military Academy and his son-in-law, Raymond H. Reiser is second lieutenant in the Army.

Representative ARTHUR L. MILLER, Republican, Nebraska, was discharged from the Medical Reserve Corps in January, 1919. His son, Richard K., is a private in the enlisted Army Medical Reserve. Representative CAMERON MORRISON, Democrat, North Carolina, former Governor and United States Senator, has a son-in-law, James J. Harris, a lieutenant in the Navy. Representative JOHN R. MURDOCK, Democrat, Arizona, has two sons in the Army—David N., an Army lieutenant, and John B, an Army captain. Representative REID F. MURRAY, Republican, Wisconsin, has a son and namesake, a pharmacist in the Navy. Representative JAMES A. O'LEARY, Democrat, New York, has a son and namesake, an ensign in the Coast Guard, and two sons-in-law, James D. Lucey, an ensign in the Coast Guard, and John K. Lucey, a first lieutenant in the Army. Representative STEPHEN PACE, Democrat, Georgia, has a son and namesake, a West Point cadet.

Representative JOHN R. PHILLIPS, Republican, California, served in the United States Army during the World War No. 1. His two sons, Carl and Robert W., are in the Air Corps, respectively second lieutenant and corporal. Representative WILLIAM A. PITTINGER, Republican, Minnesota,, has a son, Robert W., an Army private. Representative LOUIS C. RABAUT, Democrat, Michigan, has a son, Vincent C., in the United States Naval Reserve. Representative HOMER A. RAMEY, Republican, Ohio, has a son, Bernard C., Officers' Candidate School, in the Army. Representative JOHN M. ROBSION, Republican, Kentucky, has a son and namesake, a Coast Artillery captain.

Representative ROBERT F. ROCKWELL, Republican, Colorado, has two sons in the service—Robert F., Jr., lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy and Wilson M., an Army private.

Representative TOM ROLPH, Republican, California, besides having his son, Henry R., a major in the Marine Corps, has another son, John R., an Army private.

Representative ED ROWE, Republican, Ohio, served in the World War in the United States submarine chaser service of the Navy and is a member of the American Legion. His son and namesake is a Navy aviation cadet.

Representative DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr., Democrat, Virginia, served as a commissioned officer in the Naval Flying Corps during the World War. Today he has two sons in the naval aviation service, David E. III, an Ensign and Richard B., an aviation cadet. Representative THOMAS E. SCANLON, Republican, Pennsylvania, saw 1 year's service in the World War. His son, Edward A., is now a corporal in the Air Corps. Representative A. C. SCHIEFFLER, Republican, West Virginia, served in Government units during the World War. His son, Robert A., is a private, first class in the Air Corps. Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, Virginia, graduated from the Bethel Military Academy in 1901 and during the World War served as assistant general counsel of the Alien Property Custodian. His son and namesake is an Army captain and his son-in-law, John H. Tonnahill is an ensign in the Navy. Representative JOE L. SMITH, Democrat, West Virginia, has a son and namesake, an Army captain, and another son, Hulett C. Smith, a Navy ensign.

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, Republican, Wisconsin, who was a first lieutenant of Infantry, Thirty-second Division, during the World War, later Wisconsin Department Commander, national executive committeeman, and national child welfare chairman of the American Legion; has a son, John L. Smith, private first class, in the Medical Corps. Representative ANDREW L. SOMERS, Democrat, New York, has a son, Arthur S., a lieutenant in the Marine Air Corps. Representative JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, Alabama, was a member of the Students Army Training Corps during the World War and is a lieutenant colonel in the Organized Reserves. His son-in-law, T. T. Shepard, Jr., is an ensign in the Navy. Representative JOE STARNES, Democrat, Alabama, served with the American Expeditionary Forces. His son and namesake is an officers candidate school cadet.

Representative MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, Democrat, Nevada, was adjutant general of Nevada during the World War, disbursing officer for the United States Government, and draft executive for the State. He was colonel in the Army of the United States from May 11, 1922, for 10 years. He is author of a book, "Nevada's Golden Stars," a biographical memorial volume of Nevada men who died in the service during the World War. His son and namesake is a lieutenat in the United States Army, Engineers. Representative JOHN TABER, Republican, New York, has a son, Charles, who was injured in service. Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, Republican, New Jersey, during the World War, immediately after the declaration of war, enlisted in the United States Army and saw active service in the front line. He was honorably discharged as captain, was past vice commander of the American Legion and is a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. His two sons in the services are—Stiles, a corporal of paratroops, and his namesake, J. Parnell, who is an Air Corps cadet. Representative R. EWING THOMASON, Democrat, Texas, has a son, William E., a major in the Army, and a son-in-law, Ben Decherd, an Army captain.

Representative JOHN H. TOLAN, Democrat, California, has a son and namesake a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, and a son-in-law, William Gale, a lieutenant in the Army Air Corps. Representative CHARLES W. VURSELL, Republican, Illinois, has two sons in the armed forces, Charles E., lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, and H. D., an Army private. Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, Republican, California, has a son, Garrett J., a lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve. Representative MILTON H. WEST, Democrat, Texas, has a son and namesake a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy. Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON, Democrat, Mississippi, has a son and namesake, a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy. Representative THOMAS D. WINTER, Republican, Kansas, served in the air service during the World War. His son is Second Lt. Robert G. Winter in the Engineers. Representative JAMES WOLFENDEN, Republican, Pennsylvania, has a son-in-law, John J. Tomalino, a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy. Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, New Jersey, has a son, Donnell Knox Wolverton, an Army major.

Representative ROY O. WOODRUFF, Republican, of Michigan, enlisted as a corporal in the Thirty-third Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Infantry, during the Spanish-American War, and saw considerable service. He served for 2 years in the World War as an Infantry officer and rose to the rank of major during service in France. His son, Devere H. Woodruff, is now a captain in Army Motor Transport.

Representative CHARLES H. ELSTON, Republican, of Ohio, was in the United States Army aviation service during the World War, is a member of the American Legion and Forty and Eight. His son-in-law, Robert P. Dietz, is a second lieutenant in the Army Air Force.

Representative A. LEONARD ALLEN, Democrat, of Louisiana, has two sons in service overseas—Maj. Harwell L. Allen, United States Army, and Lt. Lyndon Blaine Allen, United States Army.

Representative JAMES W. MOTT, Republican, of Oregon, enlisted in the Navy in the World War. His son-in-law, John L. Sullivan, is an Army first sergeant.

Representative FRED NORMAN, Republican, of Washington, has a son-in-law, Harry Carlson, an apprenticed seaman in the Navy.

Representative WILL ROGERS, Jr., Democrat, of California, son of (the) Will Rogers and grandson of Clem Van Rogers, a leader of the Cherokee Nation, was commissioned a second lieutenant, Field Artillery, Reserve Officers Training Corps, in 1935—the commission expired in 1940. He enlisted as a private in the United States Army in June 1942, and the next month was commissioned a second lieutenant, Field Artillery, and assigned to the Eight Hundred and Ninety-ninth Tank Destroyer Battalion. He withdrew from the Army to accept election to Congress.

SUMMARY OF MILITARY SERVICE

A summary of the military service of some Senators, whose record is not given above is:

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS, Democrat, Florida, was captain, Company M, First Regiment, Florida National Guard and volunteered for the Spanish-American and World War.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, Alabama, served in the Army with the Seventeenth and Seventy-first United States Infantry Regiments during the World War.

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, Democrat, Rhode Island, was commissioned lieutenant during the Spanish-American War, and commanded a provisional company of infantry. During the World War was prominent in many patriotic activities.

Senator ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, Democrat, Arizona, was discharged from service in the World War in the spring of 1919.

Senator BURNET RHETT MAYBANK, Democrat, South Carolina, graduated from Porter Military Academy. Served in the South Carolina Naval Militia and in the United States Navy in the World War. He is a member of the Society of Colonial Wars, American Legion, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, Republican, Maine, resigned from the Maine Legislature to enter military service. He was successively—private, second lieutenant, captain, and regimental adjutant, Third Infantry, Maine National Guard. He was a private in Field Artillery in the Central Officers Training School, Camp Zachary Taylor.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, Florida, served in the Students Army Training Corps, University of Alabama. He is a member of the American Legion.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia, served in the United States Naval Reserve Force in 1918.

MILITARY RECORD OF HOUSE MEMBERS

Representative PETE JARMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Committee on Printing, was a second and a first lieutenant in the Three Hundred and Twenty-seventh Infantry during the World War, and was slightly wounded on the western front. He was inspector general of the Alabama National Guard with the rank of major (1922–24); division inspector of the Thirty-first Infantry Division, National Guard, with the rank of lieutenant colonel (1924–40). He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of the World War, and of Forty and Eight.

Representative A. L. BULWINKLE, Democrat, of North Carolina, was a captain in Company B, First Infantry, North Carolina National Guard (1909–17). He served on the Mexican border, 1916 and 1917. During the World War he served as major in command of the Second Battallion, One Hundred and Thirteenth Field Artillery, Fifty-fifth Brigade, Thirtieth Division, American Expeditionary Forces.

Representative LEO E. ALLEN, Republican, of Illinois, member of the important Rules and Accounts Committees, during the World War served for 27 months in this country and in France as sergeant in the One Hundred and Twenty-third Regiment, Field Artillery, Thirty-third Division.

Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, was in the Navy in the World War.

Representative WALTER G. ANDREWS, Republican, of New York, served on the Mexican border as a private in the First New York Cavalry, and in France as major. One Hundred and Seventh United States Infantry, Twenty-seventh Division. He was wounded in action, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, the new Republican whip, served in the United States Navy during the World War. He was a charter member of Melvin Post, No. 642, American Legion, and served as post commander, county commander, and seventeenth district commander.

Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, New Jersey, is a veteran of the Seventh Regiment, New York National Guard, and in the World War No. 1 served as captain in military intelligence.

Representative JOSEPH C. BALDWIN, Republican, New York, served in both the Army and Navy in World War No. 1. He enlisted in the Navy, April 1917 and transferred to the Army in January 1918. He fought overseas as a private in the Machine Gun Company, Three Hundred and Fifth Infantry; received a commission and commanded the First Platoon, Machine Gun Company, Thirty-ninth Infantry. He is an officer of the French Legion of Honor; captain, Infantry Reserve, and a member of the American Legion.

Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, Democrat, North Carolina, served in the United States Navy in World War No. 1.

Representative FRANK A. BARRETT, Republican, Wyoming, during World War No. 1 served in the Balloon Corps, United States Army.

Representative JAMES G. BEALL, Republican, Maryland, served in the Ordnance Corps,

United States Army, during World War No. 1, and was discharged with the rank of sergeant.

Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina, was sergeant of Company I, Three Hundred and Twenty-second Infantry. He served overseas with the Eighty-first Division during World War No. 1.

Representative FRED BRADLEY, Republican, Michigan, was in the Army during World War No. 1.

Representative MICHAEL J. BRADLEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania, enlisted in May 1917 when he was just 20 years old, and served in the Navy, overseas, for 2 years. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative WALTER E. BREHM, Republican, Ohio, was a member of the Ohio National Guard, 1908–14. He volunteered in the World War but was rejected for service in the Regular Army Dental Corps because of a shoulder injury.

Representative OVERTON BROOKS, Democrat, Louisiana, enlisted in the United States Army in July 1918 and served in the Sixth Field Artillery, First Regular Army Division until September 1919. He saw service in France, Belgium, and Germany. He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Forty and Eight.

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, Democrat, South Carolina, volunteered as a private in the World War and served for the duration.

Representative FRED E. BUSBEY, Republican, Illinois, enlisted in the Regular Army in World War No. 1, later transferred and served overseas with the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Field Artillery, Thirty-third Division, American Expeditionary Force. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative A. SIDNEY CAMP, Democrat, Georgia, served 2 years in the Army in the First World War as a member of Headquarters Detachment, Eighty-second Division, American Expeditionary Force. He is past commander of the Georgia Department, American Legion.

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, Republican, New Jersey, enlisted in the Signal Corps, Regular Army during the First World War. War.

Representative FRANK CARLSON, Republican of Kansas, is a World War No. 1 veteran with Army service.

Representative HENDERSON H. CARSON, Republican, Ohio, during the World War enlisted in the Field Artillery at Camp Zachary Taylor and was honorably discharged in 1919 as a corporal. He was vice commander of American Legion Post No. 44.

Representative FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, served in the Marine Corps in the World War.

Representative ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, Republican, Illinois, was in the Army in the World War and is a member of the American Legion and Forty and Eight.

Representative RALPH E. CHURCH, Republican, Illinois, was a member of the executive committee, central department, Citizens Military Training Camp Association, in 1916. In May 1917, while serving in the fiftieth general assembly, he volunteered for military service and was later honorably discharged. He was lieutenant commander L–V (S), United States Naval Reserves (1938–41).

Representative CHARLES R. CLASON, Republican, Massachusetts, is an Army veteran of the World War.

Representative WILLIAM C. COLE, Republican, Missouri, served 10 months as mounted scout on the Mexican border with the Missouri forces in 1916. He served 14 months in the war zone on U. S. S. *Machias* doing submarine patrol and convoy duty during the World War. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars; past commander of Jack Schneider Post, No. 135, Veterans of Foreign Wars; past judge advocate, Department of Missouri Veterans of Foreign Wars; past commander of Pony Express Post, No. 700, Veterans of Foreign Wars; radio chairman, third district of Missouri, Veterans of Foreign Wars. He has also served as a member of the Registrants Advisory Board, Draft Board No. 1, St. Joseph, Mo.

Representative WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, Mississippi, during the World War served as a private and was honorably discharged as regimental sergeant major. He is a member of the American Legion and Forty and Eight.

Representative RANULF COMPTON, Republican, Connecticut, graduated from Howe Military School, at Howe, Ind. He was captain of Infantry, New York National Guard, 1912–16; captain of Infantry, United States Army, July 1916 to March 1918; captain and major, Tank Corps, April 1918 to August 1919; went overseas with the American Expeditionary Force in December 1917; captain, Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry; assigned to Tank Corps, Bourg, France; served as captain and chief instructor, tank school; served for a time with the French tanks; commanded Three Hundred and Forty-fifth Battalion, First Brigade, United States Tank Corps, in battles of St. Mihiel and Argonne; was decorated with the Purple Heart, United States; Legion of Honor, France; and Conspicuous Service Cross, New York State. He now holds the rank of major, United States Army, retired list. He was military secretary to Gov. Nathan L. Miller of New York, 1920. He also served as aide de camp to Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut.

Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, North Carolina, served in the Naval Aviation Flying Corps during the World War.

Representative JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, served 2 years in the Army in the World War. He enlisted in the Second Tennessee Infantry, National Guard, in May 1917 and on July 23 was commisisoned first lieutenant. In October he was transferred with his company to Company K, One Hundred and Nineteenth Infantry, Thirtieth Division, and served with this regiment throughout the war, going through all its engagements in France and Belgium. He was promoted to captain and discharged in April 1919 after a year with the American Expeditionary Force. He was State commander of the American Legion of Tennessee in 1921 and national executive committeeman of the Legion in 1922.

Representative WIRT COURTNEY, Democrat, Tennessee, member of the Foreign Affairs and Un-American Activities Committees, enlisted as a private in the One Hundred and Seventeenth Infantry, Thirtieth Division, September 1917. He was discharged as first lieutenant after 14 months in France. He was adjutant general in Tennessee in 1932 and commissioned brigadier general, National Guard.

Representative FADJO CRAVENS, Democrat, of Arkansas, served in the Navy in the World War.

Representative FRANCIS D. CULKIN, Republican, New York, served as a private in the New York Volunteers in the Spanish-American War. He was a captain in the New York National Guard, 1901–08.

Representative PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Republican, Iowa, attending the Fort Sheridan Training Camp in 1917 and was commissioned first lieutenant of Infantry. He had previously been captain in the Iowa National Guard. He is a member of the American Legion.

Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, Illinois, during the World War served as first lieutenant of the Three hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry, in the American Expeditionary Forces.

Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, Illinois, served in the United States Army, 1917 to 1919, with a record of 17 months' overseas duty. He was commissioned second lieutenant from the ranks. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative CARL T. DURHAM, Democrat, North Carolina, served in the United States Navy in 1918.

Representative HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Republican, Idaho, served with the Army in 1918–19 in the World War. He served in the American Expeditionary Forces for 6 months. He was Idaho commander of the American Legion in 1932.

Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, served as private in the Twentieth Infantry, United States Army, during the World War and holds the rank of captain in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

Representative HUBERT S. ELLIS, Republican, West Virginia, served 2 years in the Army during the World War, including 20 months in France with the One Hundred and Fiftieth Field Artillery, Forty-second Division. He is a past department commander of the American Legion.

Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Republican, Oregon, served in the Students' Army Training Corps in the World War and is a member of the American Legion.

JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii, entered the United States Army in 1918 and was commissioned a second lieutenant, Field Artillery.

Representative JAMES H. FAY, Democrat, New York, during the World War served in France with the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry, the famous Fighting Sixty-ninth, New York, and was wounded in action as a result of which he now wears an artificial leg.

Representative HAMILTON FISH, Republican, New York, served throughout the World War, being a company commander of the Fifteenth New York Volunteers, later known as the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Regiment of Infantry. He was awarded the American Silver Star and the French Croix de Guerre for gallantry. He served as major of Infantry in the Fourth Division of the Army of Occupation and graduated from the Army General Staff College of the American Expeditionary Force. He now holds the rank of colonel in the Officers' Reserve Corps. He was chairman of the subcommittee at the first American Legion convention in 1919 that wrote the preamble to the American Legion constitution. He was appointed chairman of the Advisory Committee on Veterans' Preference by President Coolidge in 1928, and was appointed chairman of a special House Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States in 1930. He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Society of the Cincinnati.

Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was sergeant, first class, in the Motor Transport Corps, in the World War. He served in France 12 months, with the American Expeditionary Forces, 1918 and 1919. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. He was chief of the Rhode Island State division of soldiers' relief and commandant of the Rhode Island Soldiers' Home.

Representative ROBERT GRANT FURLONG, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, served in the World War with the Two Hundred and Eightieth Ambulance Company, Twentieth Division.

Representative JOSEPH A. GAVAGAN, Democrat, of New York, served as first lieutenant, United States Army, in the World War.

Representative LEON H. GAVIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, served in the World War as sergeant in the Fifty-first Infantry, Sixth Division.

Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Republican, of California, served in the World War from August 1917 to February 1919, in both the United States and in France. He is one of the founders of the American Legion and a member of the emblem committee, which at the St. Louis caucus of 1919, selected the now famous insignia of this great patriotic organization. He was California State commander, and national executive committeeman of the Legion. He is a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, qualifying as a descendant of Capt. Jacob Gearhart, who fought with Gen. George Washington throughout the Revolutionary War. In Congress he was the author of the act establishing Armistice Day as a national holiday. He is honorary life member of the United Spanish War Veterans, and a member of the board of directors of the California Veterans' Home by appointment of Gov. James Rolph in 1932.

Representative WALTER K. GRANGER, Democrat, of Utah, served in France with the Eleventh Regiment of Marines as a volunteer during the World War.

Representative GEORGE M. GRANT, Democrat, of Alabama, served in the United States Army in 1918 and 1919; is a member of the American Legion and a former State commander.

Representative P. W. GRIFFITHS, Republican, of Ohio, enlisted in the United States Navy and served from 1910 to 1913 and during World War No. 1 in 1917 and 1919.

Representative JOHN W. GWYNNE, Republican, of Iowa, served in World War No. 1 as a second lieutenant with the Eighty-eighth Division.

Representative ROBERT HALE, Republican, of Maine, served in the United States Army from August 1917 to September 1919, in grades from private to second lieutenant, receiving his commission in March 1918. He was with the American Expeditionary Forces in France for approximately 2 years and was a member of the staff of a mission sent by the United States peace commission to Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1919. He was honorably discharged in September 1919.

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, served in the Infantry, United States Army in World War No. 1 and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative CLARENCE E. HANCOCK, Republican, of New York, served with the First New York Cavalry on the Mexican border, 1916–17. He was with the Twenty-seventh Division in World War No. 1, 1917–19. He was a captain of a machine-gun battalion.

Representative FOREST A. HARNESS, Republican, of Indiana, served in World War No. 1 from April 1917 to June 1919. He was commissioned first lieutenant, Three Hundred and Nineteenth Infantry, Eightieth Division, and saw 1 year's service overseas. He was awarded the Purple Heart decoration. He is a past State commander of the American Legion.

Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, served in the United States Army from September to December 1918 and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative WILLIAM E. HESS, Republican, of Ohio, was a private in the infantry, United States Army, at Fort Sheridan, Ill.; artillery in Officers' Training Corps, Camp Taylor, Ky.

Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, of California, enlisted in the United States Army, May 8, 1917; served in the American Expeditionary Forces, and resigned as captain, Corps of Engineers, in September 1919.

Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Republican, of Iowa, during World War No. 1, served with the American Expeditionary Forces in France and England.

Representative WALTER F. HORAN, Republican, of Washington, enlisted in the Navy, April 5, 1917, when he was just out of high school. He is an American Legionnaire.

Representative JED JOHNSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma, served in the American Expeditionary Forces as private in Company L, Thirty-sixth Division. He was a delegate from Congress to the twenty-fourth annual peace conference of the Interparliamentary Union in Paris in 1927; the Peace Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, 1929; a delegate to the American Legion convention in Paris, 1927; appointed to the Interparliamentary Conference in Paris, 1937. He is a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative WARD JOHNSON, Republican of California, a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, was in the Army in the World War.

Representative WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, enlisted in the United States Army in 1918 and served in the Field Artillery. After the war he made the most of a fellowship in surgery at the Mayo Foundation, and then became a medical missionary and superintendent of hospitals in China—from 1925 to 1938. Since then he has been giving lectures throughout the United States to arouse Americans to the menace of Japan's military expansion and treachery.

Representative CECIL R. KING, Democrat of California, is an Army veteran of the World War.

Representative MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Democrat, of Ohio, served with the Sixty-fourth Artillery, United States Army, with the American Expeditionary Forces in 1917-19. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative JOHN C. KUNKEL, Republican, of Pennsylvania, served in the Student Army Training Corps during the World War.

Representative CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Republican, of Indiana, enlisted in the Army May 8, 1917, including 4 months overseas as sergeant, and was discharged February 14, 1919.

Representative WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON, Republican, of Kansas, son of a Civil War veteran and pioneer, attended the Second Officers' Training School at Fort Sheridan, Ill., 1917.

Representative GERALD W. LANDIS, Republican, of Indiana, was second lieutenant in the United States Army in 1918.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, is a World War veteran.

Representative HENRY D. LARCADE, JR., Democrat, of Louisiana, served at Camp Pike, Ark., during the World War, obtaining a commission at close of the war as second lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, Officers' Reserve Corps. He belongs to the American Legion and other service organizations.

Representative KARL M. LECOMPTE, Republican, of Iowa, served as a private during the World War, 1918.

Representative JAY LEFEVRE, Republican, of New York, served in Field Artillery, Camp Taylor, during the World War.

Representative LAWRENCE LEWIS, Democrat, of Colorado, was a private in Field Artillery and officer candidate at Camp Zachary Taylor, Ky., 1918.

Representative JAMES P. MCGRANERY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, was an observation pilot for the duration of the World War. He also served as adjutant for the One Hundred and Eleventh Infantry.

Representative CHARLES E. MCKENZIE, Democrat, of Louisiana, was an aviation enthusiast before the World War. He volunteered for service on the Mexican border in 1916 with the Louisiana National Guard; was mustered into Federal service in April 1917; commissioned in September 1917; went overseas in June 1918, and returned to the United States in September 1919. He is past commander of the Louisiana department of the American Legion and past member of the national executive committee. He also belongs to the Forty-and-Eight, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Military Order of the World War.

Representative JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, served in the United States Navy for 5 months in the World War, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS, Republican, of Connecticut, during the World War served 18 months in France with the Twentieth Engineers, United States Army. He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Forty-and-Eight.

Representative RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana, resigned from a municipal judgeship to serve in the armed forces during the World War. He is a member of the American Legion.

Representative MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, served successively in the Navy, Army, and Marine Corps. He left home in 1917 and at the age of 14 joined the United States Navy February 23, 1918, for the duration of the World War. He served 10 months overseas, enlisted in the United States Army for 1 year, 1919–20, then enlisted in the United States Marine Corps for 2 years, 1920-22. While serving in the Marines was stationed in the Far East.

Representative MATTHEW J. MERRITT, Democrat, of New York, served as sergeant in the United States Army in the World War. He is a member of the American Legion and early in this global war was called for a tour of intensified study in the Army War College. He is a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Representative EARL C. MICHENER, Republican, of Michigan, served as private in Company B, Thirty-first Michigan Volunteer Infantry, in the Spanish-American War, April 26, 1898, to May 17, 1899.

Representative ARTHUR L. MILLER, Republican, of Nebraska, was discharged from the Medical Reserve Corps in January 1919.

Representative LOUIS E. MILLER, Republican, of Missouri, was a member of the United States military forces in 1918, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative THOMAS B. MILLER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, descendant of a pre-Revolution family, was an officer in the World War, serving with the Sixteenth Field Artillery.

Representative BOLESLAUS J. MONKIEWICZ, Republican, Connecticut, was in the Columbia University naval unit from September 1918 until December 24, 1918. He is a member of the Connecticut State Guard.

Representative TOM MURRAY, Democrat, Tennessee, served in the United States Army in the World War and was a member of the American Expeditionary Forces in France. He was honorably discharged from the Army in 1919. He is past post commander of the American Legion and past vice State commander, also a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative JOHN P. NEWSOME, Democrat, Alabama, was captain of Infantry, Fifth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, in the World War. He is a member of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars; past post commander, American Legion; past president of the County Council of American Legion Posts; past vice commander of the State department of the American Legion.

Representative JACK NICHOLS, Democrat, Oklahoma, reported for duty in the first officers training camp, Fort Logan H. Root, Ark., May 14, 1917, but failed of commission because of a quarrel with a superior officer; joined the Nineteenth Infantry, Regular Army, from which he was honorably discharged March 27, 1919. He is a member of the American Legion.

Representative WILLIAM F. NORRELL, Democrat, Arkansas, served in the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, in the World War.

Representative GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, Democrat, Michigan, served in the United States Army, October to December 1918.

Representative JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN, Republican, New York, served in the United States Navy, 1917-19, and after the war was an amateur and professional football player and wrestler. He belongs to the American Legion.

Representative EMMET O'NEAL, Democrat, Kentucky, served in the First Division of the United States Army in France, and was honorably discharged in 1919. He was one of the first department commanders of the American Legion in Kentucky.

Representative HUGH PETERSON, Democrat, Georgia, attended the United States Military Academy at West Point, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative JAMES H. PETERSON, Democrat, of Florida, was chief yeoman, United States Navy in the First World War, and lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve. He is a member of the American Legion, Army and Navy Union, and the United States Naval Reserve Officers' Association.

Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts, is a veteran of the First World War, with service in the Navy.

Representative WILLIAM "BOB" POAGE, Democrat of Texas, served as apprentice seaman, United States Navy, 1918, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative D. LANE POWERS, Republican, of New Jersey, graduated from the Pennsylvania Military College with the degree of C. E. in 1915; B. M. S., 1921, and M. S., 1935. He enlisted as a private April 13, 1917, and was discharged as a first lieutenant and battalion adjutant of infantry in April 1919.

Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the World War Veterans' Legislative Committee, was a soldier in the First World War, and is author of the amendment to raise the base pay of the men in the armed forces to $50 a month.

Representative B. CARROLL REECE, Republican, of Tennessee, enlisted in May 1917 and served in the American Expeditionary Forces from October 1917, to July 1919, with the Twenty-sixth Division. He commanded the Third Battalion, One Hundred and Second Regiment of Infantry. He was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Purple Heart, and the Croix de Guerre, with palms, and was cited for bravery by Marshal Petain, Generals Pershing, Edwards, Hale, and Colonel Lewis.

Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED, Republican, of Illinois, during the First World War served as sergeant in the Eighty-sixth Division of the United States Army. He was first commander of Naperville Post, No. 43 of the American Legion, and served as National Garde de la Porte and National Conducteur of La Societe des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux.

Representative EDWARD N. REES, Republican, of Kansas, served in the Army in the First World War, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative JAMES P. RICHARDS, Democrat, of South Carolina, volunteered as a private at Camp Styx, S. C., in 1917, a few days after war was declared, and served throughout the war in this country and France with the Trench Mortar Battery, Headquarters Company, One Hundred and Eighteenth Regiment of Infantry, Thirtieth Division as a private, corporal, and sergeant, and was commissioned as reserve second lieutenant in February 1919. He was discharged March 31, 1919.

Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, served as first lieutenant, later captain and major of Infantry, United States Army, from August 1917 to June 1919.

Representative ROBERT L. RODGERS, Republican, of Pennsylvania, enlisted in Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry in the Spanish-American War.

Representative SAM M. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Texas, served as a soldier in the World War.

Representative LANSDALE G. SASSCER, Democrat, of Maryland, served 13 months in active service with the American Expeditionary Forces in France. At the time of his discharge held a first lieutenant's commission.

Representative HUGH D. SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, enrolled in Reserve Officers Training Corps and Students' Army Training Corps during World War. Is a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserve. He is a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Sons of the Revolution, and Patriotic Order Sons of America.

Representative DEWEY SHORT, Republican, of Missouri, served as acting lieutenant of Infantry, United States Army, during the World War, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, served during the World War in the Tank Corps, at Raleigh, N. C.

Representative SID SIMPSON, Republican, of Illinois, served with the American Expeditionary Forces in the World War and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative ANDREW L. SOMERS, Democrat, of New York, during the World War enlisted on July 18, 1917, as a hospital apprentice, second class, United States Naval Reserve Force. Subsequently served as ensign in the Naval Reserve Flying Corps and was appointed a naval aviator on September 30, 1918. Proceeded to foreign service and served until honorably discharged March 4, 1919.

Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, Republican, of Indiana, was commissioned captain of infantry, United States Army, in the World War and is now lieutenant colonel of infantry, United States Reserve Corps. He served as first State commander of the American Legion in Indiana.

Representative FOSTER STEARNS, Republican, of New Hampshire, was first lieutenant of Infantry, United States Army, 1917-19. He served with the Sixteenth Infantry, First Division, and at General Headquarters, American Expeditionary Force. He was wounded at St. Mihiel; was assistant military attaché in Belgium and captain, Officers Reserve Corps (resigned). He was decorated with the Order of the Silver Star and Order of the Purple Heart; Privy Chamberlain of the Sword and Cape to Pope Pius XI; Knight of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. He is a member of the Society of Mayflower Descendants, Society of Colonial Wars, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the Society of First Division, American Expeditionary Force.

Representative HENRY O. TALLE, Republican, of Iowa, served in the United States Navy during the World War and was commissioned an ensign.

Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas, served as second lieutenant, United States Army, in the World War.

Representative HARRY L. TOWE, Republican, of New Jersey, attended the United States Naval Academy, 1918 and 1920.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, has served in the World War and for a brief period in this global war. He enlisted in the United States Navy in April 1917 for the duration of the World War, and had 2 years' duty overseas. At the time of his discharge he held the rating of chief quartermaster. He enlisted in the United States Naval Reserves in 1919 and is still an active member, being commissioned lieutenant (senior grade) May 22, 1941. He is a member of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and honorary member of the United Spanish War Veterans. He was twice commander of the Department of Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars, and three times commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. During his third term as commander in chief he headed the good-will delegation of veterans touring the Orient. He served as chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars national legislative committee, 1936-38. He is now serving as member of the national council of administration, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Representative BEVERLY M. VINCENT, Democrat, of Kentucky, served in the United States Army during the World War, 1918-19, and is a member of the American Legion.

Representative JOHN M. VORYS, Republican, of Ohio, was a pilot in the United States Naval Air Service, overseas, in the World War, retiring to inactive service in 1919 with the rank of lieutenant (senior grade). He was assistant secretary of the American delegation, Conference on Limitation of Armaments and Pacific and Far East Affairs (1921-22), and director of aeronautics of Ohio.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, Democrat, of Idaho, served in the Army in the Spanish-American War.

Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, Republican, of Massachusetts, served in France as captain, Battery E, and commanding officer of First Battalion, Three Hundred and Third Regiment, Field Artillery, Seventy-sixth Division, United States Army. He is a member of the American Legion, Forty and Eight, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Military Order of the World War, Military Order of Foreign Wars. He was legal adviser to the Assistant Secretary, United States Treasury, in charge of foreign loans and railway payments, and secretary of the World War Debt Commission (1922-24). He was assistant to the adjutant general for reparation payments, Berlin, 1924-27.

Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Republican, of Michigan, during the World War served as second lieutenant, Machine Gun Company, Twenty-sixth Infantry, First Division, and saw active service in France during the Meuse-Argonne offensive. He was State commander and past department commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, member of the American Legion.

Representative ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, Democrat, of Missouri, volunteered for service in the World War and served as a private. He is a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars (honorary).

ROSTER OF VETERANS IN THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

(W1 denotes World War No. 1; W2, World War No. 2. The letter "S" denotes the Spanish-American War; the letter "O" indicates service with the Army; an asterisk (*), Navy service; and the letter "M" denotes service with the Marine Corps.)

Senators

Lister Hill, Alabama (W1-O).
Carl Hayden, Arizona (W1-O).
Ernest W. McFarland, Arizona (W1-*).
Eugene D. Millikin, Colorado (W1-O).
Francis Maloney, Connecticut (W1-*).
John A. Danaher, Connecticut (W1-O).
Charles O. Andrews, Florida (S-W1-O).
Claude Pepper, Florida (W1-O).
Richard B. Russell, Georgia (W1-*).
Scott W. Lucas, Illinois (W1-O).
C. Wayland Brooks, Illinois (W1-M).
Guy M. Gillette, Iowa (S-W1-O).
Albert B. Chandler, Kentucky (W1-O).
Allen J. Ellender, Louisiana (W1-O).
Ralph O. Brewster, Maine (W1-O).
Millard E. Tydings, Maryland (W1-O).
Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Massachusetts (W2-O).
Bennett Champ Clark, Missouri (W1-O).
Harry S. Truman, Missouri (W1-O).

Kenneth S. Wherry, Nebraska (W1-*).
James G. Scrugham, Nevada (W1-O).
Harold H. Burton, Ohio (W1-O).
Theodore F. Green, Rhode Island (S-O).
Burnet R. Maybank, South Carolina (W1-*).
Chan Gurney, South Dakota (W1-O).
Tom Connally, Texas (S-O).
Elbert D. Thomas, Utah.
Mon C. Wallgren, Washington (W1-O).
Harley M. Kilgore, West Virginia (W1-O).
Chapman Revercomb, West Virginia (W1-O).
Edward V. Robertson, Wyoming (Boer War).

Representatives

Leo E. Allen, Illinois (W1-O).
H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota (W1-*).
Walter G. Andrews, New York (W1-O).
Leslie C. Arends, Illinois (W1-*).
James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey (W1-O).
Joseph Clark Baldwin, New York (W1*-O).
Graham A. Barden, North Carolina (W1-*).
Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming (W1-O).
J. Glenn Beall, Maryland (W1-O).
Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina (W1-O).
Fred Bradley, Michigan (W1-O).
Michael J. Bradley, Pennsylvania (W1-*).
Walter E. Brehm, Ohio (W1-O).
Overton Brooks, Louisiana (W1-O).
Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina (W1-O).
Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina (W1-O).
Fred E. Busbey, Illinois (W1-O).
A. Sidney Camp, Georgia (W1-O).
Gordon Canfield, New Jersey (W-O).
Frank Carlson, Kansas (W1-O).
Henderson H. Carson, Ohio (W1-O).
Francis Case, South Dakota (WI-*).
Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois (W1-O).
Ralph E. Church, Illinois (W1-O).
Charles R. Clason, Massachusetts (W1-O).
William C. Cole, Missouri (W1-*).
William M. Colmer, Mississippi (W1-O).
Ranulf Compton, Connecticut (W1-O).
Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina (W1-*).
Jere Cooper, Tennessee (W1-O).
Wirt Courtney, Tennessee (W1-O).
Fadjo Cravens, Arkansas (W1-*).
Francis D. Culkin, New York (S-W1-O).
Paul Cunningham, Iowa (W1-O).
William L. Dawson, Illinois (W1-O).
Charles S. Dewey, Illinois (W1-*).
Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois (W1-O).
Carl T. Durham, North Carolina (W1-*).
Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho (W1-O).
Herman P. Eberharter, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia (W1-O).
Harris Ellsworth, Oregon (W1-O).
Charles H. Elston, Ohio (W1-O).
Albert J. Engel, Michigan (W1-O).
Joseph Rider Farrington, Territory of Hawaii (W1-O).
James H. Fay, New York (W1-O).
Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Hamilton Fish, New York (W1-O).
Aime J. Forand, Rhode Island (W1-O).
Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Joseph A. Gavagan, New York (W1-O).
Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Bertrand W. Gearhart, California (W1-O).
Walter K. Granger, Utah (W-M).
George M. Grant, Alabama (W1-O).
P. W. Griffiths, Ohio (W1-*).
John W. Gwynne, Iowa (W1-O).
Robert Hale, Maine (W1-O).
Charles A. Halleck, Indiana (W1-O).
Clarence E. Hancock, New York (W1-O).
Forest A. Harness, Indiana (W1-O).
Brooks Hays, Arkansas (W1-O).
William E. Hess, Ohio (W1-O).
Carl Hinshaw, California (W1-O).
Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa (W1-O).
Clifford R. Hope, Kansas (W1-O).
Walter F. Horan, Washington (W1-*).
Ed. V. Izac, California (W1-*).
Pete Jarman, Alabama (W1-O).
Ben F. Jensen, Iowa (W1-O).
Jed Johnson, Oklahoma (W1-O).
J. Leroy Johnson, California (W1-O).
Lyndon B. Johnson, Texas (W2-*).
Ward Johnson, California (W1-O).
Walter H. Judd, Minnesota (W1-O).
Robert W. Kean, New Jersey (W1-O).
B. W. (Pat) Kearney, New York (W1-O).
Clarence E. Kilburn, New York (W1-O).
Cecil R. King, California (W1-O).
Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio (W1-O).
John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Charles M. LaFollette, Indiana (W1-O).
William P. Lambertson, Kansas (W1-O).
Gerald W. Landis, Indiana (W1-O).
Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts (W1-O).
Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana (W1-O).
Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa (W1-O).
Jay LeFevre, New York (W1-O).
Lawrence Lewis, Colorado (W1-O).
John W. McCormack, Massachusetts (W1-O).
James P. McGranery, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
J. Harry McGregor, Ohio (W1-O).
Charles E. McKenzie, Louisiana (W1-O).
John L. McMillan, South Carolina (W1-*).
J. D. McWilliams, Connecticut (W1-O).
Melvin J. Maas, Minnesota (W1-W2?M).
Ray J. Madden, Indiana (W1-*).
Warren G. Magnuson, Washington (W2-*).
Mike Mansfield, Montana (W1-*-O-M).
Thomas E. Martin, Iowa (W1-O).
Matthew J. Merritt, New York (W1-O).
Earl C. Michener, Michigan (S-O).
Louis E. Miller, Missouri (W1-O).
Thomas B. Miller, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
William J. Miller, Connecticut (W1-O).
B. J. Monkiewicz, Connecticut (W1-*).
James W. Mott, Oregon (W1-*).
Tom Murray, Tennessee (W1-O).
John P. Newsome, Alabama (W1-Q).
Jack Nichols, Oklahoma (W1-O).
W. F. Norrell, Arkansas (W1-O).
George D. O'Brien, Michigan (W1-O).
Joseph J. O'Brien, New York (W1-*).
Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota (W1-O).
Emmet O'Neal, Kentucky (W1-O).
Wright Patman, Texas (W1-O).
Hugh Peterson, Georgia (W1-O).
J. Hardin Peterson, Florida (W1-*).
Phillip J. Philbin, Massachusetts (W1-*).
John Phillips, California (W1-O).
W. R. Poage, Texas (W1-*).
D. Lane Powers, New Jersey (W1-O).
John E. Rankin, Mississippi (W1-O).
B. Carroll Reece, Tennessee (W1-O).
Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois (W1-O).
Edward H. Rees, Kansas (W1-O).
James P. Richards, South Carolina (W1-O).
A. Willis Robertson, Virginia (W1-O).
Robert L. Rodgers, Pennsylvania (S-O).
Will Rogers, Jr., California (W2-O).
Ed Rowe, Ohio (W1-*).
Sam M. Russell, Texas (W1-O).
Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland (W1-O).
Dave E. Satterfield, Jr., Virginia (W1-W2-*).
Thomas E. Scanlon, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania (W1-O-W2-*).
Dewey Short, Missouri (W1-O).
Richard M. Simpson, Pennsylvania (W1-O).
Sid Simpson, Illinois (W1-O).
Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin (WW1-O).
Andrew L. Somers, New York (W1-*).
John J. Sparkman, Alabama (W1-O).
Raymond S. Springer, Indiana (W1-O).
Joe Starnes, Alabama (W1-O).
Foster Stearns, New Hampshire (W1-O).
Maurice J. Sullivan, Nevada (W1-O).
Henry O. Talle, Iowa (W1-*).
Albert Thomas, Texas (W1-O).
J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey (W1-O).
Harry L. Towe, New Jersey (W1-*).
James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania (W1-W2-*).
Beverly M. Vincent, Kentucky (W1-O).
John M. Vorys, Ohio (W1-*).
James W. Wadsworth, New York (S-O).
Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania (W1-*-W2-*).
Compton I. White, Idaho (S-O).
Richard B. Wigglesworth Massachusetts (W1-O).
Thomas D. Winter, Kansas (W1-O).
Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan (W1-O).
Roy O. Woodruff, Michigan (S-W1-O).
Eugene Worley, Texas (W2-*).
Orville Zimmerman, Missouri (W1-O).

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

FORTY-SEVEN MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS—COUNT IT

The Senate has voted the National Youth Administration $47,800,000.

That's enough to pay a month's wage for 9,560,000 buck privates in the Army—but that's more men than we have in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

That's more money than the Government will collect in 1 year by its new withholding tax from 136,000 married men with two children each and earning $2,500 a year each.

And what will the taxpayers and the war effort get for this money? The National Youth Administration says its main business is training youth for war industries. The record shows that the National Youth Administration actually trains only 3 percent of all who are trained for war-industry jobs—and that less expensive training and better training is provided by training within industry and by the public schools vocational training.

All that the taxpayers and the war effort will really get from this money is a lot of soft jobs for boondogglers and ward heelers.

The House of Representatives, we think, is the wiser of the two branches of Congress. It voted $3,000,000 to liquidate the National Youth Administration. That's too much. As Senator MCKELLAR has said, the whole shebang "isn't worth two bits."

Proposed "Four Freedoms" Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution adopted June 28, 1943, by Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York is of interest and should be brought to the attention of every American:

Whereas it appears from statements in the public press that a "four freedoms" flag is projected, symbolic of the United Nations, to supplant the flag of the United States of America in ceremonies overseas. According to the United Press account, "The two-flag system was arranged in unofficial discussions between Chairman Brooks Harding of the "four freedoms" committee and representatives of all the United Nations. In cere-

monies overseas the United States will be represented in a "four freedoms" flag flown beside the standard of the Nation in which the event is held"; and

Whereas the flag of our country was chosen by Congress on June 14, 1777, and was carried by our ancestors in the Revolutionary War, sustained in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the other conflicts in which our country has been engaged; and

Whereas it is the emblem of freedom and the symbol of the unity of our country for which our ancestors died and our sons are fighting, and is a token of all that has made America great and for which there can be no substitute: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, with unyielding conviction, protests and condemns the flagrantly unpatriotic and spiritually destructive proposal to have the United States represented in ceremonies overseas by a "four freedoms" flag, flown beside the standard of the Nation in which the event is held, and demands that no flag other than the Stars and Stripes, adopted by Congress on June 14, 1777, shall officially or unofficially represent the United States directly or indirectly, nor may the Stars and Stripes be merged, amalgamated, symbolized, or in any manner be abridged or be included in any composite of flags; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Members of both Houses of Congress, the President, the Secretaries of War and the Navy, as well as the Governors of all the States and to the press, to the end that the patriotic citizens of our country be aroused in defense of their flag and all it represents.

Mr. Speaker, let us give credit to the well-intentioned global-minded. Let us cooperate in every way for a real world peace; a world understanding and respect—each nation for the rights, the culture, the ideals of the other. But, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that we of the United States of America are Americans with our own culture, our own ideals, our own rights, our own "four freedoms." And, all these American privileges are represented in and typified by one ensign, the emblem of freedom, the Star-Spangled Banner. We will not subordinate it to any other.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 22 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of the ablest addresses which have come to my attention on the subject of post-war organization is an address entitled "This Time We Must Win the Peace," delivered by William G. Carleton, of the faculty of the University of Florida, at the annual district conference of Rotary International, one hundred sixty-seventh district, comprising the State of Florida, at Jacksonville, Fla., on April 12, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that this able address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the notice of Senators and others fortunate enough to observe it. The estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the cost of printing the address of Mr. Carleton will be $171.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

For the second time within a single generation the American people will have an opportunity to build a world peace in the spirit of enlightened internationalism. No opportunity of equal magnitude has ever come to another great people even once. To have failed the first time was tragic for us and for the world. To fail the second time may be fatal to civilization itself.

II

Make no mistake about it, we can build a peaceful world. Wars are not inevitable. Those who claim that warfare among nations is but an expression of human nature are blind. Superficial men always contend that whatever happens to be established at any given time in society is necessary and grounded in human nature. They said that about polytheism and polygamy. They said that about serfdom and slavery. They said that about aristocracy and the divine right of kings.

As a matter of fact, this thing we call human nature is wondrously malleable. Men are largely the products of their training and of their social environment. Is there anything inborn in putting on a uniform, goose-stepping in a regiment, and fighting fellow human beings with guns and tanks and planes? Of course not. Such conduct is man-made, and not inherent in human nature. When we change the social and political setting we will change men's conduct.

Formerly tribe fought tribe, city state fought city state, feudal province fought feudal province. Today tribes and city states and feudal provinces are merged into nations and the conflicts which once were settled by physical combat are now settled by the peaceful methods of national government and national law. Today men don't say that fighting between one part of a country and another part of the same country is "human nature."

The time will come when the conflicts between nations which once were settled only by war will be settled by the machinery of international government and the processes of international law. And then this thing called human nature will respond, as it always responds, to social and institutional changes, and wars between nations will go the way of idol worship and voodooism, human sacrificial offerings and witchcraft, polytheism, and polygamy, human slavery, and the divinity of kings. And then what was once called human nature will be called superstition.

World peace, however, can never come by individual persons proclaiming that they will not bear arms in a national war. It will never come by one nation or even several nations proclaiming that they will not fight. That is the way of the impractical pacifist and is only an invitation to attack by the nations which as yet have made no such renunciation. Peace will never come by unilateral denial. It will only come by the multilateral cooperation of all nations and the substitution of international political and legal machinery for violence as the means of adjusting and compromising the conflicts of interest between the various parts of the world.

III

With respect to the peace there are three distinct classes of Americans. Let us take up and analyze each of these.

First, there are the isolationists. The isolationists are nationalists, and they would express that nationalism by cutting us off from the world and going it alone in the Western Hemisphere. These men claim that there will always be wars, that war simply can't be prevented and that it behooves us Americans to build a system in the Western Hemisphere that will insulate us from them.

But isolationism is an illusion. There is no such thing. The history of the last 30 years shows that isolationism actually means nonparticipation in the diplomatic events that might prevent wars but participation in the wars themselves. Thus so-called isolationism robs us of the opportunity of stopping wars before they start but cannot prevent the shedding of our blood in those wars after they get started. We had no voice in the events that led up to the First World War, yet we poured out our blood and our treasure in that war. We had no voice in the events that led up to the Second World War, yet we are now pouring out our blood and our treasure in this war. Thus by a fatuous policy of our own choosing we have in peacetime no more voice in international affairs than Venezuela or Paraguay or Bolivia, yet unlike them, when war comes our actual world interests force us to do the fighting and the dying. Isolation is in effect taxation without representation. It is equivalent to being called upon to pay a blood tax in wars the making of which we have no voice, a blood tax we probably would not have to pay at all if we were represented in the peacetime councils of the world.

Then there are the American imperialists, who, like the isolationists, are also nationalists. American imperialists claim that wars can never be eliminated, that international cooperation is an idle dream, and that American security must look only to American might. Unlike the isolationists, they contend that in order to protect America it is not enough to retire to the Western Hemisphere. According to them, America must have the strongest army, the strongest navy, and the strongest air armada of any nation on the face of the globe. According to them, America must have protective bases under exclusive American control in Africa, in Asia, and in the western Pacific. According to them, America, operating alone or with shifting allies of her own choosing, must be vigilant and assert herself in every part of the earth.

Now this is nothing but the age-old and discredited system of militarism, imperialism and power politics. This is nothing but the old system of the balance of power with the United States temporarily the "top dog." At its worst, this is the old system exemplified by Sparta, by Rome, by Spain under Philip II, by France under Louis XIV and Napoleon, and by Germany under Wilhelm II and Hitler. And at its best, this is the old system exemplified by Britain when for the last 300 years that country has been called upon to take part in almost every Asiatic and European struggle in order to maintain the balance of power.

Have we no other alternative but the dreary prospect of succeeding to Britain's place as the maintainer of the Asiatic and European balance of power through participation in periodic wars? Such a policy opens up for future generations of Americans a never-ending vista of bloody wars fought in every part of the globe. If we of this generation make such a peace and adopt such a policy we are in effect but unsheathing a sword and plunging it into the hearts of our own sons.

No, there is a better way. That way lies along the pathway of enlightened internationalism.

There is, then, a third group of Americans, the internationalists, who know that both long-run national self-interest and humanitarian idealism dictate that America take the lead in establishing a truly world peace

conceived in the spirit of international justice. These men are determined that mere naked and unabashed power shall no longer be the measure of influence and the standard of conduct in international relations. They realize that we have lived not in an international order, but in an international disorder, an international anarchy, an international jungle. They are resolved that the rule of the tooth and the claw shall be made to yield to an international order in which immorality, irrationality, might, and violence are supplanted by morality, rationality, righteousness, and law.

IV

The path to a truly international peace will be a hard one, but we must not turn back because of the difficulties. Rather we must foresee them clearly, the better to master them.

There are, I believe, six chief barriers to American leadership in an international peace. These are our unwillingness to surrender a portion of our national sovereignty to an international organization; the wartime impulse to visit vengeance upon the Germans and the Japanese and thereby plant the seeds of another war; the failure of some Americans to see clearly that nineteenth century imperialism is a played-out game; our reluctance to make any adjustments or concessions to freer world trade; prejudice in America against cooperating in the international sphere with socialist countries; the temptation to exploit for political and partisan purposes the reaction against participation in world politics which may come when a war-weary nation relaxes its exertions in the hour of victory. Let us analyze each of these.

V

First, there is the American unwillingness to surrender a portion of our sovereignty to an international organization. Even many of those who favor participation in world politics maintain that a continuation of the alliance between the Allied Nations will be all that will be necessary to maintain peace in the post-war world. But that merely means the perpetuation of balance-of-power politics which never has maintained a durable peace and will prevent the development of a pattern of international collective security. Power politics is not enough; we must press on toward collective security.

The small nations of Europe should be joined in regional federations. In addition, a general European federation should be formed with the large nations and these federations as member units. Then on top of this should be built a system of world collective security.

This time, collective security must go beyond the League of Nations. The League of Nations had no international police force and it could only recommend that its member states enforce article 10 or declare an economic boycott. On the other hand, a plan as drastic as "union now," which in effect creates a federal state with power to operate directly on its own citizens, to tax them and to force them into its armed services, is too extreme for our times and would prevent collective security from ever making a start by scaring America and other nations from joining. To begin with we should seek to create an international organization strong enough to be effective in maintaining peace and yet not so strong that present-day nations will not join it. Such an organization should take the form of a confederation with its own police power and air force, maintained by contributions and quotas levied on member states and not directly on the individuals composing those states.

We must not expect that power politics and class politics will be eliminated from this organization, because power politics and class politics are based on conflicts of interest which cannot always be avoided, but with the passage of time and the building of peaceful precedent, these conflicts can be canalized into political, constitutional, and legal channels just as sectional and class conflicts within nations have been so canalized.

Is America less interested than other countries in the building of such an organization? Is America more reluctant to yield up some of her sovereignty to such an organization? I am afraid the answer is yet. What are the reasons for this? There are several. For over a hundred years it was our traditional policy to stand aloof from world affairs. We have had less experience in taking part in international diplomacy, participating in international conferences, and thinking internationally than any other great nation in the world. There is still considerable isolationist opinion in the country. Then, too, we are a young Nation, strong and vigorous, and have never yet suffered in international wars in any way like the degree other nations have suffered. Even in this age of air power, we seem remote from the actual battlefields. Hence many feel that in such an organization we would because of our relative strength, location, and security, give more than we received.

During the months ahead the advocates of an international peace must hammer home to the American people the significance of our being forced into a world war for the second time within a generation and the fact that this is the very last war in which America can escape being in the actual war zone, since the next war, if it comes, will be an intercontinental air war. We must also look into the future and face the possibility that some time nations stronger even then we are may develop in Europe and Asia, and the day may come when we more than some other people will stand in need of an international organization to curb aggression.

VI

A second barrier to American leadership in the building of an international peace is the danger that we shall visit upon Japan and Germany a punitive and draconic peace and thus plant the seeds of World War III. There is a naive but dangerous notion prevalent among Americans that Germany as a nation and Japan as a nation are inherently wicked and must be drastically dealt with. This is what Dorothy Thompson has aptly called the application of the doctrine of original sin to world politics.

This view of innate depravity leads to many unwise proposals with respect to the peace. Some would have us dismember Germany and return her to the pre-Bismarkian days of petty states. This was an anachronism in 1870 and would be a political and an economic absurdity today. Others advocate the armed occupation of Germany indefinitely. This would further fan the flames of resentment and hatred. Still others would saddle Germany with billions of dollars of reparations. This would dislocate world trade and for the sake of revenge give us another unworkable peace from which we would all suffer. Lately there has been made a proposal that we take over and supervise the German educational system. This could only be done by regimentation and armed occupation. It is founded on a grossly exaggerated notion of the influence of formal education on national ideals and policies. It would bring the United Nations into disagreement since the Russians and the Americans would have different views as to what should be taught. And it would defeat its own purposes since such education would become odious when imposed from without. German students would bootleg the old ideas and they would be stiffened in their errors rather than cured of them. Do you not recall how the radical republicans during the reconstruction came down here in the South and attempted to supervise our way of life? What did they get? Not the solid Republican South that they expected, but instead the solid Democratic South.

We are, I think, misjudging the situation in Germany. It is not necessary to resort to Hegel or to mysticism or to so-called racial biology to explain the rise of the Nazis to power. The effect of the last World War on Germany, plus the disastrous inflation of 1923–24, plus the impact of the world depression upon German life, will suffice to do that. In Germany the world depression was the last straw. I am strongly of the opinion that had there been no world depression there would have been no Hitler. The reduction of trade barriers, the operating of world markets, and the restoration of the free flow of world trade will do more to solve the German problem than all the vindictive peace treaties in the world.

There are millions of Germans who hate Hitler even more intensely than we do because they have cruelly suffered at his hands, and these Germans can be trusted to take over Germany and to cooperate with us in the building of an international peace. The Socialists and the Social-Democrats ruled Germany under the Republic, and if the Allies had given them as many concessions as they later gave the Nazis I am confident that the Nazis would never have come to power. There are today millions of Germans who in their hearts are Socialists and Social-Democrats. In the last free elections in Germany and as late as 1933 they polled millions of votes. Their ideals are the ideals of democracy, social democracy, and peace. Let us put them in power, cooperate with them to the limit, and allow them to do for us inside Germany what we as outsiders could not possibly hope to do.

Even in Japan there are groups among the laboring and peasant classes who will respond to the new world now being built. When given a chance, they will reject the conventional standards and fanaticism of the Japanese upper classes. The Chinese know these groups better than we do, and I think the Chinese can be trusted to pick the groups to be placed in power in Japan after we win the victory. When these groups are placed in power in Japan we should cooperate with them to the limit. It is significant that the Chinese, who know the Japanese better than we do and who have suffered bitterly at their hands, never speak of a vindictive peace.

Germany and Japan should be admitted to the international confederation if that organization is to be a truly world organization. If they are excluded, the concept of collective security will become a delusion. In reality, "collective security" will become the old balance of power in another guise—the alliance of those inside the confederation and the counterbalancing alliance of those outside.

Not long ago Herbert Hoover made the remark, "We can have revenge or we can have peace but we cannot have both." A little later HENRY A. WALLACE declared, "We Americans must remember that we are no more a master race than are the Germans." It would be well for us Americans who want a genuinely international peace to proclaim these sentiments up and down the highways and byways of America.

VII

A third barrier to American leadership in an international peace is the hold imperialism has over some American minds. There already is ambitious talk about the necessity for American bases in Africa and in Asia under exclusive American control. Joseph Patterson, publisher of the New York Daily News, has announced that when we Americans conquer the Dutch East Indies we ought to keep them. Several members of Congress from the Pacific coast have come out for American ownership of New Guinea and the Solomons. Colonel Robert McCormick of the Chicago Tribune in an editorial last fall entitled "A Republican World in the Making,"

insisted that at the end of this war we must see that the Dutch get out of the East Indies and the British out of India in order to increase our own opportunity for investments and concessions in those areas. (You will notice that when you scratch an isolationist below the surface you often discover an imperialist.)

Now we Americans must understand once and for all that the old nineteenth-century imperialism is a played-out game. And if we don't learn this simple lesson, then we will be taught it during the twentieth century by events written large and red in blood. We will ignore at our peril the patent truth that the twentieth century is to be one not of more imperialism but of less imperialism.

The colonial and backward peoples of the earth, stirred by new and deep and vital urges, are on the march. The nineteenth century imperialism of the western powers planted the seeds of nationalism among the colonial peoples and today those seeds are bearing fruit. Everywhere those people are awakened to their strength and their rights. Everywhere they are in revolt against political and economic exploitation—in Tunisia under the Destourians, in Egypt under the Wafds, in the Philippines under Manuel Quezon, in India under the Nationalist Congress of Gandhi and Nehru, in China under the Kuomintang of the immortal Sun Yat Sen and of Chiang Kai-shek.

During the past 20 years the western powers have been loosening their holds on the colonial peoples as evidenced by the British treaty with Egypt, the British treaty with Iraq, the French treaty with Syria, the grants of new powers to India in the acts of 1919 and 1935, the Tydings-McDuffie Act with respect to the Philippines, and the Washington conference treaties with respect to China. This trend would have become a full retreat had it not been for the fears aroused by the rise of a cruder and more ruthless imperialism undertaken by the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese.

And now the crucible of war is further crystallizing colonial nationalism. Under the impact of war, China is developing unsuspected sources of unity and strength.

Morally the United Nations are bound to respect and further colonial rights. Twenty-five years ago we waged a war for the self-determination of peoples. Today we are waging a second war in the name of the same principles. The Atlantic Charter applies to the Pacific as well as to the Atlantic. And the principles of self-determination and of the Atlantic Charter have since been sealed with the blood of the Filipinos on Bataan and with the blood of the Chinese spilled on a hundred heroic battlefields.

Remember, too, that this revolt is not merely against political imperialism but also against economic imperialism. The colonial peoples are determined to build for themselves mass-production industries and modern technology. They have no native capitalist class and no native middle class sufficient to finance these enterprises. On the other hand, they are determined not to pay tribute to foreign concessionaires and the investment bankers of the West. They are determined not to furnish cheap labor for absentee capitalism. Therefore, they are more and more being driven to the development of modern industries by the collective devices of state ownership. This was the method of Mustafa Kemal when, 20 years ago, he freed Turkey from western exploitation. This is the developing method in China, where the new war industries are state-owned.

We must find a constructive solution to the colonial question. We must lift from China all servitudes on her sovereignty. We must give political independence to all peoples who are ready for it—the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Hindus, and the Filipinos—and admit these peoples into the world organization as member states. Victors and vanquished alike in this war must surrender all colonies not yet ready for independence to the world organization, to be held and prepared by that organization for eventual nationhood and ultimate admission to the world organization as member states. The economic interests of the colonial territories held jointly by the world organization should be safeguarded, and all the nations of the world treated equally with respect to access to territorial raw materials, markets, and trade. This solution differs from the old mandate system of the League of Nations because under that system only the colonies of the vanquished nations were surrendered, and then these were parceled out and turned over to specific mandate powers and held by those powers in a manner not differing greatly from mere colonies.

The development of modern industrialism in China and India should be welcomed by us. It will increase the purchasing power and the effective wants of these people, not only for their own products but also for the products of other countries. The industrialization of a country does not injure the older industrial countries; on the contrary, it is usually followed by a great increase in the volume of trade between the newly industrialized country and other countries.

VIII

A fourth barrier to American leadership in a truly international peace is the reluctance in America to make the necessary governmental readjustments in the field of economics. We live today in an international community which in trade, in economics, and in technology is one and indivisible, and our post-war economic adjustments must recognize this interdependence as the most fundamental economic reality of our time. When we defeat the Fascist attempts to put the continents together politically by force, then we must at least find a way to put them together economically by consent.

If international trade is to revive, if the "have-not" nations are to be given a chance, if world prosperity is to return, if this potential era of plenty is not to be perverted permanently into self-imposed poverty, then the neo-mercantilistic barriers to trade which existed in the 1920's and the 1930's—the quota systems, drawbacks, embargoes, prohibitive tariffs—must be removed. Our own high protective tariff was one of the chief contributing causes to the world depression of the 1930's.

In order to get more foreign markets for the products we produce best and most economically, we must lower the tariff and open our markets to those products which we produce less advantageously than other countries. Just which products in America are advantageously produced here and which are disadvantageously produced here is a subject for technicians and research workers, but these decisions must be courageously and wisely made in the post-war era in the interest of greater general prosperity for the Nation and for society as a whole, even though some specific American industries are thereby sacrificed.

IX

A fifth barrier to American support of and leadership in an international peace is the aversion of some Americans to cooperating with socialist states. We had better get over this aversion if we expect to play a leading part in the building of a peaceful post-war world, because when the forces of fascism go down there will be a lurch to the left and additional socialist states are likely to emerge in Europe and Asia.

Too many Americans are thinking of international cooperation in terms of the Wilsonian world of 25 years ago. We must constantly bear in mind that the world with which we must cooperate at the end of this war will not be the Wilsonian world of 25 years ago, but the new world born out of the revolutionary sweep of events of the past quarter of a century.

Whether we like it or not, the truth is that for the past 25 years Europe and Asia have been passing through a socialist revolution. Even by 1914 a socialist party of one kind or another had become either the first or second political party in almost every nation on the continent of Europe. From 1917 to 1920 occurred the Russian Revolution with the result that about one-sixth of the earth's surface went Communist, the most extreme form of socialism. For a time in 1919 and in 1920 the Communist revolution threatened Hungary, Poland, and Germany. In the 1920's socialist parties were in power in Germany and Austria, and "Green Socialism" was in power in most of the states of Balkan and Danubian Europe. The fundamental truth is that had Socialists and Communists been able to bury their differences and present a united front in the 1920's, socialism would have triumphed in Europe in the decade following the Paris peace settlement. It was only because of this division between Socialists and Communists that fascism, which at first was in a decided minority, was able to come to power in Italy and Germany as a counterrevolution to socialism.

During the 1930's middle-class parties and democratic parties were disappearing in all parts of Europe and the twe extremes, socialism and fascism, faced each other in growing hostility. In Germany and Italy the conflict had been resolved in favor of fascism, and socialism had been driven to underground resistance. But in other continental countries the two antagonists faced each other in open and bitter conflict. In Spain this conflict reached a climax in bloody civil war. Even in France, the home of representative government and democracy on the continent, middle-class and middle-of-the-road parties were declining, and Frenchmen were gravitating either to socialism or fascism. In the elections of 1936, the last held in France, the Socialist Party became the first party in France and the Communist Party made tremendous gains. At the same time, Fascist organizations were growing in France and army leaders and politicians of the right—Petain, Weygand, Laval, Tardieu, Flandin, Bonnet—were inclining more and more to fascism. These men seemed actually to prefer German nazi-ism and Italian fascism to any form of French socialism. Out of this internal division came the paralysis of appeasement, the indecisions of war, and the collapse of the Third Republic.

And now the forces of fascism and socialism are locked in gripping and titanic conflict on the continent. In the end fascism will go down and with it will go Hitler and Mussolini and Laval and Petain and Franco and Mannerheim and Antonescu and Horthy. Then will come a lurch to the left and the rise to power of some form of socialism in perhaps every country of Europe. When this stage of the drama arrives, some of our conservatives and imperialists will then clamor for us to underwrite semi-Fascist groups in Europe in order to stave off socialism. But this would make the United States the successor to Germany as the defender of fascism in Europe. Such a policy could not in the end be successful even if we were foolish enough and inconsistent enough to attempt it. Such a policy could not for long prevail against the liberal and dynamic forces of Europe, released and given new energy as the result of our own victory over the Fascist powers.

The triumph in Europe of socialism in some form is not a mere matter of increasing the number of Socialist converts. By no means. All the Socialists and Communists could be dumped into the Atlantic Ocean, and still the victory of some sort of socialism in Europe seems indicated when the Fascists do down. Conditions, circumstances and deep-rooted forces are working a revolution in the older

ways of capitalism in Europe and destroying the independent middle classes upon which that system depended. Even before 1914, capital and economic control were being concentrated into giant syndicates and cartels. Small and moderate-sized businesses were being driven out. Since 1914 the disappearance of the independent middle class and capital-supplying class has been accelerated to revolutionary tempo. First came the economic waste, destruction, and dislocations of the first World War. Then came the disastrous inflation of 1923–24 in Germany and central Europe which liquidated more of the middle class. Then in countries like Britain that escaped destructive inflation came confiscatory taxation which made it less and less possible for the declining middle classes to buy stocks and bonds and finance private industry. Then came the world depression of the early thirties which wiped out more of the middle classes and further increased taxes for social services. Then on top of all this came the second World War within a generation with all of its destructiveness, economic waste, economic dislocations, and economic uprootings. At the same time these events were occurring, the Russian revolution and the revolts in all parts of the colonial world against economic imperialism were closing large parts of the world to capitalistic investments and capitalistic expansion, thereby further liquidating European investments. Thus there has been occurring before our very eyes the processes of deep-seated social revolution in Europe.

In Asia, too, the trend toward socialism in some form seems unmistakable. In Europe the independent middle class has been declining. In Asia it has never existed to any extent. However, the colonial peoples of Asia are determined to develop modern industries and technology. They are equally determined that they shall not pay tribute to western capitalists and absentee owners for the use of foreign capital. Therefore, they are being driven to collective action and government ownership as the means of developing their industries.

We in the United States, too, are moving in the direction of more and more government intervention in our economic life. This trend did not begin with the New Deal and with Franklin D. Roosevelt. It began several decades ago, but the events of the past 10 years have greatly expanded and accelerated it. The war is accelerating it still more. And the controls necessary to prevent the ravages of a post-war depression will accelerate it still more.

Yet, when all this is conceded, there still remains the basic fact that we in America will not go as far or as fast in the direction of statism as Europe and Asia are going. There is a difference in degree, and that difference is considerable. Conditions do not require us to go so far or so fast in the direction of government intervention. We are relatively young. We have a small population and tremendous resources. We do not suffer an economic pressure comparable to Europe and Asia. We do not have the European tradition of class conflict. We still possess the largest independent middle class in the world in spite of its relative decline during the past few decades.

It is precisely this difference in degree in social development and rate of social change that raises the possibility of our failure to cooperate with socialist states at the end of the war. However, our only alternative is to cooperate wholeheartedly with the socialist, social-democratic, democratic, and nonimperialist forces of Europe and Asia, for in this cooperation lies our only chance of achieving a truly international peace settlement. It will enable us to prepare ourselves mentally for such cooperation if we keep certain considerations in mind.

First, if we must choose between fascism and communism, the most extreme form of socialism, it seems to me that communism, even Russian communism, is preferable because it respects the literature, art, music, science, technology, and cultural achievement of all peoples regardless of racial and national origin, banishes racial hatred and persecution, does not in theory exalt dictatorship as the ultimate and ideal form of government in spite of the acceptance of dictatorship as a transitional revolutionary device and whatever you may think of it, possesses a distinct social ethic in contrast with the brutal and tribal dynamism of fascism. Moreover, as the books of Wendell Willkie and Joseph Davies on Russia show us, there is a wide opportunity under the Russian system for ability and brains to reach the top, whereas the Fascist systems are corroded with party favoritism, corruption, and racketeering.

Second, if communism, the most extreme form of socialism, were to triumph in western Europe, say in France, it could not help but be more libertarian and democratic than in Russia, since revolutionary change necessarily is conditioned by the social and national culture in which it works.

Third, it is very probable that a much milder form of socialism will triumph in western Europe, one which leaves room for some private enterprise and one which respects civil liberties and democratic processes. Perhaps it would even be more accurate to call this social-democracy rather than socialism. This is almost certain to be the case in Britain, where socialism in our time is not likely to go beyond the Beveridge report, the wise declarations of the humanitarian Archbishop of Canterbury and the objectives of the Labor Party.

Fourth, and most important, socialism is not aggressive and it is not imperialistic and it does not represent a physical threat to the Western Hemisphere as fascism does. As a matter of fact, socialism has in it a large element of pacifism which augurs well for the future peace of the world.

We in America cannot change these trends in Europe. Even military occupation would not alter them because military occupation could not duplicate in Europe and Asia the conditions in North America which still make possible and which will continue to make possible a large degree of free enterprise. We will never get in Europe a social, economic, and political system which coincides exactly with our own system and our own ideals. Let us, then, prepare to cooperate with the socialist, social-democratic, and nonimperialistic forces of Europe and Asia, for only in cooperation with these forces can we hope to achieve a peace settlement that is just, durable, and truly international.

X

Finally, a sixth barrier to American leadership in world cooperation is the tradition in America of violent political partisanship. Unlike the British, we do not in time of crisis bury partisanship or debate great issues with the detachment and objectivity the British debate reports of royal commissions on fundamental questions. We have no tradition of party cooperation and coalition. No less a figure than Winston Churchill has warned that the bitternes of our party battles would wreck another peace treaty.

Yet in order to win the peace all believers in international cooperation must put first things first, hew to one line, and subordinate all domestic questions and all personal and partisan advantage to the attainment of this supreme end. That is powerful opposition in America to an international peace, and if the believers in that kind of a peace allow themselves to be diverted from that end by domestic issues and partisan motives the peace will surely be lost.

There is a danger that when victory comes and the common danger is removed Americans will relax and indulge even more than today their irritations, their sense of grievance and discrimination suffered during the war, their concern over domestic questions. International relations will seem less important than questions of taxation, debt, and domestic politics. Many men will say in effect that while international peace is important and even connected with far-sighted economic adjustments at home, still it is more important to get a government at Washington that will restore us to "normalcy." But "normalcy' is just another name for short sightedness, a refusal to face realistically post-war planning and our long-run relations to the new world, and the scuttling of an international peace.

To put it bluntly, we will not get an international peace unless in 1944 we elect a President who means business on this subject and a Senate and a House that will aggressively and courageously back up the President. And what can we as individuals do to insure this result? If we are Democrats we can see to it that our Party comes out squarely for an international peace as it did in 1920. And in Florida we can vote in the primary for a Senator and for Members of the House who really ring true on this issue, no matter how much we may differ from them on other questions. Republicans have an even more difficult task. They must prevent their Party from falling into the hands of the isolationists or the imperialists, and just as important, they must prevent their Party from straddling the issue. They should fight for the nomination of a Willkie or a Stassen, and, failing that, have the courage to bolt their own party and vote for the Democratic candidates, if these candidates come out unequivocally for American leadership in an internationl peace.

There is a very real probability that the Republican Party may face both ways on this issue, work both sides of the street, and play both ends against the middle. In some parts of the country the Republicans may exploit the isolationist records of their Congressmen, point with pride to the isolationist position of their leader in the House, JOE MARTIN, and their leader in the Senate, CHARLES MCNARY, and boast that their Party caucus in the Senate demoted as party whip Senator AUSTIN because of his internationalist views and that their new national chairman, SPANGLER, was elected over the Willkie men. On the other hand, they may encourage Willkie, Stassen, and the New York Herald-Tribune to give the impression that the Republican Party is internationalist. And then they may name for President a political mediocrity with no expressed views on vital international questions to present a Janus face during the campaign and thus catch votes coming and going. The party that gets control of our Government after such a campaign and after using such tactics will be in no position to drive through the difficulties to an international peace.

How reminiscent all this is of 1920. You will recall that in that year the Republicans nominated for President a midwestern mediocrity who one day would sound off like Hiram Johnson and the next day like William Howard Taft. That year the Republicans told us they would cooperate with the world all right but would not surrender one iota of national American sovereignty and that they would get us into a league but not the Wilson league. In the East Taft, Root, Hughes, and Wickersham were telling international-minded audiences that Harding would take us into the League at the very time Johnson, Borah, La Follette, Norris, and Jim Watson were telling midwestern and western audiences that this same Harding would keep us out of the League.

Let us hope that the internationalists in the Republican Party will move heaven and earth to make their party an internationalist party so that both parties in 1944 will favor

an internationalist peace. And should they fail in this, let us hope they will have the courage temporarily to subordinate their views on domestic questions, and, assuming the Democrats in 1944 ring true on the issue, join the Democrats, and elect a President who feels in every fiber of his being the need to put American leadership squarely behind the winning of an international peace.

XI

Let us pray that when this war is won we will not relax from our exertions but instead will press forward with strong wills and steadfast hearts to the winning of a healing peace that will bind up the world's wounds and set mankind again on the high road of human progress.

The Good-Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting address delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon on June 15, 1943, at the annual meeting of the Kansas Institute of Inter-American Relations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here to clarify our thinking. The greatest problem of all times confronts the American people today. That is helping build a just and durable peace in the world.

As I see it, we are repeating the same mistakes that have been the curse of our foreign policy time and time again in our history.

First, we are approaching the difficulties and the responsibilities involved in an old-fashioned camp-meeting hallelujah way.

Second, we are assuming in our thinking that we are solely responsible for the kind of world we will live in and do business in.

If we are to help build a stable world, we must avoid those two fatal traps.

Too frequently we have approached the question of international solidarity on the theory that we are senior partners of God Almighty, whereas we are only one, even if a powerful, member of a family of nations. Other countries have their ideologies radically different from ours, but vital to their way of thinking.

We are basing our present foreign policy as announced by the national administration of collaboration and cooperation on a hand-out instead of a helping-hand basis.

Our missionary societies long ago learned that the way to help people was to teach them to help themselves.

Private enterprise has applied that principle over the years to the development of the natural resources of new countries. Yankee ingenuity spurred by the profit motive, of course, has been responsible for the development of the natural resources of many countries and for the bringing to those countries modern conveniences produced by Yankee inventors.

That development has not been without its scandals and its abuse. Not only has this been true of the United States, but also of the colonial policies of our allies.

Somewhere between the hand-out method seemingly advocated by Vice President WALLACE and other administration spokesmen and ruthless exploitation of the natural resources and trade markets of underprivileged peoples lies the road toward building a stable world based on rights and justice for all minorities.

Appeals are being made to the generous emotions of the American people hinting at the establishment of an international organization superior to the American Government and by implication designed to give away the resources of the American people.

But any peoples capable of development want to contribute their fair share to their own advancement. Government or intergovernmental charity merely robs them of an opportunity to stand on their own feet.

We Americans have no monopoly on enlightened self-interest. We may leave the subject of control of international capital movements to the various governments in whose area investments are proposed, but always realizing that the widest participation of the native peoples is for the best interests of a stable world and is the soundest international policy to foster.

It would be a great mistake to allow this or any other administration to make the good-neighbor policy a political issue. The way to prevent our good-neighbor policy from becoming a political issue is for the Republican Party to realize that it is at least equally entitled to stand forth as the champion of the good-neighbor program on the basis of historical fact. We all want to be good neighbors. The point at issue is whether we are to be good neighbors on the basis of a helping hand or a hand-out.

Address by Senator Tobey to Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Tuesday last to the Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce, at Hampton Beach, N. H.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency, and fellow Americans, it is a privilege to address this gathering of the Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce and their friends, and through the mystic radio, a larger audience on the air. I can say in all sincerity that there is no group of men in New Hampshire who are more loyal in their devotion to their own community and its interests, than you of the Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce, and this is the second time I have been privileged to be your guest speaker.

For 2 years I spent summers at Hampton Beach with my family, and have memories of many fine associations.

In this time of stress and trial, it is good to have such a place to come to and relax, and this is not only a true statement, but is an invitation to all who are listening in.

There is a great responsibility resting upon a public speaker in this hour of national crisis, and I hope that what I may say to you tonight may have some suggestions that find echo in your hearts.

Washington is intense today. Everything is on a war basis. Temporary buildings have sprung up in parks and recreation grounds. Armed guards, machine guns, and jeeps are conspicuous. New bridges have been erected across the Potomac, and hotels and taxicabs are crowded. One of the features of wartime Washington is the new War Department building, the largest ever built by man. It is called the Pentagon Building, has 5 wings each 1,000 feet long, is 4 stories high, houses 42,000 clerks, and has in it 25 miles of corridors.

Many who visit Washington on official business are unfavorably impressed with the red tape and static minds, which are often in evidence.

As illustrating this situation let me tell of an experience which a sister of President Compton, of Tech, had in India a while ago. She was building a home, and employed a native electrician to wire the house. But he kept running to her to ask her how she wanted this or that thing done, until finally she cried out, "Oh, use common sense." With a solemn bow the native replied, "Madam, common sense is a gift from God. I have only a technical education."

There are many officials in Washington today like this Indian, lacking in common sense, but long on technical education.

On the other hand, in all fairness there are officials today who are handling tough jobs with courage and ability, and there are able businessmen who have given up their private business for the duration to give the war effort their experience and knowledge.

It is the duty of each of us to support those charged with the responsibility of directing the war effort.

Mere carping criticism of men or measures, for political purposes, is unworthy of any true American in this time of national peril.

But constructive criticism, having for its purpose the speeding up of the efficient conduct of the war and safeguarding the welfare of our Nation, is always in order and is the very heart of patriotism.

For many months I have urged that the people be told the truth about the war situation.

The people have a right to know, within those limits made necessary by military security, the strengths and weaknesses of their fighting men and fighting machines. It is their right to be informed and to debate these vital questions. When we meet reversals and the pull to victory seems to grow long and hard, Americans will do well if they indulge to the full their genius for critical self-analysis.

I desire now to give you a few word pictures incidental to the war effort. First, I bring you some details of the marines' campaign on Guadalcanal, and these were told the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, by General Vandegrift, who was in command of those operations.

The first time our marines landed on the island the Japanese, who were in the hills and woods, believed it was only a temporary landing, but when our ships steamed away empty they realized they had a fight on their hands. Our men erected barbed-wire around their quarters and the second night the Japanese charged off the hills in a fierce attack. In the morning 1,200 of them were taken off the barbed wire by our forces.

An instance showing the treachery of the Japanese is that of the Japanese prisoner who had been wounded and who lay on the grass before being taken to a dressing station. He called for a glass of water and one of our young doctors in uniform took the water to him as a Good Samaritan, but just before the doctor reached him the Japanese took a bomb from his uniform and timed it

to explode as the water was given him, and both men were blown to pieces. I said then to General Vandegrift that this incident should be told all our troops in the East and West, and from now on the innocent must suffer with the guilty.

Then there is the story of the brilliant presence of mind of one of our soldiers who was lying in a foxhole when a Japanese tank charged and stopped over the foxhole in which he lay. He had the presence of mind to drop a bomb in the caterpillar tread. The tank started on and the bomb exploded, ruining its steering gear, so that it could only go forward into the ocean where it was captured with its men. The soldier whose quick thinking caused this capture was given a Distinguished Service Medal.

May I take you with me on a trip I made as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy at Annapolis? It was an interesting sight to see 3,200 splendid young Americans marching to the great dining hall and be served dinner at one sitting. The second day we went out in the harbor where was anchored the largest battleship ever built—the *Iowa*—nearly 800 yards long, and having the most powerful armament ever built into a ship. She has a speed greater than many destroyers, and while we were there a force of planes attacked this ship in sham battle and every gun crew was at station training the guns upon the planes as they made their attack.

It was there we had a demonstration of the most wonderful invention of modern times—a scientific apparatus, applying electronics, which, in the opinion of many, will be the largest factor in winning the war. I refer to the new device, radar. It has been almost an unknown and untalked-of subject until recently. Suffice it to say that through its operation rays can be sent out and pick up, just as well in absolute darkness as in broad sunlight, a ship many miles away. When the ship shows on the screen of the radar, as it does in a certain formation, the distance of that ship from the radar is automatically shown on a dial; the guns are sighted at that range and fired. The progress of the projectile appears on the screen and it is immediately evident whether that shot has hit the ship or not. Radar can also be operated against planes 150 or more miles away in the air. It is radar that allowed one of our largest cruisers to destroy a number of Japanese warships in the middle of the night, the enemy ships becoming visible to our ships on the radar screen and being sunk by gunfire, yet never knowing what the ship was, or where it was, that sunk them.

Large scientific agencies, both Government and private, are working constantly in research work to further improve this science, and after seeing it in operation, I recall the words of Thomas Carlyle who said in one of his essays: "The age of miracles as it ever was, now is."

One of the Government agencies, of which little is known, is the Board of Economic Warfare, or the B. E. W. as it is commonly called. As its name implies, the purpose of this Bureau is to wage economic warfare on Germany, supplementing the efforts of our armed forces.

They have started large plantations of a new rubber tree in South America, called chrystostegia. It resembles our forsythia and will come into bearing in 12 months, and produce 200 pounds of rubber to the acre.

Then there is a little-known wood which is being planted in tropical countries, called balsa wood—a wood which is extremely light when dry, and will be a large factor in airplane construction in the future.

When, awhile ago, our country was short of mica, a much needed item in the making of magnetos for bombers, having only 3 weeks' supply on hand, the Board of Economic Warfare sent a group of Army planes to the heart of India, loaded them with mica and came back safely with an ample supply for sometime to come.

The same thing happened with tungsten when we sent planes into the heart of China to replace our depleted supply of this vital mineral.

Much of the operations of this Bureau are romantic and venturesome, and make a distinct contribution to the war effort.

For instance, we lost 95 percent of our quinine supply sources when Japan invaded the East Indies. We also found ourselves with inadequate reserves to meet the needs of total war.

For substitute sources the United States turned to Latin America, the original home of the cinchona tree from which quinine is gotten.

It was necessary literally to establish a new industry, because for years the world's supply had come from the Far East. Under the direction of the Board of Economic Warfare two types of operations were launched; finding and gathering bark from wild trees, and establishment of cinchona plantations.

Technical staffs were established to direct the harvesting of wild bark. Agreements with some of these South American republics gave the United States the exclusive right to develop cinchona resources. The Board of Economic Warfare is fighting for every pound of wild bark as though a soldier's life depended upon it, which it well may a year or two from now.

To guard against the eventual depletion of wild-bark sources, plantations are being established. Normally 7 years pass before stripping of the trees begins. The trees could be harvested within 2½ years after planting, however. This would be unprofitable in terms of dollars and cents, but a wise investment in protecting the lives of our soldiers.

One plantation project in Guatemala calls for the growth of 300,000,000 seedlings, to be transplanted in small units throughout Guatemala. The total cost of this project is estimated at $6,000,000.

Col. Arthur F. Fischer of the United States Army, escaped from the Philippines with 2,000,000 cinchona seeds of the highest yielding varieties. Working in cooperation with the Army, Board of Economic Warfare is arranging the development of plantations from these seeds. These trees also will be available for emergency harvest at the end of 2½ years.

The economic commandos of the Board of Economic Warfare have achieved what seemed to be the impossible on the quinine front.

Let me give you a picture of the campaign on Attu, that island in the Aleutians which the Japs held but which we recently took over. The Japs were well entrenched but we annihilated them. Our men killed 1,500 Japs and took only 15 prisoners. That's about the right proportion.

A sad and heroic happening was the incident of one of our men who had both legs shot off and whose liver was punctured and who was in a dying condition. Looking up at a comrade standing near him, he said "I am not afraid to die if my sacrifice will have helped the cause we are fighting for, but oh, why, why, when men are dying, will men back home strike?" This is a true incident, thought-provoking and moving.

I want at this time to sound a warning note that a serious food shortage is threatened for this fall and winter. The implications of this threat are a challenge to us. At the present time there is an acute shortage of corn, and we of New England, who have responded so finely to the Government's appeal of 6 months ago to increase our production, now find ourselves in a tragic situation.

In view of this, I took the floor of the Senate 2 weeks ago and offered an amendment to the lend-lease bill, then under consideration, calling for immediate release and sale of 50,000,000 bushels of Government wheat. It passed and became a law, and shipments are going out under that authority, but that does not directly help the corn situation, and we are working earnestly to better that. The Government has put a ceiling on corn in Chicago of $1.07 a bushel. Adding freight rates and charges to that ceiling price, it becomes about $1.20 here in the East, and the farmers in the West who have grain stored on their farms are not selling it. The ceiling price is too low, they say. Instead, they are feeding it to their hogs, and by marketing the hogs at current prices, they are getting more for their grain than the ceiling price.

Heroic treatment is called for and in conference with a high Government official at the White House recently, he told me it might be necessary to commandeer corn in private hands to secure adequate distribution. What this scarcity means to dairy and poultry farmers only they know, but I can assure them we are going to do everything possible to help in this dilemma.

If the war should end in 12 months, we would have no adequate food supply to care for the three or four million starving people of Europe, in addition to our own country. Colossal food production is going to be necessary for 1944. Further rationing of food and commodities are said to be on the way.

Probably no question affects more people than the gasoline regulations. Two major factors are responsible for the current shortage; first, the need for supplying our armed forces. The uncertainty in estimating this is due to the sinking of our tankers. Not only is the cargo of oil and gasoline lost but the tanker is lost also. The second factor is transportation of gasoline to the East. The recent floods in the West caused a break in the big pipe line by which much oil was lost. The movement of tank cars and railroad traffic has been seriously impaired. The final problem is how to get more petroleum into New England, and this is largely a problem of transportation.

The Congressional delegation from the Eastern States has worked earnestly on this problem for many months. The 20-inch pipeline from Indiana to the Eastern States is well under way and should be finished in September.

One improvement I strongly recommend is that the whole matter of fuel and gasoline supply and the rationing of such, should be coordinated under one responsible head. It is now a divided responsibility.

The best news I can bring you on the gasoline situation is a statement Donald Nelson made at a conference which I attended last Monday, when he said: "We can promise you relief at this time as we could not before. You can look toward complete solution of the problem in the fall."

This was interpreted in Washington to be in line with the proposed new relief program for the East, which has been resentful of restrictions imposed, while the rest of the country is permitted to drive about freely. What I have been demanding, and earnestly so, has been equality of sacrifice in this gasoline matter.

It is understood that under the relief program, the Federal agencies involved, plan to make an immediate survey of tank cars now in use hauling asphalt, and divert them to hauling petroleum products, and also to make maximum use of the 12,000 tank trucks available, by substituting them wherever feasible for tank cars, in order that the latter may be made available for long-distance hauling from the oil fields.

We shall explore every possible expedient to assure that the population of our industrially important eastern States, shall have no less than their fair share of gasoline.

The cost of carrying on this war is running to figures which are beyond the understanding of the average man.

It is estimated that if the war runs until July 1944, the national debt will be $300,000,000,000. Only last week the Senate passed a

bill giving the Navy $27,000,000,000, and passed it unanimously with but a few minutes debate. And there has also just passed a bill giving the Army $71,000,000,000, on top of tremendous sums already used.

We have enacted a tax bill which is going to hurt, but it is the only thing to do. So far as possible, this war must be paid for currently. There are only two ways of paying for this war; by taxation and money raised from bond sales. This burden is going to bear down heavily, particularly on the average family in our country—the people whose incomes are in the lower brackets. It will call for sacrifice and self-denial; but when the American people are being called on to make such sacrifices, and to give and to lend their money for the war effort, it is the duty of those of us in Congress to examine these appropriations and apply our best judgment as to whether or not they are necessary. There can be no question about that. But over and against all this, I now bring to your attention a situation which angers me, and which should arouse righteous indignation in every home in the land. Because, while you are being called on for sacrifice and self-denial, and to lend your money, yet there are certain people in this country who have a lust for money and profit, and who would secure that objective even through dishonest practices. But that is not the whole of it. When dishonest practices are employed, which endanger the lives and safety of American boys in the armed services, then somebody must cry out loud in this country.

A few weeks ago, I made a speech on the Senate floor in which I followed this course, and brought to the attention of the people the fact that one of the large steel corporations in the country which had a contract for millions of dollars worth of steel for the Government, to be built under specifications which it had accepted, had cheated the Government and endangered the lives of American boys in the service, by turning out steel which was deficient and below specifications. When called before the Truman committee and put under oath, the management of this plant admitted its guilt and testified that on its books this business had been listed with a capital F on the page, and that F stood for fake.

Mothers and fathers who may have sons in an American submarine, the sides of which might have been built with this defective steel, which might collapse under a German depth bomb, what do you say about such rotteness?

Then, there was the incident of the large wire and cable company which made millions of dollars worth of wire for the use of our troops and allies, to be used to signal men in the front lines to advance or retreat, or bring up reinforcements. This wire was found to be defective and would not deliver the goods, and the manufacturers have acknowledged it. Think that over, people in the homes of America.

Only the other day the Truman committee made a trip to Kansas City to inspect a new powder factory. The original cost of this plant was set at $40,000,000, but instead it is going to cost $130,000,000. Completion was scheduled for 1942 but it cannot be finished until 1944.

Listen to this—a contractor was called from Denver to Washington by Army engineers, and was introduced to a stranger whom the War Department told him was to be his partner. These men were told their joint fee on this job would be $800,000 and to divide this sum between them. They considered together and split it on a 70–30 basis. The junior partner did not know a thing about this work, and was of little value and had to be moved out of the way, but he got $240,000. The other man never got nearer to Kansas City than Washington, and knew nothing about local conditions, local labor, or anything of the required duties. All the Government and the taxpayers received for their $800,000 were the names of these two men. The general superintendent testified his previous experience was only in looking after Civilian Conservation Corp camps and he had never been in full charge of anything before, but had only worked for others at an average salary of $3,000 to $4,000 a year. The plan will never be good for anything. A quantity of new structural steel had been buried up as the grounds were graded off.

It is such crookedness that Members of Congress should be, and are, looking into, The money of the people shall at least be used honestly, if occasionally inefficiently, but cheating and treachery (for that is what it is) on the part of any concern or individual, cannot be condemned too severely.

We must hold in our minds constantly the sacrifices which our youth are making. Every city and town has made a contribution of its youth to build up our armed forces to approximately 10,000,000 men at the present time. They have gone out to all parts of the world. Many of them are still in training, and many have seen actual fighting. They die for us. The least we can do is to buy for them.

Buy bonds, to finance the purchase of guns, ships, radar, planes, supplies, medicines, and all necessary equipment.

You of the Hampton Beach Chamber of Commerce are to be commended for dedicating this summer season to our armed forces, and building up our national strength and unity, by inaugurating a season-long campaign for the sale of War bonds and stamps.

When an individual buys bonds, he is giving nothing to the men who are fighting for us, he is only loaning his money and receiving in exchange the strongest security in the world, plus interest—the note of the United States Government, your country, your native land, and it promises to repay in the future what you loan now.

During and after the last World War, it was my privilege to have charge of the various Liberty Loan campaigns throughout New Hampshire, and I well recall one man whom I asked to buy bonds. He was a tightwad, a cynic, and he replied: "Why should I? I can get more interest in other investments. Do you see anything green in my eye?" "No," I said, "and neither do I see anything red, white, and blue."

This war in which we are engaged is literally a war for our survival—nothing less.

Before Pearl Harbor, we had differences of opinion as to our getting into the war, but with the Japanese attack, the Nation became a unit. We have put our hands to the plow, and we shall make a straight furrow to a victorious conclusion, and that conclusion should be effected only when our enemies have made an unconditional surrender.

So, while we as a people are determined to win this war, whatever its cost, yet deep in our hearts we cherish the hope of peace and an enduring peace, as speedily as possible.

But, referring to the time when the war shall end, let me point out that the problems involved in shifting from a peacetime economy to a wartime economy are mild in comparison to the problems which will accrue in making the shift back again to conditions of peace. It will have to be done when the resources of private enterprise are at a low point, and there is a crushing debt on our backs. It will have to be done when a starving and impoverished world cries out for assistance, and when we have a sense of fear for the future.

It is not too early, then, to project our thoughts into the aftermath of the war. I am convinced that this country should begin now to lay a foundation of basic principles for the peace, in cooperation with the other United Nations, and to make that peace as permanent as possible, so that the aggressor nations may not again have an opportunity to disturb the peace of the world.

Over on the western front in 1917 they picked up one of our doughboys in no man's land and brought him back to the dressing station behind the lines, where he passed away. They found pinned to his undershirt these words, written by him in lead pencil in the trenches the night before. They represent the aspirations of his soul:

"Ye that have faith
To look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And know that out of death and night
Shall rise the dawn of ampler life,
Rejoice, whatever anguish fills the heart,
That God has given you the priceless dower
To live in these great times, and have some part
In freedom's crowning hour.
That ye may tell your sons, who see the light high in the heavens,
Their heritage to take;
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break!"

He had a vision—a hope for better things to come, and he died in that hope; but were he alive today, how disillusioned he would be.

He thought that he was taking part in a war which was to end all wars, but, in sad contrast, the world today is engulfed in the greatest war in all human history. The powers of darkness which he thought had been put to flight are still doing business, and the dawn of the new day which he dreamed of is still far below the horizon.

On us who carry on, whether at home or in official position, is the great and grave responsibility to keep faith with that American doughboy of 1917 and those who died with him, by a grim determination to win this war, whatever it may cost, to demand an unconditional surrender and to make a just and enduring peace so that those who come after us may not again be called upon to drink this cup of suffering and sorrow, and that peace and the blessings of peace may become the normal attribute of civilization.

God help us to keep faith with this ideal.

Address by Senator Maloney at Commencement Exercises of St. Joseph's College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered during commencement exercises at St. Joseph's College, West Hartford, Conn., on June 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Right now I wish that I possessed a greater gift of language, for I am pleased, beyond my ability of expression, to be back home among my neighbors—and visiting with the neighbors' children as they receive the precious evidence of their college accomplishments.

I know your feeling of pride—and I think I understand your feeling of satisfaction, and the eagerness with which you look toward tomorrow—and I am certain that I

know the pride and the satisfaction of your parents. If these years have at times been difficult for you, they have at the same time, and at other times, been much more difficult for them, for your lives have been their lives. Your successes have in many instances come through their sacrifices and while this is a great day for you, be certain that it is a greater day for them. You are looking forward—all of you in different directions—toward the chance of achievement and success. They are looking forward with you—though with perhaps a more modest ambition than most of you now entertain. All that they hope for you, and it is much, is that you retain your sweetness and your goodness—and that you find ultimate happiness. They know that success is happiness and peace of mind—and they know that those who find happiness and peace of mind here are destined to live in the household of God and amid the never-ending beauties of eternity.

And may I say that I am honored, as well as greatly pleased, by this opportunity to participate in the commencement ceremonies at the center of women's education in the Hartford diocese. This College of St. Joseph, coming every day to be known better to the people of Connecticut, exemplifies the cultural aspects of the church in Connecticut. It is a monument to the zeal of a great bishop who has recognized the necessity for a sound development of the proper educational facilities for young women, and an outstanding example of the great work of the Sisters of Mercy, that inspiring order which has won the respect and admiration of all enlightened persons. It would be presumptuous for me to attempt to appraise Sister Rosa's contribution to your college—and to you—and to this community, and the State of Connecticut. We are, all of us, deeply in her debt.

I doubt very much that more than a few of you as yet fully appreciate the rich privilege that has been yours in these recent years, as you have lived under the guidance of good women who have a special "call" on God's attention because they have given their lives to work in His vineyard.

The church of which most of us are members has an enduring philosophy. It doesn't change with the wind or the tide, or soften its teachings to meet the emotions and passions stirred by social upheaval or economic storm. Founded upon the rock of Peter, it has weathered the fury of centuries, and after these hundreds of years, and in the most terrible period the world has yet known, there is no other institution to which man can look for so much comfort and with so much faith as toward this bulwark against all of the evils of mankind.

With each passing year you will come to a better understanding of the value of the time you spent here. Your hearts and your minds will turn again and again to this college, and your gratitude to the nuns here and to your lay teachers will be almost boundless. It will only be exceeded by your thanks to God and to your parents.

To me, however, St. Joseph College, in its maturing development as an authentic institution of higher learning, has an even greater significance. It demonstrates the cooperative part the church has played in nourishing the Connecticut tradition for education. By the leadership of its men and women and in the support of academies, colleges, and universities established within its borders, our State has contributed much to the teaching of America. St. Joseph College, although still in its infancy as we measure time, has already become an important part of that Connecticut tradition. It is living evidence that the church is no alien force, but rather a strong ally in carrying out the cultural objectives to which the Commonwealth from colonial days has been dedicated.

And so I congratulate you upon the signal honor and privilege you have been accorded today in receiving a degree from this great institution—an institution which recognizes above all things that the development of the human mind and the human personality must have for its very core the recognition that we are made to the image and likeness of our Creator. It is from this recognition that there flows the proper emphasis upon education as receiving its true sanction from God Himself. It is this recognition that provides the order and discipline which is so characteristic of the higher Catholic education. This privilege is all the more to be prized because you are graduating into a world of conflict.

All about us are visible the results of total war. Its impact is felt on the farms, in the factories, in the homes of the great and wealthy, and in the cottages of the poor. This kind of war leaves no one unscathed. The price our citizens must pay is not for all of us the same. However, the call of our country must be heeded in order that freedom may live and tyranny be swept from the face of the earth. This is so even though for some of us the price of that call may be to give up life itself.

Let it be emphasized that it was not a war of our making. It came to us in stealth by nations who sought to divide the earth in their lust for power and their savage ambition to rule the minds and bodies of mankind. It is a war which in retrospect makes the ancient method of battle seem by contrast both sportsmanlike and chivalrous. In it there is not even the prospect of a truth of God, and the pleas for the innocent bystanders fall on deaf ears. The world has become almost immune to pity, and civilization itself seems to have blacked out as man carries on a pitiless war against his brother. But there is no alternative for us because the sawdust Caesar's had prepared with malice aforethought a program which they so falsely thought would give them possession of a new order bent to their wills. To destroy this tyranny we have been forced to meet fire with fire, and we are fighting them successfully in manpower, in arms, and in sacrifices.

Into this strange world you are sent—a world where the position of women has developed in ways never believed possible. All over the earth women are performing every conceivable task, in some places even bearing arms. This new place of women as combatants makes us shudder at the curse which has come upon our world. In the factory, even in the armed services, women have broken with all taboos and society ferments in most unexpected ways. Because you enter a world of bewildering change you are to be congratulated that you possess knowledge and faith, which more than anything I can think of will constitute the guaranties that your life will have meaning in the ways in which your teachers have planned.

That added quality of your education imposes an obligation which in conscience you cannot avoid, for it is to you, by reason of your trained intellect, that your school and your church will look upon to insure that the essential values are not destroyed or swept aside in the boiling society engendered by this war. Already the thoughtful among us can see the high price which society will have to pay for its disruption of the home, brought about by the new demands upon women. Each generation has the task to govern by example so that the world may be a better place for their having lived in it. Each has the obligation to attempt to leave a sweeter and happier society for those coming after. But war is a grim and ruthless monster who too often transforms the good and the beautiful into the evil and the ugly.

So in adulations and congratulations of today we must in sober thought take into account that a changing world needs the philosophy of the wisdom which you have received from these kind and loving preceptors. I can think of no greater obligation than for you to use your influence in your social life, in your business life, in your teaching profession, and in your home life, to insist that home, the cornerstone of society, be preserved and safeguarded through all our dislocations.

The tragic dislocations of this war are indeed sad events. In many cases they are an unavoidable part of the price total war exacts. But the danger is that the dislocation will come to be taken as a permanent part of our institutions and that the security of the home, its esential preservation as the source of true discipline for the youth, will become lost to us. This fundamental principle of family influence and responsibility may threaten the better society we all hope to see in the bright tomorrow.

It is unfortunate that each generation must so often learn anew from bitter experience that which earlier generations' mistakes could have disclosed to it. As one writer recently put it, much of today's trouble is caused by our failure to read the minutes of the last meeting.

The now ludicrous dictator who launched this terrible war is only a symbol of a society which had turned its back on the teachings of our Saviour. And even in our land those men without faith have been destructionists, and their mark can be seen upon our own times. But thank God their false philosophies have not been able to rob us of our faith as a nation or of our love of country as a people.

It may be a bit inappropriate, after having successfully passed your examinations, to receive on this day of your gladness even a passing word of advice, but I do believe that too many of our fellow Americans are becoming victims of catch phrases, and too few of us are critically examining the labels which are tossed around with reckless abandon. More and more, it seems to me, we find a label used as a substitute for critical thought. To that end the admonition is: Be on the alert; use your God-given talents and the spiritual insight you have been taught here.

My further advice to you young women now being graduated, is that you appreciate the full value of your alma mater, and that you estimate it over the years, as I know you will, with the pride it has justly won.

But we are concernod today not alone with our institutions, however hallowed they may be, but wi'h the lives, the hopes, and the destinies of our young men and women. We have not educated them for war—yet they move forth from their schools and colleges this year faced with the tremendous responsibility of bearing the brunt of the battle for freedom. We have not sought to make them the creatures of a military organization, yet all over the land they are closing their books during these early days of June to step into the ranks of disciplined warriors. It would be a sad commentary upon our way of life if the precepts of our religion and the principles for which our country stands had not fortified our children against the despair that must fill the human soul if warfare is to be the final justification of life.

We find it difficult to understand why men make war. We ask ourselves why it has happened to us. Sometimes—because it is all so completely beyond our finite minds—we ask ourselves why God permits it. And still we know—although we cannot explain how we know—that God is permitting man to work out his salvation—that He has given man an irrevocable free will—and that mankind shapes its own destiny. We do know that if man kept God's commandments there would be no war. We do know that it is only when we leave Him, or when those about us leave

Him—that there is unhappiness. He has tried to teach us that we are responsible to and for each other He has told us that we are "our brother's keeper."

And it is because of all of this that we have institutions of learning, and especially why the church is so deeply concerned with Catholic education. The great purpose is to help men to help each other—and especially in the way set forth by God.

The world had again fallen from grace. Greed and avarice and a lust for power overcame the frailty of man. War has come to your generation for the first time. It came for a second time to your parents.

We of an older generation may have failed in many ways. We may have been too headlong in our pursuit of this world's goods. We may have conditioned ourselves too readily to a blind sense of security. But, thank God, we have kept alive in our schools and colleges those spiritual values, the true inheritance of American patriots, which give to our young men and women the vision to see beyond the conflict that rages around them.

To me, the great inspiration of this war is the wisdom and understanding of our children. In many ways they, better than we, know the purposes of this war. They, better than we, do see beyond the enclosures of the battlefield. They have the uplifting hope that leavens our own despair. It has required no regimentation to give them the firm resolve to fight now and fiercely, that they may have the opportunity to mold their own futures as free men and women. Whatever may have been our mistakes in the past, we have through the grace of God saved for this new generation of American patriots, a sense of justice, an appreciation of the fruits of liberty, an understanding that the future of America is worth fighting for. And thus, even on this day, and at a college for women conducted by nuns of the Cloister, we witness the emergence of the spirit of American youth unquenchable and unconquerable in an hour of crisis.

This is true because these girls go forth to battle no less than their brothers. They are as men in the tasks of war that must now be assumed. Whether they go to the factory bench, or to the auxiliary units of the armed forces, to the noble ranks of the Red Cross or to the scientific laboratories of war research—they take their places side by side with the men who carry our weapons. It is true, indeed, that in this total war we count on our daughters as well as upon our sons and it is equally true that in our daughters we are finding the same courage, the same readiness for sacrifice, and the same resolution for victory.

But there is an even higher purpose and a nobler responsibility for the women of America at war. It is a destiny created for them by the Mother of God on the desolate slopes of Calvary. It is a destiny which alone can save the world. It is to this deeper, this nobler purpose of women at war, that I would in part address this class of graduates today.

No matter how just a war may be—and God knows the war we wage is just—its activities are ugly. We fight for love of our country, but to win that fight we are unleashing forces of destruction unparalleled in the history of the world. We are training our boys to be the roughest, the toughest, the most unrelenting warriors on earth. We are giving them the weapons of terrible death—we are sending them forth to meet the enemy and to destroy him. In no other way can victory be assured, because we are in mortal conflict with evil men whose brutality is their greatest strength.

But there must be on our side some counteracting influence—some balancing force that will save the Nation from the permanent ravages upon the spirit of mankind which might follow the horror and ugliness of war. For this, we place our hope in our daughters. Theirs is the sacred duty during this awful conflict to keep alive the dignity and nobility of the human soul.

Does this mean that we ask our women to remain in an ivory tower? Does it mean that we seek for them a quavering reluctance to be exposed to the realities of the grim conflict? Does it mean that we want them to dilute the determined courage of our sons by querulous protestations against ugliness of fighting? By no means. Indeed such an abject attitude would be impossible for any true daughter of America. The ancestors of these young women stood side by side with their men in other battles for freedom. Indeed, the fortitude of a woman's heart has always been a bulwark in a war justly waged.

I ask you only to consider the example of St. Joan. She was a warrior—but she also was a saint. She rode forth to battle and to victory but she sacrificed not a whit of the goodness and purity that made her the true child of Our Lady. She led the men of France in a fight for liberation, but she also lifted up their hearts and saved them from the degradation of mere brutality. She had courage—but she was gentle. She rode into the midst of a bloody struggle but her spirit of goodness shed light and hope and charity on the field of battle.

Such is the noble purpose that our women of America must fulfill in this war. Theirs is the sacred task of assuring that we shall not be branded with the brutality that war breeds. They must dedicate their lives now to the solemn duty to see to it that America shall one day emerge in the full glory of victory, but with none of the dirt and taint of war. Theirs is the mission to lead our Nation once more toward the cleansing light of a peace justly and nobly won. They must keep alive the ennobling spirit, the human dignity, the goodness of the immortal soul. Theirs is the destiny to lift up our warriors from the field of battle and make them men again. Theirs is the destiny to give strength to the "lines" at home.

And with the lessons learned here—and the responsibility imposed upon you by the church—I am certain that you will help hold aloft and keep aglow the torch of eternal light which has burned for more than nineteen centuries.

As you go forth you face a world still suffering from the cruel blows of a depression and the terrific shock of war. You will find men and women bewildered and saddened and oftentimes angered. You will find some people yielding to frustration. That is the way of war. With war comes waste, extravagance, and fury. People become bewildered, and then intolerant. Self-restraint is difficult, and imposed restraint, which is oftentimes necessary, sometimes seems tyrannical. All of this is a great challenge to you. It will test your own forbearance and your faith.

Those of us in the generation ahead of you may be growing a little tired. We have been rowing upstream for a long time—and the current has been swift. We have taken hard blows—as you will—but you are young and fresh and strong. Your minds will develop rapidly from this day forward. You hold our hopes and you have our faith.

And so I say to you young women, on this day of your commencement—be strong hearted—be brave, be determined for victory—but be good and pure and gentle. Surrender not the dignity of womanhood in the excitement of a nation at war. Help your brothers fight the good fight but be noble as well as courageous—and keep ever in mind that upon you depend not merely the aid, the comfort, and succor you can now give to fighting men—but also the precious inheritance of an unimpaired and untainted spirit that must be handed down to the generations of Americans that will follow you in peace.

"Who shall find a valiant woman?" asks the Book of Wisdom. We fathers of America are today finding her in the daughters we have reared. May she fulfill her destiny in the grace of God and in the hearts of her countrymen.

Control of Appropriation and Expenditure of Public Moneys

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, for many years we heard much of waste and diversion of funds appropriated to bring about recovery from the depression; and for months we have been and are now hearing, and seem destined to continue to hear, about waste and extravagance in the war program. Speaking to the theory that neither a depression nor a war justify wanton waste and extravagance, I suggest that something ought to be done about it. Mark Twain said there was much complaining about the weather, but nobody did anything about it; and it certainly seems high time that Congress do something tangible and enduring about the waste of the taxpayers' money.

One of the first things that should be done is for Congress to see to it that proper restrictions—restrictions in keeping with old acts of Congress that require the application of funds to the specific purposes for which they are appropriated—are revived and thrown around funds appropriated to the various agencies of government. And Congress should make it impossible for funds appropriated to one department or agency to be transferred to another department or agency except pursuant to express authorization by Congress. Furthermore, we should see to it, for the future, that old and venerable statutes, such as the one prohibiting the employment and payment of publicity experts and the one inhibiting the purchase of land without express appropriations therefor by Congress, are complied with religiously and faithfully. In other words, Congress should recover its powers over the purse strings and make it its business to know how appropriated funds are used and applied.

Much has been said on the subject of waste and illegal expenditures by various agencies of government, and it may not be amiss to mention a few of the well-known instances.

It has been shown that the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, both headed by one and the same man, have adopted the view that, according to their judgment and ideas, Congress failed to provide just compensation for vessels

requisitioned for title or use in the war emergency; and they merely adopted a policy of their own—a policy of paying more than the act of Congress provides to be paid. In other words, Congress said out of an abundance of experience gained in World War No. 1 that vessel owners should be compensated for their vessels on the basis of the vessels' costs, plus improvements, and less depreciation to the time of taking; and that, in no instance, should the values of the vessels be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating their taking. In this way, Congress took into account the many heavy subsidies paid shipowners to enable them to compete with shipowners of other countries, and guarded against buying the Government's investment in the ships when they are needed for emergency or war purposes. Certainly Congress, at least theoretically, is the policy-making power of this Government—not the United States Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration, or any other Government agency. It is said, too, on good authority, that the War Shipping Administration is assuming war risk and other insurance on vessels requisitioned for use during the war at 10 and 12 times their book value—that many times in excess of their depreciated value, which is the amount required by the Merchant Marine Act to be paid for the vessels.

Much has been disclosed concerning unheard-of and unconscionable earnings of vessels operated in the lease-lend service to the Red Sea area; but, with a single exception, not one shipowner has disgorged any part of his ill-gotten gains. Quite to the contrary, the rest of the owners have refused to make any refunds because their charters, being with an agency of the British Government, though the Maritime Commission paid the charter rates, our own Government is powerless to force any refund of their unjust enrichment. Such practice of allowing a British Government agency to make contracts calling for the spending of our appropriated funds is most unusual, to say the least.

We have had any number of instances of unconscionable profits by shipbuilders and other contractors serving their Government in its hour of need; and we are told that the Maritime Commission is engaged in spending more than $100,000,000 in the revival of the concrete ship and barge program of World War No. 1, which proved such a colossal flop. The concrete construction program of the Commission is going on apace, although Admiral Land has twice told committees of Congress that no enthusiasm may be expected from him for the program. His sole and only excuse for this wasteful and unauthorized concrete program was that the venture was undertaken as a form of insurance for people who could construct concrete ships and barges but could not build steel ships. Is the war effort thus to be turned into a program for the relief of people merely because they cannot construct steel ships? Is it another W. P. A. project, operated without rhyme, reason, or excuse?

Inordinate or fraudulent profits should not be countenanced for one moment; and particularly is this true when we consider that Congress has made funds available to finance contractors, and most of them have no substantial investments in their work. I have in mind a case considered by the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries where it was shown that a defunct company at Tampa, Fla., was reorganized with the aid and assistance of the Maritime Commission and the R. F. C.; where the assets were written up beyond all reason; and where, for the paltry sum of $500, one man, a banker, became the owner of the stock of the new company; and where that company, as far back as December, last, had contracts with the Government aggregating $200,000,000—contracts financed with Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, much has been disclosed, but little seems to have been done. Congress has two agencies, and one in particular, which seems to be clothed with the duty of assisting Congress in the preparation of the annual Budget and in keeping track of how appropriated funds are expended. I refer, first, to the Bureau of the Budget; and secondly to the General Accounting Office, which is presided over by a highly respected former Member of the House. Theoretically, as I say, the Budget Bureau was established in the thought that it would assist Congress in its budgetary and appropriation work; but speculation is becoming rife as to whether, after all, it was not a grievous mistake to place the Budget Bureau under the Chief Executive and the administrative departments of government. One of our House committees but recently had before it on one or more occasions representatives of the Budget Bureau and experienced great difficulty in discovering what aid, if any, is being rendered to Congress by that agency. Most all questions elicited answers tending to show that the Budget Bureau performs entirely at the direction and pursuant to the wishes of the President, without regard to the Bureau's responsibility to Congress. Indeed, it may well be suggested and concluded that the Budget Bureau has become a mere rubber stamp for the Executive and is a hindrance rather than a help to Congress.

As to the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General, we do hear and read where, on not too frequent occasions, the Comptroller renders a report to Congress; but, with the great amount of public disclosures concerning waste and extravagance, both during the relief spending and during the conduct of this war, it does seem that the Comptroller's communications of illegal expenditures to Congress are too few and too far between.

And one may well believe that the Comptroller has failed fully to understand the powers, duties, and functions conferred upon—yea, enjoined upon him—by the plain language of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. That act specifically requires that the Comptroller General shall make investigations at the seat of Government and elsewhere; that he shall make annual and special reports to Congress of every contract and expenditure made in any year in violation of law; and that he shall make suggestions to Congress looking to greater efficiency and economy in Government. As stated, the Budget and Accounting Act was approved in 1921; but can any Member recall any recommendation made either by the first Comptroller or any of his successors looking to greater efficiency and economy in Government?

Despite these plain and mandatory duties, the present Comptroller General, estimable and loved gentleman though he is, made a recent appearance before the Ramspeck committee and delivered a most astounding statement. He said that he had reported numerous extravagant expenditures for such as cocktail parties, entertainment, and the like; but that they were legal because they had been made on a certificate of an emergency. It seems to me that Congress, though making lump-sum appropriations in even too many instances has never intimated, even provided, that appropriate funds could be spent for such purposes, regardless of the certificate that an emergency existed. Why the Comptroller did not denominate those expenditures as altogether illegal and unauthorized I am totally unable to understand. The Comptroller further told the Ramspeck committee that Congress has no idea how appropriated funds are spent in the departments and agencies of Government, including those appropriated for his own General Accounting Office. Who, of all officials of this Government, should know but the Comptroller General himself? The law requires that he know, and that he report to Congress all illegal contracts and expenditures. Yet the Comptroller General further and astoundingly suggested that Congress should create an organization which will inform Congress as to the way and manner in which appropriated funds are spent. He makes no disclaimer that he is unable to comply with and perform the duties enjoined upon him; but he suggests that Congress should afford a means which will furnish it the information it ought to have.

Hearings on the 1943 independent offices appropriation bill reflect that the General Accounting Office had investigated twenty-odd matters involving Maritime Commission transactions; and that committee was assured that reports concerning those investigations would be forthcoming. While the Comptroller had previously reported a few such matters, it is understood that the greater part of that work yet remains unreported to Congress. I am told, too, that the same promises and failures to perform obtain in respect of similar matters as between the Comptroller General and committees of the Senate. Why should this condition of inaction and apparent purpose of plain evasion of duty be continued further? There is now pending in the Senate a resolution calling for an investigation to determine whether the General Accounting Office, as presently constituted, organized, and manned, is equipped and competent to render to Congress the services it has said by the Budget and Accounting Act shall be rendered.

We have all heard complaints of inaction by the Department of Justice in matters affecting Government funds, and its failure to press for the collection of debts due the Government. Much the same situation must have existed at or about the close of the Civil War; for Congress then passed an act authorizing private citizens to bring suit for and in the name of the Government in cases where fraud had been practiced against the United States, and where the law enforcement officers failed to act in the public interest.

The act provides that if such a person shall bring such suit, and shall finance the costs thereof, he is entitled to recover double damages and to have as his compensation one-half of the recovery. That self-same act was but recently held valid by the present Supreme Court in a sweeping decision. Now, however, we have the spectacle of the Attorney General urging the repeal of that ancient statute; indeed, largely if not principally on the Attorney General's recommendation, the bill to repeal that act got on the Consent Calendar of the House some weeks ago and slipped through without discussion or apparent notice. It has now been reported favorably by a committee of the Senate. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if there ever was a need for this particular act it is now; and it seems also that the recommendation of its repeal by the Department of Justice comes with bad grace. Surely, if there is not a right in someone to protect the interests of the Government in cases where the Department of Justice fails to act, as it frequently does fail, the taxpayers are, indeed, at the mercy of the profiteers and chislers. And I recall that, when the Comptroller General made his appearance before the Ramspeck committee he further said, in substance, that the Government is at the mercy of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractors who write their own ticket and get what they write. Again, that worthy official failed to explain the whyfors of his failure to report more such matters to Congress, instead of asking the creation of another agency to do so; and his suggestion was the sum total of his contribution on the subject.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time is ripe for Congress to bestir itself in the matter of safeguarding the appropriation and expenditure of public moneys.

Address of Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, before the Wisconsin Bar Association in Milwaukee, Wis., on Friday, June 25, 1943:

Although our legislature really adjourned several weeks ago, the sine die adjournment became effective yesterday. The National Governors' Conference was held in our capital city the first 3 days of this week. Preparation was that, the sessions held, the immense amount of work done, and territory covered prepared me for this particularly pleasant trip into your State.

I enjoy therefore very much meeting the Wisconsin bar. You have produced great leaders in the field of the law. This is the profession to which I have devoted my life and to which I will return. It is a short step from the practice of the law, dealing constantly with public matters, into political life. I made that step several times. It is likewise a very easy step to take back again. I suppose one should not call it a step, but rather a push and that I have done also.

The years of public service have not in any way diminished my love of the law or my gratification in association with lawyers.

At the Governors' conference, two important matters were considered. The first—how we can implement and aid the conduct of the war from the standpoint of the States, and, second, how we can best meet the problems of rehabilitation and reconstruction following the war. The deliberations of that conference brought clearly into the foreground of our thinking many national problems.

The national problems that we are facing these days result from the accumulation of unsettled questions over a long period of years. For that reason those problems are of supreme importance. Upon the wisdom of our solutions for them rests the welfare of our people for many years to come. It is necessary, therefore, in discussing them to do so with the utmost care and, so far as possible, in the most specific manner. There are those who believe that these problems can be settled through the method of easy generalities. I do not share that view. The problems that beset us cannot be solved by words or phrases, however happy; they can be settled only by consistent thought and determined action. I should like, therefore, today, to limit myself to one aspect of our post-war problems. My subject concerns the principles and policies that should be adopted and followed by the United States in order that this Nation may, as we hope it will, be strong and effective and cooperative when the war is won.

Beyond this war lie two vital and grave decisions. Those decisions will have to be made by the American people after widespread discussion and long and serious thought. The first is, what part this Nation will play in world affairs. What, in short, will be its foreign policy? The second is the question of what domestic policies this Nation will adopt in fitting itself for its proper role in the world beyond the war.

It is obvious that these two problems are intimately related. There are those who are able to discuss the one without any consideration of the other. But I cannot share such easy and complacent assurance. Whatever we promise to the world is in the nature of a promissory note. When men give promissory notes they must, if they are honest, know how their promises can be kept. If their personal future is cloudy, if their health is infirm, and their earning power doubtful, they must take that into consideration. We dare not destroy the hopes of the world because we have not been honest with ourselves.

I join with those who wish to lend the strong arm of American help in the solution of world problems. I find, moreover, as I meet people in all walks of life and talk with them of their fears and hopes, that they feel that the destiny of America must be, to a greater extent than before, involved in the destinies of the world at large. I find, in short, that people want to be shown how the United States can effectively join with other nations in solving some of the fundamental causes of war. Since that desire is so wide-spread and so evident, no one should ignore it. I shall never do so. That desire born of the suffering of war must be strengthened and implemented. I propose, at a time not too far removed, to speak of the possibilities of American participation in world affairs, in some detail and with specific suggestions. But today I should like to create the foundation for such an expression by looking to the state of this country's affairs and to discuss with you the basic reason why our position in the world depends upon policies and principles which we pursue within our borders. For what we do abroad, must in peace as well as in war, depend upon what we do at home.

For 10 years our national administration has pursued a domestic policy which, at every point, hampers and contradicts its professed foreign policy. Ten years ago, we adopted certain domestic policies that were based upon an America isolated from the currents of world affairs. In the field of agriculture, the President announced and compelled the adoption by Congress of a policy which was professedly intended to free the farmer from the shackles of world prices. That agricultural policy was set up for the purpose of establishing within the borders of this country a self-sufficing economy. We were to grow what we needed for our own purposes, and only what we needed for our own purposes. Surpluses of food were viewed as a national calamity. We embarked on a policy of suppressing production. Millions of acres were put out of production. The tragic results of that policy now face us with grim and forbidding reality. Hunger stalks around the world and we are rationed here, because of such fallacious programs.

But that is only one of the handicaps under which we shall suffer as we seek to take our proper place in the world after the war. Let us consider another example. One of the most obvious necessities, not only for our own sake but for the sake of all nations, is the need that America participate freely in the trade of the world. Since we have proved, in this war, that our capacity for production is so great that we can meet the necessities of half of the world at war, we ought to be able to look forward to that time when, after swords are turned to plowshares, we shall be producing for many nations no longer the machines of war, but the machines of peace. If we can supply the world with tanks and guns, we ought to be able to supply the world with trucks, reapers, refrigerators, and automobiles.

But at the end of the war we shall meet, in foreign markets, competition of a most formidable nature. That competition will produce goods created by workers who are able to work for low wages. But American workers are not willing to lower their living standards. And they are right. We must, therefore, make up the difference by the superior efficiency of our system of production. I have confidence that we can make up that difference under conditions that are tolerable to bear. But, if at that moment of trial, we encounter another handicap, we shall be crippled beyond measure in our effort to carry on world trade. That other handicap that threatens is destructive inflation. If, as the result of unsound financial policies, inflation overtakes us, the cost of production in this country will grow prohibitively large. That will mean that when we attempt to meet foreign competition in the markets of the world, we shall be laboring under an insuperable handicap. Any man who deals in goods and knows the simple rules of trade realizes that the misfortune that we shall meet is a misfortune from which wise policy might

have saved us. And yet, we have an administration in Washington so divided within itself that for 10 years the State Department and, at times, the President and other agencies, have exalted the mission of America in promoting foreign trade. At the same time we have had other departments, and you can supply the names of those responsible for those departments, who have been telling us that sound economic policies require continuous inflation. And the President has supported that side of his administration too. But the New Deal cannot change the laws of mathematics. The consequences of this ruinous division of policy are already appearing. No official pronouncement, no matter how exalted, can reconcile a policy of inflation with a policy of increased foreign trade. There, in all of its reality, is perhaps the most striking of the examples of how foreign policy must, in the last analysis, depend upon domestic principles.

Another aspect of this conflict of policy has to do with the management of our economic life generally. There were those in high office who sought to lead us to believe that our industrial production should, in all of its details, be managed by an all-wise bureaucracy. Manufacturers were to be told what to make and how much to make. Businesses were to be regulated in every detail. The farmer was to be told what to plant and where, how many pigs to let live and how many to kill. The abundant life was to come from a nice set of blueprints made by some bureaucrat in Washington. Here again, a matter of infinite importance to the foreign relations of our country is involved. A nation which has launched itself upon a totalitarian economy cannot be the good neighbor of any other nation. You cannot have a managed economy at home and abundant trade abroad. That choice the President has never made. Whether he has perceived it, I do not know; but if he has perceived it, his words and policies have never given evidence of it. If there were one point on which all the Governors agreed it was that the people ought to have the right to vote on our policy-making officials, and that rampant and costly bureaucracy must be curbed or our free government will be destroyed.

The most tragic aspect of an economy of scarcity is already being pressed home upon us. We shall, when this war is over, be faced with a hungry and impoverished world. Whether we give food or whether we sell it, there will be demands from the four corners of the world; but we shall have to answer that we have had different plans with respect to food in the past few years. We have systematically cut away our power to produce what the world needs. Continuation of these policies, or a continuation of those responsible for such policies makes an empty mockery of any expressions by them of a desire to help the world. I believe that we should contribute in every way that we can to the abolition of want in the world, but I cannot believe in the sincerity of a national administration which tells the world in one breath that we shall keep it from want and at the same time tries to limit our capacity to meet those wants.

I have no desire to claim that all regulation is bad. I find few people who believe that under modern conditions we can go back to unbridled individualism. Neither business, labor, nor agriculture wants that. They all recognize that the increasing complexity of life requires many Government regulations. The public interest can be protected in no other way in the Republic. And when we have laws we must have people to enforce them. Nor do I claim that all of the increased Federal regulations of the past 10 years are bad and unnecessary and should be abolished. I have the honor to have served 4½ years as Governor of a State that, like your own State of Wisconsin, has pioneered for more than 30 years in social and economic reform. I only wish that the experience of the states had been studied more carefully by Washington. Nor am I going to be intimidated by the shop-worn New Deal question begging cry of "What would you abolish?" In my good time, I propose to be very specific on that point and my specifications will not be pleasant reading in some high quarters in Washington. But because the New Deal has never made up its mind on either its economic principles or its policies of regulation, it is necessary to clear away the underbrush before we survey the land and set the stakes. When we know what we want to accomplish, we can know what laws we need to achieve those purposes. Law should follow policy, and policy to be effective, must be consistent within itself. Law, it has been said, is the public opinion of yesterday. That is another way of saying that before we make tomorrow's law, we must know our policy today.

Let us look at a few basic principles.

When a business is sufficiently invested with a public interest, and when, in the conduct of that business, a monopolistic interest is involved, it is a proper exercise of governmental power to provide the means by which the public can be protected from unfair prices and poor service. In such cases, the Government should not, except in the most extreme cases, enter into direct competition with private business. The public interest is never protected by the Government using the taxpayer's money to compete with him or to deprive him of a right to engage in business.

But the public must at all times be protected from the evil of public or private monopoly, and to that end laws are placed upon the statute books. Those laws should be strictly enforced, but they should not be used as official blackmail to compel business to conform to economic theories inconsistent with a free economy. There is such a thing as using the antitrust laws to enforce not free competion but ironbound Government regimentation of little and big business alike.

Through the States and the Nation in close cooperation, it is a legitimate purpose of government to assist citizens in their quest for security against the needs of old age, against unemployment. In the administration of social security, the beneficiaries are entitled to the most sacred trusteeship by government and to the full truth in all promises of future benefits. I believe that our existing social-security facilities in States and Nation should be reconsidered after this war, to the end that inequities may be eliminated and that extension of its benefits be made wherever they are consistent with a sound economy and fiscal system. Our fiscal experimenters must not gamble with the dollars that our tax collectors take from our people. By faithful performance in this field we can build an abiding confidence in our Government.

All Government regulation of business, labor, and agriculture must be imposed as a quasi-legislative function of government but with a judicial impartiality. Rules of procedure must be kept within the limits of established law. Such agencies as are vested with this responsibility must not usurp the powers of the courts. Their orders ought to be reviewable by the courts. Those in charge should be persons of balanced judicial temperament, concerned with strict justice and fair consideration of the rights of all parties concerned. These agencies should never be empowered to determine public policy under the cloak of administrative processes.

Moreover, in every act of Congress extending Federal authority the competence and constitutional authority of the States must be respected. In 10 years, during which Federal authority has added to its power, many powers were seized from the States that might better be left to the States. Our Federal Government has the right to grow. But there is a big difference between growing and swelling. Growth is normal; swelling is evidence of disease.

Finally, in the extension of regulation in the Nation and in the States, every step should be taken in line with consistent economic policy. Either we believe in the future of free enterprise and competition in America or we do not. Either we believe in the future of America or we do not. If men contemplate the present state of American enterprise as mature, washed up, finished, and ready for the socialist undertaker, those men are not competent to guide the destinies of a vital, growing nation. And dozens of official new dealers have said just that of our economy. In fact, so many have expressed that view that we can only conclude that such is the official New Deal Party faith. That feeble faith is not enough for the times beyond this war. We cannot move forward half socialistic and half capitalistic. For my part, I choose America of private enterprise and equality of opportunity.

The presence of such un-American doctrines does a lot to explain the tragic inconsistency of policy that we have witnessed. In the field of antitrust law enforcement, the inconsistency has been glaring. In a Federal court in this very State—Wisconsin—the spectacle was revealed of one department of the Federal Government prosecuting people for the very thing that another department had told them to do. Mr. Thurman Arnold sought certain changes in labor regulation. Other Federal departments opposed them. The controversy became a public scandal. And Mr. Arnold was elevated to the bench. It seems to be a favorite practice with the New Deal, when two new dealers cannot get along with each other, to silence their outcries by making them Federal judges. This is a curious test for judicial fitness. It suggests that the Federal courts are to be regarded as a species of official doghouses. That makes for neither good administration nor good courts.

Even in our agencies created to meet the specific problems of war, this inconsistency is apparent. Under the guise of war, administration activities looking toward permanent radical changes go on. Only recently, it was revealed to a House comm ttee that the former chief counsel for the Office of Price Administration had spent his time gathering material wholly irrelevant to his job of price administration. Perhaps that is why price control has been such a tragic failure. Some men are so intent on making America over that they would ruin America in the process. Like an amateur at watch repairing they can easily take the thing apart, but they cannot make it run.

Nor are we given any assurance of when or how our war controls will be terminated. In the last war, President Wilson was most explicit again and again that war controls were temporary. He said something in that connection that might well be repeated now:

"Our people, moreover, do not wait to be coached and led. They know their own business, are quick and resourceful at every readjustment, definite in purpose, and self-reliant in action. Any leading strings we might seek to put them in would speedily become hopelessly tangled because they would pay no attention to them and go their own way. All that we can do as their legislative and executive servants is to mediate the process of change here, there, and elsewhere as we may. I have heard much counsel as to the plans that should be formed and personally conducted to a happy consumption, but from no quarter have I

seen any general scheme of reconstruction emerge which I thought it likely we could force our spirited business men and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience."

No such assurance has been given during this war.

Meanwhile, in spite of official confusion, our war effort proceeds. The strength and spirit of our people is a tribute to the deep patriotism and efficiency of a people grounded in freedom. Our armed men are winning victories wherever they fight. The leadership of our armed forces is superb. The Nation to which our fighting men return must be worthy of their courage and sacrifice. We must resolutely prepare for the future beyond the war. The United States, in that future, will play a generous and constructive part in building for permanent peace and a better way of living. In our public discussion, we shall examine every reasonable plan for world order as our sacred duty.

I have sought today to make clear how closely we must match our considered foreign policy with rational domestic policies. For a nation which is to play a helpful part in the world must be sound at home. America cannot reach out a helping hand unless we have a strong arm. We cannot inspire others to be free unless we love liberty here at home. We cannot show others how to govern themselves unless we save and strengthen self-government in America. Nature has given us the materials for that righteous role and our Creator has given us minds and hearts to achieve it. Let us build a nation worthy of our great opportunities.

Overton and Allen Vote Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial from the Alexandria Daily Town Talk, of Alexandria, La., of June 29, 1943:

OVERTON AND ALLEN VOTE RIGHT

Senator JOHN H. OVERTON, of Alexandria, and Representative A. LEONARD ALLEN, of Winnfield, were among the Democratic Members of Congress who voted "right" in overriding President Roosevelt's veto of the anti-strike bill last week.

We are glad to know that our Eighth District Congressman and our Senator were close enough to the people back home to know that the Presidential veto was unpopular.

Statutory authority for seizure of war plants and mines and maintenance of present employment conditions and terms are covered in the Smith-Connally measure. A number of newspapers pointed out that the veto constituted the first major set-back for the President on labor legislation. It showed an unusual independence in Congress; the Members evidently have decided to think for themselves, and it was a tremendous blow to all of the John L. Lewises who are leading labor into a degrading and unpopular and unpatriotic position.

Senator OVERTON and Representative ALLEN cast patriotic, 100-percent-American ballots.

Protesting Refusal of Stabilization Director Vinson To Grant an 8-Cent Adjustment in Pay of Railroad Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. James McAndrew, president of the Port Jervis Local Shop Crafts Federation, Port Jervis, N. Y., protesting against the recent ruling of Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson in denying an 8-cent adjustment in wages paid to railroad employees.

This is a matter which should be investigated by the Congress, as it must be apparent to everyone that such an increase is warranted and justifiable in view of the mounting cost of living and the higher wage scales paid in war industries, and particularly because practically all railroads are now earning far more money, and have been since the war started, than ever before in their history.

The railroad employees and the American people would like to know whether or not Stabilization Director Vinson acted within existing law, or merely under Executive orders. The ruling of Director Vinson affects a million non-operating railroad employees, who are contributing loyally and very effectively to the war effort. No group of American wage-earners has done more to help win the war, by keeping war materials and food supplies rolling to war plants, ports of embarkation, and to consumers at home.

The letter from Mr. McAndrew follows:

BROTHERHOOD RAILWAY
CARMEN OF AMERICA,
PORT JERVIS LODGE, NO. 962,
Port Jervis, N. Y., June 27, 1943.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
Congressman, Twenty-sixth District.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is difficult to describe the stunned amazement of the average railroad shop worker when he first heard that Stabilization Director Vinson had denied the recently granted 8-cent adjustment in shopmen's wages, or the resentment, disappointment, and anger when it gradually developed that this denial was based upon a phony fear of inflation. Some needlessly cruel and terrible things have been done this past year in the name of inflation, but there has been nothing so utterly unbiased or so willfully stupid as this latest blast from the Washington bureaucrats.

Director Vinson says that the raise would be in violation of the Little Steel formula. But this is patently untrue. The Little Steel formula specifically states that gross inequalities in wages should be eliminated and that minimum wages should not go above 75 cents an hour. The findings of the Railroad Labor Board, after months of hearings, conclusively proved that there do exist gross inequalities between railroad wages and the wages paid in comparative industry, and that minimum wages on the railroads are about 25 cents below those in other industries. It was because of this that the Board ordered a readjustment. If Mr. Vinson does not know this, then he is an ignorant man and certainly not fit for an important post in these times of war; if he does know it, then he is guilty of willful and malicious discrimination against railroad workers. In either case he is guilty of contributing toward disunity and perhaps disorder on the home front on a scale that Herr Goebbels could never accomplish in a thousand years.

For railroad workers are not likely to accept his report meekly. The rewards of meekness, we have learned from bitter experience, are to be ignored and shunted aside when we try to press our just demands. For more than 20 years there have been no major strikes in the railroad industry. We have brought our grievances to the conference tables and have submitted to endless "cooling off" periods while in other industries strikes, violence, and disorder flared. But today in the other industries the workers earn from 10 to 25 cents more per hour than we do for the same kind of work.

The railroad unions have been praised; they have been held up as an example to other unions, and very nearly everyone, from the President down, has promised that we would be treated fairly. But now we see these promises betrayed. We still can recall the praise, of course, but one can't buy many War bonds with praise.

There are few of us who can understand this so-called threat of inflation. Is it that the workers of this Nation must be driven to the very brink of pauperism to escape inflation? Must everything that we have fought for these past 50 years be thrown out the window because two men, representatives from the poll-tax-ridden States of the South (Byrnes and Vinson) decide that money in the hands of the workers to provide their families with the necessities of life is inflation?

There has been much written about the boys who are fighting and dying overseas. But when one looks at the scene in Washington, with the bureaucrats holding down wages and Congress pushing up prices, we wonder what sort of a country they are coming back to. And we wonder what they'll think of us if we lack courage now to challenge the nonsense and stupidity, the passion and prejudice, that seems to have overwhelmed the men charged with the responsibility of keeping up the morale of the home front.

It has been charged that there are certain forces in Washington who, with the zeal of Fascists, are usihg the war emergency for an excuse to break down trade-unions precisely the way Hitler and Mussolini used emergencies in Germany and Italy to break up the trade-unions of those sad countries. And today the trend of events seems to support those charges. It would be a tragically terrible thing if, while our soldiers at a tremendous price defeat the Fascist enemies abroad, they return home and find them solidly entrenched in America.

It is well to remember, in these crucial times, that had the trade-union leaders of Germany and Italy possessed sufficient courage, neither Hitler nor Mussolini would have achieved their power. It may well be that the leaders in America today are being called upon for the supreme test.

Respectfully,

JAMES MCANDREW,
President, Port Jervis Local,
Shop Crafts Federation.

Posters Work for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year when all of us are thinking of patriotism, and particularly thinking of it in symbols. The Fourth of July itself is a symbolic reminder of our stirring national heritage and our independence. Our flag is a symbol, the dome of our Capitol is a symbol, and the very firecrackers that some little boy sets off are a symbol, too, whether he knows it or not. Our great patriotic painting and war posters, familiar as they are, and equally symbolic, deserve our special attention.

Probably there is not a single American, whether he be a citizen of this land by birth or by adoption, whether he hold degrees from a dozen colleges or be barely acquainted with the three R's, who has not at some time seen, and thrilled to the significance of, that famous historical painting The Spirit of '76. This is probably the best known picture produced by an American artist. In one form or another, it has been reproduced literally millions of times, and in every possible way. Color reproductions of it hang in millions of homes. It is constantly used in advertisements, calendars, posters, school histories, and even as a trade-mark. It appears over and over again in patriotic tableaux, and a Fourth of July parade would hardly be complete without the three familiar figures of the stern old drummer, the valiant and determined fifer, and the eager drummer boy. Archibald M. Willard painted this picture in 1876, just 100 years after the event which it commemorates. A large popular demand for colored reproductions immediately placed the picture within the reach of everyone.

In a very real sense, The Spirit of '76 was our first war poster. It was made, not during a war, but shortly after a long and bloody one, the struggle between the States, and it has remained for almost 70 years the best war poster which we have ever had.

Henry Kelsey Devereux, who posed for the drummer boy of the painting, says:

> The painting created little or no stir among the art critics and connoisseurs. It was not painted for such. The painting was a patriotic human document that reached the hearts of millions and will for centuries to come be an inspiration to further millions yet unborn.

Mr. J. F. Ryder, art dealer and patron of Archibald M. Willard when he was a struggling young artist, gives us the best contemporary account—and, incidentally, the best possible definition of a war poster:

> The idea of the artist in painting the picture was to concentrate all the determination and enthusiasm in a few figures. * * * Pictures have been painted by artists of great skill, possessing qualities of technique of method, valuable beyond the works of other artists; pictures which give pleasure to experts and connoisseurs. In the midst of such works "The Spirit of '76" stands. The eye wanders from these works of great technique, and is awed by the grandeur of the old man, by the force of the fervid and devoted group, by the spirit which invades the whole. Mr. Willard with his powerful but, perhaps, less finished, touch did more than please the eye of experts; he stirred the heart of a nation.

During the last war many of our finest artists turned to the production of posters as their contribution to national morale and the war effort. I am sure everyone remembers the Howard Chandler Christy drawing of the tall man in the top-hat, with his finger outstretched: "Uncle Sam wants you." Mr. Christy continues to make inspiring posters during the conflict of today. Particularly memorable is his picture of the Red Cross Nurse. His magnificent painting, on an heroic scale, of the Signing of the Constitution, now hangs in the main hall of the House of Representatives.

Probably, too, everyone is familiar with "The Four Freedoms", painted by Norman Rockwell and reproduced in recent issues of the Saturday Evening Post. These four stirring pictures of what we are fighting for have had wide distribution and equally wide acclaim. Another extremely familiar poster is one of the fine series put out by W. P. B.: "Men Working Together", which depicts a soldier, a sailor and a welder, all shoulder to shoulder and looking sturdily forward. War Department, O. W. I. and Treasury posters are everywhere—and they represent the best and most vigorous in American art.

This is not the art of the salon, of the critic and the connoisseur. It requires no mood, no studio atmosphere, no correct lighting, no proper background, no hushed voices and no beautifully printed catalog of explanatory notes. This art must succeed, if it succeeds at all, by immediate impact. It must be effective in any light and against any background—school room, barber shop, streetcar, restaurant. It must be strong enough to enlarge for a billboard or the side of the proverbial barn; it must be sharp enough to make a cut for a letterhead. It must be clear enough to stand reproduction on all kinds of paper, from the finest bond to the cheapest unbleached woodpulp. It must carry its caption boldly, if there be caption at all, so that the passenger on a swift overland train or the casual pedestrian who glances once at a handbill before discarding it instantly seizes and understands the message. It must constitute the graphic representation of the soul and sinews of a people at war. It is not studied, not posed; it is quick and vivid with colors forged in the furnaces of our effort.

The general and generous cooperation of the advertising industry in using the best of American art for patriotic purposes looms large in these difficult days. Few of us will ever forget "The kid in upper four." Almost all of our Nation-wide companies have been using outstanding pictures—and outstanding text. I know of one concrete example which, if it did not make history, certainly managed to collide with it. As part of their contribution to the war effort, a New York advertising firm engaged a full page of both the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune on the day the second front in north Africa opened to reproduce a poem called Prayer to Jeanne of France, by Joseph Auslander. The poem was illustrated by a drawing of Jeanne d'Arc, made by an American artist, Adolph Treidler, for this occasion. The fact that the page appeared on the very day of the second front was a happy stroke that called double attention to the poem. The advertising firm, the author, and the artist received literally thousands of letters about the page. The whole page was eventually set up as a poster reprint and has been widely distributed.

The National War Agencies tell me that—

> Posters are divided into five categories: (1) Recruiting; (2) selling War bonds and stamps; (3) production, which now includes related subjects, particularly those designed to reduce absenteeism; (4) morale building, general patriotic themes; and (5) security or "Don't Talk" posters.

I am inclined to believe that the last two categories are the most important. Recruiting will come as inevitably as the draft; it is virtually a matter of getting a man into the niche best suited for him. War bonds and stamps will be bought, and bought in increasing numbers. Production, if only from a selfish motive of the individual who must be sure of his daily bread and butter, must and will go on. In all these fields posters help but especially in the matter of building morale and of keeping us from rumor mongering. Every one of us has a moment of despair or depression now and then, when we, almost in spite of ourselves, began wondering what is the use of it all. Every one of us, sooner or later, comes into possession of some isolated scrap of information which, if overheard by alien ears and pieced together with other seemingly unrelated scraps, can send a ship to the bottom or a squadron of brave men to their graves.

In these fields the national war agencies have done magnificent work. One particularly notable poster bears the caption "Strong in the strength of the Lord, we who fight in the people's cause will never stop until that cause is won," from one of Vice President WALLACE'S recent speeches. The picture is that of three resolute arms, one holding a monkey wrench, one a rifle, and one an S wrench. Two of the "don't-talk" posters remain fixed in my memory. One is a simple brown background, like the sands of the African desert, with a wooden cross and the pitiful heritage of a helmet and a cartridge belt hung over the arms. The title is, "A Careless

Word; Another Cross." The second depicts a drowned sailor washed up on the beach, his clothing and his fair hair still awash with the sea water. The caption "A careless word; a needless loss."

We learned to "Join the Navy and see the world" through a poster which has served well in peace and war. Now we learn to buy War bonds through the huge billboard on the lawn of the Treasury Building—one of the best strokes of outdoor advertising which has come to my attention.

Let us remember to give our war posters more than a casual glance. They are really worth while. And some of them may be tomorrow's famous paintings. The more simple and direct and vital they are, the more our heart's blood is set pounding. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the national war agencies, the advertising industry, and the artists themselves upon this most useful and effective enterprise in helping to win our war.

Spies—Genuine, Grim, and Close

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of July 1, 1943:

SPIES—GENUINE, GRIM, AND CLOSE

High credit is due the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its 3 months' work which resulted in the capture of the two Nazi spies on Staten Island—Lehmitz, the air raid warden and victory garden cultivator, whose invisible ink letters conveyed to his Nazi masters information about American troop and convoy movements; De Spretter, the highly trained engineer who, at secret meeting in a Staten Island wood, fed Lehmitz technical data on American war plants, etc., for transmission to Berlin.

Note that both Lehmitz and De Spretter, after arrest, promptly pleaded guilty. This is in line with reported Nazi instructions that when German spies are caught in this country and the case against them appears overwhelming, they must immediately confess guilt in the hope of heading off further prosecution and probing that might discover more accomplices and wider ramifications of espionage. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, of course, knows this and will be neither fooled nor halted.

Note also that these trained and efficient Nazi spies—they were no amateurs or dubs—compiled many of their reports from conversations heard in waterfront bars and restaurants and even on ferry boats. This should be sharp warning to easygoing Americans that expert spies are not all in storybooks and that careless talk may mean grim and heavy cost in American lives.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has done a fine job. The public's job is to help, not with hysterical spy-hunts but by setting a guard on its lips and by keeping its eyes and ears open in sober realization that the spy danger is neither unreal nor remote.

Controlling Runaway Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, majority leader of the House of Representatives, a radio address over a Nation-wide hook-up of the Columbia Broadcasting System, July 1, 1943:

My colleague, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, over this network last week presented an able and frank discussion on the dangerous threats of inflation. Tonight I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Columbia Broadcasting System for extending its facilities to me so that this discussion might be continued. I wish to talk to you particularly about the necessity for controls of rising prices and your participation in these controls.

Congressman PATMAN said the threat of run-away inflation is growing stronger. I wholeheartedly agree. It cannot be overemphasized that it is a dangerous threat. Unless there is courageous and immediate and continuing action on the part of all of us, this threat may seriously impair our way of life.

The main influence that brings about inflation is a sudden and unusual increase in money among the people without any proportionate or corresponding increase in things that money can buy—or too much purchasing power in relation to the physical volume of business being done.

Business, of course, is booming. There never was a time in this country's history when there has been such a tremendous amount of business. Fifty-two million people each day are toiling on farms, in factories, on our great transportation system, in mines and smelters, in offices and stores—the largest working force ever assembled in our country.

It is assembled—first and foremost—to satisfy the enormous production demands of this tremendous and total war. It is assembled—secondly, and let us never forget that this must come second—to satisfy, on a democratic sharing basis, the essential civilian needs.

You and I, and your neighbor and my neighbor, collectively constitute the United States Government. You and I and our neighbors are the principal customers for all the war material we can buy. And we are spending billions and billions of dollars. For you and I and your neighbor and my neighbor have accepted the battle challenge of the Governments of slavery. The will of the free people the world over is for complete victory—victory that will destroy the tyrants' yok forever and lift it off the shoulders of the oppressed. And we shall not lay aside our tools until that day is here.

Uncontrolled prices caused by excessive spending for civilian goods can prolong that day. Uncontrolled prices can make the cost of war and the cost of our essential civilian supplies prohibitive. Our Government has taken vigorous steps to keep prices down. But in order for the Government to be successful we must realize how terrible runaway inflation can be and we must cooperate fully with your Government in preventing it. This means the exercise of clear judgment, courage, and determination to control human selfishness. This means the willingness on the part of all of us to make sacrifices. Otherwise everyone will suffer.

Let me be frank. The huge shift of our productive capacity to the war effort has converted a large part of our industry to war production. This has reduced the amount of goods and services for farmers, wage earners, salaried workers, and shareholders, who now have more purchasing power than ever before. This more-than-usual purchasing power set against an inadequate supply of civilian goods has thrown supply and demand out of balance. Therefore it is the increase in demand and reduction in supply of civilian goods, which creates the danger of an explosive rise in prices.

The national income is now estimated at about $140,000,000,000. Out of this total about $15,000,000,000 are now being deducted for taxes. This leaves $125,000,000,000 to compete for $80,000,000,000 in available goods. The excess $45,000,000,000, which is about two billion less than our total national income a decade ago, can exert such a terrific pressure as to cause prices to skyrocket.

When prices run away the poor, in particular, suffer, as well as the fixed-income white-collar worker and the widow, who has a little savings or preferred stock. Holders of bonds, both Government and private, would likewise suffer. Every business concern in the land would be faced with uncertainties. In other words, the resulting economic disorder would be incapable of calculation.

If, for example, one bed or a radio, or any other item you may think of, was available for five persons having the money to purchase it, what do you think would happen to the price of that bed or radio if open to competitive bidding? Use this simple illustration and apply it to our whole economic life and attempt to picture the situation. This will give you at least an idea of what conditions would be under run-away inflation.

Let us go back 25 years for a real example of how ruinous inflation can be. One dozen eggs retailed at four trillion marks during the runaway inflation period in Germany after the last war. If the equivalent had happened here 12 eggs would have cost us $400,000,000,000. This would have been four times as much as our Government is now spending in 1 year to carry on this war.

The German Government, as you may recall, did little to finance the last war by taxation. It relied to the greatest extent on war loans, the subscription quotas on which could be met only with the help of a steady expansion in the amount of money outstanding. In other words, money was printed recklessly.

After the war conditions deteriorated rapidly in defeated Germany. Its financial obligation was far greater because of reparations. Nevertheless, the German Government continued to neglect imposing sufficient taxation. Prices went out of control. Money became dirt cheap. The government finally resorted to hypo-inflation to take resources from a demoralized people, and it finally required the help of foreign capital to stabilize economic conditions.

Many keen students of finance are studying our economic treads and the threat of inflation. Among them are many who know in detail the history of other inflations. All are agreed that the only way to protect ourselves against inflation is to reduce our buying; to increase our taxes, and to increase our savings. Unless we do so, we not only make inflation possible, we make it inevitable.

It must be understood that the upward spiraling of prices caused by the downward spiraling of the dollar substitutes an uncertainty for every certainty in the economic system. It substitutes an item of instability for every stable item in economic relations. It thereby vastly increases the difficulties of

Government and business, for it makes difficult the planning of the war and the long-range planning necessary for the post-war period. It endangers existing savings and insurance and makes difficult the planning of those personal programs of security, thus striking directly at the community's sense of well-being.

While the upward spiraling prices confers temporary profits on a few, it cuts the standard of living for the many.

The dangerous consequences of rising prices are widely recognized. Nevertheless, the hope always persists among some groups of the population that the advantage they get will be greater than their share of the general damage done. Such an attitude is extremely shortsighted for so thoroughgoing are the consequences of inflation that none can escape them; and any advantage is certainly temporary.

We are going to win the war. And we most certainly can shorten it by all groups pulling together. The only way to hold down prices, to paraphrase President Roosevelt's recent remarks, is to stop trying to find reasons for not holding them down here and for not holding them down there.

Although the Government must be the center of any effective program for holding down prices and insuring economic stability, we must carry out our share of the program by doing the following:

Buy and hold as many War bonds as we can afford.

Pay willingly any taxes that our country needs.

Pay off our debts and avoid making new ones.

Provide for our own future and the future of our families with adequate life insurance and savings.

Pay no more than ceiling prices. Buy rationed goods only by exchanging stamps.

Buy only what we need.

Don't try to profit from the war.

The dangerous inflationary situation can be averted only by courageous action on the part of public officials, with your support. It is up to each one of us to realize that when our Government takes strong measures to prevent inflation they are necessary steps to the winning of the war.

I want to stress particularly that we must lift ourselves above our personal reactions to Government controls. The Government can and it has already provided methods to control this vicious economic disease. But unless you cooperate by making all necessary sacrifices and unless you appreciate the necessity for strong measures to control prices, the efforts of your Government will be in vain.

The choice is ours, yours and mine, and each of us.

The responsibility is ours.

It's not up to the man next door.

It's up to us, each and every one of us, to work for tomorrow, today.

American War Dads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, since last December the fathers and mothers and other near relatives of men in the armed forces have been banding themselves together with common ties in an organization known as American War Dads, and this group of patriotic Americans have taken unto themselves the preservation of the cardinal principles of our forefathers in two respects, first in backing up our forces in battle and secondly a determined conviction of the peace to follow the war; they are 100 percent behind the American Legion in the program they have so faithfully sponsored since their organization.

Mr. Julius H. Almond, of Enid, Okla., and incidentally the president of Oklahoma Chapter, No. 5, at Enid, Okla., on June 22, 1943, delivered an address before the Oklahoma State organization of the W. C. T. U. and has ably set forth the tenets and activities of the War Dads organization. We think this patriotic and informative speech is worthy of a page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Almond is a native-born Oklahoman. He was a commissioned officer in World War No. 1 with many months in foreign service. He was in attendance at the then peace conference as a military officer, and today his son, his namesake, also a commissioned officer, is serving his country in the armed forces.

American War Dads are deeply concerned over the activities and administration of our Government and by their having organized no doubt much reform will result.

Mr. Almond's speech delivered before the Oklahoma W. C. T. U. organization is as follows:

Mrs. Atkinson, ladies, and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and gentlemen, I want to assure you that it is a privilege, an honor, and a pleasure to be with you this afternoon and speak to you on a subject in which I am vitally interested. Mrs. Atkinson, when she called me several days ago—and, incidentally, it was about the third time I had been asked to appear but bcause of other business was unable to do so—told me that I might choose my own subject. And when I tell you that I hadn't chosen it even after I walked in that door this afternoon, you may believe me. But I think you would all be interested in something that I have been thinking about, and that is, keeping faith. Keeping the faith for these boys and girls of ours who have gone out to fight the battle to preserve America for Americans, but before we get into that, I want to tell you frankly and candidly what I have learned about the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, your fine organization. For many years, as one of the laymen, so to speak, the rank and file, cross section of your Nation. I have heard of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and in each case it was always connected with something about temperance or the use of liquor. I want to tell you I have learned of your activities and that they have extended far beyond that one particular point. I observe that you have accomplished many things in your lines of endeavor; in fact that you are a distinct contribution to the community in many accomplished programs.

There are organizations of many kinds—civic clubs, fraternal organizations, organizations in the churches, different denominations, many of them—and they are good. Then we have, just recently, a new organization which has been titled the "American War Dads." Mrs. Atkinson gave it a new name, but I will accept it in reference to our organization, which is the national organization of the American War Dads. I happen to be president of the Enid Chapter, No. 5; we have nearly 500 members, one of the largest organizations in northwest Oklahoma; also State chairman of organization and extension, and recently they saw fit to make me a member of the national executive committee. I do not know why. We are a new organization. We started in December last year. After finding throughout the Nation many organizations, comprising fathers of boys in service and of sons in service, we set about to unify them and mold them into one known as the American War Dads. I mention that not as a glamour view, trying to promote the Americar War Dads, but merely to explain to you the facts about another organization coming into being, which will include the members of all organizations, I hope, throughout the Nation.

We have at this time many things confronting our Nation, too many things. To tell you or attempt to tell you what they are would be questioining your intelligence. I am sure you hear the radio and read the newspapers, perhaps not as I do, because I spend several hours a day with newspapers; like Will Rogers many times said, all he knew was what he read in the newspapers—and that just about fits me.

You know of the problems confronting not only our Nation, but the world, and your organization and other organizations are definitely doing something about it. The time has passed to talk so much about the terrible wrongs that are being done. The time has come to do something about them and we feel, in our organization, that we will be able to do something about them, definitely, before long. I might give you a word about the principles and reasons behind our organization, this all-inclusive organization. In the first place, the fathers of sons and daughters in the service—and we have something like eleven million of them, are rapidly banding themselves together throughout the Nation to back up and keep faith with our own flesh and blood in this conflict. To do that as quickly as possible to prove our numerical strength and unity. To assist in the early termination of this war in the right way, and that we may have a permanent and lasting peace. I might enumerate to you the four principles or basic objectives we have in our organization.

First. To assist, in any way we can, our boys and girls in camp or at the front.

Immediately comes to your mind a number of things that can be done in that regard. No. 1, I think, or uppermost, there would be the writing of frequent and cheerful letters to our boys and girls in the service. We know from having read the experiences in the letters of the boys, or those who have gone to visit them—Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and others—that nothing uplifts their morale like a cheerful letter from home; they have told you they would rather have a letter from home than something to eat. They don't mind so much going without food or sleep but they do mind not getting a letter from home.

Second. The second objective is to further unify and promote the effort on the home front. Ladies and gentlemen, that is a big order. The home front. Not the least by any means, as a part of this war, is the home front. It is all important, and we can see the things to be done. As individuals we all try to do our share, but as groups such as your own fine group, you know you can do so much more banded together than as individuals, and it is with this thought that we, as American war dads, feel that by unity and strength, we will be able to accomplish so much more in the effort on the home front. We could talk about that for weeks, we are going to have to continue to talk about that and to really do something about that. We have a situation in our country today—strikes seriously interfering with the production so vitally necessary in the production of implements of war, transportation of foodstuff and supplies to our boys and girls in distant

lands. I need not dwell on that; it would probably concide with what you think about it, but you can all see the need for something to be done immediately to relieve that situation. That is a definite part of the war dad's program; we have something in mind and are beginning to take definite and effective action. I have assisted in banding together more than 6,000 war dads in northwest Oklahoma alone during the past 90 days. Our national objective in membership is for 2,000,000 dads by the end of the year.

Third. In which we hope to have a definite hand in the post-war planning and permanent peace terms. If I had the time, I might tell yo uwhy I know something about the wrong and right way for peace. A lasting peace. It was my good fortune to be associated with the American commission to negotiate peace in 1919, following the other war. I was associated with Mr. J. C. Grew, secretary of the Commission, with Mr. William C. Bullitt, member of the International Law Section of the Commission. Later on, Mr. Grew was Ambassador to Japan and Mr. Bullitt Ambassador to Russia and France. I was associated with those men and know them well. I could see what was going on around the peace table in Versailles, near Paris. I was one of the 500 there. I had occasion to be in London on June 15, 1919, only 13 days before the peace was signed. As I walked along Trafalgar Square, I was faced with a placard there. The newsboys had on the card, three large headlines—Wilson Courting Treason. As an American officer, you can imagine the feeling I had.

There were many mistakes made at the last peace table. If I had time to tell you, I could enumerate many of them. I should like to mention some of the things we must consider and do in order to have a permanent peace in the future. I would call your attention to only a few. First, everyone should know that it is just as important to prepare for peace as it is to prepare for war. The requirements of preparation for peace are more complicated than for war, secondly, at the next peace table, in my opinion, there we will see a woman for the first time in the history of the world, and that woman, I believe, will be Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. I hope she is there, she can write my terms of the peace. Then I think, too, we must not lose sight of the fact that the small nations, the nations overrun, that have been starved, such as Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, and so forth, should be considered first, before any political subdivisions or boundaries are attempted, that those nations must be heard at the peace table and have full representation on the same basis as England, Russia, or America. Unless we give full consideration to all of them we will have World War No. 3, and if we have a World War No. 3, with the future advance of technological institutions, development of engineering and technology, we can understand it will be total oblivion, because if in the next 25 years we progress as we have seen progress during the period since the last war, in the air age, we can visualize that the next war will not last long, it will be annihiliation of civilization. So I think the considerations of the peace by every father and mother, every living person on the face of the globe, should be fully considered and weighed before the terms are finally written, and that is an all important factor for enduring peace. It is my opinion that it will probably take at least 5 years to work out a permanent and just peace. Now, you may be wondering why I am talking so much about peace. We were talking about peace when Pearl Harbor happened, ever since the first American Legion convention in 1919 the American Legion has been talking about peace, but about an armed peace. We must talk about peace, even when at war, and visualize the things absolutely necessary to end the war victoriously.

Then objective No. 4, ladies and gentlemen, would probably be No 1. were the conflicts over today, but it isn't over today by any means. We have only started. And that would be to assist in any way possible as an organization of war dads, in connection with the hospitalization, rehabilitation and reemployment of boys and girls when the conflict is over, briefly, to get them back into civilian life, so they could go ahead with their respective vocations and take up where they left off and continue to progress as Americans. That is a big order. Today they are already returning. The little town of Chickasha right now has the hospital filled with several hundred boys, already returned from World War No. 2. You know about that. That they are maimed, many of them helpless for life. Many of them can be rehabilitated and if the United States Government isn't going to do it, it is going to be the duty of the American War Dads to see that it is done. In the O'Reilly General Hospital in Springfield, Mo., I want to relate a recent incident. Mary, that is my good wife could not be here, so I brought Aunt Margaret Lewis, Mary was with me when I came through Springfield, we passed through a hospital filled with boys returned from World War No. 2, it was my occasion to visit with a man who had talked with some of the boys returned, he walked up to one with the colonel in charge, this was a young American boy of Italian parents, he had gone out in the southwest Pacific to fight for you and me. He had his right arm off at the shoulder, he was reading a book, with his left hand, incidentally the book was furnished by the local chapter of War Dads in Springfield. He was bright and cheerful, in response to queries. He was thanking him for the book made available by the War Dads. The colonel asked him if he might lift the sheet, the boy said, sure, the colonel lifted the sheet and revealed that the boy had no legs, right arm gone, both legs gone, the man said, "That's terrible, son, I am sorry." "Oh, that is all right," he replied, "I still have a good left arm left to give them hell." That is the spirit of America and of these 11,000,000 boys, the spirit of the dads and mothers throughout America, and the spirit that will carry this war to a successful and victorious conclusion. I could talk to you all day, I think my 20 minutes have gone to 30. I would say in closing what I mentioned in the beginning, we must keep faith with the boys and girls in whatever our endeavor, whether individuals or collectively, let's keep faith.

Resolution of the United States Selectee-Parents Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Servicemen surviving mud, water, and air hazards in this the greatest war in history deserve the right to have most to say and do in fashioning post-war in the United States of America. Flesh and blood home folks of these men—parents, wives, sisters, and brothers—they, too, will have much to say and do in backing up the victors of this war when they aid authorized post-war planning and action. They will join their men and boys who fight to preserve our United States by maintaining sufficient nationalism in order to meet any excessive internationalism: Wherefore it is

Resolved by the United States Selectee-Parents Legion at national headquarters, Cincinnati, Ohio, That—

1. Just as does American Legion Post 20, Miami, Fla., so do we endorse Journalist Damon Runyon's suggestion that national legislation be enacted now making provisions for the veterans of this war;

2. As other organizations of the last World War have done, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans, so does the Parents Legion propose to help see the men of this gigantic war given all necessary protection toward forming their own organization, of their own conception, free of outside interference or attempts to absorb them in some kind of a vain hope they might lose their own governing strength;

3. The Parents Legion goes further to resolve that the Military Affairs Committee of the Congress of the United States should report out of committee H. R. 2193 as it is, or as it may be amended in form, so that now we can show some real indication of the appreciation most every one of us feels for the magnificent, often tragic, sacrifices our boys and our men in the service make 24 hours a day, every day of this war. Let us tell them now that among other considerations we have for their future welfare, we fully intend they shall have immediate income upon receiving an honorable discharge from any branch of the armed forces at the rate of $50 per month for every month they have served since the first Selective Service Act was passed. They must not return to see a civilian life of chaotic incompetence and complacent indifference—they deserve all we can do, now as well as later;

4. The Parents Legion goes further to resolve that when this war is done, those first in the service should be privileged to come home first; and

5. It is further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to all Ohio Representatives in the Congress, with the recommendation that other chapters of the Parents Legion in other States do likewise, and that a copy of these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Adopted in regular meeting, June 11, 1943, at Cincinnati national headquarters, in session at Memorial Hall Auditorium.

GEO. ALBERT SHIVES,
Chairman, National Policy Committee.
ANDREW F. SCHAFER, Jr.,
President.
Mrs. ANDREW OWENS,
Secretary.

The Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over the Mutual Broadcasting System on July 1, 1943:

Some 60 years ago, because of the fear that cheap Chinese coolie labor would be flooding this country if not checked, Congress passed what is known as the Chinese exclusion law. Under that act no Chinese

were allowed to enter the United States except as merchants, or students, and since that time there has been no Chinese immigration into this country.

When the Immigration Act of 1921 was passed, commonly known as the quota law, and again in the Immigration Act of 1924, this exclusion of Chinese was continued and no Chinese were allowed to enter this country under our immigration quotas.

At the outbreak of the war, with the dastardly attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese, sentiment in this country was thoroughly aroused in favor of the Chinese people who, for so many years have valiantly resisted Japanese aggression. Even people who had not realized it before, now had to admit that China had been fighting a common enemy and that in keeping Japan occupied she had given us a chance to become better prepared. It is unfortunate that it took a national calamity to bring to public attention the debt which we owe to the brave people of China who for years, despite a poorly equipped army and only by sheer courage and will power, held the Japanese at bay.

When the United States joined China in the fight against Japanese aggression, the Japanese war lords immediately changed their tactics, and they started an intense propaganda program trying to convince the Chinese that they ought to throw in their lot with the Japanese in their fight for what they called a free Asia. They tried to convince them that the Japanese were their friends and that their so-called allies were only interested in broadening the sphere of influence of the white race. In this psychological warfare the Chinese Exclusion Act is one of the strongest weapons the Japanese have. They are using it as an example of the American's complex of white supremacy. They are using it to prove to the exhausted Chinese people that their allies treat them as inferior people who are not even welcomed in their country. Japanese broadcasts state, "While white people are free to live in China, the Chinese cannot live in the United States and every Chinese allowed to enter the States for a temporary visit is forced to undergo the most humiliating and disgraceful treatment." This propaganda has become such an important issue that it can no longer be disregarded.

Friends and admirers of the Chinese people began to voice their sentiments demanding that the discriminatory Exclusion Act be repealed. The Chinese are much too proud to ask for the repeal, but Americans, outstanding citizens of our country, decided that steps must be taken immediately to repeal this act in fairness to our great ally, China. Several bills were introduced in Congress and the list of witnesses who appeared in support of the bills to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws might have been taken from Who's Who in America. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I have the honor to be chairman, held hearings for over 3 weeks and heard well-known men and women who represented a fine cross-section of public opinion in this country. People from all walks of life, businessmen, authors, missionaries, who had lived in China for years were most emphatic in urging the repeal of the Exclusion Act in justice to our own principles of democracy as well as in fairneses to a great and loyal ally. Congressman Judd, Pearl Buck, Reverend McGee, and scores of other people who have spent years in China all agree that the Chinese people have long been perturbed by this exclusion law. They all agree that it is very much resented by the Chinese people and that it may be one of the most important factors in determining our future relationship with China. As Bishop Yu Pin, of China, stated before the committee, "His people might understand that it is difficult to get much material help to them at the present time, but they cannot be expected to accept any excuses for the continuance of such a discriminatory act." Many witnesses who discussed this problem with people in China explained to the committee that the Chinese Government is finding it difficult to counteract Japanese propaganda because the Chinese know that there is an Exclusion Act against them. They feel that th Chinese people are entitled to know what the score is. They feel that as our allies they have a right to know whether they are going to be treated as equals or whether we are going to continue our discrimination against them.

The strongest blow we could strike at Japan is to take away the basis for their vicious attack upon us by the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. Admiral Yarnell, who spent most of his time in the service, in the Pacific, is one of the best qualified men in this country to discuss this problem. As he stated in his testimony before the committee, "the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act is most essential not only for the future peace but as a vital war measure. Our main attack on Japan must come from the Chinese mainland and China must be encouraged in every way possible to continue war until we can give real military assistance. One of the most effective methods of sustaining Chinese morale would be the repeal of this act not only as a simple matter of justice, but as a recognition of the heroic resistance of China against our common enemy." This statement coming from an authority like Admiral Yarnell should not leave any doubt in anyone's mind as the advisability of such repeal for the best interests of our country in this fierce struggle in the Pacific.

As to the post-war effect of this repeal, it is worth while observing that China has a population of some 450,000,000 people who are facing their great industrial revolution. China after this war can become one of the most important markets for American goods while we may profit from her vast resources of raw material. As the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce stated in their resolution calling upon Congress to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws. "Our unfortunate method of restrictions is being exploited by Japan in its approaches to China. China is conscious of the stigma our exclusion laws have placed upon her nationals. Not only for the war effort but for the post-war period of reconstruction and trade development, the exclusion laws will be a barrier to best possible United States-China relations."

China is an important member of the United Nations, in war as well as in peace, and deserves all the help we can give her. Of course, it is true that we have sent military supplies—but we have not sent enough. Unfortunately, until the Burma Road is reopened, our help as far as military equipment is concerned will be limited. Therefore, it is even more important to give them all the moral support we can. Japanese propaganda that the Chinese are being neglected by their allies and that they are being treated as inferiors is as potent as Jap guns. Now is the time to wipe out the insult of American immigration exclusion legislation. That act of decency and justice would not cost us anything. By putting China on a quota basis we would allow but 105 Chinese to enter this country annually and to become citizens like all other legally admitted aliens. It is preposterous to claim that the admission of 105 additional people per year could throw our economic structure out of balance. It would mean nothing to us and a great deal to the Chinese Government in counteracting the Japanese propaganda among their people. It would mean a great deal to the courageous Chinese people who are entitled to have our friendship in deeds as well as in words.

As chairman of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee I have, for the last few weeks, listened to many arguments on this important legislation before the committee. I have considered every possible angle and have come to the conclusion that it is imperative that our committee bring this legislation to the floor of the House at the earliest possible time. But the committee has, for the time being, withheld its approval of this bill.

This is a vitally important measure, and Congress, as the Representatives of the people of this country, should be given a chance to cast the deciding vote.

By allowing this limited Chinese immigration within our quota laws we shall have paid a debt of gratitude to the Chinese nation. China has the will and the manpower to fight Japan until final victory. By utilizing this Chinese will and manpower we shall save the lives of many of our boys, whom otherwise we shall be obliged to send into the Pacific to fight the menace of Japan. We have a ready-made Army eager to fight our common enemy, a courageous Army which we cannot supply with implements of war as well as we would like to until the Burma Road is reopened. Let us at least give the fighting Chinese our moral support. Let us show them that we are really their friends. I know that by repealing the Chinese exclusion law we shall make a wonderful gesture of friendship and goodwill, and we will make millions of friends and gain millions of fighting soldiers.

We owe this duty to our own fighting men and we owe this duty to the valiant Chinese people.

Failure of the O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, attempts to defend O. P. A. almost invariably contain the complaint that the agency is being hamstrung by appropriation cuts or congressional restrictions. This defense, inspired very probably by the agency or its friends, is a sorry excuse for O. P. A.'s failure. If the agency is being hamstrung, the reason is clear enough. Congress is trying to rid the Government of a lot of power-drunk theorists.

No sane person discounts the danger of inflation or denies the necessity for price control. But we are forced to admit that little has been accomplished by O. P. A. to prevent the one or to enforce the other. O. P. A. is noted chiefly for its 2,700 lawyers and its efforts to defer its Ginsburgs from military service. It has refused to deal sensibly with farm prices, thus encouraging and almost necessitating farmer dealings with black markets if cost of production is to be had.

The agency is run by people inherited from the Leon Henderson regime. It seems to be the rule rather than the exception that they possess little practical experience in the fields which they seek to control. Their far-fetched rulings are the despair of businessmen throughout the country. Stories of overstaffing of offices are common. I cannot see that efficiency and economy have been the watchwords of O. P. A.

Few will deny that the average family is encouraged by present rationing poli-

cies to buy more sugar, coffee, shoes, and other items than they actually require or would normally purchase. The hysteria of scarcity forces them to buy, regardless of real need, against the time when they may not be able to buy. I have heard this statement time and again: "I don't need this, but my coupons are about to run out, and I'm afraid not to use them."

Rationing and price control are a bad job at best. There are many fine people in O. P. A. who are doing the best they can, and most of them are heartily sick of the mess they are trying to clear up. They know the Henderson heritage has smeared O. P. A. almost beyond salvage.

Effective control methods do not depend upon manifold regulations or top-heavy office staffs for success. Real freezing of prices has not been attempted, but where that step might have worked, the system of compromise which was adopted has simply begged the question and postponed the show-down. In either case, common sense appeals for patriotic cooperation in reasonable buying can be infinitely more effective than elaborate and sometimes confusing enforcement formulas. Unfortunately the public has not been made a partner in rationing and in price control. Henderson tried to ram them down our throats, and the program has never got over that bad start. The specter of an American gestapo, waiting to crack down upon the unwary, is still fresh in the minds of the people.

Americans have no fear of sacrifice or of hardship. They will follow wise leadership. They will respond to appeals to reason. But 10 times 2,700 lawyers cannot drive them. From its start, Office of Price Administration violated these fundamental principles. That is why O. P. A.'s policies are not working today.

Safeguards of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Hon. Joseph B. Ely, former Governor of Massachusetts:

[From the Boston Post of June 30, 1943]

ELY TELLS SAFEGUARDS OF NATION—BASIC RIGHTS SHOULD BE KEPT IN MIND IN THESE TIMES

"Citizens should not let themselves forget the fundamental safeguards which were written into the Constitution to protect the individual and minorities," Ex-Gov. Joseph B. Ely declared yesterday. "They should be kept in mind," he said, "when there is discussion of measures which have been enacted during the last 10 years."

ENGLISH SOCIALIST

The former Governor's statement follows:

"Harold Laski, in the foreword to Brogan's book entitled 'Government of the People,' wrote as follows:

"'The foreign observer can see without difficulty how the American Constitution could work without undue conflict in an epoch of remarkable growth. His problem is to understand whether the equilibrium it protects can be harmonized with the needs of an era in which, as in our own, the claims of property to a special position in the state are seriously challenged.'

"Brogan's book is used as a textbook in some of our most famous universities. Harold Laski is an English socialist. You can read his articles in American newspapers and magazines and you can hear his voice on occasion over your radio station.

"In the book itself Brogan writes:

"'The American Constitution is a specimen of a very rare historical achievement, the stopping of a revolution at the point most convenient for its original sponsors, the dream of all political innovators, the saying to the people, thus far and no farther, and the inducing of sobriety in the masses stirred out of their usual passivity, was achieved by the ingenious gentlemen whom President Harding called the founding fathers.'"

BOTH INFLUENTIAL HERE

"Had you ever heard that the people of this country were wildly revolutionary in their ideas of government and that it was necessary for Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison and John Adams to stop the progress of this wild demonstration by setting up the Government of the United States in constitutional form? I never did.

"My understanding of our historical development and the adoption of the Constitution of the United States was that as originally drafted it did not give proper protection to the States for the preservation of their own local governments; that it did not give proper protection to the home and that it did not protect them in the enjoyment of their freedom of worship, their freedom to hold property, and that, therefore, in order to secure its adoption by the States a promise had to be made that the first 10 amendments would be added to the original Constitution.

"I have quoted from Brogan and Laski's foreword to Brogan's book because both men have powerfully influenced the carefully planned movement of this Government away from the original moorings provided for it by the Constitution of the United States. Laski, the English Socialist and friend and confidant of some of the most powerful personalities in the government today, wrote in this same preface to the Brogan book as follows:

"'The Constitution he (Brogan) describes is one in which, behind the abstract formulae, can be discerned a clear effort to protect a certain view of property from invasion by the demands of the multitude. That such an attitude should so long have gone unquestioned is due, I think, above all to two things: It is due, in the first place, to the skill with which, behind the formal facade, the actual working of the Constitution has been adapted ceaselessly to new needs; and it has been due, in the second place, to the fact that America has genuinely been, to a degree unknown to Western Europe, the land of opportunity for the comparatively humble man.'"

WHAT MADISON SAID

"The two causes have, of course, been closely related; and they explain why, until quite recent times, it has been so largely unnecessary to ask in America those essential questions about the foundations of the state with which we in Europe have been largely concerned. They explain, for example, the curious absence from American political life of a socialist perspective to party action such as has been, with ourselves, one of the motivating forces of political policy.

"From this criticism, and that is what it really is, of our Government and the Constitution it might be interesting to take a look at some of the writings of James Madison for, after all, Madison was the real guiding genius of the Constitutional Convention. He gets back to the basis of government. Madison wrote:

"'As long as the reason of man continues fallible and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed. The diversity in the faculties of men from which the rights of property originate is not less an insuperable object to a uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government. From the protection of different and unequal faculties of acquiring property, the possession of different degrees and kinds of property immediately results and from the influence of these on the sentiments and views of the respective proprietors arises a division of the society into different interest and parties.'

"These different interests and parties Madison calls factions. He says that there are two methods of curing the mischief of factions. 'The one by eliminating its causes, the other by controlling its effects.' From these quotations you will see that Madison figured that men were of unequal abilities and were acquisitive."

WHY PLANNING WON'T WORK

"Just in passing it might be of some interest to comment that when the boys in Washington make the rules those rules are obliged to enter into a contest with the individual and varying abilities of about 100,000,000 men and women, who from various viewpoints and various motives are seeking, each in his own individual way, to circumvent their operation and to turn them each to his own advantage.

"That is one very potent reason why they do not work any better than they do. That is one reason why it will be quite impossible to plan our economy until we are made a docile people or, in more elegant language as described by one Rexford Guy Tugwell, 'a disciplined democracy.'

"Returning now to Madison and his logic, he said: 'There are two methods of removing the causes of factions: the one by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same possessions, and the same interests.' In other words, you could get rid of man's inequality of ability and his desire to get ahead if you destroyed man's liberty or if you could bring all the citizens into one groove and make them as alike as two peas in a pod, and could give each one of them the same possessions and the same interests. To state it another way, you can get rid of factions if you could regiment the people."

STILL TRUE TODAY

"I will agree that this is a blueprint that would furnish us with security, provided the someone who has to run the show were wise enough to do the planning. Madison remarked, as all of us, at least you and I will agree, that security at the secrifice of liberty is worse than the evil. He further remarked that human nature being as it is and probably always will be, it is certainly impossible to bring all men to the same viewpoint.

"These are truths which to me seem self-evident. It is on the basis of these self-evident facts that we must start to reason when we consider what a government can do for society.

"Will you agree with me that 'the most common and durable force of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property?' The quotations are again from James Madison. If you do agree with me that the unequal distribution of property is a source of factions and of constant dispute, then you will agree with Madison again that 'the regulation of these forms is the principal task of modern legislature.'

"What was true in Madison's day a century and a half ago is equally true of our times. It is doubtful if the world and the people who make it up have changed very much in the last 150 years, at least in this respect."

MINORITY PROTECTION

"Madison continued to write of factions and he said, 'When a majority is included in a faction, the form of popular government enables it to sacrifice to its ruling passions or interest both the public good and the rights of other citizens.'

"That is to say, in a pure democracy with no controls upon the majority, that government representing the majority without limitation, in its passion of the moment may well err in its direction, to the injury of the people and the government, to say nothing of depriving the citizens who represent the minority of what would otherwise be their rights. So, said Madison, 'from this view of the subject it may be concluded that a pure democracy can admit of no cure for the mischief of factions.'

"The purpose of the Constitution was to set up a Government to control the majority factions of society and to bring all factions into proper harmony, to their lasting and mutual advantage. For this purpose the Constitution was set up. It created a republican, as distinguished from a purely democratic form of government. It gave to the minority protection up to a certain point against the unbridled authority of a ruling faction, a majority faction."

THREE SEPARATE AGENCIES

"To restate that principle as Madison stated it in reference to the labors of the Constitutional Convention: 'To secure the public good and private rights against the danger of such a faction and at the same time to preserve the spirit and form of popular government is thus the great object to which our inquiries are directed.'

"What is the framework provided by the Constitution 'to secure the public good and private rights against the danger of factions and at the same time preserve the spirit and form of popular government'?

"The Constitution divides the responsibility of the Federal Government into three parts, each part exercising its authority, practically supreme in its own sphere. To the Congress was delegated the responsibility of legislation. The Congress was not given any authority to carry into execution these laws or to administer them in any way."

JEALOUSLY GUARDED

"To the President was given the Executive authority, the duty, and responsibility of seeing that the laws which Congress enacted were carried out. The Congress appropriated the money to run the Government, but the President spent the money in accordance with the plans which Congress made for him. These were two separate and distinct agencies of Government.

"The third agency was the courts. In framing the Constitution the founders sought to provide a judicial tribunal as impartial as could be humanly devised. To the courts was entrusted the responsibility of passing on the controversies that would arise between the state and its citizens, even to the point, in proper cases, of deciding whether or not either the Congress (the legislative authority) or the President (the Executive authority) had transgressed in its action against the Constitution.

"This segregation of authority in the three great branches of the Government was very jealously guarded as a means of preventing all the powers which protected the rights of the minority, or of the majority for that matter, from falling into the hands of one faction or of one individual.

"WICKED PROJECTS

"I believe that Madison felt it to be a very fortunate circumstance in the organization of our Federal Government that this was a federation of States, for he said:

"'A religious sect may degenerate into a political faction in a part of the confederacy; but the variety of sects dispersed over the entire face of it must secure the national council against any danger from that source. A rage for paper money, for an abolition of debts, for an equal division of property, or for any other improper or wicked project, will be less apt to pervade the whole body of the Union.'

"In passing it is interesting to note that Madison and his fellow workers looked upon a sharing of the wealth, the issuance of paper money and the abolition of debts as not only the best examples of improper governmental conduct but also as 'wicked projects.'

"Taking advantage of the existence of the States, the Federal Constitution was given specific powers which it was deemed necessary to give in order to afford dignity and the ability to enforce its councils upon the people, but all other powers not expressly granted to the Federal Government were reserved to the States."

FUNDAMENTAL SAFEGUARDS

"Here again the responsibility of government was divided and limitations were placed both upon the local government and the Federal Government in the exercise of authority to the end that the people might be protected in the enjoyment of their freedoms against the encroachment of a particular faction which had gained control of any particular branch of the Government. In the making of this national union the founders were very careful to provide that the representatives of the people in the legislature and in the executive chair should return periodically and ask for the approval of the people for what they had done.

"They further provided as to the legislative branch by dividing it into two separate houses, that not all of them went back to the people at the same time, in order that a further check might be given to the protection of the provisions provided by the Constitution to the rights of minorities and to the freedom of the individual. Each Congressman is elected every 2 years but only a third of the Senate is elected every 2 years.

"It would not seem to be necessary under any ordinary circumstances that the people of this country should be reminded of these very fundamental provisions in regard to their own government. But as all of my reasoning in this present crisis starts from an unwavering faith in the soundness of these provisions for the protection of liberty, I am fearful that whatever argument might be used in a discussion of special topics or measures which have been proposed and enacted during the last 10 years will not be understood or fully appreciated unless the reasoning starts with a good knowledge of the attributes of the Federal Constitution in the forefront of our minds—and furthermore no one else ever seems to make any reference to it."

The Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. H. CARSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Martin Agronsky, staff correspondent, Blue Network, on Sunday, June 27, 1943:

As we near the end of our nineteenth month at war two major trends are visible in this country. One is our growing strength abroad on the war fronts. The other is critical internal disunion here on the home front. Here in the Nation's Capital, optimism as to the future course of the war among our commanders and leaders is deep, sure, and unwavering. Equally as prevalent among all observers is pessimism and uncertainty about our future on the home front.

One of the favorite remarks of most of those whose business it is to watch and evaluate the Washington scene is this—the President ought to call a peace conference for the home front. It is a remark that you hear repeated in every section of the Capital—in labor groups, in Capital groups, up in the legislative halls on Capitol Hill, in the myriad and teeming offices of the various Government agencies, among the men on the street, and, if you bother to ask visiting soldiers and sailors in the city's parks, as I did, you find they share the same impression. There is nothing obscure about why the impression of growing confusion and disorganization persists in the United States.

Our home front troubles come from the basic causes of rising prices, fixed wages, lack of a centralized food policy and lack of set policy to correct any one or all of these things. The coal strike stems essentially from the complaint of the coal miners that their present wages are insufficient to permit them to live decently in the face of the persistently increasing cost of living. No one defends the miners for striking and harming the war effort as they undoubtedly did by forcing some great steel works to bank their blast furnaces. However, taking an unbiased approach to the miners' attitude, there is a certain amount of right on the miners' side. Their living conditions are bad, the cost of living has risen—especially in food—to disproportionate heights. Their grievance seems understandable though nothing could justify their striking. What the miners were striking for, however, is what all labor groups in this country are disturbed about and that goes for all American workers too and for the section of the population known as the white-collar class. It is the same old story—that wages are not keeping pace with rising prices and that real economic privation threatens the great percentage of the American population. In time of war it is correct to argue that nothing should matter but the well-being of the men on the fighting front. That is true. It is also true that no American workers of any category—no matter what their living conditions—are enduring anything even comparable to what our soldiers and sailors and air force men are facing without complaint hourly.

The problem of inflation—of lack of a good and workable policy of food growing and distribution—are essentially Government problems, and what seems to be the trouble here at home is that government has not successfully met that problem. Today there is, for example, a real corn famine in the United States. We can't get the corn we need in the East to feed our livestock or even to produce corn meal for food purposes. Two large American corn meal mills have had to close down. It's not that we lack corn in the United States. There is just as much corn being produced today in the great middle-western Corn Belt as has ever been produced. The trouble is that the farmers are using the corn to fatten their pigs because they figure that the ceiling price on corn is so low they do better to fatten their livestock than sell it on the market. That's something that the Government must control. Another thing is the presence of ceilings in one part of an industry and lack of ceilings in another part of the same industry. The cattle industry provides a good example of that. We have

today a tremendous surplus of beef cattle in the United States. At the same time we have a growing shortage of beef throughout the country. Even for the armed forces who have always for good reasons been able to eat better than the rest of us, there was a dangerous shortage of beef. Steaks were becoming a rarity in our Army camps. The reason for this is clear enough. There is no ceiling placed on the amount of money a cattle grower may ask for his livestock from the meat packer. At the same time the Government has placed a ceiling on the price that the cattle packer may ask in selling his slaughtered meat on the market to distributors and butchers. Because of the cattle packer's ceiling he is unwilling to buy beef from the grower at a price which will not give him a profit in selling the meat to the distributor. The ceiling the packer has to meet is too low for him to offer the grower a price that the grower will accept. Hence the cattle grower keeps his beef unsold and we have beef starvation in the midst of beef plenty.

Again it's a business for the Government. It's up to the Government to work out a system which will satisfy both packer and grower and make beef available to the country again. The corn famine and the beef famine threaten to be duplicated by a milk famine—when we should have surpluses, not shortages of milk. At the same time we are facing a vegetable shortage because canners, uncertain of ceiling prices, hesitate to buy vegetables at existing prices. That means that the vegetables now ready for market may rot before they are bought. Well, behind the whole mess, seems to lie the absence of any fixed Government food policy. The fault here seems to be shared by both the President and Congress. The President has come out for subsidies. Congress has just knocked his plan on the head. At the moment, Congress also seems to be preparing to force through powers for Food Administrator Chester Davis that would make him food czar in fact as well as in name. The President has declared he is opposed to one man being in absolute control of our food policy. All along the line the President and Congress have tangled on matters of internal policy.

The conflict is not a hopeless one as some pessimists seem to think. It can be resolved by compromise and the feeling is growing here in the capital that it must be resolved and soon in order to hasten the end of the war. Powerful compromise forces are growing up though it is too early to name them. Observers here in both camps are not joking—they are in deadly earnest—when they say that what the President must do is call a peace conference in Washington for the home front.

Don't Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune:

DON'T FORGET

The write-a-letter idea is just as important and imperative today as at any time since the first United States servicemen left the shores of this country.

This has been called to our attention by several letters that have recently arrived from boys in both the Atlantic and Pacific areas of war in which they say that if the folks back home would only keep writing it would make the task of serving in the Army, Navy, and Air Service much easier.

It is too bad that the folks back home have to be reminded of the importance of keeping up the line of correspondence. The correspondence line is almost as important as the convoy line and supply line and the lines of communication generally. It is highly important to the maintenance of a high standard of morale.

At the outset of our participation in the war much was said about writing to the boys in the camps and the boys who were leaving for foreign lands and waters to carry the torch of democracy and decency. Organizations started movements and propaganda was spread everywhere urging everybody to write to his boy or brother or to some lad from his neighborhood so that they might be among those receiving mail when it was passed around in camp. There seems, however, to have been some let-up in the letter-writing activity and some reminders of the importance of keeping it up will undoubtedly do some good.

Any let-up in the program of letter writing is certainly only due to thoughtlessness. If there was one campaign that met with 100-percent interest and cooperation it has been the write-a-letter campaign. Any little lag will undoubtedly be more than taken care of by just a few words of reminder. The love and the respect and the devotion of the folks at home for all those in the service is so great that there is one thing that will be kept up as a first and a must and that is the writing of letters to those who are away. There is no greater thrill than to be among those receiving letters when the mail is passed out and there is no greater disappointment than to be there waiting and to have no letter arrive.

Some people think that unless they write long letters the purpose is not accomplished. That is not so. The one in service would rather get one each day even though it is short than to have to wait a week or 10 days for a long one. There is nothing to make them feel better and to contribute to their happiness than news from home. News from the family circle comes first, news from the groups in which they moved comes second, and general community news comes next.

Keep up the write-a-letter program until the war is over.

National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois:

Whereas on March 10, 1943, there were presented to the Congress of the United States two plans devised by the National Resources Planning Board, which plans make proposals for fundamental changes in almost every phase of the American way of life; and

Whereas these plans have been transmitted to the Congress with the request that they be given consideration during the present session of the Congress; and

Whereas millions of American citizens who would be vitally affected if these plans were to be adopted into legislation are absent from their homes at this time as members of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps or in associated services, and, during such absence, are unable effectively to express their views on this subject; and

Whereas it would be manifestly unfair to enact into law, during their absence, any plan designed to change that same system of government which our citizens in the armed forces are fighting to preserve; and

Whereas the task of winning all of the wars in which we are presently engaged is so gigantic that it requires the concentrated effort of every citizen; and

Whereas this is not the time for the people or the Congress to be distracted by the injection of controversial proposals concerning theoretical social gains from the single purpose of winning the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That we hereby petition the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which has for its purpose any change in the fundamental concept of the constitutional form of American Government, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and amendments thereto, particularly those amendments known as the Bill of Rights, at least until such time as the members of our armed forces and associated services have been brought home, demobilized, and given an opportunity to express their views; and be it

Resolved further, That copies of this preamble and resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, and to each of the Senators and Representatives therein from the State of Illinois, and to the legislatures of all other States of the Union, that those of the same view may take similar action.

Adopted by the senate March 18, 1943.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurred in by the house of representatives June 17, 1943.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
B. O. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Alabama Ordnance Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable work being done at the Alabama Ordnance Works prompts me to call the attention of the House to it at this particular time. Last month, on May 11, to be exact, the Alabama Ordnance Works marked the second year from the date on which ground was broken for the project.

This plant is located on the banks of the Coosa River between Birmingham

and Montgomery, Ala. It was constructed ahead of schedule and at one time had a pay roll amounting to more than $1,000,000 a week. When construction was at the peak there were 28,000 employees. The majority of people who worked on the construction were from Alabama and the neighboring Southern States. There were, however, many skilled workmen from all parts of the country.

Houses sprung up all around the project. At one time there were over 700 trailers housing workmen and their families. It was estimated that over 1,000 automobiles left Birmingham every morning for Childersburg and returned every evening. Two railroads ran spur tracks into the grounds. Huge trestles were built across the numerous streams that run into the Coosa River. A 100-foot highway was built with two large bridges and an overpass that enabled workmen to come and go from the office building to the main highway. Several hotels were built on the highway to accommodate workmen and their families.

The Alabama Ordnance Works is now the largest combination powder and explosive plant in the United States. Many thousands of operators are employed there.

The plant consists of miles of buildings, huge pumping stations, power plants, igloos, and acres of warehouses. There are 35 miles of railway and 37 miles of highways running through the plant. There is a water storage capacity of 13,715,000 gallons, 96,247 feet of sewer lines, and 249,351 feet of electrical service lines.

The commanding officer and constructing quartermaster during the construction of the plant was Col. James D. McIntyre, Ordnance Department, United States Army. Although born at the West Point Military Academy, Colonel McIntyre is an Alabamian. Like his father, Maj. Gen. Frank McIntyre, United States Army, retired, Colonel McIntyre has been in the Army all of his life. Colonel McIntyre is from Montgomery, Ala., where his family has resided nearly 100 years.

During construction the Government staff consisted of about 19 officers and 500 civilian employees.

This is an example of splendid administrative work on the part of the Ordnance Department of the Army under the leadership of Maj. Gen. Levin H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Ordnance. It is also a very splendid testimonial to the administrative ability of Colonel McIntyre who, as I have said, was the commanding officer and constructing quartermaster during the construction of the plant.

We in Alabama are proud of this achievement and appreciate very deeply the part we have been able to play in this great undertaking.

On behalf of all my constituents I want to congratulate the Ordnance Department, its gallant chief, and especially Colonel McIntyre for the great work he did while in command at Alabama Ordnance Works.

Col. Charles H. Traeger is now the commanding officer of this great establishment, and I tender to him also the congratulations and thanks of his Alabama neighbors.

Roosevelt Maintains His Lead in South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, despite caustic criticisms bandied about by many Roosevelt baiters in and out of the House, it is interesting to note the recent Gallup Poll indicating the favor with which our President is still received, particularly in the South among Democrats. The following New York Times editorial is most illuminating:

ROOSEVELT MAINTAINS HIS LEAD IN SOUTH—IS STILL CHOICE DESPITE SOME LEADERS' CRITICISM

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., July 1.—Although President Roosevelt has been sharply criticized by many southern political leaders and writers, his standing among the rank and file of southern Democratic voters as a candidate for 1944 is virtually as high as among Democrats elsewhere.

In its latest periodic check-up of the popularity of various candidates who have been suggested for the Democratic nomination next year, the institute finds that Mr. Roosevelt is the choice of 80 percent of the Democratic voters of the South, as against 83 percent among Democrats throughout the country as a whole.

The vote of preference for him in the South is four times greater than the combined vote for six other men who have been discussed as possible Democratic standard bearers for next year.

The second choice of southern Democratic voters is one of their own native sons, James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, the War Mobilzation Director. He outranks HENRY A. WALLACE in popularity with southern Democrats, although Mr. WALLACE is second to President Roosevelt in the choice of Democrats throughout the Nation.

In conducting its survey among Democratic voters the institute handed each respondent a list of seven men, including the President, who have been talked about recently as possible Democratic candidates for 1944. Each voter was asked:

"Which one of these men would you prefer as the Democratic candidate for President next year?"

The vote of southern democrats is as follows:

	Percent
Franklin D. Roosevelt	80
James F. Byrnes	8
Henry A. Wallace	6
James A. Farley	3
Paul V. McNutt	2
William O. Douglas	1
John G. Winant	(1)

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Chinese Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization held hearings on the subject of extending to China the immigration quota principle, which has been the sound policy of our Government since 1924 in determining the number of immigrants to be admitted annually from various countries of the world. Under that formula the Chinese would be allowed an annual quota of 107 selected individuals. To extend them this quota would put them on a basis of equality with our other allies and remove for all time the one sore spot in our relations with China.

During the hearings the statement was made that this matter apparently was not considered of much importance by the Chinese, because practically all the requests came from Americans rather than from the Chinese. The basic reasons for the Chinese reticence is their own sense of dignity and pride. Their record for 5,000 years as well as for the last 6 years will stand without any need for them to advertise or argue it. They realize that our discrimination against them, while pretending to be their best friend, is a reflection more on us than on them.

However, to make the record clear that they do feel deeply on the subject, and that those among them who are America's best friends realize that such action by Congress would greatly strengthen their own position as they try to combat Japan's propaganda against us and to increase enthusiasm among the Chinese common people for the cause of the United Nations, I have asked permission to include in the RECORD a cablegram just received by the International Missionary Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, and the Federal Council of Churches, all with offices in New York.

The cablegram is signed by the General Secretary of the National Christian Council, which is an organization representing practically all of the thousands of Chinese Christian churches, as well as the Protestant mission boards carrying on religious, agricultural, educational, and medical work in China.

CHUNGKING.

Revised immigration laws would greatly enhance traditional friendship China and America, have incaculable good effect international relations.

Bishop W. Y. CHEN,
General Secretary, National Christian Council.

Peace Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN A. DAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution by the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Whereas the United States is engaged in a horrible global war to preserve our national independence declared in 1776, to maintain our free economic system and our traditional American way of life; and

Whereas the proponents of world government in the United States, instead of directing their attention and energies to the winning of the war, continue to use the war in a mad drive for a commitment of our Government to a post-war new world order; and

Whereas the proponents of world government agree that if their scheme becomes a reality, the United States must surrender her sovereignty, must surrender her control of her defense forces, must surrender her right to enact tariff laws, must surrender her right to coin money and regulate the value thereof, must surrender her high living standards and accept for her citizens a lower standard of living and a greater tax burden; and

Whereas if we become a part of world government by thus surrendering our sovereignty we would be returning to the same condition of servitude in which we were prior to 1776 and the galling chains our Revolutionary forbears broke would again be forged around us; and

Whereas our founding fathers, whom the world has praised for their patiotism and wisdom, believed and hoped that the admirable system which they founded and bequeathed to us would serve us and endure for all time, but the proponents of world government maintain that the work of our founding fathers was but folly, that our constitutional and representative form of government is a failure and that the glories of the Republic of the United States have faded and have come to an end: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Illinois, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in annual encampment assembled this 24th day of June 1943, in Chicago, Ill., That we denounce the proponents of world government for their weakening of the war effort of our people and their breeding of disunity and confusion in attempting to use the war to bring about a surrender of our Republic to a new, supreme, sovereign, world government, that we call upon all persons interested in writing a lasting peace to postpone discussion of peace plans until after our fighting men have returned from the battle fronts of the world and can participate in discussions and decisions on plans and terms of the peace which they won, and that we request the officers of the Government of the United States to formulate plans for peace which will not imperil our American sovereignty, our American rights, our American independence, our American standard of living, and our American tradition, and without the commitment of our Government except as directed by the vote of our people.

Adopted June 25, 1943, by unanimous vote of the encampment.

The Food Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will it ever be possible for the one person who has the authority to get the different agencies dealing with the food program together and get busy with the idea of saving the food crops of this country and simplifying regulations?

Crops of vegetables have been canned and are being withheld from the market because there is disagreement in allowing increased labor costs the canners incurred in their processing being included in the price they will receive for their pack.

Let us have someone with a modicum of common sense in charge of the program and tell the canning industry to go ahead and do the job in a common sense practical manner.

The Secretary of the Ohio Canners Association, Mr. Roy Irons, writes me, in part, as follows:

No canner can do a first-class job when he is confused with a lot of rules and regulations that he does not understand. There are short cuts in the canning business and to travel a long red tape road now leads to more confusion and poorer results. Every canner today is afraid to go ahead in the manner his common sense and practical experience dictates is most advisable to get best results. It is this fear that is holding back the normal operations of food canning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that surely something should be done to see that we are not hungry this winter. I have had one canner tell me he was going to put up 50 percent of his crop at a loss as that was the amount the Army and Navy needed and his only son was in service and to h—— with the remainder.

We know the pea crop in Ohio is a failure and in Michigan it is much less than anticipated—but must it rot because of indecision awaiting the regimentation which they fear is the main purpose of our higher-ups, or is the belief gathered in Work Projects Administration days that the votes of the hungry are more easily corralled by a hand-out.

Look at the situation shown in the following copy of a letter which I am inserting here. Maybe the cherries are supposed to rot instead of being processed. Here it is July 1 and no reply to a request made on May 19.

CLYDE, OHIO, *June 26, 1943.*

MR. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Chairman, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our red sour cherry crop will be ripe and ready for the market in 10 days, and up to this time we have not received authority from anyone in Washington as to what we shall pay the grower for these cherries. Without a price we cannot very well purchase them.

We are without any price from the Office of Price Administration on the sale of cherries or any reply to our request for increase in ceiling price of last year, caused by the necessary increased hourly wage of cannery workers in competition with the war plants and other Federal agencies in our immediate vicinity. We have approval of our schedule price from the War Labor Board, providing our increased costs are approved by the Office of Price Administration. Our request has been in since May 19 to attention of Mr. Carl A. Auerbach.

It is over 6 months since we have been trying to get something definite out of Washington, and we have but 10 days more in which to act, and unless something is done we will not be able to operate our cannery and pack the cherries this year, even for the Army which have demanded from us double the amount of cherries that we will be able to furnish caused by crop prospects of 15 to 20 percent of normal.

One would think that after 6 months of consideration that something could be done for the canning industry. If it were not for the penalty of a year in jail and heavy money penalties, we would take a chance on operating our plant and depending on the proper adjustment later and save this food which is so badly needed.

It is necessary for someone in Washington to act immediately, or these cherries will not be put into cans this year.

If there is anything you can do to help us save this fruit, please do it immediately and oblige.

Yours truly,

THE CLYDE KRAUT CO.,
W. W. WILDER,
President.

Meat Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, if the O. P. A. were doing as good a job as the farmers and livestock producers, we would have meat in our stores and on our tables. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics reported that there were 78,170,000 head of cattle on ranges and farms on January 1, 1943, an increase of approximately 3,000,000 head over the total on January 1, 1942. By January 1, 1944, it is expected that the cattle population will have risen to 82,400,000. The average cattle population of the country is approximately 67,000,000 head, so that by the end of this year, it will be about 15,400,000 larger than the prewar average for all heads of cattle. The same story is true in other livestock. The hog population was increased by more than 13,000,000 head during 1942. It is estimated that the 1943 pig crop will be 125,000,000 head, contrasted with last year's record of 105,000,000.

In view of these figures, my people ask "Why are small packing houses closing down when more animals await slaughter than ever before? Why do we have meat shortages in the midst of plenty?" The answer is apparent: Failure of the O. P. A. in its meat-control program, as well as numerous other programs, caused by confusion, red tape, and at times contradictory O. P. A. regulations, all of which are the results of too many attempted practices of theorists rather than the operations of practical, experienced personnel. What we need in O. P. A. is men who will issue regulations based on good common sense. We cannot afford to experiment any longer, especially when such experimentation is being done at the expense, and is a direct threat, to the livelihood of every American. We here in Congress want to put a stop to this bungling and confusion and I hope we can do it now.

Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Prohibition," published in the May 20, 1943, edition of the Stars and Stripes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROHIBITION

They're at it again in America, and even as in the days of World War No. 1 we may yet hear that America is "dry."

Most of us in the United States armed forces could not be classed as violently opposed to liquor control, for most of us believe in moderation. On the other hand, there are few of us who could be included in the group of Americans who felt "the noble experiment" was a huge success.

It is with alarm, therefore, that we learn of the growing political strength of the anti-liquor crowd in the United States.

Taking advantage of wartime conditions and restrictions, the new prohibition group is working night and day for legislation which will give America prohibition, in fact if not in name. Using the tactics of the farm bloc, the antiliquor crowd is tacking on amendments to practically every military appropriations measure in a desperate effort to secure prohibition or the nearest thing to it they can force through Congress.

Rationing is playing into their hands and gives them a good excuse, and no opportunity is missed to use this excuse in their effort to limit the production and distribution of liquor of all types.

We can remember the days of prohibition, when moonshine whisky made quick fortunes for bootleggers, crooked politicians, and dishonest police officials. As a result, we claim we know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control.

Oil and Gasoline Rationing in Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to Mr. Ralph K. Davies from the Oil Controller of Canada:

DEPARTMENT OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY,
OFFICE OF THE OIL CONTROLLER,
Toronto, Ontario, June 10, 1943.

RALPH K. DAVIES, Esq.,
Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, New Department of Interior Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIES: I am advised by our representative to your office of the formation of a Conservation Committee consisting of members from your organization and other agencies, and the wish which has been expressed that at future meetings of this committee, both your Mr. Fred G. Jackson and our Mr. C. R. Brasier should attend in order to answer any questions that might be asked regarding our conservation measures, and which might be helpful to you in the consideration of your problems.

In the light of this request, I feel this might be an opportune time to write you regarding our activities along the line of conservation of all petroleum products. On March 31, we completed the first year of gasoline rationing under the coupon system, and I may say there were many pitfalls experience taught us to avoid in the preparation of the ration plan for the succeeding year. We found after considerable study that it is well-nigh impossible to identify the pleasure car as such; a wide check of individual cases was made and in a country such as ours—sparsely settled—and with urban transportation facilities quite inadequate, there is some emergency and essential driving in every car. Accordingly, we established a new basic category, known as the AA; our objective was to hold as many as possible down to this category, and you will see as you read further that we accomplished this.

The AA ration book contains 40 units, which at a value of 3 Imperial gallons per unit, allows each user 120 Imperial gallons (144 United States gallons) per year, or the equivalent of 2,160 miles per annum. This basic category is given to each registered passenger vehicle.

After the basic AA, we have created five categories, namely A, B, C, D, and E, which allow the following maximum additional mileages:

	Miles
Category A	3,240
Category B	6,480
Category C	9,720
Category D	12,960
Category E	16,200

It should be borne in mind that these are maximum allowables, and the mere fact that an individual can justify additional mileage over and above his AA, it does not follow that he will be granted the ceiling of the category within which he falls. For example, we tailor his book. If he can substantiate 9,000 miles of driving, we take into consideration the 2,160 miles he receives in his AA, and will grant him additional coupons to cover the difference, namely 6,840 miles.

Incidentally, the only drivers who can qualify for anything higher than category C are provincial police, some rural doctors, some rural veterinarians, certain service cars used in connection with war plants, a limited number of individuals engaged in the production of timber, and a few Government cars.

Our second ration plan has now been in effect for something over 2 months, and I am happy to state that of the total passenger vehicles registered in Canada, 68.8 percent receive nothing more than the basic AA category—we have eliminated from this percentage the forty-eight-thousand-seven-hundred-and-odd passenger vehicles which have no more than an AA, but are included in our wartime industrial-transit plan, which I will explain later. Further, of the special categories issued, 61.3 percent receive no more than an A category or a portion of an A, and 30.5 percent received B category, or a portion thereof. These percentages may alter somewhat for we are still receiving a few requests for higher categories. Incidentally our gasoline ration plan has been Nation-wide since its inception on April 1, 1942, and all Provinces are treated in a like manner.

In respect to commercial vehicles, all taxicabs and livery cars have been limited to 25,000 miles per year, and this restriction has been in effect since November 1, 1942. All commercial vehicles, with the exception of common carrier trucks, operating on scheduled routes to supplement our overburdened railroads, and a few others such as those engaged in logging operations, public-utility maintenance work, have been drastically rationed. Today no truck can exceed a 35-mile radius from its home base without a permit, and cross hauls have been eliminated. These restrictions have been worked out in conjunction with the transit controller and the administrator of services. I will not burden you with all the details relative to them, but I feel we can safely say that as a result of their restrictive orders, we are effecting a saving, in respect to the 230,000 trucks in operation in Canada, upward of 500,000,000 truck-miles per annum.

With respect to industrial workers, we have evolved a most interesting plan known as the wartime industrial transit plan. Under this plan, industrial workers who cannot get to work by regular means of transportation are eligible to be included in the plan, but they have to share their cars, and in this way we keep driving down to a minimum for any one plant. A transit officer appointed by the management of the plant keeps a very strict record of all cars used in transportation, and he, himself, distributes gasoline coupon books as needed. We have found this plan of inestimable value, for it has eliminated thousands of requests for special categories to enable individuals to get to work. The plan in respect to each plant is reviewed once a month and coupon books are issued on a monthly basis.

As regards motor boating, both inboard and outboard, the restrictions imposed in the last rationing year on pleasure boating were so severe that the total consumption in all Canada only amounted to approximately 189,000 gallons. The unit value at that time was for the greater portion of the summer season, 4 gallons. With our present unit value of 3 Imperial gallons, we can expect at least a 25-percent reduction this year. The allowances we have made for the present rationing year are as follows:

OUTBOARD MOTORS

The allowances below are designed to give approximately the same number of running time to engines in this classification.

Class	*Units*
1. 2 horsepower and under	1¼
2. Over 2 horsepower but not exceeding 6 horsepower	2
3. 6 horsepower but not exceeding 10 horsepower	2½
4. 10 horsepower	3

INBOARD MOTORS

The allowances below are designed to give approximately the same number of hours running time to engines in this classification.

Class:	*Units*
5. 10 horsepower and under	2
6. Over 10 horsepower but not exceeding 20 horsepower	3
7. Over 20 horsepower but not exceeding 30 horsepower	4
8. Over 30 horsepower but not exceeding 40 horsepower	5
9. Over 40 horsepower but not exceeding 50 horsepower	6
10. Over 50 horsepower but not exceeding 60 horsepower	7
11. Over 60 horsepower but not exceeding 70 horsepower	8
12. Over 70 horsepower but not exceeding 80 horsepower	10
13. Over 80 horsepower but not exceeding 90 horsepower	12
14. Over 90 horsepower but not exceeding 100 horsepower	14
15. Over 100 horsepower but not exceeding 125 horsepower	16
16. Over 125 horsepower	18

The allowances are so small with respect to inboard motors that owners of these boats are not putting them into service.

The conservation of fuel oil has been, and is, a very live subject with us. As a matter of fact, we commenced to restrict the consumption of fuel oil in 1940. In September of that year our Order 002 was issued prohibiting the installation of all types of oil-burning equipment where the consumption would exceed 4,000 imperial gallons (114 barrels) of fuel oil annually. In June 1941 we decided to go still further and our Order 004 prohibiting the installation of all types of oil-burning equipment except by special permit was issued, and thereafter no permits were granted for heating installations or other purposes not connected with the war effort.

In August 1941, and again in November of the same year, all commercial and industrial users of fuel oil in Canada were warned to immediately consider the best plans for converting heating plants from oil to some alternate fuel. As we found this voluntary approach inadequate, we decided to make it mandatory for all commercial heating plants to convert their oil heating equipment. Accordingly, in May 1942, all commercial and industrial users were advised that the use of fuel oil for heating or the production of steam or hot water would be prohibited after July 31, 1942, and that some steps should be taken to convert such plants to the use of other fuels. This requirement was made mandatory by our order 004A of August 31, 1942, and covered all types of buildings, factories (including plants on war production), warehouses, office buildings, schools, churches, hospitals, institutions, apartment buildings, boarding houses, Provincial and Federal Government buildings, Army cantonments, barracks, administrative offices, etc., etc.

To further ease the fuel-oil situation, and knowing full well that a barrel of asphalt is the equivalent of a barrel of fuel oil, on June 1, 1942, regulations were introduced to drastically reduce the use of asphalt. With a view to increasing the available supply of fuel oil in order to care for our rapidly mounting war effort, Canadian refiners were directed in June 1942 to change their refinery runs so as to reduce gasoline production to as low a figure as possible. The cooperation was wholehearted and I am happy to say that refinery runs were drastically altered and these changes have been maintained.

The records of our office indicate that the consumption of fuel oil for all purposes up to May 31, 1942, was at the annual rate of 35,236,000 barrels—this was our peak consumption. As our order making it mandatory to change over from fuel oil to a substitute fuel became effective August 31, 1942, it will not be possible to make a full year's comparison until August 31, 1943. However, as of April 30, 1943, our annual rate of consumption was down to 32,981,000 barrels, or a drop in the annual consumption rate of 2,255,000 barrels.

The foregoing saving was effected despite our soaring war effort and the increase in our Navy from 13 vessels with a permanent strength of less than 1,800 men in September 1939, to over 500 vessels manned my 44,000 men as of today. The majority of these units are fueled in our own waters. Increases in our production of war materials ranging as high as 1,000 percent were achieved in 1942 in comparison with 1941. I give below a few of these comparisons:

	Percent increase 1942 over 1941
Ships	185
Aircraft	158
Mechanical transport	95
Guns and small arms	981
Shells and bombs	143
Chemicals and explosives	102
Tanks and armored vehicles	857
Small arms ammunition	206
Instruments and communication equipment	1,083

I believe the foregoing gives you a comprehensive picture of what we are doing in the matter of conservation, and with your kind permission, I am sending a copy of this letter to our Washington representative, Mr. C. R. Brasier.

Yours very truly,

G. R. COTTRELLE,
Oil Controller.

Scarcity of Meat

REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and other Members from city districts have complained frequently about the shortage of meat, and particularly beef. That situation is not peculiar to the large cities or to the eastern seaboard. It prevails over the entire country. Kansas is one of the leading cattle-producing States. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, there were in Kansas last January 1 almost 4,000,000 cattle and calves; to be exact, 3,889,000. Over 3,000,000 of these were beef cattle. There are more cattle in Kansas today than there have been any year since 1904. Yet Kansas people cannot buy beef. They cannot buy all they want of other meats. Here is a letter typical of many which I have received from Kansas. It is from Mr. J. R. Bushell, who operates a grocery and meat market at Dodge City, Kans., in the heart of a great cattle-producing area. This is what Mr. Bushell says:

Wheat harvesttime has arrived and my meat market is bare. I haven't been able to buy any kind of beef for 5 weeks. I can get pork and cured meats, but at harvesttime you know that a harvest hand who works in the hot sun wants a little beef.

Our local packing plant, Lochman & Co., will not sell beef or pork at packing-house wholesale ceilings. Mr. Lochman operates a cutting department and is catering mostly to hotel, restaurant, and retailers who are willing to pay the allowed cutting cost.

I cannot operate my meat market on the frozen ceiling prices and also pay the additional premium and hold my trade. The chains are getting my meat business. I have been in business in Dodge City for a long time and my trade is principally ranchers and farmers.

I have appealed to the Office of Price Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the United States Department of Agriculture war boards, and all the alphabetic organizations known to me. We have appealed to our association secretary, Mr. C. M. Sandstrom, at Kansas City, Kans. He writes that so far the whole food situation needs overhauling, so I am appealing to you for some sort of relief.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and others talk about the Government commandeering cattle. Such talk is silly. Farmers are not deliberately holding cattle off the market. The trouble is the restrictions imposed by the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration are such that dealers and packers cannot buy cattle. There is more beef on the hoof in the country today than ever before in our history. Except for the utterly unjustified restrictions which have been placed upon distribution, there would be more beef in the markets today than ever before in our history. What the gentleman from New York and others similarly situated should do is to help us get these hampering restrictions removed so that their people can secure the beef which farmers have already produced and which they want to sell if they have the opportunity.

The Coal Act—A Pattern for Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on the pending bills to continue the Bituminous Coal Act:

FURTHER STATEMENT OF JAMES A. EMERY, GENERAL COUNSEL, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Judge Emery, on yesterday and the day before, considerable testimony was presented to us concerning the effect of this act upon the consumer, our attention being called to the fact that the minimum price in docket No. 15 was 18 cents above what it should have been, and in docket No. 21 it was 38 cents above what it should have been, and that a representative of a large

consuming group in New York complained bitterly of how the act had affected the consumers, not only in New York but throughout the Nation, who have been forced to pay millions of dollars, and we do not know the exact amount more because of the act than they would otherwise have paid.

I feel that we have been fortunate in having the discussion that you brought to us today on the broader aspects of the problem dealing with the underlying philosophy of this legislation.

You have called our attention to the emergency acts adopted by the Congress during a grave depression, designed primarily to relieve unemployment, but most of which have been continued into the war effort.

For instance, the 40-hour week, which was a depression measure designed to spread employment and to implement the policy by a 50-percent overtime payment, which was thought to be so heavy the average employer could not afford to work a man more than 40 hours in 1 week, and would have to spread the employment.

Even Mr. Henderson, who was one of the chief witnesses who testified before the joint meetings of the labor committees of the House and Senate on behalf of the 40-hour week stated to our committee that when we had full employment the 40-hour week should be relaxed, and of course everybody knows that we not only have full employment but an acute labor shortage, and yet it is not relaxed.

So in a word you have called to our attention that we are at the crossroads with respect to legislation that will affect the post-war era, at a time war spending will be ended, and the need for employment will again arise.

I believe that you will agree with me that there will be only two ways by which that employment can be furnished, first by private industry and second by the Government.

Mr. EMERY. Or by the two in cooperation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are certain post-war planners who believe that our system of private enterprise has failed, that private employment will be unable to do the job in the post-war era, and they are therefore drawing up grand plans for public employment on a scale never before witnessed in this or any other country that was not under a dictatorial form of government.

What was the basis that you told us on which competitive business in this country had always rested?

Mr. EMERY. Do you refer to a quotation offered from James Madison?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that that is substantially what it was.

Mr. EMERY. He said the economic foundation of the United States depended upon the unequal and varying capacity of men to employ property.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And then you went on beyond that and mentioned a basis on which you said that competitive business had always rested?

Mr. EMERY. I said it rested on its capacity to efficiently serve the consumer by undertaking so far as it could by continuous development and technological progress and improvement of management and skill and organization and the use of materials and the management of business and the general improvement of industry to better serve by increasing its volume and serving its customer by giving him a better article at a less price.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the National Association of Manufacturers believe in a system of private enterprise?

Mr. EMERY. Believe in it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir, it does. It believes it is essential not only to the economic future of the country but it expresses in the economic field the fundamental principles of liberty under law that lies at the foundation of our governmental structure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Can a system of private enterprise compete with Government in the industrial field?

Mr. EMERY. Well, no; in the sense that if the Government competes with its own citizens, it has many advantages, obviously, over the citizen, and it pays no taxes and it carries no insurance and it does not necessarily have to sell or recover the cost of its operation. It suffers capital losses and replaces these by capital appropriations, and in many cases it is in a position to recover through taxation the losses that it would suffer.

But it, nevertheless, would be compelled to meet the same problem that the business manager must meet, as Mr. Justice Holmes once said in one of his great moments. He said, "The hated capitalist is, after all, only the mediator—the prophet who has to undertake to prophesy the future trend of human desires."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Do the members of the National Association of Manufacturers engaged in private enterprise believe that the private enterprise system will successfully function in the post-war period if given a chance to do so free from Government competition?

Mr. EMERY. Given the chance to do so, yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the post-war era does the National Association of Manufacturers favor having the Government fix minimum prices of all products moving in interstate commerce?

Mr. EMERY. I do not think so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does it favor fixing such prices for any product that moves in interstate commerce?

Mr. EMERY. Of course, you are not referring now to public utilities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, no.

Mr. EMERY. You mean privately produced goods and commodities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is right.

Mr. EMERY. That is right, we do not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is there any product that moves in interstate commerce that will not in some way be affected by the Government's fixing of prices of bituminous coal?

Mr. EMERY. I do not get that last.

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. EMERY. Well, yes, I think, as a matter of personal opinion, that all goods relate themselves in a complex interdependent economic structure like ours so that all costs of operation, of every kind and character, are reflected in the price of goods and services, as a very famous physicist once said, however, delicate the relation may be, he said, a man does not flick the ashes from his cigar nor drop a stone from his hand to the ground, that the stars do not react under the law of gravity.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That undoubtedly is true, and the reaction to coal prices is a little quicker and sometimes a little more violent than the stars' reaction to the ashes from my cigar.

You might say to me, how does the price of coal affect the apple business in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia? Well, we cannot operate a packing shed and a grading machine and a washing machine without electric power. If the power for that comes from coal the price of coal affects it. When that apple starts to market we load it on one of our splendid Virginia railways, the Norfolk & Western, or the Chesapeake & Ohio, and they have got to buy their coal to haul those apples.

Coal is a key to steel; two tons of bituminous coal make one ton of steel through the use of coke and the blast furnaces.

Steel enters into nearly every field of production, does it not?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So any law that arbitrarily fixed the price of a commodity like coal extends much further than the effect upon a little householder who burns 10, 15 or 20 tons of coal a year; it affects the entire industrial system of the nation.

Certain witnesses have asked us to believe that the reason this law was passed for the coal industry was that it of all industries was in the most precarious condition and therefore faced utter ruin or chaos unless it had a law of this kind, but did you tell us this morning that in 1932, 1933, and 1934, of 508,000 corporations, only 16.25 percent had any net income at all?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that the coal industry——

Mr. EMERY (interposing). That is in 1932, Mr. Robertson.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understood your figures were for 1932, 1933, and 1934.

Mr. EMERY. No; not for the 3 years. I said that those were 3 desperate years in which the number of corporations with net income was exceedingly low, but in 1932 it reached the lowest level of 16.25. I said that in those three years that the corporate deficit was very great, and I could give you the exact figures if you cared to have them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, so far as my immediate objective is concerned, it is not necessary.

In 1933, 1934, and 1935 we commenced the process of enacting emergency legislation with a view to relieving the intensity of the depression and one of the first was called the relief and recovery act, which combined N. R. A. with $700,000,000, I believe, which looked mighty big in those days but has since been dwarfed by comparison, to be spent on certain relief projects.

Under N. R. A., industry committees were set up which adopted codes relating to prices and to sales practices, is that not true?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And we had a code of that kind for the bituminous coal industry, is that correct?

Mr. EMERY. I assume so, yes, sir; all industries had one.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In 1935, in the Schechter case, the Supreme Court declared N. R. A. to be invalid and unconstitutional. Was it not then that Mr. John L. Lewis rolled this pink pill for pale plants and forced the coal operators to swallow it?

Mr. EMERY. I do not remember just when the movement began, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, it was in 1935, and it was at the instance of Mr. John L. Lewis, and I thought that you called that a pink pill for pale plants, is that right?

Mr. EMERY. That is right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did you go on to say that that pill was so indigestible that it did not take effect for 2 years and 4 months?

Mr. EMERY. The first bill of 1935 was of course held invalid, and the second bill of 1937 became effective on passage, and then there was a transfer of administration from a commission to an administrative division in the Interior Department, and during the period of the Commission's life there was no determination of minimum prices, I believe, but that was effected after the administrative reorganization which put the act under the direction of the Bituminous Coal Division.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But the only substantial change and we will discuss that later, was the labor provision which the Supreme Court threw out in the Carter Coal Co. case.

Mr. EMERY. That is the first act; yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And the 1937 act, you said, did not take effect for 2 years and 4 months, with respect to announcing the sustaining part of it which was a minimum price level.

In the meantime had not Congress, in furtherance first of the defense effort, and then of the war effort, rolled a different kind of pill that we might call private production for public projects?

Mr. EMERY. You refer to the development of the defense appropriations?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir; what we call war spending?

Mr. EMERY. That substantially began in 1940. Of course, the European war breaking out on September 8, 1939, had an immediate effect on our economy, because the nations attacked immediately came into our market.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Foreign war buying was not the major cause of our recovery. Under the Neutrality Act we required them to lay the money on the barrel head and haul it home in their own ships.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You remember that?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So that the first point that you made about the bill was that the coal business was not the only sick business during the depression, the second was that it recovered by forces other than those that were set in motion by the enactment of the Bituminous Coal Act?

Mr. EMERY. I think so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. You did mention it.

Mr. EMERY. I offered some proof of that this morning, I believe, from the income-tax statistics of 1940.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, Mr. Lamb went into that quite fully and showed that even for the year 1940 the coal industry had been lifted out of the red and was about $16,000,000 to the good, on the favorable side of the ledger. You did not mention it this morning, but I believe that you will agree with me, since 1940 war spending has stepped up from $25,000,000 approximately in 1940 to a rate slightly in excess of $100,000,000,000 in 1943, that the same forces that lifted the bituminous coal industry out of the slough of despondency will keep it lifted and carry it to still higher levels unless the Office of Price Administration checks it, as long as the war lasts.

Mr. EMERY. I should hope so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that there will be no need for any minimum prices during that war period?

Mr. EMERY. Well, it seems to me that there is substantially little evidence of sales at minimum prices, from what I have heard.

Mr. ROBERTSON. If I correctly understood the essence of your testimony to us, it was that you see no necessity for the continuation of this law at all but that if the Congress decides to continue it you had some suggestion to make that would do the job without carrying forward everything that is now in the act and that would confer upon the Solid Fuels Coordinator for War, the power to fix minimum prices and maximum prices if he wanted to do it.

Mr. EMERY. I suggested in the outline that I thought that the President's Executive order of April 19, 1943, authorized the Solid Fuels Administrator for War, in conjunction with the Price Administrator, to provide for the upward or downward adjustment of prices in the bituminous or other coal fields for the period of the war.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As a lawyer you think that he has that power now?

Mr. EMERY. I am impressed with that, that is in conjunction with the Price Administrator, because he is the adviser of the Price Administrator in this field and the Price Administrator is not authorized to act without previous consultation with him in the adjustment of those prices, and in the light of the purpose for which those powers are given it seems to me that whether you call it minimum or maximum or other adjusted prices, that it is entirely within the power of the Solid Fuel Administrator or the Price Administrator in cooperation with him, to make those adjustments, and that is required by the nature of his office, in order to secure the amount, quality, and movement of coal that is indispensable to the war effort.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So, according to your testimony, we have got two facts that stand out like a lighthouse in the fog:

1, The Bituminous Coal Act did not lift this industry out of the depression but war expenditures did; and

2, We do not need the act as long as the war lasts.

They are two well-established facts, according to your testimony.

Mr. EMERY. I think so.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore, you reach this conclusion, that if we vote now to continue this act we will be setting the pattern for post-war operations of the Government in business.

Mr. EMERY. That is the matter upon which we are most deeply concerned.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, let us analyze your testimony on what that pattern was and is and will be.

You tell us that the general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, who drafted the act passed in 1395, incorporated in it certain essential provisions of the Wagner Labor Relations Act?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not the provision with respect to collective bargaining. We did not need the Wagner Labor Relations Act to establish that. It was a fundamental right that nobody that I have ever heard contested, that was put in the Wagner Labor Relations Act, but many things beside that went in along with it.

The general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations put into this act certain provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act; is that not correct?

Mr. EMERY. I do not know whether it was the general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, sir, but I know the provisions were put in there.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then they were in there; somebody put it in there.

Then the drafters of this act in 1935 put in the new theory in our Government that the Government could use its taxing powers as a deliberate penalty to compel compliance with a so-called social reform.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the drafters of this act put in the provision in keeping with what Ben Cohen and Tommy Corcoran deliberately put in the draft of the so-called Fair Labor Standards Act, better known as the 40-hour week, a provision that what the Supreme Court had said in the Coronado Coal Co. case was not interstate commerce, was interstate commerce, and broke down to that extent the distinction previously existing between interstate commerce and intrastate commerce.

You gave some references as to how the constitutional provision that the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce and actions impeding or obstructing interstate commerce had been extended. Have you kept up with the regulations and the decisions of the agency in the Department of Labor that administers the 40-hour week?

Mr. EMERY. I have tried to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then you have known that they have ruled that if a country sawmill in the mountains saws a plank that is put on a bridge on a little mountain road, and an automobile from New York rolls over that bridge, that plank is then in interstate commerce, and the sawmill has got to conform to the standards of the 40-hour week.

You are probably aware of the fact that they have ruled that if there is a two-story office building in my home town, and an insurance agent representing a New York insurance company has an office in that building, and the roof leaks and the owner of the building puts a shingle on the leak, the presence of that insurance agent in that building makes that shingle in interstate commerce and, therefore, the man who produced the shingle had to conform to the 40-hour week.

I could sit here for quite a period, because I have been harassed world without end about these various interpretations, on how the 40-hour week has been used to destroy every concept that we have ever had of the just and proper distinction between interstate commerce, which was the proper field of the Federal Government, and intrastate commerce which we thought under the Constitution had been reserved to the States.

Now, that principle is carried into this act.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All right.

Then we had a labor principle carried into this act that so far as I know was not directly involved in any of the other depression acts that I have mentioned or can think of, and that is this:

That when a majority of the producers in a given industry agree upon a wage scale, everybody else in that industry has got to pay the same scale. That was put in here.

Mr. EMERY. That refers to the operation of the so-called district committees.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So far as you can recall or so far as you have told us, of all of these various devices that we have adopted in the past 10 years in the name of democracy and freedom and liberality, that is the only one that is not in this act today that we are asked to endorse as a pattern for post-war operations.

Now, let us see how this legislation was implemented to make it even more effective.

In 1933, did not we have a strike in the bituminous coal industry to compel the unionization of all coal mines?

Mr. EMERY. I do not recall the year, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that we did, and I think that through that strike and the help that was given by the late Hugh Johnson, then head of the National Recovery Administration, and of certain high-placed officials, that objective was reached and the mines were unionized, so that no one could work in the bituminous coal field who did not belong to the union and the union could not work when the leaders said, "The contract offered us by the operators is not satisfactory."

Was not that done?

Mr. EMERY. I did not think that the unionization was completed until the ruling of the Mediation Board in the captive mine case a year ago. I thought that that completed it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, the next move in line with the 40-hour week, which was held not to go far enough for this industry, was the 35-hour week secured through collective bargaining and written into a 3-year contract after a strike; is that not true?

Mr. EMERY. I did not get that last.

(The reporter read the pending question.)

Mr. EMERY. I believe that that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be back in 30 minutes. We will take a short recess.

(Recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. We will proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The next move, Judge Emery, as I recall it, was in 1939, when there was a strike over the closed shop and exclusive representation which, as you said, completed the program of unionization. I will not dwell on that but we will proceed to the most disastrous strike in my opinion that has occurred during the war period—namely, the one that commenced in May of 1941 and lasted for 4 weeks.

You will recall that the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor finally compelled the operators to agree to the demands of uniform pay after Mr. O'Neill, representing the northern operators, had agreed to an increase of $1 a day, and the Appalachian operators in districts 7 and 8 were hiked up $1.40 a day and in the Alabama fields the hike as I recall was more than $2 per day.

Do you remember that strike?

Mr. EMERY. I remember the strike, sir, but I do not remember the details that you state.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the way it was settled, according to my recollection, and in line with the labor provision inserted in the act of 1935, which, from the standpoint of the general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, who was the moving figure in framing that bill, was the essential portion of the bill, namely, that when 60 percent agreed to a certain wage, they all had to pay it, or when just a majority agreed they all had to pay it.

Mr. EMERY. You mean in the act?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. EMERY. In 1935 my recollection is that the act provided that where the majority of the employees and the operators agreed upon a wage, that that became the prevailing wage of the industry. That was in 1935.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Now, they accomplished that purpose under this act, but in a different way, by the strike that commenced shortly after we agreed to continue the act in 1941, or, the positive assurance that the continuation of the act would prevent a strike.

Now, there is just one more move in that same direction, which was made, as I recall, in the fall of 1941, when Mr. Lewis decided that he would bring the captive mines into line and they would not agree voluntarily to come into line, and he called another general strike when all of the bituminous coal operators other than the captive mines were just innocent bystanders, so to speak, but he shut them down, and in doing so did he not rely upon the provisions of this Coal Act, that whatever happened anywhere in the coal business affected it all, and therefore he had a right to shut down all of the privately owned and operated mines in order to compel the steel companies and certain other companies that had what they call captive mines to fall into line with the closed shop and over-all wage plan?

Did he not rely on the provisions of this act, I say, in calling that general strike and shutting down the mines of everybody?

Mr. EMERY. I think the fundamental trouble, Mr. ROBERTSON, was that in the endeavor to protect the right of organization, of association, and of collective bargaining, the parties here engaged, that great power was given to the organizations without any corresponding responsibility for its exercise, so that the employers were left in an utterly hopeless position.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And that is the reason that I voted against the Wagner Labor Relations Act. I was not opposed to collective bargaining, but I thought it was one-sided, and it certainly has been one-sided in its administration since its adoption.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And I voted against the Walsh-Healey Act and I voted against the 40-Hour Act, all three of which you say are rolled up into this act with some more besides.

Now, I have outlined to you the labor provisions put in the 1935 act, and the way that objective has been reached through a series of strikes, and I ask you how can anyone stand before us and say that the enactment of this act had nothing to do with wages.

Can you tell me?

Mr. EMERY. Not I, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Why, it was the essence of the whole movement, to be implemented, of course, by a price-fixing scheme under which and by which the operators would be enabled to pay these increased wages and pass the increased cost of production on to the consumer.

And so we find ourselves passing an act that permits the organization of district boards and we have got 23 of them and they can act separately and apart or in unison. They can propose to the Bituminous Coal Division a price and that price can be put into effect, but you said that when the oil company was in distress, and some of the operators got together not to fix prices and not to engage in any cut-throat competition and not to do anything to affect the price of gasoline, they were indicted by the same Government that sponsors this otherwise violation of the Sherman Antitrust law, is that true?

Mr. EMERY. I said that the court there held that when they undertook to remove distressed gasoline from the market at the request and with the acquiescence or as the court said, when the administrative authority winked at it, that the court there held that the endeavor to remove this distress gasoline which otherwise would have come on the market and reduced the general price of oil or gasoline that that agreement—that that action, not agreement, because of its effect on the market price of the goods, violated the antitrust act because it affected the price.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And did you also tell us that the lower court instructed the jury that if these defendants had contributed in any degree to an increase in the price of gasoline they could be found guilty and should be found guilty?

Mr. EMERY. The lower court substantially instructed the jury in the Socony-Vacuum case that they should find the defendant guilty if their action had contributed in any degree to an increase in the price of gasoline.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was the holding of the Court in the oil company case, and we passed a law that if, due to increased wages or any other factor, the costs of the production of a ton goes up as much as 2 cents, then we must make a change in the price and hike it up.

Now, that act, you tell us, went to the Supreme Court in what you call the Sunshine case.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir; the act of 1937.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A beautiful and euphonious name for a remarkable decision that was handed down.

I understood you to say that in that Sunshine case the Court virtually overruled the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in McCulloch against Maryland, in which he handed down the famous statement that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and he restrained the State of Maryland from exercising that power in a detrimental way against a bank which was then the property of the United States Government.

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But in the Sunshine case, you tell us that the Court held that not only in collecting revenue could the Government destroy, if necessary, but it could destroy deliberately, purposely, as a penalty for nonconformity, and upheld the 19½-percent tax carried in this bill, to crush any operator who did not become a code member; was that not the holding in that case?

Mr. EMERY. I think that there is this distinction, Mr. ROBERTSON, that in the McCulloch case, the bank was an instrumentality of the United States and they held the State could not tax the instrumentality because that carried with it the power to destroy.

In the Sunshine Anthracite case they held that the—the court held that in regulating interstate commerce, that the Congress could use any power which it possessed to sanction the otherwise valid exercise of its power by using the taxing power as well as any other police power as a sanction.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then there were some communities that got a little sick and tired of having Jehovah's Witnesses ringing their doorbells at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, and when you say who is down there they would holler out, "I am Jehovah's witness," and they put a tax on the distribution of the literature of Jehovah's Witnesses, so high that it made it difficult and at least expensive for them to witness, and that case went to the Supreme Court, did it not?

Mr. EMERY. Well, of course, that tax could not be said to be levied expressly but it was levied on the circulation of any pamphlet, and the Court held that since in the exercise of religious freedom men were entitled to express their religious views through the circulation of pamphlets, that the power to tax when applied under these circumstances could be used oppressively to such an extent that it would destroy the religious freedom expressed in the circulation of the pamphlet.

So that they did hold there that the power to tax was the power to destroy or could be used for that.

They did not hold that it had been in this case, but it could be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Court had to take two bites at that cherry, did it not?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir; that is the case in which Mr. Frankfurter said that in dissenting with that—I am recalling his previous statement—he said that it was now settled that a tax can be a means for raising revenue or a device for regulating conduct or both; that was now a settled doctrine; and I tried to point out this morning that that had not been the doctrine of the Court over a century and a quarter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, the point I am trying to develop, if I understood your testimony, was this: The decision in the Sunshine case was in essence against the decision in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, and the Court got out on a limb and came back again on the ground of religious freedom in the final decision made in the case of Jehovah's Witnesses; is that not true?

In other words, there had been no continuity of policy on this subject of the power to tax.

We thought for years that the decision in the McCulloch case was the established law and then the Court very erratically departed from what we thought was established law in the Sunshine case, attempted to follow that latter ruling in the first decision in the case of Jehovah's Witnesses, reheard the case and reversed itself; is that not correct?

Mr. EMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So I ask you this question: When we consider all of the regulations and court decisions, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, that has changed every conception that we have had of the meaning of interstate commerce, of the decisions under the Wagner Labor Relations Act, where it was held that the Court had no power at all over the actions of labor unions that might wreck and destroy the plant of their employer, and the decisions of the Court on the subject of taxation that we have just discussed, using the taxing power as a sanction or penalty to compel compliance with so-called social reforms, when we consider all of that program and speak of stabilizing industry, do you know of any better way that Congress could contribute to the stabilization of industry, and especially with respect to the important problems that will confront us in the post-war era, than to stabilize the laws, the rules, and the regulations under which industry must work and operate during the war and in the post-war era?

Mr. EMERY. It would be one of the greatest contributions that could be made, sir, because we are in a fog today, very must like the man who would try to operate under a famous Kentucky statute which provided that any person who discharged a firearm on a public road would be guilty of a misdemeanor whether it was loaded or not, and nobody has ever been able to determine whether that phrase applied to the man with the weapon or the weapon itself.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Thank you very much.

Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me:

On the eve of July 4, in the year 1826, the father of our Declaration of Independence, wasted with his last illness, sat up in bed, went through the motions of a man writing, and muttered some disconnected phrases about the Revolutionary Committee of Safety. He seemed to be making a supreme effort to live until the Fourth. He never said so in so many words, but once or twice, as the shadows deepened before the dawn over the oaks of Monticello, he roused himself to inquire anxiously if it was yet the Fourth. When finally informed that the morning of the Fourth of July had dawned, his anxiety left him. At 1 o'clock in the afternoon of that day, Thomas Jefferson breathed his last.

So, on the very day on which, 50 years before, the birth certificate of our Nation was signed, the man, whose faith and fortitude were chiefly responsible for it, died. God moves in mysterious ways, indeed, His wonders to perform.

As Thomas Jefferson looked back from the fullness of a long life dedicated without reservation to the service of his country and his fellow-men, his mind must have reviewed the events, the struggle, the battles and soul-searing vicissitudes that preceded the final victory.

What a sense of peace and satisfaction must have been his as he remembered those ringing affirmations of his faith, so triumphantly, so abundantly vindicated—his faith in the rights of man; his faith "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed * * *."

His faith in a free press: "The only security of all is in a free press. The forces of public opinion cannot be resisted. * * * It is necessary to keep the waters pure * * *."

His faith in religious liberty: "Almighty God hath created the mind free and manifested His supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraints; that our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions any more than our opinions in physics or geometry; that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government nor under its jurisdiction; and, finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument, and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them."

His faith in free public education: "The most effectual means of preventing tyranny would be to illuminate, as far as practical, the minds of the people at large, and more especially to give them knowledge of those facts, which history exhibiteth, that, possessed thereby of the experience of other ages and countries, they may be enabled to know ambition under all its shapes, and prompt to exert their natural powers to defeat all its purposes * * * whence it becomes expedient for promoting the public happiness that those persons, whom nature hath endowed with genius and virtue, should be rendered by liberal education worthy to receive, and able to guard, the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens, and that they should be called to that charge without regard to wealth, birth, or other accidental condition or circumstance."

And, finally, his faith in that eternal vigilance and resolute valor which furnish the bulwark and strength of our liberties: "We most solemnly, before God and the world, declare that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers which our beneficent Creator hath graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume, we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die free men rather than to live slaves."

On the proud and solemn anniversary of the birth of our Nation and the death of the great American who brought that Nation to birth, let us this day take renewed faith and fortitude from Jefferson's unshakable faith and fortitude; let us, with sober rejoicing, take stock and inventory of our spiritual heritage and our spiritual resources; let us take to heart the profound and imperishable wisdom and truth of that American scripture which Jefferson bequeathed to us—that legacy of loyalty and sacrifice and devotion to the principles of the American credo which, today as never before in our history, are beset from within and menaced from without, distorted, confounded and encompassed with perils. Let us with a full realization of its import in our appointment with destiny, carry on high, as an invincible banner, the noblest instrumentality ever devised by man, under Providence, for the good of man—the Declaration of Independence.

Superior, Wis., Pays Tribute to War Effort, the Greatest Family in the World, and to a Great Shipbuilder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I had the pleasure and honor of attending a launching of the Quint Fleet at the city of Superior. At that time the city of Superior played host to the Dionne quintuplets, to Naval officials from Canada and the United States, and to thousands of people from the United States and Canada. It was an event that would have thrilled the heart of any Member of this Congress had they been there. I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD several articles and speeches pertaining to that event because it will undoubtedly go down in history as perhaps the greatest launching ever to occur in the history of the world:

ADDRESS OF ROBERT BUTLER

Distinguished guests, friends from Canada and the United States, ladies and gentlemen, and the good men of production here in our own yard, all of us in the Walter Butler Shipbuilders organization are thrilled at the privilege that has been extended to us today, in playing host to the world's most famous children and their parents. We are happy, too, in being honored by having as our guests today, men and women who have achieved national and international recognition in their service to their countries. Their names and their deeds are synonymous with the mighty war effort of the United Nations. We are not unmindful of the honor that is paid us today in their being here and what their presence is doing to further the now existing good relations between our country and great neighbor of Canada.

Significant, indeed, is the launching here today on the Great Lakes of these five ships, not only that they form a small part of the production genius of America, but more potently, they signify the "sting" that American workmen can deliver, from one end of this great Nation to the other. Long hours, day in, day out, will not deter the workmen on the home front.

Today, more than ever, these stalwart men of production realize the importance and seriousness of their work. From countless numbers of their homes they have even been given the sorrowful news of "missing in action" or "killed at the front"; yes, the home front realizes its task, it will not let false issues, demagogic leaders or Axis propagandists influence the big pull ahead.

It gives me deep satisfaction in welcoming you, to be able to point out that this occasion is, in no small way, made possible through the cooperation we of management have had from the American Federation of Labor unions in our yard. The work of our labor-management war production drive committee has proved conclusively that labor and management can pull together and has contributed in large measure to the outstanding production achievement which we are celebrating here today. Labor-management cooperation is launching the ships of freedom now and it must and will continue after the war in building a world of freedom. Stimulating to us engaged in shipbuilding, inspiring to the tens of thousands of workers in this yard and throughout the nations, is in the magnificent leadership that has been given the shipbuilding program, by the United States Maritime Commission.

Admiral Land, your untiring energies, your boundless enthusiasm to get the job done, your undying patriotism and loyalty stands out today as symbolic of what can be done on the home front. Speaking for our men in the yard for this Great Lakes region engaged in ship production, permit me to thank you for being with us today. We feel greatly honored by your appearance here, honored to have you participate in this international event and know that what you say to us will remain long after the program has ended.

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to introduce Admiral Emory S. Land, chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. Admiral Land.

ADDRESS OF ADMIRAL EMORY S. LAND

This is a grand sight out here today, five ships ready to be launched, five such charming, young sponsors as the Dionne Quintuplets; but if I said all the things that impressed me, I'd be taking up all the radio time. One of the things I'm going to say is this: People used to say the Middle West wasn't interested in the merchant marine. Oh, yes; it is. And the launchings that bring us here are just a symbol of the fact that the whole United States has gone to sea. One of the things seen here that has aroused my feelings most is the part this great Middle West is playing in waging this war. From here one

can see a huge grain elevator. I'm told it's the largest in the world. It stands as testimony that the midwestern farmer is producing his share of the food to feed the United Nations. One can see the smoke of railroads bringing ore from the earth of the Midwest. I have seen—can't see them from here—an endless string of ore boats—a moving bridge from mine to mill. Here one sees five vessels—the product of midwestern suppliers and factories, of midwestern brains and labors. I'm sure there are millions of Americans, particularly from our seaboards, who don't realize the tremendous load the Midwest is shouldering in this war—nor do they realize, even from the maps, the vast amount of waterborne transportation in this part of the country, nor the mighty part the interior of this country, far from both oceans, is taking in our great shipbuilding program.

Certainly if American's don't realize it, Hitler doesn't. Not yet. If he did, he'd realize as we all do today, what a slim chance he has of standing up for long against the resources, the industry, the shipping, of the Midwest. Then add to that what all the rest of the country is doing for the full development of American striking power, add the spirit and fighting power of United Nations and Hitler doesn't stand a snowball's chance, even though he has robbed the wealth of Europe and dragooned its millions of people to build the Nazi war machine. As an evidence of the common cause we share with the United Nations, we are building these ships under the lend-lease program for our British allies to operate. As one looks at these ships now in the last few minutes before they take their virgin bath, we see them as a total, not merely of five hulls, of so many tons of steel, of so many man-hours of labor, but a sum of many hands, many skills, hearts, hopes. Tired bodies are in them, weary brains, but a total beyond any total on a machine. These ships, built by Americans, christened by Canadians, to be manned by the British, we wish them well as they go out to sail the seas carrying cargoes of victory. Wherever they may go in their work I hope there is one special trip they will make be it soon or later. I hope they will sail into the seaports of Japan with supplies for our garrison in Tokyo.

ADDRESS OF ADMIRAL VICKERY

Because of limitations in the dimensions of ships which can be taken from the Lakes to the sea, Great Lakes shipyards have been assigned different types of ships to build than those which make up the bulk of deliveries from seacoast yards. But these types are just as sorely needed in the winning of the war. This shipyard, and its sister yards here and across the river, and elsewhere on the Lakes, have a most essential job to do. With every ship which sails from these yards, the men and women who built it help bring closer the day of final victory for the United Nations. American merchant shipyards today are building ships at the most staggering rate in history. In April they delivered into service 157 vessels, totaling more than 1,600,000 tons deadweight—carrying capacity equal to a freight train over 300 miles from locomotive to caboose. A train stretching from here almost to Milkaukee. In terms of tonnage, for every four seagoing ships in all the world at the time of Pearl Harbor, the men and women in American merchant shipyards have built an additional ship. And by the end of this year they will have built still another one. There is no brighter picture in the battle of production. You know, and I know, that the proper place to fight and end this war is on the enemies' soil. Our fighting forces and those of our allies are doing their part. And as the arsenal of democracy, America is working day and night. But we can train soldiers, manufacture munitions, and raise crops, until we're blue in the face—it still takes ships to put the "over" in "over there."

SUPERIOR HAS EQUIPMENT TO AID WAR EFFORT—ORE, GRAIN, COAL, AND OIL FACILITIES HERE ARE LEADING IN NATION'S INDUSTRIAL MACHINERY

(By Clough Gates)

That the world's most famous little ladies should choose Superior as the city to be the scene of their first act of international significance is not only a happy choice to the people of this section of the country, it is also the most logical of acts.

The first journey of the renowned quintuplets to their country's sister nation, especially on an errand of public importance, would for the time center the minds of the people of two great countries on the scene of their visit. They are coming in the midst of a world war in which the fate of these and many other nations depends on ultimate supremacy on the high seas.

Although as yet only an inland port Superior is equipped to make a most vital contribution to the cause of North American maritime supremacy—perhaps the greatest single contribution that can be made by any one port on the North American Continent.

Even the people of Superior have been slow to realize the full importance of their city to the war effort of the Allied Nations. The news of the quint launching here on May 9 will doubtless be the vehicle which will impress this fact for the first time on the minds of millions of their countrymen and of the people of all countries where the press, radio, and movie news reels permeate. For the quints of Callander are known to every household that these agencies reach. Their every experience since babyhood has been eagerly and widely chronicled, but in their nearly 9 years there has been no such experience, no such adventure as this thousand-mile journey west to Superior to sponsor five merchant vessels built in an allied land in aid of their mother country.

HISTORIC

The event must have significance. Only so would the Canadian Government officials have planned with the State Department at Washington to give the occasion the sanction of two great governments.

A historic event in a historic spot. Why this honor for Superior? That is the question that will be asked all over the country. It is the opportunity to drive home some facts not too well known even in neighboring States.

In the days when railroad building was just making some of the keener minds appreciate what transportation could do for a land of such vast extent and resource, Lake Superior seemed to point like the finger of destiny to the expansive Northwest country. One of the great eastern editors declared that one day there was destined to be a great city at the most westerly point on the great inland waterway.

The Soo River, coursing over a barrier of granite between Lakes Superior and Huron, shut the greatest of the Great Lakes out from important commercial intercourse with the rest of the chain. Only by expensive portage could cargoes be transferred from one to the other.

SOO LOCKS OPENED

In 1855 the first Soo lock was opened by the American Government and the large vessels of that day began to ply between Superior and Buffalo and points between. That fact seemed important to residents of the Lake Superior country of that day. Already small iron deposits had been discovered and worked in upper Michigan. And there were forests to be cut and fish from the deepest and coldest of the Lakes to be shipped to the eastern market. Supplies, including a little coal, came back.

But a busy season's traffic of the pioneer days would be but a trickle to what this watercourse sees today. With total tonnage, which in 1942 ran way beyond the 100,000,000-ton mark, the Soo Canal has long since taken position as the scene of the world's greatest concentration of water-borne traffic. The famed Suez Canal in the center of Eurasia and Africa and the wonderful Panama Canal of the Western Hemisphere, these two together make only a fair rival to the storybook accomplishments of the boats of Lake Superior. In all the history of the world there has been nothing of such magnitude developed by man's activity in commerce.

SUPERIOR IS LEADER

Superior is the greatest single factor contributing to make up this stupendous total of traffic. Situated at the focal point of origin of the greatest single item of this traffic, iron ore, this port alone pours into the commercial stream more than one-third of that tonnage supplied by all Lake Superior ports. Together with its twin port of Duluth, total shipments of iron ore crowd close to 60 percent of the Soo's volume. In 1942 the United States Government asked for 90,000,000 tons of Lake Superior ore and got over 92,000,000. Of this, more than 31,500,000 tons went from Superior's five big ore docks and the Duluth shipments came next with over 23,000,000 tons.

The Great Northern Railroad is the big shipper from Superior, handling ore from the Mesabi Range. The Northern Pacific and Soo handle at Superior all the ore produced by the smaller Cuyuna Range. Duluth docks handle ore from the Duluth, Missabe, & Iron Range Road.

HEAVY ORE TRAFFIC

In time of war attention centers on iron ore. In other years the volume of other products, while usually lighter than that of ore, at times surpasses it. Coal and grain are the closest rivals. Here again Superior's facilities serve the Nation with remarkable efficiency. Superior and Duluth constitute one of the greatest primary grain receiving centers of the country.

The magnitude of this traffic is illustrated by the huge elevators located here. The Twin Ports have storage capacity for nearly 60,000,000 bushels, of which about 55 percent is in Superior and 45 percent is in Duluth. Similarly, great coal docks line the water front with acres of space capable of storing some 12,000,000 tons of coal from the Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and West Virginia mines. Again Superior docks afford about 55 percent of the coal-handling capacity. This city is also an important oil and gasoline storage and shipping point with tanks that hold over 77,000,000 gallons.

Superior's matchless railroad facilities are ably equipped to take care of the land end of this fabulous stream of traffic. Extensive yards are devoted to the handling of incoming ore and grain. No transportation center in the entire country has as many miles of trackage in its railroad yards. When the late fall marks the closing of lake navigation ore ceases to flow and grain slows down, these extensive yards are available to transfer almost any volume of outgoing coal that the exigencies of winter in the Northwest may require. The facilities are made complete by almost unlimited power in mammoth engines and carrying capacity in modern ore and freight cars.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

All this development has happened here without benefit of direct access to the commerce of the world. Contemplation of the vast extent of the traffic of the port of Superior as an inland port gives an inkling of what will be when the St. Lawrence River rapids are bypassed with channels capable of accommodating ocean vessels. More than 50 years ago agitation for the deep waterway improvement began but only in recent years has the project reached the stage where surveys and official estimates have been made under authority from the Canadian and United States Governments. It is expected that this will be one of the principal items on the Nations' post-war list if indeed it is not actually started sooner.

Yes, the quintuplets have chosen well for the scene of their historic gesture of international good will. They come to the very source of that power on which the forces of civilization rely in their supreme effort.

The Cattle Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM McCORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Rodney Crowther appearing in the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 29 relative to the cattle situation in the United States:

CATTLEMEN LAY BLAME FOR BEEF SHORTAGE ON WASHINGTON

(By Rodney Crowther)

WASHINGTON, June 29.—With more cattle roving the ranges of America than ever before in history why should this Nation be confronted with a beef famine?

Department of Agriculture experts estimate there will be 82,500,000 head of cattle on the farms and ranges of the country by the end of the year. Practical cattlemen—and one of them is Congressman KLEBERG, of the great King Ranch, of Kingsville, Tex.—today said there are already that many cattle on the farms. By January 1 there will be close to 85,000,000 head, KLEBERG claims.

SUPPLIES SHRINKING

Why, then, should the Nation's supply of dressed meats be shrinking toward the vanishing point, butcher shops by the thousands closing down in the Middle West as well as in the East, and armed forces even in the cattle country finding it difficult to fill their beef needs?

Spokesmen for the livestock and packing industry say the answer to these questions can be summed up in three words: Confusion in Washington.

This confusion, they say, is compounded of three parts—the quota system, which limits the slaughter of livestock for civilian consumption; Office of Price Administration ceiling prices on beef, and the fight between the administration and Congress over price rollbacks and subsidies.

WHY KEEP TO QUOTAS?

What is this quota system? Why was it ever imposed in the first place? Why doesn't the War Food Administration abandon it at once and thus set the livestock moving from the farms to the slaughter pens?

The writer asked those questions today at the Office of Price Administration, at the Department of Agriculture, and at the War Food Administration.

Spokesmen for these agencies assert that if the quotas were abandoned the chaos would be even worse than it is now.

BEGAN UNDER HENDERSON

The quota system originated in the Office of Price Administration when Leon Henderson was running that organization. Meat-restriction order No. 1 of October 1, 1942, imposed quotas on civilian deliveries of beef.

The percentages have been changed from time to time, but in the main the figure has been around 70 percent of the 1941 delivery.

Subsequently the Food Administration, which had been a joint affair between the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture, was lodged solely in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the quota system became a prerogative of Mr. Wickard. Later, when the War Food Administration was set up, with Chester C. Davis as its head—a post he quit yesterday—the quota system moved over to War Food Administration.

TO MAKE SUPPLIES AVAILABLE

Why was the quota system inaugurated in the first place? What was its purpose?

"To bring the beef business under control so that it would be possible to obtain the meat needed by armed forces and lend-lease," a Government spokesman explained.

The limitation was not imposed on federally inspected plants, but only on slaughterers not engaged in interstate trade.

SLAUGHTER TO CAPACITY

In other words, the federally inspected plants have always been able to slaughter to capacity, if they desired. But they were required to supply the armed forces and lend-lease ahead of any civilian requirements.

Under the law the Army, the Navy, lend-lease and other Federal agencies can only buy beef from federally inspected plants. These plants account for abqut 70 percent of the entire slaughter of beef in the country.

The other 30 percent are those which kill only for distribution within State boundaries and for the most part are engaged in sales to the civilian population.

CUT TO 70 PERCENT

These are limited in the cattle they can kill—limited to 70 percent of the kill of the year 1941.

"Why were these local slaughterers put under this quota system?" a Food Administration spokesman was asked.

"Simply because this was necessary in order to assure an adequate supply of beef for the armed services and for lend-lease," he answered.

"How did the quota system achieve this result?"

SETTING ASIDE 35 PERCENT

"Simply by saying that the total slaughter in plants not subject to Federal inspection must be limited, and that of the unlimited slaughter in inspected plants 35 percent had to be set aside for Government use," the Food Administration spokesman answered.

Recently the requirement was raised to 45 percent. This does not mean, it was explained 45 percent, of all cattle killed, but only 45 percent of steer and heifer grade of certain army weights. Actually it amounts to about 20 percent of the grand total of all cattle of every description killed in the country, a department of agriculture official asserted.

NOT SATISFACTORY ANSWER

"But none of this yet explains why you have to put noninspected killers in a strait jacket, why in the face of a virtual nation-wide beef famine you can't just lift the restrictions and let local killers fill the demand," the writer said to the Food Administration spokesman.

"We had to impose the quota in the start to get beef for the Government; and we have to keep it on now to continue getting it," was the reply.

WOULD HAVE TAKEN ALL

"Everybody likes a good piece of beef. And with the workers of the nation stuffed with money, they would have quickly gobbled up all the beef in sight and the Army and the Navy and lend-lease would have had none.

"If you didn't have restrictions, you'd have no control. And with no control, you'd have no beef for the services. Necessity compelled us to inaugurate the quotas. Necessity comples us to keep them."

WHY NOT LIFT RULES?

"What necessity?" the writer asked. "If the cattle are jammed on the farms, the deliveries to Chicago, New York-New Jersey pens, Omaha, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and other cattle pens near the vanishing point, and the butcher shops of the big cities closing down, why not lift the restrictions and say to the local slaughterers: 'Go to it and kill all you can get.' "

"Because the small civilian plants would quickly gobble up every beef in the land and the services would get none," the food spokesman retorted.

PREFER CIVILIAN MARKET

"They are not particularly interested in selling to the Government. They would prefer to serve their own customers, in their own communities. And with the pockets of the workers everywhere bulging with money, it wouldn't be long before they would get all the beef and the boys in the Army and Navy would get none."

But the cattlemen, the packers, and spokesmen for them today pointedly denounced the quota system.

SIRED BLACK MARKET

"It sired the black market," was the comment of Congressman KLEBERG. "The black market is patently the outgrowth of Government regulation."

In this assertion the Texas Congressman was backed strongly by Judge J. G. Montague, counsel for the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, who was visiting him at the Capitol.

"You must remember that there was no beef problem in this country," said Congressman KLEBERG, "until the Government inaugurated its quota system and imposed its ceiling prices. Before this there had been no visible evidence of an over-the-counter shortage."

BOTTLENECK'S CAUSE?

Why are the feeding ranges and farms of the Nation glutted with cattle? Why are the shipments to the big packing centers at the moment less than half of a year ago?

These questions were put to the spokesman for the Department of Agriculture.

"For one reason, because the farmers are holding the cattle and expecting higher prices. For another, because of the immediate unsettlement resulting from the subsidy controversy."

"CONFUSION" BLAMED

The same question put to Congressman KLEBERG and Judge Montague at the Capitol today brought this reply:

"One word will explain everything—confusion," said the two Texans who are outstanding cattle experts.

"If you were in the business you'd no more know where to turn than the cattle growers throughout the Nation. Already clamped down by mistaken Government policy," they are subjected to this new confusion over roll-backs and subsidies. The cattle growers don't know whether they are going to be the victims. The killers don't know where they stand."

NO LIMIT ON SOME

But a Department of Agriculture spokesman when pressed for a specific statement as to why cattle should not be arriving at the Chicago and other pens, contented himself with the observation that "the federally inspected slaughterers can slaughter all they want to; there is no limit on them."

The War Food Administration here has been advised by the American Meat Institute that last week's output by major packers was only about 50 percent of normal. The number of cattle slaughtered at federally inspected plants dropped to 150,000, compared with 173,000 for the preceding week and 273,000 for the corresponding week last year. Indications are that the drop will be even sharper this week.

ONLY 25 PERCENT LEFT

After supplies are earmarked for the armed forces less than 25 percent of the restricted output is available for civilians, it was stated. Authorities here insist that a great many slaughterers in the noninspected areas paid little or no attention to the quotas, used up all their quotas within a month or two earlier this year, and now can kill no more without violating the quotas.

In fact, in some areas of the country, they say, slaughtering has been in excess of quotas, and many killers face suspension of their permits.

The writer pressed various authorities here to state just "why the farmers and cattle growers appear to be on a strike."

The situation can be summed up in a few words: Packing house cattle buyers generally have lowered their offering prices and the buyers, on their part, have refused to pay the prices the farmers are asking. The packers say they are already losing money on beef and, what's more, they are not at all certain they will receive the subsidy payments promised them to compensate for losses under the roll-back.

MARKET SETS THE PRICE

"The farmer can ask all right," said Congressman FULMER, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, "but if nobody will pay him what he asks then he is stuck with his cattle. And that's that. Farmers don't set the price; the market sets the price—even if it means a loss, the farmer has to take it or leave it alone."

Some authorities here say that because of the general air of confusion and uncertainty the growers for the most part are just waiting. But there have been some suggestions that a great many cattle are finding their way into black markets.

The American Meat Institute states that one of the best indications of the magnitude of the black market is the increased volume of country hides moving into the market. In the 6 months to the end of April this volume was 41 percent higher than a year previous, despite the fact that country slaughterers mainly are under quotas.

The War Meat Board, now in session in Chicago, is trying to find a solution for the beef muddle, particularly hoping it can find a way to stem supplies reaching the black market, and machinery for assuring a continuous flow from the farms to the pens.

THROW OUT QUOTA SYSTEM

Congressman KLEBERG declares there is only one answer to the muddle: "Throw away the ridiculous figure of 70 percent of the 1941 kill, and stimulate the slaughter of about 6,000,000 extra head of cattle to fill up the gaping holes in the Nation's refrigerators."

"How ridiculous to operate a program of shortage in the midst of plenty," he said to Congress in a recent statement on the cattle situation.

"The present course not only promotes famine but fans inflation," he commented today.

Tin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from American Metal Markets, dated June 30, 1943:

TIN—MEMBERS OF METAL INDUSTRY WILLING TO BACK RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION RATHER THAN BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE—VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE NOTWITHSTANDING

NEW YORK, June 29.—Vice President WALLACE, in accusing Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones of carrying out obstructionist tactics in his dealings with the Board of Economic Warfare, and of failing, when the responsibility was his, to create sufficient stock piles of critical materials and drugs, has brought into public view the differences which have long been known to have existed between the Board of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation organizations, particularly the Metals Reserve Company. This report is not the place to discuss the respective merits or demerits of the Board of Economic Warfare's activities since it was given complete control of all public purchase import operations, but it can be said that the opinion definitely prevails in metal-trade circles that the job which was very efficiently handled by Metals Reserve during the time when it had the responsibility and the power to purchase strategic metals abroad, had better have been left in its hands.

Mr. WALLACE says that the Board of Economic Warfare has tried for over a year to do its job in spite of the obstruction which Mr. Jones has employed from time to time, but it is to be wondered whether the Vice President is able to distinguish between what he describes as "obstruction" and the expert opinions of those who know whereof they speak. It is to be wondered whether the Board of Economic Warfare has in its organization any who have a knowledge of such things as tin, tungsten, manganese, copper, and zinc to compare with that possessed by the men who have directed the policies and the activities of the Metals Reserve Company. Certainly it can be said that Metals Reserve does not have in its whole organization any such crass ignorance as has been displayed by some Board of Economic Warfare "experts."

We should all have reason to be thankful that Metals Reserve Company was in the saddle when the movement to accumulate tin in a large way was undertaken about 3 years ago. Its accomplishments were such that the tin situation has been and still is comfortable despite the fact that we are entirely dependent upon foreign sources for our supplies.

Conditions in Coal Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address regarding the coal situation, which was delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and Solid Fuels Administrator for War. The address was broadcast over the Blue Network from station WMAL on June 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have come to this microphone tonight to talk about coal—and to talk about it straight from the shoulder. The time has passed for oratorial shadow-boxing on this subject. The time has also passed, in my opinion, for mere high-powered emotional appeals to any man or to any group of men to be patriotic. The man who tonight or tomorrow or the next day does not carry his full share in this country's fight either does not understand the immediate crisis that we face or he deliberately sabotages in that fight in the hope that our enemies may win.

Right at the beginning I want to go on record as insisting that the men in the mines are not saboteurs. The men in the mines are not deliberately tossing their picks into the coal production cogs to help the enemy. I say this without qualification. I do not offer it as pap—or as a sop to the men who mine coal. I believe it even though what these men have done recently has interfered seriously with the smooth operation of our war-making machinery.

It is my belief that the men who mine coal are in the category of those who have not yet understood or felt the urgency of the real crisis that we face here at home and, consequently, the crisis that our armed forces face abroad. And, I may add, these men are not alone in that ignorance, nor is it confined to a single group in our society.

But tonight I want to stick to coal. This is a subject about which there is a great deal of confused thinking and diverse opinion.

I don't think many listeners will disagree with such a statement. But I don't want you to take my word alone. Let me give you a few simple illustrations. Let me quote from a few letters picked at random from a single day's mail coming to my office.

Here is a man who writes from the East. He says: "My solution is, why in the name of common decency, to say nothing of common hog sense, don't you take the mines away from the operators?"

Here is another proposed solution—this time from just across the border in Canada. This fellow is just as intense, but he takes what you might call the opposite slant. He says: "Why don't you end the strike by freezing all union funds and arresting Lewis and other union leaders for treason?"

A man writes from the South to say: "I would like to make a suggestion on how to break the coal strike. Secure enough war prisoners and put them to work operating the mines."

Another letter comes from a miner's daughter. She lives out in the Midwest. She says: "Yes; I agree wholeheartedly that the miners should not strike, and they also

feel that way, but they, too, know that if they want to make a decent living for their families, they must receive better pay."

And here is one from a soldier in the Air Force who says that he was the champion coal loader of his mine before he joined the Army. He writes: "* * * I am for the miners, though I do not want them to strike. I would like to hear that the Government raised their wages for them. Mining is tough work, and I would still rather load coal than enjoy myself in the Army, because I feel as if I haven't done anything for my country yet, and I'll do anything my country calls me to do."

Those are a few of hundreds of suggestions and comments that I get every day. They represent, in total, every possible shade of opinion on this important subject. But they also represent a good deal of confusion, when unity is what we need, when a single idea must prevail supported by everyone everywhere—the idea that we must mine coal to win this war, and anything, anything at all, which interferes with mining that coal, makes victory harder and could make victory impossible.

This would seem to say that I favor the mining of coal whether there is or is not a contract between the coal-mine owners and the miners. I meant to say just that.

It would also seem to say that I favor mining coal whether miners do or do not get a raise in wages. I meant to say that, too.

It would also seem to say that I favor mining coal whether miners are paid for portal-to-portal time. I also meant to say that.

I say these things simply because coal must be mined in great quantities if we are to win this war. Nothing is more important than victory. No one listening to me tonight would deny this statement. Every American knows it to be true. And no American can fail to understand why, if he reflects on the consequences to himself and his country of defeat by the Nazis and the Japanese.

I also say these things with full knowledge that definite hardships exist so far as the miners are concerned. I know full well that they have honest complaints. But I also know that some day the cause of those complaints will be removed. It may be no comfort to the miners to know that others, too, are serving their country under economic disabilities, but this is the fact. All of us must continue to serve until the need passes, disability or no disability economically.

Notwithstanding, we have come a long way in recent years toward greater economic justice for the mass of citizens of this country. We have a long road ahead. The major obstacle on that road is the enemy that we are now fighting—the enemy we must destroy before we can resume our march toward the better things for which this country stands. Consequently, anything which impedes this major effort becomes a delaying action, a drag on our military effort and a threat to victory.

Let us face the realities of this situation squarely. As I have suggested, it is not the miners alone who have grievances. Here in Washington not a day goes by but what some group of citizens exercises the historic right to petition. Every one of these groups has a complaint—many of them just ones. Manufacturers complain that they can't make enough profits if the Army and Navy renegotiate their contracts to bring their prices down. Farmers' representatives want higher prices for their farm products. Packers want Office of Price Administration price ceilings removed so that they can make more money. Labor groups want their wages increased to meet the rising cost of living. And so it goes—and goes every day.

It seems to me that each of these special groups tends to overlook the major issue—the winning of the war—for the immediate interest of the particular group. This is natural. It is human. Ordinarily, I could not complain very vigorously about it. But today—on the eve of the greatest military campaign of history, when every muscle, every sinew, every ounce of blood, and all of the guts that we have, must be pledged to a single purpose—the complaints of no man or group of men can be placed above our military goal. Is there anyone who doubts this? Is there anyone, who taking thought of the awful consequences of defeat, could disagree? Or are there those among us who are not yet convinced that this is not a game that we are playing, that it is not a weakling against whom we have matched our arms? If there be such among us, let me warn him now that the day is at hand when stark proof will be had of the magnitude of the struggle that will be convincing even to those few of little faith who still may doubt.

We could go back tonight over the history of the present coal controversy if there were any profit in that. However, I think that we should try to look at the history we hope to make, rather than moan over the dreary months of stalling, bickering, backbiting and oral bludgeoning through which we have just passed with the mine owners and the mine union.

Behind us are 23,000,000 tons of coal that we did not produce in May and June because of this dispute. Ahead of us is the necessity for the greatest production that we have ever attempted. The goal is 600,000,000 tons of bituminous coal and 65,000,000 tons of anthracite this year and half of the year is already behind us. Yet more than half that total production is still below ground. But the miners, somehow, can actually make up for this loss. They will produce prodigiously as they have in the past when we called upon them for extraordinary production. They will be inspired by the thought that out of the cold and dark bowels of the earth itself they will dig us the victory that will spell for them and their children peace and security.

These goals were not set without much study and expert calculations of our war needs. They were known to the coal industry and to the United Mine Workers long before the expiration of their contract on April 1. Everyone with more than a little knowledge of coal mining realized that it would take an enormous and continuing effort to achieve them. Even so, there was resistance on the part of some operators to working a 6-day week. There were complaints, too many of which proved to be well founded, that operators were trying to chisel out of their contractual agreement to pay time and one-half for the sixth day of work. There were also well-founded complaints that absenteeism was too high among the miners to give us assurance of meeting our goals. Yes; here were some people placing their own interests ahead of those of their country—people failing to comprehend the importance of their action in its relation to the gigantic task of winning this war and winning it as speedily as possible.

These things that I mention happened many weeks ago. Time has passed. We have taken north Africa in the meantime. We have conquered some of the Mediterranean islands on our way to Italy. We are face to face with the invasion of the Continent of Europe. And that, you all must know, will bring us finally face to face with the full strength of our Germany enemy.

In the shadow of this campaign, can any man's private, individual problems amount to more than a pin prick on the hide of an elephant as compared with the great public and collective problem confronting every American and every citizen of the nations with which we are allied? It is truly a collective effort that we must make, submerging beneath a single purpose many of the private interests that we can properly protect in happier times.

Specifically, what would a lack of victory mean to all of us—miners included? It would mean, in concrete terms, a lower standard of living than has prevailed in this great Nation for many years. It would mean less to eat, less to wear, less to spend.

It would mean less of everything for miners and operators alike. It would mean less of everything for the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker. There would not be, nor could there be, as much as we have had for the doctor, the lawyer, the merchant, or even the thief. This is war—total, all-enveloping war—from whose effects no one can escape. And if we are to win, everyone must contribute his full share, and that means sacrifice in the true sense of the word. Come to think of it, what small measure of sacrifice, if, indeed, any at all, have we made here at home since this war began? None, save those whose beloved ones have fallen in the conflict, has yet given more than a minimum to this fight.

There is no intention on my part to expect a greater contribution from the miners than from any other group. On the other hand, so long as I am charged with the responsibility of operating the Nation's coal mines, I cannot expect that their contribution shall be less, and that goes for the operators of the mines as well.

On May 2 President Roosevelt said: "I believe now, as I have all my life, in the right of workers to join unions and to protect their unions. I want to make it absolutely clear that this Government is not going to do anything now to weaken those rights in the coal fields." I share this view of the President's. I also believe in the right of a man to private property and in honest private enterprise. I, therefore, have no intention of snatching the mines from their rightful owners. However, the Government has had to assume supervision of the Nation's coal mines in this protracted dispute. That has become necessary because—and I repeat and emphasize it once more—we must have every ton of coal that we can dig just as fast as we can dig it out of the ground. It is perhaps difficult to visualize clearly what stoppage of coal production for a single day can mean in this fight to which millions have already pledged their lives and for which thousands have already died.

We normally produce about 2,000,000 tons of coal each day that the mines are worked. That gives us enough bituminous coal to make the steel required to build 324 Liberty ships—the ships that carry the stuff to the men who are fighting our war around the world.

It provides us with enough bituminous coal to provide the power to haul 1,275 freight trains of 100 cars each from New York to San Francisco, trains loaded with the ammunition and supplies needed by our fighting men in the Pacific.

That 1 day's supply gives us enough anthracite coal to heat 33,718 family dwellings, or a city of 100,000 persons—and heat those homes all winter.

There is another point that the miners in particular should not overlook in these hard days when the cost of living pressed their pocketbooks. For every day the mines are not worked, the miners lose $3,500,000 in wages—and I don't think that any of us can afford that extravagance, especially if we have families to support.

But I am sure from what I have seen and heard recently that many thousands of miners are realizing their responsibilities to their country as well as to their sons and brothers in the armed forces, and because of that realization they are eager to pursue the tough job of digging coal. I have had letters from such men. I have had telegrams from various fields all telling this story. But I have had others telling of a small minority

here and there who still attempt to persuade the majority that they are being sold down the river by anyone whose name can be used conveniently.

I also hear that these men, seeking to prevent fellow miners from digging coal, urge them not to trespass on mining property. To all miners, I want to say this: The coal mines today are in the custody of the people of the United States Government. Miners are citizens of the United States. They are not trespassing when they go into the mines to dig the coal that their country needs, particularly when the coal mines are in the custody of the Government of the United States—their Government. If there is any trespass, the guilty men are those few who urge that this coal be not mined.

I can assure the men who mine coal, and all others, that their Government does not sell the citizens of this country down any river at any time. For superior reasons of national policy, it must frequently say to its citizens: "This you shall not do"—or even: "This you may not get at this time regardless of how right your demands may be." So far as my job in the coal industry is concerned, mine workers and mine owners shall enjoy no advantage one above the other. Each has his job to do, and it is my responsibility to supervise their doing of that job.

It was with that thought in mind that I talked with the president of the United Mine Workers on the three occasions that I have seen him since this dispute began. It was with the same thought in mind that I have talked with the mine owners singly and in groups. There have been no deals, no off-the-record agreements, nor any private commitments, made either to John L. Lewis, the United Mine Workers, the operators' organizations, or to any single operator. And it is not my intention to make any deals with either group now or in the future. It is my hope that a firm understanding can soon be reached between the miners and the operators. Such an understanding, within the existing law and the policies of the Government is of primary public importance. It would be of extreme benefit to the success of the war that we fight, and incidentally a token of the good will that has not been conspicuous in the negotiations thus far. There must be an agreement eventually and the sensible thing to do is to reach one as quickly as possible. To do so would also be an evidence of mutual good will and good faith.

The lack of good will; the failure on both sides to proceed directly and promptly to an agreement has done great damage to the coal industry. Such actions as have been entered upon the public record in recent months have inflamed public sentiment to an extent that is dangerous in time of war. They have inflamed the Congress, which felt compelled to pass a most stringent law designed to prevent, or to outlaw strikes in enterprises taken over by the Government. It is, in my opinion, most unlikely that the coal difficulties can be abolished by the stroke of a pen—any pen. Whether that be possible, we shall see. But, possible or impossible, it should not have been necessary.

There should be that quality of leadership in labor's councils, which adjusts its grievances with management, without resort to extremes which embarrass production for war at such perilous times as these. Indeed, we have already seen examples of the kind of leadership to which I refer. We have seen instances of labor statesmanship in this war of which labor's rank and file may be proud. We have seen groups hard pressed economically submit to majority opinion, despite their very definite feeling that their cause was just. By going back to work on practically the same terms as prevailed under their last contract (which has been continued in full force and effect by the Government) the miners have entered into a competition in generosity of which they are entitled to be proud.

Only in a spirit of cooperation—between the miners, operators, and the public—can we achieve the kind of unified effort within our home-front ranks that is so necessary to the success of the intense phase of the war that we are now entering. It is expected of us by our allies. It is of vital importance to them and absolutely essential to ourselves. We will fail neither our allies nor ourselves. Least of all will we betray the high ideals of liberty that we serve.

Those are not mere words. They are facts; the facts that we face. They are inescapable and failure to meet them head-on points to disaster. Surely the coal industry, owners and miners, are aware of all of them as are all of the rest of us. Consequently, it is expected that they will act accordingly, which means in such a way that they will do their full share, carry their full burden of this greater task—the greatest that this Nation has ever attempted. It is upon coal that success depends—coal for heat, coal for power, coal for medicine, coal for chemicals, coal for oil, coal for coke, and coke for steel, and steel for ships and guns and tanks and planes.

Those are more facts, cold facts. They are some of the hard facts of war.

It is coal that we need. We need it urgently. And, pray God, it is coal that we will get.

One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence—Thomas Jefferson's 16 Points of Good Government

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, written by Thomas Jefferson, the great political philosopher of all time.

In his first inaugural address Jefferson laid down in 16 points what he calls the sum of good government. I will read from that address, and will take the liberty to number those 16 points and set them out by paragraphs. In that, the most historic address of the nineteenth century, Mr. Jefferson said:

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations.

He then lays down the following 16 points:

First. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political.

Second. Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Third. The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

Fourth. The preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.

Fifth. A jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided.

Sixth. Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics from which there is no appeal but to force—the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism.

Seventh. A well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war till Regulars may relieve them.

Eighth. The supremacy of the civil over the military authority.

Ninth. Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened.

Tenth. The honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith.

Eleventh. Encouragement of agriculture and of commerce as its handmaid.

Twelfth. The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason.

Thirteenth. Freedom of religion.

Fourteenth. Freedom of the press.

Fifteenth. Freedom of person under the protection of habeas corpus.

Sixteenth. Trial by juries impartially selected.

These principles, he says, form the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of terror or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Nation Faces Severe Food Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, when the President turned down the program of giving Chester Davis full control over the Nation's food supply and vetoed the antisubsidy legislation he closed the door of opportunity for an abundant food production. He did this against the advice of farm organizations, food processors, distributors, and every American citizen

that feels it his duty to pay his own grocery bill. These farm groups, composed of practical men, know how to obtain maximum food production which will provide protection against starvation and incidentally against inflation.

This administration, under the leadership and guidance of Frankfurter, Hopkins, Cohen, and company, must assume the responsibility for the lack of food due to their impractical approach to the food problem of our Nation.

It is regrettable that the President is surrounded with so many men who know little or nothing about the food problem. It makes no difference who is the nominal Food Administrator. We have had three of them in the past 4 months. None of them has had a chance to do a real job because the real power has been in the hands of this group of New Deal theorists headed by Frankfurter, Hopkins, Cohen, and company. This group in Washington appears to be more interested in remaking the American way of life than in getting food production.

All food authorities agree that America faces a severe food shortage. We cannot win the war and the peace without food. Food is just as important as tanks, planes, guns, and ships. This administration has failed to develop a definite and well-planned food program.

The chief factors which are causing the food shortage are lack of experienced farm help, too much regulation from Washington, misunderstanding of the farm problem in Washington, need for profit-insuring prices, lack of farm machinery, lack of wooden containers, early frosts, spring floods, the wage-freeze order, the lack of transportation facilities, and the administration's lack of confidence in producers, processors, and distributors. Of course, weather conditions will have a great bearing upon the final results of the 1943 crop.

In this land of plenty, where present food rationing provides a plentiful supply so that no one needs to go hungry, we had better start tightening our belts a little tighter, as there are more serious times ahead of us. Present supplies will look like a surplus compared with what we may have to face.

In the past the public has been led to believe that there were vast quantities of food and that the farmer was a profiteer. Our producers, the farmers, did break all records in food production last year. However, it is not a question of helping the farmers but how to get food at this late hour to win the war.

There has been too much confusion between the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, and the Agriculture Department. There has been too much red tape and delay. This bungling by the O. P. A. has already caused a shortage in the 1943 vegetable pack. Canners and processors have made several trips to Washington this year in order to get something done about canning the food which will be harvested this year. They have been given the run-around by the O. P. A. officials.

The canners made their final plea to the O. P. A. and Members of Congress last month. From recent studies of the Republican Food Study Committee, we have found the chief objection of the O. P. A. to be: Its lack of confidence in American businessmen; a poor fundamental policy; complexity of the program; and a personnel with little experience about the practical problems involved. We also discovered that America needs a food administrator with complete authority to handle the food program from the farmer to the consumer. He should have authority on production, distribution, rationing, and price fixing of food products.

Unless the present system is changed immediately we will have a critical shortage in vegetables, canned goods, protein feeds, meat, and dairy products next year. The O. P. A. has been too slow in determining price ceilings. Many acres have not been planted in vegetables due to this delay. Some price ceilings set by the O. P. A. are too low to cover the cost of production. The ceiling prices which have been applied to certain fruits and vegetables have caused a tremendous amount of confusion and actual chaos at the shipping point and in the receiving markets. In the case of certain commodities, such as potatoes, there has resulted the development and operation of the worst black market in history. Thousands of business places have closed this year because potatoes, poultry, vegetables, and other food products have entered the black markets. It is common knowledge among the wholesalers and retailers in most of the larger cities that the consumers are finding it necessary to purchase their supplies of potatoes and certain other commodities from these black markets at almost prohibitive prices from which the producer benefits very little, if any.

People who live in the cities and those engaged in war work and other factories should be more concerned about getting food enough to eat rather than the price. If prices are too low the food will not be produced or processed. It would be much better to be able to get a can of corn or tomatoes next year at 15 cents per can than to find no corn or tomatoes on the market at 14 cents per can. The canners want an adjustment of maximum prices which will reflect the increased cost of labor in event that regional labor rate increases are granted by the War Labor Board. The average increase for raw products and labor would be 1 cent per can. On the present basis of rationing the increase would amount to 36 cents per year. Unless they are substantially increased the result will be financial loss or bankruptcy for many canners.

America is demanding a program of abundance rather than one of scarcity. It is very difficult for the New Deal to change from a scarcity program to one of plenty. This year America lost the production of 500,000,000 bushels of corn because the dairy farmers went along with the A. A. A. program and only raised 8 acres of corn instead of 20 acres. They were required to follow the A. A. A. program in order to receive the loan benefits and avoid being considered a slacker. As a result, we have a corn shortage in the dairy and poultry sections. We have an acute situation in the distribution and marketing of corn caused by the bungling efforts of the O. P. A. to control food prices. Corn is primarily a livestock feed. Normally, only a small portion of the corn crop is used for human food or for industrial purposes. However, in the past 2 years there has been an additional demand for cornstarch in war production, an increased use of corn sirup as sugar substitutes and an expansion of the use of corn for alcohol.

It is a well-known fact that a large portion of our dairy, livestock, and poultry production is outside of the corn-producing area. Unless steps can be taken at once to make corn or other grain available to these outside areas, the production of such vital food products as milk, butter, eggs, poultry, and meat will be seriously curtailed.

The situation is also serious for the industrial users of corn. Many plants have been closed down and many others will close unless supplies are made available. Reserves are now being used up and corn shipments have dwindled to practically nothing.

One of the main reasons for this condition is price fixing by the O. P. A. They placed a ceiling price on corn at $1.07 per bushel, Chicago basis. That means a farm price of somewhere between 90 cents and $1 in the Corn Belt. Farmers will not sell corn for that price when they can make 40 cents a bushel more by selling it as pork. The hog and corn ratio prices are not in balance with a corn ceiling at $1.07 with a floor price on hogs at $13.75 per hundred pounds.

Many farmers in the Midwest are holding their corn for next years' feeding on account of the doubtful outlook of this years' crop due to floods and the late planting of corn. Last year the farmers were urged to raise more hogs and fatten them to heavier weights. Now these hogs will eat up the corn which is needed in the dairy cattle and poulty areas. The result will be a serious feed shortage for livestock and poultry next year.

Our only remedy to this situation is for the O. P. A. to raise the price ceiling on corn so the farmers will release part of their corn.

Every day brings new evidence of the serious dislocations caused by the O. P. A.'s bungling efforts to control prices. Today, there is a critical emergency confronting the livestock-producing and feeding industry. The industry's existence is not only threatened but also the Nation's meat supply is dwindling daily.

Due to the continued failure of the Office of Price Administration and other Federal agencies to work out a price structure which will cover the cost of production of beef, the Nation faces an increasing beef shortage, despite the fact that the total number of cattle on hoof is the greatest on record.

Prices of food are out of control and the Price Administrator appealed to our people to assist him in enforcing the price-control law. Black markets are increasing by leaps and bounds. No wonder the consumer is discouraged over high prices. No wonder we hear the cry of inflation.

In order to conceal the black markets the administration wants to adopt subsidies and a roll-back in prices. Subsidies are unsound and vicious. They lead to regimentation and political control. They retard the economic processes by which the balance of supply and demand would become better adapted. Subsidies are unfair because they are paid from the borrowings at the expense of future generations. These roll-backs are introduced at a time when the consumer is more able to pay. Subsidies lead to inflation because they increase available purchasing power, increase Federal expenditures, and contribute to a loss of confidence in the financial stability of the Government. The only way to avert inflation is through increased production. An abundant production is our best guaranty against inflation.

The proposed roll-backs of food prices, even though subsidized, will not effectively stimulate food production. Greater emphasis must be placed upon food production if our armed forces, civilians, and allies are to eat. The subsidy program is a complete admission on the part of the O. P. A. that it is unable to control prices and must resort to hidden inflation rather than orderly wartime price adjustments.

Only a star-gazer can believe that subsidies reduce the cost of living or prevents inflation. In paying taxes to provide funds for subsidies the people are in effect paying higher prices for food.

In conclusion, some of the things that are desirable to solve the food shortage are: First, a single Food Administrator should have authority over production, price fixing, rationing, and distribution; second, stop trying to regiment the American farmer; third, hire competent people in the O. P. A. and Agriculture Department who have practical knowledge of food production and distribution; fourth, real recognition of agriculture as a war industry by giving it adequate allocation of machinery and manpower; fifth, simplification of the over-all food program; sixth, make every possible use of the experience and ability of those persons familiar with the normal methods of marketing and distribution.

The Cost of Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

THE COST OF SUBSIDIES

In the long, confused, and extraordinary veto message that the President sent to Congress on the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidy bill, the charge that probably did most to secure the vote sustaining the veto was this: "By this measure the Congress will compel every housewife to pay 5 cents a pound more for every piece of butter that goes on her table, and to pay higher prices for every pork chop, every ounce of beef, every slice of ham or bacon which goes to feed her family."

This argument would have been equally good—even much better—if the administration had begun subsidies twice as great or four times as great on butter and meats and if the subsidies extended to every important item on the dinner table. What limit does the President put on the subsidy policy? Where does it begin and end? How many billions will it take to carry it out? Where will these billions come from? The President's argument talks of reducing the cost of living. But there is not a line in his whole veto message which points out that every penny of subsidies must ultimately be paid out of increased taxes.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Tribune of June 27, 1943:

LETTER TELLS TROOP WRATH AT COAL ROW—STRIKE CALLED BLOW TO MORALE

News of the mine workers' strike had a more disturbing effect on American soldiers on at least one battle front than any major engagement with the enemy, according to a letter from a Minneapolis soldier to his father-in-law here.

The letter from the north African front obviously referred to the trouble with the mine workers before the first truce was declared. It was dated April 30.

"The mails do not permit me to repeat the adjectives used by the boys to describe how they feel about this deplorable condition of the home front," Sgt. Richard Hollister wrote C. F. Ashton, 2439 Bryant Avenue South.

The strike was the last news they heard the night he wrote the letter and it "hurt the boys terribly," he said.

"It was after dark and the boys gathered to hear the news from London," the letter began. "We knew how we were doing, but hoped to find out how the war is going as a whole. All went well until near the end.

"'The mine workers are going out on strike.'"

That sentence hurt. The boys squirmed in their fox holes. They became taut and what they were thinking of the miners wasn't anything pleasant, according to the tone of the letter.

The letter went on:

"Remember us? We left home February 10, 1941. We went to camp at 21 bucks a month. We left our sweethearts, wives, classrooms and jobs. Our country asked, we gave. We were the first American expeditionary force. We have been overseas 15 months.

"Many men have children they have never seen. A few days ago we buried five of our boys in one grave. We couldn't identify them. We hoped they wouldn't mind. It's warmer sleeping together.

"We haven't had the simple pleasures such as baths, fresh food, clean clothes or entertainment. We sleep with sand fleas, lice, mosquitoes, snakes, and anything that crawls, too numerous to mention. Stew gets tiresome after a few months. Then the ever-present thought, 'Will I make it home or is my number on the list?'

"I could write for hours on the things the boys have given up or gone without * * * Do we want sympathy? Hell, no! We want cooperation. This news of strikes—it hurts * * * We believe that men who strike are traitors * * * What if soldiers on the front lines should strike?

"We need coal. The lack of it holds up industry. We need planes, tanks, guns. Without them we die. Two hundred and forty thousand traitors! Is that what we fight for?

"I'm not a writer. It's hard to concentrate in a fox hole. Don't let these traitors spoil our America."

The Vote on the President's Veto

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that in the future, events will show that the 228 Congressmen who stood up to the last round and voted to override the President's veto to prevent the Government from embarking on a Nation-wide program of subsidies, that the names of these Congressmen will deserve a place on the honor roll of the Nation.

For these men opposed the President's policy to reach into the Federal Treasury for billions of dollars at this time when wages are the highest that were ever known, with which to pay a part of the grocery bills for all of the people of the Nation in a time of their greatest prosperity.

They refused to be a party to the President's inflationary policy of adding billions of dollars to the national debt for the soldiers and their families to help to pay when they get home, this future debt voted upon them to help pay our grocery bills while they were away fighting to preserve this country on the battle fronts of the world.

Congress has taken the position that "the least we can do is to pay our own grocery bills." The President has taken his usual position of "eat, drink, and be merry; don't worry about the future; spend with a lavish hand; others must pay the bills."

It is unfortunate that to pass a measure over the President's veto requires a two-thirds vote. By this provision a majority of the House yesterday, which cast 228 votes, was defeated by the small minority of 154 votes, many doubtless voting politically to sustain their political leader.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that the founders of our Government did not

provide for a secret vote on overriding a Presidential veto. A secret vote yesterday would have overridden the veto by a large majority. If all Members of Congress would have followed their conscience, the results would have been different, and the Nation's future would have been more hopeful and secure.

The greatest pity is that the founders of our Government failed to write into the Constitution a prohibition against more than two terms for a President. If they had, there would be more hope today for the continuance of this Republic they founded as a land of freedom and opportunity to carry out their high ideals.

Those who joined with the President yesterday will now have to take the blame and the consequences which will follow in the course of their decision.

You have disregarded the urgent plea of every farm organization, every processor of foods and dairy products in the Nation. You have turned your back on them and the best business brains of the country, all of whom opposed national subsidies.

You have opened up the floodgates of the National Treasury for more spending, extravagance, and waste. You have become a party to this thing that will hold down production and cause people to go hungry in this land of plenty.

You have followed the President's promise of more manna from heaven in a speech read to you yesterday that sounded more like a last-hour campaign speech for votes than a veto message, an incessant jumble of many words in an effort to dodge the facts. A refusal to courageously meet the issues when patriotic people are demanding courageous and true leadership to save the economy of the Nation and to win the war.

You who followed his advice yesterday in his veto message, which was unique in its lack of logic and facts, its abundance of fog and confusion, will have to share the consequences of your decision and votes.

The O. P. A. and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the remarks which I made last evening over radio station WRC and the National Broadcasting Co.:

I am very grateful for the opportunity to participate in this program with Congressman PATMAN. I consider him an outstanding authority on fiscal matters, especially in the field of finance and economics.

Although we have at times differed in methods, in recent conversations we have concluded that we have a common purpose in respect to the all-absorbing question of inflation.

I believe everyone who listens to the radio or reads the newspapers has a clear understanding of what is meant by inflation. It is reflected in a depreciation of the value of our money and results in our having to use more money for the purchase of any stated amount of goods. Any abnormal increase in purchasing power at the same time that there is not sufficient available consumer goods to meet the demand attending the increase in purchasing power, causes the value of our money to go down, and prices, in terms of dollars, to go up. The increase in purchasing power at the present time is due largely to the tremendously large expenditures by the Government.

The Government gets its money for these expenditures by issuing bonds. These bonds are sold to the public; the insurance companies, investment houses, and commercial banks. If the general public bought Government bonds in the same proportion as the national income is increased, then there would be no danger of inflation, because there would be such a siphoning off of purchasing power through the purchase of bonds by private investors as to reduce the amount of money left with which to purchase goods. Unfortunately, however, a large part of these bonds find their way into commercial banks and are used as security for new issues of currency and credit. In this manner the volume of our currency has increased in a few years from about $5,000,000,000 to about $16,000,000,000.

Because there is this close affiliation between the national debt and the circulation of currency and credit any expenditure by the Federal Government, in addition to taxes collected, therefore increases the volume and velocity of our currency and credits, thereby decreasing the value of our money, which of course results in increased prices. There are many other practices which influence inflation in addition to the use of Government bonds as security for currency issues, such as our gold and silver programs, which we will not take the time to discuss at present.

Congress has spent a great deal of time in attempts to solve this problem, and much has been said about the part which the Office of Price Administration has in stabilizing and controlling prices. When the Price Control Acts were passed no one contended that they were the cure-all for inflation, but everyone admitted that they were desirable contributions to keeping down the cost of living. They gave authority to the Price Administrator to stabilize and control prices.

That the attempts of the Administrator in these respects have failed is not the fault of the acts. The fault lies clearly in the administration of the acts. Prices will never be stabilized so long as the Administrator neglects to establish and enforce maximum prices. All necessary authority was given to the President and the Price Administrator in the Price Control Acts to keep down prices. No additional authority is necessary if the acts are administered and enforced according to their terms and in accordance with the clear intent of Congress.

Under the acts the President is authorized to stabilize and control all elements of the price of living, prices, wages, salaries, and rents, not only the cost to the consumer but all of the production costs of any and all of the thousands of commodities which people necessarily buy. The dissatisfaction with the administration of this law has resulted in frequent demands being made for various so-called solutions. These suggestions vary from transferring a portion of the Office of Price Administration functions to various other agencies to repeal of the acts in whole.

We must look at this problem realistically, and in doing so we must conclude that nothing would be accomplished by destroying the agency which Congress has set up to control and stabilize prices. Little could be accomplished by transferring the functions of the Office of Price Administration to any other agencies of the Government. The reason for this is that all of the agencies to which these functions could or would be transferred are now under the same administrative head and subject to the same restrictions as have hamstrung the Price Administrator in the performance of his statutory duties. There is no more reason why we should destroy the Office of Price Administration at a time when, if it functions properly, it is so necessary in any program to prevent inflation, than there would be to burn down the barn to get rid of the rats.

On several occasions lately, Congress has voiced its disapproval of the manner in which the Office of Price Administration is being administered, and when I say this I do not intend any reflection on the Price Administrator, the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown. He is functioning probably as well as anyone could under the circumstances. His hands are tied so tight that he can hardly issue an order without first consulting someone else in the Government; for example, he cannot set a food price without first getting the approval of the War Food Administrator; he cannot effectively regulate the price of hard fuels, gasoline, or oil without first consulting with Mr. Ickes; he cannot establish maximum rents in defense areas without first consulting and clearing his orders through the Federal Housing Agency, and, of course, he cannot do anything about prices of critical and strategic materials without the prior approval of the War Production Board.

In order to effectively control prices we must, as Congress intended, vest the power in a single office. The whole question of prices has become so complex and confusing that a reshuffling of agencies exercising control over prices should be made, with the result that all attempts to curb inflation by the control and stabilization of prices should be coordinated as was intended by Congress under the direct and untrammeled control of the Office of Price Administration. The pulling and hauling among the agencies of the Government in respect to prices has got to stop immediately if we are going to stop runaway inflation. This the people have a right to expect. The administration has ample power to correct all of the evils incident to rising prices without further action by the Congress. It can and should be done.

Roosevelt or Hitler—Which?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Roosevelt or Hitler—Which?" from the Wichita Plain Dealer of June 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT OR HITLER—WHICH?

In a game of chess, whoever captures the king wins; in the game of war, the same rule

is observed. The United Nations are using every form of propaganda to incite the Germans and Italians to a rebellion against Hitler and Mussolini—and in like manner, Adolf Hitler is using every form of psychological warfare he can against Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Three times since the outbreak of hostilities between Great Britain and Germany, has Winston Churchill been called upon to defend his office against ouster from the House of Commons. In every instance Churchill won overwhelmingly, consequently Hitler ceased his efforts in that direction.

Ever since his declaration of war on America, Hitler has endeavored strenuously, through the employment of his two agencies, the German-American Bund and the America First Committee, to either overthrow Roosevelt's administration by force of arms or to render impossible the reelection of Roosevelt in 1944.

It is a well-known fact that the Nazi propaganda machine is the best in the world and today Adolf Hitler's only hope of victory is the crack-up of America's war effort. Tojo also shares this hope; Admiral Yamura voiced his belief in a broadcast to Berlin and Rome in which he stated: "It is not necessary to open any new offenses, all we need to do is to hold onto what we have—and time will break the democracies." About 10 weeks ago a prominent politician, who before Pearl Harbor went about the country at the expense of the America First Committee, declaring that "the Yanks are not coming," made this statement: "Before 1944 events will transpire both in Europe and in the United States that will render impossible the reelection of Franklin D. Roosevelt." Shortly afterward, the first coal strike happened. Then we had a second and now a third walkout in an industry vital to the success of our war production. Of course, it must not be assumed this prophecy had anything to do with John L. Lewis' conduct; nevertheless, it is a strange coincidence.

After the first coal strike Adolf Hitler stated that "John L. Lewis was acting properly because in America the dollar is the only thing that counts." Again, the June 4 issue of Hitler's own newspaper, the Volkischer Beobachter, gave editorial orchids to John L. Lewis. And the Wall Street Journal recently called attention to the close similarity of tactics of Adolf Hitler and John L. Lewis in which it said: "Hitler rode to power as the friend of the poor man when in reality he was the instrument of the German bankers and the industrial tycoons and that John L. Lewis was receiving strong support from similar sources in this country."

Everyone can remember in the fall of 1941 when the America First Committee was staging meetings throughout the Nation that John L. Lewis gave the movement his wholehearted support. Hitler knew that Franklin D. Roosevelt's popularity was chiefly among the working classes, he therefore calculated that if Roosevelt was deprived of this power, he would easily be defeated in the election. Consequently, John L. Lewis was selected as the man to perform this task. On account of the coal strike the Smith-Connally antistrike bill was passed by Congress. Immediately organized labor appealed to President Roosevelt to veto the bill.

Now, the strategy of Adolf Hitler in this movement is really worthy of mention. If the President complies with the request of organized labor, the German-American Bund and the America First Committee will proclaim that the American farmer and businessman are being sacrificed on the altar; if he signs the bill they will cry out that the American laborer is being crucified. Consequently, no matter how soon or how satisfactorily the coal strike is settled, Hitler will have achieved his goal by successfully antagonizing one group of Americans against another. This is exactly what that astute politician meant when he said: "Events will transpire in the United States that would render the re-election of President Roosevelt an impossibility."

However, this is war, so the American electorate will have to decide who they desire to be captured, Hitler or Roosevelt. Naturally Adolf's nominee will be financed by the German-American Bund and the America First Committee, well camouflaged with such words as Isolationist, Nationalist, Non-Interventionist and Constitutionalist. Only time will tell if we are smart or stupid.—A Fighter's Father.

Subsidies Are Inflationary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include as follows the remarks which I made last evening over radio station WOL and the Mutual Broadcasting System:

On June 25 over this station some very interesting statements were made by a group of Congressmen who styled themselves the "40 fighting Congressmen."

What they were fighting for may have seemed nebulous, but in substance they were and still are fighting for a share of public moneys out of the pockets of the taxpayers to pay a part of their grocery bills for the duration of the war.

They advocated subsidies by the Treasury to pay a part of our living costs at a time when the Government seems justified in impressing upon us the feasibility of paying as much of the cost of this war as is possible as we go along. These subsidies can only be paid by moneys received from the sale of bonds. The interest and carrying charges on these bonds are about 4 percent per annum. The national debt cannot be retired for at least 25 years. Therefore, for every dollar which the Treasury pays in subsidies $2 must be raised in taxes to retire the increase in the debt resulting from their payment.

Those of us who oppose subsidies do so as a partial solution of certain fundamental harassing problems which must be solved if the American form of government is to be preserved.

The terms "subsidies to pay our grocery bill" and "inflation" are synonymous. Inflation is next in importance to the winning of the war. Such subsidies constitute the basic threat of inflation today. Their payment by the Treasury increases the purchasing power of the Nation. They are directly contrary to the announced policy of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury that to curb inflation we must siphon off as much of the excess purchasing power as possible by increasing taxes or otherwise.

Subsidies do not reduce prices to consumers. Take the typical example of butter. The price of butter has been rolled back 5 cents a pound—from 46 cents to 41 cents. Do you pay 46 cents for the pound of butter you were allowed to buy in June? Of course you do. You pay the grocer 41 cents and the Treasury of the United States will deduct 5 cents from your pay envelope to make up the difference. The Treasury will then turn about and pay your grocer the 5 cents after it has run the gantlet through half a dozen Government agencies of expensive red tape.

If you don't pay it, then your son or daughter will pay it, and I don't believe there is an American today, other than those who do it for political expediency, who would want our returned soldiers and sailors to pay our grocery bills in addition to fighting our country's battles. We can better afford to pay for our food now than could any of our people at any time in the history of our country. As a witness to this fact, I present no less an authority than the United States Government itself, which, speaking through its Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, in analyzing food costs and consumer income for all the years 1913 to 1943, has this to say: "The total cost to consumers of fixed quantities of foods making up a typical consumer's food basket was smaller in relation to average consumer income in recent months than at any other time on record," and presents official charts to that effect.

Consumer subsidies are objectionable:

1. Because they constitute the basic reason for the threat of inflation by increasing surplus spending power.

2. Because we merely postpone the day when we will have to pay our food bill, and then twice over.

3. Because the wage earner of this generation and following generations will have to pay a disproportionate share of that part of the national debt which results from the payment of subsidies.

4. Because it is economically wrong to pass on to our sons and daughters any part of the war debt which we can possibly pay ourselves. And it is morally wrong to obligate our sons and daughters to pay for years to come for the food which we are eating today.

Monthly Payments to Dependents of Enlisted Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a schedule of monthly payments to dependents of enlisted men, as prepared by the War Department.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Monthly payments to dependents of enlisted men under Public Law 625, 77th Cong. (Family Allowance Act)

	Enlisted man's share	Government's share	Total
Wife but no child	$22	$28	$50
Wife and 1 child	22	40	62
Wife and 2 children	22	50	72
Wife and 3 children	22	60	82
Wife and 4 children	22	70	92
Wife and 5 children	22	80	102
No wife but 1 child	22	20	42
No wife but 2 children	22	30	52
No wife but 3 children	22	40	62
No wife but 4 children	22	50	72
No wife but 5 children	22	60	82
Divorced wife	22	20	42
1 parent	22	15	37
1 parent and 1 sister, brother, or grandchild	22	20	42
1 parent and 2 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	25	47
1 parent and 3 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	30	52
1 parent and 4 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	35	57

Monthly payments to dependents of enlisted men under Public Law 625, 77th Cong. (Family Allowance Act)—Continued

	Enlisted man's share	Government's share	Total
1 parent and 5 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	$22	$40	$62
1 parent and 6 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	45	67
2 parents	22	25	47
2 parents and 1 sister, brother, or grandchild	22	30	52
2 parents and 2 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	35	57
2 parents and 3 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	40	62
2 parents and 4 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	45	67
2 parents and 5 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	50	72
No parent but 1 sister, brother, or grandchild	22	5	27
No parent but 2 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	10	32
No parent but 3 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	15	37
No parent but 4 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	20	42
No parent but 5 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	22	25	47
Wife but no child and 1 parent	27	43	70
Wife but no child and 2 parents	27	53	80
Wife, 1 child, and 1 parent	27	55	82
Wife, 2 children, and 1 parent	27	65	92
Wife, 3 children, and 1 parent	27	75	102
Wife, 4 children, and 1 parent	27	85	112

Tribute to the Late Thomas S. Smith, Collector of Internal Revenue for Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have just received from Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Herbert E. Gaston. The letter comments upon the death of Thomas S. Smith, collector of internal revenue for Connecticut, who died on June 15. I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the letter there be printed editorials from the Hartford Times and the Hartford Courant.

Mr. Smith served as collector of internal revenue for several years. In addition to the duties of that office, he undertook much additional work made necessary by the war. He has been, over the years, a leader in raising funds for the noble undertaking at Warm Springs, Ga., and for those stricken with infantile paralysis who live in other sections of the country. Those who knew Mr. Smith feel that as a result of his untiring efforts and his devotion to the extra activities of the Government and to the welfare of unfortunate people he exhausted his strength and his death was hastened.

Mr. Smith was highly regarded by the people of our State and all others who knew him. He commanded the love and respect of his associates and those with whom he came in contact, and among these are those connected with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department. Mr. Gaston, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, has written to me on the death of Mr. Smith. His letter is a tribute to a good man, as are the editorials to which I have referred.

On behalf of the people of Connecticut who knew Mr. Smith or knew about him, and on behalf of the Members of the Connecticut delegation in the Congress, I want to pay this modest additional tribute to his memory. That is why I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gaston's letter and the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 29, 1943.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: In the absence of Secretary Morgenthau I am acknowledging receipt of your letter of June 26, speaking of the death of Internal Revenue Collector Thoma S. Smith, of Hartford, on June 15, and enclosing copies of news articles and editorials from Hartford newspapers.

The death of Tom Smith was, of course, a shock and a source of grief to all of us in the Treasury who knew him. He had been not only an extremely active and efficient collector of internal revenue, but the extra patriotic service he rendered as War Savings Administrator for the State of Connecticut constituted a war service beyond praise. He had succeeded in building one of the very best War Savings organizations in the country and undoubtedly in his devotion to this task drove himself beyond the point of his physical capacity to endure the strain. His death certainly constitutes a direct war sacrifice, but one which he made cheerfully and willingly.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT E. GASTON,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 17, 1943]

THOMAS S. SMITH

In the death of Thomas S. Smith, United States collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, this community loses a sympathetically understanding official, a public-spirited citizen, and an abettor of good causes. For the past 8 years he has been chairman of the Hartford County committee to raise funds for combating infantile paralysis, and his interest in that work was unflagging. That he thus helped materially to bring health and joy in living to many handicapped children was no doubt his supreme satisfaction.

This ending of "Tom" Smith's career in his middle fifties will come as a distinct blow to many different elements in Hartford, from the employees in his large office to his own wide circle of warm personal friends. As Kipling wrote of his brother-in-law, Wolcott Balestier:

"He had no need to doff his pride or slough
the dross of earth,
E'en as he trod that day to God, so walked
he from his birth
In simpleness, and gentleness, and honor,
and clean mirth."

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times of June 16, 1943]

A GOOD AND FRIENDLY MAN

Many things could be said in praise of Thomas S. Smith, whose death yesterday caused widespread regret throughout the community and the State and beyond. He had a multitude of friends, which included practically everyone who knew him at all.

His character was sound, his instincts of the finest, his abilities excellent. Loyalty, sincerity, and trustworthiness were fundamental in his make-up, accompanied by a zeal in the numerous worthy causes he undertook to help which probably had considerable to do with his early and untimely passing. He threw himself so earnestly into a number of things besides his duties as collector of internal revenue, war savings, the annual infantile paralysis campaign, and other activities—that his friends long ago became concerned lest he wear himself out. He was always willing, always indefatigable and effective.

Outstanding was his friendliness. Mr. Smith did not have to agree with a person to have a friendly attitude toward him and a desire to be helpful. This was not merely a pose, for he was genuine and sincere in his relationships and he withheld no good turn it was in his power to do. Active in politics and in social and civic affairs he was self-respecting, a believer in honor and decency, completely loyal to those with whom he was associated.

As a young man and city alderman he won a wide popularity which he retained to the end. His multitude of friends were glad to see him win the collectorship and rejoiced at the excellent way the office was conducted under his direction. Taxpayers and others having business with the office found him eager to serve and accommodate them, as well as zealous as to his obligations to the Government. His life was a relatively short one, but it was a full one, and it must have had many satisfactions in its pleasant relationships.

Inflation and War Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me an open letter addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], written by Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American. The letter is captioned "Inflation injures 50,000,000 patriots." In his letter Mr. Vanderpoel calls attention to the fact that 50,000,000 loyal, patriotic Americans are today buying War bonds to carry on our war effort, and that if inflation is permitted to run rampant these bonds will become very poor investments; that the persons who are buying these bonds and have paid for them with a dollar of one value will, if inflation occurs, be paid back in an entirely different and a much depreciated dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION INJURES 50,000,000 PATRIOTS

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel, Financial Editor)

An open letter to Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, Senator from Illinois:

"DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: As you know, there are more than 50,000,000 people in the

United States buying War bonds. Almost every household has at least one War-bond buyer.

"These bonds are good investments only as long as inflation is avoided. If inflation is to be encouraged or permitted to run rampant, the bonds become poor investments.

"I have full confidence in the integrity of the American Government, and I have never had any doubt but that these bonds will be paid in full at maturity. But if the American Government is to play fair with the people, payment must be made in dollars of approximately the same purchasing power as prevailed when the dollars were saved. Otherwise the investment principle of the bonds became a farce."

MAY BE RESULT

"I am very sure that the American Congress has no desire to play fast and loose with the faith of 50,000,000 American people. Recent developments, however, have left me unconvinced that this may not be the consequence of politics not intended to produce such results.

"The administration had a policy to prevent excessive inflation. This involved, first, a hold-the-line program for prices, stabilization of wages, limitation of profits. Another and very important weapon recognized by administration leaders has been increased taxes. The third weapon has been increased savings, either through voluntary purchases of bonds, or forced saving."

A BETTER PLAN?

"Some parts of the administration's program have been poorly administered, while numerous mistakes have been made and some policies have been of a highly controversial nature. It has been my opinion, however, that unless one had something better to offer he should not assume the responsibility for knocking the props out from under a considered program.

"Recently, it seems to me, Congress has been doing exactly that. Certain elements among the farmers, among organized labor, among business interests, and in Congress itself, have acted very much as though they favored uncontrolled inflation. Obviously no sane, intelligent man could do that, yet plenty of sane, intelligent men are allowing their hopes for personal gain for the interests they represent to outweigh their better judgment."

TAX PROGRAM INADEQUATE

"On the matter of taxes, too, both Congress and the administration have failed to show the courage and leadership necessary to prevent inflation. The administration has stubbornly refused the sales tax which it probably could get and which would be helpful in combating inflation and making people tax conscious.

"Congress fought at great length over the Ruml forgiveness scheme, but refused to adopt personal-income taxes sufficiently stiff to check the inflation danger."

PROVE CYNICS WRONG

"Senator LUCAS, in the name of the 50,000,000 loyal Americans who are investing in War bonds, I beseech you to use your great influence to awaken Congress to the dangers now besetting the country.

"There are people who refuse to buy bonds because they say Congress has not the courage to levy the taxes and enforce price and wage stabilization.

"In the name of those Americans who love their country more than the almighty dollar, I beg you and your fellow Members in the Senate and the House of Representatives to prove these cynics wrong.

"Sincerely yours,

"ROBERT P. VANDERPOEL."

What the Armed Forces Wonder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What the Armed Forces Wonder," from the Toronto Daily Star of May 20, 1943. It is in fact a report by Archbishop Derwyn T. Owen, who visited the troops in England for a period of 7 or 8 weeks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE ARMED FORCES WONDER

Back from spending 7 weeks in England, most of the time with the troops, Archbishop Derwyn T. Owen has been telling the Toronto synod of the Anglican Church about the questions with which the fighting men are most concerned. And first among these questions is speculation as to the conditions which they will encounter in Canada on their return home. Are they going to wander the country over, looking for work, as many did after the Great War? What does Canada think of the Beveridge report? What provision is Canada making for the social security of its people?

Archbishop Owen quotes them as saying: "We are not fighting for the old things that broke down. We are not fighting for the return of the days of old peace and the old boom and the old depression. They are not worth fighting for. We are not fighting for the poorhouse." Asked how the ills of the past could be avoided in the future, the men invariably replied, in effect, that "if there are brains enough to organize for war, there must be brains enough to organize for peace." And with respect to financing: "Never again are we going to be deceived about money, and put off with the statement that there is no money to organize another state of things, to give work, etc. If there is money enough to finance a war, there is money enough to finance the peace."

The archbishop approaches the problem humbly. He does not pretend to be an authority on money; he wonders whether anybody really understands it. What he does understand is that men have a peace duty as well as a war duty, and that the peace problems will be as difficult, and at the same time as vital, as the war problems. "I do plead," he says, "that this peacetime phase will require the same kind of sacrifice, of effort, of concentration—the consecrating spirit of a great crusade—which the war requires. The great danger will be the danger of exhaustion, of going to the opposite of effort, and letting go, seeking distraction and pleasure in the throes of a great reaction. Let us now realize these things, prepare, so far as possible, for these things, and be ready to take our full part in making a better Canada for our sons and daughters."

There will be foes of a peace victory as there are foes of a war victory. "What lions are on that road? Money interests? Vested interests? The selfishness of the human heart which will not carry over into peacetimes the unselfishness of wartimes? These are questions to be faced. These are problems to be solved, and the church must have something to say concerning the application of the Christian ideals to these problems, though she has little to say as to the details, but much to say as to principles."

Archbishop Owen strikes at the root of the matter when he asks whether "the selfishness of the human heart" will stand in the way of the kind of new order to which Canada's men overseas look forward on their return. That is the great danger. The new order will involve not only the provision of employment, but the provision of social security during unemployment, sickness, disability, and old age. Both provisions will cost the state money. The money will have to be raised by taxation. Profits will have to be taxed and incomes taxed to provide it. Taxation that is tolerated in war will be resented by many in peace. There will be, as the archbishop points out, a reaction.

He is right when he says that the church, together with other agencies, can play a great part in "carrying into the establishment of peace conditions something of the spirit of war conditions." After all, what agency should be better fitted for the task, since what is required is "the application of Christian principles to social reconstruction?"

At His Worst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday July 3, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

AT HIS WORST

Mr. Roosevelt was at his petulant worst yesterday when reporters at his press conference attempted to get information from him concerning the feuds between Washington officials and the startling break-down of administrative efficiency as revealed by the resignation of Chester Davis. In asking for answers to such matters as the Vice President's terrific indictment of Jesse Jones, the reporters were merely acting as representatives of the people as a whole, who most decidedly are interested in ending the dissension, confusion, and conflict in Washington.

Instead of throwing light on the situation, the President countered with an attack on the press, accusing the newspapers of encouraging quarrels among officials. When it was pointed out that Mr. WALLACE'S statement before the Senate Appropriations Committee, in which he charged Secretary Jones with hamstringing the war effort, had not been solicited by the reporters, but was initiated by WALLACE, the President could only answer that he was taken by surprise, too.

Nor could the newspapers have had anything to do with the resignation of Chester Davis. The inside story of that, as published in the Post-Dispatch, is an almost incredible tale of administrative inefficiency which drove Davis to despair and resignation. Here was a man of the highest type, who accepted only a few months ago the exacting task of Food Administrator, being left in ignorance of all kinds of governmental moves concerning food. He was not even informed of

the order setting up Director Byrnes as Director of the O. W. M.

Davis on June 16 laid his cards on the table at a meeting with Byrnes, Vinson, and Brown, pointing out that in accepting great responsibility, he would also have to be vested with commensurate authority. He asked that there be no more surprise price-fixing orders from the Office of Price Administration and that he be given a voice in policy councils. When it was evident his pleas were of no avail, he sent his resignation to the White House. It appears, also, that although the Executive order which appointed Davis made him directly responsible to the President, about the only way he could get the President's ear was to quit his job.

The newspapers have plenty of faults, but they did not inspire the WALLACE denunciation of Jones; they did not produce the administrative chaos from which Davis escaped; they did not manhandle the controversy with Lewis so as to produce three separate coal strikes; they are not responsible for such controversies as have occurred between Rubber Administrator Jeffers and other public officials. All these symptoms of Washington fumbling and dissension, of course, have been reported by the newspapers, but the person responsible for the administrative muddle is the President himself.

The President has shown something less than genius in his handling of the Washington front. He has a very bad weakness for not wanting to fire anyone, no matter how bad or futile the appointee's record may be. He has kept Frances Perkins in her job as Secretary of Labor at a time when that office should have a person of the highest caliber as a labor statesman; he has permitted Jesse Jones to wield enormous power long after Jones' record was discredited; when he appointed Chester Davis, he did not fire Wickard, who had failed on the job. And these are only a few of the instances that could be cited.

When O. P. M. broke down, the President set up S. P. A. B.; then came the W. P. B., the O. E. S., and the O. W. M.—a dizzy succession of initials, and usually officials who had failed were reshuffled around and retained in positions of power and responsibility. One new face that was brought in was that of ex-Justice Byrnes, and only a short time ago it was announced, when he was made Director of O. W. M., that his job was to referee disputes between warring officials. Now comes the biggest dispute of all—the slugging match between WALLACE and Jones, which occurred before the referee ever got into the ring.

In addition to his reluctance to fire anyone, the President has shown a disinclination to relinquish authority and to delegate responsibility. Many able men—such as Byrnes—have made sacrifices to take war jobs in the interest of patriotism, only to find that they cannot act with firmness and decision because the main strings are all manipulated from the White House. Just how a President, in this universal war, can keep his finger in every pie and look after every major detail, both on the war and the domestic fronts, is something no person trained in administration can understand. It is precisely because the President tries to do this that Washington has become an administrative madhouse.

The President's acts of omission and commission of late, we feel sure, have alarmed and disturbed the country. It has been charged in some quarters that, by his veto of the Smith-Connally-Harness bill and his price policies, he is playing fourth-term politics to get the support of organized labor. Whether this be true or not, it shows public awareness that something is wrong and a consequent search to find the motives behind fumbling home-front leadership. Those who would ordinarily sympathize with the President's great burdens are asking why he deliberately overburdens himself instead of delegating part of his authority.

The time has come for the President to address himself to the conflict in Washington, to lop off inefficient heads, to straighten out the numerous snarls among high officials, and to give Director Byrnes a fair and full chance to function as the home-front czar he was advertised to be.

Personal Responsibilities Entailed by Higher Incomes Created by the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many of us today are enjoying higher incomes than ever before. It is a sobering thought, however, to remember why we have higher incomes.

The reason is the war—the same war which, started by the Axis, has cost thousands of American lives and which will cost thousands more—the same war which has caused death and untold suffering for millions throughout the world.

This Axis-created war has caused the greatest demand for American food and materials in history—a demand which could be met only by more of us working than ever before, and by all of us working harder and longer.

More people working harder and longer—a scarcity of labor which helped bring about wage increases—has meant more money in the pockets of civilians than ever before. The great and growing demand also has meant higher prices for businessmen and farmers so that our income is the greatest in history.

There are less goods to buy and more money to buy them with.

This fact, which is the simplest possible statement of the problem of rising prices, places great responsibility on the American people. We can do one of two things about it.

First, we can use all of our higher incomes to scramble to get what goods are available. This will start a price rise which can go so high as to endanger the war effort, create hardship for many people, and eventually rob all of us of the benefits of peace to come. High prices will not increase the supply of goods today.

Second, or we can put our higher incomes to work at speeding victory. We can do this by buying and holding all the War bonds we can afford, by willingly paying and supporting higher taxes, and by saving for the future rather than spending and bidding up prices now.

The choice is ours—the responsibility ours. It is up to us.

The Crew of the "Booker T. Washington" Urges Action Against the Instigators of Anti-Negro Riots in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter from the entire crew of the United States Liberty ship *Booker T. Washington*. While there are those in America who seek to destroy national unity by inciting anti-Negro riots in several sections of the country, it is gratifying to know that the 39 officers and men of this ship, Negro and white, are daily risking their lives to deliver the goods to our boys overseas, who need these weapons of war to defeat Hitler. This letter is not only a symbol of the kind of teamwork America needs for victory, but it is as well a rebuke to those evil forces which promote anti-Negro riots and to the ineffectual policies of those in the Federal Government who refuse firmly and effectively to stamp out these riots as a danger to our war effort.

ABOARD THE
STEAMSHIP "BOOKER T. WASHINGTON,"
June 25, 1943.

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MARCANTONIO: The crew of the United States Liberty ship, *Booker T. Washington*, addresses you with the most earnest request that you read this communication on the floor of Congress and so bring it to the attention of the American people.

While on the high seas, sailing homeward to pick up another cargo of war materials to follow that which we had just put into the hands of our armed forces in north Africa, we heard over the radio with mingled rage and disgust of the Fascist attack on the Negro people of Detroit. Our captain, Hugh Mulzac, is a Negro. We are what is called a mixed crew—about evenly divided as to color between whites and Negroes—though we do not feel ourselves divided in any respect, but are as the fingers of one fist in our resolve to crush the enemies of our country and of humanity. The news of this barbarous massacre of Negro Americans in Detroit, paralleling Hitler's brutalities against the Jews of Europe, aroused us to the stark realization that fascism is at work behind our own home front, that the Nazi summer offensive has been launched by Hitler's fifth column in the very heart of America. We must admit that this realization impels us to take stock and to wonder why we should daily risk our lives in carrying guns, planes, tanks, munitions, and other war materials thousands of miles across the seas to fight foreign fascism when the foe has so clearly revealed himself with the steel poised to strike us in the back at home.

We are not fooled by the distortion of the Detroit massacre into a race riot. We know that the home Fascists prepared for this bloody day over many long months—months marked by such rehearsals for slaughter as

the Sojourner Truth housing riot, provoked and executed by native Fascist storm troopers mobilized for the occasion from all over the Detroit metropolitan area. We know also the wave of master-race strikes recently pulled off by Fascist agitators in Detroit war plants as a result of the introduction of Negro workers into these plants—strikes designed to impede war production and to sow the seeds of hatred and distrust which have just ripened into mass murder.

We can't be fooled by the Fascist-minded propagandists who would have the American people believe that the peaceable Negroes were responsible for causing their own deaths, or that the affair was some sort of spontaneous combustion resulting from uncontrollable antagonism between the races. We can't be fooled because we know that it is a normal condition for whites and Negroes to live and work together in harmony. Trouble between the races is the product of deliberate, systematic agitation and of what must be called, in time of war, treasonable conspiracy.

For 9 months now we—a fairly average group of Negroes and whites from the deep South, as well as the North, East, and West—have been sailing together on the steamship *Booker T. Washington* under circumstances which have compelled the most intimate contact. If there were any real antagonism between the races, surely it would have burst forth again and again aboard. Even in peacetime a ship like the *Booker T. Washington* is a much smaller place than Detroit, but in wartime—due to the black-out—the space actually occupied by the crew most of the time is smaller than the smallest drug store in Detroit, and yet some would have us believe that the vast metropolis of Detroit—extending over 250 square miles—isn't big enough for the two races to live in, side by side, without bitter discord. No; nothing can make us believe that fantastic and contemptible lie. Our own experience has demonstrated to each of us that the contrary is true—that harmony and fellowship are the natural relations for Americans of both races, who share the traditional American democratic faith and unite to bring about its triumph over the dark, competing lack of faith which is fascism.

During the 9 months that we have lived and worked together on this ship—and manned the guns together when under attack from planes and submarines—we have not known the slightest racial tension, discord, or instance of animosity between white and colored. All observers of the conditions aboard our vessel will verify this assertion, which we make unequivocally. Among such observers have been officers of the Navy, Army, and Coast Guard, as well as officers of the armed forces of the Allied Nations and officials of the War Shipping Administration, Maritime Commission, and other agencies. We attach hereto an unsolicited letter from the United States naval armed guard commanding officer who has served aboard our ship and, for periods of many months, has lived in our midst and seen at first hand the relationships which prevail.

We know what sinister and disruptive forces really plotted and carried into action the Detroit massacre. We know, further, that unless these traitors are brought to justice the Detroit slaughter is but the beginning of a Nation-wide drive on the part of home Fascists to disrupt the war effort, paralyze the Allied drive against Hitlerism just as victory is within our grasp, and so ultimately to divide the American people that fascism can seize power in the United States in the classic manner adopted by Hitler in Germany. We urge you, therefore, to take every opportunity offered on the floor of Congress—and off—to demand a fearless, searching investigation of the Detroit massacre, this to be followed by prosecution of the guilty parties—including the higher-ups who instigated the massacre as well as the mobsters who did the killing—to the full extent of the laws against murder, arson, sabotage, and treason in time of war.

Very sincerely yours,

The crew of the steamship *Booker T. Washington;* Capt. H. Mulzac; First Officer Folks; Chief Engineer J. A. Smith; First Assistant Engineer Leroy King; Second Assistant Engineer A. S. Treskin; C. Lastie, second mate; John Beecher, ship's clerk; William K. Hart; H. E. Duport; Fred Deckard, Jr.; Willie King; Guy D. Morand; B. Hammadeng; Michael R. Vavick; Anthony W. Catshall; Nicholas J. Arrindel; Allister Mulzac; Alexander Hossu; T. Watchi; Herbert M. Lang; William B. Shepard; Robert C. Bacon; D. Lee; Louis Burton; Joseph B. Williams; Frederick A. Reed; George A. Cheney; H. Alexander; Segundo Rodriguez; Lawrence P. Burke; Wilbur Williams; Fernando Cruz; Chas. Miller; Clair L. Gossart; Cecil H. Blackman; J. Carapiet; James C. Keegan; Antonio Bianco; Manuel A. Diaz.

ABOARD STEAMSHIP
"BOOKER T. WASHINGTON,"
June 9, 1943.

To the EDITOR OF GENERAL ALARM (ship's newspaper):

It has come to the attention of the undersigned that aboard many other armed merchant ships are numerous instances of friction between merchant and Navy crews.

These disputes often range from the captain of the ship on down the line, but not one single instance has been found where the argument was not of petty origin, certainly not meriting attention of intelligent people engaged in important wartime enterprise.

How fortunate are you men of the *Booker T. Washington* for your splendid attitude. Each man aboard this ship seems so well to recognize his responsibility. You are, each of you, obviously determined to win this war. You are engaged in a hazardous task with a bold, aggressive attitude. You make evident to others the fact that harmony is necessary to success. Do not the petty differences, permitted on board some ships to become violent disputes, really act as an aid to our enemies?

This is a time for each of us to present to the Axis the bold front, the cool American determination and the unbroken force of power that will result in the crushing of those bestial fiends so frantically trying to destroy our country, our loved ones, and our property.

You who have been long aboard this ship do not realize how well you are accomplishing a splendid purpose. For your attitude of cooperation with naval personnel aboard it is my desire to say "Thank you."

With those ships operating without harmony we are all a bit disgusted; are we not? How fortunate to be able to deliver the goods and to "keep 'em crash diving" on your *Booker T. Washington.*

Please accept my promise of complete cooperation with you at any time, day or night, and permit me to extend congratulations for a job well done. From effort such as yours will spring a glorious victory for us and upon the brow of our enemy the scalding humiliation of defeat.

Your gunnery officer,

CHARLES V. ELLIOTT,
Lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy.

Overlapping Governmental Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. F. NORRELL
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the eighth district convention of the Department of Arkansas, American Legion:

Whereas there exists in the public mind great confusion about the authority, scope, and activity of governmental agencies which is seriously hampering our war-production program; and

Whereas this is directly caused, in part, by jealousy of bureaucrats, lust for power by department heads, and overlapping authority of different departments. An example of such overlapping of which is to be found in the agency handling labor or some other phase of it, which are—

1. War Labor Board.
2. Conciliation Service.
3. Labor Relations Board.
4. Wages and Hours Division (controls lower wages and salaries and hours).
5. Internal Revenue (controls changes in higher salaries).
6. Labor Relation Division in the War Production Board.
7. Labor Relation Division in Army.
8. Labor Relation Division in Navy.
9. Labor Relation Division in Maritime.
10. Labor Relation Division in War Shipping.
11. Labor Relation Division in Federal Works.
12. Labor Relation in Farm Security.
13. Labor Relation Division in Office of Price Administration, and many others, which are reported to be more than 20 agencies.

The same overlapping of authority and division of responsibility is to be found in many other different branches of the service. This permits "buck passing," produces red tape, delay, and confusion; and

Whereas united action, intelligent dynamic leadership, are just as essential behind the lines as at the front, because this is a war of peoples in which the armed forces are only a part: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That our Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Congress, and all persons to authority be urged to—

(a) Eliminate jurisdictional conflicts between governmental departments.

(b) To have one responsible head in each department.

(c) Whenever a governmental official, whether head of a department or otherwise, is more interested in gaining power or money for his department, or more interested in smearing some other department or official, or is more interested in seeing his own name in the headlines of the newspaper than he is in carrying out our war program, that such individual be dismissed at once regardless of his party affiliation. There can only be one standard to be used now in judging our governmental officials, that is: Is our war program being helped? Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished the President of the United States, United States Senators of Arkansas, the Member of Congress from this district, and the press.

Whereas the civilian population of our country is constantly being asked to do more on less, whether it is gas or groceries, coffee or canned goods, minerals or manpower; and

Whereas the civilian population is constantly being urged to economize in its expenditures for the purpose of counteracting inflation and increasing the sale of War bonds; and

Whereas we recognize that only by such sacrifice can our war effort succeed and we therefore wholeheartedly approve the same: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we demand that all bureaus, departments, and branches of our Government not connected directly in the war program be required to follow the same economy and sacrifice demanded of the civilian population; be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to enact such measures that will assure the public that the Government in all of its nonwar activities is following the same pattern of sacrifice we are asked to follow before additional taxes are levied, because when our citizens are convinced that governmental waste is at a minimum there will be little objection to additional war levies.

Appointment of an Additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the afternoon a request was made by a Member for unanimous consent to consider H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

I objected to this request, and, therefore, the bill failed of consideration by the House. I think when Members learn the facts about this measure they will agree that the objection raised by me was fully justified.

The explanation given by the Member who made the unanimous-consent request mentioned only that the bill provided for an additional assistant secretary of the Interior Department, and to a question I propounded as to what the salary would be he stated $9,000 per year.

The truth is this bill is much more than that. It is in reality more a pay raise bill than one providing merely for an additional Assistant Secretary. This is seen upon reading the following clause in it:

> The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum.

Upon inquiry I learned from the Department of the Interior that Assistant Secretaries of that Department receive, some $8,000, others $8,500, and still others $9,000 per annum.

The effect of the language above quoted, therefore, would have been to raise the lower salaries to $9,000.

I am convinced the Member who brought this bill up and asked unanimous consent for its consideration was unaware of the effect of this provision.

However, I want to condemn this sort of procedure. If the head of any Government department feels any of his employees are entitled to an increase in pay he should bring a forthright request and justification to the Congress for such raise. He should not attempt to do this by subterfuge, as it appears has been done in this case.

F. C. C. Balks Security Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION BALKS SECURITY MOVE

(By David Lawrence)

An amazing and sensational document has been made public by a special House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission. It reveals that since February of this year there has been on the desk of President Roosevelt, unacted upon, the draft of a proposed Executive order requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Navy and deemed by them essential to the security of the United States.

Up to now it has been supposed that the President saw eye to eye with his military and naval chiefs and that when they felt a step should be taken in the interests of military security, he acted promptly. The evidence produced at the hearing shows that instead the wishes of the civilian Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission apparently have prevailed and that the judgment of the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet, as well as that of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, apparently have not been persuasive.

CONTROL SOUGHT

The request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff referred to a desire to control the handling of military intelligence as it relates to radio. Secretaries Stimson and Knox, in their letter dated February 8, 1943, say:

"The Secretary of the Navy, on September 11, 1942, requested the Joint Chiefs of Staff to study the problem of responsibility and security of radio intelligence. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have made a thorough and comprehensive study, and their response, based on that study, is attached hereto. They, as well as the responsible military commanders in the field, are of the belief that radio intelligence, the location of clandestine stations, the supervision of military communications security and related activities must, in their very nature, be under the sole control of the military forces. Enclosed is a copy of a letter from Admiral Leahy, recommending this action."

The letter from Admiral Leahy is dated February 1, 1943, and was signed in behalf of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States Army and Navy. The letter states that the Federal Communications Commission is constantly expanding its activities and that this is a "substantial drain on available material and personnel." The statement is made that the information obtained by the Federal Communications Commission "through its own radio-intelligence activities is not, in the military sense, secure, due to inherent tendencies toward publicity of Federal Communications Commission activities, use of nonsecure methods of reporting and correlation and the necessarily close relationship of the Federal Communications Commission military-intelligence activity with other phases of the agency's work."

ENDANGERS EFFECTIVENESS

The letter then makes this startling accusation:

"Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods, it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission to work that is being effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence.

"In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi military intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy."

No explanation has been forthcoming as to why this request from the responsible heads of the Army and Navy has been sidetracked. An effort is to be made by the House investigating committee to get at the reasons. It will be recalled that division of responsibility over communications led to an unsatisfactory situation at Hawaii, out of which the Japanese agents were able to transmit information about Pearl Harbor before the attack came on December 7, 1941, which cost the lives of nearly 3,000 American soldiers and sailors.

EXPLANATION NEEDED

Is there now a drifting on the same sort of problem—conflict of jurisdiction?

There must be some explanation for the long delay in failing to issue an order requested by our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Certainly it is a subject in which there ought to be light shed, lest the impression develop that Washington and bureaucratic friendships are preventing the military and navy men from getting the necessary authority from the President to conduct the war effectively.

Keeping Inflation Under Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, although activities of government must be the focal point of any effective program for holding down prices and wages and insuring economic stability, civilians must carry out their share of the program by doing the following:

First. Buy and hold as many War bonds as you can afford.

Second. Pay willingly any taxes—increased taxes—that your country needs. They are the cheapest way of paying for the war, of buying victory and protection for the American way of life.

Third. Pay off your debts and avoid making new ones.

Fourth. Provide for your own and your family's future with adequate life insurance and savings.

Fifth. Pay no more than ceiling prices. Buy rationed goods only by exchanging stamps.

Rationing is your protection that you will get enough of scarce essential goods.

Ceiling prices are your protection against serious and unwarranted price increases—one of your main guaranties of economic stability.

Sixth. Buy only what you need. Make the articles you have last longer by proper care and avoidance of waste.

Eat it all, wear it out; make it do, or do without.

Seventh. Do not try to profit from the war. Do not ask higher prices than you absolutely need if you are a businessman or farmer. Do not ask for higher wages or salaries than you need, and always ask for them through established Government channels.

Eighth of Nine Sons Inducted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of June 17, 1943:

EIGHTH OF NINE SONS INDUCTED—LAST MALE HEIR LEFT IN FAMILY OF OAKLAND COUPLE EXPECTS TO BE CALLED SOON

Since Pearl Harbor, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Couture, of Oakland, have given eight of their nine sons to the armed forces.

Their youngest, Paul Bernard Couture, 19, who will not graduate from high school until next Thursday, was inducted into the Navy yesterday afternoon.

The ninth son, who is married, expects to be called soon for induction.

Mrs. Couture, white-haired mother of 11 children, who only recently underwent 4 major operations in Woonsocket Hospital, sat resignedly in her rocking chair this morning, trying both to be pleasant and to hold back tears.

"WHY SO MANY"

"What can I do about it? What can anyone do about it," she asked wearily. "I know they have to go, but why do they take so many from one family?"

Mr. Couture, a carpenter, feels that if he keeps busy he will not be so lonely for his boys, but all the mother can do is sit and wait and pray for their safety, explained a daughter; Lucille, 15, who remains at home. An older daughter is married.

"The house sure does seem empty since the boys left," said Lucille, speaking for her mother, who feels more sure of her French than she does of English. "It is as quiet as a church around here. We miss them something awful. Of course, we hear from them pretty nearly every week, even those who are overseas. It helps to cheer us up a little, but not like their being here."

REPORTS NEXT WEEK

Paul, a senior at Burrillville High School, will be graduated next Thursday evening and will report for active duty with the Navy the following day. He participated in baseball, football, and hockey at the high school, being selected on the all-State hockey team for 2 years running. Prior to attending Burrillville High School he attended Our Lady of Good Help grammar school in Oakland.

SEVEN WHO PRECEDED

The other brothers are Pvt. (1st cl.) Wilfred, 33, with the military police in Oklahoma; Pvt. Norman, 29, an infantryman in North Carolina; Seaman (2d cl.) Henry, 28, serving in Alaska; Pvt. Edgar, 25, with the Medical Corps somewhere in the South Pacific; Corpl. Gerard, 24, with a Field Artillery unit in north Africa; Lt. Robert, 23, in the Air Corps in Arizona; and Corpl. Gilbert, 21, with the Quartermaster Corps, somewhere in the South Pacific.

The remaining son, Oscar, is 27 and he expects his call to service any day.

Boykin Committee Selects North Dakota-Minnesota To Produce Sponge Iron From Local Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report on a joint meeting held on June 25 here in Washington of delegates representing the States of North Dakota and Minnesota, in session with the Boykin steel shortage investigating committee.

The matter under discussion was the methods by which the mineral resources of those two States can be most expeditiously employed in furtherance of war production.

Those present at the meeting included:

Members of the Boykin steel shortage investigation committee of the House, and staff.

Gov. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota.

Lt. Gov. Henry Holt, of North Dakota.

Hon. GERALD P. NYE, United States Senator of North Dakota.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN, Member of Congress, Ninth District of Minnesota.

C. F. Ramseyer and H. A. Brassert, engineers for the iron and steel industries, New York N. Y.

Fred A. Cina, Range Municipalities and Civic Association, Virginia, Minn.

Dr. L. H. Reyerson, Northwest Research Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

R. E. Wilson, commissioner, Minnesota Iron Range Resources Board, State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn.

Alex C. Burr, Industrial Commission of North Dakota.

Fred J. Fredrickson, North Dakota Resources Board.

The joint meeting made the following declarations and recommendations in regard to utilizing the sum which the Boykin committee has recommended to be included in the Bureau of Mines appropriation in the Department of the Interior annual appropriation bill:

1. Purpose: The underlying hope that inspires the two States in undertaking this venture is that of enabling these areas to participate more fully in war production, by putting their resources of nature and manpower on a 12 months' basis. For this it is necessary:

(a) To determine the essential engineering data needed for the erection of commercial-sized facilities for the production of hydrogen by the use of North Dakota lignite on a commercial basis.

(b) To determine the essential data needed for the designing of commercial-sized facilities for the beneficiation, semireduction, and complete reduction to metal iron of the various grades of Minnesota iron ores.

(c) Incidentally: To determine the economics and methods for efficient utilization of the various chemical byproducts that result from the aforementioned production of hydrogen from North Dakota lignites, including hydrogenization of lignite into liquid fuel.

2. Procedure: It is contemplated:

(a) That there be immediately erected two coordinate pilot plants, one to produce the hydrogen and the second to consume the hydrogen in the treatment of Minnesota iron ores.

(b) That these pilot plant facilities be designed by engineering firms which have an established national reputation for the erection of successful commercial hydrogen and iron and steel facilities, and are capable of presenting completed plans detailed for erection in 6 weeks from July 1, 1943.

(c) That an appropriate amount be expended by contracting for the designing and erection of a hydrogen pilot plant. Another amount for the designing and erection of iron ore beneficiating with an ore-reducing or iron-metal-producing unit. The sum remaining is to be available for operating expenses.

(d) That nonessential and Federal salaries be kept at a minimum, and that the limited funds allowed be expended in close cooperation with the respective States through the joint cooperating committee.

3. Control: The project to be erected and operated under the authority of the United States Bureau of Mines, but in close cooperation with the respective States through a "Joint Minnesota-North Dakota Resources Development Commission," which commission is to consist of eight persons appointed by the two Governors, including themselves, and representative of the range municipalities and civic association, with a chairman appointed by the Bureau of Mines, for which responsibility the name of Dr. A. C. Fieldner is suggested.

4. Location: The site of the pilot plant project is to be in North Dakota, in the low sulphur lignite area, at a point determined on technical grounds by the joint commission.

I wish at this time to commend the Boykin committee for the thoroughgoing manner in which it has gone into the steel shortage situation, and for its pledge that it will vigorously pursue its activities during the present year, and for its further pledge that it will diligently undertake to see to it that the intent of the Congress is fully accomplished in the subsurface exploratory work provided for in the Bureau of Mines appropriation. I also want to express the appreciation of all of us to Representative WILLIAM PITTENGER of the Eighth District of Minnesota for his support of the Boykin committee's efforts and its

present activities in trying to utilize low-grade iron ores for the benefit of northern Minnesota and the entire Nation. Many other members of the North Dakota and Minnesota delegations in Congress have shown their itnerest and given cooperation in these efforts.

One Hundred and Sixty-seventh Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the one hundred and sixty-seventh birthday of the American Republic. Today we celebrate the birth of democracy as convinced by the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

In preparing a speech for the Fourth of July, 1940, I picked up the magazine section of the New York Times. On its front cover was the Statue of Liberty and the following part of the preamble of the Declaration of Independence, such part being of necessity the basis for any essay, sermon, oration, or discussion of the Fourth of July. Let us begin then by quoting this part of the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

In my Fourth of July speech of 3 years ago I made mention of two articles appearing in the aforesaid magazine section. The first article was entitled "World Fires Illuminate our Fourth," and the heading of the second article gave expression to grave and current thoughts then uppermost in the minds of the American people, "Could It Happen to Us?" At this time we all know the answer to that question. The fires then burning half way around the world now engulf the entire globe—it did happen to us.

Fourths of July should ever be days of taking American inventory. Days of remembering should have a peculiar significance in the lives of a people who would be great. Beware of that individual in whose heart there lives no images of heroism. Beware of that nation that does not on occasion stand before some altar of national sacrifice or some memorial of national rejoicing and who does not stand there with uncovered head, standing not alone in adoration but also in resolution. Today more than ever before we should take inventory of our national resources and responsibilities both physical and spiritual. We should ask ourselves from whence we came and whither are we going?

For this purpose, let us briefly compare what now seems to be the most significant Fourths of July in the history of our country. Of course, we have that first Fourth on which the Declaration of Independence was born, born as a result of the struggles of a great people for freedom.

But the first great crisis in the life of our new country, founded upon a new philosophy, and dedicated to new ideals, came in 1787. Following the successful termination of the American Revolution, the Colonies found themselves to be 13 separate conflicting States. Strife and bitterness and lack of unity for a time threatened to destroy the new freedom for which they had fought together. Democracy as conceived by the Pilgrim Fathers must chart a new course, must set up machinery to effectuate new ideals. This difficult task was accomplished with miraculous success in the year 1787. The celebration of an eleventh birthday gave unmistakable evidence of divine benediction and of the growing strength and power of a new republic builded in a new land, upon a new philosophy of individual liberty.

The third Fourth of July requiring mention and the second real crisis in the life of the new Republic was in 1863. Our country had come upon evil days. Internal problems with which the people seemed unable to deal threatened to destroy the American Republic. As sad hearts celebrated July 4, 1863, word came of the fall of Vicksburg and of the defeat of the Army of Virginia on the bloody field at Gettysburg. The flag which we today display with pride came near being destroyed by those who loved it. Surely, Divine Providence must have intervened because Old Glory was assaulted at Gettysburg under the command of the ablest general and the grandest gentleman ever to fight in behalf of a lost cause. Seventeen hundred and eighty-seven and eighteen hundred and sixty-three are both significant dates in American history. Both represent triumphs of democracy over itself. In both cases we were saved from internal forces that almost destroyed the Union.

Today is the third most significant Fourth of July since 1776. Eighty years following that fateful July 4 of 1863 we again pause to survey the horizon. We find our country assaulted from without and we find our country troubled from within. We are now active participants in a war that we did not want, that we did not make, and that we did little to prevent. In its very beginning we saw one of the world's oldest democracies crumble into dust with little or no resistance. In its very beginning we saw two distinct philosophies of life fighting for predominance, if not survival. Those philosophies have stood and now stand in clear outline and in bold relief. They represent two distinct and opposed schools of thought, two philosophies of government. One is totalitarian, the other is democratic. One is symbolized and proclaimed by Adolf Hitler and those who support Axis regimes. The other is represented, generally speaking, by the English-speaking peoples of the world, notably American. Totalitarian government seeks to completely regiment the social, economic, political, and religious life of all persons. On the other hand, democracy as expressed in the American Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution, proclaims the dignity of man and his predominance over the state. Democracy exists in order to protect the liberties of the individual, to stimulate individual initiative, to promote individual genius, to permit individual happiness. In the eyes of the dictators, liberty, freedom, and all of the rights proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence, and guaranteed in our Constitution, are sins against the state. In democracies the suppression of these things by the state is a crime against the individual, the individual for whom the state exists. In one philosophy all power comes from above, in the other philosophy all power comes from below. In one, man is a creature of the state; in the other, the state is the creature of man. There are those who contend that two such repugnant and different philosophies of life cannot exist in the same world.

On this Fourth of July, as we take inventory of ourselves and as we review history, we are convinced that totalitarian ideals and philosophy cannot possibly win over democratic ideals and philosophy. At least, totalitarian ideals cannot win of their own strength. Barbarian aggression never conquered of its own might but rather because of the weakness of its opponents. Democracy is in danger only when its champions decay and become faithless to its ideals. The Old World democracies, defeated and near-defeated in the beginning of this world conflict, suffered from their own internal weakness more than from the external strength of their foes. While the French fought over the 40-hour week, over gains for selfish interest groups, their ancient enemies plotted their ruin. France was not only weak in arms but weaker still in spirit. Her soldiers did not go into battle singing the Marseillaise and with the glory of French traditions and the preservation of the Tricolor spurring them on to courageous action.

Across the channel, the English people made equally grave mistakes. But for the fortuitous circumstances of geographical position, they, too, would doubtless have suffered the fate of the French people.

On this Fourth of July, as we survey the heroic accomplishments of our armed forces on the battle fronts of the world, we have every reason for pride in their remarkable achievements. On the home front we cannot feel quite so proud of our conduct. True, we have made amazing strides in industrial production. We like to brag that our scientific, economic, and industrial resources are vastly superior to those of any combination of our enemies, that we possess over one-half of the world's radios, over two-thirds

of the world's telephones, over three-fourths of the world's automobiles, and that our weapons of war are superior to those of our enemies. We like to recall that we, in fact, invented airplanes and tanks and radar, radar by which a ship can be spotted and destroyed through 25 miles of darkness. But when we are reminded that one of our most implacable foes, the Japanese, started their war with less than 200,000 motor vehicles, we must admit that strength does not lie in physical possessions alone. This Fourth of July, as every Fourth of July, is an appeal to the heart and the spirit of the American people.

On our first birthday our life was endangered by foreign foes. On that important birthday of 1863 our life was endangered by internal strife. On this birthday our life is endangered from both sources. To cope with these foes, to solve economic and political problems, may endanger for a time at least American standards of living. The life of this Republic and the preservation of this democracy is more important, however, than our standards of living. No organized group in this country whether in industry, in labor, or in politics, should be permitted for 1 minute to obstruct a program of complete mental and physical mobilization for total war and total victory. Better to have lower standards of living than to have no standards of living. Better to be free in poverty if necessary than to be secure in slavery.

We must never forget or neglect to teach each generation of American youth devotion to the noble traditions in which our country was born. Discipline and devotion are essential to a strong and a courageous people. We must see in the flag a symbol of Valley Forge, of Gettysburg, of St. Mihiel and the Argonne, of Bataan, Guadalcanal, and Midway. We must see in it the character of Washington, the philosophy of Jefferson, the ideals of Wilson, the courage of Roosevelt.

On magazine covers throughout America this week is displayed in a variety of gorgeous hues the America flag. Today of all days we should remember that the Star-Spangled Banner is not a flag of conquest, is not a flag of aggression, is not the flag of militarism. We take just pride in the fact that it was the first flag to fly the oceans, that it was the first flag to be planted at the two poles of the earth; but we should take greater pride in its being the first flag to stand for individual and personal liberty, freedom, and opportunity.

The boys who fight America's battles today are adding many glorious chapters to American history. Recently I met Commander Charles Kirkpatrick, of San Angelo, Tex., now attached to the staff of the Naval Secretary, Frank Knox. At the time of Pearl Harbor he commanded a submarine. Under his command 11 Japanese ships have been sunk. During the battle of Midway he was returning to Pearl Harbor. When radioed, "Do you have any torpedoes left?" he replied, "Hell, no; if I had any torpedoes, I would not be coming home."

To John Paul Jones' battle cry, "We have just begun to fight," to Captain Lawrence's dying request, "Don't give up the ship," to Admiral Perry's cryptic report, "We have met the enemy and they are ours," can now be added many other slogans of naval lore. There is Captain Moran, of the U. S. S. *Boise*. When his lone vessel sighted six Japanese warships he immediately gave the order, "Pick out the biggest one and start firing." Then there is the last order of the wounded Commander Gilmore as he lay on the deck of his surfaced submarine. Feeling that there might not be time to take him inside the submarine upon its being attacked, he gave the order, "Take her down, boys." Then we remember Major Devereaux's last communique from tiny Wake Island, "The enemy has landed but the issue is still in doubt." The issue, of course, was not in doubt, except in the minds of those dauntless defenders of Wake.

These things on this Fourth of July should have a solemn and sobering effect on those of us who remain on the home front.

In fact, on this Fourth of July our domestic leaders and our home-front soldiers might utter this prayer to the goddess of liberty: "Oh, liberty, liberty—notwithstanding the many mistakes and some crimes we have committed in thy name, we beseech thee to continue to make this, our country, thy dwelling place. Because of thy many benedictions and because of the innocent and heroic blood our sons have spilled, and are spilling, upon thine altar, give us the wisdom and character to be worthy of thy habitation."

Victory Gardens in Alhambra, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, so successful has been the work of the people of Alhambra, Calif., in their Victory garden work that I am asking consent to include with my remarks the following 14 steps of a successful Victory garden program prepared by Mr. Paulsen Visel, Secretary-Manager of the Alhambra Chamber of Commerce:

THD 14 STEPS INVOLVED IN SETTING UP A CITY OR COMMUNITY VICTORY GARDEN ORGANIZATION

(By Paulsen Visel, secretary-manager, Alhambra (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce)

1. Lease, for the duration and 1 year thereafter, all vacant property, without cost, within the city limits.

2. Develop through the water supplier suitable reduced water rate for Victory garden use.

3. Promote through publicity all famillies to put in a home Victory garden, or if the back yard is not suitable because of shade, soil, or space, to lease (without cost) a lot, or part of a lot, from the vacant-lot pool of free leases.

4. Set up mechanical facilities for the first tillage—plowing, harrowing, and smooth dragging. This to be done at the expense of the Victory garden grower.

5. Set up a city- or community-wide Victory garden educational program to cover all phases of Victory garden operation.

6. Set up gangs of boys (men are not available) in groups of three forming Victory garden commandos, who will spade, hoe, and rake areas too small for power equipment. These boys work at a flat price (about a cent a square foot). The commandos take care of the old, infirm, and lazy.

7. Set up a model garden and have a well-qualified adviser on Victory garden problems available to all for advice and demonstration.

8. Set up through some service club the installation and maintenance of a Victory garden for each indigent and helpless shut-in.

9. Set up the Girl Scouts Victory Garden Sales Commandos who will pick up on Saturday morning and one afternoon during the week all Victory gardens' surplus produce—sell it—and retain 33 percent for troop funds.

10. Promote Victory garden products exhibit contest once a month.

11. Promote contest to determine the finest Victory garden every 90 days (in southern California our gardens grow the year around).

12. Constant promotion, publicity, and the urge for replanting is essential at all times.

13. Promote conservation of Victory garden products, such as canning, drying, and dehydration.

14. Use your Victory garden set-up to promote neighborliness, parties, and fun.

A Victory garden kettle party that works very well in these days of rationing and costs but 3 red points or less is successfully promoted as follows:

Obtain a good-sized stew pot into which each guest donates one-half pound of meat and a pound of fresh, well-cleaned Victory garden vegetables. Use one pint of boiling water to each pot donation. Save a little of the vegetable donations for salad. This leaves you with a menu of wonderful deep South pot liquor, Victory garden kettle stew, seagoing salad, dessert, and coffee (as you will).

We Must Face the Facts About Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Max Eastman entitled "To Collaborate Successfully We Must Face the Facts About Russia," published in the July 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest.

Mr. President, I have been informed that the article which I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD will exceed two pages of the RECORD, allowed under the rule, by two-fifths of a page. I have procured an estimate of the cost of printing the article, which is $108. I renew my request for unanimous consent

that the article by Mr. Eastman may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO COLLABORATE SUCCESSFULLY WE MUST FACE THE FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA

(By Max Eastman)

Few great events in history command more admiration than the heroic fight of the Russian armies and people against Adolf Hitler's military machine. There is a mixture of pride in our admiration, too, because the Russians are fighting on our side—and gratitude, because their incomparable feat of arms gave us our chance to prepare.

Russia's stand has, moreover, taught many Americans who did not know it before that the Soviet Union is a going concern with which it will be our task to colaborate after the war. If any iron-jointed reactionaries are still blind to this fact, their brains are buried in the past. Collaboration with a powerful Russia will be a main preoccupation of living Americans for a long time to come.

If this collaboration is to be successful, however, it will have to be based on facts and not on propaganda. Elementary prudence demands that our people understand Russia's position in the global conflict, know the attitude of her ruler toward the Anglo-Saxon nations, and assess without any intervening pipe dreams the true character of her regime. It is absolutely vital to our own national self-interest that we discard wishful thinking and base our policy on unclouded fact.

Let us remember that the stubborn resistance of the Russians no more justifies communism than the stupendous assault of the Germans justifies nazi-ism.

That simple and obvious fact must be held steadfastly in mind if our policy toward Russia is to have force. And if our policy does not have force, you may be sure it will not command the respect of Stalin. The Russian leader is not a mollycoddle who can be soft-soaped into doing what cold calculation does not recommend. The only sound way to do business with Stalin is to let him know we thoroughly understand his set-up as well as our own. The speech that weighs with Stalin must be firm, brief in courtesy, bluntly concerned with the real issues at stake. If we want the Russians to respect us, we must let them know that we are not dupes.

RUSSIANS AND AMERICANS

It is natural, since she fights so brilliantly beside us, to be a little undiscriminating in our praise of the Soviet Union. Americans who go there are especially prone to this fallacy, because Russians, as Wendell Willkie observed, are so much like Americans. They are like us in their bold good humor, generosity, and taste for doing things in a big way. They are like us also in their disposition to revolt against tyranny. It has always required a huge police machine to hold the Russians down, and the present one is the biggest the world has ever seen.

Nevertheless, there is a deep difference between Russians and Americans. Their revolts never got anywhere; ours did; that is the difference. They came into modern history as serfs and humbled subjects of a semi-oriental despotism. We came in as westward pioneers exploring beyond the reach of any government, each of us enforcing his own laws with his own musket. And even before we started for the frontier, we had behind us the long-victorious struggle of the Anglo-Saxon common man for rights which no government could touch. The Russians had no victory behind them, and no rights which their ruler could not crash through like a man on horseback through a paper hoop.

The revolution which overthrew the Czar was an attempt to attain our western principles of liberty. But that could not be done in eight months; and within eight months, Lenin, with his tightly organized small group of Marxian cruders, had seized power and laid the foundations for a new despotism which was to become, after his death and the rise of Stalin as Vozhd,[1] infinitely more ruthless that the Czar's.

Lenin invented—with millennial freedom for the masses as his goal—the system of totalitarian one-party tyranny which stamps out all actual freedom completely. Mussolini and Hitler borrowed Lenin's technique and applied it in their own countries. Stalin—who despises the masses and fears freedom—perfected it on the home grounds, extinguishing in Russia the last surviving trace of the democratic concept of the rights of man. His great purge, in which an estimated 300,000 people were shot or imprisoned, was a purge of all who might conceivably oppose his despotic power. That Stalin is an absolute dictator is the simple truth. And it is so important a truth that I am not going to leave it in my own words.

"The Soviet Union, as everybody knows that has the courage to face the fact, is a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world."

That statement, made by Franklin D. Roosevelt, February 11, 1940, is as true today as it was then.

THOSE WHO FAWN ON STALIN

Such being the case, what should be, in sober political wisdom, our attitude toward Russia since Hitler forced her into the democratic camp? Exactly this: give all possible military help; offer unbounded praise to the heroism of her people and her soldier; extend every courtesy to her government. But if we believe in democracy, be dignified and intelligent—not muddled and mawkish. To those in the Kremlin, American gullibility is only one more evidence of bourgeois decadence.

Instead of that an astonishing number of our influential men and magazines and newspapers are fawning on Russia. You would think Stalin was some stern Deity who held the destiny of the whole planet in his hands. "Don't say a word against Stalin or he won't accept our tanks" seems to be the attitude of some of those who are now giving away the national treasure so avidly.

This is an attitude of spirit which I find diplomatically foolhardy, morally disgraceful, and dangerous to the survival of democratic institutions within this country.

Discovering virtues in Stalin's tyrannous regime has become a main preoccupation for many intellectuals and public officials. President Roosevelt led off when he remarked, perhaps with a smile, that the Russian Constitution guarantees religious freedom. The Russian Constitution guarantees no freedom. It guarantees the dictatorship of the Russian Communist Party, naming it specifically, and asserting that it shall "form the directing nucleus of all organizations of the toilers—that is, the citizens" (ch. X, art. 126).

No constitution which names a small, disciplined organization of zealots as absolute sovereign can possibly guarantee any freedom to any person or institution except that organization and its Vozhd. To inscribe the principles of free speech, free religion, free elections in a Constitution which contains this joker is to rob those principles of any meaning whatsoever. Our self-deluding leftists love to describe this totalitarian document as at least an aspiration toward democracy. It is no more an aspiration than Hitler's phony plebiscites were. It is a tried and perfected instrument for fooling all the people all the time. But there is no good reason why we should let it fool us.

Vice President WALLACE became another apologist for communism when, in his speech at a Soviet friendship rally, he said:

"Some in the United States believe that we have overemphasized what may be called political or Bill of Rights democracy. * * * Russia, perceiving some of the abuses of excessive political democracy, has placed strong emphasis on economic democracy. This, carried to an extreme, demands that all power be centered in one man and his bureaucratic helpers. Somewhere there is a practical balance between economic and political democracy."

That sounds like poised judgment, but it is emotional adulation. It is lowering America's banner of democratic principles in an act of homage to a system that permits not one whit more economic than political democracy. What, indeed, does the word "democracy" mean if "when carried to an extreme," it "demands that all power be centered in one man and his bureaucratic helpers"? It means dictatorship. And that is what they have in Russia—economic as well as political dictatorship.

Mr. WALLACE went on to say that "in Russia differences in income are almost, but not quite, as great as in the United States"—which is accurately true. But he added that "in Russia it is almost impossible to live on income-producing property"—which is not true at all. The income-producing property belongs to the state. And the one boss and his foremen (some 200,000 feudal lords raised above the enslaved masses), who control the state, live as they choose on that income-producing property. They form a new exploiting class. Some 10,000,000 more enjoy a certain security, about as it was in the old Russia.

To call present conditions in Russia economic democracy is pure gush. There is no equality in the factories, no liberty, no right to form independent unions, no right to strike, no right even to change jobs. The workers are chained to the machines and lashed to the wage scale as in no other country in the world, Nazi Germany included. The wage scale is lower in relation to prices than it was under the czars.[2] And the whole system is enforced by an army of secret police which would stir envy in the breast of the Pharaohs of Egypt or of Heinrich Himmler himself.

Many Americans feel obliged to maintain a polite silence about such abhorrent aspects of the Soviet regime. More than that, they invent fantastic casuistries to make the Russian dictatorship palatable to humane Democrats. We produce a steady stream of pro-Soviet plays and pro-Soviet magazines and books. High officials of our Government have taken part in celebrations of November 7—the day when the Bolsheviks overthrew the only democratic government Russia ever knew. Even Christian ministers go all out to convince America that Russia enjoys religious freedom, although religious instruction for Russian children under 18 is rigidly prohibited.

This is, of course, the very opposite of what the Russians are doing. Soviet spokesmen make no attempt to sell America's way of life to their people, or to reinterpret our system of free enterprise to make it more palatable. They set up no organizations of friends of the United States. They do not celebrate our national holidays, or make films to glorify our ideology, or call mass meetings to extol our victories in Guadalcanal and north Africa. Until rebuked by Admiral Standley—a notable event—they were glum

[1] Russian for the Leader; equivalent to Fuehrer or Duce.

[2] According to official Soviet statistics. See Manya Gordon's Workers Before and After Lenin.

and sullen even about the aid we send them. They publish no books explaining the American system. They do not permit agents of American democracy to propagate the overthrow of the Communist society. And their newsstands and book shops, meanwhile, are filled to overflowing with denunciations of the supposed misery and degradation of our way of life.

Yet this does not prevent the American Communists from denouncing as an attempt to drive a wedge between the Allies, or a service to Hitler, or even as fascism, any word spoken by any American in honest criticism of life under the Russian dictatorship. They will so denounce the present article and the Reader's Digest for printing it. A plain speaking of minds, however, is the sole basis for a lasting collaboration between these two great countries. It cannot be achieved while Russians attack our civilization hammer and tongs—and we meekly exclaim, as our Vice President recently did, that we must not double-cross Russia. As though shipping arms and provisions free of charge to a whole planet in its fight for the principles of civilized life were a sin that should make us hang our heads in silence.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA FROM HOLLYWOOD

The kind of logic that has brought our leftists into this state of morbid apologetics toward Russia is well illustrated by former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies. Mr. Davies was in Russia during the notorious Moscow trials, in which the foremost leaders of the old Bolshevik party "confessed" that they had been treasonably plotting with foreign secret agents (German and Japanese or French and British, according to the momentary shifts of Stalin's foreign policy). Those mysteriously unanimous confessions were but a public window dressing behind which the bloody purge of Stalin's critics was accomplished. While in Moscow Mr. Davis, shocked by this purge, wrote the State Department:

"The terror here is a horrifying fact. There is a fear that reaches down into, and haunts, all sections of the community. No household, however humble, apparently but that lives in constant fear of a nocturnal raid by the secret police. * * * Once the person is taken away, nothing of him is known for months—and many times, never—thereafter."

Horrified also by the mock trials, Mr. Davies described them in a letter to Arthur Krock of the New York Times, January 26, 1937:

"If any demonstration of the wisdom and desirability of the principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence for the protection of the accused by the presumption of innocense, the right of counsel, the right of refusal to testify against oneself, and the soundness of Anglo-Saxon law were required, it would be found in this proceeding."

There is no sane reason why Hitler's attack on Russia, or Russia's heroic resistance, should have destroyed Mr. Davies' pride in Anglo-Saxon institutions. Yet the fact is that he is currently recommending those trials, and the barbaric and inhuman slaughter of antitotalitarians for which they formed a screen, as an example for "other liberty-loving nations" to ponder. Mr. Davies' performance only points up by extreme example the epidemic of hysterical adulation of a tyrant state which is sweeping so many influential Americans off their feet.

When Mr. Davies' book, Mission to Moscow, was made into a movie by Warner Brothers, those well-known friends of Soviet Russia, Erskine Caldwell and Jay Leyda, were employed in its preparation. Every item of the current Communist propaganda was inserted in the film, to the distortion not only of historical fact, but even of the peculiar interpretation in Mr. Davies' own book. If this film had been made in Moscow, or in the office of the American Communist Party, it could be no more adept an instrument of foreign propaganda. It is a compendium of what the Soviet Government wants the American public to believe. And yet it is put over on Americans as having the official sanction of their own Government by the ingeniously handled appearance of an actor impersonating President Roosevelt, and by an opening in which the title of the film is drawn with Mr. Davies' book out of an official diplomatic pouch of the United States.

John Dewey, America's best-known educator and philosopher, and Suzanne LaFollette, formerly editor of the Freeman, wrote jointly in the New York Times of May 9 a long statement citing in detail the flagrant inaccuracies of the picture. They concluded:

"The film, Mission to Moscow, is the first instance in our country of totalitarian propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission, or pure invention of facts, and whose effect can only be to confuse the public. Even in a fictional film this method would be disturbing. It becomes alarming in a film presented as factual.

The whole effort is to represent the Soviet dictatorship as an advanced democracy. Such gross misrepresentation can only contribute to confusion in our relations with the Soviet Union.

The film is anti-British, anti-Congress, anti-democratic, and anti-truth. It deepens the crisis in morals which is the fundamental issue in the modern world."

And this is the film which the Communist Daily Worker now boasts Warner Brothers are spending $500,000 to advertise throughout our country—$200,000 more, the party journal adds proudly, than has ever been spent on the promotion of any other American film.

To me it is bewildering that American State officials and public champions of democracy should wish to whitewash or ignore the judicial murders, mass deportations, and State-planned famines by which Soviet totalitarianism has been established and maintained. The danger to our foreign policy involved in ignoring the Kremlin's real purposes is a small thing compared to such corruption of our own democratic habits of thought.

Democracy is primarily, as Mr. Roosevelt has constantly reminded us, a way of life. It has its existence in the habit of mind and action of the whole people. In issuing books and films condoning the totalitarian tyranny, you strike the most deadly blow conceivable against this way of life.

Either we believe in demoracy, and that is what we are fighting for, or we don't and it isn't. While our boys are dying on foreign battlefields in the cause of democracy is no time for us to be spreading the totalitarian corruption on the home front.

MR. WILLKIE REPORTS ON RUSSIA

If ever strong, hard-minded patriots of democracy were needed in our public life, it is now. The mushheads and the muddleheads are doing us in. We turn naturally to Wendell Willkie, whose professions of democratic idealism have been eloquent. Mr. Willkie, one hopes, will stand up against the national inferiority complex, and give us the straight dope about Russia. He has gone there to see what things are like with his own eyes. But we open his book—which is both wise and charming on many other subjects—and what do we learn on the first page? That to show him through Soviet Russia and make sure he got an "unbiased" view of it, he chose Joseph Barnes, a man who, whatever his ability may be, is universally regarded by those critical of Stalin's regime as the slickest apologist for the Soviet Union in the United States. Mr. Willkie might at least have chosen an escort who was known neither as a skilled apologist nor a confirmed critic of the dictatorship he was to look at so briefly. He owed that both to himself, it seems to me, and to his constituents.

In Russia Mr. Willkie saw barbed-wire-enclosed concentration camps in various towns and spoke of them in his article in the Reader's Digest. This reference to the camps, however, had somehow dropped out of the article by the time it appeared as chapter 5 of his book. Did his "perfect traveling companion," Joe Barnes, who was "most helpful and generous in the preparation" of the book, perhaps have a hand in revising the proofs? Or did Mr. Willkie himself decide to let us forget this bit of vital information?

How vital it is may be understood if we bear in mind that there are, according to the estimates of those best qualified to judge,[2] at least 10,000,000 people living, or rather dying, at hard labor in concentration camps in the Soviet Union. Ten million ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed, despised and suffering slaves—that is the bottom layer upon which the whole edifice of so-called economic democracy rests.

The evil is that many Americans who do not believe in communism are acting as if they did. They are fooling with it, just to be on the "left," fooling with death, destruction, devastation—civil war to establish, not to abolish, slavery.

Whoever actually set down the words, Mr. Willkie's chapters on Russia certainly read as if they were written by two minds—one anxious to recite only the Communist catechism, the other shrewdly, if naively, observing the facts. On page 53, we read that "there is hardly a resident of Russia today whose lot is not as good or better than his parents' lot was prior to the revolution." That sounds like a fellow traveler reciting the catechism. It could not be Mr. Willkie observing the facts, for Mr. Willkie never saw Russia before the revolution; and what he saw on his trip was, in his own words, this: "Clothing nearly gone. * * * Women and children gathering wood from 50 miles around to make a little warmth against the coming cold. * * * Many vital medical supplies just did not exist. * * * Children work, in many of the shops, the full 66-hour week worked by adults. * * * The only food that could be bought in the markets was black bread and potatoes, at exorhibtant prices. * * *" These are findings which agree with the observation of Ralph Ingersoll, a friendly visitor to Moscow before Russia entered the war: "A dishwasher in an American hash-house would not trade his life for that of the average Soviet workman."

People who do not instinctively distinguish between what is true about Russia, and what Communists and their fellow travelers want us to believe about Russia, are not to be relied on in this day of democratic crisis.

THE REAL STALIN

It is well known—to all who want to know—that Stalin has two foreign policies; one conducted by his diplomatic corps, the other by his secret agents who sit in the directing committee of every foreign Communist party. The former is essentially a facade; in the latter Stalin talks his own language of "world revolution," "revolt of the colonies," "doom of finance capital," overthrow of "imperialism" (by which he means, primarily, Eng-

[2] Examples: Alexander Barmine, former brigadier general in the Red Army, estimates that the number is above 12,000,000. Anton Ciliga, Jugoslav Communist intellectual who spent years of imprisonment in the camps, gives their total population as 10,000,000. Boris Souvarine, French historian of Bolshevism, estimates 15,000,000. Russians, as I said, do things in a big way.

land and the United States), and other projects which bear the same relation to the Atlantic Charter that a mine full of TNT does to an advancing soldier.

Stalin talks this language also in his books and in keynote speeches made at every general meeting of the Russian Communist Party. But our molders of opinion, in their eagerness to love Stalin and to believe that Stalin loves democracy, are evidently avoiding those books and speeches. They are making the same kind of mistake former Prime Minister Chamberlain did. Hitler explained to Chamberlain in Mein Kampf exactly what he intended to do, but Chamberlain found it such painful reading that he preferred to muddle along on guesses.

Stalin's Problems of Leninism is just as explicit as Mein Kampf. The victory of his regime in Russia, he there explains, is not "self-sufficient," but is a prelude to similar victories in all other countries. The revolution presided over by him in Russia is "a prerequisite of world revolution." This book (revised up to 1939) has been issued to the number of 4,000,000 copies in Russia. All young people have to study it, every Communist must know it thoroughly. It has been translated into all important languages for the guidance of Communist parties everywhere. It is for sale today in the Daily Worker bookship in New York. Its promises have been rigidly adhered to in every piece of territory that Stalin has invaded.

In Poland, for instance, in order to hasten the victory there the invading Communists killed or imprisoned all the democratic and social-democratic leaders of labor,[4] and shipped away 1,500,000 to 200,000,000 of the civilian population to concentration camps in Siberia. Of these, 400,000 have since perished from hunger and exposure.

I take these figures from the official announcement, three times repeated, of the Polish Premier Sikorski, and from the statement of Bishop Josef Gawlina issued through the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

This means that, in order to establish a Communist dictatorship Stalin has to remove or exterminate approximately one-sixth of the population. All those people—workers, farmers, teachers, ministers, businessmen, officers, leaders of all walks of life—are briefly labeled "bourgeoisie" or "kulaks" and liquidated. They are not merely Polish patriots. They are everyone who has any objections to a general confiscation of property under the dictatorship of a totalitarian party.

This explains why the Polish Government in exile insists on talking about 10,000 murdered officers and hundreds of thousands of dying civilians. It explains why Finland persists in her sit-down war on the Russian border. It explains why General Mikhailovitch will not dicker with the Communist-led partisans in Yugoslavia. It is another fact which those who guide our policies in the post-war world ought to hold clearly in mind unless they like being taken in.

The tough, brutish realism of Soviet foreign policy stands out so flagrantly that one wonders why any diplomat should want to meet it with mouthwash. The Kremlin shows no regard even for its own supporters in foreign countries, unless they produce results. Russia made close pacts with Turkey at the very moment when Kemal Pasha was killing off Turkish Communists wholesale. Although Mussolini climbed to his pinnacle over the corpses of Italian Communists, Stalin went right on supplying him with oil for "the rape of Ethiopia," notwithstanding League of Nations sanctions. Under the same hard-boiled code comes Stalin's joint invasion of Poland with Hitler; his seizure of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania when the ink was hardly dry on treaties of nonaggression with those countries; his unprovoked invasion of Finland; and the Kremlin's recent announcement that it considers the territories seized during the period of collaboration with Nazi Germany as permanently its own.

[4] Two of these leaders, Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, were men of international repute. When it became known that they were in prison in Moscow, liberals all over the world addressed pleas to Stalin for their release. For 15 months no word was uttered in answer to the pleas. Finally, Soviet Ambassador Litvinov informed William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that the two men had been shot in December 1941.

COMMUNIST WORLD REVOLUTION

United Nations officials needed to be reminded, it seems, at the time of the Casablanca Conference, that Russia is our ally only against European enemies. Stalin could not go to Casablanca, even by proxy, because his country still has friendly dealings with Japan. Both nations have emphasized their unspoiled relations on the basis of the friendship pact signed in Moscow, with Hitler's blessing, a few weeks before the Germans invaded Russia. That pact, of course, freed Japan to attack the United States at Pearl Harbor, just as the pact with Germany freed Hitler to unleash the war in the west.

An explanation of both pacts may perhaps be found in the principle laid down by Stalin long ago; that the "mightiest ally" of Communist Russia is "strife, conflicts, and wars" among "capitalist nations." (Pravda, January 30, 1925.)

Stalin has never retracted these words. Every one of his keynote speeches on world politics has been based on them. All Communists clearly understand that they are still in force. The molders of our foreign policy should study Stalin's acts and read his books and his speeches to the inside crowd, instead of swallowing like starved pickerel every glittering propaganda lure the Communists throw out.

This becomes more important every day, because there is little doubt that Stalin will soon move closer to the United Nations now that their final victory seems sure. There is no doubt at all that such a move will be heralded by the fellow travelers as proof of the Kremlin's sublime devotion to democracy. I would like to give warning that the closer we work with Russia the more vital it is, both to our national self-interest and the interest of world democracy, that we qut kidding ourselves and face the facts.

In this connection, it should be stressed that the much-advertised "dissolution" of the Comintern—self-styled "General Staff of the World Revolution"—was not such a move toward closer collaboration. There is plenty of evidence that the mere "dissolution" of a Soviet organization does not mean anything. The Cheka was "dissolved" when its name became infamous, and the GPU took over; the GPU was "dissolved" when it became infamous, and the NKVD took over; yet the same regime of police terror continued unchanged. Why should we expect a sudden end to the world Communist conspiracy just because the bosses of the Comintern have ostentatiously burned their letterheads? No powers have been surrendered, no principles revoked, no pledges given. That the American Communist conspirators who look with such obsequious fervor to Moscow for guidance will continue to get guidance is not subject to intelligent doubt.

We forget that Stalin once before pledged noninterference in American affairs—in 1933 when our Government officially recognized his regime. Earl Browder himself, chief of the American Communists, in his official statement on the "dissolution," said that it is of "no immediate concern" to his followers. He pointed out that his party resigned from the Comintern 3 years ago—and we need only add that, since then, as before, his party has followed the Moscow party line as deftly as the thread follows the needle.

There is one way to make the dissolution of the Comintern helpful both to democracy's survival and to our collaboration with Russia. That is to accept it as carte blanche from our ally to take effective action against the Communist conspiracy at home, Switzerland, the oldest and most steadfast democracy in the world, has set the example. She has recognized that totalitarian parties of all kinds—Nazi, Fascist, and Communist—are a conspiracy against the democratic state. She has outlawed her Communist Party with the others, and taken rigorous measures to prevent its revival under any camouflages or false labels. Our Attorney General, Francis Biddle, recently stated in an official opinion that "the Communist Party of the United States teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments, including that of the United States."

If we heed Mr. Biddle's words, and follow the Swiss example, quickly and in direct response to Stalin's act, we will both block his long-time schemes and compel his respect. But if we sing hosannas to Stalin for delivering us from the Comintern, he will laugh in his sleeve. And he will laugh last.

Those eager to be fooled about Russia make eloquent pleas for Stalin's "good faith." But Bolsheviks do not believe even theoretically in good faith. They believe that moral principles are a reflection of class interests, and that Communists are right merely because they represent the interests of the "advanced class." Stalin conceives himself as playing a role in a world-historical drama in which those who fawn on him are inexorably cast for the role of dupes. There is only one way to evade this role—this is to study Stalin's ideas and become as subtle in defending democracy as he is engineering its overthrow.

Winston Churchill showed some of this subtletry in 1937 when he wrote:

"Communism is not only a creed, it is a plan of campaign. A Communist is not only the holder of certain opinions, he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect, and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions.

"No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-Communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then, when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence, from revolt to private assassination, must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions, must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterward broken."[5]

It is a mistake to imagine that this drive against world democracy so vividly described by the British Prime Minister has been abandoned by Stalin or can be abandoned so long as he remains dictator. He knows as well as we do that liberty is contagious, that free business enterprise is an irresistible temptation. He knows that his revolution, like Hitler's, must be international. And this, too, he made unmistakably clear in his book when he wrote:

"What is the meaning of the impossibility of complete and final victory of socialism in a single country without the victory of the revolution in other countries? It means the impossibility of having full guaranties against intervention, and hence against the

[5] Great Contemporaries, pp. 168–169.

restoration of the bourgeois order. * * * To deny this indisputable fact is to abandon Leninism. 'We are living,' Lenin writes, 'not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer.' "

Is that not clear enough? Is there any reason why we represent Stalin to ourselves as a "man of mystery" whose aims are "inscrutable," except that we want to hide from ourselves the fact that he is a man of inflexible and brutal will whose aim is to overthrow, by any and every means available, the governmental, economic, and social system in which we live?

CAN WE SAVE DEMOCRACY?

If there were any military reason for hushing all these facts, I should be the last to bring them up. If there were a public opinion in Russia which might, if we coddled it, sway Stalin to lend us a base in the Pacific, I should be still. But there is no opinion except state opinion in Russia on any vital question; and not one word either of our praise or blame ever reaches the Russian people unless by special provision of the ruler.

As for that ruler himself, bred and educated in principled contempt for the statesmen of "bourgeois democracies," he finds only confirmation of contempt in their praise of him before their peoples while he sits cynically silent before his. If you want anything from Stalin, that is the way not to get it. There is no diplomatic or military reason why we should fawn on Russia and there is every moral, political, and patriotic reason why we should not.

Mr. Willkie says that he never has understood "why it should be assumed that in any possible contact between communism and democracy, democracy should go down." I agree with him there. The level of life in every respect is higher under democracy, and I believe it can continue so. I agree also, as I have said, that the Soviet Union is an "effective society" with which we must cooperate. I endorse his conclusion, "Learn all about them and let them learn about us."

But I submit that, if we confuse learning all about Russia with learning the propaganda slogans fed to us by those who, in blind worship of Russia, are plotting to destroy democracy, democracy will go down. If we respond to their brutal disavowel of moral principles with mushy pleas to believe in their good faith, democracy will go down. If, while they teach their people to sneer at democracy, we obsequiously hush-hush every bold word about the purges, the prison camps, the police army of 2,000,000 and the 10,000,000 galley slaves upon which their sneering rests, democracy will go down. If, while every Communist carries an inflexible purpose to destroy democracy built into the conceptual framework with which he apprehends the world, Democrats carry no purpose but to appease communism and kid themselves about its democratic war aims and the democratic rights guaranteed by its totalitarian constitution, democracy will go down. If, while Communists suppress by police terror and execution without trial every murmur in favor of democracy, we passively allow our schools, newspapers, radios, book and magazine publishing houses, cinema studios, Offices of War Information—any and every one of our centers of education, information and publicity—to be permeated with the agents and apologists of communism, democracy will go down.

Democracy is at a disadvantage in contact with communism because it is more civilized. It believes in tolerance, in free discussion, in popular enlightenment, in the value of life and the dignity of the individual, in honor and truth-telling and the principles of morality. Each of these virtues of the democratic way of life is a weakness in its struggle against the unscrupulous power drive of a conspiratorial party which replaces education with indoctrination, holds truth secondary to experience, and regards moral principles as old-fashioned prejudices.

It is the essence of democracy to be vulnerable to such an assault. One thing, one thing only, can save it, and that is clear and bold understanding. Democracy must have from its leaders incisive and uncompromising exposures of the barbaric nature of the Communist society and the devious method of the Communist attack. The closer our military and economic cooperation must be, the more pitiless must these exposures be. You cannot save democracy by shutting your eyes to the horrors of dictatorship. You cannot stop night from falling by turning the lamps down. Our sole weapon against their darkness is our light.

A Vote That Was Heard 'Round the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 25 of this year the President vetoed the War Labor Disputes Act.

At 3:13 p. m. o'clock the President's veto message was read in the Senate. Thereupon Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, a Democrat and a consistent supporter of President Roosevelt, then made the following statement:

Mr. President, I am sorely disappointed. The Senate is sorely disappointed. The House, I am sure, is sorely disappointed. The people of the United States in overwhelming majority are sorely disappointed. Every soldier and sailor on the seas and on the land and in the air is sorely disappointed. The sections of the bill about which the President complains were contained in the bill as it passed the House. They are not vital provisions in the bill. They are merely incidental. The President has the right, under the Constitution, to veto a bill, and the Senate has the right to pass a bill over the President's veto. I hope the Senate will exercise its high constitutional privilege.

The Senate passed the measure over the President's veto by a vote of 56 to 25.

In the House action came at 4:50. The veto message was read and the roll call began. By 5:28 p. m. o'clock the antistrike bill was law. Immediately before the veto message was read in the House, Representative WOODRUM of Virginia, a Democrat and a consistent supporter of the President, made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, we are at a critical hour in the history of this world conflict. Our armies in the field are winning glorious victories. Today in the minds of many American citizens, we are about to lose an important battle on the home front. * * *

Every man is entitled to his own individual opinion, and he must take his own responsibility. The President can take his. He is amply qualified to do it. I want to take mine. I do not want to put it off. I want to say to the people that I represent, and I want to send a message to the boys in the fox holes and on the battle fronts, that those of us here at home are going to do our part. I hope very much it will be the pleasure of the House to take immediate action upon this important matter, and not let it simmer here and work into a festering sore. We should unhesitatingly pass this bill over the veto.

The House of Representatives passed the measure over his veto by a vote of 244 to 108.

The action of the Congress in overriding the President's veto was the swiftest and most emphatic action ever taken on such a question in the history of the country.

The President, in his veto message, approved the act and stated that he would have signed it but for the cooling-off provisions that it contained and its inhibition against contributions by unions to be used in Presidential and congressional elections.

His objection to the provision of the law that gives the members of a union the right to vote on the question of whether or not they will strike during the war and requiring a cooling-off period of 30 days before such strike can go into effect, and which also forbids an employer to close down his plant and be guilty of a lock-out without giving a 30 days' notice of his intention so to do, are hard to understand. The cooling-off period provision has worked well in the Railroad Relations Act.

The President's opposition to the no-campaign contributions by unions provisions of the act can be better understood. In 1936, he was the beneficiary of a half million dollar contribution from John L. Lewis. If Mr. Lewis could call back that $500,000 gift, he would doubtless gladly do so. He and the President no longer love each other.

This provision against campaign contributions by unions is a wise provision of the law. The members of unions do not pay dues for the purpose of financing political campaigns. Those who make up the unions are members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. If the head of a union, therefore, is permitted to take $500,000 of the union's funds and give it to a candidate of his choice he will be using money contributed by Democrats to aid a Republican, or money contributed by Republicans to aid a Democrat. To permit such use of the union's funds cannot be justified on any ground, legal or moral.

The six provisions of the law are these:

First. Persons who coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with or encourage any person to interfere by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption with the operations of plants in possession of the Government, or who direct such interruption or provide funds for them, shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Second. Employees of war contractors must notify the Secretary of Labor, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board of any dispute which threatens to interrupt production, and the N. L. R. B. is required, after the passage of 30 days, to take a secret ballot as to whether they will strike.

Third. The President receives authority to seize plants, mines, or other production facilities affected by labor disputes.

Fourth. Wages and other working conditions in effect in a seized plant or mine shall be maintained as they were before seizure, unless the W. L. B. consents to a change.

Fifth. The W. L. B. receives power to subpena the parties to labor disputes, but a W. L. B. member is forbidden to participate in any decision in which the member has a direct interest—as an officer, employee, or representative of any party to the dispute.

Sixth. Labor organizations, banks, and corporations organized under Federal law are forbidden to make political contributions in any election involving officials of the Federal Government.

The law provides a legal method of settling industrial disputes during the war and for 6 months thereafter. What has been the procedure heretofore? The President, without sanction of law, has been seizing plants and using the armed forces of the country to supervise their operation. He seized the coal mines of the country, and took them out of the hands of their owners in the absence of any law specifically authorizing him to take such action. And, after placing them in the hands of Secretary Ickes, he authorized Ickes to use the Army, if necessary, in his effort to produce coal.

As an alternative to the measure which he vetoed the President then said:

> There should be no misunderstanding—I intend to use the powers of Government to prevent the interruption of war production by strikes. I shall approve legislation that will truly strengthen the hands of Government in dealing with such strikes, and will prevent the defiance of the National War Labor Board's decisions.

In other words, he proposed to the Congress and to the people of this country to use his unbridled will in the attempted settlement of industrial disputes and in the seizure and operation of the private property of citizens and to use the armed forces of the Nation in so doing, and thus substitute a Government of one man for a Government of law. He then made the following recommendation:

> I recommend that the Selective Service Act be amended so that persons may be inducted into noncombat military service up to the age of 65 years. This will enable us to induct into military service all persons who engage in strikes or stoppages or other interruptions of work in plants in the possession of the United States.
>
> This direct approach is necessary to insure the continuity of war work. The only alternative would be to extend the principle of selective service and make it universal in character.

Such a proposal and such a law are without precedent in all the history of this country. It was objected to by the boys in the Army and the Navy on the ground that it proposed to make service in the Army a punishment and the uniform of the soldier the garb of one guilty of violating the law. It was well nigh universally objected to as a form of slave labor. The President thus actually proposed to draft every man in the country up to 65 years of age and force him to work at any task assigned him.

It is, therefore, seen that the President endorsed seven sections of the Connally-Smith Act and sponsored a work-or-be drafted law for strikers.

The President, in his veto message, well said:

> Laws are often necessary to make a very small minority of people live up to the standards that the great majority of people follow.

This is the expression of a self-evident truth. On the statute books of every State in the Union, murder, theft, arson, and many other offenses against society are denounced as crimes. These laws constitute no reflection upon people who do not violate them. They are on the books for the protection of the many who do not commit such crimes, and they are aimed against the few who do. Is there anyone who would wish to repeal them?

The President wished to limit action to John L. Lewis and his miners. Congress made the law apply to everyone who undertakes to slow up our war effort.

The issue is simple. The issue is clear. The boys in uniform, on the battle fronts, all over the world, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, are "striking" against Germany, Italy, and Japan. The American people are determined that no one shall "strike" against these boys here at home. And be it said, to the credit of our people, but few have done so. Industry, management, and labor have performed miracles in the production of war materials.

Up to this good hour no American boy facing the enemy has turned his back and ran. They have gone into battle with traditional American courage, and have written in their blood glorious chapters in American valor and sacrifice.

As Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, said:

> The veto was not the act of the Commander in Chief of a great Nation at war. Rather it seemed the act of the politician who is a candidate for a fourth term.

Let him who will show the white feather and run here at home when he ought to stand, but let it be remembered that on the battle front our boys have stood, and are standing, with an unflinching courage that puts to shame those who have run out on them here at home.

Address of Hon. Forest A. Harness at the Ceremonies Observing the First Anniversary of the United States Naval Air Station, Bunker Hill, Ind., Friday, July 2, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOREST A. HARNESS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the ceremonies observing the first anniversary of the United States Naval Air Station, Bunker Hill, Ind., on July 2, 1943:

There is for me a real thrill of pride and satisfaction in being here with you today for the observance of the first anniversary of the establishment of the Bunker Hill Naval Air Station. In fact, I never miss an opportunity to visit the station, for I am absorbed in the tremendous job you men of the Navy are doing here. Your accomplishments here have aroused in me a feeling of profound admiration and respect, and your station complement, from your commandant right down to the newest fledgling I have met, are gentlemen I consider it a privilege to know personally. Believe me, then, this visit would be a real pleasure even though this were just another routine work day.

But this day, closing the first year's activities at the station, is indeed a significant occasion. It deserves to be marked as a milestone in our inexorable march to victory. For what has happened here in the 12 short months in which this quiet countryside has been converted from the ways of peace to the hard, grim business of war, amazing as it seems in retrospect, is, after all, quite typical of our total national achievement. This is the transformation of a nation, sadly unprepared and desperately fighting on the defensive, into the toughest fighting power in the world, which from this point forward will definitely call all the important turns until our enemies are utterly crushed and destroyed.

This record of achievement seems all the more amazing and unreal when it is measured against our background as a peace-loving people. America tried through all the years of world unrest to avoid war. We went to such lengths to remain at peace, in fact, that the dictators fatally misjudged us as a soft, indolent people who would not, or could not, defend ourselves. None of us wanted to undertake this hard conversion of war. Navy men and civilians alike, we would have much preferred to leave this fertile area to its productive peacetime pursuits. We all fervently wish we had not been forced by brutal aggressors to tear our civilian economy out by the roots to make way for the machinery of war.

But with war thrust upon us, we in this community, like good Americans everywhere, willingly made our sacrifices; and are proud that we have been able to contribute in the creation of this important naval operation.

Very few Americans can realize quite as fully as you men of the Navy just how far we have come during these past 12 months, for none of us as civilians could possibly know, as many of you men of the service know from your own bitter experiences, just how desperate our situation actually was in the opening months of the war. Now that the first critical dangers have passed, we at home are beginning to learn bit by bit just how tremendous were the odds we faced. But even when the full history is written, we can never know, as many of you do, what it meant to face odds of 5, 10, yes even 100 to 1; and still to gamble audaciously; and to fight and die bravely against those overwhelming odds for that precious interval of time on which our very national life depended.

Nowhere in all the bright pages of our history is there one to surpass that which our fighting forces wrote in the early stages of this war. Nowhere in the glorious record of the United States Navy is there anything to surpass the magnificent achievements against insuperable difficulties which your comrades and you won in those dark days following Pearl Harbor.

To you, Commander Seligman, and to others of you in this gallant service who have met the enemy, and have added luster to our naval traditions, this milestone must hold for you a deep satisfaction which compensates largely for those weeks and months of heartbreaking trials and struggles through which nothing but your own indomitable

courage and unquenchable spirit could have carried you. I know it must mean more to you than words can describe to look back over the road we have traveled, to appraise the progress we have made, and to know with increasing certainty that total, final victory will surely come, no matter how desperately our enemies may fight.

To you young men who are on your way to join that constantly growing band of heroes carrying the war to our enemies through every sky in the world, I know the record your comrades have already written will inspire you in your own time to add more shining chapters to the glorious history of the United States Navy.

Certain though the ultimate victory is, we all fully recognize that there is still much tough going ahead. Our confidence, therefore, shall not lull us into a sense of complacency or false security. You men of the Navy, above all others, will, I am certain, carry on with the same grim determination which has enabled you to accomplish the amazing results which show on the first year's record at this station. I hope I shall have the good fortune to visit you again frequently, and to rejoice with you in the tremendous contribution you have made, and will continue to make, toward victory.

Veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Washington News, which I ask consent to include with my remarks herewith, expresses very clearly my own general point of view on the whole problem involved in the Presidential veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I voted to sustain the veto, and for the same basic reasons that the News presents in the first two paragraphs of the editorial.

It is also my very strong opinion that the News is right when it says "Congress owes it to the country to develop a program much more adequate than this device." I expressed myself to that effect in the House yesterday.

Most important of all, however, is the last paragraph of the editorial. "Inflation" and "increases in the cost of living" are not the same thing. Increases in living costs are a result of inflation. So are increased farm prices and increased wages. The cause lies in a surplus of active buying power over the volume of consumer goods to be bought with it. And this in turn has been due basically to the fact that we do not have a compulsory savings program to insure a distribution of Government bond ownership among the whole population nor an adequate tax program to pay a larger share of war costs currently. As a result billions upon billions of dollars of brand new money in the form of demand deposits have been created by the private banks of the country including the Federal Reserve banks for the sole purpose of buying Government bonds. This, plus the decline in the supply of consumer goods due to war production is the cause of inflation and of the almost irresistible pressure on prices. Only taxes and compulsory savings can end any inflationary danger that may exist. Until definite action is taken on these matters and from this point of view we shall have a serious and dangerous situation. We ought not to be selling a single bond to a bank for money that bank creates.

Indeed, the basic reason we have the O. P. A. with all the difficulties connected with it is because of the lack of action along the lines of the last paragraph in the News editorial.

I have repeatedly spoken to this effect and did so the first time when the original Price Control Act was passed.

The editorial follows:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS FOR CONGRESS

Congress acted sensibly when it sustained the President's veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. This was a slam-bang piece of legislation, slapped together in anger. And it was wholly destructive in effect, for while it undertook to outlaw the administration's price roll-back subsidies it offered no substitute program to check the rise in living costs.

In our opinion, the President's subsidy plan is a makeshift, unlikely to do more than temporarily slow down the rise in living costs, unless other and drastic steps are taken. But it is an integral part of the only stabilization program now being pushed in Washington; it complements the administration's policy of freezing wages on the Little Steel formula, and, in the circumstances, if it were abandoned, the inevitable result would be to speed the upward spiral of prices, wages, and living costs to the even greater distress of all the people.

The Government is already committed to subsidies for meat, butter, and coffee. Failure to pay them would create chaotic conditions in the food industries, and their cost probably is not too extravagant a price to pay for an experiment to find out whether the roll-back will work.

Meanwhile, Congress owes it to the country to develop a program much more adequate than this device of charging a small part of each family's grocery bill against the credit of future taxpayers. One suggestion, well worth considering, is that offered by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont. Mr. AIKEN would revive the food-stamp plan, the effect of which would be to subsidize the grocery bills of only those in the lower-income brackets whose spending power has not increased. Certainly that is better than the President's plan, which undertakes to help pay for the food of everybody, including millionaires, war contractors, war-industry workers who are making two or three times as much money as ever before in their lives, and well-stuffed bureaucrats who haven't known a moment of insecurity in their 10 years on the New Deal pay roll.

But most important, and essential to the success of any program to keep down living costs, whether it be the President's roll-back plan or Senator AIKEN'S food-stamp plan, is the development of realistic Government taxation and borrowing policies. Prices are being pushed upward for the simple reason that there is more money to buy things with than there are things to buy. And the only way to drain off this excess spending money is through fiscal policies which will bring home to all people the realization that this war is no gravy train; which will recognize the truth Mr. Roosevelt uttered many months ago—"our standard of living will have to come down."

Mr. President, It's Your Next Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, little is gained by governmental denunciation of John L. Lewis or the coal operators. The damage has been done, and it will go on being done until our Washington officials have adopted an intelligent program which ties wages to prices. So long as price rises are permitted, the demand for wage increases to meet the rising cost of living is inevitable. In many communities it has been demonstrated by simple calculation that the price of food, clothing, and recreation essential to good work has gone up far higher than the 15-percent increase which has been so widely publicized as the Little Steel formula.

Whenever this occurs it is impossible to prevent the recurrence of vigorous demands for pay raises. The question of wage levels cannot be divorced from purchasing power, and if a seemingly good pay envelope of $40 can purchase only what $35 bought a year ago, both labor and capital must cooperate in the effort to achieve an intelligent formula to meet the issue. This is the underlying basis of the coal controversy from the viewpoint of objective-minded observers. We are not interested in the overweening personal ambitions of men or groups. We are interested in achieving a fair solution in keeping with the American desire to maintain the living standards for which our men are fighting overseas. Our Government so far has registered a signal failure on this basic, underlying issue.

Four Freedoms Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. BUTLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a copy of the resolution adopted by the Board of Managers of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York at a special meeting on June 28, 1943:

Whereas it appears from statements in the public press that a Four Freedoms Flag is projected, symbolic of the United Nations, to supplement the flag of the United States of America in ceremonies overseas. According to the United Press account, "the two-flag system was arranged in unofficial discussions between Chairman Brooks Harding, of the Four Freedoms Committee and representatives of all the United Nations. In ceremonies overseas the United States will be represented in a Four Freedoms Flag flown beside

the standard of the Nation in which the event will be held"; and

Whereas the flag of our country was chosen by Congress on June 14, 1777, and was carried by our ancestors in the Revolutionary War, sustained in the War of 1812, the Mexican War, and the other conflicts in which our country has been engaged; and

Whereas it is the emblem of freedom and the symbol of the unity of our country, for which our ancestors died and our sons are fighting and is a token of all that has made America great and for which there can be no substitute: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, with unyielding conviction, protests and condemns the flagrantly unpatriotic and spiritually destructive proposal to have the United States represented in ceremonies overseas by a Four Freedoms Flag flown beside the standard of the nation in which the event is to be held, and demands that no flag other than the Stars and Stripes, adopted by Congress on June 14, 1777, shall officially or unofficially represent the United States directly or indirectly, nor may the Stars and Stripes be merged, amalgamated, symbolized, or in any manner be abridged or be included in any composite of flags.

I heartily concur in the above resolution, and I think the patriotic citizens of our country should be aroused in defense of their flag and all it represents.

Governor of Wisconsin Threatens Arrest of O. P. A. Probers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it appears from the following news article from the Antonio Journal that the O. P. A. is going to be required to follow the laws of the State of Wisconsin. The time to stop this assumption of power is when it begins. These bureaucrats should be forced to follow the law as well as the citizens are. The farmers are doing a mighty good job in spite of the senseless rulings of this O. P. A. outfit, and the citizens will make approved civilian contributions to the war effort more fully if "little men" in big places do not overestimate their importance. The article is as follows:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE THREATENS ARREST OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION PROBERS—DEMANDS STATE OFFICE LEAVE DRIVERS ALONE

MADISON, WIS.—Advisers to Acting Governor Walter S. Goodland, who protested yesterday against an Office of Price Administration plan to stop and search cars in Wisconsin for gas-rationing violations, said today they had been advised by Regional Director Raymond McKeough, of Chicago, that the drive had been called off.

The Governor's executive secretary, Roy L. Brecke, and his former secretary, James J. Kerwin, now district attorney of Milwaukee County, contacted McKeough by telephone and said they were assured there would be no unlawful search of automobiles or seizures of gas coupons.

The drive had been planned for the July 4 week end by John C. Reinhart, Office of Price Administration director for the Green Bay area, who had announced his investigators would keep sharp watch on northeastern Wisconsin highways to detect rationing violators and users of black-market gas.

MADISON, WIS.—A spokesman for the Governor's office, who declined to permit use of his name, declared today that any Office of Price Administration investigators stopping motorists in Wisconsin "illegally" to search for gas-ration violations would be subject to arrest by State and county highway enforcement officials.

The executive office was awaiting a reply today from John C. Reinhart, Office of Price Administration director for the Green Bay area, to a demand from Acting Gov. Walter S. Goodland that he abandon plans to stop and search automobiles over the July 4 week end.

The Governor told Reinhart in a telegram yesterday that the Federal and State constitutions forbid unlawful searches and seizures and warned the director that "I shall not tolerate any interference with the due process of law.

"Unless we hear from Office of Price Administration sources by 2 p. m. today and are advised that there will be no illegal searching of cars, Hugh Jones, head of the State motor vehicle department, and his enforcement officer, Homer G. Bell, will be summoned to the executive office for instructions.

"They will be told to take into custody any person who illegally or unlawfully stops a motorist on the highways and searches him or demands that he give up any personal effects."

SHERIFFS ADVISED

The informant said these instructions would go directly to members of the State highway patrol and that similar advice would be sent by telegram to the sheriffs of the State's 71 counties.

Goodland's telegram to Reinhart declared that the Office of Price Administration official did not "have the right to indiscriminately indulge your suspicions against the citizens of this State or other States traveling in this State as to the possible illegal use of gasoline coupons."

Reinhart had announced that Office of Price Administration investigators would keep a sharp watch on northeastern Wisconsin highways during the July 4 holiday to detect illegal use of gas-rationing coupons and users of black-market gas.

The Office of Price Administration director said he had not received the Governor's telegram last night and would not comment on it until he had read it. Earlier yesterday Reinhart declared that the Office of Price Administration would go ahead with its check-up as scheduled, despite the fact that police officials of Green Bay and Manitowoc said they would not stop motorists suspected of gas ration violations.

NO HELP FROM POLICE

City Attorney Thomas Dwyer, of Green Bay, told Police Chief Thomas E. Hawley his officers had no authority to stop motorists suspected of violations. Reinhart had asked police assistance in the check-up.

Police Chief James J. Kuplic, of Manitowoc, declared his officers would not stop motorists to check their coupons, adding that if they did so they might be overstepping legal bounds.

Governor Goodland declared his wire to Reinhart stated:

"I have observed an article in the press, relative to a wholesale check-up announced by you, in which you state that every investigator will be employed throughout the week end to deal with motorists unable to account for gasoline or coupons in their possession and that this proposed action is based upon your assumption that people traveling in this State will be doing so illegally insofar as Office of Price Administration regulations with respect to gasoline are concerned.

"I cannot condone the illegal use of gasoline coupons by either citizens of this State or vacation guests traveling in our State as I am unalterably opposed to the waste of gasoline or rubber in this critical period.

"But I vigorously protest the right of Office of Price Administration investigators under your directions to interfere with people lawfully upon the highways of the State and insist that you do not have the right to indiscriminately indulge your suspicions against the citizens of this State or other States traveling in this State as to the possible illegal use of gasoline coupons.

"I shall instruct proper law enforcement agencies of the State of Wisconsin to see to it that the rights of people are not invaded by you unless you have good grounds to stop and search. The Constitutions of the United States and of the State of Wisconsin alike guarantee the citizens of this State against unlawful searches and seizures, and I warn you that I shall not tolerate any interference with the due process of law.

"I am informed by reliable sources that the action you propose is not taking place in any neighboring State. The publication of your statement in the press has given most unfavorable publicity to Wisconsin. Would like an immediate reply from you."

Informed of the Governor's telegram, Raymond S. McKeough, regional Office of Price Administration administrator, said at his Chicago office the Office of Price Administration would continue to insist on strict adherence to gasoline rationing regulations.

"Unlawful search and seizure in connection with the enforcement of Office of Price Administration regulations have not been employed and will not be countenanced by this office," McKeough said.

He added that gasoline rationing is no longer important solely to save rubber but that conservation of gasoline and automobiles also has become vitally important to the successful prosecution of the war.

"The use of gasoline for vacation travel is not of itself illegal," McKeough continued. "If the motorist saves his A coupons for his vacation trip and foregoes the use of his car in the anticipation of that trip the regulations do not preclude the use of gasoline for that purpose. On the other hand, the use of gasoline which has been allotted for business purposes and defense purposes is illegal if used for vacation trips."

Post-War Plans—Proposed International Monetary Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, this Congress after 6 months of constant consideration of subjects which involved every phase of our war effort as well as our battle on the home front to maintain our economy on a sound basis is about to recess. It is probably well that we go home for a space of time. We have been so constantly away from the good

people we represent I sometimes wonder how well we know what they are thinking. Are we ahead of them in our thinking, or, as many believe, are they far ahead of us?

But while we are absent from the Nation's Capital other departments of the Government will be hard at work interpreting by their efforts the various laws we have enacted. Not only this, but they will be making studies and holding meetings with other interested parties with a view of asking for further power and authority.

It has become increasingly evident that much thought is being given to post-war problems, national and international. The former are so close to us all, and so much a part of the districts we represent, that no matter whether at home or in Washington we are pretty closely in touch with them. The international post-war problems, however, are doubly complicated for the reason that they not only touch our own domestic economy but that of each nation with the representative of which our Government may be having conversations looking to future agreements. These conversations by their very nature are not given general publicity.

As one Member of the Congress, I am willing to go on record as to my deep interest and sense of obligation to take a constructive part in the post-war international problem. However, I also wish to go on record to the effect that America's participation should be on the basis of enlightened self-interest. Further, the citizens of our great country should be fully informed, in advance, what will be their future responsibilities. This knowledge can only be disseminated if the Congress is itself kept informed as to what plans and policies are being developed.

Within the past several weeks a plan looking to the stabilizing of values of international currencies in the post-war period has been published by the Treasury Department. On June 3, the Treasury issued regulations calling for a census of foreign assets of all types and descriptions owned by persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. This census, I understand, is required in connection with the proposed Treasury currency stabilization plan.

I further understand that there have been a number of informal meeting in the Treasury between our officials and Treasury representatives of foreign governments, at which many plans and projects for international monetary and credit cooperation have been discussed. These meetings, I am told, are the forerunner of an official International Monetary and Credit Conference that will take place here in Washington during the summer months when Congress will probably be in recess.

Mr. Speaker, I believe many of my fellow Members are as desirous as am I to accept our share in post-war rehabilitation, but like myself will want to keep fully informed as to what may be our country's responsibilities. Congress in the last instance will legislate on these points, and our information should be current in order that agreements that should be only tentative do not become so formal, that if the Congress should in final analysis find itself in opposition to some phase of the proposed agreement and so legislate, embarrassment will not ensue.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully offer the suggestion that the Chair appoint a small committee of Members who will make it their business to be present in Washington at the time of the monetary conferences I have mentioned, and that they be authorized to attend all such meetings as observers, and from time to time furnish the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader with reports of proceedings.

"Civilian Defense Is a People's Movement Which Offers a Greater Variety of Opportunities for Self-Expression in the War Effort Than Any Other"—Gov. Earl Warren, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because of its timely interest and the unusual importance of that which he then had to say, I offer for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address which was delivered at Columbus, Ohio, on June 21, 1943, by the Honorable Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Governors' Conference:

It has been almost 3 years since the fall of France and the evacuation at Dunkerque—and therefore 3 years since we first thought seriously of the question of civilian defense.

Prior to that time we stood in "splendid isolation," unprepared for any war and relying upon two great oceans to protect us from the forces and design of totalitarianism.

Overnight the size of those oceans diminished in our minds until we could clearly see the specter of Nazi and Fascist aggression approaching our shores. This was the birth of civilian defense in America.

In August of that year the Federal-State conference on problems of defense was held at the Hall of Justice in Washington, D. C. As a result of that conference a plan for organization on the State and local levels was submitted to the Nation with varied results. Some States became extremely active, others gave lip service to the cause, and others ignored the entire situation as being too remote for concern.

The Office of Civilian Defense was created but not really activated.

Then came Pearl Harbor, accompanied by intense public interest, considerable hysteria, and resulting confusion. In this period, however, much was done. Most of the States set up councils of defense, thousands of cities organized for the same purpose, and millions of citizens volunteered under the banner of civilian defense. We then remembered the sabotage and other fifth-column activities in France and the lowland countries. Our people, and government at all levels, were willing to do anything to protect us from aggression. The Office of Civilian Defense was soon restaffed, activated, and the movement grew to monumental size in a remarkably short period of time. A sincere effort was made to protect the system throughout the country. Volunteers became active and a sizable percentage of them have retained their enthusiasm and have continued to serve patriotically and efficiently ever since.

On the whole, however, I believe it is a fair observation to say that insofar as the general public is concerned, interest has been geared very largely to the day-to-day news of the war. When the news is bad the interest is high. When it is good, interest wanes.

Our present concern is that in many places we are in the latter state of mind. I say this without criticism of any particular community because I believe it is the tendency of most of us. It is another indication of our willingness to ride with the tide. I have wondered if perhaps there isn't something in the name of civilian defense that contributes to the condition.

In 1940, when we first started thinking of it, it was civilian defense in the strict sense of the word. We were concerned with the thought that we too might be attacked. We were attacked, viciously, and as treacherously as our worst fears. But the attack came a long way from the States. We did not see the destruction and bloodshed. It left no burning picture lingering in our memories. It was like the fall of France—separated from us by more than 2,000 miles. But it did change our national position from that of defense to war—all-out war.

Unfortunately, neither the name "Civilian defense" nor the approach to it changed sufficiently to represent our actual change in position. And as the war has progressed civilian defense has fluctuated in the public mind and on the whole borne too close a relationship to the current fortunes of our armed forces. This must be rectified.

Civilian defense, so-called, must become a militant and integrated part of total war. It must represent offensive mindedness. It must constitute the active mobilization of all civilian forces of America for participation with our allies in a life and death struggle to preserve our freedom and to determine the entire course of civilization. It is no longer defense. It is offense. I would start, therefor, by calling it what it is—home-front mobilization or some other term of like connotation.

I am one of those who believes that, at best, we are in for a long war and that the war news from day to day has no more bearing on the necessity for home-front mobilization than has the daily number of fires throughout the country upon the wisdom of carrying insurance policies on our homes. I believe we are not only in a war—we are in two wars. We are now bearing down on the European war with most satisfying results but we should never lose sight of the fact that when we finish there we still have to deal with an enemy that has no equal for mendacity, a foe who has planned for this world situation daily for a quarter of a century—a foe more ruthless and more desperate than any we have yet dealt with. We must remember that we will still be at war in an area that dwarfs the size of Europe in comparison. We will be opposing the combined resources of the West Pacific which are being marshalled day by day for our destruction. This indeed will be total war.

I trust this observation will not be considered simply a western viewpoint, although most thoughtful people in the West share it. It may be that the danger is more apparent to us than it is in some parts of the country, just as the danger to our civilians from the European Axis is more understood in Boston and New York than it could possibly be in the mountains of Nevada or California.

There is something about standing on the shores of California and seeing Jap submarines sink our coastwise ships or fire at shore installations that has a sobering influence. There is something about locating enemy incendiary bombs in the vast forests of Oregon that sharpens the imagination of those who know something about western forest fires.

Yes; and there is something about the thousands of boys who are invalided home from the Pacific front to our military hospitals—something about the stores of their experiences—that convinces one that we are in a war different from any the occidental mind has ever before even conjured with.

In passing let me say that there are in this country over 150,000 potential aiders and abettors of this kind of warfare. They are, or at least were until recently, in relocation centers in various parts of the country. Large numbers of them are reservists in the Jap military forces. Others have been taught the art of sabotage preparatory to this struggle. All have been indoctrinated with the imperial designs and have had them coupled with Shintoism—the religion of the race.

Recently we have read of the social experiments in these relocation centers and the movement within our Government to release the most of them as harmless to the security of our home front. But please don't be deceived. No more dangerous step could be taken. Nothing more destructive to our civilian defense could be perpetrated upon the country than the release of these potential fifth columnists upon the American public.

Some months ago we became terribly alarmed over the landing of six German fifth columnists in this country. They had been trained for sabotage in Germany and equipped with money to perfect their plans here. We recognized them as a national menace. We promptly tried, convicted and executed them and severely punished those who had aided and abetted them. But by comparison with the thousands of Japs now in relocation centers, who could and would do the same as these Germans, the whole incident was but a tempest in a tea pot.

This is not a personal view. Have you ever heard an Army or Navy man advocate release of these Japs? Have you ever heard anyone connected with the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate such action would be consistent with the national security? What do State and local law-enforcement officers believe? I can tell you. They believe they cannot long be responsible for the safety of their communities if these people are released and scattered throughout the country.

If the Japs are released no one will be able to tell a saboteur from any other Jap. We are now producing approximately half of the ships and airplanes of the country on the Pacific coast. To cripple these industries or the facilities that serve them would be a body blow to the war effort. We don't want to have a second Pearl Harbor in California. We don't propose to have the Japs back in California during this war if there is any lawful means of preventing it. And, we believe, that what would be bad for us would also be bad for you.

We believe that one of the most vital necessities of civilian defense is to keep the Japs in relocation centers where they can do no damage to any part of the war effort. And further than that we would have them placed under the jurisdiction of the Army or the Federal Bureau of Investigation which are charged with the security of our Nation. There we will have unlimited faith that the interest of all Americans, both on the field of battle and here at home will be protected. This isn't an appeal to race hatred. It is an appeal for safety.

Civilian defense is a people's movement. It offers a greater variety of opportunities for self-expression in the war effort than any other. It enables us to rub shoulders with neighbors in a patriotic spirit of fellowship and common understanding. Properly organized and led, it can be the greatest morale builder we have. It is one of the few war activities in which States and local communities have been left to their own devices and their own judgment, based upon their own conscience, to do an important job in the prosecution of the war. It is one of the few Federal agencies that has recognized the necessity of a partnership between the three levels of government as well as between the three coordinate branches of government.

This agency, charged with the problem of activating 15,000,000 citizens for war activities, has been satisfied to make the pattern, declare the policies, and leave the execution where it belongs—with the States and their subdivisions.

In the West we have had an equal partnership with the Office of Civilian Defense and I believe this is due largely to the views of Director Landis, who declared:

"Government under our system is a resultant of the three sources of Federal, State, and local power. It is the sum total of these forces operating upon the individual that defines his rights and obligations with reference to his community, his State, and his Nation. Nowhere is that more true today than in the field of civilian defense, for civilian defense, either in terms of protection or in its promotion of the essential civilian war services, requires the interaction of all these forces."

These three sources of governmental power must be closely knit together in both peace and war. This is essential to our combined war effort and is essential to our peacetime efficiency. To say that such a welding together of the sources of governmental power is impossible is to deny what has been proved in the West by our experiences with the Office of Civilian Defense.

I wish that the other Federal agencies could also be made to see that Federal, State, and local governments must work together as a team; that all thinking, planning, and execution cannot be done in Washington to the exclusion of States and cities; that mass participation in the war can only be obtained by delegating responsibility to the other levels of government and that real national unity comes from the grass roots of the 48 States, rather than from the directives of innumerable bureaus in Washington, D. C.

For this reason alone, if for none other, it behooves us to make the most of civilian defense; not just from the selfish motive of protecting our own homes and property, but from the vastly broader viewpoint of enabling us to participate fully in all manner of related war services.

If we can remain constant in our loyalty to this cause, we can prove that State and local responsibility can be relied upon. To others who believe only in the centralization of power, it can be an object lesson and a goad to their conscience as we experience bureaucratic break-downs in the future.

In a short address of this character it would not be worth while to attempt to outline approved forms of organization for civilian defense. That has been done by Office of Civilian Defense, by many of the States and numerous counties in a far more comprehensive manner than could be done here. This much only I would say:

The day of defense has passed. The time for affirmative offensive action is here. Likewise, the Advisory Council of Defense belongs in the past. What we now need is a war council with power to initiate action and expand it into every National, State, and community service necessitated by the war and with extraordinary powers vested in it or the chief executives for use in times of great emergency.

Through such organization, with the leadership that can be given to it by the 48 wartime Governors of the United States, civilian defense cannot fail.

New England Shipbuilding Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 I took occasion to tell the House of the very gratifying construction record that had been made by the South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation—now the New England Shipbuilding Corporation—in the 60-day period next preceding. I did this because this company had previously been a laggard and had been most severely criticized on that account. Indeed, there had been a recommendation for the cancelation of its contracts with the Maritime Commission.

I now take particular pleasure in announcing that the company is to receive next month an award of the Maritime M. In the period from January 20 to and including June 30, 1943, 39 ships were completed and delivered, 3 in the last 10 days in January, 6 each in February and March, and 8 in each succeeding month.

Actual deliveries of ships are now averaging a little better than one every 4 days. If account be taken of progress on ships under construction, as well as those which have been actually completed and delivered, work under the Maritime Commission's contracts with New England Shipbuilding Corporation is now rather more than a month ahead of schedule.

I am certain that the House will share my satisfaction at this record.

The Butter Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, apropos of my remarks on the floor of this House yesterday dealing with the butter shortage in this Nation and the silly rationing regulations of the Office of Price Administration, I now insert a letter from the Honorable Prentiss M.

Brown, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, to which I referred:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C. July 3, 1943.
The Honorable CHARLES E. MCKENZIE,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In compliance with your request over the telephone this morning, I am giving below a brief digest of the rationing regulations which concern farmers and home producers of rationed foods. Two copies of the applicable ration order, Ration Order No. 16, together with sets of amendments, and two copies of the applicable form, Office of Price Administration Form R-1609, have already been sent under separate cover.

The ration regulation covers the sale of most meats (except poultry), butter, fats, and oils, American and certain other cheeses. All persons who sell any of these rationed items must do so in compliance with the ration order, no matter how small their scale of operations.

The requirements imposed by the order on small farm and home producers are extremely simple. They are not permitted to sell any rationed items unless they receive in return the proper number of red points. Also, they must report periodically to their local Office of Price Administration war price and rationing board. The farmer may report either once a month, once every 4 weeks, or by using a system of 12 reporting periods a year of 4 or 5 weeks each. He may choose the one of these alternatives which is most convenient to him. Within 15 days after the close of each reporting period the farmer must file a copy of R-1609 with his local war price and rationing board, and include with it the points which he has collected during the rationing period. The report may be filed by mail.

You will note that all the form requires, in addition to the name and address of the farmer, is the number of pounds of each rationed article which he has sold during the period, and the number of points which he has collected from the sale of rationed articles, and which he has submitted with the report.

There is one type of point-free transaction in which the farmer may engage under the regulations. He may lend up to 25 pounds of butter and cheese a year without taking up ration points. However, if he receives any payment for making the loan, it is not considered to be a loan and the points must be collected. Meat may also be loaned, up to a limit of 400 pounds of beef and veal and 150 pounds of other meats.

If you require any further information in regard to these regulations, we shall be glad to provide you with it.

Sincerely yours,
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

First I want to call your attention to the fact that while information was given to me on the telephone yesterday, July 2, 1943, and I made reference to it on the floor of the House on that same day and the letter itself makes reference to "your request over the telephone this morning"—the letter carries the date of today—July 3, 1943. Is this evidence of the fact that O. P. A. does not even know the day of the month?

The letter states, "the requirements imposed by the order on small farm and home producers are extremely simple." Then it goes on to say that all the farmer or housewife has to do is to collect the "proper number of red points" and then make a return to the O. P. A. War Price and Rationing Board either once a month or once every 4 weeks or in 12 reporting periods of 4 or 5 weeks each. Within 15 days after the close of each reporting period he "must file a copy of R-1609 with his local war price rationing board and include with it the points which he has collected during the rationing period." He must show the number of pounds he has sold and the number of ration points he has collected during the period, and he must not make a mistake. Great guns. What is simple about that? He must stop milking his cows, feeding his chickens and livestock. He must take time from cultivating his crops—producing vital food for the war effort. What for? To make a silly, foolish report to the O. P. A. And if he does not have time or choose to do this he must either go to jail, pay a fine, or not sell or give away his butter. Hitler could demand no more. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, is this an effort to boost the food production and distribution, or is it an effort to create a planned confusion, resulting in a shortage of food and a consequential regimentation of the American people?

And do not overlook the paragraph about the lending of butter, cheese, beef, and veal, and other meats. You can lend them but you cannot give them away or sell them. Mr. Speaker, does that make sense? Does that help the food situation? Is it not confusing? And then O. P. A. squalls and bawls because the Congress cut $35,000,000 from its appropriation. If they would cut out this sort of foolishness they would not need the $35,000,000.

Local Officials Cooperating Effectively in Fuel Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. CLASON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 2, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the people of western Massachusetts, and in fact of the entire East, are greatly concerned about the supplies of fuel which will be available for civilian use during the coming winter. Each week we are advised that supplies of petroleum products are not accumulating to the extent that will be necessary to provide adequately for our requirements. Articles in trade journals show that less anthracite coal has been coming into Massachusetts in 1943 than in the similar period of 1942. The present strikes in the anthracite fields necessarily add to this problem. We have long since learned from Government officials that there are plenty of petroleum products in the United States but that our shortage is due to transportation facilities. Unfortunately additional facilities have not yet been made available which will permit the actual requirements to reach the East. Every Senator and every Congressman from the East has personally, and as a member of the New England or eastern blocs, urged the heads of the several agencies in control of the supply and distribution of petroleum products to act promptly in securing additional transportation facilities for the East. Several methods for bringing in supplies have been brought to the attention of the officials. Unfortunately they have not acted promptly or efficiently in many cases. On the other hand, the officials have charged lack of cooperation by local agencies and the people of the East generally in the use of fuel oil and gasoline. Previously I have brought to the attention of the House incidents where local boards have acted for the advantage of their communities and of the entire country.

I am pleased to cite another instance in point, and I quote the two following paragraphs from a letter which I have recently received from a constituent:

> In view of the fact that you are aware of the importance that oil in its various grades plays in this war, we feel that the accomplishment of the Springfield War Price and Rationing Board in saving 250,000 gallons of range oil would interest you. It has been possible to make this saving by a direct method of reviewing space-heating facilities. This is accomplished by means of a personal interview with the applicant and a questionnaire appended to the application. This questionnaire has been set up by our fuel-oil panel and has aided very materially in effecting this saving.
>
> The Springfield district Office of Price Administration and Mr. Murray, of the Washington Office of Price Administration, both complimented the Springfield War Price and Rationing Board very highly for this method and procedure and have recommended both the questionnaire and the method to the majority of boards under the supervision of the Springfield district.

This letter shows that not only our local officials, but the people of the East generally, are taking every means possible to conserve the supplies of fuel oil and gasoline which are coming in. It also shows that the officials who are acting on local boards—many of them devoting long hours without pay to the service of their country at this time—are giving close thought to the problems which come before them. They are seeking solutions for these problems and are advancing methods which will contribute to the welfare of the public.

It is to be hoped that sufficient supplies of range and fuel oils will reach the East this winter to prevent any suffering among the people of our area. The health, physical endurance, and the n orale of millions of workers in war industries depend upon the efficient handling of fuel for the East during the next 9 months.

Wisconsin Republicans for International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks,

I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal of July 2, 1943:

NOT ISOLATIONISM, SAY REPUBLICANS

The Republican off-year conference at Appleton, though it had previously voted to leave international relations out of its resolutions, realized that the people of the country everywhere are concerned about what the post-war world is to be.

So there had to be a resolution, and what is adopted is good—so far as it goes. It is one more indication that Republicans generally are against isolation. Though the Nation has been devoted to neutrality in foreign wars, the resolution says, and during each of two great wars has tried to follow this policy, it has become involved in both wars, and "it is now obvious that our previous policies of neutrality and minimum armaments have failed." The resolution continues:

"The United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace. The Republican Party of Wisconsin believes that world peace can be best assured only when sovereign States, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together.

"The Republican Party of Wisconsin believes this common ground can and must be found and an international reign of law and order developed."

To this much a conference of conservative Republicans was ready to commit itself on June 27, 1943. Taken at its face value it means a pledge, so far as this conference could pledge its party, not to run out on the world after hostilities cease.

Loopholes are left, of course. It would be impossible to write a paper now saying exactly what any group will support or reject when the time comes for action. The smooth tricks played by Henry Cabot Lodge and his group in 1918 to defeat cooperation could conceivably be repeated—if there were enough Lodge-minded thinkers left in Congress and the country.

However, the animating spirit is more important than the words used. It is the conviction of these men and women that the United States shall take part actively in "an international reign of law and order." This is the conviction reported today wherever Republicans or Democrats or men of no one party meet to consider what is to be done after the war.

Renegotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include here a copy of a statement made by Mr. Francis Callery, vice president of Consolidated-Vultee Aircraft Corporation, before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, on the subject of contract renegotiation in the aircraft industry. I include it here for what value the opinions and information may be to Members of the House.

The statement follows:

The opportunity to appear before your committee is very much appreciated. I am glad to be able to tell you some of the problems of the aircraft industry and how they are affected by the present renegotiation law. At the outset, I want to make it clear that the aircraft industry, as a whole, and every single member of it that I have any knowledge of, is opposed to making undue profits out of the war. I believe it would be fair to say that we feel as strongly on this point as anyone in the Army and Navy and in Congress. There is a clear distinction, however, between profits and profiteering, and in the course of my testimony, I am anxious to explain this distinction.

The aircraft industry has enlisted for the duration. Its business must be judged over this period and the transition period which inevitably will follow. Renegotiation adjusts the yearly profits of the aircraft companies as they appear on their books. These profits in a dollar sense may appear large but in fact they are mere bookkeeping profits. They are not the kind of profits that stick to your ribs. Stockholders do not get their hands on them. They do not represent undue enrichment to anyone. As far as I know there are no wartime aircraft millionaires in the making. The profits of the industry which we have been allowed to retain and a great deal more in the way of reserves are needed in order to permit the survival of this great industry which is doing such a magnificent job toward winning the war. Entirely aside from the perfectly natural wishes of all of us to survive, it is obviously a matter of national interest that the aircraft industry should survive in a healthy condition.

Before coming specifically to the subject of renegotiation, I would like to bring out a few very general facts to support the statement I have made that the stockholders of the aircraft companies have not profited from the war. In fact, they are not as well off now as they were a year or so before Pearl Harbor. I do not contend that they should be better off. I am merely pointing out that they aren't. I have had some figures made up for six large airframe manufacturers: Boeing, Consolidated Vultee, Douglas, Lockheed, Martin, and North American. In 1939 the average price of the shares of these six companies ranged between $41.70 high and $22.81 low. In 1940, the high was $42.97 and the low $25.72. In 1943, the range so far has been $29.97 high and $21.91 low. The present average price is approximately $24.90. It is clear that stockholders have not made any profit through any increased market value of their shares.

The average dividend of the six companies was $1.06 per share in 1939; $1.96 in 1940; $2.79 in 1941; and down to $1.96 again in 1942. Present dividend payments are no higher than in 1940 and, as stated above, no market profits. Dividends and increase in values of stocks are the only two ways I know of by which stockholders can benefit. The aircraft stockholders have not had the advantage of either of these benefits.

I wish to point out, however, that earnings on the average have gone up during this period from $1.83 per share in 1939 to $5 in 1940, to $9.61 in 1941, and $12.18 in 1942. This seems like a fantastic increase. It is, but as pointed out before the profits as shown are merely bookkeeping figures. Apparently aircraft-company stockholders and investors in general do not consider, and rightfully so, wartime earnings as real earnings but more the nature of reserves and highly inadequate reserves for the transition period after the war. So much for the figures on the aircraft industry.

Now, if I may, I would like to state briefly a few suggestions as to the changes in the renegotiation law which we think are necessary for the protection of the aircraft industry. We are not asking for rewards. We don't think anyone in industry is entitled to a reward for his contribution to the war effort. We don't want rewards, we only ask that we be left enough in the way of reserves out of the war to continue in business. This, in my opinion, is not asking too much and I believe this would be voted for by the overwhelming majority of our people.

I have had a great deal of experience with the Price Adjustment Board of the Navy. I have had many meetings with them. I have gotten to know the members of the Board well. Without exception, they are able, experienced, sincere, and patriotic men. In my many meetings they have invariably dealt with me with courtesy and with patience. Naturally, we have had many differences of opinion. We still have, on general policy matters, but we have a mutual respect for the other's point of view. We have about reached a settlement with the Board for the year 1942. It is the opinion of our directors that it is good business policy for us to accept the offer of the Price Adjustment Board rather than to continue with further prolonged renegotiations.

We are not opposed to the objective of renegotiation in preventing excessive profits. We think that the law should be amended or the regulations revised wherever possible, or both, so that:

1. Renegotiation would be based on net profits after taxes and net profits not exceeding 3 percent, or whatever rate the committee might determine, would be exempt from renegotiation.

2. Provision should be made in the revenue bill to allow necessary reserves for the post-war transition and these reserves should be exempt from renegotiation. In the aircraft industry, as I hope to be able to convince you, these reserves are desperately needed.

3. The provision for the termination of contracts should be changed so as to give adequate protection to contractors.

With your permission, I would like to comment briefly on the three points I have just mentioned and I will be very glad indeed, after this statement has been completed, which I assure you will be soon, to have you ask any questions you might care to ask.

1. RENEGOTIATIONS AFTER TAXES

At my early meetings with the Price Adjustment Board a very considerable amount of discussion had to do with whether we should consider profits before or after taxes. I then took the position that profits after taxes were the only real profits. I still take that position. Profits before taxes are stage money. You know the stand of the Price Adjustment Board on this subject and the reasons given, so I will not go into their side of the case. In a memorandum which I prepared on May 13, 1942, a year ago, just after the law was passed, I pointed out that, in my opinion, the word "profit" or "excessive profit" as stated in the law could only mean profit after taxes. Webster defines profit as advantage, benefit, the excess of returns over expenditures in a given transaction or series of transactions. God knows the old adage is true today that there is nothing more inevitable than death and taxes. Taxes are an unavoidable cost no matter how you may reduce expenses by efficient operation of a business. Taxes loom as the one item of cost that is proof against efficiency. It is a fixed element of cost. It is the one irreducible element of cost. The law says that excessive profits are to be recaptured through renegotiation. The law does not say profits before taxes but the price-adjustment boards renegotiate before taxes. In my opinion, it makes just as much sense to compute profit before pay rolls, or cost of raw materials, as it does to figure profit before taxes. How can a profit be identified as an excessive one until the profit itself is known and how can a profit be determined until the taxes are known?

The thing that should matter is what the United States Government pays for what it

buys. The Government is both the buyer and the collector of taxes. The taxes paid, from an over-all cost standpoint, should be considered a net reduction in the price paid by the Government. To illustrate, let us assume that an identical type of airplane is sold to the Government by each of two manufacturers at a price of $150,000. Let us also assume arbitrarily that this price of $150,000 is after all renegotiation adjustments and the Price Adjustment Board allows each company a profit of 10 percent before taxes. Let us further assume that one manufacturer is an aircraft company which designed, developed, and spent its own money on the airplant. This aircraft company naturally has a small tax base and its profits are taxed at the 80-percent over-all limitation. The other manufacturer, an automobile company perhaps, would be building the plane to the aircraft company's designs and specifications and would be benefiting by the know-how of the aircraft company. This manufacturer, we will say, has a favorable tax base and is taxed at an over-all rate of 50 percent, as compared with 80 percent for the aircraft company. Now, the profit before taxes for each company would be 10 percent of $150,000, or $15,000. The aircraft company would pay a tax of 80 percent, leaving 20 percent, or $3,000 for its net profit. The other manufacturer would pay a tax of 50 percent of the $15,000 profit, leaving a net profit after taxes of $7,500. If the price is $150,000 and the profit before taxes $15,000, the manufacturer's cost of the airplane would be $135,000. The net cost to the Government, however, washing out taxes as in one pocket and out the other, would be the manufacturer's cost plus the net profit to the manufacturer after taxes. In the case of the aircraft manufacturer this would be $135,000, plus $3,000, or $138,000. In the case of the other manufacturer the cost to the Government would be $135,000, plus $7,500, or $142,500. In this hypothetical case, which is probably paralleled throughout industry in general, the Government would be paying $4,500 more for the same product from one manufacturer than from the other, and one company would be making $4,500 more profit in wartime for the same service. In effect, this is a subsidy to hold up the earnings during the war of companies that were profitable before the war.

The aircraft companies are selling airplanes which they have created and sweat blood over. It is their only business. They have nothing to look to except airplanes after the war. It is not a stop-gap business for them. Because of low tax bases they end up with less profit than companies which are filling in on war work and will have huge market demands for their own products after the war.

I imagine that a number of examples have been brought out before your committee on how net profits are affected by varying tax bases. The extreme example under present tax rates would be a comparison between two companies, one with the highest tax base and the other with the lowest base, assuming both companies are allowed a profit by the renegotiators of 10 percent before taxes on adjusted sales. The company with the high base would pay a tax of 40 percent, leaving him a net profit of 6 percent after taxes. The other manufacturer with the low tax base—and the aircraft industry generally is in this class—would pay a tax of 80 percent, leaving him a profit of 2 percent after taxes. In this illustration it is 6 percent net after taxes compared with 2 percent net. The old company with a good background of earnings and probably large capital reserves makes 3 times as much net profit as a manufacturer with a small tax base. In 9 cases out of 10 the low-profit company needs the additional profit much more urgently than the high-profit company.

I have heard it said that the job of renegotiating the thousands of war contracts would be materially reduced by exempting companies doing an annual renegotiable business of $500,000 or less. This, I understand, would screen out a large number of contractors, some making very high profits perhaps, and others small profits. We think a fairer method of screening would be to exempt companies on the basis of profits made rather than on the basis of the size of their business. The suggestion made earlier that profits of 3 percent or under after taxes, or some other appropriate rate, be exempted from renegotiation would, in our opinion, be an effective method of screening. Under this method, the companies exempted would not be making, by and large, inordinate profits out of the war.

I do not by any means wish to convey the idea that companies are entitled to 3 percent after taxes and that this profit rate must be allowed by the procurement agency. I think it is the job of the procurement officers to buy as cheaply as they can but, if, through efficient operation, a company can end up with a profit of, say, 3 percent after taxes, this profit should be his and not subject to recapture through renegotiation.

It has been said that the computation of profits after taxes is highly inflationary and requires a high price in order to allow a company to end up with such-and-such a profit after taxes. I do not agree with this contention at all. If the Government agencies, the Treasury, and the procurement authorities are considered on an over-all basis, it amounts to merely a matter of "in one pocket and out of the other."

2. RESERVES FOR POST-WAR TRANSITION

This we think is the most important single problem confronting the aircraft industry. The problems of the industry can be well illustrated by using the figures of Consolidated Aircraft with which I am familiar. Our business has expanded from sales of $3,600,000 in 1939, $9,300,000 in 1940, $94,800,000 in 11 months of 1941 and $304,000,000 for the year to November 30, 1942. The sales of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation for the year to November 30, 1943, are estimated at over $650,000,000. This company represents the merger of Consolidated and Vultee which became effective on March 18, 1943. The combined sales of the two companies for the 1942 fiscal year amounted to approximately $400,000,000. The net working capital after suggested renegotiation settlements, as of November 30, 1942, amounted to approximately $9,000,000. This is only about 2.25 percent of sales in 1942 and less than 1.5 percent of our estimated sales for the current year. I hope you will keep this figure of $9,000,000 in mind. It is our entire working capital and it is equal to about 2 weeks' pay roll.

On November 30, 1942, Consolidated alone had liabilities and commitments of $546,000,000 against which we had cash, receivables, and inventories and Government supply contracts covering our commitments to subcontractors and suppliers. In addition, we had our own working capital of $9,000,000. It is easy to see that this meager margin of capital to risk is a real problem. If we were not devoting all our efforts to getting out more airplanes at the lowest possible cost, this would be enough to give us nightmares. I say to you with the utmost sincerity that our stockholders are risking every penny of their capital, up to the hilt, in the war effort. The general belief is that we have been benefited by the immense volume of business which has been entrusted to us. This is far from being the case. Our stockholders and the stockholders of all companies in the aircraft industry would be far better off if their businesses had not been expanded to these wartime fantastic levels. I have contended in my dealings with the Price Adjustment Board that the profits we asked for were not real profits in any sense but merely an effort, and an inadequate one at that, to cushion the shock of shrinkage which is bound to occur. Even the most ardent aviation enthusiast—and I am one of them over the long range—cannot foresee anything but a shrinkage of business in the period immediately following the war to a fraction of what it is now. We have been raised to the sky from humble origins. We are going to be cut back to our size. Make no mistake about that.

Assuming that we would survive the post-war transition, the aircraft industry would then need capital to develop peacetime products. The airplanes of today are not commercial types. Entirely new designs or major modifications of existing designs must be made. It costs real money to build a new, big airplane, and this money—"seed money" it has been called—must be available in the hands of the aircraft manufacturers if they are to continue in the business. For example, the prototype—that means the first airplane—of a 100-passenger transport would cost around $4,000,000. The tooling to go into quantity production would cost an additional $10,000,000.

I know it is not the intention of Congress or of the Price Adjustment Board to take the aviation business away from those who have done so much to give us the best Air Force in the world and to deliver it to the automobile companies or other companies with adequate capital after the war. This may well happen and it can only be prevented by leaving the aircraft companies with enough resources to continue in business, to keep at least their pre-war organizations together and to continue applying toward aircraft development the engineering brains and skills that have made this country great in the air. I do not know how to emphasize this point strongly enough and, when this statement is completed in a very few minutes, I hope you will question me on it.

In the aircraft industry we are concerned not with wartime profits but with the survival of our businesses and any intimation that we are profiteering is bitterly resented.

To get back specifically to the question of reserves, I think it would be very helpful if Congress—either through the tax law or through amendment to the renegotiation law—could provide for the post-war transition period. I am sure that the Navy Department Price Adjustment Board is fully aware and sympathetic with this problem and I am sure that they would welcome instructions from Congress that would permit them to allow reserves. Members of the Price Adjustment Board are businessmen. They know what the aircraft industry has done for the war and what it will be up against when the war is over. They interpret the present renegotiation law as not permitting them to allow these reserves and congressional clarification appears necessary.

3. TERMINATION OF CONTRACTS

All of our present contracts with both the Army and Navy can be canceled at any time by the Government if the contracting officer determines that it is for the best interest of the Government. The present contracts in effect provide that expenditures up to the date of cancelation will be paid for, plus part of the profit. A final determination under these provisions, however, may well be a prolonged affair and expenditures made by the contractor in all good faith for the carrying out of the contract might not be allowed in the settlement. Assume even that all costs up to the date of cancelation are paid, the contracts do not give any protection to the contractor against his real problem; that is, operating expenses and losses after the termination date. We go on the theory—and perhaps it is wishful thinking—that our expenditures for Government account up to today are covered if a cancelation notice should be sent out to-

night. Tomorrow, however, is an entirely different matter. Our operating expenses could not possibly be cut off in time to prevent enormous losses. As I mentioned before, our net working capital is less than 2 weeks' pay roll and pay roll is only one element of expense. Frankly, I do not know what we could do. A drastic cut-off would be chaos in the commmunities in which we are doing business and, while we hope this method of termination will not be followed, it is possible under our contracts and we must be thinking of it as a possibility. We would like to see termination provisions written so that they will give the contractor some measure of protection against loss during the period following termination. I do not think this is asking too much.

CONCLUSION

The story is a long one and I have already taken up a considerable amount of time. I could bring in considerably more information, but, as it is, I think I have touched on at least the main points; namely, renegotiation after taxes, reserves for the post-war transition, and the termination of contracts.

Thank you for your attention.

Before closing, however, I would like to bring out the accomplishments of Consolidated Aircraft in the matter of price reductions. Early in 1942, before the renegotiation law was even discussed in Congress, it was decided by Consolidated's management that, due to reduced costs brought about by manufacturing efficiency, it would be proper to pass this saving along to the Government in the form of reduced prices. In April, before the renegotiation bill was introduced, Consolidated advised the contracting officers at Wright Field that it was planning to make certain voluntary reductions. In May, the price reductions were made. Further price reductions were made in July and again in September, with the net result that the Government for the fiscal year to November 30, 1942, benefited to the extent of $127,400,000. Of this amount, approximately $41,000,000 was refunded in cash and the balance through reduction in contract prices and waiver of escalator payments due. All of these returns to the Government were made voluntarily and this is proof of our willingness to return savings made possible through manufacturing efficiency. In addition, in the proposed settlement with the Renegotiation Board, Consolidated is planning to return something over $20,000,000 applicable to 1942 business. As this income has been reported for tax purposes, this latter refund may have to be made in the form of a net amount after taxes.

We Protest, Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, when the hearings on the Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1944 were held before the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee considerable testimony was taken on the discharge of men for disability existing before induction. I urged that the War Department leave to the Veterans' Administration the determination of how physical disability was caused and not prejudice a veteran's case by the wording on the discharge given.

At that time I pointed out to General Magee a case had come to my attention where a man had 14 months of service and then was discharged on the basis of a preexisting disability.

The following excerpts from the hearings will be of general interest:

Mr. CASE. Why do you put in an allegation of the possibility of the man having contracted the disease prior to service? Can you not leave that open? If you leave it open, the Veterans' Administration could make its own determination.

General MAGEE. I think it is our responsibility. Take, for instance, the form of insanity known as dementia praecox. Some people have it and some do not. It is not an uncommon experience to bring a young man into the service who looks all right and who gets by pretty well. And it is possible if he had stayed in civil life he would not have had any trouble. But after he has been in the service 3 months he develops dementia praecox. There are certain forms of insanity that develop in the person himself. It is hardly possible that when he got into the Army he so changed his mentality, or his emotional content, so much as to its being the cause of the dementia praecox. So we have drawn an elaborate schedule. We used to have a 3-year limit; we assumed that if a man developed such a disease after 3 years of service it was in line of duty. In that we were out of step with the Veterans' Administration and the Navy and the most humanitarian thought in that direction. They put the time at 6 months. We changed ours. That is as effective as the 3 years, only it gives a man a break of 2½ years. Then somebody will say this thing happened to that man in 5 months and 2 weeks; why should he not be considered to be in line of duty?

Mr. CASE. Of course, the time in the service will have something to do with it. A man might go on for a year's time and not show any unfavorable mental condition, and then in another 6 weeks suffer from the adjustment under war conditions——

General MAGEE. Of course, those are intangibles.

Mr. CASE. In deciding that a soldier can be given an honorable discharge, an ordinary discharge, or a discharge without honor, all I am asking is why you cannot give him a medical discharge, which would be the same as an ordinary discharge, without prejudging the case, so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned?

General MAGEE. I do not know that I can. It does not become entirely a mental problem with us, but an administrative problem that concerns finances. We would be perfectly willing, if the War Department saw fit to open up that field of inquiry, to give the information, but I think the decision would have to be between the Veterans' Administration and the War Department.

Mr. CASE. You can give a discharge where you can say it was because of disability incurred in line of duty, and a comparable discharge would be an honorable discharge, or you can give a discharge which would be simply a medical discharge, without comment.

General MAGEE. We do not do that.

Mr. CASE. But they do give an ordinary discharge to a soldier.

General MAGEE. If it is indicated as being in line of duty, a board of officers investigates.

General LULL. Cannot the Veterans' Administration determine whether a case is compensable?

Mr. CASE. They can, but when you have that in the record and you have said it is because of the possibility of preservice origin, you have set up an almost insuperable bar which is difficult to offset.

General LULL. The doctor's judgment at that time is better than it would be some months or years later, because the man is right there where he would have his history, and have the case fresh in mind. The Veterans' Administration does not know what the attitude toward this particular case is, and I should think they would want to take the judgment of the medical men who have treated the case and observed him under those conditions.

Mr. CASE. There is a clinical record and the medical history of the man which should give them that, but you should be able to draw a conclusion as to whether or not a man is compensable within the intent of Congress in the law.

General MAGEE. If a situation of that sort arises, where two governmental agencies can take the same conditions and come to divergent conclusions, and if they can get no further, Congress will, of course, have to say what the answer is.

Mr. CASE. Your purpose is different. You are passing upon whether this man is fit for service in the Army. The Veterans' Administration has to determine whether his medical condition is compensable in the terms of the act of Congress in providing compensation where there is direct injury, or contribution toward the cause. I am trying to see if it is not possible to get a decision so that case is not prejudiced in the minds of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ENGEL. I think we can all agree that the case of a man who has epilepsy, where it develops that he was in an institution before he got into the Army, he apparently did not give his history and got into the Army wrongfully. I had the case of a man at Fort Sheridan who saw a man drop in the rest room in a fit. If he had gotten into the Army there is no question about what would have happened to him. But Mr. CASE's case is one where there has been no prior history at all.

General MAGEE. I can see exactly how you feel, and it might be that a review of that case might bring another decision.

Mr. ENGEL. The difficulty is that you can have these cases where an injustice was being done, and they come before Congress and we pass a law which takes in that particular case, and then it makes it so broad as to take in some other cases which should not come into it.

General MAGEE. That is right.

Since that time some other outstanding cases have been brought to my attention.

One is that of a man who had been in the service for more than 2 years, during the course of which he went through the Pearl Harbor incident, and then was finally discharged with dementia praecox, as having existed prior to enlistment and not aggravated by military service.

Another was a case where a major was discharged after nearly 2 years of active service in the Tank Corps, with a notation that his heart disability preexisted his service and was not aggravated by military service, although, prior to his service, he had served in the Officers' Reserve Corps for about 20 years and had been frequently examined with no notation as to a heart disability.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit herewith an editorial on

the subject appearing in the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly of June 25, 1943:

WE PROTEST AGAIN

Several weeks ago we registered a protest against the practice of certain officers of the armed forces in obtaining, under duress, the signatures of men to statements that the condition or conditions for which they were about to be discharged on a certificate of disability existed prior to enlistment.

We made no claim at that time that the practice was general or that it was in compliance with orders or that it was the accepted policy of the military. We just did not want to believe that such unethical, if not crude, methods had received the sanction and approval of America's outstanding military leaders. Frankly, we believed we would receive the assurance of those in command that such practices would stop.

But they haven't stopped. At the time of our original protest we had sufficient evidence in the form of specific cases which had been thoroughly investigated and which justified our protest. Now we are in possession of additional evidence of such volume and from such scattered sources that we demand that the continuance of this practice be stopped immediately.

This is no request that our sons and brothers and friends in the armed forces be babied and spoiled in training or in combat. It is a very definite demand, however, that the very un-American practice of bulldozing and threatening men who are admittedly sick in mind and body into signing false statements or statements against their interest be done away with.

Yes; it is our concern and we consider it very much our responsibility to do all in our power to correct a situation which is becoming odorous and which can be stopped with the stroke of a pen.

We may be criticized in being so frank. As a matter of fact we should be complimented by those in authority for our restraint in not publishing in detail the facts of specific cases which have aroused us and would certainly arouse, if not disgust, any fair-minded American.

We suspect the purpose, but what is the logic of educated medical officers in obtaining from sick and broken men or their grieving parents signed statements written in mysterious medical phraseology and relating to conditions the very cause and nature of which is often hidden from the vast majority of the medical profession itself? Indeed, the whole practice is absurd if it were not so often tragic.

The serviceman has the right to assume that the physical examination given him at the time of his acceptance into the service is complete and reliable. If this is not so it should be immediately corrected. If the medical authorities in the service counter this with the statement that the examiners are working under such pressure as to render this impossible, may we not then assume that the findings and conclusions of the medical officers, working under even greater stress and strain, are likewise fallible?

House Resolution 2703, now before Congress will, if enacted into law, render these false statements worthless and will direct the Veterans' Administration to disregard them. In the spirit of American fairness and as a long step toward the goal for which we are fighting House Resolution 2703 should become law.

We reiterate, the entire problem will be solved when the Army and the Government adopt the policy that when a man has been examined and accepted into the military service he is considered to be in sound mental and physical condition except for those conditions noted by the medical examiners and made of record at the time of his acceptance. It is the only equitable solution. It is the American way.

The Race Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram from the Honorable E. D. Coleman, sheriff of Tensas Parish, La., speaks for itself and emphatically expresses the majority opinions of the people of Louisiana and the Southland:

JUNE 28, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES E. McKENZIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Racial situation tense, caused by attitude politicians in high places and inflammatory literature circulated throughout Nation especially Pittsburgh Courier and Chicago Defender papers. We have deep interest in welfare of our white and colored people, but cannot subscribe to teachings of such poisonous periodicals. Attempt to put teachings into practice can only end in disaster to our colored race and bring sorrow and lasting regrets to their friends of the South. Our relations have been cordial, friendly, and mutually advantageous for many years and especially should not be disturbed at time of great national peril. Results could be no different if agitators were in fact Axis agents. We do not want a repetition of the dark days of 1865–78, the beginning of the reconstruction period of Dixie after the Civil War. The shameful and dangerous position in which this Nation stands today with reference to the Congress of Industrial Organizations and its No. 1 traitorous leader, John L. Lewis, is an example of a tragic blunder by our President. We hope he and other misguided persons will change their attitude on the race question before it is too late.

E. D. COLEMAN,
President, Louisiana Sheriff's Association.

Empire Parliamentary Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Prime Minister of Canada in the Canadian House of Commons:

[House of Commons, Tuesday, June 29, 1943, Speaker: The Honorable James Allison Glen]

The house met at 3 o'clock.

EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION—OTTAWA MEETINGS—DELEGATION FROM UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it would, I think, be in keeping with the wishes of honorable members were I to make a brief reference to the conference concluded today by the Empire Parliamentary Association. The meetings were attended by delegations from the parliaments of the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand and from the legislative assembly of Bermuda, as well as by many honorable members of our own parliament. The proceedings throughout were of a high order and demonstrated the value of the free expression and interchange of ideas among the nations of the Commonwealth which the conference has been formed to promote.

The conference will be particularly memorable because of the attendance, yesterday and today, of a distinguished delegation of visitors from the two Houses of the Congress of the United States. The delegation, comprising Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, was appointed by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, accepting the invitation of the Canadian branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association. The resolution itself will, in time, become a historic document. It is a signal honor, paid to Canada and to the Empire Parliamentary Association, by the Congress of the United States. The resolution is also of historic significance, as adding another bond to those which already join the nations of the British commonwealth of nations and the United States in the common defense of free institutions.

The House will, I am confident, wish to record its appreciation of the visit, at a time of war, of our distinguished fellow parliamentarians from other nations of the commonwealth, and its satisfaction that Canada should have been the place of the meeting for the first time of a delegation from the United States Congress with the Empire Parliamentary Association. In this meeting we can see the development of the understanding, friendship, and good will on which even now is being laid the enduring foundations of a new world order.

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (leader of the opposition). Mr. Speaker, I am glad at this point to associate myself and the members of the party which I have the honor to lead with the sentiments which have been voiced so eloquently by the Prime Minister. The meetings of the Empire Parliamentary Association which concluded today have been memorable in character. They have served a most useful purpose and in future will be looked upon as having been of great value, not only in relation to the problems which may arise during the war period through which we are passing, but also in relation to the tangled problems which the nations and Governments of the British Empire, the United States, and others will have to solve in the post-war period.

In my opinion the meeting of representatives of the people rather than the heads of government is an occasion of which we should take cognizance. If permanent peace is to come, the common man of each nation must learn to respect and to understand the common man of all the other nations. These meetings have brought forth a new feeling and have generated a new spirit which will be of great value in the days that lie ahead. I wish to echo the words of welcome extended by the Prime Minister to the delegates from the various parts of the British Commonwealth and also from the United States. We view with a great deal of interest the renewal of the acquaintanceship, friendship, and brotherhood among those who met together.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar). Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our party I should like to add an expression of appreciation that this conference has been held in Canada. To those of us who visited Great Britain some 18 months ago it was indeed a pleasure to welcome such a delegation to Canada. There is not much that one can say, except that conferences of this kind, participated in by what we might term the rank and file of our legislative bodies, including on this occasion Representatives of the Congress of the United States, can bring nothing but good to the United Nations and to the world. I hope that it will be the first of many such conferences.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge). Mr. Speaker, the members of my party rejoice along with other Canadians in the fact that we have laid the foundation for the development of good will between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race. The conferences which have just been held were epoch making in their significance. I do not believe I have ever attended meetings at which such frankness, candor, and good will were displayed. I am grateful indeed to those who arranged the conference and to those who have taken part in the meetings.

Dangers of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a radio address delivered by me last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System:

I am glad to be on this program with my good friend and colleague, who is one of the ablest and best informed men in the United States Congress, the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan.

Probably within a few weeks our soldiers and sailors may be engaged in a mighty and bloody struggle on and along the shores of Europe and in the Far East. Withdrawn into their defenses, our enemies can only be crushed by the biggest offensive in history. We are confident in the fighting ability of our sons and our neighbors' sons. We are confident that they, with the aid of our allies, will be victorious. We must not let anything interfere with their plans of battle. We must give them their needed weapons. We must give them their needed food, gasoline, and other supplies. For weapons and supplies are their very life line.

But economic conditions at home are taking shape that may retard the flow of these guns and planes and tanks and ships. I am referring mainly to the dangerous threat of runaway inflation. Our purchasing power has now reached enormous proportions. It is out of balance with the war-curtailed supply of civilian goods. Unless we curb our spending for things other than the bare essentials of life we raise a specter of doubt as to our appreciation for the sacrifices of our fighting men.

The dollars we spend today for luxuries may boomerang tomorrow with terrifying force.

The more we spend today the higher will be the price of victory.

The more we spend today the closer we come to the dangerous brink of runaway inflation—a frightful economic disease that can prolong the war and cause untold suffering for us and our children.

The more we press our excess purchasing power the lower in value become our dollars.

With roughly $4 bidding for every $3 worth of goods, prices are bound to skyrocket. These price increases will not make more goods available. They will merely set off all of us bidding against one another, in a wild scramble for the scarce goods. And in the end we would not get any more goods; we would simply spend more money for the same goods.

Price ceilings are not easy to hold in the face of inflationary pressures. We must siphon off these pressures by converting our excess purchasing power to help win the war. Paying taxes, buying War bonds, paying off personal debts, increasing savings and the purchase of life insurance can stave off the evils of inflation. By taxing heavily now to draw off excess spending power we make it easier to finance the war, we fight rising living costs, and we help build a sounder peace. This is one time the people should be glad to pay taxes and increase their personal savings.

Self-discipline in spending contributes to victory in two important ways:

First, it lessens the inflationary pressures.

Second, it stretches our supply of available goods.

What is the outlook on the home front? Will we have enough food? Will we have enough clothes?

Although by the end of this year our living standards will be about 20 percent lower than last year, I have been officially advised that our essential requirements can be adequately met. We shall have enough food. We shall have enough clothing. No one will be forced to go hungry and no one will need to go ill-clothed. But conditions will call for ingenuity and resourcefulness in making the most of what we have.

There is nothing shrewd or farseeing about people in wartime who purchase more of things than are necessary for their immediate needs. The grasping instincts of hoarders will deprive others of badly needed commodities, aggravate artificial shortages, and, in general, hinder the progress of the war. Hoarding, by its short-sighted selfishness, betrays a dangerous lack of patriotism, and hurts everybody, including the hoarders. And such goes for the black markets—the sale of goods and supplies outside of established controls as a means of circumventing price regulation and equitable distribution of limited supply. Black markets, although made through illegal channels, have the effect of preventing a fair distribution, thereby injuring both the selfish and the unselfish. It is neither smart nor clever to grab off more than we expect and accept as our rightful share.

Through our rationing program we must share our available goods. Among the reasons why this program is so vital is that we must direct raw materials and manufacturing facilities to war production.

It is vital because of the heavy requirements of our armed forces and fighting allies.

It is vital so as to curb the demand of most of us who, because of higher incomes, want to buy more food and other goods than we formerly did.

It is vital so as to relieve the congestion of transportation and distribution difficulties which hinder the movement of essential goods from producing areas to the consumer.

It is vital because it is a guaranty to every one of us that we shall get all we need for the maintenance of personal health, welfare, and working ability.

Rationing does not mean abundance—but it does mean enough.

In order to be absolutely certain that we get enough, we must keep the lid clamped on hoarding and black markets and on excessive spending.

We must keep it clamped so that living costs will remain stable;

So that sacrifices of war will fall equitably upon all, rich and poor alike;

So that we can effectively complete the job of mobilizing ourselves and our resources to meet our production goals;

And, above all, so that we can win the war and the peace.

Your part in all this program is personal participation in supporting the necessary regulations and controls established by the Government for fair distribution and at fair prices.

And further than that to increase your savings by additional frugality and self-control in spending.

It is now my pleasure to introduce my colleague, the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan.

Tribute to Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a poem, Tribute to Mother, which was sent by V-Mail to Mrs. Doris Liddell of 193 Hancock Street, Everett, Mass., by her brother, Pvt. Andrew King, and composed by him while with the United States Army "somewhere in England." I am doing this at the request of a former popular page in this House, Mr. John B. Wells, of Massachusetts. The poem was first printed in the Boston Globe of May 10, 1943. The poem follows:

TRIBUTE TO MOTHER

(By Private Andrew King, of Everett, Mass.)

The sweetest name in all the world
To us: there is none other
Can take the place and do the things
As the sweetest name of "Mother."

From childhood days to adult years
We've caused her many a sorrow,
And yet in spite of all those things
Her love is the same tomorrow.

For, after all, who is the one,
Not sister, dad, or brother,
To whom we go with all our cares
But to the one called Mother.

Who is the one, when we were young,
Shed many a tear and wept
Before the throne of God in prayer
For us before she slept?

Yes; always thinking of our welfare
And the days that are to come.
Praying God to guide and lead us
Through each trial 'til it be won.

And now to us on earth who dwell
Remember, there is no other.
For when she's gone she can't return,
The one we call our Mother.

Professors and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement taken from a speech I

delivered over the national network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, July 2, 1943:

For 10 years we have seen a steady concentration of power in Washington. The war extended an opportunity eagerly seized upon by those who believe that all business should be run from Washington. A multitude of new agencies has been set up to effect such a purpose. Some of these agencies have been necessary. Without entering into the question at this time as to whether or not the corner store should be operated by virtue of edicts and directives from Washington, and I do not for one moment concede it should, I wish to direct your attention to the fact that it cannot be operated successfully, in fact will be destroyed, if the regulators in Washington don't know anything about it. The House of Representatives took such a position on June 18 when it approved by an overwhelming vote an amendment submitted by Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, to require anyone who formulates an industry price policy to have at least 5 years of experience in that industry. The House was persuaded to take such action because at present the bureaucrats regulating American business, a great percentage of them, either do not believe in private enterprise or are ignorant as to its operations. This is not idle talk. It is based on personnel information in the hearings on the Office of Price Administration appropriation bill.

THE NEW BRAIN TRUST

Let's look at the record. The price executive over the Nonferrous Metals Branch is an economist, a professor, who has had no business experience whatever. The price executive over building materials is an oil economist. The price executive over iron and steel is a college professor without business experience. The price executive over the Industrial Metals Division is a professor without practical experience. The executive for the Paper Branch is a political science professor with no business experience. The price executive over the Machinery Branch is a professor without business experience. The price executive over the Restaurant Branch was a New York department store employee. The price executive over consumer durable goods is an editor. The price executive over solid fuels is a student not long out of college. The price executive over the Petroleum Branch was a deputy revenue collector and auto salesman. The head economist of the Economic Analysis Branch is an economist and professor. The director of the Textile, Leather, and Apparel Branch is a professor without business experience. The price executive for meat, fish, fats, and oils is a professor with no business experience. The director over the export-import price control office is a Harvard professor. The director of rent operations is a lawyer with no experience in rents except possibly paying that on his own apartment. These tax eaters infesting the body politic speak in strange, unknown, and confusing tongues to American business.

There is the record. Is it any wonder that the American people are faced with the prospect of hunger and cold and bankruptcy? These bureaucrats, many of them, are making more money regulating your business than you are, yet know nothing about it. Small businesses the country over are falling by the wayside. It is time we sent the professors back to the schoolroom where they are prepared to serve a useful purpose and turn the management of American industry over to those who know something about it, if indeed it needs to be turned over to anybody other than the owners. We need more business in government and less government in business.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times of June 29, 1943:

IN THE NATION—MR. C. C. DAVIS BLAZES A USEFUL TRAIL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 28.—It required unusual courage and a true sense of responsibility to a people engaged in war for Chester C. Davis, the Food Administrator, to return his commission to the President. The food situation is so grave, its implications are so alarming, as the consequence of politics, misorganization, and mismanagement that candor was the obligation of a patriot to a country which is the victim.

If improvement shall be the result of Mr. Davis' candor—though the President's response and his appointment of the docile Marvin Jones as successor do not encourage that hope—the retiring Food Administrator will have doubly served the people. But even if the disorganized administrative mess shall remain as it is, Mr. Davis will have performed the great single service of making clear where the chief responsibility for it lies. Should his courageous example be followed by other war administrators whose assigned tasks are being ill-performed for the same basic reasons, a special badge of public service will be his due.

Fear of being stigmatized, or love of place, will probably prevent such a mass effort to compel the President to delegate necessary authority with responsibility and then stand behind his appointees. But Mr. Davis' resignation may induce Congress to achieve the result by statute.

CAUSES OF RESIGNATION

There were several reasons why Mr. Davis could not effectively deal with the grave problems for which he was given public responsibility by proclamation and by title.

1. The President at the outset made promises to Mr. Davis which he did not keep. It is reliably reported that when Mr. Davis, offered the assignment, said he did not see how he could do any better in the set-up than the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude Wickard, had done, the unkept promises were made. Mr. Davis was told he would be given all the authority he required and would deal directly with the President.

2. Mr. Roosevelt's food-price policies are linked with those of organized labor and are in direct conflict with incentives to production. The subsidized roll-back project was taken in pursuance of his political-economic alliance with labor; therefore it was devised for relief of the consumer—temporary, because eventually he must pay for subsidies in taxes—and not as a production incentive. Also, Mr. Davis was not informed that this was to be major policy on a broad scale until he read about it in the papers.

3. Instead of giving to Mr. Davis the authority he needed and was promised, the President set up the Office of War Mobilization under James F. Byrnes and included in it the semi-independent economic stability unit under Fred M. Vinson. Not only was Mr. Davis left off the Office of War Mobilization Board, but he soon discovered that both Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Vinson were established as layers between him and the President, which was also contrary to his clear understanding. He has seen Mr. Roosevelt alone only once since he became Food Administrator.

4. Mr. Vinson proceeded to make decisions in what had to be Mr. Davis' field of authority if food control was to be effective, once upsetting an agreement between the Food Administrator and the Office of Price Administration, which was also making price decisions in the agricultural field. A series of incidents over price ceilings arose which made it clear to Mr. Davis that food conditions would grow worse and that he, to whom the public had been told to look for help, could not correct them.

HOW NOT TO HITCH UP

Some 10 days ago he wrote his letter of resignation, which was lying on the President's desk at the very press conference in which Mr. Roosevelt was asked about the resignation and denied it. No word came to Mr. Davis until the President's letter of acceptance was suddenly issued today.

In the letter the President spoke of the necessity of "effective teamwork." It is a point in reverse. The team in which he had hitched Mr. Davis had the off horse facing the dashboard and the near horse looking the other way. There are several teams of that kind in the Washington war program, and, when they don't pull effectively, the blame is placed on the wrong horse or on the "complacency" of the American people.

OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. Jones will be an uncomplaining member of a team like that, or even of a politically harnessed four-in-hand in which every horse is pulling in a different direction. But the food situation will go from very bad to intolerable unless Congress assumes statutory control of it by taking Herbert Hoover's advice and passing the Fulmer bill. The President has indicated once again that he cannot or will not do what must be done before the "inseparable functions of food production, distribution, prices, rationing, Government purchases, imports, and exports" (as Mr. Hoover describes them) are efficiently performed.

That which the President or Congress must do is to divorce the food program from group politics and give authority with responsibility to an able manager. If these things are not done, the entire war activity will be imperiled.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment Removing Two-thirds Requirement for Passing a Vetoed Bill and Also Amendment Making Members of Congress Ineligible for Appointment to Office During Term for Which Elected and 2 Years Afterward

REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, after matured consideration, over a long

time, I have today introduced two resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution. One resolution proposes that in the event a bill which has passed both Houses is objected to by the President, is vetoed, the result of the second vote is to be determined by a majority exactly as the judgment of the two Houses is usually expressed. That would make effective section 1, article I, of the Constitution, which provides:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

It would get the executive branch of the Government back on its side of the fence and would remove a hurtful confusion in the allocation of governmental power, which allocation is violative of the nature of a representative government.

Whether those who drafted the Constitution foresaw the development of the use of this power is, of course, speculation. It is a fact, however, that from Washington to Lincoln, inclusive, there were only 52 bills vetoed by those 16 Presidents, covering a period of 76 years; whereas from March 1933 to June 26, 1943, inclusive, there have been 592 vetoes. This resolution, if adopted, would leave to the Executive the responsibility of examining bills after Congress shall have acted, pointing out objections, giving Congress and the country the benefit of his judgment, and so forth, as is now provided, which is a fine service. It would require a second and recorded vote as now, which is wise, before the bill becomes law. This proposed amendment changing the requirement from two-thirds to a majority vote would not only get the Executive back on its own side of the fence, where, by the nature of our sort of government, it belongs, but also would remove the irritating element of coercion and strengthen the persuasive force of the President's objections and place upon Congress the exclusive, inescapable, responsibility to the people for legislation which, by nature, it must bear if there is to be a chance to have the maximum of legislative efficiency.

An examination of the provision requiring a two-thirds vote shows that it puts the Executive where the Executive does not belong, and handicaps the legislative branch of the Government where it ought to have power not only to do its work, but also have the responsibility associated with that power which removes every excuse for not properly doing its work. Much of what I have said is illustrated by a vote recently taken in the House. On July 2 the President returned to Congress, with his objection, the bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation. That made it necessary for the House, in the first instance, to take a second vote on that bill, since the bill originated in the House. The vote was 228 for passing the bill, to 154 against passing the bill. There were 49 absentees, but if all the absentees had been present and voted to pass the bill, making a total of 277 to 154, the bill would have been defeated by 11 votes. This illustrates the Presidency's direct power in legislation, in effect as a part of Congress, resulting from this provision of the Constitution which requires a two-thirds majority of each House of Congress to overcome adverse votes of Members plus the opposition of the President. This power, as we all know, as compared with the power of a Member of the House or the Senate, is not merely the power which Members of the House may have limited to the House, and Members of the Senate may have limited to the Senate. It is the power of the Presidency in each of the Houses of Congress, because, if defeated in one House, this power moves over into the other House. If the bill originates in the Senate and is vetoed, the President moves out from the executive branch of the Government to the legislative branch into the Senate as effectively as if he were sitting in that body, casting as many votes in the Senate, assuming all Senators are present and voting, as 15 Senators. Think of that. He sits as 15 Senators for the purpose of that vote. In effect, he votes just the same as if his name was called and he should answer "I cast 15 votes for seven and one-half States."

If the bill should be defeated in the Senate none of the Senators could go over to the House, but, in effect, the President then moves over to the House of Representatives—two chances to beat the bill—and in the House he casts as many votes, in effect, as 72 Members, assuming all Members are present and voting. So in order to defeat any legislation which is contrary to the President's objection, it is required to have on his side only 33 Senators out of a total of 96; and if the President's views should lose in the Senate there would be no defeat, the contest merely shifts into the House of Representatives, and there, out of a membership of 435, assuming all are present and voting, only 146 votes supporting the President's position would defeat the bill. That is true notwithstanding article I, section 1, of the Constitution:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

That is not all, to be entirely candid about it. It is thoroughly understood by every Member of Congress seeking to acquire appointment to office, or hoping to be taken care of in the event of defeat, that his chances certainly are not hurt by voting according to the President's attitude. I wish to say in this connection that I have no desire to criticize. I am merely stating a well-known and important fact, important in this picture, that rests upon a very well understood characteristic of human nature.

So, I am introducing a second amendment proposing that Members of Congress shall be ineligible for appointment to office during the term for which they are elected and for 2 years after the expiration of that term. I do not mean to say that Members of Congress are influenced in their votes by the hope of appointment to office, but the hope of appointment to office by Members of Congress angling for such appointment, and the desire by the appointive power for votes to put through a project or sustain a position, puts a considerable nervous strain upon a Member of Congress hoping for such an appointment, which strain this proposed amendment would eliminate.

It seems to me that an examination of our constitutional set-up makes it very clear that the Congress must have the exclusive power to legislate. It must rest under inescapable responsibility to the people for legislation. In order that that shall be true, the Congress must be able to speak by the voice of the majority, as is recognized in Anglo-Saxon systems of government and recognized by people generally, otherwise it is the minority and not the majority which controls.

The present arrangement under which 33 Senators out of 96 and 146 Members of the House out of 435 may speak the legislative judgment of the Senate and of the House is, of course, an absurdity. It is not only hurtful for the reasons which I have tried to emphasize, but that arrangement subjects Members of Congress to temptation in situations to cast a vote deemed good politics at the moment, expecting to be protected against having to face its hurtful consequences, by the intervention of the veto power. As a matter of fact, this arrangement is unfair to the President, to the Congress, and dangerous to the public.

I am not criticizing. I am trying to analyze the situation and present the picture as I see it. In that general picture are the vast Executive powers originally possessed, which powers are constantly being increased as a result of and as an incident to our concentration of general governmental powers in the Federal organization and their shift to the bureaucratic organizations of which the Presidency is the head.

This is none too pleasant a job for me, but as one of the hired men of the people I am responsible for trying to give to them for whatever it may be worth this statement of what I see as one of their watchmen on the tower, and the conclusions which seem to me from my observation, experience, and thinking to be sound. I know this is important. Look at this picture from another viewpoint. Suppose all Senators are present when one of these votes is taken. Looking north from Washington we see that the legislative power of the President would be equal to the vote of the two Senators from Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Delaware, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, with one vote to spare. Think of that and talk about all legislative power being vested in the two Houses of Congress. Then, if defeated in the Senate the contest would move over into the House, and to all intents and purposes the President, or Presidency, would move over into the House and become a part of it, and would cast five more votes, looking South from Washington, than are cast by all the

Members of the House from the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Florida. That is more power than any individual ought to possess in the legislative branch of a free government, ever. if he possessed no other governmental power. But when that power is associated with the other enormous powers of the Executive—greater than kings possess—with the President constituting the center around which is being builded as complete a bureaucracy as can be found anywhere in the history of the rise and fall of democracies, the importance of these suggested amendments, it seems to me, ought to be generally appreciated.

I do not suggest these resolutions should be taken up now. We will see how things develop. I do suggest that they ought to be considered by the people now and, if possible, incorporated in the Constitution substantially as drawn before the intelligent, patriotic, public interest, now active, shall have subsided, as such interest did subside following the World War.

Everything in the picture indicates that we are headed for another one of the great contests which have occurred in Anglo-Saxon governmental history when the people, recovering from periods of indifference and of man-worship have returned to neglected responsibility of self-government, and to the guidance of great fundamental natural laws, laws of God, which He has provided for the guidance in self-government of His creatures in whose souls He has implanted the aspiration to be free and self-governing.

It is my judgment, and I give it for whatever it may be worth, that as a necessary preparation to win that contest the people had better establish it exclusively within the power of their own chosen representatives in the Congress to make their laws and to determine their governmental policies, just as the people themselves would do in a pure democracy, if our democracy had not so outgrown itself so as to require that it function now through chosen representatives of the people.

I recommend further as is proposed by the second resolution that the people establish it in the Constitution that their chosen representatives, insofar as this amendment would control, shall be free from every allegiance and controlling influence except that incident to the relationship which they sustain to the people as their own representatives in the councils of the Government. Do not let anybody so deceive himself as to imagine that the possessors of these bureaucratic powers are going to send them back voluntarily to the States and back to the people, surrender these powers, and surrender their jobs.

The people are going to have to attend to that themselves. I believe they are getting ready to do it. Within my own vision, for at least 8 years, the people have been coming up from the low level of efficiency to which they sank during the reaction following the World War. They are perhaps fitter now to deal with the problems of a great democracy than at any time since the establishment of our Government. The power that renews a democracy does not go from the top downward. It must come up from the people because a democracy is a people's government. As with our own eyes we may see this renewing coming up from the people. President Wilson, as he examined history, saw the same phenomenon. That is what he said about it:

When I look back on the processes of history, when I survey the genesis of America, I see this written over every page: That the nations are renewed from the bottom, not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the youth and energy of the people. Everything I know about history, every bit of experience and observation that has contributed to my thought, has confirmed me in the conviction that the real wisdom of human life is compounded out of the experiences of ordinary men. The utility, the vitality, the fruitage of life does not come from the top to the bottom; it comes, like the natural growth of a great tree, from the soil, up through the trunk into the branches to the foliage and the fruit. The great struggling unknown masses of the men who are at the base of everything are the dynamic force that is lifting the levels of society. A nation is as great, and only as great, as her rank and file.

There is much to indicate that thing effectively is happening now in this country. If so, we can save this democracy. While strength to renew must come up from the people, their hired men in office, their representatives, must have no other allegiance—no other master—than the people whose representatives they are. Otherwise we shall have to have our own experience of bitter travail as nature drives us with the lash back to the discharge of neglected responsibility and neglected opportunity.

Shortage of Corn

REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it happens that I come from one of the greatest corn-producing areas in the United States. There are thousands and hundreds of thousands of bushels of corn in storage on the farms in my district. Much of this corn will, of course, go to market on hoof, while the balance will be sold to the elevators for outside uses.

At this very moment there is a great shortage of corn for feed and processing purposes all over this country. Something is wrong when we on one hand have a surplus of a certain commodity and on the other hand witness a shortage of this same commodity. Let me read one of the many telegrams which has come to my desk dealing with this shortage of corn. This telegram comes from the heart of my district, Bloomington, Ill., where we are, literally speaking, sitting on top of vast supplies of stored corn:

We insist on removing corn ceiling before Congress adjourns. McLean County feed stores are out of corn. You ask us to produce more chicks and we hatched 4,000,000. Very important action should be taken at once.

THE MILLER HATCHERY,
E. M. MILLER.

Like all other interested Members of Congress, I want something done about this ironical situation. We are facing a crisis and must act. I have this morning talked to the Honorable Marvin Jones, head of the War Food Administration, asking that this matter be dealt with immediately and that some workable solution be brought forth through his determination and with the cooperation of the O. P. A. The order issued last week stating to the farmer that he would, if he at once moved his corn into the market under present prices, be granted any price increase which might follow in the market between now and October 31, will not do the job. In truth, I feel it will slow up more than increase the flow of this previous grain into the regular channels of trade. That order, it seems to me, was ill-advised. It indicates a lack of clear thinking on the part of those issuing the order and emphasizes the "confusion extraordinary" that still exists in many of our departments.

I have recently discussed this problem with many other Members of Congress, suggesting that we do something about this situation before the recess. I hope we can call together all interested Members of this body to thoroughly discuss the dilemma before us and then present our best thoughts and ideas to the W. F. A. and O. P. A. Representatives of these agencies should meet with us and present their viewpoint and then cooperate with all concerned to the end that this serious problem be quickly adjusted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman, coming from a corn area the same as I do, can tell me where a constituent of mine can get a carload of corn to feed 300 hogs for which he has no feed.

Who Wants To Be President?

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, to assume the duties of President in peacetimes is a strenuous job. Our Government is so complicated because of depression remedies that no one man can be familiar with more than a small part

of our huge set-up of governmental machinery. Any President must necessarily rely on many other people to help direct the business of administering this great field of activity.

In fairness to the President, it should be stated that when he came into office in 1933 our whole private business machine had broken down and was stalled. Those who had funds in banks could not draw out a cent, and the unemployment ranks were growing by leaps and bounds daily. This, indeed, was a serious situation charged with dynamite which might explode any minute.

This situation was not due to any legislation which could be said to interfere with private business. The Republicans had been in power since the election of Harding in 1920, and it is admitted that the Republican Party in those years was completely under the control of friends of private business.

The situation in March 1933 called for new action. The old action had ended not only in failure but had brought about a condition which put the Government on the verge of collapse. This situation was evident during the fall of 1932 while the Presidential campaign was in progress. The situation had been made worse by the treatment handed out to the veterans of the World War who assembled in Washington.

I do not believe this country was ever as close to outright disorder and chaos than it was when the Presidential campaign opened in 1932. President Hoover was blamed for everything. He was in distaste with the public, and there was not anything he could do then to change the public mind. He tried, but anything he said served only to arouse the people to a higher pitch of dissatisfaction.

Along came Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic nominee for the Presidency. He reasoned with audiences in person and on the radio. Those who saw him saw a great big, good-looking, smiling man who promised the people a new deal. This was a slogan which meant that we would not continue in the way we were then going, but would try something new. Roosevelt literally smiled his way into the Presidency. The dragon of revolt, disorder, and chaos was averted by the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The new administration first had to meet the banking situation by reorganizing all financial institutions and backing them up with a guarantee of deposits by the Government. This was the first New Deal action.

Unemployment was becoming rampant—millions out of work where thousands had been out of work before. A relief program had to be established, and established quickly. You cannot stall off hungry men. This was another New Deal enterprise, but the unemployed began to eat again. It does not matter what you call it, it was different from the old and it was new at the time.

This unemployment situation racked the larger cities more severely than the rural sections, but soon in the Northwest, which I have the honor to represent in part, a new unforeseen enemy appeared. In my particular section of the country, North Dakota, the north end of the Dust Bowl, we had drought and grasshoppers for 9 years, and the Federal Government was called on to furnish feed for livestock, seed for crops, and aid to families, both by W. P. A. grants and in direct grants. This situation continued so long that the first four terms of my service were devoted almost exclusively to relief.

This aid of the Federal Government brought the people through, and in 1941 and 1942 the crops were so good in North Dakota that many thousands of farmers who could see no hope through the dust in the Dust Bowl are now independent and have paid back their obligations to a considerate Government. This was a new venture in the work of the Federal Government, and because it was a new venture it was named a New Deal venture.

Besides this Dust Bowl disaster, the people also suffered from the devastating effects of the general depression that started in 1920 when the Federal Reserve Board demanded a pay-up policy in complete reverse of the encouraged loaning policy advocated by the Federal Reserve Board during 1917 and 1918. There was absolutely no reason for adopting this drastic policy, and the result was that it ruined the country. Eastern business kept afloat until 1929 on various schemes such as installment selling, but by 1930 business was as effectually broke as were the farmers in 1921 after the depression had been created by the Federal Reserve Board.

In carrying out relief to the victims of the general depression and the victims of the Dust Bowl—double victims—many new enterprises were necessarily created, all of which came under the head of the New Deal. Mistakes were made in the philosophy of what to do and in the doing of what was done. Forced scarcity of food was started in order to bring up the price instead of putting pay checks in the hands of consumers to buy what they normally needed. No greater blunder was ever made, but no such huge Federal undertaking could be expected to function on first trial and done quickly without planning. The New Deal, of course, had to shoulder all mistakes, but it also is entitled to all successes.

While we were beginning to emerge from the depression of 1920 which followed the last war, we were driven head-on into this war and we have appropriated so much money for the war effort that we have lost track of how many billions we are in debt. The last guess was two hundred seventy-four billion. Of course, we do not have the money to pay these appropriations. We cannot tax the people enough to make our business current. We have to supply the money in a different way.

In the Civil War Lincoln paid the soldiers in bills issued by the Treasury Department, and no interest was ever required or collected to finance these bills. Over $300,000,000 in the form of those greenbacks are still circulating and have been since 1862. We have forgotten that example in finance and now borrow the money by issuing bonds and selling them to those who, like the Government, have no money. The Government has no money, those to whom we sell the bonds have no money, but we get the money from those who do not have it. Does not that sound crazy? Well, it is crazy, but that is the way we do business.

The banks to whom we sell the bonds give us a deposit credit in their banks for, say, $2,000,000,000. We can draw on that fund, but before the bank is required to pay any cash, we accept from the bank our own bonds—which the bank does not own—as security, and then we issue new money to the bank, and, lo and behold, we have plenty of money. The only difference between this method and the Lincoln method is that we pay close to 3 percent interest on all of these bonds for the next 20, 30, 40, or 50 years. We, of course, collect the interest, and after having collected it we turn that over to the financing bank for their kindness in borrowing our own cash on our own bonds. You can see how simple it is. We shall, no doubt, owe $500,000,000,000 before we are in this war another 2 years—maybe 1 year—and the interest on that amount will be fifteen billion annually.

This plan of financing cannot be charged to the New Deal alone, because there are not three Republicans in the House of Representatives who would change to the Lincoln plan.

We are financing ourselves, sending men and munitions to every corner of the globe, feeding every country on earth except our enemies—and they get some of our food—and loaning billions and billions to other countries. When any foreign potentate appears before the Congress, the only question asked among Congressmen is: "How much does he want?" We have plastered South America with loans, but not a single man from South America has shown up on the battle fronts.

We are now in this World War in full blast, and we must go through with what we have and the allies we have. We cannot stop to inquire just what any ally thinks he must have out of the war; we must first win the war. Too much effort has been wasted on post-war activities, when we are a long way from the post-war period. This war can last 2 years or 12 years depending on whether we keep at the job of fighting or start orating around an imaginary peace table.

Since we are in this war, my philosophy is that every citizen, no matter who he is, should exert his utmost energy in winning the war. This should apply to Members of Congress as well as all others.

Maybe we are big enough and strong enough to do our part in this war in spite of all the confusion; with our officials charged with taking too much power, or not taking enough; with the President accused of wanting to be a dictator; with Members of Congress smeared in every investigation, especially those who tried to keep this country out of war; with the action of Congress in their attempt to save tax money by invariably taking it out of the food producers of the Nation at a time when we must have food and when we know food

will finally win the war; with Congress labeling every worker a criminal if he refuses to work, no matter what the reason; with members of the Cabinet in open disorder among themselves; with Congress raising a hue and cry against every administration head with the slogan, "Down with the bureaucrats," no matter how trivial the occasion may be; and with administrators ignoring Congress in retaliation. All this in the midst of war. That is the picture of how we are all putting forth our best efforts to win the war.

Hitler for once is right. He says, "I don't want to bomb Washington because it might clear up the confusion existing there."

The responsibilities of the President on the war front are supremely great. It was only because of his insistence that the Allies drive the enemy out of Africa that the job was done. This seems to rank with MacArthur's success in stopping the Japanese. These are the two bright spots in our success thus far.

Every Member of Congress should forget about politics and how to put the administration in the hole, and instead should try to make it just a little easier for the President to function. He is a great American, and so are Members of Congress, those heading the administration, and those actually conducting our forces on land, sea, and in the air. We are all trying to do one thing—defeat our enemies—and I, as one Member of Congress, am willing to put our war effort ahead of personal and party consideration. I am willing to eat "crow" and live on it if we can win this game we are in now.

Those in America who would like to be President should look at the situation we are in now and honestly ask himself, "Would you like to be President?"

This Congress has placed itself open to criticism. In the last few days we have legislated furiously—we have made more mistakes than we have in the past 9 years. Just at a time when we want the farmers to increase their acreage of wheat 15,000,000 acres, we repeal their insurance. Everyone in this Congress ought to know how essential food is—we want to increase that supply. We insure every one in the world, free of charge, but we withdraw from the farmer what little insurance he has. The principal reason why we are making all these fundamental blunders is that some want to adjourn. They say it is too hot, and for the last 4 days, it is too cold. We have not the stamina to stay on the job and give our actions due consideration. Suppose the soldiers on the front should say they wanted time off for 2 months and shot away their ammunition at random and pulled out for a rest. What would the Nation think of them? Are we in any better situation? Can we not stay here and logically think—when the soldiers have to stay in line to be shot up?

If we pack up now and leave behind this mass of ill-considered legislation, just because we want a rest, you can imagine the reception you will get at home. Those who are fanning these flames for an adjournment need not fear they will not get home—it may be possibly that they will have plenty of time to stay home after the next election. If we quit cold and leave our post are we supporting the President and the war effort? Who would want to be President with a Congress that has not courage enough to stay on the job?

America's Outstanding Governor Speaks Out for Private Enterprise

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, delivered at the Governors' Conference held recently at Columbus, Ohio:

This conference of Governors, meeting in a war year, is very properly concerning itself largely with two matters. One has to do with finding new means of assisting with the winning of the war while the other relates to planning for the days of peace. My remarks have to do with the latter problem primarily.

In discussing planning I would like to quote a remark recently made by Mr. Charles F. Kettering, head of the research department of General Motors Corporation. He believes in planning but cautioned that much of what is now designated as "planning" is merely "wishing." He then went on to describe the difference between the two. "If," he said, "you are expecting human nature to change, that is merely wishing." I am one who agrees with him. I feel that the present is the time when we should be planning for the days to come, but I feel that this planning should be done by those in a position to know something of human nature, with all its strengths and with all its weaknesses.

I am also inclined to the belief that too much of our planning is restricted entirely to the post-war period. There is a tendency to proceed on the assumption that we can go on indefinitely as we are today and that suddenly there will be a declaration of peace—something like the coming of Christmas morning, when somebody turns on the lights and shouts, "Merry Christmas!" There seems to be a feeling that there will be a signal like that and then we will all bustle around and open up our packages of plans and begin living by them.

Actually, the facts are that this anticipated post-war era may be several years away and one of our great needs today is for better planning for what very well may be a long, drawn-out war. I think we should adjust our planning to be of immediate use in this current period—this period that begins now and continues until the day peace comes.

The young men who are fighting this war are anxious to finish their job so that they can return to the United States they love; the United States that offers them opportunities and all the hundreds of little freedoms and liberties they think of as a part of home in a peaceful democracy. But if we do not solve our manpower and inflation problems now, these young men will take off their uniforms and make the bitter discovery they have fought for a mirage.

I believe it is the first desire of our men in service, once this war is done, to return to a nation whose domestic life is founded upon individual effort, whose economic system is based upon the working premise that private industry is able and eager to supply men and women with the material things they need for enjoyable, constructive living. In other words, I cannot believe that our returning soldiers want a jingle-jangle-jingle existence fed by synthetic work on a governmentally glorified Work Projects Administration program.

As we look about us today, we see that the war is being won, not because our Government is doing a good job of handling our domestic economic problems, but because our boys are proving to be valiant and courageous fighters, and because private industry is producing the armament that is needed to win this kind of a war. In recent years no two groups have been so criticized and maligned as have been those engaged in business and as have been our young people, and yet during the past year and a half it is these two groups which have proven to be our country's real dependable source of strength. In spite of obstructions that have been placed in the path of business, our industrial leaders have gone ahead and done a splendid job, and today they are producing war goods at a peak above anything of which we ever dreamed.

But we need better planning for the financing of this war, with more of the necessary money raised by taxation and the balance raised by long-time bonds in the hands of individuals. Bonds, due virtually upon demand, can wreck our economy when the war is over, and bonds held by banks are directly inflationary.

We need to have demonstrated—as we have been told so often—that the people must sacrifice here at home. Up to date, our only financial sacrifices have been to pay back, in the form of taxes, a portion of the increased pay and increased profits that the war has brought to us. There are very few civilians whose standard of living has really been lowered because of the war.

We need to fight inflation with a holy hate. We need higher taxes, lowered incomes; we must learn that we can't fight a world war and a war against inflation—and both successfully—without straining both our economic and our philosophical resources. But if we do not win this war against inflation, this war on the home front, then the country to which our victorious fighting men return will be one of defeat and desolation.

We need better planning today for the fighting of this home-front war. Our leaders must act as statesmen, not as demagogues; they must preach a life of individual responsibility, not of ease—and if they do not so act, they will be faithless to the trust our fighting men have left in their hands.

But it is proper also that we are—and should be—thinking of the special problems that will face us when the men are mustered out and turn into the paths of peace. Perhaps the word "planning" is overused, but there are some facts we had better face realistically.

Never has man seen such a large portion of the world completely torn from its previous standards, as it has seen during the past few years. This very disruption of our way of living, and of our habit of thinking, forces us to do some planning for the future. Never before has there been a war which has caused such terrible physical destruction, but at the same time allowed science and technology to advance so rapidly. Peace will bring to the world the greatest problems of physical reconstruction in history, and just as mobilization for war here in our country has caused terrific readjustment, both of men and minds, so by the same token will a readjustment from war to peace bring other monstrous problems.

And we had better be realistic in our contemplation of this post-war future and recognize that deep as is the faith of the majority of our people in the doctrine of free enterprise, that sincere as is the desire of our young men for individual achievement, they will never again permit another period of terrific unemployment without demanding that the Government take control. Let us not blind ourselves, either, to the fact that a minority of our citizens already feels that socialism, or communism, or complete government control in some form, is better than a system of private enterprise, and that its members are working to see their beliefs inaugurated. Another serious depression would recruit millions for their ranks. In short, the free enterprise system, the mighty champion of our present struggle for survival, may be pounded to pieces before it has a chance to catch its breath, may be tumbled to ruin by the shock of post-war adjustment. At least, such a danger is evident to me.

I am sure that no system of government operation can produce goods and raise living standards as does a system of private industry, but the political situation is such that we who feel that way must see that private industry is prepared to furnish employment to people when this war is over. It requires some planning right now in order to make sure that the 10,000,000 men taking off their uniforms and the 20,000,000 men and women coming out of war plants shall have some place to go to work. I thank God that the leaders of American business are planning—planning now—to do this very thing. The Committee on Economic Development, the Manufacturers Association, the National Chamber of Commerce, and other groups are working constructively to meet readjustment problems that will arise.

Every element will be present in this country for a tremendous boom. New processes, new devices, new gadgets will be coming onto the market as a result of war developments; thrilling stories are even now coming to us from modern industrial laboratories. The development of new alloys, especially the light metals, the use of plastics, new synthetic products—all of these scientific changes—are going to bring onto the market new products, and they are going to bring into the market new demands. We will have available in our labor supply several million new mechanics, while people with money saved are going to be present with a large list of desires. They are going to want to buy new automobiles, airplanes, homes, home heating and cooling devices, tractors, farm machinery, jewelry, furniture, everything which they have been unable to buy during the war. One prominent banker told me a few weeks ago that he expected the 5 years following this war to be the biggest boom period this Nation has ever seen. He predicts, instead of unemployment, a period when it will be impossible to find people to do the work that will need to be done.

But if industry following this war is to have a chance to make good, then certainly industry must have proper laws under which it can function. It needs tax laws which are written before the taxing period starts. It needs tax laws which are intended to help, not punish, and which permit industry to make a profit and use some of it for new developments. Our statutes must be in accord with economic law if our Nation is to prosper.

And private industry must also observe economic law, it must steel itself to reject the soft way of life—that of depending on the Government. If anyone is about to go broke because of some new development which promises threatening competition, he should not rush to the Government to keep this new product off the market. If the buggy makers of this Nation had kept the automobile builders from ever developing their machine, they would have only held back the progress of the world. We need the constant development of new products, perhaps making other items worthless, but it is all part of the great competitive industrial system that makes us strong.

We all realize that we will be living in a changed world. We are not going back to the "good old days." In my judgment, we will have social-security laws, laws protecting the rights of employees—many kinds of Government regulations will be continued.

In connection with these regulatory laws, however, I call your attention to one matter—the importance of which is often overlooked. It is this—that the general attitude and desire of the person administering any law can be a tremendous influence. I have found that if a person wants to do a certain thing, he will easily find excuses why it should be done. If he wants to find excuses why it should not be done, they are just as easy to discover. My wife even says that the same rule applies when I talk about going on a hunting or fishing trip. Under certain conditions, I can always find that I am not particularly busy and that anyway I have some business in that section of the country. By the same token, the attitude of the agency administering regulatory law is tremendously important. We need those in charge who are trying to use these laws to assist private industry to function more effectively. We do not need those who are looking for reasons why private industry must fail.

I have said that we must plan to give industry a chance to operate. Our statutes should recognize that he who makes a profit can be a good citizen, that in fact a reinvested profit is the source of new employment.

If we are to care for, perhaps, a million disabled veterans, if we are to provide a social-security program and freedom from want for those who do not work, then it means that those who do work must carry that load of expense. We will need to stimulate new industry, new processes, and new inventions. We will want to urge the development of better equipment and better machinery. We will need to provide for the selling of more items at a more rapid and continuous pace than ever before. In other words, there will have to be more business and it will need to be more dependable. Our lawmakers will need to be friendly toward industry and our tax laws and other enactments must encourage and reward industrial growth.

Too many of the organizations now making plans for the post-war period are merely planning for the spending of wealth and there is not enough attention to the creation of new wealth for everyone to share.

By now it should be an accepted truth that you cannot have more to divide among people when less is being produced. I am told that the decade from 1930 to 1940 is the only 10-year period in our history when this Nation made no net gain in wealth. Scarcity and an increase in our standard of living do not go hand in hand.

Following a war it is natural that people should seek relaxation from its strain by desiring to return to the peaceful days they knew in the past. But if there be some in this country who expectantly look for a return to normalcy, to them I convey my condolence. The normalcy they thought they knew will not be back. Progress is a stairsteps of change, each step followed by a plane of new normalcy. The task we face is not one of return. It is rather to take from our past the things we feel certain will be most useful in the new normalcy ahead.

No statesman, and no political party, seeking added power should advocate a policy of merely being against what has been done or what is being done today. What the people want and must have is an opportunity for better days than they have ever known. To merely oppose what has been done has no appeal. It holds no hope for future years. It is too abundant in sterility.

Is it not time for a clear-cut pattern of domestic enterprise? The rush of war postponed a climax in the festering problem of governmental control of business and industry but let no one mistake, that problem is still with us. There is need for planning that has the courage to reach out and grip this issue—to take the firm position that private enterprise is not a whipping boy but is an asset vital to democracy and is to be treated as such. By now, certainly, it is evident that the American people expect their Government to insure them against acute want. It must also be made clear that the premiums for this insurance are to be treated as an expense to be paid out of the profits of private citizens. Business, and resulting profits, must be encouraged. We must meet this challenge, not by following a demagog, but boldly by refusing preferment to those who desire authority so that they may hamstring our system of free enterprise.

And what of the distorting affliction that has attached itself to the labor movement? Why must our planners accept the premise that to say "No" to the scowling demands of a minority in the ranks of labor constitutes a vicious attack upon labor any more than saying "No" to the bigoted insistence of a minority in the ranks of management constitutes a vicious attack upon our industrial system? There is a middle ground, a fair ground, and it must be found or the laborer will be knocked down the long flight of stairs he has climbed so painfully.

To speak of planning is to speak of advancement. It is impossible, of course, to step forward and stand still at the same time. But elementary as is this natural law, it is the first realization that we must obtain if we are to pilot the course to lasting achievement in the years ahead.

In contemplating this change it is vital that we carefully safeguard those elements essential to retention of democratic fundamentals. I believe that individual rights should head this priority list of American possessions.

No matter how academic we make it sound, we cannot escape the final conclusion that the essence of our way of living lies in our insistence that in this country the individual is the important entity. It is the individual who is to have the right to control his destiny so long as he acknowledges the same right for others.

If the time ever comes when, through change, we alter this basic conception, we will no longer have the democratic life that we are fighting to preserve. It is important, then, that we keep the individual in mind as we plan for the solution of the tremendously complex problems we face. I am not one to contend that regulation of the individual to some extent can be entirely avoided. Surely, we must admit that such great problems as transportation, the integration of labor and industry, marketing and price controls—to cite a few—can be successfully attacked without sweeping regulations. But I insist that the way in which the regulation is applied is highly important. Many of these problems are so extensive that States cannot cope with them alone, but it does not follow that we can successfully apply complete Federal regulation. The point is, we must take care lest the regulation rides roughshod over the individual, and the best way to insure against this is by keeping the controlling authority close to the people. What is needed is a plan whereby the Federal Government will be the general director and

the local levels of Government the administrators.

Let us never forget that much of this Nation's greatness springs from our insistence that the hundreds of little desires of the individual have an opportunity for expression. Trivial as some of these desires seem—the urge to boo the umpire, to go fishing, to "tell off" the boss, to write the editor—trivial as they seem, the satisfaction of them and the hundreds like them, is the ingredient that gives our American life its zest, its flavor, and its desirability.

Our need is for men who appreciate that democracy is not a mechanical vehicle to be streamlined with engineering proficiency to transport its people with the greatest possible speed to some coldly efficient never-never land where living is done by national rote.

We can well afford now to fully grasp the plea of the poet:

"God give us men: a time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and will;
Men who love honor; men who will not lie."

Our planning must include the demand for leaders who recognize democracy as a thing of beauty, of local color, gracious and decent and understanding. For it is within democracy that can be found our firesides and our families. For it on every continent our men fight today; for its continuance, we here at home have the duty to plan, and work, and pray.

Comparison of Income-Tax Payments During the 2 Calendar Years 1942 and 1943 in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement and tables that were prepared by the Honorable Randolph E. Paul, General Counsel of the United States Treasury Department. They are self-explanatory and as follows:

Table 1 shows the sum of income-tax payments during the 2 calendar years 1942 and 1943 in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada. The United States data assume that the 1941 liability is paid in 1942 and that the full current liability, including net Victory tax, is paid during the calendar year 1943. The unforgiven portion of 1942 liability is payable in 1944 and 1945, and is therefore not included in this table.

The Canadian method of reaching a pay-as-you-go system calls for paying the unforgiven portion (one-half) of the 1942 tax during 1942 and 1943, in addition to the taxes which would otherwise be payable during those years. The Canadian tax shown in the table, therefore, represents 2½ years' liabilities.

NO PAY-AS-YOU-GO IN ENGLAND

British taxpayers are not on a pay-as-you-go basis. While there is a system of collection at source in Great Britain, such amounts are not applied in payment of the current liabilities. Further, the surtax in Great Britain is on behalf of the second prior year's liability. That is, tax payments in 1942 include income-tax liability for 1941 and surtax liability for 1940, and tax payments in 1943 include income-tax liability for 1942 and surtax liability for 1941.

Comparison of income-tax liability without regard to the year of payment is shown in table 2.

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of income-tax payments during the 2 calendar years 1942 and 1943 in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada at selected levels of net income*

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Annual net income before personal exemptions [1]	Net income for the 2 years, 1942 and 1943	Income-tax payments during the 2-year period 1942 and 1943						Income-tax payments for 1942 and 1943 as a percent of net income for the 2 years					
		United States [2]		United Kingdom [3]		Canada [4]		United States		United Kingdom		Canada	
		Including New York	Federal only	Total	Refundable portion	Total	Refundable portion	Including New York	Federal only	Total	Refundable portion	Total	Refundable portion
								Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,000	$2,000	$15	$15	$221	$121			7.5	7.5	11.1	6.1		
$5,000	10,000	1,351	1,269	3,709	453	$3,567	$750	13.5	12.7	37.1	4.5	35.7	7.5
$10,000	20,000	4,081	3,772	9,009	520	9,723	1,500	20.4	18.9	45.0	2.6	48.6	7.5
$25,000	50,000	17,833	16,899	30,034	520	32,204	1,500	35.7	33.8	60.1	1.0	64.4	3.0
$100,000	200,000	123,704	121,288	168,159	520	168,506	1,500	61.9	60.6	84.1	.3	84.3	.8

[1] Income assumed to be all salaries and wages.
[2] Assumes 1941 liability paid in 1942 and full current liability paid in 1943. Includes net Victory tax. Victory tax based on Victory tax net income, which is assumed to be 1% of net income. Does not include unforgiven portion of 1942 liability payable in 1944 and 1945.
[3] Pound converted at $4.
[4] Assumes payment in 1942 and 1943 of 1941 liability, adjusted (one-half original) 1942 liability and 1943 liability.

TABLE 2.—*Comparison of income-tax liabilities and effective rates under present law in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada at selected levels of net income*

MARRIED PERSONS—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemptions [1]	Income tax liability						Effective rates					
	United States [2]		United Kingdom		Canada		United States		United Kingdom		Canada	
	Including New York	Federal only	Total	Refundable portion	Total	Refundable portion	Including New York	Federal only	Total	Refundable portion	Total	Refundable portion
							Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,000	$15	$15	$111	$61			1.5	1.5	11.1	6.1		
$5,000	933	894	1,855	227	$1,878	$500	18.7	17.9	37.1	4.5	37.6	10.0
$10,000	2,612	2,467	4,505	260	4,762	1,000	26.1	24.7	45.1	2.6	47.6	10.0
$25,000	10,452	10,035	15,017	260	14,846	1,000	41.8	40.1	60.1	1.0	59.4	4.0
$100,000	69,422	68,584	84,080	260	76,247	1,000	69.4	68.6	84.1	.3	76.2	1.0

[1] Income assumed to be all salaries and wages.
[2] Includes net Victory tax. Victory tax based on Victory tax net income, which is assumed to be 1% of net income.

WHY PRICE CONTROL DIFFICULT

It will be noticed that the average income taxpayer in England or in Canada will pay from 200 to 300 percent more in taxes for the combined years 1942 and 1943 than the same taxpayer would pay in the United States for those 2 years. Price control is more difficult in our country because Congress has not siphoned off enough of the excess purchasing power. The citizen with $2 in his pocket can well afford to pay $1 in taxes in order to keep the remaining $1 a sound dollar and one that will purchase the normal amount of food and other essentials rather than keep both dollars and have their purchasing power reduced to a very small amount. This is one time that people should gladly pay taxes in order to protect the value of their wages and salaries.

The Attempt of the O. P. A. to Cover Up Its Own Sins

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers this morning carry the headlines "Meat shortage worse yet."

Last night on Theodore Granik's American Forum of the Air Russ Nixon, a representative of the C. I. O. and who, I understand, is one of the official advisers of the O. P. A., charged in substance the American farmers as being responsible for the food crisis. He compared the American farmers and producers of meat with John L. Lewis, and further charged that the farmers and producers of meat are responsible for the shortage, and that they are now carrying on a meat strike comparable to the recent strike in the coal industry. His shameful performance in this respect demands his immediate elimination from any official capacity, advisory or otherwise with the O. P. A., or any other governmental position requiring integrity.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS], who was buddying with Mr. Nixon on the program, charges the Republicans with being responsible for the mess the O. P. A. has made in the food-distribution program, all of which reminds us of what the elderly practitioner said to the young lawyer who was just starting out in the law practice, "When the law is on your side, and the facts are against you, give the facts hell. When the facts are on your side and the law is against you, give the law hell. When you have neither the law nor the facts on your side and both are against you, give your opponent hell."

The subsidy insistence, of course, is a political gesture, designed to gather votes for the fourth term from the labor and industrial consumer sources to which the President's advisers look for sufficient backing to keep him in the White House for as long as he lives or wishes to stay.

The President's stooges are for the plan for political purposes. The labor and industrial consumer groups, which are practically identical, are for it because it means cheaper food, albeit at the expense of the general taxpayers. Otherwise there is consistent opposition to the plan. Practically all farm organizations oppose it. Food distributors oppose it. The individual farmers oppose it. Common sense opposes it. And the argument that only such subsidies—consumer subsidies, mind you, not producer subsidies—can prevent inflation is "bunk," pure "bunk." Borrowing money from all the taxpayers to make living cheaper for the highest wage groups cannot prevent inflation. It will help speed it.

But subsidies provide a measure of control over the farm producers, whereas the logical method to ease the food situation, by allowing fair prices to the producer at the market place, will give the farmer a degree of independence from the bureaucrats which he has not had for years under the New Deal.

Meat and Food Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am this day in receipt of a letter from Mr. William H. Schlicht, a substantial farmer of Manchester, Washtenaw County, Mich. The farmers in this community have for many years fed lambs for the market. The lambs are purchased from the rangers in the fall, fattened, and sold on the market. The wool is often clipped before the lambs are sold.

Mr. Schlicht is a typical lamb feeder in our community. He has written me a letter in his own way giving the details in connection with the purchase of 1,050 lambs last fall, their recent sale after shearing, and the amount of the wool clip now on hand. It all adds up to the fact that if Mr. Schlicht sells his wool under present conditions, he will sustain an actual loss of $4,140 on his annual lamb-feeding venture. This is most interesting in view of present discussion in reference to farm prices, subsidies, and so forth.

In short, Mr. Schlicht has an actual investment in this transaction of $18,202.17, less $7,702, the sale price of the lambs, and he has not included as a charge against the lambs his own labor and facilities in caring for them during the feeding process.

Mr. Schlicht cannot afford to take this loss of $4,140. Neither can the Government nor the consumer ask the farmers of the country to take such losses. Surely, if our farmers are not to be allowed at least the cost of production for the food which we consume, then those same farmers cannot be expected to produce. It is just plain arithmetic. It is just common sense. It is just financial necessity that the farmers be given consideration at this time.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the privilege granted to me, I include herein Mr. Schlicht's letter, together with the itemized statement in connection with the transaction of which he complains. Mr. Schlicht's statement is as follows:

MANCHESTER, MICH., *July 2, 1943.*

Hon. E. C. MICHENER, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I fed 1,050 lambs and I am sending you their return up to date as far as mutton is concerned. The lambs shore 9,500 pounds of wool.

I find difficulty in selling it. As I understand the law I must first get man No. 1 to handle it. He gets 1½ cents per pound, or $143. Then to grade it at 2½ cents costs $237. Then pay the freight to Cleveland, 1½ cents per pound, or $143. Then I must leave off 1⅛ cents per pound to the Credit Corporation Bank or $107, making a grand total of $630.

The ceiling price, I am told, is 44 cents after taking off 6½ cents, leaving a net price of 37½ cents. Now 9,500 pounds of wool at 37½ cents totals $3,456.25. These 1,043 fat lambs sold for a total of $10,500.

You will note the wool would have to sell at 80 cents per pound to break even.

If you can clarify my mess I am in I would be very grateful. Show this letter to some of the bosses and tell them I am not going to feed any more lambs under such conditions.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM H. SCHLICHT.

Cost of lambs before sale

First cost of 1,050 feeding lambs	$10,956.58
Freight charges from Texas	523.30
For 10 pounds' shrink on 1,050 head at 14 cents	1,400.00
For feed in transit at Montgomery, Ill	48.00
For hay consumed in 4½ months' time	1,800.00
For grain consumed in 4½ months' time	2,000.00
For interest on loan of $11,480.48	180.00
For shearing whole flock at 22 cents each	231.12
For electric current for shearing machine	10.00
For extra labor for feeding and tying up wool	480.00
For trucking from railroad to farm 5 miles	44.00
For premium on $10,000 special insurance, 4½ months	30.00
For twine for fleeces	15.00
For lambs lost, 10 head	90.00
Total	17,808.00

Outgoing expense

Freight to Cleveland, 3 cars	101.46
Yardage at Cleveland	108.04
Hay at Cleveland yards	41.07
Commisison for selling 3 cars	66.00
157 lambs trucked to Detroit, 50 miles	32.00
Corn, yardage, and hay	45.60
Total	394.17
Grand total	18,202.17

$18,202.17 less $10,500 leaves $7,702. The wool stands me at 37½ cents per pound; the 9,500 pounds net me $3,562.50. Then $7,702 less $3,562.50 costs to me of wool leaves a loss of $4,140. This represents this lone farmer's reward for putting over 80,000 pounds of mutton on the market and enough wool to make 2,000 soldiers' uniforms.

I am going to quit feeding lambs. I don't want to do this but these rules, regulations, and unreasonable requirements are forcing me with many other small businessmen to the wall.

War Over There, Brawls Over Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio

broadcast by John Paschall, editor of the Journal, on the Views of the News period on station WSB, Wednesday evening:

I believe it was George Eliot who wrote "We are all islands shouting lies to each other across a sea of misunderstanding." That was a dramatic way of pointing out the difficulty of human beings in understanding each other. Speaking so often out of our prejudices instead of our minds, our words make more clamor than sense. The result is misunderstanding and even chaos. In a democracy it is essential that we make an effort to understand each other and to compose our differences. We need to look for points of agreement, rather than for something else to fall out about. Otherwise the democratic processes bog down in a sea of misunderstanding and a storm of words. After a year and a half of war which has brought us many victories and growing confidence in the final triumph of the United Nations, we suddenly find that we are not doing so well on the home front. Many sensible observers are becoming disturbed over this deterioration of domestic morale. As far back as May 28, one forthright editor, Mr. Virginius Dabney, of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, sensed this slump in home front morale and discussed it in a challenging editorial entitled: "Wanted: A Rededication for America."

Perhaps we can do no better than to make this fine editorial the subject of tonight's discussion.

"The fundamental reason why the war is going badly on the home front," said Editor Dabney, "the reason why the country is confronted by successive demands from grasping blocs of one sort or another, and inflation looms at a greater and greater threat, is to be found in the fact that the national attitude toward the crisis is wrong. We are trying to turn a fight for survival into a free-for-all grab for higher wages, higher prices, and higher profits.

"Did any country ever win a battle for existence in this way?" asks the editor. "Can the will to victory be forged from the greed of this group or that, each determined that its living standards shall not suffer, even in the greatest war history has seen?

"Some would be inclined to say that most of our difficulties stem from John L. Lewis and his effort to sandbag the country in this great emergency. That is not true. If there was not something radically wrong with our attitude toward the war, Lewis could never have got to the place where he can defy the Nation almost at will.

"Basic to all our troubles," thinks the Virginia editor, "would seem to be that too many of us are seeking to get something out of the war, instead of to put something into it. * * * That is not true of all of us, of course, but even a blind man can see that millions of others are trying to get rich on the war, or at least to improve their mode of living while it is in progress."

Some of the blame for this state of affairs Mr. Dabney places on the shoulders of the President, who, he says, has given lip service to the need for lower living standards for the duration, and then belied his words by his actions. He feels that the administration has encouraged the unions to demand more and more at a time when it ought to have been impressing upon them, and everybody else, the necessity of living on less and less. He quotes Bureau of Labor statistics to show that industrial wages were upon March 1, 1943, an average of 57.1 percent since January 1, 1941, while living costs were up only 21.4 percent. Hence there is no good reason, says he, why organized labor should be capitalizing on this emergency to force greater and greater concessions. On the contrary, there is every reason why the administration should be using its best efforts to persuade labor to cease its constant demands, and why it should employ stronger means than mere persuasion, if necessary.

"But it hasn't done it," continues Editor Dabney. "Whether a Republican administration would be more satisfactory in this regard is anybody's guess. Certainly the Republican record in Congress on several measures most vital to the winning of the war could hardly have been worse * * *. Both major political parties are evidently lacking in the determination to forge in this Nation the sort of spirit which held Leningrad for months in the face of the most tremendous onslaughts the German Wehrmacht could throw against it, and which saved Britain in 1940, when Goering's Luftwaffe rained death and terror from the skies for a hundred days and nights.

"Let it not be imagined," says the editor, "that organized labor is the only element of the American population which is derelict in this emergency. The average farmer, like the average laborer, is wholly patriotic, but the farm lobby in Washington is out to get what it can out of the situation. And are the farm and labor blocs the only sinners? Not at all. Every grasping manufacturer who puts profits above the public welfare is just as antisocial and unpatriotic as a striking union, or a farm group which tries to undermine the Government's program."

He then cites the report of the Truman Committee concerning the faking of steel by the Carnegie Steel Corporation, steel for use of the United States Navy and the United States Maritime shipyards and for lend-lease. He recalls the indictment of officials of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., of Marion, Ind., on charges of conspiracy to defraud the Government through the sale for military use of wire alleged to be defective; the indictment of officials of the National Bronze & Aluminum Foundry Co. at Cleveland, on charges of violating the sabotage law and conspiring to defraud the Government; the indictment of the Baker-Lockwood Manufacturing Co., of North Kansas City, and of four persons on a charge of conspiring on contracts involving more than $7,000,000 worth of aircraft accessories. He mentions the fines imposed in a New Jersey court on nine companies charged with conspiracy to fix prices on United States Navy orders for $50,000,000 worth of cable.

"Indictments are not convictions," says the editor in fairness, but "hundreds upon hundreds of cases involving alleged war frauds, from minor chiseling to conspiracies totaling high into millions of dollars, are in various stages of investigation and prosecution by the Federal authorities. It is obvious that many employers in this country are just as guilty of sabotaging the war effort as are striking labor unions."

"All of this signifies," concludes Mr. Dabney, "that a canker of selfishness and self-indulgence is eating away our integrity as a nation. We are treated to the spectacle of manufacturers deliberately turning out defective steel for our ships, labor unions recklessly defying recognized Government agencies in the hope of forcing wage increases, and farm organizations trying to high-pressure Congress into unwarranted concessions. It is all part of a pattern which has been woven from complacency and greed. It is not only hamstringing the production of guns and munitions at home, but it is undermining the morale of our boys on dozens of foreign fronts. * * * This effort to turn the war into a grab bag for the Nation is the only thing which can defeat us now. We are our own worst enemies. We need and we must have a rededication of American people in the spirit of George Washington and Robert E. Lee, of George Rogers Clark and Nathan Hale. Otherwise we are in danger of losing our battle for survival at home, even if somehow we manage to win it abroad."

We believe Editor Dabney has called the turn on what is basically the matter on the home front. We can't conscientiously dismiss this indictment by abuse of John L. Lewis, Congress, or the President.

The storm that has broken over Washington was brewed in the Nation. You and I are a part of it. Despite American casualties of 87,304 of which 15,000 were killed in action or died of wounds, our petty differences at home still consume much of our time and thought and inflame our passions and prejudices.

Writing from an American bomber station somewhere in England, John Steinbeck, famous novelist, now a war correspondent, brought Atlanta Journal readers the reactions of our soldiers to the antics of the people back home. "It seems to me," said the waist gunner of a bomber crew who was quoted by Mr. Steinbeck, "it seems to me that the folks at home are fighting one war and we're fighting another one. They've got theirs nearly won and we have just started on ours. I wish they'd get in the same war we're in. I wish they'd print the casualties and tell them what it's like. I think maybe that they'd like to get in the same war we're in if they could get it to do."

Isn't it about time we got into that war over there and stopped these brawls over here?

Post-War Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Raise a Question," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE RAISE A QUESTION

The people who are aiming to destroy the American Republic have adopted a new strategy. They are trying to get Congress and the major parties to adopt pleasantly altruistic resolutions asserting America's devotion to peace and her willingness to cooperate with other nations in achieving it.

It's a neat trick. Everybody is for peace and almost everybody believes that our Government can contribute something to the prevention of war. Accordingly, when a resolution which vaguely expresses the common hope is presented, little opposition is encountered, if only because there is nothing to oppose.

You can't saw sawdust. These resolutions never say anything about what is to be done with Germany, Japan, or Italy; they offer no opinion about the Polish frontiers; and the one thing they avoid most sedulously is a description of the mechanism of international cooperation that is to be set up. All the difficult questions and all the controversial subjects are eliminated.

And so, more often than not, the resolutions are adopted with almost no opposition. The men who voted for them did so in the belief that they were committing themselves to nothing. The schemers sit back and smile. They realize that the vague phrases in due

time can be quoted as evidence that those who voted for them favored whatever scheme for subordinating our Government and destroying our institutions may be put forward at the peace table.

The plot is to foreclose opposition in future. The way to meet these subversive tactics today is to insist that the do-gooders drop all their pretenses and present a clear-cut plan of international cooperation that can be examined on its merits.

Before endorsing any plan for a post-war settlement, Americans want to know what sacrifices it may entail and what commitments in money and men it requires of us. Under what circumstances will we be bound to fight? What assumptions regarding American institutions and America's role in international affairs are implicit in it?

In the belief that candor now will avoid a good deal of trouble in the future we propose to ask a number of specific questions of those who are presenting the resolutions for adoption and we propose to keep on asking until the questions are answered. The Nation will readily recognize that a refusal to reply can mean only a purpose to evade and deceive.

The first question is this: Do you admit that the American Revolution was the greatest event in the history of human progress?

Subversise Activities—Race Trouble

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the only difference between me and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is that I believe when a man on the Federal pay roll is found to be subversive he ought to be removed from that pay roll at once.

I understand that Vice President WALLACE is going to Detroit to advise the people what to do about race troubles. I hope he does not go. I hope he follows the lead of Mrs. Roosevelt, who, I understand, has declined to go; because if he goes there he will find, if he investigates, that this race riot was promoted by the Communist Party.

He should leave that proposition to the people of Michigan to settle. Let them solve it themselves in their own way.

Do you think we want either Mrs. Roosevelt or Mr. WALLACE to come to Mobile, Ala., or to Centerville, Miss., or to Beaumont, Tex., to try to tell us how to solve the race problem? They would only make bad matters worse.

I can tell you now that these race troubles are being promoted right here in Washington, and all over the country, by the Communist Party.

Any man or any woman who has condoned the forcing of white women to work in Government departments under or beside of Negro men, when they knew it was offensive and dangerous to them, is not a proper person to send out to tell the rest of the country how to solve the race question.

I repeat what I have said before, that the only way for whites and blacks to get along is to have complete segregation of the two races.

Race Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, conceived by class hatred, nurtured by greed, selfishness, and ambition, the recent race riot in Detroit was but the reaping of the crop sown when the seed of intolerance, of disregard of personal and property rights was planted in the sit-down strikes of 1937 and subsequent years. Then violence, disregard for lawful authority were rampant, tacitly encouraged by at least one high official of Michigan and by the national administration.

The Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, referring to the ouster of employees from their usual places of employment, to the seizure and destruction of private property, to rioting, went so far as to say that no court had declared sit-down strikes illegal. She thus lent the stamp of Federal approval to the riots of that period.

The unbroken connection between those days of bloodshed and the more recent ones is so clearly pointed out in a letter from Detroit, printed in the United States News of July 9, that it is printed herewith:

ANOTHER LETTER FROM DETROIT

(By David Lawrence)

RACE RIOTS WILL NOT BE PREVENTED BY HUSHING UP THE FACTS ON THE CAUSES THAT UNDERLIE THESE UNFORTUNATE CLASHES—NEED FOR INTELLIGENT DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF RACES AFFECTED SO THAT ADJUSTMENT MAY BE ACHIEVED

There has been a tendency to hush up what happened in the race riots at Detroit. The tendency is derived from a belief that the less said about it, the better. But that's a way really to promote more rumor and more turmoil. For indignation and hate are easily syndicated throughout the Nation, especially where the potentialities of race friction exist.

It should, therefore, be helpful to begin to understand the background of Detroit's race conflict. Last week we received a letter from the Christian clergyman in Detroit whose comments on the strain in that city between management and labor appeared on this page last month. This second letter is also worth careful reading. It follows:

"The riots here are fevers of a city sick with hate. Right now we are looking for some group to take the rap. We should be doing some grade A repenting. It is always easier to throw stones at somebody else than to cast ashes on your own head. Perhaps we shall be able to make a case stick against that ever present fifth column. Or perhaps we shall drag some "screwball" Kluxers out for a big investigation with news reels and all. If we could only find a Japanese or two, the thing would be solved. The trouble with most of the Germans is that they are some of our best workmen in war plants. Some folks propose that it was the Jews who did it, but that does not quite stick, for it was the Jewish-owned stores that got the worst smashing. Now, if we would begin to admit a few faults of our own, we might get red faces—but it would be good for us.

"How did Detroit get to be the hate capital of the world? Simply because it is the demonstration city in class warfare. Here it was that systematic and effective attempts were made to get everybody to hating the capitalists. Amusingly enough, it is necessary now that we make everybody capitalists—by getting them to buy War bonds—in order to win the world war. Here it was that we were told that all the trouble was with nasty old Wall Street. Our banks were closed, and the biggest one has paid dollar for dollar despite the looting by every legal process. The employer was next the bogey man, plotting the ruin of the workers.

"The street corners were filled with shouters damning 'the bosses.' The employers, confused and badly led, sulked on overstuffed club chairs and damned Roosevelt.

"And so hate became our civic mood.

"People here forgot that intolerance is infectious. It is like a plague which strikes down rich and poor, black and white, native and foreigner.

"So the intolerance, which is simply hate in action, spread. Two tense situations developed, the one between Jew and Gentile, the other between white and Negro.

"As in every pestilence, there were the great numbers who tried in every way they could think of to prevent the spread. But there are those who, forgetting the laws of moral sanitation, spread the plague of hate. In the old days many believed that a good plague now and then was necessary for the health of a community. So today there are those who believe that a bit of rioting now and then 'will put them in their place.'

"You see, many people here not only thought the riots would come but they had no alternative. Men would make great speeches for tolerance and then privately tell you that some direct action would have to be used.

"That is what confused the police in those first 20 hours. The police did not know whether to treat this like a strike or like a riot. In a strike the police are merely referees. Their business is to see that the rumpus does not spill over too much. If they interfere to protect property or personal rights, they are taking sides in the game and bang goes their badge. Don't jump on the police about that. They were just citizens who were in a tough spot and who failed to get a clear lead from the top as to what to do. They did what they thought best, and that simply was not good enough.

"Then Governor Kelly came from Columbus. The great decision, when the Governor came, was that this was to be treated as a riot rather than as a strike.

"We have had worse troubles here in Detroit. But they were clashes between economic classes and not between color classes. Clashes between economic classes are accepted as 'democracy in action.' People get killed, stores are looted, neighborhood tensions are aggravated, but this is 'winning social gains.' Nor should the worker be blamed for that any more than the man whose body is full of strep germs should be blamed for running a fever. It all depends on whether you are going to look at hate and intolerance as a disease, no matter where it happens, or whether you are going to call hate and intolerance a democratic process when it gets going between people who are on opposite sides of the time clock and call it a riot when they are on opposite sides of the color line.

"Now what were some of the common people doing while the riots went on? The common man was a hero. Without much leadership and with little understanding of principles involved, thousands of ordinary citizens worked without sleep to care for the wounded and to drain off the pus of hate.

"One of my brother ministers, a Negro, knew that among 300 families in his area just 3 families were the active trouble-makers. He went into these homes time and again to cool off their tempers.

"One large union had tolerance pickets out. These went from store to store, to the gates of the plants, and on the busses. They

joined naturally in the conversations and 'shot the rumors dead on sight.' They said simple things in which they had been coached—'Great headlines in Berlin tomorrow.' 'Let's not be zoot-suiters,' 'Let's keep our mouths shut and our heads cool.'

"In one large plant, the union, together with representatives of various groups in the community, had recognized that there are carriers of hate just as there are carriers of typhoid. A quiet study was made, and in this plant a few dozen men and women were quietly interviewed. The things which had gone wrong in their own emotional set-ups were probed and at least partly cured.

"To isolate and treat carriers of hate is an act of moral sanitation. The time will come when we will see that hate is a disease, and we will treat the hawker of hate as we treat the peddler of diseased meats.

"Attempts were made to solve this problem by forcing the issue. To try to make the Negro and white love each other by legislating beyond the moral sense of both is to repeat the mistake of prohibition. If a parent had two children who were not getting along together, he would not try to make them like each other by banging their heads together. And yet this is precisely what was attempted here. To try to make people get along with each other by forcing them together is as sensible as trying to make teetotalers by taking away the bottle. There is another way and we should begin it now.

"We have been on an emotional binge since the last war. Let's admit it, face it, and be sorry for it. A big dose of repentance is the greatest single thing we could do to increase our war output. Just as a few people corrupt a community by peddling the germs of hate, so a few people purify a community by promoting the sulfa of personal realism. Tolerance is not the antidote for hate. Tolerance is the healthy tone of a well civic body. We shall never get tolerance by dabbing sick cities with iodine of nice gestures. Only personal repentance goes deep enough to kill hate."

There is need of self-examination among groups as well as individuals. We are too prone to think that the only way to solve human difficulties is by fighting and too prone to believe also that in race riots only the irresponsible are to blame—as if they alone lose their heads.

But there's a history back of every race riot. It's related to the conditions and circumstances in which peoples of different races live. The failure to recognize possible conflict and to assume it will solve itself is just as much evidence of irresponsible citizenship as letting each individual deal with situations of this kind when they become acute.

Many northern cities in recent years have felt the impact of immigration from the South. The economic condition of the Negro has vastly improved and will continue to improve as high war wages are paid in an era of scant manpower. But precisely because this introduces new sociological aspects is no reason to assume that the problem has not existed before.

There are intelligent persons in the white and Negro races who have dealt before with this challenge to human adjustment. Their advice should be sought. Committees, for instance, are meeting in Richmond, Va., in which members of both races are sitting down together to think out a solution. Americans know that race difficulties can, in time of war especially, produce a dangerous form of disunity. But the outbursts are not confined to wartime. The National Capital itself saw a shameful race riot a few months after the close of World War No. 1.

It is not by any means a problem that can be solved by mere conference. It requires a sympathetic approach, a frank assumption that color differences will remain and that it is not possible to change human nature suddenly. It is rather that we must deal with the difficulties realistically.

The issue is not one that can be resolved by suppression. It can be helped by an abandonment of the hate method and by dispassionate discussion among the civic-minded leadership of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, riots are not democracy in action, nor do they aid in winning social gains. The levying of tribute is still extortion though practiced by union racketeers.

The remedy is obvious. The remedy is equal justice under law, respect by all for law, and orderly procedure.

Refugees Making Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, strange as it may seem, Hitler has at last created a benefit for the United States.

Among those who have escaped Hitler's persecution and who have sought refuge on our shores are eight Nobel prize winners. Their genius and talents are now at our disposal.

In this connection, the newcomers generally have created many new industries. They have brought new trades to the United States and are making here articles which were heretofore imported, such as fine leather goods, perfumes, Viennese knit goods, Karlsbad wafers. Diamond cutters, so essential to war industries in the manufacture of precision instruments, have brought to us their skills from Belgium and Holland.

In this connection I herewith submit a letter which appeared in the New York Times, written by Dr. Jacob Billikopf, director of Labor Standards Association, Philadelphia, entitled "Refugees Making Good":

REFUGEES MAKING GOOD

I was deeply impressed with your editorial They Too Can Aid, in which a strong plea was made that among those who have succeeded in escaping to our shores there are 2,250 exiles who are a source of intellectual war power which we have not yet tapped and whose services should be utilized.

In 1937 and 1938 it was my privilege to serve as codirector of what is now known as the National Refugee Service. One of my tasks was to create throughout the country resettlement committees for the reception of refugees—confident that through such intelligent distribution they might more readily be absorbed in American life and civilization. The record of the 15,000 or more refugees who have been sent inland has been remarkable.

Only this morning I received a communication from a leading social-service executive on the Pacific coast, from which I quote the following:

"You asked how many refugees there are now in our city and how many are on relief. We have between 3,000 and 3,500 refugees. The refugee relief problem has become trifling. In fact, at the present time there are only 8 cases on relief and these, of course, are all of a residual character with no earning power in the families.

"We have, however, opened a utility shop, obtaining jobs of a simple character—addressing envelopes, labeling, folding material for mailing, etc.—and some of the so-called unemployable people will be able to earn part of their requirements.

"We are actually making a profit on relief disbursed at the present time. During the month of April, for example, we received refunds on account of relief previously granted to emigrees which were actually in excess of the amount of relief disbursed during the same month."

A refugee for whom a job was found in 1938 writes: "I employ now about eight persons. If it were not for shortage of goods we could employ many more. You will be pleased to know that my wife and I will shortly become citizens and that will be one of the happiest days of our lives."

The aliens who come here are never again what they were in the lands whence they came. We bruise them at times; we set up some of the old world barriers against them; we regard as inherited racial traits characteristics common to all people bursting from oppression and persecution; but for all that we change them and they become an integral part of our American civilization.

As Clarence E. Pickett, secretary of that great humanitarian institution, the Friends Service Committee, has observed:

"The majority of the refugees have made rich and significant contribution to our American life and are doing it with supreme joy and satisfaction."

JACOB BILLIKOPF,
Director, Labor Standards Association.
PHILADELPHIA, *June 10, 1943.*

The Outlook for the Canning Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the very definite threatened reduction of the canners' pack of fruits and vegetables this season and the prediction by many that there may be no canned products on the market at all next year for civilian purchasers, I am inserting a very able article in the RECORD written by Mr. L. M. Jones, manager of the Washington Canners Cooperative, Vancouver, Wash.

Mr. Jones is a leader and expert in this field, and I recommend his article to Congress, the administration, and the country as a fair statement of the outlook for the future and the reasons therefor.

The article follows:

TODAY'S GUEST EDITORIAL

(By L. M. Jones)

WASHINGTON CANNERS COOPERATIVE

Instead of a busy season of packing fruit for future consumption, canners in our territory are either shut down or are operating in a very small way. Take strawberries, for example. Fresh market prices, on which there is no ceiling, are netting growers 20 to 24 cents a pound. Office of Price Administration has fixed a price limit of 12 cents, to be paid growers by the canners. What is actually happening is that Office of Price Ad-

ministration says we cannot can or freeze. Packers must give the berries that they normally got in past years to the civilian trade for fresh consumption. This may not be admitted by them in so many words, but this is actually how it works out.

We have no complaints with our growers for receiving these high prices on the fresh market, for they have had some poor years, and are entitled to good prices, now, to make up for them. We do, however, object most strenuously to permitting handlers of fresh strawberries an unlimited ceiling, thereby diverting berries from our cannery because of lower ceiling. All this is having a serious effect on our costs, as strawberries are one of our largest packs. We have lost heavily in volume, which means higher indirect cost, and we must maintain all our key men and women for future packs that we hope to put up.

We were informed by the War Food Administration that strawberries were wanted for the soldiers and sailors in the shape of strawberry preserves and jams. Now, under present circumstances, they will get very little, if any. We were also informed on several occasions that they would fix it so the Government would get its requirements of strawberries; either ceilings would be imposed on the fresh market or berries would be placed on the fresh market for a certain number of days, and for the balance of the season would be diverted to canners and processors for Government requirements. These promises have not been kept. What is true of strawberries will apply on all other berries, fruits, and vegetables much desired by the Government.

A few days ago we were told that ceilings would be placed on prunes and pears for fresh consumption. In view of past promises we question whether or not this will be done.

The total estimated pear pack in the Pacific Northwest is 50 percent of last year's. Present Government requirements are 50 percent of last year. This means that the entire pack will be needed by the Government to fill its quota, and still there will be a shortage. Here, again, the fresh market is capable of paying extremely high prices and taking most of the supply.

In normal times conditions like these do not exist. There would be open competition for the fruit, giving all interested processors and shippers an equal opportunity to obtain it. The matter resolves itself into a question of whether the Government wants fruit and berry canners to operate this season.

Another source of trouble is the wage scale set by the War Labor Board for canners. Canners in western Washington stated that the minimum that labor could be obtained for in the Puget Sound and Portland areas was 85 cents for men and 75 cents for women. Then we received official notice that wage rates would be 80½ cents for men and 66½ cents for women, the notice coming long after operations had started. Because of this situation, we have lost much of our old help, with wages so much higher in shipyards and other defense industries. We have been dependent during the summer months on high-school boys and girls to help in putting up the pack. Even this age group is not now obtainable, as even 16-year-olds have been readily absorbed in the shipyards at 90 to 95 cents an hour for both boys and girls.

What fruit will be canned this year under existing circumstances must be packed by patriotic, part-time citizens who are not concerned about what wages they receive but who believe, more than does the Government, that food can win the war.

After being told three times that wage increases certified by the War Labor Board would be added to canners' ceilings, Office of Price Administration scrapped its promises, and now has come out with the statement which practically means that if, at the end of the season, a packer goes into the red, it will give him some help on the added costs because of the increase in wages.

As far as the cooperative canner is concerned, this statement is meaningless. It has no profits or losses. Its grower membership is affected through the returns. If costs are high and ceilings are unfair, by not taking care of increased costs of processing they must take less for their fruit or vegetables. We, as cooperative canners, believe firmly that Office of Price Administration should make good its original promises and not offer a meaningless substitute.

Look Ahead—Look South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to extend in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a praiseworthy editorial written by Stanley Parkman, of the Gadsden County Times, at Quincy, Fla.:

"LOOK AHEAD—LOOK SOUTH"

Quite a bit has been said in recent months about post-war aims and plans—most of it has been from an international point of view.

It is not too early to give consideration to post-war plans of a local nature. The South, as a section, and Florida must begin now making plans for its future after the war is won.

The South will be greatly changed when the war is over. Many things will be different from the pre-war era. Most of the prospects are bright, for the South will have a chance to regain something that has been lost since the Civil War.

Industry has turned southward in recent years, partly because of Government encouragement and partly because industry found that the South is a fertile field for its development. Much of the industry that has come South is now Government owned and serves a strictly war purpose. The coming of peace must not mean that these facilities will be idle. Plans should be made well in advance for their conversion to peaceful production to serve a world that will be hungry for their output.

Billions of dollars will be in the hands of southern people and those who will seek to spend it in the South. Of course much of it will be in War bonds but that will assure an even flow of surplus income to avert boom conditions and at the same time prevent a tide of depression.

Much of the criticism of the Work Projects Administration and its kindred agencies was born in the South where it was clearly seen how the dole system brought about a slowdown of personal initiative. Possibly businessmen and leaders of private industry in the South are sicker of such practices than anywhere else in the Nation. They should take the lead in seeing that Government employment does not get a hold on people of the South again. Plans should be made now to avert another Work Projects Administration era.

The South must prepare itself to employ its own people when the war is won. Politicians of the South must plan now to see that Government gives private industry a chance to adjust itself. Jobs must be available for those who want to work and the Government must not cater to those who don't want to work.

Government projects and employment were necessary in the depression era because industry had failed to absorb the available supply of manpower, but careful planning can avert a recurrence of the same situation after the war.

The South has something to sell. We don't need to sit by and accept the crumbs that fall from the table of prosperity. This section of the Nation is wonderfully blessed with natural resources. Our farms have to supply the raw products of the Nation. Labor here is plentiful and the war has brought industry that can be put to profitable use.

Let us get away from this practice of offering all kinds of concessions to prospective industrial expansion here. There is no reason to bait industry with promises of no taxes, free land, and local capital. Some of the South's most enduring and prosperous industries have been developed by Southern people who started in a small way and built to bigger things.

Let us look ahead, to the South, for an era of prosperity after the war.

Shipbuilding Record of the Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, recently, at the suggestion of the Office of War Information, I sponsored a foreign broadcast on the shipbuilding record of the United States Maritime Commission.

I request that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The June figures, released by the United States Maritime Commission, brought the total merchant ship production for the first half of 1943 to 879 ships, aggregating 8,816,622 deadweight tons. In the entire year of 1942, American yards turned out 746 merchant vessels, aggregating 6,089,732 deadweight tons. American shipbuilding has taken tremendous strides in the past 6 months and there is every indication that the goals set for this vital war industry will be attained.

The first job of the merchant marine is to get great quantities of men and supplies to the right place, at the right time, to deliver crushing blows to the Axis—blows that will hasten the unconditional surrender of all enemies of liberty.

But, the merchant marine is a tool of peace as well as a weapon of war.

Admiral Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, has repeatedly emphasized the role of the merchant marine in peace. The vast fleet of merchant ships now built or being built have a well-defined task to perform in the rebuilding of the world after the defeat of the Axis. It is a possibility, Admiral Land points out, that ships now used for transporting planes and guns and tanks will be of service at a later

date to carry cargoes of food, medicines, clothing, and supplies necessary for relief and rehabilitation.

In addition to the large numbers of merchant vessels constructed for the United States merchant marine in American yards, scores of merchant ships have been built for our allies. It will require the employment of all we construct for ourselves, together with the use of the trained maritime personnel of the United Nations—operating their own ships as we operate ours—to bring order out of the Axis-created chaos.

The contribution of the workers in American shipyards and the men and ships of the United States merchant marine toward victory over the Axis and the establishment of better living conditions in the peace that follows victory will be an accomplishment never to be forgotten by the people whose liberties have been preserved and whose very lives have been saved by the tireless efforts of American builders and sailors.

How Prices Rise and How They Rise Too Far Unless All of Us Take Proper Safeguards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the reason for a price rise in wartime is simple. Anyone can understand it. The production of more materials for war means the production of less civilian goods. More people working for more money means more money available to spend. This increased volume of money competes for scarce goods if we let it, and when more money competes for scarce goods, it bids up prices.

But higher prices increase the cost of living, so that workers will seek higher wages to meet increased living expenses. Higher prices and higher wages will mean increased costs for businessmen, which they will try to cover by charging still higher prices.

Higher prices will mean increased costs to farmers, which they will try to meet by charging higher prices for farm products. But if farmers or businessmen charge higher prices for their products, this will raise the cost of food. Higher food prices will raise the cost of living and workers will want still higher wages, which, if granted, will increase business costs and bring a pressure for still higher prices, and these price increases finally will get back to the farmers, who then will want still higher prices.

Thus the circle goes, unless we carry out the control program. Each price increase breeds another price or wage increase; which in turn breeds another, and yet another, and the amount of goods remains the same.

It is to the self-interest of the individual to do everything possible to help hold down prices.

The situation which faces us today is simple to understand. We Americans have more income, more money to spend, than ever before in history. But there are less goods on which to spend our money. There are enough goods to meet most of the essential requirements of civilian life, but no more. If most of us make more money, which is what is happening, there still are no more goods, the amount of money does not help.

If we use our extra war-created income to buy this limited supply of goods, all that we will do is bid up prices.

There will not be any more goods. We have had to limit the production of civilian goods to meet the needs of our Axis-created war.

If we go out and buy to satisfy our whims and desires, rather than keeping our purchases to the things we really need, all we shall do is to pay more for the same amount of goods. We, therefore, will have less money available to buy new and improved goods later on.

If we help bid up prices, we will increase materially the cost of the war.

The many thousands of people with relatively fixed incomes—teachers, white collar workers, veterans, and veterans' families living on pensions, widows living on insurance payments, families of the men in our armed services—would suffer at once.

Those who received increases in wages or prices would live in a fool's paradise for which the final day of reckoning would be swift and certain. As prices continue to increase, they outstrip wages and civilian purchasing power is squeezed. When this stage is reached, any one of a number of events may start prices tumbling. Sharply falling prices produce a period of depression and business stagnation which hurts nearly everyone, producing bankruptcy and unemployment.

For wage earners they mean cuts in wages, reduced working hours, and unemployment, less money to pay off mortgages on houses bought at high prices, less money to meet insurance premiums on policies bought when wages were high; less money for day to day needs.

For farmers it would mean less money coming in to pay for farms and equipment bought during the period of high prices. It would mean failure and foreclosure of many.

For businessmen it would mean severe losses and financial receivership; often receivership and bankruptcy.

None of these things need happen if all of us do our part to keep rising prices under control.

Freight Rate Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to Chairman LEA, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, copy of which is herewith enclosed as a part of my remarks along with an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

There are a number of bills before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce dealing with the question of freight rate discriminations and I sincerely trust that the committee will soon begin hearings and as promptly as possible report some measure dealing with this important situation.

The letter and editorial follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Knowing that your committee has been heavily loaded with important measures dealing directly with the war program and hoping that upon our return from the short recess your calendar will be lighter, may I express the hope that the bill introduced by me designated as H. R. 2519 may soon be considered.

There can be no further justification, if ever there was, for the unjust sectional discriminations in freight rates. Let us now see to it that appropriate legislation is speedily passed dealing with this important issue.

Very respectfully,

JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

A CALL FOR EMANCIPATION

The South, that section of the United States which President Roosevelt denominated Economic Problem No. 1, now feeling the beneficial results of a great surge of emergeney industrialization, hopes that its wartime gains can be extended so that it can escape the stigma of being called the Nation's problem child.

At the same time, its economic and political leaders point out that the South's status is not its fault A northern industrial oligarchy, it is contended, was largely responsible for inflicting economic handicaps which have held Dixie in virtual bondage ever since the Civil War.

The magazine Fortune, in its July issue, takes cognizance of this condition. A subhead under the title of the article "The Deep South Looks Up," reads: "It sees an opportunity, with northern aid, to join the Union." The economic shackles on the South are listed by Fortune as the protective tariff, the uneven freight-rate structure, and the North's almost complete financial control of the South.

The tariff has always been a thorn in the side of the South—as, indeed, it has been to American agriculture in general. For generations, protection has increased the price of practically everything the farmer has had to buy, and its compensations have been small. Retaliatory tariffs, in particular, have prevented the South from marketing its surplus cotton abroad. The resultant reduced income kept the South poor.

The second handicap is the arbitrary division of the United States into freight-rate territories, which not only hampered the South in competing with northern producers in heavily populated regions, but actually discouraged the establishment of new or enlarge industries and the legitimate exploitation of natural resources below the Mason and Dixon's line. Fortune points out that it "costs 50 percent more to ship an auto storage battery from Jacksonville, Fla., to Washington, D. C., than from Chicago to Washington, 6 miles farther." This is a sample of rates affecting many competitive raw materials and manufactured articles.

The South is in an excellent position to become the center of post-war light-metal, chemical, and plastic industries because of the huge pool of cheap Tennessee Valley Authority power. The region has semi-skilled labor in quantity. The correction of the inequalities in rail and truck freight rates should be the first step toward emancipation of the South. Also, continued support for the Hull trade treaties in the future and a reexamination of the tariff laws at the first opportunity should be on the agenda of the post-war administration in Washington if equality of opportunity is to be something more than a mere phrase.

Crop Insurance

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, last week when the crop-insurance matter came up the chairman of the House conferees, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], promised to give me some time in the discussion, if he gave anyone any time, but then he moved the previous question and kept his promise. I find no fault with that.

But I find this matter is still in dispute, that the Senate has refused to concur in the House position, and that the House conferees have refused to meet with the Senate conferees. I feel that this is an arbitrary position on the part of the House conferees. I feel that they should submit to the rule of reason rather than to the rule of stubbornness. I think it is unjust and unfair and setting a dangerous precedent for the House conferees to refuse to meet and discuss any matter in disagreement between the House and Senate. In this particular case the Senate is right, and you Members of the House are selling the farmers down the river, especially when you refuse to carry out the 3-year contract your Government made with these farmers. You might at least discuss the issue and reach a compromise by carrying out the contract that has been made.

I here give you the wheat and cotton contracts in force in the different States that you are arbitrarily canceling. I will also give the yearly growth in popularity by years. This will show that all of the statements made on the floor were not correct:

Crop-insured farms

Wheat contracts by States:	
Nebraska	67,000
Kansas	42,000
Ohio	40,000
Michigan	32,000
Indiana	32,000
Missouri	30,000
Illinois	29,000
Oklahoma	22,000
Minnesota	20,000
North Dakota	13,000
Wheat contracts by States—Continued.	
South Dakota	9,000
Texas	9,000
Pennsylvania	7,000
Colorado	4,000
Oregon	4,000
Maryland	2,500
All others	124,000
Total	487,000
Cotton contracts by States:	
Texas	54,000
Georgia	25,000
South Carolina	20,000
Alabama	12,000
Louisiana	11,000
Oklahoma	9,000
North Carolina	9,000
Mississippi	9,000
Arkansas	8,000
Missouri	4,000
All others	16,000
Total	179,000

Steady growth in popularity of Federal crop insurance

Farms insured:	
1939	165,775
1940	379,710
1941	420,939
1942	503,266
1943	512,000

(All farms insured in 1943 under 3-year contracts. Some farms insured on both wheat and cotton.)

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that a studied attempt has been made to misrepresent Federal crop insurance. An attempt has been made to show that it has been operated extravagantly. Senator NYE has shown that this attempt is not founded on fact. He gives the true picture of these operations, that it cost the Government about $23,000,000 to provide approximately $55,000,000 of benefits to the farmers who have suffered crop losses. Of this fifty-five million the farmers themselves contributed thirty-five million in premiums.

The Senator says:

Compared with the operation of private insurance companies, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been administered very economically. * * * The expense ratio of the Corporation has been approximately 30 percent, as compared with a combined average of approximately 41 percent for stock and mutual fire insurance companies.

The cost of handling each wheat-insurance unit has been cut 56 percent since the first year beginning in 1939.

The excess of indemnities over premiums for wheat insurance has been reduced from 66 percent in 1940 to 49 percent in 1941, and to a low of 20 percent in 1942.

I am sorry, but if my colleagues persist in their blind opposition to agriculture, then there will be a day of judgment. In a democracy election day is judgment day. That is when the farmer will do his protesting. I repeat, I am afraid that unless this House changes its attitude toward the farmer and the laborer that then there will be strange faces to greet us here. Unless you change your attitude you will have made a fourth term possible if not inevitable. This is not a threat—just plain common horse sense.

Congress Aids Hitler With Inflation Moves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter that appeared in the Columbia (S. C.) Record of June 30, 1943. It is as follows:

CONGRESS AIDS HITLER WITH INFLATION MOVES

To the EDITOR OF THE RECORD:

Is it not full time our Congressmen were warned that lining up with Republicans who confess they'll cripple the President is aiding Hitler and Tojo to bomb us worse than we are bombing the Ruhr? Is it too late to warn them that opposing subsidies is heading toward inflation? I was in Germany when inflation struck there, and, believe me, inflation is hell. It can ruin any country.

Why blame the President for the impossibility of pleasing everybody? Why cry for ham and eggs and business as usual when our dear ones are dying at the front? Mistakes are unavoidable, but an unpardonable mistake is deliberately to cause inflation. God pity the middle and lower classes. Why are subsidies proper everywhere except where F. D. R. wishes to use them? In going beyond its prescribed lawmaking power and dictating the personnel and manner of execution of its laws, Congress robs the President of his constitutional executive powers. Why hamstring him by stirring up the hates which Hitler prophesied?

People's rights do not include the right to "git all you can while the gittin's good." Honor has no place for labor blocs and farm blocs and Republican and Democratic blocs groaning for votes and pie for dessert. What patriot expects not to suffer? Who should strive to profit but in the field of honor? What hero but greets the glory to suffer for freedom?

Election year is near and prophets of "grass'll grow in our streets" are again at their sounding boards, with crafty politicians knowing more than Pa and Ma and Uncle Joe and Aunt Mary. The result? Two-cent dollars!

This war is a long, long way from being won. Humanity's greatest tragedy is the treachery of man to himself. Greatness is reached only by cooperation. Whether a soldier on the front line or a soldier on the home line or a lawmaker or a law executor, you cannot escape that unforgettable warning: "Therefore, if the world goeth astray, in you is the cause."

Is it not full time, Mr. Editor, to sound the warning that inflation is hell?

Read what a wise man says of our President:

"When he first became President, the Nation's house was on fire. He put it out. Confidence was lost. He restored it and infused it into the hearts of the American people. The farmers were bankrupt. He made them solvent. Tens of thousands of shops and factories were closed. He opened them. Commerce was buried. He resurrected it. Business was dead. He brought it to life. Prosperity was banished. He restored it. Millions were homeless. He housed them. Millions were half naked. He clothed them. Millions were hungry. He fed them. Millions were idle. He employed them. The country was defenseless and seething with

unrest; revolution was just around the corner. Franklin Roosevelt has made the United States the arsenal of democracy, the fortress of liberty, the haven of happiness, and the home of content. In 10 centuries no other born of woman has ever rendered as much service to the hosts of toil, underprivileged, affliction, and distress as he has rendered them during the last 10 years."

Deliberately to create inflation by thwarting this man in the proper execution of his constitutional duty may needlessly cost the lives of millions of American boys such as yours and mine, may needlessly mean thousands of vacant chairs, and crepe on millions of American doors.

Is it not full time, Mr. Editor, that those who speak for us should speak constructive words and furnish cooperative aid? When a nation's existence is at stake it is certainly no time to play politics or flourish ignorance of economics. This is war! Not a home war of Americans against Americans, but a war of freedom against slavery!

THORNWELL HAYNES,
Columbia, S. C.

Why I Opposed Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, my reason for opposing the President on this issue of subsidies was certainly not to be anti-administration, as some would attempt to label the opposition, but because I sincerely and firmly believe that subsidies are unsound and will lead to further inflation.

Now, let us discuss this subject in simple terms, confining ourselves to fundamental facts and truths, and by all means abandoning any form of demagoguery. I personally think it was unfair that the President labeled us, who opposed him, as people who wanted inflation. Such remarks do not add to unity when we feel that we have sound reasons for opposing subsidies. We were elected to legislate as we think best for the interest of the country, and that does not necessarily mean that we must be a "rubber stamp."

In the first place, my district represents a district of consumers, and therefore I am vitally interested in the food problem and the matter of cost of living. Consequently, I am opposed to inflation. What causes inflation? Every authority on economics has claimed that inflation results when our purchasing power exceeds the available commodities and articles to be purchased. In other words, there is more money in circulation than there are consumer goods in value, which causes the amount or selling price of the consumer goods to rise to meet the amount of circulating money offered in purchasing certain goods. Mr. Roosevelt took note of the fact that an increase in consumer spending power, which is already far in excess of the available supply of consumer goods, is a contributing factor to inflation. This being the case, it is obvious that any success which the administration has with its price roll-backs will simply add to the already excessive volume of consumer spending power. If prices should be reduced by 10 percent, for instance, the money which people thereby would not need to spend on food would be available for them to spend on something else. Unless this new surplus should be absorbed by taxes or savings, it would simply find its way into the inflationary stream.

Now, as the President has stated, it will take approximately $2,000,000,000 to finance a complete subsidy and roll-back plan, and this means an additional $2,000,000,000 placed in circulation. The only method by which this additional $2,000,000,000, plus the already existing surplus of cash, can be siphoned off to avoid inflation is by forced savings or taxes, plus the original price control by O. P. A. Mr. Morgenthau has stated that the tax rate on the higher incomes has about reached the limit, so the bulk must fall upon the middle-class and lower-income brackets, or even a sales tax, which I do not welcome. In other words, the amount not collected in taxes will be passed on to future generations. Let us assume we save $10 per year in the food costs, the cost of administration will be at least $2.50 and the interest will be $2.50, so the future taxpayers will be paying $15.

As I understand, the real purpose of subsidies is to assist those who are definitely unable to absorb the 8-percent increase in the cost of living from May 1942, which is the figure Mr. Roosevelt gave us in his veto message. I have suggested, as others have, that instead of subsidizing the processors and allowing the advantages to go to all, that it should only apply to those in serious need, such as the low-income earner, the pensioner, and the persons of fixed salaries in the lower brackets. This could be handled in the form of food stamps and determined upon the basis of their earnings to be adjusted from time to time according to the changes. This is not new legislation, and it has been recommended by both Republicans and Democrats.

I realize that O. P. A. has made mistakes, but nevertheless I have supported O. P. A. and voted against all cuts in their budget, because I realized they needed sufficient money to control and regulate prices.

Here is another danger arising from general subsidies such as has been recommended. This danger is based upon past experience. All we have to do is refer to the past inequities of the minor farm-subsidy plans. This information was brought out on the floor of the House during debate: Last year California produced over 7 percent of the food alone of the Nation, not counting cotton, wool, and so forth, and obtained $12,000,000 as subsidy, whereas Mississippi only produced 1.8 percent of the food and fiber of the Nation and received over $28,000,000 as subsidy. Of this $28,000,000, over $5,000,000 was paid to 63 large operators. This $5,000,000 amounted to more than all of the farmers of the following 21 States received:

Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

There were 6,400 large checks to farmers in Texas which amounted to more than the farmers in 21 other States received. It should be noted that New York is one of the leading agricultural States in food production. That State alone produces more than half as much food and fiber as Texas, but her 153,000 farmers got less subsidy than 6,400 farmers in Texas.

We must also bear in mind that there is no pattern or yardstick by which they will apply this. Supposedly, they will attempt to subsidize the processor for the difference between costs and selling price. This is bound to lead to many discrepancies and inequities from a practical application of this policy. Too, we do not want a similar incident to occur such as was brought out on the floor recently regarding the pancake flour industry, which I will outline briefly.

The nationally advertised standard brands were sold in 20-ounce packages at 12 to 15 cents per package. Brands produced by independent producers and sold locally or through chain stores were sold at 5 to 7 cents per 20-ounce package. The spread is accounted for by the fact that the advertised brands pay for advertising, for greater distribution costs, and usually for better packaging. The independent producers were selling on such a small margin of profit that with the increase in materials and labor costs, they were unable to sell at that price. They petitioned for a 1-cent increase and were denied the increase. Incidentally, these manufacturers sell about 60 percent of the pancake flour sold. This denial resulted in 80 percent of the manufacturers of unadvertised brands going out of business. Two new companies with entirely new ownership purchased the machinery and equipment of the majority of these independent mills and have started manufacturing pancake flour.

O. P. A. has not held them to the low ceiling price but has allowed them to price their product at the maximum price. These prices range from 19 to 24 cents per 20-ounce package. As a result the consumer and the men who have pioneered this business are the losers. This is becoming the common practice.

So, summarizing my argument, the additional $2,000,000,000 is bound to create an inflationary condition, which will necessitate the retaking of this money from the public in the form of taxes or forced savings. Remember, the Treasury Department stated that of the 44,000,000 taxpayers, 40,000,000 were included in the first bracket, which means that these 40,000,000 taxpayers will carry the heaviest burden of this subsidy load. According to the President, there are

approximately 4,000,000 wage earners in need of the benefits of subsidy. Why not subsidize them direct instead of the general subsidy program for the benefit of the 130,000,000 in the United States? This will mean less taxes on the 130,000,000.

Now that the policy of the Government has been set up to use the subsidy plan, I pledge my sincere support and cooperation in assisting this program.

The Romance of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malcolm W. Bingay, which appeared in The Detroiter of June 28, 1943:

THE ROMANCE OF COMMERCE

(By Malcolm W. Bingay, editorial director, Detroit Free Press)

"Events have mended the tear in the tapestry of our history."

In the days of a younger America, when we were closer to fundamentals than we have been lately, there was a bit of advice from the Book of Proverbs that was set forth for our youth: "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before kings."

A man diligent in his business these days, however, is making out questionnaires and governmental forms and he is standing—in line—before clerical representatives of myriads of alphabetical bureaus.

For more than a decade now the youth of America have been taught that there is something shameful about making a success out of life. American industry, commerce, business, were in the dog housse.

Then came the war.

The Nation and its Allies were desperate for the naval, military, and aerial implements to fight the well-entrenched enemy. The men who had created America, as wonderland of the world in industrial achievements, were called back from their exile in disgrace. That was a little more than 18 months ago.

Today the miracle has been achieved. The world is being saved from the despoilers of human liberty by the power and the glory of the American businessman who knows how to get things done. And Detroit stands peculiarly alone, unique in the municipalities of the earth in the creation of the greatest war machine history has ever known.

American industry and commerce has found itself again. It no longer stands apologetic before the wrath of a misled multitude. By its triumphs in war-winning production it has falsified the contentions of governmental Lilliputians that all that is needed to run the country is a new set of theories, a few textbooks and a flock of laws.

Detroit stands forth again, the industrial capital of the world, the dynamic center of salvation for all free peoples.

Looking back through the vista of the years it is fitting at this time that our Detroit Board of Commerce should be celebrating the fortieth year of its being.

For it was around this organization that the giants of our creation rallied: Men with driving genius, majestic courage, and unfaltering faith, to change the whole course of civilization—and, in the end, to save it.

Gone are the days when men must apologize for making a success out of life. At best it was a passing phase, a longish nightmare out of the hours of our despair. The tear in the tapestry of history has been mended by events. Once more we see the picture as a whole.

For thousands of years there has been no improvement in public morals, in philosophy, in religion or in politics, but the advance of business has been the greatest miracle the world has ever known.

Business is the salt of life. Business has to prosper before anybody can benefit. And the leaders of business have made it prosper and all mankind has shared in that prosperity. The politician can accomplish nothing without business because, out of the earnings of business, and its great byproduct of high wages, comes the money which permits the politician to function.

Never in the history of the world was there a great culture which did not come about through commerce. The glory that was Greece came from the money brought to Athens by its commerce; so it was with Rome, and so it was with the city-states of Italy, wherein was born the Renaissance of the world's wisdom. It was the awakening of commerce that aroused Europe out of its slumbers of the Dark Ages. It was commerce which gave Great Britain its culture and character and its traditions that made it possible for those heroic people to stand alone against the enemy after Dunkerque.

Commerce is the great civilizer. We exchange ideas when we exchange fabrics. The culture of the Greeks began when they discovered the letters of the Phoenician alphabet in the markings on letters from the traders of Tyre. Trade is the bloodstream of existence. Without it the world would return to primitive barbarism.

In America it has been commerce and industry and business which have made possible the greatest system of free education in all the history of the world. It has built our libraries, our museums, our parks, our recreational centers, our churches, our whole system of civilization.

For, as a byproduct of its achievements, it has created the moneys that have gone into the taxation by which all things of lasting value have been built.

A little more than a century ago, Michael Faraday, the father of our electrical age, the man who conceived the induction system which made possible mass production, the creator of the magneto, was giving a demonstration of his work before the British Royal Scientific Society in London. A rising young politician of the day, William Gladstone, was invited to attend the demonstration.

He evinced a polite interest at first and then became bored, asking:

"It is all very interesting, Mr. Faraday, but what on God's earth good is it?"

"Some day," answered Faraday, "you politicians will be able to tax it."

So it is that the businessman, the industrialist, the merchant, the investor, need not be ashamed of his calling, for without him there would be no comforts of life, no leisure, no culture.

Our times refute the theorists.

And around this old Detroit Board of Commerce of ours there has rallied through the years these very men who have made of Detroit a city apart. They labored for the creation of vast industries without losing sight of the civic needs of our community.

The very word "commerce" comes from a combination of two of the most used words in any language—"com" and "merci"—a getting together of that which is good.

For trade is more than mere sordid barter. It is a social act, a getting-together of all that is good. It is trade as much as prayer or laughter or any of the other higher attributes of man which places him above the animals. As Adam Smith quaintly put it in his Wealth of the Nation:

"Nobody ever saw a dog make fair and deliberate exchange of one bone for another with another dog. Nobody ever saw one animal by his gestures and natural cries signify to another: 'This is mine, that yours; I am willing to give you this for that.'"

The giants of Detroit, who 40 years ago founded our Board of Commerce, were men with the vision to see beyond mere dollars, mere trade, or they could not have achieved so mightily.

And those who are following in their steps must have that high vision and purpose as we come out of this war and revert our giant industries to the ways of peace. The one thing above all else it will require is courage. In that the City of the Straits has never been lacking. It is a part of our imperishable tradition from the days of our valiant founding almost two and a half centuries ago.

We have gone through wars and famines, revolutions and plagues. Our city has been swept away by fire. Our banks have crashed, through no fault of ours, but always there has been the will to survive and to triumph over our obstacles, in keeping with that heroic motto on the seal of our city:

"We hope for better days: it shall rise again from its ashes."

That challenge is here for us all now.

World events have come upon us to make it so.

And all who know the history and the tradition, the vision and purpose of the Detroit Board of Commerce, know that in that challenge this organization will play its mighty part.

The Source of Their Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we can draw strength and inspiration from a recent editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is entitled "The Source of Their Strength":

THE SOURCE OF THEIR STRENGTH

For hundreds of years the great military and naval leaders of the English-speaking race have been devout men, with a sublime faith in God and a firm belief in the ultimate triumph of right as the fulfillment of His will. It came as no great surprise, then, when Gen. K. A. N. Anderson ordered a special service of thanksgiving to be held Sunday, May 23, for his victorious British First Army in Tunisia, explaining:

"When success comes our way we are inclined to place too much emphasis on our own skill and power and not enough on the strength which comes from beyond human limits."

Those are words which might have been uttered by that fighting man of God, Gen. Sir Bernard Law Montgomery, of the British

Eighth Army, or by that other Covenanter, Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson, C. S. A., who lived according to the New Testament and fought according to the Old.

Nelson knelt on the deck of the *Victory* on the eve of Trafalgar, and Farragut committed his course to God as he sailed into Mobile Bay. Washington and Lee humbly asked for divine guidance on every occasion. Stonewall Jackson ordered thanksgiving services after victory and never failed to give God the credit for his successes. On one of his last days he recommended the Bible as a model for generals' official reports, and cited the narrative of Joshua's battle with the Amalekites: "It has clearness, brevity, fairness, modesty; and it traces the victory to its right source, the blessing of God."

That this remarkable quality of true humility is common to many great military men is emphasized by General Anderson's action.

Renegotiation Law Should Not Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members of the House who are interested in preventing war profiteering, and especially the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], who has introduced a bill (H. R. 2698) for the outright repeal of the anti-war-profiteering law, have been giving some attention to the hearings being held by the Naval Affairs Committee on the renegotiation law. These hearings have not been concluded; but the evidence already presented to the committee, which includes testimony of the Navy Department and of industrialists, large and small, conclusively proves that in no other way, except through renegotiation of war contracts, can we control the costs of the materials of war and effectively prevent war profiteering. The evidence presented to the Naval Affairs Committee is a complete answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], who has addressed the House on two occasions, May 12 and June 1, urging repeal of the law, without at any time proposing a substitute.

A WAR MEASURE

The renegotiation law is purely a war measure. It is, as Mr. Kenneth H. Rockey, Chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board, stated to the committee "the wartime substitute for the normal peacetime controls and stimulants of free competition." He said further:

> In the administration of the law we have sought, through practical application, to give recognition to the same factors and principles, with reward of reasonable profits in accordance with performance and capital risks, that would be in operation under competitive conditions in normal times.

That is a very significant statement, Mr. Speaker. It expresses in a sentence the basic theory and purposes of the renegotiation law. Contrary to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] would apparently have us believe, the renegotiation law is not a punitive measure. It is not a revenue measure. It is designed not solely to recover "excessive profits" on war contracts nor solely to keep prices of war materials under control. Equally important, it is also designed to stimulate production, with reward of reasonable profits in accordance with performance and risks. This feature of the law the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] completely overlooks or ignores.

RECENT INVESTIGATION

I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to examine the arguments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] in the light of the evidence in the record of the Naval Affairs Committee in its investigation into the operation of the renegotiation law. The evidence is factual and not conjectural. It is detailed and not just generalities and assumptions. The committee has not only examined the Navy Price Adjustment Board but has made a detailed inquiry into several cases that have come before that Board.

The principal argument of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], as well as that of the disappointed would-be war millionaires, is that the existing excess-profits tax is in itself sufficient to prevent war profiteering, and since the 90-percent excess-profits tax was enacted subsequent to the renegotiation law, the renegotiation law can now be repealed.

At the outset one must understand that the 90-percent excess-profits tax is limited in application by the provision of the revenue code which places a maximum of 80 percent as an over-all tax. It should also be kept in mind that the excess-profits-tax provision of the revenue code provides for a 10-percent postwar credit. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] admits both these points, but they merit repetition lest someone erroneously conclude that the so-called 90-percent excess-profits tax is in fact 90 percent. The maximum eventual over-all tax is but about 72 percent.

When I was privileged to address the House on May 17 I presented several examples of the manner in which the excess-profits tax actually operates and in fact leaves large sums of money in the hands of war contractors. The gentleman from Michigan made no refutation. He attempted to answer merely by saying that percentages do not mean much, which, of course, is no answer at all.

Let me refer the gentleman to the Naval Affairs Committee hearings, where he will find actual cases involving war contracts and renegotiation. When the gentleman has opportunity to study these cases in detail I suspect he will be somewhat disturbed that he has introduced a bill for the repeal of the renegotiation law.

A CASE IN POINT

Take the case of the Northern Pump Co., owned entirely by a Mr. John B. Hawley, Jr., who appeared before the committee. I am reluctant to mention names but the data of specific companies was made public at the hearings. And I might add, according to the evidence, this company has done an excellent job of producing naval machinery at low costs.

In 1941 the private capital invested in the company amounted to around $2,500,000. The Navy, however, provided the company with over $16,800,000 in rent-free facilities. In other words, the Navy has invested in the company more than seven times the amount of the owner's investment.

In 1942 the company realized a profit of $22,720,000, which, after paying all taxes, left the company $5,205,000. This was a return of 160 percent on the owner's investment, in spite of wartime taxation. The growth of the company was in large measure due to the Navy's assistance.

For the benefit of the gentleman from Michigan I should perhaps repeat that after paying all taxes the owner of this company—one man—would have realized a profit on war contracts of $5,205,000.

ANOTHER CASE IN POINT

Let me call attention to another case developed before the Naval Affairs Committee: The Defoe Shipbuilding Co. This company is a partnership and as such it is not subject to the excess-profits tax, upon which the gentleman from Michigan places complete reliance.

The partners had $600,000 invested in the business. As a result of the war and the Navy's need for small craft the company was given $100,000,000 of Navy contracts. In 1942 the Defoe partnership realized a profit of $2,500,000. Surely the gentleman from Michigan would not contend that this company, which is a family partnership consisting of two brothers and three sons, should be permitted to retain $2,500,000 of the taxpayers' money as a profit on their investment of $600,000. The profit would be divided five ways in one family and, I must remind the gentleman from Michigan, the excess-profits tax does not apply in cases of partnerships.

When Mr. Defoe appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee he complained bitterly because the Navy Price Adjustment Board had requested a refund that would leave the partnership something like $700,000 as a profit. It is not without significance that one of the partners is a 23-year-old boy, brought into the partnership after the company started getting war contracts, and his share would be $110,000 for 1942.

RENEGOTIATION PRICE-FIXING MEASURE

Other specific cases, to be found in the hearings of the Naval Affairs Committee, could be presented to show the inadequacy of the excess-profits tax as a medium for the prevention of war profiteering. But, Mr. Speaker, the recapture of excessive profits from those who would become millionaires out of the war effort at the expense of the taxpayers, is only one phase of renegotiation.

Rengotiation is not a revenue measure. It was never intended to be. It is a price-fixing measure, designed to keep the costs

of war materials under control, when the Government is obliged to spend billions and billions to get the maximum possible production at the earliest possible date.

MORE THAN A BILLION DOLLARS RECOVERED

The Chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board testified that they had recovered in actual refunds to the Treasury $399,009,777. And it has been estimated that the total refunds on war contracts that have been renegotiated by all the departments—War, Navy, and Maritime Commission—in the first 12 months of operation amount to $1,062,000,000.

But, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the actual refunds to the Treasury is only one phase of the savings obtained through renegotiation. The Chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board testified that through direct renegotiation the Navy Department had secured price reductions in the amount of $612,615,964. And he further pointed out that voluntary price reductions, at a very minimum, amounted to $300,000,000. While some of these so-called voluntary price reductions were doubtless made out of the patriotic desire of some companies and individuals not to want to realize enormous profits from the war, it is a fair assumption that many of them were made with the knowledge that their company was subject to renegotiation.

In other words, the price reductions obtained by virtue of the renegotiation law on articles not yet delivered to the Navy or on which payments have not been made has been well over $900,000,000. There is, of course, no way of estimating the amount of savings that will result in subsequent contracts for additional materials.

If $900,000,000 constitutes the price-reduction savings on war materials obtained by the Navy Department, which has only a small part of the contracts in comparison with the War Department, if this has been the savings in only one department in only 1 year of operation, it is a perfectly reasonable conclusion that the renegotiation law savings will amount to several billion dollars before the end of this war. I am not referring to actual refunds, which would in part be subject to taxation. I am referring simply to price reductions. It is this feature of renegotiation which the gentleman from Michigan does not recognize when he advocates the outright repeal of the law.

QUESTION ASKED AUTHOR OF BILL TO REPEAL RENEGOTIATION

Let me ask the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in what way would the excess profits tax, or any other system of taxation, realize these price reductions? On the contrary, it is axiomatic that heavy taxation aggravates the incentive of producers to increase costs, thereby reducing the profits on which the tax applies.

Heavy taxation tends to destroy the incentive to produce goods for the Government at the lowest possible costs. Tax rates do not differentiate between a man who is a high-cost producer and one who is a low-cost producer. No scheme of taxation has been devised to provide for the element of incentive for the efficient low-cost producer.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to point out to the House the ways by which costs may even be deliberately increased, with, of course, resulting decreases in profit and decreased taxation. Very often it is done in such a manner and by such a method that it can be discovered only by the closest scrutiny of the company's records. The most obvious method, one well known to all of us, is to increase the salaries of the executives and to hire several additional vice presidents and assistants to the vice presidents and assistants to the assistants.

It was brought out in the Naval Affairs Committee hearings that in the case of the Northern Pump Co., to which I previously referred, Mr. John B. Hawlay, Jr.'s salary was raised from $24,000 in 1939 to $49,000 in 1940 and to $442,000 in 1941. The company also paid a life insurance premium for him of $33,834.

I am reluctant to mention names of companies and individuals. I do so in this instance because these facts became a matter of public record during the Naval Affairs Committee hearing. A great many cases of exactly the same nature could be presented. I mention the Northern Pump Co. case merely to illustrate the point: Taxes are no substitute and merely tend to aggravate the cost of materials to the Government.

It has been said that the Bureau of Internal Revenue passes upon the allowances and deductions permitted by law for income-tax purposes. But that argument overlooks the fact that the Bureau of Internal Revenue does not have the time nor the staff to keep current, that it would probably be a matter of 2 years before the Bureau audited a company's income-tax return. The facts that a company could present 2 years from now, after the work may have been completed, as to the necessity of certain allowances as a part of costs will look considerably different than the facts as they would appear to the Renegotiation Board, able to examine the records of the company while the work is in progress. In other words, it is one thing to be able to justify the work of a vice president added to the staff as an item of cost to the taxpayers 2 years after the contract has been completed than to be able to justify it on the spot when the work is being performed.

If the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is followed, the renegotiation law is repealed and the excess-profits tax is relied upon, you may be certain that this war will cost the American people many billions more than it is now costing and you may be certain that the American system of free enterprise will suffer from an adverse public reaction when it is learned that another crop of millionaires grew out of this war, that some got rich while others gave their lives.

The gentleman from Michigan's second point in his argument for repeal of the renegotiation law is that there is no fixed formula for determining what constitutes excessive profits. I have asked him to suggest a formula. He has not been able to do so, nor can anyone advise a fixed formula which would work fairly and equitably in all cases of war contractors doing various kinds of work under most varied circumstances. Indeed, it is the absence of a fixed formula which gives value to the renegotiation law.

In some industries all the capital is supplied by the companies themselves; in other industries a large part of the capital is furnished by the Government or guaranteed by the Government. In some cases the manufacturer is furnished with rent free facilities, with an option to purchase. In other cases the plant is furnished by the company to be amortized over a 5-year period. In other cases the plant is furnished by the Government and merely operated by the company with no right to purchase at the end of the war.

Does the gentleman from Michigan contend that all these contractors should be allowed the same percentage of profit? Would he say that a contractor who furnished his own capital should receive no larger percentage of return than a contractor who was furnished capital by the Government? Would he say that the contractor who furnished half the capital should get the same percentage of return as one who furnishes all? What formula would the gentleman suggest as being fair and equitable in allowing reasonable profits in all these cases?

As the gentleman from Michigan well knows, some war contractors have been able to continue their peacetime operations with little change. Others have not. Some operations permit a very rapid turn-over of a contractor's investment. Others do not. Some contractors have entered into work with which they are entirely unfamiliar. Others have not. Some contractors have been engaged in work where the volume is small, where considerable time has been spent in perfecting a particular article. Others have not. Some contractors have engaged in construction work in foreign fields, where the risk has been great and there have been many unforeseen developments, even to actual loss of life among the contractor's technical personnel from enemy bombings. Other contractors have produced materials which can be readily produced by mass production. Other contractors have been producing war materials on which, during the process of the production, many technical changes or improvements have been made and will be made as the war needs dictate. In a war strategic plans and materials needed change overnight.

Let me ask the gentleman from Michigan again what fixed formula is there which, applied to these many and varied cases and circumstances, will, in every case or even in the majority of them, produce fair and equitable results? Obviously, a flat formula applied to all the cases, whatever the circumstances, would lead to unfortunate results. It would, in

effect, tend to penalize the venturesome and efficient and reward the inefficient. I remind the gentleman from Michigan that we have had some experience with flat formulas in determining reasonable profits on war contracts, and it was because of this experience that the renegotiation law does not provide for any fixed rule or formula.

The renegotiation law permits the fitting of profits to the facts. And it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the purpose of renegotiation is not alone to prevent excessive profits, not alone to bring about a reduction in costs and prices, but also, and most important, to stimulate production. As the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee make clear, the Navy Price Adjustment Board makes allowances for contractors who show results in production, who show initiative, and who are efficient. If the Board did not have discretion and was obliged to apply a fixed formula, there would be little incentive for any contractor to be a low-cost producer, to experiment, to develop new products, or to take risks of any kind. Under a set formula he would receive no better treatment from the Government than a contractor who was inefficient or a high-cost producer.

The third point the gentleman from Michigan raises in his argument for repeal of the renegotiation law is that no allowance is made for post-war reconversion. The gentleman's argument is really directed to the tax law and not to renegotiation. If the gentleman is really disturbed over the question of industries being permitted to set up a reserve for post-war reconversion, he should introduce a bill to amend the tax law. Instead he introduces a bill to repeal the renegotiation law. It causes one to wonder if the distinguished gentleman is really interested in the question of reserves for post-war reconversion or whether he is more interested in finding arguments, however unsound they may be, which might be advanced against the renegotiation of war contracts.

Mr. Speaker, it is my personal opinion that if the Price Adjustment Boards had adopted the policy of allowing reserves for post-war reconversion as an item of cost, the very same people who are now complaining because the boards make no such allowances would be complaining that the boards exceed their statutory authority. Anything to get the renegotiation law repealed.

In the excess-profits tax provision of the internal revenue code Congress has set up a 10-percent post-war credit. Perhaps the post-war credit should be increased. Perhaps some other provision should be made in the tax law for the post-war period. Perhaps a complete post-war program should be worked out. That is for Congress to decide. But under existing law the Congress has said that 10 percent of the excess-profits tax will be the amount of credit to be allowed for the post-war period. It expresses the policy of Congress. Moreover, in the Internal Revenue Code Congress has stated what are allowable costs. If the Price Adjustment Boards were to make additional allowances they would, in my opinion, be entering upon a field in which their legal right to make such allowances would be highly questionable.

I have heard any number of speeches delivered on the floor of the House by my friends on the other side of the aisle in which they questioned the legal right of this agency or that to carry on a particular activity which they did not like. They have complained bitterly whenever they thought some agency was assuming to do something which the Congress did not by statutory enactment expressly say that they could do.

We now have the unique experience of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan complaining because the price adjustment boards have sought to carry out the intent of Congress to the letter and have not seen fit to take unto themselves a power which they do not clearly have. We now have the unique experience of having the gentleman from Michigan urging the repeal of a law because agencies of the Government have not broadly interpreted the law, whereas heretofore, on all other occasions, he has been one of those who has advocated the strictest possible interpretation of statutory enactments by the administrating agencies.

The gentleman from Michigan apparently does not recognize that if the price adjustment boards were to allow post-war reserves they would be confronted with the administrative problem of determining how long the war will last, what new commercial products will come out of the war effort, what the nature, extent and cost of reconversion will be for each industry, and estimate the amount of money that would be required for reconversion. Indeed, the necessity for reconversion in a great many industries may never arise. It would be a tremendous undertaking and a tremendous responsibility. But the gentleman from Michigan complains because the boards have not undertaken it without a clear declaration from Congress, he, therefore, asks that the entire law be repealed.

I do not believe that the gentleman from Michigan realizes that if, under existing law, the price adjustment boards were to allow a reserve for post-war reconversion they would have to allow at least $5 for every $1 to be set up as a reserve. It must be recognized that the reserve would be subject to taxation, because it would necessarily have to be an item of profit under existing law and not an item of cost. In other words, if a company were to be permitted to set up a reserve of $500,000 each year, the board would have to allow the company at least $2,500,000 to be able to set up the reserve. That $2,500,000 would enter into the price the Government would be obliged to pay for the article, and, obviously, would be highly inflationary. Such a policy would defeat the very purpose of the renegotiation law, to secure lower prices on war materials.

If the gentleman from Michigan were to take the time to inquire deeply into this subject, I think he will discover that the companies who are arguing the longest and the loudest for post-war reserves are companies who have always been the most liberal in the payment of dividends and have never followed a conservative financial policy. In any event, the question of post-war reserves is one pertaining to taxation and not one for renegotiation. But, to the best of my knowledge, the gentleman from Michigan has introduced no bill to amend the tax statute. He simply wants the renegotiation law repealed.

In his speech on the floor of the House on June 1 on the subject of renegotiation, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan devoted considerable time to a discussion of bureaucracy, long-haired professors and star-gazing theorists. I do not see where the remarks have any bearing on the merits of renegotiation, but I should like to comment briefly.

If the gentleman would consult with the members of the Naval Affairs Committee, who have had the Navy Price Adjustment Board before them, if he would consult with the members of the subcommittee on the War Department of the Committee on Appropriations, who had the War Price Adjustment Board officials before them during the recent weeks on the Army supply bill, I believe he will find unanimous expression from the members, both Republicans and Democrats, that the Navy and Army Price Adjustment Boards consist of outstanding businessmen. They are made up of men who have had many years' training and actual experience in the business and industrial world; men who are technical experts in finance, accounting, law, and engineering. If the distinguished gentleman from Michigan would just examine the statements of the witnesses who have appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee, he would note that practically every witness unhesitatingly stated, whether or not he agreed with the Board's conclusions in the renegotiation of his case, that the price adjustment boards were outstanding in their knowledge of the problems, in their understanding complicated questions, and to be absolutely fair and just in arriving at agreements. The reference of the gentleman from Michigan to long-haired professors and theorists in connection with the price adjustment boards is simply without foundation in fact. Of course I realize that the gentleman wished to popularize his appeal, and that he felt that the old cry of bureaucracy and star gazers would serve his purpose.

The postion of the gentleman from Michigan in urging repeal of the renegotiation law is rather unique in one other respect. He complains about the cost of Government and the great bureaucracy. He speaks of professors and theorists. But he introduces a bill to wipe out an agency of Government, which like the General Accounting Office in purpose, is designed to save the taxpayers money. He attacks an agency of Government whose personnel is probably the smallest of any agency, and whose personnel is made up entirely of

practical businessmen and experts in the business and industrial field.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other matters in connection with renegotiation to which I would like to refer. I shall not do so at this time. I earnestly recommend that you read the testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee. You will find in that record a full and complete answer to the gentleman from Michigan, and you will be impressed with the importance of the renegotiation law to the war and our efforts to preserve democracy.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 23, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, the Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Pursuant to the request contained in your letter of March 25, 1943, to Lt. Comdr. Frank R. McGregor and your conversation of Wednesday morning with Mr. Slyvan Coleman, Lieutenant Commander McGregor, Lieutenant Commander Carroll, and the undersigned, the following facts with respect to the Northern Pump Co. are herewith submitted:

As of 1927, the Northern Pump Co. was a comparatively small manufacturer of rotary pumps, but by 1938 had developed electrical hydraulic drives for ordnance purposes, which required a highly specialized technique. The company has done an excellent production job.

For the period from 1936 to June 30, 1940, its annual sales ran from $1,000,000 up to approximately $2,000,000.

Result of proposed renegotiation for the year ended June 30, 1941: As of June 30, 1940, which is the date as of which the full impact of war business began to be felt, the Northern Pump Co. had a net worth of $1,007,000. Its sales for the year ended June 30, 1941, were $18,446,000, most of which were to the Government; its net profit before Federal taxes for the year ended June 30, 1941, was $5,226,000 (including $588,000 on nonrenegotiable business), or 500 percent on net worth, and after taxes estimated at $1,841,000, or almost 200 percent on net worth. Expressed in relation to sales, the over-all profit before taxes was approximately 30 percent of sales. As of the end of the year ending June 30, 1941, the working capital furnished by the Government constituted $8,000,000 and Government furnished facilities constituted approximately $6,500,000.

The Price Adjustment Board has requested a refund with respect to this period of $1,872,000, reducing the profit on renegotiable business, before taxes, from $4,712,000 to $2,839,000, leaving an estimated profit after taxes on all of the company's business of $1,205,000.

Result of proposed renegotiation for the year ended June 30, 1942: For the year ended June 30, 1942, its sales were $67,930,000, practically all of which were to the Government. Net profits before taxes for the year ended June 30, 1942, were $21,186,000 (including a small amount of nonrenegotiable business), or 2,100 percent of net worth as of June 30, 1940, to which no outside capital had since been added. Expressed in relation to sales, this is a profit of over 30 percent.

Net profits after taxes for the year ended June 30, 1942, were $5,206,000, or 500 percent on net worth as of June 30, 1940.

A refund of $15,155,540 was requested for the year ended June 30, 1942, reducing the profit on renegotiable business before taxes from $21,206,000 to $6,054,000, leaving an estimated profit after taxes on all of the company's business of $1,075,000.

Result without refunds: If no refunds are made, Northern Pump Co., beginning with a net worth as of June 30, 1937, of $362,000, which was built up to $1,007,000 as of June 30, 1940, would, as of June 30, 1942, have a net worth of $7,706,463 and will have acquired a new plant originally costing $2,393,000 at a net cost, after amortization and depreciation, of $360,000. This will have been accomplished largely on Government money, for, as of June 30, 1942, the Northern Pump Co. had advances from the Government of $7,500,000 in addition to Government facilities of approximately $16,800,000, with respect to which no rent was charged.

I trust that this is the information which you desire.

Very truly yours,
CLARENCE H. ROSS,
Counsel, Navy Price Adjustment Board.

Music for Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 16, I received unanimous consent to extend a few remarks in the RECORD on the value of music in the war efforts. Since that time, I have received letters from Americans all over the United States, commenting on the value of music as a morale builder, and urging that I continue my efforts to make the country song conscious at this particular time.

One of those letters contained an article about what music means to England during the war.

It was written by Mr. Melville Clark, chairman of the advisory board, National Association of Music Merchants, Inc., Syracuse, N. Y., and published in the Mail Pouch of the New York Times of April 11, 1943.

The article entitled "Music and Government" follows:

I was much interested in the article "Government Support for Music," by Sir Robert Mayer, in the music pages of the Times, March 7, telling of the establishment and splendid work of Britain's Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. The author pointed out clearly that this council was born of war and has forged right ahead even in Britain's most crucial war experiences to bring fine concerts of instrumental and choral music, dramas, and art exhibits to the widest possible audience, including factory towns and factories themselves.

He also brought out that, though the Council for the Encouragement of Music and Arts is now entirely a government subsidy, admission charges of 20 and 40 cents are made for all concerts, outside of those given in factories, where admission is free, and that people are buying the higher-priced seats in increasingly greater numbers, thereby showing their appreciation and desire to help make this activity self-supporting.

IDEA FOR UNITED STATES

Sir Robert likewise considered it highly significant that this council's formation was undertaken in 1940, coinciding "with the very moment when the country was in mortal danger of invasion. * * *"

For many months since I first learned of this council's existence and activities I have felt keenly that our Government, perhaps in conjunction at first with private financing, should create a similar council in this country to bring more music, entertainment, and cultural opportunities to our industrial workers and the rest of us on the home front.

Music's practical importance to the factories as a fatigue lifter and monotony breaker—a spiritual refreshment, you might say—and a vital recreational and cultural opportunity for both participants and listeners in those plants which maintain bands and choral groups for employees is more and more being recognized.

However, the number of individual industries providing music for their workers is vastly in the minority as yet. With the growing seriousness of accidents in plants and absenteeism, it seems imperative that our Government consider carefully the wisdom of establishing now some sort of music and arts committee to bring more music to our factories and thus help to reduce these problems. For it is well known that a happy man is the best worker.

I firmly believe that music in our factories—recorded music played over sound systems during working hours, when noise levels permit, the maintenance of factory bands and choral groups, and the giving of regular concerts in factories by orchestras and soloists of sound musicianship and reputation—would go far toward cutting down absenteeism and other problems.

Last year during my term as president of the National Association of Music Merchants we began a wide investigation of the practical benefits of music in war industries, sending out writer representative Miss Amy Lee to visit several plants already using music, to talk with workers and management officials. In every case appreciation for and belief in music's essentiality has been found to be practically 100 percent. This, our wartime work, we are continuing right along, despite the severe restrictions on all the musical instruments which are our normal livelihood, because we have absolute faith in music as a vital war winning force, and wish to see its practicality more universally recognized.

Therefore, I respectfully submit this idea of a Government-sponsored music and arts committee for our country, to function along the lines of Britain's C. E. M. A.

MELVILLE CLARK,
Advisory Board, National Association of Music Merchants, Inc.

Independence Day Thoughts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered Sunday afternoon, July 4, at Manchester, Mass., on the occasion of the dedication of the honor roll, containing the names of the young men and women of that town that have

entered the armed services of our country:

The day and the occasion upon which we assemble must inevitably fill our hearts with patriotic emotion and enthusiasm. The Fourth of July, our national anniversary, represents the living realities, the suffering and the privation, the triumph and the results of our struggle for independence. The occasion today, a tribute of honor to those from Manchester serving in our armed forces, bespeaks our responsibility and duty to preserve in a world threatened by the flames of war, the great principles that have made our Government the freest on the face of the earth.

The days of 1776, as today, were grim days. The men who signed that Declaration of Independence know they were committing treason in the interest of the liberty of 3,000,000 in America. Failure meant hanging for the signers, who realized that their audacious undertaking was scorned upon by the rest of the world. But stirred by the great principles of justice, liberty, and peace, the founders paved the way for their crusade and America began to rear its majestic temple of liberty and freedom.

The Representatives on that famous day did not only declare that the Colonies would henceforth be free and independent States. They also proclaimed the first principles on which just civil government is founded, a system where the sovereignty of the people is supreme. They proclaimed political equality, established justice, and established the American way. Our founding fathers knew that there were certain rights beyond the power of any State to confer. They are rights which come from the Creator. Our founding fathers acknowledged these rights and what is more, they acknowledged the source of these rights.

HISTORICAL NOTES

One hundred and sixty-seven years have passed since this glorious day, when the Thirteen Colonies announced to the world that the new Nation had assumed its equal station among the powers of the globe, and that the lives, the fortunes, the honor of every free human being forming a part of it, were pledged to a new government by the people, such as the world had never beheld in practice, and in which the sovereignty of the people was to be the basis of that system.

Built upon the solid rocks of truth, justice, and liberty, the Nation has soared to tremendous heights, in the extension of Christian and philanthropic efforts, in scientific research, activity of thought, freedom of speech. More than any other nation, it has given so much that adds to the comfort and happiness of man. The shifts and expansions that have taken place during these 167 years are believable only because they actually happened. In this period, our population has risen from fewer than 4,000,000 to over 130,000,000. Our 13 States had a total area of a little under 900,000 square miles while our 48 States have more than 4 times that area now.

Today, we are writing another declaration of independence—not a declaration of words but a declaration of deeds. We are returning to the spirit of the men who met 167 years ago in Philadelphia, determined to preserve that great heritage which they left to us.

The Nation is today plunged into a great conflict because the form of democracy that was the basis of our Government as provided in the Declaration of Independence in 1776, has been challenged. The honor roll which we dedicate today proudly proclaims the names of those now actively engaged in answering that challenge. They are fighting not only for loved ones at home, but fighting to establish and preserve the conditions of freedom under which the people of the earth, including ourselves, can work out and put into effect, a world society in which the individual can live, work, play, and enjoy life at peace with his neighbors. This is to me the great broad issue of this fight to which Manchester has contributed so nobly with her youth. It is appropriate, indeed, that we should by our presence and actions today, pay official recognition to members of your families in the armed forces of our country.

WAR PICTURE

A year ago, the war picture was far from optimistic. Since the preceding December, we had seen defeat after defeat. We had lost an important part of our Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. We had lost Wake and Guam and the Philippines. We had lost our rubber and oil and tin supplies in the East Indies. Japan dominated practically all of Asia. The map of the Russian line still showed the Nazi army still deep in the heart of Russia. The situation in the Middle East was bad. Our merchant ships were being sunk at a terrific rate.

Today, a mighty freedom-loving people moves steadily toward victory and peace, and the situation is changing daily. China, Britain, and America were not prepared for war. For 6 years, China has suffered as no nation has suffered. The Russian armies were punished terribly but they held and turned the tide. Once weak, Britain is now strong, after many trying ordeals. Our allies have given us what we needed so badly, namely time, and we have taken advantage of it. The Axis has been cleared out of north Africa. Our American flyers and Royal Air Force are doing a magnificent job in the air over Europe. Attu has fallen and the drive to rid the Japs from Kiska may soon be on. The battle of Coral Sea and Midway has shown the power of our fleet, Guadalcanal speaks for itself. Chinese forces have scored a major victory recently, and Russian power continues to demonstrate itself. The submarine menace is gradually diminishing. Our Army and Navy have become mighty machines of war. Our boys are in the air plunging through bullet-separated skies at ever-pressing foes, struggling and sweating in deserts, keeping vigil on seven seas, and giving their lives so that the fighting will be kept far from our shores and homes. We and our allies have now taken the initiative from the enemy. We are on the offensive and we will continue to maintain it. Such is the picture today.

OUR FIGHTING FORCES

Total victory is our objective. To obtain this goal we must have superiority in men and armaments over the Axis aggressors. We are raising and training a magnificent Army, and we are constructing and manning a superb Navy. We are planning to have raised by the end of this year 1943 an Army of 8,200,000 men, including an Air Force of about 2,500,000 and a Women's Army Corps of upward of 150,000. Our Navy now has well over a million and a half men in the service and on the way to 3,000,000. Compare this with the Navy of 3 years ago of 158,000 officers and men. Three years ago we were building less than 800 planes a month, half of which were training planes. Today we are building 8,000 a month, mostly of combat type. Three years ago we turned out machine guns at the rate of 25,000 a year. During the last 12 months we turned out 1,500,000. In this same period we turned out 44,830,000 bombs, including incendiary and block-busters. Since Pearl Harbor we have produced 37,000 tanks and plenty more are coming. Since that day we have produced 14,000,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition, and the progress picture is the same for artillery and all those other weapons and munitions of war that we need to carry the attack to the enemy.

During this year we will more than double the number of warships in our Navy. The combat tonnage of the fleet will increase this year two-thirds over what it was at the end of 1942. That accomplishment is without parallel in history. These are fighting ships—battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, escort ships, and submarines. These do not include the several thousand landing craft which have been completed during the last 5 months. The Navy has developed a special convoy vessel, the destroyer escort. It has but one function—to hunt down the submarines. More of them will be built this year than there were destroyers in the fleet at the end of 1942. Within a year and a half we will have more of these vessels than any other single class of vessels in the fleet. The submarine menace has to date been one of our biggest problems. We are well on the way to a solution of this problem, and here in Manchester in one of your shipyards you are making a notable contribution to this end. The number of carriers, both large and auxiliary, completed in 1943 will multiply many times our total carrier force at the end of 1942.

The Navy started the war with the strongest—and I think I can add the best naval air force in the world. The number of naval combat planes was more than doubled between Pearl Harbor and the end of 1942. We have established new records in production, but we must make more and more. We have demonstrated that America can do the impossible. Labor and industry have already made valuable contributions through production to the war effort. The demands of war are insatiable and our efforts to produce must continue unabated with a driving force that will not stop until the enemy is defeated. Strikes and lock-outs in our defense industries must not be tolerated while our boys are giving their lives on the far-flung battlefields of the world. Government machinery is now available for the conciliation of any dispute that may arise and it should be used.

We must not be too confident in the job we have at hand. It would be foolhardy to suggest that the submarine menace is fully under control at this time. We have not yet invaded the continent of Europe. The Nazis may be planning another terrific drive in Russia. China is weak. The battle line with the Japs is 6,000 miles away, requiring a tremendous supply line to bring food and equipment to our men. There is a tremendous task ahead but despite this, we are informed by the War Department that the production in May was 3½ percent less than in April. A 2-percent increase had been expected rather than a loss. This let-down occurred at a time when we are so short of weapons that they are being taken from troops training in this country and sent abroad for combat, seriously impairing the training program and affecting the morale of the troops. Let us keep in mind that every day this war is prolonged means the lives of our sons and loved ones, destruction, waste, suffering, and heartbreak.

THE HOME FRONT

Our eagerness for news from the battle fronts of the world should be matched by our eagerness for doing our share in this great conflict. We must learn to make sacrifices and to learn to do without a lot of things. Total war requires so many materials that there is just not enough to go around. We need ammunition and we must do without the toy trains, the counters heaped with chromium-coated gadgets, limitless supplies of shoes, and so forth. Business as usual has come to an end for the duration.

In order to meet our task effectively, full and honest cooperation by both labor and management is imperative in this great emergency if we are to have unity, and unity, of course, is the keystone of our every plan and operation in this grim and desperate

conflict for the survival of democratic institutions.

This unity is not something to be dusted off and paraded upon state occasions. It is a basic principle which must exist in full vigor and as a weapon of offense. If unity once falters, we must also falter. But standing firm, we and our allies will march to inevitable victory. The plain truth is that, for the duration, none of us can quite be master of his fate. You and I and every one of us, have the good of all to consider first and foremost now, and in the days of trial which lie ahead, we must welcome rather than shun such discipline of thought and deed. We must see this new discipline as an invisible chain which binds us all to our proper duty, not for individual survival only, but for the good of all. Victory in war cannot be achieved cheaply. We must pay dearly for our victory not only with the lives of our men but also by unremitting and unrewarded toil on the home front.

CONCLUSION

We are all involved in the present situation. Today nearly every United States family is represented in some national defense service with millions of our loved ones in combat ranks, offering their lives to cur country under Old Glory.

In this moment of uncertainty, peril, and the tragic losses of loved ones, every true American feels the need of keeping faith and of preserving poise. A good many things seem to be crashing down and each of us is endeavoring to find a foundation on which we can stand firm and from which we can fight the good fight without flinching.

The founding fathers built a great institution. Democracy is right. Cooperation among races and nations is right. Our cause is right. Let us keep faith, work unceasingly, and assume all of our responsibilities. There is no one to save America but each one of us. Backed by spiritual strength and His guidance, our flame of liberty shall light the nations to yet nobler heights and lasting peace.

Address of Hon. Carl Hinshaw at Charles Town, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CARL HINSHAW, of California, made at Charles Town, W. Va., on July 4, 1943, on the occasion of his dedicating the War Service Roll of Jefferson County, W. Va.:

DEDICATION OF WAR SERVICE ROLL, JEFFERSON COUNTY, W. VA.

About 10 days ago my colleague and good friend, your very distinguished Representative in the Congress of the United States, Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, prevailed upon me to participate in your service today. I must admit that at first I did so just for him and because he is such a fine fellow. But then when I questioned him about Charles Town and he told me that this place and Jefferson County contains the finest people in the world, and that you maintain the traditions that have made our country great, and that I really ought to visit this beautiful old city, I gave in and assented.

I do not need to tell you that JENNINGS RANDOLPH of Randolph County, W. Va., is a man of great ability, because that is doubtless one of the good reasons why you keep on sending him to the Congress. But in Washington we have found that out, too. With great distinction, he handles one of the most difficult jobs we have. As chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, he really is the uncrowned mayor of Washington.

But I did not come here to tell you, who know him so well, of JENNINGS RANDOLPH. He would be with you here himself were it not for the fact that at this same hour he is performing this same service in his home city of Elkins. He is today dedicating the War Service Roll of Randolph County. He asked me particularly to present to you his warmest greetings with his regrets.

And so it was that I accepted this invitation to address you today and to attempt in my poor way to substitute for him on this occasion.

I thought it might be well, before coming here, to learn something about Charles Town and Jefferson County, and launched upon a study of its history. I had not gone very far in my brief research before it dawned upon me that some of my own forebears had lived in the great Shenandoah Valley in early times, and my heart quickened to the task. Eagerness to learn more led me on. If I now tell you much that you already know forgive me, for to me it is new-found knowledge and of greatest interest.

JEFFERSON COUNTY, W. VA.

This county is indeed in an unique geographical position, an enviable one. Not many counties lies in the renowned Shenandoah Valley, and this one lies in the fertile lower valley where the Shenandoah joins the Potomac as that great stream breaks through the famous Blue Ridge Mountains on its course to Chesapeake Bay and the ocean. Who has not heard of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia—and what student of American history has not heard of the Shenandoah Valley? Here is that place of song and story of rugged pioneers, of valiant men and splendid women who joined in building America.

Out of Spottsylvania County came Orange County in 1735.

Out of Orange County came Frederick County in 1738.

Thirty years later there came Col. Charles Washington, brother of George and Samuel, who acquired many acres of land in Frederick County, and in 1786 set apart 80 acres upon which he laid out Charles Town, this beautiful place.

Out of Frederick County came Berkeley County in 1772.

And from Berkeley County was born Jefferson County with its seat at Charles Town. in 1801, the year that Thomas Jefferson of Virginia took office as the third President of the United States. April 13 of this year marked the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Here it is that the ancient Indian trail from the west broke through the last gap, now known as Harpers Ferry Gap, en route to tidewater—that trail became known as the Conestoga wagon road as settlers driving ox teams moved from tidewater back into the wilderness. It is here that George Washington, as a young engineer, surveyed and plotted a new road to the Ohio River that ultimately became the road bed of a great railroad, the Baltimore and Ohio. It was the Shenandoah that felt most frequently the ebb and flow of the fortunes of that awful catatstrophe that descended upon us in the last century—the War between the States. It is said that Winchester, a few miles to the south of us changed hands from Blue to Grey and back and forth 76 times in those terrible years.

Farther up the Shenandoah to the south on Linville Creek lie the broad acres of John Lincoln, father of Capt. Robert Lincoln, great-grandfather of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator.

And, of course, Harpers Ferry, where I was met this morning, is a name burned deep in the heart of every school child.

And it was in 1859 here in the courthouse of Charles Town that John Brown was tried for treason to the State and a month later taken to be hanged by the neck at a place not far away. In the ranks of the militiamen who mounted guard at the execution stood John Wilkes Booth, who was to be the assassin of Abraham Lincoln, while Maj. Thomas J. Jackson, who became Gen. Stonewall Jackson, commanded a section of howitzers. "John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in his grave" (in New Elba, N. Y., whence taken by his wife).

In 1721 Spottsylvania County included most of northwestern Virginia, a place of indefinite and almost unknown boundary. In fact, the Colony and Dominion of Virginia in those days extended to the Mississippi River and to Lake Superior. It included what are now the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia—a vast domain that only a few venturesome and brave men had passed through.

I do not know the then limits of Spottsylvania County, but the county seat was Orange Court House in Virginia. Within its jurisdiction was the Sherundo or the Shenandoah Valley.

To the Sherundo came a few settlers from Pennsylvania, mostly German, Irish, Scotch-Irish, and English, beginning in about 1725 or 1726. In 1730 two men who must have traveled through this valley repaired to Richmond, and on October 28 of that year were granted application for 100,000 acres of land on the west side of the Opequon and in the valley of the Sherundo. They were Alexander Ross and Morgan Bryan. Their purpose was to obtain settlers for this land, and the lands were held for them under condition that they obtain 100 families to settle upon and develop them.

Five years later they had obtained at least 70 of the 100 families and had evidently placed them on the land, for in the State land office at Richmond in book 16, pages 315 to 415, may be found the records of 36 of the 70 patents known to have been issued—all on the same date—November 12, 1735. These patents all recite that the grantee is one of 70 families brought to the land by Alexander Ross and Morgan Bryan. Many other families were brought here by one Joist Hite, a German, and by Robert McKay, Sr., under similar arrangements, and like patents were granted them. Many of the families brought by Hite and by McKay have remained in the valley, while most of those brought by Ross and Bryan moved on south and westward between 1750 and 1800.

Curiously enough these Crown grants were made under the ancient English tenure of "in fee and common socage and not in capite or knight service" which later led to much difficulty with the family of Lord Fairfax who claimed these lands as lords proprietors of the northern neck of Virginia.

In 1735 when the land upon which we now stand may have been originally granted, it had a distant tie. It was stated in the patents that these lands were a part of the manor of East Greenwich in the county of Kent in England. That was 208 years ago. Among those who received such Crown grants were John Mills, George Hobson, John Beals, and William Hunt. Through their descendants I have a blood kinship to this valley, of which I am very proud. A few miles south of here near the South Fork of Bullskin Run may be found the remnants of their place of worship, Bullskin, later Berkeley Friends Meeting.

It is interesting to note here that Robert Worthington, of Quarry Banks, Cheshire,

England, received a grant of 3,000 acres on Evitts Marsh, which estate he promptly named "Quarry Banks New Stile," after his former home. It is possible that this grant embraced the site of Charles Town. It was his son, Robert Worthington, who erected St. George's Chapel, which was said to be the most costly chapel in Virginia at that time. Its now ancient ruins are but a short way from this place. Thomas Worthington, his son, removed to Ohio and settled in Rose County of that State and became the sixth Governor of Ohio.

Following the dread French and Indian wars which ravaged this valley—the outpost of Virginia—after the Shawnees, the Delawares, the Tuscaroras, and the Sioux had been pushed farther to the West, there came here to settle people of distinguished names from the Tidewater sections of Virginia.

Lawrence and Samuel Washington, brothers of George Washington, purchased portions of the Worthington estate, and Samuel built upon a part of the land his famous estate known then and now as Harewood. It was at Harewood that James Madison, fourth President of the United States, was married to Lucy Payne Todd, a widow whose sister was the wife of George Steptoe Washington, son of Samuel and nephew of George.

Some time prior to 1740 came Edward Lucas to live nearby on a plantation which he named "Cold Spring." I presume Lucas Creek is named for him. His grandson, Edward Lucas, became the eleventh Governor of Ohio. Other descendants were Edward and William Lucas, who represented this district in the Congress, and Daniel Bedinger Lucas, a distinguished United States Senator.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

In fact, my friends, were one to assemble a roster of our country's great and adventurous whose forebears settled upon this land when it was a wilderness, the list would be long and distinguished, even as is this roll of those who have gone now from this county to serve their country in its hour of peril. I see upon this roll many whose names have been a part of these broad lands for two centuries and many who have come here following in their footsteps. These are the great of today and tomorrow. These are your sons and daughters—your husbands and brothers and sisters.

May the great God of our fathers, Grand Architect of the universe, in whom is all wisdom and power and glory, bless their valiant undertaking to defend this noble land, our heritage, from its savage enemies, and preserve to us their lives while they defend our homeland.

May they return to us one day soon in glorious victory over those who would destroy us, bringing gladness to our hearts and happiness to our firesides once more.

And may we here have the will and the courage and the fortitude at home to do those things necessary; to make those small sacrifices in their honor to have awaiting them a land worthy of them, a land of freedom and happiness, a land of opportunity, a land of liberty under law, a worthy home for the brave.

And now let us in the words of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, reaffirm our belief:

"That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

And finally, as we here dedicate this roll of honor of those who serve our country in this war, reaffirm our determination to carry on to our last breath today's fight for freedom:

"We most solemnly, before God and the world, declare that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers which our beneficent Creator hath graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume, we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolve to die freemen rather than to live slaves."

NOTES TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS

Material for this address has been obtained from a number of sources. Much of the history of Jefferson County, W. Va., subsequent to the opening of the French and Indian wars is well written but most of the historical writers are apparently satisfied to treat its earlier history very lightly. True—the remnants of the basic material still in existence are not assembled and may be exceedingly difficult to find, but it is a task that should, and, it is to be hoped, may be undertaken by one who will not be overly dazzled by the stars in the geneological firmament of early Virginia.

Some leads to this material may be found in a volume entitled "Hopewell Friends History, 1734–1934," by John W. Wayland and others, published in 1936 by Shenandoah Publishing House, Inc., of Strasburg, Va.

From a facsimile on page 42 of that work the following is a poor reading:

At a council held at the Capitol the 20th day of October, 1730.

Present: The Governor, Robert Carter; James Blair; William Byrd; Cole Diggs; John Robinson; John Grymes; William Dandridge; William Randolph, Esq.

Alexander Ross and Morgan Bryan, of the province of Pennsylvania, having by petition to this board, set forth that they and divers other families of the said province, amounting to 100 are desirous to remove from thence and settle themselves in the Government praying that 100,000 acres of land lying on the west and north side of the river Opeckon and extending thence to a mountain called the North Mountain and along the river Cohongaruton [upper Potomac] and on any part of the river Sherundo [Shenandoah] not already granted to any other person may be granted to them in as many tracts or dividends as shall be necessary for the accommodation of the aforesaid number of families. The Governour, with the advice of the council, is pleased to order as it is hereby ordered that the said Alexander Ross and Morgan Bryan, the petitioners in behalf of themselves, and their partner have liberty to take up the said quantity of 100,000 acres of land within the limits above described and that upon the above number of families coming to dwell there within 2 years patents shall be granted them in such manner as they shall agree to divide the same and in the meantime it is ordered that the said lands be reserved free from the entry of any other person.

Pursuant to this order in council, and amendments and extensions no doubt, patents were issued first to 70 families substantially in the following form (p. 12, Hopewell Friends History), all of these patents bearing the same date, November 12, 1735:

"George the Second, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith, etc.,

"To All Whom these Presents may come: Greeting,

"Know Ye, that for divers good Causes and Considerations but more especially for the consideration mentioned in an Order of Our Lieut-Governor and Council of our Colony and Dominion of Virginia, bearing date the three and twentieth day of April One Thousand Seven Hundred and thirty-five, Granting leave to Alexander Ross and Morgan Bryan to survey in such manner as they should think fit, one thousand acres of land for each family of seventy families by them brought in to Our said Colony and settled upon the lands in the said Order mentioned and to sue out patents for the same; We have given Granted and confirmed and by the Presents do give Grant and confirm unto Isaac Perkins one certain tract or parcel of Land containing Seven Hundred and twenty-five acres and bounded as followeth, To wit: Beginning at a red oak on the West side of a Branch that runs into Opeckon next below the Branch which John Calvert lives on, and running thence with [*sic*] eighty West one hundred and three poles to a red oak, thence North twenty five degrees West one hundred and twenty poles to a white oak, thence North twenty eight degrees West one hundred and forty two poles to a red oak, thence north thirty eight degrees West sixty two poles to a red oak, thence north-west one hundred and twenty poles to a hickory, thence North forty degrees West eighty three poles to a hickory, thence North fifty degrees East eighty three poles crossing a small meadow to a red oak, thence south thirty six degrees East eighty poles, thence South sixty two degrees East one hundred poles to a hickory and red oak, thence South seventy five degrees East thirty seven poles, thence North fifteen degrees East one hundred poles, thence south seventy five degrees East forty four poles, thence South fifteen degrees East one hundred poles, thence South-east one hundred poles to a small hickory, thence South nine degrees East sixty seven poles to a Spanish oak, thence South twenty five degrees East thirty one poles to a hickory, thence South thirty degrees East seventy four poles to a white oak, thence South sixty six degrees East sixty six poles to a crooked red oak, thence North eleven degrees East one hundred and nine poles to a hickory, thence, South forty degrees East one hundred and twenty two poles to a red oak, thence South twenty degrees West sixty two poles to a red oak thense South fifty five degrees East sixty one poles to a red oak, thence south East fifty four poles to a white oak by a meadow, thence south west crossing the same forty poles to a hickory, thence north sixty eight degrees West one hundred and sixty poles to the Beginning; with all woods, underwood, swamps, marshes, low grounds, meadows, feedings, and his due share of all veins, mines and quarries, as well discovered as not discovered, within the bounds aforesaid and being part of the said quantity of seven hundred and twenty five acres of Land, and the rivers, waters, and water courses therein contained, together with the privilege of Hunting, Hawking, Fishing, Fowling, and all other profits, commodities and Hereditaments whatsoever to the same or any part thereof belonging or anywise appertaining. To Have and To Hold, possess and enjoy the said tract or parcel of Land and all other the before Granted premises and every part thereof, with their and every of their appurtenances, unto the said Isaac Perkins his heirs and assigns forever, to the only use and behoof of him, the said Isaac Perkins his heirs and assign forever. To be held for Us Our Heirs and Succcessors as of our Manor of East Greenwich in the County of Kent, in fee and Common Soccage, and not in Capite or by Knight Service; Yielding and paying unto Us, our Heirs and Successors, for every fifty acres of Land, the fee rent of one shilling yearly, to be paid upon the Feast of Saint Michael the Archangel, and also cultivating and improving three acres part of fifty of the tract above mentioned, within three years after the date of these presents. Provided always, that if three years of the said fee rent shall at any time be in arrears and unpaid, or if the said Isaac Perkins, his heirs or assigns do not within the speace of three years next coming, after the date of these presents Cultivate and improve three acres part of every fifty of the tract above mentioned, then the estate, cease and be utterly determined, and thereafter it shall, and

may be, lawful to and for Us, Our Heirs, and Successors, to Grant the same Lands and appurtenances unto such other person or persons, as We, Our Heirs and Successors, shall think fit. In Witness whereof, We have caused, these Our letters patent to be made. Witness Our trusty and well beloved William Gooch, Esq., Our Lieut. Governor & Commander in Chief of Our said Colony and Dominion at Williamsburg, under the Seals of said Colony, the twelfth day of Novr. one thousand seven hundred and thirty five, in the ninth year of Our Reign.

"WILLIAM GOOCH."

A volume entitled "Shenandoah Valley Pioneers and Their Descendants 1738–1908" by T. K. Cartmell, on page 250, states as follows:

"CHAPTER XLVII. GEORGE WASHINGTON, SURVEYOR, CITIZEN, SOLDIER, LEGISLATOR, AND PRESIDENT

"George Washington, the young surveyor for Lord Fairfax, and his two brothers, Samuel and Charles Washington, may be very properly classed with the early settlers of Frederick County. George acquired title to certain large tracts of land from Lord Fairfax. Some are designated the Bullskin surveys. One contained 550 acres, several other tracts were purchased from lessees of Fairfax. While Lawrence purchased several tracts in 1747, he was not a resident of the county. Samuel and Charles settled on this land, and continued as residents of the valley. Samuel lived on a tract near the site of Charlestown, Jefferson County. Charles owned the site, and laid out the town, and the village took his name. (See notes on towns.) Their homesteads were established prior to 1750, and maintain individuality to this day. Harewood, a large stone structure, still standing in good repair, was built in 1749–50 by Col. Samuel Washington. Large families were reared on these historic plantations. Many of the names became prominent both in the civil and military life of the Shenandoah Valley. The last male member of the family, Capt. Bushrod C. Washington, removed the remnant of his family to the State of Washington during the preparation of these notes. Colonel Samuel was a member of the old Justices' Court in 1771, and a vestry man of Norborne Parish.

"Augustine Washington owned large tracts in Frederick County in the vicinity of Old Hopewell Meeting House. Part of this land became the property of George Fayette Washington, born 1790, died 1867. His son, Maj. Burwell B. Washington (known as Bird), born 1830, died 1868, married Miss Buchannan. She and their only child, Miss Birdie B. Washington, are all that are left in the valley bearing the name. The old homestead, Waverly, is owned by them, though they reside in Washington, D. C. Augustine Washington executed a deed for several tracts. His signature was attested by George Washington and others. The family seal was used; the originals are in the old clerk's office at this writing, bearing date June 19, 1752."

It is believed that the author, T. K. Cartwell, has generalized too freely in stating "Samuel and Charles settled on this land" that had been acquired from Lord Fairfax and purchased from lessees of Fairfax, for it is known that some of these lands such as those purchased from heirs of Robert Worthington, Sr., were direct grants of the Crown through the Governor and Council and were "in fee and common socage and not in capite or knight service."

It seemed of some importance, historically, to learn something of the chain of title anteceding the ownership by Col. Charles Washington of the lands from which he set aside the 80 acres upon which he established the city of Charles Town in 1786. Hence some research was conducted by the Congressional Library on this point, among existing publications of students and societies, there being no direct evidence available in records that could be found readily.

A footnote commencing on page 392 of the Virginia Magazine of History and Biography for the year ending June 1908 (vol. 15) concerning "The Last Charter for the Northern Neck," which is therein reproduced, reads as follows:

"The Northern Neck of Virginia was probably at first supposed to include only the peninsula between the Potomac and Rappahannock up to the head of tidewater; but under the construction finally given the Culpepper-Fairfax grant, it included the present counties of Northumberland, Lancaster, Richmond, Westmoreland, Stafford, King George, Prince William, Fairfax, Loudoun, Fauquier, Culpepper, Madison, Page, Shenandoah, and Frederick in Virginia; and Jefferson, Berkeley, Hardy, Hampshire, and Morgan in West Virginia.

"This section of Virginia at an early date attracted the attention of persons desirous of obtaining a great amount of land in the Colony. In 1639, the Somers Islands Co., petitioned the King for a grant of the lands between the Rappahannock and Potomac, as a compensation for the small size of their own colony (Virginia Magazine, Historical and Biog., XII, 396). No response appears to have been made to this petition; but Charles II, while in exile, issued letters patent, dated at St. Germains on Ley, September 18, 1650, granting all the country between the Rappahannock and Potomac, and up to their heads, to Ralph, Lord Hopton, Henry, Lord Jermyn, afterward Earl of St. Albans; John Lord Culpeper; Sir John Berkeley, afterward Lord Berkeley, of Stratton; Sir William Morton, afterward one of the justices of the King's Bench; Sir Dudley Wyatt and Thomas Culpeper. No copy of this patent is known to the writer; but it is recited in later ones. Sir Dudley Wyatt came to Virginia to look after the interests of the patentees; but died in 1651, and as the Colony was soon after surrendered to the Parliament no further action was taken at this time. The patent is said to have been renewed by Charles II, in 1662; but probably there was no new grant. On pages 84, 85 of the Report of the Virginia Commissioners on the Maryland and Virginia boundary line (Richmond, 1873) is the abstract of a letter from the King, dated August 3, 1663, to the Governor of Virginia, describing the original grant, and stating that the original letters patent had miscarried (been lost), and that the patentees had assigned their rights for a term of years to Sir Humphry Hooke, and others. The Virginia government was to give these persons aid and assistance. There is a copy of this letter in the De Jarnette Papers (Virginia State library) No. 80.

"On May 8, 1669, as some of the original patentees were dead, and others had sold their interests, the King issued a new grant of the Northern Neck, to the Earl of St. Albans, Lord Berkeley, Sir William Morton, and John Tretheway. There is a copy of this patent in De Jarnette Papers, No. 94. Subsequently, Thomas, Lord Culpeper, son of Lord Culpeper, became the owner by purchase, of the rights of the other grantees, and on September 27, 1688, James II, issued to him the patent here printed. After being held for a time by Lord Culpeper's widow, and by his daughter and heiress, Katherine, who married Thomas, Lord Fairfax, the great property came, in 1722, to Thomas, Lord Fairfax, son of the last named, who was the last owner, and died at Greenway Court, Frederick County, Va., March 12, 1782.

"See William and Mary Quarterly, VI, 222–226, for a valuable account of the Northern Neck and its proprietors; Kercheval's History of the Valley (edition 1902), pp. 156–173, including report of C. J. Faulkner; the briefs of John Howard, Esq., in the case of *Morris and others* v. *the United States* (in U. S. Supreme Court); Calendar of Virginia State Papers, I, 223–231, 239–241.

"The Northern Neck was never a palatinate. Except in regard to escheated lands, this section was as fully under the civil and military control of the government at Jamestown and Williamsburg as any other part of the Colony."

From the foregoing it could be deduced that Lord Fairfax, having acquired rights as Lord Proprietor of the Northern Neck of Virginia by marriage, inheritance, and purchase from Lord Culpepper hired George Washington, in part to survey the Shenandoah Valley in order to learn what lands remained to him that had not been granted in patents by the Governor and Council at Richmond. It is quite possible that the lands of which the site of Charles Town is a part was among the unpatented parcels and that Lord Fairfax either sold or delivered this land to George Washington in payment for services, and that the latter then transferred a part or all of same to his brother Charles.

It is quite possible that the site of Charles Town was a part of the 3,000 acres on Evitts Marsh which was granted to Robert Worthington by Crown patent. Research to resolve this question would contribute much to the history of Jefferson County while adding to the existing knowledge of those times in the Shenandoah Valley. At all events it is well known that the confusion of rights between the Fairfax family and the grantees under Crown patents, and their heirs, induced many suits at law that occupied the attention of the courts of Virginia for years.

It is indeed unfortunate that so many of the old records were destroyed when Richmond was burned. Historians and historical societies have been struggling ever since to reassemble the information lost and to them, all credit for their faithful labors.

Resolution of the Lithuanian-American Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

WATERBURY LITHUANIAN-
AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn.

Congressman B. J. MONKIEWICZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a mass meeting held at Waterbury, Conn., on June 27, 1943, under the auspices of the Lithuanian-American Council, Inc., an organization newly created by the union of all Lithuanian groups anxious for a free and democratic Lithuania, with the purpose of lending all possible aid to the United States toward the successful prosecution of the war, and with the added aim of fostering a just and lastting peace among nations, the following resolution was passed by the unanimous vote of the 1,500 delegates and members there assembled:

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania is the struggling victim of an unprovoked invasion and occupation at the hands of Nazi tyrants; and

"Whereas the people of Lithuania have persevered and remained loyal to the principles of freedom and democracy upon which their nation was built, and still resist every attempt made to subjugate them or to assimilate them into a foreign state; and

"Whereas the loyal hearts of our relatives and countrymen again appeal to the leadership of the United States and her allies for inspiration and deliverance from the heavy oppressor's yoke: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we affirm our complete support of the cause of the United States and the policies of its leaders in their efforts to restore a world of free peoples; and

"Resolved, That we favor a peace wherein Lithuania, and the other peoples comprising the Baltic states, will be granted the territorial integrity and the freedoms promised them under the tenets of the Atlantic Charter; and

"Resolved, That we unite in our efforts to establish the Lithuanian State, restoring her to her place as a free, democratic, and independent nation safe from the hands of the Axis aggressors; be it finally

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to the Connecticut Members of both Houses of Congress."

CLARENCE V. BALANDA, *Chairman.*
MARCELLE ANDRIKIS, *Secretary.*

Food Subsidies—Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PEHR G. HOLMES
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation:

MASSACHUSETTS FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Waltham, Mass., June 7, 1943.

To all Massachusetts Members of Congress:

There are two matters before Congress on which our board of directors wishes you to know their opinion representing 2,200 farm families in this commonwealth.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

They are absolutely opposed to the use of subsidies to hide the real cost of food at a time when the Massachusetts division of the necessaries of life reports average wages in the State the highest on record, and increased far beyond the percentage increase in the cost of living.

Paying food subsidies out of borrowed money appears to commonsense farmers a more inflationary practice than to have consumers pay the price food costs out of their current earnings.

But the worst aspect of subsidies on food is in another field. Our Government would make a fatal mistake to put the livelihood of 25,000,000 farm people, the backbone of democracy, at the beck and call of political appointees, with all the chance for loss of independence and for political maneuvering such a course would entail. I hope you will read the editorial from our Massachusetts Farm Bureau paper on this subject, which is attached.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The second matter is Farm Security Administration. There has been no serious criticism of the operations of Farm Security in this State, or in New England, where its operations have been on only a small scale. You are already informed of the abuses reported in some parts of the country. Our board believes, however, that Farm Security Administration costs far more than it is worth to farm people; and that its loaning functions could be better and more economically performed by the efficient and experienced Farm Credit Administration; and its agricultural and household advisory functions by the efficient and experienced Agricultural Extension Service.

Put in another way, the millions now appropriated for separate farm security would bring the country and farm people a very much greater return under the effective management of Farm Credit Administration and Extension Service. We believe that were the Farm Security Administration staff transferred to the Extension Service, which is heavily burdened, they would accomplish an immense amount more both for the small and insecure farmers for whom Farm Security Administration was set up and for all farmers, than they do at present.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD S. RUSSELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

IS IT SAFE?

Is it safe to place 25,000,000 farm people in a position where the prices of their products and their cash income depend completely on the whims of Government officials?

Is it safe, we repeat? What will become of democracy and representative government if we add a quarter of our population at one stroke to the millions of Government employees and pensioners of all kinds now dependent on Federal largess; and that quarter composed of our rural people, the most independent sector of our citizenship?

This question seems never to have entered the thought of those who confidently seek subsidies to keep food prices low. They are concerned only about the effects of such a program in terms of money. They want to side-step inflation without resorting to the heavy taxation which alone appears capable of accomplishing this result. But what will be the effects of widespread subsidies in terms of freedom, of citizenship, and of our Nation's future? Our subsidy friends point to Great Britain and say that a subsidy program there has worked successfully. Great Britain is a small country geographically with a relatively low proportion of farm people. It imports most of its food. When it comes to agricultural policy, Great Britain is certainly far from a model. She has debased her agriculture for a century in order to boost her foreign trade, and now in the hour of her peril must resort to expedients.

The United States, on the contrary, was founded as a nation of farmers. Even though their relative proportions have decreased, this great body of rural people still furnishes a sharp contrast as to quality of government to the graft-ridden and inert population of the great cities. The farm people furnish the balance wheel that keeps us functioning as a democracy.

Just at the moment when we are paying reverence to that great statesman and rural leader, Thomas Jefferson, who foresaw just this, it is seriously proposed to place this great farm population at the mercy of politics, of hand-outs. Such a step would create a politician's paradise, where the honest independent man would have no place, no voice, and where all the favors would go to him who bows down and does as he is told.

American farmers fear subsidies, and they fear them with good reason. Such a carefully planned and well-founded program as Agricultural Adjustment Administration and soil conservation has already shown the possibilities for control and patronage that lie in payments by the Government. The mistakes of the well-intentioned but misguided Office of Price Administration officials, on the other hand, point out the dangers that face the farmers themselves in attempts to control prices.

We are fooling ourselves as to economics when we think that subsidies will prevent inflation. But far more important than that, let us pause long enough before we embark on such immense perils to the privileges of citizenship for which we are fighting. (Farm Bureau in Massachusetts, May 1943.)

Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the Women's Army Corps, delivered on July 4 by Rev. George W. Casey on the National Broadcasting Co. network Catholic Hour:

I come to you to report on the distaff side of the Army, the Women's Army Corps; its spiritual and moral health.

Let me state at the outset that the Army is on the side of religion. For religion and patriotism go together; they grow together; they support and strengthen each other. They are cousins, of a sort. They derive from the same grandparent, the cardinal virtue of justice, down through the special virtue of piety; that is the virtue that inclines man to recognize and reverence the source of good and benefit to himself—in this instance, God and country. Or, as someone has put it in another way—the mystic chords which bind the human heart to faith and fatherland lie close together; what strikes upon one reverberates along the other. The Army knows this and it knows the comfort and courage religion imparts—the discipline it imposes, the sacrifice it inspires in the embattled soldier. So it wants more religion. It reaches out for every chaplain it can get; gives him a chapel whenever possible—assistants, transportation, equipment, and supplies—to amplify himself, to enable him to meet the spiritual needs and desire of every soldier. The typical commanding officer wants the fullest religious program that the exigencies of a strenuous training schedule or combat conditions will allow.

Here at our own post—we have the same set-up in the Women's Army Corps as in the Army—with the active cooperation of our commanding officers, we have a full program of Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic services. And we modestly maintain that a devout person can live as full a religious life as in the average parish in America.

However, some of our members do get away from the habit of church-going. There are a variety of reasons—the break-up of their old routine, the loss of their familiar parish church, and, probably the most important cause, the absence of parental direction. Sometimes it is duty—though War Depart-

ment regulations permit excuse from all but the most essential duties—sometimes it is distance and sometimes it is plain distraction from long hours, loneliness, the press of studies, and training.

But more, I think come back to church than fall away. Many look at life seriously for the first time and reorganize themselves accordingly. Bad habits are broken in the Women's Army Corps as well as good ones. Loneliness makes some turn to the church to fill in the gap. Then again in the Army, the mountain goes to Mohammed. The church literally goes to the man out on bivouac and maneuvers, in trucks and into tents, wherever the men or, in our case, the women go, the mass goes, too. And even the lukewarm are captured by this. New friends are made, too; for church is thrust directly in front of those who have had no church experience before. And, a congregation, kneeling devout and rapt before an altar in the open field, preaches a better sermon than the preacher himself. We've all heard men who have never seen a mass before declare that they were strangely moved and attracted by it. Though we may say this about the chaplain, he can do more to bring his people to church in the Army than he could in civilian life, because he is closer to them. In the Army he shares their life, he is one of them. And, I must mention, too, as a most helpful factor in bringing members to church, those splendid girls whose type is so familiar to all clergymen of experience, who are always, but gently and unobtrusively, inviting their sisters back to church or bringing them in for the first time. Women incline to religion and so does the Women's Army Corps.

The Women's Army Corps is on the side of morality, too. It has many suggestions for the members' leisure time—which is temptation time—sports, shows, dances, concerts, books, but licentiousness, never. It is concerned with that which killeth the body, but not unconcerned with that which killeth the soul. The commanding officers, right down to the company officers, and especially the company officers, look upon themselves as guardians of the girls you parents have entrusted to them, watching and worrying over them, as you would yourselves. Whatever moral danger threatens them isn't due to the Women's Army Corps or its lack of vigilance; it isn't due entirely to the war—it's due to the same causes as in civilian life, namely, the current lack of consciousness of sin; and loss of the fear of God. Those who have been jeering at purity in song and show and book are the guilty ones. Until we put conscience back in control of the affairs of boys and girls, we will have trouble in and out of the service.

The Women's Army Corps is not a choir of angels: but a corps of women of flesh and blood; when they get tired and depressed some of them may strain a little after relaxation and diversion. There were, too, in the beginning, members whose moral and physical stamina was untested, who were woefully unaware of the impact of fatigue, homesickness and restriction of liberty on a frail spirit. And there were some who were just adventuring. A few of those were bound to fall from grace—since most of them were neither helpful nor happy, they have by now almost all gone home. The wonder isn't that there were moral failures, but that there were so few.

It is an understatement to say that on the whole the Women's Army Corps are a hard-working, high-minded, patriotic lot of girls, somewhat amazed at what has been said about them. From my own observation and experience, and not because of wishful thinking, I will say that their service has been for some a means of grace and the beginning of a new peace and diginity of soul. Others are lifting themselves up to permanently higher levels of living by their unstinting devotion, their willing sacrifice and their quiet endurance. They are finding new strength and new satisfactions, a new direction of life and a new nobility. And, I will further say that I have met here, some of the most devout and decent women I have ever known.

Women have engaged in war before without loss of gentleness and grace. Our own nuns went out onto the battlefield of the Civil War and came back without tarnish but with new distinction and honor. Corregidor was no place for women—but our nurses didn't shock the men with whom they shared hardship and danger, but thrilled and heartened them and the whole country. And won everlasting glory for their corps. If women can endure the sights and sounds of the battlefield and the dressing station without being coarsened and made unwomanly, then surely they can do the jobs the Women's Army Corps are undertaking without damage to their sweeter selves. Long ago a maid achieved sanctity by her soldiering. She clothed her slight form in shining armor and went off to the wars, indifferent to the surprise and scorn of men, listening only to the voice within. She revitalized her faltering king and his failing armies and led them on to victory. Our women soldiers in the spirit of St. Joan of Arc are not only marching on to victory over our visible foes, but over those implacable enemies of the soul, the world, the flesh, and the devil, and are keeping themselves clean and unspotted.

When one of our public men was visiting in Russian front lines—he asked his host how much of the front he was defending. The young general quickly retorted "Defending, sir? I'm attacking." I feel that way about this talk that I am not defending the Women's Army Corps so much as attacking the unchivalrous, ungrateful, and unjust criticism of their Corps. What they have a right to expect is the praise and thanks of all Americans.

When the War Department declared its urgent need of supplementing its manpower because of the enormous demands of total and global war, they were the first to answer the call. Eager and impatient to go all-out, on full time, for their country. They left their loved ones; they left their homes, where they had been shielded from danger, sheltered from hardship, and saved from labor. They left good jobs for which they had trained and waited long for tasks that were humble and hard. Resolute and unafraid, 100 percent volunteer, no laws or public opinion urging them on, they marched out to whatever awaited them, the long labors of the training centers or the foam of perilous seas and foreign lands, forlorn. They were not content with the old assignment of women in war "for men must work and women must weep." They insisted upon working with the patience, faithfulness, and devotion that is characteristic of women. As their director says "They are determined to make their new chapter of American history a serious contribution and not a feminine footnote." And the Chief of Staff of the United States Army testifies that "commanders have spoken in the highest terms of their efficiency and value." (Telegram from Women's Army Corps headquarters, June 19, 1943.)

The Declaration of Independence, the beginning of the life and greatness of our Republic was the work of a comparatively few men. It was rather the result of the prophetic and providential vision, the political genius, and the constant preaching of Samuel Adams, Thomas Paine, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and a handful of others than the spontaneous rising of the people. It was implemented by the force of personality and military leadership of George Washington and Lafayette. And though the war was long and drawn out and it impoverished the country, there were not a great many of the citizens engaged at a time. But, unhappily, wars have grown since then in scope and involvement, so now it is not army against army, but people against people. The enemy is still mighty; he has concentrated all the national energy and attention upon war for years and unless we mobilize all our resources and all our powers and all our prayers, we will not prevail against him. The keeping of the Declaration of Independence and indeed the independence of the world from ruthless domination, from fanatical dictatorship, from the powers of darkness is not in the hands of a few, not in the hands of the Army and Navy alone, but in the hands of all of us. Nobody can lie back, nobody can sit it out—it is everybody's fight this time. That's the way the women of the Women's Army Corps feel and that's why they went to war.

Take Off These Handcuffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

TAKE OFF THESE HANDCUFFS

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

New and further sensations are promised for next Friday when the Congressional Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission resumes hearings. If the revelations to come are more staggering than those made on the opening day of the hearings, last Friday, they will be stunners. On opening day, Eugene Garey, counsel for the investigating committee, disclosed that the Army and Navy distrust the Federal Communications Commission and have asked the President to take away from it control of a staff which conducts "radio intelligence" work, polite term for radio espionage and counterespionage.

Garey read into the record letters and documents concerning activities of the Federal Communications Commission, and to its chairman, James L. Fly, which he said "constitute a danger and menace to national security."

Garey said the Federal Communications Commission is also accused of being "entirely motivated by political partiality and favoritism in the performance of its duties" and "its powers are unlawfully exercised for the purpose of furthering its own political ideologies and philosophies."

One more. "The radio industry has been so purposefully terrorized by the Commission that it is enslaved and lives in an unremitting state of fear, as a result of which it acquiesces in every whim and caprice of the Commission."

That is tough talk. And the word is that the congressional committee expects to demonstrate proof of the charges by documented, detailed evidence.

As to that, we will see. Congress plans to adjourn shortly, and there are no other big investigations on just now unless the Jesse

Jones-Wallace controversy gets off to an unexpectedly quick start, so this Federal Communications Commission investigation is likely to get a lot of attention during these next few weeks.

But whatever happens in detail, the fact remains that the Federal Communications Commission is in a bad way, and needs a going over. Herewith, the background.

The Federal Communications was one of the first projects of the New Deal, and has been an excellent demonstration of its basic philosophy toward private industry, property, and free enterprise.

Radio transmission was at the beginning of the First World War just about where television was at the beginning of this war—proved in the laboratory and waiting only on the breaks to emerge into the common stream of affairs.

World War No. 1 gave it a tremendous push forward, knocked together small companies warring for trade position, and brought the broadcasting of news and entertainment into being as a gigantic industry.

The peculiarities of radio transmission, that one station may pirate into another's territory and crowd out its program if there is no firm division of fields, in time brought the need for aerial traffic cops.

The first United States radio law was passed in 1910. It was a mere requirement that users of ship wireless obtain licenses from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor. In 1912 it was revised, but still there was no power given by Congress to withhold a license from any applicant.

The 1912 law stayed on the books until 1927, by which time radio had long since outgrown the field of mere ship's wireless, and the anarchy of program piracy was in danger of wrecking the whole, battling new industry of broadcasting.

The 1927 act provided for a radio commission of five members to grant broadcasting licenses and really act as aerial traffic cop between the tooth-and-claw competitors.

But radio kept on outrunning the regulators, so that it was obvious by 1933 that the act needed broadening again. This gave the New Dealers their chance.

The Federal Communications Commission as we know it today came into existence with the act of 1934, which in effect swept all property rights out from under the holder of a radio license and made him a mere dependent upon the Government.

His license, as of today, is for 2 years only. The law and the regulations attached thereto, really do make the radio broadcaster entirely dependent upon the Federal Communications Commission as to whether he will stay in business. Of independence in radio there is none. The whole industry is at the finger's beck of Government.

That is the basic vice in the Federal Communications Commission Act of 1934—its destruction of property rights in radio and the immediately consequent wreck of free, independent behavior by radio operators.

The committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission has a chance to show up that vice, if it will, and to demonstrate what happens when men are made entirely dependent upon governmental bureaucracy for their daily bread.

Once that is shown, maybe Congress will start to roll back oppressions laid upon us all in the past 10 years, not only in radio but all across the field of business enterprise and daily living.

The New Deal laid those oppressions on us calling them reforms.

They are not reforms, they are handcuffs. The affairs of this country cannot really be moved ahead until they are unlocked.

Six-Point Program Outlined for Meat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times:

SIX-POINT PROGRAM OUTLINED FOR MEAT—PLOESER, OF MISSOURI, SENDS HIS PLAN TO VINSON, BROWN, OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION, AND MARVIN JONES—SET-UP CALLED WORKABLE—REPRESENTATIVE SAYS HE DREW IT WITH AID OF ALL SEGMENTS OF THE INDUSTRY

WASHINGTON, July 4.—A workable meat program drawn up after conferences with representatives of all factors in the meat industry today was presented to Federal food officials by Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, Republican, of Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER's program, which was submitted by letter to Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization; Prentiss Brown, Price Administrator; and Marvin Jones, Food Administrator; embodies these six major points:

SIX POINTS IN PROGRAM

1. Revision of the War Meat Board to include industrial elements not now represented.

2. Establishment of retail ceilings at the roll-back level on all grades of dressed beef, except Government graded AA, and ceilings on all grades of beef, lamb, veal, pork, and poultry.

3. Establishment of a wholesale ceiling allowing reasonable profit mark-up for retailer and insurance to nonslaughterers of meat allocation.

4. Establishment of a slaughterers' ceiling price based on the cost of live animals and poultry, plus operating costs and shrinkages with allowance for minimum profit.

5. Establishment of feeders' selling price ceiling on all cattle except those graded AAA when dressed, and a ceiling on stocker and feeder cattle and beef calves.

6. Protection for producers and feeders of cattle—including Government assistance where any deficiency exists in the proportionment of the over-all price range from producer to consumer.

EARLY ACTION ADVOCATED

"The alarming and chaotic situation in the meat industry calls for early action," Representative PLOESER wrote Messrs. Vinson, Brown, and Jones, "the establishment of an over-all program, which will be an incentive for production of meat and the proper movement of meat products through the market to various consumers.

"I have given many months of study to this problem as a part of my duties with the Small Business Committee of the House and am accordingly proposing what I believe to be a workable program in the light of Executive orders now in effect and in the hope that the 10-percent roll-back on meat prices can be held."

His plan, Mr. PLOESER commented, was drawn up after months of study and is a set-up "which embodies the sincere and unselfish collaboration of practically every group in the meat field from the grass roots to the retail store."

Its adoption, he believes, would provide an ample supply of meats for war needs, increase production, eliminate black markets, assure to the public an adequate supply at a fair price, and preserve the small business units of the meat and poultry industry.

The Gold Dust Twins of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, at this time it becomes necessary for me to unmask the hypocrisy of two individuals known in Louisiana as the Gold Dust Twins, namely, Little J. Y. Sanders and Gov. Sam Jones. These two hypocrites, burning with the envy of my ever-increasing political strength, have resorted to the most yellow and cowardly act of putting out an unsigned, anonymous circular in a silly and futile attempt to defame me.

The contents were so manifestly untrue that they even lacked sufficient manhood to sign their names to it, or to admit they wrote it. If these two Gold Dust Twins want to blast me, why do they not come out like real men and sign their names to a truthful circular?

When I want to expose them I always sign my name to any circular I write.

Now I will reveal to you why this untrue circular was written by this lowly pair. They have been getting what is known as political growing pains and cannot bear to see JIMMY MORRISON go too high in politics in Louisiana. First they tried to stop me by ignoring me. That failed. Then they tried a whispering compaign. That failed. Now they try to vilify me with a false, untrue, and anonymous circular. When this fails no one knows what they will try next in their sheer desperation. However, you can bet your last dollar that whatever they do will be something silly.

The old J. Y. Sanders crowd, of which Sam Jones is a product, made Huey Long a great political figure with these very same tactics, and it looks like they are going to do the same for me. They said Huey Long was a menace. Now they say JIMMY MORRISON is a menace. Why? Because they are quivering with fear that the people of the State of Louisiana will elect JIMMY MORRISON Governor. While Huey Long helped the people get paved roads, free schoolbooks, old-age pension, free bridges, and many other constructive programs, Sam Jones and J. Y. Sanders have not helped anyone except themselves and their special clique.

I have done everything within my power to help the people of my district and Louisiana here in Congress. Sam Jones and J. Y. Sanders do not want me for the same reason that they did not want Huey Long.

Now let us be fair about the whole thing. Let us give everyone what is due him. First let us take the record of the "Gold Dust Twins," Little J. Y. and Sam Jones, and then we will take my record. You can then judge all these records for yourself.

Everyone knows that J. Y. Sanders was a rubber stamp here in Congress. If you search the records, you cannot find where Little J. Y. introduced one single bill in the 6 years he was in Congress. I cannot find where Little J. Y. has ever done anything that would assist any particular group or any individual. He has no record for helping any class of people, such as the farmers or the laborers. As a matter of fact, he opposed many farm measures and he has always gone out of his way to vote and work against the laboring man's interest.

J. Y. has a nerve to call me "$12,000 JIMMY." Well, perhaps this is the only time he ever beat me in my life, because whereas he calls me "$12,000 JIMMY," nowhere will a record show that I received a $75,000 fee for my law firm as did J. Y. while in Congress receive for his law firm from the Plantation Pipe Line Co.

The truth of the whole matter is that these two boilers that I was erroneously referred to as having made $12,000 out of have never been paid for and they were even purchased before I ever came to Congress. Evidently it will take a lawsuit for Mr. E. A. Jumonville to get the O. P. A. price for these two boilers. I did not want, nor did I receive, a penny in this boiler transaction. I assisted a used machinery dealer, Mr. E. A. Jumonville, of Plaquemine, who, everybody knows, is a constituent of mine and a close friend of mine and who supported me in my campaign, in an effort to get him out from under all of the red tape that he became entangled in here in Washington. I tried to help him remove the red tape, which is the duty of every Congressman toward his constituent. In another transaction Mr. Jumonville had lost many thousands of dollars on some second-hand steel he had purchased, because the O. P. A. lowered the price after he purchased the steel and refused to let him sell the steel except at a big loss. Mr. Jumonville explained to me that it was a poor law that did not work both ways. On the one hand, the O. P. A. had forced him to sell at their price so that he lost several thousand dollars on some steel and, on the other hand, they would not let him get the O. P. A. price on two boilers when he had an opportunity to make several thousand dollars back that he lost on the other transaction under their ruling. So, as his Congressman, I went to bat for him.

It so happens that, unfortunately, some of the Sam Jones people attempted to judge me by my predecessor, Little J. Y., and when I got up and went to stomping on the toes of the big bureaucrats here in Washington in connection with this transaction, a lot of people wondered what kind of a Congressman is this that is actually fighting for his constituents and actually endeavoring to carry out his campaign pledges to represent his constituents, because Little J. Y. Sanders had never stepped on anybody's toes and had never helped anybody but his own law firm (incidentally his law firm that made the $75,000 fee from the Plantation Pipeline Co. is called Sanders, Miller & Herget).

If you will further check Little J. Y.'s record, you will see that he has never made any substantial amount of money in the practice of law. He uses his law firm, however, as a cover up for his political shake-downs, which amount to thousands and thousands of dollars.

If you investigate closely you will find where Little J. Y. owns a big cattle ranch just south of Baton Rouge. You will also find that Little J. Y. gave large sums of money to his father to establish one of the biggest cattle ranches in Tangipahoa Parish.

Now let us see how the other "Gold Dust Twin," Governor Sam Jones, has double-crossed the people of Louisiana.

I think that you people should know a little bit about the record of graft and corruption of Governor Jones' administration in Louisiana. As you recall, in his campaign, Sam Jones promised the people that he would reduce taxes, and instead he added 22 new taxes.

Sam Jones also promised the people before he was elected Governor that never would there be a sales tax and in a very dramatic manner he affirmed that with his right hand raised toward heaven and his eyes pointed toward the sky on every political stump in Louisiana. The previous administration left Jones a balance of $18,000,000. The governmental bureau here in Washington that keeps track of what every State's income is, as well as its expenditures, shows that thus far in the Jones administration Sam Jones has spent $1,000,000 more per month than the State is receiving in revenue.

Thus, in 3 years, Sam Jones has gone in debt $36,000,000 and it is estimated when his fourth year is up, by these same figures here in Washington, that the Jones administration will have cost $48,000,000 more than any other administration in Louisiana's history. Naturally this has shaken the faith of the people of Louisiana since Jones has received in increased and new taxes over $30,000,000 more than any previous administration. When you consider the increase in old taxes and the additional new taxes, plus the $18,000,000 that was left over from the old administration, together with the $10,000,000 that was issued in new bonds by the Jones administration, together with the $48,000,000 that has been spent over and above the revenue, one would believe that tremendous improvements would be evident in every nook and corner of the State.

Yet with all this money, millions and millions of dollars, Louisiana has had no new hospitals built, no new graveled roads, not over 50 miles of new paved roads, no new free bridges, no new college buildings, no public buildings, and few, if any, of other improvements. Yet it was Sam Jones who said that the previous administration was the most corrupt in the history of the United States.

Now it therefore boils itself down to this, with the Jones administration costing $96,000,000 more, with no improvements, either the Jones administration is the most crooked and corrupt on earth, or else it has proven itself the most extravagant and wasteful on earth. The money has gone somewhere and yet the people of the State of Louisiana, the taxpayers have not gotten the benefit of it. Theft is bad and waste is bad, but as far as the taxpayer is concerned, the results to the taxpayer is the same whether his tax money is stolen or wasted.

Here are just a few examples of the graft and corruption in the Jones administration.

First. Steve Alford, appointed by Governor Jones as superintendent of State police. Thirty-two thousand dollars shortage in connection with the State police at Camp Polk, La. Steve Alford at present is still under indictment for intimidation of voters. So many thousands of dollars were received by Alford in gambling shake-downs that Governor Jones was forced to remove him as superintendent of State police.

Second. Kansas City bridge deal scandal, where the State of Louisiana was defrauded out of $225,000, while Prescott Foster was chairman of the Louisiana Highway Commission. Just ask Mr. Foster how much he got out of this bridge deal.

Third. Eugene Stanley, Sam Jones' attorney general, indicted for conspiracy to defraud. Ask Mr. Stanley whether Jones is crooked or not.

Fourth. Jerome Hayes, superintendent of public accounts, appointed by Sam Jones, indicted for stealing. Indictment still pending.

Fifth. Prescott Foster, arrested for hiding the highway department books. Charge still pending. Mr. Foster was removed as chairman of the highway commission recently.

Sanctimonious Sam has proven on every occasion just exactly what kind of a fake and fraud he really is. First he started out trying to hold political meetings in the various churches in Louisiana. He would go from church to church and instead of sticking to religion he would mix in politics. This caused tremendous resentment and he finally had to give up the idea. Next, when he thought it would be a short war he began parading around the State in a soldier uniform, but when the war did not end quickly and he realized what a foolish spectacle he was making of himself unless he joined the Army, he abandoned that idea.

Do not let him tell you that as Governor he cannot go in the Army because if he had wanted to keep his word that he was "raring" to serve his country in the armed forces, he could have done just exactly like Governor Stassen of Minnesota, resigned and stepped immediately into the armed forces.

I predict that when his term as Governor is up that, even then with nothing to do, Sam Jones will not go in the armed forces.

Intimidation, indescribable pressure never dreamed of before in the State of Louisiana, are being brought to bear in an attempt to convince the people that the Sam Jones candidates should be elected, but never again will the people be misled into voting for anything that is sponsored by the "Gold Dust Twins."

This Jones crowd can distort, misinterpret, and twist any and all facts, but the people remain steadfast in their rock-bound belief that this reform Governor tried to reform everybody except themselves. From now on the people of Louisiana are going to be subjected to much more of this Jones-Sanders propaganda. Every undue effort is going to be made to influence you, to intimidate you, to persuade you to keep the Sam Jones administration in office. There are not many more months left during which the highfaluting Boston Club will rule the State of Louisiana. You people just sit tight. The political noose is drawing closer and closer around the necks of Sam Jones and his gang, who betrayed the people and their pledges to them.

In the New Orleans States, a paper which tries to defend Sam Jones, in an editorial, on June 5, 1941, said:

> We, the people, think we are voting for something that we want and desire, for something that is for the benefit of the Nation, the State, and the city, and then we find out we have done no such thing.

This lament is on the lips of 80 percent of the people who voted for Sam Houston Jones; the other 20 percent are on the State pay roll. It is the result of political fraud, deceit, treachery, and chincanery unparalleled in the history of any State, and Louisiana's hop-skip-and-jump Governor is never in one place long enough for an ordinary man to talk to him.

The following is typical of the Sanders-Jones administration:

Practical destruction of democracy in Louisiana by relegating the elected representatives of the people in the legislature to a standing no higher than an office boy. A senator or representative under Jones-Griffenhagen-Sanders government is like a fifth wheel on a wagon.

Destruction of the three basic branches of the government by open, flagrant, and arrogant attempts to coerce, intimidate, and browbeat the State judiciary.

Neglect of duty by practically vacating his office in running around the country to no purpose but his own amusement and advertisement.

Gross maladministration resulting in an enormous increase in governmental expense and decrease in governmental service to the people.

Padding State pay rolls with highbrows at big salaries.

Failure to keep promises made to the people, thus obtaining his election by fraud.

Increasing the State debt by millions.

Bringing Griffenhagen into the State government.

Destroying local self-government.

Interfering with the national defense by claiming political credit for bringing into the State the Army camps and other defense units made necessary by the national emergency.

Spending public funds right and left without results.

Keeping pay rolls and other public records secret.

It is well remembered by the people of Louisiana that this sanctimonious Sam promised the people that he would take the 7 cents per gallon gasoline tax off of the farmers, trappers, and the fishermen. Did he do that? He promised to give the trainmen a full-crew bill. Did he do that?

He promised to repeal the sales tax. What did he do about that? He promised to stop the deadheads. Did he do that? He promised to stop waste in government. Did he do that?

He promised that there would be no new taxes. How about that one? He promised to give every old man and woman $30 a month pension. Did he do that?

He promised the people of the city of New Orleans a free ferry service. Did he do that? He promised the school teachers of Louisiana to raise their salaries and to pay them for 12 full months. Did he do that? He promised to raise the pay of the school bus drivers. What about that one?

You, the good Christian people of Louisiana, know the answers to these questions. You know Jones stands indicted in the minds and hearts of all these people he has misled. Can it not now be said that he obtained that office under false pretenses by promising things he never really intended to do, and has not to this time done?

From my childhood days until the present time it never heretofore occurred to me that there was anything in the life and character of Judas Iscariot that I could ever defend, but there is one point in his conduct that differs from that of Governor Jones, and that is this, that, finally, when Judas came to realize what a terrible thing he had done in betraying his Master and his people, old Judas, after all, finally had enough manhood to go and hang himself.

All of you people know what Jones' record is in Louisiana. You know how he stands in Louisiana with the people. Let me now tell you how he stands here in Washington. There is not a department head, there is not a department secretary, there is not a department assistant secretary to an assistant secretary that will let Jones in the outer office. Authorities here in high places have long ago, as have the people of Louisiana, found him out. May we not now be reminded that we are told in the Bible, "Make sure your sins will find you out"? As you have found him out in Louisiana, they also have found him out here in Washington.

Now let us take the record of Jimmy Morrison. Sam Jones and J. Y. Sanders shook down every contractor in the State of Louisiana and almost drained the State treasury paying all the padded pay rolls and deadheads trying to defeat me. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was spent by the Jones forces for Little J. Y. and still he could not win. The main issue was rubber stamp or independent. J. Y. was a rubber stamp. I was not, and I won.

J. Y. stated that I voted 14 times against the President of the United States. That is a lie. On every bill for the interest of the armed forces and the war effort I have voted 100 percent down the line with the President's wishes.

Just contrast this vote with the article Sam Jones had in the Saturday Evening Post, where he belittled President Roosevelt and the war effort at the present time and urged the formation of a third party in order to destroy the Democratic Party.

My record here in Congress speaks for itself. You people know that I have done my best here in Congress and have made a real record in 6 months. Thousands of letters have poured into my office congratulating me. Since I took my seat in Congress I am glad to relate a few of my accomplishments, which I shall enumerate as follows:

1. Introduced a bill to give the late Billy Mitchell, one of America's greatest heroes, a posthumous Congressional Medal of Honor.

2. Introduced a bill to provide that all soldiers, sailors, marines, WAAC's, WAVES, and other members of the armed forces ride on all trains, including streamliners, for one-half cent per mile and one-third of the present Pullman sleeping-car rate. This one-half cent per mile also applies on all busses.

Today members of the armed forces ride at a reduced rate, but not at a rate of one-half cent per mile, and these rates apply only on slow trains.

As an example, under the Morrison bill, if a soldier lives in New Orleans and is stationed in Chicago with a week's furlough, he can go to New Orleans and back to duty in Chicago on the Panama Limited and sleep at night on a Pullman for approximately $15.70. Today the same trip costs that soldier over $60. Many a poor mother and daddy has had to dig down in their pockets to help pay transportation charges for their sons in the armed service in order that they can come home on a furlough. My bill will stop that.

3. Introduced a bill known as the shorten the war—win a bonus plan, which will give every member in the armed forces 3 years' pay if the war is ended in 1 year, or by April 16, 1944, or if ended in 2 years they will get 2 years' pay. All members of the armed forces who have been killed or who will be killed, are entitled to the bonus, which will be paid to the next legal kin. Thus this bill provides for an incentive to shorten the war.

According to experts here in Washington, if the war is ended in 1 year it will save the taxpayers of the United States, with the 3 years' bonus being

paid under the bill, the sum of $370,000,000,000. If the war is ended in 2 years, $280,000,000,000 will be saved by the taxpayers.

4. Introduced a bill providing for the creation of a Supreme War Council to consist of four members, patterned after the Supreme War Council of England. According to this bill, two members, a Republican and a Democrat, are to be nominated in the House, and two members, a Republican and a Democrat, are to be nominated in the Senate. In this way the Supreme War Council will be composed of Members of Congress who would be answerable to the people, and if they did not fulfill the people's desires, the people have an opportunity to vote against them when they come up for reelection.

5. Introduced a Federal pension bill for payment to all needy and old persons in the amount of $40 per month by the Federal Government.

6. Visited the Strawberry Belt and made speeches at Albany, Independence, Ponchatoula, and Gonzales. It was the first time any Congressman ever spoke to the strawberry growers when it was not election time.

7. Prevented strawberries from being declared nonessential.

8. Prevented a ceiling price of $2.50 per crate being put on strawberries this past season.

9. Secured for the high school at Pine, La., a permit to build a new schoolhouse when the War Production Board had previously refused such permit. That building at this time is in the process of construction and soon will be nearing completion.

10. Secured for the third ward of East Baton Rouge Parish 2,500 feet of 4-inch pipe in order that Istrouma and the defense plants located north of Baton Rouge would be adequately protected against fire with sufficient water. For 6 months local people in Baton Rouge had tried to get the necessary priority, and it was not until the matter was taken up with the W. P. B. that the pipe was secured.

11. Secured a new housing unit, which was badly needed, at Slidell through the F. H. A.

12. Secured for the city of Baton Rouge hundreds of new housing units that were badly needed.

13. Cooperated with other Congressmen to get additional housing in New Orleans, Lake Charles, Alexandria, Leesville, and Cotton Valley.

14. Aided and assisted the Higgins Industries, of New Orleans; argued on the floor of the House that a plywood factory located in Louisiana was necessary for the production of cargo planes. When certain materials became scarce and it was necessary to go before the W. P. B. to secure permission for these materials, I personally met with Mr. Andrew J. Higgins, Sr., here in Washington, offered my cooperation, my office, and did everything possible to work out the important details which meant so much to the people of the Sixth District, the State of Louisiana, and the war effort.

15. Secured for Louisiana State University, one of the greatest universities in the United States, several special units for specialized training of men in military service. There are at present almost 5,000 men in specialized training at L. S. U.

16. Met with President Hodges on numerous occasions in Washington and cooperated with him to the fullest extent in his problems and the problems of L. S. U.

17. Am using every effort to endeavor to get a training unit for Southeastern Louisiana College in my home town of Hammond.

18. Urged that the defective runways at the airport at Hammond be corrected. This airport is now completed and its facilities having been recently enlarged makes it one of the finest airports in the United States.

19. Went to bat to keep the Baton Rouge abattoir, or slaughterhouse, from being permanently closed down, due to underhanded work of Mayor LeBlanc and Roland Kyzar. Met with the delegation from Baton Rouge and took them personally to see Prentiss Brown, head of O. P. A. The abattoir is now open and has been open for sometime due to my efforts.

20. Secured from Mr. Clifford Townsend, Food Administrator, an order to prevent the minimum carload rates on potatoes from being raised from 30,000 pounds to 45,000 pounds.

21. Secured for farmers in Tangipahoa Parish an order allowing mixed cars of potatoes, peppers, and other vegetables to be shipped under maximum icing. The ruling was otherwise and this took a good deal of time with O. D. T.

22. Received from the Franklinton Chamber of Commerce and from leading citizens of Washington Parish telegrams thanking me for my efforts in keeping the Franklinton N. Y. A. school from being moved from that locality.

23. Aided many farmers and small manufacturers in securing farm equipment and necessary machinery.

24. Fought to get a better price for the dairymen who were not being treated fairly by the O. P. A.

25. Fought to get the price on Irish potatoes raised by O. P. A.

26. Personally went before the O. P. A. and objected to a ceiling price on logs.

27. Voted for and supported the Pace agricultural bill, which, together with the Bankhead bill, will give the farmers 25 cents a pound for all cotton they produce. Unfortunately President Roosevelt vetoed the Pace and Bankhead bill and same is now pending before committees in the Senate in an effort to override the President's veto in order to give the farmers 25 cents a pound for cotton. I feel that I have done everything by voting for both of these measures to aid the cotton farmers and that I have thereby kept faith with them. If it had been left up to other Members of Congress and myself, the farmers would get 25 cents per pound for their cotton.

28. Secured for many sheriffs and officials in many parishes equipment for their defense organizations.

29. Secured for the dairymen in many communities additional feed where it was so vitally necessary.

30. Fought for the sugar growers' interest, and especially the small cane grower's interest.

31. Tried to help every single person, group, or anyone who has called on me, and in many instances volunteered my cooperation.

32. Supported every act introduced in Congress which would aid or benefit the farmers directly or indirectly.

33. Secured boilers for tire recapping machines.

34. Answered the request of many small businessmen, asking me to secure equipment for them and priorities for them, asking me to untangle this and untangle that. I am glad to give them my time and effort to aid them.

35. Straightened out many allotment payments that were badly tangled in order that those who were left behind by the boys in the armed forces would receive their allotment checks promptly.

36. Answered every letter that was received by me without one single exception. Made every effort to do everything possible to accommodate anyone and everyone that made a request.

37. Voted for and supported all appropriations that were for the armed forces and the war effort. Voted for and supported every war measure sponsored and asked for by President Roosevelt.

38. Consistently voted against all appropriations that were a waste of the taxpayers' money and not essential to the war effort.

It is my firm conviction that 85 percent of this red tape, rationing, and bureaucracy is unnecessary. As a result of it the destruction of the little businessman is practically inevitable. It is impossible for a right-thinking man to go along with a lot of these theoretical, dreaming bureaucrats and for that reason I have opposed many of their stupid and blundering policies, which have proved such a terrific detriment to our people.

Part of my fight day and night is to save the little businessman. He was my friend in Louisiana and he is my friend in Washington. His fight is my fight and I am doing everything possible to aid him.

As far as my record for the first 6 months that I have been in Congress is concerned, I feel justly proud and I realize, and I am sure that you realize, that I have done as much, or maybe more, than the people expect of me. I am proud of that record. It not only serves to show what a man with determination, courage, and energy can do but it shows by contrast how J. Y. Sanders tried to fool the people of Louisiana. The time of the Sanders-Jones crowd is through. They will never win another election in the State of Louisiana.

These two "Gold Dust Twins", Sam Jones and Little J. Y., remind me of two little Negro boys running through the woods in a thunderstorm, scared to death, praying for less noise and more light.

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1943.

The PRESIDENT, FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am sending to you herewith copies of a letter and a memorandum regarding the Florida Barge Canal which I have written to the Petroleum Administrator for War, Hon. Harold L. Ickes.

Your approval of this project in 1935, and your expenditure of over $5,000,000 on the beginning of its construction, together with your subsequent recommendation to Congress that it be completed for commercial and military needs, constitute a consistent record of your far-sighted policy in this matter of our national transport. Unhappily, this policy was frustrated and defeated by Mr. Ickes.

It is an officially recorded fact that but for the action of this Cabinet officer, who is now also Petroleum Administrator for War, our Gulf and Atlantic intracoastal waterways would have been long since connected by this channel across northern Florida, and we should now have no petroleum problem in the eastern United States. The water route between the Mississippi Valley area and the Atlantic seaboard could not have been severed by the enemy, and there would have been no death roll of merchant crews and ships destroyed in attempting to do by sea what could have been safely done by barges via the intracoastal waterway through the Florida Canal.

Mr. Ickes' direct responsibility for this, coupled with his continued efforts to prevent relief by means of this project, and his general failure to arrest further deterioration of our petroleum situation, have raised the question as to the usefulness of his continued participation in the Government.

I commend to your attention the facts set forth in the attached letter and memorandum with a view to such action by you as you may deem best.

Respectfully,

JOE HENDRICKS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ICKES: Your letter of June 4 replying to mine of May 15 relative to the Florida barge canal was received during my absence. I note that your opposition to connecting the intracoastal canals of the Atlantic and Gulf seaboards by this 72-mile barge channel across the neck of the Florida Peninsula is unabated.

In a memorandum which I attach hereto as a part hereof, I have dealt in detail with the several points touched upon in your letter, and have pointed out the fallacious nature of the technical argument you present.

The real issues, Mr. Administrator, are far broader and go much deeper than the mere necessary technical assessment of cost and service, which, when correctly appraised, prove the Army engineers to be right in their support of the canal and in their stand in opposition to your efforts to destroy it.

The fundamental facts are these:

(1) Long before this war, as early as 1935, you were officially on record as opposed to a channel across northern Florida which would connect by water the Mississippi Valley and Gulf areas of this country with the Atlantic seaboard, and which would afford a major safeguard in time of war, and cheaper transportation to more than 37 States of the Union. You had an opportunity then, in the direct line of your duty as Administrator of Public Works, to have caused such a channel to be constructed. The official record of the Senate Committee on Commerce (hearings on S. Res. 210, 74th Cong., 2d sess., February 19, 1936), carries your own testimony to this effect. In spite of your own examining engineer's report and recommendation, made after exhaustive study, that "the design is in accord with sound engineering practice, and that the project is economically sound. It is recommended that the loan, with or without the grant, be made," you caused the project to be shelved. You had abundant justification in the recommendation of your technical advisers for finding the project to be self-liquidating and causing it to be built. But you reversed these findings and vetoed the enterprise, and by this act of disservice to the public welfare and security, our country is today without this vital element in the national defense and the civilian economy. You are thus personally and individually responsible for the absence of inland water transport between east and west in our hour of need, and for the consequent failure of petroleum and other supplies in the East and for rationing in the balance of the country.

In the face of this record, your pleading that there is not time to build the canal for service during the emergency is not only in direct opposition to the statement of the Chief of Army Engineers to the Senate Committee on Appropriations that it is a reasonable anticipation that the project could be in service by the winter of 1944–45, but it cannot relieve you of the responsibility for failure to provide this facility 8 years ago.

Again, in 1942 your representatives appeared before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and did their best to dissuade that committee from approving the Mansfield bill to authorize the project.

Again, in March of this year (1943) you caused your representatives to appear before both House and Senate Subcommittees on Appropriations to oppose this project, and did by these efforts defeat it. As to the misleading nature of that testimony, I have something further to say in the accompanying memorandum.

A dispassionate examination of the whole record makes it impossible to escape the conclusion that for more that 8 years you have left no stone unturned to prevent this project from coming into being and that you are responsible for the absence of through barge transportation and the petroleum situation we face today. And you are the Petroleum Administrator for War!

(2) We are without adequate transport and without adequate petroleum supplies for the civilian economy and security today. You have not only failed to remedy the situation, but the record shows that you went so far as to discourage by personal testimony before the Senate special committee the first efforts of the railroads to relieve the situation. Above and beyond this, you tell us that you cannot prevent a further decrease in eastern supplies.

(3) The opposition of the major oil companies to the cross-Florida Canal is a part of the official record. Yet your office is staffed by men from these companies, and you offer their opinions and their figures as disinterested evidence. I invite you to publish a list of the men from the major oil companies who are members of your staff and who are paid—or whose positions are kept open for them—by those oil companies, as well as by the Federal Treasury, and their respective salaries. As long as this situation exists, Congress and the public cannot be expected to receive with the confidence they have a right to place in a public agency your pronouncements and the testimony of these men.

(5) The Florida barge canal is not only an answer to our petroleum situation, but it is an answer to the even more important problem of our whole overburdened and deteriorating transportation system. Dry cargoes are as vital as is petroleum. I do not think you can be excused by mere reiteration of the statement that the position of the Petroleum Administration for War in this matter relates only to the relative efficiency of the barge and the pipe line for the transport of petroleum. You have apparently acquiesced in, if you have not actually recommended, the use of large amounts of steel, equipment, and manpower for the construction of tugs and barges for operation on the Mississippi and its tributaries, on the Gulf intracoastal waterway as far as the west coast of Florida, and on the Atlantic intracoastal waterway from the east coast of Florida to Trenton, N. J. Yet you take the position that these same barges and tugs and more of the same operating on these same intracoastal waterways and across the 72-mile trans-Florida channel is not advisable. This would be incredible if it were not a matter of record. Further, a mass of engineering opinion, including that of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, refutes the contention of the major oil company members of your staff—companies traditionally and selfishly opposed to the project—that barge transportation is not more economical in material and manpower than are pipe lines.

You are not only the Petroleum Administrator for War, you are the Secretary of the Interior, and as such you have a duty and a responsibility toward the devolpment, security, and welfare of this country. I am not impressed by your plea in your letter of May 13 that "the utility of this canal for the transportation of materials other than petroleum is a matter upon which this office cannot express a considered opinion." In your letter of June 4 you do not hesitate to go far afield from the duties of the Petroleum Administrator to invoke as a basis for your opposition the war program as a whole, nor have you refrained from discussing the questions of critical materials and manpower and transportation, all of which are responsibilities of other Government agencies, not of the Petroleum Administration for War. Further, you were Administrator of Public Works, and as such directed in 1935 an exhaustive study of the potential dry cargo movement through such a waterway, and you must be aware of the favorable recommendations made by your examining engineer. If not, you must admit that you vetoed the canal without acquainting yourself with those findings.

The above are the real issues in this matter, Mr. Administrator; not decimal points and finely balanced comparisons of steel and manpower. We have neither adequate transport nor adequate petroleum supplies. You have failed to solve the problem, and yet you oppose this connection of our waterways which, regardless of all other considerations, can be made to relieve the situation. I believe that it should be begun now, and that the Chief of Engineers is correct in saying that it is a reasonable expectation that it may be in service by winter after next; and I believe that Congress will take the matter in hand very soon.

Speaking for myself, and I believe that a substantial majority of the Congress and the

people feel as I do, I can no longer be satisfied with promises that "all essential needs will be met." This is an absolutely misleading phrase, which we have heard before and relied on to our sorrow. As a matter of fact, we do not have today, and we have not had for many months, enough gasoline and fuel oil to meet all essential needs, and you tell us that in all probability we shall have less in the future.

I think it is almost universally acknowledged, by friend and foe alike that failure to provide this connecting channel across north Florida was one of the most tragic omissions and errors in policy in the history of this Nation, and has resulted in detriment to the public welfare and security to a greater extent than the Pearl Harbor disaster. More men have died, more ships and cargoes have been lost, more suffering has been caused, and more detriment to our ultimate war effort has resulted from this failure to see to our vital transport than followed in the train of Pearl Harbor. I believe that the people of this country, regardless of party or section, are rapidly approaching a conclusion as to where the responsibility lies.

Respectfully,

JOE HENDRICKS.

MEMORANDUM

To Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War.

From Representative JOE HENDRICKS.

The following is comment on certain erroneous figures and statements set forth in your letter to me under date of June 4, 1943, and is supplementary to and a part of my reply thereto.

(1) The first point you raise is that of relative manpower required to effectuate plans for moving to the eastern seaboard 250,000 barrels of petroleum daily via (a) a 24-inch pipe line, and (b) the intracoastal waterways through the proposed connecting channel across northern Florida.

You state, in substance, that you do not favor the barge movement over the Florida Canal route because the equipment would involve a vastly greater draft on our manpower resources. This is so directly contrary to actual fact, and the figures you give so utterly ignore the elementary principles of economics and engineering, that I take this opportunity of dissecting them in some detail.

There are several assumptions and omissions underlying your figures which are untenable and unreasonable and which cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. These include:

(a) The totally erroneous basis which has been used by you in computing man-hours. It is an elementary fact that the manpower represented by any construction project is the total labor required to bring it into being, beginning with the natural raw materials. For this reason, the manpower represented by any project is very roughly proportionate to its total cost. For the total cost is, in the last analysis, substantially all labor. An intelligent approach to great precision in determining the man-hours can be made by dividing the total cost by an informed estimate of the average hourly wage involved (including all operations concerned from the natural raw materials up). If a completed project costs $10,000,000, and it is estimated that the average hourly wage (from the natural raw materials up) is $1, then with moderate precision it may be determined that the project represents a draft on manpower resources of approximately 10,000,000 man-hours. By the same token, if each of two projects costs $10,000,000, and the average hourly wage represented by one is 80 cents and by the other $1, then the first may be reasonably assumed to require 20 percent more man-hours than does the second. To take simply the direct labor on a project as the basis for computing the total draft on manpower resources is so violently opposed to the facts that it would not be tolerated by the most elementary engineering or economics. And yet this is what you have done. Even in so doing, the statements of the Petroleum Administration for War, including your own, are so improbable as to arrest attention. I give you some examples:

On page 156 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House, War Department civil functions, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, the Petroleum Administrator for War has submitted for the record the statement that construction labor on the 24-inch pipe line is estimated to be $12,000,000, plus $21,000,000, or a total of $33,000,000. If it is true, as you state in your letter of June 4, that the total man-hour requirements of the 24-inch line are 9,000,000, this $33,000,000 estimate for construction labor shows that you contemplate paying an average wage of $3.66 per hour. This is astonishing, to say the least. Yet it is confirmed by the statement in the hearings referred to, where it is set forth, that the total man-days estimated for the project is 650,000 plus 420,000, or 1,095,000, which indicates an average daily wage rate of $30.12. Arithmetical analysis of the statement clearly shows that it is computed on the basis of one 8-hour shift per day. Thirty dollars and twelve cents for an 8-hour day, average for the 8,000 estimated as employed and for this class of work, is a startling scale even for these times. I am willing to believe that this is simply one more of the many erroneous statements presented to Congress by Petroleum Administration for War in this matter. If not, then this $30.12 per day wage scale might well be the subject of inquiry by appropriate authority.

Again, if your figure of 9,000,000 is for total man-hours, and the cost of the project is really only $95,000,000, as stated, then the average hourly wage would be $10.55, or $84.40 per man for 8-hour day. This further illustrates the confusion in your figures.

(b) You assume that the 24-inch pipe line will deliver to the eastern seaboard a daily, year-round average of 300,000 barrels of crude oil. I point out to you that you have never yet (even on the western portion of this line) been able to transport anything approximating this quantity. Further, the best engineering opinion is that you cannot expect to exceed 250,000 barrels daily on the year-round average. It is regarded as a tacit admission of the faults and difficulties of the 24-inch line that the second large line now under construction has been reduced to 20 inches. There appears no other possible justification for putting in a 20-inch line instead of a second 24-inch line, if the latter would function to give us a proportionate increase in deliveries to the east. By persisting in the assumption that the 24-inch line will carry 300,000 barrels daily as a year-round average, instead of 250,000 barrels daily, and by carrying this figure of 300,000 into your computations you have introduced from this cause alone a 20-percent error in favor of the pipe line in all your figures for manpower, horsepower, and materials required per barrel of petroleum delivered. This error is only one of many which must be corrected before rational comparisons between the pipe line and the barge can be made.

(c) You have assumed that the proposed connecting channel across northern Florida should be charged to the emergency movement of petroleum. This is an unreasonable assumption, and is not justifiable by any system of accounting. The proposed connection of the Gulf and Atlantic Intracoastal Waterways is a part of our permanent national general crago transport system, and is not, like the pipe line, a facility for the emergency only, nor only for petroleum; although it could be used to the greatest advantage during the emergency.

(d) You have omitted from your computations all manpower represented by the cost of feeder lines and distribution facilities along the Atlantic seaboard. On the other hand, the barge proposal includes distribution all along this coast from Florida to Trenton, N. J.

(e) The number, kinds, and capacity, and the cost of barges and tugs shown in your and other Petroleum Administration for War statements are so at variance with the facts and the estimates of the Chief of Army Engineers that they cannot be accepted. It can only be concluded that the Petroleum Administration for War has put forth these figures arbitrarily in an effort to reduce by computation the efficiency of barge movement.

A rational comparison of the draft on our manpower resources which would be required for a 24-inch pipe line on the one hand and for the proposed barge movement on the other, shows unquestionably that the barge movement is by far the most economical. To make such a comparison, it is first necessary to develop a rational estimate of the cost of each project.

The cost of the trunk of a 24-inch pipe line, without feeders or any distribution facilities along the Atlantic seaboard, is stated by Petroleum Administration for War to be $95,000,000. When the feeder lines and the cost of facilities for distribution along the Atlantic seaboard are added, the total cannot be taken as less than $114,000,000, all net Federal expense. This cannot be assumed to deliver more than 250,000 barrels daily on the year-round average.

The total cost of barge and tug equipment to deliver 250,000 barrels daily, year-round average, from and to the same termini, substantially, as assumed for the pipe line, and assuming that 150,000 barrels of this is to be residual fuel oils and 100,000 barrels is to be lighter products, would be as follows:

600 10,000-barrel wooden barges, at $48,000 each	$28,800,000
400 10,000-barrel steel barges, at $55,000 each	22,000,000
324 600-horsepower steel tugs, at $175,000 each	56,700,000
Total, if all had to be constructed	107,500,000

As a matter of fact, over 100 of these steel tugs and over 100 of these steel barges and numerous wooden barges are already on order for lease to private enterprise on a basis which will shortly return their cost to the Government. The total cost of these steel barges and steel tugs referred to as being on order, at the above scale, is $23,000,000, which should be deducted from the above $107,500,000, leaving the total cost of the fleet yet to be built as $84,500,000.

While it should be pointed out that the $84,500,000 for the barge and tug program is not and will not be a Federal expense item—because this equipment will be leased to private enterprise on a self-liquidating basis—this figure may be used to compute man-hour requirements as compared with the actual Federal expense item of $114,000,000 for a 24-inch pipe line shown above.

Summarizing, we have:

To deliver daily to, and distribute along the eastern seaboard, 250,000 barrels:

(a) By 24-inch pipe line (all direct Federal expense)	$114,000,000
(b) By barge movement over Florida canal self-liquidating Federal financing)	84,250,000

In the over-all picture of the draft on manpower resources, both of these figures represent man-hours of labor, and substantially nothing else. Since the construction of barges and tugs involves, on the whole—from the raw material up—a wage scale probably 20 percent higher than does a pipe-line project, the ratio of $114,000,000 for the pipe line to $84,250,000 for the barge movement (1.35 to 1) should be altered accordingly, that is, the actual ratio of the man-hours required by the 24-inch pipe line to those required for the barge-movement facilities is as 1.69 is to 1. In other words, facilities for a 24-inch pipe-line movement of 250,000 barrels per day requires 69 percent more man-hours than do facilities for barge movement of the same amount.

The above is a substantially true picture of how very much smaller would be the actual draft on our manpower resources by the construction of barge and tug facilities than would be the draft caused by the construction of a 24-inch pipe line.

One essential fact emerges plainly. By its insistance on pipe-line construction, and by its opposition to the connected Intracoastal Waterway, the Petroleum Administration for War has wasted 41 out of every 100 man-hours and 58 out of every 100 tons of steel it has employed in its 24-inch pipe line.

(2) You advance the point that the pipe-line construction involves no use of shipyard facilities now devoted to military and naval production, whereas you say that the building of barge and tug equipment to the extent required would cause either a serious curtailment of present shipyard programs or the construction of entirely new yards. Whoever furnished you with this information could have been only ignorant of the facts or careless of the truth. In the first place the figures given by you as to the number of tugs and barges required is more than twice the actual number determined by the Chief of Army Engineers. In the second place, the records of the committees of both House and Senate are replete with testimony to the effect that the small boat yards and barge-building concerns (suited to this class of construction) have not enough work to keep them operating at capacity, and that there are ample idle facilities for constructing all the tugs and barges needed for this movement, without interfering with the construction of a single vessel in the military and naval program.

While the construction of these barges and tugs would in no way occupy construction facilities needed for naval and military vessels, the construction of a 24-inch pipe line does require 237,560 more tons of steel than do the equivalent barges and tugs. This would certainly occupy rolling mill plate capacity which could otherwise be devoted to plates for more than 160 destroyers or more than 75 large cargo ships.

(3) You submit a table which purports to truly set forth the relative steel, horsepower, and manpower requirements of the barges and pipe lines. These are the same misleading and erroneous statements presented to Congress on several former occasions and are based upon utterly inaccurate assumptions. The totally erroneous nature of these figures and the really much greater efficiency of the barge over the pipe line (in steel, horsepower, and manpower) was so thoroughly demonstrated by competent testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations (hearings on H. R. 2346, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) that I am entirely willing to rest on that record, and I am confident that Congress will arrive at an accurate judgment as to these matters. For your personal information, I give you herewith the correct comparison of the efficiency of facilities for barge movement and pipe-line movement. These show that the pipe line is a very poor and wasteful second.

	Barge, including distribution	Pipe line, excluding distribution [1]
Barrels delivered daily per ton of steel employed, all-steel fleet	0.98	0.76
Using wooden barges for residuals, and steel barges for products, with all-steel tugs	1.46	.76
Barrels delivered daily per prime horsepower installed	1.24	.99
Barrels delivered daily per utilized horsepower	2.40	.99
Relative consumption of manpower in construction of additional facilities	1.00	1.69

[1] Relative manpower figures include distribution facilities in each case.

(4) I am glad to note that you admit in your letter that "any opposition to the canal that is based on a prediction of the duration of the war would be * * * wholly unjustified." And yet, regardless of this statement by you, your representatives have, inferentially, taken a position before congressional committees that time is of the essence and that therefore the canal should be opposed. You yourself have done this in your letter to me of May 13, where you state that "our conclusion is based upon two major considerations," and proceed to name the time you say will be required for the construction of the canal as the first of these major considerations.

No one can object to honest enthusiasm for a given plan; and honest mistakes in empirical data may be forgiven (although such errors do not increase the confidence imposed in those habitually making them), but actual destructive attack upon other plans which could serve the same and other purposes, and a demonstrated willingness to let the public welfare suffer rather than fail in that attack is a phenomenon so astonishing that it challenges public attention. I have yet to witness the most ardent advocate of barge transportation, via the Florida canal or otherwise, attempt to block the construction of any pipe line which was reasonably designed to meet the emergency needs, regardless of its relative efficiency. We must have adequate transport for all commodities. We must have petroleum. The spectacle of a Cabinet officer waging war upon a project calculated to render vast service in this field, endorsed and vouched for by the highest technical authority of the Government, is grotesque, and it remains to be seen whether it will be further tolerated.

(5) You state in your letter that "no witness from this office has testified that an abandonment of rationing of fuel oil is in prospect." Here, again, Mr. Administrator, we have a typical example of those numerous statements and representations, made by you or your representatives, which are diametrically opposed to the facts and the record. A witness from your office did testify that an abandonment of fuel-oil rationing is in prospect. The record is in the hearings before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, War Department Civil Functions, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. On page 147 of these hearings the record shows that Mr. Ralph K. Davies, of the Standard Oil Co. of California, and your Deputy Administrator, as testifying:

"We hope that we may be able this coming winter to supply the full civilian requirements of heating oils."

Again, on page 150, Mr. Davies stated:

"With the completion of these two lines, we should be able, I think, to supply the full demand domestically here except on gasoline * * *."

Again, on page 169, there is the following testimony:

"Mr. ENGEL. I believe you stated that the administration hoped to furnish the full requirements for heating oil under the plans now proposed by your Administration, is that right?

"Mr. DAVIES. That is our objective; yes, sir.

"Mr. ENGEL. Well, do you think you can supply it?

"Mr. DAVIES. We think we can, provided we have approval from the War Production Board for the materials to furnish this second pipe line, and provided the military estimates are not greatly increased."

Again, on page 199, there is the following testimony of Mr. George A. Wilson, also from your office:

"Mr. POWERS. Mr. Wilson, we are at liberty to state on the floor or publicly that with the completion of your two pipe lines from Texas to the east coast, plus existing tank-car facilities, that the present gasoline rationing system in the East will be definitely taken care of, and enough oil will be delivered to the east coast next winter without fuel-oil rationing.

"Mr. WILSON. In answer to that, Mr. Powers, I would say that upon the completion of the 2 new, large-diameter pipe lines, the 24- and the 20-inch, all the way from Texas through to the east coast, which would provide approximately 535,000 barrels delivery per day by those 2 lines, plus continued use of tank cars, existing pipe lines and existing or under construction inland waterways equipment, that we will be able to meet the full east-coast petroleum requirements on a basis of continuing gasoline rationing, and substantially as it now is, and supply normal requirements of fuel oil and other petroleum requirements for domestic and offshore use.

"Mr. POWERS. Without rationing of fuel oil?

"Mr. WILSON. That is what I mean by normal requirements."

These quotations from the official record show beyond question that statements which you say were not made were actually made by your representatives. Were the official record of the hearings lacking, your statement is directly refuted by the formal report o the House Committee on Appropriations, reporting to the House on H. R. 2346 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), page 7:

"The Committee is advised that pipe lines presently built and in course of provision, plus the use of tank cars and a relatively small amount of water transport, assuming proper priorities yet to be granted on pipe lines in course of provision, will take care of the eastern-seaboard area during the next winter in a normal way, including the heating of homes, except gasoline for pleasure driving, which is taboo anyway because of rubber shortage."

Not only did your representatives mislead the committee in the matter of fuel oil, Mr. Administrator, but the situation today as to gasoline is eloquent proof as to the misleading testimony regarding this commodity.

(6) I note that your staff includes, according to your statement, men who have had many years' experience in the construction and operation of all forms of petroleum transportation. Experience is desirable, but we should not ignore the allegiance to selfish interest which that experience may imply. Beyond doubt, such experience could be used either in or against public interest. When we remember that the men of whom you speak are drawn from the ranks of those private and competing interests who are traditional foes of the Florida canal, and when we couple this with the fact that you, yourself, by your former action prevented the

construction of this essential transport facility, the situation is worthy of scrutiny. If you care to submit to me a complete list of all men in your administration who have been drawn from the oil companies, together with the respective positions they occupied therein, and the salaries or other considerations still afforded them by these companies, together with the compensation being paid them at the same time by the Federal Treasury, I shall be glad to present it to the House of Representatives and request its publication in the RECORD.

If you feel that your Petroleum Administration for War will not be justly judged in this matter, I am inclined to believe that the House of Representatives would, upon due proposal, constitute a special committee of inquiry before which you and all other parties at interest, including the general public, might appear. My own view is that such an inquiry into the opposition to the Florida canal and the failure of our petroleum supplies is overdue.

JOE HENDRICKS.

Action, Not Words, Needed to Stop Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress have on their desks the monthly digest of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor. I hope that Members will read this digest in connection with the President's veto message on the Commodity Credit Corporation extension bill. I wish the President might have read it before he wrote his veto message.

This digest shows that from April 1942 to April 1943, hourly earnings in manufacturing industries increased 12.2 cents, or approximately 15 percent. It further shows that weekly earnings in April 1943 were $42.48 as compared with $35.10 in April 1942, or approximately 21 percent higher. It shows also that from May 1942 to May 1943 the cost of living advanced 7.8 percent. Inquiry of the Bureau of Labor Statistics gives me the information that the increase from April 1942 to April 1943 was exactly the same, 7.8 percent. In other words, weekly earnings in factory employment went up almost three times as much as the cost of living. Yet the President's message attempts to give the impression that wages have been stabilized and that it is only the cost of living which has been advancing. The President says we must roll prices back in order to avoid inflation. If we roll prices back and do not roll back wages and income, we are simply increasing the inflationary gap. We are increasing the amount of purchasing power at a time when the quantity of goods available for purchase is becoming smaller and smaller.

I am anxious to back the President in any real fight against inflation. I voted for the Gore amendment when the original price-control bill was under consideration. The administration opposed that amendment. It has continued to oppose every real effort to combat inflation. How can anyone take the President's talk about combating inflation seriously when the record shows that the administration has not up to date done one single thing to stop or even slow up inflation? On the contrary, it has sponsored and urged many highly inflationary proposals such as the 48-hour week with time and a half for all time over 8 hours and the present food-subsidy program. If the President means what he says about stopping inflation, let him prove it by rolling back income and wage payments as well as prices. This is a time for deeds rather than words.

The Shipbuilding Program in the San Francisco Bay Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio broadcast made by me over stations WSOO, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and WMAM, Marinette, Wis., on July 4, 1943:

Last Sunday I told you about the remarkable record that had been made by one of the famous Six Companies that had participated jointly in building Boulder Dam and other huge construction projects and who had been asked by Uncle Sam to turn their talents over to shipbuilding. Today I want to discuss another side of this shipbuilding program out here in the San Francisco Bay area which is not so rosy, and if I can I want to offer some reasons for the bogging down in this program.

In the course of our investigation we got up one morning at 5 o'clock in order to get aboard a new C-3 cargo vessel for its trial run. This ship, built in the Moore Drydock Co.'s yard in Oakland, had been launched June 4, 1942, over a year ago. It was to be a standard C-3, 19-knot dry-cargo vessel such as is standard in our pre-war long-range construction program. It is a beautiful ship, well built in every particular so far as I could see and I went over it with a fine-toothed comb. But when it was nearly complete the Maritime Commission decided it should be converted into a "reefer" ship, to have its cargo holds refrigerated to carry perishable meats, vegetables, etc., under lend-lease to Britain. Consequently, instead of completing this ship as originally designed—and we are still building many of this type—instead of pushing this almost completed ship through to completion, much of its interior had to be torn out and scrapped and then began a long wait for refrigeration machinery that was not received until late in April of this year, and so this ship that was launched over a year ago is just now going into service, and all those vital vessel-months of service have been sacrificed on the altar of indecision or of changed decisions.

A sister ship, launched shortly after this ship, was likewise ordered converted to a "reefer." Now, when that ship is about 85 percent completed, along comes the Navy and requisitions this ship ond orders it reconverted back to a one-fifth "reefer" and four-fifths dry cargo, unrefrigerated ship. So here is a case where we install dry cargo equipment, then rip it out and install refrigeration—then rip that out again and reinstall dry cargo equipment again. Do you wonder that the men who have put their heart and soul into their work and into the war effort, should not only become discouraged, but, in fact, actually rebellious? And I mean just that, because we had testimony freely given our committee that a committee of foremen in that yard had in their possession a petition which they intended to present to management stating they would henceforth refuse to buy any more War bonds if that ship was again reconverted, because they felt it was a waste of their own hard-earned money. And the unfortunate part of it was that they blamed the shipyard management for making these changes—whereas, they are only obeying orders from the Government departments. One certainly hesitates to question the judgment of either the Maritime Commission or the Navy in instances such as this, but at the same time, no one but a moron could fail to sympathize with the feeling of the men. And out here on the coast there is a shortage of manpower, and every honest hour's effort is demanded of every honest person engaged in every phase of the war effort. But, our committee could not fail to come to the conclusion that these constant changes in governmental designs, specifications, and so forth was doing untold harm to the over-all ship production schedule. It is almost driving both labor and management crazy. One manager showed me a cartoon that hangs near his desk in which it portrays a shipyard management and its whole office staff poised in a daily silent prayer, even before opening the morning's mail, that they be not hampered all that day by more changes in demands or specifications.

I might add in passing, that our committee, after witnessing the various tests to which these ships are subjected by the Maritime Commission before they accept the vessel from the builders, were taken off this ship by a Coast Guard patrol craft and taken direct to one of the newer shipyards which we inspected carefully and talked to a number of the employees. We were especially interested in checking into the food situation because of violent criticism which labor leaders had made to our committee that the men were not being fed hot lunches and given covered dining halls in which they could sit down during their half-hour lunch period and enjoy a hot meal. I shall not comment on that demand—I prefer to let you form your own comment. However, what we did find was that this yard had nine canteens scattered throughout the yard from which the workers could purchase cold sandwiches, milk, chocolate milk, coffee, all at 10 cents, and cigarettes, tobacco, etc. They could also purchase box lunches, put up by the yard in its own cafeteria, which contained two sandwiches, a salad, a dessert, an orange, and a drink for 35 cents. This reminds me that several days a week, back in Washington, I find it necessary to have one of the girls in my office get my lunch for me and I eat in my office. On such days I usually get two sandwiches and a bottle of milk and it costs me 37 cents. We went through a very excellent cafeteria, spotlessly clean, and in which a variety of hot and cold foods are served at prices which I considered somewhat below our prices in the Capitol Restaurant in Washington. True, this cafeteria is outside the

plant gates and far away from the shipways and their workers on shift, but it was designed for the office force as well as for the convenience of the several thousand employees that live nearby in the dormitories and apartments that the Government has built for the workers. In this yard at least, I cannot subscribe to the labor union representative's complaint.

At 5:45 that afternoon we witnessed a launching of a tanker at this yard after which we literally dashed back to our hotel to freshen up a bit and left almost immediately for a dash across San Francisco again and back to the Moore yard in Oakland across the bay to witness another launching over there of a vessel for the Navy. This particular launching was most interesting and a novel experience because I had a "worm's-eye view" of it. I was permitted to watch the operation of the huge and novel trigger arrangement by which this company launches its ships and in so doing stood directly under the hull while it slid down the ways over my head. It was quite a thrill. After speaking at the lunch which followed the launching, I was indeed glad to get back to the hotel at 10:30 and go to bed after a somewhat well-filled day.

We had some extremely sensational testimony before our committee with reference to the rather famous Kaiser yard, known as Richmond No. 3. An auditor of the Maritime Commission, Mr. Alonzo Bryan, voluntarily came before our committee and charged gross mismanagement, inefficiency, waste, and extravagance in the operation of the yard. Among other things, he charged that this yard had spent $106,000,000 out of an original appropriation of $185,000,000 and had not yet completed a single ship under that contract calling for some troop ships. He charged that the management kept no inventory whatsoever of the supplies and equipment and materials in the yard. If so, of course, that is absolutely inexcusable—and it is noted that in his prompt reply to these charges, Mr. Kaiser himself made no mention of that charge. As a matter of fact, he denied none of Bryan's charges but instead defended the yard by charging the fault to changes in designs and specifications by the Government. Mr. Bryan further charged that Kaiser had spent and was seeking repayment from the Government through the Maritime Commission of over $600,000 for the recruitment of workers in 11 Midwestern and Southern States. As I understood his testimony, he said this money was loaned the men in advance for transportation and living expenses and was to be repaid after the men earned it. But he charged that already, Kaiser management had admitted that at least $40,000 of this could never be recovered because at least 300 of these men had accepted the money and had never since shown up in the Frisco area—neither at Kaiser's plants, nor at any other Bay area shipyards. Mr. Bryan charged further that Richmond No. 3 had over 50,000 tons of steel on hand over and above its requirements and that much of this steel, prefabricated, was being transferred to its other yards. He charged that over $1,000,000 worth of linoleum and other floor coverings were on hand and being disposed of at less than cost because of changed designs. Now, of course, Mr. Bryan was not entirely aiming his charges against Kaiser but was simply pointing out facts and again we come back, as Mr. Kaiser himself pointed out in answering these charges, that the constant changes in designs and specifications and requirements of the Government are responsible for gross extravagance, waste, and inefficiency and contribute to a devastating slow-down in the production program for vitally needed ships.

However, following Mr. Bryan's testimony, we had still more startling testimony from a number of workmen in the yard. These men, likewise appearing voluntarily, were all keymen—they were foremen, leadermen, hull superintendents, yards inspectors, etc. With one exception, they claimed to be veteran shipbuilders of many years' practical experience. They charged a devastating lowering of morale among the trained men because of the fact that, first, Kaiser was trying to maintain his peacetime construction; second, that Kaiser was more interested in building facilities—that is, the shipyard itself—than he was in building ships; and, third, that their recruitment of manpower was a fabrication of falsehood, with resultant dissatisfaction, which caused a devastating turn-over of that manpower, with resultant drop in production.

Let us examine those charges more closely. These men, who proved they were veteran shipbuilders, charged that when Kaiser first started building ships for the Government he very wisely sought out trained shipbuilders and employed them as his inspectors, foremen, superintendents, etc. One of our biggest problems—and admittedly most disturbing problems—in this whole accelerated shipbuilding program has been the necessary dilution of our trained shipbuilding supervisory personnel. It has worried all of us who are concerned with the prosecution of the problem. However, these men charged that once they had been put in charge Kaiser immediately brought into the picture his own personnel who had been successful in his organization in building his large construction projects in peacetime; for example—Boulder Dam—in which he was one of the six companies (possibly the dominating voice). These men, excellent on such work, still know nothing about building ships. But these men bragged openly that once they had been trained in the shipbuilding techique by these trained shipbuilders they would be, and in many instances were, elevated in rank over their teachers—even when they were not half trained or half experienced in shipbuilding—and then the trained shipbuilders were either discharged outright or their salaries and other working conditions so altered that they were forced to quit in disgust or at least in discouragement. They could only say to themselves, "What's the use; I train them and then I get the ax one way or another."

Then, to make matters worse, when the Government comes along and changes designs or specifications, these half-trained dam builders do not know how to change their construction program accordingly. They are still not trained shipbuilders. If these charges be true—and they seem to be—the Kaiser miracle-man stuff is a complete hokum as far as I am concerned. He and his organization, having proven their inability to change as necessity demands, and as such can only qualify in my book as trained shipbuilders and good shipbuilders in exactly the same proportion as Machine Gun Jack Kelley can qualify as a tailor because I saw him deftly operating a mechanical cloth-cutting device in the Alcatraz Prison clothing factory recently. So this practice has ruined the morale of trained men who know how to lay out work on a ship, regardless of changes in design—such men must be trained shipbuilders of long experience. It was a mistake of the Maritime Commission to change designs at Richmond No. 3 if they knew Kaiser was building such an organization of pseudo shipbuilders out of admittedly experienced and excellent dam builders. Such men might be excellent at building shipyard facilities, but not ships. As for the misrepresentations in recruitment of manpower, these charges stem from the fact that perhaps some overzealous manpower salesmen in their zeal inform the recruits that they will have working conditions that do not exist, housing conditions that do not exist, feeding and transportation conditions that do not exist. That this has been done—no one can successfully deny to those who have experienced it. The labor turn-over speaks for itself. Also, the fact that Kaiser's recruitment agencies have even sent crazy people out here, whom the authorities returned to their homes under armed guards for whom they are now billing the Maritime Commission, cannot easily be excused. In fact, in this instance it cannot help but appear that Mr. Kaiser must have employed some old-timers who had had experience in the gentle art of Shanghaing seamen. Richmond No. 3 is not the rosy picture the press has built up about the miracle man.

Rotation of Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, numerous reports of conditions in the tropics and in the Arctic have reached me. I have been informed, for instance, that conditions in tropical climes such as the Solomon Islands are such that white troops have a hard time maintaining their health and morale under the depressing influence of these climates. On the other hand, I have received many letters from soldiers stationed in the Arctic indicating that these men miss the diversions and the entertainment of the more salubrious climates of the temperate zone; and the need of a change in station is very apparent after they have served in the Arctic for many months.

I realize that during the course of a long war, the War Department cannot consult the wishes of the men in service as to the place they desire to be stationed. I realize the needs of the service require fighting men who cannot be mollycoddled and pampered. On the other hand, I realize that this war has been going on for over one year and a half; and without rotation in the use of men there is danger of lowering the morale of our troops and even impairing their health if they are continuously kept in the severe heat of the tropics or in the rigors of the cold of Arctic latitudes. With this in mind, I have written the War Department regarding the policy of rotating troops who are exposed to the two extremes—heat and cold—and have received a reply to my letter. I feel that the country is entitled to the benefit of this correspondence which is most informative, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that this exchange of letters may be printed in the RECORD below:

JUNE 11, 1943.

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,

Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention through many channels that some of our troops stationed in out-of-the-way

parts of the world are living under most trying circumstances. For instance, I have just received a letter from a soldier in Guadalcanal who tells of the terrible strain upon white troops stationed in tropical countries due to insects, bugs, rodents, etc., which one finds in the tropics. I also have an Associated Press dispatch from a war correspondent, Olen W. Clements, in which he refers to the terrible annoyance of the "flies, ants, lizards, scorpions, and mosquitoes."

I have similar reports from the Arctic regions in reference to the strain upon the troops due to continuous cold and lack of normal entertainment, etc.

It has occurred to me that the War Department must have some rotation policy as to troops stationed in out-of-the-way places where such unusual strains are placed upon the troops in addition to the normal battle conditions. If such is the case, I would like to have your attitude on such a policy. Such rotation may not include the return of the men to continental United States; but may contemplate relief by moving them to other nearby theaters of action where such conditions do not obtain. Proper rotation may result in increased morale as well as reduction in number of hospital cases.

I will appreciate your report on this matter which in my opinion is becoming increasingly important as the war lengthens from months into years.

Very sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 24, 1943.

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BROOKS: I have your letter of June 11, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning the health and morale conditions of troops stationed in tropical countries and in the Arctic, and the possible rotation of troops on duty in these areas.

The War Department fully appreciates your views on this subject and you may be assured that every effort is being exerted for the health, welfare, and contentment of our armed forces wherever they may be stationed. They are being constantly watched over by men long experienced in detecting any change in health and/or morale. When the situation is such that it appears favorable to make a change, the men in isolated outposts are removed to larger bases where more facilities are available. In some areas soldiers are being furloughed to the continental United States in such numbers and at such times as shipping facilities, the tactical situation, and the availability of trained replacements permit.

With reference to your inquiry concerning troops in regions which lack normal entertainment, every practicable measure is being taken to encourage self-entertainment among the soldiers. In this connection, theatrical advisers are assigned to each area headquarters whose duties are to assist soldiers in entertainment projects. A limited number of soldier kits are available and every effort is made to distribute them to the most isolated groups. These kits are of various types, some containing theatrical equipment, others radio transcriptions and turntables, music and musical instruments, games, books, or athletic equipment.

Health conditions are being closely watched and our soldiers are receiving the benefit of the best medical and scientific teaching of this country. I am enclosing copies of War Department press releases on health measures being taken overseas, which will attest this fact.

I appreciate your interest in this vital question and I am sure you understand that there is no disinclination or oversight on the part of the War Department to limit the rotation or furloughing of these isolated groups. Such limitations as do exist are imposed by the lack of shipping facilities and the strategical and tactical considerations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

United States Faces Defeat on Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John H. Cline, from the Washington Star of July 4, 1943:

UNITED STATES FACES DEFEAT ON HOME FRONT

(By John H. Cline)

Despite the efforts of some officials to minimize the deterioration of the home front by accusing the press of making mountains out of molehills, it is perfectly evident that the state of affairs prevailing in Washington today gives very real cause for concern. The simple fact is that we are faced with a crisis in our conduct of the war on the home front—a crisis which cannot remain static, but which inevitably will grow worse unless determined and intelligent measures are taken to eliminate the causes of the trouble.

Broadly speaking, the difficulties now harassing the Government have their origins in two areas. The first and the primary trouble area is in the executive branch of Government, where poor administration has produced an appalling compound of confusion and conflict. The second area encompasses the relations between Congress and the President. To some extent the troubles in this field may be traced to an ailing executive establishment.

The chaotic conditions prevailing in the executive branch are the direct result of a persistent refusal to gear the Government's administrative machinery to the demands of total war. And the responsibility for this failure rests with the President. After the start of the war in Europe, but before Pearl Harbor, Mr. Roosevelt told the country that our defense program could be carried through without impairment of social gains by superimposing the defense establishment on the framework of normal industry. We were going to have guns and butter, too, although that assurance then was hardly less realistic than it would be today.

In fairness to the President, he has long since ceased to talk in terms of social gains. There is no longer any suggestion that we can enjoy the good things of life and also produce the facilities that we must have to fight the war. But granting this, the fact remains that Mr. Roosevelt has not yet been willing to go all the way down the line in converting the administrative branch of the Government from a peacetime to a wartime establishment. He lacks the time or the temperament, or maybe both, to get down to the tiresome and detailed job of personally administering the executive branch. And he has not been willing to delegate this onerous task to capable subordinates endowed with adequate and clear-cut authority.

This weakness in administration first showed itself when the President set up the old Office of Production Management under the joint direction of William Knudsen and Sidney Hillman. Neither man was to have final authority, the President said, but were to work together as partners. Presumably they were never to disagree, but, of course, they did, and within a short time the Office of Production Management disappeared in the first of a bewildering series of reorganizations which has brought forth a long list of alphabetical combinations, a few good men and a patchwork of Executive orders that would drive a jigsaw puzzle fan to distraction. It is only natural that there should have been a scramble for power in this legalistic no-man's land on the part of officials who seldom knew where their authority began or ended. And it is not surprising that the term "bureaucrat" as employed by a bewildered citizenry, has taken on a connotation that is something less than complimentary.

Had he been willing to do so the President at any time could have slashed a clear path through this maze, or he could have commissioned someone to do it for him. But he has preferred to reorganize and improvise, shuffling agencies and faces but never getting down to the unpleasant business of throwing out the incompetents and turning the job of running the administrative branch of Government, and the necessary authority, over to the best available men, regardless of their predelictions for or against the New Deal. The result is a state of demoralization at the seat of government, which forces into the open such feuds as that between Vice President WALLACE and Secretary of Commerce Jones. What are the people to think when nothing is done about a complaint from the Vice President that a Cabinet officer is obstructing the war effort by operating an "utterly inexcusable" form of "bureaucracy at its worst"? The complaint is either true or not true. If it is true, Mr. Jones has no right to continue in office, and if it is untrue, the Vice President should be called to account. But there is not the slightest indication that anything will be done about the matter.

In addition to its adverse effect on the people, this state of affairs has helped to widen the breach between the President and Congress at a time when they should be working in closest harmony. Not all of the President's differences with the legislators are due to sincere conflicts of opinion. Some are inspired in part, at least, by narrow political considerations in the House and Senate, but in the main the so-called legislative "revolts" are genuine manifestations of concern at the turn from bad to worse which our domestic affairs have been taking. Congress is close to the people. Every 2 years all of the Members of the House and a third of the Senators have to stand before their constituents for reelection, and it is a reasonably safe assumption that the uneasiness and the discontent that are so evident in Congress today reflect a similar uneasiness and discontent throughout the country.

Unfortunately, however, the recourse of the Congress, when it is in disagreement with the President, is largely negative in its effect. It can prevent the President from doing many things, but there is little that it can compel him to do. Thus, if the judgment of Congress were infallible, which it certainly is not, there would be little that it could do on its own initiative to put our domestic affairs in order.

In this situation, two things are imperatively needed. First, the President must clean house in the executive establishment himself, or turn this task over to some one who will not hesitate to see it through. Second,

the President and Congress must find a meeting ground on which they can subordinate their differences and work together to pull the country out of its headlong slide toward total demoralization. Unless both of these needs are met, and met soon, the people of this country are going to suffer some very painful consequences.

Independence Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the Independence Day exercises at Plainfield, N. J.:

My fellow Americans, we are met on the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. It is the year we also celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. We know that the substance and much of the form of the Declaration of Independence was the work of Thomas Jefferson. His knowledge of the efforts of humankind to obtain freedom and self-government, his intense desire to advance the principles to which he had devoted his life, established him as the individual to be the author of the declaration of principles upon which our Nation is founded. It was the most momentous document in the struggle for freedom that had been given to the world since the Magna Carta of 1215. Five hundred years had passed between these two events. One hundred and fifty years of it covered the period from the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock to the surrender at Yorktown. The culminating incident of this era of human progress was the Revolutionary War, resulting in a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and are endowed with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our whole existence since then has been one of continued progress and the development of institutions to preserve the freedom which had been won. The Declaration of Independence was the foundation upon which a new perspective of government was to be builded. The Constitution welded the Nation into an "indissoluble Union of indestructible States"; the Gettysburg Address gave new life and rededication to the principles established and recognized as essential to our continued existence as a free people.

Lord God of Hosts, whose mighty hand
Dominion holds on sea and land,
In peace and war Thy will we see
Shaping the larger liberty.

Our experiment in free government has been successful. For 150 years it has been our guaranty of the blessing of liberty. Our habit of life has attracted the attention of the civilized world. Peoples of all nations, races, and creeds have sought refuge on our shores, and we have carried the blessings we have enjoyed to enslaved peoples in all parts of the world. This has not been done without suffering and sacrifice. One generation after another has been faced with its problems, but as each difficulty presented itself we have met it with fortitude, in the cause of humanity, and in accord with the purposes wrapped in the folds of the American flag.

We meet today with the consciousness of the world cataclysm in which we are now involved—the most cruel and inhuman war that history records. We did not seek it. We sought in the name of humanity to avoid it. The barbarous forces of aggression and greed that brought it about must be and shall be destroyed. It is the obligation of every American to have an active part in that destruction. The men and women in the combat forces have a right to expect—and they demand—our utmost in production and self-denial. This war cannot be won by the men on the fighting fronts alone. The casualty lists bring home to us the seriousness and tragedy of the conflict. They emphasize what our fighting forces have to meet; 15,000 dead, 22,000 wounded, 34,000 missing and 20,000 are prisoners. These sacrifices are a challenge to the rest of us to do our share of the fighting by grim and courageous determination to keep the supply lines unbroken.

The Axis Powers ridiculed our entrance into the war. They had a mistaken notion that it was impossible for our men and women to develop into a fighting army, and that our industry was incapable of producing the necessary equipment. What we have accomplished is giving them an entirely different idea.

When the threat of war came we were under a severe handicap. We are a peace-loving nation. Our industry has always been geared to our peacetime habit of life. The Axis Powers are not so minded. The first objective of their industry has always been the preparation for war. So it came about that when we found ourselves the object of attack our enemies were well equipped, and we had virtually no war-production facilities. It was necessary to convert our entire industry to wartime needs—to build new factories, create new devices, and discover new formulas. How well we have succeeded is certified to by Maj. Gen. G. M. Barnes, Chief of the Army Ordnance Technical Division; he has said, "The achievements are beyond our greatest expectations"; and General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, recently said, "Not long ago our Air Force was so small that we knew each other by name." Our expansion started in June of 1940. In that month the military strength of the Army Air Forces was approximately 47,000. Today there are over 2,000,000 officers and men, or 42 times more than 3 years ago. The expansion in civilian personnel for the same period has been comparable—an increase from 8,000 to 330,000, or 41 times. Sixty thousand American flyers take the air every day all over the globe There are 1,600 planes being flown daily everywhere, mostly in foreign service. Every day more bombers are arriving in England. We have organized and equipped fighting forces on land and on sea. We have furnished our allies much of the equipment that has restored their confidence and given assurances of success.

All that has been accomplished demonstrates the capacity of the American people, their skill, and their patriotic zeal.

We are making progress. We are no longer on the defensive, we are carrying the battle to our enemies with marked success. We not only look forward to the success of our armed forces, but we realize that destruction of the enemy is only a part of the program ahead of us. Unless the peace is won the war will be lost. There is much discussion as to the form our participation in post-war rehabilitation should take. There is anxiety on the part of some that when the end of the conflict comes we will withdraw from participation in world affairs, and assume an attitude of so-called isolationism. That is impossible. It is impossible by the very nature of things. The world is still round, but it is much smaller than it was when Columbus made the discovery. Science has brought that about and, if we are to really understand our future position, we must evaluate such things as the part radio communication and airplane transportation will have in our commercial relations with other nations. But this much is certain—the American people anticipate participation in world affairs after the war sufficient to insure a lasting peace.

Our policy has been thought out and was given sanctity by the declarations of the Atlantic Charter as long ago as August 21, 1941: We seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise. We desire no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. We respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We will endeavor with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity We desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field to secure, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security. We hope, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, to see established a peace which will afford all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, which will afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want. We believe that all of the nations of the world must come to the abandonment of the use of force, and that, pending the establishment of a wide and permanent system of general security, disarmament of all nations is essential.

These are our hopes and aspirations. How they are to be brought about will depend upon conditions when the time comes for us to superimpose the blessings of peace upon the ravages of war. Then will come forth another Declaration of Independence, guaranteeing to millions throughout the world the inalienable rights with which they are endowed but which they have never enjoyed. The principal obstacle will have been removed with the unconditional surrender of the Axis Nations, and with that surrender will come release—then will come the reign of truth and peace—

God of the nations, who has led
Thy children since the world began,
Through doubt and struggle, pain and tears,
Unfolding Thy eternal plan;
From countless hilltops as of old
The fire upon the altar flares;
Through countless rites, in countless tongues,
Men offer their imperfect prayers;
Hasten the time of our release,
Bring in Thy reign of truth and peace.

O Holy Spirit, who dost touch
The prophets with Thy sacred fire,
Eternal Wisdom to whose light
All seekers after truth aspire;
Behold the warring sons of men,
The helpless by the strong oppressed,
The truth with error still concealed,
The evil grudgingly confessed;
Hasten the time of our release,
Bring in Thy reign of truth and peace.

Prohibitionists on Wrecking Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following edi-

torial from the Sheboygan (Wis.) Press of June 23, 1943:

PROHIBITIONISTS ON WRECKING TOUR

The brewing industry of the country will be curtailed for the duration of the war if certain organizations and individuals bent upon prohibition have their way.

We remember only too well what occurred in the World War when our young men were away fighting, and we are about to have a reoccurrence of the same, the goal being prohibition.

When the Office of Price Administration placed a ceiling on corn which was out of line with the ceiling on pork products farmers refused to sell their corn, believing they could realize a greater profit by feeding it to livestock. The Government, hopeful of remedying a grave situation, called loans on 1941 and 1942 corn, hoping this would force corn into the market. Up to date it has not had this effect. Farmers have paid for their loans and only a small amount has come into the market.

Congressman FRANK B. KEEFE states that he has received numerous wires and letters from various interests including a large number from brewers who claim they are dependent upon corn products in their brewery processing, and from the tone of these letters the situation is critical. Unless they can get an adequate amount of corn products the brewers will face the problem of curtailing to an extent that will paralyze the industry. Fast gathering rumors are circulating throughout Washington that the Government is going to adopt methods to seize corn much the same as was done with scrap but that it is to be delivered to essential industry—and the brewing industry is considered nonessential. This would leave the brewers out in the cold, and many would be forced to close.

In the First World War the same arguments were advanced that food was necessary to win the war, and prohibition followed. It was an overnight campaign of malicious falsehoods which swayed the people, and a minority, not a majority, became the controlling factor in putting over prohibition.

Today there is enough corn in the country for all essential industries and a supply for the brewing industry, if it is brought into use. The farmers have this corn, and it can be utilized with profit. To keep this corn on the farm, mortgaging the future of the country to the extent that it might be a war hazard, is not the way to solve this question.

Farmers and the Office of Price Administration must get together and move the corn. Corn is a commodity of value and essential, more so now than ever before. It should not be necessary in this country to have a corn drive similar to a scrap drive. There should be a frank understanding between the Government and the farmers, and the sooner this is accomplished the better for all concerned.

We would say to the Office of Price Administration and to the farmers don't let the prohibition crowd get a stranglehold on this country again. In the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States are many individuals who would sacrifice the welfare of a community or of a nation to win on the prohibition front. That is their stock in trade, and then they go home to their constituents and preach what a great service they have rendered.

It is an easy matter to upset the markets of the world, but not so easy to remedy them. If the Government will set the corn moving it will find its way into every industry and a problem that now looks serious could be righted in 30 days. If the Office of Price Administration and the farmers continue to fight over what is a fair price for corn and withhold it from circulation then we can look for drastic action, and that is what the prohibitionists favor. They want an order that will prevent corn from going into anything but an essential industry. The brewing business is considered nonessential.

We would ask that the Government, instead of adopting strong-arm methods to seize corn work it out on a basis that will be fair to the country at large and which will give a steady flow of corn to every State in the Union. Let us promote a system of good feeling, protect the workingman's glass of beer and say to the boys on the fighting front that we are going to keep the faith while they are away, that never again will we allow fanatical prohibitionists to dictate the policies of Uncle Sam.

We want to thank Congressman KEEFE for certain facts brought to our attention which have been most helpful.

Happiness—A Right?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Channing Pollock:

HAPPINESS—A RIGHT?

(By Channing Pollock)

Every now and again I serve on a board that hears human-relations controversies and attempts mediation. A few weeks ago one of the appellants, a young woman who was urging that a man divorce his wife to marry her, supported her claim by telling me, "The Declaration of Independence gives everybody the right to be happy."

My answer was, "I don't think our founding fathers meant what you mean. Anyway, hasn't this wife the right to be happy, too?"

The lady hadn't thought of that. Her idea was the not uncommon one that what Thomas Jefferson and his collaborators intended was an assurance that henceforth we should "eat, drink, and be merry," each of us being guaranteed whatever he or she regards as essential to his or her unvarying satisfaction.

Few phrases are used as often as "the right to happiness," meaning, according to the person who utters it, the right to limitless self-indulgence, to animal gratifications, or to material possessions. The right to happiness is the right to a fat bank account, to be idle and thriftless, to a mink coat, or to the man or the woman we desire at the moment, no matter what the legal or other obstacles.

There is no such right to happiness, and nothing could be more absurd or fallacious than the notion that anything of the sort was among the truths held "to be self-evident." The desperate men who signed "the unanimous declaration of the Thirteen United States of America" could hardly have been in the mood to consider bank accounts or illicit love.

Most of them were sober citizens of extremely moderate means who toiled long hours under conditions that we should regard as unbearable. They were our leading citizens in the sense of mental and moral leadership; very few of them had, or cared about, even the modest luxuries of that day. At the moment they certainly were not interested in what so many of us call happiness. More probably, they were thinking of their embattled brothers at Lexington and Concord, of Ethan Allen and his ragged and badly armed Green Mountain boys at Fort Ticonderoga, of the farm lads out of ammunition on Breed's Hill and Bunker Hill, of their just cause and the likelihood that every mother's son of them might be hanged if it failed.

As a more or less casual bystander, it seems to me that there are many misapprehensions as to the Declaration, as to Independence, and as to happiness. The Declaration was purely a political document, that is, pertaining to public policy—and every sentence in it referes to political authority and jurisdiction. Whatever his personal opinion of parity of intellect and character, when Jefferson wrote that "all men are created equal," he meant only that they were equal before the law and had equal rights under it. Among these, he mentioned "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Plainly, he meant the right to earn a living, and to retain and use our earnings, to do that and other things freely, and the right to achieve happiness by our own efforts. The pursuit of happiness does not suggest that it shall pursue us.

No one has the right to do that which, if it were done by everyone, would be opposed to the common good. I might regard intoxication as blissful, but that doesn't give me the right to inflict it upon my family and the community. The conviction that riches are happiness doesn't give me the right to steal. Nor does desire for the happiness of an extra day or two of idling give me the right to jeopardize other men's lives, and our victory, by deserting my post at a desk or lathe. I have the legal right to spend my money as I choose, but even then the happiness I find in motoring does not give me the moral right to waste rubber and gasoline, nor does the happiness I may derive from luxury give me the moral right to buy champagne rather than War bonds.

In short, we have no rights that interfere with the rights of others. As my lawyer friend Arthur Garfield Hays has often remarked, "I have the right to swing my arm; that right ends at the point of your jaw."

Finally, it seems to me that many of us attach too much importance to happiness, and that what we call happiness may be shabbily mean and ignoble. To be happy because we live, because we are free, because we are well and neither naked nor hungry, because we have work to do and are doing it to the best of our abilities, because we have deserved and kept the love of those under our roof or protection—these are happinesses we may seek and enjoy with our own self-respect and that of the community.

That truth is self-evident. Since Jefferson declared that he wrote the document in an outburst of patriotism, it is, I feel sure, what he and his fellows had in mind when they risked death by signing a declaration that men are endowed by their Creator with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Life Magazine Calls House Concurrent Resolution 25 First Step in the Development of a Truly National Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in

the RECORD the following editorial, which appeared in Life magazine June 28, 1943:

FULBRIGHT'S RESOLUTION—A YOUNG CONGRESSMAN OFFERS A FOREIGN POLICY PLANK THAT BOTH PARTIES CAN ACCEPT

Well, last week the home front made some progress. Not that it sprouted wings, exactly. John L. Lewis, wages, price control, rationing, subsidies, food shortage—all these administrative matters were in a terrible snarl. The new boss of the home front, James Byrnes, was in the middle of the snarl, which was so bad that he had called on Bernard Baruch, veteran wager of war, to help him cut his way out of it. But these two had not yet had enough time to prove what they could do. The progress that the home front made last week came from another and entirely unexpected quarter. It came from Congress.

A couple of months ago, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, a freshman Congressman from Fayetteville, Ark., introduced a resolution to which few paid any attention. The resolution was as plain as an old hat. It said:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

This forthright, simple declaration was referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which Congressman FULBRIGHT is a member. It was allowed to soak in the committee for more than 2 months, and hardly anybody outside of Congress even knew of its existence. But last week Chairman SOL BLOOM gave it a hearing. The result was a spectacular unanimous vote. Friends of the resolution may well keep it off the floor until after the approaching congressional recess. For while the backing for it is now very large, some think it will grow even larger after Congressmen have had a chance to talk to the folks.

FIFTEEN YEARS

The Fulbright resolution is stated in exactly one sentence. When someone asked the Congressman how long it took him to write that sentence he smiled and said he guessed about 15 years. What he meant, of course, was that he had been studying the problem of United States foreign relations for at least that long. In fact, when the folks back in Arkansas' Third District chose him for Congress in 1942 they picked a man well equipped to represent them in a world crisis. For Congressman FULBRIGHT, relatively unknown up to now, has a broad background. He was a Rhodes scholar at Oxford University, England, 1925–28. He traveled in Europe. And he became president of the University of Arkansas at the early age of 34. Sitting last week amidst a deluge of fan mail and telephone calls, which were running 15 to 1 in favor of his resolution, he cracked, "Everybody assumes that just because a fellow comes from Arkansas he can't read or write. But that's where they're wrong."

Congressman FULBRIGHT is a Democrat, as are 13 other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. But he was able to carry his resolution across party lines and get the unanimous support of the 11 Republican members, too. In fact, some of the Republicans were very active—for example, JAMES WADSWORTH of New York, leading Republican statesman in the House, JOHN VORYS and FRANCES BOLTON of Ohio, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is perhaps worth noting that the resolution is particularly popular with new Congressmen, whether on or off the Foreign Affairs Committee. Young Democrats like WILL ROGERS, Jr. of California and MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, new and rising Republicans like RICHARD GALE or WALTER H. JUDD of Minnesota, CHRISTIAN HERTER of Massachusetts, or JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS of New Jersey—to mention only a few—are burning with desire to have the United States develop a more dynamic foreign policy. They see in this resolution a chance to take a big step ahead—and for three chief reasons:

1. It would put our allies on notice that we intend to be counted in. Such a notice is urgent because, without it, United Nations statesmen cannot develop intelligent policies. For that matter, unless we give such a notice, policies may be developed which will not be to our advantage.

2. Although very general in form, the resolution has a set of teeth. Not only does it call for international machinery with adequate power but it also favors United States participation in such machinery.

3. It is a grass-roots resolution in which the administration has had no hand. It can therefore help to put United States foreign policy on a broad, popular base.

OBJECTIONS

Politics being what they are, a number of objections have been raised against the Fulbright resolution. One is that it is too general and vague. Yet an attempt at this time to frame a specific plan might lead to eventual disaster, as in the case of the League of Nations. It is better to begin with a simple expression of popular opinion. Another objection is that the resolution would not constitute a foreign policy, because it would not be irrevocably binding. It would, however, be morally binding, and the voters could make it stick by keeping the heat turned on their Senators and Congressmen.

It is also objected that the treaty-making power does not reside with the House but with the Senate, and, moreover, that it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty. But this is surely a very narrow view of the matter. For one thing, the people have on occasion bypassed the Senate to carry out desired policies. Both Hawaii and the State of Texas, for example, were annexed by joint resolutions of the House and Senate, chiefly because administration leaders had despaired of Senate action. But as a matter of fact the Fulbright resolution leaves all the actual arrangements with the Senate and does not in any way infringe on that body's treaty-making power. The Fulbright resolution is a popular expression of a general principle, leaving to Senators the tough job of deciding on the kind of machinery needed. Indeed, it merely takes advantage of the courageous work already done by several Senators, notably Messrs. BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL, who have been advocating for months a similar—though more complex—Senate resolution.

TWO-PARTY POLICY

The fact is that this resolution opens up a great political opportunity, it is a first step in the development of a truly national foreign policy. As this page has pointed out before, a foreign policy has to be basically bipartisan—that is, it must be advocated in principle by both parties. Naturally the Republicans are never going to agree with the Democrats concerning all the details of any policy, because the Republican view of what is good for America differs greatly from the Democratic view. But a foreign policy advocated by the party in power and flatly opposed by the opposition, can never work; for foreign statesmen can never tell when the opposition will gain power (perhaps on a domestic issue) and so cancel out every previous foreign commitment, expressed or implied. Foreign statesmen can only accept United States commitments if they know that the opposition agrees in essence with the party in power—as for instance, in the case of the long-accepted Monroe Doctrine. Thus if either party is to have a foreign policy at all, it must find agreement with the other party. For if such agreement is lacking, neither party can govern in foreign affairs.

This is the great principle toward which far-sighted Republicans, often misunderstood and reviled by their own party, have been working for the last several years. They have sought a common ground on which all Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, can undertake to deal with the rest of the world. The House Foreign Affairs Committee may not have discovered all of the common ground that there is. There may be other, more advanced principles on which both Democrats and Republicans can agree. But by its unanimous vote the committee has shown that such a ground does exist and is possible to achieve. In this sense it has opened up a new horizon. And the time has now come for Americans of all parties to lift their eyes to this horizon—because it is their common horizon, it belongs to all of them.

Congress Revolts Against Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently 17 meat-packing houses and scores of meat dealers in the Cincinnati, Ohio, area have suspended operations, and others are bound to follow unless immediate action is taken by responsible Government departments to assure processors of meats and dealers at least an opportunity to exist. As the situation which I have described prevails generally throughout the country we are facing a tragic meat famine. The sad part of it is, this is occurring at a time when the supply of livestock is estimated to be greater than at any other time in our history.

Bureaucratic bungling is destroying the meat-packing industry when it is needed the most, yet we appear to be no closer to a solution of the problem than we were more than a year ago when it was first pointed out that packers could not continue in business under existing policies. Congress has made every possible effort to have those responsible for food administration adopt a sound program and to adhere to the laws enacted by Congress, but it all appears to have been without avail.

As some of the circumstances which contributed to the present deplorable situation are well described in an able article by Owen L. Scott entitled "Congress Revolts Against Irresponsibility," appearing in the Washington Sunday Star of July 4. I am submitting it herewith for your consideration:

CONGRESS REVOLTS AGAINST "IRRESPONSIBILITY"

(By Owen L. Scott)

Out of today's revolt of Congress against the White House is likely to develop a more responsible type of administration of wartime powers. This revolt, in fact, stems from a strange situation in which persons with little or no public responsibility were exercising immense authority.

There had developed here what amounted to a "brain trust" that shaped domestic policies and, on occasion, enforced those policies.

This brain trust, which stemmed from Harry Hopkins, who lives in the White House, was and still is very small and compact. Its principal members are three.

Ben Cohen is the elder statesman of the group. Mr. Cohen is right-hand man to James Byrnes as war mobilizer and is the former junior partner in the Corcoran-Cohen team. The second of the group is Richard Gilbert. Mr. Gilbert is former economic adviser to Harry Hopkins and now is right-hand man to Prentiss Brown as Price Administrator. The third is Edward Prichard. Mr. Prichard is not long out of Harvard and is a former law clerk for Justice Felix Frankfurter. He is right-hand man to Judge Fred Vinson as economic stabilizer.

This little group decided on a price rollback for a few agricultural commodities and selected the commodities. The decision was made without prior consultation with the Government's officials who are responsible for wartime food policy. It was made on this basis in spite of the fact that the Price Control Act passed by Congress specifically directs that the Secretary of Agriculture, or in this case the Food Administrator, shall give prior approval before policies affecting farm prices can take effect.

One or two further examples illustrate part of the reason why Congress revolted.

The first concerns meat. The country is aware that the Nation's whole meat-producing and meat-marketing industry recently has been in turmoil. Congressmen discovered that an important part of this turmoil traced to a decision of youthful Mr. Prichard.

Mr. Prichard, without prior consultation with the responsible Food Administration officials, apparently had made up his mind that public announcement should be made that a meat roll-back would take place on a specific date. The announcement was made before regulations governing the roll-back were drawn. No cattle grower or cattle buyer or meat packer had the slightest idea of how he was expected to do business from that time until days later, the regulations appeared. The Nation's whole cattle-marketing system was thrown into turmoil from which it did not easily recover.

Then a second example concerns wages. This country has a War Labor Board made up of four outstanding labor leaders, four outstanding employer members, and four outstanding public members. These are men of long experience and reach their decisions against a background of wide knowledge of individual cases. Therefore, it has been something of a surprise to the Labor Board members to find that their decisions are subject to the veto of 27-year-old Mr. Prichard, whose entire worldly experience has been gained in recent Government service.

In one case, as an example, the War Labor Board decided that an equally important industry in that same area, competing for the same labor, likewise would have to have an increase in wages if it was to be able to obtain the labor needed to operate. In this case, without consulting the Board, Mr. Prichard decided that the increase should be vetoed, and so he vetoed it. The result was a serious situation in another industry.

The American people have the idea that there is a sort of a supreme court of elder statesmen, operating through an adequate machine and making decisions on the basis of exhaustive study, which now runs the planned wartime economy. They have confidence in Justice Byrnes, Judge Vinson, and Bernard Baruch, who advises them. But these men have next to no real staff. The problems that they must pass upon are many and complex. It is only natural that a handy brain trust takes over much of the job of making Nation-shaking decisions.

However, Congress is not satisfied that this method of operation is the best. It is unwilling to permit the very life of American industries to be entrusted to the tender mercies of youthful lawyers and economists, selected without Senate approval, and exercising vast authority with no public responsibility. The Nation has not been aware of the way decisions were being made, or by whom those decisions were being made.

To try to remedy a situation that was getting out of hand, Congress has given the War Labor Board specific statutory standing. This means that this Board is a creation of Congress. It may mean that Mr. Cohen and Mr. Prichard can be less high-handed in dealing with its decisions. At the same time, Congress is trying to bulwark the authority of the War Food Administration so that this administration can have some authority to go along with its great responsibility.

The revolt in Congress is directed at what Congressmen regard as irresponsibility in public administration. It is designed to prevent high-handed practices on the part of officials who operate in the background and who do not take responsibility for their acts.

Resolution of the Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1943, the Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, adopted a resolution urging that aliens who have not availed themselves of the opportunity to apply for citizenship and those who have filed their first application and who have been found to be giving aid and sympathy to our enemies be returned to the country from which they came within 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, and also expressing opposition to unrestricted immigration.

Pursuant to authority heretofore given, I include as a part of my remarks this resolution, which is as follows:

DEPARTMENT ENCAMPMENT,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 27, 1943.

Be it resolved, That all aliens who have had ample opportunity to make proper application for citizenship and who have not availed themselves of that opportunity and those who have made their first application and who have been found to be giving aid and sympathy to our enemies be returned to the land from whence they came within 6 months from the cessation of hostilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to letting down the bars to unrestricted immigration from any foreign country whatsoever; and be it further

Resolved, That citizenship be not granted to any alien under any circumstances who has been admitted to this country by Presidential decree or by other method of avoiding the present laws governing entry to the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be given to the press, the Oregon delegation in Congress and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars National Encampment.

Adopted by the Department Encampment, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States.

The Only Way To Save the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE ONLY WAY TO SAVE THE DAY

We don't promote prosperity
When we discourage thrift—
We don't by weakening the strong
Give to the weak a lift.

We've never yet helped small men up
By tearing big men down—
It does not help the poor to break
The rich in any town.

We can't keep out of trouble if
We spend all our income—
We can't secure world brotherhood
By stirring strife at home.

We can't have sound security
On money that's a loan—
We can't in men build character,
If we've none of our own.

We can't give courage, yet destroy
Men's independence—nor
Can anything but hope for peace
Make sane men turn to war.

We can't help men by helping them
To feed from public shelves—
The only way to help men is
To help them help themselves.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Inflation—The Economic Fifth Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the so-called Commodity Credit Corporation bill passed the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States and was vetoed by the President. The President in vetoing this bill sent to Congress one of the strongest veto messages that I have heard.

To my mind, the danger of inflation is the most serious situation that confronts the American people from a domestic standpoint. I can remember, as I stated in the House on Saturday, coming home from the last war and having to pay enormous prices for the common necessities of life. Each person can remember what sugar, coffee, bacon, flour, and other supplies cost in that period of the World War and following it.

Fortunately, in this war there has been a control of prices—while mistakes may have been made, yet the American Government and the American people have been saved from these abnormal conditions due to the wise policy of the

administration. Much has been said in the papers about inflation. Much has been said on the radio about inflation. Many people in each community have been discussing this subject. Some are asking what it is—what it does—and whether we are already having a taste of inflation and can expect more of it.

I shall answer the last question first. We are now tasting inflation in the way that a small boy takes the first bite of a green apple. And, like the small boy, if we eat all of the unripe fruit and many more like it, we shall be a very sick country. It will take us a long time to recover.

Before I give you a definition of inflation I will tell you how it works. Its approach is often slow and insidious. The victims rarely know what is happening until the damage is done. But it works with increasing speed and terrible efficiency. Once set in motion, like a stampede of wild cattle, it is very hard to stop, and when at length it is halted, it leaves behind it the wreckage of human lives and fortunes that may take decades to repair.

As a part of my definition of inflation, therefore, I will tell you that it is a force, a force in motion, and that this movement is one marked by increasing velocity. That is, the effect is similar to an avalanche. A lump of snow or ice, at an elevation, and under certain conditions is dislodged and begins to roll down, gathering weight and momentum as it rolls until, perhaps, it overwhelms villages in its path until it stops at the bottom—at the end of its devastating journey.

There is this difference, however, between a picture of an avalanche and the effects of inflation. An avalanche is pulled downward by the force of gravity. The force of inflation is upward. It pushes everything up. Wages go up. The prices of farm products go up. Farm land values go up. And all prices, on which are based the cost of living, go up, too. Unfortunately, it is a peculiarity of inflation that cost-of-living prices go up much faster after a certain period than all these other factors. The cost of living by degrees overtakes and passes wage increases; it exceeds the rate of rise in farm land values and in prices received by farmers, so that neither higher wages nor higher farm prices nor any other temporary advantages that people may secure through selling their products or services at a better than normal figure are ever able to keep up with the cost of living during a period of inflation. It becomes a race in which every entry seems to be an also-ran. Certain classes of citizens suffer more acutely than others during inflation, but I will speak of them later.

To many of us inflation is just another name for high prices. There have been periods of generally high prices without inflation. During the gold-rush days in the Klondike, eggs at one time sold for a dollar apiece. There was a good deal of gold dust, and not many eggs. When more eggs got to Alaska, the price broke. A gold rush sets up a mild form of inflation, because there is more money to spend than goods to spend it on, but the effects are usually local and temporary. A wartime inflation, on a Nation-wide scale, is more than a gigantic gold rush; it becomes a national catastrophe. A small stream in a flash flood may do considerable local damage, but when some of our mighty Midwest rivers go on a rampage a vast area is affected and the economic consequences affect millions of people remote from the scene of the calamity. That is the way a national inflation works.

Inflation, as I have explained, has to do with the upward movement of the cost of living. But it is not a steady, gradual rise. It gathers force and speed until, toward the end, the effect may be one of almost explosive violence; that is, the prices of goods and services skyrocket, and, like a spent rocket, when the thing is all over, prices plunge downward abruptly, values collapse within a short space of time.

Let me give you an example. During the last war, as I have stated, we had an inflation that started about 1918. It did not come to a head, however, until 1920, when the war was all over. In May 1920 American farmers were receiving prices for farm products that on the average were 244 percent of the 1909–1914 average—almost 2½ times what they had got in peacetime. Then the bubble broke, and 1 year later their receipts were only slightly above the prices they got in the pre-war period. But mark this. The cost of living was still up. It had reached extravagant heights, and while the farmers' income was more than cut in half within 1 year, the prices they had to pay for living and for producing fell only 20 percent. The result was, that the real per capita income of America's farmers in 1921, what they could get for what they raised, was 19 percent below the 1913 level. With their 1921 income they could buy only a little more than four-fifths of what they could afford 8 years earlier.

Putting it another way, we can measure what happened to the American farmer during the last war in terms of the value of the average farm. At the height of that inflation, in 1920, our farms were worth, on paper, quite a lot of money. Farm land was considered very valuable because of the returns it yielded. The price of all grains, for example, was about two and one-third times the pre-war level. Cotton was almost two and one-half its normal price. Meat animals had more than doubled in price. The result was a great deal of speculative buying and selling of farms. While the wheat boom was on, hundreds of thousands of acres of grazing sod in the West were turned under and sowed to wheat. The notorious Dust Bowl came about from plowing up that prairie soil, which should have been kept as dry pasture.

Now, in 1920 the average value of farm land and buildings throughout the country was $10,284. That is a high average, but these values, you understand, were inflated values. They were not justified on the basis of long-time returns from farms. What was the average value of American farms in 1935, 15 years later? Just about $4,825, or less than half of their war-boom values.

Another thing happened during that inflation which was bad for the farmer. Under the temptation of high prices he went into debt. Mortgage loans, especially short-term notes, underwent a terrific expansion. Down payments were relatively small, and farmers, flushed with high incomes, piled up obligations without meeting them out of cash balances. When the boom collapsed, the farmer had to meet his obligations or see his farm foreclosed. He had to meet his debts with money that would not stretch as far as it did in 1920 because of his lowered income. In short, he met debts incurred in a period of "cheap" money with payments in a long period of "dear" money.

Twenty years after 1920 the American farmer was still paying the penalty for the inflation spree. In the single decade ending in 1939 more than 85,000 farm owners lost their farms under foreclosures. As for the farmer's race with the cost of living, it was not until 1942 that the average of farm prices reached parity with other prices.

Returning to the present inflationary trend, we must ask ourselves why we are in danger of experiencing a worse inflation than the last one unless, as the President warned us, we "hold the line" on every side of the domestic economic front. There are several circumstances that might lead to extreme inflation, but the main one is the increasing lack of balance between our national income and the quantity of goods and services that we can spend it on.

Briefly, in 1939 the gross individual incomes of all American citizens totaled about $71,000,000,000. After Pearl Harbor, as our war industries began to spurt, the national income went up by leaps and bounds. Last year it was approximately $116,000,000,000 and this year it is expected to pass $140,000,000,000, or about twice what it was 4 years ago. Let us see how we stand on consumer goods and services. In 1939 these amounted to around $72,500,000,000—plenty for the money we had to spend on them. Two years later their value had increased by about $10,000,000,000. There were still plenty of things to spend money on. In 1942, however, we began to discover that we couldn't carry on a war of this magnitude and enjoy peacetime luxuries, gadgets, and machines using essential war materials. We had to stop buying new automobiles, electric refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners and radios. By degrees we found hundreds of items to which we had been accustomed missing from store shelves. Nevertheless, our inventories of civilian goods were so large that there was still some $82,000,000,000 worth available. Today we are spending more than $7,000,000,000 a month for war—and although this money is going into people's pockets through wages and

profits it goes for things that civilians can use. We shall be lucky if we have $80,000,000,000 in civilian goods and services.

Under normal conditions this amount would be ample. These are not normal conditions. Millions of people who never had much money to spend now have a comfortable income. And they want to spend that money, along with everyone else. Unfortunately, there are not enough ways to use up our enormous buying power, not even with the considerable taxes we are now paying. In fact, it has been estimated that this year the people of the United States could pay all their taxes, spend $80,000,000,000 for available goods and services, and still have more than $40,000,000,000 left over.

That excess of disposable income over consumer goods and services is like a huge reservoir, into which floodwaters are pouring. These unused billions exert a tremendous pressure against the price structure. If we did nothing about it, excess consumer money bidding for scarce goods would force prices sky high; wages and farm values would follow suit. We would have a first-rate, large-scale inflation on our hands.

To meet this menacing situation, the Government has taken a number of measures. We have rationing, or dividing up scarce goods on a fair and equable basis. Along with that, we have a great number and variety of price controls. We have drained off some of the surplus through rather heavy taxes. But the Government alone—no government—could halt an inflation without the cooperation of all its citizens.

What can the citizen do to prevent the bursting of the inflation dam?

He can invest every cent he has to spare in War bonds. This not only drains off excess buying power, it provides a backlog for the post-war period. War bonds after the war will enable us to buy many things we cannot get now, and they will be better things in every way—more modern houses, automobiles, electric household machines, and the like.

The citizen can also pay off mortgages and other debts. In the case of farmers this is very important. Farm land values throughout the country during the past year have shown a disturbing tendency to increase abnormally. In 13 States values have increased from 20 to 24 percent. Fortunately, these average increases have not been accompanied, as in the last war, by a great increase in mortgage debt. On the contrary, American farmers during the past year paid off three times as much mortgage debt as they had, on the average, during the previous 3 years. This is a healthy sign. Debt-paying is a brake against inflation. Down payments on recent land purchases are also reported to be substantial, as a rule, and there is less speculative buying than during the last war.

The most important step for the citizen to take, however, is the hardest one. It is hard for the farmer, for the businessman, for the wage earner. That is, to forego special privileges that lead to increases in costs or prices.

It is easy to see why such a step is necessary. In spite of all efforts to keep down the cost of living, it has gone up, although not as rapidly as during the last war. At present the index of the cost of living is about 24 percent above that of 1939. In general, the farmer at present is in an advantageous position. Last year, for the first time in 20 years, the annual average of farm prices reached parity with other prices. Since the outbreak of the war in Europe, the average of farm prices has risen more than 90 percent, and farm income by about 80 percent, while the average of prices paid by farmers, including taxes and interest, has increased about 25 percent.

If, however, the farmer demands more for his products, and the laborer demands more for his work, and the businessman takes larger profits, the dizzy wheel of inflation is set in motion. It spins faster and faster, until all of us are caught in the mad whirl, and no power on earth can halt it.

There are whole classes of citizens to whom such a distortion of values means extreme hardship. These are the people with fixed incomes—teachers, employees of county, city, and State governments, those who have invested their savings in insurance or other stable investments. For the rain of inflation dollars will not increase the face value of your insurance policy by a single dollar.

We have taken a bite of the green apple, a 24-percent bite. But we are not small boys in an orchard. We are men and women engaged in a desperate struggle with ruthless enemies. Millions of our young men are risking and giving their lives to preserve the freedoms we have cherished since 1776. We must assure those millions of citizens in uniform that we at home have not permitted the home front to be wrecked by the most deadly and insidious of fifth columns—inflation. We must make sure that our citizen soldiers, sailors, and airmen return to a land that is economically sound and whole.

We can do this if we consider that the good of the Nation takes precedence over the temporary advantage of any one class of citizens. We must observe on our home front the same self-denial and discipline that are observed throughout the world by our fighting men.

It is the duty of each one, and especially those of us who are Members of Congress, to remember that while our soldiers are fighting on many fronts in the world that we must preserve the economic situation in our own country. We must not permit the farmers, the wage earners, the school teachers, the professional men, and others who live on wages and salaries to be ruined financially. It is our duty to prevent inflation even though each one of us makes a sacrifice for this purpose. The sacrifice that we make is small compared with what our men and women in the armed forces are making.

Vacation Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an article in the Washington Times Herald, of date July 4, 1943, by Helen Essary, which article I think should be read by every Member of Congress:

I had a thrilling experience one evening last week. I heard America talked about in terms of America.

I heard America talked about—not in terms of Timbuctoo or Shangri-La but, I repeat, in terms of America. When I say "America" I mean, of course, "The United States."

It was not only a thrilling experience. It was an unaccustomed experience. I was not the only member of the little after-dinner conversation group who was aware of the novelty of such a theme in this globe-conscious Nation.

Each of us there was a citizen of the United States, yet each of us was startled to hear the present and future of his own native land selfishly put above the present and future of all far-away and nearby countries.

When we began to realize that, we were indeed startled at such unfamiliar doctrine. We were embarassed that we were startled. Suddenly we knew that unwittingly, like many Americans, we had been setting our minds on strange gods and strange goals.

Stupid business we had been engaged in, we thought with one accord, for here in America, in this great powerful country that is our own, are the gods and the goals, the promised land of most of civilized mankind.

The man who was selling us America was not a native American. He was a naturalized American. He was a Nordic born in one of the now occupied countries. He came to the United States many years ago as an immigrant boy of 14.

He had sailed away from an old land where life had little promise for the underdog. He had made his way up, doggedly, adventuringly, in this New World. He had fought through the hard days with no assets but strength of purpose and strength of body. He had come through the struggle tough and still fighting, with mind uncluttered with benevolent thoughts about helping the entire world.

His creed—he told us again and again—was America first, now, after the war, and always.

"Why should any American worry long over the comfort of any country but his own?" this forthright fellow demanded. "Who is interested in us except as a source of supply? Why do we fool ourselves with all this nonsense about love between nations?

"Why do we continue to give and give and give? Is it because we want other people to live our way? Will we ever stop meddling? Don't we know we can't afford to be missionaries forever?"

"I tell you there has got to be an end to this squandering," he added. "We've got the greatest of all countries but we can't hand out our children's resources the way we are doing. What we need to do and do at once is to be conscious first and last and all the time of America. And be conscious

of it without apology or explanation. What we need is passionate loyalty to America.

"Why are Stalin, Churchill and Hitler such leaders in their own countries?" asked the one-time immigrant now turned crusader. He had an answer before any of his listeners could find a sentence. It was because Stalin was a thousand percent Russian. Churchill was forever and completely a Briton. Hitler had his mind on Germany. Yet many of us in this country are in danger of forgetting the interests of America in our zeal to help the entire world.

"You can't keep this up," he declared. "You've got to put a limit somewhere or you will drain the country dry. Say you will stop at a debt of $500,000,000,000. And see that you do stop there. This country is so rich in resources, in energy and in the character of the people that $500,000,000,000 can be carried through without hardship to anybody, providing, of course, that you let it go no further."

"Providing also that industry will give jobs to the 12,000,000 fighting men and the 20,000,000 in war plants who will be stranded when peace comes," one of the group remarked.

Our 100-percent American had an answer for this, too. He was an industrialist himself, he explained. He was enlarging his plant to take in thousands of workers after the war. Everybody had to put a shoulder to the wheel of reconstruction, he said, and everybody would, if there was certainty that this Nation would grow up and stop loving the universe at the risk of its own salvation.

"What are we doing with the Old World still hanging around our necks?" demanded the former immigrant. "I am proud of the country in which I was born. But I am prouder of the country that gave me a chance to succeed and can still give every man a chance to succeed if he will work.

"After this war we've got to let those old countries, big and little ones, too, fight their way alone. We can't have them all pulling and nagging at us.

"Our responsibility is to our own people. The only talk we ought to have with any nation is the talk of trade. Not pretty, philanthropic trade, but the kind of trade by which, for example, I would sell an automobile to England at not only a profit on what it cost me but at a profit greater than the citizen of any other nation could make.

"If England, or any other country, can manage to sell us something at a profit to herself, all right, let her. But for heaven's sake, at the end of this war let's stop being mawkish. We've got to show we're made of the same stuff as the pioneers who built the grandest country on earth."

Talk to make you think, isn't it? I pass it on to you.

Bulkley Telegraph Trail Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to present herewith a copy of the remarks made by Col. K. B. Bush, Chief of Staff, Northwest Service Command, in presenting the Bulkley Telegraph Trail Journal to the Alaska Territorial Museum at Juneau, Alaska, on June 18, 1943. Colonel Bush is not only an engineer of great ability, but is possessed of the vision and foresight so valuable for the development of a frontier.

Governor Gruening, Secretary Bartlett, Mr. Keithahn, my friends of Juneau: We of the Northwest Service Command have been favored with so many kindnesses by the people of Alaska in general and you of Juneau in particular that it is a pleasant duty for us to come here today on behalf of the Commanding General of the Northwest Service Command to present the Bulkley Telegraph Trail Journal to your Territorial Museum and to the chief executive of Alaska.

And in making this presentation I like to think that Colonel Bulkley and his heroic followers would consider it especially appropriate. Much of their adventurous exploration took place in the lofty and imposing mountains which guard this community. Their wilderness trek led them both up the Inside Passage by naval craft and through the Coastal Range on foot. And their charting of the far-flung fastnesses of Russian America, as Alaska then was called, resulted directly in 1867 in the purchase of this vast land from the Imperial Russian Government by Secretary of State William H. Stewart for $7,200,000. In fact, the map folded in the back of the journal that I bring today is a photostatic copy of Colonel Bulkley's map which lay on Secretary Seward's desk when he completed that historic and momentous transaction three-quarters of a century ago.

So it is highly fitting that a copy of the frontier colonel's journal and letters should come at last to the capital of the Territory which he was so influential in adding to the domain of the United States.

In recent months we have had the honor to present copies of this document to many distinguished persons. At Ottawa in February Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, Commanding General of the Northwest Service Command, presented one to the Canadian Government's archives through the Right Honorable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of the Dominion. On that occasion—an occasion which will ever be remembered by those of us privileged to participate—General O'Connor declared:

"I have brought with me another token of Canadian-American friendship. Nearly eight decades ago far-sighted men in our two lands dreamed of a route northwestward across our continent toward Asia. This was the Telegraph Trail, an expedition which was to string telegraph wires through British Columbia, through Alaska, and into Siberia and Europe. This was one of the first expeditions ever to explore the immense and scenic mountain wilderness of northwestern America.

"President Lincoln authorized American participation in the undertaking. Queen Victoria granted a right-of-way through British Columbia. The Russians built a line 7,000 miles across Siberia to join our efforts.

"Recently we have found the original journal kept by Col. Charles S. Bulkley of the United States Army Engineers when he led that historic adventure. It has been photostated by our War Department, and I am pleased to have a copy with me today to present to the Prime Minister. I am sure it will claim a merited place in Canadian archives.

"The Bulkley Journal underscores only one phase of the historic friendship between the United States and Canada. This friendship has made possible in North America the longest unfortified boundary in the world. Some day our alliance in this war will also be a part of the history of our two lands. And I feel sure that the construction of the Alaskan Military Highway, a project of great importance in both war and peace, will be one of the brightest chapters."

I am certain all of you will be interested in the very descriptive and succinct letter with which the Prime Minister, in turn, sent the journal to the official Canadian Government Archives.

I shall read it in full:

OTTAWA, *February 20, 1943.*

Maj. GUSTAVE LANCTOT, K. C.,
Domain Archivist,
Public Archives,
Ottawa, Ontario.

DEAR MAJOR LANCTOT: I am sending herewith, for deposit in the public archives, the accompanying volume Journal and Letters of Colonel C. S. Bulkley, United States Army, Telegraph Trail 1865–1867.

This volume was presented to me this morning by Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, United States Army, under whose command the Canada-Alaska Highway was built. It contains a record of the Telegraph Trail expedition which was designed to join wire communications with Europe through Siberia and Russia.

President Lincoln authorized American participation in the undertaking; Queen Victoria granted right of way through British Columbia; and the Russians built a line 7,000 miles across Siberia as their contribution.

General O'Connor informs me that his aide, Lt. Richard L. Neuberger, was largely responsible for finding the original manuscripts and notes of Colonel Bulkley's expedition, which are here reproduced in photostatic form.

In view of the historic value of this book and its relation to early developments in British Columbia and the Yukon Territory, I stated to General O'Connor that I was pleased to accept the volume as a gift to the people of Canada and as a token of friendship sent on a notable occasion to Canada from the United States.

It is with this thought that I am now sending the Journal and Letters of Colonel Bulkley to the public archives.

Yours sincerely,

W. L. MACKENZIE KING.

In addition to this very timely international ceremony, General O'Connor has presented copies to HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, and to a man well known to all of you, ANTHONY J. DIMOND, Alaska's veteran Delegate in Congress. Next month, General O'Connor will present copies to the Alberta Provincial Library at Edmonton and to E. C. Manning, the Premier of Alberta, and in September to the Vancouver, British Columbia, Public Library, and John Hart, Premier of British Columbia, at an occasion being arranged by M. E. Nichols, managing director of the Vancouver Daily Province, and other prominent citizens of that city.

Thus will the record of Colonel Bulkley's valiant exploration be made available to the men and women who live in that section of the North American Continent which he and his fellow argonauts explored. Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL, of the State of Oregon, has referred to the Telegraph Trail Expedition as "a stupendous undertaking and a project of vision and foresight on the part of our pioneer ancestors to bring into closer relationship this continent and the Old World." He also has pointed out that the story of the trek is of "great interest now in view of the successful completion of the Alaskan Military Highway connecting continental United States and our Alaskan possessions."

This is the fact which makes Colonel Bulkley's pioneer exploit of such special significance to us of the Northwest Service Command. We are responsible for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Alaska Military Highway. Colonel Bulkley and his fellow frontiersmen planned the first link of any sort by land between Alaska and the interior of the continent. In a very direct way, the record of the Telegraph Trail is the legacy of those American soldiers who in less than a year hewed through forests and mountains to enable the first men ever to travel overland from the United States to

Alaska to arrive in Fairbanks one cold morning last November.

The attempt made in 1865 to extend a telegraph line from the United States to Europe, via British Columbia, Alaska, and Siberia, presaged other events besides the present highway. It forecast, as Prime Minister King told us in February, the mighty alliance of America, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth of Nations. Just as the Telegraph Trail was a joint undertaking of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, so is the conflict in which we are now engaged a common task that those unconquerable peoples will conclude victoriously.

The Telegraph Trail was an effort to bind the Eastern and Western Hemispheres across the Arctic roof of the world. And only last week in Toronto, James A. MacKinnon, Canadian Minister of Trade, declared that the Alaska Military Highway will "eventually lead into Asiatic Russia and the Orient itself." Nearly eight decades later, we are following Colonel Bulkley's trail-blazing march through the Northland.

Part of Colonel Bulkley's Journal is the map he used. It is listed in the ledger as "Map of Russian America, or Alaska Territory, compiled from charts and surveys of Western Union Telegraph Expedition, Charles S. Bulkley, engineer in chief." On the map appear many places easily recognizable in Alaska today, even though the spelling has slightly changed: Fort Kadiak, Fort Sitka, Fort Wrangell, Fort Youkon, Behring Strait, Kodiak Island, Bristol Bay, Mount Fairweather.

The Lewes River, on which is located Whitehorse, one of the main bases on the Alaskan Military Highway, appears as the Lewis River on Colonel Bulkley's map. The Andreanof Islands appear as the Andreanoffski Islands. But most points are instantly familiar to Alaskans; for example, the St. Elias Mountains, Oumnak Island, Norton Sound, Cook's Inlet, and the Taku River.

The Telegraph Trail did not accomplish its misison, because an easier route for wires to Europe had been found. Yet it played a vital role in America's acquisition of Alaska, a step of immeasurable historic significance, particularly in the light of contemporary events.

"Whenever I think we have difficulties," says General O'Connor, "I can thumb through the journal kept by Colonel Bulkley and see the practically insurmountable obstacles which he and his men subdued."

The Alaska Territorial Museum, where this record will be held in safekeeping for all the people of Alaska, is an appropriate trustee for such a document. This museum was established by act of Congress in 1900. It contains samples of Eskimo stone work that are more than 7 centuries old. Here are kept the blankets, pelts, beaded skins, and totem poles which reveal the handicraft and culture of Alaska's original inhabitants, the Indians. Under Mr. Keithahn and his associates the museum has been enlarged and enriched as a repository of the symbols and skill of the people of Alaska. Colonel Bulkley's journal will find a welcome niche in this institution, I am sure. Its possession, too, by the Governor of Alaska will also be a token of the resolute place which the feat of the Telegraph Trail occupies in Alaskan history.

In presenting this document I again say that we of the American Army do so with profound gratitude for the cooperation and hospitality we have received from the fine people of the Territory of Alaska. Never could newcomers have been welcomed more wholeheartedly. On behalf of General O'Connor and the officers and men of the Northwest Service Command, I give to the Alaska Territorial Museum and to you, Governor Gruening, copies of the Journal which Colonel Bulkley and his followers kept in 1865 and 1867 when these granite mountains and inland waters were first explored by Americans.

Ernest Lindley Discusses American Foreign Policy After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following article by Ernest Lindley. This column appeared in the Washington Post and other newspapers throughout the United States on June 20, 1943.

FOREIGN POLICY

(By Ernest Lindley)

WASHINGTON, June 20.—The Fulbright resolution approved unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee goes directly to the heart of the question about American foreign policy after the war. It carries no excess baggage. It contains no clause which invites argument over ways and means and other details. It asks only that Congress express itself "as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

As a declaration of intention this is adequate. This Congress cannot bind its successors. It cannot commit itself to take any particular action in the future on concrete proposals. In a resolution of this sort it can only express its general sentiment.

The need for such a declaration was understood by the four senatorial authors of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, and by the authors of sundry other resolutions now reposing in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Many of our allies fear that we will retrace the trail toward isolation which we took after the First World War. None of them can be sure that we won't. Without our participation there can be no world-wide system of security. For the present, most of our allies are proceeding tentatively on the assumption that we will take our part in enforcing the peace. But, until our course is clear, they must keep the door open for alternative arrangements.

INFLUENCE WEAKENED

The effect of this situation is to weaken the influence of the United States. If the uncertainty is allowed to continue too long, we may find both that the opportunity to organize an enduring peace has been lost and that our more narrow national interests have suffered. If the world believes that we intend to pull our full weight, it will pay more attention to our views and interests now. It knows that the Senate was responsible for rejecting the League of Nations. It knows that the present Congress is running over with antagonism to the President. This opposition has been shown principally to home-front policies—although some of them are closely related to the efficiency with which the war is prosecuted. But many outside observers feel that this is only a sign of a swing of the political pendulum which will produce another Harding and a Congress to match.

If a great majority of the American people really are resolved to do their utmost to preserve the fruits of this victory, once it has been won, the sooner the rest of the world knows it, the better for us. An agreement on the essentials of national policy which would stand above party, as the Monroe Doctrine has come to stand above party, would be of immeasurable benefit. The prompt passage of a resolution by an overwhelming majority of both parties in both Houses of Congress would amount, if not to an agreement, at least to solid evidence that an agreement can and will be reached.

A resolution which touched off a prolonged and bitter debate or could not command the support of a substantial majority of both parties would, on the other hand, be worse than no resolution at all. A prolonged debate or a fairly close vote would only confirm the fears of our allies. It would weaken and possibly even disrupt the present alliance before the war has been won—which, in turn, might mean that the war could not be won.

TOO DETAILED

The trouble with the "B2 H2" resolution is that it is too detailed. It contains more than one point as to which even thoroughgoing supporters of international collaboration disagree. It proposes, among other things, the creation of an international police force. What is an international police force? The authors apparently had in mind a small international constabulary to which the victorious nations would assign forces. But in some minds this clause awakens the fear that most of our Navy, Army, and Air Force would be turned over to the command of an international body. The creation of any kind of international police force apart from the national forces of the victorious powers is not essential to the enforcement of peace. If the victors, especially the three great military powers, Russia, Britain, and the United States, are determined to enforce the peace, they can enforce it. If they disarm our present enemies and keep them disarmed no nation or combination of nations now visible could challenge the Big Three as long as they stuck together.

The central question is whether we are willing to commit ourselves to use of the armed power of the United States in collaboration with that of our allies to enforce the peace. That is the simple but vital question posed by the Fulbright resolution.

By implication, the Fulbright resolution has two other merits. As Representative FULBRIGHT himself said, it recognizes that the details of arrangements with other nations should be worked out by the Executive. He must come back to Congress for support of certain of these arrangements—although not necessarily all of them. In his conduct of foreign relations he will be guided to some extent by his appraisal of public opinion and the general views of Congress. And he must come back to Congress for approval, or support, of certain of the arrangements which he makes—although not necessarily all of them. The Fulbright resolution does not encroach upon the prerogatives of the Executive by venturing to tell him exactly how he shall proceed.

HOUSE HAS PART

Also it recognizes, by implication, that the lower House has a part to pay in the formation and ratification of foreign policy. The ratification of treaties is the constitutional duty of the Senate. But in the voting of appropriations and of various authorizations related to the size and disposition of our armed forces the House enjoys equal authority with the Senate. Moreover, agreements

and resolutions which practically are as effective as most treaties have been adopted in the past by a majority vote of both Houses. In all probability this method will be used more frequently in the future, since the treaty ratifying power has placed a troublesome disproportion of authority in the hands of a minority of the Senate.

However, to allay doubts about future American policy, the Fulbright resolution, or any like it, would have to pass by more than a two-thirds majority of each House, and preferably with the support of at least two-thirds of the Republicans in each House. It should not be brought to a vote until thorough canvass has revealed whether approval to this degree is assured. The unanimous action of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, however, holds the promise that such an agreement, reached first behind the scenes and then underwritten by a formal vote, is within the bounds of possibility.

Post-war Agreements Can and Should Be Made in a Form Requiring Only the Approval of a Majority in Both Houses of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Walter Lippmann, appearing in his column Today and Tomorrow in the Washington Post of June 5, 1943.

The power of a minority in one house of the Congress to veto treaties is, as Mr. Lippmann says, as formidable as ever. For many years in the past this power has been frequently and, on some occasions, disastrously exercised. As we look today upon the shadows of coming events, the thought must come to all of us that one of the greatest dangers now threatening the world's dream of a just and lasting peace lies in the insistence of a minority in one body of Congress upon this right to nullify treaties.

That our established procedure for the ratification of treaties is violative of the democratic principle of majority rule is not subject to argument. That we can return to the principle of majority rule by adopting a different method of procedure is the suggestion offered by Mr. Lippmann in the following article:

WHAT DID THE TEST PROVE?

Since the action of Congress in extending the Trade Agreements Act has been regarded as a test of post-war policy, what did the test show?

Primarily, it seems to me, the test has shown that the procedure requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify treaties is still, as it has been throughout American history, almost unworkable. But the test has also shown that the more democratic procedure of ratifying agreements by majority vote of both Houses is workable.

It is true that the final vote in the Senate was 59 to 23, or better than two-thirds. But the Danaher, O'Mahoney, Maloney, and Reed amendments were rejected by majorities of less than two-thirds. So the test is a clear demonstration that the power of a minority of one House to veto treaties is as formidable as ever, and that the remedy is to place our reliance on the principle of majority rule by Congress as a whole.

No constitutional amendment is needed. For the resort to majority rule in international affairs is founded on ancient and ample precedent. In fact, it would have been impossible to carry on the business of the United States if international engagements had always been placed at the mercy of one-third of the Senate.

Under the agreements made with Canada in 1816 and 1817 there has been disarmament on the Great Lakes for more than a century. These agreements were made originally not by a treaty ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, but by the President under authorization of an ordinary act of Congress. This agreement has been one of the most beneficial and lasting in our history.

The treaty by which Texas was annexed to the Union was signed in April 1844 by Calhoun, the Secretary of State, and by the Texan representatives, Van Zandt and Henderson. In June the Senate rejected the treaty by a vote of 16 ayes and 35 noes. The administration then decided to act by means of a joint resolution of both Houses. "This mode of effecting it," said Calhoun, "will have the advantage of requiring only a majority of the two Houses, instead of two-thirds of the Senate." In December the joint resolution was adopted in the House, 132 to 76, and in the Senate, 27 to 25. Thus, we see that Texas could not have been admitted to the Union if the question had been left to a treaty submitted to the Senate.

Nor could the United States have acquired the Hawaiian Islands. President McKinley submitted two treaties of annexation to the Senate. The Senate would not act on either of them. Finally the President got a joint resolution of both Houses on July 7, 1898. We were then at war with Spain in the Pacific as well as in the Atlantic. Yet in the Senate the vote was only 42 to 21—a comfortable majority, but even under these exceptional conditions only exactly a two-thirds majority.

The Samoan Islands, now of such critical importance to us in the war with Japan, were acquired by the presidential action of the first Roosevelt in 1902 and 1904. Twenty-five years later Congress gave its approval by joint resolution.

It is well worth noting, too, that naval stations in Cuba were acquired by executive agreements in 1905. The authority to do this came from an appropriations act of 1901.

As a matter of fact our greatest foreign policies have not been founded on treaties submitted to the Senate or shaped by them. The Monroe Doctrine was announced to Congress. Our Chinese policy of the Open Door, and our various arrangements with Japan, such as the Root-Takahira and the Lansing-Ishii agreements, have had greater effect than formal treaties. But they were not treaties, and were not placed at the mercy of a filibuster by one-third of one house of Congress.

Experience has shown, therefore, how right was Washington when he said 1 month after the Constitution was adopted that the evil, when "one of the three is to have a negative control over the other two * * * will infallibly work its own cure." The cure has been the Executive agreement, ratified usually by majorities of both Houses.

Otherwise, we should always be, as we have much too often been, the victims of the conditions which Alexander Hamilton described when he said of the two-thirds rule that "its real operation is to embarrass the administration, to destroy the energy of the Government, and to substitute the pleasure, caprice, or artifices of an insignificant, turbulent, or corrupt junto, to the regular deliberations and decisions of a respectable majority."

The conclusion to be drawn from the test to which Congress has just been put is that the post-war agreements should be developed in the form not of treaties, but of measures which depend upon a respectable majority in both Houses of Congress. An obstructionist Senator who wants to complain about that will have a hard time persuading his colleagues, even more the people as a whole, that he has a good case.

Our Country Comes First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have received letters asking me to explain my vote for the Smith-Connally antistrike bill, which was recently passed over the President's veto. I am not defending my position, as my action needs no defense. My vote was not against labor at all, but rather it was for labor and for America, and against John L. Lewis.

Due to the patriotism of thousands of workers and their excellent leadership in Louisiana, there has not been a single strike, and what is more, it is a safe bet to predict that there will be no strikes for the duration of the war in that State.

If all labor followed the example of those in Louisiana, there would be no necessity for an antistrike law and there would be no such law today.

The American people have but one all-important job, and that is the winning of this war as quickly as possible. Labor, as a whole, has contributed a magnificent job toward the winning and ending of this war. Labor's record of 99.95 percent work without strikes in accord with the no-strike agreement for the duration is remarkable. No other nation can show such a great record.

But this record was apparently doomed when John L. Lewis called the coal strike, which would not only hinder the war effort but, if continued for any length of time, would completely cripple the war effort. The result could have been a major disaster.

The miners walked out, obeying John L. Lewis. The coal miners want their union and they need their union. They also want America and they need America. To have a successful union the miners must obey their union leader. This they did. I do not blame the miners. I blame John L. Lewis. Whatever the good that John L. Lewis did for labor, his uncalled-for strike took it all back and hurt the labor cause to no end, inflicting serious damage.

John L. Lewis did more to hurt the labor cause in calling this strike than any major act by any individual or group

of individuals in America in the last 10 years.

Here was the situation. The miners were out. Lewis refused to order them back. Congress had to act and act fast. Soldiers, sailors, and marines were panicky. Mothers and fathers became shocked and filled with bitter emotion. This was not an isolated strike. It was a strike so general and so paralyzing that it could cause our beloved Nation to go down in defeat and slavery. It was the beginning of what Hitler was hoping for—his ace in the hole.

Letters came pouring from all battle-fronts. A typical letter from a typical American soldier in Africa, which reads like thousands, related:

It was dark and the boys gathered around to hear the news over the radio here in Africa. We knew how we were doing, but hoped to find out how the war was going as a whole. All went well until the end. The miners are going out on strike. That sentence hurt. The boys squirmed in their foxholes. Remember us. We left home February 10, 1941. We went to camp at 21 bucks a month. We left our sweethearts, wives, classrooms, and jobs. Our country asked, we gave. We were the first American expeditionary force. We have been overseas 15 months. Many men have children they have never seen. A few days ago we buried five of our boys in one grave. We couldn't identify them. We have not had the simple pleasures such as baths, clean clothes, fresh food, or entertainment. We sleep with sand fleas, lice, mosquitoes, snakes, and anything that crawls, too numerous to mention. It gets tiresome after a few months. Then the ever-present thought, will I make it home or is my number on the list? I could write for hours on things that the boys have given up or gone without. Do we want sympathy? Hell, no. We want cooperation. This news of strikes, it hurts. What if soldiers on the front lines should strike? We need coal. The lack of it holds up industry. We need planes, tanks, and guns. Without them we die. Is that what we fight for? Don't let these traitors spoil our America.

A Congress that had for 10 years befriended labor acted, and acted quick, and passed this Antistrike Act. Congress actually befriended labor in passing this act because, just 1 hour after its passage in Congress, Lewis, seeing the handwriting on the wall, ordered the miners back to work. If Congress had not passed this act, would Lewis have ordered his miners back? You know the answer as well as I—Lewis most assuredly would not have done so.

The miners again struck at Lewis' command and the President vetoed the strike bill. Congress, acting in accordance with the Constitution, overrode his veto. The President made a mistake but the miners went back to work. Even the President's leaders in the House voted to override his veto. America was now assured that the war effort would continue.

I am firmly convinced that every rank and file member of labor, or 95 percent of them, would have voted as I voted, if they had been sitting in my place here in Congress. Labor wants their unions preserved—they need their unions, but labor also needs America in order to have their unions. America was about to be lost, and with it labor as a cause would have been lost. This strike would have ended both America and everything that America has.

Every soldier, sailor, or marine is proud of the action of Congress. Every patriotic mother and father, as well as every other citizen in the United States, is also proud that Congress acted and that the strike was thus settled. With the ending of this coal strike, soldiers overseas, in the camps, have their morale stimulated as never before. No longer can our enemies raise their vanishing morale by pointing to this coal strike. No longer will these enemies be aided and comforted by John L. Lewis.

Everyone in my district knows that I am a liberal and that I am for labor and labor organizations 100 percent. I ran for office and a plank in my platform was to support labor. I am still a liberal and still for labor 100 percent. I have voted for and supported all labor legislation. I have voted against and fought all legislation that was detrimental to the cause of labor.

In this antistrike, or anti-Lewis bill, it was to take a choice; to vote for the American flag, for the men in the armed forces fighting and dying, or to vote for John L. Lewis and help Hitler. I voted for the American flag and the soldier boys. I would do it again, and I believe 99 percent of the entire membership of organized labor in Louisiana would have done likewise, had they been in my place.

In this life-and-death struggle we must all sacrifice. As I said before, I am in sympathy with the miners. They deserve more pay. But if they cannot get it without striking, they must sacrifice that pay raise until after the war. With them it is a question of their country or a little more money. Their country comes first.

And my country comes first with me. One of John L. Lewis' labor leaders told me I was through politically if I voted for the antistrike bill, that he would see I was defeated. He stated that a great deal of literature and propaganda would be sent to my district. My answer was that if I had a choice to make between my country and my political office, my country comes first. I know you and a few others could not defeat me, but even if you could, I would still vote for my country and my flag and against John L. Lewis, because, after all, my political ambitions are so small and infinitesimal as compared to those American boys who at the very moment are fighting, bleeding, and dying, that it is hardly worthy of mention.

Naturally none of us likes to see any adverse labor legislation. Any legislation at all is often used as an opening wedge. However, this Anti-Strike Act will not affect one single member of organized labor in Louisiana. The act automatically dies when the war is over. Lewis has hurt the cause of organized labor in America. It will take many years for this damage to be repaired.

As for my part it shall never be said that, by my vote, I had aided and abetted John L. Lewis in impeding or destroying the just gains that labor has gained in the past decade, or that I had or would by my vote aid or help Lewis lose the war on the home front.

As a result of this growing hatred against John L. Lewis, he, and some of his unscrupulous leaders, are trying to shift the angry public sentiment of labor, of the farmers, and the people in general, from himself to the Members of Congress. Do not fall for this slick scheme of John L. Lewis. Just remember that Members of Congress did their duty and if America comes first in your heart, you would have done the same had you been a Member of Congress.

France did not come first in the hearts and minds of her Parliament, and France fell.

I was a friend of labor before my election. I am their friend now, and I shall continue to be their friend in the future.

Mr. Farley's Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading Times:

MR. FARLEY'S FAITH

When more than 600 people sit through a noon luncheon with the temperature above the 90° mark to hear a speaker, then we can say, in the Berks vernacular, "Ain't that sump'in'."

That is exactly what a Rotary Club audience did yesterday when the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General in the Roosevelt Cabinet and former national chairman of the Democratic Party, was the weekly noonday luncheon speaker.

Mr. Farley, we believe, drew a packed house, a suffocating house on a sweltering hot day, for three reasons:

There has been a rejuvenation of interest in national affairs with the people hungry for some intimation whither we are bound.

Some of the guests of the meeting anticipated that Mr. Farley might let go of some political dynamite.

That many of the people wanted to see one of the biggest and most colorful figures in national politics.

We prefer to believe that the first and the last of the reasons we have given predominated.

Those who came expecting to hear a political blast were disappointed. They, however, left with a better picture of Farley the man, Farley the patriot, and, above all, Farley an intense American.

Mr. Farley was far too wise to indulge in politics. It was too hot to talk about politics, he said. And when he said "too hot," the connotation that was implied was more than just mere atmospheric heat, we believe.

The man who left the Roosevelt Cabinet voluntarily, the man who could probably go back to that Cabinet without having too many minor obstructions to hurdle, in his talk to the Rotarians and their guests put unbounded faith in America.

He frowned upon formulas for security. He expressed the thought that the Nation's salvation lay in hard work, in honesty, in self-reliance.

If Mr. Farley, one of the greatest political leaders of the Nation, had in mind any criticism of the administration with which he

broke he skillfully concealed it in his language and demeanor.

Much could be read between the lines. Such a statement as he made about the pioneers who made America what it is, as "these were not men who made compromises with forces that threatened them. They were men who destroyed those threats by their own indomitable strength and courage," might have been a barb aimed at this or that policy today or yesterday in Washington and then again it might not have been.

He spoke of the wise policy of the founding fathers of creating, as they (the pioneers) grew, "political institutions that preserve political freedom while they offer the broadest protection from selfish influences."

Mr. Farley saw in our national greatness something that comes back fundamentally to the American as an individual.

"Only sound men can make a sound nation," he said. Despite evidences here and there that wealth and security have made the American people careless and pleasure-loving, Mr. Farley pointed out that the pessimists are wrong in coming to the conclusion "that the fiber of America has become soft and that the inner integrity of our people has been destroyed."

Such weaknesses, Mr. Farley termed superficial and passing, calling attention to American prowess on the field of battle and on the home front's efficiency in production which he said "is not created by the mere proclamation of an intention. * * * Efficiency rises from the strength of free people."

America, he said in summing up, was "not built upon formulas; it was built upon the individual. * * * It is for us to preserve for our posterity what our forefathers created for us, a Nation of free people, ever helpful to others, but always selfish for the continuance, within our own domain, of the American way of life."

We gather from what was said at the close of the meeting that many of his audience gained a new conception of Mr. Farley, a conception of something more than a mere opportunist politician, a picture of a man who continues to loom large in our national life and about whom more undoubtedly will be heard.

That Mr. Farley drew such a great audience is heartening. It indicates a resurgence of interest in national politics and in the men who formulate the policies and control the destinies of this great Nation.

Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to a letter that I received this morning from the Honorable Guy M. Boyd, a prominent merchant of Morehouse Parish, La.:

COLLINSTON, LA.,
June 24, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES E. McKENZIE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLIE: Can't the Government do something about the farm labor situation? Why does farm labor have to produce food at $2 or $2.50 per day when the Government is paying $1 to $2 per hour? I know that labor that was getting $2 per day producing food and feed, went to defense plants and got 75 cents to $1.50 per hour. If something is not done about this condition, things are going to be in bad shape.

If we are going to run our Government on an equitable basis to all, this condition must be changed and the farmer and farm labor given a chance, too.

Please give this some thought.

Yours very truly,

GUY M. BOYD.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Boyd—something must be done for the farmer and farm labor. Will this Congress do it?

Statement of Hon. Vicente Geigel-Polanco, Senator at Large of Puerto Rico, on the Need for Puerto Rican Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include herewith a statement by Hon. Vicente Geigel-Polanco, senator at large of the island of Puerto Rico, which gives authoritatively and completely a picture of the real issues facing the people of Puerto Rico—which issues are of utmost importance not only to the people of Puerto Rico, but equally important to the United States in this period of crucial war, when our whole colonial policy toward Puerto Rico, endangers our good-neighbor policy, and weakens our ability effectively to defend the Western Hemisphere from Axis attack. I urge the membership of this House to give careful study to the statement of Senator Geigel-Polanco in connection with my bill for Puerto Rican independence, H. R. 2989:

The Legislature of Puerto Rico, in its ordinary session of 1943, adopted by a unanimous vote the following concurrent resolution:

"Concurrent resolution to lay before the President and the Congress of the United States of America the right of the people of Puerto Rico that the colonial system of government be ended and to decide democratically the permanent political status of Puerto Rico as expeditely as possible, immediately if feasible

"Whereas in all political parties and civic and economic sectors of Puerto Rico, the unanimous opinion prevails that the colonial system of government should be totally and definitely abolished;

"Whereas the form of definite political status which, on the basis of this unanimous anticolonial conviction, the people of Puerto Rico are to have, should be democratically decided by the free vote of the people of Puerto Rico;

"Whereas it is the unanimous desire of the people of Puerto Rico that, in accordance with their will set forth in the program of the political parties, the permanent political status be decided as expeditely as possible, immediately if feasible, or at the latest when the war ends and peace is established, whichever shall be most compatible with the best conduct of the war against the totalitarian powers: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico (the House of Representatives concurring)—

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of Puerto Rico, in the name and in representation of the people of Puerto Rico, by this concurrent resolution, lays before the President and the Congress of the United States of America the right of the people of Puerto Rico that the colonial system of government be ended and to decide, in special free and democratic elections, by the free will of the people of Puerto Rico themselves, their permanent political status, as expeditely as possible, immediately if feasible.

"SEC. 2. That if the President and the Congress of the United States of America consider that in order to make effective this right and to act favorably regarding this petition, we should wait for the moment when victory is won and peace is being organized, the people of Puerto Rico will wait with patriotic resignation until that decisive moment for their natural aspirations.

"SEC. 3. That a copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington, the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to the press."

Authorized as it is to study upon the ground the political, economic, and social conditions of Puerto Rico, I think it would be highly desirable and appropriate for the Bell committee to recommend to Congress the legislation necessary for the immediate termination of the colonial system of government, existing here and the establishment, by the will of the people of Puerto Rico themselves, of a free, democratic, and responsible government.

According to our rights as a people, to the American principles of government and to the democratic institutions, the political problem of Puerto Rico has no other solution—just, adequate, and historically feasible—than the independence of the island and the foundation here of a free and democratic republic within the community of American nations.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Island of Puerto Rico, one of the Greater Antilles, was discovered by Columbus in the year 1493. The first Puerto Rican settlement was founded in 1508, 100 years before the establishment of Jamestown, Va. Spain settled and colonized the Island, transplanting and adapting to the Antillean environment the best institutions of Spanish culture. The formative process of the people of Puerto Rico took place during the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The first 300 years covered the necessary stages for the development of the population, the administrative organization of the different towns, and the initial promotion of the material resources. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the people of Puerto Rico had already attained its own peculiar characteristics, a sufficiently defined personality and a clear concept of social justice. All through that century Puerto Rico kept on laying firmer foundations for its personality and developing a culture of strong vitalities.

As a province of the Spanish Crown, we enjoyed a wide representation in the National Parliament on the same basis of equality as the Spanish provinces of the peninsula. On November 25, 1897, the Spanish Government granted Puerto Rico the Autonomy Chart acknowledging the sovereignty of our people to such a substantial degree that it could enter into trade agreements with other nations. The Autonomy Chart established a

government of the parliamentary type. The legislative branch was composed of a chamber of representatives and a council of administration empowered to legislate on all local matters including administrative organization, public credit, banking and monetary system, and with full authority to dictate its own tariffs. The executive power was vested in a governor general, assisted by a cabinet composed of five secretaries—Grace, Justice, and Interior, Finance, Public Education, Public Works, and Posts and Telegraphs, and Agriculture, Industry and Commerce—all of them Puerto Ricans and endowed with such powers that no executive order of the Governor could be carried out unless it was previously countersigned by the corresponding secretary.

In 1898 Puerto Rico had a homogeneous population of approximately a million inhabitants, a well-defined historical personality, a common language—Spanish—and a solid culture related to the purest Greco-Latin traditions. The country was enjoying an autonomous and responsible government.

AMERICAN OCCUPATION

It was then that the Spanish-American War took place. Puerto Rico was not responsible for that armed conflict, and neither did it have any interference in it, nor was it a conditioning factor thereof. Nevertheless, on July 25, 1898, United States military forces occupied the island. It is a proclamation addressed to the people of Puerto Rico on that occasion, Gen. Nelson A. Miles, commander of the forces of occupation, said as follows:

"In the prosecution of the war against the Kingdom of Spain by the people of the United States in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity, its military forces have come to occupy the island of Puerto Rico. They come bearing the banner of freedom. They bring you the fostering arm of a nation of free people, whose greatest power is in justice and humanity to all those living within its fold. We have not come to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but, on the contrary, to bring you protection, not only to yourselves but to your property, to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our Government."

In the peace conferences which followed the war operations the Government of the United States demanded the cession of the island of Puerto Rico. By the treaty of peace signed at Paris December 10, 1898, the island was ceded accordingly. Article IX of the treaty provides that "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by Congress." As an explanation to this article the American Commissioners, in their memorandum of December 9, 1898, made the following statement: "As regards the political status and civil rights of the native inhabitants, these were reserved to Congress, which would enact laws for the government of territories ceded to the United States, this being but a confirmation of the right of the sovereign power to leave to the new government the establishment of these important relations. The Congress of a nation which never enacted a law oppressive or detrimental to the rights of residents within its dominions and whose laws guarantee the greatest liberty compatible with the conservation of property, surely can be trusted not to depart from its well-established practice in dealing with the inhabitants of these islands."

PRESENT STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

In spite of these promising words, the United States has not yet done justice to Puerto Rico nor has established here a free, democratic, and responsible government. After a period of military rule, the United States Congress passed the Foraker Act on April 12, 1900, establishing a so-called civil government in Puerto Rico. This law declared the inhabitants of the island "citizens of Puerto Rico," and as such entitled to the protection of the United States.

On March 2, 1917, Congress passed the Jones Act which, slightly amended, is still in force. The new law created a legislative assembly composed of a house of representatives and a senate, both elected by popular vote and empowered to legislate on some local matters, but subject in its action to the veto power of the Governor of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States, and Congress. The President appoints the Governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education, the auditor, and the judges of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. This act declared the citizens of Puerto Rico citizens of the United States.

The political status of Puerto Rico has always been ambiguous. Certain Supreme Court decisions have characterized the Island as an "unincorporated" Territory in contrast to Hawaii and Alaska that are "incorporated." The extent to which the Constitution of the United States applies to Puerto Rico has never been specifically delimited. Under the present status, the United States Congress exercises full powers to pass upon all matters, both internal and external, affecting Puerto Rico. Our people entirely lack authority to face and solve their fundamental problems. We live under a regime of a purely colonial type.

In the economic sphere we were deprived of the autonomy that in tariff matters, we enjoyed in 1898. The free exchange of goods was introduced in our trade relations with the United States. All American tariffs were made extensive to cover our trade with other countries, and we were included in the United States coastwise shipping system, which forces us to depend on the more expensive services of the American merchant marine.

SOME OF THE EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT STATUS ON THE ECONOMY OF PUERTO RICO

The present political status has affected the Puerto Rican economy in the most disadvantageous and harmful way. The whole system, including the implications of the tariff, has gradually built up a type of commercial agriculture exclusively suitable for exportation which, by seriously curtailing the subsistence farming activities indispensable to feed our people, compels us to import almost every article of consumption. Import duties imposed on commodities generally consumed by most people are so high that they create an unsurmountable barrier for our commercial exchange with other nations. Instead of simply regulating commerce, the American tariffs when applied to this island shut out all foreign products that could be obtained elsewhere to our economic advantage. We are thus forcibly obliged to make practically all our purchases in the American market. From 90 to 95 percent of our outside commerce is carried on with the United States.

One of the most noticeable effects of the tariff in Puerto Rico is an exceedingly high cost of living. Rice, wheat, codfish, beans, olive oil, cotton fabrics, and a hundred more items that we must import fall under the prevailing rates of tariff protection. That means that we have no choice but to buy those commodities in the United States, although other countries may have them at more convenient prices for us. Let us see just one example of how the American tariffs work on this island. In the case of rice, subject to an import duty of 2½ cents per pound, we pay every year nearly $2,000,000 in excess of the amount that we would have to pay in any other market. This figure does not include the overcharge of the transportation in American vessels. About 17 commodities comprising 65 percent of all food consumed in the island cost us from 8 to 14 percent higher than they cost in the city of New York. Not a single commodity of general consumption in Puerto Rico appears on the free list.

However, should the effects of the tariff end with the increase in prices and the cost of living as their only consequence, our problem would not acquire such a threatening aspect. But besides, it is a fact that due to our peculiar conditions the tariff does not protect the industrial development of the island. We encounter a state of things which rather frustrates the initiatives of an industrious people such as ours and renders practically void any attempt of industrialization with Puerto Rican capital due to the absence of adequate tariff protection for our own producer who cannot stand the competition of the American manufacturers. Consequently we are unable to create new sources of employment to meet our serious unemployment problem. It is undeniable that a tariff devised to give generous protection to a country of such powerful agricultural and industrial activities as the United States cannot be wisely applied to a small and almost exclusively agricultural country mostly made up of consumers, suffering an economy of the colonial type, subject to outside capital, as Puerto Rico, without incurring not simply in a mere absurdity of economics, but also in the annihilation of the local sources of production and in a precarious impoverishment of the country.

Furthermore, the tariff is greatly responsible for the large-scale land tenure and the absentee ownership that persist in the island.

This asurd economic regime—a direct outgrowth of the system of government in force—has retarded the development of the Puerto Rican industry; it has delayed the promotion of the authentic wealth of the country; it has obstructed our commerce with unnecessary restrictions and limitations; it has lessened our opportunities of employment to a most perilous minimum; it has contributed to increase our taxation in a way injurious to the insular economy; it has taken away from us the sources of income which could be derived from our own customs directed by local laws and local convenience, and therefore creates for our Treasury a state of perpetual neediness and scantiness impelling it to almost exhaust its borrowing capacity in a fruitless effort to take care of the public services to a more or less fair degree; it has established such an economic structure that all sorts of hardships, burdens, and disadvantages weigh on the Puerto Rican consumers. Amid these circumstances it is natural that our economy should have suffered a gradual process of decline and impoverishment, and today it is on the verge of collapse. The agricultural adjustment program imposed substantial sacrifices from Puerto Rico, although we do not share its benefits on the same basis as the continental areas, neither have the reconstruction projects been extended to the island in the same sense of generosity and justice that moves them in the States. Under the quota system for the production of sugar—the most important and basic local industry—Puerto Rico has suffered a greater reduction than any of the domestic areas. Besides injuring the growers and other producers, this curtailment has considerably diminished the already meager chances of employment. As a climax to all arbitrary acts the Sugar Act of 1937 places Puerto Rico in the category of foreign zones as regards to the importation of refined sugar.

In all those aspects in which the tariff really protects some of our products we find that favorable effects are being virtually annulled by the agricultural adjustment policy and specially by the trade agreements which displace us from the American market through the advantages accorded to countries sending to the United States the same commodities that we produce.

We face, indeed, a very critical situation. On one side we are forced to buy in the American market all we consume, and on the other we are not allowed to produce as much as our resources would permit under normal conditions. And then, after being reduced to a single market and to a very limited production, still we find the above-mentioned obstalces in our way when marketing our products. It is a situation that necessarily ruins our economy and plunges our people into despair.

AN END TO THE COLONIAL SYSTEM

We are dispossesed of any power to protect ourselves from said circumstances, to work for a proper solution, or to chart our economic life in accordance to the potentialities, means, and wealth of the Island. Hence, our productive possibilities tend to vanish, our resources are coming to naught, and our people are getting poorer and poorer.

An unavoidable state of profound collective restlessness and discontent arises from those conditions. It is that our people cannot willingly accept it own destruction. We firmly believe that we also have a right to the enjoyment of life, liberty, justice, and happiness. Puerto Rico longs for the power to promote its production, raise the standards of living and the working conditions of the laboring classes, introduce policies of true social justice, insure the well-being of all its citizens, and organize itself under a democratic form of government.

But as long as this anomalous situation resulting from our undefined political status prevails it will be absolutely impossible to draw up a program for the economic reconstruction according to the peculiar needs of the Island, because we lack the indispensable authority to trace that program and because we have not been given the opportunity to decide and direct our destiny through a democratic procedure.

No step has been taken by any of the Federal administrations to place the island in condition to clarify its permanent political status. Up to now, and during 45 years of American rule, the people of Puerto Rico have been living aimlessly, without a chance to determine the course of their aspirations. The undefined status has prevented the island from the proper orientation of its economic structure, its school system, and its normal life as a civilized community. The absurdity of the situation has maintained in us a feeling of anxiety as to where to direct our future; it has provoked the present social crisis, the economic chaos, and the inability of the island to utilize its resources to the benefit of its needy classes; it has obliged us to waste our efforts, our energies, and our millions of dollars in keeping an educational system which lacks a definite purpose; and it has dragged the people to the present degree of uneasiness and uncertainty so damaging to its progressive evolution and so detrimental to the development of a good citizenship.

It is therefore most urgent and undeferable that this colonial system be replaced by a system of government responsible to the people of Puerto Rico. To attain this change it is indispensable that Congress should authorize Puerto Ricans to decide the permanent political status of the island in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

The right of our people to decide its own political status rests on the natural right of every civilized community to rule its own life. From the Puerto Rican point of view the urgency to decide the final political status is based on the fact that the present system fails to provide the means and the permanent guaranties that must be had for the progressive development of the economy, culture, and welfare of the people.

OUR DEMAND FROM THE AMERICAN POINT OF VIEW

Besides the arguments that could be avanced by Puerto Rico asking for authorization to decide its political status, there are from the American point of view itself additional and very powerful reasons strengthening our petition, to wit:

That the system of government which prevails in the island does not derive its powers from the consent of the governed and therefore runs contrary to the Constitution and the democratic institutions of the United States.

That the United States is responsible for the economic chaos existing in Puerto Rico as a consequence of the present governmental system, and that it behooves Congress and the Federal administration to free the island from the system producing that chaos not only for the good of the national prestige but also as a protective measure for American taxpayers who are suffering, in part, the effects of the economic chaos of Puerto Rico.

That the continuation of such a colonial type of government, or of any other system not deriving its powers from the people of Puerto Rico, does not satisfy the moral pledges and legal commitments incurred before the world by the United States at the time of the occupation of the island.

That the continuation of such a colonial type of government imposed by the United States on a civilized country of the Western Hemisphere—a sister country of the Spanish-American group of nations and united to them by the bonds of race, tradition, history, language, and culture—is in opposition to the basic postulates of pan Americanism, impairs the moral principles of the good-neighbor policy, and hampers the international position of the United States as a democratic power.

That an early definition of the Puerto Rican political status will effectively contribute to encourage better economic relations and to bring a closer spiritual understanding between the United States and Puerto Rico.

That in the light of American history, precedents, and free institutions of the United States it is evident that the only democratic way to solve the problem of Puerto Rico is by an authorization from Congress allowing the people of the Island to decide its political status in accordance with the principle of self-determination.

INDEPENDENCE, THE SOLUTION

At the arrival of the American forces to our shores in 1898, the Puerto Rican people constituted already a Christian community with a well-rounded history of achievements. Customs and traditions had been established in the course of four centuries of civilized life. Repeated proofs had been offered to the world about our capacity for the fulfillment of the duties implied by social life, for the performance of Government responsibilities, and for achievements in various fields of human knowledge.

Our historical reality in 1898 was not, therefore, that of a territory open to colonization. Neither was it a country in need of the civilizing effort of the United States. We were a people fully matured, conscious of our destiny, with our own way of life, with a type of culture of Greco-Latin origin, enjoying a Governmental system of actual sovereignty. Our historical reality today—45 years after the change of government—is as follows: that the Puerto Rican nationality subsists in the integrity of its formative elements, with the advantage that now we have a population of 2,000,000 inhabitants, that public education is more outspread, that we have achieved an evident material progress, that the sources of our economy have multiplied themselves, that our capacity for self-government has been enriched with new experiences, that the people are wide awake in regards to their rights and with the attitude to protect their justice, and that the clash of interests and culture brought about by the interference from the United States has produced a strengthening of the moral consciousness of our people, underlining differences and sharpening the native force of resistance against foreign pressure.

The solution to the problem of our sovereignty was already implicit in that historical reality that we had reached and that we were in 1898. The existence of the Puerto Rican nationality, as a community in full activity of social intercourse under a type of differentiated culture, involved the right to constitute an independent political organism. In the historical reality that we are today—after 45 additional years of deep experiences in the field of culture, economics, and government; enrichened our nationality in the values of social intercourse, in its administrative capacities, in its social understandings, in its desires of human betterment, in its aptitudes for responsible life—in that reality our right to our own sovereignty strengthens and affirms itself, a right which finds in independence a concrete political expression. Independence is the solution that history furnishes to our problem of sovereignty. That is the logic and unavoidable result of the historical law that has governed our life as a people. The historical reality is the force that determines for us a course that necessarily leads to that solution.

The solution to the constitutional problem of Puerto Rico does not depend, therefore, on fate nor on whim, nor on any fleeting convenience, but on those secret forces which throughout history have modeled the destiny of our people up to the point of maturing its capacities and training it for the responsible functions of a free life. And this is so, not only because of a predetermination of history, that is to say, a culmination of a process of growth in the realms of human intercourse, culture, economics, administration, and morals. It is so, additionally, because the constitution of a people in a sovereign entity does not mean anything else but an act of equipping it with the power to continue the process of growth under better auspices, to continue living its typical way of life, to continue developing its potential values. The political constitution cannot be a sudden social derailment, contrary to the historical reality of what a people actually is.

On the other hand, it is a fulfillment, in the realms of conscience and responsibility, of that very same reality. Since that historical reality is the fountain which provides everything that the nationality signifies as a value of life, of culture, of spirit, of human tradition, it is not possible to do without it at the hour of collective integration, precisely when the physical and spiritual forces which form the historical reality of a people reach the fuller maturity, the greater foresight, and the most vigorous vitality.

When a people face the problem of its sovereignty it is not with the purpose of becoming something else, but to continue being what it is in its most high and fruitful values. Puerto Rico desires to solve the problem of its sovereignty, not to be something different to its own reality, not to be an appendix to another people, not to destroy its personality, not to ruin its historical destiny, not to annul its creative aptitudes, but simply to be Puerto Rico in itself, according to its own spirit, according to its own way of life; to be a Puerto Rico in the enjoyment of liberty, in the progress of culture and in the strength-

ening of justice. And to be that Puerto Rico, to continue being Puerto Rico, history does not offer to our people any other way out but that of its independence.

STATEHOOD, A FALSE TRACK

The solution of the problem of the sovereignty of Puerto Rico is desired so that our people may develop its personality under more favorable auspices. Would that be possible under statehood, which implies the entrance of our country into a community of nations having a language, race, and culture of British cognation, grounded in the traditions of the common law, with philosophy, ideals, customs, beliefs, and standards of living distinct from our own? Would it be possible even to conserve our personality as a people, not to mention the continuance of our historical development, once we have been merged into the American Federation, impelled as the latter is by a sweeping process of historic integration, of forcible nationalization, which must erase the distinctive characteristics of the States so as to give the country a typical and united appearance?

In that process of nationalization which the Government and the people of the United States promote with unusual vigor and huge resources, our personality as a people must necessarily be wrecked since, its history, its spirit, and its destiny being different, it would not find in the American Federation a hold for its traditions, acceptance of its customs, encouragement for its culture, understanding for its language, sympathy for its ideals, atmosphere for its creative ability, or a reason for its manner of living. Americanization would be compulsory. And Americanization would necessarily, fatally, and inevitably mean a depuertorricanization. Joining the federation would compel us, both by command of law and policy of Government, as well as by loyalty to American nationality, to renounce being what we are, to renounce being what history has made us; to renounce our language, our culture, our personality, everything that we are and represent in the world or moral and spiritual values, in order to try to be something else foreign to our existence, foreign to our history. And because such a transformation cannot be effected, considering that the soul and the life and the history and the basic facts of a people are not the consequence of chance or caprice, or convenience, the said spectacle of a slow disintegration would await us; we would be sentencing ourselves to a barren adaptation which would yield only hybrid fruit; the strength of our creative energy would be broken; our culture would be corrupted; the soul would be confused; the vital impulses would be smothered; the collective soul would never attain to maturity of expression; we would experience a sensation of emptiness, and we would continue to blunder along, adrift in the most hazardous adventure in heedlessness, without insuring our existence, without a hold in history, without connection with reality, without a bond with our own destiny.

The sponsors of statehood sidestep this fundamental aspect of the problem. They also sidestep all consideration of the economic aspect, because it is absolutely against them. And when it is mentioned, if the one who mentions it is a responsible person, he admits that statehood would be highly prejudicial for our country from the economic point of view. In fact, after the island is admitted as a State we would be obliged, in addition to the tax burden already weighing on our people, to pay the Federal Treasury several million dollars for internal revenues, income taxes, inheritance taxes, taxes on alcohol, drugs, cigars, cigarettes, etc., etc. We would lose the customs revenues which are now returned to us by the Federal Treasury. The Federal wage-and-hour law would be in full force in the island and the amendment which authorizes the establishment of differential rates for the benefit of our small industries would be without effect. The Federal Insurance Contributions Act, the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and the Federal Victory Tax Act would increase our tax burden in several million dollars. Under statehood we would continue to be subject to the customs tariff which compels us to import practically everything from the American market at an overprice which in normal times economists estimate at more than $20,000,000 a year. Under statehood we could not even protect our coffee by an import duty—a thing we are now allowed to do as a special concession under the present regime. Under statehood practically all discriminations, prejudices, and disadvantages of an economic order which we have been suffering because of the present commercial reciprocity agreements, and of those hereafter entered into, would subsist, inasmuch as the situation would continue to be the same due to the essential differences which exist between our economic structure of a tropical country and that of the United States.

Generally, the adherents to the idea of statehood limit their pleadings to three points: (1) That certain United Staes officials, legislators, and leaders have made declarations in favor of granting statehood to Puerto Rico; (2) that the action of constituting Puerto Rico into an organized Territory leads to statehood; and (3) that the collective citizenship granted to the Puerto Ricans through the Jones Act is an unmistakable sign of the purpose of making the Island into a State of the Union.

But none of these points stands analysis. As to the opinion from United States officials, legislators, and leaders who favor statehood, it is easy to produce the opinion from those who are against the idea, rather backing independence. Henry L. Stimson, who happened to be Secretary of War when the War Department had jurisdiction over Puerto Rican affairs, expressed himself as follows during a hearing before a committee of the United States Senate: "I am one of those who feel very strongly that the ultimate statehood of Puerto Rico would not be of benefit to either Puerto Rico or the United States. * * * The racial difference is a very great difference. The difference of climate, habit, tradition, and distance, but perhaps more than anything else the fact that it would be for the first time going beyond the territorial limits of the United States, thus making a precedent for going beyond those territorial limits in other cases." (Hearing before the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, United States Senate, May 7, 1912, pp. 5 and 7.)

The same idea had been expressed by Marcy, Seward, Fish—outstanding Secretaries of State—all coinciding in this fundamental thought: "Even if we could own any territory overseas as a possession of the United States, the Federal Union should keep itself strictly limited to the territory contiguous to the North American continent."

President Wilson expressed himself in the State, page 357, that with the acquisition of Puerto Rico and the Philippines as a result of the War with Spain, the United States acquired noncontiguous territories already inhabited by peoples different from them in language, customs, and institutions; that contrary to what happened with the other territories acquired (except Alaska and Hawaii), the insular possessions are not fitted for the progressive development running from territory to statehood, and that they are dependencies and must remain as such until they reach the necessary development to become independent or autonomous.

Elihu Root, the noteworthy jurist, inspirer of the United States policy during many years, and also Secretary of State, declared addressing our people: "Do not you ever expect to be a State of the Union; we have put an end to the last two contiguous territories turning them into States. Puerto Rico cannot escape the logic of things, and should also be a republic. * * *" The words of the great American jurist contain a statement which we the Puerto Ricans must repeat daily, and prescribe it as a curative formula to those who suffer from the crazy mania of pretending to deviate us through the false track of statehood: "Puerto Rico cannot escape the logic of things." The logic of things in this case is the logic of our beings, the logic of our spirit, the logic of our personality, the logic of our history, the logic that we are Puerto Rico. It is from that logic that the advocates of statehood for our people pretend to deviate us.

A recent restatement of the policy regarding noncontiguous territories was voiced by the Joint Committee on Hawaii in its official report to Congress, as follows: "That the admission of Hawaii as a State presents a departure as it would be the first noncontiguous area to be admitted." (Senate Doc. No. 151, 75th Cong., 3d sess., February 15, 1938). The committee recommended that the question of statehood for Hawaii be deferred.

If the action of constituting a noncontiguous territory as Hawaii in an incorporated territory does not involve an actual promise of statehood, much the less involved is said promise in the action of constituting a noncontiguous territory in an organized territory, as is Puerto Rico defined in the law in force.

The argument adduced as a greater show of persuasive strength in favor of statehood, is that of citizenship. Nevertheless, among the arguments to that end, none of them so misleading, none lacking so much weight as this argument about citizenship. Collective citizenship was not extended to Puerto Rico until 1917. Historical facts throw the following light: (1) The so-called granting of citizenship was by no means an act of just acknowledgment of our personality, but an imposition from the Government of the United States; (2) citizenship extended to this island falls into a second- or third-class category, and (3) the extension of American citizenship does not carry a promise of statehood.

In a speech before Congress, when Congress was considering the Jones bill which forced Federal Citizenship upon the Puerto Ricans, Luis Munoz Rivera, then our Resident Commissioner in Washington, made the following statement about the Puerto Rican citizenship acknowledged by the Foraker Act: "We are satisfied with this citizenship (Puerto Rican citizenship) and desire to prolong and maintain it—our natural citizenship, founded not on the conventionalism of law but on the fact that we were born on an island and love that island above all else, and would not exchange our country for any other country, though it were one as great and as free as the United States. * * * It is true that my countrymen have asked many times, unanimously, for American citizenship. They asked for it when through the promise of General Miles on his disembarkation in Ponce and through the promises of the Democratic Party when it adopted the Kansas City platform—they believed it not only possible but probable, not only probable but certain, that American citizenship was the door by which to enter, not after a period of 100 years nor of 10, but immediately into the fellowship of the American people as a State of the Union. Today they no longer believe it. From this floor the most eminent statesmen have made it clear to

them that they must not believe it. And my countrymen, who, precisely the same as yours, have their dignity and self-respect to maintain, refuse to accept a citizenship of an inferior order, a citizenship of the second class, which does not permit them to dispose of their own resources nor to live their own lives nor to send to this Capitol their proportional representation. * * * As the representative of Puerto Rico, I propose that you convoke the people of the Island to express themselves in full plebiscite on the question of citizenship and that you permit the people of Puerto Rico to decide by their votes whether they wish the citizenship of the United States or whether they prefer their own natural citizenship. It would be strange if, having refused it so long as the majority of people asked for it, you should decide to impose it by force now that the majority of the people decline it." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 53, part 8, 64th Cong., 1st sess., May 5, 1916, p. 7472.)

Congress did not listen to the voice from Puerto Rico. Congress preferred to dictate its imperial writ imposing upon us, by force, a citizenship of a colonial type.

Actually, the citizenship thus extended to the Island belongs to a second or third category. Senator Clarke, from Arkansas, had the foresight that it would be like that. In 1912 he pointed out that what was proposed for Puerto Rico was a qualified citizenship, devoid of the rights that citizenship implies for the continental citizens. (See hearing before the Committee on Pacific Islands and Puerto Rico, U. S. Senate, May 7, 1912, pp. 13-14). The citizenship imposed upon the Puerto Ricans is a citizenship without sovereignty, a citizenship without nationality, a citizenship without constitution. To the inhabitants of the continent, their citizenship guarantees them sovereignty rights within the State and within the federation. To Puerto Rico it does not guarantee any right of sovereignty at all. To us it is a citizenship without nationality—we belong to, but we are not a part of the American Nation, according to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U. S. 244). To us it is a citizenship without constitution. In the case of *The People* v. *Tapia y Muratti* (245 U. S. 639), the Supreme Court of the United States declared that the granting of citizenship does not imply the extension of the Constitution to the Island.

The granting of citizenship does not involve a promise of statehood. It was made clear by Secretary Stimson in the year 1912 when he stated: "I see myself no inconsistency in the grant of American citizenship to Puerto Rico; no inconsistency between that and the ultimate ideal that Puerto Rico shall have practically an independent local self-government. * * * I only allude to it to rebut the argument that I have heard advanced, namely, that to grant American citizenship to Puerto Rico necessarily involves ultimate statehood." (Hearing quoted above, pp. 5 and 6.) President Taft ratified this point of view by saying: "Neither in the mind of the American people, nor in the mind of the Puerto Rican people, the grant of citizenship should be associated to any thought of statehood." When the Jones bill was passed Judge Horace Mann Towner, then a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs in the House of Representatives (later he became chairman of the committee and afterward served as Governor of Puerto Rico), stated that: "If we grant you citizenship today, said citizenship would not prevent a revolution that you may choose to stir later on. Your condition will continue exactly the same. You could rebel just the same as if we had not granted citizenship. Should the United States desire to confer independence upon you the United States can do it, whether or not you are citizens of the United States. One thing has nothing to do with the other." And Congressman Jones himself, the author of the law which besowed citizenship upon us, emphatically stated: "I believe that in the United States there is no opinion in favor of statehood for Puerto Rico."

The previously mentioned three points generally adduced to support the idea of statehood come out to be, therefore, mere interpretations of opinions and facts which have no bearing to our historical reality. They are points of support of a purely dialetical nature, which a better informed dialectics instantly eliminate, leaving the vanishing idea of statehood in the air and without any real support.

Nations are deeply interested in two things: culture and economics. All questions related to spiritual values are implicitly contained in the former, just as all questions related to material values are implicitly contained in the latter. Those are the cornerstones of every nationality. Sovereignty is nothing else but the power to keep developing, under more propitious auspices, the historial personality in the realms of culture and in the fields of economics.

As a solution to our problem of sovereignty, statehood would be contrary to the historical and natural development of our people. Within the fold of the American Federation we would find ourselves pressed by forces antagonistic to our own forces—antagonistic to them in essence and in substance—since the people of the United States react to a different psychology, to a different social course, to a different way of life, to a different sense of things, to a different spiritual projection. Necessarily, our historical destiny would be distorted, and the creative impulse of our nationality would be void, coming to an untimely end in the dangerous adventure both culture and economics—the two great values for which the people struggle everywhere.

That is why statehood is not the right solution to our problem of sovereignty. To us statehood would not go beyond being a political fiction, or juridical arbitrariness, or at most, an imposition by force; but it could never be a natural culmination of our historical destiny; it could never be a result of the vital forces which act within us. It is just the logic of things—about which Mr. Elihu Root spoke—which discards statehood as a possible solution. The logic of things, the voice of destiny, the sentiment interwoven in the race, the guiding light of the spirit, the mighty force of history: they all proclaim independence as the only possible solution to our problem of sovereignty.

VICENTE GEIGEL-POLANCO.

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, *June 17, 1943.*

The Role of Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an editorial appearing in the New York Times:

THE ROLE OF SUBSIDIES

The President's veto message on Friday raised two grave problems: First, what policy Congress and the administration should now adopt with regard to subsidies; and second, what the relationship of the President and Congress will be in dealing with the whole domestic economic problem.

Neither in its arguments nor in its tone was the President's veto message reassuring. Whatever the defects may have been in the bill the President vetoed—and it was altogether proper that he should have drawn attention to these and asked for their correction—it is clear that Congress has been more nearly right on the whole subsidy issue than the President. In the present crisis, it is true, Congress should not attempt to forbid subsidies altogether. Even if there were no such thing as a good subsidy, there would still be such a thing as a subsidy that is the lesser of two evils in a specific situation. Whether a subsidy is more desirable than its alternative is a question that can be answered only for a specific commodity under specific circumstances.

It would not be difficult to show that the specific subsidies that have been most in dispute—the roll-back subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee, and even some subsidies that Congress has quietly accepted, such as that on petroleum—have been either wrong in principle inconsistent with other policies of the the Government, or calculated to do more harm than good in the method of their administration. It was for these reasons among others that Chester C. Davis felt obliged to resign as Food Administrator. His letter to the President did not contain any blanket condemnation of subsidies, but pointed out that the "broad general subsidies" announced by the President would be ineffective "in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply."

Certain general principles should be clear. Subsidies cannot be considered a primary weapon against inflation. They do not in the least deal with its basic causes. The best they can do is temporarily to mitigate certain of its symptoms—always at the risk, which must never be lost to sight, of building up far worse evils in the future. They are at best, therefore, a secondary and minor weapon in the battle against inflation. They play something like the role of dynamite in building a road; and, like dynamite, should be handled only by experts. In no case should they be used as a substitute for genuinely basic measures, but only as a supplement to them. The harm of using subsidies too cautiously would be minute compared with the harm of using them too recklessly.

Yet the President talked in his veto message not only as if he considered subsidies a major weapon in the battle against inflation, but almost as if it were the most important single weapon against it. Of Congress's action against subsidies he declared: "This is an inflation bill, a high-cost-of-living bill, a food-shortage bill. * * * It will have a devastating effect upon our economy and our war effort. * * * This measure will make it virtually impossible to institute any additional measures to reduce the cost of living or even to hold the line."

One reason that Congress has been profoundly suspicious of the whole subsidy program is that it has no confidence that the administration will administer it with care and skill and within strictly defined limits. The President's veto message is hardly reassuring in this regard. It is true that the President declared at one point that subsidies "should be applied only in strictly limited and clearly defined circumstances." But he went on to say that Congress must leave with the executive branch "the means of seeing to it that further increases in producers' prices do not increase the cost of living." When one considers that the roll-back of meat and butter prices, according to the calculation of the Office of Price Administration itself, will reduce the cost of living only 1 percent, though this subsidy alone will cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year, one can only imagine the dimensions of a subsidy designed

to prevent any further increases in living costs—especially with the administration policy of continuing to boost industrial wages, which have already raced far ahead of increases in living costs.

It was gratifying to find the President suggesting, at the end of his message, that "in this task of saving our free economy, Congress and the Executive must work together as a team." But, with the exception of one or two such lines, the implication of the whole message was that the chief duty of the congressional member of the team was to nod approval, and that if Congress failed to approve the President's subsidy program in its entirety he would place upon it the full blame for any failure in the whole anti-inflation program. Surely a more conciliatory spirit and a more extensive use of consultation and compromise are essential to the conception of working together as a team.

Posters Work for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by myself entitled "Posters Work For Victory":

This is the time of year when all of us are thinking of patriotism, and particularly thinking of it in symbols. The Fourth of July itself is a symbolic reminder of our stirring national heritage and our independence. Our flag is a symbol, the Dome of our Capitol is a symbol, and the very firecrackers that some little boy sets off are a symbol, too, whether he knows it or not. Our great patriotic paintings and war posters, familiar as they are, and equally symbolic, deserve our special attention.

Probably there is not a single American, whether he be a citizen of this land by birth or by adoption, whether he hold degrees from a dozen colleges or be barely acquainted with the three R's, who has not at some time seen, and thrilled to the significance of, that famous historical painting, The Spirit of '76. This is probably the best-known picture produced by an American artist. In one form or another, it has been reproduced literally millions of times, and in every possible way. Color reproductions of it hang in millions of homes. It is constantly used in advertisements, calendars, posters, school histories, and even as a trade-mark. It appears over and over again in patriotic tableaux, and a Fourth of July parade would hardly be complete without the three familiar figures of the stern old drummer, the valiant and determined fifer, and the eager drummer boy. Archibald M. Willard painted this picture in 1876, just 100 years after the event which it commemorates. A large popular demand for colored reproductions immediately placed the picture within the reach of everyone.

In a very real sense The Spirit of '76 was our first war poster. It was made, not during a war, but shortly after a long and bloody one, the struggle between the States, and it has remained for almost 70 years the best war poster which we have ever had.

Henry Kelsey Devereux, who posed for the drummer boy of the painting, says: "The painting created little or no stir among the art critics and connoisseurs. It was not painted for such. The painting was a patriotic human document that reached the hearts of millions and will for centuries to come be an inspiration to further millions yet unborn."

Mr. J. F. Ryder, art dealer and patron of Archibald M. Willard when he was a struggling young artist, gives us the best contemporary account, and, incidentally, the best possible definition of a war poster: "The idea of the artist in painting the picture was to concentrate all the determination and enthusiasm in a few figures * * * Pictures have been painted by artists of great skill, possessing qualities of technique of method, valuable beyond the works of other artists; pictures which give pleasure to experts and connoisseurs. In the midst of such works, The Spirit of '76 stands. The eye wanders from these works of great technique, and is awed by the grandeur of the old man, by the force of the fervid and devoted group, by the spirit which invades the whole. Mr. Willard with his powerful but, perhaps, less-finished touch did more than please the eye of experts; he stirred the heart of a Nation."

During the last war many of our finest artists turned to the production of posters as their contribution to national morale and the war effort. I am sure everyone remembers the Howard Chandler Christy drawing of the tall man in the top hat, with his finger outstretched: "Uncle Sam Wants You " Mr. Christy continues to make inspiring posters during the conflict of today. Particularly memorable is his picture of the Red Cross nurse. His magnificent painting, on an heroic scale, of the Signing of the Constitution now hangs in the main hall of the House of Representatives.

Probably, too, everyone is familiar with the "Four Freedoms," painted by Norman Rockwell and reproduced in recent issues of the Saturday Evening Post. These four stirring pictures of what we are fighting for have had wide distribution and equally wide acclaim. Another extremely familiar poster is one of the fine series put out by the War Production Board: "Men Working Together," which depicts a soldier, a sailor, and a welder, all shoulder to shoulder and looking sturdily forward. War Department, the Office of War Information, and Treasury posters are everywhere—and they represent the best and most vigorous in American art.

This is not the art of the salon, of the critic and the connoisseur. It requires no mood, no studio atmosphere, no correct lighting, no proper background, no hushed voices, and no beautifully printed catalog of explanatory notes. This art must succeed, if it succeeds at all, by immediate impact. It must be effective in any light and against any background—schoolroom, barber shop, streetcar, restaurant. It must be strong enough to enlarge for a billboard or the side of the proverbial barn; it must be sharp enough to make a cut for a letterhead. It must be clear enough to stand reproduction on all kinds of paper, from the finest bond to the cheapest unbleached wood pulp. It must carry its caption boldly, if there be caption at all, so that the passenger on a swift overland train or the casual pedestrian who glances once at a handbill before discarding it instantly seizes and understands the message. It must constitute the graphic representation of the soul and sinews of a people at war. It is not studied, not posed. It is quick and vivid with colors forged in the furnaces of our effort.

The general and generous cooperation of the advertising industry in using the best of American art for patriotic purposes looms large in these difficult days. Few of us will ever forget The Kid in Upper Four. Almost all of our Nation-wide companies have been using outstanding pictures, and outstanding text. I know of one concrete example which, if it did not make history, certainly managed to collide with it. As part of their contribution to the war effort, a New York advertising firm engaged a full page of both the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune on the day the second front in North Africa opened, to reproduce a poem called Prayer to Jehanne of France by Joseph Auslander. The poem was illustrated by a drawing of Jean d'Arc, made by an American artist, Adolph Treidler, for this occasion. The fact that the page appeared on the very day of the second front was a happy stroke that called double attention to the poem. The advertising firm, the author, and the artist received literally thousands of letters about the page. The whole page was eventually set up as a poster reprint and has been widely distributed.

The national war agencies tell me that: "Posters are divided into five categories: (1) recruiting; (2) selling War bonds and stamps; (3) production, which now includes related subjects, particularly those designed to reduce absenteeism; (4) morale building, general patriotic themes; and (5) security or 'don't talk' posters." I am inclined to believe that the last two categories are the most important. Recruiting will come, as inevitably as the draft; it is virtually a matter of getting a man into the niche best suited for him. War bonds and stamps will be bought and bought in increasing numbers. Production, if only from a selfish motive of the individual who must be sure of his daily bread and butter, must and will go on. In all these fields posters help, but especially in the matter of building morale and of keeping us from rumor-mongering. Every one of us has a moment of despair or depression now and then, when we, almost in spite of ourselves, begin wondering what is the use of it all. Every one of us sooner or later, comes into possession of some isolated scrap of information, which, if overheard by alien ears and pieced together with other seemingly unrelated scraps, can send a ship to the bottom or a squadron of brave men to their graves.

In these fields the national war agencies have gone magnificent work. One particularly notable poster bears the caption, "Strong in the strength of the Lord, we who fight in the people's cause will never stop until that cause is won," from one of Vice President WALLACE's recent speeches. The picture is that of three resolute arms, one holding a monkey wrench, one a rifle, and one an S wrench. Two of the "don't talk" posters remain fixed in my memory. One is a simple brown background, like the sands of the African desert, with a wooden cross and the pitiful heritage of a helmet and a cartridge belt hung over the arms. The title is "A Careless Word, Another Cross." The second depicts a drowned sailor washed up on the beach, his clothing and his fair hair still awash with the sea water. The caption: "A Careless Word, a Needless Loss." The third shows a woman who has just received that fateful message "Missing in Action . . . somebody talked."

We learned to "Join the Navy and see the world" through a poster which has served well in peace and war. Now we learn to buy War bonds through the huge billboard on the lawn of the Treasury Building—one of the best strokes of outdoor advertising which has come to my attention.

Let us remember to give our war posters more than a casual glance. They are really worth while. And some of them may be tomorrow's famous paintings. The more simple and direct and vital they are, the more our heart's blood is set pounding. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the national war agencies, the advertising industry, and the artists themselves for the help contributed toward winning the war by this useful and helpful medium—the Poster.

Generation of Power at Boulder Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Reno Evening Gazette of June 21, 1943, on power generated at Boulder Dam:

BOULDER POWER AT RECORD PEAK—NEW GENERATOR TO BE INSTALLED

Boulder Dam has become the first single power plant in history to operate at more than 1,000,000 kilowatt capacity.

The record output, sufficient to meet the prewar needs of a city the size of Chicago, first was reached June 11, Interior Secretary Harold Ickes told the Associated Press at Washington today.

The rated capacity of the Boulder power plant is about 950,000 kilowatts, but by operating the 12 big generators at a 10-percent overload it was possible to obtain more than 50,000 additional kilowatts.

The Bureau of Reclamation has ordered another large generator of more than 80,000-kilowatt capacity and that when all installations are made the capacity will reach 1,332,300 kilowatts. The 1943 output is estimated at 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, more than the 1921 production of all Pacific coast plants.

A large proportion of the power from Boulder Dam goes directly or indirectly to airplane factories, shipyards, munitions plants, air fields, army posts, naval stations, mineral developments, and other industries in southern California and Nevada.

The Office of Dependency Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I include here an article written for the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. J. C. Furnas, in which he explains the problems and methods of procedure of the Office of Dependency Benefits.

The article follows:

THEY GET 'EM PAID

(By J. C. Furnas)

On her way back from the Rural Delivery box, the old lady noticed that a Plymouth Rock chick had fallen into the brook and was swimming no better than you would expect. She dropped the mail in a fence corner and went to the rescue. When she returned, the old cow was standing near by, her jaws swinging thoughtfully, but whether in eating or cud chewing was not clear. The weekly paper was still there, but the skinny stampless envelop with the highly official air was gone.

Inside that envelope and now inside the cow was a check on the United States Treasury for $37—the old lady's indispensable monthly allowance from her soldier son in cahoots with Uncle Sam. So she went back to the house, got out the rusty pen and dime bottle of ink and the lined tablet, and wrote the Office of Dependency Benefits about it—the whole story, down to the possibility, for she was fair-minded, that the wind had blown the envelop away and the cow was guiltless after all.

What is Office of Dependency Benefits? For one thing, a set of initials already bulking larger than anything since Works Progress Administration as an American household word. Formally, it is the Office of Dependency Benefits, a unit of the Army's Services of Supply. Physically, it fills a brand-new 18-story office building in Newark, N. J., commandeered from a great life-insurance company. Functionally, it is a key war-production plant. This north end of Jersey is full of high-powered industries making ships, motors, planes, bandages, and explosives. But, for importance, Office of Dependency Benefits need take no backtalk from any of them. Its job is the mass production of morale for both civilian and military needs.

That is no mere metaphor. The Office of Dependency Benefits plant uses both production-line methods and diabolically ingenious machine tools to speed monthly production of more than 2,500,000 individually made-out checks, totalling more than $110,000,000 a month, paid out mostly to soldiers' families and dependents. Its daily mailing floods the gasping Newark post office in a quantity usually expected of a city of 150,000 people. If that isn't mass production, Henry Ford is a hotel doorman. And the vast majority of checks so mailed mean continued reassurance to fighting men that the folks they left behind are not resourceless.

That is where the morale comes in—plenty. Too many soldiers brooding over those at home would be just as dangerous sand in the cogs of the war effort as too many families at home angry, hungry, and frightened because their breadwinners have been hauled off to camp.

Congress created Office of Dependence Benefits last June in a burst of enterprise due to suddenly realizing that something had to be done about the dependents of the family men who were soon to be drafted wholesale. The Navy has a smaller similar set-up. Who gets what and why is simple in principle. Of accounts handled, some 950,000 are class E allotments—money regularly deducted at soldiers' request from their pay and remitted to dependents or savings bank or life-insurance company. The Army has run that system since Spanish War times. Anybody in uniform, from General Marshall down, can get in on it voluntarily. The only limitation is that enlisted men can't peel down below the $10 a month considered a soldier's necessary minimum by his solicitous superiors.

That is a colossal job in itself. Office of Dependency Benefits also handles Public Law 490 accounts—emergency payments to needy dependents of soldiers captured or missing or otherwise out of touch. That job will get tragically busier and bigger as American expeditionary forces tangle more with the enemy in the other hemisphere. But family allowances, aimed directly at the draft-and-dependents problem, are the biggest job of all—to date more than 2,000,000 separate and individual accounts, each full of personal emotions.

Family allowance is a special privilege of enlisted men up through the rank of sergeant. Because their pay is supposed to be enough to enable them to look after their folks unassisted, fancier non-coms and officers need not apply. A married private, for instance, can chip in $22 of his monthly pay of $50, whereupon Uncle Sam chips in $28 and sends his wife $50. A first child rates $12 monthly, subsequent children $10 each. The total of the Government's contribution rises with each additional child, but the soldier's contribution rises only if he has class B dependents as well as class A relatives. He chips in an additional $5 for class B's. A dependent parent gets $37, a dependent sister $27, if no other dependents are in the picture, and so on in a nicely graduated scale through several hundred varying cases, all figured out in advance, with Uncle Sam making up the deficit wherever necessary.

Being sensitive on the subject of drafting husbands, Congress even fixed it so wives and children are looked after regardless of either need or the soldier's wishes. Parents, sisters, and so forth, are only class B dependents, getting an allowance only if the soldier asks for it and after "disinterested parties" have made affidavits that the dependency is real. But wives and kids are class A. Even if Private John Doe doesn't apply, even if he doesn't want to in the least, even if his wife Jane has a job that supports her or an independent income, she has only to prove to Office of Dependency Benefits that she is married to him and start collecting $50 a month, rain or shine.

On finding $22 missing from his pay for the benefit of a lady who doesn't need it or whom he hasn't seen for 5 years and doesn't want to see for another 500, John may get unmistakably burned up about it. Since common-law marriages, still obtaining in many States, are also recognized by the allowances law, John may actually find himself helping support a lady to whom he didnt even know he had become formally attached. But he has no recourse. The law says one legal wife—or one divorced wife entitled to alimony—equals one full allowance, any time she applies. Those in Office of Dependency Benefits who should know, however, say this arrangement does a great deal more good in protecting wives with regardless husbands than harm in giving unscrupulous wives a chance to bleed men in the service.

That is only one of a thousand ways in which the personal equation crops up in Office of Dependency Benefits. Newark is spang in the middle of the Nation's heaviest concentration of population—a good 10,000,000 Americans within 25 miles—and every day three or four hundred Office of Dependency Benefits beneficiaries come shyly or belligerently in from New Brunswick and Brooklyn, Paterson and New Rochelle, to check up on what happened to that money the boy said he would send. Fifteen full-time interviewers barely manage to keep sympathetically abreast of their confusions and problems. Ten more are needed to handle the day's usual bag of 300 phone calls, often over long distance. On occasions Office of Dependency Benefit's staff must cope with more than a dozen different languages. But Armenian, French, or Cantonese, it all translates into the one sore point of "Where's my dough?"

Distress cases—where the caller is having a baby or is stony broke and can't wait for allowance payments to go through—are turned over swiftly to the Red Cross or the Army Emergency Relief for quick rescue. The Army Emergency Red Cross maintains a small and harried staff right on the premises, also handling any and all distress letters arriving in the mail room downstairs. Special readers look for signs of tragic trouble and shoot such mail to Army Emergency Red Cross at once. Army Emergency Red Cross then wires its local office, wherever indicated, and help is on the way.

Some of the callers in person take versatile tact in handling. There was the lady last winter indignantly asking how come she couldn't draw Class A allowance from all three of her husbands. Told she couldn't legally be married to three men at once, she retorted crushingly that she had been careful to marry each in a different State. The Office of Dependency Benefits still said no. But it neglected to pursue the matter of whatever bigamy might be involved. Its job, it feels, is to

pay money where Congress says it is due, not censor the customers' private lives.

To make up for her, however, there was the lady appearing later, showing indubitable proof that, just to be on the safe side, she had married her man three separate times.

Enter an excited Italian unable to understand that the money his boy wrote about can't be paid till after the first of the month. His idea of speeding things up is to stand and shriek fluent Sicilian in the interviewing room until guards work him out into the street. Enter a soldier's pregnant wife, parking defiantly in a chair and announcing she will stay right there, 24 hours a day, until either check or baby appears—preferably both at once on the spot. Enter an embarrassed old Irishman, explaining that his baby grandson fell foul of the check and tore it up.

Producing the pieces from his hat, he wants to know can he get another check right away; the electric bill is way over-due. As it happense, he can; whereas the old lady with the ruminative cow is probably in for a long wait. The United States Treasury is very slow about issuing duplicate checks without better proof of loss than the cow could furnish when put on oath.

Requests for documentary evidence of children's legal status are often baffling. Such six-bit words may move a mother of eight to bring the whole brood to Newark in person, deploying them in platoon front before the interviewer. Whatever documentary evidence may or may not mean, here are Angelo, Maria, Giuseppe, Giovanni, Beatrice, Lucia, Francesco, and little Pietro yowling in her arms, to prove they unquestionably exist and could certainly use $10 a month apiece. Under such circumstances class A allowances can add up amazingly. A recently drafted husband and father from a Pennsylvania industrial town had been on Work Projects Administration at $87.50 a month. To the surprise and delight of all concerned, he found that allowances would better than double the family income the moment he was inducted—1 wife and 11 children equaled $162 a month, not to mention that papa was also getting free lodging, clothes, and food, and $28 a month cash besides.

But for every customer who comes in person, thousands take pen in hand. It takes 22,000 square feet of desks and more than 750 letter-writing clerks to answer the daily mail. Everything gets answered—not only correspondence straightening out formalities, but all the letters of protest, appeal, and slander that keep flooding in from Geyserville, Calif.; Sebeka, Minn.; Jacobsburg, Ohio; Bloomfield, Conn., and practically all points in between. Only two in five are standard enough for form letters in reply, and the flood is steadily mounting. The officer in charge of the correspondence branch is, consequently, always at his wits' end for an adequate supply of letter writers, and says, with a grim kind of satisfaction, that this one end of Office of Dependency Benefits will outlast all the rest of the outfit—long after peace has washed up the determinations or information branch, the girls will still be writing letters to folks in Dogtrot, Ark., who want to know, with reason, what happened to the money Uncle Henry wrote he was sending 47 years ago.

Three or four hundred letters a day come from Representatives or Senators in there pitching for constituents who want help in building a fire under Office of Dependency Benefits. A few enterprising legislators, in fact, appear to have circularized their districts with form letters saying you may be eligible for an allowance if you have relatives in the service, and, if so, just let me know and I'll gladly fix it.

There is no fixing. Office of Dependency Benefits handles inquires or applications by precisely the same method as if no franked envelope was concerned. Now and again somebody writes the President direct. One recently turned up addressed: "Mr. President Theodore Roosevelt." There was probably a much higher I. Q. behind the soldier who, after studying the regulations, concluded that he was unquestionably dependent on himself and applied for a class A allowance in his own favor.

Nobody yet knows what lay behind the case of the soldier and wife who couldn't get together on what their children's names were. The 6-year-old daughter on papa's application was named Angela Mae, for instance, whereas his wife stated firmly in papers she submitted that the child was named Ann Beulah. A dubious detail like that usually produces on-the-spot investigation. Among millions of beneficiaries chiselers and fakers are sure to show up, and some 12 regional field investigation offices from coast to coast are constantly working at ferreting out the fraudulent claims.

On the whole, however, Office of Dependency Benefits has been startled by its customers' honesty. When allowance payments were just starting hardship cases were often sent regular allotment checks while family allowance applications were pending, the allotment being a charge against the family allowance payments later. In practically all such cases mere notice that refund was expected produced quick and complete repayment—so far $250,000 has been refunded without any kind of pressure being applied.

The patriotic honesty of wives and old folks who write in refusing payments is even more warming. A migrant west coast laborer, by definition no plutocrat, said no with great effect:

"I think we can get along the way we are without any Government family allowance. Who knows? What you would allow me might be the straw to break the Jap's back. If George wants to send us a little to help along, O. K., but we don't want your allowance dear old U. S." When a soldier is headed overseas, Office of Dependency Benefits reminds him that allowances and allotments had better be arranged to avoid long-range delays later. Even after arrangements have been completed on the soldier's initiative, the beneficiaries may refuse articulately.

"Hope I never need assistance, so every cent we have can go to help win the war quicker," wrote one father under those circumstances. "This boy did not know I could keep agoing, but I can." It made lumps in the throats of several correspondence clerks when a scrawly letter came in from an old Mexican couple in Arizona, saying they were doing all right without an allowance:

"I am glad because he is going to defend our country, and I am sorry because we are very old to wait until he comes back. And we want the Army officers to do us the favor to take a good care of our boy, Juan S. Hernandez. He doesn't know how to talk a very good 'inglesh."

Better staff work at the customers' end would often help speed payments up. Many slow-ups occur because wives don't know their men's Army serial numbers—the quickest point of reference for that particular guy in Office of Dependency Benefits files. Names can be run down eventually in most cases. But when the files already contain 6,000 Smiths, of whom more than 500 are named John, the difficulties are evident. Out of sheer instinct for sabotage, some women lacking serial-number information blithely dreamed up likely sounding strings of numerals and wrote them in the proper spaces, thereby tangling up any possible chance that Office of Dependency Benefits trouble shooters could straighten out their difficulties.

Many customers don't know what a birth certificate or an affidavit is. Or, as a baffled wife reported, "I can't find no notary republic in this here neighborhood." Others report that some small-town bankers or lawyers, asked to help in making out affidavits testifying to dependency, just glare suspiciously at this newfangled document and refuse to have anything to do with it. A country bank distinguished itself last winter by returning an allowance check to the depositor; it was punched all full of funny-looking holes, the cashier pointed out, and had obviously been canceled. Probably the only case on record since the panic of 1837 when a check on the Treasury of the United States bounced.

The error is not quite so flagrant as it sounds, since these checks are not only full of holes, as alleged, but are also made of thick cardboard instead of paper and have one corner cut off—the effect is very like what the State Department does to a passport in canceling it. All that is required to suit the needs of the automatic sorting, calculating, recording, and mailing machinery, without which it would probably be impossible to get the job done, unless half the United States were hired as clerical help.

Setting up Office of Dependency Benefits has been a field day for makers and designers of such half-human gadgets. Once an account gets into the works, the entire process of monthly check writing and addressing is literally untouched by human hands. No layman can begin to describe the involved sensitivity and accuracy arrived at. The net of it is that the soldier, the dependent, and the amount are all reduced to code numbers on a stencil card with oblong holes punched at significant places. When the card goes through the works, cunningly alined steel fingers feeling for the holes actuate machinery that writes the check. It is signed by machinery and even inspected by machinery. Another clacking gadget runs both checks and stencil cards through itself and throws out, in disgust, any check that doesn't agree absolutely with the information on the card that sired it.

Machinery also does the enveloping and sealing. Since the enveloping machine occasionally puts two checks in one envelope or sends another through empty, the Office of Dependency Benefits has a gadget that tests filled envelopes for too much or too little thickness. When it finds a suspicious specimen it flashes a signal and hands the offending envelope to the operator. The temptation to give it a bit of dog biscuit for reward is practically irresistible.

Many of the officers who supervise these Tom Swift robots were recruited from among the crack personnel of business-machine manufacturers. Half their time is put in making sure that the drama of human life gets properly recorded on the file cards as it happens. Private Doe's wife has another baby—$10 must be added to her allowance. Sergeant Box's mother dies and her allowance is discontinued. Captain Cox's daughter marries a marine lieutenant, and father reduces his allotment to her. Every such item of emotion-charged behavior—birth, divorce, marriage, death—translates into numbers like 467892093876 73694 6 500 on a new card with mystic punch holes to match, and next month the machine recognizes all the facts as a mechanical matter of course.

Get 'Em Paid! is the official slogan, printed huge on poster strips on every wall in the building. It has been tough going right up to now, and present plans in Washington to go in even more heavily for drafting married men won't simplify matters. Under the original law and starting last June with two colonels and a secretary, the mission was to get the first allowance checks mailed by November 1, a date that looked barely possible as of then. Early in summer, however, the demand for allowances piled up so that the law was

amended, shifting the starting date forward to September 1.

The Office of Dependency Benefits could only moan, send a figurative roustabout to sit on the safety valve and pile in the wood till the sparks flew out of the stack as big as pigeons. With steam leaking at every gasket and the untried disbursing set-up threatening to tie itself into pretzel bends any minute, she managed to meet September 1 on the nail. The customers apparently appreciated it. Several of them actually sent Christmas cards to the Office of Dependency Benefits with grateful messages written in.

Booming in number of employees and accounts handled, the outfit was just hitting its stride in Washington last fall when the second blow fell. In one of the decentralization moves now popular, it was decided to shift Office of Dependency Benefits from the overcrowded Capital to some area offering more employee housing and better help-recruiting facilities. Such a shift always means terrific pay-roll mortality. The average employee of an agency booked to move immediately rushes out and gets a job in an agency due to stay in Washington, so he won't have to uproot himself. Office of Dependency Benefits lost 60 percent of its newly trained and organized personnel at one swoop. Even so, in both personnel and bulk of files and equipment, it was the biggest such trek yet made when, in November, 3,400 Office of Dependency Benefits employees invaded Newark so slickly that total interruption for any department amounted to only a couple of days.

The director, Col. Harold N. Gilbert, United States Army, a native of Pennsylvania, on whose broad shoulders rests the tremendous responsibility for this vital activity, is an organizer and administrator of long and wide service. He raised the whole show from a pup to its present strength of 150 officers and about 9,500 civilian employees. Previously, by his foresight and planning, the largest peacetime Army and Air Force in our history was recruited; it gave us a head start when war finally broke upon us. Among the bright colors on the left breast of his uniform are the ribbons of the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, and the Purple Heart, attesting to his outstanding services to our country.

A good many of these Office of Dependency Benefits officers, completely lacking enlisted men under them and in command principally of shoals of young women, carry the Victory medal ribbon that means service in the last war, often with the tiny gold star that means the wearer survived action.

When taking over this present job, which involved creating a new organization to administer the allowances, greatly increasing the already existing machinery for allotments and synchronizing the two, the colonel laid down the principle, "No moss or barnacles brought along," from outside and stuck to it. His correspondence branch has many innovations that save time and work; his production lines for routing case records and correspondence are unlike anything else ever seen under heaven, but they keep the job moving fast; flexibility and "Why not do it this way?" alone got him through those first few months of fantastic development, which has enabled the Office of Dependency Benefits to receive and handle more than 2,000,000 family-allowance claims, nearly 1,000,000 allotment accounts and more than 15,000,000 pieces of mail, exclusive of checks, up to the time this was written. Now he is hammering at a new principle. He is going all-out to get and keep it in the heads of his whole crew, from department supervisors to messengers, that the checks they stuff into mailbags are aimed at real flesh-and-blood human beings like themselves to whom lack of the money involved can mean deprivation and heartbreak.

Independence Day Address by Senator Wiley at Abbotsford, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Independence Day address delivered by me at Abbotsford, Wis., on July 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the Fourth of July, 1776, a resolute group of farmers, lawyers, and businessmen wrote their names to the document called the Declaration of Independence. They were daring men who signed that instrument. They were courageous and liberty-loving.

The Nation at that time consisted of 13 colonies along the Atlantic seacoast with a total population of about 3,000,000 people—about the same population as now living in Wisconsin.

Those were the horse-and-buggy days. There were no airplanes, no radios, no railroads, no cement highways, no steamboats, autos, or gasoline engines, no telephones or telegraphs. But there were thinkers in those days—folks who thought strongly, who loved liberty, and justice, and who dedicated their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, to carrying out that Declaration of Independence.

Since that eventful Fourth of July in 1776, the world has changed much. America has changed. We have become the foremost Nation on earth, and the British whom we fought in those days are now our allies in a world struggle.

Most everyone who hears my voice has a personal interest in this war. Each of us knows that if we should lose, it would mean economic and political slavery for us. Many of us have a son, brother, sweetheart, husband, relative, or friend in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or in a war production plant. Each one of us on the home front is seeing to it that the home front is held intact. We know that if the home front is not kept intact—that is, if the morale breaks—production will break, and if production breaks, the boys on the front line won't have the wherewithal with which to fight and we will lose the war. We know that the food and the weapons which our boys get are what equip them for victory.

But, you ask, when will victory come? That I cannot answer. When war came upon us on December 7, 1941, we were not prepared for it. It came like a thief in the night. But now, thank God, we are prepared.

Some of us in Washington were anti-interventionists. We knew that America was not prepared psychologically or otherwise for war. Every Gallup poll showed some 60 to 90 percent were against intervention. If this country had intervened in war, there would not have been the unity there is today, but we were attacked by a treacherous foe—this foe intervened in our affairs—and now a united nation dedicates its all to victory.

We have a tough job in front of us, and, in my opinion, a longer job than some folks seem to think. I would make sure that none of us become overconfident, and I would make sure that none of us indulge in the spirit of defeatism.

There is reason for the faith that is in us—the faith that we will win. Why? Because we are fighting a just war and the god of battles is with us.

Our recent victories in Tunisia, in the south seas, and in Attu, are all indicative of the fact that we are hitting our stride. But this must not breed overconfidence. Once Hitler was victorious and many of the folks in this country believed he was invincible, but now the situation has changed.

In the days of Hitler's victories, Britain was unarmed. Only a few intrepid flyers in Britain and the British Navy stood between her and slavery. Today her armed forces have increased a thousandfold. Today she has joined with us in sending tanks and planes to Russia. Today her Royal Air Force and ours control the air over Britain and the Channel and Europe. But we must remember that we haven't a soldier on Europe's soil—Hitler's fortress. The battle has just begun.

Today Russia—magnificent Russia—who has given 10,000,000 of her lives, still stands valiantly baring her breast against Hitler's hordes.

Today we have almost a three-ocean Navy and three and one-half million men in the armed forces, with millions more on the way. We have seen many set-backs since Pearl Harbor—the loss of Bataan, Corregidor, and the Philippines, 3,000 dead at Pearl Harbor, over 65,000 casualties—killed, wounded, and prisoners.

But we have also seen magnificent victories—the story of Midway with the Japanese threat turned back, the Battle of the Coral Sea, 3,000,000 tons of Japanese shipping at the bottom of the sea, and, above all, we know that these so-called weakling sons of ours—those sons who the Japs said could not fight and would not fight—are, man for man, better warriors than either the supermen of the East or of the West. They have demonstrated this in the air, on the sea, under the sea, and in every battle in which they have engaged.

On the home front, while we may differ about partisan politics, we are united in the effort which will bring victory. Labor and management are doing a tremendous job. Our production has been the marvel of all time. Our bombers are flying across to Britain in droves. We are way ahead of production schedules.

Our armed forces are made up of Colin Kellys, General Doolittles, John Buckeleys, Commander Gilmores, Elsie Otts, Lieutenant O'Haras Admiral Callahans—men and women of extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty.

These boys of ours are flying over the continents and seas of the earth, plunging through bomb-infested skies. They are struggling and sweating and dying in the deserts and the jungles. They are sailing underneath the surface of the seven seas, destroying the commerce of the enemy—they are doing all of this for you and me, that the enemy may be kept from our beloved and their beloved homeland.

It is up to us to carry on as their bravery demands. This is no time for any of us to so love gain—that we neglect our job on the home front—the job of production and the maintenance of morale. It is no time for the racketeer and the profiteer. It is no time for the breeding of hate and dissension.

When Thomas Jefferson died on the Fourth of July, 1826, his last words were, "Tell the committee to be on the alert." That is the lesson which Pearl Harbor should teach us also. This Nation must be constantly on the alert—alert so that dangers from without and dangers from within cannot destroy the great values of which we are trustees.

These great freedoms of ours—freedom of press, speech, worship, petition, trial by jury, freedom to work and to own and accumulate

property—these did not come into being by accident. They were the result of hundreds of years of sacrifice. They can only be preserved by this people remaining on the alert. We are told eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is also the price of retaining liberty.

For 167 years we have kept the light of freedom—like a beacon light—burning so that all mankind could see it. Hitler and the Japanese would snuff out that light and make us slaves as they have made the Czechs, the French, the Dutch, the Norwegians, the Danes and the Belgians.

We have accepted the challenge made by our enemies to our liberties and our freedoms, and we have dedicated all that we are and all that we hope to be to the preservation of those freedoms.

It is to the preservation of those freedoms that I desire to speak very seriously. Some day this war will be over. Some day our boys who are astonishing the world with their valor will be back to take their part in the maintenance of law and order and the preservation of the American way of life. They will become with us the American phalanx that will preserve the Nation against all impacts, internal and external.

As we are seeing now, little Hitlers will arise; there will be opportunity for such to come into being because in the future there will be many problems, economic, social, and political. Then we will see these fake mastermen come forward like the old medicine man in my boyhood days. They will come forward with all the fake remedies and panaceas.

I can see that medicine man now standing on the corner mesmerizing the people. First he would describe all the symptoms, all the aches and pains. Then he would build himself up to where the people might accept him as the great remedial agent—then he would pull out the bottle and sell it for a dollar or more that didn't cost him over 5 cents.

So today we have the medicine men of this generation. They are no different from the racketeers in labor and in management. They dwell on the ills. They make out a great case and of course their purpose is to "sell a bill of goods" and the "bill" they sell is not the fake medicine contained in a bottle but the fake philosophies contained in their heads.

They have another technique. They are in fact little Hitlers. He used the idea "divide and conquer" and almost conquered the world with it. But these fake politicos we now have, even have the nerve in these days to try to divide management and labor. They have made contact with individuals who find it to their advantage to preach dissension and discord, hate, etc. One would think, as one listens to the impassioned plea of these modern medicinemen, that management only contains bad men. You and I know that a bad man, no matter where he is, makes a bad condition. A bad man, be he clergyman, lawyer, farmer, businessman, or laborer, will affect detrimentally the place in which he lives and operates.

No one in America, except the racketeer type, wants to interfere with the rights of labor. I said "except the racketeer type." We have a small percentage of folks in and out of labor of that type as we all know.

As we proceed along on our course toward victory and approach the era when this Nation is among the victors in fact, it is the obligation of each of us to see that there are no supergovernment groups in America. By that I mean there must be no group in America that is bigger than the Government.

I am talking to the farmers today. The farmer has never really organized. Of course, there are various farm organizations, but by and large, the farmer is an individualist. I thank God for that. He is not driven like sheep. He thinks things through.

For a while he may be led by a demagog—someone who plays up his fears and emotions—but ere long he awakens and he lands on both feet. The reason for this is because he lives close to mother nature. He sees in nature a certain standardization. The frills and the folderol of superficial living do not belong to him. Politically, he is occasionally taken for a ride by some politico or sham messiah, but he lands back on his feet.

In my opinion, he is the hope of the Nation. He will not stand for any group taking over this Government for any length of time. He knows the value of American citizenship. He wants his children, when he passes on, to enjoy those values and privileges.

Right now the farmer is becoming fed up particularly with what the theorists in government tell him he must do. Essentially the farmer is a practical man. He has learned that industry and thrift and honesty and hard work bring results. He has dedicated all that he has to the preservation of what he considers as the American way of life, and he will not be led astray by any of these fake medicine men who come around and preach class hatred, fake political ideas, and would build their own political fortunes on division.

With God's help, fellow Americans, we will remain constantly on the alert against any internal Pearl Harbors or any external Pearl Harbors, and with His help we will carry through to victory, making sure that our children and the children of America for all time to come will possess and enjoy liberty and freedom.

What Happened Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "What Happened Flag Day," published in the New York Journal-American. The editorial is a most patriotic one, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENED FLAG DAY?

By what accident did two branches of the Federal Government, the executive and the judicial, select Flag Day to deprecate or to disparage the American flag?

Was it purely an isolated circumstance that the Executive, by a proclamation of the President and by an exhortation through the Office of War Information, proposed that all of the flags of the so-called United Nations be impartially displayed on the one day set aside by Federal law solely for Old Glory and that in the medley of alien colors the four-barred ensign of the hypothetical "four freedoms" be prominently flown?

Was it by mere chance that this day of all days should have become the occasion for the Supreme Court to reverse its numerous previous decisions—including at least one decision handed down by present members of the Court—and to hold for the first time in more than 150 years that neither the Congress nor the legislatures of the several States may enact laws to be obeyed by all making a salute to the flag a part of the ceremonial in public schools or, presumably, in any other assemblage?

And was it wholly fortuitous that these highly significant actions occurred at a time when propagandists, some of them from foreign lands, are trying to needle the American people into a League of Nations condition of mind, for the post-war construction of a supereminent "world government" in which the American people shall submerge their historic freedom and to which the American Nation shall abandon its priceless sovereignty?

It is obvious that if a supergovernment is to be erected, in which America is to be entrapped, the American people must be converted away from that jealous regard for their own form of government which has never, until now, been successfully assailed.

It is equally obvious that the people cannot be seduced from their old and ingrained loyalties, for which their forefathers shed heroic blood on these shores and for which their devoted sons are dying even now in wide regions of the earth, unless the people can be induced to disrespect the symbol of their nationality and to reject the instrument of their democratic governance.

That symbol is the flag.

That instrument is the Constitution.

The two of them are inseparable in the hearts and thoughts of patriots.

So long as our flag flies unchallenged over our offices and domiciles, so long as the Constitution prevails unimpaired over our civil processes, America will remain the free home of a free people.

When the flag is allowed to be belittled, when the Constitution is permitted to be distorted, our loyalty diminishes and our liberties are in danger.

And both the flag and the Constitution are being ominously challenged today.

We are being told that the United States now belongs to a group of governments comprising the United Nations.

Insofar as the phrase implies only that we have temporary military allies in a world war, it is a plain and honest phrase.

But we know—as witness the "world government" propaganda—that the phrase "United Nations" is also used designingly to denote a scheme of future international entanglement from which America, if once enmeshed therein, could probably never deliver herself.

Similarly, in being asked virtually to adopt the flag of the "four freedoms" we are told tacitly that the blood of our fighting men flows abroad to cement these freedoms into the creaky foundations of world government.

However, the way to slay such chimeras is utterly simple.

Let us merely look at the truth—the truth that our 10,000,000 men in arms are not fighting for myths and vagaries.

They are fighting for America—for the American flag and the American Constitution.

And so we arrive at the other aspect of this confused subject—the aspect that concerns us alone, as a nationality.

We arrive, in other words, at the Supreme Court decision on Flag Day declaring that the flag need not be honored by Americans in America.

This decision, nullifying four previous Supreme Court decisions, took for its basis the first amendment of the Constitution, part of our Bill of Rights.

And this decision was preceded by voluminous and continuous propaganda in left-wing publications calling upon the Supreme Court

for a reconsideration and reversal of its previous judgments.

Until this Flag Day the Bill of Rights has never been interpreted in such a way as to protect unpatriotic or subversive deeds or words.

If the new decision remains as the supreme law of the land, it may spawn all kinds of troubles and may be invoked to shield all kinds of villainies perpetrated in the name of constitutional freedom.

Now, the query remains—why did the Supreme Court choose this particular day to hand down this amazing decision in reversal of itself?

Why, indeed, did not the Court avoid this designated day?

The decision could have been issued any day.

So why was this decision, holding it to be no crime to despise the flag, made public on Flag Day—the one day in all the year that is dedicated to the flag; and the only Flag Day—strange coincidence—since the occasion was instituted in 1916 on which the executive branch of the Government has paid public honor to other flags than our own and has asked the people to do the same?

Had there been a set purpose to displace our flag from its primacy in the minds of the people and to subject its lustrous folds to contempt, the deed could not have been more skillfully contrived.

Recess of Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand a resolution is going to be brought in here to recess this House for 2 or 2½ months. I want to say in all seriousness that I shall oppose any such recess. I think it would be a terrible mistake—with the country in the condition it is, with the war at its height, with race riots all over the country, with internal disturbances disturbing the administration, with much unfinished legislation pending before us—it would be a serious mistake to adjourn this Congress and go home for that length of time.

We might be justified in taking a recess for 3 weeks, with the understanding that at the end of that time we would take 3-day recesses; but I am not willing, under the conditions that now exist, to vote to adjourn for a period of two or two and a half months.

I believe I have been as consistent as any Member of the House in trying to stay here and attend to the business of the Congress.

I am told that I was the first Member who ever served in this House who answered every roll call for 10 consecutive years. On yesterday our colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] finished out his 10 years without missing a roll call. I am glad to welcome him to the 10-year club.

Of course, it is nerve-racking at times to stay here, and sometimes I feel like Alcibiades who is said to have stopped his ears and fled from the presence of Socrates for fear he would grow old listening to his eloquence.

But we were elected to serve here, and I, for one, feel that we should remain at our posts of duty—especially during these trying times.

Bureaucracy's Threat to Liberty

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the causes of the American Revolution was the number of Government employees sent by the Tory Government of England to govern the actions of the Colonists. Accusing the King personally of this form of oppression, the Declaration of Independence stated that—

He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

The right of home rule, the right to govern themselves through officers of their own choosing, the right to change those officers whenever they should not serve the common interest—these were some of the reasons for the revolt against the Government of those days.

During the last few years those same reasons have returned again to menace our freedom. Again home rule is threatened in every community and State; again our right to have our actions governed by officers of our own choosing is being outrageously infringed; again our right to rid ourselves of unwanted officials and unneeded offices has been made impossible to exercise. And again there are signs of a spirit of revolt against a situation fast becoming intolerable.

When Thomas Jefferson was President, there was but 1 Federal employee for every 5,308 Americans. Today there is 1 Federal employee for every 45 persons, without counting the men in uniform. Figuring the average American family at 4½ persons, this means that 1 in every 10 families is supported by the Federal Government, and help to rule the other 9.

These Federal employees are not all in Washington. Most of them are scattered throughout the States Less than half are concerned with the war. There are 44,000 Federal employees in the State of Michigan alone, as compared with 93,000 Michigan State and local government employees—excluding the 50,000 engaged in education. The total number of Federal employees in the United States on April 1, 1943—the latest official figures available—not counting the military, is 2,991,327. The total number of State and local government employees, including school teachers, is 3,237,000. More than 48 percent of our combined Federal, State and local government employees are at work administering the laws of the Central Government at Washington. This in a country which fought for its freedom from a government that denied the principle that local affairs should be governed by local governments consisting of local officials.

There was a time in the memory of living Americans when the only contact most persons had with Federal officials was when they bought a postage stamp, saw a United States marshal ride horseback into town, or caught a glimpse of a Federal circuit judge alighting at the station platform for a short term of court.

Today, however, Federal officials and Federal officeholders are permanent residents of every city and county, almost of every block and township. There is now hardly a man or woman but who must frequently accommodate his actions to the regulation of some local representative of the strong, centralized power in Washington which we have allowed to encroach upon the rights of States and communities to govern themselves in matters affecting only local interests.

Businessmen are harassed and handicapped in attempting to serve their customers and clients by multitudes of Federal regulations, often based upon little or no legislative authority, and too often administered by small-fry Federal employees from whose whimsical, but annoying and dangerous interpretations, appeals are costly and time wasting.

O. P. A.'s regulations controlling business transactions fill 5 thick volumes with 11,000,000 words. Even housewives are not immune from the effects of the extension of Federal power through the O. P. A. The regulations proposed to govern housewives who seek to can and preserve food for their family tables fill 6 newspaper columns with technical wordage. It took 500 O. P. A. lawyers in Washington to prepare this agency's maze of regulations. More than 2,200 more lawyers have been hired to see that they are enforced in every State, city, and village, on every farm and in every home.

It is the same story in many other Federal agencies and bureaus. The entire country has been infiltrated with Federal employees who draw their power and authority, not from the States and communities affected by their actions, but from the Federal Government in Washington. Their first allegiance is not to those with whom they deal and among whom they live, but to a hierarchy of officialdom which may be thousands of miles away.

Herein lies a grave danger to our continued freedom: That thousands of those who govern us are not subject to the people's control. They are not elected by the people. They are appointed by entrenched bureaucracies in Washington. Neither are these bureaucracies

subject to anything more than the most tenuous supervision or control by the people or the people's representatives in Congress. The King's officers in the American Colonies and the absentee landlords of Ireland never created a situation more inimical to the liberties of a people than does the presence of Federal employees extending their power even into the most remote villages in America.

The tremendous cost of this continent-wide government by bureaucracy is secondary to the threat it has created to the American system of representative democracy. True it is that the salaries of Federal employees, even though they are numerically 10 percent under the total of State and local government employees, including teachers, exceeds the salaries of the latter by almost 14 percent; but the millions spent from taxes to support the horde of Federal employees would be cheap if it guaranteed the preservation of individual freedom. On the contrary, however, the millions being spent are destroying, not preserving, the American way of life.

We are engaged in a foreign war which broke upon us suddenly one Sunday morning in Hawaii. But there is another war which began 167 years ago when we proclaimed ourselves to be a free and independent Nation, and which has continued uninterrupted to this day. It is the day in and day out struggle to keep free of domestic tyranny, and it must continue to be fought in every corner of America. There are forces—some ignorant, some malicious—constantly at work to swerve us from the clear paths blazed by our forefathers. They have had to be resisted in every city and town and State, at every ballot box, in every public forum, in every legislative body, in every court in the land. But one threat to our liberties has been allowed to intrude itself slowly and subtly into every office, factory and home: The threat borne by a locust swarm of Federal employees so remotely responsible to the people that such responsibility can hardly be said to exist. It is this threat which we must fight even as we fight our foreign foes. It is this threat we must crush now, lest tomorrow it crush us.

Taking Profiteering Out of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the program of the American Forum of the Air entitled "Taking Profiteering Out of War." The program was conducted on June 20. I have received from the Government Printing Office an estimate regarding printing of the program. It is estimated that it will make four and one-fifth pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $189.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcer JAY CALDWELL. The American Forum of the Air. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. From the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C., stations WOL and WOR take pride in presenting to the Nation-wide audience of Mutual one of radio's pioneer features, the American Forum of the Air.

Since 1928 Theodore Granik, attorney and editor, has arranged these weekly programs, in which the news personalities of the day discuss the issues of the day freely and frankly in the American tradition of free speech. Again this week the Shoreham is crowded with hundreds who have come to hear this important discussion, many of whom are from official life.

And now, Director Theodore Granik.

Director GRANIK. Thank you, Jay Caldwell.

America this year is spending over $100,000,000,000 to prosecute the war.

Many of those billions consist of contracts from the Army, Navy, and other procurement agencies—billions for everything from planes and ships to pins and shoes.

With so much being spent on war contracts it was only natural for the people to be wary of war profiteers. So Congress enacted an excess-profits tax which takes up to 80 percent of war-boom profits.

But Congress felt that was not enough. So, as an extra precaution, in April 1942 it enacted the renegotiation law, providing that the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and the others could renegotiate all major contracts to arrive at a fair price based on actual operations and costs.

And so, in the first year of renegotiation, the price boards report adjustments totaling $2,800,000,000, consisting of cash refunds on completed contracts and credits and lower prices on future deliveries. And these adjustments have all been voluntary, the boards tell us.

But renegotiation is not as simple as that, It involves considerable paper work and conferences. It takes production executives away from their plants. And it leaves a war contractor uncertain as to how he may fare on any job.

So the House Naval Affairs Committee a few days ago began studying this problem to determine whether renegotiation should be retained, amended, or repealed outright.

This evening the American Forum of the Air considers the over-all problem, taking profiteering out of war.

Our speakers are Mr. Maurice Karker, the Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board; Representative ROBERT A. GRANT, of Indiana, member of the House Naval Affairs Committee; Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, who has questioned 5,000 war contractors as to their feelings about renegotiation; and 2 of the thousands of manufacturers affected by the law—Mr. S. C. Allyn, president of the National Cash Register Co., of Dayton, Ohio; and Mr. Scott Russell, president of the Bibb Manufacturing Co., of Macon, Ga.

Each has a brief statement. Then all five will join in a round-table discussion of taking profiteering out of war.

First, then, Mr. Maurice Karker.

ADDRESS BY MAURICE KARKER

The renegotiation statute has been called dangerous and un-American. Maybe it is both, but I know that we are engaged in a dangerous and un-American war in which we are fighting for our liberties and our lives. Extraordinary measures are justified in the protection of both.

Renegotiation is neither a punitive measure nor a taxing statute. It is a part of the procurement process—the adaptation to war of a common commercial practice in time of peace. It is the wartime substitute for peacetime competition, and the law was passed (and is being administered) in the interest of the people who pay for what is bought and of private industry which produces that material. It is the best answer yet devised to that problem which has plagued every wartime President of the United States since George Washington. It is the best safeguard yet developed to see to it that the people's money is spent with intelligence and rigid economy and that they get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent.

Whether or not profits are excessive in the case of any individual company depends upon the facts. It does not and cannot depend upon a formula. In the first year of administration of this act, the War Department alone recovered nearly $700,000,000 and secured price reductions of over $1,000,000,000 in addition—all this from about one-sixth of the war contractors in 1942. The reductions made average about 10 percent on the total prices of the contracts reviewed.

This job is being done with a small force at a minimum of expense and in a way to leave industry strong and fit to resume postwar reemployment, recapture of domestic and foreign markets, restore the American standard of living and maintain a higher degree of prosperity for all the people than the country has ever before known. It provides incentive and reward for the superb job of production which has been done by American industry, but it provides them from the very minimum of debt and taxes to be laid upon the backs of all the people.

Director GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Karker. And now, Representative ROBERT A. GRANT of Indiana, a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee, which is holding hearings on this problem. Congressman GRANT.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT A. GRANT

I am grateful for the opportunity to take part in the discussion of this vital subject of war profits.

All of us are agreed that no man should make inordinate profits out of this war. At the same time, we must be equally determined that our system of private enterprise shall survive in the difficult period of readjustment that will follow. Therein lies the most glaring deficiency in the Renegotiation Act.

The price adjustment boards do not make any allowances whatever for a reserve for reconversion and rehabilitation of American industry. The Government did allow conversion into war business as an item of cost, but that same Government refused that same concern any reserves out of its own earnings out of the converted plant with which to reconvert and rehabilitate itself back into peacetime business.

During the current hearings before the House Naval Affairs Committee, the Chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board admitted in response to my question:

"Looking at it as a practical matter, I think business will have to have the assistance of the Government to reestablish itself after the war."

After the Government becomes a big stockholder, and a preferred one, in any business, the next step would be to send out a man to sit on the board of directors and the Government would soon be dominating every business in this country. It would be operated with the same inefficiency that we associate with the receiver of a bankrupt concern. Such domination, to me, is state socialism.

What is the difference between that and the Nazi system?

This is total war. The Renegotiation Act, however, applies only to prime or subcontractors making war products for the War, Navy, or Treasury Departments, the Maritime Commission, or the War Shipping Administration. Any other business concern that operates outside this list, either because of its inability to get into war business or because it chooses not to do so, is entirely outside the jurisdiction of the price-adjustment boards.

If present tax rates are not effective to really recapture excessive profits, then why shouldn't they be revised so that they will more effectively do the job. It is a terrific and an awful power to vest in three individuals the right to sit down at the table of American industry and, without any fixed formula, to tell American industry how much money must be paid over to the Government over and above the obligations to the tax collector.

Please don't misunderstand me. The chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board is doing his very best in a herculean task of dictating profits over thirty-five billions of American business. I know that the same thing can be said for you, Mr. Karker, and your job is even bigger than the Navy's. My complaint is not with the men who man these boards but rather with the present application of the law itself.

Director GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman GRANT. Now, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, who has questioned 5,000 war contractors about renegotiation. Senator BRIDGES.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STYLES BRIDGES

Months ago I became interested in the program of price renegotiation of war contracts. Spurred by a desire to ascertain just how the plan was affecting American industry, and to learn first-hand what industry felt should be done to remedy shortcomings under present administration of the law, I started a personal survey.

With the cooperation of the committee of Americans, I sent out detailed questionnaires to some 5,000 industrial establishments. Frankly, I received a fine response. This information has given me and my colleagues in Congress the most complete data on the subject yet assembled or made available.

Two large volumes, comprising the first half of the survey, have been turned over to the Truman committee, the House Naval Affairs and Ways and Means Committees, the Senate Finance Committee, and other committees directly interested. With continued interest from every section of the country, it will be necessary to prepare a third volume.

Since this evidence deals with actual experience it is possible Congress will move to remedy certain phases of the law and its administration.

I believe the American people and American industry favor some effective and efficient form of war-profit control. Business does not want to come out of this war an inflated free enterprise. It does desire to emerge with sufficient strength to face the huge task of peacetime conversion.

Under existing circumstances business faces critical days ahead because of the popular zeal to take virtually all profits out of wartime production.

Everyone must make a contribution in this war. Most people are willing to. This is true of industry, which has already done a grand job in production. But, industry must have some assurance financial reserves will be available to meet the multitude of complex problems certain to face America and American industry in the post-war era.

One of two things should be done; either the present tax law should be amended, or new legislation enacted to permit industries to retain—while yet they can—sufficient cash reserves to meet problems of the future.

I offered a plan to meet this contingency—a plan permitting industry to purchase Government bonds with all profits above a certain level.

The cash reserves accrued in these bonds would be earmarked for purposes; to be expended at fixed intervals over a period to meet the emergencies of reconversion and deflation.

Thus, the Government would get money now for war needs and industry would have assurance of cash reserves for peacetime enterprises.

Mr. Granik, let me say I think we have one definite problem in mind beside winning this war, and that is to preserve free enterprise so that when the boys return home they will return to more than an empty shell of democracy, and in that objective, I think this problem of renegotiation of contracts is vastly imporant to the future of this Nation.

Director GRANIK. Thank you, Senator BRIDGES. We hear now from one of the thousands of war contractors affected by renegotiation, Mr. S. C. Allyn, president of the National Cash Register Co., of Dayton, Ohio. Mr. Allyn.

ADDRESS BY S. C. ALLYN

I think we can assume that manufacturers are not interested in making anything more than a reasonable profit from war contracts. Any other attitude would be no less than a betrayal of the 8,000,000 men in the armed forces who not only are making no profit but do not even have a guaranty that they will return alive.

Granting that there is no desire for excessive profits, the question then is, "How can profits be kept reasonable?" In answering that question, we must consider the abnormal conditions under which contracts are placed and executed in time of war.

The great majority of manufacturers are making items with which they were not the least bit familiar before the war. It has often been impossible to accurately determine ultimate costs at the time a contract was placed. "Good Faith" is the saving factor and the unwritten element in every contract which protects both manufacturer and Government. Renegotiation is nothing more than a means of exercising that good faith. To my mind it is the best method of adjusting profits to actual costs that has yet been developed.

I believe there should be a better understanding of renegotiation. In the beginning at least, there was some feeling that this procedure was a reflection upon a company's integrity. That is certainly not the case. It is rather a certification that the adjusted profits are satisfactory to the Government. As the manager of a business, responsible to the public, to stockholders, to employees and to 3,000 of our former employees in the armed forces. I welcome this official stamp of approval. It means a great deal now. It may mean even more at some future date.

When we started renegotiation, we did not know exactly what to expect, but we soon realized that this was something to be desired rather than opposed. The attitude taken by administrators was fair and businesslike. The voluntary price reductions which we had made were given full consideration, as was every other factor.

I do not presume in this discussion to be speaking for anyone or any organization except myself and our own company. However, I know that what I have said parallels the opinions and the experiences of others.

Renegotiation is an emergency measure, a fair and practical method of performing a necessary wartime function. It should be intelligently administered and by the same token it should be accepted by manufacturers in good grace and good faith.

The act is not perfect. Some amendments can and should be made. But to ask for repeal would be taking too great a risk because no satisfactory substitute has been proposed. I sincerely believe that private enterprise owes it to its own future to cooperate in making renegotiation work.

Director GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Allyn. And now, a big textile manufacturer likewise affected by renegotiation, Mr. Scott Russell, president of the Bibb Manufacturing Co., of Macon, Ga. Mr. Russell.

ADDRESS BY SCOTT RUSSELL

In common with the vast majority of American businessmen, I am utterly opposed to profiteering, in war or in peace. I am willing to do whatever is reasonably necessary to prevent it.

I do not believe the bureaucratic monstrosity set up by the Renegotiation Act is either reasonable or necessary.

Its proponents defend it by citing certain horrible examples. No one questions that such situations should be prevented, but they leave me cold when they are used as an excuse for applying renegotiation to the great bulk of Government contracts.

The demand for the renegotiation law grew out of the mass production of items that never before had been mass-produced. No one knew what they would cost. In such situations it has a real place and should be preserved, but it should be confined to them.

It should have no place in the Government's dealings with manufacturers of standard goods, the costs of which are readily ascertainable.

In the first place, taxes have already taken 80 percent of this profit, so renegotiation is dealing with only 20 percent of it.

The Office of Price Administration has fixed all these prices and in many instances the procurement agencies have set their own ceilings below the Office of Price Administration.

But, worst of all, the patriotic manufacturer who has given up his customers and turned all his production to his Government, has to go through the inquisition of renegotiation, while one who has sold identically the same goods at the same or higher prices to his civilian customers, and probably to customers of the other producer has no worries over renegotiation. That the Government gets the goods under such circumstances is a tribute to the patriotism of American industry.

A simple amendment by Congress confining it to the purpose for which it was originally intended would make it both fair and possible of administration. Now, it is neither.

Director GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Russell. The American Forum of the Air continues with its informal, round-table discussion.

Mr. Karker, to start the discussion, will you tell us precisely, why it is that the excess-profits tax doesn't do the whole job; why renegotiation is necessary to eliminate excess profits?

Mr. KARKER. An excess-profits tax, briefly, operates too late after the damage has been done, and it cannot by any formula or proposal seen or heard yet do a job equitably, as between companies whose sources of capital and performance factors vary as widely as they do in American industry. When you rely upon the excess-profits tax to reduce the amount of profit in even a given situation to that which is regarded as fair, you have already paid a higher price than should have been required to be paid for whatever it be that you buy, whether it be a tank or textiles; you have to borrow the money, you have had to add it to the public debt. You are adding to it this cost of service of the public debt, and eventually you are adding it to the tax burden to be laid upon the backs of the peo-

ple, and you have had the whole inflationary effect of that artificiality. Whereas——

Congressman GRANT (interposing). Mr. Karker, let me——

Mr. KARKER (interposing). Excuse me just 1 minute, please. Whereas, if it is prevented in the first place, you go through none of that process, and you are a deflationary influence instead of being an inflationary contribution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Karker, you don't think it is important—you don't think it possible for your negotiators to get around any quicker than the tax collector will get around, do you?

Mr. KARKER. We have done it for 17 percent of the companies for 1942 already.

Congressman GRANT. How long is it going to take you to do it to the rest of them?

Mr. KARKER. It will depend on the cooperation of American industry in two directions: First, in providing intelligent, experienced and able personnel with which to do the job; and, second, stepping forward and finding out what the facts are in their individual cases. Otherwise 1942 cannot be done before the end of this year.

Mr. RUSSELL. You admittedly have no formula which you can use as a reply to any given business before going into this, have you?

Mr. KARKER. That is perfectly correct. There is no formula and none is possible.

Congressman GRANT. For the benefit of the radio audience, I would like to have you tell us and tell them, what factors you do take into consideration when you arrive at the profit that you decide you shall allow a given business.

Mr. KARKER. Mr. Grant, there are probably a thousand and one of them. The principal ones, of course, are the volume of business that they have done, the degree of speed with which they have met their delivery schedules, the care with which they have used labor and conserved material, the cost at which they have produced, the inventive and management contributions which they have provided not only for their production but which they have provided to help other people; the source of capital which is used in making this production, and on and on into all of the factors, relationships, and ratios which businessmen themselves take into account in measuring their own efficiency.

Congressman GRANT. Their own efficiency. Mr. Karker, what factor would you say was given the greatest weight of all?

Mr. KARKER. There isn't any one factor given the greatest weight of all; all factors are taken into account.

Congressman GRANT. How much weight do you give to the factor of cost?

Mr. KARKER. It is one of the primary considerations because the basic philosophy of administering this statute, as laid down in the joint issue by all of the departments concerned, is that there shall be provided incentive and reward for the production of more, and for that production at lower and lower cost.

Congressman GRANT. But the very point I wanted to get at, Mr. Karker, is: You say that cost is one of the biggest factors in arriving at an allowable profit to a concern; and isn't it true, then, that to that extent you are allowing a fee based on cost, and we are reverting back to the old cost plus a percentage of profits contract that plagued us during the first World War?

Mr. KARKER. Not at all. It isn't a fixed percentage and, of course, we are not, because we don't allow a fixed percentage; the Case amendment as it was proposed in the House a year ago or thereabouts, made a fixed limitation of 6 percent, and that is definitely cost-plus or selling-price plus.

Congressman GRANT. I would like to ask Senator BRIDGES, if I may, on this matter of post-war reconversion—and that is the thing that worries me most of all, Mr. Granik, and I am afraid we are going to have private industry prostrate at the end of the war—I would like to ask, Senator, what you learned from your questionnaire over the country about the interest of American industry about the vital part of that problem.

Senator BRIDGES. More than any other single thing, Bob, I found out that in the mind of the average businessman was the problem of facing the post-war era and the problem of conversion to a peacetime basis, the problem of rehabilitation, the problem of deferred maintenance, the problem of adjustment over a period of time with the possible deflation period in progress.

Mr. ALLYN. Isn't the question of a reserve for reconversion a question of amendment to the existing law?

Mr. GRANT. You agree with us, then, that there should be that amendment made?

Mr. ALLYN. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Allyn, do you think——

Mr. ALLYN (interposing). Certainly, I think it would have to be amended in the income-tax law at the same time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask two questions.

Mr. KARKER. I haven't answered the first three yet.

Mr. RUSSELL. First, where are you going to get enough men to weigh with discretion all these factors that you say have to enter into every individual consideration? You have not got a yardstick for them.

Mr. KARKER. That isn't true, Mr. RUSSELL. There is a yardstick; there isn't a formula.

Mr. RUSSELL. It hasn't got 36 inches to it.

Mr. KARKER. Oh, yes; it has probably 39.

Mr. RUSSELL. One other question.

Mr. KARKER. Have you read the joint issue from the departments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I have read it.

Mr. KARKER. And you haven't found any basis, any policy, any outline of principles to be followed? You haven't found any philosophy to be followed?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a philosophy, but I don't know where you are going to find the thousands of men necessary to administer the philosophy.

Mr. KARKER. Where do you estimate that there are going to be thousands?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Truman committee said that there were 85,000 of them that you had to negotiate, and you have only got 200.

Mr. KARKER. The Truman committee made a minor mistake; they listed as renegotiable all the manufacturing concerns listed by the Department of Commerce of the United States. Our best estimate in the War Department—and it is purely a guess—is that we may have to renegotiate 15,000 manufacturing companies. For all the departments it won't exceed twenty to twenty-five thousand.

Mr. RUSSELL. How many have you renegotiated?

Mr. KARKER. Something over 2,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. In a year and a half?

Mr. KARKER. Oh, no; not in a year and a half. In the first place, it isn't a year and a half since April 28, 1942; it isn't quite 14 months, if my arithmetic is correct. But in the first part of last year our time was taken up trying to define principles, to develop policies, to get an organization together. Really, there had been no production on the matter of renegotiation until the 1st of January 1943, and since that time the War Department has reached agreements with something over 2,000 companies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me ask you one more question. Isn't the real basis for your renegotiation, isn't the driving reason for renegotiation, the manufacture of goods that have never before been manufactured? Is there any reason why standard goods sold both to civilians and to the Government at the same price should be under the renegotiation statute when the revenue act takes 80 percent of any profits and 90 percent in some cases?

Mr. KARKER. Never 90 percent; but go ahead.

Mr. RUSSELL. Ninety of the top part that you have always said comes from the increased production; that is what induced the 90 percent. Now, why apply it to standard goods that you can go uptown to a store and buy just as well as you can buy it from the manufacturers?

Mr. KARKER. Because, Mr. RUSSELL, strictly under those situations, excessive profits result from increases in volume, which, in turn, result in lower costs. I have in mind one situation, with which you are probably familiar, in which the volume in 1942 was 3 times that in the base years; the profit per dollar of sales was 3.4 times that of the base years; the dollar profit before taxes was 10 times that of the base years. Does it seem logical that excessive profits might be involved in that situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Isn't it true that 80 to 90 percent of that goes back to the Government anyhow without your boards?

Mr. KARKER. Eighty-one percent of the top dollars in any business can be taken out, but over all the maximum possible is 72.8 percent.

Congressman GRANT. Didn't I get from your opening remarks that the War Department recaptured some $2,800,000,000? Was that your statement?

Mr. KARKER. No.

Congressman GRANT. That was somebody's statement and figure or a part of whatever figure they used.

Senator BRIDGES. It was Senator MCKELLAR'S figure in the Senate yesterday in which he was not fully informed.

Congressman GRANT. Thanks, Senator, but Mr. Karker, a part of your money goes back to the Treasury on contracts that have been completed and payment made, but the rest of those funds go back to the procuring agencies where those contracts were let. Now, of course, it is the responsibility of Congress to provide for the Army and the Navy, and if the Navy comes up to our committee and asks authority for an airplane program of a billion dollars, and they are finally able to renegotiate the contract for $1,000,000 less before final payment, then they have got the program and they have also got the $1,000,000. What do they do with the $1,000,000, what becomes of the responsibility of Congress to look into those matters and make provision for the Army and the Navy?

Mr. KARKER. May I answer the first part of your question first, Mr. Congressman. The amount referred to (and we don't like the word "recapture" which the Congress used) which was recovered up to the end of May was $698,000,000. That wasn't recovered from contracts completed; that was recovered from contracts which had deliveries and for which the deliveries had been paid up to the end of the last fiscal year. Those contracts may still be in effect; the $1,000,000,000 approximately, the amount which has been saved through price reductions for deliveries remaining, is simply money not expended under the appropriation and is handled exactly as it would be had you appropriated $170,000 for a particular airplane, and the Department had been able originally to negotiate with the manufacturers to buy it for $160,000. The $10,000 are not spent for each plane, but the money is available, and within 10 percent, available for transfer for other purposes under the authorization of Congress.

Congressman GRANT. But did the War Department ever report that they had so many hundred millions of dollars accumulated in a reserve that they had saved, and what should they do with it?

Mr. KARKER. Why, Congressman, the report which has just been made to the appropriations subcommittee shows that $12,000,000,000 is unexpended on appropriations already made.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Karker, I feel rather strongly on this particular thing because I think the general public have been rather confused by the statements, not that you have given out, but that have been given out, whereby they are supposed to have saved about $3,000,000,000 when part of it, as you have explained here, is an actual saving, money that has gone back into the Treasury, but the substantial part of it is an imaginary saving which has come about actually by price reductions, and I think that to the American public we should all have a very clear distinction between money saved, which is money returned to the Treasury, and this sort of imaginary saving which goes on as a result of reduction of prices.

Mr. RUSSELL. Senator, wouldn't 80 percent of that money have come back into the Treasury or some percentage, approximately 80 percent, come back into the Treasury regardless of the renegotiation boards?

Senator BRIDGES. That would be my understanding, generally.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figures that were given, as I understand it, were before taxes were deducted.

Mr. ALLYN. In the first place, I don't think you can confuse renegotiation with excess-profits taxes because renegotiation is not a revenue measure. The purpose of renegotiation is to recover excessive profits and when renegotiation works it exerts a stronger moral effect to hold prices down. On the other hand, I think excess-profits taxes have a strong effect to hold prices up. When you have got 20 percent that you are going to get of whatever is left, the tendency is to keep your prices up and keep your profits up, and 20 percent of a million dollars is $200,000, and 20 percent of $500,000 is $100,000, and I don't see how the excess-profits tax can be used as a means of controlling excess profits.

Mr. RUSSELL. How is the renegotiation statute going to be so used if you can't get around to the contractors within 2 years after they are through with this year's business? You don't know what your business earned last year until you have been renegotiated.

Mr. ALLYN. You can find out awfully darned quick.

Mr. KARKER. As a matter of fact, it isn't going to take 2 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Karker, it has taken us 8 months to get up the information your men have asked for, and we have never seen the men yet.

Mr. KARKER. I didn't realize that even Macon moved that slowly, Mr. Russell, because there is no reason why it should.

Mr. RUSSELL. They asked for a lot of information.

Congressman GRANT. Mr. Granik, I wonder when we think of the cost of renegotiation to the taxpayers, if the renegotiation boards have ever considered that effect and cost represented by the hours and the days and the weeks and months that are spent by the auditors and accountants of a business in supplying the necessary information to the Price Adjustment Boards, and also the loss to the Government in production of vitally needed products for the war. We had a man, Mr. Karker, before our committee who said the effect of his shutting down to supply figures to the Price Adjustment Board cost 100 gun mounts. What would that have meant in the ships on which they were to be manned?

Mr. KARKER. It means that he is a liar. I don't want to get into a discussion of that situation here, but I know the particular case, and the decline in the manufacture of gun mounts was due to a change in design, and none of the men in that organization is interested at all in renegotiation. As a matter of fact, he has delayed renegotiation for a matter of 12 months, but we are coming to grips with him.

Congressman GRANT. But the problem you have raised in the waste——

Mr. KARKER (interposing). The problem has been considered and it is a very serious one, and we have made it as simple as it possibly can be, but perhaps it can be made simpler. The number of special audits that have been made have never been more than two or three in the War Department. We accept the figures of the regular auditor; we accept certificates of the officers of the corporation; we accept the segregation of sales which is the most difficult and expensive part of renegotiation on the basis of spot check from the officers of the company. We have done every reasonable thing that we can to make it simple, direct, and smooth.

Senator BRIDGES. I just wanted to point out in answer to Mr. Russell's question something that I ascertained in talking with your Board, Mr. Karker; that one of the advantages that some form of renegotiation has, in addition to what would be accomplished by excess profits, is the fact that it allows them to get into a firm, for instance, that has bloated or inflated its expenditures. In some instances I know of, they paid their stenographers an unhead-of salary, and had all the family at big salaries on the pay roll, and in that case it very definitely can do something that excess profits won't accomplish.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said to start with that in that situation I was favorable to keeping it. It ought to be kept in the situations where they are making new goods and mass-producing goods that they have never produced before. My objection to it is in dealing with perfectly standard goods that are sold every day over the counter to the civilian or the Government at the same price.

Senator BRIDGES. I think you have got a point there, Mr. Russell.

Congressman GRANT. I want to hark back to this matter of reserve for rehabilitation, and I want to ask Mr. Karker (and he is in this where policy is being determined) what his thought is on the matter. Do you agree with the statement that was made by the chairman of the Navy Price Adjustment Board to our committee that industry is going to have to come to the Government for help to survive when the war ends?

Mr. KARKER. Not generally, no.

Congressman GRANT. Do you believe that a good bit of it will have to come to the Government for help?

Mr. KARKER. Oh, yes, I think that some of it will, and I think that it is more largely from that group which doesn't have war business that your casualties are going to come. I don't like you to assume that I am not sympathetic to the provision now of adequate reserves in the case of every individual company to tide them over that period of readjustment, to provide for the reconversion of their facilities to the extent that that reconversion is a necessity at the time; to provide for the separation pay for those men that they have and the reemployment of other men who become available. You load an enormous responsibility on the Renegotiation Board, the Price Adjustment Board, by criticizing us for not allowing it when Congress itself has not allowed it.

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Karker, do you think that in order to bring that about the act should be amended?

Mr. KARKER. Senator, I am not a policy-making officer of the War Department, and I think that question could and should be answered by the Under Secretary of War. As an individual, I think that the tax statute, the Revenue Act, can very properly be amended. I think there are a great many considerations which the Congress will have to keep in mind, and take into consideration when you do it.

Congressman GRANT. Do I understand, Mr. Karker, that you would personally like to have an amendment to make allowance for reserves?

Mr. KARKER. I would.

Congressman GRANT. I am glad to hear you say that.

Mr. ALLYN. Mr. RUSSELL, do you advance the argument that products such as you have mentioned should not be renegotiated because there are no excessive profits?

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that there is no difference between those products in wartime and those products in peacetime. The argument has been made that because the production has expanded that profits have become excessive. But it is the expanded production that has put the companies in a 90-percent tax bracket, and you're only arguing over 10 percent, and certainly the Government expects the people who stretch themselves out to get that last modicum of production, to get the 10 percent out of it.

Mr. KARKER. The amount is 80 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me explain Mr. Allyn's statement. The over-all top is 80 percent, but it is this last expanded production that Mr. Karker is talking about that puts you in the 90-percent bracket that has a stopper of 80 percent. But you wouldn't be in it except for that possibility.

Mr. ALLYN. Then you have a post-war credit of 10 percent and you get back to 81 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right, but you don't know what your inventory is going to be worth, and Mr. Karker's men, as I understand it, are not giving any credit for inventory.

Congressman GRANT. Mr. Granik, I want to make one point on the matter of post-war credit provided in the excess-profits tax. It provided for these bonds that are negotiable. They are not negotiable now, but they are to be negotiable after the cessation of hostilities as proclaimed by the President and by the Senate in a concurrent resolution, and may I point out to you that in the last World War it was ended by a concurrent resolution on the 2d day of July 1921, almost 3 years after the armistice, and business would be broke in the meantime if it has got to wait that long on the credits that come from the post-war bonds.

Mr. KARKER. We have a better Congress than we had in those days. [Laughter.]

Congressman GRANT. Mr. Karker, I hope you are right. I want to say that I am interested in the future of renegotiation. I want to be understood as saying that I believe it was fully justified and very, very well intended, and, possibly, the only way to meet the situation in that experimental period when we were making new commodities for the war and increased volumes that we have never known before, but with the experience we have had, aren't we pretty well able to negotiate contracts closer to the line, and shouldn't we be able to see this thing taper off pretty fast with a better negotiation process by the procurement agencies themselves, by taking a break-down from a contractor and going over it with a fine-tooth comb before they ever sign a contract in the first place?

Mr. KARKER. Mr. GRANT, there isn't the slightest question that the amount of recovery will be reduced substantially and materially from now on. It will be very much less, but the minute you take this statute off the books the pressure to keep costs down and to price in relationship to cost will be taken off.

Congressman GRANT. I would just like to say, lest I don't have another opportunity, that I don't advocate outright repeal without adequate safeguards being thrown around it. We have got to make some provisions for post-war reserves. I think, too, that we ought to be able to write some sort of a formula for an irreducible minimum below which we shouldn't go, so that a man should have something of his earnings which should be his own.

Mr. KARKER. Every man who has been renegotiated has something plus something

more, plus something more for good measure.

Congressman GRANT. But thousands of them are still on the outside wondering.

Mr. KARKER. There is nothing holding them back except their desire to put off the day; the money nerve is right over the heart, and it is for that reason that they are on the outside; they hate to be touched.

Congressman GRANT. I think that is an unfair indictment of industry generally.

Mr. KARKER. Oh, no; I am not trying to indict industry; I am indicting human nature, if anything.

Congressman GRANT. After all, business is conducted by human beings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Karker, you have got a terrific administrative task in this thing as it is now set up, haven't you?

Mr. KARKER. There is no question about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it were confined to nonstandard goods—goods that were never made before, couldn't you administer it much more efficiently, much more satisfactorily, and wouldn't you catch practically all of these horrible examples such as Senator BRIDGES was talking about, where they were paying their secretary $100,000 a year, and not have to deal with the great mass of American business and have thousands of people uncertain as to whether they would come out, and where they would come out?

Mr. KARKER. Of course, the number would be greatly reduced, but the inequities would be perfectly enormous. Mr. Russell, you yourself complained during the course of this discussion of the fact that business with the departments is negotiable and business with civilians is not, and you would not add another favored class.

Director GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, our time is up. You have been listening to the American Forum of the Air discussion of Taking Profiteering Out of War.

We invite your letters and comments. And now, your announcer, Jay Caldwell.

Announcer CALDWELL. Thank you, Mr. Granik. Your comments and suggestions will be welcomed by Director Theodore Granik, attorney and editor, who founded the American Forum of the Air 15 years ago. Next Sunday at this same time the American Forum will present another discussion of current interest. This has been presented by Stations WOR and WOL as a public service feature in the American tradition of free speech. Jay Caldwell speaking. This is Mutual.

The Post-War Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in connection with the subject of inflation and the subject of business generally with which the Senate has been concerning itself for the past several days, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the syndicated articles by Mr. Lewis Haney. The article was published in the July 4 issue of the Washington Times-Herald, and is on the subject of the post-war outlook.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANEY DISCUSSES FURTHER POST-WAR OUTLOOK

(By Lewis Haney, professor of economics, New York University)

At a recent meeting of businessmen for the purpose of discussing the post-war outlook, I was asked certain questions. You may be interested in them and in my answers.

First, I was asked "If everybody goes in for post-war planning, isn't it likely that there would be chaos—wouldn't it be better to have one master plan for the Nation?"

To which question I replied that a system under which each individual plans for himself, his family, and his business, is not chaotic. Intelligent individuals soon learn that their own well-being depends on the welfare of others. They learn to adjust and cooperate. They take a social point of view that leads to a synthesis of their plans.

This sort of free individual cooperation is facilitated by business associations, trade-unions, and reasonable Government regulations.

One master plan, however, means subjecting all of us to a master. It means collectivism and a maximum of coercion to force each and every individual to conform to a plan in the making of which he had no part.

Free individual choice is the basis of democracy. And to have freedom, each individual must plan for himself, subject only to the limitations required by the plans of other individuals.

Then I was asked, "Don't you think that we should definitely plan for post-war participation by Government in business and by labor in management?"

Well, as implied above, I think that business must be regulated by Government, but that is not participation in business. The Government makes a very poor businessman, and the more democratic it is the worse it is as a business enterprise. That is exactly why in wartimes we give up democratic procedures in Government and make the President a temporary dictator.

So businessmen should welcome governmental regulation to insure fair competition and Government research, information, and advice. Aside from that, let the politicians have no control over business except in cases of monopoly and public utility.

As to labor participation in management, this would amount to making the workers more than laborers. It would require them to participate in business risks and to take business losses. Their time would be taken up trying to study business problems and market conditions.

NO PROFIT SHARING

The world has seen plenty of experiments with profit sharing and cooperation in production, but these have never resulted in any general success. Even in the special cases where they have been sustained they are not highly successful.

The function of business organization and direction is definitely different from the function of labor, and must have profits as a reward. To mix wages and profits does not work well.

Businessmen have been forced to learn more about the importance of labor and the rights of the workingman and his organizations. This is well. But now it seems that the laborers, in their turn, are going to have to learn more about the nature and importance of the enterpriser's function. They cannot be expected to participate in management in any decisive way unless they bear the responsibility and run the risks of business enterprise.

I conclude: Democratic government is as different from business as peace is different from war. Labor is as different from management as the big-shot labor leader is different from the average laborer.

Defense Against Chaos—Open Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting open letter, addressed to the President of the United States, by Harry E. Sharkey, published in the column headed "Fact and Fancy," of the June 29, 1943, issue of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND FANCY

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Speak to the American people. Congress has thrown the Nation into chaos in its mad and irresponsible efforts to destroy you.

You cannot ignore that challenge. You must take your fight to the American people.

And you must do it, not to defend yourself against Congress, but to defend the Nation against the chaos that Congress is bringing upon us.

You, as an individual, regardless of how the rioters in Congress may hate you, are not an issue in this matter. You, as the Commander in Chief of the United States Army, fighting the most desperate war in the history of the Republic, are very much an issue.

You must lead the people in the fight against those who are trying to destroy your effectiveness as Commander in Chief. You must lead the fight of the people against those who are creating the confusion that may well result in our losing hundreds of thousands of lives of American boys and possibly losing the war.

Mr. President, we in the United States have been mumbling to ourselves for a long time, "These men are not unpatriotic. They don't seek to overthrow the Republic. It is an honest difference of opinion."

The same thing was said in France just before the debacle. The home front cracked when it was discovered that the dissidents did want to overthrow the French Republic. Their price was complete domination of the French Government. They would rather lose the war and hold control of the reins of government than win the war with democratic control of the Government.

Mr. President, if you had been a weakling like Daladier, this country would have cracked a year ago, and for the same reasons.

It might well be that some of these men are not unpatriotic. Whether or not this is true, they are at least playing into the hands of those who are seeking to destroy the Nation. And they could not be any more effective if they were deliberately plotting against the Government. They, at least, are creating a state of confusion which is the kind of environment in which those who have been plotting our destruction can best operate.

Mr. President, in all the months since Pearl Harbor, those confusionists have struggled against your administration. They would vote for appropriations for the war, but they would hedge those appropriations about with conditions which impeded your administration of the war effort. Their support of you

as Commander in Chief stopped with voting appropriations. They have not even supported you on matters of providing an Army. They have made a mockery of your efforts to finance the war. They have deliberately sabotaged your efforts to prevent inflation. They have interpreted your good intentions as signs of weakness. They have deliberately wrecked the morale of the working people of this country, the people on whom we are depending to produce the materials of war. They have tried to destroy the confidence of the people in the integrity of the Office of War Information to the end that the one official source of information would become the source of doubt.

Moreover, Mr. President, the confusionists in Congress have had more than a little aid from the outside. The press of the country has never been half-way fair to you. During the period in which the confusionists were creating a lot of racket and disunity, the press has been cheering them on. The Hearst-McCormick-Patterson axis has been the cheerleader. The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have given aid in helping to destroy national morale on the labor front. Their agents in the war agencies, too, have thought more of laying the groundwork for control of the economy than of programming production for expediting the war.

In spite of all the efforts at confusion, in spite of all the efforts to mislead them, the people of the United States are still behind you, Mr. President. The confusion has not yet completely demoralized them. But unless you speak up and carry your fight against the confusionists to the people, your leadership as Commander in Chief will be seriously jeopardized.

Mr. President, the people are listening for your voice. And they want to hear a tough note in it when you speak.

HARRY E. SHARKEY.

The Eleventh Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Jewish Comment, published by the World Jewish Congress:

THE ELEVENTH HOUR

The preceding issue of Jewish Comment noted the heightened German propaganda of Jew-hatred, the threats of reprisals against the Jews for losses by bombing and for Allied victories. The past week has demonstrated how deadly serious were those threats. In four countries—France, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria—heavy, in most cases mortal, blows have been reported against the Jewish community. Even in this war, so weighted with frightfulness for the Jews, there has hardly been so tragic a week's news.

The occurrence of a violent turn against the Jews all over Europe at almost the same time cannot be a mere accident. It indicates that the Nazis are rigorously pursuing their purpose of completing the extermination of the Jews. Every military set-back is answered by the Germans by a renewed attack on the Jews. The time for the prevention of this horror is growing rapidly shorter. Many of those who could have been saved yesterday can no longer be rescued today; and those who can be saved today will tomorrow be lost.

The most damaging acts of brutality were committed by Germany itself in Czechoslovakia and the Netherlands. As yet unconfirmed but highly credible reports state that in reprisal for the bombing of Möhne and Eder Dams the Jewish internment center of Terezin (Theresienstadt) in Bohemia-Moravia has been liquidated. In this town were incarcerated some 50,000 Jews from Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. The internees were in large part aged persons who had not much longer to live and to whom the International Red Cross was permitted to transmit gift packages from abroad. To the ordinary human mind, even thinking in purely cold-blooded terms, the deportation to "unknown destinations" of helpless old men and women, partly maintained from abroad, would seem like pointless savagery. Yet the Germans seem to have deliberately done this deed—a fact which, when it is further confirmed, ought to satisfy any questions which still may remain in anyone's mind how far the Germans are prepared to go in the plan of annihilating the Jews.

In the Netherlands last week it was reported the Germans forbade Jews to reside in the last city still open to them, Amsterdam. Temporary internment camps in the Dutch interior are rapidly being emptied of their Jews, who are being disposed of in batches in such execution centers as the notorious Treblinka camp in Poland. The day when the Netherlands will be completely "judenrein" (except for scattered Jews in hiding) is in sight, despite the heroic resistance of the Dutch. If the Germans desired only to evacuate Jews from the coastal Provinces in order to prevent them from helping Allied landings, they could have maintained the internment camps in the interior, and need not have ordered killings. Their actual procedure shows they had another purpose as well—the familiar aim of completing the destruction of the Jews in lands Germany controls.

A typically Nazi abuse of law is the voiding of the citizenship of all French Jews naturalized since 1927, which was ordered by the Nazi puppet Pierre Laval, to become effective on Sunday, June 27. To deprive peaceful, law-abiding citizens of their ultimate source of protection and security solely on the grounds of their descent is unconstitutional in France, whose legal system forbids the annulment of legally acquired rights. It is cruel and exceptional persecution of a kind practiced only by brutal and disorderly government. The mass of newly declared "alien Jews" will, of course, be treated as were other alien Jews resident in France; unless something is done to prevent it, they will be deported to areas in the east and disposed of there in the usual way.

Perhaps the most tragic case of all is that of Bulgaria. Only a few months ago, it looked as though a beginning was going to be made in Bulgaria of the evacuation of small groups of Jewish children, accompanied by adults. If successful, such a start might have led to similar projects in Rumania, Hungary, and even Italy. It would also have created a situation between parts of the Axis satellite population and the United Nations which would greatly have facilitated invasion. But this opportunity has been lost. Our information indicates that delay on purely technical and administrative matters gave Germany the opportunity to kill the project. Bulgaria has been crowded into the extreme of antihumane behavior. High officials of their Department of the Interior are reported to have stated that Jews will not be allowed to leave either for Turkey or Palestine. Bulgarian authorities, revealing the conditions in internment camps to which Jews have been sent, state that epidemics of typhus have broken out which Jewish doctors cannot prevent for lack of medical supplies. Even if the Sofia Jews are not sent to Polish or Rumanian prison areas, their prospects are grim.

What are the Nazi purposes in their implacable drive to finish off the Jews? One purpose is clear and unmistakable. They have declared the Jews their mortal enemies, and they are determined to destroy them wherever they have the power to do so. Every defeat of German arms makes it all the more necessary to hasten this operation where they still exercise power.

Another purpose is almost equally plain. For the Germans, the decision of any of their satellites to relax or increase their persecution of the Jews has a very simple but cardinal importance. They are fully aware of the effect that the imminence of invasion has upon their satellites; and they know that many of them would like to keep the door open for a graceful exit from belligerency at the "proper" moment and under "suitable" conditions. One of the methods of placating the Allies, the Germans believe, is to tone down the anti-Jewish laws. It follows, therefore, that German interests lie in the opposite direction: they must bring about a greater stringency in the anti-Jewish laws of all their associates; force them deeper into their complicity with Germany in its inhuman crimes; and thus cut off the possibility of an approach by an Axis partner to the civilized portion of humanity.

The interest of the Allies in this matter seems plain. Every success of the Germans in driving their satellites into anti-Semitic crimes is likely to increase the fidelity of those groups to the German cause on the day of the Allied invasion.

The United Nations must adopt an active policy in this matter. We are aware that the German leaders can no longer be approached in terms of the ordinary remedies of wartime brutalities. They yield only to the threat of immediate, overwhelming reprisals, without which they will not abide by any international rules concerning the treatment of civilian populations. Threats of post-war retribution do not affect them since their leaders are apparently determined to impose themselves as the lawless masters of the world or risk death in defeat.

But their subordinates and associates cannot all be megalomaniacs. Such must share the ordinary scruples and fears of mankind about the consequences of inhuman conduct. They must be brought to realize that continued association with the Axis and the mad crimes of its leaders must lead to disaster. In some cases even the governments of Axis satellites may be susceptible to pressure on this score. Certainly the past record of Bulgaria and Hungary, which have maintained the forms of parliamentary rule, justify belief that their governments will not lead them headlong and without throught down the path to destruction along which the Germans are piping them. The hour is late; and Hitler, by threat and persuasion, has neglected no opportunity to implicate all his partners in his own crimes; but it may not be too late to turn some of the Axis satellite states to better courses.

In Germany itself and in countries which Quisling leaders have sold out, there can already be no hope for anything but purely military defeat. There is nothing th eleaders in such countries can do any longer to clear themselves before the world. Their stains of guilt are too deep-dyed. It is for this very reason that they are so furiously intent on making their own guilt common to as many subordinates as possible. There is no reason whatsoever for the United Nations to accept this situation. Only those with

clean hands will help the Allied invasion; those who have been involved in guilt will aid the enemy as they have been aiding him all along. They have violated the commands of conscience and religion; they have broken with the basic rules of law and order. In defense, they may claim they have done all this not "on their own responsibility," but "under orders" from their superiors. When the time of invasion comes they will still be under orders—to resist the Allies.

The United Nations must break this fiction. An officer who assists in murder and looting, or a citizen who does not shelter the hunted and despoiled, cannot disclaim responsibility. It must be made plain that no subordinate official or private citizen is obliged to respect orders based on laws which are contrary to the elementary principles of morality and of all civilized constitutions. Any person required to assist in the enforcement of such acts must be regarded as an accomplice in treason and in the specific crimes committed; if he fails, to the extent of his opportunities, to impede or sabotage their execution. The projected international commission on war crimes must begin to list the guilt of such accomplices and to pass sentence upon them. The underground movements in Europe must be instructed, wherever possible, to assist the victims of Quislingism.

All these measures would tend to preserve and heighten the spirit of resistance in Europe and prepare the ground for invasion. The present passivity can only have the opposite effects.

War Expenditures of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous expenditures involved in the present war are well set out in the figures prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. War expenditures of the Allied countries for the latest year for which figures are available approximate $105,000,000,000. Of that amount the expenditures of the United States are $67,584,000,000, or almost twice as much as all the other Allied Nations put together. The figures for the various nations are as follows:

WAR EXPENDITURES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. AUSTRALIA

Year ending June 30—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
1939	£A9,974,000	$3.71	$37,004,000
1940	55,715,000	3.29	183,302,000
1941	170,828,000	3.23	551,774,000
1942	319,500,000	3.23	1,031,985,000
1943	[1] 359,970,000	3.23	1,162,703,000
	[2] 440,000,000	3.23	1,421,200,000

[1] 8 months through Feb. 28, 1943.
[2] Budget estimate of war expenditures for whole fiscal year.

Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1754-1755; 1940-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1651; 1943 actual, Moody's Governments, May 19, 1943, p. 1342; 1943 budget, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1651.

2. BELGIUM

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Francs		
1940 [1]	1,329,000,000	$0.17	$225,930,000

[1] Budget estimate.

Source: Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1705.

3. BOLIVIA

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Bolivianos		
1939	[1] 89,796,000	$0.03	$2,694,000
1940	[1] 175,000,000	.03	5,250,000
1941	[1] 195,159,000	.02	3,903,000
1942	[1] 232,000,000	.02	4,640,000
1943	[1] 246,000,000	.02	4,920,000

[1] Budget estimates.

Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1791. 1940-41, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1686. 1942-43, Moody's Governments, Feb. 27, 1943, p. 1435.

4. BRAZIL

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Centos		
1939	1,099,000	$60.03	$65,973,000
1940	1,244,000	60.56	75,337,000
1941	[1] 1,207,000	60.58	73,120,000
1942	[1] 1,488,000	60.58	90,155,000

[1] Budget estimates.

Source: 1939-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1692.

5. CANADA

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
1939	$34,432,000	$0.91	$31,333,000
1940	131,482,000	.91	119,649,000
1941	752,239,000	.91	684,537,000
1942	1,339,934,000	.91	1,219,340,000
1943	3,802,765,000	.91	3,460,516,000

Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1607; 1940-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1507; 1943, Moody's Governments, May 19, 1943, p. 1342.

6. CHINA

No data found.

7. COSTA RICA

No data found.

8. CUBA

Year ending June 30—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Pesos		
1939	[1] 17,408,000	$0.93	$16,189,000
1940	[1] 17,416,000	.90	15,674,000
1941	[1] 17,416,000	.98	17,068,000
1942	[1] 18,781,000	1.00	18,781,000
1943	[1] 23,054,000	1.00	23,054,000

[1] Budget estimates.

Sources: 1939-40, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1857; 1941, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1753; 1942-43, Moody's Governments, Feb. 27, 1943, p. 1435.

9. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

No data found.

10. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Year ending Dec. 31—	United States currency
1939	[1] $1,889,000
1940	[2] 2,070,000
1941	[2] 2,128,000
1942	[2] 2,114,000

[1] Estimated expenditures for Army.
[2] Estimated expenditures for War and Navy.

Sources: 1939-40, Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1795; 1941-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1763.

11. ETHIOPIA

No data found.

12. FRANCE

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Francs		
1939	[1] 12,649,000,000	$0.025	$316,225,000
1940	[2] 250,000,000,000	.021	5,250,000,000

[1] Budget expenditures for Army, Navy, and Air Force.
[2] Estimated budget for war expenditures.

Source: Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1809.

13. GREECE

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Drachmae		
1939	[1] 3,234,000,000	$0.009	$28,459,000
1940	[2] 3,867,000,000	.008	30,163,000

[1] Actual expenditures for War, Navy and Aviation.
[2] Budget expenditures for national defense and armaments.

Source: Moody's Governments, 1041. p. 1864.

14. HAITI

Year ending Sept. 30—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Gourdes		
1939	7,809,000	$0.20	$1,562,000
1940	7,466,000	.20	1,493,000
1941	6,408,000	.20	1,282,000
1942	6,903,000	.20	1,381,000

Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1943; p. 1819. 1940-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1926.

15. GUATEMALA

Year ending June 30—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Quetzales		
1939	1,941,000	$1	$1,941,000
1940	1,812,116	1	1,812,116
1941	2,074,906	1	2,074,906
1942	[1] 1,900,000	1	1,900,000

[1] Budget expenditures. Budget for war was 1,900,000 quetzales for each fiscal year from 1939-40 to 1941-42; 1,880,000 quetzales for fiscal year 1938-39.

Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1867; 1940-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1817.

16. HONDURAS

Year ending July 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Lempiras		
1940	[1] 2,082,000	$0.49	$1,020,000
1941	[1] 2,130,000	.49	1,044,000
1942	[1] 2,031,000	.49	995,000
1943	[2] 2,416,000	.49	1,184,000

[1] Actual expenditures.
[2] Budget expenditures.

Sources: 1940, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1925; 1941-43, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1821.

17. INDIA

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Rupees		
1939	[1] 507,769,000	$0.36	$182,797,000
1940	[1] 539,326,000	.33	177,978,000
1941	[1] 594,074,000	.30	178,222,000
1942	[1] 845,666,000	.30	253,700,000

[1] Budget expenditures. Actual defense expenditures for 1941 were 763,100,000 rupees; for 1942, 1,039,300,000 rupees. [Moody's Governments, Jan. 13, 1943, p. 1485.]

Sources: 1939-40, Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1662; 1941-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1645.

18. LUXEMBURG

No data found.

19. MEXICO

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Pesos		
1939	[1] 92,000,000	$0.19	$16,068,000
1940	[1] 105,000,000	.19	19,950,000
1941	[2] 130,000,000	.21	27,300,000
1942	[2] 144,500,000	.21	30,345,000
1943	[2] 178,000,000	.21	37,380,000

[1] Actual expenditures.
[2] Budget expenditures.
Sources: 1939-40, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1845. 1941-43, Moody's Governments, Feb. 17, 1943, p. 1444.

20. NETHERLANDS

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Guilders		
1939	[1] 233,614,000	$0.53	$123,815,000
1940	[1] 232,029,000	.53	122,975,000

[1] Budget expenditures.
Source: Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1911.

21. NEW ZEALAND

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
1939	£NZ2,099,000	$3.83	$8,039,000
1940	8,033,000	3.43	27,553,000
1941	30,867,000	3.10	95,688,000
1942	59,797,000	3.23	193,144,000
1943	[1] 75,369,000	3.23	243,442,000

[1] To Dec. 31, 1942.
Sources: 1939-40, New Zealand, Monthly Abstract of Statistics, July 1941, pp. 36-37. 1941-43, same, Mar. 1943 p. 29.

22. NICARAGUA

No data found.

23. NORWAY

Year ending June 30—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Kroner		
1939	[1] 51,265,000	$0.24	$12,472,000
1940	[1] 54,762,000	.23	12,595,000
1941	[1] 202,995,000	.23	46,689,000

[1] Budget estimates.
Sources: 1939, Statesman's Yearbook, 1938, p. 1194. 1940, Statesman's Yearbook, 1939, p. 1201. 1941, Statesman's Yearbook, 1941, p. 1174.

24. PANAMA

"The Republic has no army or navy to support."
Source: Statesman's Yearbook, 1942, p. 1162.

25. PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Pesos		
1939	10,825,801	$0.50	$5,413,000
1940	18,652,922	.50	9,326,000

Source: Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 89.

26. POLAND

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Zlotys		
1939	800,000,000	$0.19	$152,000,000

Source: Statesman's Yearbook, 1940, p. 1221.

27. RUSSIA

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Rubles		
1939	[1] 40,885,000,000	$0.19	$7,768,150,000
1940	[1][2] 57,066,000,000	.19	10,842,540,000
1941	[1] 70,865,000,000	.19	13,464,350,000

[1] Budget estimate.
[2] Preliminary figures for actual expenditures for 1940 are 56,102,000,000 rubles.
Sources: 1939-40, Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1955; 1941, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1886; 1940 preliminary, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1886.

28. EL SALVADOR

Year ending Dec. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Colones		
1939	[1][2] 2,049,000	$0.40	$820,000
1940	[1] 3,814,000	.40	1,526,000
1941	[1] 3,789,000	.40	1,516,000
1942	[1] 3,878,000	.40	1,551,000

[1] Budgetary expenditures.
[2] Budgetary expenditures for last 6 months of 1939.
Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1999; 1940-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1890.

29. UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
1939	[1] £SA6,436,000	$4.73	$30,442,000
1940	[1] 7,915,000	4.30	34,035,000
1941	[2] 26,128,000	3.93	103,989,000
1942	[2] 34,332,000	3.98	136,641,000

[1] Actual expenses for law and order.
[2] Estimated expenses for law and order.
Sources: 1939, Moody's Governments, 1942, p. 1738; 1940-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1637.

30. UNITED KINGDOM

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
1939	£382,456,000	$4.78	$1,828,140,000
1940	1,118,147,000	4.29	4,796,851,000
1941	3,240,545,000	4.04	13,091,802,000
1942	4,105,540,000	4.04	16,586,382,000
1943	4,840,000,000	4.04	19,553,600,000

Sources: 1939-40, Moody's Governments, 1941, p. 1616; 1941-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 1612; Stateman's Yearbook, 1941, p. 39; 1942, p. 39; 1943, White Paper Statistics, Economist, Apr. 17, 1943.

31. UNITED STATES

Year ending June 30—	Amount
1939	$1,162,268,000
1940	1,558,623,000
1941	6,301,047,000
1942	26,011,065,000
1943	[1] 67,584,622,000

[1] Through June 12, 1943.
Sources: 1939-42, Moody's Governments, 1943, p. 36, from Daily Treasury Statements (unrevised); 1943, Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury, June 12, 1943.

32. YUGOSLAVIA

Year ending Mar. 31—	Original currency	Exchange rate	United States currency
	Dinars		
1939	2,772,000,000	$0.02	$55,440,000
1940	2,928,000,000	.02	58,560,000

Source: Moody's governments, 1941, p. 1995.

Our Post-War Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. HAWKES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Chippewa Herald-Telegram, Chippewa Falls, Wis., commenting on the address recently delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] before the Republican convention in Appleton, Wis., referring specifically to the subject of our post-war policy.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR POST-WAR POLICY

Senator WILEY, in his speech at the Republican State convention at Appleton on Sunday, stated his own position on American post-war policy in forthright language.

Shortly after he concluded his address the convention, itself, adopted a resolution which squared with the Senator's position in every particular.

Senator WILEY said:

"In the field of world affairs the Republican Party proposes that never again will the American people be compelled to face with so few weapons such deadly danger as struck out at us on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor.

"The Republican Party proposes that never again shall the United States undertake any international commitment without the necessary Army and Navy and Air Force to make the commitment good.

"Let me make this point clear:

"The Republican Party will continue to lend its influence to any real program of world disarmament. That is in the American tradition. The American people have never and do not now love armament for its own sake. But we do love this land of ours. We do love our freedom. We do love our children. That is why we must never again invite such deadly risk as we invited a year ago last December. That is why we must never again send out our sons as gallant expendables to buy time for us on some future Bataan or Wake Island or Guadalcanal.

"And finally:

"The Republican Party recognizes that as one of the major nations of the earth, the United States must accept a major share in helping to restore and preserve international law and order in the post-war period.

"The Republican Party proposes that the people of this country stand ready to join all like-minded peoples in seeing to it that never again shall any gang of national savages and international outlaws be permitted to destroy the peace of the world in a lethal challenge to every standard of human decency which the nations of the earth have raised up through 3,000 years of slow and painful and persistent effort.

"The Republican Party proposes that a strong America shall be a strong champion of international justice; that a purposeful America shall help weave the pattern of a durable international peace; that an America aware and confident of her own great future shall help relight the lamps of freedom for all the groping nations of men.

"The Republican Party insists that all this can be done without the sacrifice of any vital American interest or the undue expenditure of any American wealth or the yielding of any sovereign American right.

"Only men of good will and nations of good will can build a world of good will. Our fighting sons have proven to us that, with proper will and purpose, a way can be found no matter how beset with hazards. We must prove to them in turn that we are worthy to be their fathers and their mothers."

The resolution, adopted shortly after the Senator concluded his address, reads as follows:

"Whereas the United States has become involved in two great wars within a quarter of a century; and

"Whereas it is a matter of record that, in the earlier years, before each war this country followed a policy of strict international neutrality; and

"Whereas it is also a matter of record that even in the years immediately before each war, this country still clung to this policy until in each instance our National Govern-

ment became convinced that continuation of the policy would gravely endanger our national security; and

"Whereas in the years before each war, and indeed during all our national existence, the United States maintained such a minimum of armaments as to make it obvious to all the world that we had no designs of any sort against other nations; and

"Whereas it is now obvious that our previous policies of neutrality and minimum armaments have failed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled, That it is our considered conviction that at the conclusion of this war the United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace; be it further

"Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin believes that world peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together.

"The Republican Party of Wisconsin believes this common ground can and must be found and an international reign of law and order developed; be it further

"Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin believes that in the immediate post-war years, and until such time as international relationships become beyond all question orderly and secure, the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations but will assure our national security."

Both the Senator's speech and the resolution which followed it place Wisconsin Republicanism squarely on record in favor of a realistic approach to post-war conditions.

It should be obvious to all that in the dangerous post-war world only a strong America can be a secure America, and only a strong America can discharge our international obligations.

It should be obvious, too, that there can be no real peace unless a common ground can be found on which to build it. And although neither speech nor resolution said so, it seems to us that the only way to find a common ground is to clear away the obstacles which now clutter the approaches to it. This can best be done through a series of treaties between the major states of the United Nations. We say "treaties" advisedly, because a treaty is not a surrender of sovereignty to some superstate; it is an agreement between sovereign states. The treaty approach is the only realistic approach because it is specifically designed to remove obstacles to a mutual understanding and to remove them obstacle by obstacle.

Only through the removal of obstacles, only by the elimination of frictions and differences, only through the organization of the strong in the interests of international order can a reign of international order be assured.

To close our eyes to these obstinate facts is not to assure peace; it is to invite chaos.

A Plea for Post-War Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carl A. Gray, president, the Grenby Co., Plainville, and former head of the Governor's employment commission:

A PLEA FOR POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT

(By Carl A. Gray, president, the Grenby Co., Plainville, and former head of the Governor's employment commission)

In all public discussions, so far, of plans for a post-war world, the vision of most statesmen seems to be focused on lands far off. Perhaps this is only right and proper, for the future welfare of the United States and its prosperity may well be dependent on the welfare of the Chinese or the Algerians. However, there is a real danger that in our zeal to remake the pattern of our international relations, we may overlook some of the realistic problems at which we must ultimately come to grips here at home. Not the least of these is the readjustment of several million young men back into the civilian economy at a period when most of our important industries will be struggling to resume peacetime production. Moreover, it will be necessary to retain many who are now making high wages and think they are skilled.

Unpleasant memories dim quickly, and there are few people today who have a keen recollection of the maladjustments, the injustices, or the real harm that was done to citizens subsequent to the last war by our unpreparedness for peace. Perhaps those who were shoved unceremoniously back into civilian life can remember and there is no doubt in my mind that the clamor for bonuses and special favors arose from the fact that no definite plan for readjusting these men to civilian life had been made. The shout for a bonus was a cry, a protest against a society which had used men—and yet gave no thought to them when they had returned.

This time, we may be sure, we cannot, with safety to our form of government, tell these men to sell apples, nor can we insult them with made work under the name of Work Projects Administration or any other label. National programs will say "jobs for all," to which I agree, but all must be qualified to take those jobs or else we will have coddling, and private initiative will die out. We must not promote wards of the state.

What I suggest is a plan for absorbing these men back into productive society with the least pain to them and with the most profit to society. This plan is not based on nebulous thinking but on practical experience and insight I have gained by studies into some of the unemployment sequels of the last war.

A few years ago, when the State of Connecticut was trying to find a solution to the problem of unemployment, an analysis was made of the educational and vocational background of those who were without work or income. Starting out as an effort to solve the unemployment problem of the man over 40, the scope of the inquiry was soon expanded.

Tragically enough, it was soon discovered that these men were unemployed because they had nothing to offer that had present value. They had no trade, skill, experience, or training for anything that American industry needed. The fundamental prejudice was not against men over 40 but against men over 40 who had no training.

Of the employable unemployed between the ages of 16 and 26, untrained and inexperienced, there were few, indeed, who had ever held a real job in their lives—young people unable to get any job requiring experience, young people of whom it could truly be said, "They haven't had a chance." Many of these youths were only 9 or 10 years old when the first great depression started, and these had only heard of relief payments at home. These were about one-third of the unemployed.

Another third were "skill rusty" older workers; men who had formerly worked as artisans but who had been away from their trade so long that their touch had been blunted and their reaction slowed down.

To meet this situation manufacturers of the State were queried to find out what kind of tradesmen were most needed, and having gotten this information a start was made in training these groups for specific job families. This simple formula requiring only a small expenditure, soon became known throughout the country as the "Connecticut plan."

At first blush this may seem to have no relation to the problem we are going to face in the post-war era—but the facts are analogous. Going into the Army now are young men who are fresh from school; others have been in business or industry for too short a period to have developed a skill. Normally, these next 2 or 3 years would be the period of discovery, placement, and experience. Because of the unrealistic type of training most of these boys have received in our high schools and colleges, they are unprepared for work on leaving school. Their actual scholastic training ordinarily, in the course of things, is leavened by work experience, which makes them a salable product on the labor market.

We are plucking from these lives now this period of orientation. When our boys return to civilian life after the Army, they will be mature—indeed with an accelerated maturity. They will be restless, a little bitter, but still without the fundamental sales qualities which will make them easily placeable in a highly competitive society among older men and women who have learned to work productively.

But these men must be fitted back or we shall reap the whirlwind.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR MUST BE WON

It is my suggestion that in our conversion to peace we utilize the machinery of war, and with a disregard for cost, on a scale of actual warfare. Make no mistake about it—when peace comes we shall be waging another kind of war—a psychological war for the preservation of our American way of life here at home. To meet this threat we must keep our resources mobilized and working cooperatively.

The machinery of a broad selective service, the technical, professional resources, the expenditure of money, should be maintained—the machinery, however, thrown into reverse and utilized for the replacement of these men back into civil life.

If a country can take a man from a job or from school, submit him to intensive medical, physical, neurological, psychological, psychiatric, and vocational interview; train him at great expense over a period of months; equip him with the best to muster him into military service—then that same country must have the imagination and the courage and the willingness to bear great expense, to do the same thing in mustering that man back into civil life.

To repeat the errors of the hastily contrived honorable discharge, the parades, the homecomings, and then the bleak days and weeks and months seeking employment is to court disasters far worse than a march on Washington for a bonus.

Fortunately, the exigencies of war have provided the very machinery we shall need for such a peacetime conversion, with one notable exception. When the Army organizes for battle, it provides a bill of specifications; it orders so many cooks, so many tank drivers, so many infantrymen, so many medical men, so many Signal Corps men, and so many artillerymen. Then the manpower group, through selective service, sets out to provide the trained material. Requisitions are made for the number and the kind of men who are needed.

It is possible to forecast trends in business. It is possible to forecast manpower needs, even in specific categories. Not only is it possible, but it is being done every day now.

Why should the adjustment, the training of new entrees into the business and commercial world in peace be left to chance, when in war it can be done so specifically? Men are being chosen every day in the Army for the Air Corps, to drive a tank, for the Adjutant General's Office, to become cooks, infantrymen, or to go to Officers' Candidate School. By reversing the process of selective service, we can make those things come true in civil life; we can say with a degree of certitude that a great many cooks, truck drivers, tool makers, school teachers, lawyers, physicians, clerks, or textile machine operators are going to be needed in a certain area. Then we must proceed to train our demobilized troops who are not definitely and certainly tied in with a job or a business.

Many, through former connections, family, or friends, will slide back noiselessly into civilian life, but our attention is focused on those who would otherwise be left adrift.

They must get as thorough a going-over as they got when they went into the Army. Their vocational interview must be no cursory thing. It should last for an hour or for a day if necessary; aptitude tests must be given; trained employment interviewers and psychologists must consult with the soldier, talk to him about his plans, and steer him into the right kind of training. It must be done well.

The man with an I. Q. of 155 must be discouraged from seeking retreat into a menial job, and the I. Q. of 75 must be dissuaded from trying to study medicine.

Impossible, you say? It is being done today. It was done yesterday. It must be done tomorrow. The weeding process is going on in every Army reception center of the country. The machinery is here waiting to be used.

Industry may need some help, too. Industry should be encouraged to convert to peace, so that it can help our young men to be converted to peace.

All we need to do is reverse the process from ingress to egress. Going out of the Army should be as meticulous a process as going in.

Should Government subsidize veterans so that they may get their training for civil life? Yes; and why not? Government trains and pays men to learn to kill. How much better to pay them to learn to live and to produce for our general welfare. Where would these men be trained? Where are men being trained now? In every conceivable wartime trade—these training centers could easily be converted to peacetime pursuits.

NO POLITICS HERE

Costs a lot of money you say? Has anybody so far squawked about the cost of the war? Has anyone objected to a small subsidy to either a key manufacturer or an embryonic officer? All this plan needs is a readjustment of thought so that we can maintain the eye-on-the-goal type of thinking that persists in wartime, and which lapses into selfish indifference and pinching pennies in peacetime.

This is no political program. There is no place in it for professional politicians who have their eyes on higher rungs of the ladder. This is a program for trained technicians and professional people, just the same as running the Army and providing it with trained personnel and finished material is no job for politicians.

HOW PLAN WOULD WORK

How would it work? Well, let's take Bill Jones. They took him into the Army after he had finished his third year in high school. Bill was taking the commercial course, hoping some day to work in a bank or insurance company. He played on the football team at school, and when he got in the Army certain qualities of leadership developed. He got to be a corporal and finally went to officers' candidate school. Perhaps when the war ends he will be a sure enough captain with a good record.

Should Bill go back to high school? He's only 22 now, but he has the maturity of a man of 30. He has been through things, and has assumed responsibility. Should he be a bank teller, or an insurance clerk, working 40 hours a week at $40 and with no responsibility for people?

Taking up the thread of our hypothetical organization: Bill is once again processed before being returned to civilian life. When the results come in Bill finds he has an I. Q. and a personality that warrants aspiration to a much higher level of society than to which he had aspired. He is given his choice. He can go through medical school; he can go to a school of political economy and civil administration. Bill chooses to be a doctor because, as he says, at the interview when the facts are presented, "That's what I always wanted to be—a surgeon, but I knew I could never make it because I never had enough money."

The Government pays Bill's tuition, and his room and board—and pays him a salary. Experiment? It has worked out well in at least one country. Bill will contribute eventually more than he got.

Take another case, also hypothetical: That of Trumbull J. Hooker who was drafted from his second year in Yale Law School, entered the Army, sure that in a matter of weeks he would be a major at least, but who finished the war as a buck private in the tank repair division. He would have been a sergeant at least if he had shown as much interest in his fellows as in the transmission of tanks.

The interviewers tell him kindly, "You don't want to be a lawyer. Your people want you be one—but you know a whole lot more about gears and such stuff than you do about people." Then they point out that Litchfield County, where he would expect to resume life, is already overstaffed with good lawyers. "But there is a crying need for men who have a feeling for machines—now we'll put you through school and find a place for you."

On a slightly lower employment level, we find the ordinary guy who has been driving a truck when he should be selling shoes, or real estate; the machinist who should go to a good plumber and get an apprenticeship; the tough, rough, embryonic fireman on the railroad, who is told that his aptitudes are along mathematical lines, and why doesn't he take this special high school course to prepare him to be an expert accountant? These problems can be, and should be, met.

Turning the wheels of selective service into reverse should be done the minute we have an army as large as we need, and long before peace is a prosaic, hackneyed fact. This reversal needs to be done in advance for the same reason that it is important to seed your lawn with a good grade of grass seed before the weeds get strong. Unless, through a combination of government and those pariahs who are now being suffered to operate making war goods (the industrialists), there is a definite plan to greet the American soldier, he will have a good reason for turning with anger against both.

The lack of a definite plan here at home, the lack of a definitely planned reception of our soldiers, will mean the sprouting of "isms" and crackpot "causes" that may plague America and Americans for at least a generation.

I remember very well my own discomfiture, disappointment, when more than 4 years ago I wrote to a high Government official, now a Presidential adviser, in an attempt to suggest that the unemployed should be given specific training rather than allowed to drift on Work Projects Administration. We had a shortage of skilled hands even in the 1930's but, even so, in reply I got a curt and evasive reply from his secretary. It seems this great social thinker wasn't interested.

However, we went ahead and the original Connecticut plan for training machine workers was at the disposal of Federal authorities more than a year before Washington saw the need. This training program was set up and operating long before this Government got into the war, thank God. When the war started, the program was already turning out 1,500 qualified beginners for industrial jobs every 5 weeks (over 45,000 today in Connecticut). As these workers were trained, our eyes were on the rest of the country where many people raked leaves and complained of what the country should be doing for them. We were then training people to do something for the country. There was no high-paid staff. The work was being done by volunteers, with a total cost to the State of less than $1,000 in 2 years.

In our plans for the future (now that men's minds are absorbed with war) there must be a few who are concerned with peace and the reconstruction. I do not disagree with Mr. WALLACE and the need for milk for the children of all the world. But I do insist that, here at home, we must get our house ready for the homecoming: The program should include no apples to sell, no leaves to rake, no $150,000 fly casting pools to build, all eked out expensively at the high cost of another Work Projects Administration.

Are we ready for this homecoming? Are we making our homeland a place where our boys can pick up the thread of their ambitions, their dreams, to prove that America not only offers a promise but a fulfillment of that promise?

THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PLAN

Reduced to the barest details the post-war manpower rehabilitation plan for returning servicemen may be broken down into seven sections, or groupings, as follows:

1. All men returning home who have their previous jobs back and wish to return to those jobs would be released from the armed services. Those who believe they would prefer to get into other work, or if they did not have jobs, would stay in the Army.

2. The Army then, in cooperation with existing agencies and personnel, should start making a complete analysis of its men.

3. A corps of trained experts would be assigned to each camp to begin the work of interviewing, checking records, and analyzing—testing each man. This cannot be any cursory interview. It may take hours or days of study. The experts would be made up of experienced men and women trained in their respective fields, knowledge of skills required in each of the many industries. For example in guidance and knowledge—vocational education—occupational therapy, personnel administration, psychology, psychiatry. Tests would be given each man, and the combined judgment would be filed. These people must have a knowledge of the skills required for industry, business, agriculture, and the many occupational fields.

(While mistakes can be made and it is true that misfits have been put in many of the wrong places while going into the armed services and particularly in some of the War Production Board jobs, nevertheless this job can be done a lot better if we really get people to do this work who know their business.)

However, as a check against the I. Q. tests and the interviews and the decision to guide a person into certain occupations, if this corps of interview experts makes mistakes it may be checked by the next step which is the vestibule schools.

4. Vestibule schools would be set up on a regional basis. While the man is still in the Army and under Army supervision he is transferred to the regional vestibule school. His Army pay continues and he has barracks

at these schools—or places approved by the Army where he lives.

At the regional vestibule school he has an opportunity to try out one or several of the occupations which he has chosen or been advised by the guidance experts to try. Those courses are perhaps not over 6-week courses. He may decide or his instructors may decide in this short-term course that he is a misfit for that particular work and he tries perhaps another 6 weeks' course in the regional school where he finds he is enthusiastic about the work. Also he is closely watched and rated by his instructors and if they approve he carries on. (For example, in our 200-hour mechanical job training started under the Connecticut plan, we found in a few days whether or not a man had any mechanical ability. This was because our instructors were men from industry and knew their job. They could spot a misfit in short order. Not all vocations are as easy. However, if we succeed in steering 75 percent of our men in the right direction the plan will have been worth while.)

5. Once the man has been graduated from the vestibule school and passed by his instructors he then goes to a special school. He can be graduated ahead of time, and, with the approval of his commanding officer and instructors, sent to the special school which gives him a basic training in the occupation he has chosen. His expenses and traveling expenses are to be paid just as if he were to be shifted from one post to another in the Army. The length of the course at the special school of training may take anywhere from 6 months to 2 years depending on the type of occupation.

If a man had been just examined by the guidance experts and found to have the ability and background he might not go to a vestibule school but directly to, for example, a technical college where he is given 2 or more years professional training. He would have had to be found extremely able to make this jump, just as the man who thinks he is able will have to be persuaded to go to a vestibule and thence to a special school that would give a training in skills that do not call for college grad ability.

6. From the special school of training the graduate would then he ready as a beginner in whatever occupation he had chosen. When the man is placed upon graduation from the special school of training he is then released from the Army.

7. A record and follow-up would be made of each man so that any elements found lacking in his basic-training courses could be changed to correct any future errors.

The Origin of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRIK SHIPSTEAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, entitled "What Is the True Origin of N. R. E. C. A.?"—the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The document is a very interesting one, and I hope it will be widely read.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Public Utilities Fortnightly, Washington, D. C., of July 8, 1943]

WHAT IS THE TRUE ORIGIN OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION?

IS THE RECENTLY FORMED NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION TRULY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GRASS ROOTS IN THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MOVEMENT? WHY ARE ATTEMPTS BEING MADE TO EXPAND THE CO-OP PROGRAM BEYOND THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF BRINGING POWER TO THE FARMS?

(By Judson King, director, National Popular Government League)

Since mid-May the executive officers of the recently created National Rural Electric Cooperative Association have been conducting a campaign against Administrator Harry Slattery, of the Rural Electrification Administration, demanding his removal from office.

Coming so soon after the first national convention of the association in St. Louis in January, where the Administrator made an address, and where relations appeared harmonious, the assault—for assault it is—has caused surprise and concern for the future of Rural Electrification Administration. This agency is rightly acclaimed as one of the finest and most needed achievements of this administration. In private and public utility circles alike, Mr. Slattery is known as a "straight shooter." His integrity is unquestioned. Every right-thinking citizen wants to see Rural Electrification Administration, Tennessee Valley Authority, and like agencies kept out of politics and free from self-seekers, without and within. This episode is creating misapprehension and confusion everywhere. Its cause lies in an unexpected quarter. It involves not only the future of Rural Electrification Administration and the farm cooperatives, but clean government and honest administration, especially where governments—municipal, State, or National—are operating enterprises involving electric power. It is important that the people and State and Federal officials, as well as private utility executives, know the truth about this matter, and now.

Since the Public Utilities Fortnightly has a national circulation in official circles, I am glad to contribute an article to the Fortnightly forum on this controversy, as I have in the past on other disputed issues.

The St. Louis convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association challenged the attention of the utility world, as indicated by Mr. Farrar's article in the Fortnightly of May 27. What did the newcomer actually signify and what was really behind it? Public power people took it to be a genuine rural grass-roots organization, inspired, organized, and controlled by the cooperatives, that was formed to defend the co-ops against attack from without and to speed up rural electrification after the war.

Private power people and politicos saw in it also, among other things, the possible makings of a political machine instigated in fact, if not in theory, by the Roosevelt administration, which would be useful in congressional elections and the Presidential contest of 1944, in addition to unwarranted and ill-advised invasion of the domain of private enterprise outside the utility field.

The truth is that neither of these assumptions is correct.

The association was not inspired by Administrator Slattery, Secretary Wickard, and certainly not by President Roosevelt. The evidence herein presented would indicate it is primarily the brain child of one man—Robert B. Craig, a deputy administrator of Rural Electrification Administration up to his resignation on May 6.

Many of the activities of the high-powered executives of the association, working in close cooperation with Mr. Craig, are just as much a surprise to the high officials named and will be to the distinguished gentleman who spoke at the St. Louis convention and to myself, as they doubtless were to the members of Chairman TARVER'S subcommittee in charge of agriculture's appropriations who inquired how this new association happened to happen.

To make my position clear at the start, I have advocated rural electrification since the struggle over Muscle Shoals, resulting in Tennessee Valley Authority, began in 1921, I have been special consultant on power policy to Administrators Carmody and Slattery since 1937. I believe in an organization of the Rural Electrification Administration co-ops from the bottom up—and not from the top down—and hoped this might be carefully managed and become one.

THE OFFICIAL THEORY OF 1943

Steve C. Tate, president of the association, in his address at the St. Louis convention, gave an official account of its origin. He began:

"The birth of your association is almost like fiction. As a result of copper hearings during the months of November and December 1941 before the Tarver subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, there were those of us from all sections of the country, who had the pleasure of meeting and exchanging views as to the Rural Electrification Administration program and, growing out of this meeting, there was expressed a feeling from all parts of the country that a national association of the cooperatives would be an ideal means of fighting for, and the mutual protection of, all the cooperatives since it was evidenced at the congressional hearing that there was a concerted private utility opposition to our program." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 5, 1943, p. A1054.)

The impression here given is that cooperative leaders from the country themselves got the idea of this association in December 1941. (Note the date.) To say the least, Mr. Tate's historical account needs to be supplemented.

DEPUTY CRAIG'S PLAN OF 1940

John A. Becker is a substantial businessman of Hartford, Wis., and director in several companies. For many years he has been an advocate of rural electrification and became a strong supporter of Rural Electrification Administration. He was director of rural electrification for the State under the governorship of Phil La Follette to August 1938 when the Wisconsin Development Authority was created. He was its manager until July 1940 when illness forced him to resign. He is still a director.

Some 5 months later, on Saturday afternoon, December 14, Becker, in Washington on business, was invited by Mr. Craig to meet him at a luncheon conference. It lasted nearly 3 hours. At that time Craig outlined a scheme for organizing Rural Electrification Administration co-ops on a national scale which he was promoting. He tried to enlist Becker's interest, insisted that they keep in touch, but did not offer him a position at that time. Later Craig instructed a Rural Electrification Administration official under his jurisdiction to interview Backer and offer him a position with the Rural Electrification Administration. Becker was not interested, however, although he was not aware that the offer was made at Craig's direction.

Three days after this conference Becker wrote a memorandum on the substance of Craig's talk, in which he states, "To me the scheme looked very sinister, unscrupulous,

and politically corrupt * * * [and] I am just putting it in type for future reference."

This document, known to but few, and never published, is before me with the author's permission to quote therefrom. The following will show that Craig's plan, then outlined, is in the main essentially of the same pattern as the association now operating and which President Tate reports in effect was originated by himself and other back-home cooperators a whole year later.

Ambition, tutor, and tactics

Mr. Becker records that Craig first told him of securing the discharge of certain head men in Rural Electrification Administration who had refused to cooperate with him. He went on to say that he had learned his politics right in Columbus, where Harding was nominated and from whence the United States was run for some time. Craig said his tutor was Harry Daugherty, who was the smartest politician of his time, and from Daugherty he had learned that in public life you either had to rule or be ruled, and that he made up his mind when he came to Rural Electrification Administration to run it. He said he was running it from within, but if anything should come up that he could not do so he would run it from without.

It will be remembered that Harry Daugherty was the leader of the famous "Ohio Gang" of the 1920's and was Attorney General under President Harding.

Personal control and how exercised

Mr. Becker wrote that Craig then proceeded to elaborate on his plans and described a method of greatly reducing rural electric rates, for which he claimed to have secured support in high places. Craig said in substance that this would be a spectacular plan, would get a lot of publicity, and make friends among the cooperatives. Cashing in on this popularity and confidence, purchasing groups would be set up.

These groups will send to the central group all their orders for appliances and equipment and the central organization will buy from the manufacturers on bid or negotiated basis and send merchandise to the groups, allowing them a small commission, but they would sell to farmers at a considerably lower figure than other retail outlets. Payments would be extended over long periods at about 4 percent. These groups would be their most important and loyal contacts with the public, and absolute control over them would be secured through the commissions on merchandise. These local groups would be allowed to collect from 25 to 35 cents from each member of the cooperatives, of which 10 cents would be remitted to the central organization. This would give the central organization, which Craig proposed to control directly or indirectly, $100,000 from membership fees alone. The country would be regionalized into 10 regions and staffed with personnel absolutely loyal to himself. This would give him absolute control of the field from the organizational, economic, and political angles. There would be no whisper in the field that he would not hear.

POLITICS AND CAMPAIGN FUNDS

Mr. Becker records that Craig went on with his elaboration and explained that through these purchasing groups and the central organization he and his associates would be in a position to control many congressional and several senatorial offices. They would have 1,000,000 members, which means about 4,000,000 votes. Further, they would have manufacturers doing millions of dollars worth of business with them, and during campaigns they could raise lots of money for their political friends from these sources. Craig explained that, as a matter of fact, the purchasing plan itself would be set up in such manner as to allow a certain percentage of sales for campaign purposes and boasted that with 4,000,000 votes and several hundred thousands in campaign funds, they would maintain in public office enough friends that even the devil could not hurt them.

Craig's machine

Mr. Becker records Craig's description of the methods he intended to employ to accomplish his ends. His memorandum goes on, in effect, to state that Craig told him that he, Becker, must realize that to accomplish this program he would have to have in the organization people who were loyal beyond any possibility of a doubt and who were able (the organization appeared to include people inside as well as outside Rural Electrification Administration). Craig said he would have to have the same type of people in the field (as in Washington), and that is where the hard job would come, because outside people could not be watched closely like those in the office; but Craig was sure that he would have that part of the organization working satisfactorily. He urged Becker to keep in touch with him and said that so-and-so had assured him Becker was reliable.

Mr. Becker's prophesies

Concluding his "Transcript of Conversation," as he heads this remarkable memorandum, Becker notes that on returning to his hotel he told a friend:

"Without going into details, that Mr. Craig intends to run Rural Electrification Administration for some time to come, either from within or without."

He adds:

"Allowing the so-called 'State-wide' or purchasing groups to tax members for the benefit of individuals who will run these groups, he will have their support. Political manipulations of farmer votes are a matter of disreputable record of many pseudo farm leaders. I can see that Craig, if permitted to carry his plan through, may become one of the moral menaces of Rural Electrification Administration and our political and social well-being. Yet, what can I do?"

Had this memo been given publicity at the time it was written, it would have appeared preposterous, since Mr. Craig had a general reputation of being an able, forceful, loyal, hard-working Deputy Administrator, enthusiastically devoted to the Rural Electrification Administration program and public power generally. Becker, himself, thought it might be a "pipe dream," but the astonishing fact remains that Craig has apparently put over much of his plan by essentially the methods he described to Becker.

THE NATIONAL IS INCORPORATED

Fifteen months later, on March 19, 1942, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association was incorporated in the District of Columbia by 10 men who named themselves its board of directors. These gentlemen, while connected in various capacities with Rural Electrification Administration co-ops in their respective States—some being employees, others members of co-op boards—were not sent by the co-op or State co-op organizations to Washington to start a national association. It is now known that they were acceptable to, if not selected by, Deputy Craig. Indeed, several persons are unkind enough to assert that they were handpicked.

The next day a reception was held at the Willard Hotel. Testifying before Chairman TARVER'S subcommittee on agriculture appropriations on March 3, 1943, Mr. Craig said, "I attended, on invitation, the meeting when the directors came to Washington. They invited Members of Congress, the Administrator, and myself. I think they invited the Secretary of Agriculture to a meeting here at the Williard Hotel." (Hearings, p. 1244.) Senator Norris and Representative RANKIN, among others, attended. Thus the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association got off to an auspicious start under the apparent aegis of official Washington, including the two most distinguished proponents of rural electrification in Congress. These names they could and did use as their sponsors and inspirers.

Administrator Slattery had not been consulted and knew nothing about the incorporation of the new association until invited to attend the reception at the Willard. The writer was likewise in the dark. When he asked Deputy Craig concerning its origin, Craig definitely stated that he did not know, that it was the work of the farmers, and gave the impression that he was as much surprised as Mr. Slattery and the writer.

A vigorous membership campaign was launched, with the incorporators paying their own expenses at the start. The cooperatives were solicited by letter and personal visitation. President Tate, in St. Louis, reported that he traveled 30,000 miles and covered 30 States. Deputy Craig was also active behind the scenes.

After Congressman Clyde T. Ellis, of Arkansas, lost his race for the United States Senate that fall, he was made executive manager. Mr. Ellis had introduced the Arkansas Valley Authority bill and was known throughout Washington as a sincere fighter for rural electrification and public power. He and Craig were close friends, and still are. His reputation was a strong factor in inspiring the confidence of the farmer members of the co-ops and the power bloc in Congress in the new association.

In the canvass, as was right and to be expected, chief emphasis was placed upon the purpose of the association to fight the Power Trust. The farm cooperatives had long felt the need of united effort for mutual protection because most of them had suffered from opposition.

Next came plans for reducing insurance costs, a new safety program, cheaper appliances and equipment, and a national magazine.

ST. LOUIS CONVENTION

Came January and the spectacular St. Louis convention, where increased confidence was inspired by the character of the chief speakers and further emphasis on the need of protection.

It is small wonder that the public and even official Washington was confused, failed to distinguish between the Rural Electrification Administration, the administration, and the new association. It appeared at first that the latter was a child of the administration and Rural Electrification Administration, and the whole affair a family birthday party. Why not? The promoters had secured letters from the President and the Vice President; Secretary Wickard also sent a message, read by Administrator Slattery, who made an address. Secretary Ickes wound up the rogram with a night address; Chairman Olds, of the Federal Power Commission, and Director Pope, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, were speakers. Senator Norris made an address; Representative Rankin sent one to be read; Senator Russell was a speaker; also two Republican Senators, Mr. Aiken, of Vermont, and Mr. Butler, of Nebraska.

The subject of Deputy Robert B. Craig was Rural Electrification Administration and Tomorrow. President Tate spoke on Progress of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to Date. Executive Manager Ellis explained Why We Are Here.

The major theme of the convention was reflected in newspaper headlines—"Electrifying every farm is keynote here"; "Norris relates a never-told story of Rural Electrification Administration"; "Ickes denounces 'selfish patriotism of money' of private power interests." All of which was normal, exactly what the public power forces of the Nation would expect and approve, and which certainly expressed the will of the thousand and more earnest, honest, farm co-op people in attendance.

It needs to be pointed out, however, that what brought over 1,000 delegates to St. Louis at that time at the expense of their local co-ops was, not the association, but a Rural Electrification Administration "food-for-victory war conference." This was held at a hotel on January 21–22. By holding its convention on January 19 and 20, the association got the benefit of the whole attendance, since most of them came 2 days in advance to attend both events. Not more than one-third of the auditorium audience were delegates to the association convention.

As a boost for Rural Electrification Administration and public power, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association affair was helpful and a great success.

But, there was something else afoot—unknown to the distinguished speakers, the audience, and, my guess is, even some of the incorporators. Suppose Bob Craig had set forth in his speech what he had told to Becker?

The fact is that a majority of the co-ops would have preferred a national association which grew, as they express it, "from the bottom up." They do today Many of them feared the possibility of manipulation by a small coterie in this venture being promoted "from the top down." But this, of course, is exactly what Craig wanted, as revealed in the Becker interview. The existing board of directors was officially elected, with some changes. Reports were made and business transacted since when the executives, in speeches, letters, and official bulletins have constantly impressed on the members that "this is your organization." The high-powered campaign proceeded under its supposedly high sponsorship; many of the hesitating grass-root cooperatives, but by no means all, went along, joined up, and waited for future developments.

When Mr. Tate started his membership drive after incorporation in March 1942, Deputy Craig got busy in the Rural Electrification Administration. His first lieutenant was the late Charles O. Falkenwald, chief of the Division of Applications and Loans, which was directly under Craig's supervision. Here Craig had the loyalty and ability he desired because "Charley," as he was affectionately known, honestly believed in the plans for the new organization in principle. There came a time, however.

It is known (and investigation would establish) that, true to the tactics revealed to Becker, Craig built up a personal machine among the home office and field personnel of the Rural Electrification Administration and also among the cooperatives. These kept him constantly informed and used their influence to urge the co-ops to join the association. This despite an order issued by Secretary Wickard on July 22, 1942, forbidding employees to take part in "promoting" the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. This was in accordance with a general rule of the Department prohibiting employees from promoting or aiding membership campaigns in general farm organizations. The Craig following naturally wanted him to become Administrator and Craig was willing. It is my opinion that he even had such ambition at the time Slattery was named Administrator.

Always pleasant and captivating in manner, Craig could be quite bluntly forthright when he encountered opposition.

Recalling Craig's idea of tapping private corporations, it is interesting to note that Tate and Ellis were apt pupils. The St. Louis Sunday newspapers for January 17 preceding the convention carried an impressive, full-page ad inviting the public to attend, with cuts of five of the distinguished speakers. At the bottom we read: "This advertisement sponsored by manufacturers and distributors of electrical equipment and appliances." Contributions were solicited, not volunteered. Some responded, others did not, but that is another story.

When Mr. Craig himself described the pretentious magazine the association proposed to publish with a prospective circulation of 1,000,000 copies monthly, I asked him, "Bob, how pay for all this?" He replied, "Advertising." I answered, "No. Better publish a 12-page mimeograph sheet than put your necks in that noose." And the fight was on.

THE INSURANCE PROGRAM

The war and priorities forced a postponement of the plan of Becker of setting up appliance and equipment purchase concerns as subsidiaries controlled by the central organization, and insurance took first place.

It had been made a main sales feature of the membership drive. Everywhere it was assumed the set-up would parallel the no-profit-to-anybody Rochdale cooperatives, or mutuals, with which farmers are familiar.

But here again Mr. Craig had been quietly in the lead with his own ideas. Max M. Drefkoff has been head of the insurance section of the cooperatives' operations division of Rural Electrification Administration. He did the spade work for Craig on the insurance scheme. He was recently suspended for insubordination and other reasons. A statement by John Carson, submitted personally and not for the Cooperative League of the United States, of which he is the Washington representative, and used in these suspension proceedings, contains the following:

Mr. Carson states that in the spring of 1942, not long after the association was incorporated, Dreikoff came to him seeking information about cooperative insurance companies, explaining that they were thinking of developing a Rural Electrification Administration insurance cooperative.

Carson asked Drefkoff why this was advisable, since the co-op members could get cheap insurance from reliable cooperative insurance companies, of which many Rural Electrification Administration people were already members. Why duplicate? Drefkoff replied, "Oh, no; we are going to have our own company. We want our own insurance company that Bob (Craig) and I can control."

Carson said, "That is just what I suspected. You are no more interested in the welfare of Rural Electrification Administration cooperative members than is the average insurance company official."

On January 6, 1943, two companies, the Rural Mutual Casualty Insurance Corporation, and the Rural Mutual Fire Insurance Corporation, were incorporated in Maryland by two directors and the two counsel of the association acting as individuals. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, per se, is not mentioned and has no control. Steve C. Tate was made president of both.

At about this time Mr. Falkenwald, who had, in connection with his other duties and under the direction of Craig, advocated the insurance plan in private sessions of many co-op meetings, rebelled. He quarreled with Craig, withdrew his support, and reported to the Administrator who then first learned about the change in the insurance plan.

Falkenwald had supposed that the working capital of the insurance mutuals would be derived from memberships which gave the co-ops control. He discovered, however, that the plan actually developing was that the mutuals, set up as private corporations, proposed to raise $1,000,000 or more as loans from the cooperatives on unsecured notes.

Mr. Slattery had already requested Secretary Wickard[1] to have an opinion prepared on the legality of the use for insurance purposes of any funds of the Rural Electrification Administration cooperative borrowers. He learned from Falkenwald for the first time of the switch to the loan plan, which astonished him. No opinion has yet been handed down by the department solicitor or by the Attorney General. Nevertheless, the promoters of the mutuals have boldly and confidently assured the cooperatives that they have such rights and have gone ahead. Many thousands of dollars have been already received.

The Administrator was disturbed still more when later he received from a local co-op official a 20-page, mimeographed pamphlet which the executive manager, Clyde Ellis, was preparing to send out. It was titled "A Comprehensive Insurance Plan for Rural Electrification Administration Cooperatives." This shows that the enterprising promoters were then planning not only to insure the co-ops per se but to vend all sorts of insurance to individual members and their immediate families. We quote from the heading "Benefits to be derived from rural mutuals," the following:

"44. Question. Will Rural Electrification Administration directors, trustees, superintendents, and employees, derive any special benefit from the insurance program of the rural mutuals?

"Answer. Yes, in a very substantial way, directors, trustees, superintendents, and employees on the 800 Rural Electrification Administration systems aggregate over 15,000 persons, a group sufficient to benefit from a program of accident prevention, health, and hospitalization insurance, which may either be written by the rural mutuals or purchased at greatly reduced rates from other companies through rural mutuals. This group of over 15,000 persons is large enough to procure advantageous rates of group life insurance, also.

"45. Question. Will individual members of the cooperatives benefit from the insurance program of the rural mutuals?

"Answer. Decidedly. The charters and bylaws of both the Rural Mutual Casualty Insurance Co. and the Rural Mutual Fire Insurance Co. are broad enough to cover a large number of insurance activities which may directly be used to benefit individual members and their families.

"46. Question. Specifically, what types of insurance may the rural mutuals write in accordance with their charters and bylaws?

"Answer. The rural mutuals may, in addition to other types, insure specifically against:

"1. Loss or liability for bodily injury, death by accident, disability, sickness, or disease, including employees' liability and workmen's compensation.

"2. Loss or liability resulting from the ownership of automobiles or other vehicles, excluding losses by fire (fire losses are covered under separate charter).

"3. Loss or damage to machinery or boilers, transmission lines, etc.

"4. Make contracts for hospitalization insurance.

"5. Make contracts for fidelity and surety bonds

"6. Losses or damage by fire, lightning, hail, frost, snow, or explosion, on all types of property, real or personal.

"7. Losses or damage caused by action of the elements or adverse manifestations of nature."

The question arises where President Tate and his board were to get the money to repay these loans on a 3-percent interest rate It is proposed to organize appliance and equipment mutuals in some form, probably along the lines Craig described to Becker, and out of the returns settle the loans. Craig's plan envisioned a business of millions of dollars, with many corporations and most of the co-ops.

Pressure was now brought upon Administrator Slattery. On March 25, in St. Louis,

[1] It is understood that the Solicitor of the Agriculture Department has prepared such an opinion (now pending for release in the Attorney General's office) and that it generally sustains the right of the Rural Electrification Administration to restrict the use of funds and revenues (including membership fees) of mortgaged co-ops.

Executive Manager Ellis, and others came, laid upon his desk a prepared letter for his signature, endorsing the mutuals, to be mimeographed and sent to all cooperatives, together with a copy of the pamphlet above described. This, in effect, would make a Government official a kind of super insurance salesman for a private corporation. Slattery refused to sign, and a scene ensued, which was broken up by a telephone message that Charles Falkenwald had been seized by a heart attack at his home and was dying. Mr. Slattery immediately left for the bedside.

Later Ellis sent the Administrator a long letter, charging that he had been kept fully informed about the insurance plan and was now double-crossing the association by declining to endorse it.

On April 19, in response to a large number of inquiries from the cooperatives asking advice, the Administrator mailed to all cooperatives a stop, look, and listen letter, which had been carefully prepared with the assistance of General Counsel Nicholson, of Rural Electrification Administration, and high officials of the Department of Agriculture.

On April 23, at a session of the executive board of the association in Washington and in its presence, President Tate called Mr. Slattery over the long-distance phone at St. Louis, expressed indignation at the letter of April 19, and threatened to drive him out of public life. Slattery stood pat.

Tate, Ellis, et al., then made charges against the administrator to Secretary Wickard and on May 8 sent a letter to the President, demanding his resignation. An intensive lobbying campaign against Mr. Slattery among Senators, Congressmen, and Washington officials was begun and releases were sent to the press. The St. Louis Post Dispatch, for example, on May 19 carried a front-page article headed "Rural electric co-ops seek to oust Slattery. Association attacks him because he opposes their two insurance projects." Ellis afterward denied their opposition grew out of the Administrator's failure to endorse the insurance plan and alleged the real reason as incompetency.

It is extremely doubtful, however, that, had Mr. Slattery signed the letter of endorsement, as demanded, and approved the famous catechism, these charges would have ever been brought.

In an attempt to buttress the incompetency allegations, association spokesmen have alleged that the resignation of Deputy Administrator Craig, on May 5, was due to his inability to work longer with Mr. Slattery. There are other things, however, which appear to have a significant bearing upon his resignation. On March 3, when the Rural Electrification Administration appropriation was under scrutiny by Chairman TARVER'S House subcommittee, the origin of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association was brought up. Congressman DIRKSEN, who had been inquiring as to whether Rural Electrification Administration men had been guiding the destinies of the association, turned to Craig and asked, "Mr. Craig, did you have anything to do with it? Have you any identity with it? * * *" Craig replied, "* * * Now, as to guiding its destinies, I have not guided its destinies in any way whatsoever." (House hearings, p. 1245.)

To sum up, the conduct of the Washington office of National Rural Electric Cooperative Association checks with the original Craig determination to control the policies and personnel of the Rural Electrification Administration either from within or without, or both. He is still influential in the association. The June issue of its bulletin carries his picture and an editorial headed "We are not happy over Dr. Craig's resignation."

Mr. Craig, incidentally, went directly from St. Louis to Pittsburgh to accept a position with a wire equipment company. He was last reported in Mexico representing this corporation. Subsequently, William J. Neal, well-known New Hampshire farmer, president of the New Hampshire Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, and master of the State grange, was appointed by Secretary Wickard to succeed Craig as deputy administrator.

The framers of the Rural Electrification Administration Act did their best to keep the administration of Rural Electrification Administration strictly nonpartisan. The spirit and text of the act have been observed, and that is one reason why Rural Electrification Administration stands so high in public esteem in addition to its splendid financial record.

The imminent danger is that this unfortunate episode be made a football of partisan politics which would be a crime against the great cause of rural electrification.

WHAT THE EDITORS SAY

The following excerpts are reproduced from the Pages With the Editors department of Public Utilities Fortnightly of July 8, 1943:

There is increasing evidence that the rural electrification program has reached a very important crossroads in this, the seventh year of its statutory life. The fundamental issue involved seems to be whether the Rural Electrification Administration co-ops will continue under Federal supervision or whether they will strike out for a greater measure of home rule. Unfortunately, there are complicating issues which rob the current controversy of any such clear-cut distinction.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (N. R. E. C. A.), claiming to represent 580 of the 740 Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives, is taking a position as champion of more home-rule independence for the co-ops. Harry Slattery, at this writing Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, sees danger, however, in certain specific programs sponsored by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in turn, sees danger in continuing Mr. Slattery in office. So we see right off that it is not simply a matter of cutting the co-ops loose from paternalistic apron strings tied to Washington.

With so much smoke in the air we decided that there must be a raging fire somewhere. It did not seem tc us that such a modest program as starting up a mutual insurance company for the co-ops could really be the basis for such a broad conflagration. In our effort to get Administrator Slattery's side of the story we went to a well-known figure in the public power field, a man who has been a close associate of Rural Electrification Administration and Administrator Slattery, virtually since Rural Electrification Administration took form.

He is Judson King, director of the National Popular Government League, who will need no further introduction to many of our readers because of his past contributions to this magazine. Differ as we may on questions of power policy, we have known Judson King too long to question his sincerity as a consistent advocate of public power and rural electrification. Admittedly, Mr. King has a personal interest in presenting his side of this controversy in the opening article which appears in this issue, since he is one of those whose association with Rural Electrification Administration has been under attack by National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. He frankly concedes this.

In addition, however, all who are familiar with Judson King's record of many years as a liberal leader well know that he has always opposed racketeering in any form and is dead set against having the Rural Electrification Administration or its sponsored cooperatives become a football of partisan politics.

Philip A. Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the death of PHILIP A. BENNETT brought to a brief close the legislative career of one of the most promising of all the large number who entered the House in the Seventy-seventh Congress. Few members have made so favorable an impression and have achieved so much in their first term.

The end came so suddenly and so unpectedly, following almost immediately upon the approval of his record by his district and his reelection to the House, that his colleagues, and particularly the Members of the Missouri delegation, suffer not only a deep sense of loss but a feeling that something inexplicable had happened.

I cannot say and I will not say that he is dead—he is just away;
With a cherry smile and a wave of the hand, he has vanished into an unknown land.

PHIL BENNET was peculiarly gifted as a man, and especially adapted to congressional service. His long experience in newspaper work had given him an insight into character, a familiarity with public issues and the happy faculty of clear and convincing expression, that stood him in good stead on all occasions. He was already attaining an enviable position in the House and was recognized as one of the outstanding men of his delegation. He sleeps while it is yet day.

His people will remember him; his State will remember him, and those who are left in this busy forum will remember him with affection and regard as a comrade and as a friend.

His life was gentle and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world
"This was a man!"

Post-War Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN J. MAAS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, the war has of necessity forced the abandonment of practically all municipal, county, and State construction work, and in fact much needed repair work has had to be postponed until after the war. Unfortunately, practically nothing is being

done in the meantime by way of providing orderly plans for this work when the war is over. Actually, such work will constitute an enormous reservoir of public work that could be instituted to take up the slack created by the cancelation of war contracts upon the termination of the war. Without a definite plan there will be great chaos resulting in a huge unemployment problem and the origin of a vicious cycle that will depress business by drying up purchasing power in the hands of the people. The more that happens the more there will be a shut-down in even normal business activities resulting in an ever-mounting unemployment. Instituting public works projects of an essential character that can be progressively launched as war industries shut down will help to take up the slack in employment and also to level off the decline in business as the result of disappearing pay rolls in war plants. If this is to be accomplished the plans for such public works projects must be made now so that they will be available for immediate use when hostilities cease.

To this end I have introduced a bill that provides Federal assistance to States, counties, and municipalities to make plans now for such future essential public works. The bill, while it grants up to 50 percent of the cost of making such plans, does not commit the Government to pay for the actual construction of such public works that may be instituted under the program when the war is over. While we are talking so much about post-war world plans, we had better do some thinking and take some action on post-war domestic plans or we may not be in a position to carry out any post-war world plans.

In support of my views I am including an address by a distinguished engineer, Col. William N. Carey, Corps of Engineers, Chief Engineer, Federal Works Agency, presented before the thirteenth annual convention of the League of Minnesota Municipalities, St. Paul, Minn., June 11, 1943:

It is with exceptional pleasure to me that I am privileged to speak today before your thirtieth annual convention of the League of Minnesota Municipalities. We are not strangers to each other. Among your members are many of my oldest and best friends and former associates. During the past 20 years, in happier times and in times not so happy, I have attended your annual conventions and have spoken fairly often from your platform. My subject was then, as it is now, Public Works. My text today can be put as a double-barreled question, Will we need a post-war public-works program, and, if so, how can the construction of needed public works be programmed in order to provide the maximum possible public benefit during the inevitable period of post-war economic readjustment?

No speaker on any phase of the post-war problem denies for a moment that our immediate job is the winning of the war as quickly as possible. There are some citizens, however, who assert that the problem of winning the war is so all-absorbing that there is no time or place now for consideration of post-war readjustments. This view, to me, is as senseless as would be the attempt of a man with two good eyes to traverse a difficult path with one eye willfully closed. The winning of the war is indeed our imperative and immediate necessity, but victory is but a means to an end—peace. To win the war but to lose the peace would be an empty victory. To approach the day of armistice without definite plans for action thereafter would assure the loss of the peace.

There is no dearth of post-war plans. Everybody has one. Members of Congress have evolved 27 or more bills on post-war plans since the first of the year, but no general public-works planning bill has yet passed, or even been reported out of committee. Plans and ideas for our salvation in the post-war period are advanced and discussed daily at hundreds of conventions, lunch clubs, and dinner tables all over the country, and the subject is prominent in the thoughts and conversations of our armed forces. Post-war thinking ranges from the one extreme of a 100-percent federally controlled national economy to the other extreme of complete negation of any planning now by any local, State, or Federal unit of government for any post-war activity. It is reasonable to assume that the sound path lies somewhere between these two extremes. Your group primarily is concerned with but one phase of the peacetime readjustment, with but one of the win-the-peace objectives, namely, "freedom from want."

Unemployment and want always have been Siamese twin ghosts ready to haunt any municipality at the slightest opportunity. We have been well haunted before. Must we face that fear again? Is there real danger of large-scale unemployment lurking just beyond the armistice? With 11,000,000 or more men in the armed services at the end of this war and other millions in specialized war industries it is anyone's guess as to just how many men there will be, able and willing to work, who cannot immediately be absorbed by private industry and agriculture after peace is declared. Experts disagree on this point, and they use different bases for their figures. While their guesses cannot be truly averaged, we cannot escape the assumption that there may be many millions. If employment is not planned for now there will be found among these millions war veterans in the bread lines, in the soup kitchens, among the street corner apple sellers, and there will be those other thousands forced to exist on a bare subsistence wage made possible by make-work projects. Here will be found hungry and hopeless men in worn remnants of the uniforms of their country leaning on long-handled shovels and staring blankly back to the foxholes of Bataan or the steaming jungles of Guadalcanal, wondering bitterly if their sacrifice was worth the effort. Whether the potential array of the unemployed numbers one or several millions makes little real difference to the worker who cannot find work because there are no jobs. The spectre of want will ride the shoulders of unemployment just the same. To the degree that we permit unemployment and want to follow the war we will have lost the peace.

We Americans learn the hard way. Until action is forced upon us we seem incapable of profiting by the experience of other peoples. What always has happened to other countries in a given set of dire circumstances cannot happen to us—or so we usually assume up to the very moment it does happen. All of us have not always been so blindly optimistic, but for more than a century in times of peace the majority has been either too blind or too busy to be bothered with many matters national in scope. In years of prosperity and plenty we consistently have refused to fill our granaries against future years of famine. The economic famine years which began in 1929 furnished us a hard lesson. Time alone will prove whether or not we have learned it.

In spite of the presumably great and wise men who then assured us that there could never again be a period of economic drought in the United States, the contrary became true with a vengeance. Our vaunted wealth and prosperity dried up almost overnight. We became one vast economic "dust bowl", with no signs of rain, and with no plans for irrigation ditches to bring our parched economy back to life. There were those who said that there was really nothing to worry about, that the economic cycle was simply proceeding on its destined course and quite according to schedule. The theory was that at least once in each generation a sort of national purge must occur. During the purge half of the business firms would go bankrupt, which would take care of the problem of too much production, and the jobless millions would starve to death, which would very neatly solve the problem of the surplus labor supply. Thus, the evil would cure itself, the surviving business concerns would again prosper, the labor that managed to survive would again find jobs, and the economy thus would automatically right itself until the cycle spun around again.

Those wishful thinking optimists who feel that we shall very gracefully glide from our wartime economy into a period of great and lasting prosperity for all usually base their expectation upon the great reduction in the volume of consumer goods which is occurring during the war. They point to the fact that many consumer wants are now being deferred and that large mass savings in the form of War bonds are accumulating. These savings, they believe, will be spent for consumer goods the day after we turn back to business from celebrating a new armistice day marking our certain victory over the Axis. But we may well wonder what there will be to buy during those first months of our hard-won peace. Stocks of consumer goods, household equipment, and automobiles available to wholesalers, jobbers, and merchants are steadily dwindling, and those stocks cannot be fully replenished until factories now making war goods have retooled to produce peace goods. This retooling process takes time, and it doesn't employ a great deal of labor.

It is said that it took Henry Ford 18 months to reconvert from the production of the old model T car to the production of the model A. Not all factories would need that much time, but some might need even more. It is not simply a matter of taking out the present machines and putting the old ones back in place and going on from where we left off when war came. Some of the old machines will have become obsolete, will have rusted away or have been broken up for scrap. In many instances entirely new machinery will have to be built as it will become necessary, or certainly desirable, to incorporate into manufacturing processes the lessons learned during the war regarding the more effective use of materials. So it seems to be entirely possible that, by the time the factories are again ready to turn out consumers' durable goods in quantity, and to employ additional millions of workers in the process, the returned soldiers and the displaced war workers will have used up their savings merely to pay the rent and keep alive.

Even though we may continue to avoid looking at it objectively, the sharp sword of mass unemployment and want, sooner or later in the post-war period, hangs over our heads. The white light of the history of other peoples and of our own very recent experience sharply reveals the nature of this threat if we will but look at it with eyes to see and minds to reason clearly.

All of these facts are well recognized by level-headed leaders in Washington and in every State in the Union. Practically all of these leaders agree that needed public works must be made ready to absorb as many as possible of the employables who are not taken by industry and agriculture. Former Governor Harold E. Stassen, of your State, in an article in the May 15 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, puts this thesis most aptly. He says:

"What, then, are the principles from which we can develop the ways and means to answer America's problems and move toward America's objectives after victory?

"The first and foremost (principle) is to provide an environment in which free enterprise, individual initiative and ingenuity can produce with reasonably full effectiveness.

"The second is to maintain a supplementary program of valuable public improvements to make worth-while use of any portion of our manpower not used by private enterprise."

And the Governor adds two other principles, one social and one political.

In a letter dated May 22, just 20 days ago, President Roosevelt wrote the Vice President:

"It has been more than 2 years since I first called the attention of the Congress to the need for preparing in advance plans for public works and improvement projects to be undertaken in the post-war period. During the war we are deferring the construction of every project not vitally needed for war purposes. By so doing we are storing up a reservoir of work that can be undertaken when the war is over and thus be useful in providing employment opportunities and demands for materials. But if such projects are to be ready for rapid inauguration in the post-war period, the plans and specifications must be prepared during the war. I hope the Congress will approve the necessary legislation to make my recommendation in this matter effective * * *.

"I believe that a Federal grant to support the more general planning activities of these (local) governments along with reimbursable advances to cover the detailed planning for their individual projects would be an effective means to assure that plans will be ready when they are needed."

With further reference to post-war public-works projects, the President, in a memorandum of the same date to the heads of Federal departments and agencies, said, in part:

"If, however, such projects are to be ready for a quick start at the time (of need), the plans must be made ready in advance and all the possible preliminary arrangements completed."

It would be easy to assemble a hundred recent quotations in the same vein by prominent citizens, local and national, and of both political parties to show that these leaders are awake to the real need for detailed plans now for post-war work. A large program of public works ready for a quick start cannot be developed with a simple turn of the wrist, or even by appropriations of money by Congress, the States and municipalities. Time, much time, and effort must be expended, in addition to money, before a program can be made ready for operation. We are inclined to forget how much time is necessary even when money to build the needed works is ready and begging for use.

Let us look back for a moment to our experiences during the last deep depression when the Public Works Administration was created by Congress. To Public Works Administration was allotted $33,000,000,000 to aid, by means of loans and grants, in the construction of needed, sound public works. I talked on that subject then to many of you as officials of your respective municipalities and again at your league meetings. All were willing, in cooperation with Public Works Administration, to build the public works needed, but almost no one was ready to build at once. On a few purely Federal projects advance engineering had proceeded to a point where contracts could be let with little delay. States, municipalities, and other corporate bodies, which wished to participate in the program, generally had ideas, some rather fanciful, but they were all undeveloped. It was necessary to develop the sound ideas into workable, practical undertakings, adequately covered by legislation, financing, and engineering.

Generally speaking, a large majority of the projects submitted to Public Works Administration required, prior to construction, State or local legislation to authorize the work, to create a body to construct and operate the project, to authorize bond issues, and for many other purposes. It was necessary to formulate a practical and sound scheme of financing, in some instances to set up trusteeships, to negotiate the sale of securities, and to perform other functions of a financial nature. It was necessary to study the technical features of each contemplated project in detail, to coordinate the proposed work with existing facilities, to prepare working plans and specifications, and draft other contract documents. It was necessary to attend to and complete all of these operations, functions and details before a single man could be put to work on Public Works Administration construction. These preliminary, though absolutely vital, steps consumed time, the extent varying with size, type, location, and other factors. And the loss of time delayed the fulfillment of the then primary purpose of the program, which was to provide jobs quickly. Eighteen months went by before it was possible to put as many as 100,000 men to work.

But unemployment and want would not wait for engineers and architects to develop plans and specifications, for the slow processes of law and finance to take their devious courses, and for the many other things that had been left undone before the depression descended upon us. In this dire social emergency, rather than to distribute a dole as such, the President reallocated $400,000,000 of Public Works Administration funds to the Civil Works Administration through which the States improvised projects on which the unemployed could be put to work at once. This was the opening door for Work Projects Administration and the so-called security wage. In its earlier years Work Projects Administration also was forced to resort to improvised projects of doubtful if any permanent value as public works. Sharply divergent views as to proper methods of Federal participation in public works for unemployment relief purposes became political issues. It took a second war, with its resultant manpower shortage, to clear the air to the point where I believe nearly all thoughtful citizens will now agree upon the following general principles:

That Government, both Federal and local, has an obligation to help close the gap when private initiative cannot provide all the jobs necessary to maintain full employment.

That the most useful jobs Government can furnish are in the construction of soundly conceived public works which add to the Nation's wealth and promote the general welfare and convenience.

That worthwhile public works require months for advance preparation—for engineering surveys, the preparation of plans and specifications, and the acquisition of land. Jobs cannot be called into existence by money alone or by waving a magic wand.

The doles are enervating, undermine self-confidence, and that no honest man wants a dole as a substitute for a useful job at decent wages.

That improvised relief projects are useful in sustaining life, but seldom add much to permanent material wealth.

While these principles of a declaration of independence against unemployment are generally conceded among groups such as this, to date little has been accomplished to activate those principles. Only small and timid beginnings have been made. Congress, in December 1941, appropriated $10,000,000 to the Public Roads Administration, a unit of the Federal Works Agency, for the purpose of matching funds of States desiring to make working highway plans and specifications now for future highway development. This fund has been available for use for the past 17 months and but half of the $10,000,000 has been called for to date by the States. New York City is an outstanding example of one municipality which already has allotted substantial funds of its own for the purpose of developing final working plans and specifications for sound and needed public works. Some municipalities and States are accumulating reserves in the form of war bonds to finance public works after the war. Taking the country as a whole, however, surprisingly little has been done either nationally or locally toward translating public works ideas into plans and specifications on which bids could be taken. In this sense post-war public works construction is like Mark Twain's weather. Everybody discusses it but few are doing anything practical about it.

It seems to me that it should be plainly evident to all that a post-war public works program, for maximum success, must evolve from the municipalities and the States. It must have its original among the "grass roots" of the Nation. It is certain to be wasteful of money and non-contributive to permanent prosperity if apathy on the part of local subdivisions of Government shall finally force the national Government to pour some general emergency made-work program over the Nation as from a giant gravy boat.

Now, while we are still at war and when older engineers and architects are becoming available by the hundreds, we have the best opportunity we are ever likely to have to plan in detail a sound national program of public works. I think it is reasonable to suppose that we are not going to have a year or two after the war in which to commence to begin to get ready to start these plans. When the boys come home and the millions now working in war factories have been discharged, the need may be immediate. If we have a public works program well prepared in advance, we can provide millions of jobs at once. If we haven't a program prepared—and I mean prepared in all of its engineering and legal aspects—then we will probably go through the old expensive cycle of Civil Works Administration and Work Projects Administration, with hastily improvised projects of little permanent value on which people can be employed at bare subsistence wages. That isn't going to add up to prosperity for anybody. I have confidence in free enterprise and individual initiative. I believe that private business eventually will provide all the jobs necessary to maintain a general standard of living at a high level. I have seen nothing to convince me, however, that private business, unaided, can handle the colossal job of economic readjustment we must inevitably face in the immediate post-war period.

It would be ill advised for me to attempt to tell you how I think you should, in whole or in part, finance the work required to put in your municipal files the essential rolls of blueprints of working drawings for needed public works. Similarly, I offer no suggestion as to how the Federal Government's share of the planning or the construction costs should be provided. These are questions for the Congress, the States, the counties, and the cities to decide. I can and do point out, however, that it is high time some of these decisions were being made and working plans and specifications brought into being.

When we do develop a post-war public works construction program, reason dictates that it should be national in scope and control. It must be national so that it can be

integrated into local, regional, and national needs and be capable of management in such a way as to complement the reconstruction efforts of private business. With a controlled national reservoir of worth-while projects, the valve could be turned on in areas where private industry cannot provide all the jobs needed and shut off in areas where private industry alone can absorb the unemployed. It seems to me that it would be most uneconomic to prosecute with vigor public-works projects in Detroit, for example, at a time when they would add little to business recovery but simply come into competition with private industry for men and materials. In such case it might be desirable to slow down or defer public works in Detroit and speed them up in Chicago or the Twin Cities.

Moreover, without a properly balanced program, we run the risk of seeing public works left to the mercy of various pressure groups. The crowd that could make the most noise, or exert the greatest political influence, would press its pet projects at the expense of communities in greater need. This could involve an enormous waste of public money. For example, magnificent airports might be demanded and built in towns that don't need magnificent airports, superhighways, constructed in areas where present roads are adequate, monumental public buildings erected in cities which have a far greater need for adequate water-treatment works or sewage-disposal facilities, and other works constructed similarly wasteful of public funds.

The question is not, "Can we afford to take such steps as have been here indicated to insure full employment?" but, "Can we afford not to take them?" I need hardly remind you that depressions are exceedingly expensive. The last one is estimated to have cost the Nation $200,000,000,000. That sum does not include the staggering cost of relief; it is merely the cost of enforced idleness. It represents the wealth that would have been created if, instead of millions of unemployed, we had had full employment. For considerably less than the war is costing us in this 1 month of June 1943 we could underwrite full employment for years to come, and assure to ourselves and our children happier, more comfortable, and better living.

If we do not seize the present opportunity to avoid post-war unemployment and to build a better America, it will not be because of any shortage of men, materials, or money, but for some less convincing and respectable reason.

Stabilization of Currency

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, following the last war there was a long period of disordered currencies or unstabilized currencies throughout the world. The British pound was stabilized at its pre-war gold parity. The French franc was stabilized at a greatly depreciated value. This led to the flow of gold from England and other countries to France. The British people felt that America was largely responsible for many of the currency disorders, through our high tariffs and low prices which we maintained for some years. We were terribly criticized by the British and somewhat charged with acting in such manner as to cause gold to flow to Washington to be buried in the vaults.

The forthcoming discussions on the stabilization of currencies will be of interest to every Member of this House. The currency controls will have a tremendous influence on our internal economy when and if the program begins to operate. With the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] I join in hoping that this House will not ignore the importance of those discussions. At present I do not favor either plan that has been suggested.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

From Appeasers to Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sterling Morton from the February issue of Finance, a banking magazine:

FROM APPEASERS TO FIGHTERS—BUSINESSMEN MUST "STICK THEIR NECKS OUT" IF THEY ARE TO PRESERVE THE PRINCIPLES THAT HAVE MADE THE UNITED STATES A GREAT COUNTRY

(By Sterling Morton)

Being extremely interested in a project which did have a certain political flavor, I wrote to a number of my associates, asking their support. From one I received this reply: "While I approve heartily of your project, you must remember that I am in business, and a businessman cannot mix in politics."

To this I replied, "This seems like a one-sided arrangement. Politics has certainly mixed in business in a big way!"

I have served in various capacities in business organizations over a good many years, so when Finance asked me if I could advance any reason why the average public official gives such small weight to the wishes of businessmen, there was some experience to draw on. The answer is, of course, simple: A public official pays little attention to the businessman because the businessman pays little attention to the public official.

POLITICS A PROFESSION

To elaborate: Maybe it is because the average businessman considers himself above politics; maybe it is because he is too busy with his own affairs; maybe it is because he is just "too damn dumb." (The quotation is from Harry Hopkins.) But the truth is that the businessman who has any conception or knowledge of that very intricate profession known as politics is indeed a rare bird. For politics is a profession.

The businessman who thinks that political office is a haven for loafers, ne'er-do-wells, or even scoundrels, is sadly mistaken. Politics is a big game, and it engages the full time and attention of many very able men. True, these men do not deal in commodities or materials; they are not engaged in teaching or in healing the sick; yet, to be successful, they must have native ability and aptitude. Aside from the exceptional cases, they must serve a very rigorous apprenticeship. Furthermore, businessmen must realize that there is a sort of professional bond between politicians, regardless of party, just as there is between businessmen, regardless of line.

The Illinois Manufacturers' Association, which I have the honor of serving as president, is the oldest, largest, and strongest of such organizations. It is not afraid to express an opinion. It is not "too good" to get into the political field; in fact, it feels this to be a most important part of its work. For 49 years this association has worked to further the common interests of industry at the State capitol. It is common knowledge that the associations' recommendations are treated with respect and consideration. Further, during this time the State legislalature has passed very few laws adversely affecting industry. (The Federal Congress has, however, passed a multitude of crippling restrictions and restraints.) The association has been well and ably represented. We have found that our Illinois legislators are, on the whole, reasonable men, and that the majority of them listen sympathetically to a straightforward story from business. They know, too, that if they are reasonably cooperative with the association, our members are ready and willing to fight for them when they stand for reelection. No general assemblyman ever says to our people, "Where were you on election day?" He knows! Our people were in the field fighting for them or fighting against them. Our officers, prior to election, were making trips throughout the State, telling their fellow manufacturers who was who from the business standpoint.

WILL HE STAND HITCHED?

Now, we don't look into a candidate's politics. We are not particular about his race, color, or previous condition of servitude. What interests us, if he has served before, is: Was he open-minded on bills affecting business? And if he is a new candidate, would his record or reputation in his home community indicate that he would adopt such an attitude? For instance, in the campaign recently concluded, there were two State-wide offices open. We recommended a Democrat for one, a Republican for the other. Sometimes we run head on into reform organizations, who looking at a candidate through glasses colored differently from ours, feel he should be defeated. If—as is sometimes the case—he has been reasonable on business legislation, we favor his reelection. When elected, we do not ask blind following of our recommendations. If we can't prove our case to a reasonable man, we don't deserve his vote.

Many business associations are entirely technical, dealing with engineering, marketing, or other specialities. These are in a class apart. It is evident, though, that any association purporting to render a general service to its members cannot overlook the vital effect of decisions arrived at by political bodies chosen by political methods. If the businessman's association is unwilling to go into the practical actualities of our governmental bodies it cannot fully serve its members. Certainly, other groups in our country are not backward about mixing in politics. Labor, agriculture, silver—all manner of special interests—have their representatives, whose demands on the National and State legislatures are many and vociferous.

There are altogether too many businessmen who feel they "shouldn't stick their necks out." Well, those are the ones who

usually "get it" right in that part of their anatomy. The man who goes out and fights openly and squarely, stands on his convictions, and is not afraid to let the world know how he stands, usually gains the real respect of his opponents, who, incidentally, have nothing but contempt for the spineless jellyfish who, if he has any principles, won't fight for them.

A LOW SPECIES

Another low species of humanity, in my mind, is the local committee which, appointed to investigate suspicious happenings in local government, prefaces its work with the public statement, "We are not out to put anyone in jail. We merely want to take steps so that this sort of thing can't happen again." Well, such a committee might just as well fold up. It can spend contributors' or taxpayers' money and produce a lengthy report to the effect that the horse is missing from the barn. It may also get a very good idea of whose hand was on the halter when the animal left; but about the only effect on the guilty ones is to evoke a good laugh—of the equine variety. Why should businessmen waste time on such totally futile pursuits? If their objective is to stop graft in local government the way to do it is to convince the would-be grafters that to be caught means a jail sentence. Setting up budgets, limits on expenditures, and all those things mean absolutely nothing unless there are sanctions—penalties, real penalties with teeth in them—teeth capable of biting hard enough to cause the utmost discomfort to the transgressor.

Buinessmen, afraid to offend those temporarily in power, have allowed the most outrageous libels on business to go uncorrected. They have allowed two-by-four demagogues to vilify them from every rostrum. They have allowed cheap little local Hitlers to push them around from pillar to post. They go on paying, with only the mildest protest, ruinous local and other taxes, a substantial part of which are tribute to inefficiency, favoritism, and, often, plain graft. Their eyes are directed, by dulcet words, to far-away matters, while their very pockets are being rifled and their very livelihoods taken away from them at home. When one of them finally sees through the deception and gets up enough courage to make a protest, he is immediately "shushed" by his week-kneed associates. Those who make capital out of stirring up hate and unrest only chuckle the louder and go on with their attack on the system which, ably administered by the businessmen, has brought more happiness, more abundance, a better standard of living, to more people than any system the world has ever known.

CAME THE WAR

Then came the war. The businessmen, swallowing all the insults, took off their coats and went to work. It is an open secret that industry has produced such a flood of material that it has outstripped all plans to handle it, so cut-backs and cancelations are in order. No other group could do the job, clear up the mess—the mess so largely created by the contemners of business. The greatest statesman can't run a production line, while labor must have both tools and direction before it can produce. Business, industry, capitalists, furnished the tools, the experience, the "know how."

It may be that the war will force our businessmen into a different attitude toward government. I hope so, and I hope a change will come in our business organizations. I hope that from war they will learn how to fight. I have been close to them for a good many years, and I am convinced they will accomplish little unless and until they stop resolving and go to fighting, until they replace their appeasers with scrappers, unless they stop trying to be all things to all men, unless they decide that principle is more important than increased membership, and unless they are willing openly to back their friends in politics and just as openly fight their enemies.

Had anyone last spring told me that a man—even as able, genial, and, yes, inspired, a man as AL HAWKES—could go from the presidency of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to the United States Senate in 6 short months, I would have put him down as a prophet undeserving of honor in any country. But it happened. It happened because AL HAWKES had the forthright courage to stand up for his principles early and late; because AL HAWKES refused to "pussyfoot"; because AL HAWKES is a real fighting man.

Other States have just as large a proportion of decent people, people who will support a man with courage, convictions, and sound basic principles, as has New Jersey. Perhaps they have men approaching AL HAWKES in character, who will follow his example. If so, this New Jersey election may be the dawn of a new day. I hope so. But if the "pussyfooters," the "keep-away-from-politics" boys have their way, the dawn will be a false one.

Falange: The Axis Secret Army in the Americas

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, today a new book, Falange: The Axis Secret Army in the Americas, by Allan Chase, has thrown the healthy spotlight of truth on one of the greatest dangers facing all of us. Not since Mein Kampf was made available to the world has one book so completely blueprinted the menace of a Fascist tyranny to the democratic peoples of the world. But unlike Mein Kampf, Falange is not the psychotic bragging of a Nazi but the sane and all-too-rational work of a patriotic American who has devoted himself to the task of opening the eyes of the United Nations to a Fascist conspiracy which can well cost the lives of an extra million allied war dead unless we act immediately.

The Falange Espanola Traditionalista—the sole political party in Fascist Spain (and its branches in every one of the Latin-American countries) is more than just another Fascist party. Since 1935, the Falange has been under the direct control of a Nazi general, one Wilhelm von Faupel. Mr. Chase, in his important book, has shown just how Von Faupel is leading an Axis army not only in Spain, which the Nazis control, but also in Latin America and in the Philippines. The details of this undercover army in the Americas which Mr. Chase exposes are too shocking to ignore. Time will permit me to cite only a few examples, chosen at random from this amazing book:

Back in 1934, Hitler made Von Faupel head of the Ibero-American Institute of Berlin. Through this office, the Nazi general planned the conquest of Spain and of the former Spanish Empire—a job the Nazis proposed to do by setting up a fake Spanish emperor owned by Germany. Franco became this candidate for the ersatz imperial crown. The Falange became Franco's party, by courtesy of Berlin.

To prepare Latin America and the Philippines for conquest, Von Faupel organized branches of the Falange in every Spanish-speaking country of the world. From Fascist Spain, Von Faupel shipped Nazi-trained Spanish leaders to run these exterior Falange branches. These Falange chiefs are so powerful that they even control the Spanish legations of the countries where they work. The only Spanish diplomats who do not have to take orders from these Falange chiefs are men like Consul General Jose del Castano, of Manila, who also happens to be the Falange chief of the Philippines.

These branches of the Falange have been doing Hitler's work since 1936. Their blue-shirted members receive military training, act as spies and propagandists for the Axis, and swear allegiance only to Franco—the sworn enemy of the United Nations. With German thoroughness, the Falange Exterior has been built into an international fifth column fraught with dangers of the enemies of Hitler.

A moment ago I mentioned Jose del Castano. Exactly one day after del Castano was made Spanish Consul General to Manila in November 1940 he was appointed to the post of chief of the Falange in the Philippines—an appointment which was duly announced in the Fascist press of Madrid. At that time the controlled Spanish press was also whooping up attacks on "Yankee paganism" in the Philippines.

Let us not forget the Philippines—

Wrote the Madrid official paper, Informaciones, when del Castano was sent to Manila.

Japan will impose a new order. Yankee domination can never cast out from the Archipelago what our forefathers sowed to last forever.

Acting on del Castanos orders, thousands of Falangistas swarmed into the civilian defense organization of the Philippines. Perhaps when you know these facts you can understand why Manila's civilian defense organization broke down as soon as the Japanese attacked the city—and why at shore points of the Archipelago trucks and busses owned by the Falange and its members were ready and watiing for Japanese landing troops exactly on schedule—the schedule of Axis Spain's Tokyo partners. When Arriba, the official organ of the Falange in Madrid, received the news of the fall of Manila, it declared:

The ancient and renowned culture of the magnificent Oriental Empire, and its exceptional human values, are shown in the important victories of the first days—victories that have won for Japan the admiration of the world.

And on January 5, 1942, the Japanese Imperial Government formally decorated the Philippine branch of the Spanish Falange for its role in the fall of Manila.

In Colombia, that strategic democracy which flanks the Panama Canal, the leaders of the Falange were promised military and material aid by Franco himself if they staged a fascist revolt.

In Cuba, the 30,000 members of the Falange have stopped at nothing in their war on the democracies. Espionage—particularly against American naval and air bases—is the least of the services they perform for Hitler. In raid after raid on the headquarters and homes of the Falange and its members, the Cuban secret police have found orders from Madrid and Berlin, caches of arms, anti-American propaganda printed in Spain and in Germany, and positive evidences linking the Falange to the oiling and servicing of Nazi secret submarine bases in the Caribbean and the South Atlantic.

In Mexico the Falange not only has its own militia but also works with the more than 5,000 agents of the S. I. M.—the Spanish Intelligence Service—operating in our sister republic. But more dangerous than the Falangist militia in Mexico is the Sinarquist movement, a subsidiary of the Spanish Falange, whose 500,000 members in Mexico, California, Texas, and Arizona are subject to the whims of General von Faupel and his Nazi bosses. The role of these Sinarquists in the recent soldier-civilian zoot-suit riots in lower California is only a slight hint of what lies in store for us in this quarter.

In Puerto Rico, a Latin-American nation under the flag of the United States, leaders of the Falange have swarmed into the civilian-defense organization. On March 10, 1942, Federal Judge Robert A. Cooper, sitting in San Juan, P. R., admitted to American citizenship 21 proven members of the Spanish Falange—a decision handed down despite positive evidence introduced at the hearings that the Falange and its members are sworn enemies of democracy. This decision must not go unchallenged.

But Mr. Chase, in his book, does more than expose the work of the Falange in country after country. He shows how the merchant marine which flies the Franco flag has become Hitler's bridge of spies to the Western Hemisphere. In the workings of this merchant fleet, which runs spies and arms and propaganda to North, South, and Central America and oil and other war supplies to the Axis from the Americas, you can find one of the reasons the Nazis invaded Spain in 1936 and set up their own puppet dictator.

I have in my hands a number of documents on which Mr. Chase has based only a few of the charges made in his book. If any of my colleagues here today would care to examine them, I would be glad to place them at your disposal.

But these documents, like Mr. Chase's vital and imperative book, must not be studied and then laid aside. Our Government can no longer avoid the implications and effects of Falangist Spain's being a German puppet state. For Fascist Spain has furnished the Axis with the diplomatic shield its agents need in every country which has broken diplomatic relations with Germany, Italy, and Japan. Hitler's officers command 500,000 Spanish and native troops in Spanish Morocco, Fascist divisions poised to strike at British and American troops in north Africa as bitterly as Franco's Falangist Blue Divisions are striking at the troops of our allies on the Russian front.

The Falange can no longer be ignored. Once before our Government was warned that the events which began in Spain on June 19, 1936—when the Nazis invaded Spain—menaced the lives of Americans in Kansas, on Bataan Peninsula, in my home State of Washington. Claude Bowers, now our Ambassador to Chile, but then our Ambassador to the Spanish Republic, repeatedly reported that the Spanish War was not a civil strife, but the opening of Germany's drive for world domination. His reports failed to move the State Department. The Honorable Henry L. Stimson, during the Spanish War, appealed to the State Department to lift the embargo on arms to the embattled Spanish Republic. He declared, on January 23, 1939, that—

> Any danger that may come to the people of the United States from the situation in Spain would not arise from any lawful sale of munitions in our markets to the Republican Government of Spain, but from assistance which our embargo has given to the enemies of Spain.

Subsequent events have tragically confirmed the warnings of informed Americans like Ambassador Bowers and Secretary Stimson. They more than confirm—they make it incumbent upon this Congress to delegate to a special committee the task of investigating the menace of the Falange and the role of Spain as an Axis satellite in this war.

Let us invite our sister nations in Latin America to contribute to this probe—nations like Cuba, Mexico, Colombia, Chile, and Uruguay, to name but a few—nations which have been fighting a valiant battle against the Falange fifth column within their borders. Let us hear from available American eyewitnesses about the Nazi submarine and oil bases in Spanish mainland, island, and colonial ports. Let us find out why North American newsprint should flow to publishers like Rivero of Cuba, Laos of Peru, Gomez of Colombia—publishers who openly back the Spanish Falange. Let us establish the truth about Spain and the Falange while there is still time to prevent Falange branches in Latin America, in north Africa, yes, even in the United States, from performing the type of treacherous services which won for the Falange division run by Spanish Consul General Jose del Castano in Manila the eternal gratitude and the formal decoration of the Jap murderers who bombed Pearl Harbor. Let us hear from Andres Soriano, now in Washington as a member of the Philippine Government in Exile, a man who was photographed giving the Fascist salute at a Falange rally in Manila shortly before Pearl Harbor. I have a copy of this picture in my hands.

A prominent European Fascist declared, on September 30, 1942, that—

> The great unity of the Axis includes Nazis, Fascists, and Spanish Falangistas. There is no longer any distinction between fascism, nazi-ism and falangismo.

The name of the Fascist who made this statement was Benito Mussolini. Let this jackal's boast be a challenge to this Congress—a challenge that will not pass unheeded.

Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] made certain statements with respect to my position on silver which are not in accordance with facts, and I wish at this time to correct same. He said:

> The gentleman from Ohio is the bitterest foe of silver whom I know of in this membership. He want all modern silver legislation repealed. He would demote one of the precious metals, one used since the dawn of civilization as money and recognized by the founders of this Republic, to the status of a mere commodity and stricken entirely from its proud place in our monetary system. At least, that is the way I judge his implied attitude toward the white metal. Be that as it may, he does want our Government-owned silver sold to private industry from the United States Treasury for 50 cents an ounce. Nor do I understand that the gentleman would have such Government silver sold to private parties exclusively for war uses. He would tell you this silver was purchased, at least some of it, by the Treasury for about 71 cents an ounce.

I feel certain that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] means to be fair and that he would concede to me the right to have my own opinion on some of these matters. In the first place, I do not think there is anything in my record which indicates that I have ever been a foe of silver. I think a disinterested reading of my record in respect of silver legislation will show that instead of having been the enemy of silver the very reverse comes nearer to stating the fact.

I contend it is the silver interests who are the real foe of silver. As I see it, the legislation enacted under the New Deal pertaining to silver has had the effect of destroying this metal for use as money instead of improving its position for such use.

Could anyone honestly believe the position of silver has been helped by the Silver Purchase Act that unleashed the worst orgy of speculation in this metal the world has ever known? Was it a benefit to silver when the Silver Purchase Act drained China of its silver, closed practically all of her banks, and threw her into a depression as severe as ours was, and from which the Chinese are still suffering?

Has it helped the monetary position of silver to overvalue it by law anywhere

from 200 to 400 percent, as has been done since 1934? Has the effect of paying the silver-mining interests a subsidy amounting to possibly as much as 120 percent in excess of its world market price increased confidence in silver for money, or has it decreased it?

As to the statement that I want our Government-owned silver sold to private industry from the United States Treasury for 50 cents an ounce the gentleman from Arizona is entirely in error. He did not read the amendment which I had prepared and which I intended to offer to cut the price from 71.11 cents to 50 cents. That amendment provided for a 50-cent price exclusively for war uses.

But if the gentleman from Arizona had listened a little more closely to my remarks he would not have made the error of stating that I want the Government-owned silver sold to private industry at 50 cents an ounce. If he will take the time to go over that speech he will see that the remarks contained therein refer entirely to the use of silver in war industries.

No, I think the real enemies against the use of the white metal for money are those who are responsible for placing the silver legislation on our statute books that has been enacted in the last 10 years. The real friends of silver are those who would wipe that legislation out and put an end once and for all to the silver subsidy program. If the silver-mining industry is really in such dire penury as to require public assistance this should be provided directly and forthrightly. It should not be done under the false pretense of enhancing its monetary usefulness.

Anyway, the loud protestations of love by the silver interests for silver as a monetary metal might have a truer ring if they had not personally benefited financially to the tune of one hundred and forty to two hundred and thirty million dollars in the form of a Federal handout.

United States Cadet Nurse Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with me by Mary Mason over N. B. C., July 3, 1943:

ANNOUNCER. From Washington the National Broadcasting Co. presents Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON is one of six Republican women Members of the House of Representatives and is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Tonight she will be interviewed on a law, recently enacted, that sets up a United States Cadet Nurse Corps. Representative BOLTON will be interviewed by Mary Mason, N. B. C.'s director of women's activities in Washington.

Miss MASON. For many years Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, has concerned herself with public-health nursing, nursing education, social service, and other educational activities of like nature.

Mrs. BOLTON, have the funds necessary to implement your nursing been made available?

Answer. Yes, Miss Mason, the conferees for the House have accepted the provision made by the Senate for $45,000,000 covering a 6-months' period, during which time the Budget will give it further study so that adequate funds may then be provided for the full year on a basis of accomplishment.

You see, there could be no actual appropriation made until the bill was signed, and this came too late to be included when the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation bill was before the House. But there was no hesitation among the conferees as to the need of the amount inserted by the Senate upon recommendation of the Budget. Indeed there has been nothing but the finest appreciation of the need for a real nursing program in both the Senate and the House. I am happy to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the membership of both Houses for their intelligent efforts to bring H. R. 2664 to the point where it could become an activated Public Law No. 74.

Question. You must be very proud and happy, Mrs. BOLTON, to have sponsored successfully this bill that bears your name.

Answer. Indeed I am, Miss Mason, for nursing is to me the No. 1 service for women not only in time of war when hundreds of thousands of men's lives depend upon nursing care, but also in peacetime, when the nurse is not only caring for the sick but teaching health and so laying ever deeper foundation stones for a world where the incoming generations will have sound bodies and a chance for ever-increasing joy in living, physically, mentally, and spiritually. And, in addition, in making possible to our young women a constructive professional career, nursing training is the best preparation I know for marriage, homemaking, and motherhood.

Question. Is what you call nurse training very different from what it used to be?

Answer. Indeed, yes. It was after the Crimean War that Florence Nightingale started the first school for the teaching of sick care. Since then bit by bit the training of nurses has been brought from crude apprenticeship to scientific preparation for a broad and contributive professional career. This has been a slow and difficult progression, each step the outgrowth of clearly defined need.

This is dramatically true at this moment when need for highly skilled nurses has pyramided astronomically due to the requirements of the Army and Navy, of the new industrial centers and all phases of civil life.

Question. Have the nurses responded to the call to the colors, Mrs. BOLTON? One hears such conflicting stories.

Answer. The nurses of this country have been magnificent. Do you realize that there are some 30,000 of them serving with the forces here and all over the world? Do you realize that this has meant that those on the home front are doing at least double duty in many, many instances? They carry a heavy regular job and in addition volunteer to teach classes in first aid and home nursing, in addition to refresher courses for inactive nurses who are coming back into active service for the duration. I hope we can recognize the home front service in some suitable way—perhaps a special arm band, as in the last war. All the heroism is not on the battlefield.

And the nursing profession responded to the call too! Its leaders were quick to realize that many more nurses were going to be needed than the schools of the country could train unless these schools could have help. The first sign of war clouds brought together such women as Miss Annie W. Goodrich, head of the Army Nurse Corps of World War No. 1, and dean of the Army School of Nursing; Miss Isabella Stuart, much of whose original plan has found its way into the present program; Miss Mary Beard of the Red Cross; Sister Olivia, chairman of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing, and others I have not time to name. With the setting up of the Health and Medical Committee of the Federal Security Agency there was born the subcommittee on nursing, whose executive secretary, Alma Haupt, was loaned by the Metropolitan Life Association. Out of the activities of these committees and others associated with them there came a program in 1941 under the Public Health Department that helped schools to expand and made available some subsidy for students, some of whom were graduate nurses taking refresher and special courses such as midwifery.

Question. Didn't you have a hand in that somewhere, Mrs. Bolton?

Answer. Only a tiny one, Miss Mason, though it was an exciting one to me. It was no more than a three-word amendment in an appropriation bill in the summer of 1941—just inserting "and student nurses" in a section that provided help for the graduate nurses. But if the program so begun and enlarged in 1942 had not been, it might well have been impossible to have secured from Congress the wonderful support given to the new program.

Of course, the money made available for this trial program has not been the deciding factor. If the work done under the Surgeon General for Public Health, Dr. Parran, by Miss Pearl McIver and her competent staff had been anything less than it has been, the Bolton bill would most surely have had very hard sledding.

Question. Did you actually write the bill, Mrs. BOLTON?

Answer. Oh, no, Miss Mason, as I have suggested, the program contained in this bill is the result of some 2 or 3 years of conferences of the representatives of all the groups with responsibility for the nursing of our forces and our civilians. The Army, the Navy, the Veterans Bureau, the Public Health Service, the American Nurses Association and its War Council, the League of Nursing Education too—indeed all branches of nursing have sat in, as have the doctors and the hospitals and a few educators. It has been my privilege to be invited to these meetings, perhaps to represent the laity—the public.

I wish I could give you all a real sense of the earnestness of purpose, indeed the determination to do the impossible that was always present. It very naturally gravitated to Dr. Parran's department to draft the bill itself and to prepare the substantiating evidence. Coming under the Federal Security Agency naturally its officials checked it with great care and carried some of the responsibility of obtaining the Budget O. K. so necessary for the passage of all legislation. Then when all that was done it came to me for sponsorship in the House, where, thanks to the sympathetic attitude of Mr. BULWINKLE of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the members of both his Subcommittee and the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the bill was given immediate hearing, voted out and passed by unanimous consent in record time.

In the Senate it was sponsored by Senator BAILEY and Senator THOMAS of Utah, chairman of the Committee on Education, shepherded it through with almost equal speed. To me it is such a fine demonstration that the Congress can and does act without partisanship of any kind when human needs are involved.

Question. What are the main features of the law?

Answer. Public Law 74 is "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed

forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training." This training may be limited to student nurse training, post-graduate, or refresher nursing courses.

The law sets up the United States Cadet Nurse Corps—I like the sound of that. In the corps there are three ranks: Precadet, junior cadet, and senior cadet. Street uniforms will be supplied. I have just seen artist sketches of these uniforms and I want to say here and now that they are just tops!

In addition to uniforms, the student receives through her school her tuition and fees for the courses of study and training, maintenance, uniform, and insignia (and I can assure you that is tops too) with a small sum called a stipend, which is really a bit of spending money which I dare say will cover beauty shops and such very handily.

Graduate nurses also are included in these items, as determined upon by the regulations of the Surgeon General. To participate in this program you, whoever you are, agree that you "will be available for military or other Federal Government or essential services for the duration of the present war."

Question. What happens to the girls who are still in training when the war is over?

Answer. All students who have been in school 90 days have the privilege of finishing their course. Nothing less would have been justifiable.

The program will be carried out as a major division of the Public Health Service, known as the Nurse Education Division, Office of the Surgeon General, Bethesda, Md. Miss Petry, dean of the Cornell School of Nursing on leave of absence, is in charge. The advisory committee has met and passed upon the regulations and has been assured by Dr. Parran that he will not go forward without the sanction of this committee.

Question. You are enthusiastic over nursing as a service career for young women, aren't you, Mrs. BOLTON?

Answer. How could anyone fail to be! It offers so much, not just for the duration, but for a lifetime!

Yes, I say again, nursing is the No. 1 service for women. To begin with, the lives of hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of our boys are going to depend upon skilled nursing care. This care has to be given in field hospitals, in amublances, and planes en route to evacuation hospitals, in transport planes and ships and in the many hospitals here in America. Even after the guns are silenced many of these men of ours are going to need that same skilled care and the equally important understanding heart to meet the years that lie before them. There will not be an end to nursing work. And has it not always been women's work to bind up the wounds of the world? Is there any training so adequate as nursing training to make ready for the long and arduous and heartbreaking task that will face us as a part of an exhausted and devastated world?

Can you imagine any field that will need more dramatically skilled hands, trained minds, disciplined and understanding hearts than the field we call public health? That means all the people, old and young, without regard to economic status or to race or creed.

If I could do so I would like to go into every girls' school in America and say to them: Girls, life lies before you, life needs you, needs the best that is in you. You face a world that will challenge the essential magnificance of your womanhood. Suffering and agony increases on every hand. Anguish of body, mind, and soul follows in the wake of the world's war.

First upon your list of opportunities to fulfill your own need for deep experience in the great adventure of living is the profession of nursing, developed by women down the long halls of time. Look well into your hearts, examine well your inmost desire for fullness of living before you pass it by for some more seemingly worth-while vocation.

In the world that lies ahead no one will live in idleness. The unimaginable needs of all the people of earth will demand the constructive effort of each one. Nursing offers the discipline, the training, the rich experience of renewing life in re-creating the desire for constructive living. Nursing, as no other training that I know, prepares you to meet the shock of the devastation man has wrought in God's world and fits you to take your part, your woman's part, of re-creation in the world that we must build upon the ashes of that which has been destroyed.

To all nurses everywhere I would say: The people of America have no words with which to express their appreciation of your courage, your steadfastness, your faith. Wherever you serve, with the forces or on the home front that needs you so sorely too, know that our grateful hearts are with you. And may the Infinite and Eternal God constantly recharge you with His energy, His gentleness, His fortitude, and His divine love, that you may be upheld and strengthened in the work you have chosen to do. And may He give us all courage to uphold decency and honor and truth until in His own time we come again to Peace.

Ploeser Plan for Solving the Critical Meat Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, July 3, I proposed an over-all meat program to various Federal officials charged with responsibility of food production, distribution, and price. My letter to Fred M. Vinson, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization; Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator, Office of Price Administration; and Hon. Marvin Jones, Director, War Food Administration, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., follows:

JULY 3, 1943.

The alarming and chaotic situation in the meat industry calls for early action, the establishment of an over-all program, which will be an incentive for production of meat and the proper movement of meat products through the market to the various consumers.

I have given many months of study to this problem as a part of my duties with the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives and am, accordingly, proposing what I believe to be a workable plan in the light of Executive orders now in effect and in the hope that the 10-percent roll-back on meat prices can be held:

GENERAL PURPOSE STATEMENT

To propose a workable plan which will:

(1) Bring meats and poultry from producer to consumer in adequate amount to properly feed all our people.

(2) Provide ample supply for war needs.

(3) Increase production of meats and poultry.

(4) Function in conformity with the spirit and letter of the Price Control Act.

(5) Bring to the consuming public adequate supply at a fair price.

(6) Eliminate the black market.

(7) Protect the health of the Nation.

(8) Provide an adequate program to supply post-war needs.

(9) Preserve the small business units in the meat and poultry industry, and encourage them to greater production.

(10) Expedite the war effort.

RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

1. Revision of War Meat Board, as follows:

(a) Creation of Industry Section of 15—Beef, Pork, Lamb, and Veal.

Two cattle raisers.
Two cattle feeders.
Two sheep raisers.
Two hog raisers.
Two slaughterers one, independent; one large packer.
One wholesaler, nonslaughtering indepenent.
One nonslaughtering processor.
Two retailers: One independent; one chain.
One director, Government.

(b) Creation of industry section for poultry.

One western producer.
One eastern producer.
One western processor.
One eastern processor.
One live poultry receiver.
One live poultry shipper.
Two dressed poultry wholesalers.
Two retailers.
One director—Government.

Committees to work directly under the direction of the Honorable Fred Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, in order to coordinate program and function with both Office of Price Administration and the Office of War Food Administration.

2. Establishment of retail ceiling on all grades of dressed beef, except Government grade AA. Ceiling on all other grades of beef, lamb, veal, pork, and poultry to be that now established by Office of Price Administration, which is the rolled-back level.

It is believed that all steps of processing and distribution can live under this level if proper safeguards and ceilings and quotas are established at the various levels from producer to retailer.

3. Establish wholesale ceiling which allows a reasonable profit mark-up for retailer.

It must be emphasized that the retailer is much better protected if operating at a reasonable minimum profit with ample supply than at any wide margin without supply. Ample supply and accordingly larger volume has a definite bearing on operating cost at the retail level. The same is true of all other levels.

The plight of the retailer is the same today as the plight of the consumer—extreme shortage of supply. The problem of supply is, therefore, primary.

The history of the meat industry shows conclusively that the independent retailer has depended on the independent nonslaughtering wholesalers and processors as his chief source of supply. It is necessary, therefore, to insure the proper allocation of dressed meat and poultry products from the slaughterer to the wholesaler and the processor.

Failure to allocate the available civilian supply through these normal channels of distribution has caused maldistribution, black markets, and extreme shortage.

The wholesalers' profit mark-up can be fixed at 1½ cents per pound with no discounts either from the slaughterer or to the retailers.

4. Establish a slaughterers' selling price which is based on the cost of live animals

and poultry plus operating cost and shrinkages with allowance for minimum profit.

These operating costs and shrinkages are known factors. It, therefore, becomes necessary for the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture to establish live animal prices in order to make this cost a known factor. For example, slaughterering costs on beef are sufficiently constant so as to permit profitable operation at the margin of one-half cent per pound on dressed-beef carcasses.

Much of our present difficulties in the pricing of dresesd meat could be alleviated by proper pricing of offal products, as for example, hides and tallow. These byproducts are now price-fixed by Office of Price Administration at a level so low that consumer costs of dressed meat are bearing the burden of this squeeze. Release of this squeeze will permit a substantial release of the squeeze which holds back the production of dressed meats. The result has been shortage of dressed meats, shortages of fats and oil, and shortage of leather products, black market, and excesisvely high prices on meats to consumer.

Strict enforcement on slaughter licensing.

5. A feeders' selling price ceiling should be placed on all but cattle which will grade AA when dressed. Likewise, the feeder must be protected by placing a ceiling price on stocker and feeder cattle and beef calves.

The cattle feeder must be permitted a proper margin for the feeding of heavier and better beef cattle. Grain and miscellaneous feed cost must be adjusted so as to encourage a production of a greater poundage of meats and fats in each animal placed on feed.

Present loss of live-beef weight approximates 200 pounds per head of cattle. This total loss annually approximates over 2,000,000,000 pounds.

AA grade of dressed beef in accordance with United States Department of Agriculture figures normally only amounts to 5 percent of production, and therefore, can well be excluded from basic ceiling price fixing. It is a premium grade and should be so treated as to increase incentive for production of heavier and better cattle.

6. Producers and feeders of cattle should be protected in their feed costs.

This includes corn and miscellaneous feeds required in production of beef. In this way squeezes can be avoided and increased production and movement can be obtained for the protection of the cattle raisers and feeders. These groups are the keys to our meat production and distribution. Producers and feeders must be protected on their feed costs by the Government. Any deficiency in the proportionment of the over-all price range from producer to consumer may be aided at this point by incentive Government assistance.

SUMMATION

The plan outlined above is equally applicable to lamb, veal, pork, and poultry when the peculiarities of their production are analyzed similarly. Beef is the No. 1 problem of maldistribution and consumer shortage. There is not a shortage of live cattle. Lacking proper consumption and distribution a critical shortage may easily develop. The entire beef problem can quickly be solved by (a) proper adjustment of byproduct prices, (b) protection of feed costs, and (c) proper proportionment of the retail price.

Respectfully submitted and recommended.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Member of Congress.

Identical letter sent to Hon. Fred M. Vinson and Judge Marvin Jones.

The Bennetts of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us who were here during the Seventy-seventh Congress recall the untiring efforts of the late Honorable Phil A. Bennett of the Sixth Congressional District of Missouri, to maintain our republican form of government. He was a man of vision, foresaw the evils seeking to destroy us today, and literally gave his very life in an effort to preserve for future generations the life, liberty, and happiness he had enjoyed.

Yes, Phil Bennett gave the best that was in him in representing the people of his district. He was one of the hardest working, most sincere, conscientious Members of the House of Representatives and we, who had admiringly watched his work, considered his loss a great one. When we were informed that his son, MARION T. BENNETT, had been elected to succeed him, we wondered to what extent he would be able to fill the place on the floor of this House, made vacant by the death of his very able father.

Barely 6 months have passed, and it is already evident that MARION is a "chip off the old block," that he is not only an able representative of the people of the Sixth Missouri District, but that he is a fighter and an enthusiastic supporter of the principles so ardently supported by his father.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, as I am sure it does the rest of my colleagues, to see MARION step into and fill the shoes so ably filled by his father.

Missouri, you should be proud of him!

"Let Freedom Ring"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Daily Independent, Murphysboro, Ill., of July 3, 1943:

"LET FREEDOM RING"

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."—(From the Declaration of Independence.)

One hundred and sixty-seven years ago, in downtown Philadelphia, a little band of fearful but courageous men proclaimed to the world certain human priciples which, from that day to this, have been the lodestar for this Nation.

Nothing in the Declaration of Independence was really new except its compilation in a single document in words that rang with sincerity and purpose. It is, as many have said, a document of glittering generalities, and yet it has provided inspiration for all the peoples who from that day to this have sought to struggle toward genuine, working democracy.

Of all the pungent phraseology in that Declaration, probably none expresses either the spirit of America or the goal toward which we now are fighting so well as one short clause:

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It is all very well for ideologists and evangelists and zealots to dream of how we might make the whole world over into our own image, but the great mass of our people have in mind just two things they want to see come out of victory.

First. That this Nation itself shall maintain a government that derives its powers exclusively from the consent of the governed.

Second. That the rest of the world shall be guaranteed the opportunity to establish governments that derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

Everything else is secondary. Everything else flows from this one thing.

If, in the course of generations, we can assure that the governments of the world shall all derive their powers from the consent of the governed, everything else will follow automatically.

For all people, everywhere, want the same things that we do—freedom, prosperity, peace.

Never since that Declaration was signed, 167 years ago, has this Nation been in greater peril of losing a government "deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed."

Today a ghastly, unconstitutional, oppressive system of government by directives instead of government by law, has grown up in the United States. It is a foul and rank growth and it threatens the very existence of the Republic. It is a cancer eating at the heart of the Nation. If it is not cut out it will destroy our right to life, and to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. When government becomes master instead of servant human rights die. And when governments govern by orders and directives instead of by written laws they have advanced far upon the road to becoming masters.

We need a new Declaration of Independence in 1943. It is not one whit less important than winning the war.

Compulsory Savings Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks we have heard Congress criticized

for not attempting to take some action or propose some program in lieu of subsidies, incentive payments, and roll-backs that have been proposed by the Administration. We have been accused of fighting all these measures without offering any substitute.

I have introduced a bill that, in my estimation, will at least be a proposal to remedy the situation that we now find confronting us. I believe you will agree with me that—

First. Increased revenue is absolutely necessary.

Second. And it must be had in one of three ways:

a. Increased rates of income tax.

b. Sales tax.

c. Compulsory savings tax.

Third. Compulsory savings tax may make either of the other two unnecessary.

Fourth. The chances are that voluntary purchases of stamps and bonds will fall off considerably when withholding tax plan goes into effect.

Fifth. Experts tell us there is too much money in circulation for the amount of goods available.

Sixth. They also tell us the majority of previous bond purchases have been made by our banks and that this did not drain off an appreciable amount of this surplus money.

Seventh. I believe this compulsory savings tax would drain off this surplus money and thus serve a twofold purpose; first, of providing the money necessary, and, second, help prevent inflation by reducing the purchasing power of our people at this critical time.

Eighth. If the people realize the fact that we are going to be compelled to increase the revenue naturally they will prefer a savings tax.

Ninth. My purpose in introducing this bill at this time is to give the Members of the House an opportunity of getting the reaction of their people during the recess.

Excerpt From "Men in Motion"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent book entitled "Men in Motion" by Henry J. Taylor, there appears a clear statement of some of the present social and political trends. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from the above-mentioned book, as follows:

When governments go bad in a large area anything can happend, for the mechanistic sphere, with all its mass action, communicates its political venoms.

This is why, since the mass forces took hold and the mechanistic sphere began to roam, occasions of economic and political crises have multiplied, and this is why there have been fewer crises affecting only one country—confined to a single nation.

The mass forces have presented mankind, therefore, with a new kind of crisis—the long-distance crisis in government ideas—which advances and spreads in the saturating way that a tide fills all crannies of a cave.

This is reflected in the amazing similarity of political movements all over the world, all in a direction away from self-faith and toward fascism, communism, or collectivism, and each in the hands of men who ride the forces of discontent in the way most practical for their special locality.

Therefore the brew of bad government has blended between nations, boiling to higher and higher levels as one moral value after another has been sacrificed to meet a general pattern of financial, social, and political expediency. And the tragedy of the world is that our own country, which should have repudiated this process with every act and every deed of its national life, took its place in the pattern along with the rest.

Instead of dedicating our Nation to arresting the swing away from self-faith, our New Deal leaders actually accelerated it.

Communism is the red. Fascism is the black. We are shepherded into a blending. We are both reddish and blackish. We are a brown. For the fundamentals of the government idea brought forward in our country were already prepared in a combination of the polyglot doctrines of Europe. Our Government became Europeanized.

In the name of a strong personality, American collectivists practiced in wider and wider measures a strange mixture of sheer opportunism, emotional economics, and reckless adventure, along with a hard-headed political program of making the labor unions and farmers of our Nation so dependent on special favors from them that they could control the votes of these two groups and thus maintain themselves in power indefinitely.

In this, they perform a profound disservice. For one of the political venoms communicated from abroad is that even America now wonders whether democracy will work. We are losing faith in our own system at home while we battle the system of our mortal enemy abroad.

The depression itself was not a direct reflection on the American principle of self-faith and the fundamentals of American Government.

In the worst months of the depression it seemed obvious that the closer we stuck to the fundamental truths—economic, political, and social—the quicker and more certain our recovery would be. The real danger was that we would lose our heads and go off on some tangent when our basic problem was to keep our heads and undo our mistakes one by one.

As with all, things were very difficult for me during these years. I had to meet my problems the same way that all others had to meet theirs—by working harder than ever before, by developing new products in the paper company I ultimately founded, and by protecting my savings as best I could.

Two Douglas airplanes had flown around the world—the first aircraft of any nation to circumnavigate the globe. They carried United States Army Air Service flyers. I was convinced that these ships were the best planes in the world, and I had bought a third interest in the Douglas Aircraft Co., at Santa Monica, Calif. I had all confidence in this company, and it turned out to be justified, but I had to sweat through it. There was nothing else to do.

I seldom left my office, and it did not seem possible to keep up with one disaster after another. Sometimes I didn't know whether I was coming or going, and I could see myself and my friends age in front of my very eyes. We were all up against it, and we were all up against it together.

Otto Schnering's immense confectionery company in Chicago went into the hands of a creditors' committee, owing me nearly all the money I had in the world. But every man who ever knew Otto Schnering trusted him. I had known him all my life.

"Harry," he said, "we can't collect the accounts due from our customers now. We can't pay your bills now. I know what this means to you, and I won't let you down. If everybody will wait and is willing to help, I can see this awful time through." His whole life centered on this task. His courage never faltered, and his word never weakened. He fought like a tiger to keep his business—and his honor. He did both. He paid every cent he owed. And through his self-faith and integrity his company retained its place as the largest candy manufacturer in the industry.

In all these trials and bewilderments it never occurred to him that the depression was proof that our Nation was weak and that free enterprise had failed in America. He knew that neither of these contentions was true. He did not think that any American had the right to lose confidence in himself or his country at a time like this, and, of course, his common sense rebelled at the assumption that we had become the greatest nation in the world by doing everything wrong.

I felt the same innate protest against the suggestion that we had reached our peak; that henceforth we could not have a national life of our own but must instead adjust ourselves to the qualities of a governmentalized civilization. I thought this a cynical and mischievous contention and I resented it as un-American.

I felt it just as untrue to believe that the depression had stabilized us at a low level as it had been to believe that the Coolidge prosperity had stabilized us at a high level, and, in any case, by the summer of 1932 it was clear to anyone who traveled around our country that we were on our way up. The real bet for the future of our Nation and the future of the world was that we make the grade soberly. The Europeanized new dealers, however, were sure to repudiate their promises, always and at any time, and scrap the good things with the bad in the process of their collectivism.

All my life I had been steeped in the cause of liberalism. And for a number of years I had been urging certain economic modifications in American and British technical periodicals. About this time I was invited to lecture before the economics and political science departments of a large New York university. In a question period afterward a student remarked: "I disagree with nearly everything you have said, sir; but, you see, I'm a liberal."

The term "liberal" had grown so out of hand that an honest use of it was impossible. I stopped saying I was a liberal. I have refrained ever since from saying I am a liberal. I answer that I am an American and let it go at that.

Collectivists stole the liberal label and falsified the concept.

It is typical of collectivism that it calls itself liberal when it is, in fact, reactionary. It is reactionary because it turns back the course of man's advance to the liberal social order which it seeks to overthrow. Its enemies are Chatham and Burke, Fox and Pitt, Palmerston and Cobden, Bright and Gladstone, and, on our side of the Atlantic, Washington and Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Clay, Webster, Lincoln. Where in all history can be found a group of names like these, and in what teachings have there been more fruitful influences in the thoughts and institutions of mankind?

Instead, there had been various sorts of incompetents, like Karl Marx, preaching the doctrine of reactionary radicalism for the better part of a hundred years. But they were not listened to until the sudden growth and distortion of the mechanistic network, when new industrial, social, and economic problems began to face us with such force and in such a bewildering manner that, separated from the good earth, we hesitated to act in terms of what had, since the early immigrations to America, been the fundamental, underlying convictions of free people.

The great mass beliefs in a society of individuals, centering around Jeffersonian concepts of individualism, inalienable rights, natural prerogatives, freedom of contract, and similar conceptions, were appropriate to the task of instilling personal attitudes and habits favorable to individual life. It was only when the distortions within the mechanistic network diluted the power of these beliefs over the minds and hearts of discouraged Americans that the collectivists had their chance. History will never forgive them for having used their opportunity for experiments which led to weakness and cleverness when mankind all over the world had so much at stake in an American example of sobriety, stability, and integrity.

Surely, if our new dealers were honest and had no special involvements of their own, they would agree that it is moral principles, and moral principles alone, by which any individual's accomplishments should be limited. But they are herd minded, and they do have the special interest of converting our country to state collectivism.

The state is both useful and dangerous. But the fundamental lie of state collectivism is that it professes to be the sum of the state's citizens. It is really only the instrument of a few.

But our situation is temporary.

The changed world, with its problems of the mechanistic network, its lopsided development, its faster pace, its departure from old ways, and the simple life of Billy Harkness' time, has never outstripped the American spirit.

The destiny of our country is within our people. The things within us that make us Americans can never change, please God.

Let the Chips Fly—Cherokee Iron Ores Must Be Put To Work Despite Dollar-a-Year Big Steel Executives in W. P. B.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NAT PATTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, my recent statement on the floor of the Congress will have to stand even though it has disturbed certain quarters. In a faithful effort to represent my constituents I have always pursued a policy of giving credit where it is due. If there is hatchet work to be done, then let the chips fly.

I consider it my duty to focus the light onto the outstanding sore spot in our retarded war-production program. Those who are responsible for our present shortage of steel are found complacent and have the audacity to inspire publicity tables about miracles to their credit. I refer to the big steel companies who have somehow succeeded in placing their high-salaried executives in the W. P. B. In fact, they remain in control of every position of significance.

These executives are known as dollar-a-year men. They are entrusted with the authority of government. It is they who actually do the rejecting of applications which the small-business people present for employing local labor in operating furnaces to make iron and steel from native local iron ores.

"HE WHO PAYS THE PIPER * * *"

In my judgment such a practice is untenable. To so entrust Government responsibility to persons maintained at big salaries paid them by the very companies who are interested in stopping these potential but small competitors, only guarantees the big companies that their monopoly is not to be disturbed. What a vicious practice!

One need not have lived in my district to appreciate the tremendous iron-ore resources that abound in the Cherokee County area; for though they are now dormant, it is common knowledge that in this community more than 50 years ago, pig-iron production flourished as an established industry. In fact, its iron and steel castings by the thousands of tons are found in service to this day all over this region. Our State capitol, municipal castings, sewer pipes, water mains, and countless other articles of commerce were cast and machined with local labor from these local resources. A well-balanced economy was then in the making—when lo and behold, its continued existence was found to be an interference with the newly formed and rapidly growing iron and steel monopoly. Leave it to them, ways were found to put it out of business, in those days of rugged individualism, where the most lavishly financed competitor survived. For those were days when fair trade practice was without standing. Today there remains in these cose-to-the-surface deposits more than 100,000,000 tons of fine iron ore awaiting the opportunity to help expedite this war.

A more fortunate location for the production of good quality charcoal pig iron does not exist in these United States.

Like my constituents, we are struggling hardest to hasten the day of victory. We are also mindful of the problems that await the return of peace. What sort of opportunity is to await the return of those lads. From experience and memory we know that we have both the makings and the will to erect and maintain an almost ideal economy of unlimited employment opportunity. Countless industries are certain to locate again in this vicinity, once it is realized what low-cost and high-quality pig iron we are capable of making available to the foundry and metal trades. Numerous durable-goods industries can prosper for centuries on the native resources that abound beneath our feet.

Despite these overwhelming facts, my constituents' application to build a furnace has been given the merry run-around by the dollar-a-year executives. The only explanation that holds water is the inherent merit in this proposition, and the fact that monopoly fears competition.

The Wallace-Jones Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include the following editorial from PM of July 6, 1943:

THE WALLACE-JONES CASE

There are several simple clues which will help the ordinary reader through the maze of facts hurled by both sides in the Wallace-Jones controversy:

1. Jones' reply boils down to an admission of delay in building up stock piles and to the excuse that in most cases this was due to the advice of other Government agencies, notably the Office of Production Management and its successor, the War Production Board, sometimes the State Department.

2. The difference between the two sides is a fundamental difference in approach to the war effort. Though the Board of Economic Warfare is also run largely by businessmen, the difference between the Board of Economic Warfare, on the one hand, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, War Production Board, and State Department, on the other, is a simple one. The former seems to have acted on the assumption that ordinary profit motivations and business-as-usual considerations could not be depended on to build up stock piles of strategic materials.

3. The reader will notice how often Jones gives as an excuse that he was only supposed to buy up those quantities left over after private business had bought what it wanted. Jones says it made no difference to the war effort whether these materials were in the hands of private concerns or the Government. The difference, however, was considerable—as the Truman committee showed in its investigation of rubber. Stocks in the hands of the Government were saved for emergencies. Stocks in the hands of the rubber companies were used to stage the greatest civilian boom in the industry's history.

Re Jesse Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, The Honorable Jesse Jones has been very much in the news lately. One of the great domestic newspapers of America is the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In its editions of June 30 appeared an editorial which

is self-explanatory. I believe its reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be helpful to the Congress and to the country.

Here it is:

JESSE JONES SHOULD BE FIRED

Vice President WALLACE is not a temperamental sort of person. He is studious, even-tempered, and fits of indignation are foreign to his nature. But the statement Mr. WALLACE made yesterday before the Senate Appropriations Committee, on the subject of the obstructionist tactics pursued by Jesse Jones in his dealings with the Board of Economic Warfare, was that of a patient man goaded beyond his endurance and now filled with flaming wrath.

The statement was more, however, than a denunciation of prolonged harassments of the Board of Economic Warfare by Jones, of his indulgence in "hamstringing bureaucracy and back-door complaining," of his "timid, business-as-usual procedures," of his "dismal failure" in building up stock piles of strategic materials.

Mr. WALLACE documented every charge with facts and figures. He told in detail how war agencies had called for the purchase of so many tons of certain vital materials, and how the Reconstruction Finance Corporation either failed to fill the orders or obtained only a small fraction of what was needed.

When the Vice President of the United States publicly assails a Cabinet member, a fellow-adviser of the President, it is an indication of how deep the rift within the administration has grown. It is apparent that WALLACE was unable to get rid of the Jones incubus by working in private, so he has been obliged to bring the whole affair out into the public eye in order to get action.

This is not the first time that the methods of Jesse Jones have been denounced. As Secretary of Commerce, Reconstruction Finance Corporation Chairman and head of its seven subsidiaries, Federal Loan Administrator, and War Production Board member, the former Houston banker wields tremendous power in the war effort. Time and again investigating committees have heard the same story from competent witnesses; that Jesse Jones' dilatory, penny-pinching policies are handicapping the Nation's war program.

When evidence of Jones' many failures came to light last year, the President acted. He did not make the clean sweep that was needed, but made his characteristic move of transferring powers. The Board of Economic Warfare on April 13, 1942, received authority for importing needed commodities, but Jones, as Reconstruction Finance Corporation Chairman, continued to hold its purse strings. The result has been a constant running battle between Board of Economic Warfare and Jones ever since, and the Wallace statement told how "he and his personnel down the line have thrown a great many obstacles in the way of our exercise of the powers given us to carry out wartime assignments."

This was another example of the divided control and the overlapping agencies which are obstructing the war on the home front. It brought the usual results. Now WALLACE, as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, is obviously sick and tired of having Jones as the obstructionist banker of his highly useful agency. He proposed to the committee that Congress appropriate money directly to the Board of Economic Warfare instead of giving it to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its agencies, to be doled out at Banker Jones' discretion.

WALLACE showed restraint when he made this suggestion. Its acceptance might result in expediting the work of the Board of Economic Warfare, but the only way that the administration as a whole can be rescued from Jones' bungling and incompetence is for him to be removed outright from its councils.

His critics have many times invited Jones to resign. He clings tenaciously to his powerful posts, however, through all the barrages of criticism and all the exposures of failure.

It seems up to the President therefore. Mr. Roosevelt is chronically averse to dismissing an old associate who has failed to make good, but the episode of the cinchona seeds alone should be enough to convince the President of Jones' incompetence.

General MacArthur, newly arrived in Australia from Corregidor, cabled Washington on April 14, 1942, that 2,000,000 seeds of high-grade cinchona had been shipped on one of the last planes leaving the Philippines, and warned that "they must be planted without delay," WALLACE related. Cinchona is the source of quinine, the specific for malaria, and Jones had failed to lay in adequate supplies of this essential drug before the war. Nevertheless, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation considered and stalled for months about planting the precious seeds MacArthur had sent out of the Philippines because, WALLACE charges, it feared a possible dollar loss from the transaction!

Jesse Jones long ago lost his usefulness to the Administration in helping fight the war or preserve the home front The President should put the national interest first, and fire him outright.

A Short, Simple, Sensible Utterance on International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., June 19, 1943:

FULBRIGHT'S RESOLUTION

Representative JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas Democrat serving his first term in the National House of Representatives, has suddenly leaped to fame in the Nation for reasons none too flattering to the previous record of the Congress in which he serves. People all over the country are speaking well of Representative FULBRIGHT because he said something sensible in a very few simple words, and the wonder is greater because his subject was international relations. The so-called Fulbright resolution, unanimously approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, reads as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

The foregoing 51 words tell their own story, and it is interesting to find Representative FULBRIGHT, now 38 years old, saying it took him a dozen years to get ready to write them. His background is significant. He comes from the Ozarks of northwest Arkansas, and now and again strength comes from the hills. He graduated from the University of Arkansas, and later as a Rhodes scholar, studied political science and history at Oxford University in England. He then studied law at George Washington University in Washington, and became a professor of law there. He was president of the University of Arkansas from 1939 to 1941. In private life he is president of a lumber company and an investment company in Fayetteville, Ark., and lives on his farm near that town.

It may be hoped that Congress and the Roosevelt administration will be impressed and influenced by the great and joyous measure of public approval that has greeted a short, simple, sensible utterance on international affairs. Representative FULBRIGHT has rung the bell, and its tolling should awaken the visionaries and dwellers in ivory towers. Unless the Congress and the administration can and will formulate and express a plan for post-war activity that makes sense and can be understood by the rank and file of the American people, all their noble sentiments and well-intentioned plans will head for disaster.

The Man Who Knows Your Groceries—An Article From the Nation's Business Concerning Roy F. Hendrickson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying to anyone to see an old friend receive recognition for his work.

It was indeed a pleasure for me to read an article about my colleague, friend, and classmate, Roy F. Hendrickson, in the Nation's Business for July 1943. It was written by Larston D. Farar.

The story was entitled "The Man Who Knows Your Groceries" and it related the work and life of Roy F. Hendrickson, who is at the present time Director of the Food Distribution Administration and is a Deputy to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, a former Member of this House. Mr. Chester Davis resigned since the article was written.

I had the pleasure of attending St. Olaf College, a Lutheran liberal arts college at Northfield, Minn., with Mr. Hendrickson.

I think all the Members of this House will find the brief story of his life of great interest since Mr. Hendrickson is particularly concerned at this time with the subject of food and food distribution. Mr. Hendrickson has more to do with the food business than any other Government administrator, but he lets others take the headlines.

The article from the Nation's Business follows:

Every day Roy F. Hendrickson buys $7,000,000 worth of food. By December, he will be buying at the rate of $10,000,000 a day.

As director of the Food Distribution Administration and as deputy to War Food Administrator Chester Davis, Mr. Hendrickson has more to do with food than anyone else in America.

Judging by volume, he is the greatest allocator and distributor of food in history.

Mr. Hendrickson issues "set-aside" orders forcing canners to hold back part of their pack for shipment abroad. He tells Prentiss Brown when a commodity may, or may not, be rationed. He tells wholesalers they must reserve a portion of their stocks for his purchase.

He tells food processors they must limit production in certain items and increase it in others. He tells Edward Stettinius whether or not more food can be shipped to Russia—or England—or Iraq.

On top of all that, Mr. Hendrickson finds time to administer the school milk program, to supervise meat-grading, to direct public feeding programs, and "to plan for the needs of special groups based on nutrition requirements."

A mere outline of his powers and duties fills many pages of small type. All of his duties affect the businessman in one way or another.

At 39, Roy F. Hendrickson is at the highest point of a 10-year Government career, getting the highest salary ($10,600) he has ever received, and can look back on a long series of promotions. Typically, he came through the latest shake-up occasioned by the arrival of Chester Davis from St. Louis.

On the first morning Mr. Davis took office as administrator of War Food Administration, succeeding Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, he called Mr. Hendrickson on the phone. It was 9 a. m. and Mr. Hendrickson had not arrived.

"Well, when he gets in, tell him to come and see me," Mr. Davis said.

At 9:30 a. m., Mr. Hendrickson arrived, went straight to the new boss. There, he outlined his duties to Mr. Davis, whom he had known years before, but had seen only occasionally since the latter left for St. Louis.

"Well," said Davis, after the conference, "you are on top of your work. Keep at it."

That was not the first "reorganization" Roy Hendrickson had lived through. And, as he well knows, that if he stays in Washington it will not be his last.

Dr. M. L. Wilson, director of extension for the Department of Agriculture, likes to think of Mr. Hendrickson as one of his proteges.

They met in 1933, when the new Agricultural Adjustment Agency wheat program was about to be announced. The program, as evolved, was known in its entirety to only two men—Chester Davis, head of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, and Dr. Wilson, wheat administrator—when it was sent to the White House.

Three days before the program was announced, however, the Associated Press carried a long description of its details, signed by Roy F. Hendrickson, then agricultural reporter for the news agency.

"I was so surprised, I didn't know what to think," Dr. Wilson recalls. "That story had the very points of our program, which was on the President's desk."

Forthwith, Dr. Wilson sent for the reporter.

"I know darned well there were no leaks, because only two of us knew the program," he said. "Tell me, how did you get that dope?"

WANTED HIM IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Hendrickson explained that, having gathered all available information from congressional hearings, talks with policy makers (most of whom disagreed), and general knowledge of farm laws, he had deduced his own wheat program.

"If your program isn't like mine, yours isn't the best program," he said.

When word got around at Agriculture one of the bigwigs advised: "He's too smart to be on the outside. Offer him the first good job that is open."

That's why Dr. Wilson, when he became Director of the new Division of Subsistence in the Department of the Interior, in 1933, appointed Roy F. Hendrickson as his administrative assistant.

Dr. Wilson didn't know it, but a lot of officials were trying to catch Hendrickson in the Government net. In 1 month he had been offered as many as three jobs to leave the Associated Press.

The two have been firm friends through the years, although their positions have changed greatly. Today Hendrickson has the biggest administrative job in Agriculture, outside of Chester Davis; while Dr. Wilson, in his late 50's, might take orders from his protege at any time.

KNEW HE WOULD GO FAR

"I knew when I first met him that Hendrickson would go far in the Government," Dr. Wilson recalls. "He has two traits that stand out—a tremendous amount of physical and mental capacity, and the ability to make up his mind and stick to his decisions. When he gets the facts, he acts."

Other acquaintances (everybody seems to know him) explain the Hendrickson march to power with other accolades:

"He hasn't tried to run a publicity show for Hendrickson. His whole mind is on getting the job done, not on personal projects.

"Of all the men I knew years ago in the Department of Agriculture, I picked Hendrickson as the comer. He is the best administrator in the Government today, bar none."

"I kept him, didn't I?" says Chester Davis.

Mr. Hendrickson's Government career is a Horatio Alger story, Washington style. He left Subsistence Homesteads to go to the staff of HENRY L. WALLACE, Secretary of Agriculture, in 1934. After 2 years he became director of economic information for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. A year later he was assistant director of personnel in the Department of Agriculture. Shortly after that he became director. He left his position in 1941 to become Administrator of the Surplus Marketing Administration and Director of Marketing, positions he held when he was made Director of the Food and Drug Administration in December 1942.

When he took on his latest position, he was in charge of food distribution and Herbert Parisius was in charge of food production, both under Secretary Wickard. They were known as "the Siamese twins of food." But Mr. Parisius left, with warnings about a coming crisis. Mr. Hendrickson stayed to face the crisis.

"As I see it," Mr. Hendrickson says, "my duties are very simple:

"The most important thing is to get food. I buy for lend-lease, for our overseas possessions, for the Red Cross.

"Next most important is procurement coordination. I must see that when the Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, Veterans' Administration, and other big buyers go after food, the food is there and that they don't bid up prices or overlap in their purchases.

"The next big phase is allotting the food. We have procedures by which each group—lend-lease, armed services, etc.—put in their claims for certain portions of the total supply. We see that the food is available and that each group gets its fair share."

Mr. Hendrickson is chairman of the Inter-Agency Planning Committee, which plans how to speed up food production, and also is chairman of the Allocation Committee, which allots each claimant its percentage of the total supply.

On the production front, he and his men are planning ahead for 3 or 4 years, no matter if the war might end in 6 months—which he doubts.

He asks: "What's the use of taking a chance? We'll need enormous amounts of foods for some time after the war. Our job won't end on armistice day.'

Although he reduces it to simple terms in conversation, Mr. Hendrickson's job is most complicated. Congress, through the years, has passed some 26 regulatory laws which he not only must administer, but obey.

In addition, he must plan and issue the 55 emergency "set aside" orders. And, of course, he must see that these are obeyed after issuance.

"A Government administrator," he says, "must be able to make a big organization move within, or in spite of, the rules that have been built up through accumulated laws.

"Many persons who have been successful in business have found themselves frustrated and bewildered in Washington, because they couldn't slash through the rules and did not know how to operate within them.

"Administering a food program any time is difficult. In war it is like traveling in uncharted territory without a compass."

To go into this uncharted territory with him, Mr. Hendrickson has some 13,500 employees. Most are in Washington, but many work out of regional offices in San Francisco, Denver, Dallas, Atlanta, Des Moines, Chicago, and New York. Mr. Hendrickson's men check on the grocer to see that he doesn't accept milk deliveries from more than two dairies a day. They check on the packer to inspect and pass on meat. They check the broker to see that there is no "funny business" on the exchanges. They check the consumer by telling the Office of Price Administration what to ration.

FOUR HUNDRED DOLLAR PROFIT ON ONIONS

"Thunder," he says, "we have problems that nobody ever has faced before."

Roy F. Hendrickson (he won't give his middle name) was born December 29, 1903, in St. Ansgar, Iowa (population 934 today), where he still maintains his legal residence. His father, now retired and an Office of Civilian Defense blockleader in St. Ansgar, had a fair-sized farm, and Roy picked up a general knowledge of agriculture.

However, the only real experience he had in farming, he recalls, came when he was 14 years old. In that year, the elder Hendrickson gave Roy an acre of ground, staked him with a little cash, and the boy planted onions.

The onion market in 1918 "went to hell," he remembers, but he refused to sell for low prices. By the next summer, his onions had rotted.

Not to be outsmarted by economic forces, the next spring he planted two acres of onions. The market was good. After he paid back his father, he had $400 profit.

Years later, he sat down one afternoon and knocked out an essay entitled: "Onions by the River Bank," which The Country Gentleman bought for $50.

Roy's two brothers, Morris B. and Otto Hendrickson, are still farmers. One lives on the home place near St. Ansgar and the other at Fertile, Iowa. The girl in the family, Miss Esther Hendrickson, teaches biology.

At the time Roy went to St. Olaf's College at Northfield, Minn., he yearned to be a professor of literature. But after 3 years there, he wanted to write. He became editor of the school paper, The Manitou Messenger, in his sophomore year, and soon was correspondent for both the Associated Press and the United Press, serving the rivals so skillfully that both offered him regular jobs before he left school.

In the summer of 1923 he took a job with the Duluth News-Tribune, and by September was making $30 a week.

"Let me stay a year and save some money, I'll go back to school," he told his father.

"Do as you like, but not many people ever go back to school after a year out," the father replied—prophetically.

A short time later Roy Hendrickson accepted a job at $35 a week on the Sioux City (Iowa) Tribune. Within a year he was making $40 a week—much too much to leave to go back to school. Besides, he had won a

large automobile in a lottery and sold it for $1,400.

Striking out to see America, he did free-lance work through New England and beat around the East pretty thoroughly. Then he decided to keep his promise to return to school, and in the fall of 1925 he registered at the University of Minnesota, going to school by day and working for the Associated Press by night.

LIVES IN SUBURBS

When he chose $50 a week and leisure to less than that and school, he dropped out of the university. Besides, he had married Charlotte Nicholson. He soon became State capital reporter for the Associated Press, staying in St. Paul until 1929, when he became the Associated Press bureau chief at Minneapolis. He remained there until coming to Washington in 1932.

Today, Mr. Hendrickson lives in an old Washington suburb. Around his home is a half-acre of ground, with an orchard and a Victory garden.

He has three girls and two boys—"a full house in poker." Mr. Hendrickson is six feet tall, weighs 210 pounds and in normal years would keep his weight down by playing tennis. Now he spends his Sundays in his garden. He reads several books a week, does little entertaining, although he has many friends in Washington. Nominally a Lutheran, he attends no church regularly.

Mr. Hendrickson is wrapped up in his work. He is frequently on the radio, urging farmers to produce more and consumers to kick less. Like all human beings, he makes mistakes. One of these he would like to forget, but his friends remember it.

He was taking part in a discussion of food problems after attending a radio forum in which he defended grade labeling vigorously.

"Why bring in grade labeling now?" one of the debaters asked. "It's late in the war and will require thousands of new employees, despite our strained manpower situation."

"We won't have to use manpower," he replied, "We'll employ women."

He was considerably riled when the debater, a woman, rejoined: "Well, wait until Paul McNutt hears that you don't think womanpower is manpower."

Mrs. Hendrickson had the last word at this point. "Let's go home, dear," she is reported to have said.

The Wallace-Jones-Clayton Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Post of July 2, 1943:

THE WALLACE-JONES-CLAYTON CONTROVERSY

The natural reaction of any informed person—and therefore, probably, of the American people generally—to Vice President Henry Wallace's assault upon Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones and W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, is threefold:

1. Mr. WALLACE made about the worst possible choice of men to criticize for their services to the country, for they are two of the strongest in the Federal administration, and stand high in public esteem.

2. Mr. WALLACE is about the last man in the administration whom anyone would pick as a match for men of Jesse Jones' and Will Clayton's records and caliber.

3. Mr. WALLACE's attack was ill-advised and deplorable, considering their relative public services, and especially in view of President Roosevelt's instructions of last August that department heads come to him with their differences, rather than air them publicly. In this critical hour when the Nation's future hangs in the balances, and our governmental leaders should set a high example of unity, the Vice President showed extremely bad judgment and thought for the country's welfare in publicly agitating dissension which could and should have been settled by the President who placed all three men in their present positions, and to whom they should be accountable.

As for the merits of Mr. WALLACE's charge that Mr. Jones was guilty of "obstructionist tactics," anyone casually familiar with the diligent efforts Mr. Jones has given to the service of his country during the past decade will require more than the unsupported charge of HENRY WALLACE to convince them that Jesse Jones has employed "obstructionist tactics" against their welfare. The books of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the achievements of its Chairman attest that he is one Government official in Washington who has guarded the public interests.

As for the charge that Mr. Jones has hamstrung the Board of Economic Warfare, of which Mr. WALLACE is Chairman, the Galveston News put its editorial finger on the seat of that trouble when it said that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation holds the purse strings to money which the Board of Economic Warfare gets for its export and import operations, "and HENRY doesn't like it. He wants the Board of Economic Warfare to get its funds by direct congressional appropriation. * * * If Board of Economic Warfare got its money directly from Congress, Mr. WALLACE could spend it as he pleases—or thinks he could."

One branch of Congress—the Senate—has in effect replied to Mr. WALLACE's charge on this score by demonstrating its opinion as to which is the safer to control these funds—the level-headed businessman, Jesse Jones, whose financial acumen is a matter of Nation-wide knowledge, or the visionary theorist-reformer HENRY WALLACE. This the Senate did by voting to tighten restrictions on the Board of Economic Warfare by requiring a majority of the full Board, of which Jones is a member, to approve its programs, instead of leaving them more or less to Chairman WALLACE's determination.

As for Mr. WALLACE's charge that Messrs. Jones and Clayton failed to obtain sufficient stock piles of vital war materials, that is an old complaint of his which has been refuted time and again. Concerning rubber, the commodity of which most has been heard in this connection, only Monday the country heard some of the Nation's leading rubber manufacturers, at Houston's celebration of American Made Rubber Day, pay high tribute to Jesse Jones' vision and enterprise in acquiring the world's greatest stock pile of rubber, before Pearl Harbor.

Those tributes were only samples of the praise which Mr. Jones' accomplishments have won ever since his appointment on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He was first selected by a Republican President for that job, and then reappointed by a Democratic President. He is one high figure in the New Deal whom both Republicans and Democrats have endorsed. The former have claimed him as their contribution to the administration, though Mr. Jones is a lifelong Democrat.

And what about Mr. WALLACE? Who is for him? Remember the Democratic National Convention of 1940 in Chicago, when Mr. WALLACE had one backer for vice president, and the delegates were overwhelmingly opposed to him. No one pretended otherwise than that they nominated WALLACE only because the President insisted upon having him as his running mate, and his election automatically went with that of Mr. Roosevelt.

Thus, while Mr. Jones is in effect the choice of both major parties, Mr. WALLACE is the choice of neither. And this fact is pertinent to an appraisal of the present controversy.

Mr. Jones has demanded a congressional investigation, at which Mr. WALLACE would be required to substantiate his charges. That may be the best way to get at the bottom of the dispute. Meanwhile, the American people know enough about Mr. WALLACE and about Messrs. Jones and Clayton to form a reasonably satisfactory verdict in their own minds.

The Japanese Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Central Valley of California have had about 40 years' experience with Japanese. They are thoroughly familiar with their mode of living and with their general characteristics. I insert as part of these remarks a copy of a memorial to the Congress of the United States, setting forth the views of the hundreds of signers of this petition on how to handle the Japanese problem. I am glad to note that several of their suggestions are embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 29 and H. R. 3012, introduced by me and on which hearings will be requested after the present proposed recess.

MEMORIAL TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the present World War No. 2 has demonstrated beyond a doubt that the Japanese Government and the Japanese people are untrustworthy, treacherous, irresponsible, and faithless; and

Whereas the Japanese as a race are unassimilable and their mode of life incompatible with the American way of life: Now therefore,

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States, respectfully submit, That any treaty made or consummated between the Government of the United States and the Japanese Government which may be made following the close of the present World War No. 2 shall contain the following provisions:

1. That all alien Japanese be immediately deported.

2. That it provide that any American-born Japanese may be deported when it is shown that such Japanese holds dual citizenship; that the citizenship by birth of such Japanese be voided.

3. That such treaty provide that there shall not be established in the United States or any of its possessions, any Japanese language school, nor shall any Japanese language newspaper be published therein.

4. That no Japanese shall be permitted to fish in the waters of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the United States and its possessions within the limits of 500 miles offshore.

5. That no person of Japanese extraction shall be permitted to perform any labor upon any farm, the products of which are placed

on the public market for human consumption.

6. That any labor employed on any public or private project in the United States shall consist of 98 percent American citizens.

7. That no alien shall be entitled to hold title to real property in the United States or its possessions, or lease, rent, or operate or labor upon any land in the United States or its possessions.

8. We especially demand that the Congress refrain from making any change or revision of any of the laws now on the statute books relating to Oriental exclusion and request that the matter be permitted to remain status quo.

9. We ask Congress at this time to give full assistance to the Chinese Republic and its fight for a free China, and to cooperate with the Chinese Republic in driving the Japanese from their native land.

Respectfully submitted.

The following is a copy of the signatures on the original memorial circulated in Sacramento and at a mass meeting held June 20, 1943. The addresses of the signers have been omitted so as to conserve paper and space:

Willard Williams, Mrs. R. B. Williams, R. B. Williams, R. J. Dyke, Bertha L. Dyke, Budd Wilcox, Leo Williams, Mrs. Mary A. Rogers, Charles Rogers, Charles E. Hill, W. H. Hastin, Mrs. Frank H. Bower, W. D. Waits, Edgar Booth, Walter E. Bennett, Louis E. Kruges, F. N. Treleaven, O. A. Krepp, Arthur P. Maehl, H. P. Freidenfelt, Dr. Kenneth E. Cole, Clarence A. Robinson, Dixie L. Lockett, Franklin Abadie, O. A. Evans, Gordon Ingram, C. H. Nichols, D. L. Connelly, R. Beavis, Wesley W. Davis, R. H. Lee, H. Wilson, Pyralinsa M. Waugh, C. A. Cooper, Milton P. Morgan, Gus J. Jones, Pete B. Florio, Melvin Mills, Ralph Colyer, Jr., Mrs. Victor King, Jess King, Mrs. Jess King, Mrs. Mary Hoffman, John Hoffman, Mrs. Lydia Dolezal, W. A. Evans, Edith F. Evans, Helen R. Andrews, Oscar L. Andrew, Ora M. Nichols, M. Royer, Clyde Allison, B. Royer, C. D. Crosson, L. Crosson, Nancy Hayes, Joseph L. Yates, Geraldine Jorgensen, Frances M. Sherman, Harry W. Barker, Mrs. Clara R. Metcalf, E. M. Fainter, Mrs. E. M. Fainter, D. Graythorn, Mrs. D. Graythorn, Jay Cranor, Mrs. Jay Cranor, Mrs. Marie Omnes, C. R. Young, Mrs. C. R. Young, Mrs. Nettie C. Mathews, Henry Mathews, W. A. Mathews, J. A. Nason, Mrs. A. W. Adams, Al Utz, J. E. Myers, J. H. Myers, Louis C. Dolezal, Esther Dolezal, James McDonald, Mrs. L. I. Crater, Mrs. Anna Brown, Esther H. Gedney, Merle L. Gedney, Goldie Glenn, Virginia Downing, Cloa Scaggs, Harlen Scaggs, Louis Ressouches, M. Giles, Leona Howard, Ray A. Howard, Mrs. Edward Walker, George H. Peck, Mrs. Dorothy Peck, Mrs. Nellie Ridge, Sam Ridge, Mrs. A. E. Benn, Albert C. Benn, Mrs. Martha Hayes, Henry Friesen, Verna Friesen, E. A. Gilliam, Mrs. Francis Tolmon, Oscar Olson, Ferdinand J. Parques, R. W. Billings, Louigi Premazzi, Katie Premazzi, Lee A. Premazzi, Mrs. R. V. Hughes, Mrs. Louis E. Ward, R. E. Hughes, Sgt. M. E. Ward, Mrs. Eva Betts, Tom Glott, Mrs. Anna Moniz, Mrs. Gladys Carpenter, W. H. Prescott, Mrs. B. Black, Ella M. Harder, Mabel Adkins, Mrs. Ruth Jenkins, Thomas Jenkins, Al H. Peak, Mrs. Carrie E. Peak, Pete Lyda, Louis Lyda, Mrs. Elsie Labour, O. L. Labour, Mrs. Edna M. Rivette, R. W. Rivette, Mrs. Noland Barratt, H. S. Betts, Ray L. Clark, Ann Lane, Ellen Herendeen, Millie E. Henseley, Charles H. Dolezal, Victor V. King, Thomas W. Baker, Clarence G. McNeely, Evelyn G. Garjoli, Margaret Trainor, A. T. McDonald, Ray F. Manary, John J. Winslow, Jr., A. E. Zahn, Harold C. Johnson, Mary Harris, Ruby Post, Eleanor Tucker, Dorothy Warren, Etna Bell, Mae Raffetto, Wm. P. Arnold, Neil C. Hayes, Lena O'Connell, Clara A. Buell, Alice Pfund, E. W. Lepetit, Joe P. Sullivan, S. F. Myers, Theodore Klein, Ed Schwertzer, J. J. Winslow, Sr., W. J. Farm, N. J. Rath, Dave J. Steffens, Joseph Wiezel, Charles A. Meredity, R. G. Morrison, Wilbur, J. Gelling, Purl S. Huff, Howard Mackay, Earl A. Miller, Wallace T. Hyde, Frank Christiansen, Albin Glans, Mrs. Eva Wright, Henry Allen Wright, Mrs. Elizabeth Adloff, Mrs. Emily Seley, Joe J. Godines, Rose Godines, Frank Miller, Mrs. Frank Miller, John D. Schulz, Mrs. John D. Schulz, J. P. Carnio, Mrs. J. P. Carnio, Wm. A. Malsom, May B. Malsom, Dorothy Andrews, John R. Andrews, I. L. London, Elva London, Rose E. Dunigan, M. C. Lamb, W. F. Lower, Lawrence Hanson, Geo. C. Hanson, Irwin F. Koenig, Michael Dawdle, Rose Pauline Engel, Frank H. Bower, Mrs. Laura Sparks, Mrs. Fannie Malson, John R. Malson, Mrs. Julia Cocking, Mrs. B. Wilcox, Ivan H. Parker, Mrs. Alice A. Parker, Nellie Burton, F. C. McKay, S. J. Ford, John M. Barnes, Delbert L. Walker, Ralph Cocking, R. W. Doney, Mrs. Mary A. Rogers, Charles Rogers, J. J. White, William A. Applegate, Fred L. Johnson, Benjamin H. Waits, F. Byrne, H. B. Sparks, Canuto Ray Gallardo, M. L. Nelson, Myrtle A. Nelson, W. B. Phillips, L. D. Jeans, Geo. R. Glacken, Eva L. Glacken, Ellen Loverde, Nick Loverde, J. N. Taylor, Bernice Ceretto, Henry O. Webb, Pearl Webb, Margaret J. Kidder, A. U. Kidder, Thos. E. Pinckney, Mrs. Anna Johnson, W. H. Dodge, Edgar Booth, C. G. Ritchey, Hazel L. Ritchey, Charles C. Shields, Jesse W. Broyles, H. B. Sparks, Mrs. Nina Mathews, and Benjamin H. Waits.

Exhibit No. 2,456,342X of "What's Wrong With the New Deal?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, from every section of America loud wails are reaching Washington about the inefficiency and ineptitude of New Deal bungling and bureaucracy as political appointees seek to direct from the Capital City the complex activities of the economic life of a free economy. Lawyers are telling the farmers what to do; professors are dictating to production experts; those who have failed in private life are pulling the key strings in public positions; theorists and star-gazers are slowing down the productivity and progress of hard-headed and realistic businessmen. The following short squib clipped from a South Dakota newspaper tells a true story, which in significance and purport far exceeds what might be expected from so short an item:

HOW NOT TO RUN A FREE REPUBLIC

R. T. D. in the Vermillion Plain Talk: This little yarn comes to me from unofficial but usually reliable sources. In a nearby city the manager of a big wholesale food house had a visit from an Office of Price Administration official. The official's name seemed strangely familiar to the manager, but he couldn't place the man.

The official went into detail as to how the business should be run—what the company should do and what it shouldn't do. He practically blueprinted a plan of operation.

The manager sat and listened, and finally he said, "Your name is Mr. ———, isn't it?" The official confirmed the statement.

"I remember you now," the manager said. "You went broke in the grocery business a couple of years ago, owing us $4,000."

The Wallace-Jones Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, to those millions of American citizens whose greatest desire is to gain the inevitable triumph over our enemies in this great world conflict, it is a distinct shock to learn of the highly publicized break between the Vice President, Mr. HENRY A. WALLACE, and the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

These two distinguished gentlemen are in disagreement with reference to the acquisition of strategic war materials. Regardless of the seriousness or the truthfulness of the charges being exchanged between them concerning the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, headed by Mr. Jones, and the Board of Economic Warfare, headed by Vice President WALLACE, the incident is a sad and regrettable commentary on our national unity and our war effort.

But now that the break has occurred and since the charges and countercharges have been publicized in the newspapers and made the subject of considerable comment and speculation on the radio, there is only one thing to do.

That is to conduct a fair and impartial investigation, and do so at once, so that the trouble can be solved and eliminated.

Such an investigation has been suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, in his House Resolution 277. The Wigglesworth resolution provides that the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives be authorized to conduct a complete investigation of the operations and expenditures of the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and any other affiliated subsidiary corporation in the acquisition of critical materials for our war effort with a view to determining the truth or the falsity of these charges.

I congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] for his wisdom and forthright determination to establish the truth in this instance. I hope that every other Member of the House of Representatives will share my view that this investigation should be started immediately, so that the President and the people of the United States can be given the complete truth and at the same time

establish the guilt—if any exists—of any individuals or Federal bureaus which may be involved.

If ever in the history of our Nation we should forget partisan politics and petty internal differences, now is the time. With our Nation at war, with millions of our sons and daughters fighting for the rights of freemen all over the world, with millions of our people on the home front exerting every ounce of energy and every cent of money to achieve victory for the United Nations, certainly those officials in Washington responsible for the direction of our war effort should set an example for unity.

That is the only course to follow. Let us have no additional spectacles of internal dissension, quite unusual in the history of our country and very foreign to our system of free enterprise, private initiative, and self-government.

We should and must have the truth, and it is only fair to those patriotic Americans making every possible sacrifice in this war crisis that they receive it.

At the same time, I believe we should guarantee that the circumstances concerning both litigants be given full publicity in what is still the free press of America.

In this connection, like most Americans on the scene in Washington, I was greatly surprised to note that the White House recently saw fit to blame the American newspapers and the radio for much of the internal bickering in the Nation's Capital. Certainly, the break between Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Jones cannot be laid to the door of those enterprising correspondents and commentators assigned to the Washington front.

It is my understanding that mimeographed copies of Mr. WALLACE's statement, consisting of 28 pages, were handed to all news and radio correspondents and commentators without solicitation on their part so as to assure widespread publicity. As a matter of fact, Members of Congress received copies the following morning, accompanied by a note from Mr. Milo Perkins, Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, calling our attention to the statement.

For an administration that has been notorious for gagging the American press—as shown by the recent treatment accorded our newspapermen at the food conference—is this not a strange reversal of form? What is behind this move? Has the administration guillotine been oiled and poised for another purge for some purpose that we do not yet surmise?

The break between Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Jones has again burst into print, this time on the issuance of a lengthy statement by Mr. Jones. He has gone the erstwhile Vice President at least 2 pages better, extending his reply and countercharges for 30 pages, 2 more than Mr. WALLACE used.

Mr. Jones likewise has followed the technique of the Vice President by providing a complete mimeographed copy for each Member of Congress.

The situation, then, seems to have passed beyond the statement stage. It is apparent that Congress once more must step into the breech and settle this latest of a long series of crises on the home front. This is why we must pass the Wigglesworth resolution or a similar one having the same objective.

Tell the American people the truth, and our country—as well as its destiny—will be safe.

The Meat Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LOUISIANA CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Lake Charles, La., July 2, 1943.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Acknowledging the receipt of your letter of June 26, in regard to your request for my opinion of a solution of the meat crisis. I don't pretend to know all the answers, but I will, as briefly as possible, furnish you with basic information known to me:

1. The cattle raiser or breeder, whose herd produces calves primarily for ultimate slaughter, who sells the cattle produced to feeders, other cattlemen for further grazing, or to the processor.

2. (a) The cattle "feeder," who is also often a grain farmer, purchases calves or steers of recognized beef breeding and heavily feeds them his forage, grain, and other purchased feed concentrates that make up a balanced ration, thus selling his farm products through the purchased cattle. The duration of the feeding period will largely determine the degree of finish.

(b) The cattlemen, who specialize in grass fattening cattle for feeders or slaughter. The pastures used by the cattlemen produce very nutritious grass.

3. The processor slaughters livestock suitable to yield edible meat.

(a) The meat "packer" operates a sanitary slaughterhouse, maintains ample refrigeration, and usually a rendering plant where the edible and inedible fats, with other byproducts, are saved. Moreover, a technically trained corps of workers, who salvage such glands as the pancreas from which insulin is made, gallstones needed in the treatment of human ills, as well as numerous other medicine ingredients. The packer usually possesses the equipment to sanitarily transport the carcasses or meat products from the packing plant to the retailer.

(b) The rural slaughterer who uses a shed, sometimes screened, in which to slaughter the animals, with only meager equipment, no refrigeration, and no facilities to salvage the fats and other byproducts. The offal is often fed to hogs. Seldom does the rural slaughterer have the proper equipment to transport the carcass.

4. The retailer who keeps the meat under refrigeration, cuts and dispenses it to the consumers.

It is hoped that this brief outline will indicate the necessary functions of the cattle raiser, feeder, and processor in the production of beef and veal. Any inequities that cause stoppage or curtail this chain of functions will become a bottleneck in the production and distribution of this important food.

Those who prepared the present livestock and meat program undoubtedly were motivated by good intentions, but their program is neither realistic nor practicable so far as this Nation of ours is concerned.

The price ceilings are so inequitable as to seriously impair the functions of the feeder and the responsible processor.

An example of the results of this program: In a neighboring Louisiana parish substantial number of calves have annually been shipped to the feeders of the Midwest. At shipping time these calves will average in weight approximately 300 pounds. After being on full feed in the Midwest for several months, these Louisiana calves will go to market weighing from 700 to 1,000 pounds, weight determined by period of time fed. Full feeding is very expensive. After the price ceilings went into effect last year, I was reliably informed that 10,000 less calves were shipped from one Louisiana point to the Midwest. The rural slaughterers bid the calves to a price that the feeder buyers could not purchase them due to the price ceiling on dressed beef. Result: These 10,000 calves were slaughtered, producing approximately 150 pounds of meat instead of 400 to 600 pounds if they had been fed in the Midwest.

While full feeding is very expensive, it produces the maximum amount of beef in the shortest period of time. In order to continue to operate, the feeders had to change their methods to a time-consuming but less expensive way. Such calves as were purchased were grazed on grain fields, fed forage and other less expensive feeds. It requires two or three times as long to develop an animal under this less expensive method as it does under full feeding, and then the meat is not as palatable.

The situation confronting the responsible processor is even more desperate than that of the feeder. The responsible processor has a large investment in his plant and equipment. He has an indispensable, large overhead, if he is to retain a capable organization. He is attempting to operate under impossible and impractical regulatory conditions. He has a Federal grader who arbitrarily grades every carcass processed at his plant and thereby fixes the price ceiling for which that carcass can be sold. His every move and all his records are under the constant scrutiny of some Government official. When he attempts to buy cattle he is outbid by the rural slaughterer. There are cases where the rural slaughterer will bid a price for the live animal which is within a cent of the responsible processor's ceiling price of the carcass. Whereas, the responsible processor has a Federal grader, the rural slaughterer does his own grading. The same carcass which the Federal grader would fix at $15.75 per hundredweight price ceiling, the rural slaughterer may by ignorance or dishonesty grade with a $20.75 per hundredweight price ceiling.

Moreover, some retail butchers have entered the slaughter business. They have no adequate facilities but they are not bound by the wholesale ceiling price. They operate only under the retail ceiling price. Quite obviously they can outbid the responsible processor.

The rural slaughterer and the retail butcher who have entered the slaughter business are not equipped to save the fats from the offal, the highly important medicine ingredients and other byproducts desperately needed.

Result: the slaughter of cattle is being diverted from the well-equipped, responsible processor to the poorly equipped and less efficient slaughterer, and far too often the black-market operator.

The livestock and meat industries are Nation-wide in scope. Moreover, they are so highly complicated with numerous ramifications that any program to be successful must of necessity be practicable, equitable, and simplified to a degree it is easily understood.

Because of the widespread and enormous operations of the black market substantial price-ceiling revisions must be made to the responsible operators in order that they can compete with the illegal operators. It will be far more costly and more difficult now than if a realistic, equitable, and practical program had been formulated in the first place.

As a result of the present program and the man-made meat shortage, much confusion has been caused. In the minds of some cattle owners and speculators, the much heralded meat shortage is confused with cattle shortage. As a consequence livestock that should have gone to the slaughter plants have either been retained on ranches or merely transferred to others at costs far in excess of the Government's ceiling prices. Fictitious values have been created by this speculation and the economic structure of the livestock industry seriously disturbed.

At this time when there are unprecedented numbers of cattle as well as an unprecedented demand for meat to supply the needs of our armed forces, lend-lease and civilian consumers, we are accumulating cattle instead of making a healthy reduction.

I apologize for the length of this letter.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

P. T. SARTWELL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The New Deal and the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 29, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following article by Dr. H. C. Nixon of the faculty of Vanderbilt University which appeared in the current number of the Virginia Quarterly Review:

THE NEW DEAL AND THE SOUTH

(By H. Clarence Nixon)

The South during the years of the New Deal has experienced a development that enables it and tempts it to talk the confident language of a regular child of the national household, not the subservient terms of an undernourished stepchild or orphan. It has growing pains and is quarreling about those pains. It is diversifying its economy, making inroads into its poverty, complaining about these changes, and complaining about the complaining.

Governor Jones, of Louisiana, with many sympathizers, complains in the Saturday Evening Post that the New Deal has not done more about southern poverty within some sort of States' rights framework but without State matching of funds. It would seem quite an order to demand more States' rights and more Federal aid at the same time. The Manufacturers Record, with abundant support from southern rail officials and leaders in heavy industries, asserts that southern manufacturing between 1929 and 1941 gained relatively twice as much as that of the great industrial east, and goes on to take the New Deal to task for meddling with States' rights, publicizing southern poverty, and thus bringing double harm to the South.

The southern region is diversifying its thinking about the New Deal, as it is diversifying its thinking about freight rates, labor problems, race relations, war issues, and postwar planning. It is more a real and integral part of the United States today than at any other time since the administrations of Polk and Taylor—the last Presidents elected from the South. It has furnished to the Roosevelt administration the ranking Cabinet member in Cordell Hull, who heads the most conservative department; another conservative member in Jesse Jones; the most socially progressive Justice of the Supreme Court in Hugo Black; and one of the most liberal members of the War Labor Board in Frank Graham. It might be said that the South has the war-time deputy President in James F. Byrnes, the middle-of-the-road Director of Economic Stabilization. The Interstate Commerce Commission has four southern members, who were appointed by Roosevelt. One of these four, J. Haden Alldredge, economist, came up from the Tennessee Valley Authority, where he had made special studies of freight rates as affecting the South. Incidentally, a majority of the non-southern members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are from the West or Middle West, leaving the East distinctly in the minority.

The South has in the Tennessee Valley Authority the regional ace of the New Deal. This creation of the Roosevelt administration is one of the largest five or six national Government agencies in normal civilian employment, ranking in this sense above most of the cabinet departments. It is the only agency of such size located exclusively in one region of the Nation. The Tennessee Valley Authority serves the South and the country, as well as the United Nations, in the South. It has perhaps been directly responsible for the development in the South of more war industries, excluding textiles and shipbuilding, than any other one factor. The Tennessee Valley Authority could appropriately be stamped on many an airplane or part, other war equipment, or war chemical. The Tennessee Valley Authority power production has been rapidly expanded to meet the industrial demands of war. About three-fourths of its power is now serving war industries. By deeds and facts this agency has demonstrated in peace and in war that there is something to the theory of co-ordinated expansions of production and consumption in a wide range of goods and services. The point is being grasped by many Tennessee valley inhabitants, including white and colored share-croppers who are enjoying the conveniences of cheap electricity. It has been demonstrated to the understanding of not a few private utility executives.

High praise has come from Governor Jones who wrote an eloquent letter on Tennessee Valley Authority to its chairman, David E. Lilienthal, in December 1941. This letter appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 1, 1943, shortly after the Jones attack came out in the Saturday Evening Post. The governor praised the Tennessee Valley Authority for its freight rate findings and for its programs in forestry, housing, fertilizer, soil conservation, and farmer education, adding that "you have done one of the outstanding jobs in the country."

The South's major farm groups, particularly the cotton-growing interests mainly wrote their own crop program as part of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency policy. Their program was broadened by legislation and administration to give more protection to tenant interests. When the whole Agricultural Adjustment Agency was modified for constitutional and scientific reasons, with emphasis on soil-improvement crops and conservation practices, the South reached gains that had been advocated in this region, largely in vain, for 100 years. Erosion control, terracing, and contour plowing came into vogue in the hills and slopes of Dixie as never before. The New Deal, for whatever reasons, has brought about an unprecedented soil saving in the South, where more land has been wasted by man than in all the rest of the country. The South has got something it badly needed in addition to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency cash benefit payments it so badly wanted.

The South has had the major stake in the tenant-aid program of the Farm Security Administration, since this region leads in farm tenants relatively and absolutely. More scutherners than others have been enabled to purchase family-size farms by this agency. More southerners than others have been included in its rural rehabilitation program, which has applied production loans and education to tenants as tenants, has reached hundreds of thousands of low-income farmers in the process, and has definitely improved the productive power, income, and net worth of these clients. These farmers were far ahead of other farmers in the increase in food production last year.

This rehabilitation work, which came under the new Farm Security Administration in 1937, was inaugurated in the spring of 1934 by the F. E. R. A. Its administrator, under Harry Hopkins, was Col. Lawrence Westbrook, a Texas planter. It was publicly launched at a conference in Atlanta of relief administrators, social workers, agricultural college officials, farm organization leaders, and actual farmers. It transferred rural families immediately from relief to a productive contractual status, and its results have been "thrilling," to quote Brooks Hays of Arkansas, who has moved from an Farm Security Administration office to Congress. The agency's good work is known and appreciated by other Southern Congressmen like TARVER, of Georgia, and SPARKMAN, of Alabama. Words of high praise for the Farm Security Administration's rehabilitation work have come from many southern sources, including Clarence Poe's Progressive Farmer. Not a few observers are like Elmer Peterson, the Oklahoma City editor, who is extremely critical of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, but eloquently favorable to the Farm Security Administration. Governor Jones gives at least mixed praise to the Farm Security Administration, which has added variety to its work in Louisiana by extending loans and market guidance to a group of bayou trappers. My own favorable judgment is based on my experiences as an adviser in the early stages of the program, and later as a landlord dealing with Farm Security Administration tenants. I have seen the good works of economic and human rehabilitation.

The coming of the rehabilitation program was welcomed or accepted by many landlords and rural merchants, who at the time could not afford the risk and burden of financing down-and-out farmers. It was good business for the merchants and landlords. These are now more able than in over a dozen years to bear the burden of credit to tenants, and, moreover, the risks in such credit have come down considerably. It is thus only natural that there is a drive for pre-New Deal normalcy on the southern countryside.

Part of the criticism leveled at the Farm Security Administration is based on possible mistakes made by this administration in handling community projects and experiments inherited unavoidably from Rexford Tugwell's resettlement administration. Part of the criticism seems to stem from the success of Farm Security Administration in organizing forgotten men into rural cooperatives for purchasing, processing, and selling purposes, and

for medical service. Real investigation will most likely show nothing of the alleged communistic practices but something much nearer the Scandinavian pattern of organizing farmers.

The Farm Security Administration program has represented an approach to social security for bottom-rail farmers, who are more numerous in the South than elsewhere and who are not included in the permanent features of the industrial social security program. But organized labor in the South, which supports social security, is behind the movement for organized farm security. If the divided South sees the Farm Security Administration and its work scrapped, it may witness a more sweeping and highly organized movement of lowly farmers and farmworkers. The Congress of Industrial Organizations is in the field with a union of workers in agriculture and agricultural processing. For some years John Lewis has been eyeing the southern tenant-farm scene.

Labor in the South is changing more rapidly than many realize. Through wage-and-hour regulation, collective bargaining, and industrial trends, wage differentials between northern and southern laborers are attaining skills and increasing productivity. Absentee-owned corporations are leaving more pay-roll funds and social security taxes in the South. While labor-union membership in America was increasing by some 200 percent in the New Deal period, the gain for organized labor in the South was nearer 1,000 percent. The American Federation of Labor reports as of last March a southern membership jump since 1933 from 300,000 to 1,700,000. Beatings of labor organizers in industrial centers like Gadsden, Ala., have ceased. Cities like New Orleans and Memphis, through officials or political bosses, at first said they would have none of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. They have changed. The labor vote and influence are becoming important. Many laborers have begun to pay poll taxes in "poll-tax States." Labor power was an important factor in the abolition of the poll tax in Tennessee last winter. It is behind the movement at Washington to prevent poll-tax requirements in Federal elections.

The labor movement was affecting the South's traditional pattern of race relations before the coming of the present war. Negroes were becoming faithful members and officials of unions without adhering to Jim Crow divisions. This was particularly true, for instance, in the Congress of Industrial Organizations groups in the Birmingham district. It was less true in the older American Federation of Labor unions. There is a close connection between race tension and labor tension in the divided South. Both tensions, which strike at Southern paternalism, are intensified by the impact of the war, with new opportunities for southern laborers and southern Negroes. Both tensions mirror a national spread, with organized labor cutting its lag in the South and Negroes furnishing population to the North. The two tensions may be solved together, with stand-pat reactionaries finding little comfort in choosing between a Roosevelt or a Willkie.

The coming of war is bringing industrial changes in the South, which is also the greatest campground and training field for the Nation's armed forces. In the early stages this region got less than 10 percent of the industrial business flowing from the Government's defense program. This was not so much a discrimination against the South as it was an Army-Navy preference for big business, which has the inside track, with initial advantages in organization, technology, machine tools, and a supply of high-class labor. Roosevelt was in the position of Woodrow Wilson, who had not finished with disciplining the large business elements before he had to go to them for the sinews of war.

Wilson admittedly regretted the shift, and Roosevelt must not like it.

No southern conservative revolt against the New Deal could aid the New Deal in managing big business and aiding little business. Time and necessity, more than politics and sectional pressure, distributed the war business. This war is too big for big business or the big business section alone. Inevitable expansion and decentralization brought more industrial war work to the South, particularly in textiles and shipbuilding. In the past 2 years the South has approximately doubled its dollar proportion of the Nation's war contracts.

However, the South industrially is still holding only the national "hind tit." The handicap is in the South, not in the New Deal, whoever may be responsible for the original sin. This region could not forthwith take on a big job of producing the fine, high-quality instruments of warfare, because it lacked the organization, the technology, the machine tools, and the highly trained personnel required for such production. The South's peacetime industries had been more conspicuous for tonnage output than for dollar value. In spite of significant gains in the period between the two wars, Southern manufacturing was far below the national level. "In 1930," says Henry B. Kline, a Tennessee Valley Authority economist, "the per capita value added by manufacture in the 10 Southeastern States was only $96, compared with $187 for the country as a whole, and $272 in the 18 States north of the Ohio and Potomac, and east of the Mississippi." Southern commerce, with the rest of the country in 1940, showed an export balance of millions of tons, but an import balance of scores of millions of dollars. The region's unbalanced economy has a favorable balance of trade in quantity, with an unfavorable balance in quality. The war is stimulating a measure of qualitative production, particularly in the Tennessee Valley Authority country, and the Government sponsorship of industrial training of southern youth and adults contributes to this improvement. The accompanying taste of high wages is no small item in this progress. Southern institutional and service facilities are strained to accommodate the drastic shifts in population brought about by the industrial impact of the war. The inadequacy of these facilities is a conditioning factor in the racial tension.

The South's structure of industrial production and the southern freight-rate structure dovetail in a total picture. The two structures have developed together, and no one but a politician with a bias can say which caused the other. The two structures must be changed or corrected together, and the South is divided on the issues and methods of change.

Any point or criticism concerning railroad freight rates can be proved by selecting examples from class and commodity rates affecting over 14,000 items or groups of items and more than 5 times that number of stations in 5 major freight-rate territories of the United States. The southern territory is at a disadvantage in comparison with the official, or eastern, territory in rates on high-class manufactures, except where special adjustments have been made for important shippers or groups of shippers. This status adversely affects small diverified business and unborn business in the South. It serves as a tariff barrier against potentialities more than against actualities. Small and unborn interests are not very articulate or powerful.

The South enjoys many rate advantages on coal as well as other raw materials and cheap products. The interests behind these heavy industries in the South are distinctly articulate and powerful. They pay lower wages and lower freight rates than manufacturers of quality goods, and are not complaining about any regional colonial economy. Interregional uniformity could double squeeze them with higher wages and higher rates. They are against rate parity or uniformity between regions. They favor piecemeal adjustment and oppose the reforms. They have a varying degree of sympathy and support from southern rail interests, for whom they are great customers. Southern railroads have never liked "reform." The Southern railroad and heavy shipping interests constitute a combination of conservative economic forces that can be effective before administrative bodies and in State politics. These elements are strong in Jones' Louisiana, Dixon's Alabama, and Arnall's Georgia. Of course, there is abundant support in the North for their point of view. Any southern governor or group who would buck these forces and at the same time oppose or disown the New Deal is doomed to failure before starting. Freight-rate revision on the scale contemplated is a progressive step that is nothing less than national social planning. In fact, any planning for abundance must be based on efficient transportation and an equitable rate system. For such a step the New Deal offers the best bet.

Freight-rate revision is a national problem, affecting several regions and many economic interests that cut across regional borders. It is well for southerners to realize this, as did the late Bib Graves, ardent New Deal Governor of Alabama, in the middle thirties.

Though only a few specific downward revisions have followed the hearings of 1938, the general attack on the problem is making headway. By the Transportation Act of 1940 Congress declared for a policy free from interregional discrimination and called for an administrative investigation of the interregional workings of the rate structure. That investigation is going forward under a special expert group. It might be said that the Interstate Commerce Commission, with the South and West well represented in its membership, is working energetically at the task of doing justice. The Commission seems to be more broadly constructive and less legalistic than formerly. Its hearings on regional rate problems are extensive and of a broad scope.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the best advocate the South has for freight-rate revision. This agency put a staff to studying the question in 1933. It has cooperated with southern Governors on a nonpolitical research basis, and this has been well recognized by southern Governors. It has released several reports and studies, notably the Regionalized Freight Rates: Barrier to National Productiveness, which President Roosevelt transmitted to Congress last March. Its experts envisage an enlargement and diversification of southern manufacturing under a freight-rate system free from regional discriminations. They point out that such a reconstruction can and should be made and that it will not rob Peter to pay Paul, whether Peter be a northern manufacturer, a southern railroad, or a southern shipper of raw material.

Differentials must be corrected together, not singly, for they operate together. The Roosevelt administration is clearly exploring the issue of freight-rate differentials. It has moved against a whole set of differentials affecting the South. The Hull trade agreements are checks to a tariff system that is a toll system against much of the South's agriculture. Southern wage differentials and other labor differences are admittedly being reduced. The economic differentials against Negroes are being tackled in the face of tremendous difficulties. In a sense, the South is escaping from a long-standing differential in opportunity. No New Deal or other Washington government alone can realize upon that enlarged opportunity for the region. The South or southerners have some responsibility for action. The region must furnish its own leadership and statesmanship.

Independence Against Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a speech made by me in Faneuil Hall, the American Cradle of Liberty, Boston, Mass., on July 5, 1943, on the occasion of the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

These exercises have been held each year from 1783 and always in this historic Cradle of Liberty, except one year when this historic building was being restored.

I am deeply conscious of the significance of today's anniversary. I am grateful to the distinguished mayor of Boston, Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, for conferring upon me the honor of appearing in the capacity that I am at this traditional meeting.

We are gathered today in this historic Faneuil Hall, the Cradle of Liberty, at a time when our country is engaged in the war that was thrust upon us, a war of survival, and during one of the most important and trying periods of the known history of man. We are also assembled at a time when our loved ones are fighting and dying for the preservation of our beloved country—of the religious civilization that we believe in, the origin of which is in God Himself.

Having in mind, as we all must have, the trying conditions that exist, I feel that the traditional kind of a speech for this occasion should be departed from, and therefore my observations will be mainly confined to the present war and the danger that confronts us.

There are similar basic considerations between those that confronted the people of the Thirteen Colonies of 167 years ago, and us of this generation of Americans of today.

In this historic building, the Cradle of Liberty, men gathered 167 years ago to fight to obtain freedom, liberty, and independence. They fought to escape the governmental absolutism of those days, the attempt to deny them the liberty which they sought and prized.

Today, we are gathered in the Cradle of Liberty and are faced with the necessity of preserving liberty, freedom, and independence. They gave us a free nation, giving to us the rights of the individual. Today we are faced with the attempt to destroy the free Government that they gave to us and to take away the rights of the individual that the hardy men and women of the Revolutionary and succeeding days established for our benefit. In 1776 they fought to obtain liberty. In 1943 we are fighting to retain liberty.

We remember reading in history of the living statement of the famous Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." Today we could well paraphrase that famous utterance and say: "Retain my liberty or give me death."

Since those days several generations of Americans have come and gone. You and I possess the Government that the Founding Fathers established, the Government that each succeeding generation has preserved and strengthened.

You and I inherited that Government.

It is our duty and obligation to preserve those institutions of government and to pass them on—strengthened—but in no event weakened or destroyed, for the benefit of the generations of Americans to come.

That is our duty!

With the guidance of God and the spirit of those hardy and brave men and women of the Revolutionary days, and those who gathered in this historic building 167 years ago, animating us today, we will perform that duty with complete success.

One hundred and sixty-seven years ago, the courageous founders of our country—willing to make every worldly sacrifice, even life itself—declared the Independence of the Colonies of the Western Hemisphere. The Declaration of Independence is just as much a part of the fundamental law of our land as the Constitution of the United States itself.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence are long since dead, but their immortal words echo today just as strongly as they did 167 years ago. Those words will always echo and live. The Declaration of Independence is just as much a command to you and me of today—to fight and to die to preserve the inalienable rights of man, as it was to the signers of that immortal document.

The signers of the Declaration of Independence and the fathers of our country, gave us political freedom—a Government of laws and not of men. They gave each and every one of us the benefit of a free government—yes, they set forth the rights of the individual—God-given rights—and by solemn compact, obligated our Government to guaranty and protect those rights, as well as the free exercise thereof.

But they also recognized that these constitutional rights carried with them the obligation, the duty, and the responsibility of everyone exercising them in the best interest of our Government. And further, of fighting and dying, if necessary, to protect and preserve them, as well as our Government itself.

In the days of George Washington, our first President, the enemies of the new republic from within (the forces working for the establishment of a monarchy), were the main constant source of danger to our country. It was the personality of Washington that prevented these forces from receiving any popular support. He laid the sound foundation for the Nation which we enjoy and possess today.

nI the days of the War between the States—the Civil War—the existence of our country was threatened from within by internal division and disunion. Lack of sound leadership in those two periods of emergency might have resulted in the destruction of the United States of America as a sovereign Nation.

The same situation exists today.

We are confronted by the first external danger in the constitutional history of our country that threatens our very existence as a nation.

We can understand better the solution of our present problems; we can explore the unknown future more effectively by briefly reviewing the road over which we came, to where we are today. The landmarks of our path through history will guide us as we stride forward to success in this war and to a better, stronger life in the future.

Independence Day, ever since it originated in the dangerous period of 167 years ago, has reaffirmed and confirmed the landmark of freedom and liberty.

On the first Independence Day, the American patriots faced a desperate battle for life itself. Our forefathers bled and fought, risking their lives, and established the glorious fact of independence, a strong Nation built of a strong and fighting people.

I have made reference to the dark days of the Civil War when our Nation faced an equally grim decision. For 4 long years, we, as a Nation, fought, and the generation of the Civil War days died in the struggle for life and independence, and national unity. In our other wars, including the fierce struggle of 1918, we knew we had to win, but our national existence was not at stake.

We must bear in mind that if we lose this war, we lose not only a war, but we lose our country.

In this war more than in any other, we are fighting powerful enemies who are imbued with the monstrous doctrine of hatred, antireligious hatred, economic hatred, and racial hatred, determined to enslave the world. Our German and Japanese enemies would destroy our national life, our mode of living, everything that we hold dear. Axis domination of the air and sea would mean Axis strangling of America, perhaps economically at the start, but certainly economic starvation would be followed up by the firing squad and the bayonet. The enslaved countries of Europe have discovered this bitter truth.

We know well the odious nature of the enemy, his tenacity and his strength. That is why I say this is as desperate a war for Americans as was the War for Independence and the Civil War. It is a war of survival. We are fighting an enemy who would destroy Boston or any other city; whose leaders would happily tear this historic building down to a rubble of bricks. Why? Because Faneuil Hall is a landmark of independence and freedom.

We know these things from the mouths of the enemy's own leaders—Hitler, who said: "No economic policy is possible without a sword"; from the bemedalled Goering, who said, "Our business is not to do justice but to destroy and exterminate;" from the unlamented Yamamoto, who proposed to write the peace treaty in the White House at Washington. One Nazi newspaper put it this way: "Totalitarian victory means the utter destruction of the vanquished nation, and its complete and final disappearance from the historical arena."

Our enemies despise the rule of the majority, because their power lies in their own success in pillaging and destroying, in the burning of books and in the persecution of minorities, in the destruction of the dignity and personality of the individual. Their Quislings and puppets go further, and call democracy "an idiotic system where every individual has the same say in everything whether he understands it or not; where important questions about the future of nations are decided by an assembly of people without special insight into such things, elected by people who also have no insight." This shows their contempt of and hatred for democracies.

The Axis leaders who say these things are trying to win their war by dividing us, by shaking our confidence in our own way of life and our willingness to fight and die for independence and freedom. The Berlin radio is aiming special programs at this country, asking why we are fighting, and shedding crocodile tears for Americans because we are cutting down on gasoline, tires and food. That would be an effective way for the Axis to wage war, if our citizens listened and believed the German and Japanese lies and slanders, those which come over the airwaves, and the equally vicious ones spread here at home by a few traitorous fifth-columnists.

But the enemy's evil efforts to divide and discourage us are doomed to failure. They cannot win among our people on the home front, any more than their soldiers can win against our fighting men on the battle fronts. They cannot win because our people have known independence and freedom and demo-

cracy since 1776. We know we are fighting for our philosophy of life, for the principles and ideals for which our country stands, and the right to progress in our own chosen way to greater prosperity and happiness for all of us.

We should not underestimate our task merely because we have caught the enemy in a maze of lies about his own strength. Whilie we have not yet won the war, we are doing all that is humanly posssible to speed up the happy day of peace. But we have yet a long way to go.

The roads to Berlin and Tokyo are long and hard. Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan planned and built and looted for years, preparing for war. They produced great war stores of planes, tanks, guns, and submarines. They spent years testing and concentrating upon their military machines.

Three major elements are important to waging war—a nation's manpower, its economic resources, and the degree to which both are militarized. In the United States devotion to country is also a major element of our strength; in the Axis countries the slavemaster's lash forces men to die on the war fronts for the Herrenvolk, the master race. Germany, with all the captured countries under the lash, and Japan, with hundreds of millions of captives, have great manpower resources. They have already robbed China, the United States, Great Britain, and Holland of incalculable natural resources. And they have been busy getting ready for total war for many years, while we were building, we thought, for peace and prosperity.

Germany has made the Continent of Europe into a fortress, strongly armed, with short and secure communications lines. Our troops and weapons and supplies must travel thousands of miles to hit the enemy. It has been estimated that it takes 400 troop ships and 730 cargo ships to transport a million infantry soldiers overseas. It takes 10 to 18 tons of shipping to deliver a soldier and his equipment, depending upon what kind of fighting he is going to do, and it takes from 1 to 3 tons of shipping a month to keep him supplied. A single mechanized division burns up 18,000 gallons of gasoline every hour when it is on the move—and this fact explains why we are cutting out our own pleasure driving.

The war news is good. We have swept the Axis out of Africa, and we have driven the Japs back in the Solomons and the Aleutians. Further offensive action is now under way in the Far East.

But there is danger ahead for us if we assume, here at home, that the war is nearly over, or that the victory will come quickly or easily. Our advantages in production and planes are still largely offset by the distance from which we must wage war. When we land in Europe, we land in front of a wall of steel and guns.

We will win the war sooner if we realize what a difficult job we still have to do here at home. You may be sure that our soldiers abroad realize full well their grim and terrible task. Here at home, men and women on the production line, in the shipyards, and the factories, must continue at top speed. We must support the war up to the hilt. We must be prepared for mounting casualties. And when they come, we must remember that Hitler and Tojo and their murdering military machines are responsible for every American boy who is killed or wounded. We must never forget for a moment that we are fighting the most sinister enemies we ever had. We must never forget that our boys in Europe and in the Pacific are fighting for our homes and our freedom and independence.

We have done a good job so far in this war. Our fighting men and our producing factories and our railroads have accomplished feats that surpass anything in the history of mankind. Consider that Xerxes, the King of Persia, won undying fame because he assembled less than a million troops and transported them across the Hellespont, a few miles of water, to invade Europe and conquer Greece. In 19 brief months we have trained and transported more than 2,000,000 troops overseas, most of them for thousands of miles. None of the great military devastators of history, Napoleon, Genghis Khan, Attila, no, not even Hitler, even dreamed of the grand-scale accomplishments already attained by our Nation of peace lovers in the few brief months since Pearl Harbor.

United States participation in the war of 1917–18 lasted from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, 4 days over 19 months. In 3 days from today we will have been at war with Japan and Germany for 19 months. There is nothing that I can see in the stars which indicates that Germany is weakening now as she did in 1918, or that we can count upon time and internal disruption to break down the resistance of the enemy. However, when the collapse comes, it will come quick.

But it can be said for certain that we have accomplished a far greater task in our first 19 months of war than we did in 1918 in terms of preparation, as well as in war itself, against an infinitely stronger enemy. Our Army is about twice as large now as the one we raised in 1917 and 1918. We are producing the weapons with which our allies are fighting, instead of having our allies supply us as they did then. We are out-producing the entire Axis in weapons and supplies of war after only 19 months, despite their 10-year start. In 1917–18 very few, if any, United States-made planes actually got into combat. Today we are supplying the Russians, the British, the Chinese, and many others of our allies with most of their fighting planes. The other day in the National House of Representatives we passed the largest wartime fighting bill in the whole long length of history, carrying over $71,000,000,000 for our Army alone. The fighting forces, military and industrial, will spend more than $100,000,000,000 in the fiscal year which started 4 days ago. Of war planes alone, we will produce more than 100,000; our fleet will be doubled by the end of this year, and we will be on our way to ultimate victory.

A little over 1 year ago we had a one-ocean Navy to participate in a two-ocean war. During the past 18 months, in addition to our recovery from the Pearl Harbor disaster and despite errors and blunders, we have made progress that has amazed the world. We are rapidly on the way to a two-ocean Navy. By the end of 1943 we shall have increased our Navy over our fleet of 1942 by 60 percent in tonnage and 100 percent in the number of vessels. We have transformed our peacetime merchant marine into the greatest wartime merchant marine fleet in all history, and, despite the attacks of enemy submarines, we are adding to that fleet by hundreds of thousands of tons.

We have assembled an Army of over 6,000,000 men, every one of whom either has been, or will be trained before going overseas. They have demonstrated prowess on the battlefields that stretch from Guadalcanal to Attu in the Pacific, to north Africa and the Mediterranean, and undoubtedly will in the near future, on the mainland of Europe itself. Our leadership on land and sea, and in the air, has been outstanding.

Our Navy is living up to the great traditions of the past.

Our fighting men on land, on the sea, and in the air, are fighting with courage and great success.

In passing, a tribute should be paid to the youth of this generation. The spirit and courage of the youth of today—of this generation—will always occupy foremost pages in the history of our country.

We have seen great changes take place during the past year. A year ago the outlook was dark and gloomy. Today, the situation has changed. The Nazi blitzkrieg is over. Nazi Germany is on the defensive. However, that does not mean that we should underestimate the fighting abilities of our enemy, and neither should this marked change for the better bring about a feeling of overconfidence on our part. This change for the better should create a stronger feeling of determination to carry the battle to the enemy and to administer the knock-out blow as soon as possible.

Every indication points to Italy's being eliminated from the war in the near future. We do not entertain the same feeling of bitterness toward the people of Italy that we do toward those of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. It has been apparent for a long time that the heart of the average person in Italy is not engaged in this war. However, whether Italy makes peace terms or not, every indication points to the fact that Italy's days of active participation in this war will be over in the near future. The elimination of Italy from the war will have a very favorable effect throughout the entire world. It will bring immediate relief to our Russian ally, and everyone will admit that Russia has played a heroic part in this dreadful conflict.

With Italy withdrawing from the war, it will mean 20 to 25 divisions of Italian soldiers withdrawing from the conquered Balkan states. Germany will have to draw upon her reserves to replace Italian withdrawals. With Italy under the control of the military leaders of the United Nations, German soldiers in a good part of the Balkan states would be open to a flank attack. The probabilities are that the control of Italy by the United Nations would force the German army to withdraw from some conquered parts of the Balkan peninsula. It will enable those of the conquered lands located in the Balkans to more openly battle the Nazi conqueror. It will enable us to make easier contact with them. It will enable us to locate air fields closer to the industrial part of Germany that heretofore has been practically immune from air attack. It will place the Mediterranean Sea completely under the control of the United Nations. It will greatly aid our transportation problem in the shipping of weapons of war to Russia, China, India, and to the European theater of war. The elimination of Italy from the war will ease the strain on Turkey, with probably favorable results to our cause.

But, above all, the elimination of Italy from the war will release a large part of the British Fleet and a good portion of the American Fleet now in that area, both of which are now engaged in protecting our lines of communication in the Mediterranean, and in the watching of the Italian Fleet. The elimination of Italy will enable a substantial part of the British Fleet and of our own fleet in that area to be released for fighting in the Far East. The elimination of Italy will not only have an immediate effect upon the European front, but it will be of decided advantage to us in releasing British and American naval vessels that can be used against the Japanese.

This will also greatly assist our brave ally, China, where under great difficulty, the situation is improving.

On the China front, the recapture of Burma, and the reopening of the Burma Road, is of vital importance. Many things are happening in that battle area that must be kept secret. But one thing is certain, that the people of the United States have a lasting feeling of friendship and respect for the

people of China. After victory, China will play a major part in the post-war world.

I can also say without disclosing any military secrets that President Roosevelt appreciates the importance of the part China plays in the Far East theater of war, and that he has and will see that everything possible is done to give Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his brave men the maximum assistance possible. Increased aid is already flowing to China. Much more is needed. The difficulty is means of transportation.

The recapture and reopening of the Burma Road, affording the opportunity of land transportation to China, is generally recognized as a matter of primary importance. In any such future effort naval forces will have to play an important part.

We can, therefore, see that the release of American and British naval units in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean for service and fighting in the Far East might well be of inestimable assistance to brave China.

It took a great deal more than natural resources and manpower to accomplish these world-shaking feats. What it took, what made possible our great production progress, and what will bring about our ultimate victory, is the patriotism, the unity, the God-fearing willingness to fight and to sacrifice for freedom and for our country. Our soldiers have this patriotism and so do our industrial fighters, our home-front civilian workers, our farmers, our housewives, our boys, and our girls. They all know that there are no bystanders in this war as there have been in some previous wars. They know that the way to peace is through the combined efforts of everyone.

The home-front fighters as well as the men in uniform stand ready to make the sacrifices necessary to victory—long, back-breaking hours in factories and shipyards by many new and inexperienced workers, efforts to meet and surmount the dislocations in home and community life brought about by the need for more and more production, and the foregoing of useful and comfortable things which have long been integral parts of our standard of living. Our civilian fighters are making these sacrifices now, and they will make more, because they know that every act of wartime cooperation here backs up our fighting men on the battle fronts and helps to shorten the war's cost in money as well as in the blood of our young men.

Our duty on the home front is clear, in terms of the action that is needed. All of us must work for victory, in the place where we can do the best job and where we are most needed. All of us must put our money to work for victory, in War bonds and war relief. We must willingly assume any tax burdens necessary to the winning of the war.

All of us must waste nothing, and all of us must spread out and share among our people the necessary goods and services that are available. The more we save and share, the more there will be for our soldiers and those of our fighting allies. I do not need to labor the point that our soldiers must not be denied anything they need to fight—and a fighting man needs a great deal more.

No single one of our home-front sacrifices will win the war by itself. Our soldiers, brave as they are, cannot win without full support on the home front. Food by itself will not win the war. We must have weapons, too, and victory will come only through the successful interrelation and coordination of all the factors.

It is our Nation's policy to spread sacrifice as evenly as possible among all our people. There are bound to be inequalities based on time and place, but none because of favoritism by the Government. We are determined that no one shall use gasoline needlessly and for pleasure, when our boys in Africa, England, and the Solomons or elsewhere need that gasoline for their warplanes. At the same time we recognize that the sacrifices asked of most civilians, even though increased, are small and minor, compared with the sacrifices asked of our men in uniform and their wives and parents.

The measures taken to fight the war on the home front have caused many dislocations and inconveniences and some hardships. Some of these, perhaps, were avoidable. But you may be assured the steps that have been taken were taken because they were for the benefit of the armed forces and of the Nation—and aimed to help bring about more quickly ultimate victory. It is my confident observation that the public does not expect victory without inconvenience.

In short, the people are willing to make whatever sacrifice is necessary. But not all of us realize fully that a few careless errors of omission and of commission on the home front may seriously weaken our war fronts. I refer here to petty chiseling, hoarding of food, dealing with or operation of black markets, unjustified absence from war plant jobs, careless indifference, waste of money and material, selfish acts and attitudes, strikes or stoppages of production for any reason. Such offenses, even on the part of a small minority, can do much to slacken and damage the war efforts of all of us. I am convinced that our people soon will realize the danger caused by the few who are stupid or willful, and draw together their ranks to prevent such dangerous activities.

The housewife who realizes the devastating effects of black markets in causing an inflation which will cut her husband's pay check in half will not patronize the illegal merchant who bootlegs groceries at more than ceiling prices.

The worker who realizes that what he produces is an important contribution to the war, and everything, every service, whether consumed by soldier or civilian, is an important contribution to this all-out-war, the worker who realizes the importance of every hour's work, every minute's production, will not idle on the job, nor lose a minute from his machine.

The plant manager or superintendent who does not do his best to adjust working conditions to attain the best efficiency and harmony among workers under wartime conditions—he, too, must realize that workers are human beings, and that their contribution to the whole war effort may depend upon their health and safety, and the health and safety of their families and children.

We must realize that the war has not adjourned the social and economic problem of our country and our industries. It does no good for a worker to sacrifice his health through over-long hours, because that worker then will become a net loss to the war, to the Nation and to his family. We have need in wartime as in peace for job security, social security, recreation, health, and the other safeguards of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which make our labor and our industries the most productive in the world.

This Independence Day is an appropriate time to call attention to the fact that we are not alone in our fight for freedom. The United States has always been in the forefront in fighting for freedom, and independence and democracy, ever since we started on a new road in history 167 years ago today. But we have always sympathized with the myriad of peoples who have since then struggled for independence and democratic forms of self-government and self-expression, and helped them wherever we could.

This war presents again that same 1776 problem—independence against tyranny—for ourselves and for the whole world.

The United Nations, which became a reality 18 months ago have already become a fighting team of states waging a single fight on a world-wide front. We are pooling our strength, our manpower, our resources, our home fronts, and our strategy in whatever ways will most quickly and thoroughly crush the enemy.

The United Nations developed out of an immediate and historic need, symbolized by the treacherous attacks of the Japanese against us in Pearl Harbor and the Philippines, and by the Nazis' earlier, equally barbarous nvasions of Holland, Austria, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and other countries. We have learned that Munich and appeasement are not the answer. We must crush the enemy forever.

To accomplish this necessary task, there exists the United Nations, a vast group of people working toward certain common objectives, people who live on every continent from the Arctic Circle to the Equator.

The United Nations is the largest and the most powerful combination of nations in history in organization and objectives, and it is actually working. The exchange of goods and services, the many joint war planning boards, and the Combined Chiefs of Staff, are only a few of the outstanding examples of international cooperation accomplished through the United Nations.

It is important that this vast and advancing army of 32 nations is marching on to war and to victory, and, after victory, realistic efforts to prevent a recurrence of this destructive conflict.

The cry from all the peace-loving people of the earth throughout this terrible holocaust has been: "What can we do to prevent this from happening again?"

This cry was answered by our country, when our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the United Nations Pact of Washington, which expands and carries further into definite promise of performance the Atlantic Charter drafted a few months previously by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

The United Nations pact binds all 32 subscribing nations against aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise, democratic consent of peoples concerned in any territorial changes, the right of all people to choose their own form of government, and, among other things, a continuing peace wherein all persons may live their lives in a normal way.

In a speech made by me January of 1942 at the Boston Chamber of Commerce, I said: "America is on the march, tyranny will soon be on the defensive and on the run."

Seventeen months have gone by since I made that statement.

America has been on the march. Tyranny is now on the defensive. The spirit of the signers of the Declaration of Independence is not dead in this day. It is alive, just as virile, active, and determined for victory today as it was then.

The spirit "for God and country" animates our people. It is that spirit which I detected right after the Jap treachery and which prompted me 17 months ago to confidently state: "America is on the march," and to predict ultimate victory in our darkest days of the war. And after victory, let us hope and pray that men of vision and courage will represent the United Nations and any other nations represented around the peace table, who will view the future from a forward-looking angle, who will unselfishly lay the foundation for future permanent peace based on equity and justice, and recognizing the necessity of complying with and following the teachings of the great lawmaker and judge, God Himself.

That gifted humorist, the late Will Rogers, once said:

"America has never lost a war nor never won a peace."

This time, God willing, we shall win both.

Silver in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to offer any objection at this time to S. 35, which authorizes the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States. In view of the statement of the distinguished Speaker, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], that it is vitally important that this bill pass immediately and that it should be passed without amendment, I shall raise no objection.

It would seem obvious however, from the way this bill is presented, that is, at the eleventh hour, and without opportunity to properly consider the question or to have any debate, would appear to be proof that the so-called silver bloc fears the open light of day on this whole question.

As is well known, the Treasury Department only this last March recommended that the minimum average price of silver for war uses should be 50 cents per ounce. The War Production Board through its Chairman, Donald M. Nelson, and the Office of Procurement and Materials of the Navy Department also urged that the silver at this price be released to our manufacturers everywhere in order that there would be a freer flow of the material. We all understand that at 71.11 cents per ounce there is no profit to the Government since the difference between 50 cents per ounce and 71.11 cents per ounce will simply be added to the cost of war material for which the Government will pay. The only interests served by the price of 71.11 cents per ounce are those of the domestic silver mining companies represented here and in the other body by the so-called Silver Bloc.

It is true that today apparently they are condescending enough to allow us to have this vitally necessary silver for war and industrial purposes, but only at their own inflationary price. They further evade the question by practically telling us that it would be unpatriotic if we do not immediately pass this bill.

The only comfort I can get out of this whole situation is that finally some affirmative action has been taken in this silver question and in spite of the fact that there is no assurance here today that this question will have further consideration in the committee responsible for this legislation in the House. Yet I am confident that public opinion will be reflected through this body during this Seventy-eighth Congress and we shall make some real progress toward dissipating the so far invulnerable position of the silver bloc and delivering the country from this pernicious subsidy which has no excuse for being except that it has the strength to be. I am still hopeful that my bill H. R. 2955 to repeal the Silver Purchase Act will have favorable consideration.

Distribution of Power From Fort Peck Dam, Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I incorporate a news release by the Bureau of Reclamation quoting an announcement by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes on the distribution of power from Fort Peck Dam which began operations on the night of July 1. I join with Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, in congratulating the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Glasgow (Mont.) Chamber of Commerce on the occasion, which has peculiar significance for the district which I have the honor to represent.

Fort Peck power is important to the war industries of Montana and Utah in the present national emergency, but it will be even more vital to the development of eastern Montana and western North Dakota when peace comes. Through pumping water from the Missouri and its tributaries, Fort Peck power will transform desert wastes into productive farm lands which will enable these States to support a far greater population.

I regret that I was unable to attend the supper at Glasgow on June 30 in honor of the opening of the power plant.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to initiate and secure the appropriation in the House of $300,000 to install the necessary electrical appliances with which to develop electricity at this great dam. It is my hope and wish that the time is not far distant when the power facilities at this dam will be increased so that people on farms in northern, eastern, and southern Montana and other adjacent localities will be privileged to enjoy the use of this great convenience and comfort in their homes.

The news release is as follows:

The major part of the newly produced power at Fort Peck Dam, Mont., will be distributed by the Bureau of Reclamation to war industries in that State and Utah, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today on the basis of a report from the Bureau's Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore.

The plant, which has begun commercial activity with more than 30,000 kilowatts of capacity, was constructed and is operated by the Corps of Engineers, War Department. The output is distributed by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, under a congressional act approved May 18, 1938. Rates are subject to approval by the Federal Power Commission.

Acting Commissioner Bashore advised Secretary Ickes that Fort Peck power would have an important place in the development and utilization, in the prosecution of the war, of the mineral resources of Montana and Utah. Practically all of the power developed in these two States is hydro and the Fort Peck output is a further conversion of natural resources of the West into useful channels, Mr. Bashore added. In peacetime, the power will be used largely to pump water from the Missouri River and its tributaries for irrigation developments to be located in eastern Montana and western North Dakota.

The addition of power from Fort Peck Dam to the Bureau of Reclamation systems in the West brings to more than 1,875,000 kilowatts the capacity of 31 plants on reclamation projects or the output of which is distributed by the Bureau.

Mr. Bashore made public the following telegram he dispatched to Josef Sklower, secretary of the chamber of commerce at Glasgow, Mont., near which Fort Peck Dam is located:

"The Bureau of Reclamation extends its congratulations to the Corps of Engineers and the Chamber of Commerce of Glasgow on the opening of the new power plant at Fort Peck Dam. This occasion is one of great significance in the prosecution of the war, and it paves the way for a major contribution to the permanent development of eastern Montana and western North Dakota when the clouds of war have been dissipated.

"The power from this plant will be used in war industries now, and later will pump irrigation water from the Missouri River and its tributaries that will transform many thousands of acres of desert and sagebrush into productive farm land. Thus the Upper Missouri Valley will be enabled to support a much greater population than is now possible. The increased purchasing power in peacetime, which will come from the developments and the stabilization of agricultural regions now subject to drought, will be of tremendous benefit to the country as a whole."

Naval Uniform Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the Navy Department announced certain changes in the regulations relating to uniforms which, because of misunderstanding, caused some criticisms and uncertainties. In response to several inquiries and complaints from Members of the House, the Naval Affairs Committee inquired into the matter and on July 2 the Navy Department issued a new order which removes all uncertainties and basis for complaints.

For the information of the House, I am including the new order as a part of my remarks:

MODIFICATION OF UNIFORM REGULATIONS

The recently announced changes in naval uniform regulations have been modified in the following respects:

1. The wearing of gray or white shirts with blue service uniforms is optional.

2. Half lace (gold sleeve stripes extending only from seam to seam) is optional on sleeves of blue service uniforms.

3. The uses of plain-visored caps for officers of the rank of commander or above, and black braid chin straps for all officers, is optional with service uniforms.

Service dress blue uniforms may be worn on occasions where the wearing of white uniforms is appropriate.

Gray working uniforms will be worn when available. As announced previously, during the necessary transition period officers will

be permitted to wear khaki uniforms, now in their possession or manufactured, until the supply of these uniforms in stock is exhausted or until those in possession are worn out.

Welcome, Frank Gannett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Binghamton, (N. Y.) Sun of June 19, 1943, extolling Frank Gannett and complimenting him upon the purchase of the Binghamton Press:

WELCOME, FRANK GANNETT

Newspapers, as a rule, like to give the public all the details about any major real estate deal but when the transaction involves the newspaper itself, that's a different story. There is a natural reticence born, no doubt, of modesty and as a result some important facts escape attention in formal announcements of changes in ownership.

In the case of the sale of the Binghamton Press to the Frank E. Gannett interests, announced yesterday by the evening newspaper, one fact in particular is completely overlooked and it becomes the pleasant duty of the Sun to let the public in on something of real importance to the Triple Cities community. Otherwise nobody would know how fortunate the people of this section really are.

Mr. Gannett wasn't the only newspaper publisher interested in acquiring the local property. He was one of several bidders, as stated some time ago in the news columns of the Sun. Perhaps it is enough to say that if one or two, in particular, of these other bidders had been successful a type of journalism not wholly constructive—to state it mildly—might have been introduced here. And folks hereabouts know pretty well by this time just how destructive the wrong kind of a newspaper can be, how much damage can result from radical and sensational editorial policies.

Mr. Gannett's 20 other newspapers operating in this State, Illinois, New Jersey, and Connecticut, have never had the slightest tinge of "yellow" about them. They are conservative, well edited, and well managed. While all of them reflect the dominating policies of the central Gannett management and follow a fairly uniform pattern as to editorial expression, news content, features, make-up, and advertising, they are governed to some extent by local conditions and never depart from the first principle of the Gannett organization—wholesomeness and truth. The Binghamton Press, under Gannett ownership, will never become a "bad influence" locally and we might not have had this happy assurance if the deal had gone the other way.

As to the publisher himself, Triple Cities may well welcome him as an absentee owner who won't be absent too much of the time. He has long expressed, as a close neighbor, a lively interest in this community, an interest which has been mutual. Most people in this section of the State admire him greatly for his fearless battle to protect the integrity of the United States Supreme Court as well as for the soundness of his views on national and international politics.

Mr. Gannett and his newspapers have been vigorous in opposing governmental waste and mismanagement and the publisher never pulls his punches in his many outspoken expressions from the rostrum and in his editorial columns. Regarded as a strong national figure, not long ago a contender for the Presidency and even now prominently mentioned as the next United States Senator from this State, Mr. Gannett is bound to be a factor locally and a welcome addition to an ever-increasing circle of men of wide outside interests who are willing to sit in with our own civic leaders.

In its new status as Binghamton's only strictly independent and home-owned newspaper—for which we have to thank Mr. Gannett—the Binghamton Sun extends sincere congratulations to the new owner and to the present staff of the Binghamton Press with every good wish for continued success. Mr. Gannett and all of the executives of his organization will find a cordiality and cooperative spirit here of which we will be more than happy to be a part.

Where Price Control Got Off the Beam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Lawrence Sullivan from the July issue of Nation's Business.

It is a searching analysis into the ramifications of O. P. A. and a portrayal of the extent to which this agency has spread beyond the borders within which it was intended to function.

The article follows:

WHERE PRICE CONTROL GOT OFF THE BEAM

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

Office of Price Administration was set up originally to control prices and rents. Soon, however, its activities included everything from limiting inventories to prescribing manufacturing methods. To carry on its work for the coming year, it asked Congress for $177,335,000.

In April, when Office of Price Administration was just 2 years old, it submitted its annual budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943. Congress was shocked. The Budget called for $177,335,000—about $25,000,000 more than was appropriated for the entire United States Navy in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1916.

A number of men in Congress remember the Navy of 1916. It comprised 346 vessels of 1,500,000 tons displacement. Officers and enlisted personnel numbered 66,653 men.

No wonder then that when the Office of Price Administration budget reached the House Appropriations Committee, eyebrows were lifted.

"What are those fellows doing up there? Are their operations worth this much?"

These, as it turned out, were fair questions because nobody in Washington really had a clear conception of what Office of Price Administration was doing. Informal inquiry developed that Office of Price Administration itself was not altogether certain.

The thing had begun in April 1941, as the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, created by Presidential decree. On the staff were Leon Henderson and eight assistants. To begin operations the President allocated $75,000 from emergency funds. But the work expanded prodigiously. Every time one price was fixed another got out of hand.

The Price Control Act was approved January 30, 1942. In April 1942 the Office of Price Administration's first annual budget went to Congress. It contemplated an organization of 90,000 persons. The funds requested were $110,000,000. Congress whacked off $20,000,000. Then came the second budget asking for $177,335,000. Congress determined to have a "look-see."

Committee members were surprised to learn that the Office of Price Administration was attempting not only to control prices and rents but to specify the length of women's stockings, limit retail and wholesale grocery inventories, prescribe manufacturing processes for hot water bottles, define roast reef, and fix margins of profit in 56 industries.

Congress launched three simultaneous investigations of the Office of Price Administration—through the Truman committee of the Senate, the House Committee on Small Business in Wartime, and the House Committee on Bureaucratic Excesses, the latter headed by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia. Before these committees American businessmen for the first time were afforded a hearing on the obstacles the Office of Price Administration regulations placed before them. A spokesman for the apartment house owners of Cleveland charged bluntly:

"A personal opinion, which was developed from my contact with certain officials of the Rent Section, is that the men administering this act have sabotaged it either through total ignorance of the business they are charged with administering or deliberately with subversive intent. Eleven months ago I would have preferred to accuse them of ignorance. Today I am inclined to accuse them of subversive intentions."

In the same vein, Rivers Peterson, managing director of the National Retail Hardware Association, charged that Office of Price Administration regulations which attempted "to control every element of the trade" were forcing independent dealers out of business.

Earl Constantine, president of the National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers, testified:

"Misunderstandings, suspicion, and even malice are what we have experienced with Office of Price Administration."

In New York, at a mass meeting, 2,000 restaurant owners threatened to close their doors unless rationing rules were simplified.

In Virginia, a local real-estate board charged that Office of Price Administration rent control had reached "the point of confiscation and control of property without trial or due process of law."

Many complaints reaching Congress from the business community charge that confusion in Office of Price Administration orders flow chiefly from divided sentiment among the top administrators as to the ultimate ends to be achieved. Congress established Office of Price Administration as a price-control mechanism, providing in section 2 (h):

"The powers granted in this section shall not be used, or made to operate, to compel changes in the business practices, or cost practices, or methods, means, or aids to distribution established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any price ceiling established under this act."

TOWARD SOCIALISM

Instead of following this mandate, many Office of Price Administration administrators have seized upon the price control mechanism as a heaven-sent opportunity to reor-

ganize the whole pattern of American business along the lines of state socialism.

In some instances, they have presumed to reduce or eliminate entirely the normal margins of profit. In other lines, they have undertaken to limit inventories arbitrarily, and to prescribe standards in packaging and retail services. Amid all this eager reform, the major job of controlling prices often has become almost a secondary consideration.

Testifying before the House Small Business Committee, Rowland Jones, representing the National Association of Retail Druggists, thus presented this aspect of Office of Price Administration operations:

"We believe that the Office of Price Administration has much more important tasks facing it than an attempt to revolutionize any business or industry. The wide dispersion of activity by Office of Price Administration is responsible for its failure to deal successfully with the main issue and its main job—the control of inflation. Office of Price Administration has embarked upon procedures that constitute meddling in all the technical and economic details of management in 1,700,000 retail establishments."

Jones pointed out that, although retail druggists were frozen at their March 1942 prices on 99 percent of their volume, every item of operating cost, including wages, rent, maintenance, and inventory replacement, advanced from month to month.

"Office of Price Administration has allowed costs to mount to a point where the druggist has three choices: to lose money; to violate the law; or go out of business. We believe some fatalities among retailers are inevitable bu*, if the maladministration in price control is not corrected, the death rate for small business enterprises will be enormous. If not corrected, prevailing price-control policy will continue to grope in the maze of its own making; black markets will absorb more and more of the goods available for civilian consumption; and, in the end, the degree of inflation will not be less than it would have been had we had no price-control legislation at all.

"Only Congress can now clear up the administrative chaos that has resulted."

RETAILERS' MARGIN CUT

After freezing all retail prices at the March 1942 level, Office of Price Administration authorized numerous price increases at wholesale, forcing retailers to absorb the entire increase. On one biological chemical, an 18 percent increase was authorized at wholesale. But the Office of Price Administration required the wholesaler to notify each purchaser that the increase must not result in a higher retail price. This order cut the retailers' margin in half. By this device, several hundred wholesale ceilings have been lifted with no concurrent increase in the old retail ceiling.

"It is economic murder, so far as the retailer is concerned," Jones told the House committee.

In another case, a candy manufacturer was authorized to increase his wholesale price 6.25 percent. The order required that the trade announcement carry this language:

"The Office of Price Administration has not permitted you or any other seller to raise maximum prices on the sale of said item. In order that we may continue to supply you, it will be necessary for you to accept this reduction in your margin."

In this instance, the item in question did not offer an average retail margin of 6 percent. The net effect of the order, therefore, was to require the retailer to sell it at a loss if he offered it at all.

"In orders of this type," Jones testified, "the Office of Price Administration, in violation of the statute, says in effect that the usual and customary profit margins may be reduced at the whim of the bureaucrats."

In another instance, the War Labor Board authorized certain cigar factories to increase wages. The Office of Price Administration then followed with permission to 11 manufacturers to increase their ceiling prices by the amount necessary to cover the wage increases. But here again the authorized increase at wholesale was combined with a warning that the retail price must not advance.

Again, distributors were authorized on November 7, 1942, to increase their wholesale ceiling prices on six items on condition that retail prices would not reflect the increases. In case of hardship, the order provided that the retailer might apply for relief at his district Office of Price Administration office, "provided that such action must be taken not later than November 30, 1942."

In this instance, most retailers did not learn of the authorized increase until November 14. They then had 2 weeks to obtain local adjustments. Of course, no distress petition to the Office of Price Administration can be "processed" in 2 weeks. Usually 6 weeks is the best possible clearance time.

Another Office of Price Administration device authorizes concealed price increases through a reduction in weight or package volume. When the weight of one candy specialty was reduced 10 percent, the Office of Price Administration order stipulating that the old retail ceiling, originally fixed for the larger package, might be continued for the smaller. Here, in fact, is a 10 percent price increase passed along in the habiliments of price maintenance.

MUDDLED CEILINGS

For some undisclosed reason Office of Price Administration fixed a wholesale ceiling price of $2.50 per hundredweight for Louisiana potatoes. At the same time the Texas price was fixed at $3.75. Thus Louisiana potatoes trucked across the State line brought 50 percent more than when sold in the accustomed local market. These muddled ceilings diverted normal supplies from New Orleans to create an acute shortage there, while Texas markets were flooded.

"The fault lies solely with O. P. A.," Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana, told Congress.

"I read in the papers that New York City is without potatoes. Washington is short of potatoes. And yet tons of potatoes in the ground in Louisiana may never be dug, because they have a ridiculous ceiling price of $2.50. Either an ulterior motive is behind this whole thing, or it is based upon gross incompetence."

MORRISON presented a survey by the Louisiana Agricultural College predicting that, if the $2.50 ceiling prevailed, Louisiana farmers would put in no crop to supply early potatoes in 1944.

Since 1941 Office of Price Administration has established 48 industry advisory committees. In theory, each industry is consulted on forthcoming regulations and orders. Office of Price Administration then inserts a stock sentence in every price-fixing decree:

"So far as practicable, the Price Administrator has advised and consulted with representative members of the industry which will be affected by this regulation."

This language skillfully glosses the fact that, under Office of Price Administration regulations, the industry advisory committees may act only in a consulting role. One set of regulations governing the operation of these committees reads in part:

"It should be noted carefully, however, that committees are advisory only, and that all decisions are made by the Government."

Another section of these unpublished regulations says that the committees may discuss any subject pertinent to the war effort and "furnish advice and recommendations to the Government presiding officer when requested to do so."

The regular practice has been for the Office of Price Administration to draw up its orders, then call a meeting of the industry committee. The Office of Price Administration's section chief appears at the meeting, reads the regulation, and announces the effective date. The industry representatives have no authority to veto the proposal or change the effective date.

Similar testimony has come from many witnesses. In one instance, members of an industry committee were summoned to New York from all parts of the country, one from Seattle. At the appointed hour, the Office of Price Administration's section chief entered, read the new order, explained the theory behind it, and bowed out with the statement that he must hurry to catch his train to Washington. The whole performance did not require 20 minutes.

Twenty-two business managers had left their plants in 17 cities. Their combined travel expenses to and from the meeting were tabulated at $4,750. They had not been permitted even to discuss the new order to the extent of getting an authoritative interpretation.

GROCERS HARDEST HIT

Grocers, perhaps, have been harder hit by conflicting and overlapping Office of Price Administration orders than any other retail group. When Office of Price Administration began, there were roundly 575,000 retail food outlets in the United States. Today those stores still in business are governed by 29 maximum price regulations, 63 other price controls applicable at the processor, wholesaler, or jobber level, plus 10 general ration orders governing food products.

All of these regulations are subject to amendment from day to day. The General Maximum Price Regulation, for example, has been amended 160 times in 13 months; and at least 15 supplementary orders have been issued under it.

In one case, a general price order was issued on May 10, 1943. On May 13, Office of Price Administration indicated through the press that these price tables would be changed. While retailers still were re-marking their stocks in line with the May 10 order, Office of Price Administration issued the revised order over the week-end of May 14–16. In this case, the official text of the May 10 order was not available in mimeographed form at Office of Price Administration headquarters until about 5 p. m. May 13, although the text had been published in the Federal Register for May 12, to be effective May 10.

By making it harder to do business, in whatever line, Office of Price Administration has served to hamper, curtail, and retard production and distribution at a time when every energy of the Nation should be mobilized for maximum efficiency. This bungling already has imposed an unnecessary burden on the whole war effort. That burden may be removed by either an administration house cleaning within Office of Price Administration, or by a thorough job of legislative overhauling by Congress.

Every business interest acknowledges the need of wartime price controls. Every segment of the population is eager to cooperate in all practical and workable measures against inflation.

Price control can be accomplished. But the job demands some "know how." If Office of Price Administration cannot supply it, another agency must. American business has a job to do—to maintain the home front to victory. That means food, clothing, shelter for all. No one should be allowed to get in the way of that job.

We Should Pay Our Own Board Bill in Full

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, did it ever occur to you that the farmers' dollar from the year 1920 to 1942 was only worth an average of about 80 cents? Now, in plain understandable words, the consumers of farmers' products—which includes every one of us—jumped 20 percent of our board bill due the farmer during all that time. But now, when the large consuming industrial centers are asked to pay their board bill in full, a great howl is raised, and the President is persuaded by them to help them avoid a part of their food cost and pile the avoided portion on the backs of soldiers and sailors who will return victorious, and onto the backs of the children of all Americans for generations to come.

When President Roosevelt vetoed H. R. 2869, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill on July 2, he did just that. I did not and could not believe he would do this unfair thing, but it is plain to see this administration is determined to keep the farmers of America under complete control of the New Deal bureaucrats even while the farmer, his wife and children are straining every muscle to produce the food and fiber to win the war.

Mr. Speaker, it is a disheartening situation for our farmers, and every sound thinking American. Why cannot the administration see it is hindering production by all this regimentation and needless spending for subsidies and so-called roll-backs? All the farmer wants is a fair and equitable price at the market place, a price commensurate with the cost of commodities he must buy. Give him that and production will increase, then the greater supply will tend to keep prices in line. But, no, the big and little czars just will not have it that way. They scream "inflation" whenever farmers' prices are mentioned. Do they think all of us are so befuddled, as apparently they are, that we swallow their confusing theories, when they know that the greatest threat to stabilization is the inflationary printing of more Government bonds and paper money to pay the bills for all this nonessential New Deal waste and spending, to say nothing about the war expenditures. Why fool themselves? They are fooling no one else.

Hold the line. Bosh. F. D. R. by his own acts since 1933 has broken the line in hundreds of places in his spending spree, and when he vetoed this bill he again broke that line and should know it. I say the President has and is listening to the gang he has around him, his personally selected advisers and appointees, for whom he is solely responsible and who I have every reason to feel know less than nothing about running the home front. It is his own mistake and wholly his responsibility. All the freedoms wrapped up in the words American liberty and American justice, for which our armed forces fight and die, are being destroyed, and let me say here and now, we had better restore them before the boys come home.

Here are excerpts from folks in my district about this disturbing situation. I have received hundreds of like statements. These folks are not being fooled and they are not chronic complainers, as the New Dealers call everybody who dares criticize them. To the contrary they are all sound thinking, square dealing, patriotic American citizens who are worried about the future of their country. I direct the attention of the President to what these good people have to say, in the hope that it might help clear up a beclouded situation regardless of the fact that John L. Lewis demanded food prices be rolled back.

AUDUBON, IOWA, *June 17, 1943.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN.

DEAR BEN: I happen to be in touch with the farmers all over about 12 counties and wanted you to know the situation if you don't already know it.

Cattle feeders all over the country are not refilling their feed yards and are not going to unless feeder cattle are going to be cheaper or the ceiling raised on the finished steer.

Feeder cattle are being sold at about 16 cents and that is what the finished products will bring. Unless this situation is cleared up soon less beef will be grown than any time within 30 years and one of the largest shortages, instead of more beef, will be noticed all over the country.

BEN, if you can work to that end it will be one of the best services ever rendered to southwest Iowa. And I am sure every one concerned will appreciate your efforts.

Very truly,

L. H. MCCLAREN.

ELK HORN, IOWA, *June 15, 1943.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As an individual and leader of a farm organization, I want to inform you I greatly oppose the subsidy program and the roll-back price of food. As a farmer and producer of food, I feel I am being let down and that any efforts, hard work, and long days are unappreciated. In effect, my wages are cut down and rolled back while industrial wages, already far above parity, are being further raised.

I have a fairly large amount of livestock on my farm, some purchased at a high figure, about ready for market; and now to see those prices deliberately dropped is most discouraging. My plans for future production must be changed.

I much prefer the absence of expensive governmental red tape and receive a fair price for my products on the market.

I am not alone in this. There are many with me, and I urge this be corrected immediately before further damage is done.

Producers of food want and deserve a fair treatment. If we cannot have a fair balance while we are fighting for democratic principles, it just does not look right. It seems to me the subsidy program is a plan of kidding one's self and at the same time taking a beating.

Thanking you and yours,

J. EMORY FREDERICKSON,

President, Shelby County Farm Bureau.

AUDUBON, IOWA, *June 16. 1943.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: I have noticed for the last few weeks that the administration at Washington is attempting to roll back prices by means of a subsidy that will place increased burdens of taxes upon generations born and unborn.

To my way of thinking, this is about the most vicious and deceptive method of sleight-of-hand finance that can well be imagined. Just think of it, BEN, when practically every class in the United States is obtaining an income, salary, or wages that makes them more able to pay their way in the world, and at higher prices than ever before in the history of the country, and yet now the Government is going to pay a part of that price of commodities, and especially foods, and charge it back to the whole Nation and have it paid in the future by way of taxation. To me it is sickening.

You boys that claim to have some backbone in Congress, as I believe that you have, ought to fight a thing of this nature as you would a serpent. I believe if it is necessary to advance prices in order to get the value of commodities in harmony with each other or if it is necessary to advance them in order that each party through whom the commodities pass gets a fair profit, then advance them. What is the use of coddling the public and leading them to believe that you are keeping prices down when in truth and in fact you are advancing them? Better tell the truth and go forward and fight for it.

Sincerely yours.

CHARLES S. WHITE,

Attorney at Law.

HARLAN, IOWA, *July 1, 1943.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The sealed corn loans we signed last year carried a clause making loans callable July 15, but few farmers seemed to have noticed it, and are therefore much surprised to have their 1941 loans called June 30 and immediately have their 1942 corn loans called at a time when there is no assurance at all of a 1943 crop.

In fact the season is late and much of this 1942 crop may be needed by the farmer himself. A Harlan paper last week carried a front page editorial voicing the farmers complaint and I have personally heard many farmers complain.

As a concrete example I have bought back 1,168 bushels of 1941 corn. I have also on hand 2,297 bushels of 1942 corn which I will also feed this year or next, depending on the outcome of this year's crop.

It seems the Commodity Credit Corporation is playing into the hands of the speculators at the expense of the farmer, the farmers who have gone to a great deal of trouble and expense to provide a lot of extra storage, stood the shrink and paid the interest all this time.

So it is unjust that the farmers should be compelled to sell now and buy back later at an advance in price or sacrifice his feeders.

As Congress is the only body according to our United States Constitution that can alter a financial contract, I appeal to you to do something about this matter at once.

Yours sincerely,

CARL C. CARLSEN.

P. S.—Hope this "roll-back prices" doesn't succeed as I recall some serious consequences following such a procedure in 1920 and the dire results of 1932–33.

C. C. C.

FONTANELLE, IOWA.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN:

Instead of offering additional subsidies it is time now to abolish all such payments. Even pensions and other so-called security benefits may better be met by the States or by local governments, if not by local charity, rather than add this load to the heavily burdened Federal debt. The practice of loaning money to individuals from Federal funds adds to the burden and can well be stopped. The public must not be misled with those postwar utopian plans that call for further outpourings of money from the Public Treasury.

No one questions the necessary costs of the war. But now, while employment remains high, the present is the most opportune time to cut to the bone all nonwar Federal expenses. Rationing, price ceilings, and other forms of regimentation cannot safely be relaxed even after the war unless this is done.

The road back to a balanced budget may not be easy, but the reestablishment of a financially sound government is the only solution that can assure the people that their life savings will retain a semblance of their normal value. Thomas Jefferson has said: "I place public debt as the greatest menace of all dangers to be feared."

THE STATE SAVINGS BANK,
Fontanelle, Iowa.

SHELBY, IOWA, *June 28, 1943.*

Mr. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Office of Price Administration Director,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a producer of beef cattle, I am writing you in regard to the recent reduction in the wholesale price of beef.

During the winter and early spring months of this year we were urged by the Department of Agriculture to produce all the beef we possibly could as it was urgently needed for our armed forces and lend-lease and we were sincerely promised by the then Office of Price Administration Director that there would not be anything done by that office that would directly cause any financial loss to the producers of beef; so, as a patriotic duty to our country, we made arrangement to produce beef to full capacity even if we had to do it at cost of production.

Then, a few weeks ago, like a flash of lightning from a clear sky came the order to the slaughterers of beef to reduce the wholesale price of beef $2 per hundredweight, which in turn meant that the price of live cattle had to be reduced $1 per hundredweight, or about $10 per head. I doubt very much whether either Hitler or Mussolini would dare to impose such a brazen violation of a public trust on their people, although Tojo might do such a thing.

I do not know how many hasty and unwise actions like this it will take to break down the morale of the American people completely, but I do know this action has had a very unsatisfactory effect on the beef producers of this country. I do not like to write letters like this but feel that as a citizen of these United States it is my duty to do so.

Very truly yours,

F. O. PETERS,
Shelby, Iowa.

P. S.—I am sending copies of this letter to both Iowa Senators and Congressmen from this district.

War Information for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, during World War No. 1 those who were in charge of the information to be given to the public in regard to the war were often unjustly criticized, especially by those who were motivated by partisanship or for some other reason; yet I felt then that a very fine piece of work was done by those in authority.

During this present war, World War No. 2, a little over a year ago, June 13, 1942, to be exact, there was established by order of the President an agency of the Government designed to keep the people correctly informed on the progress of the people's war and to wage a war of ideas against our enemies to aid in hastening victory and thus save many precious lives of our fighting men. That ageney was called the Office of War Information, now familiarly known throughout the land as O. W. I. As its director, the President appointed a very capable and a very efficient man, Mr. Elmer Davis. Mr. Davis has had wide experience with both the newspapers and on the radio. And I think you will agree with me that when Mr. Davis was a news commentator that he was one of the very best. Personally, I was very much pleased when he accepted the appointment.

It is not amiss for me to speak about the Office of War Information—to give you information about it that I know of my own knowledge—things that you will be interested in and will be glad to know.

You have been hearing a lot lately about O. W. I.—some of it bad. Comparatively few people fully appreciate the tremendous job O. W. I. did during the first year of its existence. But our fighters in north Africa—thousands of whom are alive today because of O. W. I.—appreciate it. They know, from first-hand experience, that if the pen is not mightier than the sword, it is at least a powerful weapon in supplementing the sword's effectiveness. The power of well-directed propaganda was brought home to them when they saw tens of thousands of surrendering Germans and Italians streaming into our stockades, hopefully pulling from their pockets the leaflets that had been dropped behind their lines by the millions. Everyone proudly displayed his leaflet as if it were his passport to freedom.

Leaflets were not the only weapon that had been used with telling effect. The moment our troops landed on the shores of north Africa last November, O. W. I. mobile units with special field broadcasting equipment, printing presses, and other means of effective propaganda—staffed with experts in psychological warfare—were on the spot and went immediately into action. They stayed in action until the last enemy soldier laid down his arms in Tunisia. They demonstrated the effectiveness of propaganda as an important instrument of warfare, which, as Mr. Davis recently said, has been "recognized by military commanders all the way down from Julius Caesar to George C. Marshall."

But that instrument and the means of making it effective did not just suddenly appear, to be picked out of thin air at the moment they were to be put to use. Months of meticulous and secret preparations had to be made. Way back, when most Americans little dreamed that a north African campaign had even been thought of, O. W. I. experts were preparing the mental ammunition that was to prove so deadly. Working in the utmost secrecy, they were preparing leaflets, writing radio scripts, and making vitally important recordings for broadcast at the right moment, including President Roosevelt's words of advice to the French and other inhabitants of north Africa. There is abundant evidence that these measures bore fruit in lessening—and in some places even eliminating—resistance to our landing on African soil. How many lives were spared that otherwise would have been destroyed no man can say, but if the life of your boy or mine was saved by this action, I am sure you would agree that it was worth while.

Somebody may say that may be all very well, that perhaps the Overseas Branch of O. W. I. has done a worthwhile job, but that we do not need the Domestic Branch—that part of O. W. I. devoted to keeping our own people informed about the war. That is a popular misconception of the function of O. W. I. It is like saying, "Let's tell all the world except ourselves what is happening on the battle fronts and on the home front." The kernel of the whole O. W. I. set-up was that the Domestic and Overseas Branches should mesh together like well-oiled gears. The Domestic Branch, in addition to furnishing the information the American people need to win the war, is the feeder of raw material to the Overseas Branch. It goes to the sources of information, sifts out the inconsequential, resolves the conflicting versions of various Government agencies, and presents the facts in their true perspective.

If you want to know what the American people think of the domestic operations of Office of War Information, ask the man who knows from personal contact, not from hearsay. Ask the radio commentators, who could not possibly cover the multitude of scattered news faucets and get any sort of perspective for their daily broadcasts. Ask the hundreds of newspaper reporters how much time and leg work they have saved by having Office of War Information place at their disposal all the essential facts from which to write their dispatches.

The work of Office of War Information, both domestic and foreign, is so vast and has so many ramifications that I cannot begin to describe it all within the time limits of this address. I can only give you a few illustrative facts. The Domestic News Bureau, for example, serves the news columns of nearly 2,000 daily papers throughout the country having a total circulation of 41,000,000. It furnishes accurate war facts to another 1,380 foreign language papers published in as many as 27 languages. It supplies the rural press with information designed for their special needs, and gives special interpretations of the news for women's pages and the collegiate press. Besides, it gets out over 30,000 words a day to be sent to all parts of the country on teletype machines.

The domestic branch in its duty of keeping the people informed has three main objectives:

First. To eliminate conflicts and confusion in information that would occur if all agencies having to do with the war were to handle their own news;

Second. To safeguard the public interest by giving, as accurately and speedily as possible, the people all the news consistent with national security; and

Third. To enlist the cooperation of non-government agencies—newspapers, radio, motion pictures, and other means of telling the story of the war.

Untold savings have resulted in eliminating duplication by the various other agencies of government. By using specially selected mailing lists of trade papers it is estimated that there has been a saving of over 500,000 copies of releases by the Office of Price Administration alone, and over a million copies that would have had to be handled by the War Production Board. These are just isolated but typical examples.

By enlisting the patriotic cooperation of private means of informing the people, O. W. I.'s accomplishments have been even more spectacular. The radio networks and individual radio stations of the country have cooperated with the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. to the extent of donating broadcasting time that would have cost commercial advertisers at least $100,000,000—20 or 25 times as much as it cost to operate the whole Domestic Branch during its first year's existence. Newspaper advertisers have spent a like amount in carrying the message of freedom to the people on behalf of their Government. Besides, the newspapers and magazines of the country have thrown open their columns with unstinted patriotism to carry to the people the war information largely originated by O. W. I.

Of course, much of the free radio time would have been given and much of the advertising money would have been spent without the existence of O. W. I. but I think few people can doubt that if O. W. I. had not coordinated and given direction to the material it would have lost much of its effectiveness and sense of proportion. Such scattered efforts would have been like the story of the man who jumped on his horse and rode off in all directions.

Handling the daily grist of news—with its hundreds of separate items, statements, speeches and announcements—is of course one of the big jobs of O. W. I.'s Domestic Branch. But it is by no means all or the most important. The people cannot be expected to be informed about the war alone by glancing at a news item here or hearing snatches of a speech there. O. W. I. has done, and is doing, a superior job in going back of the day-to-day news, unraveling the skein of daily items and weaving a background fabric on various subjects to give the people a better perspective from a longer view. Such stories as O. W. I.'s round-up reports on transportation, air transport, drinking in Army camps and the like are cases in point.

My friends, the story of O. W. I. is an essential part of the story of the American people's determination to win this war of freedom—and win it as soon as possible. I am convinced that the Office of War Information is one war weapon we can ill afford to discard or allow to get dull for lack of funds necessary to keep its cutting edge in fighting shape.

I felt that it was my duty in the House of Representatives, for the benefit of the American people, to vote against the reduction in the appropriation for the Office of War Information, and just recently again when this bill came back from conference, it was my privilege to vote for the restoration of the greater part of the funds which had been reduced by the House in its previous bill.

The people of the United States are entitled to the very best and the fullest information in regard to the war—in regard to production—in regard to the domestic home front against inflation—and against economic disaster provided, of course, that it does not give aid and comfort to the enemy.

When this war is over, it shall be written down by the historians of the future that the work of the Office of War Information, Mr. Elmer Davis and his associates, played a great part in the winning of the final victory.

Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, here is more evidence of the terrible and almost criminal manner in which the food distribution problem is being handled, or I should say mishandled, in this country. We are supposed to be and actually are facing a food shortage, yet there is no market for "victory" potatoes. Why? Is it because O. P. A.'s arbitrary and senseless price ruling makes it illegal for a farmer or merchant to sell a sub-grade at a lesser price than the regular grade United States No. 1?

Certainly there are many thousands of housewives in the cities of this country who would be glad to purchase these "victory" potatoes if they were just made available to them. Why do the big produce merchants refuse to buy them? Why does the O. P. A. and the Food Administration permit these valuable food units to waste and rot in the cars when thousands upon thousands of people in this country are begging for potatoes to supplement their food rations? Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for this outrage, this sabotage, lies at the door of Prentiss Brown, Claude Wickard, and Marvin Jones. Theirs is the obligation and duty to see that this situation is promptly corrected, not only as regards potatoes, but also meat, butter, eggs, milk, cheese, and fresh vegetables—all products of the farm—all vital articles of food. It is the duty of these three gentlemen to put an immediate stop to this waste and to see that the responsible parties, no matter whom they may be, are summarily and severely dealt with. Failing in this duty, these gentlemen should resign. Mr. Speaker, I quote below an article from the West Carroll Gazette, Oak Grove, La., under the date of July 1, 1943. It speaks in eloquent condemnation of our present lack of system and use of common sense in marketing our food crops so there will be an even and uninterrupted flow between the farmer and the consumer:

"VICTORY" POTATO MARKET IS HALTED—23 SACKS RUINED

After shipping four carloads of Irish potatoes from West Carroll to eastern markets 2 weeks ago the local market is "halted" this week because "victory" potatoes are not wanted—only those which are classed as No. 1.

"Victory" potatoes are those which measure from 1½ inches in diameter up, while the No. 1 variety has to be uniform in size, C. M. Tillman, manager of the West Carroll Marketing Service, Inc., parish farmers' cooperative, pointed out.

"Last week an entire carload of potatoes stayed in the boxcar until 23 sacks of them ruined," Jesse M. Kees, parish farm agent, advised. "There was just no market for them," he said. "Not even the market in New Orleans will handle 'victory' potatoes."

Mr. Tillman wired Food Administrator Claude R. Wickard Friday: "We have been told that our Nation faces a food shortage. Our farmers have been told to raise all the food possible, and many additional acres of farm land have been converted to food production crops. However, we now face a situation of not being able to sell several cars of Irish potatoes which are spoiling on account of our not being able to find a market * * * this is very discouraging to the farmers who are bending every effort to help win the war."

The answer was: "Potato support program now active. Suggest you communicate with Lester J. Cappleman in Dallas." The wire was signed by Carl G. Wooster. A representative of Cappleman was here at the time of the receipt of the wire, Kees said, but the Dallas representative pointed out that there was no market in sight for "victory" potatoes.

Statement of O. C. Bailey to Subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1943, a subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives held a hearing at El Dorado, Ark., on the petroleum situation affecting the progress of the war. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement of O. C. Bailey, chairman of the Arkansas Oil & Gas Commission, made to that committee. It gives a very fine picture of the subject with reference to reserves, discoveries, materials, labor, and price. I commend to every Member of this House this statement as the problems there are no different from those in other sections of the Nation.

Chairman RIVERS and members of the Naval Affairs Subcommittee, we are honored to have the members of your committee here today and welcome the opportunity it affords us to present information needed in your study of conditions prevailing in the oil industry.

Your responsibility is a great one in the gathering, for the information of our Congress, the essential facts, bearing upon the available supplies of crude petroleum and its products necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. It is reassuring to see you use your valuable time, at so much personal inconvenience of travel, to appear here today in the acquisition of first-hand factual knowledge upon the important subject of your inquiry. No more eligible or equal method has been known to our Congress, or perhaps to legislative bodies of other free countries than the method we witness today of this most important committee of our Congress meeting face to face with the men of the industry in order to collect the facts for use as a guide in determining the legislative policies of our Congress.

The gentlemen who are to follow me as witnesses before your committee represent a cross-section of the petroleum industry of Arkansas. They can answer specifically any question that may be of concern. We wish it were possible to take you to our fields and show you the operating practices prevailing today, to let you see our repressuring plants, natural gasoline plants and the new remarkable desulfurization plants, wherein so-called "sour" gas is being processed and made available to the war effort.

I will attempt to give you a general picture and then to answer any questions that I am qualified to answer.

While Arkansas ranks ninth among the oil-producing States in volume of dairy production, the operating conditions reflect a true picture of the industry as a whole. Our production ranges from shallow stripper wells producing a few barrels of oil per day to high pressure condensate wells over 9,000 feet in depth. Drilling costs range from $10,000 per well or less for the shallow wells to $100,000 each for the deep wells.

Our oil production at the present time is approximately 75,000 barrels per day. Fifty percent of our production is refined by our seven local refineries and the remainder finds adequate transportation facilities through existing pipe lines, waterways, and splendid rail connections. Approximately 80 percent of the gas produced incident to the production of this oil is being consumed by war industries and other commercial users.

The utilization of this gas, which is commonly called casinghead gas, provides an interesting sidelight into the growing efficiency of the industry. The great majority of the gas produced contains hydrogen sulfide and other deleterious material. It is called "sour gas" and is found commonly in the Texas Panhandle, West Texas, and New Mexico.

Exploitation of the rich natural resources of Arkansas has been retarded due to a lack of cheap fuel. With the discovery of the tremendous reserve of sour gas (now estimated to be in excess of one trillion cubic feet) the best efforts of the industry, State and Federal Governments were exerted to find a means of freeing this gas from those things that made it "sour." After much experimentation, a way was found and now 13 war industries, representing an expenditure of over $500,000,000, are served by this sweetened gas.

Three large desulfurization plants are in operation or under construction, and at these plants not only is the hydrogen sulfide removed from the gas but it is saved as sulfur in its purest form. This same gas in part is used as new energy for our oil fields; that is, it is forced back into the oil-producing horizon and used again as a propulsive force in the movement of the oil from its reservoir to the surface. This gas supplies our refineries with fuel and powers the pumps in the older fields. Wastage of natural gas is unknown in Arkansas today.

The latest estimate on crude reserves of the State, as given by the Petroleum Administrator for War, is 295,000,000 barrels. At current rates of production this is approximately a 12-year supply. However, this reserve is not the same as bales of cotton in a warehouse or wheat in an elevator. It will take years to bring most of this oil to the surface, and the amount ultimately recovered has a direct relationship to price.

Our fields are being operated under the most advanced engineering practice known to the industry at this time, and the present rate of production cannot be stepped up unless new fields are discovered. We are operating under what is known as "optimum rate of flow." In other words, the oil is being produced at rates that will insure the greatest ultimate recovery by the husbanding of natural reservoir energy, commonly spoken of as "bottom hole pressure."

As the fields become older, water encroachment begins and to secure the greatest recovery, methods must be devised to combat salt water production, for a barrel of water produced consumes as much energy as a barrel of oil produced. This is a problem now confronting the operators in Arkansas.

On June 1, 1943, the Oil and Gas Commission called a meeting to which all operators with wells producing salt water were invited. At this meeting a Steering and Coordinating Committee was appointed to study the problem. Subcommittees were appointed for each field to give the problem detailed study. All of these committees are now at work.

On Wednesday, June 23, a hearing will be held to consider the application of the Carter Oil Co. to convert a well in the village pool to a salt water disposal well. If an effective means can be found to return the salt water to this deep reservoir, it will mean that production can be sustained at a higher rate than would be otherwise possible and the ultimate recovery can be greatly increased. However, this will add to the cost of producing oil.

We have a serious problem in maintaining production in the older fields of the State. Due to higher labor costs, shortage of manpower, and inability to secure necessary materials, many wells in the older settled fields are now reaching the end of their economic life. The rate of abandonment of wells has been accelerated in recent months. During the first 5 months of 1942, 29 wells were plugged and abandoned, while during the first 5 months of 1943, 61 wells were plugged and abandoned. On the 1st of January 1943, there were 3,178 wells operating in the State; on May 1, 1943, there were 3,063 wells operating. This indicates that in addition to the permanent abandonments many wells have been shut down and will be permanently abandoned later unless crude prices are increased to the point where they can be operated again at a profit.

The 1943 legislature authorized a study to be made by the oil and gas commission of the older fields of the State to determine which would offer practical prospects for the operation of secondary recovery projects. This study has been instituted under the direction of Dr. George H. Fancher, nationally known authority on secondary recovery methods.

In my opinion if present prices are continued for the next 2 years, in many of our older fields there will be so few wells remaining on production that secondary recovery projects will not be feasible and this reserve will be lost to the State and Nation.

The production in the stripper fields is owned largely by independents and also the independents do most of the wildcatting. During the first 5 months of this year, 47 wildcats were drilled in this State, 45 by independents and 2 by major operators. If the independents are forced out of business, it necessarily follows that the rate of wildcatting will decline and with it the number of new fields discovered.

Another factor retarding development is the inability to secure the necessary materials. Mr. D. R. Knowlton, director of production for Petroleum Administration for War, recently stated that the amount of steel allotted to the oil industry for the third quarter was about 25 percent less than requested. This is especially serious when it is realized that during the past 18 months the industry has exhausted the stock piles on hand when war was declared. I have talked to several operators recently and they advise me that they cannot get deliveries promised on casing or tubular goods earlier than September.

No prudent operator at this time is going to start a well until he has the casing on hand for completion of the well. This means that the drilling of many wells is being delayed until the operators can get the material. The difficulty of obtaining replacement parts is also affecting operations in the older fields. If an operator of a pumping well cannot get replacement parts, he has no recourse but to shut the well down.

Another factor retarding development is the burdensome restrictions imposed by some governmental agencies. These restrictions are especially severe upon the independent operators for they do not have the legal and engineering staffs necessary to fill out all applications and get the requests approved by these Washington bureaus.

Oil is the most essential of all commodities needed in the war effort. It is useless to build ships, tanks, or planes without sufficient supplies of petroleum products to operate them. For this reason it is imperative that sufficient supplies be allotted to the oil industry to carry on its operations and prices should be increased to the point necessary to produce the oil.

Rev. George Hildner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I want to introduce to the Members of the House the most dynamic personality I have ever met—Father George Hildner, pastor of St. John's Church, Gildehaus, Franklin County, Mo.

He is, paradoxically, an eminent clergyman and a distinguished agricultural scientist, and because of the contagious enthusiasm with which he attacks and solves seemingly hopeless problems he is frequently referred to as "Missouri's fighting priest."

Reared in the city, he has made his greatest success in soil conservation and in an enriched rural life and is also dubbed affectionately in Missouri farm conferences as "Alfalfa George." He radiates energy, inspiration, and confidence, and, withal, he is the personification of tact and diplomacy, and is equally versatile whether officiating as pastor, farmer, engineer, scientist, or financier in State conference or parochial service.

If my colleagues will visit me on my Missouri farm I will take them with me to call on Father Hildner, who is one of the most democratic of men and never

too busy in his crowded life to reach out a hospitable hand and I will guarantee them not only a delightful visit but a memorable experience which they will treasure through life.

In the meantime, let me introduce him to you through the pages of the Reader's Digest, in a notable article by Carroll P. Streeter, condensed from the Farm Journal:

MISSOURI'S FIGHTING PRIEST

Up and down the Mississippi River for 100 miles from St. Louis he is known as the "levee priest." Brother clergymen call him "Alfalfa George." His actual title is the Very Reverend George J. Hildner, Vicar Foraine, dean of the Franklin County, Mo., deanery of the Catholic Church. But the name that describes him best is "the fighting priest."

A jovial, energetic 210-pound hulk of a man, Father Hildner has fought flood, drought, ignorance, legislators, or whatever stood in the farmer's way. Never, until war came along, had he lost any farm boys to the cities. He had seen to it that they had, at home, jobs, education, and recreation. Never has a couple that he married been separated.

In his college days, 40 years ago, George Hildner was a star semipro baseball player; in fact, he was offered $1,500—big money in those times—to play one summer in the Three-I League. Right then he had to decide whether to be a second baseman or a priest. Priest it was.

When Father Hildner's archbishop sent him to Claryville, Mo., a village of 100 people on the banks of the Mississippi, he knew nothing about farming. But a good rural pastor, he felt, should understand the farmer's day-to-day problems and be ready to suggest solutions. So he subscribed to farm publications and studied the latest agricultural methods. The first building he put up was a chicken house, built from Missouri College of Agriculture plans, and he became one of the college's poultry collaborators. He got a flock of the best Barred Rocks he could find, took some blue ribbons at the county fair, and was soon selling hatching eggs at a fancy price throughout Missouri and Kansas. That did all the preaching about poultry that was necessary.

The Claryville area often suffered from devastating floods. In 1922 the roaring river inundated the whole valley. Father Hildner, clad in hip boots and oilskins, stood in Claryville's general store in water up to his knees, telephoning for help. Then, into the night, he helped load the barges which were poled to haymow doors to take aboard such hogs as farmers had been able to get up there.

"If you want to have fun sometime," Father Hildner told me, "try loading scared and stubborn hogs onto a raft coated with slick, slimy mud, by lantern light, in a high wind and pouring rain."

The only consolation farmers got out of the recurrent floods was that some good black dirt washed in from up north. But, the priest concluded, there must be some cheaper way to build soil—clover and alfalfa, for instance. So he launched a one-man campaign to get the Federal Government to build a levee. He gathered the necessary data and bombarded his Congressman with telegrams.

At length the Government agreed to erect a levee. But it would cost $3,000,000, and the local farmers would have to raise $450,000. The priest now had to persuade the people to organize a levee district and vote bonds. When that was accomplished he had to sell the bonds. He held 3 public auctions at the church, with representatives present from some 40 midwestern bond houses. With true rural-church instinct, he gave the buyers the biggest chicken dinner the women of the parish could heap on the table. When it was all over he had sold the bonds over par and had a surplus of $1,650—surely a record for church chicken dinners.

Levee districts along the Mississippi have been notorious for defaulting on such bonds. Plenty of bondholders have settled for 25 cents on the dollar or less. But not one farmer in the priest's district was ever delinquent on his bond taxes. This year the last of the bonds will be retired, paid in full.

The farmers' next need, the priest perceived, was livestock. "Why ship out all your corn and let somebody else make the feeding profit?" he asked. But these Missouri farmers wanted to be shown. So Father Hildner rented Horse Island in the Mississippi River, installed a tenant farmer, raised a crop of corn, and then borrowed enough from the local bank to buy 85 steers and 200 hogs.

"Cattle feeding is a risky business even for a fellow who knows what it's all about," he told me, "but somebody had to have the guts to be first." Fortunately the markets let him cut with a whopping profit. Since then the farmers have been feeding their corn and harvesting not only the cash profit but the manure.

Father Hildner also looked beyond his own neighbor's problems to those of farmers throughout the country. He was one of the little group who met with Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara to organize the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, which has become one of the most active forces for the betterment of rural life. He is now treasurer of that organization.

Nine years ago the Archbishop promoted Father Hildner, moving him up to the St. Johns'-Gildehaus parish in Franklin County, 40 miles west of St. Louis. Here he found that the farmers were trying to raise wheat in a hilly country better suited to dairying. Though they were right on the doorstep of St. Louis, only a few sold milk there.

Hildner couldn't stand that. "The day of the two-cow dairyman is gone," he preached. "Why not learn something about the dairy business and really get into it?" He showed movies, presented speakers, ran a complete dairy school. Both Protestants and Catholics attended the lectures and demonstrations. Then the priest organized a local unit of the Sanitary Milk Products—the big cooperative that sells 75 percent of all milk entering St. Louis. Today, through his efforts, Franklin County is fourth in inspected-milk production among the 60 counties of the St. Louis milkshed and first among the Missouri counties.

Wheat-growing had encouraged soil erosion, and the hills were washing full of gullies. When Father Hildner heard of the new soil-conservation demonstration areas which the United States Department of Agriculture was establishing, he succeeded in getting one located in Franklin County. The farmers learned about contour farming, strip cropping, gully control, reforestation. Furthermore, they still practice what they learned, and the farms they hand on to their children will be better than the ones they received from their parents.

Two years ago Franklin County farmers were hard hit by drought. They paid $25 to $30 a ton for alfalfa, when they could find any. On his way to a Rural Life Conference in Kansas, Father Hildner saw from the train window hundreds of stacks of luxuriant alfalfa hay. Grabbing his suitcase, he bounded off, made a deal for 500 tons, got back on the next train. When he reached home he formed a partnership, borrowed money at the bank, organized a caravan of trucks and went after the alfalfa. The cost was $15 a ton, delivered.

Partly as a result of the priest's efforts and partly because of the thrift and hard work of the people, every one of the more than 100 families in the St. John's-Gildehaus parish owns its own farm. More extraordinary, not one of these farms is mortgaged. The farmers have good houses and modern conveniences. Considering that Franklin County has hilly land of only fair quality, this is a phenomenal record.

Father Hildner has been as active in his social work as in his agricultural program. As his Archbishop puts it, "He has been preventing human erosion as well as soil erosion."

He is particularly interested in helping to make happy and lasting marriages. Like many another priest he gives premarital counsel to his young people who plan to marry. In addition, after a marriage ceremony, he gives the couple a wedding breakfast in his home, and that evening there is a reception or dance to which the entire community is invited. Once a year he honors all those who have married during the preceding 12 months by reading their names from the pulpit. "In such ways," he explains, "we make something of marriage. A couple can't lightly toss it aside after community recognition and a celebration like that."

This country priest finds that, valuable as premarriage counsel is, many people need advice after marriage. He doesn't pose as a marriage expert, but believes that good horse sense, plus 37 years of observation as a priest, is worth something.

His advice is: "Be genuinely in love. Don't let any quarrel last more than 1 day—and don't take it to mama for sympathy. Be neat and clean in household and person. Take out an insurance policy. Own, or struggle to own, something. Have a religious home. Have children. That's not a complete list, but it's a good start."

Father Hildner has a dozen community jobs—all the way from being county defense chairman, to playing Santa Claus at the Christmas program. "My creed for a rural pastor is to be all things to all men," he explains. "A pastor's mission is to live for his flock, not off it. I may not have measured up to this ideal, but at least I have tried a few angles."

Ban on Driving to Summer Home Lifted

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] for his untiring efforts to relieve the gasoline shortage in the East. On June 24 I sat in on a conference with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], along with representatives of the O. P. A. and P. A. W.

First of all, we asked O. P. A. to consider lifting the existing restrictions on holders of A gas-ration books. In other words, we asked that these people be permitted to use the small amount of gasoline available to them under the A book for whatever purpose they desired. This request was definitely turned down. I then asked that they consider allowing holders of A books to make one vacation trip to the lake, shore, or wherever they desired to spend their vacation, within the limitations of the A book. These representatives of the O. P. A. promised to take this request under consideration.

The result was the announcement just made by Mr. HARTLEY—that such vacation trips will be allowed. In all fair-

ness I should say at this point that Administrator Prentiss Brown seemed to be exceedingly sympathetic to the idea suggested to him. I am more than pleased to be able to tell you now that, this afternoon, I received an announcement from the O. P. A. containing the provisions by which motorists in the Northeastern gasoline restricted area, beginning July 15, may use their A rations for one round trip to a summer home or other vacation place.

I want to emphasize that in all other respects the nonessential driving ban will remain in full effect and will continue to be actively enforced. The supply of gasoline on the East Coast is exceedingly small, but I believe that the privilege extended by the forthcoming O. P. A. amendment will not be abused.

Before making such a trip, previously prohibited in this area by the ban on nonessential driving, motorists will be required under the plan to apply to their War Price and Rationing Board for a written authorization. This will be a simple form stating the starting point and destination of the trip, and the dates on which the trip will be made. Since boards cannot be supplied with the necessary forms until July 15, motorists should not apply to the boards before that date. This certificate will not constitute an extra ration. It will be simply a statement for the motorist's use should he be questioned about compliance with the ban on nonessential driving.

Vacation trips may be made only on the specific dates designated and only by the shortest and most direct route. Travel in disregard of these limitations constitutes violation of the ban on nonessential driving. A copy of the authorization will be retained by the board for enforcement purposes. Obtaining an authorization by false representation is ground for revocation of all rations and denial of future rations as well as being a criminal offense.

Before receiving one of these authorizations an applicant must satisfy his ration board and certify that he has sufficient gasoline purchased on A coupons in the fuel tank of his car, or has enough A coupons to make the complete trip. He must also give the board his speedometer reading at the time of application. Motorists making use of the authorization will not have recourse to further rations should they be stranded along the road.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on July 3, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, there is an old saying which I think is only too true, "That which you will not yield, you must fight for—that which you will not fight for you must yield."

This adage applies not only to individuals but to nations. I suppose it is the universal law that started with the first living things on earth. When one creature became so self-satisfied and contented with his lot, he became soft and flabby. He did not hold on to what he had for long. Some fellow popped up who was a little stronger, a little better equipped for the battle of life and took it away from him. Unless he was prepared to fight for his own in a most determined way, he stood to lose his possessions and even his life.

It is the same with nations. Hitler found Germany's neighbors weak and unprepared. They didn't know how to put up a strong resistance. They had become oblivious to their peril. Therefore these nations fell to the ruthless conqueror one by one. They fell because they did not believe they would ever have to yield their wealth and their lands. They thought they could hold those earthly goods by sheer authority of the law. Their mistake was to believe they were secure without first making certain of their strength or weakness.

Before long, however, the might of the Nazi aggressors will bow to a greater power, American might guided by right. While Hitler grappled with weaker adversaries and laid waste to Europe, we gained time to build a military and naval supremacy over all other world powers, friends and foe alike. We are now prepared to carry the war into our opponents' back yard. When the signal comes for the invasion of the Axis-held mainland, you will see the greatest array of armed strength ever pitted against a foe. This will be the attacking American armies pressing forward on a dozen different fronts. These armies supported by our fleets will win the war, because they have what it takes to be victorious.

But who makes up these glorious American fighting forces? Who are these heroes of wide acclaim who are every day showing the world that free men are superior fighters to slaves?

I'll tell you who they are. They're your sons and husbands and sweethearts and relatives. They're Jack and Joe and Bill and Mike and 9,000,000 other honest-to-goodness Americans. They're scattered over the length and breadth of the world fighting for this Nation. Some of them won't come back after this war is over. But most of them will.

Yes, most of them will, and you can bet they are going to look for the same kind of freedom and the same kind of home they left behind. There's not a man in service who isn't hoping every day and praying every night that this hell will soon be over, so he can return to mother or dad or wife or sweetheart. It will be a day of days when he comes home, too. The country will welcome him with open arms.

But after the fanfare and the tumult and shouting die down, what then? Aye, there's the rub. What then? The job he had is gone. Either somebody grabbed it or it just vanished in thin air—it wasn't essential, you know. So he has no job.

Has he any wealth? Hardly. In the first place, whoever heard of anybody getting wealthy on $50 a month? That's a joke. He probably won't have more than a few dollars in his pocket, especially after he has paid for his railroad fare. They just don't pay soldiers' transportation here in America, even though a lot of us have agitated for it.

Well, things can't be as bad as all that. Let's see. Let's look around. This soldier ought to be all right. All he needs is to go to his little home or farm and think things over a few days. Something will come up. But wait. Does he have a home? Does he have a farm? Of course, he hasn't. He lost his home when he went into the Army. He couldn't raise enough to cover the payments. He was sure the home folks could keep it up. But they didn't, and so he lost his home. When food went so high they exhausted the little they had to buy it.

There must be some hope, some way he can turn. What about a good job? Like the one he had before the war? He pounds the pavements for weeks but finds war work has almost ceased. Nobody is making any more guns or tanks or fighter planes any more. You see, the war is over, and nobody is interested in producing weapons. Let's forget about them until the next war is thrust upon us. There will be plenty of time then to prepare. The only danger is that next time the enemy may strike at us while we're still unprepared.

But we have left our friend, Mr. Ex-soldier, trying to find a job. He can't. He is stumped. No peacetime goods moving, no war production, although it will be needed even in peacetime, no chance to own a home or a farm, no money in his pocket, no future for him—so far as he can see. From 5 to 10 million other men will find themselves in the same boat. A condition like this will be no laughing matter for America.

My suggestion is to start a little post-war planning here at home. I think we owe it to our boys and we certainly owe it to ourselves. While we're thinking about what we're going to do after the war with Tunisia, Ethiopia, France, Poland, and a score of others, it might be well to give a thought for the future of our own sons in the armed forces. We ought to do some post-war planning right here at home and immediately. Whatever attention we give to other nations and it seems we are administering to their needs remarkably well. I believe we owe the boys a debt of gratitude which can only be paid by planning a future for them after the war instead of offering them the same uncertainty, the same hard going and despair the fighters of the First World War had to go through.

I propose, then, to call for the passage of legislation guaranteeing the servicemen a place in the sun upon his return after victory. He must not come home to a Nation which no longer gives its citizens a chance in life. He has the right to expect to be placed on the equal basis he knew before the war. And, mark you, he is going to have that place at home or know the reason why.

I suggest that Uncle Sam keep every soldier, sailor, and marine on the pay roll at least a year after victory has been won or at least until he obtains a job which returns him more than base Army and Navy pay. This will keep him from becoming desperate as the home-coming servicemen were last time when every door was closed against them, every job was filled, and no plans had been conceived for his future well-being.

Probably only a minority of the men would ever stay on the pay roll the length of time I have specified. After all, no man wants to live on below subsistence when there is a chance to make good money. And we should furnish the chance to every serviceman to return to peacetime pursuits as soon as possible.

By the end of this war, our production will be the greatest ever conceived by man. We will have facilities for elaborate and extensive war industry far greater than the rest of the world. We will have ironed out the obstacles, corrected our mistakes, perfected our production system. We will really be geared for war.

Why not then convert a large part of this wartime industry to supply the unlimited demands which peace will thrust upon our people? Why not put just as much effort into our post war production which will know no bounds if the American people are allowed to participate once more in the fuller, richer life which they most certainly deserve?

Our internal planning will be as important as any we pursue abroad. If we do it thoroughly we need not fear what is to become of the millions who will come back from the armed forces. If we plan unselfishly for our own people, we are sure to do right by the rest of the world. A man's treatment of his neighbors depends on how kind he is to his family. We must not fail our own.

Today our factories are filled with women, who are the mothers, wives, and sisters of our fighting men. More of them will be there before the war is over. But the vast majority of these women do not plan to remain in the factory after victory comes. When their loved ones return, they want to go back to their American homes. They will return to keep house just as they did before.

There is no reason then, why the jobs these women leave vacant should not be filled immediately. They should be turned into peacetime jobs, with as good pay as the present workers receive. The servicemen should be given priority over all for jobs converted from war production to the manufacture of consumers goods.

Even if only 50 percent of war plants were changed over, it is easy to visualize the construction of enough automobiles, radios, refrigerators, washing machines, and other household equipment to meet the needs of this country and the entire world. I hope the powers that be recognize the right of people everywhere to be happy and prosperous. If they will present post-war plans which assure our citizens of a higher standard of living and a greater measure of security than they ever knew before, it will be all right with me.

The men coming back from this war will never accept another world of greed and selfishness. They will be the power behind any regime or administration. They will represent a great force for good in America. If wisdom and sound judgment prevail in our treatment of them, the armed forces can be assimilated into peaceful pursuits with a minimum of confusion. If on the other hand neglect and delay persist in future relations with these war heroes, and everyone is a hero, you cannot expect other than unrest, violence, and serious results to the safety and well-being of our Nation.

I am sure we will profit by the mistakes of the past in dealing with our future veterans. I know you join with me when I say that the future of America is wrapped up in our boys at the front. Let us waste no time in acting immediately upon some post-war plans which will assure them jobs, reasonable security, and, I repeat, a place in the sun.

Federal Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Capt. John Schmidt to Clarence Streit on the subject of Federal Union:

JUNE 20, 1943.

DEAR MR. STREIT: Having read your books Union Now and Union Now With Britain, as well as various short articles and statements of yours, I should like to take this opportunity to express some of my thoughts on the subject of organization of the people of the world to keep the peace.

Since I read your books, I have talked over the Federal Union idea with many people. The reaction of the vast majority is extremely encouraging. The Federal Union principle makes sense to most of us, and it is the only system so far proposed that does make sense.

However, there are a few dissenters. Among the arguments advanced is the one that the problems facing us today if we attempt to accomplish a world federation are not the same as the problems faced by the founders of our own Federal Union when they formed our Government. The statement is undoubtedly true; but as an argument against attempting a world federation now, it is absolutely pointless. Since our own Union came into being, the federal principle has been adopted by numerous other countries: Australia, Brazil, Canada, Mexico, South Africa, and Switzerland, to name a few, all have federated governments. I am sure that no two of those governments faced identical problems in their creation; nor were the problems of any of them identical with the problems of Franklin, Madison, Hamilton, Jay, and George Washington. In no two instances were the situations alike, and undoubtedly there were wide extremes among the various nations named. Yet, none of them found the difficulties to be insurmountable obstacles.

By the same token, the problems we face today in organizing an international federation differ from the problems of other groups who have built federations. But our problems today are not insoluble, if we but determine to solve them.

When the question of the difficulty of forming a world federation is raised, I find myself wondering whether the aggregate difficulty is after all nearly so great as the one that faced our President and his military advisers on December 7, 1941. As has since been disclosed, after that historic act of infamy our Pacific Fleet was virtually nonexistent, most of our airplanes had been destroyed, and our west coast region was practically unprotected. Had the "yellow Aryans" known the success of their treachery, it is conceivable that they might have established a foothold on our very west coast mainland. But our leaders did not throw up their hands in despair, crying, "It can't be done; all is lost, all is lost." We all grimly got down to the business of making war as we had never done before.

Or take the British. I hope their problems as a nation are never greater than the one they faced after the surrender of Vichy France. They were without the tools of war, having left most of their equipment on the sands of Dunkerque. The immortal Churchill fired the determination of the British and the hopes of decent people all over the world when he said,

"Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, 'This was their finest hour.' "

I am sure, Mr. Streit, that the problems of organizing the world for peace are not nearly so difficult as the problems we have already faced and solved in saving ourselves from defeat.

Some folks I talk to object that the British will not give up anything pertaining to their Empire, and that the British will block any effort to cooperate with us. To that, there are several answers. One is that the British went into this war directly to help a third power, Poland. To be sure, indirectly, they knew they were fighting for themselves. But at least I give them credit for realizing that the cause of the immediate victim was their cause also. We in our infinite wisdom did not even realize that, but had to wait until we were attacked. The British know the value of collective security.

Another answer is that the British have suffered terribly in this war. They have seen their cities almost destroyed by unparalleled savagery, they have seen their children's arms, legs, or heads blown off by bombs that fell "where they were intended to fall." Truly, the cave dwellers of London have felt the terrible consequences of being too close to Germany I feel that they will not forget all that in a few moments, but that they will gladly cooperate so that they need not again bear the rain of death upon their heads.

(I am reminded at this time of Britain's offer to France of a federal union in 1940. But the defeatists had their way, and the French Government rejected the offer.)

I have heard, too, that Federal Union is not necessary to keep the Prussian military spirit from again setting the world on fire. But I think back upon how utterly defeated Germany was in 1918—even upon the hopeless outlook for Germany in 1930. I am not impressed by the assurance that, "this time," Germany will not be allowed to come back. We are kidding ourselves when we talk that way. England, France, and the United States were closely allied in 1918, and the United States fought that war to end war. But when the open necessity for the alliance disappeared, we could not agree among the three of us. Indeed, none of us could even find any unanimity of opinion at home. We were torn internally by social upheavals, economic depression made us reluctant to worry about circumstances beyond our borders, and we were in excellent condition for a Hitler to come along and unify the leaderless Germans. It happened then, and it can happen again.

The former three great allies were actually divided against themselves. The remarkable foresight and wisdom of our own founding fathers is in point at this time. In the second paragraph of The Federalist No. 6, Modern Library Edition, Alexander Hamilton wrote, as follows:

"A man must be far gone in Utopian speculations who can seriously doubt that, if these States should either be wholly disunited, or only united in partial confederacies, the subdivisions into which they might be thrown would have frequent and violent contests with each other. To presume a want of motives for such contests as an argument against their existence, would be to forget that men are ambitious, vindictive, and rapacious. To look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighborhood, would be to disregard the uniform course of human events, and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages."

Surely what Hamilton said many years ago is applicable now. When this war is over, the present United Nations will find many causes for quarrels, and while we squabble amongst ourselves, the next hopelessly defeated Germany will rise up at the bidding of another Schickelgruber; and slap us down one by one.

Note in the above quotation from Hamilton the reference to Utopia. Occasionally, someone refers to federal union as being a Utopian system. I have found it possible

to stop those critics by the simple expedient of asking whether they have read Utopia. The answer is always "No." I have read it, and can find no comparison. The Utopian system required a fundamental change in human nature. Federal union, on the other hand, takes human nature as it is. For example, federal union advocates know that no human can be trusted with absolute power. Accordingly, the federal union system makes the acquisition of such power virtually impossible. The system of checks and balances in our own Government is too well known to require explanation here.

In the face of rapidly rising sentiment in this country favoring our participation in world affairs, comes now the stern warning of an isolationist Senator, exhorting us to be realistic. Good. I am a stark realist, so I welcome the warning. To my mind, there is nothing so realistic as a corpse on the battlefield. To satisfy our realistic Senator, let us say, a stinking corpse on the battlefield. Just a few days ago, that corpse was a live human being, a man. He breathed, walked; he loved and was loved. Realistic, isn't it? Maybe he had two little children. Maybe they were curly little tow-headed boys like mine. When Daddy left, there probably were wonderings in their little heads. If those kids are like mine, they probably asked: "Where Daddy go?" Adding, "Daddy come back?" they were assured by Mommy and Daddy that Daddy would come back. Probably they repeated those questions at irregular intervals as the days, weeks, months passed, and Mommy repeated the assurance, "Yes, Daddy will come back." Then, one day, the inevitable telegram, "killed in action."

Mr. Streit, how would you explain that to a trusting little shaver only 3 or 4 years old? My older boy has a touching faith in my ability to fix everything. He breaks a toy, and brings it to me to fix. The trouble is that he does not distinguish between damage and total destruction. His faith in me bothers me, because I cannot always fix it. Similarly, his faith in my ability to protect him worries me. The air raid siren is practically in our front yard. The sound of that siren terrifies him. His little body trembles all over and his cries are nearly hysterical. For days after a practice air raid he says, "Siren not goin' blow today, no," as we put him to bed, expecting, of course, that I shall assure him that it will not blow. When I know there is to be a drill, I cannot so assure him, because I will not lie to him. When I am forced to tell him that the siren will blow, he is indignant, thinking I have control over it.

If I have that difficulty with him over practice drills, I wonder how he will react if and when the bombs fall. How the poor British, Russians, Chinese, French, Poles, Norwegians, Greeks, and all the others (the list is long), must have suffered in trying to explain the savage cruelty of an international gang of arsonists, thieves, and murderers, to their innocent children. It would be simpler to be killed.

But I digress, maybe. Let us return to our realistic Senator. He wants us to remember that, after all, the British, the Russians, and the Chinese are fighting this war for, respectively, Britain, Russia, and China. His fine sense of altruism finds the instinct for self-preservation repugnant. Let us look at the record. If our isolationist Senator ran true to form, he doubtless voted against repeal of the Arms Embargo Act (or so-called Neutrality Act), he voted against lease-lend. In so voting, he refused to extend a helping hand to people who were fighting for their very lives against unprovoked, sadistic aggression. He is in no position to point the accusing finger, and would do better to keep quiet. Also, he probably opposed extension of military service to 18 months from the original year. That was very realistic, inasmuch as it indicates either that he thought we would not be involved, or he wanted our boys to be insufficiently prepared.

Being realistic, I take note of history. I note that sovereign powers cannot exist side by side where their interests clash, without coming into armed conflict. I note that all attempts to solve the problem fail so long as sovereignty remains unlimited. Evidence is the long history of the failure of alliances, treaties, and leagues, to keep the peace. As soon as sovereignty is limited, people get along very well, as in a Federal Union.

No, I have not overlooked our own so-called Civil War. It is not an instance of failure of the Federal Union principle. That war had to be fought to decide whether or not members of the Union had the right to secede. The Union victory decided the issue, and it will probably never again be raised.

Occasionally I hear the argument that we must not mention Federal Union to the people in just those terms, because that might frighten them away from the whole subject of collective security and international cooperation. Whether or not that is true is a question of fact, and the question is not answered by loud assertions of the people on either side of the question. But I would approach that question in this way: The Federal Union idea makes sense to sensible people; other systems do not. The people of the United States of America are fundamentally sensible folks. Therefore, Federal Union will make sense to them.

I have a lot of faith in the common people. I consider myself one of them. I have faith in the ability of the people to understand the basic principles of Federal Union. I am confident that I could go to the people directly and tell them about Federal Union, and that the large majority of them would see it as readily as Benjamin Franklin, Jefferson, Hamilton, Washington, and the others saw it. I believe I could do this in spite of the combined efforts of the demagogs, isolationists, imperialists, reactionaries, and all other opposition, who will throw up their hands in horror at the thought of the people of the United States giving up any of their national sovereignty, and they will try to make out that the people will thereby give up certain inalienable rights. One of those rights that the opposition will conveniently forget to mention is our right to be shot at and bombed every 20 years or so. That right we enjoy to the full under present world anarchy. The people are beginning to see through these "phonies." The people are more intelligent than most of our misinformed, self-styled public leaders. It should take very little argument to show them that the man who shouts the loudest about not surrendering any of the people's rights is usually one of the first to deprive them of those rights. Hitler and Mussolini are cases in point. On this point it is interesting to realize that demagogs we have always with us, and they will eternally harp on the subject of the rights of the common man. Alexander Hamilton recognized this in the Federalist No. 1, wherein he wrote:

"A dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the specious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics the greatest number have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the people, commencing demagogs and ending tyrants."

Moreover, I should have no fear in taking Federal Union to our people for their approval, because it is as American as the hot dog. It is our own history, our own national existence, and as such will appeal to them.

Once in a while I get the impression that someone thinks I was born with a prejudice in favor of Federal Union. But I still remember the critical frame of mind in which I approached your book Union Now. I, too, thought then it was a fine thing for the theorists, but not for a practical person like me. But since reading your treatment of the idea, I have been firmly convinced of the practicality of Federal Union as applied to the world. The amazing part of it all is the simplicity of the basic principles of Federal Union. Surely the people can understand it and will support it.

When I hear league advocates argue in favor of another League of Nations instead of a Federal Union, I keep thinking of Alexander Hamilton's oft-repeated reference to a league as an imbecility. Understand, of course, I do not refer to the League advocates as imbeciles. It is more becoming in me to let Hamilton do that.

Hamilton had good reason for such a statement. A league is a government of nations instead of a government of men. Of this system he wrote in the Federalist No. 15:

"Government implies the power of making laws. It is essential to the idea of a law, that it be attended with a sanction; or, in other words, a penalty or punishment for disobedience. If there be no penalty annexed to disobedience, the resolutions or commands which pretend to be laws will, in fact, amount to nothing more than advice or recommendation. This penalty, whatever it may be, can only be inflicted in two ways: by the agency of the courts and ministers of justice, or by military force; by the coercion of the magistracy, or by the coercion of arms. The first kind can evidently apply only to men; the last kind must of necessity, be employed against bodies politic, or communities, or states. It is evident that there is no process of a court by which the observance of the laws can, in the last resort, be enforced. Sentences may be denounced against them for violations of their duty; but these sentences can only be carried into execution by the sword. In an association where the general authority is confined to the collective bodies of the communities that compose it, every breach of the laws must involve a state of war; and military execution must become the only instrument of civil obedience. Such a state of things can certainly not deserve the name of government, nor would any prudent man choose to commit his happiness to it."

And at the end of the Federalist No. 20:

"A sovereignty over sovereigns, a government over governments, a legislation for communities, as contradistinguished from individuals, as it is a solecism in theory, so in practice it is subversive of the order and ends of civil polity, by substituting violence in place of law, or the destructive coercion of the sword in place of the mild and salutary coercion of the magistracy."

A recent suggestion by a midwest isolationist source of wisdom propounds that we accomplish Federal Union by admitting the British Commonwealth of Nations as States of our own United States. This is not a good-faith suggestion, but sounds like a deliberate attempt to discredit, undermine, and sabotage the whole Federal Union movement. A comparable offer would be for the British to suggest that we become a British dominion. But imagine the cries of horror that would bring from the isolationists. They would excitedly exclaim, "See? The damned British! Always trying to dominate."

Some people cannot understand why I get excited about Federal Union, and even accuse me of being almost evangelistic on the subject. I am honored to be in the uniform of the armed forces of my country, because I am fighting for the same liberties today—freedom of speech, religion, the press, conscience, etc.—as the great men of history have fought for. I shall never be great in the sense that children will read of me in the history books,

but I cannot be so small as to deny the dignity of man. This is my war as much as it is the war of the Chinese, the Russians, the French, or the British. But not being a Nazi, I have no use for any nonsense about the glories of war. War subjects the human soul to the meanest sort of indignity. And I see in Federal Union the opportunity to eliminate war.

Yes; I do get excited about Federal Union.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SCHMIDT,
Arlington, Va.

Report and Program Submitted by the United Labor Committee Executive Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report and program submitted by the United Labor Committee Executive Board and adopted by the delegate conference in St. Louis, Mo., on June 30, 1943:

A CALL TO ACTION

Since the call for this conference went out, the drive against price control in Congress has reached heights which place before this conference of labor and other civic-minded groups the responsibility for immediate, urgent action to save the home front from economic collapse. Over and beyond the need to win the President's price-roll-back program, we face the danger of a complete scrapping of all checks on inflation, which would not only mean acute hardship for all of us but would stab our armies in the back at the very moment when they are ready for the final drive against our Axis enemies. Our country's war effort is in acute danger of defeat by the wreckers at home.

THE COST-OF-LIVING FACTS

Every consumer knows from personal experience what has happened to the cost of living. Official figures show that it is 25 percent above January 1941. Food costs in St. Louis in April are shown to be 43 percent above January 1941, 51 percent over August 1939, when the war started in Europe. Actual increases are greater than these figures show, and present price ceilings will allow further increases. Against this cost-of-living increase, which does not take increased taxes into account, organized workers have been allowed wage increases of 15 percent over January 1941. Millions of unorganized workers, and particularly office workers and teachers, have received much less than 15 percent; many have received no increase at all.

The cost of living has gone up steadily since May 1942, when it was supposed to be stabilized, and again since September 15, 1942, when the supposed stabilization of prices was written into law.

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

We recognize that the Office of Price Administration has tried to do the job. We recognize also its manifest shortcomings, its weakness in enforcement, its long delays in establishing dollars and cents price ceilings, the fact that it has set ceilings much too high, the appointment to Office of Price Administration positions of many business officials devoted chiefly to sabotage of price control, the constant appeasement by Office of Price Administration of all the enemies of price control.

However, at this time Office of Price Administration is making an honest effort to carry out a real program. It is idle to consider the details of Office of Price Administration's weaknesses when these weaknesses merely reflect the fact that defeatists and special interests have organized effectively to block price control. The enemies of price control, working in and through Congress, appear to be on the verge of achieving the complete destruction of all price control. Only the common people, aroused to the country's danger, can turn the tide against inflation and for victory on the home front, essential to military victory.

CONGRESS SEEKS INFLATION

Whatever may be the motives of individual Members, both Houses of Congress have just taken action which can result only in uncontrolled inflation. They have forbidden subsidies and standardized grades (grade labeling), exactly those essential elements of price control which have proved their necessity and their effectiveness in the experience of our British allies.

Both the Senate and House have forbidden the use of subsidies to processors, despite the proved fact that such subsidies save many times their cost to the Nation. Both Houses would turn the main functions of price control over to Chester Davis, who has shown conclusively that he wants prices to rise. The House has gone further by proposing to forbid grade labeling, to turn the Office of Price Administration over to representatives of the Food Trust, and to cut Office of Price Administration funds for enforcement purposes by 45 percent.

The House program would destroy the Office of Price Administration now, but the Senate action on subsidies alone would achieve the same effect before long. Subsidies are needed, not only for a roll-back, but for any price control, since farm prices are not yet subject to real control. Defeat of the subsidy program would simply mean a vicious circle of pressure for constantly higher prices—one price increase pushing up another.

THE DANGER TO THE WAR EFFORT

Unchecked inflation today represents the greatest single threat to victory in the war because it would demoralize war workers and the whole civilian population, create tremendous unrest, if not chaos, on the home front, deprive our fighting men of the all-out support which they need as they attack the enemy, and set the stage for the reactionaries who would rather do business with Hitler than build democracy at home. We must look at this threat as part of a whole series of developments in recent weeks which the Senate War Mobilization Committee a few days ago described as "a further deterioration of the domestic war effort."

We have had the John L. Lewis strike over the opposition of the whole labor movement, and Lewis is an admitted advocate of inflation; the resultant ability of the reactionaries to enact the Connally-Smith bill, a strike-provoking measure, over the President's courageous veto; the current strike of meat packers, a strike just as treasonable as that of Lewis; the wave of race riots in major war-production centers, obviously with Fascist support; and the wholesale attack by the House of Representatives on important war services, such as the Office of War Information, the National Youth Administration, and the Office of Civilian Defense on the same day that it sought to wreck price control.

Undoubtedly, most of the Members of Congress want to win the war. But whether because of an antilabor bias or the pressure of special interests who put profits first and do not understand the real interests of the Nation, the majority of the Members in Congress today are giving active aid to Hitler at a time when he has his back to the wall and is fighting desperately to stop or weaken the coming invasion of Europe. Continued activity of this kind on the home front can save Hitler and bring disaster to this Nation.

The fight to save price control is a fight to win the war. To date support for real price control has come mainly from the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Railroad Brotherhoods, and consumer groups. The fight has suffered from lack of organized leadership in Congress. A major step forward has just been taken by the formation of the Congressional Committee for the Protection of Consumers now numbering about 50 Members of the House. This committee last Friday held its first meeting with representatives of labor and consumer organizations from all over the country. The secretary of the United Labor Committee was one of several hundred delegates present. The committee's program is in effect our program. It is our job to rally backing for the committee and to demand that our Representatives support it.

WHAT IS NEEDED FOR EFFECTIVE PRICE CONTROL

1. Subsidies

The subsidy program is the key issue in price control. The most vicious opponents of price control, the defeatist leaders of the misnamed "farm bloc," have made it clear that what they want is unchecked price rises and unlimited profits. That is the demand of Herbert Hoover, veiled behind a lot of confusing words. The reaction of the very practical Chicago grain market to the Senate action against subsidies was much clearer than the speeches in the Senate. According to the Associated Press on June 26, the day after the Senate vote, "moves to make War Food Administrator Davis food czar and Senate passage of a bill prohibiting any further price-reducing subsidies combined to fire speculative enthusiasm."

Subsidies would stop this speculation, and thereby save many times their cost. Any one subsidy would reduce the retail price by more than the amount of subsidy. Since the ceiling at each step from processor to consumer is based on a percentage mark-up over the ceiling at the previous step, the saving at the retail level is substantially more than the amount of subsidy paid at the processor level. More important is the fact that subsidies would have to be paid only to a small part of the processors who are unable to operate at a profit because investigation would show that most of the processors are making huge profits even at reduced prices. This is the very thing which the food trust does not want. It would expose their false cries of financial difficulty with which they are trying to hold up the American people and the war effort.

The "proof of the pudding" is given in the experience of Great Britain and Canada. By spending about $500,000,000 a year, less than 3 percent of the total budget, Britain has stabilized food prices so that on January 1, 1943, the food index was actually four points lower than on April 1, 1941. While this may not take into account some hidden price rises through lower qualities, the fact is that Great Britain has effectively stabilized its cost of living through subsidies. The same is true in Canada.

The food profiteers carry on their campaign against price control in the name of protect- a time when he has his back to the wall and tually are seeking greater profits at the expense of both farmer and retailer and of the whole war effort.

The small storekeepers, as distinguished from the chain operators who are part of

the Food Trust, are actually in favor of price control, provided they can be protected against extortion by the processors and wholesalers.

We must recognize that the farm bloc has been able to sell a bill of goods to many genuine farmers, since such a legitimate organization as the Missouri Farmers Association has come out against subsidies. These honest and patriotic farmers evidently overlook the fact that we are in a war economy in which the ordinary market controls do not work. It is just as necessary and fair to check the profits of the food trust as to limit wages, and it is to the direct interest of the farmers. By using subsidies to regulate the prices of processors, it is possible to insure a fair return for the farmer at one end, and protect the retailer and the consumer at the other end, instead of letting the food trust gouge the farmer and everybody else. And the farmer, as a consumer, has just as much at stake as the rest of the people in checking inflation. Small farmers also would be aided directly by subsidies where needed.

Subsidies are and have been in effect in numerous forms to aid industry and commerce. They are opposed now by the defeatists and profiteers, only when they would help the consumer and the whole Nation.

2. Grade labeling

Since brand names and qualities can be and are changed at will, ceilings on branded goods are meaningless without grade labeling. A study of the British experience by the very conservative Brookings Institution found that "standardization and classification are essential for successful price control of products normally characterized by many grades and qualities. In the absence of such measures * * * consumers are unable to distinguish moderate variations between grades or are afraid of losing their source of supply if they protest."

The attack on grade labeling is simply an effort by canners and manufacturers to evade all price restrictions.

3. Dollars and cents ceilings on all cost-of-living items

Price ceilings can be enforced, quite obviously, only if they are clearly understood by the general public. The proposal to return to an elaborate system of mark-ups is simply a proposal to make price control unworkable. The Office of Price Administration should immediately complete the issuance of dollars and cents ceilings, and correct those which are too high. Violators of ceilings should be treated by the Government and by the community as saboteurs of the war effort.

4. Continued rent control

Rent control has been the most effective part of the Office of Price Administration program. In the critical housing situation in St. Louis, rent control has saved vast sums of money for the average citizen. The records prove that the real estate owners have continued to make a fair return. The vicious campaign against rent control has been conducted by real estate speculators led by Cyrus Crane Willmore of St. Louis, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. This attack must be stopped.

5. A strengthened Office of Price Administration supported actively by the public

The enemies of price control have carefully confused the picture by creating a false issue, of the supposed need of a food czar, or food manager in Herbert Hoover's latest words. They have shown what they really want by seeking to place price control in the hands of Chester Davis, who wants higher prices. We hail President Roosevelt's action in forcing Mr. Davis' resignation.

All the other enemies of price control should be removed from the administration, and specifically from Office of Price Administration.

Office of Price Administration must be built up with a personnel completely devoted to price control, and then allowed to function. It must demand and obtain appropriations adequate for real enforcement. It must have the power to investigate the operations of the food processors and compel them to deliver supplies where needed. It must be able to end the withholding of supplies from the market as in the present meat-packers' strike.

The Office of Price Administration must receive the active backing of the public in the checking of price violations, the public participation which made real price control possible in England. The citizens of St. Louis can make their influence felt directly on stores which violate ceilings and in particular on such unpatriotic influences as the St. Louis Meat Packers Association and Mr. Willmore.

We must also demand that the mayor and the city administration assume their responsibility in this vital community problem, and act vigorously to prevent price violations and food shortages, whether artificial or real.

A PROGRAM OF ACTION

To give effect to the above price-control program for victory on the home front, it is necessary that the people of St. Louis organize to make themselves heard now, and first of all by Congress. We propose:

1. Petition campaign

Petitions summarizing the demand for necessary price-control action, to be addressed to Congress, should be prepared and circulated immediately for signature by all union members and by the general public.

2. Warn our Congressmen

The people of St. Louis must put their Representatives in Congress on notice that they will be judged at the polls not on their lip service to the war but on what they have done specifically in the interests of the war. They will be judged specifically on their record on the vital question of price control.

We call the attention of the delegates now to the available record of the two Missouri Senators and the St. Louis Congressmen.

Senator CLARK was the author of a bill to forbid roll-back subsidies. He has supported farm subsidies, but voted for the Byrd amendment to transfer the functions of Farm Security Administration, with its excellent record of aid to small farmers, to the Farm Credit Administration, dominated by the farm bloc. He worked against the President's veto of the vicious Bankhead bill.

Senator TRUMAN, after supporting the President's veto of the Bankhead bill and supporting Farm Security Administration, spoiled a fair record by voting for the amendment to bar roll-back subsidies.

Congressman PLOESER has been campaigning actively against price control as a member of the House Small Business Committee. He joined in the broadside attack on price control in the House action on June 19. He voted against farm-subsidy payments.

Congressman MILLER also joined the House attack on price control and was against farm-subsidy payments.

Congressman COCHRAN has been absent from most all votes on this issue, because of illness.

It is evident that our Representatives have not heard from us effectively. In seeing to it that our Representatives respond to our demands, we must make full use of the machinery of the new congressional committee for the protection of the consumer.

3. Use union funds for price-control fight

Unions have set aside the strike weapon for the duration. Price control is the most important fight they can carry on for their members on the home front. They should be prepared to draw upon their reserve funds for this fight.

4. Participate in enforcement

Even if the Office of Price Administration is adequately staffed, effective enforcement will still need action by the consumers. The price-control law provides for court action by individual consumers. We propose that unions with permanent headquarters be enlisted as price-control headquarters on a neighborhood basis, where all residents of the community can report violations. A union committee would then investigate the complaints and assist in taking the case to court. The same union committees would set up their own price police system on a neighborhood basis.

5. Committee for ward action on price control

We propose that the officers of the United Labor Committee designate active union leaders residing in each ward and in each township in the county to organize, along with officers of other organizations in those wards, committees to direct the application of this entire program on a ward and township basis. The work of these committees should be supervised by a top committee consisting of the United Labor Committee Executive Board and a representative of each organization subscribing to this program.

6. Work with the farmers

We propose that the top committee set up under point five approach the Missouri Farmers Association, Missouri Grange, and Missouri Farm Bureau Federation with a view to reaching a common understanding on our common problems, and joint action in support of effective price control, adequate returns for the farmer, and production of food for victory.

Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a table of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture which shows the appropriations from all sources for 1942 and 1943 and the appropriations which will be available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1944.

The table is itemized in such fashion as to indicate amounts which will be available for all of the various activities of the Department and should prove helpful to Members as reference information.

I want to express my appreciation to the very able and efficient budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. William A. Jump, and his staff for compiling this information:

Subappropriation table of appropriations from all sources, fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944

[NOTE.—Figures in brackets not included in totals; 1942 and 1943 columns adjusted on basis of appropriation set-up in 1944 act, and include supplemental appropriations]

Bureau and item	Appropriations, 1942	Appropriations, 1943	Appropriations, 1944
Office of the Secretary	$1,841,704	$1,673,588	[1] $1,498,184
Working capital fund			400,000
Office of Solicitor	2,229,643	1,976,433	[1] 1,679,105
Office of Information:			
Salaries and expenses	641,781	546,038	[1] 439,257
Printing and binding	1,550,111	1,300,000	1,200,000
Reproduction of 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture			178,000
Total, Library	[2,191,892]	[1,846,038]	[1,817,257]
Library	486,318	469,007	468,932
Extension service:			
Payments to States:			
Capper-Ketcham extension work	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000
Additional cooperative extension work	555,000	555,000	555,000
Extension work, sec. 21, Bankhead-Jones Act	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
Alaska	23,918	23,950	23,950
Puerto Rico	100,000	100,000	140,000
Cooperative agricultural extension work (permanent)	4,704,710	4,704,710	4,704,710
Total, payments to States	18,863,628	18,863,660	18,903,660
Salaries and expenses: Administration and coordination of extension work	634,696	641,358	658,843
Total	19,498,324	19,505,018	19,562,503
Bureau of Agricultural Economics:			
Economic investigations	2,881,040	2,206,806	[1] 2,127,236
Crop and livestock estimates	1,274,043	1,158,296	1,354,266
Total	4,155,083	3,365,102	3,481,502
Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations	223,841	[2] 321,795	[3] 420,670
Agricultural Research Administration:			
Office of Administrator	18,000	62,000	60,965
Special research fund	1,206,300	1,150,000	1,147,086
Office of Experiment Stations:			
Payments to States:			
Hatch Act	720,000	720,000	720,000
Adams Act	720,000	720,000	720,000
Purnell Act	2,880,000	2,880,000	2,880,000
Hawaii	67,500	67,500	90,000
Alaska	25,000	25,000	37,500
Puerto Rico	50,000	50,000	90,000
Title I, Bankhead-Jones Act	2,463,708	2,463,708	2,463,708
Total, payments to States	6,926,208	6,926,208	7,001,208
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration of grants and coordination of research with States	154,702	156,155	156,010
Insular experiment stations	83,482	90,592	[4] 100,000
Total, salaries and expenses	238,184	246,747	256,010
Total	7,164,392	7,172,955	7,257,218
Bureau of Animal Industry:			
General administrative expenses	167,180	165,840	165,575
Animal husbandry	824,578	801,970	800,000
Diseases of animals	[5] 723,528	708,030	706,463
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease:			
Direct appropriation	5,612,456	3,573,869	5,983,800
Reappropriation	750,000	2,463,331	
Eradicating cattle ticks	300,629	276,000	220,000
Hog cholera	113,497	102,000	100,580
Inspection and quarantine	[5] 635,927	666,000	661,350
Meat inspection	[6] 5,885,073	[7] 6,827,000	[8] 7,134,079
Virus Serum Toxin Act	220,927	223,718	223,148
Total	15,233,795	15,807,758	15,994,995
Bureau of Dairy Industry	732,537	756,617	755,720
Bureau of Plant Industry:			
General administrative expenses	194,715	183,430	183,430
Cereal crops and diseases	580,478	577,395	547,070
Cotton and other fiber crops and diseases	444,660	446,355	422,940
Drug and related plants	[9] 65,620	65,890	62,250
Dry-land agriculture	229,943	230,788	230,563
Forage crops and diseases	306,130	358,500	292,000
Forest pathology	256,835	258,460	239,100
Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases	1,438,827	1,430,539	1,361,828
Irrigation agriculture	141,200	142,220	134,900
National arboretum	54,662	54,892	38,000
Plant exploration, introduction, and surveys	353,821	301,403	286,160
Plant industry experiment farm	50,314	51,109	48,550
Soil and fertilizer investigations	355,526	337,251	320,130
Soil survey	277,355	205,430	149,595
Sugar-plant investigations	367,470	369,725	350,340
Tobacco investigations	141,444	126,950	120,520
Total	5,259,000	5,140,337	4,787,376

[1] The 1944 appropriation act provides for decreases below 1943 in working funds available (by direct appropriation, and transfers to be continued in 1944) as follows: Office of the Secretary, $248,098; Office of Solicitor, $271,296; Office of Information, salaries and expenses, $107,781; and Bureau of Agricultural Economics, economic investigations, $162,970. (The amounts to be transferred are subject to adjustment.)

[2] Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.

[3] Includes increase of $98,875 to establish on a full fiscal year basis the Combined Food Board for which $100,000 was provided on a half-year basis in 1943.

[4] Includes decreases of $7,300 and an increase of $16,708 for payment of foreign service salary differentials.

[5] Includes $16,500 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.

[6] Includes $375,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.

[7] Includes $680,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.

[8] Includes increase of $307,079 to establish on a full fiscal year basis additional meat inspection work made necessary by the war and by the extension of this activity to establishments concerned with intrastate commerce only. $680,000 was provided on a part-year basis in 1943.

[9] Includes $17,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.

Subappropriation table of appropriations from all sources, fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944—Continued

Bureau and item	Appropriations, 1942	Appropriations, 1943	Appropriations, 1944
Agricultural Research Administration—Continued.			
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine:			
General administrative expenses	$155,072	$145,700	$138,420
Fruit insects	428,320	404,630	399,130
Japanese-beetle control	427,805	382,275	360,120
Sweetpotato weevil control	70,825	71,585	67,770
Mexican fruitfly control	169,655	163,740	155,320
Citrus canker eradication	13,585	10,160	9,650
Gypsy and brown-tail moth control	378,410	382,570	350,000
Dutch-elm disease eradication	351,845	352,475	333,330
Phony peach and peach mosaic eradication	90,870	92,190	87,090
Forest insects	214,665	199,680	150,000
Truck crop and garden insects	369,625	324,020	282,340
Cereal and forage insects	382,860	371,395	350,170
European corn borer	10,000		
Barberry eradication	182,635	182,970	223,250
Cotton insects	145,959	148,439	140,730
Pink bollworm and Thurberia weevil control	530,615	483,135	637,460
Bee culture	81,595	79,500	79,500
Insects affecting man and animals	[10] 187,985	175,105	165,940
Insect-pest survey and identification	[11] 162,935	140,000	130,000
Foreign parasites	38,480	20,775	19,740
Control investigations	73,213	66,585	66,585
Insecticide and fungicide investigations	128,215	120,015	113,820
Transit inspection	44,719	41,235	38,940
Foreign plant quarantines	[12] 707,370	719,550	682,900
Certification of exports	32,087	30,710	29,180
Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases	[13] 1,750,000	[14] 3,722,000	
Total	7,129,345	8,830,439	5,011,385
Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering:			
General administrative expenses	105,200	102,044	102,044
Agricultural chemical investigations	[15] 365,542	349,251	348,557
Agricultural engineering investigations	313,519	[16] 348,333	257,128
Naval-stores investigations	116,605	118,456	115,100
Total	900,866	918,084	822,829
Regional research laboratories	3,470,195	3,967,395	3,959,385
Bureau of Home Economics	[17] 354,710	[18] 386,270	[19] 416,131
Beltsville Research Center	97,865	105,855	100,560
Emergency dehydration investigations	[20] 144,000		
White pine blister rust control:			
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine	490,892	730,000	711,093
Forest Service	685,668	1,044,000	1,018,160
Department of the Interior	115,000	175,000	170,747
Total	1,291,560	1,949,000	1,900,000
Forest Service:			
Salaries and expenses:			
General administrative expenses	588,594	569,144	563,670
National-forest protection and management	[21] 11,622,803	12,710,691	[22] 14,978,537
Water rights	20,000	10,000	9,410
Fighting forest fires	100,000	100,000	100,000
Forest management	598,389	543,829	400,000
Range investigations	273,103	255,500	250,000
Forest products	[23] 959,437	991,789	940,280
Forest survey	250,292	200,292	140,000
Forest economics	141,490	119,000	75,000
Forest influences	136,820	133,000	75,000
Total, salaries and expenses	14,690,928	15,633,245	17,531,897
Forest-fire cooperation	2,417,210	3,992,210	6,300,000
Farm and other private forestry cooperation	809,508	810,442	[24] 746,168
Acquisition of lands for national forests	1,708,000	294,862	100,000
Acquisition of lands from forest receipts	316,000		
Forest-fire deficiency	[25] 2,050,000	[26] 1,719,300	
Emergency forest-fire control	[27] 6,100,000		
Payments to States and Territories from the national forests fund	1,525,306	1,670,043	1,670,043
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico, national forests fund	23,392	23,392	23,392
Roads and trails for States, national forests fund	613,187	668,018	668,018
Total	30,253,531	24,811,512	27,039,518
Forest roads and trails:			
Direct appropriation	9,955,500	6,965,335	2,537,168
Reappropriation			1,241,555
Total	9,955,500	6,965,335	3,778,723
Emergency Rubber Project	[28] 12,435,000	[29] 19,000,000	13,048,000
War Food Administration			25,000,000
Farm Labor Program		[30] 26,100,000	

[10] Includes $5,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[11] Includes $6,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[12] Includes $11,500 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[13] Appropriated in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[14] Appropriated in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.
[15] Includes $20,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[16] Includes $30,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.
[17] Includes $20,000 appropriated in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[18] Includes $20,000 appropriated in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.
[19] Includes decrease of $20,139 and an increase of $50,000 for study of new problems in human nutrition, food conservation, and food preservation.
[20] Appropriated in Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[21] Includes $500,000 for forest plantation care, appropriated in Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[22] Includes increase of $2,151,711 for "emergency forest-fire control" and $116,135 for handling increased volume of timber sales.
[23] Includes $175,000 appropriated in Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[24] Consists of $644,811 for "cooperative farm forestry" and $101,357 for "private forestry cooperation," which items are consolidated in the 1944 act.
[25] Appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.
[26] Appropriated in First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.
[27] Includes $1,100,000 appropriated in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and $5,000,000 appropriated in Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[28] Includes $4,200,000 appropriated in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and $8,235,000 appropriated in Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.
[29] Appropriation of $19,000,000 contained in Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943. In addition, $8,282,442 available in 1943 from funds appropriated in 1942.
[30] Available through Dec. 31, 1943.

Subappropriation table of appropriations from all sources, fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944—Continued

Bureau and item	Appropriations, 1942	Appropriations, 1943	Appropriations, 1944
Office for Agricultural War Relations	[31]	[32] $475,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation: Administrative expenses from Corporation funds	[33] [$3,500,000]	[34] [4,138,498]	[$4,500,000]
Conservation and use of agricultural land resources	494,624,383	444,470,072	400,000,000
Parity payments:			
Direct appropriation	211,726,448		[35] 170,281,000
Reappropriation		5,386,958	
Total	211,726,448	5,386,958	170,281,000
Sugar Act	47,844,184	47,356,447	[36] 63,883,060
Federal Crop Insurance Act: Administrative and operating expenses	8,330,273	8,327,912	3,500,000
Soil Conservation Service:			
General administrative expenses	510,334	501,315	401,315
Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations	1,500,000	1,339,429	1,071,573
Soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information	23,356,652	20,360,124	19,130,000
Emergency erosion control, Everglades region, Florida	75,000	75,648	72,248
Total	25,441,986	22,276,516	20,675,136
Water facilities, arid and semi-arid areas:			
Direct [37] appropriation	450,578	318,649	1,000,000
Loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	[962,439]	[1,000,000]	
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land (title III, Farm Tenant Act):			
Direct appropriation	2,026,219	1,443,162	1,126,120
Reappropriation	701,743		
Total	2,727,962	1,443,162	1,126,120
Payments to counties from submarginal land program	53,700	61,500	66,500
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities:			
Permanent appropriation, sec. 32	97,729,589	131,429,533	97,051,938
Supplemental appropriation	[38] 124,746,444		
Reappropriation		43,847,499	
Total	222,476,033	175,277,332	97,051,938
Marketing Service:			
General administrative expenses	36,073	31,000	
Market news service	1,162,295	1,141,655	1,084,570
Market inspection of farm products	470,090	477,837	474,137
Marketing farm products	409,680	375,450	388,250
Tobacco Inspection and Tobacco Stocks and Standards Acts	[39] 681,575	866,000	812,530
Perishable Agricultural Commodities, Produce Agency, and Standard Container Acts	166,095	188,285	177,520
Cotton Statistics, Classing, Standards, and Futures Acts	973,845	992,428	1,042,428
United States Grain Standards Act	772,751	783,358	742,330
United States Warehouse Act	462,110	465,415	464,115
Federal Seed Act	83,490	84,890	80,650
Packers and Stockyards Act	392,424	398,044	364,070
Naval Stores Act	35,700	31,700	30,120
Enforcement of the Insecticide Act	175,250	176,715	167,880
Commodity Exchange Act	626,525	466,032	300,000
Total	6,447,903	6,478,809	6,128,600
Emergency supplies for Territories and possessions	[40] 35,000,000		
Rural Electrification Administration:			
Administrative expenses	3,668,310	3,007,083	2,258,000
Loans:			
Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds	[100,000,000]	[10,000,000]	
Appropriated funds			20,000,000
Farm Credit Administration: [41]			
Salaries and expenses:			
Direct appropriation	3,037,948	2,326,801	689,259
Transfer from farmers' crop production and harvesting loans	[3,555,843]	[3,603,076]	[3,938,561]
Amounts chargeable against activities administered by Farm Credit Administration	[1,313,564]	[2,280,493]	[3,224,588]
Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans:			
Direct appropriation			[42] 4,907,273
Reappropriation	17,761,616	11,427,731	3,449,655
Collections available	[17,600,575]	[18,625,000]	[19,250,000]
Total	20,799,564	13,754,532	9,046,187
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation: [43]			
Administrative expenses from Corporation funds	[8,500,000]	[9,050,000]	[7,822,000]
Orchard rehabilitation loans:			
Direct appropriation	[44] 1,000,000		
Reappropriation		[45] 400,000	
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation:			
Direct appropriation [46]	63,068,711	36,987,404	20,000,000
Reappropriation	6,500,000	5,000,000	
Total	69,568,711	41,987,404	20,000,000
Loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	[119,037,561]	[96,500,000]	[60,000,000]

[31] $188,100 transferred from Office for Emergency Management.
[32] Appropriated in First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.
[33] Includes $2,000,000 authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941.
[34] Includes $625,000 authorized by the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.
[35] Provides funds to liquidate the obligations incurred pursuant to contract authorizations contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, for full parity payments on the 1942 crop. Contract authorization not continued in 1944 act.
[36] Provides for increased conditional payments to sugar producers for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944 pursuant to the change in the base rate of payment provided in Public Law 386, 77th Cong.
[37] Shown as a project under "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" in the 1944 Budget, but carried as a separate item in the appropriation act.
[38] Includes $25,000,000 appropriated in Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1942.
[39] Includes $131,000 appropriated in Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941.
[40] Appropriated by Public Law 371, 77th Cong., approved Dec. 23, 1941.
[41] Appropriations of $26,800,000 for 1942 and $24,800,000 for 1943 made to Treasury Department for payments on account of reduction in interest rate on mortgages.
[42] To replenish funds available for loans under this program.
[43] Appropriation of $9,600,000 for 1942 and $9,000,000 for 1943 made to Treasury Department for payments on account of reduction in interest rate on mortgages.
[44] Appropriated in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.
[45] Reappropriation made available by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.
[46] Excludes "Water facilities, arid and semiarid areas," shown as a project under "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," in the 1944 Budget, but carried as a separate item in appropriation act.

Subappropriation table of appropriations from all sources, fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944—Continued

Bureau and item	Appropriations, 1942	Appropriations, 1943	Appropriations, 1944
Farm tenancy (title I, Farm Tenant Act):			
Salaries and expenses:			
Direct appropriation	$2,234,762	$1,471,860	$1,326,070
Reappropriation	392,350		
Total	2,627,112	1,471,860	1,326,070
Loans (Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds)	[50,000,000]	[32,500,000]	[30,000,000]
Liquidation and management of resettlement projects (title IV, Farm Tenant Act)	674,579	427,126	421,039
Total, appropriations and reappropriations	1,279,735,127	925,200,900	957,171,694
Deduct reappropriations included in foregoing:			
Parity payments (includes transfers to staff offices)		−5,652,901	
Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (includes transfers to staff offices)		−44,497,745	
Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land (title III, Farm Tenant Act)	−701,743		
Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation	−6,500,000	−5,000,000	
Farm tenancy (title I, Farm Tenant Act)	−392,350		
Farm Credit Administration (Farmers' crop production and harvesting loans—includes transfers to staff offices)	−17,865,773	−11,523,958	−3,449,655
Orchard rehabilitation loans		−400,000	
Eradicating tuberculosis and Bang's disease (Animal Industry)	−750,000	−2,463,331	
Forest roads and trails			−1,241,555
Total, deductions as above	−26,209,866	−69,537,935	−4,691,210
Total direct appropriations	1,253,525,261	855,662,965	952,480,484
Administrative expenses authorized from corporation funds, and collections available to Farm Credit Administration—listed above but not included in totals	20,914,139	34,003,991	34,796,588
Borrowings authorized from Reconstruction Finance Corporation for loan activities—listed above but not included in totals	270,000,000	140,000,000	90,000,000

Prepared by: Office of Budget and Finance Division of Estimates and Allotments, Estimates Section, Department of Agriculture, July 6, 1943.

United States Loans During World War No. 2 to Countries at War With the Axis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, as part of this extension of remarks, I enclose a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress relative to loans made by the United States Government during World War No. 2 to countries at war with the Axis:

I. LOAN TO CHINA [1]

On March 21, 1942, the United States and China concluded an agreement providing for financial aid to China. By the terms of the agreement, the Secretary of the Treasury established on the books of the United States Treasury a credit in the name of the Republic of China for $500,000,000. The Secretary of the Treasury agreed to make transfers from this credit to accounts of the Government of the Republic of China in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York at such times and in such amounts as the Government of the Republic of China should request. This agreement was signed by the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States under the authority granted to him by Public Law No. 442, approved February 7, 1942.

In a joint statement, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau and T. V. Soong, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China, said that the purpose of the agreement was to "contribute substantially toward facilitating the great efforts of the Chinese people and their Government to meet financial and economic burdens which have been imposed upon them by almost 5 years of continuous attack by Japan." A significant provisior in the agreement defers the final determination of the terms upon which the financial aid is given, including the benefits to be rendered to the United States in return, "until the progress of events after the war makes clearer the final terms and benefits which will be in the mutual interest of the United States and China and will promote the establishment of world peace and security."

II. RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LOAN TO THE UNITED KINGDOM [2]

Under section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended,[3] the Corporation is authorized, upon the request of the Secretary of Commerce and the approval of the President, to make loans to foreign governments on the security of American obligations. Pursuant to this authority, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in July 1941 authorized a loan to the United Kingdom of $425,000,000. The loan is secured by listed and unlisted securities of United States corporations (including 41 United States insurance companies) and by the assignment of earnings of the United States branches of 41 British insurance companies.[4] It bears interest at 3 percent and is to run for 15 years, subject to partial extension under certain conditions. The income accruing on the pledged investments is applied first to servicing the loan, and the balance is applied to reducing the principal of the loan. The proceeds of the loan are used by the United Kingdom to pay for war supplies contracted for in the United States prior to the enactment of the Lend-Lease Act.

By March 31, 1943, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had advanced $390,000,000 of this loan to the United Kingdom. Repayments totaled about $30,600,000 as of that date. Such repayments were made partly out of interest, dividends, and other income from the pledged securities, and partly out of the proceeds of the sale of some of the collateral.

III. DEFENSE SUPPLIES CORPORATION LOAN TO AMTORG TRADING CORPORATION [5]

Prior to the extension of lend-lease aid to Russia in June 1941, Defense Supplies Corporation (a subsidiary of Reconstruction Finance Corporation) contracted with Amtorg Trading Corporation (a United States corporation owned by Russia) to purchase needed materials from the Soviet Union to the extent of $100,000,000 and made an advance payment of $49,668,247.96 in the form of a loan against their delivery, subject to the condition that such advance payment be used to purchase in this country supplies needed by the Soviet Union. Materials already shipped by the Soviet Union, through Amtorg Trading Corporation, including cargoes afloat or that have been sunk, include the following: Asbestos, buckthorn bark, chrome ore, goatskins, goose down, horsehair, licorice root, lumber, dead-burned magnesite, potash, platinum, pulpwood, sanonin, and sheep casings. By the end of 1942 the aggregate value of these items was in excess of $5,500,000.

IV. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK LOANS, DECEMBER 7, 1941 TO JUNE 15, 1943

See the attached table prepared by the Export-Import Bank:

[1] Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1942, p. 43. For full text of the agreement, see exhibit 43, p. 292.

[2] U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, To Increase the Borrowing Authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, hearings on S. 209, December 2 and 8, 1942, p. 54; and Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Report for the Period From the Organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1943 (Washington, June 7, 1943; mimeo.), p. 5.

[3] 55 Stat. 249; 154 U. S. C. 606b.

[4] For a list of the pledged securities, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 29, 1941, p. 6379.

[5] U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, To Increase the Borrowing Authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, hearings on S. 209, December 2 and 8, 1942, p. 46.

Export-Import Bank of Washington statement of loans and commitments reflecting new and increased commitments and advances thereon in connection with credits within countries which have declared war on 1 or more of the Axis countries, for the period Dec. 7, 1941, to June 15, 1943

Country and borrower [1]	Commodity	Net amount authorized	Balance not yet disbursed, June 15, 1943 [2]	Amount disbursed
Bolivia	Machinery, equipment, materials, services, and miscellaneous.	$19, 537, 562. 75	$17, 533, 075. 02	[3] $2, 074, 578. 67
Brazil	Steel mill equipment, miscellaneous materials, equipment, and services.	40, 350, 000. 00	47, 417, 735. 68	[4] 12, 654, 593. 69
Canada	Aluminum	34, 250, 000. 00	31, 250, 000. 00	3, 000, 000. 00
Costa Rica	Dollar exchange and miscellaneous	3, 400, 000. 00	2, 200, 323. 18	[3 4] 5, 010, 743. 12
Cuba	Materials, equipment, and services	15, 000, 000. 00	15, 000, 000. 00	
El Salvador	Construction materials, equipment, and services.	1, 196, 000. 00	796, 000. 00	400, 000. 00
Haiti	United States agricultural and industrial products, materials, equipment, and services.	1, 500, 000. 00	1, 420, 000. 00	80, 000. 00
Honduras	Materials and equipment	2, 700, 000. 00	2, 650, 000. 00	50, 000. 00
Mexico	Steel mill equipment and Mexican handicraft	6, 100, 000. 00	6, 043, 729. 26	[3] 158, 902. 39
Nicaragua	United States agricultural and industrial products and miscellaneous.	750, 000. 00	750, 000. 00	[3]
Puerto Rico	Machinery and equipment	250, 000. 00	150, 000. 00	100, 000. 00
Total		125, 033, 562. 75	125, 210, 863. 14	23, 528, 817. 87

[1] Borrower includes not only the Government and political subdivisions but also banks and private concerns.
[2] Includes balance undisbursed of commitments prior to Dec. 7, 1941.
[3] Variations due to revolving credit lines.
[4] Variation due to reflecting only new and increased commitments since Dec. 7, 1941. Original commitments approved prior to Dec. 7, 1941.

Our Next Transportation Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the history of transportation during the past months has shown us that the automobile, truck, and bus are much more important to the war effort than was at first acknowledged or admitted.

Of every 100 United States war workers, 73 depend on passenger cars for transportation between home and job. Total motor-vehicle mileage is down. But the war has increased transportation needs in critical areas.

Motortrucks are indispensable to farm and factory. They move millions of tons of war plant goods and material. Besides moving vital foodstuffs to markets or terminals, trucks haul seeds, fertilizer, and other supplies back over the same roads to the farm.

In many States appropriations for road construction, repair, and maintenance were cut to the bone following Pearl Harbor. Highways, roads, and streets are visibly deteriorating, and if this trend is permitted to go on, the Nation will be faced with a transportation crisis that will do irreparable damage to our production efforts.

Although everyone seems to be interested in conserving tires and trucks and automobiles needed in the war effort, little thought is being given to the roads on which they run. Unless we keep our highway systems in repair we will court disaster.

For that reason I have asked that the following article by Curtis Fuller from the July issue of the Nation's Business be reprinted in the RECORD:

The slow disintegration of a highway is hardly as spectacular as the blowing out of a right rear tire. A thin spot today is a ravel next month and a chuck hole next spring. In a year it may be an axle-breaker.

Under weather and traffic, our roads are wearing out today almost as rapidly as our rubber stock pile is melting away.

Little more than a year ago the Government was following a policy which seemed to assign motorcars to a negligible and declining role in the war-transportation picture.

A few months of war and vast expansions of traffic demonstrated how preposterous this policy was. Now, instead of ignoring the automobile, the Nation is going to great lengths to conserve it.

There seems to be no realization, however, that the proper maintenance of highways is as essential as the maintenance of cars.

Probably the greatest misconception behind the attitude determining public highway policy today is that roads are permanent. Anyone who has maintained the sidewalk to his front door knows this is wrong. Even a concrete pavement has an expected life of only about 20 years. The lighter surfaces especially those on inadequate bases—need constant attention and maintenance. A gravel road may lose 100 to 200 cubic yards of stone per mile in a year. Bituminous highways ravel and pit and wear out.

Instead of requiring less maintenance because automobile traffic has declined, roads today need more because construction has been halted and heavy hauling has increased. Traffic, however, is probably not responsible for half of the disintegration of highways. Weather may cause even more.

Yet no one seems to be worrying about the roads in spite of the fact that they play a large role in moving men and goods.

According to Transportation Coordinator Joseph Eastman, trucks carry about a fourth as many ton-miles of property as the railroads. The great importance of trucks cannot be measured as much by the amount of goods they haul, however, as by the particularly important services they fulfill in short hauls and terminal distribution and collection.

Moreover, about two-thirds of the Nation's 150,000 busses are in school service especially vital to rural areas. Out of more than 1,000 cities over 10,000 population, nearly three-fourths depend wholly upon busses for their local public transportation.

Intercity busses carry passengers for about two-thirds as many miles as the railroads and travel 330,000 miles of highway while, in 749 war-production plants surveyed, nearly 500,000 workers were found to arrive by private automobile.

At one aircraft factory employing 50,000, 92 percent used private cars. In another 741 war-production plants, 65 percent of the incoming and 69 percent of the outgoing freight moved by highway.

Furthermore, the disintegration of highways could isolate more than 50,000 communities in the United States which are served only by highways for long-distance transportation.

In one of his last statements as Office of Price Administration Administrator, Leon Henderson declared that "reliance on the automobile or rubber-borne transportation is considerably more" than claimed in "even the loftiest statements made by the industries connected with the making of automobiles and tires," and by such organizations as the American Automobile Association.

In spite of these facts, the only roads now being built are those of direct value to the war effort, principally access roads serving war industries and military camps. Highway departments are reconciled to the halting of road construction while the war lasts, but they are genuinely concerned about maintenance, without which untold road mileages will collapse. The chief limiting factors in carrying out effective maintenance are shortages of men, money, materials, and equipment.

Of these perhaps the most serious situation is that involving equipment. New maintenance equipment is not available and the spare parts situation is even more urgent.

ANOTHER THREAT LOOMS

Another threat, difficult to assess at this time, is the possible requisitioning for the armed services of road equipment registered through the War Production Board Nationwide inventory of all construction machinery.

The armed forces have taken by negotiation some snow equipment in the North and a certain amount of county-owned maintenance equipment in the South. Although the amount taken so far is probably negligible, some War Production Board officials have talked as though a great amount might be forcibly requisitioned. This action could only mean the speedy disintegration of many highways.

The most important materials shortages are steel and bituminous. Steel is essential for bridge repairs and replacements in some locations and some way must be found to make it available in those cases where a road would otherwise be closed.

Except for the slow-curing light asphalts, the shortage of bituminous materials is largely one of transportation. It is responsible for serious damage to thin surfaces over light bases. All light bituminous surfaces are bound to ravel and pit as time passes and many such roads will have to be plowed unless asphalt or tar can be had. In fact, many lightly surfaced roads are already reverting to gravel.

At least three Federal agencies are concerned with highway maintenance, though none seems to be directly responsible and none, of itself, has authority to remedy the difficulties.

The Office of Defense Transportation, interested in highway transport, so far appears not to have thought beyond the motor vehicle.

The Public Roads Administration of the Federal Works Agency is organized primarily as a construction-supervisory agency for Federal-aid funds. It has little to do with maintenance, which is performed entirely by State and local units. Nevertheless, the Public Roads Administration has undertaken surveys designed to produce the evidence of highway disintegration that the War Production Board apparently needs before granting needed materials.

The third agency is the governmental division of the War Production Board, whose

interest in the matter apparently duplicates that of the Public Roads Administration. The governmental division has only recently given any evidence that it is aware of the highway maintenance problem.

Without maintenance, no one can say how long our roads will last. A few roads are badly hurt today. Some authorities have suggested 2 years. Many roads will be worn out long before that. Others might continue without maintenance for 5 years.

Once traffic is paralyzed it will be too late. The construction of new highways or the reconstruction of old requires much time, vast expenditures, and much manpower. Even extraordinary maintenance activity can at best only postpone reconstruction.

It would be only wise economy to make parts and materials for road equipment available now for another reason. Poor roads are much more costly than good roads in terms of vehicles, parts, and tires. Equipment parts for road machinery now will be saved many times over in parts for commercial and private vehicles later.

To prevent enormous losses by failure of our road transportation facilities, the Federal Government should make materials, parts, even equipment available. Selective Service officials should be instructed to consider skilled highway workers as important as skilled railroad workers.

To allow our highway system to disintegrate is to court disaster.

Hon. John C. Page

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert a news release by the Department of the Interior which announces the resignation of John C. Page as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. The regret the people of the West feel at this event is tempered by the announcement by Secretary of the Interior Ickes that the Bureau of Reclamation will have the benefit of Mr. Page's continued service as a consulting engineer with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

John Page in the 32 years of his connection with the Bureau of Reclamation has rendered yeoman service to the cause of water conservation and western irrigation and power development. No man knows better than he the needs of the arid and semiarid regions nor has made more valiant effort to bring about results that have bettered conditions.

I join with President Roosevelt and Secretary Ickes in paying tribute to the great contributions Mr. Page has made to the advancement of the West and the country as shown in the following news release:

Following an announcement by President Roosevelt that he had accepted the resignation of John C. Page as Commissioner of Reclamation, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes today said he had appointed Mr. Page as consulting engineer for the Bureau of Reclamation with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

Commissioner Page, whose resignation was due to ill health, will spend some time in Denver and other western areas for the purpose of regaining his strength. His resignation will become effective at the expiration of accumulated leave.

Pending the appointment of a permanent successor to Mr. Page, Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore will be in charge of the Bureau of Reclamation, Secretary Ickes said.

"The strain of the war activities of the Bureau of Reclamation has told heavily on Commissioner Page's health," Secretary Ickes added. "I have ordered him to take a real rest so that the Bureau and the Department may have the advantage of his valuable services when he has regained his strength. I can ill afford to spare men of Mr. Page's ability and knowledge of the problems confronting me with respect to irrigation, power production, and related activities which are essential to the prosecution of the war, but like so many other of my able assistants he has given more of himself than nature could permit.

"I trust that the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department and the country will have Mr. Page's services for many years to come.

"The long experience of Mr. Bashore in the field and in the Washington office of the Bureau of Reclamation equips him well to carry on in Mr. Page's absence."

The correspondence between Mr. Page and the President is as follows:

The PRESIDENT, JUNE 12, 1943.
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On advice of my physicians I hereby submit my resignation as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. I wish it to be effective whenever you and the Secretary of the Interior determine the most appropriate date.

Respectfully, JOHN C. PAGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., June 22, 1943.

Hon. JOHN C. PAGE,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation,
Department of the Interior.

MY DEAR MR. PAGE: I have received your letter of June 12, tendering your resignation as Commissioner of Reclamation because of ill health. In these circumstances, I must, of course, accede to your wishes, though I do so with regret because you have made an outstanding record during the more than 6 years you have served in this position. Secretary Ickes tells me that he has persuaded you to stay on in a consulting capacity, and I am glad that the Government will continue to have the benefit of your extensive knowledge of the problems of the West in land and water utilization. Your resignation as Commissioner may be effective immediately preceding the date you enter on duty under the Secretary's appointment as consulting engineer.

You have my very best wishes for a speedy recovery.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Appointed Commissioner of Reclamation by President Roosevelt in January 1937, Mr. Page has been associated with the Bureau of Reclamation for all but 9 years of the agency's 41 years of existence. Except for 2 years of work in another capacity shortly after he joined the organization, he has served continuously with the Bureau since 1909.

Born in Syracuse, Nebr., on October 12, 1887, he was graduated from the University of Nebraska in 1908 with the degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering. For 18 months thereafter he continued his studies at Cornell University, specializing in hydraulics and civil engineering. In 1909, after completing his education, he entered the employ of the United States Reclamation Service, as the Bureau of Reclamation was then known. Soon afterward he left the service to accept a position as assistant to the city engineer of Grand Junction, Colo., returning in 1911 to serve continuously from that time on.

Mr. Page became Superintendent of the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project (Colorado) in 1925 in which capacity he worked until 1930 when he was transferred to the Boulder Dam project to become Chief Administrative Assistant.

Five years later he was called to Washington by the late Dr. Elwood Mead, long-time Commissioner of Reclamation, to head the Engineering Division. When Dr. Mead died in 1936 Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes designated Mr. Page as Acting Commissioner.

Mr. Page has served as a member of the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee and as a member of the President's Great Plains Drought Committee. In 1941 he received the honorary degree of doctor of engineering from his alma mater, the University of Nebraska. He is a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, is married and has two daughters. Mrs. Page and her daughter, Mildred, will accompany him to Denver where his married daughter resides.

Today's American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the RECORD a broadcast heard over radio station WOL reported by Billy Repaid, the Flying Reporter. He related this story—a story filled with human interest and heroism. In ordinary news releases or news reporting, as Mr. Repaid said, the heading might have been simply, "More planes shot down."

This story is of special interest to me because the pilot of this Flying Fortress was Lt. Frank Hunter, a native of my own hometown. I have known him all his life and his parents and grandparents before him. Such heroism stirs to the very depths our gratitude to those few who have given so much for so many of us. I bow in reverence to this gallant crew and rejoice with their families who have every right to take a genuine pride in their gallant achievement.

The radio broadcast follows:

The words of a communique are as significant for what they don't tell as for what they tell.

Americans last week learned through the formal language of a statement from allied headquarters in north Africa that another raid had been made on Messina. More enemy planes were shot down.

Those were facts. But behind those facts are a score or so of dramatic human-interest stories. Stories of heroism and bravery. Like this one.

The sun was high over the dappled Mediterranean when the compact formation of Flying Fortresses left the coast of Tunisia

behind. On the trip to Messina, gunners calmly tested their equipment. And bombardiers and navigators swapped stories of battle and talked of the letters from home.

Soon the hills of Sicily appeared below. And suddenly the Fortresses were over the target. It was all over in a minute. The bombs had been dropped and the Fortresses had turned, and were headed for home.

In their Fortress Lt. Frank Hunter, of Salt Lake City, and Lt. Hohn Wylie, of Apollo, Pa., breathed a sigh of relief. But suddenly one of the crewmen shouted and pointed behind.

A crippled American bomber had lagged over Messina and now was engaged in a hot and heavy battle with enemy fighter planes. Lieutenant Hunter banked to go to the rescue of the hapless plane. And as he did, his Fortress shuddered and smoke billowed from one engine.

But, with one engine out, he went to the rescue, anyway. And his gunners went to work. Gunner Sgt. Kenneth Titus, of Huntingdon Park, Calif., bagged one Messerschmitt right away. Then Sgt. John Tenis, of Waterbury, Conn., got another.

The enemy planes scattered after that, and the crippled Fortress got away. But as Lieutenant Hunter banked to head for north Africa, a chance shot blasted out another of his engines. Two gone, two left. Copilot Wylie recalls:

"Things quieted down then, and we thought the excitement was over." But they were wrong. The crippled plane was about 80 miles off the Tunisian coast, flying low. Suddenly a pack of 15 to 20 Messerschmitts dived down on them from the rear, their guns spitting.

Quickly the gunners rushed to their stations. Lieutenant Wylie ran to the radio cabin, and there a sorry sight met his eyes. The cables from the pilot's cabin to the control surfaces hung like loops in a clothesline.

As the Messerschmitts came on, a shell smashed the rudder. The allerons snapped. The crippled bomber apparently was at the mercy of the Nazi wolf pack.

Lieutenant Hunter settled grimly to his job. With the cables gone, he maneuvered the plane with the devices used to keep a plane on an even keel. Ask a flying man what a job that is.

The gunners also were busy. Sergeant Titus got one enemy plane in his sights and pressed the trigger. He saw the plane fall apart. Sergeant Tenis got another. Sgt. Eugene Cantley, of West Virginia, smacked two out of the sky. Sgt. James O'Brien, of South Minneapolis, Minn., battled down another.

The deadly aim of the Fortress gunners was too much for the Nazis. The rest fled. When the boys brought their limping plane to base, they counted up seven planes they had shot down. That's a new record for the Mediterranean theater.

Now, that is the real story. Yet all the communique said was: "More enemy planes shot down."

Recognition for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I desire to place in the RECORD a few facts about existing legislation pertaining to Gold Star Mothers, as supplied by the Library of Congress.

I do this for reference in connection with the bill to provide a Congressional Medal of Sacrifice which I have introduced today.

The reference service advises me that Gold Star Mothers do not appear to have been incorporated by Congress like some other groups connected with the World War, and, of course, my bill does not propose incorporation for them. It merely proposes that they be recognized by the award of a suitable medal embracing a gold star.

Congressional recognition has been given in the designation of an annual Gold Star Mothers' Day (U. S. C., title 36: 147, 148); and soon after the World War No. 1 provision was made for a pilgrimage of Gold Star Mothers to the battlefields of Europe at Government expense. (See acts of Mar. 2, 1929, 45 Stat. 1508; Apr. 19, 1930, 46 Stat. 225; and May 15, 1930, 46 Stat. 334.)

And, of course, that many Gold Star Mothers, not by that designation but as dependent relatives, receive compensation under the various veterans regulations. Code sections covering this phase are listed in the index under Gold Star Mothers' Act, as follows: United States Code, title 38, pages 424a, 472b–472e, 506, 509, 510, 512c.

Reference to all these, however, indicates that while we have various medals for soldiers, sailors, and members of the merchant marine, to wear, we have never provided an appropriate award in the way of a medal or emblem for the mothers of those who make the supreme sacrifice for their country.

The Library of Congress has provided me with a résumé of a movement designed to associate the Gold Star Mothers in an organization, and for its light upon my proposal for a medal of recognition, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

During the World War, service flags—blue stars in a red-bordered field of white—were familiar sights throughout America. Each star stood for a man or woman in war service. Sometimes a blue star was replaced by one of silver, signifying that someone had been wounded while serving his country. When a gold star appeared on the service flag it designated that someone had given his life for the ideals we worship. In the post-war years the mothers of the men who had fallen came to be known as Gold Star Mothers.

The service flag was introduced by the nationally organized association of the American War Mothers. This association originally comprised the three groups of mothers, those entitled to use the blue, silver, and gold stars. But during the years following the war the organization lost its hold on the latter group of women, who have endeavored to establish a federally organized body of Gold Star Mothers of America.[1]

The purpose of the organization has been neither political nor social. Its apparent aim has been to perpetuate the memories of the men who gave their lives in the service of their country.[2]

The National Association of Gold Star Mothers developed slowly after the war; at first it was known as the Gold Star Mothers of the World War, Inc. For a long time this organization embraced only the Gold Star Mothers of the State of New York. Movement to expand the organization had been sponsored for some time, but real interest developed in such a venture when other States were invited to join a pilgrimage to Washington, D. C., to mark the first observation of Gold Star Mothers' Day in 1932.[3]

Governor Roosevelt had designated September 25 as the official Gold Star Mothers' Day of the State of New York, at the request of the Gold Star Mothers themselves. This date was considered appropriate, since it marked the anniversary of the beginning of the last great offensive of the Allies.[4]

After a long and continually active role in the interests of a pilgrimage to the graves of their sons, the Gold Star Mothers realized their dream when on May 7, 1930, the first group of mothers sailed for France. Such pilgrimages continued periodically all summer, the last group returning on October 3, 1930, of that year. The trips were planned to take place throughout several summers in order to enable all those who so desired to visit the graves of their sons buried on foreign soil.[5]

There are 42,000 Gold Star Mothers in the United States, not all of whom belong to the organization; yet we find that this association has worked to obtain public aid for all. The average age in 1938 was 71; many of the members have been described as "pitifully poor."[6]

The advanced age of hundreds of the Gold Star Mothers prevented them from visiting the graves of their sons in France. Of the 17,389 eligible to make the pilgrimage at Government expense, 3,653 did so in 1930, and 1,766 in 1931. Although the pilgrimages extended over 2 more years the age and physical condition of many mothers prevented them from making the trip. The oldest to attempt such a journey was 92.[7]

The National Association of Gold Star Mothers of North America was organized June 20, 1936, with Mrs. Mathilda Burling, of Richmond Hill, N. Y., as president. For a number of years Mrs. Burling had been president of the Gold Star Mothers of the World War, Inc.

The new group was formed in Staunton, Va., at a business session of Gold Star Mothers from eastern States participating in a pilgrimage to the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson. Mrs. J. Frank Clemmer, Staunton, was elected vice president, and Mrs. Alice O'Sullivan, of New York, secretary. Named to the executive committee were Mrs. A. Wendell, of New York; Mrs. M. W. Dyson, of Tennessee; and Mrs. M. E. Rodman, of Maryland.[8] At this same place they held their first annual convention, September 28, 1937.

The Gold Star Mothers have upheld certain ideals and policies. They have been much opposed to United States residence for those swearing allegiance to a foreign country and feel such people should be promptly deported. They have favored restriction of immigration, mandatory deportation, and prohibiting employment of aliens in the Federal Government. Though opposed to foreign wars, they support a policy of adequate national defense.[9]

Numerous legislative measures have come before Congress relative to the Gold Star

[1] Information received from American War Mothers, Washington, D. C., March 26, 1942.

[2] New York Times, March 22, 1935, p. 24:4.

[3] New York Times, September 23, 1932, p. 21:8.

[4] Idem.

[5] New York Times, July 5, 1930, p. 6:7, and October 3, 1930, p. 18:6, and April 28, 1930, p. 8:4.

[6] New York Times, July 28, 1938, p. 17:5.

[7] New York Times, September 19, 1931, p. 35:3.

[8] New York Times, June 21, 1936, pt. II, p. 3.

[9] New York Times, July 28, 1938, p. 17:5, and May 13, 1938, p. 4:4.

Mothers. Since 1936 President Roosevelt has issued annually a proclamation making the last Sunday in September Gold Star Mothers' Day, in accordance with the law of June 23, 1936, which set aside this day for this particular purpose.[10]

From time to time a pilgrimage to Europe by the Gold Star Mothers (as previously referred to) had been suggested. The crystallization of this dream was realized with the appropriation by Congress of a large sum of money to take care of the expense incurred by such an undertaking. The bills finally passed regarding this venture not only took care of the actual expense of the trip but the moneys needed for the preparation by the Government, and the individuals making the journey.[11]

The extension and increase of pensions for the Gold Star Mothers was passed by both Houses, but vetoed by the President. This measure was not passed over the President's veto.[12]

In the Seventy-sixth Congress a bill was introduced for the incorporation of the Gold Star Mothers.[13] But as yet they have not been incorporated under Federal law, due to the failure of any bill to pass.

Clean Bill Given to the O. P. A. in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Bill Cunningham which appeared in the Boston Herald, July 4, in which Mr. Cunningham pays due tribute to the excellent work which has been done by the O. P. A. in Boston.

Mr. Cunningham's conclusion was reached after a thorough study of the situation and should be read with close attention because of the frequent attacks which the O. P. A. has been subjected to of late.

Mr. Cunningham's article follows:

CLEAN BILL GIVEN TO OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION IN BOSTON—BIG STAFF WORKS HARD, FINDS GASOLINE WORST HEADACHE, PRAISES PUBLIC AID

(By Bill Cunningham)

The botching and battling of the bureaucrats, the long-time target of these articles as readers will attest, has culminated in an open fight at headquarters. Chester Davis, the Food Administrator, and considered by all but the New Deal left wingers a good man, has resigned, stating that he found responsibility without authority an uninhabitable position.

Vice President WALLACE, perhaps the most impractical man in America, delivered a public tirade against one of the most practical of the original New Dealers, Jesse Jones, and the wealthy Texan fired back with both barrels.

President Roosevelt, testily accepting the resignation of Davis and expressing surprise and regret at the explosion between WALLACE and Jones, borrowed a term from the sports world and stressed the necessity for team work. The Chief Executive is just exactly correct. That has been the plaint, the plea, and the prayer of these theses all along.

To keep faith with our fighting men, to knit our home front solidly, to get all the punch, the power, all the fight and fire we possess solidly with full and unfaltering unity into the war effort, team work is just exactly what we need and must have. But team work calls for exactly what we don't possess under the existing order—a quarterback on the field with full authority.

No team can ever run a play if it stands back in the huddle, with each member trying to call signals more insistently than any other, and with no playing captain or quarterback with sufficient authority to tell the rest to stow their contradictory chatter, that here's the play, and either to cooperate or get out of the game.

There's no authority, no head, and, if anybody wants to insist that the President is the authority, there still is none in this domestic tangle, for although he has it, he has neither used it nor, as yet, has he really delegated it. In the meanwhile the headless bureaucrats are all trying to play quarterback and are mostly bumping heads and falling down.

But our mission today is to examine the most unpopular, the most criticized, the most personal bureau of all, so far as the average citizen goes—the Office of Price Administration. This probably rates as a journalistic first—the first time a reporter has been invited to walk in and tear such an outfit to pieces, if he could.

MUCH OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION CRITICISM BASED ON SUSPICION

I'm not tearing. I'm against the entire idea of a political police force, all snoopers, informers, tin cops, and stool pigeons. But since we've evidently got to live with, and by, this program until further notice, a better understanding of what it is and how 't works, will undoubtedly clear up some confusion, scotch some lies, and bring some ease to the public mind.

The Office of Price Administration has had a miserable press, and anything like it is probably doomed to reap mostly resentment and criticism—a lot of it merely upon suspicion. It has done nothing to fight back, and that has led to the story that it refused to answer questions, and therefore probably had something to hide. This report, if nothing else, will prove that not to be true. The idea was my own, not the Office of Price Administration's. I believe in giving the other fellow the platform occasionally. I asked the hardest questions I could think of. They produced the answers without exception, or hesitancy. Those answers make a definite picture.

I couldn't take them all, so I took the biggest single unit in New England, the one affecting the lives of the greatest number in this general district. That's the so-called Boston district board, comprising 9 counties in eastern Massachusetts and servicing 3,235,870 people. There are 2 other districts, 1 in Worcester, the other in Springfield. They are much smaller. There is a regional headquarters. It likewise is smaller.

The first thing to realize is that the Office of Price Administration isn't a bunch of mysterious hobgoblins hived up somewhere in Boston plotting ways and means of pouncing upon the public. Your local rationing board is really the Office of Price Administration. That's where it starts and that's most of it, in this particular district, at any rate, although perhaps that is not its national Office of Price Administration policy. The official name of your neighborhood rationing board is War Price and Rationing Board, and its members are selected from a panel of names submitted by the community itself. So they're your neighbors.

There are 200 of these in this Boston district—11 in the city of Boston proper. Lawrence J. Bresnahan, the director, says this is probably a greater number than any other district in America has, but that it not only makes calls easier for the public, but fits more nearly into the traditional New England pattern, where communities prefer to handle their own affairs.

BOARD MEMBERS UNPAID, BOUND BY OATH

These board members are not paid, they are under oath, they may not hold political office, and their light, heat, and quarters are generally furnished by the communities. In fact, 171 communities furnish such quarters. There are 1,574 board members. They are supplemented by 4,200 additional volunteers. There is a paid personnel of 1,129 clerks and stenographers, appointed by the board chairman from civil-service lists furnished by the United States Civil Service Commission. There are 61 part-time helpers.

This makes a total of 6,964 people, 83 percent of whom receive no compensation, 17 percent being paid the civil-service scale. This is 45 cents and 50 cents per hour for part-time clerks, $1,080 to $1,440 per year for filing clerks and typists, $1,620 for chief clerks. They work six 8-hour days, with overtime only for Saturday afternoons. They work, so says Director Bresnahan, many additional hours at night for no money, and they get no holidays except Christmas.

The district headquarters staff, meaning Bresnahan's headquarters force, consists of 282 employees, all of which come without exception from the civil-service lists. Asked if politics plays a part in getting one of these jobs, Bresnahan, who frankly and even proudly states himself a New Dealer personally, said he can't deny that troops of people parade in with letters from this politician and that, but that none can, or does, get on that way. When he needs an employee, he is obligated to ask Civil Service for people available and qualified. From the names they send, he then selects.

The headquarters office, which is what most of us undoubtedly have in mind when we say, or think, Office of Price Administration, consists really of six departments. These are organization, rationing, prices, legal, and administration. The standard story is that clowns, political "bootlickers," and business failures hold all key posts, and that you have such comical situations as former ribbon-counter clerks trying to run the hardware business, and college professors trying to measure out coal.

And they probably have in some places, but we are examining this one and the facts here are that William Hale, heading organization, was vice president and sales manager for Bird & Son in Walpole for 26 years; John Deely, rationing officer, is president of the Lee Lime Co., a major industry in Lee, Mass.; Henry Silberman, price officer, was merchandising manager for Conrad's, long familiar with department store merchandising of all sorts; Ray Baldes, head of the legal division, is on loan from the Boston University Law School faculty; and Harold Dunney, head of administration, which means budgets, management, and personnel, is the one alumnus of the Work Projects Administration. The latter, however, has had 8 years' experience handling Government budgets and New Deal paper work, which, according to Bresnahan, is a science in itself and calls for a veteran in its intricacies.

[10] 49 Stat. 1895, ch. 736, June 23, 1936.

[11] 45 Stat. 1508–1509, March 2, 1929, and 46 Stat. 334–335, May 15, 1930.

[12] 75th Cong., 1st sess., S. 1516, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 81, pp. 1194, 1274, 3060, 3227, 8242, 8999, 9196, 9324, 9410, 9419, 9614.

[13] 76th Cong., 1st sess., H. R. 5622, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 84, p. 3942, see also H. R. 5877 (same session), p. 4513.

MEN OF EXPERIENCE HANDLE OWN LINES

As for the men directly handling the most controversial commodities: Bill Little, in charge of fuel, has had 21 years of practical experience, including 15 years as Alvan T. Fuller's man on gas and oil, and 4 years as sales and service supervisor for the Metropolitan Coal Co. Jack Crooks, automobiles, was 17 years the general manager of Ford sales in Boston. John F. Doheny, meat, has had 21 years in the meat business in all parts of the country. Bill Hoyle, miscellaneous products, has had 35 years in the retail trade and was vice president of the Steiger-Cox Co. John Hamill, food, was 15 years with Lever Bros.

As to the sapience of these gentlemen, deponent sayeth not, because deponent knoweth not, but they, at least, should know their commodities by sight, which is contrary to the usual legend.

These men work in great part with the local boards. In fact, as much responsibility as possible, or as it can be prevailed upon to accept, is given the local board. Each of these is being organized into its own organization with its own specialists, price panels, and the rest. In this State, at any rate, the local board is pretty potent and a lot of the abuse hurled at something rather vague called the Office of Price Administration really belongs in the home neighborhood.

If you want to squawk about so many C cards, for instance, the Office of Price Administration headquarters has nothing to do with that. The local boards give them. There is a story going around about certain sections getting heavy cream at a lot of houses on doctors' prescriptions. That's local board business again.

The headquarters office, says the Director, wants and expects the local boards to try all alleged gasoline violations in their districts. Some do, but some don't want to because they don't want to risk the local hard feelings. Some are willing to but apparently just don't get around to it. To take care of those cases, district headquarters has set up three courts of its own.

The headquarters, now at 10 Post Office Square but soon to move to the old Houghton-Dutton Building, is a tremendously busy place. I was through it, and nobody's sitting around doing cross-word puzzles or a personal manicure. It receives 7,300 pieces of mail a day, and approximately 6,500 telephone calls at this time of the year, mostly about the use of gasoline. There's a switchboard serving 48 trunk lines. It sometimes gets so far behind that calls are from 5 to 7 minutes late going in, and from 16 to 17 minutes late going out. There is, in addition, a lot of extracurricular routine such as the distribution of ration book 3.

HUGE MASS OF CORRESPONDENCE HANDLED

An endless stream of documents and directives pour in steadily from Washington. These all have to be processed and passed on. An idea of correspondence and paper work is to be had from the records of the price section, a single unit, for the month of June.

This division received 1,754 personal visits from businessmen. It received 9,018 telephone calls and made 6,339. It wrote 1,912 letters, each double checked by the legal staff for accuracy. It received and filed 6,000 pieces of mail. During June, it prepared 2 orders for area pricing. The Boston order included 1,000 individual brands. Careful checking revealed that only 6 errors were made in the Boston area affecting 43 cities and towns. It mimeographed 15,000 copies of these orders, cut 130 stencils, and mailed 1,000 copies of each stencil to the local boards. In other words, it sent out approximately 130,000 pieces of material. This division says that in the case of material intended for merchants, it is not unusual for it to send 5,000 copies in a single distribution.

That's a sample of the clerical background, but, insofar as the public is concerned, the big story here is probably enforcement. The black market, big and little, is their target, says the Director. Instead of harassing the public or poking or snooping, he says, they move carefully and don't pounce until they are sure.

In testimony of this, he cites the 100-percent score in the case of criminal violators of the beef and poultry provisions. They've gone to trial with 15 cases, all prepared by their own legal staff, and they got 15 convictions, with sentences ranging from 10 days to 6 months and fines totaling $22,500. A total of 20 investigators worked on these cases for 4 months, interviewing hundreds of witnesses and examining a large number of records, vouchers, checks, and invoices.

This was straight, criminal, black-market stuff. After one trial and conviction involving three defendants, the defendants admitted that over a period of 4 months they accepted an amount in excess of $125,000 "on the side" for deliberately selling in defiance of the law.

But to get to the principal headache of all hands, which is gasoline, the public should understand, if it wants to be fair, that the Office of Price Administration has nothing to do with the matter of supply. In fact, it has nothing to do with supply in any interstate items such as meat, potatoes, gas, or fuel of any sort. There's no head to gasoline—in line with our opening paragraphs—no authority, and therefore no real responsibility.

ICKES IS BOSS, BUT HE ONLY MANS PUMP

Mr. Ickes is the official Coordinator of record, but he only mans the pump. The Army and Navy, having priority, tell him how much they require. That leaves so much for civilian consumption. He informs the Office of Price Administration, and their job is to see that nobody gets more than his card says he should and that he uses it only in the manner officially specified.

When the latest nonessential ban went on, Director Bresnahan says, hoping for the best, he didn't at first try to crack down. Instead he went on the radio pleading with the public to cooperate, and even thanking them for cooperating. Then came the first good Sunday, and the State registrar's office reported an increase of 51 percent in automobile travel. The State checks with those contraptions you've seen and probably wondered about, a small piece of rubber tubing stretched across some highway and connected with a metal can or box at one side of the road.

With this unexpected increase, the Department sent out its car stoppers, the "gestapo" you've read about. Regular police, State, county, or local, did the stopping, as they alone had the authority, but the Office of Price Administration inspectors did the interviewing. They turned in 5,000 names.

Of these 3,200 looked bad. The rest were thrown away. Of the 3,200, 1,363 looked like possible violators. Of these, 360 were reported to their local boards, and 87 were handled from headquarters. Of the 360 sent to local boards to date, the rations of 40 were revoked, 25 were found guilty but let off with a warning, and 27 were acquitted. At headquarters hearing offices, 24 were found guilty, 6 possibly guilty and warned, and 23 not guilty. A total of 916 were sent those letters which have been publicly criticized, but which Bresnahan defends as the best way to handle the matter, and these are still in the works.

These figures hold up to 10 days ago, and they say that of the 5,000 cars stopped, the rations of 64 drivers were revoked, 31 were warned, and 50 turned loose, with 916 cases still pending. Bresnahan says with 800,000 cars in the State, 500,000 in his district, and 116,000 C books, this is an excellent record and shows that the public is cooperating.

He says, incidentally, that his office is being flooded now with new calls following newspaper stories, and other stories to the effect that the East is newly flooded with gas. The actual facts are, he said, that a safe minimum for this region is a million barrels, that in December we had a million and a half barrels, that our absolute low point was April, when we had 393,000 barrels, and that, at the moment we have 663,000 barrels, a big up over April, but still far below our safe minimum.

AMAZED BY ATTITUDE OF DIRECTOR AND STAFF

Gasoline is the headache, he says. The rest would be easy. Gasoline was a luxury in the last war. It's a necessity now. It hits all business, and everybody in one way or another. Bresnahan says his sympathy is strictly with the public. He wishes there were more gas. He could use some himself, he says, but these are the rules and his job is to enforce them.

I'm frank to state that the attitude of the man and his entire staff amazed me. The public has done little but abuse them. They did little but praise the public. I gathered that they are as bewildered by a lot of it as the public they have to pass it on to, but I naturally couldn't try to place the man in the position of criticizing his superiors by asking him if he didn't personally consider it a lot of junk.

He was strictly explaining the workings of his own department. References to any other were incidental, and so obviously accidental that he hastened to slide back to his base before I could tag him out with a question. For instance, I asked, "In these investigations of yours, have you any going around deliberately trying to create incidents?"

"We have never had a 'shopper' in this district and we never will have," he snapped.

"But they have them in other places, don't they?" I asked him.

"We're discussing this district," he said with a smile.

"How about these week-end meat situations?" I asked him. "The papers come out with a statement that a great shipment of meat is headed for New England. Everybody's mouth starts to water, and the meat never shows up. I understand one of the reasons is that the meat gets here all right, but that the Army and Navy park their officers right on the tracks when they read the papers and grab it first. Is that correct?"

"You'll have to ask the Army and the Navy," he said. "Supply isn't our province. We supervise the sale of it in the civilian market."

"What's your considered opinion of the public reaction?" I asked him.

"For the preponderant part, it's been cooperative and really swell," he said. "There'll always be stinkers and cheats, and that's what we're here for. For example, we froze restaurant prices because the representatives of 90,000 war workers complained to us that restaurants and lunch carts around war plants were kiting their prices in some instances more than 100 percent. We investigated and they were correct. Some were charging 15 cents for a hot dog and 15 cents for a cup of coffee. We had a case of where one of the elevator girls out there bought a radio on credit for $25. When the bill came they had charged her $36, despite the fact that the ceiling price was $25. She didn't know that the law says, in case of that type of overcharge, the victim is entitled to three times the excess charged, or $50, whichever is the larger sum. But she came in here and we started to investigate. Their lawyer came running down with a bill of sale and the $50 for her."

PROUD OF JOB DISTRICT IS DOING

"Do you think all this is economical and sensible?" I asked him.

"I'll put this district against any in the Nation," he said, "for the job we have to do, I don't believe anybody does it better."

It's hard to quarrel with him there having seen, not alone the facts and figures but his

big and busy staff grinding steadily away. Maybe it's like taking pride in the fact that of a lot of broken legs, you've got the cleanest break, but this office and its figures seemed to say that: (1) here was no free ride for a lot of political free loaders, (2) the executives have had practical experience with the subjects they're handling, (3) they're a hard-working lot, and they stay abreast of their job, (4) they bear whatever fumigation civil-service rating gives them, (5) none has been asked his political affiliation, and (6) like the Light Brigade, theirs not to reason why, but just to do it.

It may not be true in a great many places, and the entire conception is open to challenge, but so far as doing a job by the rules set goes, this Boston job rates in the plus position.

Professional Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 14, 1943, Mr. James R. Newkirk, president of the Indiana Bar Association, delivered an address to the Evansville Bar Association of Evansville, Ind. It is my opinion that the thinking expressed in Mr. Newkirk's speech includes so many observations which are pertinent to the questions confronting the country that I consider it an honor to cause the same to be inserted into the RECORD:

When the guns begin to rattle the voice of reason has been silenced. I wonder if we haven't blown out the light of wisdom and decided to fight it out in the dark. During the past decade I have read at least 200 books, listened to three or four hundred essays and addresses, followed a dozen commentators in the newspapers and over the radio, studied numerous court decisions, and exchanged views with men in every walk of life, and my thoughts, time and time again, have irresistibly focused upon the opening paragraph of The Tale of Two Cities, where Dickens begins by saying, "It was the best of times; it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom; it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of belief; it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light; it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope; it was the winter of despair; we had everything before us; we had nothing before us; we were all going direct to heaven; we were all going direct the other way." This quotation does justice to the period through which we are living and during which we have been flinging so many piles of green wood upon the altar of freedom that the smoke from the smoldering fire obscures our vision. It is said that the flame remains feeble on which piles of green wood are flung. I intend to fling on some dry and seasoned chips this evening.

Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, in a recent address, said: "Until there can be some semblance of agreement upon the aims of human life and the ends of organized society, humanity must fumble on from catastrophe to catastrophe, learning little as it goes." History reveals from the very dawn of civilization a continuous struggle of men to organize a society or system of government under which they can live peaceably together and enjoy to the fullest extent the fruits of their own labor. More than 23 centuries ago Plato proposed the perfect state, which he admitted could neither be established nor maintained until rulers become philosophers or philosophers become rulers. His pupil, Aristotle, first gave expression to the principle that the rule of law is preferable to the rule of any individual and said, "He who bids the law rule may be deemed to bid God and reason alone rule, but he who bids man rule adds an element of the beast; for desire is a wild beast, and passion perverts the minds of rulers, even when they are the best men."

Cicero contended that laws governing human behavior were as natural and immutable as the laws of science; consequently we should treat them in the same manner by employing those that are conducive to happiness and checking those that are injurious to our existence. This can only be accomplished by recognizing the natural weaknesses in every person, such as passion, selfishness, greed, desire, and love of power, against which must be self-imposed checks, restraints, and controls. Polybius was probably the first to advocate checks and balances in organized society, and John Locke was the originator of the plan for separating government into separate and independent departments, to wit, legislative, executive, and judicial. It would add length but little substance to this discussion to enumerate all the philosophers who contributed the ideas and principles which are embraced in our Constitution. No other document has ever been conceived which provided checks, restraints, and controls of the natural and inherent weakness of mankind and at the same time recognized the individual as the servant of his Creator, in whose service he must be reasonably free to work, to think, to speak, and to own and to use property. The Constitution is predicated upon the fact that an individual has certain inalienable personal and property rights of which no government can justifiably deprive him. Property rights and personal rights are necessarily of equal importance to the individual and neither can have a preference over the other. The loss of one exterminates the other and the extinction of either leads to political dictatorship.

When we refer to dictatorship, we usually have in mind the philosopher of despair and oppression, Machiavelli. He was color-blind to commonplace morality, disregarded every ethical standard for political expediency, and considered the people as mere puppets who were always obedient to the will and command of their ruler. He said: "A prince, therefore, who is wise and prudent cannot and ought not keep his word when the keeping of it is to his prejudice. * * * He that best personates the fox has the better success. * * * It is great consequence to disguise your inclination and to play the hypocrite well. * * * It is honorable to seem mild, and merciful, and courteous, and religious, and sincere, and indeed to be so, provided your mind be so rectified and prepared that you can act quite contrary upon occasion. * * * A prince, then, is to have particular care that nothing falls from his mouth but what is full of the five qualities aforesaid, and that to see and hear him he appears all goodness, integrity, humanity, and religion, which last he ought to pretend to more than ordinarily, because more men do judge by the eye than by the touch; for everybody sees but few understand; everybody sees how you appear but few know what in reality you are, and those few dare not oppose the opinion of the multitude who have the majesty of their prince to defend them; * * * nothing recommends a prince so highly to the world as great enterprises and noble expressions of his own valor and conduct."

This political doctrine which places expediency above morality and all virtues and which countenances the use of craft and deceit by rulers is not the only kind of dictatorship against which we should ever be on guard. I refer to economic dictatorship which, without detection, develops within a country and in many instances has been the forerunner to political dictatorship. I therefore intend to consider this evening the centralization of economic power in this country and its effects upon everyone, but more particularly our profession. I may indicate a degree of stupidity and shortsightedness on the part of our professional leaders and then suggest the responsibility which our profession must necessarily assume in the restoration to the individual of his personal and property rights under our constitutional form of government.

What we have today is not the capitalism which made this country the envy of the world. The corporate structure has undermined and split the original conception of the right to own and to use private property. The thousands and millions of shareholders and bondholders neither manage, use, nor dispose of the property in which they technically have an interest, but the presidents and boards of directors of large corporations do manage, use, and dispose of property of which they are not the owners and in which they oftentimes have a very small interest. By virtue of their position they are, in a sense, merely trustees of property; however, they are not so charged under law, and they do not bear the risk or responsibility of owners. The managerial aristocracy has frequently mismanaged the corporate property and preserved nothing for the stockholders, yet they have rarely omitted to grant themselves high salaries and bonuses amounting to thousands and millions of dollars. Corporate officials of the large industrial and financial combinations manage what they do not own, reap in their own interest what they do not sow, and are gradually but effectively eliminating real private-property rights which constitute the basic principle of capitalism.

They are bureaucrats in the same manner and to the same extent as if they were managing Government property. It is only a short step from corporate bureaucracy to State bureaucracy when the Chief Executive can by a directive take over the corporate administrative system as a governmental agency. We have already, for a just and sufficient cause, observed several such transformations. The struggle between Wall Street and Washington is not then a conflict between capitalism and totalitarianism, or private property and State property, or private business and public business, but between corporate bureaucracy and political bureaucracy. In this conflict the individual is not directly involved and he should renew his opposition to both economic and political dictatorship, for the one is as dangerous as the other and neither is compatible with the rights and dignity of the individual.

We must admit that both the engineers and the promotional personnel in industry have been successful and each group profited by the achievements of the other. Financial institutions considered the abilities of those identified with American industry as good risks and made available to them fabulous funds for development and expansion. The advertising agencies were enlisted to sell their product to the public by appealing to the personal likes of the average individual, and particularly his sense of taste, beauty, and pleasure. A commodity of medium quality supported by clever advertising can be sold in vast quantities, but a like commodity of excellent quality unsupported by advertising cannot be sold. As sales increase the company expands and then the advertising not only praises the commodity but the corporation that produces it. Thus begins a power that envelops an entire field of production simply because quantity production reduces

the cost of the article or commodity and the less the cost the greater amount there is to allocate to wages and advertising and the more advertising the greater the sales. Advertising becomes so much more effective when it constantly refers to the fine working conditions of the employees, the high wages, the gifts and donations to charity, the taxes paid by the corporation, and then dividends incite much favorable comment in financial circles.

The process I have just outlined develops behind and in connection with a clever and convincing stream of advertising or propaganda, whichever term seems to you more appropriate, and there is no opposition, since the ultimate consequences of the corporate monster are so concealed and so remote that few can discern them. As a matter of fact people cannot balance the attraction of the immediate and palpable advantages against the danger of remote and concealed evils. To further accelerate the corporate growth and expansion the Congress of the United States and the legislatures of the States enact corporate and other legislation condoning all kinds of inside manipulations and authorizing mergers, consolidations, and other kinds of combinations. Add to this development the holding companies and subsidiary corporations plus the interlocking directorates and we find that free enterprise has become a mere myth and that competition is only a memory. Practically every industrial and manufacturing field is now dominated by a very limited number of corporations—one, of course, might be construed as a monopoly.

It is only natural for corporations to eliminate their competitors through purchase, merger and consolidation simply because it is easier to make profits when a corporation can fix, without fear of competition, the price for which it sells its products. I maintain that there is little or no competition or free enterprise in transportation, railroading, banking, moving-picture production, steel and coal production, communication, power and light distribution, manufacture of automobiles and accessories, manufacture of cement, soap, farm machinery, electrical appliances, rubber, automobiles, and numerous other articles and commodities. There is to a small extent both free enterprise and competition in the retail business but that is gradually and effectively succumbing to the large chain organizations which in the near future are likely to control the whole system of distribution of consumer goods.

This is an age wherein the sensate values of pleasure, utility, and expediency have been predominate. The heroes of the past decade have been the Babbitts, the Elmer Gentrys, the warped and morbid characters of Hemingway and Steinbeck. People of all classes revel in a cheap and debasing brand of pictures and stories which have become the stock and trade of a variety of debunking magazines and periodicals. Sex, love, and religion are distorted by mocking refrains such as the crooners' We Kiss and the Angels Sing, Heaven Can Wait, This Is Paradise, and Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition, all of which profane our most cherished moral and religious values. We construct the tallest buildings and boast that they are the best because they are the biggest. We maintain huge choruses and orchestras—the bigger the better. A book sold en masse is regarded as a masterpiece; a play enjoying the longest run is accepted as the best. Our motion pictures are conceived on a vast scale and endowed with sumptuous trimmings and accessories.

The bulk of one daily newspaper often exceeds the life output of many eminent thinkers. A person enjoying the biggest income, a college with the largest enrollment, a crooner with the biggest public, a phonograph record sold in the largest quantity, a preacher having the largest audience, a research project entailing the greatest cost, in short any commodity or service that is in some respect the biggest becomes for this reason alone the greatest or the best. Because of our materialistic philosophy we brag of possessing the largest number of schools and colleges; the greatest number of books published and plays produced; the largest number of churches, museums, plays, and the like. We have simply adopted the corporate slogan, "The bigger the better." and anything to be good and right must be colossal. The prevailing notion is that money alone can overcome oppression and depression, insure happiness and security, dispel fear and poverty.

It is not my purpose to condemn big business nor to indict the good people of this country; however, we can never cope with the problems facing us by ignoring the facts and existing conditions, some of which are both distasteful and unpleasant. At the present time there is hardly any ethical values common to and equally binding upon all races, religious groups, the rich and the poor, employers and employees, the oppressors and the oppressed. Our ethical and juridical values are quite contradictory and irreconcilable. The greatest tragedy of all is the fact that we no longer have a respected and independent judiciary, acceptable to all factions and whose decisions are equally authoritative upon all. We have developed into a society of endless contesting factions which are above any judicial control and the whole body of ethics has accordingly become a plaything of unscrupulous pressure groups, each of which tries to snatch as big a share of sensate values as possible at the expense of the other pressure groups. In any organized society issues between parties, regardless of size or influence, should be decided in an orderly process by courts of justice, but today the differences between the powerful forces are being handled by force and political pressure, which, if not checked, must ultimately lead to moral and financial bankruptcy.

Lawyers become impotent under any kind of dictatorship and we all know that our courts have purposely been ignored and avoided as a forum in which to adjudicate the conflicts between modern forces. The blackest pages in the history of our profession are those that reveal the aid and assistance we rendered in the promoting and building of the corporate powers which now challenge the very existence of our honorable and dignified profession. I am not unmindful of the fact that the large corporations employ men who are trained for the profession, yet working under a boss deprives them of independence, the very essence of their profession. The ethics and standards to which we all subscribe are impliedly a part of every engagement, yet we all know that our clients have little or no respect for them and our adherence thereto, in face of a large salary, may weaken. When the bread and butter for me and my family depends upon a salary or the benevolence of one corporate client I am very apt to yield to its commands and accept its directives, irrespective of my personal judgment and opinion.

A large percentage of our lawyer population by reason of necessity are simply servants of great corporations, unions, and Government, occupying a relation in which they dare not exercise their own judgment or assert their professional independence. I am indeed happy that we still have a great majority of our lawyers who have retained their independence and who are free to think and act according to their own judgment in all matters that come to them. I have always admired and I will continue to admire the medical profession for its courage in resisting the socialization of the practice of medicine. The doctors should have and do have our support. Our weakness seems to be in part due to an erroneous impression that we can legislate both morals and justice, therefore lawyers are not indispensable. How foolish it is to believe that the legislature or the Executive can command the laws of human behavior any more than those of science. I would not be surprised, however, to hear some modern intellectual advocating an Executive directive or an act of Congress dispensing with all mental and physical defects, enjoining sickness and pestilence throughout the world and thereby making available all the doctors for industrial employment. This seems ludicrous yet it is actually happening in the field of human relations.

The very nature of employment requires direction by the employer and obedience by the employee. This direction and obedience cannot be construed as dictatorship when industry is so diversified and so divided that employees have a reasonable opportunity to choose between numerous potential employers, but the centralization of industry plus the necessary limitation of individual ability to perform the highly technical type of work demanded, has brought about a condition where industry has become a benevolent dictator. An employee has to work for either one or two large corporations or not work at all. The worker is virtually compelled to force himself into employment and demand that wage and those working conditions conducive to a decent and respectable living. To resist this centralized economic power and the many abuses thereof labor unions were organized and we are now witnessing a critical conflict between two powerful forces, neither of them amenable to law nor controllable by courts of justice.

This is a situation which lawyers should have foreseen and against which lawyers should have warned the people. Lawyers are between the firing lines and dare not permit either side to win the battle because whichever side is victorious lawyers must necessarily be among the vanquished. There is in my opinion a solution and only one solution of this very serious controversy, and that is a return to constitutional government and the restoration of independent and locally owned and operated industrial companies. How is this to be accomplished and who should assume the major responsibility in this great conversion?

I do not wish to be numbered among those who view with alarm the trend of the Government and then fail to suggest a reasonable plan to extricate ourselves from the dilemma. The first thing to do is to reverse the process by which the economic power has been concentrated, that is to repeal all laws authorizing holding companies, mergers, consolidations, and combinations. Second, enact and enforce a law against monopoly. Third, amend the Constitution, if necessary, to permit Congress and the State legislatures to regulate, restrict, and control corporations and unions leaving the individual all the rights and freedoms enumerated in the Constitution; and, further, temporize the process by necessary relief measures supplemented by an educational program calculated to teach the aims of human life and the ends of organized society. In principle these things will be done, otherwise we might as well reconcile ourselves to some form of socialism or dictatorship because the forces about which I have been talking are incompatible with a republican form of government. I am not unaware of the fact that many people, including men in high positions, sincerely believe that the evils can be and are being eliminated by public welfare, social security, and cradle-to-the-grave measures, but these are designed to cushion the hardships and not to eradicate the evils. They are but attributes of appeasement. They scotch the snake instead of killing it.

We simply cannot countenance a system of economic powers and a philosophy of materialism wherein the individual is but a mere gadget wholly dependent either upon government or modern feudalism. The lords of our complex economic system can no better protect or secure their vassals than those of Europe in the Middle Ages. Material progress must necessarily be tied to and limited by the principles of the Creator of all things to whom we must inevitably account for our own conduct and for the stewardship of the many things entrusted to us.

No group of men is better qualified to assume the responsibility in the process of decentralization of these forces and the restoration of individual rights than the lawyers and no group stands to lose more in neglecting this duty than the lawyers. It is not a matter to be discharged by an organization of lawyers but rather by the individual help and assistance of every lawyer acting under the influence and guidance of his own conscience. This entails the envelopment of higher moral standards and a more thorough preparation for leadership in culture, science, philosophy, and jurisprudence. It simply means that we must again become leaders in every phase of intellectual pursuits and standards. We must champion the cause and uphold the rights of the average American citizen and thereby gain the confidence to which we are rightfully entitled. We should ever remember that justice not power or wealth is our ultimate goal. The fortunate and the privileged must have counsel, but the unfortunate and the underprivileged must never be neglected.

Some lawyers have money and some lawyers make mistakes, yet the rank and file of our profession are common, ordinary men who have dedicated their lives to the promotion of justice. We need not relax our effort to sponsor reforms of procedure and judicial administration and rededicating ourselves to the principle that men should be governed by law and that controversies should be seasonably disposed of by an impartial and independent judiciary.

Notwithstanding the constant criticism of our profession I say to you that man for man, the world around, in view of its temptations, its difficulties, and the grade of citizenship with which it deals, it is the cleanest and the most high-minded of all the learned professions. The marvel is, not that some lawyers go wrong, but that so many lawyers go right. Such is the nature of our calling that we are inevitably internes for the epidemic wards of humanity.

In the very nature of things, our profession could not exist in the absence of integrity and fidelity to trust and duty. So long as integrity is intact, the conscience may not be bartered for money or at all, while as to the accumulation of fortunes, Webster's dictum still carries the force and weight of judicial fiat, namely, "Lawyers work hard, live well, and die poor."

No man or class of men labors harder or more persistently; is criticized as much, or trusted as far; is as poorly paid in proportion to labor done, ability applied, and results accomplished. The legal profession demands that the lawyer be a manly man, an upright citizen, a tireless worker, a student of the affairs of life, and thoroughly familiar with the mainsprings of human nature.

It is he who, standing upon the high promontories of life, looks backward across the untold centuries to the dawn of time, forward to the boundary line of eternity, and, catching the message flashed by Omnipotence, observes written upon the face of all he sees, or hears, or feels, or knows, the decretal orders of the Supreme Justice of the Universe, and sets about, with all the powers at his command, to discover and to rationalize the relation of man to his Creator and of man to his fellowmen; recognizes that man can no more create the laws which apply to his fellowmen than he can create the laws which apply to his relations with his Creator; devotes his life to the ascertainment and the administration of the law; strives ever for the discovery, vindication, and establishment of the truth; concentrates his energies and the talents which God gave him to the triumph of right and the dispensation and promulgation of equity and justice between his fellowmen, and keeps constantly in mind, in office and in courtroom, his duty to his client, to the court, to the state, to his God, and to himself; he it is who is entitled to the proud distinction of being justly and appropriately termed—the lawyer.

There is no higher or nobler calling in all the earth than his profession. This sphere of endeavor is as broad; his domain of inquiry and investigation is as boundless; his commission is as high; his labors and achievements are as permanent; his powers for good and his contributions to progress are as great; and his memory and his monuments are as enduring as any that have been vouchsafed to the children of men since the world began. This is the most propitious time in the history of our profession for us to erect by acts, counsel, and guidance a great memorial to our profession. Let us champion the right of the common man and resist the forces which tend to undermine, discredit, and destroy the fundamental principles of justice, independence, and democratic processes. The bar relies upon logic and reason and its voice must rise above the cries of selfish interests. We must immediately liberate ourselves from that false and despicable impression that we have sold out lock, stock, and barrel to the new economic powers and special interests.

You know and I know that our people believe, and rightly believe, that our economy is unbalanced; that the standards of compensation are inequitable; that monopolies are present in every field of production; that free enterprise does not exist; that personal and property rights are in jeopardy; that security and freedom from want depends entirely upon receiving and enjoying to the fullest extent the fruits of our own labor; that government is our servant and not our master; and that our faith in God is indispensable. Someone asked Newton if he believed in Darwin's theory of evolution or in the biblical story of creation and Newton replied that he was on the side of the angels. I subscribe to the teachings of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who said "Men always desire their own good, but do not always discern it; the people are never corrupted, though often deceived, and it is only then that they seem to will evil. * * * The general will is always right, but the judgment which guides it is not always enlightened."

The people, as before stated, know that our economic system is out of balance and it is our duty to enlighten the political leaders of this country who have it within their power to make the necessary readjustments. Those who advocate the status quo are referred to as reactionaries; those who would build a paternalistic government are called liberals; and those who would change the whole form and structure of our Government are denominated radicals. Let us avoid all of these groups first by recognizing the real aims of human life and second by pointing out how these aims can be achieved under our Constitution.

The Constitution embraces only principles of political science and provides such checks and balances as to prevent the centralization of political power in one man or a small group of men. No political structure, however perfect in form, can long endure unless it exercises control over the economic forces under it. It is just as necessary to have checks and balances in our economic system as in our political system and it is the duty of the three departments of government to establish and maintain an economic balance by and through reasonable checks, restraints, and controls for which they have ample power under the Constitution.

States' Rights or Federal Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "States' Rights or Federal Bureaucracy," delivered by me last evening over the facilities of the Columbia broadcasting network on the Congress Speaks program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The States' rights guaranty in the Constitution may well be called the lost amendment. The almost complete abrogation by the vast Federal bureaucracy under the New Deal has lost to the States the lion's share of the rights they once had.

The tenth amendment is the one that guaranteed to the States the rights which so often have been taken away by Federal power seekers. It was originally a guarantee of good government by the people who lived close to their elected officials. These officials they could see and reach and occasionally give them Hail Columbia if they didn't behave, Often they were neighbors.

At least the voters' will could be felt at the polls. But the Federal bureaus are impervious to the ballot. They are not elected. They dominate as designees of the dynasty. Article 10 of the amendments to the Constitution specifically states:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

It is inevitable that as government gets further removed from the people, then the further it gets away from a real first-hand knowledge of their best interests and their will and influence. In contrast with this remoteness, is the present draft board set-up, which—thank God—is still in the hands of the local people, who in most cases know the boys that may be called up and know their circumstances. And this draft board, with its strong local character, is one of the few efficient organizations among the United States Government agencies today. They have been subjected to less criticism than other wartime Federal agencies. Credit goes to the close local tie. But aside from the local draft board, local government and State rights have been taken over largely by the Federal Government. This repudiation of States' rights has become progressively serious since 1932.

Is it odd that the Republicans now have to champion the principles of Jeffersonian democracy which the New Dealers have forgotten so completely? Well, the Republicans must champion States' rights or soon there will be none left to protect. Here are some facts of what has happened under the New Deal:

The securities laws of the various States have become submerged to the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission regulations.

The agricultural welfare of the important agricultural States has been negated by Federal agricultural planning, to the point where now we may face a hungry America.

The inroads made on State education administration are serious, and State direction and control of education is further

threatened by a vast $300,000,000 program of Federal aid—involving Federal influence.

The State employment services have been brought under Federal control through domination of the United States Employment Service.

Remembering the history of the battle for State rights, we recall that Rhode Island was the first State to come out for State rights. Thomas Jefferson was an advocate for State rights and later on Calhoun was among its most notable exponents. America grew and prospered under this principle. State rights have been progressively usurped by the Federal Government since the New Deal administration took the reins. What happened soon after they took over—back in 1932 and 1933—was but prologue for the future.

In those years to pull us out of an economic debacle we were supposed to rely on the Federal Emergency Relief Administration and the Civil Works Administration. These agencies were State administered and they were to spend several billion dollars to help pull us out of a depression. Their programs were State administered. They did not last long. Harry Hopkins rose to the czardom of all spendthrift dynasties of the New Deal and he decreed that this great spending spree should be federally controlled, operated, managed, planned—yea, and spent.

When the Federal Government under Messrs. Roosevelt and Hopkins took over the administration of all relief, all depression spending—all the bloated billions of the age of political splurge—they dictated, then and there, the political future of this Nation. For they controlled the patronage, they controlled the purse, they controlled the rights of the people of all America, since those rights centered in economic matters then more than they ever had before.

This power the bureaucrats abused. This decade of decadent spending the American people now despise. Whenever men with the power of a federal government as great as the United States control a nation politically and economically by profligate spending, they become the masters of the nation's politics. Whenever they center that power in the Federal Government to the exclusion of the local interests then truly the power of a few men has but little offset. Their centralized power and might grow ever stronger.

Could this federalization have happened under a political doctrine that guaranteed States' rights? Was Maine to be forced to have sea walls because Hopkins said so? Was Nebraska to have to discard her program of decent economical government to accommodate a wasteful Work Projects Administration because Hopkins said so?

Is the great Nation of the United States to be desolated with desire—the desire for power in the hands of a few—a few in Washington? The very name of the great land where we live is the United States, but the States have been largely forgotten. The United has been made to mean united if you let us run it.

The Governors of the 48 great States that make up America are chosen by the people, too, but their voices have been falsettoed by the foster fathers of federalism. Whence came this evil? We American folks used to look to the county for a lot of our government. But it seems that the big county-seat town down on the Potomac has taken over.

Do States have rights? Do the people of the States have rights? Are these rights to be submerged through the planned perfidy of New Dealism? Today a Governor's conference has become a new battleground for States' rights.

At the recent Governors' Conference at Columbus, Ohio, June 24, a strong and healthy revitalization of State government through vigorous leadership of Republican Governors was indicated by their action demanding a return to the States of those powers so brashly borrowed by the Federal Government.

This Governors' Conference action of voicing demand for return of rights to the States is acknowledgment of the danger to good, decent, economical government in the post-war period unless the States have their proper share of administration of the people's rights.

The Governors also made it clear that they would investigate the vast bureaucracy that has been all too evident in their States, sometimes reaching ridiculous heights, such as there being many times as many Federal employees in their States as there are State employees.

In an article in this month's issue of Readers Digest by Senator BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, it was stated that the total of Federal employees exceeds the combined total of all State, county, municipal, and all local governments in the United States. Surely this threatens rule from Washington.

Jefferson, the desecrated idol of the Collectivists who have used his name in blasphemy so many times to get $25 a plate at Jefferson Day dinners for the Democratic political expenses, said over and over again that no government could be strong without the support of the States that made it up.

Lincoln, a great welder of States, pointing to the hordes of office seekers, said some day that would be a greater problem than slavery, and today Federal bureaucracy has reached its zenith. The States should come alive. States' rights are at stake.

The Declaration of Independence contains this sentence: "He (King George) has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance."

Would you believe this was written in 1776?

The most destructive force to the States' rights in the Nation's history is the veritable flood of the 3,000,000 officeholders now on the Federal pay roll. They are concentrated in States to a degree ofttimes much greater than the entire State administration number. For instance, Ohio, where there are over three times as many Federal pay rollers in the State as there are State employees; Nebraska, where the Federal number is 24,600 and the State total only 5,680.

Every seizure of power, however small, is at the expense of the State. It is the only source of power to be tapped. The main trouble with Federal seizure of power is this: The national rule seldom fits any appreciable segment of the people or any appreciable number of States. There may be many men in the Army who wear size 44 uniforms, but that is no reason for fitting all soldiers with size 44. Any attempt to make a blanket order—as is usually done by Washington bureau chiefs on national matters—usually means a compromise on the multitude of widely divergent needs of the people of the various States with the result that such a blanket application seldom fits anyone.

Consequently the need of Government frequently is self-government within the State among the people who are best qualified to determine their own needs. The different characteristics of different areas are too often overlooked by the pompous Federal planners. Gas rationing by the Federal Government is a good example. For instance, when the New Deal professors and theorists, not knowing the broad reaches of the country outside of the big streetcar centers, took over gas rationing, they bungled the business, and howls were heard all over the Nation. What can a man who may have to drive 50 miles to reach a doctor do with 3 gallons of gas? It is evident that cognizance of local problems has not been taken by the New Deal dictators in this instance. Another example is the Federal Office of Price Administration regulation on chicken feed. Farmers used to buy feed for their chickens by the ton. Now they must buy it at not to exceed 200 pounds at a time. This requires them to go to town 5 times as often, and use lots more gas.

Federal order M68, designating 40 acres as the drilling area for one oil well, applicable alike in all States notwithstanding varying circumstances, is one of the primary causes of the threatened oil shortage. It caused the prohibition of drilling of several thousand wells (about 13,000 in 1942). Federal interference with State oil production plans is a glaring example of Federal encroachment on States rights, not only to the exclusion of the welfare of the people of those States, but to the detriment of the Nation at large. Even now that bit of czarism is crippling the war effort.

Federally fattened fuehrers rule more Government agencies affecting the daily life of the people of the States than there are States in the land.

Domineering New Dealers drum up more regulations for a supposedly free populace to live under than can be recorded in 100 fat volumes. The War Production Board's regulations alone fill some 20 thick books.

Free enterprise in State after State has been ruined by edicts of dictatorial Washington demagoges.

Today's test to democracy in America may be framed in the question: "Are we to have State's rights or Federal bureaucracy?"

Detroit's Part in Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William A. Mara, which appeared in the Detroiter of June 28, 1943:

DETROIT'S PART IN AVIATION

(By William A. Mara, Consolidated Vultee Aircraft, Inc.)

The development of both military and commercial aviation has been influenced to an amazing degree by work performed by the Detroit Board of Commerce and its members.

Harvey Campbell has asked me to tell this story which in retrospect is startling, because so many of the things we worked for and which seemed visionary at the time have now been dwarfed by actual achievement. Air lines, airplane manufacture, air races, air shows, glider competitions, exploration, balloon races, global planning, airports, airways, and a host of other projects were tackled with enthusiasm and ability. Therefore, if memory becomes hazy when looking back over a quarter of a century, and if the names and achievements of some of the actors who played important roles are omitted, the slight is unintentional.

Speaking first of air lines, the board has acted directly and indirectly in the creation of United Airlines, Northwest Airlines, Braniff Airways, and others. Detroit's part in these developments began one day in 1923.

Maj. Leon B. Lent, now Colonel Lent in charge of the National Inventors' Council in Washington, walked into the Board's offices with a plan for an air line to connect Detroit with Cleveland. Backing Lent financially was Inglis M. Uppercu, prominent Eastern

Cadillac distributor. Lent and Uppercu had acquired some twin engine World War No. 1 flying boats and had converted them into passenger-carrying planes. They had operated between Florida and Havana during the previous winter season. This was the pioneering step in our present aerial overwater networks.

Lent felt that a passenger operation between Cleveland and Detroit during the sumber months could be profitable, thus in effect giving them a year-round operation—Florida to Cuba in the winter and Detroit to Cleveland in the summer months.

Lent proposed what at the time seemed to be a rather difficult condition. He wished to have $25,000 worth of tickets sold prior to the opening of the line to Cleveland. The board was able to do this job.

On his staff Lent had two outstanding pilots: One was the late great Capt. Edward Musick, who later won international fame when, as Pan American Airways' chief pilot, he pioneered all of their far-reaching transoceanic services. Musick was chief pilot of the Detroit-Cleveland line. Operations manager was Roland Rholfs, who earlier had won the world airplane-speed championship held in Paris.

The first Cleveland-Detroit flight was made in the early summer of 1923. The passengers were Col. and Mrs. Sidney A. Waldon, Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Campbell, Colonel Lent, the writer and Mrs. Mara. Captain Musick was the pilot of the ship.

Detroiters were quick to patronize this new air service, which made the flight in 1 hour from a base on the Detroit River just above the Belle Isle Bridge to the docks in the heart of downtown Cleveland.

The success of this service furnished inspiration for the other air-line activities in which the board and Detroiters played important parts. Two members of the Board's Aviation Committee who acted on the inspiration were the late Howard E. Coffin, of Hudson Motors, and Carl B. Fritsche. They knew that the New York to San Francisco air-mail line was being operated by the Government through Assistant Postmaster General Paul Henderson. The Government was anxious to turn air-line operation over to private capital, but wished assurance of financial soundness to insure the continued growth of air mail, which had already been proven so necessary. Fritsche and Coffin asked the Board to make a study and prepare the prospectus for the section of this mail line which was to fly between New York and Chicago. In the meantime, Bill Boeing of Seattle, head of Boeing Aircraft that now builds the Flying Fortress, was making similar plans with the Post Office to take over the Chicago to San Francisco end of the line.

Carl Fritsche, Howard E. Coffin, Eugene W. Lewis, Walter L. Briggs, Charles Kettering, and the late Bill Metzger pledged their financial support and talked to leaders in eastern financial circles, including C. M. Keyes and the Ludingtons of Philadelphia. A meeting historic in the annals of air-line history was held one noon in 1925 in a private dining room at the Detroit Club. Gathered there were the Detroiters and easterners mentioned, together with Harvey Campbell and the writer. Plans were made for the formation of a company to be known as National Air Transport, Inc. Two million dollars was subscribed over the luncheon table to finance the new company. Shortly thereafter, Boeing completed his arrangements to handle the western end of the transcontinental line. The Government then relinquished its air-mail operation, turning it over to the two new groups. America's first privately operated transcontinental air line was born.

Later, a merger was effected between the two groups and the unified system now known as United Air Lines came into being.

Bill Stout, likewise a member of the board's aviation committee, has also played a strong hand in both airplane and air-line development. During World War No. 1, Bill built a "Batwing" airplane in Detroit. Later, he secured a contract from the Navy for a torpedo plane. Next came the "Tin Goose," an all-metal single-engine plane adaptable for either passengers or cargo. It carried seven passengers and was powered with a Liberty engine of 440 horsepower, developed in Detroit during World War No. 1. The board was instrumental in helping Stout organize and finance his company which flew the first passenger line between Detroit and Grand Rapids.

Stout's "Tin Geese" were also used by Mr. Ford, who pioneered America's first freight lines which operated daily between Ford plants in Detroit, Chicago, and Buffalo. The cargoes consisted of parts and materials which Mr. Ford interchanged between plants.

Later came Stout's association with Ford when the latter purchased the Stout Metal Airplane Co. and built the famous Ford trimotors which in themselves helped to establish a new transport era. These planes were successfully used on the first air-rail hook-up operated jointly by Transcontinental and Western Air and the Pennsylvania Railroad between New York and Los Angeles. Passengers flew by day on Ford planes and traveled by night via Pullman connection.

As proof of their inherently good design and long life, Ford trimotors, built in the early thirties, are still in operation today in Central and South America and probably in other parts of the world.

Later Stout, with the Board's assistance, began the operation of an air line bearing his name between Detroit and Cleveland. Detroit capital furnished the money for this enterprise, which was eventually absorbed, to the financial benefit of Detroit stockholders, by United Air Lines.

The board and its members—and I stress members because a board of commerce represents only the activities which its members inspire and carry through—had a hand in other successful promotional activities which affected the national aviation picture.

For example, the national air races were brought to Detroit in 1922. Apart from their value in making the public air conscious, the national air races served as a tremendous spur to the creative abilities of leading engineers and manufacturers who sought the prizes and prestige which went to national air race winners.

Formed also in the Board of Commerce, largely by reason of the work of the Board's committee, was the National Aeronautics Association, whose work in the early days was so important in the creation of a national force which helped to lay out the Nation's system of airways, airports, and aerial navigation aids in the form of beacons for night flying, and later the radio beam which furnishes an invisible aerial pathway along which you fly today.

Early in 1924, in an effort to sell air transportation to millions of people in other communities and thereby create a market for Detroit-made airplanes, Bill Metzger, Lee Barrett, Harvey Campbell, and the writer had a meeting. Metzger and Barrett had pioneered in the automobile industry. They helped to operate the early Glidden automobile tours. The idea back of the Glidden tour was a competition in which automobile manufacturers sent their cars cross-country to prove that they would actually run and thereby convince the public that they were practical. Don't you remember the day when duster-clad motor-car drivers were urged by wisecracking observers to "get a horse!"?

Harvey Campbell proposed at the meeting that the same idea be applied to airplanes. A course of approximately 2,000 miles was laid out. A formula for the race was established, and manufacturers were invited to enter their planes.

Through the good offices of William B. Mayo, then chief engineer of the Ford Motor Co., Henry and the late Edsel Ford became interested. Mr. Edsel Ford subscribed generously to the costs of the race and presented the handsome Edsel B. Ford trophy, which can be seen today at the Dearborn Inn. The event was known as the commercial airplane reliability tour, but by reason of Mr. Ford's trophy, was known as the Ford tour. The board, with the writer as manager, organized the first two tours. Later this work was carried on by Ray Cooper, now a colonel in the Army Air Forces, but at that time serving as assistant secretary of the board. Every airplane manufacturer of note entered these tours. The Ford trophy was the most sought-for prize in the industry. Most important, however, was the fact that these tours took the country's best airplanes to the people in many cities and helped to demonstrate the reliability of the airplane. As had been hoped, the tours' usefulness was ended as air lines operating on daily schedules began to reach many American cities. By reason of the daily demonstrations of air-line reliability, the need for the Ford tour ended. But, in the opinion of the industry, it exerted a powerful force in helping to make America air-minded.

And nobody can deny that the national air tours, initiated by the board of commerce, spawning State tours as they progressed, created the original demand for landing fields throughout America—fields that are now our finest airports.

Worthy of note also is the fact that tours were won largely by Detroit-made aircraft—Stinson winning in 1927 and Ford planes finishing in front on at least three other occasions, to win permanent possession of the trophy.

During the 1923–24 period aeronautical engineer Ralph H. Upson, who was also an international balloon champion, conceived the idea of a dirigible constructed entirely of metal. Through the promotional efforts of Carl Fritsche and other members of the board's aviation committee, the Aircraft Development Corporation was formed. A contract was secured from the Navy to build the world's first experimental metal dirigible which was affectionately known throughout the long years of its service as the "tin balloon." Associated in its development were two outstanding engineers and technicians, Art Schlosser and Eddie Hill, who also teamed up on another occasion to win the International Gordon Bennett Balloon Race, the stellar event of its kind. To Eddie Hill, who had a great mechanical mind, went the credit for developing a sort of sewing machine which used strands of aluminum wire instead of thread and made it possible to sew together the long sections of duralumin which were necessary in the dirigible's construction. While I make no claim as a lighter-than-air expert, I do know that the old Detroit-made "tin balloon" outlasted the Navy's larger ships, the Macon, Shenandoah, and Akron, and served illustriously for more than a decade until it was retired, all in one piece, a year or so ago.

In aviation's early days the Board attracted aeronautical engineers, pilots, manufacturers, and promoters from all parts of the United States. The late Anthony Fokker was a frequent visitor. Fokker, a Hollander, won fame during World War No. 1 for his pursuit planes which constituted Germany's chief aerial weapon. Fokker brought to the United States the first trimotored plane and entered it in the first of the Ford Airplane Reliability Tours.

A Fokker trimotor, *The Josephine Ford*, can be seen today in Mr. Ford's Edison Museum in Greenfield Village. With Ford's backing it made the first flight to the North

Pole, carrying on board Admiral Byrd and piloted by the late, great Floyd Bennett and the equally great Col. Berndt Balchen, who today serves illustriously in the Arctic with our Army Air Forces, and who made several notable rescues in Greenland not so long ago.

Later Admiral Byrd used a Ford trimotor to fly to the South Pole. Fokker, through his Detroit visits, was successful in securing the backing of General Motors. From that time on there was a battle of giants as Ford with his trimotor and General Motors with its Fokker competed for international air line business.

Detroit had also attracted the late Edward A. Stinson. Eddie was known as the dean of all aviators, having flown more than any other pilot in the world. During World War No. 1 he trained more pilots for the Army than any other man. Eddie was a frequent visitor to the board. Using a Junkers seven-passenger all-metal plane, in which he had established a world's endurance record of 26 hours, he operated a passenger and charter service and many a Detroiter was carried into the air for the first time in Eddie's plane.

He came to the Board one day with an idea on an old piece of brown wrapping paper. Before Harvey Campbell and the writer he unrolled the paper which contained the sketch of a biplane which had so many unusual features that at first it seemed fantastic. The plane, instead of being the conventional open type, had an enclosed and heated cabin. It was also to be inherently stable, meaning that it could fly safely with the pilot's hands and feet off the controls. It was equipped with an electric starter and finally, it was to have brakes on its wheels. None of these features had ever before been combined in one airplane. I remember that Harvey asked Eddie if he was an engineer and why he had come up with such a radical design. Eddie's reply was that he was not an engineer but he knew where he could get engineers and felt sure, from his experience, that this was the kind of plane that pilots wanted.

Neither of us had ever heard of inherent stability, so Eddie borrowed a pair of scissors and a sheet of Board of Commerce stationery and made a little paper model which demonstrated to our satisfaction at least, many of the theories of flight. Later we were to find that the real airplane was able to do all of the things just as successfully as they were demonstrated by the little piece of paper. It is also a matter of record that in order to be licensed all modern planes must be inherently stable.

Today, none of our air liners or military planes could possibly operate if it were not for the brakes. Landing at high speeds, they would overshoot the limits of the airports. Brakes are now a commonplace, yet they remain one of the greatest safety factors ever developed. When Stinson first suggested the use of brakes, aeronautical engineers set up a great hue and cry and learnedly contended that brakes could not be used. We listened to them but we must have listened more earnestly to Stinson. After all, we knew he was the world's most experienced pilot and he had a confident way of making one believe that he could back up his claims.

At any rate, the writer with Harvey Campbell's enthusiastic support undertook to organize the Stinson Airplane Syndicate for the purpose of building and demonstrating Eddie's airplane design. Practically every member of the board's aviation committee became a member of this syndicate. Eugene Lewis, Frank Blair, Luther Thomas, and other Detroit bankers came along. Bill Metzger, Edward S. Evans, D. B. Lee, and the late Tom Merrill, and others in the automotive industry were members. The advertising field was represented by Art Winter, Jim Evans, and George Slocum; the accounting profession by the late Dick Fitzgerald; insurance by George Carter, Jake Livingston, and the late Phil Marion, Sr. Even the city hall was represented in the person of the late John W. Smith, who was then mayor.

Stinson made another promise which seemed radical. He promised to completely design and build a plane in 3 months' time. Many were skeptical about this, feeling that a great deal more time would be required and that the $25,000 originally subscribed by the syndicate would also fall short of financial needs.

The first Stinson plane was built on the second floor of a little loft on Congress Street in downtown Detroit. There was considerable betting as to whether or not it could be taken out of the building without tearing the building down. However, Eddie guessed right in all respects. The plane came out of the building; it was built in the surprising time of 2 months and 10 days, and was first flown at Selfridge Field on January 25, 1926.

Later, in order to demonstrate the efficiency of the brakes, Eddie flew it one Sunday before several hundred people. Because the field was covered with snow and the tires would therefore slide when brakes were applied, Eddie put automobile tire chains on the wheels and demonstrated without question that brakes would work even in snow and ice.

Significant also in appraising Stinson's judgment was the fact that when a number of other Detroiters, at a luncheon meeting at the Detroit Athletic Club, subscribed the capital needed to turn the syndicate into the Stinson Aircraft Corporation more than $9,000 of the original $25,000 remained in the treasury of the syndicate.

At about the same time the Buhl family became interested in aviation's possibilities and secured the services of Fred Verville. Fred's work as an Army engineer had been outstanding. I believe that to him goes the credit for another great development—the retractable landing gear—which adds so much to the speed of present-day planes. Verville racers, built for the Army and flown by the Army pilots, won two of the Pulitzer races, then emblematic of the airplane-speed championship. In 1927 the name of the firm, Buhl-Verville Aircraft Co., was changed to the Buhl Aircraft Co. The Buhl planes had an excellent reputation and, if memory serves correctly, the Buhl "bull pup" was one of the first, if not the first, of the small planes built in what at that time was considered quantity production. It was a single-seater, wire-braced monoplane. The firm also produced a cabin biplane known as the Buhl air sedan.

Later Verville designed a four-place cabin monoplane and organized the Verville Aircraft Co. with a plant in Detroit.

Working in Detroit on an airplane-engine development was Eddie Rickenbacker who built the five-cylinder Detroit Bear Cat engine. That Rickenbacker dropped the engine project to become an outstanding success in the air-line field as president of Eastern Air Lines was no reflection on his original thinking with respect to small engines, as many thousands of light planes have since been powered with engines of the Bear Cat's approximate power.

At work also were two outstanding aeronautical motor engineers, Col. J. G. Vincent, vice president of Packard, and the late Captain Woolson, whose memorial plaque can be seen at the Detroit City Airport. They had designed water-cooled aviation engines which were successfully used and which I believe today form the basis for the Packard engines used in our PT boats which are such a thorn in the side of the Japanese Navy.

To this illustrious pair must also go credit for the creation of our first successful Diesel aircraft engine. For its test flights this engine was installed in a Stinson plane and the motors also operated daily in other Stinsons on the Thompson Airlines between Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago. Captain Woolson's untimely death probably was responsible in some degree for the fact that Packard's Diesel experiments were not pressed.

Active also in the development of airplane motors was the Warner Aircraft Corporation and Continental Motors, both of whose products have won international acceptance and who are doing such a splendid job today in producing engines for the military services.

With the public now conscious of the possibilities of global air routes, which will fly across the top of the world to attain the shortest distance between two points, it is interesting to remember that the Board was aware of these opportunities 18 years ago.

The story of the backing given Admiral Byrd on his Polar flights has been mentioned briefly, but they offered definite proof that Polar flights could be made.

Interjected also into the picture was Sir Hubert Wilkins, who had the global idea and sought to find and claim land in the North Polar regions for bases for commercial or military operations. He found willings ears in Detroit. Backed by the Detroit Aviation Society, and assisted by the Board, Wilkins, Maj. Tom Lanphier, and Capt. Alger Graham made several notable flights, but, due to unfavorable weather conditions, the expedition missed its objectives on the first year's attempt.

The following year the party was known as the Detroit News-Wilkins Arctic Expedition. Stinson planes were used. On one memorable flight with the late famous Arctic flyer, Ben Eielson, as pilot, a landing was made on an icecap more remote from shore than the North Pole itself. Soundings showed only water below. Thus, while Wilkins found no land which he could claim, he covered thousands of miles of exploration of previously uncharted wastes.

Pursuing the idea of the northern routes to Europe, B. R. J. "Fish" Hassell, a pioneer pilot, came to Detroit in 1928 determined to demonstrate that an easy route to Sweden lay via Labrador, Greenland, and Iceland. He called this the "land route" to Europe because the water jumps between landing points are relatively short. Hassell, in a Stinson plane, made the first flight to Greenland. How right he was is proven by the fact that these bases are used today by untold numbers of our military planes which take this route to England. And still true to his belief is "Fish" Hassell, now a major in Air Transport Command, who is stationed at an Arctic base helping to get ships across.

No story of Detroit's early aviation days would be complete without touching briefly on airport development. In this the Board took a leading part. It pressed for airports just as strongly then as it is doing today. I think Mr. Ford must have heard our prayers. Certainly it can never be said of him that he lacked vision, because he made what seemed to be an overnight decision to build the Ford airport, which was then the most outstanding port in this country. I recall that when he built his airplane hanger it was regarded as a marvel in point of size, and many stated that it would never be filled with airplanes. How much, even in our optimistic thinking, we underestimated aviation's possibilities is indicated by the fact that the gigantic hangars on La Guardia Field in New York are already too small, though they cost $1,000,000 each.

There was also the day when the Board's aviation committee welcomed Dr. Hugo Eckener to Detroit. Eckener built the famous German Zeppelin ZR-3 and had flown it from Germany to the United States. We took Dr. Eckener to Packard and other Detroit factories, finally ending up at Mr. Ford's laboratory in Dearborn. Dr. Eckener could speak and understand little English. Mr. Ford could speak no German. The introduc-

tion was made by an interpreter and by way of greeting, Mr. Ford quoted Tennyson's poem, Locksley Hall.

"For I dipped into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging through the thunderstorm;
Till the war drum throbbed no longer, and the battle flags were furled
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

Mr. Ford believed this was the greatest aeronautical prophecy ever written. It had to be translated to the doctor who thereupon invited Mr. Ford to ride in the Zeppelin. Mr. Ford replied that he thought he would enjoy the flight and asked the Doctor to bring the Zeppelin to Detroit. Eckener said this would not be practical because Mr. Ford had no place to put the ship.

"What sort of a place do I need?" asked Mr. Ford.

"You need either a mooring mast or a large dirigible hangar," replied the doctor.

Mr. Ford studied for a moment and then said, "Which do you think would be best for my airport?"

Dr. Eckener recommended a mooring mast and Mr. Ford with no hesitation turned to Bill Mayo, his chief engineer, and said, "Bill, get the plans for a mooring mast."

"I already have them through the courtesy of the Navy," was Mayo's reply.

Whereupon Mr. Ford said, "Bill, you start in tomorrow morning and build a mooring mast." And so, a few weeks later steel was being erected and the present mooring mast on Ford Airport came into being.

The board's activities contributed to the establishment of three other airports and the saving of one—a very fortunate circumstance since two of these, Selfridge Field and Wayne County, are extremely important Army bases, and Grosse Ile is used as a Navy training station. The field saved was Selfridge. In the general let-down and disarmament proceedings which followed the last war and paved the way for this one, Army appropriations were cut to the bone and Selfridge was to be allowed to go to seed. The board's aviation committee secured the assistance of other Detroiters and a fight was led in the House by Bob Clancy, then our "good gray Congressman," who by dint of much personal persuasion and I believe by some parliamentary ruse, managed to save the day. The fight was also led for the Wayne County Airport. Finally, this mile-square port was secured. Again statements were made to the effect that this air field was too large, but history again refutes this argument.

However, to tell the story chronologically, the Detroit City Airport came first. Mayor John Smith called on the board to formulate plans for a city airport and named your reporter as the first aviation commissioner for the city. A great many sites were investigated, culminating finally in the present location. We failed to vision the day of blind or instrument flight when planes would land in the foggiest weather solely by instruments. For that reason, and because of the desire to locate the port as close to downtown Detroit as possible, we failed to pay sufficient attention to the hazards that exist in the shape of surrounding buildings. However, we did get an airport. The present site was available, and we took what we could get. It has rendered a service, even if now outmoded. Likewise, the hangar which was built by the late Albert Kahn was the largest in the United States. Here again the thought was widely expressed that it could never be filled.

With history repeating itself so many times not only in Detroit but with practically every airport in the United States, it is hard to understand Mayor Jeffries' lack of vision in not aggressively leading the fight for the airports the city so urgently requires.

The Grosse Ile Airport was brought into full flower by the Detroit Aircraft Corporation, who also acquired control of Lockheed Aircraft, of Burbank, Calif.; Ryan Aircraft, of San Diego; and Parks Air College, of St. Louis. Included also in their holdings was the all-metal dirigible previously described. That the Detroit group later relinquished control of Lockheed, Ryan, and Parks has no bearing at the moment. But it is important to know that Lockheed and Ryan are among the major airplane producers, and Parks has always been an outstanding air school which during the past few years has trained thousands of military pilots.

A great many of the Board's achievements came indirectly in the sense that if you assist in the birth of a child you become responsible in some degree for its activities. I can illustrate this with the case of Stinson Aircraft knowing its work best by reason of association. If Stinson is mentioned to the exclusion of other companies, whose work has been of equal importance, the reason is merely that I do not know their history quite so well.

Both Stinson and the Board of Commerce helped to sire Northwest Airlines, one of our four great transcontinental systems. On a Ford tour the writer met Colonel Britton of St. Paul and suggested the need for an air-mail line to link Chicago with the Twin Cities. Colonel Britton acknowledged the need. He felt that he could raise half of the money in St. Paul if we could raise the remainder in Detroit. The writer who was then associated with Stinson appealed to the Board of Commerce. Detroit's half of the money was raised promptly and Stinson equipment was purchased. However, it was not until some time later that St. Paul was able to furnish its financial quota.

Also at this time the Board and Stinson worked with Reed M. Chambers who was operating the No. 1 contract air-mail line between Atlanta and Miami. Chambers started his line with Ford single engine all metal planes. As a result of financial assistance secured in Detroit, Chambers extended his line using Stinson equipment. It was a temporary misfortune that the Florida real estate bubble burst and a hurricane struck more or less simultaneously wiping out most of Chambers' flying equipment on the one hand and emptying his potential customers' pockets on the other. It was Chambers who had the dream of air service from the United States to South America, which Pan American Airways has so successfully operated. Chambers, stopped temporarily on one aviation avenue, took another and organized U. S. Aviation Underwriters, the largest aviation insurance group and a highly successful one. Today, on leave of absence, he is vice president of the Rubber Development Corporation, in charge of getting vital rubber out of South America by air.

In 1928 the board of commerce took the initiative to sponsor and promote the first aircraft exposition of national scope. It was known as the all-American aircraft show and staged in Convention Hall. Sixty-seven planes, the products of 47 manufacturers, were exhibited to an attendance of more than 125,000 persons.

The first show was a financial success and it was decided to put the profits back into the promotion of aviation. For this purpose the aircraft bureau of the board was formed to promote and manage future events. Under the guidance of such Detroiters as William B. Mayo, Edward S. Evans, Thomas S. Merrill, Harry R. Graham, Charles T. Bush, Eugene W. Lewis, William E. Metzger, and a number of other prominent businessmen, the aircraft bureau staged more aircraft events of national scope than any similar organization in the United States.

Later, in 1928, the board staged the Detroit Air Olympics. The event began in the morning with the start of the fourth national air tour from the Ford Airport on a 6,000-mile tour to the Pacific coast and return. At 1 p. m. the finals of the boys' national model-airplane contest were held. This competition was between 500 winners of local contests held throughout the United States and several foreign countries. The day was climaxed by the start of the seventeenth Gordon Bennett international balloon race.

In addition to sponsoring both the 1927 and 1928 Gordon Bennett international balloon races, the board of commerce donated the third Gordon Bennett trophy at a cost of $4,000. This was done to continue this event, due to the face the second trophy had passed out of competition by having been won three consecutives times by the United States entries.

One of the outstanding events in 1930 was the All-American Flying Derby. This was sponsored by the American Cirrus Engine Co. of Marysville, Mich., with the assistance of the Aircraft Bureau of the Board. It was one of the most grueling tests of light planes and engines ever held. The race started from the city airport and followed a course of 5,700 miles in daily stages from city to city around the United States. Requirements were that all planes be powered by Cirrus engines rated at 95 horsepower. Entries ranged from specially built, streamlined racing planes to conventional type ships. Lee Gehlback won the contest in the Command Aire, averaging slightly over 200 miles per hour between Detroit and Buffalo on the first leg of the race and covered the entire 5,700 miles at an average in excess of 150 miles per hour. This contest was responsible for the development of many new types of light planes.

All-American Aircraft Shows were held in 1929 and 1930. Detroit shows had gained such prominence that in 1931, the National Aircraft Show was held in this city through joint sponsorship of the Aeronautical Chamber of Commerce and the Detroit Board of Commerce. This show was held in the new exposition hangar which had just been completed on the city airport. Here, for the first time at a major show, aircraft manufacturers could exhibit their wares and fly them as well. The hangar served as the showroom—the flying field as the actual demonstration point. This was one of the most successful shows ever held, as all exhibitors made sales. Indirectly, it had a bearing on changing the trend of air-line operations in this country.

The 1932 national aircraft show under the same sponsorship was again held at the Detroit City Airport. Space for exhibits was in such demand that it was necessary to place a three-pole circus tent on the apron of the hangar to accommodate the overflow.

In 1931 Stinson had built and was exhibiting its first trimotored airplane. At the show we met Paul Collins, one of the original air-mail pilots who had also had a lot of operating experience with Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., and Eugene Vidal, who later became head of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Collins and Vidal had the dream of an air line which would operate every hour on the hour between New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington. Since they expected to receive no air-mail subsidy because

Eastern Airlines carried the mail on that route, all of their revenues would have to come from passenger traffic. They were looking for new air-line equipment purchasable at a price that would permit low operating cost and thus enable them to charge fares no greater than rail Pullman costs. They found it in the Stinson trimotor.

The Pennsylvania Railroad was one of their stockholders but since the controlling financial interest was owned by the Ludington Brothers of Philadelphia, the line was known as the Ludington Line. It operated so successfully for a period of more than a year that the frequent-service, low-cost policy which it established became the accepted practice on other air lines and paved the way for the growth in air transportation which followed. Ludington Lines were such a successful competitior that they were purchased by Eastern Airlines.

In 1930, E. L. Cord, having acquired the controlling interest in Stinson, was persuaded to start Century Airlines using Stinson equipment and also featuring frequent service at low fares. Century operated between Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago, as did the Thompson Airlines. However, Century went further and flew also from Chicago to St. Louis and on the west coast from San Francisco to Los Angeles, Phoenix, and Tucson. Both of these lines later became a part of today's American Airlines' picture when Cord secured control of that organization.

After the war it seems logical that all first-class mail will be carried by air. Probably also every town will receive air-mail service. It is also probable, if operating costs work out favorably, that cargo planes will tow trains of cargo-carrying gliders which will be picked up by the tow plane while in full flight—without stopping. Later the gliders will be released from the tow plane and will glide down to their destinations.

The du Pont interests have already demonstrated the technical practicability of both ideas.

Since 1939, Richard du Pont's All American Aviation, Inc., using Stinson planes, has operated the world's first "pick-up" system for taking on and discharging air mail without landing the airplane. All American today serves many cities and small towns, many of them without airports, in Pennsylvania, New York, and West Virginia. In operation the plane slows down to about 100 miles per hour and picks the mail off the ground, simultaneously dropping mail for that city, in a manner somewhat similar, in results at least, to that used by railroads who pick up small city mail without stopping.

More spectacular, but equally practical, is the du Pont method in which the Stinson is again slowed down to 100 miles per hour and snatches a loaded glider from the ground and into the air in almost instantaneous motion. Reasons of military secrecy prevent greater description of du Pont's work in this respect at this time. But technical foundation for peacetime has been laid.

Stinson, and indirectly therefore the Detroit Board of Commerce, was also responsible for raising the initial money and suggested the idea which resulted in today's highly successful Braniff Airlines. It is significant to note that most of these enterprises have been successful ventures, in which the stockholders have made money.

The board has played a part in many other ventures which have done much to promote and develop interest in aviation. Edward E. Evans, president of the board's aircraft bureau, furnished the Evans' Glider Trophy which was competed for annually by the world's foremost gliding experts. Gliding was called prominently to the attention of the world when German gliders loaded with troops landed on and took possession of Crete. Today Henry Ford is turning out great numbers of 15-passenger troop-carrying gliders.

It must be true also that a great many of the boys who participated in the airplane model contests sponsored by the board of commerce are today manning our fighting planes.

History is important because it indicates that persons and cities who have achieved success in a given field have acquired a "know-how." Today we might easily have been numbered among Hitler's slaves if it were not for some of the aeronautical developments pioneered in Detroit and if it were not for the tremendous production of military equipment flowing out of our factories. Detroit faces a post-war world which finds her in a fortunate geographic position. By means of the airplane Detroit rather than New York and other coastal cities can become the take-off point for Europe, the Orient, and South America. We have the opportunity to profit handsomely in the post-war aviation growth which is certain to come.

Whether or not Detroit will realize on her potentialities depends on whether or not management, labor, and government have the vision and desire to team together to reach this golden goal.

Jefferson Day Address by Senator Barkley at University of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the very able address delivered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] at the Jefferson Day celebration at the University of Virginia on July 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Darden, President Newcomb, ladies and gentlemen, all over the world today, and especially all over America, the memories and significance of this day are such as to stir our souls and lift them to new heights of emotion and resolution.

The celebration and observations of this day are marked by a trinity of associations. It constitutes a sort of triple observation of events linked forever in the history of America.

It marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

It is the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence which Jefferson wrote.

And it is the one hundred and seventeenth anniversary of the day on which he died in the eighty-fourth year of his life.

This day, therefore, is more intimately associated with the name and deeds of Jefferson than with those of any other single American in all our history.

The Fourth of July without Jefferson would be like Christmas without the Man of Sorrows.

In saying this I do not detract from the renown of any other illustrious names associated with the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution. But Jefferson is the man who gave tone, color, substance, and vital breath to the document which proclaimed our independence and gave the reasons for that proclamation.

It was Jefferson who wrote the words and set the music to the immortal epic of our liberties. He was acknowledged by his comrades as the premier in the expression of American faith and determination in an era of transcendent movements in fixing the fate and welfare of America and the world.

No man can, in the space of one speech or one book, draw an adequate portrayal of Thomas Jefferson. No comprehensive or satisfactory biography of him as yet has been written. This is unfortunate but perhaps not strange. He was a man of such versatility, such breadth of research and range of intellectual and spiritual vision, of such prophetic understanding and yet of such simplicty of approach to and the mastery of every subject which absorbed his talents, that it is not easy to garner the vastness of his life and labors into one vehicle of expression, whether it be a single discourse or a collection of volumes.

His interest in, his accomplishments for, and his contributions to agriculture alone would afford the subject for fascinating discussion and contemplation.

His excursions in the field of science, his achievements as an applied mathematician, his faculty for mastering the difficulties of ancient and modern languages; his familiarity with the philosophical and metaphysical literature of the world's great thinkers; his knowledge of botany and zoology and his use of that knowledge in the cultivation of his lands and the beautification of his beloved home atop the "Little Mountain;" his devotion to the divine art of music and his contribution to that art, in which he says he spent no less than 3 hours per day for at least 12 years of his life; his warm and tender devotion to his family and his relations and his friends; his solicitude for the welfare of those for whom he was responsible, whether white or black, free or slave; each and all of these qualities of the man, and more that might readily come to mind, furnish material for interesting and fruitful discourses without number.

But it is not in these particular fields that I shall dwell on this occasion.

It has been truthfully said that some men are born great, some men achieve greatness, and some men have greatness thrust upon them.

Rare indeed is the man who combines all of these sources of greatness in himself.

Jefferson was born great. That is, he was born with the background and the environment and the physical and intellectual qualities that marked him from earliest boyhood for a rendezvous with destiny.

He certainly achieved greatness. The roll of his outstanding, and as it now appears indispensable, contributions to the welfare and history of organized society in his day and for all time cannot be exceeded for number or importance by those of any other man in our history or any history.

Assuredly, he had greatness thrust upon him. Modest, almost diffident in his aversion to public display, preferring in his heart the peace and quietude of his mountain sanctuary, yet he was drawn forth from it by the force of events and by the people's choice to a service and to honors covering a period of half a century.

When, if ever, has there lived such a mortal man born of woman and created in the image of God?

As I stand here at this hour in the shadow of the home he loved and the great seat of learning which he established, it seems as though his spirit hovers about us, and that his tall and manly form, with hands clasped behind him in contemplation, might be seen

to stride across this campus in benediction upon his handiwork.

It is in the field of statecraft, however, that Jefferson made his greatest impact upon our institutions.

Statecraft does not necessarily mean the holding of public office. If the mere holding of public office was a guaranty of statesmanship we would have little to worry about in this country or in the world. We know there is no such guaranty and we know that there are many men who may be called statesmen who never held a public office, who never commanded the applause of listening senates or bent the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning.

They may be found in the pulpits, in the schoolrooms of the colleges or universities or in humbler scholastic stations. They may be found in medical or legal professions or in the counting rooms of business or finance. They may be found in the fields of cultivation and production close to nature and to nature's god.

Jefferson would have adorned the field of statecraft, of philosophical statecraft, if he had never held an elective or appointive office.

But the occupancy of these public stations from the burgesses to the Presidency, afforded the setting and the opportunity for the display of his transcendent abilities and human sympathies and for the skill with which he was endowed in translating his ideals into laws and proclamations and constitutions.

Most of these things which bear his name might not have come, or might not have come at that period, nor borne his impress upon them, had he not been in an official station where his aspirations for mankind could take form an be embedded in statutes written for the guidance and supervision of the people's affairs.

Jefferson has been called a dreamer. By his bitter enemies he was called a demagog. By the reactionaries, the tree sitters, and the stand-patters of his day, those whose timid or selfish souls are always in every age afraid to advance three paces from the status quo, he was denounced as a revolutionist.

Some of these things he may have been and undoubtedly was.

He was a dreamer. He dreamed amid the hills and mountains beyond the tidewater of a brighter day for the oppressed children of men. He dreamed of a new independent nation of free people dedicated to the establishment of self-government among men. He believed that men could govern themselves if given the opportunity, and he dreamed all through his long life that this eternal principle might find vindication in ever broadening fields in America and throughout the world.

He was beyond question a revolutionist. I do not mean that he sought to destroy existing orders merely for the pleasure of seeing them topple. His iconoclasm was not capricious. If he could have seen the rights of men as he believed in them recognized and established under the existing Government in the Colonies, he might never have sponsored the Separatist movement embodied in the American Revolution.

But to him the liberties of the people, their right to govern themselves, were more important than forms of government, and when he became convinced that these inherent rights could not be secured or preserved without a revolution, he became a revolutionist. He not only became a revolutionist for the special purposes he set out to accomplish for mankind, but he recommended revolution to all peoples and all generations as a remedy against the same or similar intolerable conditions as those which he challenged and helped to overthrow.

The very doctrines which he set forth in the Declaration of Independence were revolutionary. They were so considered by a majority of the people of the mother country and by a considerable element of the people of America at that time.

It is true, of course, that during the long and struggling history of mankind many men had proclaimed doctrines akin to those advocated by Jefferson, who himself acknowledged his indebtedness to them.

But when Jefferson constructed the Declaration of Independence he built it out of the experience, the suffering, the humiliation and the hopes and convictions of men who never conceded or believed that God created man in His own image and proscribed some of them in the enjoyment of rights essential to all of them.

When Jefferson started out to draw the resolution which he had been commissioned to frame, he did not indulge in ambiguities.

He did not say "We have a feeling that there is something wrong," or that "There is a suspicion abroad in the land that there are some inequalities that should be adjusted," or that "It is claimed that there ought to be a more substantial equalization of the privileges that are enjoyed under Government."

He boldly and unequivocably proclaimed "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In his conviction, there was no dispute, argument, doubt, or equivocation about the equality of men. It was not to be debated in any forum. It was not to be submitted to a jury, after argument, from whose verdict an appeal might be taken to a higher tribunal. It was not a problem to be submitted to the decision of a political campaign.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident"—beyond the peradventure of doubt—to be seen and acknowledged by all authorities—that all men are created equal."

The equality which Jefferson proclaimed was not physical nor intellectual equality, nor moral or financial equality. We know that there are variations in the physical, moral, and intellectual equipment of men which preclude any leveling off process for these divergent qualities.

What Jefferson was talking about and what the Continental Congress meant when it adopted his declaration was that all men are equal in their right to enjoy the privileges of freedom under a government of their own choosing which derives all its just powers from the consent of those who are governed.

It was a revolutionary doctrine to announce that these human beings were not only equal but that they had been endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

These rights were not to be the subject of barter or sale.

They could not be alienated by the people themselves, much less could they be alienated by some governmental agency that is presumed to have power over their lives and destinies.

These men for whom he spoke—in all ages, lands, and generations—for the truths which he announced as self-evident were timeless and without boundary—were not only equal but were endowed from on high with rights which could not be taken from them; and among these rights were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It seems almost incredible that in view of the length of days and years and ages which has elapsed since the creation of man, and since even the dawn of history, it has been only 167 years since man's equality was proclaimed in the fullness of sweeping comprehension as set forth in the American charter of liberties. If these things were self-evident why had it taken 6,000 years of recorded history and 17 centuries of the Christian religion for even a small portion of mankind to realize it?

The answer to that question would take me beyond the scope of my present task.

But the answer to it is sufficiently apparent to explain why Jefferson was looked on and denounced as a revolutionary firebrand who was seeking to overthrow established society and build flames of unobtainable hope among the common people who were and should remain subservient to the aristocracy of wealth and position they had served so long.

While the immediate occasion for this burst of devotion to the equality and freedom of man was the intransigent policy of the British Government, the views he expressed and the language with which he clothed them were suitable for all generations of men and are as appropriate today in the world as it is now, as they were when Jefferson proclaimed them.

In the Declaration of Causes of taking up arms issued July 6, 1775, he said this:

"We have counted the cost of this contest and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery. Honor, justice, and humanity forbid us to surrender tamely that freedom which we received from our gallant ancestors and which our innocent posterity have a right to receive from us. We cannot endure the infamy and guilt of resigning succeeding generations to that wretchedness which inevitably awaits them if we basely entail the hereditary bondage upon them.

"Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly obtainable. We most solemnly, before God and the world, declare that, exerting the utmost energy of those powers which our beneficent Creator has graciously bestowed upon us, the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume we will, in defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die freemen rather than to live as slaves."

That quotation taken from a document that antedated the Declaration of Independence by 1 year, might well have been uttered yesterday by the President of the United States. For in terms as cogent and as unimpeachable it portrays the present determination of our Government and our people in the world-wide struggle we are waging now to preserve the things about which Jefferson was talking.

One of the great things which made Jefferson the political, philosophical, and intellectual leader of his day was his faith in man. This does not mean that he trusted the judgment or disinterestedness of every individual human being in all the world, but it means that he trusted mankind. He was convinced that man would avoid error when the facts were known. Hence he trusted man as a whole rather than a few who would enslave him. Hence he wanted him to be free. Political freedom was the goal of his life's devotion.

He had faith in the ability of man to fix his relation with his Creator. He held it to be a cardinal requirement in a democracy, and logical and appropriate under any government, that man's soul should be and remain unfettered by any restraint imposed by government; and because he believed this he fought for and accomplished the emancipation of man's soul by the Virginia statutes for religious liberty.

For this he was denounced as an atheist. He was pilloried by those who invoked the power of the state to bind man's eternal soul in the chains of a state-imposed and state-supported religion.

But he was gloriously vindicated in the Constitution of his country and in the enlightened opinion of mankind.

Jefferson knew that political and religious liberty, essential as they were, did not constitute the whole category of freedoms which should flourish in a democracy.

Therefore, he charted the way for intellectual freedom to go hand in hand with political and religious freedom, by advocating and striving to inaugurate a system of public education which would loose the chains of ignorance which bound and shackled the minds of the people.

In a letter to George Wythe, August 13, 1786, he had this to say:

"I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other surer foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness. Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils, and that the tax that will be paid for the purpose is not more than one thousandth part of what will be paid to kings and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance."

One of the great disciples of Thomas Jefferson was Abraham Lincoln. All through his writings and public papers we may depict the influence of Jefferson upon Lincoln. In the midst of a great war between the States in an address at the battlefield of Gettysburg, Lincoln began as follows:

"Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived, and so dedicated, can long endure."

It has been 80 years since the delivery of that brief and immortal address. We might, with equal truth and equal solemnity, now say:

"Eight score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great world war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

We who live today and who believe in the immortal principles which Thomas Jefferson wove into the fabric of our life are called upon to struggle beyond a wider field and more far-flung battle lines, but the issue is no less centered around the rights of the people in this struggle than it was in the day of Jefferson. It was natural for the timid soul in 1776 to hesitate about paying the price for the creation of liberty on this continent and for its extension throughout the world.

We have timid souls now in our midst and throughout the world who question whether we should have embarked in this struggle in defense of our liberties and our institutions but unless our Nation had arisen in all its might and power to preserve what Jefferson helped to create for us, we who speak and think of him today would have been unworthy of his heritage.

Jefferson died on the fiftieth anniversary of the immortal document which his brain conceived and his pen inscribed. He wanted to live until that day of anniversary.

On that same day died John Adams, his lifelong associate in the establishment of liberty and his friend until the grim reaper claimed his reward.

Jefferson's last words were, "This is the Fourth of July."

John Adam's last words were, "Jefferson still lives."

Those words of John Adams were prophetic and it is true and will be forever true that Jefferson still lives.

Post-War Idealism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered by me before a Republican rally at the Terrace Garden, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, on Thursday, July 1:

Americans have a right—nay, they have a positive duty—to scan carefully and examine minutely the post-war programs which, in simple abundance, put our victory gardens to shame.

I wish that some of these schemes for post-war activity were as substantial in common sense as the victory gardens are expected to be in nutriment.

Most of the post-war planning schemes which I have looked into, all of which are advanced under the bromide of "winning the peace," will produce a crop. But they won't produce a crop of international amity and friendship. They will produce a crop of international distrust, of international bitterness.

If they, or any of them, should by some disastrous lapse on the part of the people of the world be adopted, they will breed international pressure politics with the inevitable consequence of a war in comparison to which the present struggle is but a mere battle.

Conceived in super-state megalomania and nurtured in cheap ward politics by pseudo-idealists, these schemes are advanced and fostered without any consideration of the natural reactions of governments and of peoples.

Super-state politicians are rampant in Washington. They are tireless in their efforts to sell to the Congress and to the people the demagogic appeal that it is the duty of America to save the world.

America cannot save the world. America's duty now and when victory shall have been achieved is to save America.

We went to war to save America. We must go to the peace table with the same patriotic and high purpose.

We are told by all of those who are fostering these internationalist schemes that in the post-war world America must stand ready voluntarily and willingly to sacrifice portions of her sovereignty, part of her liberty, and much of her freedom—political, economic, and personal—to make the world a better place for other nations.

I cannot subscribe to that theory.

There is no more substantial manner in which America can contribute to the welfare of the world than by preserving completely and totally her political sovereignty, her economic liberty, and her personal freedom.

These have, in the past, been America's crowning examples to the world. They must be preserved in their entirety for only through their preservation can America and Americans furnish to the world an example which in time may lead other nations to substantial emulation.

Americans have again the right, and again the duty, to scan the credentials of those who advance what they are pleased to call post-war ideals. We have a right to test those credentials and their application to the ideals of America.

Have the schemes which are being advanced been applied satisfactorily in America? Have the proponents of these peacetime blueprints made their blueprints of a wartime America and a peacetime America work? For, make no mistake about it, the post-war schemers have a blueprint worked out in meticulous detail not only for the nations of the world but for the individual citizens of the post-war world state.

They already propose to tell the world and its people what they shall eat, what they shall wear, what they shall produce. They already propose to tell the world and its peoples what they shall think, what they shall say, and what they shall print. They already propose to tell the world how much a man or woman shall earn and how much of his earnings he may keep or spend. They already propose to tell the world and its peoples what shall be their conception of freedom and liberty—either not knowing or not caring that freedom is not something which is imposed from above but which intrinsically comes from below.

Many of these schemes have been tested in the United States and on its people over the last decade. They have been tested in peace and in war.

And history will show and common sense will demonstrate that these schemes, in their application to America and Americans, have been a 99-percent failure. In the 1 percent of their success they have served not the country but the selfish desires of their manipulators.

Let us briefly examine a few of the proposals which we are told must be in the portfolios of the delegation which we will send to the peace table. Let us test them in the light of their having been applied in the United States. In the test we will find the answer to the vicious and bitter personal attacks which an almost limitless army of propagandists and stooges level at all who dare to oppose them.

The source from which all of the internationalist schemes flow is the statement of the "four freedoms" as the objective for which we are fighting. The very statement of the "four freedoms" is a negation of freedom and liberty. For these "four freedoms" are not within the gift of any nation or any group of nations to bestow upon any other nation or any group of nations. The minute you impose a freedom on someone else it ceases to be a freedom and becomes a chain.

Freedoms are inherent. Sometimes we are deprived of them by outside forces. But we are never given them by outside forces.

But let us look into the "four freedoms" individually and how America is going to give them to the world.

Out of order, I take up "freedom of want." I do so because the international schemers have already sought to implement this freedom—at least in one direction—by an international conference on food. A conference which has been barren of results, but the sterility of which has not in any way dismayed the megalomaniac maneuverers.

Freedom from want means, in the simple old-fashioned American language, which is the only one I know, that everyone is going to have all he wants to eat, all he wants to wear, all he wants in the way of a home, all he wants of money, all he wants of moving pictures, or any other necessity, conveniences or luxury.

All these things the superstate is to supply when peace comes. It is to supply them to all the world and to all its peoples.

Do you think any state, national or international, can do it?

Do you think that that is the reason our men and our women are fighting on all the seas and all the continents?

We, here in America, have enjoyed the greatest freedom from want ever enjoyed by any people in any land. We have created here the highest known standard of living. Was that freedom from want given to us by the Government? Or was it won by us individually in the pursuance of our own

happiness and by our own energy and our own ability?

A few years ago it became the theory of some in our Government that the giving or withholding of freedom from want of Americans was the function of government. The same long-haired and short-brained theorists who now propose international dictation of everything stretched the long fingers of Washington into every State, every county, every home, and touched every individual in the United States.

Has that grasp of Washington brought greater abundance, greater prosperity, greater happiness, more freedom from want to Americans?

You and I know it has not. We know that impractical bureaucrats in Washington took the greatest producing country in the world and have reduced it to a Nation which cannot get what it wants and what it needs to eat.

By a series of Executive decrees our domestic economy has become so disrupted, our production so curtailed, and our distribution system so disastrously entangled that many fear that America can never be truly America again.

Think you that the men—and women—who brought want to the United States are capable of eliminating want from all the nations of the world?

I know it will be said that this want in America is due to the war. But it simply is not so. The food which you lack today has not gone to the countries associated with us.

That food has simply not been produced. An administration dedicated to the doctrine of economic scarcity made it impossible for Americans to produce and distribute the food which this country and its citizens need.

Rationing, adopted from foreign lands and heretofore unnecessary in America, came to us under the guise that it would promote equitable distribution. Actually, it was forced upon us because some bureaucrat thought it was a method of overcoming what he imagined was the complacency of Americans in the face of the war. And the rationing contributed to the muddle, to disrupted production and distorted distributions because it immediately put a damper on the will of Americans to produce.

Think you that the fathers of our muddle are capable or should be entrusted with putting all the nations of the world under a superinternational economic dictatorship?

Is all the world to be starved by those who killed little pigs by the millions and paid billions of dollars to farmers not to plant and not to grow food crops? Is that the way to freedom from want?

Let us look at another of the "four freedoms" and consider its world-wide application in the face of America's recent experiences. Let us take up freedom of the press and of speech.

For generations America preserved freedom of expression. It was preserved as a bulwark of all our other liberties and for generations no man in public life dared to shatter the guaranty which wise forefathers had written into the Constitution.

Now it is proposed by Washington that this constitutional guaranty shall be extended world-wide and it is said that this is one of the objectives for which our men are fighting.

Let us examine the fidelity to this American ideal of those who proclaim their intention to force freedom of the press upon all the world.

The radio stations of the Nation today have the hand of bureaucracy around their necks. They dare not say a word that will displease the masters. Their very existence is made contingent upon their saying what the master wants them to say and remaining silent when the master proclaims silence. Ask any radio station or radio chain official and if he is not overcome by fear he will tell you that.

To bravely assert their independence, to fight for their freedom, would mean that licenses would not be renewed and the radio station or chain destroyed.

See what the bureaucrats think of freedom of the newspapers. Have they been left their historic freedom and independence as guaranteed by the Constitution without molestation by those who are drunk with power and with a dream—or rather a nightmare or megalomania?

Why, the great Associated Press, the distributor of more news to more newspapers than any other organization in the world—not excepting the "kept" associations of European nations—is the objective of sneaking action designed to make it amenable to the theorists and their pets. Government proclaims that it will tell the Associated Press what it shall do with its news and to whom it shall give it.

Is that proof of good faith on the part of those who say that freedom of the press shall be made world-wide by official edict, and who say that that is what we are fighting for?

Recently there was held in the United States a so-called international food conference—at which presumably the abundance of America was to be further partitioned among other nations in order to bring scarcity to all.

Was the free press of the United States welcomed to that conference in order that Americans might be told what went on? Not so. Armed soldiers with gleaming bayonets herded the reporters and correspondents from the place of meeting And we don't know yet what went on at that session.

Are the men who do these things holders of substantial credentials for their guarantee of an international free press? Are those who stifle the one free press of the world—the American—likely to be the legitimate fathers of a world-wide free press reform?

Another of the group of "four freedoms" so loftily expressed and so secretly sabotaged is freedom of worship. Let me recall to you that this most sacred of freedoms was not proclaimed in the same stentorian tones as the other three. For diplomatic and political reasons it was soft-pedaled when the new proclamation came down from Mount Sinai.

And let me tell you that when its pronouncement is delayed for diplomatic or any other reason the guarantee becomes qualified. Americans don't want any qualification of their adherence to freedom of man to worship as and when he will. Not even when that qualification is designed to buy favor with one of the nations which valorously fights by our side.

So we come to the last of the "four freedoms" as announced by the new dispensation—freedom from fear. It sounds good. It sounded good when it was fathered on the steps of the Capitol by Mr. Roosevelt at his first inauguration long, long ago.

But again let us test this freedom by the credentials of those who have had it in their keeping for America and who now are to dispense it to the world.

How free from fear are you? Do you consider yourself secure in your property, secure in your traditional freedom, secure in your right to live your life as you see fit? You know that everything you do, everything you eat, everything you earn, is now dictated from the ivory towers of Washington. And that can't bring freedom from fear.

You know that what a dictatorially inclined Government gives today it will take from you tomorrow. Does this uncertainty bring freedom from fear?

Are you free from fear when you know that the very halls of justice are not free from the hand of the bureaucrat? Think you that those who would not hesitate to besmirch and control the Supreme Court of the United States are apt to be deterred from interfering with your personal life?

This Government which we now have lives and thrives on the very fear which it nobly says it will eliminate from the world.

Is the American farmer free from fear, with a myriad of Federal agents swarming his fields and threatening him with jail if he overplants and overproduces? Is the American worker free from fear when Government tells him what he may earn, where he may work, and threatens him with jail if he violates one of a myriad of incomprehensible and often contradictory orders and edicts? Is the American businessman free from fear when each day brings to his factory or his office or his plant scores of impractical orders from men and women in Government who don't know the first thing about business or industry?

Freedom from fear. The very words are a mockery when they come from the lips of those who distill hatred to one group while slavishly cringing before another.

Yet, these are the dreamers and schemers who say that freedom from fear shall become world-wide and that that is what our men are fighting and dying for.

Those who want Americans to lead in a world-wide crusade to establish an Utopia for all nations should give us first some proof of their faith in the principles to which they give lip service.

Let the New Dealers restore the four freedoms to America first.

They have endangered, if not destroyed, them here. Let the New Dealers set our own house in order before setting up new houses in other nations.

We are fighting this war and we will fight it to victory. We will fight it with every ounce of energy and ability we have. We will give our lives and our fortunes to its successful prosecution. But we are doing it to preserve America's freedoms for America.

And whatever treaty or treaties follow this war, whatever increases in our armies and our armaments follow this war, they will follow in order that America and Americans may remain free.

The Radio Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I desire to place in the RECORD the column of George E. Sokolsky, found in the New York Sun of the 5th instant, concerning the investigation of the Federal Communications Commission now being conducted by a select committee of this House. The column portrays briefly a few of the things that are being done these days by departments and agencies which have wrapped about themselves the American flag, and, when challenged for waste and inefficiency, even for indulging in activities dangerous to the national war effort and security, cry from the housetops that those questioning their activities are interfering with the war effort.

It is high time that Congress, as millions of our people are now doing, take note of the fact that we are wasting our

taxpayers' money in carrying on alleged war activities which, when examined, are not war efforts at all, but are figments of the brains of bureaucrats who have been permitted to magnify their importance beyond all rhyme or reason. Certainly, the existence of a war constitutes no license to pilfer and waste the funds so generously and uncomplainingly being contributed to the Government through bond purchases and in the form of unusual and burdensome taxes which, as time goes on, must of necessity become more and more onerous.

There neither has been nor can there be any denial by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission of the facts found by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, upon which the recommendation was made for the transfer of the F. C. C.'s so-called intelligence activities to the military establishments, where such activities may be better and more safely utilized. The Secretaries of War and Navy have said that the so-called war functions of the F. C. C. are worthless. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have said the same thing, and it is unfortunate that Army and Navy officers have been silenced and prevented from giving testimony before the select committee now investigating the F. C. C. It is now known that both the Secretaries of War and Navy have informed the House committee of such a gag on their officers, although it is clear to all that testimony to the effect that F. C. C.'s alleged war activities render no valuable services to the military establishments from the standpoint of intelligence does not, and in the very nature of things cannot, involve the disclosure of any military or naval secrets. One has only to read, even carelessly, the testimony of the F. C. C.'s representatives in appropriations and other hearings, when the claimed importance of that agency's war activities have been glowingly described, to see that such hearings have involved disclosures which should not have been made in respect of the activities of any agency doing truly military or naval intelligence work.

There is but one conclusion to be drawn; and that is that the officials of the Federal Communications Commission are so afraid that an aroused Congress, now and at long last supported by public sentiment, might expose the utter uselessness of the F. C. C.'s war communications activities and curtail their huge appropriations. An outraged public is sure, at some time, to demand a curtailment of spending by our "squandermaniacs" on the domestic front. So, Mr. Speaker, why should we not have the facts concerning the F. C. C. as a starting point for better things to come in the way of economy and good government? If we do good there, further good may flow from other things which surely will follow.

It is to be remembered that the silencing of Army and Navy officers is not pitched upon a possible disclosure of military or naval secrets, or on a possible interference with the war effort. The order is predicated upon the tenuous ground that, to inquire into such matters, will be incompatible with the public interest. What greater interest can the public have than in seeing to it, through its duly elected Members of the Senate and House, that both our war and domestic affairs are conducted in a businesslike and economical way? And by what stretch of the imagination can it be said that the public interest is best served by covering up, rather than by exposing, wrongs against the people? Can the concealment of vital information be deeded paramount to the inherent right of Congress to demand and get information necessary to, and in furtherance of, corrective legislation?

I submit that the right and duty of Congress to conduct hearings, gather facts, and enact remedial and curative legislation are inherent in this legislative body—powers which cannot be, and must not be, frittered away. If the present trend and practices of the entrenched bureaucrats is permitted to continue, the time soon will come—and it is practically at hand—when the administrative and executive departments will wholly and successfully disregard and defy the will of Congress, and legislative procedures and progress will meet an untimely end.

The charge of the F. C. C. that the Army, Navy, and the House committee are conspiring to wreck the F. C. C. is without foundation in fact, for reasons too numerous to mention. The charge is so utterly absurd that its assertion reflects no glory upon its authors, if the charge had more than one author. Of course, the committee's staff could not be in the conspiracy, nor could the members of the committee, because the committee was not in existence when many of the things charged in the alleged conspiracy occurred.

Be all this as it may, however, there are conspiracies and conspiracies; and if, as clearly appears to be the case, the object of the concerted action of the committee will but serve to correct wrongs, stop waste, inefficiency, and bring about proper remedial legislation, then give the people of this country more such conspiracies.

THESE DAYS—THE RADIO INVESTIGATION

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Although every effort has been made to smear the Cox committee in advance of its open hearings, its counsel, Eugene L. Garey, has got off to a good start by a careful, documented statement of the problems arising from the expansion of the power and authority of the Federal Communications Commission, and by the release of his letter to Secretary of the Navy Knox and Secretary of War Stimson which, in effect, discloses that the military forces were in protest against the methods of the Federal Communications Commission and that their protest and criticism and the data pertaining thereto had been suppressed and withheld from the American people.

In his introductory statement, Mr. Garey said:

"It is clear that the practically unrestricted delegation of power made by the phrase 'public interest, convenience, or necessity,' without guiding standards and without the check and balance which a full judicial review might have provided, created ample and unlimited opportunity for the Commission, if so minded, to distribute unchecked Government favor and largess among the politically faithful and subservient; and ample power with which to whip and cow all political opponents possessing the temerity and courage to protest or challenge the actions or policies of the Commission.

"And it is claimed that the Commission has not altogether failed to take full advantage of the opportunities presented to establish its own purposes and policies and advance its own ends. It is said that the Commission has neither been slow nor loath to utilize its asserted powers so to intrench itself that on occasion it has even defied the Congress. Power always seeks and thrives on more power."

Mr. Garey, in this statement, lays down a proposition that is absolutely sound in a representative republic:

"It must be recognized that the existence of a state of war constitutes no license to raid the Treasury, either through waste and extravagance by lawfully constituted war agencies, through the operation of worthless activities under the guise of the furtherance of the war effort or otherwise. Hence this investigation has thus far proceeded in such matters in the belief that this committee, the Congress, and the public are entitled to know the facts surrounding the Commission's so-called war activities and functions, to the end that such activities and functions may be abolished, curtailed, or extended as the Congress shall see fit."

It has been anticipated that when this particular investigation got under way it would deal with the networks, radio stations, broadcasts, and such matters. Mr. Garey has apparently chosen a different course. He is going into the fundamentals of the administration of the Federal Communications Commission and is relating the problem to the war. For instance, in his letter to Secretary Stimson, Mr. Garey asks for this type of data:

"1. All Department files and correspondence pertaining to the Army's efforts to obtain approval of the use of ultra-high frequencies, and the difficulty encountered by the Army in getting the Federal Communications Commission to make a study of the subject.

"2. All files and correspondence pertaining to the Army's position favoring the passage of a bill to permit wire tapping and Chairman Fly's opposition to such bill.

"3. All files and correspondence pertaining to the Army's efforts to stop Japanese language radio broadcasts from Hawaii prior to Pearl Harbor and the reports of the Army officers of their activities in negotiating voluntary agreements to that end; and Chairman Fly's opposition to such action and his subsequent actions which are alleged to have caused such voluntary agreements to be abandoned."

Apparently, Mr. Garey possesses that data. His communications to Secretaries Stimson and Knox indicate that this is no fishing expedition; that what he asks for officially, he has already seen and heard and that he is rejecting a refusal in public of what was provided in private. Except as such information may serve the enemy, it ought to be available to the American people. But the phrase, "of aid and comfort" to the enemy ought not to be used as a cloak to cover up inefficiency, maladministration, or corruption. Mr. Garey wisely brings the problem into the open that the public may understand the seriousness of Federal Communication Commission control of radio.

Prepare a Tax Bill Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, because preparation of further safeguards against inflation is more essential than ever at this time, I wish to call the attention of Congress to the following editorial, which appeared in the New York Times of July 7:

PREPARE A TAX BILL NOW

The desire of Congressmen to get away from the stifling heat of Washington in the summer is understandable; but it is not in itself excuse for a recess at this time, while the fixed personnel at Washington and, in fact, the great mass of Americans everywhere are nailed to their jobs. A valid reason for a recess, however, is that it is important for the Representatives of the people to get in first-hand touch with their constituents, and learn the problems and the sentiment of their districts.

But it will be inexcusable for Congress to leave Washington now unless it sees to it that a new tax bill is prepared for its consideration as soon as it meets again. The sooner a new bill is passed, the sooner can the problem of excess purchasing power be brought under better control. There is no excuse for waiting until January 1 before a new bill is made effective. Certainly a general sales tax and heavier excise taxes should be put into effect long before then.

In the few days that now appear to remain before a recess, therefore, Congress should do at least one of two things. It should either invite the Treasury to prepare a new tax program in all its details, so that it will be ready to submit it to Congress as soon as that body meets again; or it should make sure that the House Ways and Means Committee prepares now a bill for submission at that time. It would do no harm if Congress did both. The inflationary problem increases daily. It would be tragic if the summer months were wasted without either action on it or study of it.

Overcharges for Electricity by States in 1942

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are completing 10 years of arduous struggle for justice for the light and power consumers of America.

Unfortunately, my old friend and coworker, Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, is not here to help carry on the fight; but the effect of his work while he was in the Senate will never die. One of my services of which I am most proud is that of coauthor with him of the bill creating the T. V. A. It has turned out to be one of the greatest developments of all time.

My greatest service to the farmers of this country has been that of promoting rural electrification. As a result of my efforts there are at least 1,000,000 farm homes in this country that are enjoying the use of electric lights and power that probably would not have had them for another generation if I had failed in securing the adoption of the legislation I have sponsored for that purpose.

Every person in the district I represent that uses electricity at all gets it at the T. V. A. yardstick rates. It is true that we have not reached all the farmers of the district yet, but we expect to do so when materials are made available. In fact, we expect to electrify every farm home in America at these rates before we are through.

On June 30 I inserted in the RECORD some tables which I invite every one of you to take home and read to your constituents. They show that the American people last year were overcharged $1,185,233,674 for their electric lights and power. In other words, if they had all got their electricity at the rates paid by the people in the district I represent, they would have saved $1,185,233,674 last year on their light and power bills alone. I have broken these overcharges down by States to show how much the people of each State were overcharged.

ALABAMA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Alabama used 3,693,914,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $37,163,600.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $25,897,377, or $11,266,223 less than they actually paid.

ARIZONA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Arizona used 704,002,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $12,764,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $5,974,339, or $6,790,061 less than they actually paid.

ARKANSAS

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Arkansas used 683,145,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $16,811,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $8,945,934, or $7,865,006 less than they actually paid.

CALIFORNIA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of California used 12,005,897,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $198,175,200.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $152,321,279, or $45,853,921 less than they actually paid.

COLORADO

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Colorado used 847,821,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $21,959,700.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $11,927,125, or $10,032,575 less than they actually paid.

CONNECTICUT

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Connecticut used 2,418,832,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $53,930,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $29,062,632, or $24,868,268 less than they actually paid.

DELAWARE

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Delaware used 345,458,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $6,884,800.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $3,768,435, or $3,116,365 less than they actually paid.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

During the year 1942 the people of the District of Columbia used 1,439,442,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $17,668,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $13,571,378, or $4,097,522 less than they actually paid.

FLORIDA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Florida used 1,263,010,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $40,138,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $17,542,349, or $22,596,551 less than they actually paid.

GEORGIA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Georgia used 2,512,867,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $42,543,700.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $25,719,092, or $16,824,608 less than they actually paid.

IDAHO

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Idaho used 781,471,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $11,418,200.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $6,869,292, or $4,548,908 less than they actually paid.

ILLINOIS

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Illinois used 10,397,217,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $205,524,500.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $113,204,822, or $92,319,678 less than they actually paid.

INDIANA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Indiana used 4,286,988,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $85,064,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $49,061,887, or $36,002,513 less than they actually paid.

IOWA

During the year 1942, the people of the State of Iowa used 2,017,295,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $46,735,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $25,741,659, or $20,994,241 less than they actually paid.

KANSAS

During the year 1942, the people of the State of Kansas used 1,374,621,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $31,893,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $17,588,319, or $14,305,581 less than they actually paid.

KENTUCKY

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Kentucky used 1,677,998,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $32,803,500.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $20,016,579, or $12,786,921 less than they actually paid.

LOUISIANA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Louisiana used 1,645,335,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $31,148,700.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $15,781,723, or $15,366,977 less than they actually paid.

MAINE

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Maine used 975,232,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $18,700,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $10,200,161, or $8,500,739 less than they actually paid.

MARYLAND

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Maryland used 2,472,084,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $45,660,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $26,682,888, or $18,977,512 less than they actually paid.

MASSACHUSETTS

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Massachusetts used 4,322,849,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $113,448,800.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $56,818,482, or $56,630,318 less than they actually paid.

MICHIGAN

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Michigan used 7,097,806,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $134,278,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $76,671,788, or $57,607,112 less than they actually paid.

MINNESOTA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Minnesota used 2,239,736,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $55,011,100.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $30,673,578, or $24,337,522 less than they actually paid.

MISSISSIPPI

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Mississippi used 666,511,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $14,783,300.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $8,027,803, or $6,755,497 less than they actually paid.

MISSOURI

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Missouri used 3,489,639,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $68,648,800.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $41,417,857, or $27,230,943 less than they actually paid.

MONTANA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Montana used 1,736,720,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $15,671,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $10,681,298, or $4,989,702 less than they actually paid.

NEBRASKA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Nebraska used 773,693,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $19,973,300.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $11,458,180, or $8,515,120 less than they actually paid.

NEVADA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Nevada used 154,729,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $3,277,100.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $1,711,755, or $1,565,345 less than they actually paid.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

During the year 1942 the people of the State of New Hampshire used 487,904,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $12,335,600.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $6,510,473, or $5,825,127 less than they actually paid.

NEW JERSEY

During the year 1942 the people of the State of New Jersey used 5,000,452,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $119,253,300.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $57,691,002, or $61,562,298 less than they actually paid.

NEW MEXICO

During the year 1942 the people of the State of New Mexico used 178,147,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $6,599,200.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $2,616,419, or $3,982,781 less than they actually paid.

NEW YORK

During the year 1942 the people of the State of New York, used 18,429,737,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $361,418,600.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $175,957,975, or $185,460,625 less than they actually paid.

NORTH CAROLINA

During the year 1942, the people of the State of North Carolina used 3,499,721,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $52,173,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $34,808,548, or $17,364,452 less than they actually paid.

NORTH DAKOTA

During the year 1942, the people of the State of North Dakota used 180,278,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $7,008,200.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $3,235,239, or $3,772,961 less than they actually paid.

OHIO

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Ohio used 11,137,170,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $183,233,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $113,962,679, or $69,270,721 less than they actually paid.

OKLAHOMA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Oklahoma used 1,261,583,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $30,359,900.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $16,315,747, or $14,044,153 less than they actually paid.

OREGON

During the year 1942, the people of the State of Oregon used 2,016,158,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $26,471,200.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $19,343,469, or $7,127,731 less than they actually paid.

PENNSYLVANIA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Pennsylvania used 15,700,440,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $249,036,700.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $153,861,342, or $95,175,358 less than they actually paid.

RHODE ISLAND

During the year 1942, the people of the State of Rhode Island used 807,095,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $20,006,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $10,352,504, or $9,653,896 less than they actually paid.

SOUTH CAROLINA

During the year 1942, the people of the State of South Carolina used 1,685,051,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $23,770,300.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $15,944,865, or $7,825,435 less than they actually paid.

SOUTH DAKOTA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of South Dakota used 223,137,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $7,832,500.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $3,641,292, or $4,191,208 less than they actually paid.

TENNESSEE

During the year 1942, the people of the State of Tennessee used 4,833,695,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $40,183,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $33,781,545, or $6,401,455 less than they actually paid.

TEXAS

During the year 1942, the people of the State of Texas used 4,716,867,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $95,196,300.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $52,673,271, or $42,523,029 less than they actually paid.

UTAH

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Utah used 1,117,518,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $15,351,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $9,432,423, or $5,918,977 less than they actually paid.

VERMONT

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Vermont used 299,933,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $7,880,700.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $4,346,035, or $3,534,665 less than they actually paid.

VIRGINIA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Virginia used 2,203,554,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $43,664,000.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $25,109,110, or $18,554,890 less than they actually paid.

WASHINGTON

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Washington used 6,253,201,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $55,289,100.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $43,153,856, or $12,135,244 less than they actually paid.

WEST VIRGINIA

During the year 1942 the people of the State of West Virginia used 2,752,822,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $37,641,700.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $23,274,974, or $14,366,726 less than they actually paid.

WISCONSIN

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Wisconsin used 3,380,057,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $69,062,800.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $39,585,289, or $29,477,511 less than they actually paid.

WYOMING

During the year 1942 the people of the State of Wyoming used 144,633,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $4,456,300.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $2,137,658, or $2,318,642 less than they actually paid.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

During the year 1942 the people of the whole United States used 158,333,465,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, for which they paid $2,850,307,400.

Under the T. V. A. rates the cost to them would have been $1,665,073,726, or $1,185,233,674 less than they actually paid.

If every person in America who uses electricity could read and understand what these figures mean to them, there would be such a ground swell of demands for relief from these overcharges that no official or set of officials could resist them.

Home Front Reforms at Top Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, entitled "Home Front Reforms at Top Needed," published in a recent issue of the Washington Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME FRONTS AT TOP NEEDED

(By David Lawrence)

Something fundamental is wrong with the home front. Unless corrected, it can mean a longer and costlier war and an even more painful post-war period.

The main evidence of this trend is to be found in a lack of unity behind the Government, a lack of faith in its administrative set-up, if not in its sincerity. The administrators themselves exhort and plead and try to obtain the people's cooperation in rationing and the many sacrifices that are needed to support a maximum effort on the battlefronts, but such pleas and exhortations are not heeded as they should be.

There is friction where harmony should prevail and there is waste and incompetence where the utmost in conservation and efficiency should be achieved. Irritation has replaced calmness, and clashes of policy and lack of functional coordination particularly in Washington have given the people generally a discouraging picture of their leaders.

It will do no good to start blaming the other fellow—a favorite tendency when one feels his own guilt and does not have the courage to admit it. Neither will do no good to assume that the disease is incurable, because at bottom it has the germs of political ambition, selfish quest for power, or the maintenance of public office.

CRITICAL PERIOD AHEAD

If it were conceded that most of the problems are as perplexing as they are because President Roosevelt, though a man of broad vision in foreign policy and world strategy, is just the opposite in domestic administration, and that there can be no relief until and unless a new President is elected, the fact remains we are faced in the next 18 months with the most critical period of the war, and under our system of government, no other leadership in the executive branch of the Government is available.

Who, then, can help the home front? The responsibility rests primarily on those who have been thick-and-thin supporters of the President and who must have faith in and influence with him. There must be in the ranks of the New Deal men of such strength of character as to recognize that the conflict on the home front can be resolved only by the application by them of some of the basic principles of the Christian philosophy. There can, for instance, be no reconciliation of groups if either or both sides of a controversy insist on the maximum obtainable or if one or the other deals with governmental power on a dictatorial or dogmatic basis.

ROOM FOR REFORM

Faith and confidence are instilled in a nation when the men at the top not only abide by the rules but do not seek to take advantage of wartime to change the fundamental rules without consulting the people. There is, for example, room for considerable reform in the relations between the Supreme Court and the people. It is no exaggeration to report that never in its whole history have lawyers generally so little esteem for the court, believing it political and class-conscious.

There is need, also, for a better handling of the labor problem. Many hard-working, conscientious members of labor unions and their officers are being condemned for the acts of a few. Also, the administration is not playing the game fairly as between employer and employee, but is conducting what appears to be a political game of special privilege. This only sows the seeds of deep ideological conflict.

Just as left-wing extremists were born out of the stupidity and selfishness of the conservatives, so today right-wing extremists are being bred every day and the seeds of an American kind of fascism or state socialism are being sown by the stubbornness and intolerance of power-conscious left-wingers.

OF FIRST IMPORTANCE

To those of us who strive for the middle way and who see in right-wing attitudes as many dangers as in the so-called reforms of the left wing, the task of rebuilding the home front on a new basis looms as of transcendent importance. For, notwithstanding the prevailing optimism about the military situation today, this war may last at least another 2 or possibly 3 years more, and there is no telling how long it is going to take to conquer Japan.

Meanwhile, we shall multiply irritations and sap the vitality of the home front unless we take refuge in the basic principles of self-examination and fair play. For governments are no stronger than the individuals who exercise its powers, and nations are no stronger than the moral fiber of their leaders.

The Flag Speaks for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Flag Speaks for America," delivered by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., on Flag Day, Monday, June 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans: Here in this old city where the flag of America was born and where it was adopted by the American Congress, the celebration of Flag Day is peculiarly appropriate.

On June 14, 1777, we were completing the first year of our independence. We were in the second year of the Revolution.

Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill had come and gone. Germantown and Valley Forge were yet to come. The surrender at Yorktown was somewhere in the future.

The flag was born in a time of storm and strain. The united colonies were about to become the United States. It was not a time for the sunshine patriot or the summer soldier. The Nation of the future was being shaped and tempered by the fires of sacrifice and the hammers of war. It was a time that tried men's souls, just as they are being tried again in America today.

And now, after 166 years, the Stars and Stripes is one of the oldest, proudest, and best loved flags in the world. It is hated in Berlin, Tokyo, and Rome, and wherever the spirit of hatred, conquest, and tyranny exists. But it is loved by free men and free women everywhere, and by all unfortunate countries that, having lost their freedom, would be free again.

And, please God, it will wave once more over battered Manila and the blood-stained foxholes of Bataan. It will fly again over Kiska, Guam, and Wake Island.

In its stripes and stars and its field of blue is all that has been, now is, and will be America. Woven into it are the first log cabins of the white men in Virginia and New England, the little homes, the little ships, and the little farms of a lonely seaboard on the rim of a continental wilderness.

It speaks for the old Indian wars, for the forgotten explorers, and for all the nameless dead whose forgotten graves were made in the frontier clearings and along the lost trails.

In its bright colors you can see Bunker Hill and Ticonderoga, Brandywine and Trenton, Saratoga and Yorktown. You can see Morgan's riflemen and the long bayonets of the Continental line. You can see this old statehouse and hear, down through the years of struggle and growth and greatness, the old bell ringing over this Independence Square.

The epic of America and the glory of the American dream are symbolized by these stripes and stars. They stir great memories of the mighty panorama of a Nation on the march. Back along the roads of history the Long Rifles in their buckskin shirts are moving over the endless mountains of Pennsylvania and through the Cumberland Gap. You can hear the creaking wagon wheels rolling on across the plains to the Pacific.

You can hear the guns at Fredericksburg, Shiloh, and Chancellorsville and watch Pickett's charge at Gettysburg, breaking as a gray sea breaks on the immovable rock of human valor. You can hear the guns at Manila and the thundering roar of Pershing's massed batteries in the Argonne.

A little louder, a little nearer, echoing across this Nation today, are the guns at Midway, in the Solomons, and in Tunisia.

The long, sometimes stern, sometimes happy, sometimes bright, and sometimes gray annals of our country are written across that banner in the sky. Great names and great figures out of the past: Washington at Valley Forge, Perry on Lake Erie, Jackson at New Orleans, Taylor at Buena Vista, Webster in the Senate, Lincoln at Gettysburg, and Grant and Lee at Appomattox.

That flag speaks for all America, for the tall forests and tall ships of New England, for the lordly Hudson, for Penn's Woods, for the deep South, the bright Southwest, the great Midland Valley, the mighty Great Lakes, the endless plains, the massive Rockies, the high Sierras, and the imperial Pacific.

Woven into the flag are the immortal Declaration, the enduring Constitution, and the Bill of Rights that safeguard our liberties. It symbolizes every right we have won and every liberty we enjoy. It stands for the work of our hands, the fruit of our dreams, the spires of our churches, the halls of our great universities, our law courts, and our statehouses.

More than anything else it symbolizes the homes of America, our families, our long traditions, and our undying beliefs.

In this global war in which we are so fully and desperately engaged, that flag must fly on two great fronts.

In winning this war or the battle fronts we must be careful that we do not lose that other great conflict at home.

We must not lose the true America, the old and new America, the fine and strong America, the dynamic and free America, built by the hands of our many generations.

It can be lost. It is just as well that we face the facts. In this vast storm of war and change that is now sweeping the world, dark forces have been let loose. They threaten us not only on the battle fronts, but on the home front as well.

Many of the ideals and beliefs symbolized by the flag are in danger. We are fighting regimentation abroad with all the strength we can summon. We can and will win that battle.

We are submitting to regimentation at home so we may destroy regimentation in the world.

We are submitting to regimentation as a war policy and only as a war policy.

We must make sure that in winning this war against the tyranny and regimentation that would be imposed upon us by our enemies we do not find ourselves wearing the yoke of a home-made fascism after the war ends. Remember that American regimentation can be just as hateful and intolerable as Fascist regimentation.

Make no mistake about this: We have here in America our own economic fascists. These powerful groups of politico-social planners sit in the seats of the mighty. They plan to use our wartime economy as the pattern for a peacetime economy.

These economic Fascists are powerful in Washington. They inspired the massive report of the National Resources Planning Board. That 6-pound document proposing a so-called security plan is the holy book of the new American order. It is the system whereby our economic Fascists hope to control every step taken by Americans from their cradles to their graves.

Its purpose is to end the incentive system and discourage or destroy the American initiative that carried the flag from the Atlantic to the Pacific and made this the freest and strongest nation in the world.

It is intended to create a race of faceless, sheltered, docile Americans, willing to give up every right except the right to live, in exchange for a false security.

It promises to set up a caste and a class system whereby the young men and young women of America will be frozen into a politico-economic system. It will sound the death knell to ambition.

It will create a new pyramid of power, a great group of bureaucrats, an army of tax-gathering, tax-eating parasites, and a new breed of self-perpetuating tycoons living upon the substance of the people.

There is a battle coming between those who believe in the doctrines of a Christian civilization and the cynical, godless group who insist that no man should bow to the divine law. These new prophets of the new order hold that we should follow the doctrine of the supremacy of the economic man. They say that man, through science, can and will control his own destiny. They would repeal the laws of God and nature. Their own great god is social planning. They profess to dread the fear of want more than they do the loss of human liberty and freedom of action.

This great conflict of ideas is world-wide and is being fought in America under the smoke-screen of the war. It takes strange political forms. It is being whispered now in Washington that we must change our form of government in order for us to cooperate successfully in the post-war organization of the world.

We hear that America must forget the great past. We are told we must have a more responsible government, a government whose foreign policy need not depend upon the Senate, upon the Congress, upon the representatives of the people, or upon the wishes of the people themselves.

This is the day of the planner who sits down before the map of the world with his drafting board. Our economic Fascists, our politico-social groups, want to do far more than plan the food production of this Nation, far more than control the industrial output, far more than fix its standard of living by peacetime fixing of wages and prices. To thes towering thinkers, our wartime economy and our wartime controls are no more than the preliminary actions.

They wish, in collaboration with similar-minded groups in other countries, to fix the standard of living in every nation. They want to control the food production of every country, to say that wheat farmers of Iowa and the Argentine, the beef growers of Canada and Montana, the sugar planters of Louisiana and of Cuba, shall grow so much and no more. They would control the shipping of the world, the air lanes of the globe, and the lives of billions of the inhabitants of this planet.

They want, in fact, a regimentation of the globe. All of this would mean the surrender of what Benjamin Franklin called "essential liberty." Here in Philadelphia, Franklin wrote:

"They that give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

Franklin saw deeper into the human heart than these bulging-browed gentlemen of today who hope to make the world over on their planning boards, their charts, and their blueprints of tomorrow. Franklin knew that liberty meant far more than security and far more than freedom from want, or freedom from fear.

Remember, when you look at the flag, that freedom is a great word, but it is more than a great word. Men who have carried that flag by land and by sea, plain men and idealists, have died for it and for the freedom it symbolizes. They did not die that masterminds, seated at mahogany desks, might chart the lives of all mankind on their drafting boards. For nearly 170 years Americans have died under that flag to be free of superminds, supermen, and the Divine right to rule claimed by both kings and tyrants.

Against these doctrines of the superman in government, of rule by men instead of rule by law, we must declare unrelenting war. That is the road down which Hitler Germany and Fascist Italy are marching to their doom. That doctrine denies every stripe in the flag. It would blot out the 48 stars in that field of blue and set in their places a single, sinister star of centralized power. For America, it would mean a covenant with death and a dishonored grave in the cemetery of nations.

America and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Max Lerner answering Max Eastman.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWERING MAX EASTMAN

(Editorial by Max Lerner)

Having written a series of seven pieces on America and Russia a few months ago, I had hoped to keep off the subject for some months more. But the July Reader's Digest is out, with a 14-page article by Max Eastman that is bound to irritate and anger many Americans, confuse more, and confirm millions in their hatred of Russia by giving it plausible reasons to feed on. Eastman gives his attack the title "To Collaborate Successfully—We Must Face the Facts About Russia."

I brush aside the usual amenities with which the article starts, like all attacks on Russia: Admiration, gratitude, etc., for the Russians. I am on a search not for protestations of affection but for the facts about Russia which the title tells us we must face.

But before I can reach them I have to wade through pages of attacks not on Russians—but on Americans. The principal targets are Vice President Wallace, Wendell Willkie, and Joseph E. Davies. They are described as "apologists for communism." It is not quite clear whether Eastman charges them with deliberately misleading their countrymen about Russia, or whether he regards them as bewitched and deluded softies who talk drivel about Russia.

In either case he is wrong. When the history of American foreign relations in this crisis period comes to be written, Wallace and Willkie and Davies will be shining names in it. Two of them are men of the right in politics, as applied to them. Eastman's statement that "many Americans are fooling with communism, just to be on the left," simply makes no sense.

The present line of those who write as Eastman does is that the liberals and conservatives who are working for close relations with Russia in the war and the postwar are soft-headed and sentimental, and that realism is the monopoly of those who attack Russia.

WHO ARE THE REALISTS?

But who are the realists? Are they those who said before the war that Russia is so deeply a dictatorship that there is no difference between it and Germany? Are they those who said that Russia is so rotten internally that the first external attack will cause it to crumble? Are they those who said that the Russian Army was so shattered by the purges that it was incapable of a major war? Are the realists those who say now that the ally fighting on our side is a wicked herd-state and slave-society between whom and us there stretches a flaming gulf as between hell and heaven?

It is Wallace, Willkie, and Davies who are the realists. What they have done represents the triumph of historic events over past prejudices. They know the faults of Stalin and of the Russian system fully as well as Eastman does. Davies and Willkie have seen Russia at first hand during the past year, while Eastman was there from 1922 to 1924, and has not seen it for close to 20 years.

But they are men of action who are thinking of the battles of the future, rather than embittered doctrinaires who are preoccupied with ancient wrongs. And they know that the war cannot be won unless America and Russia win it together. And that the peace cannot be organized unless America and Russia organize it together. That is why they put Russia's strength and its qualities as a going concern in the foreground, and communism's sins in the background.

Why assume that these men, and others like them, are fools, dolts, gulls? Why not conclude rather that they are triumphant proof of a democracy's capacity to save itself from class blindness and national suicide?

But the case of American-Russian accord rests not on anyone's opinion, but on the mutual interests of both nations and on Russia's own record.

RUSSIANS AND NAZIS

But Eastman proposes to wipe all this off the slate at the very start. "Let us remember," he writes, "that the stubborn resistance of the Russian no more justifies communism than the stupendous assault of the German justifies nazi-ism."

This is a curious statement. In the first place, none of the people Eastman attacks have ever said that Russian resistance justifies communism. They have said that it is a basic argument for our cooperation with the Russians.

In the second place, the admiration of the English and the Americans for the Russian achievement was all the greater because they had been led to believe, by men like Eastman, that Russia was rotten to the core, would not fight, and could not resist.

And finally I am appalled by the cynical way in which, in the sentence above, Eastman tricks the reader into concluding that nothing in their war record distinguishes the Nazi system from the Russian. Is there no moral difference between a nation that makes a stupendous assault upon another, and a nation that offers stubborn resistance to it? Is there no political difference between a nation whose life and aim are war and a nation that wants to build its own social system and, to do so, requires to live at peace with the world?

Is there no difference, finally, to a poet and a humanist like Eastman, between the mask of sadism of the attacking Nazi soldiers, and the image of firm and bitter defense by Russian soldiers and civilians?

I thought of the way the Russians were fighting while I was reading the heart of Eastman's article—the facts about Russia. They are basically three. One is that Russia is politically a vast concentration camp. A second is that it is, in economic terms, an impoverished and a slave society. The third is that the Russian leaders hate and despise the democracies, and that they plot international revolution against us.

I don't pretend to know, as Eastman does, the final truth on these issues. But I try to use reason on them.

Take the question of international revolution. Eastman quotes learnedly from the theoretical writings of Lenin and Stalin. Yet we all know that a politician's words, especially for home consumption, are less important than his deeds. By quotation, Eastman in effect makes Stalin out to be a Trotzkyist, with a hunger for permanent world revolution. Yet if you look at the record of Russia's deeds you find that, under Stalin, Russia abandoned the tactics of world revolution and used the Comintern mainly for its own safety. And if you look at the record you know that Russia's so-called Communist plotting has not caused us in a quarter century to add a single soldier to the American armies.

DO SLAVES FIGHT?

On the economic issue, no one has denied the poverty of the Russian people in the last decade when they were arming for a struggle that was to absorb everything but the barest necessities. But what is crucial is that the Russian people know that their total national income is greater than ever, and that when they can live at peace it will mean higher living standards for the people. Lower than ours? Of course. But before you speak contemptuously of the Russian economic achievement, measure the rate of progress in the national income of the two countries in the past quarter century.

As I read Eastman on Russian poverty and the subjection of the people, I kept thinking: If these people are slaves, why do slaves fight so well? Why do starving people form themselves not just into a nation with an army, but a nation in arms? Why do Russian children, as Maurice Hindus described them in Mother Russia, die for their country with a deep joy that would do honor to grown and mature men? Why do Russians have the sense that they are fashioning a new world, with new meanings—a sense that we in America seem sadly to have lost?

If this were all, I should be more enthusiastic about the Russian system than I am. But there is also political suppression, the single-party system, the police state. Eastman quotes enormous figures about people in concentration camps in Russia. Although I don't trust his figures, I am willing to believe that the true ones are large. But the figures are not crucial. What is crucial is that Russians lack freedom of thought. The lesser punishment is absorbed in the greater—the imprisonment of the body in the imprisonment of the mind.

It is because of this lack of freedom in Russia that we on PM have opposed the Russian social system, and opposed all who advocate it for America.

But what follows from Eastman's argument on this score? Does he want us to demand of Russia that she change her social system as the condition of collaboration? Imagine what the Russians could say about our distribution of income, our treatment of Negroes, our class system of education.

Or does he want Roosevelt and Churchill, each time they make speeches, to include denunciations of their Soviet ally?

Or does he want us to break off relations with Russia now, and try to get along without her in the post-war world?

HIS TWO SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

He doesn't come out openly for any of these things. His only specific suggestions are two: that America ban the Communist Party; and that we should not "passively allow our schools, newspapers, radios, book and magazine publishing houses, cinema studios, Office of War Information, to be permeated with the agents and apologists of communism."

That is to say, he proposes Stalinist suppression of American political and intellectual freedom. He proposes that we take over from the Russians the one big thing that scars their record, and refashion ourselves in their image.

As for myself, I have more faith in America than that. I have faith in our democratic institutions—so much faith that I believe they can compete in the world with those of a totalitarian socialism--and without our having to resort to suppression.

We need freedom from external attack, and we can get that best by working with Russia. We need internal economic and social justice, and we can get that best by concentrating on our own inadequacies. And we need national stature and moral greatness. But we can get that best not by hating the ways of others but by measuring our strength against our own tasks.

Victories at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Victories at Home" published in the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer of July 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICTORIES AT HOME

The United States over the Fourth of July week end won several victories which were unheralded in the headlines. Yet they were as important as any victory on any fighting front in their effect on the outcome of the war. All were of the civilian rather than the military forces, yet their contributions, in the last analysis, are to the military rather than the civilian life of the Nation.

First, there was the low accident death rate. We don't know how many lives are lost ordinarily over a Fourth week end, but we know it is several hundred above the figure for last Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. Since every life saved is a life gained for the country we can chalk up a victory which, along a battle front, would have made important news.

The coal strike, in reality, was ended Monday. In spite of a tradition of years which calls for the Fourth of July holiday, miners went trooping back to the pits on that day and the production of coal was returned to normal once more. The losses of the strike cannot be made up and their effect on the war will be unfortunate. But Monday the strike was over and done with. It was a negative victory, but a victory nonetheless.

There was a victory in international relationships marked by the Fourth of July. Great Britain, Russia, Free France, and all the republics of South America joined in paying tribute to the cause of American independence. These gestures of friendship and good will, more than any other single fact, seem to us to point to the spirit of cooperation existing between the nations lined up to bring defeat to the Axis Powers.

There were other victories. Two destroyers and a submarine went splashing into the sea at Kearney, N. J. From a New London, Conn., shipyard another sub was commissioned to take her place in the Allied Fleet. The first freight-laden glider completed a successful trip across the Atlantic. In Cincinnati an Office of Price Administration check-up disclosed the fact that only a minor fraction of local people are attempting to "beat" the gas ration program.

In all, it was a comforting and promising week end. The hopes of millions of gallant fighting men will be raised when they learn of new successes on the civilian front.

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the draft agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration:

The governments or authorities whose duly authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

Being United Nations or being associated with the United Nations in this war,

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes, for the resumption of agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services, to the end that peoples once freed may be preserved and restored to health and strength for the tasks and opportunities of building anew,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies, and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

2. Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Administration shall be as follows:

(a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, and other basic necessities, housing facilities, medical and other essential services; and to facilitate in areas receiving relief the production and transportation of these articles and the furnishing of these services so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief. The form of activities of the administration within the territory of a member government wherein that government exercises administrative authority and the responsibility to be assumed by the member government for carrying out measures planned by the Administration therein shall be determined after consultation with and with the consent of the member government.

(b) To formulate and recommend measures for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments for the coordination of purchasing, the use of ships and other procurement activities in the period following the cessation of hostilities; with a view to integrating the plans and activities of the Administration with the total movement of supplies, and for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of available supplies. The Administration may administer such coordination measures as the member governments authorize.

(c) To formulate and recommend for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments measures with respect to such related matters, arising out of its experience in planning and performing the work of relief and rehabilitation, as may be proposed by any of the member governments and approved by unanimous vote of the central committee.

ARTICLE II

Membership

The members of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be the governments or authorities signatory hereto and such other governments or authorities as may upon application for membership be admitted thereto by action by the council or between sessions of the council, by the central committee.

Wherever the term "member government" is used in this agreement it shall be construed to embrace such authorities as shall have signed the agreement or shall subsequently become members of the administration.

ARTICLE III

The council

1. Each member government shall name one representative, and such alternates as may be necessary, upon the council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which shall be the policy-making body of the administration. The council shall, for each of its sessions, select one of its members to preside at the session.

2. The council shall be convened in normal session not less than twice a year by the central committee. It may be convened in special session whenever the central committee shall deem necessary, and shall be convened within 30 days after request therefor by a majority of the members of the council.

3. The central committee of the council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, with the Director General presiding. Between sessions of the council it shall exercise all the powers and functions thereof. It shall invite the participation of the representatives of any member government at those of its meetings at which action of special interest to such government is discussed. It shall invite the participation of the representatives serving as chairman of the committee on supplies of the council at those of its meetings at which policies affecting the provision of supplies are discussed.

4. The committee on supplies of the council shall consist of the members of the council, or their alternates, representing those member governments likely to be principal suppliers of materials for relief and rehabilitation. The members shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. The committee on supplies shall consider, formulate, and recommend to the central committee and the council policies designed to assure the provision of required supplies. The central committee shall from time to time meet with the committee on supplies to review policy matters affecting supplies.

5. The committee of the council for Europe shall consist of all the members of the council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the European area, and such other members of the council, representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the European area, as shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. The committee of the council for the Far East shall consist of all the members of the council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the far eastern area, and such other members of the council representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the far eastern area as shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to the council's ratification. The regional committees shall normally meet within their respective areas. They shall consider and recommend to the council and the central committee policies with respect to relief and rehabilitation within their respective areas. The committee of the council for Europe shall replace the inter-allied committee on European post-war relief established in London on September 24, 1941, and the records of the latter shall be made available to the committee for Europe.

6. The council shall establish such other standing regional committees as it shall consider desirable, the functions of such committees and the method of appointing their members being identical to that provided in paragraph 5 of this article with respect to the committees of the council for Europe and for the Far East. The council shall also establish such other standing committees as

it considers desirable to advise it, and, in intervals between sessions of the council, to advise the central committee. For such technical standing committees as may be established, in respect of particular problems such as nutrition, health, agriculture, transport, repatriation, and finance, the members may be members of the council or alternates nominated by them because of special competence in their respective fields of work. The members shall be appointed by the central committee, with the approval of the council if it be in session and otherwise subject to its ratification. Should a regional committee so desire, subcommittees of the technical standing committees shall be established by the technical committees in consultation with the regional committees, to advise the regional committees.

7. The travel and other expenses of members of the council and of members of its committees shall be borne by the governments which they represent.

8. All reports and recommendations of committees of the council shall be transmitted to the Director General for distribution to the council and the central committee by the secretariat of the council established under the provisions of article IV, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE IV

The Director General

1. The executive authority of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be in the Director General, who shall be appointed by the council on the nomination by unanimous vote of the central committee. The Director General may be removed by unanimous vote of the central committee.

2. The Director General shall have full power and authority for carrying out relief operations contemplated by article I, paragraph 2 (a), within the limits of available resources and the broad policies determined by the council or its central committee. Immediately upon taking office he shall in conjunction with the military and other appropriate authorities of the United Nations prepare plans for the emergency relief of the civilian population in any area occupied by the armed forces of any of the United Nations, arrange for the procurement and assembly of the necessary supplies, and create or select the emergency organization required for this purpose. In arranging for the procurement, transportation, and distribution of supplies and services, he and his representatives shall consult and collaborate with the appropriate authorities of the United States and shall, wherever practicable, use the facilities made available by such authorities. Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General. The powers and duties of the Director General are subject to the limitations of article VII.

3. The Director General shall also be responsible for the organization and direction of the functions contemplated by article I, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

4. The Director General shall appoint such Deputy Directors General, officers, expert personnel, and staff at his headquarters and elsewhere, including field missions, as he shall find necessary, and he may delegate to them such of his powers as he may deem appropriate. The Director General, or upon his authorization the Deputy Directors General, shall supply such secretariat and other staff and facilities as shall be required by the council and its committees, including the regional committees and subcommittees. Such Deputy Directors General as shall be assigned special functions within a region shall attend meetings of the regional standing committee whenever possible and shall keep it advised on the progress of the relief and rehabilitation program within the region.

5. The Director General shall make periodic reports to the central committee and to the council covering the progress of the Administration's activities. The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the central committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential. The Director General shall also arrange to have prepared periodic reports covering the activities of the Administration within each region and he shall transmit such reports with his comments thereon to the council, the central committee, and the respective regional committees.

ARTICLE V

Supplies and resources

1. Each member government pledges its full support to the Administration, within the limits of its available resources and subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, through contributions of funds, materials, equipment, supplies, and services, for use in its own, adjacent, or other areas in need, in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a). All such contributions received by the Administration shall be accounted for.

2. The supplies and resources made available by the member governments shall be kept in review in relation to prospective requirements by the Director General, who shall initiate action with the member governments with a view to assuring such additional supplies and resources as may be required.

3. All purchases by any of the member governments, made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency.

ARTICLE VI

Administrative expenses

The Director General shall submit to the council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration. Upon approval of a budget by the council, the total amount approved shall be allocated to the member governments in proportions to be determined by the council. Each member government pledges itself, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses so determined.

ARTICLE VII

Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area, and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary. The determination that such hostilities or military necessities exist in any area shall be made by its military commander.

ARTICLE VIII

Amendment

The provisions of this agreement may be amended by unanimous vote of the central committee and two-thirds vote of the council.

ARTICLE IX

Entry into force

This agreement shall enter into force with respect to each signatory on the date when the agreement is signed by that signatory, unless otherwise specified by such signatory.

Lake Michigan Level Two and One-half Feet Above Normal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of June 22, 1943:

LAKE ERIE, ONTARIO FLOODS CAUSE WIDESPREAD DAMAGE

Docks, roads, and camps were reported under water yesterday along the shores of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River as the waters neared record high levels. Mounting damage was feared as high water in the upper Great Lakes continued to pour eastward as the result of heavy May rains.

Lake Michigan, according to Army engineers in Chicago, is about 2½ feet above normal, but is still 3 feet under the record high of 1917. The Coast Guard and lake cities reported little or no damage.

Lake Ontario was reported to be less than an inch under its highest recorded level, reached in 1870, and 3½ feet above its level in March. Many resort homes on its eastern shore and at Cape Vincent, where the St. Lawrence flows from the lake, were reported under water, with dock supports and ferry landings washed out.

At Sackett Harbor on Lake Ontario and in the Thousand Islands region up the river considerable damage was reported, with docks a foot or two under water, and boathouses, homes, camps, and cottages flooded. Practically all beaches were said to be under water and not usable.

At fashionable Henderson Harbor, near Cape Vincent, and at other exclusive communities up the St. Lawrence on both the United States and Canadian sides of the river, it was feared that strong winds or storms from the west might blow in more water and cause heavy damage to homes and towns.

At Cleveland, on Lake Erie, the water was within a half foot of the high mark set in 1929 and erosion along the east shore of the city was reported as the heaviest in many years. At suburban Villa Beach a brick buliding and a section of walled bank slid into the river. Trees, walks, and drives were washed out. Residents were said to have asked the city council to strengthen the retaining wall along the lake.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, knowing that most veteran beneficiaries are unaware of their rights to benefits, privileges, and exemptions, as extended to them under certain circumstances by the laws of the great State of Illinois, I am pleased to present for your information

an outline of these laws as they affect the veterans, their wives, their children, and their organizations, as compiled by L. J. Zimmer, National Service Officer of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his office in C–119, United States Veterans' Administration, Hines, Ill.

The Disabled American Veterans is a congressionally chartered organization that is composed solely of men who are wounded or disabled as a result of their services to the United States, in a war or campaign. This organization, because of its very nature, has made a special study of the needs of America's defenders, and is thereby rendering a great service to these men and to their country. I heartily recommend the high service standards followed by the Disabled American Veterans in Illinois, through their office at Hines, Ill.

The outline, as prepared by Comrade Zimmer, is as follows:

EDUCATION, CHILDREN OF WAR VETERANS

Educational grants are given to children over the age of 18 and not more than 21, who have resided in the State of Illinois for at least 12 months and whose parents, or parent, served either in the Army, Navy, or the Marine Corps, and who was killed in action or died as a result of either service in the World War between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or who served on and after July 7, 1941. The purpose of this aid, which will be given so far as moneys appropriated will permit, is to cover the payment for matriculation, tuition, board and room rent, books and supplies at State educational institutions or secondary colleges, business colleges, vocational training schools, etc. The administrative agency for this program is the department of registration and education. Scholarships will be granted on the basis of one honorary scholarship in the State university for each county in the State. However, the board of trustees may from time to time increase the number of honorary scholarships when, in their judgment, such conditions will not embarrass the finances of the university.

EDUCATION OF WAR VETERANS

The State provides for normal school and University of Illinois scholarships to veterans of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

REHABILITATION

The State provides for rehabilitation of its disabled. The purpose of the rehabilitation is to determine what type of work the veteran should be rehabilitated in, and then to provide the funds for the educational program and to supply, if needed, any artificial prosthesis that may be needed to rehabilitate and to assist in the rehabilitation of the veteran, providing these are not furnished by the Federal Government. This is given to both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 veterans. Benefits are obtained through the Department of Rehabilitation, Springfield, Ill., or the office located in Chicago, Ill.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS

At the present time, when a veteran is found to be incompetent, being a veteran of World War No. 1 or World War No. 2, he can be committed either to a State institution or directly to the Veterans' Administration, who will have the right to hospitalize this veteran through commitment in any of the Veterans' Administration mental institutions.

Veterans organizations may lease grounds from the forest preserve districts for the purpose of erecting convalescnt camps for the housing of convalescing, sick, and disabled veterans, and as a place upon which to construct rehabilitation quarters.

VETERANS' RELIEF

County aid can and may be given to needy veterans and the families of deceased veterans, through veterans organizations, providing that they qualify under the Bogardus Act.

Relief for widows and children, or deceased war veterans' families can and may be made through the department of public welfare. Applications for relief are to be made direct to the relief office administering the Bogardus Act in each individual county, or to the department of public welfare in the immediate jurisdiction of the family who is in need.

SOLDIERS' HOME

The State of Illinois has a soldiers' home to which veterans of all wars and their wives are admitted upon proper application and approval thereof. The soldiers' home in Illinois is in Quincy and applications for admission are made direct to the manager of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Home, Quincy, Ill. Such applications must be accompanied by proof that the applicant is in need of care and treatment in such form, by submitting certificates from two physicians or other medical evidence as may be required.

SERVICE OFFICERS

The State provides, through the department of public welfare, a veterans' division which is under the direction of the superintendent, Guy E. Bonney, Springfield, Ill. Under the veterans' division there are employed by the State, certain veterans as service officers, who are attached to stations in State mental institutions and State penal institutions, for the purpose of assisting the veterans confined therein, in the proper presentation and prosecution of their claims and to assist them and their families generally in securing their entitlements to the benefits they are entitled to as veterans, and the families of veterans.

DOCUMENTS

A. Recording of discharges: In honorable discharges of veterans from any branch of the armed forces, either World War No. 1 or World War No. 2, as well as certain other wars, veterans are recorded by the county recorders of each county free of charge. Each veteran is urged to record his discharge from service with the county recorder, so that in the event that the original is lost, stolen or destroyed, there shall be available to him and his dependents at all times, an exact copy of the original discharge certificate.

B. Marriage certificates: When needed for governmental purposes, shall be furnished free of charge upon application to the county clerk in which the marriage took place, and be forwarded to the county clerk, along with a proper certification that the document is needed for governmental purposes.

C. Divorce certificates: Certified copies of divorce proceedings may be secured by proper application to the clerk of court having jurisdiction in the county where the divorce took place. These will be furnished free of charge when properly certified that they are needed for governmental purposes.

D. Death certificates: Certified copies of death certificates can be secured from the county clerk in the county in which the death took place. These will be furnished free of charge when properly certified that they are needed for governmental purposes.

E. Birth certificates: Birth certificates may be secured through the Bureau of Federal Statistics, Springfield, Ill., or in the county in which the birth took place. These will be furnished free of charge upon proper certification that they are needed for governmental purposes.

F. Delayed birth certificates: Many of the veterans of World War No. 1 and prior to that date, who were born in the State of Illinois, have been unable to secure birth certificates covering the date of their birth, due to the fact that the State of Illinois did not require compulsory registration until just recent years. These veterans can secure delayed birth certificates by writing to the county clerk in the county in which they were born, requesting an application for delayed birth certificates and then having the application properly certified by either a member of their family or one who knows the date of their birth and the names of their parents. This certificate will then be forwarded to the county clerk with a fee of 50 cents, requesting a certified copy of the delayed birth certificate, which will cover the law on birth registration and supply the necessary missing certificate.

DEATH BENEFITS

A. Indigent veterans, their mothers, fathers, wives, widows, or minor children, may not be buried in a potter's field. Burial allowance shall be provided by each county and a place other than potter's field shall be set aside in certain cemeteries for the burial of this corpse. Relatives of the deceased are permitted to conduct the funerals.

B. Burial grounds: Burial grounds for such classes as mentioned above may be acquired by the counties in such cemeteries as they shall see fit, and shall be set aside for burial of this class only.

C. Cemetery lots, property of veterans' organizations: Where cemetery lots are owned by a veterans' organization and upon dissolution of such organization, the property shall vest in the municipality, and it shall be the duty of the municipality to enforce contracts for care of such a lot, or lots.

D. Grave registration: The State of Illinois establishes and has a Department of Grave Registration. The public is to collect the data concerning the names of the veterans interred in cemeteries in Illinois, together with all the information as to place, location, etc., as well as rank and organization. Veterans' organizations are authorized to aid in collection of data and are entitled to copies of cemetery plots at the expense of the county.

E. Headstones: Headstones are furnished by the Federal Government; however, the State of Illinois allots a certain sum for the erection of headstones in each cemetery. Cemeteries should be contacted to determine the type of headstones that is permitted in each individual cemetery. Counties may provide headstones for the soldiers' graves if they so desire.

F. Decedent's estate: No fees are allowed public administrators for service performed in administering that part of personal estate of war veteran, which consists of compensation, insurance, and other moneys due or payable from the United States.

EXEMPTION FROM EXECUTION

Money received by a war veteran as pension, adjusted or additional compensation, or bonus from the United States or from the State of Illinois on account of military service, is exempt from execution, attachment, and distress for rent, for 1 year following its receipt.

MEMORIAL BUILDING PRIVILEGES

Quarters may be set aside in county memorial buildings for the use of veterans' organizations, without charge to the organization.

PREFERENCES, RIGHTS, AND PRIVILEGES IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

The State law grants preference to veterans in State and municipal civil service. Preference is granted to veterans in the civil service of Cook County. Annuity to Civil War veterans is granted upon retirement from municipal service. Preference is granted to veterans in the employment on public works of State and local units. Preference is granted to veterans, or their widows in appointments to administrative positions

under the veterans' relief commission. Credit for service in the Spanish-American and World Wars is granted in the computing of eligibility for fireman and police pensions, upon payment of the amount such firemen and policemen would have contributed to the pension fund during that period of time.

The Fight of Agriculture for Economic Equality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, sometime ago, at the request of the editor of the Missouri Farmer, which is the organ of the Missouri Farmers' Association, one of the great agricultural organizations of the United States, and I believe the largest farm cooperative in the United States, I wrote for that publication an article entitled "The Fight of Agriculture for Economic Equality." I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and that it be preceded by the editorial note entitled "Let's Get the Record Straight."

There being no objection, the editorial note and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Missouri Farmer]

LET'S GET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

During the past 12 months or so there has been a lot of misinformation disseminated by the daily press, radio and other mediums concerning agriculture, the farm bloc in Congress, the farm organizations, and various farm legislation. It is important that farmers understand what has been done and why. For unless we do understand the situation we become confused, and as an organization we become ineffectual. This is why we asked Senator CLARK to write the accompanying article. From time to time we expect to ask other competent legislators to write on the same subjects.

Senator CLARK, by the way, has been one of agriculture's stanchest friends in the United States Senate during the trying times through which we have been passing. He has steadfastly supported measures which he believed were in the farmer's best interest. On one occasion he stood out until the last with three other Senators on a proposal to definitely fix prices on everything—including farm prices, wages, profits and transportation charges—as was recommended by President Heinkel. Another time he was willing to get up out of a sick bed, against his doctor's orders, to confer with Frank Young, who was sent to Washington to represen' the Missouri Farmers' Association on a price-fixing bill. These instances and others, we feel sure, the Missouri Farmers' Association membership will appreciate.

THE FIGHT OF AGRICULTURE FOR ECONOMIC EQUALITY

(By Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK)

Among the strangest phenomena of these tragic times is the persistent and relentless efforts on the part of many great metropolitan newspapers and particularly of newspaper columnists and radio commentators to discredit the farmers of the United States and hammer down the price of agricultural products. In this short-sighted and un-American attitude it is a fact, regrettable but true, that in recent years these efforts have apparently had the connivance and assistance of some of the highest administrative officials of our Government.

These efforts upon the part of the great metropolitan press are the more remarkable in view of the fact that in the passage of the price-fixing and stabilization bills, the newspapers of the Nation sought and obtained for themselves a specific provision exempting newspapers from price limitations. Nearly every large newspaper in the country has freely and properly availed itself of the right to raise its own prices to cover increased cost of production. Yet the right which they have claimed for themselves of raising prices to cover cost of production—including increased labor costs—plus a reasonable profit on their investment and for their efforts, they have been the first and loudest to deny the farmers. The farmers themselves and those of us in Congress who regard agriculture as a fundamental and essential American industry which must at all hazards be not only permitted to survive but encouraged and stimulated to maximum production for the supply of those most vital war necessities of food and clothing, have been assailed and abused in the public press and over the radio, and accused of every crime from callous selfishness to downright treason. No more unfair campaign has ever been waged against any great section of the Nation's population.

No sensible man or woman can have the slightest doubt that one of the most desperate and pressing needs of the United States and its allies in this war emergency is the greatest possible production of agricultural foods and fibers. We must supply our armed forces around the globe with food to eat and clothes to wear. We must supply our own civilian population with sustenance in order to keep production of other essentials at the maximum in order to support and maintain our armed forces at highest efficiency. We must to a large extent supply the needs of our allies and of friendly neutrals in order to prevent a complete break-down in the combined effort so vitally necessary to win the war. Without the very greatest possible production in this country of these vital essentials our war effort must inevitably collapse, and disaster beyond any possible calculation might follow.

FARMERS ARE PATRIOTIC

Yet while all admit these salient facts, many high officials and many editors and commentators apparently have not had the wit to see what is necessary to bring about this maximum production of these essential requirements. Many of them have apparently never realized that the mere writing of a "quota" or an "allotment" on a piece of paper and the noisy trumpeting of "aims for agricultural production" through the press and over the radio does not of itself bring the needful production.

The average American farmer is as patriotic, as industrious, and as self-abnegating as any citizen of any nation in the history of the world. He has been the very bone and sinew of our Nation from the very beginning. But he cannot perform miracles, and he should not be expected to do so. To use a Biblical expression, the farmer "cannot make bricks without straw."

Too many of our professorial and editorial economists—who so often feel themselves entirely competent to speak as the last authorities upon agricultural problems about which they know nothing and care less—have completely overlooked the most rudimentary requirements for adequate agricultural production.

This may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. A price which will enable the farmer to pay his costs of production, including labor, plus the carrying charges on his investment in his land, improvements, and equipment, plus at least a living wage to the farmer and his family for their own labor and efforts. This is absolutely necessary because no matter how patriotic a farmer may be, the vast majority of farmers do not have sufficient resources to continue to produce at a loss even if they were willing to do so. Furthermore, when industry engaged in war work is being awarded cost-plus contracts insuring them cost of production including labor costs in addition to a reasonable profit, and when under the Little Steel formula wages have been stepped up to meet the increased cost of living, there is no reason on earth why the farmer should be asked to operate at a loss.

2. Sufficient farm labor to at least prevent wanton wastage of the agricultural resources of the Nation. It should have been recognized long ago that the man who is engaged in producing the materials for food and clothing for our armed forces is certainly engaged in no less essential an effort than the man engaged in producing munitions and that his occupation, though less hazardous, is no less essential than that of the man who carries a gun. But the farm has been steadily depleted of its manpower for production by drafts of farmers for military service and even more dangerously by high wages offered in munition factories with Government sanction and encouragement.

MORE MACHINERY NEEDED

3. Adequate farm machinery to make up the deficiencies in farm labor due to the foregoing causes. Since it was inevitable that a vast number of young men would leave the farms to enter the military services or be attracted by the disproportionately higher wages of munition plants, some provision should long ago have been made for filling this loss in farm manpower with an adequate supply of farm machinery.

These requirements are so plain and simple that he who runs may read. It is amazing that there should ever have been any dispute about them among men and women who recognize the absolute necessity for the greatest possible production of the vital agricultural products. Yet nearly all of the controversies with regard to agricultural production which have taken place in the last 2 years have revolved around these very points.

When—nearly 2 years ago—a few of us in the Senate and in the House began to point out the danger to agricultural production by the curtailment of manpower on the farm both from the operation of the draft laws and from the steady drain on farm labor by the ruinous competition with the higher wages of munition factories, as well as the imperative need of supplementing the farm labor remaining available by liberal allocation of farm machinery, if necessary financed by the Government, we were voices crying in a wilderness.

THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT

It should have been clear as crystal from the beginning that if maximum production of foods and fibers was to be maintained, the available supply of farm labor must not be unduly depleted either by the draft or by competition of munition factories and that the only way in which any such depletion could be made up was by additional farm machinery. But it was impossible to obtain any action on deferment of essential farm labor until adoption of the Tydings amendment, which was forced on to the last Draft Act by a militant group of Senators last October. Even then the spirit of this amendment was largely flouted by the Selective Service System and its effect largely nullified.

The Senate at last took drastic action and over bitter administration protests passed an

act for the blanket deferment of bona fide essential farm workers. This act has apparently been salted away in the House Committee on Military Affairs with little hope of passage, but its adoption by an overwhelming vote in the Senate has had the effect of forcing the selective service to carry out the spirit of the Tydings amendment. The situation has been thereby much improved, but the improvement came so belatedly that, as I stated in the Senate, it was a good deal like locking the barn after the horse was stolen. The suggestion seriously advanced as a substitute by the War Department of using military units as organizations to work the farms is, of course, ridiculous. It would be interesting to know what possible use such a fine military organization as the old Seventy-seventh Division, exclusively from Greater New York, would be on the farms of Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa.

The situation with regard to farm machinery has been equally slow and difficult in improvement. For a long time the War Production Board stoutly resisted all efforts to obtain an allocation of the necessary material for agricultural implements. Even with the substantial reduction in the critical materials necessary for the use of tanks, and certain allocations were made for farm machinery, a quota system was set up based upon the extent to which the farms of the various States were already mechanized. Thus, States like Iowa, which were already mechanized to the extent of 85 to 90 percent, were given quotas of the available supply on that basis, while States like Missouri and Oklahoma, mechanized to the extent of only 13 or 14 percent, were restricted to that basis despite the fact that their need was undoubtedly greater. This situation has been much improved and is likely to be further improved in the immediate future. Only a few days ago Chester Davis, the new food czar, who really knows something about the the farm situation, notified the War Production Board that the most pressing necessity for agricultural production at the present time is additional farm machinery. This will in all probability bring about great improvement, but too late to be of great effect in this season's crops.

It can scarcely be denied by anyone that taking the 10-year administration of President Roosevelt as a whole it has been notably friendly to agriculture and has brought about a vast improvement in farm prices, farm credits, and farm conditions. One has only to compare conditions at the outbreak of the war with the unforgettable disastrous situation existing when President Roosevelt took office in 1933 to be convinced of that fact.

I was not one of those who favored the plan of the original Agricultural Adjustment Agency bill. I believed with William Hirth and many other distinguished farm leaders that the preferable plan was to determine the amount of agricultural production needed for domestic consumption, guarantee the farmer a fair price for his production and then permit him to produce anything else he pleased to be sold on the markets of the world for whatever he could get for it. But when the theory of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency became the policy of the Government, in company with other friends of agriculture, I accepted this principle and voted for every measure to make it work to the best advantage. Whether or not the Agricultural Adjustment Agency was the best possible plan which could have been adopted at that time, it can scarcely be denied that the over-all results of that measure and its accompanying and succeeding legislation was greatly to the advantage of agriculture until the outbreak of war conditions.

I do believe, however, that since the development of war conditions, the handling of the whole price situation has been unfortunate and has worked unfairly on the farmers of the country in comparison with other great sections of the population. A very strenuous and sincere effort is now being made to correct these inequities.

Everyone recognizes the necessity for stabilization of economic conditions during this war if inflation which would be disastrous to all classes alike is to be prevented. Everyone realizes that all must make sacrifices—desperate sacrifices—if we are to win the war without precipitating calamity at home. But there should be—and should have been from the beginning—insurance for equality of sacrifice and insurance that all should be treated alike in an economic sense. There should have been over-all control from the outset—control of profits, wages, and prices, as well as control of agricultural commodities.

When the first price-fixing bill—largely written by Mr. Leon Henderson—was before the Congress, it was strongly urged by a few of us that the plan would not work unless it did include over-all control. The sponsors of the bill, however, were unwilling to include control of profits or wages. By reason of this refusal, it was necessary to provide that prices of agricultural products should not be fixed at less than 110 percent of parity. Now, no one had any idea that this provision would bring about an over-all price of farm products above parity. The limit of 110 percent of parity was inserted because of the sponsors of the price-fixing bill refusing to deal with profits or wages and on the theory that a general floor of 110 percent of parity would actually in practice permit about 100 percent of parity on the average.

Some of us in the Senate pointed out the dangers of such a system and insisted on an over-all system which would protect agriculture against a repetition of the calamitous experiences of the last war, when with high prices on agricultural products, the farmer was whipsawed as to his actual returns—his real prices—between exorbitant profits and abnormal wages. We were overruled by the majority. I predicted then that the system would not work and that further legislation would speedily be necessary to correct the very evils that we were then creating. As far as I was then advised—or for that matter so far as I am still advised—the farmer was perfectly willing to submit to Government price control so long as it did not upset the essential balance between commodity prices, wages, salaries, profits, and transportation charges, any one of which being out of control might be calculated to throw the whole system askew.

In September of last year, the President made his Labor Day speech. With the substance of this speech I was not in accord. He used the farmer as a whipping boy. He attributed the dangers to the safeguards against riotous inflation to the limit in the previous act to 110 percent of parity. While not denying the possible effects of exorbitant profits and of wage increases, he placed the blame squarely at the door of agriculture. His suggestion was that he would take care of profits and wages by Executive order, but his demand was that unless Congress should act by a day certain to reduce the limit on farm prices, he would proceed by Executive action to exercise powers which few competent lawyers in the United States believed him to have and reduce these limits by Presidential decree.

When the stabilization bill, drafted in accordance with the President's instructions, came before the Senate it followed this outline. I pointed out in the Senate that this really meant that the control of commodity prices would be put in the hands of Mr. Leon Henderson, already notably and publicly hostile to agriculture, while the control of wages would be put under the control of the War Labor Board, openly and notoriously committed to an increase of wages at least to the extent of 15 percent. It seemed to me that such a system could not possibly work in the direction of stabilization because the act itself was setting up contending forces to pull in opposite directions. After consultation with Mr. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association, and other farm leaders, I introduced and supported a substitute for the administration bill which eliminated the discretion between contending governmental agencies and definitely fixed prices, wages, and salaries at the highest point reached between January 1 and September 15, 1942.

It is in effect the exact provision recently put into effect by the President's Executive order. Whether he has waited too long for it to be really effective only time will tell. In September 1942 it could have easily been made effective.

During the consideration of the last stabilization bill, an amendment was offered by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma providing for consideration of the increased costs of farm labor in fixing the prices of farm commodities.

The proposition seems to me so simple that the farmer should be placed in a similar position to every other producers of essentials in the United States that I have never been able to understand the bitter opposition to this proposal. Nevertheless it did meet with bitter opposition and was supplanted by a compromise amendment, which I denounced on the floor of the Senate as a "fake compromise"—which indeed it proved within a week after its enactment. I will always be proud of the fact that I was one of the four Senators—and the only Democratic Senator—who voted against its adoption.

During the consideration of the stabilization bill in the Senate, any suggestion that the powers conferred in the measure could be used to apply benefit payments under soil conservation or other governmental acts was either denied or pushed off. In my opinion, if it had ever been stated that it was the purpose to apply these payments to a reduction of parity prices, the bill would never have been passed. Such intention was specifically denied on the floor of the Senate by Senator Brown, who was in charge of the measure. Everyone recognized that these benefit payments had to do with advantages to the whole people through soil conservation, etc., which had nothing to do with parity. After the passage of the act, there appeared in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement never read or delivered on the Senate floor which put a construction on the provisions of the act to authorize the deduction of these benefits in fixing parity. My information is that this statement was written by Mr. David Ginsburg, at that time General Counsel for the Office of Price Administration. By what chicanery it was introduced into the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as representing words spoken in debate I have never been able to determine. Certainly, the Senate had no intimation that the bill contained such powers. Indeed, it was specifically denied on the floor by those in charge of the measure.

Shortly thereafter, an Executive order proceeded to put into effect the exact provisions foreshadowed by Mr. Ginsburg's memorandum, clandestinely slipped into the RECORD after the passage of the bill. Congress promptly passed the Bankhead bill to correct this situation by an overwhelming majority in both Houses. The bill was vetoed. The Senate referred the question to the Committee on Agriculture with a view to watching subsequent developments as to wages and profits to see whether further action was necessary. The measure providing for the consideration of labor costs in fixing parity is in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and will probably be acted on at an early date.

My conclusion is that it behooves every American farmer and every friend of agri-

culture in Congress to watch every step of the road to insure that the experience of the last war may not be repeated. That is to say, that agriculture should not again be the first to suffer restriction during the war and the first to feel the heavy hand of deflation after the war. That was what had paralyzed agriculture in the United States long before the official date of the depression in 1929. That resulted from unfairness of treatment during the war. It must not be permitted to occur again. Otherwise we will have no effective farming industry in the United States.

Shortage of Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the educational system of the United States is in such condition that I feel compelled further to call attention to it by asking that a very instructive and comprehensive article from the New York Times, regarding the shortage of teachers, be printed in the Appendix. In my opinion, we cannot too strongly stress the conditions confronting us in this matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHER SHORTAGE DECLARED A PERIL—NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SPEAKERS SAY 100,000 RECRUITS WILL BE NEEDED IN FALL, WITH FEW TO BE HAD—13,000 ROOMS UNMANNED—MYERS SO REPORTS, WARNING CONVENTION THAT 500,000 PUPILS FACE LOCK-OUT

(By Benjamin Pine)

INDIANAPOLIS, June 28.—A teacher shortage of alarming proportions, with resulting lowered standards, crowded classrooms, and curtailed school services faces this country, educators attending the annual convention of the National Education Association warned today. The 1,500 school leaders present were told that at least 100,000 new teachers would be needed this fall, and that there was little prospect of getting them.

There is particular danger that rural areas will be forced to keep their school doors closed, according to a report submitted by Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the National Education Association's commission for the defense of democracy through education. Last year, Dr. Myers said, 13,000 classrooms were vacated because of inability to get teachers, which meant that 390,000 boys and girls could not go to school. He predicted that in September the number might rise to 500,000 or more.

Moreover, by fall 200,000 to 250,000 teachers, or about 25 percent of the total, will be new to their positions in the country at large. On that basis, said Dr. Myers, who is chairman of the New York University Department of Higher Education, 6,000,000 children will be receiving their schooling at the hands of inexperienced instructors, many unfit for their jobs. He estimated that 100,000 of the new teachers would have substandard qualifications.

TEACHERS QUIT FOR MORE PAY

"Many thousands of our best teachers are leaving for jobs that are paying them two and three times what they are getting as teachers," Dr. Myers declared. "Under present conditions it is absolutely impossible to replace them with competent people. There is a grave danger that the public will not realize what has happened until it is too late."

Provision of better salaries for qualified teachers was suggested in the report as the best way to halt the exodus to higher paying jobs in Government and industry.

A minimum salary of $1,500 for qualified beginning teachers was recommended.

"The United States Office of Education has found that more than 100,000 rural teachers left their teaching jobs between May and October last year," Dr. Myers said. "These rural teachers are the lowest paid members of our profession, thousands of them working for less than $600 a year. Who will replace them? Even morons can earn more than twice that amount today.

"Either we must here and now organize our profession for effective action on this matter or we must step aside and let those with sufficient courage and vision do the job.

"To meet the appalling situation, some school systems are employing as teachers persons who do not have even a high school education" Dr. Myers reported. In many communities, he charged, new teachers lacked the rudiments of effective training for their profession and were hired because they were unsuited for any other kind of employment. That would be reflected on teaching standards for many years to come, he warned, as these poorly qualified teachers would be frozen to their jobs, to the detriment of the pupils.

STRAYER CITES LOW SALARIES

Speaking on the same thing, Dr. George D. Strayer, of Teachers College, Columbia University, declared that more than 100,000 teachers had left the profession during the last year, and that another 100,000 could be expected to quit during the coming year. For the most part, he said, they were leaving because of poor salaries.

Dr. Strayer said that for the country as a whole 40 teachers out of every 100 were receiving less than $1,200 annual salary and 8 in every 100 were receiving less than $600 a year.

"We cannot hope to maintain the service of education by staffing our schools with persons less well qualified than those who have left the profession," Dr Strayer said. "We are not pleading for ourselves when we call the attention of the people of the United States to the necessity for immediate action by the Federal Government in support of public education.

"It has been established beyond the possibility of doubt that there are areas within the United States in which the resources available locally and in the State are not sufficient to maintain a standard of education adequate to meet the challenge which the current situation presents. There are children in America today for whom no schools are available. There are hundreds of thousands of boys and girls who have little or no opportunity beyond that provided in a poorly equipped and inadequately staffed elementary school."

Strong support for the $300,000,000 Federal-aid bill came from the National Education Association leaders. A report distributed at the convention declared that the education of our children is in serious danger and that the first signs of educational collapse had appeared as a result of the impending teacher shortage.

Holding that the emergency in education was a Federal responsibility, the National Education Association warned that if the local and State-supported schools were to carry effectively the increased burdens of wartime, they must have financial help from the Federal Government. The schools of all the States, the National Education Association report said, were threatened with lessened efficiency just at the time in our country's history when the school's contribution to the war effort was indispensable.

Support was urged for Senate bill 637, which provides $200,000,000 for emergency salary aid to all States, distributed on the basis of the number of school children, and $100,000,000 for an equalization fund to be distributed among the States according to need.

A report on teacher turn-over, presented by Mrs. D. Edna Chamberlain, State National Education Association Director of Oklahoma, disclosed that many school systems were being disrupted because of the rapid changes among teacher personnel. A survey made in Oklahoma, she said showed that a turnover of 40 percent had taken place during the year in the cities, while in the rural areas it was even greater. In one school system a turn-over of 300 percent had taken place, as more than 45 teachers served in a 15-teacher school during 1 year.

Pleading for higher teacher salaries and more adequate tenure laws for them, Dr. A. C. Flora, president of the National Education Association, asserted that there still were 15 States that had no tenure laws at all, and 7 other States in which the protection of tenure might be granted only on a local basis, confined largely to cities. Many of the retirement laws, he added, were inadequate and offered meager protection for the security of teachers after they have retired from active service.

"Danger lurks wherever there are teachers who are woefully underpaid, wherever teachers do not have sound contractual bases or face retirement age without hope of subsistence," Dr. Flora asserted. "Wherever these conditions maintain, children are being short-changed and the profession of teaching stands indicted for lack of real concern for all of its workers. No one group of teachers, however well organized or seemingly self-sufficient, should be content or satisfied until all of the teachers of the Nation have the necessary income and the welfare safeguards to make them effective and respected members of our profession."

Resolutions looking toward improvement of the teaching profession were presented to the convention. In one of the resolutions the National Education Association said that the stress of war demanded of teachers physical fitness, technical perfection, emotional stability, higher morale, and civic competence.

The association urged that schools, in cooperation with other agencies, develop a constructive program to counteract those forces which were contributing to juvenile delinquency. It advocated also that the United States participate in an international effort to establish peace and order under law, adding that "the importance of education must be recognized in the establishment and maintenance of international justice."

Despite the heat, the delegates engaged in a spirited campaign for the National Education Association presidency. Mrs. Edith B. Joynes, principal of Gatewood Elementary School, Norfolk, Va., and Miss Frances Jelinek, teacher in Milwaukee, were nominated. The elections are to take place tomorrow.

Another question, that of raising the annual National Education Association dues, now $2, also will be threshed out tomorrow. Many association leaders favor higher dues so as to build up a war-and-peace fund. The sessions are to close tomorrow evening, with an address by Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education.

Boulder Dam Reaches Peak of War Production of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention to an event which has great significance in the prosecution of the war and for the permanent development of the Pacific southwest. I refer to the announcement by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes that Boulder Dam was operated at a capacity of more than a million kilowatts—the first time in history that a single power plant has been capable of turning out that much electric energy.

Arizona shares with Nevada in the location of Boulder Dam on the Colorado River—the boundary between the two States.

I congratulate Secretary Ickes and Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, on this memorable achievement.

The news release in which Secretary Ickes made the announcement is as follows:

For the first time in history a single power plant has operated at more than a million kilowatt capacity, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today. The plant is the Boulder Dam installation on the Colorado River in Arizona and Nevada, operated by the Bureau of Reclamation.

News of the record-breaking output, first reached on June 11, was brought to the Secretary by the Bureau's Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore. He explained that the previous highest instantaneous peak load occurred on January 7, 1943, when slightly more than 900,000 kilowatts were generated. A million kilowatts is sufficient to meet the power needs of a city the size of Chicago.

"The rated capacity of Boulder power plant is about 950,000 kilowatts but by operating the generators at a 10-percent overload we were able to obtain more than 50,000 additional kilowatts from the machines," Mr. Bashore said.

"This added power is of vital importance, for every additional kilowatt the Bureau of Reclamation can deliver contributes to increased war production in an important area. A large proportion of this huge block of energy goes either directly or indirectly to airplane factories, shipyards, munitions plants, airfields, Army posts, naval stations, mineral developments, and other industries of the southern California and Nevada areas. The largest magnesium plant in the world is operated by Boulder power.

"The extra output of Boulder generators is also significant at this time from the standpoint of conserving vital fuel. Power companies which have contracted for this energy are using all the water power available in order to minimize the operation of their steam plants using coal and oil."

Looking ahead when Pacific Southwest industries will make further demands on the Boulder Dam power plant, the Bureau has ordered another large generator of more than 80,000-kilowatt capacity, which, together with the 12 big machines now in operation, will bring the installation to more than 1,030,000. The ultimate capacity, when all installations are made, will be 1,332,300 kilowatts. The estimated output of the plant in 1943 is 6,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, more than was produced in all power plants on the Pacific coast in 1921.

At the end of the last fiscal year Boulder Dam, which began operation late in 1936, had returned to the United States Treasury $18,200,000 as repayment of funds advanced for its construction. In addition the States of Arizona and Nevada have been paid $2,400,000, and $2,000,000 has been allotted to the Colorado River development fund for investigations of potential projects in the Colorado River Basin as provided for in the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

Through regulation of the release of water from Lake Mead, the Boulder Dam reservoir, and through facilities downstream, irrigation water is provided for the Imperial Valley in southern California and the Yuma project in Arizona, both highly productive all-year agricultural areas. These projects are important units in the list of 41 irrigation projects being operated by the Bureau, which are serving 4,000,000 acres of land producing large quantities of war foods. Control of the flow of the Colorado River at Boulder Dam provides water, through diversion downstream at Parker Dam, for industrial, military, and domestic needs of 12 cities of the southern California area, where live 3,000,000 people. The regulation also makes possible the operation of the power plant at Parker Dam where the installed capacity, used mainly for war production, is more than 115,000 kilowatts.

The rated capacity of power plants on 19 Bureau of Reclamation projects in 11 States is now more than 1,840,000 kilowatts.

War Law Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following outline of the War Law Institute conducted by National University Law School, which is an exceptionally fine discussion of the various phases of the war effort:

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF LAW, WASHINGTON, D. C., WAR LAW INSTITUTE II, DR. MILTON I. BALDINGER, DIRECTOR

June 14: Legal Controls Over Shipping, Mr. William Radner, War Shipping Administration.

June 16: Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; Dr. Baldinger.

June 21: Legal Aspects of Cartels, Mr. Hugh Cox, Department of Justice; Economic Aspects of Cartels, Mr. Joseph Borkin, Department of Justice.

June 23: Labor Under War, Mr. Lee Pressman, Congress of Industrial Organizations; State Regulation of Unions, Mr. Joseph Padway, American Federation of Labor.

June 28: Legal Problems of War Relocation Authority, Mr. Philip Glick, War Relocation Authority; the Work of Office of War Information, Mr. A. H. Feller, Office of War Information.

June 30: Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Treasury Department; the Work of the Navy Judge Advocate General, Capt. J. R. Wallace, United States Navy.

July 5: Constitutional Basis for War Legislation, Dean Charles Pergler.

July 7: Investigating the Defense Program, Senator Harry S. Truman; Radio in Time of War, Commissioner Ray Wakefield, Federal Communications Commission.

July 12: Rent Control in the District of Columbia, Mr. Ernest F. Henry, Office of Administrator of Rent Control.

July 14: Work of War Labor Board, Mr. Jesse Freidin, War Labor Board; War Manpower Problems, Miss Bernice Lotwin, War Manpower Commission.

July 19: Renegotiation of Contracts, Mr. Robert E. Kline, Jr., House Naval Affairs Investigating Committee.

July 21: Alien Property Custody, Mr. George A. McNulty, Department of Justice.

End of Secrecy in Allotting Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN J. MAAS
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, Donald M. Nelson, Director of the War Production Board, got in touch with me today in connection with my charges made on the floor of the House that the Printing and Publishing Division showed evidence of being used for control of the press, including magazine and book publishing.

I am quite convinced that Mr. Nelson not only has never approved of any such policy, but has not known of the trend in this Division toward this objective. I am sure, also, that he did not realize the dangers of the potential abuses that are possible under the procedure that the Printing and Publishing Division operates. I do not think that he has had any realization of the dangers inherent in the secret method of operation indulged in by the Printing and Publishing Division. After disclosing my sources of information, which included an investigation by a highly reputable law firm for a number of months, Mr. Nelson has agreed to my recommendations and has assured me that rules for procedure will be adopted by the Printing and Publishing Division and that all appeals with their disposition and reasons for final decision will be published, probably in the daily Federal Register. This is satisfactory to me as I am sure that there is no danger of a secret control of the press by controlling white paper so long as all of the proceedings are open to public examination.

At Mr. Nelson's request, several officials from the Printing and Publishing Division are to meet with me tomorrow morning to go over the details of this matter.

Double-Seven Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, today our noble ally, China, is observing what they call, Double-Seven Day—the anniversary of their 6-year-old fight against Japanese aggression.

In the Shrine of the Sacred Heart Church here in Washington this morning, hundreds of Chinese and Americans gathered to attend a solemn Pontifical Requiem High Mass conducted by His Excellency, Bishop Paul Yu-Pin, Vicar Apostolic of Nanking, celebrated for repose of the souls of all men who today fight with the Allied Nations for the principles of justice.

Following the mass a sermon was preached by Rt. Rev. Msgr. G. Barry O'Toole, former rector of the Fu Jen University of Peking and now professor in the Catholic University here. This mass and sermon, sponsored by the Chinese Catholic Cultural Association, was broadcast to Chungking via short wave and because of its unusual nature, I ask leave that it be included in the RECORD:

"Greater love hath no man than this, that he should lay down his life for his friends" (John xv:13).

Six years ago today the Chinese people undertook to defend the divine order of justice against the lawless violence of men. At Lukouchiao, a point 20 miles west of Peking, the Chinese garrison returned the unprovoked fire of their Japanese assailants, and China's heroic war of resistance began. Poorly armed though they were, but making up in sheer courage for what they lacked in equipment, the Chinese Army, under the splendid leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, pitted their bodies of flesh against the mechanized forces of Japan and, spilling their blood in torrents, eventually stopped the invader dead in his tracks of ruthless carnage and devastation.

But the incident of the Marco Polo Bridge, on July 7, 1937, was not the beginning of Japanese occupation; that had begun 6 years before when Japan, in open violation of the Nine-Power Pact she herself had freely signed at Washington on February 6, 1922, took possession of the four northeastern provinces, known to the West as Manchuria, on September 18, 1931.

Americans will always recall with pride the fact that, through Secretary of State Stimson's note of January 7, 1932, the United States was the first, if not the only nation to protest against the scrapping of a solemn treaty by this wanton act of aggression. Unsupported, however, by concerted action on the part of the other signatory powers, that protest proved too feeble to quench the fatal spark of aggression, destined in time to ignite the conflagration of the Second World War.

The League of Nations inquiry was equally unavailing, and China realizing, at last, that she could not count on support, either moral or physical, from without, drew the sword herself, determined singlehandedly to vindicate the sanctity of treaties as essential to the moral order divinely ordained to regulate international relations.

The issue then at stake was more than China's survival as a nation, it was one of universal import; whether, namely, in a civilized world, any nation may arbitrarily set aside a treaty of its own making, resorting to armed force in order to impose its prepotent will upon another nation.

In his encyclical Summi Pontificatus, dated October 20, 1939, our present Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, expressly condemns all such breaches of international law:

"But to consider treaties on principle as ephemeral and tacitly to assume the authority of rescinding them unilaterally when they are no longer to one's advantage, would be to abolish all mutual trust among states. In this way, the natural order would be destroyed and there would be dug between different peoples and nations trenches of division impossible to refill."

Indeed, the nations of the western world owe an immense debt of gratitude to China's soldiers who for 6 harrowing years have fought this good fight for international justice. Believing in universal human brotherhood and rejecting the race issue raised by Japan, they, with little or no help from us, have kept at bay Japan's formidable armies which, but for them, might even now be ravaging California and our whole Pacific coast.

If the United Nations are deeply indebted to Poland for having been the first country in Europe to resist international lawlessness, they should be no less grateful for what China has done in Asia. The Chinese, in fact, were the very first to sound the tocsin of warning to a sleeping world and, failing to awaken that world to its danger, they took the field alone, resolved to ward off at all costs the evil tide of violence threatening to engulf humanity.

True to that resolution, they have endured—for justice' sake—the torments of hunger and every species of cruelty. Let us never forget their sufferings, for they have borne them for us no less than for themselves. Neither let us forget the sacrifices unstintingly made in our behalf by the brave Filipinos, 20,000 of whom died fighting at Bataan. God willing, Americans will repay those debts by helping both the Chinese and the Filipinos to regain the territory they have lost.

Among the United Nations, none has entered this war with a cleaner conscience or with nobler ideals than the Chinese people. Their war with Japan has been purely defensive, forced upon them after they had exhausted every reasonable means of avoiding recourse to arms. As for ideals, can we conceive of nobler ones than those for which the Chinese soldier fights? Against force he upholds reason, against hatred he upholds brotherhood, against racism he upholds universalism, against despotic stateism he upholds the personal rights and dignity of the human individual. Of these lofty ideals, which the Chinese hold in common with all Christian people, every truly democratic nation must approve, and it is because the United Nations stand committed to these principles that our soldier boys are sincere in their patriotism—ready to die in order that their countries may live.

Patriotism is the sweetest, the noblest, the most unselfish of human ideals. It is the moral virtue which inclines a man to love and serve his country as it deserves to be loved and served. The human individual is not self-sufficient; he has absolute need of the social support of the country in which he lives. From the cradle to the grave, society must wait upon him with every sort of benefit, if he is to survive and develop all his powers. Patriotism, therefore, adds to mere civic loyalty, a sentiment closely akin to family affection, since our country is, in a sense, a father and a mother to us. Our country's traditions, its culture, and civilization, its arts and its sciences, its literature and history constitute a rich heritage, a glorious patrimony handed down to us by our forefathers, that we in our turn may transmit it to posterity. We are but its trustees and, should necessity arise, it is incumbent upon us to give our very lives in order to preserve it for future generations.

Most Rev. Bishop Yu-Pin, from the first days of the war, Your Excellency—like Cardinal Mercier during the last World War—has preached this noble virtue to your countrymen. Nevertheless, you appreciate as few others do the magnitude of the sacrifice that patriotism demands of soldiers.

"There lie many fighting men, dead in their youthful prime,
"Never to laugh or sing again, or taste the summertime."

—*Joyce Kilmer.*

It is because you fully realize the great tragedy of their sacrifice that you have called us here today to pray for the soldier dead of all the United Nations, in union with the holy sacrifice of the mass—eternal continuation of Christ's sacrificial death for mankind upon the altar of the cross. In the language of humanity's universal mother, the church, may their souls and the souls of all who, in imitation of Christ on Calvary, have laid down their lives for their friends, find in our Saviour's love an everlasting "place of refreshment, light, and peace." Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them.

Mr. Jesse Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, with all reverence I say thank the good Lord that we have such a man as the Honorable Jesse Jones in charge of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This organization, built up over a long period of years, has made a great contribution to the war effort. I urge every Member of the House to read the copy of Mr. Jones' letter to Senator CARTER GLASS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, along with Mr. Jones' statement in reply to charges made by Vice President WALLACE, a copy of which you doubtless found on your desk this morning, with reference to the purchase abroad of critical and strategic material by the R. F. C. After you read this statement I am sure you will agree with me that, in all fairness to Mr. Jones, Congress should make a full and complete investigation of the charges made recently by the Vice President.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that this information was not available to the Congress before we passed the appropriation bill containing appropriations for B. E. W. If this information had been available, we could have doubtless saved several million dollars of the taxpayers' money.

People Must Understand That They Must Practice Self-Restraint To Help Keep Prices Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, practicing self-restraint to help keep prices down means foregoing buying things we really do not need—restricting our purchases to what is essential—so as to hold down the pressure of demand for the limited supply of civilian goods. It means that we must make what we have last longer so that we will have to buy less.

It means foregoing the temporary advantage of higher prices for the things we have to sell—foregoing higher wages. It means putting our money to work in winning the war by paying higher taxes and buying and holding all the War bonds we can afford.

It may mean sacrifices for some of us—but these are trivial sacrifices compared to those asked of our fighting men at the front. And these are sacrifices which will pay out in the long run, which will help keep the Nation strong for the fighters who are offering their lives for it.

It may mean that the burden of sacrifice will fall unevenly and that some of us will have to give up more than others. But this is true of the fighting front as well as the home front. All soldiers are not asked to make the same sacrifices. Some die. Some are ordered into posts of great danger. Some are more fortunate. But all are ready to make any sacrifice which is asked of them. We on the home front must be willing to do no less.

We must remember that living standards are now generally high enough to enable the great majority of us to exert a maximum productive effort in winning the war. This is the important thing in wartime. Government will do its best to see to it that everyone will get this much, but it will not encourage any group in its efforts to get more than this. Everyone must help the Government resist such pressures.

The fight to hold down prices is a vital part of the war effort. Like the war, it has a cost, but it is well worth the cost.

It involves the acceptance of controls throughout the war and into the peace. These controls are necessary to make sure that the program is fair to everyone; that no individual or group profits at the expense of anyone else. And that, at the war's end, the Nation is sound and strong—the very things we are fighting for.

It involves the acceptance of sacrifies, minor indeed when compared to the soldier's offer of his life. The program cannot give us our peacetime habits and standard of living.

It can distribute the burden of economic sacrifice equitably, insure a fair distribution of the goods and services available, and protect the economy which is our common concern.

These benefits far outweigh the inconveniences and sacrifice the program requires. Indeed, these inconveniences and sacrifices are not the result of the program—they are the result of war—of a war caused by the enemy, not by you and me. We would be much worse off without a program, with one group pitted against another, with the burdens of war falling unevenly on different groups, with restricted supplies of goods unfairly distributed. Our fight against the enemy, our entire social and economic structure would be jeopardized by the failure of the economic stabilization program. We have an immediate and long-term stake in its success.

Oilmen Must Rely on Congress for Relief, Prevent Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY E. DISNEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of July 3, 1943:

OIL MEN MUST RELY ON CONGRESS FOR RELIEF, PREVENT SHORTAGE

(By Andrew M. Rowley)

Reduction in value of gasoline ration coupons in the Middle West, including Oklahoma and Kansas, long predicted by this column, increasingly looms as an almost foregone conclusion. But its inauguration for the territory west of the Mississippi River probably can be postponed if businessmen and Representatives in Congress of the States west of the river get busy quickly and present to proper authorities factual information which should be the basis of any decision affecting the quantity of gasoline which may be purchased by consumers in this territory.

Business organizations, chambers of commerce and all other trade groups, together with individual citizens, should make it entirely clear and conclusive this territory will not willingly submit to any reduction in gasoline rations simply to salve the feelings of easterners rationed drastically solely because of lack of transportation facilities to their area. Also, that Nation-wide reduction of value of gasoline ration coupons should not be imposed until after districts with gasoline supplies available for shipment to the east coast had been called upon to supply what they could to the Atlantic seaboard States and had completed performance of that duty.

In other words, the Illinois-Indiana-Kentucky district should be called upon first to start shipping gasoline to the east coast for two unanswerable reasons. It has a greater supply of gasoline in storage now, in comparison to 1 year ago, than any other area in the United States except California, which does not figure in the shipment of gasoline to the Atlantic coast. Secondly, it is much closer to the east coast than producing centers west of the Mississippi River, thereby eliminating long hauls by railroads from points west of the river and permitting shipments of far greater quantities of gasoline with the same railroad equipment.

Here is the line-up of gasoline stock figures as of June 26 this year and June 27 a year ago: Illinois-Indiana-Kentucky, 16,670,000 barrels now and 16,857,000 barrels a year ago; Oklahoma-Kansas-Missouri district; 6,532,000 barrels as against 8,107,444 barrels; Appalachian district, 2,426,000 barrels as against 3,067,000 barrels; Rocky Mountain, 1,846,000 and 2,415,000; and California, 20,857,000 now as against 16,598,000 barrels a year ago.

Consequently, the Illinois-Indiana-Kentucky district is off only 1.1 percent from its gasoline stocks of a year ago while the Oklahoma-Kansas-Missouri district has approximately 22 percent less gasoline in storage now than a year ago.

When the 24-inch crude-oil line from Longview, Tex., is completed around August 1 from its present eastern terminal at Norris City, Ill., to the New York-Philadelphia refining centers, there will be released something like 10,000 to 12,000 or more railroad tank cars which then will be available for shipment of oils to the east coast and which now are carrying crude oil from the Norris City terminal of the Big-Inch.

Government plans to utilize these tank cars to carry gasoline and, probably, burning oils, to the east coast from the Middle West and, maybe, the Southwest. Such shipments will draw on supplies in storage in the Middle West and Southwest and, undoubtedly, will result in stricter rationing of oils in these areas.

So, reduction in value of gasoline ration coupons depends on where and when the Government authorities call for supplies to make up these shipments and how much oil they will require to be shipped. It is almost certain the quantity demanded will be the limit of capacity of railroad facilities to transport.

Vociferous eastern politicians and consumers will have a strong argument in demanding greater quantities of oil for their area if transportation facilities are available and oils can be procured from other areas. It is a cinch Government authorities will do everything possible to get as much oil from other areas into the Eastern States as is possible with existing transportation facilities.

People in the Midwest and Southwest do not begrudge easterners all the oils they can get and they are willing to share their supplies with those along the Atlantic seaboard. But they don't want any maudlin sentiment or political exigencies to determine the matter of rationing in the Middle West or Southwest. This idea "If one must suffer, all must suffer" so often expressed, is pure poppycock.

And there is no more reason why Government should pay for the higher cost of transportation of oils to the east coast, or a subsidy representing the difference between former transportation costs when ocean tankers were the chief means of transportation and present railroad tank car charges, than there is for it to pay the $100 or so transportation cost of an automobile to Tulsa from Detroit. Transportation costs of oil should be added to price of products sold in the East, just as railroad charges are added to everything else people in this country buy.

By granting a subsidy, covering the additional transportation costs, the Government is simply making all people throughout the United States pay the additional charges of getting oils to Eastern States. It is not the fault of the people in other sections of the United States that ocean tanker shipments to the east coast were stopped. Consequently, easterners should absorb the additional transportation costs through higher prices for oils, just as people in the rest of the country pay for transportation costs on articles they buy.

Government is responsible for the shortage of gasoline impending in this country which will force a reduction in value of gasoline ration coupons throughout the middle west and southwest.

In the first place, refiners cannot make as much gasoline as they could manufacture simply because they cannot get the crude oil with which to make the gasoline. Government has limited crude oil supplies to refineries to 80 percent of the average runs to stills during the last six month of 1941. In addition, it reduced the permitted yield of gasoline from a barrel of crude oil.

Why was it necessary to place this restriction on crude oil allowables? Simply because the Nation is not producing the quantity of crude oil needed. That is due to greatly reduced drilling operations. And the low level of drilling operations is due to refusal of the Office of Price Administration to approve a needed and justified increase in the price of crude oil and to spacing restrictions on drilling operations, difficulties in obtaining needed equipment and shortage of manpower.

There are numerous factors which prevent refiners from making as much motor fuel as they did previously. First, is the fact the government reduced the permitted yield of gasoline from a barrel of crude oil to force greater production of burning oils and fuel oils. The permitted yield some time ago was down to 70 percent of former yields. Since, it has been raised to around 90 percent. Secondly, crude oil supplies are allocated to refiners and the quota for refineries not making 100 octane gasoline or ingredients thereof or other war products, is 80 percent of the average . ins of the last half of 1941. Thirdly, many refineries throughout the country are either making 100 octane gasoline, synthetic rubber, ingredients or products used in making toluol, basic ingredient of high explosives, or products used in making aviation gasoline or synthetic rubber.

Making these products reduces the quantity of ordinary motor fuel a refinery can make. Ordinary gasoline is used as a base stock in many refineries making aviation fuel, hence the output of motor fuel is lessened appreciably. Making other ingredients for 100-octane gasoline cuts down the quantity of high volatile products which go into the making of ordinary motor gasoline.

The vice president and sales manager of one of the largest refineries in the Midwest told the writer his company's output of motor gasoline is 30 percent less than what it was prior to the time that company started making ingredients for 100-octane gasoline and synthetic rubber, and that company does not make finished 100-octane gasoline or synthetic rubber; it makes only ingredients for the finished products.

With reduced production of automobile gasoline, and the output will probably become less before it increases, due to the fact more refineries are getting into the production of ingredients for aviation gasoline and synthetic rubber, an actual shortage of gasoline is imminent because consumption has not been reduced as much as production has fallen.

Stocks of gasoline in the Oklahoma-Kansas-Missouri districts are 22 percent less than they were a year ago, but demand for gasoline in this district is off not more than 10 to 12 percent, and in some areas, notably around Kansas City, where there are numerous war plants, demand now is greater than a year ago.

In addition, a most important factor which must be considered, is the fact that at this time last year, large supplies of gasoline were being shipped out of this territory by railroad tank cars to the east coast. Shipments of gasoline from outside Petroleum Administration for War district 1 (east coast) by tank cars into district 1 were prohibited by the Government on January 21 last.

So, despite the fact these shipments of gasoline were stopped from this territory, stocks have declined 22 percent. What will be the result when shipments of gasoline are resumed to the east coast, as they will be on completion of the big crude-oil line around August 1? It is not hard to figure.

What is the answer to the problem?

Raise crude-oil prices to stimulate drilling, thereby getting more badly needed oil reserves and increasing production, which would permit refineries, with adequate capacity, to run more crude to stills and make more gasoline. When crude-oil prices were advanced in certain California fields, drilling operations increased by something like 52 percent.

Relax Government restrictions on spacing wells. Provide more materials for drilling. Getting needed oil is just as important as building ships and tanks, for without oil they would be useless.

And stop drafting skilled oil-industry workers into military service or permitting them to go into other lines of work. A raise in crude-oil prices would permit producers to pay higher wages to workers, thereby offsetting, to some extent at least, the lure of other more highly paid jobs.

A simple solution of the whole oil industry problem and the tragic possibility of an actual shortage of oil which would prolong the war unnecessarily and result in loss of many lives of boys who, otherwise could have been brought home, is to place entire responsibility and regulations of the oil business in the hands of one Government bureau instead of dividing that responsibility among a number of bureaus as is now the case.

Divided responsibility, with resultant petty jealousies, bickerings, and myriad orders by inexperienced, politically appointed economists, with no business training or background, is hamstringing the oil business and preventing it from going ahead and supplying all the oil this Nation and its allies need.

When things start going badly, that is, when the public finally becomes aware of the mess being made of things by the young, power-drunk, know-little-or-nothing bureaucrats, due to divided responsibility and placing powers over one business in the hands of several bureaus, the New Deal solution is to appoint still another bureau or committee or organization to mess with the trouble, further complicating an already bad situation.

Some time ago Chairman Donald M. Nelson of the War Production Board is quoted as announcing a solution would be announced soon of the problems affecting the oil industry. Late yesterday he announced what supposedly is that solution. It consists of the appointment of two committees, representing various Government agencies having authority on matters relating to oil. Committee members can advise with each other, but the one and only vote of a committee is that of the chairman and the chairmen of the two committees are the same men who now head two important bureaus handling oil matters—Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, and Prentiss M. Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration.

As far as the writer can see, there is absolutely no change whatever in the set-up or authority of Ickes or Brown. In fact, Nelson, in the announcement, is quoted as saying, "In general, these and the other interested agencies will continue in their same roles, with the advice of committees which will include representatives of other agencies."

If that is a solution of the oil industry problems, Heaven help the oil business.

But what else can people expect of a bureaucracy? It thrives on increasing personnel, enlarging spheres of activity, grabbing more power, dividing authority so that no one bureau can function efficiently or do a job in itself, and appointing other bureaus, committees, or what not, all of which serves only to further muddy the waters and hinder operations and decisions on matters of vital importance.

It appears more and more that the oil industry must rely solely on Congress for relief and to prevent a shortage of oil.

Every oil man in the country should get busy and contact his representatives in Congress—both Senators and Congressmen—and demand, not request, that immediate action be taken to place oil industry regulation in the hands of one bureau in Washington, with men experienced in oil industry matters to handle the matters relating to the business.

Why should Prentiss Brown have power to set oil prices, the most important factor influencing production, when Ickes, head of another bureau, is charged with the responsibility of seeing that adequate quantities of oil are made available for all military, industrial, and essential civilian needs?

The whole thing just doesn't make sense and never will.

Unless something is done and done quickly, this Nation will face an actual shortage of crude oil. If such a tragedy materializes, watch the bureaucrats start making alibis and blaming other bureaus or the oil industry itself. The Office of Price Administration is primarily responsible for present conditions. Prentiss Brown and his bureau of economists and young lawyers, entirely inexperienced in oil-industry matters, should be shorn of all power and authority relating to the oil industry.

The column reiterates a statement it has made so often. It is our personal belief, New Deal bureaucrats are actually fostering a shortage of oil so they can go to the public and say "The oil industry failed to supply the oils so badly needed in the war effort, so, to save the country, it is necessary for us to take over control of the vitally important oil business."

Let's all get busy and ask Congress to ditch the Office of Price Administration as far as the oil industry is concerned.

It Is Patriotic To Do Everything Which Would Help To Hold Down Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is patriotic to help hold down prices.

First. To act contrary to the rules of the game is playing into the enemy's hands, is doing what Hitler wants, what Japan wants. When men are dying we are asked to do very little, especially when we benefit in the long run.

Second. Price increases would raise the cost of the war because the prices of things the Government has to buy would be higher. That would increase the burden of taxes which all of us—including our fighting men when they return—would have to pay for many years.

Third. It would cause immediate hardship for many people with fixed incomes—including veterans and veterans' families living on pensions, families of the men in our armed forces, widows living on insurance payments, and so forth.

Fourth. It would create demands for higher wages, foster labor disputes, hurt morale, and impair the war effort.

Fifth. Business would have to face maddening uncertainties in all costs that it would not know how to plan its activities. Business would become reluctant to take risks, slow up, and again the war would be impaired.

Sixth. At some point prices would outstrip wages in the race upward. At this point very little could be required to knock down the house of cards which uncontrolled price rises had reared. When prices come tumbling nearly everyone would suffer, our economic life would stagnate in a depression, and the national well-being would be seriously damaged.

Natural-Gas Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include some remarks setting forth the situation in regard to the natural-gas situation in the Midwest and eastern area of the United States.

I have before me a copy of Opinion No. 93 by the Federal Power Commission, in which, after extensive hearings continuing over a period of 5 months, the Commission has indicated its intention to issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the construction of a natural gas pipe line from southern Louisiana to the so-called Appalachian area, which at present is the principal source of natural gas supply for the public eastward from Indiana to the seaboard. This project deserves the support of every Member of the House, not merely because it advances the war effort and the post-war needs of the most populous region of the United States, but principally because it eliminates a grave threat to the present and future operations of industries which now are dependent upon the gas fields of the Southwest for natural gas supply.

During the recess of Congress many of my colleagues may expect to receive from me further information on this subject with a view to obtaining approval by the War Production Board at the earliest possible moment of a release of steel priorities necessary to construct this new pipe line. It averts a disastrous withdrawal of natural gas from the southwestern gas fields now supplying the region from Detroit westward to Denver, by rendering totally unnecessary a project which has been hastily thrown before the Federal Power Commission in recent days by the Hope Natural Gas Co., a subsidiary of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. In addition, simple reasoning will convince my colleagues that this project, now approved by the Federal Power Commission, should have their continued interest and support. Let us consider the facts.

First. This new project, namely the piping of natural gas from southern Louisiana to the Ohio River near Ashland, Ky., will require less than 800 miles of main pipe line, as against 1,140 miles required for the proposed Standard Oil line from the Hugoton field in southwest Kansas.

Second. Steel required for this main pipe line would be approximately 60,000 tons less than requirements for the proposed Standard line.

Third: Despite these savings, the ultimate capacity of this approved project would exceed the capacity of the pipe line from southwest Kansas, as proposed, by 10,000,000 cubic feet per day.

Fourth. The approved pipe line will cost substantially less, and the saving will be reflected in a lower price to the ultimate consumer.

These are the obvious advantages which should flow from the Federal Power Commission's decision but, to the Nation at large, construction of this pipe line from southern Louisiana by a wholly independent enterprise will serve to break further the monopolistic grip which now is throttling production, transportation, and sale of natural gas in the Appalachian area by competitive businesses. In contrast, would be the harmful effect of any certificate and steel priority granted for piping gas from southwest Kansas to the Cleveland-Pittsburgh area through a new pipe line. This latter scheme has been so hastily thrown together that, in the application to Federal Power Commission for a certificate, its sponsors admit that they are only now entering upon negotiations for the purchase of gas, and those negotiations are so preliminary that said sponsors are unable to state either their steel requirements for gathering the gas or the entire project's ultimate cost—and believe me, gentlemen, the ultimate gas rate payer will have to bear such cost and is entitled to some advance information.

Present Military Trends of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, as our offensive in the southwest Pacific gains momentum and the energies of the Nation are being girded for an even greater venture on the Continent of Europe we have reason for grim confidence in the outcome of the war, but no justification for overconfidence or complacency.

The Nation's military leaders are counting on the spirit and determination of the American citizen to put the needs of our fighting forces ahead of every personal consideration.

We are engaged in the greatest task of production ever undertaken by any nation in history and the job is not finished. As our soldiers and sailors move into the new offensives, our soldiers on the production line must produce a new outburst of energy to keep pace with the accomplishments on the actual battle fronts.

The present trend of the war gives us a magnificent opportunity to demoralize the enemy and bring his surrender closer. If the men and women working at home produce the materials of war to see these offensives through there can be no doubt of our ultimate victory.

And what are these present trends of the war? To understand them in all their vivid reality and their fullness of promise of victory we should go back for a moment to the dark day of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

We know now that the Japanese bombers which sneaked over Hawaii on December 7, 1941, dealt a severely crippling blow to our Pacific Fleet. We remember back to perilous days also on other fronts. In north Africa we were wondering whether the Nazi-Italian drive would break through to Alexandria. We were wondering whether the Russian lines would hold through the winter. Even the fear of a German attempt at invasion of England was fresh in our minds, and we looked forward with dread to the spring. And in the Pacific many of us were alert for a Japanese attack on our mainland, far more extensive than the puny and temporary accomplishments they achieved in the Aleutians before our war machine got into gear.

The world picture for free men was dark indeed in those days. Had the German drive to Alexandria succeeded, the Mediterranean would have been closed, and the day when Hitler and Hirohito would join hands in India might have been near.

And not only was the Mediterranean threatened. The Nazi submarine campaign was threatening our very life lines to the fields of battle.

What is the world picture today? The staggering losses to our fleet at Pearl Harbor have been almost entirely repaired, while our shipyards at home have built newer, more deadly warships at such a rate that our fleet is far stronger both in the Atlantic and the Pacific than it was on December 7, 1941. The Russian lines have held, and the much-heralded Nazi summer offensive on that vast front has failed to develop. The Axis armies have been completely cleared out of Africa, and allied troops hold stepping-stone islands to Europe. The Continent of Europe is being plastered almost daily with bombs, and the talk of invasion in Germany today is not of a Nazi invasion of England but of an allied landing on the impregnable Continent held by Hitler. The Japs have lost one of their two toeholds in the Aleutians. They are on the defensive as our fighting men attack in the Solomons and New Guinea. And the dread submarine is almost as harmless now as a bad dream since the close cooperation be-

tween the British and American Navies and their new weapons have won in May and June the most complete victory over the undersea killers in history.

The day is drawing near when the Axis dogs of war will be fighting their last fights on their own soil, when American boys will be fighting to victory. But the road to this turning point has been long and tortuous, and the remainder of the road will be even more costly in blood and tears and sweat.

The world over, our side is on the offensive. We are not wondering what the enemy is going to do. He is wondering what we are going to do, and most of the time we are doing it.

The biggest and most important front of the war so far has been Russia; in fact, the most gigantic battle line in world history. When Hitler's legions moved against the Russians it was a matter of conjecture by many military experts whether the drive would last a year or 6 weeks.

We all remember how in that first year of the Russian campaign the German Army swept north in a mighty wave, and then how it was stopped at Leningrad and at Moscow. The world can hardly forget how, a year later, the magnificent defense of Stalingrad refused to collapse in the face of almost certain defeat; how by savage, bloody fighting the tables were finally turned and the entire attacking arm wiped out. That was more than a mere tactical victory. It was the explosion of the myth of German military invincibility. From then on the story was different in Russia.

True, by early spring of this year the enemy was able to make a number of offensive moves. The biggest and most important of these moves was the German counterattack in the Ukraine. It had regained considerable territory and freed the German Army north of the Sea of Azof from the danger of encirclement and had brought the Germans back to the outskirts of Kharkof.

But at the same time the Russians were pushing ahead in the north, knocking off one by one the fortified strong points the Germans had held through the winter. And in the south the Germans were gaining their successes only at tremendous cost and by drawing heavily on their resources.

The German leaders realized this, of course. That is why they put over their total mobilization plan, trying to get more soldiers out of Germany and the satellite nations, more workers out of the occupied countries, an undertaking that developed into the greatest manhunt in history. The little nations like Rumania which had gone along with Hitler and paid with the blood of their young men, were pressed for more men. A spirit of rebellion was being fostered by the extreme demands.

By April the Russians had started an offensive on the southern end of their front, across the straits from the Crimea. When the Germans retreated from the Caucasus they held onto some territory there which they might use as a springboard for another drive against the Caucasus this summer. Military experts by this time were expressing doubt that the Nazis ever again could put on a general offensive on the Russian front. But they may draw together enough force this summer for desperate regional attacks. The Caucasus with its oil fields is regarded as one of the most plausible points for such an attack.

By early May the only major change on the Russian front was steady, slow progress in the Soviet drive along the Taman Peninsula. Tension grew along the major fronts through the month of May with both sides sparring for position and much talk of a major offensive coming from both sides. By mid-June, military authorities were saying that Hitler would have to get started with his much-promised summer campaign in Russia if he wanted to get anywhere before winter. But as the month ended he had not started such an offensive.

Perhaps the terrific drain of manpower exacted by the Russians, and developments in other theaters of war, had caused the famous Hitler military "intuition" to change its mind.

And other developments there were aplenty. The Russian campaign is the biggest of this war—or any other war; in area covered and in men and materials engaged, the greatest campaign of all history. But the campaign of the Americans, British, and French in Tunisia was very important too.

It has not been so very long, as global wars go, since we woke up one day to learn with tremendous pride and excitement that our fighting men had crossed from America and England in the world's biggest and best protected convoys and landed in French-held north Africa. We remember how Rommel had "high-tailed" it across north Africa from the position where he had been threatening Alexandria. By early March of this year he was beginning to feel his fate closing in on him from all sides. He was making little sorties in force, at one point, then another. But all his successes were minor and short lived. The rainy season delayed his end, and the end of the Italian Empire in Africa, for a time.

By March 20 the United Nations began the final drive to push Rommel and his men out of north Africa. The British Eighth Army broke through the Mareth line. Rommel left for Europe. The British, French, and Americans began to demonstrate a teamwork that boded no good for the defense of Europe. While the British Eighth Army was attacking Rommel on the coast, the American Second Corps attacked his flank, forcing him to detach a sizable force. This weakened his army so that the British broke through. By the middle of April the campaign in Tunisia had reached its final phase. Rommel's unbeatables had retreated farther than any other army in history before a pursuing force. But they had no other place to go. Airplanes and submarines shut out any possibility of a German retreat across the Mediterranean.

The United Nations achieved a blasting superiority in the air over Tunisia. By the end of April the final squeeze was on. But the Germans were still fighting with great skill and tenacity. We began to feel the solemn, sobering effect of more heavy casualties. Then, early in May, Bizerte and Tunis fell in one day.

This sudden victory apparently was due chiefly to the victories of American troops in the hills west of Bizerte. The whole campaign had been a matter of constant pressure from all allies on all sides. The Germans in the Bizerte hills held strong positions. But suddenly the American Army appeared out of nowhere, after a brilliant forced march. The Americans who took those hills against strong opposition proved themselves worthy descendants of the men who fought on both sides at Gettysburg and Chickamauga.

It was all over in an amazingly short time. The Germans were completely wiped off the face of Africa. The last remaining troops gave up by the thousands, despite the Nazi boasts of fighting to the last bullet. There were ample stores of ammunition. But the cause had been rendered hopeless by our superior fighting, superior air power, and superior weapons.

By mid-June the Italian island of Pantelleria and its two little neighbors had surrendered to an attack conducted almost entirely by air. The surrender has a strategic effect that will be felt all the way to Delhi and Chungking and a moral effect that was felt most keenly in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo. The Italian Gibraltar had fallen and the Mediterranean was open to United Nations shipping, cutting off months from the time of convoys and thus in effect doubling the tonnage of our merchant ships.

But our assaults did not slacken. During the month of June the weight of our bombs has been felt not only on Sicily and Italy but on airports and docks in Greece. A new technique of bombing was set up. British bombers employed a shuttle system between England and north Africa, flying from home with heavy loads of bombs, dropping them on Germany, flying on to Africa. There they refuel and reload and on the return trip drop their destruction upon Italy.

German reinforcements were moving into the Balkans and Greece to strengthen the garrisons of these countries against possible United Nations attack. But the Germans cannot tell where we are going to attack. It may be in Greece and the Balkans and it may be in Sicily, Sardinia, and Italy. It may be in southern France.

And, of course, while wondering whether to concentrate defense forces in Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, France, Italy, or the Balkans, the "master race" is under constantly increasing attacks from the very air over their heads. We all know of the mounting devastation the American and British bombers are dropping on Germany and its occupied countries. The day of doom does not seem so far away as it did on that fateful day of Pearl Harbor.

And the day of reckoning will not come alone in the Occident. With the spectacular victories of the Coral Sea, Midway, and the Solomons behind us, with the Jap Fleet diminished while ours is growing, with Australia transformed

from a continent fearful of invasion to the base for mighty offensive action, with air superiority on our side we are striking the opening blows of a drive to Tokyo and the final liberation of the Philippines.

The Solomons action of last year was a defensive offensive. Our action today in the Pacific is purely offensive and military observers predict it will give us bases from which to carry the war against Japan into its final stage.

Meanwhile hard fighting is going on in China. A Jap drive up the Yangtze River was thrown back with disastrous losses. American airplanes flown by American and Chinese flyers played a major role in that fighting.

While we strike in the southwest Pacific, the Chinese with our help strike from the other side. Fate is as surely closing in on Hirohito as it crowds ever closer to Hitler.

In order that the men and women serving in the armed forces may be provided with all necessary equipment, materials of war, food, and clothing, it is absolutely necessary that each and every one of us continues to do our part to win this war. If we do give to our armies and the armies of our allies what they need the triumphant end of the war is as inevitable as fate itself. It is a big job. There is plenty of work for us. I know that there are those who gripe about this, that, and the other thing. I know that in spite of those few who are so selfish that they put their own interests first that we are going to do the job. We are not going to let our men down by a failure on our part.

The Kerr Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives which was set up in compliance with H. R. 105, this committee being generally known as the Kerr committee, has decided to suspend activities until November 15.

Prior to recessing the committee heard the cases of Marcus Goldman, Nathaniel Weyl, and Davis Wahl. In the opinion of the committee, there is now not before its sufficient evidence to conclude that any of these men are unfit to continue in the Government employment by reason of their present association or membership, or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States.

With great respect, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

JOHN H. KERR,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee.

Sabotage on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I received a very interesting statement from a responsible constituent of mine concerning the mishandling of fruits and vegetables in the wholesale produce markets in Los Angeles. I have previously taken this subject up with the O. P. A. in Los Angeles and San Francisco, but to date have received no answer. I think this statement worthy of consideration:

My wife frequently goes to the wholesale produce market at Seventh and Central Streets, in Los Angeles, to buy oranges by the crate in order to share with neighbors who also have children. Saturday, June 26, my wife, accompanied by a neighbor's 11-year-old twins and our little daughter, went to this wholesale market for oranges. The youngsters had never seen a produce market of such proportions, so she took them for a walk through and about the premises. Imagine her surprise when, rounding a corner, she saw a man dumping crate after crate of beautifully fresh summer squash into a big pile on the ground. She asked, "What are you doing with all the squash; throwing it away?" He answered, "Yes. Would you like some?"

Filling her shopping bags with squash, she thought about the many victory-garden blistered hands and children working to harvest crops. Getting madder and madder, she told the man and others within hearing what she thought about such criminal destruction of good food.

Walking to her car with some of the squash, she noticed a man behind her with a hand truck stacked high with crates of nice tomatoes. Coming alongside her, he said, "Lady, I hate to do this as badly as you hate to see me do it. Do you mind if I put these tomatoes in your car? If you can't use so many, you can give them to plenty of people who can't afford to buy them." Six crates of them, and tomatoes selling at 30 cents a pound in the Safeway and other chain retail markets.

My wife, thinking of our large refrigerator and our vegetable-starved neighbors, said that she could use them, but what a shame to be dumping better looking tomatoes than any she had recently found in the neighborhood markets at sky-high prices. "This is nothing," said the man. "These are culls. The really fine ones are stacked behind the building, waiting to go to the hog farms in Fontana." As they finished loading the car to the gills with cabbage, lettuce, parsnips, turnips, and so forth, he added, "If you will come back around 1:30 this afternoon I'll have about 60 crates of apples to be dumped."

Mrs. Wilson took the vegetables home, filled our refrigerator, and distributed the remainder among the neighbors. She went back for the apples at 1:30 but was too late—trucking space had been found to deliver them to the Fontana hog farms. Retail markets sold their lowest grade apples at 13 cents a pound that day. However, in place of the apples she found more vegetables, including huge piles of corn, and away went another carload of fresh food for the citizens of Echo Park district—snatched from the jaws of the enemy. Corn was only 10 cents an ear in the retail markets that day.

Puzzled by this appalling waste of food, Mrs. Wilson spoke to a policeman, telling him that she used to pass this market daily, when doing social-service work several years ago, and had not observed any such tremendous dumping of food. His reply was that he had been on this beat for some time, and the extravagant waste had not been noticeable until high prices came into vogue. He further said that he and his friends had spent no money at all for vegetables since this season's crop came in.

We cannot make sense of it. Newspaper headlines, radio howls about food shortage. Victory gardens, people's money spent for bill boards exhorting high-school students, women and vacationers to join the land army. Save, save. Food is ammunition. Eat fresh vegetables and keep up civilian morale.

Now I am not a man to complain, but I think that I express the sentiment of the majority of defense workers in being the least bit resentful of being discriminated against in favor of a hog farm. In the first place, hogs can eat food that defense workers cannot. It might be said that the defense workers can eat the hogs, but in the second place, a defense workers' wages will no more meet the price of pork than the price of fresh vegetables. In the third place, I like to think of America as a whole, and thousands of working people in Los Angeles are receiving less wages than defense workers.

Rolling Back the Red Tape Would Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps our good people who have to work for the bureaus rolling up the red tape should be given some consideration, too. Here is a good example of the backlash of too much of too much.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter:

BAIRD NAUNDORF LUMBER CO.,
Spokane, Wash.

GENTLEMEN: I am going out of the sawmill business.

It is impossible to keep up with all the new Government regulations and scarcity of help.

I have to put in more time bookkeeping and studying all the new trash they send me than I have time to log and sawmill.

So I am going to sell my equipment and go out and work and let someone else do the bookkeeping and the worrying.

Thanking you kindly for the orders you have sent me which I am compelled to turn down.

Very truly yours,

H. F. NEWELL,
Addy, Wash.

Use of Silver for War Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House yesterday passed by unanimous consent the bill S. 35, to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee which considered the measure and recommended its adoption. We were advised by the War Production Board that silver was urgently needed in connection with the war program as a substitute for critical metals of which there is a shortage. Hence the bill S. 35 may properly be described as a war measure.

It is well known, of course, why silver has to be taken from the Treasury to take the place of copper. Our copper was suffered and permitted to be sent to Japan. There was exported from the United States to Japan during the period from 1936 to 1940, inclusive, 717,277,918 pounds of refined copper, enough to meet the combined copper requirements of building 179 cruisers, 179 destroyers, 110,805 Flying Fortresses, 10,680 field guns, and 10,000 howitzers. Not only this, there was also exported from the United States to Japan during this same period—1936 to 1940, inclusive—scrap copper amounting to 36,695,740 pounds; hence, all told some 3,500,000 tons of copper was exported from the United States to Japan during the period mentioned, which has made this Nation distressingly short of this essential war material.

It may be asked why tin cannot be substituted for silver, but here again the United States is short of tin because this imported metal was also exported to Japan in such quantities that none is available for our own war purposes.

I mention this because in a time of war the choice as between a perfect piece of legislation and the lives of our men cannot be debated on its merits.

While I supported S. 35 because of its emergency character, I am frank to say that I have some misgivings about the measure, particularly the requirement that the Treasury shall not sell any of its silver hoard for less than the inflated subsidy price of 71.11 cents per fine troy ounce.

The Treasury Department strongly recommended that the price be fixed at not less than 50 cents, which is about the average cost of the silver to the Treasury, but the silver bloc in the other body refused to permit the enactment of the measure unless the price was fixed at 71.11 cents.

Silver has been called the "slacker metal," due to the fact that the New Deal silver subsidy legislation now on the statute books makes impossible its use in war industries. Although the proponents of the silver subsidy legislation are willing that some of the Treasury silver be used for war purposes, they insist that the silver subsidy be maintained, even at the expense of the war effort.

The War Production Board is in the position of needing the silver so desperately that it is willing to pay the subsidy price for the Treasury silver if that is the only way legislation permitting its use for war purposes can be secured. The following extract from the letter of War Production Board Chairman Donald Nelson to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee touching on this point is significant:

> I would much prefer to have silver released at the lowest price possible, as this will mean that it will be available to a far larger group of manufacturers. Therefore, I believe that the higher price will restrict the substitution of silver in war equipment. However, it is vital that the Treasury silver be released and if, in the judgment of the committee, the price should be 71.11 cents rather than the 50 cents indicated in S. 35, I would not interpose an objection thereto.
>
> I am so anxious at this time to get legislation through, as the shortage of silver is becoming increasingly acute, that any steps which you can take to expedite the passage of legislation along the lines of S. 35 would, I assure you, be excedingly helpful to the war effort.

Here we have the statement of the official in charge of war production that the 71-cent subsidy price for silver provided in the bill as passed by the Senate will restrict its use for essential war purposes, yet the silver bloc insists that this artificially high price be maintained as a condition for permitting this war measure to become law.

To my mind, this action on their part is just another example of the rottenness of the whole silver subsidy program. For some time, I have had a bill pending which would repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 and related legislation, and I am in hopes that after the Congressional recess the Ways and Means Committee will initiate legislation toward that end. The Secretary of the Treasury has time and time again urged its repeal, but the law still remains on the statute books.

Under the terms of the Silver Purchase Act, the Secretary of the Treasury must continue to buy silver until the ratio of silver monetary stocks to gold monetary stocks is one in four. In view of the fact that the Government now controls over $22,000,000,000 of gold, it would appear that this goal will never be reached.

The present subsidy price of domestic silver is 71.11 cents, which is considerably above the world price. The Government now owns and controls something like 2½ million ounces of silver, about half of which is maintained as a backing for outstanding silver certificates. The balance is so-called free silver. Under existing law, this free silver cannot be sold by the Treasury except at the prohibitive monetary price of $1.29 per ounce.

The silver subcommittee gave consideration to amending the bill so as to permit the sale of the Treasury stock of "free" silver at a price not less than 50 cents, as recommended by the Treasury Department, but we faced the practical difficulty, as recognized by the Chairman of the War Production Board, that in view of the emergency and the necessity for congressional action before the contemplated recess it would be hopeless to secure the adoption of such an amendment over the opposition of the silver bloc.

The subcommittee also gave consideration to limiting the authority conferrred under S. 35 to December 31 of this year so that the matter could be gone into more fully after the congressional recess, but because of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee will take up the general tax bill after the recess it was felt that this would prevent action on the silver question this year. Moreover, it was obvious that any change made in the Senate bill might jeopardize its passage. Hence it should be understood that the bill has been considered and passed under extreme duress. The subject matter should be given more careful study at the earliest opportunity.

A Florida Citizen Speaks on the Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herein a letter in regard to the attempt on the part of the proponents of the Florida barge canal to force it through regardless of the action of the committees of Congress to the contrary:

MIAMI, FLA., *July 6, 1943.*
Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: According to a news story, a spokesman for the Army engineers admits that plans and specifications are now being prepared at Ocala by Army engineers for the north Florida Canal.

Do these engineers, and the President, desire to admit that the first five millions was spent without prepared plans and specifications? For that is the direct implication, if the plans are just now being made.

Do they realize, that according to the President, this is a total war and that to divert to unnecessary pursuits trained engineers is at this time directly hampering the war effort—if there is need for the large army that we are told is essential.

And that to withdraw essential men from the pursuit of the total war to do nonessential work is helping Hitler just as much as though these same men were killed in battle?

I wonder just how obtaining funds by trickery, to devote to nonessential work and taking men away from essential work, can be con trued as patriotic, when at one and the same time we are told that it will be essential to draft labor?

Mr. DONDERO, I do not enjoy freedom of speech on the floor of the House or Senate, but I do not like hypocrisy and deception—and that is what is being used in the matter of this canal. Sabotage is not too strong a word, and—were I granted the privilege of the floor of the House—I would use it.

This letter is on the record, to use as you see fit.

Cordially,

EDWARD DOANE.

Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. LANE POWERS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski in an airplane accident near Gibraltar is one of the most serious losses the cause of the United Nations has suffered.

General Sikorski was not only the Premier of the Polish Government-in-exile, he was also one of the ranking military strategists of the world. His death came when his immediate mission—a mission to which he had devoted a great deal of his time and energy, had been completed. That mission was to put into the field Polish armies fighting for the side of liberty and right—Polish armies that were battling to restore freedom to their country, a freedom which is the heart and soul of every Polish patriot.

There is no doubt but that the passing of the esteemed and able General Sikorski will leave a great void in the councils of the United Nations. There is also no doubt that a worthy successor will be found from among the patriot Poles in exile. But there is and can be only one General Sikorski. Someone will replace him, but no one can take the place of affection and respect which he holds in the hearts and minds of all of us who are united to crush a mutual enemy.

I wish to pay homage to this great statesman, patriot, and military genius. I also wish to pay homage to those of his staff who died with him, and especially to his lovely daughter, Mrs. Sophia Lesniowska, who was traveling with him, and who perished with him.

The restoration of a free Poland was the lifeblood of General Sikorski. It still is the primary motivating factor of all those patriots who serve under the white eagle of Poland. Since the origin of the Second World War was the preservation of the territorial rights of Poland, the complete restoration of those territorial rights should be one of the principal purposes of the peace. Unless we are all dedicated to that restoration, unless we pledge ourselves completely to it, General Sikorski and all other Polish citizens who shed their blood for their country have shed it in vain.

We have lost General Sikorski, but we will not lose the cause for which he fought and died. We will crush our common enemies on all fronts, and we will restore Poland to the peace and freedom it enjoyed before its ravishment at the hands of Hitler's hangmen. In all reverence we ask that God hasten the day when the white eagle of Poland will fly again over its own territory, smiling upon its own happy and industrious citizens, and proudly takes its place among the councils of the nations who have won the peace.

The Role of Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of July 5, 1943:

THE ROLE OF SUBSIDIES

The President's veto message on Friday raised two grave problems: First, what policy Congress and the administration should now adopt with regard to subsidies; and second, what the relationship of the President and Congress will be in dealing with the whole domestic economic problem.

Neither in its arguments nor in its tone was the President's veto message reassuring. whatever the defects may have been in the bill the President vetoed (and it was altogether proper that he should have drawn attention to these and asked for their correction), it is clear that Congress has been more nearly right on the whole subsidy issue than the President. In the present crisis, it is true, Congress should not attempt to forbid subsidies altogether. Even if there were no such thing as a good subsidy, there would still be such a thing as a subsidy that is the lesser of two evils in a specific situation. Whether a subsidy is more desirable than its alternative is a question that can be answered only for a specific commodity under specific circumstances.

It would not be difficult to show that the specific subsidies that have been most in dispute—the roll-back subsidies on meat, butter, and coffee, and even some subsidies that Congress has quietly accepted, such as that on petroleum—have been either wrong in principle, inconsistent with other policies of the Government, or calculated to do more harm than good in the method of their administration. It was for these reasons, among others, that Chester C. Davis felt obliged to resign as Food Administrator. His letter to the President did not contain any blanket condemnation of subsidies but pointed out that the "broad general subsidies" announced by the President would be ineffective 'in controlling inflation unless they are accompanied here, as they are in England, by current tax and savings programs that drain off excess buying power, and by tight control and management of the food supply."

Certain general principles should be clear. Subsidies cannot be considered a primary weapon against inflation. They do not in the least deal with its basic causes. The best they can do is temporarily to mitigate certain of its symptoms—always at the risk, which must never be lost to sight, of building up far worse evils in the future. They are at best, therefore, a secondary and minor weapon in the battle against inflation. They play something like the role of dynamite in building a road, and, like dynamite, should be handled only by experts. In no case should they be used as a substitute for genuinely basic measures, but only as a supplement to them. The harm of using subsidies too cautiously would be minute compared with the harm of using them too recklessly.

Yet the President talked in his veto message not only as if he considered subsidies a major weapon in the battle against inflation but almost as if it were the most important single weapon against it. Of Congress' action against subsidies he declared: "This is an inflation bill, a high cost of living bill, a food shortage bill. * * * It will have a devastating effect upon our economy and our war effort. * * * This measure will make it virtually impossible to institute any additional measures to reduce the cost of living or even to hold the line."

One reason that Congress has been profoundly suspicious of the whole subsidy program is that it has no confidence that the administration will administer it with care and skill and within strictly defined limits. The President's veto message is hardly reassuring in this regard. It is true that the President declared at one point that subsidies "should be applied only in strictly limited and clearly defined circumstances." But he went on to say that Congress must leave with the executive branch "the means of seeing to it that further increases in producers' prices do not increase the cost of living." When one considers that the roll-back of meat and butter prices, according to the calculation of the Office of Price Administration itself, will reduce the cost of living only 1 percent, though this subsidy alone will cost hundreds of millions of dollars a year, one can only imagine the dimensions of a subsidy designed to prevent any further increases in living costs—especially with the administration policy of continuing to boost industrial wages, which have already raced far ahead of increases in living costs.

It was gratifying to find the President suggesting, at the end of his message, that "in this task of saving our free economy, Congress and the Executive must work together as a team." But, with the exception of one or two such lines, the implication of the whole message was that the chief duty of the congressional member of the team was to nod approval, and that if Congress failed to approve the President's subsidy program in its entirety he would place upon it the full blame for any failure in th whole anti-inflation program. Surely a more conciliatory spirit and a more extensive use of consultation and compromise are essential to the conception of working together as a team.

Distribution of Fuel Oil and Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following resolution of the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass.:

Whereas the States on the eastern seaboard of the United States are contributing greatly to the war effort; and

Whereas the proper maintenance of such contribution and the economic stability of such States requires a sufficient supply of gasoline and fuel oil; and

Whereas equal facilities for the distribution of such fuel is not afforded to such States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the communities in such States be urged to circularize their representatives in Congress, to do all other acts, take all steps and exhaust all means to achieve a more equitable and equable distribution of such fuels; be it further

Ordered, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member in the Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Jesse Jones, Business Stabilizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, when banking and business lost control of the credit and finance of this country and our national economy was threatened with destruction, and banking and business was headed for disaster, our Government came to the rescue by establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, placed in charge of the best financier and administrator that this country could produce, to cope with all the frailties of human nature and the uncertainties of business affairs in an effort to stabilize banking and business and place our national economy on a firm financial basis.

How well that institution has succeeded and how firm business confidence has been restored by the leadership of the man in charge of its administration, can best be judged by the stability of banking and business today, in meeting the greatest emergency of all time.

American business confidence is personified in the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Mr. Jesse Jones, who has given so freely of his time and his talents that American business might succeed. Now, when the motive of this great financial leader and public servant is under an unfair attack, it is my privilege to present his statement to my colleagues for their consideration:

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, July 5, 1943.

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, today made public the following letter:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: June 29, Vice President WALLACE, in his capacity as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, released to the press a statement prepared for the Senate Committee on Appropriations containing grave charges against me and my associates in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In my 11 years as a Government official, I have consistently refrained from any public criticism of other Government departments, and reluctant as I am to burden the Congress and the public with a detailed reply to Mr. WALLACE, his tirade is so filled with malace, innuendo, half-truths, and no truths at all, that considerations of self-respect and of common justice to my associates force me to expose his unscrupulous tactics.

Mr. WALLACE offers as an excuse for his charges that in my testimony before the Byrd committee I gave it certain misinformation about the Board of Economic Warfare. This is a falsehood out of whole cloth. The truth is that in answer to questions as to the connection between Board of Economic Warfare and Reconstruction Finance Corporation I merely testified that, by Executive Order 9128, issued April 13, 1942, Board of Economic Warfare was given authority to issue directives to Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies with respect to the purchase of critical and strategic materials from abroad.

Mr. WALLACE implied that I testified before the Byrd committee that Reconstruction Finance Corporation had received a directive to pay employees of the Board of Economic Warware. There is no truth in this. Both Mr. WALLACE and Milo Perkins, who undoubtedly assisted him in the preparation of his amazing statement, must know this, because Mr. Perkins asked me by letter, June 7, if I had so testified. June 8, I replied by letter that I had not, and gave Mr. Perkins a copy of what I had said about Board of Economic Warfare in my appearance before the Byrd committee.

Mr. WALLACE'S statement that I have harassed administrative employees of Board of Economic Warfare in "their single-minded effort to help shorten this war by securing adequate stocks of strategic materials" is as silly and ridiculous as it is false. It is completely refuted by the record, which reveals that of Reconstruction Finance Corporation foreign purchases and commitments totaling $3,500,000,000 made since the middle of 1940, not more than 10 percent has been acquired under programs initiated since Board of Economic Warfare entered the field, April 13, 1942, and that of $1,600,000,000 in foreign materials already paid for by Reconstruction Finance Corporation, less than 5 percent has come from such programs; and this after 15 months during which time Board of Economic Warfare has frantically sent at great expense many "missions" composed mostly of inexperienced men to all parts of the world. Furthermore, the 10 percent initiated since Board of Economic Warfare entered the field would have been undertaken anyway by Reconstruction Finance Corporation under recommendations of the War Production Board, which is the planning and policy-making agency of the Government for war production, and the procurement of strategic materials, and from which agency Board of Economic Warfare gets recommendations for which it gives Reconstruction Finance Corporation directives.

In the war effort, Reconstruction Finance Corporation functions as a service agency, and not as a war policy-making agency. Reconstruction Finance Corporation acts on recommendations of the President, War Production Board, and its predecessor agencies, the State, War, and Navy Departments, the Rubber Director, the Maritime Commission, the Petroleum Coordinator for War, and the Board of Economic Warfare.

A very significant thing in this controversy is the fact that not one of these agencies has had reason to complain, nor has any except Board of Economic Warfare ever complained, of Reconstruction Finance Corporation's performance in the war effort, which has involved the authorization of expenditures of more than $20,000,000,000.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation began foreign purchases in the summer of 1940, and has complied efficiently and speedily with every request made of it by the President or any war policy-making agency.

Because of the nature of some of the directives from the Board of Economic Warfare, some of the trades they make and contracts they prepare for execution by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies without consulting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it has been necessary to call their attention to errors and poor practices in some of the contracts. Their reluctance to admit anything but infallibility has sometimes required a few days to make the necessary corrections, and sometimes they refuse, but no delay in any important material has been occasioned by Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has always believed, and after years of experience now believes more strongly than ever, that the maximum production and procurement of materials can be obtained, in a minimum of time and at a minimum of expense, without resorting to methods bordering on the hysterical.

The foreign purchase program of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been conducted under the personal direction of W. L. Clayton, who has had wide experience in the field of foreign trade for many years. He has been assisted by a number of competent men, among them G. Temple Bridgman, executive vice president of Metals Reserve Company, who has been a leading figure for many years in the metals trade, both in this country and abroad.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has felt, and it has learned, that production is best brought out and handled through established and experienced agencies, and not by sending great groups of inexperienced men to overrun foreign countries. A few well-selected men, under proper leadership, can accomplish much more in foreign countries, utilizing the citizens of such countries as much as possible, than scores of our own people hastily brought together and sent abroad with little knowledge of what they are to do or of the country to which they are sent.

While generous prices are desirable and often necessary in the war effort, lavish prices do not always increase production. Our immediate efforts in the foreign field should be concentrated on war procurement needs, and not on past-war ideologies. Furthermore, it is the unspectacular rather than the spectacular methods, and the quiet rather than the noisy approach, which accomplish the most.

Mr. WALLACE speaks of sending a hundred men to Brazil alone, on a single program. It is our belief that those hundred men, hastily recruited as they were, and with little or no familiarity with the work they were to do, have done little more than get in each other's way, and substitute confusion for order. That program would be in better shape today if most of those hundred men had stayed at home.

If the policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in dealing with private business at home and abroad, when possible, subjects me to Mr. WALLACE'S criticism, that cannot be helped. It is my belief that Government should seek to preserve private business, use it wherever possible in the war effort, and operate directly only when necessary.

The statements made by Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Perkins before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in December 1942, and to which the former again refers, were at that time shown to be unjustified and some of them untrue. My answer is contained in the hearings of that committee. My detailed reply to his present accusations is attached.

The President's Executive Order 9128 gave the Board of Economic Warfare authority to issue directives to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to foreign purchases. That Mr. WALLACE'S own order No. 5, issued while the President was in Casablanca, has equal force, is open to serious question.

Under Mr. WALLACE'S Order No. 5, officials of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are allegedly given no choice but to sign, without question or inquiry, any contract or make any commitment which the Board of Economic Warfare negotiates and prepares and gives a directive for, regardless of the

terms and conditions of the contract or the extent of the Government obligation assumed.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its operations are well known to Congress. It is bipartisan by law and in its administration. Its directors are men of character, experience, and ability. They are appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate. Their duties and responsibilities cannot be properly discharged by signing blank checks or executing, without careful examination, contracts that commit the Government for hundreds of millions of dollars.

The directives the Reconstruction Finance Corporation receives from the Board of Economic Warfare are signed by Milo Perkins, Morris Rosenthal, or Arthur Paul. At the pleasure of Mr. WALLACE, they may be signed by any employee of the Board of Economic Warfare whom Mr. WALLACE designates.

These directives are not considered or approved by the members of the Board of Economic Warfare. The members know very little of Board of Economic Warfare operations. To my knowledge, and I am a member of the Board, few, if any, purchase or development contracts have been considered at Board meetings, much less formally approved by the Board.

As for the charge which Mr. WALLACE appears to regard as a major crime, that I have attempted to safeguard the taxpayers' money, I must plead guilty. Squandering the people's money, even in wartime, is no proof of patriotism. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not pay $2 for something it can buy for $1. Maybe no one does, but the point is that some men know when you can buy it for $1, some don't know, and some don't care as long as they are spending other people's money.

It takes a long time and a lot of hard work to build an organization of men who are competent to trade and to handle vast sums of money properly—particularly public money. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has such an organization, and I am proud of it.

I will appreciate your placing this letter and my accompanying statement in the official record.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. CARTER GLASS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

The Rising Torrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Tuesday, July 6, 1943:

THE RISING TORRENT

The turn of the Government's fiscal year on July 1 has furnished the occasion for summarizing the outlay of money by the people of this country for the New Deal and the war.

In a little more than 10 years, Mr. Roosevelt has had the spending of more than $196,000,000,000, half again as much as was spent by all his predecessors together. In the year just closed the Government spent $78,000,000,000, a sum so large that it exceeds the total outlay from the adoption of the Constitution until after the end of the first World War.

We mention these figures not for the thrill of standing aghast before them, but only to emphasize that it is these vast expenditures which menace the Nation with an inflation. In the year just closed we spent seventy-eight billions and collected only twenty-two billions in taxes. We added more than $55,000,000,000 to the national debt and a very large portion of the bonds have gone to the banks. If the purpose had been to devise a method of financing the national debt that would create an inflationary menace, the Treasury could not have found a more suitable one.

It is important to bear these facts in mind because of the false clamor from Washington to the effect that the prevention of inflation depends upon a few thousand more snoopers in the employ of the Office of Price Administration and upon the use of subsidies to give more money to producers without increasing the price of food proportionately. The subsidy plan is itself inflationary, because it places aditional spending power in the hands of the people. If the present disparity between the income and outgo of the Treasury is allowed to continue, a million snoopers cannot keep prices from rising.

What is at stake is the existence of the middle classes and all that they mean for political sanity and stability, and for economic progress to the Nation.

The people who believe that subsidies and snoopers can prevent an inflation are trying to dam a torrent with a couple of pebbles.

Avoid Creating Fear About Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, to avoid creating fear about prices is of the utmost importance, because such fear in itself can cause prices to get out of control. If people expect prices to rise wildly, they will bid against each other, thus causing the very condition they are trying to avoid.

For the same reason parallels between our present problem and past uncontrolled price rises must be made with the greatest care.

For instance, public-opinion studies show that people generally have no real fear that we will have the German type of inflation at the close of the last war. They probably tend to be right in this. The German Government printed paper money recklessly. In this country we have an effectively controlled banking system which could be made a mechanism for inflation, but which can also be used to restrain inflation.

The fundamental difference, however, is that defeated Germany with its industrial plants run down, its manpower reduced, and its export trade completely disrupted had to meet reparation and other demands that strained her economy past the breaking point. The desperate government knew only one way to take resources from a demoralized people—hyperinflation. This will not happen here because we will not be defeated. Our economic machine will not break down and our productive capacity will continue to be adequate to meet the demands that will be made upon it. Moreover, because the nature of inflation is better understood than it was 25 years ago, we know what we must do to prevent it.

Nazi Extermination of Jews and Other Minorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS ROLPH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, June 17, 1943, a historic meeting was held in San Francisco's civic auditorium. All sections of the northern part of California were represented. More than 11,000 citizens were in attendance. Unanimously they petition the United States Government to use its good offices in aiding millions of Jews and other minorities in Axis-dominated Europe. Succor those who are daily being ground under by ruthless dictators. This plea should strike a responsive chord in Washington. The Nation's Capital is the heart of democracy.

State Senator Jack Shelley submitted the resolution, moving its adoption.

So all Americans may read this poignant appeal, I attach Senator Shelley's remarks, together with his resolution:

MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

I have seldom been so deeply stirred as I have been here this evening. I think that I have not felt completely until now the enormity of the tragedy that has befallen the persecuted peoples of Europe and the urgent necessity that we, who are still free, begin without delay the work of rescue. Rabbi Heller and Mr. Cantor have just stated to you simply and forcefully the purpose and the spirit of this great gathering. I know that the labor groups of this city and of the Nation would join me in endorsing the resolutions proposed by these gentlemc and in recommending that these resolutions be here adopted by us as the basis of a positive constructive program to bring hope to the stricken victims of Nazi barbarism.

Let us make it known to the officials of our State(our Nation, and our allies that we are not content to sit idly by while millions of our fellow human beings suffer torture, starvation, and death. Let it be known that we demand action.

Mr. Chairman,-I move that these resolutions be unanimously adopted by this assemblage. (Senator Jack Shelley, president, San Francisco Labor Council.)

UNITED JEWISH COMMITTEE OF SAN FRANCISCO AGAINST NAZI EXTERMINATION OF JEWS AND OTHER MINORITIES

Resolution at mass meeting, Civic Auditorium, Thursday evening, June 17, 1943

This assembly, representing a great cross-section of citizens of northern California, convened in the Civic Auditorium of San Francisco on June 17, 1943, voices its sympathy and encouragement to the persecuted peoples under the yoke of Nazi oppression.

We honor the memory of the dead; we honor the memory of the innocent and helpless martyrs of all peoples and the millions of Jews who fell victims to a madness unparalleled in history.

Whereas silence and inaction on our part in the face of such monstrous conditions would betray the sacred obligations of brotherhood, as well as the humanitarian ideals to which the United Nations are dedicated; and

Whereas the holocaust of mass murder of civilian populations, especially Jews, continues unabated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

1. The United Nations should approach neutral governments with a view to having them intercede for the release of Jewish and other minority victims; and

2. The United Nations should, without delay, take steps to designate and establish a number of sanctuaries in Allied and neutral countries to accommodate substantial numbers of Hitler's victims and to serve as havens of refuge for those whose release from captivity may be arranged, or who may find their way to freedom through efforts of their own.

3. We urge that the doors of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration.

4. The administration of immigration laws to the United States be liberalized to permit the filing of the established quotas.

That copies of this resolution be directed to the President of the United States, the Department of State, and the Representatives of the State of California in the Senate and House of Representatives.

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the President of the United States to Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 1, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: I have received your letter of May 25 1943, regarding the need for improvement of the Atlantic-Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, and, in particular, the need for construction of the Florida barge canal.

I have always realized the importance of an adequate and continuous inland waterway for barge traffic along our Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast Upon authorization of such a waterway by Congress steps were taken promptly to initiate the improvement, and work has been carried on as fast as possible without interfering with the war effort. This work has consisted of large-scale dredging operations along the existing sections of the waterway, which, without improvement, could not be used to full capacity. It is my intention to continue these dredging improvements during the next fiscal year.

As yet, it has not been feasible to undertake work on sections of the waterway not now in existence, primarily because of shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages are overcome. While I cannot foretell how soon that will be, it is possible that the situation with respect to these shortages will change sufficiently to permit an early dredging of the sea-level sections of the canal, and I am, accordingly, asking the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Chief of Engineers to keep me advised of any changes of conditions which would justify the inauguration of this work.

I appreciate the further expression in your letter of May 25, of your continued concern with the improvement of our waterway system, to the development of which you have contributed so much.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my personal tribute to a colleague whom I loved as a friend of long years of association, and for whom I had a profound respect because of his high integrity and marked ability as a Member of this body.

HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT was a man who loved his country and served it well. He loved his native State of California, and he was a fine type of Representative in the best American tradition.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT won the respect and the love of his colleagues when he came to Washington in the Sixty-ninth Congress, because he was a western man of the outdoors. He was a mining engineer. He was a builder, a doer, a man whose whole outlook was constructive. He had the breezy friendliness of the western man of the great open spaces. He was frank, courteous, and honest in his dealings with his colleagues and his fellow men at all times. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was the type of legislator who took his oath of office as a sacred duty and who was always ready to stand by that oath regardless of the consequences to himself.

The high esteem in which his Republican colleagues held him was expressed by the fact that he was chosen and served for many years as the Republican whip.

Without respect to party or to section, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this Congress were deeply shocked by the sudden death of this able California Representative. Those of us who knew him best felt the greatest shock at his passing. It is our consolation, as well as that of his relatives, that throughout his career as a public official he served his Nation and his constituency faithfully and with high honor to himself. His memory will ever be bright in the hearts of his colleagues in the Congress.

Some of the Things You Can Do To Help Hold Down Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, put your money to work helping to win the war—all that you can afford. Keep on doing it. No matter how much higher taxes go, they still cannot pay for all of the war. When you buy War bonds instead of goods you also are helping in the vital fight to hold down prices and the price of the war.

You are helping to hold down prices because the dollars which you put into War bonds are not dangerous dollars bidding in the market for scarce goods, forcing up prices that in turn force up wages, creating higher prices and wages, which increase business costs and generate a pressure for even higher prices, starting a rising flood of higher prices and wages that can lengthen the war and endanger the peace to come.

Equally important, when you buy War bonds you help insure your future economic stability and the economic stability of your country. You are laying aside a nest egg for after the war, for the home you want when civilian building resumes, for the education of your children. Save now. Spend when you can get your money's worth. In holding down prices you are making easier your task and your country's task in getting back to a peacetime basis. The lower we keep prices now, the easier it will be for all of us to buy the new peacetime goods, the easier to keep our factories working and all of us employed, the easier to build a strong, prosperous Nation.

PAY WILLINGLY ANY TAXES, HIGHER TAXES, YOUR COUNTRY NEEDS

They are the cheapest way of paying for the war—of buying victory and protection for the American way of life. They are the cheapest way because there is no interest to be paid; because there is no problem of retirement as there is with bonds—retirement for which funds must come from further taxes.

Taxes also help keep down the cost of living by removing dangerous dollars from the market where they only bid up prices by competing for the purchase of scarce goods and services.

PAY OFF YOUR OLD DEBTS AND AVOID MAKING NEW ONES

It is a much better way to use your money than to employ it to bid up prices.

If you pay off your debts you achieve independence. You are in a better position to take advantage of our return to peace.

PAY NO MORE THAN CEILING PRICES

Ceiling prices are your protection against serious and unwarranted price increases—one of your important guarantees of economic stability. However, they will work only if you make them work—if you will observe them in your buying, if you will help in enforcing them.

SUPPORT RATIONING

Rationing not only ensures you a fair share of scarce commodities. It also helps hold down prices by stabilizing supply and demand.

BUY ONLY WHAT YOU NEED

Dollars you spend for unnecessary things are dangerous dollars. They compete with other dollars for the fewer things available because of the war. Hence they are the dollars that bid up prices. So before you buy, carefully look over what you have. Eat it all, wear it out; make it do, or do without. If you still think you need to buy, compare the slight sacrifice you would make in not buying with the unlimited sacrifice our fighting men must make without having a choice.

DO NOT ASK MORE FOR WHAT YOU HAVE TO SELL, MORE IN PRICES FOR GOODS, MORE IN WAGES AND SALARIES

Any additional amount you ask for either goods or wages will only be passed on to others and will eventually have to be paid right out of your own pocket. This is inevitable because the war's demands on our productive facilities and our labor supply make it impossible for others to produce more or do more. No one can produce any more. No one can get any more. But all have to pay more for the same goods, the same work that formerly cost less. Before you charge more for your work or for what you have to sell do this: Compare what you would sacrifice by foregoing a rise in your price with the many sacrifices our fighting men must make without even having a choice.

Food and Gas Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this war is a long way from being won. The reports of the heroism of our boys on the front lines are of a most inspiring character and should put to shame those who are responsible for the confusion and lack of leadership in the Executive department relating to the home front.

The Chief Executive seems to take particular delight in forcing every person in the executive branch of the Government to yield to his opinion, whether it be on a question of food supply, gasoline rationing, stock and poultry feed or any other problem now confronting the public. The President has failed ignominiously to give heed to the knowledge of those who could and would, if permitted to do so, bring order out of chaos with reference to the future food supply for our soldiers, our allies, and our civilian population.

I can imagine no greater calamity than to have millions of our men, fighting on fronts thousands of miles from home, deprived of the necessary food to enable them to win the war.

Every person of experience and sound judgment knows that there should be a central food administrator, clothed with adequate powers to meet and solve the food problem. This farming season is so far advanced that irreparable injury has already been done because of failure to meet the issue, but a national calamity of starvation is in the making for next year and the years to follow unless action is taken now. The appointment of a person capable of solving the food situation should not be longer delayed if this country is to escape a famine at home and the danger of a lack of food supply for our soldiers abroad.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great industries vital to the life and health of the present and the coming generation is the dairy industry. Already this source of indispensable food is on the verge of destruction because of the inability of the dairymen to get feed for their cattle. It has always been necessary for the dairymen of the east to purchase grain from the west. A situation now exists which, if suffered and permited to continue, will ruin the dairy farmer of the east. The price of corn is so low that it is more profitable for the western farmer to feed corn to his hogs than it is for him to ship it east. This is something that the administration has been in a position to correct but it has failed to do so, until the dairymen in the east face a most critical situation.

Furthermore, the poultrymen in the East constitute one of the greatest food producing segments in the field of agriculture. I say without fear of successful contradiction, that the farmers, in spite of the fact that their sons have been taken in the draft, have tightened their belts, lengthened their long working hours, invested their meager capital in the poultry industry in a sincere and patriotic effort to meet the appeal of the Government that they produce not only enough food for their own use, but a sufficient quantity to insure an adequate supply for our Army, the needs of our allies, and the requirements of our civilian population. Whenever they have asked for the cooperation of the Government to help them in their almost superhuman task of war production they have been insulted by the bureaucrats and, moreover, they have been charged by the President with encouraging inflation. What I have said with reference to the patriotism of the dairymen and the poultrymen applies equally to all other branches of agriculture.

I have said repeatedly that the only way to stop the inflationary rise in the price of food is to produce more food. This the farmers cannot do against the bureaucratic resistance in Washington with which they have to contend. The indifference displayed by the President of the United States to this vital problem is difficult to understand. I stated months ago that every farm ought to be considered a war industry. No matter how many millions of guns and tanks and planes may be manufactured, the one thing that the Army and the civilian population must have is food.

I noticed yesterday a large advertisement in a newspaper offering a girl trainee $214 per month to learn welding. Is it possible for any dairyman, poultryman, or other type of farmer to obtain help in the face of these attractive and irresistible offers of high wages in war plants? Such inducements to young people to leave the farm could be multiplied thousands of times. The administration has, from the first, obstructed the efforts of the farmers to meet the demands for greater food production.

I deplore the effort on the part of the administration and its bureaucrats to attempt now to create ill feeling and even hatred as between the city dwellers, who are having difficulty in obtaining food, and the farm population, which has suffered from every discrimination the bureaucrats could devise to hinder food production. If we are going to win this war this fomenting of class hatred will have to be stopped. There can be no teamwork when such a feeling of bitterness exists between the city consumers and the farm producers. The clever, tricky New Deal politicians, now filling many of the posts of the alphabetical set-ups, have approached this war program from a political angle, always counting the votes that will result from every move they make. They are endeavoring now to make political capital out of the fact that there are more consumers than there are producers of food. Consequently regulations and wages are manipulated with only one thought in view, and that is to corral the most votes in the coming election. Subsidies are part of the same program of political control, notwithstanding the fact that this system is admittedly inflationary.

The administration's political scheme is to coddle one class and create ill-feeling between it and another group in order to obtain some political advantage. One of the difficulties in the oil situation is that although the index number of crude oil is 70, and the index number of labor 170, the administration is perfectly willing to see stripper oil wells in western New York and Pennsylvania dismantled and the oil lost forever rather than to increase the price sufficiently to assure to the operator the cost of production. This production, as the administration knows, would help supply the need for fuel oil and gasoline to the East. Where does this opposition stem from? It goes back to the days when the oil men almost solidly backed Mr. Landon for President, and every day since then the oil producers have been the victims of the vindictiveness of President Roosevelt, but the real victims of this peevishness are the people of the Northeast who have suffered from a lack of fuel oil and are being harrassed with an unfair gasoline rationing program.

It will be recalled that the Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary Harold Ickes, twice recommended an increase in the price of crude oil to meet the cost of production, but when this recommendation was communicated to a higher power, it was turned down under the catchy phrase, "Hold the line."

There never has been any justification for the discriminatory coupon gasoline rationing system as between certain States. Why 4 gallons in 1 State and 2½ in a contiguous State? Political pressure from the South results in pleasure riding without restriction, and in the food-producing districts of the North restrictions are imposed that prevent the use of gas to operate cars, tractors, and trucks essential to food production.

Congress should force immediate action on the part of the Executive to protect the producers and consumers of this country from the effects of the many political hindrances to an all-out program of farm production. Every day that action is delayed on these important questions, the morale of the American people is weakened and millions of men abroad have cause to wonder whether their country is really behind them in the glorious effort they are making to win this war and to win it quickly.

Outline of Policies and Objectives of the D. A. V.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a former Regular World War No. 1 Army officer, retired by reason of disability, I am eligible for, and I am pleased to state, a life member of the Disabled American Veterans, which, by the way, is the only congressionally chartered organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled while serving actively in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

As a D. A. V. member, I receive its official publication, the Disabled American Veterans Semimonthly newspaper, in the last issue of which I noted an outline of the policies and objectives of the D. A. V.

This outline emphasizes and is divided into four points:

First, preserve America's freedoms; second, equalize burdens and profits of war; third, promote welfare of America's disabled defenders; and fourth, extend adequate provisions for dependents of service disabled. All of these points—with which all of us can certainly agree—are interrelated, and all are of vital importance to the future welfare of America.

As slightly amended, I here insert such outline, as follows:

I. PRESERVE AMERICA'S FREEDOMS

A. Protect America.

1. Expand our specialized armed forces. (Numerous laws and appropriations and pending bills.)

2. Produce needed war matériel quickly. (Policy.)

3. Mobilize America's manpower efficiently. (Policy, H. J. Res. 2, by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON of New Mexico, and now before the Committee on Labor.)

B. Perpetuate Americanism.

1. Protect Americanism by promoting Americanism. (Educational publicity.)

2. Promote active workable representative democracy. (Educational publicity. Numerous bills.)

3. Protect democratic institutions against subversive forces.

(a) Have all persons fingerprinted, registered, and identified. (H. R. 1032, by Hon. RAYMOND J. SPRINGER, of Indiana. Now before Committee on the Judiciary.)

(b) Issue certificates to all citizens. (H. R. 812, by Hon. CHARLES R. CLASON, of Massachusetts. Reported favorably by Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, on March 2, 1943, Rept. No. 201. Now on Union Calendar of House.)

II. EQUALIZE BURDENS AND PROFITS OF WAR

A. Provide adequately for America's defenders and their dependents.

1. Maintain adequate pay during service and for 6 months after discharge or death in service. (H. R. 823, by Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania. Now before House Committee on Military Affairs. Also sec. 55 of Disabled American Veterans' omnibus bill, H. R. 912.)

2. Extend protection against permanent and total disability in insurance policies. (S. 231, by Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation. Now before his committee. Also, H. R. 883, by Mr. VAN ZANDT, now before House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also sec. 42 of H. R. 912.)

3. Establish Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Boards of Appeals and Reviews, with authority to revise discharge certificates (H. R. 1105 as to Army, by Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, of Louisiana. Now before House Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1110, as to Navy and Marine Corps, by Hon. ED. V. IZAC, of California; now before House Committee on Naval Affairs. Also, secs. 55–56 of H. R. 912.)

4. Emphasize desirability to complete medical records during service. (Policy.)

B. Eliminate excess profits from all-out war for freedom.

1. Control purchasing power of United States money. (Policy.)

2. Impose taxes according to ability to pay. (Policy.)

3. Regulate men, money, material, machines, toward war victory. (Policy.)

III. PROMOTE WELFARE OF AMERICA'S DISABLED DEFENDERS

(H. R. 912. Disabled American Veterans' omnibus bill, by Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Referred to his committee.)

A. Extend Disabled American Veterans' services to all of America's disabled defenders. (Policy.)

1. Through national and local service officers. (Policy.)

2. By extensive educational publicity. (Policy.)

B. Secure actual liberalization of policies as to service connections.

1. Reinstate direct service connections granted by the President's review boards. (H. R. 985, by Hon. JOE B. BATES, of Kentucky. Now before House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also, sec. 8 of H. R. 912.)

2. Decentralize authority to review and readjudicate all previously denied claims. (H. R. 706, by Hon. JERRY VOORHIS, of California. Now before House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also, sec. 31 of H. R. 912.)

3. Insist upon recorded résumé of all pertinent facts and evidence in claims filed prior to certificate of appeal. (H. R. 706 by Mr VOORHIS, of California. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also, sec. 32 of H. R. 912.)

4. Liberalized eligibility as to disability retirement benefits. (H. R. 1036, by Mr. BROOKS, of Louisiana. Now before Military Affairs Committee. Also secs. 44–45 of H. R. 912.)

C. Extend increased monetary benefits to disabled defenders.

1. Increase compensation and pension payment by 10 percent for every 10-percent increase in cost of living over 1940 figures. (H. R. 1111, by Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON of Florida. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 1–2 of H. R. 912.)

2. Provide minimum 10-percent rating for wounded or gassed veterans. (H. R. 738, by Mr. VOORHIS. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 4 of H. R. 912.)

3. Increase basic ratings by 20 percent for each 5 years after age of 40. (H. R. 754, by Mr. VOORHIS. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 3 of H. R. 912.)

4. Restore full compensation to the so-called presumptives. (H. R. 1000, by Hon. GEORGE M. GRANT of Alabama. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 5 of H. R. 912.)

5 Rate war veterans as totally disabled while hospitalized for service-connected disabilities. (H. R. 1862, by Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN of Louisiana. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 7 of H. R. 912.)

6. Increase pensions to war veterans with permanent total non-service-connected disabilities to $60 per month. (H. R. 1370, by Mr. VOORHIS. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 11 of H. R. 912.)

7. Authorize payment of compensation for partial service-connected disability, plus the percentage of pension for permanent total disability (nonservice) equal to the difference between 100 percent and his degree of service-connected disability. (H. R. 918, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before his committee. Also sec. 13 of H. R. 912.)

D. Liberalize Veterans' Administration determinations.

1. Determine permanent total disability on individual ability to follow any substantially gainful occupation. (H. R. 1118, as to service-connected disabilities, by Mr. PETERSON. Now before the World War Veterans' Committee. H. R. 683, by the Honorable VICTOR WICKERSHAM of Oklahoma, as to non-service-connected disabilities. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also secs. 9–10 of H. R. 912.)

2. Eliminate statutory limitations as to applications for benefits. (H. R. 707, as to bonus, by Hon. FRANK CARLSON of Kansas. Now before Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1036, by Mr. BROOKS, as to E. O. R. benefits. Now before Military Affairs Committee. H. R. 318, as to World War decorations, by Hon. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, of New York. Now before Military Affairs Committee. Also secs. 16, 37, 40, 45, 46, 48, 51, 52 of H. R. 912.)

3. Limit misconduct bar to willful or felonious misconduct. (S. 227, by Senator CLARK

of Missouri. Favorably reported by Senate Finance Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation July 7, 1943. Also H. R. 986, by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Reported by Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation May 18, 1943, Rept. No. 462. Passed by House on June 8, 1943, and favorably reported by Senate Finance Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation on July 7, 1943. Also sec. 15 of H. R. 912.)

4. Adjudicate claims retroactively according to facts. (H. R. 796, by Mr. RANKIN, and now before his committee. Also sec. 17 of H. R. 912.)

5. Adjudicate pending claims after death of veteran. (H. R. 793 and H. R. 2703, by Mr. RANKIN, and now before his committee. Also sec. 18 of H. R. 912.)

6. Forfeit benefits only where evidence is clearly not sufficient. (H. R. 644, by Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also secs. 49–50 of H. R. 912.)

7. Veterans guilty of fraud to be subject to fine or imprisonment. (Same as III–D–6.)

8. Extend time within which to make appeal from decisions of rating agencies. (H. R. 855, by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON. Now before Word War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 16 of H. R. 912.)

9. Provide minimum rating of 1 percent for veterans noted as having some disability at time of discharge. (H. R. 641, by Mr. ALLEN, of Louisiana. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 12 of H. R. 912.)

10. Schedule no examinations for those on permanent ratings. (H. R. 980, by Mr. BATES, of Kentucky. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 14 of H. R. 912.)

11. Permit suit on any claims after final denial. (H. R. 706, by Mr. VOORHIS of California, and H. R. 980, by Mr. BATES, of Kentucky. Both now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 33 of H. R. 912.)

E. Liberalize insurance benefits.

1. Reduce interest on Government insurance policy loans to 3½ percent. (H. R. 682, by Mr. WICKERSHAM. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 36 of H. R. 912.)

2. Permit suit on any Government life insurance policy at any time. (H. R. 1120, by Mr. PETERSON, of Florida. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 40 of H. R. 912.)

(a) Insurance judgments to be binding upon Veterans' Administration until modified by court order. (H. R. 803, by Hon. JOHN S. GIBSON. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 41 of H. R. 912.)

3. Make Government life-insurance policies incontestable after 1 year. (H. R. 749, by HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 39 of H. R. 912.)

4. Return premiums on canceled Government life-insurance policies. (Same as III–E–3.)

5. Continue permanent total-disability insurance protection to veterans who have received 240 or more monthly installments of insurance benefits. (H. R. 794, by Mr. RANKIN, and now before his committee. Also sec. 37 of H. R. 912.)

6. Veterans receiving insurance benefits on permanent and total disability not to be reexamined more than once each 5 years. (H. R. 981, by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. H. R. 799, after 10 years, by Mr. RANKIN. Favorably reported on February 10, 1943. Rept. No. 113. Now on Union Calendar of House. Also sec. 38 of H. R. 912.)

F. Provide miscellaneous benefits.

1. Extend effective preferences for veterans, their wives, and widows, for all Government employment for which qualified. (H. R. 822 by Hon. JOE STARNES, of Alabama. Now before House Committee on the Civil Service. Also sec. 58 of H. R. 912.)

(a) Permit exemption of civil-service retirement law as to disabled persons deemed to be risk to Retirement Act, and then cover them into the social-security retirement provisions. (H. R. 1016 by Mr. MCMILLAN. Now before Civil Service Committee. Also sec. 59 of H. R. 912.)

2. Extend vocational training and suitable employment to all handicapped veterans. (Now Public Law 36, 78th Cong., as to service-connected disabled veterans of World War No. 2. H. R. 2950 by Mr. RANKIN as to all service-connected disabled veterans, now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Also secs. 51, 52, and 53 of H. R. 912.)

3. Extend preferences of appointment to West Point and Annapolis Academy to sons of service-connected disabled veterans. (Now Public Law 778, 77th Cong.)

4. Provide adjusted compensation for provisional officers. (H. R. 1547 by Mr. CARLSON. Now before Ways and Means Committee. Also sec. 48 of H. R. 912.)

5. National cemetery in every State. (H. R. 1109 by Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas. Now before Military Affairs Committee. Also sec. 61 of H. R. 912.)

6. Urge consideration of a national war memorial auditorium in the Nation's capital. (H. R. 1245, by Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California. Now before Public Buildings and Grounds Committee. Also sec. 60 of H. R. 912.)

7. Liberalize State laws and appropriations affecting veterans, their dependents, and their organizations. (Policy, Educational Publicity.)

G. Eliminate existing inequalities and inequities as among various similar groups of disabled veterans and their dependents.

1. Uniformize administrative provisions of all Veterans' Administration laws. (H. R. 2703, to effect numerous uniformizing administrative provisions and liberalizations as to all war veterans and their dependents, by Mr. RANKIN. Favorably reported by Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation May 18, 1943. Report No. 463. Passed by House on June 21, 1943. Favorably reported by Senate Finance Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation on July 6, 1943. Passed by Senate with amendments on July 6, 1943, and immediately concurred in by House. Scheduled to be approved by President. H. R. 1774 by Hon. HARRY P. JEFFREY, deleting limitation as to number of dependent children. Now before Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 1445 by Mr. CARLSON of Kansas, to replace destroyed or withheld bonus certificates. Now before Committee on Ways and Means. Also secs. 6, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, and 47 of H. R. 912.)

H. Extend needed hospitalization and domiciliary care in following orders: (1) For service-connected disabilities; (2) for nonservice-connected disabilities. (Now Public Law 10, approved March 17, 1943. Also secs. 34, 35, of H. R. 912.)

I. Urge construction of Veterans' Administration facilities in accordance with veteran-population needs. (H. R. 981, by Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 54 of H. R. 912.)

J. Liberalize adjunct treatments. (H. R. 658, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. (Policy.)

IV. EXTEND ADEQUATE PROVISIONS FOR DEPENDENTS OF SERVICE DISABLED

A. Provide pension of $60 per month to widows of war veterans who have died by reason of service-connected disability, or who have suffered permanent total, combat disability. (H. R. 841, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, to increase widows' pensions to $60. H. R. 888, by Mr. VAN ZANDT, to include widows of total combat-disabled veterans with widows of veterans who died by reason of combat disabilities. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also secs. 19, 20 of H. R. 912.)

B. Provide pension of $50 per month to widows of deceased war veterans who were suffering from service-connected disability. (H. R. 915, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before his committee. Also sec. 23 of H. R. 912.)

1. Eliminate "needs" test. (H. R. 979, by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 26 of H. R. 912.)

C. Extend pensions to dependents of veterans who have suffered disabilities traceable to examination, or hospital treatment, or vocational training. (H. R. 842, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Now before World War Veterans' Committee. Also sec. 28 of H. R. 912.)

D. Widows otherwise eligible for pension to be eligible if married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death, or if being married, she gave birth to a child by the veteran. (H. R. 846, by Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, chairman of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions, and now before his committee. Also sec. 30 of H. R. 912.)

E. Provide pensions to dependent parents of deceased service-connected disabled war veterans. (H. R. 915, by Mr. RANKIN. Now before his committee. Also secs. 22, 24, 25, 27, of H. R. 912.)

Mr. Speaker, the many various objectives under the last two principal points above are, it will be noted, embodied in the D. A. V. omnibus bill, H. R. 912, introduced by my friend from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. Separate objectives, however, are also covered by separate legislative bills as indicated.

This extensive program of the D. A. V. is certainly well integrated, looking to the welfare of our country, our communities, and our comrades. It is predicated on the principle that by promoting and providing for the welfare of America's disabled defenders and their dependents we thereby help to promote, protect, and preserve America and its democratic institutions.

America will be able to continue to provide adequately for its disabled defenders and their dependents, however, only if democratic America is preserved. The protection, preservation, and promotion of America is inevitably linked up with adequate provisions for America's disabled defenders and their dependents.

To see to it that worthy disabled veterans, of all of America's wars, and their dependents, are enabled technically to establish their equitable claims for various types of benefits provided by existing legislation, the D. A. V. maintains the largest staff of nationally paid National Service Officers—one or more in nearly every regional office of the Veterans' Administration—of any veteran organization.

Every American war veteran who has been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of his active military or naval service is eligible for membership in this exclusive service-giving outfit, and ought to support its legislative and service activities by becoming a paid-up life member of the D. A. V., which, if he was born prior to January 1, 1902, he can do by payment of $50 or, if born thereafter, by payment of $100 in cash, or by a down

payment of $5, plus installments until fully paid.

Application and payment for D. A. V. life membership should be sent to my long-time friend, Vivian D. Corbly, National Adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, 2840 Melrose Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Tribute to China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Century of July 7, 1943:

TRIBUTE TO CHINA

Today China enters its seventh year of war. It was on July 7, 1937, that a Japanese force maneuvering outside Peiping attacked a Chinese post at the Marco Polo Bridge and thus deliberately brought on the conflict of which the second World War may well be regarded as a projection. As this anniversary rolls round the free world will unite in tribute to the heroism with which the Chinese people have borne the trials of these bitter years. All the peoples who have resisted invasion in these war years have shown great heroism. The Russians, the Norwegians, the British, the Yugoslavs, the Filipinos—who can adequately celebrate their courage? But there has been something about the heroism of the Chinese, standing almost with bare hands to defy a completely armed invader, which compels a praise that is beyond words.

There was a time when westerners were tempted to minimize this achievement of the Chinese because they sadly underrated the strength of China's enemy. The length and determination of China's resistance was credited to Japan's weakness rather than to China's resolution. We know better now. No invader who could drive the British, the French, the Dutch, and the Americans out of their Oriental empires in less than 6 months can longer be discounted. Yet China has taken the heaviest blows this invader could strike, stood up under them, and come back for more. The bombing inflicted on her cities has equaled in destructiveness that rained upon London or the cities of the Ruhr, since China has, until now, had no means of defense against low-level, leisurely bombing. The atrocities committed against her people have resurrected a pattern of horror which had been thought buried with Attila and Genghis Kahn. By all the rules of warfare China should have surrendered years ago. She has been shattered as few nations have been shattered. But she has not been broken. She has not surrendered. She has not been defeated because she would not be defeated.

It has not been only on the field of battle, or in the calm courage of her people undergoing terrible air bombing behind the lines, that China has shown the quality of her soul. Equally in the field of statesmanship she has displayed a moral stature with which the world must reckon. No national leader has risen beyond the height on which Chiang Kai-shek took his stand when he said:

"There has recently been some talk of China emerging as the leader of Asia, as if China wished the mantle of an unworthy Japan to fall on her shoulders. Having herself been a victim of exploitation, China has infinite sympathy for the submerged nations of Asia, and toward them China feels she has only responsibilities—not rights. We repudiate the idea of leadership of Asia because the 'fuehrer principle' has been synonymous with domination and exploitation. * * * China has no desire to replace western imperialism in Asia with an oriental imperialism or isolationism of its own or of anyone else. We hold that we must advance from the narrow idea of exclusive alliances and regional blocs which in the end make for bigger and better wars, to effective organization of world unity. Unless real world cooperation replaces both isolationism and imperialism of whatever form in the new interdependent world of free nations, there will be no lasting security for you or us."

During these 6 years, and particularly during the year just closing, China has suffered some terrific blows. The entrance of the United States into the war, which she had been assured would quickly free her, instead immensely complicated her military difficulties. When she sent her military mission to Washington to consult on the problems of far eastern warfare they received so contemptuous a welcome that, in very self-respect, she was forced to call them home again. And most recently, she has seen the expeditionary force which invaded Burma with the avowed purpose of reopening a supply line to Chungking, driven back in disaster to the protection of the Indian border. These have all been military disappointments. They have been hard to bear. They must have left their mark on the morale of the Chinese people. But they are disappointments which those people know will pass, and they fight on.

Yet as this anniversary day returns there is a question, not military at all, which these same Chinese people ask of us, the common people of America. Will we inflict another, and a lasting, blow upon them by refusing to erase the racial and national insult against them which we have written into our immigration and naturalization laws? For 6 desperate years they have held back the forces of tyranny, and are we not yet ready to do them this belated act of justice? We praise them. We render tribute to their heroism. We know that if they were to weary of the fight our war in the Pacific would be lengthened for years, or perhaps even made impossible of winning. So we hold before them bright visions of the role which they are to fill after the war, as the Asiatic partner in a quadrilateral of powers to control the earth. They hear our praise; they see the visions. But they return to one inescapable and decisive question: Will we continue to treat them as human inferiors?

A Threat to Our Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from today's Washington Times-Herald:

A THREAT TO OUR SECURITY?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

A ferocious undercover struggle is going on between the Federal Communications Commission on the one side and the Army and Navy on the other, as to which shall have control over wartime spying and counterspying by radio.

A brief glimpse of the fight was given July 2, at the opening of the investigation into the Federal Communications Commission by a special investigating committee of the House, but that was really nothing, compared to the real thing.

Here is the background: The Federal Communications Commission has set up an elaborate and expensive section called the "Radio Intelligence Division," which undertakes to locate enemy fighting units at sea and abroad; to intercept enemy army, navy, and diplomatic messages; to spot secret broadcasting and receiving stations; to give directional bearings to lost planes; to keep watch on "distress" radio channels on which ships in danger would send out SOS signals; and to check up on military radio circuit users.

The Federal Communications Commission listens in on enemy radio programs of all kinds, translates, reports, and interprets them for our Government's use.

It is, therefore, in a position to know diplomatic, political, and military secrets of enormous importance, and its employees would have to be thoroughly reliable and intelligent for those secrets to be secure.

Well, do they meet these critically important specifications? Consider in answer to that a letter written to President Roosevelt on February 8, 1943, by Secretary of War Stimson and Secretary of the Navy Knox, asking him to take this military radio intelligence work away from the Federal Communications Commission.

Their recommendation was based upon a study of the Federal Communications Commission and its personnel by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.

These are Admiral William D. Leahy, chief of staff to President Roosevelt; Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army; Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval Operations and commander in chief of the fleet; and Gen. Henry H. Arnold, chief of the Army Air Forces.

They add up to a serious-minded and responsible body of men, and if their composite judgment on this matter cannot be trusted, then we had better all throw in our chips and head for the high ground.

Here is what Knox and Stimson told the President the joint chiefs of staff had to say about the Federal Communications Commission and its reliability as a handler of radio intelligence:

"They, as well as the responsible military commanders in the field (that is generals such as MacArthur, Eisenhower, and Kenney, and admirals such as Halsey and Nimitz), are of the belief that radio intelligence, the location of clandestine stations, the supervision of military communications security, and related activity must, in their very nature, be under the sole control of the military forces."

That ought to be an answer to all questions, but the fact is that Mr. Roosevelt has not yet acted on the recommendation above mentioned, though it was laid on his desk 6 months ago, lacking 1 day.

Not only that—an absolute gag has been put upon the Army and Navy.

Officers have been ordered to ignore subpenas for testimony or evidence, served upon them by the House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission. And Federal Communications Commission Chairman Fly has even been so bold as to denounce the congressional investigation as a conspiracy between Wall Street, the radio monopoly, and the military to wipe out the Federal Communications Commission.

Wall Street and the radio monopoly can look out for themselves, but the Army and Navy, being gagged, cannot set the record

straight as to their part in this "conspiracy." Maybe a few facts will.

The Secretary of the Navy ordered to survey of the Federal Communication Commission's intelligence work and the security thereof September 11, 1942. This present Congress was not then even in existence.

On January 19, 1943, the House of Representatives in the new Congress adopted the resolution authorizing this present inquiry into the Federal Communications Commission, and Representative EUGENE COX, of Georgia, was made chairman of the investigating committee.

On February 8, 1943, the Secretaries of War and Navy sent their recommendations and reports to the President asking that radio intelligence be taken from Federal Communications Commission.

The congressional investigating committee didn't even have a staff then—in fact, didn't appoint its counsel and head of investigation until 11 days later.

Some conspiracy!

The evidence put in the record of the Federal Communications Commission investigation so far has been a terrible jolt to the Federal Communications Commission and to Chairman Fly. It calls for refutation not by generalized charges but specific testimony. Why aren't the Army and Navy officers allowed to testify?

If they were ready to repudiate the recommendation of February 8 and to tell why the Federal Communications Commission is to be trusted, surely Chairman Fly would want that as vindication.

And if they have another story to tell, surely the country's interest ranks above protection of Fly and company.

Let's have the facts, for a change, regardless of whose toes are mashed.

The Unimagined America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, because, amid a welter of indifference and timidity, this address, The Unimagined America, delivered by the Librarian of Congress before the University of California on their Charter Day, last March 22, and published in the June issue of the Atlantic Monthly, rises up hard and sharp and challenging as a mountain, I commend it to the earnest attention of this House.

It is, in the best sense, practical and proud and provocative American thinking, as American as the courage and the vision and the labor which created a new world. It is a stirring summons to us, as Americans, to re-create our American future, on our own terms, according to our native resources of imagination and hope and passion and power; to be, in fact, the pioneers of our own world tomorrow, the architects of our own confident and tremendous destiny.

The address by Mr. Archibald MacLeish follows:

1

The proposition can be put as follows: that the American future is in issue in our time as it has been in issue only twice before; that insofar as the determination of the American future depends upon the American people, it depends upon their power to imagine such a future as they want and can believe in; that they have not imagined such a future, but seem rather to be unable or unwilling to consider what they wish their lives to be; that this failure of imagination will affect our victory in this war and may, indeed, lose us our victory.

I think it will not be questioned that the American future is in issue. There are some, I know, who do not wish to think so. There are some who would like to suppress the future for the duration of the war and to forbid the people to discuss it. They are noisy but not numerous. The great majority of the American people understand very well that this war is not a war only, but an end and a beginning—an end to things known and a beginning of things unknown. We have smelled the wind in the streets that changes weather. We know that whatever the world will be when the war ends, the world will be different.

There is hardly a meeting of three men in earnestness that does not say so. The talk about war aims, about peace aims, about post-war plans, is talk, at bottom, about nothing else but this. It is not the formal negotiation of a treaty of peace which concerns us, but the human negotiation of our personal lives: not the determination of the frontiers or the ratification of the international agreements, but the actual and present world that men will live in when the war ends.

It will not be too seriously questioned either, I believe, that the determination of the American future in this time of change depends, insofar as it depends upon ourselves, upon our power to imagine such a future as we can believe in. There is, it is true, a theory that the future of any society depends very little on the purposes of men themselves—that their systems of industry and economics determine what they must become.

That theory has not appealed to Americans. We remember that a hundred and sixty-seven years ago, at another moment of decision in our history, our predecessors did imagine such a future as they could believe in, and that the image they conceived had consequences. We remember also that after another war, a war that many living men took part in, we left the future to the laws of economics to construct. And we recall that future: it is now our past. We recall a future that should have been peace and freedom and became the radio, the automobile, and the depression of 1929.

There may be some who would like to repeat that future with cheap planes in the place of the automobile, and plastics succeeding refrigerators. There may be some, but not many. Most of us have learned the lesson once for all. Most of us know now that you do not fight a war for the privilege of buying things and then not buying them—for the privilege of becoming the world's most numerous consumers and thereafter the world's most numerous unemployed. Most of us know now that if you leave your future to the markets and the manufacturers to plan, you will get the future that the markets and the manufacturers can think of. And we know that future. Planes instead of cars, plastics instead of radios—we know it all. We know it and have lived it, and we don't propose, I think, to live it through again.

Nevertheless, and this is the strange and contradictory heart of our dilemma, nevertheless, we are apparently not willing to propose our future for ourselves. We are unwilling or we are unable to commit the act of the imagination for ourselves—to say for ourselves what we mean our lives to be. We know, if we know anything, that the disaster of 1929 was a failure not of wealth but of will, and not of will so much as of the purpose of the will. Starvation in the midst of plenty is not a paradox. It is a declaration of moral and intellectual bankruptcy. For if the means to cure the ill exist and are not used, the failure is a failure of decision, an inability to choose. And yet, in all our present talk of change, there is no talk of choice, no talk of affirmative purpose—none, to be blunt, of a people's dream of its future, a people's vision of the future it proposes to create.

There is, it is true, a deep, unreasoning conviction in the minds of people here, as in the minds of people elsewhere, that this war, whatever was true of wars before, *must* have consequences—that anything that costs in life and suffering what this war is costing *must* purchase, not merely an end to itself, but something else, something admirable, something of human worth and human significance. It is a profoundly held conviction and one that neither the superior wisdom of wise men nor the cheapening cynicism of cynical men can dispose of. Those indeed who try to silence that conviction, or to laugh it off, or trick it, will end certainly where the cynical and the wise who fool with the terrible sincerity of the people have always ended. The people of the world *believe* that all the anguish of this generation cannot go for nothing. They believe it in spite of the lessons of history. They believe it in spite of the last war and the war before that and the war before that one.

But their belief is the passive belief of powerful hope, not the active belief of determined purpose. All our talk is of the world we should avoid and of the ways we should avoid it—how to police our enemies, how to disarm the aggressors, how to avoid unemployment, how to escape the errors of the peace we made before. At the worst we talk like fortune-tellers of the dangers we foresee. At the best we talk like lawyers of devices—ways and means.

We debate bitterly whether business should do it or government should do it, but what it is that government should do, or that private business should do, we do not even ask. We argue whether to do it by air, and, if so, on what conditions; we consider the question whether to do it at home or to do it abroad, but what we propose to do by the use of the air or at home or wherever, we have not said—what we propose to do in terms of men, of men's lives, of human realities. Never at any point or by any mouth have we talked as a virile and creative people talks in its moments of decision—as men, for example, talked in Philadelphia in a certain summer when they pledged their sacred honor, and their lives.

Our silence on these things, moreover, is not merely silence. We are not all of us mute and dumb. We have words to say. But the words are contemptuous words. We are shamefaced and self-conscious when we hear the talk of purposes—of our purpose as a nation, of our purpose to construct the greatness of this Nation. The word itself and the whole conception of "planning" distress us. We think of ourselves—some of us anyway think of ourselves—as a practical hard-headed people who aren't taken in by utopias, who can't be fooled by the talk about better worlds, who know too much for talk like that—a people famous for salt, ironical, practical, hard good-sense who can't be bamboozled with talk about dreams and visions.

2

It is a strange and curious picture of Americans. If ever a people had behind them a tradition of great purposes, tremendous dreams, the people of America have that tradition. There is not one of us, there is not a child in this Republic, who does not know the story. The whole history of our continent is a history of the imagination. Men imagined land beyond the sea and found it. Men imagined the forests, the great plains, the rivers, the mountains—and found these

plains, these mountains. No force of terror, no pressure of population, drove our ancestors across this continent. They came, as the great explorers crossed the Atlantic, because of the imagination of their minds—because they imagined a better, a more beautiful, a freer, happier world; because they were men not only of courage, not only of strength and hardiness, but of warm and vivid desire; because they desired; because they had the power to desire.

And what was true of the continent was true of the Republic we created. Because our forefathers were able to conceive a freeman's government, they were able to create it. Because those who lived before us in this Nation were able to imagine a new thing, a thing unheard of in the world before, a thing the skeptical and tired men who did not trust in dreams had not been able to imagine, they erected on this continent the first free Nation—the first society in which mankind was to be free at last.

The courage of the Declaration of Independence is a far greater courage than the bravery of those who risked their necks to sign it. The courage of the Declaration of Independence is the courage of the act of the imagination. Jefferson's document is not a call to revolution only. Jefferson's document is an image of a life, a plan of life, a dream—indeed a dream. And yet there were men as careful of their own respect, as hardheaded, as practical, as eager to be thought so, as any now in public life, who signed that Declaration for the world to look at.

The truth is that the tradition of imagination is behind us as behind no people in the history of the world. But our right to live as we imagine men should live is not a right drawn from tradition only. There are nations of the earth in which the act of the imagination would be an act in the imagination only—an action of escape. But not with us.

We have, and we know we have, the abundant means to bring our boldest dreams to pass—to create for ourselves whatever world we have the courage to desire. We have the metal and the men to take this country down, if we please to take it down, and to build it again as we please to build it. We have the tools and the skill and the intelligence to take our cities apart and to put them together, to lead our roads and rivers where we please to lead them, to build our houses where we want our houses, to brighten the air, to clean the wind, to live as men in this Republic—free men—should be living. We have the power and the courage and the resources of good-will and decency and common understanding—a long experience of decency and common understanding—to enable us to live, not in this continent alone but in the world, as citizens in common of the world, with many others.

We have the power and the courage and the resources of experience to create a nation such as men have never seen. And, more than that, we have the moment of creation in our hands. Our forefathers, when they came to the New England valleys or the Appalachian meadows, girdled the trees and dragged the roots into fences and built themselves shelters, and, so roughly sheltered, farmed the land for their necessities. Then, later, when there were means to do it, when there was time, when the occasion offered, they burned the tangled roots and rebuilt their fences and their houses—but rebuilt them with a difference: rebuilt them as villages, as neighborhoods; rebuilt them with those lovely streets, those schools, those churches which still speak of their conception of the world they wanted. When the means offered, when the time offered, men created, on the clearings of the early useful farms, the towns that made New England and the Alleghenies.

Now is the time for the re-creation, the rebuilding, not of the villages and towns but of a nation. Now is the time to consider that the trees are down, that the land has been broken, that the means are available and the continent itself must be rebuilt. Our necessities have been accomplished as men have always accomplished their necessities—with wastefulness, with ugliness, with cruelty, as well as with the food of harvests. Our necessities have been accomplished with the roots of the broken trees along the fences, the rough shelters, the lonely lives. Now is the time to build the continent itself—to take down and to rebuild; and not the houses and the cities only, but the life itself, raising upon the ready land the brotherhood that can employ it and delight in it and use it as a people such as ours should use it.

We stand at the moment of the building of great lives, for the war's end and our victory in the war will throw that moment and the means before us. But to seize the moment and the means we must agree, as men in those New England valleys were agreed, upon the world we mean to bring about. We must agree upon the image of that world.

3

And this precisely is the thing we have not done and seem incapable of doing. Neither in these years of war nor in the years before them; never since America became a land of wealth, a country of abundance, a nation which could bring its dreams to pass; never since the industrialization of the continent and the opening of its vast American resources of men and ore and grain and cloth and cattle—never have we considered as a people what we meant to be, what we desired.

When we speak of our ideal conception of ourselves, we speak still in terms of the agricultural and sparsely settled nation Thomas Jefferson and his contemporaries had in mind. The ideal landscape of America which Jefferson painted hangs unaltered in the American imagination—a clean, small landscape with its isolated figures, its pleasant barns, its self-reliant rooftrees, its horizons clear of the smoke and the fumes of cities, its air still, its frontiers protected by month-wide oceans, year-wide wildernesses. No later hand has touched it, except Lincoln's maybe, deepening the shadow, widening the sky, broadening the acreage of the name of freedom, giving the parts a wholeness that in brighter, sharper light they lacked. For fifty years and longer it has been a landscape of a world that no man living could expect to see except behind him, a landscape no Americans could bring to being, a dream—but of the past, and not the future.

And yet we keep this image in our minds. This, and not the world beyond us, is the world we turn to: the lost, nostalgic image of a world that was the future to a generation dead a hundred years. No other image has been made to take its place. No one has dreamed a new American dream of the new America—the industrial nation of the huge machines, the limitless earth, the vast and skillful population, the mountains of copper and iron, the mile-long plants, the delicate laboratories, the tremendous dams. No one has imagined this America—what its life should be; what life it should lead with its great wealth and the tools in its hands and the men to employ them.

The plants and the factories and their products have been celebrated often enough—perhaps too often. The statistics have been added up. The camera has held its mirror to the great machines. But the central question we have never asked. What are they *for*, these plants and products, the statistics? *What are they for in terms of a nation of men*—in Jefferson's terms? What is the ideal landscape of this new America? What are we trying to become, to bring about? What is our dream of ourselves as a great people? What would we be if we could: what would our lives be? And how will we use this skill, this wealth, this power to create those lives?

What is demanded of us in this time of change, what our whole history and our present need demand of us, is that we find the answers to these questions—that we consider what we wish this new America to be. For what we wish to be we can become.

And if we cannot wish—we shall become that also.

4

There are men, it is true, who believe there are no answers. There are men, and among the wisest of our time, who do not believe that an image of this new America can be conceived—who do not believe in a world of plenty; do not believe in it with their hearts whatever their senses tell them; do not believe that the lives of men can be good lives in the industrialized society which alone makes plenty possible.

Judge Learned Hand spoke not for Mr. Justice Brandeis alone, but for many others, when he summarized the Justice's position as resting on the strong belief that "most of our positive ills have directly resulted from great size. With it has indeed come the magic of modern communication and quick transport; but out of these has come the sinister apparatus of mass suggestion and mass production. . . . The herd is regaining its ancient and evil primacy. . . . These many inventions are a step backward . . . our security has actually diminished as our demands have become more exacting; our comforts we purchase at the cost of a softer fiber, a feebler will, and an infantile suggestibility."

And in the concluding sentences of his noble tribute to the great justice, Judge Hand used words which many of the best of his contemporaries would speak after him without the alteration of a syllable: "You may build your Towers of Babel to the clouds; you may contrive ingeniously to circumvent Nature by devices beyond even the understanding of all but a handful; you may provide endless distractions to escape the tedium of your barren lives; you may rummage the whole planet for your ease and comfort. It shall avail you nothing; the more you struggle the more deeply you will be enmeshed."

They are eloquent words and noble words. They respond to a strong strain in the American character. But are they necessarily and inevitably true? Is it inevitable that men who contrive ingeniously to circumvent Nature should live tedious and barren lives and fall into the fatness of the spirit we, as well as Justice Brandeis, have seen and hated? Is it inconceivable that men should achieve a life with the machines as disciplined and honorable and as free as the life that Jefferson believed they could achieve with mules and oxen? Is it certain that the human spirit can survive and flourish only in a world where need and hardship drive with stinging whips?

Is the fault with the machines or with ourselves? Is it because we have automobiles to ride in, because we can purchase certain commodities easily, because our presses can turn out tons of printed paper in a day, that our fiber is soft, our will feeble, our suggestibility infantile? Or is it because we do not use these things as we should use them—because we have not made them serve our moral purpose as a people, but only contribute to our private comfort as their owners?

Is the whole question indeed not a question of ourselves instead of our devices? Is

it not for us to *say* how these devices, these inventions, should be used? Does their use not rest upon the purpose of their use? And does the purpose not depend upon our power to conceive the purpose—our power as a people to conceive the purpose of the tools we use; our power as a people to conceive and to imagine?

A hundred and fifty years ago de Crèvecoeur asked a famous question which has echoes now: "What then is the American, this new man?" But what then is he? What then is he now? A man incapable of the act of the imagination or a man to whom it is native and natural? A man to dare the dream of plenty with all its risks and dangers, or a man to hold to the old nostalgic landscape with the simple virtues safely forced upon him by the necessary self-denial?

A man who has the courage—or the foolishness perhaps—to think a nation may have physical abundance and still retain, or still not lose, its soul? Or a man to accept the shamefaced verdict of the twenty years just past and return to the discipline of want and hunger?

A man who has the hardihood or the courage to believe that the machines which have enslaved his fathers will make his children free—free as no human beings in the world have yet known freedom; free of the twisting miseries and hungers; free to become themselves? Or a man to reject the hope of that enfranchised freedom and to seek his independence in the ancient narrow circle of his old dependence on himself?

Which of these two men is the American? We should have said awhile ago we knew. We should have said the American character was self-evident: A restless man. A great builder and maker and shaper, a man delighting in size and height and dimensions: the world's tallest; the town's biggest. A man never satisfied—never—with anything: his house or the town where his grandfather settled or his father's profession or even his own, for that matter. An inveterate voyager and changer and finder. A man naturally hopeful; a believing man, believing that things progress, that things get forwarder. A skillful man with contraptions of one kind and another—machines, engines, various devices: familiar with all of them. A man of certain unquestioned convictions—of a strong, natural attachment to certain ideas and to certain ideals. But first of all and foremost of all a restless man and a believing man, a builder and changer of things and of nations.

We should have said, a generation back, there was no possible doubt or question of the will and power of this nation to propose the kind of future for itself which would employ the means of plenty for a human purpose. We should have said the principal characteristic of the American people was a confidence in the future and themselves—confidence that the future was the thing they'd make it. I cannot think, for myself, we have so changed that we do not believe this now. I cannot believe we are so changed that we'll let ourselves go with the drag and the current of history—that we'll let the future happen to us as the future happens to chips on a river or sheep in a blizzard; that we'll let the peace make us: not us the peace. I cannot believe we have so changed that we do not believe in ourselves and the future.

And yet we have not done what must be done if we believe the future is the thing we'll make it. We have not named that future.

And the time is short.

It is many years since Matthew Arnold saw his generation standing between two worlds, one dead, the other waiting to be born. Our time is still the time between these worlds; and the wars we suffer, the disasters, the uneasiness, are natural to the time we live in like the continuing and violent storms that drive the days between the seasons. We shall not have peace in truth, peace for our lives, peace for the purposes of our lives, until the world we wait for has been born. But it will not be born until we recognize it, until we shape it with our expectation and our hope. The new worlds do not bring themselves to being. Men's minds, when they are ready for them, find them. The labor and the longing must be ours.

They must be ours as men and also—and this is the truth our generation in this country must accept—as Americans. For the future is America's to make. It is not our future, as a few Americans have asked us to believe, to master or exploit. It is not an American future for some vast imperial enterprise, some huge dominion of the earth or sky. And yet it is our future. It is ours to shape. It is ours to shape, not because we have many planes or great numbers of ships or rich industrial resources but for a different reason: because we have the power as a people to conceive so great a future as mankind must now conceive—because we have behind us a tradition of imagination in the people.

But because we have the power we have also a responsibility to use the power. While there still is time.

The Negro Lawyer and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 3, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, Frank R. Beckwith, an attorney of Indianapolis and a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, delivered a radio address at Indianapolis on March 18 which was timely and full of sound patriotism, and which I think is worthy of general perusal. The House of Representatives has unanimously approved my request for its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Beckwith is chairman of the Committee on Legislative and Civic Affairs of the Federation of Associated Clubs, Inc., of Indianapolis, of which Mr. Starling W. James is president. The address of Mr. Beckwith was the feature of the "home front" program sponsored by the Committee on Public Information Service of the American Bar Association.

Mr. Beckwith spoke as follows:

THE NEGRO LAWYER AND THE WAR

In the course of events leading up to the birth of our Republic, one distinguished American lawyer uttered these words, "I know not what course others may take, but, as for me, give me liberty or give me death." That same distinguished lawyer and statesman also said, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." If we should undertake to reduce, to merely a few simple expressions, the principles constituting the fundamental precepts upon which our entire national structure rests, I am of the opinion that we could find no words anywhere in the archives of our country's history which would stand out so singularly as those two utterances. At this very hour the entire civilized world is embroiled in a violent struggle between the forces of liberty and the forces of oppression. The greatest factor among those seeking to maintain the cause of liberty is the fact that on the side of liberty are to be found the entire physical, mental, and military resources of the United States of America. The essence of the real might of our Nation lies not alone in our financial power, nor our so-called aristocracy of brains, nor our natural resources, because, underlying every phase of our strength is the fact that we are a liberty-loving Nation—a people who have made liberty the watchword of our entire national structure.

Our enemy within the gates would have some of our irrational citizens to believe that because they have not yet reached the point that they experience and enjoy certain advantages of a financial or social nature enjoyed by others of our fellow Americans, that they have nothing to fight for, nothing to sacrifice for. In fact, Axis propaganda agents, either those definitely commissioned as such or those inadvertently lulled into becoming such, have advocated, among various minority groups, who, perhaps, are subject to some degree of exploitation, that they have nothing at stake in the great conflict which is now raging and that it is merely a battle between the economic powers of the world. At a glance, such idle talk sounds alluring to some of our complacent fellow citizens, but, the Negro lawyer has had the courage and the foresight to say to such propagandists and to their victims as well, that regardless of the things that they do or do not enjoy the humblest among our fellow citizens can proudly view his accomplishments.

He can proudly appraise his possibilities and his accomplishments.

He can proudly appraise his possibilities and his potential success, and in the language of one song writer he can conclude, and rightly so, "This is worth fighting for." Throughout the recent era of depression in our country, some propaganda schemes found fertile soil in the minds of some of our persons who were unemployed and who were otherwise depressed, and consequently, it became necessary for those among them who did have a clear conception to put those people straight and to instill into their hearts a ray of hope in the future of our great country. That situation was a challenge to the lawyers of our country, the traditional leaders of thought and opinion in the community, and the American Negro lawyers, numbering approximately 1,000, carried a substantial share of that responsibility.

The formula for the dispensation of liberty is the Constitution of the United States. The lawyers, who avail our citizens of their rights under that Constitution, might well be considered, for the sake of discussion, the guardians of liberty. The due process clause of our Constitution, alone, is sufficient to warrant the undivided, unhyphenated loyalty and support of every American. Under that clause which provides, as it does, "that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall deprive any citizen of life, liberty, or property without due process of law," every American whether he be rich or poor, high or low, is placed upon an equal footing with every other American. In fact, that portion of the Constitution might well be called the common denominator of all Americans. Just the same as it protects the person of much means from confiscatory legislation and practices which would amount to confiscation, it also enables countless thousands of unfortunate, humble citizens to preserve for themselves and for their families the blessings of human liberty. It entitles them to their day in court, thus bringing to them the benefit of every scintilla of constitutional protection. Hence, the lawyer who earnestly and faithfully represents his client in small matters, be they of either a civil or a criminal nature, is actually the guardian of liberty in the truest sense. It is the masses of the people in

our great country, who carry, directly or indirectly, the burden of taxation, which, without representation, would be tyranny, and it is those same masses who carry the burden of selecting those duly chosen representatives who stand between the taxpayers and probable tyranny. It is those same masses who frequently find themselves in the courts of justice where small matters are litigated, more precious to those individuals of the common herd than are the matters involving thousands, yes, even millions of dollars, to those who are involved in matters of greater intrinsic value.

The clientele of the Negro lawyer numbers among its fold a high per capita number of the relatively obscure individuals of the masses who have minor matters in the courts, but matters which are precious and dear to them—matters pertaining to their personal liberty without which ours could not be a great country. Without constitutional government and a definition of liberty, such as we know it, ours, doubtless, would be a country where concentration camps, kangaroo courts, prisons without rules, and other institutions of the Dark Ages of the past and of the dark areas of the present, in dictator-ridden lands, would be the order of the day. I have seen some of the humblest, some of the most illiterate citizens living in our country ask, in substance, the question and seek the answer, "Is not this thing or that thing which has been proposed against me a violation of my constitutional rights?" Consequently, the Negro lawyer, notwithstanding the frequent inadequacy of compensation for his time and his efforts, continues to devote them, day after day, without any feeling of discontent or any expression of dissatisfaction. This he does because he knows first of all that in doing so he is safeguarding the rights and liberties of those who come to him for protection and redress and he knows also that in so doing he is underwriting the perpetuity of a great country—a country founded upon and interwoven with that fundamental idea of liberty and all the blessings which it bestows upon humankind. The task of the Negro lawyer is a tact-requiring one. His is the task of presenting in the courts and elsewhere, without antagonistic overemphasis, however, the unsolved problems of a weak, yet loyal, minority.

When the lights of liberty go on again all over the world, yes, that light called Greece, that light called France, and similar ones, which we have seen flickered into extinguishment by the oppressors and the aggressors, it will be only because one of the other lights of liberty, the greatest of all of them, has continued to shine through the ages. That light of liberty which shines between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and which is called the United States of America, must ever shine illuminating the pathway of liberty for all liberty-loving and liberty-longing peoples throughout the world.

U. S. S. "Helena"

REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers today carry the story of the sinking of the American light cruiser *Helena* in the battle of Kula Gulf.

I recall the old *Helena*, a gunboat, on which I served on the Yangtze patrol over 20 years ago. It did its job in Chinese waters well. The U. S. S. *Helena*, its modern successor, which was sunk yesterday, did its job splendidly and courageously.

The battle of Kula Gulf was a magnificent and striking victory and one very much in line with the precepts of Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., who presides over the south Pacific Fleet Command, "Bull" Halsey, as he is known to officers and men alike, has one doctrine.

It is: "Blast the hell out of them."

In line with Admiral Halsey's motto I am happy to inform the Congress that the State of Montana is going to blast hell out of the Japanese with bonds to replace the *Helena* just as the American Navy in the Pacific is going to do likewise with bombs.

The 9,700-ton cruiser *Helena*, which was sunk in the battle of Kula Gulf in the Central Solomon Islands early yesterday, was one of the ships which the Japanese damaged at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Subsequently she was repaired and returned to sea service and reportedly had an active career in the Pacific, although details of her accomplishments have not been made public.

The light cruiser named for the city of Helena, Mont., was commissioned at the New York Navy Yard September 18, 1939. She was equipped to carry four aircraft and her armament included fifteen 6-inch guns and eight 5-inch antiaircraft guns.

The skipper, Capt. Charles Purcell Cecil, of Louisville, Ky., was a veteran of naval service. He was graduated from the Naval Academy in 1916 and saw escort duty during the World War.

Before the present conflict started, he was serving as executive officer of the naval training station at Great Lakes, Ill., but was detached from that duty in June 1941, to take command of a destroyer division at Honolulu. In March 1942 he was given command of a destroyer squadron.

Captain Cecil won the Navy Cross for heroism as leader of a destroyer group assigned to a task force during the battle of the Santa Cruz Islands last October.

He maneuvered his ships into a defensive screen around an American carrier and his brilliant tactics and performance of duty were credited with inflicting heavy losses on the enemy and protecting American vessels.

Captain Cecil assumed command of the *Helena* in November 1942.

Encouragement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following column, by Raymond Clapper, brings basic encouragement as to the success of our production and delivery lines in actually getting equipment to the fighting forces. Almost every person in this whole Nation has made some contribution to this accomplishment. The one note of warning that should be struck is that the job is far from done, the war far from won, and there can be no slackening of our efforts.

DELIVERING THE GOODS

(By Raymond Clapper)

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS, NORTH AFRICA, July 3 (by wireless).—Not so long ago I used to wonder where all the planes, ships, tanks, and men that we talked about in such gigantic numbers actually were. Now I am at the other end of the line, or rather at the end of several lines, and the results of America's production program are bountifully evident.

Flying across north Africa, I have landed at or passed over numerous air fields, all servicing planes in enormous numbers. From the air some of these fields looked as if flocks of enormous birds were roosting on them. Here we are 4,000 miles from the American shipping ports, yet material and men for the invasion of the continent of Europe are flowing regularly and smoothly into the concentration ports of north Africa as well as those of Britain. In Britain I saw acres of supplies in huge depots serviced by specially constructed depot railroads. In north Africa, from the west coast across more than 1,000 miles of coastline, are more such depots. Harbors are busy with shipping, which is now freely using the Mediterranean.

What I have seen both in England and here proves to me beyond question that the submarine, if not licked, is in no serious degree hindering the shipping of supplies to concentration points around the perimeter of Axis Europe.

Figures on sinkings of material bound for north Africa are unbelievably low. Allied ships loaded with supplies are now seen far inside the Mediterranean in large numbers. For the time being the submarines have ceased to be a serious problem.

These facts indicate a spectacular change in the Allied war position since I went across Africa a year ago. That trip had to be made through central Africa, because the Axis had the north. We were trying to send urgent supplies by air because the shipping route was so slow. The central African route was then an important artery, but now in a year's time it has become secondary. The Allied line has moved a thousand miles north to the coast and the Mediterranean.

A year ago production figures were in the thousands, yet MacArthur in the Pacific and Stilwell in India talked in hundreds, and that was sometimes exaggeration. As far away as China I heard pitiful stories. Perhaps it has taken a long time for the flow of material to "fill up the pipe" so that the equipment coming out at the end bears some proportion to the amount rolled off the production lines.

Whatever our shortcomings in management on the home front, American production of material and movement of it and of enormous number of troops over long and dangerous supply lines is clearly a historical achievement unapproached in the last war, and probably far beyond anything Hitler ever calculated as possible.

Success in modern war depends 90 percent on organization of a superior mass of material and men beforehand. The Tunisia campaign was delayed many months. But after a sufficient force had been assembled to achieve dominance, the actual campaign was over quickly in a joint victory for our forces in the field and the factories at home.

Warning From the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present for the RECORD a quotation from Aristotle which might be of interest at this time:

"The insolence of demagogs is generally the cause of ruin in democracies. First, they calumniate the wealthy, and rouse them against the government, thus causing opposite parties to unite against a common danger. Next, they produce the same result by stirring up the populace and creating a sense of insecurity. Nearly all the tyrants of old began with being demagogs. In well-balanced commonwealths, besides strict observance of established laws, it is especially necessary to keep close watch upon little matters. For a great change in the laws may creep on gradually, just as a small expense often incurred ruins a large fortune. Next let men be on their guard against those who flatter and mislead the multitude; their actions prove what sort of men they are. Of the tyrant, spies and informers are the principal instruments War is his favorite occupation, for the sake of engrossing the attention of the people, and making himself necessary to them as their leader. An unbridled democracy is exactly similar to a tyranny. Its objects and instruments are the worst, and both are equally served by the tamest of mankind. It is always anxious to lord it as a sovereign; it therefore has its flatterers in the shape of demagogs. Ancient customs must be done away with, ancient ties, civil and sacred, must be broken; everything must be changed according to new and false theories; and the result is an assimilation of democratic to tyrannical government, in its habits and modes of action."—Aristotle.

Contributions of Organized Labor to the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ROWAN Mr. Speaker, terrific tirades have been directed against organized labor recently throughout the land because of the act of one man who is affiliated with neither of the two dominant labor federations of the United States. In some instances the patriotism of organized labor has been impugned by its critics and very little stress has been placed upon the magnificent contribution that the union men of this Nation have made to the all-out war effort before and since Pearl Harbor. In a common analysis of the situation it is doubtful if any other single group, outside the actual fighting forces of the United States, has made a contribution that will parallel that of the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Some reference has been made to the record-breaking production of materials of war and the fact that our output of airplanes this year would approximate 75,000, with a greatly stepped-up production for 1944. The manner in which the American workman has turned out all the equipment and all of the ammunition, guns, tanks, planes, and ships has astounded the world and has bewildered our enemies.

This, however, is but one portion of the efforts of labor. Have you ever stopped to consider the enormous purchase of War bonds by the men who are making the guns, and weapons, and the vehicles that our soldiers and our allies are using so effectively to turn the tide of this titanic struggle? Labor has given gladly of the most precious things in its possession. The sons, brothers, fathers, and husbands of the union workers have gone into the armed forces by the tens of thousands. In addition, the wage earners have gone to the very limit of their financial resources to purchase bonds. Labor has not been found wanting, and without the patriotic service of organized labor America, our country, and our allies would not be so far advanced on the road to victory as at the present time. Long before Pearl Harbor organized labor recognized its obligation and responded with alacrity. After Pearl Harbor, however, their efforts were redoubled. Before Pearl Harbor the union workers bought Defense bonds; today they are buying War bonds, and they are willing to set their record against any other group in the country or in the world.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., who, incidentally, has the reputation of being one of the Cabinet members most friendly to labor, called in the councils and insisted that labor be given every opportunity to participate in every War-bond drive held throughout the country. Secretary Morgenthau talked with President Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and President Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Both Mr. Green and Mr. Murray readily responded and offered not only their personal help but the help of the entire membership of both organizations, totaling over 13,000,000 people. President Green, in addition, turned over to the Treasury Department the entire organization staff of the American Federation of Labor, consisting of approximately 1,300 men and women, gratis, in addition to establishing four district offices in conjunction with the Treasury Department so that every organization, regardless of size, would be able to participate in this most worthy cause. Mr. Green further pledged the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated organizations to buy one billion in War bonds and it is needless to say the A. F. of L. went over the top in 1942, and they have again pledged themselves to purchase a minimum of $1,000,000,000 in War bonds for 1943.

Secretary Morgenthau called in Mr. Gilbert E. Hyatt, known to practically every union man from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Dominion to the Gulf by virtue of his long affiliation with the American Federation of Labor. Few, if any, men in the labor field have as many personal and intimate friends as Mr. Hyatt, who today is Chief of the Labor Section of the War Savings Staff. If memory serves correctly, Mr. Hyatt was a member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen for 40 years, and also served in various capacities—among them that of president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks—so no better choice could have been made.

Immediately after assuming his office, that of dealing with organized labor entirely, Mr. Hyatt wrote Mr. James C. Orr, secretary-treasurer of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America. Mr. Orr responded at once and offered all the facilities of his organization and all the resources that the international and local unions could provide. The ultimate result is that the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union of North America, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, has purchased up to date in bonds and stamps $3,464,879. In addition, the organization is buying in excess of $125,000 each month or an average of $1,500,000 each year.

Mr. Hyatt next wrote Mr. Louis Krouse, general secretary of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Machine Operators. Mr. Krouse is one of the most widely known and highly esteemed music leaders, which is attested to by the fact that he has been elected and reelected to his position many times. Through his efforts this organization, with less than 50,000 members, has purchased to date $1,213,600 in bonds. In the percentage of aggregate pay-roll deductions they are No. 1. They are No. 1 in the average monthly salary, also in the average deductions of employee participation. This is cited to show how readily labor in all walks of life has responded. The Chicago Motion Picture Operators, Local 110, of this union, bought $80,000 worth of bonds through their own treasury. The New York Motion Picture Operators, Local 306, bought $50.000; the Philadelphia Motion Picture Operators, Local 307, bought $40,000; the Los Angeles Motion Picture Operators, Local 150, bought $42,500. This is, without question, one of the smallest organizations in the A. F. of L., and practically all of its members are today participating in the pay-roll deduction plan.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Warehouse Helpers of America is a shining example of labor's participation in financing the war. You have heard this organization roundly condemned on the floor of this House and elsewhere. What is the actual record of the Teamsters' International Union? This union, as an international union, through its president,

Dan Tobin, has purchased over $25,000,000 worth of bonds in addition to building and paying for recreation centers, and furnishing and maintaining them. Take, for instance, the recreation center located at Fort Lawton in the State of Washington. This organization, located there, in addition to buying bonds, jeeps, and iron lungs, is sending to the soldiers in Alaska and the Aleutians 200,000 packages of Raleigh cigarettes each month. Most of us have read in the newspapers just recently that over 4,000 members of the milk wagon drivers located in New York City donated a pint of blood each. Two thousand members of the joint council in and around Los Angeles, in turn, were blood donors. In my own city of Chicago they have erected a Victory Plaza at the entrance to the city hall to be known as the war memorial to the more than 6,500 members of the teamsters' union of Chicago who are now serving in the armed forces as another forceful gesture of labor to create further war consciousness and further the sale of War bonds and stamps. This project will attract the attention of millions of Chicagoans as well as the tens of thousands of visitors to the city because of its location. Every Chicagoan is proud of the fact that over 80,000 Chicagoans, who are members of the teamsters' union, have purchased to date over $10,000,000 worth of War bonds through pay-roll savings and through their local union treasuries.

The Air Line Pilot Association, of which Mr. David L. Behncke is president, has purchased $150,000 worth of bonds. This union has very few members, but in spite of that fact has cooperated magnificently. The Union Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Allied Workers, whose general secretary-treasurer is Tony Gallo, has purchased $189,274 in bonds. And now, closer to Washington, is the city of Baltimore, Md. The Central Labor Union, affiliated with the A. F. of L., pledged and purchased $156,225 worth of War bonds. Here are a few of many locals that participated:

Steamfitters Local 438	$25,000
Plumbers Local 48	20,000
Painters District Council	20,000

Then there is that stanch union leader, Mr. C. W. Sickles, secretary-treasurer of the Asbestos Workers International Union, which is a comparatively small union in the American Federation of Labor. On November 28, 1942, the Building and Construction Trades Council of Buffalo sponsored a Victory dance, floor show, and bond sale for the purpose of obtaining sufficient funds to purchase and donate to the Government a bombing plane. Mr. Jack Farrell, business agent of Local 4 of the asbestos workers, in a letter to Mr. Sickles advised that over $700,000 in War bonds and stamps were sold in that one night in the city of Buffalo, over $40,000 of which were purchased by asbestos workers and their friends.

Mr. Edward J. Volz, president of the International Photo Engravers Union, with 90 locals scattered throughout the United States and a membership of 10,834, sends word that his organization has purchased $369,240 worth of bonds and, let me call this to the particular attention of the House, individual members of 25 locals purchased $750,000 worth of bonds.

Has anyone any criticism to offer on this?

And now, just one more of the many accomplishments of organized labor in this connection, in my own home State. In 1942 Mr. Patrick F. Sullivan was appointed a vice chairman of a committee organized for the purpose of stimulating the sale of War bonds and stamps, and was in charge of all building tradesmen in the State of Illinois. In a local drive in Cook County approximately 125,000 members of the construction industry purchased $30,000,000 in bonds. Mr. George Meyers, a member of Mr. Sullivan's committee, and a representative of the glaziers union of Chicago, conceived the idea of raising funds for the purchase of a bomber plane to be presented to the Army Air Corps. Mr. Thomas Murray, also a member of Mr. Sullivan's committee, and a representative of the electrical workers union, cooperating with the Treasury Department, the Union Station Co. of Chicago, and the Society of Typographic Arts and the Chicago Building Trades Council, arranged to finance and construct a gigantic war exhibit now on display in the Union Station in Chicago. This project was erected at a cost of over $25,000 and was a gift from the Building Trades Council. At the dedication ceremonies of the Union Station project, Mr. Meyers presented General Krogstadt, representing President Roosevelt, with a check for $100,000 toward the purchase of a bomber plane on behalf of all members of the American Federation of Labor of the State of Illinois.

On November 1, at the Municipal Airport in Chicago, the bomber plane was christened and presented to General Krogstadt of the Army Air Corps.

In the second war loan drive $1,250,000 in War bonds were sold to the treasuries of the local unions through the medium of approximately 200,000 letters to the union membership. At a business agents' luncheon by the Chicago Building Trades Council, admission was by presentation of War bonds and $106,000 of bonds were purchased by 117 business agents. In this connection it might be well to remind you that the quota for the metropolitan area in Chicago was oversubscribed by approximately 50 percent in the Second War Loan drive.

Time does not permit one to go into detail on the virtues of all of the organizations that are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. There are 102 national and international unions, 762 city central unions and local trade and Federal unions numbering 1,540. There are over 36,000 local unions affiliated with these today. You can see how utterly useless it would be to attempt to enumerate all of them. However, the Nation can rest assured that organized labor stands ready and willing to do its share at any time to help win this war. The records definitely show what it has done. When you stop and consider that the labor staff of the Treasury Department is composed of only 4 field men, certainly this is a most remarkable showing and think what could be done if more direct contact were to be made with the 36,000 locals.

The figures cited herein relate only to the organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. A similar compilation is being prepared covering Congress of Industrial Organizations affiliates and should be ready within the next few weeks.

It is indeed a privilege to pay tribute to the patriotism of organized labor in this crucial period in our history and in world civilization.

Labor will do its full share in this emergency and is, indeed, proud of its contribution to the fighting forces on land, on sea, and in the air, and will help set the pace for others to follow on the road to victory and to peace.

FEBRUARY 13, 1943.

Mr. C. W. SICKLES,
Secretary-Treasurer, International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BROTHER SICKLES: Our mutual guide, philosopher, and friend, James F. Barrett, in charge of the southern office of the Labor Section, War Savings Staff, has stolen one right from under our noses. This consists of extracts from the January issue of the Asbestos Worker, giving in detail the amount of bonds purchased by your different locals.

As Brother Barrett points out, you are one of the smallest of the unions in the American Federation of Labor and therefore this information has been received with gratification.

With such enthusiasm it goes without saying that your members are, in addition to the amount purchased from the treasuries of local unions, undoubtedly participating in pay-roll savings plans in the various institutions by which they are employed. Experience has demonstrated that in unionized establishments pay-roll savings plans do not reach success without the sponsorship and continued support of the union.

Should any information be available as to the number of these locals which have achieved not less than 90 percent of participation in pay-roll savings plans with an average investment of not less than 10 percent of income, we should be glad to receive it. In the meantime accept the congratulations of the War Savings Staff for the good work already performed.

Sincerely and fraternally,

GILBERT E. HYATT,
Chief, Labor Section, War Savings Staff.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta, Ga., January 26, 1943.

Mr. GILBERT E. HYATT,
Chief, Labor Section, War Savings Staff, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GIL: Here is a great story of the asbestos workers, which is one of our smallest international unions.

Thought perhaps you might be able to use this to good advantage.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES F. BARRETT,
Staff Assistant, War Savings Staff.

War bonds purchased by international and affiliated local unions of the asbestos workers, January 1943

International Association	$20,000
Southwest States Conference	1,000
Local No.—	
1, St. Louis, Mo	10,000
2, Pittsburgh, Pa	5,000
3, Cleveland, Ohio	2,500
4, Buffalo, N. Y	200
5, Los Angeles, Calif	1,500
6, Boston, Mass. (purchasing $100 monthly for duration)	2,600
7, Seattle, Wash	2,000
8, Cincinnati, Ohio	500
9, Norfolk, Va	500
11, Baltimore, Md	7,800
13, Jacksonville, Fla	1,000
14, Philadelphia, Pa	4,000
15, Wichita, Kans	400
16, San Francisco, Calif	2,000
17, Chicago, Ill	12,500
18, Indianapolis, Ind	1,000
19, Milwaukee, Wis	1,500
21, Dallas, Tex	12,000
22, Houston, Tex	10,500
24, Washington, D. C. (purchasing $200 monthly for duration)	2,000
25, Detroit, Mich	2,500
26, Rochester, N. Y	2,100
27, Kansas City, Mo	1,500
28, Denver, Colo	500
30, Syracuse, N. Y	100
31, Providence, R. I	1,000
32, Essex and Hudson Counties, N J	1,400
33, Connecticut	500
34, Minneapolis, Minn	1,500
35, Youngstown, Ohio	750
36, Portland, Oreg	2,000
37 Evansville, Ind	1,000
39, Omaha, Nebr	300
41, Fort Wayne, Ind	125
43, Springfield, Mass	800
44, Columbus, Ohio	500
45, Toledo, Ohio	500
46, Knoxville, Tenn	150
47, Grand Rapids, Mich	1,500
48, Atlanta, Ga	400
49, Duluth, Minn	300
50, Tacoma, Wash	2,500
51, Louisville, Ky	3,000
53, New Orleans, La	4,000
55, Mobile, Ala	4,000
56, Wood River, Ill	1,000
57, Sioux City, Iowa	200
60, Miami, Fla	150
61, Charlotte, N. C	225
63, Springfield, Mo	700
64, Tulsa, Okla	3,000
65, York, Pa	100
69, Salt Lake City, Utah	200
70, Vallejo, Calif	700
72, Greensboro, N. C	400
73, Phoenix, Ariz	500
74, Des Moines, Iowa	500
75, South Bend, Ind	1,000
76, Albuquerque, N. Mex	75
80, Charleston, W. Va	600
81, Cedar Rapids, Iowa	1,500
84, Akron, Ohio	500
86, Nashville, Tenn	3,000
87, San Antonio, Tex	1,100
88, Richmond, Va	1,500
89, Trenton, N. J	150
90, Memphis, Tenn	1,000
91, White Plains, N. Y	100
92, Columbia, S. C	100
94, Oklahoma City, Okla	1,600
98, South Portland, Maine	200
6-B, Boston, Mass. (purchasing $50 bond monthly for duration)	600
14-B, Philadelphia, Pa	600
19-B, Milwaukee, Wis	400
27-B, Kansas City, Mo	700

War Finance Committee, District of Columbia, sales to labor organizations, to Apr. 29, 1943

United Shoe Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations	$20,000
United Mine Workers	600,000
International Association of Machinists	800,000
American Federation of Labor	100,000
Bricklayers International	200,000
United Association of Plumbers	100,000
Hod Carriers, Building and Common Laborers	600,000
Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	200,000
Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Benefit Association	700,000
Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Standard Life	250,000
Carpenters District Council	35,000
Pattern Makers League	20,000
American Federation of Government Employees	10,000
National Federation of Post Office Clerks	2,000
Sheet Metal Workers International	202,500
Labor Cooperative and Educational Society	$50,000
International Association, Heat, Frost and Asbestos Workers	3,500
National Federation of Federal Employees	2,000
Plasterers Local No. 96	15,000
Meat Cutters Local No. 393	2,000
Bakery Workers Local No. 33	6,800
Operating Engineers Local No. 77	30,000
Steamfitters Local No. 602	10,000
Meat Cutters Local No. 555	5,800
Truck Drivers Local No. 639	20,000
Building Laborers Local No. 74	50,000
Motion Picture Operators Local No. 224	4,000
Machinists District No. 44	5,000
Plasterers, Painters Local No. 1	1,000
Roofers Local No. 90	1,000
Brewery Workers Local No. 48	2,500
Ice Cream Drivers Local No. 11	740
Bricklayers Local No. 1	10,000
Plumbers Local No. 5	15,000
Total	4,073,840

Adoption of pay-roll savings plan recommended

Industry	Number of employees	Percentage of employees participating	Percentage of aggregate pay roll deducted	Average monthly salary	Average deduction per employee participating	Percentage of pay of participating employees deducted
Motion pictures, theaters, and amusements	50,413 (32)	73.1 (23)	8.2 (1)	$287.88 (1)	$32.34 (1)	11.2 (1)
Shipbuilding	700,482 (6)	76.4 (18)	7.7 (4)	251.00 (2)	25.38 (2)	10.1 (2)
Automotive manufacturing	872,012 (3)	89.9 (3)	8.1 (2)	230.67 (3)	20.76 (4)	9.0 (4)
Construction and building material	363,012 (13)	72.6 (24)	7.2 (5)	224.15 (4)	22.13 (3)	9.9 (3)
Aviation manufacturing	736,702 (4)	78.5 (14)	7.0 (6)	217.88 (5)	19.54 (5)	9.0 (4)
Machinery, tools, and plant equipment	519,809 (9)	78.7 (13)	6.7 (9)	215.80 (6)	18.35 (7)	8.5 (6)
Electrical equipment	550,754 (7)	86.5 (5)	7.8 (3)	212.15 (7)	19.19 (6)	9.0 (4)
Petroleum	325,125 (16)	77.5 (16)	6.1 (12)	211.51 (8)	16.63 (10)	7.9 (9)
Railway equipment	143,612 (23)	83.4 (9)	6.8 (8)	209.88 (9)	17.24 (9)	8.2 (7)
Steel and iron	964,647 (2)	82.5 (11)	6.4 (10)	204.16 (10)	15.89 (13)	7.8 (10)
Agricultural implements	100,952 (28)	96.2 (1)	8.2 (1)	202.76 (11)	17.33 (8)	8.6 (5)
Publishing	79,619 (29)	62.1 (29)	4.4 (20)	200.01 (12)	14.18 (17)	7.1 (13)
Chemicals	465,895 (11)	84.4 (8)	6.9 (7)	197.15 (13)	16.19 (11)	8.2 (7)
Nonferrous metals mining and process	240,421 (18)	70.8 (25)	5.4 (15)	196.98 (14)	15.02 (15)	7.6 (11)
Household appliances	65,567 (30)	76.1 (19)	5.9 (14)	195.79 (15)	15.31 (14)	7.8 (10)
Railroads	1,409,354 (1)	75.8 (20)	3.7 (22)	194.28 (16)	9.45 (27)	4.9 (21)
Metal products, miscellaneous	516,178 (10)	82.3 (12)	7.0 (6)	188.86 (17)	16.15 (12)	8.6 (5)
Public utilities	360,743 (14)	77.5 (16)	4.1 (21)	186.06 (18)	9.89 (26)	5.3 (20)
Banking and finance	102,588 (27)	84.9 (7)	4.1 (21)	183.87 (19)	9.02 (29)	4.9 (21)
Insurance	146,452 (21)	82.7 (10)	4.7 (19)	181.99 (20)	10.34 (25)	5.7 (19)
Rubber products	217,719 (17)	88.7 (4)	7.2 (5)	181.02 (21)	14.65 (16)	8.1 (8)
Paper and pulp	143,869 (22)	77.1 (17)	5.4 (15)	171.06 (22)	11.89 (20)	7.0 (14)
Food products	357,760 (15)	66.9 (26)	4.7 (19)	167.92 (23)	11.92 (19)	7.1 (13)
Services, miscellaneous	115,237 (25)	58.8 (30)	4.1 (21)	165.63 (24)	11.67 (21)	7.0 (14)
Telephone and telegraph	386,769 (12)	90.6 (2)	7.8 (3)	162.56 (25)	13.96 (18)	8.6 (5)
Meat packing	218,313 (20)	85.0 (6)	6.2 (11)	162.12 (26)	11.89 (20)	7.3 (12)
Glass, stone, brick, clay, and cement	141,235 (24)	73.7 (22)	5.1 (17)	159.31 (27)	11.03 (23)	6.9 (15)
Coal and coke	223,036 (19)	75.7 (21)	5.1 (17)	156.75 (28)	10.62 (24)	6.8 (16)
Lumber and wood products	105,983 (26)	66.2 (27)	5.2 (16)	146.47 (29)	11.47 (22)	7.8 (10)
Mercantile establishments	550,681 (8)	65.6 (28)	4.4 (20)	123.35 (30)	8.28 (30)	6.7 (17)
Textiles, clothing, and shoes	706,556 (5)	76.4 (18)	6.0 (13)	118.66 (31)	9.36 (28)	7.9 (9)
Tobacco products	51,804 (31)	77.6 (15)	5.0 (18)	112.09 (32)	7.29 (31)	6.5 (18)

NOTE.—Figures appearing in parentheses in each column indicate rank of industry for detail at head of column. (Industries are ranked in order of highest monthly salary per employee.)

Home Fronts Held Weak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of July 4, 1943:

HOME FRONT HELD WEAK—BAN ON PLANNING BOARD CASTS OUT AUTHORITATIVE BODY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Regardless of the failures and achievements of the National Resources Planning Board, its dissolution by Congress leaves the country without an authoritative agency qualified to deal with post-war domestic problems in a comprehensive manner.

To be sure, there are scores of public and private agencies in the United States today that are studying and discussing post-war problems. Many of them are doing very competent work within their special areas of interest. But no single government or private agency is sufficiently broad in the scope of its activities or disinterested enough in its viewpoint to plan for the variety of problems sure to arise when peace "breaks out."

OTHER PROBLEMS

Several Members of Congress have recognized the need for an independent official post-war reconstruction commission with legislative authority and executive support, and have introduced resolutions to create one. All of these resolutions have been lost in the shuffle except that of Senator GEORGE, which was approved by the Senate last March. A strong committee of six Democrats and four Republicans wes appointed under authority of this resolution, but the Senate Post-War Committee has not yet begun to function actively, presumably because its members have perforce been preoccupied with more immediate and pressing problems.

Meanwhile V-day is approaching. It may come sooner than we think. There is widespread public interest in post-war problems and a growing demand that governments be prepared to assist industry and labor in the difficult transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. But, just as after World War No. 1, as the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics points out in a recent study by Stella Stewart, "there is no unified plan, no common agreement, no centralized agency, no evidence of teamwork among the groups which will be most affected by a planless demobilization."

WORK NOT FINISHED

The recent statement of policy jointly issued by the business, labor, and agricultural committees of the National Planning Association is an apparent exception to this lack of teamwork.

Under these circumstances, there is real danger lest we again lose the peace on the domestic front unless some authoritative agency is promptly established to carry on the coordinating work left unfinished by the National Resources Planning Board.

Such an agency, I suggest, might well be composed of representatives of both Houses of Congress. It ought to be representative of both political parties, and it should include representatives of the administrative branch, as the temporary National Economic Committee did. We can learn something here from the successful use of mixed or royal commissions in Great Britain and Sweden.

A post-war reconstruction commission so constituted would avoid the otherwise inevitable rivalry between the legislative and executive branches over control of the transition from war to peace.

Furthermore, it would also avoid duplication of the same testimony by busy administrators and business and labor leaders. A joint investigation would also be less expensive.

In composing the post-war reconstruction commission provision should also be made for the representation of professional groups, of functional economic or occupational interests, as well as State and local governments. Professional groups—lawyers, economists, engineers—presumably would be represented on the technical staff of the commission, which would assemble the basic data and do the requisite research work.

Functional groups, the so-called blocs, might well be represented on an advisory council to the commission, while State and local governments, which have a natural interest in the administrative decentralization of post-war programs, could be represented on the commission itself.

In view of the apparent demise of the National Resources Planning Board and the inactivity of Congress with reference to post-war planning, I submit that the time is ripe for the creation of a truly representative post-war reconstruction commission. Otherwise history may repeat itself, and we may again find ourselves without well-developed and coordinated programs of practical action on the home front when demobilization day comes.

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY.

WASHINGTON, *June 29, 1943.*

O. P. A. Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE WORLEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week when the House was considering the appropriation bill for the Office of Price Administration an amendment aimed at the O. P. A. policy makers was offered which would have required 5 years' business experience from all the personnel of that department. This amendment was hurriedly and rather poorly drawn and would not have accomplished the desired results. Proof of this statement can be found in the fact that later on the House and Senate conferees abandoned this provision.

However, I am of the opinion the principle of such an amendment is sound. In light of many of the rules and regulations which have been issued by the O. P. A., I am constrained to believe that those who formulate these regulations do not seem to have sufficient information as to how such regulations would affect the people to whom they are supposed to apply.

I have therefore prepared and introduced a bill which, briefly, provides that the officials of the O. P. A. who formulate and who participate in formulating the policies of any rule, regulation, order, or directive with respect to any industry, trade, or business shall be persons who have had at least 5 years' experience in such industry, trade, or business.

It seems to me that a man who issues an order regulating retail drygoods stores should certainly be familiar with their problems. Likewise one who attempts to control the actions of druggists ought to be aware of matters peculiar to that line of business. And those who assist in regulating meat markets and grocery stores should have sufficient experience to know what the problems of those merchants are. The same thing holds true of the hardware merchants, newspapers, automobile dealers, farmers, ranchers, laboring men, and what not.

Theories and ideologies might be fine things in peacetime but what we need today on the home front is more good common horse sense. We need those who are familiar with the common problems which are facing every merchant in the country today.

I believe that if the services of experienced men, rather than theorists, are secured, then the rules and regulations issued will be sounder, will involve less red tape, and will be simpler and more satisfactory to the merchants and to the consuming public.

Another Accomplishment of the World War Veterans Legislation Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I have the honor to be a member, has secured approval by Congress of another important and far-reaching piece of legislation, H. R. 2703. This law was finally approved by this House on July 7, 1943.

The act in question is designed to correct inequalities arising under existing law with a view to simplifying adjudicative practices and administrative procedure by establishing uniform provisions wherever possible. This measure has the approval of all veterans' organizations and of the Veterans' Administration. I am glad to have had a part in making it law. It is a law of extreme importance to veterans of the World War No. 2 and their dependents.

Briefly the law provides, first, that in case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, any compensation, pension, or retirement pay may be made to his wife at the discretion of the Veterans' Administration and without the expense and red tape of securing appointment of a guardian. As a lawyer who has had experience in handling these estates, I know that this is a wise provision, because the expense of usual court costs to handle the small sum paid by the Government to these veterans just about eats up the money which the widow and children should get and will get from now on.

The new law provides in the second section also that when death benefits are payable to the widow of a veteran or to the child, it will be paid to the widow for herself and child even though the widow is a minor. Many cases have arisen where the wife of a deceased veteran was not of age and money rightfully belonging to her and the children has gone for court costs.

The third section of this law provides that any person entitled to veterans' benefits may reject his rights to them for any reason and later apply for them again without in any way having the rights in the second application altered or changed, except that on the second application it must start from the date of application and will not be retroactive.

Section 4 provides that any person found guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or aiding our enemies shall forfeit all veterans' benefits. However, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may, in his discretion, pay benefits that otherwise would be due the soldier or veteran to members of his family upon his death.

Section 5 deals with persons entitled to compensation who are located in an enemy country. If such a person happens

not to be a citizen of the United States his compensation stops. These benefits, however, may be paid in the discretion of the Veterans' Administrator to his dependents if they are not in a place occupied or controlled by enemies of the United States.

Section 6 refers to widows of World War No. 2 veterans who marry such veterans more than 10 years after the end of the war. The purpose of this provision is designed to prevent a common racket under which marriages are sometimes made with a view to getting Government benefits of a soldier who is about to die.

Sections 7 and 8 define a child, parent, father and mother for the purposes of the act.

Section 9 extends the benfits of the present veterans' hospital facilities just the same to veterans of World War No. 2 as to veterans of World War No. 1. Section 9 also provides that every person in the armed services shall be assumed to have been in sound condition when accepted for service except as to defects noted at the time of examination for enrollment or where clear evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to enrollment and was not aggravated by military or naval service.

Section 10 provides that cadets at the United States Military Academy, Coast Guard Academy, and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, during World War No. 2, are considered as in active military or naval service for the purpose of extending to them veterans' benefits.

Section 11 provides compensation shall not be paid to any widow without child or to a child whose annual income exceeds $1,000, or to a widow with a child whose annual income exceeds $2,500.

Section 12 provides the order in which compensation shall be paid to dependents of a deceased veteran.

Section 13 provides that a disabled veteran, without dependents, being taken care of by a Government institution, will receive compensation at the rate not to exceed $20 per month instead of $15 per month as at present. Such a veteran entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability will get $8 per month instead of $6 as at present.

Section 14 simplifies and adjusts the rates of wartime service-connected death compensation or pension by elimination of the differentiation in rates to the widow or children based upon age, adopting the higher rates for all ages. These adjustments result in increased rates. The increase of the widow's rate from $45 to $50 per month and the payment of that rate regardless of age—now $38 if under 50 years of age—is believed to be a conservative and more appropriate recognition of the Federal obligation in these cases. It is expected this additional cost will be largely offset by the savings that will ensue from the simplification of procedures as provided by this law. Extra compensation is provided for each child the widow has, $15 for the first child and $13 for each additional one. The total amount payable cannot exceed $100 per month. Slightly lower rates are paid in case of peacetime service-connected death.

Section 15 governs receipt of concurrent payments, removing certain inequalities in existing law. Section 16 makes this law effective from the date it became law and provides no payments can be authorized for any period prior to enactment of the law. Section 17 provides that pensions payable for disability shall be payable from the date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

Enactment of this law is another of the steps taken by Congress on what I hope will be a path of continued justice to those called upon to wear the uniform of their country.

The Wallace-Jones Affair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE WALLACE-JONES AFFAIR

(By Walter Lippmann)

It would be useless for Congress to investigate the brawl between the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Commerce, and it would be quite beside the point for the general public to attempt to judge the merits of the dispute. The real question is why such an unseemly affair has exploded in our faces.

When we can answer that question we shall know what is wrong on the home front, and we shall begin to know what ought to be done about it.

In looking for the answer we may begin by asking ourselves what a strong executive in a well-conducted government would do if two leading members of his official family got into such a public row. The answer is clear and obvious: Before paying the slightest attention to their allegations, he would instantly remove both men—Mr. WALLACE as Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare and Mr. Jones as Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This would be done because, without discipline within a government, it is impossible to conduct a government. The President has a rule that his officials must not quarrel publicly. The way to enforce that rule is to remove instantly officials who do quarrel publicly. For when a man takes office in an administration, there are two and only two choices open to him: To remain a member of the team by composing his differences with the other members, or to resign from the team and, then, as a private citizen to exercise his right to speak his mind.

But this rule so essential to good government is unworkable in Washington today because it presupposes an effective method of composing differences within the team. The quarrel between the Board of Economic Warfare and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has smoldered for months. It burst into flame because, as things are set up, the President alone could compose it, or could judge it and decide it. But he wouldn't. He wouldn't because he was too busy with other things, because it bored him, because he never studied it, because he did not wish to offend either Mr. Jones' friends or Mr. WALLACE'S friends.

Because Mr. Roosevelt conducts government personally and by improvisation rather than by relying on institutions, like the Cabinet, and an established procedure, the task of settling the issues of the dispute was a painful personal duty from which he shrank. If he had had a war cabinet, they could have settled it in the early stages before the argument became a personal feud.

For the knowledge that the argument could be settled, and the rule that a man must play ball or retire to the bleachers if he does not agree, would create a team in Washington.

If there were a team, the administration would not have one-tenth the trouble it is having with Congress. For one thing, if the administration were united and disciplined within itself, it would not make so many mistakes. Nor would it have one frustrated agency lobbying against another frustrated agency in Congress and in the press.

If at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue there really were one coherent, agreed, thoughtfully considered program for dealing, let us say, with inflation—a program backed by the Treasury, Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, and all the others concerned—then Congress would have to make the momentous, responsible decision of supporting it or rejecting it. That would be orderly government. But when Congress is invited to vote on one incidental feature—subsidies—before anyone knows what the whole inflation program is to be, need anyone be surprised that Congress is confused and obstructionist?

It is generally supposed that the trouble is on the home front alone, and that our foreign relations at least are well conducted. Unfortunately that is not the case, and the same indiscipline, the same lack of coherence and considered action, the same personalism and improvisation exist there, and will, if not corrected, have long, deep, and very serious consequences. The discerning are already aware of them, and the portents of trouble—not in one place but in many—are already visible.

They arise from the fact that our foreign relations, which ought to be firmly in the hands of the State Department, are carried on through a large number of amorphous and discordant agencies—Board of Economic Warfare, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Treasury, Office of War Information, some generals, and some admirals. Our foreign relations are not controlled by the State Department because that Department is not adequately manned and it has no real head. It contains within itself several headstrong factions. It is said that the President is his own Secretary of State. But if he is, he needs a State Department nonetheless in order to be Secretary of State. In fact he has been handling the greatest and most difficult affairs by intuition, improvisation, and personal feeling.

For this there will be, unless there is a decided change soon, a reckoning in foreign relations as there is now a reckoning on the home front. For he is blind indeed to the handwriting on the wall who does not see the accumulating evidence.

Government Finances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury transmitting to me a set of statements relative to receipts, expenditures, the public debt, status of the general fund of the Treasury, and a preliminary statement of amounts made available for war activities during the fiscal years 1941, 1942, 1943, and an estimate of the amounts for the fiscal year 1944 as of their status on June 30 last. I believe this material will be useful and helpful to the Members of the House in their study of Government finances generally.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 7, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: By direction of the Secretary and pursuant to your letter of September 25, 1941, I am enclosing herewith the following financial statements for June 30, 1943, covering the finances of the Federal Government:

Statement No. I. General Budget summary—receipts and expenditures.

Statement No. II. Effect on the public debt of financing cash requirements.

Statement No. III. Statutory debt limitation.

Statement No. IV. General fund balance.

Statement No. V. Borrowing power and outstanding obligations of corporations and credit agencies which issue obligations guaranteed by the United States.

Statement No. VI. Combined statement of assets and liabilities of Government corporations and credit agencies for the period ended May 31, 1943.

Statement No. VII. War activities program (exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries) appropriations, contract authorizations, and expenditures, July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1943.

Attention is called to the fact that the Budget estimates of receipts, expenditures, and net deficit used in statements I, II, and IV are the President's latest estimates reflected in the Budget for the fiscal year 1944.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

TABLE I.—*General Budget summary—Receipts and expenditures*

[On basis of the daily statement of the U. S. Treasury, i. e., checks paid by the Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1944 [1]	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1942
Receipts:			
Income tax	27,645	16,094	7,960
Miscellaneous internal revenue	4,936	4,553	3,847
Social security taxes	1,726	1,289	1,016
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	245	209	170
Customs	204	324	389
Other	651	916	286
Total receipts [2]	35,407	23,385	13,668

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*General Budget summary—Receipts and expenditures*—Con.

[On basis of the daily statement of the U. S. Treasury, i. e., checks paid by the Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1944	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1942
Less:			
Net amounts transferred to Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund	1,525	1,103	869
Post-war credits for excess-profits tax and Victory tax	800	-------	-------
Net receipts	33,081	22,282	12,799
Expenditures:			
War activities:			
War Department	62,000	[3] 42,317	[3] 14,103
Navy Department	22,000	20,888	8,580
Agriculture Department	1,367	2,011	696
Federal Security Agency	157	153	111
Federal Works Agency	191	215	62
National Housing Agency	177	608	297
Treasury Department	50	1,201	519
U. S. Maritime Commission	1,300	2,776	929
Aid to China	-------	40	200
War Shipping Administration	2,758	1,105	132
Other		795	382
Supplemental items	7,000	-------	-------
Total, war activities	97,000	72,109	26,011
Interest on the public debt	3,000	1,808	1,260
Departmental (not otherwise classified)	[4] 763	732	685
Agriculture Department [5]	901	976	983
Federal Security Agency [6]	562	573	799
Federal Works Agency [6]	117	447	1,136
Reclamation projects	56	69	91
National Housing Agency [6]	15	15	18
Panama Canal [6]	24	31	38
Post Office Department (deficiency)	-------	15	18
Railroad Retirement Board	4	8	10
River and harbor work and flood control	158	201	191
Tennessee Valley Authority	54	111	127
Refunds of taxes and duties	128	79	94
Veterans' Administration [6]	635	572	555
Transfers to trust accounts, etc.	708	435	381
Total expenditures, excluding debt retirements	104,124	78,179	32,397
Budget deficit	71,043	55,897	19,598
Public debt retirements	5	3	95
Gross deficit	71,048	55,901	19,692

[1] Based on 1944 Budget (see pp. A1 to A9 and A15 to A24).
[2] Does not include increased income tax receipts under the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.
[3] Includes expenditures for selective service.
[4] Includes estimates for supplemental items.
[5] Additional expenditures are included in "Departmental" and "War activities" above.
[6] Additional expenditures are included in "War activities" above.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE II.—*Effect on the public debt of financing cash requirements*

[On basis of the daily statement of the U. S. Treasury, i. e., checks paid by the Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1944 [1]	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1942
Amount to be financed:			
Budget deficit (statement I)	71,043	55,897	19,598
Excess of expenditures over receipts in trust accounts, etc., during the period [2]	4,739	1,861	3,506
Total	75,782	57,758	23,103
Increase in the general fund balance during the period [3]	−1,929	6,515	358
Total increase in the public debt	73,853	64,274	23,461
Gross public debt at the beginning of the period	136,696	72,422	48,961
Gross public debt at the end of the period	210,549	136,696	72,422

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Effect on the public debt of financing cash requirements*—Con.

On basis of the daily statement of the U. S. Treasury, i. e., checks paid by the Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1944	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1942
Guaranteed obligations not owned by the Treasury at the end of the period	[4] 1,206	4,100	4,568
Total gross public debt and guaranteed obligations outstanding	211,755	140,796	76,991

[1] Based on 1944 Budget. (See pp XX and XXI.)
[2] Includes amounts necessary to cover total net advances from the Treasury to Government corporations.
[3] Negative figures indicate decrease in the general fund balance.
[4] On basis of earliest call or maturity dates.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE III.—*Statutory debt limitation*

[Under sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Loan Bond Act, as amended, as of June 30, 1943. In millions of dollars]

Limitation		210,000
Deduct:		
Gross public debt outstanding June 30, 1943	[1] 136,696	
Unearned discount of United States Savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	4,939	
Total	141,635	
Less: Debt outstanding not subject to statutory limitations	1,166	
Total		140,469
Balance of borrowing authority		69,531

[1] Exclusive of obligations guaranteed by the United States not owned by the Treasury, in the amount of $4,099,943,045.75.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE IV.—*General fund balance*

[On basis of the daily statement of the U. S. Treasury, i. e., checks paid by the Treasurer of the United States. In millions of dollars]

Classification	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1944 [1]	Actual	
		Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1942
Balance in the general fund of the Treasury at the beginning of the period:			
Working balance	8,744	2,229	1,885
Increment on gold	144	143	143
Seigniorage (silver)	619	619	605
Total	9,507	2,991	2,633
Analysis of the change in the general fund during the period:			
Increases:			
Borrowings (net increase in the gross public debt) [2]	73,853	64,274	23,461
Decreases:			
Budget deficit (statement I)	71,043	55,897	19,598
Excess of expenditures over receipts in trust accounts, etc., during the period	4,739	1,861	3,506
Total decreases	75,782	57,758	23,103
Net increase in the general fund balance [3]	−1,929	6,515	358
Balance in the general fund of the Treasury at the end of the period:			
Working balance	6,815	8,744	2,229
Increment on gold	144	144	143
Seigniorage (silver)	619	619	619
Total	7,578	9,507	2,991

[1] Based on 1944 Budget (see pp. XX, XXI, and XXIII).
[2] Includes amounts necessary to cover total net advances from the Treasury to Government corporations.
[3] Negative figures indicate decrease in the general fund balance.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE V.—*Borrowing power and outstanding obligations of corporations and credit agencies which issue obligations guaranteed by the United States, as of June 30, 1943*

[In millions of dollars]

Corporation or agency	Gross limit of authority	Outstanding obligations			
		Total	Held by Treasury	Held by others	
				Unmatured	Matured [1]
Commodity Credit Corporation	2,650	2,430	1,950	480	(2)
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000	932		930	$2
Federal Housing Administration	[3] 5,365	23		23	(2)
Federal Public Housing Authority	[3] 800	397	283	114	
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[4] 4,750	1,751	212	1,533	6
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	17,108	6,044	5,033	1,011	(2)
Tennessee Valley Authority	[5] 62	57	57		
United States Maritime Commission	[6] 200				
Total	32,935	11,635	7,535	4,092	8

[1] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal of $8,300,000 and interest of $3,100,000.
[2] Less than $500,000.
[3] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. This amount may be increased by $1,000,000,000 upon approval by the President. Debentures may be issued and tendered only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure.
[4] This amount may be increased only by the amount of issues for refunding purposes.
[5] Exclusive of $8,300,000 issued on the credit of the United States and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
[6] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of mortgages and the issuance of debentures. This authority transferred to War Shipping Administration by Executive Order No. 9054 dated Feb. 7, 1942.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE VI.—*Combined statement of assets and liabilities of Government corporations and credit agencies, as of May 31, 1943*

[In millions of dollars]

	Assets		Liabilities				Net worth	
	Exclusive of amounts due from Government corporations and agencies	Due from Government corporations and agencies [1]	Obligations guaranteed by the United States [2]	Due to Government corporations and agencies [2]		All other (including reserves)	Proprietary interest of the United States	Other
				Treasury	Other			
Commodity Credit Corporation	1,676		487	701		393	[4] 96	
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1,137	2	936		1	102	101	
Federal Housing Administration	120	(3)	[5] 25			2	94	
Federal land banks	2,048	5			1	1,573	255	224
Federal Public Housing Authority	549		115	284	(3)	9	[4] 142	
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	1,848	100	1,549	[6] 232		83	[4] 83	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,008	5,458	998	5,093	92	613	[4] 669	
Tennessee Valley Authority	643	3		57	(3)	24	[4] 564	
U. S. Maritime Commission [7]	4,624	67			(3)	1,745	2,947	
War Shipping Administration [7]	616	32			(3)	295	353	
All other	10,042	[8] 6,787			5,360	2,736	[9] 8,517	216
Subtotal	25,312	12,455	4,110	6,367	5,455	7,575	13,820	440
Less: Interagency interest shown above		12,455		6,367	5,455		633	
Total	25,312		4,110			7,575	13,188	440

[1] Includes capital stock and paid-in surplus of Government corporations and agencies.
[2] Includes principal and accrued interest.
[3] Less than $500,000.
[4] This is exclusive of the amount of the Government's financial interest in these agencies on account of obligations held by the Treasury and included as liabilities under the caption "Due to Government corporations and agencies—Treasury."
[5] Includes claims for debentures authorized and pending in amount of $905,750.
[6] Does not include $12,000,000 in transit for redemption.
[7] War Shipping Administration created under Executive Order 9054 dated Feb. 7, 1942, was included in figures of U. S. Maritime Commission through June 30, 1942.
[8] Includes amounts due to Treasury Department, and other Government departments not listed in this statement, from Government corporations and credit agencies.
[9] Includes items referred to in note 3.

NOTE.—The foregoing figures are compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury Department from the respective corporations and agencies. The amounts covering obligations guaranteed by the United States differ from those shown in table V for the reason that they are stated in this table as of May 31, 1943, instead of June 30, 1943, and include accrued interest. Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

TABLE VII.—*War activities program (exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries) appropriations, contract authorizations, and expenditures, July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1943*

[In millions of dollars]

	Total War activities program	War Department	Navy Department	Agriculture Department	Federal Security Agency	Federal Works Agency	National Housing Agency	Treasury Department	U. S. Maritime Commission	War Shipping Administration	Selective Service	Aid to China	Other
Appropriations: [1]													
Fiscal year 1941	20,502	12,050	4,488	104	78		301	321	1,077		25		2,058
Fiscal year 1942	110,837	78,398	20,808	1,775	145	414	569	1,481	2,763	701	37	500	3,243
Fiscal year 1943	81,318	42,216	24,029	2,505	172	70	615	2,261	4,603	2,396	56		[2] 2,396
Fiscal year 1944	28,831	1	27,435			88			1,290				17
Total appropriations	241,488	132,666	76,760	4,385	396	572	1,485	4,063	9,732	3,097	118	500	[3] 7,714
Less appropriations for liquidation of 1940 and prior contract authorizations	468	169	58						240				
Net appropriations	241,020	132,496	76,702	4,385	396	572	1,485	4,063	9,492	3,097	118	500	7,714

See fotnotes at end of table.

TABLE VII.—*War activities program (exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries) appropriations, contract authorizations, and expenditures, July 1, 1940, through June 30, 1943*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Total War activities program	War Department	Navy Department	Agriculture Department	Federal Security Agency	Federal Works Agency	National Housing Agency	Treasury Department	U. S. Maritime Commission	War Shipping Administration	Selective Service	Aid to China	Other
Contract authorizations (net): [4]													
Fiscal year 1941													
Fiscal year 1942	2,748		2,615			35			98				
Fiscal year 1943	13,542		[5] 10,643			35			2,264				600
Fiscal year 1944	2,000		2,000										
Total, contract authorizations (net)	18,290		15,258			70			2,362				600
In pending appropriations: [6]													
Appropriations	62,483	59,035	1	38	188					2,272			948
Contract authorizations	18												18
Total in pending appropriations	62,501	59,035	1	38	188					2,272			966
Total appropriations and net contract authorizations (approved and pending)	321,811	191,531	91,961	4,423	584	642	1,485	4,063	11,854	5,369	118	500	9,289
Expenditures: [7]													
Fiscal year 1941	6,301	3,678	2,313	3	62		45	24	51		18		108
Fiscal year 1942	26,011	14,070	8,580	696	111	62	297	519	929	132	33	200	382
Fiscal year 1943	72,109	[8] 42,270	20,888	2,010	153	215	608	1,201	2,776	1,105	[8] 47	40	795
Total expenditures	104,421	60,018	31,781	2,709	326	277	950	1,744	3,756	1,237	98	240	1,285

[1] In many instances, funds appropriated during any fiscal year are also available for the succeeding fiscal year. In this statement, immediately available funds are shown in the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made. This statement excludes unexpended balances of appropriations on June 30, 1940 which were available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1941.

[2] Includes allocations in fiscal year 1943 which reduced unallocated balances of the President's lend-lease funds appropriated and reflected in this statement in fiscal years 1941 and 1942 The allocations made in the fiscal year 1943 are shown under the respective departments or agencies to which allocated.

[3] Includes unallocated balances of the President's emergency funds amounting to to $68,386,694.02 and lend-lease balances amounting to $5,424,704,484.60.

[4] Contract authorizations have been reduced by later appropriations which were earmarked in authorizing acts for this purpose.

[5] Includes $7,103,522,201 in estimated requirements of the naval expansion program as provided in Public Law No. 763, approved Oct. 26, 1942, and $3,489,000,000 as provided in Public Law No. 92, approved June 26, 1943.

[6] Pending appropriations, as used herein, represent war legislation reported from the Committee on Appropriations to the floor of the House.

[7] On basis of daily Treasury statements.

[8] Includes expenditures for Selective Service (administrative expenses) for the month of June 1943.

[9] Expenditures for month of June 1943 included with War Department.

NOTE.—This statement includes appropriations and net contract authorizations provided for in the 76th Cong. (3d sess.), 77th and 78th Congs. Figures are rounded to the nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

More Meat—More Copper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress draws toward a recess I want to once again renew my plea in behalf of more meat for the miners of Butte, Mont. For over 3 months now I have been fighting in behalf of a greater allowance for these soldiers of production. They have been and are continuing to do a magnificent job in getting out that most precious of all metals—copper. Under the unusual conditions of their trade it is necessary that they receive additional rations of meat. This is a matter of vital importance to the furtherance of the war effort.

To date, I have received 15,143 letters and post cards from Butte asking me to do what I could to alleviate this difficult situation. I have contacted Prentiss Brown, George Burke, John Madigan, and numerous others here in Washington, but to date have received no concrete satisfaction. Yesterday, I was able to arrange for representatives of the O. P. A., W. P. B., and F. D. A. to go to Butte to meet with the miners on Tuesday next. It is my sincere hope that out of this conference will evolve a solution to the meat problem so that the miners of Butte can continue to produce the copper for the tanks, guns, planes, and ammunition which will bring us eventual victory. They have a job to do; let us help them by giving to them the necessary sustenance to carry on. I ask in their behalf not favors, but only a square deal.

New Healing Facilities at Hot Springs, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter addressed to me under date of July 5, 1943, from Miss Regina H. Kaplan, administrator of the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital, of Hot Springs National Park, Ark., regarding the dedication of an annex to the hospital:

The radioactive waters of Hot Springs National Park, Ark., are about to be put to a new and humanitarian use. A Federal Works Agency project has made that possible. A grant from the Federal Government to Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital Association, a charitable institution sponsored by B'nai B'rith but serving the sick poor citizens of the Nation regardless of their religion, at the governmentally owned spa. Through this grant, made possible by the Lanham Act, an annex has been built which includes a physiotherapeutic pool 34 feet by 18 feet, supplied with the thermal waters of Hot Springs, Ark., and equipped with all devices recommended for the reeducation of muscles feared atrophied. Only indigents are eligible for admission to the hospital.

The selection of Hot Springs National Park for such a project is particularly fortunate. The healing quality of the waters there was a tradition with the Indians hundreds of years before the arrival of the white man. Even before De Soto visited Arkansas-to-be, the red men of rival tribes bathed together in peace in the hot springs, their quarrels forgotten at the spot they felt to be a sacred boon, given by the Great Father to all his children.

After the coming of the white man, scientific research demonstrated the truth of the findings of the unlettered Indians. One of the first acts of Thomas Jefferson, following the Louisiana Purchase, was the delegation of a party of scientists to visit the hot springs about which so much had been heard. Their instructions were to map the water routes leading to the springs and to carefully analyze their contents. The result of that expedition caused the setting aside of the springs, denying them forever to private ownerships and dedicating them in perpetuity to the United States Government. The purpose, obviously, was to prevent exploitation by the selfish of the radioactive, healing, thermal waters and to guarantee that they would be forever available to all citizens of the Nation.

Scientifically administered tub baths have been the basis of therapeutics at Hot Springs, Ark., for many generations. The concept of deep-water treatments for the reeducation

of muscles, seemingly atrophied is comparatively new. But since it has been found that stiffened muscles which cannot even be flexed in the lighter medium of air, can frequently be definitely moved in the buoyancy of water, a new era in the treatment of crippling conditions has been entered. Immediately a broader base for the concept of balneotherapy as a rejuvenating agent came into being. Through a combination of passive exercises (administered to the afflicted by a trained physiotherapist) and active movements of the patient (directed by that same physiotherapist) the program of human rehabilitation progresses. All treatments are carried on in deep-water pools. Thus the stimulating effects of the hot water is augmented by the ministrations of those scientifically educated to the task of revivifying muscular activity, and the hopelessly handicapped may once more become self-reliant.

Physiotherapists and physicians in allied fields almost universally agree that deep-water pool treatments, properly administered in increasingly warm water are highly beneficial in a large majority of cases. Many of them state emphatically that waters, naturally hot, and possessing radium emanations are by far the most efficacious. The waters of Hot Springs National Park, Ark., rank among the finest waters of all spas, which possess undeniable radium emanations.

All these forces combine to make Hot Springs National Park, Ark., an ideal spot for the location of a therapeutic pool. But until now, unfortunately, it was impossible to furnish the services of such a therapeutic agent to those unable to pay. The installation of such a pool is in itself expensive. Equipment designed for the special stimulation of specific muscles is in great demand and consequently costly to produce. Physiotherapeutic experts must be in constant attendance. Frequently the period of treatment is prolonged. Therefore, the creation of a pool devoted exclusively to the benefit of those who could not bear the cost themselves is a humanitarian program of unusual merit.

Levi Hospital is a humanitarian institution and has for many years been operated with a high degree of efficiency to the benefit of the ailing indigents of the entire Nation. The quality of the untiring service maintained there is unquestioned. It is served with the thermal waters. Those hot springs, by good fortune, have radium emanations outstandingly beneficial to victims of certain crippling conditions.

June 27 marked the dedication of the pool. Ceremonies drew together interested notables, not only from Hot Springs and the State of Arkansas, but from New York City; Dayton, Ohio; Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; New Orleans, La., and elsewhere. The high peak of the program was the dedication of the new pool to Congressman W. F. NORRELL, who has proved himself at all times a true friend to the Levi Hospital and loyal in his cooperation in furthering its humanitarian service.

America: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article appearing on the editorial page of the Index-Journal, Greenwood, S. C., July 3, 1943, by Dr. R. O. Lawton. The article is as follows:

SERMONETTE

(By Dr. R. O. Lawton)

AMERICA: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

He hath not dealt so with any nation.

Psalm 147: 20.

The Fourth of July is at hand.

It is a good time to think of our founding fathers, of the great and good men who, under God, have led our Nation in peace and in peril to this hour; to examine and analyze ourselves at the present crisis; and to glance a moment at the future.

1. America—yesterday.

One of the most amazing facts of history is found in the character, patriotism, courage, and genius of the coterie of immortal men who banded themselves together in a poor, struggling, small country for the high purpose of founding a nation under God, which would hold so high the burning torch of liberty that the whole world would look upon the experience with admiration and awe.

The daring valor and passion for freedom is fittingly and eloquently expressed in the flaming words of their greatest orator—Patrick Henry: "The next gale that sweeps from the North will bring to our ears the clash of resounding cries! Our brethren are already in the field. Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death!"

And Patrick Henry's immortal words may be properly used by our Nation once more at this grave crisis, when liberty is in peril and freedom is challenged.

Another member of that famous group, the great Franklin, exclaimed, "Where liberty dwells there is my country."

Fired with the pure passion of patriotism, Nathan Hale uttered these inspiring words: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

Thomas Paine truly observed that, "It is the object only of war that makes it honorable. And if there was ever a just war since the world began, it is this in which America is now engaged. We fight not to enslave, but to set a country free, and to make room upon the earth for honest men to live in."

Can we today, in our present conflict of arms, adopt those words as our slogan? We can.

Is not Hitler trying to enslave men, to banish justice from the earth, to dethrone God, to drive Christ out of His world, to close the doors of the church of God, to undermine the Christian home, and to violate the sacredness of personality?

Our cause is just.

We fight for freedom, for home, for justice, and for God.

The greatest of all of them, George Washington, said: "The reservation of the sacred fire of liberty, and the destiny of the republican model of government, are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

This body of immortal men regarded themselves as divinely commissioned to set up in this Nation a government "by the people, of the people, for the people," which would guarantee to all men the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and to found a nation whose God is the Lord, whose crown of glory is freedom, whose scepter is justice, whose symbol is righteousness.

Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Franklin, Adams, Henry, Rutledge, Jay, Pinckney, and a host of others. What a galaxy in such a poor, weak, struggling, uninformed Nation.

They are masterpieces of God, and their followers were equally imbued with the spirit of liberty and the passion for patriotism.

2. America—today.

What of today?

Once more danger confronts us. Once more we have heard the call to arms.

Once more we are called upon to sacrifice our sons, our resources, our luxuries, even some of our rights, for a season, that liberty may be preserved, that freedom may not depart from our Nation.

How well are we performing the great task?

Our boys are magnificent.

Our armies are in grand array on many fronts, fighting as becomes the sons of a great tradition.

Our war effort has been wonderful.

Since Pearl Harbor we have worked miracles in raising and training a great army and navy, in producing vast numbers of ships, planes, guns, tanks, etc.

But all is not well with us at home.

Certain great corporations, in order to make money fast, have deliberately turned out inferior material, which has actually endangered the lives of some of our boys.

This is yellow, shoddy, rotten business.

On the whole labor has wrought well, else we could not have worked miracles of production in so short a time.

But in some spots labor has injured itself and hampered the progress of the war by unnecessary strikes, an evident lack of patriotism, an obvious jockying for position at a time when every American should be at his post of duty.

This is crass, stupid, unseemingly, unbecoming a nation which has a rendezvous with destiny.

John Lewis is not the friend of labor; he is doing infinite harm to the cause of labor.

What of the average American citizen? How are we behaving in this great crisis?

Not so hot.

In plain unvarnished, blunt words, there is too much bellyaching among us.

We are complaining about too many things.

We are knocking everything in sight.

We sound like crybabies.

We are afraid somebody will take our little toy.

We seem not to care to give up any rights, to make any sacrifice. What's the matter with us Americans, anyway?

Selfishness, greed for gain, money-mad, pleasure-mad, fault-finding, buck-passing, unpatriotic—that is what is the matter with most of us. Thank God, all are not like that.

It is time for us to get into this war with our sons and husbands and brothers.

3. America—Tomorrow.

What about tomorrow?

First, win the war.

It won't be long now.

Second, prepare for peace.

Third, let God in.

Fourth, punish the instigators and traitors against the human race.

Fifth, fix it so that this sort of thing won't happen again before breakfast.

Sixth, make a just and righteous peace.

Seventh, get back to work and pay off the enormous debt.

Eighth, work and pray for a great revival of religion.

O beautiful for patriot dream
That sees beyond the years
Thine alabaster cities gleam
Undimmed by human tears!
America! America!
God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea!

Wartime Problems of Salaried Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the wartime problems of salaried employees presented to Congress by the New York City delegation of white-collar workers July 8, sponsored by the United Office and Professional Workers of America, C. I. O.:

Our delegation, representing both organized and unorganized white-collar workers, and sponsored by the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, represents that great segment of the national population to which the President referred in his recent message to Congress as "the millions of salaried, white-collar workers whose salaries have remained low, but whose living standards are being cruelly and inequitably slashed by higher food prices."

There is great economic distress today among the roughly 8,000,000 employees in administrative and service fields who are generally referred to as "white-collar workers." The continued neglect of our wartime problems is already creating large areas of social discontent which are fertile fields for those who seek to open up a second front of domestic strife and disunity within our Nation. The same groups who today attempt to provoke strikes and to promote conflict between all different groups of Americans, Negroes and white, soldiers and workers, are today urging the white-collar worker to blame his problems on organized labor, or the administration, or the farmers, and to weaken his support for the war effort.

America's white-collar workers have no interests that run counter to those of any other group of Americans. For us, as for all Americans, the main issue today is the survival of our Nation, and we believe that the immediate issue before the entire Nation is the stabilizing and strengthening of the home front to guarantee full unity and full production for the military offensives. We bring forward our special problems at this time because the correction of these problems is an inseparable part of the total economic problems of the Nation.

WHOM WE REPRESENT

The United Office and Professional Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, which sponsors this delegation, represents 50,000 white-collar workers employed in private industry in 38 States and in every metropolitan center of the Nation. Its jurisdiction includes general office workers, financial, bank and brokerage employees, industrial insurance agents and clerks, screen office workers, screen readers and publicists, publishing, advertising, and periodical distribution employees, professional welfare workers, and many others in allied fields.

Their work is vital in maintaining essential administrative, professional, and morale-building services, and gearing them to the needs of the war effort.

The union holds contracts with hundreds of employers of office and professional workers, including the Prudential, John Hancock, and Metropolitan Insurance Cos., the home offices of Columbia Pictures, Paramount, Twentieth-Century Fox, Loew's-MGM, and United Artists, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Union News Co., the Mail Advertising Sales Association of New York City, and many others.

The record of the union is one of consistent and wholehearted support to the war effort, of strict observance of labor's no-strike pledge, and of cooperation with all agencies and community groups concerned with mobilization of any phase of our national life behind the war effort.

Its first objective has been to mobilize salaried employees for fuller participation in the war effort both on the job and in the life of the community and the Nation. It has consistently supported President Roosevelt as our Commander in Chief and has backed his economic stabilization program as an indivisible program designed to secure the welfare and unity of all groups. It has vigorously condemned the disruptive activity of John L. Lewis and supports fully the constructive win-the-war program of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The delegation coming here today represents not only the 20,000 organized members of the New York locals of the United Office and Professional Workers of America but many organized and supervisory employees who not only share our problems but our patriotic desire to correct them so that we can better serve our country.

Because through our friends, our families, our daily contracts in our office buildings and through our community activities we have talked with many white-collar workers and studied their problems objectively, the facts and the program we present here represent the broad experience and interests of this vast group of workers which has been so long inarticulate in the affairs of the Nation.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

The problems which concern us particularly as white-collar workers and salaried employees are due largely to (1) our constantly declining living standards in the last two decades before the war, and (2) the serious aggravation of our economic plight because of rising prices, "one sided" stabilization, and the failure of Congress to help the executive branch of our Government hold the line against inflation.

DECLINING LIVING STANDARDS BEFORE THE WAR

In a memorandum submitted to the National War Labor Board over a year ago by President Lewis Merrill of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the position of the white-collar worker was described as follows:

"The white-collar worker is in an anomalous position. In terms of economics, he is very much a part of the working class, but in terms of social habits he is generally considered to enjoy privileges and securities which are not part of the normal experience of the average American worker. This confusion between the ostensible superior social status of white collar workers and their inferior economic status is reflected in much of our social legislation. * * *

"Between 1870 and 1930, the percentage increase of white-collar workers was 2,067.5 percent of the gainfully employed population. In Great Britain for the same period the rise was 2.9 to 16.7 percent of the gainfully employed population. The vast increase in the growth of the white-collar class over this period paralleled the needs of business, which was actively exploiting a rich internal market. In this process administrative costs in the broad sense became a secondary question. However, with the advent of the economic changes which were ushered in by the 1929 collapse, business has been forced to secure some moderation in the cost of operations by ruthlessly reducing the amounts expended for white-collar labor.

"Therefore unemployment has been on the increase and salary trends have been downward. The United States Department of Labor for the period 1935–36 discloses that 47.3 percent of white-collar workers earned less than $1,000 per year, and 9.3 percent earned less than $2,000 per year.

"In addition to these permanent trends which have been manifest over the past 13 years, the effect on the white-collar workers of even a partial war economy has been most drastic. During the last war, purchasing power of white-collar workers was reduced 24 percent. There is even likelihood that the strain on them in this war will be even greater than during the last war, when the disparity of sacrifice was apparent to all. In this situation, the white-collar unions, even where they have not been able to represent the workers directly, have nevertheless served (in an economic sense) as a cushioning and moderating influence. * * *

"If it is borne in mind that the standard of living of this group has been on the constant decline since the last war, that they received further punishing blows in the past 1929 period, and that they did not, in any major way, share the wage increases secured either in 1937 or 1941, then it is easy to understand the urgency of the question and the great effect in morale in dozens of communities throughout our Nation."

The background of the economic problems confronting the white-collar workers today was likewise commented upon in a recommendation handed down by War Labor Board Referee Max Meyer and recently approved by the National War Labor Board in a case involving 1,200 workers in 4 New York title companies. In recommending cost-of-living increases for these workers, the referee said:

"We are dealing here with a fragment of a large picture—a picture of that stratum of society known as white-collar workers. This group's contribution to our national prosperity has consistently been far greater than its share of that prosperity. * * *

"We seem to have been content to let the office worker struggle along. Too often has the white-collar worker been regarded as just another item of overhead, or as an unproductive, albeit necessary member of our industrial society.

"The truth is that the office worker constitutes one of the most essential cogs in the production wheel of a factory. In an industry such as the one we are dealing with, production and success depend almost entirely on the competence of white-collar personnel.

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics index of weekly earnings for workers in manufacturing industries shows an increase of 68 percent for October 1942 over the average for 1939; on the other hand, in two typical white-collar fields, insurance and retail trades, the same index has declined about 0.7 percent and increased about 1.9 percent, respectively.

"On October 2, 1942, the New York Herald Tribune commented on this state of affairs as follows: 'If there were an index depicting what has happened to the Wall Street worker, the contrast would be without doubt sharper, for in that area the history of the last few years has been one of wage cuts and discharges.'

"It is the referee's conviction that this is not too strong a statement of the facts, and the referee has stressed this unfavorable position of the white-collar class in order to point out the urgency of the War Labor Board's removing whatever undue handicaps, in the form of war-born wage maladjustments, inequities or substandards, may confront any specific group of these employees."

INCREASING WAR HARDSHIPS OF WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

When in addition to the facts brought out here, it is also borne in mind that few white-collar workers have received the full 15 percent cost-of-living increase permitted under the Little Steel formula, that the purchasing power of the white-collar worker has been cut from 20 to 28 percent in respect to food prices which constitute anywhere from a third to one-half of his living expenses, and that approximately $1,000,000,000 in new taxes has been levied on incomes between $1,500 and $3,000 by the new Revenue Act of 1942, it becomes clear that the white-collar group as a whole is being put in an increasingly adverse economic position.

From our own personal experience we can cite many cases of personal hardships in white-collar families.

Although we do not have access to figures showing the proportion of the armed forces drawn from this group, it is certain that the induction of many of its young married men has left thousands of young women office workers, formerly able to maintain decent living standards through incomes shared with their husbands, struggling along at serious disadvantage.

An examination of savings-bank withdrawals in 1943 will certainly show that many white-collar workers were forced to draw out much or all of their small savings to pay the new taxes which they could not possibly save for out of current income.

Although thousands of white-collar workers are voluntarily investing in War Savings regularly, the Secretary of the Treasury himself in a recent statement recognized that it would be impossible to press this group further for additional investments. Thus it can be seen that not only are the white-collar workers being penalized economically today but their inability to keep up with other sections of the population in War Savings will leave them in a further unfavorable economic position in the postwar period.

ADVERSE EFFECT ON WHITE-COLLAR OCCUPATIONS

Along with the individual hardship being suffered by white-collar workers, the present situation is having a serious effect upon the businesses and industries in which they are employed. Economic worries are taking a serious toll of morale and health and threatening break-downs in efficiency in vital civilian services. Many trained workers are leaving positions where they are needed in the best interests of the war effort to take higher-paid positions elsewhere. Haphazard and chaotic job changes are taking place within all white-collar fields as workers leave one office to take an identical position with another employer willing to pay a few dollars more. In one office in the New York area it is estimated that the turn-over has been 90 percent in the last 6 months, while figures in four New York title companies and five motion-picture offices show a 60 and 30 percent turn-over, respectively.

Since this is a total war in which all industries are in a sense war industries and all workers are in a very real sense war workers, it is easy to see that the lowering and breaking down of morale and efficiency in this section of our war economy is bound to have serious repercussions on the entire national war effort. The slowing down of commercial and welfare services eventually will slow down production in war industries.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NECESSARY

Although we cannot believe that our Representatives in Congress are totally unaware of these facts, we can only judge by the record that they are not fully aware of their significance and of the threat to our national unity and our war effort if the present situation is not corrected.

We have watched with growing alarm the increasing tendency in Congress to put politics as usual above the needs of the people and the war. At a time when our American boys are putting up their very lives as guaranties of our free democracy, Congress can do no less than put aside all partisan interests and inclinations and unite around legislation that will aid our entire Nation fulfill its historic role in this global war for freedom.

We believe that such legislation will take our problems and interests as white-collar workers into consideration along with those of all other sections of the population.

We welcome as a first step in this direction the formation of the nonpartisan committee to protect the consumer in the House of Representatives. We urge all Congressmen to join this committee, and we urge our Senators to form a similar committee in the upper House.

Specifically, we urge Congress to fulfill its responsibility in stabilizing and strengthening the home front and in helping us, the white-collar workers, to overcome the economic obstacles that are today preventing our fullest participation in the war effort by—

1. Remaining in session until the subsidy program is approved by both Houses so that prices can immediately be rolled back to September 1942 levels.

2. Restoring the full appropriation to the Office of Price Administration and granting additional funds and passing all legislation necessary to enable it to maintain and enforce dollars-and-cents price ceilings on all commodities and to grade-label all products.

3. Levy additional tax revenue by increased taxation on excess corporation taxes and high incomes; exempting all incomes under $2,000 from further taxation; rejecting any form of sales tax and the so-called excess income tax which penalizes workers who were unemployed or living at bare subsistence level before the war.

4. Supporting and enacting legislation that will strengthen democracy and national unity, including the anti-poll-tax bill and the anti-lynching bill.

5. Repealing the Smith-Connally bill, which is an undemocratic assault on the rights of millions of American workers who have loyally observed labor's no-strike pledge.

Swapping Horses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of July 6, 1943:

SWAPPING HORSES

If the Republican Party should offer the American people an able, dependable, and forceful candidate next year they will change horses while crossing the stream. They will do this in spite of the fact that the organized labor vote of some 8,000,000 and the 3,000,000 persons on the Federal pay roll are likely to support Roosevelt.

Industry in the face of distressing difficulties has done a marvelous war job. So have our Army and Navy. But strikes, waste, extravagance, taxes, governmental strife and confusion are wearing out the patience of the American people. They know a new leaf can be turned without risking victory in the war, but they want to be sure they are picking the right man to turn it. They now realize the frightful cost of picking the wrong one.

There is not a State in the North, East, or West that is safely Democratic any more. There is a party rebellion in the hitherto solid South. Moreover, the southern Democrats are now realizing how they were sold out in 1936 when the Democratic National Convention of that year revoked the rule which made it necessary for two-thirds of the delegates to nominate a candidate for the Presidency.

This was a safe rule, long cherished by the South. The South might not have been able to name the party's standard bearer, but representing more than one-third of the delegates it could prevent any nomination not to its liking. The two-thirds rule would block any danger of a third or fourth term.

So long as Mr. Roosevelt is President the country will stand behind him in the conduct of the war. Indeed, the country would stand behind any President in any war emergency. The people of this country are ready to make any sacrifice to win the war and it will be won in spite of Mr. Roosevelt or anybody else. But they have had enough of the New Deal. They see now what grave dangers lie in political partnership with corrupt and selfish pressure groups. They are sick of social and economic dreaming. They are appalled at the use of the United States Treasury to further any man's passion for power.

The people of America are for any and all alliances which will defeat the Axis and Japan. They like Churchill and Stalin and Chiang Kai-shek as war partners, but not as political partners. They are fearful of global, social, and economic planning that would reduce American standards to European or Asiatic levels, and they do not want to see free enterprise throttled in America.

However, we do not think the American people will change horses next year unless they have absolute assurance that they can replace Mr. Roosevelt with a man capable of the mighty job of handling the Government and cleaning up the New Deal mess. They want all the force put into this war that our industrial production can provide. They want a leader in whom Congress and the people can have confidence. They want a man of ripe experience in matters of government. They want to see the White House ring smashed. And they know our Army and Navy will win this war no matter who holds the empty title of Commander in Chief.

Let the Republican Party nominate such a man and the American people will take him—and how glad they will be to get him.

Address of Hon. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a commencement address delivered by my distinguished colleague, Representative HUGH D. SCOTT, of Philadelphia, at Randolph-Macon College. Representative SCOTT gives his views on some of the probable developments in the post-war world and I feel sure that everyone will be interested in his ideas and suggestions and

will find the study enlightening and profitable.

The address follows:

It is hard, indeed, to realize that it is now full 27 years since, on a mild September day, I first arrived at Randolph-Macon College, to be welcomed shortly after my arrival by the customary vendors of left-handed radiator keys, gym books, and tickets to the Young Men's Christian Association reception.

The beloved Dr. Hatcher looked over the season's catch soon after our arrival. As he recently confessed to me, he was about to throw me back—I was that scrawny and wholly unprepossessing—but he took another look at his books of original entry, decided he had not caught his legal limit anyway, and I was permitted to stay. To stay, free to wander through the groves of Academe en route to Dr. Hughes' drug store, or to pursue elusive knowledge in the cloistered quiet of the new dorm, the silence broken only by the more or less continuous shouts of its exuberant and uninhibited occupants or by persistent repetition on somebody's guitar of the songs of the day—My Little Girl You Know I Love You, or Yaka Hula Hiki Dula. Verily, "upon knowledge is a house builded, and with wisdom shall its chambers be filled with all beauteous and pleasant riches."

And, despite one distraction and another, we builded our house of knowledge, and if we did not fill the chambers wholly with wisdom, we did find in time the beauteous and pleasant riches of recollection.

When our president, Dr. Moreland, asked me to speak on this commencement day, he specified no subject, and I confess to you I have been long in coming upon a topic to conform to the specifications of an address of this kind: One of current interest, one as to which the speaker may have some qualifications warranting his discussion of it, and one which can be compressed within the limits of attention—which, I take it, is merely another way of saying which won't permit you to sleep peacefully through it.

I have been thinking of talking to you about certain stresses and strains in our national and international life. I am quite sure that so large a topic falls well outside the rules I have set for myself and my "vaulting ambition" in tackling it may well "o'erleap itself and fall exhausted on t'other side." (And if, in quoting Shakespeare here, I have erred in accuracy of phrase, you can blame it on my early education.)

Nevertheless, I am going to try to paint with a large brush the outlines of certain problems with which as citizens we shall have to deal and which will touch every one of us very personally, indeed, and more and more, in the years to come.

By stresses and strains I intend no reference to the existence of any real effective divisive force among us as regards the prosecution of the war. On the contrary, in recognition of the necessity of sacrifice, we are reacting as would men of good will everywhere. In a good deal of traveling about the country I have found, generally speaking, full willingness to assume any burden or to suffer any deprivation willingly and in good spirit if it will help to win the war.

It is true that there is a feeling that not enough is being asked of the people on the home front; it is true that one finds impatience with such evidences as there are of unfairness or stupidity in the administration of emergency laws and regulations. I think you will agree with me that these are healthy omens, that the republic is still a republic.

But when the lights come on again from Singapore to Reykjavik, and the last parade has passed the last reviewing stand, what then?

The underlying tensions will still be there, but lacking then, so it will begin to seem, the unifying purpose which during our common crisis, had compelled postponement of their solution.

For the present, you, who leave the colleges this June, for the blazing world outside, will have little time and perhaps little inclination for these matters. First things first; and there are wars you must win, because the pre-1914 generation and the "lost generation" between the wars never understood what it should have held, imprimis: That peace is indivisible.

But you will run this world when you come back, just as the veterans of the last war must take care of the home sector this time. Will you profit from our error? Having seen what happens to nations and peoples who refuse to think things through at the cost of comfort and complacency, will you not wish to be doing some thinking about the strategy and tactics of peace?

When this war is won the country will face the greatest internal domestic problem since the War between the States. For millions the change-over from a war economy will mean, for the fortunate, an opportunity to apply newly learned skills in peacetime industrial pursuits. But for the less fortunate there will surely come a reduction of opportunity and a lowered standard of living unless we can find ways to step up the process of production and consumption far beyond the pre-1939 figures. To these millions on the move from one form of industrial pursuit to another must be added the millions more who will return from our myriad battle fronts, deserving well of the Republic. We shall not prove to be such ingrates as to leave them alone with the problem of finding their places in the American economy.

We cannot solve our problem merely by voting bigger and bigger bonuses, because bonuses in themselves are no substitute for jobs and the Government cannot supply employment for all or even for a substantial number of those returning. Certainly we want no bonus marches or bloody battles of Anacostia Flats.

There is time now, if we take thought for the redistribution in industry and upon the farms of those to whom we will owe a primary obligation. As one example, suggested by the President of the United States to a small group, of which I was one, industry will probably be expected to employ a certain percentage of returning soldiers according to the size of the industry and the number of its employees who went into the service. Among these, it was also suggested, some partially disabled veterans should be employed in order that these men should be given an early opportunity to secure a self-respecting place among the Nation's workers.

In parallel columns in a magazine this week, I was interested to note that one item set forth the magnitude of the problem we shall face. Its neighbor told how one group proposes to solve a fraction of it, without demands on Government paternalism.

This item illustrates what we face:

"How many jobs must a free United States industry provide in the post-war world if it is to save itself?

"Studebaker's able, handsome president, Paul G. Hoffman, who is also chairman of industry's committee for economic development, tried valiantly to answer this question at the National Industrial Conference Board session at New York.

"Said he: Industry will have to supply 'something like 58,000,000' full-time jobs, a jolting 12,000,000 more than in the good year of 1940. That means a United States output of goods and services of some $145,000,000,000.

"But industry must be ready to perform fantastic tasks. Warned Automan Hoffman: 'The very toughness of the assignment makes clear the necessity of starting to plan now. When the fighting is over ex-soldiers on street corners selling apples * * * people starving in one part of the country while food surpluses rot in another would be death rattles for private business. * * *'

"As a start for any planning, Hoffman listed: (1) Revision of tax laws to restore rewards for risk taking (those who risk create the jobs); (2) restoration of competition to the fullest possible extent; (3) a solution for the special problems of small businesses which have found it 'too tough to be born, even tougher to stay alive'; (4) recognition that 'those who persist in thinking as isolationists are headed down a blind alley.'"

And the following article illustrates an approach to a small part of the problem:

"The 34-year-old International Ladies Garment Workers' Union last week pulled off another 'first' in the labor movement. International Ladies Garment Workers' Union's 35,000 cloak and suit workers (one-eighth of its total membership) signed a new 5-year contract in which the only major change was a provision for their employers to put $2,000,000 a year into an old-age-insurance fund. Under the new agreement, each cloakmaker, at 65, will receive $600 a year—a good deal more than most of them can expect from Federal old-age benefits."

The unprecedented vastness of the post-war dilemma provides the greatest challenge ever to American industry. As the Iron Age gave way to the Steel Age, so the Age of Steel (covering a span but little greater than that between two wars) appears to be about to give way to the Age of Light Metals and of Chemistry.

I am neither engineer nor prophet by profession, but he who runs may read, and I am sure all of you will agree that in such broad fields as housing, especially prefabricated housing, air and surface transportation, plastics, air conditioning, refrigeration, dehydration, medical technology, and innumerable other fields, we are on the threshhold of the great venture into a better material life for all mankind.

It may not be amiss here to remark that the achievement of these things material can, however, only be made available to the whole mass of the people if our spiritual foundations are firmly set. And I mean by this that unless we warmly sympathize with and deeply understand the aspirations of the individual, we will fail to extend the material benefits which are possible because without understanding of what we owe to each other, greed will again assume its ancient dominion and too much will be sluiced off in the form of profits to the few to permit filtering down to the many their just returns.

There are other stresses and strains which we are going to have to face head-on sometime after the end of this war. Time does not permit analysis of them, but their nature grows more apparent daily. For example, we will have to reorient ourselves on matters of immigration (which suggests the Oriental Exclusion Act as it affects our great friend and ally, China, as an illustration of this problem); we shall have to confront old controversies revived, new problems given added acuteness by the character of their sponsorship, in the areas of race, of religion, of social obligations which will clamor for honest and courageous solution. To meet them I suspect that we, as a Nation, will need even more courage and forbearance, and even greater willingness to sacrifice than has been or will be required of us in order to achieve the basic rights for which we now give battle.

Internationally we see through a glass darkly, and there are as many opinions as there are speakers. Admitting that our sole immediate task is to prosecute the war to complete and absolute victory, I cannot agree that American public opinion should be precluded from considering any and every plan for the post-war world. Surely it is only by free and open discussion that we can hope to arrive at some crystallization, if not of a

common viewpoint, at least of a choice between viewpoints, the nature of which has been clarified by public debate.

For myself, I hesitate to prophesy (although I hope you will permit me some pride in pointing out that on this same platform in 1938 at a time when 93 percent of the American people had indicated in polls their firm intention to stay out of war, I expressed my conviction we would inevitably be drawn into a coming war and suggested 1943 as a possible date); nevertheless one good guess deserves another, and one who states that he hesitates to prophesy usually ends up by prophesying, so I will venture a prediction.

In my view, we are heading for a world organized, at first informally, but later more and more firmly, on a regional basis. Recent events in South America rather strongly illustrate the effect of pressures toward regional solidarity when faced by compulsion to make a choice between ideologies.

I believe that the day of England as the layer of weights upon the continental scale is past. I doubt if the way in which the old game of balance of power has been played will work in quite the same way in the future. Great Britain, in a shrinking world, must look beyond the continent and beyond the seas for her regional ties instead of being the deus ex machina in a position to set right the tangled situation on the world stage. Great Britain is likely to find herself between a continent largely overshadowed by Russia and a world whose seas are not hers alone.

I believe that these regional groups will roughly divide as follows:

1. Europe, seeking a modus vivendi with Russia.

2. The British Commonwealth of Nations, seeking its most workable way of life with the natural allies and customers of the Commonwealth, developing most of Africa and sharing the seas with the United States and perhaps with other growing maritime powers, including the Scandinavian.

3. An Orient, in which the situation will remain dynamic for generations, with ultimate hegemony, either in a modernized, advancing, Christian China or possibly—but, I think, less probably—in an India, which has shaken itself down into a solution of its ancient conflict between Mohammedanism and Hinduism, having also cast aside the shackles of caste. Japan, let us hope, will be reduced to a small group of unobjectionable little islands occupied by a chastened people. The chastening must come from outside, however, and is coming.

4. The Western Hemisphere in which, let us hope, the United States will play the part of partner rather than of patron.

You will note that some of the pieces do not fit in the jigsaw puzzle and some of the other pieces overlap. For example, what of Australia with its leanings toward the United States, sentimentally and economically, and New Zealand, a true and loyal British colony? What about the status of Turkey and the Middle East?

Rather than a world state, I look for regional consultative bodies, charged not alone with political concerns, but seeking economic, social, and religious formulas for the easing of irritants and frictions, the promotion of world betterment, and the maintenance of peace. As Churchill said of the bombing of Germany, "it is worth trying," and if it shall save us from bombing each other again 25 years from now, I hold that we are challenged to test out this and other post-war plans, whether from motives of pragmatism or of simple faith.

Well, the dreams of a professing prophet are never finished and never complete. And perhaps I had better leave the subject here, knowing that man has but charted the fringes of the vast terra incognita of tomorrow's world.

I close with this word: Back of your first job lies another, and the second is greater than the first. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." In you and in those like you must the vision be found. If you are not possessed of greater will and stronger purpose and broader dreams than those who went before, then the future of man upon this earth is dark indeed. There is light beyond the horizon. Is it the light of vision or is it but an afterglow? The future will tell. We have need of our faith.

Scofield Dam, Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a news release by the Bureau of Reclamation containing an announcement by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes that President Roosevelt had approved the construction of the new Scofield Dam in Carbon County, Utah. Following the President's request to Chairman Donald L. Nelson, the War Production Board granted priorities for the critical material required for the job.

The importance of a permanent new dam to replace the old Scofield Dam on the Price River was recognized by all agencies concerned which joined in the recommendation to the President.

I hope that the water users, landowners, and others interested will cooperate earnestly with the Bureau of Reclamation in clearing away the legal difficulties so that construction may begin promptly. The news release is as follows:

President Roosevelt has authorized the Bureau of Reclamation to construct the Scofield project in Carbon County, Utah, for irrigation and flood-control purposes, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today.

The approval permits the Bureau to replace the existing Scofield Dam, built by private interests in 1925–26, to avert a total failure of the badly deteriorated structure during a sudden flood, Mr. Ickes said. Vital parts of the old dam have collapsed and it is a constant threat to the safety of farms, industries, and lives below it.

In notifying Secretary Ickes that he had approved construction of the project, President Roosevelt said, "I have also addressed a letter to Mr. Donald L. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, requesting his cooperation relating to preference ratings for the necessary materials and supplies in order to expedite construction during the short working season of this location."

When the necessary critical materials are released and funds are provided, the Bureau will start construction at once, Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation, announced.

In addition to alleviating a critical condition, the new Scofield Dam will provide about 73,000 acre-feet of storage. This storage will stabilize the water supply of 12,500 acres of irrigated lands of the Price River Valley, now faced with shortages, and form the basis for providing supplemental water to the nearby Gooseberry project of 30,000 acres when that project is authorized. The latter has been investigated by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a recommendation for its construction is under consideration. Opportunities for permanent settlement in addition to the rehabilitation of existing families will be offered to farm families in both areas, Mr. Bashore observed.

"Failure of the dam would release 30,000 acre-feet or 10,000,000,000 gallons of water," Mr. Bashore said. "This volume of water would flood vital coal mines serving the large Columbia steel mill in Utah, the Kaiser steel mill in California, and war plants in the Pacific Northwest. It would also wash out the main line of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad, carrying heavy war traffic, cut off all irrigation water for 12,500 acres of rich agricultural land producing essential food crops, and endanger the lives of hundreds of people.

"While potential damages are conservatively estimated at $5,000,000, the loss to the Nation would be far greater. The disruption, during the war, of the vital services of the railroads, highways, coal mines, and communications systems would probably amount to an additional $12,500,000, making a total of $17,500,000."

The War Food Administration, as a wartime program contributing to the food-for-victory effort, proposes to assist water users of the Price River Valley in rehabilitating the present irrigation distribution system. Currently waterlogged and submarginal lands would be exchanged for new lands, and the War Food Administration would sponsor refinancing, improvement of tillage and irrigation practices, and other measures essential to meeting established production goals.

The new Scofield Dam will be an earth-fill structure, 56 feet above the stream channel, 420 feet long, with a crest width of 30 feet, and will be constructed just below the existing unsafe dam. In addition to Bureau forces, alien, civilian public service, or similar labor may be used if available, or the dam may be constructed by contract. The total estimated construction cost of the project is $640,000.

General Sikorski's Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are saddened by the news of General Sikorski's death. He was a brave leader known and honored, not only by the people of Poland, but by those of all the United Nations. We in America are bound by many ties to Poland. In the struggle for our own independence the skill and valor and brilliant leadership of many Polish patriots were dedicated to our cause. The names of Pulaski and Kosciusko are reverenced by us, and the record of their heroic service will always be preserved.

The county which has been my home for many years, one of the eight which it is my honor to represent in the Congress, bears the name of Pulaski. Many years ago a group of Polish immigrants seeking a new home in America established themselves in Pulaski County. With their traditional love of the soil and an industrious spirit, they have succeeded in their farm pursuits and have retained their splendid rural culture. Their young people eagerly

took advantage of educational opportunities and many of them assumed positions of leadership in the civic life of Pulaski County. The patriotism of the community is of a high order. It is today the location of an important munitions plant, and many of its citizens are engaged in its activities.

The pride which the members of this community feel in Polish achievements is not incompatible with their devotion to American institutions. Their neighbors share their appreciation of the part that Polish soldiers have played in fighting to put down tyranny. Poland will live again. Its capital will be restored and its borders made secure once more. Until then the people of Poland can be sure of our admiration and support in their noble fight for freedom.

National Radio Forum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio addresses over the National Radio Forum, WMAL and the Blue Network, July 7, 1943:

Mr. MCKELWAY. When the United States was plunged into war with the Axis, we made good use of lessons learned in the First World War. For one thing, we discovered that you couldn't win a war without labor with which to operate the industrial machine and that with men being drafted a slowing down of war production was inevitable. It was then that industry began to draw upon womanpower and constantly increasing numbers of jobs that had been exclusively men's were taken over by women.

With the increased use of women workers came new industrial problems. Working standards had to be adjusted to the new labor force. Women themselves had to be shown how to make a maximum contribution to expanding war production. The need for some agency to study factory conditions and to recommend adjustments for women workers became apparent. Women's organizations throughout the country expressed a demand for such an agency of government. The result of the demand was the creation, within the Department of Labor, of the Woman in Industry Service, which later became, by act of Congress, the Women's Bureau.

That Bureau came into being a quarter of a century ago tomorrow. For almost all that time it has been directed by Mary Anderson, dean of women administrators in Washington.

Tonight Miss Anderson will tell the National Radio Forum audience what contribution the Bureau is making to the war effort. With her is Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, and two outstanding Members of the Congress, the Honorable Hattie W. Caraway, Senator from Arkansas, and the Honorable Edith Nourse Rogers, Congresswoman from Massachusetts. These women are authorities on the subject of womanpower. What they have to say on the eve of the Women's Bureau anniversary will be informative to all of us. First, Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor.

Secretary PERKINS. Tomorrow—July 8—the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor will have completed 25 years of service to the working woman of America. Born out of the needs of the First World War, this agency of the Labor Department has worked for the maintenance—in war and in peace—of the principle of fair labor standards for women. In equal measure it has sought to bring about a more effective contribution to industry by women workers.

Today, with millions of women replacing men on the production front, and with millions more to take their places in industry—by the end of 1943 the responsibilities of the Women's Bureau will have increased tremendously. This challenge of new and greater responsibility has been met. Those who will speak to you tonight will tell you in a more concrete way about the increasing share that women are taking in the operation of our war plants and in our essential civilian industries.

From the President of the United States I received today a letter referring to this twenty-fifth anniversary of the Women's Bureau. It expresses what all of us feel about the work the Bureau is doing. It reflects great credit upon the Bureau and upon Mary Anderson, who has been its director almost since its inception in 1918. I should like to read the President's letter to you.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 7, 1943.

DEAR MADAM SECRETARY: The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor will be 25 years old tomorrow, and it is altogether fitting that its many accomplishments over the years be told tonight. The Bureau is to be congratulated on the work it did in the First World War and on the work it is doing now in the interest of women workers all over the United States.

I am informed that approximately 16,000,000 American women are now working, more than 2,000,000 of them being engaged in producing the munitions with which the United Nations are steadily beating down the Axis. More and more of our women, in the months to come, will go into munition plants, into aircraft factories, into shipyards, and into the other industries making actual equipment for our soldiers, sailors, and marines, or into plants servicing our armed forces.

They are doing a grand job, all of them. Working under what are new conditions for most of them, they are showing the skill and efficiency which make for high production. We owe them and their sisters who are taking the places of men in many drudging civilian jobs, a great debt, and I join with Americans here and those on fighting fronts all over the world in acknowledging it upon an occasion such as the anniversary of the Government agency which is so much concerned with their welfare.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The activities of the Bureau are not focused alone upon the current need for womanpower in industry. Its program encompasses the post-war period, when women will play a vital role in the adjustment that will come with peace. We are determined that the difficulties which followed the First World War shall not recur. All of us who are charged with guarding the well-being of future Americans are planning now against the period of reconstruction.

If no other purpose is accomplished by this war, we shall make sure that a better standard of living is placed within reach of the millions of the depressed populations of the world. We shall make available reasonable and expanding standards of living for those who already have subsistence. There will be a free opportunity for every man and woman to achieve a fully satisfying standard by work and intelligent foresight. We shall accomplish these objectives in a practical way. When the war ends, because we plan now, individuals and families will be protected against loss of income suffered for any reason. Through contributions by workers, their employers and the National Treasury, these benefits will be made available to all: Support for the temporarily unemployed; larger annuities to aged workers who, though they might have retired in 1940, remained at work until the end of the war; care for the permanently disabled, crippled, chronically sick, injured, and those too young to be eligible for old-age benefits; payments for hospitalization to ease the burden of cost; and, finally, some measure of support to widows, orphans, and other survivors of workers who die. That system of social security will be a part of the better world, just as the post-war program of the Women's Bureau will assure better working conditions for women and a more effective contribution on their part to the building of a greater America.

ANNOUNCER. Our second speaker is the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Congresswoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The women of America have always supplied a major part of the labor force of certain important segments of our industry. We are inclined to give greater consideration to women workers today because the realization has come that without them we cannot continue to produce in the volume needed for victory. For that reason we have learned to adjust working conditions so that we may make most efficient use of this emergency labor supply. We are now willing to admit that the woman worker is quite as efficient and quite as productive as the man whom she replaced.

Civilians are giving up a great many things these days and yet we must still be clothed, kept clean, and cared for when sick. Because we are scraping the bottom of the normal manpower barrel, it is now up to women not only to carry on their traditional work as makers of consumer goods, as saleswomen, laundry, hotel, and restaurant employees, as teachers, nurses, and domestic employees. They must in increasing numbers take the places of men leaving civilian jobs. They have already stepped in for essential operations in banks, businesses, as drivers of busses and trolleys, radio announcers and engineers and in many other occupations new to them.

I think it is important for us to remember, however, that women have for many years composed a sizable part of the labor force in such industries as apparel, textiles, shoes, electrical equipment, food, leather and leather products, rubber products, chemicals, and many others. And they are continuing to perform Trojan services in these industries, producing not only for war but for civilian use.

My own State of Massachusetts is typical. In the manufacture of cotton and wool textiles, women made up 37 percent of the labor force as long ago as 1940. At that time, in the boot-and-shoe industry of Massachusetts, over 42 percent of the workers were women, and in the apparel industry over 70 percent of the labor supply was female.

Women's work in this field goes back to the days when Lucy Larcom of Lowell, Mass., back in 1834, was a leader in the crusade for better working conditions for women. This was the day when, at the signal of a waved poke bonnet, 2,000 cotton mill women struck in protest against a wage cut.

Today throughout the country there is an urgent need for women on farms, and we have been engaged in the enlistment of 60,000 such workers from the cities and towns. It is clearly evident that more womanpower must be turned to essential civilian industries and services. There is a vast reservoir

from which to draw, of which the most important group includes 12,000,000 nonfarm housewives with no children under 16 years of age. The majority of these women are under 45, and we shall draw upon them increasingly, not only for the production of needed civilian goods, but for the materials of war as well. Other sources of labor which will be tapped will include girls coming out of high schools and colleges, unemployed women, and those who lost jobs because the industry in which they were engaged was curtailed.

One thing we must keep uppermost in our minds. If we are to benefit from the productive capacity of these women workers, we must jealously guard the standards under which they are employed. For one thing, we must avoid long hours of work. I'm rather proud of the fact that my State of Massachusetts enacted the first enforceable hour law for women, and, incidentally, the first minimum wage legislation. But coming back to the present, we can well follow the recommendation of the eight agencies of Government most directly concerned with the war effort, including the War, Navy, and Labor Departments. For both men and women, the workday ought not to exceed 8 hours. A 48-hour week will provide one day of rest in seven. There should be a meal period of at least 30 minutes in a work shift. If we follow the recommendation we shall keep the efficiency of our womanpower at its peak and we shall continue to maintain the production that is so essential today.

The production of essential civilian goods will continue. It will continue because the women workers who have always contributed their labor and skill to civilian production will stay on the job and because many more women will come into industry to replace those men who are drawn off either for employment in war industries or for the armed forces. When the Women's Bureau came into existence in July 1918 women were beginning to play an important part in war production. They are contributing a far greater share to the production for victory program of this war. We can be thankful that the Women's Bureau is now, as it did in 1918, protecting standards of employment, working for a more efficient contribution by women, educating employers and workers in safety and health, asking for community cooperation in providing housing and recreation facilities, and encouraging women of all ages and stations to lend their energy and their skill to the war effort.

We can also be thankful that Mary Anderson is still carrying on as the Director of the Women's Bureau. She has devoted her life to the bettering of conditions for women workers. Today with her many years of experience and her unfailing vision she is still leading the way toward greater gains for women workers.

Miss ANDERSON. Thank you very much, Mrs. ROGERS. No one will deny that the women of America have responded wholeheartedly to the need for labor with which to keep our wartime industrial machine in operation. Some 16,000,000 women are employed today.

There is, I am glad to say, an increasing acceptance of the principle of equal pay for women for comparable work. This has not always been so. Moreover, it is not yet generally accepted throughout the country. Yet I believe that it is as necessary to the successful prosecution of the war as is the labor supply itself. I should like to tell you why I believe this is so.

The Women's Bureau pioneered in the establishment of the policy of equal pay for women. When the bureau was created 25 years ago, one of its first acts was to urge that wages should be based on occupation and not on sex or race. Progress was made when the National War Labor Board of World War No. 1 applied the equal wage standard in many of its decisions. Yet in the years that followed that war, the double wage standard persisted, with one set of rates for men and a lower set for women. Although the Women's Bureau continued to press for a balanced wage standard, its acceptance was slow in coming.

When the National Recovery Act became a part of our national economy in 1933, we had a part in eliminating from many codes wage differentials based on sex. With the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 the principle of equal pay, as it related to minimum wage rates, became the national policy. When America became the arsenal of democracy in 1942, the Women's Bureau intensified its campaign, urging the establishment in plants having war contracts of the same wage standards for women as for men. In a statement of policies, the War, Navy, and Labor Departments recommended that "wage rates for women shall be the same as for men, including the entrance rate."

Acceptance of the principle of equal pay became more general. The War Manpower Commission supported it. The War Production Board, the Maritime Commission, and the Office of Defense Transportation recommended to State labor commissioners "the same wage rates for women as for men." Then came the all-important decision of the National War Labor Board, implemented by its General Order No. 16. Under that order, employers were authorized to equalize the wages of women with those of men without the prior approval of the Board.

Why, you may ask, has the Women's Bureau for a quarter of a century steadfastly insisted upon equal pay for women for comparable work? Why is this principle so important a part of our victory effort? Because underpayment of women is not only undemocratic but economically unsound. It is obviously unfair to ask the woman who is taking the place of a man called to the front to do the same job for lesser pay. It would be unfair to men returning from the war to have to compete with lower-paid woman labor. Men going into the armed forces must not be allowed to feel that the women who are carrying on at home are being forced to cut established wage standards.

Employers today know—and the studies of the Women's Bureau confirm—that the industrial efficiency and the output of women workers are as satisfactory as those of men—in some cases more so.

We must not overlook the fact that more and more we are drawing into industry women with dependents. In the past some employers who wanted an excuse for not paying women the rate for the job fell back on the statement that men workers have to support dependents. But today that is often as true of women. Their responsibility in this respect will increase as more and more men are drawn into the armed forces.

Those agencies most directly concerned with winning this war are on record in support of the principle of equal pay. More and more the great labor organizations are incorporating that principle in labor contracts. There is also a growing trend among employers to pay equal rates. We can be grateful for the ready loyalty of the millions of American women workers and their willingness to leave the comparative comfort of home for the wearing grind of the mill, the factory, and the shipyard. The least we can do to reward that loyalty, as well as to protect the interests of the men who are away, is to see that every woman worker receives equal pay for equal work. It is a pleasure now to present Hon. HATTIE W. CARAWAY, Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. CARAWAY. Without womanpower it would have been impossible for us to gain and hold the tremendous war production rate we have achieved. I wonder how many of us realize just how much womanpower we are depending upon. We are told that over 2,500,000 women are at work in munitions industries today, with more coming into industry every week. By the end of 1943 the total will be about 3,500,000.

Unless you are a war-plant worker, or have investigated the field of wartime labor use, I think you will be amazed at the things women are doing today. Women normally employed in civilian-goods industries have turned their skills to war production. In my own State, Arkansas, women who used to make work clothes are now loading fuzes; in Detroit they have turned from making spark plugs to machine guns; in Maryland, furniture upholstering has become production of sleeping bags; in New England the building of toy locomotives has been changed to parachute flare casings. The production of nail polish has been abandoned in favor of bomber fittings; time fuzes have replaced loose-leaf notebook binders; clothing factories are now producing uniforms and military work clothing. And women are doing these jobs and countless others like them.

Yet this is only a fraction of the story. The operations I have described are conversions from civilian goods production, in which employment of women is normal peacetime procedure. The amazing thing is the kind of work women new to industry are doing. It took Pearl Harbor to show this country how essential and extensive a part our women have to take in waging and winning a war. The aircraft industry is an example. A week before Pearl Harbor, there were only 4,000 women in aircraft production. Today there are 300,000. Railroading is a ne wfield for women, but someone had to do the job—so they're doing it. And they aren't all office workers, either. They are operating steam hammers, turntables, and rivet heaters. They're handling bolt-cutting machines, drill presses, paint sprayers, and lubricating appliances. They are tractor drivers, crossing watchmen, locomotive wipers, yard and crew clerks, stationary firemen.

In the shipyards today women in increasing numbers are doing all sorts of jobs, in many cases the difficult and even dangerous operations. They are helping to keep steel mills and lumber mills in operation. You find them taking responsible places in ordnance plants, in quartermaster depots, rubber plants, in communications and air transport, in the production of electrical and radio equipment.

Almost without exception, where there is a war job to do, women are doing it. Like the unsung heroines of the home front in earlier wars, the great majority of American women today are proving themselves worthy of the tradition of the pioneer women of another day. Their good sense recognizes the dignity and the urgency of any job that contributes to the maintenance of the democratic way of life.

Women are doing a superb job in war production today. Surveys of the Women's Bureau show that to be true. They also reveal that women workers are efficient, productive, and loyal, and that employers—even those who resented the need for hiring women at first—have come to recognize and appreciate those qualities.

Women are on the war-production front two and one-half million strong. Their numbers will be increased within the year. We shall have to ask housewives to become industrial soldiers. And they will respond to the need.

Secretary PERKINS. Thank you, Senator Caraway, Congresswoman Rogers, and Mary Anderson for your part in this wartime observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Women's Bureau. It is apparent to employers and now increasingly to the public generally that we shall have to depend upon womanpower for maximum production.

In the years to come women will continue to be an important segment of our national labor force. I believe that the principle of equal pay for equal work will become firmly

established because of the very contribution that women are making today. I further believe that in the post-war period we shall no longer think of our labor force in terms of "manpower" or "womanpower." Rather, we shall think of both men and women in terms of equality as workers, each earning and receiving equal consideration. I cannot but think that 25 years of activity on the part of the Women's Bureau has helped immeasurably to bring that democratic condition into existence.

Army-Navy E Award to Hamilton Watch Co. at Lancaster, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, the Hamilton Watch Co., located in my home city of Lancaster, Pa., has enhanced its long record of achievements in peace and war, of which we in Pennsylvania who know its contributions to our Nation's welfare and security are very proud.

On May 22, 1943, Hon. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, addressed a letter to Mr. Calvin M. Kendig, president of the Hamilton Watch Co., informing him that the Army and Navy were conferring upon the Hamilton plant the Army-Navy E award for outstanding production of war materials.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the letter of notification from Mr. Forrestal:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, May 22, 1943.

Mr. C. M. KENDIG,
President, Hamilton Watch Co.,
Lancaster, Pa.

DEAR MR. KENDIG: This is to inform you and all employees of the Hamilton Watch Co. that the Army and Navy are conferring upon your plant the Army-Navy E award for outstanding production of war materials.

This award consists of a flag to be flown above your plant, and a lapel pin, symbolic of distinguished service to America, for every individual in your plant.

You men and women of the Hamilton Watch Co. are making an outstanding contribution to victory. You have every reason to be proud of the record you have set, and your accomplishment stands as an example to all Americans.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

The Hamilton Watch Co. was incorporated December 14, 1892, and has been in continuous operation since that date. It was named for James Hamilton, the original owner of the site of Lancaster under grant from William Penn. It is located on a beautiful parked site and because of its charm and appeal to the esthetic nature of man has become the center of the finest residential section of Lancaster.

In its apportionments and the manner of its management and operation, the Hamilton Watch Co. has achieved ideals that forward-looking industrialists strive to match.

For more than 50 years the Hamilton Watch Co., makers of "the watch of railroad accuracy," now making accurate war timepieces, has led in the evolution of fine watchmaking.

Mr. Speaker, our air, sea, and land forces and those of our allies require a vast number of various precision timing instruments. In the past, we have depended solely on foreign sources for many of these, some never having been produced in the United States prior to this war.

Precision timing instruments for all branches of our armed forces, designed, developed, and produced by Hamilton technicians, include time fuzes, marine chronometers, chronometer watches, chronographs, navigation master watches, comparing watches, hack watches, deck watches, fire-control wrist watches, map measurers, a vital war instrument employing the principle of electronics and accurately measuring time intervals down to thousandths of a second, and numerous other precision instruments, as well as parts supplied to other war industries on subcontract, and also timing instruments for the British, Canadian, and Russian military establishments. Many articles being produced by Hamilton cannot properly be discussed in detail but it is notable that, without the articles being supplied by the Hamilton Watch Co., victory in this war would be more difficult, if not impossible.

In this connection, it is not generally known that prior to our entry into this war marine chronometers never had been produced in the United States. The Hamilton Watch Co. now is producing this vital instrument for our Navy and merchant marine in unprecedented quantity and in minimum time. This instrument was designed and developed in the Hamilton plant by Hamilton technicians and is produced on the assembly line with parts completely interchangeable. The Hamilton chronometers successfully meet the high standards and the severe tests required by our Navy. Indeed, it is acclaimed the finest marine chronometer produced anywhere in the world. Heretofore, marine chronometers have been produced by hand work and never before on an assembly line. I believe, sir, that this is one of the major achievements of American industry during this war. Certainly, no American company has undertaken any task presenting greater difficulties, and the full story of this achievement, when it can be told in detail, will be a recital of one of our Nation's greatest victories on the production line.

Mr. Speaker, the Hamilton Watch Co., and, indeed, the entire American jeweled watch industry, has suffered almost a total eclipse of its production of standard commercial watches during this war. It is wholeheartedly devoting all of its skill, energy, and resources in the behalf of victory for our armed services.

Other industries are also exerting maximum effort in the behalf of victory, but I think it is an indisputable fact that the American jeweled watch industry has been called upon by our Government for a heavier contribution to victory than any American industry.

I say this because the normal commercial production of this industry is in practical eclipse while our Government has aided and abetted the importation of Swiss watches in greater number than ever before in the history of our Nation—indeed, in such vast quantity that Swiss watches glut the market and there must inevitably be vast numbers of unsold Swiss watches on the American market at the close of the war to impede the recovery of this essential American industry.

No other American industry has had its home market completely usurped by a foreign competitor with the assistance of the United States Government while it was engaged in loyal service to the armed forces of the Nation. Not only is its commercial market lost, which it is willing to sacrifice as a national necessity, but it has been kidnaped with the aid of the Government it serves for the benefit of a foreign industry which very materially serves the Axis Nations by supplying them with vital instruments of war.

When this war is brought to a victorious conclusion the American jeweled watch industry will face the necessity of regaining an American market that has been completely absorbed, with the assistance of our Government, by the Swiss watch industry.

The American jeweled watch industry thus will enter the post-war period faced with the seemingly hopeless task of regaining their home markets. Yet they must win this victory or perish. They must win it to provide work for the American men and women of this skilled industry, who have given so much on the production line to victory for our arms, and to provide work for the men and women of the industry who will be returning in large numbers from service in the armed forces. They must win it to again provide the American people with the high quality American watch to which the American people have been accustomed in the past and which they have the right to be able to obtain. They must win it, and the Congress of the United States has a solemn duty to see that they win it, with the aid of the Congress, because it has been amply demonstrated that without a highly competent jeweled watch industry a successful war could not be fought. It is, therefore, essential to the future security of our country that the American jeweled watch industry be fostered and developed.

No one has suggested how a navy, a merchant ship, a military airplane, or an army could hope to operate successfully without the precision timing instruments supplied to our armed services in this war only by the American jeweled-watch industry and obtainable from no other source.

It has been customary to obtain these articles from abroad, mainly from Switzerland, but when war came to the United States this source of supply was

cut off. The American jeweled-watch industry, our only possible source of supply, was then called upon by our Government to save this situation. They are doing so and the men and women of this industry are rendering unprecedented service to the success of our armed forces with inconceivable efficiency and expedition.

For the welfare and security of our Nation, quite aside from the debt of gratitude we owe to the men and women of this industry, it is our duty to foster the reestablishment of the American jeweled watch industry commercially certainly not later than immediately after the close of this war and to assist them in reestablishing themselves sooner if the exigencies of the war permit.

Mr. Speaker, the Army-Navy E award was formally conferred upon the Hamilton Watch Co. at ceremonies conducted at the Hamilton plant, at Lancaster, Pa., on June 16, 1943. I include herewith an illuminating letter concerning the work and condition of the industry addressed to me on that day by Mr. C. M. Kendig, president of the Hamilton Watch Co., and president of the American Jeweled Watch Association:

HAMILTON WATCH CO.,
Lancaster, Pa., June 16, 1943.

Hon. J. ROLAND KINZER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KINZER: It has been very gratifying to the management and our employee group to be told today by representatives of the Army and Navy that the work that they have been doing in the past few years has been of a most essential nature.

As I have told you before, the American jeweled-watch industry is having a very unique experience in the war period, with which I would like you to be familiar.

On December 17, 1934, we pointed out to the Committee for Reciprocity Information that, entirely from a national emergency point of view, nothing should be done to jeopardize this small industry whose facilities were found indispensable in time of war. We warned the committee against depending on Switzerland as a source of supply, because of the possibility of the import facilities from Switzerland being discontinued. Now Switzerland is prohibited by the Nazi Powers from supplying anything having a military significance.

On December 2, 1940, the members of the American Jeweled Watch Association were called to Washington to consult with the Office of Production Management and to advise with them on the production of jewel bearings. This is an article that has always been imported from Switzerland, in volume from fifty to ninety millions per year, and they were looking ahead to the possibility of warfare, and wanted to plan for the production of jewel bearings in the United States, in the event that our supply from Switzerland should be cut off. The watch manufacturers today are manufacturing jewel bearings.

In this connection, we need only to reflect that a ship of war could not operate, a military plane could not function, and not one of the many and varied precision instruments of war could be made to operate efficiently without jewel bearings. This is one service to the Nation of which the American Jeweled Watch Association is justifiably proud.

On May 21, 1942, the members of the American Jeweled Watch Association were again called to a meeting on this occasion by the War Production Board, in connection with the conversion of the jeweled-watch industry to full war production. Because of delay on the part of the armed services in specifying exactly what they would need, and when, consideration was being given to occupying the facilities of the jeweled-watch industry on such things as airplane instruments, time fuzes, etc. At that time, we familiarized the group with what had occurred in World War No. 1, so far as our industry was concerned, and impressed upon them the fact that it would be a serious mistake to convert the watch factories for making other articles of defense, because past experience demonstrated that there would be requirements for watches and timekeeping mechanisms that would tax the watch industry to produce even on a 24-hour day. Now the orders have come through for watches and timekeeping mechanisms in large volume, so that our plants are operating two and three shifts.

The following is a summary of the vital war activities of the American Jeweled Watch Association during World War No. 2: Chronographs for Army and Navy, chronometers for the Navy and merchant marine, chronometric tachometers for Air Corps, clocks for Army tanks, deck watches for the Navy, hang-fire recorders for small-arms munition testing, jewel-making machinery for war plant corporations, jewel-making plants for war instruments, machine-gun camera watches for Navy flyers, map measurers for Army Engineer Corps, military camera and radio parts, navigational master watches for bombers and long-range flights, stop watches for naval gun turrets, time and impact fuzes for Army ordnance, waterproof watches for Marine Corps.

Also aviation watches and clocks, escape wheels for ships' clocks, fine gages, instrument parts for tanks and trucks, jewels for watches and other precision instruments, military and naval watches, parts for aviation instruments, parts for arsenals, Navy yards, and high-priority war instrument-makers, stop timers for Army and Navy.

Also vital are the following: Railroad watches to keep transportation rolling; watches to coordinate civilian air-raid defense; watches for doctors, Red Cross, Army, Navy, and civilian nurses; watches for enlisted personnel of armed forces; watches for workers in industry and distribution; watches for commercial air-line pilots and personnel; watches for laboratory and scientific research; watches for Government employees and other office workers.

Ninety-five percent of the work that has been assigned to our industry for the war program are articles which we were not tooled to make. Many of these articles were formerly imported from Europe, principally Switzerland, and more than a few of them had never previously been manufactured in the United States.

The armed services tell us it would be impossible to conduct a successful war, global in scope and covering all the oceans of the world, without the many timekeeping mechanisms indicated above.

The experience of the American Jeweled Watch Association is unique. We are entirely converted to wartime production and have lost our commercial market completely. Simultaneous with this experience, arrangements were made, presumably by the Board of Economic Warfare, to import larger quantities of Swiss commercial watches than have ever been imported into the United States. These import figures have been withheld by Executive order.

The award of the Army-Navy E for outstanding production of war material is the best evidence that the watch industry, instead of being considered by some a luxury business, is a most essential industry, and in view of these facts we feel that this industry should be protected and nurtured in the reconversion period to safeguard its important place in the national economy—thereby assuring its continued availability in any future emergencies.

Respectfully yours,

C. M. KENDIG,
President, Hamilton Watch Co., and President, The American Jeweled Watch Association.

That Good Ol' Sausage and Ham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Westmoreland Observer under date of July 1, 1943:

The farmers of America have had their retail market destroyed, at least for the time being.

It will be recalled that Federal and State departments of agriculture spent millions of dollars to induce our farmers to market as much of their produce direct to consumers as possible. Many farmers who were favorably situated to centers of large population had developed quite a business, and many were able to survive the depression only by this means of marketing their produce.

Up until the notorious alien-staffed Office of Price Administration, it had always been conceded as a fundamental right of our American farmers to sell anything and everything they raised. Farmers were always exempted from mercantile and other taxes and license fees which were levied against dealers and retailers. The practical theory back of these exemptions was that when a man produced anything on his own land by his own labor it was his to dispose of as he pleased without any governmental interference, and this was particularly applicable to the producers of food.

Of course, there have been some restrictions and prohibitions of this rule, notably the prohibitions against farmers distilling liquors. Such exceptions have been rare and only invoked by the revenue laws or the growing of narcotic-producing plants. Never before the present Hitleresque regime was the right of farmers to sell their products direct to consumers challenged.

How much of the Nation's food has been bought direct from producers on the ground and from farmer-hucksters cannot possibly be estimated, but from time immemorial farmers have been selling their offal at butchering time, their one or two surplus cured hams to their friends in town, and those who have regular customers in neighboring towns and cities to whom they sell their entire produce in regular weekly trips. Then, too, there are the city-market stalls and the farmers' curb markets. All this has been abolished by the Office of Price Administration.

This farmer-to-consumer marketing of food has been a considerable item in the country's food distribution system, and when it is completely eliminated, as the New Deal officialdom seems bent on doing, it is going to make the family marketing a lot more difficult for city dwellers than it has ever been, to say nothing of freshness and flavor of vegetables, butter, eggs, and meats bought direct from farmers.

The Office of Price Administration says that farmers may sell not more than they

sold in 1941 providing they take ration stamps and keep records and comply with all the red tape and bull. To which we hear the farmer say, "To hell with all you crooks and shysters, we'll quit first."

Congress should lose no time in amending the price-fixing laws to exempt farmers from all restrictions of such laws. The age-old fundamental right of farmers to sell what they raise by their own labor without governmental hindrance should be restored. This right of a free people is as basic as any in the Bill of Rights.

The Food Situation in the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the kernel of the food situation: Although we are producing food at the most tremendous rate in history, our need for food has increased even more tremendously.

Therefore, the whole war-food program aims at boosting production as high as possible, gearing it to the things needed most in wartime, and using all the food produced to best advantage.

First, there is the production side. Nineteen hundred and forty-two was the sixth successive record year, with output nearly a third bigger than the average of the 5 pre-war—1935–39—years. Good weather was the biggest contributor, and early 1943 weather has not been as good. But American farms could not be producing at their present high level if certain things had not been done in the war food program. For instance:

Farmers, with the Government, set production goals for every farm and for every important commodity needed in the war program. Price supports and other long-term guaranties enable farmers to go ahead without fear of going broke on a market slump. Credit to expand production can be obtained from Government agencies if it is not available from banks. Machinery has been scarce, but following the report of the Truman committee, the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture worked out allocations for next year which will provide 80 percent of the big 1940 machinery production, with much higher allowances of repairs and replacements. Gasoline, too, has been scarce, but farmers have been given high priority. Under a farm-labor program, changes in draft regulations have brought back to farms many workers who had left, and kept others there. About 3,000,000 men will be deferred this year by reason of agricultural occupation. Local labor is being recruited, trained, and placed by the Extension Service with funds provided in the Farm Labor Appropriation Act. Also, with funds provided in this act, Mexican, Bahamian, and Jamaican laborers have been brought in for special crop areas. Finally, we had a head start on big wartime food production through the productivity stored in the soil by 10 years of conservation programs and through the feed grains stored in the ever-normal granary.

This is how the food is distributed and used in the war food program.

There are many claimants for a share of the food. American food must fortify the bone and sinew of 128,000,000 civilians on our production front, and 11,000,000 men in our armed services. It must give an extra fighting edge to Russian armies, and to British armed forces and civilian population. We have food commitments to meet in liberated north Africa, and in other areas to be liberated. Part of the war food program is to make a fair division of food among all those who need it.

All these food needs are set down in a trial balance sheet, measured against the supply. If the claims are too big, they are adjusted where it can best be done until the balance is struck. The needs of our civilians are fully considered. Sometimes it is our armed forces which adjust their claim, sometimes lend-lease, sometimes civilians. When the allocations are made, steps are taken to see that the division carries through. Actions that restrict civilian consumption of certain kinds of food are necessary to assure supplies for our armed forces and to keep our allies in fighting trim. Actions that affect distribution of food are necessary for efficiency and economy and to assure the best use of available supplies. The chief purpose of the War Food Administration bread order, for example, was to eliminate the wasteful practice of delivering more bread to a retail store than would be sold and returning left-over loaves.

The rationing- and price-ceiling programs authorized by Congress in the Price Control Act make sure our civilians each get fair shares, by dividing scarce foods, and by keeping all food within reach of those who have less money to spend. Despite high taxes and bond buying, our people have in total a good deal more to spend for food than usual. In 1941 and 1942, we had record amounts of food available and ate up record amounts—about 10 percent more than the average of 1935–39.

Military and lend-lease requirements took 4 percent of the 1941 food output and 12 percent of the 1942 output. In 1943, these two uses will take about 25 percent of the output. In England, north Africa, and the South Pacific, reverse lend-lease helps to feed, house, and clothe our fighting men.

On the basis of prospective 1943 output, civilians this year will have about 10 percent less meat than in 1942; 21 percent less canned and shell fish; 17 percent less butter; 25 percent less cheese; 21 percent less canned milk; 37 percent less canned fruits and juices; from 3 percent to 25 percent less of various fresh vegetables; 22 percent less canned vegetables; 8 percent less dry beans; about 25 percent less sugar; 25 percent less rice; 22 percent less coffee; 36 percent less tea; 14 percent less cocoa; 9 percent less fresh and frozen fish; 3 percent less eggs; 13 percent less frozen fruits; 5 percent less tomatoes.

Civilians will have about the same amount of turkeys, fluid milk and cream, lard and other cooking fats, potatoes and sweetpotatoes, wheat, corn, rye, oats, and barley for human consumption.

Civilians will have 27 percent more chicken; 53 percent more margarine; 7 percent more apples; 17 percent more dried fruits, slightly more citrus fruits.

It must be remembered, however, that these are comparisons with 1942, a year of history-making production. A better view of our actual food situation is revealed by a comparison with the 1935–39 average, the period before the wartime production boom began. Compared with those peace years, civilians in 1943 will get about the same amount of meat—2 percent less—per person, 56 percent more chicken, 5 percent more eggs, 17 percent more fresh citrus fruits, 7 percent less dairy products, 10 percent less commercial fresh vegetables, and all the cereals we can eat.

Farm prices have been climbing steadily—116 percent since the war began. By June 15, prices of goods farmers sell were 190 percent of the level of 1909–14, the base period for the parity formula. Prices of goods farmers buy on June 15 were 164 percent of the 1909–14 level. This means farm prices now average about 16 percent above parity.

Average consumer incomes, however, have risen more rapidly than retail food prices. As a result, consumers are able to fill their market baskets with a smaller share of their income than ever before.

While it means that every one of us will have to sacrifice or do without some portion of food that we have been used to, yet, we must remember that this is necessary in order to feed our Army, and the armies of our allies, and other people in the world. All of it is necessary in order that we can obtain final victory.

"Coal Dust on the Fiddle"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the bituminous industry is in full production again. The mine workers are back in the pits, producing the coal so essential to the winning of the war. They have gone back into the bowels of the earth without achieving any of their major demands either from the operators or the Government. It was a bitter dose for them to swallow, but this is war. It is a great sacrifice.

While they were out and their coal tipples were silent, they took a terrific beating on this floor, and in the press, and over the radio. With our country engaged in the greatest war in its history, interference with production necessary to victory cannot be condoned, even when justice is on the strikers' side. While public bitterness directed against

the miners and their leaders was understandable, there might have been less of it, I think, if the full story of the miners' side had come out.

Lately I have been reading a new book, entitled "Coal Dust on the Fiddle," by George Korson, and published by the University of Pennsylvania Press in Philadelphia. This book has nothing to say about the recent controversy. The author is not a political writer, nor even an economist, but a folklorist, and Coal Dust on the Fiddle is not a political work nor an economic tract. It is a collection of the folklore and folk music which a century of soft-coal miners have created.

Yet, I commend this book to my colleagues in Congress and to the public who would know the background of the bituminous industry and the cause of the perennial unrest in the coal regions. This folklore collection concerns itself with the mine workers as human beings, and with their peculiar way of life. Through their songs they tell their own story, and while much of it is tragic, it is not altogether so. Even in the depths of sorrow, the miners could sing and laugh. In painting a setting for these songs, Mr. Korson, formerly a newspaperman in my State of Pennsylvania, has contrived to capture a rich slice of the miners' history on paper.

Much of what he has written is not new to me, for I represent a bituminous district in Congress and many of my constitutents are mine workers. But through diligent research Mr. Korson has managed to gather many interesting facts about the industry, the coal mines, and the mine workers which is new to the public.

I know well the coal camps in which so many of my constituents live. I know what it means to live in a company house, though I have never had the misfortune of having to live in one myself. I know all about the company store and the discipline of the coal operators. I know all about the coal dust which withers and disfigures everything it touches. I know about unemployment in the coal camps, and the hardships that come from poverty. I know about mine disasters and the tragedies they cause.

I know all these things because mine workers are my friends and neighbors, and I have seen these things, and many more with my own eyes. These people, honest, hard-working and patriotic, deserve the public's understanding and sympathy.

Antistrike Bill Threatens Rift Between Labor and Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Evening Star of June 30 by Dorothy Thompson entitled: "On the Record—Writer Views Action of Congress on Antistrike Bill as Threatening Rift Between Labor and Government." Following is the text of the article:

ON THE RECORD—WRITER VIEWS ACTION OF CONGRESS ON ANTISTRIKE BILL AS THREATENING RIFT BETWEEN LABOR AND GOVERNMENT

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Congress has not, I think, acted in a statesmanlike manner in passing its antistrike bill over the President's veto, and disregarding the President's criticism.

The country would have welcomed an antistrike bill incorporating into law for the duration of the war the existing administrative strictures on trade-union action. But this bill is more than an antistrike bill. It restricts the political activities of labor, which is certainly beside the point, and in this sense it is antilabor and anti-Roosevelt, not antistrike.

The President's criticisms of section 8 are reasonable. And inasmuch as the whole bill is conceived as a war measure, the opinion of the Secretaries of War and Navy should certainly have been considered. The armed forces are the last people in the world to feel soft toward strikes in war-production plants. But they agree with the President that the provision for a 30 days' notice of a pending strike, with a secret ballot, is an odd provision in a bill which is designed to prohibit strikes altogether.

LEADERSHIP RELIEVED

The theory behind this provision is, obviously, that discontent in the ranks of labor is fomented by the leadership, and does not arise from the rank and file. But actually, in the most important case, and the one which precipitated the whole question—the coal strike—this is obviously not true. The rank and file want better conditions of work and pay, and Mr. Lewis has truly represented them—truly, though not wisely.

The leadership has given antistrike pledges, and is interested in preserving its leadership and discipline. This bill relieves them of both the opportunity and the necessity. It makes possible strikes that have majority support, taken by secret ballot, and destroys the authority of the leadership.

The Congress, in disregarding the President's advice and maintaining an unamended and inadequately deliberated bill, was obviously asserting its own prestige over the President. But the Congress, though it has the legislative responsibility, does not have the executive responsibility to see that the country is administered and the war won.

NO AID TO WAR EFFORT

If, as a result of this law, there is an increasing conflict between the administration, which must carry it out, and the working people of America, Congress will legally have no responsibility. Partisan Members may be pleased by this state of affairs, but it will not contribute to winning the war.

The blindness of the Congress to the larger issues of the war is also revealed in this bill. In the social alinements in all nations, engaged in this war as active belligerents or as victims, the reactionary forces are our enemies and the liberal and prolabor forces are our friends. Fascism in the realm of ideas—ideas which are an inextricable part of the war itself—can only be defeated by progressive and liberal ideas, and by a program which promises freedom and status to working men and women. If the workers of the world once get the idea that this is merely a power struggle, in the course of which their rights may be abrogated, no matter who wins, there will not be an atmosphere in our factories favorable to the most consummate effort.

The Congress does not do much careful thinking. It might have considered that the dissolution of the Comintern gives liberal, progressive democracy a chance to overcome the class struggle and, by integrating the workers fully and equally into society, to reconcile the chaotic differences between classes. If, on the other hand, the rifts are deepened, while the rank and file of the workers are cut loose from their leadership and driven into general opposition—to the administration, the Congress, the economic system, and society as a whole—our industrial age will be threatened as it never has been before.

Our industrial effort does not depend merely on antistrike legislation, but on the morale of the workers. Mere indifference can do more damage than a strike.

WHAT IS AGITATION?

Furthermore, the bill is coupled with a rejection of the food subsidy program. This can only mean that there will be a rise in the cost of living, felt most keenly by the industrial workers. This, to say the least, is an unfortunate coincidence. Can we set up an American Gestapo to arrest every grumbler? What constitutes agitation?

Ill-considered measures always have unforeseen results. I greatly fear—and fervently pray that I may be proved wrong—that the result of this bill will be to deflect the discontent of workers against their employers, to a discontent against the state. And that, in time of war, can be much more dangerous.

It is obvious that Congress wanted a showdown with the President. But such showdowns, under our system, only result in immobilization of government. In a European parliamentary system, such fundamental showndowns result in the creation of a new government, with new authorities and a new accord with the legislative body. But serious rifts between Executive and Congress, in our system, cannot be breached or resolved. They create a vacuum in responsibility that in a time of great emergency can be disastrous for the Nation.

The Costs of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD P. GALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. R. Champion from the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of June 27, 1943:

NEW BRIGHTON EMPLOYEES VIEW THE COSTS OF WAR AS A PROBLEM HITTING THEIR OWN POCKETBOOKS

(By E. R. Champion)

"Remember—it's your money," is the admonition which greets workers at the Twin Cities ordnance plant as they go about their jobs of making small arms ammunition for the Army and the Navy.

"Remember—it's your money," is the slogan of a group of unique employees' organizations fostered by R. B. Ehlen, general manager of the ordnance plant near New Brighton. These organizations are known as the taxpayers' committees. Their function is to remind employees of the plant that it is their money, paid out in the form of taxes, that is used to pay the expenses in-

curred in the manufacture of .30- and .50-caliber bullets, and that when they waste money at the plant they are wasting their own money.

Formed in July 1942, at a time when it was apparent that the taxpaying population would soon be greatly multiplied, the taxpayers' committees are rounding out their first year of an aggressive cost-conservation campaign that has resulted in the saving of many thousands of dollars.

Taxpayers' committees have been organized in each of the many units of the New Brighton plant, and recommendations for paring down the costs of operation are passed along from these committees to a management board known as the taxpayers' executive committee.

Taxpayers' committees meet in each production unit periodically to discuss ways to cut costs. Members of the committees come to meetings primed to deal intelligently with various proposals, and when recommendations are made, they are turned over to the management for administration and follow-up.

USE POSTERS, LEAFLETS

A continuing educational campaign is carried on, using posters, signs, leaflets, and plant newspaper articles, which dramatize to employees the ways they may help save their own money by saving the plant money.

Appeals to the workers go beyond those of requests to "turn out the lights," "turn off the faucets," and "save supplies." Employees are urged to maintain good attendance records, because absenteeism costs the taxpayer money. Efforts also are made to build employee respect for Government property which has been provided the plant operator for the manufacture of ammunition.

The plant also maintains a well-patronized suggestion-box system, and already more than 1,000 have been adopted out of a total of more than 7,000 ideas which have been turned in, most of which have dealt directly with improvements in the manufacturing process that result in saving the taxpayer money.

There is evidence that the taxpayers' committee program has been successful in reducing the cost of operation at the Twin Cities ordnance plant but employee committee members and management representatives declared emphatically that "we've really just got started on this big job. There still is a great deal to be done."

Increased emphasis is being given the economy program at the New Brighton war plant with the taxpayers' committees taking the leading role in seeking other means by which materials and production time can be conserved without reducing the quality of the product.

THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS A MONTH

One report shows that employees' efforts have resulted in saving the plant $3,000 a month on electric power alone, simply by constant attention to lights that can be turned off, plus the provision of a switch for each light, rather than master switch, making it necessary to turn all of a series of lights on when only a few are needed. Machinery is quickly shut down when not in use, offices have been painted white to conserve candlepower, and the life of hard-to-get fixtures has been lengthened by proper use.

Taxpayers' committees asked that water fountains be turned off "between drinks," and this has saved the plant many thousands of gallons of water—all of which must be pumped three times before being used. Heated water, costing 32 cents per thousand gallons, has been conserved to the extent of 175,000 gallons a day.

A machine adjuster suggested a method for saving soap solution used as a type of lubricant, and this idea is now saving 100 gallons of the solution per machine every day. Hundreds of similar ideas have been adopted, saving thousands of dollars every month.

While the taxpayers' committees are essentially a "grass roots" proposition, in which rank and file employees take the leading roles, corresponding taxpayers' committees have been organized among technical and engineering experts. A committee on the recovery of waste process materials has recently been formed, and already the committee reports that it has found ways to save hundreds of dollars' worth of copper and soapy fats each week. These economy programs are continuing.

In reviewing the achievements of the committees which he "fathered" nearly a year ago, Ehlen says, "We have felt that it is our responsibility to exercise the same care and judgment in the use of utilities and equipment purchased with the taxpayers' money as if it were our own.

"This is our employees' own movement, and it is saving thousands of dollars daily which they won't have to pay back to the Government in the form of taxes.

"Through the educational and promotional campaign of our taxpayers' committee organization of employees, most of the people working at the Twin Cities Ordnance Plant have developed a different viewpoint than most workers on a Government-owned project ordinarily have.

"Unfortunately, despite the fact that the average American sets up a howl about Government spending, when he comes in personal contact with such expenditures himself as an employee of the Government or a worker on a Government-owned project, he forgets that the wages or salary paid him and the equipment and building facilities which he may use come out of the pockets of the taxpayers—out of his own pockets. Our workers are learning not to forget this fact."

The Twin Cities Ordnance Plant scheme of achieving manufacturing economies by constant reminders to workers they are the ones who pay the bills for war production is thought to be the first of its kind in war plants of the Nation.

"We have been pleased to find that a number of other war plants in the country have taken a strong interest in our taxpayers' committee work, and have asked us for the details of the program," Ehlen said.

The activity recently drew comment in Congress when Representative WESLEY E. DISNEY, of Oklahoma, declared that it "deserves the attention and approbation of every citizen of the United States."

And Senator HARRY E. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, in a letter to Charles L. Horn, president of the Federal Cartridge Corporation, Minneapolis, operator of the New Brighton plant, stated that "as far as I know, this introduces a new and most effective economy program within Government-owned war plants. * * * I feel sure that not only will production be advanced, but at a greatly reduced cost to the general public."

PERSONAL CONTACT

The conservation program at the Twin Cities Ordnance Plant is headed by Ehlen as chairman of the executive committee, which directs the promotion of the campaign to educate employees and encourage suggestions. This is done through the use of posters, pamphlets, literature, bulletins, reminder signs, and similar media. The advisory committee composed of one or more members from each department in the various production buildings in the plant area, provide a personal contact for all workers.

Don't Beat Poland to Her Knees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Nowy Swiat of New York, N. Y.:

DON'T BEAT POLAND TO HER KNEES

It seems that political emergencies have among other things caused the truth to be rationed. Substitutes are plentiful on the market. The price is cheap, the quality low, and the result more than doubtful.

This is what you hear these days:

Poland's territorial claims against Russia.

That's what has happened. One day Poland stood up and made demands and claims against poor Russia.

Stalin knew nothing about it until Poland presented claims against Russia.

Our ally means Russia.

You may listen to Hans Jacob and Johannes Steel, you may read the Daily Worker, and PM, and the Post, and learn that the Polish Government only since Stalin broke diplomatic relations with Poland—only since that time—is composed of landowners, Fascists, tycoons, antisemites, reactionaries, etc.

They were all right before.

Our ally means only Russia. The rest does not count.

You may call Vice President Sosnkowski a pro-Nazi, Wyszynski may accuse the Polish Government and the Poles of cooperating with Hitler, one is free to slander and libel, to poison anybody's mind against Poland—because Russia is our holy and only ally.

You may also hear that Poland disrupted the unity among the United Nations. True—it was Stalin who chased the Ambassador of Poland from Moscow, but—

Poland disrupted the unity.

Under your own eyes the Russian War Relief has turned into a Russian Propaganda Relief.

You are being indoctrinated with new axioms—"We must," "America must."

Or else!

Unconditional surrender. You are not to care what Russia will do in China, or in Europe, it is immaterial what Russia has to contribute, it's you who must.

A dreadful picture is painted of a world without Russia shaping it.

You must—or else.

You read and hear loud demands that Poland and the Poles must change their attitude toward Russia.

How about Russia changing some?

Her's is the final, irrevocable, accepted, ballyhooed decision.

Russia is right—she may demand things, she is entitled to dictate to decide without approval or even consultation.

No change asked of Russia.

What is this attitude of Poland and the Poles toward Russia?

The Poles know Russia from age-long contact and bitter experience. They know what Russian oppression means, they are familiar with Russian gallows and prisons, with nahajkas and Siberia, with concentration camps and Russian methods.

They had refused to join Germany in a campaign against Russia, were stabbed in the back by Stalin in the darkest hour of their

history, suffered unspeakably while Stalin and Hitler were allies, yet when Germany attacked Russia the Poles were the first to stretch out their hands in a gesture of sympathy, expressing strongly their will to fight on the side of Russia against the Nazis.

The Poles forgot and forgave, spoiling to get into the fight again, to beat the Nazi beasts.

Just then Stalin told them that half of their country will be grabbed by Russia.

After liberating Lwow and Wilno from the German yoke the Polish soldier, hailing from Wilno or Lwow was to agree to hoist the Communist flag and to become a Russian and a Communist.

Just then—when he was ready to forget the cruel treatment in prison or concentration camp the Bolsheviks told him that he will be given a chance to fight and expel the Germans from his village or town and turn it over to Russia.

Yes—and the Steels and Jacobs and others want the Poles to change their attitude, to love Stalin and to hand over half of their country—to the * * * Russian preachers of democracy.

You hear the overloud clamor:

"The Poles must change their attitude."

You will now bear witness to a tragic campaign of pressure on the Polish government to be formed.

Puppets are wanted.

"Patriots" who should sign a partition of their country, unconditionally surrendering to Stalin.

Here is a Red logic:

The Polish Government has authority to say "yes" to Russian demands. It would be voicing the will of Poland and of the Polish nation.

But it has no authority to say "No."

In that case it is composed of landowners (what a crime to own land), tycoons, reactionaries, and, of course, disrupting the unity of the Allies.

Pressure and threats are being used now to browbeat and stifle the true will, the free and only will of the Poles to get back to Poland and not to Russia after this war has been won.

America's voice is needed now.

Now is the time for the United States to make it clear to the Poles that America does not join in any pressure and that America will permit the President of Poland to form a government that will have the authority of the constitution of Poland and the moral and legal power to speak in the name of Poland.

It seems to us that a political crime is in the making by this strong, unjust, and harmful pressure.

It is a distortion of history before its birth.

It can only breed tragedy as did other such acts before.

Poland is a valiant ally and has won her right as an equal among equals in the family of nations.

Hers was the greatest contribution. It was given at a time when treachery and appeasement were virtues and wisdom.

Let us not beat Poland to her knees before the Russian dictator while many hundreds of thousands of soldiers, marines, and fliers are dying and ready to die for the common cause, when millions of Poles are engaged in their tortured country in the most cruel war against the Nazis.

America should not take part in a foul game that is pregnant with tragedy.

We want no share in the responsibility for what may be the outcome of using threats to dictate now what kind of government the Poles should have.

Stalin will recognize no one, except a puppet of his own choice.

The Atlantic Charter specifically brands such interference as against the aims of this war.

The spirit of America does not tolerate such diplomacy—the diplomacy of a political hold-up.

PETER P. YOLLES.

Foreign Policy for Post-War United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Policy for Post-War United States," published in the Washington Times-Herald for June 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY FOR POST-WAR UNITED STATES

There are moments when we feel highly optimistic about the war—that Germany may be licked this year and Japan next—and there are moments when we feel pessimistic about it. We suppose all of us have these alternating currents of optimism and pessimism; and maybe they are controlled by the amount of calcium, vitamin B, or whatnot in one's system at any given moment.

Whatever the cause, this is one of our more pessimistic moments. At this time it looks like a long war to us, despite recent cheering news. We have a feeling that the boys won't be coming home for good for maybe 2, 3, or 4 years; that many of them won't be coming home at all; and that many more will arrive home minus arms, legs, or other useful parts of their anatomies.

Those that do eventually come home, though, will be men—tough men, grim men, with first-hand knowledge of how fine a place the United States as they knew it was in comparison with the places they will have seen.

When they come home, the United States will be in effect theirs, and rightfully so, because they will have saved it from conquest and slavery and brought it to victory over a horde of barbaric enemies. These men will be entitled to run this country, not we who stayed at home and cheered them on with eloquent words while cussing the wartime deprivations on the home front.

There will be some ten or twelve million of them—which means that if they form a fairly well-integrated bloc with intelligent leadership they can hold the balance of political power throughout the Nation, and can hold all Government policies that amount to anything.

If they react to this war experience as their fathers reacted to the 1917-18 thing, these men will have two prime desires when they get back: That they themselves will never have to go to war again, and that their children will not be dragged into another war 20 or 25 years hence.

They can't make certain of either of these things, any more than their fathers could. But they can force this country, over the objections of the pacifists and the warweary, to adopt a standing policy of adequate national defense and stick to that policy.

Such a policy would call for the world's finest air force, for plenty of submarines manned with trained crews at all times, and for such surface warships as we may need. It would also call for an army capable of being expanded to war strength almost overnight, because based on universal compulsory military training.

Even the most aggressive nations think a long time before they attack a nation which they know to be well armed and ready to fight. We spent $76,000,000,000 on the war in the fiscal year ended July 1; expect to spend around $100,000,000,000 this fiscal year. Had we spent $5,000,000,000 a year on our defense set-up ever since World War No. 1, we could in all probability have stayed out of the present war or gone into it, as we preferred.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE (Republican), of Connecticut, remarked in a recent speech that the United States has no foreign policy. There is a great deal of truth in Representative LUCE's statement.

We used to have a foreign policy; namely, stay out of Europe's eternal wars.

We abandoned that policy under Woodrow Wilson, and again under Franklin D. Roosevelt. In World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, our foreign policy has been nothing but Great Britain's foreign policy.

If we team up after this war in some world state run mainly by Great Britain and ourselves, we shall be hooked inescapably into the orbit of European politics. Every time Great Britain feels concerned enough over some European upset to go to war about it, we shall have to follow Britain into that war, as we have now done twice in a quarter century. And knowing that we are behind them with our great resources and manufacturing abilities, British statesmen will be the more encouraged to risk European wars.

We hope that the returning soldiers will insist on a return to our former foreign policy of staying out of Europe's eternal wars, minding our own business, and keeping our powder dry.

We realize that these sentiments are what are nowadays called isolationism, American firstism, treachery to the human race, etc. Nevertheless, we expect that a large majority of our boys will be found to entertain precisely these sentiments when at long last they come home from this global war.

The Issue in 1944—Americanism Versus "Globaloney"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

THE ISSUE IN 1944—AMERICANISM VERSUS GLOBALONEY

The Washington battle between Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE and Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones is not just a quarrel between two high Government officials who happen to dislike each other personally.

It is a clash between two points of view, two philosophies, which are now struggling for supremacy in this country.

Mr. Jones expresses his point of view—that of American individualism, under which this country swiftly became very rich and very comfortable—in his July 5 letter to Senator CARTER GLASS, Democrat of Virginia, about Mr. WALLACE'S attack on Jones and his associates in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:

"If the policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in dealing with private business at home and abroad, when possible, subjects me to Mr. WALLACE'S criticism, that cannot be helped. It is my belief that Government should seek to preserve private business, use it wherever possible in the war effort, and operate directly only when necessary. * * *

"As for the charge which Mr. WALLACE appears to regard as a major crime, that I have attempted to safeguard the taxpayers' money, I must plead guilty. Squandering the people's money even in wartime is no proof of patriotism. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not pay $2 for something it can buy for $1. Maybe no one does, but the point is that some men know when you can buy it for $1, some don't know, and some don't care as long as they are spending other people's money."

In thus stating his own views, Mr. Jones also broadly outlines Mr. WALLACE'S views. Mr. WALLACE is a leader of what can be called the "globaloney" school of thought. He summed up his philosophy in his remark some months ago that the outcome of this war ought to be to enable everybody in the world to have a quart of milk a day.

The "globaloney" program for this war and afterward is (1) to spend ourselves into national bankruptcy while the war goes on, and (2) to put the world on a glorified W. P. A. after the war, the American taxpayer, of course, to foot the bill. We can bet that no other nation is going to offer to pay any part of it.

And the "globaloney" school of thought is strongly entrenched in the New Deal administration. One of Felix Frankfurter's major activities as a leading professor in the Harvard Law School was to place bright young lawyers who thought as he did in key Government positions. Nowadays, Washington is full of these persons, and they wield great power; and their hope is to use this war as a means of bringing some kind of socialism or communism to the United States.

1944 ISSUE

This conflict between the Jones type of individualists and the Wallace globaloney slicers is sure, we think, to boil into the 1944 Presidential election.

By that time the war should be over or an Allied victory should be in sight. If the war is going badly for the Allies by that time, it will be because of mismanagement by our leaders of the huge resources, the tremendous productive apparatus, and the fresh manpower with which the United States entered the war after most of the other belligerents had been fighting for 27 months.

The New Dealers will insist that the only election issue is the winning of the war or of the peace, as the case may be.

The majority of Americans by that time, we hope, will realize that there is another issue; namely, Americanism versus "Globaloney." They will, if there is sufficient airing between now and November 1944, of such fundamental and far-reaching conflicts as the one between Jones and Wallace.

We think, too, that the more thoroughly the American people come to grasp the plans and intentions of the "Globaloneyites," the less they will like them and the more earnestly they will long to repudiate them at the polls.

Americans are accustomed to thinking and acting for themselves. That habit made us the powerful and wealthy Nation we are today. The "Globaloney" crowd wants to fasten on us a system under which all the thinking and deciding will be done for us by a great central brain at Washington—and under which we shall attempt to buy the presidency of the world by means of a world-wide WPA for the President of the United States.

The great majority of us, we believe, are opposed to any such overthrow of the American system, and will vote it down if given a fair chance.

Opportunity for Peaceful Cooperation Among All Races

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the recent racial disturbances which have taken place in Detroit and in a number of other centers in various parts of the country have brought to light the need for a peaceful cooperation among all races, colors, and creeds within America, for the disturbances have shown us how great productive centers can be tied up and rendered virtually inactive whenever racial strife flares up.

Mr. President, the problem of racial security is one which must be solved, both in the interests of the war effort and in the interests of the future welfare and progress of the American people. It is a problem which the leaders of all races must undertake to solve in a just and reasonable manner, if the destinies of this Nation and the races represented therein are to be secure. For that reason, any constructive steps which can be taken by the Government to prevent racial strife and to promote the necessary unity and cooperation among all the American people will be steps well and wisely taken.

In this connection, Mr. President, I was pleased to read an editorial which appeared in the July 10 issue of the Pittsburgh Courier. The Courier is a Negro publication. The editorial, entitled "Opportunity Beckons to Us," represents a type of constructive thinking which cannot but help reduce the causes for race friction in America. The editorial deals largely with the post-war world, and it urges the American Negro to conduct his affairs in such a way as to equip himself for productive activity in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred. A reading of the editorial by any impartial person will serve to make clear that the outstanding Negroes of America are sincerely trying to lead their people to a more effective participation in the Government and to a more productive participation in the various economic enterprises of the Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

OPPORTUNITY BECKONS US

After the war, America, the United States, must be remade. Everything we have now is being worn out. In a large, public way, we are going to need new housing, new schools, new roads, new bridges, new rolling stock for our vast transportation system, new communications. But in a more personal way, it is hardly necessary to remind that our automobiles are wearing out, our refrigerators, our radios, our rugs, our chairs, our tables, our knives and forks, many items of clothing irreplaceable now, our furnaces, our bathtubs, our garden tools. And the factories which used to make all these things are now wearing out their tools producing articles for war.

When peace comes, there must be new industries and new factories, for it is no secret that the wizards of American industry have already fashioned new aids to living and comfort that will provoke amazement from post-war Americans, such as that felt by the barbarous hordes of feudal Europe when they were first confronted by the dazzling civilization of the Saracens. There will be new automobiles, new radios, new devices for ease and enjoyment in the home. Recording has already been changed from discs to thin wires, enabling an individual to carry around in his pocket the recording of an entire musical library. Industries already converted to war, will have to be reconverted to peace.

These new industries and reconverted industries will require money, white money and black money. The industrial securities committee of the Investment Bankers Association has recently predicted new capital demands for the first 3 post-war years "should not be less than $5,000,000,000 for each year." The American Negro should not regard this prediction as prognostication for white folk only. This prediction has not only to do with the remaking of America, but also with the creation of jobs for some fifty-five or sixty million Americans, at least six millions of whom should be Negroes. Unless expert planning is done now, there are fears in responsible quarters that at least 20,000,000 Americans will be without jobs in the post-war period. That compares frightfully with the peak depression number of unemployed—13,000,000.

The Negro has a chance now to save his money to help himself when the new America is being made. Purchase and retention of Victory and War bonds gives him this chance. He can literally pile up a reserve of billions of dollars in capital through organized saving of Victory and War bonds. He can help to preserve some of the economic gains made during this war by using his saved-up resources to create enterprises that will provide him with new jobs as both employer and worker. The war is giving him a chance to acquire new skills that will qualify him for a superior position in industry in the future.

The American Negro has never been an integral, functioning part of American financial and economic life. His first opportunity to become such a part presents itself in this war emergency. This is the concrete silver lining behind the dark clouds of racial strife which beset us. There is hope. We can build for a brighter, more secure future. But the responsibility for doing so belong to us. We can't forget, nor ignore, the evils which plague us. But we must reserve some of our energy and some of our vision to exploit the opportunity which beckons. If we plan and save now, black money and white money, unemotional and unprejudiced, can help to blaze a trail after the war, a trail that will lead to greater economic security and the fuller life for all American Negroes.

Address by J. Clifford McManaway at Unveiling of Plaque to Inductees From Harrison County, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered on Independence Day by J. Clifford McManaway, at Clarksburg, W. Va., on the occasion of the unveiling of a plaque commemorating the men from Harrison County, W. Va., who have been inducted into the armed services.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Citizens of Harrison County, on this the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of our independence, we are again engaged in a war in which our national existence is challenged.

We are met today to dedicate a memorial plaque, upon which it is our intention to inscribe the name of every soldier and sailor from this county who dies in line of duty in this war. There are now 27 names on the plaque. Reports of the death of six more men from this county have been received.

This memorial of our dead and the purpose to erect it in the most conspicuous place in Harrison County while we are at war is a project of La Societe des Quarante Hommes et Huit Chevaux, a branch of the American Legion. With the consent of the county court of Harrison County and with the cooperation of all the patriotic organizations of the county, this plaque has been placed here in the lobby of the courthouse, where it will be seen by every person who comes into the courthouse.

The plaque is carved from American walnut. It was designed by Aubrey Crawford, of Weston, and was executed by our fellow citizen, Rollin A. Frederich. It shows the Cross of Christ, the Hope of the World, arising from an earth in mourning, symbolized by a globe entwined with a broken wreath. The inscription is—

"Men of Harrison County. They died that we might live."

It is not my intention to recount the exploits, the heroism, or the virtues, of any of these men. In fact, we know very little about the manner of their deaths. In most instances, we have only the official message to the next of kin; your husband, son, or brother died in line of duty as a result of enemy action. These young men went forth, willingly, to fight, and if necessary, to die, that we, whom they left behind, might live in safety, in liberty, and be free to pursue our happiness in the enjoyment of those inalienable rights with which all Americans believe our Creator has endowed all men.

We cannot honor these men who have given their lives for their country. They have honored us, the members of their families and their fellow citizens. And we did not presume, when we caused this plaque to be raised with the names of these men on it, to honor these men. It has been raised in their memory that we, and every citizen of this county, when we pass this place and see these names, will remember the duty that we owe to these men. It was put here in the most conspicuous place in this county to remind us of an unpaid debt that we owe these men. This debt is plain. This debt is going to be hard to pay. But we, and every one of us, will be forever dishonored if we do not pay it willingly, and pay it in full.

Every member of the committee responsible for this memorial, and responsible for placing it here now while the war is still in its early stages, served in battle in the last war. Every one of them has offered his services to his country in this war but, due to age or disability, has been rejected for active service.

When we returned from Europe in the summer of 1919, we found that the people of the United States who had not been directly touched by the war, had already forgotten it. It was pretty much a breach of etiquette to discuss battle and death, and men physically and mentally broken forever, and, when those few of us who had been in Germany; had talked to German officers and leaders; had carefully scrutinized their attitude after the war and had taken the trouble to familiarize ourselves with their ideals; had read and heard their declarations that they would take their revenge and would yet rule Europe, and then the world, were rather less than politely laughed at. We were called warmongers, militarists, who wanted to strut in uniforms, or wanted a job.

The war was over. To American public opinion, and especially our pseudo intellectuals, there would never be another war. We, behind our two oceans, were safe from any aggression, and besides, training our young men for war, burdening our industry and economy with the preparation for modern war, interfered with everything that made life pleasant and agreeable. Compared to our population, our casualties in the last war were small. Few of our citizens were directly touched. And those who were not directly touched did not like to be reminded of the debt they owed to those who had suffered and died for them.

We, as a nation, failed in our duty to the men who died in 1918. We abandoned our allies. We disbanded our Army. We destroyed our Navy. And we entered four-power pacts and nine-power pacts with enemies who laughed at our imbecility as we left ourselves defenseless while demanding that all the world observe our declarations of policy, which we had no power to enforce. Our public followed the leaders who promised them something for nothing, and sneered at and scorned those few leaders who told them the truth. As a result of our failure to pay the debt we owed the men who died in the last war, the murderous and obscene Prussian empire was permitted to reconstitute itself. Of the men who were responsible for the death and havoc of the last war, not one was punished. Seeing that there was no real penalty on failure, the Prussian and Japanese war lords were encouraged to go forward again with their long-cherished plans of conquest. As a result of our neglect of our national duty, our friends and neighbors—whose names are on that plaque—have been murdered. Their homes are desolate. Millions of people in Europe have died, and many more millions in Europe, and all over the world, have been reduced to a degree of misery and degradation worse than death. And today, it is only due to the strategical errors of our enemies that we have had an opportunity to prepare to defend ourselves and to remedy the mistakes of the past 20 years. Had England been invaded after Dunkerque; had the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor with an army of occupation, the United States would now be the battleground.

And the reason for this plaque—and the reason for its being where it is—is that those of us who are responsible for it have determined that if the citizens of this county this time forget their obligation to these men who have died that they might live, they will do it deliberately. Their obligation will be before their eyes every day. I hope and trust that a similar plaque will be placed in every county in the United States, in every big factory, in every church, in every great business establishment, so that every citizen, as he goes about his ordinary affairs, cannot miss seeing the names of his own dead and realize that to them he owes his life, his liberty, and his privileges as an American citizen.

This plaque is not a monument to these men whose names are now on it, or to those whose names are to go on it. Their monument is an unravaged coast; undestroyed cities; women and children and old men living in decency and peace and freedom. This memorial is directed to us—to the citizens of Harrison County—to remind us that we owe these men a debt, and that that debt is: This must not happen again. The victory must be won—victory absolute and complete. And we must make and keep ourselves, our own Nation, strong enough to maintain the peace that we will have won.

We come here in holy righteous anger, resolved that the men who are responsible for this war must be punished personally. Their punishment must be dire and terrible. It has been said that you cannot indict a nation. That is right. A nation cannot commit a crime. Crime is committed by man. The names of the men who have committed this crime are known. They must be sought out, hunted down, wherever they take refuge, tried, and, when found guilty, punished.

The whole Prussian Junker class responsible for this war have lived on, and for, war since 1660. That class must be destroyed. This Prussian, so-called German, Empire is an artificial monstrosity, created by "blood and iron," forced on an unwilling population that has been turned into an instrument for making war by a group who glorify war as an end in itself, who have made war a substitute for religion, and worship brute force as we Christians worship charity and the love of God and our neighbor. That Empire must be destroyed.

Japan is a pagan nation, with a deified ruler, governed absolutely by hereditary clans of warriors who, in their hearts, believe that they are appointed by their god to rule and govern, not only the Japanese, but the world. They believe this as revealed religious dogma and they believe that war is their only honorable occupation.

If we are going to realize what we are fighting we must realize that the Prussian Junker and the Japanese Samurai are absolutely sincere that what we are fighting are not wicked men doing something they know to be wicked and bad, but honest fanatics, sincerely believing that they are doing the will of God. What we are fighting is heresy, and that heresy is the denial of the freedom of the human will. These deliberate Japanese atrocities, such as the organized mass rape of English nurses and the execution of the American flyers who bombed Tokyo, are calculated to make it impossible for any group of Japanese to eliminate the Samurai from power and make peace. The same is true of the Nazi atrocities in Poland, in Greece; the deportation of the youth of France as hostages; the deliberate extermination of the natural leaders of the people of Norway, Holland, and Belgium.

There is no possibility of our making peace with our present enemies. There is no common ground upon which we can meet. Our differences are fundamental. Either we have to turn our whole civilization into an instrument for making war for conquest, or we have to destroy these enemies, so that peace can be established on this star we call earth.

I make no pretense of being a military expert, but for a moment let us consider

the strategical situation as it is today. Our only effective help is the British Empire and the Soviet. France is prostrate, but we may create an effective ally in the French Empire. Hitler today has possession of every part of Europe that he needs, or will need, for the next 25 years, with an armed zone of defense from three to five hundred miles deep around what his writers have called the heart of Europe. Within his boundaries he has everything he needs for making war—provided he is permitted to develop it. The same is true of Japan and her conquests in the South Pacific. Either one of them would be happy to have a year's truce, or a 5-year's truce, or a peace that might last for a generation, with conditions remaining exactly as they are.

It is true that we have driven the Axis Powers out of north Africa, a campaign our military leaders had confidently expected to complete—as Mr. Churchill told our Congress—before the first of January. Now, we are taking the offensive. Let us consider whether we have won the offensive, or whether the offensive has been thrust upon us, and always remember that our capacity for waging war in Europe does not depend upon ringing statements from Casablanca, but does depend upon the amount of shipping space available for the transportation of troops and materials of war to the scene of war. Except from the air, we are not yet in contact with the German armies. And, so far as I know, there is no military opinion to the effect that the Russians can wage a successful offensive against the German armies. At best it is hoped that they can hold them. In the East the situation is the same. We have to dislodge the Japanese. We have to search out their fleet and their armies, and destroy them. For God's sake, don't let anyone deceive us into thinking that this is going to be done easily, or rapidly, and without terrible cost in blood and treasure.

We were forced into this war because it was and is the apparent fixed resolution of our people, our politicians, and our so-called intelligentsia, not to see things as they are; to deal in names instead of realities. Every German and Japanese writer for the past 20 years has told us that their strategy calls for a long war. That the virtue, the manliness, of the people of the United States has been sapped by ease and luxury. That its public opinion is effeminate, and that the United States cannot, and will not, take the losses and privations that a long hard war necessarily entails. This low opinion of our national war morale is based on evidence. In the last war our allies and our enemies say that we went from absolute indifference to hysteria in 8 months. They are acute students of public opinion. They are convinced that mass emotions come in waves, and that action and reaction are equal and opposite in direction, and they feel that after our first enthusiasms after privations become universal, when the casualty lists start to come in by thousands, our civilian population will become revolted and will force our Government to make a peace that will apparently leave us entirely unimpaired, but will leave our enemies in a position to develop and consolidate their conquests, and to so tremendously increase their power that when they are ready for the next phase they can and will destroy us.

It is our duty and our debt to the men whose names are on this plaque, and other similar memorials throughout the country, to see that no peace is made until victory is complete. And when victory is won we have the further and imperative duty to see that after the peace our Nation is secure—our own Nation. These men did not die for democracy. They died for the United States of America, its people, its principles, and its institutions. Of course, we will cooperate with our allies to insure peace. Of course, our allies will agree to cooperate with us to insure peace. But let us hope that we will never again rely on treaties to secure our peace. We cannot possibly depend on the guaranties of others. Where are the democracies of Europe that relied on the strength, the promises, the guaranties of others? As General Johnson said in 1940, "There are 10 of them, from Czechoslovakia to France, hanging like the slaughtered corpses of Bluebeard's wives in Hitler's bloody closet." We have no right to depend upon the strength of any nation for our national existence. We must rely on our own strength and the courage, patriotism, and loyalty of our own people.

Assuming that the victory has been won and we are making the peace, who, with us, are going to determine the fate of the world? Remember that Russia ceased to exist in 1918. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not Russia, just as the United States is not Texas. And the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is not at war with Japan. The British Empire is not a democracy. For example, General Montgomery owes no allegiance to the British Empire. He is not an Englishman—he is a citizen of Northern Ireland. His oath of allegiance does not run to England, Northern Ireland, or the British Empire. He swears loyalty and allegiance to his King. So runs the oath of every officer in the British Imperial Army. France, Poland, and Czechoslovakia and the Baltic states were republics. They have ceased to exsit. China is a republic, but China is not a nation. It is an empire, like Germany, consisting of a number of nations. And it would indeed be a daring man who would try to count on what will come out of the chaos we now call China.

Our fuzzy-minded intellectuals who talk about a supernational government—to which we will trust our destinies—cannot be permitted to prevail. These men whose names are on this plaque died to defend the American way of life. And our duty to them is to preserve these United States—true to the principles upon which it was founded—because they and we believe these principles are right.

We will do well to occasionally stop and think why we are in this war. We did not declare war on Japan, Germany, or Italy. In a crusade to save democracy to the world we definitely refused the crusader role. We were attacked without warning by Japan. Our men at Pearl Harbor were brutally murdered—not killed in war. And Germany and Italy declared war on us. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics entered on no crusade for democracy. Stalin's treaty with Hitler gave Hitler a free hand to attack Poland. Without that treaty he would not have dared attack Poland.

And, as consideration for this free hand, Stalin was to get the part of Poland that he occupied. Stalin's treaty with Japan gave Japan a free hand in the South Pacific, and, without this treaty with Stalin, Japan would not have dared attack Pearl Harbor, because if we had Siberian bases for our planes, Japan could not wage war. Now, Stalin's existence depends upon us. Would not now be the time to get the bases we need in the Soviet Socialist Republics of eastern Asia?

If we have one settled principle of foreign policy it is that the United States will not recognize the title of the conqueror to territory acquired by force. Unless we abandon this principle, Poland and the Baltic republics occupied by the Soviet, must be restored.

How can we enter into a superstate where no two partners agree upon the fundamental principles upon which all just government is based? The Soviet Union acknowledges the validity of no principle enunciated in our Declaration of Independence. As said by President Roosevelt on February 11, 1940, "The Soviet Union, as everybody knows that has the courage to face the fact, is a dictatorship as absolute as any dictatorship in the world."

But we can do business with the Soviet Union, who, like us, is engaged in war against Hitler. And we can do business with our allies, and with them we can make peace, but only if we deal with them as they are. Then let us have the truth, not nauseating propaganda like the picture Mission to Moscow. We are not children. We are men. And if we are permitted to know things as they are, and deal with realities honestly, trading consideration for consideration, the public will support the Government, and, as a Nation, we can preserve the peace of the world, but only if as a Nation we are resolved to allow to other nations those privileges which we demand for ourselves That is, to determine for themselves their own form of government.

And we can do our part toward peace, and we can pay our debt to the men who died in 1917 and 1918, and to the men whose names are on this plaque and to the men who are dying for us today, if we will prosecute this war to a final and complete victory, and, when peace comes, accept the sacrifices and the hardships necessary to maintain ourselves strong enough to defend ourselves and our liberties against any combination of enemies, and to that end, make alliances with our allies, depending ever not on our allies, but on our own strength and resolution and the loyalty and patriotism of our own people.

Bond Rally Address by Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able, interesting, informative, and patriotic address delivered by Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General of the United States Army, at a bond rally held at Somerset, Pa., on July 5, 1943.

At this time I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to say that, in my opinion, General Ulio has made a very efficient, and a very fine Adjutant General of the Army. No man more competent could have been selected, and no better man has ever filled the position of The Adjutant General of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ordinarily this would be a difficult assignment for me to undertake, for I am neither an orator nor a salesman.

However, in taking part in these ceremonies incident to this War-bond rally, I feel that neither of these qualifications are of particular importance.

As free Americans I know full well that you are more than willing to do your individual share in the matter of assisting your Government finance its war program, a program in which we all share such a vital stake.

From that 1st day of May in 1941, when our Commander in Chief purchased the first War bond, then known as Defense bonds, the people of this Nation have responded to successive War bond and stamp drives in a most generous and patriotic manner.

Quota after quota has been met through the united efforts of a free and independent people who have been only too willing to underwrite their own and their Nation's future through the purchase of these bonds and stamps.

But we cannot, we must not be satisfied with the goals that have been attained in the past. Our sights must constantly be raised to meet increased demands of the armed forces for vast new quantities of munitions and equipment.

I sometimes wonder if our people, in buying their full share of bonds and stamps, fully comprehend the vital necessity of their purchases in direct relation to the prosecution of the war. Only when such a realization is had, can one feel that he or she is contributing directly to the downfall of the enemy.

Speaking as The Adjutant General of the Army, I want to tell you frankly, yet briefly, some of the reasons why your individual bond and stamp purchases are so important.

Today we are fighting a new type war, a war in which the balance of power is held—not by men alone, but by machines and weapons of modern warfare. In every campaign, in every battle in which American soldiers have taken part the outcome has been decided, in the final analysis, by the quality and quantity of our weapons and equipment.

We are engaging the enemy not on one continent, not on one hemisphere but in battle areas throughout the world. We have in the field today the largest Army in the history of this Nation; we have the largest Navy ever to fly the Stars and Stripes on the high seas, and, in the air—we have the world's most powerful air force.

Today, in the Army, we have whole divisions which are completely mechanized. We have the finest and best equipment had by any army in the world. It is hardly necessary for me to tell you that the cost of equipping and maintaining an army the size of ours is stupendous. The sum of money required to run the Army for a single year runs into figures which stagger the imagination.

Statistics are seldom interesting, and it is not my purpose to bore you with them today. There are, however, a few figures—relative to the cost of Army equipment—which I should like to recite as a means of giving you some insight into the tremendous amount of money required to equip the Army alone. Large sums are, of course, also necessary for the maintenance of the Navy, the marines, and the Coast Guard.

A single heavy bomber costs $300,000; a medium bomber, $175,000; a small fighter plane, $75,000; a 60-ton tank, $145,000; a medium tank, $90,000; a light tank, $45,000; a 75-millimeter antitank gun, $10,000; a 90-millimeter antiaircraft mobile gun, $43,800; a 25-ton pontoon bridge, $130,000; a Garand rifle, $80; a 155-millimeter howitzer, $32,700; a .50 caliber machine gun, $740; a scout car, $7,500.

These are but a few, but they are nonetheless typical of modern Army costs. Multiply them thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of times, and you can have some slight conception of Army costs in World War No. 2.

Consider the cost of a single bomber in relation to the great fleets of bombers of the Army Air Forces, fleets which the commanding general of the Air Forces stated a few days ago would be augmented by 115,000 new planes during the coming year. Consider the cost of a tank in relation to the great numbers of these mechanized giants which are now possessed by the Army Ground Forces.

Only when we have some idea of the cost of maintaining our armed forces can we have a clear understanding of how important is the purchase of every bond and stamp, regardless of its denomination.

Every single 10-cent stamp helps. An idea of what can be accomplished in the aggregate through their sale may be had by the results attained in the selling of stamps by the Nation's newsboys. I am informed that sales conducted by the newsboys thus far have totalled some $75,000,000, a most remarkable achievement on the part of these energetic youths.

I like to look upon the purchase of a bond or stamp, not as a personal investment on the part of the purchaser, but rather as a very definite investment in America. For today, we are engaged in a war of survival against the forces of tyranny and oppression. We are passing through the most critical period of our national history. You good people on the home front, through such efforts as bond and stamp purchases, are just as important to the successful prosecution of the war as any man in the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Marine Corps. For this is a people's war which will tax every energy and resource at our command.

The importance of bond and stamp purchases has been strikingly evidenced by our soldiers themselves, particularly those on the fighting fronts. Our reports in the War Department indicate that a large percentage of American soldiers overseas are regularly buying bonds, for they know only too well, from actual experience, the part their money, along with yours and mine, is playing in providing them with the sinews of victory.

Well over half of all American soldiers in the European theater of operations are now participating in the Army's bond reservation pay-roll plan. What greater incentive could we ask than that provided by these soldiers (officers and enlisted men alike) who, in addition to actually waging the war against the enemy, are also investing heavily in bonds and stamps.

Despite the great numbers of men now in the Army, there are many thousands of our citizens (men and women alike) who are not privileged to serve in their country's armed forces for one or several reasons. They are, nevertheless, patriotic citizens with a high sense of devotion and duty to their country. These folks at home have and will continue to form the great backbone of the bond- and stamp-buying public.

Our soldiers in the Army throughout the world are depending on you for more and better equipment. I know you will not let them down.

The dividends you will receive from them in the form of American and United Nations triumphs on the field of battle will make your financial sacrifice seem small in comparison.

Your bond and stamp investments now will insure for you and for them a future in an America whose twentieth-century destiny is at this very moment being forged on battle fronts in Europe and in Asia.

The Food Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address by former President Herbert Hoover, delivered before the American Farm Bureau Federation, in New York City, on June 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I propose tonight to make a checkup on where we have got to on the food front.

I propose to explore what happened during the 1942 food year.

I shall then examine the prospects before us for the 1943 food year.

I shall from this experience and the world need state our problem.

And I will make some recommendations for the future.

The strategy of the food front is second only to the military front in winning total war. It is of more importance than the military front in establishing peace. Total wars can be lost on the food front. Failure to recognize the importance of the food front has lost wars before now.

Through the glorious courage and ability of our Army and Navy we are making progress against a most cruel and mighty enemy. We grow stronger on the military front. We must now build up the food front. It should be reorganized again. Our job is not destructive criticism. It is to contribute constructive suggestions. The only thing that counts now is to win victory and secure the peace.

To those who are not familiar with food problems, let me say that our food year is approximately from July, when the harvest starts, to the next July, when it begins again.

THE FOOD YEAR 1942–43

We are still eating mostly on the 1942 production.

Newspaper headlines of official statements from Washington as to our present food year read:

"The most abundant harvest in 41 years."

"Harvest per acre 12 percent above all records."

"There are abundant food supplies."

"The ever-normal granary assures no shortages of food."

"Greatest food production in our history."

"We have more beef cattle, dairy cows and hogs than ever before."

"Food Administrator says food outlook is good."

This happiness and exultation in Washington did not seem to be reflected in the realistic land of housewives. A few quotations from many thousands of city press headlines over the last 4 months carry less enthusiasm.

New York City: "City facing first famine in our history." "Less than 20 percent of normal meat supplies for 8 weeks." "Shops cannot supply the Government ration." "Prices above ceilings." "One thousand and fifty-five black-market convictions."

"Mayor comes to the rescue and imports 600,000 pounds of potatoes."

Thus the mayor was lighting up the dark scene with 1 potato for every third person among the 7,000,000 people in New York. The headlines blazed for days over the mayor's having "secured 1,000,000 pounds of meat." That nourished each person with a gorge of meat equal to the weight of 2 silver dollars for just 1 meal. The mayor, however, was doing his best to keep up good cheer.

Boston: "A desperate food shortage." "Meat and vegetables nonexistent to thousands of families." "Arrivals lowest in history." "Hundred indicted in black markets."

San Francisco: "Shortage of meat and vegetables critical all along the coast." And even in the food belt we hear:

Chicago: "Shortage of meat, vegetables; black markets all about." "Housewives cannot find meat promised on ration cards."

CITES CITIES' PLIGHT

In Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, Seattle, Omaho, St. Louis, and a dozen other cities,

are headlines of the same import: "Scarcity," "Famine," "Black markets," "Shops closing; Cannot get the ration in meats, fats, vegetables."

Somehow all this leads me to the notion that the situation is bewildering.

The statistics are also perplexing. The Department of Agriculture states that the extraordinarily favorable weather at last harvest gave us a 12-percent greater yield an acre than ever before in our history. It shows a greater production of meats and fats than ever before in our history. Lend-Lease says we are shipping under 10 percent of our total meats and fats abroad. Office of Price Administration says it has rationed down meat consumption by 30 percent. Seaboard city marketing officials say not half of the meat and fat ration is available in the markets. Perhaps some statisticians can tie these figures together. They might also try to tie up the potato figures. I am aware of all the explanations. But one thing is certain. If the statistics are correct, and I do not challenge them, then some bureaucracy is strangling the flow of food from the farmer to the housewife.

RECALLS CROP LIMITATIONS

But underlying all this turmoil there is a fundamental disorder. It may surprise some people to know that in the 7 years between the harvests of 1932 and 1939, through Government restrictions, the acreage in 17 leading crops harvested was reduced by 47,000,000 acres. These 17 crops are about 95 percent of our whole harvested area.

When lend-lease was passed in March 1941, we undertook thereby a vast increased burden of food production. Yet payments to farmers to restrict production were not all removed for the two plantings of 1941 and 1942. By 1942 we had recovered only 9,000,000 of these 47,000,000 lost acres in the 17 leading crops.

During the last year we were saved, and our allies were saved, from disaster by the superbumper crop. It is not likely to be repeated soon.

1943 PROSPECTS

However, we have eaten our way to the end of that superbumper crop. We may, therefore, explore the prospects for the next food year that is now just coming on the horizon.

Two years ago, 1 year ago, 6 months ago, you and I warned that failure to place food production on an equality with munitions would bring disaster. Last winter the Midwest Governors, Congress, your organization, all of us, demanded drastic reforms in food control, increased manpower for the farms, and more farm machinery. We wanted to recover more of the 47,000,000 lost acres.

Following this, the Department of Agriculture issued a report on farmers' intentions to plant, indicating an increase of 4 percent in the acreage the coming year over that of last summer. The implication of that figure to the public was a probable increase of 4 percent of food over the superbumper harvest of last year. We vitally needed an increased production over last year. But to assure this with normal yields we should have had, not a 4-percent increase, but a 15-percent increase in planting. However, the use of this comforting 4-percent figure led the country into a statistical paradise. And such is the power of statistics that the demands for reform were flattened out. We were told we were alarmsits and something worse.

SOME REFORMS WON

We did secure part reforms. They were not accepted with the speed of light. But finally the War Department, after unkind remarks, gave concessions by deferring some farm boys from draft. The War Production Board authorized a modest increase in farm machinery. One more agency was added to the eight separate and conflicting agencies dealing with food. It was all too little and too late.

Now let us examine what has become of this statistical paradise of increasing food supply. To present to you an independent view, I have canvassed the agricultural authorities in several leading farm States. These reports indicate that the 4-percent increase is likely to vanish. And the indication is that we shall have a normal, not an extraordinary, yield like that of last year. If so, we will have a decrease in the national grain crops of anything from 10 to 15 percent from that of last year. The outlook for wheat and rye is certainly a decrease of 260,000,000 bushels less than 1942, or at least 26 percent.

We have increased our flocks and herds beyond our ability to feed them without the lost 47,000,000 acres. The agricultural experts are estimating a shortage of 10 percent to 15 percent in full supply of feed for our animals during the next year. We can get some feed from Canada. But it appears that we will have about exhausted the surplus of feed of the whole North American continent during the next 12 months. Already we are feeding large amounts of wheat to our livestock, and we are using it for industrial alcohol. By this time next year we will have a little surplus of bread grains beyond our own needs.

WHERE BLAME RESTS

Thus our supply of food is declining while at the same time the demand is dangerously rising. And these decreases cannot be blamed upon floods which have destroyed less than one-half of 1 percent, nor upon the weather, for that promises about normal crops. Nor can they be laid upon the farmer.

The American farm folks are the most skilled farmers in the world. They produce more per person than any agricultural people on earth. They have done a heroic job in planting this crop with but little help. In January last they were promised an agricultural army of 3,500,000 city folks. But it has not arrived at the food front yet. They must be there before the harvest.

The blunt conclusion from all this is: (a) Our cities will have less food supply during the next winter and spring even than they had in the last few months; (b) we will not starve; (c) we can, by better organization, and by tightening our belts, continue to feed our allies; (d) if the war in Europe should come to an end within the next 12 months, we should have no consequential food supplies with which to meet three or four hundred millions of starving people.

PREPAREDNESS FOR THE HARVEST OF 1944

Remedy for the 1943 harvest year is now too late, as the planting is mostly done. We must begin to build up the harvest of a year from now. That is in 1944.

We still have time to redeem the situation. If it is to be redeemed, we must have far wider vision. We must have drastic changes in national policies.

We simply must take seriously certain elemental facts. We must realize that the major burden of the world's food front falls on the North American farmer and the American consumer. We must realize that in peacetime on balance, we are a food importing country and today we are blockaded against many imports. We must furnish extra food to our military forces. We must ship large amounts of food to our Allies to support them in the war. We must realize that there is a minimum level in food for our 130,000,000 civilians without impairing their physical and moral resistance.

And we have also pledged ourselves to hundreds of millions of people in the world that they will be rescued from the terrible famine which has been brought upon them by a monstrous enemy. Without this action there will be no peace.

We must realize that this food shortage will last for a minimum of 4 and possibly 6 years. These are stupendous burdens.

THE ANSWER TO HITLER

But we have an answer to Hitler.

We can ration down our own consumption further with good management. And we can make sure that we do not lose the war on the food front if we stop the degeneration in agriculture and bring in a far greater production in 1944. We must do it. Otherwise we are headed for a world trouble. We have the resources to do it.

As a foundation for 1944 we must get all that lost 47,000,000 acres back into cultivation. To do that our authorities must decide whether they will spare the manpower and farm-machinery manufacture from other activities. And we must begin now or again it will be too late and too little.

REFORM IN FOOD CONTROL

Organizing the food front means far more than just increasing acreage, manpower, and farm machinery. It also requires wise coordination of prices, of processors, of distributors, and rationing.

A month ago the press reported a spokesman of the Office of Price Administration as saying, "Food prices and food distribution are out of control." It was denied by another spokesman next day. But the second spokesman had not discussed it with the housewives nor with the farmers. However, when we are fighting a war grief over spilled milk does not make more milk. Our question must be, Where do we go from here?

There is only one course which will clear up this muddle of uncontrolled food prices, local famines, profiteering, black markets, and stifled farm production. That is to abandon the obsolete methods now in use which were proved a failure in other nations in the last war or are copied from the British whose situation is wholly different from ours. We should start with the system which proved a success under the Americans in the last war and improve it.

And let me say this about food control while we were in the last war:

LESSONS OF LAST WAR

We steadily increased our food production. We shipped more food to our allies monthly than is being shipped today. We had no local famines in the United States as we are having now. We had no black markets. We had a people zealous in a moral crusade to help win the war with food, instead of lots of people trying to beat the game. Including the Department of Agriculture, we had only 23,000 paid Federal employees connected with food. Today we have over 120,000. Moreover, food prices rose only 17.9 percent in the 17 months after we declared war in 1917. Washington statisticians admit a rise of 24.3 percent in the 17 months since Pearl Harbor. The housewives will admit a rise of at least 35 percent.

I do not pretend that our methods were perfect in that war. We had to pioneer an unknown field. Results ought to be better in this war and not worse.

A PROGRAM

But what should we do now?

First. The first necessity is to consolidate all authority over food production and distribution under one single responsible administrator. There are too many cooks for too little food. Control of food is now divided nine ways over the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, the Lend-Lease, the Board of Economic Wel-

fare, the Army, the Navy, the Manpower Commission, and the War Production Board.

The recent addition of the ninth wheel, even though so able a man as Mr. Chester Davis as Food Administrator, does not make a food administration. The food functions of all these agencies must be moved into his office. He must have the right to hire and fire. The Food Administrator must today be Secretary of Agriculture, and the importance of food in the outcome of the war and peace should be recognized by his appointment to the new Office of War Mobilization.

Second. Decentralize the work under State, municipal, and county administrators. In no other way can farmers' and consumers' needs be adjusted to our varied local conditions.

Third. Increase the manpower on the farms to a higher level than before the war and plant 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres more in 1944 than in this year. On this question of manpower I offer a suggestion because we must have more skilled labor on the farms.

Public pressure upon our farm boys to join the forces is very great. They are not slackers and do not want to be called slackers. They do not want their gates painted yellow. They are doing a great and indispensable service. If we are to save this situation, I believe farm boys should be called to the Army from the farms immediately after this harvest; that the farm boys should be called up from industry; that they should be given some military training. Then as many of them as are necessary should from time to time be ordered back to the farms with their uniforms. They should receive their pay from the farms, and not the Army. They should be subject to call in national danger. That would give dignity to their service. They could constitute a great national reserve both for production of food and the direct military effort.

Fourth. Agricultural machinery on an average lasts about 12 years. Theoretically about 1 years' supply or one-twelfth of our machinery has been used up through suppression of manufacture. It will also require great additions to handle this extra 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres in 1944.

Fifth. Abolish the system of retail and wholesale price ceilings. It begins at the wrong end. Price fixing in a great food-producing country must begin as near as possible to the farmer and controls proceed from there on by regulation of the trades against profiteering. Prices rose less when this system was applied in the last war than they have under the present retail ceilings. We must regulate the flow of water at the nozzle instead of chasing the drops from the shower.

This present price system is stifling farm production. It is not stopping inflation.

Sixth. Ask the farmers to appoint their own war committee on prices and do a little collective bargaining with them in fixing prices. The so-called parities should be abandoned for the war. Prices to the farmer must include floors as well as ceilings. Prices should be fixed that will take into account labor and other costs, and above all that will stimulate production.

Such a revolution in the price system would save a few tens of thousands of policemen. It is difficult to catch an economic force with a policeman anyway.

Seventh. Rations should be set to balance consumption to production. It only adds muddle to put the ration higher than the available supplies. And it brings great injustice, for some people get the ration and some don't. We should simplify the whole rationing business by over 50 or 60 percent. It can be done by decreasing the number and variety of articles rationed and by excluding all absolutely nonessential food from rationing.

WAY TO CHECK INFLATION

It would certainly give a mighty lift of spirit to the housewife and to the grocer. Also it would save some of their time for other war duties. Also a good way to check inflation is to let food luxuries go to the highest bidder. That would spigot off spare money and get it into channels where the 90-percent-profit taxes can bite into it.

Eighth. We should recognize that processing and distributing foods are righteous and necessary callings. Thousands of small firms are being driven out of business. It would help win the war if left-wing reforms in our food economy were suspended for the duration. We should establish war committees in all the processing and distributing trades. They should be given major responsibilities in keeping the flow of food moving to the right spots. They could greatly assist State and local officials in policing the trades. They, too, have sons in the war. They are just as patriotic men as lawyers and economists. They are the only people who know how. Their interest is to stamp out black markets. And their profits can be absolutely controlled.

CURB ON BLACK MARKETS

Enforce the condition of dealers' licenses so that they may deal only with another licensed dealer and then direct the railways and trucks to transport only for licensed dealers. This would stop most of the black markets.

Ninth. Such a system will avoid subsidies either to farmers or the trades or the consumers. Subsidies will not stop inflation. Subsidies are a delayed aggravation.

The New York Times properly says they "do not in the least deal with primary causes. They are like cleaning a room by sweeping the dirt under the bed."

And who is supposed to benefit by subsidies? It is supposed to be the worker, but the worker is also the taxpayer. So is the farmer. And taxes are, sooner or later, increased by just the same amount as the subsidy. Subsidies consist of taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another with an illusion attached that the cost of living has been reduced. It is both more painful and more costly to take money out of the tax pocket than it is to get it out of the price pocket. A wage based on subsidy foundations will break down sooner or later. Moreover, subsidy money increases Government borrowing and debt to the banks and that adds to inflation pressure. Far more serious, however, is the result to the farmer and the consumer. Price fixing based on any such concept will strangle production. Its operation in the distribution trades will clog the flow of commodities and will in the end increase prices and black markets. Likewise, subsidies can become a weapon of favoritism or of punishment in the hands of the huge bureaucracy. They will sooner or later lead to scandal.

If these broad lines, policies, and organization be adopted, then food will flow naturally from farm to processor, to wholesaler, to retailer, and to the consumer. Prices will be better restrained. They will be lower, for the black markets can be blacked out. The housewives will have less trouble and worry. And above all, farm production will be stimulated, not stifled.

But over and beyond better methods of food control, we must absolutely assure the maximum production of America.

Let me say again that that is the only road that leads to the defeat of inflation, to decreased hardship in our homes, to assured support of our allies and to peace for mankind.

If those in power and those not in power shall have wisdom, implacable resolve, a spirit of sacrifice, the field of America will blossom with an abundant life that will save vast human life in a world given to human destruction.

Congress and the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article taken from the Fact and Fancy column of the Gazette and Daily, York, Pa., issue of June 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT AND FANCY

The United States is on the brink of chaos. Only two things can save us. One is the statesmanship of President Roosevelt. The other is the good common sense of the American people.

Congress has gone berserk and the Democratic leadership of Congress is in utter confusion and is following the hate-drunken orgy of the Republicans.

In commenting on the actions of Congress Saturday the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Harrison Spangler, declared: "It is a manifestation of the President's increasing weakness in the country. I wouldn't think it would help his fourth-term chances."

Following Chairman Harrison Spangler came Senator BUTLER, Republican, from Nebraska. He said: "You would think that now Mr. Roosevelt would be willing to let somebody else have the job. I look upon the vote (overriding the veto of the Smith-Connally bill) as an indication that Congress has reclaimed some of its powers and intends to reclaim more."

Note well, good people, that neither Harrison Spangler nor Senator BUTLER gave any consideration whatever to the effect upon the United States at war. They were concerned only with what effect a Congress, running mad, frothing at the mouth, waving its arms in hysterical delirium might have upon Roosevelt's chances of securing a fourth term. And they themselves were deliriously happy in the thought that what they themselves had done might be turned against Roosevelt. This time they telegraphed their punch. They openly avow that they propose to blame Roosevelt for whatever wreckage might have been accomplished by their actions.

Spangler cries, "They (Congress) believe this home-front business is in a bog, that it is breaking down, and there is confusion in many ways." He strikes a triumphant note.

Well, good people, are you glad the home front is breaking down? Are you happy that the coalition of Republicans with a bunch of hookworm statesmen from the South has brought about the break-down of the home front? Do you imagine your son and your brother in the armed forces will be happy to learn that the Republicans and the reactionary Democrats have broken the home front and therefore his chances of not having the ammunition to protect himself, or even the food to keep him nourished have been greatly increased?

Do the armed forces want the home front broken, or do they want the home front solid behind them?

Let's review the acts of Congress which make Harrison Spangler and Senator BUTLER so deliriously happy.

This coalition revolt against the home front started several months ago with the rescind-

ing of the President's order controlling salaries over $25,000. Its peak of frenzy was overruling the President's veto of the Smith-Connally bill. It reached an all-time low in depravity Saturday when the Senate joined the House in scuttling subsidies to keep prices down.

In between times it voted a $6,000,000,000 tax evasion for a handful of rich people. It threw out social-security planning for the post-war period. It wrecked the Office of Price Administration by refusing to give it sufficient funds with which to operate. It virtually destroyed price ceilings by refusing to permit grade labeling. Now you pay the top price for inferior goods.

Moreover, it virtually assures that the Office of Price Administration will be staffed by men who have an economic interest in seeing price enforcement nullified. It refuses to permit the Office of Price Administration, except for Administrator Brown, to employ any price policy officials who have not had at least 5 consecutive years of experience in the field of business in which they are helping to shape price policies.

That is the equivalent of calling in representatives of various processing firms and telling them to go ahead with the sky the limit.

Subsidies will not be permitted for keeping prices of food down, but subsidies will be encouraged to increase profits. The oil companies will continue to get subsidies for increased transportation costs. The copper, lead, and zinc mine owners will receive subsidies to increase production of these metals. The processors of vegetable oils, chiefly cotton and corn, both in the hands of big corporations, will be subsidized to produce more. Only the food grower will not be subsidized. He will get his from hiking the prices of foodstuffs which our workers must buy in order to eat. But our workers have been frozen at the level of last August. They are fast reaching the point where they won't be buying. If they strike for wages high enough to buy food, their leaders will be clapped in jail under the Smith-Connally act.

Inflation is upon us, and Congress has brought about chaos. It has been done, not to help the war, but to beat Roosevelt in 1944.

Good people, isn't it true that the war is with us now, and we should be in a position to win it, whereas the next presidential election is in 1944, and the war could be over before November of 1944 if we were really fighting it?

Which do you want to fight—Roosevelt or Hitler?

The Republican party leaders and the Republican bloc in Congress have elected to fight Roosevelt. The cost of their fighting Roosevelt you will have to pay along with the cost of the war against Hitler.

A Redeclaration of Independence, Adopted by the National Economic Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a declaration known as "A Redeclaration of Independence," adopted at a meeting last week of the National Economic Council at Chicago.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REDECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

We, the undersigned, citizens of our respective States and of the United States, bound together by an unalterable determination to fight this war to a victorious conclusion, do make this declaration:

On July 4, 1776, our fathers met in Philadelphia and declared America's independence.

As sovereigns they erected in each colony a republican government of limited powers, reserving to themselves their natural and inalienable rights.

They fought an exhausting war and made good their declaration.

Then, in order to form a more perfect union, they adopted a Constitution to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity.

Under the Constitution the people of this country have enjoyed more freedom and greater opportunities and a higher general level of well-being than men have gained under any other system of society.

The principles of liberty and free government thus established are now being violated and destroyed by public servants whom we have entrusted with high national office, and by their appointees.

They have erected a multitude of new offices and have sent among us a swarm of officers and Federal employees who harass the people and eat out their substance.

They exercise legislative powers so that today many of the laws controlling our business and domestic lives are made, interpreted, and enforced by bureaucrats who are neither known nor responsible to the people they govern.

They have gained power over the public purse so that billions of dollars of the people's money have been wastefully expended for purposes unauthorized by, and unknown to, the people's representatives.

The courts have been rendered subservient to the Executive and have become subordinate agencies of that branch of government, instead of being the impartial tribunals to which we rightfully look for protection against executive or legislative tyranny.

The press is harassed, its freedom threatened, and the radio controlled.

The wage-earner is being forced into associations not of his own choosing.

The farmer is being deprived of his right to manage his land and dispose of his crops.

The employer is being deprived of authority so to manage his business as to provide goods and services to the extent necessary for the armed forces and the civilian population.

The autonomy of our respective States, guaranteed by the tenth amendment of the Federal Constitution, has been curtailed by Federal authority without warrant of law, so that State officials are no longer able to protect our domestic interests.

Thus, the form of government which our fathers founded to insure liberty to the individual is being changed into one in which, under the guise of social reform and on the pretext of the needs of war, freedom is being concentrated in the Executive as the symbol of the State.

As sovereign citizens of our respective States and of the United States, we demand of all of our elective officials, both State and Federal, the resumption and exercise of their powers in accordance with our constitutional system.

We demand the reestablishment of the legislative, judicial, and executive as separate and coordinate branches of government equal in dignity and power.

We demand that the bills of rights in our respective State constitutions and the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution be scrupulously observed.

We demand that all our foreign policies, political and economic, be related definitely to our American needs and ideals, and with the objective of protecting and perpetuating the form of government and economic policies which have made our country great.

We demand that our foreign policies, whether political or economic, shall not be permitted to destroy or impair either our form of government or our standard of living.

A proper respect for the future of mankind makes it fitting, this July 4, 1943, that we reexamine our present state and rededicate ourselves with a new devotion, not only in word but in deed, to the basic principles, held by our forebears, which have too long been forgotton or ignored.

Therefore, we pledge ourselves to organize committees of correspondence to advance these, our faiths, throughout the country. And we call on all persons of like mind and faith to join with us.

Believing that absolute arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of free men exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority, and that the maintenance of our free institutions and the perpetuity of the Union depend upon the preservation of the rights of local self-government, unimpaired to all the States, we have hereto set our names.

War Bond Sales in Greenville County, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by Mr. Ellis M. Johnston, chairman of the war finance committee for my home county of Greenville, S. C., that sales reported second war loan drive April 12 to May 1, 1943, and that the total sales of all Treasury Department sales in said county were $8,600,529, which is by far the largest amount of securities sold in any county in the State.

It is with much pleasure that I make this public acknowledgment of the fine services rendered by Chairman Johnston and his coworkers in the sale of war securities. I also here and now proudly acknowledge the fine cooperation on behalf of the thousands of the good people of my home county and district who are continuing their purchases of war securities.

Speech at Dedication of Honor Roll at Milford, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday July 8, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following address I delivered at the dedication of the honor roll at Milford, Mass., July 4, 1943:

On this blessed day of American independence, when we once more commemorate the birth of our beloved country, it is my great privilege to join with you in dedicating this beautiful honor roll to those who have entered the service of our country.

Here, in the midst of their homes and the places they loved best of all, with their relatives and friends gathered about this sacred shrine, with public officials, leading citizens, and civic and military organizations lending their dignity, with esteemed spiritual leaders bestowing their prayers, all of Milford is proud indeed to pay homage and render tribute today to its loyal, patriotic sons and daughters.

From the homes and firesides of this beautiful community, in numbers more than commensurate with its size, these brave young folks have rallied to the call of country's need and have gone forth unselfishly to many parts of the world to do their vital and constructive part in defeating the tyrannical forces of brutality and greed that would overpower our Nation and destroy our priceless institutions.

It is, of course, most appropriate that we should accord them, through these ceremonies and this most artistic scroll, some measure of our grateful acknowledgment of their immortal sacrifices and unselfish service. There is a particular significance, however, in the fact that we should gather here in such large numbers on the glorious Fourth of July, because this day, perhaps more than any other American holiday, symbolizes the courage, the faith, the idealism and the devotion to country which these gallant young folks now demonstrate. This day, above all others, exemplifies the struggles, the trials, the sacrifices and the almost incredible hardships of those who established American liberty and turned over to their successors a greater measure of freedom and justice than human beings had ever been able to obtain.

For over 160 years, through adversity, through the dark clouds of dissension and civil strife, through trials that sorely tested the fortitude of the people, through ominous storms of war—indeed, through every human ordeal—this Nation has perpetuated that liberty, that justice, and that freedom and has maintained here in the Western Hemisphere a great liberal government which has been at once the refuge of the downtrodden and the oppressed and the hope of lovers of freedom and peace.

In this hour of peril, when we are caught in the devouring tentacles of global war so vast and so colossal that it is almost beyond comprehension, the fiber and mettle of our people is being tested as never before. We are not only called upon to wage war in distant parts of the world, in almost every clime and place inhabited by human creatures but, most unfortunately, we are also faced in our own country with the menace of the destruction of our priceless form of government and economic system.

Thus the American people at this most crucial time are fighting two wars, one against foreign tyrants and ruthless dictators, and the other against scheming, cunning, designing domestic enemies who seek to replace our democratic institutions with the slavish, totalitarian state.

On the first Fourth of July the agents of a monarchial despot were ravaging the land and suppressing the rights of man. Today, agents of our own Government, often acting with the same disregard for fundamental rights that characterizes the Commissar, dominate some of our Federal administrative agencies and bedevil our people. The influence of some of these radical commissars and their civilian associates would reach into every American home, would strike at almost every American institution—at free speech, at free worship, at free economic activity, at the family unit, at the free way of life itself. Indeed, almost every phase of our existence has come to be regulated and regimented until the free initiative of our people is well nigh threatened with extinction. These dangerous tendencies and frightening realities must be checked.

If carefully planned movements, executed by cunning, radical groups, are permitted to reach their objectives all free government will be destroyed, all the basic liberties which the American people have fought to achieve during our whole history, and which our gallant sons and daughters now so bravely fight to maintain, will be lost. The will of bureaucratic commissars, ruling with an iron hand from the National Capitol over the destinies of the American people, will supplant the prerogatives of our chosen Representatives. Democracy will be ended—totalitarianism, bureaucracy, dictatorship of the proletariat, call it by any name you will, inspired and controlled by Communists and visionary social reformists of every type and breed, will preside over the Government of the United States. That is their aim, that is their determined purpose, that is what they intend, and that is what they are well on their way to accomplish.

What are we going to do about it? What are the free, untrammeled citizens of America going to do about it? Are we going to sit idly by in supine resignation and indifference while radical schemers and reformers tear down the magnificent citadel of American Government before our very eyes, or are we going to fight here on the home front, just as our brave boys are fighting in every part of the world, to keep and preserve our sacred liberties, to maintain and protect our right to live as free men and women.

As we bow our heads in prayer for Milford's gallant heroes who have already given their all that our country might live and for the safety and well being of their comrades now engaged in the most fateful struggle of all times, our thoughts come back to the homes and firesides of this great and patriotic community, to the mothers and fathers and relatives who are left behind to mourn their great loss, or to endure the indescribable agony that is known only to those who grieve and worry through long nights and trying days over the fate of their loved ones.

These brave sons and daughters who are in every part of the world, in every arm of the service, in every phase of this terrible global war, fighting so valiantly for the sacred cause of American liberty and safety, have attained great distinction. They hold every rank of merit. Some have been cited for heroism and bravery in action, and all are demonstrating a spirit of sacrifice, gallantry, and devotion that is to the everlasting credit of themselves, their families, and our country. Milford should lift its head in pride today for the glorious patriotism demonstrated by these young heroes who can be found everywhere in the vanguard of America's fighting forces making their unselfish sacrifices for home and democracy.

This beautiful honor roll placed here in the very midst of this beautiful and progressive community by the thoughtfulness and generosity of its citizens, will serve as constant reminder of the patriotic devotion which has impelled these noble sons and daughters of Milford to face even death itself, in order that our Nation may be spared from tyranny, injustice, and oppression.

Their unforgettable sacrifices emblazoned as they are upon this honor roll enriches, ennobles and consecrates it more eloquently than any words of ours. The large number of names appearing here must be a source of great pride to us all. Every race, every creed, and every faith is represented. But how inspiring it is to note the many names of our fellow citizens of Italian blood and heritage which appear on this scroll. This furnishes stronger proof than anything else of the magnificent patriotism and loyalty to America of our esteemed and respected Italian-American friends whose love of country, whose willingness to render unselfish service and to make unstinted sacrifices is excelled by no other group of our fellow countrymen.

Love of country, love of family, love of church, love of the freedom of America, willingness to fight and to die, if need be, to protect and preserve it, these are the things that are gloriously manifest to all of us today as we gaze upon this roll. These are the things that have made America what it is, a land of refuge and hope and these are the things that will keep America what it is, a place where free men and women may live their lives in harmony, in toleration, and in peace, under institutions of equal opportunity for all.

Though the sacrifices be greater than those of any war this country has ever fought, these brave sons will surely defeat the enemies of our Nation. It remains for us who are at home to destroy the evil forces here within the confines of our own land, which conspire to undermine our precious liberties and substitute the slave state of economic oppression. If we wage this home-front battle for freedom with full appreciation of the dangers that menace us, we will be able to assure our heroes that this war will be conducted with efficiency and speed and that when it is over they will be able to come back promptly to their own homes and families and find the same free, democratic country they left, untarnished and unstained by the stigma and curse of unbridled radicalism, where they may enjoy once again the God-given right of every American citizen to live without exploitation or regimentation by the Government, under the free institutions ordained by our unequaled, matchless Constitution—a place where the right to free worship, free speech, and free enterprise, and all the other freedoms we cherish, are protected by law—a place where the sacred institution of the human family upon which all civilization is based is safe from the reach of fanatical, radical reformers.

And so on this great anniversary day of American independence as we proudly dedicate this sacred roll of honor to the living and the dead, to the gallant heroes of Milford, let us remember the great sacrifices which the early American founders, and countless generations since their time, have made to keep and preserve our blessed land. Let us catch some of the spirit of '76, something of the willingness gladly to fight and die for liberty and let us work and strive with all our hearts and our full strength to keep and preserve it for ourselves and those who come after us, praying to Almighty God that throughout the ages yet to come no enemy may set foot upon the sacred shores of America and that we who enjoy that proud bequest of loyalty, sacrifice, and patriotism, conceived and nurtured in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever known, sheltered and defended by the undying devotion of those who preceded us, protect and preserve that liberty in our own time and transmit it unimpaired and untarnished to our posterity so that freedom and peace may dwell in the homes and among the people of America.

Reflections of an Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank M. Sparks, from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of July 6, 1943:

REFLECTIONS OF AN EDITOR

(By Frank M. Sparks)

Lynn Clark, Kent County commissioner of schools, is in trouble and is asking the board of supervisors to help him out when it meets Wednesday. Well, it isn't so much Clark who is in trouble but the rural school system. The rural schools of Kent County need sadly a supervising teacher. Now this new helper he is asking is not for the purpose of installing any new-fangled notions in the school system but to keep the rural schools up where they belong in just the plain ordinary "three R's" and other fundamentals of a grade-school education.

Clark is suffering under the same handicaps that most of us are, no matter in what sort of business or profession we may be engaged. A great many of the rural school teachers have gone into the service or into some other occupation helpful to the winning of the war. The result is that the schools are suffering a tremendous shortage of teaching talent. To do as well as he can under the handicap Clark has called into service many teachers who perhaps have been away from their profession for 10 or 15 years, and so are entirely out of touch and out of practice, say nothing of being more or less ignorant of modern teaching methods and the courses to be taught. Many of these were mighty good teachers in their day but they must now have somebody to help them along a bit until they can get their bearings once more.

Clark also has been forced to employ some teachers who never did have much experience and perhaps never were the best sort of teachers and never will be. But he has to have teachers, so he has called in whatever he can get. Of course, this class of teacher especially needs some supervision and assistance in order to do even as well as she is capable or perhaps a little better than she otherwise might. During this last year he has employed 62 new teachers and expects it will be necessary to get a great many more of them in the coming year. It is quite probable that he will lose many of his old teachers and that some of those who are filling in now for one reason or another may not desire to return.

Meantime, his own work in the office, reports and all the other administrative matters which present conditions have thrust upon him makes it impossible for him personally to go out and give the help to these new teachers that they must have if the rural educational facilities are not to suffer. His deputy, Mr. Guenther, who ordinarily would be able to help out, is overrun with his work as truant officer. Delinquency and truancy have increased to an alarming degree and Guenther's time is more than occupied trying to keep pace with this phase of his work.

THE GREAT GROWTH OF THIS DELINQUENCY

Clark points out that in this last year delinquency and truancy among the students of the rural schools have become really alarming. These are the figures he shows: In 1940—41,152 cases of delinquency and truancy. In 1941—42,147 cases. In 1942—43,294 cases. This is something for the school authorities and for the parents to give some consideration. It is a most serious matter, born of the unsettled conditions of the times. In addition, work permits have jumped from 174 in 1937–38 to 751 in 1940–41. These likewise are expected to increase as the war goes on.

In Kent County are 200 school districts, including Grand Rapids and all other large communities. But there still are 156 rural schools operating and 22 closed because of the prevailing conditions. Now, since these schools still operating are widely scattered, it is no simple task to give them all the supervision in all departments they ought to have. In order that the schools still operating may continue to operate, it is necessary to employ whatever and whoever may be available as teachers. Then, since many of these teachers are inexperienced and, as said, many of them have been out of harness for 10 to 15 years, it seems highly desirable that somebody be employed who can give such help as may be necessary and desirable. So Clark is asking the board of supervisors to authorize the employment of a supervising teacher.

Some of the supervisors are inclined to let the matter drift until the October session, but Clark points out that with the great demand for teachers everywhere, it is extremely doubtful if he will be able to find the right person so late in the fall.

Seems as if Clark's position is entirely logical and that the sooner the supervisors give him the authority and the sooner he finds a proper person for the place, the more certain are the students in the rural schools to have somewhere near adequate instruction in the foundations of an education.

America's Responsibility for a Christian World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Dr. R. H. Martin, editor in chief of the Christian Statesman:

We are facing a show-down in one of the greatest issues that ever confronted the human race. This global war is a struggle to the death to decide whether we shall have a free or a slave world. We must and shall win it. But what of the peace? We won the last war and lost it in the peace. There is danger that we may repeat the same tragic mistake and thus make meaningless all the sacrifice of blood and treasure required to win this war. Winning the peace is essential, and a far more difficult task than winning the war. The hardest governmental job that ever faced the world is the coming peace. To win it requires as much preparation as is required to win the war. We should prepare for it now.

Our sons and brothers in uniform are giving their all to win the war. We will be recreant to them unless we are ready to give as much to win the peace. Whether it shall be a just and durable peace or only a breathing spell to prepare for another greater war, will depend upon America more than any other nation.

THREEFOLD CAUSE OF THE WAR

As American citizens what can we do to help our country meet her responsibility for the coming peace? To answer this question we need to have before us the answer to another question. Why have the two greatest wars of history occurred in the lifetime of most of us? The answer is threefold:

(a) This once wide world has been reduced to the size of a neighborhood. Undreamed of inventions, magic means of production, transportation, and communication have brought the peoples of the whole earth into close contact. Measured by travel time, the world is actually smaller today than our country was in the days of Washington. It took him 7 days to go by horse-drawn vehicle from Mount Vernon to New York to be inaugurated. Now our Army bombers fly from the United States to China and India in less than 3 days. Today one can travel from New York to Moscow by plane in less time than one can go from New York to Miami by train. No spot on the globe is more than 60 hours distant from your local airport. In this shrunken, interrelated, and interdependent world the peoples of all races and nations jostle each other in the streets.

(b) This neighborhood world is made up of some 60 or more independent sovereign nations, each claiming the right to do absolutely as it pleases—to make demands on other nations, raise armies, build navies, and make war to enforce its demands. In their dealings with each other these nations are actuated not by the Christian law of justice and brotherhood but by the pagan law that might makes right. What can we expect but the present holocaust of world-wide war?

(c) Contributing also to the world debacle is the failure, not of Christianity but of the church to bring to bear directly upon nations and governments the power of Christ and His principles—the only power able to overcome international discord and thus make it possible for nations to live in peace with each other. The church has faithfully proclaimed Christ as the Saviour and Master of individual life and has applied his teachings to individual relationships, but she has signally failed in proclaiming Him as the Saviour and Lord of national life and in applying His principles to nations in their relations with each other. Hence today, even within Christendom, the restraining power of Christian justice and brotherhood has not been brought to bear upon the selfishness and greed of nations in their dealings with each other.

WHAT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY?

In the light of the above, what can we, as American Christians, do to help our country meet her responsibility in setting up the new world order? What our national leaders do in this matter will depend upon what the American people want done. What, then, is our responsibility?

1. Our first responsibility is to build a public sentiment for a Christian world order.

If this new order is to bring peace, it must be reared upon solid rock, not upon shifting sand. It must be built upon moral foundations, for this world is a moral order which is based upon religion.

AMERICA'S CHRISTIAN FOUNDATION

Upon this rock our founding fathers reared our Republic. The Declaration of Independence reads: "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights to secure which governments are instituted among men." It further declares that America was entitled to a separate and independent existence among the nations "by

the laws of nature and of nature's God," and affirms "reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence" in the support of this declaration. Thus our fathers reared this Nation upon God and His moral laws, laws written into the structure of human society and transcribed in the Word of God, the book which President Jackson said is "the rock upon which this Republic rests." These laws have their fullest and highest expression in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, Savior and King of nations.

He is the cornerstone upon which to build the government of the world in accordance with the two basic laws of His kingdom—righteousness and human brotherhood.

BUILDING ON THE SAND

Hitler and other national builders have said, "It isn't practical to build a political order on this foundation." So they have tried to build on other foundations—on national self-interest and aggrandisement, racial superiority, economic exploitation. Today their building is falling in ruins. There can be no peace so long as governments are built on the shifting sands of human expediency. Have we not learned by said experience that the only way to secure national stability and peace is by building our national structures upon the foundation which God has laid and according to the principles of His kingdom?

We, therefore, propose—

A Christian charter for the new world order embodying a recognition of these fundamental principles and their implementation in a bill of rights for mankind.

To develop and strengthen a public sentiment for this Christian world order until it becomes the dominant sentiment of the country is a task which challenges the Christian citizens of America and her church leaders. To accomplish this task we should be concentrating our best energies. In this field we can render our greatest service to our country, to humanity, and to the kingdom of God.

2. Our second responsibility is to build a public sentiment for an international or world government.

A framework of world government in which these principles can operate in the community of nations is essential to world peace.

INTERNATIONAL ANARCHY

Today, within the boundaries of nations we have government and law to which individuals and groups are subject, and under which controversies are settled by peaceable means. But in the no-man's land of international relationships we are, as yet, without government or law. That is, we have anarchy in the international realm. Under the doctrine of national sovereignty each nation is a law to itself. So long as this anarchy continues there will be constantly recurring global wars. The establishment of government and law in the international realm is essential to peace.

The League of Nations was the greatest advance the world has yet made in providing an instrument of international political control. But experience has shown that the League was not sufficient to accomplish the purpose for which it was set up. It failed, not because the idea was wrong, but because it did not have sufficient popular support and because it lacked authority to enforce its decisions. No world government can be effective until the nations are ready to surrender to it some measure of their national sovereignty. Our experience has taught us that leagues, treaties, agreements, voluntary submission of disputes to a world court are not sufficient.

ESSENTIALS OF WORLD GOVERNMENT

Justice Roberts of the United States Supreme Court says: "The present war is witness to the fact that in world crises begotten by race pride, by the lust of national aggrandisement and by national selfishness, international law is powerless." Is it not evident that so long as national sovereignty remains absolute there is no way to prevent nations from failing to keep their international obligations? There must be a fundamental framework of government to which the people of the nations constituting the world government surrender that proportion of their nation's sovereign prerogative which is essential to an international order able to prevent any nation, or group of nations, from asserting an unbridled will by resorting to war.

It is evident that a world government of this sort must have a judiciary to which disputes between nation and nation, and between nations and the world government, must be submitted for adjudication. It is equally plain that it must have a representative assembly to implement its delegated powers. Also, that it must have an executive to administer and enforce its laws, and that this executive must have at its command a police force of sufficient strength to effectuate its laws.

PREPARING AMERICA FOR THIS RESPONSIBILITY

The responsibility for setting up a government of this character will at first rest chiefly upon the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China. The United Nations under the leadership of these four nations are winning the war. Under this same leadership a world order of peace must and can be established.

At first its membership will be limited, but it should presently include all the United Nations, be open to neutral nations, and finally to the Axis Nations on their acceptance of the conditions of membership.

Is America ready for a world government of this character? Will public sentiment support it? Is she ready to surrender even the slightest measure of her national sovereignty to make such a world government effective? Here again the Christian citizens of America face a duty of transcendent importance to build an intelligent public sentiment for a world government of this character. For the Christian doctrine of the unity of mankind and of the place of government and law in the world's redemption is incompatible with international anarchy.

3. Our third responsibility is to build a public sentiment for American participation in setting up this Christian world order.

There are impelling reasons for our participation:

a. America holds the key position with reference to the peace. Our influence and power in the world are so great that no world order that has any chance of maintaining peace can be established without our participation. Not only Great Britain but the other United Nations are waiting on America to see what she will do before they decide on what kind of peace is possible.

b. Our national self-interest demands our collaboration. The basic lesson hammered into us by the events of the last 25 years is that the world is one. We are inexcusably blind if we cannot see that we are members one of another, that when one nation suffers by injustice, oppression or impoverishment, sooner or later all other nations suffer with it. Our involvement in these two world wars was inevitable. Those were true and brave words that Prime Minister Churchill spoke to the American Congress:

"Twice in a generation has the long arm of fate reached out across the oceans to bring the United States into the forefront of the battle. If we had kept together after the last war, if we had taken common measures for our safety this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us."

OUR CHRISTAIN OBLIGATIONS

c. As a Christian people, we have obligations to humanity which can be fulfilled only by our collaboration. Our Supreme Court has declared, "This is a Christian Nation." National irresponsibility is utterly incompatible with our Christian origin and character. When Satan made war on the human race the Almighty did not build a wall of isolation around heaven and issue a neutrality proclamation. He sent His Son into this sin-cursed, war-torn world on a mission of righteousness and peace.

The basic law of the Christian life, "Thou shalt love they neighbor as theyself," as applicable to nations as to men—requires America today to think, plan and labor for the safety and welfare of other nations, to the same extent as she thinks, plans and labors for her own safety and we'fare.

OUR CHRISTIAN DUTY

How we shall meet this responsibility is for you and me and the Christian patriots of America to decide. We must build a strong, overpowering public sentiment for our collaboration in setting up this new order, and a faith, an abiding conviction that in spite of all obstacles, with our help, this new order can and will be established. American Christians have never faced a more challenging task.

4. Our fourth responsibility is to express to our public officials our convictions concerning the new world order.

The importance of bringing our convictions to bear upon those who will represent us in making the peace is secondary only to the creating of a strong public sentiment for the right kind of a peace.

Please, O. P. A., Have Mercy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker and colleagues of the House, I trust those in control of the O. P. A. will read the following appeal, typical of just how greatly concerned independent retailers are about the future.

If we must have a Government by bureaucrats instead of by laws until 1944, I hope at least these fellows will have a little respect for the things our American boys are fighting for and dying for today—American liberty and justice.

FARMINGTON, IOWA, *June 16, 1943.*

Mr. BEN F. JENSEN,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Please help save these nice little towns along the rivers and the highways.

Please help save the independent retailers so they can pay the taxes to help keep our schools going, in fact please help save our country by asking the Office of Price Administration to obey the law before making further appropriations. Thank you.

Yours truly,

HENRY GENTHER, Jr.

Protest Against Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the "March on Washington" group and unveiled as a scroll at an interdenominational, interracial prayer service at Soldiers' Memorial, Chicago, Ill., July 4, 1943, in connection with the "We Are Americans Too" conference, and printed in the Washington Evening Star on July 7.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FELLOW AMERICANS—NEGROES ARE AMERICANS TOO!

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."—Declaration of Independence.

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."—Constitution of the United States, fourteenth amendment.

WE ARE AMERICANS TOO

On the basis of the principle of the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence, whose one hundred and sixty-seventh birthday we celebrate today, we address this appeal to the people of America and to the conscience of the world.

Right here in our own country is one of the great moral issues of this war: Shall we have democracy for all of the people, or for some of the people? An all-out war against fascism cannot be fought on a jim-crow basis. Race prejudice is obstructing the Nation's effort to win the war and plan a real peace.

The American people have met this issue with indifference, suppression, and violence. The recent riots in Los Angeles, Beaumont, and Detroit are sufficient proof of this.

Negroes have shared in the building of our common country. From the Boston Massacre to the north African offensive, their blood has watered the sands of every war in defense of American democracy. Their labor, more than anyone else's, has built the South. Their music, folk tales, and dreams have helped make American culture what it is. This is their country in which they were born, for which they and their fathers have toiled and died, and to which they stand ready to give the last full measure of devotion.

But how are these 13,000,000 Americans treated?

I. Negroes are discriminated against in the very armed forces which summon them to shed their blood for their country. They are drafted in jim-crow quotas, trained in jim-crow regiments, and separated from their white comrades in arms in the fighting units. All too often, they are herded into menial tasks and labor battalions.

II. Negroes are denied equal opportunity in both public and private employment. They are discriminated against in training, placement, up-grading, and wages in war industry. Sometimes this is true when the Government itself is the employer. Moreover, 33 international labor unions bar Negroes from membership.

III. Negroes are denied the right to vote in most of the Southern States. A combination of intimidation, poll taxes, white primaries, and all manner of specious tests stand as barriers between the Negro and the ballot box.

IV. Negroes are denied equal educational opportunity: In most of the South the Negro child receives less than half of his share of the funds for public education, the Negro graduate student is denied the training of the tax-supported State university, and the Negro teacher is paid less for the same training and work as other teachers. Here again is the myth of equal but separate. Even in the North and West, Negro professors are barred from the faculties of practically all American universities.

V. Negroes are caricatured and slandered in the press and on the stage, screen, and radio. School textbooks paint the Negro as a happy slave, a buffoon, and a corrupt citizen. Best-selling novels and million-dollar movie plays repeat this lie of the history books. Newspapers play up Negro crime and play down the constructive achievements of Negroes.

VI. Negroes are denied participation in the policy-forming administration of government. Even when there are Negro race relations advisers to Government agencies, these advisers are not permitted to determine policy, even in this special area, and nobody accepts their advice.

VII. Negroes are forced to live in restricted residential areas and segregated housing projects. Isolated and forced into a ghetto, the Negro thus becomes the prey of profiteers and other exploiters.

VIII. Negroes are Jim-crowed in trains, busses, theaters, hotels, restaurants, and other public places; and throughout the South are forced into Jim-crow schools, libraries, hospitals, and other institutions supported by taxes paid by all of the people.

IX. Negroes are lynched and murdered by mobs and cowardly night-raider bands. Such treatment in a democracy is intolerable. Accordingly, we appeal to the American people to support us in the fight to wipe out these antidemocratic practices.

I. Demand a democratic army. We call upon the President to enforce section 4 (a) of the 1940 Draft Act, which reads: "In the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

II. We demand equal access to employment opportunities. This means a fair employment practice committee which has power to enforce decisions based on its findings; and no discrimination in training opportunities, placement, wages, promotions, and membership in trade-unions.

III. We demand an end to disfranchisement in the South. The enactment of a Federal anti-poll-tax law, abolition of the white primaries, and other registration devices that limit a free suffrage and enforcement of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution, will guarantee the right to vote to all men.

IV. We demand equal access to educational opportunities. This means equal facilities for the Negro child, equal pay for the Negro teachers, and for the Negro student equal access to public tax-supported institutions of learning.

V. We demand that the story of the Negroes' contribution to America and to the world be told. The newspapers, radio, and screen can thus end the caricature and slander of Negroes.

VI. We demand Negro and minority group representation on all administrative agencies so that these groups may be able to determine policies for all of the people.

VII. We demand an end to residential ghettos and restrictive covenants.

VIII. We demand abrogation of every law which makes a distinction in treatment between citizens based on religion, creed, color, or national origin.

IX. We demand the strict enforcement of the Constitution, especially of that clause which guarantees: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

Therefore, in the name of democracy, in the name of the common interests of humanity, in the name of a real victory and a real peace, we call upon our fellow Americans to join with us in this struggle for human dignity and equal justice for all. Moreover, the colored peoples of the world, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, will test the sincerity of our declaration about world democracy by what happens to the Negro right here in the United States. Let us band together and make democracy a living truth.

Signatures: A. Philip Randolph, E. Pauline Myers, Aldrich Turner, Layle Lane, Cornelius Scott, Dr. L. D. Reddick, Alfred Baker Lewis.

The American Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Independence Day editorial from the New York Times, July 4, 1943:

"THE AMERICAN MIND"

When John Adams and Thomas Jefferson were both old men Adams wrote that there was not an idea in the Declaration of Independence "but what had been hackneyed in Congress for 2 years before." Jefferson was at first annoyed. Later he realized that Adams was right. The Declaration, he said, "was intended to be an expression of the American mind. * * * All its authority rests upon the harmonizing sentiments of the day, whether expressed in conversation, letters, printed essays, or the elementary books of public right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, and so forth. * * * I did not consider it as any part of my charge to invent new ideas altogether, and to offer no sentiment which had ever been expressed before."

Historians have traced the ideas of the Declaration through the chronologies of the Thirteen Colonies, the struggles against royalty in England, the writings of the French political philosophers, and further back still. The beginnings cannot be found. But the important thing for Jefferson was that the document he was asked to compose should be, as of July 1776, "an expression of the American mind." If it failed in that respect it would fail in every respect. He could find words, when other men could not, for what the Nation wanted to say. He could say

nothing that the Nation, or the major part of it, did not want to say, in the great crisis with which its people were confronted. If he had contributed a single original idea it would very properly have been rejected. No wholly original idea ever was or ever will be instantly accepted by a majority.

We can apply this principle to today's situation. The one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of our independence finds our welfare closely linked with that of Britain, Russia, and China. If those three nations collapsed we should not long be independent. If we collapsed, not one of them would long be independent. This is true now, and it will be true when this war is over. The new fact in the world is the fact of interdependence. We may not feel like picking a date in the calendar and calling it interdependence day, but the situation itself we cannot alter. No nation can be independent today unless it is willing to assume some responsibility for the independence of other nations, and to play its part in safeguarding the security of those nations.

The only question is whether this truth is as "self-evident" to Americans in 1943 as were the truths of the Declaration to Americans in 1776. They had arrived at them by hard experience. We also have had the hard experience. We were not convinced by the First World War. We are now in the midst of a Second World War. If this does not teach us what we have to learn we will have to go back to school in a third world war.

The evidence is that we stand in regard to the problem of our time where our ancestors of 1776 stood in regard to the problem of their time. The Constitution came more than a decade after the Declaration. A world constitution may take longer. But a declaration for 1943, recognizing in broad terms this Nation's duties, responsibilities and necessities in maintaining a lasting peace, would be a truthful "expression of the American mind" right now.

Livestock Industry Faces Critical Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread apprehension among all groups of citizens in Idaho over the failure to adjust satisfactorily the various problems connected with the livestock industry.

This is one of the most important industries in Idaho and consequently there is great concern over the need of early readjustment of the various factors which are retarding the orderly marketing of livestock commodities. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am presenting herewith the views and recommendations of an influential group of livestock producers, feeders, packers, retailers, consumers, and farmers:

The meat situation, in this area and the Nation, has become critical. Already the depleted meat supply in the intermountain area and the Pacific Slope States has become a major catastrophe which will further reduce the amount of meat that must be furnished to the armed forces and will be detrimental to the health, well-being, and morale of civilians.

The Nation's consumers have already been the victims of impractical and theoretical handling of meat under governmental regulations. If such bungling and mismanagement continues, mounting difficulties will face producers and consumers alike, with the fatal prospects of bare meat counters and a drastic increase of black-market operations.

Accordingly, this group offers the following recommendations:

1. Ceiling prices both at the slaughter and retail levels only, must be adjusted to permit a reasonable margin of profit to both based upon the cost of live animals. Such prices should not discourage the production, feeding, and slaughtering of livestock.

2. Eliminate quota restrictions upon the slaughter of live animals. Make the rationing program upon the consumption of meats by the individual consumer the only control with reference to the amount of meat that should be supplied, with exception of the requirements of the armed forces.

3. Relax grading requirements now imposed by the meat regulations. It is believed by the committee that a relaxation of the grading requirements will result in a saving in the transportation of livestock and feed and a reduction of the threat of an extreme shortage in feeds and reduce the cost of the finished livestock. Experience indicates that the consumer in this area does not want and does not eat as much fat as is required in Government specifications for AA and A grade animals. Retail prices should be based on a flat mark-up based on wholesale prices. The economic forces of supply and demand, plus competitive factors of retailing, will operate to keep consumer prices in line without additional artificial control.

4. Increase the ceiling prices on animal byproducts. The present ceilings upon animal byproducts were based upon livestock prices at lower than the prevailing prices today. The result has been to throw the burden of increased costs for live animals upon the meat. It is believed that by distributing the load of such costs more equitably upon both the meat and the byproducts derived from the live animal, there will be a lessened pressure to increase the selling prices of the meat. An increase on hides and tallows is particularly feasible.

5. The regulations should be amended to eliminate provisions requiring discounts upon quantity purchases. These discount requirements are bringing about a tendency to transport and deliver small quantities of meat and, therefore, to increase the wastage of manpower and transportation facilities.

6. Controls over the production, prices, distribution, and rationing of meats should be consolidated in one agency. It is believed that the tendency to spread this responsibility over several agencies will merely result in increased confusion and duplication of administrative costs. Decentralization of administrative power to State offices is urged in handling local problems.

7. The committee vigorously protests the inauguration of the roll-back and subsidy program.

8. The committee urges that if Nation-wide application of these proposals is not considered feasible, they should be applied to the Intermountain area and the Pacific Slope States. Experimentation in this area could not disrupt our local meat situation more than it is now. In our opinion, it would be successful if applied and should be tried. If successful in this area, then Nation-wide application could be attempted with little revision.

ROSTER OF THOSE PRESENT OFFICIALLY REPRESENTING GROUPS AS INDICATED

A. H. Caine, chairman, manager, Idaho Livestock Production Credit Association; M. C. Claar, secretary, Idaho Wool Growers Association; M. N. Hoagland, Boise, Idaho; F. B. Wisner, retail meat dealer, Boise; M. O. Anderson, King Packing Co., Nampa; E. T. Taylor, master of Idaho State Grange; E. P. Rinehart, secretary, Idaho Swine Growers Association; C. W. Hickman, consumer; R. H. Tallman, manager feeding operations, Amalgamated Sugar Co.; D. Sid. Smith, sheep producer, Shoshone; George N. Tucker, Farm Market Relations, Inc., Boise; Leon Weeks, secretary, Idaho Cattlemen's Association; Earl Murphy, executive secretary, State chamber of commerce; Luke Williams, consumer, Boise; T. C. Bacon, sheep grower, Twin Falls; Ned Harlan, secretary, Boise Chamber of Commerce; M. Dudley, hog grower, Boise; J. O. Beck, cattle producer, Mayfield.

The Navy Officially Prohibits Anti-Semitic Utterances in Navy Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include herewith a letter from Capt. Leland P. Lovette, of the United States Navy, under date of July 7. The Members of the House will recall my previous extension of remarks in which I included an exchange of correspondence between myself and officials of the Navy Department on the subject of anti-Semitism. I am happy to indicate by the following letter that the issue of anti-Semitism creeping into publications edited by or intended for naval personnel under the guise of alleged humor or in any form has been closed by the wise action of the Navy in directing that no religious or racial attacks be made in these publications.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1943.

The Honorable VITO MARCANTONIO,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. MARCANTONIO: In compliance with your recent request, I am forwarding an order issued by the Chief of Naval Personnel under date of June 21, 1943

"R-1175—Derogatory racial or religious material in ship and station publications.
P-253-LAH, A10-6, June 21, 1943.

"Action: All ships and stations.

"1. It has come to the attention of the Navy Department that derogatory racial and religious material, principally in the form of alleged humor, occasionally has found its way into publications edited by naval personnel at various ships and stations.

"2. Commanding officers are directed to bring to the attention of personnel editing such publications that the Navy Department objects to material which, whether humorously or not, disparages or belittles any American or allied racial or religious group.—Bureau of Personnel, L. E. Denfield."

Sincerely yours,

LELAND P. LOVETTE,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director of Public Relations.

Where Is the Corn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, suddenly this Nation finds itself short of corn. The same is true of corn as was true of wheat. The Department of Agriculture kept telling us that we had a surplus when in reality there was a scarcity. The truth is there never was an adequate carry-over of either corn or wheat. The condition in which we find ourselves is the result of the philosophy of "the abundant life by scarcity."

Uninformed O. P. A. experts, radio commentators, and columnists blame the farmer. In their ignorance of the facts, they say that the farmer is feeding it to hogs because he can get more for his corn in that way. May we remind these O. P. A. experts, commentators, and columnists that with these hogs he feeds them pork chops? Of course, these get their information from the bureaucracy. They get it from those who manipulate a scarcity into a surplus by juggling figures.

There is a real shortage of corn. The reason for this is that the Department of Agriculture restricted production. During the 5-year period 1929–33 the average acreage of corn harvested in the United States was 104,500,000 acres. By 1941, under the triple A program, this was reduced to an average of 91,977,000 acres.

In 1943 the Department partially removed its restrictions and the acreage planted to corn increased to 96,800,000, but here the Lord stepped in and helped the program of the Department when it retired from business. The floods and cold weather will reduce this 96,800,000-acre planting so that less than 90,000,000 acres will be harvested. That is, perhaps, a deserved punishment for our wanton destruction and curtailment of agricultural products.

Again, last fall the Secretary of Agriculture asked the farmer to increase the number of hogs. The farmer complied. In 1940 the number of hogs raised was 63,000,000. In 1942 this was increased to 80,000,000 head. The number in 1943 is estimated to exceed 100,000,000. The Government also asked the farmer to increase the average weight of his hogs before slaughter by 10 pounds over that of 1942. Those additional 20,000,000 hogs and that additional 10 pounds on 100,000,000 head take corn.

The question is not whether the farmer gets more for his hogs than for his corn. The question is where is the corn? The farmer has his investment in the growing hogs. He will have to feed them or lose his entire investment. If Congress had had sufficient courage and intelligence enough to have passed our cost-of-production bill in place of blindly following the bureaucracy's philosophy of "the abundant life by scarcity," then we would not find ourselves in this dilemma today.

Even if we remove the ceiling on corn entirely there will not be enough corn to supply the industrial and feeding needs of the Nation. I repeat the reason for this is because the Department of Agriculture reduced the acreage from 104,500,000 to 91,977,000.

In addition, the Government asked the farmers to increase the number of cattle. Again the farmer complied. The number of cattle in the United States in 1934 was 74,400,000 head. Then the Department began its wanton destruction, and by 1938 the number had decreased to 65,200,000. But, at the request of the Government, by January 1, 1943, the farmers had again increased the number to 78,200,000. These cattle require feed and especially do the beef cattle require corn for finishing.

By this time it ought to be clear, even to the bureaucracy, why there is not enough corn for feed and commercial purposes. The Nation now knows that the philosophy of "the abundant life by scarcity" has been and is a flat failure, that it has all but wrecked the Nation's food supply.

Again a supine Congress permitted the Government to draft the farmers' sons and their help. The result is that there is plenty of corn still unhusked within 30 miles from the city of Washington. You can travel through the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois and see hundreds and thousands of acres of corn still in the fields ungathered. Some of this floated down the rivers during the recent floods, while the rest rotted in the fields.

Let us put the responsibility where it belongs. The corn shortage is the result of an ignorant bureaucracy and of the W. P. B. and the War Department here in Washington, that did not have sense enough to know that the civilian population, as well as the armed forces, must be supplied with food and clothing.

The farm-help shortage was further augmented by the farm-machinery shortage. Donald Nelson, the head of the W. P. B., placed one Joseph Weiner, a Russian-born Columbia College graduate, in charge of civilian supplies. This foreign-born individual knew little about this Nation outside of the city of New York. He refused to allow sufficient steel to the manufacturers of farm implements.

It is true Mr. Nelson finally fired Joseph Weiner, but he never should have been appointed. But why was he kept on so long after he had made a failure? Was that part of the policy of "do not change horses in the middle of the stream"? If so, let me suggest to the bureaucracy that Congress from now on is going to change horses whenever they find an old nag is incompetent and is sinking. In the future Congress will not be afraid to leave the old nag in the middle of a stream and get onto a colt that knows how to swim and that will safely get it and the Nation across the stream.

Where To Economize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper, from the Washington Daily News of yesterday:

WHERE TO ECONOMIZE

(By Raymond Clapper)

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS, NORTH AFRICA, July 7 (by wireless).—What appalls me about war is the unbelievable waste of life and effort and nature's riches.

If congressional advocates of economy, who have been trying to cut a few million dollars out of expenditures, want to do a real job of economizing, they have the biggest opportunity any men in public life ever had. Let them turn their efforts for economy into the largest field of all for saving money, material, human labor, and life. Let them start the greatest economy campaign of all time in Congress—an economy drive to prevent future war.

That is the challenge to this generation of public men—to see to it that the power and prestige of the United States is used to insure humanity against another such war as this one. No effort in public life will bear such rewards for all peoples, if successful, as an effort to adjust differences between nations by some more economical means than total war.

The cost of war, even in the restricted sense in which I have been seeing it, is appalling to me. I hear that Congress has appropriated the incredible sum of $100,000,000,000 for next year—which is far more than the total income of the whole American people in the best years before the war. We spent some $70,000,000,000 on war in the last fiscal year.

But the dollar cost is only part of it. Think of the exhausted resources, irreplaceable natural wealth which all nations are pouring into the conflict, useful careers being interrupted for millions of men, loss of health and life for thousands of them.

Traveling around Britain and here in north Africa, I have seen acres of ammunition dumps, sometimes driving for miles along roads lined with piles of big shells, bombs, land mines, stacks of metal boxes filled with machine-gun ammunition. I have seen acres of trucks, jeeps, and other vehicles, warehouses packed with all kinds of merchandise.

Nobody should think I am suggesting that we be niggardly in outfitting and equipping our men. That is not the point at all. The point is that to fight modern war the whole of civilization must consecrate itself to the task of mass slaughter and mass destruction. Nor am I suggesting this war was unnecessary. It obviously was inescapable after international anarchy was permitted to continue and aggressors were allowed to grow strong enough to resort to force without being confronted with an effective opposition.

Just as a minor operation in time may prevent a major one, so the use of minor force in time might have prevented this war. Regardless of what might have been, we now have a new opportunity coming along. When we see millions of American men committed to throwing everything, including their lives, into war, we are showing callous indifference not to begin now doing everything possible

to prepare the way for the effective restraint of future aggression.

If it is possible to organize a vast war machine and wage successful war on the modern scale, then it also must be possible to organize a machine for preventing war.

Those are thoughts that go through my mind time and again as I see convoy after convoy of Army trucks, or see jeeps bouncing down the dusty roads, or see ships in a harbor, and planes covering an airfield, or a street full of men marching in desert-tan uniforms.

Human Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have stated on many occasions that the power of the country newspaper and the philosophy of the country editor is the greatest bulwark the American people have against those who would make America over.

The rural newspapers and the sound philosophy of the country editor are the people's best weapon to save America from the starry-eyed dreamers who apparently believe that the Constitution has outlived its usefulness, and that free enterprise, integrity in government, and old-fashioned honesty are no longer needed.

I include as part of my remarks an interesting and timely editorial recently appearing in the Boise City News, under the title "Human Interest," by Fred R. Kreiger:

HUMAN INTEREST

(By Fred R. Kreiger)

THIRTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR WAR BOND ADS

Just what is this Nation coming to if every interest and clique of the country continues to demand more profit and subsidies in the midst of one of the hardest wars we have ever fought?

Now the National Editorial Association favors an appropriation of $30,000,000 to pay newspapers of the Nation for war-bond advertising.

Human interest may be grieviously out of step with the rest of the gang, but we are unequivocally opposed to the Government appropriating one cent for war-bond advertising.

What brand of patriotism is this that demands financial remuneration for a war effort of any kind through the columns of a newspaper, a medium which has always been one of our finest public services? To us it appears low and cheap, not representative of true American journalism. We do not believe the idea came from old-time, fundamental editors—but rather suspicion it originated in the minds of journalistic students who later became "jitterbug" editors.

What an affront to the memory of Horace Greeley and Col. Henry Watterson, old-time journalists; and to such statesmen as Col. Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and William McKinley.

The writer of this column, because of a dire shortage of labor, could go to a larger town where there are big war industries, and receive a salary increase of $15 a week over what the small town of Boise City is able to pay—but there is a war on; the editor of the News made a sacrifice by joining the Army; I am badly needed here mechanically, and will not swap my patriotism for a few lousy dollars extra pay each week.

For our own self-respect, a respect for posterity, and above all, respect for our fine young men on the battlefields of the world, let us all quit looking at this war from a standpoint of the money that might be made from it.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include a letter written by me on April 1, 1943, to Mr. Martin V. Coffey, department commander of the American Legion of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, and his reply under date of April 14, 1943. I want to congratulate the World War Veterans' Committee, and especially the chairman, the distinguished Member from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], for his speedy action in having H. R. 2703 become a law. The records will show this bill was introduced by Chairman RANKIN on May 13, 1943, reported from the World War Veterans' Committee on May 18, 1943, and is now ready to go to the President's desk on July 7, 1943.

As time goes on, this bill will prove of greater benefit to the veterans. I certainly was most happy to aid in my small way by voice and vote in the passage of this legislation, which puts the burden of proof of service connection disability on the Veterans' Administration, that no service connection disability exists. It has always been my opinion that when anyone has been accepted into the armed forces, such acceptance should be treated as prima facie evidence that the veteran was in good health.

Again I congratulate the World War Veterans' Committee and all who assisted in the passage of this legislation—a job well done.

The letters follow:

APRIL 1, 1943.

Mr. MARTIN V. COFFEY,
Department Commander,
The American Legion,
Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR COMMANDER: As a member of the Invalid Pensions Committee of the House of Representatives, as a World War veteran, and as a member of the American Legion, I feel that an unfairness is shown to the dependents of deceased veterans because of the present law which compels the dependents of the veterans to prove that the veteran's death was caused by direct connection and in line of duty.

We have hundreds of cases before our committee in which it seems nearly impossible for the dependents to prove direct service connection which caused death. As the veterans of World War No. 2 return, these cases will be multiplied by the thousands.

I am of the firm conviction that when a man is accepted into the Army and has passed the physical examination, he is physically okay and that if he dies while in the service his dependents are entitled to that compensation and that the proof and burden should be on the Department to prove he is not entitled to benefit.

I would even extend this statement to cover the veteran after he has been discharged from the Army, because there are thousands of cases that when the boys are discharged they think they are physically all right, but after their return to their civilian duties they find out their health has been impaired by some activity during their term of service.

This probably is a somewhat radical change from our various laws, but I think the laws should be changed as stated above, in all due fairness to our veterans.

I will be very glad to have your opinion and to know whether or not your State organization would turn its support to this type of legislation. I will be glad to have your personal comments on this proposed legislation.

Yours in comradeship,

J. HARRY MCGREGOR.

THE AMERICAN LEGION OF OHIO,
April 14, 1943.

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMRADE: Gradually working my way through the pile of correspondence that has accumulated on my desk, I find another letter from you dated April 1 calling my attention to the unfairness being shown to dependents of deceased veterans by reason of the present law which compels the dependents of veterans to prove that the veteran's death was caused by direct connection and in line of duty.

I am again taking the liberty of referring your communication to Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of our national legislative committee located in Washington and asking Francis to communicate with you for discussion of this problem at a time that will be convenient for you.

I most certainly appreciate your thoughtfulness in this matter and I hope we can discuss it when I am in Washington, which will be the latter part of next week.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN V. COFFEY,
Commander, the American Legion,
Department of Ohio.

He Is Not Here!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under extension of my own remarks I wish to include a beautiful passage of spiritual literature entitled "He Is Not Here":

HE IS NOT HERE!

With sad steps Mary and her companions had come that early morning to gaze upon the grave of the sleeping Master. It was the first, most wonderful Easter Day of all. Reverent hands would minister to His broken body. They would perform that last act of devotion of love with heavy hearts.

And now, instead of the rock-hewn, stone-guarded tomb, which held all that death had left them of their beloved, there flashed before their tear-dimmed eyes a vision of splendor and glory. It illumined the empty sepulchre and pointed in the direction of that even more radiant heaven to which the Christ had ascended.

The golden and amber-tinted dawn, just appearing over the hills, paled in comparison with that glory upon which the gaze of the faithful women now rested. The songs of the birds, caroling their early songs of gladness, were lost in that clearer, more triumphant proclamation which, for so many a passing century, has echoed down the ages, and shall, till time itself shall be no more.

"He is not here, for He is risen."

The words come back to us. They speak to us the same message of hope and reassurance. They create in our hearts a radiant hope that cannot be destroyed. They triumphantly affirm the ultimate victory of good over evil, of life over death, of love over hate, of God over all His foes. They inspire us to meet every disappointment without dismay, and face every trial life may bring without bitterness, for the glory of the empty tomb still shines, beckoning us onward, and upward.

Polluted Water Peril at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun:

CITY'S WATER PERIL GROWS; MAYOR ASKS FEDERAL AID

Water consumers were stirred yesterday as additional warnings of impending epidemics from the city's polluted south-side water piled up. Yet officials, from health authorities to the mayor, agreed they would be unable to provide a remedy until the Federal Government allows a greater diversion of lake water.

"Only a miracle will save Chicago from an epidemic of water-borne diseases," said Oscar Hewitt, city commissioner of public works. He added his warning to that of Dr. George E. Wakerlin of the University of Illinois, who characterized the South Side lake water as little better than diluted sewage.

HAMMOND ENTERS FIGHT

Hammond, Ind., sanitary officials entered the fight yesterday by suggesting that East Chicago and Whiting, Ind., take steps to set up sewage disposal plants such as the one in use at Hammond.

Other suggestions to clean up the water supply were:

1. Speeding of governmental measures to build a dam in the Calumet Sag near its confluence with Lake Michigan to hold back refuse until it can be treated.

2. A new appeal by Mayor Kelly to the War Production Board for priority to complete the sanitary district disposal plant.

3. Encouragement of more war plants to install evaporator equipment to remove contamination before it reaches Lake Michigan through the sewage-disposal system.

Hewitt predicted the danger will become acute in August and September, when the prevailing winds are from the south.

Then, he said, the accumulated sewage will be swept directly into the zones of the two cribs supplying water to the South and Southwest sides.

MUCH WASTE IN WATER

"In August of last year," he said, "the daily average coliform count—the amount of human waste in the water—soared to 3,319 a cubic centimeter, and in September it rose to a daily average of 6,907. A count of 50 has been fixed by the United States Public Health Service as the danger line."

Hewitt said it would probably be impossible to complete during the present summer enough units of the South Side filtration plant to alleviate conditions. These units, when and if completed, would remove 70 to 75 percent of the pollution.

Because the War Department has shown no inclination to permit increased diversion from the lake beyond the 1,500 cubic feet a minute, as set by a Supreme Court decision, to the former 5,000-feet flow, which would carry off most of the waste, Mayor Kelly made another appeal to the War Production Board for priorities to permit completion of the sanitary district disposal plant.

"I have already sent additional arguments to Washington as to why we should have a temporary increase in water flow through the sanitary canal," the mayor said.

HAMMOND EXPLAINS METHOD

"We should have 5,000 cubic feet a second flowing through the waterway until this emergency is cleaned up, instead of the 1,500 cubic feet a second, which has proved insufficient under war emergency. Up to date deaf ears have been turned toward our appeals."

At Hammond, Ind., Carl Carpenter, superintendent of water, said the city had been reprocessing industrial waste through the Hammond Sanitary District for more than a year.

"But some of the communities have not been showing full cooperation," he added. "If East Chicago and Whiting would treat their commercial waste as we are, it would relieve the Chicago situation."

MORE CHLORINE USED

So far as chlorination of the water is concerned, Hewitt said:

"Normally we use 6 to 8 pounds of chlorine a million gallons to purify the water. We have been forced to use 11 pounds a million gallons and have used as much as 16 pounds."

"We are gathering data and will have a meeting of our committee next week to look into the unusual number of diarrhea cases that have appeared this year on the South Side," said Dr. Robert Black, chairman of the health committee of the Chicago Medical Society.

BOILING NEEDLESS NOW

Despite the fact that many South Side residents have been boiling their drinking water, Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, said yesterday this step was not yet necessary.

After a conference with Dr. Herman N. Bundesen, city health commissioner, Fishbein said:

"City engineers are watching the situation carefully, and as soon as a hazard arises they will issue a warning to boil drinking water. The present hazard does not seem to warrant issuance of this warning now.

"An outbreak of dysentery on the South Side would be a menace to the entire city.

"Chlorination does not kill the amoeba in amoebic dysentery nor does it kill the virus of infantile paralysis, but boiling the water kills both."

Polish-Russian Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Philip Simms, from the Washington Daily News of July 7, 1943:

POLISH-RUSSIAN PEACE

(By William Philip Simms)

The broken relations between Poland and the Soviet Union may shortly be mended despite the tragic and, in some respects, irreparable loss of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, the Polish Premier.

Officials here have been assured that Polish policy, both domestic and foreign, will continue along the same lines as before the general's death at Gibraltar. The Government will remain one of national union, representing a coalition of Socialists, peasants, Christian Democrats and Moderate Nationalists.

With regard to Russia, it is said, the Polish Government will continue a course of moderation and conciliation, disregarding the demands of the small groups at either extreme.

Napoleon called Poland the "key to the European edifice." Washington and London agree with Napoleon. They acknowledge that Russia forms the great mass of the structure but, they warn, unless the Polish keystone is fitted into its proper place, the whole thing eventually will tumble down.

That is why officials here attach so much importance to a Russo-Polish rapprochement. A week ago I revealed that such a rapprochement is expected shortly. Forty-eight hours later, in Cairo, General Sikorski confirmed that a move was under way to reestablish diplomatic relations between the two countries. Unfortunately, however, 2 days later he was killed in an airplane crash.

The precise formula for the settlement, of course, has not been announced. In fact, it is likely that a final arrangement cannot be reached until after the war. What is being sought now is a just and reasonable basis for a final understanding.

Such a basis might be something like this:

1. An immediate Polish-Soviet agreement to return to the status quo as of July 30, 1941, with regard to both Polish territory and Polish citizens.

2. An agreement in principle to (A) a postwar alliance between Russia and Poland; (B) a similar alliance between Russia and Czechoslovakia, and (C) a third alliance between Czechoslovakia and Poland.

At different times both Russia and Poland have agreed to each of these points. The Polish-Soviet agreement of July 30, 1941—shortly after Germany invaded Russia—was signed in Downing Street, London, in the presence of Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden. Russia recognized the German-Soviet treaties of 1939 partitioning Poland "as having lost their validity."

Today about all that Russia is asked to do is to stand by her signature of less than 24 months ago. As for the triple alliance between Russia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, that suggestion came recently from Moscow—a suggestion which both Gen. Sikorski and

Dr. Eduard Benes, President of Czechoslovakia, were quick to accept.

United Nations officials here feel that a Polish-Soviet understanding ought not to be difficult now. The impression here is that the Polish Government in London will not greatly modify the stand it took under Premier Sikorski's leadership. Apparently, therefore, only Moscow remains to be convinced.

All agree that Russia, first and foremost, is seeking maximum security for herself. This she can have, they feel, only with the friendly cooperation of post-war Poland, Czechoslovakia, and her other neighbors, plus the collaboration of the British Commonwealth, France, and the United States.

If, on the other hand, Russia insists on going it alone, and if she makes bitter foes of her neighbors by shifting frontiers and peoples about to suit herself, a third world war will be inevitable.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, we are going to our districts for 2 months to be a listening post.

My prophecy is that F. D. R. will not do much on roll-backs beyond what is started.

We are in favor of letting the soldiers decide our future foreign policy when they return, Americanism or globaloney.

In the disposition of the N. Y. A. machinery, we make it accessible to all agencies but lend-lease. This is one thing we thought to leave at home.

Because Congress was delayed 4 days in the fiscal year on stopping N. Y. A., it cost $576,000. Quite an expensive illegitimate baby, don't you think?

In the long and many times renewed conferences on appropriations in the past 2 weeks, I have developed a higher and keener appreciation of our democratic process.

"Congress passed a bill. The President vetoed it. The Senator advocates that Congress change its mind. I advocate that the President change his mind."—Senator TYDINGS.

A Nudealer from one House and a Republican from the other will go out during the recess in pairs, like the disciples of old, to sell their new religion of the one world to the people.

Some official paid Mayor LaGuardia's town $2,600,000 for the bottom of the Hudson River, a navigable stream, in which the *Normandie* lies. The Nudeal is not only high and wide, but she's deep.

For 10 long years JOHN TABER has been the ranking man of the minority on appropriations. His industry, dissecting ability, horse sense, and courage make him the modern watch dog, and believe us there is much to watch. This is not a tribute—just a statement of facts.

How To Win the War and Save the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I print a talk delivered June 15, 1943, at Cleveland, Ohio.:

Interwoven and first in the minds of all patriotic Americans, given thought during the day, and the subject of prayer at night are the two questions—

1. How can we win the war?
2. How can we save the Republic?

Not only do we wish to win the war quickly, but we desire to win it with the least possible suffering and loss of life. But the winning of the war will be futile unless we save the Republic. Let us save the Republic after the war is won, not by revolutionary means, not through violence and bloodshed, but by using peaceful, constitutional methods. Come hell or high water, the Republic must be saved.

HOW TO WIN THE WAR

It is a waste of time and energy for civilians to debate military procedure. We will do well to avoid discussion of strategy. Civilians as a class have no knowledge as to where or when our men should fight in order to wage successful battle.

We do not know the number of men required, though we do know there is a limit to the number we can feed, equip, and transport.

We do not know the kind or the quantity of weapons with which they should be equipped, nor the moves which they should make in order that our enemy may be defeated.

No one, however high his rank, who lacks military training, should assume the burden or the responsibility of determining for those trained in warfare the course which our armed forces should follow.

Let us avoid the blunders of the Civil War, which brought disaster to our armies, death to thousands of men, and which grew out of the ambitious political action of civilians and Government officials of that day.

Let me repeat here, now, what has so often been said. No criticism of the conduct of the war, of the men or of the officers who are fighting your battle and mine, has been or will be made by me, nor, so far as I know, by any Member of Congress.

All desire to aid our allies in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and all insist that adequate aid be given to our forces in the Aleutians, to MacArthur and his heroic men in the Pacific. None—no; not one—anywhere, wherever we may have sent him, should be left without adequate support.

Dismissing, then, the thought of giving advice to those who are charged with, and who are doing, the fighting, let us turn our attention to what we as civilians here on the home front can and must do, if the complete defeat of our enemies is to be brought about quickly and with the least possible suffering and loss of life and the Republic saved for the boys who come home.

But first let us understand why we are here tonight.

Yesterday, June 14, was Flag Day. It was first so proclaimed by President Wilson on June 14, 1916, and June 14 was chosen because it was the anniversary of June 14, 1777, when the Continental Congress adopted the Stars and Stripes as the official flag of the United States.

The American Flag Day Association was incorporated in Illinois in 1894, and its purpose was to, on each succeeding June 14, rededicate our loyalty and our adherence to our flag, the Stars and Stripes.

On May 4, last, President Roosevelt issued a Flag Day proclamation, in which he urged that the flags of the other 31 nations be honored in this country on our Flag Day.

This being a time of war, other nations being associated with us in that war, it is well that their flags should also be honored.

But it should never be forgotten, on June 14, or on any other day, that the Stars and the Stripes is our flag; that it is the flag, and the only flag, to which we owe, and, with God's help, we will ever owe, allegiance.

In the President's proclamation, there was more or less about the United Nations and the brotherhood of man.

The Office of War Information in Washington presumed to give the American people directions as to how they should observe Flag Day. It suggested:

"In order that the celebration of Monday, June 14, as United Nations Flag Day shall be given point and direction, the following suggestions might well be kept in mind:

"1. Maximum display of United Nations flags.

"2. Use of the term 'United Nations' whenever possible.

"3. Emphasis on the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter for which the United Nations are fighting.

"4. Emphasis on the importance of teamwork among the United Nations, not only in war but in the peace that follows."

But just as there is in this universe for us but one God, let us remember that there is in this world just one flag, just one Nation, to which we owe an unwavering, unlimited, unquestioning devotion and allegiance.

And that Government is the United States of America, and that flag is the Stars and Stripes.

Let us get this straight. My purpose here tonight is not to speak for the Democratic Party nor for the Republican Party, nor for any political party, but to express the need which our country today has for a united, all-out effort, not only to win the war but to save the Republic.

Yesterday, from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal came a reprint of an article appearing February 12, 1933, dated at Pinehurst, N. C., reading as follows:

" 'The United States is headed for an important part in another general war which is inevitable,' Henry Morgenthau, financier and former Ambassador to Turkey, said in a lecture here."

It is impossible for me to subscribe to the doctrine that war is inevitable, but, if it be true, as the present Secretary of the Treasury said, that war is inevitable, then it is foolish for this administration, of which he is a most important member, to advocate a superworld to end all war.

We all hate war, and many of us not only, like some others, hate war but we did our utmost to keep this country out of war.

There are those in this country—some columnists, some editors, some publishers, some radio commentators—who, ever since 1933, when Mr. Morgenthau made his announcement that war was inevitable, have been hot for war, and who, since the war began, have been accusing all who opposed war with a lack of loyalty and patriotism.

They have created disunity by their false, slanderous, and libelous charges, and cowardly would we who sought to avoid war be if we let their vilification go unchallenged,

or failed to do our utmost to show the falsity of their charges, their failure—their utter, complete failure—to themselves render any patriotic, efficient service toward the winning of the war.

Germany has its Hitler; Japan has its Hirohito; and each, in his misguided, vicious way, is doing his utmost to further the interests of his country. Russia has her Stalin and Great Britain has its Churchill, and each speaks for the land he loves, for the flag under which his brothers fight, for the government of which he is the head.

Stalin speaks for Russia, for no other nation. Churchill speaks for Great Britain, for the Empire, for the preservation and the extension of the Empire, for Englishmen everywhere—and for no other land or government.

Here in the United States of America, the common man, the man on the street, the man behind the counter, the man in the factory, and the man on the farm—the common man—he speaks for America. May his voice ever be heard. May his will in the end prevail. May the Stars and Stripes continue to be our flag; the Constitution our guidance.

Let Marshall Field, the third, and all his millions, and the puppets who speak and write for his money; let the Chicago Sun, New York's PM, the Communist official publication, the Daily Worker, and publications like the New Masses, the New Republic, and all the purchaseable press—and thank God, there is but little of it and what there is has less influence—let them rant and rave; let them accuse us of being rabble-rousers. Let them say what they will. Those who have the fate of America at heart know that some publications but distribute falsehood, disunity; but seek to destroy the confidence of the people, not only in their chosen representatives, but in their form of government.

We who sought to avoid war, those of the great Middle West who abhorred war, have been doing, they are doing, and they will continue to do, their utmost, not only in support of the fighting men, but for the preservation of the Republic.

Because we are out to win this war, to save the Republic, we cannot and we will not slavishly and idolatrously accept and give adherence and obedience to the theories of those who advocate the overthrow of our Government, the remaking of America, the substitution of a flag of a super world-government for the Stars and Stripes.

We will, whenever we discern in the New Deal policies, in the theories of the Communists, in the acts of the bureaucrats, a tendency to put into practice ideas or plans which we know will lessen the support which our armed forces should and must have if they are to win, hesitate not one single minute to fight and destroy those plans, ideas, and theories, regardless of what may be said of our efforts.

There is no reason to believe that the bureaucrats at Washington are infallible; that they are all-wise. Businessmen, industrialists and farmers know, from actual experience, that many a hampering, hindering, restrictive order, rule, and directive has come out of Washington.

We should have, and we will have, but one thought, but one motive, one purpose—the winning of the war and the preservation of the Republic.

THE HOME FRONT

When war was waged by roaming tribes, who subsisted upon the country, the home front was not important. But in these days of modern warfare money, food, clothing, transportation, and production are vitally important.

Money must be had because it is a medium through which we purchase all those things which the fighting man must have if he is to win. Because we had no financial backlog, but rather an unprecedented public debt, at the beginning of this war we all realize that taxation, however exacting, will not provide the necessary billions to carry on a world-wide war.

Having declared that we are not only the arsenal but the granary of democracy, having undertaken the task not only of arming but of feeding the whole world, billions upon billions have been, and will be, required. The only source from which those additional sums can come is through borrowing, the issuing of bonds, the increase of our national debt.

But, again, when that money is spent into the hands of the people go billions of extra dollars or their equivalent. The immediate result is inflation, which, again, is followed by skyrocketing prices.

Recollection of our school days history will carry us back to the days when originated the expression "not worth a continental," when continental currency was plastered on a dog to show its lack of value.

It may not be too much to say that victory was saved for our Revolutionary forefathers when Robert Morris came to their rescue with funds raised principally in Philadelphia, New York then being in the hands of the British. Today the millions of purchasers of small bonds are performing a like patriotic and necessary service.

Notwithstanding the fact that billions have been appropriated—a hundred billion will be required during the coming year—the President recently asked for another tax bill to yield some sixteen billion additional dollars. The need being so great, there is no excuse for waste, extravagance, or incompetency in its expenditure.

This brings us to the conclusion that one of our contributions toward the winning of the war is the insistence, upon every possible occasion, in no uncertain terms, that all lost motion, that every single item of waste, that every unnecessary expenditure, be, without delay, eradicated by this administration.

There is no excuse for leaving open the door to those who would reap excessive profits, demand excessive salaries or wages.

Soon, from the well of the House of Representatives' Chamber in Washington, a Congressman will name corporations which have made exorbitant profits out of their war contracts; will cite instances where employees in factories have made as much as $8,000 per year.

Suffice it for the moment to say that, when corporations using borrowed Government money, can build and operate factories, receive Government orders for war material, and finance the whole thing, from the day when the first sod was turned to erect the plant to the shipment of the finished product from the factory, on Government funds, and make a profit of 1,000 percent, there is something rotten—not in Denmark—but in Washington. It is not an African who is in the wood pile, but a New Deal politician.

When Chicago drivers delivering milk and who are making $8,000 per year, strike and insist that they receive $25,000 per year, and, unmolested, try to enforce their demands by boycotts and sympathetic strikes, it is time to smash the political alliance between this administration and labor racketeers.

When employees in factories hold up production and insist that they receive greater compensation per year than do our generals and our admirals, it is time the people made themselves heard.

Regardless of the merits of their demands, what excuse is there for John L. Lewis, when, at his command, more than a half million men engaged in the production of the coal upon which the operation of the factories which make our arms and munitions depends, lay down their tools and refuse to work?

That our men on the fighting fronts have lost all patience with strikes, slow-downs, and work stoppages is shown by the letters which come back from those fronts. That the officers with the fighting forces have no sympathy with such procedure is evidenced by the fact that those letters from the fighting men come through uncensored.

No one longer objects to unions or to collective bargaining. But we on the home front must insist that the demands of our fighting men that those who remain at home render full measure of service be complied with.

When an executive in a plant producing instruments needed by our armed forces receives upward of $39,000 per year, we are led straight to the thought that the taxpayer's money is paying an excessive price for the instruments sold by that corporation to the Army and the Navy.

We are not doing our utmost when we insist that, for all services rendered by us, we receive a carry-home wage which, after all deductions for taxes, insurance, social security, and union dues, equals the previous total wage and which gives us an increase which includes all additional costs of living.

If we are to have a wage which is to include every additional cost imposed upon us by the war, then tell me, if you will, what, if anything, we have contributed to the war.

If we are to have, when engaged in production, retail or any other business, a profit equal to or greater than that made prior to the war, we are not contributing toward the cost of that war.

After figuring just how much increase in wage or in profit the other fellow, whom we criticize, is making, why not give a little consideration to our own situation, our own demand, and then answer truthfully the question whether we are doing our utmost, our best; whether we are really actually sacrificing anything, or as much as we should.

The man who is fighting amid the snow and the ice of Alaska; who last week was digging fox holes in the frozen soil of Attu; who will soon be called upon to risk his life in an assault upon Kiska, is not encouraged by the knowledge that, here at home, some of us are complaining of a lack of gas, of fuel oil, of butter, of beef, or of anything else. He just cannot understand why we should grouch about long hours.

The American boy, flying his bomber or his fighter through the mists and the fog, the sleet, and the snow, of the Aleutian Islands, or miles high over the South Pacific, has just cause of complaint when here at home production is stopped, even for a moment, in any of the factories, upon the production of which his life, the success of his mission, depends.

Rickenbacker, who tossed for 23 days on the waters of the Pacific, staring death in the face, holding a dying comrade in his arms, who appealed to Americans generally and in particular to American workers to do their utmost to aid his comrades, may be publicly called a rat by a crazy so-called organizer; Rickenbacker may have his pictures barred by union organizers from theaters when he appeals for the Red Cross and for his comrades; but loyal Americans know him for what he is—a patriotic American fighting man, who, in the First World War and in this has gone into the valley of the shadow of death; whose heroism and self-sacrificing devotion to his country is the admiration of every true American.

We here on the home front know that our enemies will never be defeated, the war never will be won, until we who remain at home all day and every day do our utmost.

Nor is there lack of task or opportunity for any one of us. No man, no woman, who is able to walk but can contribute something to the war effort. In the smaller towns, in the outskirts of the cities, there are the gardens,

each small in itself, producing but a little of the food which all must have. But, in the aggregate, millions of them—yes, millions upon millions—each tended with loving care and faithfully, will take at least one family for a time out of the purchasing line, leaving more for others. And hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of those gardens, will produce a surplus, the total of which will be equal to the production of many farms.

In every home, in every city, there is an individual who, if correctly advised and proper opportunity given, can do just a little more on the home production front. It is your business, it is my business, to see that that opportunity is created.

Every farmer in the land, his wife and his children, can work, and practically all of them are working, from morning until night and some, with the aid of tractors and the headlights upon them, far into the night, to grow the food which their sons, brothers, and fathers—yes, and our fighting allies—must have, if the battle is to continue.

No one questions the loyalty of the American worker. He, like many another, is the victim of circumstances. Few indeed are the workers who, having sons or brothers or parents with the armed forces, would, if they realized the situation, the necessity for production, lay down their tools, forsake their jobs, go on strike.

We are all selfish, but that selfishness will every time give way, if once we understand that because of it, someone far from home may die as the result of our action or inaction.

There are those in factories who are wasting their time; who are interfering with production; who are slowing down production. But few indeed they are in number. Out of all proportion to their number is the blighting result of their actions. They, by continuous, enthusiastic service day after day can contribute their efforts toward the defeat of our enemies.

In Washington, to save not more than a sixteenth of a mile, across the Tidal Basin, using steel needed in the war effort, apparently in furtherance of the plan to beautify Washington, the bureaucrats are throwing a bridge at a cost of millions of dollars, which should be used to purchase support for the armed forces.

There are bureaucrats in Washington who, desirous of continuing themselves and their departments in office, insist upon appropriations, upon the expenditure of money, for purposes which are not only not needed, but are harmful.

The head of the Office of Price Administration, Prentiss Brown, is a tyical American and, in my judgment, if permitted to have his will, would bring order out of the confusion which now exists throughout the country because of the hindering, conflicting rules and regulation promulgated by the Office of Price Administration.

The law under which he acts and which is the law insisted upon by the administration, by the President himself, is unworkable, and the Office of Price Administration is shot through and through with men who know little or nothing of the businessess which they undertake to regulate.

Small businessmen, small industries, have been and are being put out of business and production. Farmers are handicapped because too many of the skilled farm workers have been taken into the armed forces; because farm machinery, which they must have if they are to produce, has been shipped to other countries. The administration still limits the number of acres which can be sown or planted to needed farm crops.

Into my office last week came a letter from a processor of dairy and poultry feed, which tells how it is becoming impossible to obtain the corn, the wheat, the concentrates, the beef scrap, which must be had if feed for the dairying and the poultry industry is to be made.

Lack of this feed means that millions of laying hens will go on the market; that cows giving milk will be sold for beef; that, in the coming fall, winter, and spring, there just will not be the needed eggs, poultry, milk, butter, and beef available, either for home consumption or for our armed forces.

That same letter carried the statement that, due to the lack of feed, 6-week-old pigs, which 2 weeks ago were selling for $11 and $12, were a drug on the market for $4 and $5 each. Six-week-old pigs are of little value as food and, if the corn is not available—and it is not in Michigan at the present time—that means shortly there will be less pork to eat.

We ask, what has all this to do with us and with the winning of the war? Nothing at all, unless we take action. And what action can we take?

You have Senators and Representatives in Congress. To them in no uncertain terms you can make known your views, your demands. You can insist that they take action without any further delay to bring order out of confusion; that they at once get rid of those in the Office of Price Administration and in other departments at Washington who haven't the slightest idea of what it is all about, and place in charge of the administration of the laws production men, businessmen—men who know how to produce, process, manufacture, fabricate, and transport—and that, then, having placed them in positions of power, you insist that the President and his "little kitchen cabinet" keep their incompetent planning out of the picture.

The President cannot do everything. Let him give authority to competent men, who believe in the American way of doing things, and then let him avoid any and all interference with them.

Unless something like that is done, this war, if it is not lost, will be prolonged, and thousands—yes; perhaps hundreds of thousands—of our young men will die because, here at home, on the home front, we have failed them.

HOW TO SAVE THE REPUBLIC

As a Republican, I do not choose at the moment to charge that this administration is planning to overthrow constitutional government; is seeking to destroy the confidence of the people in their representatives in Congress.

We are aware that it was the President who said at the beginning of his second administration in 1936 that in 34 months he had built up new instruments of public power which in improper hands would provide shackles for the liberties of the people. Today much of that power is in the hands of those who desire to remake America. The Federal pay roll has on it too many Communists and Communist sympathizers.

We recall that 9 months later he boasted that in his first administration those who opposed him had met their match; that he expressed the desire that of his second administration it could be said that they had met their master.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the President made of Congress for a period of years a rubber stamp and that a revamped Supreme Court gave force to the economic and political theories of his administration.

But disregard for the moment the statements of his political opponents; the facts as to events which are in the past. Let us come down to the present.

The South is a Democratic stronghold. In that Democratic stronghold there is no State more loyal in its support of our Constitution, in its insistence that public officials abide by its terms, than the State of Texas.

In the Congress of the United States there is no more ardent, loyal, enthusiastic Democrat than Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, of Texas. Exasperated by Office of Price Administration regulations which threatened the poultry industry in his State, he made the statement that responsible officials in the Administration were—and I quote:

"Taking orders from somebody, and that what they are doing is only part of a plot to change our Government into communism, socialism, or some other foreign 'isms,' which means a dictatorship and regimentation of our people and abolishing our private system of enterprise."

Operators of small factories, businessmen, farmers—in fact, everyone who is endeavoring to carry on the business which provides the tax money; which produces, processes, manufactures, or transports the things which are needed to keep this Government a going concern, to maintain the foundation which supports the armed forces—have all been hampered and hindered in their efforts by bureaucrats, by New Deal planners.

The blighting effects of this administration are so widespread that millions of people throughout the country are almost ready to give up in despair.

Only a week ago, appearing before the House Small Business Committee, W. H. Albers, president, Supermarket Institute of Cincinnati, testifying, said:

"Let the policy of the organization be based on facts and let the Office of Price Administration stick to that policy. The agency now has become so hopelessly disorganized that the time has arrived for mobs to descend on Washington."

No one wants mob violence, but we have mob violence out in California, where the zoot-suiters have been so lawless that they have finally aroused the indignation of the men in the armed forces to such an extent that riot after riot has occurred. And the answer to that problem was an order excluding the men of the Army and the Navy from the public streets of the city of Los Angeles.

The correct answer, the proper answer, to the lawlessness of those gangs would have been law enforcement. Throw the zoot-suiters into jail. Try them and, if found guilty, convict them and send them to prison.

What must be the thought of the soldier or the sailor, walking the streets of a California city, when he and his girl friend are assaulted by a gang, and, when his comrades retaliate in kind, they are barred from the streets of the city which they will shortly be called upon to defend with their lives on some foreign battle front?

Throughout this land other gangsters are depriving American citizens of their rights. In one little Michigan city convicted criminals from the city of Detroit, driving on rationed gas and rationed tires, roam the streets, picketing grocery stores which sell milk delivered by men who have refused to join a particular organization.

Our boys are fighting to carry the "four freedoms" including freedom from want and freedom from fear, to the people of India, of the islands of the southern Pacific. Yet here at home grocerymen are not permitted to sell food to hungry people just because other men who deliver milk to them refuse to pay a fee demanded by gangsters from Detroit.

It all stems back to the political alliance between the administration and union political leaders. The result is the destruction of freedom from fear and, in many cases, freedom from want; for by the activities of the so-called organizers the legitimate business of patriotic American citizens is destroyed.

In another Michigan city manufacturers of shells were told that the finished product as well as the materials to make the shells would not be transported to or from their factories if they continued to buy coal from a dealer whose drivers refused to join a particular union.

It all finds support in the political alliance between labor leaders and the administration, determined to have its arbitrary way; to purchase political support, regardless of its lip service to the "four freedoms."

In Congress a bill was passed last week by a vote of 219 to 129 which provided that union men before a strike which would throw them out of work was called should have the right by secret ballot to determine whether a majority wanted a strike.

When that bill was before your Congress and after it had been passed, William Green, head of the American Federation of Labor, and the American Federation of Labor announced that it was the purpose of that organization to defeat every man who voted for that bill. Now, mark you, who voted for a bill which gave members of the American Federation of Labor a vote on the question as to whether they would strike in an industry which was producing arms for their sons and brothers.

Prior to the last election the executive committee of the teamsters' union in New Jersey announced that they had $4,000,000 cash on hand and the executive committee of that organization authorized its president to use so much of that $4,000,000 as might be necessary to defeat a Member of Congress.

The organizations which are making these demands are the political allies of the administration in power. If this Government is to be preserved; if the Republic is to remain, then the people must, by their protests, by their petitions, by mass meetings and by letters, by personal conversation, bring home to their representatives in Congress the knowledge that these pressure groups must not control legislation.

Let those publications which advocate the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes, the substitution of a flag of a superworld government, and whose god is the almighty dollar, call us names, make their false charges of a lack of patriotism by insinuation and innuendo, through news story and editorial, continue to stir up disunity and discord.

The American people have too much good sense, too much of good judgment, to be either deceived or misled. Proof of this is found in the futility of their efforts when at the last November election, and in fact at every election since, the people at every opportunity have repudiated their preachments, denied their demands.

It is the policy of this administration, of those who do not believe in America, in its people or its form of government, to brand all those who oppose any of their ideas as disloyal, as unpatriotic.

This, under the Constitution, is a people's Government. It can remain so only if the people now—without delay—meet the false charges which are hurled against those who oppose efforts which will destroy the republic.

While our fighting forces save us from Hitler and Hirohito, we here on the home front must save the country, the Nation, from the bureaucrats and planners, from the Communists, and the New Dealers.

Be of good cheer. Be not dismayed. The truth, courageously told and oft repeated, will prevail. Hour by hour and day by day, keeping ever in mind the principles set forth in the Constitution given us by our forefathers, let us do all things which will aid the men who are fighting our battle; which will overcome and defeat the efforts of those who here at home would destroy all those things which our fighting men hold near and dear, and which will be their only reward when the battle has been won.

When someone tells you or charges that you are unpatriotic; that you are hindering the war effort by opposing some administration policy; by criticizing something which is defeating the efforts of our fighters, ask him how many War bonds he has bought; how much of food, of clothing, of munitions of war he has produced; how many hours per day he has worked.

Ask him whether he believes in the Constitution, or whether he has some plan for overthrowing constitutional government, surrendering our independence, hauling down the Stars and Stripes and joining in a world supergovernment, which will keep our boys policing and fighting in foreign lands for years to come; which will keep our farmers working every daylight hour to feed people in foreign lands.

Ask him whether he believes in America, has confidence in her people, faith in the God who has guided us in the years that have gone.

Tell him in words short and loud that you believe in religion, in the existence of a supreme deity, in our country, our Constitution, and our people, and that, for you, the Stars and Stripes is the flag under which you wish to live and die, and, as your conscience dictate and your God may answer your prayers, you intend, come what may, to follow a course which will keep it flying until the boys come home.

Our Moral Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I read an impressive editorial in the New York Times, concerning St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Mount Vernon, N. Y. New York is my State, and beautiful Mount Vernon, a suburb of New York City, is only a few miles from my home. I have visited this historic spot hundreds of times and have always come away with an inspired and appreciative heart. Indeed, my parents took me there often, when I was a child, and I can still remember how their eyes would glow when they looked upon the patriotic monuments to our Nation's history. For they, like the founders of this country, came from a far land—a land which has fought unabatedly for freedom and the democratic way of life. I can remember hearing the bell of St. Paul's, that original bell, made by the very makers of the Liberty Bell. Today, the beautiful bells of the cathedrals of Europe, so much a part of the life of the people, are silent. Notre Dame, Bruges, Lourdes, St. Sulpice, and Trondheim shall echo no longer to the sound of their joyful and prayerful bells until every trace of the invader is swept from their lands; but in our country every church, of every denomination, sounds that glad note.

Now that we are about to recess for the summer, it is not amiss to turn our consideration to some of the larger and more general aspects of our history and to realize that our proud freedom and our brave name of America were made possible by men who sprang from alien soil, but whose hearts and souls rushed from persecution and tyranny in the Old World to liberty, and the self-discipline which liberty requires, in the New. If we remember that the fathers of our freedom fought against hatred and narrow-mindedness, against tyranny, corruption, religious and social persecution, and unjust economic discrimination, and all the other evils which totalitarianism has reawakened in other parts of the world today, we may better understand the terrible plight of the oppressed peoples of Europe and Asia. We may better judge how to alleviate that plight.

I submit this editorial for the attention of Congress:

OLD COLONIAL CHURCH

Announcement by Secretary Ickes that St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Mount Vernon has been designated as a national historic site doesn't affect it proprietorship, which remains in the corporation. It means that the National Park Service will have a hand in the care of the property. Few churches have more flavor of old New York. Van Cortlandts, Rhinelanders, Roosevelts have been pewholders or vestrymen there. Some years ago the President's mother was chairman of the committee to restore the church.

The earliest church building on the Green was a frame house, 28 by 18, and shingled on the sides. The present church, built in 1761, is of stone with a square tower at the front. It is of Georgian Colonial style. The date of the first genuine Georgian church in this town, St. Paul's Chapel, was 1764. The Green, the Eastchester Green, is famous for that election in 1733 for printing a true account of which John Peter Zenger, of the New York Weekly Journal, was tried for seditious libel against the Crown. His acquittal is the earliest monument of American freedom of the press.

In the seventeenth century Eastchester or Mount Vernon was called Hutchinson's after Anne Hutchinson, who lived there for a time after having been driven out of Massachusetts for her theological views. She was to die at the hands of the Indians on the shore of Pelham Bay. During the Revolutionary War St. Paul's was a Hessian hospital. After the battle of Pell's Point, 90 Hessians died in the church and were buried in the sand pit. The church bell still in use, cast by the makers of the Liberty Bell, was buried in 1775 to keep the enemy from making it a cannon. After the Revolution, St. Paul's was used as a courthouse, and Aaron Burr tried cases there. One more curious detail the guidebook gives: "George Washington Adams, son of President John Quincy Adams, drowned nearby in 1829, is buried here."

Almost daily in the pages of our newspapers and magazines, in platform speeches and on the radio, in the theaters and movie houses, by letter and private appeal we are besieged by pleas for some alleviation of the sufferings of the oppressed peoples. Such appeals are not only highly praiseworthy but absolutely necessary to keep ever before us the principles for which we are fighting, the sympathy and understanding which must flourish in our souls, the aid we must give, and the warnings of what should befall us should we attempt to reap the whirlwind of selfishness.

At the same time, it is well to balance these essential concepts with the facts of the case. We have been giving, and continue to give in increasing measure, all the aid to the oppressed which we can possibly muster. Lend-lease supplies

must of necessity go through the blockade at their own peril. The wonderful work done by the Red Cross, impeded as it is by the necessary blockades imposed by the United Nations, as well as the destructive actions of the enemy, continues to flourish. Although the Red Cross, the Quaker Relief, and the various Catholic relief societies are not able to send food to occupied countries, they can and do furnish medical supplies.

The injuries to the physical well-being and to the morale of the persecuted peoples of Europe will take a long while to cure. Perhaps two generations is not enough to allow. Deprivations and injuries in China are undoubtedly equal to those in Europe, but are to some slight extent counterbalanced by certain aids which we give the new China, and which we probably would not have given so quickly or in such measure were not the Chinese our active friends and allies in the present crisis. One murdered Chinese child may represent a pennyworth's value, or the worth of the whole world, depending upon the ethical viewpoint of the beholder. But we are training hundreds of young Chinese women as Red Cross nurses, and perhaps, now and after the war, their acquired knowledge may save the lives of whole generations. We are teaching the Chinese how to use and care for water-cooled machine guns, trench mortars, antitank guns, and other weapons of destruction. This means that, after the war is won, we will have taught them the principles of modern machinery, and what they have learned about jeeps and tommy guns—which, it is said, they have come to love as do our own Yanks in the Mediterranean and New Guinea—can be applied to those pursuits of peace which concern commercial flying, mechanical harvesting, road-building by tractors, bridge-building by caissons. Perhaps this may sound like cold comfort, but it is equally cold fact.

Only yesterday President Roosevelt sent a special short-wave radio greeting to the people of China on the sixth anniversary of their resistance to Japanese aggression. He said:

> Our friends have long known what our enemies are learning today—that the promises of the United States are always kept and our pledges are always redeemed.

We have been able to get some food into Greece. Our supply may be inadequate, but at least it is something. Naturally, the United Nations oppose any relief which will only fall into the hands of our enemies, and so feed and clothe and succor those who oppress the very ones to whom our help, and our hearts, are directed. With the initial aid of the Turkish Government, who sent the very first of the food supply ships to Greece, with the use of borrowed Swedish ships and the invocation of lend-lease, food has gone to the Greeks, in small measure, and at the peril of capture or sinking.

Obviously, the American Nation, as well as the unfortunate folk of such countries as Norway, France, Belgium, and Holland, question: If even an occasional trickle of food can go to Greece, why not to the others? As a certain delegation of Norwegian seamen put it, they do not wish to go home at the end of the war and "have to go to the churchyards and find the crosses of their dear ones who have died of hunger." Hostile groups, both here and abroad, encourage such natural fear and concern, and stir up dissension by capitalizing upon it.

The "why" is the almost sure danger of strengthening our enemies with materials intended for our friends. The solution is to get the war over with as quickly as possible, and then to allow some such committee as that which is now being formed under ex-Gov. Herbert Lehman, of New York, for the organization of American aid in reconstruction, to take over and restore the full vitality of the small democracies.

In the last war we brought great aid to France and Belgium even while the fighting was going on. But we did not have such stiff essential blockades imposed of necessity by ourselves and our allies, nor did we engage in a war which encompassed every ocean in the world.

Of our two problems, after victory is won, the first is the assistance of rehabilitation of the oppressed peoples of the earth; the second is the matter of post-war immigration. The first must rest in the laps of such agencies as the aforementioned for the organization of American aid in reconstruction. The second will be a matter of consideration not only for members of the legislative body, but for every American citizen. Certainly we do not wish to become, nor do we propose to be, a sort of catch-all for the misfits of the earth. With our present system of quota immigration we could never become that. On the other hand, we must make ourselves ready to welcome useful citizens. We must remember that one Toscanini is worth a thousand Capones; and that we have gained Einstein, even though Fritz Kuhn is in a detention camp. And the little, unimportant people who come here full of hope and who go to work earnestly, who pledge sincere allegiance to our flag, and who learn our language, have every right to enjoy our privileges. At one time all of us, save the Americans who are entirely of Indian blood, were immigrants, whether we stepped off the *Mayflower* onto Plymouth Rock, or came, hopeful and trusting, like my parents, from Ireland only one generation ago.

No matter when we or our forefathers came to this great land, our hearts stir to the words of Felicia Heman's poem, The Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers, which every school child learns:

The breaking waves dashed high
On a stern and rock-bound coast,
And the woods, against a stormy sky,
Their giant branches tossed.

And the heavy night hung dark
The hills and waters o'er
When a band of exiles moored their bark
On a wild New England shore.

What sought they thus afar?
Bright jewels of the mine?
The wealth of seas; the spoils of war?
They sought a faith's pure shrine.

Ay, call it holy ground,
The soil where first they trod.
They have left unstained what there they found—
Freedom to worship God.

This country was made by people driven here from other lands through oppression and religious tyranny and hunger and fear. They, a few of them, built St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Mount Vernon; more and more of them built such churches all over our country. They were proud of what they made. Let us keep it fair and brave for their descendants; at the same time, let us resolve never to close our doors against the equally courageous men and women of today—and tomorrow.

The Strategy of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. MEAD
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address on the subject "What O. W. I. Sets Out to Do for Us," delivered by Liam O'Connor, Special Assistant to the Director of Domestic Operations, Office of War Information of the O. W. I., and published under the heading "The Strategy of Truth" in the magazine Commonwealth.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRATEGY OF TRUTH—WHAT OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION SETS OUT TO DO FOR US

(By Liam O'Connor, Special Assistant to the Director of Domestic Operations, Office of War Information)

Truth, it has been said, is the first casualty of war, and the propagandist is the assassin. According to this view, the propagandist is essentially a liar; he uses the lie to mislead the enemy, to deceive his own people, to secure the aid of neutrals and allies. He has one aim, as Goebbels puts it, "the conquest of the masses. Every means that serves this end is good."

Hitler is in full agreement with his Minister for Propaganda and Public Enlightenment. He believes that the propagandist should not only qualify as a liar, but that he should be as big a liar as possible. Hitler's principle of the big lie is stated in Mein Kampf. There we read that it is a "very sound principle" that "a definite factor in getting a lie believed is the size of the lie * * * for the broad mass of the people in the primitive simplicity of its heart more readily falls victim to a big lie than to a small one."

The United States Government emphatically does not subscribe to this conception of the nature of the propagandist. It does not believe that a declaration of war necessarily implies a moratorium upon truth and an open season for specialists in the colossal lie. On the contrary, the Office of War Information was set up, in the language of Executive Order 9182, "in recognition of the right of the American people and of all other peoples opposing the Axis aggressors to be truthfully informed." The comment of Elmer Davis, Director of Office of War Information, upon this order is unequivocal:

"We even intend to see to it that the enemy peoples are truthfully informed, because we believe the truth is on our side, not only as

to the nature and issues of the war, but as to who is going to win it. We cannot profess that we are going to tell the whole truth, because some things must be held back on the ground of military security; but we are going to tell nothing but the truth, and we intend to see that the American people get just as much of it as genuine considerations of military security will permit. * * * Propaganda * * * is an instrument which may use truth or falsehood as its material, which may be directed toward worthy or unworthy ends. We are going to use the truth, and we are going to use it toward the end of winning the war. * * *" In short, we are determined to fight the enemy's strategy of lies with our strategy of truth.

But this is more than a conflict of strategies. Each of these strategies is based upon a philosophy of man. Those philosophies are radically opposed one to the other. Thomas Jefferson stated the conflict clearly: "Men by their constitution are naturally divided into two parties. Those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all power from them into the hands of the higher classes. Secondly, those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise, depository of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist, and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write they will declare themselves."

The essential conflict, therefore, is between an illiberal conception of man and a liberal conception; between the Fascist notion that the average man is a boob to be manipulated unscrupulously by an "élite," and the democratic idea that every man has the right to think his own thoughts, speak his own mind, and live his own life—so long as he has a proper regard for the rights of others.

The Fascists have not bothered to hide their contempt for the common man. Hitler's Mein Kampf states that "The intelligence of the masses is small, their forgetfulness is great." Goebbels echoes this opinion. "The ordinary man," he says, "hates nothing more than two-sidedness, to be called upon to consider this as well as that. The masses think simply and primitively."

It is true, as Thomas Jefferson pointed out, that the average man is not an intellectual giant. The average man himself would be the last to make any such pretension. But it is also true that the present limitations of popular thinking should by no means be regarded as final, unchangeable.

It may well be asked, can this strategy of truth be concerned only with truth? Must there not be, in addition to appeals to the intelligence, appeals also to the emotions? Are such emotional appeals not demanded if effective action against the enemy is to be secured? And, are not such emotional appeals destructive of truth itself?

These are basic questions and they must be answered. We deal in facts, the facts whish we and our allies must have to understand this war and to bring it to a victorious conclusion. We deal also in the background information without which facts have little or no meaning. This material must be presented, not only at home, but to widely different publics abroad. Abroad we must assure the French intellectual, the Chinese businessman, and the Filipino peasant that there are good reasons still to hope, good reasons still to fight on; we must convince neutrals and wavering satelites of the Axis that our cause is just and that it has the strength to prevail; we must speak to the Nazi official in Berlin and the Japanese official in Tokyo and make them realize that a time of reckoning draws nearer every day. We have outposts in allied countries which handle the material sent from here and also supplement it with material which they prepare and distribute to neighboring areas. As the Director of the Office of War Information has pointed out, "By encouraging our allies, convincing the neutrals, and sowing doubt and confusion among our enemies, they are making their contribution to the eventual victory of our armed forces."

In adapting our information to the cultural backgrounds of different groups we are following the excellent precedents set by Benjamin Franklin and by Woodrow Wilson. If we are to be sure that our message is understood by all peoples, if we are to be sure that the emotional values of this message of hope and defiance of aggression are properly appreciated, we must make these adaptations. Information which is not understood, which arouses no strong feeling, obviously cannot lead to action. But—and this is an all-important qualification—the emotional weight of our materials must never be permitted to destroy the accuracy or proper proportion of our information. Were this to happen, we should lose the confidence of those whom we wish to persuade, confidence which is vital to our successful operation. To a dealer in the truth even the appearance of telling a lie can be fatal.

At home the situation is somewhat different. We are not speaking here to strangers, even to strangers bound to us by the brotherhood of arms, but who nonetheless we must make some effort to understand. No; we speak here to our own, to our relatives and friends, to the members of that great household, the United States. Between members of the same household there is no need for carefully composed speeches. Simple words, plainly spoken, are enough. Indeed, any attempt on the part of any Government agency to "sell" the war to Americans by, for example, the crass methods of the circus barker, would be a monstrous impertinence. We have all made investments in this war, the investments of the flesh and blood of fathers and sons, of brothers and sisters. On far-flung battle fronts, from Guadalcanal to Kiska, from the British Isles to north Africa, these men and women are facing the enemy; they are enduring privation and wounds and disease. At this very moment some of them are dying. Others will return, later, broken in mind and mutilated in body. We who wait for news of those who are dear to us, we who live with them in our dreams though the distance of half the world divides us, do not need to be "sold" this war.

What we do need is the unvarnished truth, the truth which will help us to produce more tools of combat, grow more food, and sacrifice more of our time and energy and money so that our ultimate victory will be the more speedily assured.

An example or two may help to show more adequately how our strategy of truth differs from the enemy's strategy of lies. You will recall the agreement between Great Britain and ourselves in August 1940, whereby British bases in this hemisphere were traded for some of our destroyers. Completely contradictory interpretations of this event were brodcast by the Nazi radio to various audiences. The German home front was informed that the agreement proved the weakness of the British since, as the announcer put it, "they are selling out the Empire for scrap iron." The United States was told, however, that the deal was a sign of British strength, because it was in reality the beginning of a process by which we should revert to the status of a British colony. But this alleged United States weakness was transformed into United States strength for listeners in French Canada, in Latin America, and in Great Britain—to the French Canadians and Latin Americans it was said that Yankee imperialism was now about to dominate the entire Western Hemisphere—to listeners in Britain went the charge that the United States was plotting to prolong the war by inadequate assistance in order that the British Commonwealth should at last become the United States Empire.

Here we have complete disregard for facts, for consistency, for honesty. There is no attempt at all to tell the truth, but merely a cynical use of whatever statement seems most likely to be in accord with the prejudices, the hopes, and the fears of a given group. That is the principle of the big lie in actual operation.

Lies such as these are broadcast 24 hours a day from the short-wave stations of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Each transmission is beamed at a definite target in the appropriate language or dialect. Let me give you a brief outline of how our strategy of truth is employed against this steady barrage of falsehood.

We have a short-wave monitoring service which enables us, day by day, to keep tabs on what the enemy is saying. Foreign-language experts listen to his broadcasts, transcribe, and summarize them. The transmissions are then classified and analyzed. Within a few hours of the original reception it is possible for us to expose the enemy's contradictions, distortions, admissions, and omissions over our own short-wave stations in some 30 languages, and to deflate his lies, no matter how astronomical in size they may be, with the truth.

We have hit the enemy in a vital spot, and we have hit him hard. He has made some attempts to answer our exposures of his lies, but, as the proverb puts it, a lie has only one leg; the more a liar tries to justify himself the more hopelessly does he become involved. He has been compelled to forbid listening to our broadcasts among his own nationals and among the population of occupied countries, and to punish violations of this prohibition with death. There could be no more eloquent proof than this of the impotence of a propaganda of untruth.

It is significant that this impotence was recognized in an official German publication as early as 1936. I refer to the Handbuch der neuzeitlichen Wehrwissenschaften (Handbook of Modern Military Science), published in that year under the sponsorship of the German Society for Military Politics and Military Science. The volume was edited by Major General Franke. It declares: "Even the most obvious untruthfulness is readily believed by the unsuspecting masses of the population. But lies have short lives and their poisoned arrows may fall back on him who used them first.

"Therefore, sound propaganda, made to last, must use only statements which are based on facts, and which will increase the confidence of public opinion. * * *" Hitler would have done well to have listened to these words of warning in 1936. He put his trust instead in his principle of the big lie. Today we are shooting his poisoned arrows back at him. And the poison that he himself distilled is now working upon him.

Let me give you another example. Shortly after our entry into war Tokyo, Rome, and Berlin launched by short wave a concerted campaign against religious groups. The aim was a familiar one: to divide and conquer. On its beam to South America Tokyo stated that Protestants and Jews in the United States were banding together to exterminate Catholicism below the Rio Grande. Rome supplemented this by telling North America and Eire that the Protestant tyrant Roosevelt had landed troops in Northern Ireland for the purpose of wiping out Catholicism in Eire. Berlin, however, assured us that President Roosevelt was a second Moses. Tokyo claimed that more than 50 Protestant leaders had pledged cooperation with the Japanese forces; not one of these leaders was named. Tokyo also alleged that Archbishop O'Doherty, of Manila, and Catholic missionaries in Hong Kong had approved the Japanese occupation of Manila. Berlin made frequent mention of

its mobile churches for German troops in Russia. Tokyo outdid all competition in a broadcast to the Filipinos. The announcer solemnly proclaimed: "When the Japanese entered Manila the natives said, 'The angels have come. The angels we have awaited so long have now descended.' * * * Church bells are striking, their merry notes pealing out to the land."

The divisive intention of these bare-faced lies was unmistakably clear. We at once made the facts known to the religious press and radio. With one voice, from coast to coast and from border to Gulf, the religious press and radio castigated these lies; with one voice they proclaimed the unity of Protestant, Catholic, and Jew against Axis aggression; with one voice they proclaimed that religious groups were determined not to be divided, not to be conquered. The general press and radio joined in the chorus. So also did the domestic foreign-language press and the domestic foreign-language radio. Then, on our short-wave transmitters, in all the major languages of the world and even in languages and dialects comparatively little known, we reported this united defiance to Axis duplicity of the organized spiritual forces of America.

The effect was dramatic: For the moment Tokyo, Rome, and Berlin dropped this attack; their sudden silence on the subject was profound.

This decisive defeat did not permanently discourage the enemy, however; it merely taught him that religious groups are not as naive as he had imagined. Since then he has returned to the attack, not once but again and again, using methods a good deal more subtle. With the help of the organized press and radio of the country—especially that of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish services—we have met these recurring attacks and we will continue to meet them. We cannot afford to relax. We must not forget for a moment that the enemy wants to create war between Protestant and Catholic, that he wants to turn both Protestant and Catholic against the Jew. We must remember that his grand strategy is to divide us among ourselves, and to divide us from our allies, particularly from the British and the Russians. Only by unceasing and aggressive vigilance, only by an adamant skepticism toward all appeals addressed directly or indirectly to narrow group partisanship, only by faith in the American ideal of freedom and justice and brotherhood for all shall we survive.

A Mother Prays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a splendid work from the pen of Florida's great poet, Will D. Muse. It is entitled "A Mother Prays."

A MOTHER PRAYS

Watch over him, O Lord!
He is so young, so innocent and kind.
He does not know that thing called hate,
He knows not greed nor lust for gold.
He only knows that skies are blue,
That summer brings the roses . . .
And that birds are harbingers of happiness.
And yet . . . he felt the thrill of
Bugle call . . . the sound of marching men.
In him was born that nameless thing
Called loyalty. His youthful blood
Is hot from fires of liberty,
Burned long ago, to light our way
Through years of conflict and defeat.

Watch over him, O Lord!
And when the echoes of war's thundering
Have thinned to silent victory,
Let him come back, to step
So proudly through the little door
He left so lately. . . .
Thus a mother prays. . . . Let him come back.

—*Will D. Muse.*

The Two Fronts in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the May issue of Trusts and Estates reflects the sentiments of the members of the Ways and Means Committee who voted against the continuance of the Bituminous Coal Act—an experiment of Government control and price fixing of an essential industry:

There are two distinct philosophies represented in official Washington circles, a fact which must be borne in mind in viewing congressional as well as bureaucratic activities. Industrialists and businessmen who have been found essential to promotion of the war-production effort, together with a large number of Members of Congress, and many officials as well as career employees of regular Government departments, are primarily interested in practical matters such as winning the war and maintaining some semblance of a free-enterprise system. In the other camp—and this includes some of the highest advisors as well as the "entrenching bureaucracy"—are those primarily concerned with the new social order: the so-called controlled economy adherents bent on reform first, last, and always.

Decisions of vital importance, especially on the production and tax fronts, are delayed or vitiated by compromise with the powerful forces of paternalism. These benevolent despots (benevolent with the taxpayers' money and despotic in the theory that they know better about what is good for the people than they do) are a hang-over from the "social gains" school, which is dangerous to our national security in times that call for social sacrifices. It has set an official example for the sort of demands which John L. Lewis has made. The result is that we are seeing our unity of purpose weakened by an internal fight between paternalism and production, with more attention being given to who gets the profits than to who gets the munitions. There are many in high policy-making places who have for years been thinking in terms of distribution of an abundant supply of goods and wealth.

We now have to think in terms of stimulating production to offset a scarcity of men, materials, and time, which controls only one side of the problem. Catchy slogans and high-sounding promises for tomorrow are no match for performance today. The simple fact seems to completely escape the paternalists that you can't run a war and social uplift at the same time. Dr. Lin Yutang expressed it succinctly when he called for a fifth freedom, freedom from humbug:

"The war calls for a leadership that rests on first principles. It calls for a man with the mind of Abraham Lincoln, with its simplicity and strength. But we are so busy throwing up and laying bricks for the second and third floors that we are perfectly contented to think about the foundation afterward. And we are surprised that the bricks laid with so much pathetic effort yesterday always threaten to go out of plumb today."

We can no longer afford to sabotage the capacity of our business-trained men in war policy by socialistic nibbling at the foundations of war and public wealth production. Let us have two fronts, but abroad—not in Washington.

Bureaucracy Has Failed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, critical days and troublesome problems are ahead of us. We can charge 90 percent of this situation to the failure of administrative officials in our Government to perform their duties properly. Too many people forget that our form of government consists of three departments, the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive branch of government. The primary duty of Congress is to enact legislation. The responsibility rests upon administrative officials appointed by the executive to administer the laws and carry out their purposes. If Congress exceeds its authority under the Constitution of the United States there is procedure whereby the courts can declare such a law unconstitutional. Ours is a government of law and not of men.

I do not hesitate to say that Congress has passed all wartime legislation that has been requested by the executive branch of government. Further, it has passed legislation giving the executive branch of the Government emergency war powers in connection with our domestic problems. It has cooperated to the fullest extent.

Having done this, Congress had a right to expect that the Government bureaus and administrative officials would cooperate fully in working out our domestic affairs to the advantage of the American people. Just the reverse has happened. Bureaus and bureaucrats now flourish like a hoard of locusts and are doing more harm than good. If we lose this war, it will be because of the bungling and ignorance with which administrative officials have tackled and proceeded in connection with our domestic problems. Many of these officials have consistently mismanaged the affairs of the country. Steady efforts have been made, for example, to ruin small business and ad-

ministrative officials have done a fairly good job in this direction. In these remarks I do not mean to criticize some Government agencies and some officials who have managed their affairs efficiently and intelligently.

I want to direct my remarks to some phases of the Office of Price Administration. That office has been guilty of more ignorant bungling than any other agency of the Government. It has been almost directly responsible for our present serious food problem. I do not mean to relieve some officials in the Department of Agriculture from their responsibility. They have contributed by their activities and efforts to bring upon the American people the present food shortage in what ought to be a land of plenty. The O. P. A. has mishandled and mismanaged the rationing program.

In a land that produces a surplus, rationing of many products should be unnecessary. The O. P. A. has failed to carry out the law which created it and which had for its purpose the prevention of the increased cost of living. As I have said before, this agency ought to be abolished. As long as it exists, we will have our black markets and we will have incompetent administrative heads continuing their work of ruining American small businessmen and industry in general.

Time will not permit me to discuss other phases of activity of this dangerous organization. However, I will say that I have received letters by the hundreds from all over the State of Minnesota from many different industries, from farmers and from everybody else protesting against the practices of the O. P. A.

I am prompted to make these remarks because the other day I received a letter from a loyal businessman, the head of a concern with three or four hundred employees. He points out in his letter that the O. P. A. regulations regarding the furniture problem are without rhyme or reason and that they are creating black markets in the furniture industry. He points out that he will follow the regulations, but unless they are changed the business of his concern will be ruined. I predict that the men in charge of this problem will go right ahead and ruin this man's business. His letter contains this significant phraseology:

> Our only hope is Congress. The Office of Price Administration is hopeless. We must have certain controls, but the people who are going to direct these controls should be men of experience.

Of course, if this businessman finds his industry losing money and if he has to close it down, some three or four hundred employees are going to be out of work. I can point to many other instances in many other lines of industry. The ones who are going to suffer the most are the wage earners who will be thrown out of employment. I want to serve notice on the administration officials that I have a very definite impression that the average American citizen feels just as I do about this matter. We ought to abolish the O. P. A. and establish a new agency where people of experience can take charge.

In this connection I call your attention to an editorial in the Duluth News Tribune of Duluth, Minn., for June 30, 1943, which is very much in point in this discussion. This editorial reads as follows:

NATURE PRODUCES: MAN MUDDLES

With a food shortage threatening the Nation, the muddled conditions in Washington present a situation that sooner or later will become intolerable to the American people and something will be done about it. Let us hope the people will not wait too long in making the demands that will cause the administration, the bureaucrats, and Congress to wake up, lay aside their personal differences and jealousies, and make provision that will give the troops and the public the service and food that the country holds in abundance.

The fault is not a shortage in the country, but a question of distribution; and the fact is that Washington does not seem capable of meeting the situation and handling it as it should be handled. Nor will the administration permit anybody who knows how or whose training is supposed to fit them to know how to take over the situation and clear it up. The resignation of Chester Davis, Food Administrator, is illustrative of that weakness in the administration. Mr. Davis, whose training seemed to make him singularly fit to handle the problem if given a free hand, very frankly said that he could not do it, for he had been given no authority. Nor has anybody else been given authority with any degree of security.

We hear much about the shortage of corn, for instance. How does that happen when the production of corn in 1942 was 867,702,000 bushels more than the average production for the 10 years, 1930–39, and 497,637,000 bushels more than the crop of 1941? These are official figures.

We hear of the shortage of meat. Why, when it is announced that there is 30 percent more beef cattle on hand now than in the average year?

There are other figures in other commodities almost as out of line with the situation, but these will serve as indicators.

Do we need more production or more statesmen?

Before Congress adjourns it seems to me that we have some very pressing business. We have to face this muddled-up O. P. A. situation. When administrative officials prove a failure, then Congress, as a last desperate measure, should set up its own committee to control the executive agencies which it creates.

In other words, it is my opinion that a congressional committee should be authorized by law to supervise the Office of Price Administration, and to bring order out of chaos. I realize that this is a new departure in the field of government. Never before in our history has it appeared necessary. It is my opinion that it is now necessary for the protection of the American people.

You cannot go on creating boards, bureaus, and then new boards and bureaus, ad infinitum. We already have too much alphabetical soup.

These various war agencies, whose only excuse for existence is to strengthen our domestic economic situation and solve our domestic problems, so that we may more efficiently support the Army and the Navy, and all of our armed forces, should have some of their power taken away and the proper congressional agency should take a hand.

I think we are going to be forced to that procedure. In this viewpoint I find that I have some support of a rather high character. I refer to an article by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, in the Coronet for July 1943 which is entitled "Why Not Deal Congress In."

I commend this article to your careful attention. While it deals with the broad question of winning the war, and calls for congressional participation in the activities of the War Department and the Navy Department at the same time the same argument which Senator VANDENBERG advances for that procedure is very much in point in connection with the argument I have made for congressional control over these administrative bureaus, whose efforts are primarily concerned with problems which are neither military nor naval in character.

Senator VANDENBERG's article has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 23, 1943, and appears on page 6338.

He says at one point:

> You can't be expected to play a poker hand if you aren't allowed to see the cards. Translated into the sterner lexicon of war this means that Congress cannot cooperate effectively if it is denied the total war information which wise decisions require. Today there is no adequate war liaison between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

At another point he says:

> In the matter of post-war planning, we again question how Congress can act wisely if it has no connecting link with executive commitments and policies regarding the attitudes of our allies. For instance, the very morning that Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau was telling some of us about his plans for post-war "international stabilization" as a great secret, our plans were told to the world in London.

It is well worth your while to carefully study this constructive and statesmanlike discussion on the part of the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Tagged Press Not Part of Planned Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the July 7, 1943, edition of the Toledo Times:

GAGGED PRESS NOT PART OF PLANNED ECONOMY

The Government is edging toward a kind of censorship. This is something in America, at war or in peace, cannot afford.

The trend is subtle, moving easily toward a control of what the public should or should not know about Government activities.

The smoke screen behind which the administration hides is the necessity of shielding war secrets. But censorship is one of the political crimes which cannot be committed in the name of national security.

News reporters, schooled in the ways of Washington, often knowing the beaten paths better than the politicians, know where to get the news. They know how to find out what is going on.

They do find out. And this is getting under the tender skin of the administration higher-ups.

The administration has taken the viewpoint that its department heads are in a better position than anyone else to know what information should be given the public. This attitude is assumed under the guise of guarding information which might be helpful to the enemy.

Newspaper readers should know that the newspapers of America have never submitted to political censorship, yet since the beginning of the war, they have applied their own censorship, perhaps far more rigid than any government could enforce, to guard information of military value.

There is too much of an opportunity for the administration to use the "protection of war information" to cover up its own errors. No department head is going to hand out a new release bearing the details of one of his own colossal blunders. It isn't human nature for an individual to expose his own ridiculous mistakes.

Yet this is what the administration is trying to do. The New Dealers who, in spite of the war, have their eyes glued on their chances of staying in power in next year's elections do not want reporters to write anything which has not been approved by the head of the department or agency involved.

If this course were to be followed, the public would be led to believe that everything was running along in apple pie order in Washington, that everyone cooperated thoroughly with everyone else, and that no one, appointed under the New Deal banner, could possibly make an error.

The public may rest assured that the administration will get by with no such foolishness. The newspapers of the country will not print military secrets, but they will, as they always have, expose, fairly and fearlessly, the errors of those political favorites who have been misplaced in office.

We have been dragged a little deeper into this politically planned economy than we think, but we shall never permit a gagged press to become a part of that economy planned to keep the New Deal in office forever.

Experienced Person With Office of Price Administration Offers Good Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Mr. Sam M. Weiss, of Paris, Tex., that has so many constructive suggestions in it relative to O. P. A., I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

PARIS, TEX., *July 5, 1943.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: For several weeks I have been listening daily to someone discuss Office of Price Administration over the radio, read numerous newspaper articles, etc., all of them discussing that very vital agency.

I am firmly convinced that if we are to avoid ruinous inflation it is essential that we control prices. It follows, therefore, that the Office of Price Administration would certainly be a very important and necessary agency at this time.

For your information, I am connected with the Lamar County Office of Price Administration set-up; therefore, I have a fairly good idea of its workings insofar as it actually operates and not the theoretical idea.

On June 26 the Congress appropriated a certain sum for the operation of Office of Price Administration but eliminated all the necessary funds for its enforcement. Frankly, everyone who has anything to do with the Office of Price Administration; or, as a matter of fact, is interested in the welfare of our country was astounded at the action of Congress. What in the name of Heaven, does the Congress mean to vote a large sum of money for the operation of an agency such as Office of Price Administration if it cannot enforce its orders?

As a matter of fact, I, for one, believe that the Office of Price Administration will rapidly develop into just one more racket similar to what the eighteenth amendment brought about 15 to 20 years ago.

A large percentage of the American public will gladly obey the law if they understand what you want them to do and the reason for it. I believe there is a certain small percentage of chiselers who are constantly looking for just some such thing to get rich at the expense of the law-abiding citizens, and the Congress, for some unknown reason, always manages to leave enough loopholes for these reprobates so they can operate without much trouble.

The legitimate grocer, meat market, or what-have-you, is doing his best to comply with Office of Price Administration instructions. In so doing, his cost of operation has gone up because he must keep up with a lot of things required by the agency. On the other hand, there are a number of chiselers who pay no attention to anything and whose business is increasing daily and their profits mounting at the expense of the legitimate merchants.

May I cite you one other case that I am personally familiar with, to show you just what happens when you authorize an agency to issue certain orders and do not appropriate the necessary funds for its enforcement? Mr. Ickes issued a directive to the oil industry telling them what hours a retail station can stay open and sell gasoline to the different classes of trade. The legitimate dealers are complying with Mr. Ickes' directive, but the chiselers do not. I wrote to Mr. Dudley Cornell, district director of marketing, at Houston, and asked that he send someone up here to investigate matters. He wrote back and told me that he was very sorry, but their appropriations for enforcement were extremely light and that he could not spare a man to send up here, but he would write a certain dealer a letter. I waited several weeks and traced Mr. Cornell. He answered, stating that he had written this party a letter, but had not yet heard from him and that he would try sometime to send someone up here.

Now, all in the world such things accomplish is to cause a lot of good, honest citizens to cuss the Congress and everyone connected with it for causing certain hardships to one class and make it possible for others to get by.

I hope you understand my position. I am for anything that is best for our country today and will help win this war. If the Office of Price Administration will stop inflation, let us have it; but, for heaven's sake, if we adopt the Office of Price Administration because England and Canada tried it and found it working, then why in the world don't we enforce it just as England and Canada do?

This is not intended as criticism against you or anyone else personally. I am merely giving you this because I hear it every day on all sides and being connected with the Office of Price Administration, I see its weak points, but they are mostly traceable to the fact that the Congress permitted a lot of loopholes in the act, making it practically impossible for the Office of Price Administration to enforce it.

These are some of the things I am sure you will hear plenty of when you get back to your district.

Sincerely yours,

SAM M. WEISS.

The Corn Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina, as well as my colleague from Illinois, has explained the situation that confronts us, namely, that pledges have been made that the price of corn will be held at $1.07 per bushel. I feel that this Government should stand by the pledge and protect the farmers who in good faith, especially the small farmers, sold corn at that time. The 800,000,000 bushels of corn that are being held are being held by the big farmers and the speculators. We should not today or at any time try to help the speculators and the gamblers in corn by raising the price so they may make excessive profits. I am, indeed, surprised that some of the Members cannot see through this corn propaganda—propaganda that the eastern farmers, hog and poultry raisers are suffering because of their inability to obtain corn for feed purposes. If that is so, we should insist and order the sale of corn now held by the Government, and call in all the loans that have been nade on corn. I understand there are millions of bushels that can be, and should be, released if there is such a shortage as is claimed. On the other hand, we have over 800,000,000 bushels of wheat, which experts maintain is superior to corn for every purpose, including that of feed.

Some of the gentlemen who are so interested in corn for feed purposes are criticizing the Government. Why should they not criticize the big speculators who are holding corn until such time as they can squeeze every possible dollar far above the parity price? They fail to realize that by yielding to the pressure of these corn manipulators and speculators it will cost the consumers millions of dollars, because corn is used for the production of so many needed commodities that failure to obtain an adequate supply will destroy many manufactures and industries that are dependent upon obtaining corn at a fair and reasonable price.

In contrast, when a few hundred or a few thousand laboring men, who cannot exist on the wages they receive, protest and demand a higher wage, they are immediately abused and speeches of condemnation are made on the floor, but when corn farmers go on a strike for the purpose of mulcting the American consumers, not a word is said.

A few days ago, the Food Administrator, Judge Marvin H. Jones, appeared before the Committee on Rules. He explained the existing situation, and I am satisfied if he will be given sufficient time he will obtain enough corn for all needs with a minimum delay.

The general hue and cry of the "corn advocates" is difficult for me to analyze. For instance, my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] wants a special committee appointed because he claims the chicken and hog raisers are experiencing a great shortage of feed corn, this notwithstanding that he claims to have the richest district in the United States. Consequently his great interest in corn is very "fishy" to me.

Mr. Speaker, I feel, as I have stated, that all corn on hand over which the Government has jurisdiction should be placed upon the market, and that all loans should be called and that corn should be taken over at the price agreed and fixed upon many months ago, which is not below but way above the cost of production.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that the hoarders of corn are not aiding the cause of agricul ure or of the farmer for whom so much has been done by this administration. In this connection I insert a statement giving the appropriations for agriculture for the years 1933 to 1943:

Appropriations for agriculture, 1933–43

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1943:	
1933	$316,883,236.00
1934	110,512,207.00
1935	1,264,680,091.00
1936	810,793,320.61
1937	726,916,823.04
1938	774,935,873.00
1939	1,281,889,237.16
1940	1,423,262,745.11
1941	1,161,261,379.13
1942	1,452,073,144.00
1943	824,567,700.86
Total	10,147,775,756.91

Mr. Speaker, this shows what the Roosevelt Administration has done for the farmers. The figures do not include the amounts provided in other appropriations for the interest of the farmers, nor does it include approximately $2,000,000,000 included in the Lend-Lease Act which also has been of direct benefit to the farmers. All told, the appropriations for the past 11 years for the benefit of the farmers have been in excess of $12,000,000,000.

I want the Members, especially the Republican Members coming from the rural sections, to furnish this information to those farmers who feel that enough has not been done for them. I know the Republican Members who come from the city districts will make capital out of the fact that tremendous sums of money were appropriated in the interest of agriculture.

Our Relations With Post-War China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut, before the Institute of Arts and Sciences, Columbia University summer session, Tuesday, July 6, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am keenly aware of the honor you do me in inviting me to address this distinguished forum on a question as important as America's Post-war Relations with China. Indeed, I believe there is no question, apart from the actual winning of the war itself, more important to all Americans and to their children. For the answers that the West, and particularly the people of America, give in the next 10 years to the many problems posed by the violent awakening of 450,000,000 will either lay the foundation of peace or set the stage for war and revolution and turmoil throughout the world for a century.

Today, I believe, America is truly aware of Asia and its meaning to us as a civilization and as a nation. The veil of indifference that clouded the popular mind, no less the minds of our statesmen, was brutally ripped away at Pearl Harbor. Today we know, or should know, that it was not Hitler nor nazi-ism, nor Mussolini, nor fascism which shaped and guided this tremendous and evil storm that has engulfed us in the Pacific. We know that this was the bloody whirlwind which all the West has been sowing for 50, perhaps 100 years, in the Far East, and its seeds were greed and imperialism, contempt, and indifference, smugness and flaunted superiority.

Pearl Harbor was not inevitable. At any time, I believe, after the establishment of the Chinese Republic in 1911, wise and generous statesmanship on the part of the West, above all generous and farsighted American statesmanship, might have prevented the martyrdom of China at the hands of Japan, and thus averted the holocaust in the Pacific. We Americans will make a terrible mistake if we insist on thinking that Hitler engineered the Japanese attack upon us. Hitler merely provided the Japanese with an opportune moment for throwing down the last great challenge at Pearl Harbor to western statesmanship which years before Hitler had begun to show itself weak and flabby and vacillating toward the Orient. The first challenge which we had failed to meet was, of course, the rape of Manchuria in 1931. From then on our American failure, and the failure of the British, to come to the aid of China by every diplomatic means in our power, made the war with Japan inevitable, Hitler or no Hitler.

Indeed, Hitler may well have done our Nation a great service by encouraging the Japanese to strike when they did—which, in my opinion, was too soon for their own purposes, since China had not yet been fully subdued and conquered. And until China is conquered Japan could never, and can never, be victorious. So deeply ingrained in our western statesmen and our American statesmen was Pacific appeasement that I fear we would have allowed the conquest of China had we not been stabbed broad awake, before it was too late, at Pearl Harbor.

Four years ago I visited a poet—an American poet who was living the life of an expatriate in France. Her name was Gertrude Stein, and, as you know, she is not exactly famous for the crystal-clarity of her utterances. And yet Gertrude Stein put the proposition about China which I shall lay before you tonight more simply and more clearly, certainly than any of our statesmen was putting it then and perhaps as clearly as any of them has put it since then. I ask you to remember that this was over 4 years ago, in France, at a time when the world had hardly awakened from the dream of Munich to fall into the nightmare of the second European war.

We talked of a visit I had just made to the halls of the League of Nations at Geneva—which was a few hours' drive from Miss Stein's little farmhouse on the side of a French mountain near Aix-les-Bains. I spoke of the great, empty, marble halls, the long, deserted marble corridors—the white sepulchre of the dead League of Nations. The talk was all of European statesmen and the European ghosts-of-war which haunted them.

"Will there be another war, really?" I asked Miss Stein.

"Oh, yes," she said, "there will be. That's what you've been telling me, isn't it?"

I said, "Well, there's nothing we can do—we Americans—about it."

"Oh, yes," Miss Stein said, "there is." "But we won't do it."

I said, "What is that?"

And Miss Stein said, "Well, if we want to win this war we're going to have, the thing we've got to do first is save China." And then she said, very happy, "It's wonderful to know what you can do, even if you don't do it."

And I said: "But why is the first thing for us to do to save China?"

And she said: "Don't you see? It's very plain. We must save China first; because there are so many millions more Chinese than there are of us that if we save them first there will be that many more millions of them to save us, when we need them, in the world which is around and not flat anywhere."

Now I see, we all see, how right Gertrude Stein was. Had we saved China in the years after 1911—had we forbidden, as we could have, the rape of Manchuria, had we looked to our Pacific defenses in the Philippines—which were an American commitment, requiring no European aid or advice during the past 10 years, had we ceased long before Pearl Harbor to appease Japan with scrap and steel, had we supplied China with the airplanes and instruments of war she needed instead—we would have saved our 130,000,000 Americans much agony—and much bloodshed.

Fortunately for us, the Chinese were able to carry on without our vigorous salvation. Tomorrow marks the sixth year of their war against Japan. Six years ago the Japanese fired on them at Marco Polo Bridge. In those 6 years millions of Asiatics have died for freedom and millions are still willing to die. Not for our freedom, let it be plain, but for their own freedom. But because they were willing to do so, our own dead will not have died in vain at Manila, at Pearl Harbor, at Attu, in the southwest Pacific today with General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey.

This must be the most important factor in our post-war thinking about China: Although China is not, in our political sense, a democracy, it is a freedom-loving people, utterly prepared to preserve its freedom or perish. This fact cuts across all thinking on racial lines. However, desperately the Japanese, like the Germans, attempt to draw the issue along lines of race or color, the truth is in Asia, as in Europe, the battle is between men who would be free and men who would enslave them.

If we stick with the free men of Asia and with the cause of freedom everywhere in Asia, as we are determined to stay with the free men of Europe, we cannot fail to win the war.

Never has a people or a generation of men had a more magnificent opportunity than this one. To be sure the task is a gigantic task. It would be foolish to underestimate the problems which the revolution in Asia, the coming awake of Asia to the modern industrial age, will carry with it. All the facts about Asia are incredibly complex and many of them contradictory. But the paramount one, as I have said, is neither complex nor contradictory; millions, indeed billions, of Asiatics today aspire to self-government, to freedom, and to what we call material progress. For America and American statesmen to fail, in our age, to canalize these aspirations into fruitful fields is not only to lose the peace in our time but, perhaps, in the end to destroy America. For remember, there are so many millions more of them than there are of us that if they set off one way down the highway of material progress, with hate in their hearts for us, and we set off another with indifference in our minds and souls, we shall not survive should we meet them on the crossroads of a third war in a world which is around, is around, and not flat anywhere.

It is, of course, not possible in the time allotted to me this evening even to touch upon more than one or two of the problems which will face us in our post-war relations with China. And the Chinese are only one of the peoples we must consider in our Pacific relations. And yet every one of these problems is inextricably linked with the other, and all must dovetail reasonably well into any far eastern policy which will have a chance of bringing peace and progress to the Pacific. To make the widest possible generalization, for the moment, which will cover them all—and here I include India—cooperating with foreign powers which now have imperialistic claims upon them, the United States must use its prestige and good offices tirelessly in the direction of assuring all the peoples of the Far East more and more self-government and autonomy. It must cooperate at every turn to help raise the living standards and educational standards of the Pacific peoples and increase the flow of international trade by intra-Pacific trade agreements.

In order to do this, above all in order to be in closest touch with China, which because it is already a great sovereign freedom-loving country is the foundation stone of an American Far East policy, we must have a clear, well-defended route to the Far East. Beginning at Hawaii, we must fortify and protect our stepping stones: Midway, Wake, Guam, and in the Philippines we must keep naval and air establishments adequate to preserve these free islands against any future aggression. We must, of course, take from Japan those islands which have in the past endangered this Pacific defense route. All of which is, I believe, self-evident to the American people today.

But let us return to China. All American thinking on the subject of a far eastern policy that will maintain peace over half the world must be posited on a strong, solid, stable, and friendly China.

How, then, do we proceed toward helping to bring about this kind of a China? Or, rather, how do we help China fulfill this goal which she has suffered already so deeply to attain herself?

First, and foremost, by living up now and today to our moral commitments in China: by sending directly to China, yes, directly over the pinnacled, snow-capped Himalayas, the Great Divide of Burma, the strength in the air she must have to beat at the paper heart of Tokyo. And then to send her indirectly, by way of MacArthur and Halsey, the material that will open a great and brutal and decisive second front in the Southwest Pacific. These are the things we must do now for China. And I do not hesitate to say that our failure to do so will eventually be as costly in American lives as in Chinese lives.

Now I do not wish tonight to be accused of indulging in armchair generalship while purporting to discuss our post-war relations with China. But I believe that war and peace are indivisible; one takes shape in the womb of the other. Everyone who has seen, as I have, the tragic fragments of the long and bloody struggle of the Chinese people is aware of their keen and critical and at the same time agonized watchfulness of the American and British war effort in the Pacific. Free and fighting China is still free and fighting, but her soldiers are wearied by 6 years of war. They are riddled with illness and despondency. Her people are starved and tortured, her statesmen determined but growing daily more cynical. To be sure, they understand the problem. They will wait and fight, and fall back and advance, and fight and wait, as they have for 6 long years. But the fact stands; since December 7, 1941, Tokyo has been bombed once. And yet thousands upon thousands of tons of high explosives have been dumped not only upon Germany but upon nondecisive objectives all over the periphery of Europe.

The best way to assure ourselves that China will be strong, stable, and friendly in the future is plainly to do everything within our power to keep her strong, stable, and friendly now. And that means more and still more military aid to China.

But let us pretend for a moment or assume for a moment that within the next 6 months that aid is forthcoming and with it victory over Japan.

Are there any other practical measures, other than military, we could take to assure ourselves today of the friendship of China tomorrow?

I suggest one: The repeal in Congress of the Chinese exclusion act, which would go far to promote better understanding between ourselves and the Chinese Nation. Today an exclusion law specifically naming the Chinese, bars Orientals from this country. Those Chinese permitted to enter temporarily must acquire a special certificate defining their status, and are often ignominiously kept in long custody at ports of entry, pending examination. They are also ineligible for naturalization or citizenship. These anti-Chinese laws put upon our statute books many years ago by Congress, seem to have anticipated and given approval to the whole Hitler doctrine of race theology. The next Congress will attempt to repeal them, and put the Chinese people under the regular, long-established quota system. That quota would allow the entry of exactly 105 Chinese a year, hardly a threat to American labor markets, the American way of life, or even our so-called white civilization. Until this insult, this gross insult to the Chinese people, is wiped from our statute books, Americans can hardly claim to be fighting for and with the Chinese for freedom and human dignity. We must translate our high-sounding words into deeds now: military aid to China and the moral aid, the wiping of this stigma of exclusion from the Chinese, are two immediate and urgent steps we must take.

It is in the field of our post-war economic relations with China that the greatest room for generous and wise statesmanship both in China and America lies. The fact, subject to no dispute, is that when the war ends China will be a very needy nation. The big question, the all-important question, will not be, of course: What does China need? For China will want and will need everything—shoes and ships and sealing wax and cabbages, though no kings. She will need and want everything from needles tc harvesting machines, from vaccines to railroads, from straw hats to printing presses.

And no one doubts American manufacturers can supply these needs. But will they be supplied? That is the question. Because China's greatest need will be money with which to pay for her other needs. For China will be not only a needy but a tragically impoverished country. Wise statesmanship in China will do everything in its power to produce for trade, while raising the living standard and income of the average Chinese. Wise statesmanship in China will do everything to help free the Chinese farmer from the exploitation of the landlord, and, at the same time, to industrialize China. Above all, wise statesmanship in China, while soliciting international government loans, will also encourage the investment of private foreign capital in China, and the development of China by private enterprise.

This does not mean the Chinese will tolerate the exploitation of China and the Chinese in the old imperialistic sense. They will not. They have died, as I say, by the millions for a free China, and they intend to keep it free. But foreign investment must and should be encouraged by a greater measure of government honesty and national dependability than the Chinese have so far displayed.

On our side of the water our statesmen must, by wise trade policies, do everything they can to aid the Chinese to export. We must not set our duties too high, or China will never be able to repay those obligations which we now hold, no less service the new debts which China must incur if she is going to get the wheels of progress turning over again in the Far East. And the policy of our Government, like that of the Chinese, should be to encourage the investment of private American capital in China, rather than that of the whole people, which might merely result in a recurrence of the terrible World War No. 1 experience, when our foreign loans turned sour because in our fiscal and tariff policies we refused our debtors the means to repay them.

In the end I believe it to be an economic truism to say that the greater the damage we inflict by unwise trade policies on the economies of other nations the greater will be the damage to our own export markets. China, the land of 400,000,000 customers, is still an economist's dream. It has not yet come true. But with wisdom and generosity and patience and the exercise of sound business sense on the part of our statesmen and legislators it can begin to come true in our time.

Now you may have noted that so far I have discussed our post-war relations with China without once mentioning a post-war world organization of any kind. This may not seem so remarkable to you as it does to me. Perhaps living and working in Washington as I have for the past 6 months I have become unduly sensitive to the prevalence in every discussion of a post-war world of what are called mechanisms, machinery, plots, plans, blueprints, prospectuses, and organizations for post-war worlds. Not a day passes but there crosses my desk some elaborate and even noble scheme for the organization of a post-war world. Many of them are ingenious in device, noble in concept, all are magnificent in purpose. Perhaps one of them, or one like them, will capture the imagination of America and even the world. Who knows? Perhaps, then, the energies of the world—too long poured into destructive wars—will be poured into the construction of a beautiful edifice for the running of a federated world.

But I am reminded, when I see some of these plans, when I hear their details so hotly debated by their many adherents, of the story that was told to me in India of the building of the world's most beautiful structure—the Taj Mahal.

In 1631, you remember, the Shah Jahan, a great and noble young Indian prince, lost his beloved wife, his beautiful darling, the gay and radiant and tender Mumtaz Mahal. The shah's grief was black and terrible and for

days he was inconsolable. He had been an active and creative prince, but now that his lovely wife was dead he had no wish but to die too.

He decided, however, before he took his own life, to build a temple for his wife's remains, a temple worthy of her beauty and virtue. He ordered all other Hindu temple building stopped at once and sent for the greatest architects and builders in the land. A year after Mumtaz Mahal had been laid aside in a small black wood casket in a little burial ground in Agra, ground was broken for the Taj Mahal. Twenty years went by, during which the Shah worked tirelessly on details of the plan with his architects and the new artists that he was always sending for. In 1650 there stood the Taj Mahal, its great center dome and small domes encrusted with agates, jaspers, and blood stones—the most exquisite and beautiful building in all the world. Twenty years before, in the fullness of his grief, the young prince had arranged the heart-breaking details of the funeral cortege that would wind its way to the great central hall. No one had ever dared speak to him of it since, for fear of evoking his old grief and despair.

So his ministers just notified him that the Taj Mahal was complete at last and, said they delicately: "The procession waits, your majesty." The prince, radiant with the joy that comes of fulfilling a long and arduous and noble task, got upon his white elephant with the great bannered cortege in the rear. No one spoke to him because no one dared speak to him until the procession reached the great portals of the central dome. The prince dismounted, walked into the beautiful central hall. He stood there entranced. Then suddenly he broke into an angry exclamation: "What is that?" he demanded angrily, pointing at something small and black and oblong that lay on the marble floor. "How did that ugly object get in here? It completely mars the beauty of this hall. Take it away."

And quietly they took away the little black box in which lay the remains of Mumtaz Mahal. The prince had forgotten why he had built the Taj Mahal.

Do not let us, in our fascination with plans for a post-war world, forget why we work to build our world organization edifice—to preserve peace between the nations, lovely peace, done to death in 1931 in Manchuria.

One of the simple ways to bring about that long peace for which we today make so many complex world architectural plans is to begin now deciding precisely what we, as a Nation, wish to do about China. In reaching this decision we need not be balked by any other nation, we need scarcely wait for any other nation; certainly we need not wait to think this problem through. We can begin today, tonight, now, planning a policy for China which, if we follow it in honor and dignity, will keep peace over half the world for 50 years.

Then if the people will, let them have the Taj Mahals of world organizations, too, since they do such honor, in their beauty, to the endlessly creative mind of man.

Résumé of Veterans' Legislation During the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a résumé of the legislation enacted and bills reported by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I have the honor to be chairman, during the first 6 months of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

I call the attention of the Members to this statement because I am sure it will be of both interest and assistance to them in handling veterans' cases or making reports to their constituents on veterans' legislation:

H. R. 1749, "To amend Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended," grants to veterans of World War No. 2 hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits on a parity with World War No. 1 veterans. This bill was approved by the President on March 17, 1943, and became Public Law No. 10, Seventy-eighth Congress.

H. R. 2023, "To amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, etc.," authorizes renewal of the expiring 5-year level premium term insurance policies by the agent or beneficiary of an insured service man who is outside the continental limits of the United States. This bill was approved by the President on May 23, 1943, and became Public Law No. 13, Seventy-eighth Congress.

H. R. 801, "To amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, etc." This bill provides rehabilitation of disabled veterans of World War No. 2, to be administered by the Veterans' Administration. The measure was reported unanimously by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on February 3, 1943; however, before the House had acted on the proposition, the Senate Committee on Finance reported, and there was passed by the Senate, the companion bill, which was identical with H. R. 801. S. 786 was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the committee substituted it for H. R. 801. The measure became Public Law No. 16, upon being approved by the President on March 24, 1943.

H. R. 986, "To define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct." An analysis of this measure is contained in the Committee Report No. 462. The bill passed the House on June 8, 1943; and passed the Senate on July 7, 1943, and is now on the President's desk awaiting his approval.

H. R. 2703, "To provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes." A complete analysis of this bill, which affects veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and their dependents, is contained in the Report of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, No. 463. The measure passed the House on June 21, 1943, by a vote of 194 to 0. It passed the Senate with slight amendment on July 7, 1943, and the House concurred in the amendment on the same day. The measure is now on the President's desk, awaiting his approval.

H. R. 799, "To make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years." This bill was unanimously reported by the committee and is now pending on the House Calendar.

H. R. 1744, "To provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War No. 1 veterans." This bill provides compensation to widows and children of deceased veterans of World War No. 1, if the veteran served 90 days and was given an honorable discharge; or, who having served less than 90 days was discharged for disability in the service in line of duty. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and is now pending on the House Calendar.

In addition to the above résumé, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has a limited supply of copies of a committee print entitled "Historical Statement of the Laws Enacted and Veterans Regulations Promulgated on and After March 20, 1933, Relating to Veterans and Their Dependents With a Complete Statement Regarding Expenditures for Hospital and Domiciliary Construction."

This document contains all legislation enacted for the benefit of veterans and their dependents up to and including April 15, 1943. Copies may be obtained from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, room 356, old House Office Building, phone extension 336.

Townsend Old-Age Pension Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, even though, to the disappointment of many Members of this House, including myself, and countless thousands of people throughout this entire country, more than 6 months of the Seventy-eighth Congress have passed by without any sign of action looking toward the consideration of H. R. 1649—the Townsend-Cannon bill—which carries the endorsement of the Townsend organization, I want to utilize this opportunity to set forth briefly the tangible and intangible angles—the hard, cold, practical economic facts as well as the moral or spiritual aspects—of the Townsend old-age pension plan.

It truly has been said that necessity is the mother of invention, and the evolvement of the Townsend plan only proves for the *n*th time the accuracy of that pithy adage; as most of us are aware, this idea of Dr. Townsend for a Nation-wide old-age pension plan, to be sponsored and administered by the Federal Government, was conceived during the depth of the economic depression that stalked over the length and breadth of this great land of ours more than a decade ago.

While the Townsend plan in its entirety has been by no means as yet achieved, it has not been without force and driving power because it was the widespread interest it stirred and created—the vista of hope it envisioned—in the early 1930's that gave impetus to the adoption of the Federal Social Security Act which was placed on the statute books in 1935. Certainly all of us will concede that the enactment of that law, while inadequate to meet and cover the bare necessities of our elderly dependent citizens, was a step in the right direction; even though it affords only meager benefits, it has served to establish the principle and accord recognition and a concrete

foundation to a national social-security system in this country. But that it was only a step toward the ultimate goal is indicated by the fact that interest in the Townsend movement—despite delays, disappointment, sharp legislative tactics, and maneuverings—has vigorously flourished in every State in the Union for some 8 years subsequent to the passage of the Federal Social Security Act; indeed, its adherents, both in and out of Congress, are just as insistent today as ever they were in their demands that the Townsend old-age pension plan, solely on its merits, be accorded open and fair congressional hearings and consideration by the National House of Representatives and the United States Senate. No more than it is possible to knock out and get a really good man down is it possible to knock out and destroy a really good idea—neither knows the meaning of "can't," neither will accept failure as the final verdict—both will continue stubbornly to persevere, regardless of any discouragements or obstacles encountered, toward ultimate success and triumph. And so the Townsend plan continues to persist, continues to refuse to be relegated to the background, and continues to be the hope of millions of our elderly dependent citizens.

In the current Congress there is pending a bill, H. R. 1649, introduced by Congressman PAT CANNON, of Florida, which embodies the provisions of the Townsend plan and which is cited as the Business, Employment, and Security Insurance Act. There is nothing complicated, involved, or mysterious about this bill. Let me read its title:

> A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

The objectives of the Townsend plan are clearly stated in that title, but I especially want to explain and emphasize two sections of the pending Townsend-Cannon bill—titles II and III, the first of which provides for the raising of the necessary funds with which to defray the expenses of the proposed benefits, and the second of which deals with the administration and distribution of those benefits.

Title II of this bill directs that there shall be levied, collected, and paid a tax of 3 percent of the gross income of all persons or companies derived from any and all sources, except in personal incomes there shall be an exemption up to $100 per month. By means of the collection, as a tax, of the stipulated 3 percent of gross income, the money to provide for the payment of the benfits set forth in the general title of this bill would be raised; mind you, raised currently and paid currently—not a mortgage on the future to be carried and refinanced over an indefinite and vague period of time—not something borrowed or gone into debt for—not an obligation to be borne by generations yet unborn. Indeed, it may well be that the thrifty and wholesome efficiency of the financial structure on which the Townsend plan is based accounts for some of the blind, unreasoning opposition that prevails in certain quarters to its adoption.

Of course, we all realize how ultrafashionable Government borrowing and staggering Treasury deficits have become during the past 10 years, but we also are aware that no sound economist or practical financier as yet has been persuaded by existing trends in Government financing to spurn or discard the tried and true principles of the thrift that requires keeping in current balance income and expenditures. Nations, my good friends, are only large collections of individuals and nations operate under the same basic economic principles as do individuals. Some of us probably long ago decided that Government financing is too remote, too complex and intricate for us to comprehend, although as individuals we fully understand and appreciate that we are vastly more secure, content and better off if we can at least keep our personal budgets balanced and remain clear of the haunting specter of debt; while governments have infinitely greater credit facilities and immensely broader latitudes in which to conduct their financial operations than do mere individuals, nevertheless the same inexorable basic economic laws govern the operations of the national purse as govern the pocketbook of the individual. And so we find this provision of the Townsend plan—currently raising the revenue to defray the payment of the proposed benefits—well within the scope and requirements of thrift and sound economic principles and procedure.

Parenthetically I want to stress that word "thrift" because the requirement of current financing as stipulated in the Townsend plan eliminates the onerous burden of interest payments on borrowed money, debt adjustment and refinancing and all that complicated and cumbersome process entails over a period of years.

Having made a most thorough and detailed study of the financial structure of the Townsend plan, I am satisfied that any person who will exert himself or herself to make a similiar investigation and study of it cannot fail to be convinced of its economic soundness.

Now that we have considered the means by which the fund shall be raised with which to pay the benefits proposed in the pending Townsend-Cannon bill, let us consider title III of the measure which makes provision for the administration and operation of the plan, the manner in which the distribution of its old-age pension and other benefits shall be distributed.

Briefly, title III provides that there shall be created in the Treasury of the United States an account into which shall be deposited each month the accumulated proceeds raised through the collection of the previously described 3-percent tax on gross income, as provided under title II of the bill.

On the 20th day of the month succeeding the month in which the Townsend-Cannon law is passed, and on the twentieth day of each calendar month thereafter, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, there shall first be deducted from the total sum collected the necessary expenses involved for administrative purposes, after which the remainder of the fund shall be prorated and paid monthly to the persons eligible for benefits under the act. Please note that carefully—first, the administrative expenses are to be paid out of the fund accumulated monthly through the collection of the specified tax, and, second, the remainder of the fund is to be prorated and paid monthly to the persons eligible to receive benefits under the act.

Now, let me stress this point: The amount to be paid monthly to each individual would vary from month to month as the fund to be distributed in benefits would depend on the amount of taxes collected each month under title II of the act, and the total amount of that tax would necessarily fluctuate in proportion to the rise or fall of general business transactions and employment activities. I want to particularly emphasize that point because, in my judgment, one of the most deleterious and harmful impressions that has attached itself to the Townsend-Cannon bill is the wholly unwarranted promise of a pension at a guaranteed rate of $200 per month to every citizen 60 years of age or over. That $200-a-month business is a myth, pure and simple. Let me stress that the pending Townsend-Cannon bill holds out no such Utopian promise; instead, it is based on a straightforward, out-and-out business basis; in short, so much raised, so much paid—no more and no less.

As to the constitutional or legal authority for the enactment of the pending legislation containing the provisions of the Townsend plan, we have only to glance at article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, known as the welfare clause, which reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises; to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Let the opponents who raise a hue and cry regarding the unconstitutionality of the Townsend plan ponder article I of our great charter of government.

Another legal point that belabors many people sympathetic to the Townsend plan is why the legislation embodying its provisions has not received more fair consideration and expeditious action; frequently I have been asked, "Why should the Ways and Means Committee be permitted to continue to have jurisdiction over this legislation?" The answer to that query is simple; under the established rules of Congress the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate are the two congressional committees which have jurisdiction over and pass on all revenue-raising legislation. Obviously the legislation embodying the Townsend

plan definitely and specifically involves taxes. Of course we are all aware that the Constitution provides that all revenue legislation must originate in the House of Representatives, for which reason no tax legislation can be initiated by the Senate; under the long-established rules and procedure of the Congress, the House Ways and Means Committee must initiate and act first on all tax measures before the Senate can take them under consideration.

These days we hear much discussion about plans for the post-war world. When the ensuing tragic world conflict comes to an end, not all, unhappily, but several million of our men in the armed services will be returning home, eager and anxious to resume their normal lives. What does that mean to the average young man? It means a job, an opportunity to earn and create a decent standard of living; to marry and make a home for his wife and himself and rear a family. One of the basic requirements for the materialization of that natural and laudable ambition is a job.

As long as 15 years ago, the rapid strides made in industrial mechanical equipment and scientific management brought about a displacement of labor; machines began doing the work that formerly kept many hands busy and doomed them to idleness. The recent and further technological advances that have been made in our laboratories and industries under the impetus and pressure of the present war have not as yet been measured and are not yet known, although we may be sure that these advances will be a factor in post-war employment opportunities. But in any event, and regardless of any circumstances, way must be made for the returning young men from the battle fronts; they must have opportunity to work and return to the normal way of living that so much they desire.

Making the Townsend plan a reality—providing for the economic security of our elderly dependent citizens—would not only remove from the employment market one segment of approximately 8,000,000 elderly people, thus decreasing employment competition, but it would enable many a father or mother to help tide over that son, returned home from the shattering experiences of global warfare, who will require individual encouragement and a little time to readjust himself to normal living—that boy who will need time to swing back to normal surroundings and routine civilian living—for whom a Government hospital will be no help, but who will find himself again through just hanging around home for a while, feeding on stacks of Mom's homemade buckwheat cakes and juicy pies, tinkering around Pop's carpenter shop in the basement, or just shoveling a path through the snow out to the chicken coop or to the front gate, busying himself with chores and odd jobs around home. If these young men could return home to find even a part of their world secure and stabilized, rather than to be confronted with the responsibilities of solving the financial living problems of their elders, such a fortunate condition would be a real factor in creating confidence and building morale.

Heretofore I called on our great Constitution to bear witness to the legality of the Townsend-Cannon bill; in closing permit me to call on even higher authority—the Book of Books—to bear witness to the justice and merit of this most humanitarian plan that we as a Nation would do well to adopt and thus as a people unite in complying with the solemn exhortation of the fourth commandment—honor thy father and thy mother.

Economic Reclamation Projects in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a news release by the Bureau of Reclamation on an address Economic Reclamation Projects in the West by Acting Commissioner Harry W. Bashore, of the Bureau of Reclamation. The address was delivered before the Citizens Conference on Planning, at Omaha, Nebr., on June 14 by Walker R. Young of Denver, Colo., assistant chief engineer of the Bureau.

The subject is one of supreme importance to every one of the 17 States bisected by or west of the one-hundredth meridian, and I am glad to see the Bureal of Reclamation is doing constructive thinking along this line. First we must provide employment opportunities for returning servicemen and settlement areas on irrigated land where soldiers, sailors, and marines who will be seeking farms can be self-sustaining.

Mr. Bashore's address points the way for a substantial contribution to the desired ends.

The news release and the address are as follows:

Construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, of 79 or more irrigation and multiple-purpose projects in 17 Western States as a giant post-war public-works program to cushion the shock of the demobilization of service men and emergency war workers was outlined today by Walker R. Young, assistant chief engineer of the Bureau of Reclamation, at the Citizens' Conference on Planning at Omaha, Nebr.

Speaking for the Bureau's acting commissioner, Harry W. Bashore, on the subject, Economic Reclamation Projects in Western Public Works, Mr. Young emphasized that the Bureau's program would serve a fourfold purpose. It will provide employment during construction, settlement opportunities, a means of increasing agricultural production to make the West more nearly self-sustaining, and provide additional power for industry, farms, and homes.

The Bureau proposes to complete work on 25 projects where construction has been halted or retarded by the War Production Board and begin construction of four large new projects which have been authorized, but where work has been deferred by war conditions. In a third group is a shelf of 50 projects, principally irrigation, for which blueprints are to be ready and construction may start on short notice.

Mr. Young said that if the Bureau's post-war construction program were crowded into 1 year, work would be provided for more than 425,000 men at the sites and in widely distributed industries. When completed the projects will serve an estimated 7,800,000 acres, a large part of which will be land now inadequately irrigated by other systems and the remainder new lands for home seekers.

Settlement opportunities on newly irrigated farms will be provided for from 50,000 to 60,000 farm families. From 20,000 to 25,000 additional farm families in the Great Plains and other drought-ridden areas will be rehabilitated, and security will be given, through additional water supplies, to 85,000 to 100,000 other families in areas now faced with recurring water shortages. To maintain an increasing population the West must have irrigation expansion.

On uncompleted and new projects of the post-war program, more than 3,000,000 kilowatts will be added to the installation of 2,500,000 in place at the end of the war, as the power market in the West justifies the outlay.

Mr. Young pointed out that Bureau projects are now making major war contributions: 4,000,000 acres of highly productive land growing vast quantities of food, forage, and fiber, and power plants producing more electrical energy for war factories than was generated in the whole western third of the Nation at the close of World War No. 1.

The address in full is as follows:

"In preparing my discussion of the subject of the place of Economic Reclamation Projects in Western Public Works I was interested in Webster's definition of 'economic' as 'pertaining to the satisfaction of man's needs.'

"Paraphrasing that definition I emphasize that the objective of Bureau of Reclamation projects is to meet the urgent requirements for water conservation of the western third of the Nation, in war and in peace. The conservation of western water resources for irrigation of agricultural lands is esesntial today to provide food for the fighting forces and the civilian population of this Nation engaged in a life-and-death struggle for its existence. When peace comes, Reclamation will provide the settlement opportunities and means for the maintenance of the increased western population resulting from the wartime industrial expansion.

"Through the double and sometimes triple use of water, Reclamation power projects alone are producing today more electrical energy for war plants than was generated in the whole western third of the Nation at the close of World War No. 1. In a happier day, when our swords are beaten into ploughshares, this power will assure a permanent western industry to provide a market for labor and for increased agricultural production.

"A third major objective of Reclamation projects is water for municipal and industrial purposes. Flood control, navigation, recreational benefits, and wildlife refuges also enter the picture.

"The Bureau of Reclamation, on Thursday, June 17, observes the forty-first anniversary of the establishment of Reclamation as a national policy. Today its energies are focused upon maximum contributions toward the prosecution of the war.

"From the 4,000,000 acres of highly productive land watered by Reclamation systems

in 15 western States will come this year vast quantities of food, forage, and fiber. These supplies are essential in filling the quota of agricultural products which the West is expected to meet. Production of these war crops in the West for the West helps relieve congestion on overcrowded cross-country transportation systems.

"The urgent and multiplying need for greater food supplies is manifest. When the recognized need for food, as a partner to guns in production for war, is implemented with clearance and priorities by the War Production Board, the Bureau can resume construction on irrigation facilities that by 1945 will expand by one-third the acreage now served.

"In the field of power, the Bureau is the largest producer of hydroelectric energy in the West. Its project plants generate today at the rate of 800,000,000 kilowatt-hours per month. The output is used primarily for the production of aluminum, magnesium, and other war supplies. In another year the capacity will be increased a third with a corresponding gain in war production. Projects under construction or where work can be quickly resumed can further expand the supply for war factories.

"Practically every one of the 46 reclamation projects now in operation serves some military activity. Air bases in the desert areas have been made possible by irrigation developments, power is being supplied to war factories, and domestic and industrial water is provided to troops, industries, and communities whose activities are linked directly with the war.

"These contributions to the national security have all come about through western public works. In the 41 years of its operation, the Bureau has expended more than $800,000,000 on the construction of western projects. More than 65 percent of this amount was spent in the period from 1933–43 when the greatest strides were made toward harnessing western rivers and turning them into avenues of service to man and country. Ninety-five percent of the construction costs is reimbursable.

"The greatest impetus for Reclamation developments came with the recognition by President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the potential wealth that was dormant in western waters and land. As Public Works Administrator, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes recommended, and the Bureau carried out a program that laid the foundation for the enlarged service Reclamation is now performing in the national emergency.

"With this background I come now to what the Bureau of Reclamation will contribute to a program of post-war public works in the 17 States bisected by or west of the 100th Meridian.

"First, the Bureau proposes to complete work on 25 projects where construction has been halted or retarded by the War Production Board. On some of these projects the restriction may be lifted in the interest of food or power production for war, but in all probability none will be entirely completed before hostilities cease. These projects range in size from relatively small irrigation developments to extensive undertakings like the Columbia Basin Project in Washington, the Central Valley in California, and the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado, where power facilities are an important factor in assuring repayment of construction costs.

"The next group includes four large new projects which have been authorized under the reclamation or other laws, but where the inauguration of work was deferred as a result of war conditions.

"In the third group is a shelf of at least 50 projects, principally irrigation, for which blueprints are to be ready and construction may start on short notice. These projects are designed to qualify for a general post-war program.

"The backlog of feasible projects for a post-war public-works program is not necessarily limited to the shelf of 50 projects to which I have referred. Through investigations of individual projects or entire river basins, so far as funds permit, the opportunities for the transformation of the water resources of the West into the most useful channels for the development of the region are being explored. Included in these studies is the Colorado River Basin, an area in which seven States are interested.

"The Bureau of Reclamation is cooperating with the Missouri River States Committee recently formed in Omaha for the purpose of paving the way for the most equitable use of the waters of the Missouri with due recognition of the interests of navigation, flood control, and irrigation. Looking forward to the need for valley-wide cooperation such as has been achieved in the Colorado Basin, Commissioner John C. Page nearly a year ago proposed the formulation of a Missouri River compact as an essential step in the planning of the disposition of the waters of this great basin.

"On the basis of pre-war or 1940 prices, execution of the Bureau's public-works program will entail an expenditure of a billion dollars. More than three-fourths of this amount represents the cost of projects under construction and those authorized by existing laws, where work can begin quickly. Findings of feasibility have been made in all of these cases, and construction awaits the green light.

"The Bureau of Reclamation presents the projects in this program on the basis of what they will contribute to the economic development and stabilization of the West. It is not sufficient that the structures will be durable, that the dams will conserve water to be carried to thirsty fields by canals and laterals, or that the powerhouses will generate blocks of power.

"A crisis second only to the war itself will confront the Nation in finding employment for returning servicemen and temporary war factory workers who have been drained from and will return to the rural areas, and for those who will remain in industrial centers.

"Reclamation public works will aid materially in the solution of this problem in the rural areas of the West. The labor required in off-site activities will distribute the benefits widespread throughout the country.

"On the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, for instance, 40 percent of the labor—49,000,000 man-hours—were expended at the site of construction. Sixty percent—74,000,000 man-hours—were expended in the production, fabrication, and transportation of the raw materials and the finished products. On earth-fill dams, by contrast, 65 percent of the labor is at the site and 35 percent in mines, forests, and factories at distant points.

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor has made preliminary studies which indicate that if a billion-dollar reclamation construction program were crowded into 1 year, work would be provided for more than 425,000 men. Perhaps half of these would work at the sites of construction in the West, and the remainder would be scattered through forests, mines, and factories and on the railroads.

"When completed the projects in this program will serve an estimated 7,800,000 acres—an area equivalent to more than a third of the land now irrigated in the West. About 2,500,000 acres will be new lands transformed by irrigation from sagebrush and wastes into productive farms. The remaining acreage will be in established irrigated areas faced with retrogression to the desert as a result of dwindling water supplies.

"Settlement opportunities on newly irrigated farms will be provided for from 50,000 to 60,000 farm families. From 20,000 to 25,000 additional farm families in the Great Plains and other drought-ridden areas will be rehabilitated through a water conservation and utilization program. Security will be given, through supplemental or substituted water supplies, to 85,000 to 100,000 other families in irrigated areas now faced by recurring water shortages.

"The increase in power installations cleared by the War Production Board as a part of the war program will bring the total power capacity on Bureau projects to 2,500,000 kilowatts. On uncompleted and new projects of the post-war program, more than 3,000,000 additional kilowatts will be installed when the market justifies the outlay.

"Hydroelectric power is produced as an incident to irrigation—the major function of the Bureau of Reclamation. In the financial side of the picture, however, it has a major place as a means of repaying nearly 50 percent of the over-all cost of the reclamation program and making possible an expansion of irrigation which otherwise would not be economically feasible.

"Power will continue to be a factor in advancing irrigation in the West. The potential demand for electrical energy in the future is forecast by the tremendous increase in installed capacity in the region between 1920 and 1940. From a total of 2,000,000 kilowatts in 1920, the capacity grew to 6,500,000 kilowatts—a gain of more than 200 percent.

"To maintain an increasing population the West must have irrigation expansion. Dry farming in the arid and semiarid regions reached its peak of production long ago. The irrigated acreage from which comes more than 70 percent of the agricultural production, has not increased in proportion to the growth in population.

"Economic reclamation projects in the post-war program will serve a four fold purpose. They will provide employment during construction, settlement opportunities, a means of increasing agricultural production to make the West more nearly self-sustaining, and provide power for industry, farms, and homes."

The Answer to Justice Roberts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me at a Republican rally in Chicago, Ill.:

Congress is taking its true place of leadership. The turn is definitely toward nationalism and away from internationalism. The Constitution is winning its fight against the New Deal!

Peace determined by the mature deliberation of the chosen representatives of the people, under the recognized processes of the Constitution, presents no danger to the American people. Full discussion and debate in the halls of Congress will result in the protection of our American sovereignty and independence of action. We will cooperate with other nations but we will not surrender the free determination of our own destiny. America will remain American! But Congress must hear from the people in no uncertain terms that we intend to preserve our independent destiny!

What threatens us at this hour is the attempt to evade recognized constitutional processes and to attempt to commit the

American people in spite of the Constitution and even in defiance of it. What is this dangerous scheme?

When the millions of our boys are in foreign lands, fighting to save the American flag and the Constitution of the United States, a gigantic trick is to be played on them and the rest of the American people by having a so-called referendum vote in November 1944, placed on the ballot at the same time that we elect a President of the United States. There are those who claim that under the provisions of the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States the people have the right to conduct such a referendum and place us forever in a world super-state, supreme over the Republic of the United States and having an executive power, a court, and a legislature, also an army and navy that will tell the American people what to do and when to do it.

This scheme calls for the breaking down of party lines and the creation of one party, thus wrecking the Republican Party as was done at Philadelphia in 1940. By the instrumentality of this one party, we will become a constituent part of one world, tearing up the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States as waste paper.

How far has this scheme progressed? In an address delivered at the dinner of the American Society of International Law on May 1, 1943, Justice Roberts of the United States Supreme Court said:

"Our recent experience teaches that all the expedients to which the nations have turned are insufficient to keep the peace. We have learned that leagues, treaties, agreements, voluntary submission of disputes to a world court, fall short of reaching the goal. What other recourse is there? Our own national experience as a federation of independent sovereigns seems to point to at least one avenue to be explored. Is it not plain that, so long as national sovereignty remains absolute, no means will exist for preventing the abnegation of the obligations of international good faith? Must there not be a fundamental framework of government to which the people of each constituent nation surrender such portion of their nation's sovereign prerogative as is essential to an international order; that each nation be bound by certain agreed rules so that no single nation, and no group of nations, can, for any reason, or for no reason, assert its or their unbridled will by resort to arms?

"Naturally there will be differences as to detail. But it seems to me that there ought not be much difference of view respecting certain fundamental requirements. Supranational law must be law affecting and binding individual citizens of the nations belonging to the supernational government, in the same sense that the law of the United States, consisting of the Constitution, and the statutes adopted pursuant to it, bind every citizen of the Nation.

"It seems obvious that a world government must have a representative assembly to implement its delegated powers. Equally plain is the necessity for an executive to administer the laws and see to their enforcement. And under that executive there must be an independent police to effectuate the legislative policy and the executive action pursuant to it.

"Lastly, there must be a judiciary to which disputes between the citizens and the supranational government, between citizens and any nation a party to that government, and between nations must be submitted for adjudication."

On June 13, 1943, Justice Roberts, of the United States Supreme Court, a Republican appointed by former President Hoover, while broadcasting over a Nation-wide network on the American Forum of the Air, earnestly advocated this so-called referendum as the only method by which this world super state could be made binding upon the American people.

I am satisfied that the President is delaying union with Britain only because of the doubt in his mind that the people will accept it. He is convinced that he has the power, by Executive agreement, to join with Britain, and he does not intend to submit the question to either the Senate or the House. In other words, he does not want to take an unpopular step. He has been advised that he has the power under the new construction of the Constitution developed in the State Department and silently approved by the new Supreme Court.

Justice Roberts shares this view. I quote from his remarks delivered over the radio in the American Forum of the Air, June 13, 1943, as follows:

"The one and only indispensable condition to a federation of nations is that the citizens of this Nation make the matter the first order of the day; that, laying aside all partisan considerations, they unite in a demand that our leaders stand firmly for the only suggested form of international union that holds any promise for world cooperation and world peace. * * * Another objection that I constantly hear is that this is not the time to federate. My own view is that it is now or never; now in the white heat of war; now in the crisis and suffering of war; now with men's minds bent to this problem and with the sacrifices that are being made; now, and now only, is the time when men will be willing to lay aside certain smaller selfish interests and look to the greater and longer good that will come out of union."

In the course of this debate on the American Forum of the Air, the following dialog took place between Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, and Justice Roberts:

"Senator GILLETTE. That being the case, assume that we were able to establish a federation along the lines that you have suggested—suggested by Mr. Streit. Would it be your contention that there would be no right of secession, no right of change of form of government in any of the constituent parts?

"Mr. Justice ROBERTS. We settled that in our Union, I think, in 1861. There wasn't any right of secession.

"Senator GILLETTE. Surely.

"Mr. Justice ROBERTS. And I think that if you start with a league of people who are democratically minded and understand the democratic process they must understand that the Federal covenant, the Federal Constitution, binds them each as citizens, as every American citizen understands it binds them now."

In answer to a question by Senator GILLETTE as to the method by which the American Constitution could be superseded and whether it would not take more time than we can afford to spend, Justice Roberts replied:

"I think not. When you compare it to the chaos that is going to be existent in Europe while the United Nations try to settle what they are going to do with a Europe that has no leadership and doesn't know where it is going, I think if Congress could pass a resolution for a constitutional referendum on this question it could be settled by the States in a very short time."

It is our first duty to awaken the American people to this danger. It is more vital than the war. The outcome of the war as it affects our capacity to continue as a nation is no longer in doubt. The war has ushered in this far more important question of our continuation as a nation under the Constitution of the United States, the very safety of the Republic. This attack does not come from foreign enemies. It is nurtured and sustained by our own fellow citizens. Therefore, no possible question of sedition can be raised in the discussion of this issue. The internationalists have asked for it.

Let us analyze what is behind the position taken by those who advocate union now with Britain and world government. They insist that all post-war planning and treaty making should be left entirely to the President, and that Congress and the Supreme Court may safely be ignored. In a recently published book on International Executive Agreements, by Wallace McClure, of the State Department staff, it is said:

"A still greater gulf exists between treaties and Executive agreements on the one hand and ordinary legislative enactments on the other not with regard to domestic procedure but as a matter of international substance: International acts are national law by virtue of the concurrence in their enactment of the government of some other country or countries—a matter highly pertinent to the proposition of their unilateral abrogation. They involve obligations to other peoples and are themselves international law and the subject of international regulation and adjudication. * * *

"It becomes arguable, accordingly, that the courts possess no authority to pronounce an international act unconstitutional."

In this inspired book, carefully prepared to fortify any step which the President may take, the following conclusions are reached:

"It is believed that the President has, and was intended to have under the Constitution, all the powers and functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations; that he has, accordingly, the authority to enter into any manner of international act, on any subject, that is entered into by other states of the world. * * *. The President can do by Executive agreement anything that he can do by treaty, providing Congress by law cooperates. And there is a very wide field of action in which the cooperation of Congress is not necessary; indeed, where Congress possesses no constitutional authority to dissent."

The advocates of this scheme are trying to confuse the American people by defining the objects for which we fight. A series of broadcasts will be held this summer over a Nation-wide network when several advocates of this scheme will endeavor to convince the American people that we are fighting for objects which will make it easier for them to accomplish the world superstate. It is, therefore, important for us to weigh the objects of this war and to make a sound and just appraisal of what we are fighting for. In this connection, it is well to consider the following quoted from a recent address by Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. We quote:

"We went to war to prove that so far as the American Republic is affected, might in this world will not make right. * * * I do not believe we went to war to establish the 'four freedoms' or any other freedom throughout the world, and I do not believe we went to war for all of the purposes stated in the Atlantic Charter. We did not go to war even to establish liberty throughout the world, except as such a world condition might result from the insurance of our own liberty.

"This is no war of democracies against dictatorships. There is no freedom of speech in Russia. There are benevolent dictators in Brazil, in Cuba, and in China. There was a dictator in Poland. In Greece, which made one of the most magnificent defenses against aggression that has been seen in this war, the people were governed under a dictator, who was so benighted as to prohibit in Greece the reading of The Republic of Plato. Surely we are not going to interfere with the internal governments of Russia and China and other nations in order to insist

on all of their citizens enjoying freedom of expression and freedom of religion. If we are, we will have a permanent army a good deal larger than 11,000,000 men and we will have to suspend for a long time any renewal of freedom in the United States."

Replying to Justice Roberts, I am certain that few Americans actually realize what is involved in the so-called plan of Federal Union or Union Now With Britain. Few realize that under this plan we would forever lose our American citizenship, our American flag and our Republic ordained and established by the Constitution of the United States, also our Supreme Court, our Congress, and our Bill of Rights. There is to be under this plan a common currency to supplant the money which we now use in the United States. Holding 75 percent of the world's gold, the people of the United States would of necessity get the short end of the money angle of Union Now. American labor would face the loss of the high standard of wages paid in America by the abandonment of our protective system for a customs-free plan known as free trade. Impoverished by the losses of the war, Britain would be enabled to dump in the United States without paying any duty articles manufactured by the pauper labor of Britain and her dominions. The peace of the United States would be forever determined by this new Federal Union and whenever Britain became involved in war it would be our war.

People of the United States are not all of British origin. We have here a great melting pot made up of people from all the nations of the world. They have forgotten the nations of the Old World and have given their allegiance to America first, last, and always. They have not asked for union now with Britain any more than they have asked for union now with Germany, France, Italy, or Russia. They are content to remain all American.

Union Now would split America asunder into groups and factions who, at first heart broken, would then become sullen. If you want to see another 1776 and a war for independence, just succeed in fastening the chains of your union now upon the wrists and ankles of the American people. No, Justice Roberts; we do not want union now with Britain, and you shall not impose it upon us. We permit freedom of speech and freedom of thought in America, but there comes a point when even good neighbors must resent an infringement of the sanctity of their own homes.

To lessen the chance of a future war, we must give up our American citizenship and become citizens of a world superstate dominated by Great Britain and the Soviet Union. That is the plan.

Great Britain and the Soviet Union have entered into an alliance lasting 20 years. They do not need us, except to defeat Hitler. The war serves merely as a setting for a surrender of sovereignty far more drastic than any enemy force could ever inflict. And this at a time when we are by far the strongest nation in the world—on land, at sea, and in the air. If Churchill and Stalin want to establish a united states of Europe, that is their business, and we will gladly cooperate with them to that extent. But we want no part of it. We have gigantic domestic problems that will take all of our energy to keep the United States of America a going concern.

The tragedy of this scheme rests in the fact that after we have surrendered our Republic we still would have no guaranty of peace. Then why do it? Why take a step so obviously against our own best interest? We are familiar with the strong pro-British attitude of Winston Churchill, the strong pro-Soviet attitude of Stalin. Is it possible that we utterly lack equally pro-American leadership?

Let us look at this scheme realistically. The weakening of our American citizenship where so many millions are of different foreign origins must result in chaos. As a people we are a league of nationalities. We get along together because we confer American citizenship—"I am an American." Take this away and great, free America dies, just when we are emerging into true greatness.

After this war is over we will face a Europe dominated by the Soviet Union. No one can predict just what this will mean, but it will be safer for us to keep our powder dry and be able to determine and control our own acts. There is serious danger that we will be absorbed in the growing power of the Soviet Union.

Our domestic peace and security could never withstand the spreading of communism among our own people. Already we can see the dire consequences of the inevitable clashing of races and industrial strife. Once we weaken the national loyalty, once we dilute the pure devotion of Americans to our own free America, there will be no bond to hold us together. Today we are under the compulsion of a mortgage on our resources held by foreigners. If that mortgage be foreclosed, bloodshed and anarchy will follow. We do not intend to give a quit claim deed to our hard-won possessions. In this critical hour and in the days to come we must stand by the Constitution of the United States and resist to the bitter end any attempt to weaken this American loyalty and devotion, no matter in what form the attempt is clothed.

If you place world citizenship above American citizenship, you must open our ports to the immigration of all races, colors, and creeds. Where we now have conflicts along these lines they will be intensified and inflamed. American labor has worked for many years for the restriction of immigration so as to keep American jobs for American workers. Under the world superstate advocated by Justice Roberts, we could not refuse the entering of these immigrants because we would have previously surrendered any control over the subject. If this immigration grew to such magnitude that we would be swamped by the new infusions into our American population, all freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly now guaranteed to us by our Bill of Rights would be lost in a confusion of tongues and a veritable mob of foreigners demanding the things which we Americans call our own and for which we are justly proud.

Justice Roberts for all practical purposes has foredoomed his scheme to failure by insisting that this is the time to complete the federation which he advocates. In fact, he admits that it is now or never. He would have us in the heat of war, in the suffering of war, make this bargain to surrender the independence of his own country and to undermine the very Constitution which, as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, he has solemnly sworn to protect and defend. And he would do this without giving our boys who are fighting all over the world a chance to be heard. Would this be fair to our gallant heroes? This but illustrates how far the fallacy of global thinking can carry us.

Our minds shrink from a contemplation of the picture which this sort of false reasoning presents. What father could ever face his returning son who fought so gallantly for the Stars and Stripes and tell him that his job has been filled by a citizen of the Federal Union and that Old Glory would never fly again over the courthouse in his native village!

Justice Roberts has urged us to arouse "an enlivened public sentiment in this country in support of an integration of our own and other nations in a world organization." He has asked us to make this our first duty. Let us accept this challenge and prove to him that the American people love this Republic and refuse to surrender it to any foreign nation or to any international group within our own country. This is the great issue of 1944 and we must rise to the task.

The "referendum" vote will have no binding force in law. But it will serve the purpose of satisfying the moral question in the conscience of the President. If the people in 1944 vote for union with Britain and world government, then the Republic is forever lost, even though we are winning the war to preserve it. And with the Republic goes the blessings of our free American citizenship. Justice Roberts has asked for a referendum. Let us let him know how we will vote. And our boys in the armed forces when they return will say: "God bless you—you saved the Republic for which we were fighting!"

Straight From the Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "Straight From the Shoulder," commenting upon the address made by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey at the thirty-fifth annual Governors' Conference, recently held in Ohio:

STRAIGHT FROM THE SHOULDER

Franklin D. Roosevelt must have winced in reminiscence when he read yesterday what Thomas E. Dewey, of New York State, had said at the thirty-fifth annual national Governors' Conference out in Ohio. For the attack of New York's Governor on the national administration was exactly parallel to those devastating blows Mr. Roosevelt was himself throwing as Governor of the Empire State back in 1931 against President Herbert Hoover. And none knows better than Mr. Roosevelt that politics moves in cycles.

Said Mr. Dewey, in part: "The domestic job being done now is unspeakably bad. It has been bad, however, for the last 10 years.

"The policy of scarcity, which was not abandoned by the national administration until a short time ago—too late even to affect this year's winter wheat crop—is at the root of the whole trouble.

I have been saying for nearly 2 years that unless the national food policy was changed we were all going to go hungry, and that is what we are now beginning to do.

Our failure to produce adequate food is going to affect this country's future in the world as well as its national well-being. The cornerstone for building peace is that we feed the conquered nations. You can't build peace while people are mad with hunger."

There you find Mr. Dewey going straight into the worst mess the national administration has concocted, and taking astutely the very political weapon which Mr. Roosevelt had planned to use himself in 1944. And it is straight-from-the-shoulder talk like this of Mr. Dewey which the country needs most urgently at this time.

If Mr. Roosevelt plans, as all indications point, the use of a save-the-world-from-

hunger campaign for 1944, Mr. Dewey already has started to tell the world that such a program could not be in worse hands. For the bureaucrats and impractical theorists behind the desks in Washington are the very same who made the farmers kill the little pigs and plow under the corn.

As it was Mr. Roosevelt who 12 years ago was utilizing his office as head of the greatest State of the Union to point to palpable defects in the Hoover administration, so Mr. Dewey now has that same proud platform from which to preach. And do not make the mistake of feeling that his declination of a Presidential nomination next year weakens his position. On the contrary, it strengthens his stand for his views are not simply those of an opportunist—they are, rather, the convictions of a responsible statesman who is not simply grinding a personal political axe.

Our Serious Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this war is not yet won. We may have a long way to go before victory comes. We have the reports from the fighting fronts of the valor and heroism of our boys, and that is the most inspiring information that we receive these days. Our boys are fighting on to victory, and they do not indulge in any bickering, confusion, or bungling in so doing. They are fighting for our country. They have no thought of coming elections, and they do not play politics—they have but one thought, and that is for our country and the security of our people and the perpetuation of our form of government under the Constitution.

The heroism of our boys should inspire all those in high places in our Government, and it should make everyone ashamed of their conduct when bickerings arise and when confusion and bungling exists. Those who play the game of politics with war, and when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle, when our country is in peril, should become ashamed of their actions; the people should denounce that character of conduct in time of this our greatest crisis.

When we take an inventory of some of the things that now exist in this crisis, we find a terrific struggle in which the Vice President of the United States is making serious charges against Mr. Jesse Jones, both of whom are holding high positions in our Government. And in the countercharges made by Mr. Jesse Jones against the Vice President very serious charges are pronounced against him. Recently on the floor of the House I made the assertion that this amounted only to "one bureaucrat calling another bureaucrat a bureaucrat"; but this ugly controversy has more serious implications than the mere calling of names—it tends to break down the morale of the people of this country, and at a time when we cannot afford to have the morale of the people weakened on any front. These men, holding the high positions they now occupy, should realize that this country is at war and that this is the time to exercise ordinary common horse sense and judgment, and not be piloted into a ridiculous controversy which has spread throughout our country and which has resulted in a decreased morale on the part of our people. If this single item of bad judgment was the only one that now exists in this Nation, we would not give it more than a passing consideration. But this is not all.

The Chief Executive continues to attempt to drive every person in the executive branch of the Government to yield to his views and opinions, whether it be on the subject of stock and poultry feed, of which there is a terrific shortage at the moment, gasoline rationing, or our food supply—or any other serious problem which confronts the people. He continues to direct and drive those under his command. The pitiful part of the entire mess of confusion is that the President will not, and he does not, appoint men of superior knowledge and experience in a particular line to aid in the administration of the affairs of Government in that particular field with which they are entirely familiar, and in which they have previously exerted that experience and knowledge.

For instance, in the matter of our terribly reduced food supply—he has failed entirely to give heed to repeated requests that he place in charge men of our country who could, and would if appointed and permitted to handle that situation, bring order out of chaos and establish a fair and reasonable regulation relating to the distribution of food to our soldiers, our own civilian population, and to our allies. Our food supplies are short now. Reports coming in from the great farming areas are alarming, because the food production from the farms will be greatly reduced in 1943; in some sections that reduction will reach the appalling figure of from 25 to 40 percent, all caused by the floods, the rains, the lack of farm labor, machinery, and parts for repairs.

With this tragic situation our minds naturally reflect to the days when the President ordered the pigs killed, and every third row of the corn plowed under, and the reduction of the acreage of wheat and other commodities. Men cannot compete with nature. We need food. If food is not produced we will have hungry and starving people in our Nation. Our soldiers will falter on the battle front if we do not produce the food for them. This is one of our gravest problems at the moment. I cannot imagine a greater tragedy than to have millions of men on the fighting fronts, across the oceans and on foreign soil, deprived of the necessities of life which are so essential to our victory in this war.

Every American of experience and sound judgment knows that there should be appointed a central food administrator, with those qualifications which fit him for the task ahead, clothed with ample and adequate powers to meet and solve this food problem. In the great farming sections of our country great and irreparable damage has already been done because of the utter failure to meet the issue and to solve the problem, but unless something is done about it, immediately, hunger and starvation will be in our very midst next year, and in the years to follow. There must be no delay on this subject if we are to escape famine and hunger at home, and if we are to be able to feed our soldiers who are fighting on the battle fronts.

Mr. Speaker, when we reflect upon the bickerings, the various conflicts existing, and the bungling of material matters in the O. P. A., and when the people try to get food supplies at the various stores and they find that there is very little, or none, in stock—the people become disgusted; they are greatly disappointed. They know of the ills in that agency of Government, and they know that those in charge have utterly failed to solve the existing problem. The people want food, and they want it at a reasonable price. The people know of the curtailment in production of food which the Government directed and fully sanctioned; now there is a great scarcity of food, and the Government, and those in power, and those in charge of the controlling agencies, are unable to cope with the existing situation. It is bungling in Government, and the Chief Executive, who has full and complete control over every department of Government and every department head, is directly responsible for the existing ills. He, and he alone, has the power to hire and fire his appointees, and he, and he alone, can appoint some experienced and qualified person to take charge of these agencies who will be able to solve the problems and meet the existing conditions.

Mr. Speaker, we must win this war. We must go forward, a united people, to victory. We cannot win this war if bungling, confusion, and mismanagement in the departments of government continue. We must feed our soldiers and sailors, and we must feed our own people. When that is accomplished, then we must yield whatever food we may have to spare to foreign countries for their hungry people. In the course of this war, it has been the policy of our Government, under those in power, to give away our resources, our ships, our munitions of war—to finance and to give food and every other necessity—to other nations of the world. Many of those nations have more food than we, and many of those countries who have received gifts from Uncle Sam are not reciprocating in any way whatever. Our country appears to be the paymaster for everyone, and this—remember—cannot continue indefinitely. We are facing a financial crisis, and those in power do not appear to worry; they continue to urge the spending of the taxpayers hard-earned money for many

nonessential things; they are spending huge sums of money—fabulous sums of money—for the prosecution of this war; this war is costing our country, up to the present moment, many times the entire cost of the last World War; and the end is not in sight.

It is my constant fear that our Nation will face a financial break-down before the end of the war. The waste, extravagance, and mismanagement of this war, and in our own economic structure, has been frightful. When the people awaken, and fully realize just what has been done to them—both before the war and since we became involved in it—they will then realize that the words I have spoken here are literally true. The New Deal has been the cause of a greater disaster in this country—which will endure longer—than war, flood, or famine. Yet, the President—and his New Deal—continues to march onward, spending the people's money, and forcing the people into bankruptcy.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves today. These are not idle thoughts; they are the expressions of every American who faces the present situation with great alarm. They know that the future will bring disaster to them—they know the future years will be years of taxation, regimentation, and consternation. This is not a pleasant thought for all of the people. The youth, the maid, and the mature adult face the same foreboding future—the result of waste, extravagance, and bungling. This is not a pleasant future to behold. As Americans—who love our country, who want to win this war, who want our boys to come back home again to live in a republic under our Constitution—what are you going to do about it? We must face the future as Americans.

Title	77th Cong., 1st sess.	77th Cong., 2d sess.	78th Cong. 1st sess.
Agriculture	$1,184,516,385.00	$837,868,110.00	$967,442,616.00
District of Columbia	60,778,584.44	63,017,368.00	70,301,292.00
Independent Offices	1,986,577,372.76	2,645,053,330.89	3,883,067,316.00
Interior	222,675,113.00	196,352,158.00	122,103,376.00
Labor-Federal Security	1,203,941,940.00	1,071,574,318.00	1,137,167,010.00
Legislative	25,720,737.00	25,570,708.00	40,894,478.00
Military	10,567,986,098.00	42,820,021,846.00	71,507,694,152.00
Navy	3,449,878,416.00	26,002,741,074.00	32,422,759,198.00
State, Justice, and Commerce	279,142,477.00	426,281,885.00	226,852,680.00
Treasury-Post Office	5,663,651,791.00	5,879,403,739.00	8,091,858,177.00
War Department civil functions	230,899,173.00	346,312,076.00	97,156,798.00
First deficiency	197,272,544.88	163,780,819.77	6,279,981,739.96
Urgent deficiency	393,687,775.00		22,410,676.17
Second deficiency	1,041,444,529.75	53,721,999.74	260,256,179.72
Urgent deficiency	174,409,630.00		7,246,700.00
Do			143,430,591.56
Supplemental naval			3,836,176,119.00
Farm labor supply			26,100,000.00
Defense aid (lend-lease)	7,000,000,000.00		6,273,629,000.00
National war agencies			2,911,697,224.00
Relief Work Projects Administration	910,905,000.00	282,584,000.00	
Fourth supplemental national deficiency	1,533,567,102.00	12,556,672,474.00	
Fifth supplemental national deficiency	4,383,221,174.00	32,762,737,900.00	
Sixth supplemental national deficiency		19,146,197,010.18	
Seventh supplemental national deficiency		1,692,574,740.00	
First supplemental national deficiency	7,586,896,948.00	1,903,939,210.90	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation defense housing insurance	10,000,000.00		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase strategic materials	1,500,000,000.00		
Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation	1,250,000,000.00		
Army clothing	175,000,000.00		
Merchant ships	313,500,000.00		
Tennessee Valley Authority	40,000,000.00		
Maritime insurance		210,000,000.00	
China loan		500,000,000.00	
District of Columbia housing		32,500,000.00	
Education		9,500,000.00	
Navy bill, H. R. 7419, passed July 22, 1942		974,634,000.00	
Total	51,395,672,790.83	150,603,038,867.48	138,328,225,323.41

Appropriations of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement of the total amount which will come directly out of the Treasury in one way or another as a result of the bills that have been passed so far in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. These figures include, in addition to direct appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, and reappropriation of funds which, without this action, would remain in the Treasury.

The following table shows a breakdown of the amounts made available by bills for each department in the last three sessions of Congress:

The expenditures during the fiscal year 1943 totaled $78,182,348,640.87, and the excess of expenditures over receipts was $55,900,705,931.63.

The public debt increased during the fiscal year from $76,990,704,746.50 to $140,796,033,375.65.

Current expenditures are running at a rate exceeding $8,326,715,991.75 a month, and the deficit is piling up to the tune of over $70,000,000,000.

The following table shows a breakdown of the appropriations of this session into regular, permanent, reappropriations, contract authorizations, and special funds for each department of the Government:

Agriculture:	
Regular	$848,295,883.00
Permanent	103,132,663.00
Reappropriations	4,691,210.00
Trust funds	11,322,860.00
Total	967,442,616.00
District of Columbia:	
Regular	55,466,565.00
Reappropriations	7,579,300.00
Trust funds	7,255,427.00
Total	70,301,292.00
Independent offices:	
Regular	2,621,366,879.00
Permanent	1,261,700,437.00
Total	3,883,067,316.00
Interior:	
Regular	104,608,921.00
Permanent	17,494,455.00
Total	122,103,376.00
Labor-Federal Security:	
Regular	1,137,167,010.00
Legislative-judiciary:	
Regular	40,894,478.00
Military:	
Regular	$59,034,839,673.00
Permanent	15,279.00
Reappropriations	12,472,839,200.00
Total	71,507,694,152.00
Navy:	
Regular	27,637,226,198.00
Permanent	5,653,000.00
Contract authorization	4,779,880,000.00
Total	32,422,759,198.00
State, Justice, and Commerce:	
Regular	221,405,400.00
Trust funds	5,447,280.00
Total	226,852,680.00
Treasury-Post Office:	
Regular	1,100,691,275.00
Permanent	6,991,166,902.00
Total	8,091,858,177.00
War—Civil functions:	
Regular	63,657,098.00
Permanent	33,499,700.00
Total	97,156,798.00
First deficiency:	
Regular	4,106,262,194.96
Contract authorization	2,173,719,545.00
Total	6,279,981,739.96
Second deficiency:	
Regular	253,256,179.72
Reappropriation	7,000,000.00
Total	260,256,179.72
Urgent deficiency: Regular	22,410,676.17
Do	7,246,700.00
Do	143,430,591.56

Supplemental naval: Regular	$3,836,176,119.00
Farm labor supply: Regular	26,100,000.00
Defense aid (lend-lease), supplemental: Regular	6,273,629,000.00
National war agencies: Regular	2,911,697,224.00
Grand total	138,328,225,323.41

The House of Representatives has made a much better record than the Senate in connection with appropriation bills. Every regular bill that passed the Senate was increased and most of the deficiencies and supplementals. The savings that have been made below the Budget have been as a result of the action of the House of Representatives.

Some question may be raised as to the inclusion of the reappropriations in figuring the total of our appropriations, but if we did not have them, the money would not be spent. Therefore, I can see no escape from the inclusion of these reappropriations to determine the amount that Congress has made available. Contract authorizations, however, including an item in these bills of practically $7,000,000,000 perhaps should not be included.

Awarding of Army-Navy E to Henry Heide, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1943, I had the pleasure of attending the presentation made on the occasion of the Army-Navy E production award to Henry Heide, Inc.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the speech of Col. John N. Gage, executive officer of the Chicago Quartermaster Depot, United States Army, and the speech of acceptance by Mr. William F. Heide, of Henry Heide, Inc.:

ADDRESS OF COL. J. N. GAGE, EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE CHICAGO QUARTERMASTER DEPOT

This typically American ceremony—colorful, yet simple—is symbolic of the complete coordination between government and industry, management and labor, labor and government, for an intimate understanding of the problems of each as correlated one to the other is absolutely essential to win the flag which I am privileged to present here this afternoon.

An Army and Navy E award is the only way a grateful government may recognize your company and each of you as part of the vast army known as essential industry. It carries with it the highest traditions of the Army and Navy and is coveted by all war producers, but realized by only a few. We hear of many E awards, but it is a fact that less than 3 percent of all manufacturers engaged in war production have yet qualified for the recognition you are about to receive. This award, my friends, puts you in the top rank of war production along with the greatest names of industry in every field, for you, too, of Henry Heide, Inc., have been producing an essential munition of war which has materially contributed toward the over-all effort by assuring successful delivery and distribution of the well-known United States Army field ration K.

This ration is the result of long scientific research and development on the part of the Army, nutritionists, and food chemists. Since it was designed for use in emergencies, great care was exercised in the choice of its ingredients, which necessitated adequate protective packaging. One of the important components of field ration K is the powdered lemon juice manufactured by you. This product is highly desirable in the ration and is excellent source of vitamin C, which vitamin is easily lost if the product is carelessly or improperly handled and packed. It presented a most puzzling problem of production.

Henry Heide, Inc., has shown its ability to overcome promptly such manufacturing obstacles by the conversion of existing facilities and resorting to new inventions where necessary. I understand that Mr. Walter Zwoyer has contributed materially toward the success of your production line by his ability and vision to readily grasp the situation by inventing the machines to do the job. It is that kind of energetic versatility which is being shown everywhere by our soldiers of production together with the intelligent leadership of management which gives the Army a feeling of security at home.

You are not dodging shells, sweating and bleeding in the fox holes of some south Pacific island, nor are you buffeted on a raft with your life dependent upon the very product you are making here. You are, in fact, fairly comfortable in this New York factory, but I am inclined to believe that should the opportunity be offered to trade places with our soldiers on any front, each of you would be ready.

But fate has given you an important place in the ranks at home; a private of production is an echelon of energy. You have produced faithfully and have won this distinctive honor comparable only to recognition for outstanding service on the field of battle. This flag will mean as much to you as my own service ribbons mean to me, and let it be a reminder that our job is not yet done, and let its presence be an incentive to keep it flying until the unconditional surrender of all our cowardly enemies.

And so Mr. Heide and your associates of Henry Heide, Inc., on behalf of the Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy, and with the sincere congratulations of the Quartermaster General, I present to you this flag.

My friends, I salute you.

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

(By Mr. WM. F. HEIDE, president, Henry Heide, Inc.)

With deepest gratitude, Colonel Gage, I accept this Army-Navy production award on behalf of our organization.

Truly, this is the proudest day in the history of our firm, established 75 years ago.

The Army-Navy production award pennant will continually remind us of the signal honor which the Army and the Navy have conferred upon us.

Nothing could encourage us more, sir, than to have you men of the armed forces deem us worthy of flying that pennant and of wearing the Army-Navy E token pin.

For your part, please rest assured that our time and our talents are at the call of the fighting forces.

The men and women of our organization have worked ceaselessly to merit this Army-Navy production award, and it inspires us to intensify our efforts toward achieving the desired end. We are in this struggle and we know that there can be but one result—complete victory.

In conclusion, I am glad of this opportunity to pay special tribute to a man who, by his inventive genius, dynamic energy, ceaseless effort, resourcefulness, and tenacity of purpose, has been an inspiration to our entire organization. I refer to Walter R. Zwoyer, whose contribution toward the acquisition of this great honor has been outstanding.

Foreign-Trade Zones in Relation to the Merchandise Warehouse Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by J. Leo Cooke, Jersey City, N. J., vice president, Lehigh Warehouse & Transportation Co., Inc., and chairman of the committee on foreign-trade zones, American Warehousemen's Association, merchandise division, recognizing the value of the Celler Act creating foreign-trade zones in promoting our future foreign trade:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, some weeks ago I was privileged to become the chairman of the foreign-trade zones committee of the American Warehousemen's Association, merchandise division.

The committee has given this subject of foreign-trade zones serious consideration, and we are of the firm belief—

1. That the establishment of foreign-trade zones in cities of the United States is being and will continue to be forced upon our industry; and

2. That the administration of such zones will create competition for public warehouses throughout the country that the warehousemen will be unable to cope with if existing conditions continue on into the future.

We examined into the law creating foreign-trade zones. We found that Congress delegated greater privileges and benefits to the operators of foreign-trade zones than to class 3 United States customs bonded warehouses with class 8 privileges. We found further that although legislative intent indicated that the function of foreign-trade zones would be to encourage or facilitate the transshipment and reexport trade as distinguished from foreign goods received for domestic consumption, the Foreign-Trade Zones Act itself permits a foreign-trade zone to store merchandise entirely unrelated to transshipment and reexport. In other words, every foreign-trade zone established in the United States becomes a public warehouse for the storage of any and all merchandise, with greater privileges, however, than extended to a United States customs bonded warehouse.

We examined into the operation of foreign-trade zone No. 1, located in the city of New York. We found that the warehousing business handled by that zone was obtained largely through cut-rate competitive practices.

We ascertained that approximately 50 cities in the United States and its possessions have inquired of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board in Washington with respect to their own facilities for a foreign-trade zone in their particular port, and that such cities include Newark, N. J., Philadelphia, Pa., and Baltimore, Md., on the eastern seaboard; Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif., on the west coast; and Gulf port cities.

We found that the establishment of foreign-trade zone No. 1 in New York City has deprived public warehouses in the port of New York of a substantial amount of business, and there is no question but that the establishment of foreign-trade zones in other cities of the United States will have the same dire effect on the public warehouses of such cities.

We found that a storer of merchandise in a foreign-trade zone need not concern himself with the necessity of putting up bonds on either of the two-way movements in connection with foreign commerce. The drawback problem is completely solved for him, whereas a storer of merchandise in a United States customs bonded warehouse cannot, by reason of legislative restrictions, be accorded these same privileges.

We are convinced that in order for the United States customs bonded warehouse to survive, it must be placed upon an equal footing with foreign-trade zones.

The present war will, we all hope, be brought to a successful conclusion soon. The end of the war will bring increased activity to our ports. The principles which fostered the creation of foreign-trade zones should be extended and the field of operation increased so as to include United States customs bonded warehouses within its scope. We warehousemen have the experience, the knowledge, and the facilities to multiply the benefits which might accrue to our Nation in its endeavor to increase the trade and commerce of the United States.

The foreign-trade zones committee of the American Warehousemen's Association, merchandise division, is ready to go forward with concrete steps to accomplish these purposes and once and for all take this program out of the realm of discussion and into the arena of accomplishment.

It proposes that it be authorized to engage counsel familiar with this subject, formulate a program, and seek legislation which will make available to all warehousemen of the United States, at the appropriate time, the opportunity to make the ports of our country the greatest centers in all the world.

Prohibition—Men in Army and Navy Oppose Any Change in Present Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, my mail clearly indicates there is considerable unrest among the men serving in the armed forces due to the activities of professional drys, together with well-meaning citizens who are advocating legislation prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war. There is a daily newspaper issued by the United States armed forces in the European theater of operation known as The Stars and Stripes. This paper is published under the direction of Brig. Gen. F. H. Osborn and Col. Theodore Arter, of the Special Service Section, S. O. S., of the European theater, as well as Africa. It depicts the views of the tens of thousands of our men in Europe, as well as the thousands who won the battle of Africa, together with those who are leading the fight in the Mediterranean. A recent issue contained an editorial entitled "Prohibition." I am now quoting from that editorial:

They are at it again in America, and even as in the days of World War No. 1 we may yet hear that America is dry.

Most of us in the United States armed forces could not be classed as violently opposed to liquor control for most of us believe in moderation. On the other hand, there are few of us who could be included in the group of Americans who felt "the noble experiment" was a huge success.

It is with alarm therefore that we learn of the growing political strength of the anti-liquor crowd in the United States.

Taking advantage of wartime conditions and restrictions the new prohibition group is working night and day for legislation which will give America prohibition in fact if not in name. * * *

Rationing is playing into their hands and gives them a good excuse, and no opportunity is missed to use this excuse in their efforts to limit the production and distribution of liquor of all types.

We can remember the days of prohibition, when moonshine whisky made quick fortunes for bootleggers, crooked politicians, and dishonest police officials. As a result we claim we know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control.

Mr. Speaker, it was organized propaganda that developed the situation complained of in this editorial.

I cannot conceive of anything that will lower the morale of our soldiers and sailors more than to have legislative bodies enact laws restricting or attempting to control their personal habits while they are at the front ready and willing if necessary to sacrifice their lives that the freedom and liberty we have so long enjoyed will not be destroyed.

I am receiving petitions signed by hundreds of citizens protesting the consideration of legislation of this character. I have had these petitions referred to the Committee on the Judiciary where the bills are pending.

They Will Save America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, whenever I feel pessimistic regarding the future of the Republic and the American people, I take heart and renewed courage from the certain knowledge that our country and people are sound at heart and will therefore prevail against the evil forces that would ignore our traditions and undermine institutions and destroy our form of government.

There is a group of visionaries and dreamers now occupying key positions in all branches of the Government who would make America over, and they are using their positions for that purpose. However, the youth of America is going to save the day. That our young men and women are giving deep study and thought to present problems is indicated in many ways. The other day I was handed a copy of a communication from the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, a splendid organization made up of energetic young business and professional men from all parts of the country. The communication follows:

Honorable Members of the House Naval Affairs Committee:

One of the greatest assets of this country is the freedom of individual enterprise. Destroy this, and you destroy the Nation. Destroy the freedom of individual enterprise and you destroy the very rock foundation of our heritage.

In recognition of the fact that there is a fifth freedom, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce adopted the following resolution: Be it

Resolved, That the following statement of principle be adopted:

We believe that in addition to the "four freedoms," we have a "fifth freedom"—the opportunity of individual enterprise—by which America has grown great and through which we can insure her future greatness.

We believe this freedom requires:

The right to an unfettered start in the race of life with no artificial handicaps.

The right to work as hard as we like and enjoy the fruits of that work as our own.

The right to go as far as we can, developing according to our capacities as individual American men and women.

We recognize that the "fifth freedom"—opportunity of individual enterprise—is limited by the similar right of others and that there is an obligation to extend these opportunities to all people who are willing and able to work.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is a group of over 1,000 local organizations of young men. We have over 55,000 members in the armed forces and 85,000 members in civilian life.

We know that the young men of today will fight until victory is ours. We know that the young men of today are paying for this victory with their lives. We know that the young men coming home will want to exercise their heritage of the opportunity of freedom of enterprise.

As stewards of our members who have joined the armed forces, and as spokesmen for the young men of our Nation, we request that in your recommendations as a result of your hearings on war contracts, that you bear in mind your responsibility to these young men as their elected representatives in this greatest democratic country of all time.

In your recommendations we ask that you do not permit the evil forces of bureaucracy to destroy the opportunity of individual enterprise.

More specifically, we suggest that industry be permitted to built a post-war reserve. This should be for all types of industry. All taxes, direct or indirect, such as renegotiation, should be handled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue on a fixed set of standards.

In your hands rests the destiny of this Nation. You, by your recommendations, will determine whether or not private enterprise will exist or if industry will be forced to its knees and succumb to the theory that private

enterprise is a relic of the past and that industry is a part of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this communication shows a grasp of affairs that should serve as a pattern to their elders for clear thinking and understanding.

Then I want to call attention to an advertisement which recently appeared over the signature of the Nash-Kelvinator Corporation that I commend to the careful reading of every American—man, woman, and child. The advertisement reads:

I'M NOT PLAYING FOR MARBLES

This is it.

We're headed straight for the open doors of hell, and when we get inside they'll slam 'em shut and lock 'em.

Maybe I'll come out alive, and maybe I won't.

I'll take that chance. I'll take it because I know, now, what I'm playing for over here. And it isn't marbles.

I'm not fighting for the right to wait in line for my daily bread.

I'm not using a bayonet and a knife to carve myself a hole where I'll hide in fear for the rest of my days.

I'm not betting my life out here so anyone can tell me where and what and how to worship.

I'm not outguessing madmen with machine guns in their hands for the privilege of being told what to say and when to say it.

I'm fighting for freedom.

I'm fighting for the things that made America the greatest place in the world to live in; that are going to keep America the greatest place in this world to live in.

So don't anybody tell me I'll find America changed.

Don't anybody tell me there's no future any more in America.

Don't anybody tell me there's a ceiling on my opportunity to make a million or be President.

Don't anybody tell me there's a bridle and bit waiting for me with my name on it.

That's what took the humanity out of the men I'm up against now. And I don't want any part of it.

I want to come back to the same America I left behind me; where our way of living has always brought us new and better things, and always will; the America where there's clean, hard work to do; where there's freedom, and justice, and opportunity for all; where, if you can think and plan and act your own, there are no limits on how high you can rise, how far you can go.

That's what I'm fighting for.

That's America to me.

Keep it that way until I come back.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that fine statement breathes anew the spirit of 1776. We hear much about the so-called "four freedoms" which are serving as a sort of catch-all for scheming politicians who only think of themselves. Freedom of worship and freedom of speech, yes. But what about freedom from fear and want? Where would America be if such a fallacious philosophy had been in effect at the time of Columbus? He and his companions would have remained at home and America would never have been discovered. Freedom from fear would have welded the human family to the place of their origin. If I may borrow a phrase, "It is just so much 'globaloney' " and is on par with HENRY WALLACE'S promise to make a bottle of milk daily available to every member of the human race. Again borrowing a phrase, it is just plain "dazzle dust" put out for political purposes.

May the Almighty speed the day when the boys in uniform will return home and help restore America to the role contemplated by the founding fathers. Under their inspiring leadership America will move onward and upward to the more abundant life about which we have heard so much and seen so little the past decade.

Square Meals by the Cubic Inch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under permission of the House, I extend my remarks by including herewith an article written by me, which appears in the current—July—issue of the Country Gentleman, published by the Curtis Publishing Co. of Philadelphia.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that since this article was written I have been gratified to receive considerable additional information from Government officials concerning actual shipping space which is being saved by the rapid conversion which is being made to the use of compressed foods in our overseas shipments.

The article follows:

SQUARE MEALS BY THE CUBIC INCH

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Member of Congress from South Dakota)

WE ARE NOW COMPRESSING DEHYDRATED MEAT, VEGETABLES, AND FRUIT INTO COMPACT LITTLE BLOCKS, SO ONE SHIP CAN CARRY OVERSEAS AS MUCH AS TWO OR THREE

"Get us large amounts of shipping space—fast—without using one more boat or one more shipyard and without taking any manpower or metal away from the munitions industries."

That's the substance of an order which went out early in 1943 from the office of the Lend-Lease Administrator, confronted with the task of moving food overseas to feed millions of people at the same time that other war demands were pressing on our shipping space. It seemed to call for the impossible. But the order is being carried out rapidly and on a growing scale by means of the revolutionary new development of food compression.

Strictly as a military measure, food compression is the fastest-moving new factor in our war food program. Coming at a critical time, it helps to meet both the challenge of the submarine and our difficult shipping situation. For the peacetime future, it promises economies in transportation, storage, and marketing, of benefit to both farmers and consumers.

Really a development of the current year insofar as practical usage is concerned, food compression is so new that what follows is being revealed for the first time to any considerable group of people outside of those who have actually been working with this advance in processing, packaging, and preserving foods.

Food compression is now making it possible for 1 ship to carry the foodstuffs formerly transported by 2 or 3, and for some products the work of 8 or 10 carrying fresh produce or canned goods. In saving untold tons of shipping space, it is releasing escort vessels from convoy duty with supply ships so that they can protect additional troop transports. Thus real flesh and blood dividends are being added to the savings in critical materials, ships, and money.

Most Americans are now familiar with dehydrated foods, our first big economy in food shipping. Food dehydration, by removing the water content, reduces the weight of foodstuffs from 60 to 90 percent. Even so, dehydration alone has failed to solve the shipping problem. In overseas shipping bulk is of as great importance as weight. What was needed was a food process that would eliminate excess bulk as dehydration had eliminated excess weight.

Out of this war necessity food compression was born. Compressed foods are obtained by the simple process of squeezing the air out of foodstuffs from which the moisture content has already been removed by dehydration. These foods are subjected to pressure, forcing them into compact blocks or squares of high density. They retain their original taste, their full vitamin and nourishment content, but nothing more.

By compression the bulk of most staple foods can be reduced an additional 30 to 90 percent over the reductions already secured by dehydration. Through these two processes we are able to get the most nourishment to the greatest number with the least burden of space and weight on transportation facilities. The use of these "pressure-packed" foods, as they are sometimes described, provides an additional economy.

Being tightly compressed and of a firm density, they require less packaging material than foods which have been dehydrated only or which are shipped in cans or as fresh produce. This saving in packaging material is no small dividend at a time when tin is so important. Barrels and cans with rounded edges are notorious space robbers. In contrast, these rectangular blocks of compressed foods reduce to a minimum the labor handling and the storage space required on shipboard, in warehouses, and in railroad cars and trucks.

As Col. Paul P. Logan, of the Army Quartermaster Corps, using a unit of compressed dehydrated apples as a case in point, told the Senate Military Affairs Committee late last December: "By compression, and without the loss of texture, flavor, or quality, you can save 86 percent of the space that you would have otherwise used."

One needs to see these compressed foods and to taste them, when reconstituted by the addition of water and air, to appreciate their economy and efficiency. There is the tightly packed block, not over half the size of an ordinary shoe box, which contains beef rations sufficient for a meal for a hundred hungry men. Cranberry sauce enough for 2 dozen men can be pressure-packed into a square smaller than a deck of playing cards. One thousand pounds of fresh cabbage occupies 22.9 cubic feet of space. Dehydration plus compression reduces it to 1 cubic foot of space and the weight to 54.5 pounds, with a resultant saving of 94.5 percent in weight and 95.7 in bulk. Other fruits and vegetables vary in savings according to the nature of the product. Apples, peaches, prunes, onions, potatoes, carrots, and many other foods, including such quick-dried powdered products as eggs, milk, flour, and soups, all lend themselves to compression-dehydration.

A small square of compressed coffee, half the size of a package of cigarettes, provides enough coffee for a breakfast for four people—an indication of how a means may be found of supplying Americans with their favorite breakfast drink if the war drags on and orthodox shipments from South America become more difficult.

Canned milk takes six times as many ships to transport as the same milk dried and compressed. That's why an enormous expansion in milk-drying is urgent, since a quart of milk compresses into a space two-thirds as large as a teacup and weights only 4¾ ounces. This is recognized as a war necessity, but less well known is the fact that liquid milk is now distributed in the United States at a shipping cost 40,000 percent higher than the cost of shipping that same milk dried. This makes our liquid-milk industry such an economic nightmare in its consumption of rubber tires, equipment, and manpower that a switch to dried milk may be compelled by necessity if the war continues long.

While our practical use of compressed foods has come with a rush, the idea is not new nor is the discovery entirely our own. As long ago as 1864, compressed foods were discussed as a wartime method of keeping our military commissaries well supplied in mobile warfare.

Off and on, down through the intervening years, the research experts of the Army Quartermaster Corps have made experiments and tests. Commercial food processors and such scientific institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have also been studying and developing methods of preparing and packaging these new-type foods. Among those most instrumental in clearing the way was a versatile genius in the packaging field, John C. Donnelly, now with the Auto-Ordnance Co., of Greenwich, Conn., who gave 5 years of intensive experiment to the task.

Pearl Harbor and our consequent difficulties of transporting war foods over all the seven seas gave the impetus to the development of these Victory foods that save transportation and manpower. Our enemies had anticipated the needs for light and compact foods, as they had other phases of fast-moving, modern mechanical warfare.

Something over a year ago an Army officer showed me a captured mess kit used by Japanese fighters in the south Pacific. It contained a small, compact square of powdered rice, some chlorine, and a tube about the size of a toothpaste tube filled with fish oil. The officer pointed out that it contained enough rations to supply a Japanese soldier for about 12 days. The chlorine was used to purify the water in which the rice was reconstituted. The fish oil was to give taste to it. This captured mess kit and the advantages it suggested excited my own interest in the development of processed foods adapted to the kind of war we are fighting.

Our shipping burdens were not all that had to be considered. Fast-moving tank columns and mobile artillery units demand a supporting food service as completely modernized as the fighters which it has the responsibility to feed. The supply difficulties over jungle trails, the expanding use of cargo planes—in fact, all the necessities of this war compelled us to develop light, compact food supplies with a high resistance to perishability.

On January 4 the War Department established a special school for training officers and sergeants in the art of preparing and cooking dehydrated foods. Today they are also using compressed foods in these training courses. Even civilians, without special training, find little difficulty in preparing these new-type foods, since it is primarily a process of crumbling the compressed products into a pan or kettle of hot water where, after a few minutes of mixing, they are ready to use.

A LEND-LEASE PROJECT

The first experiment in shipping compressed foods overseas was made February 22 of this year. It was a shipment of 3,000 pounds of compressed eggs by the Lend-Lease Administration to Great Britain, where they were given "field and kitchen trials" by the British Army and English housewives.

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, took hold of this new development with the same grasp and efficiency that he has given to the operations of the whole complex lend-lease program. In mid-April he made available to the War Food Administration the necessary funds to speed the work of pressure-packing compressed foods from a variety of products.

The Department of Agriculture in April began preparation of test shipments of these compressed foods: Cheese, whole dry milk, skim dry milk, flour, meat, carrots, onions, and beets. It also began developing a program of concentrated-soup shipments, in which "tamping" the dried soups provides a partial compression. These soups are now going overseas in steadily expanding quantities, and additional economies in soup packaging are growing out of practical experience. On one soup order alone 1,500 tons of shipping space was recently saved. Shipments of roller-compressed flour were begun in April and are steadily increasing. It is hoped to save 150,000 tons of shipping space on flour alone when compression techniques are fully applied to both military and nonmilitary shipments.

PEACETIME PROSPECTS

A number of commercial concerns, with large-scale equipment, are in the make-ready stage for the handling of substantial orders of compressed foods, and developmental work is going forward in plants scattered throughout the country. Those adapting themselves to the food-compression business are a varied sort, including an auto-ordnance company, a coal-cubing concern, a tile company, a leading chemical company, a locomotive works and a pneumatic-scale corporation. Furthering the development is the work of the subsistence research laboratory of the Army Quartermaster Corps in Chicago.

New as food compression is, Government estimates now indicate that before the end of this year an equivalent of 125 10,000-ton Liberty ships will be saved through the use of compressed foods in ocean shipments and the saving of time in ship loading.

The gains will not be limited to the war. The economies in transportation, warehousing, packaging, labor in handling, and terminal deliveries plus the increased resistance to perishability have a peacetime possibility also.

Evidence already accumulated indicates that fresh produce, dehydrated and compressed near its source as it is harvested, can be delivered to the consumer with its full vitamin and nutritive content retained. The losses in nutrient values incurred by wilting, handling, and exposure will be avoided. One company is now experimenting with a portable machine for post-war use which would quickly dehydrate, compress, and package raw produce in the fields as it is harvested and which could be moved to follow the harvest.

This process would eliminate the costly procedure of shipping to market the inedible portions of food products.

Bumper crop years would no longer result in glutting the market with fresh produce. Compressed-dehydrated foods can be preserved without refrigeration, their original freshness can be sealed in by quick drying and pressure packing and an ever normal pantry can be developed.

Moreover, as we take to the air with giant cargo planes after the war, these new-type foods will be strikingly in tune with the times. By reducing weight and bulk, food shipments can be packed into planes in quantities rivaling those carried in freight cars and merchant ships by old methods.

Progress, once begun, can never be chained down by tradition or anchored by history. These Victory foods of 1943 may well crown their war achievement by providing a way for a better-fed world in peacetime. They will bring us one step nearer, at least, to removing that tragic anomaly of the past—food going to waste in one place while hunger exists elsewhere.

COUNTRY GENTLEMAN TESTS COMPRESSED FOODS

It's hard to say whether staff members were more surprised or pleased at the luncheon prepared in the Country Gentleman kitchen from materials that a few minutes before looked like a pile of child's building blocks. While this transformation is uncanny enough in itself, the fact that there was real flavor and all the savory aroma of home cooking was even more amazing. The compressed foods also retained their individuality of texture to a surprising extent. Cream of tomato and soya soup, beef, mashed potatoes, buttered beets, and cranberries were among the foods on the menu. None of the foods was disappointing. The cranberries made the biggest hit, comparing favorably with freshly cooked berries.

Answering Attacks on Rural Electrification Administration Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have been flooded with an article from the Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine written by Mr. Judson King which, if taken seriously would do more harm to the cause of rural electrification than anything else I have seen for many a day.

As every Member knows, I have led the fight in Congress for rural electrification for the last 10 years, and I know that many of the statements and implications in this article are not in accord with the facts.

For years I advocated the formation of a national association of the rural electric power customers, as well as the light and power users generally. This association was organized a little over a year ago and I am informed that 643,648 farmers are members through these cooperatives.

This National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has already contributed greatly to the cause of rural electrification. It is a live, active organization that is on the job at all times, striving to promote the cause of rural electrification.

Mr. King attacks Hon. Clyde T. Ellis, the executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in his article. I knew Clyde Ellis, and knew of the fights he was making for rural electrification and public power in Arkansas, long before he came to Congress. Clyde Ellis is one of the best friends rural electrification has ever had in or out of Congress. He worked hand in hand with me and Senator George W. Norris all the time he was here and made a great contribution to the cause of public power and R. E. A. He is the

ideal man to occupy his present important position, and to promote the cause of rural electrification now and in the post-war period.

Mr. King's attack on Mr. Ellis appeared in the July 8 issue of the Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine. But 2 days before that, on July 6, Senator SHIPSTEAD inserted it in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On July 1 Senator SHIPSTEAD introduced a resolution to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act, which contained statements similar to the ones appearing in this article. One would naturally conclude that Senator SHIPSTEAD's information came from the same source. The Senate did not pass the Shipstead resolution, but I understand the Senate Agricultural Committee, to which it was referred, is going to look into the matter.

Now that it has gone this far, I hope that committee does look into it, for when it does I am confident every member will congratulate the national association and the courageous members of these cooperatives who give expression to their independent thinking through their organization.

I am advised that Mr. King also flooded the cooperative with his article.

It has been charged that Mr. King was on the R. E. A. pay roll at around $6,000 a year as a consultant and that his attacks on Mr. R. B. Craig, former Assistant Administrator of R. E. A., grew out of a demand by Mr. Craig for a reduction of his per diem pay and for his removal from the pay roll of R. E. A.

Mr. King's attacks on Bob Craig are wholly unjustifiable. Rural electrification never had a better friend and R. E. A. never had a finer and more efficient servant than R. B. Craig. It was a great loss to the R. E. A. when Mr. Craig resigned; and I resent these false and unjust attacks on him.

Mr. King attacks these cooperatives for proposing to carry their own insurance. Whatever the merits or demerits of the cooperatives' insurance program may be, certain enemies are using it as a smoke screen in an effort to destroy this splendid national association. In my judgment, if the cooperatives want to save themselves millions of dollars in their exorbitant insurance costs, that is their business, and it is not the business of outsiders to tell them they cannot do it.

The money to pay these premiums is not coming out of the Federal Government. The cooperatives are paying it themselves, and their customers are getting the benefits of whatever savings this service may bring.

In conclusion, I want to say that I know the men on the Board, and the ones in the employ of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. I know that the Board members have unselfishly devoted long days and sleepless nights to this great work. I know that this attack on them and their able manager is a part of the organized campaign, led by selfish interests and certain individuals who want to keep themselves on the pay roll.

In my recent fights for rural electrification in the House, I have had the active and effective support of Clyde Ellis and his entire organization. They were extremely helpful in my fight to hold the $20,000,000 provided in the recent bill and in my efforts to raise it to $30,000,000; while these critics were either silent or opposed to the proposition altogether.

I hope the Senate committee will not be misled into joining in these tirades against Mr. Ellis and his organization, which is doing so much to help in our efforts to electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

Negroes Threaten March on Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a communistic movement, called the March on Washington Movement, headed by a Negro by the name of A. Philip Randolph, that is stirring up race trouble all over the country.

To my surprise, a whole page advertisement by this March on Washington Movement appeared in yesterday evening's Washington Star.

I was shocked some time ago when the Star published a full-page advertisement for the Communist Party, which, in my opinion, was subversive, and dangerous to the welfare of this country.

Now, this Negro, Randolph, is circulating a pamphlet concerning this March on Washington Movement that is dangerously inflammatory. He was taken to task by President Tobin of the International Teamsters' Union, at their last annual convention in Toronto, Canada. It was shown there by material which I am submitting for the RECORD that he was spreading this dangerous propaganda and doing the Negroes of this country irreparable harm.

Here is a report of what happened in regard to this matter at this Toronto meeting, as published in the Teamsters' Union report of that convention:

NEGRO LEADER STIRS RACE HATE—RANDOLPH CIRCULATES AXIS PROPAGANDA

(By Lester M. Hunt)

When the Japs moved on Burma they got a lot of help from the inside. They got it from Burmese who believed they had been discriminated against by the English.

The Burmese fell—like the suckers they were—for the Jap propaganda against the white race which conveniently ignored the fact that Japan's greatest allies in brutality are the white-skinned Germans.

But the Burmese didn't stop to think about that. When they listened to the Jap propagandists they weren't even as smart as Little Red Riding Hood who exclaimed to the disguised wolf, "What big teeth you have, Grandma."

The Burmese didn't even notice the big teeth of the Jap wolves. All they noticed was the soft, seductive hiss that came through those teeth.

They convinced themselves that they were being mistreated by the white race, which denied them equality. They let the Japs convince them that they would be treated better by their Asiatic brothers when all the white throats had been cut.

THEY GOT JAP EQUALITY

So thousands of them threw in with the Japs and threw off their yoke of fancied persecution and discrimination.

The Japs conquered Burma and the brown-skinned Burmese welcomed them as brothers and rejoiced in their reunion.

What has happened since?

The Burmese want the British back. They want anybody who will throw out the Japs. They have had a sample of Jap equality.

They have seen their relatives hung from trees for infractions of Jap military rules. They have seen the fiendish tortures of the Japs carried on in public to strike terror to the hearts of the Burmese.

Some Burmese who resented the fact that the British didn't sit down to eat with them have found that the Japs don't either. In fact, the Japs won't even let them eat.

They have commandeered the food and when a hungry native is caught stealing any, his hands are cut off and he is proudly exhibited in his agony as a warning to his friends and relatives.

All of this is by way of comment on a recent pamphlet which came through the mails addressed to labor publications.

SOWS SEED OF INSURRECTION

The pamphlet is published by the March on Washington Movement, a Negro propaganda organization. The national director of that organization is A. Philip Randolph, who, as head of the sleeping-car porters, poses as a union leader, but whose remarks about other unions are more unreasonable and vitriolic than any which ever came from the National Association of Manufacturers.

The pamphlet issued by Randolph carries the shocking threat that American Negroes may be lured by the same propaganda the Japs used on the Burmese.

It sows the seed of insurrection by inflaming the black race against the white. It diverts their attention from the foreign foes of America to magnified grievances at home and arouses distrust of the Army now fighting on a dozen fronts so that all men can be free from the threat of slavery.

It deliberately plants the fear in Negro soldiers that they will return to race riots after the war.

And will the Negro soldiers see it? Leave that to Randolph. He plans to circulate one million copies of his hymn of hate which concludes with the following plea to passion:

"After this war we will be lucky if the Army's racial policies inflict nothing worse on us than race riots. A new and sinister kind of political doctrine has arisen since the last war which feeds on racial antagonisms. * * *

"Unless the present policies of the armed forces are greatly liberalized, the veterans of our Jim Crow Army and Navy will make the best possible post-war breeding ground of a new native fascism."

NOT TRAITORS—YET

"Nor is the danger confined by any means to the white veterans. The 'Pacific Movement of the Eastern World' was launched by Japanese agents with the slogan:

" 'The Japanese are brothers of the Negroes and the Negro race will be better off under Japanese rule than under white rule.'

"This kind of propaganda has attracted little support among Negroes—yet.

"But already many sincere and intelligent American Negroes are thinking in the terms expressed in a dialogue recently reported between a Negro teacher and student:

"Student: I hope Hitler wins this war.

"Teacher: How can you make such a statement?

"Student: Because I am convinced that it is the only thing that will teach these white people some sense—their knowing what it means to be oppressed.

"Teacher: But don't you realize that conditions would be even worse under Hitler?

"Student: They can't possibly be any worse than they are for Negroes in the South right now. The Army Jim Crows us. The Navy lets us serve only as messmen. The Red Cross segregates our blood. Employers and labor unions shut us out. Lynchings continue. We are disfranchised, Jim Crowed, spat upon. What more could Hitler do than that?

"When this dialog was reported to a Negro audience recently it was greeted with cheers. On the basis of Jim Crows in uniform to date, it is not hard to understand those cheers."

Such statements are obviously intended to fan the fire of racial antagonism. If the pamphlet succeeds it will be another great propaganda victory for Goebbels. Goebbels will gleefully view it as proof of his theory that the German race is superior to all others and that Negroes are as stupid as the Germans have proclaimed them to be.

Certainly the pamphlet just issued cannot be considered by anyone, no matter how friendly to the Negro race, as any evidence of ordinary common sense.

It is difficult to understand the mental processes of a man who decries against racial discrimination and then does his utmost to stir it up.

It looks like he wanted to create racial prejudice in order to prove he was right when he charged it existed. Maybe it does exist to various degrees in various sections of the country.

But the kind of propaganda the self-appointed Negro saviors are now circulating can do nothing but intensify it where it exists and arouse it where it does not exist.

Consider this, for instance: The pamphlet supports the action of a Negro draftee who refused to serve in any black military unit, probably considering himself superior to his race.

Whatever his motives, this man defied the Government of the United States in war and refused the call to service.

That's good stuff, according to Randolph.

He says the defiant Negro is asserting his rights in refusing to submit to prejudicial treatment.

But is any white man permitted to say where he will serve and where he will not serve? Is he permitted to defy the Government if he does not receive special consideration?

He is not.

Yet Randolph claims this privilege for Negroes. He demands special privileges which are denied to white men. That isn't racial equality or any other kind of equality.

That's what Randolph asks the labor press of America to support. Labor is not sympathetic to such appeals. Almost 2,000,000 members of labor are in the armed services.

They went where they were assigned and did what they were told to do. They did not ask or receive any preferential consideration. They did not refuse to serve with their own people.

The pamphlet cynically quotes another Negro who refused to fight because, he said, "this is a white man's war and it's no damn good."

It is our opinion that the purpose of quoting this Negro is to give others the same idea, and it suggests they can defy the Government without penalty because "you can't send 13,000,000 people to jail."

When Randolph says this is a "white man's war" he must be color-blind. Our allies are the yellow-skinned Chinese, the brown-skinned Filipinos and the black-skinned people of every locality that has come in contact with the Japs.

Our military success in the south Pacific islands has been greatly aided by the cooperation of the black residents of those islands.

Every black tribe that has met the Japs and the Americans is the loyal ally of the Americans.

Let Randolph bear that in mind when he tries to arouse the Negroes of America against their Government in its struggle for survival against the yellow barbarians of Asia and the white barbarians of Europe.

And let Randolph remember the warning given him by President Tobin at the American Federation of Labor convention in Toronto last fall.

At that time President Tobin spoke bluntly to answer a speech by Randolph which was so full of falsehoods, threats, and racial incitement that it could not be permitted to pass unchallenged.

President Tobin told him his actions were undermining the future progress of the Negro race. He said his remarks were an abuse of the rights of free speech.

"Sooner or later this kind of stuff will have to be stopped," Tobin warned.

It would stop very quickly if the Negro people could see what is going on in Burma under the Japs and how the Japs treated every black tribe they conquered.

And they should not forget that it was Hitler who said that Negroes were half apes. It is Hitler's policy to exterminate inferior people, and according to his theory Negroes are not even people.

If Hitler wins, they will be treated like the beasts he says they are.

Why doesn't Randolph tell them that?

Maybe, like Goebbels, he thinks they are not so smart.

Our own opinion is that they are a lot smarter than Randolph.

Note the alleged conversation between the Negro student and his teacher. Can you think of any more dangerous propaganda that could be spread among the American Negroes at this time?

You will note he goes on to quote that alleged conversation between the Negro student and his teacher, in which the student says:

I hope Hitler wins this war.

The teacher said:

How can you make such a statement?

The student said:

Because I am convinced that it is the only thing that will teach these white people some sense. They will know what it means to be oppressed.

Remember that millions of copies of that subversive publication were circulated among the Negroes.

Mr. Speaker, they have had a race riot in Detroit, Mich. They have had one in Beaumont, Tex., and today they are threatening a march on Washington that would probably result in a race riot that might have a disastrous effect on our war efforts, to say nothing of its tragic results to the people of Washington and to the administration.

The inflammatory advertisement that appeared in yesterday's Washington Star is camouflaged with a few catch-phrase quotations.

It reads in part:

I. Demand a democratic army. We call upon the President to enforce section 4A of the 1940 Draft Act which reads: "In the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

II. We demand equal access to employment opportunities. This means a fair employment practice committee which has power to enforce decisions based on its findings; and no discrimination in training opportunities, placement, wages, promotions, and membership in trade-unions.

III. We demand an end to disfranchisement in the South. The enactment of a Federal anti-poll-tax law, abolition of the white primaries and other registration device that limits a free suffrage, and enforcement of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution will guarantee the right to vote to all men.

IV. We demand equal access to educational opportunities. This means equal facilities for the Negro child, equal pay for the Negro teachers, and for the Negro student equal access to public, tax-supported institutions of learning.

V. We demand that the story of the Negroes contribution to America and to the world be told. The newspapers, radio, and screen can thus end the caricature and slander of Negroes.

VI. We demand Negro and minority group representation on all administrative agencies so that these groups may be able to determine policies for all of the people.

VII. We demand an end to residential ghettos and restrictive covenants.

VIII. We demand abrogation of every law which makes a distinction in treatment between citizens based on religion, creed, color, or national origin.

IX. We demand the strict enforcement of the Constitution—especially of that clause which guarantees: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

Therefore, in the name of democracy, in the name of the common interests of humanity, in the name of a real victory and a real peace, we call upon our fellow Americans to join with us in this struggle for human dignity and equal justice for all. Moreover, the colored peoples of the world—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America—will test the sincerity of our declaration about world democracy by what happens to the Negro right here in the United States. Let us band together and make democracy a living truth.

Signatures:

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH.
E. PAULINE MYERS.
ALDRICH TURNER.
LAYLE LANE.
CORNELIUS SCOTT.
Dr. L. D. REDDICK.
ALFRED BAKER LEWIS.

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
Inter-racial Committee of Sponsors,
New York, N. Y.:

I contribute $_____ to the publication of Negroes Are Americans, Too, throughout the United States.

Name _____

Address _____

(NOTE.—The above statement was drawn up on the initiative of the March On Washington Movement and was formally unveiled as a scroll at an interfaith, interdenominational, inter-racial prayer service, Soldiers' Memorial Field, Chicago, Ill., July 4, 1943, in connection with the We Are Americans, Too, Conference,

called by the March On Washington Movement.)

This Negro, Randolph, is at present the head of the Pullman Car Porters Union, and his activities are doing more to create friction between the Pullman car porters and the traveling public, and to destroy that organization and drive the Negroes from these jobs, than anything else that has ever happened. Already white women are becoming afraid to travel in Pullman cars; and if this agitation continues, the Pullman car patronage will suffer, unless they switch to white help—which will likely happen.

In the meantime, this agitation is resulting in riots and bloodshed, to the great detriment of the honest, hard-working Negroes, who invariably become the victims of such disturbances.

The Negroes have never won a race riot in this country, and the chances are they never will.

The farther north these riots occur the more disastrous they seem to be. Look at what happened in Detroit, Mich., recently, when large numbers of Negroes were killed, larger numbers injured, and hundreds of business establishments wrecked.

Yet, in the face of that, and other similar experiences, these self-appointed spokesmen for the Negroes of the country come spreading this inflammatory propaganda here in the Nation's Capital, and the Star carries it in a full-page advertisement.

In the name of God, do they want to start another race riot here in Washington, to soak the sidewalks of the Nation's Capital in human blood while we are engaged in the greatest war of all times?

These agitators are not the friends of the Negroes, and these white radicals that are agitating these communistic movements among them are the worst enemies the Negroes ever had.

And the Washington Star is not doing them any good by carrying these inflammatory advertisements.

One Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "One Answer":

ONE ANSWER

The question is being asked throughout the Nation, with growing frequency, why the Federal Government requires in many a State twice, and sometimes thrice, the number of employees which the State itself needs. Figures show, in fact, that the Federal bureaucracy now has more employees—and we exclude the armed services for fairness—than do all the States, counties, towns, and villages for their far more intimate and, in many cases, far more vital services to the public.

Well, we know one answer, and we fear it is the real answer: There is no longer a work-relief army upon whom the New Deal may lean—as the Work Projects Administration upon its shovel—for perpetuation in office next year. Others must take over that political role. And if you think those hired by the New Deal are going to vote themselves out of jobs next year by voting against the New Deal, then you just don't understand human nature.

It is significant, too, that these New Deal employees have been placed, by the hundreds of thousands, in pivotal States where their marginal power may swing the 1944 electoral college votes. It was in these States that Work Projects Administration votes made themselves felt in 1940.

This is one answer to the question. And please credit us with not having said anywhere along the line that we believe the election can be bought. All we are saying is that the New Deal isn't above trying.

"Free" Driving Once a Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., entitled "'Free' Driving Once a Week."

I sincerely hope that now that the Office of Price Administration has altered its regulations to the extent that one may drive to and from a vacation point, provided he has sufficient gasoline therefor, that the Administration may now give consideration to allowing those who must remain at home to have an equal opportunity for necessary driving for rest and relaxation.

The editorial follows:

"FREE" DRIVING ONCE A WEEK?

There is throughout Westchester, as well as the whole heavily rationed eastern seaboard, full agreement with the necessity for strict regulations governing motoring. We know that gasoline is needed for our armed forces abroad, although we never have fully understood why the East must bear the brunt alone.

In this understanding the following suggestion is respectfully advanced to Secretary Ickes, Fuel Coordinator, and Mr. Brown, Office of Price Administration Director:

Why not, to relieve the ever-growing burden on the railways, to maintain home morale, and to give a reasonable leeway to those seeking summertime rest, permit motorists in the East to drive 1 day each week this summer without fear of disciplinary action?

Why not let motorists drive on Wednesday, let us say, without being considered culprits and without being forced to explain to inspectors the purpose and destination of the trip?

This would relieve the railways of a large part of the coming vacation load; it would not add to week-end congestion of traffic on any transportation facility, but would, instead, lessen that strain; it would give overworked, tired mothers and fretful children at least 1 day at nearby beaches; it would, we firmly believe, make for greater cooperation of the public with the Government's restrictions on other days of the week.

There would, presumably, be unfair advantage taken of this exemption by some persons; but, on the other hand, the benefit to millions who honestly follow their Government's request would be tremendous. There certainly would be better feeling all around, a greater inclination to save precious gasoline on other days of the week, and an opportunity for the Office of Price Administration to bear down harder, with public support, on violators who are not cooperative.

The mechanics would be simple: The No. 5 coupons of A drivers, which are now due to expire on July 22, could be advanced to expire on June 22, with the No. 6 coupons scheduled to give A card holders a normal 3 gallons weekly, the extra gallon and a half for "free" Wednesday driving. There need be no changes for B and C drivers.

This, it seems to us, is not much to ask of our Government, particularly in view of the fact that the West, instead of being limited to 1½ gallons weekly, still has its 4 gallons. And this exemption, this 1-day-a-week lifting of the ban on pleasure driving, could be limited to the period between July 4 and Labor Day, when nearly all of us really need recreation.

If this means 1 minute's danger to any airman or soldier or sailor at the fighting front, Mr. Ickes and Mr. Brown, why, just forget it. If, on the other hand, it has merit, what about it?

The Smith-Connally Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have written to an esteemed constituent of mine stating the main reasons why I voted against the Smith-Connally bill and to uphold the President's veto of that measure. The letter is as follows:

JULY 10, 1943.

Mr. DWIGHT SHERBURNE,
The A. Burdsal Co.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. SHERBURNE: I am glad you wrote to me in regard to my vote against the so-called Smith-Connally bill and my vote to sustain the President's veto of that measure.

You certainly are entitled to know what was in my mind when I cast those votes.

Without going into lengthy details, I will state some of my reasons.

In the first place, in all of these important matters connected with the prosecution of the war, I have felt it a duty to give much weight to the wishes of those on whom rests the responsibility of running the war. We are in a desperate conflict, that may last for years, and that certainly will test all of our resources. In such a situation, we must have leadership and unity behind that leadership. All of those responsible for running the war, the Commander-in-Chief, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Navy, the Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of Navy, the Chief of the War Production Board, that

has to produce the materials of war, all asked that this bill be not passed, fearing it would create inharmony and slow up the war effort. We may not like our leaders, but as long as they are our leaders in the midst of a desperate war, I feel that we should go along with them unless there are the most imperative reasons to the contrary.

Then, too, I do not believe in hurting innocent people. My philosophy is to help, and not to hurt, those who are innocent and worthy. It so happens that I was in a position to have an inside view of this entire situation. I am a member of the small subcommittee of twelve on deficiency appropriations, which drafts the large appropriation measures necessary to carry on the war. Recently we had before us Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he gave us, mostly off the record, the war production picture. It was an amazing picture, far exceeding all expectation. The production has been truly marvelous. No boy on any of the fighting fronts has suffered for the implements he needs. On the contrary, implements in great abundance are piled up in warehouses and at terminal points, awaiting transportation facilities.

Mr. Nelson was unstinting in his praise of the part labor has performed in producing the implements of war needed to win the victory. In the light of his glowing testimony it seemed to me there was something cruelly unjust in slapping all organized labor—for that is what the Smith-Connally bill did—when organized labor as a whole has done such a wonderful job. It did not seem to me to be right that all well-meaning, faithful, honest, patriotic labor should be punished for the sins of one man, John L. Lewis.

I share the general indignation over the conduct of Lewis. I would vote to put him in jail, if my vote were needed to do that, but I think how much better it would have been and how much more conducive to the harmony and cooperation that is vitally necessary to win the war, if labor as a whole could have been praised for the part Chairmar Nelson says it has done in behalf of the Nation, instead of having this blot and damper put on it by legislative action. The bill that was passed was a punitive anti-labor measure, too sweeping in scope, and it was passed because the pendulum of public sentiment, put in motion by John L. Lewis' misconduct, swung too far. I fear that in the long run the leaders who are responsible for running the war were right in their apprehension that the new law will have a depressing, disuniting, demoralizing effect on the war effort. Production is now falling off; for what reasons I do not know, but I doubt whether the men have the heart in it that they had when they were making such a magnificent record of production.

There were other impelling reasons why I opposed the bill. I did not like its southern sponsorship. Members of Congress from the low-wage section of the South are making every effort to break down the industrial system of the North and to repeal the wage-and-hour law. They want to return to cheap wages and thus give the South industrial supremacy. I have too much regard for the fine industries of Indianapolis and Indiana and the North, and for the welfare of both our northern employers and our northern wage earners to want to play into their hands.

I might cite just one other objection to the measure which alone, in my opinion, would have justified a vote against it. That is the extent to which it goes toward the centralization of government. I am one of those who think that the Government is already mixing too much in business. I voted against the National Industrial Recovery Administration Act and many other measures which I thought tended to augment bureaucratic authority over business and industry. I think we ought to be recapturing the powers Congress has surrendered instead of augmenting those powers. When this war is over I want this country to be the same country of free enterprise it always has been and which, please God, may it always be.

Yet no totalitarian ruler of Europe or Asia has more power over industry than this bill confers on the President of the United States. He can take over plants at will and hold them; his executive instrumentality, the War Labor Board, will write labor contracts all over the United States, and, worse still, the legislation denies any appeal to the courts. I do not want Franklin D. Roosevelt or any other President of the United States to have any such power. I will not, as long as I am a Member of the House, vote totalitarianism into the laws of the United States. It is altogether too dangerous.

The looseness with which the bill was put together in its checkered career of amendments and floor controversies, and what not, is shown by the fact that while it purports to prevent strikes it sets up a way whereby strikes may be conducted and thus legalizes strikes.

I would like for you to believe that as the representative of our people and one of the representatives of the Nation as a whole I take my job seriously. I study all angles of these important matters and try to think them out with what God has given me to think with, and I vote the verdict of my judgment and conscience. No doubt I make plenty of mistakes, but they are honest mistakes, and while you may not agree with me in specific instances, I believe you would want your Representative to go into these matters independently with an open mind and try to reach a fair and just conclusion.

Thanking you very much for your letter of inquiry,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Matt Rathert, of Camden, Ark., to the Rotary Club of that city on June 18, 1943, on the post-war world:

At the recent International Rotary Convention in St. Louis, I was impressed by the amount of time consumed and the large number of talks made on the economic phases of planning for the post-war world. Of course, the first objective with AAA-1 priority is winning the war. For that, we must work with all our strength and make whatever sacrifice necessary. But there are many of us here at home who can take time off from our duties as armchair generals (for which we have had a great deal of experience as Monday morning quarterbacks) to talk about something that will reveal no military secrets, namely, Winning the Peace. And I'm sure this will be very important to the next generation.

It took a year and a half for us to prepare for war and it will take even longer than that, before we are really prepared for peace—a peace that will mean a better America—better for you, and for the boys coming home, and for our children. Better for the common man and for his family.

When the trumpets of peace are heard around the world, what can be expected? Is there anything we can be sure of? As Paul said to the Corinthians, "The fashion of this world passeth away; the only thing we can be sure of is—change." So let's do our part to see that these changes are for a better America.

We are fighting for the "four freedoms"—and as you know, one of these is freedom from want. That means economic freedom. The right to work and save, the right to have something to save. The good old individual freedom of the common man for the American way of life. I read in the Arkansas Gazette the other day where the Arkansas razorback was the last remaining example of the rugged individualist. No heavy hand of bureaucracy has descended upon him with restraining force. So may it be with all men when the bluebirds sing again over the white cliffs of Dover.

Freedom from want—economic freedom in the post-war world—that's what we want for all.

But just what do we mean by "economic"? They say an economist is a person who knows just exactly what to do with the other fellow's money. But, I might add, has none himself. Economics, however, is a science—a study of how men produce the things they need, divide them between themselves, exchange them, and use them. It is a practical social science studying this freedom from want.

They say there are only 17 men in the world who understand money. I'm not one of them, and I don't even know one of them; and money is only one small chapter of economics.

There are a few points, however, that I have picked up that apply to this problem of post-war planning—one of them is, We don't have to lower wages in the United States in order to raise wages in any other part of the world. Now I'm not one of those who believe we ought to put a free bottle of milk on the doorstep of everyone in South America, or China, but I do believe in helping them to help themselves. It is self-evident that America must assume world leadership after this war, if there is to be any world leadership, but when I hear a speaker say that the workers of America will have to lower their standard of living in order to raise the standard of living of workers in some other part of the globe, it makes me mad.

As a student of economics and also through practical knowledge gained in the manufacturing field, I have learned long ago that this is not true. To see this very easily, let's take two counties, one with a higher standard of living than the other; when the county with the higher standard of living attempts to raise the other's standard of living, they are not going to do so by gifts or gratuities; they will do it by trying to educate the other people to better methods of agriculture, better methods of industry, and if and when the standard of living is raised in the lower standard county, that county will give the higher standard one more business, will keep its manufacturers busier, and do more trading with it, giving it more cash with which to raise its own standard of living. And each will help the other, thus increasing the standard of living in both.

To carry this further, if we could educate and help other countries to manufacture some certain items cheaper than we are making them here in the United States, it would allow all the purchasers of these items in this country to buy them at a saving, leaving more money to spend for something else, and would only injure the manufacturers of those certain items, who should turn to manufacturing something in which they have a decided advantage over the other country. In this way a general world-wide prosperity

would be developed and it would not be necessary for any country to take a backward step or lower its standard of living. This would go a long way toward preventing future wars.

Another thing I have learned is that we can have higher wages in all industries here in the United States than in any other country on the globe and still carry on a lively trade with all other countries without the aid, or hindrance, of protective tariffs. Yes; believe it or not, that is true. And that leads me to believe that we have arrived in that stage in our national economic life where comparatively free trade would be an advantage to the general welfare of this country.

Every economist talks about depressions and business cycles—why we have them, what causes them—some give one reason, some another, like Mark Twain said of the weather, "Everybody talks about the weather, but nobody ever does anything about it." Well, that's the way with depressions. It is plain that depressions occur because there is no over-all economic plan; no self-regulation on a world-wide scale to keep business running at the right speed. Even the largest and strongest steam engine down at our factory must have a little governor on it to keep it from "running away."

There was discussed in the World Food Conference which has just closed, at Hot Springs, Va., the position of an international economic authority high in the organization chart of the post-war world.

Now, freedom in government, that is government of the people, by the people, and for the people, is called a democracy. But when you take freedom away from one phase of our life, namely our economic life, we simply don't have a democracy, we have a totalitarian state.

That's simple, isn't it? Yet, many of our biggest politicians don't want to see it. They want a so-called democracy without economic freedom. If the Government tries to regulate our economic life, we will first have bureaucracy, which will tend to perpetuate itself as a ruling class. Many economists, such as James Burnham in his book The Managerial Revolution, predict that a ruling class of this type will actually develop and take over the Government after the war. Let us hope not.

Let's keep democracy working.

Did you know there are in existence right now 57 different large Government agencies? If you want to know what they are, I have a list of them right here, all 57 of them, commonly called The No Man's Land of Federal Finance. And, this does not include any Government-owned or operated war plants.

By the time peace returns the United States Government will in addition have become the world's greatest industrialist, owning factory facilities that will represent an expenditure of between ten billions and fifteen billions dollars.

Three billions of this will be in aircraft plants, two billions in shipyards, three and a half billions in facilities for making steel, rubber, aluminum, magnesium, and other key raw materials.

The National Industrial Conference Board reports that the Government will own 96 percent of new shipbuilding capacity, 93 percent of new airplane, 71 percent of new iron and steel, 64 percent of new machinery and electrical equipment, 56 percent of new machine tool, and 41 percent of new petroleum and coal products facilities.

Where will this lead?

There are over 240 agencies in the United States studying post-war planning. Many of them are Government agencies. An example of one of these Government agencies is the National Resources Planning Board, headed by President Roosevelt's uncle, Frederick A. Delano.

My idea is that industry and agriculture should do their own planning. That looks more democratic to me. Let industry call in its economists, professors, labor leaders, and scientists to help plan. The only thing the Government should do is to be sure that they do plan. Let agriculture call in its specialists, its economists, and its dirt farmers, and let them plan—plan out their own Agricultural Adjustment Administration. That's democracy at work. Let's make the Government give them a chance.

The Committee for Economic Development is a private, nonprofit organization, completely independent politically, headed by Paul Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation of South Bend. They get right down to the grass roots, and the first thing they propose to do is to find a job for every soldier, sailor, and marine, and to have it ready and waiting for him before he returns, and take care of those thrown out of war plants, too, with a few jobs to spare. In fact, they don't want to let even one of these returning veterans work for the Government; and they want to take quite a few of the millions of men who are now working for the Government away from their present jobs, too. They figure they will need 58,000,000 jobs lined up, ready to go, and that's quite a mouthful. If we would see, when the war is over, ex-soldiers standing on the street corners selling apples, and people starving in one part of the country while food rots in another, it would mean the end of letting industry and agriculture try to do their own planning. The Committee for Economic Development has already made their first survey in Peoria, and they came up with a very cheerful outlook. They made a canvass, selling each industry there, large and small, on the idea of planning now to employ enough men when the war is over to take care of Peoria's share. And they discovered Peoria could do it. Their field activities division is now spreading the work to other communities.

The Committee for Economic Development also has a research division which is concerned with the creation of a favorable environment or climate, as they call it, in the post-war period. They believe in the revision of tax laws to restore incentives for business enterprise—for those who take risks to create jobs; a restoration of fair competition to the fullest possible extent; and a solution for the special problems of the small businessmen; they want complete, nonpartisan recognition that those who persist in thinking as isolationists are headed down a blind alley—recognition of the fact that true economic development depends primarily on the exchange of interests and commerce not only of individuals but also of nations.

They have other aims and beliefs, and these are all listed in an article entitled "Industry's Plan for Post-War Prosperity" in the June issue of Reader's Digest, page 79. I urge that you read it.

Here is the committee's philosophy (which contains plenty of good economic horse sense):

"Our program originates in and is limited by certain articles of faith. We believe that the common good is prior to and higher than the good of any individual, and of every private interest. We believe in the American system of free enterprise. By that we do not mean that the Government should let business alone, nor that economic opportunity should take precedence over political liberty, nor that the good old days of the twenties should return:

"By free enterprise we mean freedom of opportunity, opportunity to work, to live decently, to educate children in the arts of citizenship and human happiness and in the skills of a trade or profession, to provide against sickness and old age. We stress opportunity, not contrasted with security but identified with security. We believe in socially responsible risk-taking for the common good, with the hope of private profit as an incentive."

Rotary International, through Walter Head, chairman of the committee on post-war participation, has prepared sample programs for discussion on economic and social subjects and invites us to go to it on these programs. They are as follows:

Retail trade: To indicate the direction that small business is taking as a result of, and in relation to, our total war effort, and to point out the types of new opportunities for small tradesmen.

Education—Change and permanence: To help the average Rotarian familiarize himself with some of the changes which have taken place in the last generation in the field of American education; and to stimulate him to think about further changes which may be desirable in the post-war period.

The free enterprise system and planned economy: To stimulate Rotarians to think about the profound changes that their society has been experiencing as a result of its impact with a fully controlled and planned national economy.

Interdependence of agriculture, manufacturing, and labor: To help the average Rotarian realize that agriculture, manufacturing, and labor do not constitute separate interests, but are mutually dependent upon each other for their very existence.

And, changes in human living: To increase the average citizen's awareness of the post-war changes in everyday living which will come as industry and business increasingly apply scientific discoveries—many of them war developments—to the filling of human needs.

These programs are suggested to create interest in the economic and social aspects of the post-war world.

In conclusion, I am going to attempt to show that I have really been talking on my subject all this time.

To summarize: We can say that, in order to secure a just and lasting peace, one that means a better America, better for the common man, we must have freedom from want; economic freedom in the post-war world. A true democracy means economic democracy. We must help others to help themselves through education in practical economics, and its application, thus raising their standard of living and, at the same time, our own; an international economic authority is probably necessary to do this and this may prevent future depressions by controlling the business cycle, but this economic authority should be a democratic one. A start has been made by the committee for economic development and Rotary International is trying to arouse the interest of all Rotarians in this economic program.

Oregon Trail and Preview of Coming Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, lest we forget that we are celebrating in America this year the one-hundredth anniversary of the opening of the Oregon Trail and

the historic events which lead the way to the saving of the Old Oregon Country, which now comprises the great Northwest region, constituting the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, parts of Montana and Wyoming, and some other contiguous territory, I include herewith letter of Howard R. Driggs, president of the American Pioneer Trails Association, giving preview of coming events in the celebration of this one-hundredth anniversary of the Oregon Trail.

The letter of President Driggs follows:

AMERICAN PIONEER TRAILS ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., July 1943.

DEAR MEMBER: Here is a brief review of recent activities along the old Oregon Trail and a preview of coming events.

1. Oregon's birthday—May 2, 1943—was impressively commemorated with the launching of a 10,000-ton Liberty ship, named after Robert Newell, one of the outstanding founders of Oregon. Three thousand or more gathered at Champoeg, the birthplace of the State, to pay tribute to its pioneers.

2. The story was carried to many schools over the land through fitting programs and pageantry. Further school programs are planned for October.

3. A movement headed by business leaders of Oregon is on to mark every mile of the historic trail, with Boy Scouts and school children cooperating.

4. Oregon is working to add 1,000 members to its State Council of the American Pioneer Trails Association, with Oregon Trail Memorial coin as token.

5. On July 3, 4, and 5, another commemoration in Baker, Oreg., in honor of American pioneers. Fine monument to be dedicated.

6. Sometime during the latter part of July, it is hoped to start the Ezra Meeker oxmobile from Independence, Mo.—with Boy Scouts representing various States along the trail—for Oregon.

7. On August 15 the site of a living memorial to our William H. Jackson to be dedicated at Scotts Bluff National Museum in Nebraska.

8. Ten monuments to be erected by Wyoming Landmark Commission along highways paralleling the Old Oregon Trail across Wyoming.

9. On August 19, 20, 21, and 22, the annual meeting of the American Pioneer Trails Association is to be held at Portland, Oreg. In connection with the historic pilgrimage on August 21, a visit is to be made to the grave of Ezra Meeker. It is hoped that the Boy Scouts with the oxmobile will be there to add their tribute to this pioneer who did so much to save the old Oregon Trail.

In all these activities, the emphasis has been on building our Nation's morale through saving the spirit of its pioneers. Travel has been and will be held to the minimum. Local communities are rising to their opportunities in this patriotic effort aimed at preserving our American way of life.

Cordially yours,

HOWARD R. DRIGGS,
President.

Uncle Sam as Landowner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the all-out war in which we are involved, Uncle Sam is engaged in many undertakings which in peacetime are carried on by local communities or individuals. One of the problems arising by reason of this fact is the huge ownership of real estate which is coming into the hands of the Government. Many of the States in the West even prior to the war were greatly hampered by reason of a major portion of their area being owned by the United States Government itself. The taxable area in my own State of Oregon has been growing smaller from year to year, due to the transfer of real property from private hands to public ownership. In 1942 only 41 percent of the area of the State was held privately. Out of the 61,644,000 acres of land in the State in 1942, only 25,220,323 acres was privately owned. Many of the counties of the State have a much smaller percentage of privately owned areas as the following tabulation will show:

	Percent privately owned
Malheur County	17
Deschutes County	18
Harney County	21
Lake County	25
Hood River County	26
Curry County	27
Josephine County	27

The Federal Government has gone into many of the States and purchased large tracts of land for carrying on war activities and has added to the burden resting upon the local communities to meet their governmental expenses through the medium of taxation. The Government established a precedent when it took over the O. & C. land-grant lands in Oregon a number of years ago and by an act of Congress provided for the payment to the several counties in which the lands were situated of a sum of money approximating the amount the lands would be charged with taxes, had they remained in private ownership. In many of the counties of Oregon these lands which were in timbered areas constituted a very considerable portion of the taxable value of the county.

Oregon is not alone in suffering from the problem of public ownership of land areas. Information I have is that areas in public ownership in Idaho is 70.9 percent; Montana, 61.5 percent; Washington, 45.9 percent, as against Oregon's 59 percent.

To meet this problem I introduced in the House on March 30, 1943, H. R. 2338, which will provide for the payment by the Federal Government of a sum of money which would be equivalent to the taxes on the lands taken over by the Federal Government for military purposes. This bill, with a number of bills with the same objective, is pending before the Committee on the Public Lands. This committee recently held hearings here in the Capital on this legislation, and I was accorded the opportunity by the committee of appearing before it and presenting facts showing the wisdom of passing this legislation. A resolution was recently passed by the House, authorizing this committee to hold hearings in various districts throughout the United States where this problem is acute. I respectfully urge upon my colleagues to give this matter serious consideration, as it is one of great concern to many of the congressional districts throughout the United States where the Federal Government has taken over real estate of great value and removed it from the tax rolls.

The Japanese War Relocation Program and Its Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, a great many Members of Congress and numerous representatives of the press have asked for my impressions and observations following the 4 weeks of extensive study which the subcommittee of the Dies committee, of which I am a member, has just concluded. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am appending hereto a brief summary of six factors which were repeatedly brought to the attention of our investigating committee, and on which I have reached some conclusions and am prepared to make recommendations.

It should be remembered that in making the following statement, Mr. Speaker, I speak only for myself and in no way either reflect or refute any views held by either of the other two members of our subcommittee. It is hoped and expected that after due review of all the evidence now before our committee that we may be able to make a unanimous and constructive report to Congress and the country on the whole picture brought to the attention of our committee by personal inspections, by public hearings and by executive off-the-record conferences with Government law enforcement and intelligence officers.

The statement follows:

The 4 weeks which the Dies committee subcommittee, headed by Congressman JOHN COSTELLO, has devoted to a careful and complete study of the methods and policies of the War Relocation Authority have entailed a tremendous amount of work, but I believe the constructive improvements which are already resulting from this investigation and the subsequent correctives which are anticipated have well warranted the time and effort involved. Our committee heard over half a million words of testimony and thoroughly canvassed the entire field of informed witnesses, including Director Dillon S. Myer, of the War Relocation Authority, community leaders, law-enforcement officials, loyal citizens of Japanese ancestry, and members of the Intelligence Services of the War Department and the Department of Justice. Investigators of our committee have personally visited every relocation center but one and the pre-Pearl Harbor Japanese investigations of the Dies committee have been carefully analyzed and rechecked for information to help guide the subcommittee in making its report and recommendations.

The subcommittee and its investigators are now reviewing the entire exhibit of evidence preparatory to writing a report to be submitted to the full committee for approval, after which it will be filed in Congess and

made available to the public as a House document. Until this report is available no final recommendations and conclusions can be made by individual members of the subcommittee. However, each of us has obtained certain definite impressions from his lengthy study of this important problem. Among the factors which appear to me to have special significance are the following, which I offer as my purely personal reactions for any value they may have in informing the public until such time as our official report has been prepared and released:

1. The early and orderly segregation of disloyal Japanese from loyal citizens and aliens of Japanese ancestry within the camps themselves is of paramount importance not only from the standpoint of our national security but also from the standpoint of more efficient project management and the obligation which our Government has to protect loyal residents against unjust suspicions and even bodily injury. Such segregation has not been provided during the past 14 months. I am therefore gratified that Mr. Myer assured the subcommittee this week that War Relocation Authority will definitely get underway with an appropriate program of segregation at an early date.

2. Closely allied with the necessity of segregating the Japanese within the project centers is the desirability of putting into complete operation a more satisfactory and effective program for classifying loyal citizens of Japanese ancestry as such, prior to their release to private employment. When this is accomplished and adequately publicized, communities may be sure that Japanese evacuees entering their localities are loyal and orderly and they should be accorded the same respectful considerations given any other American citizen. It is undoubtedly true that the vast majority of citizens of Japanese ancestry are loyal to the United States and once their identity is established and their loyalty verified no anti-Japanese sentiment should be directed against them. Until it is established, it is unfair to the general public and to the loyal Japanese themselves to give them indefinite leave from the relocation centers. In America it is not racial origin but fundamental loyalties which determine the quality of good citizenship.

3. Relocation centers can be made a highly significant factor in the Americanization of all evacuees in these centers. The War Relocation Authority has made some steps in this direction, such as establishing schools, encouraging Boy Scout troops, and providing certain entertainment features. This tendency should be greatly augmented and encouraged. This Government has never before had, and will never have again, the opportunity now presented to inculcate in people of Japanese ancestry an increased respect for American ideals, traditions, standards of living, and governmental procedures. This opportunity should neither be neglected nor be only partially utilized. If properly used, these project centers may go far toward dissipating any potential racial problem which might otherwise develop after the war with regard to citizens of Japanese ancestry.

4. As a glaring example of what not to do if relocation centers are to serve as Americanization units is the prevailing practice of the War Relocation Authority to display Japanese pictures and decorations in administrative offices, to use public funds to employ tutors to train Japanese in the art of Judo, to teach them Goh, and to provide them instruction in the Japanese language. Especially with regard to Judo, which is a form of Japanese military training in bodily combat in which participants are trained to maim or kill their adversaries, it seems to me this is one of the most indefensible misuses of public funds ever engaged in by this administration. Mr. Myer told our subcommittee that even now several hundred dollars a month is spent for this purpose. It is about as sensible as it would be to use taxpayers' money to provide textbooks in sabotage and give laboratory training in making nitroglycerin bombs to enemy prisoners of war being held in this country. It should be summarily and completely discontinued.

5. Some evidence was presented regarding waste of foodstuffs and materials in the relocation centers. In my opinion, however, the administration of Mr. Myer has not been unduly extravagant in these factors and I do not believe expenditures have been any more excessive, by and large, than those of many other current Government agencies. I think the Japanese are being amply but not lavishly fed. Housing conditions are too meager rather than too expansive and Mr. Myer has assured the subcommittee that as priorities make material available, it is planned to improve living conditions for evacuees who are not released to private life. No right thinking American wants to see the evacuees mistreated or to have them inadequately fed and housed. I believe the War Relocation Authority has met the problems of providing adequate livable standards about as well as could be done under all existing circumstances.

6. While improved policies and correctives are being developed in the lease program of War Relocation Authority it is my hope that Americans generally will refrain from letting imagination and hysteria get the better of good judgment in their associations with Japanese in their communities. Neither mawkish sentiment nor pseudo patriotism should govern our relationships with those of Japanese ancestry in this country. It is a time for realism—not revenge or remorse. I definitely do not agree with those who say that "All Japs are bad" and the evidence in War Department files of many loyal Japanese serving with our armed forces in this war bears eloquent testimony to the fact that real Americanism has a fervent appeal for many of Japanese ancestry just as it has had for the great bulk of all citizens of every nationality who come together in the melting pot which is America to comprise the world's only great corporate state which is based on devotion to ideals and principles rather than to nationality or land of origin. Japanese sincerely endeavoring to prove their good American citizenship should be given that full opportunity and, conversely, those maintaining their loyalty ties with imperialistic Japan should be segregated from the others and should not be permitted to jeopardize either our national security nor the good name of decent and dependable Japanese.

Our committee will make some detailed recommendations toward the above objectives but this statement is given at this time in response to numerous requests for my impressions of the extensive hearings just concluded.

World Literacy Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the excellent review of the book The Silent Billion Speak, by Dr. Frank C. Laubach. This book review is written by Hon. Robert L. Owen, first United States Senator from Oklahoma, a distinguished statesman and scholar. Senator Owen has prepared a global alphabet and is advocating its use in an effort to bring about, through the establishment of a standard phonetic alphabet, a world understanding and literacy, in which in a short time the races of the world, now uneducated, can learn to read their own language and later ours.

Dr. Laubach has done a colossal work of importance to the world in giving to the people of 80 different languages, an alphabet by which they have been taught as individuals to read their own language within a few hours.

Commenting upon this importance, Senator Owen says:

The 80 languages now open through a printed phonetic alphabet opens the door to the printing press of the United States Government, and the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States should immediately set up a publicity agency by which to reach these people, hundreds of millions of them, in their native tongue.

Senator Owen's review of Dr. Laubach's books follows:

WORLD LITERACY CAMPAIGN—THE SILENT BILLION SPEAK

The Silent Billion Speak, written by Dr. Frank C. Laubach, is the most wonderful epic I can recall. It represents the work of a consecrated, loving, humble, faithful soul, rejoicing in the service of the poorest of the poor and of the most helpless human beings in the world.

It represents the overwhelming demonstration of the truth that an illiterate man anywhere in the world can be taught within a few days to write and read his own language in a text he had never seen but which delights his heart and for which he shows at once a deep desire.

This book is of eight chapters, published by the Friendship Press, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, which outlined the scope of this tremendous human experience in serving mankind. The story is simple in the extreme.

It begins with teaching the Moros of Mindanao Island, the inveterate foes of the white race, who were taught, to their great delight, to read and write their own language in a very simple phonetic alphabet. Some of them learned to read this alphabet in a few hours. One of them is recorded as having learned it in less than an hour. Dr. Laubach got their attention through unaffected loving kindness where he invited their Moslem leaders to teach him the truth of their faith as Moslems. He discovered that they cherished the principles taught by Jesus of Nazareth. In 10 years, under the guidance of this servant of God, the great majority of Moros could read and write their own language, and from fierce, inveterate enemies of the white race they became dependable friends and cooperated in establishing better conditions of government and of life. Listen to what Dr. Laubach says in his book.

"These countries had a simpler problem than ours, however. They can teach reading in half the time it takes us, because their alphabets are regular and phonetic, while our English alphabet is 'confusion worse confounded.' * * *

"Mr. Galia says that he taught nine Moros to read in a half hour. That is better than any record that I have thus far made with a large group. A half dozen Moros interrupted this letter. They came in and said they could not wait until tomorrow, but had to be taught right away. They had only an hour to spare and wanted all the education they could get in that time. So I have stopped this letter to

teach them. While I concentrated on one of them, the rest listened. They have just left the house. I do not expect you to believe me, but here is the fact: This man had finished reading three pages of our newspaper, and could read everything I put before him with fair speed. One hour. Everytime that happens I feel as though a miracle had happened. It is possible only because these people are hungry mentally and spiritually.

"Nine-tenths of our job is sitting close beside the people who flock to us and getting thrills of delight with them as they emerge from ignorance."

On page 38 he describes 60 Moros coming 20 miles in a launch to be examined by him. They had just learned to read and write from other teachers and wanted to be examined and to express their delight.

"In the 10 years following the opening of the Lanao Station the attitude of the Moros toward Christianity swung from one pole to the other. It was unmitigated hatred when we arrived; love, good will, and cooperation when we departed * * *.

"Our Moro teachers kept asking, 'Do you suppose we can really make lessons as easy as these in other languages?' We knew it could not be done in English with its hopeless spelling. But what we were all eager to know was how many of the languages of the world were spelled regularly enough to be taught by our method."

This doubt has been fully answered by the subsequent experience of Dr. Laubach for he has applied his simple phonetic method to 80 other languages in Asia, India, Afghanistan, Persia, Arabia, East Africa, and Latin America and has started a literacy movement by this simple method of phonetic writing which was used by Moses 2,700 years ago when he spoke the words of Genesis transcribed in writing by 22 letters. The meaning of the Book of Genesis has come down to us through many translations from language to language with the meaning recorded by the 22 letters originally used and with the meaning unchanged, intelligible, and convincing as spiritual truth. Dr. Laubach has illustrated in his work the truth of words spoken and recorded in like manner by a disciple, John (ch. 14): "He who hath My Commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me and he shall be loved by the Father and I will love him and will manifest Myself unto him." Dr. Laubach recites the Moro experience of 10 years, where hate is converted into love. Is not this a manifestation of the spiritual power of the words recorded by John?

In 1937 the National Christian Council held a meeting in Nagpur, India, and endorsed the work of making the people of India literate, and subsequently Dr. Laubach held 226 conferences in different places of India teaching the natives to write in their own tongue their own languages with phonetic letters adopted for each as seemed expedient. The great poverty of the Indian people and their terrible illiteracy and the necessity of teaching literacy by word of mouth was a serious obstacle and at first prevented Mahatma Gandhi from giving support to the fight for literacy. Later he endorsed it.

The phonetic system of writing these languages showed how closely akin many of them were to each other. In some cases a high percentage of the common words were the same and which were discovered when put into phonetic letters.

Commenting on the difficulty of word-of-mouth teaching hundreds of millions of people scattered over the continent, Dr. Laubach says:

"It is impossible to go around and explain the principles to 345,000,000 men and women by word of mouth, but it would be easy to enlist cooperation if only the people could read."

The literacy campaign proceeds steadily in spite of the World War which broke out in 1939.

Indeed, the fight on illiteracy was not confined to the tremendous work done by Dr. Laubach because the Russians under the guidance of Lenin had made it a governmental policy to teach the Russians to read and write with the phonetic alphabet in their 58 languages, and in 20 years the Russians have conquered illiteracy, and this is a major factor in their ability to resist the long-prepared attack of the Germanic power.

The fame of Dr. Laubach in conquering illiteracy led to an urgent invitation to go to Africa, which he accepted, and in 50 days located many centers of instruction of different African languages showing them how to conquer illiteracy. This the Africans received with great delight and showed the same facility in learning to read and write their own language as the Moros had done and the Malays and the people of India. This method is now being used in more than 50 African languages.

"The greatest need of the whole world is to break down all the walls that separate us, of race and religion and nationality and class, so that the pure love of God can tie the world together. * * *

"* * * If that terrible load is lifted from the illiterate half of humanity, it will be one of the most glorious liberations in history.

"* * * The terrible eagerness of India's educated young men and women holds the promise of the making of a new nation—one of the mightiest on earth; and India's wonderful young women will have an immense part to play.

"By the end of 2 weeks our committee had prepared one set of lessons in Hindi and another in Urdu, unlike any we had ever done elsewhere. It is marvelous how working creatively on literacy lessons ties silver threads about our hearts."

Fortunately, the government at last gave its supporting hand to publishing lessons prepared by Dr. Laubach and his friends, to which he makes reference as follows:

"* * * The government agreed to publish all of the new lessons in Marathi, Gujerati, Hindi, and Urdu. They began that afternoon to lay the foundation for what was 2 years later to be one of the most gigantic literacy campaigns in any city in all history."

Throughout this book from beginning to end there is manifested humility, love of man and love of God by the author in seeking to obtain the divine guidance in all that he does or tries to do for the service of man. His pledge to God written in his diary January 1, 1937, page 130, and on April 30, 1937, page 137, should touch the heart of every human soul that worships and reveres and truly loves his divine Creator. On May 21, 1937, he made the following entry on his diary:

"Yesterday and today have filled my heart with boundless gratitude to God. The new charts are working like magic! We have tried them on twelve or more persons with uniformly striking success."

Dr. Laubach quotes the African leaders as saying to him:

"All we Africans ask of you whites is to give us your backing and financial help, and we will do the rest."

Dr. Laubach recites one voice of opposition in the person of an official of a gold mining company and he wrote it down:

"I have nothing whatever against you personally, but I will tell you frankly that professionally you are my enemy. If you teach these savages to read, they will soon think they are as good as we are. Can't you see that you will start unrest and labor troubles all over Africa?"

The fears of the official of the gold mining company are completely answered by Dr. Laubach's experience with the Moros, converted from fierce, dangerous enemies to loving friends.

Dr. Laubach's African campaign was a great success, short as it was, and he makes this observation at the close of it:

"Eight men have reached the reading stage this week. One young fellow was learning the syllables when suddenly he discovered that he could pronounce new words alone. With victory gleaming in his eyes, he shouted: 'Give me a book. I can read.' And he did, as elated as Columbus was when he first sighted the coast of the New World."

Dr. Laubach quotes the words of one of the strongest leaders, Mr. Martin Kyamba, who said:

"I have watched you day by day teaching my countrymen, and I am convinced that this is the greatest hope that has come to Africa since Livingstone."

The importance of giving the natives the Christian teaching in their native tongue is manifested by the following historical information by Dr. Laubach:

"The sections of the Eastern Church—Greek, Armenian, Georgian, Syrian, Coptic, and Ethiopic—from the beginning had the Scriptures in the vernaculars of their adherents, and these churches have survived the storms to which they have been subjected through the centuries. On the other hand, the great churches founded in north Africa had the Bible in Latin only, a foreign tongue which effectively closed the Book to the common people. When the waves of Islam swept along the southern littoral of the Mediterranean, these churches could not survive the storm and they perished.

"The same truth has been demonstrated on the mission field. The church had flourishing missions in China, Korea, and Japan in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but they failed to give their converts the Bible in their mother tongue, and when persecution came, their churches were practically wiped out of existence."

The concluding chapter of Dr. Laubach's book is headed: "Literacy and a good-neighbor policy." On his tremendous background of experience he wisely urges the teaching of the illiterates of Asia and Africa, the lessons of Christian civilization in their own tongue.

Dr. Laubach said in the beginning of his book, page 3:

"They will bless or blast the world. That is why the church must step to the front and take a leading share in the mighty upsurge of the sunken half."

The English speaking people of the world should realize the supreme importance of this message of this consecrated man who converted the warlike Moros into peace-loving cooperating friends. It has given me a deep thrill of pleasure to hear this book read to me and I wish to commend it to the attention of the people of the United States and their Representatives in Congress and in the executive offices.

ROBERT L. OWEN.

A Congressman Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under special permission granted me by the House to revise and extend my own re-

marks, I include herewith copy of a radio speech that I recently made:

Good evening, fellow Americans. This is Congressman EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois. I am speaking from the Nation's Capital. Just as a bit of background, I represent the Sixteenth Congressional District of Illinois, in the heart of the Corn Belt. This is my eleventh year in Congress. I am on the Appropriations Committee.

Congress went home. Home means the 48 States of the Union. The Members have gone back to their people. They've gone back to commune with those whom they represent. First, here will be a bit of relaxation. Then regulations, and programs. They will have a chance to appraise conditions. They will want to help people with problems which arise from war conditions, from Federal laws, regulations, and programs. They will have a chance to appraise public temper and reactions. They will have a chance to assess the effects of laws and regulations upon the welfare of the people. They will return to Washington not later than September. They will return freshened in spirit, ready to cope with the new problems which arise from time to time. They return home but a few short days after we observed the one hundred and sixty-seventh anniversary of the birth of freedom. The charter of freedom was declared by another Congress 167 years ago.

This is the Seventy-eighth Congress. It has been in session since January. In strict fact, however, sessions of Congress have been continuous since 1939. That has been a long and historic period. It was marked by important legislation on neutrality, military preparation, and domestic matters. Congress remained in session when the Nazi blitz began in late 1939. It watched the progress of conflict in Europe. It speedily met the challenge of Pearl Harbor. It followed with other declarations of war on Axis nations. It voted vast sums and authority for the prosecution of that war. It stood by to meet every challenge and every crisis that might arise. And now, after continuous sessions which lasted nearly 3½ years, it is recessing for a brief period.

The Seventy-seventh Congress which convened in January 1941 and ended in January 1943, was bitterly assailed. It was charged with ignorance and provincialism. One Washington newspaper said the spectacle of Congress was anything but encouraging. Another referred to it as a blind, scared, fumbling Congress which was throwing away its opportunities. A certain publicist spoke of the unhappy slavery of Congress to economic pressure groups. A magazine writer spoke of public esteem for Congress as the lowest in history. It was all very interesting—this attack on the Congress of 2 years ago—and very old.

I say very old because I have compiled similar comment on Congress which goes back more than a hundred years. It was 106 years ago that a New York newspaper in speaking of the sad state of affairs of that day, said, "What then is the cause? It is wholly produced by the indolence, the folly, and the party spirit of Congress." Our history abounds in such comment on Congress. But it is doubtful whether the attacks on Congress were ever so sinister, so malicious and so biased as those leveled against the Congress which preceded this one. And so the Seventy-seventh Congress slipped into history and the present Congress came on in January.

In recent days, this Congress has also been assailed. I suppose it's a part of the American tradition and becomes a favorite indoor sport. In recent days it has been described as hectic and hysterical. It has been charged with spite and partisanship. It has been charged with intent to destroy unity and spite the President. It has been charged with madness and hate. That's all very interesting but it happens to be a parcel of nonsense and balderdash. To be exact, it is a lot of piddling twaddle and scarcely deserves an answer.

But there is a reason for speaking about Congress tonight. When this body is in adjournment and the Members have scattered to their people, they become thereby a voiceless group which does not have the benefit of a sounding board in the Nation's Capital. When attacks and allegations are made against Congress, they cannot be effectively answered. And there is reason to believe that the pastime of attacking Congress will get under way in short order.

It will be a vigorous offensive and will ring all of the familiar notes. Congress will be charged with failure to provide taxes to drain off excess purchasing power as a check to inflation. It will be charged with hamstringing the Office of Price Administration, the Office of War Information, and other agencies by failing to appropriate sufficient funds. It will be charged with failure to provide funds for incentive payments to farmers, thereby hindering the food program. It will be charged with resisting the use of public funds for roll-back subsidies to check inflation. It will be charged with an attempt to weaken or demolish the hold-the-line order. It will be charged with meddling in the manpower problem. It will be charged with obstructing the program of war training by its action in liquidating the National Youth Administration. All this and more too will be said about the actions of Congress during the last 6 months because a good many of these things have already been said and there is good reason to believe that they will be amplified with many tuneful variations. But a great football coach once observed that the best defense is a good offense, and so I merely suggest that these thrusts at Congress may be designed to cover up and smoke-screen the failures and weaknesses in other sectors of the Washington front.

So it might be well to take a look at the 435 Representatives and 96 Senators and see what manner of people they are. More particularly we should ascertain, if possible, whether they are mad, hateful, hysterical, and spiteful, either as a group or as individuals, and find out, if we can, what makes them that way.

I'll begin by saying that Congress is a pretty sound, seasoned, sane, patriotic group and it wouldn't do for anyone to throw too many stones at their patriotism unless the stone thrower is ready to defend his own military record.

Will Kennedy, veteran reporter of the Washington Star, has called this a fighting Congress and then proceeds to prove it. Of the 96 Senators, 35 have served in the Spanish-American War or the First World War, or both. That's about 37 percent of the Senate with a war record. Forty-eight of the ninety-six Senators have sons or daughters in the present war. That's 50 percent. That means that one-half of the United States Senate has a direct blood and kinship interest in victory, in peace, and a free country. Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has lost a son overseas. Guess you wouldn't quarrel with the patriotism of a public servant like that.

Now turn to the House. Of the 435 Members, 168 saw service in the Spanish War or the First World War, or both. That means that 39 percent of the House served in uniform. One hundred and twenty-three Members of the House have sons or daughters in service now. If the record needs high lighting, one might observe that Congressman KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, has 5 sons in the service. Representative BATES of Massachusetts has 3 sons, a daughter, and a son-in-law in the service. STARNES of Alabama has a son, 3 brothers, and 6 first cousins in the service. TABER, of New York, has a son in service who was wounded recently. BALDWIN of Maryland lost a son in service. House Members also have a filial interest in victory, in peace, and in the preservation of this Republic.

Now think that over for a moment. Is there any group in the land which for its size could boast a greater service flag? With only 531 Members, the congressional service flag could proudly boast 235 stars. These stars would represent young men and women in all parts of the world, fighting for American principles and free government.

And that's not the whole story. By induction or by enlistment, 1,500 employees of the Congress, representing secretaries, clerks, elevator operators, guards, messengers, mechanics, custodians, and others are today in the armed services. They have lived in close association with the Members for years. When their stars are inscribed upon the congressional service flag, and added to the sons and daughters of Senators and Congressmen, it would represent more than a regiment.

Congressmen and Senators are a part of that great confraternity of fathers and mothers throughout the Republic who are anxious about their sons and daughters, who wish for speedy victory and peace. They are also a part of that other host who wore the uniform to serve the flag and to preserve that sacred birthright of freedom whose anniversary we observed this week.

Can you find cause for madness in this? Can you find cause for hysteria in this? Can you find cause for spite in this? Can you find cause for narrow partisanship in this? When Representative BATES of Massachusetts, a Republican, with three sons in the service, and AUGUSTINE KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, a Democrat, with five sons in the service, or any of their colleagues, are considering legislation and policies which affect the war effort or affairs on the home front, do you believe there can be any question about the zeal, the earnestness, the motives, the purposes which mark their legislative conduct?

So I submit the record and let the people judge whether there is madness, meanness, hysteria, and spite in the Congress, and whether this spirit is more likely to be found in other places where draft exemption was claimed by young men of military age whose services as lawyers, economists, and technicians seemed more important on the Washington front than in the uniform of their country.

But it goes without saying that there has been a spiritual change in this Congress as compared with its predecessors. Do you remember that familiar "rubber stamp" label that was hung on Congress for a number of years? You don't hear it any more. It may be due to the rubber shortage. On the other hand, there may be other and more compelling reasons. Congress is now assailed as a mad, hysterical, malicious, venal, angry lot. It's interesting and strange how labels change. Nearly one-half of the House membership has served 6 years or more. Short days ago they were spineless "rubber stamps." Now they are something else.

Nor is the change due to politics. That word "politics" is always the first refuge of a frustrated person. To be sure, there was a material gain in Republican membership in the present Congress and there is a better and more wholesome party balance. Yet it would be surprising to any person to examine the recorded votes on various issues and observe how party lines are traversed. It frequently happens that a score or more of Democrats will vote with Republicans on one

side of an issue, while an equal number of Republicans will vote with Democrats on the other side of that same issue.

Hysteria, madness, politics, and other charges of the same kidney are not the reason for the change in Congress. It's far more substantial than that.

Congress wants an efficient victory effort. It will vote whatever funds and authority are needed for that purpose. They have 235 sons and daughters and 1,500 employees in the services. They are precious young folks, like the other fine and stalwart sons and daughters of the fathers and mothers of this Nation. They're fighting for the American way and they want those sons and daughters to be provided with the best weapons, the best leadership, the best talent and skill, and the best chance of which the genius of this Nation is capable. They want a victory that all the sons of America might come back home. They want an early victory and want it crowned with a peace that will have a chance to endure. Their flesh and blood is a part of this earnest business and there is no madness or hysteria or politics about that.

There are other reasons for the change in Congress and for the spunk and determination which it has manifested in dealing with affairs on the home front.

Congress is concerned about the bungled food situation and the prospect of real food shortages in the months ahead.

Congress is concerned over the failure to centralize control of food production, food distribution, and food prices under a single head.

Congress is concerned over the constant effort to meet every problem by requests for more and more funds as if the dollar sign is the panacea and cure-all for every economic malady.

Congress is concerned over the insistent and high-pressure demands for the continuation of emergency agencies which have outlived their usefulness and which could well be discontinued in the interest of economy.

Congress is concerned about this mystic new philosophy on national debt which seeks to persuade the Nation that it doesn't matter much how large the national debt is so long as we owe it to ourselves.

Congress is concerned about the inroads upon our farm-labor supply, the failure to provide farm machinery for the production of food, and the failure to adequately appreciate the importance of food as a munition of war.

Congress is concerned over a staggering Federal pay roll of 3,000,000 persons, 55 percent of whom are not directly engaged in the war effort, and of a monthly outlay of more than $550,000,000 for pay checks to Government workers.

Congress is concerned over the rationing programs and the countless frictions which have resulted to erode morale and good will.

Congress is concerned over the many jurisdictional feuds which have developed in the executive branch of the Government and the effect of these feuds upon the war effort and upon civilian morale.

Congress is concerned over the constant and unrelenting effort to impose more and more controls upon the people, and over the effort to socialize this Nation under the cloak of conflict.

Congress is concerned over any misdirected tax programs which will finally break the back of free enterprise, and so destroy its usefulness when the time comes to shoulder the post-war burdens of rehabilitation, that all enterprise must come to Government for financial aid and thus submit itself to control.

Congress is concerned over expenditures. It has just voted $115,000,000,000 in appropriations. Of this amount fifty-nine billion went to the War Department, twenty-eight billion to the Navy, three billion for the various war agencies, six and one-quarter billion for lend-lease purposes, and the balance for other functions of Government. It is prepared to provide whatever funds are necessary for the war effort and for essential purposes. But it wants wise, sane, economical use of the funds.

Congress is and has been concerned over the growing tendency of administrative agencies in Government to so twist or ignore the laws which Congress has provided as to exceed or disregard the clear intent of the people's representatives.

Congress is and has been concerned over labor disputes in war industries and the danger of impairing the efficacy of the war effort.

Congress is concerned over the constant effort to manage and direct public opinion as if the people were not capable of doing their own thinking.

Congress is concerned over waste and extravagance and what must be done to eliminate these twin sins of Government.

Congress is concerned over this recent proposal to use more borrowed money for subsidies with which to roll back certain commodity prices and thus add to, rather than diminish, the forces of inflation and finally let the soldiers who are fighting this war meet that additional burden of debt in years to come.

These and many others are the things which have struck concern into the hearts of Congressmen and Senators and moved them to action. It is not hate and madness. It is not spite and hysteria. It is a growing concern over the future of this Republic, over its solvency, and over the preservation of freedom under law and under a balanced government which made this the greatest Nation on earth.

Now, what are some of the things which Congress has done or attempted to do which have provoked controversy and inspired attacks upon the legislative branch.

It enacted a tax bill to put the Nation on an individual pay-as-you-go basis and ultimately bring all individual taxpayers current.

It passed the war disputes bill to meet a crisis produced by a strike in an essential industry.

It liquidated the National Youth Administration after that agency had expended more than $771,000,000 on various training programs.

It transferred the Farm Security Administration to the War Food Administration and reduced its funds by $46,000,000.

It liquidated the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation after a loss of $41,000,000 on wheat in a period of 4 full years.

It reduced the funds for the Office of Price Administration by $10,000,000 on the ground that the elimination of waste and inefficiency would admit of real economy.

It liquidated the National Resources Planning Board because it had too many theorists and too few practical men, and on the further ground that planning can be done only with public funds taken from the taxpayers and that it was therefore a primary function of the Congress to explore this field and determine the future policies to be pursued.

It provided for the filing of a liquidation plan by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation on or before February 1, 1944, with the view to its ultimate and expeditious liquidation on the ground that it was an emergency agency which has performed its duty and should now retire from the field of Federal financing.

It provided for a number of investigations of the war effort, of the Federal Communications Commission, the administrative procedures of the various Federal agencies, the Farm Security Administration, and others for the purpose of developing complete information as a basis for future action by the Congress.

It has been scrutinizing waste and extravagance for the purpose of saving public funds wherever possible.

It has been carefully examining the language of proposals submitted to Congress by the various agencies of Government, and reasserting the independence of the legislative branch and its constitutional power over the purse strings.

All these are but indications that the Congress proposes to reassert its powers as an independent branch of Government. Obviously, these actions will provoke those who believe that Congress should surrender its powers.

Obviously it will provoke those who follow the debt philosophy of men like Dr. Alvin Hansen, adviser to the National Resources Planning Board and the Federal Reserve Board, who in a recent article said that (an internal debt) "is in fact so different from what we commonly think of as debt, that it should scarcely be called a debt at all."

It will provoke those who believe that the only function of Congress is to provide a blank check for untold billions and turn the expenditure over to the executive branch.

It will provoke those who believe that every economic problem can be solved by greater and greater expenditure of the people's money.

It will not satisfy those like Dr. Tugwell, who believes we should disdain the wisdom of more than 150 years of our national life and remake and remold this country.

It will not satisfy those who look upon Congress as the one instrument that stands in the way of socializing this Nation.

In the days to come when Congress is back home communing with the people and rendering an account of its stewardship and giving aid in connection with the many problems which arise, I trust that those who might be disposed to attack Congress for its sins of omission and commission will answer a few questions for the folks back home, and also tell them about so many other things which are happening on the Washington front which have stirred Congress to action.

They should tell the people about the unending controversies in the executive branch which began in 1941 and have continued to this good day. This will include the conflict between Rubber Administrator Jeffers and the War and Navy Departments over the rubber program. It will include the clash between Mr. Eberstadt and Mr. Wilson over control in the War Production Board. It will include the clash between Elmer Davis, of the Office of War Information, and 15 prominent writers in that agency who charged that misleading statements have been made to the public and to Congress. It will include the tart controversy between the President and Food Administrator Davis over a centralization of the whole food program in the interest of greater food production. It will include the present conflict between Jesse Jones and HENRY WALLACE over the stock piling of critical war supplies. The country will want to know how this intrafamily fight serves the war effort.

They should tell about Edward Pritchard, Richard Gilbert, Ganson Purcell, and other economic magicians in the new brain trust who have thwarted or overruled the regular agencies of Government and whose irresponsibility and lack of experience is a threat to morale on the home front.

They should tell about Mr. Edward Pritchard, former law clerk and one-time adviser to the War Labor Board, who authorized the roll-back subsidy idea before any regulations were prepared and before the matter was ever discussed with livestock producers of the Nation.

They should tell about scores of college professors who have not had a single day's business experience who are directing price policies in the Office of Price Administration.

They should tell the people what lies behind this intense conflict over subsidies and whether or not it is but a preview to a broader program which will involve the purchase by the Government of vast quantities of commodities which will later be resold at a loss to the Treasury and the taxpayers and whether or not it will call for the extension of Government control over even larger areas of our economic life.

They might tell how we can avoid collapse and bankruptcy unless the strictest economy is exercised.

In belaboring Congress for a modest reduction in the funds for the Office of Price Administration, they should tell the people just why the Office of Price Administration is costing the taxpayers as much money as was spent on the entire Navy with 350 vessels and 66,000 officers and men just a quarter of a century ago.

They might tell by what authority the Office of Price Administration regulates inventories, determines the length of women's hose, defines a beef roast, and performs other functions scarcely contemplated by Congress.

They might tell why the Office of Price Administration needs 2,700 lawyers to perform its legal work, whereas in Great Britain it requires but 10.

They should tell the people just what has happened to the abundant life.

They might explain by what magic we made the complete circuit of too much goods and too little money just a few years ago to too much money and too little goods in 1943, and what happened to all the promises of a managed, planned economy.

They should tell the people just why there is such pressure to continue agencies like the National Youth Administration and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation when the Nation is rolling toward a debt of two hundred and ten billions.

They might tell why the 575,000 grocers in the land must be harassed by a score of maximum price regulations and threescore and more of price controls.

They might tell why thousands upon thousands of retail meat dealers are beseeching Congress constantly for relief from impossible Office of Price Administration restrictions.

They might tell why it was that the all-wise leaders in the administration who claimed they foresaw this war a long time ago were continuing to impose acreage restrictions on the production of food as late as last year.

They might tell why the all-wise leaders who said they foresaw this war years ago reduced wheat acreage from 63,000,000 in 1938 to 50,000,000 acres in 1942 and how many people we could feed from the 13,000,000 acres which were not planted.

They might tell why the all-wise leaders who said they foresaw this war continued to reduce corn acreage from 98,000,000 acres in 1939 to 86,000,000 acres in 1941 and how nice it would be if we had the 600,000,000 bushels of corn that would have been produced on the 12,000,000 acres that were not planted.

They might explain how corn-processing plants, which are closing down for lack of corn, might operate with the corn that wasn't planted.

They might tell why as late as last year, when we had already been in war for a year, the administration was still undertaking to control the farmers and reduce acreage by means of benefit payments out of the Federal Treasury, when every available acre in the land should have been planted to food.

They might tell why there is such determined resistance to placing the production, distribution, and pricing of food under one head.

They might well enlighten the people on the real issues behind the Jones-Wallace affair, and whether or not the real issue is the junking of our costly synthetic-rubber plants when the present war is over so that we shall have to depend on foreign sources for rubber.

It might be interesting for them to tell the people why the farm-labor situation has been badly bungled; why we must send to Jamaica and Mexico for labor to harvest crops; and why, according to the official bulletin of the Department of Agriculture for June, lack of an adequate farm-labor supply is now considered a major problem.

These are but a very few of the things they might tell the people when they undertake to assail the determination, the courage, and the forthrightness of Congress in dealing with the welfare of the Republic.

There is no madness or hate or hysteria in Congress. It has become just a little fed up with some of the irresponsibility on other sectors of the Washington front, and it intends to do something about it. It intends to do something about it, because administrative incapacity and bungling might cost additional lives on some far-flung battle front and untold anguish and distress on the home front.

Folks, you can depend upon it, this Congress will do its duty. The Congress which just went home to see the people is as American and as resolute as another Congress, which 167 years ago this week filed a bill of particulars against a king and his ministers, declared the independence of this land, and then did something about it.

H. R. 2703

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 7 the House adopted Senate amendments to H. R. 2703 which had for its purpose providing more adequate and uniform provisions in the administration of veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pensions, and retirements. I favored these objectives, and upon assurance that the amendments proposed were satisfactory to all the veterans' organizations, supported the amendments.

In May of this year I addressed a letter to Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, calling attention to the practice alleged to exist in the War Department in discharging disabled men with foreign combat service on the basis of alleged preexisting disabilities and requiring them to prejudge and prejudice their cases by signing releases of all disabilities before receiving consideration for present disabilities.

I discussed this matter at some length on June 1 in the House and my remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, page 5168, in which I set forth this letter to the Secretary of War and his reply, and I also included a protest against such procedure, being an editorial appearing in the Disabled American Veterans' Semimonthly, appearing in its issue of April 29.

I am now in receipt of a letter and a statement from Omar B. Ketchum, legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, discussing these amendments and the committee considerations which took place prior to the time that the amendments were presented to the House. When the Senate amendments were considered in the House, July 7, I had no knowledge of the facts set forth in Mr. Ketchum's statement.

Pursuant to authority heretofore granted, I include this letter and my reply, together with the statement of Mr. Ketchum:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., July 8, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: I noted with interest your questioning of Mr. RANKIN during consideration of Senate amendments to H. R. 2703 on Wednesday, July 7.

It is apparent you were concerned as to whether the Senate amendments would weaken the veterans' rights in comparison to the provisions previously adopted by the House in H. R. 2703.

For your information, I am attaching herewith my analysis of the Senate amendments in a statement I am making to the National Tribune. I am not blaming Mr. RANKIN, and realize time was the essence, but the veterans of this war took a beating in that one Senate amendment.

Very truly yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

STATEMENT BY OMAR B. KETCHUM, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, RELATIVE TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 9 (B) OF H. R. 2703

The decision of the Senate Finance Committee and subsequent action by the Senate on July 6 in amending section 9 (b) of H. R. 2703, destroyed, to a large extent, an outstanding victory which had been won in the House, relative to a presumption of mental and physical soundness for persons in the armed forces.

The House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, after comprehensive hearings and studied deliberation on H. R. 2703, reported out the bill with Section 9 (b) incorporating the most favorable presumption of soundness for veterans since the passage of the infamous Economy Act of 1933. It was later approved in the House by a unanimous vote.

Section 9 (b) of H. R. 2703 as approved by the House would have established a conclusive presumption of soundness after 90 days of service, other than for disabilities which were actually noted upon entry into service, and restored to veterans the rights once granted under section 200 of the World War Veterans Act of 1924, but which were taken away by the Economy Act of 1933.

The Senate amendment to section 9 (b) of H. R. 2703 practically destroys the conclusive presumption of soundness approved by the House and will permit the Veterans' Administration to continue to apply a rebuttable presumption as under the infamous Economy Act of 1933. While it is admitted that the Senate amendment is less objectionable than existing law, nevertheless, the Veterans' Administration, acting as judge, jury, and prosecutor, will be able to deny presumption of soundness in thousands of otherwise deserving claims.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States led the argument before the House Committee to obtain the conclusive presumption-of-soundness clause in section 9 (b) of H. R. 2703, which was approved by the House; and the action of the Senate Finance Committee in changing this clause in an informal conference on a holiday observance during the unavoidable absence of

the Veterans of Foreign Wars spokesman came as a great disappointment. It is regretted that representatives of the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans who attended the informal conference agreed to such a compromise in their zeal to remove the 90-day requirement. The compromise was like swapping a one hundred dollar bill for a 5-cent piece.

It will always be the opinion of the Veterans of Foreign Wars spokesman that if representatives of the Legion and the Disabled American Veterans had stood pat in the informal conference, the conclusive presumption of soundness would have passed the Senate in spite of opposition from the Veterans' Administration.

Upon learning of the action taken by the Senate, the Veterans of Foreign Wars registered a strong protest with the Honorable JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the House World War Veterans' Committee and, at first, insisted that the House reject the Senate amendment and send H. R. 2703 to conference in an attempt to restore the House provision for conclusive presumption of soundness. Conferences between Congressman RANKIN and Senator CLARK and discussions between veteran organizations representatives developed the fear that if the bill went to conference, there would be no final action before the impending recess of Congress.

Rather than be responsible for holding up final action on the entire bill, which contains many other important benefits, the Veterans of Foreign Wars representative agreed to let the tail go with the hide, but with the assurance that if the Veterans' Administration failed to follow the clear intent of the Congress in a liberal interpretation of presumption of soundness, steps would immediately be taken to amend the law and restore the original House provision for a conclusive presumption of soundness.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1943.

Mr. OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative,
Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KETCHUM: I am just in receipt of your letter of July 8 calling attention to the colloquy between myself and Chairman RANKIN, of the Veterans Committee, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD July 7, page 7387, when Senate amendments to H. R. 2703 were under discussion. I have read with interest your statement enclosed with your letter in which you detail the negotiations leading up to the adoption of these amendments as they were presented to the House.

At the time the bill was under discussion I had no knowledge of these discussions which had taken place with reference to this bill. I was deeply concerned as to whether or not the amendments proposed were satisfactory to all of the veterans' organizations, and would protect veterans against the injustices now being visited upon them by failing to adhere to the presumption-of-soundness rule. As you will note from the proceedings appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 7 when these amendments were adopted, we were assured that they were satisfactory to the veterans. Personally, I feel that the legislation should have made certain that there would be a conclusive presumption of soundness in these cases.

If this legislation does not prove to be satisfactory upon a fair trial, I assure you I will be glad to support amendments that will correct any deficiencies.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated in the House on June 1, I am not fully convinced that the practice as outlined by the Secretary of War is such as to preserve the rights of servicemen who are not only endangering their lives but subjecting themselves to critical disabilities which may disable them for life, and who in many cases are making the supreme sacrifice in the defense of our country. When these men are inducted into service they are subjected to critical and exhaustive examinations to determine their physical and mental condition, and such examination should be binding upon the Government. The Government should not, therefore, be heard to say that such servicemen after undergoing such examinations are subject to disabilities which were overlooked and which existed at the time of the examination. Once examined, accepted, and inducted into service, there should be a conclusive presumption against the Government that any disabilities thereafter appearing in such servicemen were service-connected.

The Time To Feed Our Friends Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article by William Henry Chamberlin on feeding the starving children of occupied Europe, published in the Progressive on July 5, 1943. I hope it will be read extensively, and I am sure it will help to build up in America a humanitarian desire to help save millions of innocent children, victims of the ravages of modern and world-wide wars.

The article follows:

Americans are temperamentally optimists. But optimism would have to take on some of the qualities of blindness to mistake the fact that we are living in an age of singular and in some respects unprecedented cruelty in human relations. Man's inhumanity to man has reached new peaks. The easy assumption that the world always moves forward, morally as well as materially, has received some shattering blows.

There was nothing in the record of Imperial Germany to match Hitler's calculated extermination of the Jews, or the mass killings of hostages and civilians in occupied and invaded countries. Tsarist Russia was no school of humanity. But no act of the Tsarist government took as many lives as such Soviet policies as the "liquidation of the kulaks as a class" or the man-made famine in Ukraine and the north Caucasus in 1932–33. Japan's brutalities in China and the shooting of captured American airmen are in unfavorable contrast to the fairly decent observance of the conventions of war in the Russo-Japanese conflict of 1904–05.

But before we become too smug and self-righteous about the atrocities of totalitarian states we ought to remove a grave blot on our own record in the conduct of this war. This is all the worse because the same problem was handled decently and humanely in the last war. I refer, of course, to the airtight blockading of the occupied democracies of western Europe, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Norway. Since November of last year France has also been under German occupation and even before November the greater part of France was under German occupation and invasion and blockade had reduced the French to much the same condition of grave malnutrition, approaching actual starvation, that has prevailed in Belgium, the Netherlands and Norway.

THIS CHALLENGE EVEN GREATER

Now in the last war a situation that was in every respect identical, except that fewer people were affected, arose as a result of the German occupation of Belgium and a considerable part of northeastern France. At the initiative of Herbert Hoover, then a private citizen, a scheme for neutral feeding of the people in these occupied regions was installed with the consent of the British and German authorities. Adequate safeguards were set up against the diversion of relief supplies to German military use. After the United States became a belligerent the system continued, under the supervision of citizens of European neutral powers.

As a result the people of Belgium and northeastern France were saved from starvation. An inestimable number of human lives were preserved. The grave permanent effects of prolonged malnutrition, physical degeneration, and the development of embittered, warped, antisocial personalities were averted. If voices were raised on behalf of the inhuman theory that the starvation of French and Belgium children would contribute to the defeat of Germany those voices were fortunately neither loud nor influential.

This time the challenge to humanity has been far greater. Not only Belgium but the Netherlands and Norway have fallen under enemy occupation. All France, not only five departments in the northeast, is in the same plight. But the response to this challenge, so ready and generous in the last war, has been completely negative up to the present time, except in the case of Greece.

Cruel and false propaganda, reaching its apex in two downright lies, has confused American public opinion and led to apathy in the face of a very clear moral and humanitarian issue. The two lies are that any feeding scheme would benefit Germany and that the people in the occupied countries and their governments in exile do not desire relief.

ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS

In regard to the first statement, it should be noted that no one has been so simple-minded as to suggest the sending of food to the occupied countries with eyes closed as to what would be done with it. Every proposal that has been put forward by Mr. Hoover and by others who have been interested in maintaining a minimum of physical health and vitality in these conquered democracies has contained the most stringent safeguards against abuse: Close neutral supervision of the feeding; maintenance of small stocks of food at any one time, so that seizure would be of no practical benefit to the Germans; stoppage of operations in the event of any German effort to violate or evade the safeguards.

Moreover, there have been two practical experiments that disprove the contention that the Germans would misappropriate food sent for civilian relief and child feeding. One has been carried out in Greece, of all Balkan countries the least self-sufficient in food supply, and therefore the hardest hit by conquest and cutting off of contact with the outside world.

It was the Turks, until recently traditional enemies of the Greeks, who crashed the gate of the blockade when starvation in Greece reached appalling proportions. A relaxation of the blockade followed this generous and humane Turkish action. Wheat from Canada, dried vegetables and dried milk from the

United States are now being sent in Swedish ships directly to Greek ports. More than 500 neutrals (Swiss and Swedes) supervise the distribution of the food and see to it that there is no diversion to the occupying forces. Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles has publicly testified to the efficient working of the Greek arrangement. There is no reason that would pass the test of humanity and common sense why a similar arrangement could not be made for the occupied countries of northern and western Europe.

A DESPICABLE FALSEHOOD

We also have the testimony of Mr. Howard Kershner, who left Europe recently after serving for years as director of relief for the American Friends Service Committee. Mr. Kershner's testimony, published in a letter to the New York Times of April 20, is emphatic and to the point:

"After having fed 100,000 French children during the past 2 years I know for a fact that the Germans have never taken a mouthful of our food.

"Neither do they take an equivalent quantity of French food. I state this as an unqualified fact, for each child to whom we give a daily portion of imported food had also its full proportionate quantity of French food—everything that could be obtained for it with its own French ration card. This proves conclusively that not a crumb was left over that the Germans could take as a result of our operations."

Mr. Kershner's second point is especially interesting and an engagement to the effect that there should be no reduction in ration allotments to persons receiving relief supplies might well be included in any arrangement concluded for feeding the occupied countries.

As for the statement that the people in the occupied countries and their representatives prefer that the process of slow starvation go on without any attempt at relief, this is a singularly mean and despicable falsehood. There is not a shred of documentary evidence to support it. The "voices" from the occupied countries that supposedly cry out against the sending of relief are invariably, and conveniently anonymous. It is, of course, easy for persons of a certain moral caliber to get up after a comfortable luncheon and declaim about how the heroic Belgians, Dutch, Norwegians, and French are gladly starving themselves for the greater glory of the British blockade.

But actually no responsible spokesman for the occupied democracies has repudiated the idea of relief. The governments-in-exile of these countries are located in London and are under the strongest kind of obvious pressure to do nothing that would embarrass British policy. But members of these governments have repeatedly taken a stand for sending in food. It would not be very easy for them to live in the future among the graves of their countrymen and to face the looks of the emaciated survivors if they had taken any other attitude.

A few instances of support for the relief idea by the governments-in-exile may be cited. On March 4, 1941, Premier Pierlot, Foreign Minister Paul H. Spaak, and Finance Minister Camille Gutt of the Belgian Government, urged Winston Churchill to approve the experiment of setting up soup kitchens for the distribution of foreign relief supplies. After Hoover had delivered an address urging the feeding of the people of the democracies the Norwegian Minister in this country, Wilhelm Morgenstierne, sent the following telegram:

"Permit me to convey to you my personal warm appreciation of the understanding and sympathy regarding Norway and the present predicament of its people."

Quite recently, toward the end of March, 1943, the Belgian Premier, Hubert Perlot, urged that a Red Cross ship with supplies for Belgium be permitted to pass the blockade. This request was denied. The Norwegian delegate at the Hot Springs food conference raised the question of food supplies for his country.

SITUATION IS GETTING WORSE

There is no evidence of opposition to feeding anywhere in the countries that would benefit from it. The only opposition exists in the minds of the devotees of "Britain can do no wrong" theory, of thick-and-thin apologists for a blockade policy that is not only extremely inhuman but also inexpedient, since it starves our friends much more effectively than our enemies.

Germany can and presumably will be beaten by a combination of air bombing and land invasion. Germany cannot be starved into surrender. The improvements in agricultural technique, the possession of much larger farm areas than Germany had at its disposal in the last war, the more scientific rationing—all these factors rule out the possibility of a German collapse through starvation. Given the present distribution of political power, it is obvious that everyone in Europe (the few surviving neutrals excepted) will suffer the pangs of hunger before the Germans.

The food situation in the occupied countries is catastrophically bad and it is getting worse. Here is what Kershner, a recent eyewitness, has to say:

"A whole generation of children is slowly dying from starvation. Hundreds of thousands have already perished, and even larger numbers will be lost unless help is speedily forthcoming. I have seen these children, and grown-ups as well, in all stages of starvation. Some are wracked with tuberculosis, which is quickly fatal where undernourishment exists, and others have distended stomachs and swollen limbs, which tell the same horrible tale. There is, I believe, no question about the facts of starvation."

And Professor Richet, of the French Academy of Medicine, has recently reported to the French Ministry of Agriculture that "as a result of undernourishment 10,000,000 Frenchmen are today condemned to slow death." Conditions are most probably equally bad in other occupied countries. News From Belgium, a publication of the Belgian information center, puts the issue grimly in the following words:

"The whole question is whether the United Nations are fighting to liberate oppressed peoples or to liberate a vast cemetery sparsely inhabited by some wealthy people who survived the ordeal."

The chances of war are uncertain. While we all hope that Germany will crack up this year, there is a considerable body of opinion to the effect that the really decisive onslaught on Hitler's European fortress will come only in 1944. Perhaps the struggle will be prolonged until 1945, or even further. What will become of the starving people in the occupied democracies over that interval of time?

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

The evil that has been wrought by the cruel and shortsighted policy of refusing to our friends even a small crack in the blockade which has been imposed on our enemies will not end with the overthrow of Hitler. The physical base of some of the freest, most progressive European peoples will have been undermined for an indefinite period. The difficulties of recreating an orderly and civilized Europe will be enormously enhanced if great numbers of French, Belgian, Dutch, and Norwegian men, women, and children grow up emotionally unbalanced, warped, embittered, quick to follow the lead of any crackpot, as a result of the impairment of their physical strength and mental faculties by near starvation.

It is high time that the American people made their will on this question known in Washington, and that Washington put pressure on London, even if the bottleneck in this matter is Winston Churchill himself. Blueprints for future relief are not enough. The time to feed our friends is now.

Let's Help Europe's Starving Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 244 which has for its purpose rendering aid by helping to feed the children of Europe in the over-run, subjugated countries who are starving by the thousands for lack of food and other essential care. Throughout our history we have been known to the peoples of the world for our great humanitarian ideals and for our good-neighbor policy. In the present titanic struggle involving all of the nations of the world we are rendering aid to millions of people through the lend-lease program. Thousands of innocent children of the countries of Europe are perishing day by day, and many more thousands are being gradually starved and blighted for lack of nourishment, and if able to survive this holocaust will be crippled in body and mind.

We in America should come to the rescue of these innocent little ones who are not responsible for the tragedy of war swirling about them. None of us want to render aid or comfort to our enemies who are responsible for this great tragedy, but we can help these children by permitting mercy ships to go through the blockade with food to sustain their lives without aiding the enemy. The International Red Cross in the past has been able to supervise and make certain that food furnished under these conditions does not reach the enemy, nor help the enemy.

I most sincerely plead with you, my colleagues, to assist in the early passage of my bill, or any other bill that will give aid and relief to Europe's helpless children.

I include as a part of my remarks an article dealing with this subject by Vera Britain entitled "One of These Little Ones":

"ONE OF THESE LITTLE ONES"

(By Vera Britain)

A short time ago I was asked by the editor of a children's magazine to act as judge in a competition for Britain's bonniest babies. Into the office of that magazine poured photographs of the loveliest children you could possibly imagine. Even when the office staff had selected 50 for me to examine out of the hundreds submitted, I felt utterly bewildered by the difficulty of choice. And these babies with straight backs, rounded limbs, dimpled cheeks, perfect teeth, and laughing eyes were the products of wartime Britain. Every one of them had been born since the war began. Fresh air, a wise routine, and, above all, a good diet regulated by the loving care of their mothers had made

them the charming little creatures that they were.

On the continent of Europe today there are millions of mothers as loving, as skillful, and as conscientious as the mothers of Britain. But with all the love in the world they cannot rear children who would win prizes in baby competitions. In thousands of homes scattered throughout Europe they cannot rear them at all, for today at least half a dozen nations are slowly dying of hunger. Ever since the summer of 1940, famine and diseases that follow in its wake have gradually tightened their grip upon Europe.

Under famine conditions the first to suffer are the youngest and weakest of the population. Babies die first, then young children and adolescents, then invalids and nursing and expectant mothers. Behind the curtain of wartime silence, thousands and perhaps millions of children and their mothers—all individuals who love and hope and suffer just as you and I do—are dropping exhausted by starvation into nameless graves.

This enormous famine, spread over so wide an area of civilized mankind, is one of the most terrible things that has ever happened in the history of the world. Owing to the tremendous increase of population during the past 150 years, its scale is infinitely greater than the comparable tragedies of the Thirty Years War, the Napoleonic Wars, and even the Great War of 1914.

Say these words over again to yourself, slowly and emphatically, and try to take in their meaning: "This is one of the most terrible things that has ever happened in the history of the world." And it is happening in our day and generation. We cannot escape from the fact that it is happening by trying to put it out of our minds, nor can we, the citizens of a vast commonwealth and a still prosperous, well-fed country, absolve ourselves from the moral responsibility to do something about it.

This catastrophe is terrible, not only in terms of the thousands of innocent children who have died and will die. It is equally dreadful on account of the memories, the bitter grievances and resentments against us, which will go on from generation to generation. By Belgium, by France, by others of the worst-starved countries of Europe, we who think of ourselves as kindly and well-intentioned will be regarded, if we continue to stand aside, as cruel, selfish, and merciless. An American relief worker recently in France told me that again and again he had heard French people say, "We will help the British because we want them to win the war and get rid of Hitler. But we shall hate them forever for letting our children starve when they could have saved them."

This hatred will permanently poison the future relations between Britain and France, or Britain and Belgium, unless we make some effort to help. It will hamper post-war reconstruction beyond calculation, and postpone to an indefinite date the restoration of international friendship. Even a gesture of good will, however small and ineffective, would be better than nothing. Not food alone matters, but the spiritual grace with which it is offered. If the French, the Belgians, the Greeks, and all the rest believe that we are indifferent to their sufferings, if they feel that we do not care how many of their children starve to death so long as our own are strong and beautiful enough to win baby competitions, what else can we expect them to do but hate and distrust us so long as history is written and read?

GREECE

Conditions in Greece have been exceptionally bad because, according to the Greek Government publication, Greece Under Enemy Occupation, Greece was dependent upon imports for all essential foodstuffs. Her annual consumption of wheat was at least 1,200,000 tons, of which a third came from abroad in good years, and much more in bad. Meat, sugar, and rice were also imported on a large scale. All these imports came from overseas. According to Dr. Cawadias, chairman of the Greek Red Cross in London, overland communications were so difficult that "even in times of peace Greece never received food by this route."

Greece was at war with Italy from October 28, 1940. Therefore the autumn (1940) sowing was never completed, and the spring (1941) sowing was not even begun. During the war with Italy, Greece never had more than 2 weeks' food supply, and subsisted largely on shipments convoyed under British protection. The military land operations devastated the whole country. Roads, railways, bridges, viaducts, factories, and stores were methodically demolished by the retreating armies. Land communications broke down completely. At sea, Greek shipping suffered enormous losses. Every ship which survived, including all fishing craft, left Greek waters, so that no means of communication remained between the Greek mainland and the islands.

When the German Army occupied Greece at the end of April 1941, they seized foodstuffs and livestock, thereby aggravating an already disastrous situation. Thus it was that, during 1941, starvation came to Greece more quickly and in a more drastic form than to any other country. By the summer of that year conditions in Athens and the Piraeus, where the population had been swollen to over a million by refugees from the north, were already appalling. The same was true of some of the islands. Bread and meat virtually disappeared, and in some places people were reduced to eating dogs and cats. Children especially had begun to suffer horribly.

By December 1941 nearly 200 Greek men, women, and children were reported to be dying of starvation each day. There was no fish, no wheat, and no bread. At the beginning of 1942 the figure for deaths in Athens and the Piræus was given as 2,000 a day. The Evening Standard (January 28, 1942) reported that those who survived were so cold from the combined effects of hunger and the bitter winter that they even opened the graves and robbed the dead of their garments.

The first concession allowed to Greece was for the shipment of 50,000 tons of food, at the rate of 2,000 tons a fortnight, from Turkey. This was announced in the press on September 11, 1941. The relief was financed by subscription from Greeks in America, collected by the Vanderbilt Committee for Aid to Greece. The German and Italian Governments gave a safe conduct on condition that the ships sailed only in the daytime, and in addition Germany allowed some exports from Greece for exchange against Turkish foodstuffs. This food from Turkey fed 500,000 people daily, and is estimated to have saved 5 to 10 percent of the population of Athens and the Piræus from death.

At the beginning of March 1942 the Catholic press announced that further measures of food relief were being arranged by the Vatican, and later that month plans began for regular relief from Sweden. The possibility of shipments amounting to 15,000 tons a month, in addition to the relief from Turkey, was mentioned in Parliament on April 21, 1942. On December 17, 1942, Prince Carl, the Chairman of the Swedish Red Cross, stated that Swedish ships had so far carried to Greece 76,000 tons of Canadian wheat and 3,000 tons of other commodities, such as dried vegetables, milk powder, and medicines. A safe conduct was given for these shipments by the belligerents. The joint Swedish-Swiss Commission in Athens, with a Swedish chairman, now has a staff of 550, of whom 140 check and inspect the shops and soup kitchens in Athens which distribute the food. At various times, 600,000 Athenians have been fed in the soup kitchens.

In spite of these various small relief measures, Dr. Cawadias stated, at the end of last September that of the 300,000 children living in Athens and the Piraeus when Greece was attacked no less than 110,000 had already died of starvation, malnutrition, or epidemics. Those who still lived survived only as living skeletons, "literally creatures of skin and bone." Children were losing weight at an average rate of 2 pounds a month owing to the rapidly decreasing supply of milk. Milk-yielding livestock, lacking fodder, were being slaughtered for meat. A neutral observer described the conditions in some of the children's hospitals as Dante's Inferno. In one hospital the mortality rate was 88 percent. In another the wards were so overcrowded that each bed contained four famished children.

BELGIUM

Belgium, like Greece, is a small country, and a large-scale importer of food in peacetime. About 50 percent of the energy value of its food supplies comes from outside. Yet in Belgium's case there has been no attempt at relief in this war, much less any endeavor to imitate the magnificent work of the Commission for Relief in Belgium under Herbert Hoover, by which, between 1914 and 1918, the Belgian Nation was saved.

Up to the present, Greece alone, out of all occupied Europe, has been excepted from rigid and unrelenting blockade by the United Nations. The only food reaching Belgium from outside has come from Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. Since May 1941 this has amounted to about 20,000 tons of fish, flour, and oil, and 50 tons of dried milk. This has been distributed mainly to the poor. The country had no stocks when invaded by Germany, and since much of its soil was affected by actual warfare the harvests have been poor.

For Belgium, as for Greece, the Swedes have done their utmost, and a Swedish committee for the relief of Belgian children was formed in the autumn of 1941. An appeal, signed by the Archbishop of Sweden, by Prince Charles, brother of the late Queen Astrid of Belgium, and other prominent persons, brought contributions from the Swedish people of more than 500,000 kronor ($120,000). This money has been spent in Belgium by the committee, who state that the whole of the food purchased and sent to Belgium has gone directly to the relief of the children under the supervision of the Swedish Consul General in Belgium.

Even this assistance, which has been quite inadequate in scope, is on the verge of interruption, as the committee has come to the end of its funds, and the prospect of raising more money in Sweden is not encouraging. Last autumn the committee announced that the mortality among Belgian children is now appalling, conditions being infinitely worse than they were a year ago. Belgium, they say, will soon reach a level of starvation as bad as that of Greece, if not worse.

On December 7, 1942, the Bishop of Chichester wrote to the Times (London) to point out that, while young English children are receiving special rations of cod-liver oil and orange juice, young Belgian children are sick, listless, and dying through hunger. He inquired:

"Cannot the British Government permit the Belgian Government to use its own financial resources to send special rations of powdered milk and vitamins from America now to save the children of Belgium? These would be medical supplies in effect. A scheme has been prepared whereby shipping can be provided, and the International Red Cross would undertake the distribution of the very small amount required—only 2,000 tons a month—for saving children under 16, nursing

and expectant mothers, and invalids. It is little enough for which navicerts only are asked. Its arrival would offer no temptation for German plunder. When we are sending large quantities of food to our own prisoners (in Germany) without any interference by the Germans; when we are making it so easy for our own children to get their special rations if only their parents will take the trouble, can it be right to refuse?"

FRANCE

On January 14, 1943, the Times, in an article on "Control in north Africa," reported the fear of General Giraud that "unless military action is taken in time, starvation may come to the French before liberation."

We have first-hand knowledge of conditions in France from Dr. Howard E. Kerschner, recently director of relief for the American Friends Service Committee, who describes the French of southern France as "a nation slowly dying of hunger."

The famine there began when 5,000,000 refugees from the Low Countries, Luxemburg, and the north of France ate the food reserves during the summer of 1940. From this severe blow it has been impossible for the districts affected to recover, because over 1,250,000 Frenchmen are still prisoners of war, and farm animals have been killed in the fighting, eaten for food, or destroyed for lack of feed. Tools and fertilizers cannot be obtained, transportation has been reduced to 20 percent of normal, and there is so little seed available that in plowed fields in many parts of France nothing is grown.

During the past 2 winters the American Friends Service Committee has supplied extra food to 100,000 of the most needy children in the schools of unoccupied France. Its American members, and their staff of 140 well-trained non-American workers, have found the past year in France a year of deepened suffering. There has been less food, shabbier clothing, almost no heat, less transport, increasing ill-health, and hardships of all kinds. The infant death rate is now nearly twice what it was before the war. Tuberculosis is increasing, marriages are fewer, the number of births is greatly reduced, and the mortality among old and subnormal people has reached extraordinary proportions.

"Those who survive," Dr. Kerschner warns us in a letter published in the Sunday Times (London) on January 17, 1943, "will be dwarfed in body and warped in mind and personality." And in another letter he asks how reconstruction will be possible with these dwarfed bodies and twisted minds:

"Close study and long observation on the Continent convinces me that, in the interest of shortening the war and making reconstruction less difficult, we ought to save what is left of the children of the occupied countries."

The food and clothing which the Americans used for the French children did not come through the Allies' blockade, but was purchased in 1940 and early 1941 from central Europe, Turkey, Switzerland, Africa, and Asia. Since these stocks are exhausted, and no more can now be purchased, even the 100,000 children who have been fed must be abandoned to starvation unless the governments in London and Washington allow navicerts for the food to be brought from America. Dr. Kerschner makes a plea for these navicerts and assures us that—contrary to the belief of many British people—the Germans never interfered with the American relief work.

"We have never lost a mouthful of food. Neither have the small amounts which we have brought into France enabled the Germans to take any more of French food stocks. Up until last summer, at any rate, they were not taking from unoccupied France as much food as the terms of their armistice provided for—because they could not find it in sufficient quantity anywhere to make it profitable to take (i. e. it is economically unprofitable to scour a country picking up an egg here and a carrot there). The fact that we had a little food somewhere in a colony of children or were feeding a few children in some of the city schools did not make any greater accumulation of French food anywhere that they could seize. It only meant that these children were eating instead of starving."

OTHER COUNTRIES

Holland is stated by the Famine Relief Committee to be facing starvation this winter, because the country's capacity to produce food has been so much reduced. The occupying power robbed the country of 40 percent of its pre-war cattle, which were slaughtered or taken alive to Germany. Only a small percentage of pigs and poultry was saved. In 1941 the death rate of children under 4 increased by 31 percent from the 1939 figure. During the summer of 1942 an examination of school children at Rotterdam showed that only 36 percent were getting enough vitamins to prevent rickets. The coming months will mean real starvation for the Dutch people, and the children of Holland will be irreparably weakened unless vitamins and concentrated food can be sent in without delay.

Norway, Denmark, and Finland are in a similar position to Holland. On March 12, 1942, the Evening Standard reported that Mr. John P. Thelen, an American Red Cross representative, had stated while passing through London on his way back to the United States of America to report that in eastern Karelia 70 percent of the children under 7 were dying of starvation. The food shortage was acute throughout Finland. Even black bread and potatoes were scarce, and meat virtually unobtainable. Mr. Thelen had paid $5 for a rabbit. He explained that after the invasion of Russia all food and medical supplies for Finland were stopped. As America is not at war with Finland, he supervised the distribution of the existing stocks, and then remained as an observer.

POLAND, OCCUPIED RUSSIA, YUGOSLAVIA

At a recent gathering in London, Dr. Raymond Gautier stated that in these three countries the situation is probably worse than anywhere else, but very little is known. We have only recently learned that over a million people died in Leningrad during the siege. In Yugoslavia the southern border districts certainly are suffering acutely.

Of Poland, a report issued in 1941 by the Ministry of Information stated that instead of the daily 2,400 calories necessary to maintain a healthy existence the food rations allowed to the Poles do not amount to more than 680 calories daily, and those to the Jews only 400. It was stated that in Lwow the Germans received 4½ pounds of bread per week, the Poles 2½, and the Jews little more than 1 pound. As a result of this policy, the Poles and the Jews are dying of starvation, and in some parts of the country have been reduced to boiling down the bark of trees and the skins of dead animals.

Neither time nor remorse can restore thousands of dead children to life, nor within any measurable period give back vitality to the nation which has lost them, nor will aeons of time remove the blot on our own nation for the self-interest or indifference which permits this holocaust of youth.

One of the loveliest passages in the Bible is that from Isaiah, chapter 43, verse 2: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee."

That divine promise must have comforted millions of sick and grief-stricken souls through all the ages of history. Cannot we strive to get somewhere near the solicitude of that God in whose image we are made; to let these suffering children and their parents feel that in their dark hour we are with them in spirit? Even more important than the actual food we send them is their knowledge that we care—that we see their predicament as they see it—thinking not of children in categories or millions but of an individual child dear to his parents; of "one of these little ones" beloved by God.

THE IMMEDIATE TASK

Now receiving general support, says Howard Kerschner, is the limited feeding project for most needy children, women, and unemployed of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France.

Approximate number to be fed:	
Norway	1,000,000
Holland	2,000,000
Belgium	2,000,000
France	5,000,000
Amount each person would receive daily:	*Grams*
Cereals	100
Fats	20
Meat	30
Milk (powdered or condensed)	20
Tonnage required each month:	
Cereals	30,000
Fats	6,000
Meat	9,000
Milk	6,000
Total	51,000

Proposed Amendment of Section 107 (b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, in order to correct what I consider a gross inequity in the revenue law I propose on the reconvening of the Congress to present to the Committee on Ways and Means the following amendment:

In place of the last sentence of section 107 (b) insert the following:

"If in any period of 12 consecutive months, whether or not such period constitutes 1 or more taxable years, an individual receives gross income from a particular artistic work or invention by him, which is not less than 80 percent of the gross income in respect of such artistic work or invention received in such period, plus the gross income therefrom received previous to such period, and plus the gross income therefrom received in the 12 months immediately succeeding the close of such period, the tax attributable to the part of such gross income received in such period, which is not taxable as gain from the sale or exchange of the capital asset held for more than 6 months, shall not be greater than the aggregate of the taxes attributable to such part had it been received ratably during the entire time from the beginning to the completion of such composition or invention."

In place of (b) reading:

"The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1940, but with respect to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, and not beginning after December 31, 1941, the period specified in such subsection

shall be 60 months in lieu of 36 months, and the percentage specified in such subsection shall be 75 percent in lieu of 80 percent."

Insert the following:

"The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1939, but with respect to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, and not beginning after December 31, 1941, the period specified in such subsection shall be 60 months in lieu of 36 months, and the percentage specified in such subsection shall be 75 percent in lieu of 80 percent."

Re Lt. Col. Andres Soriano

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 6, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I made a speech discussing the Falange movement, with particular reference to recent activities in the Western Hemisphere. In the course of that speech I mistakenly made unfortunate references to Lt. Col. Andres Soriano, Secretary of Finance, ad interim, of the Philippine Government in exile. I deeply regret having cast any reflection upon the patriotism, loyalty to the United Nations and to the cause of Philippine independence of Señor Soriano. I wish now to make such amends as I can by pointing out that Col. Andres Soriano served with distinction in the defense of the Bataan Peninsula in actual combat service at the fighting front, that so outstanding was his service that President Manuel Quezon recognized and honored Colonel Soriano for his bravery and distinguished service, and that also that fearless American general, Douglas MacArthur, decorated Colonel Soriano with the Silver Star for gallantry in action; that Secretary of War Henry Stimson has stated over his own signature that he is impressed with the loyalty of Colonel Soriano and says further "that he is well acquainted with the patriotic record in the Philippine Army of Lieutenant Colonel Soriano and that no suspicion or question of loyalty of Lieutenant Colonel Soriano is borne out by the facts, but, on the other hand, Colonel Soriano has in every way justified the warm commendation and praise of the highest officials of the United States Army and Navy as well as of the Philippine government." Admiral E. J. King, commander in chief of the United States Fleet, over his own signature, has likewise certified to the patriotism, loyalty, and worthiness of Lieutenant Colonel Soriano.

I deeply regret, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that through a misunderstanding I have said anything heretofore which cast reflection upon the character, patriotism, and loyalty of this distinguished member of the Philippine government in exile, and I wish, so far as I can, to make amends by this statement. I do not want in any way to be a part, wittingly, to any reflection upon brave men who have, by actual combat service subsequent to Pearl Harbor, demonstrated in the most effective way of which man is capable his devotion to the cause of the United Nations and his desire to secure complete independence for the Philippine Islands.

I have learned that Lt. Col. Andres Soriano has a son, now aged 18, who has enlisted in the Coast Guard and is a member of the enlisted personnel of that great and important branch of the Navy Department of the United States. This adds further support to the character and devotion to the cause of the United Nations of the Soriano family. I herewith express to my warm friend, MIKE ELIZALDE, Commissioner in the Congress of the United States representing the Philippine Islands, my regret and sorrow that I have caused to him and to his associates any embarrassment in connection with the mistaken charges or reflections upon Colonel Soriano which I have heretofore made, and I wish herewith to assure him, President Quezon, and the distinguished cabinet of the Philippine government in exile, and through them to the brave Philippine people, my sorrow at having cast any reflection upon Colonel Soriano. I am proud to make this statement and desire now to pay my tribute to Colonel Soriano for having so bravely served his Philippine people and government in actual combat service in the Philippines and for having so distinguished himself in such action.

The Retirement From Congress of the Honorable Jack Nichols

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Jack Nichols resigned from Congress on July 3, 1943, and throughout the membership of the House of Representatives there were sincere expressions of deep regret that he would not be one of us after that date. Men come and go in Congress and some leave little impression upon their colleagues. The personality of Jack Nichols is such that his retirement meant a loss to all of his colleagues. I have been very fortunate in that Jack Nichols and I entered Congress together in 1935. Our contacts have been many and I have learned to have not only affection for him but a high regard for his character, his fearlessness, and his ability. He should succeed magnificently in any work which attracts his interest. His new associates will be fortunate in having his ability and his fine personality as an asset in the conduct of their business.

He leaves Congress with the good will of men in every part of the United States, and it will be pleasing to any Member of Congress to have Jack Nichols walk into his office at any time. Our best wishes are always with him.

Address of Hon. Leon H. Gavin, of Pennsylvania, Before Annual Meeting of Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association, held in Pittsburgh, Pa., June 25, 1943:

Permit me to express my sincere thanks to your association for this opportunity to appear at your annual meeting. A great many of you I know, and know well, because I have lived in the heart of the Pennsylvania oil country most of my life, and I believe that I have a clear picture of what this great industry means to our region.

Your problems and their solution are important because you are helping to win the war just as the boys who are flying the planes, manning the ships, and driving the tanks and jeeps.

Pennsylvania grade crude oil is greatly needed—needed and needed badly—to lubricate all of the mechanized equipment to fight the war and I am confident that the producers of the region know how to secure this oil. They are descendants of the men who started the petroleum industry. They have never stopped learning how to improve their skill. However, they are not skilled in combating an element who are seemingly determined to obstruct the production of oil.

The situation in Washington is very critical and gives signs at this time of causing the oil men to regard the New Deal as a picnic by comparison. The New Deal was an effort to cushion the shock caused by what looked like too much of everything. The present situation is an effort to solve the problems caused by what looks like too little of almost anything; and the bureaucratic planners, it becomes increasingly evident, certainly are playing havoc with the economic life and American system of business in their futile efforts to solve the problems. And I say that a terrible day of judgment awaits those who willfully interfere with the productions of this Nation, whether it be in the production of food, equipment, or oil.

We are all concerned over the refusal on the part of the Office of Price Administration to grant a price increase as an incentive to secure additional crude to meet the demands in this all-out effort of America to win the war.

The next great bottleneck in America will be oil.

Let us assume that the Petroleum Administration for War is primarily interested in producing the materials essential to winning the war. Let us, on the other hand, assume that the Office of Price Administration is concerned in restricting prices so as to prevent injurious inflation. We recognize that both have their places in the picture. However, I think it will be agreed that there has been no inflation in the price of crude oil, heretofore, and the small amount of increase in refined products that would be required to take care of an average of 50 to 75 cents a barrel would not produce dangerous inflation.

The first consideration in the entire picture is the winning of the war. This is of primary importance, because without oil we cannot operate the mechanized equipment to fight the war.

Facts, figures, and briefs have been filed by the various associations and others in their efforts to be of assistance and to substantiate their contentions that a price increase is necessary to increase production.

The Petroleum Administrator for War has made very definite recommendations, on April 7 and also forcibly in his letter on June 10. It is a critical situation and it will be a terrible catastrophe and responsibility I would not care to be charged with, if within a few months from now by reason of the short-sighted policy of the O. P. A., we find ourselves without sufficient oil to fully man the machines of war.

We in the Congress have been paying some attention to national oil problems for some little time, and a price increase necessary for Pennsylvania oil applies to the rest of the oil-producing country. What shall we do? Shall we go on dividing up what is left, rationing in ever smaller bits, while the professorial bureaucrats debate endlessly their theories on how to proceed in a dream world? Or shall we return to the world of reality that has always worked when the ingenuity of man was allowed to function in any lawful manner that he desired?

At the western edge of the region that is most desperately pressed for petroleum supplies there are 500,000,000 barrels of crude oil waiting to be coaxed from reluctant sands. The process of coaxing is well understood by you. But it costs more money than you can command. The East needs the additional supply of gasoline and fuel oil that can be obtained by increased crude oil production. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps need all the Pennsylvania crude lubricants they can get, and what is true of your situation is true of the oil producing industry all over the land.

All evidence points to the fact of an actual shortage of crude oil in the not too distant future. This has been said by all those who are competent to testify to conditions. The Petroleum Administrator for War has repeatedly sounded the alarm and has recommended certain methods to stimulate production—a price increase on oil. The Office of Price Administration alone refuses to recognize the conditions. That agency has been the wonderland department of this war effort all the way.

It has a curious collection of half-baked, impractical visionaries who never did know the score about anything, mixed up with some who are in there to put over a theory of "production for use and not for profit." A theory that in recent years is the theme song of the bureaucracy.

Gentleman, the shackles on productive effort should not be permitted to continue. The Congress has always withstood the shocks and gotten rid of evils that crept in because the people asserted their basic authority and today the Congress is insisting on corrections. This was evidenced in the manner we handled the Office of Price Administration in the appropriation bills in the House a week ago today. The Congress is responsive to what the people want. On our problems, and those of the rest of the people, the Congress will first demand a solution at the hands of those who have been given temporary authority which Congress was told was necessary to the conduct of the war. If the solutions are not reached in that way, the legislative power will be applied as it has been in the recent appropriation bills and a number of other cases within the year.

There has been too much delay in our productive effort. We, in the Congress, think that we can effect some remedies very soon and we are going to do something about it.

I do feel that the oil industry should pay more attention to their representatives in Congress. Today we, in this Nation, are engaged, as you know, in this all-out war effort. Everybody is concerned about food, wheat, corn, cotton, soybeans, peanuts, lambs, sheep, butter, silver, zinc, copper—but little has been said in the Congress up until recent weeks about the importance of having sufficient quantities of oil to meet the needs and demands of this Nation of ours, now fighting on 17 different fronts, and to meet the demands of our allies, who are depending upon us to furnish the oil to bring this war to a rapid and early conclusion.

This is no time for bickering over price with American boys making the supreme sacrifice every day, but a time for action to build up our inventories and stock piles to meet the demands over the months that lie ahead.

It seems bureaucracy is riding high. Producers of oil throughout the country have been on a starvation diet for the past 10 years. The price of oil has been static with but few exceptions since 1941. No one questions that material costs have greatly increased, that labor costs have gone up several hundred percent in some instances, that manpower becomes scarcer every day, that materials have become scarcer and that production is rapidly declining, that stocks and reserves are rapidly being depleted, no new discoveries are being made, and little or no exploration is being carried on, and we know that we are using more oil than we are producing.

Last year we produced 1,390,000,000 barrels of oil and used 1,400,000,000 barrels of oil, and everything indicates that no new discoveries are being made. The consumption has steadily risen and it becomes evident we need a price increase to induce producers and wildcatters to find new and prolific oil fields, if we want more oil, and we have got to have it or there is a possibility that we may lose the war, as well as the peace that follows.

The one way to get new oil—more oil—is to pay the man who goes out after it a sufficient price to at least pay the lifting costs and make it a profitable venture. The oilmen are the finest group of patriotic Americans that ever lived, and all they ask is a chance to break even.

I am of the opinion that the bureaucrats are determined to hold the line, ignore the oilmen, ignore the Congress, and that little or no attention will be given to the requests and demands made upon them. Their crackpot philosophy of production for use and not for profit becomes more apparent every day, and we all know that back of every successful enterprise is the profit motive, the American way—the system that built America.

If a person can't break even or make a dollar, why sink holes in the earth to find oil?

Permit me to state that when crude prices are increased, new fields will be opened up, old fields rehabilitated, and production will rapidly be increased. When there is no profit there is no incentive for anyone to secure more oil, and the producer doesn't have the money to carry on, even if he wanted to for patriotic reasons. So if this situation continues, there is no question that we are heading for a crisis in this country unless we secure the oil to meet the war demands.

All of these facts have been brought to the attention of the power-drunk bureaucrats, but they say that every war has its casualties, and the oil producer happens to be one of the casualties in the petroleum industry. However, I want to state to the bureaucrats that even in war we look after the casualties by giving them first aid and attention when they are badly hit, wherever they may be. But the economic casualties mean little or nothing to those who never built a business or met a pay roll but who are particularly ambitious to recast the economic structure of America.

During recent months I watched the usurping of power by executive branches of our Government and the creation of agencies which suddenly appeared with a blaring of trumpets and none of which are worth a damn, all of whom are contributing to the breaking down of the entire structure.

I cannot understand why the oil industry has not appealed to the Congress long before they have to check and correct many of these cockeyed programs that have been carried on in the name of emergency and war.

I realize as well as you that in time of war we must proceed as directly and efficiently as possible. A crying need for such action makes it imperative. You understand that it is the duty and obligation of everyone to do what he can and we owe responsibility to our Government and our country. It is our duty to speak up and not accept the crackpot theories that have been choked down the throats of the American people with little or no objection over the past several years for fear we may offend some of these half-wits.

There is approximately a time lag of 9 months to a year between increased drilling and increased production. Nine months to a year—with this country engaged in the most crucial war in its history. But in spite of all of our efforts and the efforts of those Members in Congress several impractical theorists have been able to hold up a price increase on oil to increase our production which may eventually cost the lives of thousands of American boys. There is going to be a terrible day of reckoning on this issue unless we secure action at an early date.

There seems to be within the inner circle a "political and economic planning group" who have blueprinted and charted a set-up to recast every branch and department of the Government to bring about the regimentation of the economic life of our Nation.

I am firmly of the opinion that they have determined to force upon our people a program for the regimentation of agriculture, industry, finance, and labor into a socialistic state operated by a system that might be termed "administrative democracy."

I have concluded that they aim at the elimination and destruction of the middleman, the small businessman, the oil producer, the white-collar class, whom I believe you will agree with me are the backbone of our American life. I feel with a certainty they intend to bypass and eliminate the Congress in event enough support and strength appears on the horizon to do the job. It is quite evident over the past several years that they have bypassed the Congress and will continue to do so unless the Congress reasserts its prerogatives.

There is a question in their minds at times as to the constitutionality of their acts; nevertheless they take a chance to see if they can indoctrinate, as they call it, their socialistic program, and it must be said they have been eminently successful up until recently, when Congress reasserted its position and determination to regain those powers that have been delegated to Congress to enact and legislate laws concerning the welfare of the people of this Nation. The professors, I understand, are outraged and indignant that we have the audacity to question their philosophy of "production for use and not for profit." Their arrogant manner evidences this fact. These White House pets have but one plan, and that plan is a program of "producer to consumer." This can only be accomplished by the regimentation of all of our people, and the economic life of America.

Now it is about time that this crackpot element are eliminated from control of the various departments of the Government.

These impractical visionaries have been coddled about long enough, and why we tolerate them is beyond my powers of comprehension. If we were running a business and there was some particular department head who was conceiving a lot of cockeyed formulas that were particularly harmful for the conduct and operation of the business and these ideas were causing confusion, confliction, and chaos, we would immediately proceed to fire the individual responsible for the disturbance, but not so with the Government.

It seems as though the Members of Congress are hog-tied in their efforts to rid the Government of these saboteurs of our American system of free enterprise. Although it may appear that the professors are visionary and impractical and they do not have any conception of what they are doing or where they are going, let me tell you they may have a very definite purpose, because the more confusion, confliction, and chaos they can cause and the more crackpot it appears, the quicker they will realize their ambitions to socialize American business. They are getting results, and that is tearing the heart out of the economic life of the Nation.

This group has tried everything over the past 10 years. Starting off with the National Recovery Administration, the killing off of young hogs for fertilizer, they distribute the fertilizer to the farmer, this to increase the yield in production, to plow it under. They have hired thousands of new people until the Government pay rolls are cluttered up to 3,000,000 civilian employees. They open up local offices, district offices, county offices, and they plan long into the night with a lot of crackpot ideas to break down the American way.

They have held rallies, folk dances, Maypole dances, and parties, youth movements, plowed under and destroyed our crops, planned scarcity, planned utopias, until they have gotten the country into a damnable mess. I feel the Office of Price Administration is their final big push to blitzkrieg our American way of life and freedom. We stand idly by aghast at their innovations, while they continually insist on cramming their incentive programs down the throats of the American farmers, the oil producers, and businessmen who have steadfastly refused to accept them.

They have had no practical experiences to justify their being placed in control as economic czars over the American people. They did not come up the hard way. They do not know what it is to establish a business and employ people. They do not know what it is to get the money to meet a pay roll or to buy raw materials, but they are brilliant conversationalists with glib tongues and symphonies of words, that seem to make an impression on certain people in inner circles of our national life who permit them to continue these cockeyed formulas that are putting our people out of business. All this with a war going on with good American boys being sacrificed every day on the seas, under the seas, in the air, and on land.

They contend that the American way is more or less the horse and buggy stuff that the methods are old and outmoded, and our minds are getting a little foggy and that it is better for us to get out of the way for the new school of thought and let these visionary, professorial bureaucrats take over to try out their pet schemes which is costing the American taxpayer millions of dollars and destroying our free system of industrial enterprise and impeding the war effort on the home front.

Everything lately is a British design. I was of the opinion that we had declared our independence on July 4, 1776, but a great many people in the Government seem desirous of patterning after the British. Why is it necessary for the Office of Price Administration to put in charge, working in the background, a man like this Israel Moses Seiff who headed up the political and economic planners in England with their document "Freedom and Planning," to take charge as the chief consultant and general counsel of the Office of Price Administration and advisor to War Information? What's the matter with getting some sound American with horse sense?

Here we have one of the important personages from England acting in the background as the spearhead of a movement to regiment the people of America.

It is about time that the Congress of the United States secures action and removes from our Federal Government that element who have but one thought in mind, and that is to recast every aspect of our economic life to regiment our people into some totalitarian form of government.

They are out to crush the people who are responsible for building up this Nation of ours and this American system which is strictly an American-made product that has stood the test of 150 years of trial and experiment under changing conditions, and, my friends, let me tell you, created more wealth and distributed it more widely, wisely, and equitably than any other system in the world, making America the land of opportunity because the American system gives everybody a chance. A ladder which anyone may climb to success if he has the ability and energy and willingness and resourcefulness to use it. There are no barriers in America, unless the Government becomes one, to stop anyone who is ambitious to succeed. This American system is not blueprinted by any authorities, limitations, orders, directives, or decrees. Anyone in America can strike out in any field of effort he chooses and the reward comes to him as his efforts earn it, so my remarks today are for the preservation of a system that I am determined shall be retained.

We have all heard about planned economy. We have all heard of planned scarcity, and over the past 10 years these creators and conceivers of new ideas have been concocting more formulas than the American business system can digest, with the result that confusion, confliction, and chaos exist today, due to Government regulations, restrictions, and strangulations—a condition that has brought the farmers, the merchants, the oil producers, and the American business system to a point of utter exhaustion, and so today the people of America are lifting their voices to the Congress to eliminate that element from the various departments of our Federal Government who are sabotaging this American system—men who have built America to such a strength that we have become the envy and the leader of all the world. We accept this challenge hurled at us and we are going to get rid of them.

When our backs were up against the wall after Pearl Harbor, who did we turn to, to do a job that had to be done if we were to exist? We did not turn to the planning bureaucrats. We turned to the American industry. They took off their coats and secured unbelievable results—results that have earned for them the recognition and thanks of the people of the world. They turned out the foodstuffs, ships, tanks, guns, planes, and mechanized equipment that gave the world a new inspiration to carry on. Several months ago we were sick and disheartened, worried over what might happen. Now, today, we know we are going to win the war, and it is just a question of time, so now the social reform boys are reasserting themselves and attempting to take over the American system and operate it as they feel it should be operated.

However, we, too, are thinking for the future. And if this country of ours is to remain a democracy and not degenerate into a socialized bureaucracy we, then, must maintain at all costs the American business system that built America; and let us not be driven out by the power-drunk bureaucrats who are introducing under the guise of a wartime contribution socialistic reforms for the regimentation of our people.

These economists and visionaries have for years been teaching in schools to a lot of kiddies who, no doubt, sit mystified by the theories, charts, graphs, and plans they advance.

Now the professors are accustomed to have the pupil accept their philosophy without argument and that's that—but when he runs into a practical group of businessmen and they scorn his crackpot stuff he becomes indignant, enraged, and demands action, issues orders and directives that must be complied with. Well, thank God, this is still a free country.

He decrees that these half-baked ideas be accepted although there are no laws on the books compelling anyone to accept any of these plans and they should be rejected as these planners have overstepped their authority. However, they still insist that the American business system accept them, even though the system recognizes that it is impossible to accept them because it would destroy that which they represent and, therefore, they refuse to accept them.

So the professors by directive orders endeavor to push these measures through and in many instances have gotten away with it. However, the mandate delivered by the people on November 3, 1942, insists that the planning bureaucrats who are stifling initiative, eliminating competition, and destroying trade be no longer permitted to ride herd on the American businessman and the American people.

However, my friends, I think this past few years have been boom years for the professional bureaucrats. For years they have been playing around with books, and now a generous Government comes along and gives them the money and the opportunity they have dreamed of—but never hoped to realize—and that is to experiment with their ideas and plans and charts on 130,000,000 American guinea pigs, so they try a little of this and a little of that, and sit back and gloat and glee over the results obtained. If the results are bad and they cost the American taxpayer many millions of dollars, and they fail, they laugh it off and shrug their shoulders and say, "Oh, well, they have at least tried what we have been dreaming of for years and years and it did not work, so we will try something else."

Under this American system we have proven that the American businessman has blazed more new industrial trails, developed more new enterprise than any other system in any other country in the world. Our workers today receive a higher wage and they can buy more for their money than in any other country and under our American system the thrifty and provident have been able to build up insurance to protect them and their dependents which is larger than all the systems of the other countries altogether. This year the American people will pay $4,450,000,000 in insurance premiums. You will have to admit, my friends, that there is no system better than the one in existence here today.

Do not misunderstand me; I admit, of course, that the Government is necessary. The Government should regulate and not destroy. The Government should preserve our freedom of initiative and freedom of effort and not be harassing, haunting, and destroying with restricting regulations.

What does our Nation symbolize today? If it no longer typifies the aspirations of freedmen in this day of dictatorships, if righteous individualism, if the dynamic of in-

itiative must be suppressed by the solace of a static society, if the love of liberty must be surrendered for the security of slavery, if the will to do and the courage to dare no longer exemplifiy the spirit of American manhood and womanhood, if, in a word, American representative democracy has failed in its mission at home and abroad, then the flag must needs be lowered and the hopes of mankind for liberty surrendered.

However, my friends, such is not the case. We have been smug too long. We are just starting to fight back against that element who would have us lower the flag for regimentation of our national life. We are going to rid the Government of this group of classroom guerillas who would destroy us.

You either stand with democracy or you stand with bureaucracy, and you either are going to stand or fall, one or the other. There is not room enough in America for both. This great country has given you what you have. The American business system has opened the door of opportunity for all of us and we want that same opportunity to go over to the generation of tomorrow, the opportunity of freedom of thought, freedom of operation, the liberty to create and do things that build for a great America. We are today here as representatives of the people to protect that American system, so let us have faith in this system, which has done so much to make our country great.

Our fathers fought for this freedom—for this opportunity. We fought for it in World War No. 1. We are fighting for it today, in World War No. 2, and as our fathers passed this freedom on to us I sincerely hope that we will have the courage of our convictions to carry on this fight against this element who seek to regiment the peoples of America through some bureaucratic-controlled and operated form of government. Our compensation for our work will be the satisfaction of passing on this heritage to our boys and girls of tomorrow having played our part to protect the American way of life.

I know that the Pennsylvania oil industry has and will continue to do its share. I believe that your situation not only must be improved, but that it will be.

Some day, and I hope in the near future, this war will be over and we will be on our knees with profound thanks to the God who gave us great victories and to the American boys who paid with their lives.

To those men coming back to their homes and communities, let us on the home front guard well the rights and freedoms for which they fought. You have a duty to those who gave their lives and their all to fight for you—to keep intact these chances to engage in free and unhampered businesses and professions. Let us not lose the fight on the home front.

Our system may not be perfect but we haven't done so bad when we look at the other nations in this world of ours.

In closing I want to say that we in Congress realize the important part the great petroleum industry plays in our country both in time of war and time of peace.

No industry has made greater contributions to the prosecution of the war or the development of our national life. Better gasoline, better lubricants, and a host of new products will be the lot of our country as the result of your untiring and ceaseless efforts and, bear this in mind, made possible because of our system of free enterprise and opportunity, and in spite of what must have seemed at times discouraging, hopeless, and unintelligent governmental control.

The Pennsylvania oil industry is not only the oldest but its preservation is of vital importance to every man, woman, and child in the region. I doubt if very many of our people who unknowingly depend upon its economic structure realize that fact. Your job that lies ahead is not an easy one. But I am confident that if you will all work together, cooperate with the Congress, and retain the unity which has made you strong you will emerge better organized than ever before in your glorious history.

I want you to know that we in Congress are sympathetic and understanding and we are determined that this system of free enterprise again be given an opportunity to proceed under its own power unhampered by irresponsible, thoughtless, bureaucratic planners. So let us here tonight rededicate ourselves to the prosecution of the war, the preservation of a free and independent oil business, and the preservation of our American system of free enterprise.

Paid Newspaper Advertising in Aid of Stabilization Program and War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I had hoped to have the opportunity before the end of the session to discuss at some length the bill, S. 1073, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], authorizing and directing certain aid in the stabilization program and war effort by paid newspaper advertising with special provision that a suitable amount of this advertising be allocated to rural newspapers. I think that this is an extremely meritorious bill. I think that the newspapers of the United States have contributed greatly to the war effort by their free insertion of releases from various Government departments and of advertising in behalf of the Government's financial program. Some of the larger newspapers have largely been able to recompense themselves through the insertion of paid advertising by their own large advertisers in behalf of the various war activities. In case of many of the smaller newspapers there has been no recompense whatever and this work has been done at a very heavy financial sacrifice. Every manufacturer of munitions, every purveyor of any other kind of war supplies expects to be not only paid for what he furnishes but a reasonable profit on top of it. I see no reason why the newspapers should not equally be paid for the only thing that they have to sell—that is, their advertising space—when it is devoted to the Government's interest. It is ridiculous to say that this would be a subsidy or would lead to Government control of the press. All newspapers are treated alike, paid the ordinary rates of advertising, and could be in no sense a subsidy and in no degree whatever lead to Government control of the press.

At this late hour of the session I do not desire to detain the Senate by inserting the matter in great detail. I do wish at this time to ask the unanimous consent for the insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD of a summary of newspaper sentiment in Missouri prepared by Mr. H. R. Long, the very able manager of the Missouri Press Association, with certain articles attached thereto.

I may say, Mr. President, that this matter was called to my attention early in 1943 by Col. W. B. McGregor, editor of the Budget Gazette, Brookfield, Mo. At that time I took the matter up with Mr. Archibald MacLeish, who, at that time, was the head of the interdepartmental committee having to do with such matters.

I further ask unanimous consent that the correspondence between Col. W. B. McGregor, Mr. MacLeish, and myself be included.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI PRESS ASSOCIATION,
Columbia, Mo., May 8, 1943.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: You will not be surprised at the interest of the Missouri Press Association in the current proposals, including the bill introduced this week by Senator BANKHEAD, to provide Federal funds for the purchase of newspaper advertising space to be used by the Government in advertising the war effort. Perhaps you will be surprised, however, to learn that instead of clamoring irresponsibly in the manner typical of special interest groups, our organization seeks only to obtain fair consideration to the problem.

With that in mind, I would like to report to you the results of an opinion poll conducted among members of the Missouri Press Association in the effort to verify reports that the publishers themselves are opposed to accepting the Federal Government as an advertiser. We received from 233 newspaper publishers expressions of opinion concerning the following statement:

"The United States Government should purchase advertising space in the newspapers, both dailies and weeklies, for the purpose of informing civilians of their duties in connection with the war effort."

The answers were tabulated as follows:

Strongly approve	152
Approve	60
Undecided	3
Disapprove	11
Strongly disapprove	7

The enclosed copy of a letter from Cowgill Blair, general manager of the Joplin Globe Publishing Co., presents one of the best statements on the case that I have found. I think you may also be interested in the enclosed digest of statements from other Missouri publishers.

From these comments I have been able to glean the following points:

1. The Federal Government is using freely of newspaper advertising space, the only commodity which newspapers have for sale.

2. Newspaper publishers want no subsidy as such.

3. However, if their space is worth to the Federal Government the same rate paid by commercial advertisers, newspaper publishers feel that theirs should not be the only industry expected to serve without pay.

4. Government advertising should be placed on a business basis through commercial channels and not as a plum to be awarded as patronage.

5. The papers are few and far between that are willing to sell their policies with their advertising space.

6. That if the purchase of advertising by the Federal Government amounts to a threat to the freedom of the press, Congress instead of voting money for advertising space should forbid the departments and agencies to submit for publication in the newspapers material of any kind.

One of the interesting sidelights on this question is that the Federal Government is an old-time buyer of newspaper space and that in all probability the very first advertising campaign of truly national proportions was undertaken by the Treasury Department during the War between the States. At first the war-loan issues of that day found little favor with the public. The bond issue of 1862 was a failure until Jay Cooke, a Philadelphia banker, was called in by Salmon P. Chase, then Secretary of the Treasury, to handle the campaign. Cooke did the job successfully—by means of advertising.

In 1864 when Secretary Chase was succeeded by William P. Fessenden, bond sales had fallen off and the Government again needed money badly. Cooke was called back. This time he selected Peaslee & Co., an advertising agency operated by L. F. Shuttuck, to handle the war-loan advertising. Advertisements were placed in every known newspaper in the Union, regardless of size. Altogether war-loan advertising appeared in four or five thousand newspapers—and was paid for by the Government at the newspapers' regular rates. Fessenden had, with difficulty, sold $133,000,000 in bonds in 7 months; Cooke, and the newspapers, in less than 6 months sold $600,000,000 worth.

If the use of paid Government advertising in 1864 caused the newspapers to sell out to the bureaucracy of that day, the records fail to show it. In fact the robust, outspoken policies so characteristic of the newspapers of the reconstruction period definitely were not in keeping with the behavior to be expected of a kept press.

The Missouri Press Association already has had experience in handling successfully advertising paid for out of Government funds. For several years our office has furnished clearing house service for the Missouri State Fair, which is operated as you know by the State of Missouri. We handled State orders and State money for Democrat and Republican administrations alike to the satisfaction of the advertiser and of our members which include newspapers affiliated with both major parties. So far as I know this advertising has never been considered political patronage and so far as I know, there has been no effort to control the policies of publishers through the placing of the thousands of dollars worth of business placed in the newspapers for this account.

I am not aware of your attitude toward this problem. I am sure, however, that you would not be one to deny the newspapers just compensation for their services, provided you were convinced that this compensation in the form of paid advertising did not open the way for serious consequences. I do not think it would be fair to ask you to commit yourself to support just any measure that would appropriate money for newspaper advertising. But I do not believe it is too much to urge you to study the proposals sympathetically and to consult with the publishers of this State in the hope of arriving at a sound basis for rendering just payment for the use of their commodity. On this basis an expression of your view is solicited.

With kindest best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H. R. LONG,

Manager, Missouri Press Association, Inc.

COMMENTS FROM NEWSPAPERS

There is no reason why Government advertising should be any more of a subsidy than any other advertising. (Robert W. Van Pelt, Salem Post.)

Have urged such a program for several months, feeling it was unfair to us to have to donate so much of our space. The publishers do not have to accept the advertising. (B. L. Fishback, Perry Enterprise.)

Talk of subsidy is all bosh as far as I am concerned. (J. Boulton Settle, New Franklin News.)

Such advertising would not be subsidizing the press. I carry regular advertising for five grocers—neither of them figure they have my columns subsidized. (Ernest L. Hubbard, Seneca News-Dispatch.)

Strongly approve on same terms as other advertising is handled, but we intend to be independent. (B. J. Bless, Jr., Weston Chronicle.)

I mean pay for all official announcements only. (Corley L. Overall, Campbell Citizen.)

The Government pays for everything else, why not advertising? (W. R. Painter, Carrollton Democrat.)

The compiling of copy and making of the mats are paid for. We should not be asked to beg or operate a racket. (E. H. Shepherd, Eldon Advertiser.)

Will use all such money for 10-year bonds. (F. L. Stufflebam, Bolivar Herald.)

It would distribute cost to all taxpayers. Advertising should not be borne by publishers alone, or even by business firms. (W. A. Sloan, Bismarck Gazette.)

I am an anti-New Dealer, but a firm believer in legitimate paid advertising. (C. H. McNay, Butler Republican Press.)

Strongly approve, provided it is handled through advertising agencies. (Nelson Hill, Richmond News.)

Strongly approve, if handled through agency plan, like Navy campaign. (R. E. Swain, Kirksville Daily Express.)

Approve, if it is done on a business basis and no suggestion of subsidy. (W. J. Sewall, Carthage Press.)

Approve, providing the advertising is purchased on basis of merit rather than political influence. (Frank W. Rucker, Independence Examiner.)

Approve, if they buy other advertising media. (Morton E. Holman, Maitland Herald.)

Approve, as long as it is strictly on a business basis. (T. Ballard Watters, Marshfield Mail.)

Approve only that it should be straight advertising just as other advertising, with no strings attached. (Meredith Garton, Pierce City Leader-Journal.)

Approve, if other advertising media is paid for. (Morton E. Holman, Skidmore News.)

Approve definite advertising program, but not a subsidy. (Marvin W. Pace, Willow Springs News.)

I don't want any subsidy, but I think the Government should pay for what is advertising, in war or peace. (Lewis W. Roop, DeSoto Republican.)

If the Government is seeking an advertising campaign, expecting full value received, I believed the press can come as near filling the bill as would be possible. On the other hand, if such a program is expected to influence the editorial policy of the press, I think it ill-advised. (J. E. Curry, Douglas County Herald, Ava.)

The Government should promote through legitimate advertising channels the same as any business. It isn't fair to the rural press to expect them to carry the copy gratis or to sell co-op advertising continually to merchants and businessmen. The present bond drive is an example * * * page after page is being sent with almost a "must" to run and without compensation except for the amount merchants contribute. The original mats were not made gratis, the copy writers, the lay-out men, and the compositors were compensated * * * everything was provided for and paid for except the actual publishing cost.

General public information should be carried as news when it is news.

Every publisher in Missouri is contributing time and effort to almost every Government need in the war * * * he can't keep on and give his product away, too. (Harry E. Booth, Lexington Advertiser-News.)

If the Progress could be bought by some Government advertising, in view of the hundreds of columns I have given the Government in scores of ways, I would have to be paid a thunder of a lot to be within a mile of evening the account. (C. L. Hobart, the Holden Progress.)

We do not understand just how paying for part of this advertising would subjugate a paper, when it is already giving until it not only hurts, but almost puts a large number out of business. (E. T. Hodges, the Linneous Bulletin.)

It would please the present antinewspaper administration to get its hands on newspapers. (John H. Wolpers, Daily American Republic, Poplar Bluff.)

JOPLIN GLOBE PUBLISHING CO.,
April 24, 1943.

Mr. H. R. LONG,
Missouri Press Association,
Columbia, Mo.

DEAR MR. LONG: I am enclosing ballot on the purchase of Government advertising, in which I expressed approval of the proposition.

Any advertising received and published for the Government would be received and published by us the same as advertising from any other client. It would not involve the barter of our soul or have the slightest influence on our policy. Any newspaper that could accept Government advertising on this premise I think would be wholly warranted in so doing, but any paper, the publisher of which felt that the purchase of space by the Government was a subsidy or that the acceptance of such advertising implied the acceptance of Government policies of which he otherwise would not approve, certainly should not sell space to the Government.

In the scrap drive and recent bond drive, the Government could use space to advantage. The newspapers have and will continue to donate millions of inches of free space to Government enterprises. The Government itself has sent out thousands of inches of advertising to the newspapers to sell to commercial sponsors. In this way they are rather like the Medical Association—they want the space and need the publicity, but don't want to pay for it. I can see no reason why the Government should expect the newspapers to donate advertising space any more than they should expect to donate Government bonds to the newspapers. The papers pay their taxes, purchase their quota of bonds, and conduct themselves as any other citizen, and, in addition, give of their news space as any private citizen gives of their leisure time for the welfare of his country.

I think the advertising space in newspapers should be purchased by the Government only for specific projects and that the hazard in Government advertising would be that a political oligarchy would pervert the privilege of spending Government money into propaganda for its own perpetuation. If decency in Government is not entirely obsolete, this, of course, would not occur.

With most cordial personal regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

COWGILL BLAIR,
General Manager, Joplin
Globe Publishing Co.

THE BUDGET-GAZETTE PUBLISHING CO.,
Brookfield, Mo., February 9, 1942.

Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I am writing you in the interest of the country press of Mis-

souri, and I hope that you will give this your usual close attention.

During the middle of last year, for 2 months, the Navy had an advertising campaign in all the papers of this section of the country, and a personal letter from Secretary Knox to each of the newspapers following that campaign disclosed that thousands of recruits were obtained all over the country as a result of that advertising campaign, which put the Navy in a much better position to meet the present crisis.

The newspapers of Missouri are daily receiving tons of propaganda from the different Government agencies requesting that we run this matter free of charge, which we have done as far as possible. We all want to do our part to help win the war, but since the order has been made to discontinue the manufacturing of automobiles, and the rationing of automobile tires, it has practically ruined the automobile and tire business of the country. Hence we are receiving no national ads, and the local merchants who deal in automobiles, tires, etc., have nothing to advertise, so you can see how this has hurt our business. If conditions continue as they have been during the past month, there will be many newspapers throughout the country that will have to fold up, and others will have to reduce their size, and hence will not have the space to give to this free advertising that is sent to us now each day.

There have been some rumors that possibly the Government would engage in some form of advertising throughout the country, and particularly in the rural newspapers, relative to arousing the people as to actual conditions existing at this time, but so far nothing has come of it.

I am calling your attention to this matter, particularly in the interest of the rural newspapers, who, I think, have been the hardest hit.

I believe you are in a position to take this matter up before the proper authorities, and see if we cannot have some relief in the way of paid advertising from the Government, as somewhat of a remuneration for the thousands of columns of free space that we are giving for the cause at this time.

Sending kindest regards and best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

W. B. McGREGOR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 14, 1942.*

Col. WILLIAM B. McGREGOR,
Brookfield, Mo.

DEAR BILL: Since writing you I have talked with Lowell Mellett, one of the President's executive assistants who is also director of the Office of Government Records. He expressed great sympathy with the matter I presented to him and promised to take it up in official sources but advised me that it was properly within the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Facts and Figures, headed by Mr. Archibald MacLeish who is also chairman of the Committee on War Information. I have taken the matter up with Mr. MacLeish and discussed it with him fully. MacLeish tells me that there has been a prejudice against newspaper advertising by the Government growing out of discussions which took place on that subject during the last war when the then Secretary of Treasury McAdoo very violently opposed any advertising by the Government on the ground, first, that if the program was once entered upon, it would be necessary to advertise in every newspaper whether the newspaper was good, bad, or indifferent, or effective or ineffective; second, that it would cost a great deal of money; and third, that it would subject the Government to the charge that it was undertaking to subsidize the press and thereby control it. I suggested to MacLeish that the first objection negatived the last one since the advertising was inserted in all the papers the element of favoritism would be lacking. In any event, MacLeish expressed himself as being sympathetic to the proposal and promised to take the matter up at the inner Cabinet committee meeting on Monday. I read him your letter, stating that it was typical of several other letters which I had received on the subject but perhaps more forceful and cogent than any of them. He seemed impressed by the argument in it and asked me to give it to him to take with him to the inner Cabinet committee meeting, which I did.

I will keep in touch with this matter and do what I can in that respect. In the meantime, I have also discussed the matter with Senator MURRAY, who is chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and intend to take the matter up also with Congressman PATMAN, who is chairman of the same committee in the House. If it turns out nothing can be done through the executive angle, I will see if anything can be done by legislation. You may be sure I am very much interested in the matter and think it is an extremely meritorious and appealing case.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

BENNETT CHAMP CLARK.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 14, 1942.*

Hon. ARCHIBALD MACLEISH,
Office of Facts and Figures,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MACLEISH: Pursuant to our conversation this morning, I am enclosing herewith letter addressed to me by Mr. W. B. McGregor, publisher of the Brookfield (Mo.) Budget Gazette.

This letter, as you will see, graphically and forcefully sets forth the plight of many rural newspapers in Missouri and doubtless throughout the United States. This situation, of course, has been caused by the abnormal conditions due to the war. As a result of these conditions, however, many rural newspapers will be forced to go out of existence or to so reduce their size that they will be unable to render the service which they have heretofore been rendering gratis to the Government in its war effort.

It seems to me that this is a serious situation which merits the most careful attention. The rural press has nearly always had more or less a struggle for existence. I believe that they represent a vital force which should not be permitted to pass out of existence or be circumscribed in its usefulness.

I am sending you Mr. McGregor's letter rather than burden you with others because Mr. McGregor's letter is typical and to the point.

I appreciate your promise of consideration in this matter.

Yours very sincerely,

BENNETT CHAMP CLARK.

OFFICE OF FACTS AND FIGURES,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1942.

The Honorable BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Mr. MacLeish has read with interest—and I might add with sympathetic interest—your letter of February 14 and the letter of February 9 which Mr. W. B. McGregor addressed to you concerning the plight of the small country newspapers.

The response of the country press to the Government's appeal for free space has been admirably patriotic. The country weekly and the metropolitan daily are both doing their part in getting across to the public information concerning the Government's war effort. County press and city press alike are suffering greatly as the result of curtailed advertising. Since the average country paper runs on a slimmer margin of profit, the country press is doubtless harder hit than its bigger urban colleague.

Because of the present situation, Mr. MacLeish has directed this office to make a study of various proposals which have been made that the Government should embark on a newspaper advertising campaign. The study is still in process, and what its result will be we do not yet know. Whatever the result, word of it will be conveyed to the press committee which was recently established to work with the Office of Facts and Figures. This press committee is composed of the presidents and executive directors of the trade associations representing both the daily and weekly press and covering in membership virtually all of the country's newspapers.

Mr. MacLeish wishes me to tell you how much he appreciated your interest in this matter.

I enclose a copy of this letter in case you should care to forward it to Mr. McGregor. I hope that it will be all right for us to keep Mr. McGregor's letter so that it may be given consideration in the study being made.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HERRICK,
Acting Chief, Press Division.

The Farming Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1943

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties in the present acute situation as to the national food supply is that too few people are acquainted with agricultural conditions, particularly in the Middle West, whence comes the greater portion of the food supply. Had those conditions received proper consideration earlier, production might have been aided and expanded. Because that consideration was not granted, there is less production and less food.

An article by Eugene M. Poirot, of Golden City, Mo., was published in a bulletin of the New York Chamber of Commerce. It was written in support of the Farm Security Administration. Printed also in booklet form, it has been widely circulated, a copy having been sent by the Chamber of Commerce of Springfield, Mo., to every chamber of commerce in the country.

Coming from a practical farmer, it embraces information which should be known by every citizen.

Mr. Eugene M. Poirot, Golden City, Mo., the author of the article, a dirt farmer, lives on his 1,700-acre farm, gets his mail by rural delivery, and talks over a rural party-line telephone. He is also having labor and machinery troubles, as are other large operators. In 1942 he had a farm herd of 440 cattle, 12 sows, and produced 600 turkeys. On another farm in Arkansas he produced 10,000 bushels of rice. He has been a Farm Bureau member for 20 years. Although he does much of the actual farm work

himself, he finds time to participate in many activities away from his farm.

He is a member of the Governor's industrial committee, State land-use planning committee, on the State F. S. A. advisory committee, a member of the National Chemurgic Council—presented a paper at the national meeting in 1941 that received wide circulation. He is a charter member of the State chemurgic commission. He has been recognized in Missouri as a master farmer. In 1942 he received one of four awards made by the Missouri Conservation Commission as master conservationist. Cooperates with State college of agriculture by supplying data on soil and crop experiments conducted on his farm.

The article follows:

South Missouri is a farming section, yet the Springfield Chamber of Commerce prior to September 1942 seemingly had given little thought to the operation and objectives of the Farm Security Administration. The thought occurred to me that if a chamber of commerce located right in the middle of farming activities hadn't taken the time to learn about a governmental function that is so vital to the agricultural production of low-income farmers it is reasonable to assume that your body, located in the heart of our greatest city, probably is totally unaware of their activities.

The Farm Security Administration, thought of primarily as a relief organization by some people for a certain group of farmers, is not a money waster but a money maker for the Nation, and is a pleasant shock absorber for some of the impacts of war. More than $185,500,000 in actual, appraisable food producing, not capital has been added to the national economy directly by its supervision of one-half million farm families who were broke and unproductive a few years ago. This $185,500,000 is not gold or Government bonds; it is dairy cows, beef, chickens, hogs, sheep, and farm equipment. It and the products resulting from its use are those things that people eat and wear. All the money and all the power of Government could not bring into being one of those animals even 1 day sooner than nature has decreed. This is important at a time when we need more food production at once, because it takes a year of care to make a calf and it takes another 2 years before this calf will be giving milk as a cow. The important fact is, however, that they are here now when we need them badly. They were made out of the inorganic dirt of American fields by very poor farmers and their families under the supervision and with the credit extended by the Farm Security Administration.

Were it not for the Farm Security Administration families, who represent only 7.6 percent of all the farmers, last year's increase in milk production would have been 36 percent short, last year's increase in pork production would have been short by 9 percent, last year's increase in eggs, chickens, and peanuts would have been short by 10 percent, and last year's increase in beef production would have been short by 7 percent. These should be significant items in the national economy of a food-rationed people who probably for the first time in their lives realize that all the money they have cannot buy food unless someone has first produced it out of the dirt that lies soft and mellow in American fields awaiting the seed and the rain and the skill of American farmers.

To talk about the economy of saving dollars by abolishing an agency, that makes this kind of contribution to food production while the fires of war consume the treasures of liberty that man has lived a thousand years to create, is a dangerous pastime. This pastime can only be indulged by those who, still well fed, live in the illusion that a nation is only strong if its budget is balanced and it has most of the world's gold buried in its bosom. Their awakening would perhaps come with the burning timbers of liberty's structure falling in a tangled mass about them, but that would again be too late. It is the realist who has long recognized that the strength of a nation runs parallel to the diligence with which it maintains its agriculture and the welfare of its people.

The Farm Security Administration should not need to be justified on the basis of its dollar-and-cents return. Its value in placing a sound economic and social base under that class of low-income, inefficient, underproducing farmers of which there are more than 3,000,000 out of a total of 6,000,000 farmers should cause the public to demand an extension of its duties and services to serve many more than the one-half million it now serves, so as to insure an even greater supply of food than is now being produced. However, it is perhaps significant to the economy-minded taxpayers that the Farm Security Administration borrowers who applied for credit that in the past had been denied them from regular channels, both private and public, have already paid back to the Federal Government 90 percent of the principal of their loans that have become due. It is significant that in my State the Farm Security Administration has loaned, as of December 31, 1942, $27,345,668, of which $15,071,288 principal has matured. Total collections, interest and principal are $16,044,363. Other States will have similar records. It should also be significant to your chamber of commerce and the business interests it represents that these half million farm families have already increased their net worth by 43 percent, which is reflected in added purchasing power through the Nation and will be increased in greater proportion after the war. Remember, the families were broke. Many of them were sick. Many of them had large families, and they were underemployed, underproductive, and undernourished. They were either on, or at the door of direct relief. Their minds and the minds of their children were ready to absorb any of the political "isms" that anyone wanted to talk about. The only "ism" they were questioning was the American "ism" with which they thought they had become familiar. Because of the large families, this group is contributing many sons to protect our Americanism. Many Farm Security Administration families have from 3 to 5 members in the service and are proud of it.

These families and the farms they operate are now going units of production, self-supporting and grateful for the chance they have had. They have increased not only their net worth 43 percent, but also their cash income by 70 percent. They have increased their net family income by 60 percent. They have increased their production for home use by 101 percent. In 1942 they produced and processed on the average for home use 297 quarts of fruits and vegetables, 488 pounds of meat, and 472 gallons of milk with which to feed their families each year. This is an increase of 114 percent over that which they had before, and it is a direct result of the work of the Farm Security Administration, because they insist that a family must first be able to live at home on the foods grown and processed and of the kinds that will make strong bodies and healthy men and women. Significant at this time is the additional fact that this increased degree of self-sufficiency adds that much more in processed food to the general food supply than would have otherwise been available.

I could go on with a string of tables and figures but since they are available at almost any county Farm Security Administration office and in any case in the State office, I will not try to cover all of them here.

I am just an American farmer, the son of a Frenchman who loved the American soil and adopted it as his native land. I love it, too, because it has been good to me and to the nation of my birth. I would have the feeling that I had failed my children and my America if I did not, in my small way, refer to some of the signs that point to a national decay that begins at the grass roots of American fields.

It is dangerous to exploit our American soils because food comes from there. We have already passed the point of diminishing returns in crop yields for much of our soil. The trained minds of skilled and observing men are piling up facts relating to animal and human nutritional diseases that have their beginning in lowering mineral level of our soil. Though we are for the time being producing more, we will have less soil minerals to draw from the next time.

Significantly supporting this thought, according to the 1940 census, is the fact that out of more than 6,000,000 farmers, 3,421,000 or 64 percent live on land that gives them an annual income of less than $800 per year. This is a very small part of the national agricultural income, from a very large part of the land. It suggests an exploitation of land and people that Americans some day may no be able to pay in dollars, but will be paying in terms of the health and lives of their children. Are we perhaps starting to pay now with food rationing?

I do not believe anyone who understands agricultural production, and who is familiar with the degeneration of our soils and accompanying human distress, would be willing to allow its continuation, and allow the agriculture it now supports to drift down the channel of bare economic survival, until in the end it arrives at the level at which it becomes a public burden. Would it not be far better if the Farm Security Administration that has proven its capacity to take the lowest of this group and make substantial producers out of them would be permitted to extend its functions to include many more of them?

I do not mean to leave the impression that we can hope to get enough production out of these low-income farmers and their farms to supply the food production we need now. That job in its staggering immensity, must be done by all farmers and not just the remaining 36 percent who have been carrying the major part of the production load, and who unfortunately have been placed under almost unsurmountable handicaps in the loss of labor and machinery. The fact remains however, that we are not in a position to take chances with so vital a thing as food production so that we can toy with the idea of cutting down Federal expenditures that will interfere with it. This group of 3,421,000 farmers is a lot of people and the increase from each of them would count up as a significant total. If estimates are at all accurate, this group loses 200,000,000 man days labor per year. If this lost manpower were properly applied and directed on good land, it could produce annually 18,000,000 tons of pork, or 4,000,000,000 gallons of milk, or 360,000,000 dozen eggs.

There is no agency in the field with either the authority or the experience that could attempt to do this, other than the Farm Security Administration. It is, however, limited in measure by available funds and personnel. Your chamber of commerce and the various other chambers of commerce could give Farm Security Administration support that would pay dividends in terms of food now, and increased wealth and stability after the war resulting from the utilization of this wasted manpower and improperly used land.

Some day the war will end and our men who have fought well will return. Many of them who have been farmers will want to return to a farm somewhere. Many who because of their injuries, will be unable to find their place in industry. Many of them would

perhaps find comfort and happiness on a small farm somewhere, and, with the guidance and credit available through the Farm Security Administration, would with their families make a living.

In appraising the value of an agency we often forget some of those intangible things that we cannot put down in dollars and cents, the things that keep a man fighting after he is licked. I have known farmers who, with a leaky roof over their heads and a broken floor under their feet, would, in one last gesture of hope for a crop, scoop into the balance all that they possessed, along with a year of their life—well seasoned with the suffering of their threadbare, undernourished family—and then wait for a year to see if they had won or lost. The bitter resentment that must come to a man who in desperation had tried so hard and lost breeds immeasurable hatred of something or someone that he may believe has caused it all. If the facts could be tabulated we would probably find that the Farm Security Administration has to its eternal credit the prevention of this in many of its 500,000 families.

Many of us had better investigate those things we oppose. In my opinion the Farm Security Administration has justified its existence in a national economy by creating through its supervision more than $185,500,000 in new usable agricultural wealth. If this amount with the productive capacity it represents were to be credited to its administrative costs they would appear small. It further justifies its existence in being in a position to further increase the production of food and war crops so badly needed. It has shown that through its supervision low-income farmers can become good credit risks, and that they may again represent significant buying power for the products of industry. The morale it builds is not measurable, but it is perhaps of the kind that makes American soldiers the best in the world. It is in a position to be of important service to these soldiers when they return from the battlefields of the world to try again to find the peace and comfort in a land that is their home.

Agricultural Credit—A Factual Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my statement in answer to an article appearing in the Staple Cotton Review by A. H. Stone, editor thereof, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1943. The Staple Cotton Review is the official organ of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association. Mr. Stone is vice president of the association, a director of the Staple Cotton Discount Corporation, financing affiliate of the association, and a director of the farm credit administration of New Orleans.

The statement follows:

This article quotes at length from the December 1942 statement of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to show that it had disbursed $3,365,000,000 of "socialized commercial credit" to banks in the form of loans and capital subscriptions during the depression. Mr. Stone committed the error of overlooking the fact that these highly recoverable funds were not advanced to assist banks but to meet the demands of depositors in a time of general and world-wide economic collapse, most, if not all of whom, wanted their deposits at once and in cash.

These emergency advances cannot be compared to the long-continued and expanding practice of the Department of Agriculture in extending credit on terms made possible only by the subsidy contributions of the Government.

Mr. Stone could have pointed out in his 10,000-word article that one-third, or $1,057,000,000, of the $3,365,000,000 of what he calls socialized commercial credit extended to the banks in the form of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans and capital subscriptions were advanced in order that depositors in institutions closed by public panic could get their funds more quickly. He could have added that the remaining interests of the stockholders of such banks were assigned to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as collateral and that such stockholders were obliged to pay assessments on their stock under the double liability provisions of the law, which payments went toward the reduction of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation obligations.

Mr. Stone could also have pointed out that another third, or $1,170,000,000, was reflected in preferred stock or capital notes which the banks were required to sell to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to protect depositors and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Far from being a form of socialized credit sought by the banks for their own benefit, these preferred-stock and capital-note transactions were dictated by Government officials. Nor were they free grants of credit but advances on which interest had to be paid. This is far different from the free capital put by the Government into the Production Credit System to increase its earnings but on which no interest is paid.

Mr. Stone could also have pointed out that of the remaining one-third, namely, $1,138,000,000, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans made to going or operating banks all but $51,319,000 has been repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by the end of 1942. Practically all of these advances were for the purpose of permitting unrestricted deposit withdrawals and to preserve essential banking services in the communities affected.

These Reconstruction Finance Corporation advances were emergency advances to be liquidated. They are not recurring loans nor are they a form of lending that is being renewed.

In contrast with them are Federal funds advanced to farmers, aggregating for the period under discussion more than $18,000,000,000. Also, in contrast, many of these expenditures made through numerous Federal agencies are recurring and steadily increasing.

This figure of $18,000,000,000 demonstrates the fallacy of the argument advanced by Mr. Stone, who declared that:

"It is beyond our powers of comprehension and analysis to understand why the extension of billions of dollars of Government credit to banks, trust companies, railroads, insurance companies, general utilities, etc., is said to mark the high tide of business statesmanship, while the extension to agriculture, by this same Government, of similar credit, but in far less volume, is characterized as the low-water mark of socialistic, governmental paternalism."

The implication thus made that Government credit extended to banks, insurance companies, railroads, etc., was far greater than that extended to farmers is simply contrary to the facts. Not only has the Federal Government disbursed to agriculture more than six times what it has advanced to banks, insurance companies, and railroads, but billions of dollars have been given from the Public Treasury for farm relief. On the other hand, banks have not received grants, benefit payments, or other types of subsidy.

It is difficult to believe that the financial aids to agriculture have been so vast until the figures are marshaled in one place. When they are gotten together the arguments of Mr. Stone fall like a house of cards. The erroneous character of Mr. Stone's statements concerning the assistance given to banks in relation to the assistance given to agriculture is demonstrated in detail by the following statistics:

Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans

Banks	$3,364,713,703.07
Insurance companies	137,668,209.81
Railroads	1,035,626,714.70
Total	4,538,008,627.58

A complete list of all financial aids to agriculture during recent years could be compiled only after intensive study, but would include the following:

(a) Farm Security Administration disbursements to Dec. 31, 1942:	
Rehabilitation loans	$713,000,000
Tenant purchase loans	172,000,000
Grants	151,000,000
Other expenditures	384,000,000
Total	1,420,000,000
(b) Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund loans July 1929 to Dec. 31, 1942	1,221,000,000
(NOTE.—Includes Farm Board advances.)	
(c) Emergency crop and feed loans:	
1932–33 crop production	122,000,000
1934–35 crop production and harvesting	38,000,000
1934–35 drought loans	72,000,000
1935–36 crop production and harvesting	57,000,000
1935–37 emergency crop loans	17,000,000
1937–39 crop production and harvesting	65,000,000
1940 crop production and harvesting	20,000,000
1941 crop production and harvesting	18,000,000
1942 crop production and harvesting	20,000,000
Total	429,000,000
(d) Commodity Credit Corporation loans to support farm prices to end of 1939 (excludes four billions disbursed since defense program inaugurated)	1,454,000,000
(e) Regular Farm Credit Association agencies supervised by Farm Credit Association, loans from May 1933 to end of 1938:	
Federal land banks	1,343,000,000
Land-bank commissioner	967,000,000
Production Credit Associations	1,121,000,000
Intermediate credit banks (excluding loans to other Farm Credit Association agencies)	776,000,000
Banks for cooperatives	407,000,000
Total	4,614,000,000

(NOTE.—Loans for limited period only are included in above tabulation to give rough approximation of amounts loaned under Federal auspices for relief of distress. While some of the above loans were not made for this purpose

most of the loans made in 1931 and 1932, not included above, were to relieve farm distress.)	
(f) Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations total loans made, excluding renewals from organizations to Dec. 31, 1942	$343,000,000
(g) Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to agricultural financing institutions	1,451,000,000
(NOTE.—Some duplication with loans of agencies shown above.)	
(h) Rural Electrification Administration loans to June 30, 1942	354,000,000
(i) Payments to Federal land banks and Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, reductions in interest rates on farm mortgages (estimated to June 30, 1943)	301,000,000
(j) Subsidies to encourage exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities (estimated to June 30, 1943)	868,000,000
(k) Removal of surplus cattle and dairy products (act of May 1934)	116,000,000
(l) For drought relief expenditures in 1935	83,000,000
(m) Some of the payments for benefit of agriculture, fiscal years 1934–43:	
Agricultural Conservation program	3,097,000,000
Parity payments	815,000,000
Agricultural Adjustment Administration of 1933, etc	1,521,000,000
Sugar Act	250,000,000
Crop Insurance	54,000,000
Soil erosion control program	157,000,000
Land utilization program	22,000,000
Agricultural Adjustment Administration administrative expenses	16,000,000
Cotton price adjustment payments	166,000,000
Total	6,098,000,000
Grand total	18,752,000,000

The grand total of this partial list of disbursements for the relief of farm distress is $18,752,000,000. Much of it will not be paid back because it was given, not loaned, to rehabilitate a basic industry. In the light of these facts, however, it is quite unfair for Mr. Stone to picture the banks as receiving the lion's share of financial relief.

GIVES FALSE IMPRESSIONS OF PRODUCTION CREDIT SYSTEM

After making an invidious comparison between the amount of Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans to banks and the amount of interest-free Government capital in the production credit system (which he calls credit advanced, while failing to point out that it bears no interest), Mr. Stone submits numerous statistics on the production credit associations in the district comprising the three States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and derives the conclusion that no banking organization in the country could have made an equivalent showing during the past 9 years.

Mr. Stone does not tell that the 26 production credit associations in the 3 States mentioned enjoy the use of $6,125,000 of capital, and that the Production Credit Corporation of New Orleans enjoys the use of $2,375,000 of capital, or a total of $8,500,000 furnished them without cost out of the Public Treasury.

He boasts that on total loans of $174,000,000 made by these 26 production credit associations since 1934 only $118,000 has been lost. The official report, however, shows that the losses were not $118,000 but $143,000.

Mr. Stone does not tell that if the 26 production credit associations in the 3 States mentioned had had to pay a normal market rate of interest on the capital funds they now get free their red figures would have been increased by $229,500.

It should be remembered that the amount of operating expenses in relation to volume of loans and in relation to amount of service rendered to the community is of much more significance in appraising the merits of production credit associations and banks than is the amount of principal lost on loans. Moreover, no figures are given as to amount of interest earned but not collected, or the amount of interest which should have been charged in order to put these associations on a self-supporting basis, but which was not charged because of the Federal subsidy. These losses of interest are in one sense losses just as much as is the uncollected principal of a worthless loan.

It would appear that the object of Mr. Stone's article is the promotion of a conflict between the farmers and the bankers by creating the impression that organized banking is endeavoring to destroy the cooperative credit institutions of farmers. Whatever may be the opinion of Mr. Stone, there is on record a statement on this question in which the American Bankers Association sets forth the position of organized banking with respect to cooperative credit enterprises and subsidized credit institutions. In a statement promulgated last January by the American Bankers Association, W. L. Hemingway, president of the association, said:

"1. We recognize the rights of farmers or any other group to establish, operate, and maintain cooperative credit enterprises. We believe, however, that such institutions should be operated on a self-supporting basis and that income should be adequate to cover the costs of operation, including credit losses. Continuing losses of any such institutions should not be subsidized out of the Federal Treasury.

"2. The American Bankers Association believes that the agencies of the Farm Credit Administration should be farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative credit institutions, and in this connection it will continue to support the farm organizations in their effort to protect this farmer-ownership and conrol and to provide for the ultimate elimination of Government subsidy.

"3. We believe that the present subsidies enjoyed by the production credit associations in the form of Government capital should be returned to the United States Treasury as soon as practicable."

Food and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement by Mr. Frank E. Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y., on the subjects of food and inflation. Mr. Gannett is the publisher of 21 daily newspapers in 4 States. His observations on national issues are always timely and of interest:

America today faces two most important problems—food and inflation. These problems are interwoven. They affect the lives of every man, woman, and child. They affect the prosecution of the war, the making of peace, and perhaps the future of the whole world.

One of the excuses for the mishandling of our food problem has been the professed fear of inflation. President Roosevelt has laid great stress on the danger of inflation and thus has tried to justify the position he has taken in fixing the prices of food.

However, judging from the impartial findings of two widely recognized economists of the economics department of the College of Agriculture at Cornell University, F. A. Harper and W. M. Curtiss, President Roosevelt, in the policy that he has been following or failed to follow, has not checked inflation. His recent statements and recent moves make students of these problems wonder whether he fully understands either of these great questions. Or is he merely playing 1944 politics by trying to blame others for the increase in the cost of living? The administration, in any event, has not met the critical situations that have developed and, by that failure, our country is being led straight toward the greatest disaster in its history.

First, in regard to food, President Roosevelt was warned a year ago that there would be an alarming shortage because of the bungling and mismanagement of the bureaucrats and because of the lack of farm machinery and lack of farm labor.

Food is as essential as planes, tanks, or guns in waging a war, but the President not only did nothing to improve the situation, but steps that he favored made the situation worse. His policies have discouraged and stifled production when it should have been encouraged; driven food out of normal channels into black markets; created shortages; raised prices; brought us face to face with disorganization.

Only a few months ahead lies the threat of real hunger, insufficient milk for the children in our cities, and difficulty in supplying sufficient food for our fighting forces, our allies, and our own people.

The appointment of Chester Davis as Food Administrator gave hope for improvement. Immediately, however, there was interference with his work. He was stripped of authority and so discouraged by noncooperation that he resigned. Then the President, in his unfair, ill-tempered letter accepting the resignation, wrote Mr. Davis: "It would be unfair to you to insist that you remain when you feel that, all things considered, you cannot wholeheartedly support a program to hold down the cost of living."

Mr. Roosevelt's statement was a gross, demagogic misrepresentation. Mr. Davis was never against holding down the cost of living. He resigned because he knew that the President insisted upon policies which only would increase the cost of living. Without consulting Mr. Davis, the President embarked on a subsidy scheme which, unless it be rescinded by an awakened Congress, may ultimately cost the Nation untold billions of dollars while actually contributing to the shortage of food and intensifying the inflation.

Subsidies will not give us one pound more of food this year, and they will discourage production next year. Any roll-back of prices eventually will cost the consumer, in taxes, probably two or three times the immediate apparent saving.

If President Roosevelt's policy of a 5-percent roll-back on prices of food had any merit, then a roll-back of 15 percent, 25 percent, or 75 percent would have even more merit. Once started, where will the roll-backs stop? Will they be increased again

and again until the Government supplies all of us—rich and poor alike—with food at the expense of the taxpayer?

Subsidies will destroy our price system, the most effective mechanism for distribution ever devised. Every business and group affected by subsidies could become dependent upon the favor of Government for handouts. Carried far, this policy would destroy our private enterprise system and our constitutional form of government. It would open the door for a dictator who could keep himself in power by the slightly amended formula of "tax and tax, subsidize and subsidize, elect and elect," as did Caesar doling out bread to the Romans.

Subsidies will feed inflation, for although they might seem to the unthinking to lessen the cost of food to the consumer, they actually will increase its cost. The additional money left in circulation by these deceptive lower food prices to consumers made possible through subsidies will be used to bid up the prices of other goods.

The President talks about inflation but ignores the fact that inflation is already occurring. Prices have risen nearly one-third in 2 years, and even greater danger lies directly ahead. In other words, our dollar of 2 years ago, today is worth only 75 cents. Inflation is not only on our doorstep, it is already in our house.

In wartime it seems impossible to prevent some inflation. It never has been done and apparently never will be done. Inflation, however, must be curbed as far as possible. What is alarming is the fact that the Roosevelt administration so far has failed to put any effective brakes on inflation.

Some inflation in wartime is inevitable because a large percentage of our production capacity is turned to the making of war material. The amount of production for civilian uses thus is cut down enormously.

While our supply of civilian goods thus is reduced, the purchasing power of the public is increased through high employment and good wages, with the result that the public has more buying power. It begins to bid more and more for the decreased supply of the many things needed and desired. Then up go prices.

Inflation, unchecked, leads to ruination. After the First World War the wild inflation that struck Germany was in many respects more devastating than the war itself. The value of the mark was so depressed that values of ordinary things, in terms of marks, rose to billions and trillions. For instance, at one time it required a million marks to buy a dozen eggs. A great catastrophe and complete national bankruptcy resulted.

There are many sound measures that can be adopted to check inflation, but according to the Cornell economists, price fixing and rationing will not fully accomplish their purpose. The trouble is in people's pocketbooks, not in their minds. As a group, people spend essentially all their incomes. Therefore control of prices here and there simply pushes inflation in other directions. As a result, the average cost of commodities continues to rise. The cost of living goes up.

Control of prices of necessities, on the other hand, discourages their production. With less of any one thing produced, the relative demand for it increases, higher prices are offered, thus promoting inflationary forces. On the other hand, increased production tends to check an increase in prices.

In dealing with inflation there are two strong opposing forces. Everyone wants higher wages and salaries. Everyone, at the same time, wants lower prices. We simply cannot have higher wages and at the same time have lower prices. You can't eat your cake and have it, too.

After a price rise, a dollar of anyone's income will buy fewer goods than before the rise. It is natural for people to regret this loss of purchasing power of their dollars as this means they cannot buy as many things as they previously thought they could buy. They fail to realize clearly that their hopes and expectations could not have materialized. Failing to realize this, or perhaps for purely selfish reasons, they demand more dollars—that is, higher wage rates and higher prices to compensate them for the loss in buying power of every dollar. If this demand is granted to them, then the spiral of inflation is started.

One of the principal reasons why inflation has already gone so far is due to President Roosevelt's policy of trying to win the good will and votes of misguided organized labor. Under the Little Steel formula increases were made again and again in wages. Only when John L. Lewis made demands for the miners was there any real resistance. This came too late. Time and a half or double time for overtime further increased the income of labor.

Here are reliable figures on what already has happened: Between 1939 and 1942 there has been an increase in our national income of $42,000,000,000. Of this, only 14 percent went to agriculture, while 86 percent went to nonagricultural sources—that is, to industry. Yet we hear repeatedly the false assertion that rising farm prices, not increased wages, have caused the rise in the cost of living. That is absurd.

The number of employed persons since January 1941 has increased 40 percent, rates of hourly pay are up 35 percent, and hours worked per week have risen 15 percent. The combined effect on total pay rolls has been to increase them 117 percent. There is the principal cause of inflation.

It may not be good politics to oppose wage increases, but the facts are that this big increase in wages is responsible for the rising cost of living, which kicks back at the wage earner.

President Roosevelt, in his vitriolic veto message, admitted that wage increases do raise prices. He told the Congress and the country:

"Raising wage rates raises the cost of production, both of war goods and of the goods whose prices make up the cost of living. A 10 percent over-all increase in wages would cause an increase of not less than 4½ percent in the general level of prices; would increase our annual war cost approximately $4,500,000,000; would, moreover, increase the cost of living by at least 4½ percent and would cost consumers at least $4,000,000,000 a year."

But under Mr. Roosevelt's labor policy, since 1941 there has been already, according to statistics, a 35-percent increase in hourly wage rates. Therefore, according to his own estimate of what a 10-percent increase in wages would cost, this 35-percent increase that has taken place is causing an annual increase of $15,750,000,000 in the cost of the war, and a proportionate increase in the cost of living.

You, and everyone else, of course, have noticed an increase in living costs. The blame for this rests on Mr. Roosevelt. He should not try to blame anyone else for the inflation that is under way. It has been caused by his policy of playing for the support of professional union organizers.

Today every workingman, as well as everyone else, in almost everything purchased, is paying his share of the cost of this staggering burden.

It is rather late for Mr. Roosevelt to discover that the policies he has been pursuing, of coddling organized labor leaders, have had the effect of pouring gasoline on inflation fuel. It is rather late to call for the fire department.

On Mr. Roosevelt rests the responsibility for misleading uninformed people. We now know that it is wrong—

1. To believe that labor can escape the inescapable economic sacrifices of war.

2. To believe that the cost of living could be kept from rising, despite inflationary wage increases.

3. To believe that raising farm prices to fair levels was the sole cause of higher living costs.

4. To believe that labor could not only maintain, but could raise its own standard of living, without sacrificing any of labor's gains.

Whether we like it or not, all of us must now face the fact that we cannot go on raising wages without having rising prices. Furthermore, so long as we are at war, there will be shortages of manufactured goods and inevitably rising prices for them.

What can be done to check inflation before it begins to destroy us?

1. We must halt all further increases in wages and salaries.

2. We must siphon off the public's excess spending power or buying power. Taxation, of course, is unpopular, but the cost of this war must be paid and taxation can be used to cut down spending and buying power.

3. Encourage production of necessities by permitting prices of necessities to rise and use the automatic price mechanism so far as possible instead of bureaucratic price fixing.

4. Increase production of foods and necessities. Under proper leadership that might be done. This automatically would check a rise in prices. A surplus would even bring lower prices.

Taxation, however, should not be used to redistribute wealth by soaking the rich, nor to promote visionary social gains—policies favored by the Roosevelt administration. The so-called rich, $5,000 and over, receive, net after taxes, only one-tenth of the national income. If the Government took every cent that the rich receive, it would not be enough to hold the line that way, and would be of little effect in checking inflation.

Taxation, as a weapon against inflation, must be applied fairly to all who have an increased, and therefore inflationary, spending power.

Neither purchase of War bonds nor forced savings, desirable as they are for the present, can remove the danger of inflation. They only postpone the evil day of reckoning.

If we are to check inflation, which threatens to destroy us unless it is checked, we must have a strong, courageous Congress and a change in administration policies. Those Members of Congress who have vigorously and steadfastly fought for a change to a sane and constructive way of handling our food and inflation problems, and who have tried to kill the unwise and unsound subsidy scheme, deserve the hearty praise of the public.

If your Representative in the House or a Senator from your State has taken what you believe is the right stand on these all-important questions, commend him. If, after studying these issues, you disagree with him, tell him so and urge him to support a policy that will ward off national disaster.

As never before in our history, we need men in public life who are not seeking votes by favoring this or that group, but, instead, are seeking to protect this Nation from the perils that directly or indirectly result from war. We need men in Washington who will stand up for their convictions, whatever may be the cost to their personal or political fortunes.

The American people often have shown that they will support those who fight for the right, regardless of consequences. They will do it again. And those who speak out against dangerous policies and courageously oppose them with all their might will in the long run have the appreciation and gratitude of the vast majority of our patriotic citizens.

Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM RAYBURN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following addresses delivered by myself and Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, Thursday, July 8, 1943, on the subject of inflation:

ADDRESS OF HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I want to express my appreciation of the public spirit of the Columbia Broadcasting System for allowing Judge Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, and myself to discuss the question of inflation.

A great part of our industry has been converted to war, and we have brought about a huge expenditure of money for the necessary tools of war. We have seen our sons and our allies march forth with tools unhesitantly to battle. We have seen these fighting men and their tools change the forces of evil from the role of aggressors to the role of defenders, and we shall crush them on their own lands and on the lands of free people they have conquered.

On our home front we are working long and hard. Because our industry is now tuned to war, we have less goods and services for our homes. At the same time our national income has expanded to unprecedented levels. Many more dollars are competing for these scarce goods and services. Under such circumstances there is an inevitable tendency for prices to rise.

It is the wish of the majority of people that rigorous controls be developed to prevent a disastrous price rise from occurring. Your Congress has taken a part in perfecting measures to keep prices down. Through its leadership and with the full cooperation of the people, more barriers will be erected against the dangers of an increase in the cost of living. This will mean, in plain, everyday words, that each of us must begin to think, not of his own individual welfare but as a member of a team—a team of free Americans.

Your Government is working hard to prevent the upward spiraling of prices. Its efforts so far have not been altogether perfect, but more success has been achieved than is commonly realized. For example, in the year before the General Maximum Price Regulations of May 1942 went into effect the general cost of living rose 12 percent. Since May 1942 the rise had been held down to less than 8 percent. Because many food items were not subject to control before January of this year food prices have risen over 17 percent during the last 12 months, as compared to 19 percent during the previous year. But real success has been experienced in other price areas. Clothing prices advanced 23 percent from May 1941 to May 1942 and only a little more than 1 percent from May 1942 to May 1943. House furnishings advanced 17 percent between May 1941 and 1942, and only 2 percent in the next year. Rents, which rose 3 percent between May 1941 and 1942, actually declined nearly 2 percent from May 1942 to May 1943.

The consequences of a runaway price rise are so apparent and so serious it may well be asked, Why does anyone try to beat the game? My answer is that stable prices present difficulties for certain groups in the economy. These difficulties are in the present, not in the future. To escape them some people choose the inflationary path without looking too closely to see where it leads. In seeking to protect themselves against advancing prices by asking for more for what they have to sell, some are using a method which works satisfactorily under normal circumstances. Wage earners customarily seek to protect themselves against rising costs by demanding higher wages. This is effective if there are unemployed resources.

Spending of increased wages leads to the production of a larger quantity of goods, so that higher money means higher real wages. Today, however, we face a dwindling supply of consumers' goods, so that the spending of higher wage income can result only in further pressure on prices. Farmers, too, seek to protect themselves against rising prices by asking more for the things they sell. But higher farm prices mean higher living costs. Higher living costs lead to further wage demands, which force up industrial costs. Hence, a vicious spiral of rising prices is started and if permitted to get out of control, means suffering for all of us. But, let me assure you, we do not propose to permit this to happen here.

Standing beside me here is a gentleman from Kentucky. He served with me in the House of Representatives for more than 12 years. During most of that time he was chairman of a very important subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee. While still a Member of the House, President Roosevelt appointed him to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. He resigned from that bench recently when the President asked him to become Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization. His long experience in the fields of economics, the law, and government was the reason why Mr. Roosevelt requested him to take over this important post. I know of no one better qualified. His office requires the full cooperation of every citizen, and it is to your own self-interest to give him that cooperation. It is my pleasure to introduce to you my friend and my former colleague, Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization.

ADDRESS OF HON. FRED M. VINSON, DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

My fellow Americans, tonight I want to talk to you about our economic stabilization policy—what the policy is and what tools we are using to make it effective.

To you on the home front I must emphasize the importance of keeping our wartime economy stable. Soaring wages, skyrocketing prices, frantic migration and turnover of labor, uncertainty in food production, black markets, shortages, slow-downs, strikes—these are the body sores of inflation. To throw off this dread disease in its initial stage is our primary task. Failure to win this fight will gravely impair the Nation's effective support of our heroic forces abroad; will delay the hour of military victory, and will sow the seeds of bankruptcy, panic, deflation, and poverty in the peacetime which follows.

Stabilization, on the other hand, will strengthen us in our job of supplying the armed forces; will hasten the hour of victory; and will lay the solid economic foundation for a prosperous and productive peace.

On the home front, then, we are fighting the fires of inflation.

We have not won that fight, but we are making progress. It is my firm conviction that, within the 30 days which have just passed, we have begun to roll back the tide. With your help we shall win.

If we are to conquer inflation, we must first track down its causes. Fortunately, perhaps, its principal cause is easily discovered. It is war. Total war demands a total mobilization of our resources. We must, without limit, produce the munitions of war for ourselves and our allies. To that end, a patriotic Congress has appropriated $100,000,000,000 to be spent this year for the tools of war.

That vast sum of money is an insurance of our national salvation and at the same time the source of our economic difficulties.

The results of its expenditure are obvious.

Factories, farms, mines, and mills are no longer devoting their efforts primarily to the production of goods and services to satisfy civilian needs. We have cut down the production of goods for ourselves in order to produce more for men on the fighting front.

At the same time, we have absorbed into our labor force millions formerly unemployed, and several million women and other new workers as well. Our industrial army is working longer hours and more days than ever before.

Increased employment and increased worktime mean more money in the pockets of the workers. More money in the workers' pockets means more purchasing power.

These are the basic causes of wartime inflation—more civilian purchasing power and less civilian goods in the market.

Money in the market always hunts for goods. Under ordinary conditions what happens when the irresistible force of excessive purchasing power meet the immovable object, a scarcity of consumer goods? The answer is clear. Prices will rise.

When prices rise, the cost of living rises. When the cost of living rises, wages rise. When wages rise, prices rise again, and a new spurt of purchasing power is injected into the economic stream. This is what we call the inflationary spiral.

It is this frantic race between wages and prices which we must halt. For this purpose the President requested sweeping authority. The Congress granted it. On October 2, 1942, Congress authorized and directed the President to stabilize wages and prices at the levels prevailing on September 15, 1942, so far as practicable.

Since that time we have been trying to forge tools strong enough and keen enough to hold the line established by Congress.

Our first line of defense is price control. It is here, on the price front, that the housewife finds out whether we succeed or fail. No matter what other steps we need to take, workable price ceilings are indispensible to our economic stabilization. Despite our efforts the cost of living has risen 6 percent since last September. Our principal difficulty has developed in connection with food prices, which have risen 13 percent since last September.

The difficulties of control are, of course, enormous. Due to these inherent complexities, and to the inevitable slowness of a vast governmental program, some ground has been lost.

But the tide of battle is turning. Between May 15 and June 15 of this year, food prices dropped slightly for the first time in more than a year.

Most major food items are now under specific dollar-and-cents ceilings, readily understandable to the average consumer. The prices of butter, meats, potatoes, cabbage, and onions have been or are being reduced. Other fresh vegetables, fresh fruits, and fresh fish will soon be under more effective control.

In my opinion, price control cannot be made to work without ceilings at every level, from producer to consumer. The President, in his "hold the line" order, directed that controls be established at all levels. When this direction is carried out, our retail ceilings will be constructed on a firmer foundation.

Wage stabilization is the handmaiden of price control. Wage increases, while they

may seem for a time to afford the worker temporary relief from higher prices, can only intensify his difficulty. Neither higher prices nor higher wages can create more goods. For the laboring man there are two alternatives. One is the dissipation of his purchasing power in an inflationary whirlwind. The other is the preservation of that purchasing power for the post-war period.

Therefore, every wage-earner should applaud the resolute determination of the President and the War Labor Board to adhere to the Little Steel formula which limits all general wage increases to a level 15 percent above that prevailing in January 1941.

Subsidies, limited in amount and judiciously used, are also necessary to the stabilization program. The cost of living has risen almost 10 percent since the adoption of the Little Steel formula, largely due to increasing food prices. If we are to hold the wage line, we must make good on our pledge to stabilize prices. At the same time we do not wish to penalize the farmer, or to deprive him of the necessary incentives for all-out production.

The only answer is a limited use of subsidies. Subsidies, used in moderation, will halt the spiral of inflation, thereby saving the Government billions of additional expenditures in higher cost for the goods it buys. Hence, the result in an actual dollars-and-cents saving to the National Treasury.

Furthermore, subsidies prevent the economic assassination of our great middle class and those on the bottom rungs of the ladder. In an inflationary spiral, highly organized workers and farmers may keep in the race. Those who must lose are the substandard wage earners, or the salaried workers; the preacher or the school teacher; the widow living on a small fixed income; and the dependent mother or wife whose son or husband is in uniform serving you and me.

These are the unorganized millions whose welfare is at stake and whose living standards will be ground into poverty if we fail to hold the line. If these inarticulate men and women could make their voices heard, I am confident that the line would be held. Congress will not begrudge the sum necessary to protect their unorganized constituents.

I should mention one other weapon in the stabilization arsenal. The root of inflation is excess purchasing power. None of our other weapons will remain effective unless this purchasing power is siphoned off and immobilized.

That means higher taxes and more savings. To achieve an adequate fiscal policy Congress and the Executive must play on the same team. I have every confidence that there will be effective team play in the future.

From my own experience I bear witness to the unflagging industry, intelligence and patriotism of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. I am encouraged by the recent announcement of my old chieftain, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, that the Ways and Means Committee of the House has determined to commence hearings on a new revenue bill immediately after the current recess. Adequate taxes and savings is an essential bulwark against inflation. We shall work together to make that bulwark strong and secure.

The battle against inflation is on. The attack is not draped in the spectacular. Nonetheless it is deadly insidious. Upon the result of this battle depends the security of every family in America now—and in the days when the roar of the guns is silenced.

As Economic Stabilization Director I am resolved to hold the line. In that difficult task, I need—I ask your confidence and understanding help.

Pancake Flour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am able to state that the two new companies referred to in my discussion of the pancake-flour situation are Confections, Inc., 160–68 West Loomis Street, Chicago, Ill., and Soy Food Mills, 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

Progress of Ship Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in my last report to the House on the subject of ship production for the year 1943, I said at that time that the shipbuilders and workmen in the shipyards of the United States had almost equaled the record for the year 1942, and that at the time I spoke I believed that the record had been equaled, if not exceeded.

The reports are in for the month of June 1943 and show that the total production for the first half of 1943 are 879 ships aggregating 8,818,622 dead-weight tons, or 133 ships delivered in excess of the record for the whole year of 1942, or stated in tonnage, 728,890 more deadweight tons of ships delivered in the first 6 months of 1943 than in the entire year of 1942.

America surely has reason to be proud of the splendid record that is being made by the United States Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, shipbuilding companies, and shipyard workers everywhere.

In an article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Sunday, July 7, 1943, under the name of Donald Mackenzie, written from London under date if July 6—New York News—he said that naval experts in that capital declared that day that United Nations ship construction for June exceeded U-boat sinkings by more than 1,500,000 tons. Mr. Mackenzie said:

If this rate can be maintained, it was said, our side will be able by winter to move half a million more troops to invasion points than the war planners had estimated.

The Germans claim they sank 149,000 tons of United Nations shipping during June—a figure that Allied sources term absurd and extravagant. But even if true, American construction alone would still be more than 1,000,000 tons ahead of submarine sinkings.

However, these comforting figures should furnish no inducement to reduce production but should prove an incentive to increased efforts by all.

The same writer said:

That grim swath of the western ocean between the thirty-fifth and the fortieth meridian, into which the German prowlers were being driven by shore-based aircraft early this year, is now closed altogether. It is likely to remain closed, or at least be highly hazardous.

While I was crossing the Atlantic in a destroyer during the last 2 weeks of April and the first days of May, I saw this trap being closed on the U-boats, when our aircraft carriers and other striking forces began to patrol that area.

The Germans are believed to be racing the refitting of their whole U-boat fleet in order to be ready for another all-out attack in November. The Germans are said to be confident that there is still fight in their submarines and that Hitler will make a last desperate bid to neutralize British and American war production by the most intensive underwater campaign of the war.

The outcome of that struggle, naval experts here assert, may decide the date of the final German defeat.

The outlook is promising, but there must and will be no impairment in the splendid efforts all are making. It is encouraging to know the progress that is being made and to render tribute to all who are participating in this work of progress.

According to a release from the Maritime Commission under date of July 2, 1943, June construction brought a new record for ships delivered by an individual yard.

The California Shipbuilding Corporation sent 20 Liberty ships into service compared with 18 delivered in May and 19 in April. The Shipbuilding Division of the Permanente Metals Corporation of California turned in a total of 25 Liberties; these were built in the former Richmond Yards Nos. 1 and 2 which until recently were run as separate yards. In the future they will be run as one.

Other high totals turned in included 14 Liberty ships by Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Baltimore, Md., and 17 Liberties by the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.

The total of 168 vessels included 115 Liberty ships, 19 C-type cargo ships, 9 coastal cargo vessels, 11 M. C. tankers, 3 coastal tankers, 3 special types, 6 seagoing tugs, and 2 ore carriers.

The west coast region produced 82 ships totaling 870,000 deadweight tons, or 51.94 percent of the national total. The east coast built 30.39 percent of the tonnage, or 509,400 deadweight tons represented by 45 vessels. On the Gulf coast 25 ships with combined deadweight tonage of 237,800 were delivered, accounting for 14.18 percent of the grand total. The remaining 3.49 percent of the tonnage was delivered from Great Lakes region yards which built 16 ships.

The number and types of ships built by all the yards follow:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.	1	Tanker.
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	1	Ore carrier.
Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.	3	Coastal tanker.
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard Inc., Fairfield, Baltimore, Md.	14	EC-2 cargo.
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	1	C-3 cargo.
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.	20	EC-2 cargo.
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.	7	C-1 cargo.
	1	Special type.
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	5	EC-2 cargo.
Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J.	1	C-2 cargo.
Froemming Bros., Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.	1	Seagoing tug.
Great Lakes Engineering Works, River Rouge, Mich.	1	Ore carrier.
Globe Shipbuilding Co., Superior, Wis.	2	Seagoing tugs.
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.	7	EC-2 cargo.
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.	3	C-3 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Brunswick, Ga.	2	EC-2 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.	2	Do.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.	4	Tankers.
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	1	Coastal cargo.
Marinship Corporation, Sausalito, Calif.	1	Tanker.
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.	2	C-2 cargo.
New England Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	8	EC-2 cargo.
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C.	9	Do.
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	17	Do.
Pacific Bridge Co., San Francisco, Calif.	1	Coastal cargo.
Pusey & Jones Corporation, Wilmington, Del.	1	C-1 cargo.
Pendleton Shipyards Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	2	Seagoing tugs.
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex.	2	C-1 cargo.
	1	Seagoing tug.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 1), Richmond, Calif.	8	EC-2 cargo.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 2), Richmond, Calif.	17	Do.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (Richmond shipyard No. 3A), Richmond, Calif.	2	Special type.
St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla.	2	EC-2 cargo.
Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.	2	Do.
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.	5	Tankers.
Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc., Providence, R. I.	2	EC-2 cargo.
Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis.	7	Coastal cargo.
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	2	C-3 cargo.
Total	168	

The Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to bring to the attention of every Member of Congress the results of a survey recently made into the food situation in this country. This is a compilation of 1,000 replies to questionnaires sent to publishers and editors of farm, trade, and other publications on this all-important question. These replies were received from 47 States, so that they truly represent a cross section of the entire Nation.

The food crisis staring this Nation in the face is so serious that the members of the Republican congressional food-study committee, of which I am general chairman, intend to devote their efforts during the congressional recess to more intensive study of the problems involved. That there is unanimity of opinion throughout the Nation of the importance and the seriousness of this question is evidenced by this compilation.

I particularly call attention to the fact that 988 out of the 1,000 publishers and editors replying consider this question of food supply paramount; that 594 reported their communities already suffer from food shortages, and that 781 expressed definite opinion as to the causes. Nine out of ten replying to the question, "To what do you attribute this shortage of food?" blamed it on bungling, incompetency, mismanagement, and waste in Washington; the announcement of freezing in advance; Government regulations and restrictions; too much red tape and too much regimentation; inefficient Government meddling and lack of foresight; Government overbuying and hoarding.

The survey covers eight specific questions which were included in the survey, complete reports of which will be furnished to any Member of Congress requesting me for it. A summary of this survey follows:

RESULTS OF 1,000 QUESTIONNAIRES TO PUBLISHERS AND EDITORS

QUESTION 1

Do you agree with me in general that our food supply is of paramount importance?

	Percent
Yes	98.8
No	.8
No answer	.4

COMMENTS

Yes; both from standpoint of military forces and home front.

Unrest already; hunger would threaten victory.

If the administration had given as much consideration to our good honest farmers as they have to labor racketeers there would be no present problem.

QUESTION 2

Is your community suffering from food shortages?

	Percent
Yes	59.4
No	40.6

If so, what foods are hard to get?

	Percent
Meat	53.1
Butter	17.6
Vegetables	9.3
Canned goods	7.2
Potatoes	3.9
Fats and oils	3.9
Fresh fruits	2.6
Coffee	2.4
Cheese	2.3

QUESTION 3

To what do you attribute this shortage of food?

	Percent
No answer	21.9

Seventy-eight and one-tenth percent gave the following answers:

More than 9 out of every 10 blame bungling, incompetency, mismanagement, and waste in Washington; announcing freezing in advance; Government regulations and restrictions, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Office of Price Administration; too much red tape and too much regimentation; inefficient Government meddling and lack of foresight; Government overbuying and hoarding.

Unusual war demands; armed forces; shipping food out of country; too much to whole world, to Europe, Russians, British, Arabs; too much for lend-lease; our Army oversized and food wasted; feed America first.

Government-planned economy and hoarding; abundance of scarcity; killing off pigs some years ago; hoarding caused by Government scaring public; stupid bureaus and political chicanery; subsidies for not raising; attempting to change the laws of supply and demand; public lack of confidence in Washington bureaucrats and politicians, especially WALLACE. The "Nudeal" planned it this way, and don't let anyone tell you differently.

High industrial wages lure farmers away from farms; wage inflation; Selective Service drafting men from farms.

Poor distribution—lowered quotas in busy defense areas and near Army camps; poor transportation.

Office of Price Administration refuses to let meat be sold after it is slaughtered; told one meat slaughterer to burn it (this is fact, not hearsay).

Rationing; ration points too high; independent grocers stocked with high-point merchandise, can't get it used; many persons using ration stamps for articles they never purchased before; increased use of nonrationed foods.

Lack of recognition of importance of food production; our farmers (Louisiana) have given too much thought to production of cotton; too little to food, feed, canning, and drying. Too late in getting busy. Reluctance to adopt war economy.

Waste resulting from withholding of farm equipment and machinery; failure of Government to set ceilings on farm prices; too low price ceilings. Shortage of gas and tires.

QUESTION 4

Are the people in your community planning to use all available land for gardens this summer?

	Percent
Yes	76.8
Mostly	7.4
No	4.2
Increase but not all	4.1
More than ever	3.4
Fair number	2.7
Some	1.4

COMMENTS

Surplus of land but using all man and woman power.

Increase in spite of triple A red tape.

City folk will lose enthusiasm quickly.

All the young and able to work have gone away.

Washington discourages city people from doing Victory garden work.

Ban on gas makes it difficult.

There will be more gardens devoted to vegetables this year.

QUESTION 5

Have the chamber of commerce, local leaders of industry, or other groups, formed any organization to stimulate increased food production—

(a) By making available and preparing nearby land for use by individuals wishing to have gardens of their own?

	Percent
Yes	52.5
No	30.5
Not necessary	6.4
No answer	5.3
Individuals	5.0
No organization	.3

(b) By contracting with farmers to produce increased crops for direct consumption, etc?

	Percent
No	41.6
No answer	24.6
Yes	23.6
Individuals	5.0
Not necessary	2.3
No organization	.2
Don't know	1.1
Not farm territory	1.0
Some	.6

Active groups: Chambers of commerce, Kiwanis, Rotary, newspapers, town committees, Lions Clubs, civic clubs, real estate agents, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 4-H Clubs, War Production Board, Soil Conservation Service, Office of Civilian Defense, garden clubs and committees, Victory garden committees, Girl Scouts, railway companies, mining companies, boards of trade, steel companies, Ford Motor, public schools, grange and home farm bureaus, defense councils, city administration and park commissioner, canneries, hatcheries, auxiliary police, Farm Security Administration, local service clubs, State agricultural departments, county agricultural associations, business men's associations, United States Department of Agriculture War Board, war clubs, junior chambers of commerce, home demonstration clubs, Lord's acre groups, food for freedom organizations, etc.

QUESTION 6

Are the farmers in your territory going to equal last year's production?

	Percent
Yes	40.6
Exceed	25.3
No	12.9
Doubtful	9.7
Probably	4.1
Will try hard	3.0
No answer	1.9
Not farm territory	1.4
Don't know	1.1

(These answers above were qualified as to weather, manpower, and machinery, and essential supplies.)

COMMENTS

Weather is the only item the Government leaves to a higher being to control.

Much depends on whether Government gets rid of bureaucrats and supplies sufficient labor and tools.

Labor is attracted to the mines (Minnesota).

Bean outlook poor due to low prices. Milk will be off.

Will succeed if let alone by dictators.

"Washington Dreamers—Hands Off" is local opinion.

Hard to compete with high factory wages.

QUESTION 7

What, in your opinion, are the farmer's greatest handicaps this year?

	Percent
Manpower	84.8
Machinery and equipment	41.6
Supplies (including fertilizer, gas, seeds, fuel oil, rubber, wire fencing, feeds, etc.)	8.4
No answer	.5

OTHER OPINIONS

Industry and defense get the young men (under 35); farms need young men, as well as older, experienced men.

Negro help scarce or unwilling.

Shortage of peak season and incompetent help.

Transportation. Unfair draft. Black market.

Government meddling, interference, and restrictions; Farm Bureau, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Office of Price Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, and War Relocation Authority; Office of Defense Transportation truck limitations.

Red tape and price administration; indecision in Washington; too damn much New Deal stuff.

Price uncertainty and Government attitude toward increased prices are handicaps.

Tendency of Government to ride off in six different directions at once.

Lack of confidence in Government control and distribution.

At height of depression, with people starving, Government had us plow under.

Farmer feels picked on. Office of Price Administration rules bitterly resented.

Example of living off Work Projects Administration and other soft hand-outs.

Small farms can't get priorities; Democratic farms get the service.

Waste of farmer's time because of useless regulations and bungling; confused New Deal psychology.

No combines for removing soybeans from ground.

"Did you ever have to go 8 to 10 miles to get permission to buy gasoline for a farm?"

QUESTION 8

What do you suggest we can do to get greater production and conserve our supply of food?

Three and five-tenths percent did not answer this question or had no suggestions to offer.

Ninety-six and five-tenths percent gave the following suggestions:

Defer farm labor; don't allow essential farm labor to take factory jobs; defer older men and high-producing farmers; leave 18- and 19-year-old boys on the farms; white-collar men no good as farmers.

Supply plenty of help to farmers, drafting it if necessary; we need proper allocation of man-and-woman power.

Draft all manpower for Army, farm, or factory.

Release men from armed forces and return them to farms—at least seasonally.

Release farmers from factories and war plants or let them be inducted.

Develop student farming groups; release from school boys of 12 or over for farm work.

Shoot all city farmers in Washington.

Put all conscientious objectors to work on farms.

Assure farmers of ample supplies of machinery and repair parts, fertilizer, lumber, feeds, steel, wire fencing, tools, etc., in addition to labor.

Machinery and labor can be pooled to advantage.

Get a new President and stop this wicked foolishness.

Put bureaucrats in productive jobs; put them to work.

Get rid of New Deal boondoggling; get a new administration in Washington.

We need capable men in Washington, in management; honest men with good programs and common sense.

Administration should leave farmers alone; too much paternalism.

Too much red tape and too much official correspondence; should be cut by 50 percent.

Fire Paul McNutt; he messed up Indiana.

There is nothing wrong with this country that a good election can't cure.

Sick of Government by racket; if F. D. R. would forget politics and fourth term it would help.

Let up cockeyed Washington regulations.

Less interference from high-paid Government employees who don't know anything about farming or marketing.

Cut Government extravagance and damn foolishness; these lower public morale.

Regimented existence futile; too deep for legislative correction.

Return to the laws of supply and demand.

Restore confidence in Government.

Ease truck restrictions; time, gas, and tires are wasted by red tape and delays.

Geographical distribution of 1,000 replies from publishers and editors, 47 States represented

	Percent
New York	9.1
Illinois	8.4
Minnesota	8.0
Iowa	6.7
Pennsylvania	6.2
Missouri	5.4
Michigan	4.6
Ohio	4.1
Unknown	4.1
Indiana	3.9
Wisconsin	3.5
Nebraska	3.3
Texas	2.8
New Jersey	2.5
South Dakota	2.4
California	2.1
Massachusetts	2.0
North Dakota	1.9
Kentucky	1.8
Kansas	1.6
Colorado	1.5
Connecticut	1.0
Tennessee	1.0
North Carolina	.9
Louisiana	.9
Oregon	.8
Oklahoma	.8
Arkansas	.8
Maine	.6
Maryland	.6
Mississippi	.6
Georgia	.6
Montana	.6
New Mexico	.6
South Carolina	.5
West Virginia	.5
Virginia	.5
Vermont	.4
New Hampshire	.4
Alabama	.4
Washington	.4
Idaho	.3
Delaware	.2
Utah	.2
Arizona	.2
Wyoming	.2
Florida	.1

Hundreds of Letters Say "Engel Is Right"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 I addressed the House on the subject matter of excessive labor costs in war production. I quoted specifically wages paid to certain classes of employees in war industries. I received hundreds of letters since that time. The letters were

overwhelmingly favorable and more than verified the facts set forth in my talk. They further show that the conditions I spoke about as existing in the plants which I visited exist in every State in the Union. It is interesting to note that 108 letters received in 2 mails came from 33 States. Of the 108 letters, 101 were favorable, 7 were from workers who receive high wages, 5 of whom were violently opposed to my position, the other 2 received excessive wages, but tried to justify doing so on the ground that they were purchasing bonds. The letters came from business and professional men, and persons in all walks of life. A great many letters came from workers whose wages had been frozen by Executive order at pre-war or near pre-war wages and found it difficult to meet the ever-increasing cost of living. I am quoting excerpts from a few of the many letters I received. These come from 20 States. For obvious reasons I am not giving the names of the writers, but the original letters are on file in my office and can be seen.

From Springfield, Mass., comes the following interesting post card:

I am 67 years old. I was on old-age pension, get 40 bucks a month. I left the old-age pension. I am now in a factory sweeping floors; get 50 bucks a week—easy money.

From Lodge No. 810, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers and Express and Station Employees, Ludington, Mich.:

We do agree with your statement that many workers are being underpaid. * * * The 15 nonoperating railway brotherhoods have had no increase in pay since the war began. After a year of negotiation they were granted 8 cents per hour by a board appointed by the President. This has now been denied by the Economic Stabilization Director Vinson for fear of causing inflation. The majority of these men are married men with large families. In Ludington yard, clerks with 20 years' experience receive $25.28 weekly after pension, tax, Victory tax, hospital insurance, and War bonds are deducted. Section men receive $22.61 weekly after similar deductions. * * * Their families are underfed and underclothed. Many have lost automobiles and insurance. These men are frozen to their jobs and cannot take advantage of higher-paid wages in other industries. We have pledged we would not strike under any provocation for the war's duration. Was this pledge an error, Mr. ENGEL?

From Rochester, N. Y.:

This lavish manner of spending by war industries around Rochester is without a doubt one of the greatest and most apparent tragedies. * * * I have implicit knowledge that in certain factories here * * * there are many girls in their teens making $60 to $85 a week.

From a sergeant in the United States Marine Corps stationed in California comes the following:

Please accept my humble gratitude, admiration, and sincere appreciation for your efforts. It was a splendid job. The serviceman's reward for his efforts and sacrifice in this world's struggle will be the dubious privilege of paying life-long taxes in addition to his struggle to earn a livelihood for himself and family.

From Hartford, Conn.:

There are many college graduates like myself who are receiving less than $50 a week after years of experience. If the present set-up now before the War Labor Board would go into effect, I would receive $45 for 6 days' work including 8 hours overtime. (This comes from the same factory where machine-gun assemblers were paid as high as $8,741.)

From a secretary of state of a Southern State comes the following:

I have wondered for a long time why someone did not make public these facts. I want to congratulate you on your initiative in the matter.

From Illinois, a coal miner's wife, comes the following:

It takes a coal miner, if he works his way down to the face, 4 years' experience to learn to mine coal. I have a husband and two sons mining coal. They get 69 cents per ton—5 days a week with from $3.50 to $5 check-offs. They make a little less than $40 per week; then if they break something or don't get cars, they lose work.

From Buffalo, N. Y.:

The night watchman and janitor's assistant are paid $24.25 a week.

From Oklahoma City, Okla., a doctor writes:

It is absolutely the best statement of facts that I have seen during our present crisis.

From Detroit, Mich., comes a letter from a State employee who receives $1,800 a year. He writes as follows:

I have a niece graduated from high school who was employed at J. L. Hudsons. She left to operate a drill press in one of the plants working on the night shift. Age 19, she makes an average of $82 per week with time and a half for overtime. Friends of hers are being paid $90 a week. When you think of men in the Army and Navy giving their lives at $50 a month, while girls and boys still in their teens being paid $80 to $125 a week, it makes you boil.

From a lieutenant commander of the United States Navy, from the office of Naval Inspector of Ordnance, located in an Eastern State, comes the following:

I noticed the enclosed clipping relative to your recent 44-day trip. Your remarks can be concurred in heartily by one who knows.

From a Michigan industrial town comes the following:

The writer, a graduate chemical engineer, is employed as a chemist in one of the local industries. I often wonder whether it would be better to do janitor work at ——— company in order to keep my head above water. No, we are not starving, but I have been forced to discontinue buying bonds and am selling some of them and have even borrowed money in order to keep going. On the other hand, I am very proud and happy to know that my tax money helps to swell the pay checks of ex-ditch diggers, etc. in the war plants.

From Cleveland, Ohio, comes the following:

It is about time someone is looking into this three-ring circus.

The following from a letter signed by 55 so-called high-wage employees of the Continental Motors Corporation of Muskegon, Mich.—my district:

The undersigned noted the articles appearing in the Muskegon Chronicle. * * * Those whose names follow are employed at Continental Motors and are paid the so-called high wage. Apparently you are opposed to the wages we are being paid for 7 nights per week, 11:30 to 7 a. m. You speak of these plants operating with public money—correct—and we are that public. Show me one Senator or Representative who is buying bonds and stamps proportionately to his past years' income as the average Continental worker. We are continuing to buy bonds * * * we would gladly donate the bonds and have our comrades and relatives back safe and sound—which seems to be more than a lot of politicians are interested.

The $50 a month service man will have to toil and sweat the rest of his life when he is discharged to pay the taxes necessary to redeem the bonds bought with the so-called high wages:

From Philadelphia, Pa.:

It is unfair to the white-collar worker—those whose salaries are frozen. I might say that some of the wages paid here are even higher than those quoted by you.

From Indiana:

I operate a grain elevator, feed mill, and farm-implement store. To lose a very common-plier mechanic to some defense plant, then have him come back and rub a check for $75 to $100 for a week's work under the nose of my experienced men who have stayed on the job because they felt they were giving their best service to the war effort, makes me furious.

From Michigan comes the following:

My sons and myself have about $8,000 invested in our farm. Our neighbor across the road has no investment. He gets $85 a week. That is more than we, with our investment can make together.

From Berkley, Calif., comes the following:

You think you really saw something on your tour, well, perhaps you did, but you don't know the half of it. I am working in the shipyards. I have 10 sons, have served 24 years as a mechanic and machinist, and it took years to become a journeyman. Why is it that we now have young girls who serve 60 days as helpers and then become journeymen and draw the same as a man with years of experience. I work on those large cranes, sometimes I am 75 to 100 feet in mid-air out on those booms doing repairs, still I have to work the graveyard shift in order to draw more money per hour than these girls. I more than agree with you, every word and more is true.

From Detroit, Mich.:

All you say—the ridiculous wages paid women and boys in factories is true.

From Virginia:

Spend, spend, spend—tax, tax, tax. We see this extravagance all around. We, trying to tighten at the spigot drip while the bunghole is wide open. Why can't it be stopped?

From a doctor in Maryland:

I come in contact with hundreds of persons who earned not more than $25 or $30 a week before the war. Now they make as much as $85 a week and more. While war workers make these extravagant earnings, workers in trade, professions, and white-collar classes, make but few dollars more than they did before the war. This inequity is not justified.

From a druggist in Houston, Tex.:

I only wish you had found it consistent to extend your travels to this Houston area where the condition is so deplorable as to be nothing short of a public disgrace.

From Hutchinson, Kans.:

More power to you. You have touched on the one thing that should be given plenty publicity. What you say is absolutely right.

From Kansas:

You have put your finger on one of the spots which should be corrected in our war policy on the domestic front. The American people are entitled to know the truth.

From Knoxville, Tenn.:

Both wages and profits are absurdly and unnecessarily high. I do understand the workers' desire to get all he can when he sees corporations being treated so generously.

From Mississippi:

Here at ——— Field it is disgraceful. There are women taken in as instructors at $2,200 per year and their qualifications are nil—just picked up from the general herd and given such pay.

From a doctor in Tulsa, Okla.:

There are many instances of people who a few weeks ago were working for $15 a week now make over $100 a week—young girls and boys with 2 or 3 weeks' training in riveting make more money than graduates from universities with a doctor's degree. It ain't right, Congressman, and something should be done about it.

From a lawyer in North Carolina:

It is quite evident and a matter of common knowledge that farm boys who were hauling manure last fall are receiving wages and salaries in excess of those who are skilled.

From St. Louis, Mo.:

We represent a group of toolmakers. We know we are chumps for not getting more than we are, but we are constantly reminded that we are unpatriotic if we quit for higher wages, but, as you state, these "hillbillies" come to town and declare themselves master mechanics, toolmakers, etc., starting at wages we skilled men have required years to bring up. Usually a tool maker is required to serve 4 years' apprenticeship as a machinist apprentice, then several years as a machinist, then a toolmaker.

From Dayton, Ohio:

My farm hand who has farmed my place for several years receives $25 a week and he doesn't live on the place. His son, whose best job had been an auto mechanic, works at ——— and makes $100 a week.

From Chula Vista, Calif., come two advertisements from the Minneapolis Tribune—one read as follows:

Wanted laborers for northeastern Canada, wages $300 per month guaranteed, no lost time due to inclement weather or sickness, plus overtime, board, room, and one issue of clothing furnished free.

Signed by the United States Employment Service office. War Manpower Commission, 407 Soutl. Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

The other reads:

Waiters, dishwasher, kitchen men. Wages, $250, board and lodging. Olympic Commissary, 25 South Washington.

From Abilene, Tex.:

I have over 600 customers, the larger part now in defense work. I have questioned several hundred. Everyone tells me they are not working very much. Some of them are making $200 a week now, and they never made that much in a month before.

A businessman in Birmingham, Ala., writes:

Defense workers here in Birmingham are paid twice as much as we can afford to pay our employees. Frankly it is disgusting.

From Shandon, Ohio:

I have been waiting for a long time for someone to dare to come out and say what you have said about excessive wages.

From a member of the Democratic executive committee of a Southern State I have the following:

I am very much opposed to the New Deal's squander mania and have grave apprehension as to the outcome. We are selling our children and grandchildren into debt slavery.

From California come two advertisements from a local paper both signed by the United States Employment Service. Each has a picture of a young lady, who testifies:

We are paid at least $214 a month while we learn to weld and soon earn over $270 a month as journeymen, 10 percent extra for the swing shift, 15 percent extra for the graveyard shift.

The second advertises for women 18 to 40 years and reads in part as follows:

We will train you to weld and pay you at the rate of $214 a month during a short training period. Soon you will be equipped with knowledge that will win you promotions to pay $270 a month.

From New York City:

You are right regarding excess wages to labor. You are wrong on war profits. Industrialists are making big war profits, but what of it? They are saving the country in this war.

From Ontario, Canada:

I am an American citizen and live in Illinois. Last winter I was amazed at the unheard-of wages girls were making in ordnance plants—$50 to $70 a week for unskilled labor. In Canada a girl living here in the capital considered herself lucky even with a college education to be a grade 2 clerk with $90 a month to spend in a country where everything is high.

From Akron, Ohio:

My husband and I were greatly pleased with your speech. We commend you for your courage in saying what all thinking people know—that the high wages paid inexperienced workers in our war industries is the chief reason that our country is on the brink of inflation and chaos.

From Fremont, Ohio:

I am a school teacher and our salary is fair, but there isn't any way for us to get a raise. I don't mean to complain, but it is very discouraging to see so many young, inexperienced people receive checks so large, it is hard to believe.

From Utica, N. Y.:

The condition of which you spoke prevails in this area—where youths who received $20 a week in the textile mills before the war, are now receiving from $70 to $100 a week in arms plants.

From Los Angeles, Calif.:

I am a steamfitter and pipefitter by trade, having secured my journeyman's card in 1915. I have seen waste on construction jobs to a point where it really hurts below the skin.

From Utica, N. Y.:

Boys just out of high school are drawing down in war plants from $40 to $125 a week. It amounts to a positive debauching of our working people.

From Detroit, Mich.:

Glad you brought out in the open conditions as regards wages. Here is an example—young man 22 learns a trade at ——— Corporation which took 6 weeks. He is now in ——— Motor Co. earning $137 a week besides bonuses.

From Connecticut:

Your statement regarding excessive wages paid by defense plants occasions no surprise here. The only surprising thing is that someone has the courage to make the facts public.

From St. Louis, Mo.:

Just read the morning paper—some cold-blooded facts—my clothes cleaner just cashed a check for a friend for $112—1 week's pay at the cartridge plant.

These are only a few of the many similar letters which I received since I addressed the House on excess labor costs, on June 29, 1943.

A Vital Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 5, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of profound appreciation for the outstanding leadership he has given to clean and progressive political thought and action in California that I ask consent to include in the RECORD the following radio address delivered by Mr. J. Frank Burke, the "editor of the air," over his own station, KPAS, of Pasadena, Calif.:

It is unnecessary for me to express agreement with the facts and the points of view and the emphasis which has been placed upon the great necessity that confronts our democracies to meet the problem that is presented by insecurity and to plan for the fourth great freedom—that from want—by such a complete security for the people and for the nations as will eliminate the chief cause of war in the world, and also bring to the troubled homes and hearts of the people of America and, indeed, finally of the world, that relief and comfort that can come through such an intelligent cooperation by the people with what nature has done for mankind to drive hunger and want and physical distress from the world.

Since the time that recorded history began, the world has been plagued at different times by famine and by want; and, strangely enough, due to the social and economic system that we have adopted, that distress and suffering and want, have increased in volume and severity, just in proportion as we have increased our interdependence upon one another.

When man was 90 percent self-sufficient, drought and famine and disease took their deadly toll, to be sure, but they all had to attack the individual units, and by that very fact, there was a great limitation on their power and success.

But now, with literally hundreds of thousands of men and women employed in a single institution, upon which they must depend for earning that stipend that will enable them to go into the market place and buy their necessities of life, it is found that the closing of that institution's door means that they have been denied the wherewithal to purchase their food, their clothing, and their shelter, not as individuals, but as the hundred thousand employees in that whole institution.

Thus, we have had brought about in the history of our economic and social and industrial life, a most significant phenomenon:

That, as we advanced in mechanical, engineering, and metallurgical science, we have actually advanced in the woes that come to humanity, which formerly were due to the scarcity of provisions, so that they can now all be suffered with the warehouses almost bursting with plenty.

And, friends, it is the worse today because not only the learned and the intelligent, but even the masses of workers have learned that there is no necessity for this want and distress.

They see everybody busy during the war, with incomes enlarged, with plenteous food and raiment, and they are sane enough to come to the conclusion that if that can be done when one-third or one-half the population is devoted entirely to wasteful production of destructive weapons and materials, together with supporting at least 10 percent of the population as a fighting army, that certainly if the entire physical and mental and moral powers of the people are devoted to the avocations of peace, with the same bountiful Nature doing her part, that poverty and privation can be absolutely banished from the land.

Of this there can be no more doubt. Several years ago two very thorough surveys brought forth convincing evidence of this fact. One was that of Brookings Institution. It showed at that time—and that was a decade ago—that there was potential production from factory and farm in this country for every home of an amount equal in money value to approximately $2,500 per year. More than half our population was receiving less than three-fifths of this amount at that time, and a third of our population received less than 20 percent of this amount.

In another survey that was brought out in what was called Loeb's Chart of Plenty, a considerable amount larger was shown to be the potential production of America than the Brookings Institution indicated.

Undoubtedly these surveys and other facts that were brought before the people must have had their effect upon that civil engineer, the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, when he declared in an address, possibly 5 or 6 years ago, that "We have had for nearly a century industrial pioneers who have mainly devoted themselves to building up the great industrial tools provided by scientific discovery. This generation did a good job. They won for America the greatest economic triumph in all history. That is a unique ability to produce a plenty for a wholesome standard of living and of comfort to all the people." Let me continue to quote from Mr. Hoover: "Some thousands of a marginal group out of 120,000,000 got too much of the productive pie. Some millions of another marginal group got too little. But we had so triumphed in the long journey of mankind away from scarcity and want that we began to view the promised land of abolished poverty."

Apropos of these surveys and this opinion of Mr. Hoover's is the testimony of a man who is in a position to know and who feels the responsibility to tell. Donald Nelson, who has been at the head of one of the greatest distributing corporations of the United States, has, in this great world emergency, been appointed Chairman of the most important group, probably, in Washington—the War Production Board. His duties lay upon him the obligation to know what the producing power of our country is, as well as afford him the opportunity to learn first hand by observation what we are able to do, and are doing. In absolute harmony with Mr. Hoover's statement, Mr. Nelson declared in an address 1 year ago before the University of Missouri as follows:

"Freedom from want can become—must become—a reality in the world. Poverty is not inevitable any more. For a generation we have been living on the edge of a new world. We are only now beginning to realize it. For the first time in the history of the human race there can be enough of everything to go around. The sum total of the world's greatest possible output of goods, divided by the sum total of the world's inhabitants, no longer means a little less than enough for everybody. The vast production machine the United States is creating to fill its war needs will provide the industrial plan to assure all the peoples of the world the escape from the misery and degradation of poverty."

This is the statement of the man who, in the United States, from his background of training, from his present position furnishing the ability to know, and with the combined qualifications of natural aptitude and talent, thoroughly developed by a life of experience, I say, this is the statement of that kind of man concerning the opportunity that we have to enter into that promised land of plenty from the deserts and husks of scarcity.

Incidentally, friends, he told us what we need in order to achieve these desired results. Here it is. Listen to him:

"To accept that opportunity, we need only to have the good pioneer sense not to be frightened by it, just because it calls for new mental attitudes and new habits of thought."

Friends, listen! I have been quoting to you the most important and the happiest auguries of a new day, and these possibilities that are assured by these surveys that were declared by this former President of the United States, and of which Mr. Nelson says, they are possible now, can come to us if we simply get busy.

And may I suggest to you today that the conditions which we will confront when this dreadful war is over behoove us to begin now to bring this possibility about.

It is natural, and I think unfortunate, that millions of men and women are totally indifferent to what may confront them tomorrow as long as they are assured of food enough today and a theater ticket in their pockets.

But unless democracy—let me make it specific, unless the United States—has a definite and adequate plan, not only ready but actually put into operation by appropriate legislation through our National Congress, we will, at the cessation of this war, be confronted with not fewer than 25,000,000 unemployed men and women without provision for their future together with returning and disbanding 7,500,000 men, who are now in uniform in the armed forces of our Nation.

I am not speaking here words of hysteria. I am simply delivering to you the prediction of the best informed and up-to-date economists and publicists who are fully aware that unless we have made some preparation to meet this situation, we will have a tragedy more disastrous than that which has ever met any great nation in the history of the world.

These conditions were rapidly being reached even before the war began. Through a special and uneconomic process our country had appropriated Federal money for the feeding and clothing of the unemployed in the most meager manner.

Actually, counting those that were on Government relief, together with those who were idle without relief, there were about 8,000,000 men and women so situated at the beginning of this war. They have been absorbed in industry because we have entered into war socialism as an economy.

Dictatorships have, in part, furnished an answer. Hitler found the German people hungry and unemployed and put them to work on national projects, creating a machine to murder the world.

But at least he had an answer to unemployment. And, in part, it was due to the inspiration that the people received from this employed condition that furnished him with Germany's loyalty.

Russia, through the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the leadership of a man of power and purpose, put all men to work, with the object, the commonweal.

Great Britain and the United States were haltingly doing this by the dole, and that dole route, as far as the United States was concerned, had nearly reached its end, and the leaders of democracy know that they dare not face the future and the close of this war, with this problem of the unemployed and the aged, and the sick and the cripples, without having a comprehensive and adequate program that will immediately go into operation.

In answer to that need, Great Britain has brought forth its Beveridge plan, a plan that comprehends in its outlook all of the needy of the British Isles. It is detailed. It is complicated, and in the minds of most people who have studied it, it is inadequate, but it is a plan.

The leaders in the United States, industrial, religious, social, labor, all have recognized the imperative necessity of a plan here.

Fortune Magazine, one of the most ably edited journals in the United States, exhaustive in its surveys made of each institution, as it publishes articles concerning great industries for management and the well-to-do, lamented some 2 years ago that the United States had, of that day, 25 percent of its population outside of its economic system, and that the other 75 percent had no answer for it.

And, friends, Fortune Magazine a little later appointed able, experienced men to make a survey of the situation, and bring out a program. Last December in the supplement of the magazine they furnished a program to meet the situation.

And, to me, it is remarkable the similarity, in some respects, that that program bears to the program that has been suggested by the National Resources Planning Board, which report was submitted some 2 months ago to Congress by President Roosevelt.

I am calling your attention to this program by Fortune magazine to emphasize to you that the conservatives, the men in high and responsible positions in industry, are alarmed over the condition which will confront the world, unless democracy furnishes an alternative to what the Communists and Fascists are presenting to meet the world's wants.

On the 10th of last March, the President submitted to our Congress this plan of the National Resources Planning Board to cover all the social needs of our population, from unemployment to old age and ill health.

The men who are outstanding in their backgrounds of training and education, and of their known ability, have spent months in making a survey of what must be done, and how it must be done. In this plan they have provided for every contingency, in a broad sense, that might arise, and it is intelligently and thoroughly based upon the known productive power of our country.

In this report, there is contained what is spoken of as the new Bill of Rights, and this Bill of Rights embodies the object which the plan aims to insure and establish.

Let me refresh your memory upon them, if you have read or heard them; or let us rejoice together in them, if you hear them for the first time:

1. The right to work, usefully, and creatively through the productive years.

2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service.

3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care.

4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency, sickness, unemployment, and accident.

5. The right to live in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies.

6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police.

7. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact.

8. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness.

9. The right to rest, recreation, and adventure, the opportunity to enjoy and take part in an advancing civilization.

It isn't any wonder that Max Lerner, writing on this plan, under the heading Charter for a New America, in which he called it a job and security plan, says:

"And I can report my own conviction that it is better and sounder and goes farther than the English plan. I must also add my own belief that, difficult as the fight for the Beveridge plan is now proving in England, the struggle to achieve the American plan will prove even fiercer and more difficult. * * *

"It contains political dynamite that could blast the log-jam which is today the domestic New Deal program. It contains a whole armory of economic weapons that can be used in the post-war period. * * *

"It is revolutionary, not because it invokes social violence, but because it would make it unnecessary and impossible. It is revolutionary, above all, because it is the product of that conscious forethought about the future which is the essence of planning, and because its planning is more comprehensive than we have ever thus far had from a nonsocialist governmental body.

"It may fail of adoption—that depends on the American people, upon their courage and clarity and their sense of greatness."

Friends, it must not fail of adoption. This is a definite program worth fighting for. It's worth living for. It's worth dying for. But the way we must get it is to work for it. We must achieve it. We must earn it.

During the depression we saw men's fortunes swept from them through no fault of their own. Rich today, they were poor tomorrow.

E. Stanley Jones puts it pointedly in his timely book, Christ's Alternative to Communism. He declared that it was infinitely safer to have your protection in the cooperative work where all people benefited than in those securities that were simply determined by the state of the market.

He argues very definitely for this kind of program. And, in commenting on those marvelous words which Christ quoted in the synagogue, from Isaiah, on being annointed to preach good tidings or good news to the poor, Stanley Jones says, "What would be good news to the poor? To make them content in their poverty? If so, religion is opium. To offer them a reward in the hereafter? If so, religion doesn't function here and now in human relationships.

"What then would be good news to the poor? The only good news that would be adequate is that there should be no poor. Poverty can be banished."

And then, note, you'd think it was Donald Nelson or Herbert Hoover speaking. Stanley Jones goes on to say, "Even now we have everything for the abolition of poverty. We have the knowledge and the technique. We have everything except one thing, the collective good will."

Donald Nelson puts the same thought in other words when he says, "We must have a new approach." We only need the good pioneer sense not to be frightened by it just because it calls for new habits of thought.

Stanley Jones closes with these words: "Poverty is not God's will. It is ours."

And in his book, he says in conclusion, "A labor leader told us that 'You're too late. The country's going communistic or Fascist.' These are startling words, and they stab us awake. But I believe it's not too late. The Christian way may yet be adopted, but we have no time to lose. We must act now."

We have the program before us. Never was a greater opportunity placed before thoughtful men and citizens in a democracy. We must organize to put this plan over, the democratic plan, the people's plan, the charter for America.

The Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the remarks which I have already made on the food question, I extend my remarks further.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress knows that the present food situation is the most serious and critical domestic problem facing the Nation today. The President and this New Deal administration are undoubtedly responsible. The destructive theories of Tugwell and WALLACE have contributed greatly to our serious plight, and if they are carried on much further, they will be ruinous. The impractical economic policies prescribed by the inexperienced intellectuals who administer the food activities of the Government have been so inconsistent as to throw the whole thing into chaos. The persistent and obnoxious injection of politics by Harry Hopkins, Judge Frankfurter, and Judge Rosenman into all governmental activities is evident throughout the whole food administration. Proof of this is seen in the refusal of the President to give adequate authority to Chester Davis, whom he himself had selected as one of the most capable food men in America.

There would be no serious food shortage in the country now except for the determination of the President and his advisers to keep the administration of all food matters under the direction of that mysterious coterie that compels every activity of the Government to bend toward the perpetuation of the New Deal dynasty. Although the early policies of the New Deal administration, which advocated that surpluses of foods were dangerous and that scarcity of foods was desirable, had been very disastrous, yet the great productivity of our country would have been sufficient to have overcome this disaster if those in charge of food affairs had been frank and courageous enough to admit their mistakes. As a result of their failure, dire disaster has overtaken us. Apparently it never occurred to them that no one ever went hungry on a surplus. They should recognize the fact that in any food cycle production must come first. Instead of building on a solid foundation they have proceeded to build as one who would build the second story of his house before he laid the foundation or built the first story. Instead of starting at the beginning with the producer and proceeding from production to processing and distribution they thoroughly disorganized the whole food situation. The only way to solve this food problem now is to increase the production of all kinds of basic food commodities to the maximum.

Ten different agencies now vie with each other as to jurisdiction in food matters. Their overlapping jurisdictions produce violent discord and contradictory programs. So, in a land of plenty, hunger and hardship stalk our people. This would only be considered as unfortunate except for the fact that much of it is the result of culpable conduct. In that case it is more than unfortunate. The responsibility should be laid where it belongs—on those who put the perpetuity of the New Deal dynasty ahead of all other considerations.

Those in charge of the administration of the food activities of our Nation are clearly on the defensive. Instead of floundering around in a sea of apologetic indecision they should be leading the people in an aggressive, open, and aboveboard fight against wastefulness. Production and more production should be their battle cry. They should be furnishing inspirational leadership and not leading a hopeless retreat.

After the President had called Chester Davis to Washington and given national publicity to the fact that Davis was to be put in full charge of the administration of all food activities, he should have gone forward with the program that he had led the American people to believe he would carry through. Regardless of what diverted him, the result of his refusal to even give Davis an audience and of his refusal to appoint a capable food administrator and to give him full authority to act has been most disastrous. I think the principal reason for the shabby treatment accorded Chester Davis by the President was the fact that the sentiment of the country was tremendously in favor of placing all food activities under one head. Republicans and Democrats almost unanimously proclaimed Davis as a man eminently qualified to act as National Food Administrator. The President cannot stand to divide the limelight with anybody. The President showed an unusual attitude toward Davis. It is shown in an incident referred to by Walter Lippmann, concerning which he says:

Some 10 days ago he—

Meaning Davis—

wrote his letter of resignation, which was lying on the President's desk at the very press conference in which Mr. Roosevelt was asked about the resignation and denied it.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE SET-UP

Because of the muddling of the new dealers in their handling of the food situation, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives about 3

months ago set up what is known as the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. This unofficial committee is operating without any expense to the Government. This committee consists of 44 members, which have been divided into 9 subcommittees. Each of these subcommittees has been assigned special activities. For instance, one will study and make recommendations with reference to livestock and meats. Another will study field crops while another considers dairy and poultry products, and so forth. All of these subcommittees have been very active and have done much constructive work. To this committee must go the credit for focusing the attention of the American people on the necessity for the coordination of all food activities of the Government under one food administrator with full power to act. Upon the direction of this committee, and as general chairman of the committee, I introduced H. R. 2739 on May 18, 1943. This bill was immediately approved by the people of the Nation with phenomenal unanimity. In fact not one single responsible person or organization arose to oppose it. The membership of the House and Senate quite generally approve it.

THE JENKINS BILL

The bill to which I have heretofore alluded is known as the Jenkins bill. This bill provides:

First. It establishes a food administration in the Department of Agriculture and gives the administrator thereof full power over all food activities. This power is broad enough to include the control over prices and all other controls now exercised by any of the many food authorities. It also provides that the administrator may delegate his powers to assistants, but he cannot surrender them.

Second. It protects the consumer as well as the producer.

Third. The act could be terminated with the termination of the war.

Because this bill assumed to provide controls for prices, and so forth, it was sent to the Banking and Currency Committee for consideration. Later the Agriculture Committee of the House took up the consideration of the matter, with the result that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], the chairman of that committee, with my consent, incorporated practically all the principles of my bill into a bill which he introduced, which is known as the Fulmer bill. This bill was recommended for passage by the Agriculture Committee of the House and would have been favorably considered by the House but for the fact that when the President appreciated what Congress was about to do, he forced the resignation of Chester Davis and appointed Marvin Jones. It was generally known that it was the wish of the Republicans and Democrats alike that Davis should be the man to be appointed, whichever of these two bills would have passed. But when the President appointed another man to the position, the ardor of some Members for the passage of that legislation suddenly cooled. They were willing to grant complete authority to Davis or to any other fair-minded man to operate entirely free from any domination even from the domination of the White House, but they were not willing to give the White House any such authority to be exercised by its appointee by remote control.

It is almost a national calamity that we were thwarted in our attempt to give the American people what they wanted. This determination of the White House to hold all authority and its unwillingness to divide authority with anyone, however competent, is frequently noted.

When Congress returns from its recess, I hope it will still be the purpose of this Food Study Committee to renew its efforts to take the food problem out of politics by demanding that a fair and impartial food administrator with full power to act be appointed.

The Food Study Committee also advanced several other constructive programs that have brought relief to the people. I shall discuss a few of them.

THE CANNING PROBLEM

As late as 4 months ago there were some Government authorities denouncing congressional statements that there would be a shortage of vegetables and canned goods. Our committee, several months ago, warned the food authorities and the country of the impending shortage. The failure of the farmers to procure labor in the early spring proclaimed the fact that the vegetable crop would be short. This was supported by the fact that millions of dollars worth of tomatoes and other vegetables were permitted to rot in the fields last year, because of insufficient help to gather the crop. Adding to these sure facts the additional fact of the terribly cold and backward spring season, it should have been evident to any reasonable mind that a shortage of vegetables would be inevitable. The Government authorities defended their position by depending on last year's surplus to supply the deficiency. As a result of this fallacious reasoning the canners of the country descended on Washington a few weeks ago in great numbers. They sought the assistance of our committee for they knew of our efforts and of the fact that Congressman LANDIS, of Indiana, the chairman of our subcommittee on fruits and vegetables, had introduced a bill seeking to provide more ready movement of perishable fruits and vegetables. Our committee arranged for a meeting between the canners and the proper Government authorities which resulted in a better understanding. Shortly thereafter prices were fixed on several vegetables such as peas and beans, and so forth.

The canners were especially concerned over their labor situation. The wages fixed by O. P. A. were too low. Many canners were ready to quit and would have done so except for patriotic reasons. They claimed that an increase of only 1 cent per can would have been sufficient to have enabled them to have paid the required wages. This increase would have increased the cost of the canned goods only 36 cents per person per year. Because of the agitation of the Food Study Committee and others, the O. P. A. authorities have finally consented to an increase of 10 cents per hour on the wages of canning-factory workers. While this will not solve the problem, it will aid materially.

Additional relief has just recently been given to the canners of cherries by reason of the activity of the members of this subcommittee.

THE POULTRY PROBLEM

The Food Study Committee has not confined its activities solely to improving the advantages of the farmer. This committee has carried its investigations to the large centers of population in an effort to assist in the solution of the problems of the consumer. This committee held public hearings in several large cities, including New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis. These hearings were attended by groups representing a large number of consumers. The packers, the processors, the wholesalers, and the retail merchants were all well represented. Also labor groups were represented at some of the hearings.

Special attention was given to poultry and poultry products and to fish products. The public was awakened when our committee developed the fact that practically 90 percent of all the poultry produced in the eastern and northeastern sections of the country were being handled through black markets. The failure of the administration to control black markets is a black mark on its escutcheon. Black markets come from the failure of the consumer to get available commodities legitimately. When the law fails or those who enforce the law fail, the consumer takes the law into his own hands and thereby encourages the black markets. Not only are black markets proof of the inefficiency of Government authorities, but they are a terribly disorganizing influence on business. When one of the greatest processors and distributors of poultry in the country testified at our hearing in Boston that his business had practically all disappeared to the black market, and that for the first time in 115 years one of the large and famous old markets of Boston on the previous Saturday did not have a single chicken to offer for sale to its thousands of Saturday customers whose lifetime custom had been to purchase their chicken for Sunday dinner at that old market, he told a story that has been typical of markets all over the country. Where are our thousands of O. P. A. inspectors and investigators while this practice is being carried on? Would it not be within the power of our most efficient Federal Bureau of Investigation to take up the matter of the protection of the American people? Likewise, the Department of Justice could well afford to devote their activities to breaking up the black marketers who literally steal millions of dollars from the American people and subject them to serious epidemics by forcing them to buy unwholesome poultry and meat products.

PANCAKE FLOUR

The magnitude of the business done by the manufacturers of pancake flour is

surprising. To a large extent this product is used by the families of working mer who must prepare meals quickly. But it is also used by all classes of people. The O. P. A. set a price of from 5 to 7 cents per 20-ounce package on the unadvertised brands. This is the kind of pancake flour that is sold by many of the chain stores. The prices were based on costs of 1941. The costs of the ingredients have increased greatly but the ceiling price fixed by the O. P. A. remained the same. As a result those manufacturing this kind of pancake flour were compelled to close their operations. There were producing 60 percent of all the pancake flour sold. By reason of the activity of the committee steps have already been taken which we hope will relieve this injustice.

CORN

There should be no serious shortage of corn in this, the greatest corn-producing country, yet many of our manufacturing plants that must have corn products of various kinds face a shut-down because of the failure to get corn into industrial channels. These include paper manufacturing plants and even in some cases foundries and certain classes of steel manufacturing plants. This present corn shortage has been a revelation to most of our people for few people ever knew of the many industrial and commercial usages to which corn is put.

Just recently the Government has been compelled to resort to a most unusual procedure with reference to corn. In fact, I do not now recall of any such procedure having ever been resorted to by the Government. I refer to the procedure by which the Government a few days ago confiscated several millions of bushels of corn from private owners. This procedure was denominated as a requisition; but it was in fact practical confiscation. Of course, the Government paid the regular price for the corn. The amount sought to be secured by this proceeding was 20,000,000 bushels, but I am advised that only about 6,000,000 bushels was obtainable. Let me give you some figures that will prove that this unfortunate situation could and should have been averted. For this year's use we had a carry-over from last year of 350,000,000 bushels of corn. In 1942 we raised a magnificent crop of corn that yielded 3,317,000,000 bushels. Adding these two items we had a total of 3,667,000,000 for distribution. It was expected that this would be apportioned about as follows:

	Bushels
For industrial and food uses	285,000,000
For livestock feed	2,932,000,000
For carry-over from this year	450,000,000
Total	3,667,000,000

From these figures, which are considered to be reasonably accurate, it is seen that there is no shortage of actual corn in the country. The Government agencies have shown their inability to properly distribute the corn so that the maximum of usefulness might be had. While there is yet a great supply of corn in the country there is a terrific shortage for industrial purposes and also for feed for poultry, dairy cows, and for feeder cattle.

This shortage is partly due to the fear of the corn grower to part with his corn because he thinks he may need it next year; and another fact contributing to this shortage is the fixing of the price of corn too low by the O. P. A. It has always been recognized by hog feeders that the ratio between the price of corn and the price of hogs should be about 1 to 10. In other words, if the price of corn was below $1 per bushel and the price of hogs was above $10 per hundred that then it would not pay the farmer to sell his corn but he had better feed that corn to his hogs. When the price-fixing authorities fixed the price of corn at $1.07 per bushel at Chicago, which is about $1 to the farmer, and permitted hogs to sell for $13.75 per hundredweight, the farmers decided to feed their corn to the hogs. It was more profitable. So in the race between the hog and the human, the hog wins out.

WHEAT

There is no doubt that there will be a short crop of wheat this year. In 1942 the yield was 980,000,000 bushels. The yield for 1943 is estimated to be 731,000,000. This will be a falling off of 249,000,000 bushels. It is estimated that our demands for wheat for 1943 will be 1,023,000,000. This will be 292,000,000 bushels more than it is estimated we will produce. Unless this situation is properly appraised and anticipated, we will have a serious problem from this source. Wheat is now being used extensively to bolster up the corn shortage.

The wealth of the Nation comes from two sources. One source is the yield of the ground in grains and vegetables and in minerals. The other is the skill and genius of men in fitting these natural products to the use of mankind. Can you possibly understand any intelligent administration waiting until 1943—4 years after the outbreak of war in Europe—to quit paying farmers for reducing production and fining farmers for marketing a few bushels of wheat in excess of restricted quotas fixed by professors in Washington?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that in these the most trying times in the history of the Republic, it is the duty of the Government to encourage the greatest possible production of all the grains, fruits, and vegetables that our country can grow so that these may feed our people, feed our livestock and poultry, and operate our industries. And the Government should further encourage the people to employ their genius to the limit so as to enhance the value and usefulness of all our commodities so that we may care for our people and win the war. When the Government shall have done this, our people will do their part. They never have failed.

CATTLE

The meat problem would be funny if it were not so serious. There are more cattle in the country than ever before, still beef is very scarce. The western cattle raisers are clamoring to sell their cattle, still hundreds, probably thousands of slaughterhouses and packing houses have quit business. Fifteen out of seventeen packing plants in Cincinnati are closed. The cattle raiser cannot sell because the feeders to whom he usually sells will not buy because feed is scarce, with poor prospects for improvement. The feeder also is complaining because the O. P. A. by regulations is preventing him from finishing his cattle as he is accustomed to doing.

Let me outline the different steps in the raising and disposing of fat beef cattle. First, the ranger raises the animal until it is ready to be fattened. Some are moved young as baby beeves and others as yearlings or as 2-year-olds. They are shipped to feeders who are usually located in the great corn- and wheat-growing sections of the country. The feeders then subject these animals to intensive fattening processes where they are expected to put on from 2 to 4 pounds of flesh per day. The feeder usually wants to put on as much as possible. Some animals are increased in weight as much as four or five hundred pounds. That poundage that the feeder puts on is the juicy meat that the consumer wants. The O. P. A. has by regulation attempted to prevent the feeder from carrying his process to the final steps and to compel him to dispose of the animal when it has been about half finished. That is now the crux of the delay in many cases. Four well-fed animals will produce as much meat in pounds as five animals not completely finished. Under the O. P. A. regulations it will require 5,000,000 animals to produce what 4,000,000 would ordinarily produce. The loss of a million animals in that transaction must fall on someone.

There is a tremendous black-market business in cattle. The total result is that the legitimate packing business is ruined. The cattle grower is discouraged. The cattle pens of hundreds of men who have heretofore fed and finished cattle are empty. All this is a sorry example of the incompetency of those in charge of the price-fixing program on beef. The lawless black marketer is stealing the business that rightfully belongs to a fine group of businessmen who have done their part to build up America. The black marketer is making millions in a slimy, destructive way, and is endangering the lives of millions who innocently eat his unwholesome product prepared in slimy, stinking, back-alley slaughtering places.

RATIONING—PRICES, ROLL-BACKS, AND SUBSIDIES

To this point in my discussion of the food problem I have dealt largely with production. Personally, I feel that the best antidote to inflation is a plenteous supply of goods. Inflation comes from a surplus of purchasing power and a scarcity of goods. We could forever put an end to inflation in foods and the cost of living if we could produce a bountiful sufficiency of food commodities. Therefore, I maintain that our food authorities should abandon all their makeshift plans of trying to handle this, the most important domestic problem, by attacking it in slipshod manner. It should be met head-on in a sensible, vigorous manner. Every energy should be employed

to produce and produce and produce. When this shall have been done, neither hunger nor inflation will threaten us.

Rationing is a defensive process. It should be employed only when the supply of necessary foods is not sufficient to meet the demand and when there is danger that some will suffer at the expense of others. There is a wide difference between the philosophy which underlies rationing and that which underlies price fixing and roll-back and subsidies. Rationing is supposed to insure fairness to all. It should not be used as a vehicle of unfairness either to the people or to business or to the country.

The fixing of prices, roll-backs, and subsidies are all akin and none of them would have been necessary if the authorities had adopted a plan of plenty against the plan of scarcity. Scarcity leads to starvation, while plenty leads to prosperity.

Mr. Hoover in a recent speech said of these interesting subjects:

Abolish the system of retail and wholesale price ceilings. It begins at the wrong end. Price fixing in a great food-producing country must begin as near as possible to the farmers and controls proceed from there on by regulation of the trades against profiteering. Prices rose less when this system was applied in the last war than they have under the present retail ceilings. We must regulate the flow of water at the nozzle instead of chasing the drops from the shower. This present price system is stifling farm production. It is not stopping inflation.

And who is supposed to benefit by subsidies? It is supposed to be the worker, but the worker is also the taxpayer. So is the farmer. And taxes are, sooner or later, increased by just the same amount as the subsidy. Subsidies consist of taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another with an illusion attached that the cost of living has been reduced. It is both more painful and more costly to take money out of the tax pocket than it is to get it out of the price pocket. A wage based on subsidy foundations will break down sooner or later. Moreover, subsidy money increases Government borrowing and debt to the banks and that adds to inflation pressure. Far more serious, however, is the result to the farmer and the consumer. Price fixing based on any such concept will strangle production. Its operation in the distribution trades will clog the flow of commodities and will in the end increase prices and black markets. Likewise subsidies can become a weapon of favoritism or of punishment in the hands of the huge bureaucracy. They will sooner or later lead to scandal.

Mr. Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, says of these important problems:

Price ceilings as a remedy for inflation have been tried hundreds of times during the past 2,000 years. Not once, so far as we can learn, have they succeeded over an extended period. On the contrary, they have resulted in creating food shortages, black markets, and, finally, the very inflation they were supposed to prevent.

As a matter of fact, subsidies, as now employed, do not reach many of the small producers at all, so they are direct victims of the roll-back. Neither are they sufficient to aid many of the high-cost producers. It follows, therefore, that the ceilings are cutting off production just as they have always done whenever tried.

Thus it will be seen that the ceiling method increases the inflationary gap by reducing production. On the other hand, when used in connection with subsidies, it increases the gap at the other end because the Government has to borrow the money paid in subsidies and most of this is borrowed from banks. This increases our national spendable income. The subsidy therefore defeats itself. The present plan attempts the impossible by putting economic law into reverse. Higher prices encourage production and discourage consumption. The subsidy program encourages consumption, and to the extent that the subsidies fail to reach the producers they discourage production.

Why should we cut the price of coffee 3 cents per pound, butter 5 cents per pound, and meat 2 cents per pound to everybody, including the wealthy and those whose incomes have increased more than the cost of living, in order to aid the few with fixed or low incomes? If subsidies are necessary for the relief of, say, 10 percent of our population, it is an enormous waste to subsidize the other 90 percent who do not need it. A far better scheme would be to use the stamp plan, which was employed during the late thirties. Thus the subsidy would go to only those who need it, and it would not be necessary to place ceilings which fast curtail our already diminishing food supply

Both Houses of Congress, just a few days ago, overwhelmingly rejected subsidies. The House of Representatives came within a few votes of having the two-thirds vote necessary to override the President's veto.

The Congress upon its return from the present recess will no doubt renew its attack on these programs.

It was reliably reported on the floor of the House by men high in New Deal councils that because of the tremendous majority in the House and Senate against subsidies, the President and his New Deal food authorities would refrain from the further extension of subsidies except as to butter and beef and coffee as already arranged. I predict that no attention will be paid to these promises and that these authorities will take advantage of the absence of Congress from Washington and that they will extend subsidies to many other commodities, unless they sooner find that the roll-back will not work in which event the Government may go into the market and buy commodities in a big way or it may raise the prices in cases that are pressing. One of the worst features of subsidies is that when once commenced it is difficult to withhold them and that the further they are extended the more destructive they become. There could be nothing more inflationary than for the Government to borrow money to give to the people of this generation to be repaid by the taxpayers of another generation when the earning power of the people of this generation is greater than it has ever been.

COMMITTEE PLANNING ADDITIONAL HEARINGS

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee is equipped to and expects to make exhaustive research investigation of all the phases of the food problem such as the amount and proportion of our food going to our allies and to lease-lend and to the armed forces. The figures issued by the governmental authorities are notoriously inaccurate and are prepared to suit their own purposes. The committee is also expecting to hold public hearings in the agricultural sections of the country and in some of the large western cities. Livestock and meat products invite a complete study. The tremendous production of fruits and vegetables in California and the great Northwest need to be given great and careful consideration, for their value runs into billions of dollars.

It shall be the purpose of the members of this committee to devote most of the coming recess of Congress to the study and solution of these problems. This would be a most appropriate congressional service.

LAST SESSION OF CONGRESS WAS SIGNIFICANT

I am constrained to make the observation that the last session of Congress was a most significant one. It proclaimed a new declaration of independence. No longer is there any special magic in a peremptory message from the White House. No more is the word "must" used except in the chronicles of those who write of the past; not only has the Chief Executive been held to his proper prerogatives but he has been brought back from the far-away journeys and excursions that he was wont to make into the prerogatives of the legislative branch of the Government. He has been halted in his efforts to legislate by Executive edict—witness his unlawful efforts to limit salaries to $25,000 and the unlawful efforts of the War Labor Board to usurp power which it did not have. I mention this subject, for there is, in my opinion, a battle impending between Congress and the Executive in connection with the power of the Executive to establish roll-backs and to pay subsidies in such a manner and to such an extent as he evidently proposes. There are many who deny that the President can legally put into effect his extensive program of subsidies and roll-backs.

THE PLACE OF FOOD IN OUR WAR EFFORT

The most important contribution to our war effort is the manpower employed. Nothing transcends in importance the lives of our young men and women in the armed services. The next most important contribution is munitions. Men first and munitions next. Then comes food. A willful refusal to produce food by those responsible for its production is unpatriotic. Willful failure by Government officials to do their utmost to plan to encourage the production of food is unpatriotic. Any willful effort to prevent the production of food is sabotage. Therefore, since the production of food is so vital to our war effort, every American owes it to his country to do his utmost to produce and to conserve food. Willful waste makes woeful want.

To sum up, I would say that for the remainder of 1943 those in Government charged with the production and conservation of food from the President down to the humblest producer should lay aside every consideration of personal gain or political advantage and strive to solve our food problem.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a young man in uniform and our country's history are two glorious things.

Senator CLYDE REED and the President agree on Federal crop insurance; Senator TRUMAN and Aubrey Williams on N. Y. A.

We are conservative; we would not say "the end is in sight" until at least one American or English soldier was in German-occupied Europe.

"The Truman committee's watchfulness and courage have helped reduce the temptation to profiteer, and the public would do well to support its vigilance."

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER says his life's ambition is to nominate F. D. R. for President of the United States of the World. Senator CLAUDE is a little late.

Just as Congress adjourned the air-cooling boiler or freezer literally blew up and will be off for 30 days. Don't tell me the Lord is not on our side.

William Green, who once was sensible, now asks for defeat of every Member of Congress who voted for the antistrike bill. The bill aimed only at preventing strikes in wartimes.

The President's expressed sympathy for the three professors for the want of a trial will infuriate the House after all the days they had before the Kerr committee. The gap widens.

We are taught to hate the Japs and at first they were all put in concentration camps, and the F. B. I. is constantly looking for German bunds, but the Italians roam our streets as freely as sin and nobody cares.

After the bill withholding pay from thousands of Federal employees had been agreed to by the two Houses it took another whole week to get it signed because of righteous indignation at limitations imposed on spending.

The copious tears from down Pennsylvania Avenue over the demise of Federal crop insurance on the signing of the Agriculture Department bill is a weak appeasement to the American farmers for the determination to roll them back on the price of their products.

Responsible for Corn Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, just before Congress adjourned the papers carried many articles concerning the shortage of corn. As usual the radio commentators and the columnists guessed wrong. They thought the farmer was responsible. The truth is Congress was responsible because it did not prevent the Department of War from wrecking the food supply by drafting most of the available farm help.

Of course, another cause was the national lunacy of restricting the production of agricultural wealth. We were all to get rich by stopping production, but if the War Department had cooperated as it should have, then there would not be the acute corn shortage that exists today.

I quote from a letter from C. W. Tanner, C. P. S. No. 30, Walhalla, Mich., dated May 3, 1943:

I just returned last Tuesday night from a 9-day furlough that I took expecting to finish husking my 1942 crop of corn. While I was home it rained most of the time so I was only able to husk 2½ days. However, I just happened to be lucky to hire a man who will husk the 7 or 8 acres that are left as soon as the weather permits.

Last Tuesday, May 18, one of my neighbors still had 15 acres to husk and another 25 acres. Many of my neighbors haven't started to plow, some have a small amount plowed, very few have all their plowing done and as a rule everyone has all their corn planted by that date. Because of the rains very little or no corn will be planted in May. Many acres will lay idle this year because of the shortage of farm labor and the lateness of the planting of the crops caused by the rain.

As you and I well know we have never raised enough in normal times to feed our people and that leading agricultural colleges and universities in various States have indicated production declines of as much as 30 percent in numerous localities and by States from 10 to 25 percent reduction over last year's production.

About 10 days ago an article appeared in the Kankakee Daily Republican from Washington saying that Kankakee County, Ill., was one of the counties that ranked high in the shortage of farm labor. Now because of all the rain the farm labor shortage will be more acute than ever. Washington is already asking for farmers to increase wheat production.

Now our Nation and the world is near starvation and I cannot continue to call myself a good Christian and do nothing about this condition. Our work here in the Manistee National Forest planting trees and doing timber releasing, can and should be done when food again becomes more plentiful.

Unless something is done before long to let men go back to the farm many will be considering doing as I have been thinking of, and that is to walk out of camp and go back to farming—at least until I should be picked up. Then if I were sent to prison I would still consider it a great victory because of Thoreau's assertion "Under a government which imprisons anyone unjustly, the true place for a just man is in prison." I am not selfish, I'm sure, in my view, but only want to be able to help humanity by feeding—not only our people but all people of the world that need food. What better service could men in civilian public service camps render to their country? We are being denied the privilege of serving our country in the best way we can conscientiously serve.

Why not reclassify men in civilian public service camps to II-C or III-C, those who will produce food for the duration? I think this would mean about 2,000 men to immediately help out on the farms.

Hope you will do all you can to relieve the farm labor shortage in the United States, any way to produce the full capacity.

North Dakota's Lieutenant Governor Holt Pleads for Small Business—Would Employ Local Lignite and Manpower Resources To Produce Sponge Iron for War- and Peace-time Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, all America, in its eagerness to expend freely of its natural and human resources to win the war, is concerned about the shortage of steel for armaments, airplanes, and ships and demands that the Government somehow effect adequate and unrestricted production of iron and steel.

There are 26 States that possess rich natural resources of iron ore, and there are many more States that possess coal and lignite in immense quantities, with hydroelectric power and human skill—everything that is necessary for the production of iron and steel to whatever extent that may be required for full war production.

We know that there is a steel shortage. Why should we permit such a situation to exist? Why should we continue to rely upon the steel monopoly for these all-important supplies, which they cannot produce in sufficient quantity to meet the Nation's war needs?

That question is being asked today very grimly in those States and communities which have long hoped for the development of their natural resources. The existence of these great riches is something of a mockery, so long as these riches remain in the ground unused. There are vast areas of this country which, despite the existence of such great natural resources, are still retarded areas, so far as industry is concerned.

Yet that is not the whole story. For there are States and communities where the natural resources have been opened up, but not for the industrial benefit of the local population. No; the iron ore that is taken from the earth in such areas is not smelted there; it is taken elsewhere to be turned into iron and steel. And if the people of those areas want iron and steel, they must pay for its transportation back to them, sometimes half way across the continent.

The people of those areas get none of the industrial benefits that should accrue from the exploitation of their natural resources. In order to get such benefits, there must be local facilities for the production of iron and steel. Without such local iron and steel plants, they remain in a condition of colonial dependency in a steel empire whose centers are the blast furnaces of Pittsburgh and the financial offices of Wall Street.

From those centers have come, year after year in the past, the orders which have set men to work today and laid them off next month. In those far-away places have been hatched the plans which, indifferent to the well-being of

the people in such areas, provide 6 months' work a year, and in the other 6 months leave the communities to cope with unemployment and poverty.

TRUE MEANING OF FREE ENTERPRISE

The folks out there have had plenty of time to think about all these things, and they know what they want. They have plans of their own. They want to have their natural resources brought into use, under conditions which will permit and encourage a normal industrial development. They want to have small iron and steel plants of their own. And they are well aware that the day has come, because of technological improvements in iron production, when small plants have a new usefulness of special importance to us now in wartime, and of future importance to the whole country in the years of peace to come.

Out there, let me remark, there have been dug out of ancient slime pits the skeletons of gigantic monsters that once roamed and ruled the land—huge armored reptilian forms that had their day and vanished from the scene. You can see their skeletons in the museums, vast sprawling shapes that have a strange resemblance to some of our gigantic corporations. There are some people who think that the gigantic corporations which have lorded it over us for several decades are here to stay forever. But there is good reason to think otherwise. The giant corporations and combinations whose operations are found to seriously interfere with and restrain the natural development of our country, are like the giant reptiles of the past. They are doomed to extinction. Nature, it would seem, grew impatient of those huge reptilian forms in which there was no promise of a finer intelligence and wiped them out. Man has cause enough to be impatient with the gigantic combinations which are not serving their professed purposes of human society. Man can wipe them out and restore free competitive enterprise.

Right now, in wartime, when the steel monopoly has shown its incapacity for meeting the Nation's needs, is the time to begin the work of restoring independent enterprise in this important field of iron and steel production. We are rightfully concerned not only with our wartime needs but also with our post-war prospects. Why should there be any retarded areas in this country, when those very areas possess such great natural resources?

IMPORTANT BEGINNINGS UNDER WAY

The people's hopes and plans for post-war prosperity are of importance to this Congress. The Boykin steel shortage investigating committee has become a forum for the expression of these aims and purposes. I have in mind particularly a joint session held recently, on June 25, here in Washington, of the representatives of the Governors of North Dakota and Minnesota with the Boykin committee, at which far-reaching plans were discussed for bringing into use for war production the important mineral resources of those two States.

At that joint conference, one of the speakers was Lt. Gov. Henry Hold, of North Dakota, and what he said was of such interest that I am glad to quote it here at length:

Mr. Chairman, our war production program is a matter in which this whole Nation has a direct and vital interest. We are depending upon massive and sufficient production to save American lives in this war. It is an intolerable thought that heroic young lives should be lost because of any insufficiency of war materials.

SHOCKING FACTS ABOUT SHORTAGE OF STEEL

This is a subject upon which I do not wish to expand. But I am bound to say that I have been profoundly shocked by the recent admission made by H. G. Batcheller, Chief of the Iron and Steel Division in the War Production Board, that it has been necessary to cut the supplies of steel asked by—

The War Department, by 14 percent;
The Navy Department, 20 percent;
The Maritime Commission, 22 percent;
Lend-Lease, 32 percent; and
The Office of Defense Transportation, 40 percent.

And as these figures are taken from the official news statement of the War Production Board, I would ask that the complete release be accepted for the record of this hearing.

The reasons for this unfortune state of affairs are not far to seek. The facts unmistakably pointed out the origin of the shortage. It is due to the domination of our war production program by the interests of the steel monopoly, which is reluctant to permit small business to have any adequate part in war production.

The big steel companies that show little or no interest in the future well-being of the States and communities from which they drain their iron ores first assured the Nation through the 1941 Gano Dunn report that there would be plenty of steel for our war program. That complacency, nursed along by well-prepared publicity and propaganda lulled us on doing nothing to get ready for the war, until it was almost too late. When finally the shortage was becoming tragically serious, an expansion of steel production facilities was countenanced. Whereupon the Government next permitted the allocation of a billion and a quarter dollars for the purpose of expanding and modernizing steel plants. But, mark you, thanks to the helpful counsel of Big Steel's advisory committee—more than 90 percent of this huge sum was handed the few big steel companies.

Mr. Chairman, we of the Northwest are thoroughly convinced by what has happened in the last 40 years that there will be no satisfactory expansion of steel production until the strangle hold of the big steel companies is broken. That industry will not be returned to the service of the American people until independent small business is permitted to participate in the war-production program by a utilization of our local iron-ore resources scattered widely throughout the country.

LOCAL INDUSTRY, BASIS OF GOLDEN AGE

We of North Dakota like the stimulus of competition. We sincerely hope for the restoration of that spirit of industrial pioneering which flourished over the Nation in the era of small business which lasted up to the turn of the century.

In those nineteenth century days, which some of us have not forgotten, every town had its own small business concerns, locally owned, locally managed, an integral part of the locality. And back of them you would find, scattered all over the country, local mining enterprises, and local foundries and shops, making use of the great natural resources spread so profusely in our soil.

Our mineral riches were mined from the earth, our ores were processed into metal and fabricated into the finished articles of commerce. These local enterprises were the broad base of an industrial prosperity from which no locality and no region was debarred. For in those days of free American enterprise, no power existed in financial centers to stop the wheels of industry in any town or doom any region to industrial stagnation.

I hark back to those days of free American enterprise, because it was in those days that American industry developed the impetus which has kept it going ever since, in spite of the difficulties which then began to hamper and distort its development. At about that time, taking advantage of the lavish funds available from European sources, our Eastern financiers began to take over the control of business. This process began with their domination of the iron and steel industry early in the new century. It then spread rapidly throughout all industry, until monopoly control was established in practically every one of our key industries.

And with monopoly control and the destruction of competition, there came about a gradual decay of that spirit of pioneer enterprise by which this country had achieved its industrial greatness. The impetus was great, and it carried us far, but the bloated growth of mounting corporate structure and profits could not replace the qualities of free local enterprise that had been strangled to death.

We were accustomed to think of ourselves as the world's leaders in industrial enterprise. Yet the new century was still young when the World War revealed to us the fact that we were dependent upon German industry for strategic chemicals and other essential products which we here in this country had never learned to make. Not, let us say, because our American inventors were less resourceful and ingenious than those of Germany, but because the financial powers that ruled our industrial life did not see fit to promote the research and experiment in such directions.

"HE WHO PAYS THE PIPER"

For the past 40 years we have labored under the system of regimentation in which vast absentee interests paid the piper and called the tune. It was no longer the mining people who decided where the mines should be dug. It became increasingly true that it was not the producers who decided what articles should be manufactured, or the storekeepers who decided what articles should be sold, or the American people who decided what articles they should buy.

STEEL, A CONCRETE EXAMPLE

All these matters were increasingly decided for them by the higher powers of distant corporate finance. Up to a certain point these monopoly interests were anxious for improvement of our industrial methods. Yes; they employ the best engineering skill and inventive genius and direct it along certain definite lines, with a view to intrenching themselves permanently in control. The steel monopoly, for instance, was glad to promote the further development of the gigantic blast furnace from the less efficient units of smaller capacity that characterized the industry at the turn of the century. For it meant an end of the annoying competition of the small forges scattered around the country, which could produce possibly 25 to 50 tons of pig iron a day at a cost of $30 to $50 a ton. These little forges were wiped off the map by the colossal blast furnace, which could produce 1,400 tons of pig iron a day at $20 a ton. And so the little forges were shut down, and with them the local mines, in State after State—unable to compete with the great business and financial interests that became the masters of the industry.

Then mines and foundries and machine shops and factories that had flourished in Connecticut, in New Jersey, in Virginia, in North Carolina, in Tennessee, in Michigan, in Wisconsin, in Missouri, in California, in

Washington, in Oregon—these were now blotted out, leaving the Steel Trust in complete control of this basic industry, upon which all the rest of our durable goods industries depend.

True, the masters of this steel industry are interested in improvement, but not if it disturbs their security. And that appears to be the view of those officials of the big steel companies who now continue in the service of our Government in the War Production Board while continuing to remain on the payrolls of their companies. Naturally, they are reluctant to permit the natural development of improved and inexpensive "sponge iron" plants which, if permitted to prosper with small war orders, would help return this major industry to greater service for the people.

PERMIT INDEPENDENT SMALL BUSINESS TO STAGE A COME-BACK

First and last, it is from the point of view of American lives that I consider this matter now before us—American lives to be saved in this war, and given a chance for prosperity and happiness in the days of peace to come.

This committee points the way, and its work is a step in the right direction. I earnestly hope that you continue to carry on this great endeavor and to help the many retarded and stranded communities of this Nation. Let them share in war production and they will stage a come-back that will enable them to return to peacetime pursuits in a better balanced economy. Recommend legislation where needed that will keep the monopolies from holding this country back by warping our economy.

LET US NOT FORGET OUR BOYS

North Dakota has made and is making a tremendous contribution to the war effort by her agriculture. Industrially we are not in such a favorable position. Our natural resources are available for an even greater contribution—hence we are pleading for consideration of the use of these resources in the war effort, and the building of our industrial enterprises along sound local economic lines.

Our sons have made great contributions in heroic sacrifices of which we are justly proud. It is our desire to provide expanded opportunities for these returning lads, so they won't have to seek employment in already overcrowded large centers.

A COLONY—OR A BALANCED ECONOMY—WHICH?

Let us begin to consider the problem of small business in terms of our boys and the opportunities of which they are worthy. If we continue to tolerate further domination by monopolies, North Dakota is going to become a sparsely populated colony, doomed to be exploited by distant industrial centers. Our notion of a balanced economy is one where there is a modest mingling of industrial employment with agriculture. The basic industry which supports the durable-goods industries is iron and steel. The communities that are producing this master metal from resources found in nearby deposits hold the opportunity for genuine balance, a natural industrial development ensues, with diversified industries and employment. But where monopoly is countenanced, plants are located arbitrarily and oblivious of local situations and sound economics.

THE TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW

Mr. Speaker, the speech of North Dakota's Lieutenant Governor which I have here quoted is an illustration of the great public interest felt in many States with regard to bringing into use for purposes of war production and of post-war prosperity the abundant natural resources beneath our very feet. It is an illustration also, let me say, of a practical determination to bring these purposes into action for the benefit of the whole Nation—not in an indefinite future, but now.

States' Rights and Post-War Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

STATES' RIGHTS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, the question of States' rights is a very old subject, to which the subject of post-war programs is closely related. The concentration of power in the Federal Government and our post-war programs, both domestic and foreign, are two of the outstanding fundamental problems now confronting the Congress and the American people. Of course, the primary and most urgent problem is that of winning the war, but, as "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," we cannot overlook and ignore the forces that are using the war situation to promote ideologies inconsistent with the constitutionally established principles of government.

There is a rising or increasing trend on the part of Federal agencies to enlarge the powers of the Federal Government by assuming rights and powers belonging to the States, but we cannot fail to observe there is also an increasing tendency on the part of the States to surrender their rights and powers to the Federal Government for a consideration. That is, instead of assuming and discharging the responsibilities of the States there are frequent and increasing petitions by the States through their representatives to have the Federal Government assume these responsibilities. It is time, therefore, for all State representatives and the people themselves to take stock and courageously insist upon their rights and proceed to assume the responsibilities incident to such rights, because where there is a right there is generally a corresponding responsibility. In many letters and petitions from different sections of the country we find the petitioners insisting in the first paragraph that the rights and powers of the States must be preserved but usually in the second paragraph they will urge that the Federal Government should "pass around the biscuits." If I were called upon to express an opinion as to the cause or underlying reason for this vanishing of rights and powers of the States I would suggest that it may be attributed in a measure to the passage of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution which repealed the original provision giving the legislatures of the several States the right to elect Senators to the Congress of the United States and transferring this right to the people.

I do not mean to say that the change in any way reflects upon the ability or political integrity of the people because they have been able to choose men just as capable as those chosen by the State legislatures, but it will be remembered that the one outstanding and uppermost purpose in the minds of the makers of the Constitution was the preservation of the rights of the States, and in order to make certain that such rights were to be protected in the new system of government they were setting up it was decided that each State should have equal representation in the Senate regardless of size or population and that the Senators should be elected by the State legislatures for a term of 6 years. The reason assigned for electing them by the legislature was upon the theory that the legislatures would be more jealous of the rights and powers of the States than any other one group of people within the States and would, therefore, be more likely to hold the Senators accountable for the preservation of the States' rights and powers. That is, it was definitely designed in the preparation of the Constitution that the Senators were to represent and preserve the rights of the States against encroachments by the new Government and the Members of the House of Representatives were charged with the responsibility of representing the people, their term of office being limited to 2 years in order that they would always be fresh from the people and in a position to know the will of the people.

The natural and logical thing happened following the seventeenth amendment. Senators then began to cultivate the good will of the people and they were not long in finding that this could be done most effectively by having the Federal Government assume some of the burdens and responsibilities of the people which invariably means the surrender of some right or power of both the people and the States. Furthermore, officials in the executive departments, who are always looking for an opportunity to increase their functions and powers, were not long in learning how to cultivate the good will of Senators, a situation which not only enabled Senators to command but to demand more bacon for the States, and every time there was pork for distribution the rights and powers of the Federal Government were enlarged and every time the bacon was accepted by the people or their representatives, corresponding rights and powers of the States were decreased.

If the trend continues the Federal Government will eventually absorb all of the essential rights of both the States and the people. It is a situation that commands the most serious thought and consideration by the people's representatives, both State and National, including leadership in church, school, business, and so forth. It will not be permanently solved until the war is over. However, it is not primarily a post-war problem, although it may be one of the vital related qualifications of those selected to write the post-war program. The question as I see it is whether the people and the States want to surrender their rights and responsibilities to the Federal Government and then substitute state socialism in place of our former democratic system of government. This will not be an uphill business; it is downgrade all the way.

POST-WAR PROGRAM

Of course, there are many people thinking and talking about postwar programs, and it appears that the percentage or probably the actual number is

larger than those who are thinking, planning, and praying to win the war. We all think we will win the war, but thinking people and those who are actually making the sacrifice to win already know and realize it cannot and will not be won by wishful thinking. Furthermore, too much talk and suggested post-war formulas could make a substantial contribution toward losing the war. If press reports are correct, some of our neighbors and Allied friends are already expressing some apprehension or suspicions as to what the United States may attempt to do when the war is over. They are already suggesting that if they knew for certain the United States would want and demand the biggest half of everything worth while following the war they are not so certain it would be to their best interest to continue to lend us their moral support, irrespective of the other support they have been able to give. Such an attitude on the part of some countries will make this war more difficult to win and make it more necessary to sacrifice the lives of thousands of young men that could be saved through an unselfish, jam-up spirit of good will and cooperation.

My suggestion is that the least said about these post-war formulas may be the easiest mended. We Americans know what the attitude of the United States will be toward our friends and allies when this war is over. We know that we are anxious to see the people of every nation have the right to work out, establish, and maintain a system of government of their own liking so long as they do not trespass upon similar prerogatives of others, but all the people of the different nations do not know this, and we should not deceive ourselves in thinking they are not being told differently every day, and it is this different story that gives rise to their apprehensions and we should be careful to do nothing that would lend support to their suspicions.

There is a great deal of speculation and planning as to what our post-war program will be at home. Some are insisting that they are able to visualize and predict exactly what our problems here will be and are now prepared to write a prescription or formula for their solution. The formula which seems to be uppermost in the minds of some and the one being propagandized to the greatest extent is that our Government will not only guarantee every man and woman a job, but it will be one that will enable them to establish and maintain a standard of living satisfactory to themselves. The objective is one to which every American citizen should certainly aspire and faithfully strive to attain, but the formula suggested can mean nothing less than the destruction of individual initiative, the absolute surrender of our democratic philosophy of life, and the establishment of state socialism. Ten years ago no real patriotic American would seriously have suggested such a program and there are not a great percentage of our population who are willing to admit they wholeheartedly subscribe to such a philosophy of government now, but it is tragic to think how many native-born Americans who seem to be willing to give up or surrender their responsibility to plan, devise, work out and formulate their own life-program and identify themselves with it. I have great faith in the American soldier of today and upon his return I hope to see him repudiate such a philosophy and take the position that he offered his life to sustain a government that will encourage thrift, industry, and initiative—a government that will encourage equal rewards for equal merit or equal productive power, but not a government that will regiment or ham-string business by saying to an employer he shall not have the right to exercise his discriminating judgment as to the productive ability of applicants regardless of whether they be young or old, short or tall, high or low, fat or lean, white or black, blonde or brunette.

A great deal more could be said on this latter observation because much resentment has developed in recent years to a philosophized propaganda that would have everybody believe there is no difference between the productive ability or earning capacity of white and colored people. They admit there is such a difference in white people but that there is none between white and colored, except when applied to Chinese, Japanese, and so forth. They insist further in this enigma or as some will say, "New Deal philosophy," our Government should see to it that all barriers preventing the integration of the white and colored races should be removed and it should no longer tolerate any social distinctions that may have heretofore existed. This situation will present another post-war problem for our returning soldiers provided it is not settled in the meantime. The observation I am making is that instead of creating additional problems for our soldiers to solve upon their return we should be displaying our loyalty and devotion to the principles of government for which they are fighting, for it is somewhat disheartening to find many taking advantage of the war situation to promote principles of government and philosophies out of line and inconsistent to those our soldiers and sailors are fighting to protect and sustain. There is no doubt but what our long-established principles and cherished traditions of government are now in the refining pot and it is no time to be misled or to be led astray by new political gods or goddesses.

Life's Frustrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Peter Marshall, pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, in the Nation's Capital, preached a sermon on Memorial Day which is so universal in its application, and so comforting to those of us who see frustration all about us and experience it almost every day, that he has yielded to the importunity of many of us who were privileged to hear it that it be given to the Nation through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Two of the illustrations he gave are peculiarly apt and challenging as we begin to approach the glad day when victory shall have crowned our arms and made us free to build the peace upon the foundation of righteous, clear, and constructive thinking that must be done before the imminence of the necessity for action makes thinking hurried.

While challenging all of us to put forth our best efforts, he reminds us of the assurance of Almighty aid when we work in consonance with the divine will and plan for each of us and for His world.

Therefore it is with real joy that I exercise the privilege of presenting in this forum, and through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to its readers, the Nation over and the world around, that truly great sermon:

LIFE'S FRUSTRATIONS

(By Dr. Peter Marshall, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.)

(This sermon is based upon a chapter in a book, the Healing Cross, by Herbert H. Farmer.)

"I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither." (Deuteronomy 34:4.)

It is a strange but undeniable fact of history that some of its greatest characters, despite their triumphs and their achievements have been bitterly disappointed and broken. Again and again it happens. Sometimes not until they die does the world discover their shattered dreams or come to know of their withered hopes. Sometimes the world never knows.

Take Moses, for example. A great emancipator, his was the privilege and the honor of leading his people out of bondage into freedom, from the slavery of Egypt to seek nationhood and liberty in a promised land. He was the lawgiver. His the indomitable spirit, the fearless leadership, the dynamic faith. And yet, his too was the broken heart.

Although he led his beloved people toward the promised land, he himself was never to enter it. The record states the fact with reticence and simplicity. The words contain tragedy and pathos—yet they are simple words—for it is only in simple words that the deepest things of the human heart can be described. The text leads us into the presence of an old man as he sits on a mountain top conscious that the end is very near. The sand is running out. He has not long to live. He knows it, and now he is told that the fruit of his anguish and labor is to be plucked and enjoyed by another. And there we are left.

We may never know what thoughts were his as he sat pondering this strange providence. He was a great man, a giant among men, a man of destiny, indeed. And here is a bitter ending.

Does it not sum up all the element of frustration and disappointment in life which to some extent comes to all of us? How tragic, how simple, is God's word to Moses: "I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

Come now, take counsel with your own heart, are you not compelled to confess that life has not turned out as you had hoped it would? As you look back upon your

younger years, do you not see the unfulfilled promise and the unrealized hopes of youth, the buds that never came to flower? Isn't there something unresponsive, disillusioning and disappointing in this life?

In our day dreams we see ourselves successful, overcoming difficulties, excelling in the things wherein we long to succeed. But day dreams are of fragile stuff, an enchanted vapor blown away by the strong winds of reality. We all seek the best in life, yet again and again we are forced to accept the second best—and for some it is not even that.

Is it not the wisdom that comes with age and experience that forces us to conclude that we can very seldom receive what we set our hearts upon. We may not make out of life what we once hoped to make out of it. We may not achieve what both circumstances and our own hard work indicated might be our achievement.

The hard fact is that there is a frustrating element in life. Recognizing it and making allowances for it would be the surest way for young people to avoid broken hearts and the bitter tears of disappointment.

There is a good chance that we may not get exactly what we want in life. For people have gained their objective in one direction only to find that they have lost it in another. How many have sought a goal with determination, effort, and even sacrifice, only to find when they reached it, that it was not as satisfying as they thought it would be? This is universally true. Life is full of such discoveries.

Most people will agree with me when I say that we see this truth most plainly in the moral and spiritual side of our natures. There is a vision of an unattainable holiness which haunts even the most devout and the best among us.

Am I not speaking for you also when I say that I am disappointed with myself? I look back with wistful regret on the dreams I once dreamed—how heroic I meant to be. I was to personify every noble virtue. I was going to be different.

Well, I am not different, for the dreams have faded, as dreams will. They have not been realized. And there are memories that cast shadows. Situations revealed moral cowardices, and when the test came the flaws and the weak places in character were revealed. In spite of the day dreams and the highest hopes, I have to realize that I am not of the stuff of which heroes are made, nor do I possess the ingredients for great moral or spiritual achievements, and it is beginning to look as if I never shall.

Are there not many among you who will join me in that confession? We have seen it with our eyes, but it is not for us to go over thither. We have seen the vision, dreamed the dream, given birth to the hope, but we are still struggling on the frontiers of the promised land. We are only poor, ordinary creatures after all, in spite of our dreams and our fine sentiments.

I said this fact of life's frustrations was universally true. It applies also to great causes. It might be appropriate for us on this Memorial Day to think of a historic example.

You will remember that when our soldiers, in 1917 and 1918, marched off to war, it was "to make the world safe for democracy." That was a noble sentiment, an ideal, and an objective for which a man might well give up his life. It challenged the heroism and the sacrifice of thousands of our men who manned the guns in the Argonne, who broke the Hindenburg line, who made immortal such names as Chateau Thierry, St. Mihiel, and Belleau Wood. The men who sleep in Flanders Field did exactly that. They brought that crusade to the very edge of success. They did make the world safe for democracy, but their sacrifice was nullified by the blind selfishness of men at home who had not seen the vision nor understood that humanity is a human family.

Again this same stubborn truth, this fact of frustration and disappointment appeared to dash the hopes of all who were interested in great moral movements and social programs.

More than 20 years ago, when women were given the right to vote, the sentiment was expressed all over the country that a new and better day was about to dawn, for now it was said, women would rally to the great causes of right, justice, morality, and decency. "When a question arises as to morality, or ethics, or righteousness," they said, "the votes of the women will be on that side, and we will be able to carry through some great reforms." One of the tragedies of the century is that the women's votes seem to have made little difference. They have not raised the level of society. They have not established more clean and pure social standards. They have not made marriage a more sacred or holy thing. They have not strengthened the home ties. They have not ennobled womanhood. In short, they have not done what we hoped and prayed they would.

Does not our Lord furnish us with the supreme example of this same truth? Christ seems to have begun His ministry with the hope that the whole Jewish people would respond to His call and become what they were always meant to be—the mediators of God's truth and love to all the world. But it was not to be. He found hardness of heart, opposition, spiritual blindness, and a perverse obstinacy which may not altogether have surprised Him, but which certainly did disappoint Him.

See Him nearing the close of His earthly ministry—how many had responded to His call? True, there were multitudes to receive the loaves and the fishes; but as soon as He began to talk about the cross they turned back and walked no more with Him. Think of the many who were never openly loyal. Think of those who stood on the edge of the crowd, the drifters who chose neither "the highway nor the low, but in between on the misty flats, drift to and fro," the rich young ruler, for example, and Nicodemus, and countless others, who, although they came under the spell of the Nazarene, somehow could never openly acknowledge Him, lacking the courage or the conviction, or both.

We who are only human, we who are sinners, and so lacking ourselves in spiritual discernment and understanding can never fully grasp the meaning of Gethsemane, but one thing seems clear, part of its sorrow was Christ's realization that His call to the Jewish people had failed. We can never take out of Gethsemane the bitterness and the tragedy this must have been for Christ. Yet He went on to the cross, stronger than ever, to turn apparent failure into glorious victory.

Could it not be said of Jesus that He, too, saw something with His eyes that He was not at that time to enter?

What are we to make of this quality of life, its frustrations and disappointments? Shall we allow it to embitter us? Shall we become cynical and give up the struggle?

We cannot know what the old man is thinking as we watch Moses sitting on Mount Nebo looking through his tears, perhaps, at that fair land which he knows now he will never enter. His is a noble face, masterful, strong, yet he gives no sign of the tumult within him, no tell-tale expression, only the eyes are misty. Is he looking back and bitterly repenting the weakness and disobedience which brought about this calamity? He knew when and where he had failed. He had made a mistake. He had disqualified himself. Is he fighting tears of sick disappointment that the glory of the accomplishments for which he had worked so long was to go to another? Or has all that been fought through long ago, so that now without regrets, without envy or jealousy, without rebellion he resigns himself to God? He could say, "I have done the best that I could. I must leave the rest with God." Moses had been frustrated into sublimity.

Life has certain finalities. A broken pane of glass is beyond repair. A burned-out light bulb is a dark and dead thing. An eggshell once shattered cannot be molded again. The broken flower is doomed to death. There is a sense in which we cannot undo things, and some mistakes are irrevocable.

If you take a wrong turning in life, you can never go back to where you were and take the right one. If you fail in some task and responsibility, you are ever afterward the person who failed in that task and responsibility, and the same opportunity will never come again. If you sin, you cannot go back and not sin at that particular point.

Since we all make mistakes, and take wrong turnings, and do disloyal things, and fail to realize our ambitions, life for all of us is a weaving together of a great many might-have-beens.

While this is true we must remember that we are still living in the days of grace, and the Gospel is a gospel of the second chance and the third chance and the fourth and fifth chances—seventy times seven. It is not a matter of mathematics, after all, but a matter of attitude. We are all inclined to take too materialistic a view of what constitutes success and failure in life.

What is God's view of success and failure? Not in accumulation of wealth, for, remember, Christ said to the rich young ruler, "One thing thou lackest." Not in material prosperity, for God said to the men who planned to build bigger barns, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee, and then whose shall these things be?" No; not in these things lies success.

What really matters to God is whether at the end of your pilgrimage you have a mind and character ready for eternity. This life is a preparation for the life hereafter. The end of your pilgrimage is quite a secondary thing. If only somehow we could grasp God's view of life. If only somehow we could be persuaded that the thing that matters with God is not how long you live, but how; not how much of this world's knowledge you have gained, but whether you know Him, whom to know is life eternal. It is not important to God how old you are according to the calendar, but how old you are in Christian experience. It does not matter to God whether you ever make Who's Who; the thing that is important is that your name is in the Lamb's Book of Life. You may become a famous person or you may end up an insignificant nobody; you may achieve a quarter, one-half, or three-fourths of your heart's desires; you may live to see most of your dreams come true or you may see the fruits of your labor given to another; but which it is does not finally matter so long as you have in and through it all learned patience and humility and tenderness and understanding and an utter dependence upon God and His mercy just as you are.

The world's greatest failures may, after all, be best prepared for God's purposes, just as the wood from which the lute is carved cannot sound its sweetest note until the very heart of it has been cut away.

It is a fact of Christian experience that life is a series of troughs and peaks. In His efforts to get permanent possession of a soul God relies on the troughs more than the peaks, and some of His special favorites have gone through longer and deeper troughs than anyone else.

Moses was kept out of the promised land because of a sin—a failure—a mistake many years before. There was no going back on

that sin. There was no escaping its consequences. The ambition which he had cherished for a great many years now lay dead at his feet.

Tragedy, you say? No, not tragedy, if he can die with his eyes uplifted to God in quiet acceptance of it and in calm surrender of this life and all its poor satisfactions for something higher and more spiritual and more completely satisfying in the life to come.

The greatest thing the Bible teaches us about life is that it is a preparation for eternity. We are, after all, pilgrims passing through. We are going through a school that is often hard, sometimes dull and dreary, sometimes happy and joyous, sometimes stern in its discipline, and inexorable in its grades, but always its curriculum points to graduation day and the honors it bestows are given to them who are most prepared for the life that is to come. Its parchments may have gone to some whom the world would regard as the greatest failure of history, and yet they may be best prepared for God's purposes and most ready for eternity.

Perhaps this was the idea Kipling glimpsed in his L'Envoi:

"And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame;
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame;
But each for the joy of the working, and each, in his separate star,
Shall draw the Thing as he sees It for the God of Things as They are."

Surely we can see that if this life must disappoint, if it seems to us to have more than its share of frustrations, is it not to teach us that there is a beyond for which this life is but a preparation, so that we shall concentrate not on the things of the earth, but set our affection on things above and seek treasures not on the earth where thieves break through and steal, and where moth and rust doth corrupt, but lay up treasures in heaven? That is the lesson we must learn.

Richard Cecil wanted to teach his little girl the meaning of consecration, so one day in his library he took her on his knees and asked her if she loved him well enough to give up a little necklace of glass beads which she greatly prized. She wore them constantly and loved them, although they were very cheap glass beads.

She looked up at her father with a very puzzled look, her eyes were sad, her lower lip was trembling, and as she thought of losing her beads she began to cry. She sobbed: "Yes, Papa; if you want me to, I'll give them up."

"Well," said her father, "you take them off, and throw them into the fireplace."

Still crying, and very, very slowly, she made the great sacrifice, and then ran back into his arms and sobbed as if her heart would break. Her father patted her little golden head and gently said: "Now Papa knows that you love him."

Nothing more was said for several days. Then came her birthday, and her father called her, and opening a little casket, handed to her a chain of real pearls. Her eyes opened wide, and she became excited as he asked her to put them on and wear them as his gift of love to her, "because Papa loves you."

She looked him full in the face, and then a great light broke upon her and throwing her arms around his neck, she cried: "Now I know why you made me give up my glass beads. Oh, Papa, forgive me. I did not understand then, but I do now."

That is the consecration which God loves, and loves to reward. One day we shall understand why we did not receive our glass beads, and we shall rejoice in the understanding that if we had gained Canaan we might have lost heaven.

What of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a reporter of the Detroit Times of July 4 gives his construction of what one Member of the other body thinks of the New Deal. The report is as follows:

BREWSTER BLASTS HOME-FRONT PLANS—END OF LITTLE BUSINESSMAN SOUGHT AS FIRST STEP OF SCHEME, SAYS SENATOR—HOPKINS MOST IMPORTANT MAN IN UNITED STATES, STATESMAN FROM MAINE FINDS

(By Bill Cunningham)

A small but key-positioned and superpowerful group of left wingers "in the Dr. Jekyll-Mr. Hyde administration set-up" is trying to kill our capitalistic form of government and is hailing the war as a heaven-sent speed-up of their carefully laid and long-plotted plans, charged Maine's conservative Senator RALPH O. BREWSTER, in a smashing, exclusive, and on-the-record interview with your correspondent in Portland last Thursday.

The Senator says he'll grant them sincerity. He concedes that they really believe the abolition of the profit system, the "evolution" from capitalism to national socialism, New Dealism, or whatever they prefer to call their translation of totalitarianism, will serve the greatest good of the greatest number.

TIME HAS COME TO LET PUBLIC DECIDE

But the Senator doesn't believe it. He says America won't believe it nor accept it; that the time has come to drag it out into the open and let the American public know what's been done and what's being done under cover of the war emergency. The time has come, he said, to talk—and he talked.

That itself is significant, if not practically sensational.

BREWSTER is not the talking kind. He's not a sensationalist. He doesn't seek publicity. The former Governor of Maine is a quiet, studious type of statesman, who isn't given to making statements just to hear the rafters ring.

Nor does he compound his opinions from what he reads in the newspapers and hears at the Mayflower bar, as do many of his colleagues.

A quiet, conservative, hard-working teetotaler, he stays on the job in Washington even when the Senate is recessed.

He gets his information first-hand and he doles it out the same way.

When he speaks of waste in war plants and kindred skullduggery, he speaks with especial authority, because, as the only New Englander and ranking minority member of the powerful Truman committee, much of his time is spent in hearings, inspections, and investigations at the sites.

He's not an X-card, chair-tilting statesman.

He moves around on the look-see.

He's been in Alaska, the Caribbean, over most of continental America on inspections and investigations since the war emergency began.

You may hear of him next in Africa, Iran, Russia, or China.

Certainly nobody in New England can speak with as much authority and few in the Nation probably can. With the authority he combines courage.

His background of Bowdoin and Harvard Law speaks sufficiently concerning his intelligence.

LEADERSHIP CHAOS MAY BE PART OF PLAN

"What seems to be a leaderless design for chaos," he said, "may all be part of a plan. We know that this cell of left wingers have a plan. What you call 'the do gooders' have been working on it all along.

"You ask me if these men actually meet and scheme. Your answer is in the news. The special House committee investigating the executive agencies has just seized by subpena nine boxes of the confidential files of David Ginsburg, former general counsel of the Office of Price Administration.

"Look at Committee Counsel Harold Allen's public announcement after he had analyzed the secret memoranda * * *."

Here he pointed to the front page newspaper story which read:

"Under guise of wartime price control," said Mr. Allen's analysis of the documents, "the Office of Price Administration is seeking to bring the entire industrial system under bureaucratic control by regulating not the prices of its products but by controlling the sum of its profits. * * * There is no authority for such a policy in the Price Control Act of January 1942 or its amendments, the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

"As to who are the men, they are the Harry Hopkins coterie, although he represents at the moment their reach into the international field and we'll get back to him in a minute.

"The pink Utopians, the ex-professor-social service crowd was already boring steadily away. It is commonly said in Washington that one of the leaders of these administration leftists said, of the war, that whereas they had originally estimated that it would take 15 years to complete 'the transition' in this country, the way things are going now they hope to accomplish it in 15 months.'

" 'Accomplish precisely what?' " I asked.

LITTLE BUSINESSMAN'S END TO BE FIRST STEP

"The 'liquidation of the kulaks,' " he said, kulaks being the Russian word for middle-class, "the elimination of the middle class in business, the small businessman, the farmer, the little, independent fellow.

"Stalin and Hitler used the same tactics. Kill off the little fellow, concentrate your business in a few great firms—say the automobiles to Ford, the soap to Lever Brothers, the mail order business to Montgomery Ward, and then, with your target narrowed, you can center your fire and knock private business out entirely.

"You know the story of Hitler and Thyssen. Stupidly Thyssen backed Hitler and thought he was profiting mightily because Hitler was handing the nation's industry to him.

"As soon as Hitler got it all stored safely there, however, he eliminated Thyssen.

"His erstwhile patron managed to outwit the Gestapo, which would have made the elimination permanent and get across the border and away with his life.

"But the Nazis had the nation's industry, having shrewdly figured out that it was easier to wipe out one big man than a million little ones.

"Deliberately, or accidentally, that's the pattern being followed here. The net result to the Nation is the same. You know what's happening to small business under the guise of 'war emergency.'

"You know about planned-economy, and what its further program is. There's no secret about it.

"The spokesmen of these administration totalitarians are already on record. Publications sympathetic with them have placed the further plans in print.

"These, in our entire fields of merchandise, include the elimination of brand names on

all commodities; elimination of all trademarks; ruthless curtailment of varieties in all products; the establishment of standard grades and styles in very limited numbers; the governmental decree of standard prices for everything.

"This will mean the killing of the profit system, the elimination of free enterprise, the totalitarian take-over. It's the same old planned-economy wine, newly bottled as wartime necessity.

"This death blow to business as we know it, and to a way of life traditional with free men, is apparently to be delivered by directive of War Mobilization Chief James F. Byrnes."

ONLY PROGRESS WE'RE MAKING IS AT THE FRONT

"This is not fighting a war, it's pushing an ideology, the very ideology, as a matter of fact, that we are fighting with guns at the front.

"The only progress we're making anywhere, and with anything you might note, too, is in the actual fighting at the front.

"And the reason we're making it there is because that's the only place where these meddlers and schemers haven't any say.

"The shooting has been left to Admirals Leahy, King, and General Marshall. The President himself, although participating with Mr. Churchill in the very top decisions, has sensibly left the tactics thereafter to these military and naval experts. That's why we're gaining in the fighting, and is the only reason why we are.

"The domestic scene under these others, because the President seems constitutionally unable to delegate authority and because his sympathies seem predominantly in the direction of these theorists, is an horrendous study in stoppage and confusion. There's no head to anything, no authority in anybody, and no pattern of progress discernible.

"Bureaus overlap each other and conflict with each other. Directives ordering great changes the Congress never has sanctioned are sent roaring into the ranks of the people.

"The bureaucrats and those working for them are, many of them, loyal and worthwhile people. They're as amazed and as confused as the rest.

"A commonly accepted saying in the burgeoning bureaus in Washington is, 'You don't have to be crazy to work here, but it helps.' Many of the people can't see any sense in what they're trying to do, but they go on doing it just the same because there's nobody in authority who can tell them to change."

POWER URGED FOR DAVIS ON FOOD, ICKES ON FUEL

"Take the Office of Price Administration, for instance. It has plainly and pitifully demonstrated its utter incapacity to cope with the problem of supplies. All thoughtful men in Washington of both parties know that set-up won't and can't work, and that the Nation's food supply is going to pot as a result.

"They are convinced that food must be placed in the hands of one man, and, in my opinion, Chester Davis would be a good selection.

"The fuel problem should be placed exclusively in the hands of Harold Ickes.

"Despite your recent interchange with that touchy gentleman, and regardless of his wisdom in taking time from his job to pick a private fight with a newspaperman, he is the most honest and capable administrator we have in the Cabinet.

"But he has no authority and can't do much about fuel.

"After the Army and Navy tell him what they need, and they're often pretty slow about telling him, all he can do is inform the Office of Price Administration how much is left for the public, and it's the Office of Price Administration that then parcels it out.

"Davis, or somebody like him, should have the food; Ickes the fuel; and then each should have what every bureaucrat lacks and can't get from the White House, full, hardfisted, and crack-down authority.

"These men must have power—power to act. Our efforts lack leadership, point, and horse sense.

"In the meantime, our Army and Navy are fighting bitterly and victoriously on the toughest fronts in the world, and the home folks are trying their mightiest to get shoulder to shoulder behind them.

"But the dreamers dream, the schemers scheme, and the political collectivists coldly contrive to change our form of government sufficiently to perpetuate themselves and control it forever.

"The entire domestic picture becomes more deeply involved. Congress is ignored, the people aren't consulted. The policy of promising subsidies is a case in point. Congress has never authorized it. All the agricultural agencies are bitterly opposed to it. Freemen don't want the dole.

"The consideration that a laborer is worthy of his hire is traditional with American people.

"Analogies to Britain and Canada don't hold because the backgrounds and the problems are entirely different.

"Yet the planners go right ahead insisting upon subsidies. It's paternalistic government. Mother knows best. It's plainly part of the take-over plan.

"The breaking up of small business, subsidizing the farmer, the promotion of bankruptcy, and general throwing of as many people as possible upon the mercy, and therefore into the control, of the governmental master minds all seems part of a general plan.

"So does the unbelievable waste and lack of any semblance of efficiency in the construction and management of some of our war plants.

"It's almost impossible to look at some of the figures and listen to some of the testimony and not feel that somebody let these things be deliberately done, the sooner to bankrupt the Nation and thus hurry 'the transition.'"

KANSAS CITY ORDNANCE PLANT CASE IN POINT

"I am recently back, for instance, from the Truman committee investigation of the construction of the so-called Sunflower ordnance plant near Kansas City.

"There, a man named Broderick, who looked as if he might be a pretty fair sort of contractor, and who testified that he lived in Denver, said he received a call to go to Washington and report to the office of the Army Corps of Engineers. This was to be in connection with the building of a new $40,000,000 ordnance plant near Kansas City.

"When he got there, Broderick testified, they introduced him to a perfect stranger, a nondescript little individual—Broderick said 'he looked like the last run of shad'—and told Broderick that this was to be his partner.

"They were informed that their fee for building the plant would be $800,000 and were told to go outside and figure out how they wanted to split it.

"The two perfect strangers stepped out in the hall and decided to whack up the boodle 70–30, the 70 percent going to Broderick.

"This was to be a new sort of contract they seem to be using now, the AEM form. That means architect-engineer-manager. The unexplained little nondescript was evidently supposed to supply the AEM color, but Broderick testified that he didn't know a thing, was utterly worthless, and later had to be moved to some post that didn't really matter. Apparently, most of what he had was a political connection.

"He—the little incompetent—later admitted in writing that he didn't go closer to Kansas City than Washington in connection with the negotiation or surveyal of his contract and its problems, didn't know anything about local conditions, local labor supply, nor any of the things his employment as a know-how man placed upon him as an obligation.

"But the project was started. It was to cost $40,000,000 and was to be finished last year. The waste has been so shocking, the progress so slow that it can't be completed now until next year, and the cost will by that time be $130,000,000.

"The incidental revelations were just as amazing. Broderick and his partners got $800,000 as the two know-how men, who obviously didn't know how. They contributed no labor, no materials, nothing, apparently, but their names.

"The war construction man in authority testified that all his previous experience had consisted of looking after Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and the general superintendent of construction, in charge of the full project, testified that he'd never been in full charge of anything before, that he'd always worked for somebody else and that his average salary had been from $3,000 to $4,000 a year.

"The money's gone. We've got nothing for it. The war could conceivably be over before this place is even finished. It'll never be good for anything, as it's located 23 or 24 miles from Kansas City, possibly through some political arrangement. There's nobody to indict, and nothing to get back if there were."

STRANGE-LOOKING EXPERTS MAKE BIG DECISIONS

"That's typical of the enormous and criminal waste of the American taxpayers' war-fighting money, too common to be accidental. HARRY BYRD estimates that in all our $17,000,000,000 construction program for facilities with which to fight the war, we have thrown away $2 for $1.

"Those men out at Kansas City, even the union executives, testified before our committee that the waste of labor there had been from 25 to 40 percent. Their attitude seemed to be 'so what?'

"Turning vital and expensive projects such as these over to incompetents and letting $40,000,000 balloon to $130,000,000, mostly in hand-outs to labor, is certainly too obvious, and it's likewise too common, to write off as merely an accident.

"You find some strange 'experts' handling expert responsibilities in this almost humorously bungled domestic picture everywhere.

"The man who doped out the gas-rationing directive for the Nation testified before us. When we asked his background of experience, we learned that for the last 10 years he'd been manager of the White Rock mineral springs out in Indiana.

"He didn't know anything about the practical handling of gasoline and fuel oil, and somewhat self-consciously admitted it.

"The actual writing of the directive was done by a minor and rather sick-looking professor from Cornell, who didn't look nor talk as if he knew anything about it, either.

"As serious as the domestic picture is, perhaps even more dangerous to our national future is the performance of these same future planners in the international theater.

"The same lack of integration that has bedeviled our domestic policy is now breeding serious trouble for our international postwar position.

"Again without specific authorization of Congress and without not alone the will but the knowledge of the people, these same collectivists and dreamers, such as HENRY WALLACE et al., are gayly promising the world unlimited supplies from our nonexistent reserves.

"They won't be able to deliver. Hatred and catastrophe are our certain lot. It seems more than silly to talk of feeding the world when we're not even feeding ourselves. Why

build up unnecessary disappointment and hatred by promising things we can't possibly do?

"We've got to work with the world and be a part of the world. Isolationism is dead.

"We've got to realize it and to comfort ourselves accordingly.

"But we've got to remember that we're going to have plenty of problems of our very own to take care of, and it would make better sense to figure what we can spare before promising the whole wide world that we're guaranteeing it milk and honey."

HOPKINS SEEN AS MOST IMPORTANT MAN IN THE UNITED STATES

"I mentioned Harry Hopkins a while back. He's admittedly one of the leftists and is the most powerful of all in the international sense because he's head of lend-lease and personally hands out the packages.

"There's been a recent revelation concerning this ex-social-service worker which comes as a surprise even to Congress. It's been revealed that he's chairman of munitions assignment.

"That's something that's been held under wraps. They've been featuring Stettinius in their announcements all along, but apparently Hopkins is the head man, and that makes him, to foreign nations, the most important man in the United States.

"The man who hands you your munitions when you're fighting and your food when you're hungry is, naturally, a more important individual to you than even a President.

" 'Whose bread I eat, his song I sing' * * * Hopkins' song is the original left-wing New Dealism.

"To him the world apparently must look for aid, and this Nation must make good his decisions, although nobody has ever suggested that his background of social uplifting has given him the slightest qualifications either for first-class administration or for obligating our Nation. His theories are his own. They aren't America's."

"Well, what's the answer?" I asked the Senator, "will these planners succeed? Do you figure we're headed for their translation of totalitarianism?"

"No," he said. "I have complete faith in the common sense of America and real Americans. I believe in the kind of America we always have known, and the majority of Americans do, too.

"All the public needs is information, plain talk. It's time to come out into the open and to get this pattern out into the open where real Americans can see it.

"It's been under cover all along, its true pattern unrevealed and unrecognized. They're making speed under the war effort, and they will probably be able to get part of their program in effect as 'war emergency.' But it, and they, will be thrown into the everlasting discard by an inevitable reaction.

"One thing they're forgetting are these boys who are fighting. They don't want to come back to that kind of America, and if they do, they won't put up with it long.

"Those fellows are thinking a lot of home, of freedom, of a job, a chance to advance, to be whatever they're worthy of being.

"I know, because my own son is one of them. He's in Africa now, to the best of my knowledge, and he's been there for quite a while. I know from his letters how the soldiers are thinking.

"They're fighting for the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave, not a theoretical experiment in goverment patterned by a little group of nonelected pinks after their idea of the Russian 'evolution.'

"This war will be over some day. I'm sure some of these ideological zealots hope it will last long enough for them to get at least their spade work done. But it won't.

"Its momentum on the fighting side is too great. The machine is too mammoth. It's already rolling. They can't stop it now. They can't even retard it. Nobody can slow it by as much as 1 day. If the home folks don't, or can't manage, to throw out the dreamers and their botches, the returning soldiers will.

"The real America, which has already about slept off the drug, will arouse itself and go to work as it can and must."

American Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith as a part of my extension of remarks a speech prepared by me to have been delivered on July 7, 1943, at the recent convention of National Maritime Union, New York City. I regret that I was unable to deliver the address in person because of illness. The speech is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the convention, I esteem it an honor and a peculiar privilege to be with you on this occasion, and to be given an opportunity to express to you the appreciation of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the heroic work you are doing. Men are conscious now as never before of the mettle of the American seamen. Before this war, the world did not know the caliber of the men who sailed the seas under the American flag. They are learning now to know them.

When the history of this titanic struggle is written and its glories recorded, the most glorious chapter in that chronicle will be the splendid service of the men of the American Merchant Marine who have defied death in its most gruesome forms that the Nation might live.

Writing shortly before Pearl Harbor the Secretary of the Navy called upon American seamen for service. He said: "The time may yet come when we shall need ships and men to carry American munitions directly to where the other free nations of the earth are battling with their lives. * * * Never in your history has the American sailorman backed down before a threat or hesitated in the face of danger. I know he will not do so now.

The time which Secretary Knox predicted would come has arrived. How well the merchant seamen, licensed and unlicensed, officers and crew, one and all, are answering that call, time has told and time will tell. In complete disregard of danger, death, privation, hardship, and suffering, without any blare of trumpets or beating of drums, merchant seamen have been true to their splendid traditions through all our Nation's history from early colonial days to this good hour. Before the Navy was, they were. Their work laid the foundations of this Republic, and with the immortal Washington leading, they helped to win this Nation's freedom. They have never faltered. They have never failed. They will neither falter nor fail now. They have confirmed in fullest detail the good opinions of their friends in the Congress of the United States who, in January 1941, said that the greater part of the men who were then sailing the seas were as loyal and as patriotic American citizens, either by nativity or by naturalization, as the men upon the floor of Congress. I said then: "You need have no fear, the ships are safe now under the American merchant marine, and with the American crews who are sailing the merchant ships."

Time has proven the absolute verity of my predictions and confirmed to the fullest the truth of my statement. True to themselves, true to the splendid traditions of a historic past and true to their country, they have faced dangers which might well have caused the stoutest hearts to quail. They have displayed not once only but many times the dauntless courage of the deep. When they returned home the question was asked by some, "Will they go back to the ship?" In the words of the captain and third mate of one of the torpedoed vessels, "Hell, yes! In 2 weeks we'll be back fighting 'em again."

This is the spirit of America. That was the spirit of Lexington, of Valley Forge, and of Yorktown. It was the spirit of John Paul Jones, of Perry, of Farragut, and of Dewey. It was the spirit of the Alamo when the call to surrender was answered with a shot, and the brave defenders died to the last man. It was the spirit of Pearl Harbor, of Wake, of Guam, of Manila, of Bataan, of Corregidor. America still responds to the stirring call, "Don't give up the ship."

It is the spirit that made Tunis possible and is now writing the lines of glorious victory. The men on the merchant marine have faced untold dangers. They are determined that the precious cargoes shall go through. You are keeping them sailing, and I pray that your motto, Keep 'em sailing, may be the motto of a militant America aroused to give the last ounce of its strength to the sacred cause for which we fight.

Many of you men have received the merchant-marine awards of distinguished-service medals, others the merchant-marine bars. They are all badges of honor and memorials of heroic, patriotic service.

Your record in war is an outstanding one of which you can and should be justly proud. You are winning the peace, and you must help to make that peace lasting.

Your mission in the years to come will be as responsible as now for you must help to salvage the ruins, and, out of the debris of the present, to build a new and better world.

We are in the midst of a revolution the immensity of which no man may measure and the limits of which no eye can see.

The people of America desire now as never before that the standards of American seamen shall be maintained on a high level. They realize now as never in the past the immense value of an American merchant marine to the defense of the Nation, the promotion of its commerce, the preservation of its trade, and the extension of its ideals. The American seamen are, more than any other people or group of people, the spokesmen for America. Wherever they go, they are the living representatives of all that America is and all that we wish America to be. More than duly authorized and regularly commissioned ambassadors, ministers, consuls, or other representatives, you are America, and you must typify to all you meet all that you would wish America to be. You are the exponents of the greatest democracy in the world, and you, in your persons, typify its ideals, its objectives, its aims, its dreams, its policies, its past, its present, and its future. Yours is a responsibility such as few other citizens of the Republic may enjoy. You carry to the four corners of the world our aims, our achievements in the past, and our dreams for the future. By you we are judged.

Mr. Wilson, when President of the United States, saw this and in a message to Congress advocating our return to the seas, said:

"Moreover, we can develop no true or effective American policy without ships of our own—not ships of war, but ships of peace, carrying goods and carrying much more; cre-

ating friendships, and rendering indispensable service to all interests on this side of the water."

Mr. Wilson described the merchant marine as the only shuttles that can weave the delicate fabric of sympathy, comprehension, confidence and mutual dependence in which we wish to clothe our policies.

Another great American voiced the same sentiment. The martyred McKinley said:

"We must encourage our merchant marine. We must have more ships. They must be under the American flag, built and manned and owned by Americans. They will not only be profitable in a commercial sense; they will be messengers of peace and amity wherever they go."

President Theodore Roosevelt gave expression to the same ideas when in a message to Congress he said:

"To the spread of our trade in peace and the defense of our flag in war, a great and prosperous merchant marine is indispensable. We should have ships and seamen of our own to convey our goods to neutral markets, and in case of need, to reinforce our battle line."

When this war shall end we shall have the ships, we shall have the seamen, we shall have operators for these ships, but delude not yourselves, we shall have competition of the severest kind and we shall need the cooperation of shipbuilders, ship owners, and the seamen in the merchant marine to hold our own in that future that we face. Without ships and operators and personnel fighting together to preserve and maintain our merchant marine, it is entirely possible that we may be again driven from the seas. The burden of taxation will not be lifted for many years and the memory of man is frequently short-lived. Our competitors will proclaim again the doctrine that they should carry who can carry for the lowest cost. Against such a campaign as this there must be brought the united effort of owners, operators, and personnel working together in harmony and with the united strength of all. To that end wherever differences exist there must be concerted effort of all interests and of the Nation to find harmonious solutions. I am proud to say that for nearly a quarter of a century I have been fighting to create a merchant marine, and I believe today there is more unity of effort, more concernt of action, and greater harmony than ever before in the time of my association with the merchant marine. We have sought to solve some of the problems. Infinite patience has been essential. It is still required.

I am certain that with your intelligent approach to our many problems, your scrutiny of our needs, and your efforts to help we shall win the peace as well as the war. You are winning the war. I implore you to help us to win the peace after the war. For a long time our men of the seas were for the most part forgotten men. We spoke of them as wards of the court, but we failed to realize that our wards had attained their majority and were entitled to be heard in their own right and to speak for themselves. That time no longer exists.

There is something in service at sea that enters the soul. It may be the call of the eternal. It was that of which Dr. Healey spoke in "Fo'c's'le and Glory Hole," when he said:

"But all are men of the merchant service; for the most part a forgotten race until collision, fire, or tempest calls for the gesture heroic. Then the dungareed or the golden striped, the scullion, or the radio operator, the coal passer, the boatswain, and the stewardesses arise to make common cause against Death in whatever guise he comes. Then they ascend to supreme heights of selflessness at the call of duty."

Those who sail the sea must be free. These men have breathed the spirit of the sea. Into their souls has entered that love of freedom which no dictator's hand can ever crush or tyrant's hand destroy. Into the souls of these who sail the sea there enters that mysterious indescribable something that no tyrant can take away. These men have looked into that glorious mirror—

"Where the Almighty's form
Glasses itself in tempests; in all time,
Calm or convulsed—in breeze, or gale, or storm,
Icing the pole; or in the torrid clime,
Dark, heaving—boundless, endless, and sublime—
The image of eternity—the throne of the invisible."

They that sail the seas must be free or die. They must, they will be free.

American System of Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a resolution adopted at a meeting of July 8, 1943, by the board of directors, Chamber of Commerce of Delaware, Wilmington, Del., pointing out that the wholesalers and jobbers of this country are threatened with extinction unless Governmental agencies recognize their function as regular trade channels and utilize their services in the placement of Government orders:

Whereas the method of distribution through a jobber or wholesaler developed to economically channel manufactured goods from the manufacturer through to the ultimate user is a practice in distribution which is the net result of many years of experience on the part of industry and has been adopted by almost all classes of manufacturers; and

Whereas in the development of this system of distribution there has been produced a large branch of industry which each in their respective fields are specialists of many years' experience in the sphere of their operation, and their organizations in the aggregate represent an army of workers whose training and experience are of inestimable value to our country in the present emergency; and

Whereas with the tremendous and rapid expansion which has necessarily taken place in our governmental agencies, it is not to be expected that they would have been able to develop any organizations of the same type and character; and

Whereas any policy on the part of the governmental agencies which fails to utilize fully the experience and knowledge of the various local distributing organizations as procurement agencies is not for the best interests of our national welfare and causes unnecessary loss of man-hours through the needless duplication of effort; and

Whereas it is not equitable to expect the jobbers or wholesalers to perform their services only on occasions when the urgency of the case at hand actually demands the class of service which the jobbers or wholesalers are in a position to render, and, on the other hand, bypass them in instances when the same degree of urgency does not exist; and

Whereas nothing in the foregoing preamble is intended to include instances involving engineering problems or contracts placed on an annual service of supply basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Delaware appeal for more complete use of the facilities of the wholesalers and jobbers in the placing of business by the various governmental agencies, and that the above facts be presented to the purchasing agencies of the War Department, the United States Army, the United States Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, other governmental agencies which the board may think advisable, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Delaware delegation in Washington.

Attest:

GERRISH GASSAWAY,
Secretary.

Problems of Rural Communities and the Future Peace of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Robert W. Hudgens, Assistant Administrator, Farm Security Administration, before the New England Town and Country Church Commission, Old Orchard, Maine, June 23, 1943:

For the privilege of being here today I am indebted to our mutual interest in the problems of rural communities and the bearing which the solution of these problems will have on the future peace of the world. The reputation of the New England Town and Country Church Commission is splendid as an example of cooperation among leaders of community life. You have demonstrated the effectiveness of cooperation between denominations in solving community problems.

It seems to me that the church is facing a serious crisis in its growth, for the organized church has too often denied, through inaction, its own teaching. When the church has failed to get behind something positive it has slipped into something negative. I am here for the purpose of suggesting the type of program which the church must get behind in the present world crisis. I say "must," because the only democracy which can survive will be democracy rooted in Christian principles; therein lies your challenge and at the same time your responsibility.

We're intensely interested right now in winning the war. Everybody is concerned as it should be. It is a terribly rough stretch of the road the world is traveling and that is as it should be. It is a terribly rough stretch of road, but we will get over it one of these days. And then what kind of road will we be traveling? It is high time we were deciding.

There is a lot of talk about the peace, but in order to talk intelligently about peace it is necessary for us to analyze the essentials of peace. It seems to me there are two. One is a proper atmosphere and the other is a proper framework—in other words, a plan and the right attitude toward that plan.

When peace does come it is going to be an active, forceful weapon. We're going to wage peace just as we are waging war now, and the cost of waging peace is going to be comparable to the cost of waging the war. We're not going to get off as easy this time as we did the

last. A deep understanding of this is what I mean by the right attitude.

What are some of the things we did wrong after the last war? We went to great lengths to provide political freedom and then allowed it to be nullified by economic disfranchisement. We saw hunger and we saw poverty. We saw hunger and poverty draw out the spark of democracy in a lot of people. We saw people deliberately throw away their freedom for what they thought was security. Right there before our eyes, we saw what happens when people fail to realize the responsibility that goes with democracy. We saw democracy walk off and leave burdened people for whom it should have felt a primary responsibility.

And now we're at war again. War is one of the formative stages of peace, and so I'm also thinking of peace in terms of its formative stages and its final pattern. Whether we know it or not, peace is being shaped right now. It is being shaped in men's minds and in their attitudes.

When we think about peace in this country, what we're really thinking about is a permanent pattern for our democracy. Down through history, the attitude of a Nation toward its burdened people has measured the quality of that nation's democracy. It seems to me that a democracy is weak or strong in direct ratio to its willingness to accept responsibility for those who are down at the bottom. A nation assumes responsibility for the people who live in it. It spends money and energy for their welfare, but that money and energy are not lost. They constitute an investment that pays big returns. I'm thinking now of my experience with the Farm Security Administration.

When we started out 7 or 8 years ago, and we found a million farm families hovering on the doorsteps of relief—and a million others close at their heels. We found people whose dignity had been stripped off by poverty, people who were hungry and living in shacks unfit for habitation, people who were sick and had no money with which to buy the services of a doctor, pushed out of their homes and dispossessed from the land they had thought was their security.

The Nation made an investment in these people. Through the Farm Security Administration, we did what had to be done to turn them away from relief and head them the other way. We made them loans and, when necessary, we made grants for food. We guided them away from one-crop farming and taught them how to plant and harvest crops by modern methods, how to grow the food they needed. We started small cooperatives so they could use up-to-date machinery and good livestock. We developed low-cost housing plans and helped thousands of families to build better homes. We helped local doctors to start a group medical-care program, which enables families to pay low fees once a year so that afterwards they can call a doctor when they need one. More than half a million farm people are now getting medical care through this program.

We did all these things and many others. We put the props of better living standards under a million families—we gave them a new chance and they responded. We helped them become contributing members of their communities. We have proved that people can be rehabilitated and that people can be made useful.

Now the war comes and these people have an opportunity to make a contribution that would have been impossible except for the work of those pre-war years. The housing we helped people build, the gardens we helped them make, the canning we taught them to do, the livestock we helped them to get—think what all this means in terms of this new emergency.

Contributing members of democracy in action. Thousands of these people are now independent; all of them have better living standards and better health. In four Southern States where we made a survey, the average number of rejections of draftees for Farm Security Administration families was a third less than for other families in the same area.

But the greatest contribution of the families who were given a chance when they needed it, has come through increased food production. Last year Farm Security Administration families increased production more, proportionately, than all other farmers in the country. Their increases alone were enough to supply milk to 3,000,000 active men for a year, eggs for two and one-half millions, and pork for more than one and one-half millions. And they also made outstanding contributions to the increased supplies of beef, dry beans, soybeans, and chickens.

When the war is over, we're going to find that the investment we've made in these families both before the war and during the war, will be just as important as investment and just as essential a part of post-war plans as any other phase that deals with human welfare. High up in the future pattern of a post-war world is going to be how to use and how to protect the production for these low-income farmers.

That comes very nearly being the whole idea that must run through the war period and the peace that follows—how to use the production and protect the freedom and standard of living of all the people. That is democracy, and the idea doesn't change in war or peace.

That is the idea that stands back of the "four freedoms," of the Atlantic Charter, and the Pan-American declarations at Rio. It stands back of all the people, the many little people waging this war against world domination by force.

If we understand that this war is a bridge between the old past and the new future, then we can begin to get a continuity of our ideas that must be preserved and our ideals that should guide our actions. We will then have the proper concept of the relationships of war and peace. The ideas that are sound will carry over when peace comes.

We went through a depression in this country, a depression that made us face many conditions in our social and economic system that we had evaded before. And during that depression we had to develop attitudes and techniques to cope with our problems and correct their causes.

That brings us to more discussion of the framework of peace. Not only can the ideas carry over but also the useful techniques. In agriculture, for instance, we have developed methods not only of keeping people fed but of equipping people to feed themselves and others. In this process we have learned to help people free themselves from poverty and unemployment. We have learned some essentials about the needs of a world at peace. The good health, decent housing, and adequate living standards which constitute the necessary fundamentals to a peaceful and productive people make for rehabilitation in depression, but they also make for strength in wartime and for creative stability when peace finally comes.

When the war is over there will still exist tremendous needs. But, side by side, with these needs, we're going to have great armies of manpower no longer needed for maximum war production and we are going to have great industrial plants no longer needed to manufacture destructive weapons. We will have a chance then to combine all these things—the need and the machine power and the manpower to get some of the things democracy has always lacked but has never made up its mind to afford. Freedom thus will join with productive vitality to give mankind security.

Let's take a look at the scope of this peacetime production job that lies ahead of us. Before this war started, we needed at least 1,000,000 new farm homes to meet even the least acceptable standards for decent and respectable living. By the time this war is over we will need even more.

A few years ago, a rural housing survey showed that 70 percent of all the farm homes were inadequately screened, and more than a fourth lacked any kind of screening. Only 9 out of every 100 farms had indoor toilets, and 1 in every 7 had no toilets at all. Millions of farms are short necessary farm buildings and machinery, and the shortage is increasing as we press for more production.

We need to build up rural health. Before the war started, it was estimated that 75 percent of all farm families did not have even the minimum standards of medical care. Not more than 5 percent of the farm families had full medical, dental, hospital, and nursing service.

These are but samples of the unmet needs for which we can turn the stupendous productive capacity of this country. When the war is over we are going to find out that such conditions will no longer be a problem of national scope, but one of international scope. But it is a problem that is going to be met if democracy is to survive.

Millions and millions of liberty-loving and security-seeking people are fighting on our side for the future. I hope that it will never be necessary for them to ask, For whose future?

Any successful society must provide its people both a status and a function. The laboring people of occupied Europe have a function; their Nazi overlords have seen to that, but they did not have a status. The unemployed in our own country during the depression had a status; their rights in our democracy saw to that, but they lacked a function. What I'm saying is that the framework of the future must provide for the peoples in all countries both the status of self-respect and the function of usefulness. That is another way of saying that they will have security, but it will be a self-made security.

We have been willing to accept food rationing so that our supplies could be shared not only with all the people in this country but also with our neighbors across the seas. There are a lot of things besides food that must be shared if peace endures. The miracle-working idea will be to make people useful in creating and distributing the things they need for a better living. If it can be done for the machines of destruction, it can be done for the tools of a better life. Project this idea into the future, and you have the framework of an enduring peace.

There is another idea that runs like a thread through the historic conversations that made up the Atlantic Conference and the Rio Conference and the agreements between the United States and the United Kingdom.

This idea seems to be expressed in the two sentences that appeared in the preamble and the second article of the latter agreement. For the first time in the history of the world, one major nation has agreed in a crisis to contribute to another nation and has decided on what basis it would make the contribution, without first coming to an agreement and demanding certain terms on which that nation would receive the contribution.

In the post-war world, unless the nations are willing to take the same sort of attitude toward the weaker and less fortunate nations, it will be futile for us to talk about permanent peace in this world.

Six-tenths of the people in the world at the beginning of the war were living in abject poverty. Many people believe that this had a great deal to do with the war, and many believe that, after this war, if peace is to be preserved, the United States will have to join

other nations to protect the economy of many countries.

The proper pattern for the future is also to involve the use of resources. Think how wonderful it would be if all the resources and material now going into destructive war weapons could be converted into the creative use for people and for improvement in the standard of living for those people whose standards have been miserably low. We worry about the cost, but in the Farm Security Administration we are extremely proud of the accomplishment of the past few years, and yet the cost to the country of what the Farm Security Administration has done has been less than the price of one battleship a year. All the educational work that we have given to these people has cost less than one cruiser a year. The loans we have made for medical service—which, to my mind, has created nothing short of a miracle in the lives of many, many people—are less than the cost of one Flying Fortress.

We must think in terms of an all-out peace, just as we think now of all-out war. We cannot have an enduring peace on any other basis or at any lower price. Democracy is neither cheap nor easy. It is very hard and it is very costly. But it is worth any price we need to pay, and it is worth every thought and every effort we give to it today. To have it and keep it depends on the attitude behind it and the framework in which this attitude expresses itself.

We are already witnessing the development of the attitudes of the future in the international world. It has been expressed in our lend-lease policy in the United States. We are already witnessing many of the patterns in our own national life that must be projected into the future if we are going to save the peace. We are going to see more of the attitude that the freedom of one of us is bound up in the freedom of all, and that we can't be realistic about democracy without being realistic about the obligations and the welfare of every person and every group in a democracy.

When peace comes! When peace comes, a thousand years will stretch out before us and we will succeed in our dreams only as we are worthy.

Thank you.

Aviation Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House has prepared a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 which, as chairman of that committee, I hope and expect will be reported to the House within a reasonable time after the session reconvenes on the 14th of September.

Committee Print No. 3 of this bill has been made public and interested persons have been invited to make constructive suggestions as to any phase of this legislation.

The method followed in writing this legislation has mainly been amending and revising the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 based upon the experience of the 6 years in which this act has been in operation.

The bill also attempts to anticipate the probable developments in civil aeronautics which will come with the expansion of aviation within the forseeable future. The bill attempts to give aviation its rightful opportunity to expand its usefulness both domestically and internationally.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Speaking in broad terms, the main provisions of the bill may be summarized as follows:

First. The name of the Civil Aeronautics Board is changed to that of the Civil Aeronautics Commission. The Commission is given an independent status and clothed with quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers. The Administrator is also taken from the Department of Commerce and given a more independent status.

The bill clearly defines the duties of the Commission and the Administrator in relation to each other. The Administrator is charged with duties as to such matters as the construction of air navigation facilities, and many other administrative matters. In performing the more important of these duties, the Administrator will act under the supervision of the Commission.

Second. The bill provides for a Director of Air Safety and restores accident investigations to an independent status under such director.

Third. It proposes an investigation and report by the Postmaster General and also by the Civil Aeronautics Commission as to the feasibility of carrying all classes of mail by air when delivery would thereby be speeded.

Fourth. It calls for an investigation and report by the Civil Aeronautics Commission, furnishing information with suggested plans for meeting postwar developments in civil aviation.

Fifth. It provides for a broad program of aviation training and education.

Sixth. It proposes a long-range program under the direction of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the development of air navigation facilities including airports.

Seventh. It provides a plan for protecting the safety of flight by furnishing a means for removing or preventing hazards to air navigation on and in the vicinity of airports.

Eighth. It extends and further defines Federal jurisdiction respecting air navigation and air commerce.

Ninth. It strengthens our national policy with respect to the development of air transportation and the protection and promotion of air navigation.

Tenth. It contains more strict provisions against the issuance of passes in air transportation.

Eleventh. It provides for reasonable compulsory extensions of air-line service, particularly in the foreign field.

Twefth. It brings contract carriers by air under economic regulation.

Thirteenth. It has provisions designed to prevent the growth of interstate trade barriers to commerce by air.

Fourteenth. It provides for a study of multiple taxation of persons engaged in air commerce and of their employees in order to develop recommendations to prevent the growth of unjust and unsound tax policies for civil aviation.

Fifteenth. It introduces numerous improvements in the administrative procedure under the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Sixteenth. It provides for strengthening and expanding the Weather Bureau service in aid of our air navigation, both domestic and international.

Seventeenth. It codifies civil aviation law by bringing isolated legislative provisions into the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Eighteenth. It gives the airman in command of an aircraft, or other authorized employees, adequate power to assure safety and prevent disorderly conduct.

Nineteenth. It calls for an investigation and report by the Civil Aeronautics Commission as to matters affecting aviation insurance and reinsurance.

Twentieth. It makes clear that all employees of air carriers are subject to the Railway Labor Act and it extends that act to contract carriers by air and their employees.

Twenty-first. It provides for the cooperation of local, State, and Federal authorities in the promotion and coordinated operation of air transportation.

Destroying Food To Keep Prices Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the paper, Labor, published by the railroad brotherhoods in Washington, contains a front-page article this week under the caption, "Destroying food to keep prices up. Wanton waste reported as common practice at big city markets." The article then advises that—

> Vast quantities of freshly grown vegetables are being dumped at the city's markets with the object of maintaining prices which are so high that they are beyond the reach of the pocketbooks of many Gotham families. The same wanton destruction of food apparently is under way in other parts of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this seems unthinkable, yet the source of the publicity gives it credence. If foodstuffs so badly needed by our people at this time are being destroyed in order to maintain prices, then those participating in this policy and in this destruction are not only impeding the war effort but their personal greed makes such conduct reprehensible and unpatriotic. Here is a place where the Food Administrator can do something about it. Here is a place where those in authority should act instanter and not just start an investigation which will only result in the unwinding of miles of red tape. It is instances like this which make for disunity and convince our people that there is something radically wrong with the administration of the laws, rules, and

regulations to which we are asked to subscribe to win the war.

I would not call this matter to the attention of the country if I did not think the article in Labor reported a fact. Only by giving publicity to such conduct and practices can these evils be overcome.

Mr. Food Administrator, the country is depending upon you to prevent such abuses in the future.

Food, Inflation, and Public Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, which was contained in a unanimous-consent request made by Representative RAMSPECK, of Georgia, for the benefit of all Members, I submit the following statement:

Mr. Speaker, from considerable study during the recently terminated session and during the days which followed the adjournment of Congress for a recess period, I find that I cannot leave Washington to return home without saying some things which, as a Representative from a great congressional district in Texas and as a Member of Congress, I feel must be said.

As a Representative, and upon my responsibility as such, and as a citizen of this great country, I feel perfectly sure that there has never been a time in the history of our country or of the world when the public confidence of one Nation, the United States of America, has been as important as now. The corrosive effect—yes, the disruptive and destructive effects—of confusion, based upon a combination of things which are going forward, is such that I find myself approaching the subject matter which I desire to present with a feeling of the greatest temerity that has ever possessed me. It is something like approaching a child's tower, built of separate blocks, with the intention of placing one more block atop the edifice without toppling the whole structure—a pile of blocks which has not been superimposed, one upon the other, with special skill, knowledge, or training, but which seems to have been placed at random and with no particular attention being paid to the breadth or stability of the foundation which upholds the structure.

Misconstruction, deliberate and otherwise, of the intentions of man is rampant today, and it is one of the activating forces which keeps the public confidence, wounded as it is, literally aquiver and fearsomely nigh to cracking.

America today has two most important problems about which something must be said and said in a way which will not set up any additional shock to public confidence. These problems can best be expressed as food and inflation. They are indivisible, interlocked, and interwoven, one with the other. They are likewise a part of the lives of every man, woman, and child. To use the language of an American editor, "they affect the prosecution of the war, the making of peace, and perhaps the future of the whole world."

Mr. Speaker, there is a great difference between reasons and excuses. Sometimes, though, an excuse is accepted as a reason for an act or a process. Fear is not a reason. It is, in fact, a very poor excuse. Fear is used in lieu of reason for many of the confusing and destructive things that are being undertaken in the two fields referred to. Fear of inflation is the pretext, shall I say, which is given for the perplexing situation which confronts us with reference to the food situation.

I shall try to discuss the picture as I see it. According to the findings of two widely recognized economists of the Economics Department of the School of Agriculture at Cornell University—F. A. Harper and W. M. Curtis—the administration in the policy which it has followed, or failed to follow, has not checked inflation. Recent occurrences, evidenced by statements, promulgations, and so forth, create in the minds of students the grave question as to whether these problems are properly understood, the question as to whether politics is being used in blaming others for the increased cost of living. These economists claim that the administration, in any event, has not met or coped with the critical situations which have developed, and fear again is expressed that our country is being directed head-on toward the greatest disaster in its history.

First, regarding food, abundant warning was given a year ago that there would be an alarming shortage because of bureaucratic mismanagement, the lack of farm machinery and farm labor. In the midst of a great war, the greatest in the history of the world, apparently food has not received its proper due as an essential. It not only is as essential as planes, tanks, guns, and other implements and matériel of war, but, without food, even the best trained army must fail and fold up. What goes on in the hearts of men back of guns, in the cockpits of planes, men in tanks in the field of battle and in ships at sea, is essential too. If and when the chaotic, critical condition on the home front as to food becomes known to the men in the ranks on far-flung battle fronts, this knowledge will not strengthen but will weaken them. Their mothers and wives at home face the real threat of hunger in many places, insufficient milk for their children in cities and in war industry setups, together with the patent difficulty of supplying sufficient food to our fighting forces, our allies, and our people.

From the beginning of the expression on the part of the administration that inflation was imminent and that the cost of living, if left uncontrolled, would speed the impact of inflation's destructive power, confusion began and has increased without surcease until the present moment. Time does not permit a detailed review, step by step, of the war on the home front against inflation. Before G. M. P. R., May 1942, all sorts of proposals, including subsidies and buying and selling at a loss, were proposed. I was one of the Members of Congress—and there were many—who felt that the appointment of Chester Davis gave hope for improvement on the food front. I knew Mr. Davis as an able administrator, an upstanding and patriotic citizen, with a wealth of experience and high qualification for the place. You all know what happened. And with all kindliness, high respect, and adherence to our Commander in Chief, I cannot but feel the necessity for calling attention to an injustice in this case. I only do this because of the effect this manifest injustice had upon the public confidence, which I am determined, at the expenditure of every faculty and with all of the energy which I possess, to preserve at all cost. This, insofar as my action is concerned, directed by such ability as I possess, may safeguard it.

With one statement in the published letter of the Chief Executive, accepting the resignation of Mr. Davis, I most heartily disagree. I quote:

> It would be unfair to you to insist that you remain, when you feel that all things considered you cannot wholeheartedly support a program to hold down the cost of living.

As a humble citizen, as a member of the party on whose shoulders the Chief Executive was borne to his high seat, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States and a friend both to the Chief Executive and to Mr. Davis, I earnestly hope that the Chief Executive will make no more statements like this. Of course, he knew that Mr. Davis and all other patriotic and thoughtful Americans would support a sound program to hold down the cost of living; and to make such a statement was both beside the point and inimical to the best interests of our country.

As I see it, I submit here for your study a composite picture of the food situation from the standpoint, for instance, of the man behind the counter whose position, I take it, is the terminal at the end of the distribution system which serves the food front. To illustrate, the raw product is produced on the farms and ranches of America. Some foods, such as vegetables, fruits, and nuts, are consumed raw; others must be cooked in the raw, unprocessed state; and others must be processed before consumption. But in any and all events, from origin to the counter where the consumer buys it, we have but to trace the means of its distribution, first by wagon or truck, then by railroad to processing and packing plants, then by rail, truck, or other form of delivery to the retail counter, and you have the picture. From the viewpoint of the man behind the counter, this is a boiled-down summation of one of the most acute problems challenging the people of the United States. The success of the war effort at home and abroad requires immediate action to solve the food problem. We must first

analyze what is wrong, and thereafter what should be done. I feel pretty sure the man behind the counter sees under the heading of what is wrong the following:

I. AIMS

Use of war and fear of inflation to justify domestic measures that fall outside of war needs.

A. Unnecessary expansion of purchasing power for special groups in disregard of economic essentials.

First. Wage and income policy for war-industry workers in contrast with agriculture, processing, and distribution workers.

Second. Weakening of food production, processing, and distribution by a policy of forcing key personnel out of food processing and distribution into so designated war industries.

B. Unnecessary restriction of civilian supply.

First. Affirmative reduction in supply to condition attitude of population.

Second. Absence of full production policy where no conflict with military needs.

C. Unnecessary weakening of the domestic economy by excessive reliance on taxation as an inflationary control measure.

D. Indiscriminate rationing.

First. Rationing of many luxury items, not needed for military purposes, not in short supply, and not essential in diet.

Second. Unnecessarily complicated and burdensome methods and records.

Third. Impairment of purpose by issuance of stamps in excess of available supply of certain rationed products.

E. Imposition of untested reform measures without regard for their effect on supply.

First. Grade labeling.

Second. Profit control.

F. Preconceived determination to impose subsidies.

First. Subsidies and buying and selling at a loss were proposed prior to G. M. P. R.—May 1942.

Second. Unsound and unfair regulations repeatedly imposed on industry, with promises of relief—not fulfilled—allegedly to placate demands for higher wages.

Third. Industry told in August 1942 to petition Congress for subsidies as only means of relief from squeeze.

II. POLICY

Resort to unsound and partially unnecessary price policies.

A. Disregard of the function of price in inducing production and allocating supply.

First. Invitation to false price structure and black markets.

Second. Undermining of moral standards and respect for law.

Third. Presentation of an impossible enforcement problem.

B. Prescription of ceiling prices at wholesale and retail simultaneously and without due provision for controlling essential elements of cost.

First. Disregard of lag between processor, wholesale and retail prices.

Second. Raw material and wages without ceilings.

C. Unnecessary price control of many products.

First. Luxury items; not important in diet.

Second. Items relatively unimportant in inflationary pressures.

D. Disregard of facts and historical pricing policies.

First. Baseless margins arbitrarily prescribed in disregard of facts in hand.

Second. Indirect attempt to change functions and services by prescription of arbitrary and inadequate margins.

Third. An arbitrary classification of stores by ownership and/or volume decreed regardless of functions performed and cost of doing business.

Fourth. Margins prescribed by O. P. A. that in many cases are lower than ever existed and ceiling prices generally that are not sufficient to enable retailers to pay all proper costs and continue in business.

E. Depriving the public of benefits of the normal regulating effects of competition.

F. Apparent disregard of Price Control Act and intent of Congress.

First. Apparent conflict between Price Control Act and hold-the-line order.

Second. Divergent interpretations of law resorted to on bases of expediency.

III. ORGANIZATION

Divided responsibility and insufficient delegation of authority with respect to food production, pricing, and rationing.

A. Responsibility for production with War Food Administration.

B. Responsibility for pricing and rationing with separate divisions of O. P. A.

C. No adequate recognition of controlling effect of pricing and rationing on production and supply.

D. Delegation of authority to W. F. A. and O. P. A. apparently tenuous, nominal, indefinite, and insufficient.

E. Multiplication of levels of alleged authority.

F. Apparent unwillingness to articulate the principal agency—the food industry—which must be relied upon to carry out the policies with the governmental agencies formulating and promulgating these policies.

First. Facts, experience, and practices of food industry ignored.

Second. Provisions of price-control law requiring consultation with industry are negated.

Third. Food industry, in effect, is left with an impossible task.

Fourth. Industry is hamstrung in performing its traditional function.

G. Largely futile attempt to decentralize responsibility because of unwillingness to delegate authority necessary to achieve the purpose.

First. Regional and district O. P. A. price officials have responsibility for computing and establishing community prices but do not have the necessary authority to apply historical margins which have prevailed in the community as a basis for arriving at the prices necessary if local enterprise is to continue.

IV. PERSONNEL

Key administrative personnel not qualified for task by background and experience.

A. Few qualified executives with knowledge of food production, processing, or distribution in first-level positions.

B. Economists and lawyers, inexperienced in food industry matters and in administration placed in control of price making.

C. Predilection for reform, rather than fulfillment of purposes of O. P. A., appears to have been a prime requisite in selection of O. P. A. personnel.

D. Internal conflicts, duplicity, and grasping for power have resulted from employment of personnel inexperienced in organization and unaccustomed to responsibility.

V. METHODS

Unnecessarily legalistic methods, undue multiplicity of conflicting and incomprehensible regulations, and theoretical and generally unworkable plan.

A. Adherence to methods predicated on assumption of universal dishonesty inevitably induces noncompliance and circumvention.

First. General nonviolent noncooperation throughout the population.

Second. Black markets.

Third. Indexes of cost of living rendered valueless.

Fourth. Accentuation of decline in morals.

B. The number and complexity of regulations is without practical relation to need.

First. Over 29 maximum-price regulations on food sold at retail level.

Second. More than 60 price regulations applying to food back of retail level.

Third. Ten ration orders affecting food distributors.

Fourth. Innumerable amendments—G. M. P. R. has been amended more than 50 times and at least 15 supplementary orders have been issued under G. M. P. R., 1 of which has been amended more than 160 times.

Fifth. More than 7,800 pages, averaging at least 2,000 words each, must be comprehended and complied with by food retailers.

Sixth. Average food retailer, among a total of over 400,000, unable to read and digest, much less comprehend and comply with, overwhelming regulations and red tape.

C. Insufficient time allowance for implementing changes and new regulations.

First. Many price orders become effective on date of issue; others 1 or 2 days later.

Second. Copies of regulations frequently not available, even in Washington, for several days after effective date.

Third. Ration point value changes announced publicly and made effective before retailers can post new point values.

D. Unnecessarily complicated and burdensome record-keeping requirements.

First. Innumerable records not usually kept are required for both price control and rationing.

Second. Record keeping imposes requirements beyond resources of available manpower and equipment.

Third. Record-keeping irritation adds increasingly to employee turn-over to number of merchants giving up and discontinuing business.

Fourth. Increased cost of record keeping accentuates business mortality.

E. Discriminatory and inequitable enforcement methods.

VI. MANPOWER

Unrealistic policy with respect to essentiality of manpower in food processing and distribution.

A. Essentiality of manpower in food production on farms now recognized.

B. Food produced on farm must be processed and/or distributed to ultimate consumer.

C. Essential key manpower being driven out of food distribution and into war industries by absence of an official declaration that food distribution is an essential activity.

First. Turn-over in some war industry centers currently at rate of 10 percent a week—over 500 percent a year.

D. As a consequence of an inadequate manpower policy, food distribution becomes progressively less able to carry out price control and rationing measures.

VII. ALLOCATION

Lack of clearly defined and publicly accepted policy for allocation of the food resources subject to the disposal of the United States between (a) its military forces, (b) its civilian population, (c) lend-lease, (d) Latin America, and (e) rehabilitation of foreign populations.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE

The aims which serve as touchstones for measures taken in the food situation should be the war aims of the people of the United States and briefly are as follows:

I. AIMS

A. Induce increasing production.

B. Maintain the traditional distribution economy.

C. Foster private enterprise.

D. Maintain price equilibrium.

E. Arrange equitable distribution of basic commodities in short supply.

II. PRICE CONTROL

A. Take the necessary legal measures to make possible:

First. Promulgation of a price formula to permit establishing a primary market price range consisting of maximum and minimum prices for basic commodities in short supply which will induce maximum possible production and cover all reasonable costs of the producer.

Second. Promulgation of percentage margins for processors not lower than their percentage margins in effect for 1941 and to be applied to the cost of products procured pursuant to the primary market price range.

Third. Promulgation of percentage margins for distributors not lower than their percentage margins in effect for 1941 and to be applied to the cost of products procured from their sources of supply.

Fourth. Promulgation of one maximum ceiling price at consumer level sufficient to cover the aggregate of one, two, and three, immediately preceding, and to cover only basic food products while in short supply (prescribed percentage margins and resumption of competition should keep maximum prices in various kinds of retail outlets in proper relationship without arbitrary classification which does not recognize functions performed).

Fifth. Requirement of consultation with representatives of the business affected before promulgation of regulations and requirement of publication of a statement of findings and of agreement or disagreement by both parties—Government agency and business representatives.

III. SUBSIDIES, ROLL-BACKS, AND GOVERNMENT TRADING AT A LOSS

Take the necessary legal measures to:

First. Prevent the use of consumer subsidies.

Second. Prevent buying and selling at a loss by Government for the purpose of obscuring an indirect subsidy; at a time when incomes of wage earners are at the highest level in history.

Third. Prevent a roll-back of prices in any way which will result in a squeeze that threatens to deprive producers of their established distribution outlets or deprive consumers of their customary sources of supply.

IV. RATIONING

A. Restrict rationing to basic foods while they are in short supply.

B. Issue ration currency only in amounts corresponding with the available supply of the rationed products.

C. Consider adoption of one ration stamp of one denomination to cover all domestically produced food products.

D. Simplify rationing system and reduce number and complexity of reports.

V. ORGANIZATION

A. In order to carry out the previously stated aims and to execute the policy of price control previously outlined, the following organization adjustments should be made:

First. Such functions as are to be exercised with respect to the production, pricing, and rationing of food should be consolidated in one Federal agency under a single administrator who is qualified by background and experience and in whom is vested all necessary authority.

Second. Proper coordination should be provided between the food administration and other war agencies such as manpower and transportation.

Third. Develop a local organization pattern to decentralize operations with delegation of necessary authority.

VI. PERSONNEL

A. All personnel in key positions should be qualified by background and experience in the function and with the products with which they are required to deal.

B. Lawyers should be confined to strictly legal work; economists should be confined to fact-finding and advising on economic matters.

C. There should be a thorough and disinterested review of personnel in all agencies dealing with food, with a view to a drastic reduction in the number and more effective utilization of those retained.

VII. METHODS

A. Discontinue the present legalistic system with its multiplicity of complicated and unworkable orders and regulations.

B. Substitute minimum possible number of simple and understandable orders necessary to carry out the policy previously outlined.

C. Publication as a part of each government regulation or order of the name and title of each government official whose approval was required for the issuance of such order.

D. Minimize record-keeping requirements and reports in conformity with less extensive needs under policy previously outlined.

VIII. MANPOWER

A. The War Manpower Commission should immediately declare food processing and distribution essential activities.

Summing up, with reference to the terminal of the distribution system which serves food, at the end of the transportation lines which lead from pastures and fields to the counters, I would like to call your attention to the four fundamentals involved with reference to the situation presented by the food problem to the man behind the counter and to the consumer who stands before him patiently waiting to be served.

These four fundamentals are:

First. What specific policy should be laid down to control the allocation of food resources at the disposal of the United States between (a) the military forces, (b) the civilian population, (c) lease-lend, (d) Latin America, and (e) foreign rehabilitation.

Second. What price policy should be laid down to induce increased production, proper allocation of supplies among the civil population, and at the same time to avoid excessive or dangerous price increases.

Third. What consolidation of the functions of Government agencies related to production, pricing, and rationing of food is necessary duly to relate authority to responsibility.

Fourth. What manpower policy can be laid down to assure the producers of food that their system of distribution through processors, wholesalers, and retailers will be reasonably maintained.

These, in brief, are the fundamental questions which confront us as a people. Mere words will not correct this situation. Recent developments which have appeared in the papers published by the press of this Nation, together with many which are still under cover, indicate certainly that action is needed.

What I am about to propose is more than an idea, and instead of expressing it in legal language, may I put the proposition before you in the form of an interrogation? Why not, upon our return, draft and pass a law to generally accomplish the following:

First. The policy to be observed with respect to prices should be very carefully defined and channelized. This, because of the already evidenced avidity on the part of some of the learned philosophers,

pedants, and professors in O. P. A., exhibited in their arrogation to themselves of powers not contained in either the Price Fixing Act or the Constitution. Added to this is their complete disregard of the effect of the exercise of this arrogated power upon the American way of life which the flower of our land is seeking to preserve on the widespread battle fronts of the world.

I wonder if there should not be a provision for establishing maximum and minimum prices in the case of basic commodities where there is a definite need for price limitations? If possible, state in the law the factors which would create the need for price limitations. It would seem desirable. Then it would seem important to specify the factors determining the point at which the base price should be set with a maximum and minimum or a floor and a ceiling. Then it would be important to have a provision that base prices when set must provide for the proper financing of all reasonable costs of production with reference to the article covered.

After that, it should be stipulated that processors and distributors entering into the stream of distribution at stages subsequent to that at which the base price is set, should be required to determine their ceiling price by use of the standard mark-up which they used for pricing in the year 1941.

It would also be desirable to provide in the law for a definite procedure that would require the food manager or administrator to consult leaders in the industry producing the product for which a base price is set before prices or regulations are officially promulgated and made effective.

All of the foregoing is predicated, of course on the assumption that such legislation would aim to concentrate the responsibility for production, pricing, and rationing in a food administration whose offices would be created by law and who would report directly and solely to the President of the United States.

If the roll-back and subsidy issue is disposed of in other legislation, it probably need not be taken into consideration in a situation of this kind.

It seems to me that a bill aiming to do what is suggested in the preceding comments might reasonably include in the statement of its purposes that of fostering production of food by sound economic methods in order to restrain inflationary tendencies and trends, first, by inducing an increase in supply; second, by the fixing of prices where imperative; and, third, a rationing consumption only where a stipulated set of conditions requires, and then only temporarily or during the existence of such conditions. In other words, there should be a stipulation which forces reconsideration of price and rationing actions taken under the act periodically, for instance, at least every 6 months, and a demonstration ultimately made public that there are sound reasons in conformity with the policy stated in the law for continuing price limitations and rationing on each affected commodity.

Now, my colleagues, let us have a look at the transportation situation which affects that stretch back from the retail counter to the processor, or direct from the retail counter to the fields.

Not very long ago, in my district, a serious situation developed by reason of orders by the Office of Defense Transportation, O. D. T., prescribing minimum car-lot loading of onions. Onion shippers were told that 40,000 pounds was the minimum load which could be shipped per carload. For the benefit of those who only know onions when they are present and when their fumes either bring tears to their eyes or their proper use in food tickles the palate, let me give you in a little detail the facts concerning onions and shippers of onions.

The shippers of onions make contracts with farmers who produce onions, giving them indications as to the price onions will bring and the number of crates the shippers' pocketbooks can afford to pay for. One shipper of onions who lives in my home town and who has crating and packing sheds for vegetables ot all kinds, including onions, at railside in various sections of my district, has been in this business for over a quarter of a century. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that he knows his business. He and other shippers received the orders from the O. D. T. during the time that they were making contracts with growers and after some onions had already been planted under agreements between the grower and the shipper. This shipper had found out that 24,000 pounds was the maximum load of onions which could be shipped safely to distant markets. He had discovered that to load more crated onions into cars than 25,000 pounds inevitably crushed the three lower tiers of crates and the onions in them to a condition where they were no longer merchantable. They would therefore not be accepted by the consignee. Also, the fumes released by the crushed onions at the bottom of the car permeated the entire remainder of the load and caused such complete deterioration as to destroy the merchantability or marketability of these onions upon arriving at destination.

I was requested by the shippers all over my district, as their Representative in Congress, to see what could be done about this matter. Upon my first contact with the O. D. T., I was told that they would conduct a test as soon as the onions were available to see whether the shippers were right in their contention. After considerable effort on my part, apparently my remonstrance reached the attention of the Administrator of Defense Transportation, who, may I say, immediately told the onion shippers to go ahead with their business.

This is merely an illustration of that particular class of problems which arise which in reason should never occur. Basically, the various agencies controlling the operation of the lines of endeavor of people engaged in the production of food should never issue a regulation affecting these producers or distributors without first consulting them in detail.

A long time ago Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to Edward Livingston, wrote this. I quote:

> In one sentiment of [your] speech I particularly concur: "If we have a doubt relative to any power, we ought not to exercise it."

This would be an excellent axiom for all of these agencies who wield power to change or to affect the American way of life to remember and never forget.

Second. I would suggest to them that they remember that the business of producing food and of feeding this Nation through distribution of food has been developed over the years by the know-hows, and, were I in the place of those who indicate that in certain realms of endeavor they are know-nothings, I would attempt to do some finding out before I acted.

The paper this morning, Thursday, July 15, contained references to trainloads and carloads of various kinds of goods that have spoiled or are spoiling, either en route or at points along the lines of distribution. Recently, in the West, in the East, and in the South, during a national dearth of potatoes, transportation facilities were so limited and restricted—I refer to trucks, and so forth—that literally thousands of carloads of potatoes spoiled or sprouted in the fields because they could not be moved.

Many farmers throughout the United States have made applications for the purchase of vitally necessary automobile trucks to move produce to railhead or to concentration point, or to be used on and around farms and ranches, and have either been disastrously delayed in the procurement of these items or they have been flatly denied, and in some cases without apparent or intelligible reasons given therefor.

So much for the distribution situation, which time does not permit me to discuss at greater length.

Now for a suggestion—a well developed articulation between the Office of Defense Transportation, producers, processors, shippers, and distributors, as well, including the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. This articulation is even today a long way from being effective, although in some phases it is partly accomplished.

Let me at this juncture, and for the purpose of bringing squarely before you the unmistakable situation which confronts the slaughterers of meat in this country, present this example. I offer you the following for your review and study.

I called upon the O. P. A. and upon the W. F. A. for copies of regulations, orders, press releases, concerning orders, and numbers of amendments—numerals indicating amendments which appear as footnotes to the papers referred to—solely on the matter of regulations fixing quotas, distribution, prices, and sales of meat as they affect packers, slaughterers, and so forth, of all kinds. I did not include retail or chain stores which handle meat.

From the O. P. A. I received a document in fine print containing 8 pages of 75 lines per page, 600 lines total, and

containing approximately 10,800 words. This document has reference on its first page, alone, to such a great number of amendments and references to other orders that I was unable and unwilling to attempt to give you the pages and words involved.

From the W. F. A. I received copious documents, containing 329 paragraphs, many of which paragraphs referred in footnotes to other documents and laws and regulations, which would bring the total of reading matter required of butchers, slaughterers, and packers up to an imponderable and more than formidable array.

If these tradesmen were to check on the time it requires to read and assimilate, only, without being able to understand and decipher thoroughly, the lack of time for the purpose of conducting their business might constitute a real basis for the meat shortage.

If you were to take the time, as I did, to read through this mass of material, you would have a far clearer understanding of why we have so little beef with so many live cattle roaming the ranges of our country. Such a tremendous surplus of red tape can do no less than produce stagnating confusion.

In these tragic days a surplus is indeed a blessing, if we can devise ways and means of using it to our benefit, rather than permit it to torture us, as seems to be the condition today.

On June 24 I addressed the House concerning the meat situation and the beef-cattle industry of the United States, and made reference to the inflation scare as well as to the adoption of the proposed surplus and roll-back program. I refer you to that address, insofar as what I have to say on meat and inflation has bearing thereon in this discussion.

Let me read to you a statement in which I collaborated, coming from the beef industry and its various elements, to clarify your mind. These elements, generally speaking and without breaking them up, include producers, processors, slaughterers of all kinds who do not process, distributors, and breeders. This statement was prepared in my office, and has particular bearing on the recently much-discussed subsidy and roll-back decision, as well as containing pertinent facts concerning the reasons back of the present mystifying as well as destructive beef shortage of today:

There has been no convincing evidence to show in the last World War or in the present World War that the prices of livestock if left uncontrolled would rise sufficiently to become a dangerous inflationary force. At the present time this is best illustrated by the fact that the price of hogs has remained between 14 and 16 cents most of the time, whereas in the last war hog prices reached 24 cents.

The only evidence of extremely high prices for livestock has been in the black market. We feel that the black market is an outgrowth of the Government regulation inaugurated in November 1942 at which time, among other regulations, all killers were placed on a quota of 70 percent of their 1941 average kill. At approximately the same time as the quota system was inaugurated a wholesale-price ceiling was also placed in effect. Before this regulation was placed in effect there had been no visible evidence of an over-the-counter meat shortage in the country. After this regulation was imposed the Government did buy for Army, Navy, and lend-lease purposes approximately 35 percent of the total meat killed in the United States. All of this meat was purchased from or through federally inspected killing plants, which at that time were killing 65 percent of all the livestock coming to market. As a natural consequence of this heavy buying by the Government and the various requisitions, inducements, and edicts issued to get the federally inspected plants promptly to fill Government orders, the federally inspected plants withdrew to considerable extent from supplying the civilian population in many localities. This left the small plants without Federal inspection, comprising about 35 percent of the total killing capacity, and whose quota was only 70 percent of 1941, with the impossible task of supplying the civilian meat needs of the country. It seems perfectly clear that under this condition black-market operations were to be expected and did exist in very substantial volume.

As far back as August 1942 the announcement of the intention of imposing price ceilings on livestock had so disturbed the confidence of the livestock producers that by the time the quota and ceilings had been imposed the effect of this lack of confidence in the livestock producers was strongly in evidence in the lack of cattle ready for immediate slaughter in January and February 1943. Far more important, however, than this temporary scarcity of finished cattle could be slaughtered to meet the civilian demand, regardless of how many cattle were available in the country. When the consequences of these regulations became apparent, the representatives of the various groups comprising the livestock industry asked for immediate removal of the quota system. The industry was met by the assertion that all would be worked out as soon as the ration-card system was also in effect. The industry again patiently waited to see the results of this system.

It is important at this point to state the facts covering cattle population pertinent to the preceding discussion, as follows: At the time of the 1929 crash there were approximately 59,000,000 head of cattle in the country. While this population was heavy the increase in the civilian population of the country made the number fairly low on a per-capita basis, but still sufficient for all known civilian needs. In 1932 this cattle population had increased to 74,000,000 head and the Government then stepped in and through purchase and subsidy, had 8,000,000 cattle killed. The Department of Agriculture now estimates that the cattle population will reach 82,500,000 head by January 1944. To plan for the good of the beef industry and to avoid similar overstocking conditions to those that prevailed after 1932, these numbers should be reduced during the next few years, so that at the end of the emergency our ranges and farms will not be overstocked. By planning to increase the Bureau of Animal Industry slaughter by 6,000,000 head for the next 2 years we would have enough additional slaughter in the country to provide for the total supply of meat needed for Army, Navy, and lend-lease, plus a surplus over and above normal, of around 1,000,000,000 pounds of beef per year for the civilian counter.

By March 17, 1943, the accumulated bad effects of Government regulation had made it necessary for all branches of the livestock industry to get together for the purpose of working out and submitting a comprehensive plan of their own for the good of the country and the salvation of the industry. It is true that beginning back at the time when price control was first attempted under an Executive order and on down through the period of time after Congress had enacted the Price Control Act, the industry, both the producers and the processors, had separately made numerous recommendations to the Office of Price Administration setting out suggested procedure to be followed that was believed by the members of the industry to be wise. These suggestions had uniformly been disregarded by the officials of Office of Price Administration and the failure to recognize or put into effect any of these suggestions was kept as a Government policy up to the stated date of March 17, 1943. At that time meetings were held by Office of Price Administration and by the Director of the Board of Economic Stabilization in Washington, and by the officials of the Department of Agriculture charged with the duty of administering the war food program, and the various elements of the industry became aware that additional regulations were to be issued by the various agencies dealing with the meat industry. Acting on this information and on the experience gained from observing the effect of the previous regulations, the livestock producers, feeders, marketing agencies, and all elements of packing industry, held a joint meeting in Chicago on April 2 and 3, 1943, which meeting followed separate meetings of the elements of the industry that had been held just prior to that time. As a result of these joint meetings of all the elements of the industry, a unified program or plan was unanimously decided upon and this plan was put into concrete printed form entitled "A Program for Solving Wartime Meat Problems." An industry committee was formed, known as the Livestock and Meat Council, upon which committee there were representatives of all the various elements of the industry. This council came to Washington and presented the above referred to program as the industry's suggestion to the Government of the means to solve the problems in the industry. This plan was presented to the various governmental agencies during the week beginning April 4, 1943. After a little more than a month's deliberation, the Director of Office of Price Administration, Prentiss Brown, the Administrator of the War Food Administration, Chester Davis, and the Quartermaster General of the United States, Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory, signed a statement endorsing the suggested plan with some minor administrative changes, and the announcement was made that this plan would be put into effect.

This plan is simple. It calls for the recognition of the fundamental law of supply and demand. The supply is known, or at least easily determinable by observation of the slaughter records. The demand has three factors—the armed forces needs, the civilian needs, and lend-lease requirements. All other factors must yield to the proper necessity to meet the reasonable requirements of the armed forces. The civilian needs are controlled by rationing with the point value being fixed but not invariable. The lend-lease demands would be very flexible, being coordinated with the actual slaughtering. Any surplus slaughtering, that is any surplus above requirements for the armed forces and lend-lease, would be absorbed by adjustment of civilian ration points.

Following the endorsement of the plan by the above-named officials, the Government has attempted to put it into operation. The Meat Board has been set up, operating in Chicago, with all essential details of the plan adopted, but, unfortunately and in spite of opposition from the entire industry and from the Office of Food Administration, the roll-back and subsidy plan has been hung on the neck of the plan and it is seriously feared that such an impediment may cause the failure of the entire plan. Certainly it can

and will do no good and only added confusion will result.

There is prevalent a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the effect of the roll-back and subsidy program insofar as it affects meat. Under normal conditions the average per capita consumption of meat in this country was 131 pounds annually. Under rationing the maximum per capita consumption of meat is 104 pounds annually. Actual statistics show the real consumption, now under rationing, quota, and zoning is 87 pounds annually. It is clear that the maximum per capita saving to be effected by the roll-back and subsidy plan, under rationing, is $2.08 and the actual reduction in per capita cost, based on actual annual consumption, is $1.74, which is less than 15 cents per month, or less than one-half of 1 cent per day. In order to effect this infinitesimal per capita saving, the Government's announced plan proposes to spend several hundreds of millions of dollars of public money that must be raised by taxing the people to whom the saving is supposed to be beneficial.

At this point it is well to state that the whole livestock industry is, of necessity, an industry very sensitive to changing conditions in the country and this plays an important part in its successful operation. This is best illustrated by the presence of the largest cattle population on record and at the same time a reduced volume of desirable and edible meat.

The feeling is so strong throughout the entire industry that the subsidy is unsound that the industry wishes to take this opportunity to refuse to accept responsibility for the consequences of the subsidy program, as we feel that it will result, first, in a reduced supply of meat, and, second, in the liquidation of a great many small packing concerns, and the two will greatly impede the war effort.

MEMORANDUM

In 1939 the total number of cattle slaughtered in the United States was 17,201,000 head.

This resulted in consumed pounds of beef, 7,049,000,000; of veal, 934,000,000; total, 7,983,-000,000 pounds of meat from cattle.

From Government estimates we know we will have, by January 1, 1944, a surplus of 15,400,000 head of cattle. This represents a surplus in poundage of 7,700,000,000 pounds. If we slaughtered one-half, or 3,850,000,000, of the surplus, we would produce out of this one-half of the surplus enough meat to feed 74,000,000 people, in addition to supplying our own armed forces and our civilian population with this normal supply of beef, and these additional people would be supplied as bountifully as are our own fighters and civilians. Thus we can, without hurting ourselves, actually supply normal quantities of beef for over 200,000,000 people (Americans, plus 74,000,000). In fact, the use of this surplus would be a genuine service since it would relieve our ranges and our feed lots of a severe strain on their resources.

At this moment, while dictating this discussion, Judge Joseph G. Montague, general counsel for the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, which, by the way, is an association which has continuously functioned since its organization in 1877 as an organization of producers of beef cattle, is sitting in my office. Some of the members of this organization—in fact, many of them—produce dairy cows.

Judge Montague was born and reared in the cattle country of Texas and, except for the time during which he practiced law and occupied a position on the bench—and, yes, during this time, all of it—he has been in touch with the cattle industry in all of its phases. He has been in Washington a number of times concerning matters of importance to cattle producers in all of the States. Principally, however, in the past, he has represented members of the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, which has members in 38 States of this Union and in 7 foreign countries.

By way of parenthesis, this association has no political affiliations, inclinations, aspirations, or relationship of any shape, size, or form. Presently, Judge Montague is engaged in attempting to work out ways and means of relieving the beef shortage referred to earlier. You might be interested in Judge Montague's answers to some questions which have occurred to many of you, if not to all of you. He has agreed to answer those questions, and I shall start with a question born of misconception, misinformation, and deliberate misinterpretation of fact. These misinterpretations, and so forth, have occurred mainly in the great centers of population in our country, where the meat scarcity is, of course, felt by most people more than in other sections of the country. I shall now interrogate Judge Montague:

Mr. KLEBERG. Judge Montague, what is there to the statements that cattle producers and cattle feeders are wilfully withholding livestock from shipment to the market? In oher words, as some of the rumors are worded, what is there to the idea that the cattlemen are engaged in a sit-down strike?

Judge MONTAGUE. Well, Dick, there isn't the slightest substance of fact to such a statement. When that statement is made by people who have not studied the question, then it comes from lack of information. When it is made by those who have made a study of conditions, then the statement is maliciously untrue. The cowman couldn't go on strike if he wanted to. His position is like that of a man in a leaky boat. The boat keeps filling up with water. But with reference to the cowman, his grazing land keeps filling up with cattle from year to year and season to season, and, just like the man bailing out a leaky boat, the cowman has to take the cattle off of his range, and a strike is simply an impossibility for him.

Mr. KLEBERG. You mean by that that these cattle must go to market?

Judge MONTAGUE. Cattle mut go to market; the ranges must be relieved.

In order to understand what I am talking about, the fundamental thought must be brought out, and that is that cattle, as such, are not beef. Before cattle can be transformed into edible meat for the supplying of the armed forces, civilian needs, and lend-lease requirements, it is necessary that they be, to use cowman language, "shaped up" for killing.

It is true that right at this time of the year we shall have a very large number of cattle being brought into the markets. These cattle are grass cattle, that is, they have not been given any supplemental feeds of any kind and they come directly from the range country.

Experience in the past has always been that approximately 60 percent of these cattle coming out of the grass are what in the trade is known as two-way cattle, that is, 60 percent of those cattle are bought on the open market by feeders for short-time feeding. Farmers and commercial feeders take them off of the market and feed them from 60 to 90 days, thereby increasing their weight substantially, and also improving the grade of the meat.

This year there are no two-way cattle. All of the cattle that are coming off of the grass are being slaughtered now. This means that for the next 4 or 5 months the country will have a very large supply of meat, but the disaster that will fall on us next winter and especially next spring is due to the fact that there will be no fed cattle, and just can hardly be imagined.

Mr. KLEBERG. Let me at that juncture see if this example has anything to do with what you say with reference to the fact that there will be no fed meat or no fed cattle:

Let's take a 700-pound steer, put him on feed for 100 days, that is, corn, and according to my figures, that steer has to sell for about 16.68 per hundredweight at the present price of corn and feed-lot help in order to pay the cost of purchasing steer and feeding him.

The Office of Price Administration has fixed a ceiling price on the packer who, by the way, is the principal market for range cattle, at $14.50. Is that what you are talking about?

Judge MONTAGUE. That is exactly what I am talking about. The function of the feeder is twofold: First, he increases the poundage and at the same time improves the grade and quality of the meat; and, second, he relieves the market of a pressure during the rush of grass cattle to the market, and brings cattle on to the market at a time when there is otherwise a shortage.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is because of the fact that at the time fed cattle come in to market, the ranges are usually low in grass and range cattle are thin. Is that not correct?

Judge MONTAGUE. That is right. They are not in condition for slaughter at all. The feeder makes his money not only out of the increased poundage that he adds to the animals, but out of the improvement in grade, in quality of the meat.

Mr. KLEBERG. And, also, he makes his money, if he happens to be a producer of corn, out of the increased price he gets for the corn converted into first-class beef.

Judge MONTAGUE. During the last 15 years the economy of the country in reference to cattle and farming has developed so that the grain farmer, principally the corn farmer, has found it to his advantage to market his corn through feeding it to livestock.

Mr. KLEBERG. Right at that juncture, Judge Montague, the ceiling price at which packers can sell pork would indicate that the corn will be fed to hogs rather than to cattle. Do you agree with that statement?

Judge MONTAGUE. That is true. The farmer who has corn on hand can get a higher return from feeding his corn to hogs than he could by feeding the corn to cattle under present conditions. The reason for this is that the ceiling prices that have been fixed on high-grade beef are out of relationship as established by history to pork. There has always been a margin on the market between beef and pork that brings about a proper relationship so that there is practically no difference between the return to the farmer from feeding corn to hogs or cattle.

Under present conditions, however, the farmer gets a far greater return by feeding his corn to hogs. This is proven by the fact that during the last month we have had a tremendous run of hogs on the market, showing that hogs have been finished for slaughter and at the same time we have had practically no cattle on the market, showing that cattle have not been fed.

Mr. KLEBERG. Now, Judge Montague, to make the maximum out of the blessing of having a surplus of livestock in this country, do you or do you not think it is important to utilize this surplus to its maximum advantage at the present time?

Judge MONTAGUE. That is an absolute necessity. We have not only a maximum number of cattle on hand, but the demand is

far greater than has ever been known in this country. Those two elements should be brought into relationship with each other.

Mr. KLEBERG. In addition to that, isn't it equally true that the increase in the purchaseable supply of beef across the counter would constitute a formidable addition to the stock pile of consumer goods which must be increased if we are to fight against the inflationary situation which presents itself in excess capital and purchasing power over low consumer goods?

Judge MONTAGUE. That is absolutely true. I think it is axiomatic that if you have a bountiful supply, you cannot have an inflationary tendency in that commodity.

Mr. KLEBERG. Isn't it equally true that if the available across-the-counter supply of beef which could be developed by putting the beef cattle industry to work as it alone best knows how, that is to say, reinstituting the orderly process of feeding, as well as the shipping of two-way cattle that you just referred to, increasing thereby the poundage of beef by the distribution of properly marketed corn through livestock, this problem can best be met?

Judge MONTAGUE. Yes; there must be some order brought out of chaos that exists today. The most important thing to do today is to eliminate the confusion that exists in the industry because of so many regulations placed on the industry by the various governmental agencies.

Mr. KLEBERG. You mean regulations and restrictions?

Judge MONTAGUE. Regulations and restrictions, yes; though nearly every regulation is a restriction.

And what is just as important, the constant threat of additional regulations and restrictions, these threats coming by way of press releases from the Office of Price Administration and other such agencies, all of which tend to aggravate the confusion that exists today.

Mr. KLEBERG. Among those things you are referring to is the statement in this morning's paper that the Office of Price Administration is proposing to fix ceiling prices on live animals. What do you think of that?

Judge MONTAGUE. That has been one of the strongest factors leading to the confusion that exists today for over a year. The entire industry, from the man who raises cattle down to the processor, knowns that no one can or is able to write an order fixing ceilings on live animals that is susceptible of enforcement.

We have all studied this proposition, and if such an order could be drawn it would not receive the serious opposition of anyone. But for over a year we know that various governmental officials have been trying to draw such an order, always without success. We ourselves have attempted to draw such an order for the purpose of proposing it to the Government, and no one in the industry has ever been able to draw an order that could be enforced. To try to enforce an order that is not based on reason and which would not assist in dissipating confusion, but would just add to confusion is not feasible nor reasonable.

A committee of the industry worked on this problem for 60 days, and finally submitted a plan with the statement that "This is the only plan we can offer to the industry, and it won't work."

Mr. KLEBERG. Now, with reference to what you say about the industry committee, this committee, as I understand it, recently held meetings in Chicago in an effort to find and offer a solution to the beef situation. Did you attend that meeting?

Judge MONTAGUE. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. KLEBERG. As I understand it, the committee offered a plan. Could you give a brief outline of that plan, Judge Montague?

Judge MONTAGUE. Yes; the plan can briefly be summarized like this: It calls for a recognition of the fundamental law of supply and demand and lends the entire industry's efforts to bring about a balancing of the demand with the known supply. Specifically it calls for a meat board to be established by the Government, which board would sit in Chicago, which is the center of the meat industry, and have authority to do all of the buying for the Government, both for the armed forces and for lend-lease requirements. By unifying that purchasing power, we have the Government purchasing approximately 40 percent of the entire meat supply of the country. Any single agency in any industry that has the purchasing power over 40 percent of the supply automatically is placed in the position of controlling the price on the entire supply.

This meat board would have working with it a committee from the industry, which committee would represent a complete cross section of every element in the industry from the breeder of cattle to the man who sells the meat across the block. This committee would sit with the board from day to day, and they would agree as to what price the cattle should bring on the market that date for governmental purposes, and thereby reflect back the price that the civilian beef would bring.

The board would necessarily have to have authority to fluctuate prices somewhat, so that when there was an oversupply of livestock on the market, it could shorten that supply by reducing prices, and if there was a shortage of supply on the market, it could attract the supply by increasing prices slightly.

This plan worked most efficiently in the First World War, and the industry can see no reason why it would not work during this war. Of course, it calls for one fundamental thing which we know we have, and that is every segment of the industry and every individual in it would have to eliminate from his mind all thought of selfishness, and the entire industry would have to work for the good of the country.

Mr. KLEBERG. Don't you feel perfectly certain, knowing the men who are engaged in this business, that this would be done?

Judge MONTAGUE. I know it would be done. There is no more patriotic group of men in the world than the cowmen.

Mr. KLEBERG. Don't you know, too, Judge Montague, that knowledge of the cattle industry and the delicate balance which involves its operating parts is only known to men of experience in that industry?

Judge MONTAGUE. Of course, that is true.

Mr. KLEBERG. There is also a big difference, is there not, between the man from one segment of the industry attempting to make recommendations for another segment of the industry with which he is not acquainted? For instance, the man who has been a clerk in a packing house would patently know little of the operations of range or feed-lot management in business, and vice versa.

Judge MONTAGUE. That is true.

Mr. KLEBERG. So, therefore, isn't it patent that if the best results are to be obtained and if the "know how" represented by the industry is to be put to work, it is necessary for the whole industry to select a representative from each group forming this committee to be a part of this operation?

Judge MONTAGUE. That is absolutely essential. No level in the industry can be overlooked in the formation of this industry committee.

Mr. KLEBERG. I am thinking of one other thing that you may help out on in this discussion, which has to do with the direct effect of restrictions.

You were brought up in a section of Texas which, in addition to cattle, produces more sheep and wool than any other part of the United States. I have before me a telegram under date of June 15, which I would like to read to you, and after you hear it, I'd like you to tell me what you think of the present set-up with reference to quotas and other restrictions, compared to the plan you have just discussed.

This is the telegram, addressed to H. J. Flynn, War Food Director, War Food Administration, Los Angeles, Calif.:

"Press reports Los Angeles meat supply reached new low yesterday, and with nothing to sell, scores of meat markets failed to open. Also, that you explain meat quotas virtually exhausted and that new quotas would not become effective until July 1.

"Through your San Francisco office last week we notified Washington of over 50,000 surplus lambs on hand, looking for buyers in northern California at this time, and urge special consideration be given so these lambs, largely of commercial and utility grade, can move to market immediately before their bloom is gone. Ranges are drying. Lambs must move. Lamb feeders all filled up, so only outlet is to slaughter. Present Office of Price Administration and War Food Administration regulations prevent orderly market-ward movement. Urge temporary removal of all points and other restrictions on these lambs so that they can be slaughtered at once.

"CALIFORNIA WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
"By W. P. WING, *Secretary.*"

Judge MONTAGUE. Dick, that telegram illustrates a thought that I have had for a long time in which it is absolutely true that the livestock and meat industry is by nature a very sensitive business. It responds more quickly to the vagaries of a fickle nature than any other industry in the world. That telegram illustrates this point, that out there in California they have a bunch of lambs that are ready for market, even getting past the point where they are ready, and yet the attempted regimentation of the industry that depends on nature for its subsistence prevents those animals from going to market.

There are two reasons why you cannot regiment the livestock business. In the first place, no human-made rules, regulations, or restrictions can make a rain come or keep the flood from attacking the range land. It can't keep off a frost, and can't raise the temperature during the summer.

The second reason why you can't regiment the livestock industry is the nature of the livestock man. The man engaged in raising livestock is essentially an individualist. He is perfectly willing to surrender everything that he has for the good of his country, but he doesn't like a college professor telling him what he has got to do, and he won't stand for being so told.

Mr. KLEBERG. Well, I think, summing up, Judge Montague, that it is a fair statement, to judge from what you say, that you believe that the industry can only serve the public best by being given an opportunity to cooperate under requests and regulations which are made by those who understand it.

Judge MONTAGUE. That is true. The industry resents people writing these regulations and restrictions who don't know the problems of the industry. Yet every man in the industry would gladly cooperate in an effort to bring about order by supporting the War Meat Board, which is essentially the creature of the industry.

Mr. KLEBERG. I desire to thank you, and for my part, may I say in concluding the section of this discussion which has to do with beef and beef cattle that references made to the situation confronting the Nation in the beef shortage merely is a part of the national picture involved in both food and inflation, which are the major problems of the home front today.

Mr. Speaker, I have been unable in my own research to find any reason which could stand up for the regulation which involved the fixing of quotas based on a

percentage of what the slaughtering section of the industry killed in 1941.

At the time which was selected as a base date from which to start restrictions, this Nation was not at war. This Nation had a national income, based upon figures of governmental source, indicating $95,600,000,000 as the national income of 1941. With this income, and with one person at work then where two are working today, and in this year of 1943, with indications pointing toward a national income in excess of $140,000,000,000 I do not believe it makes sense, if there is real truth in the administrative proposition that these quotas and restrictions are placed as a part of the administration's war on inflation, when the base is itself laid by its own statement on the great discrepancy between excess income and consumer's goods.

How can public confidence be maintained in the face of such reasons given by those high in authority as a basis for producing the beef shortage which we have today? I would warn the administration, as a humble Member of Congress, never for one moment to forget that the United States was built starting with tremendous conflicts between early pioneers, the elements, and the ruthless, savage aborigines. The traditions of this Nation furnish the basis for our national law and knowledge of natural and elemental laws, as well as some of the things we learned from the Indian.

The Indian was always a friend to the white man who told him the truth, but he never forgave the white man who sought to take advantage of him by misrepresentation of the truth. And such a proposal flies directly in the face of the known and developed intelligence and education of my countrymen, and along with them, I resent it. I am perfectly sure that the day has come for the Congress of the United States, which represents the 130,000,000 people of this Nation, to not only take cognizance of the amazing situation which confronts us, but upon its return to institute immediate remedial action looking toward correcting it, and letting the American way, which we Americans know so well, do the job.

I believe now, before discussing the second of the original problems mentioned at the outset of my remarks—food and inflation—referring to inflation, that you should have the benefit of the results of calculations by the National Industrial Conference Board with reference to the cost of living, which shows that since August 1939 this cost had risen 21.2 percent by February of 1943. In the same period average hourly earnings of workers in 25 manufacturing industries had risen 36.4 percent. The weekly earnings of these workers had risen 60.9 percent. The hourly earnings of bituminous coal miners had risen 140 percent from May 1933 to December 1942, during which period the cost of living had advanced only 33 percent.

It is estimated that the introduction of the 6-day, 42-hour week has added another 30 percent to the weekly wages of the miners. This is exemplary of one phase which apparently has escaped the attention of those within the administration who are leading the fight against inflation.

On July 3, viewing this situation from a different angle, I give you an excerpt from the Kiplinger agricultural letter. I quote:

Here is what Bureau of Agricultural Economics says in current Marketing and Transportation:

"Actual expenditure for food, in percentage of national income, is now at the lowest point in history, 21 percent. 'The average United States consumer is able to purchase a food basket of specified foods for smaller share of his income than at any period of record—true even when the cost of the food is compared with consumer's disposable income after payment of direct personal taxes. Advances in retail food prices since start of the war have been much less proportionately than the average increase in consumer incomes. Total expenditures for food have risen more rapidly than retail food prices, reflecting advances in standards of food consumption and increases in services obtained with food.'

"As for wages, Senator REED, of Kansas says, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Bureau of Labor Statistics figures prepared for him show there has not been a week or a month since January 1939 when factory and mill wages have not increased more than the cost of living, and that the hourly wage increased 57.9 percent, weekly wage 92.9 percent, while the cost of living has increased only 24.1 percent.

"As for wage and farm price increases based on 1909–14 as 100, Senator SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, quoting figures prepared for him by Bureau of Agricultural Economics, says that hourly wage rate indices in March of this year were up to 449, weekly wages 365. Farmers' prices were up to 182, retail food costs up to 177, and cost of living 178.

"Such figures may explain the conciliatory Commodity Credit Corporation veto message."

Because of the great confusion concerning just what kind of inflation we are supposed to fear, just what composes it or makes it up, there is one school of thought, which has appeared reasonable to me, which checks into the possibilities of discussing the four primary categories into which the inflation problem has been divided for purposes of review and assay.

The first of these is purchasing power, which is viewed both from the rate of increase as well as the amount of increase. Both rate and amount are due, shall we say, principally to what may be referred to as expedient, or, shall we say, political or Government influence, which result from unusual preferences and advantages for workers in war industry and discrimination, or, shall we say, forgetfulness against workers or of workers in nonwar production and distribution, as well as agricultural workers.

For the purpose of being logical and consistent, if the inflation which we fear is due to excess income over consumer goods, this would be the first place to exert an applied effort to control inflation. It is not necessary to call your attention to the prevailing policy, which is opposite to this line of thought.

Second, consider the supply of consumer goods. Of this, food is more than an inconsequential part. We have here the evidences of the theory which calls upon the American people to sacrifice for the sole sake of sacrifice, evidenced by reckless and irrational reduction in civilian supplies, without essential regard for military need.

Confronted as we are with the need to control inflation, the second battle line must be drawn at the point which is now looking toward the immediate effort to increase civilian supplies as the natural and patent means of soaking up excess purchasing power. This, of course, means with careful regard to ways and means, looking toward prevention of improper reduction of supplies for legitimate military needs.

Third, let us look at savings. In this category there had already been much done looking to the control of inflation. Reliable sources of information indicate that the savings of individuals, as differentiated from banks, and others going into Federal securities, had risen to a point approximating a billion dollars a month.

Fourth, taxation. And in this category I believe it is safe to say that reasonable study will indicate that taxation properly used as an inflationary control has been increased to a point way ahead of the proper marginal line with respect to income of $5,000 per year and over. Certainly, it has when comparisons with the other three categories, purchasing power, consumer goods, and savings are considered.

Therefore, it seems rational that further use of taxation as a weapon against inflation is questionable in its application save to incomes of $5,000 per year and under, if the sole object is to be the freezing of purchasing power and the reduction of this excess pressure on price levels.

I quote from Treasury Department Release to Financial Writers, No. 3:

Treasury economists estimate that seven-eighths (87½ percent) of Nation's current incomes after taxes goes to persons earning less than $5,000 per year.

In the war going on against inflation there is manifest evidence that considerable confusion exists in the mind of those presently engaged in this battle, administratively speaking, between the meaning of control of inflation and the word "freezing." To better illustrate this, we have but to look at the traditional function of price in inducing production and in allocating or apportioning supply. Where need for additional production exists, the most potent means of inducing it is by an increase in stipend paid or price therefor. But above this, in importance, is to maintain a proper, sane equilibrium and thereby control the rate of increase.

Next in importance is to remember that there is no point in increasing prices above what additional production is worth. If the cost of something you desire and obtain is in proper proportion to the value of what you get, you have your feet on the ground and are pursuing the time-honored effective means of getting it.

After review and assay of the problem from the viewpoint just expressed, let us look at a few of the things that are being

done and suggested as weapons to be used against inflation. Let us for a moment look at the subsidy and the subsidy and roll-back proposals.

At the outset may I say that, in my opinion, unless this proposal is rescinded by Congress upon its return, it bears every earmark of possibly costing the Nation billions of extra dollars, while at the same time contributing to the shortage of food and foodstuffs and the intensification of the real danger of inflation.

First, it is rational to state that one cannot eat subsidies. Second, a subsidy cannot put flesh on a dead cow or a dead chicken or a chicken that is not in esse.

Let us look, too, to the effect of proposing a subsidy to a man for the performance of his duty and the impact of this proposal on both his intelligence and his pride, multiplying this individual by the number of those who are of like thought, and see what the impact of this group would do to the public confidence of this Nation which, after all, is made up of Americans.

The people of the United States, I take it, are, in a tremendous majority, rational folk, possessed of the power to exercise American reason. A long time ago the Constitution of the United States was ratified by States which were then fewer than now. Today, 48 States adhere to its principles, and the people of these States are bound to support this compact as the very heart of our system of freeman's government, representative democracy. This organic law of ours is evidence of both the reasoning power and the faith of the American people. When the reasoning faculties of the American people have this question proposed, if the administrative policy of 5-percent roll-back on prices of food has real merit, why would not a roll-back of 15 percent, 25 percent, or 75 percent have even more merit, the answer is plain.

No one has told us where the roll-back would start or stop. Will roll-back be increased again and again, until all of us, rich and poor alike, will be supplied with food by the Government at the expense of the taxpayers? Will not subsidies destroy the American price system, the mechanism which through the years has been the most effective ever devised for distribution? Shortly, if this policy is carried on, every group affected by subsidies could become dependent upon the Government for favors. What would be its impact and final effect upon our private enterprise system and our constitutional form of government? How, in the field of American reason, can the claim be substantiated that this proposal would do less than force inflation upon us at just such pace as the subsidies might be put into effect and increased, while at the same time consumer goods, due to added confusion and the natural prejudices of man, would dwindle?

Caesar tried this, doling bread out to the Romans, as a function of government performing its duty. Down at home, when we had feed for cattle, we measured it out to them in troughs.

Subsidies might seem to the heedless and unthinking to lessen the cost of food to the consumer, but somebody pays for them, and that somebody is the American taxpayer, who is a consumer, too. This peculiar deception would leave more unspent money in circulation by reason of lower costs to consumers, and would finally be used to build up the price of other goods in other channels.

We already have inflation in this country. Inflation has always been the product of war and has always accompanied it during wartimes. In 2 years prices have risen nearly one-third. Our dollar of 2 years ago represents 75 cents worth of purchasing power today. Inflation is already here. Why speed it up by decreasing consumer goods and leaving more excess spending money in the hands of those who will spend?

Look at this other side of the picture. How could we expect to reduce inflationary effects when a large percentage of the productive capacity of this Nation is turned to the making of war goods and materials? Of course, the production of civilian goods must go down in such conditions. When supply of civilian goods decreases and the purchasing power of the public is increased through high employment rate and high wages, of course the public has more buying power and less goods on which to spend it, and of course it bids more for the goods in the decreased stock pile of consumer goods as they are needed and desired. And of course prices go up.

Of course, the President is right when he declares that we must wage unrelenting war against inflation on the home front. Following World War No. 1 we had but to look at the pitiful plight of Germany. Inflation in Germany was in many ways more devastating than the war itself. The value of the German mark was so depressed that the prices of ordinary things rose to billions and trillions. At one time the price of a dozen eggs was in excess of 1,000,000 marks. Of course, catastrophe and national bankruptcy followed.

Even though history were not replete with instances to prove the devastating effects of inflation, together with a record of how its devastation had been checked, in the field of American reason it seems perfectly simple that like any other disease or disaster it should be attacked at its source. Removing the cause, if not too long delayed, has always saved the patient.

What are we doing about the cause? Are we attempting to remove or decimate it in its various phases, or are we, in fact, proposing ways and means of feeding it and causing it to flourish? Of course, there are always two strong forces opposite to each other. Everyone wants higher wages, salaries, and at the same time everyone wants lower prices. Likewise, everyone who thinks, knows that you cannot have higher wages and at the same time have lower prices. The old adage "You can't eat your cake and have it too" applies with peculiar force.

As a Member of Congress, I recall a message by the Chief Executive to the Congress with reference to farm prices, where he insisted that Congress do something to hold them down, and that he would do something about wages. You all know what Congress did. What has the administration done?

I would ask Mr. Lewis and other labor leaders how they rate the importance of defending the Little Steel formula as against defending the American system and way of life; how they rate the defense of the total gains of organized labor without sacrifice against their insistence that other folks sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice.

The administration is acquainted with these facts. It is needless for the sake of informing the administration for me to say anything about them, but it is not needless to remind the American people of this peculiar and vicious situation. Between 1939 and 1942 our national income has increased a little in excess of $42,000,000,000, according to the best sources from which statistics come. A little later I want to call your attention to statistics. Of this $42,000,000,000, only 14 percent went to agriculture, 86 percent going to nonagricultural sources, to industry, yet the assertion is repeated time and again that rising farm prices, not rising wages, have caused a rise in the cost of living. Do your own thinking. How does it look to you?

The number of employed persons since January of 1941 has increased 40 percent. Rates of pay are up 35 percent. Hours worked per week have risen 15 percent. The combined effect of these on total pay rolls has increased them 117 percent. What part do you think this plays in causing inflation? I am asking you.

Certainly, no one will deem it good politics to oppose wage increases, but at least the wage earner should know that the situation just mentioned is responsible in the main for the rising cost of living, which always kicks back at the wage earner. No human is responsible for this, but an all-wise and beneficent Destiny, the God in whom we trust, has so ordained it in the operation of the natural laws which He administers.

Our Chief Executive, in a recent veto message, admitted to the Congress that wage increases do raise prices. So it is patent that what I have said does not leave me alone in this belief.

The people of the Nation cannot continue to be misled and misguided in these beliefs:

First. That any group, including labor, can escape the essential economic sacrifice incident to war; second, that the cost of living can be kept from rising in spite of continued widespread wage increases; third, that raising farm prices to fair levels was the major cause of higher living costs; fourth, that labor could not only maintain its gains but elevate its own standard of living without sacrifice. As long as war continues, shortages of manufactured goods in the main can be expected, and, of course, prices for these

goods will continue to rise unless something is done about it.

What, then, can we do about this situation of inflation before its impact reaches true destructiveness?

First. We can stop or control to a proper degree increases in wages, in salaries.

Second. We can siphon off the public's excess spending power, which is purchasing power. Taxation is, of course, unpopular, but after all, we must pay the cost of this war, and at the same time cut down spending and buying power.

Third. We can encourage the production of necessities by permitting their prices to rise a little and permitting the automatic price mechanism, as far as possible, to control the situation, instead of rigid price fixing by Government bureau or agency.

The power of taxation should never be used save for its legitimate and limited purposes, as set out in the Constitution. It should not be used as a weapon in domestic wars which arise out of appeals to class prejudice; nor should taxation be used to accomplish ends which are not tested in the field of American reason. After all, the so-called wealthy class received less than 12½ percent of the Nation's current income after taxes, as has just been shown in the previously quoted statement from the Treasury. Taxation as a weapon against inflation must be used fairly and equally to all who have increased in earnings and to all who have added to the increase in inflationary spending power. Purchases of War bonds, forced savings, together with highly commendable thrift, if there be such, desirable as they are, cannot remove the dangers of inflation. They can only retard the evil day of consummation of disaster.

We in the Congress can and must do something about it. It is a part of our responsibility, regardless of what others do.

I would like at this juncture to add a fourth thing that we can do, and this is a major thing: Increased production automatically checks rising prices. The development of surplus in any commodity inevitably lowers prices. That opportunity has been called to your attention and stressed somewhat in the example I gave with reference to the beef industry, and the distinction between beef and live cattle. As long as we have a surplus of live cattle, we can produce, if necessary, a surplus of beef, if we are truly serious in our intentions to win the war and save the American way of life; and I am sure we are, because through our national history the American people have again and again shown that they will support those who fight for the right, regardless of consequences. They will do it again. And the days are here now when we must speak out against dangerous policies.

I think, as seriously as I have ever thought before, that the time is here, and now is the time, to sum up some vital facts. Here they are as I see the picture, and while looking at them, may I say, in fact and earnestly, that I see a greater America as the result of the test which is upon us, an America that we have known in our dreams, an America that the flower of our youth is fighting to bring to reality, the America, yes, of the dreams of our fathers and of their fathers. This America stands solidly upon the most vital rock of ages, the rock of unshattered public confidence of the American people that will be defended to the last by all of those who are true sons.

The most recent and best estimates show we have a population of upward of 135,000,000 souls. Of these—and referring, of course, to those who are not dependent and who have reached the age of thinking for themselves—I call your attention to the fact that they represent the group whose opinions are a part and parcel of the public opinion of the United States as individuals, and as a whole they make it up in toto.

It has been said repetitiously down through the centuries that man's mind and heart are most sensitive in the regions brutally described as belly and pocketbook. There seems, therefore, to be some definite relationship between food and inflation which affects them both. Man's reasoning powers and his ability to make decisions when at its height of efficiency is, of course, measured by an accompanying physical fitness. For instance, a person suffering from sea-sickness undergoes various phases during the development of mal de mere. There comes a time when the afflicted finds difficulty in deciding whether it would be preferable to live or die. Now, later, if land has not been reached and if the crescendo of sea-sickness increases, the position is reached where the only desire remaining is to die as quickly as possible—forthwithly, in other terms. This, even though land might be in sight through a porthole, and though only 30 minutes might be required to reach it, which would indicate to one with unimpaired reasoning faculties that surely, in 30 minutes, he would be well.

So much for this example. But human reason and the reactions of the heart—not considered as a vital pumping plant to keep up circulation, but as a part and parcel of the motivating reactions which make up opinion and action—are affected by more than sea-sickness. There are reactions occasioned by confusion, by the inability of loyal beings to accept without reason being given therefor, certain things which affect this reason in an unacceptable way. So the problems of food and inflation as presented by this discourse are weighed in their presentation for the purpose of not producing impacts which destroy in part or portion that thing known as confidence in the mind and heart reactions of the individuals who make up the public opinion of the people of the United States.

It is impossible for a normal mind charged with high responsibility to accept proposals which, when passed through the reasoning machinery, do not provide a proper Q. E. D. And so it is—with reference to the discussion which I have attempted to present thus far—within me a problem which produces the temerity which I described at the outset of my discussion in approaching this subject.

Let us look at some of the things that disturb me. While I would have your reactions to them, I must be satisfied with merely stating them.

Here I stand, as a citizen, charged with high responsibility and under oath in the sight of God to perform a function as one of 435 Members of this body, which function affects the present and future welfare of each one of the 135,000,000 who make up the population of the United States.

Let us see what the impact of the statistical information that we have $142,000,000,000 worth of national income in the offing for 1943 may be. And let me, with such reason as I possess, present to you the effect of this statement:

First. What is this national income composed of? After due thought, I see it to be composed of earned increment which comes from the soil and from the rendering of service through applied effort or labor. Added to this, if I am a farmer or if I am a member of organized labor, I find an addition to my earnings as a farmer of certain Government payments; if I am a member of organized labor, I see increased wages which are the results of organized pressure. Both of these increases come by action of Government.

What does this mean with reference to the first part which makes up this income, earned increment from the soil, the original source of wealth, and applied effort?

Second. Government payments or increases in earnings by reason of pressure. Who pays this? I soon find out when the tax collector comes around, because I find though I have earned it in part and part of it has been paid me by a different line of endeavor, still I have more to pay back out of it. So much for this reaction.

I then come to the conclusion that I had better begin looking at figures in their true light. I had better begin being inquisitive about statistical statements and the soundness of the picture which they present. For instance, presented from another angle, on December 1, 1941, the total interest-bearing securities outstanding and paid for and upon which interest is paid to the holder amounted to $56,786,000,000 in round numbers. In December of 1942, following Pearl Harbor, these interest-bearing securities reached a total of $102,559,000,000. And in March of this year—the last figure which I have available—this had jumped to $103,633,000,000. And, based on the rate of increase up to March, it is safe to assume that these interest-bearing securities now total at least twice the $56,786,000,000 which they represented on December 1, 1941.

In savings bonds outstanding December of 1941 showed $1,133,600,000. In December of 1942, they had increased to $6,923,000,000. And on the 1st of May 1943, they had reached the figure of $10,709,000,000, over 10 times what they were just before Pearl Harbor.

There are, of course, considerable additions to these figures to be found in the figures which represent other lines of Government securities and investments, but for exemplary purposes they will do.

Let us deal briefly, in round numbers. Take national income at the figure of $140,000,000,000, and reduce therefrom $85,000,000,000, which represents the total consumer goods available. This leaves $55,000,000,000. Of that amount, let us subtract $30,000,000,000 for 1943 in the form of taxes of various kinds, and another $10,000,000 involved in mortgage and Army and Navy expenditures abroad. This leaves a remnant of $15,000,000,000. Out of this, do what you will with the $9,000,000,000 expended for savings bonds, which represents a round-number increase since 1941; or subtract $7,000,000,000, which represents the increase in the 12 months following December 1, 1941, leaving $2,000,000,000 as the expenditure thus far in 1943. Say we subtract $2,000,000,000 from the $15,000,000,000—we have $13,000,000,000 left. And then let us subtract $6,000,000,000, which represents the interest-bearing securities sold between December 1942 and March 1, 1943. This leaves $7,000,000,000.

To my way of thinking, we are still on fairly solid ground if we use our heads the American way in the battle against inflation. This Nation cannot be destroyed by $7,000,000,000 of unaccounted-for excess spending power.

In the beef-cattle situation, alone, together with the other food problem, an increase in consumer supplies can be made between now and the 1st of January 1944, which will leave us short of spending money to purchase the addition to the consumer goods supply which can be made by the application of American ways and means.

So, boiled down, my colleagues, while the situation requires immediate, earnest, and constructive attention, it is not yet too late, even though it is certainly not too soon, to start an attack upon this situation, by giving the American people the green light, by regulation and otherwise, to solve this problem the way we have ofttimes solved others in the past.

I do not desire to take up more time, but I would earnestly adjure you, upon your return, to remember, first of all, our obligation to the legion of good and true friends and fellow citizens who sent us here as their representatives, charged prominently with a high and vital public responsibility—yes; and charged directly with expressing the voice of the American people in the halls of state.

Connected with the problems of food and inflation is the basis for great uncertainty and legitimate concern in the minds of those people we represent. This is the reason for the internal struggle which is today upon us. We must see to it, as the only defenders of the most important fundamental in the American way of life and liberty and that involves the continuity of the voice of the people in the halls of state so that a government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not vanish from this earth.

Irrigation Projects Awaiting on the Shelf for the Benefit of Ex-Service Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill (H. R. 3179) to provide for the giving of preference to ex-service members of the armed forces of the United States in any foreign wars in approving applications for entry to public lands on reclamation projects. This bill is a revised form of one I introduced in the Seventy-seventh Congress which was H. R. 7680. The present bill has been broadened in some respects and represents a legislative proposal which has been taking shape in my mind for several years past.

Some years ago Congressman JAMES SCRUGHAM, of Nevada, and I considered the possibility of a small irrigation project on the land bordering the Colorado River in the southern tip of Nevada and across the river in Mohave County, Ariz. This land was below the site of the Bull's Head Dam and in the neighborhood of old Fort Mohave. Our original plan was to pump water from the river on both sides at a point about 9 or 10 miles below the Bull's Head site, for watering small tracts of land which could be made productive and suitable for homes for ex-servicemen.

We made some progress with the idea, even to the extent of authorizing surveys of the land and getting plans prepared for a suitable pumping plant. The lands were surveyed by the Bureau of Reclamation and a considerable sum of money was earmarked for the erection of a pumping plant. At this juncture the European war changed matters because our national defense plan called for the production of more electric power for use in the Southwest.

Accordingly an appropriation was made for the building of a dam at the Bull's Head site and $3,500,000 were appropriated to start the work. In view of the fact that the land, originally intended to be watered by pumping, is below and only 9 miles away from the dam site, it occurred to me that the Bull's Head Dam—which was later called the Davis Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation—should not only be made to produce power but should also serve as a diversion dam to furnish water by gravity to all feasible areas which might be irrigated below it. It is my understanding that the feasibility of gravity irrigation on the Arizona side of the river is readily acknowledged by Reclamation engineers.

Another turn of affairs was later occasioned by war conditions and the construction of Davis Dam was halted by a stop order of the War Production Board about a year ago because of a lack of materials. This happened in spite of the fact that there is a shortage of food which might be produced on the rich bottom land along the Colorado River under a tropical sun during 12 months of the year. Furthermore, the stop order was issued in spite of the fact that the Davis Dam is a rock-filled dam requiring a minimum of steel, concrete, and critical materials.

These facts lead us to hope that the stop orders may be removed soon. Furthermore, that the food-producing possibilities of the lands along the Colorado River to be watered may bring about a resumption of work on this dam in the near future.

A BROADER IDEA

While this specific project was proposed for the benefit of ex-servicemen before the outbreak of the Second World War, it contains the germs of a much bigger idea. At the conclusion of the Second World War there will undoubtedly be greater numbers of partially disabled men, and now women, who will want to supplement their incomes from the Government by making homes on the soil.

Experience has shown that before World War No. 2, when the Government opened up many new irrigation projects, there were many times more applicants among ex-service men than there were tracts of land to be had. This condition is bound to be aggravated in the future, even though we hope in the near future many reclamation projects will be open. By giving preference to ex-service members, both men and women, there will be so many more applicants than entries that a high degree of selection will be possible to get the best class of entrymen.

It is common knowledge that our country has experienced the greatest shock in its economic history in recent months in its conversion from peacetime economy to an all-out war footing. When peace comes again and the armies are disbanded, there will be an equal shock in reverse order in getting the returning soldiers back into civilian life. Businessmen and Government officials and all thinking persons are considering ways and means of lessening the conversion to a productive civilian life.

There will be many public and private works planned for that time. I feel that irrigation projects in the West, when carefully worked out by engineers, constitute one means of employment and homemaking which should be utilized. Therefore, I think reclamation has a big part to play in post-war efforts for the returning soldier and the good of the country.

The bill in its revised form, H. R. 3179, will give veterans preference on any land in the public domain which may be reclaimed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the water provided for the land, and repayments made to the Government over a period of years. At the present time the law specifies 40 years for repayment, the construction charges being amortized with an interest rate of 3 percent.

My bill contemplates that veterans who can qualify under the terms of the bill and under the rules of the Department may obtain fee-simple title to their

land, if it had formerly been in public ownership, in the same way as any other entryman on the project. However, there are differences to be accorded the ex-service entryman because of his, or her, war service. If the entryman meets the qualification of the bill and the Department regulations, the Government shall pay the first two annual assessment charges for such entryman, thus reducing the number of amortized payments by two. Beginning with the third annual assessment charge the Government will pay half of this annual charge for any entryman who has been an ex-service member of our armed forces.

One of the conditions imposed by the bill itself is that the ex-service member, before qualifying as an entryman must show that he or she has an income from the Government equivalent to at least one-half of the annual charge on the entry. In this way it is hoped that those who are injured in body or health who probably need some outdoor living and exercise, and are able to do a certain amount of work with profit to their health will qualify as entrymen on some projects such as may be completed in the yet undeveloped West.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who has had not less than 90 days' service in the armed forces of the United States in any foreign war and who has been honorably discharged therefrom and who meets requirements herein prescribed shall have preference as an applicant for entry on any public lands irrigated or reclaimed by the Bureau of Reclamation after the date of this enactment.

Each application for entry by any such ex-service member to public lands on any reclamation project, on that part of such project which is public domain, shall be given preference in every case in which such ex-service member (1) is qualified under the first paragraph, (2) shows his ability to pay on his entry, out of any monetary benefits which he receives as a veteran, one-half of the yearly charges (including construction costs and interest at 3 percent per annum) amortized over the legal period, and (3) has such other qualifications as the Secretary of the Interior by regulation may prescribe.

In the case of any ex-service member whose application for entry to public lands on a project is accepted under the foregoing provisions, repayment charges shall begin to run as in the case of all other entrymen, but the first two annual charges shall be paid by the United States for such ex-service entryman and the United States shall pay thereafter into the repayment fund for each such ex-service member annually an amount equal to that paid by such entryman.

Fighting Sons of Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under dates of April 7 and June 4, 1943, I extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the great work the Coast Guard is doing in this war. As one editor said:

No longer can Coast Guard men be dubbed "shallow water sailors." They're on the job whether the water is shallow or deep, the task easy or tough. They're just fighting sons of guns.

The service has been long known for its distinguished service in saving life and property at sea, in fighting floods, in providing protection against icebergs, and in battling danger wherever it appears. I have spoken of it as the great humanitarian service of the United States, and this commendation is sustained by the bare, cold facts.

The Advertiser, of Montgomery, Ala., under date of June 4, 1943, under the caption "United States Coast Guard in the War," pays fitting tribute to the Coast Guard, as follows:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD IN THE WAR

"United States Coast Guard cutter sinks sub and captures crew in sea attack," said a three-column headline in Wednesday afternoon's Alabama Journal. The story, bearing a Washington date line, told in dramatic fashion of the spectacular manner in which men normally associated by the reading public with rescuing passengers and crewmen from foundering ships battled it out, shot for shot, with desperate crew members of a damaged German submarine and then captured the whole shebang.

Thus was brought into the limelight one of the least known—insofar as combat operations are concerned—arms of Uncle Sam's fighting forces. In peacetimes a unit of the Treasury Department charged with saving the lives of our seafaring men and guarding our shores from racketeers of the smuggling fraternity, the United States Coast Guard is doing yeoman service as a branch of the Navy. In time of war the "shallow-water sailors" automatically become a part of the Navy and perform valiant deeds with little or no fanfare. There aren't many public-relations officers on their crew rosters or war correspondents on their passenger lists.

It is a far cry from the ice patrol of the North Atlantic to sink a submarine in mid-Atlantic. Yet that latter feat merely emphasizes their versatility. They can truly lay claim to being potent factors on land, on sea, and in the air, for they utilize all three means of carrying out their objectives.

The Coast Guard was there at Guadalcanal guiding the landing boats that put those other fighting men of the sea, the marines, ashore. Their cutters and other ships skelter in, out, and around the slower merchant ships as they methodically carry out convoy assignments. Their planes soar overhead along our coast lines on the lookout for victims of U-boat prowess and the U-boats themselves. Ashore their men patrol beaches afoot, on horseback, and in the mighty little jeeps; it was a Coast Guard man, if you will remember, who first discovered the German espionage agents who landed on a New England shore some months back and turned in the alarm. All the while these doughty lads with the shield on their right sleeve to denote their branch of service are still on the lookout for smugglers and such other folks as have no business coming into Uncle Sam's realm without credentials or honest purpose.

No longer can Coast Guard men be dubbed "shallow-water sailors." They're on the job whether the water is shallow or deep, the task easy or tough. They're just fighting sons of guns.

COAST GUARD MEN HELP LAND ARMY TROOPS IN FIRST PACIFIC OFFENSIVE

A recent release from headquarters shows that when the United States launched its first offensive operation in the Pacific—the occupation of the Tonga Islands—Army troops were put ashore by Coast Guard invaders assigned to landing barges and tank lighters aboard naval transports.

A participant in the landings at Tonga was Chief Boatswain's Mate Whitney C. Guptill, 27, of Newburyport, Mass., who likened the operation to a routine practice maneuver.

Assigned to duty on the landing barges aboard one transport, Guptill, together with other Coast Guard men, had previously been to England with American troops, before participating in the Tonga landings in May 1942.

There was absolutely no opposition to our landings—

Guptill related.

The natives were most friendly and pitched in to help us with the unloading of the boats. They sure went for our cigarettes, but I believe most of them helped us more out of curiosity than anything else.

After landing troops and supplies at Tonga, Guptill later landed some of the first marines to occupy Guadalcanal on August 7, and subsequent to that made 11 more trips to the "Canal," as men out there call it.

Enlisted in the Coast Guard in September 1936, at Boston, Guptill holds the American Defense Service Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the Expert Rifle Medal, and all three campaign ribbons authorized for this war.

He is married and has three children, the youngest of which, born last June, he has not yet seen.

DANIEL J. TARR, CHINCOTEAGUE ISLAND, VA., SILVER STAR HERO

Back from action in the southwest Pacific is 26-year-old Coast Guardsman Daniel J. Tarr, of Chincoteague Island, Va.—Tarr, a good name for a sailor—was coxswain of a landing barge which put the marines ashore on the isle of Tulagi during the invasion of the Solomons.

Although under withering enemy fire, Coast Guardsman Tarr was able to land his boatload of marines without the loss of a man. He then made several more trips to the shell-raked beach, carrying ammunition and supplies. For his "conspicuous gallantry in the invasion of the Solomons," Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, has decorated Coast Guardsman Tarr with the Silver Star Medal; thus he has become one of the first four Coast Guardsmen ever to receive that award in the present war. Also in recognition for his service in the Solomons, Tarr recently was elevated to the rating of chief boatswain's mate in the United States Coast Guard.

Tarr was in the Solomon Isles aboard one of the old four-stack destroyers built during World War No. 1 and converted to an auxiliary transport at the beginning of the present war. The vessel had been assigned to the task of transporting the first raider battalion of the United States Marine Corps.

It was 4 a. m., August 7, 1942, that the vessel reached Tulagi and the skipper received word that the marines were to be taken ashore to wipe out Japanese positions. The landing boats were lowered, and a coxswain was assigned to each of the craft.

Coast Guardsman Tarr was coxswain of the No. 1 boat in that first assault wave. For 3 hours before he put his marines ashore our cruisers had been bombarding the Jap positions on Tulagi with shot and shell; our planes had been lambasting the enemy positions from the air; our bombers had destroyed the 18 Jap seaplanes based at Tulagi before they could get off the water. Shells and bullets were still whining overhead as Coast Guardsman Tarr led the invasion boats toward a coral reef which was the first landing point.

The marines were landed without the loss of a single man. Tarr took his boats back to the transport ship and then made two more trips to the island, despite the heavy shell fire which was bursting from enemy guns on all sides of Tulagi. This time he brought the marines their supplies and more ammunition.

The second morning of the invasion word came that the marines were still encountering stiff and stubborn resistance and must immediately have additional supplies. Twice more Coast Guardsman Tarr took his landing barge back to Tulagi with the badly needed ammunition.

At 11 o'clock that morning his work was interrupted by an air raid of 40 Japanese planes. They were intercepted by American fighters and only 20 of the enemy aircraft managed to get as far as the American transport ships. All but 1 of these Jap planes were knocked down. Tarr's vessel was credited with bringing down 2 out of the 19.

Tarr says his closest escape in the Solomons came about a month after the invasion of Tulagi. At the time, he was landing the marines on Guadalcanal for a commando raid at dawn. Tarr disembarked the first load of marines and took his boat back to the transport for another load. When he returned to the Guadalcanal beach head with these, he found that the first load of marines had captured a big Japanese gun only 15 yards from the spot where he had landed them. Tarr says that why the gun never opened fire upon them is still a mystery.

Chief Tarr enlisted in the Coast Guard 6 years ago at Pope's Island, Va. Part of his citation by Admiral Nimitz reads as follows:

For distinguishing himself conspicuously by gallantry in action. His conduct was in keeping with the finest traditions of the Coast Guard.

Chief Tarr is from my congressional district, and the people of that district as well as the people of Virginia and of the Nation are proud of the splendid record he is making.

"ESCANABA"

The United States Coast Guard cutter *Escanaba* sank in the North Atlantic following an explosion of undetermined cause.

The entire complement aboard the cutter was lost with the exception of two men, Melvin Baldwin, boatswain's mate, second class, United States Coast Guard, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Baldwin, 124 Demers Avenue, East Grand Forks, Minn., and Raymond F. O'Malley, Jr., boatswain's mate, second class, United States Coast Guard, 23, son of Mrs. Cecilia Bruno, 11 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill., whose wife and daughter live at 1704 Clayborne Avenue, Chicago.

The *Escanaba*, under the command of Lt. Comdr. Carl Uno Peterson, of Newtonville, Mass., sank almost immediately after it was rent by a terrific explosion amidships.

Observers aboard the United States Coast Guard cutter *Storis*, the vessel nearest the *Escanaba*, said a large cloud of smoke and flame billowed upward into the air and the cutter sank, leaving only small bits of wreckage afloat. The ship sank so quickly it had no time to send out signals.

The United States Coast Guard cutter *Raritan* picked up the two enlisted men, who said they had no idea what caused the explosion.

The *Escanaba* distinguished itself earlier in the war for effecting the rescue of 133 men from a torpedoed ship in the North Atlantic.

Members of the crew of the cutter went over the side into the icy waters to fasten lines around the torpedoing victims and haul them aboard the *Escanaba*. Other crew members went out in rubber suits, swimming to life rafts to tow them to the cutter.

This rescue operation by the *Escanaba* evoked the highest commendation from medical officers aboard her. Nine men volunteered to plunge into the freezing waters to bring in survivors who were unable to make their own way to the cutter. As a result of the action of the *Escanaba* crew, only 1 man of the 133 brought aboard the cutter died from the effects of exposure in the frigid waters.

The United States Coast Guard cutter *Escanaba*, one of six cutters of her class, was built at the Defoe Works, Bay City, Mich., and was completed in 1932.

Steel-strengthened for ice breaking, the *Escanaba*, before entering upon convoy duty in the North Atlantic, was used on the Great Lakes with Grand Haven, Mich., as her permanent station.

She displaced 718 tons and was 165 feet in length with a beam of 36 feet and a draft of 13 feet 4 inches. Her normal complement was 60. Her rated speed was 13.5 knots.

The *Escanaba* carried two 3-inch 50-caliber guns and two 6-pounders. She was powered with turbine machinery with double reduction gear.

LT. COMDR. CARL UNO PETERSON, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Another hero in the service is Lt. Comdr. Carl Uno Peterson, United States Coast Guard, who commanded the *Escanaba*, and who was born in Lynn, Mass., on November 12, 1906.

He was educated at the Lynn Classical High School, Northeastern University, and the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. He was commissioned ensign in the Coast Guard service May 15, 1930.

Throughout his career, Commander Peterson was particularly interested in the radio engineering field, although he spent most of his time as a line officer at sea.

He was on the cutter *Tampa* from his graduation at the academy until September 1931, and then was on the *Conyngham* until May 1933. On both these vessels Commander Peterson served in Atlantic waters. He was assigned to the *Cayuga* until 1936 as engineering officer and assumed command of the *Guthrie* in 1936, later changing to the *Harriet Lane* the same year as commanding officer.

Commander Peterson did postgraduate work at the Capital Radio Engineering Institute, Washington, during the year 1936–37. The following year he was on special assignment in connection with radio engineering at General Electric Co. in Schenectady, N. Y. In April 1938, Commander Peterson was assigned to headquarters at Washington in the radio engineering section.

Late in 1941, Commander Peterson was detached from headquarters to assume duties aboard the *Escanaba*. He was promoted to lieutenant commander on March 16, 1942, and 3 days later took command of the *Escanaba*. On this vessel he served in both the Great Lakes district and the Atlantic.

Commander Peterson married the former Miss Esther May Conant, of Boston, Mass., at Brookline, Mass., on August 27, 1932. They have a 3-year-old son, Harvey Conant Peterson. The family has been making their home at 172 Harvard Street, Newtonville, Mass.

COMMANDER JAMES A. HIRSHFIELD

Commander James A. Hirshfield, United States Coast Guard, who was in command of the cutter *Campbell* when she rammed and sank a German submarine in the Atlantic last winter, was presented the Navy Cross on July 5, 1943, in recognition of his leadership. The award was made by Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche in the presence of high Coast Guard officials, including Rear Admirals Lloyd Chalker, Robert Donohue, C. A. Park, and Frank J. Gorman.

Commander Hirshfield's citation, signed by Admiral R. E. Ingersoll, United States Navy, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, follows:

For extraordinary heroism and distinguished service in action as commanding officer of the United States Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* when an enemy submarine was severely damaged and sunk, and during the ensuing period when the United States Coast Guard cutter *Campbell*, which was damaged in the engagement, was towed safely into port.

The United States Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* was engaged in escort operations when she caught an enemy submarine on the surface, collided with it in an attempt to ram, and finally sank it with gunfire and depth charges, taking several prisoners. Commander Hirshfield, although injured by flying splinters, remained in command throughout the action and subsequent operations, and exhibited an extraordinary degree of coolness and ability.

The outstanding courage, leadership, and devotion to duty displayed by Commander Hirshfield in the action and during the ensuing period described, reflect great credit on the naval service.

Commander Hirshfield previously received the Purple Heart for injuries received in the same action.

Within the 24 hours preceding the ramming, the *Campbell* had engaged five other U-boats with varying degrees of success. After the ramming, the cutter, crippled and powerless, was towed in to an eastern port where repairs were made.

Commander Hirshfield is now stationed at United States Coast Guard headquarters in Washington, D. C. He also served as duty officer at United States Coast Guard headquarters from 1937 to 1939, and during that period studied law at George Washington University Law School, graduating in 1939.

He and Mrs. Hirshfield, with their two children, Katherine, 7, and James A., Jr., 4, live at 33 Wesley Street, Newton, Mass.

I began these remarks with a tribute from the Advertizer, of Montgomery, Ala., and I will conclude them with an editorial in the Journal, Lansing, Mich., under date of June 28, 1943:

OLD BUT UNSUNG UNITED STATES SERVICE

Coast Guard Man Donald Munro asked, "Did they get off?" and then doubtless answered, "I'll say they did." It was Munro who supervised the evacuaton of nearly 500 beleaguered marines at Guadalcanal and who gave his life in the rescue of his fellow warriors. His words are typical of the United States Coast Guard, the most unsung of the Nation's armed forces.

This unannounced and unheralded fighting outfit, long the silent partner behind many of our country's greatest military feats, boasts a reputation of achievement unrivaled for daring and genuine accomplishment.

Few Americans realize that the Coast Guard is this Nation's oldest naval service, its origin dating back to the dim days of 1790. George Washington and Alexander Hamilton were two pioneer patriots who were largely instrumental in its establishment.

The Coast Guard is inordinately proud of its record of firsts and it rightly deserves to glow over its colorful history. This service was the first to do any fighting for the United States when it engaged the French in the undeclared war of 1798. The first ships to fight pirates and patrol the Pacific were Coast Guard ships, and in the present war the Coast Guard was the first branch of the armed services to engage the enemy with the seizure of enemy Axis installations in frozen Greenland.

In peace and war this sterling unit plies the seas on its errands of mercy and in its constant battle against murderous enemy undersea marauders. Such valiant Coast Guard cutters as the *Campbell, Icarus,* and *Spencer* attest to the skill of these maligned "shallow water" sailors. No sight chills an enemy U-boat commander more than the appearance of a speedy Coast Guard subbusting cutter.

Throughout the present conflict the Coast Guard has maintained its enviable record. It has landed troops at Guadalcanal and Africa, and its system of convoy protection has established a reasonable security for our Allied ships on the briny deep. The coming invasion of enemy territory abroad will be another test of its skill in convoy escort and landing barge operations. And the Coast Guard won't fail.

Gradually America is becoming aware of this plucky service and the invaluable work it is doing. The Coast Guard men of action are veterans and victors of many high-sea encounters. Today they are displaying their skill in wider channels, and they are winning well-earned acclaim.

As an old salty bosun put it, "You have to go out, but you don't have to come back."

The Coast Guard's history proves that it is doing exactly that.

"As Ye Sow—"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the following account published in the weekly magazine section of the Christian Science Monitor was written about a retired traveling salesman and hotel commissioner in my district. When Phil Zimmerman's doctor advised him to retire from active business he settled down at his home and began raising flowers. He is especially interested in the propagation of the morning glory:

Formerly Congressmen supplied their constituents with seeds; now Phil Zimmerman, of Topeka, Kans., supplies them to Congressmen and to thousands of others. In the past 5 years he has given away more than 10,000 packages of seeds of new and choice flowers—all grown by him.

Flowers from his seeds are growing in every State.

Since he does not have mailing privileges, he distributes at conventions, legislatures, and through organizations. Hundreds come to his home after local papers announce that the seeds are ready.

For all this he refuses a cent from any source.

Let's Do It Now, Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I received a letter from an ex-serviceman in Arizona who said:

Now is the time to pass legislation, while the war is on, for the benefit of those who are now in the armed forces to provide for them on their return to civil life. Besides hospital care each returning soldier should have his pay for 6 months or a year after honorable discharge from the Army. This will give him time to get back into civilian life without selling apples on the street or being a burden on relatives as were so many at the close of the last war.

In full agreement with this veteran of the First World War, who was turned down for service in this present war, and, wishing to propose legislation that will help to ease the shock of the transfer from the armed forces to civilian life, I have introduced H. R. 3181, to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict.

Numerous legislative proposals have been offered, and mine differs from the others in certain respects. This bill would continue the base pay of all honorably discharged persons from the armed forces for 1 year unless their base pay exceeded $100 a month. The bill would provide for pay up to $100 per month for a period of 12 months after discharge, not to exceed $100 per month unless the ex-serviceman had served overseas. This bill is offered for the consideration by Congress and a grateful country of a just and equitable transfer of our returning soldiers to civilian life. Of course, those who are disabled must be more adequately cared for than through the provisions contained in this measure.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the pay, exclusive of allowances, of all persons in the armed forces of the United States on or after December 8, 1941, and at the date of the termination of the present conflict, unless previously honorably discharged, and who shall have served at least 90 days, shall be continued for a period of 1 year from the date of their honorable discharge, separation, or release from active service, during which 1-year period such persons shall be members of the reserve forces: *Provided,* That the monthly pay of any such persons, during the 1-year period shall not exceed $100 unless recalled for active service: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding the monthly pay limitation imposed herein, the increased percentage in pay allowed for foreign service shall apply where any such service is shown.

Address of Hon. George W. Armijo, Spanish War Veteran and State Senator in New Mexico, at the Dedication of Camp Luna, Las Vegas, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, at the dedication of Camp Luna in Las Vegas, N. Mex., on June 6, 1943, the Honorable George W. Armijo, State Senator of New Mexico, was appropriately chosen to deliver the address of dedication. As a young man, he fought alongside Capt. Maximiliano Luna, in whose honor the camp was named, with Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders in Cuba. Had Senator Armijo not been wounded in Cuba, he would have been most likely with Captain Luna in the Philippines, where the latter gave his life in the service of his country. By unanimous consent of the House, I append herewith the address of Senator George W. Armijo at the dedication of Camp Luna, which is as follows:

Friends and comrades, it is a far cry from Siboney, Las Guasimas, and San Juan Hill in 1898, to Bataan and Corregidor in 1942. Yet, how closely they are connected. But

for the former, it is not likely that there would have been the latter.

The hero, in whose honor your camp was named, Capt. Maximiliano Luna, served his country in the Cuban and the Philippine campaigns. Little did he dream that 45 years later the Nation would be called upon to defend with its lifeblood the conquest it made toward the close of the last century. Were he living today, no doubt, he would be at the side of General MacArthur, as he was at the side of General Lawton in Cuba and in the Philippines.

Maximiliano Luna came from a proud and valiant ancestry. He was a direct descendant of Don Domingo Count de Luna, who came to New Mexico more than 200 years ago and established himself with his family, his entourage and his flocks on a hacienda located in what is now Valencia County, the county seat of which, Los Lunas, was named for his family, just as in later years, Luna County was named in honor of the late Solomon Luna, another distinguished descendant of the pioneer, Don Domingo.

These early conquistadores and colonists were no weaklings. They faced dangers as grim as human kind is ever called upon to encounter and that without the weapons, equipment, and comforts that fortunately a generous nation provides for us. Starvation was no stranger to them; torture and cruel death from hostile Indians often was their portion. They met bitter defeat with firmness; exile and martyrdom always threatened. They trod weary hundreds and thousands of miles over pathless desert and trackless mountains so that even today a goodly portion of New Mexico is known as the Jornada del Muerto, "the Journey of Death." They sought new worlds to conquer, more pagans to convert, to plant the cross where white man had never been before.

It is from this noble breed that came the Honorable Tranquilino Luna, twice elected to the United States Congress by the people of New Mexico, the father of Capt. Maximiliano Luna. The wife of Don Tranquilino and mother of Captain Luna, was Amalia Jaramillo, daughter of another distinguished pioneer family tracing its ancestry to heroic days in Spain.

Born in Los Lunas on June 16, 1870, Captain Luna attended St. Michael's College in Santa Fe, and the Jesuit College in Las Vegas. Perhaps he frequented this very spot upon which we honor his memory this June day. He matriculated in Georgetown College, District of Columbia, which counts among its alumni many a native son of New Mexico. He had just reached his majority when he was elected probate clerk of Valencia County and also served as chief clerk, as I have myself, of the upper house of the New Mexico Legislature. Elected sheriff of his county when only 24 years old, he functioned so acceptably to the people that they sent him to the thirty-first territorial legislative house and 4 years later to the thirty-third assembly where he was chosen speaker of the house. It was written of him at that time: "He is a young man of great ability, finely educated, and an eloquent and convincing public speaker, very popular and greatly liked by all who knew him. He was kind-hearted, courteous, and true to his friends and his convictions." Truly, an exemplar to the ambitious young man of today, or for that matter, of any time.

Early in life, Luna interested himself in military affairs and attained the rank of captain in the New Mexico National Guard. He married the daughter of Maj. E. H. Keys, of the United States Army. He volunteered immediately upon Governor Miguel Otero receiving the request of President McKinley for four troops of cavalry from New Mexico at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War. He was commissioned captain in the First United States Volunteer Cavalry, popularly known as the Rough Rider, and took command of Troop F. It was my privilege to serve under him as sergeant of the company. But for the wound received at Las Guasimas, I would no doubt have been with him when the guidon of Company F was among the first three to be planted on the brow of San Juan Hill, overlooking the city of Santiago de Cuba and the bay in which the fleet of Admiral Cervera had anchored.

The Spanish-American War, 45 years ago, was a minor and short conflict as compared with World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, but it was world shaking in its results. Let it be recalled, too, that a bullet from a Spanish Mauser fired with smokeless powder, then first coming into use, stung just as sharply as the missiles of today; that swamps and chaparral of Cuba swarming with mosquitoes and vermin were no more pleasant shelter than those of Guadalcanal; the yellow fever of those days was as deadly as the tropical diseases of today. Medical equipment and medical personnel did not measure up to today's efficiency, and as in the poem about the soldier who lay dying in Algiers:

> "There was lack of women's nursing
> And lack of women's tears."

The plight of the wounded groaning in the broiling Cuban June sun was more pitiful than that of the wounded in the modern war, pitiful as it is in any event.

But to return to the June days in 1898, in which Captain Luna played so gallant a role. It was on June 1 that the Rough Riders arrived by train at Tampa, Fla., from San Antonio, Tex. Only three of the four New Mexico troops were to sail for Cuba. To determine which of two troops was to sail, Captains Luna and Curry tossed a coin. Captain Luna won for his Troop F and sailed on June 14 on the transport *Yucatan*, escorted by battleships, cruisers, and torpedo boats. Like in all other wars, the United States was caught totally unprepared for the conflict, and as a result there were more casualties and far more suffering than should have been. On June 22, the troops disembarked at Daiguiri after a most uncomfortable voyage.

Brigaded with the First and Tenth Regular Cavalry as the Second Brigade under Brigadier General Young, which, with the First Brigade, formed a division of cavalry under Major General Wheeler, a noted Confederate veteran, the force was ordered to advance on June 24 from Siboney. The Spanish veterans were no push-over. A wilting fire met our advancing men. In our New Mexico troops a number fell wounded, Henry J. Haefner among them, mortally injured. His comrades dragged him behind a tree where he was propped up. Asking for his canteen and rifle, which were handed him by Col. Theodore Roosevelt, later President of the United States, in person, he began loading and firing until he fell dead. The loss to the Rough Riders in this first battle of the campaign, known as the Battle of Las Guasimas, was 8 killed and 34 wounded. A mere skirmish, you say, but to the individual and his family involved, it was just as important as the battles of Tunisia were to the individuals taking part in that glorious victory.

General Young, stricken seriously ill, was succeeded by Col. Leonard Wood, with Col. Theodore Roosevelt in command of the Rough Riders.

On June 30, came the order to storm the defenses of Santiago de Cuba, the main objective of the campaign. Records the historian: "Artillery opened the barrage on the following day. The heat was intense and many of the men showed fatigue. The mauser bullets drove in sheets through the trees and chaparral, but as the Spaniards used smokeless powder, their location was not immediately spotted." There was no aerial reconnaissanee or protection in those days. Man after man fell dead or wounded. Confusion ensued and the day was only saved by Colonel Roosevelt, who, taking the initiative and without orders, waving his sombrero aloft (there were no steel helmets at this time), shouted the command to charge Kettle Hill, separated from San Juan Hill by a narrow depression. The New Mexico troops and other scattered commands rallied around him. The first guidons to be planted on the crest were those of Troops F, E, and G, the first under command of Captain Luna.

From the trenches and ranches just taken, Colonel Roosevelt and his Rough Riders rushed forward, driving the Spaniards through a line of palm trees and over the crest of a chain of hills overlooking Santiago. The Spaniards counterattacked but were repulsed. The troops slept that night on the hill top. They were attacked again at 3 o'clock the next morning, but drove the enemy back into his trenches. At dawn, the attack was renewed and the battle continued until July 3. Fighting was resumed on July 10, and it was not until the 17th that the Spaniards finally surrendered. But remember, there was no chow such as Uncle Sam provides these days, even to advance posts; no evacuation by plane of the wounded, no drugs to stop infection, no blood plasma, no modern anesthetics as are used these days to still pain.

The entire division was marched back to the foothills. Many of the officers and men fell ill and for a time it seemed they had become the forgotten men of a victorious campaign. As a rule, less than 50 men were fit for any kind of work. All clothing was in rags. Even the officers had neither socks nor underwear. It was another Valley Forge, except that enervating heat supplanted the bitter cold. It was not until August 7, that the Rough Riders sailed on the Miami and landed 7 days later at Camp Montauk on Long Island. They were not discharged until a month later, because the Nation feared that the men might spread yellow fever in this country. They returned home, in many instances weakened from illness and to find their jobs gone. Their heroism was soon forgotten and few there are today, even in our schools, who have any knowledge of this momentous campaign, which threw Puerto Rico and the Philippines into our laps, with what consequences of responsibility in the Pacific, we are only learning today.

Tried and proven in the Cuban campaign and despite his bitter experience of hardship and ingratitude, Captain Luna was one of the first to offer his services when the President called for volunteers for the war in the Philippines. Few, too, remember the war or wars in the Philippines to subdue rebellion under Aguinaldo, and insurrections by Moro chieftains and Igorrote head-hunters, foes as cruel and treacherous as any that we encounter today.

Mustered out after the Cuban War on September 15, 1898, Luna was again commissioned the following June as First Lieutenant and Adjutant of the 2d Battalion of the Thirty-fourth United States Volunteer Infantry. You will notice the importance of June, the month of his birth, in his career. He sailed with his regiment from San Francisco and reached Manila on October 12, Columbus' birthday, and was immediately assigned to duty as an aide on the staff of Maj. Gen. W. H. Lawton. His perfect knowledge of Spanish made him of invaluable help in the campaign in northern Luzon, that followed. After the suppression of the insurrection in that part of Luzon, he returned to the vicinity of Manila. A brief cable on November 18, 1899, announced: Lawton reports the drowning of Lt. Maximiliano Luna, Thirty-fourth Infantry, his aide, and two men of his escort, crossing the Agno River. The following month, General Lawton him-

self was killed at San Mateo, near Manila, by an insurgent bullet.

Although death came to Maximiliano Luna when he was only 29 years of age, he had already carved out for himself a brilliant career and achieved a place high on history's scroll. In recognition of this, the Territorial legislature in 1901 unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas Maximiliano Luna, who was one of the most progressive, public-spirited, and brilliant young men of this Territory, and who had endeared himself by his many lovable and sterling qualities and at the early age of 28 years had acceptably filled the position of speaker of the house of representatives of the thirty-third legislative assembly, thereof, and who gallantly upheld the traditions of his distinguished family, and of his nationality, and the honor of his country in the war in Cuba and in the present campaign in the Philippine Islands; and lost his life while at the post of duty as an aide to General Lawton, near Manila, by drowning in the month of November 1899, be it

"*Resolved*, That there shall be placed in the niche behind the speaker's stand in the hall of representatives of the Capitol Building of this Territory a bust of the Honorable Maximiliano Luna."

This was done and with it was placed this bronze tablet, which upon my suggestion has been ordered by the Sixteenth State Legislature of New Mexico, with the approval of the Honorable John J. Dempsey, Governor of New Mexico, to be placed on this martial field, so that all those who pass here may be reminded of the patriotism of one of New Mexico's heroic sons. I would like to believe that the spirit of Maximiliano Luna is with us this day. Some of you, perhaps, may be among the hosts that will return triumphantly to Manila with General MacArthur in the not-far-distant future. I hope you will recall at that moment the valiant Luna, Lawton, Keyes, and the many others who laid down their lives a generation ago to bring the American way of life to the far outpost in the Pacific and those who fought and fell on Corregidor only in recent days.

"Gentlest and bravest in the battle brunt,
The champion of the truth,
He bore his banner to the very front
Of our immortal youth!"

W. P. B. Charged With "Double Talk" on Steel Shortage—Congressional Action Can Abolish Vicious Practices of Big Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a news summary issued by the Maritime Commission indicating that the Nation's shipyards delivered 168 cargo vessels, totaling 1,676,500 deadweight tons, in the month of June. Of this sum the west coast produced 82 ships, totaling 870,800 deadweight tons, or 51.94 percent, of the national total. There is no disputing the fact that this achievement is a remarkable one, and when one considers that the development of an iron-and-steel industry in the West has been stifled by the Steel Trust, and that the steel used by these western shipyards had to be shipped from the East by rail, the achievement of these west coast yards becomes miraculous. However, the ironic joker in the whole picture is that every ton of steel that went into those 82 ships could have been produced within a few miles of those shipyards from western iron ore deposits within close proximity to local sources of fuel and power. Is there any logical reason why millions of tons of steel should be hauled from eastern mills over railroads already choked with other necessary transportation? Of course not. But there is a reason. Big Steel has successfully prevented the establishment and development of independent steel plants on the west coast. Why? Because they are worried about post-war competition, and the consequent destruction of the monopolistic character of the entrenched Steel Trust. The facts apparently bear this out. About $1,000,000,000 in Federal funds were provided for the purpose of expanding steel-production facilities. Were those funds utilized to establish steel production facilities in various war-production areas in the United States, for example, the west coast, where over 51 percent of the cargo ships and over 55 percent of the aircraft manufactured in the United States is being produced? Again I must say "No."

These funds were allocated to the existing large steel companies in spite of the fact that allocations to small independent companies would have opened up new resources for our urgent war-production program, which at present finds itself hampered by a shortage of steel. Let me quote certain excerpts from a general letter issued by the Steel Division of the War Production Board to all steel producers, dated July 2, 1943.

GENTLEMEN: For the third quarter of 1943 the various claimant agencies presented allotment requests totaling about 23,500,000 tons of alloy and carbon steel as against an estimated supply figure of about 17,250,000 tons. Naturally, a considerable portion of all of the requests had to be denied by the Requirements Committee in making allotments of steel for the third quarter, with the result that many of the agencies were unable to allot steel for some important programs.

Lack of allotments, of course, results in inability to place orders. * * * However, the obvious danger in this situation is that the decreasing pressure on producers may be misinterpreted as a falling off in demand. This is definitely not the case. Additional steel could very profitably be utilized for urgent war needs if it were available.

So we find ourselves in the position of being about six and one-quarter million tons of steel short for the third quarter of 1943 and still no establishment of new and independent facilities that could obliterate this critical shortage. In fact the Big Steel interests are secretly worried about this critical shortage, not because it is hampering our war effort, no, no. Rather they are worried that the American people will discover the tragic steel situation and by the great pressure of public opinion smash this combine that has placed self-interest above the interests of the Nation. Witness the News Release of the War Production Board under date of June 29, 1943, just 3 days before they issued the letter excerpts of which I have quoted above. I quote excerpts:

The demand for steel is huge and our production is being stepped up to meet it.

Note how Mr. H. G. Batcheller, Director of War Production Board's Steel Division, in making that statement refrains from making public the critical steel shortage of 6,250,000 tons for this third quarter, which he so clearly points out to steel producers, in the letter I quoted from, a few moments ago. When Mr. Batcheller so casually states that "production is being stepped up" to meet the huge demand he is conveying the impression to the American people that all that has to be done is push a switch and presto we have all of the steel we need.

Let me quote further from this W. P. B. news release:

The Government's expansion program will be virtually completed by the end of this year. At that time the Nation will have nearly 7,000,000 tons of additional open-hearth capacity; 2,400,000 tons of additional electric-furnace capacity; 11,000,000 tons of new blast-furnace capacity; and about 7,500,000 tons of added coke-oven capacity as compared with capacities in existence shortly before Pearl Harbor.

Interesting, gentlemen, but does Mr. Batcheller make any statement that this expansion will provide all of the steel demanded by our war program? No. Because he knows it will not. Does he indicate anywhere that despite this expansion program steel production will run millions of tons short of the war demands? No. Why? Apparently he does not want the American people to know.

I ask you, Why did not that news release carry the same information that Mr. Batcheller's letter did to all steel producers? Why this double standard of information? There can only be one answer. Big Steel and its representatives on the War Production Board does not want the American people to know the facts. You ask why? Because they fear public opinion. Big Steel is worried that the American people will learn of its inability to produce and, as a consequence, demand the establishment of independent iron and steel plants throughout the United States, using newer processes, depending upon the natural resources situated in the various parts of the country. The sponge-iron process, for example, is one that could be utilized in many States of the Union accessible to deposits of iron ore and such low-grade fuels as lignite, peat, or natural gas. Mind you, this process is not limited to those few areas in the Nation gifted with deposits of high-grade coking coal. This process, once established, would continue to flourish in peacetime in the hands of small independent iron producers. They would forever threaten the steel kingdom of Pittsburgh, which has thus far been

protected by the steel masters through the use of doubtful trade practices. Witness the vicious practice of Pittsburgh plus pricing of delivered steel, which the Honorable Knute Hill so graphically described to the Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress on the 16th day of December 1942. I quote:

This Pittsburgh-plus pricing system was conceived to create fabulous profits for the new steel masters and at the same time weld them into a permanent monopoly group.

Pittsburgh-plus is so simple that a child in grammar school can figure its operations. Its cardinal principle is the refusal of any member of the trust to quote a price for finished products other than a delivered price. While the base price for a certain grade of steel at Pittsburgh might be $50 per ton, the delivered price at Chicago, for instance, is $58.50 per ton.

Now, suppose you wished to become a manufacturer in Chicago. Your process called for a certain tonnage of steel. So you, in seeking the nearest source of steel, would quite naturally approach a steel mill at Chicago. They, in turn, would be happy to fill your requirements. At the base price quoted in Pittsburgh? Oh, no, gentlemen. At the base price quoted in Pittsburgh plus an added amount equal to what the freight charges would be from Pittsburgh to your plant. Of course, the steel you bought in Chicago was not actually shipped from Pittsburgh, but you paid the freight over the 400 miles between Pittsburgh and your plant or factory just the same. You were not permitted to have the benefit of your nearness to sources of steel and the actual saving in freightage; the Steel Trust takes for itself the benefit of the short haul. No matter where you bought your steel or where it was made, the price you paid was the Pittsburgh mill price plus a fictitious freight charge. That, gentlemen, was an important part of the plunder-profit system by which the Steel Trust piled up an enormous reserve for its ruthless war of extinction against local economy—against the small independent iron and steel industry of this country.

This system has now developed into a so-called multiple-basing-point system, which in reality is the Pittsburgh-plus system under a new name, and which runs to the effect that different steel products have a different pattern of mill bases to which is added the transportation in calculating the delivered cost. Under the system the delivered price of steel, at any point in the United States, is the base price plus the freight from the nearest governing mill that has been classified as the governing mill for that particular product. For example, the price of structural shapes in Kansas City will be the Chicago price plus the rail freight to Kansas City no matter whether the purchases are actually made from Pueblo, Colo.; Birmingham, Ala.; Chicago, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo.; or from Sheffield steel in Kansas City itself.

By virtue of this practice Big Steel has itself not developed the iron and steel industry on the Pacific coast or other areas, because they can make more money by selling at Chicago-plus, Birmingham-plus, or Pittsburgh-plus, and they will continue to so operate. Even if Big Steel saw fit to build a steel mill in the West or on the Pacific coast, that does not necessarily mean that they will depart from the policy of Chicago-plus pricing. It would merely mean that any savings accruing by virtue of this coastal mill would go to the steel companies instead of west-coast consumers so long as the basing-point system of pricing prevails.

As a result, gentlemen, the war production effort finds itself hamstrung by the selfish interests of Big Steel that refuses to expand in war areas, and, even if they did, the move would be meaningless without the abolishment of their vicious pricing methods, which, of course, they refuse to do. Not satisfied with this selfish position, they have consistently opposed and fought the establishment of independent iron and steel plants that could have adequately met our wartime demands for steel, which Big Steel failed to do and thereby precipitated our present critical steel shortage.

I repeat, gentlemen, Big Steel fears public opinion, and well may they fear it. When the American citizen is fully educated as to the reasons for our critical steel shortage, there are bound to be repercussions. I am happy to say that progress is being made in this direction and day by day the demand for action by the Congress of the United States is increasing in tempo. I look for the climax within a very short time.

Seventy-eighth Congress Recovers and Exercises Its Constitutional Powers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1943, the Congress, by a joint resolution, recessed until September 14, 1943. The Congress has been in almost continuous session since September 1939. It recessed only 23 days in all that period of time. Congress was in the longest continuous session of any Congress during the history of our country. During this long period, Congress had been confronted with the problem of preparing our country for war and in helping to conduct the war. This war has touched almost every heart and hearthstone in the land, and Congress has had to deal daily with national as well as world problems, and aid their constituents in their domestic and personal affairs. The Members of the House and the Senate by reason of this long and exacting service, find themselves very tired and worn. Congress has completed its work, and it has been advised by the President that he had no further matters to submit to the Congress at this time for consideration, and in order to secure some necessary rest, as well as to visit their constituents and give them an opportunity to confer with their Members of Congress, and to give the Members of Congress a chance to get first hand information as to the needs of their respective districts and States and in that way be better able to serve our country and expedite the winning of the war, I think that Congress has acted wisely in taking this recess. This, of course, does not mean that the Members of Congress will be permitted to sit down and fold their hands, they will be busy daily in handling the mail and communications from their constituents, and in conferring with the people of their respective districts and States.

The adjournment resolution very wisely provided that the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, if they think it necessary and desirable, may call the Congress into session before September 14, 1943, and the Republican minority leaders of the House and Senate may do likewise. Furthermore, the President, under his constitutional authority, may call on Congress to reassemble at any time. Under this arrangement, any emergency coming up in connection with the war or other matters can be met by the Democratic leaders as well as by the Republican leaders, and the President. I know that it will be very helpful to me to return to my district and have an opportunity to visit the various counties and secure information and suggestions from the people that I have the honor to represent, and when we get back on September 14, or earlier, with renewed vigor and with more first-hand information relating to the great problems of the war, agriculture, industry and labor, I shall be better able to serve the people of my district and our country.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS EXERCISES ITS CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

For 10 long years a large group of the American people and the press have complained that Congress and the courts were subservient to the Executive and this, with other acts of the administration, brought about a reaction among the people, and for the first time in 14 years a majority of the votes cast in the 1942 election were for the Republican candidates for Senator, Representative, and governor. If it had been a Presidential election, and the Republicans had carried the same States, they would have elected a Republican President by a substantial majority. The Republicans had neither the organization, money, or the fighting spirit to win. The result of this election was a rebuke to the administration by the American people. It was a remarkable victory considering the fact that the administration had about 3,000,000 Federal office holders, extraordinary powers, and hundreds of billions of cash and contractual authority in their hands. It was one of the greatest turn-overs in the history of this country. I am wondering what would have happened if the Republicans had had a good active organization, money with which to make a campaign, and the American people knew what might be done.

While the Democrats have a small majority in the House, the administration has lost practically every important fight in the House and Senate that has come up since the November election in 1942. The Republicans and anti-New Dealers

have been responsive to the will of the American people, as expressed in that election, and the Seventy-eighth Congress has recovered and exercised its constitutional power for the first time in 10 years. The Seventy-eighth Congress has become again one of the three great coordinate branches of our Government. It was never intended by our founding fathers in writing and adopting the Constitution that the Congress or the courts should ever become subservient to the Chief Executive. Each one of these great coordinate branches has a definite service to perform to the American people and neither one of them should infringe upon the constitutional prerogatives of the other. Our Government cannot be truly free and a representative democracy unless each one of these coordinate branches honestly and efficiently performs the functions delegated to it and cooperates with the other branches.

Some of the New Dealers have criticized the Seventy-eighth Congress because of its independence. In my opinion, nothing has happened in this Nation since its founding that is more heartening to those who believe in our democracy and our American way of life than this change of attitude upon the part of Congress. Italy first destroyed her legislative branch, then the courts became subservient, and we have a Mussolini. In Germany the lawmaking body became subservient to Hitler, and later on he dominated the courts and then blossomed forth a dictator. The Congress and the courts must remain the guardian of the liberties of free Americans. We have not yet fully recovered that freedom of the Congress and the courts that is necessary for a healthy democracy.

MANY RIGHTS TO BE RECOVERED

President Roosevelt and his administration have for years through the guise of emergencies and the constant acquisition of power and more power, money and more money, regimented agriculture, industry, and labor. Through these subservient Congresses, the President has been granted blank checks for tens and tens of billions. He has sought and been granted extraordinary powers in peacetime over the people and over agriculture, labor, and industry. Beginning with 530,000 officeholders, with these enormous sums of money and extraordinary powers, he has built up a great bureaucracy consisting of scores and scores of bureaus, commissions, and other Federal agencies with a personnel of more than 3,000,000 people. He has regimented the economic and social life of 132,000,000 people.

In most cases Congress has refused to extend the life of many of these radical and socialistic laws. This administration has created emergency after emergency. It still has tremendous power because of the great war with which we are now confronted. This administration, with the bureaucrats, has but one great purpose in mind and that is to perpetuate their power over and their control of the American people.

The President has the veto power. The Republicans and anti-New Dealers are not sufficient in number to pass a measure over the President's veto, and therefore, many of the oppressive and many of the unwise laws now on our statute books will remain until the American people vote a change of administration and change of control of the House and Senate.

WIN THE WAR QUICKLY

It can be truthfully said that the Congress has stood from the attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, down to the present time, 100 percent in support of our war effort. Not a single Member of Congress has hesitated to give the President and those in charge of our armed forces every dollar and all the powers that they have asked for. In fact the records of history will disclose that no war President has had such a loyal and united Congress in the prosecution of any war, as has been given to President Roosevelt and his administration. They have sought and been granted more power than any President or any administration has had in the conduct of any one of our other wars, and, of course, they have asked for and been granted many times as much money as any administration has received in wartime.

From the time Congress met early in January 1943, until it recessed on July 8, 1943, a little over 6 months, Congress at the behest of the administration voted one hundred and fifteen billions of new appropriations, and fifteen billions more were reappropriated; therefore, there was placed at the disposal of the President and his administration beginning July 1, 1943, the astronomical sum of one hundred and thirty billions, about one hundred and twenty-five billions of this to go for war purposes. This appropriation of one hundred and thirty billions in 6 months represents almost $1,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The records of the Census Bureau show that the assessed valuation of all the property of every kind and character in the United States—real property, personal property, mixed property, money, notes, bonds, and all other intangible property, is about one hundred and fifty billions, therefore the Congress in the last 6 months at the behest of the administration, voted within twenty billions of the amount of all the assessed property of every kind and character in the United States, according to the records of the Census Bureau. We have heretofore pointed out that Great Britain last year spent twenty-two and one-half billions on the war, while we spent nearly eighty billions. Great Britain this year cut down her war budget to twenty and one-half billions, and therefore, Congress has given this administration six times as much as the budget of Great Britain. Russia is spending about fifteen billions, and China about five billions a year.

This $130,000,000,000 represents more than Great Britain, Russia, China, and the other nations allied with us, and Germany, Japan, Italy, and other Axis Powers—in other words, this $130,000,000,000 is more than all of the other nations involved in this war will spend for the year beginning July 1, 1943. No ruler involved in this war has more power than President Roosevelt. Many of us feel that a lot of this money is being wasted, and many of these extraordinary powers have been unwisely used, because they are being administered by incompetent persons, and some of this money and these powers are being used to change our American way of life. It has been shown by indisputable evidence that many persons in key positions do not believe in the American way of life. They want to make of this country a socialistic or communistic state. The administration has refused to get rid of such persons and a lot of this money is being used for propaganda purposes to promote the fourth term of the President and to keep this crowd of bureaucrats and New Dealers in power.

Every Member of Congress desires our country to have the biggest and best equipped Army and Navy in the world, and the biggest and best equipped air force, and the biggest and best equipped submarine force—the best paid, the best fed, the best clothed, and the best cared for fighting force in the world—but it burns us up to see a lot of the bond money and tax money of the American people used for political purposes, and to promote the fourth term for President Roosevelt, and to continue him in power and control of this great army of bureaucrats. They have been and they are oppressing the American people with their orders, regulations, and directives. This administration is a flop on the home front. They have hamstrung industry and agriculture.

Our fighting forces are doing a wonderful job, while the President is given credit for being a great strategist, but the real credit should go to General Marshall, General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and our other great generals and admirals who have worked out and are executing military and naval operations. The President and his inner circle of New Dealers are too busy promoting a fourth term and staying in power to conduct the home front or the battle front. What would the production be had it not been for the ability and experience of Mr. Jeffers, Mr. Nelson, Admiral Land, and others, who have done a splendid job in our war production, but it is the incompetence in the O. P. A. and the other New Deal agencies that have brought about the confusion and discord in industry, agriculture, and labor on the home front, and have wasted billions of dollars of the people's money. The President and his bureaucrats say they must have a fourth term, and after that, of course, they will want a fifth term. The American people ought to begin to think what a threat this fourth term is to their freedom and liberties and the American way of life. I believe that they will be swept out of power next year from one end of the country to the other. The American people can and will win this war. When it is over, they want their Government and their liberties restored. We want our sons and daughters in the service to come back to opportunities here. If this administration continues, there will be nothing for our boys and girls to come back to except bankruptcy, taxes, and bureaucratic control of their lives.

Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles and editorials relating to my dear friend, the late Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish government in exile, and Commander in Chief of the Polish Armed Forces. In his untimely passing Poland and the United Nations have lost a great friend, a great statesman, and a superior officer. In his appearances before the Foreign Affairs Committee he gave us an exceptionally clear picture of conditions abroad. His plans for the future were most enlightening. American statesmen realize now the excellence of his work, especially in whatever negotiations took place between Poland and the United States. I knew him well and his loss is a deep personal one.

The articles and editorials follow:

[From the New York Times of July 6, 1943]

POLAND'S FALLEN LEADER

Premier Sikorski of the Polish Government in exile died at a moment when his hopes for his native land may have been higher than at any time since 1939. He had been visiting Polish troops in the Near East and had found them, as he said, "spoiling for action." In his last public statement, made at Cairo on Friday, he had spoken of plans for a Slavic bloc in central Europe, with Poland and Czechoslovakia working on close and friendly terms with Russia. Certainly the strained relations between the Poles and the Russians had eased a little. The Polish Premier, soldier and engineer, was enough of a realist to know that his country could never be secure except within the framework of some kind of European federation with Russia's willing consent. Had he lived he might have clarified the Polish future. The work now passes to other hands.

Sikorski had one of those careers possible only in dramatic transitional periods. Only 61 at the hour of his death, he had fought in the first World War, served as chief of the general staff, Premier and Minister of Military Affairs in the early nineteen twenties, fallen into disfavor because his courageously expressed liberal views were not those of the pre-war Polish Government. It was natural that the Poles should turn to him in the democratic revival that followed their military defeat in 1939. Dying with his daughter and 14 others in a crash which only the badly injured Czech pilot survived, he leaves behind him a heroic memory for patriotic Poles and a hope of better days to come in the harassed Slavic marshlands of central Europe.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 6, 1943]

THE GIBRALTAR TRAGEDY

It is a peculiarly tragic accident which has cost the life of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski. The plane which plummeted suddenly into Gibraltar Harbor not only carried with it the Polish Prime Minister and commander in chief; it took his only daughter as well, together with the chief of the Polish general staff, the chief of its operations section, and other valued officers. One of these was Col. Victor Cazalet, a British soldier and former member of Parliament, who was well and widely known in the United States as one of the keener minds among the younger British Conservatives. There will be many to feel these losses in a personal sense. But to the loss of General Sikorski there also attaches an international importance which will be grievously felt not only by his own country but by all the United Nations.

He had been called to a singularly difficult role, which he had discharged with firmness and statesmanlike ability. Between the Nazi tyranny under which his country lay prostrate, the overriding power of Soviet Russia, the uncertainties of Allied policy, and the intranigeance and divisions of many of his own countrymen it was not easy to find the wise and workable course; and probably few other Polish leaders could have held so successfully to the essentials of Poland's problem. General Sikorski divined them clearly, and the Polish-Soviet treaty, which he secured on July 30, 1941, not 6 weeks after the Nazi invasion of Russia had transformed the whole face of the war, was an act of statesmanship for which all members of the anti-Hitler coalition have reason to be grateful.

He grasped the absolute necessity of an understanding with Russia at the very beginning; he understood it at the end, and in his last published interview, in Cairo on Friday, he expressed a desire to reopen Soviet-Polish relations. He was never, however, subservient to the Kremlin; he knew how to maintain Poland's position and dignity on the one hand, while combating with the other the more extreme Polish views which might have operated so disastrously both for Poland and for the United Nations' alliance. Mistakes were made, and it unfortunately proved impossible to prevent the deterioration of Polish-Soviet relations, ending in Moscow's peremptory break. But General Sikorski was on the side of moderation and wisdom. In a critical time he will be very difficult to replace; but the best tribute which Poland could now pay him would be to maintain the policies for which he stood.

In this large effort Colonel Cazalet played a useful role with unflagging zest. There can be few other Englishmen of our time who have touched so many nations and so many individual citizens upon terms of understanding and friendship. What he did for Poland he literally did around the world. Here in America his friends were countless. They included every type of human being, from governmental dignitaries to figures of the literary and artistic world. Doubtless his official reports to his own government were of constant value; but it was as an understanding observer and appreciative visitor that Americans held him in affection and will remember him. To that post-war world, which must lean heavily upon men of good will if peace and justice are to prevail, Victor Cazalet is a heavy loss.

[From the New York Times of July 7, 1943]

ABROAD—GENERAL SIKORSKI WAS A KEY FIGURE IN A KEY PROBLEM

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

General Sikorski was a soldier and a statesman. Mr. Churchill did not exaggerate when he described the tragic accident at Gibraltar as one of the heaviest strokes the Allied cause has suffered. If any man can be called indispensable to his country at a given moment of history, it was Sikorski at the time of his death. He emerged from the defeat of Poland and the obscurity in which he had lived because of his opposition to the policies of its pre-war Government as the natural leader and authentic spokesman of the crucified and indestructible nation.

Those who came to know General Sikorski during his visits to this country, the last one 6 months ago, recognized in him the spirit of Polish democracy, which was obscured and muted, as he was, by the rule of "the colonels" in the sultry years while the war was brewing. Polish nationalism is fiercer than almost any other nationalism because it has been driven underground so often and forced to feed upon itself. General Sikorski was a flaming patriot, a conspirator for Polish freedom in his student days in Lwow, but he was a man of the world in the sense that Paderewski was.

One man was primarily a soldier, concerned with building up a new fighting force out of the remnants of the Polish Army, and the other an artist, but both played a similar role, Paderewski in the last war and Sikorski in this, in the liberation of their country. Both had faith in freedom as the prescription for the ills of Poland and of Europe. Both opposed the Pilsudski regime for the same reason—because it took responsibility away from the people and therefore, in their view, weakened the foundations of the new state.

Sikorski was 62 years old, and yet he stood out among the national leaders in exile as a man of the new Europe rather than of the old. Perhaps because he was not in power but in opposition when the war broke, he seemed more flexible, more aware of and ready for change than many of his colleagues in his own and other refugee governments. He worked for a federation of the neighboring states of eastern Europe because he believed that this war proved beyond question that the smaller countries had no chance of independence except in combination. He was thinking of protection against a renascent Germany rather than of a "cordon sanitaire" against Russia, but he was thinking most of all of the security of his own country in the future.

As a matter of fact, no man in Europe gave more convincing proof of his desire to cooperate with the Soviet Government than Sikorski. It took courage and statesmanship of no mean order for the head of the Polish Government in exile to go to Moscow after Hitler's invasion of Russia to negotiate a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance with the power that had divided his country with Germany. Yet though his policy of conciliation caused a split in his own government, Sikorski decided instantly, and held to his decision, that Poland must be on good terms with Russia. His main objectives were to obtain the release of the interned Polish soldiers and equip them to fight the Germans and to adhere to the line adopted by the British and American Governments in holding the frontier question in abeyance until the end of the war. In this he was more realistic than Stalin, for the Soviet leader must know that the one thing a government in exile cannot do is to surrender national territory while the nation he represents is helpless and voiceless.

Despite all that has happened since, including the brusque action of Moscow in breaking relations with his government in April, Sikorski did not waver in his course. In his addresses to the soldiers he reviewed in the Middle East—all former prisoners in Russia—he explained his policy of seeking and maintaining an honorable agreement with the Soviet Union. In his last public statement, in Cairo, he implied that a change had taken place in the situation which might lead to a speedy reestablishment of friendly relations.

This change is generally connected with the letter President Roosevelt dispatched to General Sikorski by special courier at Beirut only a few days after former Ambassador Davies returned from Moscow bearing the reply to the President's sealed letter to Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt is greatly troubled by the Polish-Russian rupture—the first open breach in the United Nations' front. He sees the

dispute as a test of the capacity of the members of the grand alliance to reach post-war agreements on the basic principles of order and security. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the correspondence with Stalin touched on this issue.

The new leaders developing in the agony of Poland we do not know, but we can be sure they will be passionate nationalists. The plans for the future cannot forget that this force must still be reckoned with. Outside Poland no figure had anything like the stature and balance of Sikorski. He was in close and regular communication with the underground resistance. He was the idol of the army—fifth in size among the allied forces. He had the firm friendship of Mr. Churchill from the day he refused to surrender when France fell and took the legions he was training in France to fight in England. He was liked and respected in this country.

Sikorski's death is untimely for Europe, as well as tragic for his country, because he was a key figure in a key problem.

[From the New York Sun of July 6, 1943]

GENERAL SIKORSKI

The death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government in exile and leader of all Polish armed forces, is a severe loss to the Polish cause and to the United Nations as well. The circumstances under which General Sikorski and 14 others perished make an investigation of the accident inevitable, yet it is unlikely that such an investigation will reveal more than an ordinary accident. The airplane has made it possible for leaders of the United Nations to put a girdle about the earth in hours, but it has not been done without cost. As the Duke of Kent and Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews perished, so died General Sikorski. The cause for which he fought will go on to final triumph, but his comrades in that fight will miss his counsel and his spirit.

[From the Washington Star of July 11, 1943]

APOSTOLIC DELEGATE CELEBRATES MASS FOR GENERAL SIKORSKI

In commemoration of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government in exile, who was killed in a plane crash July 4 near Gibraltar, mass was celebrated yesterday at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception at Catholic University.

Representatives of all the United Nations were present at the service, which was planned by Ambassador and Mrs. Jan Ciechanowski of Poland. The Most Reverend Amleto G. Cicognani, apostolic delegate, was celebrant at the mass.

Following the service, Ambassador and Mrs. Ciechanowski and Col. Leon Mitkiewicz, assistant chief of staff of the Polish Army, received those officials present, among whom were Gen. Edwin M. Watson and Admiral Wilson Brown, military and naval aides to the President; Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State; Justice Felix Frankfurter of the Supereme Court; and Bishop John M. McNamara, auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore and Washington.

Among the United Nations' officials present at the service were Lord and Lady Halifax, H. B. Butler, Minister from Great Britain; Ambassador Mehmet Munir Ertegun of Turkey; Count Robert van der Straten-Pontkoz, Belgian Ambassador; Ambassador Constantin Fotitch of Yugoslavia; Senor Juan Francisco de Cardenas, Spanish Ambassador; Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, Cuban Ambassador.

Greek Ambassador Cimon P. Diamantopoulos; Hugues Le Gallais, Minister from Luxembourg; Ralph William Close, Minister from South Africa; Dr. Joao Antonio de Bianchi, Minister from Portugal; Dr. Alfred Bilmanis, Minister from Latvia; Vladimir Hurban, Minister from Czechoslovakia; and W. Bostrom, Minister from Sweden.

[From the Washington Post of July 6, 1943]

GENERAL SIKORSKI

The untimely death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, killed when the plane that was taking him from Gibraltar to London crashed into the sea, is a tragic blow both to the Polish nation and people and to the United Nations generally. General Sikorski was a gallant soldier and a far-seeing statesman. Commander of Poland's armed forces in the period following the conquest of that land by the Nazis, he was also premier of the Polish Government at London. In that capacity he visited Moscow, soon after the German attack on Russia, and in the face of bitter criticism from reactionary elements among his own people, reached an agreement with Russia which looked to the reestablishment of Russo-Polish friendship. His efforts in this sphere were temporarily thwarted by the Kremlin's sudden action in breaking off relations with the Polish Government. But he did not allow the temporary frustration of his plans to weaken his efforts to build a bridge to Russia. In fact he was preoccupied by the problem to the very end of his life.

A man of considerable breadth of vision and deep and abiding democratic instincts, General Sikorski's dream was to see Poland reestablished as a democratic republic in a democratic and federated Europe. Both as the leader of the Polish armed forces, which have played and are playing so heroic a role in the war, and as the guiding genius of the Polish Government, Sikorski helped lay the foundations of the Europe that is to be. We can only hope that when the Continent emerges from the fog of war, as it ultimately will, Polish statesmen of equal vision will be on hand to establish once more the principles for which General Sikorski fought.

[From the Kansas City Times of July 6, 1943]

SIKORSKI DEATH A BLOW—SOLUTION OF RUSSO-POLISH ISSUE DEPENDED LARGELY ON HIM—PLANE CRASH VICTIM ALSO WAS CHIEFLY RESPONSIBLE FOR POLISH MILITARY CONTRIBUTION TO ALLIES

(Article by Glenn Babb)

The death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government in exile, in an airplane crash at Gibraltar is a real loss to the cause of the United Nations. Not only was Sikorski's leadership chiefly responsible for the considerable and growing Polish military contribution to the alliance, but on him depended largely the hope of an early solution of the Polish issue on which there is a dangerous lack of accord between the Soviet Union and the western Allies.

His death draws attention again to the tragic plight of his country. Not only has the Polish fatherland been overrun in one of history's most ruthless conquests, but the Poles today are still without assurance that the defeat of their conqueror will mean the rebirth of their nation in anything like the form they desire.

Most of them hope for the reestablishment of the Polish state within the boundaries it occupied from 1919 to 1939. There is no power able and willing to promise this. On the contrary the power on whose friendship their future most largely depends, Soviet Russia, has given notice that the eastern half of Poland as constituted by the Treaty of Versailles is now considered an integral part of the Soviet Union.

WASHINGTON, July 5.—Secretary Hull issued a statement today terming the death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski a loss not only to the Polish people but to the United Nations and the cause for which they are fighting.

"I am inexpressedly shocked," Hull said, "at the sad news of the death of General Sikorski, the prime minister of Poland and commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, in an airplane accident.

"The death of General Sikorski, who symbolized so vividly the indomitable spirit of the Polish people, is a very real loss, not only to the Polish Government and people but to the United Nations and the cause for which we are fighting.

"The American people share the sense of loss of the Polish people at the tragic death of General Sikorski, his daughter, and his distinguished compatriots who perished with him."

[From the Buffalo Evening News of July 7, 1943]

POLAND'S LEADER FALLS

The death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government in exile and commander in chief of the Polish armed forces, is an irreparable loss not only to his people but to all the United Nations. A liberal and a democrat who had devoted a lifetime to the cause of Polish independence, General Sikorski saw the essential problem of victory as one of real unity among the freedom-loving nations. He also saw the need for a spirit of cooperation and accommodation among the Slavic peoples, including the people of Poland and the Soviet Union as a fundamental of lasting peace in central and eastern Europe. To this end he was exerting all his efforts at the time of his tragic death toward reparation of the breach between Russia and the exiled Government he headed.

It is encouraging to learn that the Polish Government in London intends to follow the policies he laid down, though it is difficult to see how anyone can fill the unique place he occupied both in the esteem of the other Allied leaders and the affections of the Polish people themselves. As Professor Kot, the Polish Minister of Information, commented, the people inside occupied Poland know and cared only about the name of Sikorski—the details of Polish Government politics were unimportant to them.

Premier Sikorski was no less important as a military leader than as a statesman. He had personally supervised the organization and training of a new Polish army that is fifth in size among the United Nations, and he had sworn to lead his troops back to Polish soil. In fact, his death was the result of his dedication to these tasks. He was killed on his return from an inspection of Polish troops in the Middle East when the plane in which he was traveling plummeted into Gibraltar Harbor immediately after the take-off. The tragedy also took the lives of his daughter, the chief of the Polish general staff, and other important officers, including Col. Victor Cazalet, a popular and promising younger member of the British Parliament who had been serving as political liaison officer to the Premier. It is a loss that will long be felt, but the inspiration of General Sikorski's life and heroic struggle for a free, democratic Poland will remain to encourage the Polish patriots who are fighting in the same cause.

[From the St. Louis Star-Times of July 6, 1943]

DEATH OF SIKORSKI

The death of General Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government in exile, is a major disaster to the United Nations. If another Polish leader can be found who, with equal dignity of spirit, is equally realistic about reconciliation with Russia, the anti-Axis coalition will be fortunate.

There is a quarrel between the Poles and Soviets over the eastern Provinces of pre-1939 Poland. These Provinces were incorporated into Russia when the Red Armies moved in following the Nazi attack. The Soviet Government has made it clear that she intends to keep them. Stalin and other officials have declared their desire for a "strong and independent" Polish state, but in Russia a separate Polish army—not under the jurisdiction of the Government in exile in London—is a sign that the Soviets mean to hold what they have taken.

Behind this is the Russian desire for strategic security against a revived Germany and also, perhaps, the frank recognition that anti-Soviet feeling among most Polish officials might make Poland sometime an open ally of the new German military machine.

Behind it is the Russian theory that the peace settlement of 1919 should have confined Poland to the so-called Curzon line—the boundaries recommended by Lord Curzon as proper, and roughly the boundaries which Russia now would leave the Poles.

Of all the Polish leaders in London, only Sikorski showed any clear sense of the need for some compromise with Russia which would form the basis of stability in eastern and middle Europe. Without weakness, he was able to approach his complicated problem in a spirit of good will and a clear desire to find a mutually acceptable settlement.

That was a great asset to Poland and to the United Nations, and Sikorski's leadership will be sorely missed. London and Washington will need to redouble their efforts to mediate between Poland and Russia.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of July 7, 1943]

SIKORSKI'S DEATH HURTS POLISH-SOVIET AMITY

(Carl Hartman for Overseas News Agency)

WASHINGTON.—Prospects for a Soviet-Polish reconciliation were struck a heavy blow by the death of Polish Premier Wladyslaw Sikorski, informed sources said today.

This feeling was reflected in the official statement of regret by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who said:

"The death of General Sikorski, who symbolized so vividly the indomitable spirit of the Polish people, is a very severe loss not only to the Polish Government and people, but to the United Nations and the causes for which we are fighting."

Hopes had been raised by a confidential letter from President Roosevelt which the Polish leader had received at Beirut while inspecting his army in the Near East. On his way back to London from this trip, Sikorski's plane crashed at Gibraltar.

Neutral and pro-Soviet spokesmen agreed that Sikorski was the only prominent figure in Polish affairs with sufficient stature and breadth of view to make reconciliation possible. Other exiled Poles have often criticized him as pro-Russian.

Moscow broke off relations with the Polish Government 2 months ago, indignant over a Polish demand for a Red Cross investigation of Nazi charges that the Soviets had murdered 10,000 Polish officers. The Soviets declared that members of the Polish Government were plotting with the Germans.

The Katyn Forest affair, as the Nazi charges were called, only precipitated the break. Behind it was a long-standing dispute between the Soviets and Poles over boundary and military questions.

Poland claims its pre-1939 boundary. Moscow says the regions it took over following the Polish defeat of that year have been permanently incorporated into the Soviet Union as a result of plebiscities, and in any case were wrested from it by force after the first World War.

As a result of an agreement made following the Nazi invasion of Russia in 1941, Gen. Wladyslaw Anders organized a Polish Army on Russian soil Disagreements that soon arose were settled by evacuating the Polish force to the Middle East. The Soviets charge that the Poles refused to fight at the side of the Red Army, and accuse Polish officers of espionage.

Recently, a new Polish military formation was organized in Russia under the auspices of a group called the Union of Polish Patriots, and named the Kosciusko Division after the Pole who helped this country win its independence. Head of the Union of Polish Patriots is Wanda Wasilewska, wife of a Soviet Ukrainian writer named Alexander Korneichuk. Korneichuk became a Soviet vice-commissar of foreign affairs following publication of a newspaper article he had written in vigorous denunciation of Poles who insist on Poland's pre-1939 boundaries.

Some Poles here charge that the Soviets plan to organize a puppet Polish Government, based on the Union of Polish Patriots. Informed sources doubt whether Moscow has any such immediate intentions, but it is admitted that unless the Poles find leadership that will reconcile them with the Soviets, Mme. Wasilewska's position will gain strength.

[From the Cleveland Press of July 6, 1943]

SIKORSKI AND A UNITED EUROPE

General Sikorski's death is used by Nazis trying to split the United Nations. Their fantastic tale is that the plane crash off Gibraltar, which killed the Polish Premier and his party, was a case of murder by British or Russian agents. This is the kind of enemy propaganda to be expected. But Polish statements in London, that Sikorski had been warned by his own underground not to make his middle-eastern trip, do more damage.

Naturally the Polish commander was as willing to take flying risks as the generals of other armies, and as Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt. His London friends, who now talk of advance warnings, are unintentionally playing into the hands of the enemy propagandists. That is poor service to a brave and able leader, lost in the line of duty.

Polish patriots are particularly sensitive on this matter of letting the Nazis split the Allies because Hitler made such good use of the break between Poland and Russia. That was a situation where both sides fell into a trap of their own emotions, which could have been avoided by reasonable restraint. It is unthinkable that the costly mistakes of the past shall be repeated now.

Sikorski only 2 days before his death reaffirmed his desire for a resumption of Polish-Russian relations. If he had lived, he probably would have succeeded in that aim. His death should not make it harder to achieve.

Whatever mistakes Sikorski may have made, we believe history will approve his major effort for a regional European federation. He had the intelligence to see that the smaller states cannot be secure against a large aggressor if each stands alone. And he had the courage to accept the consequence of his logic—an amalgamation of the small which would be large enough and strong enough to facilitate prosperity and peace.

In Cairo last Friday he said:

"The purpose of a federation with the Czechs and a looser federation with the Yugoslavs and Greeks is to avoid war by forming anti-German blocs. It will also have a tendency to cooperate economically with the Soviet Union. * * * The Soviet Government will eventually agree because such organizations correspond to the interests of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics."

Unfortunately, Stalin has not yet agreed. He fears the federation might be turned against Russia, and as a result the Benes group of Czechs has cooled toward the idea. Obviously such a federation could be misused, as any power can be misused, but that is hardly sufficient reason to damn it. If divided Europe cannot find economic health and political security through some form of union, it is apt to be the future prey of its own weakness and of some other Hitler.

The only way Russia or Britain or the United States really can help Europe is to help her help herself. Sikorski, a great Polish nationalist, knew that nationalism was not enough. He knew that his country to survive must be part of Europe able to help herself. We hope Sikorski's successor will have the same practical vision.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of July 6, 1943]

PREMIER SIKORSKI

Among the heads of the various exiled governments functioning at London, Premier Sikorski of Poland was outstanding. He realized, from the moment of Hitler's invasion of Russia, that Polish hopes for the future, in this war and thereafter, depended upon a firm and viable understanding with Moscow. He reached such an understanding. While relations between Poland and Russia were afterward strained, the atmosphere had been improving and there was even a project for a Slavic federation in eastern Europe, in which Czechoslovakia and Poland would each have a part at the moment of Premier Sikorski's death in an airplane accident.

Poland's cause suffers much in this loss. But other leadership will be developed to represent the interests of a great land and a proud tradition. Poland's troops in the Near East, which Premier Sikorski had just visited, will have opportunities to prove that his faith and pride in them, no less than his faith in the future of Poland, were not in vain.

The Fifth Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman from Massachusetts has raised a vital issue right now with the concurrent resolution she has introduced. She proposes that we recognize a fifth freedom, that of individual enterprise and initiative.

And right now when individual initiative is often called upon to "cool its heels" whilst government makes up its collective mind, is a good time to inquire into such a basic problem.

Around it hinges the whole principle of government as proposed by the founders of this Nation. We today could well determine whether government should restrain and control individual enterprise in the specious name of "regulated security" or whether government should concern itself with progressive efforts to open doors and enlarge the vision of those productive individuals who know that every man's security comes from the combined and exchangeable production of all men. Like the spirit in the chambered nautilus, we might aspire, at last, to be free.

It is rather useless to speak of freedom if we accept or permit systems of limitations. I think it was Brand Whitlock who said:

> If we define freedom we limit it, and if we limit it we destroy it altogether.

Yet government today, enduring the pains of readjustments to industrial growth, has turned to systems of limitations and of complete control. Always, of course, in the name of common good. We have rejected that school of reform which assumes some native honesty or faith among men. Without these latter, democracy must languish—and, short of their reassertion, the very goals we die for at this hour must fail of our attainment.

Government proposes to achieve freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of worship, and freedom of speech. And, all of us rejoice. And now the fifth freedom—freedom of individual enterprise and individual initiative. In other words, the freedom to work and to produce.

This freedom must precede and, therefore, take precedence over such a misleading promise as "freedom from want." Government can give freedom only by actually granting it—without strings, without recourse.

Yet it surrounds men who would raise potatoes with insurmountable restrictions in the form of inedible laws and regulations. We approach pretty close to martial, rather than civil law right now and all because we have left out the fundamental basis of freedom.

Creation is the first fundamental. The right to create and to recreate is the greatest human right—more than a right; it is a duty.

The individual who honestly labors creates both for himself and for his neighbor. Government's reciprocal duty is to protect him in his desire to be productive. Government cannot grant him the first essential, that of genius or industriousness, but it can protect those who have ability in their employment of it.

Freedom from want has to come out of the ground—you cannot find it in marble halls. Government's reciprocal duty here is to make sacred all aspects of production.

Freedom of worship begins when men grow thankful of the privilege of achieving. Even freedom of worship to those addicted to envious prayer can avail men or nations of no joy.

Freedom of speech becomes a blessing when men have learned the glory of discussions that lead to positive good.

Freedom, freedom for the individual, for individual enterprise and initiative—it is indeed the keystone of the arch, and government's greatest contribution lies in preserving it.

Yet this concept is not new. John Stuart Mill, in 1854, ended his famous essay on liberty with this observation:

> A government cannot have too much of the kind of activity which does not impede but aids and stimulates individual exertion and development. The mischief begins when, instead of calling forth the activity and powers of individuals and bodies, it substitutes its own activity for theirs; when, instead of informing, advising, and, upon occasion, denouncing, it makes them work in fetters, or bids them stand aside and does their work instead of them. The worth of a state in the long run is the worth of the individuals composing it; and a state which postpones the interests of their mental expansion and elevation to a little more of administrative skill or of that semblance of it which practice gives, in the details of business; a state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished; and that the perfection of machinery to which it has sacrificed everything will in the end avail it nothing, for want of the vital power which, in order that the machine might work more smoothly, it has preferred to banish.

And today when the productiveness of every one of us is so essential to victory and the peace, it seems to me that we up in the grandstands should be humble indeed when we shout "hold the line."

The line should and can be held. But it will come from fair treatment to the boys down there in the field. The ones with perspiration on their brows and their hands in the soil. It will come from gaining their confidence in the need for holding the line.

It will come from full recognition of their just rewards from the faithful employments of their talents and time in individual enterprise. It will come from recognizing their right to govern through representatives of their own choice, and not through the shallow excuse, "This is war, and we must, therefore, govern you."

Expenditures of War Shipping Administration and Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1943, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] addressed the House on the subject of the Lend-Lease and the War Shipping Administration. In view of the misconceptions which might follow from some of his remarks about the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission, I wish to point out the following facts:

First. The War Shipping Administration has not ignored or disregarded the ruling of the Comptroller General of the United States pertaining to section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but has observed it to the letter. It should be noted that the War Shipping Administrator sought the opinion of the Comptroller General on this difficult question, when it appeared that some differences in points of view might exist.

Second. The ruling of the Comptroller General on the meaning of section 902 does not confine the compensation payable for requisitioned ships to 1939 values, but requires only that such values be used as the basic starting point of the Administrator's determinations.

Third. The reports of the Comptroller General concerning certain actions of the Maritime Commission have been the subject of hearings conducted by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The conclusions of the committee have not yet been submitted to the House of Representatives, but it can be stated categorically that no evidence of looting of the Treasury or anything remotely akin thereto has been discovered. The situation is very fully covered in hearings on H. R. 2731 and particular reference is made to those hearings and Committee Document No. 20, both of which are available upon request.

Fourth. The activities of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration have been examined from one standpoint or another by no less than six separate committees of the House and Senate. Typical of their conclusions as a whole is the following paragraph from the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on H. R. 2968, the War Agencies appropriation bill, one of the most recent measures considered by the Congress:

> The American merchant marine is rendering a heroic service and writing an illustrious chapter in this war. When the full history of World War No. 2 is written, the programs, the administration, and the functioning of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, both through construction and operation, from the top admiral down the commissioned line to ships' officers and seamen, and from the civilian directory to the supplementary civilian personnel, will be found to be a significant contribution to victory.

Fifth. The popularity of the War Shipping Administrator, Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, who is also chairman of the Maritime Commission, which is alleged to have deadened the scrutiny that Congress otherwise might be giving to the expenditures of Government funds, appears from the record to transcend personality and to be based upon the fundamental character of the man.

The reappointment of Admiral Land to the Maritime Commission was confirmed by the Senate by a vote of 70 to 5. In the course of debate in the Senate, the following observations were made:

> Senator VANDENBERG. It is my opinion that Admiral Land is the man above all others whom America must thank for the couriers upon the seven seas who are making it possible for American armies to survive around the world.
>
> Admiral Land is as honest as the day is long, if I know anything about men. If it were my money, I would trust him with every cent without a bond. I think his nomination should be confirmed.
>
> Senator WHITE. In my opinion Admiral Land is the outstanding figure who has served on the Maritime Commission during the past interval of 27 years. He has brought to his task intelligence and industry. He has brought ability, he has brought character, and he has brought courage.
>
> Senator BURTON. I wish to state, in my opinion, that Admiral Land is the most strikingly direct witness I have heard before any

committee, either in open or closed hearings. His testimony always has been not only the truth but also, to a refreshing and universal degree, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Although serving as a civilian, his devotion to duty is on the high seas of that of a naval officer on active duty. His devotion to duty has carried with it a courage and a willingness to disregard private considerations which are greatly to be desired and rarely found. His integrity is so clear that it is not questioned. His diligence, his courage, and his technical knowledge are not questioned.

With these assets, I think Admiral Land can be relied upon to carry out completely and fearlessly the policies laid by the Congress. I am convinced that he can be counted on to resist any and all private pressures, however great, because his devotion to his public duty is many times greater.

Senator TRUMAN. I should like to say that it has been the duty of the committee of which I happen to be the chairman—the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program—to look into a great many shipyards and shipping contracts. In none of these investigations have we ever found anything which would in any way reflect on Admiral Land or Admiral Vickery. There are a number of things of which we did not approve, such as matters of policy; but these gentlemen have delivered the ships, and I think it would be disastrous, under the circumstances, not to confirm the nomination of Admiral Land.

Sixth. Various subcommittees and special committees of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries are continuing the special investigation of the activities of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration as authorized by the Seventy-eighth Congress. This commitee is interested in the facts only and will report them to the Congress as occasion may require, without fear or favor. This commitee welcomes criticism of all agencies under its jurisdiction and will be glad to investigate at any time any action of those agencies considered to be inimical to the public interest.

Formal Congressional Inquiry Necessary on W. P. B. Scrap-Iron Management—Optimism Characterizes Handling of Affairs—Over-all Program Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, scrap metal from the home, garage, farm, and basement of every American citizen has become an actual part of the tanks, ships, guns, and planes of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, that are so capably being utilized against the foes of democracy. Again I say, thanks to alert millions of citizens and the newspapers the importance of scrap was impressed upon the whole Nation in the great scrap collecting drives of last year, which prevented the shut-down of our war plants because of the steel shortage precipitated by the shortage of scrap metal. Without that scrap steel could not be produced. Every American citizen, therefore, has a vital interest in the matter of steel production today for his very home is the source of one strategic element vital to the production of America's weapons of war. It was in the interest of these American citizens and the Nation as a whole that I directed the attention of the House of Representatives on June 3 to the scrap-iron situation existing in the country today. Following that occasion officials of the Scrap Division of the W. P. B. indicated a desire to discuss the matter in conference. Following those conferences I came to certain conclusions which I incorporated in a letter, along with certain recommendations, and directed the same to the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, chairman of the Steel Shortage Investigating Committee of the House. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit that letter:

The Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, Steel Shortage Investigating Committee, United States House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOYKIN: After my statement on June 3 to the House on the critical scrap supply situation, I was contacted by officials of the War Production Board Salvage Division who were anxious to present their point of view before any legislative inquiry was contemplated.

After a full opportunity had been given them to discuss the matter orally and in writing, and after examination of voluminous and in many cases irrelevant exhibits, I still am unable to get satisfactory answers to the major questions which I have raised, chief among them the question as to what plans have been developed to give reasonable assurance that we will be protected in raw material supplies for vital steel production.

With pressure by the Office of War Mobilization for at least 2,000,000 tons more of steel during the last half of 1943; with coal strikes, and delays in new blast-furnace construction creating additional demands for scrap; with the collection of obsolescent scrap slowing up materially, and certain major sources of such scrap drying up, I find a serious concern in responsible circles about scrap supply for next fall and winter. I am impressed, however, with certain conditions which I think will merit inquiry by the Steel Shortage Investigating Committee of the House.

NEED FOR OVER-ALL PLAN FOR SCRAP SUPPLY LACKING

1. I find no master plan or comprehensive program projected into the near future, for assuring scrap supplies. Scrap supply in 1944, when the steel industry will have built up its capacity to 97,000,000 net tons (or 5,000,000 tons more than this year) is not even mentioned in any discussions or data that I have seen.

A great deal of reliance is placed on normal inventory of scrap existing today, but little thought is given to organizing replacements or accumulating reserves. The same complacency that everything will turn out all right exists throughout the entire scrap picture as far as the War Production Board is concerned.

In a country that has the richest reserves of potential scrap that require proper organization and translation into usable scrap tonnages, the major contribution of the War Production Board Salvage Division would appear to be the reworking of slag dumps at steel plants, whose potentialities are limited to approximately 500,000 tons.

Inquiry should determine why no master plan is available, and whether constructive suggestions may not be proposed to develop new sources of scrap, and to organize and facilitate the flow of substantial tonnages by removing such obstacles and handicaps to said flow as may be revealed by an inquiry.

UNRELIABLE STATISTICS USED AS BASIS FOR PLANNING

2. In trying to determine how the War Production Board arrived at its optimistic conclusions last January concerning 1943 scrap supply, I found that we were dealing with elusive figures and very narrow margins, with admissions of the necessity for frequent revisions, requiring changes in plan or pace. It was revealed that the War Production Board had overlooked exports of millions of tons of finished steel under lend-lease and commercial commitments, with a resulting loss in scrap to us of a very large tonnage, which error has raised some doubt on the original accounting of estimates. It should be the subject of inquiry to determine why, in a commodity like scrap that is subject to so many changes, any agency should make estimates without allowing the widest possible safety factors for the benefit of the Government program to take care of the many changes affecting scrap supply that should have been foreseen.

DOMINATION BY VESTED INTERESTS COUNTENANCED

3. I find that in establishing estimates that influence vital decisions concerning scrap, outside interests, both in the steel industry and in the scrap industry, who are under no oath to the Government and who are opposed to Government stock piles because of their threat to normal business, are playing a most important part, almost to the surrender of certain responsibilities by sworn Government officials. Inquiry should determine why we can't have reliable independent Government estimates, surveys, and judgment applied to this problem.

OBSOLETE SCRAP, THE KEY TO PROBLEM, IGNORED

4. I find little understanding of the basic problem involved. There is much talk of "home" scrap and new industrial scrap production, with credit asked by the War Production Board for these things that need no stimulation or organization on their part, and little talk, except sympathy, for the scrap collector and obsolescent scrap, both of which require continuous organization and intensive stimulation, since they hold the key to raw-material problem. Inquiry should center attention on the problems involved in the collection of obsolescent group, of which there has been a sharp falling off, and to the instrumentality for the collection, preparation, and distribution of this type of scrap—the scrap industry.

USEFULNESS OF BUREAU, NUMBERING 700 EMPLOYEES, IN DOUBT

5. I find that a large organization of 700 people is working on the scrap problem in the War Production Board Salvage Division. I have no doubt that a great deal of work is performed, but I am not prepared to say whether it is pertinent work for the problem at hand. Inquiry should evaluate their services and should determine whether, in a task that requires imagination and practical scrap experience, any of the 700 employees are properly qualified by scrap experience, and whether the concentration of effort on obsolent scrap would not require fewer than 700 people.

ABSENCE OF CENTRAL SCRAP CONTROL JEOPARDIZES WAR STEEL OUTPUT

6. I find divided authority on the domestic scrap situation, particularly between Office of Price Administration and War Production Board, in connection with scrap policy.

Many agencies make their contribution to scrap, but there is no inter-relationship between them, each disavowing the other's responsibility. Inquiry should determine not only the effects of such divided authority on the collection and the flow of scrap, but whether centralized control and direction over the entire domestic scrap picture is not indicated.

In 1942 many steel furnaces shut down because of lack of scrap. We are concerned that a repetition of this crisis shall not occur. It calls for continuous and intensified effort by Government agencies, foresight in developing new sources of scrap as reserves and replacement, without relaxation for one moment on the part of any Government agency charged with responsibility for scrap supplies. I feel confident that legislative inquiry will establish the facts by which to evaluate the work already done by the War Production Board in connection with scrap, and will also establish the foundations for a farsighted, comprehensive program, which appears to be lacking today.

Yours very truly,

CECIL R. KING,
Member of Congress.

If Woodrow Wilson Should Rewrite That Book Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 7, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, if Prof. Woodrow Wilson, who six decades ago wrote the monumental textbook entitled "Congressional Government," were today writing a book with the same title, he would probably make it less a contrast between congressional powers and duties and Presidential powers and duties, which contrast is so prominently displayed in his well-known text. Today he undoubtedly would make it a study of the relationships between the national lawmaking body and the whole executive department, but the functions which he pictured so many years ago as belonging to the Presidential sphere of action would now be divided into many departments and agencies of the executive department. Therefore such a study in our times would more appropriately be a comparison of congressional government versus bureaucracy. Nor does it invalidate this statement to point out that the executive department is made up of the various bureaus.

Although the term "bureaucracy" has current, well-known meaning, it has come to be applied too frequently as a term of contempt. I am not using it here either as a term of contempt, or of justification, but rather to indicate conveniently the many subdivisions of administrative agencies making up the executive department of our Government. More of actual government in our country today is done by officials in the executive department than ever was done before.

In the year of our Lord 1943 there is no single term heard so frequently in debate in Congress—and almost invariably with a tone of contempt—as is heard the term "bureaucracy." Congressmen do not usually stop to define the term, for it is taken for granted that everybody knows what it means. Whoever comes under the meaning of that term is evidently regarded by Congressmen as exceeding their authority, doing something they ought not to do, probably incompetent to do that which they are supposed to do, and a more or less useless, if not dangerous, element in the Government. That seems to be the average Congressman's attitude toward the bureaucrats. Although it should be noted that the term is most frequently used by political opponents of the present administration.

Of course, the term "bureaucrat," strictly applied, should refer to an administrative officer of the Government at the head of one of the many bureaus into which the executive department is divided. The term has come to be used loosely—as loosely as probably erroneously—to any important administrative officer of the Federal Government, whether he be the head of a bureau, or an underling, or an overling in a bureau. Therefore, the term "bureaucrat," likely as not, might be hurled at the venerable Cordell Hull, head of the Cabinet as Secretary of State, or at an agricultural agent or a forest ranger in some isolated spot of our country. Those who criticize the administrative officers seem inclined to lump such officers together and to brand them "bureaucrats."

Of course, the increasing complexity of government, especially under the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, during the period of the great depression and following the outbreak of the greatest of all wars, has seen an enormous increase in the functions of government and a corresponding increase in the number of executive and administrative agents of the Federal Government. Old bureaus and agencies may have had their function transferred to a newer one, but the old one has continued on with little decrease in personnel, even if considerable decrease in work; new agencies have been created, and they have grown like the proverbial snowball rolling down hill. It is not strange, then, that economy-minded Congressmen, as well as the big taxpayers, have come to feel that the most difficult thing in the world to exterminate is a no longer needed agency of our Federal Government.

As we well know, the founders of this Government provided for a separation of powers among the three great departments and provided that there should be some overlapping of functions in such a way that each of the departments should have checks upon the other two. Just how far would the founding fathers sanction the transfer of power, or the delegation of authority by Congress to the President or to any officials under him to carry on the work of our Government? Has Congress gone too far in recent years and delegated away too much of its authority? How much merit is there in the oft-heard demand today that Congress resume its proper function and conduct out Government after taking it away from the bureaucrats?

"SON, BE A LAWMAKER"

Mr. Speaker, on Jefferson's birthday in 1938 the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, was one of several who recalled that the day was Jefferson's birthday and made interesting comments as to a Congressman's duty in keeping with the Jeffersonian philosophy of government. At that time, as at the present, there was a clash between the President and Congress, which strain had been growing more severe in nature after the introduction of the court reform bill early in 1937 and later augmented by controversy over reorganization bills. The gentleman from Texas was telling us, in all seriousness, that we as Congressmen must recognize our responsibility and do our duty so that the lawmaking branch should again function as one of the three equal and coordinate branches of the Government under out tripartite division.

The distinguished jurist from Texas has a keen appreciation of the significance of legislative processes and an even keener appreciation of the part the people must play in our American scheme of government. On this particular occasion some years ago the judge was not considering the judiciary apparently, for he spoke of the necessity of teamwork on the part of the President, of Congress, and of the people. As he read the signs of the times on April 13, 1938, he thought he saw existing conditions to be very bad, that the ship of state was heading for the rocks, and, although he did not expect it to strike upon the rocks, he did think there must be a change of direction. On that occasion he called upon us to do our duty in a spirit of give and take so that effective teamwork might result, but he was far from advocating a rubber-stamp Congress. The gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, is but one of several thoughtful Members seriously disturbed by a noticeable shift of power in our Government, the end results of which no one could quite foresee.

That day I reminded the judge that in every great crisis of American history the Executive, under the Constitution, assumes more power than usual, and he is constitutionally intended in cases of war to be virtually a dictator. I pointed out such was true of Lincoln in the Civil War, true of Wilson during the First World War, and true of Franklin D. Roosevelt during the period of the great depression, where conditions were very similar to that of war. I also reminded the Members that toward the conclusion of each crisis Congress resumed its powers, usually in great haste and sometimes with a spiteful spirit, which was harmful to the country's welfare. The gentleman from Texas stated that, according to his observations, such had been historically the case, but expressed the hope that it might not be true in the case of the present occupant of the White House. He hoped Congress and the President could achieve cooperation and effective teamwork without the strife and evils which had heretofore followed emergencies.

WHAT DID THE FATHERS INTEND?

In any study of the theory underlying the American system of government it must be pointed out that our American constitutional plan provides three equal and coordinate departments, but that same Constitution provides that there shall be checks on each department by each of the others. No doubt the founding fathers expected, or at least they hoped, that by their system of checks and balances the three great departments would function coordinately and no one of the three should usurp power from the others so as to become dangerously out of line. Well, that may have been the theory. Actually the opposite has happened. American history affords numerous instances, or at least periods, where one or another of these supposedly equal departments of government has grown in power out of due proportion and has overtopped the others. I would say that equality of the three departments is not the normal state of affairs, but rather towering inequality of some one of the three over the others is the natural or usual state of affairs.

For short periods the Presidency is apt to tower over the other two departments. This has been usually during a war or some period of great economic emergency. In the period immediately following a war or great emergency it is the usual thing for Congress to seize the opportunity and recapture its lost or delegated powers and to assume control. It has been usually in a period of extended peace that the Supreme Court—that amazingly powerful institution which has no armed force to assert its power—by pure reasoning, legalistic logic, builds up its influence until it overshadows the other departments of government.

Institutions are said to be but the lengthened shadows of great men. Well apparently during those periods when the Supreme Court of the United States stood head and shoulders above the other departments of Government, it was so because a great jurist presided over the Court as Chief Justice. That was the situation for a third of a century when John Marshall presided over the high court—in times of peace. In our times it was the situation when Charles Evans Hughes was Chief Justice. In my mind there is no doubt but that the three departments of Government, constitutionally supposed to be equal, were not at all equal while John Marshall was Chief Justice nor while Charles Evans Hughes was Chief Justice.

During those periods when the Presidency arose to its height it was due to the stature of some great man. Certainly that was true in the days when Washington was President—and also of a half dozen successors, such as Jackson, Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. During any period when Congress arose above the average level of power there were a few outstanding men among the membership in the House or Senate. I would not call them in every case great men, but they were powerful men, and usually very determined men, and they have left a mark for good or ill upon our history.

THEORY OR ACTUALITY

The thing I am trying to say is that the actual working of our American political and constitutional history has been quite different from that even coordination which the fathers planned when they gave us this three-team Government, expecting each of the teams to carry its load, and thus distribute the scope of government equally among the three. The actual fact is that at any given moment in our history—if not a transitional period—one of the three is out ahead of the others, exerting probably more power and force than the fathers intended. Now, such is not a good state of affairs for getting a big job well done. Every farm boy knows that it is not well for a team of horses attached to a heavy load to behave in that fashion.

It is interesting to inquire why there has been so much unevenness in the functioning of the three great so-called coordinate departments of our Government and what is the remedy for such unevenness and how much better the job would be done if ideal teamwork could be had. I can here only point out the obvious lack of teamwork and hope that some philosopher will come along to cooperate with the gentleman from Texas in telling us how better teamwork may be obtained. I do have some ideas along that line, but they probably are not worth very much. However, I cannot close this discussion without saying again, as I did to Judge SUMNERS back in 1938, that the very safety of our country depends upon more discretion on the part of Congress when it takes back the powers which it has delegated away than it has shown on former occasions. I sincerely trust that good sense will be shown by this Congress in this necessary but delicately vital matter.

"This One Thing I Do"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are at a critical period of the war. The United States is now fighting on every front. In Europe, Asia, Africa, Alaska, and Australia, American armies have met the first shock and are advancing. The real test is now at hand. The next few months will be decisive.

Congress is adjourning today after one of the most momentous sessions in the history of the Nation. Congress has made every provision for the war. Without reference to party or politics or partisanship, it has appropriated the money and enacted the legislation required by the Army and the Navy. It has set in motion unexampled and unparalleled production of arms and munitions. It has mobilized the manpower of the Nation on the home front and in the field. It has now completed its work for the time being. The safety of the Nation and the destiny of the world now rests in the hands of the President and the people—the people as well as the President—because we must have their support and cooperation to win. There is much talk about sacrifice. But outside the men at the front, and those at home anxiously awaiting their return, many have more to spend and are living better than ever before.

How inconsequential and how ill-timed, therefore, are the querulous complaints and fretful criticisms of unthinking American citizens against the unavoidable restraints which war places on a nation at war—and especially a war in which the last liberty, the last dollar, and the last drop of blood of every American are at stake. No one would dream of imposing the draft, price ceilings, rationing regulations, taxes, and all the irritating limitations and irksome annoyances necessary in every country at war, if there were any way to avoid them. Within the narrow latitude which the imperative requirements of the war permit, all of us from the President down are seeking to so adjust and minimize these necessary regulations as to render them as practical and workable as possible without endangering the lives and success of our men at the front. And every patriotic citizen will cooperate in the war effort by adapting himself to their requirements—although in some instances they may seem, and may be, inequitable.

Likewise, every citizen will realize that war is not an economical business and unavoidably involves huge wastage regardless of who is in command. It always has been so and always will be so. Compared with former wars, and taking into consideration the vast number of men and quantities of material involved, there is less waste in this war than in any war we have ever fought from the Civil War down. Every effort is made to stop leaks and our committees of investigation are uncovering and correcting mistakes and maladministrations as fast as they occur. No one is allowed to make unconscionable millions out of the war as in former wars and our system of renegotiations—never before used by any nation—is every day returning millions of dollars from the profits of the war contractors to the United States Treasury. War and economy do not go together and never have gone together, but more precaution is being taken against waste in this war than in any previous war, as Treasury receipts convincingly demonstrate.

And yet there are radio broadcasters and newspaper columnists—and thoughtless American citizens who take their cue from them—who never mention the great victories we are winning in production and in the care of our men—victories against incredible handicaps of distance and supplies, on a thousand battle fronts—such victories as were never won before by any people. All they can see, and all they can talk about, are the flyspecks of their per-

sonal discomforts and personal peeves over coffee or sugar, or the wages some neighbor is getting, when our allies are being bombed daily and enduring unimaginable privations and horrors without a whimper.

We must win the war and we must win it in the quickest time possible. Every additional month, every additional day, every additional hour, means terrible losses.

Unconstructive criticism of matters which cannot be avoided in time of war only serve to interfere and discourage at home and at the same time encourage the enemy abroad. We do not want to have to win this war by frontal assaults of massed American troops against concentrated machine-gun fire in Germany and Japan. We want to drive home to the enemy that their cause is hopeless—that the American people are united and will support the war program until the last foe lays down his arms. Once convinced of that fact, once convinced that they must lose in the end, they will crumple from within and the lives of a million American boys will be saved. Avoid casual or chronic criticism unless it serves some positive and definite purpose. When you comment, praise the saving of life in camp and in battle. Commend the remarkable success of the war program against merciless enemies trained for war and ready to the last buckle and the last gun before we started.

Let us acquit ourselves like men. Let us endure with patience the ills we cannot cure. How unimportant they are in comparison with all we have at stake in this critical hour. Let us sacrifice to maintain the liberties our fathers sacrificed to establish. Let us give the war our undivided support and cooperation, that this Nation created under God, this "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, may not perish from the earth."

"Our Flag Was Still There"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which recently appeared in the Collector, a magazine for autograph and historical collectors, published in June 1943, about the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, the national anthem. This article was based on a recently discovered letter written by one Severn Teackle and sheds some interesting historical light on the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner:

"OUR FLAG WAS STILL THERE"

By the dawn's early light of a September morning nearly 130 years ago, two figures paced the deck of a flagship anchored in Chesapeake Bay, near the mouth of the Patapsco.

Fort McHenry had been under bombardment throughout the long night—but before daylight the firing had ceased. Had the fort surrendered? Or had the attack been abandoned?

In dread silence the two Americans, who were being detained on a flagship by the British, peered anxiously through the graying mist. Was it the Union Jack—or was it the Stars and Stripes floating over the fort?

Hope finally turned to certainty—

"And the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph doth wave * * *."

The growing light revealed the enemy stealthily retreating to their ships.

Sensing the keen drama of the moment, one of the two Americans pacing the deck stopped at the rail, drew a letter from his pocket, and on the back of it scribbled some brief lines.

Later, in a boat on his way to shore, he completed his notes.

In those inspired moments, Francis Scott Key had composed his immortal hymn, destined through centuries to lift men's hearts in a paeon of thanksgiving—

"Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the Heav'n rescued land
Praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation."

In its theme lies its immortality; not a call to arms—not glorification of a leader—but a prayer of simple gratitude.

Soon after the abandonment of the attack by the British, Key and his companions were able to land and learn the particulars of the engagement. When they reached Baltimore, still fired by the thrilling experience, he wrote out his poem in its present form and showed it to Judge Nicholson, a relative, who was also one of the defenders of Fort McHenry. The latter thought so highly of it that he had a broadside printed and circulated within a few hours.

Who was the author? How did he happen to be aboard the flagship anchored in Chesapeake Bay during the bombardment? Who was the other American pacing the deck with him?

Francis Scott Key was a young lawyer by profession and a volunteer in Major Peter's light artillery. He had set out from his home in Georgetown to intercede for the release of a friend, Dr. Beanes, who had been captured by the British at Marlborough because of activities in connection with the punishment of a few marauders, stragglers from the British Army who were disturbing the populace of his community.

With Key was John Stuart Skinner, commissioner of exchange of prisoners, the Paul Revere of 1812, who had ridden 90 miles in the night to announce to Washington the approach of the British forces.

Citing Dr. Beanes' generous care of wounded British officers, Key had been able to secure his friend's release. But in the meantime the enemy sailed up the Patapsco and anchored off Fort McHenry, preparing for an attack on Baltimore. To prevent the Americans from giving information that might interfere with the plan, they held them prisoners on the flagship during the bombardment.

The courageous defense of Fort McHenry which so inspired Mr. Key has been vividly recalled to our minds of late by an extraordinary eye-witness account of one of the fort's defenders—Severn Teackle. Faithfully today we tend the eternal light in honor of the Unknown Soldier. By a curious paradox it is an unknown soldier of long ago who now illumines for us some of those dark hours of struggle, when our Nation had not yet attained her present stature, when her fate actually may have rested upon the outcome of this closely contested battle.

In a letter dated September 23, 1814, the writer settles for all time the circumstances surrounding our national anthem and the scene that gave it birth. His story stirs our imagination to a new understanding and appreciation of the intensity of those fervid moments when the young lawyer from Georgetown scratched down the symbols of his high emotion on the back of an old letter, words that were to ring through the years.

We quote in part the newly unearthed description of the engagement at Fort McHenry:

"On the Sunday that the British Fleet made their appearance we were ordered to take our blankets to the battery and not to leave there untill ordered. In that situation we remained untill the Thursday morning following, sleeping (if it may be so called—for I could not sleep untill excessive fatigue drove me to it during the cannonade of the enemy) in the Open air and two thirds of the time it rained excessively hard. In that Situation wet—hungry & fatigued on Tuesday morning about 6 we were greeted with the discharge of about forty Bombs—

"'And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air * * *.'

"From such a rattleing & whistleing Good Lord forever deliver me—they continued the Bombardment untill about twelve, when two of their Bomb ships warped in a little nearer—we immediately opened all the Batterys on them and in fifteen minutes compelled them to cut cables & shear off—The Bombardment continued until 5 when they ceased—

"'At the twilight's last gleaming * * *.'

"and commenced again at 9 at night and continued an incessant roar untill two on Wednesday morning when they abated their fire and occasionally fired as the men were to be seen. About 11ock at night they sent (as Mr. Skinner of the Flag of Truce afterwards reported to us who was lying off with the fleet and not permitted to come home) twelve hundred & Fifty picked Seamen in Barges and a Schooner to land in the rear of the fort and storm it.—They were however seen by Sert. Covington and a Six gun Battery—

"'On the shore dimly seen through the mists of the deep'—

tho not seen by us from the Darkness of the night.

"These two Batterys of 24 guns kept up an incessant shower of shot for more than two hours on the Barges—and they were distinctly heard to say more than once By Gd. they'l blow us out of the water. About Two in the morning they returned and we got a glimpse of them and immediately opened the lower Battery which must have done considerable execution. I did not conceive it possible that the same number of men & Boats could be kept as still as they were that night—

"'The foe's haughty host in dread silence reposes.'

"We have one of their Boats, a 74 launch which was lost full of men said to be 60 or 70—

"'And where is that band who so vauntingly swore?'

"On Thursday morning the Patapsco was full of men floating about—

"'Their blood has washed out.'

"(Some) were sewed up in linen and others just as they were. Admiral Cochrane commanded in person.—He hoisted (his) broad flag on board the *Menalaus* frigate commanded by his Son.—Previous to the attack he asked Mr. Key, a Lawyer from Georgetown who was on board the flag, whether there was any person in the fort Authorized to Surrender that and the shipping as he should send in a Summons that day at 3ock which

I believe was started from the Admls ship but our battery being uncommonly annimated at that hour she put about and returned. The loss in the fort was comparatively smal only 7 killed and 23 wounded.

" 'Through the perilous fight'

"Of the latter our company has seven severely—but none killed dead. I was Blown up once whilst in the act of Removing the Powder from the Magazine—but received no other damage than getting my pantaloons torn nearly off me."

"Severn Teackle" does not ring familiarly in our ears.[1] Some descendant of his may perhaps happen upon this account, and throw light upon the circumstances of his life. But should his identity remain forever as shrouded in mystery as that of the unknown youth lying in Arlington Cemetery, still he is a part of that immortal company—one of the many figures in the colorful pageant of America's epic past.

Young "Severn"—for so he signs his letter to his friend Philip Wallis, of Easton, Md., concludes his stirring narrative without even the formality of a new paragraph:

"We have a song composed by Mr. Key of G. Town which was presented to every individual in the Fort in a Separate sheet—you may have seen it, if not at some future day I will shew it you."

Those early patriots seemed to have a sense of the future's problems as well as their own—

"O! thus be it ever when freemen shall stand,
Between their lov'd home, and the war's desolation."

[1] Since this article went to the printer, Miss Dorothy Miner, librarian and keeper of manuscripts at the Walters Art Gallery, of Baltimore, commenting on this letter, writes: "There was in the nineteenth century a well-known Baltimore lawyer called Severn Teackle Wallis, whose name combines several of the names mentioned in your letter."

In this hour when the destinies of nations hang in the balance, it is well for us to turn backward to simple records such as this, to distill from them new values, new guidance, and new hope. Inspiration and balance lie in the realization that we of our age are not alone in our sacrifices; others of bygone days as well have put aside their personal joys and sorrows to merge their lives in one great effort—have given that "last full measure of devotion" to secure the American way of life for all who tread on American soil.

Social-Security Protection for Servicemen, War Workers, and Civilian Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in further explanation of the social-security bill, S. 1161, which I introduced in June, prior to the recess, for myself and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a statement I made on August 14, the eighth anniversary of the original Social Security Act. Among other provisions, this bill covers some of the major recommendations for returning servicemen set forth in the President's recent radio speech.

In the same connection I ask to have printed also a Gallup poll showing overwhelming public approval of this means to pay as we go now for post-war social security. This confirms polls taken by other organizations and periodicals, which I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 1.

There being no objection, the statement and poll were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, SENATE SPONSOR OF THE ORIGINAL SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

This day marks the eighth anniversary of the Social Security Act. In the midst of war, it is fitting to note this great milestone of our democracy's progress toward the goal of security for the average man and his family. In good times as well as bad times, the Social Security Act has afforded a floor of protection to millions, helped stabilize the entire free enterprise system, and bulwarked the democratic institutions we are fighting to defend and perpetuate.

When our military victory is won overseas and we are secure from external attack, the Nation's first objective will be the fullest possible employment in private industry of returning servicemen, war workers, and others in the civilian working force. An extended and improved social insurance system is an important aspect of that goal of post-war readjustment. It would serve as a stabilizing force when the national economy is functioning at or near full employment, and as a first line of economic defense if we do not attain that level. Once the fighting ends, we will look to the social insurance system to help guide servicemen and other workers to private jobs, through the employment service; to enable older workers to retire with a secure income, thus leaving more job openings for others; and to provide minimum purchasing power and security for the wage earner and his family when he moves from one job to another, or from military service to private employment, or when wages are cut off in periods of illness or permanent disability.

The present law, with its limited coverage and scope, is inadequate to meet the major demands that will be made upon it when hostilities cease. These needs will be fully met by the comprehensive, unified social insurance program embodied in the bill recently introduced in the Senate by Senator MURRAY and myself, and in the House by Congressman DINGELL.

Among other features, this bill (S. 1161) covers some of the major recommendations put forward by the President in his recent radio speech and developed in the report submitted to him on demobilization and readjustment. In direct aid of returning servicemen and women—

1. The bill creates a national United States Employment Service, which is directed, among other duties, to establish and develop all necessary facilities and services for assisting men and women who have served in the armed forces to secure and maintain private employment.

2. Where jobs are not immediately available, the bill provides for the payment of unemployment insurance benefits to those demobilized, ranging from $12 to $30 a week, depending upon the number of their dependents, for a possible maximum of 52 weeks of unemployment.

3. Demobilized servicemen are given full credits toward their own and their wives' old-age insurance benefit for the entire period of military service.

4. Demobilized servicemen are given full credits toward survivor's insurance protection for the entire period of military service, so that their wives and children will be assured of protection in case of their death before they have worked long enough again in private industry to become reinsured through their own insurance contributions.

5. Demobilized servicemen and women are given credits for their period of military service, toward both permanent disability and temporary sickness benefits, in case they become disabled before they have worked long enough again in private industry to become insured through their own insurance contributions.

6. Demobilized servicemen, and their wives and children, are guaranteed medical and hospital care for a full year after discharge from military service, during which time they can become insured, for themselves and their families, through their own insurance contributions.

The cost of the social-security protection above mentioned to the individuals engaged in military service is to be met by the Federal Government out of general revenue. Financing of the expanded social insurance program to cover war workers and millions of other civilians is provided by increasing social-insurance contributions to 6 percent of wages earned by the worker, and 6 percent of pay roll paid by the employer. For employers, this represents only a 1-percent increase above the rate payable next year under the present law, and no increase above that now scheduled by law for 1949. The bulk of the increased contribution—at least $5,000,000,000 above present collections in the first year of operation—would thus come from increased payments by employees. The great labor organizations of the country, speaking for their millions of members, are heartily supporting the bill because these increased contributions will be matched by increased benefits.

By this widely accepted and conservative principle of social insurance, based upon the machinery of the Social Security Act, we would provide one unified comprehensive plan whereby the bulk of the population could pay as they earn now for post-war social security. At the same time we would provide a substantial share of the billions in new savings needed to hold the line against inflation during and immediately after the war.

This legislation should be considered and adopted promptly if it is to serve effectively in the fight against inflation and in our plans for demobilization and post-war readjustment. Sponsors of the legislation expect to urge full committee hearings promptly upon reconvening of Congress.

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY FAVORED BY LARGE VOTE IN SURVEY ON EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY—SICKNESS AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FAVORED—WILLING TO PAY 6 PERCENT IN PAY ROLL TAX

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., August 13.—Eight years ago tomorrow—August 14, 1935—President Roosevelt signed a bill which was destined to become one of the most popular and best-liked single pieces of legislation in the history of the New Deal.

On this eighth anniversary of the Social Security Act there are a number of basic amendments pending in Congress which would greatly broaden the scope of the social security program. The public, which approved the original act by the overwhelming vote of 89 percent, is in favor of many of the proposed amendments, and a substantial number of Americans are willing to pay 6 percent on their wages and salaries in order to make the enlarged program possible. Under the existing law employees pay only 1 percent this year, and 2 percent next year.

The increase to 6 percent in pay-roll deductions, as proposed in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill now before Congress, would go largely toward increasing present pension benefits and toward establishing a new feature of social security—payment of benefits for sickness, disability, doctor and hospital bills.

There have been heated arguments in the medical profession over the advisability of setting up socialized medicine programs such as this.

While a division of sentiment also exists on the part of the public, nevertheless the majority of voters favor the proposed change.

An Institute survey from coast to coast put the issue before the people as follows:

"At present the social-security program provides benefits for old age, death and unemployment. Would you favor changing the program to include payment of benefits for sickness, disability, doctor and hospital bills?"

The vote is:

	Percent
Yes	59
No	29
Undecided	12

All those who favored the program were then confronted with the fact that this would mean an increase in the amount of money deducted from their wages or salaries. They were asked whether they would be willing to accept this larger deduction:

"Would you be willing to pay (or have your husband pay) 6 percent of your salary or wages in order to make this program possible?"

The vote of the 59 percent approving the program divides as follows:

	Percent
Yes	44
No	11
Undecided	4
	59

TO INCLUDE NEW GROUPS

Another of the many proposals contained in the bill now before Congress is that social security be broadened to include farmers, domestic servants, government employees, professional persons, and others who are not now included under the program.

By a large vote the public favors expanding social security to include these groups:

"At present farmers, domestic servants, government employees, and professional persons are not included under Social Security. Do you think the social-security program should be changed to include these groups?"

	Percent
Yes	64
No	19
Undecided	17

Report of Committee on Foreign Policy and International Relations of the Republican Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of the Committee on Foreign Policy and International Relations, adopted by the Republican Advisory Council, at Mackinac Island, Mich., September 7, together with editorials on the subject from the New York World-Telegram, the Washington Star, the Detroit News, and other newspapers.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives would be impractical, and specific commitments by this council, by the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for—

(1) Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation.

(2) Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies, and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

[From the New York World-Telegram]

MACKINAC FOREIGN POLICY

We like the unanimous foreign policy declaration of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council at Mackinac. We think most Americans will like it, because it points in the direction they want to go. They want a strong and free America, taking full part in the cooperative building of future world peace and justice. And that is the common ground upon which Republican leaders of various shades of opinion have agreed to stand.

Of course, Mr. Roosevelt ridicules the G. O. P. declaration. Perhaps that is the natural thing for him to do as Democratic Party leader and a fourth-term candidate, who does not want to see Republicans get together. But it might be better politics—and certainly higher statesmanship—for him to welcome this and try to duplicate it among the divided Democrats, so that foreign policy could be lifted above political partisanship. We doubt that he really dissents.

Some may wonder why the Mackinac declaration is not more definite, and extremists on both ends will be disappointed that it does not include their pet panaceas for perpetual peace. It could not take either extreme, of isolationist or superstater, and represent the majority of Americans.

As for definiteness, it obviously would be absurd for Republican leaders to fix details in a rapidly changing world situation on which no foreign government is yet committed. Indeed, experts as far apart as President Roosevelt and ex-President Hoover agree that final detail decisions cannot even be made promptly after the war, but probably must be matured over a transitional period.

This is as definite as it can be without goldbricking the public: "Responsible participation by the United States in postwar cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

We like also the G. O. P. emphasis on adequate American armed forces, and on sticking to constitutional methods in determining foreign commitments. Any foreign policy not approved by the people and Congress is a dangerous delusion. But we are convinced that the people will support vigorously the general aims of the Mackinac declaration, which are exclusively neither Republican nor Democratic but American.

[From the Washington Star]

G. O. P. FOREIGN POLICY

Despite efforts by the President and others to ridicule it, the foreign policy statement adopted by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council seems well suited to the needs of this time and the probable requirements of the future.

Mr. Roosevelt was unable to understand the statement. Others, while having no difficulty in this respect, profess disappointment that the Republicans did not go further and commit themselves to some specific form of post-war world organization and an international police force. The fact is, however, that the Republicans have gone quite far. To the extent that men can see into the future, the statement is clear and it is specific.

The heart of the document is in the paragraph which calls for "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organizations among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to obtain permanent peace with organized justice in the world." Senator VANDENBERG, chairman of the council's foreign policy committee, said that the statement of policy was designed to commit the Republican Party, first, to defending and preserving the essential interests and institutions of our own country, and, second, to cooperation in complete good faith with our allies in the post-war effort to end military aggression forever and to create dependable peace with justice in a free world. These objectives, he contended, are not incompatible.

Other participants in the discussion emphasized that cooperative organization meant some form of organization, by whatever name it may be called, with other sovereign nations for the establishment and perpetuation of peace, and that the use of the phrase "organized justice" means that the Republicans would be committed to some form of world court to litigate disputes among nations. And, from this, it certainly follows that responsible participation by the United States in such a program means that this country, should need arise, would be prepared to make its contribution to forcible attainment of these objectives.

For a political party which had become identified as the champion of "isolation," this is a long step forward. The G. O. P. has its eyes on the future, and if the statement of the advisory council is adopted at the party's next national convention it will have buried the past. To put it another way, this means that the question of the willingness of the United States to assume its legitimate responsibilities in the world of tomorrow would no longer be a subject of partisan politics, and, with a national election in the offing, this is eminently desirable.

The President and those others who seem disposed to ridicule what the Republicans have done would be well advised to consider the importance of removing the question of this country's post-war international stand from the realm of purely political debate. Instead of belittling the Republican program, it might be better for them to concentrate on persuading the Democrats to do as well.

[From the Detroit News]

IT IS NOTICE TO THE WORLD OF UNITY IN AMERICA

Though the President was pleased to feign a humorous ignorance of what went on at the Mackinac Island Republican meeting, it is safe to say that the entire world read with great interest of the Republican resolution on foreign policy.

This resolution will be interpreted abroad as eliminating the question of post-war collaboration with other nations as an issue between the two major American political parties. It will be taken as assurance that history will not repeat and that the Republican Party will not again be the instrument or exploiter of any post-war revulsion toward isolationism.

The effect, as the President well knows, will be to strengthen his hand tremendously in dealings with our allies, with the wavering allies of our enemies, and with neutrals. As was true a quarter of a century ago, there is popular faith throughout the world in the disinterestedness of the American desire for international peace and justice. The apparent assurance that this time the United States will play out the game realistically and determinedly cannot fail to lend our efforts an influence they otherwise might lack.

The action of the Mackinac meeting on foreign policy, in the estimation of the News, was carried out on a high plane of statesmanship. It is our hope it will find in other quarters that emulation which will realize its utmost possibilities for good.

It obviously sought and apparently has provided the basis for resolving Republican differences on foreign policy. Men sympathetic with the ideas of Wendell Willkie were present at the meeting and helped shape the resolution.

But the further opportunity exists to make of this resolution a basis of national unity on foreign policy. As suggested by one of the Mackinac conferees, Representative EATON, of New Jersey, the Democratic and Republican National Conventions both might adopt the resolution as a common foreign policy plank.

The expedient is feasible, even though novel. The resolution in its essential parts is brief but explicit enough. It favors an organization of nations to preserve world peace under a system of organized justice. This is, if anything, more explicit than any Democratic pronouncement to date on the subject, yet certainly goes no further than either the President or, we believe, the people would want.

The resolution itself invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

That invitation, as good an evidence as any of patriotic sincerity, should be accepted in the spirit inspiring it.

[From the New York Times]

REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY

It is sheer coincidence that the policy-makers of the Republican Party happened to be meeting in Michigan as Italy prepared to surrender, but the coincidence dramatically increases the importance of what they had to say. We are a long stride nearer to the winning of the war and to the inescapable answer that must be given to the question whether the United States will accept its proper share of responsibility for safeguarding peace when it is won. By chance, the Republican policy-makers spoke in one of the great moments of history.

To their credit they spoke well and plainly. Nor, apparently, did they find it hard to do so. From the beginning of the Mackinac Island conference it was evident that the isolationist thinking so long dominant in the councils of the congressional Republicans had been routed by events and that there would be no battle over isolationism in this conference. International cooperation has become the order of the day, and the sole question at Mackinac was on ways and means of asserting American responsibility and leadership in world affairs. Here the only real point of difference was between the point of view of those who preferred to proceed somewhat slowly and the forthright advocacy by Governor Dewey of a continuing military alliance between the United States and Great Britain to keep the peace after the war is won.

The statement of policy ultimately agreed upon received a unanimous vote of approval. It is cast in general terms, but it lays the basis for a sound policy. It calls for "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world." Every one of these phrases points in the right direction. "Responsible participation" can only mean participation backed by the armed might of the United States. "Post-war cooperative organization" promises a new League or its equivalent. "Sovereign nations" means an association of willing partners. "Permanent peace with organized justice in a free world" encompasses the full measure of what we hope that victory will mean.

The Republicans who met at Mackinac have made a contribution to the unity of the Nation on questions of foreign policy and to the cause of post-war reconstruction.

Meat for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 8, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech entitled "Meat for America," delivered by me over National Broadcasting Co., Washington, D. C., on Friday, July 9, 1943, as follows:

The question of meat supply for America is most critical—more critical, perhaps, at the present moment than ever before. It threatens to become even more serious and more critical in the weeks ahead. Why are Americans suffering from lack of meat? Is it because we have a shortage in supply, or is it because of poor management? When the facts are known and recognized, these questions more or less answer themselves.

MORE CATTLE THAN EVER BEFORE

America today has a greater herd of beef cattle than at any other time in history. It is also true that the demand for beef is greater. But the supply is ample to satisfy the demand. It appears today that the total herd of cattle in America approximates 80 or more million head. Therefore, at the source we have ample supply. Our needs comprise supplies for the Army, Navy, Lend Lease, and the civilian population. Why, therefore, is America meat hungry?

CONTRARY TO LAW

Your Government has attempted to carry out a program of price control. Your Congress erected the foundation for a program in the price-control law. This law is specific and clear in providing safeguards against evils certain to arise if price-control authorities attempted to leave the well-marked trail and follow paths which lead to the disruption of normal business channels of distribution. Many members of the Congress being experienced in business foresaw the very catastrophe which now threatens the Nation. Notwithstanding the foresight which was displayed in the drafting of the price-control law, and notwithstanding the clear and specific prohibitions therein, the Office of Price Administration insisted upon ignoring the law. The result is chaos.

The meat problem became acute in this Nation early last fall. It has now reached the stage of a crisis. The Army, Navy, and Lend Lease require about 30 percent of the entire meat output of the Nation.

MISMANAGEMENT

The first step in the Office of Price Administration program to restrict the civilian supply to 70 percent was to put slaughtering quotas into effect and give each slaughterer a civilian quota. All meat butchered over the quota had to be sold to the Army, Navy, and Lend Lease. The meat industry depends upon more channels of trade than just slaughterers. The meat you eat may come directly from the slaughterhouse, but the chances are that after being slaughtered, it comes to you by way of a meat processor, or a wholesaler, for distribution to your retail butcher.

The people then depend ultimately upon the corner butcher. He supplies them with their meat for the dinner table. When the Office of Price Administration gave a quota to the slaughterers, it did not give a quota to the nonslaughtering processors or to the wholesalers or to the retail butcher. It was error sufficient to cause trouble when quotas were not allowed all along the line of meat distribution, but the Office of Price Administration added additional oil to the fire by establishing a ceiling price at only one level. The Office of Price Administration did not put a ceiling price on the live animals, with the result that the price of live animals continued to advance long after the ceiling had been placed on processed meats. The result was inevitable—every time a slaughterer killed an animal for meat he lost several dollars per carcass. This caused financial loss to all of the slaughtering houses in the country and caused hundreds to close.

In addition to destruction of the independent packing-house business in the country, the independent processors and wholesalers were deprived of meat. The result was that their customers were also deprived of meat. Ultimate result—a few sections of the country received plenty of meat—many sections received very little—and some sections received none. Your butcher added to all his other wartime hardships the unnecessary hardship of having his meat refrigerator empty and his customers meat-hungry.

O. P. A. has admitted the hardships caused by these rulings, but the only answer forthcoming from the Administration to date was a move which further aggravated the situation.

ECONOMIC BLUNDER

The answer to the meat problem at the first of June of this year was a 10-percent roll-back in price, with a promise to pay a subsidy to the meat packers for the 10 percent. This 10-percent roll-back offered no appreciable benefit to anybody. It did have what was thought to be political appeal. Its announcement brought chaos in the meat industry. American packers were losing money every time they killed a steer and now they were told to roll back prices another 10 percent. To be sure the Government would pay the subsidy. Pay the subsidy how and when and by what authority of law? The subsidy program and the price roll-back was in effect by Presidential order 2 weeks before the packers had received from the Office of Price Administration a rule book on how the program was to work, how frequently the subsidy would be paid, and who would pay it. This proves that the subsidy was not a well-considered program, but rather a makeshift political expedient. Congress passed a bill which ruled out this makeshift subsidy program. The President vetoed the bill and in the attempt to pass it over the veto, the Congress failed by a few votes. The Presidential veto message attempted to brand the bill as a food-shortage bill, but failed to mention that the food shortage had already been caused by the poor management of the present administration. Review of all this serves only to freshen our memory and make plainer the present situation. It does not relieve the meat shortage. In view of certain stubborn factors which have been created, let's be realistic.

PLOESER PROGRAM

Last Saturday, July 3, I addressed a letter to Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson, to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, and to Price Administrator Prentiss Brown. This letter embodied a program which I suggested to relieve this false meat shortage. The President has asked for a suggested program instead of criticism. Criticism can be helpful and in the case of the management of meat, I have been extremely critical. While being critical I have studied carefully the problem as it has grown and become accentuated by error after error. Having studied the problem for months, as a member of the Small Business Committee of the House, I have conferred with some of the best brains in the meat industry. These men represented all branches of the industry from the grower of livestock to the retailer of dressed meats. Out of these consultations came the program, which I have presented in answer to the President's public invitation.

STUBBORN POLITICS

The present situation is uneconomic. In the face of maldistribution and processing losses, the 10-percent roll-back, with or without subsidy, was a most harmful move. The claim that the retail price of meat had been reduced by 10 percent had no economic value to the Nation or the individual consumer. But the fact remains that the people are not getting meat and that there is plenty of livestock. The fact also remains that the roll-back can mean nothing to the person who cannot get meat at any price, when it is not available to the consumer. I have tried in my program on meat to deal with these factors realistically. The administration has no intention whatsoever of yielding ground on the 10-percent roll-back, or in its great desire to pay subsidies to somebody. These factors, as uneconomic as they are, at the moment are standing like a stone wall. It is behind this wall where we must find a way to bring into the market ample supply of meat to feed our people.

MUST BE REALISTIC

The Ploeser program considers the roll-back as fixed and proposes a solution of the problem with that as a known factor. The plan which I propose provides for ceilings at all steps in the growing, feeding, slaughtering, processing, and retailing of beef. It emphasizes the need for the retention in the meat industry of all normal, customary, and traditional channels of distribution. It safeguards against destructive price squeezes. It protects the feeding costs of live animals and allows for deficiencies in the proportionment of the over-all price range—from producer to consumer—to be aided if, and when, necessary by incentive Government assistance. It protects the independents in the meat industry by equitable allocation of available supply. If we must have subsidy, then let's put it to work as an incentive for production, which is the only point at which it will do any good.

While the Ploeser plan was drafted specifically for beef, it is equally applicable to lamb, veal, pork, and poultry. In other words, it is an over-all plan for the meat industry. Beef is the No. 1 problem of maldistribution and consumer shortage. There is not a shortage of live cattle. Lacking proper consumption and normal distribution a critical situation may easily develop. A drought could cause bankruptcy for every cattle grower in the Nation. The solution seems to rest in the proper adjustment of by-product prices, protection of feed costs, and proper proportionment of the retail price.

IN THE MIDDLE OF A MUDDLE

I realize fully that the rancher and the feeder of cattle does not welcome the idea of ceiling prices on live animals. None of us welcome the idea of an over-all managed economy in any line of trade. But, we must realize that we are not living in a free economy during the war. Whether we like it or not, we must be realistic if we are to feed the Nation. You and I would have managed the entire program differently from the beginning. Now we must accept the fact that we are not at the beginning—we are in the middle—in the middle of a muddle—with certain unrelenting political conditions which cannot be corrected overnight or within the next few weeks. If around these conditions we can build a program which will at least start into action the marketing and normal distribution of meat—then that is the program we must, at least temporarily, demand. This program, I believe, will permit all branches of the meat industry to live; and not only to live, but to feed the people and supply the armed services and lend-lease. I ask for your support of this program—I ask for the administration's adoption of this program.

Congress Curbs the Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at a luncheon of the Kiwanis Clubs in Denver, Colo., on August 25, 1943:

The unconquerable American courage to uphold the right, the courage to accomplish miracles in the face of any kind of difficulty, is today manifesting itself in every part of the globe. In cooperation with our brave allies, we are winning the war for freedom on the fields of battle. The dictators are in retreat; the slave-driven hordes are falling back in defeat before the courage and determination of free men fighting for their ideals and their own liberties. Already the dictators in their shell-proof hide-outs are haunted by the enemy from whom they can never escape—the fear of the just punishment which soon will be meted out to them.

The American people are, of course, profoundly proud of their fighting men and women. Their faith in the officers and men of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Forces, the Merchant Seamen, as well as in the many thousands of enthusiastic and patriotic women on the home front is unbounded. All of these devoted men and women are daily risking their lives and enduring hardships and sacrifices so the American ideal of life and liberty may be protected and perpetuated through a complete victory. Of course, we all long for the return of the fighting forces to their homes.

It is needless for me to say that a united American people are behind this greatest war effort of all time. We are all contributing to the victory, whether we be in the military ranks, or in civilian life, or in the actual fray on the battle fronts, or in the struggles of the home front. The victory which we

are determined to win, and without which we will never cease fighting will have been achieved not by any single group, or class, but through the common effort of us all.

We are moved to profound thankfulness for the achievements and successes of our fighting men and women; we are all determined that when the war is won, when victory crowns our efforts, the result shall not be a futile victory for the men and women who have endured the hardships, the privations, and the sacrifices.

As a matter of inevitable American impulse, as a matter of common justice which is inherent in the very nature of Americans, we must and we will make our plans now for the proper rehabilitation of the disabled, and for a reabsorption of our fighting forces back into peacetime pursuits. I doubt if we could find any American man or woman who would not instantly declare, if asked, that when the men and women of the military forces have completed their work they will be entitled to jobs; they will be entitled to a good livelihood in the period of transition from war activities to peace pursuits. This is the traditional American way of treating its defenders, and it is both effrontery and unconscionable assumption of virtue to attempt to usurp as the possession of any party or group the intention to do justice to the returning soldiers.

If any man, or any party, even hinted at doing otherwise, the wrath of the American people would drive them into deserved oblivion.

Several committees of the Congress have for months been studying this problem. These studies have been entirely nonpartisan in character. No attempt, as far as I know, has been made either by Democrats or Republicans to inject politics. To do so would outrage the finest instincts of the American people.

Of course, there will be no delay in the Congress passing legislation to deal justly and generously not only with the disabled, the permanently incapacitated, but with the rest of the forces in such a way that without undue hardship their readjustment into peaceful pursuits can be accomplished at the end of the war. It is needless for me to tell you that I shall demand, and continue to demand, that such legislation be given immediate consideration, when the Congress reconvenes in September. The Congress can be depended upon to do full justice to our fighting men and women, and as a Member of that branch of the Government, I can state definitely Congress will be glad to give this justice on its own initiative and we will do it promptly.

We all know that it is part of the American creed that those who are good enough to fight for their country deserve to get full justice when the fighting is over.

While we depend upon our military and naval forces to win the fight for freedom against the dictators on the far-flung battle lines, there is an equally important job to be done by the patriots on the home front. It would be tragic beyond expression if our boys were to win the victory in the conflict at arms, and while they were doing so, we should allow any pressure groups, any self-seekers, any influence, of any character whatsoever, to lose the peace at home. How unutterably tragic it would be for these heroic men and women to return from victory at the fighting front to discover the battle has been lost on the home front.

The only way the American people could possibly be brought under the shadow of danger on the home front would be by planned confusion and regimented chaos, designed so to bewilder our people as to shake, temporarily, their faith in themselves and in their Government by consent of the governed.

Signs are multiplying that Lincoln spoke with the vision of a prophet when he said: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time."

The American people are aroused now to the dangers which threaten, and it is becoming abundantly evident that they are determined their liberties, both economic and political, shall be preserved, in spite of the obstinate determination otherwise of a powerful political bureaucracy, which has, over the past 10 years, been built up in Washington and throughout the whole of America. The new spirit of independence in the Congress, which has been so much in evidence in more recent months, is a reflection of the spirit of the country.

For some years a small group in our Nation have, in the press, over the air waves, on the platform, in books and pamphlets, tried vigorously to undermine American institutions, American ideals, and our American way of life. They have tried to break down the confidence of the people in their special instrument of control over their Government, and their Governors, the Congress, as an institution.

Those thus engaged in this plan to smear American ideals have insisted that the founding fathers were mercenary and selfish. They have asserted over and over again that the men and women whose pioneering efforts on farms, in factories, and in the mercantile establishments have made America a rich and mighty country were actuated by ulterior motives. They have had the effrontery, I should say the insolence, to declare that the forebears of the people of America, those who made this great country the object of yearning to the peoples of all the other countries of the world, were buccaneers and cutthroats. These professional scandalmongers in their efforts to break down the finest traditions which find expression in our American life today, have declared the American system is outmoded. They have insisted that if we are to have security we must hand over our liberty to the custody of the bureaucrats. They have declared private enterprise, which helped to bring this country to its greatness, has failed. This in the face of the most magnificent job that any industrial institution in any country in the world ever accomplished in a like period. They shut their eyes, and they would have us shut our eyes to the astounding fact that in 2 years loyal American industry, backed by American labor and backed by American brains, and American determination, and American dexterity, has overcome the lead which Hitler and Mussolini hoped they had achieved by 15 years of careful planning, and of driving their industries and their peoples, day and night. This cannot be denied, it is not denied by these detractors of the American system; they simply try to ignore it, and, in the face of it, ask that the control of industry, of business, of agriculture, be turned over to their inept and selfish management. Were it not so dangerous and tragic, it would be the joke of the century.

There is one grave danger, to which I think the American people must be alert; that is, that in this group who thus try to smear our American institutions, and our American ideals, we are not dealing entirely with citizens who are sincere but mistaken; on the contrary we are dealing with some plotters who, definitely, and deliberately, are planning to take control of our financial system, of our industrial system, of our agricultural system, and of our political and social system. They will take over that control if they possibly can. They will wreck our American system of government, if they possibly can.

For years our people have accepted New Deal promises of good government. For many, a meager existence was called security, and was purchased at the cost of political freedom.

Taking advantage of a smoke screen of fears kept dense by declarations of a succession of crises and emergencies this political bureaucracy marched forward. Commissions and bureaus multiplied. The Federal Government usurped the rights of the States in many ways. New controls and supervision were fastened upon the people under the guise of urgent emergencies which never emerged.

Yes; bureaucracy was on its way to becoming, as someone has well said, "The masters of the people from the cradle to the grave."

The war brought new anxieties to the Nation, but to the bureaucrats it meant only a new and better opportunity for them to try to consolidate their positions and become all-powerful. They reached into the judicial branch of the Government, and men flitted back and forth between the executive and judicial branches in such a way as seriously to undermine public faith in our judicial institution.

Finally, these bureaucrats thought the great moment had come for their ultimate conquest. They sought the reduction of the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, to a mere formality—a confirmed, suppliant, and permanent rubber stamp. They first began to defy the Congress. If they desired a law and Congress refused to pass it, the bureaucrats achieved their purpose through some regulation supported by ready legal opinion. If an appropriation for one of their pet projects was refused by the Congress they promptly turned to an Executive allocation of blank check funds, regardless of the fact that such action necessarily violated the trust imposed by the people and the Congress in the executive department of the Government.

These bureaucrats actually had the insolence—and I may say the bad judgment—to believe a Nation should grovel at their feet. They thought they had the power, the money, and sufficient control of the Government, to destroy any who might oppose them. For a long time they rode high. Fear was everywhere. No one dared to venture into business without extensive legal advice. Any citizen who dared to question these would-be Caesars was denounced as an unpatriotic reactionary and an American Fascist.

All of this is the more remarkable, when we stop to remember that many of these bureaucratic so-called experts, before being placed in their exalted, powerful, and lucrative positions in the Government, never knew what it was to have authority over anything, or anyone. Nevertheless, some of them overnight danced their way into a reputation as geniuses. Their alleged marvelous abilities, and great capacity for leadership, were extolled by 30,000 paid propagandists, more or less, who have cost the taxpayers of this Nation more than $30,000,000 a year. The cattle raisers of Colorado can get some conception of this huge annual sum which they, as taxpayers, have to pay out each year to provide this personal publicity for these bureaucrats if they will figure how many head of cattle they would have to produce in this State to pay that $30,000,000 each year. The farmers of Colorado might appraise the value of a mile of beet rows, and compute how many hundreds of thousands of miles of beet rows they must plant and harvest to pay that $30,000,000 a year for bureaucratic publicity.

This publicity propaganda literally drenched the air waves, to the exclusion of more worth-while programs. It was dinned into the ears of the American people from platform and radio. It met the eyes of the American people from newspapers, booklets, and pam-

phlets, printed at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers and scattered through this Nation by the millions of copies—literally, and actually, by the trainloads.

But, said Mr. Lincoln, "You can't fool all the people all the time." The bureaucrats reached too far. With their insatiable lust for power, they reached too high. When they set out to discredit the Congress, to make that institution the scapegoat for the bungling, and the confusion, and the contradictory policies, which characterized the executive department, they attempted something that could not succeed with the American people. At first there was, or appeared to be, some popular reaction to this campaign of "smear the Congress." The people were for some months uneasy. They did not want to do anything which would interfere in the slightest with the war effort. But as the ineptitude, the internal quarrels, the contradictions, the conflicts, the confusion, and the unreasonableness of much of the operation of these bureaucrats in the executive department of the Government became more and more apparent, the people were convinced that the difficulty lay, not with the Congress but with bureaucrats who, with unparalleled boldness and insolence, had endeavored to put themselves, under cover of the war necessities, beyond the control of the Congress and to usurp the legislative functions.

The people of the South, who had hopefully accepted all the nostrums handed out as democratic medicine, became worried. They saw the States' rights for which many a gallant southern leader had died vanishing, as they were cajoled and coerced with their own money. Some of the most able leaders of the Southland became disturbed as they anxiously peered into the future and got some hint of what would lay ahead for them if this trend toward centralized Federal Government should continue.

The anxieties and fears of the South were shared by the people of New England. These anxieties spread all over the East and began to spread westward to your own lovely State of Colorado and on across the Rockies to the Pacific. Everybody began to wonder what was going on in Washington. They didn't like the look of much they observed. Although they had had some help from the United States Treasury, because nobody could spend billions without giving some help, the people began to realize more keenly that, after all, this was really their own money—money which they would be obliged to repay in taxes.

The people were whole-heartedly in favor of a vigorous and victorious prosecution of the war. They would pay taxes and sacrifice for this great effort without stint. But they wanted the war fought not as a partisan conflict but as a war of all the American people to crush and destroy a threat to the lives and the liberties of the American people. Little wonder the people became so seriously disturbed over the confusion and the bewilderment and the contradiction which characterize the efforts of little men in big administrative posts, struggling with each other for power while war production lagged. Doubt gave way to dismay as the people witnessed the sad spectacle of men in important war posts bitterly accusing each other of delaying the war efforts while they played personal power politics. So, then, it was the American people, an aroused and worried American people who decided in their own homes and in their own communities to do something about this unconscionable official bungling in Washington. They decided to try to crush out partisan politics in the war effort. That was what precipitated the change in the complexion of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The new Congress, backed by the people, asserted itself. It began to put the bureaucrats somewhat in their places. It began what historians, some day, will record as an epochal fight to reclaim delegated powers extended in a sincere desire to facilitate the war effort, but which had been shamefully abused, and misused, by self-seeking bureaucrats, who thought more of their own power and profit than they did about the welfare of their Nation. When the turmoil of war is ended, when events can be seen in their true perspective, history will find that it was in the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress in 1943 that the march of the bureaucrats toward supreme power was halted. With popular support the fight can be continued to a complete victory.

Even though the smear artists may seek to blot the names of those great, grand men who laid the foundations of this Nation, it will stand forever as a mark of their great wisdom that the founding fathers placed in the Constitution the power of appropriation in the hands of the people's representatives in the Congress. That they meant to do this to meet just exactly the danger which has confronted the Nation in this growth of bureaucratic power was testified to by Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"The representatives of the people in Congress are alone competent to judge of the general disposition of the people, and to what precise point of reformation they are ready to go."

Along with its new assertion of responsibility, the Congress must have a definite program of action, if we are to measure up to the expectations of the Nation.

We shall, of course, continue to give full, vigorous support to the war effort, as every Member of the Congress has done in the past. The conduct of the war, in large measure, almost wholly, rests with the Army and the Navy, and the Congress has not failed, and will not fail, to give them everything needed as they press forward to bring about the earliest possible victory.

The Congress must be watchful of the conduct of the war. It must be, and is, ready to protect the interests of the people. It must, without fear or favor, point out any errors of omission or commission. It must make constructive suggestions, if and when the occasion demands. This all must be in a cooperative spirit. There is no inclination on the part of the great majority of the Members of the Congress to want to take, even for a moment, the control or direction of any war plan, or war strategy, out of the hands of the military and naval experts.

This, fellow citizens, is no time for petty fault finding. It is no time for anybody to pursue a course of narrow partisanship. America is imperiled both abroad and at home. The call to protect it is above the interest of any party, or any section, or any group, or any man.

The Congress has delegated great powers to the several branches of the executive department of the Government. This was necessary because the details of war activity must be carried out by the executive machinery of the Government. It remains a fact, however, that the Congress, having yielded these powers, has a direct and solemn obligation to the people to watch carefully their use. Congress must ever be ready to amend, restrict, or even to recall any authority granted if new conditions, or misuse of the powers, should make it essential to the public interest to do so. Above all, it is the imperative duty of the Congress to take back these powers when the war is over. We do not want to copy Hitler. We do not want to fight a war against dictatorship abroad, and set up a dictatorship in America as a permanent fixture.

Pursuant to its responsibility, the Congress has intervened in several matters to save or to attempt to save the people from bungling inefficiency as in the O. P. A. The Members of Congress saw that a group of inexperienced novices were badly upsetting the economic life of the Nation and moved in with the constructive requirement that the head officials of the different branches of the O. P. A. should have had some practical knowledge and experience with the handling of the commodity over which they were given power to pronounce a life or death sentence. Congress believed, and I am sure you will agree, that a little practical experience wouldn't be a handicap, even for a bureaucrat.

The responsibility rests upon the Congress to protect the country from the natural impulses of any group of zealots who would, under cover of the war, impose their particular brand of totalitarian economics upon the people. Sheer fairness to our millions of fighting men and women decrees that if we are to consider any fundamental change in our form of government, and our system of free enterprise, we should wait until they are back home and can have something to say about what choice shall be made.

Aware that this group of experimentalists who would make the Nation a vast collection of social and economic guinea pigs if they could, the Congress moved to rescind the regulation—which it had previously emphatically rejected—that no one could receive a salary of more than $25,000 a year. The bureaucrats wanted to enforce this plan. They asked the Congress to legalize their desires by an act. The request was refused, and assurances demanded that the act which contained this power would not be used for such a purpose. The ink was hardly dry on the signatures making the act a law when the promise to the Congress was boldly and cynically broken. Then the Congress acted—as it should have—and rescinded the regulation. This is but one of several instances in which the most solemn promises of the bureaucrats made to the Congress have been insolently and cynically broken the moment the Congress accepted those promises. The issue here was not the merit or lack of merit of the particular regulation. It was whether the bureaucrats or Congress should make the laws of the land. Changes of this wide-sweeping character must remain within the direction of Congress if we are to have popular government.

Congress must protect and perpetuate the American system of free enterprise. We hear a lot of talk about maintaining the rights and the privileges of the common man, and rightfully so. America was founded on the rights and privileges of the common man. It grew great through a system of free enterprise in which the rights and privileges of the common man were exercised and enjoyed by the common man. That is exactly why, throughout all the years of our Nation's history, the son of the poorest common man in the country could aspire to wealth in business or the White House in politics and have as much hope of realizing his dreams as any other boy in the Nation if he had the stuff in him. I can speak with heartfelt sincerity and real knowledge on his subject, because I started life as the son of a poor family. I can testify as to the blessings of the rights and privileges of the common man, both in business and in politics. My country's system of free enterprise and free politics has been good to me, and I testify that it is the greatest system on earth for the common man. And we don't want any experimentalists with strange and foreign ideas as to how humanity ought to be run to destroy that system so rich with blessings and opportunities for the common man and the children of the common man. Misguided zeal must not

make the common man always remain a common man.

The most drastic economy in nonessential expenditures is an absolute necessity if we are to maintain national solvency. The proponents of borrowing ourselves out of debt and of spending ourselves back into prosperity will land the Nation in the swamp of bankruptcy if we don't curb them.

In the first session of the present Congress we saved the taxpayers more than a billion dollars a year and the potential savings through useless bureaus eliminated will go higher. And I submit that a billion dollars a year is still a lot of money in any man's language.

Congress must guard against the absorption of States' rights by means of Federal grants-in-aid. If Federal appropriations for aid of States are necessary, let them be made, but keep control of State activities and State policies within the States themselves.

We are learning with great uneasiness that important and far-reaching commitments are being made by the executive department of the Government to other nations. The American people are being committed to responsibilities they know nothing of. This should not be. Our constitutional system provides for the ratification by the Senate of foreign treaties and important commitments, and this is the only safe and proper way. Yet every day we are hearing and reading of secret conferences, star-chamber sessions in which the results are so censored the Congress and the people are kept in complete ignorance of anything but the bare information that they have been committed to some new course of world action. This is utterly dangerous, and the Congress must insist on more information and more part in these conferences, and, certainly, in the final decisions. It has become a popular, and exceedingly dangerous game among the bureaucrats in Washington of bypassing Congress. That means they are bypassing the American people as well. Congress should insist upon having representatives at all conferences.

These are a few of the responsibilities which confront the Congress. The people should make known to their Representatives their will in these matters. They have not lost their right of petition to their Congress They have not relinquished their absolute right to tell their public servants what they want done—and they never should. There have been many attempts lately to convince the Nation that in some mysterious way the people have suddenly become subjects and the bureaucrats the masters. But this isn't so. These petty tyrants can remain petty tyrants only if the people permit them to. Public opinion is still by far the strongest power, economic and political, in America.

The Congress wants the United States to assume all proper responsibilities in readjusting the post-war world, but Congress wants the people to know what adjustments will be necessary and what responsibilities America must undertake. We want to help all the other peoples of the world back to sanity, peace, and progress, but we can only help them if they are willing to help themselves; we cannot alone achieve that sanity, peace, and progress for all the rest of the world.

We all realize the desirability of a peaceful, prosperous world. We all want all the peoples of the world to be free—when they want freedom, and are ready for it.

Only a safe, sane, sound, solvent America can help the rest of the world back to peace and prosperity. Nobody ever saved a drowning man by jumping in and sinking with him.

Our first job, our first duty to ourselves and to our posterity, and to the rest of the world is to keep America strong, solvent, free, to be a beacon of hope, a torch of progress, a ready help for all people of the rest of the world who want to achieve freedom and who want to live in peace. Let us see to it that we perform that duty fully and earnestly; that those who are making the supreme sacrifice in this war, together with those who in past wars have yielded up their all upon the altar of their country's defense shall not have died in vain.

Let us see to it that this Nation, under God, shall survive and go on, under a government of, by, and for the people.

Moore Dry Dock Co., of San Francisco and Oakland, Calif., Receives Maritime M

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Americans have but a single purpose—winning the war. We shall leave no stone unturned in making sure of defeating those who would so ruthlessly destroy our way of life. Never again will the people of this Republic permit treacherous oppression to rear its ugly head. Mercy and freedom shall prevail.

Last August 14 I had the privilege of attending a most unique ship-launching ceremony at the Moore yards. The Moore Dry Dock Co. maintains its office in San Francisco and plant in Oakland, Calif. The Moore organization was prepared for the war shipbuilding program and has made an enviable record. August 14, 1943, will long be remembered in the history of San Francisco Bay area. The Moore shipbuilders launched three splendid vessels and, at the same time, received the coveted maritime M award. The day also marked the seventieth birthday anniversary of Joseph A. Moore, chairman of the board.

Ships and shipping are synonymous with San Francisco. My home city has produced a long line of shipping men. But no one has contributed more to the shipbuilding industry than Joe Moore, and I am pleased to enter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Moore's remarks. Also, I insert addresses by Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission; Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade, commandant of the twelfth naval district; Carl W. Flesher, west coast regional director of the Maritime Commission; and Joseph A. Moore, Jr., president of the Moore Dry Dock Co.

The sponsors of the three ships were Joe Moore's daughter and daughters-in-law. Mrs. John E. Mock christened the steamship *Spitfire*, Mrs. Joseph A. Moore, Jr., the *Monarch of the Seas*, and Mrs. James Rolph Moore *Herald of the Morning*.

The occasion was one of loyalty, patriotic devotion, and sentiment. It is fitting for the Nation to take pride in such stirring events.

Chairman of the day, William Baldwin, in presenting Mr. Moore said:

It is sentimentally significant that the Moore Dry Dock Co. and employees should be honored with the award of the maritime M on the birthday of its chairman. Mr. Moore has led his organization through wars and peace, a pioneer shipbuilder on the Pacific coast since the turn of the century. It is my privilege to present to you Mr. Joseph A. Moore.

Joseph A. Moore responded:

Thank you, Mr. Baldwin. This is probably the greatest day in the history of the Moore Dry Dock Co. Personally, I am very proud and happy to congratulate the employees of this company for their efforts which have enabled them, and the company, to win the merit award to be presented by the United States Maritime Commission. The design and workmanship on vessels constructed in our yards require exceptional ability and experience, and our success in attaining the maritime M is due to the fact that the employees of this organization have possessed those qualifications. I cannot too highly compliment them on the work they have accomplished. The reputation for quality of workmanship, which has stood through many years, is something in which all of them may have personal pride; it has been built by the production of fine ships, as well as through the performance of difficult repair and conversion work. Many of the men and women in our yards are engaged in an entirely new line of work and the successful adjustment of their lives to the changed conditions and environment is the best possible tribute to their loyalty, and to their determination to play a part in this great cause of freedom and decency.

We've had a tough job to perform thus far and yet, it may well be there's still a bigger job ahead. No one knows when the end of this war will come, and until it does it's our task to go all out in our efforts. We must build and repair more and more ships to carry equipment and supplies to those heroic men out on the battle fronts. Thousands of our own men are out there—over fifteen thousand from our yard are in the armed forces—some have gone to the great beyond—and I believe that every man and woman in this organization is determined that these sacrifices shall not have been in vain. We'll fight for production on this home front until our soldiers and sailors and aviators all come home with the flag of victory flying high. That's our job and we propose to do it.

It gives me great pleasure to welcome the vast audience of employees and guests who are here today to witness the presentation of the Merit Award and the triple launching which will take place immediately after the award is made. And further I would like to say that we were very happy to be advised by Rear Admiral H. L. Vickery, vice chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, that the presentation would be made by Admiral Greenslade. And so, ladies and gentlemen, I take great pleasure in presenting to you our very good friend, Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade, commandant of the Twelfth Naval District.

ADMIRAL GREENSLADE

Mr. Moore, Mr. Moore, Jr., Mr. Flesher, distinguished guests, and employees and executives of the Moore Dry Dock Co.—

1. It is a pleasure as well as an altogether agreeable duty to be here this morning with you men and women of Moore Dry Dock Co. and to share with you in the ceremonies recognizing and honoring your accomplishments. It is an added personal pleasure to congratulate Mr. Moore, chairman of the board, upon the occasion of his birthday. Both are memorable events—milestones in

the history of an able man and in the record of a company's distinguished service.

2. Although I speak now by invitation of the Maritime Commission and as the Commission's official representative, I assure you that your Navy is likewise vitally interested and concerned in all phases of your effort. So are the other services, our whole civilian population, our allies and, in fact, every person who waits and works for the utter defeat of Japan and Germany.

3. It has become universally apparent, I am sure, that the steadily increasing pressure of Allied offensives on both land and seas has followed paralleled improvements in the shipping situation. Our successes in the southwest Pacific, the Aleutians, and the Mediterranean have been finally dependent upon ship-borne men and ship-borne supplies and ship-borne weapons. When other fronts are opened, these, too, will call imperatively for ever-increasing tonnages. We are invasion-bent for victory; record-breaking production goals have been set because victory itself can come only as a record-breaking achievement.

4. Because of outstanding work, you men and women here before me have been singled out by the Maritime Commission as a select group worthy of a signal honor. The repair and conversion program of your company has resulted in the return to service of one ship already in commission every 16 hours since Pearl Harbor. The new, fast cargo ships which leave this yard add important volume to the transportation lines which are carrying defeat to the Axis powers. It is undoubtedly a particular source of pride—and rightly so—to Moore employees and management alike that operational methods in these departments of cargo ship construction, conversion, and repair have reached such an enviable degree of efficiency.

5. But you all must remember also that you assume major responsibilities with the granting of this Maritime "M" award. You have proved your mettle. The growing pains of a remarkable, as well as dislocating, plant expansion are behind you now. You are largely a seasoned lot, with an established minimum capacity which must be dependably maintained. With this fund of experience to call upon, you will be prepared for such future production changes and contingencies as may arise—and can be expected to take these in stride.

6. It may be that victory is just around the corner. I would not presume to contradict the soothsayers who appear to be much more certain on this score than I can pretend to be. But I would suggest that there already have been many such apparent corners in this war—yet we still fight on. There were Dunkerque, the blitz of Britain, Pearl Harbor, and Stalingrad.

7. We and our allies have risen from disaster. We have assumed the offensive, yes. But war-weariness and let-down are dangerous and expensive luxuries in any such finish fight. Our enemies have more than once hoisted fraudulent white flags, then mercilessly slaughtered the victims of their ruse. Now they must come to us with upraised arms or be destroyed. And the men and women of Moore Dry Dock Co. will continue, I am confident, to stand by their tools and ignore the white flags of prophecy. Let the German and Japanese masters, together with their completely dominated industrial workers and slaves, surrender unconditionally to democracy and free labor before you relax your guard.

8. So, with confidence in final victory and confidence in you, it gives me great pleasure to present on behalf of the United States Maritime Commission, this maritime M pennant and the victory fleet flag. This award, Mr. Moore, is a symbol of achievement earned by you and your employees. May you continue to fly it with the pride of accomplishment and as full partners in democracy until victory is ours.

JOSEPH A. MOORE, JR.

Admiral Greenslade, distinguished guests and fellow workers, it is a real honor and privilege to accept this maritime M pennant and victory fleet flag in behalf of the men and women of Moore Dry Dock Co. This award is made in recognition of the quality and quantity of work performed in the construction, conversion and repair of merchant vessels.

Moore Dry Dock Co. is a pioneer organization on the Pacific coast. The pioneer tradition which has developed here is one of which we can all be proud. Pioneers have always striven toward new goals, toward new horizons. To all of us here, this flag will serve as a beacon to draw us to still higher and greater goals of achievement.

I should like, at this time, to acknowledge with thanks the untiring assistance that has come to us from the Maritime Commission and its west coast regional director and his staff; furthermore, our subcontractors and vendors have worked with us heart and soul and to all of these groups goes much of the credit. It is a pleasure to acknowledge their continuing efforts.

I know that to each of us this award means recognition of the time that we put just a little more into the job, of the time when we did a little more than our best. The memory of this occasion will help us all to remember our obligations to those who are serving in the armed forces around the world. This spirit will remain with us as we fly the maritime pennant and assume its accompanying responsibilities. This award will be a symbol of our continued fight toward greater speed and efficiency in the production and repair of ships; thus we may aid in the service of our country.

It is with pride in that which has been accomplished and sincere appreciation of the work that remains to be done that we raise the maritime M pennant and the Victory fleet flag over the shipyards of the Moore Dry Dock Co.

In offering congratulations Admiral Emory S. Land, speaking over the radio, from Washington, had this to say:

It is a matter of great personal gratification to be privileged today to congratulate Joe Moore and every man and woman associated with him in the Moore Dry Dock Co. on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

Rounding out more than a half century of active association with shipping and shipbuilding, it is fitting that this dean of Pacific coast shipbuilders and his company should receive the Maritime Commission's merit award for distinguished service. It is the first such award made for outstanding achievement in shipbuilding, repairing and conversion, and it is a testimonial to the broad scope of the service the Moore Dry Dock Co. is rendering this Nation in the all-out war effort. Your organization made one of the finest shipbuilding contributions to the last World War. In the interval between that war and this, you have continued in the face of complicated and severe conditions to make further valuable contributions to the Nation's maritime progress.

Now, with a greatly enlarged plant and a force of more than 34,000 employees, of whom about 5,000 are women, you are making further shipbuilding records that will live to your everlasting credit in the history of your Nation's merchant marine and Navy.

To Joe Moore should go the grateful recognition of the American shipbuilding industry for his adoption and development of the most modern methods, such as prefabrication and welding. Those methods today are responsible in a great degree for the astounding shipbuilding records being made by the entire industry. Today you launch three C-2 ships for the Maritime Commission. That in itself is a fine testimonial to the vigor, the enthusiasm, and the ability of Joe Moore. It is an achievement that entitles him, his able sons, and every one of you associated with them to wear with the honor you so justly deserve the merit insigne of the Maritime Commission. That is as truly a decoration for distinguished service as any award made to the men of our fighting forces. It is full proof that workers and management have cooperated in the plant of the Moore Dry Dock Co. with a keen patriotic desire to make every possible contribution to victory for their Nation and its allies. It has taken brawn and brains to bring these results.

God gave us two ends to use. One to think with. One to sit with. The war depends on which we choose. Heads to win. Tails we lose.

The record of the Moore Dry Dock Co. could only have been attained because all of you have adopted the heads-we-win policy. On behalf of the Maritime Commission and the people of the Nation I desire to express our deep appreciation for your fine accomplishments.

Our wish is that Joe Moore and his great organization may go on together for many more years—to victory and far beyond, with continued health, prosperity, and happiness.

My personal congratulations to each of the charming sponsors—daughters of the boss.

And my special congratulations to every man and woman in the yards. You have arrived the hard way. More power to you. And give the Axis—you know what.

Each employee received an insignia of recognition. Carl N. Flesher conferred the badges with these words:

Admiral Greenslade, management and employees of the Moore Dry Dock Co., and honored guests, today is indeed a signal occasion for the management and employees of the Moore shipyard. No shipyard on the west coast has been confronted with such a complex production problem, for you are building ships for both the Navy and the Maritime Commission, and these of dissimilar design. In addition to new construction you have a tremendous amount of repair and conversion work, which adds further difficulties. Your accomplishment during the past year, however, is evidence that the management and men of this yard have what it takes to handle such a complicated problem.

The M flag is not given lightly; it is given only to those with steadfast purpose and constant effort who set production records for others to emulate. Men on the fighting front receive medals for valor beyond the call of duty. It is only fitting and proper that your Government should likewise give due recognition to the people on the home front for excellency in production, and that is the real meaning of the merit badges that every employee of the Moore Dry Dock Co. is now entitled to wear. Today is to be packed with one stirring event after another, but I feel it would be incomplete if we did not also celebrate Mr. Moore's seventieth birthday for, after all, this occasion has been made possible only through his many years of hard work, enterprise, and perseverance. He has, I am sure, steered this yard through many rough seas. One of Mr. Moore's favorite songs is The Builder, and it is indeed appropriate, for not only has he built the finest ships to sail the seven seas but, far more important, he has, over a period of years, built character in hundreds of men and women who have been associated with him. Many men in the shipyards on the west coast received their first training under the

guidance of Mr. Moore; and well has he schooled his own sons and daughters to follow the work of his chosen profession.

Admiral Land has just expressed his appreciation for your fine accomplishments and loyalty, and I wish to express my sincere appreciation on behalf of the west coast regional office for the important part that you thousands of men and women of the Moore Dry Dock Co. have played in contributing to this miracle of shipbuilding.

And now I am happy to present the merit insignia to three representative employees, Mrs. Pearl E. Lane, of the purchasing department; Mr. Frank A. Forthaus, of the hull department; and Mr. Frank H. Nyman, of the machine shop. As soon as distribution can be made, every employee of the company will receive this same award, a symbol of recognition of individual work well done.

A Remarkable Construction Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when the new MacArthur lock was opened at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., on July 11, 1943, it marked the completion of one of the most remarkable construction achievements in the history of this Nation. This $14,000,000 lock was completed in less than 14 months. The last preceding lock constructed at the same point took over 6 years to build at a cost of approximately $2,000,000.

A chronological history of the construction of this new MacArthur lock, together with an account of the program of the dedication ceremony, appeared in the Evening News of Sault Ste. Marie, in the issue of July 10, 1943.

Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article at this point:

CEREMONY IN UNITED STATES PARK AT 2:30 SUNDAY—E AWARDED TO COMPANY IN MORNING; BOAT TRIP IN THE AFTERNOON—MANY NOTABLES COMING

Sault Ste. Marie's new Victory lock on Victory Canal will be dedicated officially Sunday, July 11, to victory of the United Nations and named for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, hero of Bataan and commander of all Allied forces in the south Pacific.

Dedication of the lock, further assurance that the Allied cause will not lack for steel, will be in three parts:

Ten a. m. at the lock park, presentation of the Army-Navy E for excellence to the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.

One p. m., Hotel Ojibway, luncheon as guests of Great Lakes for 250 with Col. P. N. Strong, district engineer, as host.

Two-thirty p. m., trip by guests through the MacArthur lock aboard the freighter *Carl Bradley* and dedication of lock by Brig. Gen. David McCoach.

After the passage of the *Bradley*, the lock will accommodate the first down-bound boat to come along, and then thrown open to play its mighty part in sending 95,000,000 tons of iron ore to steel mills for armaments and arsenals of nations.

SABIN ALSO NAMED

Officially named at the same time will be the Sabin or fourth lock in the battery of four. The Sabin, 1,350 feet long, was opened in 1919 and popularly known since as the Sabin but never officially so designated. Now an act of Congress has placed upon it the name of L. C. Sabin, at that time civilian engineer here and now vice president of the Lakes Carriers Association.

Completed in 14 months compared to an original schedule of 20 months, the MacArthur lock will be used to supplement the work of the three existing modern locks of the vital waterway through which the big ore and grain ships move from Lake Superior into the St. Mary's River and thence to Lake Huron and the receiving ports of the Great Lakes.

Exact dimensions of the MacArthur lock and details of the present flow of shipping through this most important of the world's fresh-water canals are Army secrets, but it is commonly supposed to be 80 feet wide, 800 feet long, and 30 feet deep.

The United States engineers, which directed the work of the private contractors, revealed that 200,000 cubic yards of concrete were poured into the side walls, approach piers, and floor area, covering more than 60,000 square feet.

POURED DURING WINTER

Much of the concrete was poured during winter months at temperatures as low as 30° below zero. Plywood houses built around each section of the lock and heated with electric blowers enabled the work to go forward despite the weather.

MacArthur lock, opening Lake Superior to ocean traffic, is regarded as insurance against military action or sabotage aimed at the canal. Other projects were considered, including the bringing of iron ore by rail from the Minnesota and upper Michigan mines to Escanaba, Mich., on Lake Michigan, and huge docks have been brought to near completion for emergency use in event anything happened to the locks.

The Sault Ste. Marie Canal dates from 1855, when the first small lock was built so that boats could enter and leave Lake Superior. The rapids of the St. Marys River are impassable because of rocks and the swift current. The Weitzel lock, built under Federal supervision, came next. The MacArthur lock is located on its site.

The first of the big locks was built in 1896 and named for Col. O. M. Poe. The two modern locks, Davis and Sabin, are identical.

The canal consists now of the four big locks, each of which can be used separately to bypass the rapids.

Generally speaking, the locks of the canal can be filled or emptied in about 13 minutes and the gates opened in 1½ minutes. Electricity generated by water power is used for operating the machinery and 400 men are required to run the canal, exclusive of the military guard.

In the construction of the MacArthur lock as much as 2,000 cubic yards of concrete was poured each day, with 1,000 men employed by the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., the principal contractors. Much of the excavation was done in hard rock, necessitating considerable blasting. For this, holes 11 feet deep were drilled in rows 3 feet apart, filled with sticks of blasting gelatin and sand, and detonated simultaneously by electricity.

Sunday's ceremonies are scheduled to be attended by Maj. Gen. Samuel T. Lawton, commander of the Sault Ste. Marie military area district; Brig. Gen. David M. McCoach, Assistant Chief of Engineers; Col. R. G. Barrows, division engineer, Great Lakes division; Gov. Harry F. Kelly, of Michigan, and Representative Fred Bradley, of the Eleventh Congressional District, all of whom will make speeches.

Lt. Col. Donald E. Antes, of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, will present the Army-Navy E award to the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., following which all the officials will board an up-bound boat for the first lockage.

Chronologically, highlights in the construction of the MacArthur lock are:

January 16, 1942: The Senate Commerce Committee has unanimously recommended adoption of a bill offered by Senator Prentiss M. Brown (Democrat, Michigan) to provide for construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., at an estimated cost of $8,000,000.

The committee reported that the bill was introduced at the request of the O. P. M. (Office of Production Management) with the War Department approval.

January 17: The Senate Friday approved legislation authorizing construction of a new $8,000,000 lock on the St. Marys Falls Canal at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

Senator Brown (Democrat, Michigan) said that the new lock was needed to speed movement of iron ore required by the war effort.

January 27: The urgency of construction of a new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie was held up by dispute today, with one critic suggesting that political reasons may have motivated backers of the plan in taking it directly to the Senate.

February 3: The House Rivers and Harbors Committee rejected today a motion by Representative BENDER (Republican, Ohio) to recommend passage of a Senate approved bill to authorize immediate construction of an $8,000,000 lock for the Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Canal was attached to the pension-repeal bill by Senator Prentiss M. Brown yesterday.

The rider, with which Brown sought to force speedy House action on the proposed project was accepted on a voice vote.

March 2: With only a score of Members present, the Senate today passed legislation completing action in the passage of the Sault lock bill as a rider to the pension-repeal bill. The bill now awaits the signature of the President.

March 28: A bill appropriating $9,300,000 for construction of a new lock and related works at Sault Ste. Marie contained in a Senate amendment to the War Department civil functions appropriation bill was passed yesterday by the House.

It now goes back to the Senate because the House rejected other amendments.

May 4: Work began today on the new lock with a dredge and derrick tearing away the Weitzel Lock walls above and below the upper gate.

Main contract for the job was awarded by the United States Engineers to Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. last week.

May 6: The Poe Lock was closed today while lockmen made inspections to see if any damage had resulted to the lock's wall from dynamiting operations for the new lock.

May 12, 1942: The lock is now an area of digging, dredging, and blasting.

Except for spots near the upper and lower gates, Joshua and his trumpet have had nothon the Great Lakes Dredge and Dock crew that now has nearly all of the walls torn down. A bulldozer is piling the tumbling earth.

Fitted steel piling is being driven preliminary to the construction of the cofferdam which will make possible the pumping out of water and removal of rock. The rock will be taken out on trucks and dumped onto scows.

May 27, 1942: The lower gates of the Weitzel lock were torn down in the forging of the new lock canyon.

Spiles are being driven across the end of the lock connecting the northwestern pier with the southern bank.

June 1, 1942: Workmen have completed driving spiles for the lock's cofferdam and trucks are hauling clay to fill in the cylinders above the lock. Half of the cylinders are filled.

June 3, 1942: Lt. Col. Paschal N. Strong arrived in the Sault today to take over duties as supervising engineer, United States Engineer Corps, of the new lock construction. Colonel Strong will have his offices in the administration building.

June 3, 1942: Huge dump trucks of Speedway in Chicago have now the task of filling in the upper cofferdam about three quarters completed.

June 5, 1942: The upper cofferdam unit was completed today and water in the Weitzel lock lowered to a level with Lake Huron. Already explosive air hammers are ripping away at the cement in order to tear down an upper gate.

June 11, 1942: Workmen of the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. have just completed removal of the Weitzel lock gates.

July 7, 1942: Sault people are now accustomed to having their windows rattle and beds shake from the blasting which is loosening rock on the floor of the new lock. A 9½-pound rock that ended its flight through a window and onto the floor of the Booth Produce Co., on Portage West has been the first tangible sign of the blasting. Showers of smaller rock and clay land on the street.

July 10, 1942: Speedway Wrecking Co. trucks are busy hauling out dynamite-loosened rock from the lock bottom. The trucks roll up a road that has been graded into the valley, travel on Portage Avenue, and then up a wooden ramp that has been constructed at the head of the locks. From the wooden ramp their load is dumped onto scows that dispose of it in a deep part of Lake Superior.

July 11, 1942: Drillers whittling away the concrete lock wall beside the Administration building are setting up a machine-gun-like barrage. Within the lower cofferdam the water is a coffee color and hydraulic pumps are being set in operation to remove the liquid. The coral red clay within the lock colors pools of water on the lock floor.

July 15, 1942: Speed is the keynote of the construction with trucks rushing a load of red rock and clay out of the valley every 2 minutes the clock around, and bright lights making it possible for work to continue in the night. The hydraulic pumps have lowered water in the cofferdam 8 feet already. Steel spiles have been erected to strengthen the weakened Poe lock walls.

September 1: The tearing down is nearly completed and the actual building up of a new lock began this week as the first wooden forms are being laid against the south wall in the western end of the lower cofferdam.

The forms are of wood and will support steel rods. Concrete will be poured into the forms to make the blocks or monoliths that will form the lock walls.

September 10: The first blocks of concrete are being poured into the wooden forms from trucks of the Cleveland Builders & Supply Co. The concrete is brought in liquid form from the company's yard below the bascule bridge and is mixed on the trucks on the way to the lock. It then goes through a hydraulic "pumpcrete" which directs it evenly into the wooden form.

September 16: Two shafts are being sunk somewhere on the locks to start an underground tunnel that will be 500 feet long and a hundred feet down. The tunnel is to be used for carrying electrical cables and other operating equipment. The depth will make it bombproof. The tunnel will be lined with concrete and is the work of the John C. Tully Co., subcontractor.

September 30: Ten of the concrete blocks to form the new lock walls have been completed by the 11 trucks on the job. Since skilled truck drivers are scarce, some of the drivers are working a double shift. As soon as the concrete hardens in the form the outer frame is torn off.

The north wall and side of the lock are still being widened and deepened.

November 5: A thousand truckloads of the red clay that was hauled out of the lock pit have now been dumped in the slot between the concrete blocks and the Magazine Street wall. Later, sand will be dumped on top of the clay for topping.

November 5: Water seeping through small cracks in the lock wall is forming pools on the lock floor, making working conditions difficult. Some men have quit because of the dampness, coupled with the cold weather.

November 17: Forms to hold the gates that will swing the new lock are being placed in the pit by Great Lakes Dredge & Dock workmen and the bases to hold the gates in place have already been set in the arc-shaped pits dug for them in the upper west end of the "diggin's."

First outside appearance of the service tunnel being built by John C. Tully Co. is under the administration building, where it comes out on a level with the floor of the pit. The horizontal tunnel is about 12 feet high and 11 feet wide.

The new lock wall is beginning to take shape. On the side of the pit nearest to Portage Avenue the wall, over a hundred feet high, is completed from the east end of the cofferdam to a point opposite the administration building, and work is being done to build a lock wall beside the administration building.

Steam heating apparatus has been keeping the concrete from freezing and the pipes carrying steam vapor form a web to many different parts of the project.

December 19: Cold weather is here, but it isn't stopping Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. workmen. Last night they worked on the ice-slippery wooden forms through 11-below weather and a stiff wind. Some donned as many as three pairs of trousers for the ordeal.

Work from now on will consist mainly of the construction of forms and pouring of concrete. Some clay is still being hauled from the immense pit's floor.

The wooden forms surrounding the cement also serve as a framework for a large green canvas within which the men work and manage to keep warmer and away from the wind.

The accident rate has increased some due to the ice on the forms.

February 20, 1943: Cleveland Builders & Supply Co. poured the one hundred thousandth cubic yard of concrete into forms today, marking the approximate halfway point in concrete pouring for the lock walls.

March 10: Concrete is now being poured to make the additional blocks to fill in the empty spaces between the blocks poured in the first round. In the making of the first set of blocks room was left between each two of the gigantic concrete forms for another block. This empty space gave room to work in. Now the empty spaces are being filled and a solid wall is in the formation.

Filling-in operations are still taking place with the heavy dump trucks emptying their loads of red clay behind completed sections of the wall.

April 16: Sections and machinery that will go into the new lock are beginning to arrive by train and are run into the job on a track that leads from the D. S. S. & A. station to the locks.

June 5: The lock pit is now filled with a maze of steel. The massive gates are being set into place requiring the aid of cables, derricks, and other machines to lift the sections into place.

The cofferdam has been removed following the completion of the wall below the locks and now those wishing to cross over to the other locks are obliged to use an auxiliary gate in line with the Osborn Boulevard entrance and the administration building.

Above the locks another auxiliary gate holds back the water where the cofferdam was removed. Dredges are working a 24-hour shift removing the clay that piled on the bottom when the dam's clay-filled cylinders were torn apart.

June 25: Operations on the MacArthur lock are rapidly drawing to a close and Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. reports that the lock will be ready to turn over to the Government on July 4.

The last concrete was poured with the making of a stairway from the level of below the lock to the level of the lock wall. A similar set of steps was part of the old Weitzel lock.

Final tightening and riveting operations are being conducted to get the gates in shape and Great Lakes Dredge & Dock equipment is being moved out.

July 2: Sault's new lock was filled with water last night and today and will undergo a series of tests to be conducted by Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. before being turned over to the Government.

July 4: The Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. today turned over the $14,000,000, MacArthur lock to the Corps of Engineers for final testing before the lock is put into operation. Tests conducted by the construction company found everything satisfactory, a representative of the company said.

Sunday, July 11: Official opening of MacArthur lock.

NEW LOCK FACTS

Built by United States Corps of Engineers.

Contractor, Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.

Started May 4, 1942, finished July 4, 1943.

Construction time, 14 months; estimated 20 months.

Approximate cost, with incidental works $14,000,000.

Dedicated July 11, 1943.

Named for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, commander in chief of United Nations forces in south Pacific.

The Task Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New York Times of Tuesday, September 14, 1943.

While I do not always agree with the New York Times' editorials, I am impressed with this editorial because it gives expression to the thoughts of many of my constituents.

The editorial follows:

THE TASK BEFORE CONGRESS

After a 2 months' vacation, Congress resumes its session today. The demands upon it have not lessened. It is faced with some of the most momentous decisions that a

national legislature has even been called upon to meet. In what spirit, and by what method, shall it meet them?

There is an influential school of thought which holds that it is the main if not the sole function of Congress to "cooperate" with the President. It is true that it is one of the functions of Congress to cooperate with the President to the extent that it reasonably can—otherwise the prosecution of the war would be impeded and we should have a continual stalemate between the Executive and the legislature. But if to "cooperate" with the President is interpreted to mean, as it so often is, that it is the duty of Congress merely to act as a rubber stamp for the President, and to accept blindly whatever he proposes, then there would be no need for a Congress at all.

The whole purpose of a legislative body is to reflect the national will, and the multitudinous interests of the people, in a way in which no single man, no matter how gifted or sensitive, can possibly reflect them. A national legislature, with the opinions of one representative balanced against those of another, and with the consequent need for moderate compromises, is a guarantee against government by whim or caprice. It is a guarantee of government by discussion and popular participation. An independent and vigorous legislature, in short, is a necessary guarantee of democracy and domestic liberty.

The role that Congress can play, therefore, is an indispensable and potentially a great one. Unfortunately, it cannot be said so far to have measured up to its responsibilities. It has left undone much that it should have done and has done badly even the little that it has attempted. One need merely cite a few outstanding examples. Congress has had the opportunity as well as the duty to examine in a spirit of constructive criticism the conduct of the war. Its committees have made a few good reports and corrected some abuses. The Truman committee, in the Senate, has unquestionably done some useful work. But its general lack of judicial balance, its straining for the headlines, its championship, against expert opinion, of cotton instead of rayon for tire cord, its unsubstantiated charges against the P–40, and the nose dive in the manufacture of Wright motors which its methods helped to bring about, have led the committee so far to do more harm than good to the war effort.

In the field of labor, Congress has tolerated all sorts of abuses, most of which should never have been tolerated even in peacetime, let alone in war. There has been an imperative need for a reconsideration of the whole body of Federal labor laws. But instead of undertaking this, after the careful and comprehensive study that was called for, Congress hastily passed an ill-considered "antistrike" law that in its present form may actually do more to provoke strikes than to halt them. In the field of taxes Congress' record has been somewhat, but not much, better. It has failed to impose a tax bill calculated to close the "inflationary gap." In finally adopting, against administration opposition, a pay-as-you-go plan for income taxes, it levied a tax that was inexcusably complicated. Finally, in the field of international relations, the Senate has so far failed to provide that assurance of cooperation which will be necessary to give permanent meaning to our military victory when it has been achieved.

These failures on the part of Congress are partly failures of personnel. But they are no less the result of failure of organization. Congress lacks internal leadership. It is still pulled aimlessly hither and thither by a hundred standing and special committees, each insulated from the other and each sovereign in its own domain. Congress will never have a unified program, it will never take prompt and coherent action until it has a coherent organization, until it places above its present committees some central committee of its own selection whose leadership it is ready to accept.

Oil Is Scarce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 1st day of September, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War, made an able address dealing with the present gasoline situation. The address is important, and for that reason I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I come before you tonight with one of the most serious, one of the most urgent, one of the most important messages that I have given to you since this war began. I come before you to ask you—to plead with you in the utmost earnestness—to help us to avoid running out of gasoline. I come before you tonight to try to make it just as clear as I possibly can that we are faced with just that probability, if we continue any longer in the direction that we are traveling now. We are faced with just that probability, not only in the Eastern States, but in the entire Nation.

This statement will not be believed tonight on the Pacific coast and in the Rocky Mountains area, except by the oil men who know in their hearts that it is true. The stock position in those regions is comfortable now, but if the people there could know of the military demands that lie ahead, when the war in the Pacific really gets under way, they would know that there is anything but comfort ahead for them, so far as sufficiency of gasoline is concerned.

My statement will not be generally believed tonight in the Middle West or the Southwest, either, because the people there have been deceived into believing that they dwell in a land of oil plenty. But these sections, too, are living on borrowed time, so far as gasoline is concerned, as the physical facts will prove in the not very distant future.

My statement will not be accepted tonight—incredible though it may seem—even by some people in the East. But, to the motorists of the East, I want to give this unequivocal warning:

If there is any appreciable increase in gasoline consumption in the Eastern States above the present rate, we will be out of gasoline in a matter of days.

Now, I realize that these are strong statements; that they are alarming. They probably call for clarification in view of the revocation today of the ban on nonessential driving—the so-called pleasure-driving ban. But there should be no confusion to those who read that statement carefully. It has been emphasized that the revocation of the ban did not mean that the gasoline supply situation had improved. It meant simply a change in administrative policy. The O. P. A. has emphasized that it did not like the pleasure-driving ban. The public had made it plain that it resented this system. I did not like it, nor did I invent it. The ban was invoked to meet a very critical situation at a time when filling stations were out of gasoline and when our entire east coast transportation system was threatened with disruption. It was a crisis measure, designed to meet a crisis, and it did meet it. But it was recognized by all concerned that the enforcement technique was not practicable nor desirable for a long-range operation, and so it has been abandoned.

The point that I want to make—the point that must be made—is that, while there is no law to prevent pleasure driving, neither is there at this time, any gasoline to permit it. My purpose here is to show you why there isn't more gasoline than there is and what you can do about it if you want to be able to continue using your car for even the most needful driving.

I can let it be known that we had figured upon September 1 as the date on which we could provide for a reasonably substantial increase in the gasoline available for east coast civilian use. But, today is September 1. And why has no such increase for the east coast materialized? Is the Petroleum Administration plugging up the spigot to keep the public from having gasoline which is there to be had? Some people have suggested that, but it is so absurd that it isn't worthy of an answer. We are supplying and always have supplied all of the oil to the east coast that we could. Each month, we certify to the O. D. T. the amount of gasoline that will be available for civilian use. The amount so certified is not just a figure that we decide upon arbitrarily as all that we think that the public ought to have. It represents all that we can count safely upon supplying, in the light of available transportation and in the light of war requirements.

And in spite of the fact that local shortages have developed as they inevitably will if the over-all inventories are tight, we have supplied to the Eastern States what we said that we would supply to that region.

Remember that all of our pipe lines, tank cars, barges, and tank trucks cannot be used to haul automotive gasoline for civilian consumption. They have to be used, also, to haul aviation gasoline in an ever-mounting volume, toluene for TNT, butadiene for synthetic rubber, heavy oil for the Navy, for the rapidly growing merchant marine, and for our war industries—yes, and furnace oil to keep America warm next winter. We have therefore refused to shift from our policy of using whatever transportation is necessary to increase the supply of furnace oil. We simply must not and will not provide for nonessential motoring at the risk of public health.

When we certified on June 26 that we could supply 342,000 barrels of automotive gasoline daily for civilian motor vehicles during the months of July, August, and September, we meant that this was all that we could supply in the face of these other obligations.

Out of this had to come the requirements for nonhighway use. The balance is what we are able to supply for civilian use—both commercial and private vehicles. The determination of how much shall be allotted to commercial vehicles and how much to passenger cars is made by the O. D. T. After O. D. T. has taken out what it decides should be allocated to commercial vehicles, the remainder is what is available for passenger automobiles.

Our calculations indicated that, if everything progressed according to plan, we would be able, by today, to certify an additional amount—perhaps about 50,000 barrels per day—for civilian consumption.

But, although we have supplied 342,000 barrels per day, consumption has not come within that figure. It has been exceeding that amount consistently for weeks, and is now out-pacing it by 30,000 to 35,000 barrels per day. This has caused a drain to that extent upon our already depleted inventories.

To this you may say: "But I have used only what my coupons entitled me to use; how then have I overconsumed?" The answer to this is: More coupons have been issued than we have gasoline with which to redeem them. Whatever restrictions upon motorcar use may be removed right now, this physical fact remains a physical fact, and unless the public will, ban or no ban, exercise greater restraint in the use of gasoline for the time being we shall inevitably run out of gasoline, that is, if we continue to supply the full military requirements—and who would want us to do otherwise?

Rationing is the responsibility of the Office of Price Administration. Restricting my remarks to my own field I will simply state the supply facts. Since there are more coupons out than can be redeemed by the 342,000 barrels per day that we are able to supply, it follows that although you have coupons you should not use them at this time for other than really necessitous driving. I ask this urgently so that no war worker will be kept from his job, so that no farmer will be prevented from running his tractor, and so that there shall be no break-down in any activity essential to the prosecution of the war or to the maintenance of our civilian economy.

Now perhaps 35,000 barrels per day does not sound like a particularly large amount of gasoline, although it is 1,470,000 gallons. But consider that over a month it amounts to more than a million barrels, or 42,000,000 gallons, which is a lot of gasoline. This overdraft on gasoline—plus the very large amount of supply that was cut off by the damage to Gulf coast refineries in the August hurricane—has meant that instead of being able to build up our inventories we have been forced to draw further upon them. It has meant that instead of being able to announce—as we had hoped—that more liberal gasoline allotments could now be furnished for the East, we are going to have to struggle to maintain allotments at even their present level.

Of course, there is another reason why we were not able today to make more gasoline available in the East. To do this calls for a reduced consumption in other areas. Our recent certification that 620,000 barrels of gasoline daily would be available in the Middle West and Southwest represented a reduction of about 15 percent in consumption. For several days after the curtailment order was issued, reports to us indicated that sales had been reduced slightly, and that still greater reductions are now being achieved.

About 2 weeks ago we called upon middle western refineries to increase immediately their eastward shipments by 50,000 barrels per day and upon southwestern refineries to increase their shipments by 25,000 barrels per day. These additional shipments are being made, but only at the expense of an additional drain upon inventories which already were falling off at an alarming rate. And why has it been necessary to draw upon inventories? The answer to that question is the answer to those in the West who ask: "What reason—if any—is there for cutting gasoline allowances here?"

Well, there is not just one reason. There are several.

First, the amounts of oil needed for war are perfectly enormous—and growing.

Second, in the face of this huge war demand, crude oil productive capacity is falling off seriously throughout the important midwestern oil-producing States, and is susceptible of a substantial increase only in west Texas. On the basis of known military requirements—let alone whatever unexpected demands may develop—we will not be able by next year to produce enough oil in the United States to meet the needs of the military, of war industry, of agriculture, and for essential civilian purposes unless we cut down on consumption now. That is not my opinion. It is a fact, recognized by the practical oil men who have formally endorsed the gasoline curtailment in the Middle West and Southwest.

But not only do we face a shortage of crude oil, we are now getting 5 fewer gallons of automotive gasoline out of each 42-gallon barrel of crude oil than we did before the war. The reason is that more and more of that part of each barrel of crude oil that used to go into automotive gasoline is now going into the petroleum war products that I have mentioned—aviation gasoline and lubricants, toluene, butadiene and fuel oils. And this shrunken output has to be shared with the armed forces. Of all of the gasoline of all kinds produced east of the Rocky Mountains for the last half of this year, the military requirement will be more than 30½ percent; and, by next year, more than 37½ percent. Here is a figure which has never before been made public: The armed forces are now using in round numbers 600,000 barrels of all kinds of gasoline every day. There is where the gasoline is going. That is approximately the same amount of gasoline that was used by the entire seventeen Eastern States in the unrestricted days of peacetime. It is as much as all of the oil of all kinds produced in Russia. And, it has to come from the same source that our civilian oil comes from. So, if someone tells you that there is plenty of gasoline, and that there is no reason for curtailment, ask him to explain how—if there is plenty of gasoline—it happened that stocks of automotive gasoline east of the Rocky Mountains declined 130,000 barrels per day—or 5,460,000 gallons each 24 hours—between April and August.

Yet, to me, the idea of spreading this limited supply as equitably as possible throughout all sections cannot be questioned. It is purely a case of misunderstanding when people in the West ask: "Why should we have our necessary driving cut down so that the East can go pleasure driving?"

That answer is: First, no necessary use of gasoline is going to be restricted in the West so far as we can foresee today. Farmers are already assured, by order of the Petroleum Administration, the same treatment as the Army and Navy as to the gasoline that they need for their essential operations. There will be enough gasoline, so far as we can foresee today, for all essential driving.

Second, you in the West are not giving up gasoline to permit the East to go pleasure driving. You are giving it up because you believe in the American principle of fair play and equality under the law. You know that, up to now, civilians on the east coast have had to supply a disproportionate share of the military demand. Now, with the transportation that we have provided, you are able to share equitably that war burden. And so, to the people of the West I say: Why in the world would we curtail your use of gasoline if it were not necessary?

To the people of the East, I say: Why in the world would we not supply you with more gasoline if it were possible? We may be crazy, as some people are that I know, but we are not so crazy that we would invite people to throw brickbats at us if it were not necessary.

To both the East and the West, I say please believe me when I tell you that the reason for both of your troubles is that oil has gone to war. Oh, I know that there are those who will tell you that this is just a pretext to cover up a "bungling bureaucracy." But, just consider a few pointed facts:

It takes 12,500 gallons of gasoline to train one pilot.

The tanks of an armored division use more than 10,000 gallons in traveling 100 miles.

A thousand Flying Fortresses will use 2,500,000 or more gallons in a single 6-hour mission.

So, there isn't as much left any more for you and for me. We can't burn gasoline over Berlin, and Rome, and New Guinea—and still have all that we want to consume here at home. And we cannot consume what we do not have.

The MacArthur Lock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, July 11, 1943, was the date of the achievement of another milestone in the history of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., with its famous Soo Locks. On July 11, 1943, the new MacArthur lock was officially opened and dedicated. At the luncheon preceding the dedication ceremony, I delivered the following remarks to the 250 guests assembled:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, friends of that great maritime industry of the inland seas who are striving so valiantly to "keep the soldier's faith" to carry through this jugular vein of the United Nations' war effort their vitally needed lifeblood of iron ore, coal, limestone, and other raw materials of the war effort, and you of the United States Army Engineer Corps and the entire personnel of the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., and their several subcontractors who have labored so industriously these past 15 months to make this historic day possible. This day marks another milestone in the enviable history of Sault Ste. Marie and her famous locks. To single out any one, or any group of individuals, for congratulations today would be to do an injustice to all. This magnificent, this most miraculous job that has been accomplished in such a fantastically short time against such tremendous handicaps, even in a day of miracles, has been done because of cooperation—cooperation on the part of everyone since its very inception.

When this most destructive of all wars was forced upon our Nation, those who were charged with the problem of the delivery of our raw materials to the nerve centers of the Nation's "arsenal of democracy" realized that this new lock, that we are about to dedicate today, was a paramount necessity. Legislation of authorization and legislation for the necessary funds was imperative—prompt action was demanded. At times, the Congress of the United States moves with discouraging inaction and sometimes overcautious deliberation. That inertia was a threatening menace in this instance but cooperation found a way out. Cooperation between your several elected representatives in the Capitol—of which I had the good fortune to be one—was speedily had, and we received extremely cordial cooperation from

the gentlemen of the press, the voice of this Nation. The necessary legislation was enacted, the Engineer Corps, as ever forewarned and thus forearmed, was ready with its plans, contracts were let, the job was on the way. But it took cooperation all the way through to the very end to make this day possible at this early date.

Your new friends here in Sault Ste. Marie, one of the greatest maritime construction firms this country will ever know, and which you have previously honored today—the Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co., could not have done their admirable job had it not been for their cooperation with the Army engineers, with all their subcontractors; and above all with you wonderful citizens of Sault Ste. Marie. Then there were priority troubles, there were housing difficulties, there were seemingly endless "growing pains" as this gigantic war-necessitated program got under way. But cooperation won out again.

Once it was realized in official Washington that you cannot fight a war without guns, tanks, aircraft, and the ships needed to get them into the hands of the men who have to face the enemy and that you cannot have any of these until you get the steel with which to build them, and that you cannot get the steel until you have the iron ore, coal, and limestone which go into that steel delivered into the maws of the blast furnaces, then we got cooperation out of bureaucratic Washington. Democracy muddles through in the Capital, but you were not muddling through up here. You were pouring concrete in weather so far below zero that we might wish our Maker might have saved just a few of those zephyrs for this very day and occasion. Anyway, somehow, someway, you got your supplies and equipment up here and you got your job done. The hero of Bataan, General MacArthur, for whom this new lock is now officially named, has sworn to "uphold the soldier's faith." You who have built this lock "kept the soldier's faith."

Back in 1914 another new lock was built in Sault Ste. Marie; it was officially opened in September of 1919 and cost about $2,000,000. Those who were in attendance at that time, by official resolution, requested that it be named after a very distinguished citizen of Sault Ste. Marie, L. C. Sabin, then civilian superintendent of the locks—that official designation has now been made by an act of Congress. That lock is 1,800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 23.1 feet deep. I believe it is bigger than anything we have in Panama or elsewhere in the world.

Today we are proudly dedicating the MacArthur lock. It was started in May of last year, 1942. It was built in 14 months. It has cost approximately $14,000,000, but it is worth every cent if it will help bring this war to the earliest possible conclusion. This MacArthur lock is 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, and 30 feet deep. It will permit a vastly increased flow of iron ore to our Nation's war effort. I am proud to be here today and to be able to join you all in participating in this memorable event.

Especially am I proud of the fact that shortly we, here, will all have the privilege of riding through this new MacArthur lock on a beautiful steamer that carries the name of a pioneer, of whom I have the honor to be the son. My dad was just about the finest man I have ever heard of and certainly the finest dad any son ever had. If I can ever just attain about one-tenth of his greatness—nothing more would ever matter. And you have here in the Soo one man, also a pioneer, of whose greatness and of whose outstanding abilities and friendship I could never tire of hearing my father praise. They saw eye to eye in predicting the greatness of the future maritime commerce on the Great Lakes and through these locks. My dad was a friend of our friend—and your Number One Citizen, Governor Chase S. Osborn.

I need not elaborate here on the vessel that proudly carries the name of my father, because you have before you a description of the steamer and a picture of him. She is a self-unloader, she was until recently the largest and fastest steamer on the Great Lakes. She is 638 feet 9 inches long, 65-foot beam, and 33 feet deep. Her largest cargo of limestone was 18,284 net tons. Last year in the 8 months she carried almost 1,400,000 tons a distance of over 65,000 miles (almost three times around the world) and delivered it on the docks of our arsenal of democracy. She too, and her captain, Forrest F. Pearse, and his noble crew, have kept the soldier's faith. On board her today on this memorable trip are two men whom I hope you may have the opportunity to meet. One is the top man of one of our most brilliant arms of the Nation's armed forces, Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard. The second is one of my dad's old friends, one of his trusted associates, and now his successor as president of the limestone quarry in my home town of Rogers City, and of the transportation company which bears my father's name—the Bradley Transportation Co.—Mr. Irvin L. Clymer. He represents one of the finest crews of workers I know of—my lifelong friends in Rogers City.

Again I want to assure you that I am glad to be with you today on this most memorable occasion. May the MacArthur lock, may we all, keep the soldier's faith, now and forever more. I greet you, I congratulate you all who by your mutual cooperation have made this day a reality at this early date—let none say you have not kept the soldier's faith. And to all you valiant members of the several arms of our armed forces charged with the security and protection of these locks, our sincere appreciation for what you have already done and what we know you will continue to do. Let's all carry on!

The Truth About Our Oil Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the Representatives from the oil-producing States have been endeavoring to obtain the consideration of an increase in the price of oil from the various agencies who control this very important product, and notwithstanding all of our efforts, we have not been able to secure any action.

In order to bring to the attention of those charged with the responsibility of passing on the increase requested, and for the information of Congress, I wish to include an article appearing in Collier's magazine, of date September 11, 1943, by Frank B. Taylor, entitled "The Truth About Our Oil Supply" in my remarks in the RECORD:

THE TRUTH ABOUT OUR OIL SUPPLY

(By Frank B. Taylor)

While the vast resources of America are being brought to bear upon our enemies, the most basic of all these resources is showing definite signs of weakening. The oil industry is growing short of oil. The bald facts are that we are using our petroleum reserves far more rapidly than we are finding new reserves.

If you continually take from a barrel without replenishing—sooner or later that barrel will be empty. The same holds true for our oil reserves. If it were possible for us to draw from these reserves as we might need them, yet fail to find new fields, we would totally exhaust our oil by 1955—a mere 12 years.

Rationing has little to do with it. Even the weight of the war is a small influence. It is a critical situation within the industry itself, and it means that an industrial revolution is daily gaining momentum.

In the House, California Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA said:

"The normal drainage of these known reserves would require about 40 years to reach exhaustion. The waste of oil, due to maximum production under forced measures, would reach 20 to 50 percent in some of our most productive fields. A careful review of the present situation indicates that we will reach the decline in the productive capacity of American oil fields in 1 year."

This doesn't mean that the oil industry is going to the dogs. Nor should you dash to your broker and sell that oil stock you have acquired. It does mean that the petroleum industry is entering a new phase—a phase that will inevitably affect the lives of every one of us. It means that we should be given a frank appraisal of the situation—and this appraisal should be made now.

The fact that we have a total reserve, including oil still underground, of 20,000,000,000 barrels should be reassuring. We do not have to look forward to the early depletion of our reserves, for we will continue to find new fields, even though the rate of finding may be far slower than in other years. Our current situation does not mean that our war effort will drag, due to lack of oils or gasolines.

One out of every four of our daily production of 4,100,000 barrels is earmarked for the military. The industry sees its way clear to supply this life blood of mechanized warfare. But there is no room for revision of our war demand much further upward. The vast fleets of warplanes and air transports proposed for the future are completely out of the question if only for the simple reason that we do not have the oil.

It is hard for the uninitiated to realize what a tremendous volume of oil the Nation demands each year. If you drive 2,000 miles during the year you use 135 gallons, and still this is just a little over three barrels. But here is the catch—multiply this by our 30,000,000 cars and trucks, then add the fuel oils, the lubricants, the high-octane aviation fuels, tractor fuels, industrial fuels, kerosene, waxes, and the myriad of petroleum byproducts—by this time the total is terrific. In fact, in 1941, production in the United States reached an all-time high of 1,402,228,000 barrels to supply these demands. And this year, under the impetus of greater demands, we will set a higher production peak.

These demands would be all right if we were finding new fields at a rate equal to or exceeding our withdrawals. Instead of this, for the past 4 years we have continually lost ground by our inability to keep pace with production. In 1942, the new oil located failed to equal the oil produced by more than half a billion barrels.

Of course, our reserve of 20,000,000,000 barrels provides us with a comfortable drawing account. Unfortunately, the figure has been misinterpreted. The truth of the matter is that oil exists in porous rock formations much as water is contained in a filled sponge. The exploratory work of finding these formations is called wildcatting. The waters that are also contained in these formations have been migrating slowly about for millions of

years as the continents writhed and convulsed to their present forms. By this action, the oils, being lighter than water, were flushed about until caught in natural traps where they accumulated. These traps are known to the petroleum geologist by such names as domes, anticlines, fault zones, pools, nosings, stratographic traps, etc., according to type. It is in the hope of locating such a pool that the wildcat well is drilled.

When the field is first drilled, the oil is usually under gas or water pressure and squirts out of the formation as the water would flow from the sponge if pressed. Soon, however, the well no longer flows. Then it must be pumped. But by this method only a limited volume can be produced daily. This depends not only upon how much it is physically possible to lift, but also upon the rate of flow of the crude as it seeps into the hole from the oil-bearing formation. In most cases, the ultimate recovery from the well or field is reduced if wells are produced too rapidly.

NEW FIELDS A NECESSITY

This oil reserve, vast though it is, can only be produced a little at a time. This means that we can actually be short of oil in a period of months. It means that we absolutely cannot delay vitally needed oil exploratory work. We must have new fields now.

In 1859 Colonel Drake drilled the oil well that launched the petroleum industry. When he found production, he was credited with discovering a field. Also, and this is a point that must be kept in mind, when Drake started his well, there were only a fixed number of potential oil fields in the entire United States; and when he completed his well as a producer, he had decreased that number by one. Every successful wildcat well after that further reduced the number of undiscovered fields. And every unsuccessful wildcat reduced the potential by one.

The industry has no idea how many fields there were to start with, but it is definite that the number has not increased. Oil is not formed in the lifetime of man. Oil is irreplaceable. Once produced and used it is utterly gone—and another barrel does not spring up as one stalk of corn replaces another.

For some years following Drake's discovery, oil wildcatting was entirely and joyfully haphazard. The oil men punched holes down for any reason at all—dreams, the forked twig of a peach tree, an omen, anything. Then it was recognized that certain conditions of surface rocks usually indicated a subsurface accumulation of oil—and the famous anticlinal theory of geology came into existence. A vast search was immediately under way for these anticlines or domes, and such fields as Spindletop, El Dorado, Glenn Pool, Teapot Dome and others were discovered. But by no means all of these favorable locations were actually found to contain oil. Many were drilled and found to be entirely dry.

Petroleum geologists combed the Nation's surface and naturally found the most apparent structures first. Then the search became difficult. Exploratory tools were required to aid in the search for new fields. The "cream of the crop" was gone. The seismograph, making use of reflected sound waves, helped the geologist study deep-seated formations. With this aid he found many fields that lacked any surface indication. Also, the petroleum geologist adapted other tools to assist in the search. The gravity meter and the magnetometer, the core drill, air mapping—all helped to find new fields.

Each new tool or geologic aid was put to use the instant its worth was proved. And where the previous instruments had failed to detect oil, the new tool might find a new prospect. Each successive development enjoyed an initial success.

Soon, however, the use of the tool became routine—not because the instrument was becoming less effective, but because it had already found most of the favorable conditions possible for it to detect.

The search went deeper. Drake's well was only 69 feet deep. Today's deepest well is Continental Oil Co.'s KCL–4 in California, drilled to a depth of 15,004 feet. As the search continued for these new fields, and the test wells were drilled deeper and deeper, and exploratory equipment grew in complexity, the cost of finding new wells soared. But this didn't particularly matter as long as the search was successful. That is how the industry built up the reserve we are now drawing upon.

And here we come to a new set of facts. The rate of finding new reserves has reversed itself. Instead of finding more and more, we are finding less and less. Not only last year did we fail to locate ample new reserves, but we have actually been finding less and less new oil since 1937. What does this mean?

It means that the various exploratory tools of the industry have already served their maximum usefulness. It means new or greatly improved exploratory tools must be devised, so that the remaining oil structures can be located. In all the industry there is not a single exploratory tool that is capable of detecting oil directly; every method is designed to detect the condition favorable to the accumulation of oil.

If we allow our Nation's petroleum reserve to diminish during the present critical period, we must expect serious results in our post-war period. The industry is entering an era of near stabilization in which a never-ceasing effort must be made to retain our reserves at as high a figure as possible. We are entering a period in which we will be constantly attempting to close an ever-widening breach between greater demands on the one hand and diminishing reserves on the other.

This does not mean that no important fields remain to be located. Not at all. It means that the discovery of new fields, large and small, will become more and more difficult. The array of prolific discoveries is definitely behind us. Judging by the experience of the past 6 years, the average pool discovery will continue to decrease in size. This is best illustrated by showing the relationship between the number of new pools discovered since 1937 and the volumes of crude added to the Nation's oil barrel by the finding of these new fields:

	New pools found	Estimated reserves of new pools
1937	221	928, 742, 000
1938	256	810, 493, 000
1939	254	340, 667, 000
1940	304	286, 338, 000
1941	341	429, 974, 000
1942	348	260, 051, 000

Geologists are none too optimistic about new discoveries. To quote the Honorable WESLEY E. DISNEY, of Oklahoma, "Oil cannot be discovered at will." It takes planning, research, surveys, and money. It takes more than merely the price of the average wildcat well—which is $50,000, but which may be anywhere from $1,000 to $500,000. It takes exploration expense to find a geologically favorable site on which to locate a test well.

NO PAY-OFF IN PROSPECTING

Why hasn't this exploratory effort been made? For a number of reasons. In the first place, there has been an economic uncertainty created that has retarded this type of investment. Then there has been an actual shortage of critical materials—some of which are required in oil exploration, and not enough of these materials have been marked for the oil industry. With so many men entering the services, a paralyzing manpower situation has developed. And this is heightened by war industries that pay wages higher than those the Government allows the oil firms to pay. Combine this with the fact that it is becoming increasingly more difficult to find new fields and you have a good part of the answer.

The rest of the answer lies in the price of oil. While all operating and exploratory costs of the industry have steadily risen, an average increase of about 2 cents a barrel in the price of crude oil has been available; and that only in some few areas where it was granted as an adjustment.

To carry on our war, the Petroleum Administration for War wants 4,500 wildcat wells to be drilled during 1943. Actually, the figure will be closer to 3,300—about 75 percent of the desired total. In 1942 the industry drilled 3,166 wildcat wells against 4,000 asked by the Government.

A price increase would greatly stimulate the exploratory effort, and there are two other beneficial results that would immediately obtain. The first would allow the producing well of today to be operated further toward total exhaustion. By this means the greatest ultimate recovery would be obtained before the inevitable abandonment of the well. The other immediate result would be the development of many semidepleted oil areas as secondary recovery projects, by which methods additional oil can be obtained at greater expense.

Meanwhile, the big companies are increasing their reserves in the most logical manner. Not by exploration. That is too expensive with the present price of crude. They are purchasing as many independent small producers and producing properties as they can. And, due to maladjustment in the excessive burden of taxation, the small operators are finding it desirable to sell. W. S. Hallanan, president of Plymouth Oil Co., and a member of the Petroleum Industry War Council, in addressing a convention of oil men at Bradford, Pa., last June, stated that 2 years ago small operators controlled 50 percent of America's reserve. Today the same operators control 25 percent of these reserves. It is good business for the big companies, but is it a healthy situation? This trend would come to a natural end with a price adjustment sufficient to make it desirable for the majors of the industry to find their own reserves instead of buying out the little man.

Oil's political set-up in Washington is one of these integrated, complex, top-heavy affairs, supported by politicians and directed by practicing economists. Transportation, production, price—all are irrevocably interrelated except in Washington, and here each division has its own bureau. Heading the Petroleum Administration for War is Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. Ickes was a little too much for the oil men to take when he was appointed controller of the oil industry by the President. The industry, individually and collectively, fired both barrels at Ickes time and time again.

Then at an American Petroleum Institute convention in California in November 1941, Ickes spoke. He made the kind of talk oil men understand. He spoke straight. He called a spade a spade. There was no clouding over of facts. He asked for the support of the oil men—and he got it. The industry reversed itself overnight. To this day the men of the industry are still with him, although some still keep their fingers crossed.

Ickes can't grant a price increase for oil. Such power is not vested in the Petroleum Administrator; instead it is over in Price

Administrator Brown's O. P. A. So P. A. W. asked O. P. A. to raise the price of crude a minimum of 35 cents a barrel. O. P. A. Administrator Brown, on May 4, issued a long statement rejecting the recommendation, and, in the same decision, indirectly admitted the necessity of a price raise by offering Government financial aid for some conditions.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL IS TABOO

The offer of aid was actually a subsidy. And the oil industry wants nothing whatever to do with this. The oil man is skeptical of subsidy in any form. Government control is abhorrent to him.

The Government is itself seriously to blame for public apathy on the question of oil. It delayed correcting the impression that east coast rationing was necessary because of a shortage of oil. It wasn't long before it became known the shortage was actually due to a lack of transportation between the producing areas and the East. Next, the people were led to believe that the military requirements necessitated rationing. Then the fact came out that it was necessary to ration mileage to conserve rubber. And now, while we are aware that military requirements are great, we are told again that an actual petroleum shortage impends. Is there any wonder that the public is baffled?

But why is the question of price so vital? It is vital because it is the quickest and surest way to find new and badly needed oil to support our sagging reserves. This is important because as a Nation we are totally unprepared for a shortage of petroleum in any degree. It is a shock to know that rationing may have to be continued on the basis of actual shortage, not on the basis of military priority.

Then, too, there is another profile of the impending shortage that needs to be recognized. Not only has the molecule of oil been reduced and changed to provide the best aviation fuels in the world, but the same molecule has been stretched into rubber that is even better than the unobtainable latex. It has been combined and changed to provide an endless series of new and useful compounds, and the list is growing daily. Moth balls, plastic stocks, anesthetics, toluene, bug spray, perfume, antifreeze compounds—all and many more, some that are war secrets—are being derived from petroleum and its partner, natural gas, by the new science of petrochemistry.

The industry has chosen today to expand into these new fields. The choice in time is inopportune, but is merely a chance step in the uninterruptible march of progress. The multitude of new products will mean a richer, more pleasantly satisfying life in the future.

Technique developed for the manufacture of 100-octane aviation fuels will be utilized to make new and more powerful automotive gasolines that will deliver more miles per gallon. This will be a saving; also, it might be that tomorrow's car won't depend exclusively on this superfuel. It could be constructed with two fuel tanks, one to contain the high-octane gasoline, the other to contain a cheaper grade of fuel, a substitute, or some type of blend that could be used in ordinary driving after the motor becomes warm.

If the oil business is to continue, "heavy" industry of the east-coast area should be fed more and more by imported crude—now, and in increased quantities later, as transportation is available. As reserves further diminish, additional imports to other areas will be necessary. This will not find favor in one branch of the industry, but it is the only solution.

The prediction that we may become oil-dry at an early date cannot be justified. Research will be directed toward making new fuels available to industry and the public. A new source of power is needed, and it might possibly be found in atomic power when experiments are renewed after the war. If such a source of cheap power is found, then the petroleum refiner will be frantically reversing himself in an effort to provide lubricants for industry's wheels rather than fuels to turn the wheels.

Primary methods of producing oil must be increased in efficiency, and the new methods of secondary recovery from depleted wells must be applied. In this respect the various oil-producing States should provide some legal vehicle so that properties adaptable to secondary recovery methods can be combined in a unit operation.

DIRECT CONTROL BY CONGRESS

The industry itself must strive for a better understanding with the public, so that every time some political opportunist wags his finger, Mr. John Public won't be so anxious to jump down the oil man's throat. A price increase, not a subsidy, is necessary. The industry must remain as independent of bureau control as possible. Such control as may be required must come directly from Congress in the form of laws.

In the matter of substitutes we are extremely fortunate. The most important reserve we enjoy is the inventive ingenuity of the American to solve any problem. With this ability we can confidently expect synthetic fuels from a number of base stocks, including agricultural materials. Coal, of which we have a known supply sufficient to last 3,000 years, can be turned into fuels and lubricants by proper processing. Lignite represents another potential source of liquid fuels.

So far in the history of the petroleum industry, we have produced a total of 27,000,000,000 barrels of oil from United States fields. This volume is only a little more than one-eighth of the 200,000,000,000 barrels estimated to exist in oil shales of the Nation, and this is sufficient to last us 50 years at our present rate of consumption. In western Canada, a single shale bed is believed to contain at least 27,000,000,000 barrels. But this oil cannot be recovered at the present price of $1.25 per barrel. Instead, the difficulty of obtaining the oil from this source would increase its value to $6 or $7 per barrel.

When it is necessary to turn to new sources for our petroleum, we will encounter costs per barrel that right now seem prohibitive. Substitute fuels will be available at less cost, but they will be less satisfactory by providng less mileage in our cars and less power in our industries. We must keep these eventualities as far removed into the future as possible by anticipating them now.

The History of the Soo Locks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, not only did July 11, 1943, mark the opening of the new MacArthur lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., but also on that date the last previously constructed lock, opened in 1919, was officially dedicated as the Sabin lock by an act of this Congress. Heretofore, the lock had always been known locally as the Sabin lock and on July 11, 1943, it was officially so named.

At the luncheon immediately preceding the dedication ceremony, Mr. L. C. Sabin, vice president of the Lake Carriers Association, and formerly district engineer at the Soo in charge of the operation of those locks, uttered the following cogent remarks on the history of the famous Soo locks:

In a group of this kind, gathered to pay tribute to the progress made in the facilities of transportation on the most important waterway of the world, there is a temptation to follow the growth of commerce from its early beginnings. I shall refrain from burdening you with too many figures.

It is heartening to note, however, the degree of cooperation which has existed from the beginning between the governmental authorities in charge of the lock area and the private interests using the facilities.

Equally important are the aids to navigation, formerly under the Lighthouse Service, and now a part of the United States Coast Guard. The same fine cooperation has been given the Lake interests by this department, and I am happy to note that some of its high representatives are with us today.

The lock which is now to be officially opened is not the new first lock, but rather the eighth lock that has been built to enable vessels to pass to and from Lake Superior and the lower Lakes. The first was a lock for canoes, built on the Canadian side in 1797–98 by the North West Fur Co. This lock, only 38 feet long, accommodated bateaux which were raised only 9 feet. To overcome the remainder of the fall, canoes were towed by oxen operating along a tow path. The lock was destroyed by military action in 1814. The timber floor and sills were discovered later, and the walls and gates have been reproduced in facsimile.

STATE LOCK

The need of a lock and canal for commercial vessels to reach Lake Superior was foreseen long before the authorization of the facility by the State of Michigan in 1837. The question whether it should be a State or National project arose, and difficulties connected with securing right-of-way, as well as other legal entanglements, delayed final authorization until 1852.

A trial shipment of ore from the Marquette region in 1852 proved successful and helpful to forward final action. Construction was begun in 1853 and the lock was opened in 1855, the steamer *Illinois* being the first to pass. The lock accommodated some 12,000,000 tons of freight while in use from 1855 to 1881, mainly under State supervision. It was destroyed in 1888 to make way for further improvements.

THE WEITZEL LOCK

In the meantime, however, the registered tonnage passing the State canal having reached half a million tons, the need of additional facilities became evident and authorities in charge of the State canal urged the construction of a larger lock as early as 1867. Again action was delayed by legal difficulties connected with securing right-of-way, and while the construction was authorized in 1870 and some work done, the first stone of the lock was not laid until 1876. This lock, named the Weitzel, since Col. Godfrey Weitzel was in charge during construction, was opened in 1881 and continued in active service

until 1914. It was used to a limited extent in 1918 during the last war. The freight passing this lock in its 34 years of use amounted to 135,000,000 tons.

THE POE LOCK

Prior to the construction of the Poe lock the canal traffic in 1886 had reached a new high of 4½ million tons in 7,400 passages. Vessels could not load to full draft and the delays in lockage were mounting. The Lake Carriers' Association, formed in 1885, joined the officers of the Corps of Engineers, Generals Weitzel and Poe, in urging the need of a new lock. This was authorized by Congress in 1886. Construction was begun in 1889, the old State lock being torn out to furnish a site. This lock was completed in 1896 and named the Poe lock, Gen. O. M. Poe having died the year preceding its completion as the result of an accident received while inspecting the work. This lock has passed 574,000,000 tons of freight and is still useful for up-bound light traffic.

THE DAVIS LOCK

The commerce continued to grow, and in the 10 years succeeding the opening of the Poe lock it trebled in volume, causing an average delay in passing the canal of more than 2 hours. The capacity of the newer ships also was limited by lack of depth.

To meet these conditions the engineers submitted to Congress three plans for a new lock. The first plan would have utilized the site of the Weitzel lock where the MacArthur lock now stands. The second plan contemplated building to the north of the Poe lock—three locks being served by the same canal. The third plan, which was recommended and fortunately accepted, called for a new canal with one lock on the south side, leaving room for an additional lock on the north.

This new canal with a double length lock, the longest in the world, was authorized in 1907 and the first boat, the Alva C. Dinkey, passed through in 1914. As Col. C. E. L. B. Davis was still living the lock was called the third lock. On the death of Colonel Davis, however, my recommendation that it be given the official name of the "Davis lock" was approved by the engineer department. Some 918 million tons of freight have passed this lock in 29 years.

THE SABIN LOCK

By 1912 the traffic had increased to 72,000,000 tons and the average delay to vessels again reached 2 hours. Accordingly another lock was authorized in that year, although the Davis lock was not yet complete. Had action been delayed, this fourth lock might have been made deeper, but at that time there was no warrant for changing the dimensions, and thus it was made a duplicate of the third, or Davis lock. Construction was started in 1913 and the lock and canal were completed in 1919, the steamer *Wm. Livingstone* being the first to pass. During the construction of this lock the engineer officers in charge of the district were Colonels Patrick, Burgess, Altstaetter, and Markham, while the speaker served as district engineer for a short time. The freight passing this lock alone during the past 24 years amounted to 956 million tons—equal to the traffic of the Suez Canal during its entire life of 56 years.

THE MAC ARTHUR LOCK

Vessels recently built are capable of loading to 24-foot draft and this, combined with the existing traffic congestion, brought a demand for greater facilities which today we see fulfilled. The need of this lock, urged by the Lake Carriers' Association, was fully realized by Colonel Barrows, then district engineer, and it received also the recommendation of the chief of engineers. Its authorization was first contained in the Rivers and Harbors bill which did not pass the Congress. Congressman BRADLEY, always alive to the needs of navigation, was most helpful in securing favorable consideration and final action, while Senator Brown added the item to another bill, which resulted in authorization of the project in March 1942. Beginning actual construction immediately, this lock has been completed in record time and the engineers and contractors concerned are to be commended for so quickly bringing into service this much needed facility.

Considering the system as a whole, traffic through the locks, including the Canadian Canal, reached on June 1 of this year a total of 3,000,000,000 tons. This is practically double the commerce passing both the Suez and Panama Canals during their entire existence.

In the routine of peacetime the importance of this waterway may lack appreciation, but the present emergency has resulted in a fuller realization of its strategic value. In 1938 Gen. Max Tyler, assistant to the Chief of Engineers and a former division engineer, foresaw the part to be played in any future war when he said: "As long as the iron mines on Lake Superior and the coal mines last, and as long as wars are still a possibility, the transportation system built around water carriage on the Great Lakes will continue to be one of the greatest elements of military and naval strength, better appreciated, perhaps, by the possible enemies of the United States." (Transactions, American Society of Civil Engineers, vol. 105, p. 167.)

A further appraisal of the value of lake transportation, and the motives guiding the several agencies concerned, General Tyler expressed as follows:

"The existing system of industry and transportation which has been built up around water carriage on the Great Lakes in the last century is the result of the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government, the railroad companies, industries, municipalities, and vessel owners and operators during that entire period. In each decade, the facilities provided for navigation and at the terminals have been reasonably adequate for the number and class of vessels in the lake trade and for the tonnage moved. They have never been overbuilt, nor has money been spent extravagantly far ahead of requirements. As one examines the record, one must be impressed with the fact that the present results have been obtained by the application of good engineering practice and sound business judgment, and by planning for the future only as far as definite benefits could be foreseen."

From the organization of the Lake Carriers' Association in 1885 it has been active in recommending needed improvements in the channels and harbors including the construction of the locks. In the article already quoted General Tyler said:

"The recommendations made by the association for improvements for the benefit of shipping on the Lakes have consistently been constructive and conservative."

On the other hand, the association wishes to acknowledge the uniform courtesy and consideration with which its recommendations have been received by the Corps of Engineers. It has been shown that with the completion of each new facility the vessels have been in service to use it. This is true in the case of the lock which is to be opened today, 21 vessels having been built in the past 2 years which are unable to load to full capacity and pass the older locks. The association wishes to express its keen appreciation of the spirit of cooperation evidenced by the Engineering Department during the past 58 years.

Progress of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the progress of the war delivered by the President of the United States July 28, 1943, and broadcast over various Nation-wide radio hook-ups.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Over a year and a half ago I said to the Congress: "The militarists in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo started this war, but the massed, angered forces of common humanity will finish it."

That prophecy is in the process of being fulfilled. The massed, angered forces of common humanity are on the march. They are going forward—on the Russian front, in the vast Pacific area, and into Europe—converging upon their ultimate objectives, Berlin and Tokyo.

The first crack in the Axis has come. The criminal, corrupt Fascist regime in Italy is going to pieces.

The pirate philosophy of the Fascists and Nazis cannot stand adversity. The military superiority of the United Nations—on sea, and land, and in the air—has been applied in the right place and at the right time.

Hitler refused to send sufficient help to save Mussolini. In fact, Hitler's troops in Sicily stole the Italians' motor equipment, leaving Italian soldiers so stranded that they had no choice but to surrender. Once again the Germans betrayed their Italian allies, as they had done time and time again on the Russian front and in the long retreat from Egypt, through Libya and Tripoli, to the final surrender in Tunisia.

Mussolini came to the reluctant conclusion that the "jig was up"; he could see the shadow of the long arm of justice.

But he and his Fascist gang will be brought to book, and punished for their crimes against humanity. No criminal will be allowed to escape by the expedient of resignation.

Our terms to Italy are still the same as our terms to Germany and Japan—unconditional surrender.

We will have no truck with fascism in any way, shape, or manner. We will permit no vestige of fascism to remain.

Eventually Italy will reconstitute herself. It will be the people of Italy who will do that, choosing their own government in accordance with the basic democratic principles of liberty and equality. In the meantime, the United Nations will not follow the pattern set by Mussolini and Hitler and the Japanese for the treatment of occupied countries—the pattern of pillage and starvation.

We are already helping the Italian people in Sicily. With their cordial cooperation, we are establishing and maintaining security and order—we are dissolving the organizations which have kept them under Fascist tyranny—we are providing them with the necessities of life until the time comes when they can fully provide for themselves.

Indeed, the people in Sicily today are rejoicing in the fact that for the first time in years they are permitted to enjoy the fruits

of their own labors—they can eat what they themselves grow, instead of having it stolen from them by the Fascists and the Nazis.

In every country conquered by the Nazis, the Fascists, or the Japanese militarists, the people have been reduced to the status of slaves or chattels.

It is our determination to restore these conquered peoples to the dignity of human beings, masters of their own fate, entitled to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, freedom from fear.

We have started to make good on that promise.

I am sorry if I step on the toes of those Americans who, playing party politics at home, call that kind of foreign policy "crazy altruism" and "starry-eyed dreaming."

Meanwhile, the war in Sicily and Italy goes on It must go on, and will go on, until the Italian people realize the futility of continuing to fight in a lost cause—a cause to which the people of Italy never gave their wholehearted approval and support.

It is a little over a year since we planned the north African campaign. It is 6 months since we planned the Sicilian campaign. I confess that I am of an impatient disposition, but I think that I understand, and that most people understand, the amount of time necessary to prepare for any major military or naval operation. We cannot just pick up the telephone and order a new campaign to start the next week.

For example, behind the invasion forces of north Africa were thousands of ships and planes guarding the long, perilous sea lanes, carrying the men, the equipment, and the supplies to the point of attack. And behind all these were the railroad lines and highways that carried the men and the munitions to the ports of embarkation—there were the factories and the mines and the farms that turned out the materials; there were the training camps where the men learned how to perform the strange and difficult and dangerous tasks which were to meet them on the beaches and in the deserts and the mountains.

All this had to be repeated in the attack on Sicily. Here the factor of air attack was added—for we could use north Africa as the base for softening up the landing places and lines of defense in Sicily and the lines of supply in Italy.

It is interesting for us to realize that every Flying Fortress that bombed harbor installations at Naples from its base in north Africa required 1,110 gallons of gasoline for each single mission, and that this is the equal of about 375 A ration tickets—enough gas to drive your car five times across this continent. You will better understand your part in the war—and what gasoline rationing means—if you multiply this by the gasoline needs of thousands of planes and hundreds of thousands of jeeps, trucks and tanks now serving overseas.

I think that the personal convenience of the indivadual or the individual family back home here in the United States will appear somewhat less important when I tell you that the initial assault force on Sicily involved 3,000 ships which carried 160,000 men—Americans, British, Canadians and French—together with 14,000 vehicles, 600 tanks and 1,800 guns. This initial force was followed every day and every night by thousands of reinforcements.

The meticulous care with which the operation in Sicily was planned has paid dividends. For our casualties in men, ships and matériel have been low—in fact, far below our estimate.

All of us are proud of the superb skill and courage of the officers and men who have conducted and are conducting this operation. The toughest resistance developed on the front of the British Eighth Army, which included the Canadians. But that is no new experience for that magnificent fighting force which has made the Germans pay a heavy price for each hour of delay in the final victory. The American Seventh Army, after a stormy landing on the exposed beaches of southern Sicily, swept with record speed across the island into Palermo. For many of our troops this was their first battle experience but they have carried themselves like veterans.

And we must give credit for the coordination of the diverse forces in the field, and for the planning of the whole campaign, to the wise and skillful leadership of General Eisenhower. Admiral Cunningham, General Alexander and Air Marshal Tedder have been towers of strength in handling the complex details of naval, ground, and air activities.

You have heard some people say that the British and the Americans can never get along well together—you have heard some people say that the Army and Navy and Air Forces can never get along well together—that real cooperation between them is impossible. Tunisia and Sicily have given the lie, once and for all, to these narrow-minded prejudices.

The dauntless fighting spirit of the British people in this war has been expressed in the historic words and deeds of Winston Churchill—and the world knows how the American people feel about him.

Ahead of us are much bigger fights. We and our allies will go into them as we went into Sicily—together. And we shall carry on together.

Today our production of ships is almost unbelievable. This year we are producing over 19,000,000 tons of merchant shipping and next year our production will be over 21,000,000 tons. And in addition to our shipments across the Atlantic we must realize that in this war we are operating in the Aleutians, in the distant parts of the Southwest Pacific, in India, and off the shores of South America.

For several months we have been losing fewer ships by sinkings, and we have been destroying more and more U-boats. We hope this will continue. But we cannot be sure. We must not lower our guard for one single instant.

One tangible result of our great increase in merchant shipping—which will be good news to civilians at home—is that tonight we are able to terminate the rationing of coffee. We also expect that within a short time we shall get greatly increased allowances of sugar.

Those few Americans who grouse and complain about the inconveniences of life here in the United States should learn some lessons from the civilian populations of our allies—Britain, China, Russia—and of all the lands occupied by our common enemies.

The heaviest and most decisive fighting today is going on in Russia. I am glad that the British and we have been able to contribute somewhat to the striking power of the Russian armies.

In 1941-42 the Russians were able to retire without breaking, to move many of their war plants from western Russia far into the interior, to stand together with complete unanimity in the defense of their homeland.

The success of the Russian armies has shown that it is dangerous to make prophecies about them—a fact forcibly brought home to that mystic master of strategic intuition, Herr Hitler.

The short-lived German offensive, launched early this month, was a desperate attempt to bolster the morale of the German people. The Russians were not fooled by this. They went ahead with their own plans for attack—plans which coordinate with the whole United Nations' offensive strategy.

The world has never seen greater devotion, determination, and self-sacrifice than have been displayed by the Russian people and their armies, under the leadership of Marshal Joseph Stalin.

With a nation which in saving itself is thereby helping to save all the world from the Nazi menace, this country should always be glad to be a good neighbor and a sincere friend in the world of the future.

In the Pacific we are pushing the Japs around from the Aleutians to New Guinea. There, too, we have taken the initiative—and we are not going to let go of it.

It becomes clearer and clearer that the attrition, the whittling down process against the Japanese is working. The Japs have lost more planes and more ships than they have been able to replace.

The continuous and energetic prosecution of the war of attrition will drive the Japs back from their over-extended line running from Burma and Siam and the Straits Settlements through the Netherlands Indies to eastern New Guinea and the Solomons. We have good reason to believe that their shipping and their air power cannot support such outposts.

Our naval, land, and air strength in the Pacific is constantly growing. If the Japanese are basing their future plans for the Pacific on a long period in which they will be permitted to consolidate and exploit their conquered resources, they had better start revising their plans now. I give that to them merely as a helpful suggestion.

We are delivering planes and vital war supplies for the heroic armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and we must do more at all costs.

Our air supply line from India to China across enemy territory continues despite attempted Japanese interference. We have seized the initiative from the Japanese in the air over Burma and now enjoy superiority. We are bombing Japanese communications, supply dumps, and bases in China, Indo-China, and Burma.

But, we are still far from our main objectives in the war against Japan. Let us remember how far we were, a year ago, from any of our objectives in the European theater. We are pushing forward to occupation of positions which in time will enable us to attack the Japanese islands themselves from the north, from the south, from the east, and from the west.

You have heard it said that while we are succeeding greatly on the fighting front, we are failing miserably on the home front. This is another of those immaturities—a false slogan easy to state but untrue in the essential facts.

For, the longer this war goes on the clearer it becomes that no one can draw a blue pencil down the middle of a page and call one side "the fighting front" and the other side "the home front." The two of them are inexorably tied together.

Every combat division, every naval task force, every squadron of fighting planes is dependent for its equipment and ammunition and fuel and food, as indeed it is for its manpower, on the American people in civilian clothes in the offices and in the factories and on the farms at home.

The same kind of careful planning that gained victory in north Africa and Sicily is required if we are to make victory an enduring reality and do our share in building the kind of peaceful world which will justify the sacrifices made in this war.

The United Nations are substanially agreed on the general objectives for the post-war world. They are also agreed that this is not the time to engage in an international discussion of all the terms of peace and all the details of the future. We must not relax our pressure on the enemy by taking time out

to define every boundary and settle every political controversy in every part of the world. The all-important thing now is to get on with the war—and to win it.

While concentrating on military victory, we are not neglecting the planning of the things to come, the freedoms which we know will make for more decency and greater justice throughout the world.

Among many other things we are, today, laying plans for the return to civilian life of our gallant men and women in the armed services. They must not be demobilized into an environment of inflation and unemployment, to a place on a bread line or on a corner selling apples. We must, this time, have plans ready—instead of waiting to do a hasty, inefficient, and ill-considered job at the last moment.

I have assured our men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down when the war is won.

I hope that the Congress will help in carrying out this assurance, for obviously the executive branch of the Government cannot do it alone. May the Congress do its duty in this regard. The American people will insist on fulfilling this American obligation to the men and women in the armed forces who are winning this war for us.

Of course, the returning soldier and sailor and marine are a part of the problem of demobilizing the rest of the millions of Americans who have been working and living in a war economy since 1941. That larger objective of reconverting wartime America to a peacetime basis is one for which your Government is laying plans to be submitted to the Congress for action.

But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.

The least to which they are entitled, it seems to me, is something like this:

1. Mustering-out pay to every member of the armed forces and merchant marine when he or she is honorably discharged, large enough in each case to cover a reasonable period of time between his discharge and the finding of a new job.

2. In case no job is found after diligent search, then unemployment insurance if the individual registers with the United States Employment Service.

3. An opportunity for members of the armed services to get further education or trade training at the cost of their Government.

4. Allowance of credit to all members of the armed forces, under unemployment compensation and Federal old-age and survivors insurance, for their period of service. For these purposes they should be treated as if they had continued their employment in private industry.

5. Improved and liberalized provisions for hospitalization, rehabilitation, and medical care of disabled members of the armed forces and merchant marine.

6. Sufficient pensions for disabled members of the armed forces.

Your Government is drawing up other serious, constructive plans for certain immediate forward moves. They concern food, manpower, and other domestic problems, but they tie in with our armed forces. Within a few weeks I shall speak with you again in regard to definite actions to be taken by the executive branch of the Government and specific recommendations for new legislation by the Congress.

All our calculations for the future, however, must be based on clear understanding of the problems involved. And that can be gained only by straight thinking—not guesswork or political manipulation.

I confess that I myself am sometimes bewildered by conflicting statements that I see in the press. One day I read an authoritative statement that we shall win the war this year, 1943—and the next day comes another statement equally authoritative that the war will still be going on in 1949.

Of course both extremes—of optimism and pessimism—are wrong.

The length of the war will depend upon the uninterrupted continuance of all-out effort on the fighting fronts and here at home. The effort is all one.

The American soldier does not like the necessity of waging war. And yet, if he lays off for one single instant he may lose his own life and sacrifice the lives of his comrades.

By the same token, a worker here at home may not like the driving, wartime conditions under which he has to work or live. And yet, if he gets complacent or indifferent and slacks on his job he, too, may sacrifice the lives of American soldiers and contribute to the loss of an important battle.

The next time anyone says to you that this war is "in the bag" and "it's all over but the shouting," you should ask him these questions:

"Are you working full time on your job?"

"Are you growing all the food you can?"

"Are you buying your limit of War bonds?"

"Are you loyally, cheerfully cooperating with your Government in preventing inflation and profiteering and in making rationing work with fairness to all?"

"Because—if your answer is 'no'—then the war is going to last a lot longer than you think."

The plans we made for the knocking out of Mussolini and his gang have largely succeeded. But we still have to knock out Hitler and his gang and Tojo and his gang. No one of us pretends that this will be an easy matter.

We still have to defeat Hitler and Tojo on their own home grounds. But this will require a far greater concentration of our national energy and our ingenuity and our skill. It is not too much to say that we must pour into this war the entire strength and intelligence and will power of the United States. We are a great Nation—a rich Nation—but we are not so great or so rich that we can afford to waste our substance or the lives of our men by relaxing along the way.

We shall not settle for less than total victory. That is the determination of every American on the fighting fronts. That must be, and will be, the determination of every American here at home.

Liberty at Home—Resolutions of the Republican Post War Advisory Council in Domestic Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions entitled "Liberty at Home," adopted at Mackinac Island, Mich., by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council in Domestic Policy, September 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Immediately at the end of the war we shall face the vital problem of reconstruction at home. A military victory abroad without preservation in America of the fundamental principles on which our way of life depends will be no victory. It will be a defeat. The way we meet the problem of reconstruction will determine whether the American way of life shall survive.

We will prepare an affirmative program designed to preserve to our people all the freedoms for which we fight throughout the world, based on individual liberty, the independence of State and local government, and the independence of Congress and the courts.

That program must as promptly as possible return men to work in peace industry with special attention to those who have made sacrifices by serving in the armed forces, take Government out of competition with private industry, and terminate rationing, price fixing, and all other emergency powers. It must maintain full employment through private enterprise, and full production to furnish the goods and services so needed by our people. In so doing we must seek to make sure that the unemployment and insecurity of the years preceding the war do not return, and that hardship and poverty shall be prevented by a supplementary but comprehensive program of social security on sound principles. We must eliminate all unnecessary regulation of the individual and of business, restore and protect small business which has been so recklessly destroyed, and assure incentive and equal opportunity for the youth of America.

The present program of the New Deal Administration, with the enlargement thereof set forth in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board, would wreck the country because the only remedy it proposes for any problem is unlimited Government spending of borrowed money. It would socialize all business, agriculture, and the professions. It would extend the power of Government until ultimately no man or woman could act, write, speak, or work without approval. It would substitute for American liberty the regimented existence of a subject people.

Our reconstruction, to insure real happiness, cannot be based alone on the improvement of standards of living, but it must be based upon the character of the American people, their religious faith, industry, morality, educated intelligence, and ingrained love of justice. Only thus will we remain a nation of free men who are masters of our own souls.

The Republican Party is devoted to the Federal system of government by which basic rights and duties are reserved to the States, free of dictation and subject to the control of their people. These rights and duties the New Deal has arrogated to itself.

It has now multiplied the number of Federal civilian employees five times. Three million of them now regulate the lives of our people. The number of bureaus has so multiplied that every detail of American life is now regulated by bureaucratic decree.

These are the instruments of fascism. They are the inevitable result of the policies of the New Deal. They must be brought to an end.

The Republican Party insists upon equality of opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed, in the economic, educational, political, and military life of the Nation.

The production of food is vital to our armed forces, to the life of our own people, and to the life of the people of our allies.

The administration's policies on manpower and farm machinery and inexpert price regulation have hampered full production. Its bungling regulations, issued through multifarious and overlapping agencies, have interfered with farmers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers until the normal channels of trade have been completely disrupted. Many small operators have been forced out of business.

An immediate program of increased production and improved distribution must be adopted to be administered by a single agency clothed with full power over food in all of its aspects during the war emergency. Otherwise we shall not only be without the means of relieving the starving people of Europe and Asia but there will be the most serious shortage and hardships in the United States itself.

For the post-war period, our agricultural program must seek to assure prices in the market place comparable to the prices of other commodities. The production of successful crops shall be continued and encouraged and not eliminated by governmental action. The great field of new, improved, and suitable crops must be explored, and the greater industrial use of agricultural products should be vigorously encouraged. Our soil resources need to be conserved and sound reclamation projects should be developed.

The individual initiative of the American farmer must be unshackled and in all governmental action there should be a minimum control from Washington and a maximum freedom of operation by the American farmer.

This council affirms its belief in the strength, the character, and the rights of the American workingman; his pride in himself; his aim to get for himself a bank account, an insurance policy, a home of his own with a self-reliant American family in it; his right to organize and bargain collectively through agents of his own free choice.

We denounce the political effort to reduce labor in the United States to the European level of a class-conscious vote-shackled proletariat. We reject the doctrine that the American workman's mind must be made up in Washington and his personal life turned over to the management of Washington's political coddlers. The basic position of American labor in the American economic system must be guaranteed by fair and equitable laws. The destiny of American labor is not Fascist. It must remain American.

It is our solemn duty, as a people to take those sound measures, as Abraham Lincoln once pointed out—to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who has borne the battle, his widow, and his orphan.

The supreme obligation of our country is to immediately pay our debt of honor to those who are fighting our crusade for peace and freedom. Our post-war program must and does include fullest provisions for the rehabilitation and employment of the men and women of the armed forces.

Temporary help must, of course, be given, but that is not enough. The returning veterans must and shall have the right to launch projects, till the soil, work in the arts, in business, or professions, free to forge ahead. They are entitled to jobs, good honest jobs, jobs with which they can start and go forward, send their children through school, own their homes; jobs which will feed and clothe them in comfort.

Veterans must not come home to be treated as wards of a State or Nation, but must find their Nation a land of greater opportunity under a free American system.

The deepest yearning of our people is for victory and union of our families in peace. This is at the very heart of our whole life. If we build a better America with the highest standards of living and with deep spiritual values, we shall have met their challenge and shall have approached their devotion.

Resolutions Adopted by General Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of the resolutions adopted at board of directors' meeting of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, June 28–July 2, 1943, at Swampscott, Mass. The resolutions are as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION FOR PEACE AND POST-WAR PLANNING

Whereas two world wars in a single generation have brought upon humanity immeasurable death and destruction and have demonstrated the urgent necessity of international collaboration for the maintenance of peace and justice among the nations; and

Whereas the United States, after attempting to remain apart from each of these wars, has, in defense of its own security and freedom, been drawn into them at heavy cost in human lives and material wealth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled at Swampscott, Mass., June 29, 1943, hereby expresses its conviction that international machinery must be created for the establishment of a just peace and the prevention of future aggression, and that the United States in its own self-interest must participate therein.

Presented by war service department and standing committee chairmen of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

TEACHING PROFESSION AND LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Whereas the teachers in many public schools are leaving the school systems to join the armed services, the Federal Government, and private industry; and

Whereas curtailment of the teaching staff is causing overcrowding of classrooms, elimination of subjects from the curriculum, and the employment of teachers without adequate professional training; and

Whereas the education of future teachers is being disrupted by the discontinuance of many liberal arts colleges: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled in Swampscott, Mass., June 30, 1943, reaffirm its stand relative to the maintenance of public education as an essential function of democratic government; and that the educational authorities throughout the country be urged to maintain salaries sufficient to obtain and retain competent teachers, uphold high professional and personal standards for teachers, recognize the teaching profession as essential to the winning of the war and the liberal arts colleges as essential to the winning of the peace as well as the war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, and all members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Presented by Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, Jr., chairman, education department.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Whereas the need for the National Youth Administration is no longer acute, and it necessitates an unnecessary expenditure of funds now needed for war efforts; and,

Whereas certain other Government agencies are now providing financial aid for deserving students in high schools and colleges: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., June 30, 1943, approves the liquidation of the N. Y. A. as soon as possible.

Presented by Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie, chairman, public welfare department; Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, Jr., chairman, education department; Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman, legislation department.

BLACK MARKETS

Whereas the health and welfare of the people of the United States are threatened by the break-down in the national attempt to secure for all our people their just share of the available consumer goods; and

Whereas black markets are now an alarming evidence of this break-down; and

Whereas these black markets constitute also a menace to the legitimate business of this Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in meeting assembled, in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, condemns the disloyal practice on the part of housewives in seeking advantage by patronizing such black markets; and be it further

Resolved, That all persons and agencies possessing powers of enforcement be urged to use all diligence possible in investigation and prosecution of infractions of these laws by consumers and dealers.

Presented by Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie, chairman, public welfare department; Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, Jr., chairman, education department; Mrs. Gustav Ketterer, chairman, war service department; Mrs. R. I. C. Prout, chairman, nutrition committee, war service department; Mrs. Patrick Henry Adams, chairman, consumer problems committee, war service department; Mrs. F. Earle Magee, chairman, conservation of war products committee, war service department.

PURE FOOD, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS ACT

Whereas the Pure Food, Drugs, and Cosmetics Act, passed in 1906 and amended in 1938, has proved of inestimable value to the American people in safeguarding their health by protecting them against adulteration and misbranding; and

Whereas from time to time efforts are made to evade or violate these principles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which helped enact this legislation, goes on record in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, as endorsing its principles and upholding its enforcement from attack in every way possible.

Presented by Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman, legislation department.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Whereas the problem of the rapidly mounting rate of juvenile delinquency is confronting every community in the United States; and

Whereas this condition is a responsibility of the forces of the home, the school, the church, and the community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, urges the formation of committees within the individual clubs, districts, and States of the Federation, which shall work toward the coordination of effort of all organizations and agencies of the community interested in the welfare of children and youth, to combat juvenile delinquency

through the establishment of such community services as a survey shall prove to be necessary in the local communities.

Presented by Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie, chairman, public welfare department; Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, Jr., chairman, education department; Mrs. Edwin I. Poston, chairman, American home department; Mrs. Gustav Ketterer, chairman, war service department.

STRIKES AND RIOTS

Whereas this Nation and its allies in the present world struggle have been shocked and dismayed by the strikes and riots which have occurred in this country; and

Whereas serious delays in production of war materials have resulted which threaten the success of the war effort; and

Whereas organized labor has outlawed strikes during the war emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, condemns selfishness of purpose and failure to cooperate in the war effort, in accord with this agreement of organized labor, as unpatriotic and regards inflammatory agitations as sabotage; be it further

Resolved, That it urges its member clubs to foster a public opinion which will not tolerate such attitudes and practices on the part of any person or groups of persons, but will demand that prompt, consistent, and impartial execution of the punishments now prescribed by law be meted out to those proved guilty; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be given to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Members of Congress, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National War Labor Board, the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and United Mine Workers of America.

Presented by Mrs. Horace B. Ritchie, chairman, public welfare department; Mrs. Gustav Ketterer, chairman, war service department; Mrs. Hiram C. Houghton, Jr., chairman, education department.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court of May 10, confers upon the Federal Communications Commission broad and expansive powers, including the right to control business policy and program content of radio stations; and

Whereas the very existence of such power and the constant threat of its exercise constitutes a form of censorship which may interfere with the freedom of speech over the radio and marks a distinct step toward Government control of this great medium of communication: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, ask that Congress thoroughly review the legislation governing the regulation of radio, and specifically limit the power of the Commission to regulate the physical aspects of communication by radio; and that specific provisions be written into the law, to the end that no Government agency shall be clothed with any power whatsoever, over the program content of this greatest of all systems of mass communication.

Presented by Mrs. J. Warren Burgess, chairman, Fine Arts Department.

RADIO TRANSCRIPTIONS

Whereas James Caesar Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians, since last August 1, has banned the recording of music for both home and radio; and

Whereas, in accordance with our national wartime labor policy, the manufacturers of radio transcriptions referred their dispute with Mr. Petrillo to the United States Conciliation Service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, hereby urges the Director of the United States Conciliation Service, to certify this dispute to the National War Labor Board for appropriate disposition if conciliation fails to bring settlement within a reasonable time; and be it further

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the National War Labor Board to give prompt consideration to this prolonged strike, if and when it is certified to the Board.

Presented by Mrs. J. Warren Burgess, chairman, Fine Arts Department.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Whereas natural resources are indispensable during times of war and peace; and

Whereas emphasis upon judicious use and fullest development of renewable and nonrenewable natural resources will assume greater importance in new and widened horizons in the maintenance of a just and durable peace; and

Whereas there is danger of many nonrenewable natural resources being depleted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 1, 1943, reaffirms its convictions that a comprehensive program for the conservation of our natural resources is necessary through the study of the evaluation of the status of our natural resources of soil, water, forests, wildlife, minerals, metals, gases, fuels, helium, and other renewable and nonrenewable basic raw materials; through work for remedial action that will keep our renewable resources in continuous production, and promotion of measures to safeguard the prolonging of the life of nonrenewable natural resources; and through continued efforts to promote conservation education of adults and school children.

Presented by Mrs. T. M. Francis, chairman, Conservation of Natural Resources Committee.

WOMEN'S AUXILIARY FERRYING SQUADRON

Whereas the Women's Army Corps, the Reserves in the United States Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps are official in the United States service; and

Whereas women are serving in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron, which at the present time has no official status; and

Whereas their contribution to the war effort is of inestimable value: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in meeting assembled in Swampscott, Mass., July 2, 1943, requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would establish the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron on the same status as the other organized women's armed forces.

Presented by Mrs. Gustav Ketterer, chairman, War Service Department.

Summary of Problems, Republican Post-War Advisory Council for Future Study

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of problems approved September 7, 1943, at Mackinac Island, Mich., by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council for future study.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR FUTURE STUDY

The council has made a preliminary survey of the problems which at this time most vitally affect the present and future welfare of the country. Some of these problems grow out of the great issues created by our participation in a World War. Some of them will arise from the readjustment to a peacetime economy. Some are the normal problems which it is the duty of the Federal Government to meet. Some arise from mistaken policies of government in the past 10 years.

The council realizes that for some of these problems with which the next Federal administration must grapple there is no easy solution, no short-cut panacea. The council undertakes its work realizing that it may not be able to find a perfect solution of all the problems the country must face in the coming years, but it will make every effort to find the most just and workable solution of these problems.

The council pledges itself to study these problems and to arrive at a judgment on them, with one single objective. That objective is the welfare of the country as a whole. This council rejects the philosophy that there is a necessary and inevitable class conflict in America. It believes that the soldier, the farmer, the mechanic, the businessman, the saver, and the investor are all partners in a joint enterprise. The council pledges itself to favor no element in our Republic at the expense of other elements.

Among the problems which the council will consider are the following:

1. PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN POLICY

With the coming of peace we must make decisions which will affect the future of the American Nation. There must be plans for just and proper action at the conference of nations at the peace table. There must be plans for American collaboration in the restoration of order and normal economic life in ruined countries. We must make plans for this Nation's participation with other nations in a program to achieve permanent peace.

2. PROBLEMS OF POST-WAR INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT

It is necessary to devise ways and means by which the Federal Government will encourage the quick conversion of war industry to a peacetime basis. A plan for the orderly demobilization of our armed forces must be worked out, to the end that it shall not create unemployment, hardship, and low wages. In connection with these two programs it is essential to consider the means of restoring the spirit of enterprise and investment, long since discouraged by Government hostility, at the same time maintaining a proper and reasonable regulation of competition and employee relations. The problem of controlling monopoly without terrorizing legitimate business should be settled. The extermination of small business, now proceeding under present Government policies, should be halted.

3. PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL WELFARE

The present Federal system of security against unemployment and the hazards of old age is in need of examination and revision. The proper safeguarding of the vast funds now collected from workers and employers is a matter to be considered. Programs to extend security to larger groups and to other needs must be examined. The efficiency and justice of various methods of relief of the unemployed must be analyzed. The dangers

of federalization of relief and security should be avoided.

4. PROBLEMS OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

The Nation must bring to a halt the ceaseless expansion of Federal bureaus which feed upon the taxpayer, govern by Executive decree outside the law, hamper private business, and invade private life. We must examine the mass of Federal corporations now using the people's money to promote miscellaneous projects of Government planners. We must consider the growing invasion of States' rights by Federal action and define the constitutional limitations upon such invasion. The excessive and dangerous rate of expenditures by the Federal executive branch must be reduced.

5. PROBLEMS OF FINANCE AND CURRENCY

It is essential that the Nation find a solution of the problem of endless Government spending, deficit financing, and unbalanced budgets, long since adopted as a peacetime program by the present administration. A provision must be made for the vast weight of Federal debt now resting on the people. The Federal system of taxation, now a chaos of emergency devices to raise revenue, must be simplified and improved. Our monetary system, demoralized by rash experiments, must be restored to order and simplicity.

6. PROBLEMS OF LABOR

A way must be found to establish clearly the rights and just aims of labor under the law, to the end that the grievous conflicts of recent years may be avoided and that harmony and cooperation will result, not only between labor and management but also within the ranks of workers themselves.

7. PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

The health and solvency of our national agriculture must be assured. The present system of interference with agriculture by Federal authority is undermining the independence and the initiative of our individual farmers. The heavy load of bureaucratic control must be removed from the business of farming. This problem must be solved.

8. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The end of the war will find many countries with exhausted resources, paralyzed industry, disordered shipping, inflated currencies, and vanished foreign trade. In its own interests and in the interests of world peace the United States must cooperate in all proper programs for the revival of international trade and finance and the establishment of stable exchanges. We must develop a wise tariff and reciprocity policy for the Nation. We must make provision for the use of the ship facilities created by the war. We must establish a policy on international aviation.

In pursuance of its program of consideration of these problems, the council has set up eight policy committees, with a brief list of the subjects allocated to each. These and other subjects will be explored and studied during the months to come. They are as follows:

POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMITTEES

1. FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Program and procedure in the making of peace.

Problems of aid and cooperation for distressed countries.

Collaboration with other nations in establishing permanent peace.

2. POST-WAR ENTERPRISE, INDUSTRY, AND EMPLOYMENT

Provision for demobilization of armed forces.

Conversion of war industries to peace industries.

Encouragement of investment and of employment by industry.

Preservation of small business.

Problems of unfair competition and monopoly.

Domestic commerce and transportation.

Public works, highways, and reclamation.

3. SOCIAL WELFARE AND SECURITY

Old-age security and unemployment aids.

Extension of social security to additional groups and additional needs.

The problem of the forms of relief.

Federal or State and local administration of social security and relief.

Public and private housing.

4. FINANCE, TAXATION, AND MONEY

The problems of an unbalanced budget.

The payment of Government debt.

A sound system of Federal taxation.

A sound currency system.

5. REFORM OF GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

The problem of Federal bureaucracy.

Economy in administration.

Limitation of Executive power.

Limitation of powers of administrative boards.

Federal corporations.

Federal powers, States' powers, and local self-government.

6. LABOR

Sound and equitable labor legislation.

Solution of problems of labor and industry.

7. AGRICULTURE

A long-range program for the American farmer.

Agricultural problems of production, price, and distribution.

Decentralization of Federal control.

New crops and new uses for farm crops.

8. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

International trade.

Post-war tariff and reciprocity policy.

Stabilization of international exchanges.

Post-war shipping problems.

International air transport.

Third War Loan Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address by the President of the United States on September 8, 1943, in connection with the opening of the Third War Loan Drive.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once upon a time, a few years ago, there was a city in our Middle West which was threatened by a destructive flood in the river. The waters had risen to the top of the banks. Every man, woman, and child in that city was called upon to fill sand bags in order to defend their homes against the rising waters. For many days and nights, destruction and death stared them in the face.

As a result of the grim, determined community effort, that city still stands. Those people kept the levees above the peak of the flood. All of them joined together in the desperate job which had to be done—businessmen, workers, farmers, doctors, preachers—people of all races.

To me, that town is a living symbol of what community cooperation can accomplish.

Today, in the same kind of community effort, the United Nations and their people have kept the levees of civilization high enough to prevent the floods of aggression and barbarism and wholesale murder from engulfing us all. The flood has been raging for 4 years. At last, we are beginning to gain on it; but the waters have not yet receded enough for us to relax our sweating work with the sand bags. In this War bond campaign we are filling bags and placing them against the flood—bags which are essential if we are to stand off the ugly torrent which is trying to sweep us all away.

Today, an armistice with Italy was concluded.

This was a great victory for the United Nations—but it was also a great victory for the Italian people. After years of war and suffering and degradation, the Italian people are at last coming to the day of liberation from their real enemies, the Nazis.

But let us not delude ourselves that this armistice means the end of the war in the Mediterranean. We must drive the Germans out of Italy as we have driven them out of Tunisia and Sicily; we must drive them out of France and all other captive countries; and we must strike them on their own soil from all directions.

Our ultimate objectives in this war continue to be Berlin and Tokyo.

I ask you to bear these objectives constantly in mind—and do not forget that we still have a long way to go before attaining them.

The great news you have heard today from General Eisenhower does not give you license to settle back in your rocking chairs and say, "Well, that does it. We've got 'em on the run. Now we can start the celebration."

The time for celebration is not yet. And I have a suspicion that when this war does end, we shall not be in a very celebrating frame of mind. I think that our main emotion will be one of grim determination that this shall not happen again.

During the past weeks, Mr. Churchill and I have been in constant conference with the leaders of our combined fighting forces. We have been in constant communication with our fighting allies, Russian and Chinese, who are prosecuting the war with relentless determination and with conspicuous success on far distant fronts. And he and I are together here at this crucial moment.

We have seen the satisfactory fulfillment of plans that were made in Casablanca last January and here in Washington last May. And we have made new, extensive plans for the future. But throughout these conferences we have never lost sight of the fact that this war will become bigger and tougher, rather than easier during the long months that are to come.

This war does not and must not stop for one single instant. Our fighting men know that. Those of them who are moving forward through jungles against lurking Japs—those who are in landing barges moving through the dawn up to strange enemy coasts—those who are diving their bombers down on the target at roof-top level—every one of these men knows that this war is a full-time job and that it will continue to be until total victory is won.

And, by the same token, every responsible leader in all the United Nations knows that the fighting goes on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and that any day lost may have to be paid for in terms of months added to the duration of the war.

Every campaign, every single operation that we plan and carry through must be figured in terms of staggering material costs. We cannot afford to be niggardly with any of our resources, for we shall need all of them to do the job that we have undertaken.

Your fellow Americans have given a magnificent account of themselves—on the battlefields and on the oceans and in the skies all over the world.

Now it is up to you to prove to them that you are contributing your share and more than your share. It is not sufficient simply to put money into War bonds which we would normally save. We must put money into War bonds which we would not normally save. Only then have we done everything that good conscience demands. It is up to you—the Americans in the American homes—the very homes which our sons and daughters are working and fighting and dying to preserve.

I know I speak for every man and woman in America when I say that we Americans will not be satisfied to send our troops into the fire of the enemy with equipment inferior in any way. Nor will we be satisfied to send our troops with equipment only equal to that of the enemy. We are determined to provide our troops with overpowering superiority of quality and quantity in any and every category of arms and armaments that they may conceivably need.

And where does our dominating power come from? It can come only from you. The money you lend and the money you give in taxes buys that death-dealing, life-saving power we need for victory. This is an expensive war—expensive in money; you can help keep it at a minimum cost in lives.

The American people will never stop to reckon the cost of redeeming civilization. They know there can never be any economic justification for failing to save freedom.

We can be sure that our enemies will watch this drive with the keenest interest. They know that success in this undertaking will shorten the war. They know that the more money the American people lend to their Government, the more powerful and relentless will be the American forces in the field. They know that only a united and determined America could possibly produce on a voluntary basis so large a sum of money as $15,000,000,000.

The overwhelming success of the Second War Loan Drive last April showed that the people of this democracy stood firm behind their troops.

The Third War Loan, which we are starting tonight, will also succeed—because the American people will not permit it to fail.

I cannot tell you how much to invest in War bonds during this Third War Loan Drive. No one can tell you. It is for you to decide under the guidance of your own conscience.

I will say this, however. Because the Nation's needs are greater than ever before, our sacrifices, too, must be greater than they have ever been before.

Nobody knows when total victory will come, but we do know that the harder we fight now, the more might and power we direct at the enemy now, the shorter the war will be and the smaller the sum total of sacrifice.

Success of the Third War Loan will be the symbol that America does not propose to rest on its arms—that we know the tough, bitter job ahead, and will not stop until we have finished it.

Now it is your turn.

Every dollar that you invest in the Third War Loan is your personal message of defiance to our common enemies—to the ruthless militarists of Germany and Japan—your personal message of faith and good cheer to our allies and all the men at the front.

What We Fight For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able address entitled "What We Fight For," delivered last Saturday in Chicago by our distinguished Vice President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT WE FIGHT FOR

Those of you who must read the McCormick press know the inevitable conflict is here. Now—not tomorrow. We shall soon know whether the common man shall have democracy first or whether under the smooth phrase America first, the common man shall be robbed. Beautiful advertisements and slick editorials say "Let our soldiers come home to America as it used to be." What they are really saying is, "Let us go back to normalcy, depressions, cartels, and a war every 25 years."

In World War No. 1 we fought to make the world safe for democracy. We failed. Hitler rose, and the Second World War came on because we were not sufficiently concerned with the plight of the common man the world over. We did not realize that economic democracy must be combined with political democracy or political democracy would die. Hitler exploited our failure to establish an economic democracy by starting World War No. 2. If we are to prevent a second Hitler and World War No. 3, we must be more daring than we were 25 years ago. We must fight not merely to make the world safe for democracy but to give democracy first place in the world. Some people say America first. Under that slogan we can have only war because under it envious, hungry peoples, the have-not nations with per capita resources less than one-fifth our own, will inevitably rise up to tear us down. The battle cry America first means that sooner or later we shall find ourselves alone, encircled by and fighting against a hostile combination. But the slogan democracy first, intelligently followed up and vigorously applied can lead to peace. As a matter of fact, it is only by applying the principles of democracy first that we can have any chance of lasting peace.

The slogan "democracy first" means the supremacy of freedom in both the economic and the political world. Freedom means respect for the dignity of the individual. No man should be free to take another man's freedom away from him. God gave every one of us certain rights. He gave all of us a world rich in soil and minerals. And to many of us He gave such scientific understanding that we know it is now possible to build health, comfort, and happiness for everyone. If we plan aright, there can be freedom from hunger and freedom from the fear of a poverty-stricken old age. The farmer can be free of his fear of impossibly low prices for what he sells and outrageously high prices for what he buys. The businessman can be free from the fear of those monopolies and international cartels which use unfair practices in buying from him, selling to him, or competing with him.

In the world of modern technology, the possibilities of abundant production are so great that it is only a question of time until we can bring the blessing of freedom from want to everyone. Two hundred years ago freedom of discussion and freedom of religion meant more to people than freedom from want. Those were the days when men on the farm and in the workshop were only about one-tenth as efficient as they are today. There was little talk about freedom from want in those days, because nearly everyone thought scarcity was the will of God. Therefore, attention was centered on political freedom, on freedom of expression and freedom of religion, on the right to be secure in one's own home. With the old-line Tories having things their own way in England and France, it was necessary to have a people's revolution to launch the idea of political freedom. We in the United States told the world what we were fighting for in the Declaration of Independence. Our first action after adopting the Constitution was to improve that Constitution by adding to it the Bill of Rights so as to make it certain that political democracy would always be the fundamental law of the United States. We shall never give up the freedom embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. But that freedom is not enough. Each age demands a new freedom. The time has come for a new declaration of freedom which adds to and makes secure, in an age of airplanes, radio and abundance, the freedoms for which our fathers fought. Our new declaration must go on to cover freedoms we haven't got now but which we must have.

Three of the President's famous "four freedoms" deal with freedoms which we in the United States have long enjoyed. The fourth freedom which must be the essence of the new declaration of freedom is freedom from want, which I would spell out as follows:

1. Freedom from worry about a job.
2. Freedom from worry about a dependent and poverty-pinched old age.
3. Freedom from unnecessary worry about sickness and hunger.
4. Freedom from strife between workers and businessmen, between farmers and businessmen, and between workers and farmers.
5. Freedom from strife between the races
6. Freedom from fear of bankruptcy caused by overproduction of necessary materials.
7. Freedom for venture capital and for inventors of new ideas to expand production of needed goods without fear of repressive cartels, excessive taxation, or excessive Government regulation.

Above everything we are fighting for peace. But peace will not last long if it doesn't bring to the common man everywhere these seven freedoms. Neither will it last long if it is made before the Allied armies reach Berlin and Tokyo. We sympathize with pacifists and those who are anxious to get their boys home, but we have only contempt for those American Fascists who by their conditional peace talk strengthen the resistance of the enemy. The Middle West is not isolationist. Chicago is not mean and selfish and narrow. Here, remote from the oceans but in the heart of the war effort, we earnestly seek the road to lasting peace, not by isolationism but by cooperation with other nations.

The first step toward getting the seven new freedoms is to pass through the Senate of the United States some such resolution as No. 114, which provides for the United States taking the initiative in calling meetings of the United Nations. This resolution looks toward a court or board to listen to international disputes, a military force to prevent military aggression, and the gradual addition of such other machinery as may be necessary. I am for the resolution as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. There should be provision for joint action on the problem of unemployment and overproduction due to international causes. There must

be power to deal with those international cartels which are strangling production, competing unfairly, or using methods which lead to war.

During the past 2 months Senators and Congressmen speaking on behalf of Resolution 114 have received a marvelous reception wherever they have gone. Next Tuesday Congress again takes up its duties. Ninety-six Senators and our President will determine what we are going to do about peace. Their action will largely depend on what they think you and millions like you are willing to do to get peace.

There is no time to be lost. Now is the time to strike while the war irons are hot. The war is costing us 10 times what it should because the democracies were not prepared. The peace also will cost us 10 times what it should if we do not begin preparing now. We can arrive at understandings now which we can't get next year. The memory of the airplanes, tanks, food, and men from the United States is so recent and means so much to England, Russia, and China that they can't help being grateful. In like manner we are impressed today by the skill of the British airmen, the tremendous drive of the Russian armies, and the patience of the Chinese after 6 years of fighting a treacherous foe. Today we all face reality and are grateful for the help of friends. But tomorrow millions of us may forget and curse Europe and Asia as the cause of our woes. All nations tomorrow will too easily slump back into the selfishness which makes peace merely an interlude to war.

On a world-wide scale today we face the same problem as the Thirteen North American Colonies faced in the closing years of the Revolutionary War. Out of the anarchy of conflicting opinion, the aspirations of the common man built the Constitution and the Bill of Rights so that freemen might have a chance to go ahead on their own merit without fear or favor. Then when the dead hand of monopoly, backed by monarchy, was removed, free enterprise expanded into the Middle West. The tremendous growth of American industry was a tribute to the principle of free opportunity which for the first time in the world's history was applied in a big way here in the United States.

Isolationism is the screen behind which special privilege seeks to entrench its control. When I say this, I am not talking about people who honestly believe the United States could isolate itself from the problems of the rest of the world. Certain of these people whom I have known personally have devoted their lives to the elimination of special privilege. Senator Norris, who fought more vigorously against special privilege than any man of his generation, was at one time an isolationist. But men of Senator Norris' insight and motivation sooner or later realize that not only are isolationism and special privilege theoretically the same thing but that the men who back isolationism in the economic world have a very keen interest in special privilege. Isolationism and special privilege spoke with equal force to produce the peace of Munich. Wherever isolationism is being pushed most vigorously, there in the background can usually be found, furnishing money and power, monopolistic cartels. These cartels are customarily seeking tariffs, quotas, subsidies, or other governmental favors which are the breeding ground of isolationism.

Chicago has been the home of many a stirring fight against monopolistic privilege. Here Theodore Roosevelt was nominated on the Bull Moose ticket in 1912. Here the La Follette name, whether it be father or son, has a special significance. Here Franklin Roosevelt was nominated in 1932 and again in 1940. Here in this hall tonight are men and women in whose veins flows the blood of 20 European nations. The fight against special privilege is not confined to one party, race, or region. Senator BALL, who is with me on this program here tonight, and who as far as I am able to discover has the same ideas on international monopoly as I, is a Republican. The difference between us is that he thinks the forces of monopoly are more likely to dominate the Democratic Party and I am sure that the same evil forces are in much greater danger of dominating the Republican Party. Wherever these forces are found, our job is to fight them. Those groups which rule over economic empires have usurped the sovereignty of the people in international relations. We talk about a foreign policy based on reciprocal trade treaties and on open covenants openly arrived at with the advice of the Senate responsible to the people. This is good as far as it goes but the facts have not squared with the principle.

In reality, much of our economic relationship with the rest of the world has been governed by a small group seeking to parcel out the resources and markets of the world so as to control production, prices, distribution, and the very life blood of world industry. These cliques have their own international government by which they arrive at private quotas. Their emissaries are found in the foreign offices of many of the important nations of the world. They create their own system of tariffs and determine who will be given permission to produce, to buy, and to sell. When I attack these monopolists, these creators of secret supergovernment, I am not attacking business. I am speaking for business because the overwhelming majority of businessmen, as well as practically all consumers, are forced to pay tribute to these international freebooters. They talk about freer trade, but by dividing up the world markets, restricting production, stifling investment, playing one nation against another, they have unwittingly fostered world depression and maintained economic feudalism. By eliminating competition, they have replaced true capitalism with the dead hand of monopoly. Pope Pius XI, 13 years ago, spoke truly about these men when he said: "This concentration of power has led to a threefold struggle for domination. First, there is the struggle for dictatorship in the economic sphere itself; then, the fierce battle to acquire control of the state, so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles; finally, the clash between states themselves."

Take rubber for example. Long before Pearl Harbor many of us in government had done our best to build up a rubber stock pile, to encourage the growing of natural rubber in this hemisphere and to get synthetic rubber production started. As Secretary of Agriculture I personally took the initiative in some of this work, including the trading of 600,000 bales of cotton for 90,000 tons of rubber In the summer of 1940 I urged on Ed Stettinius the desirability of his looking into and pushing the production of butyl rubber. Later as a member of W. P. B. I continued to push for prompt butyl rubber expansion. I took this interest in butyl because of the information I had obtained when Secretary of Agriculture from the coinventor of butyl rubber who, in 1940, was working for the United States Department of Agriculture.

What I didn't know and what 130,000,000 Americans did not know was that the private rulers of world industry had their own private approach to synthetic rubber. Synthetic rubber was the subject of a private treaty between a great American oil company and I. G. Farben, the German chemical colossus. These two great concerns made a deal. The Germans were given a world monopoly on synthetic rubber. The Americans were given a monopoly on synthetic gasoline. This monopoly was good over the entire world, with the exception of Germany. The Germans knew what they were after. They would not yield their own development in their own country to foreign interests.

This secret agreement between an American monopoly and a German cartel was submitted to no public authority in this country. It was far more important than most treaties but it was never acted upon by the United States Senate. The peoples and the governments of the world had unwittingly let the cartels and the monopolies form a supergovernment by means of which they could monopolize and divide whole fields of science and carve up the markets of the world at their own sweet pleasure. The people must get back their power to deal with this supergovernment. This supergovernment has misused the people of the United States not only with regard to rubber but in a host of other critical industries as well. Today, I shall deal only with rubber, particularly with buna rubber.

Buna rubber is the German rubber which the American oil company got control of when it made its trade with I. G. Farben.

As a result of its deal, the American oil company had to choose between loyalty to the United States and its commercial obligation to its German partner. Because of its commitments to the German partner the oil company did three things:

1. It misled the Government as to the restrictive character of the patent situation.

2. It assured Government officials that every effort would be made to bring about a large production of synthetic rubber for tires and then offered licenses which were deliberately oppressive in order to prevent the production of tires from this rubber. It sued one company and threatened to sue a second for daring to produce buna rubber.

3. For 5 years the production of butyl rubber was held back, although the American company had invented butyl and knew that it possessed greater possibilities than buna. Full information and regular reports about butyl were given to the German cartel partner, but at the same time the American company tried to mislead the representative of the United States Navy who was sent specifically to learn about butyl.

In brief the civilian life and the war effort of the United States have been made more difficult because of private international rubber deals. Divided loyalty of this sort has been repeated many times. An American concern actually refused to advertise in anti-Nazi newspapers in South America because it felt obligated to comply with its commitments to a German partner. Another American cartel member felt obligated to send confidential information to Germany which the War Department of the United States had specifically requested it not to divulge. Still another agreed to assist the Germans in concealing true ownership of German property in the United States so that the Alien Property Custodian would not seize it, and so that it could be returned to the Germans after the end of the war.

Let us not be deceived into thinking that attacks on cartels are attacks on American business. On the contrary, cartels are the greatest menace to the American business principles of free private enterprise and equal opportunity. Ask the American businessman who has felt the weight of monopoly, patent control, and cartel oppression.

This whole matter takes on great practical importance as we consider the terms under which monopolists will obtain United States Government constructed war plants. These plants can be used to produce postwar abundance for the common man. The problem is whether the small businessmen are going to be elbowed to one side—whether free

enterprise is to be smothered by monopolistic controls worked out by big businessmen holding Government ring-side seats. Planning to give small business its full, practicable postwar share of war-plant facilities and equal access to raw materials must begin at once. Otherwise there can be neither free enterprise nor full employment in the peace to come.

And now let us focus on the immediate objectives of the common man:

1. Hitler, Mussolini, and what they stand for must be wiped out as soon as possible.

2. The time to dictate peace terms is when our armies are in Berlin and Tokyo.

3. The international monopolists should be conspicuous by their absence at the peace table.

4. The air space above this earth must be used to serve the needs of trade and travel for the common man. A proper degree of competition will insure the best service at the lowest cost. Government subsidies, if any, must be used to promote the common man's interest in trade and peace and not to preserve monopolies or to promote destructive international rivalries. If the airplane is to be an instrument of peace rather than an endless threat of war, there must be international cooperation.

5. International organization can build permanent peace only by serving continually the needs of the common man everywhere for jobs, opportunity, health, and security.

6. Isolationism, whether it be by stifled patents, cartel understandings, high tariffs, or any other method of restrictive greed, must continually be fought.

7. Arrangements made by international cartels should be publicly recorded. The Departments of State and Justice and the Patent Office must be continually alert to the possibility of secret agreements in addition to the written ones which should be on file.

8. Free enterprise demands freer travel between the nations and less passport, visa, and custom foolishness. We need more free moving, enterprising businessmen and fewer secret agents and monopolists.

9. Backward peoples everywhere must be educated by example for full production. Free enterprise thoughtfully planned will result in power projects on the Danube, irrigation works in India, flood control in China, and as a result of it all, the common man in every country will prosper, jobs will be created in Chicago and Detroit, and there will be a better market for the Iowa farmer right here at home. Such self-liquidating projects will not be gifts of the United States, but we can furnish engineering services and finance sales of machinery.

Senate Resolution 114 is a step toward a people's peace. A people's peace is the gateway on the path to the century of the common man. In the century of the common man rule No. 1 is the full use of all natural resources on a sustained basis. Rule No. 2 is full use of all technologies. Rule No. 3 is to use these resources and technologies so that everyone working in hope can come every night to a peaceful rest in the expectation of another day of hopeful work tomorrow.

The common man will not let the governments, corporations, and cartels of the world rest until these three rules are fulfilled. America cannot do this job by herself because in such case her standard of living, so far above the rest of the world, would bring on envy and finally war. America's only safety and guaranty of high living standards is in world-wide full use of natural resources and a world-wide rise in living standards as rapid as her own.

There is certain to be revolution until the seven freedoms are obtained and the three rules are fulfilled. The only question is the speed of the revolution and whether it will be peaceful or violent. The returning soldiers and war workers will not tolerate bread lines, closed factories, and bursting grain elevators after the style of 1930–32. Leadership will arise. If it be of the thoughtless or demagogic Nazi type, there are troubled days ahead. Monopolies which finance demagogs to cut the throat of progress and to despoil labor are playing with the fire which will burn down their own houses. And so I ask all the potential leaders of agriculture, business, and labor to take counsel with themselves and with the politicians. Time will not wait. The breath of the future is on us as it has never been before. We cannot escape. The day about which the prophets and seers of many nations have dreamed for 3,000 years is rapidly approaching. May wisdom and understanding guide our President and the 96 Senators as they try to make the dream of universal peace a reality.

Address of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, at Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of Illinois

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me at the annual convention of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, held at Chicago, Ill., on August 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Commander, fellow Legionnaires, and friends, your presence in this convention hall does me a very great honor. Grateful am I to your distinguished leader for his kind and tolerant introductory remarks.

Without thought of such graciousness upon the part of Commander Phelan, I am obliged at the outset of these remarks to pay tribute to the service this loyal Legionnaire has rendered to God and country during one of the Nation's most trying periods. Commander Phelan has kept the faith. He has respected and adhered to the mandates of the State and National Conventions. He has rigidly observed the political restriction clause of our Legion constitution. I regret to find some high officials in the national organization who seem to have forgotten that we have such a political restriction clause. Commander Phelan has diligently and faithfully applied himself to the many problems that constantly arise wherein our comrades are involved. I am glad to call him—my friend.

May I also say a word in behalf of the old true and tried warrior, our State adjutant, William Mundt. He and his staff are, after all, the men and women who sawed the wood and kindled the fire—for years they have been giving their best to a humanitarian, patriotic, and worthy cause. The fine reputation that our department enjoys throughout the Nation is due, in great measure, to the untiring efforts of Bill Mundt, Bob Hafey, Lester Benston, and Lyle Snavey, and many others who handle the administrative work of our great organization.

Since we last counciled together, another year has been borne away on the wings of bombers, the decks of battleships, the treads of tanks—its moments ticked off to the thundering cadence of roaring guns, marching feet, and dying men in battle. Since our last convention we are all happy in the thought that we and our allies have definitely gone from the defensive to the offensive on every front throughout the warring world. In my address at Peoria 1 year ago I predicted that in 1 year's time we would have supremacy of the air on every front. Today, my comrades, that is an accomplished fact, and our potential power of production of these weapons of death and destruction is still unknown.

The ingenuity, the bravery of our American boys completely exploded the Hitler and Mussolini myth that we were a decadent democracy and too proud to fight. During the last year we have definitely routed the Nazi U-boat menace in the Atlantic, while our submarines in the Pacific continue to destroy the Japanese ships at a rate which is giving old Tojo and his barbarian leaders many sleepless and restless nights.

Our naval, air, and military success in the Pacific, from Attu to Australia, during the last year, is a lasting tribute to our fighting leaders and their fearless men, when we consider how thinly our men and equipment were spread throughout the world. What we have done in the Pacific with what we have, against a savage nation that prepared for this war the last 15 years, is little short of miraculous. Yet, what we have done is only a curtain raiser to the great events to come. Someday this treacherous band of outlaws will really feel the sting, the wrath, and power of a people who wanted to live in peace with their neighbors of the world, but not at the price offered by the Axis criminals. When that hour arrives, Japan as a military and naval power in the Pacific will be destroyed. They will receive the same kind of military and naval treatment that we administered to Italy and Germany in north Africa, the Mediterranean, and Sicily. It was a glad day for the Allied forces when Mussolini took the count. Today Hitler is desperate and groggy as the hour of invasion approaches.

When this holocaust of hell will be over no man can foretell. While victory is certain, I admonish you, my fellow Legionnaires, the people of Illinois, and the Nation, that this victory is not just around the corner. The road to Berlin and Tokyo will be long and bloody, but in the end we shall triumph. Our cause is righteous and just. It shall not be denied.

When that hour approaches fighting men will return from victory at arms, some rejoicing in their strength, some broken, some enriched in spirit, and some, perhaps, with madness lurking in their eyes.

Will these gallant Americans return with the same outlook on the future world as we had 25 years ago? Will they, in 25 years from now, experience the same disillusionment and disappointment about a permanent and lasting peace as we have experienced?

You will remember that we came home thrilled with the pride of high achievement. We believed that we had established forever the American ideal that a human being is a creature of dignity and worth. We fancied our sacrifices had planted this ideal where it would spread and safeguard democracy everywhere. We felt that we had bought, even at a great price, peace and happiness, a larger freedom, and a better way of life, for ourselves and unborn generations.

But the time came when we found, in some bewildering fashion, we had been deluded and betrayed. We soon found that democracy was wavering—its cherished institutions questioned at home and abroad. New orders and various kinds of movements

violently opposing democracy, were gaining foothold in every part of the world. Soon fear spread and hate skulked everywhere. The seeds of future evil were being broadcast. World leaders were apparently powerless to uproot them. The people of the democracy just couldn't believe that it could happen either here, or there. So today we are reaping a grim harvest.

My comrades, this cannot happen again. It will not happen if you and I, and every loyal American, including the returning warriors of World War No. 2, give unselfishly the best that is in us to prevent a repetition of war. We must either abolish war, or perish by it. We must chart a safe course to lasting peace through the post-war mine fields of self-interest, apathy, specious panaceas, confused thinking, and hollow promises. We must not only make adequate plans for peace, but provide the means for their fulfillment.

Absurdly, the word "planning" in some quarters, is received with open suspicion. Purposely perhaps, it has been lent an odious connotation. Yet we have never lived without plans. We never will. We are winning this war with plans. Obviously, our paramount plan is the winning of the war, but no opportunity should be overlooked in planning and discussing the peace that is to come.

For those who sneer at planners as impractical visionaries, I want to quote Ralph Bradford, general manager of the United States Chamber of Commerce, who recently wrote:

"The present is concretely and explicitly the result of the past. By the same token, events of tomorrow and the next day are today being determined. Society is a continuous flow--every act of today has its significance for the future," adding, "If we want a better post-war life, we can have it—first by recognizing the continuum of human affairs; and, second, by making plans now to provide conditions essential to a better future."

My friends, before we can draft our blueprint for peace we must agree definitely what we are fighting for. We all say we are fighting the war so that we may have peace. The answer is true, but it is an oversimplification. We have not made clear what peace implies to us.

What vision does the word "peace" conjure for our fighting men sunk in reptile-insect-disease-infested jungle slime or crouched shivering in the cleft of a rocky crag? In my opinion, peace means to these fighting men, not only preserving the America they know and love but the creation of a new and better America for the present and future generations.

It also means to them a peace that will not plunge us again into a pool of our own blood. In the planning and discussion of peace at the present moment, we can do no better than to accept as a working premise paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Atlantic Charter, which say:

"They (the signatories) will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms, to the trade of raw materials of the world which are needed for economic prosperity;

"They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

Here is something new and refreshing for the present and post-war world to consider. It is a declaration of world-wide significance. It recognizes that after victory we cannot merely return to our post-war status. The great minds responsible for the Atlantic Charter were firmly cognizant of some of the basic reasons for the tragic failure of this world to live in peace.

Certainly, too closely related situations growing out of the First World War throw strong light on why we failed before. The Allied Powers, in the face of common danger, eagerly submerged individual economic interests in close economic collaboration calculated to speed defeat of the enemy. When this common objective was achieved, they refused to continue this collaboration designed to insure supplies and transportation facilities for all concerned at reasonable rates.

Was abandonment of this collaboration justified when its immediate objective was achieved? At the time, many of our lawmakers and those engaged in commerce believed it was, and their belief prevailed. There is far less support for such an opinion now.

Henry B. Brodie and Karl W. Kapp, private economists, in a work sponsored by the National Planning Association, offer the opinion that "by refusing to make the economic adjustments and concessions which a policy of internal cooperation would have implied, the great democracies which emerged victorious from the war of 1914–18 not only failed to build a stable world order, but undermined the very security of their national existence."

The second condition is familiar to all. In some of the forsaken Allied Powers, and some of the strait-jacketed enemy countries, food riots swept along the streets. People grasped desperately at straws. They were easily led into radical political and social experiments by opportunists who shamelessly played upon their people's desperation and indecision to further their own consuming lust for power. There demagogs offered to feed the hungry, heal their countries' wounds, mend their broken economies, and build bulwarks against their own fear. As their panaceas failed, these economic witch doctors edged their countries toward the war which would obscure their failure. They became converts to the Nazi-Japanese-Fascist philosophy of despotic tyranny.

I have searched a good many dissertations on this subject lately, and I have been unable to find a single authority who does not profess to find in the rise of these conditions, the reason why we bleed today.

Whether we have any interest from an altruistic standpoint in the dietary difficulties of our allies and enemies after the war, we may for a time, have to feed them, unless of course, we prefer sometime to fight them again. That seems pretty plain, although when such action has been suggested for security and humanitarian principles, the proponents have been called "impractical dreamers" and are accused of wanting to "give the United States away."

Of course, this is a political sophistry that is used once again to fool the American people, as was done after World War No. 1. A sophistry that brought us into the middle of the present global conflict with all of its cruel and heinous ramifications.

Bankers are rarely "impractical dreamers." They scarcely ever, as far as my experience extends, favor giving anything away, much less the United States of America. Yet Charles E. Spencer, Jr., president of the First National Bank of Boston, has said, "The stricken nations should be helped to get back on their feet", and the Federation of British Industries, with at least no widespread reputation for "crazy altruism," insist that immediately after the war "it will be necessary to send foodstuffs, equipment and stocks of raw materials into distressed areas."

Obviously, this generosity will last only until the stricken starving nations can obtain a new lease on life. If we can support lend-lease in time of war, we can continue to give aid and comfort to starving and anemic nations for a time after the war. And remember, America will not be alone in this humanitarian effort.

While we are giving this immediate relief to the needy nations, we must also have enough soldiers stationed in all of these countries to do all necessary police work. Countries conquered by ruthless and Godless dictators will return to the normal way of decent living in short order. Fascist Italy, Japan and Nazi Germany will be our permanent source of trouble. But they, too, will understand that the American people mean business at this time. No marching to the Rhine and withdrawing. Our Army, in conjunction with our allies, will march to Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo. Part of that army will be there when the peace is made. Into this peace should be written the solemn verdict that every munition factory and every shop that aids in the making of war shall be dismantled and destroyed. Every gun, tank, and military plane shall be removed. A simple embargo on certain strategic and critical materials that go into the making of tanks, bombers, and fighter planes can bring these warring nations to an understanding that we mean business about a permanent peace this time.

My comrades, common sense dictates this course; financial security impels it. The taxation necessary to carry out this program will not cost per year what one fortnight alone of the current war is costing the American taxpayer.

Let no one tell you that this kind of a hard and fast program will weaken or destroy American sovereignty. We will come out of this war as the leader of nations; whether we retain that leadership, strengthen our sovereignty, maintain our inalienable rights, protect our economic rights throughout the world, depends solely upon the type of peace that is written. I do not underestimate the many obstacles that lie ahead in this, or any other program of peace that is to come after the war.

It may be a terrible reality to even talk about some kind of a world unity, but my friends, science has abolished space. Nations have been unwittingly linked together through our technical progress. Before this war is finished, we may see bombers making nonstop flights around the world.

It is said by some that one who advocates this course hopes to seize upon the post-war situation at home to remodel our whole political system, in keeping with some foreign or rarefied theory.

My fellow Americans, I know not what others may think, but to me, to lose our present social or political or economic system would be to lose the war, no matter whose army lay crushed upon the field. Free enterprise led to our independence. It is the mechanism upon which we long have depended for our larger freedom. But strangely, there is much confusion on the subject of free enterprise. This is quite unfortunate, for private enterprise has one of the chief roles to play in assuring permanent peace. It should not be hampered by any misunderstanding of its proper function.

At a single time, we all have seen 10,000,000 persons idle in this country, hungry and in despair. Is this part of the enterprise system? No; and by the same token, an attempt to rescue those starving multitudes cannot be regarded as an attempt to overthrow it. We all have known of markets rigged and production stifled and millions of men held at subsistence levels by reason of substandard wages. Are these conditions part and parcel of the enterprise system? No; and neither is any attempt to remedy these conditions any part of a move to wreck this system.

I wouldn't suspect Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, economist for the committee on economic policy of the United States Chamber of Com-

merce, of harboring any prejudices against capitalism. So, I shall borrow a few of his words:

"From the viewpoint of the general public, the function of the enterprise system has been to gather the factors of production: Land, labor, capital, and to organize them into productive units," says Dr. Schmidt.

Profits honestly gained, and widely used, are not only legitimate, but the source of great benefit to society. But are profits alone, sacrosanct without regard for the fact that they energize a system which accomplished something more? Are they specified as the First Commandment? In short, is Smith's profit in itself something that Jones should be willing to die for?

The free enterprise system is obviously interwoven with jobs, goods, and service. It works at its best when men are employed at a decent living wage. As Dr. Schmidt has said, "Jobs and job continuity must be provided by the enterprise system if this system is to survive," adding that "the American people do not want to see their Government turn employer—they are not socialistic. But if they become convinced that private business cannot do the job, they will turn to the Government, and if they do—can we preserve liberty and freedom?"

Eric Johnston, the ex-marine captain who is president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, wrote in February's Reader's Digest, "The President recently abolished the W P. A. Why did he ever establish it? Because business was not giving full employment. If business fails again to give full employment there will be another W. P. A. There will be so under any President." He adds this prediction, "No American President will ever again permit American citizens to be unemployed. They will be employed by the Government."

Our troops will preserve democracy against overthrow by force, we must protect it at home by creating post-war jobs for about 30,000,000 persons, mostly in private enterprise. This is no little task. Private enterprise can succeed in furnishing jobs for 30,000,000, only to the extent the Government succeeds in establishing favorable conditions for business expansion at home and abroad.

Many conditions will exist favorable to the needed expansion. New commodities are being developed. New productive processes are being developed. New materials are being used. The number of skilled workers is being increased. War savings are growing into new potential capital. A deferred demand for goods is piling up. As a result of the war, our plant capacity is the largest in history. But along with these plants, we have one of the biggest problems which must be solved by the Government.

It owns a fourteen-billion stake in the war plants. What is it going to do with them? Lose them, and lose the capacity we need, or keep them open? If it keeps them open, will it actually operate them, or sell them to private industry. Questions on this subject alone are interminable.

Among all the plans for post-war activities, the serviceman probably will have the deepest interest in favorable and continuous reemployment for all. No matter how favorable his owr assimilation by the social order after the war, he will find himself in the same competition which affects everyone else if and when another depression falls upon us.

However, the serviceman's most immediate and most obvious concern at the conclusion of the war will be his own demobilization and reemployment, hospitalization, or education. These problems will be some of the many that await the return of Congress in a few weeks.

We, in America, are depending upon the men in uniform to accomplish almost unparalleled feats. Under the leadership of the Eisenhowers, the Nimitzes, the MacArthurs, and the Doolittles of today, they are adding bright chapters to the history of men who were led by the Washingtons, the John Paul Joneses, the Lees, the Grants, the Pershings, and the MacArthurs of yesterday. In turn, they are depending upon us for the accomplishment of a gigantic feat, too—the cashing in on their sacrifices by the establishment of a permanent peace. Are we going to let them down?

If we are content to depend upon wisdom instead of prejudice we must select plans to reach our objective, neither because they are practical or idealistic, but because they will best accomplish our purposes. If we refuse to be led astray by specious promises, and rely upon the leadership of those with courage to do the hard things which are inexorably necessary in shaping lasting peace, we'll get full value for our blood and tears this time.

Ours is a big job. Almost too big for ordinary conception. But it is a job that can and must be done. With the proper organization, the will to work together, we can accomplish it, providing ourselves and the world with an expanding economy and constantly rising living standards.

Above all else, we must hold a firm faith. Faith is a specific for fear. If we can be free of fear of the future, we can solve its problems.

Record of the Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Record of the Seventy-eighth Congress, delivered by me before the Alabama Bar Association at Birmingham, Ala., Saturday, July 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is pleasant indeed to come back to Alabama after 3 years and meet again the friends who were so kind to us when Mrs. Taft and I were here in 1940. When JOHN BANKHEAD extended the invitation of the Alabama Bar Association, I was delighted to seize the chance of getting away from the hectic confusion of Washington to enjoy the unequaled hospitality of the South. It is all the more pleasant now that Congress has succeeded in winding up its affairs and departing for the first recess of any length in the last 4 years.

This has been by far the most interesting, and in some ways the most dramatic, session since I was elected to the Senate. The actions of this Congress mark the end of an era, and contain a suggestion of the progress which we may make in future years. It is a long time since I have felt so encouraged about the future of our governmental system.

Today I intend to review the various actions which have been taken, and set forth the principles which I believe have guided the Congress in taking them; then suggest a future program based on those principles.

CONGRESS SUPPORTS THE WAR

In the first place, the differences between Congress and the President have related almost entirely to domestic matters. There is no difference of opinion in Congress or among the people with regard to our goal in the war, and no hesitation in giving to the armed forces the unlimited support and sacrifice which they require. You do not read much about the actions of Congress regarding the war itself, because there is no controversy, and peaceful cooperation does not make news. Everyone in Washington agrees today that there can be no goal except the complete and unconditional surrender of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Of course, there are a good many self-appointed military experts in Congress and throughout the country who differ as to the best method by which victory may be obtained, but Congress as a whole is disposed in general to leave the decisions in military matters to our military and naval leaders:

This Congress has appropriated for the Army and Navy and Maritime Commission in 1944 the huge sum of $100,000,000,000. If anything, I believe they have erred on the side of generosity. Much Army and Navy money is wastefully spent. Most of the vast horde of Federal civilian employees are employed by the Army and Navy. But if an Army or Navy officer appears before Congress and asks for money for war purposes, it is impossible to be parsimonious, and difficult to determine exactly the sum which is really necessary.

For the same reason, while Congress abolished some part of the Domestic Branch of the O. W. I., it did not touch the Foreign Branch of Mr. Elmer Davis' organization. That Branch appears to be full of crackpots and incompetents and Communists, but the committee felt that propaganda abroad might be of substantial assistance to our armed forces, that money must be supplied and responsibility for improvement vested in the Executive. Congress, I believe, has also been more than generous with the domestic war agencies, like the War Manpower Commission and the Office of Price Administration. It also approved the reciprocal trade treaty power without any modification whatever, largely because it was felt that any other action might discourage our allies in the war.

A great deal of significance has been attached to the passing of the Smith-Connally bill over the President's veto. But the bill cannot be explained as the adoption of a labor policy. It was a war measure. Nothing has been done about many important problems of labor policy involved in the National Labor Relations Act, the Hobbs Anti-racketeering bill, and other proposals. The Smith-Connally bill was passed because Congress felt that in time of war it could not permit any man or any group in the United States to defy the Government; that the President's action in vetoing the bill, if sustained, would encourage strikes and slowdowns, and prove a serious detriment to the morale of our people in the United States and the boys in the armed forces.

Congress has been generous in appropriating money for war housing and the community facilities which go with it. Wasteful as this expenditure is in many cases, because the housing is of the most temporary character, it was felt necessary that there should be no hindrance to the development of necessary industrial plants through any shortage of labor and the means of living within reach of those plants.

When presented with a demand for money for so-called war purposes, Congress has a difficult job, because there are many people in the Government and many agencies only too anxious to use the war as an excuse for the expansion of unnecessary activities. There are too many people who love to regulate for the sake of regulating. For instance, while price control is undoubtedly

necessary with this tremendous Government spending, the Price Administration itself is full of men who prefer the power to regulate and crack down to any system of voluntary appeal such as we had in the World War. We have to grant many powers; we have to submit ourselves to certain forms of Fascist control. While those emergency powers are in effect, it is almost impossible to prevent their abuse. Congress cannot be blamed for theoretical, stupid, unjust and inefficient methods of price control, any more than it can be blamed for the military and naval incompetence of Pearl Harbor.

NEW DEAL DOMESTIC METHODS REPUDIATED

Most of the controversial matters, however, relate to domestic policy both during the war and after the war. We are fighting a war to free the world from the domination of brute force and permit all peoples to develop their own freedoms. Surely we should be equally interested in retaining those freedoms in this country. During the war they must be modified, but they should be modified as little as possible. At the earliest possible moment they must be fully restored.

For 10 years we have been guided by the New Deal philosophy. It has opened up many lines of progress, some of them permanent and beneficial to the country. But it has recklessly disregarded the most fundamental principles established in the American Constitution, which have guided this country so well for 150 years. This Congress has been determined that these principles be re-established, and that further progress be within the framework of the principles of American democracy.

The founders of this Government were concerned not only with establishing a republic, but in seeing that it remained a republic. They knew from history that every past republic, in Greece, in Rome, in Europe had gradually granted more and more power to one man or group of men until it found itself a tyranny, an empire, or a kingdom. In order that the American Republic might be perpetual, they relied on three main principles. They granted to the Federal Government only the powers relating strictly to national affairs. They divided even those powers among the President, Congress, and the courts. And finally they provided that those powers, no matter how exercised, should not prevail against the inalienable rights of the individual citizen or of the smallest minority. Only if those principles can be maintained, can we avoid in this day of totalitarianism a totalitarian state. There is no use fighting for democracy in Europe if we lose it here at home.

All three of these principles have been ignored in recent years. Local self-government is the first of them, and the independence of the States is the shield of local self-government. If we permit the States to be destroyed, the Federal Government will run our cities and our counties and our schools. The Federal Government may be elected by the people, but as a practical matter it is so far away from the folks at home that they have no real voice in its operation. The machine is so big and rumbles on so relentlessly that the voice of the individual citizen cannot be heard. At home he can go to his own city council or school board. He can write letters to the paper. He can run for office himself. He can be heard. In Washington he is lost in the vast corridors of marble office buildings, and is passed from one bureau to another until he gives up the hopeless search in indignant but useless sputtering.

The Federal bureau is subject to every kind of pressure group. It listens to strange philosophies which the people would reject. It attempts to impose regulations fitted perhaps to one section of the country, but completely objectionable to others. Finally, the whole centralized government yields to the pressure of minorities, and democratic government no longer exists. Sometimes I feel that we have reached the limit of size in this country for any successful democracy. Certainly our only guard against that, or a greater size, is the protection and strengthening of local self-government.

The most obvious feature of the New Deal has been the tremendous growth of Federal agencies, operating in most cases directly on the citizen, and deliberately bypassing and depreciating his State and local governments. But Congress is determined to reverse that attempt to seize power in Washington. Last year we abolished the Civilian Conservation Corps, a direct Federal institution, partly relief, partly education, partly public works. This year it has brought to an end the W. P. A., and I hope that never again will the Federal Government operate directly a relief agency. In this last month, after a bitter fight we abolished N. Y. A. Congress has just as much interest in youth as it ever had, and just as much interest in relief and education; but it is determined that if the Federal Government is to assist in these fields, it must assist through the State organizations, and not by direct Federal operation. The primary obligation is State and local.

There is no longer the slightest vestige of the original N. Y. A. purpose of assisting in the education of youth. Its officials seized upon the war emergency to try to set up a national vocational training institution, not at all confined to youth, ostensibly to train workers for the war industries. It never trained more than 10 percent of the total number of men in training, and did so at an exorbitant cost. Our school officials felt that the N. Y. A. was trying to set up a complete Federal vocational education system, operating directly, and to operate directly after the war. We already have a widely spread vocational education system, operated well by many States with Federal financial assistance.

Congress cut off that part of the O. W. I. which maintained offices throughout the United States, and scattered leaflets and propaganda ostensibly to assist the war, but actually to assist a fourth term. If we are going to maintain free speech in this country, we do not need Federal propaganda. The newspapermen at the Capitol are fully able to transmit to the people everything the Government does or has to say.

Congress limited the appropriations for farm security and relief. In this field the States are without an organization. But also I believe that any activity in the nature of relief should be ultimately through some State activity to be promoted and developed by financial aid from the Federal Government.

I had an active part in securing the passage of a law providing for the vocational rehabilitation of civilians who can be equipped to work in the war industries. After a long battle, we won out on the State control. We turned down the Federal Security Agency proposal that medical aid toward rehabilitation be furnished directly by the Federal Government. We increased the Federal financial assistance because of the war emergency today.

The Senate passed a bill for the maintenance of day nurseries and extended school service for the children of working mothers in industrial areas, again providing that it be done through the States. But in this field the old W. P. A. organization, without adequate authority from Congress, has pushed in again a direct Federal program. I hope the House in the fall may pass the child-care bill and eliminate this vestige of the W. P. A.

I admit that there are many difficult problems in this matter of Federal aid and State or local administration. It is not easy to provide Federal financial assistance without giving Federal control. I believe that if Congress lays down the rules with which the State must comply, and does not leave the making of these rules to some Federal bureau, we can secure independent administration by the States. There are some States which should be helped more than other States, and it is not easy to find a formula.

CONGRESS ASSERTS ITS INDEPENDENCE

The second bulwark of American government is the division of Federal powers between the Executive, Congress, and the courts. It is no disrespect to the Supreme Court to say that, with seven members out of nine appointed by the President, its views and those of the President coincide with great regularity. The Court itself is dominated by the theory of administrative law. It has repeatedly approved administrative boards which make their own laws, administer the laws which they make, and then hear the cases which they themselves bring for the violation of their own laws, and has construed Congressional language to give the broadest power of final decision. This merging of the executive, legislative and judicial in a single group of men is dangerous and reactionary. As a result, we have seen in cases like the National Labor Relations Board and many others a complete elimination of any sense of justice and fairness. Men are coming to shrug their shoulders at injustice with helpless indifference when our fathers would be burning with indignation. The recent broadcasting decision interprets a law of Congress to give the Federal Communications Commission completely arbitrary power over broadcasting stations and networks. Mr. Justice Frankfurter's opinion says that the act does not restrict the Commission merely to the supervision of the radio traffic over the air. He says: "It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic". Certainly the men in Congress who wrote the law say they had no such intention. It is an indication of the tendency of the President and his followers to seize arbitrary power over many branches of business, and to concentrate all power in the Executive and in executive boards.

Up to this year a majority of Congress was inclined to follow the orders of the President. The result has been to concentrate power to an extent dangerous to the future of democratic government in this country. The most encouraging thing about this Congress is its assertion of independence. Cooperating with the President on every war question, it has differed with him on almost every domestic policy. It rejected the nomination of Edward Flynn for Minister to Australia and of Governor Allred to the circuit court of appeals because in both cases it felt that these were political appointments. Wherever possible it is recalling the powers delegated to the President by subservient Congresses. It repealed this year his arbitrary power to devalue the dollar. It rejected his $25,000 limit on salaries, largely because this limit was imposed without legal authority, in defiance of a declared policy of Congress. It has repeatedly declared its view that any general subsidy policy to support price control is unsound, inflationary, and a cowardly escape from the consequences of mistakes in price and wage control and tax policy. Certainly this Congress is no rubberstamp Congress.

CONGRESS BELIEVES IN BILL OF RIGHTS

The third great principle of the independence of the individual cannot be pressed in wartime as it could be in peacetime, but Congress has indicated clearly its belief that the individual must be left free to work out his own life, choose his own occupation, and freely speak his mind. The so-called Gestapo bill, which is drawn so broadly as to make

it possible to prosecute almost anyone differing with the administration, has been quietly suppressed in committee, though strongly urged by the Attorney General. Efforts of the administration to insist on discriminatory tax legislation, such as the Treasury withholding plan and the $25,000 salary limit, were repudiated in the adoption of the Ruml plan.

CONGRESS NOT THE BODY TO FORMULATE AN AFFIRMATIVE PROGRAM

A good many of these actions of Congress have been negative in character. Congress has acted largely as a jury, every individual voting his own convictions. But while the administration does not control Congress, neither do the Republicans or any other group It is natural, therefore, that Congress has not done so well in developing an affirmative policy. At best it is hard for any group of 531 men to agree on any comprehensive program. This year when all affirmative effort and energy must be devoted to the war it is even more unjust to look to Congress for a complete policy of domestic government.

Necessarily Congress has control largely of taxation and fiscal policy. It has received little help from the administration. It has shown its belief in sound money and in fair and conservative taxation, but it has been much too slow in developing new taxes to relieve the tremendous danger of post-war debt. It is vitally important that a tax bill be passed in the fall both to reduce the debt and to resist the tremendous pressure for inflation which the Office of Price Administration finds it so difficult to handle.

A POST-WAR PROGRAM

From the definite actions of Congress, even with the lack of affirmative program, it is possible for us, however, to develop the outlines of a post-war plan. It is the duty of the Republicans, it is the duty of the anti-administration Democrats, to bring forward both outside of Congress and inside of Congress a sound plan of dealing with the post-war difficulties in the United States. For that purpose, the Senate has created the George Post-War Planning Committee, six Democrats and four Republicans, which is undertaking a complete study. That committee I am certain will present a very different and sounder plan than that of the National Resources Planning Board. Congress abolished the National Resources Planning Board, over the violent opposition of the President, not because it disapproved the policy of planning, but because it did not propose to have its plans made by a group of theorists whose only remedy for every problem is vast Government spending. The program of the Board was plausibly presented and it had a global charm, but it would lead directly to the abolition of local self-government; to the control of all industry by administrative boards having executive, legislative, and judicial powers; to a socialistic economy. It leaves nothing to the initiative or the ability of the average independent American. Congress proposes that it do its own planning.

The first essential of a post-war plan is sound finance. We will go out of this war with a public debt approaching $300,000,000,000. It is not impossible to pay the interest on that debt if we maintain a reasonable prosperity and do not constantly increase the debt. Why do we have inflation today? Simply because we have been forced by the war into a deficit policy. The same policy in peacetime, when we certainly cannot successfully impose the arbitrary controls on prices and wages we are now attempting, would soon depreciate our money as it was depreciated in Germany. All savings would be destroyed. All life insurance values would be destroyed. All incentive to any man to begin again the accumulation of property and capital would vanish. The Government would be forced into every activity and every industry.

We must have a sound fiscal theory so that conditions exist in which free enterprise can go ahead, large and small industries and particularly small, and new industry encouraged to start. Our purpose must be the maintenance of full employment through private enterprise, and I believe it can be done. A great deal more is known now with regard to inflation, devaluation, and depressions. If wise men administer the fiscal affairs of government under present law, I believe the business cycle, with its recurrent depressions, can be largely eliminated. With impractical men in charge, inspired by unsound fiscal panaceas, no kind of legislation can prevent disaster.

Undoubtedly we must work out carefully a plan for the gradual return to industry of the millions in the armed forces. We must determine the best manner in which the huge war plants may be returned to private operation, for if the Government takes over and operates these industries, as proposed by the National Resources Planning Board, no private businessman can enter that field. In short, I believe we can return to a system of private enterprise, let the businessmen run their businesses and the farmers run their farms, without the Government attempting to dictate to every individual businessman or farmer.

If the individual is to enjoy full opportunity, there must be a much freer capital market. The Securities and Exchange Commission should confine itself to the job of preventing fraud and misrepresentation and manipulation in the sale of securities. The tax laws must be revised to remove the discrimination today against money invested in new business. The capital gains tax ought to be repealed, and the double taxation on common stockholders, who take the risk on which private enterprise depends, at least be no heavier than that on bondholders and other investors.

With regard to the field of social welfare, in which the New Deal has made its greatest advances, we can go forward constantly in our effort to improve the condition of the lower income groups, but by methods which do not endanger the permanence of democratic government. I believe in the principle of insuring to everyone, unless he refuses to work, a minimum standard of living; but it must be a standard which can be supported at a reasonable cost, without setting up a vast Federal bureaucracy, without destroying local self-government, and without removing the incentive to work, which is the very keystone to individual success and national prosperity. We can extend and improve the old-age pension and unemployment compensation laws, but there is no reason why the latter should be completely nationalized as the Board purposes. Unemployment, after all, is a local problem in the first instance. An organized locality can largely solve its own problems, and solve them more satisfactorily than the Federal Government, though it may need Federal assistance in severe depressions. The State employment systems should be reestablished. If unemployment gets beyond bounds again, it should be dealt with by a State relief organization handling both direct and work relief. I am absolutely opposed to another Federal Work Projects Administration. Of course, there must be Federal aid because the ability of the States to finance a real crisis is extremely limited.

I believe also there should be some extension of Federal aid to health and medical care and hospital service, but without socializing medicine or turning the job over to the Federal Government. But it is the primary responsibility of the States and local governments to see that their citizens are supplied with hospital services. Eighty to ninety percent of the people are already so supplied. If the gaps are to be filled, they can be filled by an adequate State plan, certainly if the Federal Government will give some encouragement and assistance.

We should plan now for the rapid development of housing after the war, through private enterprise as far as possible, but in the case of the lower-income groups a further expansion of the public housing program. The size of the Government subsidy per family dwelling can and should be reduced, so that the cost will not prevent the construction within a reasonable time of all the public housing which may be justified as part of the general plan.

In short, I believe that Congress is just as much interested as ever in the improvement of the condition of the people of the United States, but it insists upon the maintenance of the basic principles of American democracy. Services to the individual citizen must be handled through the sovereign States and their local subdivisions. The people in every State must determine the methods of administration to be followed. They must not be subjected to the orders of a bureaucrat in Washington. They must be required to put up some of their own money as an evidence of good faith and interest in their task. Federal control of the general nature of the State programs to receive Federal aid, so far as it is imposed at all, must be by laws and not by the fiat of bureaucrats attempting to make laws under delegated power.

Furthermore, the program must be worked out as economically as possible in order that it may not destroy the opportunity and the individual rights of those citizens who do not ask for Government assistance. In the long run there is no way to support those who do not work, or assist those unable to support themselves, except out of the pockets of the people who are working and the people who have the ability to support themselves and their families. We cannot get something for nothing. If we raise the standard of living of the lower-income groups by Government contribution, we reduce to some extent the standard of living of the upper-income groups. If one-fifth of the population is to be helped, only the other four-fifths can help them; and among those four-fifths we find all of the leaders and most of the able and the diligent among the workers. We cannot destroy the incentive they have by burdensome taxes and restrictions, or we will destroy the very progress on which America is based. It is not true that leaf-raking creates wealth, as Mr. Yantis, a member of the National Resources Planning Board, has testified, or that a hand-out, however praiseworthy, stimulates prosperity. Men work and produce wealth, and build up capital for machinery and cheap production, because they can obtain a better standard of living for themselves, a better education for their children, and a better provision for their family after death. The right to the products of a man's own labor is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights, and if we destroy that opportunity, we destroy the third great bulwark of our system.

For the same reason it is important that we never dispense relief in such a way that the man on relief is better off than the conscientious workman in the income scale next above. Our system of old-age pensions must insure the same pension to the man who has worked hard and built his own home as to the man who has been a ne'er-do-well all his life.

There is no great difference in the ultimate ideals of the social planners and of the hard-headed American Congress. Their difference is a difference in methods. The social plan-

ners in effect are willing to turn the whole country over to some benevolent dictator if he promises to carry out their beautiful blueprints. Congress has doubts about the practicability of the blueprints, and knows that any dictatorship, no matter how benevolent, is the end of the great American experiment in democracy. Congress believes that two and two make four, and does not believe that deficits are a blessing in disguise. It believes that every improvement in social conditions can be worked out through the sovereign states more soundly and more permanently than through any Washington bureau. It believes that the problems of regulation, when essential, can be solved by carefully-defined laws made by Congress and interpreted by the courts; that it is not necessary to vest arbitrary and un-American powers in any Washington soviet. It believes that progress can be made and employment maintained through the encouragement of private enterprise, adequate education, and protection against unfair competition. It believes that the American people themselves can develop their own ideas, form their own organizations for improvement, and cooperate in assisting their fellowmen, without specifications from Washington and crackdowns from permanent Offices of Price Administration.

Sale of War Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 26th of August the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] delivered a very able and interesting address over the radio, in connection with the War-bond campaign. He dealt with subjects of paramount importance to every citizen of this country. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman JOHNSON, and fellow Texans, allow me to express my gratitude to Congressman JOHNSON for his generous and graceful presentation to this distinguished audience.

We have met in a great cause. We are assembled to give impulse to the war effort and to the sale of War bonds with which to prosecute the war to a crushing surrender of our cruel and savage enemies.

We have been thrilled by the presence of war heroes who have distinguished themselves on far-flung battlefields. We have been impressed by the display of our armed forces typifying the Nation's might. We here dedicate our spirits, our unity, and the resources of the home front to our gallant men on the foreign front. We shall send them the weapons and munitions with which they shall wring victory from relentless and stubborn foes.

War is as old as civilization. It reaches back into primitive times—to the stone age—to the era when brute force alone was the rule of men. The annals of the centuries record campaigns and conquests among warring races and peoples. It is a terrible and cruel instrument of arbitrament. It is a harsh and bloody argument in a forum of ferocity and flame. It is tragic for great nations to slaughter their youth on bloody fields of battle. But the ambitions of rulers become so inflamed, racial and national jealousies become so aggravated and bitter, the hunger for dominion becomes so devouring that no system has yet been devised that is effective in arresting the outbursts of passionate fury that war entails. In civilization's march through the centuries, many problems have been met and measurably solved. The Anglo-Saxon, through a thousand years of struggle, has achieved a free government and constitutional rule. However, the lust of conquest, the thirst for military glory, the desire for plunder, have never yet been curbed and placed under the restraint of law, logic, and equity.

We did not enter World War No. 1 for any hope of aggrandizement or any ambition for conquest. The people of the United States frantically endeavored to keep aloof from that titantic conflict. However, we were dragged into that war. Upon foreign battlefields thousands of the finest of our youth poured out their blood. We were triumphant. With our banners covered all over with victory, with every battle flag touched with a new luster, our armies returned with not one foot of territory added to our dominions, with not one dollar of tribute extorted from the vanquished, and with not one subject of a foreign state incorporated by conquest into our system.

When World War No. 1 ended in victory, we hoped thereafter to live in peace with the powers of the earth. We had hoped that our heroes had not died in vain. Our great leader and Commander in Chief, Woodrow Wilson, with an exalted dream of peace and a noble conception of freedom from the misery of war, undertook to lead the world into the pathways of peace. We had hoped that the constructive initiative and the intelligent energies of the modern world would be devoted to the creation of useful things for the enjoyment of the peoples of the earth. We had hoped that the genius of scientists would no longer be devoted to the manufacture of arms and murderous weapons of warfare. The United States, during the score of years following World War No. 1, made generous exertions toward peace and disarmament and arbitration. These hopes and dreams came crashing about us in ruins in 1939. The dastardly designs of megalomaniacal conquerers and the flame of the cannon's mouth shriveled them into ashes.

Tonight, our Nation is involved in a war that belts the globe. For 10 years, Hitler was secretly arming and marching and drilling a mighty army. He planned the conquest of Europe. He hoped to master the Mediterranean and the lands which it washed. With his fantastic ambition to surpass Napoleon, he planned to subjugate Russia and extend his realm into Asia. He was to combine Napoleon and Alexander the Great and Caesar and Genghis Khan into the world's greatest military masters. His ultimate ambition was to leap across the South Atlantic from Africa and challenge the independence of South America and the Monroe Doctrine.

Six thousand miles westward the crafty and treacherous Japanese for 20 years had been preparing for the hour they could strike the United States. For 5 long bloody years Japan had harried with torch and sword the territories of unoffending China. Savage and destructive war had been waged against that peaceful people. The world will long remember the dastardly and treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor. Our soldiers and sailors were murdered without a hint of warning. While their diplomatic emissaries were standing at the door of the White House pretending to be messengers of peace, they drove the dagger of the assassin into our armed forces. With oriental beguilement, they sought to becalm and then betray us while she planned with fiendish deviltry the barbaric attack on Pearl Harbor. We promptly declared war on Japan. Germany and Italy quickly declared war upon us.

We were not adequately prepared for war. Many of our people opposed large appropriations for navies and armies. I have always supported appropriations for a commanding navy. A navy cannot be constructed quickly. I have always felt that the Nation's safety depended upon our mastery of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. However, the Congress of the United States feverishly and with unbending determination, directed a program of military preparation and production of war supplies. Our strength in the Pacific had been crippled at Pearl Harbor. It required time to assemble ships and supplies and men. The immense distances raised tremendous difficulties of transport of men and supplies and implements of warfare. Those difficulties are now being overcome. We are on the march in the Pacific on the sea and on the land, under the sea and amidst the clouds.

Tidings from every battle front are cheering. The gallant Russians, treacherously assailed, have heroically resisted the invader. They are now hurling him back. Our brave army, fighting with our allies, triumphed in North Africa and swept through Sicily. Mussolini was driven from power. Italy has not surrendered. If the new Italian Government and the Italian king tie their fortunes to Hitler and the Axis, we shall relentlessly force them to a humiliating and unconditional surrender. We shall not be deceived by any false pretensions that Rome is an open city. Unless military installations are removed from Rome, unless every semblance of military activity is abandoned Rome cannot be exempt from the terrors and miseries which she poured out on the innocent and defenseless. Our armies will not consciously attack shrines and holy places. The enemy, however, will not be allowed to use them as a cloak or shield to protect their infamy and to wage an unholy war.

There is a hard and costly struggle before us. Victory will entail the expenditure of tremendous treasure and many precious lives. Too great an optimism must not relax us. We shall establish a second front. Where it shall be will be determined by military leaders. All-out total war is our task. We must make this war final. We must so disable our cruel and savage enemies that they can never lift a sword against us or drop a bomb upon us while we sleep. They must be disarmed. They must be rendered impotent to plunge the world into a sea of blood.

The United States is expending colossal sums. We are pouring out treasure in greater volume than has been witnessed in all the march of time. We are sending our brave men into distant parts of the earth to fight and shed their blood and die in alien lands.

We are bearing burdens and hardships at home. We shall bear them cheerfully. We shall bear them willingly. What are our comforts, what are our conveniences, compared to the sufferings and heart-breaking sacrifices of our gallant men? We shall not grumble. We shall not complain. We shall not quarrel at any measure to promote victory.

Why do we do all of these things? Why do we fight? It is because we want peace and not war. We make war to destroy war.

The supreme object of war—any war—is the establishment of peace with terms dictated by the victors. We do not fight for conquest or loot but for world peace; for the security of law-abiding, peaceful nations. When a peace settlement is made, that settle-

ment should reflect the wishes of the nations who have triumphed. That settlement, if distinguished by equity and justice, should be maintained and preserved.

So long as the nations imposing the peace shall be ready and willing to maintain that peace by the last argument of military force, it will live. The United Nations must, when our enemies are mastered, establish an international agency to determine disputes over boundaries, over all of the quarrels that lead to international war and to arrest aggression and criminal conquest.

Such an agency, unless invested with power to enforce its decisions, cannot survive. It must have authority to call upon member nations for troops and navies, when necessary, to enforce its decrees and impose upon aggressors and violators of the law of nations punishment for their crimes.

The League of Nations was a noble experiment. It failed because it lacked the machinery to enforce its judgments. Its moral prestige was weakened by the failure of the United States to become a member. Powerful as it appeared to be, international jealousies and private understandings between particular members so enfeebled it that when Hitler reentered the Rhineland it lacked the courage to resist him. When Mussolini threw his army into Ethiopia, the League was impotent to stay his sword.

Those who oppose our membership in such an international body may argue that membership of the United States would entail an impairment of our national sovereignty. Every treaty to which we are a party somewhat restricts our freedom of action. Sovereignty, however, is the power to do that which we may wish. If peace is worth fighting for—if it is worth the lives of countless thousands of our bravest men—if it is worth the pouring out of stupendous treasure in time of war, it ought to be worth, in time of peace, the exercise of our sovereign power to prevent international outlaws and bandits from plunging the world into a sea of blood to gorge their greed or to ravish their peaceful neighbors to satisfy their hunger for land and spoils and loot.

Secret treaties have been the fruitful source of war. They have decimated free and happy lands. An international body to enforce world peace would, in large measure, eradicate these centers of infection. The peaceful peoples of the earth refuse to bow to the rule of might by those who dream of war, prepare for war, and make war. Civilization, which has been attained through centuries of struggle, cultures which have been slowly and painfully developed through countless generations cannot accept the rule of the sword or the regnancy of the jungle in this climactic period of world advancement.

The United States cannot alone provide a pattern of international peace machinery and impose it upon the will of its allies. The United Nations must be consulted and issues involved in the war must be considered.

The Senate of the United States will at an early date consider a resolution expressing the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen. It does not follow that the status quo in every particular will be preserved. The constitution of such a body could provide the necessary elasticity to meet the needs of the future. It will not be an easy task. Difficulties will be encountered. Obstacles will face us. But we need not despair. We have faced the great national and international problems before. American genius and leadership and statesmanship will not be deterred by hardships and struggles. They are rather a challenge to the highest and noblest traits of national character. It will not be perfect—what human agency reaches such a goal—the Constitution of the United States has been amended and may be amended again. The British constitution and the structure of other powers have yielded to change. They have responded to the need of changing times. The sublime objective of world peace is worth the effort. The experiment commands our highest hopes and best aspirations.

The United States is so powerful, with such a tremendous striking power upon the sea and upon the land, that it is invincible against any single power on the globe.

It is equally powerful in world councils. We gave freedom to the Philippines. We withdrew our Army from Cuba and granted it independence. The world knows that we cherish no scheme of conquest and no ambition for military rule. The hour has struck for America to instill those principles into world policy.

From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venomous head. The United States must be a member of the peace agency. Without that membership it will fail. Russia must be a party. With dominions stretching from the Baltic to the Pacific, from the snows of the Arctic to the warm waters of the middle east, with one hundred and sixty millions of the people Russia cannot be ignored. Assailed by the treachery of a savage her brave armies, loving their soil as a worshiper loves his shrine, have fought with high courage for 2 years against the despoiler of their ancient land. Her gallant troops checked and held the aggressor. She is now fiercely driving the invaders before the triumphant march of her legions. She has suffered colossal losses in material and has lavishly poured out the blood of millions. She has stood in the breach while we have been preparing and arming; Russia has gallantly fought the battle of civilization. She has earned a place at the peace table. She must be a member of the peace organization. I do not fear that Russia will make a separate peace. She trusted Hitler once and was perfidiously betrayed. How can she trust him again? A Hitlerized Germany with its eyes turned toward the East is a constant threat to the security of Russia. Premier Stalin knows that the fate of his country is safer with the friendship of the United States, Great Britain and China than it will be in the python-like grip of Hitler and Hirohito.

Great Britain must be a member. Great old China must have a seat. For 5 bitter years she has bled and burned as the victim of barbaric butchery. She must sit in judgment on future crimes.

Other members of the United Nations must have a place at the council table.

This war must end in the abject surrender of the monsters who began it. We did not begin the war but we propose to end it. Hitler and Mussolini and Hirohito must be stripped of their hellish power for evil. Their mad ambitions must be chained and their bloody crimes must be punished. Tamerlane builded a monument of human skulls of his victims. These arch criminals through their infamy have marked the battlefields of the globe with innocent and inoffending skulls of peaceful peoples. The victors must find retribution commensurate with their guilt. Our armed forces must, with relentless power, punish the nations that have followed them into this crime of the century. Their cities must be harried; their lands must be laid waste; their navies must be sunk; their armies must be defeated. These terrible measures must be taken, not for the love of war, but for the love of peace.

The Allies are on the march. Tonight we can hear shouts of triumph in the distant Pacific. In the ancient land where Hannibal and Caesar campaigned, our banners are advancing. The Russians with steel and courage are turning the enemy to flight. Let us tonight send out on the waves of the ether of the spirit a message of unity and support to our gallant heroes on every fighting front. Let us launch upon the radio of the intellect and the emotions a message of gratitude for their high courage, for their gallant spirit and their sublime love of country. America stands upon the battlefield with drawn sword. It will not know its sheath until untarnished victory is ours.

God grant that we may then lead the nations to an enduring peace.

The Will To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and interesting address entitled "The Will To Win," broadcast on the radio on August 16, 1943, by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For three years or more we have been mobilizing to defend ourselves. Now we are beginning to strike down our enemies, who sought to terrorize the world.

The tide of battle has turned in our favor because we have succeeded in mobilizing for war. In total war our fighting men do not win on the battle front unless back home their fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters for months past have worked as a team building up the supplies and the weapons with which battles are won.

Since we have begun to win some real and decisive battles on the fighting front, there has, unfortunately, been a tendency to slow down our production pace and to start quarreling among ourselves. This may be just a relaxation of the tension that gripped us when there was grave danger that we might lose this war before we could mobilize our resources for the fight.

But we must not forget that it was the united effort of our people on the home front that has brought our fighting men where they are in Africa and in Sicily, in the Solomons and the Aleutians, and has made possible their devastating aerial bombardment of Germany's war industries. And it will be only through our continued united effort on the home front that our fighting men will be able without undue delay and unnecessary bloodshed, to overcome the Axis Powers both in Europe and Asia.

Brilliant have been the achievements of the American, British, and Canadian forces in Africa and Sicily. But we have met and defeated less than 7 percent of the combat divisions which the enemy has in the European area. The strategic results of these victories

are of major importance, since they have given us the initiative, but the initiative is of no value unless followed vigorously with great forces.

Our heroic Russian Allies have been fighting against approximately 40 percent of the enemy's European combat divisions. So the enemy has been using less than half his combat divisions in actual battle, while the Allies have been using nearly three-quarters of all their combat troops which are in the general European area.

If Italy is knocked completely out of the war and her army surrendered, the enemy will still have more combat divisions in Europe than will the Allies, and will have as many divisions as the Allies will have even after the American mobilization is complete with its full strength of over 90 divisions. Only in the air will we have numerical superiority.

Even with Italy out of the war, Germany will be as strong for a defensive war as she ever was for an offensive war. This, of course, involves shortening the Russian front, evacuating much Russian territory, and adopting an entirely defensive plan of campaign.

Severe as have been the losses inflicted on the Germans by the Russians, they are still much less than those suffered by the Russians to date. In the war of attrition, the Germans still have a huge net balance in their favor in military and naval losses suffered, strategic advantages gained, territory and peoples conquered, and even in equipment destroyed, as to date the allies have lost more by U-boat sinkings than the Germans have lost through the magnificent bombing operations of the American and British Air Forces, although the current operations here are in our favor.

What we have gained is that priceless edge on the enemy—the initiative—and Allied morale and matériel and resources are increasing, while those of the enemy are decreasing. But our enemies in Europe and Asia have not yet been struck a fatal blow, and we cannot relax for one moment in the vigorous prosecution of the offensive.

In the far-eastern theater, Japan occupies one-fourth of the territory of China proper; dominates one-half of its population and controls its developed resources. In addition, she has taken over from neighboring countries and islands many valuable resources—including 90 percent of the world's crude rubber.

There is nothing to justify the hope of unconditional surrender by the Axis Powers in the near future. It is by no means clear that we are today as near winning the war as the Axis was in the summer of 1940. No full-scale offensive against Japan has yet commenced. The heroes of Bataan are still prisoners of the Japs. No Allied army has crossed the borders of Germany. Before that is done thousands of American soldiers will make the supreme sacrifice. The roads to Berlin and Tokyo are still long, hard, and bloody.

Our overconfidence is based in a great measure upon the belief that the Italians no longer possess the will to fight. That cannot be said of either the Germans or the Japanese. And as the Nazis and Japs read of our reduced production and our absenteeism, they may think that the American people no longer have the will to make war. We must realize that the war will be won by those who win the last battle. And the last battle has not been fought.

We have every reason for confidence in an ultimate overwhelming victory over both Germany and Japan, but I am authorized by the President to say that in his judgment as of today the major battles lie ahead of us, not behind us.

The prize fighter who lands a blow weakening his opponent does not immediately stop fighting in order to consider how much money he is going to win and how he will spend it. When he returns to his corner he doesn't quarrel with his seconds, and his seconds do not start quarreling among themselves. On the contrary, the fighter, after being refreshed by his seconds, puts everything he has into the effort to deliver a knock-out blow to his opponent. In fighting the Axis we must follow the same course, whether we are fighting on the battle front or working on the home front.

It is frequently said that conditions at home are worse than they were a year ago. If this merely means that, as we have become better mobilized, we are feeling the stresses and strains of total war, which we did not feel a year ago, no one could deny it. But if it means that we have slipped badly backward on the home front, I think we should refresh our memories.

We should recall that not so many months ago people were disputing the need of all-out conversion and the stoppage of the production of passenger cars, electric refrigerators and radios just as today they are disputing the need of drastic limitations on the use of gasoline.

It is not so very long ago that people were debating the need of building so many new steel, aluminum, and magnesium plants just as today they are debating the need of more men for our armed forces

It is only a few months ago that many people, some in high positions, told us we were losing the war and that our whole production program was in confusion.

Yet out of this period of mobilizing for total war we have achieved a war-production program which has caused one strutting dictator to fall almost before the real fighting began. Out of this period of travail we have built and equipped a war machine which has brought fear to the heart of every tyrant and hope to the breast of every lover of liberty.

When we first started mobilizing for war we had, generally speaking, as much as we required for our home needs. But with production reaching unprecedented goals and with millions of our men being drawn into the armed forces, we no longer have goods and services for civilian use in sufficient quantities to satisfy the normal demands of our people.

We do not now have poverty amidst plenty as we had in 1932, but we do have a scarcity of goods amidst a surplus of spending money.

If we did not feel the hardships of war on the home front, it would be a certain sign that we had not yet mobilized ourselves for total war. Shortages of goods are in a very real sense evidence not of blundering, but of all-out mobilization for war.

It inconveniences us when we cannot use our automobiles for pleasure and for greater mileage. But after all there are greater sacrifices. Today our casualties number 90,454.

We complain of the number of physicians who were permitted to enter the armed services because of the inconvenience thereby caused the civilian population. But there is comfort in the knowledge that whereas in the last war, of our wounded 7.1 percent died, while in this war, of our wounded, only 3.7 percent have died.

At the peak of the last World War little more than a quarter of our national output went for war purposes. Now a full half of our national output is being taken to fight the war.

During the last war our allies were able to furnish half of the supplies required for every soldier we sent abroad, and that half which our allies furnished included over 90 percent of the artillery and the heavy ammunition used by our men. In this war we have borne the full burden of equipping our own men. American industry has furnished a vast quantity of equipment purchased outright by our allies.

In addition we have furnished them matériel which totals in dollar volume the amount needed for 10,000,000 troops, besides huge quantities of aircraft.

Thus, we have sen. by lend-lease, 45 percent of our tanks, 46 percent of our locomotives, 40 percent of our railroad cars, 23 percent of our combat cars and carriers, and almost one-fifth of our unprecedented airplane production.

But I do not wish to convey the idea that, because we have done so much, we cannot and should not do more.

What then can we, or should we, do about the shortages which are producing increasing strains in our civilian economy?

We certainly are not going to take from our fighting men or from the fighting men of our allies the things which they must have. As to the shortages of goods which are not essential, we must simply make up our minds that we want none of them for the duration. As to the shortages of necessities we must do what we can to increase the supply without hurting the war effort. We must see that the available supply is equitably distributed in accordance with need and not in accordance with the size of our pocketbooks.

The programming of our all-out mobilization for war was not a simple task. We had to prepare, on the basis of estimates, war-production programs large enough to give us superiority in fighting strength against our known enemies. We could not know all the fields in which we would have to operate. The programs were so vast and complicated that no one, businessman or professor, civilian official or military officer, Democrat or Republican, could look into the future and tell exactly how these programs, when they swung into full production, would fit into the changing requirements of our war plans.

The programs have now developed to the point where they can be subjected to a really critical screening to determine whether in the light of known war conditions, some of them may not be reduced and others extended to the advantage of our over-all war plans, including necessary civilian supply.

At the request of the Office of War Mobilization the principal procurement agencies have set up within their own agencies, committees composed of persons not responsible for the drawing up of the existing programs, to make a critical review of those programs.

The Office of War Mobilization has appointed a special representative to meet with and aid each of these committees. Under this procedure each agency feels a real sense of responsibility for the revision of its own programs. Much progress has been made. As a result, we hope that, without lessening the war effort, some essential supplies for civilians will be increased.

But with the most efficient use of our manpower and materials there will still be acute shortages of civilian necessities. That is why we, like every other country engaged in total war, must accept rationing and price and wage control as the only effective means by which the necessities of life may be equitably distributed at prices within the reach of the average family.

There is no form of wartime rationing and price control which does not involve a degree of regimentation which we would not tolerate in normal times. But this regimentation of our civilian life is as necessary in a period of total war as military discipline is on the battlefield.

Without rationing and price control there would be a food famine in thousands of American homes. Those with the most

money and most influence at the corner grocery store would get more than they are entitled to have in wartime and would get it at the expense of their neighbors with less money or less influence.

To those who demand higher wages it is fair to recall that during the last war, from April 1917 to November 1918, a period of 19 months, the cost of living rose 29.5 percent. In the first 19 months of our active participation in this war, from December 1941 to July 1943, the cost of living increased only 12 percent. During approximately the same period the weekly wages of factory workers as a whole went up 34.7 percent. This does not mean hourly wages. It means the money a man takes home each week.

To those who demand higher prices for farm products, it is fair to recall that the net income of the farmers as a whole in 1942 was 50.7 percent higher than it was in 1941. It is estimated that net farm income in 1943 will be 24.8 percent higher than it was in 1942 when it was higher than ever before in history.

To those who want higher prices for their manufactured products it is fair to recall that the net profits of corporations after taxes in 1942 were 4.2 percent higher than they were in 1941, and 83.2 percent higher than they were in the prewar year 1939. It is estimated that corporation profits after taxes in 1943 are running 12.2 percent above 1942.

We should remember that our boys are fighting, not to increase the income of any one of us, but to safeguard the liberties of all of us.

We cannot abandon the hold-the-line order on the price front without abandoning it on the wage front. And if we abandon it on both fronts, the twenty millions or more of our people receiving low wages, small salaries and small fixed incomes which have not been increased materially since the war started will be ground below the level of fair subsistence.

Apart from those who before the war were unemployed or were receiving substandard pay, no man or woman who is as well off as he was before the war started, has a right to complain that he is not fairly treated unless he has first done his part to see that those who are less fortunate than he are justly treated.

He should think first of the soldier's wife, the soldier's mother, the preacher, the teacher, the small tradesman, the State, county, and city employees, the old folk living on small pensions whose purchasing power has gone down as the cost of living has gone up. There is no room in total war for the politics of pressure groups.

The first interest of every good citizen should be to see that there is no further rise in the cost of living. If, in some cases, increased production costs make further price adjustments unavoidable in order to obtain necessary war production, then we must, by more rigid price control, or subsidy, of other items, see that there is no rise in the cost of living.

It does not make sense to say that we can use subsidies to prevent numerous specific food prices from rising but that we cannot use subsidies to reduce a limited number of key items in the family food basket to offset rises permitted in other food items.

Congress by the act of October 2, 1942, declared that prices and wages should be stabilized so far as practicable at the level of September 15, 1942.

The cost of living rose 6 percent between September 1942 and May 1943. The rise was halted in June and the figures for July indicate a drop of nearly 1 percent. The June and July figures do not fully reflect the reduction in the cost of living which has been brought about by the recent Government action reducing ceiling prices on meat and butter by 10 percent, on fresh fish by 20 percent, and on cabbage and lettuce by 50 and 25 percent, respectively. If these reductions were fully reflected they would show that the cost of living today is only 4½ percent above the September 1942 level.

At a recent meeting of the War Mobilization Committee the President requested the Director of Economic Stabilization to work out, in cooperation with the Food Administrator, the Price Administrator, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a food price program with a view to stabilizing the cost of living as nearly as practicable at the level fixed by Congress. Definite progress is being made. There will be a substantial reduction in the cost of actual necessities—not of fancied wants.

But wages as well as prices must be held. The fight against inflation can be won if we have the will to win it. It cannot be won if the will for higher wages and higher prices is stronger than the will to keep down the cost of living.

Constructive criticism is helpful but it is not helpful to disparage our national effort. It has repeatedly been charged by persons of recognized prominence that we have a food shortage, and that it is due to our failure to reclaim 47,000,000 acres which were lost from food production between 1932 and 1939. I admit their sincerity but not their figures nor their conclusions.

This figure of 47,000,000 acres is misleading. It apparently refers only to the 17 principal agricultural crops. During the period of 1932 to 1939 the acreage of other crops increased by 9,000,000. Since 1939 we have increased the acreage of 52 agricultural crops by 16,000,000 acres so that the total harvested acreage in 1942 was only 22,000,000 less than in 1932.

The important thing, however, is not the acres in production but the food produced. We eat food. We do not eat acres.

With 22,000,000 less acres in production and with less manpower in 1942 than in 1932, the American farmer produced 36 percent more food.

We have done this through efficient soil conservation programs, by increasing our yield per acre of corn from 26.5 bushels to 35.5 bushels; of cotton from 173½ pounds to 275 pounds and of wheat from 13.1 bushels to 19.8 bushels, all under the intelligent agricultural legislation developed during the last 10 years, and supported by members of both political parties.

Instead of the war resulting in less food for the civilian population, our people are eating more food now than they did before Pearl Harbor. Neither the farmer nor the Government can be blamed if the civilian population, because of their increased purchasing power, and our war requirements, cannot be supplied with all the kinds of food they want and as much of every kind as they would like to buy.

There are many persons in and out of Government who know exactly how food production can be increased above the record-breaking yield of 1942. They have the advantage of the Food Administrator because they have no responsibility. He has. He finds it a difficult problem but he has developed a comprehensive food program which is now ready for submission to the President and to the Congress when it convenes.

We need more coal. This is due to increased requirements for civilian needs and for military purposes. At the same time our production of coal has decreased.

Because of the threatened coal shortage, several days ago the President requested me to ask Secretary Ickes to consider the advisability of increasing the working hours in the mines. Secretary Ickes, in accordance with the law, applied to the War Labor Board for authority to change from a 7-hour day to an 8-hour day, so as to permit a 48-hour week. Today the Board issued an order permitting an 8-hour day in conjunction with a 48-hour week at mines designated by Secretary Ickes. The order has been formally approved by the President.

Work as hard as we may, we will not preserve a stable economy if we do not have the courage to control the surplus of spending money which is flooding our markets. While a sizable minority of our people have less purchasing power than before the war, rising prices and rising wages have given the majority of our people a vastly greater purchasing power than they have ever before enjoyed and at a time when we have not the manpower to produce the goods which they would like to buy.

Allowing for the present higher taxes and for normal savings, our people have nearly twenty billion more to spend a year for goods and services than there are goods and services available for them to buy. It is hard to control prices, enforce rationing, and to stamp out black markets when people have too much surplus spending money.

For our own protection we must drain off by taxation or freeze by enforced savings that excess purchasing power. If we do not, we will probably try to outbid one another to get the goods and services we want. If that happens we will not get more but we will pay more, and we will find that the money we have put into insurance policies and into savings accounts is worth less, and the dollars we have earned will buy less.

We have spent too much time arguing how much of our past taxes should be forgiven in order to get on a pay-as-you-go basis, instead of getting down to the grim business of imposing the higher taxes which total war requires. We cannot ask our soldiers to do our fighting and also to pay our taxes when they return from the battlefields. War taxation should not become a pawn in a political game. It is a stern duty to be met by every citizen in accordance with his capacity to pay.

In every war there are noisy minorities engaged in intrigues and cabals to belittle the war effort of the Nation, both on the home and fighting fronts. During the Revolution even in the Continental Congress there were those who were constantly finding fault with General Washington and his conduct of the war. In the War between the States there were those even in the Congress who were continually muttering against what they considered the blundering and ineptitude of President Lincoln. It was said that they had lost the confidence of their countrymen. But these little groups of little men never understood the patriotic zeal of the common men and women who gave their full devotion to their great war leaders.

In the last war there were those who attacked President Wilson as a war leader and as a peacemaker. But now we realize that, had his health not failed him and had the people supported his wise leadership, this war, in all probability, would never have occurred.

Destructive critics are not confined to any political party. Nor has any political party a monopoly of those who now, in their zeal for party success, divert the minds of the people from the war effort. In the fall of 1944 there will be a national election. Then there must be political discussion. Until then, the less the better. The people of America are not concerned about party advantage or personal ambition. They believe in equality of sacrifice. They have faith in the free world for which freedom-loving people everywhere are fighting and dying. They have the will to win.

Building for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Building for the Future," delivered by me at the Kiwanis State Convention at Milwaukee, Wis., August 2, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Kiwanians, I am happy to be with you this evening. With very little effort I could turn the clock back to 1933 when it was my privilege to be governor of this great district—Wisconsin and upper Michigan. Being governor provided one of the great experiences of my life. It was during the period when men were cracking up—when men who had only material values among their assets found it hard to survive. I went up and down this State and met with many groups. It was my job to hold the line, to help keep Kiwanis intact. I gave of myself and, giving, I received a thousandfold in return.

I could spend hours telling of my experiences. My job was to preach the philosophy of Kiwanis—not the letter, but the spirit; and from the many contacts that I made, came some of the rarest friendships of my life. I learned much. I learned that no one can be unhappy while engaged in helpful action for others. I removed the blinders from my own eyes, and when I had done that I was privileged to find many pearls of great price. That is what Kiwanis has done for me.

In Kiwanis we learn that man does not live by bread alone, and that the saving power in civilization is not in material elements, but in the spiritual and idealistic. There are no frozen assets of the mind. The soul of man never goes into bankruptcy. Browning says that "Life has meaning, and to find its meaning is my meat and drink."

Since those strenuous, happy days when I served this district as your governor, much water has gone over the dam. In those 10 years each of us has literally witnessed a world revolution.

In 1933, the year that Hitler came into power, Roosevelt became President, Joshua Johns became international president, and I became your governor, great changes began. I need not tell you about the changes in our economic philosophy and the impact upon our way of thinking that has occurred in this country. I need not speak to you of that world movement which began under Hitler and which resulted in the Second World War. Today I want to speak to you about the broad view which we, as Kiwanians and citizens of this great country, must take. We have to brush aside the mist that confuses us. I remember in Washington last spring—I was walking in the evening in a dense fog, and I could just see a glimmer of light. It was a lamp light, which gave me direction. I followed that light. But the fog persisted. Then a breeze came up and blew the fog away so I could more clearly see my way.

Several months ago I flew from Chicago to Duluth to be present at the Quints' christening of the ships at Superior. We flew above the clouds. Below us it was raining pitchforks, but above us the sun was shining. We had risen above the obstruction and it was clear sailing.

These two instances illustrate the steps we must take in order to get that mental poise and perspective that is necessary to see through the conflicting issues, the maze of circumstances—so that we can chart our course as individuals and as citizens of the Republic.

The job that lies ahead, of rebuilding society upon the basis of lasting peace, is a task calling for the leadership of men and women who are close to the divine source of life. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the chaotic condition that the world is in is due to influences that reach far back into the history of mankind—due to evils and wrongs and sins of the people.

In Washington and elsewhere, we hear much about peace plans, resolutions. Many of our so-called leaders are indulging in wishful thinking for some magic formula. This line of thinking follows out much of the thought that we have indulged in here in America in the last 10 years. It is the old miasma of planning, planning, planning—by folks who do not know how to do it.

Now, don't get me wrong; I do not discount planning of the right kind. But if I were called upon to build an automobile engine—I, who know nothing about an automobile engine—I would be a poor man to draw plans, but I would get men who knew how. Never forget "the how" if you are to accomplish anything.

In the world of practical affairs there is a place for the practical man and a place for the idealist. A happy combination of the two generally brings the best results. There is a place for the dreamer, but we want to be sure that the dreamer is in his place in a world like the one in which we are living.

Our real problem in international affairs is the same as on the domestic front, how to attain the unity that alone makes peace possible. We know that unity between husband and wife, unity between labor and management, unity between State and Nation is not a matter of legislation; it is a matter of learning how to live and work together.

In world affairs it is our job to make democracy work, to prove that it is a safe thing for the world, to make it practical, idealistic, freedom producing.

There is much talk about a new world order, a parliament of nations. We know until the spirit of cooperation dwells among men, not material gain but the welfare of the people will be the purpose of the nations; until that time arrives, mere governmental forms will not do the job.

In the Civil War there were many Democrats who opposed the war, and they were called Copperheads. There are no Copperheads in America today. Why? Because America was attacked; the Axis intervened in our affairs. Prior to Pearl Harbor, according to the Gallup poll, from 65 to 90 percent of America was against intervention; but when the Axis made the fatal mistake of attacking us, the issue of intervention or nonintervention went out the window, and we became one people, dedicated to smashing the Axis and building a better world.

Each of us who meet today has a common interest. Each of us has dedicated our efforts toward a constructive program of living characterized by the motto "We build." We have found that in serving others we serve ourselves. We have found that in building for others we are building for ourselves.

At no time in the history of this organization has there ever been as great a challenge as there is today.

War is essentially a business of destruction and annihilation, but when it is directed against evil forces it is a constructive work.

And so, today, decent, God-fearing citizens of the United Nations have banded together to wipe out the pestilence-ridden centers of totalitarianism.

That is a constructive job. It will eliminate the plague centers and will enable us to rebuild a mangled, bleeding, suffering humanity. It will enable us to rebuild a war-shattered economy. It will enable us to restore a decent standard of international morality. It will enable us to reenshrine in the hearts of mankind the great abiding values without which mankind cannot progress.

Out of this era of war, out of this period of conflict, out of this eruption of lawlessness from powerful international gangsters, there is an opportunity for this organization and for all people who believe in building, to do a job such as has never been done before in the history of mankind.

That job of building must begin with the individual, must carry through to the family units, to civic groups, to municipalities, to States, to the Nation, and to international programs of building for a decent world order.

This will not be an easy job. The job of building will not be done by slogans. It won't be done by propaganda, and, frankly, it won't be done by speech making.

And let me emphasize, also, that it will not be done by legislation.

If this war has brought home one lesson to us, it is the lesson that there is no legislative legerdemain which can substitute for honest work and effort.

We have learned the first hard, fundamental lesson of life when we learn there is no magic carpet, streamlined route to success, peace, and prosperity.

We have learned you cannot legislate the creation of tanks and guns and planes and munitions.

We have learned that men actually have to build the tanks and the planes and the guns and the munitions. We have learned you cannot create a paper army. Men actually have to do the fighting.

We have learned you cannot finance a war with printing presses. We have learned that somebody has to pay the bills, somebody has to pay the taxes, somebody has to buy the bonds. We have learned that even the greatest professors cannot devise legislation which will put food on the American table. We have learned the simple and elementary lesson that food has to be raised by the farmer with the assistance of Almighty God.

We have learned that even an all-powerful Interstate Commerce Commission, or an Office of Defense Transportation, cannot wave a magic wand to create a fabulous transportation machine overnight. The engines and the boats and trucks have to be built and they have to be driven.

In short, my friends, we have learned one great lesson—no amount of theorizing, no amount of speculation, no amount of master planning can substitute for the sweat and the toil which actually do the job.

We of this organization must face one salient fact. At the close of this war we will face the most tremendous building job in history. It will be a job of character building. It will be a job of financial rebuilding. It will be a spiritual rebuilding job, and it will be a physical rebuilding job. We will rebuild homes and shattered lives and shattered economies. At the outset, then, let us recognize that these things will never be rebuilt by any panacea or formula which will serve as a substitute for work.

Let me make it clear that I am not disparaging any type of post-war planning. I am a fervent believer in post-war planning, but I insist that our plans shall embrace the fundamental American doctrine that we are to proceed within the framework of our Constitution and according to that pattern which has made us the greatest Nation on earth.

Let me make it clear also that I am not asking that we beat our way back to any kind of a wilderness. I am merely insisting that we build on the solid bedrock fundamentals.

Now, what do we mean by that? Well, let us take its meaning with respect to our economy.

I am frank to say that if our post-war economy is to be built on a continuously expanding centralized control, we will not be building on fundamentals. I believe that an increasingly centralized control and an increasingly stringent regimentation is alien to our American pattern.

I believe in security, but I do not believe that that security must be purchased at the price of individual initiative and progress.

I don't believe that we can successfully rebuild in the post-war period if that rebuilding is to be keyed to the creation of a new deluge of Federal agencies, created either by law or by Executive order. I believe in planning our economy, but I can find very little in the kind of "planned economy" which we have had in the last decade to recommend it for the future.

In the last years we have seen an almost fantastic trend toward controls, but I am not going to discuss these controls today, certainly not in political terms.

I do want to briefly mention them in their social aspects. Each of these controls appears to me to inevitably lead toward an increasing regimentation and an increasing erosion of individual initiative, an increasing dependence on government, an increasing appalling public debt, and in general a double-time retreat from the form of government which we know as a republic. I do not want to see American initiative, private enterprise, private property left standing at the wayside. I do not want to see business—particularly small business—drained dry of any reserves so that in the post-war period it will have to come hat in hand to Government. Individuals and business alike cannot build under that type of program. At best they can only barter their independence for a dole.

Government must be in the picture in the post-war period. There will be Government controls. There will be Government assistance. There will be Government planning. And there should be. But it must be planning and assistance within the framework of our republican form of government and within the framework of our kind of life.

Abraham Lincoln said "I have faith in the common people."

The common people of America are winning this war, and their greatness rises to the heights, above the bickering and the discontent, and some of the shortcomings in Washington.

The common people will do the building in the future.

The doctrine of building is a dynamic doctrine. It is a doctrine which repudiates the philosophy of planned scarcity. It is the doctrine which repudiates the idea of a static economy.

I believe that within one decade after the close of this war at least 60 percent of our total production will be in terms of new products and new methods which were unknown commercially at the close of the war.

We will face an era when farm products may be used as raw material in industry. We will face the most incredible research period the world has ever known. We will face these things if they are not throttled at birth by Government red tape. We will face these things if we cling to the Bill of Rights, if we reenshrine constitutional government, if we salvage freedom of opportunity, if we preserve free enterprise.

Gentlemen of Kiwanis, never forget to justify our existence. We must measure up to our motto: We build.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Foreign Policy in the Framework of Our National Interests," by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, September 12, 1943, which was broadcast over the network of the National Broadcasting Co.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the request just made by the Senator from Texas, I ask that there be printed an editorial from the Washington Daily News of yesterday entitled "The Hull Post-War Policy," and an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday entitled "American Peace Aims."

There being no objection, the address and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FRAMEWORK OF OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS

(Address of the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State)

I

In July of last year, in an address over these networks, I outlined, as definitely as was possible at that time, the chief problems and conditions confronting us in the field of foreign relations and sought to indicate some of the policies necessary for meeting these problems. I pointed out that in the present conflict each of the United Nations is fighting for the preservation of its freedom, its homes, its very existence; and that only through united effort to defeat our enemies can freedom, or the opportunity for freedom, be preserved, for all countries and all peoples. I spoke of the need to chart for the future a course based on enduring spiritual values which would bring our Nation and all nations greater hope for enduring peace and greater measure of human welfare. To this end, I urged intensive study, hard thinking, broad vision, and leadership by all those, within each nation, who provide spiritual, moral, and intellectual guidance.

At that time, the military picture was still dark. The United Nations were still fighting a desperate war of defense against better prepared foes. We had suffered a succession of grim defeats.

Since then, the military picture has greatly changed.

We are now winning heartening victories in the air, at sea, and on land. Our counterblows are steadily increasing in power and effectiveness. They are stepping stones to our final triumph over the forces of conquest and savagery.

Attainment of complete victory, although now certain, is still a formidable task. Our lesser enemies are fast losing heart and strength. Italy has already surrendered. But our principal enemies, Germany and Japan, though shaken, still possess great resources and enormous strength. They still control vast portions of Europe and of Asia. To defeat them completely, the United Nations need to make, on the battle front and at home, efforts even greater than those thus far made.

In making these more intensified efforts, it is more important than ever for all concerned to have a clear understanding of what is at stake, now and in the future.

During recent months, public discussion and debate on a high plane have revealed the profound concern of our people with the issues of the country's foreign relations. These issues need to be seen in their full perspective. Unless our people so see them, and unless our people are willing to translate their understanding of them into action, the well-being of the Nation—and even its very life—may be gravely menaced.

The foreign policy of any country must be expressive of that country's fundamental national interests. No country can keep faith with itself unless that is so.

In determining our foreign policy we must first see clearly what our true national interests are. We must also bear in mind that other countries, with which we deal in the conduct of foreign relations, have their national interests, which, of course, determine their policies.

Obviously there are, even between friendly nations, differences as regards their respective aims and purposes and as regards the means of attaining them. But there are also immense areas of common interest. By cooperating within those areas, the nations not only can advance more effectively the aims and purposes which they have in common, but can also find increased opportunity to reconcile, by peaceful means and to mutual advantage, such differences as may exist among them.

II

At the present time, the paramount aim of our foreign policy, and the paramount aim of the foreign policy of each of the other United Nations, is to defeat our enemies as quickly as possible. Here we have a vast area of common interest and a broad basis of cooperative action in the service of that interest.

Every weapon of our military and economic activity and every instrumentality of our diplomacy have been and are directed toward the strengthening of the combined war effort. All these necessarily go together.

The land, air, and sea forces of the United States are fighting, with surpassing skill and heroism, in the Mediterranean, over the Nazi-held fortress of Europe, in the far reaches of the Pacific and of Asia. In each of the theaters of war they are operating shoulder to shoulder, in a spirit of superb comradeship, with the gallant forces of one or more of our allies.

The resolute will and devoted effort of our people have brought about the greatest miracle of production and delivery in all history. Our war supplies are flowing outward in a constant and ever-increasing stream, not alone to those areas in which our own forces are engaged, but to every point on the globe at which the armed forces of the United Nations are fighting.

We are in continuous consultation with our allies on various phases of military, economic, and political activity—as required by the exigencies of a constantly changing situation.

Our cooperation with our allies has long since reached the state where contingents of the forces of various allies are serving, side by side, under unified command. We have developed this type of cooperation with invincible British, with intrepid and resolute Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, with valiant and determined China, and with the forces of other allies. It is being rapidly extended as the military operations progress.

To the Soviet Union, whose heroic armies and civilian population have earned everlasting renown through their magnificent feats of courage and sacrifice, we have been glad to render all possible aid. It is our

desire and our settled policy that collaboration and cooperation between our two countries shall steadily increase during and following the war.

With the re-emerging military power of France we have been and are developing a heartening degree of coordinated effort. We look forward to the day when reborn France will again take her rightful place in the family of free nations.

With governments which the Axis Powers have driven from their invaded and brutally oppressed but unconquerable countries we have the most friendly relations. These relations reflect our profound and active sympathy for the suffering of their peoples and our determination that the victory of the United Nations shall restore their nations to freedom.

With all but one of the nations of the Western Hemisphere we have today the closest ties of solidarity and association—the fruit of 10 years of unremitting labor on the part of all of these nations to build in this hemisphere a fraternity of good neighbors. Each of our American associates is making a magnificent contribution to the war effort. Here we have, in peace and in war, a highly successful example of cooperation between sovereign nations.

The victories of the United Nations have been the direct result, not of separate and uncoordinated military, economic, and diplomatic action, but of close coordination of all three types of action, both within each of the nations and among all of them. It is well to recall some outstanding examples.

Our protracted diplomatic effort to achieve a fair and peaceful solution of difficulties in the Far East afforded our military authorities and those of other countries now in the ranks of the United Nations many months of precious time for strengthening defenses against the combined Axis threats in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, in case Japan should reject a peaceful settlement as she eventually did.

The drawing together of the American republics to assure their common defense made it possible to establish a line of communications through the Caribbean, Brazil, and the South Atlantic. That line proved to be of invaluable importance alike in transporting equipment to the British forces at El Alamein, in supplying our own expedition to north Africa; and, at a desperate hour, in putting our war planes into the air over the Pacific islands and in China.

Diplomatic foresight and patient and vigorous activity by the agencies of our foreign policy played an indispensable part in preparing the way by which the huge strategic north African area was brought without heavy losses into the sphere of the United Nations and the French Fleet was kept out of German hands. Had Vichy felt it feasible to ignore our diplomatic pressure directed toward preventing the surrender of the north and west African areas to the Nazis and the delivery of the French Fleet to Hitler as Laval had planned, or had Spain entered the war on the side of the Axis as Hitler had hoped, control of the Mediterranean would have early fallen into the hands of our enemies. Instead, the Allied forces converged, with a skill and precision unequalled in military annals, upon this gateway through which we are now invading the European Continent.

The Mediterranean operations weakened the German air force available on the Soviet front, just as the Russian resistance, by holding the German armies on the eastern battle line, prevented Hitler from parrying our thrust toward his southern flank. Meanwhile, our constant military pressure against Japan had its inevitable effect in deterring Japan from aggression against the Soviet Union.

Our diplomatic agreements with fearless Danish officials on free soil and with the Government of Iceland made it possible to guard the great North Atlantic passage as a precious route for our supplies and troops and as defense against attack from the north.

The perseverance of China, the first victim of the movement of aggression, in resistance to Japan has been aided in no small measure by the faith of her leaders in us, based on their knowledge of our history and policy and on their observation, as time went on, of our efforts to achieve a fair and peaceful settlement in the Far East, our economic support, and, more recently, our military assistance. China's resistance has held enmeshed on her front substantial Japanese forces which might otherwise have been loosed against us and other of the United Nations in the Pacific; and China is playing an important part in the United Nations' program for the winning of the war and achievement of a stable peace.

The agencies of our foreign policy are at all times at work as instruments of national defense. Since the attack upon us, they have been intensively at work in assisting our armed forces to achieve the victories which are now fast increasing in numbers and significance.

Beyond final victory, our fundamental national interests are—as they always have been—the assuring of our national security and the fostering of the economic and social well-being of our people. To maintain these interests, our foreign policy must necessarily deal with current conditions and must plan for the future in the light of the concepts and beliefs which we, as a Nation, accept for ourselves as the guiding lines of our international behavior.

Throughout our national history our basic policy in dealing with foreign nations has rested upon certain beliefs which are widely and deeply rooted in the minds of our people. Outstanding among these are:

1. All peoples who, with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind," have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty are entitled to its enjoyment.

2. Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

3. All nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs.

4. Willingness to settle international disputes by peaceful means, acceptance of international law, and observance of its principles are the bases of order among nations and of mankind's continuing search of enduring peace.

5. Nondiscrimination in economic opportunity and treatment is essential to the maintenance and promotion of sound international relations.

6. Cooperation between nations in the spirit of good neighbors, founded on the principles of liberty, equality, justice, morality, and law, is the most effective method of safeguarding and promoting the political, the economic, the social, and the cultural well-being of our Nation and of all nations.

These beliefs are among the most important tenets of our national faith. They are capable of universal application as rules of national and international conduct. In their application by other nations and in willingness and preparedness on the part of all peacefully inclined nations to join together to make them effective lies the greatest hope of security, happiness, and progress for this country and for all countries.

Vigorous participation in efforts to establish a system of international relations based on these rules of conduct, and thus to create conditions in which war may be effectively banished, is and must be a fundamental feature of our foreign policy—second only to our present over-riding preoccupation with the winning of complete military victory. Here, too, our Nation and other peacefully inclined nations have a vast and crucial area of common interest.

In the Atlantic Charter and in the declaration by United Nations, the nations now associated in this war for self-preservation have clearly expressed their recognition of the existence of this area of common interest. Our task and that of our associates is to utilize this common interest to create an effective system of international cooperation for the maintenance of peace.

As I read our history and the temper of our people today, our Nation intends to do its part, jointly with the other peace-seeking nations, in helping the war-torn world to heal its wounds. I am sure also that our Nation and each of the nations associated today in the greatest cooperative enterprise in history—the winning of this war—intends to do its part, after the victory of the United Nations, in meeting the immense needs of the post-war period. Those needs will embrace the task of taking practical steps to create conditions in which there will be security for every nation; in which each nation will have enhanced opportunities to develop and progress in ways of its own choosing; in which there will be, for each nation, improved facilities to attain, by its own effort and in cooperation with others, an increasing measure of political stability and of economic, social, and cultural welfare.

If our Nation and like-minded nations fail in this task, the way will be open for a new rise of international anarchy, for new and even more destructive wars, for an unprecedented material and spiritual impoverishment of mankind. Many times in the course of history nations have drifted into catastrophe through failure, until too late, to recognize the dangers which confronted them and to take the measures necessary to ward off those dangers. Post-war cooperation to maintain the peace is for each peace seeking nation scarcely less essential for its self-preservation than is the present coperative effort to win the war.

IV

If there is anything on which all right-thinking people are agreed, it is the proposition that the monstrous specter of a world war shall not again show its head. The people of this and other lands voice this demand insistently. There is danger in complacency and wishful thinking. The nations that stand for peace and security must now make up their minds and act together—or there will be neither peace nor security.

It is abundantly clear that a system of organized international cooperation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose. Readiness to use force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable if effective substitutes for war are to be found.

Differences between nations which lead toward armed conflict may be those of a nonlegal character, commonly referred to as political, and those capable of being resolved by applying rules of law, commonly referred to as justiciable. Another cause of armed conflict is aggression by nations whose only motive is conquest and self-aggrandizement. We must, therefore, provide for differences of a political character, for those of a legal nature, and for cases where there is plain and unadulterated aggression.

Political differences which present a threat to the peace of the world should be submitted to agencies which would use the remedies of discussion, negotiation, conciliation, and good offices.

Disputes of a legal character which present a threat to the peace of the world should be adjudicated by an international court of

justice whose decisions would be based upon application of principles of law.

But to assure peace there must also be means for restraining aggressors and nations that seek to resort to force for the accomplishment of purposes of their own. The peacefully inclined nations must, in the interest of general peace and security, be willing to accept responsibility for this task in accordance with their respective capacities.

The success of an organized system of international cooperation with the maintenance of peace as its paramount objective depends, to an important degree, upon what happens within as well as among nations. We know that political controversies and economic strife among nations are fruitful causes of hostility and conflict. But we also know that economic stagnation and distress, cultural backwardness, and social unrest within nations, wherever they exist, undermine all efforts for stable peace.

The primary responsibility for dealing with these conditions rests on each and every nation concerned. But each nation will be greatly helped in this task by the establishment of sound trade and other economic relations with other nations, based on a comprehensive system of mutually beneficial international cooperation not alone in these respects but also in furthering educational advancement and in promoting observance of basic human rights.

There rests upon the independent nations a responsibility in relation to dependent peoples who aspire to liberty. It should be the duty of nations having political ties with such peoples, of mandatories, of trustees, or of other agencies, as the case may be, to help the aspiring peoples to develop materially and educationally, to prepare themselves for the duties and responsibilities of self-government, and to attain liberty. An excellent example of what can be achieved is afforded in the record of our relationship with the Philippines.

Organized international cooperation can be successful only to the extent to which the nations of the world are willing to accept certain fundamental propositions.

First, each nation should maintain a stable government. Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization—so long as it conducts its affairs in such a way as not to menace the peace and security of other nations.

Second, each nation should conduct its economic affairs in such a way as to promote the most effective utilization of its human and material resources and the greatest practicable measure of economic welfare and social security for all of its citizens. Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms of its internal economic and social organization—but it should conduct its affairs in such a way as to respect the rights of others and to play its necessary part in a system of sound international economic relations.

Third, each nation should be willing to submit differences arising between it and other nations to processes of peaceful settlement, and should be prepared to carry out other obligations that may devolve upon it in an effective system of organized peace.

All of this calls for the creation of a system of international relations based on rules of morality, law and justice as distinguished from the anarchy of unbridled and disordant nationalisms, economic and political. The outstanding characteristic of such a system is liberty under law for nations as well as individuals. Its method is peaceful cooperation.

The form and functions of the international agencies of the future, the extent to which the existing court of international justice may or may not need to be remodeled, the scope and character of the means for making international action effective in the maintenance of peace, the nature of international economic institutions and arrangements that may be desirable and feasible—all these are among the problems which are receiving attention and which will need to be determined by agreement among governments, subject of course, to approval by their respective peoples. They are being studied intensively by this Government and by other governments. They are gradually being made subjects of consultation between and among governments. They are being studied and discussed by the people of this country and the peoples of other countries. In the final analysis, it is the will of the peoples of the world that decides the all-embracing issues of peace and of human welfare.

V

The outbreak of war made it clear that problems of crucial importance in the field of foreign relations would confront this country as well as other countries upon the termination of hostilities. It became the obvious duty of the Department of State to give special attention to the study of conditions and developments relating to such problems. As the war spread over the earth, the scope of these studies was extended and work upon them was steadily increased, insofar as was compatible with the fullest possible prosecution of the war.

By direction of the President and with his active interest in the work, the Department of State undertook, through special groups organized for the purpose, to examine the various matters affecting the conclusion of the war, the making of the peace, and preparation for dealing with post-war problems. In doing this work, we have had collaboration of representatives of other interested agencies of the Government and of many national leaders, without regard to their political affiliation, and the assistance of a specially constituted and highly qualified research staff. We have been aided greatly by public discussion of the problems involved on the part of responsible private individuals and groups, and by the numerous suggestions and expressions of opinion which we have received from all parts of the country. In proceeding with this work we envisage the fullest cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

We have now reached a stage at which it becomes possible to discuss in greater detail some of the basic problems outlined in this address and in my previous statements. I hope to be able to undertake this from time to time in the early future.

The supreme importance of these problems should lift them far above the realm of partisan considerations or party politics. It is gratifying that both in the Congress and elsewhere great numbers of thoughtful men have so approached them. A heavy responsibility rests upon all of us to consider these all-important post-war problems and to contribute to their solution in a wholly nonpartisan spirit.

[From the Washington Daily News of September 13, 1943]

THE HULL POST-WAR POLICY

Secretary Hull's declaration of American policy is a great state document. It approaches the problems of international peace and justice from the basis of American national interests. It states America's commitment to international cooperation to win the war and to win the peace. It has the clarity of an honest and forthright mind, whose courageous vision of a better world has the maturity of long practical experience.

His countrymen can well afford to listen to one whose foresight and judgment have been proved by events. He warned the President of the probability of a Japanese attack almost a year before Pearl Harbor. He warned Russia 6 months in advance that Hitler planned to attack her.

The Roosevelt-Hull policy—and of course the President and Secretary of State shared its development—could not prevent the war or our involvement through the aggression of the enemy. But that policy did gain us invaluable time for better military preparedness. It did make the record on which this Nation could fight honorably and well in battle, and in victory stand for an enlightened and enduring peace.

Before and during the war that policy forged a closer collaboration with Britain and our other allies. In the Far East it brought new confidence to our lonely friend, China, who has absorbed so much of Japan's military strength so long, so heroically, and at such great sacrifice. In this hemisphere it produced the fast partnership with Canada, and by the good-neighbor attitude brought all Latin America except Argentina to our side. This diplomacy resulted in bases in the Atlantic, Caribbean, and South America, which enabled us to fight around the world and to supply our allies.

The policies toward Vichy France kept the French fleet and northwest Africa out of Hitler's hands. Our Darlan and Spanish policies helped us and our allies with a minimum of loss in time and blood to occupy northwest Africa, free the Mediterranean, and invade Europe through a defeated Italy. Results have demonstrated the wisdom of those policies beyond the power of a small minority of smearers to distort or defame them.

Also on the record, the policy has been one of friendship for Russia, with whom Secretary Hull now appeals for even closer collaboration "during and following the war."

After complete victory, which, will require "efforts even greater than those thus far made," Secretary Hull wants a peace to assure our national interests, which he defines as "national security and the fostering of the economic and social well-being of our people." Our future policy is part of "our basic policy * * * throughout our national history," which has been the recognition of—

The right of all peoples to liberty who are qualified to discharge its responsibilities; equality of all nations under law; non-interference in internal affairs of other nations; observance of international law and peaceful settlement of disputes; non-discrimination in economic opportunity and treatment among nations; cooperation among nations on principles of liberty, equality, justice, morality and law, for economic and social welfare of all.

Believing that these "tenets of our national faith" are "capable of universal application" in which all peacefully inclined nations have a common interest, he states:

"Our task and that of our associates is to utilize this common interest to create an effective system of international cooperation for the maintenance of peace. * * * Those (immediate post-war) needs will embrace the task of taking practical steps to create conditions in which there will be security for every nation; in which each nation will have enhanced opportunities to develop and progress in ways of its own choosing."

The "system of organized international cooperation," he says, must provide adequate means for conciliation of political disputes threatening the peace, and for adjudication of legal disputes by an international court. "Readiness to use force, if necessary, for the maintenance of peace is indispensable if effective substitutes for war are to be found."

To prevent the economic distress and cultural backwardness which also cause wars,

he appeals for sound trade and economic relations, educational advancement, and observance of human rights. To nations having trusteeship for dependent peoples, he cites our Philippine record as "an excellent example."

Finally he pledges "fullest cooperation" with Congress in working out in a non-partisan spirit the details of this policy, subject to popular approval.

Here is no isolationism; no superstate; no blank-check alliance. Here is a sane policy of cooperation by the sovereign United States with other nations for peace.

[From the New York Times of September 13, 1943]

AMERICAN PEACE AIMS

Upon Secretary Hull the country has always been able to depend for a consistent statement of the highest liberal principles in the field of international relations. His radio address last night was another important contribution to the discussion of the bases of a just post-war settlement and a lasting peace. If there are few surprises in Mr. Hull's speeches it is because, as a responsible official, he can be counted upon to say what he ought to say, and because he has embraced a well-thought-out set of principles so sound that he does not find it necessary constantly to exchange them for another set.

Mr. Hull's principles are those of a clear-sighted international liberalism. The foreign policy of any country, he concedes and insists, must be expressive of that country's fundamental national interests; but in determining our foreign policy, he adds, we must first see clearly what our true national interests are. Even between friendly nations there are differences as regards their respective aims and purposes, but there are also immense areas of common interest. Post-war cooperation to maintain the peace, for example, is for each peace-seeking nation "scarcely less essential for its self-preservation than is the present cooperative effort to win the war."

What form should this post-war cooperation take? Mr. Hull draws an instructive distinction between three kinds of differences between nations: (1) Political, (2) those capable of being resolved by applying rules of law, and (3) those arising from "unadulterated aggression." The first can be submitted to the agencies for discussion and conciliation. The second should be adjudicated by an international court of justice. The third can be curbed only by a "willingness of the cooperating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep the peace." Organized international cooperation, Mr. Hull continues, can be successful only to the extent to which the nations of the world are willing to accept certain fundamental propositions. The first of these propositions is that each nation should maintain a stable government, and "should be free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization—so long as it conducts its affairs in such a way as not to menace the peace and security of other nations."

Here we have the outlines of a statesmanlike approach to the many problems of post-war organization and world peace. It is clear, however, that much more detailed thinking will be necessary. The difficulty in the past of maintaining peace through international cooperation is that it has been impossible to get 50 nations to decide in time (or to decide at all) that their peace was being menaced by some particular aggressor and that they must act in concert. At each crisis the nations were pulled in different directions. Some tried to exploit the crisis for their own imagined interest. Even the peace-loving nations hoped that the crisis would be solved without their intervention. They hopefully relied on the resistance, for example, of the immediate victims of aggression. On the other hand, a small "nuclear alliance" runs the risk of arousing the suspicions and antagonism of the nations not included.

Again, we must decide what we mean when we say that a nation should be free "to decide for itself" the form of its governmental organization. When any individual or clique seizes control of a nation's government by force, has the nation "decided for itself" the form of government that is subsequently set up? Clearly, a nation can properly be said to make such decisions for itself only when its form of government is basically democratic—that is, when the people can choose or change their leaders by peaceful means. Wherever they are not free to do this the existing government is not only a menace to the country itself but, as we have learned by experience, to its neighbors.

But regardless of what reservations are made, Secretary Hull has made an admirable beginning. He promises in the early future to discuss the tremendous problems of post-war organization in greater detail. Meanwhile he has set forth a goal of economic and political collaboration that must inspire confidence in our aims and a new hope for the world.

Demobilization and Surplus War Property Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during recent weeks the question of exactly what provisions will be made to smooth the path for our returning servicemen has been before the public eye.

The President offered us a six-point program in this connection several weeks ago. With his suggestions I am in complete accord and feel that they should be speedily adopted in some adequate manner by this Congress.

I am introducing today a bill which I have prepared on this subject which incorporates within it all of the President's proposals to which I have added other provisions which I feel are essential and will serve to implement the principal purposes which the President so evidently has in mind.

RE-ENTER PRIVATE INDUSTRY

It is my belief that the President advocates a well-balanced program to not only tide over the returning soldier and sailor in a financial way upon his honorable discharge from the armed forces, but also to provide the ways and means for him to re-enter private industry either as an employee or as his own employer.

To accomplish this program, in which I am sure we are all in full agreement, I have included in my bill provisions for the following:

First. A provision for a 3-month furlough with full pay and allotments to dependents, whether or not the veteran is at the moment privately employed.

Second. A provision for unemployment insurance for a period of not to exceed 26 weeks after the expiration of said furlough. If at the end of that period he is still unemployed he will enjoy unemployment compensation within the framework of the system within the State in which he resides.

Third. A provision for vocational training with free courses in any field. Training allowances will be granted by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in such amounts as are deemed advisable by him. This is an extension of the present law which now limits such training and allowances to veterans having service disabilities.

Fourth. A provision for credit for veterans on their old age and survivors insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in the amount of $1,700 per year for the time they were in military service. This covers women in military service as well as men.

Fifth. A provision for special aid and counsel to be furnished veterans by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Sixth. A provision that every employer who gives employment to 100 or more employees will be required to employ disabled veterans to the extent of 1 percent of total personnel.

EXPERIENCES OF VETERANS AFTER WORLD WAR NO. 1 MUST NOT BE REPEATED

The foregoing provisions are primarily designed to assure the veterans that there shall not be a repetition of the shameful conditions which prevailed at the expiration of the last war when we had the distressing sight of honorably discharged men standing on street corners selling apples for their daily bread. This time the Government must and shall furnish the tools and means by which those who have fought and bled for us may, with dignity and peace of mind, take rightful advantage of the Government's assistance in finding their rightful niches in their respective communities. Furlough pay for 3 months; unemployment insurance for 6 additional months if necessary; vocational training at the expense of the Government; these coupled with a just allowance for credit on old-age and survivors' insurance benefits and the special services of the Veterans' Administration in an advisory capacity are surely not too much for a grateful Government to offer in the way of temporary assistance to its returning heroes and fighting men.

TOOLS AND MEANS TO ENTER BUSINESS

In addition to this, however, I propose that we regard these men and women as something more than just potential employees to be returned to jobs working for other people than themselves.

I propose that we take cognizance of the fact that many of these men and women are fully capable of becoming their own employers if given the tools and means to enter into business in their own right.

For that reason I have added three more provisions to my bill which I feel are of equal and, in the long run, pos-

sibly of greater importance than the foregoing provisions.

ENORMOUS STOCK PILE OF MATERIALS, PLANTS, AND SUPPLIES

I propose that we face squarely right at this time the sobering fact that the Federal Government now owns and will have at the expiration of this war a vast store of materials, supplies, tools, airplanes, automobiles, and plant facilities. This Government-owned stock pile is even now causing great concern in certain industrial and distributive trade circles to people who fear that this equipment and means of manufacture will be utilized to inadvertently damage existing firms and businesses through post-war competition of these facilities. It is feared that these properties and equipment may be dumped on the market at the close of the war and sold at bargain prices to large firms possessing the cash resources to purchase same and that they will be thus utilized to bring quick profits to the new owners but business disaster to the established firms now in business who are unable to bid for and acquire these surplus plants and equipment.

To forestall such a possibility and to further provide a means through which the returning serviceman or the small and deserving businessman can find employment by becoming his own employer I have added the three additional provisions, previously mentioned. These provisions are:

First. All Government-owned property declared to be surplus by the head of an agency or by the President shall be delivered to an official who shall be known as the Custodian of Surplus War Property. This official shall take charge of and manage all of the above-described plants, tools, surplus material, and other equipment which is thus delivered to him.

The Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, an organization maintaining field offices in every principal city in the Nation shall then study the uses to which this property could best be put with a view to establishing small business enterprises by veterans and to strengthening the existing small business enterprises in the various communities of the United States.

Pursuant to the recommendations of the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation it shall then be the duty of the Custodian of Surplus War Property to dispose of this property and equipment on easy-payment terms, if necessary, to those veterans, groups of veterans, or existing small business enterprises in accordance with these recommendations. These recommendations would be made with a view to building more local enterprises and would be intended to decentralize activities which are of a local character, thus creating more employment.

MAY PURCHASE FARMS ON EASY TERMS

Second. A special appropriation of not to exceed $100,000,000 a year prior to the termination of hostilities and $1,000,000,000 a year for the 5 years after the termination of said hostilities shall be voted to be used exclusively to enable qualified veterans to purchase farms under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Third. All War bonds purchased by servicemen and others shall be increased 10 percent in maturity and redemption value when used to apply on the purchase of farm lands, surplus property, and other equipment under the terms of this act.

I have included small businessmen in the scope of these last provisions of the act because I feel that we are all agreed that the years following the war are going to be increasingly difficult for small firms in the light of conversion problems, tax burdens, and other factors and because I believe that in the years following the war, more than even today, small business is going to require the guidance and cooperation of the Government in solving many of its problems.

The principal purpose of the bill, however, is to provide a cushion, a guiding hand, and the tools for the speedy rehabilitation and employment of the returning soldiers and sailors and to do this without stint and with pride in the doing.

I am inserting herewith a copy of the bill:

H. R. 3200

A bill to provide certain benefits for members of the armed forces upon their discharge or release from active duty, to provide for the use and disposition of surplus war property in the interests of small business enterprises of veterans and others, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act."

CONTINUATION OF SERVICE PAY

SEC. 2. Every member of the land or naval forces of the United States who serves therein prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall, prior to his discharge therefrom or release from active duty therein, after the termination of hostilities in the present war, if such discharge or release is to be under honorable conditions, be granted, upon his request, a furlough of 3 months' duration, at the conclusion of which he shall be discharged or be released from active duty. For the period of such furlough he shall receive pay and allowances at the same rate as that to which he was entitled immediately prior to the beginning of such period, except that he shall not for such period be entitled to pay at a rate in excess of $100 per month. The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 shall remain in effect during the period of the furlough.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and

"(10) Effective July 1, 1944, payment of unemployment compensation to individuals who (A) serve in the land or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending with the date on which hostilities in the present war are terminated, as proclaimed by the President, (B) are separated from such service under honorable conditions or released from active duty, and (C) register with the United States Employment Service and the State employment service. Such unemployment compensation shall be paid for a period of not less than 26 weeks beginning on the first day after the expiration of the furlough provided for by section 2 of the Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act, unless any such individual secures employment prior to the expiration of such period."

(b) Section 1603 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following:

"(7) Effective July 1, 1944, payment of unemployment compensation to individuals who (A) serve in the land or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending with the date on which hostilities in the present war are terminated, as proclaimed by the President, (B) are separated from such service under honorable conditions or released from active duty, and (C) register with the United States Employment Service and the State employment service. Such unemployment compensation shall be paid for a period of not less than 26 weeks beginning on the first day after the expiration of the fulough provided for by section 2 of the Demobilization and Surplus War Property Act, unless any such individual secures employment prior to the expiration of such period."

REHABILITATION AND TRAINING

SEC. 4. Part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. Any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war, who is honorably discharged therefrom, and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for receipt of retirement pay, and is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement; and any such person, whether or not having such a disability, shall be entitled to such vocational training as may be prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That no course of training in excess of a period of 4 years shall be approved nor shall any training under this part be afforded beyond 6 years after the termination of the present war.

"2. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to prescribe and provide suitable training to persons entitled thereto under paragraph 1, and for such purposes may employ such additional personnel and experts as are deemed necessary, and may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution; and, in addition, he may, by agreement or contract with public or private institutions or establishments, provide for such additional training facilities as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this part. The Administrator is also authorized to prescribe and pay or provide for the payment of training allowances to such persons receiving training who are not entitled to pensions.

"3. While pursuing training prescribed herein, and for 2 months after his or her employability is determined, each veteran, if entitled to pension and if so entitled in an amount less than the amount payable in accordance with the compensation rates

for total and temporary disability, including additional amounts for wife, husband, child, or children, and dependent parents, provided by section 202, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 38, sec. 475), shall be paid increased pension which when added to the amount of pension to which he is otherwise entitled will aggregate an amount equal to such rates: *Provided*, That when the course of vocational rehabilitation or training furnished to any person as herein provided consists of training on the job by an employer, such employer shall be required to submit monthly to the Administrator a statement under oath showing any wage, compensation, or other income paid by him to such person during the month, directly or indirectly, and based upon such sworn statements, the Administrator is authorized to reduce the pension or training allowance of such person to an amount considered equitable and just, but not below the amount of pension or retirement pay to which he would be entitled for service-connected disability if not following a course of vocational rehabilitation.

"4. Where any person while following a course of vocational rehabilitation or a course of training as provided for in this part suffers an injury or an aggravation of any injury, as a result of the pursuit of such course of vocational rehabilitation, and not the result of his or her own willful misconduct, and such injury or aggravation results in disability to or additional disability to or death of such person, the benefits under laws applicable to veterans of the present war shall be awarded in the same manner and extent as if such disability, aggravation, or death were service-connected within the meaning of such laws; except that no benefits under this paragraph shall be awarded unless application be made therefor within 2 years after such injury or aggravation was suffered, or such death occurred.

"5. The Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing in gainful employment persons trained under the provisions of this part.

"6. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary in order to promote good conduct and cooperation on the part of persons who are following courses of vocational rehabilitation or courses of training provided by this part. Penalties for the breach of such rules and regulations may, with the approval of the Administrator, extend to a forfeiture by the offender for a period of 3 months of such portion of the training allowance as the Administrator may prescribe, or if receiving the pension herein provided or such portion of the pension as will leave him not less than the amount of the monthly pension or retirement pay to which such person is entitled for service-connected disability, and such penalties may also extend to permanent discontinuance of all further benefits of this part.

"7. The Administrator is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary for the granting of leaves of absence to those following courses of vocational rehabilitation or courses of training provided by this part where in his opinion such leaves do not materially interfere with the pursuit of such courses. Such leaves of absence shall not in the case of any person be granted in excess of 30 days in any consecutive 12 months except in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Administrator: *Provided*, That during leave of absence under this paragraph such person shall be considered to be pursuing his course of vocational rehabilitation or training under this part.

"8. There is hereby authorized to be appriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, available immediately and until expended, the sum of $500,000 to be utilized by the Veterans' Administration under such rules and regulations as the Administrator may prescribe, as a revolving fund for the purpose of making advancements not exceeding $100 in any case, to persons commencing or undertaking courses of vocational rehabilitation or courses of training under this part, and advancement to bear no interest and to be reimbursed in such installments as may be determined by the Administrator by proper deductions from any future payments of training allowance, pension, or retirement pay.

"9. The Administrator shall have the power to provide courses of instruction for personnel and may detail employees to attend the same and may detail any such personnel to attend courses conducted by other than Veterans' Administration agencies, including private organizations, and such employees in addition to their salaries shall be entitled to the payment of expenses incident to such detail, including transportation and tuition, as the Administrator by rules and regulations shall provide; and also in his discretion, to make, or, as by agreement with other agency or institution, cause to be made studies, investigations, and reports inquiring into the rehabilitation of disabled persons and the relative abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of the several groups of the variously handicapped and as to how their potentialities can best be developed and their services best utilized in gainful and suitable employment, including the rehabilitation programs of foreign nations engaged in the present war. For this purpose he shall have the power to cooperate with such public and private agencies as he may deem advisable and to call in consultants who shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Administrator shall by rules and regulations provide, for each day actually spent in the work provided for herein and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and other expenses. For the purposes of this part, the Administrator may accept uncompensated services upon such agreement as he may deem feasible."

SERVICE CREDIT FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS

SEC. 5. Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Military Service

"SEC. 210. (a) Any individual who has attained the age of 65 and who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be deemed for the purposes of this title, to have been paid on and for each day in the period of his active military or naval service occurring after September 30, 1940, and prior to the one hundred and eightieth day after such termination, wages at the annual rate of $1,700, except that if such individual began such service after September 30, 1939, and was paid in the four quarters immediately preceding the quarter in which he began such service, total wages in excess of $1,700, such annual rate shall be the amount equal to such total wages: *Provided*, That the amount of wages deemed to have been paid in any calendar year under this section shall not in any case exceed such amount as would make his total wages in such year (including any wages, as defined in section 209, paid him in such year) more than $3,000.

"(b) If any pension, disability compensation, or other gratuitous benefit is payable, on a periodic basis, to any individual under any provision of law other than this title in respect of any military or naval service referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the provisions of such subsection (a) shall not be taken into account, in computing the average monthly wage, as defined in section 209, of the individual who performed such military service, for the purpose of determining the amount of any benefit payable under this title to the individual to whom such pension, disability compensation, or other gratuitous benefit is payable.

"(c) As used in this section (1) the term 'military or naval service' means service in the land or naval forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, the Women's Army Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve, the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard Reserve, and the Marine Corps Women's Reserve; and (2) the term 'quarter' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in subsection (g) of section 209.

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to meet the additional costs of payments under this title, and of administration, arising by reason of the provisions of this section."

SPECIAL AID REGARDING REHABILITATION, READJUSTMENT, AND REEMPLOYMENT OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

SEC. 6. In order to provide special aid and counsel regarding the readjustment, rehabilitation, and reemployment of individuals who served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and who are discharged therefrom or released from active duty therein under honorable conditions, there are authorized to be appropriated, for expenditure by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, such sums as may be necessary.

EMPLOYMENT OF DISABLED VETERANS

SEC. 7. Every employer who regularly has in his employ 100 or more employees shall employ for each 100, or major fraction thereof, employees so employed at least one individual who (1) served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and (2) has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay.

PURCHASES OF FARMS BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

SEC. 8. Section 6 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 6." and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) To carry out the provisions of this title with respect to individuals who served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and who were discharged therefrom or released from active duty therein under honorable conditions, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000,000 for each fiscal year beginning prior to the termination of such hostilities, as so proclaimed, and for the fiscal year beginning first after such termination and the 4 succeeding fiscal years not to exceed $1,000,000,000 for each such year. Such sums shall be available for expenditure without regard to section 4."

SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

SEC. 9. (a) There shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate a Custodian of Surplus War Property (in this section called the Custodian). The Custodian shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum.

The term of his office shall be 4 years. The Custodian is authorized to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary in carrying out his functions under this section.

(b) Whenever the President or the head of any agency determines that any property of the United States used or held in connection with the prosecution of the war is surplus to the needs of such agency in carrying out its functions and duties, such property shall thereupon be transferred to the Custodian. Upon such transfer the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is directed to make a survey of the uses to which such property may be put by small business enterprises in the various communities in the several States, and shall formulate recommendations to the Custodian with respect to such uses, and the time, manner, and place of disposition of such property. Such recommendations shall be made with a view to facilitating and encouraging the establishment in the various communities in the several States by members of the armed forces of the United States upon their discharge or release from active duty, as well as by others, of small business enterprises, and with a view to strengthening existing small business enterprises.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Custodian, pending the recommendations of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation with respect to any property transferred to him under subsection (b), to use, manage, and operate such property, and upon receiving such recommendations to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property in accordance with such recommendations. He is authorized, in selling any such property, to extend credit to the purchaser. The rate of interest in connection with any credit so extended shall not exceed 3½ percent per annum.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

USE OF WAR BONDS TO PURCHASE FARMS AND SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY

SEC. 10. In the case of War Savings bonds purchased at least 3 months prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and held (either individually or jointly with his spouse) by any individual, the maturity value and redemption value shall be increased by 10 percent thereof if such bonds or the proceeds thereof are used by such individual in payment in whole or in part for the purchase of property from the Custodian of Surplus War Property or, if such individual served in the land or naval forces of the United States after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of such hostilities, as so proclaimed and was discharged therefrom or released from active duty therein under honorable conditions, in part payment for the purchase of any farm under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

An American Looks at Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal-American, of the issue of August 14, 1943, entitled "Viva l'Italia Libera," and written by Harry H. Schlacht.

This editorial is without doubt one of the finest that I have read on the contributions of Italy to the progress of the world.

It is, obviously, the product of a liberal, fair-minded American who can see no inconsistency between our duty as Americans to our own country and the hope for the survival of an ancient glory.

The editorial follows:

VIVA L'ITALIA LIBERA

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

The famous motto of the State of Virginia "Sic Semper Tyrannis" has ever been the fate of tyrants who have challenged liberty-loving people.

Mussolini is no more.

Liberty is the voice of God.

Four and a half centuries have elapsed since the stout heart of an Italian sailor—Christopher Columbus—with high determination and a great faith had plowed the unfurrowed waves to claim for progress and for civilization a new world.

Down the corridors of time have descended the great leaders of Italian antiquity to bestow untold benefits upon mankind.

Italy has given America her theme of freedom.

In her paintings, in her letters and art, in the great expressions of her being runs her Renascence—"Risorgimento"—like a golden thread to bind her great gifts of genius to the world.

Her martyrs, scholars, and heroes have searched and hewed new paths to the liberation of man's spirit.

Let us draw the curtain of history and contemplate the glory of the race from which they sprang.

The spirit of freedom, the passion for democracy, love of beauty, art and music, and all the fine impulses of the human spirit flowered and blossomed with rich fertility on the soil of Italy.

There flash upon the canvas of our memory the immortal names of Dante, Galileo, Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Tasso, and Ariosto.

Hear Garibaldi, the great soldier and liberator, cry out to the oppressors of his day:

"He who still has faith in Italy—let him follow me."

Hear Mazzini, Cavour, and Leopardi sound the battle cry of freedom.

Such a heritage does not die with the closing of universities or the burning of books.

You may destroy the records, exile teachers, but you cannot divert the destiny of a nation that has produced Carducci, Verdi, Marconi, Puccini, Caruso, and a Toscannini.

The good people of Italy have ever remained steadfast in their convictions and ideals, even when the yoke of oppression rested heavily upon them.

They know that the American people are their traditional friends.

Never before in their history have Italy and the United States been at war.

They know that we have not waged a war of aggression on the Italian people, but a war against the pompous, strutting demagogues who led them astray.

We come as liberators and not as conquerors.

With fortitude and fidelity, the Italian patriots have waited for this moment—for them it is the "ante lucem"—or that moment before the daybreak that brings the effulgence of the sun.

Today men are dying so that man may live.

We are determined upon an order of which the Bible is the Atlantic Charter—the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Its aim is not tyranny, but justice, not only among men, but among all nations.

Italy will live again!

The luster of her ancient glory will never be dimmed.

Marching along with the United Nations, she will enjoy a new birth of freedom—liberated from exploitation by cruel aggressors who seek to crush out the light of liberty throughout the world.

And when that happy day shall come, when freedom is won both in the war and in the peace, the Goddess of Liberty will forever stand with her meaning enhanced a thousandfold.

She will be the symbol not of the nation, but of the world.

Viva l'Italia Libera!

Long live free Italy.

Unconditioned Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "Unconditioned Nationalism," delivered by me at the eastern conference of the Republican Post-War Policy Association, held at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, July 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Unconditioned nationalism is a cause of war. In the language of other times it was called "unconditioned sovereignty." It is that characteristic of government and national consciousness which seeks aggrandizement of self, regardless of cost to others. It is blind to the necessity of confining use of rights and property to the limitation of what will not injure the rights and property of others. Its demands comprehend essential, strategic or critical materials, needed by all nations but natural resources of only a few of them. These demands require communication and commerce, surmounting all obstacles, outriding every storm and penetrating every barrier.

Unconditioned nationalism is final authority, a thing greater than law. It ultimately expresses itself in predatory acts of Hitlers and Tojos. In democracies it leads to abuse of freedom, ultimately developing license.

Unconditioned nationalism presupposes war. With the leading treaty powers of the earth possesed of this devil, world war was inevitable in 1914.

Now we realize that we missed the great moment prepared through centuries of man's evolution when humanity could envisage its past and future with sympathy and understanding.

During the First World War the Allies had the vision of a better world and the opportunity to lay the foundations for it. They tried but they failed.

To us the tragic fact is that the United States as a Government, turned its face toward unconditioned nationalism and away from responsibility to its neighbors and to its own people for the maintenance of peace. In fact we emphasized unconditioned nationalism in many ways. We refused to cooperate in a league of Nations or a world

court. We built up embargoes through excessive tariffs, we tried to isolate ourselves by a neutrality act.

Now the golden opportunity has again been offered.

The United Nations are bound in a brotherhood of arms, fighting for their very existence. Common danger and common interests impose conditions on nationalism among them.

During this period of vision, seen through the eyes of comradeship, all perceive that when each great nation is a law unto itself, is aggressive, unyielding, regarding national isolationism as duty and nationalism as supreme good, collisions are bound to occur. Irresistible truth challenges us, namely, that disregard of the vital interests of other nations, in providing for the near and remote welfare of any nation, is irreconciable with enduring peace.

Therefore experience, as well as reason, points to a new principle upon which to found the edifice of peace and freedom. I am persuaded that that principle is the Golden Rule. It is practical among the nations of the world as it is among citizens of a village.

Montesquieu, in his Spirit of the Laws, undertook to differentiate between the laws of God and the laws of man by assigning the former to relations between persons and the latter to the relations between government and persons. A more modern people, the Vermonters, in founding their Republic, recognized the practicality of the laws of God in their first general assembly by passing a sweeping resolution adopting the laws as set forth in the Connecticut Law book and in defect thereof the word of God as set forth in the Holy Bible.

The absence of collisions on the sidewalks of our villages is the consequence of the operation of the divine law more than it is that of statutory prohibition. Self-discipline prevents causes of disagreement. The use of one's own with due regard for that of his neighbor creates the maximum amount of liberty and peace attainable.

This attitude denies the doctrine of unconditioned nationalism. It leads to the advance position of willingness of the nations to yield enough of sovereignty to make possible the program here outlined and open the future to change and further development of this program for the attainment of more opportunity, more incentive, more prosperity, more growth of the spirit, and more happiness of all mankind.

I would strengthen your arm and increase your activity as a Republican Party organization. Your program comprehending a strong Nation-wide organization and involving a doorbell-ringing State, congressional, district, county, and precinct leadership, will supplement powerfully the April 1942 resolution of the national committee which you have endorsed. Your organization is within the Republican Party. Another, also formed in Chicago, is soliciting membership and conducting a program founded on what they call Republican national revival and claiming the Republican Party as the nationalist party in American politics. Such movements are a menace to peace. However, they expose the fact that isolationism still lurks here and there. They emphasize the necessity for your activity.

In our two-party system we believe that fidelity to the party and service and sacrifice for it are acts of patriotism. The motive of a great party in our system is the indispensable and proximate cause of attitudes and courses of action of government. The party in power is responsible for the policy of government. The minority party also has obligations, comprehending, among other things, the testing of every proposal, constructive criticism of every act. In time of war its responsibility increases because war requires the mobilization of every human and material resource of the Nation. The minority must aid the majority in unifying and harmonizing our people. It must help to lead in the prosecution of the war to that victory which is the achievement of a peace that will prevail.

You have announced that you are not supporting any person for any office but that your objective is winning the war in the whole sense. Your determination that the Republican Party shall be committed on principle and in its choice of candidates to a new foreign policy, is sound and will help to bring together Republicans who disagree at present on candidates.

This new policy as envisaged by you disavows a negotiated peace or armistice. It seeks a conclusive victory which disables the enemy by disarmament, which establishes security by the maintenance of supreme military power among the United Nations, and which lays the spiritual and legal foundation for world government to maintain peace and order through the administration of justice.

You have endorsed in principle the Ball, Burton, Hatch, Hill Senate resolution. By this act you have contributed already to the creation of a strong foreign policy. I assume that you will employ all such contributions of thought in your campaign. The purpose to defeat the revival of unconditioned nationalism and to unify the great majority of the members of the Republican Party in post-war collaboration, would be served better by avoiding attempts to settle details which are controversial. You and all others who favor the objective of the Ball, Burton, Hatch, Hill Senate resolution will gain strength through discussion of the same general principle which pervades many such resolutions.

I believe this "grand old party" is making progress toward that degree of harmony which is necessary to win the war and the peace. A recent evidence of this is Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, introduced by Senator VANDENBURG for himself and Senator WHITE. This resolution does not go into detail regarding world organization, a tribunal or tribunals for the determination of controversies between two or more nations, the type of armed force involved in making peace and order prevail, but it is a step away from unconditioned nationalism and in favor of participation by the United States in post-war security, peace, and justice in a free world.

In the appointment by Mr. Spangler, chairman of the G. O. P. National Committee, of Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and others in office of a policy advisory council is another indication of Republican progress.

Your vigorous promotion of the plan you have announced will aid to bring together factions upon a platform which will appeal to the common sense, inspire the courage, move the conscience, and incite the effective service of a great majority of Americans.

We assume that all Republicans will adhere firmly to constitutionalism and safeguard American vital interests. No one else will place American interests first. Every issue must be tested for this. We must make clear the intimate relationship between our foreign and our domestic policies. As we favor mobilization of all of our people now, to active participation in war, we also aim to provide for orderly demobilization, and we prepare for the reception of our returning soldiers into a life of opportunity and service calculated to uplift the standard of living of the American people.

When we come to write the party platform in convention, there ought not to be great differences or disagreement regarding our policy touching agriculture, mining, manufacturing, labor relations, social security, education, commerce, and merchandising. But I need to point to only a few subjects to indicate that our decision upon foreign policy will affect our internal and domestic affairs seriously, and that we require preparation in advance on these points, thus:

Immigration.

Tariff.

Communications by radio, cable, telegraph, mail, press, telephone, teletype, television, and courier.

Commerce by air, involving crossing and landing rights on our continent, on the islands of the seas and on the continents of our neighboring nations. Here is a vast unexplored idea which is not only global but it is essenttally American.

Reciprocity in trade.

Exchange, relative stabilization of purchasing power of the monies of the great trading countries.

Lend lease, and above all,

The common defense.

Many of us feel that one of the most disloyal things the Republican Party could do would be to shirk its responsibility in the formation of a foreign policy. On the other hand we feel that the Republican Party is challenged, by marvelous opportunity, to hold aloft a torch of leadership into that new world in which the sanctions for peace contemplate a large element of self-discipline based on the Golden Rule, but in which the certainty of security from attack is maintained by armed force. Again and again we must assert, if the goal is to be attained, that relative freedom and permanent peace shall be implemented by a world organization to which the United States of America will contribute.

Our first objective is security. All others follow. Therefore agreement among peoples and nations upon means of prevention of trespass and crime by governments is sought.

Judgment must be formed by the people who elect and support governors, concerning the possible sanctions and the problems hampering or facilitating application of them. Tests by debate and discussion on the platform, in press and over radio, of the near and remote consequences on the sovereignty of the United States are necessary. The functions of the Republic Postwar Policy Association include service indispensable to these studies and the formulation of our foreign policy.

Security as contemplated by the United Nations means protection from aggression by an armed enemy.

We will exclude "peace without victory." That was tried by President Wilson and proved a cause of insecurity. "Peace without victory" was as much of a sophistry as "He kept us out of war."

Consequently, what ought to go without saying, we have to say, viz: the foundation of security is prosecution of the war to conclusive victory.

I place second in order, disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

Third, disqualification of Germany, Italy, and Japan to construct facilities for the manufacture of implements of war;

Fourth, administration of firm retributive justice by punishment of the leaders in crime and brutality;

Fifth, occupation of the land of the Axis with forces to carry out the program of security;

Sixth, provision and maintenance of armed forces at home, united with corresponding forces in each of the United Nations, to maintain peace and order.

Shall this force be an integrated world police army?

Shall the obligation respecting the sanction for security be only a promise?

Such questions illustrate details upon which the decision need not be made at once. The main goal is general cooperation of such vigor as to make certain that the opportunity now presented will not be missed, but will be transmuted into permanent guarantees of security.

It is my opinion that victory should connote a more perfect union, though not uniformity, of the United Nations. Our immediate image should have a simple form and contain the element of adaptability and growth to future needs. In due time regional organizations, suitable to the history and characteristics of the people, the resources, material and spiritual, could be, and probably would be, developed within the world organization. We could start with collaboration between China, Russia, Great Britain and the United States in the organization of a world council to codify the fundamental rules of international conduct, a judicial tribunal for the determination of controversies between two or more nations, and a military power great encugh to prevent disturbance of the peace. Each member of that union would serve best its vital interests through all-for-one-and-one for-all action. We lift our sights to a new horizon, over which is dawning the light of national self-discipline, but realism requires the enactment of laws which shall be well known and behind which there is maintained adequate force to compel obedience.

Everywhere we see evidence of an awakened Nation. It is persuaded that democracy is not safe in the United States if it is exposed to overthrow by totalitarianism anywhere on earth.

This Nation through tears, beholds a vision of dependence upon each other of all the democracies. It perceives that "the values involved in this war are universal and eternal." Its foreign policy must be settled when it commences negotiations with its partners. This is necessary to the leadership expected of the greatest democracy on earth. The aspirations of the Nation are attainable if a sufficient number of our citizens agree on major principles of the war and of the achievement of peace.

To promote such agreement the Republican Post-war Policy Association has contributed and will serve. May its purpose be fully achieved.

Peace or Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address by me entitled "Peace or Politics," delivered before the American Bar Association at Chicago, Ill., August 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the American Bar Association, fellow citizens of America, the declared purpose of the Fulbright resolution, and of many other similar resolutions proposed to Congress, is to commit Congress to cooperate in creating some permanent international organization to prevent the recurrence of the tragedy of world war. I don't suppose there is anyone in the United States who is not prepared to do anything and everything possible to assure peace for ourselves and for our children and for our grandchildren. The question is whether that purpose is forwarded by having Congress pass resolutions relating to proposals which are not yet before it in any concrete form. One Congress cannot bind any Congress hereafter elected. The debate on the resolution may lead to a public and official discussion of the relations between ourselves and our allies which will tend to separate rather than unite us. In fact, both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill have expressed concern that no such debate shall occur.

Any resolution must at this time be of the most general and indefinite nature. The Fulbright resolution, for instance, may mean nothing or it may mean everything. It is broad enough to cover, one, an international world state; two, a league of sovereign nations; three, a British-Russian-American alliance as proposed by Walter Lippmann. About the only policy which it definitely excludes is one which reserves freedom of action to the United States in the future. The policies falling within the resolution are as inconsistent with each other as each is with freedom of action. Furthermore, the emphasis on international machinery with power, suggests that whatever this machinery is it is to be a panacea for peace in our time. Nothing is said about all the other steps which must be taken, and for the most part taken first, if the international machinery with power is to have the slightest chance of success.

A PEACE PROGRAM MORE IMPORTANT THAN RESOLUTIONS

I propose to discuss today the important steps which must be taken to insure peace by protecting our people against attack or threat of attack. We pursued a policy leading to war because our people were convinced that the German-Japanese aggression would sooner or later lead to an attack on the United States itself. We are not engaged in any crusade for democracy, or for the four freedoms, or the preservation of the British Empire. We seek a world in which the American people can work out the destiny of the Republic, and solve the problems of human liberty and happiness, without physical attack on the distortion of our multiple freedoms by war.

The insurance of peace and safety in the future is not an easy task. It can't be obtained by passing Congressional resolutions. Since the dawn of history men have been trying to solve the problem. Every peace treaty has stated as its objective perpetual peace between the contracting parties. We had the Pax Romana, the Great Design of Henry of Navarre, the Holy Alliance, the Concert of Europe, the Hague Conventions, the League of Nations of 1919, to mention only a few. It isn't the desire to establish machinery which is lacking. It is a practical plan, which will work, and won't do more harm than good. Whether Congress should yet debate the problem is open to question, but the private citizens of this country should certainly engage continuously in a thoughtful analysis and discussion of the plans that are proposed. How can we in the future insure peace for the United States and its people?

First. We must pursue the war to a complete and overwhelming victory with punishment and disarmament of the Axis nations. That alone should insure peace for many years to come, and it is two-thirds of the problem. There will be no aggressors for years to come who will dare to threaten the world after they see the punishment for aggression which modern war will inflict on Germany, Italy, and Japan. The first task of the F. B. I. was to kill or capture the gangsters who defied society. The question how crime and criminals may be prevented is still engaging the attention of the sociologists.

Second. We must provide an Army, Navy, and Air Force for our defense sufficiently strong to remove from the mind of any nation the idea that it can successfully attack us. Of course such a force could not prevent air raids or other attacks, but there is nothing to suggest that modern technology has removed the ability of North America to defend itself against any nation or combination of nations. Look at the successful defense of Great Britain in a much more vulnerable position. It is said that democracies will not keep up their armed forces. But it is no argument against a course of action that one has not the sense or courage to pursue it. International machinery is not going to run itself either, and democracies will find it harder to continue the necessary ungrudging and unqualified support for it, than they will to maintain their own forces.

Third. After the initial period of relief and reconstruction we must keep out of the internal affairs of other nations, and we must learn to treat with tolerance conditions and ideologies which we may not understand or sympathize with. I seem to see a tendency, especially among our New Deal friends, to make plans for the world as they made plans for us poor Americans. We can't crusade throughout the world for the four freedoms, or force milk on people who don't like milk without making ourselves thoroughly hated. We can't force on the Russians freedom of speech and freedom of religion if Mr. Stalin doesn't approve of them as he doesn't. We can't force independence on India except as the British see fit to arrange it. We can be helpful throughout the world. But we can't be a meddlesome Matty, or try to boss the boots off the world if we expect to avoid war in the future. No nation should insist on interfering with the internal affairs of other nations unless it is prepared to submit to the same interference itself.

Fourth. The three programs I have outlined are steps of purely national policy. But I do not intend to suggest that they are sufficient. We have sometimes followed them and they have not kept us out of war. Because any war today is likely to spread over the world. I believe we should attempt again to prevent the occurrence of any war in the world by international action. Before coming, however, to the question of an elaborate international organization with power to outlaw war in the future there are other direct steps to be taken. In the period after the cessation of hostilities we have a unique opportunity to remove some of the most fertile causes of war. For several years the world will necessarily be dominated by the military forces of Great Britain, Russia, and America. The Axis nations and the occupied nations will have to accept in the first instance the basic world pattern decreed by the Allies. The Versailles Treaty failed largely because it wholly neglected economic conditions, and created countries with no visible means of support. The Allies must try to draw boundaries so that no country is forced to remain poverty-stricken. They can insist that customs unions shall be established in the beginning, even if it is unwise to interfere later with internal tariff arrangements. They can assure a supply of necessary raw materials, and they can make some arrangements to handle the exports which may be necessary to pay for those raw materials. The Atlantic Charter says that the peace should "afford assurance that all the

men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from * * * want." This seems to me a hopeless and therefore unfortunate aspiration for any peace, if applied to individuals. But freedom from want as an ideal for nations seems possible to assure, and it would reduce one of the most dangerous causes of war. The cause cannot be entirely removed because no matter what arrangements are made for a nation, failure to conduct its own affairs with efficiency or to restrain the growth of poulation, may cause poverty, hardships, and discontent. How can we possibly provide freedom of want to China's 400,000,000, or India's 300,000,000, or Japan's 70,000,000, when there are twice as many people as the country can support on a decent standard of living. We have not even solved the similar problem of little Puerto Rico's 2,000,000, with five times the density of population of Cuba, though we have poured out hundreds of millions of American dollars. But in Europe, where wars usually start, a greatly improved economic basis for peace should be possible of accomplishment.

Fifth. The desire for national freedom is one of the deepest of human emotions, and its suppression has been the source of many wars. When not carried to excess, nationalism is the basis of individual freedom and patriotism and other qualities which make life worth living. Therefore in making the peace settlement we must provide for the self-determination of nations, and we must do it with more skill and less theory than was used at Versailles. That is not an easy job under any circumstances, but it can be made particularly difficult in eastern Europe unless the Russians join sincerely in the effort to avoid future nationalist uprisings in that area. Involved also is some revision of the colonial system to promise more self-government in the future, and to establish some form of autonomous dependent status for countries and islands too small to stand on their own feet. The Atlantic Charter states clearly that no territorial changes shall be made that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. In other words it requires that national freedom must be the basis for any enduring peace.

Sixth. It is generally conceded that democratic governments are less likely to be aggressive than autocracies. In the reconstitution of governments, therefore, in enemy and occupied countries, the Allies should in the first instance insist upon constitutions providing for elections by majority. But there are dictatorships with which we cannot interfere, as in Russia, China, Brazil; and the Atlantic Charter correctly recognizes "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live," so that the finest type of democratic constitution may later degenerate into a Fascist or a Communist dictatorship. Yet the victory of the democracies should make democracies more popular, and in the immediate post-war period a boost can be given them. Any effort to impose democracy on the entire world, however, would be impossible and far more likely to cause war than prevent it.

Seventh. The Allies should provide for the revision of the world code of international law, extending it to provide the rules and ideals which shall govern the relations of sovereign nations in times of crisis and with relation to vital national interests. We are proposing to abolish the German doctrine that "might makes right," and there should be an affirmative statement of the principles on which the nations of the world may live together in peace. It may be extremely difficult, as I shall indicate later, to work out the machinery by which this law or any treaty shall be enforced, but if the law of peace is clear and definite it is much easier to enlist in its support the moral forces of the world. I believe there should be a World Court to interpret the law as recommended by your Bar Association Committee and to decide all cases based upon such law which may be submitted to it. There may be many ideals in this world which can never be attained or even promoted by force. We ought to distinguish more clearly than we do those ends which can only be obtained by voluntary appeal and the education of public opinion, and those which are within the proper scope of official power. For instance, the New Deal bureaucrats would have accomplished far more in the United States in food and price control if they had used the voluntary appeal and education methods of the World War period than they have by regulating everything and threatening crack-downs and prison sentences. And the same thing is going to be true in the continued maintenance of peace. Force may be necessary in the background, but it won't succeed unless there exists in the greater part of the world a public opinion educated to peace and to the principles of law on which it is founded.

I have reviewed at some length the steps which must be taken before we even come to consider the question of the use of power to enforce peace. I have done so to show that too much emphasis is being placed on this question of power and the passage of resolutions which treat our participation in the use of force as the panacea on which all depends. The peace of the American people will depend much more on the skill and good faith by which these seven policies are pursued in the period immediately after the war. Only if these foundations are firm can we go on to erect on them the international machinery with power for which Mr. FULBRIGHT asks, and I doubt if by the 1944 election or perhaps for several years after the armistice, any definite plan will be presented for an international organization to enforce peace.

ALTERNATIVE PLANS TO INSURE PEACE

Nevertheless, it is a good time to discuss and distinguish the various plans between which the United States must ultimately choose as a matter of its foreign policy. Mr. FULBRIGHT'S plan is apparently intended to rule out isolationism without stating just what he would substitute for it. If by isolationism he means the position of those who believe we should retire to America after the war and take no interest in any association of nations or the actions or trouble of other nations, I don't know anybody who favors it. But there is a respectable body of opinion, perhaps a majority, which believes in all the steps I have suggested, but does not think the United States should commit itself in advance to take any action outside of its territory. They would have us remain free to interfere or not interfere according as we consider the occasion of sufficiently vital interest to this country. This position, and not isolationism, has been the traditional policy of the United States for 150 years. While I would myself favor a change in this policy under certain conditions, I doubt if it should be formally excluded from consideration at this time, or until we agree on some other practical policy.

There are three other principal policies which might be adopted under the Fulbright formula of international machinery with power. They are completely distinct and contradictory. First, we have the Federal Union plan proposed by Henry Streit and former Governor Stassen, calling for the incorporation of this country into an international state. That seems to me the implication of the Ball resolution proposing an international police force greater than any national force. Second, we have the policy proposed by Walter Lippmann in his book, U. S. Foreign Policy, based primarily on a defensive, and perhaps offensive, alliance with the British Empire and if possible with Russia. The former interventionist forces in the East appear to be swinging to this Lippmann alliance policy. Third, an association of sovereign nations to include the United Nations and ultimately all others, covenanting together to use their forces to prevent aggression. This seems to me the plan to which Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have leaned, in the Atlantic Charter and in their public utterances. The differences between these three policies is greater than the difference between either of them, and the traditional American policy of maintaining a free hand.

FEDERAL UNION

The theory of an international state bearing the same relation to nations and their citizens as our Federal Government bears to the States and their citizens appears to me to be fantastic, dangerous and impractical. It is proposed that it have a supreme legislature, executive, and court. It would maintain an all-powerful military force able to dominate all nations. It would control all trade, all seaports and all airports within the various nations. Such a state, in my opinion, would fall to pieces in 10 years. The whole idea is based on the union of the 13 colonies in 1787. But those colonies were made up of men of similar origin, similar methods of thought, similar ideals, with similar forms of government. They lived approximately the same kind of life, with similar standards of living. Even in that case one single difference resulted in a violent civil war 75 years later which almost destroyed the Union. Here we would be attempting to unite peoples who do not understand even how their new fellow citizens begin to think; we would join democracies with dictatorships, Moslem states with Christian states, the Brahman with the Rotarian, men who talk only Japanese with men who talk only English. We would attempt to unite the most highly civilized with the aborgines, the workman who earns $20 a day with the coolie who earns 20 cents a day. The difficulties of holding together such a Tower of Babel under one direct government would be insuperable.

Furthermore, if it could remain in existence at all, it would not remain democratic—if a state including dictatorships like Russia, China, Brazil, and Greece could ever have been democratic. True democracy depends on local self-government, effective access of the people to their central government, and the protection of inalienable individual right. Sometimes I question whether the United States has not reached the limit of size under which the people of a nation can have a real voice in its government. Certainly a world government at Geneva or Panama would listen more closely to the voice of cranks and pressure groups than to the voice of rural Illinois, for instance. It is significant that the British Empire because of its size has moved toward decentralization of government, and has today no over-all legislative body, no over-all executive, and no over-all police force. If Canada and Australia and New Zealand and South Africa and Eire are regarded as too diverse to be consolidated into one government, what about China, Japan, Russia, and Ethiopia?

Third, I don't believe our allies, England and Russia, would agree for a moment to submit themselves to an international state and have their seaports and airports run by an international bureaucrat. Remember that this would involve scrapping all armament for an international police force, controlled by some international executive selected by a body the control of which would rest in a combination of member nations impossible to predict. If you can see Winston Churchill liquidating the British fleet, or

Joe Stalin dismissing the Russian army, or either of them turning over their forces to President Whoozis of Worlditania, you are more clairvoyant than I.

Finally anyone who suggests such a plan is proposing to tear up the American Constitution, which has made this Nation the greatest power in the world and set an example of successful popular rule to the entire world. We are asked to scrap a tried plan which up to this time has successfully maintained our liberty and afforded to this country the protection against invasion and interference which is the alleged purpose of all these international plans. It doesn't seem to me consistent with American patriotism, and most of our people are still patriots. If Congress is going to pass any resolution at all it certainly should exclude the possibility of an international supergovernment. I may say that the resolution of Senators VANDENBERG and WHITE does exactly that by emphasizing the fact that any proposed international arrangement shall be made between sovereign nations.

BRITISH-RUSSIAN-AMERICAN SUPER-ALLIANCE

A plan completely antagonistic to the Stassen plan is proposed by Walter Lippmann in his recent book U. S. Foreign Policy, Shield of the Republic. He urges that we form an alliance with England, Russia, and perhaps China. Presumably this will bind the parties to go to the defense of each other if either is attacked and perhaps to join in certain offensive action. The alliance is to be so strong that we cannot be successfully attacked. It is an expression of the proposition advanced by me earlier that we should have an adequate army, navy, and air force for our own defense, as one of the means of discouraging and preventing an attack, but it is maintained that no such force can be adequate for that purpose without an alliance at least with England. This position seems to overlook the fact that alliances have their own weaknesses, and are as likely to fall apart at crucial moments as any defensive plans based on a nation's own armed forces. The whole theory is based on the assumption that there will be powerful enemy forces seeking to attack us, and that there will be no general international machinery with power to prevent the growth of armament and renewed military aggression. Since by hypothesis this alliance is to be stronger than any possible opposition, it will have at least a benevolent control over the entire world. While it is suggested that this alliance may grow into an international association, that appears to be an after thought. The alliance is to come first and is to remain in effect so that it is hard to see how it can develop into something fundamentally different.

The book is brilliantly written and it will have a profound effect on American public opinion. It will obtain much support because undoubtedly in the few years after the war Europe will be dominated by the British, American, and Russian Armies, and perhaps by some formal trusteeship by those nations during the period of reconstruction. It is often easier to continue such existing powers than to surrender them. The idea may appeal also to the nationalistic sentiment of those Americans who picture America dominating the alliance and the world. It may appeal to the do-gooders who regard it as the manifest destiny of America to confer the benefits of the New Deal on every Hottentot. The fact that it is inconsistent with all the ideals so eloquently stated by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt does not seem to be noticed by the followers of those statesmen. It proceeds on the assumption that wars cannot be prevented by the education of the human race to a rule of law and order or by any international arrangement, but only by the armed forces of America, England, and Russia.

Fundamentally this is imperialism. It derides the idea that we can defend the United States, or America, without sea bases and air bases in Europe, Africa, and Asia. It is said that we cannot be safe unless our forces are equal to the job of meeting all our commitments, that is of defending America, Greenland, Iceland, Alaska, the Philippines, and perhaps Australia and England against any possible combination. For that purpose we must control all the sea lanes and all the air lanes over the Atlantic and the Pacific. Obviously if this is sound policy for us, it is sound policy for every other nation. England must control all the oceans. Holland must control the routes to the Indies. Russia must have bases on all sides of the Baltic and control the north Pacific because Bering Strait cannot be reached except by sea or air. If we must have bases in Africa to defend South America why doesn't France or any other African power have to have bases in South America to defend Africa from us? Since many nations are dependent on imported food for their very existence, they must each dominate the sea lanes over which that food must travel. The theory can only lead to vast national armaments in all parts of the world; every nation or at any rate every alliance of nations must be able to control the seas, which means, control the world. It has long been recognized that militarism, the very existence of huge armaments potentially aggressive is a cause of war. They are a tinder box which any spark may ignite. Those who control them unconsciously desire to see them in action. They create a profession of militarists. The plan is at variance with paragraph 8 of the Atlantic Charter which provides for the disarmament of the Axis Nations, and "all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments."

Mr. Lippmann bases his plea for an English defensive alliance on the claim that from 1823 to 1900 we depended on an understanding with England which gave us the British Fleet to enforce the Monroe Doctrine, and that from 1900 to 1940 our foreign policy was bankrupt because our Army and Navy were not large enough to enforce the Monroe Doctrine and defend the Philippines. As for the earlier period there was a long succession of eminent American Secretaries of State from John Quincy Adams to Seward and Olney and Hay who certainly would be very much surprised to learn that there was any alliance of any kind with England, express or implied, to enforce the Monroe Doctrine. It was always doubtful whether a little Nation like the United States could enforce the policy. But we could make a lot of trouble for anyone who violated it; and we relied on the fact that European nations could find other areas in the world more attractive for colonization or exploitation, and were usually involved in quarrels between themselves. As a matter of fact the number of different races in Europe is so great, the racial feelings so strong, the physical conditions so diverse, that no nation since Rome has ever been able to conquer all of Europe or dominate any great part of it for long. England and Russia are just as much a part of Europe as France and Germany. Neither has even been conquered. A policy affecting South America or the Far East therefore was carried out, and can still be carried out, with the certain assumption that it will not meet a combined European opposition.

As for the period after 1900 our foreign policy was undoubtedly based on a mistaken assumption that one nation would not wantonly attack another. But we had a Navy from 1900 to 1914 adequate to defend ourselves against any nation except England whose peaceful intentions we assumed; except for our position in the Philippines which we always intended to be temporary. After the World War we maintained the same position. The disarmament treaties so divided naval strength that again we had adequate protection against any combination of countries which did not include England. Again the Philippines were regarded as indefensible and were to be made independent shortly.

It was only after the expiration of the naval treaties that our foreign policy became bankrupt. Then we permitted Japan, to increase its Navy while we neglected to modernize our own sufficiently. Then we failed like France and England to keep up with the procession in military aviation, and let Hitler assume control of the air. But Hitler only came into power in 1932, and before that airplanes were forbidden to Germany and its Army limited to 100,000 men. If we had developed a sufficient land-based air force it seems now that we could even have defended the Philippines.

Nor was there anything isolationist about our foreign policy in the twenties after the first refusal to join the League of Nations. The disarmament treaties, the Eight Power Pact in the Pacific, the Kellogg treaties were all efforts to work with other nations. We were willing to go further than the British in the imposition of sanctions against Japan and Italy. In the Dawes and Young plans we attempted to help in solving the economic trouble brought on Europe by the Versailles Treaty. One of President Hoover's last acts was to secure the postponement of reparations and the freezing of the German short-term credits. Our foreign policy was never bankrupt. In his eagerness to support a preconceived thesis, Mr. Lippmann seems to me to have distorted historical fact.

The policy which he advocates would have promoted war in the past and would promote war in the future. I have pointed out how it would promote militarism, one of the causes of war. But it has other dangerous results. A military alliance presupposes an enemy threatening war. A military alliance is always an alliance against someone. It arouses the antagonism of the world and leads to the formation promptly of a counteralliance. Once the whole world is lined up in two opposing camps another world war is only a question of time. To avoid that condition is the very purpose of all the ideals and plans for any kind of world federation for peace.

A defensive military alliance based on a control of all the sea lanes and air lanes of the world is bound to produce imperialism. Our fingers will be in every pie. Our military forces will work with our commercial forces to obtain as much of world trade as we can lay our hands on. We will occupy all the strong strategic points in the world and try to maintain a force so preponderant that none shall dare attack us. How long can nations restrain themselves from using such force with just a little of the aggressiveness of Germany and Japan? Look at the history of the British Empire, how a trading post in India extended itself into a rule over 300,000,000 people, how the Boer War led to the domination of the Transvaal, how the desire for Chinese trade led to the colonization of Hong Kong. Potential power over other nations, however benevolent its purpose, leads inevitably to imperialism.

Any policy based primarily on alliances is an abandonment of the ideals on which the American Republic is founded. It substitutes force for a rule of law in the making of which law all those participate who are to be governed. It establishes government without the consent of the governed. It is, of course,

inconsistent with the Atlantic Charter, formally approved by 32 United Nations. The first clause of that document says, "The countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." Yet here certainly is a substantial aggrandizement of power plus the seizure of any bases which may be thought necessary. The desire to secure the alliance with Russia has led Mr. Lippman to sacrifice the third clause of the Atlantic Charter promising the restoration of self-government to those nations who have been forcibly deprived of it, for he assumes that Russia will take over the Baltic states, and in his eagerness for the Russian alliance he seems prepared to go a long way in conceding Russian domination over Poland and all the other border states. He is proposing to substitute for the appeasement of Germany, any appeasement of Russia necessary to secure an alliance. He proposes to substitute for American isolationism, the isolationism of Britain, America, Russia, and perhaps China from the rest of the world.

Finally my own opinion is that we are not fitted to a role of imperialism and would fail in any attempt at world domination. We do not have the interest or the temperament to make a success. We are so strongly democratic that we don't approve of ruthlessness even when necessary for success. We permit our colonial problems to be determined by domestic policies. We don't really want to boss other peoples, and so we don't do it well. If we did succeed in becoming imperialists abroad it would be likely to change our whole attitude at home. We are in enough danger from totalitarianism now, without abandoning the ideal of a rule of democratic law in foreign relations.

There may be some question whether the Fulbright resolution covers the Lippman plan, but on the whole I believe it does. A British-American-Russian alliance is probably international machinery, and it certainly has the power. I should prefer a resolution not sufficiently broad to cover this plan of imperialism.

ORGANIZATIONS OF SOVEREIGN NATIONS

The plan for an enforced peace which accords most closely with the ideals of the American Republic, and of the Atlantic Charter, is that for an Association of Nations to include the United Nations and the neutrals and, after a period of probation, the Axis Nations. It would be supported by covenants between sovereign nations agreeing to determine their disputes by the law of nations and judicial decision or by arbitration. It would further be supported by covenants to join in the use of force against any nation determined to be an aggressor by the decision of some international tribunal. Frankly, this is an obligation which the American people may be loath to undertake, but I believe they will undertake it, because they know that if war is not prevented at the start under modern conditions, it is more than likely to spread throughout the world. Certainly this plan is to be preferred to an international state or a British-American-Russian offensive-defensive alliance.

But there are certainly conditions to be insisted on. First, force should not be called for against any nation because of any international domestic policy, except rearmament in excess of a quota imposed or agreed to. Interference in domestic policies, even such vital matters as tariffs or the treatment of minorities, would be more likely to make war than prevent it. The test is: Is the subject one on which the people of the United States would be willing to have other nations interfere with our internal action? If not, we should not attempt to impose such interference on others. Second, the covenant must be preceded by an economic arrangement fair to all nations, and by political arrangements providing for proper self-determination. The covenant, of course, must provide for the revision of boundaries and obligations, but essentially we will be asked to guarantee the status quo. We cannot make that guarantee unless the status quo is fair to all peoples and gives them a chance to live, and therefore affords a reasonable hope that peace can be maintained. Third, I believe that any obligation to use force in Europe should only be secondary, not to be effective until the peace-loving nations of Europe have exhausted their own resources. This is in accord with Mr. Churchill's suggestion of a council of Europe under the association of nations. We cannot help solve the problems of Europe unless the great majority of the European nations first agree on what that solution should be.

I quite agree that it may be impossible to work out an association of nations, but that is no reason for not trying. Russia may insist on conditions in eastern Europe or in eastern Asia in conflict with our insistence on self-determination of peoples, but I hope not. England may insist on an empire which our people do not care to support, but I do not think so. The question of relative representation in tribunals to pass on questions involving the use of force is always difficult to adjust. But if Mr. Fulbright's resolutions were confined to machinery of the character I have described I should be glad to support it.

CONCLUSION

I don't believe that the time has come to consider what our alternative course should be if the effort to establish an association of nations based on law and orderly justice, with enforcement provisions, should fail. Let us not assume that it will fail. But if it failed we would then be confronted with a choice between the Lippmann plan of a defensive alliance with England and Russia designed to dominate the world, or an independent policy with no obligations assumed in advance. I do not hesitate to say that I should prefer the continuation of our traditional policy, with the hope that the time might soon come when an international agreement might be reached.

In the meantime we could proceed with the seven points I first suggested including provision for our own defense, and actively interest ourselves in assisting those nations who desire our help to become self-supporting economically. We could judge of the seriousness of any crisis which may arise in the world and weigh the need of interference by our armed forces. England and ourselves could assume that neither would atack the other, and be free to cooperate in any emergency. That policy has not brought upon us either catastrophe or invasion in the past and is not likely to do so in the future.

I have tried to suggest the infinite complications which we face in foreign policy, and the great difference of principles involved in the alternatives presented. I have tried to indicate that we show a complete lack of grasp of the fundamentals of peace policy, if we debate only the question of force.

I suggest that instead of passing vague resolutions about machinery with force we ought to discuss the basic principles by which we can hope to assure a peace in the world, which will enable America to work out her destiny at home. The time has not come when the President, or Congress, or the people can make a final decision, because we do not know the conditions which will exist at the end of the war. Until that time comes I do not believe we should, if we could, tie our hands against the adoption of any policy which the American people after due consideration may then desire to adopt.

Senate Resolution 114, Its Nature and Its Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Senate Resolution 114, its nature, and its mission, delivered by me at Carnegie Hall, New York City, September 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My task is to explain the terms of Senate Resolution 114, its status, the need for the action it proposes and what we should do to secure that action.

The entire resolution, of 209 words, is as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

1. To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

2. To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

3. To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

This resolution sometimes is called the B2H2 resolution. This is because it was introduced by Senator BALL of Minnesota and myself, Senator BURTON of Ohio, both of whose names begin with "B," and by Senator HATCH of New Mexico and Senator HILL of Alabama, both of whose names begin with "H". We call it "the resolution to win the peace." It is merely a Senate resolution as distinguished from a concurrent or joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives. It, therefore, does not require either the concurrence of the House or the signature of the President. It is not subject to veto. It can be adopted by a majority of the Senators present and when so adopted it will express the advice of the Senate and it will not purport to do more. It cannot bind our Government to a treaty. It does not give anyone a "blank check" to fill in and bind our Government to any-

thing. A treaty can bind our Government only when made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

STATUS OF RESOLUTION

This resolution was introduced March 16, 1943. It is pending before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. If it is favorably reported by the committee and adopted by the Senate, it will advise the President that in the opinion of the Senate it would be in the public interest for the United States to take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations with a view to securing from such meetings a recommendation of a treaty, and perhaps of other agreements, providing for the formation of an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited power relating to the prosecution of the war and to the maintenance of a lasting peace. Because such a treaty would require the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators then present, it would be encouraging, although not essential, if this resolution itself received the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present at the time of its adoption.

ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

This resolution was introduced by the two Republican and two Democratic Senators whom I have named, so as to lift the issues it presents above partisanship. There is no room on those issues to consider anything but the best interests of the people of the United States of America as a whole. Partisanship on those issues will endanger seriously the ability of the Senate to secure any action because a two-thirds vote is needed for the ratification of any treaty, yet neither party has two-thirds of the Senate, and neither party is likely to have two-thirds of the Senate at any time when it will consider those issues.

THE TWO-THIRDS RULE

Under our Constitution, some international understandings can be reached by executive agreement without any express authorization of the Congress. Others can be authorized by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress. It seems clear, however, that an agreement that concludes the greatest of all wars, establishes peace throughout the world, and provides for the maintenance of that peace, will rise to the highest dignity of international agreements. As such it would come within that third class of agreements which the Constitution recognizes as treaties. These can be made only by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. It is toward securing such a majority that our efforts are directed.

The unusual requirements of this two-thirds rule cannot be too strongly emphasized. It is contrary to the usual rule of popular government that places its faith in the sound judgment of a bare majority. The two-thirds rule calls for a majority of two to one. It means that even though a substantial majority of the sovereign people of the United States favor the treaty, and a substantial majority of their Senators favor the treaty; yet, if the roll call shows that over one-third of the Senators present have voted "No" on the question of concurrence in the treaty, then the minority wins, and the majority loses. In such a case the Nation would be deprived of the benefits of a treaty that a majority of its people and a majority of its Senators favor.

A two-thirds rule thus means a one-third control. This makes it difficult to take any action. If the two-thirds rule had applied in the ratifying bodies of the Thirteen Original and Sovereign States we might never have had the United States of America, because the Constitution of the United States was ratified by less than a two-thirds majority in the ratifying bodies of six of those States.

A VICTORY WORTHY OF ITS PRICE

It is for us, however, to observe this constitutional provision and to make sure that the best interests of the people as a whole are served, rather than defeated, by it. This makes it necessary for members of both parties to do the work required to develop such wide-spread understanding of and support of a sound treaty of peace and of sound means for maintaining the peace that the treaty will command more than a 2 to 1 majority in the Senate. When the issue is made clear and the need is understood, I believe that far more than two-thirds of the people and of the Senate will support such a treaty as will make it as sure as possible that our victory shall be worth the immeasurable price paid for it. The only kind of victory that can be worth that price is one that will establish for generations to come a just, a lasting and a living peace that will open to America and to the world a far more practical opportunity than ever before has been opened to establish and maintain "Peace on earth and good will toward men." If a just and lasting peace is not secured our victory will be empty and we shall not have kept faith with those who died for it. Certainly much more than two-thirds of the Senate want peace to endure. We must translate that desire into constructive action.

THE ACTION PROPOSED

Senate Resolution 114 leads the way in a common sense and straight-forward manner towards such a peace. It advises the calling of meetings. This means more than one meeting. It advises meetings of representatives of the United Nations. This means representatives of all the United Nations. This includes both large and small United Nations. On some issues the meetings may well include fewer than all the United Nations because all of them will not be affected, but in considering the final issues of organization and the maintenance of the peace against aggression all should take part.

It advises that the meetings be called for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority. Any organization recommended by these meetings of representatives will be subject to the constitutional approval of the several nations, including our own, before it becomes binding upon those respective nations.

While the resolution does not expressly say so, it sponsors hope that the President, when acting upon the advice of the Senate in calling meetings of the representatives of the United Nations, will include among the representatives of the United States of America appropriate members of the United States Senate and especially of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

While the resolution does not expressly say so, I hope that the President will initiate meetings not only to discuss the general organization of the United Nations, but also other meetings to pass promptly upon such other matters of international concern as international aviation and international exchange.

The first three of the specific and limited authorities listed in the resolution are obvious subjects for consideration in any early organization of the United Nations. Progress has been made on them since the introduction of the resolution. They include military and economic cooperation in the prosecution of the war and the temporary administration, relief, and rehabilitation of occupied territories.

The fourth authority suggested is the authority to establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations. This implies a court for the determination of justiciable questions and some form of council or conference for the orderly consideration of questions of international policy.

The fifth authority is vitally important. It provides for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force for the suppression by immediate use of such force of any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

This suggests the need for unity among the United Nations from a military standpoint, in peace as well as in war. It recognizes the need for military stability throughout the world as well as within each sovereign state. In winning the war the United Nations will have demonstrated the effectiveness of their united action. On the day of victory the united military forces of the United Nations will have defeated the greatest attack ever made upon civilization. It will be equally clear, on that day, that as long as the forces of the United Nations are thus united, there will be military stability and that whenever those forces cease to be thus united there will arise a corresponding military uncertainty.

This clause suggests that having won the military championship of the world that the United Nations keep their championship team together. Failure to do so will compel each nation to arm itself against an uncertainty unnecessarily created by the United Nations themselves. The cost, the manpower and the materials needed to maintain these armaments to offset this uncertainty will handicap and perhaps prevent the re-establishment of internal economic stability in every great nation including our own.

Each of the United Nations owes an obligation to its own people and to its allies to find a way to substitute military certainty for military uncertainty. Only in this way can future military expenditures be reduced to the lowest terms consistent with world-wide stability.

AVIATION

Aviation makes this plan practical today where 20 years ago it was impractical. The essential value of an United Nations air force to the world today can be compared with the essential value of a modern fire department to a city. Nearly any fire can be stopped with the use of a bucket of water or single fire extinguisher if the fire equipment reaches the fire while the fire is small. Today, a United Nations air force can reach any international danger point in less than 60 hours. The military stability of the world thus for the first time is brought within the practical control of the law-enforcing machinery of the peace-loving nations of the world.

Finally, the Senate in this resolution advises that provision be made among the United Nations for amendments to their initial organization, for the addition of new functions, for the admission of new members and for the requirement that member nations commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement. These provisions seek to meet changing conditions; they are safeguards against future wars.

ACTION NEEDED

The most helpful action that citizens can take to support this program is to speak or write to their Senators, their Representatives, and especially to members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in favor of the objectives of Senate Resolution 114 "to win the peace."

It is not important that this resolution be adopted under its present number, in its present form, or under its present sponsorship. Its substance and objectives, however, are important. It is vital that there be widespread support of continued unity of

military action among all the United Nations. It is vital that the foreign policy of the United States be a clear and practical policy to prevent the tragic repetition of two world wars in one generation. It is vital that the peace and stability of America be lifted above partisanship, personalities, and prejudices. It is vital that America become a land filled with opportunities for our children and our children's children. Finally, it is vital that when the young men who win this war come home to America that they find here the America of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

Safeguarding of Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article from the pen of Mr. David Lawrence, editor of that excellent news weekly, the United States News. The article is entitled "New Congress Must Guard Civil Rights."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CONGRESS MUST GUARD CIVIL RIGHTS

(By David Lawrence)

To what extent has the United States gone totalitarian? Visitors from Britain, some of whom have come here in an official capacity, express their amazement privately, over the degree of restriction that has been imposed upon civilians and the unlimited authority that has been given to the military as compared with the withdrawal of civil rights.

This is a subject which is beginning to trouble persons who fear the long-range effect of war policies and the dangerous trends which they represent. Vice President WALLACE spends a good deal of time and energy worrying about the application of the four freedoms to peoples abroad but he and other radicals would find plenty of food for thought in the gradual curtailment of civil rights during wartime.

The chief instrumentality of Government responsible for the deterioration of democracy during the present war is Congress—both the Republican and Democratic parties. Neither the President nor his executives can be blamed for desiring a free hand in wartime. Nor can the military be criticized for seeking to exercise as much power as possible without hindrance from the civilian side.

Congress, however, is the representative branch of the Government. And if Congress is indifferent or neglectful or simply too preoccupied in minor matters to see the gradual breakdown of the principles of constitutional government, the people alone can remedy the matter at the polls at the next congressional election by supporting candidates in the primaries and before the conventions of either party who will adhere to the Four Freedoms inside the United States.

ABUSE OF POWER

The paramount principle of Government in a democracy which is being violated and abused is that which assures a citizen the protection of the Constitution against unequal application of the laws or the confiscation of his property without due process of law.

Rent control, price control, allocation of war materials are all handled by governmental agencies which in large part are abandoning the principle of equal protection of the laws. These agencies are permitting discriminations as between citizens and are refusing to promulgate standards of regulation so that citizens may know just what are the yardsticks by which Government agencies apply a given action as between persons in the same line of business.

Normally, that is in peacetime, court review while not always utilized operates to act as a psychological preventive of arbitrary action by governmental agencies. But Congress has withdrawn from the Federal courts of the United States, located in the more than 100 judicial districts from coast to coast, jurisdiction over the acts of executive agencies in connection with several important pieces of legislation.

The simple remedy of civil injunction has been practically eliminated and the citizen can test the constitutionality of a law in most cases only by risking criminal prosecution for his attorneys will find it difficult for him to get a district court review otherwise. Last week Judge Charles S. Briggle in the United States District Court, sitting at Peoria, Ill., joined with two other judges in a unanimous opinion refusing a restraining order because he said Congress had so stipulated. He said in his remarks from the bench:

"This is a culmination of a long series of acts, depriving the courts of jurisdiction, vesting decisions instead in the various boards throughout the country. The O. P. A. act provides that no court, Federal or State, shall have power to consider the validity of any regulation of the O. P. A. or any price schedule and this court has no power to restrain the O. P. A.

"The act also covers declaratory judgments. The district court is subject to Congress. Congress can withdraw or give the court jurisdiction. In this case, it has withdrawn jurisdiction. To my mind the trend is bad. It is not in conformity with the traditions of America."

Thus the citizen, in many instances, can no longer go to his district court but must go all the way to Washington to the Emergency Court of Appeals from which he may or may not get a review by the Supreme Court. This makes the judicial process cumbersome and highly restricted but doubtless the framers of the law knew that witnesses and data could not be conveniently brought to the National Capital from all parts of the country for a trial court proceeding. It virtually assures finality of decision by governmental bureaucrats scattered throughout the country who, knowing they are not likely to be restrained by the courts, do about as they please.

Congress should either prescribe legislative standards or require the publication of administrative standards so that capricious and arbitrary decisions may no longer be made in secret or without an explanation in any public record.

Congress on its own return this week will have before it no greater responsibility than to redeem the pledge which is being so widely publicized these days, namely, that we are fighting this war to preserve the "four freedoms" under one of which certainly comes the motto engraved on the Supreme Court building—"Equal Justice Under Law."

Attitude of the People of Oregon on Public Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, during the brief recess of the Congress this summer we all have had the advantage of observations and personal contacts with our own people at home. I can report that the citizens of Oregon, with pioneer American background and American ideals, are mad.

Regardless of past political party affiliations, they demand a return to sanity and honesty in the administration of the Federal Government and that the Federal Constitution be reinstated as the fundamental law of our country and the safeguard of American liberties.

Indicative of this popular demand, I present a letter addressed to me by a constituent who is a member of the once constitutional Democratic Party, and I request unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN
United States Senator,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR: We Democrats have sold our birthright. So eager to get into power and remain there, our leaders have swapped their principles and traditions for votes. The jobs are so plentiful and the spending of public money so prodigious in the present administration that the theorists, crackpots, "isms," and sponges have swarmed around the New Deal until the Democrats are outnumbered and squelched. The President and his followers (or leaders?) ignored the platforms adopted by the last three Democratic conventions, and the next one will be as meaningless. If any real Democrat raises his voice in the next convention, it will either be not heard or be hooted down.

To call the New Deal the Democratic Party is a rank misnomer. There is no Democratic Party. Its place has been usurped by a crowd whose principles bear no resemblance to those for which the Democratic Party has always stood.

We are dismayed and indignant at the advantage taken of the war to increase Federal power. We abhorred the idea of the third term, and a fourth is inevitable unless the country rises against it.

We are angry at the profligate waste of our wealth. We fear that the crowd which has showered our money on crazy ideas and debauched so many of our people into Government dependents will do the same thing on a still grander scale with other countries after the war is over. We want to feed the starving even though it is their own fault they starve. But some of these bankrupt post-war countries may decide it would be nice to become permanent boarders at Uncle Sam's table, and there are men in Washington who might think it a beautiful and splendid thing.

What can we Democrats do about the mess we are in? Only one thing; we can beg the Republicans to nominate a man.

A plain, straightforward American with courage. A man whose "yes" means "yes" and whose "no" means "no."

One who will be honored by the office and not consider that he honors it.

We are fed up with slick and evasive oratory. Give us a man who will talk to us as though we are partners in the business.

One who says "we" more often than "I."

One who will abolish and discharge every bureau, commission, committee, authority, or what have you, not specifically established by Congress and reduce to the efficient minimum the personnel of those remaining.

We are tired of being herded and bullied by Washington. We want a man pledged to let us run our own towns, counties, and States.

We need a man who has worked and earned money, who knows that a tax dollar was worked for and earned by somebody.

A man who can cooperate with Stalin without condoning his crimes or adopting his political ideas. Who can help the countries of the world through their troubles without sacrificing the liberty and free enterprise of our own people.

A man whose family is too proud to "cash in" on Dad's job. Whose wife is content to be the White House hostess, live there and make her husband comfortable and happy.

If you Republicans will nominate such a man, millions of us old fashioned Democrats will vote for him.

Very sincerely,

E. C. GRANT,
Clackamas, Oreg.

Keeping Livestock Healthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on the Farm and Home Hour, July 31, 1943:

No country having a sound livestock industry has ever suffered famine. Here in the United States our cattle, hogs, and sheep, now numbering about a quarter billion, provide a great reservoir of sustenance that we can draw on as need arises. They are a great balance wheel in the food situation. Man is not privileged to peer far into the future, but my judgment leads me to advise that the Nation plans its affairs in a manner that will mean minimum disturbance of this efficient, well-balanced, living mechanism that has served us so well in the past.

Now that an adequate supply of meat means so much to the successful conduct of the war and in strengthening the home front, I have welcomed the opportunity to discuss briefly certain points that concern producers and consumers alike. I want especially to go below the surface aspects of the situation and explore with you some fields of thought and action that seldom meet the eye.

The quantity of meat this country is able to produce and the price of every pound are influenced by the soundness of our foreign livestock policy. In simple terms, this policy concerns the health of our animals, their ability to reproduce freely, and the quantity and quality of their products. Although taking meat as a convenient example, my remarks include dairy and poultry products as well, and of course wool, leather—in fact everything we get from domestic animals.

For a moment let us turn back the pages of history to the year 1863—80 years ago. That year the nations of the world organized an International Veterinary Congress. It was a scientific body—essentially a league of nations designed for fighting animal diseases. Before that time it was hazardous for any country to accumulate livestock in large numbers, that is, enough to serve as a dependable balance wheel for the total food supply. Animal plagues almost invariably appeared to destroy the surplus. And not only did the meat supply suffer, but disease attacked the work stock, thereby interfering with the planting, tillage, and harvesting of crops. To be sure, there had been earlier veterinary studies, some dating back to the dawn of history. But many of the old beliefs were little more than folklore. That first veterinary congress and those that followed it have brought together and organized the world's best knowledge on keeping livestock healthy. One point on which participants soon reached common accord was the value of international quarantines.

Any nation free of a dangerous disease is fully warranted, for its own protection, in excluding possible means by which infection may enter and spread. This policy, having a sound, scientific basis, now protects the food animals of the United States—meaning your meat and milk supply—from animal plagues existing in foreign lands. It is a safeguard, for instance, against the virus of foot-and mouth disease that otherwise might be introduced from any of 50 countries and jurisdictions.

I want to emphasize that a quarantine of that kind neither carries nor implies any trace of unneighborly or unfriendly feeling. There have been proposals, from time to time, that the United States relax or modify its quarantine in various ways—for instance, to quarantine only part of a country, to try to kill the virus of foot-and-mouth disease by freezing the meat, or to station inspectors abroad and give them discretionary authority to certify meat, which appears to be safe, for shipment to the United States.

Research scientists and veterinarians of the Department of Agriculture, which administers the quarantine, have made a thorough study of such proposals. Especially have they sought to determine, on the basis of research abroad, what may be done safely and what would entail too much risk. They conclude that canned and other well-processed meats may be safely admitted, and this is being done. But any weakening of the quarantine on fresh or frozen meat would be too hazardous to warrant the risk. As a veterinarian, I have been through two outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease. The malignant form of this malady is terrible. Few persons without first-hand knowledge of its destructive, virulent nature comprehend the heavy toll it takes among herds and flocks and the pitiable condition in which it leaves its victims. Our country cannot afford to flirt with expedients that leave our vast reservoir of healthy animals wide open to invasion by a devastating virus of that kind. And besides foot-and-mouth disease, there are still other foreign plagues—rinderpest, surra, and others—all of which are now excluded by protective quarantines for which we should be thankful. I ask your support of my efforts to sustain this sound and safe policy.

Meanwhile from those nations of the world that have maintained high standards of animal health, the United States has been receiving both food animals and breeding stock. Our open-door policy of admitting purebred animals duty free has, in my judgment, been a master stroke of good livestock husbandry plus wise statesmanship. As I said on a previous occasion to my colleagues in Congress, we are now literally holding in trust for the rest of the world the best bloodlines now existent for the reestablishment of disease-free herds and flocks in other countries when the war is over. We hold a great responsibility in safeguarding this valuable seed stock.

Now let us see how well we are conducting our internal affairs with livestock—not so much the familiar operations of farm and ranch, as the kind of foundation they have. In other words, how fully can we depend on continued large production of meat food products, especially in times of emergency? My answer is one of assurance. I have examined the foundations and find them substantial. The structure of our livestock industry—meaning our domestic animals and facilities for raising them—rests on a large group of strong organizations, among which there are strong interlocking ties. Arrangements for this privilege of addressing you were made by the Indiana Veterinary Medical Association. In every State there is a similar body. These State organizations in turn are affiliated with a national one, the American Veterinary Medical Association.

Then there are other types of State and National livestock organizations. Some deal with the recording of pedigrees and breed improvement; others seek improved economic conditions; others are primarily scientific; and still others, with a flair for showmanship, sponsor fairs and expositions. A few have specialized fields, as, for example, the betterment of shipping facilities and humane treatment of animals. Each organized group is well established with a definite job to do and a record for doing it. And to give further permanence and stability to the structure each State has its agricultural college and experiment station, likewise veterinary and livestock boards. Practically all these bodies have close official relations with the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture at Washington. Several other Federal bureaus and agencies likewise deal with livestock matters. That, in brief, is a general sketch of the foundation on which the superstructure of livestock raising rests. It is a good foundation, cemented by close and effective cooperation.

As a sidelight on the stability and economic strength of the Nation's livestock industry, it is noteworthy that the Bureau of Animal Industry is the oldest bureau of the Department of Agriculture and the only one which still keeps its original name. Moreover, during the 59 years of its existence, the Bureau of Animal Industry has had only three Chiefs—Salmon, Melvin, and Mohler—a most unusual circumstance in the conduct of public affairs. The stability is all the more striking, in view of the turbulent nature of some of the Bureau's activities. Several national campaigns against animal diseases were considerably in advance of public opinion in certain areas, with the result of lawsuits, violence, and even bloodshed sometimes marking the progressive application of veterinary science. In more recent years, I am glad to say, public opinion has been highly receptive to veterinary and other scientific aids.

In a sense, the Congress of the United States, lending an attentive ear to legislative needs of agriculture and stock raising, has served as consulting architect for the upbuilding of these resources. There has been need for a great deal of research—to find improved systems of breeding, to develop more useful types of animals, to test new feeds, to reduce losses, to save labor, and to enhance quality. There has been need likewise for control services such as Federal meat inspection and supervision of stockyards.

Acting in the public interest, Congress has supplied needs of the kind outlined. Livestock production responded accordingly. In some cases the benefits have been measurable with a high degree of precision. Through dairy herd improvement fostered by research and extension work, production of milk and butterfat per cow has taken a distinct upward trend. The same is true of egg yields in poultry flocks. Modern types of animals mature much earlier than those raised at the turn of the century. Good steers now are ready for market within 2 years instead of 3 or 4. Improved livestock also yield a greater quantity of finished product for the feed utilized.

In scientific research there has been more devotion to achievement than fanfare of the results. Entanglements of old traditions and smoke screens of skepticism have sometimes impeded application of the new knowledge, but in spite of obstacles, progress has been continuous. Take, for instance, the painstaking research on worm parasites of hogs and the development of the now familiar swine sanitation system. The recommendation of the scientists to scrub and disinfect farrowing houses, to wash the sow before the birth of her pigs, and to take her out of a muddy hog lot and put her in clean pasture—all these things at first seemed, to practical folks, like putting pigs in the parlor. But now this sanitary system of raising pigs is the rule rather than the exception. And it is responsible, to a large extent, for the ability of farmers to raise so many pigs with so few losses.

A definite help to the progress this Nation has made in curbing the disease enemies of livestock has been its constructive information policy. Research workers and veterinarians share their knowledge readily with other professional groups, with livestock owners, and the public. New findings appear not merely in professional journals. Any citizen can learn of them from Government and State bulletins, newspapers, the farm press, and radio broadcasts.

Within recent years much of the material has been tuned to a dominant note or theme—"Keeping livestock healthy." It's a good theme for helping us keep in step with the tempo of wartime food production. It's the title of the 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture, a volume so helpful that Congress is printing a second edition this year. My veterinary associates have chosen the same theme for radio talks of this series, in which I have the honor and privilege to be your first speaker. It's a theme that means more roasts in the oven; more chickens in the pot. Let me illustrate. Back in 1908, when I was serving as meat and dairy inspector in Fort Wayne, the original campaign against bovine tuberculosis in Indiana began in that city, under the leadership of Dr. H. O. Bruggeman, director of health. More than 1,500 head of cattle supplying milk to the city were found to be reactors, were condemned and slaughtered. Nine years later, when the national campaign against bovine tuberculosis began, about 50,000 cattle a year failed to pass Federal meat inspection. Instead of qualifying for human food, those animals went for fertilizer, grease, or tankage. By contrast, the number failing to pass inspection in recent years has been less than 2,500—in other words, an annual saving of about 47,500 cattle, equivalent to some 24,000,000 pounds of dressed beef. Thus we see how veterinary foresight a quarter of a century ago, plus good organization and courageous effort, are now paying food dividends in a hungry world. Bovine tuberculosis is just one of several disease enemies now practically conquered. Southern cattle ticks are another, sheep scab is another, and pullorum disease is another. Progress against still other important maladies is a matter of public record.

True, the attainment of the greater yields that animal health makes possible has encountered some wartime difficulties, involving scarcities of feed and labor in particular. But the output of livestock products is still going on efficiently and helping to set new records of production. And when we fail to find, in our local shops, the meats we would like to have, let us regard the inconvenience as temporary; for that meat is probably in some field kitchen in a distant battle zone. All in all, it is gratifying to know that our millions of animals are productive allies on our side.

At times the confusion that comes from trial-and-error methods of solving human problems is perplexing. I trust, therefore, that I have conveyed to you some of my confidence in the manner in which a great and complex enterprise—the livestock industry—conducts its affairs in direct, orderly fashion, guided by the findings of science. I envision this industry as a bulwark of strength for the future and a beacon for getting worthwhile things done in ways that best serve human needs.

Military Records of the Farrow and Rice Families of Fountain Inn, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an article appearing in the Fountain Inn Tribune under date of August 19, 1943, regarding the Farrow family.

It will be observed that from this family have come seven stalwart sons to serve our country during these serious times of war.

Having had the privilege of spending 2 months in our district visiting among our people, I am very gratified to learn of the splendid cooperation on the part of everyone in the successful prosecution of the war.

In pointing out the unusual contribution of the Farrow family, I would not, of course, overlook the fact that there are others who probably are making as great a contribution in that, although they may not have seven sons to give, they probably are giving all of their sons and in some instances their daughters in the prosecution of the war.

It is certainly a proud distinction that I claim in calling the unusual Farrow family to the attention of our colleagues in Congress and to the people of the country generally.

I would call special attention also to the contribution of five sons by Mr. and Mrs. J. K. Rice, of Fountain Inn, S. C., as mentioned in the attached article:

ABOUT TOWN

(By M. N.)

Most every family in the United States has a member in the armed forces, but Fountain Inn has a record we believe, where seven members, all brothers, are serving under the Stars and Stripes. Six of these boys are in the Army and the other is in the Navy. These boys are the sons of Mr. and Mrs. Broadus Farrow, who live on Gulliver Street. Mr. and Mrs. Farrow are the parents of 12 children, 10 boys and 2 girls. Two of the children, both boys, are dead, and 1 of these, who died about a year ago, served a stretch in the Navy during peacetime. Another son, who is a farmer, is registered, as is the father. The boys in service are Lt. Loys Farrow, age 37, has been in the service 17 years, and is now on foreign soil; Corp. Loyd Farrow, 35, is stationed at Morgan Field, Ky., and has been in service 2 years. Second Lt. Joe Farrow, 30, has been in service 8 years, and is at Fort Bliss, Tex.; Lt. Jack Farrow, 24, of Fort Huachuca, Ariz., has been in service 3 years; Pvt. William Farrow, 21, of Fort McClellan, Ala., has been in service just a few months. Third Class Petty Officer Bruce Farrow, 20, has been in service 1 year and is now on sea duty; Harry Farrow, 18, has been accepted into the service at Fort Bragg, N. C., but is at home for a 21-day leave. He will report for duty August 30. Mr. Farrow, father of these boys, is in General Hospital, Greenville, at present, suffering from a severe case of malaria fever.

Fountain Inn has another family who is well represented in the service. Mr. and Mrs. J. K. Rice, who live 2 miles northwest of town, have five sons in service. Mr. and Mrs. Rice received word last Thursday from the War Department that one of their sons, Pvt. (1st cl.) Henry W. Rice, was captured by the enemy on July 12, in the north African area.

Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry Post-War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on August 15 last the Second Oregon Volunteers Reunion Association met in Laurelhurst Park in Portland, Oreg., in my district. This is an annual event, commemorating the fall of Manila, P. I., on August 13, 1898, and an event which is attended by many veterans and friends of the Second Oregon Volunteers. At their meeting this year the association adopted resolutions regarding post-war plans and aims and I ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the resolution with my remarks, as follows:

Whereas it seems appropriate at this time to discuss post-war aims; and

Whereas war veterans should be heard when a post-war settlement is effected: Therefore be it

Resolved by the veterans of the Second Oregon Volunteer Infantry of the Spanish War and Philippine Insurrection, at their annual reunion, held in Laurelhurst Park, Portland, Oreg., August 15, 1943, commemorating the capture of Manila, P. I., on August 13, 1898, That in their opinion the Allied Nations should firmly insist upon the following:

(a) Complete evacuation by Germany, Japan, and Italy of all occupied foreign territory now under their control.

(b) All German, Japanese, and Italian war factories, including plants for the manufacture of war planes, submarines, warships, cannons, small arms, machine guns, and ammunition, be totally destroyed together with all completed war equipment of every kind to be destroyed.

(c) Allied garrisons to be maintained in all large German, Japanese, and Italian cities

for many years, to enforce the terms of the peace treaty.

(d) German, Japanese, and Italian schools to be placed under control of the Allied Nations for many years.

(e) The German, Japanese, and Italian general staffs to be abolished and prevented from reorganizing.

(f) Germany to be divided into separate states, including Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Hanover, Wurttemberg, and others, and prevented from combining again into one nation, these separate states to be organized under superivison of the Allied Nations.

(g) The German, Japanese, and Italian press and radio to be under control and supervision of the Allied Nations for many years.

(h) German, Japanese, and Italian assemblies of all kinds to be strictly controlled by the Allied Nations for many years.

(i) Freedom of religion in Germany, Japan, and Italy to be established and maintained. Rights of the Masonic fraternity and the Christian Science Church to be reestablished; and be it further

Resolved, That the responsible heads of the Governments of Germany, Japan, and Italy, and a certain number of their most important leaders, be tried by military commissions of the Allied Nations and duly punished; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the Oregon delegation, the Oregonian, Journal, Oregon Legionnaire, and T. Wendell Willkie.

PERCY WILLIS,
President.
RICHARD DEICH,
Secretary.

Tribute to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a proclamation issued by Hon. Fletcher Bowron, mayor of Los Angeles, Calif., setting aside period of one week as a tribute to Poland:

To the People of Los Angeles, Greetings:

Whereas the American people have a fervent respect and admiration for the people of Poland for their heroic defense of their homeland when attacked on September 1, 1939; and

Whereas throughout the past 4 years the valiant Polish people have continued to offer both passive and active resistance to the invaders who occupy their country; and

Whereas our people earnestly hope that the forces of oppression will soon be driven from the soil of Poland and that the Polish nation will live again in a world of peace and democratic freedom.

Now, therefore, as mayor of Los Angeles I do hereby proclaim, and set aside, the period of August 29 to September 4, 1943, as a week of tribute to Poland, and I urge that during that week citizens of Los Angeles join with churches and patriotic organizations in honoring the dauntless spirit and courage of the Polish people.

FLETCHER BOWRON,
Mayor.

JULY 28, 1943.

Uncle Sam's Waves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem:

UNCLE SAM'S WAVES

There is many a WAVE
On this side of the sea,
In the home of the brave
And the land of the free,
That's now doing her bit
Both a-near and a-far,
Who's not going to quit
Till we win the World War.

With a beauty and grace
That no one need defend,
She is taking the place
Of a brother or friend,
That he may fight our foes
In the battles afar,
And so hasten the close
Of mad tyranny's war.

These young beautiful WAVES
Are as loyal at heart,
As the dutiful braves
That are doing their part
In the worst of all wars
That have threatened the world
Since the Stripes and the Stars
Were first bravely unfurled.

When the World War is won,
And when peace is declared,
It ought, soon as begun,
To be equally shared
'Twixt the dutiful braves
That fought, over the foam,
And the beautiful WAVES
That fought for them at home.

No one yet can tell what
Reconstruction will be,
Tho' we haven't forgot
When the slaves were set free,
What the Southerners lost
In the secession fall,
And the tears that it cost
At the end of it all.

Methinks, many a brave,
That's escaped with his life,
Will come home to his WAVE,
And will make her his wife,
And throughout the long years
That are likely to come,
Free from sorrow and tears,
They will sing "Home, Sweet Home."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Address of Hon. Joseph J. Mansfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD before the Intracoastal Canal Association meeting held at the Rice Hotel, Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943:

Mr. President, Mr. Miller, my colleagues in Congress, DICK KLEBERG and Cousin Nat, Colonel Saville, and ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be here with you on this occasion, though up to 2 or 3 days ago I didn't know whether it would be possible or not. I have had no opportunity to prepare any address for the occasion, but will talk to you along the lines with which I believe I am more or less familiar.

I was very much interested in the splendid address of Mr. Miller and the talks of my good friends, DICK KLEBERG and Cousin Nat. Cousin Nat has obtained one honor that I don't believe has ever been bestowed upon any other American. I saw the Queen of England bow to him devotedly. I don't think she has ever bowed to any of the rest of us. When I had the honor of leading the Congress in the reception in the rotunda of the Capitol, when Nat came up in line, he addressed the King as Cousin George and the Queen as Cousin Elizabeth, and you ought to have seen her bow to him. But anybody who knows Nat Patton would feel more inclined to call him "Brother" than "Cousin" if he hadn't already said that he was only a cousin.

Now the importance of river and harbor work in the war is greater, of course, than it is for commerce in peacetime. For more than 25 years I have been on committees trying to work out a waterway program, 90 percent of which perhaps was unbeknown to the people of Texas. I have introduced and piloted through Congress bills containing projects for the improvement of practically every harbor and port in the United States, every river in the United States that is under improvement, and, of course, every canal and channel that is bearing commerce now. Not only that, but also the ports of Hawaii, Midway, and islands out there in the Pacific, Dutch Harbor, and a number of projects up and down Alaska, now so extremely important in this war. That was done as a measure of national defense more than one of commerce, because the commerce of those places is not very great. Of course the commerce of Hawaii is large, principally of sugar, pineapples, and things like that. In addition, there are the waterway improvements in Puerto Rico. I visited personally all the harbors in Puerto Rico. And in the Island of St. Thomas of the Virgin group, we have a harbor of strategic importance.

If some enemy ever attempts to take the Panama Canal, the importance of this will be shown. They haven't been so awfully important in the present war as these improvements out in the western part of the country or in the north Pacific. If you want something interesting on the subject of the use of our waterways in wartime, I will refer you to the United States News of May of this year. This, as you doubtless know, is a magazine edited by David Lawrence, one of the most versatile writers in the United States or anywhere else. In this May number he has a very interesting article showing a map of the inland waterways and the great service they are now performing in this war. I have another one here in the magazine Marine Progress of June of this year by Joseph B. Eastman, now head of the war transportation of the United States and for many, many years the leader of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a Commission dealing almost entirely with railroads, and his life work has been devoted to building up the great railway system of this country, and he has done an excellent job.

Now neither Mr. Eastman nor David Lawrence have ever torn the shirts off their back in behalf of waterway transportation, but Mr. Eastman has become a great promoter of it, especially since this war, and he has done as much as most any other man in the

United States in trying to forward the movement of commerce over our inland waterways and through our ports. Regardless of his lifelong training in the interests of the railways, he is broad enough and big enough and able enough to see the need of the waterways also. The same way with David Lawrence. David Lawrence has been associated with interests which have never been extremely friendly to waterways. The fact that these two articles come from these men whose life work has largely been along lines of association with people who are unfriendly to waterways to my mind is one of the greatest arguments in favor of them. I wish it were possible to include some of those articles in my talk, but then I will not take the time for that.

Now the waterway program has been virtually brought to a stop during the war. Some time last year—I don't remember when; some time last fall perhaps—I was called into a conference in the Speaker's office and when I got over there they had assembled the Democratic and Republican leaders of the Congress, Senator George, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, Donald Nelson, and the Assistant Secretary of War and of the Navy, and Mr. Nelson stated that they were trying to confer with members of Congress as to what expenditures they would probably want to make during the war, so that he would know how to prepare his plans. I told him very frankly that so far as river and harbor work was concerned, that I wouldn't ask for a cent, except that which would promote the interest of the war, until the war was over. I thought that was a debt that we owed to our Nation and to the taxpayers of this country. They are taxed now down to bedrock and of course we don't want to put any unnecessary burdens upon them at this time. Consequently there has been no legislation except a few isolated projects; for instance, the Intracoastal Canal enlargement and its extension across Florida. I piloted through a special bill for that and a special bill was enacted for building an additional lock up there at the Soo to get our iron ore down in greater quantities. Nearly one hundred million tons passed through there last year and about as much or perhaps more this year, although we have no official reports of it as yet. Those were in the interest of the war.

The extension of the channel across Florida was promoted by all of the little oil interests of this country, primarily the independents, so called. The big oil companies were friendly to it at that time. However, their interests have been changed to a certain extent by the installation of the large pipe lines which Mr. Ickes is extending across the country, one 24-inch pipe for conveying crude oil and then he is going to put in a 20-inch pipe for gasoline, and that will largely take care of the interests of the big oil companies and they will perhaps not feel the interest in the Intracoastal Canal that they might otherwise have felt.

Still they are large operators, both on the Intracoastal Canal and on the Mississippi River. The Standard Oil Co., next to the Federal Barge Line is one of the largest operators on the Mississippi River now. We endeavored to get the channel built across Florida and we did what we don't ordinarily do. Instead of letting it wait for the ordinary course of procedure in appropriations and allocations by the Chief of Engineers, we endeavored to get a special appropriation of $44,000,000, which was the estimated cost. Well, we had a tremendous fight over it. In the first place, we had a tremendous fight to get the channel adopted. I reported the bill as chairman of the committee. My committee was divided almost 50–50 on it, to begin with, but with a majority in favor of it, and then when we called it up under the advice of the Speaker and endeavored to get it through under a suspension of the rules without going through the regular course of getting a rule, why we ran into trouble. Under suspension of the rules, they only provide for 20 minutes of debate to the side, 20 in favor of the bill and 20 in opposition to it, and it requires a two-thirds vote. Well, we had so many able lawyers in Congress fighting me that they whipsawed me to death and beat me on that. After all, there is no time to explain anything in 20 minutes. About the time you got halfway through one explanation, these fellows would be shooting questions at you from here, there, and yonder, and the debate was closed and there was a vote on it. The Members just didn't understand it.

Then I waited for the Committee on Rules to give it consideration. That course of procedure provided for 4 hours of debate, 2 in favor of it and 2 against it. We fought it out for 4 long hours on the floor of the House, and then under the 5-minute rule for some time additionally, but before we got through there were enough intelligent men in the Congress, strange to say, to see the importance of it and we adopted it by a majority of 81 votes, which is an unusually large majority.

But there the fight had only commenced, and when we came to get the appropriation, well it was a week or two before the subcommittee of the House on appropriations, a committee composed of 9 members. We had hearings and extended hearings on it. Finally the subcommittee decided in favor of it by a majority of 2. They reported it to the full committee of 45, none of whom had heard the evidence, except those 9 of course, and the full committee decided against it by a majority of 2. So there we were headed off again.

We let it lay for a while, and after the bill got over to the Senate, we undertook to do the same thing over there, with practically the same result. The subcommittee that had heard the evidence decided in favor of it and the full committee, which had not heard the evidence, decided against it, and killed us off again.

However, I failed to mention that when the bill adopting the project was up, where we finally carried it by an 81 majority in the House, and it got to the Senate, there was a tie vote, and the Vice President cast the deciding vote in favor of it; perhaps the most sensible thing, by the way, he ever did do in his life.

So you see how it has been a fight. It has been a fight from the word go. All waterways projects now, especially inland waterways, are a fight in Congress and out of Congress too. If I had had to go through with what Clarence Holland and Roy Miller have gone through, I would be gray headed. They have fought the battles of this Intracoastal Canal for more than a third of a century, and they brought me up in it from my infancy.

The first thing I did when I went to Congress was to try to get that old 5- by 40-foot channel increased to larger dimensions. We had in mind then a 9- by 100-foot channel, which would correspond with the depth in the Mississippi River, and we fought and fought and fought for years over that, and finally we got it. Then we fought for extension of it down to the Mexican border, and we had great trouble over that for years and years and finally got that worked out.

Now with reference to this canal across Florida, they are telling me now in various places: "Why we don't need that. We have the Intracoastal Canal from here to Florida and another one from there up to the East, up to Trenton, N. J., and there is no use putting that across there." But many Members of Congress, who opposed the channel that has been adopted, pretended to favor another channel 300 miles south of there through Lake Okeechobee and the Everglades, one which they knew would never be used, for it involves a haul 460 miles longer than the one that has been adopted by Congress and one that would perhaps cost $150,000,000, because you have to make a channel across Florida, down the west coast and up the east coast. Well on the east coast we have an 8-foot project down to Miami, as well as I recall, but it is only 100 feet wide, and then across Lake Okeechobee we have what was originally adopted as a drainage channel by a private concern down there, a district organized under the laws of the State of Florida. We finally adopted that channel as a navigation channel. It is only 80 feet wide and 6 feet deep. It has locks on it. Lake Okeechobee is 17 feet above sea level, and it takes two locks on each side of it, four locks in all. The waterway is fed from this lake. The largest lock on it is only 40 by 250 feet. The largest oil barges, and only a few of them have been turned out in the last month or two, are 45 feet wide and 260 feet long, 5 feet wider than those locks and 10 feet longer. Yet some Members of Congress tell us the locks are ample for any oil movement. How you can get a fleet of three barges through a lock that is entirely too small for one of them is something the engineers have not worked out yet to my satisfaction.

Now the Intracoastal Canal has done an enormous amount of business in the last 2 years. Why Mr. Eastman says here it has increased 200 percent over last year and last year was a 200-percent increase over what it was before, as well as I remember his figures in this article.

If it is proper not to have the channel across Florida, it is proper not to have it from here to the Mississippi River, and if the channel across Florida is to remain filled with dirt, why not fill the other up and save all this expense? It can only serve partially a national purpose without being connected through. If we had had that channel at the time I first tried to get it 6 years ago, it is very doubtful if we would have had any gasoline rationing. It would have been able to supply the East, with a small amount of rationing up there, and by furnishing additional equipment, it is capable, as the Chief of Engineers says, of furnishing the East with all the oil and gasoline they can possibly use. Their normal consumption was 1,600,000 barrels a day before the war. Now this large pipe line, they say, will eventually transport 300,000 barrels of crude oil. Now mind you that oil doesn't go to the consumers through that pipe line. It is going to the refineries in Philadelphia or near Philadelphia. Then after it is refined and converted into products or gasoline—I call it gasoline, because most people can understand that when they don't know what "products" means sometimes—after it is refined and converted into gasoline, for distribution up and down the Atlantic coast it comes back to barges anyhow and to the small tankers that are operating there. Now I spend a heap of my time in Washington, and every drop of gasoline that is consumed there comes in by water, unless it has changed since I was there last. I have talked to consumers and distributors and everybody else about the matter. They bring those very large barges in there. They will bring 15,000 barrels in a barge. It has got to go to the barges anyhow after it is taken to the Philadelphia refining district. Then one branch of the line from Phoenixville goes across to Bayonne, the New York refining district, and of course the Intracoastal Canal can't reach that area by water, as there is another missing link up there.

Now if Mr. Ickes had done what I tried to get him to do 2 years ago after it was known that they were going to build the pipe line or that he was promoting it and trying to get the permit for it from the War Production Board and Donald Nelson, I suggested to him, and my letters were put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2 years ago, that he put his pipe line across Florida. The building of this 2,000-mile pipe line across the coun-

try was going to consume 355,000 tons of steel, which Donald Nelson told Mr. Ickes he couldn't spare from the war effort; that it was too badly needed. Donald Nelson told him: "Unless you want to stop the building of ships, and tanks and guns and airplanes, why you have got to cut this thing out." But Mr. Ickes' pressure finally bore down on him, and they cut 110,000 tons out of it and made the pipe lighter and finally got him to consent to it and he granted the permit. Now I suggested to Mr. Ickes that he put his pipe line across Florida and that in a very short time enough equipment could be provided, in addition to what we had already, by which the gasoline could go to Carrabelle or to some other point in western Florida, then pipe it across to Jacksonville, and then up the Intracoastal Canal on the Atlantic coast. It would have taken about one-fifth the amount of steel for that pipe line that it took for the big one across the country. They could have had it in operation in 90 days easily. That is an undisputed fact. Well, this other one has taken more than a year and it is not reaching the consumers yet, in fact. In fact it is sort of in the try-out stage now. They have had two or three breaks in it already. Instead of pumping 300,000 barrels through it they have only been pumping about 100,000. They claim, however, that in a short time it will be producing the 300,000 barrels. I have my opinion of that. I don't know. I have got nothing to back it up, except I talked with some engineers. They think that they are approaching the subject sort of easily to try out their pipes to see whether they will stand the pressure. They have got to install a great many more pumping stations to put 300,000 barrels through it in 24 hours, and that will require tremendous pressure and it is a question as to whether that pipe can stand the pressure. The pipe is much thinner than the engineers originally recommended.

Now, Mr. Ickes wouldn't do what I suggested. He wouldn't listen to it.

Then I suggested that, instead of building the pipe line from Texas north, that he build it from a point on the upper Ohio River across to the Potomac, less than 200 miles perhaps, and then they could have brought the gasoline up there through the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and put the thing in operation to furnish the East at least 9 months earlier than they could by his method. He wouldn't do that. He first built the pipe line up to a point in Illinois and then they had to wait and get further permits from Donald Nelson before they could extend it on east, and they just finished it to the East a few months ago.

I also took the matter up with Mr. Pelly, president of the American Association of Railroads, suggesting two railroads that could haul 300,000 barrels a day across Florida. Now that wasn't my own work. The engineers worked this out for me, and one of them was a railroad engineer, too, and they said that that could easily be done. Well, Mr. Pelly replied to me very politely and said that the movement of oil and gasoline to the East, if the oil companies would turn the tank cars over to them, would constitute no problem to the railroads. He has found out differently at this time; very much so.

Now, with reference to this great movement by rail, I want to show you what it is costing the Government. According to the testimony before the congressional committees there, the cost by rail is estimated at $1.05 to $1.10 a barrel more than the transportation by pipe line even, and the Government is actually paying out of the Treasury that much money going to the railroads for the purpose of making up the difference in this cost. They didn't want to saddle the whole burden on the consumers of the East. However, before this arrangement was made they did raise the price of gasoline in the East about 2 cents a gallon. I don't remember the exact figures. That raise is still applicable there. I am not sure about that, but they look upon it as a condition brought about by the war for which the people of the East were not responsible any more than anybody else and that the burden should not be borne by them alone. I take no controversy with that. I thought that was fair and reasonable, and in view of the fact that the Government would not pay the $44,000,000 to build the channel across Florida, but would rather pay $800,000 a day to the railroads, why let them go ahead. I can't stop them and I don't think there is anybody in this house can stop them. They have it going their way. Now, it was almost impossible to get any figures. Really the thing was, in a way, under the R. F. C., though the R. F. C. was not directly in control of it. There are two or three corporations, subsidiaries of the R. F. C., which had charge of this matter; the Defense Plant Corporation, and then, under it, the Defense Supplies Corporation. The oil companies are paying the railroads the regular rate, which averages about $1.05 a barrel, according to the testimony, more than the rates by other modes of transportation would be, by water or by pipe line, and then the Defense Supplies Corporation is refunding to these oil corporations that much out of the United States Treasury, and to give you an estimate of how much it is amounting to, let me make this statement: The shipments by rail have been increased from time to time. It was first thought that they couldn't exceed about 700,000 barrels a day, but here is a clipping from the Houston Chronicle, an Associated Press dispatch, of July 1 of this year, stating that for the week ending July 1 the rail shipments were 999,684 barrels a day for that week.

Now you take $1.05 a barrel on every barrel of that and see what it is costing the United States Government. It runs to $1,049,668 a day. Keep that up for a year, 365 days, and you have got about $400,000,000 that they are actually paying back to the oil companies on account of these freight rates paid to the railroads, when that Florida channel was only estimated at $44,000,000. Sometimes people can be penny wise and pound foolish. The railroads are not to blame. Their charges are not unreasonable, but this does not alter the fact that the Petroleum Administrator for War is putting the Government to an enormous unnecessary expense and probably for a very long period of time.

Now, how long is this going to keep up?

With reference to the two pipe lines, one is only claimed to be able to transport 300,000 barrels a day, and the other one 235,000. There are 535,000 barrels a day, 300,000 of crude oil going to the refineries up there in the East and 235,000 barrels of gasoline. That gasoline pipe line is not built yet, but they are going to build it. They have got the permits. That will only amount to 535,000 barrels a day to the East, when their normal needs are 1,600,000 barrels, and, in addition, what they want to give to the Navy to send to Africa and to Sicily and to the war fronts. Just how much that would amount to nobody knows. We can't get any figures on those things, of course. They are war secrets. But the pipe lines will only transport about a third of the normal needs. It will be less than a third. In other words, it would take six of those pipe lines to do the job, and that would virtually end the war, because that would take all the steel we make to do that.

Now, that is not all that is involved in this matter.

We come now to the question of cotton. Texas, as you all know, has been a great producer of cotton. Normally before the depression that came upon us a few years ago we produced in some years approximately 5,000,000 bales of cotton a year. We have produced as much as a third of the cotton crop of the United States. About 92 percent of that cotton, or over 90 percent I would say, went into the export trade. Very little of it went to the eastern mills. That which did go to the eastern mills all went by ship; none by rail. Now, I have here another clipping of August 2, of quite recent date, showing that Houston at the end of the cotton season had shipped 1,114,850 bales to eastern mills, every bale of which went by rail. Now your rate expert here with the Houston Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Holliman, who by the way, is a most competent man, tells us that that cotton which went from Houston to southern mills ranged from 56 to 62 cents per 100 pounds; that which went to New England mills ranged around 88 cents a hundred pounds. Now a bale of cotton, as you all know, weighs 500 pounds. That is how much a bale? Four dollars and forty cents in the case of the New England mills, while according to the water rates, as furnished by him, the rate would have been less than a third of that amount. Now, either the cotton men of Houston or the cotton farmers of Texas have lost that money by reason of not having this channel. It is a burden that they have been required to bear. I don't know whether the loss goes entirely to the farmers who produce the cotton or whether it is a loss that is borne by your Houston businessmen who had that cotton in charge and shipped it. But whoever bore the loss, it was a loss to Texas. Now you take a million bales of cotton running up that way at a rate of about $2.25 a bale on the average difference in transportation costs, and how much would that amount to? On a million bales that is two and a quarter million dollars right there on cotton alone. So you see, the cotton industry is interested.

Not only cotton. Texas is quite a producer of sulfur, as you all know. Texas and Louisiana produce 90 percent of the sulfur of the United States, and I am reliably informed that 80 percent of it is used in war industries and by the Federal Government. The transportation charges are paid by the United States Government, either directly or indirectly, because it all goes into war material. One ton of this Texas sulfur will make 4 tons of sulfuric acid of the type that is ordinarily used in industries, what is known as 50° Baumé. Now that sulfur formerly was transported by all sorts of transportation, much of it by rail, much of it by barge up the Mississippi River, much of it by the Intracoastal Canal, and much of it by ocean ships. Of course, of that which went to the Atlantic seacoast, perhaps all went by ocean ship, because that method of transportation is cheaper than any other. Now Texas is producing 3,500,000 tons of sulfur a year, about a million and a half tons more than it was producing in normal times, on account of the war emergency. I am informed that a million and a half tons is consumed in the north Atlantic seaport region, right where it could be reached by the Intracoastal Canal with that channel across Florida. The average transportation cost of that before the war was about $2.15 a ton. Mr. Miller, are you familiar with that?

Mr. MILLER. Around $2 to $2.50 per ton.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Around $2 a ton. That has been raised now to around $12. Is that right?

Mr. MILLER. Approximately $8.50, I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. About $8.50. And David Lawrence tells us here how that sulfur has been shipped. It has been going from here to the Mississippi River either by barge or by rail. There it has been loaded onto those large Mississippi River barges, taken up the Mississippi, up the Illinois River to the Des

Plaines River and through the sanitary canal at Chicago and from there to Lake Calumet and then transferred to Lake steamers at that point and carried 1,500 miles by lake steamer to Oswego. There it was transferred to barges on the Erie Canal, sent down the Erie Canal to the Mohawk and Hudson Rivers, down the Hudson River to New York, and then some of it, quite a lot of it, after it got to New York had actually to come by rail southwest again to the great industrial districts of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Wilmington where the largest consumption of sulfur and sulfuric acid takes place in the East. Wilmington alone is one of the largest, because that is where the DuPont interests are located. You can see it went around thousands of miles, transferring three or four different times from one type of conveyor to another, in order to get to Baltimore. On sulfur alone the Government has lost a good many million dollars.

Now there is no room for any misunderstanding about these things. No man can dispute these facts I am telling you and nobody will try to dispute them. They are just absolutely facts.

Now then, you have heard of gasoline rationing, I presume. If you have been up against it as much as I have, you have had about as much experience with it as you want. I was in the East when rationing was first applied there and it ran on for nearly a year. It was done solely because they couldn't get gasoline there by transportation. There was no shortage of gasoline; there was no known shortage of rubber, and the question of rubber never entered into the proposition at all. The East complained bitterly that they were being rationed while the West was not. You know misery always loves company. Well, they wanted to get some excuse for rationing us down here in Texas and they finally got a board appointed by the President, headed by Mr. Barney Baruch of New York, who is a very versatile gentleman in matters of that kind, by the way, and he undertook to try to drum up some plausible excuse for rationing Texas and the Southwest, and in order to do so, why he trumped up the idea of doing it to conserve rubber. Nobody ever heard of rubber in the program up to that time. Well, they applied it on that theory. Now then, they are reducing the value of our coupons down here and increasing the value of them up East, and I guess it is all being done on the theory of conserving rubber. I don't know what it is now. That contention is absolutely bunk. I don't care who it is that defends it. It is nothing but pure bunk. There never was any reason for it, except to satisfy millions of people in the East who are disgruntled. To show you that there is no truth in that contention, as I say, here is a letter from Prentiss Brown. You all know who he is. It is dated August 13. He says: "The only reason why the East has not been treated as the Middle West is that until now we have not been able to move enough gasoline to the East." That is the truth. It was a question of shortage of transportation, and no other reason. But they wouldn't put it upon that ground. They put it upon the ground of conserving rubber, which was a false issue from the very beginning.

Now I want to excuse myself for going into all these things, but I have worked on them so strenuously for quite a while. Perhaps it might be interesting to know what our post-war program is going to be. Have you seen this statement that I made up, Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it all right?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Miller and Mr. Holland wanted me to do something about furnishing copies of it, but I had no opportunity of doing it. In fact I was confined to my bed for about a week and a half, having a pretty high fever 2 weeks ago, and I just got up 3 or 4 days ago. But here is something I wanted to say in regard to the post-war program for the Intracoastal Canal.

The President has recommended that a backlog of meritorious projects be provided for post-war consideration, when it is estimated that many millions of men now engaged in the war industries will be thrown out of employment. The Democratic leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, has advised me that he desires to confer with me in regard to the matter as early as possible after Congress reconvenes next month.

Such a bill, of course, will be national in scope, and embrace many provisions only remotely related to the waterway which this association is promoting. There are, however, quite a number of projects closely connected with the Intracoastal Waterway, some of them already approved by Congress, and all of them having the necessary engineeri 3 approval. Nothing will be left undone to have all these ready for consideration as soon as the construction period can be inaugurated.

The widening and deepening of the existing canal from Carrabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi is well advanced, and will be pushed to completion with funds already made available. The channel across Florida has already been authorized by Congress, and under the law will be eligible for funds to be allocated by the Chief of Engineers.

Funds will then be sought for the following works, already approved by Congress:

Extension of the enlarged channel from Corpus Christi to Port Isabel, including the branch channel on the Arroyo to Harlingen;

Extend the Colorado River channel from the mouth to the 18" mile post;

Extend the San Bernard River section to the Jefferson Lake sulfur mine;

Complete the Colorado River flood-control project as provided by law.

All of these projects have already been authorized by Congress, but expenditures have been withheld on account of the war.

The following projects connected with the Intracoastal Waterway have been surveyed and approved by the engineers, but no general bill having been enacted within the past 5 years, have not yet received congressional approval. They will be embraced in the coming bill, and every effort will be made to have them in readiness for the post-war construction program. They were included in the omnibus bill of the last Congress, but owing to the exigencies of the war, no effort was made to have them considered:

The list includes several projects on the Sabine-Neches system and one on the Neches-Angelina Rivers;

The Trinity River to have the present channel to Liberty made uniform in dimensions with the Intracoastal Waterway;

To provide a 10-foot channel around Brady Island in the Houston Ship Channel, and to extend the 34-foot channel to the turning basin;

To provide a 7-foot channel in Clear Lake and Clear Creek to the League City bridge;

To provide channel in Chocolate Bayou to Liverpool and in Bastrop Bayou to Missouri Pacific Railway;

Extend the channel from Port Lavaca up the Lavaca-Navidad to Red Bluff and for flood control works through Jackson and Lavaca Counties;

Extend the intracoastal waterway up the Guadalupe to Victoria and for flood control dam on upper section;

To provide channel near Port O'Connor into Barroom Bay.

Now, if we reenact laws similar to those we had a few years ago this Barroom Bay channel bids fair to become the most popular channel in the whole waterways system.

Certain channel enlargements at Port Isabel and Brownsville.

Now, in regard to the bayous here in Brazoria and Galveston and Harris Counties, I would like to make this statement: They are small. The expenditure on any one is far less than a hundred thousand dollars, but I want to give you an illustration of what one of them has done. I see my good friend, Mr. Pabst, back there in the audience. He was interested in the last general river and harbor bill that became law which we put through. That bill provided for Dickinson Bayou up to the town of Dickinson, increasing the depth and width of the channel so that barges could bring mud shell up there. Now, the purpose of that mud shell was to pave some highways and the streets in the town of Dickinson and League City and other nearby points, and upon that ground it was thoroughly justified by the engineers, and Congress adopted it and agreed to it. Since then Camp Wallace was established, and the shell that paved the highways in Camp Wallace, except those which are concrete, all came up this channel to Dickinson, which is only 7 miles from Camp Wallace, and the saving to the War Department alone was nearly a hundred thousand dollars in one year in paving the highways of Camp Wallace. And it only cost $35,000 to do the work. So who can say that that is not a good investment. The same would be the case with these other bayous down there that are now under construction.

Now, I want to thank you all for your attention. I am sorry that I had no prepared address for you on this occasion, but I am always willing to meet the people and try to give them an account of my stewardship the best I can, and I just simply thank you one and all.

Today's Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable address delivered by Miss Betty Long, a young lady of the State of Iowa, which is challenging and interesting, as representing the viewpoint of youth at the present time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been asked to summarize for you the events of the afternoon as they relate to youth today. You have seen, through the medium of pageantry, a story which is a fight for freedom, and which began with the Mayflower and was carried westward to Iowa and to Hardin County by the sturdy pioneer Americans. It is a story which was found valuable enough to be fought for in World War No. 1, and it is a story which is being fought for at this very hour.

What child, upon seeing a modern wild-western movie, has not thrilled at the lawlessness, the cattle rustlers, and the barroom Mazies, which clutter the screen. However, the fact which is most thrilling to twentieth century youth is that it was not the barroom

Mazies nor the two-gun Petes who wrote the history which is our heritage. No; as Mr. Crockett has so ably pointed out, it was the good people of the early West who wrote the history which has lasted to this day. Those who gave us our pioneer heritage were the God-fearing, courageous men and women who crossed the prairie in covered wagons; men, who fought Indians by night that their families might live by day; women, who raised large families even in the face of the hardships of early frontier life. Those were the history writers of pioneer days, and in the light of their glorious deeds, the reckless men and women of that day are forgotten. They are forgotten because the men and women who made the heritage we now enjoy had a vision of freedom which they wanted to capture for themselves and to preserve for their posterity.

So it is today. Any number of the present adult generation despair at twentieth-century youth. Perhaps I feel so strongly about this matter because I am young, but regardless, I want to share with you a portion of a sermon made by Rev. Dr. William Ward Ayer, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church in New York City, and which was clipped from a recent New York newspaper by a friend of mine. I quote Dr. Ayer:

"Swing bands have become the corrupters of American youth. Our age of jazz and swing is unmistakably one of low moral standards and vastly inferior ethics, manifesting an obvious degeneracy in our culture. Young America's wildness over swing music reveals the lightness and frothiness of the day, for swing is essentially light and frothy. We could not produce a Lincoln today any more than we could produce an oak tree in an ash pile. If Abraham Lincoln had been brought up in our jazz age and had followed its philosophies, he would never have been heard of.

"Swing music reveals the lawlessness of the age as well. It represents the lowest exalted and the highest debased. In this it is typical of our modern civilization."

It is too bad, indeed, that Dr. Ayer fails to recognize on the other hand the millions of youth today who are corrupted by nothing. I speak for modern youth when I say that there are two groups in our country today which shall speak and which shall be heard. The first of these groups is that large body of young men who are wearing the colors of our country. Perhaps you know a typical Johnny Doughboy; he may even have come from your own home. You saw him grow up, through the knee-pant stage, saw him go to Sunday School, where he learned the Golden Rule, and "thou shalt not kill." You saw him learn through his family relationships that the individual is the most important and highest thing in the world. Then, just about the time you were beginning to wonder what he was going to do with this now grown-up life, a government came along and said, "Young man, we have a war on our hands, and because you are mentally and physically alert, we want you to fight it for us." You heard very little complaint from young Mr. America, and with haste he donned the uniform of his country and marched away. Perhaps the next you heard about Johnny, he was flying his bomber over some far outpost of freedom. He may have come home with some decoration pinned to his uniform, or he may be one of those thousands who shall remain forever nameless to us, but who are doing a job gallantly. No doubt he will be about the same when he comes home for good, with the exception of an older look in his eyes. You see, he now knows what it means to fight for freedom, not merely talk about it. Yes, youth has been asked to do a pretty nasty job, and they are doing it gallantly. This group shall speak, and it shall be heard.

There is one more group I wish to mention, which shall be working hand in hand with these young heroes, returned. That group is a body of young men and women who today, through education, or work, or just through remaining at home keeping things "the same" are preparing themselves for tomorrow by building Christian courage and character in their lives. They shall work side by side with our young men to build a new kind of world in which all people shall be free, because they know that freedom is worth fighting for—and living for.

These two groups shall speak more loudly than any other group in our world today because of their great deeds, just as the gallant pioneers did things which spoke more loudly than the cheap and the mean factors in early America. They shall write the history which shall be posterity's heritage, and we hope sincerely that generations to come will be as proud of the heritage we give them as we are of the one you have given us.

The thing we need to do is to lift our eyes from the mean and the lowly of our time; not that we want to forget that they exist, but to dwell on them only leads to mental chaos. We must lift our eyes to the two groups of youth who shall write the history which shall be posterity's heritage. In her youth lies America's only hope.

War Services of the Bernard A. Foster Family of Spartanburg, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from some weeks' stay in our congressional district and having had the fine privilege of visiting among and talking with many of my constituents, I am pleased to report to the Congress that there is full and unstinted cooperation on the part of everyone with the war program.

It was my privilege while at home to meet those who have freely given their sons and daughters to the service of our country. I take great pleasure in calling special attention to the members of Mr. and Mrs. Bernard A. Foster's family of Spartanburg, S. C., who are in the service as follows:

Maj. Bernard A. Foster, Jr., Office of Provost Marshal, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C., formerly lawyer, Federal Trade Commission, District of Columbia.

Capt. Ralph V. Foster, Office of Inspector General, Eighty-eighth Infantry Division, Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, Tex., formerly inspector of C. C. C. camps in Southeastern States.

Capt. Julian A. Foster, Officers' Casual Battalion, Pittsburg Replacement Depot, Pittsburg, Calif., formerly public accountant with L. C. Dodge, Spartanburg, S. C.

Maj. Donald C. Foster, Air Corps, Headquarters XII Air Support Command, now in Sicily. Thomason Act appointee to Regular Army at graduation from Wofford College.

Aviation Cadet Howard G. Foster, U. S. N. R., Preflight School at Dallas, Tex. Enlisted at Christmas, leaving junior classes at Wofford.

William Edwin Foster, seaman, second class, U. S. N. R., Naval Air School, Pensacola, Fla. Enlisted after graduation May 1943 from high school.

Dorothy Foster, married to First Lt. William P. Law, Jr., Fort Benning, Ga.

It will be observed that seven members of this fine family have answered their country's call, six brothers and one brother-in-law. As I commend this fine family in the highest terms I would not forget others who probably have not been fortunate enough to contribute so many sons, nevertheless, they too, have given freely of what sons they have.

It is very gratifying to know of the willingness on the part of parents to have their sons and daughters go into the service and, of course, each hour brings encouraging news from the battlefronts around the world.

I take pleasure in thus making special mention of the contribution made by Mr. and Mrs. Bernard A. Foster of Spartanburg, S. C.

The Outlook for Food Production in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, has presented to Members of Congress an important letter concerning the production of food for 1944. This letter is of great importance to the country, since food production is actually more important than any other production in the present state of our war effort. Daily we are called upon to furnish more food. As each country is released from the Nazi yoke more food will be necessary until production can be again reorganized in those countries.

By reason of the importance of the letter, I herewith submit it in full:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., September 12, 1943.

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

American farmers have responded magnificently to war demands for production of food. Despite wartime difficulties, such as shortages of credit, machinery, fertilizer, seed and feed and the scandal of simultaneous farm manpower shortages and surpluses, they have broken all production records. They have backed up their fighting sons and brothers. The working farm families of America have produced to the existing limits.

But this is not enough. The limits are unnecessarily low. They should have been lifted long ago. Today, 22 months after Pearl Harbor, with the demand for food rising daily and our present production level

of war foods far below present and anticipated needs, administrative agencies and the Congress should move with all speed to increase war food production by at least 20 percent in 1944 and 1945. Such a further increase is possible. It has been possible ever since Pearl Harbor. All that is necessary is to apply the same policies and methods to war-food production that have been applied with such brilliant success in industrial war production. American agriculture has yet to be converted, mobilized, and expanded for all-out war-food production.

Some steps have been taken by W. F. A. Administrator Marvin Jones. He has removed acreage restrictions. He proposes extension of support prices and, "when necessary," Government purchase and resale of farm products. The 1943 production goals were based upon production possibilities of an agriculture that was continuing on a "business as usual" basis. It now seems that the 1944 production goals are to be set in somewhat the same way. The States are to be asked whether they can meet their share of the Nation's proposed goals. Their replies, when compiled, will become the Nation's final 1944 goals.

If, in industrial war production, the W. P. B. had followed this method, we should today not have the weapons, munitions, and materials of war in the kinds and amounts needed to supply the advancing allied armies. In agriculture, we have yet to treat the war and post-war food needs as absolute imperatives which must be met. Because we have not yet faced up to these stern demands—not for "feeding the world," but for meeting our own and our share of world food needs—neither administrative agencies, the Congress, nor individual farmers have felt the imperative demand for enough food to win a total war and help establish a global peace.

The clearest, most comprehensive and incisive survey of food needs and ways and means of meeting them was recently made public by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, in a report made by an Interdepartmental Committee consisting of representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, State, War, and Interior; the Office of Economic Warfare and the Lend-Lease Administration.

The National Farmers Union believes that this report, if implemented, will solve our war food production problems. We have long advocated "a price structure designed to secure the essential war production adjustments" which the interdepartmental committee has recommended. We believe the individual prices in such a structure should be raised or adjusted to get the kinds and quantities needed, but, as a practical matter, we do not believe that prices on war foods should, in any instance, be set below the parity line. With this single exception, we endorse the interdepartmental committee's report and respectfully urge its careful consideration by every Member of the House and Senate.

FARM PROBLEMS REQUIRING IMMEDIATE ACTION

As the Congress reconvenes, it is faced with three food issues requiring immediate action. If production is to approach the volume necessary to meet our own needs and our share of world needs, provision must be made for all-out food production by all farmers. First attention should be given to:

1. Authorization of adequate loan funds to equip all underemployed farmers for all-out production.

2. Assurance that wheat goals will be met, such assurance to be given by restoration of crop insurance and parity payments.

3. Repeal of the disastrous labor-freezing provisions of Public Law No. 45, and immediate enactment of legislation designed to increase the mobility of farm labor and its fullest use under decent wage and living conditions.

1944 WHEAT PRODUCTION THREATENED

As matters stand today, War Food Administrator Marvin Jones has set 1944 wheat-production goals at 68,000,000 acres, an increase of 16,000,000 acres, or 30 percent over the 52,000,000 acres planted for 1943—and farmers have the prospect of being paid 21 cents per bushel less with no Federal crop insurance against losses.

Throughout the wheat country, farmers are watching and waiting to see whether or not the Congress will restore crop insurance and assure wheat farmers of parity for their 1944 crops, both wiped out by the present Agricultural Appropriations Act. Fall plowing and planting of winter wheat, normally well under way by September 1, has already been delayed 12 days by this uncertainty. Every additional day is important. Wheat farmers will be keeping track of Congress hourly by radio, waiting for the go-ahead signal. This decision affects not only wheat farmers but, since wheat is also a livestock feed, cattle raisers, dairymen, poultrymen, and finally the ultimate consumer of 1944 and later years. Every Member of Congress should vote for immediate restoration of parity payments and crop insurance.

FARM LABOR SCANDAL SHOULD BE ENDED

As the Nation's manpower crisis tightens, repeal of all or most of Public Law No. 45 becomes imperative. This self-defeating legislation appropriated $26,000,000 for recruiting, placement, and transportation of farm labor—and then in effect froze all farm labor where it was. Instead of mobilizing all farm labor for use whenever and wherever needed, under reasonable wages and working conditions, it has broken the United States into 3,000 little countries with the county agent as a little king, subservient in most instances to the largest farmers in the county. The law provides that no Federal funds may be used to transport farm labor from State to State without approval of the county agent. (No national farm organization will defend this provision.) In practice, this provision, along with the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act (which defers farm men so long as they are engaged in essential farming activities), and State laws against "labor snatching," are being used in combination to immobilize and freeze farm labor in whatever county it happens to be.

Thus, we have the scandalous spectacle of farm-labor shortages and farm-labor surpluses at the same time. While hundreds of thousands of farm-bred families are underemployed at low wages in some parts of the Nation, food is being lost in other parts because of labor shortages. These shortages, aggravated by an act of Congress, have forced us to divert troops and use war prisoners to harvest crops.

Such mishandling of our farm labor resources is equalled only in the continued refusal to equip and assist 1,300,000 undercapitalized and under-equipped and therefore underemployed farm families for maximum production on the land they occupy. Together, this wastage of farm manpower makes sense only to those determined to extend control of the Nation's agriculture further and further toward complete monopoly in the hands of commercialized agriculture and banking interests. The purpose is clear. Frozen labor is to be kept plentiful and cheap in some localities, and is to be replenished by small farmers and their families driven from their own land to work the land of others.

It should be enough to state that such a program is, of course, contrary to the very purposes for which this war is being fought. But it is also likely to result in declining farm production, rising food prices, and inflation that will strike at the heart of the entire war effort and endanger post-war rehabilitation and the making of a lasting peace.

ONE BILLION DOLLARS IN LOANS AND WAR FOOD PRODUCTION AGREEMENTS NEEDED

Not less than $1,000,000,000 in loans should be authorized immediately to provide small farmers with the things they need to get into all-out war food production. All-out war food production by all farmers can be best achieved by doing a production engineering job, using war food production agreements between the Government and farmers. Such agreements should assure to war food producers the same types of aid and service given industrial war producers, including credit, advance and progress payments, priorities, and other assistance in getting machinery, fertilizer, feed, seed, labor, and other essentials. The agreement should include crop and war risk insurance and technical advice and assistance. The soundness of this method has been proved by the F. S. A. record in increasing the war food production of 463,000 farm families. The F. S. A. and A. A. A., prior to the enactment of the last Agricultural Appropriation Act, had machinery through which individual agreements could be made with farmers. This machinery was adequate to write and administer war food production agreements. Those agencies should be fully utilized.

The National Farmers Union also renews its recommendation that adequate funds be appropriated to option land to provide farms for returning veterans while at the same time checking inflation of land prices.

The National Farmers Union favors lowering of the voting age to 18 years, believing that those who are old enough to fight and die in defense of their country are old enough to vote.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

Renegotiation of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt from George K. Aiken, chairman of the Oregon Committee on Interstate Cooperation, of a resolution adopted by that committee on August 27, 1943, dealing with the renegotiation of war contracts by the Federal Government, and I ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the resolution as a part of my remarks, which is as follows:

Whereas the retroactive recapture of profits on renegotiation of war contracts by the Federal Government has subjected various States to the risk of serious loss of State tax revenues through the necessity of refunding State taxes already collected and in some instances already distributed to and expended by local governmental subdivisions, and has imposed on the States other administrative and budgetary problems; and

Whereas certain factors are taken into consideration in the renegotiation of war contracts, which factors are not ordinarily, and

should not be given effect in computing State corporate taxes; and

Whereas the States do not participate in the renegotiation of war contracts, which is confined to the exclusive jurisdiction of the appropriate departments of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the financial program of the State of Oregon is subjected to risk of serious loss of State revenue through the retroactive recapture of profits from the renegotiation of war contracts by the Federal Government, and by reason of the fact that in many instances funds so collected by the State have already been distributed to and expended by local government subdivisions; and

Whereas certain States have passed legislation declaring it the policy of such States to refuse to refund any income taxes already paid, because of renegotiation between the Federal Government and taxpayers in which said States did not participate on the ground that such refunds would upset the State's tax and budgetary system, and that other States are likely to enact similar legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Committee on Interstate Cooperation respectfully recommends to the Congress of the United States and to the appropriate departments of the Federal Government the adoption of a method of renegotiation of war contracts which will relieve the States of the problems referred to herein and obviate the refunding of State taxes already collected; and be it further

Resolved, That this committee strongly urges, for the purpose of providing a uniform and equitable method of accomplishing the foregoing purposes, that every contractor be allowed on renegotiation credit for State taxes computed in accordance with the applicable State laws without adjustment for excessive profits recaptured after the end of the period on the basis of which the contractor's State taxes are determined; and be it further

Resolved, That the chairman of the committee transmit a copy of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon with a request that they take appropriate action to secure the cooperation of their colleagues in the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to implement the proposal herein, and that the chairman transmit copies of this resolution to the Council of State Governments, Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Treasury, chairman of the Truman committee, and the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission with the request that such legislation and administrative procedure be adopted to accomplish the purpose herein set forth.

The G. O. P. Grapples With Its Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John W. Owens from the Baltimore Sun of September 6, 1943:

THE G. O. P. GRAPPLES WITH ITS RECORD

(By John W. Owens)

Nothing could be more surprising in politics at this time than a satisfactory outcome of the deliberations on Mackinac Island of the Post-War Advisory Council of the Republican Party. Yet, this meeting is desirable and important. If the Republican Party is to be a worthy alternative to the Democratic Party—not a mere receptacle of dissatisfaction—a start must be made in the age-old process of removing handicaps by accepting them and stubbornly working out from under them, however awkward the performance.

In this business, the participants will certainly be nervous and self-conscious. They must eat crow. The Republican policy of 20 years on foreign relations has been overwhelmed by events. It began in the negations with which the Harding administration supplanted the Wilson administration's support of the League of Nations, and, excepting certain undertaking of limited scope, this policy continued into the fight against revision of the so-called neutrality laws. In that fight, most of the Republican leadership in Congress stood for a policy of isolation which, if it had been successful, would have left Britain in the fall of 1940 without an effectual friend in the world and might have broken the British will, with consequences that need not be elaborated. The record makes that long-continued policy impossible for the future. The crow is on the table.

To make the participants in the business at Mackinac Island more nervous, they have been hurried to the table where the crow is placed. There is little ground for doubt that the meeting is being held at this time because of the increasingly potent campaign of Mr. Willkie for an advanced party position in foreign affairs. Defeated by history, the regulars dared not delay longer lest Mr. Willkie appropriate the intelligent voters in the party. And to the regulars, another Willkie nomination would be a great gulp of the devil's own broth.

Unfortunately for the council, that is not the only trouble. An ironic punishment has overtaken the Republican Party. Because of the long continuance of grievous faults in foreign relations, the intelligence in the country naturally calls now for precision and exactitude in Republican pronouncements. Broad statements will be suspect when offered by men most of whom have been shortsighted. Yet it obviously is difficult now for any group to particularize on foreign relations.

In some respects, the whole international situation is more difficult than it was 25 years ago. Though it seems fairly safe to say that the masses of the people have better understanding of the need of international cooperation to establish international peace and order, the alinement of nations may not be as favorable. In 1918–19 the two most authoritative nations were the United States and Britain, kin in blood and institutions. Next was powerful France, with whom the English-speaking nations could have acrimonious differences, but no fundamental schism. After France came Italy and Spain and the smaller nations of Europe, mostly adaptable. The victor nation of the East, Japan, was difficult, but not then lawless. As to defeated Germany, we drew distinctions between rulers and people and held hopes of the republic. Russia was a Bolshevist curiosity. Thus, though troubles were abundant, the alinement was supported by certain natural balances. Today we look upon a violently changed alinement of nations, and in dealing with it there is no beaten path.

It is hardly reckless to guess that 75 percent of the problem of the United States in postwar relations and in the establishment of world order will be found in Russian relations. For the end of this war will show the United States and Russia to be the two great powers of the world. The British Empire will survive, to our benefit, but it will not possess either our strength or that of the Russian Republic. British population and British resources will be scattered all over the world. American and Russian population and resources will be concentrated, and they will be concentrated under economies which have shown miraculous powers of organization and production.

Since these are the facts that lie ahead of us, no one can blue print a plan of world organization at this time. We (in cooperation with the British) must learn what our relations with Russia are to be, particularly in the German settlement. If we have one sort of relations we must plan one sort of international society. If we have another sort of relations with Russia we shall be compelled to plan another and more limited sort of society. The misfortune of the Republican Party is that its record is so blackened by events that people demand particularization as proof of sincerity.

Republicans at Mackinac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 12, 1943:

REPUBLICANS AT MACKINAC

The Republican Post-War Advisory Council went up to Mackinac Island and resolved itself into two committees from which public and press were rigidly excluded. Then each committee reported a mess of meaningless words.

Senator VANDENBERG, the tired old compromiser, said of the report of his committee on foreign policy and international relations: "First, we're going to remain a sovereign state; second, we're going to proceed by constitutional means; third, we're going to consult first the interests of the United States." As though anybody had proposed otherwise.

The party which saved the Union and freed the slaves was content to stage a "phoney" performance. The packed committee on foreign policy set up three straw men and then knocked them down. In the midst of a second great war, a war being won by sacrifice and death, it offered no more than Harding promised in the campaign of 1920.

To be sure, nothing was to be hoped from a hand-picked committee which included the isolationist Governor Green, of Illinois, and the outstanding internationalist, Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont. It was like putting Abraham Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas on the same committee with instructions to bring in a report on which both could agree. Negatives were all that could be hoped.

Republican Governors who were members of the council were promptly put in their place. They had made the gains of the Republican Party in 1940. They had some constructive ideas of what the party ought to stand for. Two of them were put on each of the two committees—blanketed by two Senators and two Congressmen. And the whole show was being staged by Harrison E. Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee, an old party hack whom no one would suggest for President. The orders were to tell the country that the Republicans were united—isolationists and men who believe in a better world. "Promise

nothing but damn the New Deal" was the slogan.

The Governors stood for it. Dewey, who had arrived and who departed in his "special" car (private cars are out for the duration, but the New York Central found a way around that), who spoke of the "inevitability" of an alliance with Great Britain, stood for the meaningless report.

Governor Baldwin of Connecticut had said: "I think it would be a grave mistake to start off this council with a declaration that we will not yield or give up sovereignty in the interest of a better world order." He knew why that was being put in—but he accepted the slushy Vandenberg report just the same.

It was all a victory for negation. No wonder the isolationist Congressman HOFFMAN exclaimed: "As an America-Firster, I think it is a fine report."

One member of the council writing home said: "They produced nothing to make the father or mother, the wife or sister of a soldier believe that it is not to happen all over again in another 25 years." The men who give their lives were forgotten at Mackinac in the interest of party harmony.

Senator Taft, who never has understood and never will understand the American people, headed the committee on post-war enterprise, industry, and employment. Its first report was so empty that governors threatened to take the floor and attack it. So an expanded report was brought in. All it did was attack the New Deal. Dewey and Bricker, mentioned for the Republican nomination, were on the committee with Senator Taft. Neither could take the report to voters of his own State and get six votes on it. The farmer and the laborer in industry will find in it no promise for the future.

"Party harmony" was the watchword all the way through. The little group which met at Ripon in 1854 and began the Republican Party had said something that fired a nation. The hand-picked council of the great Republican Party, with pocketbooks so full that they had no worry for the future, no need of social security, said nothing. They talked much of courage, but they showed no courage. They gambled that the country would be so sick of the New Deal in 1944 that it would take anything, as it did in 1920. Again we return to the council member who wrote home:

"They produced nothing to make the father or mother, the wife or sister of a soldier believe that it is not to happen all over again in another 25 years."

Congress Must Regulate Government Bureaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine engaged in business in the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota, which district I have the honor to represent in Congress, presented me with a cartoon on my trip back to Minnesota during the recent recess. This cartoon pictured numerous desks, heads of the different departments, employees, typewriters, and so forth. The owner of the business is explaining to a Government bureau representative that one accountant spends all of his time on company business, sales, purchases, and so forth. He further explains that the other 17 employees in the office take care of the Government reports, forms, deductions, taxes, quotas, questionnaires, and so forth. It is a tragedy that such a situation is literally true.

Just before leaving northern Minnesota I talked with a man who told me that he had to work evenings in order to make out forms showing how many miles his truck traveled a day, how much oil it used, and so forth. He was engaged in a small business enterprise, but told me frankly that the conduct of his business was seriously hampered by the numerous Government regulations and reports, which had to be studied, filled out, and sent in to Washington. I talked with other businessmen who told me they had to have extra help in order to comply with all of these foolish regulations and in order to fill out all of the foolish forms that are pouring out of the Government bureaus in Washington and which have the effect of hampering anyone engaged in ordinary business.

Of course, the Office of Price Administration has been the champion offender. Evidently they have a lot of men in that bureau who can think up more forms and more questionnaires, and most of them pure trash, than any other agency ever devised by the hand of man. On other occasions I have stated that this outfit was doing more harm than good to the country, and that instead of helping our war effort, so far as domestic affairs are concerned, that the Office of Price Administration was retarding our war effort. I reaffirm that sentiment here and now; however, I do not want to refuse to give honorable mention to dozens of other Government bureaus that are doing the same and doing their best to make a bad job of the whole situation.

All of these efforts are costing millions and millions of dollars, and it does not require much effort to figure out that the average citizen has to pay the bill either in the shape of direct or indirect taxes, or open or hidden taxes, or in the way of increased prices of commodities which Mr. Average Citizen must purchase throughout the day.

Of course, there must be some price control, and on some goods there must be a ceiling on prices as well as a floor. I would also like to say in this connection that our mounting public debt is giving concern to the thinking people in my district. They realize the need for bond sales, and increased taxes in our war effort. They want to do nothing that will cripple or hinder the War Department and Navy Department in their fight against the Axis Powers. People are, however, resentful of the waste and extravagance and mistaken policies on the part of Government bureaus in handling our domestic problems. When the war commenced, we were promised that nondefense bureaus and agencies would cut their expenditures and reduce expenses. This has not been done. On the other hand, the expenditures of agencies, not essential to the war effort, have multiplied and increased ad infinitum.

Congress should abolish the Office of Price Administration, and consolidate it with the War Production Board, which appears to have some businessmen in charge of most of its activities. The situation requires drastic action on the part of Congress because with increased expenditures, and an inflation program that is already under way, the time is going to come when the credit structure of this country is shakened. If it is ever destroyed, we face the same situation that prevailed following World War No. 1, when the French franc and the German mark became valueless, and a thousand francs would not purchase a 10-cent loaf of bread. Life insurance and all types of investments were wiped out. Not only did the average person who had accumulated property find himself bankrupt, but the laboring class of people was likewise inflicted with hardship and poverty.

We do not want a repetition of those episodes in this country either at this time or after the war. I think the situation that now exists, the utter confusion and overlapping of bureaus, the worthless and useless multitude of regulations inflicted on the country like a horde of locusts justifies legislation that will provide for a committee of the House of Representatives and a committee of the Senate to sit in and help formulate the different programs now going on, and to be made in the future, and to see to it that expenditures are reduced and the number of unnecessary employees curtailed. Such a committee could meet with the heads of the bureaus, give them good advice, and perhaps issue a few directives that would be helpful to the country.

While I am a member of the party known as the minority, I have no hesitation in suggesting to the party in power that there is no more important matter facing Congress at this time than this proposition of having Congress take away from the bureaus, so far as our domestic problems are concerned, some of their arbitrary power and authority and forbid them to issue directives which have the force of law without advice of some businessmen and direction of committees from Congress having something to say about it.

United States Secret Service With Additional Burdens Continues Its Excellent Record Protecting the Government and Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, charged with the specific duty of protecting the President as well as the United States Treasury, the work of the Secret Service during the past fiscal year presents a record seldom if ever equaled by that or-

ganization. As part of my remarks I include a statement issued by the chief enforcement officer that describes the activities in part. It follows:

Secret Service Agents of the United States Treasury have discovered a new wrinkle in the age-old counterfeiting racket, and thus found an opportunity to strike a blow in behalf of the stamp collection, "hobby of kids and kings."

Chief Frank J. Wilson reported to Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Treasury Enforcement Agencies, that the division during the 1943 fiscal year smashed two audacious attempts to defraud stamp collectors, while approaching its goal of extermination of currency and coin counterfeiting and getting a decided jump on the check forgery racket.

The service encountered a new enforcement problem during the year, the counterfeiting of gasoline ration stamps, and cooperating with the Office of Price Administration, made a number of arrests. Nineteen defendants in these cases developed at Newark, N. J., pleaded guilty.

Money counterfeiting dropped nearer the vanishing point as a result of the cumulative effects of the "Know Your Money" program of educating the public in detecting bogus bills, which Secretary Morgenthau instituted in 1937. The same technique of preventing crime through teaching possible victims how to spot a bad bill or coin was used in one of the most intensive campaigns of the sort ever inaugurated, a campaign to prevent dependents of men in the armed services receiving allowance or allotment checks from being the victims of the check thief and forger.

With more millions of Government checks going out each month than ever in the history of the Nation, a tide now running at the rate of 199,000,000 checks a year, the number of all types of Government check cases requiring investigation increased less than 3 percent, and the number of arrests where criminal prosecution appeared justified actually declined from the 1942 figures. Chief Wilson believes the Secret Service crime prevention program contributed greatly to curbing this type of crime.

Two Pittsburgh dealers in philatelic items were sentenced to terms of a year and a day in prison as a result of their neat little scheme to defraud stamp collectors.

The dealers, Cyril J. Huber and Adam K. Bert, pleaded guilty to inventing a series of stamps of their own, bearing the wording "U. S. Postage—Free—For the Armed Forces." It was a colorful item with a red, white, and blue design of the American eagle and a shield. There is no such genuine stamp. Secret Service agents seized 300,000 of the completed stamps and found a "fraud within fraud" also aimed at stamp collectors. Huber and Bert had printed several thousand of the stamps with the eagle design inverted, to make it appear that they were misprints and therefore of unusual philatelic value.

Six New York men are awaiting trial in a somewhat similar case. With the cooperation of Post Office inspectors, the Treasury officers arrested Morris J. Stern, Abraham M. Kalish, Albert J. Rabinowitz, Michael M. Karen, Henry Lieblich, and Mervyn B. Haycock on charges of making bogus "overprints" and perforations on genuine postage and internal revenue stamps so as to make them appear rarities.

One $60 roll of stamps, which are distributed unperforated, was given bogus perforations so as to make them appear "accidents." New York philatelists who assisted agents in developing the case said that the stamps, had they been genuinely perforated, would have been valued at $6,000 in collectors' circles.

Secret Service agents assisted Cuban authorities in smashing a Havana gang engaged in counterfeiting $50 notes of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. The plant was seized, and seven persons are awaiting trial in the Cuban courts.

Agents of the Service, with the assistance of local police, also captured a counterfeiting plant in Philadelphia, and arrested George W. Place, who was all set to manufacture bogus $10 notes. Place was identified with 51 offenses of breaking and entering, including safe robberies, and was sentenced in Pennsylvania courts to from 20 to 40 years in prison. The Federal indictment on the counterfeiting charge will be waiting, when and if he gets out of prison.

Secret Service officers, in cooperation with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, obtained evidence that resulted in the arrest of six persons in Chickasaw County, Miss., in a case involving $400,000 in Government funds. James C. Barrett, county farm agent, and five associates were convicted of submitting numerous false claims for benefit payments, of forging checks, and collecting payments illegally. Sentences ranged from 10 months to 4 years. It is expected that civil suits will recover all of the losses.

Scarcely had Congress enacted legislation providing dependency and allowance benefits to the families of personnel of the armed services when the Secret Service began to intensify its "Know your endorsers" campaign to make the theft and forgery of these and other Government checks dangerous and unprofitable.

The Service showered recipients with warnings of the necessity of protecting themselves against loss of the checks by theft. At the same time, a Nation-wide campaign, in which State and city police extended efficient cooperation, was directed to merchants, banks, and other handlers urging them to require proper identification before cashing any checks.

The War and Navy Departments cooperated by mailing notices with the checks, showing how loss of the money might be prevented. Banks, surety companies, and other private firms printed several hundred thousand "Know your endorser" placards which were distributed among retailers. Warning notices have been printed on Government checks, and many State, county, and municipal governments and banks have followed this lead by printing "Know your endorser—Require identification" warning on their official checks.

As a part of its crime-prevention program, the Secret Service assembled an extensive collection of genuine and counterfeit money, including specimens of war currencies, invasion money, Japanese counterfeits, and Japanese war bonds. In cooperation with the Treasury's War Savings organization and Bureau of Engraving and Printing, United States War Savings stamps were printed at these exhibits, and $500,000 in War bonds and stamps were sold to visitors. Shown first in Rockefeller Center, New York, and later in Detroit, Cleveland, Omaha, and St. Louis, this display has been seen by 150,000 persons.

Secret Service agents were faced with many new problems in meeting their responsibility of protecting the President on his unprecedented journey to Casablanca in January. Through careful and thorough advance arrangements, and unusual protective procedures during the trip, movements were executed according to plan and were kept a closely guarded secret until the news was released officially. Great care also was taken to insure the President's security during his conference in April with President Avila Camacho of Mexico, at Monterrey, and on Mr. Roosevelt's inspection tours of war plants and Army camps.

Statistics for the fiscal year show to what dire straits the business of counterfeiting has come. Only 159 persons were arrested for offenses involving bogus bills and coins, compared to 317 in 1942 and the losses by victims of counterfeit money passers were reduced about 50 percent. Arrests for check forgeries declined from 1,171 in 1942 to 1,004 in the 1943 period. Of offenders brought to trial for counterfeiting, forgeries, and other violations, 98 percent were convicted.

Congress Should Forbid Drafting of Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, with Congress resuming its sessions today, a matter that should have immediate attention is the policy of the Selective Service Administration to draft married men with children while there are still single men available for Army and Navy purposes. I am opposed to this program, and very frankly legislation should not be needed to direct administrative offices in the exercise of common sense in performing their duties. I expect to support legislation, however, that will forbid the Selective Service officials to draft fathers until they have made an honest effort to supply the needs of the Army and Navy with single men, many of whom have been deferred for one reason or another. This idea that a single man is essential in war industry and cannot be replaced is, in my opinion, a nonsensical myth. It should not be tolerated.

While I was back in Minnesota during the recess, I had personal contact with some unusual situations. I contacted one officer in a shipbuilding concern, who told me that when they were directed by Government officials to train married men for work in that industry, they made a careful effort to comply with the directives. Orders were issued to hire and train married men with children, and to give them a preference even though single men with some skill were available. As a result, this particular shipyard does not have the problem of replacing any single men, or at least will have to replace only a small number. The officials had sense enough to know that unmarried men would and should be called into the draft. On the other hand I encountered another outfit making materials essential in the war effort which adopted the opposite policy. This employer saw the advantage of young healthy single men doing skilled work; saw an increase in his profits, and so he discriminated against married men with children. He employed single men, and trained them, and now has a bunch of young fellows, and he is yelling rather loudly to the effect that it will work a hardship on him if these single men are not exempted, or rather if the exemption which they have is not continued.

I have no sympathy whatever for this employer, and I am perfectly willing for

some other industrial plant to make up in the way of war materials whatever he cannot produce when the single men employed in his plant are taken into the Army.

I also encountered another situation where a large employer honestly complied with directives to train married men for positions in his line of industry. He did exactly that to the fullest extent, and told me the other day that he had claimed exemption for no single men, even though his industry was probably the most vital in our war effort. He told me that single men had been replaced with women wherever possible. His statement is most significant, however, to the effect that if these married men with children are now to be drafted, some of them are doing particular kinds of work which women cannot do. Consequently unless Congress acts immediately the war effort in this particular case will be very much retarded because there is no one available to fill these particular jobs.

Of course it is time that the Washington officials—even the Army has some bureaus—should begin to exercise good judgment. Congress should not have to pass legislation, but I fear it will be necessary. I have in mind the bungling and the mistakes that were made in the drafting of the essential farm help. This was carried on all last year, and apparently is still a glorified, mistaken policy of the administration. Take the case of a man who has an 80-acre farm; 18 head of cattle, and so forth. He is, we will say, 70 years of age; his wife is 65 years of age, crippled up with arthritis, and they have a son who is unmarried, 30 years of age. When this fellow is drafted the old folks find it impossible to carry on the food production; take care of the livestock, and so forth. This all means that they are not going to raise crops; that they have to sell the cattle, and the production of food comes to an end in this particular family.

There is no doubt that there will be a food shortage, and we can charge it up directly to the bungling mistakes of bureaucracy.

In these remarks, I have no criticism to make of the local selective-service boards in the various communities. They have to follow regulations which come to them from Washington, and which do not permit them to use proper discretion in the handling of these cases. It is time for a change in the program that comes out of Washington, and I hope that the proper committee will report a bill forthwith.

The Battle on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the annual convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Detroit, Mich., August 9, 1943:

I look forward each year to the opportunity of meeting with the members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Here we gather on a common ground of understanding to seek a solution to our mutual problems. From these gatherings comes a renewed inspiration and confidence to carry on, often in the face of obstacles of tremendous proportions.

That law enforcement, handicapped by the fact that there are fewer police officers today than a year ago, has been able to keep the home front secure is a tribute to its courageous men and women. The turn-over in police personnel has assumed alarming proportions, ranging as high as 60 percent in various cities. I believe the danger point has been reached, and some real understanding and appreciation of the strain and stress already placed upon law enforcement must be shown if the internal security of this country is not to be imperiled.

The efficiency of law enforcement has increased materially, as shown by the fact that more crimes were cleared by arrests last year than in the previous year. While we have gained some measure of success, dangerous days lie ahead. Whatever the difficulties, we must and will fight on. The men of law enforcement in every sense of the word are soldiers at heart—brave and courageous, persistent and determined—and they are fighting a battle that must not be lost.

This Nation in reality is waging war on two fronts. One is against the international purveyors of tyranny and barbarity that spring from the hellish hates of duplicity and chicanery which fester in chancelleries and palaces abroad. Their guns, bayonets, bombs, and tanks are aimed to crush the liberties of free people everywhere. Pillage, plunder, and destruction are their goal.

The other front is against our enemies at home who are just as determined, just as ruthless. The war could be won on the sea, in the air, and land campaigns and yet be lost on the home front. We of law enforcement fight less conspicuously, but our part of the conflict, like the other, affects every home in the land and every man on the foreign fighting fronts.

As a people, our energies must be unified and directed toward final and glorious victory on the far-flung battle fronts of the world. Any activity which imperils that effort must be pushed aside. Life cannot go on as usual; we have a war to win. I fear at times that our blessings as Americans have clouded our vision of duty. We have become accustomed to rights, but all too often we forget that for every right there is a duty, for every privilege a responsibility, and for every joy a sorrow.

We should keep foremost in our minds the real task of law enforcement. It is the protector of law and order—the cornerstone of civilization, the very keystone of democracy. It is the first step in the administration of criminal justice. Unless the investigator first gets the facts and apprehends the real wrongdoer, the most vigorous and gifted of prosecuting attorneys are powerless to act. Then, too, there must be a real spirit of cooperation between investigating officers and prosecutors. The only excuse for the existence of law enforcement is the protection of society. The general welfare of the people transcends the convenience of confirmed sex offenders, confidence men, check passers, arsonists, burglars, robbers, and murderers. Yet it appears that at times the convenience of the criminal transcends the welfare of society in some circles.

You know and I know that human lives are taken daily, homes are plundered, hard-earned life savings are stolen, and crimes by the score occur only because some gullible parole board or pardon dispenser has released upon society some unreformed criminal; or because some politically expedient prosecutor lacks the fortitude to prosecute, or compromises with defense counsel to allow the criminal to plead to a lesser offense though definitely guilty of the major crime, or because technical and capricious interpretation of statutes and rules of procedure theroretically takes the handcuffs from the criminal and places them upon law enforcement. When human jackals are loosed to prey upon society without even fundamental regard for the responsibilities of law enforcement, we should not hesitate to speak out.

The attitude of law enforcement in this respect is not due to a spirit of avengement but arises simply and solely from considerations of the safety of society. I submit it is an obligation of judicial administration to see that justice is done, rather than an obligation looking toward preferential treatment of criminals. You will be vilified and smeared by the special interests who are always vociferous in their championship of the enemies of society, but who give all too little thought to the long-suffering public.

It is no secret that hardened convicts in many instances leave prison at will; others enjoy privileges of "sob-sister" prisons closely akin to a country club atmosphere, with money, guns, and the comforts of life to be had for the asking. Likewise, it is no secret that criminals have bought their way to freedom from slimy renegades who slander the good name of law enforcement.

Law enforcement has gained much ground in the crusade against dishonesty and crime during the past decade, but recently we have suffered reverses. The present trend, unless abated, foretells difficult days ahead on the home front. We have the experience of the past to guide us. When law and order break down, you will find that public desire for law and order has first weakened.

The American daily press and magazines worthy of their name have performed a great service for law and order. For the most part, they have made a sincere effort to focus the healing rays of the spotlight of public opinion on law-enforcement problems. But there still remains, to besmirch the good name of journalism, certain psychopathic canard purveyors and others who, from motives best known to themselves, are constantly seeking to undermine public confidence in law-enforcement agencies. These oracles of disaster, who by some rare gift are able to answer every question, at least in their own estimation, should have the opportunity sometime to face a practical problem and wrestle with reality.

I think that every law-enforcement administrator, when such situations arise, should take steps at once to insure that the facts are known to the public. This will, of course, require courage. But the cause we serve is greater than any one of us. This thought must ever be in our minds.

Another trend which is again manifesting itself is the tendency on the part of some motion-picture producers to return to the formula which glorifies the criminal and ridicules the law-enforcement officer. This, combined with the gross distortion of historical facts indulged in by certain segments of the motion-picture industry, should receive the serious thought of the mothers and fathers of this Nation. You know how much damage such pictures can do in warping the impressionable minds of our American youth. Whenever any force seeks to glorify gangsterism and prostitute history, then it is time for those interested in law and order and real freedom to let themselves be heard.

Another problem which is rapidly reaching flood-time proportions involves civil violence, race riots, and insidious campaigns against

minority groups. It is a national disgrace and a reflection upon all Americans that altercations between individuals can touch off community-wide conflagrations, which are often seized upon by young teen-age hoodlums of both sexes to indulge in depredations of all kinds against property and persons.

Law enforcement is not responsible for such outbreaks. But, once lawless bands of people begin to take matters into their own hands, law enforcement does become responsible. When outbursts occur, pitting race against race, creed against creed, every officer must recognize his responsibility and realize that the only intelligent course of action is to adopt vigorous, prompt, and firm measures to restore peace. If force must be met with force, see to it that the protectors of law and order are marshaled in superior strength without delay and that they function for the good of all, with proper regard for the rights of all. Remember that crime thrives, violence and murder rage, only where law and public resistance are weak.

The real trouble causing these public outbreaks lies underneath, and we of law enforcement have a right to expect that the situation be recognized and corrected by those civic forces directly charged with such responsibilities. We are fighting for freedom of speech, but I hope the day will come when it will be recognized that freedom of speech does not carry with it the license to destroy, incite, subvert, and misrepresent the truth. Persecution or discrimination that takes place far away is often much easier to recognize than that which occurs in our own community, yet sane tolerance and democracy, like charity, ought to begin at home. They go together. Every victory for intolerance in America is a menace to democracy for all of us.

Our enemies in the war on crime include others than those who murder, rob, and steal. We have the harborers, the perjurers, and that countless class of criminal scum that subsist on the crumbs from the tables of the criminal overlords. And these include the crooked politician, the war racketeer, and the professional loose-mouthed vacuum-minded, rabble-rousers who subsist on the sweat and toil of the decent law-abiding citizen.

Among the enemies of society, we also must include those operators of dens of iniquity, debauchery, and crime, whose love of money eclipses their sense of decency. Then, too, there are the unethical physician and the shyster lawyer, both of whom are driven by the mad desire for money to give aid and assistance to our sworn enemies in this conflict.

Another element that is just as dangerous, yet less apparent until brought into bold relief by the spotlight of public attention, is the subversive group, those termites of discontent and discord, always alert to seize upon racial differences, economic stresses and political difficulties to advance their selfish and venial purposes. These "ism" termites scoff at our democracy and belittle the cherished freedom, liberty and fair play that characterize America. The threat against the American people from within is not merely a Nazi threat. It is the insidious infection of other foreign "isms" creeping up the pillars of the Republic under the false guise of democracy.

I am sure you will agree that delinquent and thoughtless parents are another problem facing us today. Some are victims of circumstances, but others, by their disregard of parental responsibilities and their frenzied chase after the extra pleasures or dollars available in these extraordinary times, forget the most sacred duty of all—that of rearing their children as self-respecting, law-abiding citizens who truly are worthy of the name American. The facts are stark and revealing, and possibly hold the key to this sad situation. Time and time again, children have admitted they did not consider their fathers as representative of honorable manhood, or that they were ashamed of them; and some have even said they were ashamed of their mothers.

What is needed above all else is more enlightened parents, to create better homes and take proper care of their children. Keep boys and girls from becoming criminals when they are young, and you can keep most of them from becoming criminals later in life.

Last year, the number of persons under voting age who were arrested and fingerprinted reached alarming proportions. Today, the situation is worse. The tragedy revealed by our latest survey is found in the fact that the arrests of boys and girls 17 years of age increased 17.7 percent. In reviewing further the trends for the past 6 months, we find an 89-percent increase in the arrests of girls for offenses against common decency. These girls are the future mothers of America. It is tragic that so many lives are ruined which could be useful, simply because right influences were not present at the right time.

Here is a real problem that calls for the intelligence and active interest of every police agency in the land. But this is not law enforcement's problem alone. Our American homes, churches, schools, and youth-serving organizations all must redouble their efforts to help young people make their way successfully to maturity. Law enforcement, having direct contact with crime, is in a better position to curb the perpetration of the actual offense than any other group, but the ultimate solution must come from the home, the church, and the school, through intelligent cooperation.

Yet law enforcement must be in the forefront of crime prevention. It is not alone the problem for sociologists, psychologists, and social reformers. It must be met with realism, understanding, and discipline, untempered with coddling and free from the cloudy mysticisms of new-fangled educational philosophies.

We still have with us those easy-going people who are too busy to vote, too tired to attend community functions, or to take a real interest in these matters of public importance. The sad truth is that most of them ill deserve the privileges and the unmatched freedoms we enjoy in this greatest of all lands. They have the fruits without contributing to the labor for its production.

But therein lies a challenge to you. For every one of these indifferent persons and every one of the delinquent parents you can convert by education and effort into an active supporter of law and order, so much easier will your job become. Citizens must be made to feel that they are a real part of the war; they must know the worst as well as the best.

In meeting your problems, please keep constantly in mind that the F. B. I. is ready every hour of the day and night to assist you. Assuredly, the security of America is law enforcement's greatest responsibility. Our problems, it is true, are major ones. They will try the patience and test the perseverance of strong men. But our war is a holy crusade. It is to protect the dearest of all our institutions—the home and the hearthside, under the double blessing of liberty and freedom. America must do some straight thinking and plain speaking in this hour of crisis. We are fighting not only the greatest military war of our history, but also the skulking enemies within our own gates.

Let us forsake all temptations to slip into careless ways. Let us avoid the tragic consequences of inaction and indecision. Let us be men enough, with courage and determination enough, to do our duty fearlessly here on the front assigned to us.

Then, when our men in khaki return after having won their war, they will find that we have not lost ours.

Chester Bowles Promises More Consideration to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, from a letter I have received from Mr. Chester Bowles, General Manager of the Office of Price Administration, I am informed small business will not be ignored in the future as it has been in the past by that agency. As chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, I have frequently criticized the Office of Price Administration for its dilatory tactics in failing to adjust hardship complaints and for issuing regulations which favored big business.

When Mr. Bowles took charge and began appointing businessmen who represented big business to replace college professors because of distrust by Congress of the latter, I complained to him that this might lead to similar protests because of those appointed or were reported would be appointed.

Mr. Bowles has assured me that he recognizes the problems of small business institutions and that he will demonstrate in the next month or two his genuine interest in that direction. He has expressed regard for their continued existence, and points out that, "One of the biggest single threats to our whole system of free enterprise is the gradual development of large organizations and monopolies which will tend to squeeze out the small independent operator."

CONCERNED OVER SMALL BUSINESS FUTURE OF THE O. P. A.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned over the future outlook. As one of the sponsors of the Emergency Price Control Act, I am heartily in favor of its continuance as an active force in stabilizing prices. Mistakes have been made in the past but this was not the fault of the law but its administration. Rather it was the wrong conception placed upon the spirit of the law.

What some of the administrators of the act apparently knew was what they read in books and certain fancied theories which they conceived. Most of those coming within this classification if not all of them have been separated from this important work. Many of their actions were arbitrary and not founded upon common business practice. They did not follow section 2, paragraph h, which provides that:

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price, schedule, or requirement under this act.

Some radical changes of business practices were injected into regulations. Preferential considerations were shown

in a number of maximum price regulations by operators. Large companies benefited from these regulations while smaller competitors were penalized. Manufacturers were ordered to change their production methods, grade labeling was demanded, and other practices were included that were highly prejudicial to recognized legitimate business of the smaller type.

With this background, Mr. Speaker, I was naturally concerned over the appointment of men representing big interests. I so expressed myself as chairman of the House Committee on Small Business to Mr. Bowles. They had business experience, but it was largely from the standpoint of big business. There is a decided difference in methods between these two types and it is highly important that so-called small business, representing more than 75 percent of total distribution, should not be penalized any more by the minority interests.

MR. BOWLES GIVES ASSURANCE

Mr. Bowles has given me his assurance that he will give small business his personal consideration to see that the complaints of the past will not be indulged in in the future. I shall watch the developments in that important branch which has so much to do with small business in which Members of Congress are deeply interested. We have all been home during the recess and have been able to get the reaction in our own districts from retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers.

We know the importance of maintaining individual initiative and the need of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. I fully believe that the Emergency Price Control Act can be made to operate effectively and with good results to the country if administered according to its provisions.

Therefore, I present herewith the letter of reply of Mr. Chester Bowles, as follows:

AUGUST 30, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I honestly feel that the next 30 days will prove to you that you need have no fears about big business taking over O. P. A.

Jim Brownlee, whom I have known for years, has had wide experience with independent grocers from one end of the country to the other. Mr. Brownlee will head the Price Department. Under him, we will probably have four division heads in place of the present six: Carroll on food, Connolly on the Department Store Division, Sumner Pipe (the only top man in the Price Department who is not affected by the Congressional edict against professors) in charge of Materials and Fuel, and a new man, whom we ought to select the first of this week, in charge of the Manufacturing Division. The man we hope to get to head this division is definitely a small business man * * * at present the head of a small manufacturing company doing less than $500,000 worth of business a year.

It is quite true that both Carroll and Connolly have come from relatively big organizations. However, I know their point of view on the subject of small independents intimately since I have made it a point to talk to them at some length on this subject. I am satisfied that both of them will go to any lengths to see that small business is given every protection.

Already, Jean Carroll has talked to the National Retail Grocers Association, the National Wholesale Grocers Association, the American Wholesale Grocers Association, and the Independent Grocers Association. He has asked each of these groups for their recommendations on the branch heads who will serve under him. They have promised to give us names in the next few days.

We have already offered the head of the Fruit and Vegetable Branch to Ben Keith, a Texan who runs an independent fruit and grocery establishment. Mr. Keith was unable to accept the job because of his health. However, the man to whom we are now offering this same position is a small independent from Minneapolis.

Jean Carroll has also talked to the canners association and I am told that the man most likely to be selected to head that branch is a well-known small businessman.

Reagan Connolly, in the General Merchandising Division, is following the same procedure; that is, talking to all the various groups in the trades with particular emphasis on small business people.

Our Price Division will be staffed during the next few weeks and I am confident that you will agree with me when this job has been completed that small business is more than adequately represented.

As a matter of fact, I have watched with great interest your campaign in behalf of small business over a period of years, as this happens to be a subject after my own heart. It seems clear to me that one of the biggest single threats to our whole system of free enterprise is the gradual development of large organizations and monopolies which will tend to squeeze out the small independent operator. When the small businessman goes, it is very likely that free enterprise as well as our democracy will go along with him.

In Connecticut, where I served as State O. P. A. director for 15 months, I had an opportunity to see the wartime problems of small business from laundries to grocery stores at first hand. I was particularly concerned about the position of the independent grocers under the community price ceiling list, which called for publishing different prices for different sizes of stores. This seemed to me unfair to the independent as it advertised the lower prices of the chains and supermarkets with no counteracting statement of the extra service that the customers usually receive from these smaller independents.

For this reason, we only printed the ceiling prices for the smallest independents. We then controlled the chains and supermarkets below those prices by special lists to be hung in the stores, which applied to their stores only, and also by margin mark-up controls. It is our plan at present to follow this same program on a national basis.

I again want to assure you that I am sincerely concerned over this whole small-business problem and I think that you will find that our action during the next few months will clarify our point of view on the subject beyond any question.

I shall look forward to seeing you and talking to you.

My best personal regards.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, distributors among retailers and wholesalers, as also manufacturers, will be much interested, I feel sure, in what Mr. Bowles said in this letter. It should create a new hope on their part if carried out. They want price stabilization but on a practical and constructive basis.

Women in War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRITZ G. LANHAM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter I have received from Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, with reference to women in war industries and the care of their children during their working hours. This report of General Fleming was sent to me upon my request as chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, which request was made by me in order to get accurate information with reference to the present program concerning the care of children of working war mothers under the so-called Lanham Act:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
Washington, September 13, 1943.

Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANHAM: I am glad to send you herewith the report on our program of child care under the Lanham Act, which you requested. This program has been pursued actively for the past year under the able direction of Mrs. Florence Kerr, Director of our War Public Services program, who has had long previous experience in this field. Federal assistance has been provided on a substantial scale and, in certain communities, has proved an invaluable aid to war production.

In general, however, the use of the facilities thus far has been disappointing. The results point to need for a careful reexamination of the program, a discriminating limitation of allotments of Federal funds, and a change in the approach to the problem.

Summarizing briefly our information and our conclusions, as of today, it seems clear that the need for child-care services up to this time largely has been met insofar as Federal financing could meet it. Most of the child-care facilities are in the right areas; that is, where they should have maximum usefulness. As you know, there is no Federal operation. It is Federal Works Agency's responsibility to allot Federal funds to applicants to meet war needs. Nearly $12,000,000 had been allotted up to August 1. It is the responsibility of the applicant to operate the facilities after allotments have been made. Operation, which for the most part has been in the hands of school systems, is deficient, although there are highly creditable exceptions. Of more controlling importance, it appears that mothers have not taken jobs or continued to hold jobs in the numbers anticipated and that provision for child care alone is by no means a solution of the problem of effective utilization of womanpower.

Not quite half of the 3,385 nurseries and child care centers, which were reported to us as urgently needed, were so certified by other Federal agencies and were therefore approved, have actually been put into operation by the local sponsors. This seems plainly to indicate that the effective demand from the mothers, evidenced in a readiness to make commitments, has not measured up to the early estimates of need. Facilities in operation were being used, as of August 11, to less than half of capacity. Therefore less

than one-fourth of the total capacity of approved facilities were being used.

While the need for wartime child-care services is extensive, much of this need will manifest itself in effective demand from the mothers for the services only as working and living conditions may become better adapted to mothers working. And insofar as the demand is immediate and compelling it is not being met fully by the types of service and operation now being provided.

To meet these conditions we are undertaking the following measures:

New or additional facilities will be approved by this agency where, but only where, the war need is abundantly evident and there is more concrete assurance of their use. Previously approved projects will be extended only as effective use is proved in operation, by attendance and by satisfactory local support.

In allotting funds for new facilities, F. W. A., while continuing to work with school systems and other applicants where there is satisfactory assurance of use, plans to act in close cooperation with the War and Navy Departments and with industry, as principal seats of the demand for womanpower, so that there may be utmost possible assurance that the facilities will be utilized fully. Wherever possible—and safe—the facilities should be located close to the military installations or the industrial plants so that the transportation obstacle may be removed and the children may be close to the mothers. This holds promise of removing two major obstructions to effective use of facilities. The operating entity and the operating method will be adapted to these changes and efforts will be made to achieve maximum participation by other interested groups in the community.

Projects and units not meeting a substantial war need are being closed out and the allotments rescinded. This will be continued, guided by the results of further examination and conference with applicants.

A more complete spot check has been projected to follow the opening of the schools to determine how far, if at all, the end of the vacation season may lead to increased enrollments.

Funds will be kept available to provide additional assistance as the employment of mothers may be enlarged and as sufficient military and industrial as well as community backing may be obtained to give reasonable assurance of effective use of the facilities.

As we get more information and additional experience I shall be able to inform you more fully and conclusively both as to the outlook for this activity and our administrative action with respect to individual projects.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General, U. S. A., Administrator.

Waging War on Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun:

WAGING WAR ON ROOSEVELT

It used to be easy, when certain industrialists met to rip the New Deal, to dismiss the event by observing that American reactionaries, like the Bourbons of France, seldom learn anything. But it isn't funny that a conference of top-flight business leaders, called by Donald Nelson to discuss production, should degenerate into an indiscriminate attack on the administration. That is what happened last week, according to information furnished the Chicago Sun by a disgusted informant.

It is not amusing when a large number of industrialists are more interested in complaining about persecution than in planning to meet critical prouction within our established frame work.

It isn't a joke when, in a war for democracy, certain businessmen cite the Army's discipline and longingly suggest a similar discipline for labor, nor when they agitate abolition of overtime pay—which means a wage cut—as the best manpower solution, nor when they reveal their ancient personal hatred of Mr. Roosevelt still smoldering and burning.

Before the war, anti-New Deal, anti-labor phobias were relatively harmless. The philosopher could recall that the coal barons of England, in the early 1900's, fought social reform with vehemence. Who will hate Roosevelt tomorrow—any more than British conservatives hate Lloyd George and Churchill today for having driven through Britain's first social-security laws?

But now, when the country faces enormous problems, when labor's wages are frozen to formula, when heavy taxation and severe economic controls are essential, it betrays an appalling psychological failure for reactionary industrialists to prosecute an anti-New Deal vendetta. It is as disruptive as John L. Lewis' persistence in waging war on Roosevelt instead of Hitler.

This newspaper, having knowledge of the more progressive viewpoint of many industrialists, does not believe the reactionary type of thinking is typical of the whole. By and large, American businessmen and industrialists are thinking more constructively today on major problems than for many decades.

Address by the Honorable James M. Barnes, Assistant to the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by the Honorable James M. Barnes, Assistant to the President of the United States, before the executives of 26 Illinois rural electric cooperatives in Springfield, Ill., on August 19, 1943.

It is as follows:

To me, the wide interest that has been attracted by this meeting on rural electrification is a sign of one of the most encouraging developments in American life. I refer to the increasing awareness of the American people as a whole about the problems of food supply and of the farmers who produce that supply.

Americans are thinking more realistically about the food they eat than ever before. That is a healthy thing. As a people we have been inclined to take food and our farmers pretty much for granted. The spectacular achievements of American industry have overshadowed the achievements of the farm for the public as a whole. That is no longer the case. Food is news today, and the country will be better off because it is.

The fact that the war has forced us to ration food may prove to be a blessing in disguise if it makes people realize that the abundance of food in this country is an undisguised blessing.

The Army, of course, and the Navy, and the Air Forces are keenly aware of the tremendous importance of food and the farmer in meeting their military schedules. Napoleon's famous maxim that "armies travel on their stomachs" was never more perfectly demonstrated than in this global war. The victories the United Nations are winning today are victories of camp kitchens as well as of bullets, of food warehouses as well as of bombs.

Consequently, you men who are the primary source of supply for the Nation's most important single resource have a personal stake in the military victories of the day. Every American farmer who is cooperating with the Nation's food program is entitled to feel a glow of pride in the impressive military power which this country has shown. For he has contributed to that power.

In fact, he has contributed to a miracle of productivity. You remember that shocking Pearl Harbor Sunday, when the radio told incredulous American that a Jap air fleet had swept out of the sky and destroyed some of our proudest battleships. Look back to that day, and then think where we stand now. We have come a long way, haven't we? The challenge that the Nazis and the Japs threw down to us was unprecedented in its danger and its enormous scale, but we have met that challenge and are crushing it, steadily and surely.

As the war began, sober warnings were given by our military leaders, our production chiefs, and our top Government officials. This war wasn't going to be a pushover, they told us. We could lose this war, they said.

That was a realistic warning. It was an intelligent warning. And it was grand to see how the people took it. You could almost see the Nation stripping off its coats and rolling up its shirt sleeves. You could almost hear 130,000,000 Americans saying out of the corners of their mouths, "Oh, yeah?"

Now, 20 months later, we have raised military forces totaling some 9,000,000 men. We have sent nearly one-fourth of those men overseas to smash the enemy wherever we find him. When President Roosevelt set the challenging goal of 50,000 planes last year, and equally unheard-of quantities of munitions and shipping, many people thought the figures fantastic. But today those goals are obsolete. Today we are concerned because our plane production was only 7,300 planes in July. In 1 month alone this Nation has turned out more tonnage of merchant shipping than the combined allied and neutral shipping which the Axis Powers were able to sink in 6 months.

But the tremendous job which our Nation has done since Pearl Harbor really began before Pearl Harbor. It began even before the lend-lease program by which we aided the British to survive the Nazi attack. Our preparations to defend ourselves have their roots in the years when we built up and preserved the potential strength of this Nation. When, 10 years ago, we undertook to keep our depression-hit people, our industries, and our farms in sound operating condition, we were already defending ourselves against attack. The reserves of strength which we are drawing on today were built up through the measures taken then to maintain the health and working skills of our people, to keep our businesses solvent, our industries producing, to rebuild and preserve our soil, and

to keep our farms and our farmers on the land and on their feet.

We took a notable step in our preparations to defend our free American democratic way of life when in 1935 we set up the Rural Electrification Administration, to carry the advantages of electrical power to all farm producers

When this program was started, only 750,000 farms, slightly more than 10 percent of all our farms, received electricity from central power stations. But at the end of 1941 when we entered the war, more than 2,000,000 of our farms had this service. Today, despite wartime restrictions, that number has been increased to more than 2,300,000.

We could ill afford today to be without the tremendous assistance that many of our farms are receiving from electrical energy. Food and our capacity to produce it his suddenly become a No. 1 factor in our war against the fascist aggressors. Electrical energy, by saving labor on the farm and increasing production, is now being translated into the calories and the vitamins, into the tremendous human energies that it takes to win a war like this.

Our farmers produced a record food crop last year, and they are doing a remarkable production job again this year. The weather has had a lot to do with it, of course. But let us not give weather too much credit. Weather did not plant and cultivate and harvest the crops. Weather did not feed the livestock and milk the cows. That was done by men and women and children on the farm. And on more than two million farms their efforts were multiplied by electrical energy that had at last come to their service.

We are fortunate, I repeat, that we launched this program in 1935. The country would have been wise to do it sooner. For years our farms, and particularly our smaller family farms that constitute the backbone of American agriculture, stood at the side of the road while power lines passed them by to serve the closely organized cities and their suburbs. The Government had to open the way and develop the means whereby the average farm could share in modern power benefits.

When we entered the war, we had 35 percent of our farms served by electricity. Germany, however, had long before electrified 90 percent of its farms. That is a grim thought. It carries a lesson for the future. We shall never again allow our agriculture to take a back seat in our progress as a Nation. Our strength does not lie only in the numbers of ships and guns and planes that we possess or can turn out. The real roots of that strength are the opportunities for full production and a healthful life that we have opened to all our people in farms and cities, to large and small operators alike.

Our war effort would be greatly strengthened today if we could extend now, to all our remaining farm plants, power and equipment similar to that enjoyed by the 2,300,000 farms now connected with central power stations. But, as you know, that cannot be done. The urgent need for critical materials for war production leaves no choice in the matter. At this time, further line extensions must be severely limited and must serve only the most essential demands.

Some, who for private reasons have long opposed the Rural Electrification program, seem to take pleasure in this enforced curtailment of rural electrification. They seem to consider the war restrictions as evidence that the Rural Electrification program is no longer needed. That is about as logical as saying we don't need water in a drought.

We need every bit of energy on our farms today that we can get. The Rural Electrification program is essential in helping to supply this energy to maximum production of food, without which we cannot win the war. And this is leaving aside the fact that many war production plants and services, including camps, aviation bases, radio beacons, and defense housing developments, are drawing their power from Rural Electrification systems.

Electric power has been a big factor in helping the American farmer carry the burden of food production in this war and that burden has been steadily growing heavier. During the first few months of the war in Europe the principal effect on food markets came from disrupted trade relations and interference with ocean shipping. Our food exports dropped off. Then came the blitzkreig of 1940. One European nation after another succumbed to German invasion. Italy joined forces with Germany. Unlike the First World War when markets in western Europe remained open to the United States, 1940 found the British Isles practically the only important overseas market for American farm products.

And for several reasons even that market was not a very active one. Great Britain had to keep down her food imports in order to acquire other essential war materials.

But as the threat of the Nazis and the Japs to this country became clear, we launched our own great defense program. As that program got under way, the demand for farm commodities sharply increased. Prices likewise rose. Then the lend-lease program went into effect, expanding our agricultural markets still more. The same farmers who had curtailed production in the 1930's in order to help maintain prices, now had to start expanding their output. And the more they expanded, the more they were asked to produce.

Today demands on our food supply resulting from the enormous expansion of our war effort go beyond anything the country has yet known. The American soldier in this war is eating even more than he did in the last war, for he is 10 pounds heavier and 1 inch taller. Today a single combat soldier eats about 5½ pounds of food every day compared with 3 pounds that are required by the average civilian. The American fighting man needs and gets about 4,500 calories a day—about 1,500 to 3,000 calories more than you and I need. And, of course, his diet must be well-rounded. He must be guaranteed all the vitamins, minerals, fats, and carbohydrates, all the calcium and phosphorus required to keep the human body at fighting pitch.

When we prepare for a military offensive we must store up great quantities of foodstuffs, just as we pile up stocks of munitions and gasoline. No new offensive can be undertaken without the assurance that ample food supplies are warehoused and ticketed for their destinations.

Food supplies are taken into account in laying out military schedules, just as much as guns. Unless we meet our food production schedules here at home, the Army cannot carry out its strategic plans abroad. The man on the farm is not merely a producer of food—in a very real sense he is part of our military service of supply. Although he wears overalls instead of a uniform, he nevertheless has a military obligation to produce to the top level of his capacity.

You have to consider, too, the importance of the American food supply for our fighting allies. In effect, we are giving them food in return for saved American lives. The battles that they win are battles that our men will never have to fight. Every Nazi slain by a Russian Army man—every Jap slain by a soldier of China—is a Nazi or a Jap who will never have a chance to kill an American.

Food for our hard-working civilian population, for our Army, for our allies, and for the invaded areas—all this demands tremendous productivity on the farms. The call has gone out for 4,780,000,000 dozen eggs this year. We need to produce 122,000,000,000 pounds of milk. We need to slaughter 30,400,000 cattle and calves, 24,000,000 sheep and lambs, 4,000,000,000 pounds of dressed chickens, 13,800,000,000 pounds of dressed pork. These astronomical figures are an indication of the tremendous task which lies ahead of the American farmer—not to mention the vast quantities of cereals and vegetables that must be grown. And this must be done at a time when the labor supply is only 58 percent of normal and when most farmers are working against shortages imposed by war—shortages of machinery, storage facilities, transportation facilities, and many kinds of supplies.

I know that the problem of manpower is especially in your minds. That problem is still growing more acute. War production requirements are going up—and so are farm-labor requirements—while the Army needs to provide fighting forces for its tremendous victory drive against the Axis. Inevitably manpower has been drained from the civilian economy of this country in order to serve in the armed forces or in war production plants. But some encouraging factors can now be seen in the picture. More than 90 divisions and a thousand squadrons of planes in our tremendous Army have been organized. Now it is possible to taper off manpower requirements for the armed forces. Already the numerous training schools for officers and specialists have been greatly reduced. The Army is now entering into the phase of development where the emphasis is being put on perfection of quality rather than on additional numbers.

The manpower shortage, of course, will be with us until this war is won. But the farmers of America are used to doing a hard job under difficult circumstances. I know that American farms, like American factories, have the energy, the grim determination, and the staying power to do whatever is needful in order to win this war as soon as the job can be done.

In spite of recent successes we know that there is still a lot of hard fighting to be done. Our fighting men will have to go through a harsh ordeal before we can destroy this ugly, venomous thing that has come upon the world bearing the name of fascism. The job has to be done no matter what the cost. And all of us, regardless of our work, today have part of the responsibility for that job.

Food will not only help to win the war, but it will also help to win the peace when the time comes to talk peace. Large parts of the world are looking to America for guidance and salvation for the future. The fact that we can save peoples from famine and hunger as we help them to restore their self-respect will inestimably enhance America's position of economic and moral leadership in the post-war world. Both nationally and internationally, it is of the utmost importance that we assure the sound position of the American farmer after the war, as well as during the war.

Of course, that is easier to say than to do. The agricultural program of today is enormous and complex. But I can tell you that the Government is watching closely every change in world conditions that may affect the American farmer, and is adapting the program to the best interests of the country and the farmer. The purpose of the Government is to do everything that can be done, both during the war and after the war, to assist farmers in adjusting production, in disposing of surpluses, and in maintaining fair prices and income.

For the first time in the 1930's, the country began to recognize the tremendous problems of the farmer—such problems as erosion control, soil building, and land reclamation—such problems as crop hazards and price differentials. Whatever the future may bring, the Nation as a whole must never again lose sight of the primary interests of the farm. For those interests touch the very life-stream of the people as a whole.

Up to now, for example, there has perhaps not been enough mutual understanding on the part of agriculture and labor. One of the good things which I hope will come out of this period of war is a closer understanding of each other's problems by farmers and industrial workers. During wartime, many a farm boy is going to find himself working and fighting next to men who have grown up in industrial work. They are bound to exchange views and ideas and experiences. The kind of understanding that can be developed in that way, the intimate awareness of the other fellow's problem, can be a strong force for the harmonious progress of the Nation in the time to come.

We will need harmony and understanding. For we have some serious obstacles to face, and we can face them successfully only if we face them together. Inflation in particular is an ugly menace. I know that all of you men who are gathered here today must be keenly aware of the dangers of inflation. I know you realize that although inflation would carry farm prices upward, farm equipment, supplies, labor, taxes and other costs would go up as well. Past experience suggests that some of these rising prices would stay up considerably longer than any higher prices paid to the farm. No one has more to lose from inflation than the farmer. My own contacts have assured me that farsighted men of agriculture everywhere see these problems clearly. But on the farm and elsewhere, we all have the responsibility to check inflationary tendencies that would raise prices for everybody and bring profit to nobody except a few speculators.

With success in checking the inflationary menace, I believe the farmers of America can look forward to the future with confidence. History itself is coming to the farmer's aid. At the beginning of our history America was an agricultural Nation. Then we became predominantly an industrial Nation. For a long period after the Civil War, the people and the Government lost sight of the farmer's problem. Now agriculture is once more coming back into its own, not as something separate from industry, but as a pillar side by side with industry in supporting the great economic and social structure of our Nation.

We are coming into an age of improved nutrition. This is bound to mean expansion in outlets for certain farm products. Education will influence consumer selection, and improved food distribution will increase demand. Dietary needs will take first place in the thinking of people as the basis of health and working energy.

There is a great new surge of interest in farm life and farm methods. This age of scientific agricultural development and improved understanding of diet is opening up vast new horizons for the farmer, as well as for every other group of American citizens. The great trend toward rural electrification is one of the splendid rays of hope in this new dawn. I believe from the bottom of my heart that the future of American agriculture is brighter today, and that the chances of the American farmer for a good life are better today than ever before in American history.

In Time of War Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NAT PATTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Roy Miller, of Corpus Christi, Tex., active vice president, Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, at conference of the association's membership at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943:

Measured in terms of tangible accomplishment, the past year has witnessed greater progress toward the ultimate achievement of the objectives of this association than in any like period of time since it was brought into being at Victoria, Tex., 38 years ago when patriotic and far-seeing citizens of Louisiana and Texas assembled at the call of the distinguished life president of the association, and perfected its organization. While that remarkable progress might not have occurred so speedily except for the tragedy of war, the association, I think, can claim a substantial share of credit for it.

After extensive hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, Congress passed and the President approved on July 23, 1942, the Mansfield bill, known as H. R. 6999. This important enactment, drafted, introduced, and sponsored by Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD of the Ninth District of Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, authorized:

1. The enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Carrabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex., a distance of 864 miles, from its existing dimensions of a 9-foot depth and 100-foot bottom width to a depth of 12 feet and bottom width of 125 feet.

2. The extension and completion of the intracoastal canal from Corpus Christi to the Rio Grande Valley on the basis of the same dimensions, and

3. The construction of a barge canal 12 feet deep and 150 feet wide from the west coast of Florida to Jacksonville, Fla., to connect with the existing 12-foot inland waterway extending from Jacksonville to Trenton, N. J., a distance of 1,064 miles.

During the month of October last year, Congress appropriated $6,485,000 to start the work of enlargement of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and the actual execution of the project was immediately begun.

In the second deficiency bill passed by the Congress on the eve of its recess July 8 of this year, there was appropriated the sum of $7,090,000 which, according to the estimate submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, will complete the enlargement of the entire waterway from Carrabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi. By this time next year the job should be finished.

Construction of the barge canal across Florida and the extension and completion of the Intracoastal Canal to the Rio Grande Valley may have to await the end of the war. In a letter addressed to Judge MANSFIELD, dated July 1, 1943, the President said, in reference to the Florida barge canal:

"I have always realized the importance of an adequate and continuous inland waterway for barge traffic along our Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast. * * * As yet, it has not been feasible to undertake work on sections of the waterway not now in existence, primarily because of shortages of manpower, materials, and equipment. Detailed plans and specifications for the Florida barge canal will be prepared so that its construction can proceed without delay as soon as these shortages are overcome."

While no definite decision has been announced by those in authority in respect to the extension to the valley, and no promises have been made, there is a chance or at least a hope that construction work may not have to await final termination of hostilities. When the enlargement now in progress to Corpus Christi is completed, dredging plant may be available and since no critical materials are involved there is a possibility that some of these dredges can be put to work on the extension.

The assured reality of a 12-foot inland waterway all along the Gulf coast, and the prospect that some time in the not far distant future we will have a 12-foot inland waterway "from Maine to Mexico" naturally recall the difficulties, vicissitudes, and disappointments of earlier years. Although the original objective of the association was "an inland waterway from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande," I am quite sure that in their most exuberant enthusiasms none of the early pioneers in the Intracoastal Canal movement ever had such a great waterway in mind. It is interesting to recall that the first result of their effort was a little canal 5 feet deep and 40 feet wide, which extended across the State of Louisiana and was ultimately constructed with the same dimensions from Galveston to Corpus Christi. Of course, those determined pioneers never had any idea of accepting a canal of that sort in full satisfaction of their vision and purpose. At our convention held in Houma, La., in October 1922, and largely at the insistence of our president, Hon. C. S. E. Holland, and the then chairman of our advisory council, the late J. S. Cullinan, our association adopted a definite and vigorous program demanding an adequate canal with a depth of not less than 9 feet "from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande."

Such a project (a canal 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide) was authorized from New Orleans to Corpus Christi in the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1925 and 1927. Most of you are familiar with subsequent events. These measures were mere authorizations and did not appropriate the money to build the canal. Meeting conditions imposed by the Government on local interests, which included the furnishing of rights-of-way, the construction of highway bridges at local expense, the provision of spoil-disposal areas and many other difficult tasks, took time and trouble and required the manifestation of unusual public spirit upon the part of the communities along the route of the waterway. In due course, these obstacles were surmounted and the canal was finally completed to Corpus Christi.

Meantime the association continued its persistent efforts to assure the completion of the canal to the Rio Grande valley. Numerous surveys were made and economic reports submitted, but it was not until about 2 years ago that the Army engineers recommended construction. Now, however, under the broad terms of the Mansfield bill the extension is not only authorized but for a 12-foot instead of a 9-foot waterway.

So much for what has gone before. What lies ahead? What of your association's future activities?

First and foremost, of course, is a final completion to the Rio Grande, which has been the fixed goal of your association ever since it was organized more than three decades ago. Construction has been authorized. All that is needed is the money to do the work, an amount which probably will not exceed $5,000,000.

There may be those who might say, "let nature take its course" and "when the time comes" Congress will make the necessary appropriation. Unfortunately, and I speak from long experience, Congress does not always operate that way. The full force and influence of our association should be applied constantly and unrelentingly until the money is actually appropriated and construction contracts let.

There is another factor which, in my opinion, may require a continuance of organized effort even after a finished canal is an accomplished fact. We want a waterway that will be used, a waterway which will provide actual transportation facilities to the hundreds of

communities it will serve throughout the fertile reaches "from the Mississippi to the Rio Grande." Everyone knows that vigorous forces are constantly at work to destroy water transportation or, when they cannot totally destroy it, to cripple and limit its services. I speak for myself and I know I speak for the fast-diminishing group of patriotic citizens of Louisiana and Texas who initiated this movement when I say that we have never sought and do not now seek to build a waterway merely for the purpose of influencing freight rates. Of course, that is the inevitable result of waterways, otherwise they would not be built, but what we have had in mind and shall ever keep in mind is a great water transportation facility that will actually handle a tremendous commerce consisting of those commodities which particularly lend themselves to water carriage. I am thinking of raw materials, natural resource products, and things of that sort which normally do not move at all without cheap water transportation.

So far as I am concerned, I want the Intracoastal Canal to be a usable transportation facility that will do its full part in bringing about the great era of industrial progress and development which, if aided by cheap transportation, is certain to occur everywhere throughout the territory served by the canal. The Intracoastal Canal Association should continue as a protective agency to see to it that the great enterprise we have created and constructed is not despoiled and destroyed by its enemies.

As great as its services already are and as extensive as will be development in the territory it immediately traverses, that service is and will be largely limited to a restricted area contiguous to it. Its benefits ought to be extended as far inland as may be possible in both Louisiana and Texas. Therefore every stream and bayou in Louisiana and every river and inlet in Texas that bisects and connects with the canal (which can be feasibly and economically improved for navigation purposes) should be developed, put to use and become a part of the Intracoastal Canal system of Louisiana and Texas. Many of these bayous and streams have already been surveyed and recommended in whole or in part for such improvement. The possibilities of others should be explored and studied. Since the activities of this association have been generously supported throughout the years by many citizens, interests and communities not located directly upon the route of the canal, I personally feel it is the definite obligation of the organization to assist in bringing about such of these improvements as may be worthy.

I may be pardoned, I trust, if I say that the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, because of its long experience and large accomplishments, does have considerable influence and, I think, is everywhere respected by those in authority.

I do not need to point out to this audience, composed of progressive and thoughtful citizens of Louisiana and Texas, that the development of the water transportation facilities of our two great States has been chiefly responsible for the remarkable progress and growth they have enjoyed, particularly in their coastal areas, during the past 25 years. No two states in the Union possess greater possibilities for industrial expansion. They have in prodigal abundance the basic natural resources upon which the structure of a great industrial empire can be erected. They have the resources, they have the climate assuring ideal working conditions, and are in a position to supply in supplement of these advantages the most important factor in the industrial and commercial equation, namely, unexampled water transportation facilities.

The matchless progress of Texas in industry during the past 25 years, for example, can be measured almost precisely by the yardstick of port and waterway improvements. Thirty years ago the total commerce handled by all Texas ports and waterways was less than 10,000,000 tons annually. In 1937, before the recession of movements by water because of world conditions, the total commerce of Texas ports and waterways approximated 100,000,000 tons in volume and $2,000,000,000 in value.

When peace comes and our normal economy is restored, this remarkable trend is certain to resume. Decentralization of industry, one of the lessons we learned even before the war was thrust upon us, will pay its tribute to the superior advantages of the great Southwest. The extent to which we may profit by it will depend in no small degree upon our ability to improve, enlarge, and extend our water transportation facilities.

This great era of progress should not be limited to the comparatively few communities along the coast which possess the priceless advantage of cheap water transportation. Wherever it is possible from the standpoint of engineering feasibility and economic justification to improve our interior waterways connecting with our ports and the great Intracoastal Canal, it should be done. It is, I think, sound public policy to extend the incomparable benefits of cheap water transportation as far into the interior as may be feasible, practicable, and economic.

I am not suggesting such a program for immediate accomplishment. I submit it as something to think about, talk about, and plan about. No expenditure should be made now which is not essential to winning the war. No one can foretell when the war will end, and it may come with unexpected suddenness. When peace does come, we must be prepared to substitute private enterprise for public expenditure as speedily as possible. We shudder at the prospect of a national debt in figures which the human mind cannot comprehend, and we sometimes wonder whether we can preserve our system of private enterprise under the load of Federal, State, and local taxation we shall have to carry.

Personally, I am no pessimist as to the future of America. If our country is worth the toil, sacrifice, and blood of our boys who are fighting and dying to save it, we must and can find a way to insure not only her preservation but a greater and more glorious future. Our job is to plan and build a greater, richer, more prosperous, and powerful America. We can do that by a fuller development and use of our matchless natural resources.

Many years ago when the Congress of the United States passed the first billion-dollar appropriation bill for the maintenance of the Federal Government and when many doubted the Nation's ability to exist under such extravagance, the then Speaker of the House of Representatives declared, "Why, we've got a $1,000,000,000 country." Since that time our country has grown and prospered beyond imagination and Federal expenditures have reached astronomical totals. Waste, extravagance, and useless expenditures must be eliminated and unnecessary Federal services eradicated. But the thing we must bear in mind is that the possibilities for growth in America are still unlimited. We can assure America's glorious future and her continued uninterrupted progress by increasing our national wealth production. In that ambitious program the fullest possible development of our water resources, which constitute our most valuable national asset, offers the greatest opportunity. The utilization of these resources for every service of which they are capable, including flood control, irrigation, reclamation, soil conservation, hydroelectric power where it can be economically produced, as well as navigation, will bestow upon America a new frontier of limitless possibilities. The Congress should lose no time in setting up the program. In time of war, let us prepare for peace, and a greater and more glorious future.

Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue Brings Over $56,000,000 to Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, as shown by the annual report, the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue continues its record of placing in the Treasury an amount greatly in excess of its appropriations. This money comes from taxpayers who tried to defraud the Government. Following will be found a brief statement submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury:

Citizens who live by cheating the public usually are disposed to cheat on Uncle Sam—but Uncle Sam can't be fooled for long.

This is one conclusion that can be drawn from the fiscal year report of the Intelligence Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, submitted to Secretary Morgenthau by Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Treasury Enforcement Agencies.

W. H. Woolf, Chief of the Intelligence Unit, said the Unit, in the process of rounding up chiselers against the Nation's wartime revenue needs, placed behind prison bars a professional card sharp whose "take" over a period of years approached six figures, a wealthy lottery czar, a racketeering tax adviser, and two purveyors of Blue Sky mining stock.

The exposure of these and other instances of mulcting the public was, so far as the Intelligence Unit is concerned, merely incidental to the business of prosecuting frauds against the Nation's tax laws. This work on the part of Intelligence and Revenue agents resulted in recommended additional tax assessments during the year ended June 30, of $56,444,954. The agents made nearly 1,000 of these investigations, and of those cases where criminal prosecution was instituted, 95 persons were brought to trial and 92 convicted. Criminal proceedings were instituted against 23 additional persons on miscellaneous charges, 17 were tried, and 15 convicted.

Mr. Woolf reported that judicial consciousness of wartime revenue needs resulted in an increasing tendency on the part of the courts to mete out severe sentences to persons convicted of tax frauds.

The long career of the card sharp, William D. Frad, of New York, who made his living by his wits, was terminated by the agents. Painstaking checking of his financial transactions and the identification and question-

ing of his victims built up a convincing picture of income unreported to the Government, and he drew 2½ years in Federal prison.

Officers said Frad posed as a son of a prominent family, associated with influential people, and plied his trade on trains and ocean steamers.

Evidence was that Frad, after becoming acquainted with wealthy individuals, would engage them in gambling games, during which the victims were led through early winnings into playing for high stakes. Then the professional and his confederates would "take" the amateurs for large sums. One businessman lost $96,000 in a single instance. The Treasury officers proposed additional taxes of $100,000 against Frad for the years 1936 and 1937.

Joseph Hotze, of Boston, was found guilty of income-tax evasion approximating $85,000 for the years 1936 through 1939, and was sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment and fined $10,000. Agents charged that Hotze had engaged in an illegal lottery business for a long period. Hotze failed to learn from a previous brush with Intelligence agents. He had been sentenced to 3 months in jail in 1935 after pleading guilty to income-tax charges. Officers said he continued his operations after this conviction, amassed a small fortune and acquired a luxurious home, while systematically understating his income for Federal tax purposes.

The Intelligence agents charged that Hugh Wilton and James Maxfield, of Las Vegas, Nev., made large profits by selling mining stock through fraud and misrepresentation, and evaded income taxes of $30,000 each. Both of the men were sentenced by the court to a year in jail, and were fined the exceptional amount of $20,000 each.

Another drastic money penalty was in the case of Dr. James W. Tipton, of Danville, Va., who also was fined $20,000, on a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of income-tax evasion over a 5-year period.

One of the neatest rackets uncovered by the Treasury brought a 2 years' prison term to Albert C. Harris, of Edwardsville, Ohio. Harris, whose business was assisting clients in preparing their returns, had them sign statements which originally showed their correct tax status, then altered the returns by setting up fictitious claims for exemptions and deductions. He pocketed the difference resulting from the lower tax liability. Harris went so far as to show an unmarried school teacher as having a dependent child which allegedly entitled her to $400 exemption under the revenue law as it existed at the time.

D. O. Mecklenberg, of Billings, Mont., and Glen C. Ackerman, of Great Falls, Mont., were prosecuted for making false statements concerning existence of a fictitious excise tax on gas-storage tanks.

An interesting tax case involving Japanese subjects developed during the year, in Florida, as a result of the seizure by Treasury agents of the assets of aliens following the attack on Pearl Harbor. Shinyu Noro, Shoei Marahide Goto, and Harna Taniguchi were in business in St. Petersburg, operating a restaurant known as Nikko Inn.

Inspection of their seized records disclosed two sets of books, one in Japanese and one in English. The revenue agent called into the case made a careful study of the Japanese characters and developed considerable ability in deciphering them. The investigation showed that the correct income, as recorded in Japanese, was $40,000 more than that reported in the English books on which tax returns were based.

The three were indicted. One of them is now in Japan, another in a detention camp, and the third is awaiting trial.

The Operation of O. P. A. as It Affects Manufacturers, Processors, Middlemen, Farmers, and Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address delivered by me over WMAL, Blue Network, on the evening of August 28, 1943. I believe that this address will be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and especially to my many friends and constituents in the Second South Carolina District. In mailing speeches to our constituents, as far as I am concerned, it is for the sole purpose of keeping them posted concerning problems confronting the Congress and my position and views thereon.

The address follows:

Last night I listened to a speech by Marvin Jones, the food czar. I was reminded of a real politician engaged in a red-hot campaign for reelection, trying to get the good will and the votes of the farmers. I am wondering what Donald Nelson, General Hershey, Paul McNutt, and especially Prentiss Brown, are going to say about it.

When the Office of Price Administration was set up, I requested a conference with those in charge. Dr. Galbraith and two other representatives called on me at my office. At that time I advocated actual price fixing to all groups from the bottom up, including fixed prices on farm products with a 100-percent bottom based on what farmers have to pay for that which they purchase, including the total cost of labor, with proper differentials for those operating between the farmer and the consumer, with price ceilings thereon.

You remember the O. P. A. started out with fixing prices on certain farm products, somewhere between the farmer and the consumer, stating at the time what would be a fair price for farmers based on the so-called parity formula, but prices of farm products were not actually fixed with a 100-percent bottom; they were subject to manipulation by speculators and by those who operate between farmers and consumers. The price on products placed under price ceilings rose gradually, but the prices of farm products and goods uncontrolled advanced so that the trend line of average retail prices, especially food, has continued upward at an unchanged angle not in any way increasing the farm prices, but at the expense of the consuming public.

An announcement has gone out this week by the O. P. A. that they are going to do something about the high prices to consumers on fruits and vegetables. Why this late attempt to remedy the serious situation, when the season for fresh fruits and vegetables is fast coming to a close?

Ask housewives how they have been held up and robbed with unfair, unreasonable high prices on fruits and vegetables. Today I priced peaches within one block of the Capitol; they were 27 cents per pound, $13.50 per bushel. This week, however, I tried to sell sweet potatoes from my farm. I was offered $3 to $4 per bushel. Here in Washington sweet potatoes are selling at 12½ to 15 cents per pound, $7.50 to $9.00 per bushel.

I wish I had the time to give you definite information concerning how the large meat packers were called into conference with the officials of the O. P. A. in connection with the price fixing of meat products in 1942, and how they put over a real stab in the back on the small meat packers, hog and cattle producers.

It would be equally interesting to tell you about how the O. P. A. proceeds to give relief to processors and manufacturers of farm products when they complain. This was illustrated in the case of Procter & Gamble—manufacturers of soap products—with roll-back of prices on fats and oils at the expense of producers of these products, so as to take care of every item of cost, including labor, advertising, radio programs, and profits as usual, all of which is paid by the consuming public.

How about farmers? Last year farmers were supposed to receive $50 per ton for their cottonseed. They sold for $35 to $50 per ton. In buying back cottonseed meal for fertilizer and feeding livestock, farmers had to pay a fixed price amounting to $8.50 per ton, added to the manufacturer's price, to take care of middlemen, jobbers, brokers, commission buyers, wholesalers, and retailers.

Government and lend-lease have purchased the best, regardless of the price, which means all of the good grades of cotton have been consumed and millions of bales of low-grade cotton have piled up in the hands of the Government and farmers.

Because of the shortage of labor this year, and the inability of the farmers to harvest their cotton promptly and properly, at least 75 percent of the total crop will grade Middling and below.

Under the price fixing arrangement, textile mills get low prices on low-grade cotton at the expense of cotton farmers. The present spread differentials on low-grade cotton (Middling and below) have been widened anywhere from $3 to $20 per bale in comparison with the price differentials in 1939–40, which will amount to actual losses of millions of dollars to cotton farmers.

From an investigation made by my committee last year, we found that the various war agencies were operating independently of each other, without a well balanced, coordinated program.

The War Production Board was operating without any serious regard to the importance of allocating priorities on critical material for the manufacture of improved labor-saving machinery to take the place of the shortage of farm labor.

Mr. McNutt, Manpower Commissioner, with the assistance of the United States employment agencies in the various States of the Union who are advertising daily for laborers, was concerned only in getting every one possible for employment by war contractors and war industries, who are operating under guaranteed "profit plus" contracts with practically no limit to the payment of high wages, apparently not realizing what it would mean in draining farmers and farm laborers away from the farms.

General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and those in authority connected with the drafting of men for the Service apparently were interested only in seeing to it that they would be able to establish an Army of 10 million by the end of 1943.

They are still drafting men from the farm, contending that they are complying with the rules and regulations governing the Tydings amendment, whereby a farmer, to be deferred, must have a certain number of cows, pigs, chickens, and various types of special crops making up one or more so-called "units."

Secretary of Agriculture Wickard has a wonderful personality. He usually gets by with his very gracious smile, but we found that his position, in comparison with the war agencies, was that he was on the outside looking in, and he is still holding this position.

Chester Davis was appointed food czar, but they refused to give him any "gasoline." My committee reported a bill to give to him definite power to place agriculture on an equal basis with other war agencies; that power was not granted and he resigned. Judge Marvin Jones, who received his appointment from the President, succeeded Chester Davis. Remembering that old, familiar political song entitled, "Whose meat I eat, his song I sing," I left Washington for a fishing trip.

Recently I wired Judge Jones, War Food Administrator, as follows:

"Is anything being done to stop further drafting of farm labor and utilizing soldiers on the farm?"

I quote from his reply:

"Utilizing soldiers on the farm is handled by a soldier's own camp commander based on the merits of the case. (Now listen to this!) If you will contact the State Director of Agricultural Extension Service and the various County Agricultural Agents, you will find that they are able to assist with agricultural labor where needed."

What a joke!

Farmers are engaged in the most hazardous business of any group in the country. They can work long hours during this great emergency, planting various crops requested under goals set by the Food Administrator. For three reasons, however, they have no assurance as to just what they will be able to produce, harvest, or what price they will receive:

1. Having to contend with drought, floods, hailstorms, insect infestation, cattle and hog diseases.

2. If they produce a good crop, in spite of shortage of labor and farm machinery (as is the case at this time), tons and tons of their products will go to waste, unharvested in the fields.

3. In that they operate as individuals, without a fixed price, they have to accept whatever they are offered for their products.

This is not true with business and industry who are able to control their production, distribution, and actually fix prices. You can take it or leave it!

This is not true, especially, with war contractors and war industries. They are operating under a guaranteed "plus-profit" contract, regardless of waste and the price paid for raw materials, labor, including millions of dollars for advertising, and regardless of whether or not they produce on a 60- or 90-percent capacity; whereas, in the meantime, if the war should end in the middle of 1944 farmers will be left with the bag to hold as far as farm prices are concerned.

This is not true with war contractors and war industry. When the war ends they are guaranteed against any losses, regardless of the amount of war materials or implements of war which they may have on hand, and they have an assurance of a profit that will enable them to rehabilitate their private business, avoiding personal losses.

The only safeguard that the Government has in connection with "plus-profit" contracts is the renegotiation provision passed by the Congress. Those who operate under Government contracts, especially the large, monopolistic groups, are now flooding Congressmen and the country with tons and tons of propaganda—in the press, magazines, and mail—urging the repeal of the renegotiation provision, having in mind being in a position to get away with untold profits.

Because of the influence of these large groups, with the assistance of important departments which seem to be under their control, regardless of the unfairness of the request, I predict that they will procure sufficient votes in Congress to repeal this one safeguard in behalf of the taxpayers of the country.

We have too long wholly failed and refused to look true facts and actualities squarely in the face and take necessary constructive steps to insure the proper production and proper harvesting of vital foods and feeds which, as stated, are not only absolutely necessary in winning this war but in winning a world peace.

I can assure you that you are not going to be able to "keep them marching, keep them rolling, or keep them flying" unless you "keep them eating."

I understand Japan and Germany have from three hundred and fifty to five hundred million slaves working on schedules, uninterrupted, to produce, harvest, and store the greatest possible reserves of food and feed. Both countries have combed all outlying areas with a fine-tooth comb, so that any territory we win back from Germany and Japan will be populated by peoples facing absolute starvation.

Russian food and feed reserves have been reduced to dangerously low levels, and her productive capacity has been dangerously curtailed by areas of normal production having been overrun by Germany. She cannot continue fighting unless she receives material help from us.

England could not have fed her citizens without the help we have given and are giving to them, and without continued help from us, famine and starvation would quickly break down all possible resistance and physical ability to wage any kind of war.

China has all but reached the point where famine and starvation may force a negotiated peace with Japan, unless we are able to increase materially the food supply we have been and are furnishing to them.

I quote from the London Daily Mail:

"The specter of famine begins to haunt nearly the whole of Europe. Hunger has been stalking Europe for 3 years in varying degrees."

Money and credit can do much when there is something to buy, but all the money and credit on this earth cannot buy that which does not exist.

Today our farmers, including dairymen, poultrymen, and cattle and hog producers, are being backed up against a wall, and they cannot properly proceed, now or after the war, even based on patriotism, unless their serious problems are given prompt and favorable consideration, including definite, fair, fixed prices, with assurances, in line with war contractors and war industries, against crop losses and unfair prices for surpluses during and following the end of this war.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a real show-down as to just who will have the definite power to administer the farm program—production, distribution, and price fixing—I have invited Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration, to appear before my committee, the House Committee on Agriculture, on September 20, 1943, or at the earliest date possible that can be arranged for the convenience of Judge Jones and Administrator Brown. The following is the letter addressed to Judge Jones and Mr. Brown:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September 2, 1943.*

Judge MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE JONES: I listened with a great deal of interest to your speech on last Friday evening.

However, as far as I am concerned—and I believe I speak the views of the farmers of this country regardless of the line they are engaged in producing—the time has arrived that we should have a definite program in black and white given to the farmers at the earliest possible date, concerning production, distribution, and price fixing of the various crops that will be planted and harvested between now and next spring, as well as for the 12 months during 1944.

Therefore, I am inviting you to appear before my committee on September 20, 1943, at 10 a. m., to outline a definite program, as above indicated, which I can assure you is very essential, and which will be helpful in bringing about a necessary production not only in winning this war, but which will be very helpful in winning the peace.

I am also extending an invitation to Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, of the Office of Price Administration, to appear at the same time for the reason that my committee, as well as the farmers of the country, are anxious to ascertain the real facts as to just who from now on will have the definite power in connection with production, distribution, and price fixing of farm products.

The farmers of this country would like to know whether or not we are going to continue a program whereby perhaps two or more people operating in connection with the various agencies will have the power to override each other at will, all of which in the past has been bringing about serious confusion and, as a matter of fact, has been seriously operating against proper production, distribution, and price fixing based on a practical, commonsense program.

Please let me know at the earliest date possible if it will be satisfactory with you to appear before my committee as above requested.

Thanking you for past favors, I am

Yours very sincerely,

H. P. FULMER,
Chairman, House Committee
on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, there are many problems confronting farmers in the various sections of the country who are engaged in the production of various types of crops, including livestock, fruits, and vegetables, all of which are going to receive my very best attention, in that I have always felt that agriculture should be considered on a national basis.

However, at this time I want to call to the attention of the farmers of the Cotton States one of their most serious problems, which is unfair and unless corrected—which I am trying my best to accomplish—will cost our people millions and millions of dollars.

The O. P. A. has fixed price ceilings on textile goods, including therein every item of cost, transportation, and labor, with a fair profit which should reflect a price to farmers f. o. b. cotton mills, as follows:

	Cents
15/16-inch Strict Low Middling	23.12
15/16-inch Middling	23.12
1-inch Middling	23.49
1 1/16-inch Middling	24.35

If you will figure the freight and the price that we are receiving for our cotton today you will find that either cotton merchants, textile mills, or both of them, are buying cotton below the so-called fixed prices, all of which while not being added to consumer prices, are definitely coming out of the cotton farmers, and adding to the profits of either the cotton merchants, textile mills, or both of them.

The following letter contains definite information concerning what I am talking about:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 3, 1943.

Judge MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MARVIN: I was very glad to have the opportunity of speaking with you and Mr. Hutson yesterday on the important matter of the present differentials on cotton grading below middling, in comparison with 1939–40 differentials.

In 1939–40 we were operating on a normal basis without prices or differentials being interfered with by any war agency. As stated to you, these differentials have been widened, ranging anywhere from $3 to $25 per bale.

You remember Mr. Hutson stated to you yesterday, because speculators could lower the so-called price which farmers are supposed to receive based on the ceiling price of cotton, that any depression in the price, either by speculators or by spot buyers, would simply reflect an additional profit to cotton merchants or to cotton mills, or both of them.

I am quoting from a letter received from Mr. Appleby April 10, 1943, when I had this matter up with Messrs. Duggan and Appleby:

"At the time the schedule of premiums and discounts for the various grades and staple lengths of cotton to which you refer was discussed with the O. P. A., the law required that no maximum price be established for any agricultural commodity or for any product manufactured in whole or substantial part from an agricultural commodity below the highest of four alternative levels. The highest of these four levels for cotton was 21.47 cents per pound (the average price received by farmers during the period July 1919–June 1929)."

This was on a basis of Middling cotton 15/16 inch.

Quoting further:

"We understand that 60 points were added to obtain the equivalent average 10-spot market price for Middling 15/16-inch cotton. This is the long-time average spread between the mid-month price received by farmers and the average 10-spot market price of Middling 15/16 inch around the middle of the month. The addition of 60 points to the price of 21.47 cents per pound gave a minimum price of 22.07 cents per pound as an average 10-spot market price for Middling 15/16-inch cotton, which ceilings on cotton grey goods, yarns, and other cotton products, should reflect."

Continuing, listen to this:

"We feel that the wide differentials in the loan program are necessary to encourage cotton producers to shift to the longer staple lengths and to produce cotton of the highest grade possible."

I understand that, back in the old days, you actually worked on a cotton farm; if so, you know, as a fact, that the growing of longer staple cotton, 1⅛ inch or longer, is confined to very few areas, especially staple lengths above 1⅛ inch.

In fact, in the Delta section of the Mississippi (and I presume this is likewise true in Arkansas and perhaps in Texas), they grow more 1 1/16-inch than 1⅛-inch cotton. I am sure you have not forgotten that the farmer does not have anything whatsoever to do with just how many bales he will be able to gather (as stated by Mr. Appleby) of highest grade possible. The quality and grade of cotton is beyond the farmer's control.

Back in the old days, cotton commenced opening in August and farmers had to continue picking until perhaps March of the next year. Now, the breeding of cottonseed has been improved in an effort to get away from a long-continued picking season so as to get ahead of the boll weevil.

For instance, the cotton this year will all be open in the deep South and ready for harvesting during the month of September and from the 1st to the 15th of October.

Now, you know just as well as I do that farmers haven't any control over the weather and that, at this time, farmers are unable to gather their cotton crops promptly because of the labor shortage and because of the necessity of having to harvest other crops planted at the request of the Department of Agriculture, due to the great demand in connection with our war efforts.

As stated in speaking with you about this important matter, unless we are able to get prompt, favorable consideration as outlined by me, farmers are going to lose millions and millions of dollars on this year's cotton crop.

Because of the splendid demand for good quality and long-staple cotton, naturally those who worked out the scheme had in mind, no doubt, trying to penalize farmers by widening the differentials on cotton below Middling and increasing the price for quality and grades above Middling, which would tend to induce farmers to grow good-quality cotton as well as longer staple cotton.

Those who represent contractors and industry are always "in" on the working out of programs affecting their business and, of course, see to it that they are taken care of from every angle. This is not true with farmers. Absolutely, they are on the outside looking in.

Quoting further from Mr. Appleby's letter:

"You understand, of course, that there are at present no ceilings on raw cotton as such."

This is true, and there is no real bottom under the price which the ceiling price of the textile mills should reflect, as above quoted, of 22.07 cents per pound basis middling 15/16-inch cotton.

You remember I told you yesterday that, under the ceiling price arrangement with the textile mills, if cotton buyers or speculators wanted to put the price up above the price which should be reflected, then the textile mills would withdraw from the market and there would not be a possible chance to increase the farmer's price.

On the other hand, however, those interested in speculating and buying cotton at a cheaper price, including the mills (which they are doing today), can depress the price at will and the farmer is just as helpless as a man on the chain gang.

As stated to you yesterday, I have been in the cotton business—buying and selling—practically all my life and at this time I am actually producing cotton, along with various other crops, hogs and cattle.

I am in a position, therefore, to know just what is going on and that is what I am trying to get over to you—who should have full control of the farm program, production, distribution and price fixing—so that you would be able to look after the interests of the farmers of this country in line with those who are administering the various other war agencies and on an equal basis because agriculture is just as important as any other war agency.

In fact, so far as I am concerned, agriculture should come first, because if we are unable to eat, we are going to be unable to manufacture tanks and planes; and certainly if we cannot eat, soldiers are not going to be able to fight.

I sold from my farm last week cotton grading Strict Middling 1 1/16-inch and, according to Mr. Appleby's letter (with the proper differentials between 15/16-inch and 1 1/16-inch cotton on Strict Middling basis), I should have received 23⅜ cents; however, I was paid only 21 cents per pound and I could take it or leave it!

Because of the shortage of labor and the tremendous increase in wage prices, there will be a definite effort made (in fact, I believe you are already receiving letters) to increase the basis price up to 25 cents.

It is my firm belief that if you and the Commodity Credit Corporation will straighten out these differentials so as to put them on a basis of 1939–40, and place a bottom under the price which Mr. Appleby stated the farmer should receive under the price-fixing arrangement with the textile mills (that is, 22.07 cents basis Middling 15/16-inch cotton), this would be entirely satisfactory to cotton farmers. Naturally, to increase the basis price would bring about the changing of ceiling prices to textile mills and all along the line which, at this stage of the game, would be quite a job.

Mr. Hutson promised that just as soon as Mr. Smith, who has been working with him for quite some time and who is a real cotton man, returns, we will go into this matter again with the hope that something may be done on a fair basis to be helpful in connection with this serious situation.

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) H. P. FULMER,
Member of Congress.

Prices of Livestock Go Down, Prices of Feed Go Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL STEWART
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, to say that Oklahoma farmers, stockmen and dairymen are disappointed over the War Food Administration order permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation on August 1 to freeze cottonseed, soybean and peanut cake and meal at last year's ceiling prices and then release those products for sale at price levels for the current season, canceling existing contracts, the difference in price to go to the C. C. C., is putting it all too mildly.

Recently livestockmen, meeting in Kansas City, condemned the order, canceling existing feed contracts, as arbitrary and in no way tending to help them in finding a solution to their problem.

The result of the feed situation and uncertainty it has created in the minds of stockmen and dairymen is clearly written in the booming livestock sales, trimming many herds to the minimum, a marked decline in livestock markets and reduced dairy production resulting from an acute feed shortage and the reduction of dairy herds.

Stockmen in the higher brackets of production to a large degree express themselves as willing to pay almost any price for feed, if there was any assurance of obtaining necessary feed, and are prone to disregard the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation is to collect the difference in price, that runs around $11.75 a ton, while smaller feeders and breeders, equally desperate over the feed

situation, are now more prone to complain over feed costs in the face of declining market values for their beef and pork.

In one instance a producer had 90 head of steers on the crowded Oklahoma City market the first week in September and buyers asserted none of the animals were fat enough for packers. Another stockman complained he had bought a car of steers on the strength of his existing feed contracts, when those contracts were canceled.

In the past 30 days the Oklahoma City livestock market has been flooded with cattle and hogs in nothing like a marketable condition and prices have slumped from $1 to $2 a hundred. There have been resultant losses taken by every stockman who has attempted to feed high-priced grains, chops, and other feeds. A Grady County farmer who had used $2.85 feed for 30 head of hogs relates that when they were sold he took a loss of $46.

There is a widespread move to sell all stock down to the minimum. Cattle and hog raisers as well as dairymen are calculating what they can reasonably afford to keep on the basis of limited feed supplies on hand and are hardly counting on future prospects for buying additional feed, indicating something of the general tone of discouragement.

At one farm market auction in the State recently the sponsor of the sale, helping start bids on a lot of pigs, offered 50 cents a head. He got the pigs at that figure when no other bids were offered. He tried different tactics on the next lot, hiking his figure to 90 cents. Once more he bought the pigs and then began wondering what he would do with the pigs.

Eight dollars a hundred is around the prevailing figure for 80-pound pigs, when feeders can be found to make offers at Oklahoma City markets.

Efforts have been made throughout the State to encourage dairymen to conserve every possible feed supply and maintain their herds without full rations of protein feeds, but campaigning to that end is not having its desired effect and there is a continued tendency to sell off dairy animals. In one of the State's largest dairy producing counties, one in which something like 50,000 pounds of cheese a week was being manufactured during last spring's peak production and before the drought and feed shortage bore down, there have been five of the largest dairy herds sold at auction since the first of the year. Labor scarcity, as well as feed shortages, have contributed to decisions leading up to these sales.

Obviously farmers and stockmen are discouraged. They know that feed supplies from State mills are the lowest they have been in years, that small grain production in the spring was low, that alfalfa hay is scarce and precious under existing prices when it can be had and that all late forage crops, as well as corn, have been cut to the lowest level since 1936 because of the summer's drought. Farmers have been making use of every available source of hay, such as railway rights-of-way and small meadows from which hay had never been cut before, hoping to salvage what feed they can despite the fact that it is inferior feed, struck by dry, hot weather.

In many instances cotton producers who have stock have openly asserted they will refuse to market cottonseed until they are assured they will receive a proportionate share of the meal or cake for their cottonseed.

In one of the leading alfalfa producing sections dealers say there is little alfalfa to be had and that most of the limited crop, cut by dry weather and insect invasion, has gone out of the State.

Protein-feed processors, concerned over the attitude of stockmen and farmers alike, assert the present trend will not encourage increased cotton acreage next year, unless there are incentive payments such as those to encourage longer staple cotton and increase in loan values, pointing out that cotton farmers feel they have been neglected on those points, so far as announced plans for the 1944 farm program are concerned.

One milling company, realizing that cotton production in Oklahoma this fall may be only half of 1942's small crop, is restoring one of its idle mills and is furnishing it to crush soybeans and peanuts, hoping that it can obtain the soybeans from Northern States through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The State has a peanut crop that is nearly double that for 1942, with estimates running around 550,000 acres, but it is to be remembered that 75 percent of the acreage this year is late and that the crop has been stricken by the drought. Where peanuts averaged something like 20 bushels to the acre in Oklahoma in 1942, the 1943 crop will average perhaps no better than 12 bushels. Much of the acreage lies in eastern Oklahoma, devastated by heavy spring floods, when thousands of acres of rich land were taken out of production for years to come or were damaged beyond reclamation, while crops on other land have been replanted as much as three and four times, as Secretary Wickard learned during his tour of the Arkansas Valley region in August.

In 1942 Oklahoma had 873 pounds of corn, grain, and sorghums per animal unit in Oklahoma. With the increase in livestock and drastic acreage reductions, along with the drought this year, stockmen have actual reason to express fear of the future. The State had a 30-percent increase in livestock in the past 5 years, while cottonseed meal and cake production has declined 44 percent, and now Oklahoma will do well, if there is enough corn, grain, and sorghums to provide 600 pounds of feed per animal unit. Oklahoma last year produced 687,000 bales of cotton and on September 1 estimates had dropped to around 350,000 bales. The wheat crop didn't amount to even half of the production for 1942.

Farmers and stockmen know that cottonseed oil mills have shipped out more cake and meal since August 1, 1942, than they manufactured, and as a result stocks are bound to be very low. On April 30, 1943, Oklahoma mills had 758 tons of cottonseed cake and meal on hand, which was only 6.5 percent of the 11,720 tons on hand April 30, 1942, when they had 9,880 tons of cottonseed as compared to the 1,226 tons on hand April 30, this year.

From August 1, 1942, to April 30, 1943, Oklahoma cottonseed oil mills have shipped 105,312 tons of cottonseed cake and meal, while in 1941–42 they shipped 95,159 tons during the same period. It is estimated that 11,000 tons of peanut meal and 34,000 tons of soybean meal were manufactured in Oklahoma. If the cottonseed cake and meal, the peanut meal and one-half of the soybean meal made in Oklahoma had been retained in the State, supplies per animal unit of all oil meal feeds would have been greater in the 1942–43 period than in the 1941–42.

If charges that "the Government's short-sighted policy is pushing stockmen around" are to be ended, steps must be taken to assure stockmen and dairymen that everything possible is to be done to provide badly needed protein feeds at price levels in line with the market value of their products. Soybeans and peanuts could be consigned to State mills for processing and drains on existing and potential supplies within the State should be ended.

It is to be remembered that on January 1 calculations were 4,589,000 animal units on Oklahoma farms while war production goals call for increased livestock numbers. Given its proportionate share of feed, Oklahoma stockmen and dairymen are ready to meet any demand placed on them for wartime food supplies. Oklahoma is doing its utmost to respond to demands of the emergency. They will go even beyond borders that circumstances establish, so long as they have assurance that they have a fair chance of working out their problems.

Certainly policies, such as the recent Commodity Credit Corporation order, have not been conceived in the minds of farmers and stockmen of Oklahoma. That order may have been issued to keep down speculation, but it certainly has not relieved any of the distress felt by drought-stricken eastern Oklahoma or the parched plains in the western part of the State.

There is not a section of Oklahoma today in which concern over abandonment of farm acres by the shifting of population to war industries has not been felt and we must agree that those who are running our farms are entitled to feel that they have a fair chance of economic stability at least.

Not many weeks ago the broomcorn growers of Oklahoma were concerned over the proposed establishment of a $220 ceiling for their product, maintaining they were being discriminated against. Since then the ceiling has been set at $300.

The feed and livestock problem confronting us now is more far-reaching than that in the broomcorn case and the decision that is to be made will mean much, not only in helping Oklahoma contribute its share to our war effort, but to the future of agriculture, dairying, and

stock raising of our State, along with brightening the mental attitude of our farmers, now critical and discouraged, if not altogether desperate.

Doubtless the feed crisis has already had its effect on prospects for 1944, but it can be checked before the move has reached a disastrous point. The sale of breeding stock, cows and sows, already promises shorter beef and pork production in Oklahoma next year, even if immediate relief is found for the feed situation.

The problem that is faced by stockmen is shared by poultrymen as well. We have only to look at a U. S. D. A. report for August 24 that shows Oklahoma's turkey production will be only about 85 percent of the 1942 crop and will be far short of the 1,500,000-bird record set in 1940. It is now estimated Oklahoma will market 954,000 turkeys, as compared with a 1,411,000 average for a 5-year period, 1935–39. Chicken raisers cannot obtain needed feed supplies, and egg production is down.

Farmers have been urged to plant wheat, rye, oats, and winter legumes to help offset a part of the loss in protein feeds. The State has been asked to boost by 2,000,000 acres the wheat acreage, as compared with 1942. It is true that a great many wheat growers have planned larger wheat crops, but they cannot plant wheat in parched soil. To a large degree they have not yet been able to get a plow in the ground and that fact is going to have some effect on response to the plea they have heard for a bigger wheat acreage.

With a near famine that has reduced crop production to 30 percent of normal yield in southeast Oklahoma, with very little feed aside from grass hay, the cattleman, farmer, dairyman, and poultryman cannot continue in operation.

These people will be off for defense work unless an adjustment is made in the price of feed with a guaranty for a sufficient amount to carry them through the winter months.

The farmer and cattleman cannot carry the entire load of price adjustments.

Middle of the Wrong Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun:

MIDDLE OF THE WRONG ROAD

The Republicans at Mackinac Island went down the middle of the road—the wrong road, the road to domestic chaos and foreign equivocation, the road back to 1920.

That is the dismal truth behind the postwar advisory council's turgid declarations on foreign and domestic policy. Who can speak now of a renascent and progressive Republican Party? If the leadership which prevailed at Mackinac dominates the National Convention, the American people will be confronted in 1944 with a backward-looking, stand-pat, narrow-visioned, intellectually bankrupt Republican Party.

Tragic echoes of 1920 already begin to surround the masterpiece of duplicity which the conference devised as a statement on foreign policy. Internationalists like Senator AUSTIN and Governor Baldwin interpret it as an endorsement of American membership in a United Nations council with police power. The Clare Hoffmans and the befuddled tools of isolationism like Gov. Dwight Green hail it as a ringing affirmation of sovereignty and constitutionalism—meaningless terms, unless they mean obstruction of a cooperative peace.

Even so, in 1920, Elihu Root could applaud Harding as the guardian angel of an association of nations, while others backed him for his isolationism. The only difference is that this time, facing a much stronger popular demand for a progressive foreign policy, the Republicans had to concede a somewhat more specific commitment. But they took care to surround it with escape clauses and ambiguous reservations, any of which could serve as pretext for killing the people's aspirations.

The domestic program brazenly reaffirms the G. O. P. leaders' determination to have no program. They demand full employment, but offer no measures to provide it. They speak for enterprise, opportunity, and security, but propose no means of protecting those values from the storms of periodic crises which threaten to sweep them away. With the cheapest of cynicism they describe as fascism the great effort of American democracy to meet the economic crisis of our times; and then advocate a return to the very conditions which created that crisis and laid the foundation for fascism. In short, the present leadership fails utterly to grasp the nature of the age in which it lives, and goes forth to meet that age armed only with a brutal and destructive recklessness.

Republican voters and independents who had hoped for a more enlightened awareness can take comfort from only one circumstance. The shocking inadequacy of the regular leadership has been ruthlessly exposed 10 months before the 1944 convention.

Fathers Draft and Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in order that my position may be known in regard to the question of the induction of family men and married men in the armed forces, I include in the RECORD a copy of a telegram which I addressed from my home town on August 7, 1943, to Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Director, War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C., as follows:

OPELOUSAS, LA., *August 7, 1943.*

PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Director, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D. C.:

Selective Service and industry have: First, taken necessary skilled farm workers and dairy industry laborers notwithstanding protests from myself and other Members of Congress who have predicted acute food and milk shortage. Second, by issuing multifarious statements in regard to drafting married men they have been in a state of turmoil and indecision being unable to make plans for the future. Third, military strategists claim that Army now has all men required in the armed forces and increase unnecessary and beyond capacity and further withdrawal of farm workers and laborers in essential industry will create further scarcity of food and essential production to supply armed forces, allies, and civilian population. Fourth, the drafting of fathers and married men presents a serious problem in destroying the homes and morale of the people of the United States and I urgently request further investigation and consideration of this question before proceeding with further announced plans in this respect. Fifth, unless you can prove to my satisfaction that these statements are incorrect my constituents instruct me to oppose these plans and your administration to the fullest extent when Congress reconvenes in September and if further action by Selective Service is not postponed at once to join other Members of Congress in requesting that Congress be called into session to take immediate and necessary steps.

HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further call to the attention of this Congress the fact that I have appeared here on numerous occasions as far back as January 12, 1943, and called the attention of our officials and this Congress to the question of labor for the farms and the dairy industry. Unfortunately, the fears which I expressed have come true. Especially in my district, which is the largest producer of rice in the United States, there is an acute labor shortage to harvest this important food crop, and as a further evidence of this labor shortage I am including the following newspaper article in the RECORD:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune of September 11, 1943]

RICE CROP LOSSES SEEN BY FARMERS—LABOR SHORTAGE MAY MEAN RUIN, SAY GROWERS

LAKE CHARLES, September 11.—At a special meeting of the board of directors of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association in Lake Charles, La., September 9, which was called for the purpose of discussing the gravely critical shortage of labor for harvesting the rice crop in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"The rice growers of the South are now inexorably faced with the fact that unless a great deal more labor is made available immediately much of the rice crop now ready for harvest in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas will be left in the fields because of their utter inability to cut, shock, thresh, and haul the crop without help.

"The largest crop in history is made. It is standing in the fields ripe and ready for the harvest. Much of it will be wantonly wasted unless the present acute labor shortage is relieved immediately.

"Appeals to governmental agencies for help were made months ago. We have attempted to secure war prison labor. We have tried to secure Mexican and other foreign labor. We have attempted to secure industrial workers with a farm background. We have investigated every possible method by which our labor needs might be met. These efforts have so far been entirely ineffective.

"Shining through the miasma of confused inaction, conflicting authority, misleading

and erroneous statements, voluminous red tape, surveys, certifications, and arbitrary regulations, is the indisputable fact that the governmental agencies having control over the labor situation have not in any degree made it possible to secure either war prisoners or foreign labor, and growers have become thoroughly disillusioned and disheartened.

"The agricultural extension divisions have been striving valiantly to render all the aid they possibly can, but they have been unduly and needlessly hampered by the confused situation with which they are faced on every hand.

"There is no further time to spend on surveys, certifications, inspections, and red tape. The situation is too gravely critical to permit departmental conflicts and prerogatives, divided authority, and the protection of theoretical group interests to stand in the way of rice growers, which in this instance, are also indisputably the needs of the Nation. We therefore in our distress appeal to the governmental agencies involved for quick and effective action and the final termination of those policies which have been so completely ineffective.

"We appeal to the war industries operating in the heart of the rice-producing territory to immediately furlough all those employees who have an agricultural background.

"We appeal to the older schoolboys and to their parents for help in this emergency.

"We appeal to the selective service boards to defer the induction of farm labor.

"We appeal to all others in towns and cities within the rice territory to do everything within their power to meet this grave emergency.

"As a people we must no longer delude ourselves with the comfortable belief that food comes from the corner grocery store. Food comes from the unremitting toil and sweat of farmers, who are today facing problems as acute as any in the Nation. Food will be too precious in the coming months to permit of its waste. We must face the fact squarely that in this emergency all the help from every source may still be too little and too late to prevent waste and want.

"AMERICAN RICE GROWERS
CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
"HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
"General Manager."

The Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the New York Times, August 15, 1943:

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Two years ago at this time, in those apocalyptic days when the Nazi war machine appeared to be moving irresistibly toward world conquest, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill met in a dramatic conference on the high seas and proclaimed what has since become known as the Atlantic Charter. In it they pledged themselves to the "final destruction of the Nazi tyranny" and agreed upon a set of common principles to guide their respective countries in war and peace. The Atlantic Charter has since been signed by 32 governments as the common charter of that community of free peoples known as the United Nations. By that fact, as well as by express declaration of President Roosevelt, it has become valid not only for the Atlantic peoples but for all humanity—including the vanquished able to qualify for it.

Today, when largely as a result of that first conference the Nazi war machine is moving in reverse and Nazi satellites are beginning to fall by the wayside, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill are meeting in another conference to discuss not only the final steps necessary to assure victory but also to lay plans for peace which will test the validity of the charter they originated. Unfortunately, the faith that is born in moments of extremity is often likely to lose its fervor when the danger has abated, and pledges taken in hours of peril are apt to be forgotten in hours of exultation. There is danger that unless the faith expressed in the Atlantic Charter is reaffirmed the charter itself may be sidetracked or nullified. For its pledges are being subjected to the skepticism of the men of little faith and the cynicism of the political realists.

No doubt the Atlantic Charter is subject to many interpretations, and its application to the political realities of the world is difficult. It may even be that a complete and immediate application of it in all parts of the world will be either impossible or impracticable. But it stands today as the pledge of the powerful and the hope of the oppressed. It is a declaration of an international morality above all selfish and greedy interests that precipitate war. It is no more specific than the Declaration of Independence; but it is a guide to men of good faith who alone can build a better world. As such it forms the best political weapon we have to rouse the enemy peoples against their brutal masters. And in the end it will be found that it is also the highest political realism.

For the Atlantic Charter envisages the only kind of peace which American and British public opinion will support. These two Nations have long since realized that international cooperation rather than domination is the key to peace; that friendly frontiers are more important than strategic borders; and that, above the clamor for vengeance of the day, though subject to just punishment of war criminals and the necessary reparation to the despoiled nations, even the vanquished will have to be accorded the right to live in freedom and self-respect.

In any case, whatever its ultimate fate, the Atlantic Charter has already accomplished this much: It has cemented a closer understanding and collaboration among the American and the British Nations than ever before. And in that solidarity, of which the Roosevelt-Churchill conferences are the visible token, rests the guaranty of their safety as well as the safety of those nations willing to join them.

The Manpower Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the manpower crisis has reached a very critical stage in our country, and this tremendous shortage calls for prompt and constructive action on the part of those in power. Unless speedy action is taken on this subject our war effort on the home front will be in grave peril. We must produce the necessary food for victory, and the essential war materials and supplies must be produced in vast quantities—we must back up our Army and Navy with the things they need.

A very enlightening article appeared in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., by David Lawrence, of date September 8, 1943, on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein the article written by David Lawrence, which I hope all may take the time to read on this highly important subject. The article follows:

MANPOWER CRISIS DUE TO "ARMY MIND"

(By David Lawrence)

The manpower crisis in an acute form, long predicted and long feared, is here at last. It is impairing war production severely not only by preventing war plants from reaching desired goals but by actually cutting down production of some of the most vital weapons needed on our far-flung battle fronts.

So serious is the failure to plan in advance, the failure to make the Selective Service System a mechanism of real selection instead of a hodgepodge choosing of soldiers irrespective of the real needs of industry, that one well-informed official was moved to say to this correspondent today:

"I really believe that if we took 1,000,000 men out of our Army and put them back into production our whole war program would go ahead faster and we would be much further ahead toward winning the war than we are today. We've got to make up our minds in America whether we are going to try to be the arsenal of democracy and at the same time furnish more than 10,000,000 men to the armed forces of the United Nations."

FEW DIVISIONS IN FIELD

This is not a war of manpower in the field. Relatively few divisions are engaged nowadays as compared with the World War. It is a war of mechanized weapons and that means industrial production on an unprecedented scale. No more important task in the war has confronted our Government than the proper selection and allocation of manpower.

While President Roosevelt is in a general way responsible for what has happened, the real blame must rest on the War Department, which has permitted the present situation to develop through an insistence that the Selective Service system must be dominated by the military. The key men in the selective service headquarters, including many State directors, are military men. These men go on the assumption that deferment means draft dodging or at least that the burden of proof is on the registrant. So they make it difficult for the registrant to determine his own relationship to industry and they have barred employers from any right to a hearing either before local boards or the appeals board or before the selective service national headquarters.

Many of the key men in the national headquarters of selective service are in uniform and, of course, are in the pay and subject to orders from the War Department. This is contrary to the spirit of selective service because the Nation was assured when the law was passed by Congress that the whole thing would be handled on a democratic basis as

a civilian activity which presumably would be able to pass on the relative needs of industry and the needs of the Army.

MILITARY MIND RESPONSIBLE

The military mind is responsible for the confusing regulations sent out to local draft boards, many of which boards have been scared away from deferments and many of which have ordered single men who are skilled workers into the Army because of a belief they must not call fathers. When Paul McNutt was given the chairmanship of the War Manpower Commission it was assumed he would not be intimidated by the military clique in selective service, but his failure to insist on the deferment of needed men in industry is well known. The directives and memoranda of the War Manpower Commission are merely advisory and there is no authority back of them—the boss of manpower is still the Selective Service System which now has enabled us to get a large Army, but at the expense of many vital industries.

Another mistake was made regrettably by Donald Nelson of the War Production Board. The President gave him power over all Government agencies. Mr. Nelson did not exercise it, but let the manpower issue get away from him. Today there is an announcement that the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission have reached an agreement on how to handle differences between these agencies. And this takes place after the United States has been on a war basis for more than 3 years. Mr. Nelson or the War Production Board should even now be given full control of the manpower problem. The military men have made a failure of it in their zeal to fill the Army up in the shortest possible time.

Today the big bottleneck is in essential production for civilians who are absent from their jobs because necessary civilian services are unobtainable or restricted. Likewise airplane production is hampered by manpower shortages. The quickest solution, of course, is an over-all authority to determine where our manpower shall be allocated. Mobilization Director Byrnes has no bigger task at the moment than saving America from the break-down in our management of available manpower.

The International Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 5, Mr. Rupert Hughes delivered an outstanding radio address in which he commented in his usual brilliant style upon the Communist activities which are still pursuing their subversive work in this country. Because of the outstanding merit of this address, I believe that it should be presented in the RECORD for the benefit of all the Members of the House, and for that reason I am including as a part of my remarks the address of Mr. Rupert Hughes, which is as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents Rupert Hughes, soldier, novelist, historian, and humorist. His remarks on the international scene phrase present day history in the entertaining style of the fiction he writes so well; Mr. Rupert Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES. For a whole week now I've been trying to get Joseph Stalin on the telephone, to tell him a few things he ought to know. But you know how it is with long distance telephones. Some army officer is talking to his wife, or some Nazi is telling Hitler something, or the static is ecstatic. Or I get the wrong number.

When I get through, Stalin's line is busy or he is away from his desk winning a battle or something. Then when he calls me back, he gets a wrong number, or my line is busy trying to persuade the market man to lend me a piece of meat for heaven's sake.

I've just about given up hope of reaching Stalin, so I'm going to tell you what I would say to him if I could get him on the wire, and if I could speak Russian, and if he'd stop the war long enough to listen to my advice. I'd say: Hello, Joe—I mean, Mr. Stalin. Who'm I? This is me. You wouldn't know if I told you, but I'm speaking from the United States—you know what country I mean—the one that has sent you two and a half billion dollars' worth of lend-leasings, including thousands of planes, thousands of tanks, tons of food. We also sent you Ambassador Davies and Harry Hopkins and Wendell the Willkie.

Yes; I know you sent the last three back, but we're sending more goods through, though many a fine ship and many a fine lad in the Merchant Marine, the Navy, or the Air Force has already perished in the icy seas getting help to you by way of the Arctic north. And right now Americans are sizzling in temperatures of 150 degrees of heat in Iran hurrying our supplies to you.

We made no complaint when you rented your fishing grounds to our enemy, the Jap. We made no complaint when you denied us air bases in Siberia. We made no complaint when you interned our American fliers who were forced down in Kamchatka after the last air raid on Japan.

Mr. Churchill said he didn't blame you, Mr. Stalin, for complaining because we haven't invaded northern Europe yet, according to your plans, specifications, and dates, but he hopes to atone for it soon.

Many people say we must not criticize or even comment on anything your people do or don't do, because it causes disunity among the Allies. When you organize in Russia a Free Germany movement, while we're insisting on unconditional surrender, we must pretend not to care. Your papers sharply criticize our Allied governments' training of military governors for occupied countries—the group called AMGOT. You say the grammar's bad and change "Amgot" to "Ain't gonna get." But that's your privilege.

Don't think I'm criticizing you, Mr. Stalin. You're minding your own business and giving us a much-needed reminder to mind our own. I think you would respect us more if we were as self-respectful and outspoken as you are. But that's outside my bailiwick. I just want to have a brief heart-to-heart with you about some funny people I've met over here who claim to represent your views.

They are American born, but they call themselves Communists, when it's convenient—and deny it when it's convenient. Somebody over there sent a lot of money over here some time ago to help convert us to communism, but the ones I'm talking about don't need foreign help. They make lots and lots of money right here in this America for which they have so much contempt. They want to overthrow our democracy and substitute the very communistic government you threw overboard when you drove out the Trotskyites, and jettisoned the basic principles of communism. Mr. Willkie says you are now paying energetic young factory managers as high as $30,000 a year and paying extra money for extra incentives for your 60-hour-a-week workers to work even harder. I was reading about one of your farmers buying 1,300,000 rubles' worth of Russian war bonds out of his savings as a farmer. And you sent him a letter of thanks. A little while back, no large Russian farmer would have been let live long enough to save up that much money. But that's ancient history. The important thing for you to know is that one reason our country and Britain have been slow about getting as ready to help you as you'd like was the activity of these very American Communists.

When the United States began to make ready to defend itself from the growing menace of Hitler, you were an ally of his—you remember. Of course, you were merely trying to hold Hitler off long enough to make ready for his surprise attack—and your surprise defense.

But your American Communists didn't know that. They thought you loved Hitler. So they did their utmost to prevent America from getting ready to meet the peril. They held up ships, they held up trucks, they fomented strikes, they beat up people who wanted to work, they screamed against preparedness, they even picketed the White House as a protest against the President's lend-lease policy, which has since come in so handy for you. They never dreamed that while they were joyously crippling their contemptible old Uncle Sam, they were also crippling their dear Uncle Joe.

Imagine their embarrassment when surdenly Hitler turned on you and you became our ally instead of his! No, don't try to imagine the embarrassment of the American Communists, because nothing embarrasses them. It does not embarrass them in the least to be as loud now in screaming for lend-lease, second front, all-out sacrifice as they screamed against them when they thought you and Adolf were really buddies.

I don't usually talk much about myself because other people break in and talk about themselves or walk off and leave me talking about myself to myself. But while I've got your ear glued to the wire, I'd like to tell you about my experience with one typical American sympathizer with the Communists.

All my life, Joe—I mean, Mr. Stalin—I've been howling for preparedness. I used to write articles and make speeches pleading that we should make ready for the inevitable war against Hitler, and that we should be ready to go to the aid of Britain and France and Poland and Czechoslovakia and other free peoples, as soon as they were attacked, instead of waiting a year or two to declare war, then taking a year and a half to get ready—as we did before, and did again; and thus letting millions of them die, as we did before—and did again.

I had been a major in the First World War, had gone to the Army War College and become a lieutenant colonel in the Reserves. I tried in vain to get back into the Army; but was given command of one of the State guard regiments. The State guard, by the way, by taking over the guarding of many danger points, released thousands of men and officers for combat training. In fact, we trained thousands of men and officers who went into the regular services.

Well, while I was working and shouting for preparedness in every form, the American Communists plastered me with every horrible name for trying to drag our Nation into the horrors of war. Whole groups of them resoluted against me, actually calling me, I quote: "A foul old degenerate who longs to have American boys slaughtered in cold blood to satisfy his psychiatric manias."

In spite of that, one of the universities out here invited me to a debate on pacificism and preparedness. For half an hour I had

to listen to an American citizen of Communist sympathies reviling the United States Government and England and the infamous lend-lease and the foul Conscription Act. He praised you, Mr. Stalin, as if you were a god, though you were at the time the ally of Hitler.

The American Communists had been working on American youth for years, calling them the lost generation, giving them the big head with nothing in it but notions. These youth booed the President and mocked his wife.

The pinks and reds had nearly taken over this university. Their young men and women hissed and hooted such students as were drilling with the R. O. T. C. When this speaker opposed all American preparation for war and made his horrible oration against his own country, the pink shrimps cheered him to the echo.

I was so infuriated by hearing such talk on American soil that I tore into the man, and into you, Mr. Stalin. I said that if I criticized Russia that way in Russia I'd have been shot or mobbed before I finished my second sentence. Well, I was hissed and booed till my voice was almost drowned.

And now the pay-off. After Germany invaded Russia, that very speaker who had got me hissed and booed at the university, had the nerve to come down and—unbeknownst to me—enlist in the regiment I commanded. And I wasn't permitted to put him out.

Such people are making the vast majority of us Americans pretty hick at our hummocks, Mr. Stalin. They make no friends for you.

We let them live. It's our way over here—freedom of speech. We can call almost anybody almost anything, especially if we smile when we say it. We never shoot people here for political reasons. We shot nobody after our long Civil War. We didn't shoot a single spy in World War No. 1. We haven't executed a spy in this war except those few Germans who came over in a submarine to blow up the war plants our American Communists did so much to slow up.

American Presidents are often the victims of our freedom of speech. When Mr. Roosevelt doesn't like what a columnist or a radiotor says, the President just calls him a liar—in severe cases a chronic liar. The man the President has called a liar says, "You're another." And that's that. It horrifies foreigners, but we're still going strong after 160 years of free speech, while most of the governments that have forbidden it have gone glimmering one after another.

The story is going about now that the Communists are going to change their names and call themselves the American People's Party, or something. But they'll still smell like American Communists. Our nostrils are weary of them.

Mr. Stalin, what would you do if several thousands of Russian-born men and women should start a movement to overthrow your government and substitute a democracy like ours? If they called themselves "Americanists" and insisted on putting up candidates for all the offices, including your own, Mr. Stalin? And if they sneered at all literature and art that was Russian instead of Americanist?

And if they invaded your schools and colleges, poisoned your young people with discontent and distrust? And stirred up your 60-hour-a-week laborers to strike for 40 hours or less and double pay for extra hours? And if they picketed the Kremlin and denounced you and the most ardent patriots as foul old-fashioned degenerates? What would you do, Mr. Stalin, to those Russian-born Americanists?

Is that you laughing, Mr. Stalin? Or is it a roar of static? Did I hear you say, "Liquidate 'em"? But we don't liquidate people here. We never have had any group of Americans trying to interfere with Russia's decisions or policies. But we, too, are in the midst of a war, Mr. Stalin. There can be no lasting peace if your vast nation and our great republic got to quarreling.

But, unless you do something to disown these rabid propagandists who pretend to speak for you there will be increasing friction, legal pressure, and perhaps mob violence, with incidents that might provoke war. These people don't like our Government, but we're not going to let them change it. And we can get awful nasty when we get mad. I beg you, Mr. Stalin, for your own sake, call off your dogs or take away their tags, or we'll have to send the dog catcher after them. And now, Mr. Stalin, you can go back to your war making, and may you continue your glorious success with it.

That's what I wanted to say to Mr. Stalin if I could have reached his ear.

I'm afraid I'll never do that. Among the answers to my message will be a few more letters and post cards from Communists calling me an isolationist because I love world peace well enough to believe that the best hope of it lies in a great and powerful America free and not shackled to the wrists of any other nation.

The Communists will criticize me for saying these things because they cause disunity. Coming from Communists, talk of disunity is funny. Their dearest wish is to make this the Disunited States.

But I can hear the Communists shouting, "Get off the air, you so-and-so."

They even want to monopolize the air. Well, I'm in favor of giving them the air—also the ether. If only they'd take ether. And sleep for the duration. What lovely operations we could perform on them.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to Rupert Hughes, world renowned author, historian, and humorist. Rupert Hughes is heard every Sunday at this time over most of these stations.

Retirement of Army Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARD JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the War Department is retiring at this time many hundreds of officers because of age, under the provisions of Section 3 of the act of June 13, 1940, which provides:

On June 30, 1942, all brigadier generals of the line who are then 62 years of age or over and all promotion-list officers who are then 60 years of age or over shall be retired and thereafter all brigadier generals of the line shall be retired at the age of 62 years and all promotion-list officers shall be retired at the age of 60 years, except that all officers in the grade of general officer whose names are carried on the promotion list are exempted from the operation of this proviso.

Retirement of many outstanding military leaders, in perfect physical condition with a background of many years of experience, is being carried out at a time when the services of these men are most needed by the Nation, and at a time when American homes are being broken up by the drafting of fathers into military service, regardless of the number of small children they may have to care for in their homes.

This act should be suspended, at least for the duration of the war, and no man should be retired from military service simply because he has reached the age of 60 years. Although it may not be advisable to have many military leaders beyond the age of 60 years in actual combat duty, there are many other highly responsible positions now being filled by these men to their credit and to the benefit of the war effort.

Especially does this condition prevail on the west coast at this time among commanding officers of many training camps and important ports of embarkation. These men are rendering far greater service to the war effort than any man can possibly render, who has had a brief military background and short experience in the training of our boys to be soldiers and the supplying them with food, clothing, arms and ammunition at points many thousands of miles away.

A very interesting editorial on this subject has just appeared in the Long Beach Independent, of Long Beach, Calif., and I set forth the same hereafter as a part of my remarks:

RETIREMENT AT SIXTY

At a time when the best trained executives are needed the most, the Army is retiring hundreds of the best men they have simply because they are 60 years old. It is a rule and the Army must operate by rule. Or does it?

As these men are retired we have the example of Douglas MacArthur, aged 64, directing his men from an airplane, landing in hostile jungles and doing the work few younger men could stand.

We have the 65-year-old Winston Churchill jumping all over the globe in never-ending work, which his many years of experience and training makes so effective.

We have President Roosevelt, past 60 years of age, doing the work of a dozen men, cheerful and even preparing for another 4 years in office.

We have thousands of the most efficiently operated war plants directed by executives past 60 years of age and many past 70, whose loss to us would be as great as the loss of a major battle. Henry Ford, who recently pased his 80th birthday, is an example. And yet hundreds of U. S. army officers in this country handling the most vital executive jobs are being retired.

The magnificent successes of our armed forces on battle fronts must not cloud our vision to the point that we forget that old rules, old jealousies and inefficiencies still exist and that here is an example of waste which should be corrected.

Among these officers who hold the rank of colonel or less are men whose experience in handling transportation, logistics, and administration cannot be replaced, because nothing takes the place of experience.

There is no examination to show whether or not an officer is capable mentally or physically to continue doing useful work, but rather there is an old rule which says a man is no longer useful after he has reached the age of 60 years. What tommyrot.

In our own community we have dozens of men past 60 and many past 70 years of age who are today the greatest assets we have in the city. These men not only work harder than most young men but their brains are as young and clear as at any time in their lives.

To retire these men from our civic and industrial activities would be a tragic error none of us would countenance and yet men of comparable ability in the Army are daily being retired.

An excuse of the War Department is that to retire some men and not others would be favoritism and not good for morale. Why then is not MacArthur retired and others above the rank of colonel? Results are what count and not the feelings of men.

There may be men to be retired who are not efficient or who cannot learn the new things necessary to carry on the war but age is not the yardstick that should decide such cases. No man should be left in a responsible post if he is not efficient, regardless of age, but many men at 60 are far more efficient and physically capable than others 10 or 20 years younger.

It would seem the Army might be as flexible in their rules as they demand civilians be in reordering their lives and this is one rule which is a very bad example of how the Army utilizes its manpower and a reason why the people question the Army when it calls for the drafting of fathers.—L. A. C.

Post-war World: Paradise Won? Paradise Lost? or Upward Climb?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a statement on peace planning as published by me in my August 1943 monthly news-letter report from Washington to my constituents:

INCENTIVE TO PLANNING FOR THE POST-WAR WORLD

As the Allies against the Axis warm up to more and bigger victories-in-arms, and the first of the enemy kingpins, Il Duce, topples, and Italy abandons bluster, goosestepping, and international violence as national policy, discussion (which is a good thing) of post-war collaboration between nations becomes ever more timely.

The world is not planless as to the making of a new world. There are something like 34 resolutions on the world after the war in the Seventy-eighth Congress; 1,200 proposals have been advanced by United States thinkers. The many plans run from leagues for peace to world superstates. Although every country at war has stated some peace aims, most of the peace plans are of American or Anglo-American birth.

Our President is not at this date offering a plan—his plan. The League of Nations was the plan of our first World War President, Woodrow Wilson, and he offered his plan while the world was at war. Thus far in this war, Winston Churchill may be more specific than Franklin Roosevelt. This is Churchill: "One can imagine that under a world institution embodying or representing the United Nations, and some day all nations, there should come into being a Council of Europe and a Council of Asia. It is upon the creation of the Council of Europe and the settlement of Europe that the first practical task will be centered. Now this is a stupendous business. In Europe lie most of the causes which have led to these two world wars." Churchill fixes the primary responsibility for the keeping of the peace in regional councils. England's cradle-to-grave security planner, Sir William Beveridge, has endorsed the peace idea of another Englishman, Lionel Curtis, who advocates an international authority with its powers "limited to defense, foreign policy, colonies, civil aviation." Sir William prefers the Curtis plan as against more ambitious federation schemes.

INVENTORY OF PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON ANY ROAD AWAY FROM WAR

The responsibility for the kind of world that results will be ours in the United States in part only. Even if we wanted to try, we could not foist our plan (which?) upon the rest of the earth. They will have their own plans. We all shall have to merge our plans. Some of us will seek hopefully a common ground on which to take a united stand for alternatives to the mistaken, shortsighted, narrow policies of us all in the past.

Our people in the United States and their Congress, the British people and their Parliaments have yet to approve a plan in support of their enunciated aims. The nearest approximation to an official plan, the Atlantic Charter, is not really a plan, but only a statement in general terms of ideals which our President and the British prime minister conceive the Allies to be fighting for. The President has just reported to the American people that "the United Nations are substantially agreed on the general objectives for the post-war world," but that "they are also agreed that this is not the time to engage in an international discussion of all the terms of peace and all the details of the future." He said further: "We must not relax our pressure on the enemy by taking time out to define every boundary and settle every political controversy in every part of the world. The all-important thing now is to get on with the war—and to win it." This is, of course, good sense.

Americans and British together will influence the course of post-World War II history—but, be their joint inclinations as they may, what of Russia? Stalin will have much to say about our world. Asia, with its greater China, should have much to say about it. A big worry in our national capital today is the position which Russia will take. Will Stalin go his own way? Russia has not relaxed its policy of strict neutrality toward one of the triumvirate of international banditry, Japan. Russia has not cooperated with the United Nations to open a second front in Asia. Russia has put forth its own peace plan for Germany—a communistic government in place of Hitler and his Nazi gang. How will Stalin's peace plan for Germany, how will Russia-on-its-own fit in with British-United States plans?

The fighting men of every nation returning home will wish to have a voice in the designing and ordering of the newer world (that is as it should be for our own returning defenders).

The shape of the world which will follow this war will, therefore, not be determined by the United States alone, nor by the Senate of the United States alone, nor by the presidential election of 1944. The final important decisions will not be made while the war goes on, may even be quite remote from this date of August 1943. The fate of the world will be evolved at conference tables, in elections, and by the future leaderships of a number of leader nations over a period of some years. Human nature everywhere will, as always, be a mighty factor of influence. Individual outlook, political and other movements, majority accord within the nations will all be factors. We are one world, as a matter of physical actuality. But, there will be new disputes, and many of them (that is history according to form). The nations will differ in purposes and motives. Each will have its own ideas as to what it was fighting for. Their definitions of "freedom" are not alike. Please note that the "four freedoms" are, today and as a future program, in most communities in most parts of the world, and within our own United States borders, beautiful aspirations which have yet to be worked out in human nature and in relations of men to each other. These freedoms pose economic, monetary, and social questions which have never been less than difficult, internationally and within nations. The question of strategic frontiers in Europe—and balance of power—could once more prove too great a stumbling-block.

To ignore the practical considerations is merely to day dream, and without reference to the world's storehouse of accumulated experience. So, let us consult—and stop characterizing, with intemperateness, by this name or that—as "crazy altruists" and "starry-eyed dreamers," on the one hand, and as "American fascists" and "blind isolationists," on the other hand—leaders of thought, just because they see it all a little differently than we, or we see it a little differently than they—and let us on to down-to-earth thinking together (and with less blood in our eyes), to thinking concretely. Let us start thinking about how much, or how little, is attainable in our time, in any one generation.

WHY NOT A BLUEPRINT FOR STEADY PROGRESSION TOWARD THE GREAT GOALS?

Whatever the eventual plan, it will have to be generally accepted, or, at the least, only peace-ardent countries with the courage within themselves to enforce their peace sentiments by forceful action (which might require military action, limited and temporary) will keep the peace. As to whether this is a war for a new world outlook on life—or another war over a map, they of the rest of the world, and we, will decide, in concert of all, or by cooperation of the leader nations only or of some of them only.

Again we shall all—including the defeated—have a grand opportunity to try a parliament of man—that is, talking things over, and seeing how well we can settle upon a common plan, and then finding out by more experience how the plan will take and how we can make it go. Such goals as the brotherhood of man and the four freedoms are the best objectives the world will ever have to work toward. Can anybody think of any better, and more to be desired?

But, with thought to the realisms which have confronted the earth's humanitarians since the beginning and which have operated since Christ and since Moses, would it not be (with regard for history and all the factors) a progressive step in civilization's long, slow march if first we made a blueprint for, let us say, the next quarter of a century? * * * a program of common specifics for peace, to prevent World War No. 3 in our time. Perhaps there will be world organization, some day, with each member-nation sufficiently sovereign within, and with controls over personal and perverted ambitions. But sooner, freedom from war may be practicably achieved by: World-wide education for understanding and tolerance, a schooling not only by the churches and the schools and societies, but also, and moreover, a schooling sponsored by the cooperating nations; a continual exchange of good-will missions and of letter-writing between the youth, and their elders, around the globe; measures of cure from the war spirit applied inside every nation; the teaching and the enforcement of law, as the only opposite of violence; constant vigilance and awareness by those nations which ally their wills for peace, against dangers and trouble zones; immediate, effective action in such unison as is possible, to end forthwith any new threat on the world horizon.

A MENTAL ATTITUDE FOR A FORWARD MARCH OF PEACE

"Incline your head toward the sky, look only at the stars, and you will lose your stride and stumble. Bend your head toward the earth, look only at your feet, and you will lose your stride and stumble. Keep your head erect so that your eyes can be lifted to the stars, and at will turned downward to see the immediate step; look straight out upon the road ahead; and you will travel it without stumbling and in stride."

United Americans of Italian Origin for United Nations Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me over National Broadcasting Co. network, August 6, 1943:

My fellow Americans, prior to and since Pearl Harbor, Americans of Italian origin have been serving our Nation with blood, labor, and property in the mines, factories, and fields and on every battlefield. Approximately seven hundred thousand young men, Italian immigrants and sons and grandsons of Italian immigrants are now in the armed forces of the country. Their heroic conduct in battle, their achievements on the far-flung fronts have become epics in the history of this war. The stories that come out of Sicily, North Africa, and the Pacific, narratives of bold, courageous exploits of these men constitute an eternal tribute to a people whose undying devotion to the country of their adoption and birth is historical.

This is neither new nor unusual. It is in keeping with a great tradition of loyalty and patriotism. There has never been a time in the life of our country, when democracy was at stake and when men and women of high courage and devotion to liberty were needed in its defense that those who came to our shores from Italy did not rise to the occasion and defend those principles of freedom which they love so well.

From the earliest days of our Republic, the honor role of liberty lists names of illustrious Americans of Italian origin who have rendered service to the cause of freedom and progress with great distinction.

Filippo Mazzei ranks with Thomas Paine and Jefferson in his fight against tyranny and his flaming pen spurred on our heroes in the war for independence.

The signature of a colonial patriot of Italian origin, William Paca, is among those appended to the Declaration of Independence. The victory at Vincennes, a feat which began the expansion of our country north of the Ohio and west of the Mississippi was made possible by Francesco Vigo. In the ranks of the Union Army, during the Civil War, there were thousands of Italians, many of whom had come purposefully from Italy in order to participate in the fight against slavery in America.

The historic message from Garibaldi to Lincoln in words that will always live in the memory of man as long as he struggles for liberty is just as inspiring a force to the American of Italian origin in 1943 as it was to his ancestors in 1861.

This record of today and of yesterday disposes with complete finality the falsehood that Italians cannot and do not want to fight. It proves irrefutably that Italians can fight and do fight well for freedom, but will not fight for tyranny. It is precisely because Italian soldiers have refused to fight in the interests of Axis tyranny that the Mussolini regime was rocked to its very foundations to be toppled over by the hammering blows of the United Nations in north Africa, Sicily, and in the Soviet Union. Italy had become a conquered province serving the Nazi Government in Berlin in negation of her own destiny. This national enslavement was oppressive to the people of Italy; so oppressive that her soldiers have been revolting against it by laying down their arms. This revolt and the victory of our armed forces have ended the violent career of the man who was a despot to his people and a supine agent to a foreign tyrant.

Now that the people of Italy have set themselves free from the Mussolini bonds that kept them helpless for 21 years, they are once again asserting their will and desire to fight on the side of democracy.

The Italian people want peace with the United Nations. The abdication of July 25 signalized not only the overthrow of the Fascist tyrant, but it was also the inexorable expression of the will of the Italian people for the cessation of the war against the United States and our allies. That is the immediate demand of the people of Italy and no government which denies it will last. They will draw no distinction between a pro-axis war and fascism because there is none. No matter who continues the war against us, he is considered by them as their enemy and a betrayer of their interests to the forces of nazi-ism. They know and they say that any policy which prolongs the war against the United Nations for even one minute is still fascism, for such a war is a Fascist war and is not and has never been the war of the Italian people. They overthrew Mussolini in order to terminate the war. The overthrow of Mussolini to them represented the ending of the war, for fascism and the pro-axis war were and are identical. They will not be confused nor satisfied by mere changes in governmental structure. For them, there is one test, and one test alone, and that is immediate peace with us and our allies. To the people of Italy every consideration is subordinated to that of the cessation of the war against the United Nations, for only the ending of the pro-axis war will insure the complete and utter destruction of Italian fascism in Italy.

For the Americans of Italian origin, our duty and task remain the same as always—to unite with our fellow Americans for the continuance and intensification of support of the complete victory of the United Nations. We recognize that without such a complete victory it will not be possible for Italy to receive the benefits of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." Our attitude, our conduct, and our feelings toward Italy are those expressed by the President in his recent radio address. The President said, "Our terms to Italy are still the same as our terms to Germany and Japan—unconditional surrender." We of Italian origin wholeheartedly renew our pledge and rededicate our energies to carry out these terms. We, as Americans, are resolved that there can be no peace except on the terms of unconditional surrender. We endorse the policy of our Government to accept unconditional surrender from anyone who can effectuate it. It is not important who formalizes the surrender, what is important is that it be unconditional surrender. We must not become dupes to any propaganda which calls for a peace on a basis of so-called neutralization of Italy.

Neutralization of Italy means withdrawal of our troops and an abandonment of Italian bases from which we must continue aggressive war against Hitler and his remaining partners. Let us bear in mind that our main concern is victory against the Axis enemy and that this victory can be achieved speedily only by pursuing every advantage heretofore gained and exploiting every opportunity placed at our disposal. To do otherwise, would be to temporize with a ruthless and still powerful foe. A foe which still has at its command 300 divisions in Europe, submarine wolf packs in the Atlantic, a powerful navy and a conquered empire in the Pacific. Therefore, the neutralization of Italy and the consequent remittance of bases in Italy from which to successfully conduct our war will mean the sacrifice of untold numbers of American lives, and will jeopardize our chances for early victory. Such a course is sham sentimentality. It is aid and comfort to the enemy. It is propaganda set in motion to weaken the victory effort of a united people.

Further let us bear in mind that the realistic guaranty of the safety of the Italian people and Italian cities is the might of the air power of the United Nations and of our naval and land forces. This course is genuine sentiment for the land of our parents.

We support the President's pledge that "He, Mussolini, and his Fascist gang will be brought to book and punished for their crimes against humanity." We enthusiastically endorse the President's historic pronouncement that "we will have no truck with fascism in any way, shape, or manner, and that we will permit no vestige of fascism to remain." This is the iron-bound assurance to the generations of tomorrow against any repetition of the holocaust of today.

As for the people of Italy, we feel that we have no right to interfere with their decision as to what form of government they shall have. What is involved here is the principle of self-determination which they themselves must apply. We have every confidence in the people of Italy. We know that they will work out their own destiny in keeping with the best democratic traditions of the Sicilian Vespers, of the Renaissance, of Galileo and Christopher Columbus, of the martyrs of the five days of Milan, of the defense of Venice, of the legionary heroes of Garibaldi, and of the unification of Italy.

The forces of the Italian masses set in motion on the 25th day of July will restore Italy to the family of nations as a great democratic nation.

We say with the President of the United States, "Italy will reconstitute herself. It will be the people of Italy who will do that, choosing their own government in accordance with the basic democratic principles of liberty and equality."

What Is Motive of O. W. I. in Russian-Polish Dispute?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American public admires the great courage

and unstinting sacrifices of Russia's army and her people. When the history of this devastating war is written, Russia will be given full credit as the nation that stopped the ruthless onslaught of Hitler and started him on the road to defeat. We cherish the friendship of the Russian people, and we gloat in numbering the Russians among our allies.

Poland and her people are also our courageous allies. Polish soldiers and fliers are proving gallant Allied comrades-in-arms on the battlefronts of the world. Why, then, is the Office of War Information conducting a survey among the Polish people of the Nation, submitting to them a list of leading questions all tending to strain existing relations among Poland, Russia, and ourselves? This is a time for unity and understanding. The Russian-Polish dispute weakens the alliance between the United Nations, and thus hinders mobilization of all forces for the winning of the war in the shortest possible time. Settlement of this dispute and reestablishment of normal Russian-Polish diplomatic relations on the basis of equality of both parties is an urgent call of the hour.

Let us awaken, O. W. I.! Let us work in harmony with our allies, not against each other.

I am happy to include as part of my remarks the editorial comments on this vital subject which appeared in the August 27, 1943, issue of the Pittsburczanin, the leading American-Polish weekly. Vic Alski, editor and publisher, is an outstanding American, and although he is a registered Republican, Mr. Alski is a great friend and supporter of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his foreign policy:

WHAT IS MOTIVE OF O. W. I.?

Not only the Polish language press but the American press as well, was greatly stirred by a suspicious survey, or rather an investigation, conducted on the Polish question in various larger cities with considerable Polish population, and among others, in Pittsburgh. Of marked pro-Soviet tendencies, this curious survey was conducted by the "National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver," although as stated by Elmer Davis, Chief of the Office of War Information, it was done on the request of the O. W. I.

When about a week ago we learned that two women from New York opened offices in the William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh and are engaging Polish women to conduct some "mysterious" survey among the Polish community, naturally we became interested in this activity. Shortly after, we acquired the 4-page questionnaire together with the special instructions for the investigators and everything seemed to point that this action was undertaken for the benefit of the Soviets and against Poland and, to a certain extent, against the United States.

We admit frankly that after reading this highly provocative questionnaire, in which we even suspected Communist-incited propaganda, our first impulse was to call this survey to the attention of the local office of the F. B. I. On second thought, we decided to inquire at the source and invited Mrs. Yl'visaker, of New York, the director of this survey, to our office. In contradiction to the statement made later by Elmer Davis, this lady assured us that this is a private survey of the National Opinion Research Center, assisted by the O. W. I.; after pointing out to her a series of tendentional and obviously antagonistic to the Polish cause and highly insulting to the Polish-American questions, she continued to maintain that this survey is being conducted "impartially" and its only aim is to ascertain Polish opinion for further "studies." However, she could not enlighten us as to who was going to benefit by this opinion.

The reason for secrecy in this survey, as explained by Mrs. Yl'visaker, a member of the O. W. I. from New York, was the desire to gather the most "unbiased public opinion" which could not be attained once it was publicized in the Polish press. Yet our visitor could not advise us as to the reason for such questions as:

"What do you think about the question of Poland's future? Do you feel it should be decided now or should wait until the war is won?"

"* * * Do you think Poland should have about the same boundaries as before the war or do you think they should be different in some way?"

"A. In what way should they be different? What particular territory should Poland get or what should it give up?"

"Which one of these four things comes closest to what you think the United States should do about Poland after the war?

"D. Guarantee a fair territorial settlement for Poland, even if it means fighting Russia."

Disregarding such tendentional posies as, "Do you happen to know whether any land that used to belong to Czechoslovakia was taken over by Poland around the time the war started?" or "Stalin said not long ago that he wants a strong Poland after the war. Do you think he really meant this?" The crowning point of this unbiased survey are the questions:

"14. Do you think the Polish Government in exile really represents the Polish people or do you think it represents only certain groups of Poles?"

"15. Do you think the Government in exile is doing all it can to help win the war or do you think it could be doing a lot more?"

And finally, the most incredible:

"16. Which of these do you think would be best as Poland's official representative at the peace conference: A man born and raised in Poland, a Polish-American, or an American who is not of Polish descent?"

There isn't a slightest doubt that, due to the construction of this questionnaire, an uneducated person, or one who does not orient himself quickly, will inadvertently reply in the favor of the Soviets if we only point to the question, * * * "If the allies win the war, who do you think will have the most to say in writing the peace treaty?" * * * where in the first place we find Russia, then England, and in the third place only the United States.

When you further consider that this survey is anonymous, and in other communties, allegedly pro-Soviet sympathizers were engaged to conduct same, it is quite difficult to refrain from the supposition that the aim is rather in favor of some undercover communistic propaganda and evidently antagonistic to the Polish cause.

As far as Pittsburgh is concerned, in all fairness it must be stated that with one or two exceptions, if there were any ulterior motives on the part of the arrangers, they completely backfired. By a strange coincidence, the ladies engaged here, on the average highly intelligent women, would never permit themselves to be used as tools of communistic propaganda, and conscientiously noted the replies received. And to the credit of the Polish community it must be stated—as ascertained from the information received—in almost 95 percent of the answers to the questionnaire, they have proven themselves as enlightened citizens who place the welfare of the United States on the first plan and next to it Poland, without any admixture and much less, of the communistic brand.

One should also bear in mind that this whole miscarried investigation is quite an expensive plaything to the pockets of the taxpayers. The cost of printing two kinds—in Polish and in English—of 4-page questionnaires, the transportation and several day stay of directors from New York, rental of offices in William Penn Hotel, etc, etc., engaging several (we believe the amount was 15) investigators, who for securing 400 replies were paid $60 each, plus 6 cents per mile for traveling expenses; all in all, in Pittsburgh alone the cost will amount to several thousands of dollars. Multiply this by larger centers as Buffalo, Detroit, New York, and Chicago, where very likely a larger personnel was necessary, this survey will cost tens of thousands of dollars, which at present could be used to better advantage in the conduct of the war.

This unsavory investigation had its one humorous side and another, exceptionally unpleasant to us, American citizens.

To the humorous category one can count question No. 8: "Have you ever heard of Colonel Matuszewski?"

Of course, the question referred to the anti-Polish Government refugee, Col. Ignacy Matuszewski. But since his activities are almost exclusively known to only a small group of the intelligentsia—who were excluded in the survey—according to the information received by the investigators, the answers to this question were almost identical, namely:

"Sure I know Teddy Matuszewski, the well-known realtor and able secretary of the Central Council of Polish Organizations of Pittsburgh, but I never knew that he is a colonel."

The regrettable side of this whole affair is, that it first received its publicity and in their own light, in the anti-Roosevelt and of the not far distant past anti-Polish newspapers of McCormicks and Pattersons in Chicago, New York, and Washington, who allegedly surmise in this survey the initial steps for the 1944 presidential campaign and the desire for sounding out the opinion of the Polish Americans as to a fourth term for President Roosevelt. In this respect, it was a most deplorable disservice to the Polish cause. President Roosevelt is too deeply engrossed with important pregnant matters to win the war to worry about sounding out the opinion of the Polish Americans, as to his chances for a fourth term. And as far as that goes, neither Roosevelt, nor those close to him, need any surveys as to the feelings of Polish Americans. They all know very well that the Polish Americans were, are and will be loyal to President Roosevelt; that they see in him the greatest President of the United States, and at the same time, the most sincerest and unwavering friend of the Polish cause, and they know also that whether President Roosevelt announces his candidacy for the fourth term, or due to the international situation is drafted by the entire Nation, he can be sure that the Polish vote, Democratic, as well as, Republican, will go 100 percent for Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This will not be changed, neither by the unfortunate activities of the O. W. I., nor by the intrigues and insinuations of anti-Roosevelt McCormick newspapers.

Address by the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Delivered on the Occasion of the Unveiling of His Portrait and the Presentation of an Honorary Degree at East Texas State Teachers College, Commerce, Tex., Friday, August 6, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

President Whitley, ex-students of the Mayo College, my fellow countrymen, I thank you, Dr. Whitley, for your generous words, and also my colleagues in the House of Representatives who have been kind enough to come here and participate in these ceremonies, and want to thank every man, woman, and child who had any part in these arrangements. They have devoted their time and their energy without stint. I am glad to be back home at any time, and especially am I glad to be in Commerce on this occasion. You have done me great honor and I have come to thank you for it. To have a likeness of me hung in these halls that are already historic and will become more so is a recognition that touches me deeply and for which to my last day I shall feel toward you an undying gratitude. To be back on this hill after all these years brings to me a satisfaction that words cannot put into expression. Here are clustered memories that are sweet and everlasting. When I left here, many now living and many dead wished me a safe journey. That journey to now has been a safe one and, if you will pardon me, in a measure a successful one. If I can put into the last port in the same safety, I will be happy and satisfied.

How great it is to be a citizen and to have the privilege of residing in a country like this where liberty is still secure and democracy is still safe. A country that is fit to live in is a country worth fighting for. The sons of America are fighting and dying for this country in order that you and I and they may, in the future, have a decent place in which to live. They fight to preserve, protect, and defend the firesides, yea, our very civilization itself.

When the men who help to run the Axis need advice they go to Adolf Hitler. When Adolf Hitler needs it he goes to a hideaway on the top of a tall mountain and consults his intuitions. Here in this country, when the Congress of the United States feels that need it goes home to its people.

Thank God, this is our way. Here, among our home folks, we—the Members of that Congress—find the helping hand that only a democracy can hold out to its leaders. Here we are the students, not the masters. We get tuition, not intuition.

In the past, through my 31 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have mingled the pleasure of renewing old friendships with the business of finding out what my people want. Today the sight of friendly faces back home, the clasp of familiar hands, are as dear to me as ever.

But this time, for me and for each of my 530 colleagues of the Congress who are now scattered through the Nation, the homecoming is a little different. This time we have come to you on business, 100 percent. And, to my mind, one of the first items of that business is to take stock of ourselves and what we have done toward winning the war, calmly, clearly, with the windows of our national house open and the smoke of politics swept from the air.

We are here given the opportunity to come to a better understanding of ourselves as a fighting nation. And it is only by reaching this kind of understanding, man for man, neighbor for neighbor, that we shall be able to work best together, to knuckle down quietly to the job that remains to be done here at home while our boys are winning this war abroad. That, fellow Americans, is our opportunity. Let us make the most of it.

Overseas, our part in the fight goes well. Under the leadership of a man who has long been in the habit of going to his people—Franklin D. Roosevelt—our armed forces and those of our allies are steadily, surely, closing in on the enemy. We have been hitting hard in north Africa, in Sicily, in Italy, in the South Pacific, and all along the hazardous routes by sea to those battle arenas. No matter how many more blows we shall have to strike, we are out to crush fascism, and we are out in force. A thing of evil is at bay, and we are set for the kill.

But what of this other battle line? This noisy, squabble-ridden front at home, where, so we are told, there has been too much criticism, too much bickering, too many rifts and recriminations. Here on this front the private speaks his mind without waiting for the general to get out of earshot. That is his right. That is one of the rights we are fighting to save, and Americans have not hesitated to exercise it—now or in any other war we have fought.

Don't mistake me. Criticism is one thing, grumbling another. Just as the men who fly our planes into battle have to cope with the sabotage of those little fellows they call gremlins, so we too, working behind the lines, have our own breed, our saboteurs of the spirit. A fit name for them, I think, is grumlins.

The grumlin is a fellow who drinks his morning orange juice, eats his cereal and his two eggs and toast while he looks at pictures in the newspapers propped before him—a picture of a smiling American boy who has had his arm blasted off in the gun turret of a Flying Fortress over the jungles of New Guinea, a picture of another lad who had had two aircraft carriers shot out from under him, and, chin up and chest out, is now going back for more. And, as he sips his coffee, this grumlin feels sorry for himself and fusses at his wife because she has used up all the red stamps and can't serve him any bacon!

Yes; we have our grumlins. But the grumlin does not hold the same position in this country that he has gained in Germany or Italy. Here in America he is a minority party. Probably not one American in a hundred is a grumlin. We imagine there are more because the main features of the grumlin are a big mouth and a loud voice. One grumlin can make more noise than 99 Americans who are busy using their strength on the job of winning this war. And so, when they set up their chorus we are fooled sometimes into thinking that they are in the majority. Let us not be deceived by that chorus. Let us not be lured into it. Rather let us keep before our minds the pictures—the boyish grin of a young American who has gone through hell for his country and has had his arm shot off in a Flying Fortress, the sailor lad who has lived through two sinkings and is going back to sea.

But there are the critics, too. Those who, though they are not grousing about personal sacrifices still do not like the way we are fighting the war. Much of this criticism has been helpful. But speech is free in this country. A commodity that is free has a price of zero. And sometimes it is overpriced at that figure. Sometimes, while we are trying to work together toward a common goal, we seem to be listening to a symphony of sour notes. We become confused, distracted. And when this happens it is time to tone down the volume of this sound and fury and make a calm, considered appraisal of the tremendous piece of work which we call our war effort.

The measure of a nation's war effort cannot be shown at once in the field of actual combat. There is always a time gap. Upon what we do now depends much of the showing in combat which our armed forces will make a year from now. In the same way the hitting power of this country today is the yardstick by which we can fairly measure the work we did in preparing ourselves, beginning 2 or 3 years back.

How good was that job? Do you want the real measure, the one that counts? Then look at north Africa, at Sicily, at the Solomons. Look at the tanks and planes that are performing so magnificently on that long battle line where four millions of Nazis have been stopped cold—yes, and as I speak, rolled back—by our Allies, the Russians. They are stopped cold now. They will be stopped a little colder a few months from now. American tanks, American planes, are on the job there. Or look at the Ruhr, at Cologne, Hamburg, Dusseldorf, Kiel—that long tracery of rubble that was once the backbone of Adolf Hitler's war machine. Look at the photos of dead Japs on New Georgia Island, Guadalcanal, Attu. There, in these pictures of 1943, you have the real story of what America did in 1940 and 1941.

Of course, mistakes were made. Of course, judgments went wrong. But looking back on them now, I do not think the worst of our misjudgments were as wide of the mark as the dire prophecies of the critics who deplored them. The noise those alarmists produced almost drowned out the factory whistles. The result was that in those years when our mighty war machine was coming out of the blueprint, this Nation had almost forgotten its own strength. We were building better than we knew.

I think we are still, in 1943, building better than we know. Yes, it is a long war and a hard one. We agree with the headlines that warn us of this. We agree that there is still more we must do to shorten it. We do not waste breath trying to shout down the symphony of sour notes. But back of it all, quietly, steadily, the people of America go on making the tools of warfare, building the strength of their Nation, doing the things that are going to count when our boys meet the enemy on tomorrow's battleground. We promised the fathers and mothers of America that their sons would never be sent to battle until they were the best trained soldiers that the United States ever sent forth and had in their hands the most complete equipment for defending themselves, and for fighting the enemy, of any soldiers who ever went to battle in the history of the world. That we have done.

For the benefit of the grumlins who do not know enough to care, and of the hecklers who do not care enough to know, I offer eight points, things to remember about our war effort which may help to cure their respective ailments. Here is my list:

1. The United States Army has sent abroad the largest overseas force of any nation in history and, to date, after months of service and important gains in combat, shows the smallest losses in proportion. Our men overseas now number more than 2,000,000. In transporting them, our total losses to the U-boats have been fewer than 700 men. That army is tough and well outfitted with steel. In the First World War, we provided

1 piece of artillery for every 1,100 soldiers. Today there is 1 piece of artillery for every 46 soldiers. As a further and more specific example, since the outbreak of the war, America's armament industry has turned out about 160,000 large caliber artillery for our ground armies, nearly 1,300,000 machine guns, and 5,000,000 rifles and submachine guns. We have made 165,000,000 rounds of artillery ammunition, not including ammunition for naval guns. Our ordnance plants have so far produced the astronomical figure of 22,000,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition—enough to enable our forces to fire 1,500 bullets at every soldier in the Axis armies.

2. Our Navy has added, since January 1 of this year, 200 new warships. For every fighting ship that we had at the end of 1942, we shall have 2 such ships by the end of 1943. In other words, within a single year we are doubling the numerical strength, and more than doubling the hitting power of the United States Navy.

3. The Air Forces of our Army and Navy have been increased by more than 64,000 planes in the past 12 months. The new planes added to the Navy in the first 7 months of 1943 alone doubled the entire number in service before Pearl Harbor.

4. We are winning the fight on the U-boat. With better weapons at sea, and bigger attacks on the bases ashore, we have already taken the profit out of Germany's submarine warfare.

5. For the greatest overseas force the world has ever known, we now have a transport vehicle and an air umbrella to match. To give you some idea of what this means in the transportation of a single item—gasoline—Gen. Jimmy Doolittle says that in 1 day the operations of his Air Force in the Mediterranean consumed 1,100,000 gallons, enough to fill 70,000 automobile tanks here in Texas, if we were filling them up in Texas instead of knocking them out in Italy.

6. Our food supply, for our own use and for our allies, is the greatest ever amassed by any nation in history. And our farmers are planting still more heavily. These farmers and farmer's wives are not only giving their sons but they are doing their part in this great effort of production.

7. In the matter of price control, after all the fussing within and around the O. P. A., too much fussing, a great many mistakes, many things done in the wrong way, we find these revealing facts: That the total, over-all cost of living in America in the forty-fourth month of the first World War was 40 percent above the level at the start of that war, August of 1914. And that in the forty-fourth month of the second World War, the cost of living has arisen 26 percent above the start of this war, September 1939. Up 40 in the last war, up 26 in this one. The complainers have opened all the stops of their gripe-organs on this subject of price control.

No one wanted price control and we would never have had it unless it had been absolutely necessary to hold down the cost of living where the common man could eat, and to prevent run-away inflation which would have been destructive to us all, but after all is said and done, we have been denied few things under rationing. Many have complained about the lack of all the sugar and coffee and meat that they wanted to eat. I have a simple answer in the form of a story that I think fits the complainers.

A lady who clerks in a store was telling of a man who came in, bitterly complaining that he could not get all of everything he wanted. She finally said to him, "My friend, do you have a son in the Army?" The man answered "No." She said to him, "I have a son in the South Pacific, and two nephews that I love like sons in north Africa. They are probably in Sicily now. I am willing to do without some of these things, or all of them, that these boys and other millions of boys may have what they need to keep them strong and well." That should be the spirit of every American.

8. The fitness of our fighting men—and I am sure that for this item every American will give his thanks to the God that watches over those we hold dear—the fitness of our boys, as reported by experts, scientifically studying it, surpasses that of any other fighters, including our own in past wars. Today the average American soldier eats better, sleeps better, is trained better, hears, sees, marches, and breathes better than he did in 1917. He is almost an inch taller, nearly 10 pounds heavier.

These are the solid realities, these the silent headlines out of which the story of victory will one day be written. That day still lies beyond a horizon of more blood, more sweat, more tears. So long as there remains a single enemy line to be stormed, so long as the life of a single American soldier is imperiled, we at home cannot afford to be complacent. In the knowledge of what we have done, we find new strength of heart, the will to go on doing still more; and it is in this spirit that I have ventured to list these eight accomplished strides on our way to victory. They are the combined works of a people and its Government, a free people, a democratic form of government. They are the measure of a strength greater than we ourselves have understood; a leadership fulfilling, in battle, the hopes of its people; a people answering, behind the lines, the call of its leaders. Only let the faith be kept, and against this people, this Government, no enemy can endure

One more word and I am through. We must and we will win this war. I am today thinking of what kind of a world the future holds for us and all people throughout the world who love liberty. But we must not forget our obligations of today or tomorrow. We of the United States of America, the greatest and most powerful nation upon the face of the earth, must not forget that we must do a man's part in the world's great work of peace. We must not stick our heads in the sand and forget our obligations to help in bringing about an enduring peace. Civilization cannot stand a shock like that which we are passing now, every quarter of a century. Unless we build on solid foundations for permanent peace, we will have failed this day and generation but I have the hope to believe that our people and the people allied with us throughout the length and breadth of the earth will pull together to preserve civilization and make the world a better place in which to live.

Address by the President to the Canadian Parliament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President to the members of the Canadian Parliament on August 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellency, members of the Parliament, my good friends and neighbors of the Dominion of Canada, it was exactly 5 years ago last Wednesday that I came to Canada to receive the high honor of a degree at Queen's University. On that occasion—1 year before the invasion of Poland, 3 years before Pearl Harbor—I said:

"We in the Americas are no longer a far-away continent, to which the eddies of controversies beyond the seas could bring no interest or no harm. Instead, we in the Americas have become a consideration to every propaganda office and to every general staff beyond the seas. The vast amount of our resources, the vigor of our commerce, and the strength of our men have made us vital factors in world peace whether we choose it or not."

We did not choose this war—and that "we" includes each and every one of the United Nations.

War was violently forced upon us by criminal aggressors who measure their standards of morality by the extent of the death and the destruction that they can inflict upon their neighbors.

In this war, Canadians and Americans have fought shoulder to shoulder—as our men and our women and our children have worked together and played together in happier times of peace.

Today, in devout gratitude, we are celebrating a brilliant victory won by British and Canadian and American fighting men in Sicily.

Today, we rejoice also in another event for which we need not apologize. A year ago Japan occupied several of the Aleutian Islands on our side of the ocean and made a great to-do about the invasion of the continent of America. I regret to say that some Americans and some Canadians wished our Governments to withdraw from the Atlantic and the Mediterranean campaigns and divert all our vast supplies and strength to the removal of the Japs from a few rocky specks in the North Pacific.

Today, our wiser councils have maintained our efforts in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean and the China Seas and the Southwest Pacific with ever-growing contributions; and in the Northwest Pacific a relatively small campaign has been assisted by the Japs themselves in the elimination of that last Jap from Attu and Kiska. We have been told that the Japs never surrender; their headlong retreat satisfies us just as well.

Great councils are being held here on the free and honored soil of Canada—councils which look to the future conduct of this war and to the years of building a new progress for mankind.

To these councils Canadians and Americans alike again welcome that wise and good and gallant gentleman, the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Mr. King, my old friend, may I through you thank the people of Canada for their hospitality to all of us. Your course and mine have run so closely and affectionately during these many long years that this meeting adds another link to that chain. I have always felt at home in Canada and you, I think, have always felt at home in the United States.

During the past few days in Quebec, the Combined Staffs have been sitting around a table—which is a good custom—talking things over, discussing ways and means, in the manner of friends, in the manner of partners, and may I even say in the manner of members of the same family.

We have talked constructively of our common purposes in this war—of our determination to achieve victory in the shortest possible time—of our essential cooperation with our great and brave fighting Allies.

And we have arrived, harmoniously, at certain definite conclusions. Of course, I am not at liberty to disclose just what these conclusions are. But, in due time, we shall

communicate the secret information of the Quebec Conference to Germany, Italy, and Japan. We will communicate this information to our enemies in the only language their twisted minds seem capable of understanding.

Sometimes I wish that that great master of intuition, the Nazi leader, could have been present in spirit at the Quebec Conference—I am thoroughly glad that he wasn't there in person. If he and his generals had known our plans they would have realized that discretion is still the better part of valor and that surrender would pay them better now than later.

The evil characteristic that makes a Nazi a Nazi is his utter inability to understand and therefore to respect the qualities or the rights of his fellowmen. His only method of dealing with his neighbor is first to delude him with lies, then to attack him treacherously, then beat him down and step on him, and then either kill him or enslave him. And the same thing is true of the fanatical militarists of Japan.

Because their own instincts and impulses are essentially inhuman, our enemies simply cannot comprehend how it is that decent, sensible individual human beings manage to get along together and live together as neighbors.

That is why our enemies are doing their desperate best to misrepresent the purposes and the results of this Quebec Conference. They still seek to divide and conquer allies who refuse to be divided just as cheerfully as they refuse to be conquered.

We spend our energies and our resources and the very lives of our sons and daughters because a band of gangsters in the community of nations declines to recognize the fundamentals of decent, human conduct.

We have been forced to call out what we in the United States would call the sheriff's posse to break up the gang in order that gangsterism may be eliminated in the community of nations.

We are making sure—absolutely, irrevocably sure—that this time the lesson is driven home to them once and for all. Yes, we are going to be rid of outlaws this time.

Every one of the United Nations believes that only a real and lasting peace can justify the sacrifices we are making, and our unanimity gives us confidence in seeking that goal.

It is no secret that at Quebec there was much talk of the post-war world. That discussion was doubtless duplicated simultaneously in dozens of nations and hundreds of cities and among millions of people.

There is a longing in the air. It is not a longing to go back to what they call "the good old days." I have distinct reservations as to how good "the good old days" were. I would rather believe that we can achieve new and better days.

Absolute victory in this war will give greater opportunities for the world because the winning of the war in itself is proof—certainly proving to all of us up here that concerted action can accomplish things. Surely we can make strides toward a greater freedom from want than the world has yet enjoyed. Surely by unanimous action in driving out the outlaws and keeping them under heel forever, we can attain a freedom from fear of violence.

I am everlastingly angry only at those who assert vociferously that the four freedoms and the Atlantic Charter are nonsense because they are unattainable. If those people had lived a century and a half ago they would have sneered and said that the Declaration of Independence was utter piffle. If they had lived nearly a thousand years ago they would have laughed uproariously at the ideals of Magna Carta. And if they had lived several thousand years ago they would have derided Moses when he came from the mountain with the Ten Commandments.

We concede that these great teachings are not perfectly lived up to today, but I would rather be a builder than a wrecker, hoping always that the structure of life is growing, not dying.

May the destroyers who still persist in our midst decrease. They, like some of our enemies, have a long road to travel before they accept the ethics of humanity.

Some day, in the distant future, perhaps—but some day it is certain—all of them will remember with the Master: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Monsieur le Premier: Ma visite à la ville historique de Québec rappelle vivement à mon esprit que le Canada est une nation fondée sur l'union de deux grandes races. L'harmonie de leur association dans l'égalité peut servir d'exemple à l'humanité toute entière—un exemple partout dans le monde.[1]

[1] English translation of the previous paragraph: My visit to the old city of Quebec has recalled vividly to my mind that Canada is a nation founded on a union of two great races. The harmony of their equal partnership is an example to all mankind—an example everywhere in the world.

Our American Constitutional Commonwealth—Is It Passing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and informative address delivered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] at the commencement exercises at Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., September 12, 1943. The address is entitled "Our American Constitutional Commonwealth—Is It Passing?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reverend president, members of the faculty of Georgetown University, honored graduates, my friends: The president of a great university was once asked the question: "Why is it that your university is called a great reservoir of knowledge?" To which he answered: "I don't know, unless it may be that the freshmen bring so much knowledge in and the seniors take so little out."

Although I am being facetious, you members of the graduating class will think of that expression more and more as you travel through life.

Reverend president and members of the faculty, I would, indeed, be short in my expression of gratitude were I not touched by the honor that has been conferred upon me today. Of all the institutions of learning in the world, I would have chosen this honor from the hands of this university. And so with all my ability by human language to express my feeling here today, I make known my gratitude to you and to your great institution.

I shall take this honor as an inspiration for the life that is mine to carry on. I shall hold it sacred, because to have such an honor from this great institution impresses upon one a responsibility demanding every ounce of his energy.

My friends of the graduating class, you today go out into a world of trouble; each of you in civilian clothes for the last time, perhaps, for some months. Regardless of the particular school from which you graduate, and no matter where your footsteps may lead you in the months to come, it behooves us to remind you of the fact that you are Americans, and, being Americans, remember that your brothers are in arms today on many battle fronts of the world. You, too, will take up the battle; you, too, will carry on the obligations; but, with God's will, you will return to a Nation that looks to you in the post-war period for its sustenance, its continuation, and its future guidance. So today, that you may take with you at your graduating hour some of the things that are in the minds of those who carry the responsibility in government, I have attempted to formulate some thoughts that might impress upon you the fineness and the splendor of the Government that gave you freedom of life. Then I would bring to your attention a few of the dangers that appear to be imminent, threatening the very existence of that Government. Those of us who take the responsibility of government seriously realize and see those dangers, and, seeing them, would militate against them, so that on your return from military fields you may have and enjoy the freedoms that have abided in this great country for a century and a half.

Public administration is never so difficult, and good public administration is never so important, as in time of war. In wartime it becomes the appropriate function of Congress to vote vast lump-sum appropriations, and to make the broad delegations of power which the Executive needs. But the fact that we are engaged in a war does not mean that we must revise our form of government. We are making war as an organized Nation, and one of the purposes for which we fight is the preservation of our constitutional liberties and our constitutional form of government. We must not let that essential truth escape us.

The founders of this Republic, the framers of our Constitution, were passionately devoted to the principle of government by consent of the governed. Adherence to this principle presupposes an orderly procedure under which laws are enacted by the elected representatives of the people, interpreted impartially by the courts in the light of our great basic law, and administered by public servants in accordance with such interpretation. Nothing could be more violative of the principle of government by consent of the governed than a system under which laws are made by appointive officials, interpreted by the same or other appointive officials, and administered by the same or still other appointive officials.

It is no fallacy, and it is no quibble, to say that a large body of our law today is so made, so interpreted, and so administered. Not only by Executive order, but by a constant stream of "directives" issued by various administrative agencies of the Government, rules and regulations are continually being put in force and given effect which have had no sanction by the Congress. Yet, without such sanction, and often without color of support from any constitutional source, these rules and regulations have all the force of law; more than that they are law; and frequently they actually supersede laws passed by the Congress.

Statutory provisions enacted by the Congress, in the exercise of powers clearly constitutional, have been expanded or contracted, added to or subtracted from, by the Executive branch of the Government, without hesitation. As an example of expanding a congressional act, we may cite the Anti-Inflation Act. An example of adding to statutory authority is the Executive order setting up

the War Manpower Commission, section 5 of which provides that "no employer shall retain in his employ any worker whose services are more urgently needed in any establishment, plant, facility, occupation, or area designated as more essential" by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. We have been unable to discover anything in the Selective Service Act, or in either of the War Powers Acts, or in any other Act of Congress with which we are familiar, which can be cited as the basis for that decree.

This trend toward greater centralization of governmental power, with and through the growing tendency to legislate by directive, is either a sound and logical development within the framework of our American constitutional commonwealth, or it is a departure from that framework, a movement away from the basic principles of true democracy. If the latter, it is either justified by events and results, or it is unjustifiable. It will profit us to examine just what is the case.

When the framers of our Constitution rested from their labors, they rested firm in the conviction that the document which they had drawn would forever preserve and protect those rights which must remain in the States, and those rights which must remain in the people, in order to preserve that happy balance of government which would insure our national security and perpetuity.

The system of checks and balances provided by the Constitution, with three branches of government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, was regarded by those constitutional founders, with what seemed to them unassailable logic, as a perfect protection against too great an accumulation of power under any one authority; for they considered it unthinkable that any one branch should ever be able to usurp the powers of another branch.

But that was in 1787. In July 1935 a President of the United States wrote to the chairman of a House Subcommittee on Ways and Means urging passage of a certain bill and concluding with the statement: "I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to its constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation."

Only a few decades ago the Congress reprimanded most severely a Cabinet member who had the unprecedented temerity to send to the Senate the text of a bill which he wished to see enacted. Today this procedure not only is common practice but is by no means confined to Cabinet members. If you list the major bills which have been enacted into law by the Congress in recent years, you will find that a substantial number of them originated, not in response to popular demand expressed through the duly elected representatives of the people, but in the brain of some one member of the executive branch of the Government, or some small group within that branch, and were drafted, not in the Halls of Congress but in some administrative office, or executive conference room, or in the cubbyhole of some second assistant supervisor of auxiliary functions. Such a bill, however brilliantly written, cannot be an expression of the will of the people, but only a mirror of the ideas and ideals of its author and of the mood of his executive and administrative superiors.

In a few of their objectives, in some of their attitudes, and in many of their excesses, no small number of these wearers of the bureaucratic purple are reincarnated Romans in full accord with the traditions primarily responsible for the fall of the Roman Empire.

When you give any man unlimited power, it is like giving a schoolboy a gun; he wants to go out and shoot it off.

When a man rises to an important position it is customary to suppose that his advancement has been due, at least in part, to some special merit; but this is not always true even in private business and industry, and certainly it is not always true in government. Still, most people are likely to believe it. Usually, the one who believes it most strongly is the man himself. As a result of this rather common failing, most of the men who write our administrative law, and who interpret it and administer it, have come to regard themselves as rather superior beings. In some cases they are. In many cases they are not. This feeling of superiority is manifested in a great many ways, ranging all the way from the petty dilatory tactics with which sundry petty bureaucrats seek to bolster their own petty egos, to the complete disregard of ordinary civil rights and established democratic processes and procedures which every now and then is evidenced by some new executive promulgation or administrative interpretation.

The Constitution contains many provisions intended as safeguards against too much centralization of authority in the executive (or administrative) branch of the Government.

In article I, section 2 provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." Is there anything unclear about the meaning of that?

Paragraph 2 of section 6 provides that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House of Congress during his continuance of office." Why this provision, except to avoid any overlapping of executive or administrative functions, on the one hand, and legislative functions, on the other?

Paragraph 18 of section 7 specifically delegates to Congress the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution * * * all * * * powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or office thereof." This is an expansion and reiteration of the second section, but it is also important because it covers specifically the situation which the average "directive" purports to meet, that is, a need for additional "law"—rule or regulation—necessary and proper for implementing some power or powers already granted to some department or office of the Government. We see that the Constitution says Congress shall make such laws. Do we hear the voices of a chorus of administrative lawmakers saying: "Congress is too slow, so we'll do it; Congress can't be trusted, so we'll do it"? Or is that only their actions speaking for them?

We are minded on occasion to call to the attention of one or another Government administrator the fact that Members of the Congress are not alone in taking oath to support the Constitution. Paragraph 3 of article 6 requires that not only Senators and Representatives, but the members of all State legislatures, "and all executive and judicial officers both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution." Compliance with that paragraph is just about 100 percent. That is, everybody takes the oath.

It is not only in the body of the Constitution that we find provisions bearing on this question.

The Bill of Rights sets up further safeguards. Sometimes we fear there is a tendency to overlook some of the provisions in these first 10 amendments to our Constitution. We wonder, for instance, if all the rules and regulations of the O. P. A., and their enforcement, are in strict conformity with the fourth amendment which provides that: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."

We wonder, whether the provision of the fifth amendment that: "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," ever contemplated, in the intention of its framers, a process of administrative law under which a "hearing commissioner" of some executive branch of the Government will sit as judge and jury over a citizen charged with violation of some order promulgated by an executive officer of the Government without any specific authority from the Congress of the United States.

We wonder how such a procedure, under administrative law, comports with the provision of the sixth amendment that: "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury."

The last two items in the Bill of Rights are of tremendous importance. They are sentinels against overcentralization of government, monuments to the wisdom of the constitutional framers who realized that for the stable preservation of our form of government, it is essential that local governmental functions be locally performed.

The ninth amendment to the Constitution provides that "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The tenth amendment to the Constitution provides that: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, now prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Many signs today seem to indicate that the wisdom of the philosophy which guided the framing of these amendments is being forgotten. We have heard it said that the belief is spreading in this country "That the people are not capable of governing themselves; that the problems of today are so complex that the citizen at large must of necessity be detached from his own difficulties." If such a belief ever becomes the prevailing political philosophy of these United States, we cannot predict what type of government we shall then get. Perhaps a benevolent dictatorship, perhaps a dictatorship not so benevolent; perhaps national socialism; perhaps even a monarchy; but certainly not a democracy.

Fully centralized control of all governmental functions, in a bureaucracy founded upon administrative law, is the very antithesis of that democracy in which all our rights are rooted; the democracy from which spring all our hopes, not only for a better future, but even for a maintenance of the unnumbered freedoms which we as a Nation have enjoyed since the foundation of our Republic.

We must remember that the more strongly centralized a government becomes, the more important it is that the government be just, and wise, and responsive to the interests of the people. In the words of Mr. Justice Jackson: "When government pervades all life, holds the economic system in its hands, becomes the greatest employer, the biggest customer, the largest borrower and the largest lender of money, neither incompetence nor low standards of disinterested conduct can be tolerated."

The Governor of a great American State, who afterward became President of the United States, once said: "To bring about government by oligarchy, masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our national Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles by which this country was founded

just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger." That statement is as true now as when it was made, 13 years ago.

Dictatorship is not always a creature of war; sometimes it comes tiptoeing stealthily upon an unsuspecting people in time of peace; and sometimes it is builded secretly by the people themselves, unknowing the potentialities of what they create; until like Frankenstein's monster, similarly builded, it is unleashed to accomplish the enslavement or destruction of its creator.

It has been said that true statesmanship must know a higher purpose than vote getting. We cannot argue with that thesis. But we say to you that if every Member of both Houses of Congress guided his every action by the criterion of whether what he did would win him votes or lose him votes at the next election, the body of law enacted by such a Congress would be vastly preferable to a body of law created by men owing no allegiance to any group of voters, and giving no particular thought or weight to public opinion, either in the country as a whole or within any particular section of it.

With every upsurge in the power of the administrative lawmaker and his alter ego, the bureaucrat, there is a concomitant slackening of initiative, a mushrooming of inertia, in the handling of State and local problems. This is more than a temporary tilting of the scales; it is a derangement of the fundamental balance which has maintained our form of government for over 150 years as the outstanding example of a free democracy. It may be a tipping of the chute down which, if it be not righted, we may eventually plummet toward the abyss of fascism. May God forbid!

Government by administrative law breeds opportunity for personal arrogance; evades the courts; sneers at the rule of stare decisis; affords no precedents; and fortifies itself by pointing ridicule at Congress and other lawmaking bodies of our Nation.

Administrative law has its seat of justice in the fiber and temperament of the individual administrator who may, if he chooses, recognize individual human rights and freedoms; or who may ignore or abrogate such rights with relative impunity, protecting himself with the law he has made and the law which is his to make.

The growth of legislation by administrative directive is the step between democracy, with constitutional guaranties protecting the body of the law in the people, and a government by men with their backs to the wall, hurling defiance at constitutional and substantial changes prompted by progress and founded on the spirit of the law.

Is this the bridge upon which we as a Nation now stand? If so, which way are we facing? The one end rests on the glory of the spirit of the law; the other on the popularity or prudence of the administrator. On one hand is democracy; on the other is autocracy, the bond made of dictatorship.

I could not close my expressions to you, my young friends, without bringing back to you the words of that great priest, prince, and philosopher, James Cardinal Gibbons, when he said: "The law is not the people; the people is not the law. The law is the spirit of justice governing the people, and its application to individuals, to associations, to every form of civil life, must be so hedged around with reverence and security that the civil courts may in an hour of popular passion, protect all the people from the tyranny of what might be a lawless majority."

My young friends, may God speed you on your way in life. May your years spent here in this institution, with all the fine training you have had, be your guide through every trial and in every place, wherever you may go.

Give Our Fighting Men a Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Give Our Fighting Men a Voice," which appeared in the September issue of the Washington News Digest. The editorial contains a great deal of food for thought, and I thoroughly endorse its contents.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE OUR FIGHTING MEN A VOICE

As the war gradually reaches a victorious end—though we still have a lot of fighting ahead—we will hear more and more of who is to sit at the peace table.

There will be a demand from many groups to have a voice in determining the destiny of both victors and vanquished.

Looking back to the sad experience which followed the peace terms of World War No. 1, the war that was to end all wars, it is our humble opinion that the older generation, which made such a mess of it all, might sensibly listen to the opinions of our young fighting men. Those who have sacrificed the most, it seems to us, should have the most to say when peace terms are discussed. After all, let us remember, it is our young fighting men (those who are fortunate to come out of it alive), who must pay for this war. It is their children who must repay the monumental debt. It is for them to have some voice in what kind of peace will give them and their children the assurance of safety against another war 25 years hence.

We hold to the opinion that the voice of our young fighting men, together with the young fighting men of our allies, might well play a part in the momentous decisions to be reached at the peace table. Certainly we believe it just and timely that Congress give to our young fighting men the feeling that when peace terms are discussed, their opinions will be sought insofar as is practical.

Joint Statement by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill to Marshal Badoglio and the People of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a joint statement dispatched by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on September 10 to Marshal Badoglio and to the people of Italy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has fallen to you in the hour of your country's agony to take the first decisive steps to win peace and freedom for the Italian people and to win back for Italy an honorable place in the civilization of Europe.

You have already freed your country from Fascist servitude. There remains the even more important task of cleansing the Italian soil from the German invaders. Hitler, through his accomplice Mussolini, has brought Italy to the verge of ruin. He has driven the Italians into disastrous campaigns in the sands of Egypt and the snows of Russia. The Germans have always deserted the Italian troops on the battlefield, sacrificing them contemptuously in order to cover their own retreats. Now Hitler threatens to subject you all to the cruelties he is perpetrating in so many lands.

Now is the time for every Italian to strike his blow. The liberating armies of the Western World are coming to your rescue. We have very strong forces and are entering at many points. The German terror in Italy will not last long. They will be extirpated from your land and you, by helping in this great surge of liberation, will place yourselves once more among the true and long-proved friends of your country from whom you have been so wrongfully estranged.

Take every chance you can. Strike hard and strike home. Have faith in your future. All will come well. March forward with your American and British friends in the great world movement toward freedom, justice, and peace.

Livestock and Feed Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have a copy of an address delivered by John R. Jirdon to the Livestock and Feed Conference held in Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943. Mr. Jirdon is the president of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders' Association. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress, Governors, and members of the livestock and meat industry, I am appearing before you today as president of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association. Under normal conditions and in normal times around 5,500,000 lambs are fattened for market in the dry-feed lots of the country and about 1,000,000 head are fattened on wheat pastures in the Southwest. This portion of the lamb crop is known as winter-feed lambs and they are marketed during the first 4 months of the year—namely, January, February, March, and April. In normal times approximately 1,500,000 head of these lambs are fattened for markets by the members of our association located in Colorado, western Nebraska, and eastern Wyoming, in the irrigated regions of these respective States. The total annual slaughter of lambs approximates 22,000,000 head and from these figures you can see that approximately 70 percent of the lamb crop carries sufficient flesh and finish to be available for slaughter direct from the ranges and farms of the country. The lambs which the

members of our association purchase and fatten for market are known as feeder lambs. These lambs would have very little relative value for slaughter as they come from the western ranges and so we are performing an essential service in providing a market for these animals and carrying on a program of fattening them so as to make them available for market during the first 4 months of the year, and I want to call your attention to the fact that during the first 4 months of the calendar year practically no lambs from any other source are available to supply the market during that period. This industry of winter feeding lambs is economically sound for the reason that we provide a market for the western range man for that portion of his crop which is not suitable for slaughter and at the same time we supply the markets of the country with grain-finished lamb carcasses at a time when no other lambs are available.

There are many reasons why the lamb-feeding industry has grown to present proportions in our area of the country. First, we used to produce in these irrigated regions large tonnages of sugar-beet byproducts, such as sugar-beet tops and wet and dry pulp, which are byproducts of the factories. However, the volume of these sugar-beet byproducts will be reduced by 35 percent as compared with last season in our area because of Government control and the hostile attitude toward the production of sugar beets by the present administration. As you know, the sugar-beet industry is now under complete Government control and regimentation, combined with grower subsidy. The prices which the grower receives for his beet crop and the price he pays for his field labor is therefore determined by the bureaucrats in Washington. For many years now the people in charge of this governmental program have proven that they are unfriendly toward the sugar-beet industry and now are openly advocating further cuts in sugar-beet production. I want to bring out this point because of the important role that sugar beets play in the production of meat. An average acre of sugar beets provides sufficient feed byproducts to produce 300 pounds of beef or lamb, as compared with about 275 pounds of beef or lamb produced from an average acre of corn, so that livestock producers of the country are vitally interested in sugar-beet production because every acre of sugar beets which is taken out of production means the loss of a market for a feeder steer or 8 to 10 feeder lambs, and it means the loss of 300 pounds of beef or lamb to the Nation's food supply, together with the loss of 3,800 pounds of sugar for the tables of the Nation. Government agencies have found an effective way to strangle the sugar-beet industry by controlling prices that the grower receives for a ton of beets. This season these prices were set so low that the anticipated return from an acre of beets was sufficiently less than the attractive prices guaranteed for potatoes and beans by these same Government agencies that the producers automatically shifted their acres to these other crops, and this all happened at a time when it is necessary to ration the sugar supply of this Nation. This is just one more example of the results of the centralization of the power over our food supply in Federal agencies in Washington.

Weather conditions are much more favorable for lamb feeding in our section of the country than in other areas because of the light precipitation during this season, permitting us to have dry feed lots which are desirable for economical fattening of lambs. However, we cannot carry on a normal feeding program without the importation into our area of reasonable amounts of corn and protein concentrates in order to properly finish our lambs for market. The products which we grow on our farms are feeds which will provide for growth but in order to properly balance our rations we must have the privilege of importing these concentrated feeds which will provide that balance and will complete the fattening program. Under present rules and regulations of the Office of Price Administration there is no assurance that we will be able to import either corn or protein concentrates of any kind under the ceilings which have been placed on corn in the surplus producing areas of the country. It is much more profitable for the surplus corn producer to withhold this corn from market and feed it to hogs. The present ceiling prices for corn in surplus areas vary from 92 cents to $1 per bushel and it is possible for corn farmers to realize $1.30 per bushel or better when fed to hogs, and so the corn producer refuses to accept these so-called ceiling prices and he continues to increase his hog-growing operations or else he sells his surplus corn on a black market at much higher prices than prevailing ceilings. The same conditions apply to protein concentrates. Although the cotton crop promises to be about the same size as last year, southern cottonseed mills are advising us now that they do not expect to be able to ship more than a very limited quantity of cottonseed meal to the livestock-producing sections of the country. Under these conditions if the breeding herds of the country are supplied with their very minimum of requirements of protein in order to winter their breeding herds, there will be no protein concentrates available for use in the feed yards of the country.

These are the reasons why at the present time there are practically no feeding lambs under contract from the western producers by the members of our association and liquidation of western breeding sheep has already set in because of the inability of these people to secure concentrated feeds for wintering their herds, and unless conditions change you will undoubtedly see the largest liquidation of western breeding herds in history. Good young breeding ewes are already going to slaughter and many more will follow. What are the remedies to this situation? When ceilings on lamb carcasses were proposed, a representative of our association was called to Washington last August, at which time we were permitted to present our views. At that time our association suggested that a graduated ceiling be placed on lamb carcasses, permitting the price to rise gradually from January until April to cover the higher cost of production during that period. If you will go back over a period of years you will find that under normal conditions the prices of lambs gradually advanced from January until April and this advance is justified due to the high cost of production during this period. The officials of the Office of Price Administration refused to establish anything but a rigid and inflexible ceiling and refused to accept our advice.

If the Army and Navy and our civilian population are to be supplied with lamb carcasses during the first 4 months of next year, two things must be done immediately to encourage the feeding of lambs. First, a graduated ceiling must be established to take care of the higher cost of production during this period and it must be done now to relieve the uncertainty and to encourage feeders to purchase lambs from the western range man. Second, the ceilings and methods of distribution on corn and concentrates must be revised west of the Missouri River in such a manner that we can purchase these supplies from the new crop. If this uncertainty is not removed, lamb feeding will be restricted to the present volume of feeds which have been grown on our own farms and lamb-feeding operation in our section of the country will be reduced more than 50 percent. We believe that the wartime meat management program, which was adopted by the National Livestock and Meat Council, of which I am a member, must be put into effect. The war meat board, which was set up at our suggestion, must have authority to function. I am sure that the entire livestock industry is in complete accord with this program. There are other gentlemen here today who have discussed the wartime meat management program and the war meat board and I will not encroach on their subject except to say that we believe that this is the only workable program that has been proposed and it must be allowed to function in order to prevent chaos in the livestock industry.

The lamb feeders of this country face the same hazards of disease to our flocks, the hazard of unfavorable weather, and the hazard of continually increasing labor costs which have more than doubled in the past 2 years. We know that these same conditions prevail with the producers of feeder lambs and in the purchasing of the feeder lamb crop from producers, we believe that they are entitled to a price for their product that will insure them the return of their cost of operation plus a reasonable profit and likewise as lamb feeders we feel that we are entitled to the same consideration. We are unalterably opposed to experiencing the fallacies of regulation and direction from Washington and we know that any subsidy would simply mean more of the same thing. We believe that Government subsidy and dictation of any branch of private enterprise will mean ultimate strangulation of that industry leading eventually to complete state socialism in this country. We feel that there is much less need for a consumer's food subsidy in this country today than ever before in our history. The income of the wage earners of this country has risen much faster than the cost of food, resulting in idle dollars in the pockets of the people which are contributing to inflation and encouraging black markets in many commodities.

Feeders of cattle, hogs, and lambs will remember that day last May when the famous hold-the-line order which made headlines in the newspapers and on the radio and also they will remember the famous consumer subsidy and roll-back order on meat made into law by Executive order without the will or intent of Congress and they have a better memory of the fact that prices on live fat animals declined around 10 percent in price and have never recovered from that decline. I am asking, Who paid the bill? Wholesale and retail prices were lowered by that order.

Certainly, we have a right to ask and demand that ceiling prices on meat carcasses both wholesale and retail, be restored to the original ceilings which were in effect prior to the roll-back order.

You cannot encourage increased production of food unless you permit the food producers of this country to obtain a price for their product which will return that cost of production to them plus a fair margin of profit as a further incentive to bring about that maximum production. If our lamb-feeding operations should result in profits, we pay our just share of the income taxes due from these profits and we buy liberally of War bonds in order to carry on the war effort, but we feel that the money we invest in War bonds and that we pay in income taxes should be spent by the Federal Government as nearly as possible to carry on the war effort without being paid out in a subsidy to any group of citizens who do not need and are less entitled to a subsidy than at any time in the history of our country. But you cannot ask us to risk our capital in a lamb-feeding venture (without even the hope of returning that capital to us without loss) in order to produce the meat that this Nation so badly needs. The lamb-feeding industry is just as highly specialized as any other industry in the country. It requires specially designed facilities and equipment. It requires men of experience to carry on these operations. We do not believe that there is a bureaucrat in Washington who knows half as much about

our industry as the average man who spends his time in the feed yards and on the farms in this country.

I want to make it plain right here that there is no such thing as a cost of production. An explanation of that statement is in order. If it were possible to secure all of the data from every feed yard in the country it might be possible to arrive at a figure which would represent the average cost of production for a given season, but those same figures would not apply for the following season because of the change in weather and labor and feed costs and death loss and other hazards. It is impossible for the feed-lot operators of the country to produce lamb as cheap as it is produced when lambs are grazed in the wheat fields of Kansas and the Southwest, when nature is kind enough to provide the wheat fields with ample growth. It might be possible, under ideal conditions, to produce gains on lambs on the Kansas wheat fields as low as 8 or 10 cents per pound of gain, depending, of course, upon the value placed on the growing wheat and the fortunes of weather and other unpredictable conditions, while in certain feed lots of the country the cost of gain per pound on lamb may run as high as 25 cents per pound in extreme cases. Now, if ceilings are placed on the finished products with the intention of reflecting the average cost of production, it is easy to see that high-cost producers are forced out of the market. Our arithmetic will prove that if the average cost is used, approximately 50 percent of the producers will have a cost which is higher than that average. Consequently, these higher-cost producers must cease to operate. Understand this, that we are very happy to cooperate in any sound methods to curb uncontrolled inflation. Our industry has gone along a good many years risking our capital, taking both gains and losses as conditions developed, at the same time we have supplied the consumers of this Nation with lamb and mutton at prices they could afford and were willing to pay. You can rest assured that there will be no inflation, either in the pockets of the sheep producers or the lamb feeders of America under the present program and at the same time you can rest assured there will be continued liquidation of western breeding herds and materially reduced lamb-feeding operations this coming season, and with it a continuing reduction in the meat supply. I want to close by quoting from Thomas Jefferson who once said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread," and the same thing applies to meat.

The Challenge to Labor Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 1943 issue of the Connecticut State Journal entitled "The Challenge to Labor Leadership," written by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE, a Member of Congress from the Fourth District of Connecticut. The article is most thought-provoking and is entitled to the serious and earnest study both of the Senate and the public to whose attention the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will come.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO LABOR LEADERSHIP

(By CLARE BOOTHE LUCE)

The next few years present to the leadership of organized American labor a great decisive challenge. For today the fate of the free enterprise system, which is a longer name for the profit-and-loss system, which is another longer name for capitalism, lies largely in the hands of the leaders of unionism. They can destroy it if they will, or they can, in large part, help save it. Which they will do, they had better make up their minds clearly in the next few years, for the war, which has saved American capitalism, cannot be expected to last forever. And when the war is over, if organized labor lets the decision go by default as it is currently doing, it will certainly go again against capitalism. I say "again" because until the day war orders began to pour in from abroad and until our own entrance into the war created an unprecedented demand on industry, American capitalism had been notably going into a decline. And it had been doing so for a very simple reason: Nearly every action this administration took over a period of 10 years was either intentionally or inadvertently calculated to drive enterprise capital out of the market into hiding, or to destroy it.

There is no evidence on hand, none whatsoever, that this administration will not revert to its former attitude toward the American capitalistic system as soon as the war is over. And there is a wealth of evidence that it will. In short there is very little hope that the new dealers, who do not understand either the nature or workings of capitalism, will try to preserve it. This being the case, it is quite safe to assume that if the same men, or like-minded men, are permitted in the next few years to guide the economic destiny of America, we will either slowly or rapidly evolve a totalitarian economy. Call it socialism, communism, or fascism. Naturally, if one of these systems appeals to the reader of this article more than the system America grew up in, it is a waste of time to read further.

Capitalism cannot save itself. Only men can save it. The men who can save it we may classify in three groups—politicians (government), capitalists (business), and workingmen (labor). The politicians who have been in charge of government, as I have said, either do not wish to save capitalism or do not understand how to do so. The capitalists are incapable of saving themselves. Even without the help of Democratic politicians for the past 10 years, even under preceding Republican regimes (and with the help of Republican politicians) they had slowly been encompassing their own suicide. There remains no group of men, in my opinion, intelligently and forcefully enough organized to save the free enterprise system but the labor leaders. For they, and they only, perhaps today, are capable of understanding the true relation of capital to labor. If they cannot or do not wish to make this relationship clear in the next few years, if they do not wish to play a major and militant part in the creation of public opinion among millions of workers in favor of capitalism, then capitalism in our day is doomed.

LABOR'S OPPORTUNITY

Labor cannot, and certainly will not, answer the challenge in the affirmative to save capitalism until it asks itself, with scrupulous honesty and with the minimum of bias, one important question: How is labor's bread buttered?

The time has gone by when the leaders of labor need ask the workingman "On which side is labor's bread buttered?" For today I believe that every intelligent person in the United States knows that labor's bread is best buttered on the side of collective bargaining, done through strong, established, orderly unions. I also believe that public opinion is not only reconciled to this answer but is enthusiastically in favor of it. Any concerted attempt on the part of private pressure groups or demagogic reactionary politicians to destroy the American trade-union movement, or wipe from our statute books the principle of collective bargaining, is doomed to certain defeat at the bar of public opinion—so long as there is any form of private industry left in this country with which labor can collectively bargain.

Naturally there are always a few bitter-enders. Naturally some few capitalists continue to fight against the principle of collective bargaining. But their only real fight today is against the continued extension of that principle. This, too, will be a losing fight. For the principle of collective bargaining is surely destined to become not only a national act but a state law everywhere. My point is simply that labor, however hard it may be fighting to extend the right to bargain collectively, is certainly not fighting on the national scene for the right to bargain collectively. This great victory has been won, even though in hundreds of cases the fruits of victory have not been garnered by the individual laboring man. Indeed, no greater proof could be given of the fact that labor has nationally won the right to organize and bargain collectively than the fact that labor has, in its own ranks, begun to compete for the exercise of the right to bargain, so that today labor's most spectacular fights are more often internecine in character than directed against the employer. In short, so much in demand is the product, unionism, that the purveyors of it have become competitive.

And in all this there lies a great danger. For the danger is that labor, absorbed in its highly justified and critical battles to extend the collective bargaining principles everywhere, and obsessed in its own ranks with its party battles, will forget, until it is too late—will forget why it fought in the first place for the right to bargain collectively. Perhaps I am being naive, but it seems to me that labor fought in the first place for the right to bargain collectively because this seemed the best procedure for workingmen to take in order to get a fuller and fairer share of—what? Why, of industry's profits. And that brings me back to the question: How is labor's bread buttered? Well, in the year 1943 of the Second World War the answer is inescapable; it is buttered by high war wages, paid out of high war profits by expanding private war industries in a period of full war employment. (At this point, in order not to send any reader's mind off at an argumentative tangent, I do not for an instant suggest that the amount of butter on labor's bread is what it could be, or should be. To argue the thickness of butter would lead into a discussion of the control of inflation and living costs, which is not a question germane to the general argument, or to the question of the relationships of the high wages to the high profits—which is germane, but will be touched upon later.) The point I wish to establish is how labor gets butter on its bread and not how much butter. The how is indisputable. Labor's butter comes through profitable employment.

And that is the way the workingman wants it to come. He does not want to be unprofitably employed—to be the walking advertisement of a boondoggle. That being the

case, I hope it is not naive to suggest that after the war the workingman will want to earn his butter in the same way—through profitable employment—that is, high peace wages, paid out of high profits by expanding private peace industries in a period of full peacetime employment.

Is this not the formula which labor leadership itself must concentrate on if, in the end, labor is to have plentiful and good jobs to bargain for, and decent and proper wages to bargain for?

Let me repeat the formula again: high wages paid out of high profits, by expanding private industry in a period of full employment. Remove any single word from that formula in any order you choose to remove it, and the result will be depression, followed by an increasing stagnation of the economy, dying capitalism, followed by a totalitarian ism, inevitably.

At this point, I should like to say that until the labor movement grew strong and powerful labor was guiltless of the decline of capitalism. The honor for the sabotaging of the enterprise system could be pretty evenly divided between capitalists and politicians, and this again for a simple reason: They were the boys who had the voices and the power. In retrospect we can see that capitalists made two egregious blunders. The first was in not cutting labor in directly and immediately on its own profits. The second was in excluding labor from the factory production team. Had it been part of the mores of capitalism to give the workingman an immediate cut, an immediate and direct profit bonus, production bonus, or profit-sharing plan in addition to good basic wages, the terrible schism which has developed between labor and capital would not exist. Well, the labor leader answers, capitalism and capitalists did not give the workingman a bonus, a share, etc., and he has not put us on the production team, and that precisely is why we organized. To which I must answer if that is why labor unions were organized, then that is what labor must increasingly struggle for. For now we have the how of the workingman's bread and butter, and the why of his unions, and we, therefore, would seem to have a clue to a future policy for labor.

I am speaking here of labor leaders who are really interested in the working man. I have no suggestion to offer to those who are only interested in organization for organization's sake, which was known when I lived in Europe as the "German disease."

For every patriotic labor leader there is now a great opportunity to move on to a great policy. The aim of this policy would be not only to further the interests of his union and the labor unions but in the crucial period ahead he should try to formulate the opinion of workingmen and the general public simultaneously on two lines: (1) The preservation of the free dynamic enterprise system, which is to say, an expanding high profit industry, the only kind interesting to finance capital and able to sustain employment. This means labor must take another look at the Nation's tax laws and fiscal policies which up to now had been destroying them; (2) labor leaders must try to educate the public, the workman, and the capitalists to the idea of labor-capital partnership. For partnership is the true relation between them and the only one that is moral. While pressing for higher profits for industry, labor leadership must press equally hard for a direct share in those profits, not in terms of higher wages but in terms of direct profit-sharing schemes and bonuses keyed to good basic wages.

I sometimes like to think of what would happen if the average workingman ever caught on to what a difference it might have made in his life between the years 1932–39 if his Government, instead of killing off millions and millions and millions of industrial profits just as it killed little pigs, had written into the law that he, the average workingman, should first collect the profits that had been produced by his hands, his brains, and his muscles. Needless to say, this idea of profit sharing will be bitterly resisted by employers, if at the same time labor is short-sighted enough to tolerate punitive taxation of industry and other Government policies which cause industry to shrink.

Give the workers a cut on the profits in his own factory, give his leader a place on the production team—and what will happen? Well, I can tell you what won't happen: There will be no drive among the workers to shorten hours except as is desirable for efficiency and health. There will be no make-work anti-technological drive. There would be, on the contrary, every incentive for workers and their leaders to do everything possible to see that the industy in which they shared the profits became more and more profitable. Stragglers and idlers, professional malcontents, and Communists, agitators, agitating for power's sake in labor's ranks, would be summarily dealt with by labor itself. And the most contentious problem in labor's ranks will vanish into thin air: Does an individual worker have a right to a job in any given plant? For his fellow workers will see to it that he has that right—only so long as he does his job well, because not to do it well is to dissipate their profits—and so long as he is needed—because if he isn't needed, he is also dissipating their profits. As an American I confess that I am a little ashamed that the Russians seem to have got onto this sensible idea before we progressive Americans did.

So long as labor leadership concentrates exclusively on high wages and make-work, while it allows its Government to enact deceptively pro-labor legislation which sucks profits, not into the pockets of the workers who made them, but into the coffers of the bureaucrats who pass it out in the shape of doles to men and women who had no part in it, while at the same time passing legislation that keeps capital from investing in new enterprises—just so long is labor on the road to economic disaster. The reverse is true; just so long as management refuses to pass the profits directly to the worker, it is widening the schism between labor and capital every day—and also pressing for socialism and encompassing its own suicide. Now labor is organized and can explain these things to its own members, put pressure on public opinion, and on Government to encompass them, far better than capital.

Today labor's relations with the public are very poor. There is no reputable labor man who will not acknowledge this. Why? Well, I believe, for one very simple reason: The general public has begun to believe that too many organized labor leaders are secretly the enemies of the free-enterprise system (i. e., either they don't know, or care, how their bread is buttered), and public opinion is overwhelming today in favor of the preservation of the free-enterprise system, if it can be saved. Selfish labor leaders, featherbedding in the midst of a terrible war in which the manpower shortage is acute, power-hungry labor leaders rowing over jurisdictional questions at a time when they themselves scream loudest for national unity, labor racketeers, Communist agitators in labor's own ranks, have all given labor a terrible black eye with the public. It is my own opinion that there are in the ranks of labor men of great vision and ability, who understand economics far better than some of our New Deal economists. Now is the time for them to take over and beat the drums for a new right: The right to preserve and share in the profits of the Nation's industries—the right to go into full partnership on an individual factory-to-factory basis with industry. For capital to deny labor this right, or for labor to fail to press for this right, is inevitably for both to conspire in the downfall of our system and their own destruction. In this respect the present administration has been as great an enemy to labor as it has to capital. It has always, and tirelessly, sought to conceal and obscure the relation between them. It has widened at every chance it had the gap between them for political advantage. It has caused business to shrink, and capital to go into hiding, and labor to identify itself with every interest except its greatest—the profit system. If the war had not come to reveal in a great light, albeit a sulfurous and hideous light, Mars-engendered, that labor's last best hope lay in an expanding high wage, high profit, full-time employment in private industry economy—we would be today, without that war, well on the road to chronic depression. There was no other solution in New Deal economy.

The State of Connecticut is the fourth largest industrial State in America. Connecticut's unions have made a splendid wartime record. Connecticut manufacturers are cooperating magnificently with those unions. No other State provides such a happy laboratory for new capital-labor relations as Connecticut. What a challenge it is to the businessmen and the labor leaders of our State, to sit down in their factories now to discuss their post-war relations, and how they can work together as a great production team in a post-war economy, to expand profits, share profits, and provide employment! What they cannot do between them, working in harmony to prevent depression, the Government will do. But if labor were ever once to take a good long look at capital's problems, and vice versa—there would be very little for Government to do. That the best governed were always the least governed was the truest thing ever said, and in our times—forgotten.

New Alliance Debate Likely in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Alliance Debate Likely in Congress," from the pen of David Lawrence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ALLIANCE DEBATE LIKELY IN CONGRESS

(By David Lawrence)

Although for one reason or another debate on our relation with other allies seems to have been frowned on as likely during the war to open up differences, Congress seems certain to debate considerably from time to time the suggestion advanced in many quarters recently that the United States enter into a post-war military alliance with Great Britain.

The proposal on its face looks innocent enough—just a continuation of our present effective and efficient collaboration with our principal ally. But the United States has never entered into a peacetime alliance with any nation since George Washington's warning against permanent alliances, so the experience would be rather novel.

Thus, for instance, how much of the cost of the combined peacetime navy will Great Britain contribute and how much of the air forces of the world will each nation maintain? Also, what obligations will the United States undertake with respect to the protection of the various parts of the British Empire, including far-flung colonies and dominions?

It so happens that the United States had a Navy about equal to Britain's at the outbreak of war in 1939 and we now have arranged to treble the size of our fleet, entailing an expense unprecedented in world history. Britain has merely replaced her losses, so that at the moment her navy is about equal to what it was in pre-war days

POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS

This means that if the United States and Britain are allied, either the size of the American Fleet can be cut down or, if it is maintained, that the financial burden will be a substantial part of any peacetime budget and that that budget will be considerably increased.

There is no such thing, moreover, as a military alliance which does not involve political obligations. Our foreign policy must coincide with that of Great Britain throughout the world and America must undertake the protection of all British possessions if there is to be equal responsibility for military or naval action in any emergency that arises. Will the United States wish to underwrite British policy in India, for example?

When Governor Dewey, of New York, proposed a military alliance between Britain and America, he may have had his tongue in his cheek. As a political stroke, it was masterful. He had been accused of being an isolationist. He was looked upon by many of the Willkie supporters as being less in favor of international cooperation than the 1940 Presidential nominee. In one fell swoop, Mr. Dewey erases that impression and makes himself a cooperationist. In fact, he goes further than Mr. Willkie ever has gone.

Governor Dewey took little chance in coming out for the alliance. There isn't much likelihood of it being voted on at the polls this year or next because the post-war settlements are not likely to be reached for a long time and the question of what kind of a world organization is to be set up will probably come to the fore along with the military alliance suggestions, so that Mr. Dewey, who says he isn't running for the Presidency, at least not in 1944, can say almost anything about the world situation and not find himself confronted with any concrete opposition.

CONTRARY TO UNITED STATES HISTORY

The most important aspect of any military alliance seems to have been overlooked by those who are zealously espousing it for America and Britain as a means of keeping world peace. That aspect concerns the provisions of the American Constitution which states that our Congress can declare war and only Congress can provide money for the national defense. If an alliance is proposed, it would require a treaty, and under the terms of such a treaty the future Congresses would, in effect, be required to renounce the constitutional right of ordering our troops or our Navy into action. The Congress would, in effect, be delegating the war-making power for all times to a joint Army and Navy board or combined command of both countries.

This is contrary to the whole history of the United States. Temporary alliances for wartime purposes have been validated in 1917 and in 1941 by a temporary delegation of power to the Executive by Congress—good only for 2 years—but it is a serious question whether Congress could make any treaty with Britain delegating for all time the war-making power and preventing Congress and the American people from deciding in each instance whether the lives of American citizens should be sacrificed and for what purpose.

Post-War Collaboration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the 12th of September the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] delivered a very able address at Carnegie Hall in New York City on the subject of post-war collaboration. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whether or not human nature can change is a subject I shall leave for the sociologists to discuss in a calmer moment; at least we know that human nature can be brought under control and self-discipline, and that it can profit by the experience.

On March 4, 1919, while President Wilson and his associates were in Paris negotiating the Treaty of Versailles, a resolution was introduced in the Senate by 37 Senators which in effect said that two-thirds of the Senate would not consent to ratification of the League of Nations Covenant. This warning to the world not to trust our negotiators in Paris is one of the most tragic events of our history. From that moment there began a retreat from the ideal of world cooperation—a retreat to the Second World War.

In striking contrast, on March 16, 1943, a resolution was introduced in the Senate which would accomplish the very opposite result. Two Republicans and two Democrats—Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL—have introduced a resolution urging that the United States take the initiative in organizing the United Nations to establish temporary administration for areas occupied by the United Nations; to administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation; to establish methods for peaceful settlement of disputes and, most important, to provide for the maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any attempts at military aggression.

This resolution not only deserves overwhelming support but is receiving it. Some of us have been speaking for the resolution throughout the country this summer.

In addition to the Senate Resolution No. 114, to which I have just referred, a large number of other resolutions has been introduced in the Senate, some preceding and others complementing it. It was my privilege, on May 5, 1941, to introduce a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations, or a subcommittee, to make a full investigation of the matters pertaining to the establishment of an everlasting peace throughout the world.

Again, on February 11, 1943, I presented another resolution to the Senate, which stated, "That it is the sense of the Senate that action should be taken immediately with a view to planning and formulating a comprehensive program of international economic cooperation which will be just and equitable to all the nations of the world, and for that purpose and in order to lay the foundations for world economic stability and a lasting peace the President is hereby requested to call such conferences of representatives of the United Nations, and to take such other action, as he deems desirable and necessary."

The success of the Food and Agriculture Conference, the high hopes for the forthcoming conference on relief and rehabilitation, and the monetary discussions about to begin show that the United Nations are facing post-war problems.

And again, on May 6, 1943, I presented a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives: "It is the sense of Congress that the United States will cooperate fully with other nations in establishing and preserving a just and lasting peace and in establishing such organizations as may be necessary to suppress any future attempt at military aggression by any other nation."

So the great discussion has already begun—in every forum, labor hall, and church of the land—and the meeting tonight is one of many. Discussion has begun in Congress and will occupy much of our attention this fall.

The tragic history of the last 25 years taught us that it is no good winning a war unless, as our President has said, "that war stays won." Lasting peace will never come by fiat. It must be planned and made to work. World wars do not just happen by accident. They grow out of causes; they result from the things men do and from the things men leave undone. As our Commission to Study the Organization of Peace stated: "Peace under modern conditions cannot be a static condition of life achieved by the renunciation of war, nor a mere pious desire to live at peace. Peace must be a dynamic and continuous process for the achievement of freedom, justice, progress, and security on a world-wide scale."

The prevention of war, rather than its cure, must be the ultimate solution of this difficult problem. This may seem to some of us like an utterly unreal dream, but I do not think it is. There is at least no reason why we should not plan and strive to make this the last of wars among the civilized people of the world.

Two lines of action lie before us. First, we must reduce the risk of war by disarming the bandit nations, and then—but not until then—reduce the armaments of the whole world to the lowest level consistent with the maintenance of domestic tranquility. Then we must agree that the employment of force in international matters be never permitted to any nation which refuses to accept pacific means of settlement of disputes, in court or arbitration, conference or diplomacy.

But this means that to get rid of war we must enthrone justice in the place of force and a decent regard for human rights in the place of violence. So we must understand that any plan to keep order in our world, and to prevent another war, must include a court system which can deal with the disputes of nations. For those disputes are not going to end, but to continue. They will be adjusted by one of two means: The means of peaceful decision, or the means of violence.

Then, too, if our world is to know any lasting peace there must be for its peoples a reasonable hope of a tolerable life. Not all parts of the world may know such fortunate conditions and glorious opportunities as we can hope for, but hopeless despair and unrelieved misery on the part of many of the world's millions will mean a resort to war. It is useless to say that we are not concerned with the condition of other peoples. Our first consideration should be for the condition of our own people. That goes without saying. Justice and peace, like charity, must begin at home. But our welfare can be increased in proportion as other people are able to buy our goods under fair conditions of trade and in proportion as they make the goods they sell to us under decent standards of livelihood. The more they can buy the more we can sell. Poverty anywhere helps no one.

There is a moral as well as an economic reason why we cannot be indifferent to injustice and suffering. It tests the fiber of our conscience and the strength of that precious heritage of kindliness which is the outstanding quality of America. In this we shall not fail. We shall help to fight starvation and disease, whether it be in gallant China or in suffering Europe. Helping China to help herself to a better life when Japan is crushed will be one of our greatest opportunities. Not only will it be an opportunity, it will be one of the best bases for our lasting prosperity. The emergence of China from economic misery will cause growing demands for our agricultural surpluses and growing markets for our industries. Four hundred million customers who are able to buy should be a concern of every businessman.

Since war and peace are now proved beyond question to be matters of universal concern, there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the United Nations must maintain a peace force. That force must be directed from that center where the United Nations' power has been and is now being directed in the war. This is what I interpret Senate Resolution No. 114 to mean when it states:

"To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations' military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation."

We must realize that in addition to helping to keep order and to promote opportunity, we must be concerned for liberty all over the world. We should not try to dictate the form of governments under which others should live, but we should know by now that when any powerful nation crushes all freedom and teaches its youth perverted cults of hate and blood and evil, the peace of our world is insecure. There will need to be some means by which the nations can be restrained from doing this and restrained before rather than after such dangerous creeds are acted upon. Liberty is like love—the more you give, the more you receive.

If all this is to be done there must be developed a sense of world community and a growing sense of world citizenship. And to this our own national experience can contribute greatly. In our own Federal system there is much that can help us, for an important suggestion as to the place of the individual in a world society can be found in our Constitution. According to that great document, we are citizens both of our Nation and of the State in which we reside. It took us some time to come to that concept. At first it was fought bitterly by those who thought only in terms of their own States.

It will take us long to come to a fully recognized concept of citizenship in our own Nation and in the world. But that is the way we must move, that is the direction we must take, if we are to enjoy a lasting peace.

Our own Nation cannot build a world of order and opportunity and freedom all alone. But it can give leadership to that great endeavor. Not only because of our strength, not only because of our wealth, but because we have in our own heritage the tradition for organization of a great peaceful, freedom-loving community. The Federal idea is capable of great enlargement.

Our world today is a smaller community than were our Original Thirteen States. It can be encompassed in 4 days' travel. It can be instantly informed of the news and views of all peoples. It will know peace and opportunity and freedom as a whole, or no part of it will long be secure or prosperous or assuredly free.

Aristotle taught that no state should be larger than the ability of its people to know on one border that they were being attacked on another. News of attack in one part of the earth can now be told to the whole world sooner than such news could be told throughout the small Greek city-states. Thus war and peace are of world-wide concern even under Aristotle's concepts.

Once we realize this the planning of a lasting peace will not be hard, for the way of peace is in the world today, even though men are not treading the path of peace.

I do not agree with those who say that after Germany surrenders unconditionally there should be a cooling-off period before peace settlements are drafted and the United Nations organized to accomplish what has been contemplated in Senate Resolution No. 114 and my resolutions to which reference has been made. The very contrary practice should be followed. Peace settlements should be prepared before hostilities cease, and in those cases in which that is impossible, the methods of solving them should be agreed upon.

The United Nations should be organized as quickly as possible, so that when the war ends the universal structure of peace to promote economic justice and to prevent aggression, by whatever means or force necessary, will be ready for man's use.

Slow Down the Trains!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar, dated September 8, 1943:

SLOW DOWN THE TRAINS!

The Pennsylvania Railroad's Congressional Limited is a remarkable train, about 30 minutes faster than others of the Washington-New York run. Monday afternoon The Congressional didn't finish its trip because of a "hot box," burned-out bearings, and a twisted axle on an old-type coach in the middle of the train. As this was written the bodies were still being counted at Philadelphia.

The New York Central's Twentieth Century Limited is another crack passenger express, fastest on the Chicago-New York run. Monday night the locomotive on this limited exploded, killing the crew and derailing the train.

Other de luxe limiteds on other lines, some transcontinental, the pride of American railways, are still trying to maintain the high-speed schedules that were possible with safety in peacetime, to save a few minutes or a few hours in trips from one point to another.

Our railroads have turned in an astonishing performance, handling the tremendous burdens of war transportation, and for the most part continuing civilian services unimpaired. But it appears possible that the railway industry may be attempting too much, in this time of shortages of materials and manpower, difficulties of maintenance and repairs, rolling stock wearing out, and roadbeds running down.

Wouldn't it be better for the railroads to cut the pattern of service to fit the cloth of available equipment? Most of the people riding the trains would rather sacrifice a little time to gain greater assurance of safety.

Naming the MacArthur Lock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening News of Sault Ste. Marie, edition of July 10, 1943, Mr. Clergue C. Schilling, an attorney of that city, who is presently in Washington serving on a wartime assignment, wrote a very interesting article prepared exclusively for that paper on the chronological history of the legislation through Congress which led to the construction and naming of the new MacArthur lock; which was formally opened on July 11, 1943, with the passage through the lock of the steamer *Carl D. Bradley*, named after my father and owned by the Bradley Transportation Co., which is a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. Schilling is not only a well-known attorney of Sault Ste. Marie, but likewise is well known in Washington in congressional circles, having served on the staff of former Representatives Frank D. Scott of Alpena, Robert H. Clancy of Detroit, and Larry W. Musselwhite of Manistee, as well as former Senator Prentiss M. Brown. As soon as the war is over and he can be relieved from his present assignment, Mr. Schilling intends to return to his native city and reopen his law office.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this very interesting article:

TRACE LEGISLATION IN CONGRESS GIVING NEW LOCK MACARTHUR AS NAME—OTHER OPENINGS RECALLED

(By Clergue C. Schilling)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—With the opening of the new lock at Sault Ste. Marie it is interesting to trace the legislation in the Congress which gives it the name "MacArthur lock" and gives the official designation to the present fourth lock as the "Sabin Lock."

The resolution for this purpose was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 18, 1943, by Representative FRED BRADLEY of Rogers City. After hearings before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate it was adopted in each branch of the Congress and approved as a public law by the President of the United States on June 15, 1943.

In support of his measure before the Rivers and Harbors Committee Representative BRADLEY placed in the record a comprehensive history of the opening of the fourth or Sabin Lock which was contained in the annual report of the Lake Carriers' Association for 1919. Excerpts from this report follow:

"REPORT ON FOURTH LOCK, ST. MARYS FALLS CANAL, MICH.

"The Fourth lock at the Sault was placed in commission on September 18, 1919.

"Completion and opening of the Fourth or Sabin lock.

"When the fourth American lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., was formally opened at 5:15 p. m. on Thursday, September 18, 1919, another epoch was written into the annals of the greatest of water traffic—the Great Lakes. With this, a twin of the Davis lock, yet possessing some additional features that make it stand out as the world's most superior lock, the efficiency of the system of locks at the Sault is now such as to remove the probability of any congestion of the fleet of bulk freighters occurring in the near future. Being 1,350 feet long, two of the modern 600-foot bulk freighters may lock through together, end to end, and be lifted or lowered 20 feet with cargo, each totaling 13,000 gross tons, in 8 minutes. The width of the lock chamber being 80 feet, and as the ideal breadth of the modern freighter is 60 feet, its width will suffice for all needs for many years to come."

"In any other country the ceremony attending the formal opening of such a marvel of engineering skill would have been ostentatious but the ceremony on this occasion was marked for its simplicity, though animated and largely attended. The Lake Carriers' Association was represented by William Livingstone, president; Harvey D. Goulder, general counsel; George A. Marr, secretary and treasurer; and W. D. Becker, John J. Barlum, S. B. Cady, and A. C. Sullivan; while E. L. Woodruff, superintendent of lighthouses, and H. E. Gilpin, president of the Great Lakes Towing Co., attended as guests of the association. The train bearing the party was due at Saulte Ste. Marie at 12:25 p. m., but did not arrive until 3:10 p. m. As on the occasion of the opening of the Livingstone Channel, steamer *William Livingstone* of the W. C. Richardson fleet was placed at the disposal of the Lake Carriers' Association, hence the party proceeded to the steamer, where luncheon was served. In addition to the above named those at the table included Col. J. G. Warren, division engineer, United States Army, Buffalo; Col. E. M. Markham, United States engineer in charge of the Detroit district which includes the Sault; L. C. Sabin, resident engineer and superintendent of the locks; Capts. F. A. Bailey, W. G. Stewart, and Warren C. Jones; Capt. Otto Gentz, of the steamer *William Livingstone;* W. S. Hoag, chief engineer of the Richardson fleet, and Capt. F. D. Root, manager of the Great Lakes Towing Co. President Livingstone, as toastmaster, recited the historical features and remarkable growth of navigation since the locks were first conceived, after which speeches appropriate to the occasion were made by Colonels Warren and Markham and Messrs. Goulder, Woodruff, and Sabin.

"At 5 p. m. the steamer *William Livingstone,* escorted by the Government boats *Voyager, Alfred Noble, General G. J. Lydecker, General G. C. Sears,* and *Clover,* and the tugs *L. C. Sabin* and *Alabama,* entered the new lock amid a din of whistles and the waving of a salute from the crowd on other boats and on the lock walls. Added to the animated scene simultaneously but without prearrangement, the steamer *Crete* was locking up in the Poe lock; the *Luzon, John Ericsson,* and *Saturn* locking down in the Davis lock, while the *Huronic* was in the Canadian lock.

"In passing through the lock the afternoon's ceremonies were resumed in the observation room of the steamer. Mr. Goulder, in a few well-chosen words, proposed that the new lock be christened the Sabin lock. Felicitous speeches were made by Mr. Livingstone and Colonels Warren and Markham eulogizing Mr. Sabin and endorsing the unofficial christening of the lock, following which those present unanimously adopted a resolution to call this lock the Sabin lock. How spontaneous was this feeling, covering some period before the official opening, that it be so named in recognition of Mr. Sabin's many accomplishments at the St. Mary's Falls canal may be gathered from the fact that popular feeling at the Sault favored such action, while at the meeting of the advisory committee of the Great Lakes Protective Association as early as September 4, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"RECOMMEND SABIN LOCK

"'*Resolved,* That as a mark of appreciation of the long and efficient service to the Government by Mr. L. S. Sabin, the resident engineer in the construction and maintenance of the locks at the Sault Canal, we recommend that the lock that is now about to be completed shall be known as the Sabin lock.'

"With the completion of the fourth lock there comes to an end a long and active campaign for more adequate locking facilities at the Sault from the American Government. So long ago as 1909 the following statement embraced a part of the annual report of this association:

"'The growing difficulties we have been experiencing for some time with the locks at Sault Ste. Marie have been steadily on the increase and the conviction has been forced upon us that owing to the length of time required for obtaining the necessary legislation and appropriation and the time required for the construction of the lock after the appropriation has been secured, that it was an absolute necessity for us to take immediate steps toward the construction of a fourth lock. The campaign was continued from year to year until finally the Congress, realizing also that improvements at the Sault were not keeping pace with the remarkable expansion of lake commerce, took favorable action.'

"Actual work on the lock began in April 1913. The excavation work was completed in just 2 years' time, or precisely on April 25, 1915. The total amount of this contract for excavating through clay and rock a distance of one-quarter mile and for a depth of 50 feet and width of 100 feet was $481,726.90. In the fall of 1915 the work of concreting the walls and floor was started. This incurred the largest expense of the lock, and amounted to more than $1,000,000. It was not completed until January 16, 1919. The work of installing the gates and machinery, the building of the west approach to the lock, was started in 1917. The contract for the gates amounted to $230,445; furnishing and installing the machinery and valves cost $221,895; the stone engine shelters cost $25,694, and the east approach to the lock cost $235,693. Altogether the lock was built at an expenditure of $2,500,000 and of 6½ years' time."

The original Bradley bill as reported from the committee to the House by Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Royal Oak, Michigan's member of the Rivers and Harbors body, instructed the Secretary of War to designate the new lock as the General Douglas MacArthur lock and the present fourth lock as the Colonel L. C. Sabin lock. How the names were changed to the simple title "MacArthur" and "Sabin" is shown in the Dondero report to the House, and Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG'S report from the Senate Commerce Committee to the Senate, together with Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson's letter to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee:

DONDERO'S REPORT

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1258) instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Mary's River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur lock and designating the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock as the Colonel L. C. Sabin lock, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the new lock now in the course of construction by the War Department in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, shall be designated 'MacArthur lock,' and the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock shall be hereafter designated 'Sabin lock.'"

Change the title so as to read: "A bill to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michgan."

The purpose of the bill is to honor two distinguished Americans, namely, (1) Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for his brilliant military accomplishments in the Pacific theater of war operations; and (2) Mr. Louis C. Sabin, a former civilian engineer employee of the Government with an outstanding record of service.

VANDENBERG'S REPORT

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1258) to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill has the approval of the Secretary of War and the Bureau of the Budget, as will appear by the following letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors as contained in the House report and which is made a part of this report.

"(H. Rept. No. 283, 78th Cong., 1st sess.)

"The purpose of the bill is to honor two distinguished Americans, namely, (1) Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for his brilliant military accomplishments in the Pacific theater of war operations; and (2) Mr. Louis C. Sabin, a former civilian engineer employee of the Government with an outstanding record of service."

The Secretary of War reported as follows on this bill:

STIMSON'S REPORT

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 6, 1943.

Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MANSFIELD: Reference is made to your letter of February 3, 1943, requesting the views of this Department as to the advisability of enacting House bill 1258, instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the "General Douglas MacArthur lock," and designating the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock as the "Colonel L. C. Sabin lock."

The War Department has no objection to the enactment of the bill. The new lock which it is proposed to name in honor of General MacArthur is now under construction by the Department, its construction having been authorized in the interest of national defense by section 17 of an act of Congress approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490). The so-called fourth lock was completed in 1919, and Mr. Louis C. Sabin, a former civilian employee of the Government whose long period of service in the Engineer Department was exceptionally able and meritorious, had much to do with its planning and construction.

It is suggested, however, that the phrasing of the bill be changed as indicated on a copy of the same herewith.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Here is the exact language of the measure as it passed both Houses of Congress and approved by President Roosevelt:

"An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan.

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the new lock now in the course of construction by the

War Department in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, shall be designated 'MacArthur lock,' and the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock shall be hereafter designated 'Sabin lock.'

"Passed the House of Representatives May 17, 1943.

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, *Clerk.*

"Passed the Senate June 10, 1943."

"[Public Law 72—78th Congress]

"[Chapter 124—1st Session]

"[H. R. 1258]

"An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan.

"*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the new lock now in the course of construction by the War Department in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, shall be designated 'MacArthur lock,' and the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock shall be hereafter designated 'Sabin lock.'

"Approved June 15, 1943."

The names—MacArthur and Sabin—which highlight the opening day ceremonies are by no means new to the Sault and especially in the vicinity of the locks. In one way or another these names have been associated with the locks area since well before the turn of the century. It was in the 1890's that Sabin began his employment at the Sault when the Poe lock was under construction. In 1906 he was appointed superintendent, a post he held with distinction for many years before retiring to accept an executive assignment with the Lake Carriers' Association. During Sabin's superintendency he had as his able assistant the late Frank T. McArthur who later became acting superintendent for a time.

When work was commenced on the excavation work for the construction of the Sabin lock, oddly enough, the contract was let to the MacArthur Bros. Co., of Chicago and New York. This company which was headed by the brothers, Arthur F. and John R. MacArthur, were the prime contractors for the excavation.

A few years later another McArthur appeared on the scene at the locks in the person of the late Howard McArthur in the role of marine reporter for the Evening News. Since his father, Frank T. McArthur, was assistant superintendent, he had a friendly news source and part of his duties, of course, included interviewing Colonel Sabin daily.

This name business is purely coincidental. There is no evidence that Gen. Douglas MacArthur is related to the MacArthur brothers who dug the hole for the Sabin lock or to Frank T. McArthur, but the fact remains that the names MacArthur (pronounced the same any way you spell it), and Sabin carry on at the Sault locks and they will be bywords for a long, long time.

New England Problems and Federal Policy and Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER STEARNS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Edward E. Chase, president of the New England Council, in Boston, Mass., on September 10, 1943:

The speakers whom I shall introduce will present certain facts and views bearing on some pressing problems of New England which involve Federal policy and legislation. They have been asked to present pertinent facts mainly, and views and opinions only when deemed to prevail in informed New England opinion. Having asked these speakers to deal with tangible and prevailing views, I have the temerity, in opening, to express some ideas on intangibles.

My professor in government was fond of quoting from Sumner, who wrote in his essay on democracy that majorities cannot determine what is right and what is wrong; that all a majority can determine is what we will do next. In these times, when we are swept by events into the "next" before we decide to go there, I wonder whether a majority can have lost even that power.

There is a theory that government should follow public opinion. A more practical view holds that government should lead public opinion while appearing to follow it. Neither theory nor practice, on this line, works fast enough. In the long run, public opinion determines what is right and wrong. But I submit that it is often more important that a majority should decide quickly what to do next.

Before we become committed to the principle of government by public opinion we ought to ask ourselves if there is such a thing; and if there is, what are its capacities for decision. We should remember that any time between elections it takes a 75-percent prevailing opinion to force a majority decision. We should remember that in our own times the collective public mind and the individual mind have been swamped by a tidal wave of change; that minds—to mix a metaphor—are groping for light and gasping for breath; that hardly anyone knows where he is at or what he thinks and that almost everyone is willing to admit it. In geometry I was taught that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. I am now advised that this is not true, but that there are only a dozen who would be competent to explain, provided I were bright enough to understand, what is the shortest distance. In almost every field of thought—social, scientific, economic, political—the average citizen is sure only that he is not sure of anything.

The state of the public mind is confusion and inconsistency. Almost everyone is talking one way and acting another, without knowing it. There is no such thing anywhere as enlightened consistent public opinion. Public opinion is a state of flux in chaos. If there is anything clear in current clamor, it is a cry for something to stay put—for something permanent and fixed and stable upon which a man can rely and in which he can have faith.

This sorry state of mind may be the most important fact we have to face. We have lost our compass and our reckoning and we have to make a landfall to get our bearings. Something has to stand still in plain view for long enough to sight on it. We cannot afford to tear down all the pillars of confidence. What people want and need, today more than ever, are stable institutions. Wherever evil exists it must be attacked; but this should be done by specific charges against named persons and not by innuendo and loose charges against groups. There are too many manhunts—too many smearing expeditions. For every public enemy uncovered, hundreds of honest men are made suspect. The price is too high for the meager results. There is too much uncoordinated and unlawful power trying to push people around by threats and scares and tricks. Let us remember, when we speak of post-war plans, that no plan is worth anything unless people are on speaking terms with one another after the war.

One American institution, intact in its framework, faith in which still abides, still retains and has recently demonstrated the capacity to act. This is representative government. Perhaps nothing has given the people of New England more courage than the recent resurgence in Congress of faith in its own capacity. I am aware that by an inconsistency characteristic of the times there are many who want Congress to be subservient to pressure while at the same time expecting Congress to be independent. But since Congress cannot be both, I believe it should openly adopt the independent course. It would be a great event, I think, if some day, when Congress is showered with pressure letters and telegrams, each Senator and Congressman should answer his constituents by collect telegram saying, "Please send me all the facts bearing on this matter." I can think of no better way to demonstrate that Congress usually knows infinitely more than those people who presume to advise it.

So far as I know the minds of our directors, the New England Council would say to the New England congressional delegation: "Let us help you get the facts; and having the facts, act independently for the national welfare as your judgment indicates. You are our representatives—the repositories of our confidence—the trustees of our political fortunes. It is necessary to trust someone, even at risk of occasional betrayal. We shall trust Congress. We affirm our faith in representative government, as the only hope of a free people in a world of infinite complexity. Restore to representative government its former dignity and vigor."

To restore confidence and unity, and to stimulate intelligent planning and constructive leadership, prompt action by Congress is needed along the lines indicated.

A foreign policy frankly based upon realism and national interest, implemented by adequate force committed to maintain peace, instituted and ratified by constitutional procedure, depending for support upon the general approval of the enlightened and the complete silence of the ignorant.

A definition of the functions and fields of free enterprise, and of the scope and purpose of business regulation; a restriction upon the expansion of Government into the field of business without clear showing of necessity and without express legal authority; a declaration of intention regarding the responsibility of industry for post-war reemployment, and an indication of the measure of Government support of post-war construction and production; with legislation designed to make possible the accomplishment by the business organism of the tasks assigned.

A thorough overhauling of the system of Federal taxation, to simplify procedure and computation, and promote the established policy for free enterprise by substituting incentive for handicaps, using the elimination of waste motion and complexities to reconcile the beneficiaries of simplification to increased tax collections.

A declaration of the right of individual security expressly conditioned by the obligation to work to the extent of capacity, fixing the responsibility for providing the opportunity, and stimulating production to a level where a guaranty of security can be made good by stressing the obligation to work rather than by providing the population with spending money.

Legislation fixing the maximum amount of currency to be outstanding and drastic measures to bring back into circulation the hoarded currency.

As for New England, we ask no favors or special advantage. In civilian supply we want an equitable distribution, whether of surplus or shortage. We would like to see an increase in New England's representation on congressional committees dealing with

legislation affecting our economic interests, notably on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which has been or may be referred important legislation on freight rates, risk capital, and aviation policy. We suggest that it would help us, and that it might help our Senators and Representatives even more, if the New England delegation could be organized by the assignment of special functions to selected individuals who could serve as contact points and centers of information on particular subjects, in order to promote unity in New England along lines of common interest.

Today's Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address I made at Williamstown, Vt., on Old Home Day, Sunday, August 1, 1943:

This is old home day in Williamstown. What a world of significance is found in that slogan. What a wealth of meaning is hidden in that word "home." It is very fitting for us to spend this day in observing such an occasion as brings us here together.

I am glad of an opportunity to meet old friends and to make new ones, though, as I stand here, I can and do appreciate just what an elderly lady said in addressing a similar gathering. She said, "I am almost overwhelmed by the fact that, as I look out at this audience, I see more faces of people who are not here than I can count of you who are present."

Such a day necessarily revives old memories, recalls old friends, old occasions, old days. "We count our rosary by the beads we miss."

Almost as soon as a Northfield schoolboy or girl learns to read he or she learns that the first land in Northfield was cleared by one Elijah Paine, of Williamstown; that the mountain was named after him and in his honor; and that the Paines, of Williamstown, contributed most of any and of all the early inhabitants to the establishment and early growth of my native town. The names of many others of Williamstown's distinguished citizens are woven inextricably into the warp and woof not only of the history of Williamstown and Northfield, but of the State and Nation, which they served so well. I pay my tribute to their achievements and to their memory.

"All we have of freedom,
All we have or know
This our fathers bought for us
Long and long ago.

* * *

Leave to live by no man's leave
Underneath the law."

I intend to speak to you briefly this afternoon, and in no partisan spirit, but as an American citizen profoundly concerned and seriously disturbed over the present trend in public affairs that seems to me to threaten the very foundations of democracy.

We are rightly concerned with respect to what must be our post-war attitude in dealing with our allies and our enemies in order to establish a just and enduring peace.

We should be more concerned with respect to what is happening to democracy right here at home, for what does it profit a man to save the whole world and lose his own soul?

The great British historian, Lord Macaulay, writing from London on May 23, 1857—over 80 years ago—commented in this clairvoyant fashion on the probable trend of events in the United States during the twentieth century:

"The day will come when, in the State of New York, a multitude of people, none of whom have had more than half a breakfast or expect to have more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, strict observance of public faith. On the other is a demagogue ranting about the tyranny of capitalists and usurers. I seriously apprehend that you will, in some such season of adversity as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act as people would, in a year of scarcity, devour all the seed corn, and thus make the next year a year not of scarcity but of absolute famine. There is nothing to stay you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand; or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth."

The blessings of representative democratic government under which you have been raised and under which you live did not come about by accident. Have you ever pondered the long series of events and sacrifices by which the concept of democracy was made real in the world? Democracy is essentially a way of life; it is not a bed of roses; it is a dangerous way of living; it is for men, not weaklings. It is not the soft and sheltered existence that a wise and benevolent monarch grants his cringing subjects—the type of government which so readily degenerates into cruel despotism and to which oriental peoples have been accustomed since the dawn of civilization. It is distinctly a product of western Europe and history shows how recently has been its emergence. At Tours in 732, Charles Martel flung back the advancing tide of Saracens and the domination of an oriental despot which would have followed in its wake; again at Wahlstatt in 1241, the Count of Silesia and his German knights checked the Tartars under Bebu Khan and thus prevented the overrunning of western Europe by the "Golden Horde" that settled later along the Volga in southern Russia; and once more, in 1683—76 years after Jamestown was colonized in this country—the peoples of western Europe were called upon to throw back eastern despotism when they defeated the Turks at the gates of Vienna. The Englishman more or less clinched his personal right to democratic freedom at Runnymede through the Magna Carta in 1215, while we Americans owe our liberty to the sacrifices of our ancestors in the 2 crucial decades from 1770 to 1789. Probably there is not a man or woman present whose own ancestors have not participated in those momentous fights for human freedom. The student of genetics can demonstrate to you mathematically that, if your forefathers came from western Europe, some of them must have been involved in these struggles because otherwise there would not have been enough ancestors to go round.

Today these hard-won rights to democratic freedom are in real jeopardy in the United States.

The principle of the sovereignty of the people is found at the bottom of almost all human institutions. It is obeyed without being recognized, or if for a moment it be brought to light, it soon hides itself in most countries. In America, however, this principle of the sovereignty of the people is never concealed. We are outspoken in our declarations, though we may not be too active when it is involved. In these United States, as nowhere else in the world, this doctrine of the sovereignty of the people is appreciated; both its dangers and advantages derived therefrom are foreseen.

I believe it is most important that we have an enlightened people, an educated citizenry, in order that the people may rule, and righteously so. Those wise men, the makers of our Constitution, called their new Government a republic, and were correct in so doing, for such of necessity was its form. Do not forget for a moment, however, that they knew they were establishing a democracy, and an independent nation. This fact was constantly and everlastingly present in their minds.

If you will study the Constitution and the debates which led up to its adoption, you will find that these forefathers of ours did not attempt to set any barrier in the way of the popular will. They sought to put effective obstacles in the path of sudden action impelled by popular passion, whim, or the excitement of the moment. Their experience with the Confederation taught them to regard a weak government with horror.

Every end they sought to accomplish or had in view was for the establishment of a democracy with a strong government, but safe as well as strong, freed from the peril of lapsing into autocracy on the one hand or into disorder or anarchy on the other. They came here to undertake to do just what they did, and that was to establish a government in which the will of the people must be supreme. They made it so.

One of the fundamental rules and guides they followed was to make sure that it was the real will of the people that ruled. To this end they undertook to make it certain that there should be abundant time for discussion and consideration of measures and policies, in order that the public mind could and should be thoroughly and well informed. Above and beyond anything else perhaps they appreciated the value of education.

In these distressful days through which we are passing, we may at times feel that the way of life which has been called civilized may have been lost or forgotten. We may wonder from whence shall come the light that will lighten our darkness, or the guide who will lead us out. And here again the story of the ages tells us that our safety lies in the education of our people.

We must idealize the real if we would realize the ideal. Facts must be faced as facts. We may well keep our wagon hitched to a star, but we must keep our feet on the ground. Ideals are the thoughts, hopes, plans and resolutions of a people. They are their purposes, resolves and principles. The ideals of this Nation are the thoughts of what its people are going to do, have got to do to save themselves. The ideals of education in this country are the thoughts of those who carefully consider what education is for and what it must do for the people.

Henry James once said that "The greatest discovery ever made by man was made by the Greeks, who cutting themselves free from the traditions of the ancient world lighted upon the conception of a civil state where citizens should be free. To carry out this momentous experiment to its ultimate consequence is the most momentous experiment we have undertaken."

Times change and conditions with them. New times and new conditions must be met by and with the action and legislation they demand. All wisdom did not die with our forefathers, so also it is true all wisdom was not born yesterday. Yet not a single new

question arises but involves some one or more of the oldest theories of government. History repeats itself, and the experience of the ages is always a safe guide.

It is for us then in these dark days to do our best to help in the work of reconstruction, keeping our heads clear, our aims unselfish, and our hearts strong. If we do this we shall see humanity raised to a level yet unheard of. But the path is a rough one, and it is a long and tortuous road which we must tread. The journey cannot be accomplished overnight. Since the beginning of time two conquests have had to be made and will continue to have to be made until the end thereof. One is the conquest of nature, and the other of human relations. The first is relatively easy of accomplishment. The second decidedly not so. Only a mere beginning of a solution of this last problem has been made. If you do not believe it just stop to think for a moment that the earth produces food enough and to spare and to waste, and for all of us. Yet, at this moment, thousands are starving; hundreds of thousands going hungry, and all suffering from the paroxysms of unspeakable anguish, both physical and mental.

The problem is not solved. It is not insoluble. There is a way out.

I hope I may not be misunderstood or charged with partisan politics, nothing is further from my intent and purpose than to make a political speech, but in this presence I am constrained to emphasize the fact that the real vigor and strength of American institutions is due in large part to the restraints which these forbears of ours in their wisdom born of experience with kings and despots placed upon and around those in authority over them; they did not deliberately destroy the superstition of the divine right of kings, in order to foolishly create another situation more indefensible in a democracy; they were too wise for that, as is evidenced by the Constitution of the United States, the eventual fruit borne by their labors.

The growth, unparalleled, which these United States have enjoyed, is due more than anything else to the lofty spirit of individualism which this written Constitution and the unwritten laws, and the underlying positive determination of the people have sought to protect and to conserve, as much, I say, if not more, than to the natural resources with which God has so richly endowed the land, and blessed us as a people.

We should never forget that the doctrine that the will of the individual must be subordinated to that of the majority, when and if, and only when and if the common good demands, still stands. It stands, however, only to the end that the largest freedom may be insured to the state, the community, and the individual. It is for this reason that democracy is progressive. Democracy grows with and just as rapidly as the individual. "Under our flag," said President Calvin Coolidge, "sovereignty rests in the individual, and his rights must be protected."

Every effort of these ancestors of ours was definitely directed toward the accomplishment of the noble end of establishing and rearing a society of utterly responsible individuals, the only society on which an enduring democracy can rest. Your military power is nothing; your wealth is nothing; your numbers are nothing without the seed from which all greatness comes, namely, enlightened citizens.

Local self-government is the germ cell of democracy, but it is of no avail to count our millions, either of money or of men, if the individuals who make up the government are ignorant and weak and venal, for zero multiplied by any conceivable magnitude still results in zero.

It must constantly be borne in mind that the training of the free citizen is not so much a development of certain lines of knowledge as a development of certain essential qualities of character and habits of action. Courage, independence, discipline, and loftiness of purpose are the things really necessary for maintaining a free government. If a citizen possesses these qualities of character, he will acquire the knowledge which is essential to the conduct of the country's institutions, and to the reform of the abuses which may arise. If he does not possess these qualities, his political learning and that of his fellowmen will not keep the state from destruction. If he has not the courage to exercise his political rights in the face of purges and possible intimidation, no amount of acquaintance with constitutional theory will save his vote from suppression or prevent popular government from becoming a mere shadow. If he has not the discipline to subject his will to the restraints of law, no amount of knowledge of the beneficent effects of these restraints will save the people from that revolution and anarchy which invite tyranny from within or conquest from without.

In conclusion, may I say that in my opinion, the most profoundly important work which falls to the lot of the American citizen is his work c" guiding the destinies of the country. It is at once his greatest privilege and his heaviest duty. If by precept and example we train the members of the rising generation to do this well, all other things can be trusted to take care of themselves. If we do not train them to do this well, no amount of education in other lines will make up for the deficiency.

May I undertake to impress the thought that democracy acknowledges no sovereign. This republic cannot stand still. The world which is rising into existence is still half encumbered by the remains of the world which is waning into decay. The Dark Ages cannot return; it is an insult to our intelligence to suggest to the contrary. The world that is in the making is the world of generations to come. Those of us whose years are fairly full will be lucky if we see even the beginning of it. How long it will take to get it started is purely conjectural, but the youth of our day have the prospect of coming into an inheritance of great things accomplished and the prospect of greater things to be performed, beside which the accomplishment of the last 50 years will become utterly insignificant.

On the wall of the room in which Victor Hugo died, in the Place des Vosges, in Paris, is written over his autograph this prophecy:

"I represent a party which does not yet exist: The party of revolution, civilization. This party will make the twentieth century. There will issue from it first the United States of Europe; then the United States of the world."

His contemporaries and many of those who have lived in later years have thought he was out of his head. Some of you who are listening to me may live to see the fulfillment of his prophecy. We cannot and must not undertake to avoid our destiny.

In our individualism is found our security. When the day of the pioneer as an individual closes, then the night of oblivion for the United States of America will have arrived. Individualism as comprehended by the liberties we claim under our Bill of Rights is the backbone of democracy and of representative government everywhere. Let's stiffen it as we continue to fight valiantly to maintain the integrity of our Republic.

To grasp faintly the future of this country is to bewilder and exhaust the imagination. The past is but the happy prologue to the swelling act of an imperial theme. No problem is too great for our solution. No work is too great for our achievement. Tomorrow keeps new yesterdays in store.

"God bless our native land!
Firm may she ever stand,
Through storm and night:
When the wild tempests rave,
Ruler of wind and wave,
Do Thou our country save
By Thy great might!

"For her our prayer shall rise
To God, above the skies;
On Him we wait:
Thou who art ever nigh,
Guarding with watchful eye,
To Thee aloud we cry,
'God save the State!'"

The Betrayal of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, from thoroughly reliable sources, information of a bitterly dismaying nature has come forth that a joint statement will be issued shortly by the British Foreign Office and the State Department, silencing all discussion on the Arabian-Jewish question in Palestine, and which will with one devastating stroke smash the hopes of those who dared look toward Palestine as the one realistic approach to the solution of the homelessness of a driven people. It will, in effect, be an implied, but nonetheless conclusive, acceptance of the MacDonald White Paper of 1939 which decreed that no more than 75,000 Jews will be admitted to Palestine for a 5-year period. The joint statement will with its "Silence, please," drown the clamor of the tortured Nazi victims pleading for a haven of refuge. Of the allotted 75,000 certificates of entrance, less than 29,000 now remain unused. These, more or less, will be confined to children. Adherence to the MacDonald White Paper means that in 1944 Jewish immigration into Palestine must cease altogether if so voted by a majority of Arabs.

Even more alarming is the accompanying information that the joint statement will be issued with the knowledge and consent of the President. Although he was importuned to stay the hand of the State Department, the reactionary forces were stronger, and while it may be somewhat softened as a result of the intercession of the President, it spells the doom of the Zionist cause and the beginning of the end of the long trek home. In the name of expediency and appeasement, under the shallow pretense of military and political necessity, Palestine as a homeland for the Jews becomes the lost Atlantis of a helpless, hopeless, unwanted people.

Neither we nor Britain can fall back upon the hackneyed, exaggerated, and

convenient excuse of military necessity or expediency. The lessons of history seem unavailing. Our scrap iron and oil did not appease Japan. Our appeasement of Vichy and Petain gave us Laval. Our diplomacy with Franco and his Falange and with Argentina has been artless and childlike. They play and continue to play ducks and drakes with us.

How ill have the Jews used Palestine that now the one open door must likewise be slammed shut in their search for dignity and security. They husbanded the arid soil of Palestine and made it rich in the fruits of the earth; they built hospitals for the Jew and Arab alike; they brought the lamp of learning to the desert with schools and the world-renowned university; they brought music and science to a world that had been left behind in civilization's march.

That which was uncultivated and considered uncultivable by the Arabs has been cultivable and cultivated by the Jews. The sands of Rishon le Zion, the swamps of Hedra, the rocks of Motza, the stony hills of Hanita, and the largest malarial area in Palestine, the Huleh Basin, which has been classified not only by the Arabs but also by the British Government as uncultivable land, are now being turned into the most prosperous and productive land of Palestine. They had to reclaim, drain, reforest, fertilize, and irrigate; they introduced modern and intensive methods of cultivation, modern machinery, new breeds of cattle and poultry, new plants, and seed rotation of crops. In 1939, the Peel Royal Commission stated: "12 years ago the national home was an experiment; today it is a going concern."

There has been since then further expansion. New industries have been started, textile, chemical, wood, metal, electrical, food, building, clothing, which supply the home market and the Near East as far as India. In 1941 alone, over 200 new Jewish industrial undertakings were established.

Nor has the immigration and settlement of Jews in Palestine been at Arab expense. The increase in the yield of the land has made it possible not merely to provide for additional settlers, but makes it possible for the old settlers to enjoy a higher standard of living. The Arabs, it was shown, have chosen to live in the greatest numbers in the neighborhood of Jewish settlements, and the increase of the Arab population has closely paralleled the Jewish increase, not only through the lowered death rate, but also because large numbers of non-Palestinian Arabs had seeped into the country to enjoy the highest standard of living in the Near East. Indeed, it would be a calamity for the Arabs if the Jewish settlement in Palestine were to be liquidated. The much vaunted limitations of absorptive capacity of Palestine is a myth in the light of Dr. Weizmann's statement that there is room for 2,000,000 more souls in Palestine, and even that estimate has been deemed conservative. It is time to ask why these facts are not given space in newspapers and magazines of large circulation? Have not they earned a right to be heard?

"Let the Jews go elsewhere," it will be said in mocking parallel to "Let them eat cake." Of all the nations fighting together in the name of freedom and liberty, not one has raised its voice to make them welcome, to offer them rescue, refuge, or asylum.

What answers can those responsible for the statement give when asked, "What is the remedy?" Where shall these people guilty of no crime but that of being born Jew go? What plans are offered by the authors of the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" for the resettlement of the Jews after the war? Will the anti-Semites give the final answer to an uprooted people?

On the contrary, it would appear that certain forces have done their work exceedingly well in preparing for an uncritical receptivity of the forthcoming statement. A number of inspired articles have appeared, all following in what seems to be a planned sequence, to create the proper atmosphere, beginning with the publication of King Ibn Saud's statement in its opposition to Zionism and continuing through with the publication of the articles by Cyrus L. Sulzberger in recent issues of the New York Times, which were more sensational than accurate and more impolitic than wise. Why was this period chosen to review adversely the Jewish question in Palestine? Is there any connection between the appearances of these articles and the mischief to be loosed shortly by Whitehall Street in London and our State Department?

How relevant may or may not be the fact that one or more of our industrial giants have received valuable concessions from King Ibn Saud we do not know. Public-relations counselors are canny people.

Small wonder that Mr. Churchill has sleepless nights when he thinks of his friend Chaim Weizmann, Zionist leader, for did not Mr. Churchill say in 1939 at the appearance of the now infamous MacDonald White Paper:

> I feel bound to vote against the proposals of His Majesty's Government. As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience or—and it will be a vain hope—for the sake of a quiet life. I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself, by silence or inaction, to what I must regard as an act of repudiation.
>
> I was, from the beginning, a sincere advocate of the Balfour declaration, and I have made repeated public statements to that effect. * * * There is much in this white paper which is alien to the spirit of the Balfour declaration, but I will not trouble about that. I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by an Arab majority. * * * What is that but the destruction of the Balfour declaration? What is that but a breach of faith? What is it but a one-sided denunciation—what is called in the jargon of the present time, a unilateral denunciation of an engagement? Is our condition so parlous and our state so poor that we must, in our weakness, make this sacrifice of our declared purpose?

Mr. Churchill was aware that 53 nations, including the United States, had ratified the Balfour declaration. On the 21st day of September 1922, our American Congress by way of resolution approved the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Nay, over and beyond the universal acceptance and approval of the Balfour declaration, on December 23, 1924, a convention was signed by the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Austen Chamberlain, and our then Secretary of State, Frank B. Kellogg, concerning the rights of Britain and the United States in Palestine. Significantly, article 15 and subarticle 7 of article 28 read as follows:

ARTICLE 15

> The mandatory shall see that no discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the ground of race, religion, or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of religious beliefs.

SUBARTICLE 7 OF ARTICLE 28

> Nothing contained in the present convention shall be affected by any modification which may be made in the terms of the mandate, as recited above, unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States.

Yet in open violation of both the Balfour declaration and the Convention of 1924, the MacDonald White Paper flouted the weighted decision of responsible government heads. The Balfour declaration was consented to by the United States. The Convention of 1924 was consented to by the United States. Who consented to the promulgation of the White Paper? What can Mr. Anthony Eden say when confronted with the forthcoming statement as his own phrases uttered in this country reecho through his mind:

> Never again—

He said—

> must the civilized world be ready to tolerate unilateral infraction of treaties. That would be to sap the whole foundation of the secure international life which it is our principal purpose to restore.

What is the White Paper but a unilateral infraction of a treaty solemnly entered into?

Surely silence cannot break the back of bigotry and racial antipathies. Enlightenment can only follow in the wake of the truth, the truth about the Arabs, for instance. The Allied Nations are well aware that of all the semitic tribes in the East only the Jews contributed the full measure of loyalty to the Allied cause, bringing in proud belief their blood and humble treasures. Not so did the Arabs of Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Iran. Far from being neutral, they were actually hostile, easy prey to the foul noises of German propaganda. Is it necessary to point to the Iraq revolt to illuminate that point?

The Arab landed aristocrats, the emirs and military chieftains are as insatiable as Satan. It were just as impossible to satisfy or appease them as it is to try to hold back the tide with a groan. You

cannot deal with them "cartes sur table." And be it remembered these potentates and princes are Arabia—Pan Arabia. Moderation and palliation are considered by them as signs of weakness. They take suitable advantage. Just as Rommel and his Afrika Korps were ready to leap from El Alamein to Cairo and then seal the fate of the Allies in the Near East by closing up the Suez Canal, the lately avowed friend of America and Britain, King Ibn Saud, had not a word to say, could not spare a single trooper, camel or donkey for Britain's use. More British troops were required to patrol the doubtful Arab areas and cities, especially in Egypt, than there were actually facing Rommel's Afrika Korps in the Libyan Desert, Pierre van Paassen reports.

It was the Jews of Palestine that stepped forward as a man, voluntarily, not waiting for an army call. How many know or care to know that Palestine furnished the British armies in Libya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, and Somaliland thousands of doctors, nurses, and dentists, and placed the great Hadassah medical center of Jerusalem at the disposal of the Empire? Who is there now to give public recognition to the courage, loyalty, and steadfastness of the Jews in their aid to the Allied Nations in achieving the tremendous victories? The striking fact remains that the countries of the Near East with an aggregate population of 45,000,000—if Turkey is included—have contributed not a single soldier to the forces of the United Nations, the one exception being Palestine which has given her volunteers of whom more than three-fourths are Jews. These Palestinian Jews alone in the British Imperial forces numbered 17,000 in September 1942 in addition to the 10,000 in the military constabulary of the country.

Yet such has been the reward of the Jews that Arab appeasement is placed above Jewish honor. In Algiers another cruel blow is struck by General Giraud's abrogation of the Cremieux decree, depriving the Algerian Jews of their French citizenship, theirs since 1870, when Minister Cremieux in recognition of their loyalty and service to France so decreed, a citizenship that the Arab never wanted and never welcomed.

The MacDonald White Paper must be examined in the light of events since 1939. If it was a breach of faith then, how much greater is the betrayal today? No other course but its abrogation is open now, and the entire problem of the Jews and Palestine must be reexamined at the forthcoming Intergovernmental Conference on Refugees. To foreclose consideration of additional Jewish immigration into Palestine by any joint pronouncement now would doom the conference to failure. It would merely repeat the cruel mockery enacted at Bermuda and the tragedy of errors at Evian. It would make us coconspirators in the violation of international decency and honor.

In the wake of the terrible scourge of war, the bitter lesson is hammered home that the Jewish problem is a problem of the civilized world, Jew and Gentile alike. The apathy of nations to the burning, slaughtering, and massacring of Jews in Germany did not prevent the horror from spreading to Czechoslovakia, to the Poles, to the Dutch, to the French. That which was viewed as a Jewish question became a world conflagration. Inhumanity is not exclusive; it cannot confine itself to one people without overflowing in all directions to drown a world in hatred and in flames.

No peace can be just or adequate until the Jewish problem is settled. The one realistic approach is Palestine.

I yield to no man in my admiration for the British men and women and their magnificent efforts in this tremendous crisis. The "common man" in England has performed heroically the superhuman tasks occasioned by this greatest scourge in civilized history. The English people and the American people, however, should not be blinded by the duststorms of official protest as to the fate of the Jews in Europe; they should not be deafened by the noise. Conversation is one thing; it can be charming, interesting, and often educational. But the situation has long since passed the conversational stage. Action now is necessary.

When the surgeon enters the operating room and his staff of assistants close in on him at the table upon which the patient rests, immediate action almost always results. The surgeon does not take scalpel in hand and make a few incisions and then cordially invite the boys to a game of poker. From then on all is deftness, coordination, and cooperation. A human life is at stake and time is of the essence. If, in the interests of humanity, the surgeon does not hesitate, what earthly reason can be presented at this time to countenance delay when the circumstances are surrounded by a complete aura of fatality.

I repeat my avowal of admiration for England's saintly sacrifices that have saved us and the world. But how reconcile that with her attitude toward Palestine. A halo need slip but a few inches to become a noose. She must open Palestine to mass Jewish immigration at once; otherwise, Europe becomes a massive Jewish sepulcher.

Because some of the English leaders regard the Jewish question as an insuperable burden that must be gotten rid of willy-nilly, I must remind them of a classic, favored story of their own King George VI. A boy is carrying an even smaller child up the hill. When asked if the burden was too much for him, he replied, "It is not a burden, it is my brother." Either Christianity in England and America give concrete meaning to "Love thy neighbor as thyself" or bear the stigma of hypocrisy. Be it remembered that not everyone who says, "Lord, Lord" shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

Reading the official protestations of horror, listening to the verbal expressions of compassion and vainly waiting for the bonds of inertia to drop from the hands of officialdom, I can almost hear the White Queen of Alice in Wonderland saying to Alice, "The rule is: Jam tomorrow and jam yesterday, but never jam today."

What schoolroom cat and mouse game is this to promise, then plague? Are the insatiable Arabs to be fed while the cry of distressed millions finds no answering call?

The British Empire upon which the sun never sets with its far-flung possessions can now find it in her heart and mind to deny the tiny portion thereof that is Palestine to a people who have watered and nourished it in reliance upon a mighty promise. Had she offered other havens to the storm-tossed of Europe, she might then have said as did King James to the fly: "Have I three kingdoms and thou must needs fly into my eye?"

What are we offering but silence?

The Jews everywhere—here and abroad—look to President Roosevelt as their only hope, their modern Moses to lead them out of the wilderness, to save them from a new and more terroristic diaspora. It apparently is too late to change the mold of opinion of Churchill, Eden, Halifax, and other English leaders save by drastic means. Their ideas are congealed except as Roosevelt will demand change. We humbly petition him to bear upon the British Foreign Office to seek the light that only justice, mercy, and humanity can bring. He must bring England back onto the beam of the Balfour declaration.

I call upon the good people of America to help in this crisis. There is so little time to act. Soon Roosevelt will meet Churchill. They may be in conclave now. Express your views to those in authority in Washington—to the President, to Secretary Hull, Secretary Morgenthau, and other members of the President's Cabinet, your Senators, your Congressmen. Your voice will shatter this conspiracy of silence.

The Fulbright Resolution—Importance Overestimated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the Fulbright resolution if and when I have the opportunity so to do, for I favor the principle of the participation of Congress in negotiations with reference to international post-war plans for peace.

I do not take the resolution too seriously, however, for it commits us to nothing in particular, as it is in fact nothing more than a gesture, although made in good faith, in favor of a just and lasting peace and the contribution of Congress to that end.

It is a concurrent resolution, which fact suggests to me that when it comes

back from the other body it may not be even recognizable.

Therefore, I say not too much time need be consumed in its consideration nor wasted in its discussion; for the importance of the resolution has been exaggerated. The party to which I owe my allegiance has already twice committed itself to the policy of United States participation with the Allies in post-war planning; so I cannot go wrong to vote that Congress shall assert itself along that line.

At best, the resolution is only an expression by the Congress to the effect that it favors the creation of appropriate international machinery and the development of power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. Everybody is for that as a general proposition. Anyway, the Republican Party is. It is not time for blueprints or scale drawings.

Then, again, the resolution has no binding force or effect on anybody, and, except for the fact that it puts the Congress on record as to its intentions, it is much ado about nothing at this day.

The President knows, without this resolution, that Congress as the legislative branch of our Government proposes not to be ignored in post-war negotiations. If this resolution serves notice to the world to that effect, it is worth voting for.

Wood-Pulp Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News of September 11, 1943, with reference to wood-pulp shortage. The solution of the wood-pulp shortage suggested is very pertinent.

The editorial follows:

WOOD-PULP SHORTAGE

We think of the products of the press as intangibles—statements of fact, ideas, opinions, public movements. That is a correct appraisal. But there is one concrete material of the manufacturing industry we call the press. It is paper. And it is vital to the existence of the press. To limit the supply would be to limit the press just as effectively as it might be limited by law or dictator's ukase. This is especially true since, in event of a drastic paper shortage, the "little press"—the country weekly, the struggling independent periodical, the crusader and reformer—would be the first to go under.

The Nation faces such a shortage now. There is an abundance of timber in the forests of Canada and the United States, but the cutting of timber for pulpwood has largely been the off-season avocation of the farmer in the forest areas. And the farmer has gone to war as nearly unanimously as any group in the country. In Canada the situation is also complicated by the fact that the Government, while making farming an essential industry, has refused to include the gathering of pulpwood, although the farmers have asked for this classification. It has been stated, and denied, that the paper industry of the Dominion has favored the Government policy which has contributed to paper shortage. Whether this is a false accusation or not, the supply has dwindled—and paper prices have advanced. In the United States wood gathering by farmers has been classed as an essential occupation.

Facing a critical situation, the Nation's publishers, who have hitherto given much space to drives for scrap metal, grease, rubber, and other strategic materials, have suddenly found themselves in need of a hurried campaign for their own essential product. Large and small publishers are now joined in such an effort.

The farmers in the wooded regions hold the solution to the problem. In east Texas, where the paper industry is new, lack of knowledge of the ready market may be one difficulty. Lack of transportation is another, but at least one of the big east Texas paper mills is working out plans for operation of its own wood trucks on gathering routes. Because of the mild winters, east Texas farmers have an excellent opportunity to develop a remunerative avocation between crop seasons. Just at present they would be rendering a patriotic service, in addition.

Future expansion of the southern pulp and paper industry may free the press of this region from dependence upon the paper industry of Canada. In doing so it would establish a market for another crop to add to the diversification available to east Texas and old South farmers. By aiding in the present emergency, farmers can help pull toward that end.

The Future of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Future of Aviation", delivered by me at Quincy, Ill., on Thursday, August 5, 1943, at the Quincy Stadium.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am exceedingly grateful to the industrious and public-spirited citizens of Quincy who have arranged for this meeting in my honor. Happy am I as one of your United States Senators to come to Quincy and participate as the principal speaker in the culmination of a long, hard fight for a standard airfield for this thriving community. What I did in Washington was in line of duty as a public servant. What so many interested people did in Quincy to accomplish this noteworthy objective came through civic pride. You looked into the future. You had vision in the realization that aviation is only in its infancy. As this gigantic enterprise reaches into every section of the world in the post-war era, Quincy now basically prepares to meet that challenge.

My friends, I need not relate to the people of a wide-awake community that a revolution in transportation is plainly under way. The ramifications of this revolution are so great that none of us can yet grasp their full significance and implications. I firmly believe that we have never had such a vast picture to study and try to understand because it covers the globe.

A quick check on what it means, at least in part, to each of us here today, may be had by projecting Quincy's place in the air world. In 1940 Quincy had 6 licensed civilian planes. If we have 500,000 planes in 1950—as was recently estimated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration—Quincy's share should be 120 planes. In 1940, Quincy had nine licensed pilots. By 1950, it should have 480 licensed pilots, based on C. A. A. expectation that the general average will be four pilots per plane. Feeder planes will fly passengers, mail, and express to big population centers, and any one of us will be able to reach any point on the globe in 60 hours or less. These projections are based on facts. If anything, they are therefore conservative. At least they give us a glimpse, in terms of one enterprising community, of the age of air upon whose threshold we now stand.

The problem focuses perhaps more clearly in other terms. The aviation industry is today—temporarily—far and away the largest in the country if not the world. Ingenious new techniques of manufacture of aircraft, engines, and accessories have been devised under the pressure of war needs. These new techniques and processes at once cut unit costs and multiply output many times. We used to point with pride—and rightly—at the wonderful mass production technology of the automobile industry, which at its all-time peak in 1941 turned out a mass of products valued at $3,700,000,000.

Aviation production makes this figure seem small. From $280,000,000 in 1939, aviation production jumped to $6,400,000,000 in 1942—and for the current year our schedule calls for the huge sum of $20,100,000,000—more than five times automobile production at its peak, a fourth of our war budget for the year, almost a seventh of our estimated national income. The President has announced that 1944 production, calculated upon a basis of tonnage, will top 1943's by more than half—by 55 percent, to be exact. About 2,500,000 men and women of various skills are at work in our aviation plants and now dependent upon them for a livelihood.

These figures mean that we now possess what are beyond question the largest and finest aviation production facilities in the world. We simply cannot afford to allow them to go to waste and become rusty through disuse.

There are other assets. Consider the number of pilots and other aviation specialists now in service or in training. We shall soon have some 3,000,000 men in the air forces of the Army and Navy. Hundreds of thousands will be trained pilots. Many more will be skilled as navigators, mechanics, radiomen, meteorologists, airport and airways engineers. All will be familiar with one phase or another of flying.

Are these men going to be content to remain on the ground again, forgetting all about their fresh and exciting experience in the air after peace comes? Undoubtedly, hundreds of thousands of these men will continue to follow aviation either as a vocation or as an avocation, provided—and it is an important proviso—that it is not made too difficult for them.

Here, I think, is where present air-minded communities like Quincy come in. People are apt to forget that flying involves more than airplanes and pilots. It requires all kinds of visual and radio aids to flying and a vast network of airports.

What is our progress in these two respects? Before the war the Civil Aeronautics Administration made a Nation-wide survey of air-

ports, and with this as a base conceived a tentative plan for a network of 4,000 ports to serve the more or less immediate needs of the country.

If these airports were evenly distributed throughout the country, they would form a checkerboard 30 miles square. Of course, in some extensive mountainous or desert areas airports would not be required, and therefore these could be applied to the more thickly populated zones.

The war, of course, has caused many shifts in this plan. To date, approximately $400,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress for the national defense airport development program, which is limited to the development and improvement of sites designated as essential to the war effort and approved by the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce. All of the appropriation is now either allocated or encumbered.

At the present time there are almost 3,000 classified airports in the country—1,000 short of the prewar plan. Altogether, these airports could probably handle 300,000 airplanes, but an immense amount of construction would be required for facilities for housing and servicing. Recent development has necessarily been concentrated largely upon the larger fields. As a result, there has been an 11-fold increase in the number of our major civil airports, with paved runways at least 3,500 feet long and capable of handling the large transport craft. Whereas we had only 76 such fields 2 years ago, we shall have 865 by the end of the year. Nor does this number include many large airdromes built solely for military use.

The situation in regard to smaller airports is this. We have 1,238 class I airports, the lowest category, which are those having unpaved runways 1,800–2,500 feet long, and at least 300 feet wide. We have 905 class II ports, each of which has paved runways between 2,500 and 3,500 feet long. These fields are situated, for the most part, near smaller cities and larger towns.

Aviation's growth is further reflected in the growth and operations of the Federal Airways, which now totals 35,000 miles within our continental boundaries, a 700 percent increase since 1927. Their length has almost doubled since 1932. Traffic along the airways is increasing at an astonishing rate. Recorded movements along the official skyways were 6,000,000 during 1942. For the current year we estimate that they will reach 13,000,000 or 14,000,000, and we believe they will continue upward despite a probable slight dip immediately following the close of hostilities. We expect that by 1950 we shall have in this country at least a half million private, commercial, and military planes in active service. You will appreciate the significance of that when I tell you that at the end of 1941 we had in the entire country less than 25,000 licensed civil aircraft.

Our airways, unlike those of Europe, have been designed for mass traffic. Our radio and other control equipment is of the best, and we can count on our scientists and inventors to keep our lead in this respect. After a study of all other airways systems, Canada and Australia chose to build theirs on the American model. The Canadian airways are so closely integrated with our own continental and Alaskan systems that the three virtually form a vast continental system, covering all territory north of the Rio Grande. Gen. Salinas Carranza, director of civil aviation of Mexico, visited Washington a few weeks ago and declared his intention of extending a similar system throughout Mexico. He expressed the belief that the Central American countries might do likewise, and that we could well contemplate a continental airways system extending from the Bering Sea to the Canal Zone. Radio men and airways engineers of the C. A. A. are not only improving and extending our domestic skyways, but are cooperating with the armed forces in establishing routes across the seas to all the other continents. We have recently installed four intercontinental super radio stations which in their combined range blanket the world, providing direct communication from our shores to an American plane in flight anywhere on the globe. The major units are located at New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Honolulu with supplementary stations at Seattle, Anchorage, and many of the Pacific islands. Such are the unseen aids upon which air transport is built, connecting Quincy with the uttermost corners of the globe.

War is primarily responsible for the quickened pace in this global development of aviation. Within a short space of time the genius of our American engineers have advanced our fighter planes to the point where they are second to none. Our bombers are superior to all. I am sure the savage Japanese would even admit this. With a bomb sight no other nation has, with pilots that have no equal in training, audacity, and courage, we are gradually closing in with the help of our allies upon the Axis criminals. Strange as it may seem, when this war was planned in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo by the Axis criminals they were more than certain that the airplane was the deadly weapon which would destroy what they term the "decadent democracies." Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, and their infamous stooges, all drunk with power, saw in the airplane the chief instrument of death that would destroy the democracies of the earth and enslave their people. They came near succeeding, my friends, but fate sometimes steps in with a mixture of strange phenomena. Today and tomorrow the airplane will be our chief weapon in forcing the dictators to the terms of "unconditional surrender."

A peaceful democracy has been aroused from its lethargy. Few people now underestimate the danger that was ours only a short while ago. Our production in planes, tanks, ships, and guns with all of our home front problems will be recorded by those who write history as the miracle of the age. And yet, my fellow Illinoians, we have only begun to produce. Tomorrow Quincy will be as close to London as she was to Springfield 30 years ago. Does any reasonable and prudent mind believe that with such a speedy development of an industry that wields such power in peace or war over the life and death of a nation that we can remain aloof from the rest of the world in times of peace?

In this ghastly war commercial air lines and our Army and Navy transport services are making 500 flights a week across the North Atlantic, and this is just a beginning. Every day new routes are being pioneered, and with the coming of peace many more will be opened up for the transport of cargo and passengers. According to a recent conservative estimate—and it may well be too conservative—there will be an eightfold increase in intercontinental air passenger traffic by 1947, and an eightfold increase in mail and express hauls. Operations of domestic air lines will increase fivefold within the same period.

On the home front the greatest boom is going to come in the field of private flying for business or pleasure purposes. This has to be if aviation is going to do for our economy after this war something of what the automobile did after the last war. Bear in mind that commercial vehicles—trucks, busses, ambulances, hearses—constituted only about 20 percent of our automotive output in normal times. We must create a similar situation in our aviation business. Cargo and passenger air liners will never keep our net aviation production potential busy and healthy.

Manufacturers now assure us—and we can accept their assurances, I think—that after the war we shall have small, safe, and inexpensive private planes costing no more to buy and operate than a medium-priced car. The most revolutionary development in this field is the new Sikorsky helicopter. Its inventor predicts that hundreds of these will be performing short-run cab- or bus-type services within a few years of the signing of peace, and that many hundreds of thousands of them will be carrying individuals and their families wherever they wish to go. The helicopter may well take over the collection and distribution function now performed by the mail pick-up operation. It seems to me that the pick-up scheme can serve best as a preparation for a service of wider scope. It is all right to yank a sack of mail off the ground, and wind it up into the plane, or even some kinds of express matter, but what if it is a passenger who wants to go?

Commercial air transport will continue to grow steadily. Between 1927 and 1942 the number of passengers riding the air lines increased from 8,700 to more than 4,000,000 a year. In the same period, air mail jumped from 1,270,000 to 44,600,000 pounds annually, and air express and freight from 46,000 to 22,300,000 pounds. Remarkable as it is, this rate of growth in my opinion will be considerably accelerated during the next decade. The day is not far distant, I believe, in which all first-class mail will go by air, with pick-up and feeder services tying the smaller communities to the great trunk air lines. Such nonstop pick-up services have been thoroughly tested during the past 3 years on routes totaling almost 1,500 miles, and the equipment has been so successful that the Civil Aeronautics Board has before it 23 applications for the establishment of similar routes in all parts of the country. So far we have no more than scratched the surface. If you consider the flying done in Alaska on the basis of the ratio of its population to that of continental United States you will find that Alaska has 100 times as many airplanes, flies 20 times as many passenger miles, 75 times as much mail, and about 1,050 times as much express and freight. Of course, Alaska's lack of roads and railroads is an important factor, but that shows what can be done.

Recent growth has been most marked in the field of air express—that is, in the carrying of small packaged goods of high intrinsic value such as films, radios, precious metals, spare machine parts, and similar articles needed at once in a particular place. In October 1942 air express was up almost 125 percent from the same month in the previous year, and it is certain to go on increasing.

It is axiomatic that after victory is won we must retain the supremacy of the air. We must continue to have the best aviation in the world. We cannot afford to give up a single air base that we have won in the Pacific through the sweat, blood, and tears of our heroic men. Security for the Anglo-Saxon institutions demands no less. America will want to be an integral part with a convincing voice in the air fields that we are now establishing in certain other parts of the world. There can be no monopoly of the air in the commercial trade routes of the world when the war is over if we expect to establish a real foundation of permanent peace.

I do not share the views of some who are predicting that the airplane is about to make our railroads, steamships, and trucks quite obsolete. This only confuses and misleads the public on the real values of aviation. If we have the type of prosperity that is in the offing in the post-war era, we will need all forms of transportation.

The question here, as in all commercial air operations, is relative cost compared to other forms of transportation. Traffic tends to flow, other things being equal, along the cheapest medium of transportation. Higher rates will only be paid when some advantage can be gained by great speed of delivery, convenience of service, flexibility of operation, or

similar factors. Air transport service does offer speed, convenience, and flexibility in many instances. But so far as the general run of freight is concerned, the differential between plane rates per ton-mile and those offered by railroad, truck, and steamship is still very large. It is difficult, indeed, to envisage our wheat, iron ore, coal, petroleum products and so on winging their way to their destinations.

The airplane has an essential job to perform, and it will do this by supplementing—and not by supplanting—other forms of transportation. In its own proper field, however, its future is practically boundless.

Whatever Quincy's course—or, in pilot language, whatever your "flight plan"—your enterprise and farsightedness would seem to assure you a clear horizon, a tail wind, and a happy landing.

Post-War Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of post-war peace delivered by me at a mass meeting held at the Chicago Stadium on September 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twenty-five years ago the United States fought in a great war to end all wars. Victory in World War No. 1 was to "make the world safe for democracy." Our arms were victorious in that war, but our cause—democracy and peace—was lost in the blind reaction and muddled diplomacy of the twenties and thirties. Our gallant youth did their share on the battlefields, but the peoples and governments of the democracies, our own included, failed to accomplish their share of the task.

Because of that failure, we are fighting today in another and greater World War No. 2. Again it is a war for democracy and peace and against tyranny and aggression. Again our fighting youth—on the snowy hills of Attu, in the steaming jungles of New Georgia, on storm-tossed oceans, and in the roaring skies of Europe and Asia—are winning on the battlefield. They are buying with their lives the military victory that will give to us another chance to assure victory in the world for our cause—democracy and peace.

Are we at home ready to do our share of the job, do it with the same courage and determination with which our fighting men are winning battles? That is the issue we meet here tonight to discuss. How effectively we answer it will decide whether the future holds freedom and peace for America or whether it holds growing regimentation and war. To those of us on the platform tonight, Democrats and Republicans, it is an issue far greater than any political party or personality, because at stake is the future of America.

Today we hear on all sides the question: We know what we are fighting against, but what are we fighting for? Our people at home are asking it, our own soldiers and sailors and airmen, risking their lives, are asking it. Our allies are asking it, and the enslaved millions of Europe and Asia are asking it.

We can, with justice, criticize our Government, both the executive and legislative branches, for their failure before now to give us and the world a clear-cut answer to that question. On the Pacific front the need for an answer has long been apparent, and more recently the timid, muddled, fascist-appeasing policy of expediency in north Africa and Italy has made the need for an answer in Europe urgent.

Yes, we can criticize our Government, but we the people also have our own responsibility. In the final analysis, it is the people who must answer the question: "What are we fighting for?" That is the reason for this mass meeting; that is why a score of us in Congress have been stumping the country on this issue, seeking to make sure that as we win the war we also win the peace.

What is America's stake in a just and durable peace, in helping to prevent World War III from happening? From a purely material viewpoint, the United States cannot afford another world war. We are shipping our high-grade iron ore out of Minnesota at the rate of 90,000,000 tons a year. There won't be enough left for another great war. The end of our huge oil reserves in continental United States is in sight, the tremendous quantities of oil used in war have just forced more stringent gasoline rationing in our Midwest. We always have imported tin, rubber, and scores of other critical materials. Our reserves of lead, zinc, and copper are running low. These materials are vital to our industrial economy. Our very prosperity, the continued operation of our production plant, will depend after the war on maintenance in the world of stability and peace, the only conditions under which we can import these materials in the quantities needed.

But far more important than the wastage of our natural resources in war is the wastage of our human resources. Democracy as a form of government depends for its strength on a continual supply of leadership from the people, leadership with the intelligence, integrity, and courage needed to solve today's complicated problems. Recurring wars deplete and eventually destroy this most vital of all resources of a democracy.

There are those who believe that the only safety for America lies in maintaining sufficient military strength so that no one would dare attack us. Consider the cost. If America must depend entirely on its own strength for security in a world in which there is no collective security, we'll spend fifteen to twenty billions a year for defense after this war. That would mean a continuation indefinitely of W. P. B., O. P. A., W. L. B., O. D. T. and all the other regulations which today curb enterprise and curtail our freedoms. That sort of total mobilization of our economy and national life is an essential part of modern, total war, and it is also part of total defense. Eventually we'd have to balance the Federal budget and we'd pay, not 20 percent, but 50- or 60-percent income taxes, and our living standards would go down proportionately.

No single nation can feel safe in the world today without going a long way toward complete militarization, and militarism and democracy simply cannot exist for long together.

This is not just our second chance to build a lasting peace. It is our last chance, as a democracy. Everyone who has seen what this war has done and is doing to our democratic institutions and our individual liberties is certain that the very democracy we fight to preserve today would go under in World War No. 3 if we permit it to happen.

That is America's purely selfish stake in a durable peace. It is equally true that a lasting peace, the elimination of fear of aggression, is fundamental to the continued growth and progress of democracy in the whole world. We can hope to solve all of the complicated international problems—colonies, minorities, distribution of raw materials, currency stabilization and air and sea routes—only in a world atmosphere of peace and security. Some of them will take generations to solve. And it would be futile to attempt the solution of international problems if every nation must be constantly on the alert against aggression, constantly striving for economic self-sufficiency as a defense measure. The first requirement of victory for our democratic cause is the maintenance of peace once the war is won.

With so much at stake, it is a cruel mockery of the sacrifice our fighting men are making, to talk of the peace in empty and ambiguous generalities. It is not enough to tell American fathers and mothers, whose sons are dying in distant lands, that "of course the United States must cooperate to maintain peace; just leave it to us and we'll work it out." Let's say what we mean and mean what we say. It's time for both the Congress and the Executive to come down out of the stratosphere and present to the American people a realistic, down to earth, specific program to make sure that the United Nations will keep the peace our sons are buying with their lives, and then implement that program with action.

Four of us in the Senate, two Democrats and two Republicans, have tried to set out clearly the minimum essentials necessary for a durable peace in Senate Resolution 114. That resolution reads:

"*Resolved*, That the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority."

Any attempt to maintain peace must be a joint venture of many nations. One nation alone can make war, but it takes two at least to remain at peace. There are only two methods of joint action by many nations. One is through alliances or pacts of mutual assistance, the other is through a democratic organization of nations.

Alliances are unstable. They are in the power politics, imperialistic tradition. Almost inevitably they mean dividing the world into spheres of influence, with the great powers running the show. And past experience indicates that the balance of power sooner or later becomes unbalanced and explodes into war.

On the other hand, an organization of nations, acting under clear-cut rules outlining and limiting its authority and functions, is in the democratic, American tradition. It is the way democratic peoples solve their problems. It recognizes the rights of smaller nations and the contribution they can make to world stability. The United Nations, so far only a concept and not a political entity, is the logical beginning of such an organization and the sooner it is organized, the better. Today, the forces pulling the United Nations together—our common cause, common enemy, our hope for a better world—are dominant in each nation. But the moment victory is won, those forces will be challenged by others—economic rivalry, imperialism, militarism, nationalism, deep-rooted prejudices and fears—and effective joint action will become much more difficult.

We propose United States leadership in establishing such an organization now for a very simple reason. Insofar as establishing an effective collective security system is concerned, the United States attitude is the biggest single question mark in the world. We do not know what we intend or want to do ourselves, how, how can we expect our allies to know? Twenty-five years ago, an American President persuaded the conference at Versailles to adopt the League of Nations, but a minority of the Senate vetoed United States participation. Our President, Republican or Democrat, cannot assume effective leadership in this field until the question of our policy is settled by positive affirmative action by Congress.

To continue with the resolution, the United Nations would be given specific and limited authority:

"1. To assist in co-ordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis."

Winning the war must always be our first objective, and while the general staffs run the war, a United Nations organization could assist in many ways.

"2. To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established."

The personnel doing this temporary administration job, whether it is A. M. G. O. T. or some other agency, is not so important, but the policies to be followed are, because to a very large degree they will set the pattern for the peace to follow. If we cooperate with pro-Fascist elements for the sake of expediency in this temporary job, we are making it that much harder for the local people to establish real democracy later. If the peace is to be a United Nations peace, the temporary administration policies should be United Nations policies. Perhaps Russia's attitude would not be quite such a question mark today if there had been some joint agreements in this field before North Africa.

"3. To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces."

Steps already are being taken to establish this work as a United Nations function. It should be that, rather than solely a United States or an Anglo-American set-up. It will be a huge job, and every nation should contribute according to its ability to do so.

"4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations."

I do not believe there is much argument on that point. Obviously, if we are going to outlaw war as a means of settling international disputes, we must set up machinery to settle them peacefully, by arbitration, conciliation, and adjudication. The argument comes over the final function, to make peaceful settlement stick.

"5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

"That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for the admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement."

The final paragraph would make sure that we have a living organization, capable of growth and change as the world changes, and not simply an international authority dedicated to maintenance of the status quo regardless of justice.

The heart of our proposal is the fifth function, an international police force. That is the question on which the issue will be fought in Congress this fall. The question is: Do we really want international law and order and peace, or are we merely talking nice generalities but determined to go back to the old system of international chaos and recurring wars? No government at any level, local, State, or Federal, however limited its functions, ever functioned successfully without having somewhere the force necessary to enforce its rules and punish violations.

The League of Nations outlawed aggression, but depended on individual nations to supply the force to make it stick. That did not work. Individual nations will not go to war or risk war simply to save the peace of the world, even though it is now clear that their own peace is involved sooner or later. They will go to war, and this is particularly true of democracies which are devoted to peace, only when their own security is threatened vitally.

Whatever the deep-rooted causes of war may be, and we can be certain it will take generations, and they must be peaceful generations, to get rid of all of them, wars always start in just one way—by aggression. One nation crosses the boundary of another with armed force. If we can devise effective machinery to stop and control that first fatal step, then we have war under control.

Aggressors are not deterred by diplomatic protests, world opinion, or even by sanctions, as we have found. They respect only force—force which they know can and will be used against them. The developments of modern war eliminate the need for any huge land armies to do this policing job. Some naval units would be needed, but, primarily, the international force would be air force.

Even a relatively small air force, available for instant use, would be tremendously effective. Consider, for instance, how different the history of the past few years might have been if at the time of Munich the League of Nations had had authority to use and had available to use against Hitler just 5,000 first-class fighting planes. That is just one-tenth of America's production in 1942 and one-twentieth of our production this year.

In joining such an organization, every nation, including ourselves, would give up one right of unlimited national sovereignty—the right to wage aggressive war. We would delegate to the international organization the right to use force to stop military aggression. The United States would have a voice roughly equivalent to its contribution and world influence in that organization, but we would not control it, and should not seek to do so, if we truly believe in democracy.

Congress will vote on that issue this fall. It is the most important issue our Nation faces today. We can make mistakes on domestic issues—farm, labor, and tax policies—and we are strong enough to survive and correct them. But our democracy will not survive World War No. 3. It is the lives and freedoms of future generations that are at stake. Let your Congressmen and Senators know what you think, watch how they vote this fall, and if they are wrong, replace them next year with leaders who will be right on this all-important issue.

To do nothing today is to invite disaster. A policy of drift, a policy of wait and see, a policy of delay until all the little problems and prejudices obscure the main issue has landed peace-loving America in two wars in one generation. And as sure as I stand here tonight, such a policy will land us in World War. No. 3.

Of course, there are difficulties to be overcome. There are jealousies, extreme nationalists, short-sighted leaders who worship the status quo, and all kinds of other hazards in the way.

But there were far greater difficulties, far more dangerous hazards at Bataan and Guadalcanal, on Attu, on the slopes of Hill 609, and in the flying fortresses over Hamburg and Berlin.

Our youth today are offering their lives for something bigger than themselves, outside of themselves and their own personal interests. Theirs is the ultimate act of faith—faith in the future of America, faith that out of this horror will be born a better, braver world, free of the curse of war, faith that we at home will not let them down.

While they fight, we at home are the custodians of that faith of theirs in the future. We must not fail that trust.

Statements of Policy Adopted by Directors, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD statements of policy adopted by the directors of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, meeting in Madison, Wis., on September 9.

There being no objection, the statements of policy were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD IS VITAL FOR VICTORY

Food production and distribution are the most acute and challenging problems facing the people of the United States. These problems will become more serious as time goes on.

National policy should be formulated with a view to producing the maximum of needed foods and fibers. The war emergency should not be used as a means for furthering social and economic reforms that fall outside of war needs and retard full agricultural production. Full production requires increased returns to farmers. In a wartime economy total agricultural production becomes a responsibility of the national administration. It is imperative that this responsibility be discharged with greater dispatch and efficiency in order to meet the ever-increasing costs of feed, labor, and equipment and to overcome the handicaps of restricted labor, equipment, and supplies.

SUBSIDY IS DANGEROUS AND UNNECESSARY

Farmers accepted Government aid during the depression as an emergency measure. A program of Government subsidies has never been considered by farmers as a permanent solution. It is in the interest of the Nation that agriculture be placed on a self-supporting basis.

Subsidies and roll-backs do not combat inflation. To prevent inflation, purchasing power must be held in check and production must be increased. Subsidies and roll-backs do neither. On the contrary, they increase consumer purchasing power and are not dependable and effective incentives to farmers for increasing production. Farmers react more enthusiastically in their production efforts to a fair price in the market place than to Government payments in the form of subsidies that add greatly to the mounting national debt. We believe that those who eat the food should pay for it now, when there is full employment and high wages, rather than postpone the living cost of the present to be paid in the indefinite future by the taxpayers under conditions of probable lower wages, lower prices, and unemployment. It is not in the interest of either agriculture or the Nation to apply the principles of subsidies or roll-backs which lead consumers to believe that they are entitled to get food at less than it costs to produce it.

Subsidies cause confusion and uncertainty rather than incentive to produce. They promote inflation by increasing consumer purchasing power to the extent of the subsidy. Subsidies increase the national debt not only by the amount of the subsidy but also by the added cost of administration. Subsidies require vast numbers of people for enforcement at a time of manpower shortage.

We stand equally opposed to subsidy in new form or name such as the contemplated new program of Government purchase and resale at a loss. We hold that such programs are an unjustifiable and unnecessary consumer subsidy which will add to the mounting national debt and would be inflationary and conducive to further bureaucracy.

PRICE CONTROL

We are not opposed to price control as a war measure. But we demand that price limitations recognize the need of prices sufficient to cover the expenditures necessary for all-out farm production. We favor prices that cover costs rather than any system of minimum prices supplemented by subsidies. The function of price as an inducement to production must be more fully recognized in the future. There has been too much disregard of facts and historical background in the setting of prices. Margins lower than ever existed and restrictive ceiling prices have curtailed the flow and availability of goods and unnecessarily restricted the production of food.

The rigid freezing of prices causes maladjustments in the production and distribution of foods resulting in surpluses in some items and scarcity in others. This situation creates confusion resulting in uncertainty which unnecessarily complicates production planning on the part of the farmer. We urgently insist that sufficient flexibility be maintained for correcting serious maladjustments so that total production is not impaired.

We urgently suggest a change in present price policies of O. P. A. By restricting the maximum price of top grades and by failing to establish proper price differentials between the top and lower grades, the incentive to produce quality products has been eliminated. This set-up seriously hampers quality programs which have been built up through much work and effort over a period of years. Present price policies encourage low grades to sell at ceiling price.

We believe extreme legalistic methods, complicatingly and confusingly worded regulations, coupled with too many theoretical and often impractical plans have characterized the whole price-control program and often have little or no practical relation to the need. Too many, inexperienced in the problems of food production and distribution, have been placed in control of price making. Too often in the administration of price control there has been a predetermination for reform rather than a practical determination to fulfill the purpose of O. P. A. Too often the advice and knowledge of those experienced in their respective fields have been neither called for nor used.

Provision should be made for more frequent reconsideration of fixed prices so as to keep commodities flowing more evenly in the channels of trade and to provide more quickly for adjustments in production and distribution as conditions vary and occasions arise.

RATIONING

We believe that rationing is necessary as a wartime measure whenever the supply of essential foods and commodities is short or threatens to be less than the demand.

Rationing to be successful must be adjusted to the quantities of specific goods available for distribution. At present some of the rationed commodities are not available in many localities because there are not sufficient supplies to go around. Ration points should not exceed supplies available for distribution. Ration stamp values should be adjusted in accordance with supply and demand. Leakages and diversions that aggravate vital shortages should be prevented as far as possible.

UNIFIED ADMINISTRATION OF FOOD PROBLEMS

Such functions as are to be exercised with respect to the production, pricing, rationing, and transportation of food should be consolidated in one Federal agency under a single responsible administrator who is qualified as to background and experience, and in whom authority is vested. Until one administrator has full charge of food production, pricing, and distribution, confusion will continue. Such unified authority should have full knowledge of and be familiar with the production and distribution problems of agriculture.

TAXATION AND EFFICIENT EXPENDITURES

We believe that increased earnings should be taxed heavily in an effort to carry as far as possible the current cost of the war. We feel that the weight of such taxation should fall heaviest on those whose net incomes have increased most.

We believe it is a responsibility of the Congress itself to do all in its power to reduce nonessential Government expenditures, to stop waste in war expenditures, and to take a hand in seeing that appropriations are efficiently and effectively administered. We believe that Congress should institute all possible improvement in control over appropriations and authorizations for appropriations.

OLEOMARGARINE

We urge that oleo should not be permitted to continue the unfair trade practice of masquerading under the butter standards of flavor and color. We have no objection to the manufacture, distribution, and sale of uncolored oleo, or oleo colored and flavored in some characteristic manner, not in imitation of butter, when produced from American fats and oils. We recommend that the regulatory power over oleo be transferred from the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the United States Department of Agriculture. We urge that all regulations applying to all processed butter be made applicable also to oleo.

SUPPORT MEAT-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The livestock industry has not been remiss in its efforts to meet the war situation, to promote production, and to equalize the distribution of meat. In April, 1943, representatives of almost 100 of the leading livestock and meat organizations of the country adopted a meat-management program, calling for the formation of a war meat board with full authority to handle problems arising in the emergency. The program outlined the following major points:

1. Encourage livestock production.
2. Adequate control of livestock slaughter.
3. Keep demand in balance with supply.

(a) Satisfy meat needs of armed forces.

(b) Establish effective rationing program to control and supply reasonable consumer demand.

(c) Determine remainder of meat supply and limit lend-lease purchases to the available supply. (In this way prices would be automatically controlled.)

4. To establish an over-all Government meat-management program under a responsible administrator to coordinate all the demand for meat with the total available supply.

5. Full and strict enforcement with an adequate educational program to enlist public understanding and support.

FARM LABOR PROCUREMENT

An effective farm labor procurement program for 1944 necessitates proper planning immediately. We recommend the earliest consideration of a sufficient appropriation to make possible the continuation of Public Law No. 45 through 1944.

POULTRY

For the protection of the poultry industry and to guarantee a supply of poultry and eggs, we insist that the industry be informed at an early date regarding the 1944 Federal plans for poultry. At present the poultry industry is handicapped with such conflicting statements as: "More poultry and eggs are wanted," and, "A sharp reduction in hogs and poultry is necessary to bring them into range with the prospective feed supplies."

We recommend that O. P. A. ceilings on eggs be discontinued except on consumer grades at retail levels of trade. Present regulations establish the objectionable confusing ceilings on wholesale grades by defining "current receipts" in such a manner as to turn back our quality egg program to the lack of standards of a quarter of a century ago.

Because of the ease with which eggs and poultry can be handled and transported, we are convinced that the rationing of poultry and eggs would be impractical.

CRITICAL BUTTER SITUATION MUST BE CORRECTED

The present shortage and maldistribution of butter has become a critical national food issue. To meet this situation, butter production must be increased. To encourage increased butter production, higher prices for butter, more in line with other dairy product prices must be permitted. Diversion of butterfat to nonrationed and uncontrolled dairy product outlets must be prevented.

CONTROL OF MILK POWDER

We contend that whole milk powder should be subject to price ceilings as well as other dairy products.

We believe it is inexcusable that condensed skim milk shipped in 10-gallon cans with no cost of packaging or danger of regrading and subject to no set-aside order should be purchased without price regulations at a price of 15 cents per pound for solids, while dry skim milk is subject to a set-aside order and is subject to ceiling prices averaging about 13½ cents per pound for solids, including the cost of drying, packaging, and inspecting, plus the possibility of being regraded.

PRICE POLICIES AFFECTING CHEESE

By placing one maximum price on American cheese, and by failing to establish a proper price differential between classes of cheese, the incentive to produce quality cheese has been killed, thereby seriously hampering the quality program which has built a great reputation for Wisconsin cheese. By placing maximum prices on a Plymouth plus base, Wisconsin is severely penalized. Furthermore, a lack of proper price differentials between the smaller size styles of natural cheese and the larger types of cheese demanded by the Government and desired by the processors, has strangled the production of natural cheese for consumer use and has practically eliminated the curing and aging of natural cheese. The dairy industry of Wisconsin spent many years in building a market for aged natural cheese.

DANGEROUS PRICE POLICIES AFFECT FOREIGN TYPE CHEESE

Foreign type cheese prices have been manipulated by the deliberate creation of inequities in an attempt to juggle production and get diversion of milk into supposedly preferred products. These manipulations have created many embarrassments and have lowered the production of all major varieties of cheese. If all-out production is to be considered, then each branch of the cheese industry should be encouraged to do the best job possible and proper adjustments should be made to increase prices which will reflect a proper relationship between foreign type cheese and other commodities.

MINIMUM MILK PRICE OF $3.05 NEEDED

We believe that our Government should increase the price of milk going into manufactured products to a minimum of $3.05 per hundred pounds on a 3.5 percent basis.

Food News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I have found very interesting the following address by Francis A Flood, assistant to the War Food Administrator. It will help you to understand the task before the farmers of this Nation and how splendidly they are doing the job.

OUR FOOD FUTURE BEGINS NOW

Our food future—however bright or gloomy it may be—begins now. So we must look into the cupboard as well as in the crystal bowl.

I would like, in my 20 minutes today, to do the impossible. I would like to answer every question about our national food problem and describe it with such complete facts and such simple reasoning and in such plain words that everyone could understand.

Now, if I were a blind optimist I could describe it by saying this—and saying it very truthfully: Our supplies of food have never been greater. Our production of food has never been greater. We have never eaten more food in our history, per capita, than during the past 3 years. During the other war our farmers did a great job of producing food, as we all know. But our food production for this year and last is 50 percent above the food production in 1917 and 1918.

There is much more to the problem than that, but that is the way I would explain it if I were a blind optimist.

Or if I were a blind critic—and there are some in the United States—I could describe our food situation by limiting myself to reciting spectacular examples of local maladjustments, mistakes that have been made, shortages here and there—these things which have always happened in wartime and always will. I could scare you, and never stray from the facts. I read a food article in a national magazine recently which so skillfully paraded all the shortages and disturbances that are inevitable in wartime—that at the end of the article the poor reader could only feel that famine is just around the corner, that the only way to keep from starving to death is to go outside and cut our throats.

Now, I want to be neither a blind optimist nor a blind critic—because neither serves his country. Each is guilty of performing an actual disservice to his country, and to do that in time of war is a very serious thing.

Neither am I a prophet. I cannot tell you just what our food supply will be next year, how much we will produce and how much our allies will produce. That has never been possible in peacetime and is still less possible in wartime. Yet, many are critical when our Government is not able to lay out months in advance the whole food program, or when changes are announced.

Nor can I tell you exactly what our food demands will be. Demand, too, changes in peace time with changes in purchasing power, prices, etc., and these influences are more active and less predictable in time of war. It is hard to tell how much food will be demanded by our civilians with their swollen purchasing power, how much will be needed in all the many theaters by our armed forces so that they can destroy our enemies, how much we should spare for our allies who are destroying our enemies, how much will be needed in the unknown number of countries we shall have liberated and by those who are also helping us destroy our enemies.

So I will not coax you to listen by reciting our record production and consumption—nor scare you into listening by the sharp practice of destructive criticism, nor try to prophecy.

First, I'd like to give a summary briefly of the food situation as it now exists. When the war began, our food and our farming situation could hardly have been better if we had known war was coming. Our reserve surpluses of food supplies were at record levels. Our food supplies were at record levels. We had never had greater reserves of food.

Besides that, our farm land and its soil was at a high productive level, partly because of the recent soil conservation programs. I learned the other day that our yields per acre for the past 5 years averaged 16 percent higher than the yields for the 20 years just preceding, even omitting the drouth years of 1934 and 1936.

From that running start the American farmer broke all food production records every year for the past 6 years. The great crop of 1941 had seemed to be the limit. Even the farmers doubted they could equal it in 1942 with shortages of farm labor and machinery. The critics were sure it couldn't be done, and they said things were in a muddle. But the American farmer broke that great 1941 record last year by a full 10 percent.

But the critics still said things were in a muddle for 1943. The farmer's answer was to plant 10,000,000 more acres even than last year, to milk more cows than ever before, to carry more beef cattle than ever before, and to farrow the largest pig crop in our history. In spite of the bad spring and the disastrous floods, the present outlook is for a total food production for 1943 which will break all records again, even last year's.

The program for next year calls for a still greater food production for 1944. This, mind you, in spite of the farm labor problem, farm machinery difficulties, and all the other obstacles which always must be expected in time of war.

These obstacles and problems will continue. This country cannot wage the biggest war in its history and still have no farm labor or machinery problems or other difficulties.

I will make the critics happy today by promising them that as long as this war lasts there will be problems and difficulties and shortages and disturbances for them to complain about. Yes, just as surely as we will always have critics with us, we will also always have unsolved problems and shortages and hardships in time of war.

Now what about food consumption? History will record—and some of us may blush when we read it—that during the last 3 years when our friends in occupied countries were starving by the thousands and when most of our allies, who have been destroying our enemies at such profit to us, were on very short rations, our own civilians here have enjoyed the three greatest food consumption years in our history. In 1942 and 1941 the American civilians ate more food per capita than ever recorded before. And current estimates indicate that for 1943 our per capita food consumption will be greater than any year in the twenties or thirties.

Some who could always afford unlimited selection of unlimited food will eat less now than before. But many, many more of our people are eating more and better food now than they did in peacetime. We have always had food rationing—with the dollar as the food coupon. There were always people who did not have enough of these dollar coupons for an adequate diet. These food coupons were unevenly distributed. Some had an unlimited number of food coupons in their checkbook and others had very few.

Now the food coupons are distributed more evenly. There are some chiselers, of course, but those who try to beat the game are few in proportion, and the American public will try to keep that number limited.

The result is that our total food supply, now larger than ever in its history, is distributed more evenly than ever before, more nearly equal to all.

We would have more food if we did not share with our allies. But they have destroyed many times as many of our enemies as we have. From a purely selfish standpoint it is in our own best interest to keep our allies at top fighting strength—with food no less than guns and tanks and planes. For in so doing we speed the day of victory and thereby save the lives of many of our own sons and the sons of our allies as well.

We do not send a very large percentage of our food to our allies, only about 6 percent of our production last year to Britain, and Russia, and the rest. The year before it was still a smaller percentage. But, without it, our British and Russian Allies might have been immeasurably weakened. Limited as this aid was by the available shipping supply, the military picture in Russian and in the Mediterranean might not today be so bright without it.

To keep this up we must produce more food next year.

This can be done. Our real farm goals are whatever it takes. Even though we have seemed each year to reach our peak we can always do better next year.

The record of Britain is an example. I might review it here as an illustration.

I went to Britain on a bombing plane to see how they have met their wartime farming problems. I spent several weeks there visiting British farms and seeing what I could see.

In the first place, I was surprised to learn that Britain is a real agricultural country. For example, Britain is about the size of Iowa and Indiana combined—two of our best farm States—but Britain, pre-war, produced half again as much wheat, almost twice as much hay, more beef, and more eggs and 50 percent more milk than Iowa and Indiana combined. It had more cattle than Iowa and Indiana combined, half as many sheep as the whole United States. Britain produced almost half as much beef as Argentina on this small area the size of Iowa and Indiana. Our national wheat yield average last year was about 20 bushels per acre; Britain's was 37.

In spite of this already high level of farm production Britain has increased during the war her total food production by more than half on a tonnage basis. We have done amazingly well here, as you know. Britain starting from a higher level of production has increased still more in the face of greater obstacles.

They had a farm-labor problem because a greater proportion of the population is under arms and in the war industries than here. They have had a farm machinery shortage, and there have been many obstacles that our farmers here have not had. The blackout is one. Every farm home and every barn is blacked out every night. You can't even carry a lantern around the barn at night. I can hardly describe what an obstacle this total blackout is to total farm production.

There are other obstacles. The fields are stuck full of poles every few rods to keep invading airplanes from landing. The farmer must farm around these poles by the thousands.

Because of the shortage of feed the British farmer must buy feed for his dairy cows,

for his beef cattle and for his hogs against ration coupons just as we buy sugar here. I am sure you can guess how difficult that would be. Much of the farm labor is women, old men, and school children. But although a cow is a cow there and requires the same care and attention, the Englishman did not sell cows when he lost his help. He got city girls for his labor, and dairy production in Britain has increased.

There are other obstacles. I visited a farm that had 53 bomb craters on the one farm. I visited another farm from which the owner had hauled 500 incendiary bombs in cartloads one morning after a raid. These bomb craters had to be filled in, fenced off, or farmed around. One home out of every five in all Britain has been damaged by bombs. They are short of materials, labor, machinery, and equipment.

Yet, in the face of all these obstacles and starting from their high level of production, they have increased their plowed acreage and their total food production by more than half.

This suggests that we have not reached our limit here in the United States. We cannot rest on our records. The battle is still on in the Pacific; it is still on in Europe; it is still on here on the farms of the United States.

But we must keep in mind that no matter how much food we produce or how evenly distributed here at home, or how wisely it is shared with our allies, there will not be enough.

Particularly, there will not be enough for two groups. One is those of us here in America who may want all the choice of all the food that we can eat. There is not enough for that. The other group are the hundreds of thousands of starving people—the Greeks, the Poles, the Czechs, and the others—who have been dying by the thousands while resisting our common enemy. There will not be enough for them.

These are the two groups which will remain unsatisfied.

Insofar as there may be food above our actual needs it may be divided between those two groups, but there cannot be enough for both.

Let's look at the first group for a moment. Last year our civilian population consumed 86 percent of all of our enormous food production. And with their pockets lined with money they asked for more. Our national income last year was the highest on record, and our people, unable to spend that money for automobiles, tires, and many other things in short supply—and being human—wanted to spend it for food. That is understandable. It was the first time that a large percentage of our population had ever been able to buy as much food as their neighbors. Mrs. O'Grady had as many food coupons as the colonel's lady, and she had enough money for the first time to buy as much food as the colonel's lady could get. As long as this condition of large purchasing power remains it will be difficult to produce enough food to satisfy it. So much for that group who will continue to ask for more food.

Now for the other group who will continue to ask for any extra food—the starving peoples who yet remain after their hundreds of thousands of relatives and friends have died of starvation. Anyone will agree that they need it.

The President has clearly stated our policy concerning food for the victims of Axis aggression. In a letter transmitted to the Congress on December 11, 1942, with the seventh quarterly report on lend-lease operations, he said:

"We also have another task, which will grow in magnitude as our striking power grows, and as new territories are liberated from the enemy's crushing grip.

"That task is to supply medicines, food, clothing, and other dire needs of these peoples who have been plundered, despoiled, and starved.

"The Nazis and Japanese have butchered innocent men and women in a campaign of organized terror. They have stripped the lands they hold of food and other resources. They have used hunger as an instrument of the slavery they seek to impose.

"Our policy is the direct opposite. United Nations forces will bring food for the starving and medicine for the sick. Every aid possible will be given to restore each of the liberated countries to soundness and strength, so that each may make its full contribution to United Nations victory and to the peace which follows."

But the amount of food we shall be able to send, considering our own domestic requirements, will depend upon a number of developments that cannot at this moment be foreseen.

Right now, and for the immediate future, it is, of course, the part of enlightened self-interest for us to give help to these hungry victims of our common enemy, some share of any extra food we have.

This will of course depend upon what our other allies will be able to contribute to the common cause. For certainly no one nation can undertake the task alone. Nor do our allies expect that either we or they will undertake the task alone. All will contribute what they can. To achieve this end preliminary discussions between the United Nations and the nations associated with them are now under way looking toward the establishment of a central United Nations agency to assume a responsibility for the relief and rehabilitation of the victims of war.

Because of this, the present outlook now is for shipping some 12 percent of our food production this year under lend-lease and for other export needs, instead of the 6 percent of last year's for Britain, Russia, and the rest, with Russia probably getting most of the increase.

While the war continues, our people will probably continue to accept as good business the practice of sending some of this food to our allies. To what extent this may continue after the war I suppose no one knows.

Perhaps we can best measure the extent to which we should send food to the stricken areas after the war by considering the reason for sending any at all.

Aside from its humanitarian aspects, a purely selfish attitude not only justifies but prompts the sending of what food we can to those in distress until they shall be able once again to produce for themselves, just as it is sound economically as well as socially to feed or otherwise rehabilitate an unfortunate citizen here at home so that he may later become a constructive member of society to our ultimate advantage. Therefore, it is enlightened self-interest for us to assist in liberating these areas and helping them get their land back into food production again, thus reducing the demand on our supplies—and bringing the cost to us down within manageable levels.

It has been said that the world cannot exist half slave and half free, and it may be similarly said that the world cannot exist half fat and half starving. Certainly there can be no sound and enduring world prosperity with much of the world hungry and unproductive. The strictest nationalist realizes that the prosperity of our neighbors is reflected in our own enduring prosperity.

Thus, the minimum assistance that we can wisely give would be to help restore the liberated countries so that they can again produce food. Our policy is to help those countries to help themselves in order that they may become self-sustaining in the shortest possible time. But until their production is partly restored it would seem wise for us to supply some food to help them regain their place as constructive world citizens.

But to what further extent should we help them get back into increased production? How will that help us?

A further advance depends on an economic and political world order which will enable the greatest production out of the human and natural resources of the world. In other words, it will depend on the kind of post-war world that we have. That post-war world is in the making now, out of the conditions that now exist. It is developing out of this forum and a thousand other forums going on today wherever a few people are talking about that time when peace is restored.

Our international food policy which will emerge is only one part of that whole post-war world—whatever it may turn out to be. If it is a world half slave and half free, world food policy will call for a world half starved and half fat. If it calls for a free world throughout, it will call for a world of abundant production of food throughout.

When I say that the food future begins now, and that we must look into the cupboard as well as into the crystal bowl, I mean that this forum and the public forum of the United States itself today is determining that future.

Security for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Security for All, broadcast by me over the radio September 15 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the trend of this global war turns in our favor, we begin to see more clearly a basic lesson of military strategy. In the last 10 years, the Axis won brilliant victories, not so much through its own power as through weakness and division among its opponents. While the Axis countries conspired and struck together, disunity in the rest of the world made it possible for the Axis to pick off its victims one by one. Now that the forces of free humanity are working and fighting as a team, the Axis is falling apart under our concerted blows. The United Nations represent in fact an organization for self-defense. They must maintain that united front, in the war and in the peace to come, if they are to win their victory and make it stick.

In attacking domestic economic problems like unemployment, we have learned, in the same hard way, the same lesson of mutual defense against a common foe. In the years following the last war, we failed to use fully and effectively our great resources of manpower and industry, land, and mineral wealth. The resulting depression fell with cruel effect on the generation that had fought and bled in World War No. 1. That was the bitter fruit of a false economic dogma called rugged individualism, whereby prosperity was supposed to filter down to most of the people if you took good care of a few at the top.

In the aftermath of this war, I trust we will follow the basic American doctrine of working together as a team, in building

security for all. As Secretary Hull said the other night, there is little hope for an orderly world unless each country puts its own house in order. The security and well-being of the people, no less than military forces, are the armament of a democracy in keeping the peace.

Private enterprises, large and small, will bear the greatest burden in attaining that goal; but there is an important part to be played by communities and States, and by the Federal Government where only national action by the whole people can meet a manifest national need. I am speaking tonight about one phase of the total effort—a unified national plan of social security backing up the free enterprise system. The legislation was introduced last June, prior to the recess, by Senator MURRAY and myself in the Senate, and by Congressman DINGELL in the House of Representatives.

The bill creates a national system of public employment offices, to help about 30,000,000 returning servicemen and war workers to find regular jobs in private industry or on farms, when the country turns again to peacetime living. Where jobs are not immediately available, the bill provides unemployment insurance protection, on a national basis, up to 26 or possibly 52 weeks of unemployment. The weekly insurance benefit would vary with past wages, and increase with the number of dependents.

In another important feature, the bill includes about 15,000,000 more people under the present old-age insurance program, such as farm workers and domestic servants, employees of nonprofit organizations, and the independent farmer, professional and small businessman. Both the minimum and maximum benefits are increased, and the retirement age for women workers is reduced from 65 to 60. We also provide, for the first time, a regular monthly income for life to the insured person who becomes totally disabled before reaching the retirement age.

A major gap in our social-security law has been the complete absence of protection against sickness. This gap is making itself felt now, in the hour of supreme need. Almost one in every two young men of military age are being rejected as unfit for military service. And in our war plants, sickness is a major cause of absenteeism. Much of this disability or illness would have been avoided if a long-range health program had been in effect. The new bill insures against loss of wages because of illness, and makes possible full medical and hospital care, with some exceptions, for the insured worker and his dependent wife and children. This Nation-wide program safeguards the freedom of the patient, the doctor and the hospital, while fostering better medical and hospital care for all.

Each of the foregoing social-security programs will benefit returning servicemen as they move into peacetime jobs covered by the national plan. The bill goes still further, however, by giving them paid up benefit rights in every phase of insurance protection I have described, covering the period of military service as far back as October 1939.

The entire plan is accomplished by combining all existing and new programs into a unified national system, to simplify administration, eliminate bookkeeping, reports and overlapping of offices and functions.

The benefits for servicemen are paid out of the Federal Treasury. The cost for civilians is met by employees and employers, each paying 6 percent of pay roll into an insurance trust fund. The self-employed—farmers, professional and small businessmen—would pay 7 percent of the value of their services, for old age and permanent disability insurance, and health and hospital care. Contributions by the Government will be added as needed, beginning some years hence. For employers, this rate is a mere 1 percent increase over the contribution under the present Social Security Act, effective next year, and no increase over the rate provided by the law beginning in 1949. It is the employee who meets the bulk of the increase for the expanded social insurance plan, amounting in his case to 4 percent above the rate effective on January 1, 1944.

There is no Nation-wide program touching the lives of millions of our people which is so well understood and widely accepted as the principle of social security. Every test of public opinion shows that the extension and improvement of that plan now along the lines of this bill, meet with overwhelming public approval.

If you believe, as some mistakenly do, that the end of the war is in sight, then there is every reason for immediate action. If you hold, with our responsible military leaders, that a hard struggle lies ahead, then it is likewise essential to make an immediate start. It requires a year or more to pass and perfect legislation of this importance, to set up administrative machinery, and build up working reserves in the trust fund. It is already late to begin this task, having in mind the uncertainties in the military and political picture abroad, and the experience of the last war, when the armistice caught us completely without plans for economic adjustment at home.

The need for early action is reinforced by the home-front battle against inflation. Congress is now studying the President's request for $12,000,000,000 in new taxes or new savings, or both. The difficulty in obtaining all of this sum in new taxes is apparent. Certainly I do not favor a general sales tax on the necessities of life; that would be inflationary in effect, and fall with greatest weight on the lowest income group. If we turn to savings to make up a substantial part of the total sum, the social security plan I have described, covering the bulk of the population, would provide about $5,000,000,000 above present collections, in the first year of operation.

For the insured employee, farmer, professional or small businessman, the plan offers full money's worth in insurance protection, for themselves and their families in the postwar years. For the citizen as taxpayer, it would help meet the need for increased wartime savings, and reduce the cost of relief and similar public expenses after the war. For the businessman and the investor, it offers a well-established, conservative means to fight off the danger of wartime inflation, and to help maintain a high level of economic activity and purchasing power in the difficult post-war period.

The sponsors of this legislation are working for early congressional action. We are convinced that such proposals, as Sir William Beveridge has said, are "a sign of the belief that the object of government, in peace and in war, is the happiness of the common man—a belief which, through all differences in government, unites the United Nations and divides them from their enemies."

The Edwards Perpetual Calendar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have presented to the House today a concurrent resolution requesting that the President, at the conference for the conclusion of treaties of peace terminating the present war, urge upon the nations of the world represented at such conference the adoption of the Edwards Perpetual Calendar.

The Edwards Perpetual Calendar is the creation of Willard Eldridge Edwards, of Honolulu, T. H., and has been formally endorsed by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii. The calendar and supporting resolution follow:

The Edwards Perpetual Calendar

New Year's Day (a day apart from any week or month) is the first day of each year, followed by the 364-day calendar shown below:[1]

JANUARY							FEBRUARY							MARCH						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

APRIL							MAY							JUNE						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Leap-Year Day (a second day apart) is observed only in leap years between June 31 and July 1 as the first day of the second half-year.[1]

JULY							AUGUST							SEPTEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

OCTOBER							NOVEMBER							DECEMBER						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7			1	2	3	4	5					1	2	3
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
29	30						27	28	29	30				25	26	27	28	29	30	31

[1] These 2 year-days, far from being "blank days," are definitely named and have a definite purpose. Considered apart from any week, they allow the calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

The text of House Resolution No. 79 adopted by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, at Honolulu, T. H., on April 28, 1943, follows:

Resolution requesting the President or Congress to propose the adoption of the Edwards Perpetual Calendar by all nations at the peace conference and to propose that all United Nations now appoint a national committee to study the Edwards Perpetual Calendar with a view toward accepting it at the peace conference

Whereas the present calendar has fundamental defects, summarized as follows:

1. Inequality in the lengths of the months, quarters, and half-years.

(a) The months contain from 28 to 31 days;

(b) The quarters contain, respectively, 90 (91 in leap-years), 91, 92, and 92 days;

(c) The first half-year contains 2 or 3 days less than the second half-year.

2. Lack of fixity and regularity.

The calendar is not fixed but changes every year. The year contains 52 weeks plus 1 odd day in usual years and 2 days in leap-years. In consequence:

(a) Each year begins and ends on a different day of the week from the preceding year, holidays wander over each day of the week and dates of periodical events cannot be fixed with precision;

(b) The positions of the weeks in the quarters vary each year, overlapping the divisions of the years and quarters in a different way each time, thus complicating all comparisons, statistics, and accounts;

(c) The extra day of leap year is now credited to February once in 4 years, thus making monthly computations and comparisons even more complex;

(d) Since, from year to year, neither the months nor the years contain the same number of individual week days (i. e., work days), there can be no true statistical or commercial comparisons between one year and another;

(e) The various subdivisions of the year itself, the half-years, quarters, and months are likewise incapable of accurate comparison;

(f) The fifteenth and the thirtieth of each month are important dates as regards the falling due and the payment of wages and rents. When these dates are Sundays, the payments must be postponed or advanced;

(g) Under our present system Easter varies between March 22 and April 25, a range of 35 days for the celebration of one anniversary. This causes an annual displacement of all movable festivals and numerous civil disadvantages and inconveniences;

(h) The present calendar does not agree with the universal conception of the seventh day as a day of rest, of Saturday and Sunday as the week end, or of Monday as the first day of the week;

(i) With such a calendar, the loss in time and effort spent in needless computation is almost beyond belief; and

Whereas the Edwards perpetual calendar simplifies the present calendar so as to remove these undisputed defects and result in the following advantages:

1. All months have exactly 26 workdays and are directly comparable. There are also 65 school days in any 3 months' period;

2. All quarters have exactly 13 whole weeks, and fractions of weeks at ends of quarters, half years, and years are eliminated. This facilitates the preparation of all Government and other quarterly reports, saving much time and expense;

3. The position of the weeks in the quarters is fixed. The quarters are equal in length and the half years are equal in length. True comparisons can be made, both within the year and between 1 year and another;

4. Each year begins on New Year's Day, a holiday apart from any week or month, and is followed by Monday, January 1, the second day of the new year and the first workday;

5. The entire calendar becomes fixed and perpetual. Holidays and anniversaries fall on the same week-day each year and court sessions, educational schedules, and all public meetings and periodical events can be fixed with precision;

6. The 15th and the 30th of each month always occur on weekdays, coordinating periods of earning and spending and the payments of wages, rents, and bills;

7. Leap-year day occurs in leap years as a second holiday apart from any week or month, and is the first day of the second half year;

8. Easter on April 14 follows a provisional bill enacted by the British Parliament in 1928 providing for the stabilization of Easter on the first Sunday after the second Saturday in April (i. e., on or between April 9 and 15);

9. Monday as the first day of the week agrees with common business practice and with the psychological conception of this day. It allows for a rest day after 6 workdays and Saturday and Sunday become the week-end in fact;

10. Friday the thirteenth is eliminated from the calendar;

11. It is only necessary to remember 30, 30, 31—Monday, Wednesday, Friday, to be able to complete all future dates;

12. Several 3-day holiday periods are provided throughout the year; and

Whereas the perpetual calendar (also known as the Edwards Calendar) simplifies and revises the calendar scientifically and permanently with no more than 2 days' variation from the present system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby respectfully requested and urged to propose that the Edwards perpetual calendar be adopted by all nations at the peace conference and to propose to all United Nations that they now appoint a national committee to study the Edwards perpetual calendar with a view toward its acceptance at the peace conference.

Crucifixion of a People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Free World:

CRUCIFIXION OF A PEOPLE

As we go to press, there is a murmur in the air of an impending act that may prove to be the climax in that stark tragedy played across the continent of Europe for 10 bitter years. From London and Washington, and now from Quebec, come rumors that the door to their only possible haven—now and in the future—will be slammed shut in the faces of the Jews of Europe. The ominous grapevine, which correspondents call reliable sources, whispers that the British Foreign Office has finally won President Roosevelt's approval to a unilateral denunciation of the solemn pledges and treaties that established Palestine as a national homeland for the Jews at the end of the last war. More specifically, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER has just released a vigorous warning that "a joint statement will be issued by the British Foreign Office and the State Department * * * which will * * * smash the hopes of those who dared look toward Palestine as the one realistic approach to the solution of the homelessness of a driven people."

It seems incredible that among the collaborators in this act of the Jewish tragedy should be Winston Churchill and those members of his Cabinet who have so often and so eloquently protested in Parliament against the MacDonald White Paper, which Mr. Churchill described as "an act of repudiation" and "a breach of faith." For it is the phrase, "MacDonald White Paper"—that measure of official indifference and inhumanity limiting the number of Jews to be admitted to Palestine—which is most often heard in the hints and whispers and rumors concerning the projected action. The MacDonald White Paper of 1939 was one of the last acts of appeasement forced by Chamberlain's Government on a rebellious Parliament. It was an executive order, not only condemned by Mr. Churchill, Lord Wedgewood, L. S. Amery, Herbert Morrison, Philip Noel Baker, and other members of the Conservative party and of the Labor and Liberal Opposition, but actually declared illegal by the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. Now, according to "reliable sources," it is this document that is to be used as authority for denying to the stricken Jews of Europe the possibility and hope of escape to Palestine. It is to be the reason for rejecting the extraordinary offer of Palestinian Jewry to welcome and support 600,000 Jewish refugees from Axis controlled countries. It is to be the excuse for the shameful inactivity of the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees when so much cries out to be done, when thousands of dead are the result of inaction.

However much or little truth there may be in these rumors, the fact remains that neither the United Nations nor Britain and America—who control the initiative of the United Nations—have taken any concrete steps to save the Jews of Europe. Every day of this inactivity sees freight trains bearing doomed men, women, and children from the western countries to Poland; sees other men, women, and children falling in their tracks from starvation in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary; every day sees suffocation chambers eject hundreds of inert bodies, sees trench graves endlessly dug and filled. The shame and tragedy of this situation lies not so much in the vast numbers of helpless victims—at a time when young and strong men fall on the battlefield we grow callous to death—but in the fact that not even an attempt is made to save these tortured human beings. Not even a gesture, beyond pious ejaculations of horror and sympathy, lightens the last moments of this abandoned people. It is this inaction, this indifference, that constitutes the spiritual as well as the physical crucifixion of the Jews.

Yet there are ways and means of taking immediate and effective action. Jewish and other organizations have suggested many practical measures. At the recent conference held by the Emergency Committee to Save the Jews of Europe, a group of experts formulated a plan that, utilizing available facilities, promises to withdraw in 4 months 750,000 Jews from the actual and potential death pits of Europe. This plan has been presented to the United States Government in a memorandum to Secretary of State Hull. It postulates that a great proportion of the 4,000,000 surviving Jews of Europe can be saved prior to cessation of hostilities without hindering the successful prosecution of the war; it calls for the immediate creation of a separate and official agency dedicated to the specific purpose of working on this problem through available international channels; and it indicates the means of effecting the evacuation and finding asylum for the Jews of Axis-occupied and satellite countries.

But Palestine, and the freedom of immigration to Palestine, are the very essence of this plan. Only Palestine is so situated that the bulk of these refugees may be quickly transported there; only in Palestine is there a great body of the population willing and ready to support and absorb the Jews; only in Palestine will the Jews find a permanent haven of refuge where they belong "of right and not on sufferance," a right legally established when the United States and 52 other nations ratified the Balfour declaration, when the United States and Great Britain signed the convention of 1924.

This right and the corollary obligations of Great Britain as the mandatory power were cited by Mr. Churchill in his opposition to the MacDonald White Paper. His eloquent and noble words are just as valid now as they were when he uttered them in Parliament:

I feel bound to vote against the proposals of His Majesty's Government. As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world set aside for reasons of administrative convenience or—and it will be a vain hope—for the sake of a quiet life. I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself, by silence or inaction, to what I must regard as an act of repudiation. * * * I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by an Arab majority. * * * What is that but the destruction of the Balfour declaration? What is that but a breach of faith? What is it but a one-sided denunciation—what is called in the jargon of the present time, a unilateral denunciation of an engagement? Is our condition so parlous and our state so poor that we must, in our weakness, make this sacrifice of our declared purpose?

The people of the world recognize that now, less than ever, is the condition of the British Empire so parlous and her state so poor that she must take cognizance of the bogey of Arab resentment against an act of justice and humanity. They will consider any action that on such grounds bars the way to saving millions of Jews from impending doom as the forerunner of those political machinations and those violations of international treaties, moral laws, and human decency, which may begin with the destruction of the Jewish people but must end with the destruction of mankind.

Foreign Policy for Post-War United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Foreign Policy for Post-War United States," published in the Washington Times-Herald for July 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY OF POST-WAR UNITED STATES

There are moments when we feel highly optimistic about the war—that Germany may be licked this year and Japan next—and there are moments when we feel pessimistic about it. We suppose all of us have these alternating currents of optimism and pessimism; and maybe they are controlled by the amount of calcium, vitamin B, or what not in one's system at any given moment.

Whatever the cause, this is one of our most pessimistic moments. At this time it looks like a long war to us, despite recent cheering news. We have a feeling that the boys won't be coming home for good for maybe 2, 3, or 4 years; that many of them won't be coming home at all, and that many more will arrive home minus arms, legs, or other useful parts of their anatomies.

Those that do eventually come home, though, will be men—tough men, grim men, with first-hand knowledge of how fine a place the United States as they knew it was in comparison with the places they will have seen.

When they come home, the United States will be in effect theirs, and rightfully so, because they will have saved it from conquest and slavery and brought it to victory over a horde of barbaric enemies. These men will be entitled to run this country, not we who stayed at home and cheered them on with eloquent words while cussing the wartime deprivations on the home front.

There will be some ten or twelve million of them—which means that if they form a fairly well integrated bloc with intelligent leadership they can hold the balance of political power throughout the Nation, and can hold all Government policies that amount to anything.

If they react to this war experience as their fathers reacted to the 1917–18 thing, these men will have two prime desires when they get back: That they themselves will never have to go to war again, and that their children will not be dragged into another war 20 or 25 years hence.

They can't make certain of either of these things any more than their fathers could. But they can force this country, over the objections of the pacifists and the war-weary, to adopt a standing policy of adequate national defense and stick to that policy.

Such a policy would call for the world's finest air force, for plenty of submarines manned with trained crews at all times, and for such surface warships as we may need. It would also call for an army capable of being expanded to war strength almost overnight, because based on universal compulsory military training.

Even the most aggressive nations think a long time before they attack a nation which they know to be well armed and ready to fight. We spent $76,000,000,000 on the war in the fiscal year ended July 1; expect to spend around $100,000,000,000 this fiscal year. Had we spent $5,000,000,000 a year on our defense set-up ever since World War No. 1, we could in all probability have stayed out of the present war or gone into it, as we preferred.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE (Republican), of Connecticut, remarked in a recent speech that the United States has no foreign policy. There is a great deal of truth in Representative LUCE's statement.

We used to have a foreign policy; namely, stay out of Europe's eternal wars.

We abandoned that policy under Woodrow Wilson, and again under Franklin D. Roosevelt. In World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 our foreign policy has been nothing but Great Britain's foreign policy.

If we team up after this war in some world state run mainly by Great Britain and ourselves, we shall be hocked inescapably into the orbit of European politics. Every time Great Britain feels concerned enough over some European upset to go to war about it, we shall have to follow Britain into that war, as we have now done twice in a quarter century. And knowing that we are behind them with our great resources and manufacturing abilities, British statesmen will be the more encouraged to risk European wars.

We hope that the returning soldiers will insist on a return to our former foreign policy of staying out of Europe's eternal wars, minding our own business, and keeping our powder dry.

We realize that these sentiments are what are nowadays called isolationism, America Firstism, treachery to the human race, etc. Nevertheless, we expect that a large majority of our boys will be found to entertain precisely these sentiments when at long last they come home from this global war.

Lend-Lease Outright Gift?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt, in his letter of transmittal on the eleventh report to Congress on lend-lease operations for the period ended July 31, 1943, stated in substance that the people of the United States are to receive no payment in goods or money for the roundly $14,000,000,000 of lend-lease war supplies already transferred to other nations and the more than $36,000,000,000 additional appropriated for lend-lease goods.

On page 6 of the above-referred-to report the President said:

The United Nations are growing stronger because each of them is contributing to the common struggle in full measure—whether in men, in weapons, or in materials. Each is contributing in accordance with its ability and its resources. Everything that all of us have is dedicated to victory over the Axis Powers. The Congress in passing and extending the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid.

The President has denied responsibility for this statement, which appears over his signature. A second printing of the eleventh report to Congress on lend-lease operations has been put out by Mr. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator, in which the two last sentences in the above-quoted statement are deleted.

In denying authorship of the statement contained in the first printing that—

The Congress in passing and extending the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid.

Does the President mean to imply the United States is to receive payment in substantial amount for the lend-lease goods—say, one-half, or one-fourth, or even one-tenth of the amount of lend-lease goods shipped out?

Would it not be the fair thing for the President to forthrightly tell the American people just what they should expect in return for the sweat and toil they have given and must continue to give, and the billions of debt this program has laid upon their backs and the many billions more of debt it will continue to pile upon their backs?

Why should the President in his explanation for deleting these sentences, by

implication at least, continue to hold out hope to our people that they may confidently expect payment in kind or money for lend-lease shipments?

The attitude of mind of those connected with the administration of lend-lease, as the hearings on the extension of the Lend-Lease Act clearly show, is one of complete forgiveness of all payment for lend-lease goods. Mr. Stettinius, on page 11, Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress, said:

> We have kept from all the transactions anything of a spirit of commercial trade.

Mr. MUNDT, member of the committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, said to Mr. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, during the hearings, on page 123:

> And throughout your statement you point out it is going to be difficult if not impossible to settle these accounts in either goods or gold.

Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, on page 153 of the hearings, in his testimony stated:

> This act does not represent a policy of charity by us to our allies. It is simply the method by which the resources of our credit and industries are put to the most effective use in fighting this war.

On page 162 of the hearings Mr. VORYS, a member of the committee, said to Mr. Stimson:

> What concerns me is how we can have dollar-sign economy at home and no dollar-sign international economy.

To this Secretary Stimson replied:

> You will find it is an old historical practice.

Mr. Stimson then attempted to point out a precedent in the subsidy policy which Great Britain carried on for centuries in connection with her numerous shifting alliances with other nations. He stated:

> Great Britain * * * had never loaned, had never rendered financial assistance in the form of loans to its allies, but always in the form of subsidy.

If Secretary Stimson meant to imply that Great Britain omitted the pound sign in those subsidy transactions, then his statement is wholly incorrect. The pound sign was never absent from any of those transactions and in making this statement I am not criticizing in the least the ever-present pound-sign policy of Great Britain.

Numerous other statements from Lend-Lease authorities and other high Government officials could be cited to show the view is general among most if not all persons in high authority that no material compensation is expected for lend-lease goods.

Among them might be mentioned the following: Mr. Berle, an Assistant Secretary of State, on page 226 of the hearings, tries to justify the giving away of our war supplies under lend-lease by citing the incident of Britain's delivery to the United States in the quasi war between the United States and France in 1797. In looking up this incident I find Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State, wrote to Benjamin Stoddert, Esquire, Secretary of the Navy, that Britain was in a position to deliver "24 cannon, French 24-pounders, and about 1,800 shot belonging to them on loan to the United States."

From this it would seem the citation given by Mr. Berle in justification of lend-lease was not apropos.

However the attempt to justify the outright making of a gift to our allies of war goods under lend-lease by attempting to cite precedents therefor is for the present entirely beside the point. The sole question now under consideration is the determination of the meaning of the President's statement in the first printing of the July lend-lease report, the deletion therefrom of the words "the Congress in passing and extending the Lend-Lease Act made it plain that the United States wants no new war debts to jeopardize the coming peace. Victory and a secure peace are the only coin in which we can be repaid," and his explanation of said deletion. Was it Mr. Roosevelt's purpose to hold out hope to the American people of payment in goods or money for lend-lease supplies?

The more forthright seem to make much of the proposition that lend-lease will avoid foreign war debts to us. They seem to claim great merit for this in that it will avoid repetition of the painful disillusionment the American people experienced following the other war.

It may be we will be spared that disillusionment, but may it not be that a much greater and more painful disillusionment is in store for us? What of the enormous debt burden that is being produced by lend-lease from which there will be absolutely no escape? It is the trouble this debt burden has in store for the American people that will trouble them, and there will be little compensation for them in being reminded that lend-lease spared them from the disillusionment they suffered with respect to World War No. 1 war debts.

But another serious disillusionment awaits the American people which may be far more serious than the one they experienced after World War No. 1. After all, the goods delivered by the United States to our allies in World War No. 1 were devoted solely to war operations. They went to the battlefield, where they were used to bring about military victory Not so, however, with lend-lease. This program is being used not only to supply military needs to our fighting allies. It is being used also as a policy for achieving all manner of international political objectives involving control of tariffs, commerce, and regulation of economic relationships between the several countries of the world. This is clearly shown in the master agreements.

The disillusionment will be great and painful indeed, when the American people learn the real truth about the lend-lease program—that military aid to our allies is one thing—the need and desirability of which no one questions—and lend-lease something else again.

Congress Should Make Post-War Plans Now To Prevent Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress has reconvened, it is imperative that administrative leaders and party leaders as well give careful attention to what is going to happen when the present global war comes to an end. Unless matters are carefully planned we are going to have a repetition of the so-called depression which followed World War No. 1 and which resulted in the collapse of business and in unemployment in every line of industry. Following World War No. 1 nothing was done in a constructive way to provide employment for the returning soldiers and sailors, and this catastrophe resulted or culminated in the bonus marchers coming to Washington. It is my hope that those conditions will not develop again.

I realize that many people will say we have Government bureaus amply able to work out these problems and do the planning. Past experiences and past performance does not indicate that these bureaus and Government agencies can meet the situation. Some of them are headed by able men, but I have no faith in the leaders in some of the other agencies. They will not work together. They are infected with jealousy, and very often even in this World War crisis work at cross purposes.

For these reasons I am of the opinion that Congress should take steps and enact necessary legislation so that a Committee of the House of Representatives and a Committee of the Senate can sit in with the different administrative officials and confer with them and work out plans for giving work to the American people and our returning soldiers and sailors when World War No. 2 comes to an end. I know already that plans are being made for highway improvements and the building of new highways, and I am glad that this matter is already receiving attention. However, when the time comes to carry out the plans I fear that Congress will not be fully informed, and in my opinion, now is the time to have Members of the House and the Senate familiarize themselves with the need for productive public expenditures, and the objects for which funds will be expended.

Parenthetically let me make a remark that was made to me by a sound constructive businessman following World War No. 1. He said in substance that a country that could spend millions for destruction purposes could afford to spend millions on projects that would contribute to the welfare of the American people.

Yesterday I talked with another man occupying a responsible Government position, and he said in substance that we are now spending billions of dollars for destructive purposes in the World War, and indicated emphatically his support for a program that would spend a few million dollars for productive projects that will help American enterprise, and very directly increase the number of jobs, and abolish the great waste of unemployed labor.

We want a post-war planning that will recreate the wealth of this Nation and increase its strength. It has been estimated that the recent depression cost the American people something like $200,000,000,000, measured in terms of what could have been produced and what we failed to produce because of industrial stagnation and resultant unemployment.

I just cite briefly one other example where post-war planning is needed; that is in the field of aviation. It is to be regretted, that last July that an $8,000,000 appropriation item providing completion and construction of 23 airports in this country failed of passage. I hope that Congress will become air minded, and wake up to the tremendous possibilities of aviation. These 23 airports should have consideration immediately. Most of them do not need to wait for post-war planning because they are already partly constructed with Government funds, and will deteriorate and become valueless unless they are completed promptly. It is only a matter of the exercise of good business to do this now.

In connection with our post-war planning, details should be worked out for a complete network—from the East to the West, and the North to the South—all over this country. The transportation of passengers and freight by airplane has unlimited possibilities, and, as I have said, we are on the threshold of new transportation methods which will make the present automobile and motor vehicle look small in comparison. Now is the time to take into account these possibilities when something over 1,000,000 aviators and men trained in the air forces come back following this war.

In this connection, last, but not least, in importance is the development of the rivers and harbors in the United States. In this connection I call special attention to the St. Lawrence seaways and power development project. There is pending in Congress a bill, H. R. 2280, providing for this work. Hearings were held on this measure in the summer of 1941, and these were probably the most exhaustive hearings ever conducted on any project. The St. Lawrence seaway project was then approved by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and included in omnibus bill, H. R. 5993, Seventy-seventh Congress. I will not here discuss the many advantages that would come with a completion of this project. I have on other occasions done so, and my remarks appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can point out, however, that in hearings held in the Senate during peacetime, General Markham of the Army engineers, stated that the savings to the American people the first year the project would be in operation would be $80,000,000.

We are going to end this war with a tremendous merchant marine. In other words, a great surplus of ships available for transportation purposes will be our problem. Are we going to scrap this shipping as was done in World War No. 1 or are we going to develop our rivers and harbors and waterways transportation facilities and use this shipping for the benefit of the American people? The whole course of this war has demonstrated the need for this project, and the hardships placed upon the country in a time of great stress, through the lack of its facilities, the old arguments that this country possesses a surplus of transportation facilities has been pretty well exploited at this time. The country now faces a pending break-down of its railroad transportation system, brought about in large measure by the reluctance of the railroad system to either expand their own facilities or permit other means of transportation to be constructed. It, therefore, ill behooves these same agencies to bring up this type of argument in the future as they have done in the past. Unless we utilize every natural resource we have to provide cheaper transportation we cannot hope to attain a high level of production at the end of this war, and to compete with foreign countries.

But to get back to the subject, the development of all of these rivers and harbors projects, including the development of the power that is going to waste on the St. Lawrence River, will give employment to tens of thousands of unemployed men. This applies not only to the project itself, but in connection with the making of materials in the factories and elsewhere, and in the development of new enterprises which will come about through the development of these resources.

Proceedings at the Conferring of Army-Navy E Banners and Pins at Union Bleachery, Greenville, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on August 26, last, to attend the ceremonies at Union Bleachery, Greenville, S. C., for the conferring of the Army-Navy E award upon this splendid industry.

Many years ago John W. Arrington, Sr., now deceased, with his associates founded the Union Bleachery near my home town of Greenville, this being one of the first finishing plants to be located in the South. As I stood in the presence of the large patriotic group of citizens assembled for these unusual ceremonies my mind went back to other days when as a child I traveled along the muddy road, now a beautiful concrete highway, beside which is situated this essential mill.

Since less than 3 percent of the industries engaged in the production of war goods have been fortunate enough to receive the special award for efficiency in production, the occasion was all the more significant. The management of the Union Bleachery is now in the hands of the Arrington brothers, sons of the founder, with many others who grew up in the community. High representatives of the Army, Navy, Federal, State, county, and municipal government were present, as well as hundreds of employees with members of their families and friends on this impressive day.

Under Secretary of War Patterson sent the following letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 31, 1943.

To the Men and Women of the Union Bleachery, Greenville, S. C.:

This is to inform you that the Army and Navy are conferring upon you the Army-Navy Production Award for great accomplishment in the production of materials needed in the war effort.

This award symbolizes your country's appreciation of the achievement of every man and woman in the Union Bleachery. It consists of a flag to be flown above your plant and a lapel pin which each of you may wear as a sign of distinguished service to your country.

I am confident that your outstanding record will bring victory nearer by inspiring others to similar high achievement.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

President R. W. Arrington replied to the above letter as follows:

GREENVILLE, S. C., *August 5, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: On behalf of the men and women of Union Bleachery, it is both a pleasure and an honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 31 informing us of the Army-Navy Production Award

Your recognition of the patriotic accomplishments of our people is deeply appreciated and will inspire us to increased production and improved quality of the essential fabrics being handled at this plant.

Every worker will wear the E pin with pride, realizing that it is a symbol of work well done for our boys in the fighting forces.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. ARRINGTON, *President.*

Governor Olin D. Johnston made an appropriate address which was followed by Lt. Col. Christopher C. Baldwin, Jr., QMC, as he presented the Army-Navy E. Colonel Baldwin spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, men and women of Union Bleachery, and guests, less than a week ago, I received a letter from a close friend of mine, and of yours—Cal Harris, now a Quartermaster captain now stationed in England. I am sure you will be interested in what he had to say and instead of attempting a speech, I am going to tell you what he said. I quote:

"I was delighted today to learn that Union Bleachery is to receive the Army-Navy E and I am hoping this letter will reach you in time so that you can congratulate for me,

John and Dick Arrington and all my former coworkers who were responsible for earning this honor. I know what splendid work Union Bleachery is doing, the large volume that is turned out weekly, and I well know that quantity and quality cannot be produced without a lot of hard work, long hours and plenty of sweat.

"I am in charge of the clothing and equipage branch in the Supply Division of the Army Service Forces here, and every day we are in contact with hundreds of suits of herringbone twill—shirts, trousers, and all items issued to our men in the Army. I am in a splendid position to see just what huge quantities of clothing are needed and I know these supplies would not be coming to this and other theaters of war without the loyalty, cooperation, and backing of those at home.

"If you get this letter in time, tell my friends at Union that they are making a real contribution to the war effort in turning out more and more cloth, and by making it good and strong. I have seen what the boys go through with and believe me when I say those herringbone twill uniforms take an awful beating when the men get into the combat zones. The workers at Union were always loyal and I know they will continue to give their best when I tell them we need the best they can give.

"When we arrived here where I am stationed, we worked 15 and 16 hours a day and even now we are so busy that we never notice when Sunday comes around for we work 7 days a week. But, however hard it is, the results in north Africa and in Sicily were well worth our effort. You can appreciate our satisfaction in knowing that we here and those working at the Union Bleachery and other plants at home contributed to those successes.

"I am hoping that it won't be too long before I shall be back to see you and my friends in Greenville. In the meantime, keep our supplies rolling."

Those are the words written by Cal Harris who is now a great many miles from Greenville, expressing his confidence that you have done everything in your power for him and the other fighting men.

When I reply to his letter, I shall tell him his confidence was justified. I shall tell him how you maintained a three-shift operation at Union despite manpower problems. I shall tell him how your older, skilled workmen trained others to take the places at the machines of those going into the service, and I shall tell him that a number of Union workers, equal to 29 percent of your personnel, are in the armed services. That your record of bond and stamp purchases is unsurpassed in this area. I shall tell him that no matter what difficulties arose, you never for a moment permitted production to lag—in fact, increased it from 50 to 59.7 yards per man-hour.

For the War Department, I want to say that your record in maintaining peak production in face of shortages of critical materials is a noteworthy one. Of particular interest to the Army was the engineering accomplishment in perfecting a one-process water repellancy treatment increasing the speed of the process by 50 percent.

Of no less interest is your conservation and salvage program. I learn that every operator must turn in an old metal item for every new replacement, and that a salvage department has been set up for the purpose of sorting and renovating discarded articles for re-use. I find, too, that a majority of your repair jobs are accomplished through use and adaptation of salvaged parts.

I am confident that with this fine record, you will not permit anything to throw you off guard and cause you to relax your efforts. War news these days is encouraging, but when we look at a map of the Pacific and compare the few places we have recaptured from the enemy with the vast expanses to be regained, we are enabled to read the news with a new understanding of the immense task still ahead of us. And with this understanding, you will be able to continue your work with the same tireless spirit which pervades your own servicemen and their millions of buddies.

You have done well and are full deserving of the honor you are to receive. May I now present you, on behalf of the Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the men and women of the armed forces, this Army-Navy production award. It consists of this flag for your plant and individual pins for yourselves. Let this award be your inspiration as you work to hasten the day when our boys will come marching home victorious.

President R. W. Arrington of the Union Bleachery spoke to his people as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Johnston, Colonel Baldwin, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the employees of Union Bleachery, whom we honor today, are the right kind of people. They are a credit to the country we all love and to the boys representing us on the battle fronts. I know whereof I speak because we grew up together. They think straight and they act straight. When there is a job to be done, they set about doing it. Whether a Community Chest drive, Red Cross, or any other activity for the betterment of their fellowmen, they can always be counted on to do their share and more. They are conscientious and hard-working, loyal, honest, God-fearing, and God-loving men and women.

They are patriotic beyond all question. They have furnished 309 of their sons and husbands as well as 1 WAC and 1 WAVE to the armed forces. Two assistant foremen, with wives and children, who were not required to go, volunteered, and left only this morning.

Their absentee record is excellent and well below the average for industrial plants.

For over a year 97½ percent of them in number have allotted 10½ percent of gross pay roll to the purchase of Government bonds. We have proudly flown for many months the Treasury Minute Man flag. Quite a few of these flags have been awarded for 90-percent employee participation, but you won't find many that carry the Treasury T for purchases in excess of 10 percent of gross pay roll. Ours does.

They have labored long and hard in producing vital clothing for our armed forces.

In thinking of the employees of Union Bleachery I trust you will pardon a personal reference while I pay tribute to an employee who is not with us today. He would have gotten a greater thrill from this celebration than anyone present. Because of his untiring efforts during the infancy of our business, he is responsible, more than any other person, for the signal honor which is being accorded us today. He loved the people of this plant and, in turn, was loved by them. His sterling character was indelibly impressed upon the lives of those, his friends, with whom he worked at Union Bleachery—our father, John W. Arrington. In his absence I will ask our mother to rise and bow.

Colonel Baldwin, I have told you something of the kind of people you are honoring today. It is with deep pride and joy that I say to you, as the official representative of our Government, that I accept this flag in the name of the employees of Union Bleachery with deep humility. In accepting it we realize full well, and cheerfully assume, the responsibility placed upon us. We know we cannot let up, but must continue to equal or surpass our past accomplishments in order to keep it flying and in order to qualify for a star at the end of 6 months. We will continue, each and every one of us, to put forth our best efforts to bring this horrible war to a speedy conclusion, to keep faith with our boys at the front and to try in our humble way to help perpetuate the ideals which have made our great country stand out among the nations of the world.

Probably the most impressive portion of the program was the speech of acceptance of the Army-Navy E pins by Mr. W. A. Bishop, an employee for many, many years, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Johnston, and representatives of the Army and Navy of our Government, I feel that a great honor has been placed upon me to represent the employees of Union Bleachery on this memorable occasion.

Therefore it gives me a great deal of pleasure on behalf of all my fellow employees to accept the E pin award for our efficiency in the production of finished materials for the armed forces of our Government.

We are not sacrificing anything that will compare to that of our sons who are in the armed services of our country. My son has been in service 29 months. He feels that he will not be doing his part until he gets into actual battle with the enemy. Likewise many of you have sons, many of them on the battle fronts, fighting. They are sacrificing their all.

We feel that the management of the company deserves the greater part of the credit for this award today, because of the fine spirit of cooperation with the employees. Our problems are always their problems, along with theirs, which are many and hard.

May we continue to work and cooperate until victory is ours and "the lights are turned on again all over the world."

In addition to the outstanding and efficient services being rendered to the Government in its war program by the Union Bleachery, at least two of its former employees have given their lives to their country's cause, Milton Reece Surratt at Pearl Harbor and Oscar C. Stone in the southwest Pacific.

The following employees are no longer on the pay roll at the Bleachery because they are proudly wearing their country's uniform:

Beauford Allen, William G. Alverez, Paul M. Ambrose, Charles Anders, Paul M. Anders, Ted Anders, William Anders, James Welch Anderson, William Harold Andrews, Alton E. Anthony, Glenn W. Anthony, James P. Anthony, Willis Moras Anthony, J. D. Atkins, Barrett Brantley Aycock, Algie Bates, Jr., Albert T. Batson, Harold Batson, J. Heyward Batson, Ray Batson, W. A. Batson, J. Aromus Batson, William Henry Bell, Colie B. Bishop, D. Eugene Bishop, Grover F. Bishop, Jr., Roy Marshall Bishop, William Adger Bishop, Jr., William Clinton Bishop, Curtis C. Black, James Black, Walter Levi Black, George R. Blakely, R. Neal Boswell, James L. Bouchillon, Jr., Johnny Uris Bouchillon, Jr., Bunyan Bowers, James Bowers, Roy Hugh Bowers, C. Bruce Brazeal, Boyd William Bridgeman, Jesse Leo Bridges, Ansel L. Bridwell, Milton N. Bridwell, J. Ben Brockman, Charles M. Brooks, Frank C. Brooks, Iola A. Brooks (WAVE), Benjamin Franklin Brown, Melvin Brown, Walter Lee Brown, Wilbert Brown, Robert Edward Bruce, Thomas G. Bryant, William A. Burns, Hubert E. Camp, Cohen Campbell, Floyd Hugh Cantrell, James D. Cantrell, William J. Cantrell, Roy V. Capell, N. D. Carpenter, Walter B. Carpenter, Andy Carr, Randolph Center, Jesse James Chastain, Leroy Christopher, John H. Clifton, Paul Corbin, Manuel Cowan, Jr., Ruthel Coward, Troy Elihue Cowart, Fred Lowman Craig, Lewis Oliver Crane, Joe Ralph Cunningham, George W. Darby, W. Allen Davis, Walter A. Dean, Lucius Delk, William C. DeWitt, Ernest Dickey, J. Lester Dilleshae, Douglas F. Dix,

Ellis Henry Duck, Roy Lee Duckett, Hulon A. Duncan, Albert L. Echols, Arthur Paul Echols, William Elrod, McClure Epps, S. T. Epps, Wilford J. Eskew, James L. Evatt, John C. Evatt, J. Cornelius Evington, Elmer L. Faircloth, John T. Farmer, David G. Ferguson, Harley Fisher, Earl Fleming, William Elzie Ford, Herbert H. Forrester, Charles E. Fowler, John A. Fowler, R. Lyman Francis, W. J. Friddle, Millard Parsle Garland, Jay Gillespie, Marshall Glenn, Alvin Goldsmith, James Allen Goosby, Ralph Arial Grant, Lee Gray, Clarence W. Green, Ralph D. Green, Jr., Sherwood Green, H. Edward Greenwood, Martin L. Harper, Jr., John McSwain Harrison, William Robert Harrison, James B. Hart, Ervin C. Hawkins, Harold H. Hawkins, James A. Hawkins, J. B. Hawkins, Arnold Brooks Henderson, Curtis C. Henderson, David Hill Henry, Fred Lyman Henson, Hershel Dempsey Herd, C. James Hester, James Paul Hester, Roy H. Hester, Otis McBride Hill, Jr., Steven W. Hiott, Jr., Charlie McG. Holcombe, Clarence Hollingsworth, Jr., Douglas Hopkins, Mitchell Dean Howard, Ben Hudson, Joel E. Hudson, Jr., Marvin Hudson, W. H. Huff, Helen Hughes (W. A. C.), Roger T. Hunt, Walker W. Hyatt, Leonard Harry Hyler, John F. Ingle, Theodore Columbus Ivey, Gordon Jenkins, William A. Jewell, C. Edwin Jones, Dee Rembert Jones, Ernest G. Jones, Glenn A. Jones, Harold James Jones, Harry Brewster Jones, Jr., Robert Jones, William B. Jones, Jr., Raymond Cyrial Julian, Bob Keith, Nathan Lawrence Kelley, James Haskell Kennedy, John W. Kerns, John Benjamin Kirby, James O. Land, Ralph Langford, James B. Lazar, Thomas E. Leopard, Ansel Looper, Harold F. Looper, Lloyd C. Looper, Dolphus Lynch, L. C. McAdams, Charles D. McAllister, Silas LeRoy McBee, Ernest McGee, Jr., Leo McKenzie, Alex McKinney, Horace Alexander McKinney, James D. McKinney, E. S. McKown, Charlie O. Masters, Edker J. Mathis, Calvin L. Miles, Herman B. Miller, J. Wallace Miller, Robert M. Mitchell, Emory Troy Moody, L. C. Moore, Philip Moore, Joe Thomas Nabors, Theodore Nabors, Olin E. Nalley, Jr., Henry H. Neuffer, Edward W. Nicholson, J. Harold Nicholson, Wm. R. Nimmons, R. J. Nix, Grady J. Norris, Arthur Norton, Joseph O'Neal, Lewis F. O'Sheal, G. Ernest Parham, Bruce T. Patterson, Jack E. Philbeck, Robert L. Pinson, Jr., Buford Broadus Pitman, Carl W. Plumblee, Grady C. Poole, J. C. Poole, Ralph Poole, Earl Walker Powers, Eulas Earen Ragsdale, William B. Ray, Charles F. Reeves, Edward Reeves, James Reid, Thomas Woodrow Reid, Walter Revis, Edward Hilton Roberts, Albert L. Robertson, Broadus H. Robertson, Clyde D. Robertson, Othell S. Robertson, S. T. Robinson, Louis L. Rodgers, Robert Lee Rodgers, Ralph Rosemond, Claude Ross, Cleveland M. Ross, Thomas Frederick Ross, W. W. Seawright, Jimmy E. Shaver, A. W. Shaw, Jr., A. Eugene Shelton, Albert J. Shelton, Joe Shelton, Howard Lee Shepard, Marvin B. Sheriff, Raymond Sherman, R. J. Simmons, W. Roy Simmons, Ray Sinclair, Charles F. Smith, Charley Smith, Henry Gracy Smith, Oel Bruce Smith, Wm. F. Smothers, Jr., Broughton M. Snow, Harvey K. Southerlin, W. Hugh Southerlin, Chas. A. Spencer, Jr., Ridlie V. Staton, Doyle Stewart, Joe N. Stinson, Jr., Theodore Croft Stone, Sherwood C. Stroud, Thomas C. Stroud, Russell H. Styles, John T. Styles, W. Bert Swindel, Thomas H. Tate, John Wiley Thompson, John Wesley Thompson, Ullen Lowry Timms, Roy W. Tomlinson, J. Wallace Trammell, Gus A. Trotter, Walter Lawrence Trotter, Eugene C. Turner, Hal Nicholas Turner, James M. Turner, Paul C. Turner, Jr., William Montgomery Verdin, J. Benson Waldrop, Willie McD. Waldrop, Ralph C. Ward, Louie O. Watson, Louis M. Watson, L. Ralph Watson, Charles E. Welchel, John D. Whittenberg, Willie Whittenberg, James Bunyan Wilbanks, Ellis C. Williams, George Thomas Williams, Jesse C. Williams, Jessie G. Henry Williams, Robert Paul Williams, Woodrow Wade Williams, Aaron Willis, C. Lavoyger Willis, B. F. Wood, Jr., Jimmie S. Wood, Kendell Wooten, Wm. Walker Wright, Rupert F. Wynn, Wm. A. Yown.

So long as we have such outstandingly cooperative relationship between our Government and its people, both employers and employees, there can be no doubt about the successful termination of the war.

It is with a feeling of extreme pride and happiness that I thus extend my heartiest congratulations to the good people of Union Bleachery who have attained this outstanding award.

A Test for the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of September 17, 1943:

A TEST FOR THE SENATE

Virtually all American discussion of postwar problems now starts from the assumption that this country must associate itself with other nations to maintain peace and then proceeds to a discussion of ways and means. In fact it would be possible at this time to secure a large measure of agreement to a number of specific preliminary steps toward the creation of international machinery to implement the basic aim. In other words, American public opinion has progressed beyond the point where it is necessary to debate the advisability of undertaking responsibilities in connection with the safeguarding of peace.

As yet, however, Congress has not ratified the national will. Whether because of inertia, or the deviousness of administration policy, or competition for prestige between its Houses, the legislature has wasted many months, during which this country's foreign policy and public opinion might have been building on the foundation of a formal expression of intent by the people's representatives. But each tense day that passes on the hotly contested beaches of Salerno shows forth more vividly the costs and risks of presenting a tardy front against aggression, and Congress is now moving toward a statement of America's determination that those risks and those costs shall not again be incurred.

Of the two chambers it is the House, traditionally closer to the people, which is advancing with the greater speed and decisiveness. Its Foreign Affairs Committee expects to bring the Fulbright resolution to a vote on Monday under a suspension of the rules which would forbid amendments but which requires assent by two-thirds vote. If successful this step would place the House cleanly and clearly on the record in favor of the creation of and American participation in "appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace." This is a minimal statement, surely, but it is broad enough to provide a sound basis for detailed and practical planning—and by its very conciseness it goes far to remove the temptation to tinker and define, which so frequently hampers congressional action.

The Senate could do much worse than to take up the Fulbright resolution as it stands. To be sure, the Senate also has available the Ball-Hatch-Burton-Hill resolution, which is somewhat more specific than the House measure, proposing immediate action by the United Nations in certain fields of joint effort—notably the creation of a military force to check future aggression. But the Senate also has a number of very opinionated gentlemen who have demonstrated great reluctance to learn by experience and who are less amenable to public opinion than their colleagues in the House. They may be expected to do as much as lies in their not inconsiderable power to bedevil any attempt to prove that the United States Senate knows the time of day.

In its own interests it behooves the Senate to take swift and effective steps to translate the popular will for some concrete expression of this country's intention into action. Here is no partisan question, as the recent meeting of Republicans at Mackinac Island made plain. The simple duty now incumbent upon the Senate is to prove that it is sufficiently responsive to public opinion and the Nation's needs to be worthy of the trust placed upon it by the Constitution and the voters. If the Senate can produce and pass a better declaration than that of Mr. FULBRIGHT it will be applauded by the House and by the country. But if it wanders into a morass of debate and delay it will suffer greatly in prestige and loss of public confidence. The House has taken the initiative. But it is the Nation at large which supplies the drive behind that initiative. The Senate must bestir itself—or be left hopelessly behind.

Chester Bowles' Figures on Reduction of Food Prices Are Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I secured leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD today because I desired to add to the remarks I had made previously today some additional matters including a table of quantities, prices, and percentages which will appear herein.

Up to the time the House met today—Friday, September 17—the Office of Price Administration has not been able to explain the basis of Mr. Chester Bowles' public announcement on September 13 that by the payment of subsidies of $100,000,000 on seven commodities the cost of living would be rolled back 2.3 percent.

Anticipating that there would be difficulty in securing such information, the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has compiled the available data on these seven commodities with a view to ascertaining as correctly as possible what the true facts are, for it has been a notorious fact that during recent months governmental figures on food have been grossly inaccurate.

Based upon the 1942 over-all cost of living, which has been reported as $69,000,000,000—which figure should not be confused with the estimated consumer expenditure amount of $81,980,000,000, as reported by the Department of Commerce—and not allowing for any increase in 1943, a reduction of 2.3 percent would require subsidies amounting to $1,600,000,000, not including a probable administrative cost of an additional 20 percent to do all of the bookkeeping, accounting, check writing, recording, and other clerical duties to put such a subsidy into effect. Mr. Bowles states that it will cost only in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to effect such a saving.

Analyzing Mr. Bowles' statistics on the basis of the subsidies which he proposes the Government shall pay on these seven commodities, that is, apples, oranges, onions, potatoes, lard, vegetable oils, and peanut butter, and assuming that the entire estimated 1943 production of these commodities will enter into retail trade, the amount of the subsidy will approximate $525,000,000. This at best can only amount to three-fourths of 1 percent of the total cost of living; or one-third of 2.3 percent promised by Mr. Bowles. But no one expects the available supply of these commodities to enter into retail trade. Large quantities of some of these crops have already wasted and have been destroyed by bureaucratic inefficiency, as for example the large quantities of potatoes lost through lack of proper refrigeration both while in transit and in warehouses. If 50 percent of the entire production of these seven commodities found their way into direct retail channels, a saving to the consumer would amount to 1 cent on every $2.67 spent for living expenses; yet the subsidy cost to the taxpayer would amount to some $212,000,000 not including the costs of administration.

I present herewith a table prepared by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, listing each of these seven commodities, together with the estimated 1943 production expressed in pounds, with the retail price before subsidy, the amount of the subsidy, and the retail price after the subsidy. As Mr. Bowles indicated the amount of subsidy on each item except apples, it is but a simple arithmetical problem to ascertain the aggregate amount of subsidy necessary, presuming the entire 1943 production will enter the direct retail market. It is as follows:

[In pounds]

Commodity	1943 estimated production [1]	Present retail price	Subsidy	New retail price	Aggregate subsidy
		Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*	
Apples	4,434,816,000	[2] 11.3	2.55	8.75	$113,087,801
Oranges	8,518,587,000	11.2	1.5	9.7	127,778,805
Onions	2,634,709,000	8.0	2.0	6.0	52,686,000
Potatoes	27,630,720,000	4.0	.5	3.5	138,153,600
Lard	2,900,000,000		1.0		29,000,000
Vegetable oils	3,880,000,000		1.0		38,800,000
Peanut butter	400,000,000	33.3	6.8	26.5	24,320,000
Total					523,826,206

[1] Source: Department of Agriculture.
[2] Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that the American public, American producers of food and American businessmen have lost confidence in the administration of the Office of Price Administration? Notwithstanding the clear mandate of Congress in opposition to the payment of such subsidies, these O. P. A. officials probably believe that when they have spent $100,000,000 of the taxpayers' money they can come to Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation for another $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 to fulfill the obligations they may have made.

The War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion magazine for August 1943 published a poem entitled "The War Effort," by Legionnaire James Patrick McGovern, of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post of the Department of Maryland.

As the composer of those lines served as a captain both in the United States and in France during the First World War, the verses, written under the inspiration of sacrificial service, reflect a patriotic and beautifully expressed challenge and reply, sentiments which no American can contemplate without emotion.

Because these inspirational lines from the pen of so distinguished a member of the District of Columbia bar as Captain McGovern undoubtedly is should be accorded the widest possible audience, I incorporate them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

They are:

THE WAR EFFORT

Effort for this war? In freedom's hour
And very life's? Vain word of compromise
To dull our Nation's will to win, our power,
While civilization falters—lives or dies.

Effort for this war? Best terms are tame,
But this breathes doubt, and men who falter fail,
When action must follow thought like ball and flame,
And strength and truth inevitably must prevail.

Effort for this war? The martial call
To warriors on land, in sky, on sea,
Fortifying them to give lives—all,
For love of the Nation's reverent memory?

Effort for this war? At home, even those
Must serve with fullest heart and readiest hand
While light at Armageddon overthrows
Darkness, so that peace may smile in every land.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

A Farce Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call upon the Secretary of War to review the court martial of Col. William T. Colman, former commanding officer of Selfridge Field, Mich. Public opinion and the welfare of our armed forces demand this.

In this connection I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press:

A FARCE TRIAL

The court martial of Acting Col. William T. Colman was a whitewash. The verdict of the court was a farce. The punishment meted out is an insult to the fighting forces of the United States.

His punishment is that he shall retain his rank of captain, being merely relieved of his temporary colonelcy.

Charged with shooting his chauffeur and seriously wounding him, Colman tried to escape punishment by the old plea of temporary insanity, claiming "my mind went blank"—the oldest gag in comedy murder trials.

When he was denied the right of pleading emotional instability the military court then decreed that, while he was not guilty of shooting a soldier, he was guilty of "careless use of firearms."

Every serious charge was reduced by the court to the status of misdemeanor so that the nightlife-loving commander of one of the most vital military bases in the United States could retain his rank.

Yet if, as the court decrees, this man is mentally and morally unfit to be an acting colonel of the United States Army, how is he mentally and morally fit to be a captain in that organization when we are fighting the most desperate war in our history?

Why should an officer with self-confessed mental aberrations be allowed to remain in charge of men?

Detroit is the armory of the United States. The fate of the Nation depends upon the products of this area. If we had been attacked by the enemy this acting colonel would have been in charge of our air defense as the commander of the great air base of Selfridge Field. Why was such a man given such responsibilities?

Who is to blame for his being given such great authority and why was he continued on the job? Where is the military inspection general? Where were Colman's superior officers?

An answer to these questions should be demanded by the Military Affairs Committees of the United States Congress.

And the answer might be that some higher-up is being protected by this obvious whitewash.

Playboy Colman is not the issue. The gay dog of civilian friendships and the petty martinet of the command is an old, old story in any army. The question, let us repeat, is: Who is responsible for putting him in command and keeping him there?

He was tried on 28 counts for violation of the articles of war. Yet there was no mention of any crime of omission in connection with the defense of Detroit—a crime which conceivably could have led to a repetition of Pearl Harbor. The picture of an air force colonel in command of the great air base cracking up from "overwork," the companionship of civilian merry-andrews and booze, and finally going gun crazy, is all that the citizens of the United States and the men of the fighting forces can see.

So they give him a slap on the wrist and return him to his captaincy.

Congressman PAUL W. SHAFER, Michigan member of the House Military Affairs Committee, asks in Washington a pointed question: "I wonder what this court martial would have done if a drunken private shot his commanding officer?" And he adds an ominous note which should be accepted as a challenge:

"If an investigation goes far enough, it will involve some State officials and a lot of persons in civilian life. I want to know about the slot-machine racket and about a lot of other people not mentioned in the testimony."

The Free Press suggests that now that the court martial has finished its investigation the court martial itself be investigated.

Liberty at Home—An American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the Mackinac Island, Mich., Committee on Domestic Problems of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council and an editorial from the New York Journal-American of September 11, 1943:

Immediately at the end of the war we shall face the vital problem of reconstruction at home. A military victory abroad without preservation in America of the fundamental principles on which our way of life depends will be no victory. It will be a defeat. The way we meet the problem of reconstruction will determine whether the American way of life shall survive.

We will prepare an affirmative program designed to preserve to our people all the freedoms for which we fight throughout the world, based on individual liberty, the independence of State and local government, and the independence of Congress and the courts.

That program must as promptly as possible return men to work in peace industry with special attention to those who have made sacrifices by serving in the armed forces, take Government out of competition with private industry, and terminate rationing, price fixing, and all other emergency powers. It must maintain full employment through private enterprise, and full production to furnish the goods and services so needed by our people. In so doing we must seek to make sure that the unemployment and insecurity of the years preceding the war do not return, and that hardship and poverty shall be prevented by a supplementary but comprehensive program of social security on sound principles. We must eliminate all unnecessary regulation of the individual and of business, restore and protect small business which has been so recklessly destroyed, and assure incentive and equal opportunity for the youth of America.

The present program of the New Deal administration, with the enlargement thereof set forth in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board, would wreck the country because the only remedy it proposes for any problem is unlimited Government spending of borrowed money. It would socialize all business, agriculture, and the professions. It would extend the power of Government until ultimately no man or woman could act, write, speak, or work without approval. It would substitute for American liberty the regimented existence of a subject people.

Our reconstruction, to insure real happiness, cannot be based alone on the improvement of standards of living, but it must be based upon the character of the American people, their religious faith, industry, morality, educated intelligence, and ingrained love of justice. Only thus will we remain a nation of freemen who are masters of our own souls.

The Republican Party is devoted to the Federal system of government by which basic rights and duties are reserved to the States, free of dictation, and subject to the control of their people. These rights and duties the New Deal has arrogated to itself.

It has now multiplied the number of Federal civilian employees five times. Three million of them now regulate the lives of our people. The number of bureaus has so multiplied that every detail of American life is now regulated by bureaucratic decree.

These are the instruments of fascism. They are the inevitable result of the policies of the New Deal. They must be brought to an end.

The Republic Party insists upon equality of opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed, in the economic, educational, political, and military life of the Nation.

The production of food is vital to our armed forces, to the life of our own people, and to the life of the people of our allies.

The administration's policies on manpower and farm machinery, and inexpert price regulation, have hampered full production. Its bungling regulations issued through multifarious and overlapping agencies have interfered with farmers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers until the normal channels of trade have been completely disrupted. Many small operators have been forced out of business.

An immediate program of increased production and improved distribution must be adopted to be administered by a single agency clothed with full power over food in all of its aspects during the war emergency. Otherwise, we shall not only be without the means of relieving the starving people of Europe and Asia but there will be the most serious shortage and hardships in the United States itself.

For the post-war period our agricultural program must seek to assure prices in the market place comparable to the prices of other commodities. The production of successful crops shall be continued and encouraged and not eliminated by governmental action. The great field of new, improved, and suitable crops must be explored, and the greater industrial use of agricultural products should be vigorously encouraged. Our soil resources need to be conserved and sound reclamation projects should be developed.

The individual initiative of the American farmer must be unshackled and in all governmental action there should be a minimum control from Washington, and a maximum freedom of operation by the American farmer.

This council affirms its belief in the strength, the character, and the rights of the American workingman; his pride in himself; his aim to get for himself a bank account, an insurance policy, a home of his own with a self-reliant American family in it; his right to organize and bargain collectively through agents of his own free choice.

We denounce the political effort to reduce labor in the United States to the European level of a class-conscious vote-shackled proletariat. We reject the doctrine that the American workman's mind must be made up in Washington and his personal life turned over to the management of Washington's political coddlers. The destiny of American labor is not Fascist. It must remain American.

The basic position of American labor in the American economic system must be guaranteed by fair and equitable laws.

It is our solemn duty as a people to take these sound measures, as Abraham Lincoln once pointed out—to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who has borne the battle, his widow, and his orphan.

The supreme obligation of our country is to immediately pay our debt of honor to those who are fighting our crusade for peace and freedom. Our post-war program must and does include fullest provisions for the rehabilitation and employment of the men and women of the armed forces.

Temporary help must of course be given, but that is not enough. The returning veterans must and shall have the right to launch projects, till the soil, work in the arts, in business or professions, free to forge ahead. They are entitled to jobs; good honest jobs; jobs with which they can start and go forward; send their children through school; own their homes; jobs which will feed and clothe them in comfort.

Veterans must not come home to be treated as wards of a state or nation, but must find their Nation a land of greater opportunity under a free American system.

The deepest yearning of our people is for victory and union of our families in peace. This is at the very heart of our whole life. If we build a better America with the highest standards of living and with deep spiritual values, we shall have met their challenge and shall have approached their devotion.

[From the New York Journal-American of September 11, 1943]

AN AMERICAN POLICY

The resolution on domestic policy adopted by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council at Mackinac Island is a well-considered American statement and reflects profound understanding of American principles.

Seldom have the stupidities and failures of the New Deal been so searchingly analyzed and so devastatingly exposed.

Too seldom, indeed, do American politicians see their responsibilities with the clarity and courage which raised the Mackinac Island conference above politics and partisanship to the higher level of patriotism.

The heart of the program to which the Republican leadership is committed is in its blunt statement of the following indisputable facts:

"The present program of the New Deal administration * * * would wreck the country, because the only remedy it proposes

for any problem is unlimited Government spending of borrowed money.

"It would socialize all industry.

"It would extend existing regulation until no man or woman could act, write, speak, or live without governmental approval.

"It would substitute for American liberty the regimented existence of a subject people."

It is not a Republican policy but a fundamental American principle that basic rights and duties are reserved to the States, free of dictation and subject to the control of their peoples.

But it is a stark fact, as the Republican statement asserts, that—

"These rights and duties the New Deal has arrogated to itself.

"It has now multiplied the number of Federal civilian employees five times.

"Three million of them, three times as many as during the last war, regulate the lives of our people.

"The number of bureaus has so multiplied that every detail of American life is now regulated by bureaucratic decree.

"These are the instruments of fascism. They are the inevitable result of the policies of the New Deal. They must be brought to an end."

The American people will read this statement of Republican policy with gratification—not as Republicans, or partisans, or with any political interest, but as citizens acutely aware of its exact truth.

The people are weary and sick of regimentation imposed in the guise of war necessity, but intended to be the permanent condition of the American people after the war.

The people are resentful of the stranglehold Federal bureaucracy has obtained upon them.

They are confused by Government restrictions which reduce their productivity, and which are conceived by arrogant bureaucrats never elected by the people or appointed by the representatives of the people in Congress, and which are ruthlessly enforced by hordes of other bureaucrats callous to the welfare of the people and contemptuous of the rights of the people.

They are alarmed and frightened by the staggering costs of Government and the mounting and monumental debts of the country—not the costs and debts of war, but the wasteful and unnecessary costs and debts of political bureaucracy.

The Republican Council has correctly appraised the New Deal.

It has correctly read the minds of the people, and has properly spoken for the people, and thus represents the people faithfully.

It augurs well for the return of the American Government to the course and policies of its founders, for the restoration of Government to the people, and for the repudiation of the New Deal concept of Government by a clutching bureaucracy.

Meeting of Republican Post-War Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the meeting of the Republican Post-war Advisory Council at Mackinac Island, September 6 and 7, has assumed a position of importance beyond the expectations or even beyond the hopes of its sponsors. The editorial comment throughout the country indicates a highly favorable reaction to the work of the council at this preliminary meeting. One newspaperman who observed the meeting said he thought it likely that it would be recognized in history as an event of great importance and that Chairman Harrison E. Spangler would be given widespread credit for his initiative, vision, and wisdom in setting up the council and directing its deliberations. In view of the important role our party is expected to be called upon to play in the near future, it is fortunate for the country that we have, at this time, so capable and broad-gaged chairman with such splendid qualities of heart and mind. In connection with these remarks I include copies of the resolutions adopted by the council and also copies of editorials from the Detroit News and the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, which are typical of the favorable sentiment reflected by the press:

DECLARATION ON FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS ADOPTED BY THE REPUBLICAN ADVISORY COUNCIL

The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

(a) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

(b) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

(c) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives would be impractical, and specific commitments by this council, by the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold.

Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including

(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization, perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for, (1) its effect upon the vital interests of the nation, (2) its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

In addition to these things this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies, and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority in behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

It is determined that this council make complete examination of the means by which these aims may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

The council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness.

DECLARATION ON DOMESTIC PROBLEMS ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL—LIBERTY AT HOME

Immediately at the end of the war we shall face the vital problem of reconstruction at home. A military victory abroad without preservation in America of the fundamental principles on which our way of life depends will be no victory. It will be a defeat. The way we meet the problem of reconstruction will determine whether the American way of life shall survive.

We will prepare an affirmative program designed to preserve to our people all the freedoms for which we fight throughout the world, based on individual liberty, the independence of State and local government, and the independence of Congress and the courts.

That program must as promptly as possible return men to work in peace industry with special attention to those who have made sacrifices by serving in the armed forces, take government out of competition with private industry, and terminate rationing, price fixing and all other emergency powers. It must maintain full employment through private enterprise, and full production to furnish the goods and services so needed by our people. In so doing we must seek to make sure that the unemployment and insecurity of the years preceding the war do not return, and that hardship and poverty shall be prevented by a supplementary but comprehensive program of social security on sound principles. We must eliminate all unnecessary regulation of the individual and of business, restore and protect small business which has been so recklessly destroyed, and assure incentive and equal opportunity for the youth of Ame ica.

The present program of the New Deal administration, with the enlargement thereof set forth in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board, would wreck the country because the only remedy it proposes for any problem is unlimited government spending of borrowed money. It would socialize all business, agriculture, and the professions. It would extend the power of government until ultimately no man or woman could act, write, speak, or work without approval. It would substitute for American liberty the regimented existence of a subject people.

Our reconstruction, to insure real happiness, cannot be based alone on the improvement of standards of living, but it must be based upon the character of the American people, their religious faith, industry, morality, educated intelligence, and ingrained love of justice. Only thus will we remain a Nation of free men who are masters of our own souls.

The Republican Party is devoted to the Federal system of government by which basic rights and duties are reserved to the States, free of dictation and subject to the control of their people. These rights and duties the New Deal has arrogated to itself.

It has now multiplied the number of Federal civilian employees five times. Three million of them now regulate the lives of our people. The number of bureaus has so multiplied that every detail of American life is now regulated by bureaucratic decree.

These are the instruments of fascism. They are the inevitable result of the policies of the New Deal. They must be brought to an end.

The Republican Party insists upon equality of opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, or creed, in the economic, educational, political, and military life of the Nation.

The production of food is vital to our armed forces, to the life of our own people and to the life of the people of our allies.

The administration's policies on manpower and farm machinery, and inexpert price regulation, have hampered full production. Its bungling regulations issued through multifarious and overlapping agencies have interfered with farmers, processors, wholesalers, and retailers until the normal channels of trade have been completely disrupted. Many small operators have been forced out of business.

An immediate program of increased production and improved distribution must be adopted to be administered by a single agency clothed with full power over food in all of its aspects during the war emergency. Otherwise, we shall not only be without the means of relieving the starving people of Europe and Asia but there will be the most serious shortage and hardships in the United States itself.

For the post-war period, our agricultural program must seek to assure prices in the market place comparable to the prices of other commodities. The production of successful crops shall be continued and encouraged and not eliminated by governmental action. The great field of new, improved, and suitable crops must be explored, and the greater industrial use of agricultural products should be vigorously encouraged. Our soil resources need to be conserved and sound reclamation projects should be developed.

The individual initiative of the American farmer must be unshackled and in all governmental action there should be a minimum control from Washington, and a maximum freedom of operation by the American farmer.

This council affirms its belief in the strength, the character and the rights of the American workingman; his pride in himself; his aim to get for himself a bank account, an insurance policy, a home of his own with a self-reliant American family in it; his right to organize and bargain collectively through agents of his own free choice.

We denounce the political effort to reduce labor in the United States to the European level of a class-conscious vote-shackled proletariat. We reject the doctrine that the American workman's mind must be made up in Washington and his personal life turned over to the management of Washington's political coddlers. The destiny of American labor is not Fascist. It must remain American.

The basic position of American labor in the American economic system must be guaranteed by fair and equitable laws.

It is our solemn duty as a people to take those sound measures, as Abraham Lincoln once pointed out—to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who has borne the battle, his widow and his orphan.

The supreme obligation of our country is to immediately pay our debt of honor to those who are fighting our crusade for peace and freedom. Our post-war program must and does include fullest provisions for the rehabilitation and employment of the men and women of the armed forces.

Temporary help must of course be given, but that is not enough. The returning veterans must and shall have the right to launch projects, till the soil, work in the arts, in business or professions, free to forge ahead. They are entitled to jobs; good honest jobs; jobs with which they can start and go forward; send their children through school; own their homes; jobs which will feed and clothe them in comfort.

Veterans must not come home to be treated as wards of a State or Nation, but must find their Nation a land of greater opportunity under a free American system.

The deepest yearning of our people is for victory and union of our families in peace. This is at the very heart of our whole life. If we build a better America with the highest standards of living and with deep spiritual values, we shall have met their challenge and shall have approached their devotion.

THE REPUBLICAN ADVISORY COUNCIL ADOPTED AND APPROVED FOR FUTURE STUDY THE FOLLOWING SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS

The council has made a preliminary survey of the problems which at this time most vitally affect the present and future welfare of the country. Some of these problems grow out of the great issues created by our participation in a World War. Some of them will arise from the readjustment to a peacetime economy. Some are the normal problems which it is the duty of the Federal Government to meet. Some arise from mistaken polices of government in the past 10 years.

The council realizes that for some of these problems with which the next Federal administration must grapple there is no easy solution; no short-cut panacea. The council undertakes its work realizing that it may not be able to find a perfect solution of all the problems the country must face in the coming years, but it will make every effort to find the most just and workable solution of these problems.

The council pledges itself to study these problems and to arrive at a judgment on them, with one single objective. That objective is the welfare of the country as a whole. This council rejects the philosophy that there is a necessary and inevitable class conflict in America. It believes that the soldier, the farmer, the mechanic, the businessman, the saver, and the investor are all partners in a joint enterprise. The council pledges itself to favor no element in our Republic at the expense of other elements.

Among the problems which the council will consider are the following:

1. PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN POLICY

With the coming of peace we must make decisions which will affect the future of the American Nation. There must be plans for just and proper action at the conference of nations at the peace table. There must be plans for American collaboration in the restoration of order and normal economic life in ruined countries. We must make plans for this Nation's participation with other nations in a program to achieve permanent peace.

2. PROBLEMS OF POST-WAR INDUSTRY AND EMPLOYMENT

It is necessary to devise ways and means by which the Federal Government will encourage the quick conversion of war industry to a peace-time basis. A plan for the orderly demobilization of our armed forces must be worked out, to the end that it shall not create unemployment, hardship, and low wages. In connection with these two programs it is essential to consider the means of restoring the spirit of enterprise and investment, long since discouraged by Government hostility, at the same time maintaining a proper and reasonable regulation of competition and employee relations. The problem of controlling monopoly without terrorizing legitimate business should be settled. The extermination of small business, now proceeding under present Government policies, should be halted.

3. PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL WELFARE

The present Federal system of security against unemployment and the hazards of old age is in need of examination and revision. The proper safeguarding of the vast funds now collected from workers and employers is a matter to be considered. Programs to extend security to larger groups and to other needs must be examined. The efficiency and justice of various methods of relief of the unemployed must be analyzed. The dangers of federalization of relief and security should be avoided.

4. PROBLEMS OF FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

The Nation must bring to a halt the ceaseless expansion of Federal bureaus which feed upon the taxpayer, govern by Executive decree outside the law, hamper private business, and invade private life. We must examine the mass of Federal corporations now using the people's money to promote miscellaneous projects of Government planners. We must consider the growing invasion of States' rights by Federal action and define the constitutional limitations upon such invasion. The excessive and dangerous rate of expenditures by the Federal executive branch must be reduced.

5. PROBLEMS OF FINANCE AND CURRENCY

It is essential that the Nation find a solution of the problem of endless Government spending, deficit financing, and unbalanced budgets, long since adopted as a peacetime program by the present administration. A provision must be made for the vast weight of Federal debt now resting on the people. The Federal system of taxation, now a chaos of emergency devices to raise revenue, must be simplified and improved. Our monetary system, demoralized by rash experiments, must be restored to order and simplicity.

6. PROBLEMS OF LABOR

A way must be found to establish clearly the rights and just aims of labor under the law, to the end that the grievous conflicts of recent years may be avoided and that harmony and cooperation will result, not only between labor and management but also within the ranks of workers themselves.

7. PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURE

The health and solvency of our national agriculture must be assured. The present system of interference with agriculture by Federal authority is undermining the independence and the initiative of our individual farmers. The heavy load of bureaucratic control must be removed from the business of farming. This problem must be solved.

8. INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The end of the war will find many countries with exhausted resources, paralyzed industry, disordered shipping, inflated currencies, and vanished foreign trade. In its own interests and in the interests of world peace

the United States must cooperate in all proper programs for the revival of international trade and finance and the establishment of stable exchanges. We must develop a wise tariff and reciprocity policy for the Nation. We must make provision for the use of the ship facilities created by the war. We must establish a policy on international aviation.

In pursuance of its program of consideration of these problems, the council has set up eight policy committees, with a brief list of the subjects allocated to each. These and other subjects will be explored and studied during the months to come. They are as follows:

POST-WAR ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMITTEES

1. Foreign policy and international relations

Program and procedure in the making of peace.

Problems of aid and cooperation for distressed countries.

Collaboration with other nations in establishing permanent peace.

2. Post-war enterprise, industry, and employment

Provision for demobilization of armed forces.

Conversion of war industries to peace industries.

Encouragement of investment and of employment by industry.

Preservation of small business.

Problems of unfair competition and monopoly.

Domestic commerce and transportation.

Public works, highways, and reclamation.

3. Social welfare and security

Old-age security and unemployment aids.

Extension of social security to additional groups and additional needs.

The problem of the forms of relief.

Federal or State and local administration of social security and relief.

Public and private housing.

4. Finance, taxation, and money

The problems of an unbalanced budget.

The payment of Government debt.

A sound system of Federal taxation.

A sound currency system.

5. Reform of Government administration

The problem of Federal bureaucracy.

Economy in administration.

Limitation of executive power.

Limitation of powers of administrative boards.

Federal corporations.

Federal powers, States' powers, and local self-government.

6. Labor

Sound and equitable labor legislation.

Solution of problems of labor and industry.

7. Agriculture

A long-range program for the American farmer.

Agricultural problems of production, price, and distribution.

Decentralization of Federal control.

New crops and new uses for farm crops.

8. International economic problems

International trade.

Post-war tariff and reciprocity policy.

Stabilization of international exchanges.

Post-war shipping problems.

International air transport.

[From the Detroit News of September 8, 1943]

FORTHRIGHT AND POSITIVE

In its resolution on foreign policy the Republican meeting at Mackinac Island to establish the position of that party on post-war problems has had a far happier outcome than many had dared imagine.

The phraseology of the foreign policy resolution necessarily is general. Yet its meaning is explicit enough. It would pledge the party to "cooperative organization" among the nations to preserve peace "with organized justice" in the post-war world.

If this language is adopted by the platform committee at next year's Republican national convention, the effect, so far as one can see, must be to remove foreign policy as an issue in the presidential campaign.

No happier outcome could have been imagined. We have here a historic declaration, by virtue of which the dictum that politics "should stop at the water's edge" may be applied literally to our winning of the peace.

The declaration goes as far, if not further, in endorsing post-war collaboration for world peace, as any like statement thus far emanating from the Democratic administration in charge of the Government. It could be adopted word for word by the Democratic Party as its platform plank on foreign policy, and the hope that this will follow, expressed by one of the Mackinac conferees, yet may find fulfillment.

The Mackinac resolution on domestic problems is strongly worded, repeating and reinforcing Republican criticism of the New Deal philosophy of government. A presidential campaign fought out on those lines, with foreign policy, no less than war victory, set apart as a subject of national unity, will meet the wishes of the people.

[From the Washington Daily News of September 9, 1943]

MACKINAC FOREIGN POLICY

We like the unanimous foreign policy declaration of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council at Mackinac. We think most Americans will like it, because it points in the direction they want to go. They want a strong and free America, taking full part in the cooperative building of future world peace and justice. And that is the common ground upon which Republican leaders of various shades of opinion have agreed to stand.

Of course, Mr. Roosevelt ridicules the G. O. P. declaration. Perhaps that is the natural thing for him to do as Democratic Party leader and a fourth-term candidate, who does not want to see Republicans get together. But it might be better politics—and certainly higher statesmanship—for him to welcome this and try to duplicate it among the divided Democrats, so that foreign policy could be lifted above political partisanship. We doubt that he really dissents.

Some may wonder why the Mackinac declaration is not more definite, and extremists on both ends will be disappointed that it does not include their pet panaceas for perpetual peace. It could not take either extreme, of isolationist or superstater, and represent the majority of Americans.

As for definiteness, it obviously would be absurd for Republican leaders to fix details in a rapidly changing world situation on which no foreign government is yet committed. Indeed, experts as far apart as President Roosevelt and ex-President Hoover agree that final detail decisions cannot even be made promptly after the war, but probably must be matured over a transitional period.

This is as definite as it can be without goldbricking the public: "Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

We like also the G. O. P. emphasis on adequate American armed forces, and on sticking to constitutional methods in determining foreign commitments. Any foreign policy not approved by the people and Congress is a dangerous delusion. But we are convinced that the people will support vigorously the general aims of the Mackinac declaration, which are exclusively neither Republican nor Democratic but American.

Mr. Speaker, these editorials reflect the views of the country itself toward the Mackinac declarations. An editorial from the Washington Star comments pertinently upon the attitude of the New Deal.

Says the Star, in part:

Despite efforts of the President and others to ridicule it, the foreign policy statement adopted by the Republican Post-War Advisory Council seems well suited to the needs of this time and the probable future requirements of the future. * * * The President and those others who seem disposed to ridicule what the Republicans have done would be well advised to consider the importance of removing the question of this country's post-war international stand from the realm of purely political debate. Instead of belittling the Republican program, it might be better for them to concentrate on persuading the Democrats to do as well.

Appeal to Hungary To Withdraw From the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on Monday last, at the Fort Pitt Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., I had the distinct privilege of addressing the largest American-Hungarian organization in the United States—the Verhovay Fraternal Insurance Association.

This organization, composed of Americans of Hungarian descent, is doing everything within its power to sustain the American war effort and to insure the victory of Allied arms over the forces of totalitarian aggression. The members of this organization are to be found on the farm, in the production centers, and in the armed forces. They are determined to defend the heritage which America has given them.

In this connection, the organization has addressed an appeal to the citizens of their native Hungary to get out of the war—to surrender to the Allies immediately. Since this appeal to the citizens of Hungary may have a definite effect upon the Hungarian will to break the chains of Nazi domination, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that the entire world may be apprised of the desire of the American-Hungarians to break asunder the world of Hitler, and to restore all nations to a status of freedom and equality.

There being no objection, the appeal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,

United States Senate:

The board of directors of the largest American Hungarian society, the Verhovay Fra-

ternal Insurance Association, adopted the following proclamation at their session. Two members of the board of directors were instructed to contact Washington authorities through the American-Hungarian Federation in order to have the proclamation conveyed to the people of Hungary. Please use your influence toward having the proclamation reach its destination. If possible when Congress convenes, enter same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. With kindest personal regards.

The military successes of the Allied armies advancing victoriously and the armistice signed with Italy, foreshadow more clearly the sad plight awaiting Hungary if she remains any longer in the unhallowed Nazi alliance. The board feels that as the largest fraternal organization of American-Hungarians, it is their obligation in these historic hours to turn to the Hungarian people with words of warning and appeal and for this reason they issue the following unanimous proclamation:

"PROCLAMATION OF THE VERHOVAY FRATERNAL INSURANCE ASSOCIATION TO THE PEOPLE OF HUNGARY

"Brethren, your blood brethren in America speak to you.

"We can speak freely. Our new country does not place a padlock on the lips of our sons.

"We can rightfully ask you to hear us. For, through decades we have sent you gift donations—money, clothing, food. 'Hoover kitchens' for the sustenance of starving Hungarian children. Our heritage and our little properties we left for you.

"We have never asked anything from you for these, but now we do ask.

"We ask you not to permit the 1,000-year-old state to perish, for it will always remain dear to us, and for you it is your country.

"Do not tolerate that the Hungarian people should bow their heads under the Nazi yoke in the manner of slaves. The domination of the Nazis has driven you to ruin. You can see this yourselves. Your sons have been driven into the maw of Nazi cannon by the tens of thousands. The whole Hungarian land mourns. Throughout the whole country Hungarian dead are being mourned, Hungarian wounded are being nursed.

"You have no bread nor meat because all your crops are taken away by the Nazis and they would take more if they would win.

"But they will not win.

"They cannot win. The liberty of men cannot be crushed.

"The power of the Nazis has wavered. The military strength of Hitler suffers one defeat after the other. The immeasurable strength of the nations allied against his despotism will shatter to dust his military and political power.

"The last hour of the Nazi regime has struck. The victorious allied military power has stepped onto European soil. The Italian Nation has surrendered. She has opened her gates to the military power of the United Nations by her unconditional surrender.

"And through the open door shines the sun of freedom. The Italian people greet the Allied soldiers with shouts of joy everywhere because they know that these stepped onto the land of their former enemies with good will and fraternity. The Italian people believe in the promises of the United Nations. The Italian people know that the United Nations' military powers will not crush the Italian Nation but will give it new, free life.

"You are promised the same things by every United Nation, the great-hearted and courageous protectors of the rights of men.

"Believe in the promises of the United Nations.

"Now is the time.

"Cast off from yourselves the shackles of Nazi-ism.

"Do not fight for another moment at the side of the Nazis.

"Do not give them either food or ammunition. Hide what you raise. Burn it, rather than give it to the Nazis. And, if the tyrannical revenge of the Nazis should throw you into prison or condemn anyone of you to death, choose rather the death of a martyr but do not permit the whole Hungarian Nation, the whole Hungarian country should perish forever. Do not fight against your own freedom and independence, the brighter future of your children.

"The hour of liberation is not far off. Every day brings closer to you the military strength of the United Nations victoriously pressing forward on the continent of Europe. And among the armies liberating you, your blood-brethren will also be there, our sons of American-Hungarian blood.

"Do not shoot at our sons. Do not fight against your brethren. But, stand beside them. Grasp the guns forced into your hands by the Nazi tyranny and turn them against the annihilators of Hungarian fate.

"Remove the Government, let everyone who is responsible for your being in the Nazi alliance clear out.

"Believe in us.

"We do not come to rob you, but to give. Not to subjugate but to liberate. From the day that the United armies step onto the soil of Hungary, you will not hunger, you will not be cold, you will not be ragged. We fight for you and not against you.

"The future of the Hungarian Nation is in your hands. If you will cast off the Nazi bondage and stand beside us in the crucial hour, you will save the future of the Hungarian Nation. But, if you will remain beside those who have misled and plundered you, then you will throw away even the hope of a happier future.

"The God of the Hungarians will bless or punish you accordingly, as you defy Nazi tyranny and stand beside us in the glorious battle for the liberation of Hungary.

"Dated at Pittsburgh, Pa., on September 9, 1943.

"THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE VERHOVAY FRATERNAL INSURANCE ASSOCIATION."

The board announces that the proclamation must be sent to the people of Hungary without delay by radio and in the form of pamphlets, if the respective American civil and military authorities permit and make it possible to do so.

COLOMAN REVESZ.

For a Little More Audacity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of September 16, 1943:

FOR A LITTLE MORE AUDACITY

It is good news that the House Foreign Affairs Committee has decided to take the Fulbright resolution to the floor next Monday. The time has come for Congress to speak up on the question of American post-war policy, and the Fulbright resolution, favoring American participation in an organization with "adequate power" to enforce peace, does this well.

In the Senate there has been greater caution about facing the issue now. This is because a poll of Members is said to have shown two risks: first, that a long and acrimonious debate, possibly injurious to our relations with some of our allies, might precede the adoption of a declaration of foreign policy, and, second, that a two-thirds vote of support for such a declaration does not seem to be entirely assured. Since the Constitution requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify a treaty, any resolution now approved by Congress without that margin in the upper branch would have the effect of repudiating the very commitments it stated or implied.

Certainly there is a place for caution in matters of this kind, and certainly there is no use in courting a disaster by rash action. But it is a fair question, in this instance, whether caution on the part of the administration leaders has not begun to defeat itself.

It is now 24 weeks since the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations created a special subcommittee to study and report on a number of resolutions relating to the part to be played by the United States in the post-war world. This subcommittee held its first meeting on March 31. Since then not a peep has been heard from it.

And what has been happening meantime, outside the cloistered committee room where these resolutions sleep the sleep of death? By every available test of measurement, the tide of American opinion in favor of post-war collaboration has been rising irresistibly. The Gallup survey shows it to be overwhelming. It has run so strong that the House Foreign Affairs Committee found it wise to give unanimous support to the Fulbright resolution. It has reached so high a point that it swept the Republican leaders at Mackinac Island far beyond the moorings of their old stand for isolation.

No doubt there are some timid men, and a few complete irreconcilables, who, when approached for their opinion in an unofficial Senate poll, advise delay or threaten to make trouble. But we do not believe for a moment that either timidity or irreconcilability could stand up, in open debate, against the fierce demand of the American people for some positive action, this time, to prevent the outbreak of another war.

The time for a show-down is at hand. A little more audacity is needed.

Farm Bureau Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, for consideration and study by the Congress, I wish to call attention to the following statement of Mr. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and presented by him to the President earlier this week.

I would not say that this program is perfect, or the complete answer to our

farm problems, but it certainly contains some helpful suggestions:

The food front is second only to the military front in war. It is the first front in establishing and maintaining a just and lasting peace. The broad objective of a wartime food program should be an abundant production, tied in with a permanent conservation program at stabilized prices which are fair to farmers, distributors, and consumers. American farmers are being asked to produce sufficient food to meet the needs of our armed forces, the United Nations, the starving people of the liberated countries, and our civilian population.

The ability of farmers to meet these needs is gravely jeopardized by confusing and hampering price policies and orders, unwise efforts to appease organized labor and consumer groups, shortages of farm machinery, farm labor and supplies, the multiplicity of agencies and the division of authority dealing with policies affecting the production, processing, and distribution of food. It is imperative that immediate action be taken to provide a constructive, practical, and coordinated war food program. The essential features of such program should be as follows:

1. Support or "floor" prices at adequate levels should constitute the foundation of a program to assure abundant production and stabilized prices. Such prices should be announced early and should continue long enough to protect farmers through the postwar readjustment period.

2. Ceiling prices must be adjusted so as to assure maximum production and avoid subsidies. Under no circumstances should the ceiling price be placed below the floor price. Subsidies to roll back prices or to maintain price ceilings in lieu of price adjustments are unnecessary and inflationary, and should be abandoned. There is no justification for such consumer subsidies when, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the period of January 1941 to June 1943 the average hourly earnings of industrial workers increased 40 percent, and average weekly earnings increased 63 percent, but the cost of living increased only 24 percent. It is an unsound and dangerous policy to add this additional burden to the Federal debt and pass on our current food bill to be paid by our boys returning home after the war and by future generations. The national income is now at the highest level in history; employment has reached an all-time high; and food costs are lower in relation to the income of workers than ever before.

3. All unnecessary controls and restrictions on food production should be removed during the war emergency and unneeded supervisory manpower should be freed for other work.

4. Relative prices as between commodities should be adjusted so as to encourage the production of the types of food most needed. Such an adjustment would not only be fair to farmers, but would tend to stabilize living costs and reduce consumers' expenditure for food.

5. To the extent that governmental authority is required over the production, processing, distribution, rationing, and prices of food, such authority should be centered in the War Food Administrator. He should be given more authority and cooperation in the procurement of adequate farm machinery, farm supplies, and farm labor. He should be represented on all boards dealing with all phases of the food problem, both national and international, and no decision relative to food should be made without his approval.

6. Responsible boards for the major farm commodities—similar to the War Meat Board—should be established under the War Food Administrator, to direct processing and distribution to prevent alternate gluts and shortages at major consuming centers, such as have occurred during the last year.

7. The public should be fully informed concerning the critical importance of maintaining adequate farm production and of conserving and sharing foods.

8. American farmers, in their supreme efforts to break all-time production records each year in order to meet the ever-growing food requirements, are entitled to the closest cooperation between the President and the Congress in establishing and maintaining an understandable, workable, and coordinated war food program.

Government Benefits for World War No. 2 Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a short speech I delivered on September 12, 1943, on the subject of Government benefits for World War No. 2 veterans. This speech was delivered as one of the regular reports I give to the people of my Sixth Congressional District each Sunday over the Springfield, Mo., radio stations—KGBX at 12:15 p. m., and again the same day at 5:30 p. m. on KWTO:

Fellow citizens: With your permission we will digress a little today from our customary report of news developments on the congressional front and discuss a subject of special interest to men in the armed services and their dependents. Many questions have been asked me about the laws now in existence for servicemen and their dependents and those under consideration by Congress. As you may know, I am a member of the War Veterans' Legislation Committee and have had special concern with this legislation.

While a war is in progress there is always strong public sentiment to do many things for those in uniform. This sentiment is shared by Congress. During peacetimes this sentiment dies down and the people as well as many of the people's leaders devote attention to other problems. For instance, before the American Legion convention at Chicago on October 2, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt explained how he personally felt regarding the payment of benefits. Said he, "No person, because he wore a uniform, must thereafter be placed in a special class of beneficiaries over and above all other citizens. The fact of wearing a uniform does not mean that he can demand and receive from his government a benefit which no other citizen receives. It does not mean that because a person served in the defense of his country, performed a basic obligation of citizenship, he should receive a pension from his government because of a disability." That same year the President made this statement, 1933, the only real economy act of his administration was adopted repealing laws granting medical or hospital treatment, domiciliary care, compensation and other allowances, pensions and disability allowance or retirement pay for many classes of veterans and their dependents. Of recent date, however, the President promises liberal handouts from the Federal Treasury to veterans of World War No. 2. How well these promises may be kept may be found in ample measure in the President's life record.

HISTORIC AMERICAN POLICY

Other Presidents have expressed the public feeling about men who have had the honor and privilege of wearing the uniform of their country. George Washington said, "In what part of the continent shall we find any man or body of men who would not blush to stand up and propose measures purposely calculated to rob the soldier of his stipend and the public creditor of his due? And, were it possible that such a flagrant instance of injustice could ever happen, would it not excite the general indignation and tend to bring down upon the authors of such measures the aggravated vengeance of Heaven?"

Abraham Lincoln said, "It is the duty of the country to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphans."

It has been my opinion, exemplified in practice, that now while war is in progress Congress can and should take those steps which will guarantee the veteran against changes in public sentiment and leadership sentiment in the matter of veterans' legislation. Congress has shared this view, as a whole, and the committee of which I have the honor to be a member has made no promises and held out no tantalizing hopes to veterans and their dependents but rather has, without fanfare or publicity, written into the lawbooks of this Nation provisions which enable me to state now that no nation has provided for the veterans of its various wars, and their dependents, as well as has our own. Much remains to be done. However, veterans of World War No. 2 now have all the privileges and benefits of the World War No. 1 veteran (Public Law No. 10, 78th Cong.). While action in extending such benefits, with war still in progress, is unprecedented in our history, I am not forgetting we have also veterans of other wars whose problems must not be forgotten nor overlooked by Congress in its haste to take care of the millions of new veterans.

I do not favor any raid on the Treasury by war veterans. However, it has been a policy from the foundation of our Government to recognize the whole Nation owes a debt to its soldiers which must be paid by the whole Nation. It is no time to change that policy now. If we can afford to give away billions of dollars to foreigners we can afford to bind up the wounds of our own people. I think, however, that any public consideration of the question by a public official should frankly include recognition of the fact that this obligation is a colossal financial undertaking. The politician who promises rich rewards without stating that they must be paid for is playing politics of the rawest kind. In order to acquaint the public with the seriousness of the whole problem I favor a nonpartisan, nonpolitical survey of the whole field of pensions and compensation for veterans and their dependents by the Congress of the United States.

A REVIEW

I want to review briefly some of the things your Congress has already done for servicemen of World War No. 2 and following that to make a few short statements about what I think should and must be done in addition to that already accomplished. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains detailed statements by me on what has already been done by Congress for the veteran. The greatest single thing done for servicemen in this war was the enactment of the Dependents Allowance Act. Under this law the dependents of men in the service are compensated so that they will not suffer unduly in a financial way due to the fact the family breadwinner is in uniform. It has been my pleasure to assist many of these dependents who

have written me in Washington, to get Government approval of their allotments which had been held up because of red tape. I am supporting a proposal to increase the amount of these allotments for the dependents of fathers who are soon to be inducted in great numbers. My investigation and observation have persuaded me that present allotments are in many cases inadequate. I also am supporting proposals which will help to eliminate some of the abuse to which the dependency allotment plan has been subjected by unscrupulous people.

As in the last war, the Government has provided life insurance which is available to all men in uniform. The National Life Insurance Act and the War Risk Insurance Act are very important to dependents. No man in the service should be without the full protection offered by these laws. Beneficiaries can renew the policy of an insured serviceman who is outside the continental limits of the United States (Public Law No. 13, 78th Congress).

When a soldier dies on active duty the expenses incident to preparation of his remains and transportation to the place designated by the legal next of kin are borne by the Federal Government. After the war I will insist that as in the last war, the remains of all men who die abroad be brought back to the United States for interment in national cemeteries if the next of kin so desire. Burial allowances are also provided for those who die in veterans' hospitals. Headstones are provided for deceased veterans.

Medical attention is provided for servicemen at all times including while on leave and is provided, also, to their wives who are expectant. Civil relief from court action is also provided in certain cases. Pensions are provided all who can establish service-connected disabilities of 10 percent or more. Pensions are provided all who are totally disabled for non-service-connected disabilities. Death and disability from the present war have brought to more than $2,000,000 per month the benefit payments being made by Uncle Sam. These payments are increasing each month. Disability payments average $40 per month and range as high as $250 per month. Pension payments to dependents of deceased veterans average a little more than $48 per month and insurance payments to dependents of deceased veterans of World War No. 2 are now averaging about $37.71 per month. The new vocational rehabilitation program, authorized by Congress this year (Public Law No. 16, 78th Cong.), is now getting under way. Last month 1,300 applications were filed and a number of men are already in training to earn a livelihood despite war-connected handicaps. After the last war 128,000 men completed such courses. It may interest you to know that 13,800 veterans of the present war have already been treated in Veterans' Administration hospitals. There have been veterans who do not feel kindly toward the Veterans' Administration because their claims have not been allowed by it. Congress, of course, can only write the laws. It is the duty of the President to enforce those laws as Chief Executive. The Veterans' Administration is his agency for this purpose. Congress has tried to keep a friendly attitude in the Veterans' Administration toward the veterans by requiring that its policy-making officials all be veterans themselves. On July 8, 1943, Congress enacted Public Law No. 144 (H. R. 2703) which will further streamline the complicated procedure of the Veterans' Administration and, I hope, be of great aid to veterans and their dependents. All of the provisions I have been talking about for servicemen apply also to women in the service. These things I have been mentioning, including a raise in the pensions secured by my committee this year, constitute just the highlights of what has already been done. A few minutes ago I said much remains to be done. I want to suggest just a few things which have been mentioned by others and a few ideas of my own.

LOOKING AHEAD

The administration failed, miserably, to solve the problem of unemployment before the start of the war and the present war boom, of the kind which accompanies all wars. The Department of Commerce the other day reported that if the war is over by 1946 we will have 19,000,000 unemployed unless we have reached a level of business activity higher than in 1940 just before Pearl Harbor. It goes without saying, then, that the greatest problem we face in helping the veteran is in finding a job for him. Congress has made feeble strides along this line. It has said that the veteran should get his same job back when he returns to civilian life. Congress has required by law that veterans be given preference in Civil Service appointments. There are those in places of great authority in Washington who say that the unemployment problem cannot be licked and that we will have to keep the men in the Army for many years, letting them out a dribble at a time, or keep the Nation embroiled in constant wars, or keep a great standing army as a world police force, to eliminate unemployment. I do not look with favor on any prosperity gained at the expense of the blood of young Americans. I have faith enough in the future of our country and in the intelligence and ingenuity of our people to believe that unemployment can be eliminated. It has not been suggested by anyone in the present administration but I think that one of the surest ways to solve unemployment is, after the war, to take the shackles off of business. If investors had confidence that they could make a profit, if business had faith that the Government would not harass it to death with rules, regulations, laws, snoopers, and taxes, we would see an expansion of the private enterprise which built this Nation. I would put this as the first point in any real plan to help the veterans. They will want jobs in private industry and small businesses of their own rather than Government hand-outs.

Second, it appears to me that the Government should take steps to encourage home ownership for ex-servicemen and women. This has not been mentioned by the administration. Veterans should be encouraged by Government to own homes and farms. This question is pertinent right now. More than half a million men have already been released in this war from the Army alone, due to physical or mental unfitness for service. By the end of this year the turn-over, exclusive of casualties in our armed forces, will be over one million per year. There is nothing new about the idea I have just advanced. The Homestead Act of 1862 developed the West with veterans of the Civil War. Following the Spanish-American and First World Wars, 21 States took action to aid veterans in home ownership. None of this legislation really gave anything away. It merely aided the ex-serviceman and guided his steps.

Other ideas I feel worthy of public and congressional consideration are, third, rapid reconversion of industry from war to peacetime production of civilian goods. Fourth, a public works program to supply jobs during industrial reconversion. Fifth, financial assistance during the period of transition, such as in muster-out pay as proposed by the President. Sixth, voluntary withdrawal from the labor markets of as many women, school-age youths, and over-age employees as possible. This can be accomplished through a more intelligent social security and old age pension system and through extension of the advantages of public education. Seventh, there should be a Federal job placement program to direct workers to available jobs.

The War Dads and related organizations now, and the veterans organizations of World War II, in later years, will be helpful in securing such legislation. I hope that it can be secured in the spirit and tradition of America's willingness to "care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and orphans," and not because it is a political football much to be desired by the demagogue. For my part, this is the spirit in which I will continue my labors as a member of the War Veterans Legislation Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next we are to consider the Fulbright resolution which places the Congress on record as being willing to participate with other world powers to insure lasting peace.

It is difficult to see how anyone could logically oppose the resolution. We are all most anxious to have lasting peace. However, certain signs are beginning to appear which create doubt in my mind that even America is ready to lend its great influence in insuring permanent peace. Every effort that has been tried heretofore since the dawn of civilization has failed. What objection is there to trying another course? Human life cannot be measured in dollars. Property destruction can. The terrible disruption of economic stability, the destruction of homes, plants, and other properties by the gods of war can be measured. The hindrance to the progress of civilization caused by war can be roughly estimated.

I believe it will take a generation of teaching to develop respect for the rights of others and to uproot the ideologies that have been burned into the minds of the present generation of Axis peoples before we can hope for a permanent peace. We cannot hope to establish democracies in countries who do not have trained native leadership. This training will take a period of years. During that time the only safe insurance against war will be the maintenance of strong military forces.

I ask permission to include in my remarks an editorial written by Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist, appearing in the issue of September 16, 1943, entitled "The Mistakes of the Realists":

THE MISTAKES OF THE REALISTS

The mistakes of the so-called realists are tantamount to the mistakes of the isolationists. They suppose that the United States is wholly self-sufficient and is not in the

least dependent for anything upon any foreign nation or combination of foreign powers.

The war is now having to be fought on the outer circles of the German and Japanese powers—not at the center of these powers—because the isolationists supposed the outer circles were of no value in the defense of the nations. The Federal Congress refused to fortify Guam because, as it was said, that would offend our Japanese friends (?) and neighbors (?). And all the fighting with Japan now is to retake positions we have already lost, including the Philippine Islands. Isn't it queer how the realists think that their realism has so beautifully worked? It has worked so well that they don't want to try anything else other than that which is actually bleeding the world white.

One is reminded of the surgeon who had discovered a clever operation. When he was asked how many he had performed his operation upon he replied "sixty." Then, when asked how many of them got well, he replied, "They all died." Still it was a clever operation. If the best the realists can do is just what they have done to this world, then, in Heaven's name, it would seem the part of wisdom at least to try something else. But, no, they are still opposed to any collaboration among the Allied Nations and any federation looking toward a warless world. If this were tried and it actually failed, would the failure do anything worse to the world than their philosophy has already done?

Suppose there can be no world federation among the Allied Nations following the war? Suppose China is knocked out and Russia kicks out? And the South American republics revert to their sympathies to their European cultures, then what? Then Britain and the United States should stick together though the heavens fall and the earth be removed. The Stars and Stripes and the British Union Jack should be forever intertwined or Anglo-Saxon civilization is doomed. And suppose, by any stretch of the imagination, something could happen to contravene the friendship between the United States and Great Britain then what? Then the United States alone would have to build not a two ocean navy but a navy sufficiently strong to command all the seven seas and an air force and standing army of proportionate strength. The United States cannot outbuild all the balance of the world combined.

The British, though they were in a far more dangerous position, were as short-sighted as the American isolationists. Along with the British we are fighting to reopen the Burma Road, to retake Burma, and to defend China. The British supposed that the great bastion of Singapore would protect the Far East. But their big guns were all pointed out to sea and the Japs, painted green, swept up through the jungle from the rear and the British couldn't turn their big guns around.

We are fighting now to get a bridgehead in Europe and it will be at a frightful cost all because 4 years ago we didn't hold France, which was then and could have been held until now as our all-sufficient bridgehead in Europe. But France fell and then the Japs at Pearl Harbor, at long last, convinced our isolationists that we are not isolated. And finally the United States didn't declare war on Germany and Italy. Those powers first declared war on the United States.

All of this would be unnecessary to state but for the fact that there are still millions of so-called realists in this country and their influence is still great. They defeated the idealism of Woodrow Wilson for a realism—a realism indeed which broke the heart of the world and has filled it with woe.

The wonderful realists (?) that we are reading about ought to be realists enough to foresee just where their political philosophy will lead them if they carry this country their way. So why not give the idealists and men of faith a chance? Why not make at least an attempt to organize the states (governments) of Europe and the world in some such fashion as the 48 States of the United States are organized under a federal constitution and an international court and a joint police power composed of ships and planes to enforce, if need be, the decisions of the court.

Everyone knows that there are many difficulties in such a plan. But the alternative proposed by the realists has something worse than difficulties. It means perpetual blood and fire and war for this planet. It is just that and will be that forever if men do not at long last come to the place where they will organize the world so as to prevent it. The prophet said "He (God) shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." That prophecy is going one day to come true. That day must come and when it comes it will be because God, Himself, so impresses men with a sense of right and good will and justice that the world will, by good men, be so organized that wars will end.

Narcotic and Customs Division of Treasury Department Report Shows an Excellent Enforcement Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Narcotic Division of the Treasury Department, under the able leadership of H. J. Anslinger, continued its intensive campaign against importers and peddlers during the last fiscal year. A brief summary of its work is outlined in a release from the Treasury Department which I include as part of my remarks. It follows:

Mexico has replaced the Orient as the major source of narcotics entering illicit traffic in the United States, and Treasury officers, with the cooperation of Mexican officials, have carried on an intensive campaign during the past year to halt the flow of drugs from remote mountain poppy fields of our neighbor to the south.

At the same time, wartime shipping between far eastern ports and the United States has brought a widespread, small-lot traffic engaged in by orientals making up crews of many vessels.

In one of a series of reports to Secretary Morgenthau covering the 1943 fiscal year, Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Activities of the six Treasury enforcement agencies, said that narcotics officers of the Bureaus of Narcotics and Customs reported a substantial increase in drug seizures following the sharp curtailment of traffic experienced during the first year of the war.

Combined seizures of opium-type drugs during the fiscal year were 9,933 ounces, against 2,445 ounces seized in the 1942 fiscal year. Similar seizures in the 1941 period were 5,863 ounces. Marihuana seizures of 14,315 ounces in the 1943 fiscal year were slightly smaller than the 14,709 ounces in 1942.

Treasury officers concluded investigations spanning a decade or longer to obtain convictions in two major cases prosecuted during the year, while an adventuresome undercover narcotics agent at Portland, Oreg., enjoyed the unique experience of being given a vote of confidence by the Chinese underworld just before he sprang the trap on a dangerous band of dealers in smoking opium and women.

George and Elias Eliopoulos, Greek nationals, who virtually monopolized world traffic of almost unbelievable proportions back in 1929, 1930, and 1931, were convicted in Federal court in Brooklyn and are awaiting sentence. They were flushed out of Europe by the war, and when they sought haven in the United States, were promptly indicted on evidence assembled by customs and narcotics officers.

The Drug Barons of Europe as the brothers were known, from headquarters in France, Germany, and Turkey sent enormous quantities of narcotics into this country and to the Far East. Claiming to be friends of kings and princes, and occupying powerful places in European finance, the brothers had heretofore jousted successfully with the laws of three continents.

Narcotics agents climaxed a 10-year drive to stamp out a highly organized, gangster-dominated traffic in the Middle West with convictions of the principals in the so-called Kansas City narcotic syndicate. Paul and Joseph Antinori, Florida suppliers of the ring, drew sentences of 7 and 5 years, respectively, and James DeSimone and Joseph DeLuca, Kansas City kingpins, were given 6 and 3 years in Federal prison, respectively. Numerous other members of the ring were prosecuted successfully or are awaiting trial.

The Oregon case principals were, with few exceptions, Orientals and their white paramours, but the prosecutions are interesting in that they dealt a substantial blow to the Chinatown underworld and uncovered an elaborate opium-smoking den of a type now rarely found in American cities.

The narcotics agent who spearheaded the Treasury investigation introduced himself into the gang and lived in constant peril for months while the evidence was being assembled. When he incurred the suspicions of some of the lesser lights, he boldly forced a show-down, and won a vote of confidence from a special meeting of the Oriental overlords.

Sixteen persons were sentenced in this case, one leader, Wong Suey, drawing 5 years in prison and a fine of $5,000.

A seizure of 225 ounces of opium of Mexican origin in this case was one of the largest in years for the Pacific Northwest.

Other important cases involving Mexican opium included seizure or purchase of more than a thousand ounces of smoking opium from an El Paso Chinese, Jim King Wong, who drew a 5-year prison term; and prosecution of Alfonso Montana, Ernest F. Culling, and Frank E. Taylor following seizure of 150 ounces at El Paso. These three also were sentenced to 5 years in prison. The cases were joint investigations by customs and narcotics agents. There were numerous smaller seizures on the border.

Meanwhile, a cooperative national government has struck a substantial blow at narcotics business originating in Mexico. Treasury officials have been informed that the notorious La Nacha, queen of the border dope traffic, will be interned as a menace to the war effort, on personal direction of President Avila Camacho. La Nacha is to be sent to the Government prison on Islas Tres Marias.

The Mexican woman smuggler, whose real name is Mrs. Ignacia Jasso Gonzales, successfully fought in the Mexican courts efforts of the United States to obtain her extradition to face indictments in this country. However, 13 members of her gang were in-

dicted late last year, and many of them convicted in Federal courts at El Paso and San Antonio. Narcotics agents worked their way into the lair of the smugglers deep in the hill country of Guadalajara to assemble evidence to break this major international dope ring.

J. W. Bulkley, Assistant Deputy Commissioner of Customs, in charge of narcotics enforcement, reported that it was necessary for his agents to search every nook on many vessels calling at United States ports, with opium, usually in chop-stick form, being found in every conceivable hiding place in some instances.

Most of this opium appeared to originate in Iranian and Indian ports of call, and was held in many cases by oriental crew members for their own use. However, other lots were of a size to indicate smuggling intentions. One resourceful Chinese was caught after he had swum ashore with a tin of smoking opium concealed in a specially constructed vest fitted with water wings. Individual vessels yielded total seizures of from 3 to 16 pounds of the contraband.

H. J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, reported that the relative scarcity of illicit narcotics continued during the year, with prices still fantastically high. Prepared drugs such as morphine, heroin, and cocaine were especially scarce. Addicts and traffickers resorted in numerous cases to thefts from pharmacies and other registered establishments; and the cooperation of the legitimate trade was obtained in efforts to safeguard supplies of the vital war material. Numerous cases involving prescription forgeries were prosecuted. The Bureau won a major court victory in its efforts to prevent diversion of stocks when the United States Supreme Court upheld conviction of a New York distributor selling directly to a physician engaged in illegally dispensing drugs to addicts.

A steady trickle of marihuana continued along the Mexican frontier, but only petty violations were reported at seaports. A seizure by Customs of 170 pounds of bulk marihuana at Laredo was largest reported, this case involving Charles A. Smith of New Orleans, and three others. Smith was given a 2-year prison term. A new wrinkle in enforcement developed in this case, involving gasoline rationing violations. The marihuana was concealed in a truckload of onions.

Narcotics officers made two successful prosecutions of major marihuana peddlers in the Washington, D. C., area, and, with the help of Customs officers, obtained convictions in several other cities in what appeared to be a loosely knit, Nation-wide distribution system supplied by a common source in Mexico.

Arrests for violation of Federal narcotics laws increased slightly in 1943 fiscal year, from 1,777 in 1942, to 1,794. Marihuana arrests declined from 1,090 to 777.

Italian Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sun of September 10, 1943:

ITALIAN FINANCE

Italy's surrender raises some interesting financial problems—to say nothing of the matter of feeding that country—which in part, at least, probably will fall on the United States. Inflation in Italy has gone to great extremes, and its recent war loans were a failure. So low had the Italian Government's credit fallen that it was impossible to meet deficits either with taxes or with loans. The river was spanned, as it inevitably is in such circumstances, by resort to the printing press. For some time now the government has paid its way, in large part, simply by printing bank notes, which naturally worsened the situation. Signor Bertolini, Minister of Finance, is trying a conversion loan at a higher rate of interest, but although that undoubtedly would produce conversion and lift the carrying charge of the Italian debt, it would not produce a lira of new revenue. Heavier taxes are contemplated, but they promise little except in the realm of indirect levies. Italy had come to the end of her financial and economic rope as well as to that of her military cord.

In striving to regain some measure of financial stability the new minister announces virtual scrapping of state capitalism, which has involved the Italian treasury in about one-third of its debt to the Bank of Italy, largely the result of subsidies to hold down prices—an effort that has been so conspicuous a failure in Italy that it might well serve as a warning to this country.

In announcing his intention of traveling the hard road toward economic sanity the minister proposes "stringent economies in all categories of expenditure" and asserts that "above all" it is necessary to call a final halt to the policy of intervention and nationalization, and "to prepare for a gradual winding-up" of the internal debt held by the state. The Italian Government holds a direct or indirect interest in over 200 business enterprises.

A Burke Among Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "A Burke Among Us" which appeared in the Hartford Courant, August 1, 1943, concerning my colleague, RANULF COMPTON:

A BURKE AMONG US

Congressman RANULF COMPTON, of Madison, who represents the Third Connecticut District, and who was decorated with the Conspicuous Service Cross for gallantry in the battles of St. Mihiel and Argonne, is on the blacklist of organized labor for having voted contrary to its wishes. In fact, he is accused of being more antilabor and anticommon people than any other member of the Connecticut delegation at Washington because he voted to continue the Dies committee, to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, opposed subsidies, and supported the Hobbs antiracketeering bill and the Smith-Connally antistrike bill.

Mr. COMPTON meets this accusation by saying that so long as he remains in Congress he will continue to vote as his conscience dictates. "I appreciate the views of labor," he says. "I sympathize with the efforts of labor leaders to further the causes of organized labor, but I will resist with my last breath any and all attempts to set up a double standard of behavior and privilege in this country that gives organized labor immunity from the laws and restrictions that other groups and the main body of the American people are required to abide by."

In the specific instances referred to Representative COMPTON reminds his critics that his vote was in accordance with the majority's views, the legislation he favored having been adopted either by one or both Houses of Congress. Furthermore, it is his belief that the majority of the voters of his district uphold the position he took. But whether so or not, he says that "to vote always as labor dictates would be to violate my oath of office and to ignore the rights of those who believe in and want equality of treatment."

The attitude taken by Congressman COMPTON somewhat parallels that of Edmund Burke, who won his seat in Parliament against an opponent who promised the pressure groups of his day about everything they wanted. In thanking his constituents for supporting him, Burke, with characteristic independence, said that their desires naturally would have great weight with him, their opinions high respect, their business uninterrupted attention. He conceived it to be his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfaction to theirs, and above all to prefer their interests to his own. But he held it to be of the greatest consequence that a representative should not sacrifice his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience to any man or to any set of men living. He held that government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, not of inclination.

No representative in Congress of all the people has any sanction to speak for one group to the exclusion of other groups. His function is to give proper attention to the desires of labor, agriculture, business, industry, and the professions, while remembering at all times the interests of the unorganized, inarticulate majority. That calls for the constant exercise of independent judgment based on an understanding of all available facts and the courage to stand by that judgment once it is formed. It looks very much as if Congressman COMPTON had done exactly that, and if organized labor wants to take it out on him for not being subservient to its wishes, it is privileged to do so. But if he is a candidate for reelection the voters of the Third District may decide that it is worth their while to have a representative who cannot be intimidated.

Activities of Alcohol Tax Unit of Treasury Department Reduces Federal Liquor Law Violations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Alcohol Unit of the Treasury Department in its annual report maintains violations of liquor laws declined sharply during the last fiscal year. A brief account of the work of this organization will be found in a recent statement issued by the Treasury Department which

I include as part of my remarks. It follows:

Despite the increase in Federal taxes on distilled spirits last November 1, from $4 to $6 per gallon, a factor which might under normal circumstances be a possible stimulus to bootlegging, Federal liquor law violations declined sharply during the fiscal year ended June 30, the Treasury reported today.

Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator of Treasury Law Enforcement Agencies, reported to Secretary Morgenthau that arrests for the year of 10,090 were 50 percent fewer than in the 1942 period, and that mash seized—the best measure of the volume of illicit distilling operations—showed a decrease of about 68 percent.

Wartime rationing of sugar, together with gasoline and tire rationing, has made it increasingly difficult for bootleggers to operate, Stewart Berkshire, head of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, said.

Another contributing factor in the drying up of sources of non-tax-paid liquor, Mr. Berkshire said, was the opportunity for lucrative employment in expanding war industries which attracted many potential bootleggers.

Alcohol Tax Unit statistics indicated a marked decline in illicit distilling in all parts of the country to the lowest level since repeal of national prohibition. The so-called moonshine areas in the Southern States continued the chief centers of the traffic.

Improvement in this phase of enforcement enabled the Unit to concentrate investigators on a drive against evaders of the floor tax imposed by the 1942 Revenue Act, as well as to supervision of the vastly expanded production for war of industrial alcohol, to which the Nation's distilleries have been wholly converted.

Assessments of $2,500,000 in taxes and penalties have been recommended in the 3,400 floor tax cases perfected, in which $2,000,000 worth of liquor was seized.

The 1942 Revenue Act provided for additional levies against liquor on the floor of distributors to bring the total tax up to the higher rate imposed at the manufacturing level.

Evidence obtained by the Alcohol Tax Unit resulted during the year in the liquidation of one of the most highly financed and strongly entrenched illicit alcohol manufacturing syndicates ever to operate in the New York area.

After a 3 weeks' trial in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York, 34 persons were convicted in what is known as the Giallo-Valenti-Palmeri conspiracy, headed by Vito Giallo. Sentences passed by the court in this case totaled more than 14 years' imprisonment to be served, and 34 years' probation.

The group operated 17 illicit distilleries in 6 New York counties between 1934 and 1941. The distilleries ranged from 500 to 3,000 gallons daily capacity, turning out high-proof alcohol. This was a "family affair," most of the operators being related by marriage or blood. Records submitted by sugar dealers indicated that this syndicate purchased three and a half million pounds of sugar.

Another substantial illicit operation in the New York area involved Anthony Vaccaro, Carmine Uvino, and three others. Uvino was alleged to have been financier of the project, which had five plants in Brooklyn and on Long Island between 1939 and 1941. All had been previously convicted in similar cases. The new case brought sentences totaling 9 years in prison.

Ten persons were convicted at Brooklyn for making false floor-stocks-tax returns, and were given jail terms and fined heavily. The defendants were bar and grill owners and George J. Andreola, an accountant, who was termed by alcohol-tax officers as the moving spirit in the conspiracy.

One of the largest operations involved in prosecutions during the year was centered in the Baltimore area. George Edward Dryden and three others pleaded guilty to charges of conspiracy in the operation of 19 distilleries. Each was sentenced to 20 months' imprisonment and fined $10,000 and costs. Operations of the group occurred between 1937 and 1942.

Eleven persons were convicted in June 1943, at Greensboro, N. C., in an extensive conspiracy to engage in interstate traffic in illicit liquor. This was known as the Rosie Copeland case, and involved distribution of 3,000 gallons of moonshine whisky made in Guilford and Rockingham Counties, N. C. Sentences totaled more than 7 years' imprisonment. Operations of the group extended from late in 1942 to February 1943.

During the year 5,654 stills were seized at which were found 1,700,406 gallons of mash. Property seizures included 926 automobiles and 154 trucks, with the total appraised value of confiscated property being $929,000, exclusive of property seized in floor-stocks-tax cases, which amounted to an additional $2,000,000.

Bristol, Virginia-Tennessee, War Loan Rally Speech of Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 1943, we celebrated Labor Day in my home town by staging one of the greatest war-loan rallies ever held. The rally was preceded by a luncheon at the General Shelby Hotel, where several hundred of the leading men and women of our section heard I. W. Wingate, fire patrolman, second class, veteran of four major engagements against the Japanese in the Pacific, and who was a member of the crew of the U. S. S. *Vincennes*, which was lost last year during the invasion of the Solomons, recount his near death-taking experiences. Following the luncheon a gigantic parade, in which the Army air cadets of King College and the naval V–12 trainees of Emory and Henry College participated, marched to the stadium to hear Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew deliver the address of the occasion. That night the labor organizations of Bristol gave a banquet at Hotel Bristol, which was largely attended and at which a great many bonds were sold. I had the honor of introducing Ambassador Grew. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my introductory remarks and the address of Ambassador Grew:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA

Chairman Anderson, Chairman Copenhaver, Ambassador Grew, my countrymen: Today, here on the home front, we launch another campaign against the enemy. While it is not a campaign that will test the valor and courage and strength and skill of American manhood upon the field of carnage, it is a campaign to furnish the armament, food, and equipment without which valor and courage and strength and skill would be helpless, but with which American valor and courage and strength and skill are invincible and will triumph over the heH-sent enemies of liberty and preserve the freedom that is ours by reason of our Christian heritage. While it is not a campaign where blood sacrifices are made in order to pay the price the ruthless Hun and treacherous Jap have exacted as the price a free people will have to pay in order to retain their freedom, it is a campaign that calls for self-denial and sacrifice here on the home front. The raising of $15,000,000,000 in so short a time is the greatest money-raising undertaking ever attempted by any nation in the history of the world, and will put to the acid test the sacrificial spirit of every American. Yes, the undertaking is a challenge to the spirit of sacrifice that freedom's peril has engendered in the very soul of every true American. We accept the challenge! And, Mr. Ambassador, when you return to Washington you can say that if the success of this campaign depends upon Bristol, Virginia-Tennessee, going over the top, then success has been achieved. Report that when our boys left our hearts left with them, that our prayers daily follow them, and that our dollars became theirs to command. Proclaim that the mountain men of southwest Virginia and east Tennessee, where freedom has ever dwelt, esteem it a privilege to sacrifice that freedom may ever live. Yes, Mr. Ambassador, the message we send back is this: No matter what the sacrifice, a Bristol dollar will never stand between our soldier boys and freedom's victory.

This is a rare occasion for the capital city of the mountain empires of southwest Virginia and east Tennessee. Seldom, if ever, have we been honored with the presence of one who has rendered such outstanding service to our country? At the time the treacherous, slimy Jap stabbed this proud, peaceful, and mighty Nation in the dark, the one who has honored us with his presence today was the distinguished representative of our country to the Government of Japan. His record while there is a glorious tribute to his brilliant, penetrating mind, his forethought, and his fidelity to a sacred trust.

Ambassador Grew, it is now my high privilege to present you to an audience composed of the purest Americans in America. Here in the mountains, where our crystal streams as they flow through our green peaceful valleys ever reflect the rugged emerald hills that surround and stand guard as sentinels of freedom, in the colonial days of long ago, it pleased the Master to set up his strongest citadel of Christian democracy and people it with a people dedicated, under Divine guidance, to freedom. Here, 18 months before the immortal pronouncement of Jefferson electrified an enslaved world and filled the breast of man with new hope, the voice of freedom first found expression in the Fincastle resolves that publicly, boldly, proclaimed our liberty and bid defiance to every human master of the mind, conscience, and voice of man. Here when the distress call of freedom reverberated over the hills the mountain men gathered 900 strong and, after a parting blessing from their spiritual leader, under the intrepid, liberty-loving Campbell, Sevier, and Shelby, marched through the mountain fastness 300 miles to Kings Mountain, and there captured or killed an entire army of the enemy, rekindled the fires of freedom, and started the victory rally that led to Yorktown and independence. And here through the years that have followed the descendants of those fathers of liberty have dwelt in the conscious knowledge that "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," maintaining their identity as if set apart for some Divine purpose, nurturing in their hearts their glorious heritage, and enjoying the freedom and liberty their forefathers conceived and brought into being; and, sir, today I am happy to record

that no men and women in our armed forces, no men and women on our home front, are battling harder to preserve and vouchsafe to their progeny that freedom and that liberty than the men and women of southwest Virginia and east Tennessee.

Men and women of the mountains, I present to you Ambassador Joseph Clark Grew.

ADDRESS OF AMBASSADOR JOSEPH CLARK GREW

As we look back over the past life of our country and survey the march of our civilization, the progress of our democracy, and the free development of our national institutions, our minds, especially today, hark back to an historic incident which took place in New York City in 1882, over 60 years ago. The incident was merely a parade, a parade of the Knights of Labor, yet from that parade sprang the annual observance of one of the great days in our national life, Labor Day. The real significance of the day and the inspiration to be drawn from it lie in the great progressive achievements and the steadily mounting capacities of labor as the backbone of our economic structure. For while it was the Pilgrims who unlocked the door, and the pioneers who explored and blazed the trail, it was the workers who, by skill and craft and toil, translated into concrete effect the dreams and visions of courageous planners and brought our country to the high degree of national advancement and strength it enjoys today. Therefore, while Labor Day in peacetime is essentially a day of rest and in time of war, for many, just another day of work, it should be at all times a day of profound national pride, a day when stock is taken of labor's achievements and of its mighty contribution to the building of our Nation.

Yet today reminiscent pride is not enough. Today we must take stock not of the past but of the future. Today we know that that process of building must continue with ever-increasing acceleration—if we are to continue steadily with the winning of the war.

We are going to win the war without any shadow of doubt. Indeed there has never been a shadow of doubt in my own mind of our ultimate victory, even though we passed through some pretty dark days of anxiety during the initial stages of the war when our enemies were still able to take the offensive and to menace even the gates and soil of our beloved country. But the very fact that we have passed through those dark days and are emerging upon a brighter prospect is in itself a danger. That danger can be succinctly expressed: It is the danger of premature complacency; the danger of relaxation. The war is not won yet, not by a long shot, and if we allow ourselves to indulge in that premature complacency and to relax, we shall beyond peradventure bring upon our country and our people two disastrous results—one a risk, the other a certainty; the risk that the war will end in a stalemate; the certainty that through the inevitable prolongation of the war, many more young American boys, who might otherwise have been saved, will have to lose their lives in battle.

Those thoughts should give us pause. You and I know what a stalemate would mean. It would mean that our Nation would have to remain permanently on a war footing, called upon, perhaps for another generation or more, to continue to sacrifice many of the good things of the world, and for another generation or more held back from a return to the advancement of our peacetime civilization and from much that we most love in our American way of life.

You and I know, too, what an indefinite continuance of those casualty lists would mean. I do not need to elaborate that thought.

We cannot afford for a single moment to relax our all-out, constantly accelerating war effort. We cannot afford to relax until we have brought our enemies, all of our enemies, to unconditional surrender. We must complete the job—now.

That being the case, I frankly cannot imagine any man, woman, or child in our great country who would not be miserable, who would not feel utterly ashamed, if he were not taking his or her maximum part in our war effort. A good effort is not enough. It must be maximum if our inmost consciences are to be clean and clear. I heard the other day the story of a group of visitors who were walking through a hospital which had just received some of our wounded soldiers from Tunisia. One of the latter had no legs. The visitors were embarrassed, but a man jumped into the breach. "How'd you lose 'em, buddy?" The soldier looked up, studied the visitor for a moment, and then said: "Lose what?" "Your legs; how'd you lose your legs?" The wounded man remained silent for a moment, thinking, and then he replied, almost as if talking to himself, "I didn't lose them; I exchanged them for a clear conscience."

My friends, we have our chance to clear from our own consciences a lot of underbrush, if it exists, now. I guess we would all like to have a direct hack at the Nazis or the Japs. Unfortunately we cannot all of us enjoy that privilege. I suppose that all of us are contributing to the war effort in one way or another, but are we all contributing our maximum, and can our consciences be clear unless we do? This bond drive opens one way—and an essential way; for without the financial sinews of war our workers could not continue to turn out those other sinews, the planes and tanks and ships and guns and ammunition, and without those sinews, our boys on the far-flung fronts could not continue to fight, could not continue to battle for the security of our country, for our way of life, for the "four freedoms" for civilization and for the future welfare of humanity here and everywhere.

We have not been slackers yet. Since 1941 we have bought nineteen billions in War bonds. The present drive is going to reach fifteen billions, but not without the full backing of every loyal American. Virginians and Tennesseans have made a fine showing, together purchasing $500,000,000 in bonds. This was a magnificent contribution, but now we must do even better. Incidentally I had the privilege of helping to launch the third and the fourth Victory loan drives in Canada and the Canadians went over the top in all four of them. We must keep the attack rolling—rolling along like Old Man River—if we are to bring those boys of ours fighting overseas back to their homes soon. Furthermore we must buy these bonds to stabilize our national economy so that when our boys do return they will find a strong Nation and a free one. We must do our part now, so that later there shall be no regrets. We must be able to look our returning soldiers squarely in the eye, proud of the work that they will have done, and they must know and be proud of our support.

Let us remember one important fact: In the totalitarian countries, the people are told when and how much they must contribute, and they do it—or else. In our democracy we determine those things for ourselves individually. If our democracy means all that we would have it mean, we shall know how to act. And that can only be our individual maximum effort.

Now I know that you will wish me today to say a word about our enemy, Japan. But, first, let me go back a little in history.

The scene was the regimental mess hall of one of the Prussian Guard regiments in Berlin; the date some time in 1912 or 1913; the hour late. Much champagne had been consumed, and restraints were off.

"Die Wacht am Rhein" had been sung in thunderous volume; glasses had been banged on the table to the toast "Der Tag." "In Vino Veritas." I said to the Junker officer beside me: "There you have the quintessence of the martial spirit. In fact, the German Army reminds me of a football team which after long training is tired of practice and wants a game." "Yes," he replied. "You are right. And we shall have that game, unquestionably. It's only a matter of time before we shall have to fight our traditional enemy France again." He spoke of it much as one might speak of our Army-Navy football game—as an inevitable engagement. "But that will be quite simple," he continued. "We are much stronger than France. We may have to go in through Belgium, but, of course, the Belgians won't fight; they will simply let us through. And the British couldn't fight if they wanted to; they're a decadent race, and, anyway, they are far too much occupied with their labor troubles and the Irish problem. We can count them out. As for you in America, it would be laughable for you to try to fight us. Of course, the hundreds of thousands of Germans in your country would never allow that, and even if you should try to come in, you could never get a single soldier across the Atlantic. We would attend to that."

Thus the Prussian officer before 1914.

Time moves on to the early spring of 1941. The panorama has moved, too, and another scene is presented, the garden at the Tokyo home of Matsuoka, Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs. We walk up and down by the hour, both smoking pipes; he talks, and I, as usual, listen. "Democracy is bankrupt," he says—how precisely I remember those words—"this is the day of the great military powers. Germany will unquestionably win this war and will control all of Europe, while we are the stabilizing force in the Far East, and we shall create in Greater East Asia, including the South Seas, a new order constructed on the principle of coprosperity." His predecessor, Arita, had contrasted the great open spaces of the South Seas regions and their vast natural resources with overcrowded Japan, a country poor in resources. Matsuoka developed that theme. And then he went on to say that if the United States should get into a shooting war with Germany, even in defense against the German submarines, Japan would be obliged, on the basis of article 3 of the Tripartite Pact, to go to war with us. "Democracy is decadent," he repeated, and he added: "But if you insist on sending your ships into the European war zone, you will have to take the consequences."

A few months earlier, after Japan had joined the Axis, I was playing golf one Saturday when a messenger hurried on to the course and said that the Foreign Office wanted to see me immediately. As it was my first game in several weeks, I finished the 18 holes and then repaired to the official residence of the vice foreign minister. The higher officials were sitting in a circle with an Admiral of the Navy, expressions of deep concern written on their faces. They handed me a telegram and said: "What does this mean?" I read it. It was a press telegram saying that Mr. Hull had called home all Americans in the Far East who could be spared from their duties. I said: "Gentlemen, I have not yet seen this news; presumably a telegram is now on my desk in the Embassy. But I can tell you at once what it means. When you joined the Axis and entered into partnership with a country which has threatened my country and has announced its intention to wreck many of the fundamental principles for which my country stands, you believed that we would

become intimidated and would step back. I told you, on the contrary, that we would step forward. This is the first step." Those Japanese officials were amazed.

In international relationships, not only in past history but in contemporary affairs—and certainly this axiom will apply with equal or greater force in future—one of the fundamental sources of danger is the lack of understanding, the erroneous conception, among governments and peoples of the background, the underlying impulses and motivations, the psychology, stamina, and spirit of other peoples. Had the Germans in 1914 and the Japanese in 1941 better understood those things, had they more accurately conceived the inherent qualities of their future enemies, might they not have hesitated to rush headlong toward certain ultimate destruction? Democracy, they said, is bankrupt; the people of the democracies decadent, soft, flabby from too much luxury, disunited by too much individual independence, unwilling to save or to sacrifice their comforts, unable to unite or to endure the grim and constantly intensified demands of total war.

Alas, what they did not know and perhaps do not yet wholly understand is that, while we in the democracies begin war as novices and in low gear, because we are not in time of peace geared for war, with the wheels of our war effort grinding and groaning in the initial stages, gradually but surely we move up through the gears, and when finally and inevitably we slip into high gear with the component parts of the great machine working in unison, then nothing in the world can stop us. They did not know this. But they shall know.

What I am leading up to is this: Even in our own country—and I have been all over our country since coming home last summer—I find a surprising and ominous lack of understanding among our own people of the problems of foreign affairs and of the lives, history, resources, habits, and psychologies of foreign nations and foreign peoples. Various bodies throughout our nations are doing admirable service in fields hitherto inadequately explored, but they are only nuclei which should be greatly expanded as time goes on. After the war, when the liberal arts can once again come into their own, all of our institutions of learning should in my opinion lay far more emphasis than in the past on these things. I venture merely to lay down the general principle that in every country in tne world a goodly knowledge not only of foreign psychologies but of the problems—all the great problems—that beset foreign nations, is the surest way of avoiding future wars. Isolation in our modern world has become an anachronism.

But, first of all, we must win the war, and I should like to say a word about our enemy Japan. I know that enemy well as one should come to know any people well among whom one has lived for 10 long and trying years. Not many of our people really understand that enemy. There is still abroad in our country all too much fallacious thinking, to the effect that once we get around to it we shall have little difficulty in conquering Japan. Some of our people do not seem to realize that we have steadily, intensively, and progressively been getting around to that task ever since Pearl Harbor as a few outstanding incidents such as those that have happened in the Coral Sea, at Midway Island, at Guadalcanal, at New Guinea, at Attu, and in the Kula Gulf have brilliantly attested. Today, we are sending to the Asiatic theater every instrument of war that the traffic will stand, and the traffic itself is steadily increasing. Those who have said, and who sometimes still say: "When we're through with Hitler we'll mop up the Japs" seem to have little comprehension of the magnitude of the task we face. It is true that we are fighting a global war, a war waged in many theaters and on many fronts. No theater, no front is being neglected, and every success of our arms, the arms of the United Nations, in Russia or Africa, in Germany or the Near East, spells a success in the Pacific Ocean theater, and vice versa. I have high hopes that even though we still have a long way to go and a hard road ahead before we shall bring Germany and Italy to the unconditional surrender which is the irrevocable objective of our effort, the tide of war, now flowing in our favor, will never ebb. But even when we can turn our entire attention to Japan, let us not for a moment think that we can regard with complacency the problem of defeating that enemy

Today, the Japanese occupy tremendous areas throughout east Asia and in the islands of the Pacific, areas which contain every raw material needed by any country for national power, and they control some 300,000,000 native inhabitants in those areas whom we know, by experience, they will use as forced labor to develop those raw materials. In the ports that they have taken there exist great potentialities for additional shipbuilding facilities. The industrial plants everywhere in those regions they will have put in first-rate working order—for the Japanese are tremendously industrious, thorough, pertinacious, and scientifically expert. No grass will have grown under their feet—for they will undoubtedly have aimed from the start to make those areas so far as possible self-sustaining and independent of shipping facilities to and from the homeland. Their shipping is vulnerable and will become increasingly so as time goes on. Eventually, if we have not reached that point already, we shall sink their ships faster than they can build. They know this, and they will therefore prepare for the day when they can no longer depend on ships for maintenance of their supplies.

There's the problem. It isn't going to be so easy to "mop up the Japs." And there is no sense in thinking it will be. Complacency in war is always dangerous. That is what I have been trying to tell our people ever since I returned from Japan last August, over a year ago. And I have been telling them that there must be no halfway measures in solving that problem, no temporizing, no compromise, no half-baked peace. We can never relax in safety and security in our own country until that cancer of Japanese aggressive militarism, which has spread over most of east Asia—and which if left alone would assuredly some day spread over into our hemisphere—has been utterly destroyed, cut out to the last cell and rendered powerless ever to reproduce itself in the future. To most of our people the overweening ambition and megalomania of those Japanese military leaders are incomprehensible. Those leaders have long planned and built against the day when, having developed the immense potentialities of power now at their command, they would come over and attack these United States. When Admiral Yamamoto said in public before he was recently killed that the peace after this war will be dictated in the White House in Washington, he was speaking in grim seriousness. And only a few days ago another of his breed repeated the same thought.

Well, we are not going to leave that cancer alone. We are not, thank heaven, leaving it alone today. But we have a long, difficult task ahead beset, I fear, with much blood and sweat and tears. Once the American people fully comprehend the magnitude of this task, they will see it through with their traditional grit and determination. All of this adds up to three simple "musts": We must not relax; we must continually intensify our effort in this war; and our effort must depend not alone upon our boys at the front but upon every one of us throughout our mighty land

Now, what shall be done with Japan after we have achieved final victory? Here a good many imponderable factors enter into the problem. Among these factors will of course be the extent of the impact on the Japanese people of their losses, their defeat, and their final unconditional surrender, as well as the attitude toward Japan at that time of the other United Nations.

In any discussion of post-war policy it should be borne in mind that one fundamental principle set forth in the Atlantic Charter is respect for the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. The charter, however, contains, inter alia, another principle of equal fundamental importance, namely, abandonment of the use of force and, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, the disarmament of nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers. In the light of that latter provision, common sense dictates that the military terms of settlement shall prevent Japan from again becoming a menace to international peace. This, of course, presupposes disarmament and the denial to Japan of certain strategic islands, quite apart from the restitution by Japan of other territories seized by force. It presupposes too the condign punishment of Japan's military leaders responsible for her aggression, as well as of those guilty of the hideous and utterly barbarous cruelties practiced alike upon prisoners and wounded and upon noncombatant civilians of the United Nations.

But that would solve only a part of the problem. Effective steps will undoubtedly have to be taken to rid the Japanese permanently of the cult of militarism of which, in varying degrees, they have been the unresisting pawns throughout their history. This will of course mean a substantial reorientation of their domestic life and outlook through the process of reeducation in all their institutions of learning from the kindergarten to the university.

My own opinion, based upon my 10 years of experience in Japan, is that this process will present no insuperable obstacles. At least a part of that process will come about automatically with the defeat of the Japanese nation. First of all, we must remember that in Japanese life and thought a loss of face plays an important role. When the Japanese people witness the complete defeat and discomfiture of their army and navy and air force—which they have been told have never yet lost a war and, being allegedly protected by their sun goddess, can never be beaten—that military machine will be discredited throughout the length and breadth of the land. Within the last generation there have been times when the prestige of the Japanese Army was so low that army officers were reluctant to wear uniform in public when off duty; and the incursion into Manchuria in 1931 was undoubtedly stimulated if not impelled among other considerations by the desire of the army to recover its former influence and prestige. What has happened before can happen again. Throughout Japanese history the pendulum has swung to and fro between aggressive and peace-seeking policies and action.

Furthermore, ever since the Manchuria venture, and especially since the commencement of the China War in 1937, the Japanese people have suffered acutely. Living conditions have become harder; the standard of living has steadily deteriorated, and periodically Japanese families have received from overseas in ever-increasing numbers the little white boxes containing the ashes of their loved ones. They are taught the glories of such sacrifice, but human nature and human sorrow are fundamentally much the same everywhere. Weariness of war is just as current among the Japanese as among any other people.

It is my belief that when Japan's war with the United Nations is over, even in their defeat, the great majority of the Japanese people will give a sigh of profound relief and will welcome a new orientation and outlook

so long as they are not deprived of the hope of better things to come.

Just as we must not deny to ourselves hope of better things to come, so we must not deny them, or anyone else, that hope. I have no sympathy whatever with those who hold, as some people do hold, that before we can find permanent peace in the Orient, the Japanese common people will have to be decimated. Man for man, the Japanese people at home in their own land are not inherently the wolves in human form which some of our own people who do not know them believe. Once caught in the military machine they are taught brutality, cruelty, trickery, and ruthlessness as a matter of high strategy—in the mistaken belief of their leaders that these things will break the morale of their enemies and lead to victory. Little do those Japanese leaders seem to realize that such methods of warfare have an effect precisely the reverse of that intended. The Japanese people are going to learn to their sorrow that crime and brutality do not pay, and once they have learned that lesson, the finer qualities which I know that many of them possess will have opportunity to come to the fore. The Japanese in their own Japan are naturally a thrifty, hard-working, progressive people with great recuperative powers. Throughout their history they have become inured to and have surmounted great disasters—disasters wreaked by fire and flood, by earthquake and typhoon. Given the opportunity, they will likewise overcome the ravages of war, even with their substance spent and their cities destroyed. Those recuperative powers must be wisely directed into the healthy channels of peaceful economic and cultural pursuits and away, forever, from military enterprise.

But many difficult problems will confront us in the post-war settlement with Japan, problems of industry, commerce, agriculture and finance, of education and government. We are already preparing against the day when those problems will arise but the time has not yet come when their solution can be decided upon in detail. As a fundamental conception I personally believe that the healthy growth, wisely guided in its initial stages, will have to come, through re-education, from within. If an ancient tree is torn up by the roots and remodeled, it will not live, but if the healthy trunk and roots remain, the branches and foliage can, with care achieve regeneration. Whatever is found to be healthy in the Japanese body politic should be preserved; the rotten branches must be ruthlessly cut away.

Only skilled hands should be permitted to deal with that eventual problem upon the happy solution of which so very much in the shaping of our post-war world will depend.

But first of all, let us get on with the war, in the winning of which every one of us has his or her part to play. It is a hard war; it may be a long war. But it is our war—yours and mine—and the maximum effort of all of us is needed for ultimate victory. In this War-bond drive let us show our own fighting spirit.

Put Professors in the Right Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle:

PUT RIGHT PROFESSORS IN THE RIGHT PLACES

(By Chester Rowell)

There has been so much howl against professors that it is perhaps time for somebody who once suffered under that stigma himself to put in a word for them.

To be sure, I was starved out of the profession 45 years ago, as my father had been some 40 years earlier, and I have spent much of my life since then where I had to meet pay rolls (and did, with some success), so perhaps I can qualify by the now proclaimed standard. After all, what else need a man know, especially about the governmental responsibility entrusted to him, provided his pay rolls have been met!

The trouble, after all, is not so much that the victims of the prevalent grillings are professors, as that they are the wrong professors, or in the wrong places. It is not even that they are theorists. Theorists are exactly what their critics want—but theorists on their side.

There are no more theory-minded men on earth than some of our business ultra-conservatives. They do not even need to study their subjects, as the professor unfortunately has to do. They know their creed to begin with and use facts, arguments, and slogans to put it across. Is not that the most direct way to get what you want? And is not getting what you want the supreme end of endeavor? Certainly it meets the pay-roll test.

A lot of these professors, to be sure, are experts in one thing and have been put in charge of another. Or they are professors of the right thing but are precisely the last ones that the other professors would have chosen. Some of them are charged with a wicked conspiracy to undermine the whole system of private business and property. To the end that Government shall own and operate everything socialistically, but with them. Put in others whose sole purpose is to get the Government out of business and leave it wholly to private owners.

There must be practical exceptions, to be sure, for each particular group which wants the Government to go, are the way in helping it. And there must be hands off her competitive system, except that each particular group shall be free to combine to squeeze out competitors in its own line. But that is theory. The trouble with the professors is that sometimes they annoyingly point out such things, which is not good for the confidence of the people, so desirable to business.

Of course, this is only the most extreme attitude of theoretical preaching of business, just as the contrary theory, of which it accuses the brain trusters, is also a minority one. Neither is practical, and there should be a clearing out of both from Government. Probably there won't be, and this is a justified complaint.

However, we see veteran business executives going to the Stanford School of Business Administration, there to learn from professors (some of whom have met pay rolls themselves in business) the things they need to know for the enlarged business responsibilities to which they are being called. We see universities being transformed everywhere, to train for administrative service in the Army, in Government, and in a multitude of the most practical arts, from buying and delivering food to devising the weapons that are winning the war, saving the lives and health of soldiers and equipping administrators for the sure emergencies of peace.

These are the most "practical" things we are doing to win the war, and we are conscripting for professors to do it—we are even finding that the most recondite subjects, higher mathematics, subatomic physics, and the harnessing of the mysteries of radiation are the most urgently "practical" subjects of all.

We even accept this dependence on professors in all subjects but one. Physicists who talk a language we cannot understand are trusted with our physical problems. The research that has revolutionized the care of health is welcomed, provided it does not touch the taboo of how the physician in civil practice gets his pay, and so on.

But had not the economist to face economic problems—he might be a "theorist" who knows that we cannot sell to those from whom we will not buy. Not the "theorist" who knows that you cannot prevent inflation by more money to your particular group. Not anybody with a scientific knowledge of her sciences of life and society. They might floor us with some facts which our slogans could not undo.

They have, to be sure, too many of the wrong sort of professors. Also, too many of the wrong sort of dollar-a-year "practical" men.

The remedy is to get rid of these.

The other is to bring in the right sort—a lot of them professors.

Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the American Bar Association on Thursday, August 26, 1943, at Chicago, Ill.:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I deem it an honor and a great privilege to be invited to address this distinguished gathering of the leaders of the American bar. I cannot deny that it was with considerable trepidation that I accepted the invitation to come here today, realizing as I do that I am exposing to you and to the world how very limited is the knowledge and the wisdom of a freshman Congressman.

Your president requested in his invitation that I present to you this morning some of my thoughts concerning the proper relations of this Nation with the other nations of the world. I do not have the temerity to express these thoughts as being those of an experienced international lawyer. I thought, however, that coming from a Representative of an agricultural district, of which there are many in Congress, they might be of interest to you as an indication of what the common citizens of this country are thinking about the war and what we should do about it.

Many of us feel in our bones, so to speak, if not in our heads, that if we are to survive in this world as a republic of freemen, we must do something about recurrent total wars. We feel that we are sacrificing our finest boys and expending our material wealth and resources for something we do not quite understand. We know that we must do it, yet we want so very much to understand why we must do it, and what is to be gained by our sacrifices and how we may avoid in the future the necessity of such senseless destruction and suffering.

The obvious answer to why we must fight now is that we were attacked and must defend ourselves. But why were we attacked at this particular time? Many abstruse and

learned volumes have been written on the causes of the war, but if any single circumstance can be said to have caused this war, I think that Hitler's belief that his opponents would follow the "one by one" road to destruction would head the list. In spite of all the alleged social, ideological, or economic causes of war, I think the decisive cause is the conviction of the aggressor that he can win. The principal consideration in the German mind in arriving at this conviction in 1939 was, I am sure, the each-for-himself, the one-by-one, isolationist philosophy of the United States and the other non-Axis countries. These sovereign nations attempted to deny the essential interdependence of nations. Hitler, relying upon our Neutrality Act and a pact with Russia, sought to apply the old principle that "Ten men can overcome a thousand if each of the thousand says: 'I will fight for myself alone; I will not cooperate with the others,'" in which case the 10 do not face a thousand, but face only 1—1 at a time. It makes one shudder to think how close to complete success Hitler came after the fall of France. From such a demonstration surely we now recognize that individual defense is in the long run a physical impossibility and, therefore, that our only hope for security is in collective action.

If it is true that the decisive cause of this war was Hitler's belief that the United Nations would not unite as they have done, but would go down to defeat one by one, then the answer to what we may gain from this war should be clear. We shall have acquired the experience and knowledge by which we may prevent, or at least make less frequent, the recurrence of these appalling tragedies. The immediate fruit of our victory will be the prevention of our enslavement by the Nazi and the Japs, a vastly important, but somewhat negative benefit. Since, however, we do not desire the conquest of large territories, the only great and positive good that we can hope to achieve from our victory is the assurance of a peaceful world in which man's energy and genius may be devoted to creative and beneficial, rather than to destructive and savage, enterprises.

I believe that our recent experiences and the history of government over the centuries, which is largely the chronicle of man's efforts to achieve freedom by the control of arbitrary force, indicate that only by the collective action of a dominant group can security be attained. It was in this belief that I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 25, which is, as a matter of fact, the real reason why I am here today. Before I read the resolution, may I say that perhaps the most significant thing about it is the fact that it originated in the House of Representatives and is, at the moment, a nonpartisan measure. Both are important. Our foreign policy must be consistent, and must not be a partisan affair shifting with every election. Further, since the House of Representatives is at all times more nearly reflective of the will of the people than any other body, it should play a part in the formation of fundamental policy. Only with congressional sanction can the other nations of the world rely with assurance upon commitments of our Executive. The adoption of this resolution by the House and the Senate will create a precedent for the further participation by the House of Representatives in the matter of foreign policy, and give that policy stability and force.

This resolution reads as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring the participation by the United States therein."

This simple statement is, I believe, the first step in the development of a foreign policy which should enable us to achieve a greater degree of security than we have hitherto had. It tells the world that the United States recognizes that any organization for peace must be based upon power adequate to enforce peace, and that the United States will share both in supplying that power and in the responsibility for the exercise of that power. One may say that this is a commitment that this Nation undertakes to participate with the other nations of the world in a genuine and bona fide effort to find some reasonable means to solve the international disputes by methods other than by war.

Much has been said about a provision for the use of force. The words "power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace" not only envisage the use of some kind of force, but may also include the power, if necessary, to control the productive capacity of instruments of aggressive warfare. The traditional "police force" which disturbs so many people may not be nearly so important as control of strategic materials and productive capacity.

A FIRST STEP

This commitment to participate is, of course, only the first small step in the process of creating a system of international relations that makes sense. Some people have been misled by the false impression that our own Constitution was suddenly, as if by magic, produced from the minds of our founding fathers. Nothing could be further from the truth. Rather than being a document of original principles or ideas, it was more in the nature of a codification of principles and institutions of human freedom which had been evolving through countless centuries. Millions of brave men and women, of many lands, had sacrificed their fortunes and their lives in the struggle for human freedom which that instrument so beautifully and so perfectly described and established in this great continent. It is important to remember that institutions and principles for the government of men, whether they be of morals, economics, or politics, do not spring full-blown from the minds of mortals. They evolve, and all too slowly, but in the evolutionary process they acquire validity and stability. With this in mind, it seems to me that, in venturing into the uncharted realm of international controls, it would be a mistake to attempt a complete blueprint which, I am confident, would sooner or later prove too restrictive and perhaps fatally so. The first step, therefore, should be the adoption of broad and basic principles. After that step is taken, then may we consider the succeeding moves to be made.

It might be more helpful to our purpose to discuss some of the things this resolution does not contemplate. Many opponents of collective security seek to confuse the issues by proclaiming at length that we do not want an international W. P. A. The question of relief and rehabilitation has little to do with the formulation of a foreign policy or the creation of machinery to keep the peace. It may be that relief in the form of food or other goods has a place in military operations in occupied countries or in the settlement of this particular war. But this war is but a tragic and horrible episode which one of these days must end. A proper foreign policy, together with the machinery to keep the peace, is continuing in its nature; it does not consist of sporadic instances of emotional altruism or niggardly selfishness. To be successful it will require the assiduous daily attention of the best brains of our country. It is brains and leadership that we must supply and not gifts of bread and milk and money and oil. It is not contemplated that we, the people of the United States, are to give our goods to others, that we are to raise the standards of living of the peoples of the world, or even to give them all a free and democratic government. If we can contribute leadership and our fair share of the force found necessary to make an international system of control effective, that is all the world can or should expect. As a matter of fact, if these total wars can be prevented for a reasonable length of time, most of the peoples of the world probably can work out their own economic and political salvation.

Participation by this Nation in a system designed to prevent war is inspired and justified primarily by the desire to preserve that integrity and freedom of the individual which is the great distinction of our Nation. It is, of course, true that in saving our own freedom we will inevitably benefit other peoples of the world. But surely we will not refuse to save ourselves simply because in doing so we may help save others.

SOVEREIGNTY

Another shrewd, but no less false and emotional, flank attack on the proposal for collective security is the cry that we must never sacrifice our sovereignty. The professional patriots beat their breasts and wave the flag and shout "sovereignty," hoping thereby to frighten us, like sheep, back into the corral of isolationism. In the minds of many the word "sovereignty" has some mystical connotation in some way associated with divinity. In days gone by when men were slaves, their masters imposed their will by an appeal to the divine right of kings. "Your sovereign by appointment from the all highest" was the doctrine. By some peculiar quirk, today in this Republic men talk as if the Federal Government, even if it is made up of bureaucrats, is a sovereign body, above and apart from the people. Of course it is not. If sovereignty means anything and resides anywhere, it means control over our own affairs and resides in the people. The people, according to our republican principles, are sovereign. They may delegate all, or any part, of the power to manage their affairs to any agency they please. So far they have delegated part to their city government, part to the county, part to the State, and part to the Federal Government. We may recall that, under the Articles of Confederation, in 1781, our people delegated certain limited powers to the central government. When these powers proved inadequate, for the purpose of preserving order and tranquillity, further powers were delegated under the Constitution in 1787. Does it make sense to say that in creating the Constitution and establishing order our people sacrificed their sovereignty? On the contrary, they acquired through that delegation the means of preserving order and their individual freedom.

Certainly it cannot be denied that twice within 25 years we have been forced, against our will, into wars which have seriously threatened our free existence. To this extent the supreme control over our affairs—over our destiny—is at present incomplete. Our sovereignty is imperfect. Therefore, if we can remedy this defect, by a delegation of limited power to an agency designed to prevent war, in which we participate fully and equally with others, how can this be called a sacrifice—a giving up of anything? Rather, I should say, it is the acquisition of something infinitely precious to civilized man.

I realize, of course, that international lawyers and professional diplomats may be shocked by this unorthodox and perhaps rustic conception of sovereignty. I know that the textbooks and the authorities say that a nation must be legally free to determine its relations with other countries to be sovereign and independent. But these academic concepts have lost much of their force in the light of present circumstances. France, Poland, Belgium, and Holland, according to the books, were, and still may be,

sovereign nations, but I wonder how much comfort that is to the starving citizens of those nations. To argue about or to insist upon the preservation of sovereignty in its strict legalistic sense is reminiscent of the medieval treatises of the monks on how many angels can sit upon the point of a needle. Bitter experience has shown us that traditional national sovereignty as a foundation for international relations is a death trap. Nations, as well as men, in this modern world of swift transportation and instantaneous communication, are interdependent; their fate is inextricably interwoven, whether we like it or not. Until we recognize this basic fact of the modern world, we can make no progress toward the prevention of war—the greatest affliction of our civilization.

In an appeal to prejudice and emotion, the devotees of the status quo attempt to scare us by saying we would be turning over the control of our country to the Communists or, as some would say, to those clever British. This is, of course, rank nonsense. We will have our own representatives who can be relied upon to safeguard our interests. It may have been excusable during the youth of our country to assume that these "furriners," as Gene Talmadge might say, would outsmart us. But surely today, having proved our capacity in so many ways, we are not going to insist that we are too stupid to participate with the other civilized peoples of the earth in a common undertaking. It is true, of course, that since this Nation has outgrown its swaddling clothes and must now play a man's part in the world, it should find the means to induce its men of wisdom and understanding into its public service, for too long already have we looked upon public service as a place for the unscrupulous or the incompetent. The rewards of wealth, power, and especially honor have been reserved for our successful industrialists, scientists, movie actors, and entertainers. How many times have we all heard our best citizens say, "I simply cannot afford to give up my practice or my business to run for Congress, or to go to Washington in a department at eight to ten thousand a year"? The plain fact is that we can no longer afford not to have our wisest men in, for all of us, the most important business in the world. Not even the Germans, with all their ingenuity in developing ersatz food, clothing, and fuel, have been able to find a substitute for brains and judgment. I think it is safe to say that it is this shortage that will account for the destruction of that country.

Many of our people, both in and out of Congress, have a natural fear of the unfamiliar. Having had little to do with the other peoples of the world, they cannot believe that most of them, especially those of the United Nations, are quite like us in their instincts, their desires, their hopes and their fears. We have built up, through the years of our isolation from the world, a suspicion and distrust of practically all the peoples of Europe and Asia; and we cannot believe that those peoples want peace and security as much as we do.

It is only natural, therefore, that, before accepting even a simple declaration of policy, such as this resolution embodies, our people insist upon asking, "Where do we go from here?" They want to know exactly what is to be done, what kind of organization we are to have, how the power is to be distributed, how much it will cost us, what all the risks are. In a few words they want a blueprint of the whole thing before making any commitment at all.

Upon reflection it is clear that this cannot be done. This is not a unilateral undertaking for us alone to plan. In its essence it is cooperative, and no man or nation alone can say exactly what shall be done. To describe how or where we go after we decide to assume our share of the responsibility for the solution of international problems should not and cannot be the specification of plans and blueprints. It is rather the description of a course of action, a continuing, day-to-day process of working with other peoples—peoples, it is true, who differ from us superficially, and who may compete with us for the goods of this earth, but who, basically, do not desire war any more than we do. No man can say at this time what can or what cannot be done in cooperation with other nations because we have never tried it. On the other hand, we do know, only too well, the cost of noncooperation.

In the absence of a definite congressional declaration, it is probably premature and unwise to attempt a further description of where we go from here or of the process of building a peace. Nevertheless, I shall venture a few suggestions.

The creation of machinery to maintain order should not be burdened with the difficult, controversial problems arising from this war. In other words, the peace treaty concluding this war should not undertake to provide for the development of cooperative security. The failure of the Versailles Treaty is a case in point. We should not permit such questions as the Russian-Polish border, or the fate of Latvia, of Tripoli to endanger the primary and essential goal, which is the prevention of war in the future by collective action. I think, therefore, that, as soon as we accept the principle of participation, immediately we should proceed to participate by direct negotiations with our principal allies in an effort to find a basis and method of permanent united action. As soon as any methods or procedures are tentatively agreed upon, they should then be submitted to the Congress for approval. It is probable that a series of agreements will evolve in the course of the development of a workable system. The scope of these agreements should not be restricted by an inflexible blueprint hastily adopted at the peace table.

As a matter of fact, where we go from here depends upon how intelligent we are, and how successful we are in getting wise men to lead us. Our leaders must have vigor and they must have confidence in our power and in the fundamental rightness of our democratic principles. For 10 years—yes, for 25 years—we have been timid, cautious, compromising, and undecided in our attitude toward the rest of the world. We have not stood for anything positively and affirmatively. We have had a negative fearfulness that we might become involved in a struggle in which our very freedom was at stake, and for years we shrank from lending a hand. We can thank the Japs for making the decision for us; otherwise, even yet, we might be hesitating while freedom and the dignity of man were eliminated from this earth.

We must have a policy, and we must have leaders who make decisions according to principles in which we believe and not according to volatile and transitory emotions or nearsighted expediency. One of the principal values of a clear-cut policy is that it enables us to distinguish our friends from our enemies, to determine which course of action is for our own self-interest, and to avoid the indecision which led many of our people to believe that we could do business with Hitler, or that we could exist as a free people in a Nazi-dominated world. Charity, prejudice, sympathy, or expediency should not be the basis of a foreign policy. It must be built upon a profound evaluation of self-interest, of economics, of physical power, of geographic relations, and of fundamental human desires. These matters cannot be blueprinted, but surely men exist who understand their significance.

Such men are the principal contribution we can, and must, make to the future welfare of this Nation. Such men, I believe, are to be found in this body of trained lawyers. You who understand the evolutionary process of democratic constitutional government, you must help this Nation assume its proper role in the world and you must lend your talents so that this process may be fruitful. You men who understand the art of government and appreciate the psychology of human relations must take the lead in building the peace. I have heard the analogy of an architect, of an engineer used with regard to the building of a peace. But lawyers know that in dealing with human relations that analogy is not applicable. Men are not stones or brick or steel to be handled with precision and finality. We cannot build a peace like we do an Empire State building and go off and admire it, sure that it will be there on the morrow. Political institutions, like human beings or growing plants, must be constantly cultivated or they will wither and die. They are living organisms, not structures of steel and stone.

We read much about the danger of socialism and communism in this country. But why should we be so frightened. Have we no faith in the inherent merit of our republican, capitalistic system? I think our system can hold its own with any in its ability to bring the greatest good to the greatest number, which is the final justification for any government. But no system is automatic. It can be no better in the long run than the men who direct it. Too often do we criticize it and too seldom are we willing to participate in it. While I have little faith in blueprints, I do have great faith in the ability of our people to rise to great emergencies. The fundamental superiority of democracy is that it is fluid, that great men can in a crisis rise to the top, that from the lower strata a revivifying surge of new and virile blood can, like cream in a separator, flow out the top when the body is sufficiently agitated.

In spite of the numerous objections to participation by this country in a system of mutual security, I believe that our chances of success now are excellent. The very fact that our failure to participate in 1919 has resulted in this present war is in itself reason to hope that we may be wiser this time. Having tried and found wanting the policy of isolation during these last 25 years, I cannot believe that our people will make the same mistake a second time.

Further, I think we may find cause for hope in the long-time history of man's effort to bring order into his turbulent life. The history of government tells us that through the centuries there has been a gradual growth in the size of the unit of government. From the early family and tribal units we have progressed through the various stages of cities, states, and nations. Probably the most compelling reason for this development was the desire of the peoples to substitute law and order for the physical strife that so often occurred among these groups. This development has decreased the number of disputes and battles but, on the other hand, has vastly increased the intensity and destruction of the wars. With the tremendous increase in power and mobility resulting from modern science, we have created a force that threatens to destroy us. The art of government has not kept pace with the physical sciences. But the lesson of history is that the unit of government will in time proceed to the international level. The question is: Do we have the intelligence to do it now or must we wait one hundred or five hundred years to achieve that goal?

In conclusion, I think this war has definitely demonstrated the futility of Maginot lines and defensive armaments, as well as neutrality acts and isolation as methods of discouraging aggression. With modern weapons of warfare, the advantage is always with the aggressor who has the initiative in the first instance. This being true, the

only alternative I can think of as a means to physical security is concerted or cooperative action by a dominant group. We recognized centuries ago that an individual can have no security of person no matter how heavily armed he might be and, therefore, we created a Government with power to give us cooperative protection. Nations, as well as individuals, are inescapably interdependent for security, as well as for many the other values which constitute a civilized way of life. The rapid progress of the war toward victory presses us for a decision. Already we have shown indecision in our political strategy in Africa and Italy, and Russia within the week gives evidence of dissatisfaction. I can think of nothing that would do more to strengthen the determination of our allies and insure the fruits of victory than a positive declaration by the United States and by all the United Nations that this time we intend to work together, in peace as well as in war, to destroy the ruthless and savage forces of aggression.

In 1919, honorable, but misguided men, jealous of their personal prerogatives and distrustful of a new idea, defeated our first opportunity to create order in the world. It is obvious that similar men will oppose our efforts now; not directly, but just as they did in 1919, by indirection and pretense, by reservations and restrictions, but largely by an appeal to the emotions and prejudices which all too often overcome our intelligence. Nevertheless, I am confident that we now have a Senate and a House of Representatives of intelligence and understanding, determined to rise above personal or party interests in their consideration of this vital question. In this, our second opportunity, may God grant us wisdom.

The Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Mr. E. O. Taulbee of Bay City, Tex., president of the Lower Colorado River Flood Control Association, at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, held at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943:

President Holland, Colonel Miller, and members of the association: Many years ago officials and members of the Texas-Louisiana Intracoastal Canal Association, proposed in connection with the great waterway which has now been completed to Corpus Christi, that the larger streams in Texas, and the bayous in Louisiana, be developed for flood control, soil conservation, and navigation.

In line with this proposal, at the suggestion of our fine Congressman, the Honorable J. J. MANSFIELD, we started a movement to develop for these purposes the lower Colorado River in Texas. Surveys were made by the State Reclamation Department of Texas, by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and later, the final studies were made by the engineers of the War Department.

The status of this project today is that the Mansfield Dam above Austin has been completed at a cost of $26,000,000. This will satisfactorily control floodwaters originating in the Concho, the Pedernales, and Llano Rivers. Many destructive floods have originated below the site of the Mansfield Dam. The engineers proposed special flood works at La Grange, Columbus, Wharton, and Matagorda. They recommended also a parallel levee system near the town of Eagle Lake in Colorado County to the town of Matagorda. The project has been authorized by Congress and would no doubt have been under construction had it not been for the World War.

In addition to these works, and important, Congressman MANSFIELD has had the War Department assume the maintenance of the delta section between Matagorda and the Gulf of Mexico. The cost of this congressionally adopted project for levee protection and special flood works is estimated at $6,700,000. Work will shortly begin on redredging the channel through the Delta, and the guard locks at Matagorda are nearing completion. Both will facilitate the movement of flood waters into the Gulf of Mexico. It is the considered opinion of competent engineers, and waterway proponents, that the lower Colorado River will have the most efficient system of floor control of any stream in America.

The Colorado River, a 900-mile stream originating in New Mexico, is one of the most destructive streams in America; and for the period of time for which the War Department has kept a record, the annual damage has been more than $5,000,000. The estimated cost, as against benefits, completely justify the construction which has now been adopted by Congress.

Congressman MANSFIELD also proposed navigation projects for the lower section of the Colorado River, because of the enormous quantities of heavy, bulky freight which would naturally move through such waterway. There are more than 30 producing oil fields in the three lower counties on the river, and the potential production is enormous. Oil naturally seeks water transportation. Agricultural products would provide important commerce.

Navigation has been authorized by Congress to a point near Bay City, at an estimated cost of $540,000, and a project is being studied to continue the navigation to the city of Wharton. A navigation project on the Bernard River is now under construction, which will serve an enormous production of oil and sulfur. Navigation on the major streams of Texas will serve as important feeders to the Intracoastal Waterway, which is already being widened and deepened to accommodate the indicated traffic.

We are indeed proud of the part the War Department engineers have had in the study of these projects. This organization, more than a hundred years old, has never been We are assured that when they make a recomjustly criticized in any of their activities. mendation that it is fully justified, and when they construct a project we have the same assurance that it will be constructed in the most capable and efficient manner. We are glad indeed that the construction of the important projects on the lower Colorado River will be under their supervision and constructed with their usual efficiency. Possibly this and more money could have been spent on the flood-control and navigation projects on the lower river, by political and bureaucratic engineers, on flood control which possibly would not control, and on navigation which would not permit of navigation.

We are greatly pleased with the progress on the lower Colorado River projects, and must say frankly that this accomplishment has been due to the fine service of one of the greatest statesmen in America, the Hon. J. J. MANSFIELD. He it was who made possible the great dam above Austin which in appreciation of his services was named the Mansfield Dam. His honesty, his ability, and the high regard in which he is held in Washington, have no doubt made possible this constructive effort for the improvement of the lower Colorado River.

I have on many occasions been permitted to learn of the regard, and almost reverent affection, his colleagues in Washington have for this good man. A few years ago I stood in the lobby of the Naval Hospital in Washington, in which Congressmen MANSFIELD was confined, and heard one of his colleagues pay a great tribute to him. He expressed the opinion that we in Texas probably did not appreciate the services of our Congressman as we should. A contributing factor to the love and affection which Congressman MANSFIELD'S fellow Congressmen have for him, he stated, was the known fact that when Judge MANSFIELD gave a promise he always kept it, and that he was America's Congressman as well as a representative of the State of Texas.

Undoubtedly the effectiveness of a Member of Congress is regulated to a great extent by the regard other Members have for him, and Congressman MANSFIELD'S successful acomplishments in the past 27 years are no doubt due in part to the regard in which he is held by other Members of Congress.

We are encouraged by the hope that Judge MANSFIELD will continue to serve us until the great projects such as ours, which he instituted, have become a constructed fact.

Only Then We Shall Be Able to Say: "Our Hands Have Not Shed This Blood"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of September 7, 1943:

ONLY THEN WE SHALL BE ABLE TO SAY: "OUR HANDS HAVE NOT SHED THIS BLOOD."—DEUTERONOMY 21: 7

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE BRITISH PRIME MINISTER

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE TO SAVE THE JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE,
New York, N. Y., September 5, 1943.

To His Excellency Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, and to the Right Honorable Winston S. Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The White House, Washington, D. C.

SIRS: Seven months have gone by since I addressed "An appeal to the conscience of Humanity" on the occasion of your historic meeting in Casablanca, where the era of offensive warfare of the United Nations was inaugurated. If I venture to write again on the same subject, I do so by order of a high command that comes from the death agony of a people. As then, 7 months ago, Jewish human beings, men, women, and children, are being massacred day in, day out, in those somber regions of eastern Europe where the Germans are seeking to wipe out the name of humanity with its own blood.

Your words, sirs, that the wrongs suffered by the Jewish people will be set aright and that their tormentors will be punished after

the war, have not made the least impression on the brown marauders. The Germans go on with the killing of Jews relentlessly, and with no sign of remorse or fear of reprisal. It is as if you had not spoken at all. Hitler's gruesome decision to make Europe Judenrein, whether Germany wins or loses the war, is carried out with unflinching resolution.

A few weeks ago, in the ghetto of Warsaw, where 35,000 Jews remained out of a population of half a million, the survivors fought with bare hands against the steel engines of war of the Gestapo and the Schutz Staffeln. For 10 days the battle raged in the alleys, in the cellars and on the roofs; starving, ragged, unarmed men, women, and children against the brutes of the "new order" equipped with every deadly weapon devised by modern science. When the cobblestones of that walled-in enclosure ran red with the blood of the slain, a last handful of Jews sought shelter in a synagogue against a detachment of Elite Guards of 500 which had been detailed to wipe out the last pocket of Jewish resistance.

Artillery was brought to bear on the doors of the place of worship and soon the butchers streamed in through the breach in the wall. Inside, we know from the one man who came through the frightful carnage that followed, but who, unable to bear the memory of the spectacle, committed suicide subsequently, inside a strange sight met the eyes of the Germans: grouped around the rabbi in the sanctuary stood 50 or 60 Jews, old men and young, women, boys, and girls.

It was the hour of sunset, when the Jews since time immemorial recite the Schma Israel: Hear, O Israel, the Lord Our God, the Lord is One. From outside came the cries of anguish and the moans of the wounded who were being finished off by the daggers of the heroes of Lidice and Rotterdam.

For an instant the Storm Troopers hesitated as the small group repeated the eternal words. Then a volley of hand grenades burst in the midst of the worshipers. The Jews fell as if a volcano had erupted under their feet. Only the rabbi, a venerable patriarch of 87, still stood erect. In his hands he held the Scroll of the law with those Ten Commandments to which the President made reference in his address the other day before the Parliament of Canada. Another bomb was flung. It set the rabbi's clothing on fire. The law of God flamed in his hands as he fell.

That night there was peace in the ghetto: the last Jews of Warsaw had been killed. Nazis went around with torches in the streets and burned the faces of the slain to make sure they were dead.

The killing continues! Each day new batches of Jews are slaughtered. Only recently we learned of a group of Netherlands Jews having been sent to the human abattoirs which the Nazis have set up in Poland. A group of French Jews numbering several thousands followed. Now, apparently, the turn has come for the Jews of Denmark.

If that evil man in Berlin should tomorrow announce that he is going to make Europe Bulgarenrein as he once promised to make Europe Judenrein and if he began carrying the blood purge of the Bulgarians into effect, and if the Governments of Great Britain and America warned him then that for every Bulgarian slain they would exact the lives of 10 Germans, the Nazis, I venture to say, would desist at once.

The Bulgarians are not our allies, but the Jews are. In the interest of saving Jewish lives no such definite and specific warning has ever been given to Germany. No other people of Europe has suffered as the Jews. Against no other people a decree of extermination was issued and on no other people so high a percentage has been slain. The Jews have 2,000,000 dead.

His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury asked in the House of Lords recently if "nothing then, really nothing" could be done by the United Nations about this the greatest and most fiendish crime of history and the Most Reverend Primate warned with solemn and prophetic gravity that in the matter of the persecution of the Jews Great Britain stands before the bar of history, of humanity, and of God.

Indeed, the universal conscience has an open eye. These things are not done with impunity.

The more one admires Britain and the British people, the more one feels his heart shrink when it is seen that, precisely in the hour when the Jewish people are systematically exterminated, the ancient homeland of the Jews which is under British mandate is closed even to those men and women who by almost superhuman efforts succeed in escaping from the Nazi hell. The immigration policy of Palestine operates even now in accordance with the terms of that White Paper of which Mr. Churchill said at the time of its forced passage through Parliament that it was "a plain breach of promise" and "a repudiation of the mandate." * * * He asked if the British Government was "too weak to carry out its obligations and wish to file a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy."

That was in 1939. Since that time Germany's design to cut the British Empire in twain by the drive on the Suez Canal has been foiled by the brilliant victories of General Montgomery and the Eighth Army. In this triumph Jewish Palestine played a not insignificant part by its amazing industrial development and its fighting manpower. The threat to the Near East has been removed. Yet still the doors of Palestine remain shut. Foreign princes, who stood cautiously aside while the Empire's fate hung in the balance and while Jews fought in their tens of thousands on Britain's side, are now allowed to broadcast to the world from Cairo that they oppose the opening of the doors of the national homeland to Jewish men and women.

Sirs, this is an injustice the gravity of which is not diminished by the greatest of the nation which commits it. To cover this cruelty with silence is to condone it and to share in the responsibility.

Your exalted mission is not one of destruction alone. It is also one of civilization. You are to blot out the evil past and to regenerate the present. You are worthy, as the leaders of the two great Anglo-Saxon peoples, to make the voice of humanity heard. Great solutions are near. We are passing through one of those epochs when history advances with the stride of giants. In Europe the heavens are beginning to glow. Light comes after the long nights of darkness and horror.

Do not turn your eyes away in this hour from the agony of Israel.

We hear it said on all sides that nothing can be done for the Jewish people until after the war.

This is not true.

Our present silence is growing audible in Berlin. For us to say that we will do our best to find a solution for the Jewish question after the war is a mockery and only evokes laughter in hell.

Are the United Nations so weak that they cannot even now make one effort to save the remnants of that harassed and tortured nation? Must we give in and resign ourselves to an irreparable disaster without at least accepting battle? This has not been the practice of Anglo-Saxons in other fields.

In the hour of victory that is surely coming, the grandeur of the United Nations will be for each to be crowned with the freedom of others. Is the Jewish people to be excluded by reason of it having ceased to exist?

One word, sirs, from you, especially to the leaders of some of Germany's satellite powers, at this time when the fortunes of the Axis are in rapid decline, would be sufficient to stop the horrible deportations which they carry out at Germany's demands.

For every conceivable purpose agencies and commissions are appointed and created. Only last week an agency was set up whose task it is to safeguard and preserve the art treasures in the occupied countries of Europe which are soon to be turned into battlefields.

There is no agency to establish, investigate, and devise means to remedy the condition of the four or five million Jewish Europeans who are still alive. There is, in fact, not one single official appointed to look into that problem.

After so long and strange an inactivity what less could be done for a whole people in agony and torture than to appoint a few men, with compassion in their hearts and knowledge and experience, for the task of saving countless human lives.

Set up an Anglo-American intergovernmental agency with powers and prerogatives to act immediately and on a large scale for the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

I am sure that such an agency will bring humanity nearer to a solution that will forever end the scandal of Christendom of an ancient and great people being driven forth to haunt the corridors of time as ghosts and beggars and to wander about as waifs in every storm that blows.

Open the doors of the Holy Land to its children!

In this exalted hour, when the victorious American and British Armies are battling on the Continent of Europe and the onslaught of the United Nations is proving irresistible, I appeal to you, Mr. President and Mr. Prime Minister, to lead the moral offensive against this cold-blooded massacre as you have led the military offensive against brutal aggression.

Only then we shall be able to say "Our hands have not shed this blood."

PIERRE VAN PAASSEN.

Congress' War Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron Beacon-Journal of September 14, 1943:

CONGRESS' WAR JOB

Congress returns to work today to tackle the greatest and most important assignments ever handed the legislative bodies.

On the war front the representatives of the people must maintain the supply of men and materials necessary to win the war, and must also levy taxes to pay for it.

On the home front they are confronted with the problems of manpower, inflation, domestic shortages, price control, labor legislation, and a dozen other issues that are all political blockbusters.

Theirs is the task, too, of laying the groundwork for peace, of charting, at least in preliminary stages, the future course of the Nation in world affairs. They must look forward to post-war reconversion of industries, rehabilitation of soldiers and civilians.

As each of these issues is brought into the spotlight of discussion it will be analyzed and evaluated. But until the individual merits of the various programs have been thoroughly aired pro and con it is premature to praise or to criticize them.

The important fact that every Congressman should realize is—

This is your war job. The Nation—the soldier abroad and the workers at home—expect you to deliver the goods. The same rules that apply to every war factory also apply to Congress.

Absenteeism cuts production in war plants. It also will impair production in Congress. It's your job to be at your desk, at your committee meetings. The vacation is over.

There isn't time for demagogery and political harangues. The people are more interested in production than in politics. Speeches may look good in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but unless they contribute materially to the topic under discussion, constituents are likely to regard them as wasted effort.

Cooperation is necessary. Compromise may prevent needless delay. The 4-month battle over pay-as-you-go legislation in the last session is an example of refusal of either side to concede. But the ultimate result was a compromise. Meanwhile, other important legislation was postponed.

The administration has given some indication that it will submit proposals to Congress for approval, abandoning, perhaps, its former tactics of demanding enactment of its programs intact or not at all. If the administration is willing to cooperate, Congress can reciprocate to the advantage of the country.

The responsibility resting upon this Congress cannot be minimized. It must keep pace with our fighting armies. The successes abroad must be matched by victories in Washington.

Religion, Labor, and the Common Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, entitled "Religion, Labor, and the Common Good," at mass meeting of religion and labor council, Dayton, Ohio, September 5, 1943:

I want to begin my remarks today with a personal confession. When I received your invitation to address you on this occasion and on this subject, I accepted it with a great deal of humility. When you asked me to talk on religion, labor, and the common good, you were giving a layman a very large order indeed. This triple subject calls for a discussion of theology, economics and their relationship to ethics, subjects upon which wiser men than I have written thousands of books and delivered millions of sermons and lectures. By combining the three in the scope of a single discussion, it seems that you required that I point out, I find, the principle of unity among them; add religion to labor and obtain a sum which we call the common good.

That I possess no high academic degrees in economics and philosophy and have not been ordained to preach, is, however, not the sole reason for my timidity. Every man, whatever his training or vocation in life, is a philosopher and an economist by intellectual and physical necessity, and every man must acquire an idea of the final cause and the ultimate meaning of human existence, whether he be a doctor of philosophy or of divinity, or only a labor skate. Even my circuit-rider father, other-worldly as he was, in the course of providing for a family of five children, had to be an economist of a sort between his sermons.

Humility and doubt are the beginning of wisdom, for the arrogant and the smug learn nothing. These are disquieting times for those who are proud and complacent in their opinions. These are days of uncertainty for even the wisest of us. Civilization seems to have reached in the years of our generation one of those epochal points in its development where many formerly accepted truths and values seem no longer to meet, if you please, the requirements of the common good.

Within the life span of all of us who are in this room, Christians have murdered each other wholesale in two world wars, and we have experienced an interim of a precarious peace, where Christians permitted their brothers to suffer agonies of mass unemployment, to waste and to rot in hunger and disease.

Our generation has lived under economic institutions justified by economic and social theories which just didn't work out for the common good—at least for any sane, common-sense conception of the common good. Through these irrational years we have held formally to an ethical religious system which has had too little practical effect upon a physical environment wherein the masses of mankind have endured lives of terror and suffering and privation.

The universally accepted idea of the common good, the good life, has somehow been divorced from practice in human society; we invoke Deity and call upon human beings to act like human beings and Christians—yet we tolerate, aye, we construct and defend economic and social institutions which seem to require that men must practice deceit and swindle, robbery and pillage, persecution and wholesale murder as a condition of their physical existence.

Do not infer that I am denouncing religion, my friends. What I say is not new, and the situation I describe is not new. If this be an attack upon religion and its concept of the common good, then we might as well expurgate the first chapter of Isaiah from the Old Testament and the Sermon on the Mount from the New.

All over the world the masses of the people are revolting against this insanity, against these cruel and inexplicable contradictions, which deny them not only food but deprives them also of that peace of mind and spirit, which is also necessary to the good life. This revolt has taken numerous forms. There is the revolt against private property and the profit system itself, which occurred in Russia. In Italy and Germany under totalitarian leadership the middle classes and capitalists revolted against the republic and sought solution in a world war of conquest. In this country, among others, we have seen this revolt against this intolerable situation in the New Deal and the tremendous growth of the organized labor movement during the last 10 years. In those countries where social upheavals came, they have in notable instances been attended by antireligious demonstrations, with violence against religious leaders and church property. In our own country, as the labor movement grew, churchmen have been moved to complain of a waning popular interest in religion and its activities.

Although what I have said implies a criticism of our religious leadership and institutions, I am not one of those who in recoiling from the sorry mess society is in, deny God and disavow the basic faith and ethics of Christianity. There are those who assert that religious ideals are nothing and material things are all, and argue that to make man and his society better, we must change the society, alter the environment, and do less preaching. While I agree that religious ideals of progress will not acquire vitality in a social framework of a pig sty, these materialists have never been able to explain whence and how came their ideas which inspire and move them to change the material world for the better. That is a question they cannot answer.

But there is another equally pertinent question that those of us who profess these ideals must answer, and it is this, my friends: Why have not we and our religious institutions been moved to take practical measures to correct this physical environment in which men must sin to avoid starvation? Is there anything in the confession of a faith and an ideal of a better world, the common good, that would disqualify us to work and act to attain it? Can an ideal be so lofty, so fine, so pure, that it would be defiled if we used a spade or a shovel or cast a ballot, or even seized a bayonet to effectuate or defend it? Is religious contemplation only an escape from the sordid, burdensome, and sometimes sacrificial responsibilities of the world?

I know that you of this group here have given an emphatic answer to this question which I have stated in a number of ways. You have answered it just as Jesus Christ answered it, when He drove the moneychangers from the temple, when He healed the bodies of those who were sick as well as preached to them, when He fed the hungry with bread and fish. That is why I feel honored to be with you today.

The common people of the industrialized countries have found in the organized labor movement an instrument for the attainment of this ideal of the common good. While organized labor is a lay movement, the Christian ideal of the common good is implicit in its aim. I do not think that the great body of organized labor in the democracies is atheistic or antireligious in its philosophy. Organized labor merely seeks to be effective in a field of practical material affairs where religious influence as such has not been found adequate. Labor feels that there is no contradiction between a full life for living people and God's fullest blessing, but as a matter of fact, that the first is part of the second.

Labor unions have neglected the religious aspect of their program, I think, for two reasons, because religious leadership has neglected labor's interests, and many workers reciprocate with a similar lack of interest in religious affairs. The average union membership cuts across many sects and creeds. Hence the schooling in religious tolerance which a man receives in the labor movement works against religious education within the unions. Very seldom will a member or officer discuss religious problems in connection with union work and program. This is because none feels qualified to attempt such discussion, fearing he may arouse disruptive sectarian controversy.

A movement such as yours should go far toward bringing the labor movement and religion closer together, laying the basis for cooperation. If religious leaders lend assistance to labor, workers will inevitably take a more lively interest in the churches; if a preacher, a priest, a rabbi, and a Christian Scientist reader can sit down together and work out a nonsectarian religious appeal to labor, there is no reason to believe that religiously inclined laymen in the ranks of labor will not respond.

In both domains of thinking and activity we have much to gain by a closer unity between organized religion and organized labor. The basis of such a unity, which I have mentioned but not described, is not artificial. We find it in a common ethical goal. That goal is described as simple justice among men, and the assertion of the worth and dignity of the individual. Any religion which looks to this goal and teaches this credo is a natural friend and ally of labor.

In claiming this high ethical aim for labor, I do not mean to assert that a man is inherently virtuous because he works for wages and belongs to a union, that he is nobler than other men. Labor as a social movement, its philosophy and its program, is the greatest historical force for progress toward the common good, because by circumstance of the worker's position in the economic scheme of things, it must be so. Historically it is labor, the workers, who have been the unique victims of exploitation and oppression and injustice and wars. It is natural that a class which suffers most from economic exploitation will strive to remove the system of the exploiter; it is inevitable that the oppressed will attain a first conception of freedom and feel an impulse to fight for it, that those who suffer injustice will dream of justice and pursue it, and that those who must fight the wars and pay for them will lead in the fight for decent and a durable peace.

One needs be no romantic friend of the underdog or emotional sympathizer with labor to comprehend the natural logic which allots to the labor movement the leading role in this epochal battle for democracy, of which the vast military operations throughout the world today are but a phase. Labor's social position thrusts upon it the necessity, and out of this necessity has been born the determination and the courage, to win this fight. Any social or political group who may think so superficially as to believe that the Fascist movement, which has spread its blight throughout civilization, can be beaten back and that a democratic peace can be won without fullest utilization of the free labor movements of the world, is making a fatal mistake. Without the democratic participation of labor, physical and moral, the fight to defend and extend democracy will be lost. The statesmen and diplomats of the Allies must not forget that. Our appeasers and compromisers—and there are still many in high places in the democracies—before they undertake to erase labor from the blueprints of victory and the post-war world, will do well to remember that they can't have democracy without democrats.

As I jotted down these thoughts for this Labor Sunday address, I recalled a similar statement as to labor's place in society's design for progress uttered 40 years ago last July 4th by one who was perhaps the greatest humanitarian America has produced in our time, the late Clarence S. Darrow. I knew Mr. Darrow intimately for a great many years, and he sent me a copy of that speech, the rough draft edited in his own handwriting. I was a young man then, but I have cherished that manuscript through all these years. What Darrow said in Youngstown on that Fourth of July is as applicable today as it was 40 years ago, because it expressed with such moving eloquence that spirit of mankind which has been the mainspring of all progress toward the ideal of "liberty, equality, and fraternity," a spirit as young as the great heart and soul of Darrow.

Mr. Darrow professed no religion, but I have a personal, though perhaps unorthodox, faith that when the immortal Darrow comes face to face with a just God, there will be a mutual recognition. I just want to quote you some lines of that Youngstown address:

"The natural resources of the United States may pass into the hands of a few men without altering a line of the written Declaration of Independence or the Constitution that our fathers meant should protect and guarantee liberty and equality to all citizens of the land," Mr. Darrow said, "because with greater liberty has come greater opportunity to amass wealth and exploit the poor and to subjugate the land.

"Against this great centralized power the labor unions have offered almost the only organized resistance, the only substantial protection against the monopolization of the earth.

"Labor has learned that while capital is organized in every branch of activity, while it has taken to itself in a constantly larger way all the natural opportunities from which wealth is created and all the machines by which wealth is made, there is no way to protest its rights except by countercombinations in return.

"Apprehensive people too often forget that excepting for the labor combination there would be no powerful force against wealth and greed. They overlook the fact that the history of trade-unionism has taught that without the organization of the craft, the great body of workmen, divorced from the soil, divorced from their tools, would be the helpless prey of that class of men who recognize no God but gold.

"These great combinations of labor stand for the right of mankind against the power of wealth; they stand for the claim that individuals are more than dollars, that combinations of men are more sacred than volumes of figures representing the clearing houses and the banks."

My friends, we meet here on the eve of the sixty-second annual Labor Day observance in America. We are gathered here at the close of a quarter of a century of democratic frustration and defeat. While democracy, as represented by the labor movement and people of good will, has made important gains in the two great English-speaking nations during this period, these gains must be appraised for what they are: merely local democratic victories in a world-wide counter revolution against democracy.

This is a time when we must look history straight in the eye. We must recognize the fact that the democratic revolution which began in the eighteenth century was stopped in its tracks in the decades following the Napoleonic wars. More than a century has passed and still democracy and its benefits are unknown to a vast majority of the peoples who inhabit the earth.

We must recognize that the First World War was not a war for democracy but essentially one to defend the status quo, which, even in the countries of the so-called Allied democracies, was by no means satisfactory. The peace treaty after the war, and the economic dislocations which resulted from it, aroused the democratic protest of peoples throughout the world. The great democracies did not accept the Christian responsibilities which victory had thrust upon them and go to the defense of oppressed peoples. We stood aside; we maneuvered for advantage in a system of power politics, and permitted large sections of the masses to turn in confusion and desperation to false prophets of fascism. They were betrayed by the faltering representatives of the ideal of the common good. They did not stop with denouncing merely its representatives: They denied democracy itself; they abandoned the ideal; they cursed both God and man—in fact, they went berserk.

On October 22, 1922, just 21 years ago, Mussolini marched on Rome and set the torch to western democracy. In the next decade, while diplomats of the democracies mouthed pious platitudes and cartelized the world, the fire spread to Germany. This anarchy in the west gave the rising power of a feudal barbarism its advantage in the Orient. In 1931 the Japanese war lords invaded Manchuria, and 2 years later their armies had marched into the Province of Jehol, and the conquest and murder of the Chinese people had begun. The democracies stood by.

Two years later, in 1933, Hitler ascended to power in Germany and began his plans for world conquest. On March 7, 1935, he broke the Locarno Pact and marched his legions into the Rhineland. Within less than 2 years the Rome and Berlin Axis was formed. The democracies stood by.

In 1936 Mussolini invaded and overran Ethiopia, while Hitler prepared for the next move in his world-wide program of plunder. The spring of 1938 saw the Nazi invasion of Austria; and in the autumn the world witnessed the rape of Czechoslovakia. The democracies again stood by. They not only stood by—they signed the Munich pact, assenting to their own execution.

September 1, 1939, brought the Nazi invasion of Poland, when, at long last, the scales fell from the eyes of the blind men of Munich.

The World War followed, and in the course of the next 2 years, democracy paid, in defeat after defeat, for the blindness of that pre-Munich leadership. On April 9, 1940, the Nazi war machine rolled over Denmark and Norway, encountering little more than token resistance. In May, the Nazi hordes overran Belgium and Holland and on June 17 invaded France. By June 26, the French armistice had been signed, and the greatest European democracy lay prostrate under the iron heel of the German dictator.

The democracies stood by once again because they had to stand by. Left unprepared both in a military way and ideologically, they were helpless. So 1 year later on June 22, 1941, Hitler marched into Russia, after the invasion of Greece and Yugoslavia, and his successful infiltration into the Balkan countries. The conquest of western Europe was complete. The democracies were helpless because still unprepared.

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, and the United States, which had had its share in this war guilt by default, was at war.

So completely unprepared was our own Nation that during the first year of the war, the Japanese accomplished the conquest of all the Pacific coast lands of Asia and the entire island area south of that continent.

This was the situation toward the close of 1942, and when I said, my friends, that we are now nearing the close of a 25-year period of world-wide democratic retreat I did not exaggerate.

So ineffective were the democracies in their efforts to dam the onrushing current of totalitarian aggression, that the Nazi and Fascist propaganda agencies were able to spread defeatism among us with the very plausible argument that something in the ideolcgical core of democracy itself had destroyed democratic desire for freedom and the ability to fight for it. Democracy as a principle, a way of life, was ridiculed as a decadent ideal, as no longer valid in a modern world.

Events of the last year, however, have given the lie to that charge. In the southwest Pacific the Japanese are in slow retreat, having suffered defeat after defeat, before Australian and American forces. On the Russian front the Nazis are fleeing before the armed might of an aroused Russian people. The last totalitarian soldier has been pushed from the shores of Africa and Sicily, and the democratic invasion of totalitarian Europe is imminent. Mussolini, the first dictator, is out.

When Herr Goebbels and the recent Virginio Gayda challenged the democratic ideal and questioned democracy's vitality and will to survive, and when the Axis Powers put in

motion their scheme of world conquest with this belief, they committed for all the world a tragic, and for themselves a fatal error. They made their false conclusion on the performance of our diplomats, and the appeasers in high places, with whom they had been dealing. But they forgot the people. They forgot the people, because they did not understand the nature of the democratic ideal. They underrated certain powerful factors in their calculations.

They forgot that the desire for freedom, evidenced even in the conduct of lower animals, is instinctive in the human race, as instinctive as the will to live. They forgot that man's intellectual nature demands it for its own intrinsic good, and by the logic of its conception, that one man must demand it for another. They forgot that this great truth had for nearly two milleniums been enshrined in the religious and moral beliefs of Christian-Hebraic civilization, that it was a heritage too old and too sacred to be destroyed by military conquest. They forgot that the far-flung labor movements in the great industrial democracies were a powerful and significant manifestation of democracy in the economic life of the United Nations, and hence a major factor in a machine-made war production, which would in last analysis be the decisive element in the repulse of this mechanized assault they had unleashed upon civilization. They forgot that the population of the earth was too numerous for them to kill, that you could not conquer the human heart as long as it beats. In their frenzied determination they preferred to discount that which they despised.

Is it for these reasons that wherever you have seen Fascist dictatorships in power, you have seen them in their true character, as the sworn enemies of both organized religion and organized labor?

They have tried to destroy both religion and labor because, with a certain madman's cunning they recognized in the institutions and principles of both, this hand-and-glove identity of purpose, with which fascism by its very character is at war. They had to declare war on free labor and free worship because theirs was a war to enslave the body of man and destoy the sovereignty of the human soul.

So we here and all over the free world are aroused and resolved—millions of us, with other millions who now chained in prisons and choked to silence by this new unhuman tyranny, will rise to join us on the day of their deliverance.

Today we are able to stand up against the Axis Powers, gathering strength as we fight and as we learn the nature of the issue that confronts us. We challenge with a new confidence the Axis governments. We say to the Nazis and the Junkers of Germany, to the Fascist blackshirts of Italy, and to the war clique of imperial Japan:

"You have declared war on mankind, hence there is no justification for your existence. Your existence, moreover, threatens ours. You threaten our very lives and all that life means: Our liberty, our peace, and the pursuit of happiness. We intend to destroy you.

"You have glorified war and conquest and constructed robot governments designated especially and solely for these ends. You have surprised, stabbed in the back, and murdered peaceful peoples, who were not prepared to oppose you because, too late, they understood your criminal purpose. But the hour of your day of destiny is now getting late. Your sun is still up but the shadows lengthen. Your sun is setting. The night will come, when that dream of world mastery you had will be transformed to become the nightmare of your own disaster.

"We, not you, will face the dawn."

Address of Judge J. F. T. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Judge J. F. T. O'Connor on the fourth anniversary of German entry into Poland, over Station KPAS, Pasadena, Calif., Wednesday, September 1, 1943.

Four years ago today, September 1, 1939, Hitler's Nazi troops invaded Poland, while Russia struck from the west and the unsympathetic Balkans to the south, friendly to Russia, were claiming neutrality. This small country, less in area than the State of California but with five times the population, found itself in an iron vise, closing upon it, between the two greatest mechanized armies ever assembled on this earth. Two enemy countries with a combined population of approximately 280,000,000 people and a combined area of over 9,000,000 square miles—against a small country with 35,000,000 people and 150,000 square miles in area. Never in all history was there such an unequal conflict, not even the historic battle of the courageous Belgians in August 1914 could compare with Poland's plight. Poland's defenseless cities were bombed from the air, her homes destroyed, her people machine-gunned in the streets, on the roads, and in the fields because they dared to resist—dared to defend their homes and the honor of their women. For 27 days the Poles refused to surrender even in the face of such overwhelming odds. Twenty-seven days—never-to-be-forgotten days, which will live forever in the Polish history!

Russia, by a treaty signed with Poland on July 30, 1941, yielded the territory taken from Poland by the treaty between Russia and Germany on September 30, 1939. This was the fourth partition of Poland in her long, glorious, yet tragic history. The Nazi occupied territory of Poland spells one of the greatest tales of horror, destruction, persecution, mass murder, torture, and personal violations worse than death, ever written in any language by any people. The civilized world thrilled when the pronouncement came from Quebec last week by authority of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill that the perpetrators of the crimes against Poland and the other invaded countries would be punished and that reliable and authenticated evidence had been secured naming the criminals.

Some Poles fortunately escaped from the Nazi reign of terror, deported from Russian Poland to Siberia in February 1940, to join their husbands, fathers, and male relatives, mostly Polish officers taken prisoners by the Russians. These Polish fighting men joined the Allies, comprising a valuable unit of 75,000 men in the Middle East under General Anders. The story of their gallantry and heroism will rank with those of Poland's greatest heroes. The Russian Government permitted the refugees to leave Siberia when the soldiers went to the front. The long journey was commenced in October 1941. The tired refugees walked until exhausted, but they never lost faith and each night thanked God for their deliverance. Now and then a few carts and, infrequently, a train helped to carry their belongings. Finally they reached Astrakhan on the shores of the Caspian Sea, where, after weeks of waiting they sailed for Enzeli, and then, in trucks provided by the British Army, to Tehran, the capital.

The refugees, tired, sick, and despondent, yet gratified for their deliverance, found food, rest, and comfort, the first in many weeks, furnished by the American and British Red Cross. The scarcity of food, the lack of medical supplies, made temporary residence in Iran impossible. Where to go in a war-torn world? No European country had an abundance of food whether at war or not. To live in a subjugated country meant not only starvation but invited death from Nazi guns. The Republic of Mexico invited the refugees to their country. The problem of transportation seemed not only difficult but impossible to solve—the land of peace and plenty was thousands of miles away. It was at the end of the rainbow. The British Army came to the rescue again, and trucks were provided. The refugees, after much suffering and sickness and weeks of travel, reached Karachi, India, then on to Bombay, where endless days of waiting made many despondent. No words can express the joy of these homeless people when the news came that an American transport would take 703 of them to New Zealand. A delay of three weeks was not unwelcome amid the friendly and hospitable New Zealanders, where good food, warm clothing, and medicine for the sick were supplied. Again came the news that an American transport carrying wounded soldiers could take the little colony to America. The transport steamed into the harbor of San Pedro after a stormy voyage. Arrival time was a military secret, and day after day passed with only a limitless horizon surrounding the lonely and fearful passengers. At night the transport was darkened—Japanese submarines lurked in her pathway—a transport with wounded heroes of the war, helpless to strike back, old men, women, and children, was a most desired prize for the fighting men of Nippon to sink and report another great victory to their emperor. Then the command rang out: "Make ready to leave ship!" Confusion and terror, children crying and women screaming while the wounded men, unafraid of death, clenched their fists, gnashed their teeth and muttered for just one more chance to fight as they had done, before they died. But wait, they had not heard the full command.

"We are at San Pedro, Calif." Never such rejoicing, never such prayers of thankfulness, while the wounded heroes of the American fighting forces just said quietly, but with determination: "We'll get another chance to even the score for the men who were murdered at Pearl Harbor."

Temporary quarters were provided in Griffith Park and Juneau camp for the Polish refugees while in Los Angeles. Food, clothing, books, and entertainment were provided by the Polish womens' relief committee. Fear vanished from their faces, the gentle breeze from the Pacific made nights agreeable for sleep—the warm California sun brought memories of harvest days when Poland was free and the memories brought back the folk songs of happier hours. They were in the land of the free.

During the passage one of the stewards noticed some of the children, when the meal was finished, hiding bread. He convinced the little ones there would be bread every day. Countess Zamoiski-Soskievitch, whose husband, a distinguished Polish soldier, was among the 10,000 Polish officers massacred by the Germans—was among the refugee group. Another was a Jewish woman with her daughter, every member of whose large family had been murdered by the Germans. A little fellow asked if they would be put behind

barbed wires in Mexico and was assured they would not, and ran among the refugees shouting, "No barbed wire in Mexico."

The 703 refugee Poles arrived in Mexico in June of the present year—the longest journey for so large a group of refugees ever recorded. It took 3½ years to cover the many thousands of miles from Siberia to Mexico.

Last Saturday I returned from a brief visit to Mexico—our friends will be interested in the present condition of these refugees. The facts were secured from Vice President Weissblatt of the Polish Federation of Mexico, and I am also indebted to Dan Lundberg of the Columbia Broadcasting System in Mexico City, formerly of Los Angeles.

The 703 refugee Poles are living in Santa Rosa, Mexico, as a free people, subject to no restrictions other than that they may not go to the capital and cannot accept employment except on their own hacienda. The Polish Government in exile, in London, by means of lease-lend money obtained from the United States of America, was able to finance the immigration to Mexico of these 703 Poles under a plan providing for the rescue of some 23,000 persons. These Poles are at present in Teheran, Iran, awaiting their turn. At the moment they are almost at the point of starvation in Iran because of food shortages. The Poles are in Mexico only for the duration of the present war. When victory comes to the United Nations, they will be given transportation back to Poland. They cannot optimistically answer for their fate in the event that Poland is never restored; they have no answer to that.

At present the United States and Mexican Governments are together supervising the lives of the Poles in Mexico, preparing for the arrival of more, setting up primary schools, preparing to make arrangements to send the older boys to the University of Mexico. Means have been provided for them to work the hacienda for food and profit, and many of the Poles have their own fortunes available to them and are allowed to, and do, buy commodities and even available luxuries. They have no doctors, but the members of the old Polish colony in Mexico City provide them with every care. The people on the hacienda have, in true democratic spirit, set up their own legislative body and rule themselves and appoint disciplinarians according to a democratic system. The Catholics, the Protestants, and the Jews among the refugees attend their respective services. In Santa Rosa they have all privileges and attend movies and fiestas with the people of Mexico. No children have been born in the colony as yet, but when they are born they will be Polish citizens enjoying Mexican citizenship rights. They may intermarry with Mexicans now and thereby gain Mexican citizenship. The flag of Poland flies over the hacienda, and the people think of themselves as Polish colonists. When it was raised, the refugees cheered, the children sang, and the women wept. Many of them would like to come to the United States and live here permanently. Here they believe is security and peace; while others think only of getting back to their beloved Poland to rebuild it and restore it to its ancient beauty, power, and glory.

In 8 weeks the Poles have done wonders with the rich, Mexican soil. The Mexicans in the neighborhood are real friends, sympathizing with their lot in life, and have helped them in every way. Much credit is due to the sympathetic attitude of Professor Pelly of the United States Embassy, who is the refugees' chief supervisor. Mexico City is beautiful—the main thoroughfares, Paseo de la Reforma and Juarez, are wide and adorned with statues of Mexican heroes and statesmen. Modern business blocks and ultramodern apartments at once attract attention, and new buildings, new homes, are being constructed on nearly every street. The building activity is remarkable. Religious freedom has been restored and the cathedrals and churches are crowded. The Metropolitan movie theater, costing over a million dollars, will be formally opened on Independence Day, September 15. It has no rival in beauty and size in Los Angeles. The Basilica de Guadalupe and the cathedral towering above the Plaza de la Constitucion look back through the centuries proving the civilization and high culture of an ancient race, while our own land was still a forest. The hospitality of our neighbors south of the border is of unforgettable memory. May the boundary become less and less distinct in the years to come—may the friendship prevailing grow, and two great republics with common aspirations live side by side in peace as an example to the world—each coveting only the affection of the other.

Improvement of the Guadalupe River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Dewey L. Granberry, manager of the Chamber of Commerce, Victoria, Tex., in reference to the proposed improvement of the Guadalupe River, delivered at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas held at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am sure that all of you must have grown tired being reminded at each and every meeting, for the past 38 years and 21 days, of the more or less useless fact that this association had its beginning in Victoria. As a matter of fact, the birthplace of the idea is not important at all—the only really important thing about the beginning of this association is the fact that the idea was so challenging, and so sound, and so in keeping with the progressive spirit of the Southwest, that it very soon became the most influential, powerful, and wide-awake waterway organization in America. It still holds that enviable position in the Nation and will continue to do so until the ambitious program laid out at its very first meeting is accomplished. Thanks to the masterful leadership of men like J. J. Mansfield, Roy Miller, and C. S. E. Holland, and others too numerous to mention, the ultimate goal is beginning to take shape in the form of miles upon miles of safe and useful waterway along the Gulf coast from New Orleans to Brownsville, Tex.

According to the best information I can obtain, it seems that a great many of our citizenship did not fully realize, in the beginning, just how dependent our cause, that is, the navigation of the Guadalupe River, was to the larger program, or the Intracoastal Canal proper. They did not fuly realize how utterly useles a 6- or even a 9-foot barge canal would have been from Victoria out into the open Gulf—and for obvious reasons our cause could not be justified on economic grounds. In the face of this sort of a seemingly hopeless condition extending over a period of 37 years, there has, quite naturally, grown up something of a feeling that Victoria has been left out of the picture entirely. We know now that this is not a fact; we know now that the completion of the Intracoastal Canal to Corpus Christi marked the beginning or our opportunity to become a part of the great Intracoastal Canal system in a much more practical way than that of simply being the birthplace of the idea.

A 9-foot barge canal from a point on the Intracoastal Canal a few miles below Seadrift in San Antonio Bay up the Guadalupe Valley to mile 52 above Victoria was officially approved by the War Department engineers in 1938 or early 1939, as a direct result of the brief submitted by us covering this subject at a public hearing held by the engineers at Seguin, Tex., on July 7, 1938.

This important branch or feeder canal was a part of that ill-fated rivers and harbors bill passed by the Congress, only to be vetoed by the President in the dark and uncertain days of 1940.

It seems to us that there are many good reasons why this feeder canal up the Guadalupe Valley to Victoria should, by all means, be a part of the next rivers and harbors bill. We sincerely hope that the powers that be will take into consideration the fact that this comparatively inexpensive project will, when completed, be the deepest penetration into the interior of Texas of any waterway with a depth of 9 feet, and, more than that, it will be made at a point almost exactly midway between the two great deep-water ports and terminal cities of Galveston and Corpus Christi. What is more important still is the fact that this deep inland penetration of a 9-foot channel at this midpoint will be made at the right place to serve the largest, richest, and most rapidly developing section of the upper Gulf coast between these two points. I realize that this statement sounds strangely like a chamber of commerce manager might be expected to talk—I sincerely hope all of you will doubt this statement so sincerely that you will feel compelled to make a determined personal investigation.

Here's another interesting fact. We are told that there is a very definite relationship between population figures and tonnage—if this is a fact, the completion of this channel up to Victoria should increase, by at least a hundred percent, the total tonnage now originating or destined to points between Galveston and Corpus Christi, since the addition of Victoria would increase the urban population served by at least 100 percent. I'd like for you to check me on that one too, if you will, please.

A little careful study of the Texas coast between Galveston and Corpus Christi will reveal how important this 50-mile penetration of a 9-foot channel up to the Guadalupe Valley will actually be. Such a study will reveal, beyond a doubt, that this great waterway will be compelled to extend its feeding fingers as far as possible into the interior, if its ultimate goal is to extend the blessing of water transportation to the greatest number of people.

On its way up the Guadalupe Valley to milepost 52 at Victoria this channel will cross five great pipe lines—go under two great trunk-line railroads, two branch-line railroads, and intersect a network of Texas' great highway system at Victoria, and, in addition, gentlemen, it will have tapped the rich farming and ranching section of the upper coast, and be in position at the same time, to take on real tonnage from the great oil-producing area extending in every direction. Just to illustrate, there are 8 separate fields in Victoria County and more than 2,300 producing wells within a radius of 45 miles of that city. These items constitute only the beginning of tonnage possibilities at this point. Every city, small and large, on the Texas coast is desperately in need of Victoria sand and gravel. Even now, these growing cities

are either using inferior sand and gravel or, they are paying excessive prices for Victoria, or some other similar product, being shipped in by rail. In spite of these transportation difficulties two of our three producing companies shipped upward of 13,000 carloads during 1942. Barge-rate savings on this one product alone, used by the Government in construction jobs up and down the Texas coast during the past 3 years, would doubtless have paid for a big part, if not all, the 9-foot channel to mile 52 at Victoria.

A reduction of 34 miles in the short-line rail haul to the city of San Antonio would be affected by a 9-foot channel to mile 52. The saving thus achieved would pay for the project over the period of years customarily used in determining economic justification. With this beginning the channel could very well be carried on up the river to Seguin, Tex., from which point San Antonio and Austin could both be served.

There is so much to be said, Mr. Chairman, in support of this first great feeder canal toward the rich and populous interior of Texas, one cannot begin to even touch upon the highlights in the time allowed.

It is our sincere hope that when the next rivers and harbors bill is passed, our little project to mile 52 on the Guadalupe will be a part of it. You will note that I said the next rivers and harbors bill. I emphasized the word "next" because we, in Victoria, suspect that by the time this next bill comes up a lot of people on the Atlantic seaboard will be able to recall most vividly how they shivered through the winter of 1942 and 1943. We believe a great many will remember, that long, how their automobiles gathered dust in garages when they needed them most. We hope somebody will tell them about the $400,000,000 a year in good old taxpayers' money being paid now in subsidies to the railroads in order that they might have half enough fuel instead of absolutely none at all.

Their Representatives in Congress will surely know these things, and so, Mr. Chairman, we have high hopes for the next rivers and harbors bill.

Federal and State Governments Should Become Partners in Airport Construction: Stanton Advocates Highway Formula Be Used

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following illuminating address, delivered by Charles I. Stanton before some 500 persons attending the Midwest Global Air Conference:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES I. STANTON, ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS, BEFORE THE MIDWEST GLOBAL AIR CONFERENCE, FRIDAY EVENING, AUGUST 20, 1943, HOTEL SAINT PAUL, ST. PAUL, MINN.

This is an important anniversary year in the history of flying.

As I look around this large gathering brought together by their interest in aviation, I think of a very different scene not quite 40 years ago. It was in December 1903, on a North Carolina beach, and just five persons were sufficiently interested to watch the Wright brothers make their first successful powered flight. The audience on that occasion consisted of a boy of 16, three members of the crew of the local life-saving station, and a lumber buyer of the vicinity.

A little later, in Dayton, an editor who had steadily ignored the flying experiments of the Wrights, asked Orville if it were true that he and his brother had been flying all around a local field. Orville acknowledged that they had, and then changed the subject. The editor did not follow up his query. Leaving, he said: "If you ever do something unusual, Orville, be sure and let us know."

We have come a long way in 40 years. We no longer ignore or underestimate the potentialities of the airplane. In fact, we tend to go too far, or fast, in the other direction, expecting it to oust other forms of transportation almost overnight. Our progress in aviation has not taken place that way, however. A quick review of aviation history high lights will show a steady forward movement, not in sudden leaps, but by the accumulation, year after year, of knowledge gained through painstaking, persistent experimentation.

We can expect the same type of progress in the period immediately ahead, accelerated by reason of the fact that more people than ever before are concentrating their energies in the aviation field.

Let us see what we can project for the future by recalling how we have advanced in the past. Taking arbitrary intervals of 5 years for our anniversaries, this is what we find:

Thirty-five years ago, 1908, the Wright brothers received the first substantial recognition of their achievement, when Wilbur sold French rights for $35,000 in cash and $65,000 in stock. This preceded by 6 months the award of $25,000 for building a plane which met United States Army specifications, one that could carry a pilot and passengers 10 miles across country at a speed of 40 miles an hour.

Thirty years ago, 1913, Roland Garros flew from southern France to Bizerte, then to Sicily and Rome, unwittingly pioneering routes for the application of United Nations airpower in 1943.

Twenty-five years ago, 1918, United States air-mail service started between New York and Washington. From this beginning stemmed the world-wide scheduled commercial flying of today. 1918 is truly a date to be cherished by civil aviation.

Twenty years ago, 1923, the first nonstop flight across the United States was made by Lieutenants Macready and Kelly. The same year saw a successful 4-day trail of night flying as part of a 28-hour transcontinental air-mail schedule by the Post Office Department. In 1923, I might add, the National Aeronautic Association was founded, and held its first national convention at St. Louis.

Fifteen years ago, 1928, the number of passengers carried in scheduled service increased more than 4 times over 1927, totaling 52,934. Air lines turned to the development of passenger traffic as a main source of revenue, and aircraft manufacturers concentrated on the development of planes suitable for passenger service. C. A. A. began installing the system of radio range stations which now blanket the United States and Alaska, and tie in with an identical Canadian system.

Ten years ago, 1933, the fleet of 60 new transport planes for the United Air Lines was delivered by the Boeing Co. The Boeing 247. An all-metal, low-wing, twin-engine transport carrying 10 passengers at a cruising speed of 155 miles an hour, set the type for efficient air-line operations. The later, larger, and faster commercial airlines, including many yet to come, have faithfully adhered to type. And most of these 10-year-old 247's are still flying daily.

Five years ago—1938—the millionth passenger was carried by Pan-American Airways, which had grown until it was serving an air route system of 53,166 miles, including trans-Pacific and Alaskan routes and a great extension of the original South and Central American networks. The first Boeing 314, better known as the Yankee Clipper, was launched in May in preparation for scheduled trans-Atlantic service the following year.

1943—Today no place in the world is more than 60 hours by plane from any other. We are now making 500 trans-Atlantic flights a week. The Army Air Transport Command routes alone are several times the combined length of all the pre-war commercial air-line routes in the world.

The aviation industry today is—temporarily—far and away the largest in the country.

From $280,000,000 in 1939, aviation production jumped to $6,400,000,000 in 1942, and for the current year our schedule calls for the huge sum of $20,100,000,000—more than five times automobile production at its peak, a fourth of our war budget for the year, almost a seventh of our estimated national income. And the President has announced that 1944 production, calculated upon a basis of tonnage, will top 1943's by more than half—by 55 percent, to be exact. As for employment, about 2,500,000 men and women of various skills are at work in our aviation plants and now dependent upon them for a livelihood.

We shall soon have some 3,000,000 men in the air forces of the Army and Navy. More than 300,000 will be trained pilots. Many more will be skilled as navigators, mechanics, radiomen, meteorologists, dispatchers, airport and maintenance engineers. All will be familiar with one phase or another of flying. And most of those not trained as pilots will have an urge to try their wings.

It is my belief, based on recollection of the aviation-trained boys who came out of the last war, that hundreds of thousands will continue to follow aviation either as a vocation or as an avocation, provided (and it is an important proviso) that it is not made too difficult for them to do this.

This means, among other things, all kinds of air navigation facilities and a vast network of airports.

What is our progress in those two respects? Before the war, and at the direction of the Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Administration made a Nation-wide survey of airports and with this as a base developed a tentative plan for a network of 4,000 ports to serve the more or less immediate needs of the country.

If these airports were evenly distributed over the country, they would form a checkerboard of 27-mile squares. If the number of airports were increased from 4,000 to 6,000 and these were evenly distributed, the checkerboard squares would be reduced to 22 miles. Mountain and desert areas would need relatively fewer airports, of course, and these would therefore be allocated to more thickly populated zones.

Census figures reveal that there are in this country 6,669 communities with a population of 1,000 or more. Of these, 3,464 have 2,500 or more; 2,042 have 5,000 or more; and only 1,077 exceed 10,000. It seems reasonable to suppose that all communities of a thousand people or more will desire to be accessible by airplane. Therefore, if we disregard those which are so close together that they can make joint use of an airport and consider the fact that larger cities will require several airports, we arrive at a national total of 6,000 airports as a reasonable target to shoot at in the early post-war years.

The war, of course, has caused many shifts in our original airport plan. To date, approximately $400,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress for the national defense airport development program, which is limited to the development and improvement of sites designated as essential to the war effort and approved by the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce. All of this

appropriation is now either expended or specifically allocated.

At the present time there are almost 3,000 classified airports in the country—1,000 short of the pre-war plan. Altogether, these airports could probably handle 300,000 airplanes, but an immense amount of construction will be required for housing and servicing facilities. Recent development has necessarily been concentrated upon the larger fields. As a result, there has been an elevenfold increase in the number of our major civil airports—with paved runways at least 3,500 feet long and capable of handling the largest transport craft. Whereas we had only 76 such fields 2 years ago, we shall have 865 by the end of this year. Nor does this number include many large airdromes built solely for military use by the armed forces.

The situation in regard to smaller airports is this. We have 1,213 class I airports, the lowest category, which are those having landing areas 1,800 to 2,500 feet long. We have 905 class II ports, each with paved runways from 2,500 to 3,500 feet long. These are situated, for the most part, near smaller cities and larger towns. In my opinion we shall have to have many more of this class for future commercial flying. Nor can it be said that we have enough larger ports, for those in many of our major cities are already overcrowded.

How are we going to obtain the airports we shall certainly need? Should they be provided by the Federal Government? Or by the various States? Or by municipalities and other local government units? Or by a combination of all three?

A major question of policy is involved here, one that will ultimately be decided by the citizens of the Nation speaking through their duly elected Representatives, two of whom—your own JOSEPH P. O'HARA and West Virginia's JENNINGS RANDOLPH—I am so happy to see participating in this conference.

The airport problem can be solved in many ways, and I make bold to suggest one possibility here—a plan based upon the wide experience and careful study of veterans in the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I offer it not as a finished proposal but rather as a basis for discussion, as something we can all mull over in our minds, for there is no easy and automatic solution to the airport problem.

After the war civil aviation will be of three major types: (1) Scheduled air-line transport; (2) general commercial transport of goods and passengers by chartered planes, and other commercial services—crop dusting, aerial photography, forest patrol, etc.; and (3) private flying for pleasure or business purposes. Scheduled air-line routes, it appears, are likely to stop at approximately 1,000 points, each of which will require one or more major airports. Local or feeder lines will radiate from these points to smaller airports within each larger city's sphere of influence.

In addition to airports required for this transport network there must be thousands of inexpensive fields to serve the large number—literally hundreds of thousands, I believe—who will be flying their own planes or rented aircraft.

Since about 3,000 of the 4,000 sites in the original national airport plan are primarily local in their significance, it is our view that State agencies can wisely determine which locations should first be improved, and when. And since a tributary wheel of "feeder" airports is useless without an adequate trunk airport at its hub, we are willing to entrust the order of priority on major airports to State authorities.

I suggest that the Federal Government and the State governments become partners in building the Nation's post-war civil airport system in general accord with principles worked out in building our national highway system—admittedly the best in the world. If the President and Congress authorize a Federal-aid airport program, the funds appropriated could be apportioned to the States by the C. A. A. upon the basis of some accepted formula. Such a formula, we believe, should take account of four factors: (1) The area of the State; (2) its population; (3) number of registered aircraft in the State; and (4) the existing number of accredited airports. Under this plan, as in the Federal highway system, each State would have to match a specified percentage of its quota of Federal funds.

Decentralization of Federal operation and delegation of more responsibility to State aviation agencies should be beneficial. Airport improvements or construction projects within each State would then be selected and carried out by the State's aviation agency. Only projects included within the C. A. A. national airport plan would be eligible for Federal aid, of course, and C. A. A. standards of location, lay-out, and construction for the class of airport proposed would have to be met.

There has long been need of a clarification of the relationship between the Federal and State governments with respect to aviation. Many have feared that the States would seek to regulate individual aircraft and airmen without regard to the problem as a whole, thus creating a mass of conflicting rules and standards, such as are found in the motor trucking and divorce laws. This would be peculiarly disconcerting in the case of a flyer who passes from State to State in midair, often being unaware of State boundaries as he passes over them. State officials, on the other hand, have lived in fear that local needs and wishes would be inadequately considered by Federal officials.

The field of airport development offers a splendid chance for the Federal Government to work in partnership with the State authorities by establishing a policy which for more than 20 years has proved its practicability in the field of highways. Federal airport authorities would retain control of national planning and of minimum standards, just as Federal highway authorities have done. Yet local problems would be decided at the State level where such decisions should be made. And the sincerity with which State authorities advocated specific projects would be demonstrated by the dollars they put up to match Federal funds.

It may be contended that Federal aid should be extended only to airports having at least interstate significance. But the very nature of the airplane makes even the smallest airport a base for interstate operations. Moreover, the experience of Public Roads officials with Federal highway aid provides a valuable lesson. At the outset, Federal highway aid was limited largely to trunk routes. But local and Federal traffic has become such an important factor in the whole highway picture that there is steadily growing demand for Federal aid on other classes of roads. There should be no strait jacket on Federal airport aid. It should be kept as fluid as possible.

We are not yet ready to suggest the specific formula upon which the allotments to States should be based. But we have progressed sufficiently in our studies on the subject to be confident that we can put forward an equitable and satisfactory prescription.

Events are moving so rapidly, particularly in the field of aviation, that we must be forehanded if we, as individuals, as local communities, as a nation, are to take full advantage of them.

Nothing as clearly reveals the recent phenomenal development of aviation as the growth and operation of the Federal airways, which now totals 35,000 miles within our continental boundaries, a 700-percent increase since 1927. Their length has almost doubled since 1932. Traffic along the airways is increasing at an astonishing rate. Recorded movements along the Federal skyways were 6,000,000 during 1942. For the current year we estimate that they will reach 13 or 14 million and we believe they will continue upward despite a probable slight dip immediately following the close of hostilities. We expect that by 1950 we shall have in this country at least a half million private, commercial, and military aircraft in active service. You will appreciate the significance of that when I remind you that at the end of 1941 we had in the entire country less than 25,000 licensed civil aircraft, and probably less than half that number of military planes.

I believe I am not too optimistic in looking forward to having 300,000 civil aircraft within 3 years of the war's end. Those civil aircraft will naturally be distributed in general accord with the distribution of population. The Twin Cities share of the 300,000 planes would be about 1,700, or almost 3 times the 600 aircraft registered for the entire State of Minnesota in 1942.

On the assumption of 500,000 airplanes in 1950, we might look for something like this in Minnesota and neighboring States:

State	Population	Planes
Minnesota	2,792,300	9,972
Wisconsin	3,137,587	11,205
North Dakota	641,938	2,215
South Dakota	642,961	2,215
Nebraska	1,315,834	4,699
Iowa	2,538,628	9,066
Illinois	7,897,628	28,204
Total	18,966,498	67,576
Twin Cities	780,106	2,785

Fortunately, our air-navigation facilities, unlike those of Europe, have been designed for mass traffic. Our radio and traffic control equipment is of the best, and we can count on our scientists and inventors to keep our lead in this respect. After a study of all other airways systems, Canada and Australia chose to build theirs on the American model. The Canadian airways are so closely integrated with our own continental and Alaskan systems that the three virtually form a vast continental system, covering all territory north of the Rio Grande. General Salinas Carranza, Director of Civil Aviation of Mexico, visited us a few weeks ago and declared his intention of extending a similar system throughout Mexico. He expressed the belief that the Central American countries might do likewise, and that we could well contemplate a continental airways system extending from the Arctic to the Canal Zone. Radio men and airways engineers of the C. A. A. are not only improving and extending our domestic skyways, but are cooperating with the armed forces in establishing routes across the seas to all the other continents.

We have, in recent years, installed four intercontinental super-radio stations which in their combined range blanket the world, providing direct communication from our shores to an American plane in flight almost anywhere on the globe. The major units are located at New York, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Honolulu with supplementary stations at Seattle, Anchorage, and many of the Pacific islands. Such are the unseen aids upon which air transport is built.

The intercontinental flying I cited as already taking place is just a beginning. Every day new routes are being pioneered, and with the coming of peace many more will be opened up for the transport of cargo and passengers. According to a recent conservative estimate by the Civil Aeronautics Board—and it may well be too conservative—there will be an eightfold increase in intercontinental air passenger traffic by 1947, and

an eightfold increase in mail and express hauls. The Board estimates that the operations of the domestic air lines will increase fivefold within the same period.

Someone, in the Board of Economic Warfare I think, figured that to carry all the nonsteerage passengers crossing the oceans throughout the world, all the passengers now riding in Pullmans in the United States, all the first-class domestic and foreign mail of the United States, about 25 percent of the express matter normally carried by express companies, as well as the existing normal airline traffic, would require a fleet of aircraft which would be equal to about 1 month's output of our multi-engined bomber and cargo aircraft manufacturers at the 1943–44 rate of production. Someone facetiously remarked that he should start looking for an outlet for the second month's output.

But the greatest boon is going to come in the field of private flying for business or pleasure purposes. This has to be if aviation is going to do for our economy after this war something of what the automobile did after the last war. I, for one, do not hope to see aviation production continue at war-time rates. We cannot expect the plants to continue at forced draft for 24 hours a day. Thanks to someone, a substantial portion of our present production is coming out of automobile, furniture, refrigerator, piano—even pickle—factories. And we should devoutly hope they will revert to more and better pianos and pickles after the war. Surely there will be shortages in these and many more commodities crying for fulfilment. Bear in mind that commercial vehicles—trucks, busses, ambulances, hearses—constituted only about 20 percent of our automotive output in normal times. We must create a similar situation in aviation. Cargo and passenger airliners will never make full use of our net production potential.

The family plane of the future is not very far away. Manufacturers now assure us—and we can accept their assurances, I think—that after the war we shall have small, safe, and inexpensive private planes costing no more to buy and operate than a medium-priced car. The most revolutionary development in this field is the new Sikorsky helicopter. It is peculiarly fitted for getting to the wilder recreation spots of the country—or the continent. Its inventor predicts that hundreds of these will be performing short-run cab-or-bus-type services within a few years of the signing of peace, and that many hundreds of thousands of them will be carrying individuals and their families wherever they wish to go. The helicopter may well take over the collection and distribution function now performed by the mail-pick-up operation. It seems to me that the pick-up scheme can serve best as a forerunner of a service of wider scope. It is all very well to yank a sack of mail or an express package off the ground at flying speed and wind it up into the plane as one reels in a big trout or bass. But what if a passenger wants to go?

There is going to be a phenomenal growth in private flying—as phenomenal as the growth in automobiling after the last war. Every thoughtful man has long been aware of the profound influence which the motor-car has had upon every part of America and every phase of our lives—upon all of our institutions, traditional points of view, modes of recreation, business habits, industrial technology, marketing practices, city planning—and the general pattern of living. The airplane is likely to have a similar influence. It will intensify some of our present problems and create new ones of its own. These problems will not automatically solve themselves. They can be solved only by clear foresight and intelligent anticipation of the difficulties to be met and overcome.

Commercial air transport will continue to grow steadily. Between 1927 and 1942 the number of passengers riding the air lines increased from 8,700 to more than 4,000,000 a year. In the same period, air mail jumped from 1,270,000 to 44,600,000 pounds annually, and air express and freight from 46,000 to 22,300,000 pounds. Remarkable as it is, this rate of growth, in my opinion, will be considerably accelerated during the next decade. The day is not far distant, I believe, in which all first-class mail will go by air, that is, whenever delivery can be advanced thereby, with pick-up or feeder services tying the smaller communities to the great trunk air lines. Pick-up services have been thoroughly tested during the past 3 years on routes totaling almost 1,500 miles, and the equipment has been so successful that the Civil Aeronautics Board has before it 23 applications for the establishment of similar routes in all parts of the country. So far we have no more than scratched the surface of air transport potential. If you consider the flying done in Alaska on the basis of the ratio of its population to that of continental United States you will find that Alaska has 100 times as many airplanes, flies 20 times as many passenger miles, 75 times as much mail, and about 1,000 times as much express and freight. Of course, Alaska's lack of roads and railroads is an important factor.

Recent growth has been most marked in the field of air express—that is, in carrying of small packaged goods of high intrinsic value such as films, radios, precious metals, women's clothes, spare machine parts, and similar articles needed right now at some distant place. In October 1942 air express was up almost 125 percent from the same month in the previous year, and it is certain to go on increasing.

Here let me add one word of caution. Some aviation enthusiasts are predicting that the airplane is about to make our railroads, steamships, and trucks quite obsolete. Maybe so, but I for one doubt the probability of the airplane carrying any large amounts of heavy bulk freight except where surface transport is nonexistent as in some parts of Alaska and Canada. Extravagant claims along this line merely confuse and mislead the public about the real values of aviation.

The question here, as in all commercial air operations, is relative cost compared to other forms of transportation. Traffic tends to flow, other things being equal, along the cheapest medium of transportation. Higher rates will only be paid when some compensatory advantage can be gained by greater speed of delivery, convenience of service, flexibility of operation, or similar factors. Air transport service does offer exceptional speed, convenience, and flexibility in many instances. But so far as the general run of freight is concerned, the differential between plane rates per ton-mile and those offered by railroad, truck, and steamship is still very large. I see no present possibility of flying our wheat, iron ore, coal, petroleum products, and such things to their destinations.

The airplane has an essential job to perform, and it will do this by supplementing—and not by supplanting—other forms of transportation. In its own proper field, however, the future of the plane is practically boundless.

The Trinity River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Mr. John M. Fouts, of Fort Worth, Tex., general manager of the Trinity Improvement Association, at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas held at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to see such a large and representative audience on this occasion. Every stream flowing into the Gulf of Mexico, from Texas and Louisiana, is represented in this audience and we are all indebted, deeply, to the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas for furnishing the leadership in the development of our soil and water resources in the Southwestern States.

The Texas-Louisiana Intracoastal Canal will soon be completed and enlarged and I am again thankful that this great organization has announced to us today, through its vice president and general manager, Mr. Roy Miller, that it is going to endorse and sponsor, in a militant manner, the improvement of all streams leading into the Intracoastal Canal, both for flood-control purposes and navigation.

TRINITY RIVER

The Trinity River lies wholly within the State of Texas and has a watershed of approximately 17,500 square miles, which represents only about one-twelfth of the total area of the State of Texas. Yet, it contains approximately one-fourth of the wealth of the State. Therefore, you can see at a glance, that here is a great region with enormous wealth already developed and still greater wealth in natural resources still entirely undeveloped.

Two of our greatest natural resources are soil and water, and we are energetically endeavoring to conserve these two valuable resources and use them for all beneficial purposes.

The people of the Trinity River watershed have spent some $50,000,000 developing plans and building structures to conserve and utilize our surface waters. As evidence, we now can point to over 450 miles of levees and six great lakes, already built, at a total cost of over $500,000,000, without 1 cent of State or Federal aid. There is not, in these United States, a case parallel to this.

THE OMNIBUS FLOOD CONTROL BILL OF 1936 MAKES FEDERAL AID POSSIBLE

After the passage, in 1936, of the omnibus flood control bill, which placed the War Department in charge of all improvements on the main stem and main tributaries of our rivers, and the Department of Agriculture in charge of all measures for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention, we immediately grasped the opportunity and had the Congress authorize surveys by both departments, of the Trinity River and its watershed. The preliminary reports were favorable and Congress then ordered actual surveys and preparation of plans. These actual surveys further showed the engineering feasibility and economic justification for the great regional plans prepared by these two strong departments of our Federal Government.

I am happy to announce to you today that this is the first great watershed in the United States to have a recommended plan prepared by the Federal Government under the provisions of the Omnibus Flood Control Act.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S PLAN FOR TRINITY WATERSHED

The Department of Agriculture, in developing its plan for the Trinity watershed, had two thoughts in mind: First, to hold each drop of rainwater on each piece of land where it fell, thus enlarging and increasing the productivity of that land, and at the

same time withholding the water from the main stream of the river. So, it is readily seen that the Department of Agriculture's program will stop the waste of valuable top soil and at the same time utilize to the fullest extent the surface waters, and second by withholding these waters from the main stem of the river, their program will materially benefit a flood-control program for the river.

The landowners in the Trinity watershed are enthusiastically supporting this program of the Department of Agriculture and have already voted for the creation of 13 soil-conservation districts which embrace practically all of the Trinity watershed, and they are now carrying out this program in a limited way because of the emergencies of the war. But here is a place where Federal moneys can most profitably be spent in a properly planned post-war program. The experts of the Department of Agriculture estimate that the cost to the Federal Government in carrying out this program will be approximately $31,000,000.

THE WAR DEPARTMENT'S PLAN FOR TRINITY RIVER AS PREPARED BY THE UNITED STATES CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The United States Corps of Engineers have developed plans and recommended these plans to Congress, first, for flood control of the Trinity; second, for water conservation, and third, for navigation for the Trinity River.

Flood control

The Army engineers propose to take the six great reservoirs and 450 miles of levees already built by local interests and add to them six more great reservoirs and then the upper reaches of the Trinity will have ample facilities for a genuine flood-control program. All flood-control structures will then be operated by the United States Corps of Engineers. They recommend other lakes to be added in a second program to be carried out at a later date which will give flood protection to the landowners in the lower reaches. The estimated cost to the Federal Government for its part of this great flood-control program will be approximately $19,000,000.

Water conservation

One of the most valuable assets in the Trinity watershed is our surface water. When the Federal Government builds six more great lakes, we will have impounded more than 3,500,000 acre-feet of water. This water should be, and will be, used for every beneficial purpose for which we can show economic justification. The Army engineers recommended the following: First, municipal and industrial uses; second, navigation; third, irrigation; and fourth, reclamation.

Navigation

The proposed Trinity Canal conforms to the standards of the modern waterways of the Mississippi and Gulf coastal systems, so as to permit the ready interchange of barge traffic. It is to be 9 feet deep and 150 feet wide at the bottom with some 26 navigation locks, 75 x 400 feet. All sharp bends are to be eliminated by long, sweeping cut-offs, reducing by practically one-third the length of the river below Fort Worth. The principal intent of this improvement is to permit the practical operation on the Trinity River of a unit of 6 barges, moved by a pusher-type towboat. The Army engineers say that their Trinity plans would permit the movement of such a unit with 9,000 tons pay load from Beaumont or any Galveston Bay port to Fort Worth in 5 days—allowing for eight stops en route to load and unload. The district engineer further stated in his report, completed 2 years ago, that the direct savings in transportation costs of the freight, reasonably to be expected to move on the Trinity Canal, would more than warrant the expenditure of the $96,000,000, the first cost of his plan.

The Army engineers recommend that the Federal Government spend, as their part of this great navigation improvement, approximately $90,000,000.

CONCLUSION

The plan prepared by the Department of Agriculture to conserve our soil and water resources in the watershed of the Trinity River was developed by the Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, while the plan for the conservation and use of waters stored behind dams on the main tributaries of the river was developed by the War Department, through their United States Corps of Engineers. Thus, today, the Trinity River has a great regional plan already prepared by the experts of the Federal Government, and approved by all of them. These plans have been sent to Congress and Congress has had them printed and they are now ready for incorporation in the great post-war plan for development of the soil and water resources of the Nation. The total cost to the Federal Government of this great plan is approximately $150,000,000, and the local interests have already spent approximately $50,000,000, and will be asked to spend approximately forty millions more. The Corps of Engineers has wisely stated that this is such a huge undertaking that it should be carried out by sections at a time, and they have recommended for immediate expenditure approximately $15,000,000, to be spent mostly in building the six new lakes that are needed to complete the flood-control program. They also recommend the rebuilding at this time of the navigation channel from Houston ship channel up to Liberty, Tex. The balance of the program will be carried out as, if, and when conditions justify.

A THOUGHT-PROVOKING FACT

Three billion five hundred million barrels of oil have been produced within 75 miles of the Trinity River, and that's just one-half of the known reserves. If the Trinity River had been improved for practicable navigation when our first oil well came in, the general public would have saved $500,000,000 in transportation costs, that is moving oil and refined products out, and oil well supplies in.

The Trinity River should be improved at the very earliest date.

Michigan Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith submit recommendations of the Michigan Food Conference of Farmers, Processors, and Distributors, August 9, 1943, at Lansing, Mich.:

PREAMBLE

Ill-advised activities and propaganda by various agencies, public and private, are resulting in programs that are adversely affecting production, distribution, and processing of food. Producers, processors, and distributors of food are experiencing unnecessary costs and hindrances as the result of unwarranted and destructive machinations and bungling. All of this is resulting in higher prices to and less food for the consumer.

The situation has reached a stage where all food industry groups are being obstructed seriously with resulting discouragements in their efforts to grow, process, and distribute food for our armed forces, our allies, and for civilian needs. The entire food program will be defeated if these matters are not corrected soon. It may even result in serious food shortage with accompanying hunger in this country and the starving of millions in foreign lands. In the light of the above, the recommendations of the conference are:

1. Unification of the whole food production, processing, and distribution program under one Government agency.

2. Recognition of all branches of the food industry as essential to the war effort to the same respect and to the same degree as is the production and handling of armaments.

3. Administration of a price program on the basis of encouraging production, and elimination of price ceilings which tend to have the opposite effect.

4. Solution of the inflation problem on a constructive basis by encouraging production and siphoning off the ever-increasing purchasing power of the American people through taxes and enforced savings by additional purchases of War bonds.

5. Elimination of subsidies and discontinuing their use as a means of controlling inflation and prices.

6. Requirement that Government agencies making announcements affecting the food program do so in conformance with the terms of the 1942 Price Control Act, and only after consulting with those familiar with the practical phases of food production, processing, and distribution, and sincerely receive their suggestions.

7. A return to constitutional government with the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, functioning as the policy-making, legislative branch of Government, as opposed to government by directives from the administrative branch.

8. Approval for all essential expenditures by Government for the prosecution of the war. Elimination of the waste of money and duplication of effort by Government agencies, or permitted by them in the war effort.

Michigan Food Conference of Farmers, Processors, and Distributors: C. L. Brody, Lansing, chairman; American Dairy Association of Michigan; Michigan Allied Dairy Association; Michigan Bean Shippers Association; Michigan Canners Association; Michigan Elevator Exchange; Michigan Feed Manufacturers Association; Michigan Independent Packers Association; Michigan Live Stock Exchange; Michigan Milk Producers Association; Michigan Retail Grocers Association; Michigan State Farm Bureau; Midwest Producers Creameries, Inc., Michigan District.

Unfair Wheat Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the War Food Administration has asked the wheat farmers of this country to plant 26 percent more wheat for the 1944 harvest than was planted for the harvest this year. This means an increase of about 14,000,000 acres. The greater part

of this increased acreage must come from Kansas and other Great Plains States if the goal is to be met. Farmers are expected to plant and harvest this greatly increased acreage with less machinery and far less labor than have been available in normal times.

In addition to this, wheat farmers find themselves the victims of serious and wholly unwarranted price discrimination. The price of wheat today is 11 percent below parity. The price of agricultural products as a whole is 14 percent above parity, and wheat is the only important farm commodity which is selling at substantially less than parity at the present time.

The sole reason that wheat is selling at less than parity is the ceiling on flour prices. This ceiling has been imposed in direct violation of the Price Control Act which says that no price ceiling shall be imposed upon any agricultural commodity or any product manufactured therefrom which does not reflect parity to the producer.

The sole excuse given for the wholly illegal and arbitrary price ceiling on flour is that it is necessary in order to keep the price of bread at its present level. Just why the price of bread should be maintained at depression levels when practically every other item entering into the cost of living has advanced substantially during the war period is a question for which I have up to date found no satisfactory answer, although I have made diligent inquiry of those in charge of the determination of ceiling prices. It would take an increase of 16 cents per bushel to bring wheat prices up to parity today. That would mean very little in the cost of a loaf of bread because 62 one-pound loaves of bread can be manufactured from a bushel of wheat. Thus, a 16-cent increase in wheat price would mean about one-fourth cent increase in the cost of a loaf of bread, assuming that all of the increase had to be passed on. Even if we assume for the sake of argument that it might be necessary to increase the retail cost of bread as much as one-half cent per loaf, it would still be by far the cheapest food we have. It would be less than the price in 1926 when both wages and employment were far below what they are now.

As a matter of fact, the wheat producers of this country have been subsidizing the consumers of bread for many years by furnishing wheat at less than parity prices which means at less than fair prices. Whatever excuse there might have been for this when we had millions of unemployed, there is no excuse for it now when everybody who wants work can secure it, when wages are the highest ever known, and when the American people generally are spending the smallest percentage of their income for food in all of our history. The wheat producers of this country are not going to strike for higher prices or shorter hours or better working conditions. They are going to work harder during the coming year than they have ever worked before. They are going to do everything possible to overcome the handicaps of inadequate supplies of machinery and labor.

Should farmers be expected, however, to do all this and still receive a price for their product below what everyone concedes to be a fair price? Is it not time that this administration gave the wheat farmer a fair break? I do not believe that the consumers of this country want farmers to subsidize the cost of their bread and yet that is exactly what this administration is asking of the farmer when it imposes ceilings on flour which result in wheat prices substantially less than parity. I consider this situation as nothing less than a scandal and a disgrace. The present wholly illegal, inequitable, and discriminatory price ceiling on flour should be at once increased to parity level.

Overtime Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with the contents of a brochure received by me from a constituent of mine.

Mr. Speaker, the foundation of this great Nation is founded upon the principle that there be provided opportunity for the individual to develop according to his ability, to make him a free and individual man, not part of a mass. This principle was imposed upon our founding fathers by the very nature of their circumstances. The revolutionary rebellion came into being because of the individuals collectively revolting against the attempt to stifle individualism by despotic and tyrannical oppression. Today, as then, there are tendencies to submerge that same individualism by regimentation and the creation of masses within our great Nation. This tendency, emanating from a strong centralized bureaucracy, will bring about the deterioration of a nation that in the short time of 160 years afforded greater economic and social benefits to a larger number of people than any other nation in the history of man. It has been said that any society which cannot prevent the development of masses is irrevocably doomed. Certainly, then, any society which encourages the development of masses writes its own death warrant. The following will clearly indicate that we are not only permitting the development of masses but permitting the bureaucrats to effect rulings and edicts that tend toward classes as well. This message shows the hatreds that are being engendered between our citizens by treating our people as pawns instead of people.

The brochure follows:

Because our sons need greater production for victory and to save the American way of life, the War Manpower Commission lengthened the workweek for all industry in manpower shortage areas, changing the hours from 40 to 48 per week. When this necessary and patriotic step was taken, promptly the Communists and fellow travellers in this bureaucratic Government of ours used the event to make a vicious underhanded attack on the very way of life the longer workweek was designed to help protect. They did it, these unelected and unauthorized masters of our prosperity, by making "class" the criterion by which it was decided how much pay a worker was to get for those extra 8 hours that were added to the workweek. And by "class-angling" the decisions concerning the pay questions, they are destroying the worker's will to work, his desire to produce, his native urge to improve his status; they have made these qualities penalties upon the worker's material progress. Almost every worker wants to become a foreman or a superintendent; once such a promotion carried with it a substantial material reward, but now the case is different. Many a young man wants to become an engineer, for example; once that too, meant material progress, but now it means that he actually decreases his chance of prosperity.

Let's take a laborer, a mechanic, a foreman, a superintendent, and an engineer in a war plant, to illustrate the way this tinkering with the American way of life is done. Let's assume that the plant changes from a schedule of 40 hours per week to one of 48 hours, and then see what happens to the pay rates of each of them.

The laborer and the mechanic get time and one-half for 8 hours of that 48; for the week they get the equivalent of 52 hours' pay for 48 hours of work, a 30 percent increase in pay. Why? Because a "class-angled" Federal law so specifies, for the laborer and the mechanic. But that Federal law specifically excludes from its provisions the foreman and the superintendent and the engineer (but the bureaucrats call it the Fair Labor Standards Act).

The Federal law specifies nothing as to how the foreman and the superintendent and the engineer shall be paid for their extra hours. Here's where the communistic bureaucrat steps in and starts his work of changing our American system. The scheme is outlined in Press Service No. 37-31 of the Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue, dated Thursday, July 1, 1943. This verbose and vaguely worded statement says in part, in speaking of increased pay for this 8 hours of additionnal work, "The Commissioner stated that no set rule may be established for determining such amounts, because of the variations of differentials between wage and salary levels within plants and industries. However, the amounts allowed will be proportionately less in the higher levels. The amount allowable to the highest rated hourly employee will then be progressively reduced for the several intervening pay levels in such manner that each succeeding higher level receives a proportionately lesser amount * * *." As an illustration of how this works out in practice, in one company the highest paid man covered by the so-called Fair Labor Standards Act gets about $15.30 for that additional 8 hours' work; the foreman, handling about five to seven men, gets about $13.85 for this 8 hours; and the superintendent, who handles about 100 to 150 men, gets about $10.85 for working that extra day. The general superintendent and the manager get nothing—except the 8 hours to work; that, too, is a ruling of the Treasury Department, so I am told.

And the engineer, what about him? He isn't a foreman or a superintendent but he

is discriminated against in the same way. He doesn't get time and one-half, either; in their rulings in individual cases in the same company mentioned, his increased pay has almost invariably amounted to about straight time (20 percent) or less.

That isn't all. The foreman and the superintendent usually are paid a flat salary, and they work whatever hours are in the scheduled workweek plus any overtime that's necessary. The Treasury Department says that they cannot be paid for this overtime, but the laborer and the mechanic get paid, at time and one-half, for every hour of overtime they work. The foreman and the superintendent work those same overtime hours, too, but they get no additional pay for it, so the result is that many a time the mechanic draws more pay each week than his foreman or his superintendent. Where's any incentive to become a foreman? A workman would be foolish indeed to accept what was once a promotion.

The bureaucrats carry this "class" idea to even further extremes than those cited. For instance, the United States Civil Service Commission issued, on July 9, 1943, a bulletin headed "Applications accepted for technical aid, quartz crystals (trainee), $1,620 a year (plus overtime pay)." It further states, "Overtime pay. The standard Federal workweek of the 48 hours includes 8 hours of overtime. The increase in compensation for overtime amounts on an annual basis to approximately 21 percent of the basic salary." Notice that 21 percent, and remember that the Fair (?) Labor Standards Act says that the laborer and the mechanic in the war plant, under the same conditions, get 30 percent "increase in compensation for overtime." These Communists reach far afield.

The only explanation ever given me to account for these discrepancies is the claim that to pay the foreman and the superintendent and the engineer time-and-one-half for these additional 8 hours is "inflationary," but to pay it to the laborer and the mechanic is not. That's utter nonsense. Reduced to figures the statement means that to pay the technical aid about $6.54 for his extra 8 hours, on top of a salary of about $31 for his 40-hour week, is inflationary; to pay the mechanic $15.30 for his extra 8 hours, on top of a pay of $51 for his 40-hour week, is not inflationary. That's utter rot.

What has happened to American justice, when a man's pay rate is based on what "class" he belongs to? Who give these bureaucrats the right and power to change the American way of life? Why shouldn't pay rates for overtime, whether they are time-and-one-half or straight time or no pay at all, be applied equally to all men?

It seems to me that this is a drive by the bureaucrats to put into practice the theory (long since abandoned by the Russians, who couldn't make it work, by the way) that every man should get the same dollars pay regardless of his work-contribution to society. We are being herded into an unwanted "class" system by these self-appointed messiahs and are being robbed of our American system by insolent bureaucrats convinced of their own all-embracing knowledge, but who are too sly to put their ideas to the test of the people's vote. If we want to retain the American way for ourselves and our children and to strike off the chains these men are rapidly fastening on us all, we must act and act soon, else our "class" will be wiped out. Write your ideas on this subject to your Congressmen, your Senators, your newspapers and magazines, your radio commentators, in fact to anyone who can in any way influence our system of government. And when the time comes, get to the voting booth and throw these bureaucratic Communists out of power by voting out of office those elected officials who are responsible for them and their acts.

A Poet Speaks From the Visitors' Gallery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Archibald MacLeish:

A POET SPEAKS FROM THE VISITORS' GALLERY

Have Gentlemen perhaps forgotten this?—
We write the histories.
Do Gentlemen who snigger at the poets,
Who speak the word professor with guffaws—
Do Gentlemen expect their fame to flourish
When we, not they, distribute the applause?
Or do they trust their hope of long remembrance
To those they name with such respectful care—
To those who write the titles in the papers,
To those who tell the tattle on the air?
Do Gentlemen expect the generation
That counts the loser out when tolls the bell
To take some gossip-caster's estimation,
Some junior voice of fame with fish to sell?
Do Gentlemen believe time's hard-boiled jury,
Judging the sober truth, will trust again
The words some copperhead who owned a paper
Ordered one Friday from the hired men?
Have Gentlemen forgotten Mr. Lincoln?
A poet wrote that story, not a newspaper,
Not the New Yorker of the nameless name
Who spat with hatred like some others later
And left, as they will, in his hate his shame.
History's not written in the kind of ink
The richest man of most ambitious mind
Who hates a president enough to print
A daily paper can afford or find.
Gentlemen have power now and know it,
But even the greatest and most famous kings
Feared and with reason to offend the poets
Whose songs are marble and whose marble sings.

—*Archibald MacLeish.*

Drafting of Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted on September 9, 1943, by the executive committee, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion:

Whereas over 50,000 members of the American Legion in Massachusetts, individually and through their department executive committee, have watched for the past year the operation of the Selective Service System in Massachusetts and throughout the entire country; and

Whereas as far back as October 1942 the department executive committee went on record as opposed to undeserved deferments from military service for young inexperienced men of selective sevice age in industry, having in mind that if such a practice was not stopped that the civilian status of married men and fathers would soon be jeopardized; and

Whereas the time has now come when the single manpower of selective service age in Massachusetts is no longer available for service in the armed forces save that single manpower in industry and in the service of the Government; and

Whereas this conclusion is so universal throughout the Commonwealth that various Selective Service boards and groups of boards have openly in the public press protested against the situation and certain Members of Congress have suggested three concrete plans whereby the single manpower for the armed forces can be supplied, thus protecting the civilian status of married men and fathers, namely: (1) That industry be first drained of its selective-service age single men; (2) That Federal bureaus throughout the land, especially in Washington, be forced to release its single men of selective-service age; (3) That those single men of selective-service age now classified as 4-F be rehabilitated at once and put into active service as rehabilitated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Department of the American Legion in Massachusetts does hereby go on record as unalterably opposed to the inefficient, expensive, and un-American plan to draft married men and fathers before every single man of selective-service age is taken from industry and Federal bureaus, having in mind that those single men for the most part can be replaced by married men or fathers, or by women; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every member of Congress from Massachusetts urging each member to actively work for the accomplishment of this result so that the basis bulwark of American life, the family, may not be undermined at least not until such time as such an emergency has been more definitely proven necessary.

Rationing in Worcester County, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PEHR G. HOLMES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper clipping:

WORCESTER COUNTY WAR PRICE
AND RATION BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Worcester, Mass., September 11, 1943.

Representative PEHR G. HOLMES,
Worcester, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed please find newspaper clipping on report of association meeting here September 10. This is for your information.

Yours very truly,
C. M. DEARING, *President.*

RATION BOARDS HERE ASK O. P. A. REFORMS—WORCESTER COUNTY GROUP OFFERS 14-POINT PRICE-CONTROL PLAN

A 14-point program, designed to secure more uniform administration of O. P. A. rationing regulations, was adopted by the Worcester County War Price and Ration Boards Association last night at a meeting in Hotel Bancroft.

The group, comprising nearly 50 representatives of local boards, also voted to assume

responsibility for the rationing program in Worcester County when the O. P. A. district office ceases to function September 30.

Centralization of O. P. A. powers within Massachusetts under one State head, abolition of needless reports and surveys, less frequent changes on O. P. A. regulations and broader discretionary powers to local boards were included in the program. It will be forwarded to Regional O. P. A. Administrator Kenneth B. Backman, State Director Lawrence J. Bresnahan, and Worcester County's Representatives in Congress.

14-POINT PROGRAM

The 14-point program provides:

1. Centralization of O. P. A. powers in Massachusetts in one State head.
2. Broader discretionary powers to local boards.
3. An increase in enforcement personnel.
4. Greater cooperation among individual boards and less harassment from Federal, State, and district officials.
5. Greater distribution of O. P. A. funds for clerical assistance for local boards.
6. Consideration of Worcester County men, experienced in rationing problems, for any supervisory appointments in this area.
7. Abolishment of needless reports and surveys.
8. A central distribution center in each county to provide speedy distribution of supplies.
9. Abolition of Gestapo methods in enforcing rationing rules.
10. Use of educational methods in seeking cooperation of public.
11. More uniform and simpler application blanks, preferably printed on one side of paper.
12. Release of information direct to local boards rather than conflicting announcements from national and regional offices.
13. Less frequent changes in O. P. A. regulations.
14. Closer cooperation with business for price control.

NO ACTION ON PROTEST

The association discussed the recent protest of the O. P A. District Labor Advisory Committee against closing the district office but no action resulted.

It was also voted to draft a set of by-laws for presentation to the October meeting and increase the number of executive committee members to nine.

Officers are Carroll M. Dearing of Westboro, president; Edward B. Conroy, of North Brookfield, vice president; Harry E. Howard, of Northboro, treasurer; and M. Lawrence Price, of Paxton, secretary.

Members of the executive committee are Michael J. Fitzgerald, of Worcester, Thomas J. Barry, of Northbridge, Palmer J. Lord, of Petersham, Hugh F. Ruane, of Clinton, and Leo F. Brown, of Millbury.

Address by Stuart A. Seelye, President, New Orleans Association of Commerce, at a Conference With Louisiana Senators and New Orleans Congressmen, Tuesday, August 24, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. MALONEY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Stuart A. Seelye, president of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, at a conference with our Louisiana Senators and myself on August 24, 1943.

I wish to express to our guests tonight our genuine appreciation of the opportunity of meeting with them before their return to their arduous duties in Washington.

As our elected Representatives in Congress, you are desirous of having our honest views on the difficult problems which confront our Nation. Business, generally, may be blamed for not vigorously stressing its views on the basic principles of our economic system. Business has been, to some extent, intimidated by the tirades of demagogs who have attacked it and have attempted to create an impression that businessmen do not represent the true spirit of America.

The Association of Commerce is an organization representing business. I do not mean business in the sense of big business, but small business, since the vast majority of our membership represents small business.

As businessmen, we have the responsibility to assist Congress in every way possible and the best way to do this, as good Americans, is to state what is in our minds plainly and frankly and, in this way, contribute to sound conclusions in vital issues.

RESUME CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

This Nation was created on the principle of a government for and by the people. This ideal which has stood the test of more than 150 years, must be maintained and I feel confident that I speak not only for ourselves, but for the Nation as a whole, in complimenting you and all of those in the Congress who have clearly shown an intention to regain its rightful position as the legislative branch of our Government. This has had a heartening and reassuring reaction from all the people. We urge that you do not relax in your efforts so that we will again have legislation by representation and not by edict.

As a consequence of war, certain methods contrary to peacetime procedure are necessary and the people must relinquish some of the freedoms they have regarded as inviolate. We can say with pride in all business that it has cooperated wholeheartedly in the war effort and has made all necessary sacrifices, as its contribution. It is the opinion of all of us here that the actual conduct of the war is in competent hands and that victory, so far as the world conflict is concerned, is a foregone conclusion. It would be very fortunate indeed if our internal affairs were handled with the same efficiency.

We hear our internal affairs described in various terms, the least of which is "confusion" or "organized chaos." There are many reasons for this opinion when we consider the multitude of bureaus which have taken over, to much too great an extent, functions which should be handled by the Congress.

TOO MANY BUREAUS

The creation of one bureau leads to another and further subdivisions of authority and overlapping of functions. As a result of this, there surely arises in the public mind great confusion as to the authority, scope, and activity of governmental bureaus. I would like to cite just one example of overlapping, and there are hundreds like it, which is found in the handling of just one problem—labor. There are 13 existing boards or divisions all concerned with labor, wages, and salaries. This condition is equally true with every other bureau activity. It is not conceivable that, with this set-up handling the important phases of our domestic economy, anything but confusion should result.

We are convinced that there are opportunities to abolish many existing bureaus. We feel that this should be done in the interest of both efficiency and economy, and we urge you to do all you can to accomplish this, in our interest.

We cannot help but feel that Congress, to some extent, is to blame for the conditions. All of the bureaus were created by congressional action. They are creatures of the Congress which, when it created them, set up the limits of their authority and their functions. It is fair to expect that Congress will not forget its responsibility, but will hold them within the limits of their authority and to strict accountability to Congress for their performance.

When peace comes, there will arise from the four corners of the Nation a demand that bureaus created for wartime emergency shall be promptly terminated. Certainly that is our opinion. It is a well known and accepted fact that bureaus do not readily relinquish their powers. We have several examples of that in the W. P. A., C. C. C., and N. Y. A., all of which were created to meet conditions of unemployment and which would still be in operation at this time, when an extreme shortage of manpower exists, if it had not been that Congress wisely cancelled out appropriations to these agencies.

Congress will face a difficult job when the day comes when bureaus which have served their purpose should be terminated. Bureaus will endeavor, by every means, to keep their places on the taxpayers' pay roll, but we tell you now that the people will demand, in no uncertain terms, the prompt ending of bureaucratic government.

It has been said that many of those now serving our Government in the various bureaus are endeavoring to create, under the guise of war necessity, new situations, new ideas, and perhaps a new economy which they do not intend shall terminate with the war. Surely we know that you agree that no such plan should be permitted to develop into accomplishment and all such planning and effort should be fought to a finish.

While the American people are perfectly willing to be guided by legislation enacted by Congress, they will, in peacetime, strenuously object to be governed or in any wise controlled by bureaucrats or by executive directives. Such government would be entirely contrary to our traditions and the spirit of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

Another matter in which we have very strong convictions is that neither in the prosecution of the war, nor in any other matter concerning the Nation, should the question of political expediency have any part. If there ever was a time in the history of the Nation during which the first consideration should be "the greatest good to the greatest number," it is now. While American citizens may be Democrats or Republicans, they are first, last, and always Americans. In our country, the citizen is the sovereign and he recognizes public officials not as masters, but fellow citizens whom he has chosen by election to administer the affairs of his country.

In one of the reports which reached our office, the statement was made that in a poll of Congress conducted by the New York Herald-Tribune the lawmakers rate as first in importance the preservation of free enterprise. No one who has thought much about the source of the growth and prosperity of our Nation could question the wisdom of this decision.

A "FIFTH FREEDOM"

President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill formulated the Atlantic Charter, in which were outlined "four freedoms" they hoped might be attained throughout the world. The first two of these—freedom of speech and freedom of worship—are a heritage from the founders of the Nation and are guaranteed to us under the Constitution. Nobody can question freedom from fear and freedom from want for all the peoples of the world, as a noble aspiration, but one for which it is only

possible to vaguely hope. There is, however, another freedom, a "fifth freedom," far more possible of attainment. That is freedom of opportunity—freedom of individual enterprise and initiative—freedom for every individual to improve his condition, limited only by his willingness to work for it.

This freedom, we must have for ourselves. We are fighting a war now for the preservation of this "fifth freedom." If it could be had by all peoples, it would, alone, go far toward attaining freedom from fear and freedom from want.

FREE ENTERPRISE

There is a tendency with some public officials of the demagogue type to picture free enterprise as something to be feared. That hardly makes sense when we know that every dollar spent for anything that people buy or pay taxes, has its source from the pay roll or from the earnings of free enterprise.

In its simple analysis, every business is simply an enterprise, big or little, in which people invest their dollars, their faith, and their energies in the hope of earning a reasonable profit. Our biggest corporations merely represent the combined risking of dollars by thousands of stockholders in an enterprise in which they have faith. Every man who endeavors to sell something for a fair return is a unit in the system called free enterprise, whether he be stockholder in the biggest corporation, a man who operates his own business, or a man who sells the labor and skill of his hands.

There certainly can be no division of opinion as to the necessity of maintaining a system by which every man may, under his own power and limited only by his own ambition and ability, improve his standard of living. If it were possible to consult with every man in our armed forces, the vast majority of them would say that they are fighting for a chance, when they get back from the war, to resume their peacetime activities and an opportunity to build a future for themselves under the free-enterprise system. Certainly they do not expect to become part of a regimented economy or to be the wards of the Nation under some paternalistic set-up.

The system of free enterprise has made America. Its continuance is equally necessary in the future. If, when the peace comes, the system of free enterprise is not permitted to function we will have lost a most vital source of employment and progress.

An interesting comment on free enterprise was made at a meeting in New York City on April 28 by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, from which I quote:

"When the war ends we shall have the largest productive plant in the history of the world. We will have a larger, better balanced and more flexible force of skilled workers. We will have management steeped in the experience and engineering knowledge of the intensive war-production effort. Let us now meet the issue squarely. Let us recognize frankly that efficient production backed by the solvent financial position of private enterprise is just as essential to win the peace as it is to win the war."

Many of the bureaus now in existence have to do with the fate of the free enterprise system. We urge you, therefore, to be ever watchful and to safeguard the hundreds of thousands of enterprises—85 percent of them small business—from which flow every dollar that circulates throughout the Nation.

GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY

We urge you also to do everything within your power to produce in government those measures of economy which are expected by the people who are footing the bill. The civilian population is urged to economize in its expenditures to counteract inflation. Such sacrifices and economies are necessary in our war effort, but certainly it seems reasonable to demand that all bureaus, departments, and branches of our Government, which are not directly concerned in the war effort, should be required to follow the same economy demanded of the civilian population, who produce the tax revenue with which Government expenditures are paid.

TAXATION

We could spend hours discussing the matter of taxation and still not cover the subject. We should, however, bear in mind that Government is not a producer of revenue, but is solely and entirely a spender. The money that it spends comes mainly from taxes of many forms paid from their earnings by the people of the country, and the Government, as a spender, is simply acting as the agent of the people. If this could be kept clearly in mind at all times, it would seem that there would be greater efforts toward economy and perhaps more reasonable and fair decisions in legislation which impose taxes.

I would like to touch upon one tax proposition which directly concerns business. It has been stated by Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, that he has the conviction that business has now been taxed up to its maximum capacity to pay. There seems to be little doubt but that this is true. Yet, of course, business realizes that the cost of the war must be paid and can only be paid by taxes.

BUSINESS RESERVES

However, in the levying of taxes on corporations, there is one consideration which has not received proper attention. That is the fundamental that business be permitted to accumulate reserves from earnings without paying the heavy tax penalty on these reserves. It doesn't seem reasonable that dollars from business earnings set aside to meet needs for replacement, expansion, or transition to peacetime production should be taxed to the extent of 80 cents on every dollar of reserve. It would seem fair to limit such reserves to a percentage of gross or net income and make these reserves, on such a basis, tax free. If this is not done, many peacetime and wartime enterprises may be entirely lost as a part of the post-war industrial transition and reconstruction.

It is very clearly indicated that labor organizations have a very intelligent appreciation of the necessity of permitting free enterprise, which gives them employment, to create such reserves as will be necessary to transform business, as a whole, from wartime activity to normal, peacetime economy.

We, therefore, urge you that when tax legislation comes before you, that the creation of proper reserves by free enterprise should not only be permitted but should be encouraged, if we are to provide employment to the maximum number of men released from the armed forces and from war industries.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS

There is another matter of vital concern to many businesses normally engaged in peacetime activities, but which at present are producing a large volume of goods for the war. That is the matter of renegotiation of contracts. There seems to be no doubt that drastic changes and improvements should be made in the methods of renegotiation.

Renegotiators will do well to consider what will be left over after both they and the income tax collector have finished. As you know, renegotiations are based on profit "before" taxes. On the face of it, this is wrong. Many of our local small business concerns have government material contracts. Apparently the amount of profit which the renegotiators seem to regard as fair and reasonable is 10 percent. When such business concerns, as is generally the case, because of the unusually large volume of business resulting from these war contracts, get into the excess-profit tax bracket, they pay 80 percent of the remaining 10 percent, and have left only 2 percent from which to meet demands for reconversion to post-war operations and dividends.

There must be developed some fair and more reasonable basis for renegotiation. If the present basis continues in renegotiating contracts, it is easy to see that when these industries return to their normal pre-war activities, and Government contracts are no longer to be had, that few, if any, of them will be in position to absorb their share of men who will be seeking employment at that time.

The whole matter of renegotiation leaves the seller or producer of goods in a position of doubt as to what, in the final analysis, will be the result in profit of a contract into which he entered in good faith, and in the performance of which he assumed all of the risks. Renegotiation should be based on profits "after" instead of "before" taxes.

SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Another matter about which business interests of many kinds are deeply concerned is the disposition of surplus war materials which will be in the hands of the Government or for which there may be uncompleted contracts. When the war ends, particularly should it end sooner than expected, we will find the Government with hundreds of millions of dollars of foodstuffs and other materials for which some disposition must be found. The quantity of these materials will be large enough to seriously disturb the market and we are convinced that their sale and disposition should be handled through those businessess experienced in the handling of such commodities, and that such disposition should be made gradually so as not to destroy the normal markets for the various commodities.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

A fundamental to the peacetime prosperity of the Nation is the maintenance of its foreign and domestic commerce by means of an adequate merchant marine under our flag. This requirement is fully recognized in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which outlines reasons which make necessary a merchant marine, and from which I quote:

"A merchant marine sufficient to carry its domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of the water-borne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign water-borne commerce at all times;

"Capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency;

"Composed of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

We are in position to have, in peacetime, a merchant marine which will provide all of the requirements outlined above. Before Pearl Harbor the United States had only 1,150 ships of slightly over 7,000,000 gross tons operating under its flag. The Maritime Commission has reported delivery, during the first 7 months of 1943, of 1,046 vessels of almost ten and a half million gross tons, and it is estimated that the United States will have in operation at least 30,000,000 gross tons of shipping at the end of 1943, and under the present construction rate, by the end of 1944, should have a merchant ship tonnage almost equal to the total world tonnage.

All American vessels of all types have been taken over by the Government by bare ship charters or, to a large extent, by outright purchase from the owners. The ships operate under the direction and control of the War Shipping Administration. In the prosecution of the war, normal services, schedules, and sailings were necessarily abandoned. As soon after the termination of the war as possible, these services and sailings should be resumed, to provide for the movement of freight in coastwise and foreign trade. This can only be done by providing a sufficient number of vessels of the most suitable types available, to merchant shipping companies, operating under the free-enterprise system. It should also be borne in mind that local shipping companies which in the pre-war days were given rights and privileges to serve certain trade routes from Gulf ports, must have, in full, these same rights when the war is ended. Consideration must also be given to building, to replace war losses, of special types of vessels, mainly tankers, passenger vessels, and vessels specifically designed for specific services or trade routes, under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

We urge that you gentlemen be insistent, upon the termination of the war, that this vast fleet of merchant vessels operating under our flag be provided and used to serve world trade routes, all of which should be maintained and further developed. Any plan which would include the operation of merchant vessels engaged in either domestic or foreign trade by the Government through any bureau or agency, is definitely undesirable and an intrusion into a business normally and successfully handled by free enterprise.

We should be ever watchful for plans which may develop after the war and be presented by other nations, even those friendly to us, to utilize our merchant marine, created as a result of the war, in competition with our own shipping interests.

It is equally important that our interests in industry, agriculture, and shipping should be completely protected in international trade agreements which will follow the war.

New Orleans is tremendously interested in these particular matters because of its port and our interest is shared by all the other Gulf ports as well as the entire Mississippi Valley, which is mainly served in its export and import commerce through these ports.

DISPOSITION OF WAR PLANTS

Another matter which concerns business is the disposition of the many industrial plants built with taxpayers' funds and provided through the War Plant Corporation. We understand there are more than 1,500 of these plants, many of gigantic size, producing many products. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money are invested in these plants created solely for the production of war materials. Utilization of these plants by private industry should be the aim and purpose of our Government on a basis which will make this utilization possible.

Perhaps many of these war plants, for which there is no peacetime use, should be dismantled and written off as a part of the cost of the war. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if there should be any intent, as has been frequently indicated as a possibility, that the Government itself may operate some of these plants as yardsticks of industrial operation. It is certain that business of every kind, big and little, and the individual citizen will vigorously oppose the entrance of the Government into business in the post-war period.

LABOR

There has been no subject of public interest about which there has been more discussion than labor. The elements necessary to the continued progress of the Nation, the happiness of its people, and the maintenance of our high standard of living, include labor, capital, energy, and ambition. Since all of these are ingredients of prosperity for all the people, there seems to be no fair and reasonable reason why there should be any serious difference of opinion. Of course, there will always be some business concerns who will endeavor to take advantage of those who are employed by them in the way of inadequate wages, unfair treatment or bad working conditions. On the other hand, there will also always be leaders of labor who are not disposed to be fair and cooperative, but who endeavor to take advantage of situations to make unreasonable demands for the workers they represent.

In the conduct of this war there certainly can be no difference of opinion as to the necessity of utilizing to the greatest extent the full productive capacity of industries essential to war production. Labor and industry both should recognize their obligation to maintain full efficiency and production. We believe that industry, on its part, should afford all possible cooperation to maintain full operation. On the other hand, labor should put an end to strikes, boycotts, slowdowns, and jurisdictional disputes. We believe that labor also should use the power of its organization to curb absenteeism. Just as business is expected to carry out its obligations and contracts, labor should also be expected to do the same.

As our Representatives in Congress, we hope you feel that way about the matter. We think, also, that in fulfilling your obligation as lawmakers for the Nation, you should resist coercion from labor, capital, agriculture, or any other bloc, and, by sound reasoning and consideration of the greatest good for the greatest number, arrive at your decisions. The people will have confidence in a Congress which has the courage of its convictions and resists any effort to sway it from its honest conclusions.

PRICE CONTROL EFFORTS

Certainly we cannot omit mention of the matter of price control, nor the confusion which has resulted from the constantly changing regulations of prices and production, and the apparent lack of decision of bureaus charged with handling the matter. It has been stated in the House of Representatives that one of the difficulties results from the type of persons who are handling price control, production, and rationing. A statement made on the 3d of July by the Congressman from Missouri, in which he mentioned practically every important commodity used or consumed by business and the public, pointed out that the price executives or administrators were all men with no previous experience in the business they seek to regulate.

The net result of this situation has been a state of confusion which has not only made it impossible for business to understand what is expected but practically impossible for it to avoid violating conflicting regulations. This situation has created conditions favorable to the black market and has been the source of general disorganization not only to business but to the 130,000,000 citizens.

There is a willingness on the part of both business and the consumer to observe such regulations as will provide the maximum quantity of the things we need and at prices which are fair and proper, and yet the confidence of the public has been almost entirely destroyed by the methods used by various bureaus to attain this result.

"ROLL-BACKS"

A question particularly alive at this moment is the subject of food subsidies and "roll-backs," and a very recent suggestion of legislation to come up in the next session of Congress by which the Government will purchase, for one price, all of the meat produced, as well as other food products, and sell them to the public at a lower price. The announced purpose of such plans is to reduce the cost of living, yet, a simple analysis of the result would show that quite the contrary would ensue.

If the Government buys meat at a price and sells it to the public at a lower price than it pays, a loss to the Government will result. Not a loss to the Government, but to the taxpayer who must, by means of some tax, make up this loss.

This burden of taxation will probably not be paid by the present generation, who may benefit in a very small way by this scheme, but by generations to come, so that the net result would be a burden placed on our children to offset lower prices to us for certain foods at this time.

It would seem that instead of subsidies or "roll-backs" preventing inflation, they would have the contrary effect. A lower price for any commodity would leave more spending money in the hands of the consumer, thereby tending to produce inflation. Price "roll-backs," by subsidy in any form are, at best, a most undesirable makeshift.

EXPERIENCED EXECUTIVES

We urge that you gentlemen consider, in connection with the operation of the Office of Price Administration, that it be made to comply with that portion of the law under which the Administration was created, which requires that they shall consult with the people in the industries affected by price fixing or rationing.

It is a matter of report that this is not done, except as window dressing, and the failure of these administrators to avail themselves of the information and experience of those engaged in business, multiplies the confusion and error. It is clearly indicated that bureaucrats look with disdain upon business and consider their judgment, based on theory, as being superior to the judgment of business, based on practical experience.

WHOLESALER AND JOBBER

We would also urge that in the consideration of rationing, distribution, and price fixing that there should not be neglected that element of the business world which has played an important role in the distribution and sale of goods. I refer to the jobber and wholesaler. As a result of the rapid expansion of governmental agencies, there has been, to a very large extent, a failure to utilize the experience and knowledge of the various local distributing organizations as procurement agencies for the Government. This is not in the best interest of the war effort or our national welfare, as it causes unnecessary loss of time in procurement and needless duplication of effort.

We urge that you keep the situation of the wholesaler and jobber in mind so that the valuable asset represented by this type of business may be recognized and utilized and given its fullest opportunity in our domestic economy.

GRADE LABELING

Another matter which deserves your serious consideration is the proposed grade labeling. No more vicious suggestion has originated in the Office of Price Administration than this idea which is a definite step toward regimentation and will kill the competitive spirit necessary in any and all business. American producers and manufacturers who have spent millions of dollars in research in continuing efforts to improve the quality of merchandise sold under their brands or trade

name, certainly could not be expected to continue those efforts. The hundreds of products known by their trade names as an accepted mark of quality, deserve to maintain a position of preference with the discriminating buying public.

Not only is this a measure of regimentation but it might also be taken as an indication of Government intent to participate to an entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable extent in the operation of free enterprise.

It also has the effect of damaging or even destroying distributors, since the classification of distributor is based on sales volume. That is, the greater the volume the lower the basic figure in establishing ceiling prices. Such procedure will eventually mean the elimination of the small independent concern. It can have no other result. The little man is the one who knew how and did build America. He should not be threatened with damage or destruction by the suggestion of grade labeling or any other regimentation.

SELECTIVE SERVICE AND MANPOWER

There is just one more matter we would like to bring to your attention—that is the confusion which has resulted from the apparent lack of ability for decision by the Selective Service and the War Manpower Commission. From what we have read in the newspapers regarding the activities of both of these bureaus, it would appear that they change their minds and their policies almost every week. This has had a naturally disturbing effect on married men and others who, while they are perfectly willing to assume their full part in the war effort, are uncertain as to what they should do.

It may be that it would prove desirable or even necessary, that the Congress enact specific legislation covering selective service as well as necessary provisions for manpower in industry. We believe that such legislation will be brought up for consideration by Congress when it resumes its session and we regard both of these matters as of serious importance not only to business interests but to the individual citizens who are affected.

In further connection with the matter of the armed forces and the problem of manpower, we feel it is safe to assume that at the termination of the war it will be necessary to maintain a very much larger Army and Navy than we have had in the past, for the policing and protection of areas involved in the war. Policing of some sort probably will be necessary over a considerable length of time in order to see that the new governments set up, observe the terms of peace.

It is natural to assume, however, that a great many men now in the armed forces will be returned to civilian life following the close of hostilities. We urge that this not be done all at one time, but very gradually and only as fast as it can be demonstrated that employment is available for them.

FREEDOM OF PRESS AND RADIO

The principle of free speech which is set forth in our Constitution should at all times be fully and completely protected. The press and radio should not be restricted in their use of news, views, or criticisms of any individuals or groups of individuals which are not seditious.

All citizens will agree that no bureau or method used by the Government in the dissemination of news or propaganda should be used to advance the interests of any individual, group of individuals, or political party. Also, there should be stopped immediately any indication or suspicion of indication of any use of Government bureaus or individuals on the public pay rolls, to create a political machine, or to advance the political interests of any political party. Our fellow citizens on our pay rolls must have the same freedom of opinion as we enjoy.

PREPARING FOR PEACE

We could spend hours discussing matters of vital importance at the present time and in the years to follow the war. I have necessarily been able to talk only in terms of generalities. I am confident that you feel that our Association, with its membership of approximately 4,500, represents a very complete cross section of American free enterprise. We know that you recognize us as honest and sincere Americans who have no desire to place any selfish interest above the welfare of the Nation. New Orleans and its business interests have responded to every call made upon them in connection with the war effort. Even as we make our contribution in every way possible toward the war effort, we know that war is an abnormal condition and that peace is normal. For that reason, as businessmen accustomed to thinking and planning ahead, we urge you to bear in mind that when the day of victory comes, it must not find us as poorly prepared for peace as we found ourselves prepared for war on December 7, 1941. Failure now to prepare for peace will surely spell confusion and perhaps disaster.

The principles of freedom, as laid down by the founding fathers in 1776 in the Declaration of Independence, were passed on to us as a form of government under which all of the people could live and prosper. The 167 years which have elapsed have demonstrated the soundness of those principles.

It is the obligation of our generation, and those that will follow, to preserve, protect and maintain our form of government. It is our obligation to resist any effort from any source to change it in any way. In these difficult days while we wage war against powerful enemies, it may seem expedient or desirable to some group or groups in our country to wander from the path which, experience has indicated, alone leads to the greatest good for the greatest number. We look to you, as our elected Representatives in the Congress, to be ever watchful that nothing is done to violate the principles of self-government which date back to the greatest day in the history of the Nation—July 4, 1776.

How Can the United States Best Procure Ample Food Production?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I submit as an extension of my remarks the address given by Hon. Tom Linder, commissioner of agriculture, Georgia, at the recent annual meeting of the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture at Detroit Lakes, Minn. His address follows:

How can the United States best procure ample food production?

The very fact that such a question is asked is ample evidence that our economy is out of balance, for if it pertained to any other commodity, the answer would be the same as it is in the matter of food production.

The best way—the only way, in fact—to encourage ample production of a commodity is to pay a price for that commodity which will enable the producer to increase his output at a profit.

How can we encourage the farmers to produce ample supplies? is not the basic issue; How can we free the farmer from being hamstrung by governmental agencies long enough so that he can produce? is the real problem of food production.

A man, with his hands tied behind him, is thrown into a river; he cannot swim ashore. While he is struggling in the water, let us ask, "How can we best induce this man to swim ashore?" and we have a condition quite similar to the present food situation. It is not a question of inducing the man who is struggling in the water to swim ashore; it is simply a matter of untying his hands so that he can swim ashore.

Today the American farmer is struggling in the water; his hands are tied behind him. He starts out to plant a crop, but ur Government threatens dire penalties against him if he under- or over-plants the acreage which the triple A has allotted to him for various crops. Much of the valuable time he should spend in his field is used in visiting the triple-A office at the county seat.

The farmer needs these supplies to carry on his operations; his crops are neglected and we follow him as he endeavors to comply with regulations:

1. Fuel for tractor or truck. He must wait his turn to secure an allotment, then locate a source of supply.

2. Farm equipment. He must go to the United States Department of Agriculture War Board at still another location, try to obtain priority enabling him to make the purchase, and, if successful, find a merchant who has it for sale.

Since large manufacturers of agricultural machinery and equipment now are canceling their contracts with many small business houses, the farmer must buy direct from the manufacturer, giving him the profit that heretofore has gone to the local dealer.

After considerable delay, the farmer makes arrangements to purchase the machinery direct from the manufacturer, but, under orders of the Office of Defense Transportation, the manufacturer cannot make delivery to the farmer unless he can have 75 percent of a load on his return trip.

What happens? The manufacturer, in many instances, finds that it is impossible for him to make delivery to the farmer; the order is canceled and the farmer's efforts are for nil.

3. Transportation. In a great many cases, farmers of my State are dependent upon truckers to transport their produce to market when it is gathered.

The truckers find themselves hemmed in by so many limitations of O. P. A., O. D. T., U. S. D. A., and I. C. C. that many of them have gone out of business and consequently their trucks no longer are available to haul the farmer's crops to market.

Handicapped on all sides, the farmer has struggled through the year and produced a crop, only to find that the O. P. A. has fixed a ceiling on it that is below the cost of production.

Occasionally the Government does place a support price under a crop, that price is so low that it has a demoralizing effect on prices rather than being a support.

In many instances there is no relationship between the support price and the ceiling price.

As an illustration, compare these prices for snap beans, per bushel hamper, at the Atlanta market this spring:

Ceiling	$7.50
Support	1.50

The ceiling price on Irish potatoes, an essential crop, at the farm was fixed at $2.50 per hundredweight, or $750 for a 15-ton car. On the other hand, watermelons, a nonessential crop, brought as high as $1,000 to $1,100 for a 15-ton car.

Some months ago the United States Department of Agriculture called a meeting at the Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta to discuss the shortage of protein feeds. I, as well as a number of others, took it for granted that such a meeting likewise would be interested in taking steps to counteract this shortage by encouraging production of more protein crops.

After the better part of the day had been spent outlining the shortage of protein feeds and its cause, it was proposed that farmers be encouraged to grow more crops carrying protein contents. We were amazed to find that Government representatives present at the meeting were very much opposed to any increase in crops; their prime interest was in having all control officials agree to a reduction in the protein content of mixed feed.

Often I have seen some shiftless Negro farmer who had a mule but no feed; by some means he would get a sack of corn and then would try to force the old mule to eat dry grass, corn stalks, or whatever else Nature provided, to finish out his rations. In each instance, however, the old mule finally died from starvation.

This is the Government's present procedure—cutting down protein and grain content in feed and then selling the feed to poultry raisers, dairymen and others; and, like the shiftless Negro farmer, the Government is expecting some miracle to produce chickens and milk after the protein and grain has been eliminated from the feed.

Last year the O. P. A. fixed a ceiling price on cotton goods and yarns, based on the farmer receiving 21.47 cents for cotton.

The United States Department of Agriculture, on the other hand by use of its fake parity on cotton, held down Government loans to force the farmers' cotton on the market at around $10 a bale less than the ceiling price upon which mill products were based. Further, the United States Department of Agriculture continually threatened the cotton market by dumping Government stocks whenever the price of cotton showed a tendency to rise.

It is my opinion that the shortage of agricultural products is a direct result of the Administration's fixed policies:

1. The policy of scarcity and reduced production.

I do not see how any reasonable man could expect anything but a shortage of agricultural crops under a policy of burning wheat in the field, throwing hogs in the river and plowing cotton into the ground.

Personally, I do not believe that the shortage of food and other farm products surprised Washington. To the contrary, I think it was planned that way. From the beginning, I think the intention of the policy of scarcity was to create this very shortage. But I do not think the Administration foresaw the shortage of ships to bring into the United States foreign farm products in tremendous quantities.

2. The policy of low prices for farm products.

This fixed policy of the Administration reasonably would be expected to bring about the shortage of production.

The control officials in Washington are not as crazy as their acts would indicate; their acts are strictly in line with the fixed policies of the administration.

3. The policy of reciprocal trade agreements, so-called.

This is another fixed policy of the administration which demonstrates the determination to liquidate the American farmer.

Under these agreements, if continued, the American farmer cannot produce or compete with agricultural products flooding this country, produced by peon labor at 20 to 40 cents a day. It is impossible to operate a farm in the United States under the American standard of living and with protected industrial commodities and then compete with foreign crops.

To undertake to force the American farmer to produce on a peacetime basis, with all the world at war and with all other business on a war footing, would be undertaken only on a theory of forcing the American farmer out of business.

There is but one policy to be followed to secure the necessary food and clothing for our civilian population and our armed forces, to say nothing of our allies and the people of occupied countries:

Take the shackles off the farmers.

Supply the farmers with equipment, seed, and fertilizer in abundance.

Permit the farmers to obtain a price for their products that will represent at least the cost of production, after allowing them to compete with other industry in the labor market.

We hear a daily chant, "Hold the line against inflation," which would be fine if those who sing this chant were not the principal offenders against their own doctrine.

Does any responsible man believe you can spend a hundred billion dollars in a year on cost-plus basis without creating inflation?

Does any sane man believe that the Government can employ one-half of the citizens at the present wage level without creating inflation?

At a time when most processors are making more money than at any time in history, does any man in his right sense believe you can pay subsidies to processors without accelerating inflation?

Does any rational man believe that you can reduce prices of commodities without reducing wages and still hold the line against inflation?

Until the present fixed policies of the national administration are changed, it is impossible to produce adequate food and clothing. Whether that change is brought about by the Congress this year, or whether it will be brought about by the voters themselves next year, I do not know.

One thing I believe I do know; in fact I am convinced—that so long as the present policy of scarcity, the present policy of low prices on farm products, and the present policy of hamstringing the farmers is continued, we may expect to see a growing shortage of food.

We may expect to see "a measure of wheat for a penny," "a measure of barley for a penny," and "see thou hurt not the oil and wine."

When a country is geared to import food and fiber in peacetimes, how can we expect that country to be self-supporting as to food and fiber in wartimes?

How can you get a prisoner in a dungeon out into the open air?

Simply unlock the door.

Open the bars.

Give him the opportunity.

And he will walk out all too gladly.

How can we get farm production?

Simply take shackles off the farmer.

Return to him the freedom which he is guaranteed under the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Give him equality before the law.

Give him equality of economy.

Give him an opportunity to serve his country in its time of need.

And he will come through.

The farmer will feed and clothe all of us if we only give him a chance.

Address by Frank E. Bourgeois, Chairman, Waterway Transportation and Development Committee, New Orleans Association of Commerce, and Chairman, Waterways Committee, Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Mr. Frank E. Bourgeois, chairman of the Waterway Transportation and Development Committee of the Association of Commerce of New Orleans, at a conference of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas held at Houston, Tex., August 26, 1943:

It is always a great pleasure for me to attend a meeting of the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas and listen to those stalwart fighters for inland-waterway development, Clarence Holland, and Roy Miller, tell of the wonderful work that the association is doing.

Texas and Louisiana have far more in common than some local rivalries might suggest. They both produce petroleum, gas, and sulfur, and agricultural products. They both have ports on the Gulf. The Intracoastal Canal passes through the entire width of each of them. Thus, anything that affects petroleum, gas, and sulfur, and agricultural products affects them both. They have a common interest in Gulf shipping. The beneficial effects of the Intracoastal Canal are enjoyed by both.

These are large interests and have an important bearing on the development of new economic impulses and on trade and commerce in the post-war period.

In such a situation there is no place for local rivalries, but there is a real place for cooperation. It is well to remember the words of a wise statesman, "Either we hang together or we will hang separately."

Louisiana advocates the early extension of the Intracoastal Canal to the Rio Grande, just as Texas does. Louisiana and Texas both advocate the opening of the Florida barge canal and the completion of the Atlantic deep waterway all the way to Boston. When these improvements shall have been made, there will be a protected barge canal from Boston to the Rio Grande, and there need never again be a petroleum shortage in the Northeastern States.

But there is something far more important than this. Coastal commerce in general may then move between the densely populated north Atlantic States and the Gulf ports at the lowest possible cost.

The Mississippi River navigation system, which extends from Pittsburgh, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Kansas City, Omaha and St. Louis to the Gulf, crosses the Intracoastal Canal at New Orleans, and through that canal is now available to the ports of Texas. In advocating the opening of the Intracoastal Canal, some people think that New Orleans has divested itself of an advantage, but I feel that the advantage gained by New Orleans from the canal more than offsets the loss. The greater the drift of commerce by way of the Gulf ports, the great-

er will be the power of all Gulf ports to draw commerce and enterprise.

Then there is the advantage of low-cost water transportation to large sections of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida which the Intracoastal Canal makes possible. All bayous and rivers flowing into the Gulf, and therefore connecting with the Intracoastal Canal, should be improved and made navigable and thus extend the benefits of low-cost water transportation as far inland as possible.

Old-fashioned railroad men might feel that such an extension of inland waterways will adversely affect their interests but I think just to the contrary, because the movement of basic commodities at the lowest cost cannot fail to promote enterprise on a large scale, and such enterprise will generate higher paying freight for the railroads to move in large volume.

It seems to me that the key to success in the post-war period will be the elimination of waste and unnecessary expense.

Louisiana expects to more than hold its own through improvements which will prove more efficient and reduce costs to commerce handlers. The Texas ports will of course do the same thing. The general result will be increased commerce for all.

New frontiers will be opened when the war shall end. The Intracoastal Canal will help us all to take advantage of those new frontiers. Let's combine our force and influence in promoting the early completion of the Corpus Christi section and the Florida barge canal at the earliest possible time. In other words, let's be ready when new opportunities knock at our doors.

Incontrovertible Reasons for Not Drafting Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert a letter which I addressed to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and a letter addressed to me by Mr. Harry Alexander Ash, former chairman of a selective-service draft board in Chicago, which throws much light on the draft situation with respect to occupational deferments.

The letters are as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1943.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director, Selective Service System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: The enclosed is a copy of a letter directed to me by Mr. Harry Alexander Ash, of Chicago, and I feel that it is entitled to consideration, especially in view of his experience as a former chairman of a draft board.

I have been very much impressed with his statement relative to the deferment of single young men of draft age engaged in work necessary to national defense. I called attention over a year ago to the fact that there were abuses with respect to such deferments, as well as the unnecessary deferment of farmers, especially the latter, when I observed that deferments were made of men employed in the skinning of rabbits. These and similar ridiculous deferments I feel have not come to your attention.

I am of the opinion that if the suggestions contained in Mr. Ash's letter are carried out and if the drafting of those unmarried men who shun work and who are found in pool rooms, barrel houses, and on the highways and byways, and of all the young men between the ages of 18 and 25, it will not be necessary to draft fathers.

With personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. J. SABATH.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1943.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Congressman from Illinois,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: As former chairman of a selective service draft board, I am taking the liberty of addressing you.

At the outset of selective service, draft boards were ordered to recognize these two basic principles:

1. Be mindful of the harm that will result in separating a father from his children.

2. The maintenance of the family unit is of paramount importance to the national well-being.

The order drafting fathers with children scraps these two fundamental principles. Thousands of family units will be broken up and untold harm will result.

My letter, however, deals with the subject of occupational deferments. The selective service lists are saturated with hundreds of thousands of doubtful occupational deferments granted to single men who should have been in the Army months ago. The entire system of granting deferments to men, allegedly engaged in work necessary to national defense is wrong and is conducive to fraud and deceit.

Congress should abolish the present system whereby an employer is given the power to request a deferment in behalf of employees and where, on the statement of an employer, thousands of single men have been deferred as being engaged in work necessary to national defense.

The present system rewards the selfish employer who asks for the deferment of employees irrespective of the work they are engaged in, and penalizes the patriotic unselfish employer who often refuses to request the deferment of any employee.

Congress should write into the Selective Service Act a provision making it mandatory for Army and Navy ordnance officers to be assigned to draft boards.

Congress should revoke every present occupational deferment unless it bears the approval of an assigned ordnance officer who should be required to certify that the deferred registrant is engaged in necessary war work.

Each day we see able-bodied single men working at their usual civilian tasks, and we wonder how they stay out of the Army. Check on such cases and invariably they have an occupational deferment. Draft boards do not have the time, the help, the facilities or the inclination to check upon such requests for deferment in order to determine whether or not they are justified.

If, however, these deferments were based on a statement by a qualified ordnance officer, in whose opinion the registrant was actually engaged in war work, thousands of single men would be subjected to immediate induction. As a result, instead of the need for inducting fathers with children, every State in the Union would add thousands of able-bodied single men to its lists of available inductees who are now coasting along on an occupational deferment that never should have been granted.

If military exigencies demand the induction of fathers, well and good.

But first purge the list of selective service of occupational deferments. They need it.

I will appreciate hearing from you on this subject.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY A. ASH.

How the Servicemen Feel About Amending the Soldier Vote Act To Enable Overseas Soldiers, Sailors, and Civilians To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a letter which I received from a member of the Fleet Marine Force who is stationed at San Diego, Calif. He is in active service and therefore I shall not divulge his name. His letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 6, 1943.

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I harbor a deep respect for an elected Representative of the people from my home State who had the foresight as far back as 1940 to champion the idea of closer collaboration and cooperation with our present ally—the Soviet Union. It was during this year that I was granted the honor of discussing current events with you aside from the political newspaper advertisement I had come to solicit.

Your attempts to lift the veils of suspicion obstructing the American-Russian view were not in vain, Mr. SABATH. Our country's people can well thank public officeholders of your understanding for the better relationship existing between two nations figuring in the leadership of the United Nations' camp today. Your addresses and releases to the press did much to clarify the political issues of 3 years ago when I was in civilian circulation.

Now you plan to introduce a bill enabling us to vote for our governmental officials when we are overseas fighting the enemy.

Congressman SABATH, I salute you and wish to congratulate you upon your initiative in this important undertaking. Realizing that we are fighting military battles overseas while other battles are being fought at home, I sincerely believe that the two—foreign and domestic melees—are not separate engegements but are part and parcel of the same struggle for a speedy victory over German nazi-ism, Japanese militaristic imperialism, and Italian fascism, a lasting people's peace through progressive legislation directed toward international understanding between democratically elected representatives.

You buy bonds, donate blood, work long hours, and attend meetings so that you can aid us in our country's battles overseas. With the passage of your bill, Congressman SABATH, we will help you civilians elect representatives of the people's wishes for the continuance of vast domestic contributions so compulsory for the successful prosecution of this global war, and the construction of an eternal peace which must follow so that men everywhere, forever, shall know the true

meaning of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

A toast to the timely passage of your important bill calling for an amendment of the Soldier Vote Act of 1942.

Respectfully yours,

———— ————,

Fleet Marine Force.

A Soldier Thinks of Home and This Fair Land of Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter written by a marine now stationed at Quantico to his loved ones in California. The letter is beautifully written and reflects the young man's full appreciation of home and all that it means to him. The sentiment expressed in this letter is the same sentiment that animates all of the fighting men of America. It is home for which they are fighting; and when men are inspired by a love of home and all that it means to our national life and welfare, all the Hitlers and Tojos in the world cannot stop them in their onward march to victory.

I call this letter to the attention of the Members of Congress to the end that they may know some of the thoughts of the men in uniform who have given up their homes and firesides, their loved ones, and all in our fight for the preservation of the altars of freedom.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 6, 1943.

DEAREST ONES: Well, here it is Friday already, and another week is almost at an end. This one seems to have crawled by, and it seems as though tomorrow will never come. Guess the reason it has passed so slowly is because I'm anxious to get into Washington tomorrow night, and because I know that you'll be leaving next week to come East.

I went to the show last night, and it did nothing but make me very low and blue. It was an all Warner Bros. bill, the feature being Background to Danger, which I enjoyed very much. However, it was the short that hit me right between the eyes. It was a little job called Horses, Horses, Horses, and it had to do with the training of circus horses and the schooling of bareback riders. As the short opened, the foreground was all cluttered up with horses, pretty girls, and people doing all kinds of acrobatic stunts—but the point that really murdered me was the background. You see, it was all shot at Uncle Harry's ranch, and everything was done from the riding ring up by the house. As the camera panned around in a circle I could see the house, the racing stables, the valley full of alfalfa, the riding stables, the tennis court and pool, the chicken coops, and all the other landmarks that I loved so very much. While everyone else was remarking about the gals and the action, it seemed as though everything I ever loved passed in review before me. It never hit me quite so hard before. I could easily recognize all the hills that I used to tramp looking for quail, and could even recognize the cut-out on the very top of one mountain where Sid and I had our first shots at a coyote. Then, the slope behind the corral where Doc MacWilliams and I had gone off on that coon hunt one night with the kids. Then on the other side where Marv and I used to sit by the hour shooting squirrels, and the long steep draw, where Doc and I used to go after dove. It seemed as though, in that short few minutes watching the picture unfold, everything I really loved to do was contained in the one pan shot of the whole ranch. Guess that a guy never realizes just how lucky he is until you've been cooped up in a barracks for 8 months. To think that I never appreciated all of that, and how I'd often fight to be able to stay in the city and fool around instead of going out there for a week end.

I guess that one panorama is really what we are fighting this war about, and it never hit quite so close until last night. I still like to think that this whole mess hasn't been brought about by power politics, and by intrigue, but rather by a few people who are jealous of what we have, and don't want to allow us to live our lives in the way we'd like to. I think that the reason why I'm sitting here in Quantico, so many miles from home, is because I want to have that right and that privilege after this war is over. I want to be able to go home, and find that scenery just like it was when I left. I want to get up early one morning, step off the front porch, and start up into those hills and valleys with my shotgun over one arm, a package of cigarettes, a close friend to "shoot the breeze with" and most of all, no one to tell me how long I should stay out there, nor when I have to come back. I couldn't help but think of all the other kids that might have seen the same thing in a picture that played here—a shot of the wheat fields of Kansas, the cliffs of Maine, or the desert of Texas. Yes, I'm beginning to understand now the real reason why I'm here, and in spite of what anyone else might say, I can truthfully say that I've suddenly come to the realization just what makes this country so precious, and why we can't lose this war or any other. Guess that it's rather silly to say that trudging some hill in California with a shotgun looking for quail is why we are all engaged in this bloody mess, but that is the way I see it, and I wouldn't want to give that up for anything in the world. It means too much to me. And I'll be doing it again, too, folks—you can bet your last bottom dollar on that. I know that I'll be out there early one morning, on that same hill, and that I'll hear the blast of Doc's gun, and hear him swear when a covey goes up and he draws a roach. Yes, and I'll hear Marv say "J——, how could I miss the b——" when a squirrel goes running along and he empties his gun. Or I'll be able to hear Sid give a yell when he pulls down a long shot on a crow and see him fold up over some haystack. Yes; we'll be doing it again, and if I've learned nothing else out of this war, I certainly have got a much greater appreciation for what I've got and what a lucky guy I've been. It's indeed an ill wind that blows no one no good.

Looks as though I've gone terribly philosophical here in this letter, folks, but there really isn't much else to write about. I know that you'll understand that I've been shooting off my mouth here, and that I really feel fine, and that there isn't any cause for you to worry. I get this way every so often, but I always snap out of it, just as I will out of this.

So you tell Harry to keep that place just the way it is, and Dad, you keep ours the same way, and then when this mess is all untangled, we'll be together again, doing the things that we've always wanted to and that I've dreamed of so often here. It won't be long now, and when it is finished, we'll still be able to get up in the morning and smell the orange blossoms and be able to walk back by the barn to see how the berries are coming—and that, in spite of rising prices, labor, inflation, power politics, and world orders. Just keep it that way until I get home.

I love you, and enjoyed your two letters that I received yesterday. Be good, and I'll speak to you tomorrow—Sunday—I mean.

All my love, as always,

SAMMY.

Senator Capper's Farm Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks I am placing in the RECORD a newspaper account of the meeting of Kansas farmers in Topeka on August 31 called by Senator Capper, senior Senator from Kansas. This was a remarkably interesting and large gathering of farmers, who came together very seriously to discuss their problems and those of agriculture in the country generally. This story was written by Clif Stratton and Virgil Hill, of the Topeka Daily Capital staff. I present it for insertion in the RECORD because I know that it will be of interest to a great many people:

THOUSAND KANSAS FARMERS TELL ALL AT CAPPER FORUM—NO SUBSIDIES; NO BONUSES; PRICES TO GET PRODUCTION; CONGRESS TO TAKE BACK POWERS FROM EXECUTIVE

(By Clif Stratton and Virg Hill)

Senator CAPPER asked farmers of Kansas to come to Topeka and tell himself and other Members of Congress what Congress ought to do.

About 1,000 of them came to the municipal auditorium yesterday afternoon—and told them. They came from as far as Morton County in the southwest; from Smith County to the northwest.

And apparently the farmers who stayed at home are back of those who came. Willard Mayberry, who headed the southwest delegation (others were Rice Davies and Al Smith of Liberal) reported that their rationing board had allowed them gasoline for the trip.

"They said it couldn't be used for a better purpose," Willard explained in what he fondly believed to be a whisper, but which could be heard as far south as Pauline and well toward Holton on the north.

SUMMING IT UP

Summing up what was told the Kansas congressional delegation would take some space, but here is part of the summary:

Congress is expected by Kansas farmers to—

Do everything necessary to win the war.

Take back the powers it has delegated (some like to say abdicated) to the Executive.

Insure a return to constitutional government and a free enterprise system when the war is over.

Repeal the A. A. A. (don't repeal the A. A. A.—there was some division among the thousand attending the Capper Farm Forum yesterday).

Cut down extravagant Government expenditures.

Compel the O. P. A. and other agencies concerned to recognize that production is neces-

sary to get things to distribute for consumption.

Get labor, machinery, and necessary gasoline for farm production.

End the confusion over livestock and meat prices, and take the bugs out of rationing and price fixing generally, or face a meat famine next year.

Senator CAPPER was presented to the forum by Ray Gilkeson, editor of the Kansas Farmer, a few minutes after 1 o'clock, with some 800 farmers present; another 200 came in during the first 20 minutes of the meeting.

SENATOR SPOKE BRIEFLY

The Kansas Senator spoke briefly in opening the meeting. He explained that in the 6 weeks he has been at home he was unable to get over the State as he had wished, so had asked the farmers to come in and tell himself and the House Members present (Congressmen W. P. LAMBERTSON, of the first, and FRANK CARLSON, of the sixth) what their principal troubles are, and what they want the National Government to do in the coming session of Congress.

"I feel that you people here can give us the information and the inspiration needed," said Senator CAPPER. He read several letters from farmers unable to attend the meeting—the letters read much like the talks that followed from farmers present; and then proceeded to introduce his colleagues and others seated on the platform.

A VOTE OF THANKS

Nearly 4 hours later John Peck, of Tecumseh, moved a vote of thanks to the Senator for calling the meeting, and giving those in agreement, as well as those in disagreement, with governmental farm policies their chance to tell the Congressmen.

"I think the meeting has been well worth while, and that good will come out of it," said Senator CAPPER in closing the session. "I know that I have received valuable information and inspiration from these frank and well-founded statements of conditions and expressions of opinion."

Speaking as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman W. P. LAMBERTSON said, "The only thing we can do is to curtail funds," having reference to New Deal blunders and extravagance. This, he said, was done with respect to O. P. A., and he added that its chief, Prentiss Brown, is trying to improve the situation by placing more competent men in control.

HITS AT WAGE SCALE

"The blackest crime of the pre-war and war effort" the First District Representative went on, "Is the wage scale Madame Perkins and Franklin Roosevelt placed in war plants—we have it as a social gain." He charged the New Deal with raising labor wages sky high, and then freezing them there. "Labor," he went on, "is getting twice as much now as in the other war, and agriculture about half." The Manpower Commission, he said, is floundering without a plan. There was applause when LAMBERTSON declared he does not intend to vote for another adjournment or recess of Congress, but will instead insist on it remaining in session during the war period.

WANTED TO KNOW

Representative FRANK CARLSON, then introduced by Senator CAPPER, informed the 1,000 farmers present that if they could do a better job of telling what was wrong and what ought to be done than his Sixth District farmers had told him in the past 6 weeks they would be going some—but he'd like to see and hear them attempt the job.

"We want you to tell us, your Representatives in Congress, what your needs and wishes are," said CARLSON. "If we don't represent you properly, we know we won't be returned to Congress—and ought not to be.

"We in the United States face grave problems after the war. I am gravely concerned over the unrest brewing in our industrial centers. If we have riots in Detroit, Harlem, Birmingham, on the Pacific coast, during a period of high wages, and when we are united in the war effort, what may we expect when the urge for unity against the enemy is over, and millions are on compensation payments instead of high wages?

"We have a real job ahead of us—you at home, we in Congress, to protect the heritage our forefathers left to us and intended us to keep intact—and the basis of this heritage is constitutional government."

SCHOEPPEL ENDORSED FORUM

Attired in his shirt sleeves, and presented by Senator CAPPER as a Governor sympathetic to agriculture, Gov. Andy Schoeppel hit a few hard blows at bureaucracy, endorsed the farm forum idea, and said he hoped the people of the State would also let his administration know what they want. "Don't stop with the Senators and Congressmen," he suggested. "Let us in the State know your wants."

What the country needs, said Schoeppel, is "more practical, sensible views by those in authority and administrative capacity. What we desire is a decent place to live and an opportunity for advancement after the war is over."

Bert Culp, of Beloit, who has probably marketed more sheep than any man in Kansas, spoke of his work as chairman of the Farm Labor Commission appointed by Governor Schoeppel and said that the group anticipates more work in the fall. He is a former State senator.

WANT FAIR MARKETS

"I am tickled to death to get this chance to tell our Congressmen what we want," Lee Cowden of Lyon County opened up. "First I'll tell you what we don't want. We don't want bonuses; we don't want subsidies. We want fair markets; ceiling prices when needed, and I think they are needed. But we want those ceilings fixed equitably and for the purpose of obtaining production, not to stifle production. Something has to be done about these thousands of cattle in Kansas; I believe it will have to be done by the Congress."

He recommended a gradual increase in ceiling prices through the coming months, as needed to keep a constant flow of livestock to market.

"It is dumb," declared Cowden, "to have the coolers full, the shops empty, of meat, and the pastures full of cattle. If we don't get feed and fair prices, the cattlemen lose money, the cattle lose weight, and the consumers lose meat. That's foolish."

"NATURAL-BORN RABBLE ROUSER"

Leaving his 10-gallon hat at his seat, Willard Mayberry vaulted to the stage, presented himself as "a natural-born rabble rouser," and tore into what he called "not the black market—but the blind market."

The former secretary of Governor Landon, now farming and raising stock in the vicinity of Liberal, described an experience with sheep, declaring he spoke "from the heart and from my pants pocket." He had to sell 26,000 pounds of wool to the Commodity Credit Corporation without knowing the price in advance, although a pair of "experts" were sent out by the Government to advise him. They forecast a price of 37 cents. Sent to Denver, the wool brought 30 cents.

To Mayberry, the three most significant happenings of the summer are: Editor Gene Howe, down in Amarillo, spending his own money to advertise in other newspapers the truth about the black market; Senator CAPPER'S farm forum; and the livestock meeting tomorrow at Kansas City.

"THERE ARE LIMITS"

"Unless you Congressmen bring about some changes in the Washington controls," warned Cal Floyd, veteran Sedan cattleman, "you'll wake up without meat, and later without wheat.

"We farmers can take it. We have taken a lot, always. We'll keep on taking it. But there are limits.

"For the first time in my life I can't buy cake, and I have been feeding cattle 50 years. We cannot see why. And neither can those dumbbells in Washington. We want you to get results. There is a man in Washington who has promised the rest of the world everything, and is trying to deliver. Anyone can see where we are heading. And if we keep heading there, the Floyds are not going to handle 8,000 head of cattle next year. We just cannot do it."

SHOOTS AT F. S. A.

Victor E. Hawkinson, Riley County, long a foe of the A. A. A., did some shooting at the F. S. A. as well and concluded: "While our boys are fighting for freedom across the seas, it is our duty to keep farming a free institution at home to await their return." He characterized the A. A. A. as: "No compliance—no shirt."

As a preview of the Constitutional Government which his committee is sponsoring in Topeka today, Dr. P. P. Womer declared there is "too much arbitrary government by officials thoroughly inexperienced and entirely unfitted for governing—back-stage men never elected to office but exercising tremendous authority, with no responsibility to the Nation. We must formulate public opinion to sweep out forever this thing which has been going on in Washington."

DEFENDS ADMINISTRATION

Maurice Copt, of Osage County, who followed Dr. Womer, came to the defense of the administration and made a plea for more consideration for other peoples in the world.

"I came here from Switzerland," said Copt, who is considerable of an orator as well as a first-class farmer. "Three years ago I was in a bad way. I allowed the A. A. A. to help me, and the A. A. A. did help me. Today I have 35 cattle to sell, and am not crying because they may not bring as high a price as I would like. There is no reason why any farmer in Kansas cannot make a good living today, and contribute also to winning the war.

"We ought to get above our own immediate selfish interests. We are a part of our State; we are a part of the Nation; we are a part of the world. We cannot shut ourselves up and feed our own bellies and let the rest of the world starve."

Mr. Copt pointed out that the people of Switzerland, with a little thin soil on top of the rocks, feed themselves and also bring in 1,500 starving children from outside every 3 months and feed them back to health.

DISTRIBUTED LITERATURE

V. A. Kear, of Colby, who distributed a sheet, the Busy Tomcat, throughout the audience, is off the New Deal, off F. D. R., generally off of what is being done in Washington.

"The roll-back of meat prices amounted to sabotage of the meat supply," declared Kear. "The 40-hour week in wartime is sabotage of industrial production. We ought not have sabotage from high officials, of all people, while we are bending every effort to win the war. The 40-hour week was good news for the Japs."

And Kear closed with an appeal against authorizing him to retread his rubber stamps in the 1944 election, and urged the Congressmen to abolish one-half to two-thirds of the Washington bureaus and help the manpower shortage to that extent. George L. McCarthy, Farm Security head in Kansas, jumped as

if a pin had been injected when Keai declared, almost venemously, that "F. S. A. stands for farm slavery administration."

A veterinarian's view of wartime farm difficulties was presented by Dr. Ben Shambaugh, Burlington, who said a shortage of proteins and minerals is resulting in livestock being starved for want of a proper balanced ration. Complimenting Kansas farmers, he said they are willing to work 24 hours a day, if necessary, to produce food, and would work 36 hours a day if days were that long. But labor, he believes, is letting the country down.

WHY NOT RAISE THE CEILING?

Shortage of food might easily lose the war, according to Robert White, Osage County. "Inasmuch as 20 percent of our meat is being sold through the black market and the consumer is showing his willingness to pay more for meat, why not raise the ceiling on both meat and grain so that feed grains will move and livestock feeders will continue to operate?" he asked. "There is nothing like a good profit to insure maximum production and utilization of land."

FEELS THE WORLD IS GOING CRAZY

A colored man in Clay Center, in a fit of pessimism and misery, declared he felt "The whole world's going crazy and so am I," and sometimes M. L. Beckman almost feels that way, too. If the whole world is to be fed by Uncle Sam, why didn't the planners think of it when they stuck on that 49-cent wheat penalty in order to cut down production, Beckman demanded to know.

Mr. Beckman made three specific suggestions to the Members of Congress—says we want them to get Government programs to—

1. Maintain an adequate food supply;
2. Maintain our own people first;
3. Maintain our form of government.

"You might tell them in Washington," he warned significantly in closing, "that if it comes to that, the farmer will be the last man to starve."

READS LETTERS FROM O. D. T.

W. G. Carlile, of Auburn, brought down the house as he read two letters from the O. D. T. outlining what questions he had to answer and what trips he had to make to the county seat to get a renewal of the certificate allowing him to operate his farm truck. What irked him particularly was the repeated insistence that after filling out all the forms—the information had been given out last year, he pointed out—and assuring him the granting of the renewal was only a matter of form; take less than 5 minutes—

"The letter still insisted that I drive in and talk it over with somebody," protested Carlile.

"I needed two tractor tires," he went on. "I came in to get a priority or something for them, and the girl in the office insisted I bring in the two good tires for inspection. Those tires weigh from 500 to 600 pounds, and if they weren't in good enough shape to use I would know it."

RUGGED INDIVIDUALIST

A. B. Armstrong, of Smith County, admitted with pride that he is one of those rugged individualists who made this country. "We started with only our shirts and worked," he said. "We want our children to have the same opportunity, and to want to work their own way."

"Senator CAPPER," he said, "you asked some months ago if we wanted the A. A. A. repealed. You told us that of the first 500 letters you got only 20 wanted to keep the A. A. A. You wrote me you couldn't understand that 20-to-1 opposition, when the A. A. A. votes taken showed more than two-thirds in favor of the A. A. A.

"I'll tell you why. When they elected A. A. A. committeemen they put us in opposition off to one side and told us we were not to vote for committeemen. They had their own judges and clerks when referendums were held, and most of us didn't consider it worth while to try to vote."

HIT AT BIG APPROPRIATIONS

"We want you in Congress to stop some of these big appropriations," he continued. "That is the way to get started on the way back to sound government and sound people. Just answer this question: Who furnishes all this money? We will have to. Think of that when you are voting it away so generously.

"Some of us are called rugged individualists. Well, I'd rather be a rugged individualist than one of these efficient experts. Do you know what an efficient expert is? I'll tell you. He is one who cannot make a living himself but wants to be paid a salary for telling us rugged individualists how to make a living.

"And the way they swarm. They come out to my place and say they want to measure my land. My land doesn't need measuring. I tell them to take themselves down the highway—it was built for them to get away from my place on. Ah-h-h—these efficient experts.

"Tell me, who's going to pay the salaries and expenses of all these experts, boards, bureaus, commissions, when us rugged individualists have all been wiped out and have passed on?"

DEFENDS A. A. A.

John Peck, Tecumseh, raising one of the few voices heard in defense of the A. A. A., said of himself and fellow farmers: "We're the dumbest bunch of all—we won't stick together." Labor, bankers, politicians, doctors—all others unite, he declared and demanded: "Is it necessary for farmers to live a life of serfdom when labor has increased its income three or four times?" His idea is that something should be done to stabilize farm prices "so we won't go back to 10-cent corn and 17-cent wheat after the war." And until the A. A. A. came along, he asserted in the face of protests from the audience, the farmer had no protection against low prices.

LOOKS LIKE FARLEY

Chester Dunn, of Cowley County, who looks like Jim Farley and admits it no longer makes him mad to have the resemblance noted, said he just had one question this year:

"How are we to fill out the blank for this productable income tax?" he wanted to know, referring to the Ruml-Carlson September estimate to be filed the 15th.

Dunn repeated his request three times; got no answer from the platform. He got some from the crowd:

"Call in a college professor."

"Get an efficiency expert."

"Remember there's a penalty if you guess wrong."

Chester sat down, apparently satisfied. It seems he had not expected an answer to his question; he just wanted to state it.

"Run your own business and lay off the fellows who skin you too much," advised R. J. Ackley, Garden City. "People who couldn't run a wheelbarrow and keep it right side up are running the Government in some departments. Congress should take the bit in its teeth and regain control."

Ackley believes better distribution and less waste of vital products and materials must be brought about. Gasoline distribution in particular, he said, is in "an awful muddle," and mentioned how pleasure driving is again permitted in the East, although at times this summer Ackley did not have sufficient gasoline on his farm to take care of harvest.

WOULD REPEAL A. A. A.

Roy Stevens of Geary, who supported the A. A. A. when it was started, had been a supervisor, made a heated demand that the act itself be repealed.

"There is no justice when one of my neighbors with 65 acres gets an allotment of ½ acre for wheat," declared Stevens, "while a neighbor friendly to the A. A. A. gets an allotment of two-thirds of his acreage."

Stevens was greeted with cheers from the rugged individualists when he got through—hailed as a returning sinner to the ranks of believers.

Bert Anderson of Dodge City made a plea for labor, machinery, and repair parts for the western farmers—and for tractor fuel.

"Can you promise us these things, and especially repair parts and gasoline?" he asked of the platform. "We squeezed through this year, but are hesitating about planting for next year's harvest unless we are sure of these necessities."

Senator CAPPER assured him that the Kansas delegation is doing all it can, but that the O. P. A. and W. P. B. have not seen the light clearly enough.

"We'll keep on trying," the Senator promised.

COGSWELL DRAWS APPLAUSE

C. C. Cogswell, for years master of the Grange in Kansas, provoked applauding approval when he said, "We farmers have no objection to necessary rationing. But we will fight to the last ditch any rationing as a means of discipline or as toy balloons from Washington to see how much the people will stand."

During the last week, Cogswell said, he has talked to more than 500 farmers in Kansas and Oklahoma, asking questions about what's wrong with agriculture. Testing the audience before him, Cogswell asked a number of questions, and by a showing of hands demonstrated that Kansas farmers expect to raise fewer cattle, fewer hogs, and less grain. In some cases, the demonstration indicated, cuts will be from 25 to 50 percent, because of the inability to obtain farm supplies and market conditions.

Cogswell got a laugh when he reminded that the sale of coffee fell off 8 to 12 percent after rationing restrictions were removed.

A. E. Gunnerson, of Wamego, who has some manufacturing interests in Kansas City, just dropped in on the way to Wamego after a 2 days' struggle with labor difficulties.

"The farmers are so much better off these times than the manufacturing industry that there is no comparison," he assured the farm audience. "I am selling out all my other interests and going back to farming. When the war is over I think I'll sell my farm and retire."

J. D. Fowler, of Butler, warned that unless the Congress quits appropriating all this money without any check on its spending pretty soon the taxpayers are going to ask "Where is all this bond money going?" and when that time comes, the bond sales will fall off. He also urged that the 10,000,000 who he said eat all the meat they want in restaurants, be required to pay in points, the same as the less well-to-do who eat at home.

Nazi Blitzkrieg Stopped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Wednesday, September 8, 1943, before the Boston Building Congress at the Architectural Club, Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.:

The war that Nazi Germany thought would be over in 1 year has now entered its fifth year. As we look back over the past 10 years, and the past 4 years in particular, we see things more clearly. The old saying, "Hind thought is better than foresight," applies.

We now know that as long as 10 years ago, in the case of Nazi Germany, and longer, in the case of Japan, they were preparing for war. When it would happen, the exact time and place, the events that would lead it about, they probably did not know but they were preparing for war.

Years of preparation by forces determined to conquer and control the world, intense preparation which peaceful nations ignored, closed their eyes, failed to grasp the real significance, stuck their heads in the sand, and failed to make the preparations necessary for self-defense and to meet the impending danger.

And just prior to the move the softening-up process, the appeals to selfish ambitions of powerful individuals or groups within the country to be attacked, the appeal to hate within such country, the war of propaganda prior to attack designed to divide, to soften up, as I have said, so that the actual attack, the blitzkrieg, could be made suddenly, and with swift and destructive success.

The preliminary softening-up process and the swift attack, and the conquering of one country at a time before other countries on the list could awaken or prepare to resist—that was the blitzkrieg.

The apparently peaceful taking over of Austria was brought about as a result of a conspiracy with certain elements within that country; the attack on Czechoslovakia, on Poland, the awakening then of the democracies to the world danger; the declaration of war by England and France; Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway; the break-through of the Maginot line; Dunkerque, France conquered; later Yugoslavia, Greece, the dark days that followed; the blitzkrieg was on the march.

Well might Hitler, his military leaders, and the people of Germany, at that time have felt that the war would be over in a year—and that victory would be theirs.

Nazi Germany on the offensive. Confident, cruel, flushed with victory; a powerful people and military machine responding to the commands of an individual, with no opportunity for divided public opinion interfering with his commands. The monster modern Nazi machine of war, the blitzkrieg, was on the march. Its progress to victory after victory, and its ultimate success seemed to most persons to be irresistible.

A nation powerfully armed, its people indoctrinated with a fanaticism to conquer and bend the world to its will, even challenging the civilization of God itself, its people willingly responding to the voice and the orders of one man.

And all this time public opinion, so powerful in democracies, divided through fear, hate, or selfish ambitions, or other human emotions that obscured sound reason and judgment, with the demagog, false prophet, and hypocrite operating full blast. England and France up to the invasion of Poland, and our country prior to Pearl Harbor, compelled to hesitate and delay in the taking of necessary steps to meet the impending danger, months of delay, and many times doing by indirection what a divided public opinion would not permit to be done by direction.

The difficulty in the passing of vitally important legislation prior to Pearl Harbor, the extension of the Selective Service Act in the House of Representatives by the dangerous margin of one vote, the defeat on two occasions of a $5,000,000 appropriation to improve Guam Island for defense for fear the Japs would be offended are illustrations of the dangerous results of a divided public opinion in the pre-Pearl Harbor days.

The blitzkrieg was the means by which Hitler and his powerful military machine, backed up by the indoctrinated-minded people of Nazi Germany, hoped and intended to accomplish his and their diabolical end.

Fortunately for us, the blitzkrieg is now over.

The nations opposed, opposed to Germany and Japan, have developed their armed forces and their manpower and productive capacity to such an extent that they cannot be attacked, defeated, and conquered one by one.

There are three underlying factors as I see it that stopped the Nazi blitzkrieg.

1. The failure of Hitler to follow up Dunkerque by a land invasion of England, and thereafter the failure of his air blitzkrieg.

2. His attack on Soviet Russia with the expectation of an easy and early victory, resulting in failure, an attack made to remove Russia as a threat to his rear or flank when he undertook the land invasion of England, necessary for the victory he sought. After the failure of the air blitzkrieg on England a land invasion was necessary to win the battle of the Atlantic. No matter how many battles he won or territory conquered, Hitler was not ultimately victorious in Europe, which meant Africa and a powerful sphere of influence in Asia, until he had won the battle of the Atlantic.

And as we were not in the war at that time, winning the battle of the Atlantic meant invading and conquering the British Isles. He, therefore, turned on Russia (and we are fortunate that he did) to remove that country as a possible threat, fearing for some reasons unknown to most of us then and now, that with his delay after Dunkerque and England's recovery during that period, that an invasion of England, even if successful, would be long and costly; that he could not afford to let Russia stand by in a position to enter the war while his forces were heavily engaged in the invasion of England.

Underestimating Russia's military strength, its productive capacity, as well as the devotion and the bravery of its people, he attacked, expecting easy and an early victory.

As you well remember, even our own military experts expected an easy victory for the Nazi, predicting that Russia would be defeated in a period of from 6 weeks to 3 months.

His failure in Russia is the second in sequence and undoubtedly the major contributing factor to the Nazi blitzkrieg being stopped.

The third one was the attack of the Japs at Pearl Harbor. History will probably record the fact that Germany made a major mistake when it exercised its influence on Japan to make the attack at Pearl Harbor, thereby bringing us actively into the war, devoting all of our full resources to winning the war.

Slow and uncertain, as we were in our realization of the impending danger, and in the making of preparations for our national defense, divided as public opinion and our people were, Pearl Harbor in a flash brought to our people a complete realization of the danger. The response was immediate. It brought forth in splendid manner the greatness and strength of our beloved country.

Diabolical and destructive as Pearl Harbor was in man and ships, it brought us out of our emotional reactions, of our lethargy, of our division, and from that day on America was on the march.

We realized that our liberties, our Government—fought for, established, and transmitted to us by the fathers of the country—were threatened.

Our manhood and womanhood responded to the call. The devotion of our youth to a free government quickly evidenced itself. With all of the mistakes that have been made our people and our Government have performed a wonderful job since Pearl Harbor.

Free men and women were fighting to preserve for themselves and for future generations of Americans, freedom under a Government they loved.

In the early stages of our entry into the war, supplying with weapons of war the nations united with us in fighting the common enemy was our primary contribution. But that meant a great deal to them in those trying days.

The building of a two-ocean Navy, of our merchant marine, of our Army, Air Forces, are now well under way. We are now in a position to contribute a powerfully trained Army, Navy, Air Force, in addition to the products of our factories, the weapons of war.

Yes; the Nazi blitzkrieg is over. It was over in September of 1942. Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering admitted it at that time. But that does not mean that the enemy is licked.

The combined strength of the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia is approaching their maximum. China, our other great and brave ally, will increase its strength tremendously when we are able to get necessary supplies and weapons of war in large quantities into that country.

From the best information I can obtain, that will be dependent upon the recapture of Burma, and the opening up of the Burma Road.

If Burma is recaptured, it would not be difficult to go forward on land, sea, and in the air, toward Malaya, Thailand, and Indochina.

The difficulty in getting supplies and weapons of war into China—particularly tanks and heavy weapons of war, such as artillery—in large quantities, is one of transportation. What we get now into China must be flown in by planes. It is essential that a land route of transportation be opened up. That is one of the great values of the Burma Road. In addition, the recapture of Burma would give a base from which further operations against the Japs can be carried out, such as Malaya, Thailand, and Indochina, as well as the effective and telling blows that a well-equipped and trained Chinese Army can administer, and which powerful air forces can make from China proper.

The stopping of the blitzkrieg was necessary. It has, thank God, been accomplished. Following that, the gloom of a year ago and more has changed. Africa cleared, Sicily conquered, Italy invaded, and for all practical purposes out of the war. After the successful resistance of the Russians to the Nazi blitzkrieg, their counterattacks and extraordinary successes now taking place, all followed the stopping of the Nazi blitzkrieg.

Not only on the war front, but on the propaganda front, our position has changed for the better.

For nearly 4 years the Nazi propaganda operated with telling effect. In this field we were also on the defensive. We are no longer on the receiving end, with its jittery effects on our nerves. The Germans and the Japs are receiving some of that punishment now. Effective propaganda plays an important part in modern warfare.

Where and when our armies and our Navy will strike is a matter for the military and naval leaders to decide. We do know what has happened to date, and what is taking place now in Europe and the Far East.

What happens in one area, as President Roosevelt has so well said on many occassions, has its effect upon another area of the far-flung battle fronts.

Take, for example, Italy. The removal of Italy from the war will play an important part in the Far East, as well as in Europe. It will enable the release of naval units of

our Navy and of the British Navy, now necessary to watch the remaining Italian Navy, to be assigned for duty against the Japs.

Among the favorable results from the unconditional surrender of Italy will be:

1. The bad effect it will have upon the people of Germany and its satellite nations.

2. The removal from the Balkans—some of which has already taken place—of about 25 Italian divisions and their replacement by German divisions, drawing upon their reserves.

3. Placing our forces in a position on the flank of the Balkans, as well as in a pivotal position for future action in France.

4. Ability to help those brave forces resisting the Germans in the conquered Balkan nations and in France.

5. Complete control of the Mediterranean, shortening our transportation routes to Europe, to Russia, and to parts of the Far East.

6. A stepping place for other operations in the future.

7. Obtaining air fields and bases enabling the bombing of industrial parts of German-controlled areas heretofore immune or practically immune from attack.

8. The powerful influence it will have on countries, like Bulgaria and Rumania, to withdraw from the war.

9. A favorable effect on Turkey, important in the event of an invasion and attack through the Balkans.

There is no question but that other operations in Europe on land will take place in the future. We should leave that matter to the judgment of our military and naval leaders. But there is no question but operations other than that being carried on now in Italy will take place.

In Europe, the blitzkrieg having been stopped, the offensive has been taken by our forces, and on land, on sea, and in the air, will be vigorously prosecuted to final victory.

It seems apparent that Germany is now seeking to bring about a stalemate. Such a condition, resulting in a compromise peace, would be adverse to our best interests. It would mean a temporary cessation of hostilities. It would be a partial victory for Hitler and nazi-ism, and from a short-range or long-range angle harmful to the peace-loving nations of the world.

It will be only by unconditional surrender of the enemy that we can destroy another attempt of world control, and a repetition of the viciousness we are now undergoing. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill see that clearly.

It is only by unconditional surrender that the foundations can be laid for future permanent peace.

Unconditional surrender of our enemies means the opportunity, with statesmen and diplomats of vision and courage sitting at the peace table, and a courageous United States Senate, to establish a peace of permanency.

A compromise peace means the continuation of the present inhuman, unreasoning, and destructive road of war.

In this great struggle that will come after victory, you and I and all other Americans, as well as the decent people of all countries, where public opinion can express itself, can play an important part in helping to form a vigorous, affirmative, sound, and realistic public opinion that will demand that this war shall truly and in fact be "the war to end wars."

Without such a healthy public opinion, the road to a peace which will have the elements of permanency will be difficult. Such a peace cannot ignore the moral law and be enduring.

It will be the battle of reason and of sound interest against hate, other baser human emotions, and of selfish interest. At best it will be a hard fight, but you and I can help substantially if we think and talk clearly, and resist successfully the forces of division that will exist. Already, they are sending out their little feelers to see what the public reaction will be.

Too much loose thinking and talking will be injurious to the next great step of mankind—the step towards permanent peace; the journey away from the horrors and destruction of war.

In the Far East, where we have been on the defensive, that situation is rapidly changing. We are no longer on purely a defensive basis.

We are changing rapidly from defensive to offensive action against the Japs. The foundation is being laid in the Far East for a general offensive.

The Quebec conference, as we know, dealt largely with that area of the war. It was the most complete of conferences held to date between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

The course agreed upon properly cannot be made public before the various parts of the plans are carried out. But one thing is certain—that due to our miraculous recovery after Pearl Harbor, and our increased strength in that area, our military and naval leaders are in a position to go forward—to go at the enemy instead of being compelled to try and hold the enemy back.

This does not mean that we can feel overconfident.

This is not the time to underestimate the military strength of the enemy, or to overestimate our own strength. If "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" eternal vigilance is also the price of victory in this war.

Instead of overconfidence, this is the time for grim determination to exist among our people and among the United Nations—the knowledge that while the tide has turned—that victory has not yet been won. We must appreciate the fact that the enemy is powerful from a military angle—and that overconfidence will cause us to make mistakes that will unintentionally and unknowingly aid and assist the enemy. Overconfidence might cause mistakes to be made that would place us on the defensive again—fighting for our very existence with our backs against the wall. While the blitzkrieg has been stopped, and the tide has changed—it is not the time for a feeling of overconfidence to exist—but it is the time for a feeling of grim determination to exist to bring about an early victory. This is the time to break the morale of the enemy—and there are signs of that occurring in Germany. To hit harder and harder and to make every sacrifice on the civilian front willingly and without murmur in order to make our maximum contribution toward ultimate victory—that is demanded of all of us.

This is a crucial period in this war. This is the time with the opportunity of going forward with grim determination to remove for all time those vicious elements that are mainly responsible for the last war, and for the present war, and to destroy for all time this constant threat to the peace-loving nations of the world—and this dastardly challenge to the civilization of God.

Views of Indiana Bankers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the bankers of the city of Indianapolis rank high in the banking fraternity of the United States in respect to public esteem, advanced thinking, and constructive leadership.

I have just returned from a brief trip to my home city and while I was there, getting in touch with the home front and receiving various committees and delegations, I met by invitation a fine group of our representative bankers who wanted to tell me what the bankers are thinking about. At the head of this group, presiding as chairman of the meeting, was Mr. Ludwig G. Burck of the Indiana National Bank of Indianapolis.

I think it would be of interest to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know what is uppermost at this time on the minds of these leaders of banking and finance in Indiana, and by unanimous consent granted by the House I submit for publication in the RECORD a memorandum which they presented to me, as follows:

OUTLINE FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

I. Banks object to the following in regard to the internal economic policy of the United States:

(A) The subsidization of 19 farm-lending agencies by the United States Department of Agriculture, which agencies make farm loans in direct competition with rural banks.

1. The federally subsidized lending agencies are able to charge a lower rate of interest than banks simply because they are supported by public moneys which make up their deficits.

(B) The representatives of the 19 Federal farm-lending agencies soliciting good bankable loans away from banks and in many instances attempting to dissuade farmers from borrowing from the banks.

(C) The highly paid publicity men who propagandize the benefits accruing from the 19 Federal lending agencies, spending much more money for publicity purposes than banks individually or collectively can afford.

II. Why the banks object to these practices:

(A) Because the Federal lending agencies are not self-supporting and their deficits must be made up through public money partially provided by the banks themselves through taxes and the purchase of Government securities.

1. The whole situation is one in which the banks are supporting their chief competitors.

(B) Bankers object to the principle of the Federal Government entering in direct competition with private enterprise.

III. What the banks want their Representatives in Congress to do:

(A) Refuse to vote appropriations to the United States Department of Agriculture to subsidize any of these 19 lending agencies excepting in the case of floods, droughts, and situations and conditions which represent grave emergencies, and stipulate that at the end of such emergency, Federal credit will be withdrawn.

(B) Withdraw congressional support of subsidy from the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit associations.

(C) Refuse to grant appropriations for salaries to be paid to officials in any projected lending agency such as occurred with the revival of the R. A. C. C. or to renew appropriations for salaried officials in the agencies now in operation.

(D) Eliminate all appropriations for propaganda purposes as exemplified by highly paid publicity men, advertising agencies (note extensive advertising carried on by the Federal intermediate credit banks), newspapermen, radio programs, and movie shorts.

(E) Refuse appropriations for money to pay men to solicit loans personally from the farmers.

DUPLICATE ASSESSMENTS ON PUBLIC DEPOSITS

Another matter of interest to the banks is a bill introduced by United States Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma on April 6, 1943, known as S. 986, to eliminate Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation assessments on public deposits in insured banks where such public funds are secured by the bonds and other obligations of the United States. This bill has been referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and provides that section 12 B of the Federal Reserve Act be amended.

All bankers in Indiana who are managing banks which are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation find themselves in the position of paying a duplicate insurance assessment in relation to their public funds. In 1932 the General Assembly of Indiana passed a law known as the public-depository law, which law provides by statute a fund called a State depository fund. This fund is administered by a board of five members, consisting of the Governor, treasurer of State, auditor, the chief examiner of the State board of accounts, and the chairman of the commission for the Indiana Department of Financial Institutions.

All of the public funds in Indiana are protected insofar as the State of Indiana and its subdivisions are concerned by the total resources of the Indiana State depository fund. Then, in addition, the State depository fund has the power to issue anticipatory warrants for the purpose of satisfying any liabilities defined within the statute governing the administration of such fund. However, please realize that public funds in Indiana, insofar as the F. D. I. C. is concerned, are only insured up to but not exceeding $5,000.

Therefore, we would like to have the bill which has been introduced by Senator THOMAS amended to include public funds which are protected by the State depository funds such as we have in Indiana. Over the years we have appealed time and time again to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for relief from this duplicate assessment but the F. D. I. C. chairman, Mr. Leo T. Crowley, has always been against our petition for relief.

We urge you to support the principles of Senator THOMAS' measure as we believe it is sound and will give the banks some relief from the F. D. I. C. assessments which are becoming an increasingly painful burden in view of the pyramiding of deposits.

A Bed for Buddy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. TOLAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Sunday morning, September 19, at 4 o'clock a. m., I visited the Union Station here and was surprised at what I saw. Hundreds, and yes, close to a thousand, of Army, Navy, and marine boys, sitting, if they could find seats, fast asleep. Others were stretched out on the cement floor, on counters, and on the outside, and in every telephone booth was one of our boys.

The Arlington Recreation Center was filled and hundreds were turned back from there and there was no other place for them to go but the Union Station. These boys were not waiting for trains; they came to see the Nation's Capital on furlough so they could take with them to the battle fronts a picture of the American Capital. They may forget the monuments and the public buildings, but they will never forget how they were treated here.

There is no use talking about this situation unless we attempt to correct it. Accordingly I am introducing today a house concurrent resolution to vacate the Senate garage now used for the automobiles of the Senators and Representatives, and make the same available for temporary sleeping quarters for our armed forces. This garage is a block long, well ventilated, heated, with lavatories, and approximately 250,000 cubic feet of space. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding any existing public law or resolution, the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the joint direction of the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall suspend all permits for the parking of privately owned vehicles in the legislative garage, situated under the Senate Terrace, for the duration of the present national emergency, and offer the floor space therein released to the armed forces of the United States as temporary sleeping quarters for military personnel on furlough or traveling under orders or temporarily sojourning in the Nation's Capital. The armed forces of the United States, or such public agencies as they may designate, shall install suitable facilities and accommodations to carry out the purposes of this resolution and shall be responsible to the Architect of the Capitol for the orderly operation of these quarters. It is hereby authorized a joint payment of expenses incidental to carrying out the purpose of this resolution to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that at least 1,000 cots or double-decker bunks can be placed in the Senate garage and the expenses to convert the garage into temporary sleeping quarters for our Army, Navy, and marine boys would be insignificant. The Union Station is only one block away from the garage, and there is no other housing available in Washington. I am anticipating no single objection from any holder of space in the garage, but it requires legislation. All expenses to be met by the contingent fund of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States. I am sure the cars of the garage can stand the cold weather, the rain, and sleet far better than our boys, and if they go into battle they will remember, I am quite sure, that they had a good, warm bed provided for them in Washington. Similar deplorable conditions exist in railroad stations in other sections and cities in our country. "A Bed for a buddy" is a slogan wending its way across the Nation, and we must not fail them here.

Puerto Rican People Ask for Immediate Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith the text of a resolution adopted unanimously by the General Assembly of the Puerto Rico Pro-Independence Congress, held in San Juan, P. R., on August 15, 1943. This congress, convened after the holding of a number of regional congresses, was truly representative of the Puerto Rican people. More than 1,800 delegates from 77 municipalities and other communities in the island were present.

The resolution follows:

The Puerto Rico Pro Independence Congress, composed of delegates from all the communities of the island, declares that it is the right and the will of the people of Puerto Rico to constitute itself in a free and sovereign nation, in close economic and political collaboration with all the other nations of the Americas, and in peace and fraternity with all the democratic countries of the world.

In the course of four centuries under the sway of Spain—mother country, discoverer, missionary, and colonizer—Puerto Rico succeeded in forming its own personality as a nation endowed with its own culture, its own faith, its own tradition, and its own history. During 45 years of relationship with the United States of America, Puerto Rico has vigorously maintained its historical personality and its culture and has strengthened them under the influence of democratic ideals; it has also made progress in its ability for self-government, its administrative capacity, its social understandings, and its eagerness for human betterment.

Now, in this transcendental moment of its history, Puerto Rico lays its claim to freedom and bases its hope and its faith upon natural law, upon incontrovertible reasons of justice and morality, upon Bolivar's concept of inter-American equality, upon the principle of American international law that no American nation can have colonies in America, upon the guaranties of the Atlantic Charter and of the good-neighbor policy, and, finally, upon the basis of democracy itself.

The Treaty of Paris, which, on December 10, 1898, put an end to the Spanish-American War, imposed upon the Congress of the United States the obligation of determining the political status of the people of Puerto Rico in accordance with the democratic practices and the free institutions of the Americas. The final political status of Puerto Rico has not yet been determined. The sovereignty of our people has not yet been recognized, and there still subsists in the island a governmental regime that does not derive from the will and consent of our people. Under the prevailing system of political and economic subjection, the people of Puerto Rico lack authority to face and solve their fundamental problems.

Puerto Rico eagerly desires to constitute itself as a nation under a democratic system of government; Puerto Rico desires to preserve its historical personality, to develop its culture, to orient its economy, to promote its production, to foster its industry, to raise the working and living standards of labor, to enforce policies of true social justice, and to provide security and welfare for all its citizens. For these reasons the people of Puerto Rico throughout all sectors of public opinion, categorically repudiate the colonial regime. To accomplish its destiny as a nation and to direct ably and conscientiously its collective aspirations, Puerto Rico must, without further delay, be organized as a free and independent republic in the family of nations of the world. The enjoyment of our own sovereignty is absolutely necessary to the progressive development of the culture, the economy, and the welfare of our people, and to the national dignity of our country.

We have rejected in the past, and we now reject once again, through this congress which represents Puerto Rican public opinion, any form of political status that does not recognize the international personality of Puerto Rico, and we therefore firmly refuse any measure of annexationists or absorptive character, since that would unavoidably lead to the disappearance of the Puerto Rican nationality and to the annulment of our right to freedom and sovereignty.

The people of Puerto Rico claims its right to sovereignty on terms of friendship and brotherhood with the people of the United States of America. In the case of Puerto Rico, the traditional devotion of the American people to free institutions and to democratic ways of living coincides with their moral duty to help us institute our own Republic in the family of the free countries of the Americas. The people of Puerto Rico trust that the United States Congress, which has already fulfilled the responsibilities imposed upon it by the Treaty of Paris in 1898 in regard to Cuba and the Philippines, will again act upon the principle that democracy should be creative of democracies, and will recognize without further delay the independence of Puerto Rico.

This Congress Pro Puerto Rican Independence at once proclaim the right of Puerto Rico to its independence, and demands from the people and the Government of the United States the immediate recognition of the full political sovereignty of our people.

In order that this right and this will of Puerto Rico be taken into full account and as a hearty message and a sincere claim to justice from the people of Puerto Rico to the friendly people of the United States, we, with faith in God, and with consciousness of the supreme destiny of our people, hereby sign this declaration in behalf of independence for Puerto Rico on this 15th day of the month of August in the year of our Lord 1943, in the city of San Juan, capital of Puerto Rico.

A Slap on the Wrist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Adrian (Mich.) Telegram bespeaks the feelings of millions of Americans regarding the decision of the court martial of Col. William T. Colman, former commandant of Selfridge Field. I have asked to include this editorial in an extension of remarks in order to bring it to the attention of the Secretary of War and others who have been called upon to thoroughly review the case:

A SLAP ON THE WRIST

For repeated instances of being drunk on duty in time of war and for shooting and seriously wounding an enlisted man, Col. William T. Colman, former commandant of Selfridge Field, has been sentenced by a court martial to demotion to the rank of captain—the rank he held before the war. He was not sentenced to a term in military prison; he merely was reduced in rank. He was given only a slap on the wrist, and a very mild slap at that.

Actually the court's verdict amounts to an acquittal. The colonel was acquitted of 23 charges against him and he was found guilty on 5 minor counts of reduced charges. He was convicted of being drunk on duty in wartime while in charge of an important air base and training center, but the court held that such instances of drunkenness did not constitute "conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman" but was only conduct that worked against proper military discipline.

He shot and wounded a Negro private who was his chauffeur. The original count charged the shooting was an assault with intent to do bodily harm. But the court modified that charge and found him guilty of only careless use of firearms. Careless, indeed. Does the Army want to retain officers who are careless with firearms?

Colonel Colman testified that his mind was a complete blank prior to and at the time of the shooting. The court apparently believed that statement. And by its verdict it is on record as believing it is wrong for the Army to retain a man as a colonel who is subject to mental blackouts but all right to keep a captain afflicted that way.

The verdict was thoroughly bad. The punishment was too lenient even for the reduced counts on which it is based. It inspires the suspicion that military justice is tempered toward officers and reaches its full severity only when applied to men in the ranks.

That is not true. Military justice, as a rule, is just and even-handed. The Colman case is a glaring exception. But it gives rise to that suspicion just the same, and such a suspicion is bad for Army discipline and also has a very bad effect on public opinion.

The court martial constituted a military investigation of a train of unwholesome charges of laxity and worse in the operation of the Selfridge Field base. They cannot be dismissed by shrugs of the shoulders. The court's verdict is subject to review by the War Department in Washington and the sentence cannot take effect until given final approval. That review should be so searching that even the court martial is investigated. If the War Department won't do it, then let Congress get into the picture.

Should the United States Repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over the radio on September 17, 1943:

Some time ago, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as an extension of remarks, a statement by Senator HOLMAN, of Oregon, claiming, among other things, that I, as chairman of the Immigration Committee of the House of Representatives, introduced a far-reaching bill for the repeal of Chinese exclusion. From his statement, I do not believe Senator HOLMAN even read my bill.

In spite of the fact that I am more than in favor of any legislation which seeks to put an end to Chinese exclusion, it so happens that the bill which I introduced not only was not far reaching but was wholly inadequate. I considered it of such little importance that I myself saw fit to withdraw it.

My bill, unfortunately, did not go far enough. But there are other bills before the Committee on Immigration which should receive the support of every fair-minded American. I wish to speak, at this time, in favor of the enactment of proper legislation to settle this problem of Chinese exclusion.

The Chinese exclusion law was passed at a time when this country was very much afraid of being flooded by cheap labor. In a sense, it was a measure to restrict immigration which at that time would have resulted in the lowering of the American standard of living. Since this act was passed, however, the entire structure of our country and our immigration laws have undergone a rapid change.

Today cheap labor cannot come into the United States. We have on our statute books very stringent immigration laws, forbidding the entry into the United States of any person who cannot qualify mentally, physically and financially. Under the proposed repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, not more than 105 Chinese could enter the United States in any one year. The admission of 105 Chinese to the United States, in any one year, will therefore not break down our immigration bars. It will not make any appreciable difference on the United States as a whole. But it will make a great difference to the people of China.

Men and women of prominence, who have spent years of their lives in China, came before the Committee on Immigration and told us of the fine character and great achievements of the people of China. Pearl S. Buck, the noted author, who spent the greater part of her life in China, said, and I quote, "The standards of living are high. I mean the moral standards. Her people have high standards of ethics, of business ethics; we know that in our country. What really hurts them is not this lack of material help, which they can excuse because of the many demands on us, so much as our continued attitude toward them expressed in total-exclusion acts, which, until this war broke out, made it actually harder for a Chinese to enter this country than a Japanese."

Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States had the unique privilege of hearing and seeing a great person, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, the wife of the great Chinese leader. She came to us and made a very eloquent plea for assistance to the people of China, to be given by the people of the United States. No one who witnessed this wonderful scene in Congress, when the first lady of China appeared before that body, will ever forget the splendid impression made by her.

Opposition to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act came from sources which, to say the least, were misinformed, either as to the purposes of the act or as to the significance of any action which might be taken. The opposition is centered on the theory that Chinese workmen will compete with American labor, destroying our standard of living.

Again the opposition fails to take cognizance of the fact that these arguments might have been all right in 1882, but they surely do not apply to conditions as they exist today. What possible effect can there be on American labor, even if 105 workers should enter these shores annually from China? But even this is impossible because, as I pointed out before, immigration to the United States will not consist of workers and laborers but of persons who will never enter into competition with American labor.

It is important that public opinion of this country be fully acquainted with the fact that there is not the slightest intention or intimation on the part of any of the sponsors of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act that our immigration laws should in any way be curtailed or done away with. We wish to keep in force all of the restrictions and provisions applicable to all aliens. I am sure that if the opposition to the measure will bear this important fact clearly in mind a great deal of misunderstanding and useless criticism will be avoided.

By granting the Chinese equal rights with other aliens, who come to the United States, we will put the Chinese people on a standing of equality, and once and for all give the lie to Japanese propaganda that the American people have only prejudice and contempt for the people of eastern Asia. Such is not and never was the fact. We respect the people of the Philippine Islands, who have so valiantly fought side by side with us in defense of their own independence. We likewise have a deep respect and gratitude for the people of China for everything they have done in their fight against Japanese imperialism and aggression.

An important consideration, perhaps the most important consideration under the present circumstances, is the effect our action will have on the war effort.

As you all know, China carried the burden of Japanese aggression for 7 years. She is still in the war, undefeated, although considerable portions of Chinese territory have been seized by the enemy. China is ready and willing to continue in the war. Chinese manpower and her determination to preserve her liberties have been, thus far, the only barrier between Japan and the Western Hemisphere. Chinese hatred for the Japanese was the only thing which saved many Americans at the time of the Japanese invasion.

Mr. William P. Hunt, American vice consul at Tientsin, from 1925 to 1927, who remained in China until the present time, appeared before the Committee on Immigration and said, "I was interned by the Japanese at Hong Kong and I was chairman of the American community in the Japanese Hong Kong prison camp. We did not have sufficient food. Three hundred and fifty packages twice a week were later allowed to come into camp and these were all sent in by Chinese, the Chinese in a city which did not have much money; Chinese who had to put their return address and their names on these parcels." As you can easily see, these brave Chinese people endangered their own lives by aiding the Americans.

We all know what importance morale plays in the war, and there is an opportunity for us to bolster up Chinese morale by an act of kindness, which is only an act of justice, and which will cost us nothing, but will give us a higher standing in China and will insure here cooperation throughout the duration of the war and the ensuing peace.

Admiral Yarnell, who is perhaps the best known naval strategist in the Pacific area, told the Committee on Immigration how important it is to pass this Chinese exclusion repeal, in order to destroy any vestige to Japanese influence in China. He added that he believed we would not have to send many American soldiers to fight on Chinese soil, that China had the manpower available for a tremendous army. All they needed was munitions and technical advisers. From his testimony we can surmise that China is willing to do our actual fighting in the Pacific; but would you, as an American be willing to fight for China, if you knew that the Chinese did not consider you as their equal, and had barred you from their country? Of course you would not.

Many Americans are laboring under the delusion that only a very few of the millions of Chinese people are aware of the Exclusion Act. Marion Dudley, of the International Young Women's Christian Association, who was interned by the Japanese at the outbreak of the war, and who spent many years of her life in China, said, "The Chinese have never clamored for the end of the Exclusion Act. They are too proud. But the Japanese have kept the question before them. People ask, 'Do the Chinese know about the Exclusion Act?' Of course they know. The Japanese see that they know."

If we are preaching democracy, let us act as a democracy, whether it be toward an individual or a nation. We cannot slap a friendly nation in the face by telling her that her people are not wanted. Until we, as a nation, repeal this Exclusion Act, we cannot counteract the insistent propaganda of the Japanese, who day after day repeat the fact that we are only using China as means to our own ends. If this propaganda continues we will find the Chinese people turning against us and we will see the Pacific war dragged out for many years to come.

Now is the time to show China that we respect her, and now is the time to lay the basic foundation for future peace in the Pacific area.

Furloughs for Married Servicemen on Duty Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the following resolution. The resolution speaks for itself and it is not necessary to elaborate on its contents to any great extent.

On my visit back home during our recent recess I found that mothers, wives, and sweethearts of soldiers abroad could not understand why their loved ones were kept on the other side of the world while company after company was held in camp long after the training period was over.

We have several camps in my State, and I found dissatisfaction among some of the men who are held there as they felt that they should have been shipped months ago. Many of them are anxious to get into the fight, and cannot understand why they are kept inactive in camp when they might be overseas.

On the other hand there are wives whose husbands have been gone for a year and a half and more with no opportunity to get back to their families. Some of these young mothers have given birth to babies which their fathers have never seen, and it would be only fair to give these men an opportunity to get home to visit their wives and children and mothers and all their relatives and friends. I think such a move would strengthen the morale of the soldiers as well as the families and help to preserve the tie that binds, keep up the courage and the standards of everyone.

Of course, we cannot take any action that will hinder or disrupt the war effort, but it seems to me that many cases could be found where men could be shipped back without interfering with the program of the war. Transportation need in nowise be affected if proper care and management is used in granting furloughs in these cases.

I trust that the committee will give this matter serious consideration, and at least hear the views of those who are most interested so that we might find some way whereby we could work out a satisfactory solution to this problem.

The resolution referred to follows:

Whereas many married servicemen in the armed forces of our country have been overseas for 18 months or more and have been unable to return to their homes on furlough; and

Whereas many of these men have become fathers while overseas; and

Whereas there are servicemen who have been in training in the United States for over a year who are available to replace such married men overseas: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, wherever feasible, married servicemen, and especially fathers, who have served overseas for 18 months or more should be granted furloughs to visit their families in the United States.

Customs Division Cooperating With New Foreign Funds Control Division Kept Busy Preventing and Prosecuting Attempts To Defraud Government and Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, many new duties burden Government agencies as a result of the war. Among them are the activities of the Customs Division of the Treasury Department working with the new Foreign Funds Control Division. An interesting statement recently issued is well worth reading. I include it as part of my remarks. It follows:

Treasury officers, maintaining an intensive vigil over channels of trade and ports and borders in the war against the Axis on the economic front, have dealt a substantial blow against a budding black market in United States currency.

During the fiscal year just closed, the Bureau of Customs and the Foreign Funds Control Division made numerous investigations of cases involving attempts to smuggle into this country currency suspected as being Axis loot from occupied countries of Europe.

The most important such case was a $30,000 deal in currency promoted by three South

American seamen, who were sentenced to jail terms.

The two Treasury agencies have major enforcement responsibilities under the Trading with the Enemy Act, and the Bureau of Customs enforces directives of Government agencies such as the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Price Administration, and the Department of State.

Other Treasury enforcement divisions frequently assisted in these investigations under the unified administrative arrangement headed by Elmer L. Irey, Chief Coordinator.

Customs and Foreign Funds officers, acting on information that crew members of Chilean vessels were engaging in forbidden operations in United States currency, struck at this traffic with the arrest at New Orleans of Ernesto F. Allu, Jose Manuel Solas, and Oscar Luna. They were indicted, and on pleas of nolle contendere, were given substantial jail sentences. Forfeiture of their funds is being sought.

Treasury officers said the men were engaged in purchasing, at fractions of its value, United States currency from black-market sources. The seamen were alleged to have conspired to smuggle the currency into the United States when they touched port, exchange it for negotiable paper, which was to be returned to South America where it would command the highest rate of exchange.

Treasury officers also attack a ransom racket victimizing European war refugees or their friends in this country. It was learned that large sums of money were being demanded of persons in this country for the purchase of exit permits for friends and relatives in enemy-occupied countries. Frequently these requests were for transfer of funds to agents in neutral countries, often unknown to the persons solicited. It was believed that such requests for funds, if not actually a shake-down racket, were a means used by enemy agents to obtain foreign exchange credits in the neutral countries.

A three-way agreement between the Netherlands Government, Great Britain, and the United States was put into effect which sought to ban the transfer of money for this purpose. The Foreign Funds Control, working with the State Department, was designated as this enforcement authority for this Government. Investigations by the Treasury agency identified seven individuals in Switzerland as engaged in this organized ransom traffic. These persons were put on the proclaimed list of blocked nationals, thus shutting off financial dealings with them, and since this action there has been a marked decline in the volume of such requests for funds reaching this country.

The field investigative staff of the Foreign Funds Control, under Theodore H. Ball, compliance chief, made some 1,000 investigations during the fiscal year. As a result, assets of enemy nationals of substantial value in this country were brought under control through the blocking of accounts. Numerous violations of the "freezing" regulations of the Trading with the Enemy Act relating to enemy-owned property were discovered and administrative sanctions applied or criminal prosecutions instituted.

A typical case involved a company incorporated in the United States, which reported that its ownership was vested in a Swiss corporation. Investigation disclosed that there was no such Swiss corporation, and that actually the United States company was beneficially owned by a German company.

In another case an attorney practicing in the United States, representing clients in Germany, attempted to conceal the true ownership of securities that had been transferred to him as custodian.

Customs officers, in cooperation with the United States Secret Service and Canadian authorities continued to wage war on smugglers of stolen gold. The most spectacular incident in a series of such cases saw an under-cover customs officer obtain the essential evidence by posing as a buyer for the contraband. Eighty-three ounces of gold were seized at the tunnel entrance between Detroit and Windsor, Ontario, and three persons were arrested.

Collins Sterling Smith of Detroit, whose arrest in New York late in 1942 set off the latest serious of investigations into border traffic in "high-graded gold," was sentenced to a year in jail and fined $10,000. More than 300 ounces of gold were seized in the case involving Smith and several associates.

Severe prison terms were meted out in Federal Court in Seattle to two Japanese convicted of conspiring to violate export control regulations in an attempt to ship steel oil storage tanks to Japan. The offense occurred prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, but at a time when exportation of critical materials to Japan was banned. The case was developed jointly by Customs and the Foreign Funds Control, and in cooperation with the Board of Economic Warfare. Charles T. Takahashi and Edward Y. Ozuma were sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment initially, but subsequently the terms were extended to 5 years after the court was informed of activities of the pair in an enemy internment camp.

Customs made numerous seizures of merchandise attempted to be exported in violation of office of exports regulations, but fewer of these involved critical war materials than in the 1942 fiscal year.

Seizures of all types of smuggled commodities totaled 10,800, an increase over the previous year. There were 3,920 seizures of liquor.

Searches of vessels, vehicles, cargo, baggage, and persons entering and leaving the United States were of necessity much more strict than during peacetimes, and this and other wartime functions were welded into normal operations of the Customs Service and accomplished effectively despite a slightly decreased personnel.

Acting on behalf of the Department of State, customs officers maintained unusual scrutiny of transit papers of persons entering and leaving the country. In addition, censorship of all communications outside the regular mails was a customs function. With the Navy Department and the Coast Guard, customs shared the protection of piers, docks, and other waterfront facilities.

Secretary Ickes' Speech on Gasoline Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s network, on September 1, 1943, on the subject Oil Is Scarce.

The address is as follows:

I come before you tonight with one of the most serious, one of the most urgent, one of the most important messages that I have given to you since this war began. I come before you to ask you—to plead with you in the utmost earnestness—to help us to avoid running out of gasoline. I come before you tonight to try to make it just as clear as I possibly can that we are faced with just that probability, if we continue any longer in the direction that we are traveling now. We are faced with just that probability, not only in the Eastern States, but in the entire Nation.

This statement will not be believed—tonight—on the Pacific coast and in the Rocky Mountain area, except by the oil men who know in their hearts that it is true. The stock position in those regions is comfortable now, but if the people there could know of the military demands that lie ahead, when the war in the Pacific really gets under way, they would know that there is anything but comfort ahead for them, so far as sufficiency of gasoline is concerned.

My statement will not be generally believed—tonight—in the Middle West or the Southwest, either, because the people there have been deceived into believing that they dwell in a land of oil plenty. But these sections, too, are living on borrowed time, so far as gasoline is concerned, as the physical facts will prove in the not very distant future.

My statement will not be accepted tonight—incredible though it may seem—even by some people in the East. But, to the motorists of the East, I want to give this unequivocal warning:

If there is any appreciable increase in gasoline consumption in the Eastern States, above the present rate, we will be out of gasoline in a matter of days.

Now, I realize that these are strong statements; that they are alarming. They probably call for clarification in view of the revocation today of the ban on nonessential driving—the so-called pleasure-driving ban. But there should be no confusion to those who read that statement carefully. It has been emphasized that the revocation of the ban did not mean that the gasoline supply situation had improved. It meant simply a change in administrative policy. The O. P. A. has emphasized that it did not like the pleasure-driving ban. The public had made it plain that it resented this system. I did not like it, nor did I invent it. The ban was invoked to meet a very critical situation at a time when filling stations were out of gasoline and when our entire east coast transportation system was threatened with disruption. It was a crisis measure, designed to meet a crisis, and it did meet it. But, it was recognized by all concerned that the enforcement technique was not practicable nor desirable for a long-range operation, and so it has been abandoned.

The point that I want to make—the point that must be made—is that while there is no law to prevent pleasure driving, neither is there at this time any gasoline to permit it. My purpose here is to show you why there isn't more gasoline than there is and what you can do about it if you want to be able to continue using your car for even the most needful driving.

I can let it be known that we had figured upon September 1 as the date on which we could provide for a reasonably substantial increase in the gasoline available for east coast civilian use. But today is September 1. And why has no such increase for the east coast materialized? Is the Petroleum Administration plugging up the spigot to keep the public from having gasoline which is there to be had? Some people have suggested that, but it is so absurd that it isn't worthy of an answer. We are supplying and always have supplied all of the oil to the east coast that we could. Each month we certify to the O. D. T. the amount of gasoline that will be available for civilian use. The amount so certified is not just a figure that we decide upon arbitrarily as all that we think that the public ought to have. It represents all that we can count safely upon supplying, in the light of available transportation and in the light of war requirements.

And in spite of the fact that local shortages have developed, as they inevitably will if the over-all inventories are tight, we have supplied to the Eastern States what we said that we would supply to that region.

Remember that all of our pipe lines, tank cars, barges, and tank trucks cannot be used to haul automotive gasoline for civilian consumption. They have to be used also to haul aviation gasoline in an ever-mounting volume, toluene for TNT, butadiene for synthetic rubber, heavy oil for the Navy, for the rapidly growing merchant marine, and for our war industries—yes; and furnace oil to keep America warm next winter. We have therefore refused to shift from our policy of using whatever transportation is necessary to increase the supply of furnace oil. We simply must not and will not provide for nonessential motoring at the risk of public health.

When we certified on June 26, that we could supply 342,000 barrels of automotive gasoline daily for civilian motor vehicles during the months of July, August, and September, we meant that this was all that we could supply in the face of these other obligations.

Out of this had to come the requirements for nonhighway use. The balance is what we are able to supply for civilian use—both commercial and private vehicles. The determination of how much shall be allotted to commercial vehicles and how much to passenger cars is made by the O. D. T. After O. D. T. has taken out what it decides should be allocated to commercial vehicles, the remainder is what is available for passenger automobiles.

Our calculations indicated that, if everything progressed according to plan, we would be able, by today, to certify an additional amount—perhaps about 50,000 barrels per day—for civilian consumption.

But, although we have supplied 342,000 barrels per day, consumption has not come within that figure. It has been exceeding that amount consistently for weeks, and is now out-pacing it by 30,000 to 35,000 barrels per day. This has caused a drain to that extent upon our already depleted inventories.

To this you may say: "But I have used only what my coupons entitled me to use; how then have I overconsumed?" The answer to this is: More coupons have been issued than we have gasoline with which to redeem them. Whatever restrictions upon motorcar use may be removed right now, this physical fact remains a physical fact, and unless the public will—ban or no ban—exercise greater restraint in the use of gasoline for the time being we shall inevitably run out of gasoline—that is, if we continue to supply the full military requirements—and who would want us to do otherwise?

Rationing is the responsibility of the Office of Price Administration. Restricting my remarks to my own field, I will simply state the supply facts. Since there are more coupons out than can be redeemed by the 342,000 barrels per day that we are able to supply, it follows that, although you have coupons, you should not use them at this time for other than really necessitous driving. I ask this urgently so that no war worker will be kept from his job, so that no farmer will be prevented from running his tractor, and so that there shall be no break-down in any activity essential to the prosecution of the war or to the maintenance of our civilian economy.

Now, perhaps 35,000 barrels per day does not sound like a particularly large amount of gasoline, although it is 1,470,000 gallons. But consider that over a month it amounts to more than a million barrels, or 42,000,000 gallons, which is a lot of gasoline. This overdraft on gasoline, plus the very large amount of supply that was cut off by the damage to Gulf coast refineries in the August hurricane, has meant that, instead of being able to build up our inventories, we have been forced to draw further upon them. It has meant that, instead of being able to announce, as we had hoped, that more liberal gasoline allotments could now be furnished for the East, we are going to have to struggle to maintain allotments at even their present level.

Of course, there is another reason why we were not able today to make more gasoline available in the East. To do this calls for a reduced consumption in other areas. Our recent certification that 620,000 barrels of gasoline daily would be available in the Middle West and Southwest represented a reduction of about 15 percent in consumption. For several days after the curtailment order was issued reports to us indicated that sales had been reduced slightly, and that still greater reductions are now being achieved.

About 2 weeks ago, we called upon middle western refineries to increase immediately their eastward shipments by 50,000 barrels per day, and upon southwestern refineries to increase their shipments by 25,000 barrels per day. These additional shipments are being made, but only at the expense of an additional drain upon inventories which already were falling off at an alarming rate. And why has it been necessary to draw upon inventories? The answer to that question is the answer to those in the West who ask: What reason, if any, is there for cutting gasoline allowances here?

Well, there is not just one reason. There are several.

First, the amounts of oil needed for war are perfectly enormous—and growing.

Second, in the face of this huge war demand, crude oil productive capacity is falling off seriously throughout the important midwestern oil-producing States, and is susceptible of a substantial increase only in west Texas. On the basis of known military requirements, let alone whatever unexpected demands may develop, we will not be able, by next year, to produce enough oil in the United States to meet the needs of the military, of war industry, of agriculture and for essential civilian purposes unless we cut down on consumption now. That is not my opinion. It is a fact, recognized by the practical oil men who have formally endorsed the gasoline curtailment in the Middle West and Southwest.

But not only do we face a shortage of crude oil; we are now getting 5 fewer gallons of automotive gasoline out of each 42-gallon barrel of crude oil than we did before the war. The reason is that more and more of that part of each barrel of crude oil that used to go into automotive gasoline is now going into the petroleum war products that I have mentioned—aviation gasoline and lubricants, toluene, butadiene, and fuel oils. And this shrunken output has to be shared with the armed forces. Of all of the gasoline of all kinds produced east of the Rocky Mountains for the last half of this year, the military requirement will be more than 30½ percent; and, by next year, more than 37½ percent. Here is a figure which has never before been made public: The armed forces are now using, in round numbers, 600,000 barrels of all kinds of gasoline every day. There is where the gasoline is going. That is approximately the same amount of gasoline that was used by the entire 17 eastern States in the unrestricted days of peacetime. It is as much as all of the oil of all kinds produced in Russia. And, it has to come from the same source that our civilian oil comes from. So, if someone tells you that there is plenty of gasoline, and that there is no reason for curtailment, ask him to explain how—if there is plenty of gasoline—it happened that stocks of automotive gasoline east of the Rocky Mountains declined 130,000 barrels per day—or 5,460,000 gallons each 24 hours—between April and August.

Yet, to me, the idea of spreading this limited supply as equitably as possible throughout all sections cannot be questioned. It is purely a case of misunderstanding when people in the West ask: "Why should we have our necessary driving cut down so that the East can go pleasure driving?"

That answer is: First, no necessary use of gasoline is going to be restricted in the West so far as we can foresee today. Farmers are already assured, by order of the Petroleum Administration, the same treatment as the Army and Navy as to the gasoline that they need for their essential operation. There will be enough gasoline, so far as we can foresee today, for all essential driving.

Second, you in the West are not giving up gasoline to permit the East to go pleasure driving. You are giving it up because you believe in the American principle of fair play and equality under the law. You know that, up to now, civilians on the east coast have had to supply a disproportionate share of the military demand. Now, with the transportation that we have provided, you are able to share equitably that war burden. And so, to the people of the West, I say: Why in the world would we curtail your use of gasoline if it were not necessary?

To the people of the East, I say: Why in the world would we not supply you with more gasoline if it were possible? We may be crazy, as some people are that I know, but we are not so crazy that we would invite people to throw brickbats at us if it were not necessary.

To both the East and the West, I say, please believe me when I tell you that the reason for both of your troubles is that oil has gone to war. Oh, I know that there are those who will tell you that this is just a pretext to cover up a bungling bureaucracy. But, just consider a few pointed facts:

It takes 12,500 gallons of gasoline to train one pilot.

The tanks of an armored division use more than 10,000 gallons in traveling 100 miles.

A thousand flying fortresses will use 2,500,000 or more gallons in a single 6-hour mission.

So, there isn't as much left any more for you and for me. We can't burn gasoline over Berlin and Rome and New Guinea and still have all that we want to consume here at home. And we cannot consume what we do not have.

What Does It Mean To Support and Defend the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Constitution Day this year, new emphasis attaches to it, and to me a greater meaning is added because of tragic war. All the Members of this body have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Some have taken it on assuming membership in this body, or in some other legislative body, and some have taken the oath of allegiance on joining the armed forces of our country.

There are various ways in which we are solemnly bound to observe that oath. As the veteran William Tyler Page said to me in this Chamber on June 14, 1940:

The soldier observes the oath, or fails to observe it, by his conduct on the field of battle. Each Member of this Chamber observes his oath of office, or fails to observe it, by the way he votes on measures presented here.

Quite true, but let me add that along with the Nation's defenders and lawmakers, teachers of the Constitution take the same oath and are under the same binding obligations as are the soldiers and lawmakers. The burden of this obligation on teachers is not only to instruct but to inspire in the young a devotion to that Constitution.

The Constitution is very powerful both to give and to take away, to protect and to require. In normal times we think of its protective power. In times of war we are impressed with what it requires. But what it requires may be of a few for the protection of all.

Early in the spring of 1917 in a teacher-training college at Tempe, Ariz., a young man—by name Howard Draper, of Wickenburg—wrote on an examination:

> The Constitution is the supreme law of the land. All State constitutions and laws enacted by Congress or State law-making bodies must conform to it. All officials take an oath to protect and defend it. All citizens between certain ages are expected to uphold it even to the extent of giving up their lives.

Only a few months later Howard Draper lost his life in the First World War in the service of his country. The following inscription might well have been written over that first foreign cemetery for Americans: "Stranger, go tell the American people that we lie here in obedience to their command, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and in the Constitution of the State in which we lived."

Never during the past quarter century have I taken that oath to "support and defend the Constitution" but that my thoughts turned back to Howard Draper. Henceforth when I take the oath new thoughts and emotions will crowd upon me for other young men who have "kept the soldier's faith" in the present most critical conflict. First among these is my own son—our first-born son, Lt. David Nathaniel Murdock—who gave his life in battle only last month. He, too, was a product of the great open spaces of the West, where human and eternal values can be so easily studied. He had spent the first 28 years of his life in quiet ways in Arizona, but in good preparation for 2 hard years preceding a soldier's death.

David Murdock took the oath "to support and defend the Constitution" as a teacher long before he took it as a soldier. His parents have ample reason to know he realized and appreciated its ultimate meaning. From north Africa he sent home his foot locker before embarking on another great convoy to make a second beach landing on enemy shores. In this foot locker were his uniforms, probably no longer needed, pictures of loved ones, prized newspaper clippings, treasured programs as mementos of athletic or musical accomplishments, and souvenirs of home and friends and peace. As his mother and I turn through his personal belongings we know he understood his sacred obligations and our own understanding is going through a refining fire.

During the years I taught constitutional government at the Tempe Teachers College in Arizona my educational colleague, Prof. A. C. Peterson, taught the same at a sister school, the State Teachers College at Flagstaff. Many teachers in Arizona have come under our instruction in this important subject as required by State law. Of the many friends expressing sympathy to us on the loss of our boy, one of the first and most understanding was my fellow worker, Professor Peterson, who said, in part, as follows:

> Little did we think when but a short time ago, you were so kind and helpful at the time of the loss of our son, that we would be extending our sympathy to you under similar circumstances, but let us say our hearts go out to you in a full realization of what has happened to you in the loss of your brilliant and talented son, Lt. David N. Murdock. He paid the full sacrifice for us all that we and countless millions may enjoy the things we prize so highly. His reward is certain. As we look at his picture which is before us as we write these poor feeble lines, we also look around and see the picture of Arman, who like your David paid the full price, we fully realize what the war is costing our Nation. Let us pour out our souls to God that he may aid us in bringing this carnage to a more speedy close than is generally held to be possible.

This understanding sympathy grows out of the fact that only a few weeks ago this frantic father phoned me from Flagstaff seeking any further information concerning his first-born son reportedly shot down over enemy territory. His son, too, was a gifted young man, signally honored and highly trusted. Yes, Professor Peterson, Arman paid the same full sacrifice for us all. I can only say to you, my educational colleague, that whatever dim perception you and I may have had concerning the solemn obligation of that oath to support and defend, it has been more than made good by the soldier deaths of our heroic sons.

In spite of all the present turmoil of conflicting interpretations of the meaning of the Constitution and the American way of life the same inscription suggested for the cemetery in France 25 years ago could still be used over that new cemetery in Sicily or elsewhere on the Continent:

> Stranger, go tell the American people that we lie here in obedience to their command, as expressed in the Constitution of the United States and in the constitution of the State in which we lived.

Present and Post-War Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of policy of the New England Council, made up of Representatives from the six New England States:

"1. A foreign policy frankly based upon realism and national interest, implemented by adequate force committed to maintain peace, instituted and ratified by constitutional procedure, depending for support upon the general approval of the enlightened and the complete silence of the ignorant.

"2. A definition of the functions and fields of free enterprise, and of the scope and purpose of business regulation; a restriction upon the expansion of Government into the field of business without clear showing of necessity and without express legal authority; a declaration of intention regarding the responsibility of industry for post-war reemployment, and an indication of the measure of Government support of post-war construction and production; with legislation designed to make possible the accomplishment by the business organism of the tasks assigned.

"3. A thorough overhauling of the system of Federal taxation, to simplify procedure and computation and promote the established policy of free enterprise by substituting incentives for handicaps.

"4. A declaration of the right of individual security expressly conditioned by the obligation to work to the extent of capacity, fixing the responsibility for providing the opportunity, and stimulating the production to a level where a guarantee of security can be made good by stressing the obligation to work, rather than by providing the population with spending money.

"5. Legislation fixing the maximum amount of currency to be outstanding and drastic measures to bring back into circulation the hoarded currency."

Members of New England's congressional delegation heard the above program presented by Mr. Chase at the New England Council's seventy-second quarterly meeting in Boston last week end. And they heard the council president declare:

"You are our representatives—the repositories of our confidence—the trustees of our political fortunes. It is necessary to trust someone, even at the risk of occasional betrayal. We shall trust Congress. We affirm our faith in representative government as the only hope of a free people in a world of infinite complexity."

International Alliances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Journal-American of Wednesday, February 15, 1943, regarding international alliances. It is well worth-while reading before reaching a conclusion as to the need or value of entering into military alliances which may be the direct road to continuous wars:

> The Republican Party in its assemblies is wasting a lot of time in trying to decide what kind of international alliances the United States should enter into now or after the war.
>
> There are two burning questions involved in this situation.
>
> One question is whether the United States wants any kind of international alliance whatsoever.

The second question is whether the United States can get the kind of international alliance it wants, even if it wants one.

To begin with, any permanent international alliance means a complete departure from the tried and proven policy of the United States for 150 years.

It is not likely that the present crop of erratic, fanatic, irresponsible, and experimental statesmen who have messed up matters, political and financial, in this country during their brief tenure of office are wiser and sounder than the statesmen who founded the Nation and conducted it more successfully than any other Nation on earth for a century and a half.

Yet, even assuming that an international alliance is permissible as one of the inspired innovations of the New Deal—why is it necessary?

What will it accomplish that we have not been able to accomplish without an alliance?

We wished to save England from destruction in 1917.

We did it—and then came home and attended to our business.

Our business was building up our industries—our best occupation in peace and our best protection in war.

We did some foolish things, like sinking a good part of our fine defensive Navy.

But we were hoodwinked into that.

And even that did not matter so much as long as we developed the industries which could (and promptly did) build our Navy up again when the need came.

In the broadest sense we did eminently the right thing.

We expanded the industries which are the Nation's source of supply for conveniences and advantages in time of peace and for necessities in time of war.

In 1941, England having got herself into another complication by declaring war before she was prepared, we decided to save her again.

We had no international alliance.

We did not have to save her if we had not wanted to.

We were a free agent, and as a free agent we did what we conceived to be our duty.

And there is no doubt that up to the present moment we have succeeded thoroughly in accomplishing our object.

Would we have accomplished it any better if we had had a hard and fast alliance?

Certainly not.

And is it not conceivable that impelled by the confidence—the overconfidence—which an unbreakable alliance might create—England could possibly get into complications and wars into which we would not feel it our moral duty to follow her?

Wherefore, the alliance would not do any good to us or to England, and might do both nations a great deal of harm.

It might easily become a cause of war rather than a creator of peace.

But let us suppose that an international alliance could be desirable and could in someway be beneficial.

What kind of an alliance would we have and with what nations?

Would we have an alliance with all the Allies?

Could we make an alliance which would satisfy all of them—and how long would it satisfy them?

Should we rather have an alliance between the leading Allies—Russia, England, and the United States?

These three nations are hardly united now, during the war, on the same objectives.

England and the United States are moving to crush Germany and the other Axis Powers as they are crushing Italy.

Russia is moving to drive the Axis out of Russia, to be sure, but is even now negotiating for peace with Germany and Austria, and has already come to a partial understanding with Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Russia, moreover, quite irrespective of England and the United States, has a peace treaty with Japan—and might easily come to have a military alliance with Japan if Stalin fails to get what he wants from the industrial democracies.

What kind of an alliance can we have with that kind of an ally unless we give him all of Europe for bolshevism and give Japan all of the Pacific for imperialism?

This we may be prepared to do.

But what a price to pay for an alliance which we do not need—and which probably would not hold for our advantage if we did need it.

Is it not better to continue to let our conscience be our guide in every individual complication which shall arise, rather than be bound by contract and compact to a course which might be not only against our welfare but contrary to our moral convictions?

Would it not be a good thing to retain the freedoms we are fighting for and to add to the "four freedoms"—freedom of action and freedom of choice?

Would it not be well for the Republican Party or any true American party to declare against any commitment to any international policy until after this war is won, and until Americans are able to see what international policies are practicable and what are desirable in view of the conditions and the international relations which shall exist after this war?

It is always possible to make an alliance with some nation or nations if we want an alliance.

But it might be very difficult to get out of an alliance if we had one and did not want it.

Furthermore, this war is far from over yet.

We do not know how long it will last, and we do not know what phase it will take.

Let us keep free to do whatever we believe to be our duty.

Let us keep free to protect the welfare of the American people as well as of other peoples.

Let us keep free from compact and commitments.

We have done very well while we have been free.

Indeed, this is—as our National Anthem says—"the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Let us keep it free.

War Food Administrator—Marvin Jones Best Man for Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, permission having been granted, I am inserting herewith a radio address delivered by the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, on Friday, August 27, 1943, on the subject of agriculture's attack for 1944.

To my mind, the President could not have made a better selection for the place of War Food Administrator than our former colleague here in the House of Representatives, Judge Marvin Jones. He is not only an able man, but he has plenty of good, common, horse sense, which is manifesting itself rapidly in connection with the administration of this high and very important office. Judge Jones is further to be commended for surrounding himself with good men like our former colleague here in the House, the Honorable W. L. Nelson, who served on the Committee on Agriculture of the House when Judge Jones was chairman of that committee, and the Honorable Grover C. Hill, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The address is as follows:

I am going to talk this evening about food—about our food prospects and our food problem. Life begins with food. It cannot be sustained without it. Powerful in time of peace, it is even more powerful in time of war.

Food is as important to an army as guns, as important to our home front as steel or oil.

Food is not a political issue. It is a critical war material, and I respect it accordingly. Tonight, I want to give the full facts and then rely on the common sense of the American people to know what to do.

Our duty here on the home front is to produce the food and then to distribute it—not just to please those who want a lot of food and can afford to pay for it—but according to one rule: How will it best serve the whole Nation in the emergency?

Our armed forces come first. They must be supplied. Next, there must be food for our civilians. Then we must supply food for our allies who are helping to fight our common enemies. Then, too, helping to supply food to the hungry people in the liberated countries has been shown to be of great help to our fighting forces.

The more efficiently we produce and distribute food, the better it is for us and for our soldiers, and the quicker they can come home.

First, a brief summary of the actual food situation as it now exists. When the war began, our food and agricultural situation could hardly have been better if we had known when the war was coming.

The morning of Pearl Harbor found our bins and warehouses piled high with the biggest stock piles of basic farm commodities we had ever had. Our stocks of corn, wheat, and cotton, and our livestock numbers were all at record levels or near.

The productive capacity of our soil was at an all-time high. Partly because of the conservation programs of the preceding years, our yields per acre for the past 5 years have averaged over 20 percent higher than the average for the 20 years just preceding.

Then, there was a trained and experienced farmer organization at the county and community level, all ready to mobilize agriculture to win the war. The beginning of the war found agriculture prepared.

The man who criticizes American agriculture has not studied the facts. The American farmer, each year for the last 5 years has broken the all-time food-production record which he had set the year before. Each year he has set a new record, and broken it the next year.

Nineteen hundred and forty-one was a great production year, but in 1942, in spite of the increasing shortages of farm labor and machinery, the American farmer continued to work and set another all-time record.

But the critics are hard to silence. They say that the situation is so muddled and hopeless that famine is just around the corner. Yet we now have the largest livestock

population in our history—more cattle, more hogs, more dairy cows, and more poultry than we have ever had before. In spite of the late and unfavorable spring, in spite of the disastrous floods in the Farm Belt, in spite of other obstacles—the present outlook is for a total food production for this year which will closely approach the record of 1942, and surpass any other year in our history.

I give you this record to think about. The American farmer has a war record to match even the war record of his sons at the battle fronts, and no greater tribute can be paid.

The critics, who talk about muddle and famine, cannot smear that great record. It will stand inspection.

The August crop report indicates a total crop production for the year about 5 percent higher than any year in our history except last year. And because of our greater livestock production, the total food output this year, given favorable weather, may break all records again, even last year's.

Now what about food consumption?

Our civilians ate more food per capita in 1941 and 1942 than ever before in our history. They ate it partly because of our huge supply and partly because they could afford to buy it, with their present record-buying power.

For this year, present estimates indicate that our civilian food consumption—per capita—will be slightly less than during the last 3 feast years—but higher than for any year in the twenties or the thirties.

But this is only a part of the story. This does not mean that every housewife can have all the choice she wants, or all the food she wants. Those who have always had an unlimited supply will eat somewhat less—and many who in peacetimes could not afford so much will now eat somewhat more. Since this is in keeping with the wisdom of distributing our food supply so it will do the most good, I know that those who have always had all they wanted will not object now to sharing with our soldiers and our workers who must eat more now than before.

I want to repeat that in spite of our enormous production and in spite of our high total level of consumption, there will continue to be short supplies of various foods at various times. And there will be continuing short supplies of some foods. No matter how much we increase production, the needs of our civilian workers, our allies and our soldiers will outrun the supply.

Our responsibility in the food field includes two major problems. First, to produce as much as possible. Second, to distribute this food to best advantage.

We are announcing step by step a program for the greatest production in our history for 1944. Fortunately this can be done in conformity with good soil conservation practice, thus avoiding the tragic blunder of the other war when land was plowed up without regard to its fitness and the soil was allowed to wash and blow away without any adequate means to prevent it. That blunder will not be repeated.

It takes hard work to produce food. There is no other way. It cannot be produced by directives. What we can do here is to remove obstacles to production and to assist in getting supplies and labor to meet the farmer's needs. He knows full well that in wartime this cannot be done perfectly by anyone and that there will always be shortages of various kinds.

I know that the Nation's farmers and ranchmen will produce an abundance if they have the necessary tools, equipment, and repairs, fertilizer, credit, labor, and a price that is adequate to cover the extra costs and hazards of increased production.

We shall continue the drive for a full allotment of all these, but I am sure the producers will understand that war makes many demands for critical materials, and although we will do all we can, there will be shortages and they will, I am sure, continue to make these limited supplies go just as far as possible.

We will continue to help solve the farmer's labor problem by cooperating with the local labor people in the counties and communities where the problem is best solved. We have brought in thousands of workers from Mexico and the Caribbean. We have arranged for the use of thousands of war prisoners on farms. There has been deferment of some millions of essential farm operators and workers. We have helped organize the United States Crop Corps which has hundreds of thousands of workers on farms. We will keep on doing these things, although the real solution has been found out in the country by the farmer and the communities themselves.

In addition to equipment and labor, the farmer needs prices that will allow him to produce. Farmers don't want to get rich out of the war; they merely want adequate price protection. This should be given to them.

In my judgment the best way to get production is to have a definite support price that will last throughout the season. It should be high enough to cover the added risks and hazards that go with increased production. And it should be announced early.

That means the Government would stand ready to buy any surplus of a commodity that might not flow into the regular channels at that price. In some cases it might be necessary for the Government to absorb a loss.

I can't give a single formula here for all commodities, because no single formula would work for all crops. In the case of some commodities it might be necessary to license processors and handlers. I think it is very desirable that existing processor and wholesale and retail facilities be utilized.

There will be no restriction on food production. All-out production is needed. We hope to give the farmers the information as to the needs well in advance of planting time and then rely on a voluntary program, with no written contracts, for the farmers' response.

We already have the local organizations throughout the country at State, county, and community levels, with the committeemen selected by the farmers themselves. They know how to administer this program, and we can depend on them in this emergency. The State and county war boards have been doing fine work and they will be continued.

I expect to consult the Congress, the farmers, and the farm groups and seek their advice and help. If a better way can be found, I am willing and anxious to have it. I served more than 20 years in the House of Representatives and 10 years as the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and during those years I worked with the representatives of the farm groups and expect to stay in close contact with these producers. No program can succeed without the support of the people throughout the whole country.

In our effort for production of food, in our effort to prevent waste of food, and in our effort for the best distribution of food, we hope that producers and consumers, throughout the whole country, will be willing to work together in the common cause.

Ever since that day in 1775 when the embattled farmers stood at Lexington, no group has ever played a more important part in our country's history than the producers. When the farmer joins hands with the worker and the businessman, and they join hands with him, victory will be assured on the home front. And with victory on the home front, our armed forces and our allies will make certain of victory.

What the Home Folks Are Thinking About Post-War Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Don F. Cochrane, long editor of the Hartford Day Spring, published in Van Buren County, Mich., comes the following editorial clipped from the Coloma Courier, which accurately expresses the views of many of the Nation's patriotic citizens:

WHO WILL SPEAK FOR AMERICA?

Who, however obscure, but still possessing some semblance of administration authorization, will speak for post-war America?

Our Government spokesmen seem profuse in their rhetorically gorgeous word pictures of dreamy Utopias they propose to establish in Europe's conquered countries and in those still unconquered, with Uncle Sam as the beneficient manager and principal bagholder in a conglomerate earthly paradise in which people of conflicting racial instincts and irreconcilable ideals are expected to dwell in peace and happiness forevermore, according to a formula for which mankind sought for centuries in vain until the latterly created seething pool of super brains in Washington discovered it with the greatest of ease, like the agile man on the flying trapeze.

Quite smug in their belief that our mode of life is best for all men, irrespective of the racial soil in which their customs are rooted, our self appointed world reformers propose to mold the appetites of foreign nationals to a typical American bill of fare, array them in our type of toggery, and send our school teachers and disciplinarians to instruct their offspring in the wizardry of our newer economic theories and the niceties of our social code; albeit, in our own country such economic theories have backfired while juvenile delinquency is increasing here at a rate alarming to the puritanically inclined.

ALLIES DO NOT SHARE OUR DREAMS

Our allies, let alone the conquered and the unconquered, do not share the idealisms that our dreamers would impose. Englanders raise their eyebrows in recognition of the incompatibility of such utopianism with the preservation of the English Empire for which they are fighting.

The French, being Frenchmen and proud of it, are not keen to be Americanized. The Italians still love their spaghetti and their rhythmic folk songs and demand a change in menu even when brought over here as prisoners of war.

Joe Stalin remains eloquently silent, which in the light of his previous silences means only that he is uncompromisingly opposed. The Poles, the Czechs, the Dutchmen dream, not our dreams, but of the restorations of their own normal ways of life. The Japs want none of our proven unsophistication in international intrigue. The Chinese, who have yielded slowly to the Christianizing influence of our missionaries, want to get back to their rice fields and the mode of their fathers in the material phases of their existence.

As for the Germans, they are still convinced that they, not Americans, are the supermen. Their ambitious plans may have misfired, but

that does not mean that they will not fire again.

WE ARE WORLD'S PHILANTHROPISTS

Americans have ever felt the philanthropic urge and have evidenced open-hearted willingness to share their abundance with less fortunate peoples of other lands. We have been the most unselfish givers in the world.

Often have we fed the starving hordes of Europe. The solicitation of American dollars for the relief of distress in all quarters of the globe has become an organized business in this country. Many of our own people, capitalizing upon generosity, make it their vocation. In a few instances such alms seeking has been exposed as a racket.

We have loaned our money in fabulous amounts to poor debtors abroad, and such loans remain not only unpaid but repudiated. We unsuspectingly furnished our enemies in advance the materials with which they are fighting us now, and we sent our best engineers and technicians abroad to teach them the efficient methods of American industrial production, methods that are now making enemy fighting forces more efficient in taking a heavy death toll of American boys.

Our Red Cross has carried mercy to stricken peoples in many lands, and we are proud of the work of that organization as one of America's outstanding humanitarianisms.

We are also proud of the fact that the hat has never been passed in any foreign country for the relief of distress in America. It is our good fortune that we have never stood in need of foreign charity. We have never borrowed from foreign governments to replenish our own National Treasury nor failed to pay our international obligations. To revive a homely expression, America has paddled its own cance.

AMERICA FACES THE FUTURE, TOO

These facts are not recalled deprecatingly, nor bemoanfully, but they should serve to remind us that the proposed super gratuities of our do-gooders will meet with no more appreciation than have some of our past philanthropies; that they may be no more appreciated than our current colossal contribution to the defeat of the common enemies seems to be in some foreign quarters.

Our allies are very definitely looking to the future—to the future of their own countries and their places in the post-war world.

The United States faces the future, too. Most of us expect to live our allotted days in post-war America. We are justifiably concerned as to what sort of America it is to be. We are particularly solicitous of the America to which our millions of fighting men will return after winning the victory for us and for our allies.

We expect it to be a self-reliant America in which we must work out our own destiny, exactly as successive generation of Americans have done since the colonists revolted against English rule.

It is time that we and our national leaders gave more though to our own post-war weal and less to grandiose theories of world-wide social and economic supervision that may make us only despised as international meddlers. We should harbor no delusions that the world at large will concern itself with America's domestic welfare save as we prove a help or a hindrance to them in international trade, in which they will, as always, take the better of the bargain if they are more clever than we.

To think in terms of America first is not selfishness. Neither is it isolationism, a misconstrued term to which much undeserved odium has been imputed. It is plain common sense, plus observance of the law of self-preservation as the first law of nature.

It is time that we took steps to prevent visionary wasters of our national resources from approaching the inevitable peace table bearing unwanted idealisms that hard-headed allies will promptly throw in the ash can. America should not be elbowed out of the peace parley, as it was following the First World War.

We are not fighting for more territory nor for the privilege of plundering any nation. We are fighting in defense of our right to live our national life and pursue our ideals unmolested by foreign tyrants. But we shall miss whatever we are fighting for unless we begin to face the facts realistically and make America's post-war security a matter of first concern.

It will avail little if we peddle the "four freedoms" abroad and lose them at home. A little coterie of starry-eyed visionaries temporarily in control of America's official megaphone should not be permitted to convert Uncle Sam into Uncle Sap.

Let's Treat the Red Man White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I am attaching hereto a copy of a magazine article written by me and appearing in the September issue of The Nation's Schools. It is entitled "Let's Treat the Red Man White," and in six short words this title expresses what to my mind is the obligation of the United States to the American Indian. It is an obligation which has never been met, and it is an obligation which I propose to do my best to fulfill as a Member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs.

I now have before the Rules Committee of the House an investigatory resolution which has had the unanimous approval of the House Committee on Indian Affairs. This legislation is known as House Resolution 166, and it is my hope that the Rules Committee will permit the House to have an early vote on its adoption. It is high time, in my opinion, when this body made a complete and careful survey of Indian conditions in this country and then took steps to give to the American Indian the white man's chance, to which he is so richly entitled.

The article follows:

LET'S TREAT THE RED MAN WHITE

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Congressman, First District, South Dakota)

Our "four freedoms" are faltering badly on every Indian reservation and in every State in which Indians live in substantial numbers.

On March 15 of this year, after having served for more than 4 years as a member of the House Committee on Indian Affairs, I introduced a resolution (H. Res. 166) calling for a complete investigation of Indian conditions throughout the United States.

WE CANNOT DENY OUR RESPONSIBILITY

Rich in its native culture and in its potential capacities, the Indian population of America in many areas still lives in conditions of poverty and backwardness so startling as to indict us before the world. Improvement of the status of the American Indian is a responsibility that we cannot and must not longer dodge. It is a responsibility that cannot be met simply by a continuation of our policy of making substantial annual appropriations to the Indian Bureau. We must take time to develop a continuing and constructive program for gearing the Indian into the white man's economy in North America. In 1924, the Indian was belatedly given full citizenship rights in this country, but his elevated legislative status has done little to improve his standards of living. It came, instead, as a tardy recognition of the fact that during World War No. 1, the Indians furnished more men per capita than any other race and likewise furnished more money per capita for the support of the war than any other race. Every general with the Allied forces in that war commended the American Indian for his heroism.

Again in the present war, the Indian is duplicating his record of leading all other races in men reporting to the colors. In time of war we find ample use for the talents and courage of the Indian, but in times of peace we shamefully revert to attitudes of indifference which for more than a century and a half have recognized the Indian as an American problem without working out an American solution to the situation.

It is hoped that this time Congress will act intelligently and sympathetically to develop a long-view program destined to solve once and for all a problem that could well have been eliminated in its entirety years ago.

In writing to a friend of his under date of February 18, 1803, Thomas Jefferson outlined what in my opinion is a sound approach to make in dealing with the Indian problem.

Said Jefferson: "In truth, the ultimate point of rest for them (the Indians) is to let our settlement and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix and become one people, incorporating themselves with us as citizens of the United States. This is the natural progress of things and it will, of course, be better to promote than to retard it. Surely it will be better for them to be identified with us and preserved in the occupation of their lands than to be exposed to the many casualties that may endanger them while a separate people."

The policy set up in contradiction of the Jeffersonian principle has proved a dismal and disturbing failure.

Today, in many areas, Indians are living in homes and huts and tepees inadequate to keep out the weather and to protect either health or happiness. Sanitary conditions on many reservations are deplorable. The Indian Service has constructed admirable hospitals in some communities, but in others the natives lack suitable medical care, especially for the younger children.

Educational conditions among the Indians vary greatly. We have some excellent Indian schools, but many Indian children are bundled off to boarding schools at early ages and family life is disrupted.

A start, but a very inadequate one, has been made in the proper training of the Indian children in vocational schools where they can be fully prepared in the handicraft arts and in the handling of the tools of trade in which they have a tendency to show excellent capacities.

Needed badly is adequate opportunity for training Indians above the high-school level so that they may attain both greater maturity and greater skills before being turned out to battle with a society all too likely to be skeptical of the Indian's ability and, in addition, unsympathetic with his problems.

SEGREGATION SHOULD BE DISCOURAGED

The present Indian Administration appears to place much hope in separate Indian schools and to discourage the attendance of Indian pupils in schools enrolling whites. In some areas, however, Indians have displayed a marked capacity to adapt themselves to educational programs in which both white and red children attend the same institutions. It is indicated that perhaps greater headway can be made toward the goals outlined by Thomas Jefferson if the segregation of Indians is discouraged wherever feasible, whether it be in private life or in public education.

Indians take well to farming, especially to the management of livestock. Under proper guidance to nurture their appreciation of property rights and the importance of ownership, Indians have demonstrated their ability to earn an independent livelihood on the farm either in competition with one another or as part of the white man's agricultural economy.

One criticism of the present administration of Indian affairs may be a tendency to treat the Indians too much as a race apart rather than to direct their destiny toward that of an assimilated race.

Our Government may be charged with being negligent in showing a true appreciation of the Indian's needs, but it cannot be indicted for being niggardly. During the last 20 years, it has spent more than $643,000,000 on the American Indian and we are presently employing more than 8,000 persons in the Indian Service. The latest statistics show 332,969 Indians living in the United States; thus, we find one Government worker for about every 40 Indians; 1 for every 8 Indian families on the average. In their early days of savage fighting, it scarcely took more white soldiers with good rifles to patrol the Indians than are now being employed in the Indian Service.

What is needed, therefore, is not larger appropriations necessarily, or more employees under the Indian Bureau, but a constructive and continuing program.

As late as 1934 the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, said at an Indian council in Rapid City, S. Dak., "The guardianship maintained by the United States is carried out under bad laws which are wicked and stupid and which make slaves even of the Government employees hired to enforce the law."

Mr. Collier's criticism is stern and drastic. Unfortunately, the progress he has made in the correction of the conditions he criticizes has not kept pace with the energetic indictments he has leveled at the Indian Service, both before and since it has come under his control.

An apathetic Congress and an indifferent public must share the responsibility for this snail-like progress, but it is also true that Mr. Collier has not provided a long-term program that gives promise of meeting satisfactorily the Indian's fundamental need for an economic or educational background and experience that will make him an independent, self-supporting citizen.

It is my conviction that any governmental Indian policy must be measured for its efficacy by the simple yardstick, "Does it hasten the day when the Indian can become an independent citizen and take his rightful place in our American economic and political activities?" Any program that helps to answer this question in the affirmative should merit the support and encouragement of the Congress and the country.

Education has a vital role to play in the attainment of the goals defined by Thomas Jefferson. We are making the Indian literate, but we are not making him self-supporting and independent. More vocational training for students of mature age is required and all Indian education should be slanted at helping the Indian to fit himself into the national life, rather than at perpetuating for him a separate culture, a separate status, and a segregated reservation life.

Under careful planning a forward-looking Indian policy on the part of the Government should be able within less than 50 years to obviate the necessity of maintaining a separate Indian Bureau which is no more necessary than a bureau to handle problems for Italians, French, Irish, Negroes, Russians, or any other racial group.

More and more the separate States may well be entrusted to assume greater responsibility for Indian health, work, education, and vocational guidance. The Federal Government for some time will have to supplement State funds with Federal appropriations, but just as the general American educational program is best developed when its direction is localized, it follows that too much Federal direction of the Indian's destiny has, over the years, retarded his progress.

It is to be hoped that the investigation which I have proposed will help to shape a permanent Indian policy destined to release and reenforce the splendid native characteristics so abundant in our first Americans.

Newsprint and the Quislings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

NEWSPRINT AND THE QUISLINGS

The War Production Board is considering a further cut in newsprint use of at least 5 percent. It announced that the 5-percent cut had been recommended by the newspaper industry advisory committee meeting in Washington. This reduction, if put into effect, would result in slashing American newspapers 15 percent in size or in circulation or in a combination of both during 1943.

The newsprint mess presents the same old story of Quisling bureaucracy that has characterized the management of food, gasoline, fuel oil, and all the other civilian commodities since the New Dealers assumed control of our economy. They divide up what we have because they do not believe in producing more and do not know how to produce more if they believed in doing it. They promote crises in order to find the excuse for seizing more power.

Newsprint production could be expanded to meet any need if private enterprise were free to do it and if the Washington planners had not created a deliberate scarcity of workingmen by their sly mismanagement of manpower.

Limitations placed on newspapers by the so-called newsprint shortage are deliberate blows at the free press of America, which the New Dealers know they must destroy before they can assume the complete, tyrannical control over this country toward which they have been building.

Renegotiation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and print a letter, I am submitting a comprehensive legal discussion of the renegotiation of war contracts by M. F. Cosgrove, of Topeka, Kans., one of its leading attorneys. It is a criticism with suggested remedies, which are all illuminating:

DORAN, KLINE, COSGROVE,
JEFFREY & RUSSELL,
Topeka, Kans., September 15, 1943.

Hon. W. P. LAMBERTSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: I have been consulted by clients with reference to the renegotiation of war contracts which I find set forth in section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 28, 1942, as amended by section 801 of the Revenue Act of 1942, approved October 21, 1942; section 1 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, Public Law 108, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 1, 1943; and Public Law 149, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 14, 1943.

I find that there is nothing in the law so enacted by the Congress which necessitates the advice by a lawyer to his client. It is the province of a lawyer, after a careful study of the law, to advise his client what his rights are under the law and what procedure he shall follow if those rights have been infringed. This act of the Congress has done away with property rights entirely. It has no counterpart in any other act of Congress with which I am familiar except those of the same general nature passed in recent years. I have found it necessary to turn to the laws of Russia to find anything comparable. If you will turn to the laws of Russia under the heading of "Property," you will find the following:

"Private property in the sense of ownership of the means of production has disappeared. The economic basis of the U. S. S. R. is the socialist system of economics and socialist property in the means of production, which has been established as a result of the abolishment of capitalism, private property, and the exploitation of man by his fellows." (Constitution of 1936, sec. 4.)

The Congress, in setting up the machinery for renegotiation of contracts, has set up another bureau with power to legislate and to issue regulations and directives with all the force and effect of law. Again turning to the law of Russia under the heading "Legislation," we find the following:

"The only legislative organ is the SuprS. But ordinances and decrees are being issued also by the Presidium of the SuprS and by the CouncPC. The most important decrees issued by the CouncPC are often signed by the central committee of the Communist Party as well, although that is not required by the constitution. All these decrees have practically the same importance as the acts of legislation, and may be counteracted only by the SuprS, acting on its own initiative or on the protest of the Attorney General."

I will now attempt to point out the reasons why I have made the foregoing accusations and will suggest the remedies. I will quote some pertinent sections in the law passed by

you for the government of the people by whom you were elected:

"(c) (1) Whenever, in the opinion of the secretary of a department, the profits realized or likely to be realized from any contract with such department, or from any subcontract thereunder, whether or not made by the contractor, may be excessive, the Secretary is authorized and directed to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract price. When the contractor or subcontractor holds two or more contracts or subcontracts, the secretary, in his discretion, may renegotiate to eliminate excessive profits on some or all of such contracts and subcontracts as a group without separately renegotiating the contract price of each contract or subcontract.

"(2) Upon renegotiation, the secretary is authorized and directed to eliminate any excessive profits under such contract or subcontract (i) by reductions in the contract price of the contract or subcontract, or by other revision in its terms; or (ii) by withholding, from amounts otherwise due to the contractor or subcontractor, any amount of such excessive profits; or (iii) by directing a contractor to withhold for the account of the United States, from amounts otherwise due to the subcontractor, any amount of such excessive profits under the subcontract; or (iv) by recovery from the contractor or subcontractor, through repayment, credit, or suit of any amount of such excessive profits actually paid to him; or (v) by any combination of these methods, as the secretary deems desirable. * * *

"(4) Upon renegotiation pursuant to this section, the Secretary may make such final or other agreements with a contractor or subcontractor for the elimination of excessive profits and for the discharge of any liability for excessive profits under this section as the Secretary deems desirable. Such agreements may cover such past and future period or periods, may apply to such contract or contracts of the contractor or subcontractor, and may contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems advisable. Any such agreement shall be final and conclusive according to the terms, and except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or a willful misrepresentation of a material fact, (i) such agreement shall not be reopened as to the matters agreed upon, and shall not be modified by any officer, employee, or agent of the United States; and (ii) such agreement and any determination made in accordance therewith shall not be annulled, modified, set aside, or disregarded in any suit, action, or proceeding. * * *

"(6) This subsection (c) shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause. * * *

"(f) Subject to any regulations which the President may prescribe for the protection of the interests of the Government, the authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Secretary of each Department may be delegated in whole or in part by him to such individuals or agencies as he may designate in his Department or in any other Department with the consent of the Secretary of that Department, and he may authorize such individuals or agencies to make further delegations of such authority and discretion."

I do not contend, and no one will contend, that anyone is entitled to profiteer as a result of the war. I still have sufficient faith in my fellow man to believe that when this piece of legislation was enacted into law, it was the belief and intent of all Members of the Congress, by this means, to check profiteering and to return to the Treasury of the United States any moneys which may have been taken from it wrongfully. If such was the intent, the results obtained fall far short of producing the results desired.

Just as the Supreme Court has defined what constitutes interstate commerce within the meaning of the National Labor Relations Act, so could it be held that practically everyone is a subcontractor within the meaning of the renegotiation of war contracts. Practically everyone in the United States has performed some service or sold some material to a contractor, and thus has become a subcontractor within the meaning of the act. Thus you have enacted into law a means by which the powers vested in you by the Constitution have been delegated and permitted to be redelegated without end so that under its provisions there can be set up a gestapo with powers more far reaching than those delegated to revenue agents to inquire into the profits of all, whether such profits be in the form of wages, salaries, fees paid, commissions paid, amounts received from the sale of merchandise, or from the combination of these various things.

No yardstick is provided by you for the measuring of excessive profits as you have set up for the revenue agents. What constitutes excessive profits is an amount within the sound discretion of each member of the gestapo thus created by you. No right of appeal to a court of competent jurisdiction was given by you. You did except from the finality of the decision of the gestapo "fraud or malfeasance or a wilful misrepresentation of a material fact." Of course you need not have made that exception. The law, if such a thing still remains, gave to the party affected that right.

The persons to whom the act applies were defined by you as follows:

"The term 'subcontract' means (i) any purchase order or agreement to perform all or any part of the work, or to make or furnish any article, required for the performance of any other contract or subcontract."

From the foregoing, it will be seen what I meant when I stated above that practically everyone in the United States could be said to be a subcontractor.

The term "renegotiation" would ordinarily mean that two people would get together and have a meeting of the minds—in other words, reach a new agreement. You changed the meaning of that. Here is the way you defined it:

"The terms 'renegotiate' and 'renegotiation' include the refixing by the Secretary of the Department of the contract price."

This means that the Secretary of the Department can go back and refix the price that anyone has received for any article furnished or required for the performance of any contract or subcontract or for any service rendered for that purpose.

You have failed to fix a yardstick by reason of the definition which you have given to the term "excessive profits." Your definition is as follows:

"The term 'excessive profits' means any amount of a contract or subcontract price which is found as a result of renegotiation to represent excessive profits."

Since renegotiation means refixing by the Secretary of the Department and since the Secretary of the Department can delegate and redelegate his authority, this means refixing without rule or regulation the price received for all services performed, for all work done, or the price received for any article required for the performance of any contract or subcontract.

REMEDY

Ordinarily, a piece of legislation which is bad may be remedied by an amendment here and there. The plan for renegotiation which you have given to your country is not susceptible to amendment. There is only one thing to do, and that is to repeal it and start over again. And in the consideration of new legislation on this subject, there is no necessity to create another bureau as you have attempted to do. It should be handled in its entirety by the Treasury Department, which already has competent employees entirely capable of handling the matter in conjunction with the collection of income taxes. An adequate provision has heretofore been made for review by the courts of all decisions of the Treasury Department.

An identical letter to this is being written to each Member of Congress from Kansas. Most of you attended a meeting of cattlemen recently held in Kansas City. The things which were said by the livestock men from the stage of the Music Hall on that day were mild in comparison to what was being said by the men attending that meeting. I was there as a livestock producer. I sat through the entire meeting and visited with many of them during the noon hour and in the evening. I am deadly in earnest in what I have said to you in this letter. If you want to preserve the form of government which we once enjoyed, if you want to prevent a revolution in this country, Congress must not only cease the establishment of additional bureaus, but must abolish a great majority of the bureaus which have been established and must discontinue the Russian practice of attempting to govern by executive order, directives, and regulations. You have already departed so far from the traditional path of legislators that property rights in this country have now scarcely more meaning than they have in Russia, as defined by the Russian law which I have quoted herein. I know that I speak the will of the majority of the people of the United States, should all of the people make a careful study of the subject matter of legislation which we have here had under consideration, when I say that it is your solemn duty to at once repeal all statutes and parts of statutes pertaining to the renegotiation of war contracts, and, in the drafting of new legislation to cover this subject, to consult with and be governed by men who are familiar with war contracts from a practical standpoint and not with crackpot theorists who are working to overthrow our form of government.

Yours very truly,

M. F. COSGROVE.

A Lesson in Arithmetic in Connection With the Purchase of Bonds To Back the Attack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a very interesting and timely poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Thomas H. Williamson, Aiken, S. C., which I am sure will prove to be interesting reading not only to Congressmen, but the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With the real answer given in this example in arithmetic, it should be very encouraging to all of us in buying bonds to the limit.

The poem follows:

A LESSON IN ARITHMETIC

Arithmetic will do the trick,
Buy a bond and do it quick;
Buy and buy, and what you lend,
By and by—goodbye Berlin.

Thirteen dollars twenty dimes,
Multiplied a billion times;
Add these figures at the end,
And it will divide Berlin.

Cancel zero's from the world,
Then Old Glory can be furled;
Subtract the Axis, square the rest,
Then your taxes will be less.

—*Thomas H. Williamson.*

Address by Senator O'Daniel at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "What America Needs Most Is a House Cleaning in Washington," delivered by me at the National Food Conference at Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AMERICA NEEDS MOST IS A HOUSE-CLEANING IN WASHINGTON

I appreciate the invitation to attend this food conference here in Chicago because it gives me an opportunity to speak to this splendid group of citizens who are here from all over the Nation, also by radio to the rank and file of the good people of America. I am no politician, but instead I am just an ordinary common citizen who has rubbed shoulders with the rank and file of thousands of other common citizens for many years, until the good people of Texas became sick and tired of the way the pussyfooting professional politicians had bungled the affairs of the State and neglected the rights of the people, so they picked me out of the ranks and elected me Governor of Texas for two terms, and then sent me to Washington as their United States Senator. During my 2 years in Washington I have discovered that the gang of professional politicians in my home State of Texas were pikers compared with that gang of professional politicians at Washington who constitute the dynasty club which has taken over the affairs of this Nation and is operating the United States of America for the personal benefit of themselves, their relatives, and cohorts, and with practically no attention being given to the welfare of the great rank and file of our good people throughout this Nation. During the recess of Congress I have been staying on my little ranch, near Aledo, in Parker County, Texas, and from the front room of that little ranch house away out in the wide open spaces, I broadcast a report to the people of Texas concerning what I had found out in Washington. In those broadcasts I simply told the plain, unvarnished truth about what is being done to the people of this Nation by that gang of bungling bureaucrats in Washington. Of course, time on this radio will not permit me to tell you the whole story today, but if any of you folks now listening would like to have the full story of what I reported to my people in Texas, just drop me a card or letter and I will be glad to send you copies of those broadcasts. Address your card or letter to Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Washington, D. C.

Let me also say that I do not believe that it does a great deal of good to criticize the bungling bureaucrats in Washington, and complain of the demoralizing conditions on the home front which have been caused by their twisted thinking and crackpot edicts unless at the same time I can offer suggestions that will remedy the situation. Therefore, in the copies of broadcasts which I will mail to you, you will find 15 suggestions which I have made for your consideration. I say they are for your consideration because I am old-fashioned enough to still believe whole-heartedly in our American form of democracy, and in our Constitution, and I believe that when our wise forefathers wrote that Constitution of the United States they had in mind that the people of this Nation should be the masters, and the public officials should be the servants. Exactly the opposite condition prevails now and your public officials in Washington are the masters, and the people are the servants. Each and every one of you must make application to, and get a permit from, some bureaucrat in Washington before you can plant, harvest, or sell your crops, or before you can buy the food for your family's meal, or before you can make a dress, buy a suit of clothes, kill your own turkey for your own use, or get a new diaper for the baby. Therefore, these 15 suggestions for correcting these deplorable conditions are for your consideration, and I as your servant, am ready to respond to your wishes after you have considered them. After reading the 25,000 letters which poured in to me from people who heard those broadcasts, and which represented a cross-section of public opinion from people in almost every walk of life, I have reached the very definite conclusion that there is no division in the minds of our people insofar as problems of winning the war are concerned. The American people are willing to make any sacrifice necessary to see that this war is fought to a successful conclusion and terminated by the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers. Let me add that the same determination prevails practically 100 percent in the Congress of the United States, and never before in our history has a President had more unanimous support of the Congress than our present Chief Executive has had in all matters essential to the war effort. The people of America are satisfied with the way the generals are running the war, and, thank God, the war is being run by the generals, and not by the bungling bureaucrats in Washington.

This war is a terrible thing and has reached into almost every home in America and touched the tenderest heartstrings which bind our homes together, and while my profound sympathy goes to each aching heart, my eyes cannot be blinded, my ears deafened, nor my voice silenced regarding the attempt that is being made by the dynasty in Washington to use this war emergency as a means of destroying our true and tried American system of representative democracy and substituting in its place, communism, socialism, or some other form of foreign "ism," which means dictatorship in America. The people of America are tremendously concerned about our domestic affairs. The people of America are concerned because they know that during the past 10 years the glad hand of welcome has been held out in Washington for the Communists and fellow travelers and those theorists and star-gazers who would make America over according to the European pattern. The people of America realize that the chief troubles which we face today did not originate with the war, but that they had their origin during the past 10 years—during peacetime. For 10 years the prevailing philosophy of government in the United States has been that we can have more by producing less. It has been a philosophy predicated on the idea that it is the function of the Government to support the people, and not the function of the people to support the Government. It has been a philosophy which has offered a reward for indolence and has placed a badge of honor on shiftlessness. It has been the philosophy which has led the people to believe that they were serving their own personal welfare and the welfare of the country when they spent every dollar they made. It has been a philosophy that has pointed the finger of scorn at those who believed it was a responsibility of every citizen to save a part of that which he made. It has been a philosophy which classified the man who had a bank account as an economic royalist and the man who was living off of public charity as the Nation's No. 1 citizen.

These philosophers and theorists who want to do away with our American system of democracy, individual initiative, and our system of private enterprise in this country; these people who want the Government to take over and operate all lines of business; these people who want to use the war as an excuse to try out their pet socialistic philosophies on the people of this Nation, have caused the great rank and file of our people to realize that unless something is done in the near future to stop this communistic movement and get back to our old-fashioned system of American democracy, we may find to our sorrow that while our brave sons are fighting, bleeding, and dying on foreign battlefields to destroy dictatorship abroad, that dictatorship has been established right here at home. During the time I have been away from Washington I have talked with farmers, dairymen, and cattle raisers throughout the United States, and every day dairymen in this country are being forced to sell their herds, and the reason they are being forced to sell their herds comes primarily from two causes. One is a shortage of labor which has been created largely by governmental blundering, and the other is the fact that the O. P. A. has fixed the price of milk, but has not at the same time fixed the price of all the commodities that go into the production of milk. Labor which the dairymen must pay costs him twice what it did a year ago and the feed which he uses has, in many cases, gone up 50 or 60 percent. These bureaucratic bunglers in the face of a serious transportation shortage in this country have tried to work out schemes to ship cottonseed meal from Texas up here to Illinois to feed the Illinois cows, then ship soybean meal down to Texas to feed the Texas cows. These bunglers destroy the source of production of milk and then offer the American people as a remedy, the rationing of condensed milk. With more livestock on the ranges of America than there has ever been before, Government edicts have prevented it from getting into meat markets where people can buy it, and many of our honest working people are going hungry for meat in a land of over-populated cattle, sheep, and hogs. Thus O. P. A. proves its uselessness and its own actions bear testimony that it should be abolished immediately.

There are many disturbing factors which are causing our trouble on the home front today, but two of these factors stand out prominently. One is the way our labor con-

ditions have been bungled by the professional politicians who have petted and pampered the labor leader racketeers of this Nation, in hopes of getting their financial support in their campaigns for reelection. This unsound labor policy has created a manpower shortage which is threatening our whole domestic economy, and is seriously impeding our war effort. The other factor is the disgraceful bungling of our whole agricultural problem, which has brought on a serious food shortage in this Nation, and threatens to become dangerously worse, with the possibility of impeding our war effort. In discussing these labor conditions, I want to make it perfectly clear that I am a true and sincere friend of the laboring people of this Nation. I am the son of hard-working parents, and I have performed hard manual labor much of my life. I am strongly in favor of organized labor. I believe in unions and in their right to organize, and to bargain collectively, and in their right to strike and picket peacefully in peacetime. My fight is not against the honest working people, but it is against the designing labor leader racketeers who work not, but live in luxury from the exorbitant fees they extract from the pockets of the honest hard-working people, and in their unholy alliance with the unscrupulous professional politicians who work hand-in-glove with them. This detestable combination determined in Washington that this war should be fought on a basis of the 40-hour-workweek, with penalty for overtime, which has resulted in war plants of this Nation being operated with three shifts instead of two.

It means that during this period of no unemployment we are operating under the same law that was enacted several years ago to help correct a serious unemployment situation and that in most cases three men are working at jobs which could better be done by two men. Honest, patriotic working people who would like to work longer hours per week during this war crisis, and thus help to hasten the end of this horrible war and at the same time make more money to lay aside for that rainy day which is sure to come after the war, are prevented from doing so because their racketeering labor leaders prefer to keep three men on every two-man job because it means three fees paid in to them instead of two, and that means more money which they may contribute to help reelect the professional politicians who make the laws that permit this disgraceful racket. Well-informed people know that there would be no manpower shortage in this Nation if all restrictions were removed and our honest, patriotic men and women were permitted to work as many hours as they desire, to help build the implements of war that their brave sons on far-flung battlefields need to fight this war. The manpower shortage has been created by the bungling bureaucrats in Washington. It could be corrected overnight if you had enough men in the right positions in Washington who wanted to correct it. Right here let me say for the benefit of our radio listeners that radio time for my full speech was not available, but if any of you folks in radioland desire a copy of my full speech I will be glad to send it to you if you will drop me a card or letter addressed to Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, Washington, D. C. Now to the food shortage, which has also been created by the bungling bureaucrats in Washington. Due to the fact that the farms of this Nation have been absolutely stripped of labor to put in our war plants, due to the bungling of the O. P. A. and other governmental agencies, this Nation faces the grave danger of a serious food shortage. But, my friends, this again is not something that has happened since the war started; if you will refer to the record, you will find that there were only 1 or 2 years during the past 10 years when we did not import more food in America than we exported. The policy of this Government to limit production and to regiment every activity of agriculture had, prior to the beginning of the war, reduced the efficiency of the operation of agriculture to a very low level.

Another thing, if during the last 10 or 15 years we had set up in this country a system that was fair and equitable to agriculture, we would not have started this war with agriculture in the impoverished condition which it is in today. I do not have time to go into a detailed discussion of this matter, but one thing is very obvious and all of the figures compiled by the United States Government itself reflect this fact: the agricultural program which we have had in effect in America during the past 10 years has been an absolute failure. The nonagricultural classes in this country are today earning $3 where those employed in the field of agriculture are earning only $1. The average earnings of the farmer during the past 10 years have been less than they ever were in a similar 10-year period during the past 30 years, even after you included all of the Government checks which have been sent to the farmers throughout this Nation for not raising food and for not growing livestock. You find that these checks received for what they did not do, plus the checks received for what they did, when totaled, would not represent a living wage for agriculture. And furthermore you find that the average earning of agriculture during this 10-year period has not been raised over what it was during the previous 10-year period. My belief is that the plan generally referred to as the domestic allotment plan which gives to American agriculture a priority to the American market, at American prices, will accomplish two things: First, give to agricultural classes a fair break with the nonagricultural classes; and, second, accomplish the purpose without regimenting the farmers into a socialistic society. I do not believe there is any thinking person who knows America, who does not realize that we are capable in America of producing enough food, not only to feed all of our people, but probably enough to feed the world, but it cannot be done under the directions of these bungling bureaucrats who are trying to solve the problems of agriculture sitting behind mahogany desks in the big office buildings on the banks of the Potomac. Please bear in mind that this labor policy and this agricultural policy which I am discussing were not adopted after we got into war. These policies were adopted about 10 years ago during peacetime, so let nobody say they are war measures. The trouble with our Government today is that prior to the time we entered the war we had built up a Government which is composed of a vast bureaucratic system; prior to the time we entered the war we had discarded government as set up under the Constitution with three separate departments: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. And since we entered the war all of the fellow travelers who had already located themselves in key positions in Washington, are using the war emergency as a means to further regiment, control, and dictate to the citizens of this country.

Now, my friends, these things that I have mentioned as problems peculiar to agriculture are, after all, only typical of the situation which faces American business throughout this Nation, and if there is one thought which I should like to leave with those who are listening to me, above every other thought, it is this: You cannot solve the problems of agriculture, or the problems of any other one industry, alone—the trouble which we face in this Nation today is too general. We are going to have to solve the problems of all industry and the way we are going to have to solve them is by electing men to the United States Senate and men to the House of Representatives who will reestablish the dignity of the legislative department of this Government; men who will cease to be the craven slaves to do what they are told to do by the executive department of government and by the bureaucratic bosses. The Constitution of the United States is the foundation upon which we have built our whole system of free enterprise in America. It is the system which has at all times maintained an open road down which the youth of this country could travel with the knowledge that through perseverance and effort success could be achieved. It is this system of constitutional government that has formed the mainspring of American business. It is this which has caused individual citizens to go out and fight battles of life and to build American industry on the gigantic basis upon which it has been built. The biggest trouble which we face in Washington today is that all questions are decided with an eye set on the election in 1944, in order to satisfy the blocks of votes which the politicians in Washington who have headed this Government for the past 10 years, believe it is necessary to satisfy. You know and I know that so far as the executive department of government is concerned and so far as the bureaus set up in Washington are concerned and so far as many Members of Congress are concerned, before you proceed with any plan it must be O. K.'d by the "fellow travelers" in the big bureaus and by the leaders of organized labor who have sought to use the war to set up a dictatorship of labor over business in America.

One thing we must realize if we expect to maintain free government is that a free democratic system of government cannot be maintained when all of the decisions are made in Washington and when all of the power of government is vested in a strong centralized bunch of boards and bureaus and most of these boards and bureaus presided over by those who have distinct communistic leanings. True democracy, as provided for in the Constitution of the United States, means most definitely the rule of the people; it does not mean a rule by blocs, classes, and groups. You simply cannot have democracy and dictatorship at the same time. If there is any right on earth that is fundamental and should be guaranteed by the Government, it is the right to work. When laboring people of this Nation are forced to pay $25, $50, or $100, for their God-given right to work, freedom and liberty in this land of the free are only empty, meaningless words. That condition in industries here in America financed by taxpayers' money, now exists and bears the stamp of approval of your own Federal Government. So I say it is high time that we take off our rose-colored glasses, call a spade a spade, and proceed to the task of a general house cleaning in Washington. Right now while we are engaged in this horrible war, our American soldiers who worked in New Jersey canneries during the tomato canning crisis, had money taken out of their pay envelopes to pay for their right to work, according to recent news dispatches. That, my friends, is an indication of what our brave soldiers may expect after they return from winning this war and try to get jobs here in America. Yes, I say it is high time that we who are left at home conduct a thorough house cleaning in Washington while our sons are cleaning house in other parts of the world. The Constitution of the United States should be so amended as to protect the rights of all our citizens either to join labor unions or to stay out of labor unions. And this constitutional amendment should provide that no employer in America would

be allowed to enter into any contract which would either require or prevent a man from belonging to a labor union as a prerequisite to the right to hold a job. It must be obvious to all thinking people that if the time ever comes in this country when the mass of our people cannot hold jobs unless they belong to labor unions, then you have placed in the hands of the bosses of organized labor more power than the Government itself has, because the right to work means the right to live. If we expect to continue democratic government in this country, then the three departments of government—the legislative, executive, and judicial—must function as independent departments of government as provided in the Constitution.

The power of the executive department of government to control the legislative department of government through patronage must be broken. The Constitution of the United States should be so amended as to prevent any Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate from being appointed to any Federal job by the President during such Member's term of office or for 5 years after he leaves office. When you consider the enormous public debt which we have built up in this country, it is obvious to every thinking man that taxes in this country upon all lines of business and individuals must not only be high during the remainder of this war, but they must remain high for a long period after the war. Private business simply cannot pay from 40 to 80 percent of its earnings in taxes and at the same time compete with Government-owned business which is tax free. We face a very different situation now from that which we faced in the past, before we incurred this enormous public debt, and established this unprecedented high tax rate. If we expect to pay this debt, if we expect to maintain free enterprise, then the Government should go out of business in competition with its taxpayers. The idea that the Government must go into the railroad business in order to regulate the railroads, or the idea that the Government must go into the public-utility business in order that it may have a yardstick to enable it to regulate the public-utility business, is absolutely unsound from every standpoint. But if we allow these fellow travelers and communistic theorists in Washington to have their way, they are going to use the high tax rate as a means of subsidizing Government-owned business and they are going to drive private business, not only the railroads and the public utilities, but every other line of endeavor, completely out of the field of business. Be not misled. These things are definitely planned for the future. I have already made reference to the vast public debt we are accumulating and the absolute necessity for the continuation of high tax rates. It is inevitable that in the future taxes on individuals must remain high and that taxes on corporations must remain high, but I want to make this most emphatic statement: Taxes should be levied with equity and fairness and taxes should be levied for the purpose of raising revenue to operate the Government and they should not be levied for the purpose of changing our form of government. Great aggregations of wealth as represented by our corporations should be required to pay their fair share of taxes, but we should realize that the American people have used the corporation as a vehicle to bring together necessary capital from both large and small investors to provide mass production and thereby provide cheap prices on manufactured goods, and a high standard of living, and we should not let these fellow travelers and Socialists in Washington tax corporations out of existence for the express purpose of substituting Government ownership for corporation ownership.

Now, then, let me come to the final matter which I want to talk about today. I have pointed out to you some of the things which I think it is imperative we have done in this country if we are to preserve our American way of life. Now let me tell you how I think we can accomplish this; and let me tell you, furthermore, that I think it is the only way we can accomplish it. We have got to elect to the United States Senate and to the House of Representatives men who believe sincerely in our American form of government and our system of free enterprise; men who will have the courage to fight to maintain this system; and then after we have done this, we must not let them stay in Washington too long, because I will tell you now that when a man stays in the atmosphere of Washington too long, he forgets that he is the servant of the people, and he adopts the attitude that he is the master of the people. The first thing I think we ought to do is to try to elect in our next election just as many good, responsible men as we can to membership in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. Then, the next thing we ought to do is to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide that hereafter no Member of Congress could serve for a period of more than 6 years. When a man has been in Washington 6 years, the welfare of the people will be better served if he goes back home. And in this same amendment, I would provide that the President of the United States and the Vice President could serve only 6 years. We have 130,000,000 people in the United States. If, out of that number, we cannot select new men to go to the House of Representatives and to the Senate and to fill the President's office at least once every 6 years, then we should simply admit that we are not capable of operating a democratic government. I would provide in that same amendment that one-third of the House of Representatives would be elected every 2 years the same as Senators are now elected, but when the 6-year period was up, I would send these Representatives and Senators back home and let them try to live and to make a living under the laws they had passed. Now, folks, we can get this amendment to the Constitution of the United States adopted if the people want it, and you can do it in one of two ways: You can do it by electing men to Congress who will vote for it or you can do it by having your State legislatures propose the amendment.

One thing I am certain of, if you do not amend the Constitution of the United States so as to stop keeping men in the House of Representatives and in the Senate for life, and if you do not stop keeping one man in the President's office until his grandchildren get old enough to succeed him, our constitutional form of American government will be lost. Generally speaking when you leave a man in Washington too long in either the House or the Senate, he loses his contact with the people, he gets to wondering if he were returned to private life if he could make a living; he becomes a coward; he begins to dodge every time some high-powered block of voters puts on the pressure; he becomes the slave of the executive department of government as he pleads for patronage; he does the bidding of the bureaucrats because the bureaucrats have lots of jobs at their command, or they can control the spending of money in his district. Let us stop all this, let us get back to the theory of government upon which the Constitution was originally developed, and that was the rule of the people and not the rule of the bureaucrats. Let us stop the practice of keeping one man in the President's office so long that he begins to completely ignore the duly constituted representatives of the people. Let us stop the practice of building up the power of the executive department of government in order that that department may through this power and through patronage secure a continuation in office from year to year, or from decade to decade. And in conclusion let me say that the problem of maintaining a land of free opportunity and free enterprise in America is the biggest task which faces the citizens of this country at this time and I mean all of our citizens, whether they be day laborers, merchants, public-utility executives, or great industrialists. All that we have and all that we may hope for in the future is dependent upon maintaining in America a government where the people are the masters and the public officials are the servants. Without democratic government, we sink to the level of the beasts of the field that think only of food and water, a place to eat and a place to sleep. The greatest need of this Nation today is a thorough house cleaning in Washington.

T. V. A. Yardstick Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if we are to preserve democracy in America; if we are to maintain our American way of life; if we are to perpetuate our system of free enterprise and make it possible for every human being in America to live comfortably and peacefully, and to enjoy the blessings to which they are entitled, we must give them the benefits of cheap electricity by extending the T. V. A. yardstick to every consumer of electric energy throughout the country, and then extending that service to every farm home in America.

That yardstick which you will find in the fourth annual report of the Electric Power Board of the City of Chattanooga, Tenn., is as follows:

ELECTRIC POWER BOARD RATE SCHEDULES

RESIDENTIAL

Alternating-current service at approximately 60 cycles, 110 or 220 volts, either single-phase, two-wire or three-wire; or, three-phase, three-wire, or four-wire, as may be required by board.

Rate: First 50 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 3 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 150 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 200 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour; next 1,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 0.4 cent per kilowatt-hour; excess over 1,400 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 0.75 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Minimum monthly bill: $0.75 per meter.

COMMERCIAL

Alternating-current service from the local distribution system at approximately 60 cycles, 110 or 220 volts; either single-phase, two-wire or three-wire; or, three-phase, three-wire or four-wire, as may be required by board. (Customers with demands of over 20

kilowatts and/or using over 4,000 kilowatt-hours per month billed on industrial rate.)

Rate: First 250 kilowatt-hours per month at 3 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 750 kilowatt-hours per month at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour; next 1,000 kilowatt-hours per month at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour; excess over 2,000 kilowatt-hours per month at 0.8 cents per kilowatt-hour.

INDUSTRIAL—CHARACTER OF SERVICE

Alternating current, three-phase, 60 cycles. Voltage supplied will be at the discretion of board and will be determined by the voltage available from distribution lines in the vicinity and/or other conditions.

Rate: Demand charge (based on 30-minimum demand), $1 per kilowatt of demand per month—first 1,000 kilowatts; 90 cents per kilowatt of demand per month—over 1,000 kilowatts.

Energy charge: First 10,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 10 mills per kilowatt-hour; next 25,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour; next 65,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 4 mills per kilowatt-hour; next 400,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour; over 500,000 kilowatt-hours consumed per month at 2.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Charge for energy in excess of 360 times the demand shall be subject to a reduction of 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour from the otherwise applicable rate.

Note the rates for the three classes of consumers—residential, commercial, and industrial.

If everyone who used electricity last year had got the benefit of these rates, the residential consumers of the Nation would have saved $433,355,112; the commercial consumers would have saved $394,871,206; the industrial consumers would have saved $357,007,356, making a grand total of $1,185,233,674 the electric light and power consumers of America would have saved last year if they had all enjoyed the benefits of these T. V. A. yardstick rates.

The electric light and power consumers in Chattanooga alone saved $3,249,216 on their light and power bills last year, as the following statement from this annual report shows:

CUSTOMER SAVINGS—RATES

Based on the average rate per kilowatt-hour charged for service in 1938 by the former privately owned company, from which the board acquired the electric distribution system, the customers of the board saved in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, an amount of $3,249,216, as follows:

Residential customers	$881,167
Commercial customers	245,786
Industrial customers	2,103,144
Street lighting	19,119
Total year's savings	3,249,216

These, added to previous years' savings of $6,736,990, bring the total savings in electric service costs to Chattanooga users, since August 15, 1939, to $9,987,216—almost equal, in only 4 years, to the $10,850,000 paid for the system.

I know it will be contended by the advocates of the private power monopoly that these publicly owned systems pay no taxes, and that they do not have to meet other expenses that private power companies have to bear. But the following statements from this report of the public power system of Chattanooga refutes every one of these contentions:

DEPRECIATION; TAXES; BOND INTEREST; BOND RETIREMENT; ADDITIONS TO PROPERTY; SURPLUS

Charges against income from depreciation (replacement of worn-out property) during the year totaled $377,339.14 and such equipment and property as needed replacement was replaced (except where new equipment was unobtainable, due to war conditions). Much of the board's system requires copper and steel, which are highly critical war materials, and only priorities for those replacements made necessary by total failure are being asked for from the War Production Board.

In accordance with the board's legislative act, tax replacements were paid to the city, Hamilton County, and other taxing units in an amount of $276,500—the amount being paid upon property acquired by the board at the time of acquisition by the city of the former privately owned system.

Interest charges, due semiannually, upon the board's revenue bond issue were paid in an amount of $357,923.95. These bond interest charges, after provision for depreciation and taxes, were earned three and two-tenths times.

Cash payments, amounting to $321,170, were made into the board's bond fund during the year. On July 1 an amount of $260,000 in bonds, which became due, were retired. The board has outstanding $12,440,000 in revenue bonds and $100,000 in general obligation bonds.

Only those extensions and additions made necessary by service required in connection with the war program were built during the year. As over 75 percent of the kilowatt-hours sold by the board go almost directly into war material, these were of considerable size. Likewise, provision was made during the year to extend the board's lines to serve 870 homes adjacent to the board's present lines when the war is over and materials are available.

The unappropriated net income (surplus) of the board, as of the end of the fiscal year, was $381,932.13. This is not all a cash surplus but represents an accumulation of assets over liabilities since August 15, 1939. Since that date the expenses of furnishing electric service by the board have required 97.4 percent of all the income received by the board from its charges for electricity. Thus, it can be seen that the rates charged have been just slightly more than the income required for furnishing the necessary service. The principles of publicly owned electric power are based upon having rates that will just cover the cost of the service. As rates cannot, from a practicable standpoint, be put up and down according to economic conditions, it is good business to accumulate, when possible, a reasonable surplus to guard against having to raise the rates when sales of electricity may fall off. Undoubtedly electric sales will fall off following the war for a time, and this small surplus will be a safeguard against having to raise rates.

If there are any Doubting Thomases in Congress whose constituents are paying these enormous overcharges for their electric energy who question the wisdom of a public power system, or who oppose municipal ownership for electric facilities, let them read the following excerpt from the report of the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga of August 28, 1943:

In accordance with the requirements of chapter 455, section 12, Private Acts of 1935, amending the charter of the city of Chattanooga, the Electric Power Board of Chattanooga is submitting herewith a statement showing the operations and financial conditions of the electric distribution system for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943. This statement has been prepared by Arthur Andersen & Co., a nationally recognized auditing firm.

During its fourth fiscal year, the board had a total income of $4,900,415.36 (100 percent); expended in furnishing electricity to its customers $4,824,120.62 (98.5 percent); had a balance left for future use of $76,294.74 (1.5 percent).

This annual audit of the board's financial condition showed that at the end of the fiscal year it had total assets of $13,444,503.67, including current cash assets of $438,069.34. The board's liabilities consisted principally of $12,540,000 in bonds, due and payable at regular yearly periods up through 1969. An amount of $260,000 of bonds was retired on July 1, 1943, making a total of $760,000 of the board's bonds which has been retired to date.

In this, its fourth fiscal year of operation, the board continued as the largest municipal contractor of T. V. A., from which it purchased the 617,870,212 kilowatt-hours for the use of its 45,264 customers. The basic T. V. A. rates, without surcharge, that have been preserved for the board's customers, brought electricity to Chattanooga at an average cost of 0.87-cent per kilowatt-hour for all users. This is in contrast to the average cost of 1.70 cents per kilowatt-hour for all users in 1938, the last full year of private ownership of the electric distribution system.

Savings in electricity costs, based on the average rate charged in 1938, during the last fiscal year, amounted to approximately $3,249,216. Since August 15, 1939, on which date the board acquired the local distribution system, these savings, by the board's customers, totaled approximately $9,987,216. It is interesting to note that these savings in cost of electricity for the 4 years almost equal the $10,850,000 paid for the system by the board.

What is being done in Chattanooga is being done likewise in every other municipality and by every cooperative power association within the T. V. A. area. It can be done throughout the entire Nation, and it must be done if the American people are to prosper and enjoy the great benefits which this modern electric age afford.

In order that everyone who reads this RECORD may know what it would mean to him or her and what it would mean to every other individual in America to have these rates applied throughout the Nation, I am inserting below the tables which I have had compiled showing the overcharges for all classes of consumers in every State in the Union, including the District of Columbia, for the year 1942.

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by the residential users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 1.—*Residential electric service, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	262,462	349,202,000	$9,134,800	$6,184,260	$2,950,540	$5,581,363	$3,553,437	$5,106,353	$4,028,447	$4,823,174	$4,311,626
Arizona	96,137	117,680,000	4,508,900	1,997,443	2,511,457	1,803,560	2,705,340	1,650,257	2,858,643	1,560,079	2,948,821
Arkansas	150,625	123,004,000	5,615,200	2,684,066	2,931,134	2,425,766	3,189,434	2,218,004	3,397,196	2,094,470	3,520,730
California	1,839,900	1,876,605,000	56,562,000	37,613,730	18,948,270	33,993,762	22,568,238	31,052,538	25,509,462	29,355,678	27,206,322
Colorado	217,270	194,901,000	8,053,100	4,396,993	3,656,107	3,970,178	4,082,922	3,631,948	4,421,152	3,430,621	4,622,479
Connecticut	472,439	521,297,000	19,994,400	10,617,026	9,377,374	9,577,318	10,417,082	8,757,547	11,236,853	8,277,682	11,716,718
Delaware	60,961	60,960,000	2,688,000	1,290,240	1,397,760	1,163,904	1,524,096	1,064,448	1,623,552	1,008,000	1,680,000
Dist. of Col	67,891	209,160,000	5,177,800	4,292,396	885,404	3,878,172	1,299,628	3,541,615	1,636,185	3,350,037	1,827,763
Florida	350,975	426,672,000	17,411,400	7,661,016	9,750,384	6,929,737	10,481,663	6,337,750	11,073,650	5,989,522	11,421,878
Georgia	383,695	485,145,000	15,294,100	9,252,931	6,041,169	8,365,873	6,928,227	7,649,050	7,645,050	7,234,109	8,059,991
Idaho	110,037	204,946,000	5,191,200	3,000,514	2,190,686	2,709,806	2,481,394	2,481,394	2,709,806	2,341,231	2,849,969
Illinois	1,849,955	1,817,960,000	69,688,500	39,861,822	29,826,678	36,028,955	33,659,545	32,892,972	36,795,528	31,081,071	38,607,429
Indiana	762,796	754,230,000	28,725,700	15,914,038	12,811,662	14,362,850	14,362,850	13,127,645	15,598,055	12,409,502	16,316,198
Iowa	479,103	445,734,000	18,686,300	9,791,621	8,894,679	8,838,620	9,847,680	8,072,482	10,613,818	7,642,697	11,043,603
Kansas	341,343	309,163,000	12,842,200	6,677,944	6,164,256	6,035,834	6,806,366	5,522,146	7,320,054	5,213,933	7,628,267
Kentucky	344,604	308,900,000	11,587,000	6,963,787	4,623,213	6,291,741	5,295,259	5,747,152	5,839,848	5,434,303	6,152,697
Louisiana	296,105	236,550,000	10,854,200	5,253,433	5,600,767	4,754,140	6,100,060	4,341,680	6,512,520	4,102,888	6,751,312
Maine	186,895	158,561,000	7,114,000	3,272,440	3,841,560	2,952,310	4,161,690	2,703,320	4,410,680	2,553,926	4,560,074
Maryland	470,929	359,224,000	13,380,800	7,827,768	5,553,032	7,065,062	6,315,738	6,462,926	6,917,874	6,115,026	7,265,774
Massachusetts	1,152,014	920,085,000	43,264,600	20,810,273	22,454,327	18,820,101	24,444,499	17,219,311	26,045,289	16,267,490	26,997,110
Michigan	1,342,654	1,641,918,000	50,634,300	32,051,512	18,582,788	28,912,185	21,722,115	26,431,105	24,203,195	25,013,344	25,620,956
Minnesota	543,552	667,994,000	21,439,100	12,498,995	8,940,105	11,276,967	10,162,133	10,312,207	11,126,893	9,754,791	11,684,309
Mississippi	150,454	147,467,000	4,748,200	2,639,999	2,108,201	2,383,596	2,364,604	2,179,883	2,568,317	2,060,719	2,687,481
Missouri	695,521	692,011,000	24,883,800	14,457,488	10,426,312	13,039,111	11,844,689	11,919,340	12,964,460	11,272,361	13,611,439
Montana	98,625	115,262,000	4,103,600	2,084,629	2,018,971	1,883,552	2,220,048	1,723,512	2,380,088	1,629,129	2,474,471
Nebraska	234,130	217,885,000	8,796,000	4,785,024	4,010,976	4,318,836	4,477,164	3,949,404	4,846,596	3,738,300	5,057,700
Nevada	26,142	35,253,000	1,336,100	618,614	717,486	558,490	777,610	510,390	825,710	482,332	853,768
New Hampshire	130,380	111,382,000	5,434,300	2,385,658	3,048,642	2,157,417	3,276,883	1,972,651	3,461,649	1,863,965	3,570,335
New Jersey	1,123,048	945,608,000	45,232,900	21,711,792	23,521,108	19,585,846	25,647,054	17,912,228	27,320,672	16,962,338	28,270,562
New Mexico	59,487	50,768,000	2,468,500	1,014,554	1,453,946	915,814	1,552,686	839,290	1,629,210	792,389	1,676,111
New York	3,506,955	2,841,238,000	128,057,500	64,412,923	63,644,577	58,266,163	69,791,337	53,271,920	74,785,580	50,326,598	77,730,902
North Carolina	407,588	437,757,000	15,025,700	8,759,983	6,265,717	7,903,518	7,122,182	7,227,362	7,798,338	6,836,694	8,189,006
North Dakota	71,711	71,522,000	3,008,300	1,446,992	1,561,308	1,308,611	1,699,689	1,197,303	1,810,997	1,131,121	1,877,179
Ohio	1,686,920	1,800,472,000	61,304,300	39,234,752	22,069,548	35,495,190	25,809,110	32,429,975	28,874,325	30,652,150	30,652,150
Oklahoma	303,306	241,190,000	11,625,600	5,522,160	6,103,440	4,987,382	6,638,218	4,568,861	7,056,739	4,313,098	7,312,502
Oregon	282,929	524,796,000	11,039,700	7,849,227	3,190,473	7,087,487	3,952,213	6,480,304	4,559,396	6,127,034	4,912,666
Pennsylvania	2,203,207	2,202,202,000	83,919,000	46,826,802	37,092,198	42,295,176	41,623,824	38,602,740	45,316,260	36,504,765	47,414,235
Rhode Island	187,735	131,941,000	6,855,300	3,146,583	3,708,717	2,838,094	4,017,206	2,598,159	4,257,141	2,454,197	4,401,103
South Carolina	196,246	210,772,000	6,845,800	4,162,246	2,683,554	3,758,344	3,087,456	3,436,592	3,409,208	3,251,755	3,594,045
South Dakota	76,022	71,758,000	3,140,000	1,485,220	1,654,780	1,340,780	1,799,220	1,224,600	1,915,400	1,158,660	1,981,340
Tennessee	383,691	586,620,000	12,412,300	10,016,726	2,395,574	9,048,567	3,363,733	8,279,004	4,133,296	7,819,749	4,592,551
Texas	930,574	785,774,000	33,438,700	17,154,053	16,284,647	15,515,557	17,923,143	14,178,009	19,260,691	13,408,919	20,029,781
Utah	137,159	157,238,000	5,179,300	2,948,211	2,224,089	2,663,734	2,508,566	2,436,153	2,736,147	2,301,674	2,870,626
Vermont	75,737	77,589,000	3,321,200	1,491,219	1,829,981	1,348,407	1,972,793	1,232,165	2,089,035	1,165,741	2,155,459
Virginia	412,047	452,617,000	17,101,300	9,268,905	7,832,395	8,379,637	8,721,663	7,661,382	9,439,918	7,233,850	9,867,450
Washington	491,374	998,364,000	18,292,600	14,103,495	4,189,105	12,749,942	5,542,658	11,652,386	6,640,214	11,012,145	7,280,455
West Virginia	273,670	228,011,000	9,228,200	5,057,054	4,171,146	4,567,959	4,660,241	4,171,146	5,057,054	3,949,670	5,278,530
Wisconsin	649,693	720,978,000	23,703,400	13,463,531	10,239,869	12,159,844	11,543,556	11,116,895	12,586,505	10,500,606	13,202,794
Wyoming	43,763	40,298,000	1,843,100	868,100	975,000	785,161	1,057,939	716,966	1,126,134	678,261	1,164,839
United States	26,620,456	26,936,773,000	990,185,300	556,830,188	433,355,112	503,080,419	487,104,881	459,812,470	530,372,830	434,681,794	555,503,506

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by commercial users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 2.—*Commercial electric service, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	38,107	219,355,000	$5,725,500	$3,297,888	$2,427,612	$2,696,711	$3,028,789	$2,576,475	$3,149,025	$3,114,672	$2,610,828
Arizona	15,581	98,982,000	3,064,600	1,360,682	1,703,918	1,109,385	1,955,215	1,063,416	2,001,184	1,284,067	1,780,533
Arkansas	34,365	121,251,000	4,609,500	1,954,428	2,655,072	1,594,887	3,014,613	1,521,135	3,088,365	1,470,431	3,139,069
California	357,160	3,425,247,000	58,611,900	37,101,333	21,510,567	30,302,352	28,309,548	28,895,667	29,716,233	34,991,304	23,620,596
Colorado	37,562	224,889,000	6,898,700	3,311,376	3,587,324	2,697,392	4,201,308	2,566,316	4,332,384	3,118,212	3,780,488
Connecticut	62,097	443,042,000	13,935,800	5,825,164	8,110,636	4,752,108	9,183,692	4,543,071	9,392,729	5,490,705	8,445,095
Delaware	8,916	48,863,000	1,435,300	647,320	787,980	528,190	907,110	505,226	930,074	610,003	825,297
Dist. of Col	10,706	239,901,000	4,657,700	3,670,268	987,432	2,999,559	1,658,141	2,873,801	1,783,899	3,469,987	1,187,713
Florida	66,069	422,991,000	14,823,400	5,573,598	9,249,802	4,535,960	10,287,440	4,328,433	10,494,967	5,247,484	9,575,916
Georgia	63,313	460,195,000	12,949,800	6,241,804	6,707,996	5,089,271	7,860,529	4,869,125	8,080,675	5,892,159	7,057,641
Idaho	18,980	175,294,000	3,282,900	1,628,318	1,654,582	1,323,009	1,959,891	1,260,634	2,022,266	1,529,831	1,753,069
Illinois	248,833	1,434,019,000	49,100,000	23,469,800	25,630,200	19,198,100	29,901,900	18,412,500	30,687,500	22,193,200	26,906,800
Indiana	107,360	698,135,000	19,546,100	9,968,511	9,577,589	8,131,178	11,414,922	7,779,348	11,766,752	9,401,674	10,144,426
Iowa	95,499	535,692,000	16,076,600	8,263,372	7,813,228	6,752,172	9,324,428	6,462,793	9,613,807	7,781,074	8,295,526
Kansas	57,642	505,978,000	11,055,500	5,560,917	5,494,583	4,532,755	6,522,745	4,333,756	6,721,744	5,251,363	5,804,137
Kentucky	47,980	218,027,000	7,090,700	3,743,890	3,346,810	3,056,092	4,034,608	2,921,368	4,169,332	3,531,169	3,559,531
Louisiana	46,519	360,454,000	10,809,600	4,334,650	6,474,950	3,523,930	7,285,670	3,372,595	7,437,005	4,086,029	6,723,571
Maine	30,303	114,753,000	3,656,100	1,685,462	1,970,638	1,371,038	2,285,062	1,305,228	2,350,872	1,583,091	2,073,009
Maryland	74,266	412,005,000	12,036,400	6,607,984	5,428,416	5,404,344	6,632,056	5,175,652	6,860,748	6,246,892	5,789,508
Massachusetts	172,737	735,105,000	27,713,200	10,780,435	16,932,765	8,785,084	18,928,116	8,397,100	19,316,100	10,170,744	17,542,456
Michigan	167,517	1,356,991,000	36,941,500	18,840,165	18,101,335	15,367,664	21,573,836	14,702,717	22,238,783	15,958,728	20,982,772
Minnesota	101,590	523,254,000	17,649,000	8,206,785	9,442,215	6,688,971	10,960,029	6,371,289	11,277,711	7,730,262	9,918,738
Mississippi	29,483	146,324,000	4,733,100	2,021,034	2,712,066	1,647,119	3,085,981	1,571,389	3,161,711	1,902,706	2,830,394
Missouri	123,930	691,679,000	20,433,500	10,604,987	9,828,513	8,663,804	11,769,696	8,296,000	12,137,499	10,012,415	10,421,085
Montana	21,646	92,696,000	3,045,000	1,446,375	1,598,625	1,175,370	1,869,630	1,120,560	1,924,440	1,358,070	1,686,930
Nebraska	42,346	181,905,000	6,081,900	3,192,998	2,888,902	2,603,053	3,478,847	2,493,579	3,588,321	3,010,541	3,071,359
Nevada	5,158	74,718,000	1,331,200	593,715	737,485	484,557	846,643	463,258	867,942	560,435	770,765
New Hampshire	17,779	61,792,000	2,367,800	1,046,568	1,321,232	854,776	1,513,024	816,891	1,550,909	987,373	1,380,427
New Jersey	187,423	866,953,000	35,601,900	13,350,713	22,251,187	10,894,181	24,707,719	10,395,755	25,206,145	12,603,073	22,998,827
New Mexico	12,579	107,935,000	3,689,200	1,390,828	2,298,372	1,132,584	2,556,616	1,084,625	2,604,575	1,313,355	2,375,845
New York	600,144	3,940,139,000	131,908,200	52,499,464	79,408,736	42,870,165	89,038,035	41,155,358	90,752,842	49,597,483	82,310,717
North Carolina	74,036	415,674,000	11,211,400	6,233,538	4,977,862	5,078,764	6,132,636	4,854,536	6,356,864	5,874,774	5,336,626
North Dakota	21,250	74,032,000	3,074,000	1,282,108	1,792,492	1,042,289	2,032,311	999,245	2,075,355	1,205,243	1,869,357
Ohio	209,884	1,316,500,000	37,576,100	20,742,007	16,834,093	16,946,821	20,629,279	16,232,875	21,343,225	19,614,724	17,961,376

TABLE 2.—*Commercial electric service, 1942*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Oklahoma	52, 861	217, 222, 000	$7, 844, 200	$3, 529, 890	$4, 314, 310	$2, 870, 977	$4, 973, 223	$2, 737, 626	$5, 106, 574	$3, 318, 097	$4, 526, 103
Oregon	43, 271	427, 311, 000	7, 462, 600	4, 417, 859	3, 044, 741	3, 604, 436	3, 858, 164	3, 447, 721	4, 014, 879	4, 164, 131	3, 298, 469
Pennsylvania	312, 847	1, 536, 607, 000	44, 547, 800	22, 273, 900	22, 273, 900	18, 220, 050	26, 327, 750	17, 418, 190	27, 129, 610	21, 026, 562	23, 521, 238
Rhode Island	24, 624	94, 734, 000	4, 153, 900	1, 690, 637	2, 463, 263	1, 374, 941	2, 778, 959	1, 308, 479	2, 845, 421	1, 586, 790	2, 567, 110
South Carolina	35, 647	200, 140, 000	5, 108, 000	2, 742, 996	2, 365, 004	2, 237, 304	2, 870, 696	2, 135, 144	2, 972, 856	2, 584, 648	2, 523, 352
South Dakota	21, 500	81, 847, 000	3, 122, 200	1, 323, 813	1, 798, 387	1, 080, 281	2, 041, 919	1, 030, 326	2, 091, 874	1, 248, 880	1, 873, 320
Tennessee	53, 169	342, 360, 000	6, 989, 300	5, 207, 029	1, 782, 271	4, 249, 494	2, 739, 806	4, 060, 783	2, 928, 517	4, 913, 478	2, 075, 822
Texas	161, 975	1, 195, 318, 000	30, 110, 700	14, 663, 911	15, 446, 789	11, 953, 948	18, 156, 752	11, 442, 066	18, 668, 634	13, 820, 811	16, 289, 889
Utah	14, 804	105, 401, 000	3, 073, 200	1, 410, 599	1, 662, 601	1, 149, 377	1, 923, 823	1, 097, 132	1, 976, 068	1, 327, 622	1, 745, 578
Vermont	11, 705	50, 398, 000	1, 636, 800	730, 013	906, 787	594, 158	1, 042, 642	564, 696	1, 072, 104	687, 456	949, 344
Virginia	63, 607	432, 389, 000	12, 046, 400	5, 649, 762	6, 396, 638	4, 613, 771	7, 432, 629	4, 421, 029	7, 625, 371	5, 336, 555	6, 709, 845
Washington	64, 301	876, 056, 000	12, 789, 700	8, 837, 683	3, 952, 017	7, 213, 391	5, 576, 309	6, 907, 438	5, 883, 262	8, 338, 884	4, 450, 816
West Virginia	37, 724	156, 365, 000	5, 308, 800	2, 691, 562	2, 617, 238	2, 197, 843	3, 110, 957	2, 123, 520	3, 185, 280	2, 542, 915	2, 765, 885
Wisconsin	106, 569	725, 961, 000	18, 754, 700	10, 052, 519	8, 702, 181	8, 214, 559	10, 540, 141	7, 858, 219	10, 896, 481	9, 489, 878	9, 264, 822
Wyoming	6, 153	46, 541, 000	1, 606, 900	707, 036	899, 864	575, 270	1, 031, 630	549, 560	1, 057, 340	665, 257	941, 643
United States	4, 219, 457	27, 233, 420, 000	767, 278, 900	372, 407, 694	394, 871, 206	303, 983, 435	463, 295, 465	290, 822, 646	476, 456, 254	349, 245, 237	418, 033, 663

Here are the overcharges, by States, paid by industrial users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 3.—*Industrial and other electric service, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	40, 372	3, 125, 357, 000	$22, 303, 300	$16, 415, 229	$5, 888, 071	$10, 259, 518	$12, 043, 782	$12, 088, 389	$10, 214, 911	$15, 255, 457	$7, 047, 843
Arizona	2, 024	487, 340, 000	5, 190, 900	2, 616, 214	2, 574, 686	1, 635, 134	3, 555, 766	1, 925, 824	3, 265, 076	2, 429, 241	2, 761, 559
Arkansas	28, 310	438, 890, 000	6, 586, 300	4, 307, 440	2, 278, 860	2, 693, 797	3, 892, 503	3, 174, 597	3, 411, 703	4, 004, 470	2, 581, 830
California	300, 385	6, 794, 045, 000	83, 001, 300	77, 606, 216	5, 395, 084	48, 555, 761	34, 445, 539	57, 934, 907	25, 066, 393	72, 128, 130	10, 873, 170
Colorado	23, 170	428, 031, 000	7, 007, 900	4, 218, 756	2, 789, 144	2, 634, 970	4, 372, 930	3, 104, 500	3, 903, 400	3, 917, 416	3, 090, 484
Connecticut	7, 402	1, 454, 493, 000	20, 600, 700	12, 620, 442	7, 380, 258	7, 880, 276	12, 120, 424	9, 300, 326	10, 700, 374	11, 720, 410	8, 280, 290
Delaware	1, 627	235, 635, 000	2, 761, 500	1, 830, 875	930, 625	1, 143, 261	1, 618, 239	1, 347, 612	1, 413, 888	1, 701, 084	1, 060, 416
Dist. of Col	3, 750	990, 372, 000	7, 833, 400	5, 608, 714	2, 224, 686	3, 501, 530	4, 331, 870	4, 128, 202	3, 705, 198	5, 209, 211	2, 624, 189
Florida	5, 216	413, 347, 000	7, 904, 100	4, 307, 735	3, 596, 365	2, 687, 394	5, 216, 706	3, 169, 544	4, 734, 556	3, 999, 475	3, 904, 625
Georgia	3, 982	1, 567, 527, 000	14, 299, 800	10, 224, 357	4, 075, 443	6, 392, 011	7, 907, 789	7, 535, 995	6, 763, 805	9, 495, 067	4, 804, 733
Idaho	6, 868	401, 231, 000	2, 944, 100	2, 240, 460	703, 640	1, 401, 392	1, 542, 708	1, 648, 696	1, 295, 404	2, 081, 479	862, 621
Illinois	82, 919	7, 145, 238, 000	86, 736, 000	49, 873, 200	36, 862, 800	31, 224, 960	55, 511, 040	36, 776, 064	49, 959, 936	46, 317, 024	40, 418, 976
Indiana	79, 562	2, 834, 623, 000	36, 792, 600	23, 179, 338	13, 613, 262	14, 496, 284	22, 296, 316	17, 071, 766	19, 720, 834	21, 523, 671	15, 268, 929
Iowa	44, 417	1, 034, 869, 000	11, 973, 000	7, 686, 666	4, 286, 334	4, 801, 173	7, 171, 827	5, 663, 229	6, 309, 771	7, 147, 881	4, 825, 119
Kansas	26, 502	559, 480, 000	7, 996, 200	5, 349, 458	2, 646, 742	3, 342, 412	4, 653, 788	3, 942, 127	4, 054, 073	4, 965, 640	3, 030, 560
Kentucky	22, 783	1, 151, 071, 000	14, 125, 800	9, 308, 902	4, 816, 898	5, 819, 830	8, 305, 970	6, 851, 013	7, 274, 787	8, 644, 990	5, 480, 810
Louisiana	6, 583	1, 048, 331, 000	9, 484, 000	6, 193, 640	3, 291, 260	3, 869, 839	5, 615, 061	4, 562, 237	4, 922, 663	5, 757, 334	3, 727, 566
Maine	16, 047	701, 918, 000	7, 930, 800	5, 242, 259	2, 688, 541	3, 275, 420	4, 655, 380	3, 862, 360	4, 068, 500	4, 869, 511	3, 061, 289
Maryland	26, 005	1, 700, 855, 000	20, 243, 200	12, 247, 136	7, 996, 064	7, 651, 630	12, 591, 270	9, 008, 224	11, 234, 976	11, 376, 678	8, 866, 522
Massachusetts	7, 477	2, 667, 659, 000	42, 471, 000	25, 227, 774	17, 243, 226	15, 756, 741	26, 714, 259	18, 559, 827	23, 911, 173	23, 443, 992	19, 027, 008
Michigan	19, 412	4, 098, 897, 000	46, 703, 100	25, 780, 111	20, 922, 989	16, 112, 570	30, 590, 530	18, 961, 459	27, 741, 641	23, 958, 690	22, 744, 410
Minnesota	20, 891	1, 109, 388, 000	15, 923, 000	9, 967, 768	5, 955, 202	6, 225, 893	9, 697, 107	7, 340, 503	8, 582, 497	9, 251, 263	6, 671, 737
Mississippi	13, 442	372, 720, 000	5, 302, 000	3, 366, 770	1, 935, 230	2, 104, 894	3, 197, 106	2, 476, 034	2, 825, 966	3, 122, 878	2, 179, 122
Missouri	34, 721	2, 105, 948, 000	23, 331, 500	16, 355, 382	6, 976, 118	10, 219, 197	13, 112, 303	12, 039, 054	11, 292, 446	15, 188, 807	8, 142, 693
Montana	2, 226	1, 528, 762, 000	8, 522, 400	7, 150, 294	1, 372, 106	4, 465, 738	4, 056, 662	5, 266, 843	3, 255, 557	6, 638, 950	1, 883, 450
Nebraska	12, 686	373, 903, 000	5, 095, 400	3, 480, 158	1, 615, 242	2, 175, 736	2, 919, 664	2, 562, 986	2, 532, 414	3, 230, 484	1, 864, 916
Nevada	133	44, 758, 000	609, 800	499, 426	110, 374	312, 218	297, 582	367, 709	242, 091	464, 058	145, 742
New Hampshire	3, 073	314, 730, 000	4, 533, 500	3, 078, 247	1, 455, 253	1, 922, 204	2, 611, 296	2, 266, 750	2, 266, 750	2, 860, 639	1, 672, 861
New Jersey	4, 820	3, 187, 891, 000	38, 418, 560	22, 628, 497	15, 790, 063	14, 138, 008	24, 280, 492	16, 673, 629	21, 744, 871	21, 014, 920	17, 405, 580
New Mexico	344	19, 444, 000	441, 560	211, 037	230, 463	132, 009	309, 491	155, 408	286, 092	196, 026	245, 474
New York	22, 120	11, 648, 360, 000	101, 452, 900	59, 045, 588	42, 407, 312	36, 928, 856	64, 524, 044	43, 523, 294	57, 929, 606	54, 886, 019	46, 566, 881
North Carolina	29, 630	2, 646, 290, 000	25, 935, 900	19, 815, 027	6, 120, 873	12, 371, 424	13, 564, 476	14, 601, 912	11, 333, 988	18, 414, 489	7, 521, 411
North Dakota	2, 239	34, 724, 000	925, 300	506, 139	419, 161	316, 453	608, 847	372, 896	552, 404	470, 052	455, 248
Ohio	100, 844	8, 020, 198, 000	84, 353, 000	53, 985, 920	30, 367, 080	33, 741, 200	50, 611, 800	39, 730, 263	44, 622, 737	50, 190, 035	34, 162, 965
Oklahoma	24, 251	803, 171, 000	10, 890, 100	7, 263, 697	3, 626, 403	4, 541, 172	6, 348, 928	5, 357, 929	5, 532, 171	6, 751, 862	4, 138, 238
Oregon	13, 009	1, 064, 051, 000	7, 968, 900	7, 076, 383	892, 517	4, 422, 740	3, 546, 160	5, 211, 661	2, 757, 239	6, 574, 343	1, 394, 557
Pennsylvania	56, 775	11, 961, 631, 000	120, 559, 900	84, 760, 640	35, 809, 260	52, 930, 186	67, 639, 714	62, 455, 208	58, 114, 692	78, 732, 145	41, 837, 755
Rhode Island	1, 410	580, 420, 000	8, 997, 200	5, 515, 284	3, 481, 916	3, 445, 928	5, 551, 272	4, 066, 734	4, 930, 466	5, 128, 404	3, 868, 796
South Carolina	14, 267	1, 274, 139, 000	11, 816, 500	9, 039, 623	2, 776, 877	5, 648, 287	6, 168, 213	6, 652, 690	5, 163, 810	8, 401, 532	3, 414, 968
South Dakota	1, 987	69, 532, 000	1, 570, 300	832, 259	738, 041	519, 769	1, 050, 531	612, 417	957, 883	772, 588	797, 712
Tennessee	14, 538	3, 904, 715, 000	20, 781, 400	18, 557, 790	2, 223, 610	11, 596, 021	9, 185, 379	13, 674, 161	7, 107, 239	17, 248, 562	3, 532, 838
Texas	82, 391	2, 735, 775, 000	31, 646, 900	20, 855, 307	10, 791, 593	13, 038, 523	18, 608, 377	15, 380, 393	16, 266, 507	19, 367, 903	12, 278, 997
Utah	3, 380	854, 879, 000	7, 105, 900	5, 073, 613	2, 032, 287	3, 169, 231	3, 936, 669	3, 737, 703	3, 368, 197	4, 711, 212	2, 394, 688
Vermont	6, 203	171, 946, 000	2, 922, 700	2, 124, 803	797, 897	1, 329, 829	1, 592, 871	1, 566, 567	1, 356, 133	1, 975, 745	946, 955
Virginia	15, 575	1, 318, 548, 000	14, 516, 300	10, 190, 443	4, 325, 857	6, 372, 656	8, 143, 644	7, 504, 927	7, 011, 373	9, 464, 628	5, 051, 672
Washington	29, 229	4, 378, 781, 000	24, 206, 800	20, 212, 678	3, 994, 122	12, 635, 950	11, 570, 850	14, 887, 182	9, 319, 618	18, 784, 477	5, 422, 323
West Virginia	24, 592	2, 368, 446, 000	23, 104, 700	15, 526, 358	7, 578, 342	9, 703, 974	13, 400, 726	11, 436, 827	11, 667, 873	14, 417, 333	8, 687, 367
Wisconsin	77, 266	1, 033, 118, 000	26, 604, 700	16, 069, 239	10, 535, 461	10, 056, 577	16, 548, 123	11, 839, 092	14, 765, 608	14, 925, 237	11, 679, 463
Wyoming	1, 579	57, 794, 000	1, 006, 300	562, 522	443, 778	351, 199	655, 101	414, 596	591, 704	522, 270	484, 030
United States	1, 369, 334	104, 163, 272, 000	1, 092, 843, 200	735, 835, 844	357, 007, 356	459, 952, 075	632, 891, 125	542, 792, 206	550, 050, 994	683, 653, 812	409, 189, 388

Here are the total overcharges, by States, for all users of electricity in 1942:

TABLE 4.—*Total electric sales, 1942*

State	Estimated sales data for 1942			Estimated revenues and consumer savings under rates in effect in—							
				Tennessee Valley Authority		Tacoma, Wash.		Bonneville Administration		Ontario, Canada	
	Number of customers	Total kilowatt-hours	Total revenues	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	340,941	3,693,914,000	$37,163,600	$25,897,377	$11,266,223	$18,537,592	$18,626,008	$19,771,217	$17,392,383	$23,193,303	$13,970,297
Arizona	113,742	704,002,000	12,764,400	5,974,339	6,790,061	4,548,079	8,216,321	4,639,497	8,124,903	5,273,487	7,490,913
Arkansas	213,300	683,145,000	16,811,000	8,945,934	7,865,066	6,714,450	10,096,550	6,913,736	9,897,264	7,569,371	9,241,629
California	2,497,445	12,005,897,000	198,175,200	152,321,279	45,853,921	112,851,875	85,323,325	117,883,112	80,292,088	136,475,112	61,700,088
Colorado	278,002	847,821,000	21,959,700	11,927,125	10,032,575	9,302,540	12,657,160	9,302,764	12,656,936	10,466,249	11,493,451
Connecticut	541,938	2,418,832,000	53,930,900	29,062,632	24,868,268	22,209,702	31,721,198	22,600,944	31,329,956	25,488,797	28,442,103
Delaware	71,504	345,458,000	6,884,800	3,768,435	3,116,365	2,835,355	4,049,445	2,917,286	3,967,514	3,319,087	3,565,713
Dist. of Col	82,347	1,439,442,000	17,668,900	13,571,378	4,097,522	10,379,261	7,289,639	10,543,618	7,125,282	12,029,235	5,639,665
Florida	422,260	1,263,010,000	40,138,900	17,542,349	22,596,551	14,153,091	25,985,809	13,835,727	26,303,173	15,236,481	24,902,419
Georgia	450,990	2,512,867,000	42,543,700	25,719,092	16,824,608	19,847,155	22,696,545	20,054,170	22,489,530	22,621,335	19,922,365
Idaho	135,885	781,471,000	11,418,200	6,869,292	4,548,908	5,434,207	5,983,993	5,390,724	6,027,476	5,952,541	5,465,659
Illinois	2,181,707	10,397,217,000	205,524,500	113,204,822	92,319,678	86,452,015	119,072,485	88,081,536	117,442,964	99,591,295	105,933,205
Indiana	949,718	4,286,988,000	85,064,400	49,061,887	36,002,513	36,990,312	48,074,088	37,978,759	47,085,641	43,334,847	41,729,553
Iowa	619,019	2,017,295,000	46,735,900	25,741,659	20,999,241	20,391,965	26,343,935	20,198,504	26,537,396	22,571,652	24,164,248
Kansas	425,887	1,374,621,000	31,893,900	17,588,319	14,305,581	13,911,001	17,982,899	13,798,029	18,095,871	15,430,936	16,462,964
Kentucky	415,367	1,677,998,000	32,803,500	20,016,579	12,786,921	15,167,663	17,635,837	15,519,533	17,283,967	17,610,462	15,193,038
Louisiana	349,207	1,645,335,000	31,148,700	15,781,723	15,366,977	12,147,909	19,000,791	12,276,512	18,872,188	13,946,251	17,202,449
Maine	233,245	975,232,000	18,700,900	10,200,161	8,500,739	7,598,768	11,102,132	7,870,848	10,830,052	9,006,528	9,694,372
Maryland	571,200	2,472,084,000	45,660,400	26,682,888	18,977,512	20,121,336	25,539,064	20,646,802	25,013,598	23,738,596	21,921,804
Massachusetts	1,332,228	4,322,849,000	113,448,800	56,818,482	56,630,318	43,361,926	70,086,874	44,176,238	69,272,562	49,882,226	63,566,574
Michigan	1,529,583	7,097,806,000	134,278,900	76,671,788	57,607,112	60,392,419	73,886,481	60,095,281	74,183,619	64,930,762	69,348,138
Minnesota	666,033	2,239,736,000	55,011,100	30,673,578	24,337,522	24,191,831	30,819,269	24,023,999	30,987,101	26,736,316	28,274,784
Mississippi	193,379	666,511,000	14,783,300	8,027,803	6,755,497	6,135,609	8,647,691	6,227,306	8,555,994	7,086,303	7,696,997
Missouri	854,172	3,489,639,000	68,648,800	41,417,857	27,230,943	31,922,112	36,726,688	32,376,195	36,272,605	36,473,583	32,175,217
Montana	122,497	1,736,720,000	15,671,000	10,681,298	4,989,702	7,524,660	8,146,340	8,110,915	7,560,085	9,626,149	6,044,851
Nebraska	289,162	773,693,000	19,973,300	11,458,180	8,515,120	9,097,625	10,875,675	9,005,969	10,967,331	9,979,325	9,993,975
Nevada	31,433	154,729,000	3,277,100	1,711,755	1,565,345	1,355,265	1,921,835	1,341,357	1,935,743	1,506,825	1,770,275
New Hampshire	151,232	487,904,000	12,335,600	6,510,473	5,825,127	4,934,397	7,401,203	5,056,292	7,279,308	5,711,977	6,623,623
New Jersey	1,315,291	5,000,452,000	119,253,300	57,691,002	61,562,298	44,618,035	74,635,265	44,981,612	74,271,688	50,580,331	68,672,969
New Mexico	72,410	178,147,000	6,599,200	2,616,419	3,982,781	2,180,407	4,418,793	2,079,323	4,519,877	2,301,770	4,297,430
New York	4,129,219	18,429,737,000	361,418,600	175,957,975	185,460,625	138,065,184	223,353,416	137,950,572	223,468,028	154,810,100	206,608,500
North Carolina	511,254	3,499,721,000	52,173,000	34,808,548	17,364,452	25,353,706	26,819,294	26,683,810	25,489,190	31,125,957	21,047,043
North Dakota	95,700	180,278,000	7,008,200	3,235,239	3,772,961	2,667,353	4,340,847	2,569,444	4,438,756	2,806,416	4,201,784
Ohio	1,997,648	11,137,170,000	183,233,400	113,962,679	69,270,721	86,183,211	97,050,189	88,393,113	94,840,287	100,456,909	82,776,491
Oklahoma	380,418	1,261,583,000	30,359,900	16,315,747	14,044,153	12,399,531	17,960,369	12,664,416	17,695,484	14,383,057	15,976,843
Oregon	339,209	2,016,158,000	26,471,200	19,343,469	7,127,731	15,114,663	11,356,537	15,139,686	11,331,514	16,865,508	9,605,692
Pennsylvania	2,572,829	15,700,440,000	249,036,700	153,861,342	95,175,358	113,445,412	135,591,288	118,476,138	130,560,562	136,263,472	112,773,228
Rhode Island	213,769	807,095,000	20,006,400	10,352,504	9,653,896	7,658,963	12,347,437	7,973,372	12,033,028	9,169,391	10,837,009
South Carolina	246,160	1,685,051,000	23,770,300	15,944,865	7,825,435	11,643,935	12,126,365	12,224,426	11,545,874	14,237,935	9,532,365
South Dakota	99,509	223,137,000	7,832,500	3,641,292	4,191,208	2,940,830	4,891,670	2,867,343	4,965,157	3,180,128	4,652,372
Tennessee	451,398	4,833,695,000	40,183,000	33,781,545	6,401,455	24,894,082	15,288,918	26,013,948	14,169,052	29,981,789	10,201,211
Texas	1,174,940	4,716,867,000	95,196,300	52,673,271	42,523,029	40,508,028	54,688,272	41,000,468	54,195,832	46,597,633	48,598,667
Utah	155,343	1,117,518,000	15,351,400	9,432,423	5,918,977	6,982,342	8,369,058	7,270,988	8,080,412	8,340,508	7,010,892
Vermont	93,645	299,933,000	7,880,700	4,346,035	3,534,665	3,272,394	4,608,306	3,363,428	4,517,272	3,828,942	4,051,758
Virginia	491,229	2,203,554,000	43,664,000	25,109,110	18,554,890	19,366,064	24,297,936	19,587,338	24,076,662	22,035,033	21,628,967
Washington	584,904	6,253,201,000	55,289,100	43,153,865	12,135,244	32,599,283	22,689,817	33,446,006	21,843,094	38,135,506	17,153,594
West Virginia	335,986	2,752,882,000	37,641,700	23,274,974	14,366,726	16,469,776	21,171,924	17,731,493	19,910,207	20,909,918	16,731,782
Wisconsin	833,468	3,380,057,000	69,062,800	39,585,289	29,477,511	30,430,980	38,631,820	30,814,206	38,248,594	34,915,721	34,147,079
Wyoming	51,495	144,633,000	4,456,300	2,137,658	2,318,642	1,711,630	2,744,670	1,681,122	2,775,178	1,865,788	2,590,512
United States	32,209,247	158,333,465,000	2,850,307,400	1,665,073,726	1,185,233,674	1,267,015,929	1,583,291,471	1,293,549,122	1,556,758,278	1,467,580,843	1,382,726,557

Keep the Record Straight—O. P. A. Is Necessary To Prevent Inflation and Generally Has Done a Good Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has become a favorite pastime to criticize and censure the Office of Price Administration. I agree that this organization has made a lot of mistakes. I, too, believe that the organization in the past has taken too long to correct known, obvious errors. However, I believe it can truthfully be said that improvements have been made all along and are now being made in the direction of correcting a lot of mistakes that have been made and causing the administration of the law to be less irritating and less annoying to the people generally.

INFLATION WILL WIPE OUT MIDDLE CLASS

Without the Office of Price Administration, we would already be suffering from ruinous and run-away inflation. Run-away inflation will wipe out the middle class of people very quickly—the ones who depend upon fixed wages and fixed salaries for a livelihood. It is this class or group that has principally built our country in time of peace and who furnish the young men to save our country in time of war. High prices destroy this group first. The only way high prices can be met is with high wages; then, with high wages and high salaries, higher prices will be caused. In the end, if we permit inflation to get out of hand, it is not unreasonable to suppose that it will soon require a wheelbarrow load of printing-press money to buy a loaf of bread.

EIGHT MILLION DIFFERENT COMMODITIES

O. P. A. has not succeeded in keeping down all prices, and doubtless will not succeed entirely. Possibly too much is expected of this organization. It is dealing with 8,000,000 different commodities, including grades, classes, styles, fashions, and designs. I suspect if all the regulations and orders that have been issued involving these 8,000,000 commodities were stacked up they would possibly be as high as a five-story building. On the other hand, if we were to stack up the rules and regulations about which there is serious controversy and just complaints, this stack would be very small—possibly not an inch high. This is not to justify mistakes that have been made or to encourage the continuance of any existing mistakes but for the purpose of suggesting that the number of rules and regulations that have caused trouble are very small compared with the total business done by this enormous organization.

BILLIONS SAVED BY O. P. A. IN COST OF WAR

The cost of the war has been tens of billions of dollars less so far by reason of the O. P. A. The prices of steel, aluminum, copper, brass, and other principal, critical, and strategic materials going into the cost of the war have not increased 1 penny since we have become involved in the war. Therefore the O. P. A., having held down the cost of the things going into the war, has saved the taxpayers tens of billions of dollars already.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A3798, there was a statement by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, relative to the O. P. A. I will quote excerpts from this statement as follows:

Just before leaving northern Minnesota, I talked with a man who told me that he had

to work evenings in order to make out forms showing how many miles his truck traveled a day, how much oil it used, etc. He was engaged in a small business enterprise, but told me frankly that the conduct of his business was seriously hampered by the numerous Government regulations and reports, which had to be studied, filled out, and sent in to Washington. I talked with other businessmen who told me they had to have extra help in order to comply with all of these foolish regulations and in order to fill out all of the foolish forms that are pouring out of the Government bureaus in Washington and which have the effect of hampering anyone engaged in ordinary business.

Of course, the Office of Price Administration has been the champion offender. Evidently they have a lot of men in that bureau who can think up more forms and more questionnaires, and most of them pure trash, than any other agency ever devised by the hand of man. On other occasions I have stated that this outfit was doing more harm than good to the country, and that, instead of helping our war effort, so far as domestic affairs are concerned, that the Office of Price Administration was retarding our war effort. I reaffirm that sentiment here and now; however, I do not want to refuse to give honorable mention to dozens of other Government bureaus that are doing the same and doing their best to make a bad job of the whole situation.

Congress should abolish the Office of Price Administration and consolidate it with the War Production Board, which appears to have some businessmen in charge of most of its activities.

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE?

I thoroughly agree with my colleague that the rules and regulations of the O. P. A. are causing businessmen much concern—in fact, causing them a lot of trouble—and annoying and irritating them very much. But what is the answer? Shall we repeal O. P. A.? What would be the consequence if we did not have the Office of Price Administration? How would it affect these people, these businessmen, if there was no control on prices? Would it not be better for these very same businessmen to be annoyed and irritated rather than have their businesses destroyed by inflation? The fact is in wartime drastic measures must be resorted to—things that we would not think about approving in time of peace.

Let me answer my colleague on the one point that he suggests that the Office of Price Administration has been the champion offender on sending out forms to be filled out by businessmen. Under an existing law which was sponsored in Congress by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business, the Bureau of the Budget must approve the forms that are sent out by the different Federal agencies. It is my understanding that the month of March 1943, the last month for which the information is available to me, is typical of the other months. During the month of March the Office of Price Administration submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for approval 69 different forms, whereas the War Production Board submitted 259 forms for approval. This is not to criticize the War Production Board. I consider Mr. Donald Nelson, its Chairman, one of the ablest and best men in our Government, and I know that I am correct in assuming that all these forms were necessary or they would not have been submitted by W. P. B. to the Budget for approval. The information is given in order to suggest to my colleague that possibly the 69 forms of O. P. A. were just as necessary and vital as the 259 forms of the W. P. B. In other words, in order for the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration to properly do the big job that they are doing, a certain number of forms and plans are absolutely necessary. The statement of all forms and plans submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for March 1943 is inserted herewith:

Agency:	Number
War Production Board	259
Office of Price Administration	69
Department of Agriculture	53
Federal Security Agency	32
Department of Commerce	29
War Manpower Commission	19
War Department	11
Office of War Information	8
Department of Labor	8
National Housing Agency	7
Railroad Retirement Board	7
Department of the Interior	5
Office of Defense Transportation	5
Board of Economic Warfare	4
Navy Department	4
Petroleum Administration for War	4
Federal Reserve Board	3
Civil Service Commission	3
Maritime Commission	2
Federal Communications Commission	1
Office of Civilian Defense	1
Board of Transportation	1
Federal Power Commission	1
Interstate Commerce Commission	1
United States Employment Compensation Commission	1
Total	538

It is obvious that Congress cannot execute laws and give consideration to all details, plans, and specifications that are necessary in the enforcement of the law. It is not even the duty of Congress to enforce laws. Under our Constitution we make the laws and Congress did exactly the right thing by passing the law to control prices, wages, salaries, and the cost of living. It is perfectly proper that the execution of this law be left to the department concerned with it.

It is easy to criticize or condemn price fixing and other arbitrary rules and regimentation methods that are tolerated in wartime only, and we should stop and consider what the alternative would be in the event these laws were repealed.

Attacks on Secretary Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Frank R. Kent, in his column "The Great Game of Politics," in which he discusses criticisms of and attacks on Secretary Hull. The article is a very admirable one.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

The campaign to belittle Secretary of State Cordell Hull is not going very well, and that, perhaps, is why those engaged in it are becoming more violent and unrestrained. In such an effort nothing is so infuriating as futility. This one comes as near being completely futile as it well can be.

Among Mr. Hull's friends the campaign is referred to as the "polecat attack." And the feeling is that when it finally dies out, as it will, Mr. Hull will emerge stronger than ever with the people of the country. Meanwhile the State Department detractors continue to hurl missiles at the Secretary and to be resentful at their failure to get results, either in the way of a retort from him or a reaction from the public.

The most virulent and persistent of the Hull critics are to be found mainly in the little group of professional "liberals" and in the radical publications. Actually, the hostility toward Mr. Hull of the "advanced thinkers" within the administration dates pretty far back to the beginning of the New Deal. They had then—and probably rightly—the idea that Mr. Hull "is not one of us."

WON PLACE OF ESTEEM

In the sense that Mr. Hull was unsympathetic toward a lot of the "crackpot" ideas developed by the star-gazing experimenters who are bent on the socialization of the country, he certainly was not one of them. However, he was—and is—entirely loyal to Mr. Roosevelt and no critical or unsympathetic word concerning the President's policies ever passed his lips. By the dignity, determination, and competency with which he conducted his Department, stood by his convictions, and minded his own business, he won for himself a place in the esteem of the country not occupied by any other member of the administration.

The frequent tributes to Mr. Hull and his work paid by anti-New Deal newspapers, antiadministration public men, and private citizens "whose eyes," as the late General Johnson in his N. R. A. days once said, "have not seen the light" never endeared him to the "liberals," who feel that any commendation from a businessman is more or less of a stigma.

But the open attack upon Mr. Hull did not start until after we had gotten into the war. So far as can be gathered, the original grievance held against Mr. Hull by the liberals, aside from his lack of enthusiasm over the New Deal dreamers, was his refusal, more than a year ago, to take a course toward Spain which, in his opinion and that of military authorities, both British and American, would have been very harmful, indeed.

Some of these liberals went so far as personally to call on Mr. Hull and insist upon his adopting their views. When he declined they became greatly inflamed. His policies in north Africa, though approved by the President, wholly satisfactory to the military chiefs, and obviously working well, were even more bitterly assailed.

MARTYR ATTEMPT FAILED

And then came the resignation of Mr. Sumner Welles, of whom the liberals attempted to make a martyr, which was bad judgment, and to picture as the one able man in the Department, which is absurd. It was charged

that Mr. Hull forced Mr. Welles out because of personal dislike and jealousy and that the President yielded to Mr. Hull because of his fear of the southern Democrats, with whom Mr. Hull is strong.

Neither of these things is true. Mr. Welles was not forced out by Mr. Hull for any such reasons, and Mr. Roosevelt did not entertain any such fear. Every person really informed about this incident knows better on both counts. However, there is no way of convincing those who do not want to be convinced and the hammering continues unabated.

Nothing Mr. Hull now says or does escapes censure. To hear or read these anti-Hullites one might think that the Secretary of State is not only an ignorant and decrepit reactionary, whose policies have proven foolish and wicked, but a small, jealous old man, capable of any form of vindictive meanness, vicious as well as idiotic. Mr. Hull can well afford to be serene.

The sort of attack to which he is being subjected reacts not upon him but upon those who make it. If the kind of record the Secretary of State has made not only in his present office but in the others he has held in his long and honorable career can be damaged by the sort of attack now being made upon him, then honor and courage, character and capacity count for so little in the public life of this country that it hardly pays to have them.

New Approaches to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "New Approaches to Peace" delivered by the Honorable Herbert Hoover before the joint session of the St. Paul-Minneapolis branches of the Foreign Policy Association and the University of Minnesota, at Minneapolis, Minn., September 3, 1943.

I consider that Mr. Hoover, in collaboration with Mr. Hugh Gibson, has made an outstanding contribution to a possible solution of the problems of peace which will confront us when the war is won. As Mr. Hoover stated, the nations of the world have become adept at waging war, but they have proved themselves very inept in preserving peace.

I suggest that Senators as well as people throughout the Nation will find it worthwhile to give careful study and thought to the proposals made by Mr. Hoover and by Mr. Gibson as set forth in plain and understandable language in the address to which I have referred.

I have received an estimate from the Government Printing Office indicating that to print the address will cost $105.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Victory is now inevitable. There will be many more hard months. But every month brings us nearer to the problems of peace.

The American people are alive to the need and determined that we must have a lasting peace this time. From coast to coast you are thinking and discussing the ways to peace. You want to make your lives again free from war hardships. You want your sons, husbands, and fathers home.

The method of making peace is being hourly discussed in books, in the press, over the radio. Congressional resolutions and political offensives are in motion all along the front of peace ideas.

We have two schools of discussion. In the first are those people who are striving to distill from the world's experience something definite and positive. Several notable contributions have been put forward which merit great consideration.

In the second school are those who live in the indefinite or the infinite. Their aims are magnificent; their phrases are sonorous; their slogans are impelling. But when we sift them down, they are mostly nebular words to the effect that we must cooperate or collaborate with the world to preserve peace and restore prosperity. They are a long way from how to do it. Often enough these phrases are doors to political escape. Or alternatively, they are the pavement of good intentions. Theirs is an unreal world of perfect words.

I do not underestimate the usefulness of inspiring words. But most of this is exactly the same verbal road which led to Versailles. When we got there we had high ideals, high aims, and great eloquence. Unless we arrive at the end of this war far more realistically prepared we will have little chance of lasting peace. We must have something far more specific and definite than high aims, high ideals, $64 words, good intentions, political avoidance, or recriminations. Worse than this, we may out of such material have done no more than lay the kindling for World War No. 3.

On this whole problem I am daily more and more impressed with the fact that nations have often enough been successful in making war. But nations have never yet been successful in making lasting peace. More and mor over the centuries the world has developed the art and method of making war. But the world has never developed an art and method of making peace. More and more the methods of peace have resulted in a wider spread of catastrophe.

Surely it is time we have a new approach to peacemaking. And that path must leave the century-old bright lights of eloquence and nebular words and explore the hard road of experience.

Hugh Gibson and I, from considerable participation in these problems over the last 25 years, have suggested for public consideration some ideas of a new approach. Several of the ideas which we originally put forward have now been adopted by powerful voices.

I propose to explore these ideas further with you. The principles and the program are at least realistic and positive. And they suggest common ground over which those of even divergent views on particular questions can travel with unity toward our common purpose of a lasting peace.

I had a teacher once who said, in effect, that wisdom does not consist so much of $64 words about the ultimates as in knowing what to do next. And the next thing after that.

Therefore, I am going to examine with you what to do next. I may state the principles and program first and the reasons afterward. The program consists of 4 steps and there are 11 reasons.

Before we start on this exploration I may assure you that it does not embrace the usual democratic process of name calling. That is not a unifying or peaceful approach. From the Sermon on the Mount we learn that the peacemakers "shall be called the Children of God."

It would appear that unifying name only applies to the actual peace delegates and not to those who engage in advance discussion of what the delegates should do. In any event I will not take your time discussing isolationists, nationalists, internationalists, Fascists, or Communists. Our job is to find common ground, not to widen differences.

FIRST STEP

The first step in our proposal is to reach an agreement, before firing ceases, between all the United Nations, that a few leading nations be appointed the joint managers or custodians or trustees of peace, and that there will not be the usual armistice or the usual general peace conference.

SECOND STEP

The second step is an agreement between all the United Nations before victory over Germany, setting up the terms of a simple provisional peace which the custodians or trustees shall impose upon belligerent Europe the moment firing ceases, and later on Asia.

THIRD STEP

The third step is a transition period from war to peace of a few years, in which the world can cool off and have time for deliberate solution of the long-view problems of lasting peace.

FOURTH STEP

The fourth and last step, after the foundations of real peace have been laid, is then to create some sort of world institution to replace the managers or trustees and preserve peace.

THE TRUSTEESHIP

Some immediate questions will arise in your minds as to the trusteeship. A few great victorious nations are going to dominate the world anyway for awhile after this war. They must do it of necessity to themselves. They always have done so after every great war. They did it after the world wars of the Napoleonic period and after the last World War. It would be a great and new step to peace if they did it out in the open, by a definite authority with positive responsibilities and limitations.

I am not proposing an elaborately written piece of paper committing nations to action in unknown circumstances. A mere joint declaration of purpose by all the United Nations would be sufficient. It needs only to be that we continue collaboration in peacemaking which we have in war and that we do it under the leadership of the principal nations conducting the war; that we do it in consultation with all our allies in the fields in which they are interested; and that we do it for a limited period. If we can do this without elaborate treaties and documents in war, why not in a transition period from war to peace?

I am not proposing a military alliance of a few victorious powers, arrogating to themselves domination over other nations such as has in reality followed those other world wars. Such alliances at once raise the antagonism and suspicion of the balance of the world. A military alliance would undermine the moral influence of the custodians or trustees and would add nothing to their strength.

THE PROVISIONAL PEACE

Questions will also arise in your minds as to the terms of the provisional peace.

These terms can be made specific and comparatively simple. They are the urgent measures necessary to get the world going again.

The first need of the world, more urgent even than bread, will be order. And the second need will be food. Hungry people abandon all restraint and defy all order. The next imperative need will be to restore economic production, for the starving cannot long be supported on charity. These questions admit no delay. Without them Europe and Asia will dissolve in chaos.

There are other urgent matters. There must be total disarmament of the enemy.

Their leaders must be punished for crimes against mankind. They must return their loot, prisoners, and displaced peoples.

There must be the restoration of sovereignty to those nations deprived of it. The trustees would need at once to determine temporary boundaries for everybody.

The defeated nations should be required to hold free elections of representative bodies excluding Fascist candidates to initiate government and national life so that there will be some responsible body with which to deal.

There should be provisional restoration of the former treaties about posts, telegraphs, ships, and planes which are necessary to the reopening of economic life for the whole world.

And the trustees should at once set up regional councils for Europe, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere and such other committees of the United Nations as are needed to work out each of the host of long-view problems without the solution of which there can be no lasting peace.

These provisional questions are not difficult to settle. But they represent the stark necessities required to start the world housekeeping again.

THE TRANSITION PERIOD

It is in a transition period that the gigantic problems which confront the world must and can be solved.

In the meantime the trustee nations would need to guide these committees and police the world against any aggressors.

I may enumerate only a few of these problems to indicate their complexity and that time is needed for their solution.

The future of the three great enemy countries and a lot of little ones must be settled.

There are great territories to be justly disposed of.

Militarism must be abolished.

The face of these nations must be turned toward peace.

Gangsterism cannot be abolished overnight.

There is demobilization of the world to be brought about.

There are many boundaries to be settled.

There are peoples to be freed. There are peoples to be placed under guardianship. The Jewish refugee and the problem of Palestine must be settled.

There are gigantic debts and reparations to be considered.

There are a thousand problems of trade, of currency, of credit to be solved.

And all of these problems must be solved in such a fashion and with such justice as to allay or still the dynamic forces which have hitherto always bred war anew. Those forces must be stimulated as they were at Versailles, where they were made stronger for evil and more explosive.

And now I come to the 11 reasons for this program and the dangers we must avoid.

FIRST REASON: PROMOTING ALLIED UNITY

The first reason is one that has been made more impressive by the events of the last month.

A statement to the enemy people that there will be a provisional peace based upon renewed self-government and revived economic life should convey to them our desire to restore them to the family of nations. Such an assurance to them might bring the war to a quicker end and save much human life.

THE SECOND REASON: GAINING PREPAREDNESS FOR PEACEMAKING

The second reason for this program is that we must resolve a double difficulty. That is how to keep unity during the war and achieve at the same time preparedness for peace in advance of victory. There is a well-founded and instinctive fear that negotiation by our officials of the gigantic long-view questions during the war would disrupt the unity of the United Nations. Hence the escapist policy of every modern world war, "Victory first, discuss peace afterwards."

In consequence, aside from a few very general aims and platitudes, victorious nations have usually come to the peace table wholly without any real preparedness for the immense problems they must meet. I agree that we cannot negotiate these long-view questions without dangers. But we could negotiate the urgent matters which lay the foundation of provisional peace. There is no ground for disunity in them. Their settlement beforehand would promote unity. And incorporated in them is the machinery for amiable solution of the long-view questions after victory.

THIRD REASON: AN ARMISTICE IS DESTRUCTIVE

The third reason is that no lasting peace can be made as was attempted at Versailles in the middle of a military armistice. An armistice simply suspends the whole world between war and peace. The machinery and routines of both war and peace are out of action. It is thus a period of economic and political degeneration with an agonized world crying out for haste. The end is hasty compromise of principle and justice, not solution.

FOURTH REASON: TO COOL OFF HATE AND GREED

The fourth reason for this proposal is that the world must have time to cool off and recover a balance of judgment if a lasting peace is to be made.

When firing ceases the world will be filled with violent emotions. There will be white-hot hate and indignation at the enemy for having brought the world to this state. The air will be filled with fear and vengeance. This is no atmosphere for long-view statesmanship, which must distinguish between guilty leadership and misled peoples. Do not forget we must live with 90,000,000 Germans, 40,000,000 Italians, 70,000,000 Japs, and their increment for some hundreds of years yet. We want to get them into the ways of peace if we can.

There will be another emotion present. That is greed or, more politely, self-interest. Each of the victorious nations will face a grim vista of impoverishment. The peoples of each nation will demand those things they believe will restore prosperity and security to them.

And these are not alone the emotions of statesmen. They are the emotions of the people at home. Statesmen are not their own masters. If they ever expect to be reelected or have monuments to their memory, or get their agreements ratified they are forced to respond to the emotions of their people.

If there be a general peace conference in the midst of all these emotions, as has been the practice hitherto, then 40 nations will send 2,000 diplomats to orate, to conspire, quarrel, and grab. The world would be crying aloud for haste, that it be allowed to get back to living again. To keep passion, greed, expediency, and compromise of principle out of the settlements under these pressures calls for more than human powers. Certainly if we are to have lasting peace, it must be based on more solid foundations than the emotions of war.

Does not all this suggest the necessity of a cooling-off period which we call the transitional period?

THE FIFTH REASON: TO GET BY THE PERIOD OF REACTION

The fifth reason for this suggested approach to peace is that soon after firing ceases an inevitable reaction sets in. Our boys want to come home—and at once. They want to start life again. Their wives, mothers, and fathers want them home. They are bound to bring home all their frictions, dislikes, and opinions of the strange peoples with whom they have been operating. At home the people will be war-weary. All the suppressed frictions between allies will come to the surface. The people just don't want anything more to do with foreigners. A period of reaction toward isolationism is inevitable. And it would be further fanned by the headlines from a general peace conference, such as Versailles, daily arousing a thousand suspicions or misgivings and confirming their suspicions.

In this period of reaction nationalism will rise to such heights as to endanger all constructive plans. It will be a time of demagoguery and prejudice. The world needs time to let this pass.

THE SIXTH REASON: THE UNKNOWN SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

The sixth reason for these principles of peacemaking I suggest is that while nations are actually at war, or in the months after firing ceases, we cannot see the shape of things to come. These shapes are made by forces set in motion by the war and even long before the war. No one can for years predict their ultimate effect. The only thing men can be sure of is that after the war there will be profound change. If it were a question only of putting the world back to where it had been it would be hard enough to do. But the world will never be like that again.

A peace making that does not take account of these pressures of change will be certain to burst asunder. Surely we need a transition period in which to measure and accommodate these forces.

THE SEVENTH REASON: REAL FOUNDATIONS UNDER A WORLD INSTITUTION

There are those who believe we have only to quickly set up some league or some council or some world institution or some union or world parliament and then unload all of our problems upon it. It is not that easy.

When issues are vast and intricate it is easy to dodge them that way and then announce that the world will go to the dogs if evil men fail to agree.

Neither anything like the League of Nations nor any kind of world institution to keep the peace could succeed amid the passions, the political and economic chaos that press on the heels of war.

There are a hundred gigantic problems that must be settled between nations before such an agency would have a chance. To force its adoption prematurely is to condemn it to inevitable failure.

The purpose of any world institution must be to preserve peace, not to make it.

They are two entirely different jobs. They must not be confused. Having lived through Versailles, and having had to deal with its consequences, I can give you an idea of what I mean. The Treaty of Versailles consisted of 613 paragraphs, of which only 26 dealt with the League covenant. It was the 587 outside the League that did most to kill the League, and certainly it was the sins of omission and commission in these 587 paragraphs which laid some of the kindling for this war.

To solve these problems, to allay the forces of destruction and to build a new spirit in the world requires time. And a decisive hand which no world-wide institution can exert.

The temple of peace cannot be erected until its foundations are well laid. If we make a good peace, it will largely preserve itself. If we make a bad one like Versailles, we shall simply be laying the kindling for World War No. 3. And no machinery for preserving peace will stop it taking fire.

EIGHTH REASON: PRESERVING AMERICAN UNITY

The next reason I will give you for this program bears upon our American national unity.

The formulation of some sort of world institution to preserve peace is essential. Yet discussion of its details leads quickly to the

most emotional and the most dangerous question that can be raised among us. That is how much we surrender of national independence and sovereignty.

I would like to suggest that if we adopt the transition period, we can develop the practice of cooperation in stopping aggression during that time and we will learn much as to method. Of equal importance, our people will have opportunity to consider and debate this whole question away from the emotions of war and the reaction toward isolationism which will inevitably follow. It is my belief that with a growth of experience and understanding, the whole sovereignty question will become academic. But it takes time. Decision of this matter at the present time is about as important as the ancient worry over how many angels could stand on the point of a needle.

I have no doubt that with time and deliberation our people will no more consent to liquidate the independence of the United States than Mr. Churchill will consent to liquidate the British Empire or Mr. Stalin to liquidate the Soviet Republic. And none of that is necessary to preserve peace. And I may add that the primary safety of America will always rest in our strong right arm.

THE NINTH REASON: DOCUMENTS ARE NOT PEACE

The ninth reason for these principles of peace making is that out of 5,000 years of war, an illusion has been built up in the human mind that war can be ended and peace made by signing a piece of paper. Especially if it is signed with pomp and circumstance. The world has deluded itself before now that such a signed paper is the dawn of a new day. Hasty documents written at the end of wars have an infernal way of becoming the prospectus of renewed war.

We must learn that it is the conduct of nations over years which counts, not the papers they sign. A little good will goes further than documents.

TENTH REASON: THERE MUST BE RATIFICATION

If we are to have peace, any agreement or any treaty in democracies must be ratified by the people at home. The people must have time to debate, understand, and decide.

And we should be careful that our words do not carry more to other nations than we will perform and confirm. Neither by Executive action nor congressional resolution nor public assurance should we give the impression that the United States can be committed to anything without full free action by the Senate of the United States.

Is it not, therefore, better to go one step at a time and deal with different problems separately?

ELEVENTH REASON: THE SUM OF EXPERIENCE

And I might add an over-all reason which comes from the stern voice of experience. Do not the great peace settlements which followed the two other world wars of the last 150 years—those at Vienna in 1814 and at Versailles in 1919—confirm every one of these reasons for this program? Does anyone believe that either of these treaties would have been signed 5 years afterward? That no abiding successful peace can be written in a few weeks or a few months under these pressures has been proven by the greatest tragedy of modern history—Versailles.

TO SUM UP

For these reasons I am suggesting four principles of peace. A temporary trusteeship or collaboration of the leading nations, a provisional peace for each defeated country, a transition period of time, and an ultimate world institution to preserve peace.

Is it not the answer that we must first concentrate our immediate thought on definite principles of peacemaking? And, second, does not any program require defined and responsible leadership? And, third, must we not have quick and strong action to restore order and the productivity of mankind? And, fourth, must we not have time to settle our gigantic long-view questions? Time for emotions to cool off; time to pass over the reaction which inevitably sets in from war; time to assess the forces and change set in motion by war; time to allay the dynamic forces which cause war; time to deliberate; time to deal openly with all proposals; time for the peoples of the world to understand the solutions proposed; time to rebuild justice, tolerance, and good will; time to build a real world institution to preserve peace.

It was 6 years from the victory of Yorktown to the Constitution of the United States—and it was time well spent.

The die of war has been cast. We have taken up the sword to win lasting peace. For over 170 years Americans have fought on a thousand battlefields and always that men might be more free and have peace. Their million graves demand of us that we do not fail them in the halls of peacemaking.

A. M. L. Wiggins, President American Bankers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Small Town Banker Heads the American Bankers' Association." The article was published in the September 10 issue of The State, of Columbia, S. C. Let me say, Mr. President, that the article refers to a distinguished South Carolinian, Mr. A. Lee M. Wiggins, who came up the hard way. He has been a great asset to South Carolina, and I feel certain he will do great work for the American Bankers' Association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL-TOWN BANKER HEADS THE AMERICAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION—A. LEE M. WIGGINS, HARTSVILLE, RECEIVES HIGH NATIONAL HONOR—SOUTH CAROLINIAN IS ALSO CLOSE TO THE AGRICULTURAL, COMMERCIAL, JOURNALISTIC, INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Albert W. Atwood)

It has been nearly 40 years since the American Bankers' Association has chosen a president from a community as small as Hartsville, a fact which has a wholesome significance not only for the South but for the country as a whole.

Naturally, when the bankers elected a new president on September 15, they picked a man and not a town. But those who guide the destinies of the great American Bankers' Association certainly must be aware that Lee Wiggins and Hartsville are, in a very real sense, one and inseparable. The man and the community stand for the same values in American life.

Furthermore, this is the first time in its existence of nearly 70 years that the Bankers Association has taken a president from South Carolina. And only rarely has a president been chosen from a bank as small as the Bank of Hartsville, whose $3,077,429 of resources is dwarfed by the gigantic metropolitan institutions, which boast of hundreds of millions or even billions of deposits.

But this contrast only highlights the real meaning of Wiggins' selection. The small bank may serve the small community as well or even better than the great bank serves the metropolis.

THE SMALL TOWN

As for the small community itself, city people sometimes forget that nearly all our agricultural and much of our industrial wealth is produced within the sphere of its influence, a fact which applies with particular force to Hartsville.

To what extent Hartsville is responsible for Wiggins and Wiggins for Hartsville is not easy to say, but the reader can decide for himself as the joint story of town and man unfolds. Wiggins modestly remarks that he has had the advantage of being in the environment of great achievements and of long association with two great men, his first employer and his father-in-law.

Thirty years ago, directly after his graduation from the University of North Carolina, young Wiggins showed up in Hartsville to take a position as stenographer to the late David R. Coker. That he already knew the meaning of hard, intensive work will immediately appear.

Born in Durham, N. C., his father died when he was a year old and his mother worked to put him through public schools. He then saved $500 from 3 years of employment with the American Tobacco Co., and went through college without any outside assistance, beyond a scholarship, graduating with savings of $1,000.

Wiggins' business activities in college make an amusing story in themselves. He would think up one idea after another, finance it, arrange with other students to do the actual selling and split the profits. For example, he bought fruit wholesale, divided it up in baskets in his bedroom and employed students to peddle it retail.

COLLEGE JOBS

In addition to the more conventional job of managing the University Press and printing the college newspaper, catalog, and other publications, he ran a shoe store, a boarding house, and a number of other small business ventures. He did not make the highest grades, but managed to get in 1 year of law in his 4 years, was editor in chief of the college annual, and belonged to numerous organizations.

Hartsville, where the young man went to seek his fortune, is in the northeastern part of South Carolina, in the flat, fertile Pee Dee Basin, just east and south of the Sand Hills. Few communities of its size (population 6,000) have had such a remarkable development.

This is largely due to the ability and character of one Maj. James L. Coker, and two generations of his descendants, direct and collateral. Graduated from Charleston's Citadel and a student at Harvard when the Confederate war broke out, Major Coker was grievously wounded and walked with a cane or on crutches the rest of his life.

He settled in the rather desolate vacant land that is now Hartsville, in 1865, opened a small store and later a bank in Darlington, 14 miles away. Although he had practically no resources to start with he was able to use the profits from one enterprise to start another and thus develop from scratch one of the South's important communities.

Major Coker had four sons and two daughters. Only one of the sons is now living—William C., a botanist on the faculty of the

University of North Carolina. The other three all followed their father in his numerous agricultural and business enterprises, and it was for one of these that young Wiggins went to work.

David R. Coker had been interested in plant breeding as a hobby for several years; Wiggins promptly suggested that a real business be made out of it. "You'll become discouraged and leave," replied Mr. Coker. The young man promised that he wouldn't leave, but would state frankly if he couldn't make a go of the seed venture; he was, therefore, given the task of organizing its business end and in a few years became its secretary and treasurer.

SEED BREEDING

Today Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co. is known as the foremost seed breeder in the South, has 5,000 acres planted to seed, and has contributed greatly to the agricultural development of the South through breeding longer staple cottons, rust-, cold-, and smut-resistant small grains and better tobacco.

Although Wiggins was not born on a farm, has never lived on a farm, and is not a farmer, nevertheless, he was awarded Clemson College's certificate of merit in 1940 for distinguished service to agriculture.

One of Wiggins' first tasks in making the seed company a commercial success was to design the Red Heart trade-mark, and copyright the words, "Blood will tell," which appears on every bag of the company's seed and on all of its printed material.

Very proud of what he had done in designing this trade-mark, the youth took his brain child to old Major Coker, who approved of it, but warned: "You must never let that trade-mark appear on any product which is not worthy of the name."

One of the Hartsville companies, with which Wiggins is associated, owns a large herd of purebred Guernsey cows which have produced 2 national class representatives and 16 State class championships in advance register herds. Wiggins feels that one of the great needs of the South and of South Carolina is an increase in dairy cows on farms, perhaps not so much from a commercial standpoint as for the nutritional improvement of the people themselves.

At the time that Wiggins became secretary and treasurer of the seed company he was given the same positions in J. L. Coker & Co. department store, later becoming manager and managing director, which position he still holds. Conspicuously displayed over this most attractive and spacious store building is a sign which reads, "More than a store—an institution," and even a brief visit will show that there is no exaggeration in the slogan.

LARGE STORE

Wiggins' chief accomplishment as general manager of J. L. Coker & Co. has been to guide its transition from a large country store, engaged primarily in a farm-lien business, into a modern merchandising department store.

Although the store has been his particular responsibility and has taken more of his time and effort than any other, he is peculiarly attached to the seed company, and remains its treasurer.

In addition, in 1921 he purchased the local newspaper, the Hartsville Messenger, and has operated a printing business and the newspaper ever since. At the age of 12 in school vacation he worked as a printer's devil for $1.50 a week, and one of his chief joys in life is the publication of his country newspaper. During the past year he was president of the South Carolina Press Association.

Although he was made vice president of the Bank of Hartsville in 1921, he was not active in its management until 1932. In that year the skies were not only black but the bank needed a new president, and the Coker family decided upon Wiggins (he had married a daughter of J. J. Lawton, a son-in-law of Major Coker, in 1915).

Faced with running a bank through what was perhaps the worst panic in American history, he read through in a few days' time a correspondence course in banking that ordinarily takes 6 months. But he did more than that; he brought the merchant's and the borrower's viewpoint into banking. He was determined that borrowers should get over any attitude of self-consciousness or of being ill at ease.

He built for his bank the reputation of being glad to lend money; people came from a distance to borrow from it. Fortunately the public knew that the owners of the bank were behind it during the worst of the depression; because David R. Coker offered to place $1,000,000 of his personal assets at the disposal of both this and the other bank in town.

As a result, heavy withdrawals did not materialize. A farmer, known to be not at all well fixed, walked in during the worst of the panic and said: "I have a little money in my pocket; you can have it without any interest if you want it," and added $10,000 to his account.

PRESIDENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA

During the critical days of 1932 and 1933 Wiggins served as president of the South Carolina Bankers' Association, sponsoring and helping to secure passage of legislation in the State which has worked to the benefit of both banks and depositors.

It is an interesting coincidence that J. B. Redfearn, executive vice president of the Bank of Hartsville, and a keyman in the Wiggins scheme of organization in Hartsville, is president of the South Carolina Bankers' Association this year; this being the third time in 10 years that a Hartsville banker has held the position.

Wiggins is able to make trips to Washington and New York on American Bankers' Association business without being called on the telephone from Hartsville. Redfearn does not call his chief when things go well, and it is Redfearn's business to see that they do go well.

These trips away from home have been very numerous, as many as 45 in a single year. For Wiggins has taken his work on the American Bankers' Association seriously, particularly in the case of his 5 years' service as chairman of its committee on legislation, which he regarded as an opportunity to fight for democratic processes in this country and the maintenance of some measure of individual liberty and initiative for private business and banking.

But what kind of a man is this Lee Wiggins, now in his prime at 52, who is able to apply himself with such vigor to so many varied interests? How does he work and how does he look upon life?

HOME TOWN PRIDE

To this writer, a northerner and visiting the Carolinas for the first time, the attribute which most struck me was his love and pride in his own community. Whether this is of any interest to big bankers in New York, Boston, and Chicago I do not know, but I suspect it is a trait not unacceptable in the Carolinas.

It shows itself, in the first place, in pride in Hartsville achievements in which he has had no direct part. He is proud of the diversity of its products and especially of the Sonoco Products Co., in which he is not a director and has played no part, although it is owned by the Coker family and managed by the third generation, with James L. Coker, third, as president.

This is by far the largest of Hartsville's industries, with plants in four other States and Canada and 2,000 employees in Hartsville. It is also by far the largest producer in the country of certain paper specialties for the textile industry (chiefly paper cones on which yarn is spun).

Wiggins is proud of the fact that the Coker family in the third, as well as the second, generation is one of workers. There are five young men in the third generation, and they all work.

"They are able, honest, clean, and cooperative," says Wiggins, "not an idler or black sheep among them. I stress cooperation. There is no jealousy among them; there is too much work to do, everyone is too busy. The family has never had a failure, and no one dealing with them has ever lost a dollar. It is a case of 'we' not of 'I'; it is a group, a clan. It is a story of 78 years."

Wiggins believes that the salvation of the South lies in industry, but not in congested masses of factory hands in towns. Workers for the Sonoco Products Co. come from a radius of 25 miles, and are encouraged to buy small places in the country rather than in town.

"I believe that in Hartsville we have diversity and stability. Each factory worker is encouraged to be an individual, a unit on his little farm. If he has an acre of cotton and makes something of it, so much the better. But he should get his cash from industry, his living from the farm. The farmer entirely dependent upon a cash crop is in too much danger of having his equity wiped out; the key to the development of the South lies in a combination of agriculture and industry.

"But to break the circle of poverty and ignorance there must also be more education in the South, even to the point of discontent. There must be a rise in the standard of living."

THE GREAT SOUTH

Wiggins believes that the South is the great undiscovered market, because of its deficit of consumer goods. He is enthusiastic for rural electrification, if not unduly subsidized by Government funds, for he sees in electricity womankind's greatest friend, lifting, as it does, so much of the burden off her back and taking her out of the class of what is virtually slave labor.

But to return to his pride in Hartsville. Wiggins worked persistently for 7 years to promote the Hartsville Community Center, a self-liquidating group of two fine buildings containing city offices, public library, theater, auditorium, chamber of commerce, and farmers' market. He was chairman of the building committee and is chairman of the library board.

Evidence of civic spirit is noticeable in Hartsville. For a community of its size it has an unusually complete public park bordering a lake. About the whole place there is a feeling of spaciousness and charm, heightened by the campus of Coker College for Women, of which Wiggins is a trustee and treasurer of its endowment funds.

This by no means completes the list of Wiggins' civic and public activities, but a catalogue of such connections is not only in danger of becoming tiresome, but may conceal the true likeness of the man himself.

"Do not represent me as more than I am," he said. "I am not the keenest, the ablest small banker in America. I know myself, my place, and my level. It happens to be Wiggins this coming year who will speak for American banking; but it might be Smith."

There are, however, certain qualities or characteristics of the man which stand out, so plain that he who runs may read. They require no exaggeration; indeed it would only spoil the picture to heighten the actual colors.

LOVES HARTSVILLE

His love of Hartsville is part of a larger quality of zest in life, of a vivid interest and enthusiasm. His family, his State, the South, the seed company, store, bank, newspaper, college, and his manifold duties with the American Bankers' Association—all these and many other interests cause him to live fully from day to day.

"I have my difficulties and problems, like other men," he remarked, "but we had a preacher in college in whose regular prayer there was one sentence which has had a marked impact upon my personal philosophy. He said, 'Oh, Lord, guide our feet today.' I live one day at a time, and do what I can. I don't worry too much about tomorrow. I enjoy life with its struggles and problems."

Whenever a man attains high position or prominence those close to him usually ascribe his success to hard work. But the phrase may not mean much unless it is broken down. It is not necessarily a revealing phrase in itself.

Wiggins is certainly not afraid of work, of drudgery, and of the most intense application, whether to business details, reading and study, or to careful preparation for speeches and testimony.

But he himself feels that the variety of his interests, even in college, has kept him out of a narrow circle, out of a groove, and thus pushed him forward. The point I am making is that hard work is more than merely sticking to and grinding away at the same desk hour after hour, day after day, and year after year.

EFFECTIVE SPEAKER

One great asset has been the ability to speak effectively. This he began to learn in boyhood days in the Young Peoples Union of his church. He makes it a rule never to speak unless he has something to say, that is, unless he has a message for the particular group. Also, no matter how long beforehand and carefully he has prepared his speech, he likes to have an hour directly before delivery to go over it again.

In one important respect nature smiled upon Wiggins; it gave him a personality that enables him to make friends readily. More than once he has won over hostile groups to his point of view. Ability quickly to grasp the other man's viewpoint combined with tenacity of purpose served him well in dealing with congressional committees.

Nor is it flattery to say that he combines common sense and good judgment with a stimulating keenness of mind. Or at least that is the opinion of bankers from far larger communities and heading far larger institutions, who have come into close and prolonged contact with him.

I have tried throughout this article to indicate some of Wiggins' views. But it must be remembered that his long connection with the American Bankers' Association legislative committee was in a period of drastic financial experiment and legislation, and he had to study and express himself on all manner of theories and subjects. It is impossible to cover all of these in a single article.

"I give much time to study of the problems of government and society," he says, "and in attempting to translate my philosophy of life into public service. My greatest satisfaction arises from the contributions I make, however small, toward the solution of common problems and in promoting the welfare of the common man."

He is a lifelong Democrat of the old school. He believes that the people at the bottom haven't had enough consideration and that the weak need protection from the strong, but he doesn't believe in pauperizing them as wards of the Government or of regimenting the entire economy. The "four freedoms" are essential, he says, but there must also be freedom for individual achievement.

FUTURE VISION

He regrets that some bankers are interested only in the here and now, in immediate profit, and he tells them that their difficulties and troubles are small as compared with those of retailers and other businessmen in a war economy.

On the other hand, he does not believe that our American system of free enterprise can survive unless the American chartered banking system also survives, and he emphasizes in this the vital part played by the many small banks, on which the prosperity, well-being, growth, and development of so many of our small communities have depended.

He does not believe that free enterprise is possible, or even thinkable, under politically controlled and administered credit, and he began boldly and successfully 4 years ago to fight the tendency of the Government to socialize our credit system. Hitler and Mussolini got hold of the credit systems first of all, he points out.

But Wiggins does not confine his efforts to opposing what he considers pernicious tendencies in government. He is just as vigorous in urging the banks to perform the services that properly belong to them. He wants the banks to return to the type of credit that accepts reasonable risks, and he wants them to avoid excessive service charges and giving the impression that they no longer want the savings of the public.

HIS HOME

Mr. and Mrs. Wiggins live in a roomy, rambling house of the old southern plantation type, with large white pillars in front, on well named Home Avenue in Hartsville.

They have two sons and two daughters, all of whom have or are now taking college training. The youngest and oldest are girls, aged 18 and 27. The oldest boy completed work in aeronautical engineering at Georgia Tech and is now a designing engineer for Vought-Sikorsky Co. The youngest son graduated (Phi Beta Kappa) at the University of North Carolina and is now a pilot on a bomber in foreign service in the Army Air Force.

Perhaps the finest thing about Lee Wiggins is that his own community is proud of him. Flattery of those who have reached high position is cheap, and words are always cheap. But action speaks louder than words.

The fact that a large number of his fellow townsmen, family, friends, and business associates were at the Waldorf in New York City when he was inducted as president of the American Bankers' Association on September 15 speaks for itself.

Come-Back of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. SCRUGHAM

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Come-Back of Small Business: Meeting the Needs of Civilians," which was published in the September 24, 1943, issue of the National Week. The article relates to the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in finding a way to put small plants into use.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COME-BACK OF SMALL BUSINESS: MEETING THE NEEDS OF CIVILIANS—HOW GOVERNMENT IS FINDING ESSENTIAL JOBS FOR IDLE PLANTS TO DO—VITAL ROLE OF S. W. P. C. IN EASING FINANCIAL STRAIN ON MANUFACTURERS

(Many small manufacturing plants were hard hit when industry converted to war. The Government, through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, has endeavored to find a way to put these small plants to use. How well the Government has succeeded is told here by one of the editors of the United States News, who visited a number of these smaller plants.)

Small business, hit hard by the war, pinched by shifting contracts, is fighting slowly back into the production of civilian goods. The pool of supply that lay in warehouses when the United States went to war is depleted. More parts are needed for washing machines and radiators and farm machinery. And small plants steadily are taking over the job of replenishing stocks.

The job is a part of the pattern that Robert Wood Johnson worked out for the Smaller War Plants Corporation to follow. Mr. Johnson is the businessman who built S. W. P. C. and worked himself into a hospital while doing so. The broad pattern that he is leaving envisages S. W. P. C. as a service agency performing all sorts of liaison and engineering and contracting jobs for small plants. Mr. Johnson views every small plant that is shifted back to civilian production as one that will not have to wrestle with reconversion after the war.

The civilian production that Mr. Johnson has in mind is not the manufacture of luxuries and nonessentials. He is thinking of those goods that are marked down by the War Production Board as essential, goods whose nonexistence Mr. Johnson regards as one of the causes for absenteeism.

He puts it this way: A woman worker breaks a washing machine. She has to stay home and wash by hand. Multiply this many times by the breakage of other home equipment and you have one angle of absenteeism.

Consequently, S. W. P. C. is maintaining close contact with the civilian section of W. P. B. All sorts of contracts for civilian goods are being turned into small plants. Of 89,000 home dehydrators contracted for by 27 manufacturers, 62,000 are being made by 19 S. W. P. C. plants. Farm implement orders are keeping 800 small plants running at 100 percent of capacity.

The Johnson view is that this work can be done by small plants with less displacement of war production than by large ones. Small plants are more readily adaptable to change than are large ones. Fewer machines have to be changed. Fewer workmen are involved. And small plants are not as completely absorbed with war production as are big ones.

Mr. Johnson's definition of a small plant is one that employs fewer than 500 persons. Few plants of this size could qualify in the bidding for prime war contracts. Some of them, did manage to wangle prime contracts by pooling resources and equipment with other manufacturers. Others fought for subcontracts. Some closed and their managers went to work elsewhere.

There are between 160,000 and 170,000 plants in the country. Of these, 500 are really large, 5,000 are middle-sized. That leaves a minimum of 155,000 small plants. But there are not yet, after almost 2 years of war and 4 years of straining at war production, any adequate figures on the number of small plants that have open facilities or any real figures on how many persons they employ.

S. W. P. C. does know that there are between 8,000 and 10,000 factories with open facilities. Of these, about half are operating at less than two-thirds of capacity, which is near the collapse line. Ten percent of these needy plants—between 350 and 500—need money and machinery. The rest simply want business.

A preliminary analysis of a representative group of firms shows their ills are lack of orders, 47.5 percent; lack of material, 13.5 percent; lack of manpower, 8.5 percent. Many of them are suffering from combinations of these three elements, but the dominant fact is that about half of them need jobs to do in a land that is clamoring to have jobs done.

S. W. P. C. acts as an advisory, research, and service agency for small business. It lends money when really needed and is not available elsewhere. It leases equipment. It spends so much time worrying about wage, labor, and material problems that Mr. Johnson says a prime Small War Plants Corporation duty is to protect small business from other Government agencies and it finds contracts for small plants.

In the search for contracts, it can take the prime contract itself. Or it may talk subcontractors into letting small plants turn out some of the parts they need. In the last 2 months Small War Plants Corporation has helped small plants to get $217,000,000 in business. This took work to 2,526 contractors, over half of whom had had no help before.

Altogether, Small War Plants Corporation has taken over $11,500,000 of prime contracts to turn out goods ranging from furniture and paint to reamers and axles. Of this amount, 108 small subcontractors have gotten $8,500,000. Under the law Small War Plants Corporation can take prime contracts when it thinks best. But Small War Plants Corporation officials say there are very practical reasons, such as specifications to be met and fulfillment dates, that stand in the way of indiscriminate use of this power.

The men at Small War Plants Corporation, both at Washington and in the field, regard much of their work as liaison. In Washington, they keep in close contact with the purchasing agencies. They do the same in the field. There they also watch closely the letting of prime contracts to big concerns, help the big concerns to find little plants equipped to turn out parts of the job, and help the little ones to find work to do.

When a contract goes to a little firm, they keep contact with the plant until the goods are delivered, lending money or leasing equipment if these are needed, giving engineering advice when wanted, helping to straighten out production kinks that arise. For the field service regards its function as a combination of liaison, service, and salesmanship. Unless the subcontractor fulfills his promise to the prime contractor, S. W. P. C. will have difficulty talking the prime contractor into spreading more work to the little plants.

Cooperative nests of small plants are growing up. This may be one of their ways of meeting the hard days that come after the war. In Philadelphia the Heintz Manufacturing Co., which does not fall into Mr. Johnson's fewer-than-500-employees definition of a small plant, is feeding work to 160 subcontractors. Along with the subcontracts, the Heintz Co. provides all sorts of research and engineering advice. When it figures out a short-cut, it sends its engineers out to spread the good word among the subcontractors. When the small plants get into production snarls, they call on Heintz. S. W. P. C. men in Philadelphia call it one of the best cooperative jobs being done.

Another Philadelphia firm, the R. S. Products Co., works with 6 other small plants. The R. S. Products Co. has only 175 employees. Before the war it built furnaces and heating equipment. It still is doing some of this work. But it also has taken over what once was a garage, installed furnaces, lathes, and screw machines, and is making shot for antiaircraft guns. It also is making tank parts on a British order. Others of the firms in its group, little machine shops using from 20 to 75 men, are making tank parts, gears, castings, and precision instruments.

The use of tools by these plants requires all sorts of ingenuity. One has a machine that performs 15 different operations. It added another gadget to perform still another operation. Its engineer, keen, tall, young, still is moving machines around and stretching them into new performances. Another of the plants needed a boring machine but couldn't afford it. The manager turned a lathe upside down, on end, and put it to doing the operation.

"We want some more work," said an official. "We're flexible. We have some good men and good equipment. We can do lots of things. But I think the time has passed for anyone to look for gravy in war contracts. We'd better pull ourselves down to a reasonable profit on a job that's going to last awhile."

One plant near Philadelphia will earn $23,000 this year on a $60,000 investment.

In Philadelphia, as elsewhere in the field, the work is done chiefly by men who are residents of the area and who know it intimately. Most of them are highly skilled engineers, bankers, and industrialists in their own right. In addition to the staff men of S. W. P. C., a board of governors helps to determine local needs and policies.

On this board are bankers, businessmen, manufacturers, retailers, big and small. Few firms in the locality can come forward to ask for aid that are not known by one or another of the members of the board from past experience. On loans, every effort is made to get money from other sources before S. W. P. C. enters the picture. That is why the S. W. P. C. proportion of rejections runs so high. In some cities the boards have enlisted the cooperation of local merchants to learn what essential civilian needs exist and to help pass out orders to small local plants.

This is the main framework of the agency that Mr. Johnson will leave to carry on when he goes into a hospital on October 1. He put aside the star of a brigadier general a month ago to be freer to work toward civilian needs as head of S. W. P. C. Then doctors caught up with him.

For years he had worked at a driving pace for a few months, directing the affairs of his surgical dressing firm of Johnson & Johnson in New Jersey, then rested a few weeks. But in Washington, with Army Ordnance and with S. W. P. C. he was unable to do that. No time ever came when he could take it easy. His doctors put him through a clinic.

"You'll have to quit," they told him. "Right now." The best compromise he could get was to take it easy and resign, effective October 1. He wanted to stay in Washington that long to see if Congress had any questions to ask about S. W. P. C.

Repeal the Smith-Connally Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have offerred a bill (H. R. 3233) to repeal the so-called Smith-Connally Act.

The purpose of the original act has not been served. Primarily, it was to discourage and avoid strikes and unrest among workers in the war effort so as to increase their output. It has had the opposite effect. I am informed by the Labor Department that upward of 200 notices of intention to strike have already been filed. Instead of discouraging, it encourages strikes. It is like a lightning rod. It attracts and emboldens disgruntled minorities, be they ever so small, to file applications of intention to strike. The bill is an invitation to strike.

The strike becomes unfeared—undreaded. Before a strike can actually be called, there is set up a so-called 30-day cooling-off period. Instead, during that 30-day period, experience shows that there is continual agitation, and wide scope and play is given to unruly and unreasonable labor leaders to foment dissatisfaction and unrest. Ballots and petitions are circulated constantly amongst the workers. Instead of being a cooling-off period, it becomes a seething period and a holiday for hotheads.

Prior to its enactment, labor religiously kept its "no strike" pledge. The loss of man-hours due to strikes was negligible and inconsequential.

It is better to perform a service voluntarily rather than involuntarily. The voluntary way is the American way. The coercive Smith-Connally way is the totalitarian way.

It is interesting to note that big business is fed up with the discredited Smith-Connally Labor Disputes Act. I refer to the blistering editorial in Business Week, which is a publication devoted to the interests of private industry. Business Week does not want to amend or improve the act. It wants it repealed outright. It says as follows:

> The interests of business will be best served by leaving the details of collective bargaining and personnel policy to its industrial relations experts. Better than anyone else they know what hazards inhere in further Government intervention of any sort.

With remarkable frankness, the magazine admits that the purpose of the bill was to "divest organized labor of some of its power." But the results apparently have been disappointing to big business.

> For labor's bargaining strength—
>
> Says Business Week—
>
> has not been neutralized, strikes and labor disputes have been encouraged rather than prevented, and even labor's political activities have been enlarged, despite the prohibition in the law against direct campaign contributions by unions.

I sound a warning to industry that if the Government is invited to interfere unduly with the freedoms of organized labor, concomitantly it is invited to interfere unduly with the freedoms of industry. Today it is obstructing the normal and legitimate functions of organized labor. Tomorrow it will obstruct the normal and legitimate functions of private enterprise.

It Will Be Better To Correct the Mistakes of a Necessary Agency Rather Than Destroy It by Criticisms Without Making an Effort To Correct the Mistakes—O. P. A. Not Guilty of All Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not in favor of the mistakes, errors of judgment, or unreasonable acts of any governmental agency. In a huge program in wartime a certain number of mistakes are to be expected. It is my belief that if it is an agency of the Government that is absolutely necessary, we should direct our criticisms in a constructive way in the direction of correcting the mistakes of that agency rather than destroying it. In other words, we should not adopt the policy of burning down the barn to destroy the rats.

The Office of Price Administration is absolutely necessary. I can see a great improvement in the policies and practices of this agency in recent months. It can be called by any name that anyone desires to call it, but the functions of this agency are absolutely necessary in wartime, and will probably be necessary for awhile after the war in order to prevent ruinous inflation. Just as soon as it is possible, such an agency should be abolished; but we know it is needed now, and instead of trying to destroy it we should help correct the mistakes that are being made. Haste makes waste. In our efforts to build the largest and best war machine on earth we may expect mistakes to be made.

I am sure that the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Honorable HAMILTON FISH, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 17, 1943, page 7627, did not intend to do this agency an injustice when he made the statement:

> Before calling upon the pre-Pearl Harbor fathers back in our own districts and families that have already given two or three sons, why not draft Government employees, power-hungry bureaucrats, and O. P. A. Gestapo agents, if they will not volunteer themselves.

However, people unfamiliar with the facts will possibly believe that the Office of Price Administration is a haven for draft-evaders, if this statement is accepted 100 percent. If there is one single evader of the draft in the Office of Price Administration or any other agency of our Government, he should be brought to justice and compelled to give up any right or privilege that he is hiding behind. But I seriously doubt that we should make a broadside charge against a governmental agency which is not supported by the facts. There is a committee of this House that is investigating the subject matter of this complaint and if anyone has evidence to support such a charge it should be presented to this committee.

Believing that the Office of Price Administration should be supported and prices should be held down to prevent run-away inflation, and knowing that this charge is such a serious one that the agency will be reflected upon, I have taken it upon myself to ascertain the facts. I am officially advised by the Office of Price Administration that the following situation existed relative to draft deferments in this agency as of September 13, 1943:

Total deferments requested	73
Total deferments granted	56
Total deferments now in effect	13
Total deferments ended and people now in services	43
Total number of military furloughs from O. P. A.	843
Total male employees:	
In Washington	1,875
In field	12,207
	13,082

Percentage of deferments granted, forty-three one-hundredths of 1 percent.

Percentage of deferments in effect, one one-hundredth of 1 percent.

This being the only agency mentioned by Congressman FISH, it is the only one positive information can be furnished on.

Address by Senator Revercomb on the Occasion of the Congressional Recess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on July 10 of this year, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On last Thursday the Congress of the United States recessed to reconvene September 14, unless called to convene at an earlier date. During the last 1,281 days your Congress has been in session 1,261 days. The short adjournment that has been taken will permit the Members of Congress to attend briefly to their own personal affairs and business, and better still, it will permit those who have been here for many years to come in closer contact with the people who elected them and to learn from the people their attitude and feeling upon the subjects of government.

The order of adjournment contains the unusual provision that the Congress may be called back to reconvene at any time before September 14, upon the call not only of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but upon the call of the majority leaders of the Senate and the House, and even more unusual, upon the call of the minority leaders in both the Senate and the House. Thus, if the leaders of the minority party feel that the convening of Congress is necessary to the protection and the welfare of the people, they may upon 3 days' notice reconvene the Congress at any time.

From information given this morning by the Washington newspapers it looks as though the adjournment may be very short. No sooner had Congress adjourned than the President issued an order forbidding certain persons in administrative departments and bureaus from revealing information to a committee of the House of Representatives which is investigating the conduct and action of the Federal Communications Commission with particular respect to the control of radio in this country.

I charge that the Chief Executive would not have issued this order while the Congress was in session. It prevents the disclosure of facts to a committee of inquiry dealing with the suspicious conduct of the Federal Communications Commission in a charge of attempts by it to control broadcasts and the use of the radio. It strikes directly at freedom of speech in this country just as much so as any effort by the Government to control information in the newspapers.

The President bases his order for the suppression of this testimony upon the ground that it "would be contrary to the public interest" for the committee to hear it.

The Members of the House of Representatives who were sent here into the Government by the people are as much concerned with the public interests as the President or any other official of Government. While I do not belong to that body of Congress I have complete confidence in the patriotism of its Members and in their earnestness to represent the best interests of the country. Certainly there is no justification for barring or suppressing evidence upon such an important subject, and thereby to prevent that committee from hearing it. What is it that is sought to be hidden?

So here immediately upon a short adjournment of Congress, we find the Chief Executive ordering a commission or bureau to refuse to divulge facts to an investigating committee of the representatives of the citizens of this country. The consequence of that order will be that the testimony will not be heard until the Congress reconvenes in September or whenever it does reconvene, if called to reconvene before the date fixed in the adjournment order.

Those of us who were elected to the United States Senate for the first time and who have been here but 6 months entered this body with definite views based upon the expressed will of the people at the last elections. That expression, as I see it, was that the first duty of government in this country today was to move forward with all the force that we had to win the war in which we had become involved. And in doing this work, partisanship or differences in political views must be laid aside. Later I will review the actions of the Congress upon the war measures.

A second objective and one very little removed from the first, and very little less in importance than the duty of winning the war, was to preserve our form of representative government of the American people and to keep the Government sound and to keep the people established in their fundamental rights, so that when the victory has been won and the war ended, those infringements upon the personal liberties of the citizens that have been occasioned through the direction of war, may be restored to them completely.

One of the most definite and particular steps in keeping those personal liberties and in safeguarding this form of government is to keep the powers of government vested in the people through their representatives in the Congress.

Also one of the greatest dangers that had crept into our Government was a surrender of almost unlimited powers to the Chief Executive.

When the people of several of the States elected new Members to the United States Senate last year they were dissatisfied with the trend in Congress which for 10 years represented a gradual betrayal of the separation of powers between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. The new Members who entered the Senate came here aware of this existing danger and some of the older Members who had gallantly fought against vesting this absolute power and destruction of American Government continued to fight valiantly for that end. That the purpose of reestablishing the Congress in its rightful position in the protection of the rights of the people has been accomplished to some extent cannot be doubted. We who entered upon our work this year realized the very grave situation that threatened to result in vesting absolute government in the executive branch, to be carried on by the bureaus and commissions under that branch. Those bureaus and commissions were not responsible to the people. They were appointed by the Chief Executive and they did what they pleased. The duty plainly devolved upon the Congress to see to it that the will of the people should govern and not executive bureaus.

To this end we set out to revest in the Congress, and consequently in the people, the limitations and control of the actions of these bureaus.

At the same time we realized, and do realize, that such steps must be taken with judgment and caution here in a time of war so that government may not be disrupted and may continue to function. Therefore, the steps taken in that direction have been gradual but certain. The war will be continued to be fought with all the force of America, but we want to relieve the people in this country of the unjustified and unnecessary burdens and restrictions that have been placed upon them. There naturally has been some talk about grave issues between the Chief Executive and the Congress. There have been differences in judgment, of course. It is very difficult for any man, however high an office he may hold, to calmly give up powers that have been given him, but the Congress when the record is read will be shown to have acted with fairness and with consideration of the American people, and with full consideration of a functioning government. It has been an independent Congress as it should be. Whenever it definitely felt that the action of the President was wrong the Congress has opposed him, and has gone so far as to override his veto. On the other hand, it has declined to override his veto when the Congress felt that the administrative side of government should have further opportunity to carry out policies which may be worked out for some good for the people of our country; and again Congress has referred a veto back to a committee to hold the veto for further action until it can determine what course the administrative side of government will take on the particular subject that was vetoed.

The Congress must be deliberate if good results are obtained. It must not be hasty in action. There is much yet to be done in the elimination of needless bureaus and commissions. It is my hope that this Government may emerge from the war simplified in its organization and not loaded down with hundreds of thousands of unnecessary employees who have been given jobs for an apparent purpose of political partisanship only. This end will be obtained if the people of the country will send in to the Congress men and women devoted to this purpose. As I before stated, we have not achieved all that we desire and much remains to be done. We have appropriated for expenditure immense sums of money, but it will be found that most of this money appropriated has been to wage the war that confronts us; to see to it that those men and boys that have been placed in the armed forces receive the complete and unqualified support of their Government in equipment, their protection and sustenance. This certainly is the least that we can do for them now in the time of battle. They have given up their lives of peace, their plans for the future, their comforts of home, and their ambitions. They have gone to fight the enemies and to meet death, if need be. Their Government must not in anywise fail to give them its full support at any cost.

So those of us who have been opposed to unnecessary expenditures and the terrible waste that has gone on for years, have supported the immense appropriation for carrying on the war. That there has been some waste in the conduct of the war cannot be doubted, but better some waste if the war will move more rapidly and the victory be won earlier.

The 78th Congress has appropriated $71,500,000,000 to the Army and $27,000,000,000 to the Navy for use in fighting the war for the year 1944. Those sums are staggering but if they will win the war they cannot be refused.

The War and Navy Departments must be permitted to fight the war. This Congress has backed them in that effort and the Army, Navy, and Marines have done a magnificent job to this date.

There were certain steps to be taken as matters of general policy which the Congress felt should be taken and which are not pending for action. You may be interested in knowing of these. There is before the Senate, reported there with the approval of the Military Affairs Committee, a bill to prevent the drafting of fathers until January 1, 1944. This has not yet been acted upon, but, in my opinion, will be passed at an early date in the fall. We felt this necessary so that there might be settlement of this question for a definite time so that the fathers who may be inducted might make their plans. It is my hope that not only will this bill be passed but that further deferment of fathers may be allowed.

There is also pending for early action provisions to permit high school boys to finish their last half year of work before being inducted into the Army.

Already passed by the Senate and pending in the House of Representatives is a bill to defer bona fide farm workers. The need of this measure is apparent throughout the farming States. It has been too long delayed in passage.

On the domestic side of our Government there has been considerable accomplishment in curtailing expenditures of money. There is not any need here tonight to review at this time the terrible waste that has been going on in the administrative side of Government, not only during the war but for years prior to the war. Waste that is inexcusable; waste that resulted from expenditures for political power rather than service to the people of this country. Some measures have been accomplished within the last 6 months to curtail this waste, but much yet remains to be accomplished, and even this Congress has, in my own opinion, appropriated too much for domestic purposes. Some good in curtailing expenditures, however, has been accomplished.

The National Youth Administration was completely abolished because it was only a duplication of efforts of five other facilities sponsored by the National Government. Appropriations for other agencies have been pared and cut and there has been a saving of money in the conduct of the domestic government. The domestic expenditures for the Office of War Information have been substantially curtailed and they have been limited as to the amount they may spend for moving pictures and such other propaganda to the American people; propaganda that had all the marks of partisan political stuff instead of information to our citizens.

The House of Representatives, in particular, is to be commended upon its stand to curtail expenditure of money.

However, it cannot be denied that much yet remains to be done in stopping the spending of money, and unless expenditures are substantially lessened, particularly the appropriations to these bureaus, some of which must be abolished, in a short time we will find ourselves a bankrupt people with each individual crushed down with a burden of debt that will prevent him from making any headway or progress in living for himself and family. The ending of this wasteful layout of money will be accomplished only by turning out of office those who have subscribed to the policies of the New Deal and who blindly support the administrative policy of continued spending and the maintenance of unneeded commissions and bureaus.

Realizing the necessity during the time of war to place in the hands of the Chief Executive, sums of money which might be suddenly needed in an emergency arising out of the prosecution of the war, the Congress appropriated what is known as the President's emergency fund, consisting now of $94,000,000. This appropriation carried the provision that none of the funds so placed in the hands of the President may be spent on any Government agency for which Congress had denied appropriations. This was a proper limitation upon the use of that fund. Congress is vested under our Government with the power to appropriate money, and therefore, it has the duty to limit the purposes of such appropriation. It would, indeed, be futile if the Congress in its judgment should refuse an appropriation to some agency or bureau, and then have emergency funds, given for the purpose of conducting the war, diverted to such an agency or bureau, and thereby defeat the act of Congress. Indeed, what good would be obtained to refuse unneeded funds to an agency, if the Chief Executive could arbitrarily allocate part of his emergency funds for the functioning of the agency which the Congress had disapproved?

This limitation was not only within the power of Congress, but was the exercise of the plain duty of Congress, and it was not a lessening of the rightful powers of the President.

And now, may I speak to you personally for a brief time, in a general way, upon the processes of government through Congress? The 6 months that I have been here have been trying, have been exciting at times, have always been very interesting. I believe that this is the feeling of the other men who entered the Senate for the first time this year.

Members of Congress, in both Houses, recognize that theirs is not a simple task of voting "aye" or "no" on the bills that come before them. They are the chosen representatives of the people and in them reposes the responsibility of whether this is to be a Government by the people. They are expected to guard the public purse and to make certain that the public money is not dissipated by administrative extravagance. They are required to investigate the conduct of public officials. They have to reconcile the feelings, the divergent interest and concerns of 130,000,000 individuals, each of whom has all the rights given him by the Constitution of the United States. Each Senator and Representative is subject to a multitude of pressures from organizations and articulate

groups among the people. I have welcomed these pressures, as difficult as they are sometimes to bear, because the people of the United States have a right to organize to express their points of view. It is quite noticeable that certain Americans organize and lobby for their own particular aims and desires, yet become very critical of other Americans when they do the same thing. No organization of American people should be discouraged or denied the right to petition Congress for the redress of a grievance. A Senator learns in his first year, and I believe he should always remember, that a free people will speak in many glamorous and divergent voices. Even the people of his own State are varied in their interests and their points of view. All that can be asked of them is to be fair and to recognize the rights of other men and women. It is my duty and my obligation to listen to all of them, to seek to understand their wishes and their demands and to appraise them from the standpoint of what is for the best interest of our America. I shall not ignore them and I shall not put my own desire above theirs.

No man is loftier than the whole of the people; no man can attempt to be master of the people in a free country. No man by right is sovereign over the people in America. When these complex demands of varying interests are laid before us, it is our duty to do what is right for America and then we cannot wrong any man who loves America.

For a decade the Congress of the United States permitted itself to become what the people began to call "a rubber-stamp Congress" and permitted itself to accept the dictates of the Executive. It passed legislation which it was told it must pass by the various boards, bureaus, and commissions of Government until we approached an alteration in the form of the American Government from a representative republic to an administrative dictatorship.

The people of this country have inborn into them a love of the liberties that are their heritage, and a love of the Government which their fathers established here and which has safeguarded those liberties. Congress, through action of most of its Members, lost the respect and good will of the American people. It was not serving as our form of Government required but was doing what a political group dictated it should do. Executive agencies were permitted to become instruments of executive power, devoted not to the processes of Government but rather to the inquisition and prosecution of citizens who opposed what they were doing. Money was voted these agencies in almost boundless amounts and with little regard to the capacity of the people to shoulder the burden of public debt. Taxes have become hideously destructive of the people and no longer a process to provide the Government with revenue. Taxes have been used as a corrective and penitive process for the leveling of the economic and social standards of our people and for the socialization of their means of production and distribution.

The American people have become wearied of Congressional abnegation of its authorities and the surrendering of its responsibility.

In 1942 the people began to serve notice upon the Congress of this country that it must either function constitutionally, assuming full responsibility and authority, or its membership would be changed.

That voice of the people has been heeded and today we again have a more independent Congress, and I believe that in the elections of next year that we will then have a Congress of complete independence respecting definitely the will of the people and working wisely and earnestly without domination from any source, except that source which sent them here.

There is criticism of Congress that it talks too much. The Reichstag does not talk at all. The French Chamber of Deputies has been silenced. The Japanese Diet is a recording machine. In the American Congress debate is free. It is the Members' right to discuss openly, frankly, and with the sincerity which alone is convincing in such a body, the problems that face our people. Eliminate free discussion and the alternative is slavery. Curtail debate and the people must submit to dictation from little bureaucrats who love power more than they do the people and who are not representative of the people and who must be made subject to the will of the representatives of the people.

I cannot criticize Congress for its unwillingness to be rushed although it has before it the great duty to revest in the people the powers that it surrendered in past years. It must move with deliberation and without disruption of governmental functions. We are here to discover the truth and to perform legislatively in the interest of the American people. Only discussion and thoughtful investigation will lead to the truth of the situation upon which such action can be based. Only compromises among the elements of our people can minimize injustice in government and prevent any group from dominating the course of government. Government through ipse dixit of a group of our citizens is bound to lead to injustice and oppression to other citizens. That is one of the highest duties of the Congress to see that no group dominates the Government. It is not American to make government oppressive. It is not American for government to prove how powerful it can be. Government must not be despotic. It can be and will likely be if too much power is placed in the administrative side of government. The dictators of other countries have proved that conclusively.

Congress and the executive branch of the Government differed on the method of payment of income taxes by our people to meet the staggering money obligations that have been undertaken. Some of this obligation is justified in view of the war, but some of it, resulting from waste during the course of the last 10 years, can never be justified.

We were presented with the problem of enacting a pay-as-you-go plan for the payment of taxes. This plan was definitely opposed by the Treasury Department and the administrative side for reasons that were never convincing and often of doubtful validity. The Congress did not act until it observed the wishes of the people of our country and until it studied the effect of such a plan upon the future welfare of the citizens and whether or not it might lessen the burden that had grown so heavy.

We became convinced that the people wanted the pay-as-you-go plan and that law was enacted against the wishes of the executive department. This was done for the purpose of lightening the burden of the people and making it easier for them to pay the assessments placed upon them. Looking into the future the greatest duty upon Congress, it seems to me, is to rid the American people of those bureaus and departments which have fastened themselves upon the Government like barnacles to a ship and which grow heavier and heavier as time goes on. The bureaus that are necessary to the proper functioning of Government will be retained, but they will be made more responsible to the people and their representatives. That must be so in order to maintain their efficiency and their willingness to regard the welfare of the American people. The bureaus that have grown up here and are unnecessary to the functions of government must be ended. If this is to be accomplished, I want to say to the American people that it is up to you to send into the Houses of Congress those who are devoted to this purpose. When you do that then we may with more certainty reestablish the Congress as the true representative of the people and then you will have a government responsive to the needs of our citizens. This is your Government and it will be kept so as long as you will maintain an independent Congress. Only a Congress that is independent of the executive branch of government will head the call of the people to their government.

One of the most serious domestic problems that face our people is the question of food. Our people are not hungry yet, but they are being abused by a silly bureaucracy—the Office of Price Administration—that has become so entangled in the red tape of its own devising that if a halt is not called we shall be hungry. Fundamentally I am opposed to price fixing in ordinary times, but I recognize the necessity of fixing the prices of those commodities which the citizens must purchase in order to live when there arises circumstances that exist in time of war.

The Office of Price Administration has had ample authority to administer the fixing of prices in a fair and equitable way so that needed food may be produced, independent business maintained, and the people permitted to purchase food at a reasonable cost. But the administration of the bureau has been a disgrace to the country. The operation of such a bureau is an administrative matter and one with which the Congress should not have to deal.

However, unless this bureau does get its house in order, unless it cuts out its red tape and some of its foolish directives, steps must be taken by the Congress to clean house there.

There is no lack of food in our country. There are ample cattle—2,000,000 more head in the fields than ever before in the history of this country—but through the foolish regulations of the Office of Price Administration those cattle provide no meat for your table.

We have more hogs than at any time in the history of the country, yet pork is scarce upon the market. There is no shortage; there is only confusion and bungling. Further opportunity has been given this part of the administrative branch to correct this confusion. It must be corrected.

As we move forward toward the vanquishing of our foreign enemies, we must not be forgetful of the rights and the liberties to which our own American people are entitled.

First, above all else, those young men that wear the uniform and fight in the name of their country must receive our first consideration, but their people back home must be fed and must be made secure. Their right to work without domination from any group against their own will must be kept for them. The right of free enterprise so that no limit or lid may be placed upon the future success of any American boy and girl must be sustained. This has been done in the past history of America through the plan of government created by our fathers. These rights will continue to be saved by the American Government so long as this plan is maintained. The desired plan of government will be maintained when you, the people of this country, will send into the Congress enough Members who will be independent of the domination of any other branch of the Government.

There is a greatness in our people which is the reason for our survival. It is that same greatness that will win victory for our arms and keep our people secure. That greatness is rooted in our individual independence. No American can ever forget that his most treasured possession is his personal liberty. No American will ever recognize the right of government to deprive him of his personal liberty by law; by socialization of free enterprise or by political or administrative subterfuge.

That liberty of the people has been threatened in the past few years; threatened through usurpation of authority in the exec-

utive side of the Government and the domination of Congress by the Executive. That threat has been met and we will have an independent Congress, one that will recognize the rightful sphere of executive action and assist and aid in the administration of Executive duties, but one that will safeguard unto the people their rights which were entrusted to their Representatives in the Congress.

As long, and only as long, as you will send to Congress men who will have the independence and will to represent you for the best interest of America, no American need ever fear the loss of personal independence or the loss of his liberties. In such a Congress rests the safety and the hope of the American people in the preservation of the rights given to them by their fathers and which must be kept for their children.

Food by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An army travels on its belly. So does a nation. Curtail the food supply by whatever method or with whatever intent and both the nation and its army face disaster.

Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, stated on August 27, 1943, in an address delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System, "Food is not a political issue." I agree and earnestly hope that it can be made so, but it has been handled as a political issue by the present administration. Its planned economy, wholly political, which we have been receiving in larger and larger doses during the last 10 years, has resulted in a shortage of food and the intent of the planners is immaterial.

We have gathered here in a Nation-wide conference to consider the present food situation. To achieve any lasting benefit we must look to causes rather than results; and if the cause is man-made, we should take steps to correct it.

This conference is open to the public and to the press and not behind closed doors guarded by soldiers as was that other historic conference of 44 nations held at Hot Springs, Va., "to consider the goal of freedom from want in relation to food and agriculture." Shortly prior to that conference a joint meeting of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate requested that Members of the Congress be permitted to attend. Our request was refused. What occurred at the conference is still buried in the secret archives of the White House.

The trouble with planned economy is that the plans are changed so often we cannot keep up with them. During prohibition we developed a workable and businesslike system of evading the law. Our distribution and delivery were promptly and efficiently serviced. Anyone willing to pay the price could get his drink. Then along came repeal and threw our distribution machinery all out of gear. Bootleggers went into other business ventures where a profit was still possible. By the time the planners developed that new masterpiece, the O. P. A., our prohibition bootleg machinery had completely disintegrated and now we have to start all over again.

If the planners will chart a master plan to remake America and publish it, we can then go ahead building our bootleg organization with some degree of security. It is the uncertainty of what is being planned for us in that more abundant life that keeps us in such a dither.

We are now told there is a shortage of food. Whether the shortage is real or imaginary, is immaterial, because if we cannot get the hamburger sandwich we crave or our wife demands, we are uncomfortable and perhaps a little hard to get along with. Eventually we begin to ask why, and that is what the people are doing today. They are asking why. They are demanding an explanation, and when they have all the facts, stripped clean of governmental propaganda, they are going to hold someone accountable for the mess.

But to keep the record straight, let me emphasize that there is no actual shortage, only a regulated one. "We planned it that way," says the President, "and don't let anyone tell you differently." Well, we did not intend to contradict the President. If he says, "we planned it that way," I accept him as authority, but conversely, we have a right to say that whatever shortage exists now is due to that planning.

But let us examine the facts.

This shortage is partly the effect of 10 years of a mistaken governmental policy of scarcity and partly due to present governmental regulations. By that policy of scarcity we have been forced to reduce the land planted to food crops by 47,000,000 acres. Limitation of acreage, destruction of pigs and cattle, burning of ripened wheat are all part of our boasted planned economy and is the policy of scarcity preached by the planners in Washington.

Their alleged objective was to raise prices of food products.

Today we are at war, a war which absorbs every energy, resource, and ability we possess. In prosecuting war, food is just as important as gunpowder, but the national administration refuses, even under the dire emergency of war, to suspend its ideas of planning.

Book farmers have planned us into our present shortages, and unless stopped they will plan us into complete bankruptcy.

The farmer dares not buy cattle for feeding because of ceilings. He cannot plan his next year's crop acreage because of uncertainty of farm machinery. He cannot plan the kind of crops he will plant because of crop limitations. He cannot plan his pig crop, or his sheep, or his cattle because of the uncertainty of labor.

But what of the consumers?

For months, in the larger cities, it has been difficult to procure meat. Thousands of meat markets have remained empty for days at a time. The planners tell us there is a shortage of meat. This is a malicious misrepresentation. No actual shortage exists.

Today we have approximately 7,000,000 more cattle than we have ever had in our history. There are more hogs and more sheep and more black markets.

There are those who say the shortage is due to lend-lease shipments. The facts do not support the charge. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, says, "That during the year 1942 only one pound in every 500 pounds of American beef was sent abroad. The percentage is large today, but still it is only about 1 percent of our meat products."

Mr. Stettinius says further, "That under the reciprocal clause of lend-lease, Australia and New Zealand last year furnished our Pacific forces with 25,000,000 pounds of beef, which was 7,000,000 pounds more than we shipped under lend-lease to all countries."

Former President Hoover said recently that during the last war, "We shipped more food to our allies monthly than is being shipped today. We had no local famines in the United States as we are having now. We had no black markets."

They say the Army and Navy are consuming so much meat that it has caused a shortage. That is obviously untrue. The members of the armed forces were eating meat prior to the war. Even if they doubled their consumption, the amount used would not affect the supply, because it would amount to only 3 percent of our meat products.

They say the American people are eating more because of improved conditions financially. Even so, it could not cause a shortage. Man's ability to consume meat is very definitely set by nature within narrow limits.

None of these explanations explain. Beef, pork, and mutton are more plentiful than ever before. Then what is the answer? Regulation. The arteries of trade are damned with governmental regulations and the regulations are prepared by bureaucrats who do not know the answer to the problems.

So much for distribution, but what of production?

Early in 1942 I told General Hershey, of Selective Service, that the draft was taking essential farm labor from the farms of the Middle West and that the result would be a reduction of necessary foods. My suggestion was ignored and our farms were stripped of needed labor. When the shortage of farm labor was finally recognized, the Government promised to take care of it by recruiting hillbillies from the mountains of Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia, plus school children from the towns and cities of America. Few of those laborers had ever milked a cow, assisted in the farrowing of a sow, or played wet-nurse in lambing time. None of them know anything about power machinery with which we do our farming. The planners of the Department of Agriculture said they intended to take these unskilled, unlearned, and inexperienced children and mountain people, give them a week's training and they would then be experienced farmers who could take the places of the men who had been drawn into the military service. No finer, more patriotic group of people exist anywhere than the American farmer. He works 18 hours a day in the crop-growing season. He does not strike for higher wages. He fights adverse weather and struggles on in spite of governmental regulations. Without him, neither the Army nor the civilian population could long exist, but we have made and are making it impossible for him to do his job. Regulated farming must be abolished. Freedom, labor, and equipment are the things he needs. Give him these three things and our food problems will be solved.

They say that such a course would bring inflation. I wonder if this word "inflation" isn't a bugaboo used to frighten the American people into submission to continued regulations. Inflation is already here and no one has been harmed. Inflation cannot be controlled by law. Price fixing and rationing will not prevent it.

Give the law of supply and demand an opportunity to solve this thing for us without an army of job holders snooping their unsavory way around the country, and I predict an ample food supply in 1944.

Turn the American farmer loose, remove the hamstringing regulations with which he has been curbed, repeal O. P. A. on all food products, protect the farmer where protection is needed, give his native American

genius an opportunity to operate, and this false shortage of food will disappear.

The President says he is going to reduce the cost of living 10 percent. To accomplish this the Office of Price Administration has issued an order to roll back the retail prices on butter, meat, and coffee by 10 percent. To compensate the processors of these commodities the O. P. A. proposes to pay to the processors a 10-percent subsidy from the United States Treasury.

The subcommittee on food of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been studying this program since it was first announced. I am convinced, as are the other members of the committee, that these subsidies cannot be justified and should be prohibited unless specifically authorized by Congress.

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce and head of the R. F. C., testified before our committee recently. He stated that this subsidy program on the three commodities named will cost the United States Government $450,000,000 a year. When asked where he would get the money to pay the subsidies, he said that he had the money in his R. F. C. funds and that he proposed to pay the subsidies upon order of the President whether the Congress approved it or not, and without the necessity of an appropriation from Congress.

Nearly everyone is opposed to this program except certain C. I. O. officials and a small inner circle in the White House. Even official Washington does not approve of the program. Secretary of Commerce Jones, while declaring that he would follow orders, stated: "If you let the law of supply and demand take its course, no subsidies are needed. The subsidy plan will reduce production instead of increasing it."

Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, also appeared before our committee. He said: "I believe that a general dependence upon a broad subsidy program as the chief instrument in holding prices in line, or in expanding production, would be dangerous and would not accomplish the things we seek."

T. G. Stitts, Chief of the Dairy and Poultry Branch of Agricultural Marketing Administration, stated: "The proposal to roll back the price of butter has had an unfortunate effect. Prices—for the producer—have gone down. There is no provision to indicate that the subsidy would be passed on to the farmer."

Meat processors, dairymen, and farmers all oppose the program. Albert Goss, national president of the Grange, testified before our committee, stating his opposition to the subsidy program thus:

"We are opposed to the use of subsidies for such purposes, because they will not work. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to post-war chaos. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the state to support its people. Subsidies lead to political control and when once used they are almost impossible to get rid of."

Under this subsidy proposal only butter makers making 1,000 pounds or more a month will receive a subsidy. Neither the small creamery nor the hundreds of thousands of farmers' wives throughout America who make a few pounds of butter a week for sale at the local store will receive a subsidy.

But what will be the effect upon producers? The retail price of butter is reduced by the order from 64 cents a pound to 41 cents a pound. The reasoning of the bureaucrats who advocate this program is that it will have no effect upon the price to the producer. Their theories are not supported by facts. The price of butter and milk products and cattle declined immediately. So that the farmer loses millions because the processor does not and will not pass on this subsidy.

The roll-back program inflicts huge damage upon meat processors, too, because no subsidy is to be paid upon meat now in their hands. The American Meat Institute estimates their loss at $25,000,000. It will not help the consumer. It will increase the black market, and can be used as a club to enforce political obedience to those in power.

I oppose this roll-back and subsidy program not only because of the huge losses to the producers, but because it is wrong in principle and is of questionable legality.

By the terms of the Price Control Act of 1942 the President, or the administrator under him, is authorized to pay subsidy for one purpose only, and that purpose is "to make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof."

There is no provision whatever in the law authorizing the President to roll back prices or to pay subsidies to processors, and instead of increasing production this roll-back actually decreased production.

Every witness appearing before our committee says the program will lower production of both dairy and meat products. Both the producer and the processor will lose, but the consumer—and that includes all of us—will lose too.

Consumers are receiving higher wages and incomes today than ever before in our history, and they can continue to pay this small additional price for butter, meat, and coffee without loss worth mentioning.

Let me explain. Under the rationing now in effect, each consumer can obtain a quarter of a pound of butter a week, or 12 pounds a year. The 5 cents additional cost to the butter consumer without a roll-back for 1 year is 65 cents; to the coffee user, 24 cents; to the meat eater, $2. The entire cost to the consumer without the roll-back will be less than 1 cent a day. Isn't it better for the consumer, then, to bear the cost instead of dipping into the Federal Treasury?

Secretary Jones says that this program will cost about $450,000,000 a year. Members of the C. I. O. testifying before our committee demanded that Congress appropriate a minimum of $2,000,000,000 a year for this program. But whatever the amount required we consumers will pay it in taxes.

The Government does not have the money. It will have to be borrowed. Borrowed money requires the payment of interest. Whether the sum is $450,000,000 or $2,000,000,000, we will have to pay interest upon it by more taxes.

And do not forget the new army of thousands of jobholders to be employed to administer and enforce the subsidy program. We then have the original cost, plus the interest charge on borrowed money, plus the cost of administration. You and I know that with the Government handling it, the cost will be from two to three times the total amount of the subsidies. And who pays the bill? The taxpayer pays it and the taxpayer is the consumer.

Ladies and gentlemen, this whole scheme of roll-back and subsidy is a cheat and a fraud upon the American people, conceived to fool the people into believing that the administration is reducing the cost of living. Are we gullible enough to stand for this fraud? I do not believe we are. The policy of bureaucrats in Washington thumbing their noses at the people and Congress is going to explode in Washington's official face one of these days, and a lot of people on the Government pay roll are going to receive the shock of their lives.

Any soldier, marine, or airman will testify, if asked, that we are fighting to destroy the planners of the world. Hitler is a planner, Mussolini is a planner. Hirohito is a planner. The daily lives of their people are planned by their respective governments. We are fighting to preserve our right to do our own planning in our own way.

It would be indeed tragic irony if the boys scattered over the seven seas come home and find that the thing they fought against has fastened itself upon America and that we, too, are the slaves of planners.

The President once said, "Were it possible to find master minds so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost Godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country. There are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history." I say in extension of the President's thought, there are still no master minds on our public horizon.

This national food conference is a historic gathering. Our action may influence or determine the future policy of America. The present philosophy of dictation by the Government must give way to individual choice if we are to survive. Have we the courage to make our position clear?

I wish I could take you to the Black Hills of South Dakota and show you the Mount Rushmore Memorial. It is called the Shrine of Democracy, but it is something more. It would, I am sure, assist us to envision the crisis we face today.

Rushmore is a granite mountain thrusting its head into the heavens of the South Dakota mountains, barren of vegetation, unchangeable and as irresistible as eternity itself. Gutzon Borglum, the great sculptor, saw beneath that granite surface something which the rest of us were unable to vision, but when he had pealed it away there lay revealed the sculptured heads of our four greatest Americans, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt.

Millions of Americans have journeyed to the Black Hills in the last few years to see that marvelous work of man. Millions more will come as the generations come and go, for this granite mountain with its sculptured faces will remain forever. It is more than a work of art. It is thrilling and inspiring. It is sublime, because it portrays us, you and me, in its deathless faces. I would like to leave with you what I see in that memorial. I see America, in all its moving, glorious history. I see the people pushing steadily across the plains and mountains of this continent on foot, on horseback, by covered wagon, building a nation, creating something more lasting, more important than sculptured stone, a nation of freemen. These men and women came with little more than their bare hands into a savage wilderness. They conquered that wilderness, not by governmental directives, not by planned economy, not by dreamers of today's more abundant life, but with the sinew and brawn of their own hands, of their own bodies, and the determination of their own stout hearts. With a vision of personal independence in their eyes, they built churches, schools, towns, and highways as they moved westward, building America. That is what I would like to have you see in the sculptured faces on Mount Rushmore, because they are America. It is for that our sons are fighting in every country in the world, that they can come back to a land of opportunity, free from the planners and schemers of Washington.

Address by Hon. Jesse H. Jones at Back the Attack, United States Army War Bond Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at Back the Attack, the United States Army War Bond Show, at Washington, D. C., on September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The entire personnel of the Department of Commerce considers it a privilege to Back the Attack with all their might and main.

Fifteen billion dollars is a lot of money, but there is no safer investment than the bonds of your Government. Furthermore, these bonds will come in mighty handy when the war is over, and we are looking for peace-time jobs.

We have sent, and are sending, soldiers, sailors, and marines to the remote places of the world.

They are fighting and living under every imaginable hardship and hazard—in swampy fox holes, arid deserts, and amid ice and snow. They are meeting the enemy in the air, on the sea, and under the sea.

Many of them are giving their lives. Many more will come back maimed for life.

They must have food, and clothing, and medical attention. They must have supplies, and equipment, with which to fight.

Our job is to see that they have all of these when they need them, where they need them. This is the very least we can do, and that can be accomplished only by our working to the limit of our endurance, each and every one of us, and by buying bonds to the last penny we can spare.

We are fortunate to have with us tonight five young airmen who have just returned from an amazing tour of duty in the Mediterranean area. They have been hitting the enemy from Rumania to Tunisia, over Italy and Sicily. These five airmen are strictly civilian products. They are graduates of the Civil Aeronautics Civilian Pilot Training schools of whom there were 65,000 even before Pearl Harbor. They are:

Capt. Royden L. Lebrecht, pilot of the Squaw, who received his elementary training at North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Tex.;

Capt. Ralph M. Lower, pilot of the Warrior, who received his elementary training at Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.;

Lt. Clarence O. Seaman, copilot of the Warrior, who received all of his training at Fresno State College, Fresno, Calif.;

Lt. Clinton H. Killian, copilot of the Squaw, who received his elementary training at Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah;

Lt. Albert J. Mickish, bombardier of the Squaw, who received his elementary training at Oklahoma A. & M., Stillwater, Okla.

America's Inner Fortress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James P. Pope, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Rotary Club of Mobile, Ala., on August 26, 1943. The address is captioned "America's inner fortress."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If one may conceive of the defense of the continental United States as an outer fortress and an inner fortress, then Mobile would form one of the most important links in the chain which constitutes the outer fortress of the country. Its natural location, near the head of Mobile Bay, 30 miles from the Gulf, attracted the attention of the earliest settlers on the Gulf coast. Fort Lewis was built immediately after the settlement of Mobile in 1669, and Fort Conde was built some years later. Mobile became the capital of the French continental empire, which covered almost the entire Mississippi Valley. It played a major part in the early development of this part of the country.

During the War Between the States, Fort Morgan and Fort Gaines formed a mighty defense of the Confederate States until they fell in the latter part of 1864. The port of Mobile was certainly one of the most important in the South during that crisis.

Today Mobile is a tower of strength in the defense of the whole country. Its great shipbuilding plants are launching cargo and combat vessels at a rapid rate. Its Brookley Field is one of the largest southeastern air depots of the Army Air Corps. To a landlubber like me, the port of Mobile is a marvel of size and activity. Its 2 miles of concrete wharves, its 35 acres of shipside sheds, its network of State-owned railroads connecting with all the main lines, and its ability to accommodate 22 ocean ships at one time, make an impressive sight. And it is backed up by countless machine shops, foundries, lumber and textile mills, and a rich farming country. Its open gates to the seven seas, serving 42 American and foreign steamship lines, give it a world-wide importance.

There is an interesting and important connection between Mobile and the Tennessee Valley area. The Aluminum Ore Co.'s alumina plant at Mobile is the largest in the Nation converting South American bauxite, and the Alcoa plant in Tennessee is the largest aluminum reduction and rolling plant in the country. These plants are vital parts of the process of the Aluminum Co. of America in the production of the metal for airplanes. One cannot imagine America playing her full part in this great war crisis without the production of these plants.

With respect to the utilization of another vital resource for war purposes, another link between Mobile and the Tennessee Valley is being forged and an appropriation made by Congress for carrying it out. I refer to the proposed plant for the production of phosphorus for munitions and for the land for food during the war. This plant would be integrated with those in the Tennessee Valley and operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Congress has already appropriated money for the plant, the site has been purchased and the plant designed, but its construction is being deferred by the War Production Board. T. V. A. believes this plant ought to be constructed and put into operation for the production of munitions, if necessary, and for additional agricultural production in any event. It is our hope that construction of this plant may go forward at an early date.

My purpose today is to discuss the Tennessee Valley region—a region which I choose to call the inner fortress of the country.

This region has great natural advantages in location of war plants and in the production of implements of war. It lies about 500 miles from the Atlantic seaboard and about the same distance from the Gulf Coast. It is protected on the east by the Appalachian Mountains, some of the peaks being about 6,000 feet high. In colonial days these mountains formed an almost impassable barrier to the westward expansion of the English colonies. They are made up of a bewildering multiplicity of successive ridges, with the passes through them tortuous and rough. The rivers west of these mountains flow in a southwesterly direction, which has determined the course of water and railway transportation throughout the region.

This large area, extending from western Virginia into the northern parts of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, has a great variety and richness of natural resources. It has millions of acres of good farm lands, extensive timber resources, and considerable amounts of iron ore, copper, zinc, and other essential minerals and metals. It has enormous quantities of coal and water power. Altogether, it has a list of strategic, critical, and essential war minerals which is much too long to enumerate. Among them are substantial bodies of manganese, mica, tungsten, kaolin, and olivine (for magnesium). And in addition to these, there is an almost inexhaustible amount of alumina-bearing clay.

Because of these natural advantages of location and resources, the War Department selected nine sites for munitions factories during the First World War, eight of which were in the Tennessee Valley and the ninth not far away. Since then the Tennessee River development by T. V. A. has provided a supply of low-priced electricity for the region—a supply which is second to no other in the United States.

It is well known to you, of course, that during World War No. 1 the wartime project for the manufacture of explosives was begun at Muscle Shoals. The Wilson Dam, greatest single producer of power of the Tennessee Valley system, was begun during the war and completed afterward. Two large ammonium nitrate plants were constructed. This was the beginning of the Tennessee River development which has been carried on during the last 10 years by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since 1933, when Congress created the Tennessee Valley Authority, 14 huge dams have been built and put into operation, in addition to Wilson Dam; 2 others (Kentucky and Fontana) are now under construction; 3 others have been authorized; and 6 dams have been acquired from private concerns. One large steam plant has been built and is in operation, and 4 others have been acquired. This construction program is greater than that of the Panama Canal, and is equal to about 8 Boulder Dams. To compare it with one of the 7 ancient wonders of the world, the pyramids, the Tennessee River dams have 50 percent more cubic yardage in

them than all the pyramids of Egypt, which took 1,750 years to build. The Kentucky Dam alone is a third larger than the Great Pyramid of Cheops, upon which 100,000 Egyptians worked 30 years. There is no other river in the world so extensively developed as the Tennessee.

For obvious reasons, I cannot detail to you the extent of the war production that is now going on in this region. I can only say that there is a network of very important war industries in the region. There are vast aluminum plants, powder plants, ordnance works, aircraft factories, chemical warfare arsenals, copper works, ferromanganese plants, shell-loading plants, ammonia and ammonium nitrate plants, and plants for war goods of many other kinds. In the field of electric power where all this industry is served, T. V. A. is supplying about three-fourths of its entire output for war purposes. This agency is furnishing more electric power for war purposes than any other in the United States.

So far I have mentioned only the natural advantages of location and resources in the region, the war production which is going on, and the part that T. V. A. electric power is playing in this production. This is only a part—it may be a minor part—of the war potentialities of this region. There is located at Muscle Shoals, Ala., one of the largest chemical laboratories in the country, operated by T. V. A., and there are working arrangements between T. V. A. and the research laboratories of the various universities and colleges in the area. Experiments with the natural resources of the region are now under way, and they have vast possibilities. As an example, the Walthall process for extracting alumina from clay is now proven and ready for production when more aluminum is needed.

This process means, in the opinion of experts in this field, that the United States could have an ample native supply of aluminum in the days to come, extracted from the clays of the Tennessee Valley area. The amount of this clay appears to be practically inexhaustible. In the future, if for any reason the supply of bauxite from South America or from any other country should be shut off, the needs of the United States for this vital metal can be amply supplied.

Almost the same can be said of the process that is now under development at the Muscle Shoals laboratory for the production of magnesium from a mineral known as olivine. This mineral can be found in great quantities in western North Carolina and perhaps in other parts of the country. Magnesium is a metal which before the war had never been produced in large quantities in this country. We have always depended upon imports of the metal from other countries. The process is now far along toward completion, and our research experts are quite well convinced that it will be successful. Magnesium, as you know, is a metal much lighter than aluminum, and is being widely used now in airplane construction. The development of this process will also be a long step towards strengthening the inner defenses of the country.

And the amazing advances in the development and use of plastics are going on in this region as they are, of course, in other parts of the country. The story of plastics is one of the most thrilling in the whole history of scientific research. What the technicians are doing sounds like magic. They are taking from coal, air, and water, and some other natural resources, the materials for a host of most remarkable articles, including synthetic rubber. Actually they are tearing apart these raw materials and putting them together again into new and useful things. They are even breaking apart the molecules in waste timber and putting them together again in products of the strength of steel and aluminum. I sometimes think that we are to have a plastic age comparable to the stone and iron ages of the past. Most of the materials for these plastics are to be found in the Tennessee Valley region, and our technicians are at work upon them.

In another respect an important step has been taken in the advancement of electrochemical industries; that is, the development and use of the electric furnace. This development has grown out of the availability of electricity at a low price. Electric furnaces are now being used by the T. V. A. and by a number of the large industries in the Valley area. As an illustration of what it means to electro-chemical industries, a difference of one mill per kilowatt-hour in the cost of power in the production of aluminum is the equivalent of the cost of 1 cent per pound. The same advantages in different degrees exist in the production of phosphorus, calcium carbide, ferroalloys, and other things. The use of the electric furnace in the Tennessee Valley area has added much to the strength and efficiency of the industries of the region.

Back of all this advanced development of resources for the making of implements and munitions of war is the widespread progress that is being made in the conservation of the land and in the production of agricultural and forest products. More than 150,000,000 trees from T. V. A. nurseries have been set out in this region. Protection of the forests from fire and from destructive methods of cutting is now going on in an effective way by the States in cooperation with the T. V. A. Studies of these resources and of the best ways to utilize them are being made. The increased and effective use of wood in war production is one of the surprising developments in this war.

With reference to the land, which is the source of nearly everything by which men live, a widespread program of conservation and better use is being carried on in the Tennessee Valley and in some other parts of the country. This is the farm demonstration program of the T. V. A. and the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in cooperation with other Federal and State agencies. The use of phosphorus is the basis of this widespread development. Large amounts of phosphorus are being produced at Muscle Shoals with the electric furnaces. Much of it is being used by the War Department in the form of elemental phosphorus. Another substantial part of it is converted into phosphatic fertilizer, most of which is being shipped to Great Britain for use there in the production of food crops. The rest is being used for demonstration purposes in the Tennessee Valley area and in other States.

Around this product have been set up some 26,000 demonstration farms in the Valley and many other thousands elsewhere in the United States. Around these demonstration farms there are hundreds of thousands of farmers who are following the methods of conservation and production used on the demonstration farms. As a result of this, the volume of production has been stepped up, and the evidences of conservation and increased fertility of the soil are sources of great satisfaction to those who are familiar with this work. Since food and fiber are essential weapons of war, this backlog of solid achievement adds strength to the inner defenses of the country.

Related to this matter of food and fiber production on the farms and in the forests is the taking of fish from the great inland lakes of the United States, created along the Tennessee River and its tributaries by the building of the huge dams. In 1942 something like 6,000,000 pounds of fish were taken from these lakes for food, and it is estimated that the lakes are capable of a yield of at least 35,000,000 pounds of edible fish annually. This is no mean contribution in these war days of meat shortage. Local fishermen last year caught about 700,000 pounds of spoonbill sturgeon in Wheeler and Wilson Reservoirs, realizing an income in excess of $50,000. In the month of May 1943, four fish dealers handled more than 80,000 pounds of spoonbill, catfish, carp, and buffalo caught from Wheeler, Wilson, and Pickwick Reservoirs, which meant to them an additional income of about $15,000.

The strength of a nation at war depends not alone upon the number of its fighting men and the abundance of its natural resources. It depends not alone upon these things plus the ability to convert them into a powerful war machine. Its strength depends quite as much upon the solid foundation of a strong and well-balanced economic system under which there is a fair degree of prosperity and contentment among the people. This makes for a united nation. The existence of an economic and political system under which all industrious people may live well, and in which they may all play an active part in an atmosphere of freedom, is of the very essence of strength in war as in peace.

Recognizing this, it has been and is the purpose of T. V. A., in the development of the resources of the Tennessee Valley, to work toward the building of a sound economic structure that will contribute to the welfare of all the people of the region and the Nation. It has done this in a democratic way. It has worked toward a balance of agriculture and industry in the region.

The Tennessee Valley area is suitable both for agriculture and for industry. Since the beginning, however, it has been predominantly agricultural. Most of its people have always lived by farming and by extraction of raw materials from the earth. It has a serious deficiency in manufacturing industries. Like the rest of the Southeastern States, it ships out a large balance of raw materials and ships in a large balance of manufactured goods. While in the United States as a whole, manufacture has contributed $188 to the average per capita income of $579, in the Southeastern States manufacture has contributed only $96 to the per capita income. If there were a balance of agriculture and industry in this section of the country, there would be an additional income from manufacture of something like 2½ billion dollars a year, with an additional capital investment of about 10 billion dollars.

This is the great problem of the South, including the Tennessee Valley area. Such a balance would greatly strengthen this region and enable it to contribute more to the general welfare of the country, both in time of war and of peace.

It is the purpose of T. V. A. to make the greatest possible contribution to this end, but in achieving it, something more is necessary than a balance of dollars or of employment statistics. The development of agriculture and industry should go hand in hand. Industry in this region should, so far as possible, process and distribute the products of our farms, our mines, and our streams. It should include the building of sound, cooperative industrial units around products indigenous to the region. It should follow a policy and practice of all-time or part-time employment of members of farm families within convenient distance of the plants, to supplement the low income of these families.

T. V. A. conceives of an agricultural-industrial balance in the Tennessee Valley region, not brought about by uprooting established industries in any other section, not by the centralization of large industries unrelated to the resources of the area. It conceives of a balance that will rest upon the foundation of

a sturdy people serving one another in the growing and processing and distributing in plenty the goods that men live by.

With such an economic background, where there would be freedom of enterprise, cooperation among all occupational groups in a democratic way, and a decent standard of living for all industrious people, there would be the firmest sort of foundation for the defense of the country. Upon such a foundation, with the natural advantages of location, the abundance and variety of highly developed natural resources, and a network of major war industries available for the Nation's defense, there would be in the Tennessee Valley area an American inner fortress of enduring strength.

The Mackinac Island Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, last week a number of editorials and clippings were placed in the RECORD dealing with the historic and momentous Republican conference at Mackinac Island, Mich. Lest we forget, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New Republic entitled "Republicans and Post-War Policy," and an editorial from The Nation beginning with the words "A momentous step was taken by the Republican Party's post-war advisory council at Mackinac Island last week."

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, in the same connection, two articles from the Times-Herald, being dispatches from the front during the conference at Mackinac Island, written by John O'Donnell, one under date of September 6, and the other under date of September 7, published in his famous column "Capitol Stuff." In this connection I want to say that both these articles are "capital" stuff.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic of September 13, 1943]

REPUBLICANS AND POST-WAR POLICY

There is one point to remember, in looking at the Mackinac Island conference of the Republicans on post-war policy. The Republicans have a bad record in regard to unfulfilled promises as to what they would do for international cooperation if they were given the responsibility for the Government. In 1920 a large majority of all Americans were in favor of joining the League of Nations and working to keep the peace. Newspaper polls, the only equivalent that then existed for the present tests of public opinion, showed a majority of about 3 to 1 for the League throughout the country. Even in the United States Senate, the League never had less than a majority, although its opponents were able to block the necessary two-thirds.

In this juncture, a committee of the most distinguished Republican elder statesmen issued a joint declaration. They promised that the Republicans would support international cooperation if they were elected to office. Their Presidential candidate, W. G. Harding, supported the same idea. But once the election was over, these promises were forgotten. The Republicans will have a hard time giving the country an effective guaranty that this will not happen again.

[From the Nation of September 18, 1943]

A momentous step was taken by the Republican Party's post-war advisory council at Mackinac Island last week, and we wish we knew what it was. It had to do with foreign policy, and we have the solemn editorial assurance of the most influential papers that it marked a turning point in the history of the party, which with this remarkable achievement is said to have come of age, to have awakened to its national responsibility, and to have pointed the way to a bright future for all the world. After seven readings of the unanimously adopted report the only achievement we can detect is the council's astonishing success in equivocating at a moment when decisiveness at last seemed inescapable. The delegates voted for "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations." But they hastily added that in the event of a conflict between national interests and international obligations, we must adhere to our own Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. Force in international affairs was condemned and a proposal made for the "attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation * * *." But since no sacrifice of sovereignty was countenanced, we can't imagine what the council would use in place of collective force should some sovereign power fail to reciprocate sufficiently or relax in its appreciation of the spirit. Delegates of the most conflicting views came away from Mackinac rejoicing over the party's escape from a crippling internal row. "But what good came of it at last?' quoth little Peterkin. 'Why that I cannot tell,' said he: 'But 'twas a famous victory.'"

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 7, 1943]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

MACKINAC ISLAND, MICH., September 6.—If we, God forbid, were Franklin Delano Roosevelt tomorrow morning, we'd be sitting up in our White House bed howling with glee over the breakfast coffee and summoning our bedside companion to share our good news from a political battle front.

From a New Deal standpoint, the latest 1944 campaign news couldn't be better. So far as the New Deal's distinguished foemen of the Republican Party, now gathered at this vacation resort, are concerned, the basic strategy for a G. O. P. victory in 1944 is this: Everything that F. D. R. has done about the war—its origin, its prosecution, its post-war developments—must not be attacked.

They decided to string along with the White House and the White House spokesman.

But everything Roosevelt has done on the domestic front is all wrong. They hope to win by a violent thrust at this sector. And, strangely enough, the G. O. P. is now going all-out in a national campaign to recover State rights, that political child of Jeffersonian democracy which they claim has been kicked out by the New Deal.

The Republican spokesmen at Mackinac, who today went into what they call their shirt-sleeve session in this swanky resort, are sounding a refrain with a Calvin Coolidge touch: "I do not choose to run against the war."

The decision at this writing—but some of the hard-boiled Senators like TAFT, of Ohio, and VANDENBERG, of Michigan, may change it—is: "Our only chance to beat the New Deal is to win on the domestic front."

The boys today talked of the errors of rationing, Government stupidity in the Capitol, but much of it smacked of Alf Landon and the 1936 campaign. As a matter of fact, the orchestra at the Grand Hotel, wherein the Republican Senators, Governors, Congressmen, and party big shots are quartered, struck up Oh, Susanna, Here I Come, a tune which brought a grimace of sour memory as they recalled this Republican campaign song which sounded forth in the days of Roosevelt's greatest of victories.

The important interfamily fight among the G. O. P. group here is being staged by the Republican Governors against the G. O. P. Members of Congress.

The prize at stake is control of the delegates to the national convention.

There are 24 G. O. P. Governors in the Nation, and 19 of them are on this Mackinac scene. The politically lusty Governors are feeling their oats, kicking up their heels, and vigorously pointing out that they are the real symbol of the anti-Roosevelt revolt and represent the sentiments of the voters back home better than the old war horses of Senate and House, who have controlled national conventions in the past.

The Governors' plea is that they are closer to the voters back home. They also point out, rather maliciously, that back before Pearl Harbor they have never made isolationist or noninterventionist commitments or speeches, and proudly point out that they cannot be attacked on the record.

Now, four of these Republican Governors on the scene are potential candidates for the Presidential nomination. These are Dewey, of New York; Bricker, of Ohio; Green, of Illinois; and Warren, of California. Here they are, sparkling, incisive in their observations, each shooting for his particular target in the national spotlight, each modestly side-stepping any definite declaration that he is a forthright candidate for the post.

To a man, this gubernatorial quartet is insisting that Roosevelt must and can be beaten on the domestic front—and then each one of them goes into his own particular song and dance about post-war relations, and the linking of this Nation with the war-or-peace future of our present allies.

California's Earl Warren summed up the joint beliefs of the potential Presidential candidates when he said bluntly—but a bit wistfully:

"The Republicans can and will win in 1944 if the international situation can be divorced from the campaign. The international situation should not be a campaign issue. I'd like to see both parties come to the same conclusion and I hope neither party will use the international situation to tear the country apart."

But each one knows in his heart that Roosevelt will go before the Nation as a war hero and will fight for his fourth term on a front which none of them dares to attack.

Meanwhile, the candidates and the master minds of platform architecture are juggling words, twisting meanings, in order to evolve some tortured phrases which will express sentiments over which neither the "nationalists" nor the "internationalists" among the anti-Roosevelt voters can fight.

Keyword of the platform architecture in the foreign relations plank is "sovereignty." None of the boys, and particularly none of the Presidential candidates, wants to go on the record and proclaim that he is willing

to surrender the sovereignty of the United States of America.

But none of them seems to know exactly what the word "sovereignty" means. All shy away from the idea that any alliance or post-war pact which they propose for the Nation will give a majority of foreigners the right to vote United States into a war against our will.

The two Governors from the seaboard States—Dewey, of New York, and Warren, of California—go farthest in their willingness to back post-war commitments. The Governor from New York and the Governor from the Pacific coast are for straight out-and-out military alliance with Great Britain, and frankly say so.

The term "military alliance" arouses the deep-seated anger of Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Policy Committee here, and spurs TAFT, of Ohio, into opposition.

So far as extending the post-war military alliance to Russia and China is concerned, both Dewey and Warren suggest: Let time take care of this, and let us decide after the war is over.

Both Dewey and Warren frankly agree that the military alliance they propose means that we fight if any of our allies are attacked.

Tall, impressive Governor Bricker, of Ohio, whose Presidential candidacy has got its second wind and who is making a definite impression and a favorable one on the Republican bigwigs here, also wants a post-war agreement between the United States and its present allies. He, too, uses the word "fight."

Bricker does not like the phrase "military alliance" in its ordinary diplomatic meaning, but Bricker will support, as he told this correspondent today, "an agreement, understanding, pact, union, anything you want to call it except military alliance, which will bind the United States to our present allies after the war is over so that they will function jointly to control commerce, trade, and all those other sources of possible friction which may lead to war.

"The function of this group, of which the United States will be a member, is to preserve peace," Bricker said. Significantly, he added, "we may have to fight to preserve this peace."

Gov. Dwight Green, of Illinois, another possible Presidential candidate, was farthest away from post-war military alliances. Brushing aside the frank "military alliance" endorsed by Governors Dewey and Warren, as well as the post-war "agreement or pact" proposal of Bricker, Green suggested "correlation between the United States and other nations and their peoples."

"What we need around here are more diplomatic dictionaries," complained the exasperated newspapermen.

The towering, smiling Governor Warren, of California, tossed out the observation, "You don't need dictionaries; you need a crystal ball to read what's going on in some of the minds around here."

Governor Green came through with his definition of his new term: "I have deliberately chosen the word 'correlation' because its literal definition means the establishment of mutual or reciprocal relationships. In an even broader sense, it means the common consent of all those who participate."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 8, 1943]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

MACKINAC ISLAND, MICH., September 7.—A very tiny Republican mouse, a timorous mouse in cold fact, and not at all in shape to challenge the Roosevelt lion for White House ownership, was born today after the mountainous 48-hour labors of the G. O. P. post-war advisory council.

The big-shot Republicans came here to map a political battle strategy for the guidance of their national convention which will write a platform and name a candidate with the simple objective of ending the Roosevelt dynasty.

They have wound up the expensive session at this vacation resort hip deep in words, snarled in the barbed wire of tricky verbiage and a bit bewildered as to "why the hell" they came here anyway.

Original plan, of course, was to tear the liver and lights out of their No. 1 political enemy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But the whole show moved swiftly into a land of political make-believe when the boys decided that the war and Franklin Roosevelt's connection with its origin, conduct, and results, was not a proper topic to bring before the voters of the Nation.

And so today, in its final session, this council of the G. O. P. adopted a resolution designed to tell the Nation what the Republican Party thought about the part the United States should play in a post-war world.

The resolution was fathered by pre-Pearl Harbor isolationist Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan. It received the enthusiastic support of violent internationalist Senator WARREN AUSTIN, of Vermont. It gave a senatorial kick in the pants to the gubernatorial trousers of New York's Governor Dewey, who arrived on the peaceful scene bellowing for immediate all-out G. O. P. adoption of the foreign relations views of internationalist Walter Lippmann, with, above everything else, post-war military alliance with Great Britain.

The resolution was so carefully hedged about with qualifications that both hard-boiled isolationists and ardent internationalists clapped hands and chanted "that's what I wanted all the time." And the reason for this was that all the quarreling members of the G. O. P. could interpret the words just the way they wanted. It was something out of Alice in Wonderland.

The gist of the G. O. P. declaration on post-war foreign policy is this:

"One. Prosecution of the war by the United Nations to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including (A) disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

"(B) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

"(C) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home;

"Two. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

The key words in this resolution are the commitment of the United States to "cooperative organization among sovereign nations."

This pleased its Papa VANDENBERG because it means to him that the United States will preserve its "sovereign rights" (the worthies haven't been able to agree on what that means) and more importantly will be able, in the Senator's words, "to have its freedom of action at all times, its entry into any future war to be decided only by the American people."

And it also pleased Senator VANDENBERG because it didn't follow the course suggested by Governor Dewey, of New York, and Governor Warren, of California, that we leap pronto into a permanent military alliance which would pledge us to go to war by the side of Great Britain any time London went on the march anyway at any time.

But neither Governor Dewey nor Governor Warren objected to it and neither did that other Presidential candidate, Governor Bricker, of Ohio.

The Republican Governors, of course, had been getting under the hide of the Senators and Congressmen by this time. There are 24 Republican Governors in the Nation and 18 of them are on the scene, and every manjack of them thinks that the Presidential lightning may strike him at the next convention. (And there is the snide rumor from the anti-Willkie forces that Wendell has already promised 12 of the Governors his Vice Presidential backing if they will get behind him for the No. 1 spot on the ticket.)

The beauty of it is, you can interpret the resolution to support anything you happen to be for, complacently observed one Republican Congressman as he came sweating from the council room.

"As an American firster, I am satisfied with it," proclaimed Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, long and bitter foe of the Roosevelt dynasty.

Willkie apostles, Governors Baldwin, of Connecticut, and Maine's dapperly mustached Sewall, came out for the Vandenberg resolution. Speaking for the two, Governor Baldwin declared:

"I understand the phrase 'cooperative organization' to mean that the Republican Party looks forward in the post-war world to some form of international organization, call it what you will, joining the United States with other sovereign nations, for the establishment and perpetuation of peace.

"I raised some question about the phrase 'organized justice.' After questions, I understand that the phrase means that the Republican Party, in its foreign policy, is committed in the future to some form of world court or call it what you will, that will be established by sovereign nations to decide disputes among nations in the interest of peace."

Only 12 hours earlier, Governors Baldwin, Sewall, and Wills, of Vermont, had roared forth a declaration which smacked suspiciously of Willkie, that this council must go on record as favoring "a council of nations, a world court, and enforcement of decisions by such court by the collaboration of the military, naval and air power of the nations of the world."

Ohio's Senator TAFT, the only Republican who has publicly denounced the White House thesis that we are fighting for Roosevelt's personal "four freedoms" or the Atlantic Charter, said that he was satisfied with the post-war resolution.

TAFT, like VANDENBERG, wished to go farther and make specific in plain, simple words, a declaration that the Republican Party will oppose any foreign entanglements which would commit this Nation to a war by the action of foreigners over whom we have no control. But such vigor would have aroused the anger of the internationalists. Hence the mealy mouthed compromise.

Before the resolution was formally adopted by the full council, Maine's internationalist, Governor Sewall, said he was going along only because he had assurance from VANDENBERG that the resolution left the door open for the United States to yield some of its sovereignty in a post-war world organization.

This drew the quick comeback from VANDENBERG that the very fact of sovereignty "includes the right to part with any portion of it. That in itself is an act of sovereignty," VANDENBERG declared.

By that time the members were thoroughly befuddled, so the resolution passed and the worthy gentlemen adjourned to the cocktail

lounge to argue their personal definitions of the word sovereignty.

The Republican Governors tested their strength and won in a sharp conflict with the G. O. P. ancients from Capitol Hill in the battle over the resolution on domestic front policy.

Senator TAFT had a resolution already written but it was promptly kicked around when brought to the floor and, much to the surprise of all, including the insurgents who were testing out the strength of the old-line organization, they bulled through a motion that it be rewritten.

It was New York's Dewey who pointed out that the resolution lacked force and exactness—which it certainly did.

As finally adopted, the G. O. P. domestic program, proposed as a substitute for present White House policy, calls for immediate increase in food production, directed by a single agency, clothed with full power over food in all of its aspects during the war emergency.

Farm provisions of the resolution—these were drawn up by two important newcomers to the G. O. P. national organization—Governors Hickenlooper, of Iowa, and Griswold, of Nebraska—sharply condemned the Roosevelt administration.

They damned the Roosevelt policies on farm manpower, restrictions on manufacture of farm machinery, and "inexpert price regulation." These, they declared, were keeping food from the domestic market baskets of the Nation.

Normal channels of trade, said the final course, have been disrupted by "bungling regulations" of the Federal Government.

The G. O. P. also went down the line for State rights, a political issue once considered the exclusive property of the Democratic party. Then it hit at the White House with these election-year resolutions which:

Threatened the United States with "fascism" if the New Deal policies with respect to the ever-increasing bureaucratic power in Washington were continued

Denounced "the political effort to reduce United States labor to the European level of a class-conscious, vote-shackled proletariat."

Promised "fair and equitable labor laws."

Promised "elimination of all unnecessary regulation of the individual and of business."

Accused the Roosevelt administration of aiming at complete socialization of "business, agriculture, and the professions."

Beautiful Isle of Cuba Is Pearl of the Antilles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article published in the Michigan State Digest, Lansing, Mich., under date of September 9, 1943, written by Ed A. Nowack, entitled "Beautiful Isle of Cuba Is Pearl of the Antilles."

Let me call your attention to the fact that Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, in paying tribute to this island, says "Cuba is one of the rarest flowers in the global garden."

The article, written by Mr. Nowack, follows:

INSIDE VIEW OF THE ISLAND REPUBLIC'S POLITICAL LIFE—PRESIDENT FULGENCIO BATISTA OF CUBA, AND THE 1944 NATIONAL ELECTION, CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF REVEALED FACTS—TWO MILLIONS OF QUALIFIED VOTERS

(By Ed A. Nowack)

HAVANA, CUBA, September 9.—Upon different occasions recently, President Fulgencio Batista, of Cuba, has reiterated that he would not consider being a candidate to succeed himself in 1944, when Cuba's second presidential election under the new 1940 constitution will take place. To many persons that statement may have sounded like a bid for nomination, or an entirely unnecessary statement of an obvious fact, since Cuba's new 1940 constitution expressly makes a president ineligible for another term until 4 years after he has ceased to be president. As a matter of fact it was neither a bid for another term nor an unnecessary statement of the obvious. In a world in which the heads of states still permit interested parties around them to convince them that their countries have no other citizens honest enough, strong enough, patriotic enough, or able enough to take over the effective running of the affairs of the nation, but especially in the Spanish-American countries where constitutions are discarded or revamped at will to permit whatever the leaders may want to do, President Batista's reassurances to his people are necessary to keep them convinced that he is not going to use his immense political power to overrun the small fraction of the voting strength still opposed to him in each house of the congress and among Cuba's 2,000,000 qualified voters.

Among observers of local politics in Cuba and abroad will be found those who say Señor Batista is one smooth cucumber, shrewd as sin, and resourceful as Satan. There are other observers who insist that President Fulgencio Batista, for all that, and brushing aside any human desire to maintain himself as head of state, cannot and will not forget the principles for which he fought in 1933, which resulted in the overthrow of dead ex-President Gerardo Machado.

Among those principles the former army sergeant had written the belief that Cubans should be assured of their right to select their leaders by popular vote at regular intervals. Those who really know President Batista, and appreciate his unswerving belief in those principles, will tell you that next year's elections here in Cuba will produce a new president, selected by popular vote. All the power Batista has acquired while president, power which easily could enable him to work his will in any election, will not be exercised for purposes of perpetuating himself in office, his intimates declare.

REVIEW OF ELECTION FIGURES DISCLOSES BATISTA'S POWER

A review of the 1940 presidential election figures and of the coalitions that followed are interesting for they prove that President Batista actually is in control of the politics in Cuba.

In the 1940 elections the coalition which elected Batista polled more than 800,000 votes against a bare 500,000 for all opposing candidates. In that election, however, the opposition got a large part of its votes from the Liberal Party wing known as Accion Republicana following deposed President Dr. Miguel Mariano Gomez out of loyalty to his father, General and former President Jose Miguel Gomez. This group has gone back into the old Liberal Party and its strongest leader is now Prime Minister of Cuba under Batista.

A large part of the A. B. C. Party has also gone back into the old parties allied with Batista, and the same is true of a considerable part of the former followers of ex-President Ramon Grau San Martin's "Autentico," or Cuban Revolutionary party politicians and their followings.

The reconsolidated Democratic and Liberal Parties have extended their control as members of a coalition in power until they now represent, between them, at least 75 percent of the voting strength of Cuba, having absorbed most of the smaller factional groups.

The Grau party, which mustered nearly 300,000 votes of its own in the 1940 elections, only important opposition force still actively opposed to Batista, is believed to have a faithful nucleus of far less than 200,000 votes left.

The A. B. C. Party, never able to count on more than about 4 percent of the voters, which normally number around 1,400,000 out of a total population of a little over 4,000,000, decided a few months ago to give its cooperation to the government coalition majority in all matters of importance to Cuba's participation in the war efforts of the United Nations. This left the Grau party alone as the only real opposition group.

President Batista's very recent appointment of Dr. Joaquim Martinez Saenz, strongest figure of the A. B. C., as Minister of Agriculture, and of Dr. Emerterio Santovenia, another outstanding A. B. C. leader, as Minister of State, emphasizes the isolation of the diminished Grau forces as the sole remaining opposition group.

With such a consolidation of political power in the hands of President Batista and his friends and allies, and with the opposition reduced to less than 10 percent of the qualified voters, it is clear that the Batista forces are able to do as they please or as he may choose.

Batista is himself the most determined supporter of the present constitution to be found in Cuba, especially as it might affect his own political future, in spite of the fact that it was framed by his own enemies who had, with Menocal and Grau support, a majority in the 1940 constitutional assembly, his own coalition being only in a formative stage then.

The constitution resulting is one of the longest, wordiest, and windiest charters ever adopted by any nation, nailing down as binding articles many pieces of highly controversial legislative precept not properly material for a nation's basic charter. Much of this was aimed at hamstringing Batista's government, the opposition having become almost certain it would not be able to defeat him for the presidency a few months later.

GUARD RIGHTS OF MINORITY

One such article provides that the minimum pay of a school teacher shall be one one-millionth of the annual national budget for a month's pay, all special tax funds to be incorporated in the national budget. The same opposition which proposed and put over this article has consistently blocked every effort to vote a budget to comply with such constitutional requirements, during more than 2 years, forcing the president to extend the budget of 5 years ago by 3-month decrees. The government has faithfully prepared its budget recommendations each year and submitted them to the congress within the time set by the constitution, but the opposition has tied the hands of congress by parliamentary tactics amounting to a filibuster.

Batista being unwilling to let the majority leaders use their overwhelming majorities in each house to override the minority, or use any sort of cloture or gag rule, the smallest group can make any important legislation impossible within a time limit set by the constitution, as in this matter it is.

Now in the second half of his tenth year as the virtual and responsible head of Cuba's destinies, although six other men occupied the presidency, provisionally or by election, between the 4th of September of 1933 when he took command of a chaotic national situation and started straightening it out, and the 10th of October 1940, when he was inaugurated as first president under the new constitution which went into effect on the same date, Batista has come a long, hard road, speaking softly but always ready to act decisively in any real emergency where reason might fail to achieve the required ends without more forceful action.

STANDS WITH THE ALLIES

Also he is now entering the last half of his third year as president under a semiparliamentary form of government. His prompt action in declaring Cuba's stand against Japan, Germany, and Italy the same day the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, calling Congress into immediate session to declare war, was wholeheartedly backed by the Congress and people of Cuba.

His insistence on the sale of Cuba's whole sugar crop to a United States Government agency at a price then clearly very low and now seen to be ridiculously so in comparison with the prices to which all the goods Cuba has to buy in the United States have been permitted to climb, was accepted less wholeheartedly but quite generally for what it was; an act of good faith and a testimony of Cuba's will to do her part loyally as one of the first to sign the Atlantic Charter, avoiding any possibility of suspicion as a profiteering member of the United Nations.

That insistence was also based on definite assurances of adequate shipping and supplies from the United States at controlled prices—a reciprocity Cuba has been far from getting.

Realizing that a changing situation as to essential war logistics and the basic impossibility of preventing rises in the prices of goods and supplies were chiefly responsible for the failure of Cuba to receive such reciprocal treatment as was promised and expected, Batista's government—and Cubans as a whole—have swallowed their disappointment and suffered their discomforts like loyal friends and allies.

They have had to taste the bitterness of seeing thousands of tons of foodstuffs rotting in their fields after they had spent their labor and money to produce it on the assurance that it was needed to help win the war, all for a lack of a little bit of transportation to move it even the 90 miles across the Straits of Florida or because they could not get storage or dehydration facilities to save it.

CUBAN WORKERS HELP UNITED STATES

Cuba has offered thousands of skilled and unskilled workers to the farms and industries of the United States, and other thousands of willing volunteers for military service with the United States or United Nations Armies on any battle front.

Neither of these offers has been effectively recognized or adequately acknowledged. To Cubans, traditionally intimate with and almost a part of the United States in ways of living, education, and business, this lack of reciprocity and recognition of their will to help in the war has been a sore disappointment, but they have taken it as proof that it is a big war and that the United States is too busy supplying the fighting fronts with materials and men to have time for small friends.

In 1940 negotiations were, finally, carried through for the Export-Import Bank to finance Cuba's sugar harvest to the extent of some $12,600,000 to save the growers from being forced into sale or taking local loan-shark financing. By the time the money was made available it was no longer wanted, planters having had to let go at low prices or pay higher interest rates than usual.

About 5 years ago Cuba was promised an Export-Import Bank loan of $50,000,000 for agricultural diversification, badly needed public works, roads, and sanitation. Before the red tape could be unwound the United States Congress had imposed new limitations on the purposes for which the bank could make loans, upsetting the whole plan after the Cuban Congress had voted legislation for the loan and its repayment taxes. A new loan of $25,000,000 was arranged, but war priorities made it useless after another law had been voted in Cuba imposing taxes to cover interest and amortization.

Since about 1929 not a dime has been loaned to Cuba by the United States, although other countries—most of them less friendly, less loyal, and far less important as customers and suppliers—have gotten fabulous sums on little or no security and after having repudiated or failed to settle previous loans. In that time Cuba has repaid to United States investors more than $100,000,000 in principal and interest.

The accumulation of funds collected to care for the recently arranged $25,000,000 loan now totals around $10,000,000 in little over a year of application of the taxes provided. Long before any materials or shipping become available for Cuba's use these funds should have passed the $25,000,000 mark, making it possible for Cuba to buy what is needed for cash and pay for the work as it is done.

IS UNCLE SAM'S CUSTOMER

It has long been understood among well-informed men in Cuba that some of the United States representatives here have been the most grossly misinformed persons as to Cuban affairs, an opinion based on a consistent record of betting blue chips on the lowest hands and losing every pot. Press-agency men here, too busy to bother about underlying causes and facts while being constantly hounded to make each story hotter and more colorful than those of competing agencies, have done a yeoman job of contributing to the fund of misinformation in the minds of executives, legislators, and plain people in the United States as to Cuba, long outranking as a customer all countries in the world except Canada and the United Kingdom.

It is an unfortunate fact that few people are now interested in facts, preferring the sort of bedtime tales that have caused us to stumble along dangerous paths which encouraged our enemies to play us for the suckers we were, and made our own best friends abroad afraid to count on us in an emergency. Buffalo Bill and Diamond Dick have been supplanted by Superman and Flash Gordon, but facts are still dull things for which we have little time and less inclination, even in high places with vast responsibilities.

PESO AT PAR WITH DOLLAR

No nation has a better record than Cuba's as to the respect shown international obligations—in spite of the Finnish fables taught our children. Finland never had a war debt to the United States, and only paid back a small fraction of what she borrowed after the war to go into business as a nation. Cuba did borrow $10,000,000 for war purposes, spent twice that much of her own holding enemy aliens and building up her forces. By 1921 Cuba had paid back the whole sum with full interest. As Prof. Hudson Strode blithely informs us: "Every school child knows Finland is the only nation that paid back its war debt." Perhaps such facts have a lot to do with making us prefer fiction.

Cuba has borrowed hundreds of millions of dollars and, with a single qualified exception, has never failed to meet her obligations in a prompt and businesslike manner when due. All have been well paid, including the exception. This exception occurred when Dr. Ramon Grau San Martin, as provisional president, late in 1933 while Cuba was still at boiling point after the end of the Machado regime, suspended payment on the Machado-issued 5½-percent public-works bonds, nominally an internal loan but underwritten and sold largely in the United States when bond rates on governments had dropped to 3 percent or less. The validity of that issue and the good faith of the underwriting banks had been attacked by Machado's enemies who used their charges as one of the chief weapons against the Machado government. Had Grau failed to act as he did he would almost certainly have lost the last of his supporters, but his action was not enough to save him. His followers wanted the moon and a lot of fancy fixings immediately. Since he could not deliver, his coleaders were among the loudest in telling him to get out after 130 hectic days and nights in Cuba's fascinating Presidential Palace.

ISLAND'S SCHOOL SYSTEM

Holders of those bonds, however, made a very good investment indeed. Those who bought from buyers afraid to hold them did much better. It took a lot of honest courage for Colonel Batista, then chief of the Army—and of the revolution of September 4, 1933—to use his fullest political influence to get the Cuban Congress to find a way to refund those popularly hated bonds. He did it because he knew it was right and needful to the reestablishment of Cuba's credit as a nation. The settlement gave holders $1,100 in new 4½-percent bonds for each $1,000 in old bonds, a year of interest coupons being attached when they were offered in exchange in 1937. Any United States investor who bought and kept his bonds has already made more than twice as much on them as on the best United States bonds—and his value is a tenth more.

Since Batista was inaugurated the Cuban peso has been kept at par with the United States dollar, although it had sold at a discount of 18 percent a few months before and few expected it ever to see parity again. Cuba's bonds have sold steadily at a premium for all issues except the one mentioned. The price of those bonds had gone to 28 cents on the dollar; they are now well above par. The new bonds with which they were refunded have climbed from a low of around 40 to well over 80, headed for par and a premium.

Batista's tasks as president have not been easy. He has had to forego his plans for widespread agricultural diversification and homestead distribution has been drastically reduced because of wartime shortages of supplies and materials, and of ships to carry them. These same difficulties have cut deeply into Government revenues from imports and sales.

He has found ways, however, to do a great deal toward carrying on his programs, and it cannot be truthfully denied that he, in spite of obstacles seemingly insurmountable, has carried Cuba further and faster forward in health, education, and social welfare work, than she had gone in the previous 40 years since Spain lifted her hand from the country after that hand had been mangled by fighting Cubans and the heels of United States soldiers.

HANDLING OF DELINQUENCY

Among these advances are such outstanding and solid achievements as the creation of more than 1,300 new country schools, all of them in regions so remote that their inhabitants had never heard a school bell and few of them had ever known a man who could read or write. Into these schools flocked hundreds of thousands of children and grown-ups, hungry for the bread of knowledge set before them for the first time by the hard effort of a man who knew by bitter childhood experience what Cuba's backwoods folks wanted and needed.

It was charged, purely for political reasons, that Batista had set up these schools under Army sergeant teachers to indoctrinate the country people of Cuba with fascistic and

militaristic ideas. The true reason was that only teachers under the strict discipline of the Army could be induced to render effective service in the backwoods and to stay on their jobs and teach. Not one of the new teachers had, however, ever been a soldier before he was made a sergeant in the Reserve, called to active duty and sent out to teach, after a specialization course to prepare him. They were selected from college and normal school students, each a specialist in teaching agronomy, home economics, animal husbandry, hygiene, manual training, or some other useful branch.

PUBLIC HEALTH ADVANCED

In order to permit their inclusion in the Army pay rolls as sergeants, all vacancies in that grade for nearly 2 years were left vacant, sergeants being promoted to higher ranks and corporals left without promotion. All these teachers have been discharged from the Army and included in the rural school program of the Ministry of Education. A special rural educational normal school prepares new teachers as the program is extended, the subjects taught being those most useful to making a better living on the farm.

Forty higher centers, one for each 25 country schools, have been distributed along the highways in the geographical center of each rural school group of 25 schools. These centers are the headquarters from which the teaching in the local schools is supervised by missions of specialists who also act as teachers to some 60 more advanced pupils from each district who have completed the elementary schooling and shown their capacity for going further, many preparing to become, in turn, teachers of rural schools.

The rural schools are only one phase of Batista's personally initiated and conducted school program. The schools set up for boys and girls whose bread-winning parents have been killed or permanently disabled at their work, largely children of farm and factory workers, are models of comfort, beauty, and scientific pedagogy. He has given every encouragement to the manual training and farming branches of the technico-industrial schools and the University of Habana. His complete change in the handling of delinquent children's establishments has given such children surroundings and opportunities equal to those offered in the best schools in Cuba and far superior to those available to average boys and girls. He says they need a better chance if they are to become useful citizens.

NUMEROUS FINE HOSPITALS

In Batista's health work the crusade against tuberculosis, planned with the cooperation of two outstanding tuberculosis survey and treatment specialists from Cornell and Princeton Universities, has been the most outstanding drive of its kind carried out in America. The number of available beds for tuberculosis patients has been increased from less than a thousand to more than 4,000, with separate hospitals for children and for different classes of the disease. More than 200,000 suspected cases have been given clinical examination and treatment, the most modern methods being applied to seeking out cases, diagnosing and treating them. Similar campaigns have been set under way by Batista against infantile paralysis, leprosy, venereal, and, most serious disease of all in Cuba, intestinal parasitism in its many forms.

Under the particular heading of social assistance, which is one of the two halves of the Ministry of Health and Social Assistance, every phase of family help has been set up, from maternity leaves for working mothers with the best of hospital care before and after delivery, to generous subsidies and exacting inspection of all institutions for rehabilitation of the blind, deaf, and dumb, and on to homes for the aged and infirm. These benefits actually reach many thousands of the poor, now supported principally from funds of the national lottery, and are not mere plans or nominal benefits. The maternity care is paid for out of pay-roll taxes to which workers and employers contribute and which produce enough for the building of large, modern hospitals and clinics with more than enough left for benefits in each individual case amounting to about $75 above hospitalization and clinical service.

LINCOLN AND WASHINGTON

In all this work it has been plain that Batista's least concern was the possible political benefits he might derive. This drive has been a burning determination to wipe out of Cuba the conditions under which he and his own family and neighbors suffered when he was a boy in Banes. In the same manner his reforms in the Army and Navy, and in the National Police, have been aimed at eliminating those conditions which he most resented as a soldier. In all those plans he has had his counselors Marti, de Cespedes, the grand Marques de Santa Lucia, Don Jose de la Luz Hernandes, Jose Antonio Saco and the revered Padre Varela—great Cubans of the past century who devoted their lives to study of Cuba's needs and efforts to remedy them.

Outside of Cuba, Batista's two great heroes and examples are Lincoln and Washington, in that order. He has devoted years to the reading and digesting of Lincoln's ideas on democracy, and is able to quote or paraphrase almost every important idea Lincoln ever expressed. He got a solid grounding in the sterling, homespun doctrines of the Quakers when, as a boy, he studied, in English, at a Quaker mission school in the little town where he was born. He is also well grounded in the Catholic social doctrines of Leo XIII and Pius XI.

Batista has always leaned backward in his respect for any shade of public opinion and in his efforts to satisfy even the smallest minority groups in their utmost demands, often presented only to embarrass him, but in the name of democracy. It has been Batista's principal aim to make Cuba a land of the broadest liberties and one in which laws, instead of personal or political ambitions, should rule, even when the laws be bad or defective, and to make the vote of each citizen, freely cast, an effective fraction of the national sovereignty.

HE IS PRACTICAL REALIST

To practical politicians with long experience these aims may sound like optimism carried to the point of demagogy, but it is typical of Batista now, as it was 10 years ago, regardless of the very different picture readers in the United States have had given them of him by regular news agency men and roving reporters who went to Cuba to get material for salable articles about what each of them came to realize was one of the most remarkable personalities in the political picture of our days.

Batista is also a realist, however, accepting politics for what it is now, while hoping it will be better and trying to make it so through the new generation which he believes will, with a little better chance in life, be a little better in civic spirits.

Like every other head of a state, Batista has had his misfortunes in men on whom he relied for loyal and honest service to his government and to Cuba. He has always been very slow to believe a man he knew and worked with was dishonest or disloyal. Even when convinced at last he has been grieved rather than angry, and almost incredibly lenient. As every leader, he has had friends and associates who were sad handicaps to him.

TWO OUTSTANDING FIGURES

Among the many aphorisms left by Cuba's brilliant martyr-apostle of freedom, Jose Marti, which are a part of Batista's political bible and which he applies in his thinking and actions, is one which says: "It is with these oxen that we must plow." It means, of course, that having no better motive power we must use the cattle we have at hand.

Under Batista's 10-year regime two outstanding political figures have achieved national prestige, each universally respected and widely acclaimed as of true presidential stature. These are the present vice president, Dr. Gustavo Cuervo Rubio, head of the democratic party and heir to the political mantle of old conservative President Mario Garcia Menocal, and, the other, Dr. Ricardo Nunez Portuondo, prime figure of the newly reunited Liberal Party.

Both are men of such unusual personal integrity and are so generally respected that many good Cubans hope they will maintain the present government coalition and be elected president and vice president of Cuba in 1944, to consolidate and carry on the social gains Batista has so ably started.

HIS SUPPORTERS NUMEROUS

As is usually the case, the political field of presidential aspirants, now that Batista's decision not to run has been made, is growing. Former Premier Carlos Saladrigas Zayas is an avowed candidate and is actively planning his campaign. Every morning at the Casa Zaladrigas there gather friends and supporters of the former premier. He appears to have a following drawn from all walks of life. Strong hints that President Batista quietly favors Zaladrigas are heard on every hand. Then, too, there is Premier Ramon Zaydin, whose office in Cuba's "second palace," a block from the presidential palace, is the scene of some definite activity. Here will be found the deft handiwork of Dr. John Montalvo, secretary to Premier Zaydin, and to observe the visitors who go quietly into the "second palace" is to observe such a powerful cross-section of Cuba's business, industrial, and political life that the suspicion gradually is growing that a genuine dark horse is being groomed for the finals in next year's presidential handicap.

Batista, 42 years old last January 16, could well carry on much of his work for Cuba during the next 4 or 8 years with two experienced men in the top government positions, all working together to better the quality of Cuba's democracy. On his return to the presidency, in 1948 or 1952, Batista would be even better able to carry through his plans and go on making realities for the happiness of Cuba out of his vivid and usually remarkable common-sense dreams.

To those who actually know the real Batista it is not hard to believe that he has some such plan as this already figured out. He is certainly one of the very few, perhaps the only one, of the present-day political leaders in Cuba capable of formulating such a long-view plan, and of carrying it through—barring major accidents, of course.

Federal Assistance to State School Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, Sept. 15), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and challenging editorial written by the distinguished editor of the Anniston Star, of

Anniston, Ala., Col. Harry M. Ayers, and published in that newspaper under date of September 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHAMEFUL LESSON

In his appearance before the Anniston Rotary Club yesterday, Dr. E. B. Norton, State school superintendent, stressed one pertinent fact that educators and other progressive-minded laymen have hammered on for years—the crying need of Federal assistance to the school system of the various States.

These pleas for many years were but a voice in the wilderness, for Congress and Government agencies cast the suggestions aside as merely another attempt by State governments to obtain gravy from the Federal barrel. It took selective service and its high rate of rejections because of illiteracy to bring the lesson forcibly home to Government officials and the general public.

Too long, far too long, there was a general attitude among the majority of Government officials, and the public, that the illiterates would always be with us. State governments, more closely allied with the problem, struggled to correct the evil as best they could; but their best efforts were not good enough, and today we are seeing the results in the rejections through selective service.

It was some twenty-odd years ago that Alabama first called on the Federal Government for aid in financing its educational program, not because it was seeking money for money's sake, but because it sorely needed help, and still does. If this help had been forthcoming at that time, the Federal Government would not now be forced to spend large sums of money educating men after it had inducted them into the armed services. Due to the manpower shortage, it is forced to take these illiterates, and then teach them the rudiments of education.

Since Pearl Harbor, Mr. Norton pointed out in his speech before the Rotarians, the United States Army has rejected because of inability to read beyond the third-grade level at least enough men to make up 15 divisions, or some 200,000 men. That is the stark truth, and it is all the more tragic because it could have been changed.

Alabama's Senator LISTER HILL has drafted legislation which he plans to further in the present session of Congress making possible Federal aid to the school systems of the various States, action that had it been 25 years earlier would have given us a wider selection of men for our present armed services, and a more intelligent personnel in general.

There is no doubt that education has made vast strides forward in the last quarter of a century, and this is reflected in the make-up of our present-day armed services; but the tragic part of the situation is that it could have made even greater strides had the Federal Government cooperated with the States' programs. Greater progress than ever before must be made in the next few years, for the world of the future is to be dominated by thinkers, as Winston Churchill pointed out in his Ottawa speech, and the man or woman who does not possess the basic foundations of an education will stand little, if any, chance.

Many of the so-called illiterates which the Army is now taking into its ranks and giving the rudiments of education will come out of the war with a passion for knowledge. The mere inkling which they have received will have whetted their appetites for more, and they will not be satisfied until they receive it. Having had their eyes opened to the future which they can unlock with the key of knowledge, they will want, and demand, educational opportunities which, through various circumstances, have been denied them heretofore.

Even failing to obtain all the education and knowledge they may desire, these men will be determined that their children shall not be denied these same opportunities, and it is up to us to provide those facilities. Making educational opportunities available to all, rich and poor alike, is one of the greatest programs ever conceived by man, and nothing must stand in its way, for in enlightenment lies the hope of the world.

Some of our States, of course, are further advanced than others on educational matters and their school systems are more modern likewise. This is a natural course of events, but there is no reason why those lagging behind in this program should not be extended financial aid in order that the Nation as a whole may benefit.

As the 48 States of the Union are unified in the war effort, they must remain unified to solve their domestic problems, and no sectional feeling must be allowed to obtrude itself upon the calm reasoning required to solve the problem.

Illiteracy is not a problem of Alabama alone, nor of New York or California; it is a problem for all, and will require the efforts of all to overcome. The only method is through the National Government, and if this assistance is rendered through Federal funds, the shocking illiteracy problem will soon be solved.

The Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand why any American should be opposed to the passage of this resolution. I certainly condemn any deviation from the fundamentals of our Government. Whatever is to be done should be done in accordance with the methods provided by American governmental procedure.

This resolution specifically provides that the United States should participate in a plan to maintain a just and lasting peace "through its constitutional processes." The quoted language surely should suffice to allay the fears of any reasonable person that an attempt might be made to give up the sovereignty and independence of our country and make it subject to the whims and controls of foreign countries.

Let us realize that the people of our country are fully in accord with the general idea to prevent future wars. How successful we shall be remains to be seen. Some have honest doubts that future wars may be prevented. However that may be, we should not refuse to help with any attempt made in that direction. I should hate to know that 20 or 25 years hence, the children of today will be called to duplicate this war, or perhaps fight a worse one.

It is impossible, of course, at this stage of world affairs, to formulate a detailed plan which should be used to achieve the purposes of this resolution, but we should experience no difficulty in arriving at the general proposition that our country should participate in a plan to maintain peace. This is especially true when it is provided that in so doing the fundamental law of our land should be respected and observed.

It will be a terrible blow to the unity of the Allied Nations if the impression should go abroad that our country will not be interested in the future peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the purpose of this resolution because I am convinced that the peace of the world means the peace of the people of our country.

New England Factory Safety Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Globe of September 19, 1943:

MACBRAYNE LAUDS NEW ENGLAND FACTORY SAFETY RECORD

New England war industries have—because of plant safety programs—next to the lowest accident frequency rate in the country and have reduced their death percentage by better than 2 percent in the first 6 months of 1943 as compared with the like period last year.

So, said Lewis E. MacBrayne, regional director of the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries, of the United States Department of Labor, in a press conference yesterday afternoon. He credited "the finest cooperation anyone could ask" on the part of New England industries with his committee, as being responsible for the fine record.

MacBrayne and Arthur E. Orne, field representative of the national committee, were praised for having done a fine job in New England, by Maj. Laurence B. Tipton, War Safety Training Supervisor of the United States Labor Department's manpower conservation program.

Major Tipton, on a country-wide tour, said 44,792 safety engineers have been trained throughout the country, through cooperation of 116 engineering colleges, since the manpower conservation program began in mid 1940, 1,800 of them in New England. By July of 1944, he added, 55,000 will have been trained and they in turn will instruct 625,000 war-plant foremen in safety measures.

On a national scale, Major Tipton disclosed, safety committees have surveyed 22,000 war plants, reduced the accident rate in 62.1 percent of these, saving 1,173,000 man-days for war work, the equivalent of full-time employment of 800,000 workers.

In 1942, despite the national committee's work, Major Tipton said, more than 2,500,000 war workers received injuries, which, he pointed out, is a number five times the total of United States casualties in the armed forces in this war so far. In 1943, however, he declared, this figure was reduced 2 percent.

Mr. Orne reported that, when the committee began work in New England, 2 years ago, only 12 percent of the war plants had any type of safety program and there were only about 110 full-time safety engineers in the region (most of them in Massachusetts and Connecticut).

Now, he said, 65 percent of the plants have safety programs and there are some 300 full-time safety engineers.

Massachusetts' record is far better than the average, he pointed out; 2 years ago, 55 percent of the Bay State's war plants had safety programs, protecting employees, and now fully 90 percent have them.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann:

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY: SHIELD OF THE REPUBLIC

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

We come now to the practical question of what alliances the United States must seek to form and on what terms. If that question can be answered correctly we shall then be able to see how the level of our post-war armaments, the degree of our military preparedness, and the choice of strategic outposts and bases should be determined. For obviously we cannot remain permanently at the level of armaments which we have set for 1943. It is no less obvious that the Nation will not, in any future we need consider, disarm. Somewhere between the two extremes the level of our post-war establishments must be fixed.

Yet it will be impossible to fix it except in relation to the military power of other states, and on a basis of assured knowledge whether we must regard each of them as partner, potential foe, or uncertain neutral. We must also have this knowledge in order to determine what strategic dispositions we should make. For unless we have organized our own position in the post-war order of the great powers we cannot have a military policy. It is impossible to prepare against every contingency and all conceivable combinations. It is the business of diplomacy to reduce the uncertainty by forming dependable alliances, in order to limit the number of potential opponents against whom we must prepare our armaments.

At the end of this war, if we succeed in destroying the military power of Germany and Japan, there will exist only three great military states—Britain, Russia, and the United States. China is only potentially a great power of the future. For though the Chinese are brave and numerous, China is not yet an arsenal, and only a state which can raise great forces and equip them is a great power. France will, we may confidently believe, rise again. But there are not enough Frenchmen to make her one of the great powers of the modern world.

Germany and Japan, we have declared, will not be allowed to become great powers for a long time to come, and if this declaration is to be enforced, the three surviving great powers—Britain, Russia, and the United States—will have to enforce it. They cannot, however, enforce it unless they are allied. If they fail to form an alliance it will be because they are potential antagonists. Once that potential antagonism is recognized by their dissolving the alliance which exists in order to wage this war, one or all of the three victors will inevitably move toward arrangements with the defeated powers.

This is what happened after 1919: When the victorious alliance dissolved, vanquished Germany made an alliance with victorious Italy and victorious Japan. The state which rejects all alliances will give a high inducement to the other states to form an alliance in which it does not participate. If that state should be America because the American people still want isolation, then we must expect the other powers, who have no such prejudices, to combine for their own security.

The question then is on the formation of an American alliance with Britain and with the Soviet Union.

When we consider the region which the United States must defend, we find that Britain is established within that region as well as outside of it. Canada is in the geographic center of this region. The only land highway to Alaska passes through Canada. All the short airways to Europe and Asia pass over Canada. Thus the geography of air power links the leading Dominion in the British Commonwealth inseparably with the United States.

But no matter how boldly we allow ourselves to imagine the range, carrying capacity, and striking power of the aircraft of the future, two limitations are unalterable. The first is that aircraft taking off in North America must for civilian purposes be able to land outside of North America—somewhere in Europe, Africa, and Asia. A flight is between two airfields on the ground. So without the use of advanced air bases across the oceans, American air power cannot be developed effectively. At the utmost, American air power, with assured use of air bases only in North America, would be condemned to the strategy of the passive defense—to waiting for the enemy to strike if, when, and where he chooses. We have already examined the fatal disadvantages of the passive defensive.

The second limitation is that American air power cannot be effective without sea power. It is not practicable by means of the air alone to establish, construct, supply, and defend overseas air bases. Thus for Alaska, destined to be one of the greatest centers of the air power of the future, the use of the land highway across Canada and the command of the seas from our Pacific coast to the Aleutians are absolutely indispensable.

In regard to Greenland, or a more advanced air base in Iceland, the support of American air power also depends upon sea communications. On one side of that sea lie Canada and the British colony of Newfoundland, and on the other the British Isles. The security of the northern approaches to the American Continent is thus inseparably related to the sea and air power of Britain.

The strategic defense of the whole South American Continent as it faces the Atlantic is dependent upon sea and air communications, commanded by the outposts of Great Britain. We find the British power projected to Bathhurst and Freetown in West Africa, and to Capetown in South Africa. The British Isles command the northern entrance to the Atlantic. Gibraltar commands the Mediterranean entrance. Capetown commands the southern entrance from the Indian Ocean. The Falkland Islands command the southern entrance from the Pacific Ocean around Cape Horn. Thus the region we must defend can be attacked only from the region over which Britain commands all the approaches by sea.

Moreover, because the defense of Canada is inextricably bound up with the defense of the Western Hemisphere, the British vital interest and the American vital interest are complementary and inseparable. Britain must go to the defense of the Americas or the British Commonwealth of Nations would dissolve. America must go to the defense of the United Kingdom and its positions on the other side of the Atlantic, or run the mortal risk of letting a hostile power establish itself in the near approaches to the Western Hemisphere.

Francis D. Culkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, words of mine are inadequate to express the loss which the Nation has sustained in the passing of the Honorable FRANCIS D. CULKIN at his home in Oswego, N. Y., August 4, 1943, and who represented the Thirty-second District of New York State in Congress for 15 years.

Congressman CULKIN'S district adjoins the district that I have the honor to represent, and problems of the two districts are more or less similar. Therefore, I came to know him well and often turned to him for advice. Sound thought, profound wisdom and intellect were found in his discussions of legislation.

He believed that he was elected to Congress to look after the people's interests and this he did according to his own sincere belief. He was a fighter when he knew he was right. One of the most fearless acts of his career was his support of the St. Lawrence seaway because he thought it was desirable even when much of his home community, the port of Oswego, was opposed to it.

He was a true friend of the farmer. He courageously opposed any reactionary policies having to do with the farmer. He always fought those who would exploit the farmer and the dairy industry.

His belief in the American way of life, his balanced judgment, his fine personality, and above all his gift of true and lasting friendship will long be remembered by those who had the privilege of knowing him.

FRANCIS D. CULKIN was a statesman in the true sense of the term. In these critical times the Nation can ill afford to lose such men.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Watertown Daily Times of Thursday, August 5, 1943, written by his friend Harold B. Johnson:

THE LATE CONGRESSMAN CULKIN

FRANCIS D. CULKIN was a wise, conscientious congressman. He represented this Thirty-second Congressional District comprising Lewis, Jefferson, Oswego, and Madison counties for 15 years. He passes away at his home in Oswego after a trying illness which was precipitated by his prolonged attendance upon the sessions of Congress last winter and this spring when he should have had a period of relaxation. He fought stubbornly on, thinking he would be able to "whip it"

as he expressed it, but in May he was compelled to return home and he had been seriously ill since then. He was an admirable fighter always. Usually he won his battles. He was entitled to victory in this last fight but his strength was too far reduced, and he peacefully passed away in the upper room of his long-time residence, that old stone house, the early home of one of the pioneer industrialists of the Oswego of a century ago.

This man of pure Irish parentage rose from humble beginnings to be one of the best lawyers of his area, a conspicuous citizen, a liberal Member of Congress who steered a straight, unbending course of right as he saw it. The family of children of which he was one possessed a strain of genius that brought them success and attention in the field of public affairs, service as teachers, and in letters. They were hard workers and they were endowed with good ability which served as their foundation.

FRANCIS CULKIN early aspired to the law. He was a youth of fine appearance and stirring ambition. He was coming of age and into manhood in the mid and late nineties when the Cuban adventure was developing. He was conspicuous in National Guard affairs and in army service in the Spanish-American War. Half the people of Oswego County knew him as "Cap CULKIN" for he was long the captain of his outfit and a dashing figure of a soldier.

He entered the law and soon politics attracted him. He had a straightforward, frank way with him. Characteristic of the race from which he sprang, he liked politics. If any man survived in Oswego County politics of another day he must be a fighter and he must have quality. FRANK CULKIN came forward in Oswego County politics when the strong political figures of another day in that district, now passed away, were leading and battling, Col. John T. Mott, H. H. Lyman, Merrick T. Stowell, Patrick W. Cullinan, Thaddeus C. Sweet, John S. Parsons, Luther Wright Mott. Politics to them was more than a pastime; it was a leading interest and a profession.

FRANK CULKIN developed as a lawyer and in public affairs and politics. He became district attorney and there laid the foundation for his subsequent career. He was a good lawyer, quick of conception of a situation, a deep and thorough student, and withal invariably a relentless fighter. He had a high conception and sense of responsibility to see that law and order were safeguarded. It would be difficult in studying the records to find a county with a district attorney more conscientious than he. He had a passion for minute thoroughness in preparing a case. As a trial lawyer he had few superiors. No one could influence him in the discharge of his duty and he pursued criminals relentlessly, so it became widely recognized in Oswego County that it was dangerous to break the law.

On he went to the bench. He became county judge and here again he served conspicuously. His long service as district attorney made him well fitted for the county bench, and yet he was never the prosecutor on the bench. He had an intuitive sense of justice. He became widely known throughout Oswego and the adjoining counties. In his private practice of the law he had one of the largest practices in the fifth judicial district prior to his going to Congress. An appraisal of his qualities as a trial lawyer to determine what was responsible for his success would probably show that he succeeded so well because of his thoroughness in preparing a case, his experience in the courts, his honest, confidence-instilling way of examining witnesses, and his down-to-earth attitude before a jury. Jurors had confidence in what he had to say about a case and the points be brought out.

He was the long-time friend of the late Thaddeus C. Sweet, of Phoenix, long assemblyman from Oswego County, later Member of Congress from this district, who was killed in an airplane accident as he was near the end of a flight from Washington to Oswego. It was perhaps natural that FRANK CULKIN succeed T. C. Sweet in Congress. Speaker Sweet succeeded Luther T. Mott upon Mr. Mott's death for the Sweet machine had come to the fore prominently during the period Sweet was speaker of the legislature, and the Mott machine, always an independent group, held together by the Mott leadership, made no attempt to hold the lines after Congressman Mott died.

Thus FRANCIS D. CULKIN went to Congress. He never aspired to build up and maintain a political machine. He was responsive always to requests of constituents, and he knew instinctively the art of politics, but he kept away from the little political fights here, there, and elsewhere throughout his district, not because he was afraid of them but because they were distasteful to him. He was interested in bigger things. There is no other Congressman of recent generations in Washington representing this district who was as absorbed as he in the big issues before Congress. He studied the questions passionately. He was an omnivorous reader and the student always. He would study the most exhaustive book or pamphlet if it had to do with the subject in which he was interested, and would master it. He was far more interested in proposed policies as being considered by Congress than in the politics of Washington or of his State. At political conventions, State or national, he always preferred the sidelines.

It is true that he was criticized bitterly on occasion in his district for some of the positions that he took, but at least no one could charge that personal interest or political expediency ever influenced a single act. He supported the people's causes. He sprung from a sturdy, thrifty stratum, the son of a family not so long out of Ireland, and as he once said, he knew the annals of the submerged. He saw the average man's side of a question, and he was for it, whether it be labor or agriculture or economic development as the St. Lawrence power project. He believed that he was elected to Congress to look after the people's interests, and this he did according to an interpretation which he made with sincerity. He fought what he considered reactionary policies as having to do with the farmer and those who would exploit the farmer and the dairy industry.

One of the most courageous acts of his career was his support of the St. Lawrence seaway because he thought it was desirable and even when all his home community, the port of Oswego, was opposed to it. His intelligent work and his leadership before the congressional committee in its long hearings on the St. Lawrence seaway will stand as a monument to him. He always said that one of his deep regrets as he looked back upon his congressional career was the fact that he voted against T. V. A., which has proved so valuable during the war period.

His interest in public affairs was far reaching, not confined to those things which particularly had to do with his district. Again, while he was a Republican he did not carry party loyalty beyond the point where he thought public interest began. And no Congressman was more attentive and more devoted to his work than he.

To his friends he was loyal and devoted. Jefferson county, such an important part of his district, was almost his home. Every summer for many years he had spent many weeks in our lake waters. He sailed his yacht, the *Southerly*, out of Sackets Harbor at first, then out of Henderson Harbor, and he knew intimately the eastern end of the lake both here and in Canadian waters. He had a deep affection for the waters of Ontario. He loved sailing. He knew the vagaries of wind and weather; in so many ways he was the typical lake salt. He would cruise this end of the lake for weeks at a time. Sitting on the deck of the *Southerly*, sailing toward Henderson Harbor or Sackets, he would say, "Look at Jefferson county from here, Dry Hill, Rutland, State Street Hill. It's a wonder that Champlain ever left here, having seen the country."

Thus passes one who served the public long and well. His passing brings deep sorrow to many, many persons up and down the district. He will be remembered long as a man of strictest integrity, of rare intelligence, of unflagging energy in public position, and in his private law practice. He was brave always, he was never afraid, he had a self-sustaining mind to a most unusual degree. No matter who opposed him he stood unafraid when he felt that the position he had taken was right.

Resolution of Connecticut Wholesale Milk Producers Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a copy of a resolution recently passed by the Connecticut Wholesale Milk Producers Council. I feel sure the expressions contained in the same will be of interest to other Congressmen and Senators representing the New England area.

RESOLUTION

That the Connecticut Wholesale Milk Producers Council is fundamentally opposed to any order such as the recent War Food Administration order limiting the sale of fluid milk, a basic food of highest nutritional value, at a time when the shortage in national grain supply is causing heavy liquidation of livestock and when inept handling of price relationships has seriously reduced the prospective supply of canned goods. It is clear that to provide adequate food supplies to support the people of this State and of the Nation, and to provide foods for our armed forces, allies, and liberated populations, recourse must be to more direct consumption of grain as cereals—a diet which can be most satisfactorily balanced only if ways and means are immediately found to increase, not to limit, the production of fluid milk.

The council hereby wishes to express to the people of Connecticut their growing concern for the future food supply of the State and their conviction that, with a policy designed to increase instead of limit milk production it would be possible to meet the increased milk requirements called for by the inevitable reduction in other supplies of food.

Further, the council wishes to commend and thank Governor Baldwin for his aid in bringing the distress of the State's dairy industry to the attention of James Byrnes and in turn to the Office of Economic Stabilization and the War Food Administration; and the council hereby orders its secretary to transmit to Governor Baldwin, the War Food Administration, the National Director of the O. P. A., and the Senators and Congressmen of the Northeast a copy of this resolution.

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack Before 1943 Encampment of United Spanish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, before the 1943 Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at Boston on August 16, 1943:

I appreciate and value very much your kind invitation, and as majority leader of the National House of Representatives, welcome you to historic Boston.

We are gathered at this national encampment at a time when our country is engaged in war—a war of survival—when we are fighting not only to preserve our beloved country—but to save and preserve the religious civilization that is ours.

You are representing at this national encampment not only the remaining living comrades of the Spanish-American War, but also the memories of the heroes who served with you and who have taken the journey into the Great Beyond.

I know that in your business meetings you will pass resolutions that are fitting to the momentous period we are undergoing.

The veterans of the Spanish-American War are near and dear to the hearts of all Americans. You gave your every-all to our country in its crisis of your day, and history records that as fighting Americans you brought further honor and glory to our flag and to our country.

You fought among other things to free people. Today, your sons and grandsons are fighting to preserve freedom—not only for ourselves—but for the very people you fought to free. You freed the people of Cuba—you freed the people of the Philippine Islands. The people of the Philippines have again temporarily had that liberty taken away by the cold, vicious, cruel Jap.

The fighting Americans of today will see to it that you did not fight in vain. One of the solemn guaranties of our country is to restore to the people of the Philippines their liberty. That guaranty will be carried out by a fighting America.

The Spanish-American War was more than a war of liberation of oppressed people. As we look back, it constitutes a turning point in the history of our country. We now know it had far-reaching effects—that it brought about a marked change in our foreign policy.

The winning of the Spanish-American War made completely effective the Monroe Doctrine as a fundamental part of our national defense. It extended our responsibilities beyond continental United States—the education and development of the people of the Philippines to become free and independent—a promise we had given—as a result of which we had to assume our position as a world power. These are the main reasons why the Spanish-American War, and the results that flowed therefrom, constituted one of the most important events—a turning point in the history of our Government.

Since the war you so nobly fought in was waged—we have had World War No. 1—and we are now engaged in the present destructive conflict. Probably most of you had sons who fought in the last war, and you probably have grandsons fighting in this war. Since the days that you fought we have had two world conflicts—one still being fought.

Our first task is to win this war—but let us hope and pray—after that is done—that we will win the peace.

You have seen your children and your children's children patriotically fighting for our country's cause. The youth of this generation, to whom we all owe a salute, are nobly fighting the vicious forces of destruction and paganism. After it is over, are we going to allow world conditions to drift along—so that 25 or 30 years from now some other bandit nation or nations will be whipped into a state of fanaticism—hurl the world into another war, and instead of allowing your descendants to live a normal, happy life—to have them fighting the hordes of destruction in order to preserve a decent way of life.

Twenty-five years ago the veterans of that war fought "The War to End Wars." They fought to obtain that great objective, "Peace on earth to men of good will." Evil forces prevented the attainment of that great humane objective. Out of the efforts of the immortal Wilson, whose fame grows with each passing year, we gained experience which we should capitalize for the future.

Our country is in another war. Our youths are fighting and dying nobly, for a great cause. But after this war is over, what about the next generation of youth—the children of today and of the next 10 years or so? Are we going to allow international banditry to continue to exist with the fear of war constantly hanging over our heads, or are we going to do something based on justice and equity that will save the next generation—our own flesh and blood—from fighting to prevent a repetition of what we are going through today?

The Spanish-American War was a turning point in the history of our country.

This war is another turning point. Either there will have to be some kind of world order or there will be world disorder, with the powerful nations sitting around the so-called peace table—each grabbing what they can get out of the bag—imperialism running wild, and the basis being laid for the next war when the exhaustion of this war is over, and another generation of youth has been born and has grown up.

You fought to obtain peace. The veterans of the last war fought to obtain peace. Our boys are fighting this war to obtain peace.

The one thing that can be done is for men and women of good will in all countries to see that their representatives at the peace table—their statesmen—have the vision and the courage to take those steps necessary to stop the elements and forces of evil from at least hurling the next generation into war. If we do that we will have performed our trust. We will then leave a living heritage—after we are dead and gone for the next generation to improve upon.

America is on the march. The United Nations to date have worked together to defeat the common enemy.

Gloom existed less than a year ago. America of today, thank God, possesses fighting men and women. We are fighting to preserve our country, and a civilization that has its origin in God Himself. The motto on our coins, "In God We Trust," sets forth effectively what we are fighting for. To put it in other language, we are fighting "For God and for Country." We have a great cause. Our people are devoted to that cause.

Our fighting men and youth, and our fighting women and girls, on the actual battle front, and on the home front, have changed the gloom of a year ago.

Great events and changes have taken place during the past year. More will take place in the near future, not only on the European front, but on the Far Eastern front. This is not the time to become overconfident. This is the time to go forward with grim determination—no holding back—but to hit the enemy harder and harder—to make the enemy become more and more groggy so that the knock-out punch and victory will be all the quicker.

In this crisis—as Americans—ignoring whatever our party affiliations may be—we must admit that the general of generals, the admiral of admirals—yes, the private of privates—our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, has used unerring judgment and shown outstanding courage in leading our people and the ship of state during this war.

He is our constitutional leader. He will go down in history as one of the great men of all times. I am not talking of him as Franklin D. Roosevelt the Democrat. I am talking of him as Franklin D. Roosevelt the President and the American.

In times of danger, and particularly in a war of survival, such as faces us now, strong and courageous leadership is necessary to victory.

After you and I are dead and gone and if some future generation of Americans are faced with a situation similar to that which faces us today, my one hope and prayer is that at that time there will be in the White House a man of courage and judgment, but, above all, courage.

In days like these strong leadership is necessary to victory; weak leadership is the road to defeat.

Without regard to our creed, race, color, or political affiliations or inclinations as Americans we can thank God that in this crisis He has given to us as our leader and Commander in Chief our farseeing and our courageous man of destiny, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Foreign Minister of Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol had a distinguished visitor yesterday in the person of His Excellency, Señor Dr. Don Joaquin Fernandez Fernandez, Foreign Minister of Chile, who was present in the Diplomatic Gallery when the House began consideration of the Fulbright resolution. Under leave to extend my remarks, it is a pleasure to insert in the RECORD an editorial about Dr. Fernandez which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning, Tuesday, September 21, 1943:

The cordiality of the welcome which Señor Dr. Don Joaquin Fernandez Fernandez, Foreign Minister of Chile, has received during his stay in Washington is a reflection both of the high personal regard in which he is held by the leaders of our Government and the warmth of the friendship that exists between his country and ours.

Still a young man—his forty-seventh birthday occurs on October 24—Señor Fernandez can look back on a long and very distinguished career in the Chilean Foreign Service. Before he became foreign minister a year

ago he had held posts in Holland, Paraguay, Spain, Italy, and France and more recently in Bolivia, Argentina, and Uruguay, where he served as Chile's first ambassador to that country.

When he was recalled to Santiago in October 1942, to replace Barros Jarpa as foreign minister, his country was faced with the necessity of making a far-reaching decision. Chile was then one of the two remaining nations of Latin America which had not yet broken with the Axis, the other being Argentina. It was to no small extent through the efforts of Señor Fernandez that the break occurred. He took the position that only by sending the Axis delegations at Santiago home could Chile make her full contribution to hemisphere solidarity and be true to her own inspiring tradition. Since then the long-standing and intimate friendship between the United States and Chile has been further cemented by wholehearted cooperation in the great task of continental defense and economic interchange. Into this work Señor Fernandez has thrown himself heart and soul. In saluting him, Washington pays homage to a real statesman and the representative of a great country.

Army Retirement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army and Navy Register of August 21, 1943:

ARMY RETIREMENT PROGRAM

Almost simultaneously official releases show that approximately 900 efficient, over-age retired officers, actually performing duties of great responsibility, will be placed on inactive duty, while thousands of officers are being promoted, ordered to active duty, and newly appointed.

The economic unsoundness of wholesale retirement and promotion is apparent when it is understood that the 900 officers already are on the retired list because of an average of over 30 years' active service or physical disability, disqualifying them for field duty, though still permitting them to perform limited administrative duty at a desk in an efficient manner because of their long years of technical training. At the outbreak of the war these experienced administrators were recalled to active duty at the relatively small additional cost to the taxpayer of the difference between their active-duty pay and retired pay. When these officers are returned to retired status, they will resume their retired pay and will be replaced by other officers, many years their junior in age and training, who will get the full-duty pay of the positions vacated by this retirement.

It requires no imagination to foresee what action would be taken by the directors of a corporation on a proposal to place on one-half pay pension keymen, shop foremen, and managers of 25-40 years' service solely on the basis of age and replace them with men of 10-75 per cent of service at the same active pay in the midst of contracts quadrupling the corporation's business.

The Army policy in regard to utilizing retired officers is radically different from the sound economic position taken by the Navy. The Navy has consistently called to active service every retired officer, without regard to age, who could competently fulfill the duties and responsibilities of an administrative job. Naval officers over 70 years of age are reported performing highly satisfactory duties, so that the retired pay roll in the Navy is confined mostly to the infirm, bedridden, and crippled personnel. The recent Army orders force on to inactive-duty status practically every regular retired officer over 60 years of age in the grade of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, sweeping about 900 officers out of offices and administrative positions they are now handling and placing them again on the retired pay roll. Further, these 900 retired officers represent only that part of the overage retired Regular Army officers able to do limited administrative duty in an efficient manner who were fortunate enough to secure active duty since Pearl Harbor. Many others of overage officers, experts in their line, never succeeded in their ambition to be returned to active duty. Positions these retired officers might have filled successfully were filled by citizen soldiers of much less technical training, who were withdrawn from civilian war-effort activities, at considerable cost to business establishments, to add avoidable cost to the Army pay roll.

It would appear an elementary economic principle that every retired officer capable of doing an administrative job efficiently should be detailed on that job instead of making further drain on civilian manpower and adding additional expense to the Army pay roll. In its last analysis this is purely a question of getting a technical job done at the least expense to the taxpayer, since there is no question that these retired officers are handling their administrative jobs in a competent manner, since the positions vacated include scores of post commanders of large posts, staff officers at the heads of important supply branches, commanders of depots handling hundreds of millions dollars' worth of property, and chiefs of staffs of service commands, all of whom were selected for their positions because of their long training.

At times such as these, it would appear that officers with a background of training, understanding, judgment, and foresight would be more readily found among the older officers.

How To Boost 1944 Food Output

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Prairie Farmer:

HOW TO BOOST 1944 FOOD OUTPUT—FOLKS LIST WAYS THAT WASHINGTON CAN HELP—THINGS TO DO NOW

(By John Strohm)

If the folks of Prairie Farmer land could climb into the driver's seat in Washington, here's how they would crack the whip now to increase food production in 1944. (And remember this straight-from-the-shoulder talk comes from folks who are already raising a bigger chunk of food than any comparable group in the country.)

They believe Washington officials should do these things now, to get more food in 1944:

1. Guarantee a fair price for farm products.
2. Plan for manufacture of adequate machinery and repairs.
3. Insure sufficient skilled labor.
4. Give better leadership.
5. Remove unnecessary restrictions which slow down production.

Prairie Farmer surveyed a cross-section of dairy, poultry, hog, corn, and sheep farmers, and asked them this one question: "If you were in Washington and had the power to back up your decisions, what steps would you take now to insure greater food production in 1944?"

Our folks got down to brass tacks with ready suggestions for increasing food output. They offered suggestions that Congress, Food Boss Jones, and all other Washington mess sergeants can ponder—and, we hope, do something about.

Different people had different ideas. Some folks thought officials in Washington, on the whole, were doing a pretty fair job and others disagreed. The majority agreed on these points:

Fair price: A fair price for farm products is first on the list of the things Washington officials should do to insure more food production in 1944, believe farmers. Two out of three (68 percent) want a guaranteed price that will assure them a square deal with industry and labor. They want a fair return on their investments, same as business has. They practically grit their teeth against subsidies, and roll-back is now a fighting word in the Farm Belt.

"No subsidies, no benefit payments, no conservation payments—just a fair price in the market place," urges A. B. Alexander, Knox County, Ind.

And Raymond Shaffer, Noble County, Ind., says, "If I were in the driver's seat, I'd guarantee a stated price on all basic crops. That's no more than manufacturers producing war materials receive."

"Equalize ceiling prices so that the farmer gets a fair return for his products. I have 2,000 chickens and no feed. I must sell them or buy corn at above-ceiling prices. I either lose money or am forced into a black market," reports an Illinois farmer.

E. Seulemyre, Huntington County, Ind., says he used to feed out two carloads of cattle every year. "But because of the high prices of feeder stock and labor, not to mention the threat of price ceilings which may be slapped on the finished product at any time, our feed lots are empty. We believe in doing all we can for the United States of America, it's the best place to live in the world, but going broke isn't one way of helping."

Machinery: Two-thirds of the farmers surveyed (66 percent) want steps taken now to insure plenty of machinery and repairs for next year. They want plenty of machinery, they want it in time to do some good, and they want it distributed with a minimum of red tape.

"Build more three-bottom tractors and two-row corn pickers instead of three-bottom tractors and one-row corn pickers. Add 20 percent more material to a one-row picker and you have a two-row which will save vital materials and help whip the manpower shortage. Same applies to plows," advises J. W. Ervin, Douglas County, Ill.

"If we have machinery to work with, long hours will make up for most of the help shortage," says Charles W. Trigger, Peoria County, Ill.

"Distribute through established farm machinery suppliers rather than by appointed boards who in many cases are not informed as to needs," says J. H. Forell, Eaton County, Mich.

"Allocate steel to manufacturers so they can get us machinery when we need it—not 2 months late," is advice of Conway Farms, Rock County, Wis.

"I was unable to hire a corn picker last fall, so half my corn was out all winter. If

that happens again I will be ready to quit," says Harry Keffaber, Wabash County, Ind.

Labor: More than 57 percent of those interviewed urged that farmers be insured plenty of labor by stopping draft of skilled farm labor, releasing some farm labor from the armed forces, and bringing farm and industrial labor wages more into balance. Farmers fear draft boards will take more farm labor after fall harvest—labor needed for 1944.

Mrs. George Merm, Dodge County, Wis., reports: "We have marketed 100 broilers weekly until a few weeks ago when we were left without help. Taking care of 60 head of livestock, 40 cows, 15 sheep, 40 hogs and 1,400 chickens is just a bit more than my husband and I can manage. But if we only had one reliable helper it could easily be done."

"The 40-hour week, time and a half and double-time in war industries will cause a food shortage in this country at present prices for farm products. A farmer can't pay more than 30 cents an hour and board for help, while it would take 60 cents an hour and board to keep good help on a farm," says S. G. Appel, Vanderburgh County, Indiana.

Leadership: More than half of the farmers interviewed (52 percent) think there's plenty of room for improvement in Government. First, they want experienced agricultural men in key positions with power to back up their decisions. They want less confusion in what's wanted and what's not wanted. They want politics tossed out the window. And they want great numbers of nonessentials lopped off the public pay roll and put to hauling manure.

"I would place all planning for the highest food production in the hands of men who are real men of agriculture—and give them plenty of power to back up their decisions," says John F. Seltzer, Champaign County, Ill.

"Do not meddle with the prices every other day. We cannot change our program every month or week. Because a farmer must go through with his program as started out, or lose money," says Wm. Werner, Carroll County, Ill.

"The farmer has been told to do things so many different ways he does not know where he is. First, more hogs. Then make them bigger. Then not so many hogs. And by the time they get heavy, they don't want them that way. If definite policies are not laid out right away, there will be a shortage of all meats in nine months or a year," predicts Cecil Johnson, Sullivan County, Ind.

Red tape: Red tape and unnecessary restrictions slow down production, say 48 percent of those surveyed. Half of these people want to farm as they know best and with those crops fitted to their present land, without advice from Washington. The other half want rationing and other merry-go-round rules simplified.

"Why should a person, every time he needs an extra gallon of gas for field work, have to drive 20 miles to get a permit to get that gas, then stand in line for half a day? Wastes time, rubber, gas—can't spare any of them," says one farmer.

"There are many instances where it requires driving as much as 200 miles to obtain priorities and parts when they should and could be available locally and without signing of any papers," believes L. F. Richards, Ford County, Ill.

"I know of cases where farmers do not ask for things they need for actual production because they dislike being made to feel like they are trying to chisel by insulting ration board members," writes a Howard County, Ind., farmer.

"Rationing of farm machinery has taken so much of the farmers' time, gas, and tires that instead of being a benefit it has been a detriment. The same amount of material would have been as equally distributed without the rationing to say nothing of the waste in paper and clerical help, which is a large item," believes A. H. Parrott, Marquette County, Wis.

Equality Before the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Monday, September 20, 1943, a very able and illuminating editorial under the caption "Equality before the law" urging Congress to adopt the resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. This proposed amendment was first introduced in 1923 by former Senator and Vice President Charles Curtis, of Kansas. Many hearings have been held through the years. The present proposed amendment was introduced in the Senate on January 21, 1943, by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, with 23 cosponsors and was introduced in the House by Representative LOUIS LUDLOW, of Indiana, on January 6, 1943, with 43 cosponsors. On May 28, 1942, the full Senate Judiciary Committee reported this proposed resolution favorably. On June 23, 1943, a subcommittee of the House Judiciary reported it favorably by unanimous vote. Many women's organizations including the National Woman's Party, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National Board of Directors, General Federation of Women's Clubs, St. Joan Society—Catholic women—and 15 or 20 other great women's organizations.

The Republican Party at its national convention in Philadelphia in June 1940, adopted a plank by unanimous vote favoring the submission by Congress to the States of an amendment to the Constitution providing for equal rights for women.

The very able editorial referred to above is as follows:

EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW

Twenty-three years ago women, playing a greatly increased role in every human activity by reason of the First World War, asked to share the responsibility for elections with men. So asking, they could not be denied. It was as a simple act of justice that the nineteenth amendment was ratified.

Viewing the status of women today—in industry, in the armed services, in the responsibilities of the modern home—we have reached the conclusion that the next step in their advance cannot be delayed. We urge upon Congress the adoption of the following amendment for submission to the several States:

"SECTION 1. Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Various objections have been raised to this proposed alteration in our fundamental law. Some of them come from able and high-minded women who battled for protective legislation for women at a time when it was sadly needed. We believe that this fight has been won and that the principle of protection for the health and welfare of human beings has become a part of the general creed of people as well as of the courts.

On one point in this protective legislation we have always differed with its proponents, that of night work for women. Work has to be carried on by night as well as day and we believe that women should have the right to decide which time they prefer. Conditions pertaining to health should be handled through the category of health, not of sex. We recognize that the women who have signed a public statement opposing the amendment made a real contribution in the past. In our judgment the spirit of their efforts will be preserved while the many existing inequities throughout the country will be done away with through the passage of this amendment.

Like the suffrage amendment of a generation ago, the change comes as an inevitable phase of the era in which we live. When countless thousands of women have entered industry and the armed services to help save their nation, it is idle to attempt to withhold from them the equality to which they are entitled. The precise application of the amendment would wait upon the action of Congress. Its spirit, whether in respect to opportunity or reward, would be instantly recognizable. It would grant nothing which women did not deserve. It would destroy no safeguard which seemed appropriate. It would simply establish in the law the standard toward which every civilized people has been gradually advancing by the slower routes of custom and economic change.

We feel that the passage of the amendment is a logical product of the years through which the Nation is passing. We urge its acceptance upon Congress and the States.

Tribute to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation issued by Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, setting aside a day as Free Poland Day:

Four years ago, on September 1, 1939, the German army, acting under orders from Adolf Hitler and without a declaration of war, invaded the republic of Poland. The Nazi hordes finally overwhelmed the Polish armies and ravaged the country. But the invaders soon discovered that they could never conquer the Polish people.

Despite a planned Nazi program of brutality and murder, the Polish people, to the last man, woman, and child, have never ceased to carry the fight to the Nazis. No Polish Quisling has arisen to lead a puppet government, and the Polish underground, working against tremendous odds, has constantly harassed the invader.

In the armed forces of the United Nations, free Poles are fighting on the battlefronts of the world in the war against the enemies of mankind and are helping to bring ever closer the day of final victory and freedom from enslavement.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, September 1, 1943, as Free Poland Day and do urge the residents of the

State to participate in patriotic exercises in honor of the heroism of the Polish nation.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 30th day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and forty-three.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor.

PAUL E. LOCKWOOD,
Secretary to the Governor.

Bullets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, bullets can be used in many ways. Sometimes they afford protection, while other times they bring disaster. These bullets which I am about to describe almost backfired, not as a result of ill handling by their owner, but by the unpardonable red tape of a bureaucracy here in Washington.

Boiled down, here is the situation. The case involved only one individual corporation and, comparatively speaking, would be unimportant were it not for the fact that this company is but a symbol representing tens of thousands of other similar companies and individuals in the United States which have one of the most important jobs in this gigantic war effort—the job of supplying oil for our tremendous war machine, and at the same time using as little steel as possible in the production of same.

Here is the so-called "crime" which the Interior Department set up a committee to go on a fishing expedition, bringing one of its lawyers from Texas, and causing a busy oil operator to transport his whole organization to Washington at a loss of thousands of dollars to him, thousands of dollars to the taxpayers, thousands of barrels of high-octane oil and hundreds of manpower hours. After a full hearing, the following was the crime which came to light—a resourceful oil operator had taken a handful of steel bullets and reworked a dry well which would produce thousands of barrels of oil without the use of any additional steel piping, drilling equipment, and manpower hours. The so-called heinous part of the so-called crime brought to light was as follows: "The reworking of a dry well which had been abandoned with a handful of steel bullets at a spot where the oil sand was rather than at a spot where the oil sand was not. That, and that alone, constituted the basis for this fishing expedition by the Interior Department here in Washington."

Here is what I said at the conclusion of the hearing, and I quote from my own remarks:

Congressman MORRISON of Louisiana. For purposes of the record, my name is JAMES H. MORRISON. I am a Member of Congress and represent the district in which this oil field is located, the district, also, in which the company is located and does business.

I want further to say that I came here on my own, at the request of no one, that I am not representing Mr. Jones in any way. He evidently doesn't need me as he has so many able lawyers with him. I came here, having found out that this was going to take place by a long-distance telephone call yesterday from a person in my district. Naturally, after being here, I am not only surprised but amazed at what I have seen and what I have heard.

I am interested in this from two angles. Both are serious. One angle resulting from the fact that I am a Member of Congress, the body which appropriates money to pay employees of the Government, which, of course, would take in about four or five people who have been in this room conducting this hearing and who are members of the Interior Department. The other angle is that of a man in the oil business, producing oil, which is a very critical war material, down in my district in Louisiana who is representative of tens of thousands now operatng all over the United States.

To put it mildly, I have been shocked. I can't understand what this is all about. You say it may be making a mountain out of a molehill or attempting to do that. I can't even find a molehill. In other words, here is a man who is in the oil business in Louisiana, operating as a corporation, as most of them do. He has gone by and faithfully kept every law and regulation of the State of Louisiana; that is, of the department that handles and supervises that industry—the minerals division of the Louisiana Conservation Department. As I see it, every State has some sort of governing body for their minerals, and especially, Louisiana has its mineral division, and I think it is a very efficient organization, from every report I have heard and from what I have seen.

We sit here and hear testimony that we lost 25,000 barrels of high-octane crude oil for the reason that the Department up here in Washington refused to notify the Louisiana department. Having heard no testimony to the contrary, this Department had nothing to do with that department down there—the Louisiana Conservation Commission—but nevertheless they, as a matter of policy, held up production in that well until they heard something from the Interior Department here. Finally when they didn't hear anything from you, they went ahead and opened the well—but only after the loss of 25,000 barrels of high-octane oil.

The practical part of this is what impresses me. I can't help but look at this hearing, and if this happens to this businessman, I can imagine that it may happen under the same rules and regulations, maybe, to a thousand or ten thousand more businessmen of America. I surely can't help but believe that it is a very serious mistake and that the quicker it is stopped, the better.

In the first place, there is the manpower problem. There have been 15 people in this room and, as I have seen it, they have accomplished nothing except to realize that this is much ado about nothing and that it never should have taken place. We have here four Government officials who are paid out of the taxpayers' money. They come over there to the Hill and ask us as Congressmen to appropriate money for them—for what? Is this an example of the way they carry on for the money that we appropriate?

As I see it, the thing is backwards; any man in business, especially in the oil business in Louisiana, or this man in particular, is guilty, and he has to come up here and defend himself. My conception of law—and I am a lawyer—is that not only business men, but everybody in this country is innocent until he is proven guilty, but in the particular instance of this man, "You are guilty." Guilty of what? Guilty in the practical way of saving thousands of feet of precious and critical oil pipe, of saving thousands of man-hours, drills, and drilling equipment, and of producing oil through the more or less, I would say, resourceful and very constructive manner of taking old wells and wells where the steel is already lost and bringing in new wells. Every well that he brings in out of an old well means that 10,000 feet of pipe, approximately, in round figures, are saved. That means also thousands of hours of manpower are saved.

Here is a man who is actually producing oil, that we say is one of the most critical materials that we need, and instead of being a benefit to the country—I don't know whose fault it is, but whoever's fault it is, they should immediately remedy it and they had better immediately remedy it—instead of complimenting the man, this department holds him guilty and says that it is going to go on a fishing expedition, and tells him to come on up here and let's look and see what he has done.

They talk about the railroad trains being crowded, and ask people please to stay home. They talk about the hotels in Washington being crowded, and ask people please to stay home. How are you going to stay off the railroads and how are you going to stay out of the hotels in Washington in a situation like this? There are two gentlemen I am pointing to, whom I think are employees of this company. They work out in the field. I happen personally to know about that field. I have been there; I know all about it from first-hand knowledge. You see other men here who are connected with this company, and they are all here—to do what? to accomplish what?

Certainly by sitting in this hearing they accomplished nothing. It is a waste of time; it is a waste of money, and it is not only clogging the railroad system, but it is clogging Washington hotels and keeping other people out who, maybe, should be here and have to be here—to accomplish what? This man hasn't done anything.

If you sent one man down to Louisiana, if he had ordinary intelligence and knew anything about the oil business, he could go out there and find all the facts in the world that are necessary; and if that man had violated a State law or a Federal law, then that one man could find it out, and he could turn it over to the authorities down there, to the grand jury. If he were guilty, he ought to be punished; if he were innocent, he ought not to be punished. In other words, he ought to be turned loose, or it would be up to the grand jury to do it.

As I understand it this gentleman [indicating] is here from Fort Worth. Probably you brought him all the way from Fort Worth up here to Washington for the Department—for what? Well, that seems to be the big mystery.

I heard the chairman of the committee say that we are trying to find out the facts. In finding out the facts, are you going to summon every businessman from all over the United States who is producing oil, who is taking 10 pounds of steel and saving hundreds of thousands of pounds of steel, and bring them up to Washington and find the facts?

As I see it, this is a typical case of what a lot of people are kicking about. A lot of people in the departments here say that they are being unjustly criticized. If I get up on the floor of Congress and tell what I saw here, nobody is going to tell me that I am not justified in saying what has happened, because I know and I have seen what has happened right here, and I have been very patient. Still, it is a mystery to me how this happened. Whoever is responsible for this certainly should get the works, to put it in plain language, and if this is going to con-

tinue, then somebody should do something about it and do it in a hurry. Personally, I, for one, as a Member of Congress, am going to try to do something. I don't think it is going to be necessary, because whoever is responsible for this, I think, is going to get the works.

It all boils down to this: Instead of having a premium put on the accomplishments of this man, instead of thanking him not only for contributing to the war effort but for saving critical materials, he is being condemned and he is being put in a position that he has to spend thousands of dollars of his own money to come here to Washington to defend himself. Things have come to a pretty pass when that happens.

As I said, I am not speaking for Mr. Jones; I am not speaking for his company. I am speaking as Congressman from this district. I know that he is not the only oil man down there. I know there are other oil men down there. I am also speaking from the taxpayers' angle, because I, as a Member of Congress, appropriate the money to pay these people who, as I said, have not only wasted their time, but have wasted other peoples' time, because not one thing has been accomplished and not one thing can be accomplished by such a hearing as this.

Personally, I think that if the system is wrong in the Interior Department, you had better start correcting it, and correcting it in a hurry, because after all, we need the oil. It isn't a question of the means you use in war; it is a question of the gain in the end. I have heard all the charges made and the answers made, and that man has done absolutely nothing but what any ordinary businessman would do, what any other ordinary oil man would do—except for one thing:

In a very ingenious fashion, he took a few bullets and made new wells, and that handful of bullets, less than five pounds of steel, took the place of 10,000 feet of heavy, critical oil pipe, together with thousands of hours of manpower to drill those wells.

Regardless of what the sands are, this department up here can never check into every possible sand and can never regulate the oil business in every community in this country. That is why you have the State departments. They know the sands, and they know them better than this Department up here in Washington ever did know them or ever will know them.

I say that I think this is a terrific blunder on somebody's part, and I think there is only one thing that can be salvaged out of it. That is a good lesson. Let's not let this occur any more, and let's close down any kind of hearing like this in Washington. If you have any complaints of any oil operators in Louisiana or any other State, send one man down to Louisiana (you have men in the State or nearby in the regional offices) and let him investigate. If you have serious charges, present them to the law enforcement authorities and let them go to it.

This is wartime. We haven't any business having anything like this going on. In peacetime it would be ridiculous, but in wartime it is absolutely inexcusable, and there is no basis, there is no argument that can satisfactorily sustain the Interior Department's position in trying to create this circumstance, which I don't believe exists.

To sum up the whole thing, instead of bringing this man up here to defend himself after he has done a remarkable job down there, what should have happened is that he should have stayed there, and they should have sent him a big plaque or a big pennant and complimented him for his resourcefulness and his ability and his results in getting the necessary oil. I think I have fully explained the entire situation.

Here is what Mr. J. Edward Jones said in his defense:

Mr. Commissioner, I am president of Sugar Field Oil Co., Inc., against whom the charges contained in your letter dated May 31, 1943, were made. As president of the company, I am solely responsible for the direction of its affairs, as I have been since the inception of the company, and accordingly I desire to make a statement relating to your charges.

In presenting the statement which I now am about to make, I want you to know that I shall do so respectfully, that, also, I shall do so without bias or prejudice against you or the head of the Interior Department, of which you are a section but that, at the same time, I shall give no ground, so far as the matter of justifying our position is concerned. Neither shall I supinely avoid pointing out to you some, at least, of the matters for which I feel you justly can, and should, be criticized adversely. As an ordinary, humble American citizen, charged as I have been charged by you, I feel my duty allows me no other course to pursue. Thank God, this still is America, where officials, though highly placed, do not yet outrank private citizens, so far as their valid rights, privileges, and immunities are concerned.

In appearing before you, at your suggestion, and having in mind the statement contained in your letter or charges that if we failed to answer such charges you would recommend appropriate action, we do so with the understanding that anything we may do or say at this so-called conference will not be done or said in prejudice to our rights. We waive nothing in that connection. We are of the opinion, gained from competent advice, that your entire proceedings are invalid and without the force and effect of law.

You officially define this proceeding as a conference and state that it is informal. You have charged a violation of your Order M-68, as amended, which order, itself, states as follows: "Any person who wilfully violates any provision of this order * * * is guilty of a crime and upon conviction may be punished by fine or imprisonment." This proceeding, or this conference, is called specifically for the purpose of enabling us to answer a charge of an alleged violation of that order. Yet you have refused in writing to allow us to subpena witnesses in behalf of our defense, and you have even denied in writing, our request for the making of a stenographic record of what may transpire here.

Although you dub the conference as informal, you advise us that from the findings of fact which may flow from such informal conference, an imposition of penalties may result. Surely such an action as penalties is still regarded as a formal step in the administrative procedure of the American Government. It is strange, therefore, that the formalities in this matter apparently begin behind closed doors where the penalties are determined by arbitrary decisions of high administrative officials.

In this conference you state that the Commissioner does not act as a judge but "merely" writes a report in which he states the material facts. Since the Commissioner, you state, is no judge, he, apparently, must be the jury who in an ordinary course of events wherein citizens may be found guilty enough to merit and to receive penalties are the fact-finding agencies in all hitherto accepted principles in the administration of justice.

In these circumstances, we must declare to you that we regard you as proceeding beyond the scope of the power or authority granted to your department by Congress or by valid Executive order, that in such capacity you are attempting a usurpation of power that invades our constitutional rights, privileges, and immunities, and that you are attempting improperly to inflict penalties upon us for an alleged failure to comply with your rules, regulations, or directives, without affording us an opportunity to present a proper defense before a fair and impartial tribunal. In other words, without desiring to appear provocative, we call this performance a star-chamber proceeding—although it is headed toward penalties for us, it is not our day in court as ordinary Americans understand to be due in a proper administration of justice.

A great and fundamental difficulty which we operators find in attempting to do everything possible to cooperate with you, is the bald fact that, in your attempt to regulate the petroleum industry through your Order M-68, and all its many amendments and the exceptions which you have issued for the order, you extend your field of asserted authority to a point where it considerably overlaps State authority and supervision in regulating and ordering us in the conduct of our own businesses. In the instant case, we have done nothing at all that violates or negates the authority of the sovereign State of Louisiana. In fact, everything we have done and that you have listed as your charges against us, has been done with the expressed and written permission of the State of Louisiana. It has been done in innocence by us, acting as we have acted, in the belief that the State of Louisiana was sovereign sufficient in the exercise of its State rights to empower us to do that which we did. We wittingly violated no order of yours; we did not know or realize that we were compelled to turn to any commissar for additional permission to do that which Louisiana already officially had authorized and empowered us to do.

After studying your order M-68, and such of the many amendments and exceptions thereto as came to my notice, including Petroleum Administrative Order No. 11 (which alone numbers some 15 closely-typed pages) and your supplementary order No. M-68-1 (sec. 1047.6), supplementary order No M-68-2 (sec. 1047.7), supplementary order M-68-4 (sec. 1047.9), supplementary order M-68-6 (sec. 1047.11), Petroleum Administrative Order No 2 (sec. 1515.1) and Petroleum Administrative Order No. 6 (sec. 1515.2), and many of the amendments to such orders, and after attending lectures by your own representatives in New Orleans and elsewhere at which places effort was made to convey to us oil men understanding of that which was intended in all the hodge-podge of orders, rules, regulations, pronunciamentos and directives, my intelligence, ordinary as it is, actually came off with the none too brilliant idea, apparently, that what you were trying to do was to regulate the use of steel—primarily tubular goods—by the industry. Any other conclusion you may insist should have been arrived at by me was one which my limited mental capacities simply excluded. My mistakes, therefore, have been, as I at first so informed you by letter, unintentional and quite innocent. I also advised you that your charges were petty, trivial, and frivolous, because the only violations which I admit, had to do—not with the use of heavy tubular goods, or above-ground equipment, but simply the steel bullets used in plug-back operations—material that must be weighed in units of grains, not tons.

Our Griffith No. 2 well (formerly our Learner-Victory well No. 1) was drilled to a depth of 10,159 feet under an exception to your order M-68, granted by you for the University Field at Baton Rouge, La. This operation is your charge No. 1 in your letter of charges, previously referred to. Your exception was for the drilling and completion of wells (on a nonuniform spacing program) to the lower Oligocene zones in that field. This meant to depths below 7,300

feet. I fully advised you concerning all pertinent facts of this operation.

The log of the well indicated probable production at several deep levels and casing was set. We had a right to that casing under your exception and no objection to our use of it ever has been made. We tested five different formations—from 7,745 feet to 9,935 feet—all of which, unfortunately, proved nonproductive.

Your permission for obtaining and using the steel casing had been granted, the well had been completed as a failure in the zones for which the casing had been used, and we were confronted with a fait accompli, inasmuch as we had a dry hole with 10,000 feet of steel cemented in it. But at 6,770 feet, the log revealed a sand we knew well, a prolific sand capable of large production of high octane, aviation gasoline, crude oil, used exclusively in the war effort and badly needed for just that effort.

Since the well had failed to produce at levels below 7,300 feet, for which you had granted the permission to use the steel required to case it, I concluded then and I believe now, that the jurisdiction as asserted by you in your exception to Order M-68, ceased to exist and, desiring to complete the well in the 6,770-foot sand instead of foolishly abandoning all that steel which stood cemented at 10,000 feet, and the well itself as a dry hole, I asked the State of Louisiana to allow me to perforate for production at 6,770 feet. This the Louisiana authorities, of course, did, and I completed, last November 1942, an excellent oil well of large capacity. In the completion operation I used 15, one-half-inch steel bullets, each weighing 217 grains. The total weight of the steel required to enable me to complete this well in the 6,770-foot sand, therefore, was 0.0002325 ton. It easily could be placed in the palm of one hand. This is the steel for the use of which I, unintentionally, apparently violated a portion of your long order, a portion that, even now, I cannot discover!

At best, giving credit for sound and mature judgment regarding such a circumstance, it is inconceivable that Federal officials, charged with the grave responsibility of regulating American industry with the primary thought and purpose of winning a great war, should leap at an opportunity to make a charge against any citizen for such a frivolous, technical violation of an order. It is difficult for me, also, even having in mind my previous experiences with New Dealism, to realize that underlings of Mr. Ickes' Department might be interested in petty, trivial matters that perhaps could be termed "political persecution." But when I learned that your Department was claiming a violation, that your representatives had visited the Conservation Department of the State of Louisiana, warning their officials that I had violated an order of yours and that you could not look with favor upon my being allowed to produce the well—regardless of the country's vital need of the high octane aviation gasoline crude oil—I realized that something strange, indeed, had possessed you. I came to Washington for a conference with your Department, since the Louisiana authorities requested me to obtain a clearance from you before giving me a permit to produce the well.

At our conference with your Messrs. Schilthius, Allen, Willebrandt, and Jones, attended by me and my executive assistant, Mr. Buckley, I explained to you that the State of Louisiana authorities were quite willing for me to produce the well if I could obtain a statement from you that you had no objection to its being produced. I urged the war need for the well's production. At the conference, I specifically was advised that you had no objection to the well's being produced but that I had violated an order in perforating the well and that you could not advise me what might be done to me for having committed such violation.

I was advised that you would state in writing that you had no objection to my producing the well, providing I asked you in writing so to state. This I did, at once, but you went directly against your promise to me, and instead of advising me that you made no objection to the well's being produced, you notified me of your intention to investigate and this conference followed. You have never even at this late date, granted your permission to produce Griffith No. 2—apparently desiring, in spite of our war needs, to do everything in your power to keep the well closed in. Since November last, even on a greatly restricted proration basis, the well easily would have produced some 25,000 barrels of high octane aviation gasoline crude oil that the Standard Oil Co. would have used exclusively in the supplying of war contracts. You knew this because I advised you of such need—and for you to deny the country that oil which the Nation vitally needed in fighting the war was and is, in my opinion, to speak mildly, inexcusable. It should be called to the attention of Members of the Congress, whose cooperation in the war effort supports you. For you now to be taking my time, which I know is valuable, not to mention that of your own, which I will not appraise, is, I believe, ridiculous in the extreme. What is it you want of men in this business?

Your charge number two relates to our Richard well No. 3. In this instance, I had your specific permission to deepen this well from 6,800 feet to 7,200 feet. At the latter level, I found no production, even after I had set a small liner from 6,661 feet to 7,214 feet—and with your specific permission. Perforations were made at 7,192 to 96 feet with no results. Since production failed at the 7,200-foot level, I perforated at 6,934 feet and completed an oil well. For this latter perforation, you may charge a technical violation, since I did not complete the well finally at 7,200 feet, the depth of the originally granted permission. But the steel I used in the operation was only 24 bullets weighing .00372069936 tons. Full written permission to do this was obtained from Louisiana authorities.

Your charge No. 3 relates to our McDonald No. 2 well and complains of another plug back from a sand at 6,934 feet to one at 4,350 feet. This well was drilled long before you came into existence with your orders and your directives. The well was completed originally in March 1940. When we plugged back from the 6,900-foot level to the 4,350-foot level we did so with full permission from the Louisiana authorities. As all the history of this particular well preceded you and your asserted authority, I never thought for an instant that you had any authority over the well—certainly none that superseded the State authority. Consequently I did not ask you for your permission for me to use the 48 small bullets that I found necessary for the job. These 48 bullets weighed 0.00186034968 tons. But in the plug-back operation, I salvaged the 2-inch tubing that previously had hung from the 4,350-foot level to the 6,934-foot level, a difference of 2,584 feet. This salvaged steel meant a saving of 6.0724 tons. Measuring these 6 tons of steel saved in the operation as against a handful of bullets used, makes me, as a practical-minded businessman, ask you, a high New Deal official, What is it, that you want of me in this petty business?

Your next charge in your letter of May 31, 1943, relates to our McDonald No. 4 well. This again, is a well drilled long before your Order M-68, having been completed in March of 1941. You charge me with plugging back this well from a formation at 7,217 feet to one at 5,000 feet, claiming it violated your order. In this case, also, written permission of the Louisiana authorities was obtained for the operation. The only steel used was the bullets that perforated the 5,000-foot formation, and other formations tested between the two levels. In all, 136 bullets were used—0.0021084 tons. But I salvaged the 2-inch tubing that previously had hung from the 5,000-foot level to the 7,217-foot level—weighing exactly 5.20995 tons. Measuring these 5 tons of steel saved in the operation as against the handful of bullets used, again raises the question, What is it that you gentlemen want of me in these trivial matters?

The next, and last, violation charged has to do with our plugging back our Reinken No. 1 well. Again, this is an old well, completed long before you people ever came into existence—in September 1939. Written permission, of course, was obtained from the sovereign State of Louisiana. Seventy bullets did the job of perforating in the 4,195-foot level. It had been plugged back from the 4,350-foot sand. But in the operation, I salvaged the 2-inch tubing that previously had hung from 4,195 feet to the 4,350-foot level. The steel thus salvaged in this well weighed some 0.3642 ton. Measuring this over a third of a ton of steel saved as against the handful of bullets used, well, what is this all about?

Gentlemen, my company is a small company. It is an independent oil company that produces natural gas and some 1,200 to 1,500 barrels of high octane aviation gasoline crude oil, every day—all of which is used exclusively in the war effort. I have a letter from the War Production Board that states that activities of my company have been thoroughly examined and found to be appropriate to the public interest and essential to the war effort. I am proud of this effort and am giving all the time I can to a proper operation of my business. I do not desire to engage in petty controversy with little men of brief authority in officialdom. I have touched here upon only those specific matters under formal charge against us, but I have omitted and overlooked—deliberately—a number of other small, petty, obnoxious things you have done to me that, were we to go into them, would make triviality the order of the day. Strange quirk of destiny, when American citizens, busy as we are busy, must be haled before grave and supposedly serious-minded men, sitting high in the great Interior Department of our Government, to answer charges so petty, so trivial, so frivolous as should and would put to shame a more worthy purpose that surely must occupy the minds of our Federal officials. We businessmen of America really have no time now, for such foolishness. The "bullet case" should be allowed to die a natural death. Its force has been spent and nothing will be gained.

Mr. Speaker, and now, in closing, I, as Congressman, have one suggestion to make to the Interior Department. Let us use bullets to whip our enemies and to produce oil and not use them to fight our own loyal citizens who are doing a magnificent job in producing that oil.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

ALLENTOWN, PA., *September 16, 1943.*

Mr. CHAS. GERLACH,

Member of Congress, Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

DEAR SIR: I dare you to read this on the floor of the House.

I get a good laugh, and get mad almost every time I hear a Congressman or Senator on the air. All you fellows know is talk about Government bungling and bureaucrat government, what in h--- do we want with a Congress anyway, what have you done in all this mess. You are all afraid of organized crowds, labor, the farmer, and who not, so you just do nothing leaving everything up to some bureau, and then holler about it.

If I had the power I would vote every mother's son out of both Houses of Congress and put in a crowd of small businessmen. I bet you they would handle this mess.

If Congress would at any time have had any guts they would have done what the Parliament of Canada done in January 1942, stopped all price rises including labor, there are no $1.32 per hour munition jobs in Canada.

Telling one man to make shells at $100 per month for his brother to shoot at $50 is no more regimentation than army drafting, only the factory worker votes. Many men in the war factories are only putting in time at 10 percent above wages.

Even the soldiers helping to can tomatoes at Campbells have to pay union dues, why not let Mr. Lewis inside.

Wake up Congress or are you afraid of making mistakes.

Yours truly,

A. W. CROUTHAMEL.

Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article from the Nevada State Journal of September 5, 1943:

VALUES IN THE ROUGH

(By Brewster Adams)

JIM FARLEY

One of the pleasant and profitable gains of the summer are the acquaintances you make.

Folks are friendly in the mountains and after wintering with the Rotarians it is refreshing to meet with those who don't try to sing.

Even the Democrats are democratic and some of the scattered Republicans come out of the woods to greet you. Of course, there are a few other nuts left which the squirrels haven't got, but all-in-all there are good people in the hills.

Appearances fool you. A fellow comes along with pants as baggy as the editor's, and to your surprise he really is somebody. You realize that even these dudes may be human at home, although with a blotch of cream on their noses they do remind you of the old clown in the circus.

Often the loudest are the least and the homeliest are the highest. Nature calls for naturalness and the most important are usually the least imposing.

That was my opinion in meeting Jim Farley. Always I have had a reluctant admiration for his kind. One who does the work and shares few honors when the job is done. A plugger, he, and a plodder and a patient performer. We Republicans haven't much left which we can admire, but I learned a great admiration for Jim Farley.

He is one of those who carries the load and brings his party into pleasant places and then usually is turned out to make his own. When the sugar is passed around he gets a kick and not a pat. Faithful is his name and loyal is his nature.

It was typical and pretty to see the friends that Jim Farley drew. Perhaps that is his great gift. The children clamored for him and climbed all over him while the men showed him much respect.

They say he never forgets a friend but also has a great, if dangerous, memory for any who may impose upon him. There was a suspicion that he was holding a stored resentment for one party whom he had packed into camp and who left him in the short grass.

Anyway, I would rather have him for a friend, rather have him carrying the load for me, than to have even an uncertainty as to his good intentions.

No disrespect, but always I have heard that Jim Farley has long ears—that nothing went on or off that he did not hear and store in his amazing memory—so sagacity he shows which is almost more than human.

So it is my pleasure to recall and to relate some of my impressions in meeting with this interesting character—rightly named, I doubt if there is any better pack mule following the trails through the high Sierras.

(Any resemblance or correspondence to any living character is purely intentional.)

Participation in World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, just an additional word as to the high-lights of the debate on the Fulbright resolution.

Those wholeheartedly favoring the resolution are to be congratulated on their understanding of the situation and for the clarity and sincerity which characterized their remarks.

Those who in their hearts opposed the resolution, and with fine courage said so frankly, are likewise to be congratulated.

But, Mr. Speaker, what are we to say to that lost legion who, because of their deep-seated partisan rancor, but lacking the courage to record that rancor frankly, indulged in an orgie of damning with faint praise a resolution which they wanted to oppose but dared not.

What was their out? Simple indeed. They asserted that the resolution was too far reaching in one breath and utterly futile and meaningless in the next, but they announced that they would support it. Why? Because of the psychological effect on other nations.

These gentlemen are first and foremost congenital isolationists who have not changed their views but have changed their tactics. That is their great American prerogative.

It seems to me, however, that since these are their sentiments, they desert their great American prerogative because of a lack of intestinal fortitude.

Flood Control in the Arkansas River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am including speeches delivered by Col. A. M. Neilson, of the United States Engineer Office, Little Rock, and Col. F. J. Wilson, of the United States Engineer Office, Tulsa, at a meeting of the Arkansas Flood Control Commission, held at Fort Smith, Ark., on September 2, 1943.

The people in the Arkansas River Valley are indeed grateful for the services rendered by the Corps of Engineers in the great flood disaster of last spring and for their untiring effort to construct facilities and projects, which will prevent the recurrence of such disasters.

The speeches above referred to supplement each other. The address of Colonel Neilson was given first and was followed by that of Colonel Wilson, and are as follows:

ADDRESS OF COL. A. M. NEILSON

Mr. Chairman, members of the State Flood Control Commission of Arkansas, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, during the major flood which occurred on the Arkansas River in May and June of this year, the maximum stage of record for floods of recent years was exceeded at Fort Smith by 5.05 feet, and the maximum stage of the great historical flood of 1833 was exceeded at Fort Smith by 3.75 feet. As a result of this disastrous flood, 1,450,000 acres of land were overflowed along the Arkansas River and its tributaries in the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas; 26 lives were lost; and preliminary estimates indicate that damages were sustained in the amount of $33,000,000.

This great flood on the Arkansas River resulted in four separate and distinct activities on the part of the Army: The flood fight, the rehabilitation of farms and county roads in the inundated area, the repair of damaged levees, and the preparation of a review report, which is now under way, covering all levees on the main stem of the Arkansas River.

THE FLOOD FIGHT

High water predictions were received by my office on Monday morning, May 10, 1943. By 11:30 a. m. sandbags, shovels, portable lights, and other miscellaneous equipment were en route to the threatened areas in the vicinity of Van Buren, Dardanelle, and Morrilton, Ark. Supervisory personnel were moved to their high-water stations during the morning and afternoon, and by 3 p. m. all levee district officials had been advised of the approaching flood.

Over 19,000 troops from Camp Gruber, Camp Chaffee, Camp Robinson, Camp Claiborne, Camp Polk, and other stations were used for sandbagging existing levees, construction of new levees at locations threatened by caving banks, patrolling and guarding flood-control structures, and the evacuation of residents in threatened areas.

Rescue activities were performed by units of the Eighty-eighth Division from Camp Gruber, Okla., under the command of Maj. Gen. J. E. Sloan, and the Fourteenth Armored

Division from Camp Chaffee, Ark., under the command of Maj. Gen. V. E. Prichard. Approximately 6,500 officers and men of these two divisions were on continuous duty on work of this nature and other activities connected with the flood. These troops were dispatched at once with power boats, amphibious peeps, and ponton boats to comb the lowlands day and night from Fort Gibson, Okla., to Paris, Ark. A total of 2,700 persons, who were stranded and in danger of being drowned, were rescued and delivered to safety. These errands of mercy were made during darkness in unknown and dangerous waters, and this rescue work was continued until all residents of the lowlands were evacuated. Six soldiers lost their lives near Sallisaw, Okla., while on this rescue mission. The One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Engineers, of the Fourteenth Armored Division, assisted by 260 officers and men of the Fifty-third Engineers and Fifty-sixth Engineers of the Eighth and Eleventh Armored Divisions, respectively, from Camp Polk, La., also placed ponton equipment in the swift waters to carry three temporary 8-inch water lines, which provided nearly 6,000,000 gallons of water per day to the city of Fort Smith and Camp Chaffee and replaced the permanent 27-inch pipe line which was broken by the flood.

Approximately 4,000 officers and men of the Ninety-fifth, Three Hundred and Sixty-fourth, Three Hundred and Seventy-second, and Three Hundred and Ninety-third Engineer regiments from Camp Claiborne, under the command of Brig. Gen. John W. N. Schulz, supplemented by about 7,000 officers and men of the Eleventh and Fifteenth regiments of the Branch Immaterial Replacement Training Center from Camp Robinson, under the command of Brig. Gen. Francis B. Mallon, were used along the sections of the river lying downstream from Conway, Ark. In addition, the Seventy-fifth, Five Hundred and Eleventh, and Five Hundred and Twenty-seventh Light Ponton companies from Camp Beauregard, La., Camp Swift, Tex., and Camp Bowie, Tex., were also engaged on this work. The commanding general of the Eighth Service Command, Maj. Gen. Richard Donovan, furnished about 850 officers and men of the Seven Hundred and Sixty-sixth Military Police Battalion, the Five Hundred and Nineteenth Quartermaster Regiment, and the Four Hundred and Twenty-fifth Ambulance Motor Battalion from Camp Robinson; about 875 officers and men of the One Thousand Eight Hundred and Fiftieth Service Unit from Camp Chaffee; and arranged for the use of a large amount of military equipment in connection with this work.

During the period of the flood, Col. Edgar R. Todd, commanding officer, Stuttgart Air Field, under the command of Brig. Gen. W. W. Welsh, the commanding general of the Southeast Army Air Forces Training Center, provided planes for reconnoitering the flooded areas for the purpose of locating persons who had been stranded by the rising waters. This information was furnished to my office and promptly relayed to the Red Cross in order that marooned persons could be rescued. In addition, Colonel Todd provided planes upon request to transport personnel on special flood missions, which would have been impossible of fulfillment by automobile or train in view of the fact that highways, railroads, and bridges were inundated by the flood.

I would like to give you a few details relative to the unsuccessful fight which we made to save the Fourche Place-Woodson levees. Three companies of troops had been assigned to this area prior to the arrival of the first crest. When I arrived to inspect the disposition of troops, I was immediately confronted with the fact that the levees were about to fall in two locations. During that night, 3,400 troops were moved in from Camp Robinson and assigned to various threatened sections of the levees. Needless to say, this was a difficult task in view of the fact that the officers and men were entirely unfamiliar with the approach roads and the location of the levees which extended over a 15-mile front.

A total of 4,000 officers and men fought the rising river all that night and the following day. During this long period of time, we were constantly faced with threatened levee failures or overtopping at various locations. Finally, the levees broke simultaneously at two places and a most difficult problem of evacuation of troops and equipment had to be immediately solved. I give great credit to those comparatively inexperienced company officers for effectively carrying out the orders for withdrawal without the loss of a single soldier or item of major equipment. I wish that you could have seen those hundreds of trucks moving out the thousands of soldiers ahead of the onrushing water. All officers and men cooperated in an outstanding manner during the fight to protect the levees from the great flood on the Arkansas River. They behaved like veterans, some of them working 28 hours without rest under extremely trying conditions, and showed a determination and will to win which should carry them far in the strenuous days to come.

THE REHABILITATION PROGRAM

After the recession of the floodwaters, it was discovered that 11 counties lying within the boundaries of the Little Rock district had suffered extensive damage to their roads. The nature and extent of damage varied considerably due to local conditions affecting the movement of the floodwaters. At some locations, entire sections of the roadway were completely washed away leaving holes 20 to 25 feet deep. At others, heavy deposits of sand and silt were found on the roadway. It was necessary to completely relocate some sections of the roads in order to provide rights-of-way for levee setbacks. Numerous small drainage structures were washed out and several timber bridges were so badly damaged that they had to be replaced. Large areas of surfacing of the roadways were so eroded that the gravel had entirely disappeared. Surveys indicated that very few sections of the roads lying in the inundated area escaped without some damage.

Under peacetime conditions, the use of troops and the issue of Government supplies are authorized only during the actual existence of a flood emergency, and assurance is not rendered during the period of rehabilitation which necessarily follows such a catastrophe. Troops are normally withdrawn and the issue of supplies is stopped at the earliest practical moment. In view of the extreme shortage of manpower and construction equipment as a result of the war effort, authority was obtained by Governor Adkins and the Arkansas Congressional Delegation to rehabilitate the county roads in the inundated area by the use of troop labor. Conferences were held between representatives of the Government and State and county officials with the result that a plan was adopted whereby county judges provided the necessary materials and the Little Rock district made available most of the essential heavy construction equipment. Gasoline, fuel oil, and lubricants required for the trucks and heavy construction equipment were furnished by the Army.

Over 2,400 officers and men of the 372d and 393d Engineer Regiments, under the command of Brig. Gen. John W. N. Schulz, were promptly moved from Camp Claiborne into the devastated area. Work was initiated between Fort Smith and Pine Bluff immediately after the arrival of the troops, and civilian employees of the Little Rock district were assigned to each company commander to act as consultants during the performance of the work. Four power shovels, 7 draglines, 15 carry-all scrapers, 34 tractors of which 15 units were equipped with bulldozer attachments, 13 motor graders, 6 pull graders, 181 dump trucks, 50 miscellaneous trucks and automobiles, 1 piledriver, 25 portable electric light plants, 4 power pumps, and other items of equipment were provided by the Little Rock district.

The work accomplished by these engineer troops in a period of about 1 month consisted of repairs to 13 large box culverts, repairs to or reconstruction of 31 bridges, 345,000 cubic yards of grading, and 82,000 cubic yards of gravel surfacing. In addition, over 4,700 linear feet of pipe culverts, ranging from 12 inches to 48 inches in diameter, were relaid, which required 2,500 cubic yards of hand excavation. Approximately 200 miles of road were restored to use in the inundated area, thus making it possible for the farmers to get back on their land and replant their crops.

In addition to the country-road rehabilitation program, a 6-point program for the rehabilitation of farm lands and improvements was undertaken by the Eighth Service Command. The 6-point program consisted of the following items:

1. Removal of debris.
2. Leveling of drift deposits on croplands.
3. Restoration of surface drainage.
4. Temporary repairs to farm buildings.
5. Temporary replacement of fencing.
6. Other general rehabilitation work necessary to get the farmers to their fields.

This program was accomplished in the Little Rock and Tulsa districts by troops which operated under the direction of district commanders of the Eighth Service Command. In the Little Rock district, 21 companies, totaling 2,850 officers and men from camps in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, were employed on this work in 10 counties and assistance was rendered on 1,167 farms comprising 53,640 acres. In the Tulsa district, 19 companies, totaling 2,460 officers and men from camps in Texas and Louisiana, were employed in 9 counties and work was accomplished on 873 farms covering 19,192 acres.

THE LEVEE REPAIR PROGRAM

Immediately after the floodwaters had subsided sufficiently surveys were undertaken to determine the condition of the levee systems. The most severe damage was suffered by levee districts along the main stem of the Arkansas River between Pine Bluff and Fort Smith and on the lower reaches of the Grand and Verdigris Rivers.

Responsibility was placed on the War Department for the accomplishments of levee repairs on tributaries of the Mississippi River by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, which authorized the sum of $5,000,000 for such work. Further authorization of $15,000,000 was included in the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936, and an additional authorization of not to exceed $1,000,000 for any one fiscal year was provided in the act of August 18, 1941. Funds remaining in these appropriations were not sufficient to cover the cost of repairs required as a result of the 1943 floods which occurred in many sections of the country and an additional amount of $10,000,000 was, therefore, authorized by the act of July 12, 1943. Operating under this authority, the War Department is now in the process of restoring all of the damaged levees to their preflood effectiveness.

In the area affected by the May-June flood and upstream from Pine Bluff there are 69 individual levee districts and private levees on the Arkansas River and tributaries. These levees have an aggregate length of approximately 358 miles and provide protection for about 460,000 acres of land. During the recent flood approximately 278 miles of these levees in 63 of the districts were rendered ineffective, causing overflow of about 140,000 acres.

The question may arise as to the reason for the failure of so many of these levees. Reviewing the history of their origin, we find

that practically all levees on the Arkansas River and tributaries were originally constructed by local interests. Most of the structures were designed to protect against moderate floods only, and a record of their performance in the past shows that they have failed on every occasion when the river has exceeded what might be termed an ordinary flood stage. The successful maintenance of 80 miles of levee in 6 districts which protected 320,000 acres during the recent flood was, with one exception, made possible by the fact that the protective works in those areas had been reconstructed or enlarged by the Government as projects authorized and approved by the Congress. The one exception was the Fourche Island levee on the Arkansas River downsteam from Little Rock which was maintained against a stage approximately 2 feet higher than the maximum stage which heretofore had been successfully withheld. This levee was saved only by the use of great quantities of sandbags and materials and by the determined efforts of about 1,200 troops.

The levee repair program now under way along the Arkansas River and tributaries is quite extensive. Even before the floodwaters had receded, applications for repairs to levees were received and plans were being formulated for the accomplishment of the work. The initiation of these emergency repair projects is in itself quite a task. The full cooperation of all levee boards and affected individuals is essential. Detailed field surveys of each damaged levee were undertaken as soon as entry could be made into the flooded areas. Plans and specifications were then prepared for each project. Under the present established policy for the work, it is incumbent upon the local levee boards, at the time of submission of the application for repairs, to assure the War Department that the levee district will furnish rights-of-way without cost to the Government and will assume all liability for damage to crops or any other damage incident to the prosecution of the work. While the fulfillment of these requirements may appear to be easy of accomplishment, such is not always the case. With few exceptions, the acquisition of rights-of-way presents a serious financial problem, and in many cases serves to delay the initiation of the work.

The present levee repair program far exceeds any previous program which has been undertaken on the Arkansas River and tributaries since the War Department was charged with the responsibility for making such repairs. The work will involve the placement of approximately 2,700,000 cubic yards of embankment and the construction of numerous floodgates at an estimated total cost of $1,325,000.

THE REVIEW REPORT

I shall not discuss the status of authorized and approved reservoirs in the Arkansas River Basin as that subject will be covered later by Col. F. J. Wilson, district engineer of the Tulsa district. The first act which authorized the construction of extensive flood-control works in the Arkansas River Basin was approved on June 22, 1936. This act authorized 33 levee projects on the Arkansas River and its tributaries. Ten of these authorized levee projects are on the main stem of the Arkansas River and the estimated Federal cost of these improvements is $8,000,000. Only 3 of these 10 authorized projects have been completed: namely, North Little Rock, Ark.; from North Little Rock to Gillett, Ark.; and Faulkner County levee district No. 1. Not one of these levees was seriously threatened by the recent major flood on the Arkansas River. The construction of the other 7 projects on the main stem has not been undertaken because of the failure of the local interests to meet the requirements of local cooperation.

The flood-control act approved on August 18, 1941, authorized 4 additional levee projects on the Arkansas River and its tributaries of which 3 of them are on the main stem; namely, Tulsa and West Tulsa, Okla.; Crawford County levee district, Arkansas; and south bank of the Arkansas River from Little Rock to Pine Bluff, Ark. With the exception of the Tulsa and West Tulsa levees, these projects have not been undertaken because appropriations have not yet been made available for their construction.

In recent years, numerous reports have been submitted in connection with local flood protection at various localities along the Arkansas River. Some of these reports were unfavorable because the local interests were of the opinion that the requirements of local cooperation would not be met. These requirements of local cooperation, which have been established by Congress, are as follows: (a) provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project; (b) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; and (c) maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War. Because of this established policy, a project for local protection cannot be favorably recommended to the Congress unless there is a definite indication that these requirements will be met, even though the project may appear to be economically justified.

Because of the exceptional damage suffered from the flood of May and June of this year, the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives adopted a resolution on July 2, 1943, requesting that previous reports on the Arkansas River be reviewed with a view to determining whether any modification should be made therein at this time with respect to local flood protection along the main stem of the Arkansas River. This resolution makes it possible to prepare a comprehensive levee report covering the main stem of the Arkansas River. Because of the experience obtained from the recent major flood, higher levee grades will be considered in this report than were previously contemplated. It is deemed to be of the utmost importance that this report be submitted to Congress at an early date in order that any justifiable projects contained therein may be placed in line for authorization in the event that the Congress should consider flood-control legislation during the coming session. Based upon the rapid progress which has been accomplished to date by the combined engineering forces of the Tulsa and Little Rock Districts, it is expected that this comprehensive review report will be submitted by my office not later than September 27, 1943, and will be forwarded by the division engineer to the Chief of Engineers by October 4, 1943.

CONCLUSION

Since the organization of the Little Rock District on July 1, 1937, extensive studies have been made of projects in those portions of the Arkansas and White River Basins which lie within the boundaries of the district. We have completed the preliminary plans for all of the authorized and approved projects and are preparing comprehensive reports covering navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, irrigation, and other beneficial water uses in the Arkansas and White River Basins. Detailed construction plans and specifications are now being developed for the Bull Shoals, Table Rock, and Water Valley Dams in the White River Basin. My office is, therefore, thoroughly familiar with the potentialities of the various dam sites and all of the problems involved in connection with the development of the water resources of these basins.

The construction of the Nimrod Dam on the Fourche La Fave River, a tributary of the Arkansas River, has been completed and this dam is now in operation. The Norfork Dam on the North Fork River, a tributary of the White River, is well on the way to completion. The construction of the Clearwater Dam on the Black River, a tributary of the White River, and the Blue Mountain Dam on the Petit Jean River, a tributary of the Arkansas River, was suspended last year by order of the War Production Board so that critical materials and construction equipment could be conserved for the war effort. The Clearwater project is 55 percent complete and the Blue Mountain project is 69 percent complete. Contracts for the completion of these two projects could be entered into immediately upon receipt of an order to resume construction.

From what I have said, it is evident that the stream improvement investigations and projects which have been assigned to the Little Rock District have been prosecuted concurrently with the extensive military construction program which has been accomplished during the past year and a half. We are rapidly completing this military construction program, and, therefore, a large group of engineers who have been connected with this work are now available to supplement the engineering forces which have been continuously employed on civil projects for many years. With this nucleus of highly qualified civil works personnel, together with selected engineers who have been engaged on military projects, and with our knowledge obtained from past investigations and planning in this area, we consider that we are in a position to expeditiously prosecute a program for stream improvement of any magnitude that Congress may approve.

ADDRESS OF COL. F. J. WILSON

Mr. Chairman, members of the State Flood Control Commission of Arkansas, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, you have heard Colonel Neilson describe the May 1943 flood, the greatest flood of record on the Arkansas River in eastern Oklahoma, and western Arkansas. My remarks will deal with the planned flood-control improvements in the Arkansas River Basin, in the area west of Fort Smith, Ark.; in detail for those within the limits of the Tulsa engineer district, and in general for the entire basin.

Before considering these projects in detail, I believe that a brief outline of the approach to the comprehensive plan would be of value. As you no doubt know, the Corps of Engineers, acting under congressional authorization, has studied the problems of flood control, and the other allied beneficial uses of water within the Arkansas River Basin. These other uses include hydroelectric power generation, abatement of stream pollution, conservation of water for municipal supplies and for recreation purposes and wildlife refuges. In the western areas of the Tulsa district, the use of stream flow for irrigation of agricultural areas is of primary importance, although within this immediate area, the demand for such use is not great.

Any study of the possible uses of water and the control of its flow must consider the path of the water from the time it first falls on the ground in the form of rain or snow, to the time when it finally reaches its temporary resting place in the ocean, from whence, through evaporation, the cycle is repeated. Terraces, contour farming, reforestation, and other controlled cropping practices are of value in obtaining the greatest use of the rainfall for agricultural purposes and for the retention of the largest possible portion of

the water, near the place where it first falls. Intimately related with this method of control which has been called the little waters is the reduction of soil erosion by the use of these practices. We are all familiar with the devastating effects of gullying and sheet erosion, wherever such destruction has taken place. In this connection, it may be interesting to note that in an average year the amount of silt and sand that passes Fort Smith on its way to the ocean is about 100-000 acre-feet, or approximately 120,000,000 cubic yards. The topsoil of our agricultural areas is a national resource which should, by all means, be conserved, for the utilization of not only this, but for future generations. In addition, the silt, eroded and transported from its former resting place on the uplands presents a problem which must be given careful consideration in the design of projects for flood-control and other beneficial uses.

I am sure you will all agree that any decrease in the rate of erosion is a benefit, but we must not lose sight of the fact that erosion is a geological process which has been active throughout the ages. For example, the Appalachian Mountain Range has been leveled off to a plain at least twice in past ages, in alternate cycles of elevation and depression. At the present time, the flood plain and Delta of the Mississippi is an illustration of the eroding and transporting power of water, as is the Grand Canyon of the Colorado.

While the practice of head-water conservation will assist in the control of destructive flood waters, it is obviously impossible to obtain total control by such means. The study of major floods on the larger watersheds shows that such floods result from continued rainfall occurring after the soil is saturated when the highest run-off is produced, so that the effect of terracing, contour farming, and other controlled cropping practices is largely lost during major storms. It is therefore necessary to direct our studies and investigations to the problem of controlling this run-off, so that it does not devastate the flood plain areas along the streams.

The problem must be considered in the light of the interrelated problems of the entire basin. It cannot be solved in a piecemeal manner. Reservoirs for the detention of flood water must be strategically placed, particularly since the highest economic justification is obtained for the projects considered as a group, and their effects upon each other and on the basin as a whole considered. In addition, the urban areas in the flood plains of the streams may require protection by means of levees and floodways, and similar protective measures may be needed in the more favorably located agricultural areas.

As previously stated, the Corps of Engineers has studied flood control and the related problems of water use in this area, and from its studies and investigations has evolved a comprehensive plan for the solution of these problems. This plan, as we now see it, will consider the use of reservoirs for flood control and all the other benefits, including hydroelectric power development where it is justified. It will also include protection of areas subject to flooding, by means of levees, floodways, and other such purely local protection works, wherever concentrated industrial areas and fertile farming communities are found by careful study and investigation to warrant such protection.

With reference to the projects proposed in the Tulsa district, there are at present authorized for construction by the 1936, 1938, and 1941 Flood Control Acts 14 reservoirs, in addition to 2 which are essentially complete. In addition to the projects in the Tulsa district, 2 projects have been authorized in the Little Rock district in Arkansas, Blue Mountain on the Petit Jean River, and Nimrod on the Fourche La Fave. Also, Conchas, on the South Canadian in New Mexico, and John Martin on the Arkansas River, in Colorado, both in the Albuquerque engineer district have been authorized. All of these except Blue Mountain are now in operation. These projects were authorized after the Corps of Engineers had reported to the Congress its recommendations for such projects based upon the results of careful, comprehensive studies of the needs of the Arkansas River Basin, and of the desires of local interests. There are also authorized local flood-protection projects at various localities in Kansas and Oklahoma.

The authorized reservoir projects in the Tulsa district which have been completed or are under way are:

Pensacola, on the Grand (Neosho) River, has been completed by the G. R. D. A., an agency of the State of Oklahoma.

Fort Supply, on Wolf Creek, a tributary of the North Canadian River, in Oklahoma, now essentially complete and in operation.

Great Salt Plains, on the Salt Fork of the Arkansas River, in Oklahoma, also essentially complete and in operation.

Canton, on the North Canadian River in Oklahoma construction of which had been initiated prior to the war and which requires only the spillway structure and final closure, the embankment having been completed. This project has been placed in a stand-by status for the duration of the war emergency.

The authorized reservoir projects on which work has not been initiated are:

Optima, on the North Canadian River in Oklahoma, or a substitute therefor.

Hulah, on the Caney River, in Oklahoma.

Mannford, on the Cimarron River, in Oklahoma.

Oologh, on the Verdigris River, in Oklahoma.

Toronto and Neodesha, on the Verdigris River, in Kansas.

Fall River, on the Fall River, in Kansas.

Elk City (Table Mound), on the Elk River, in Kansas.

Markham Ferry and Fort Gibson, on the Grand (Neosho) River, in Oklahoma.

Tenkiller Ferry, on the Illinois River, in Oklahoma.

Wister, on the Poteau River, in Oklahoma.

The active authorized local protection projects are:

Tulsa-West Tulsa levees, on the Arkansas River, at Tulsa, Oklahoma. This project is very desirable due to the protection which it affords essential industries and will be placed under construction within the near future, as a war measure.

Cherokee floodway, near Cherokee, Oklahoma, on Cottonwood Canyon, a tributary of the Salt Fork River.

We can, therefore, consider that the comprehensive plan is established, in its component parts. Let us now examine these reservoirs and see just how flood control by reservoir works.

The operation of a flood-control reservoir can be compared to filling a bathtub with the drain left open. As long as the water runs in at the same rate that it runs out through the drain, the tub remains empty—when the rate of inflow is increased, the tub starts to fill.

Similarly, in a flood-control reservoir, the storage space reserved for flood control will remain empty when the rate of inflow equals the rate of outflow. Whenever inflow exceeds outflow, the excess water is stored in the flood-control pool. For the safety of the valley below the reservoir, the rate of outflow should not exceed the safe channel capacity of the stream. Therefore, the basic criterion for the allocation of storage space in a reservoir is that sufficient storage must be made available, if possible, to detain excess flood flows until the reservoir can be safely emptied. In addition to the outstanding benefits immediately below the project, the detention of floodwaters in the upstream reservoirs has a decided effect on flood flows into downstream reservoirs. Sometimes the physical limitations of reservoir sites require that the engineer be content to provide control for all but the greatest flood of record or perhaps the two or three greatest floods of record. Such floods, however, can always be reduced in severity.

As an insurance for the safety of the projects themselves, emergency spillways are provided to care for flood flows in excess of the capacity of the reservoir. These spillways may never go into action during the life of the structure.

Specifically the reservoirs contained in the comprehensive plan will provide protection for the valleys of the streams below the dam sites, as follows:

First, the fort supply project will control the greatest flood of record on Wolf Creek, controlling as it does nearly 99 percent of the drainage area of that stream. Its benefits will, of course, be greatest in the short reach of the valley of Wolf Creek from the dam to its confluence with the North Canadian near Woodward, Okla. However, since Wolf Creek is a major contributor to floods in the North Canadian in the reach from Woodward to Canton, Okla., it will also play a large part in the control of floods in that area.

The Canton Reservoir will afford protection from all but the greatest flood of record, immediately downstream from the project, and, in conjunction with the proposed Oklahoma City floodway, will afford protection to Oklahoma City, with a decreasing effect farther down the North Canadian River.

The Optima Reservoir, or a substitute, would be operated as a unit of the three-reservoir system on the North Canadian, to obtain control of the greatest flood of record and would increase the protection afforded by the Fort Supply and Canton Dams.

The Great Salt Plains Dam will control the greatest flood of record on the Salt Fork, from the dam site, near Jet, Okla., to its confluence with the Chikaskia River, near Tonkawa, Okla., about 22 miles above the mouth of the Salt Fork. Below this point the effect of the dam decreases due to tributary inflow.

In a similar manner the maximum benefit from construction of the Hulah Reservoir will be gained from protection of the flood plain immediately below the dam site to a short distance below Bartlesville, Okla. The four projects on the Verdigris River system, in Kansas—Toronto, Neodesha, Fall River, Elk City (Table Mound)—would fully protect against the repetition of all except the maximum flood of record on the Verdigris River within that State and to the headwaters of the Oologah Reservoir. The latter reservoir will effectively control flooding from the dam site to the mouth of the Verdigris River with incidental benefits on the Arkansas River below its mouth.

The Wister Reservoir in southeastern Oklahoma will control the greatest flood of record on the Poteau River to the mouth of the James Fork, where backwater from the Arkansas River is noticeable during high flood stages in the latter stream. Incidentally, the Wister Reservoir will protect an extensive coal-producing area located within the flood plain of the Poteau River and its tributaries below the town of Wister, Okla.

Of the remaining authorized flood-control projects, Mannford will provide a large measure of control for the Cimarron River to its mouth and will be effective on the Arkansas River from the mouth of the Cimarron to well below Tulsa. The Markham Ferry and Fort Gibson Reservoirs, operated in conjunction with the flood-control storage proposed to be contained in the Pensacola Reservoir, will control most of the flooding originating in the Grand (Neosho) River and will mate-

rially reduce stages in the Arkansas River from even the greatest floods. For instance, had this complete system been in operation this year in May, the stage at Muskogee would have been reduced 9.6 feet and would have eliminated damage from lesser floods. These reservoirs from a flood-control standpoint are the most important to the Arkansas River plan. The Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir on the Illinois River, located as it is near the mouth of the stream, will effect practically complete control of floods originating in the Illinois River basin.

Perhaps at this point a very brief outline of the types of structures proposed for these projects will be of interest. In general, the dams will consist of rolled earth-fill embankments with concrete spillway structures in which the outlet works will also be located. The two exceptions to this general scheme are the Markham Ferry and Fort Gibson projects. These two dams will be of mass concrete with gated spillways and will have provisions for hydroelectric installations.

It is of interest to note that the materials required for flood-control projects, if we defer the power installations during the war emergency, do not include items which are hard to supply or which detract from the war effort on other fronts. Most of these jobs have earth fills, which are made from local material, and mass concrete, the aggregates for which are procured in this area and the cement for the projects is available in many mills in the Southwest. The problem of manpower and construction equipment must be evaluated on each project. If flood-control projects hinder the war effort, they should certainly not have priority over jobs that are essential, but if, on the other hand, it can be determined that they do not detract from the war effort and do aid in the building up of the morale of the people and actually facilitate the production of food, then it seems evident that everyone, especially the people who have been wet, will agree that such projects should be given consideration even at this time.

As a more detailed description of the project which is of considerable interest to the people in this immediate vicinity and in eastern Oklahoma in general, I will describe to you, briefly, the proposed Fort Gibson Dam. As I stated before, the Fort Gibson project is included in the Flood Control Act of 1941. An appropriation of $3,425,000 was made available for its construction on May 8, 1942. However, due to the war effort and the shortage of critical materials, the War Production Board did not release the project for construction at that time and funds in the amount of $6,000,000 were impounded by the Bureau of the Budget in October 1942. The Tulsa district office has at this time, funds allotted in the amount of $2,425,000, which are being used for the acquisition of necessary lands, relocations, reports, studies, and preparation of construction drawings. Additional funds will be required to complete the project.

The revised design of the dam for construction for flood control only is practically completed and the project can again be placed under construction very quickly if it should be released by the War Production Board. If constructed now, the project will be mainly for the purpose of flood control, with incidental use for recreation and as possible source of water supply for the city of Muskogee. The development of hydroelectric power at this site will come later, after the end of the present war emergency, when and if a demand for power exists. As a flood-control project, operated in conjunction with the Pensacola and the Markham Ferry reservoirs, the dam will control flood flows from approximately 12,615 square miles of drainage area, which is over 99 percent of the Grand (Neosho) River watershed.

The Fort Gibson Dam will be a concrete gravity-type structure, about 2,950 feet in length, with a maximum height of about 110 feet above the existing stream bed and an average height of 85 feet above the valley floor, and will have a 22-foot roadway across the top of the entire structure. Seven dikes will be located across saddles in the lower part of the west bank of the reservoir to prevent the flood-control pool from overflowing into the adjacent Verdigris River basin.

The spillway will be located across the existing river channel. The spillway weir will be of concrete with its crest at elevation 547, about 45 feet above the stream bed, and will ultimately be controlled by 30 steel radial-type gates, each 40 feet long and 35 feet high. Due to the present emergency war demands for steel, the gates will not be installed at this time, but the openings will be closed with temporary nonmetallic bulkheads, so designed that they can be removed if necessary. In addition, 10 sluices for low-water control will be provided to discharge about 18,000 cubic feet per second. The combined flow of the crest gates, sluices, and normal power releases would equal the capacity of the main channel which is 100,000 cubic feet per second.

The spillway for this project will have a capacity in excess of that required for any flood of past record in this vicinity. This excess capacity is essential to insure the safety of the structure. The peak of the design storm is about three times greater than the May 1943 flood. The probability that such a storm would ever occur is exceedingly remote.

The powerhouse and appurtenances, when constructed, will be located on the left bank of the existing channel and will consist of intake structure, switchyard, and powerhouse, with the necessary power-generating machinery equipment, and so forth. For the flood-control-only project, the top of the flood-control pool will be at elevation 582, about 100 feet above the present stream bed, which will provide about 1,187,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage. In addition, a conservation pool of 100,000 acre-feet will be provided, with its surface at elevation 533, about 50 feet above the stream bed.

The top of the ultimate flood-control pool will be at elevation 582.0, as in the flood-control-only plan, which is also the top elevation of the spillway gates. The flood-control storage capacity will be about 922,000 acre-feet with a depth of 28 feet above the top of the power pool, inundating about 31,900 acres of land.

In the ultimate project, the top of the power pool will be at elevation 554.0 about 70 feet above the stream bed, and will have a storage capacity of about 365,000 acre-feet. This power pool will permanently inundate approximately 19,100 acres of land. The four power generator units, operating with an average power head of 61 feet, will generate about 78,800,000 kilowatt-hours prime electric energy annually, and will generate on the average a total of about 155,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually including secondary energy.

The reservoir, with the water surface at the top of the flood-control pool, will have a capacity of 1,287,000 acre-feet and at that elevation will inundate aproximately 51,000 acres of land. When full to the top of the flood-control pool the lake will extend 39 river miles above the dam site and will have a maximum width of about 3 miles across the main river valley.

As constructed, the Pensacola reservoir provided only 245,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage, or about 715,000 acre-feet less than that recommended by the Corps of Engineers. Under present approved plans, the Government through the Federal Works Agency has been acquiring the necessary lands to make available additional potential capacity of 295,000 acre-feet above the present top of flood-control pool at elevation 750. With completion of that program, Pensacola will have available, if so used, a flood-control storage capacity of 540,000 acre-feet.

Our studies have indicated that the deficiency in flood-control storage capacity at Pensacola should be regained as soon as possible, and a need for a total storage capacity of about 922,000 acre-feet for flood control in the ultimate Fort Gibson project.

Had the Fort Gibson dam, as now proposed, been in operation during the May 1943 flood, the discharge from the dam could have been held to about 160,000 cubic feet per second. This discharge is directly comparable to the actual discharge of 345,000 cubic feet per second past the Wagoner gage during the same flood. This amount of control could have resulted in a stage reduction of about 6.0 feet at Muskogee.

With reference to the status of the projects which I have described above, and on which construction has not been started, I can only say that on most of these, we are ready and waiting.

Contract drawings for the completion of the Canton dam and for the reinitiation of the Fort Gibson project and the construction of the Hulah project can be ready for bids within a very short time after the release of the projects for construction. As more of the personnel in the Tulsa district office are released from their duties on the decreasing military construction program, we are rapidly completing construction plans for such projects as the Markham ferry, Tenkiller ferry, and Wister dams. Funds have also been made available for detailed engineering studies on the Elk City (Table Mound) and Neodesha reservoirs in Kansas, and for the Cherokee floodway in Oklahoma.

In addition to the study of specific projects, further surveys are being made under Congressional authorization of certain streams and localities within the district. These surveys include at the present time certain reaches of the Cimarron River, New Mexico, Kansas, and Oklahoma; the Grand (Neosho) River in Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas; the Verdigris River in Kansas and Oklahoma; and Polecat Creek, Oklahoma. Also, the Tulsa district is cooperating with the Little Rock district, of which Colonel Neilson is district engineer, in a study of the recommended plans for levees on the main stem of the Arkansas River, in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, and of the complete development of the Arkansas River for navigation, flood control, and power. These surveys can be considered as supplementary to the existing comprehensive plan.

One of the most important aspects of this flood-control program which I described to you is the fact that planning for these projects has proceeded in an orderly fashion, and the most urgent projects of the group are now in a position where the plans and specifications are essentially complete and work could actually start within a very short time after funds are appropriated. You should also bear in mind that the tremendous construction program on military works in this area is nearing an end and that trained personnel who through their adaptability and versatility have been able to go from civilian projects to military projects are now ready to go back to civilian works on which they are experts by training and experience. As an example of this condition in the Tulsa district, I may cite that the Okmulgee hospital is essentially complete; the whole organization now engaged on that job is ready to be transplanted to the Fort Gibson Dam just as soon as a release from W. P. B. is forthcoming. The key people on the Okmulgee hospital job have had previous experience in dam building and

other flood-control works, so you can see it is no idle statement when I say that the Tulsa district is ready in all departments to initiate and prosecute a flood-control program with vigor and economy.

I should like to reiterate and have you carry away the thought that the Corps of Engineers has made careful and comprehensive studies for controlling floods in this area. We are ready to proceed with the actual construction just as quickly as funds are available and we have the actual plans and specifications in such shape that work could start almost at once.

Jim Farley Comes to Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of Friday, July 23, 1943:

JIM FARLEY COMES TO TOWN

Jim Farley came to Tucson this week to spend 2 full days. As usual he lived up to his unusual reputation. He proved himself to be the genuine Jim Farley who could connect names and faces not merely in one or two instances but in many instances. He had only kind words to say about everybody from the President on down. He was full of good stories. He had little to say about politics. Politics, he said, should be adjourned until after the November elections and all effort concentrated on winning the war.

Jim Farley probably knows more people than any other man alive. But this knack of his in knowing so many people appeared here in Tucson in its most impressive light. He knows so many people, because he likes people. He seems to revel in talking to bootblacks, mayors, politicians, labor leaders, bankers, and farmers. Anyone who watches him talking with all of these different people can see that Jim does it because he enjoys it. He likes his fellow men.

In these days when hospitality seems to require offering a drink or talking public affairs with plenty of set-ups around, Jim Farley's example is a rare one. He does not drink and does not smoke, neither does he offer to buy a drink or take for granted that he must serve drinks or smokes to fellow politicians. Yet he makes things so interesting for those who talk to him that nothing in the way of liquid refreshments is missed.

Jim Farley is one of the remarkable men of our country. Despite the fact that he has been mixed up in New York and then national politics ever since he was a youngster, he has kept his name not merely clean but respected. Despite the fact that he is a constant doer, he has that unusual knack of not offending despite his fluent conversation. He can say "No" with more skill than probably any other man.

During Mr. Farley's 7½ years as Postmaster General the Post Office Department saw more improvements than in many previous years. Despite the fact that he was a practical politician, who did not deny the need of patronage as a means of maintaining a political organization, more was done to take postmasterships out of politics than ever before.

Much could be written about Mr. Farley's skill in organizing the first two campaigns for President Roosevelt, about the way he willingly took raps to help the President, about his loyalty to the President, about the way he finally broke with the President because he did not believe in any President serving more than two terms. His record shows him to be a man of character.

But all of this political record pales into insignificance in comparison to Mr. Farley's long persistence and apparent delight in knowing his fellow human beings. During his brief visit in Tucson he showed that, while today he is doing the same thing in California. A year from now he will still be doing it regardless of what turn the wheel of fortune takes.

Resolutions of the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus at the annual international meeting held August 19, 1943, in the city of Cleveland, Ohio:

Whereas recent gratifying events portend the utter destruction of the armed forces of Germany, which under Hitler, with indescribable savagery and ruthlessness and without declaration of war, attacked Poland on the 1st day of September, 1939; and

Whereas the valiant armed forces of Poland, with the sublime fortitude of Christian soldiers whose forbears for a century and a quarter had suffered persecution under Prussian, Russian, and Austrian military despots, resisted to the utmost the terrific onslaught of overwhelming Nazi hordes until the Vistula and the Warthe, with their tributaries, were crimsoned with the blood of a hundred battlefields, Warsaw reduced to rubble, its resolute mayor holding his post until the survivors of the million and a half brave inhabitants of the city were utterly helpless, and the Polish nation itself partitioned between the German Reich and Soviet Russia; and

Whereas the 4 years of enemy occupation have witnessed a bloody and relentless persecution of the people of Poland; 2,500,000 Poles murdered and 500,000 starved to death by the Nazis; 2,000,000 Poles deported to Germany for forced labor; 1,600,000 driven from their homes in the western provinces of Poland and sent to the east; hundreds of thousands confined in concentration camps; the population reduced to human slavery; dissenters who disputed the Nazi philosopsy of state absolutism and a "master race" eliminated without mercy; more than a thousand towns and villages evacuated; 348 villages burned; everything of value confiscated, including farms, factories, workshops, stores, and even household furniture and personal effects; seven dioceses under "total persecution; churches, colleges, and high schools closed, and in some instances churches desecrated; members of religious orders banished; archbishops and bishops deported, imprisoned, and in some instances, put to death; thousands of priests and religious executed; other thousands thrown into concentration camps where large numbers of them died of maltreatment; and the civilian population, especially of the Jews, in many localities subjected to terrible "blood baths"; and

Whereas the final assault upon the German Reich by the armed forces of the Allied Nations has begun, and the craven Hitler, after 4 years of organized but unsuccessful effort to accomplish his avowed purpose of destroying Christianity and substituting an omnipotent state for the omnipotent God, turns forlornly to the church for help, and appeals to Polish Catholic opinion for support against "Bolshevik atheism"; and

Whereas the armed forces of the Polish Government-in-exile, in conjunction with the armed forces of the other Allied Nations, press on to final victory, with the establishment of peace with justice throughout the world, a consummation devoutly prayed for by God-fearing people of every land, and an answer to the unceasing supplication of the shepherd of Christendom, Pope Pius XII, that almighty God in His infinite wisdom and mercy will pardon the sins of the world, will save the people of Poland and of all other nations from further cruelties and sufferings of war, and will restore all things in Christ: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus in convention assembled in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, on this 19th day of August 1943, mindful that 80,000 Knights of Columbus are serving in the armed forces of the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland, recommends that during the month of September the 2,497 councils of the organization join with other organizations in promoting public exercises in commemoration of the murderous attack on Poland, at which the God of Nations shall be praised, and tribute paid to the culture, the virtue, the valor, and the steadfast and unbroken spirit of the Polish people, and to the immense resolution and gallantry of the Polish Army; and be it further

Resolved, That the supreme council of the Knights of Columbus, speaking for the entire membership of the order, hereby tenders to the people of Poland, and to the millions of men and women of Polish birth and descent in the United States and Canada, the homage of our affectionate regard and esteem, and the expression of our complete confidence in final victory and fulfillment of the obligation of recognition of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Poland; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the Ambassador of the Government of Poland-in-exile to the United States.

That Word Is "Mackinaw"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 20, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, since Congress has resumed its session, a day has not passed without reference being made on the floor of the House to the Republican Conference recently held in northern Michigan. Some call it the

"Mackinac" Conference while others refer to it as the "Mackinaw" Conference.

Mr. Carl Saunders, editor of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, one of the leading out-State dailies, has written an editorial which sheds some light on the correct pronunciation, and by virtue of the permission granted me, I include herein that editorial, which is as follows:

THAT WORD IS "MACKINAW"

Political issues discussed at the Republican conference in a Michigan northern resort have all been pretty well threshed out, but there remains one important point for Michigan authority to settle. Whenever there was mention of the locale of that conference its name always called for hesitation and doubt. Some of our most learned commentators and politicians didn't know whether to call that island Mackinac or Mackinaw, and they're still hesitating and stumbling over its pronunciation.

Of course, some of the maps of Michigan show the island is spelled Mackinac and the straits are likewise misspelled; but the town honorably clings to the grand old spelling and the grand old way of saying it—Mackinaw.

In the lusty, roaring days of timber cutting in Michigan, that whole locality was known as Mackinaw and nothing else—town, straits, island and all. If any old-timer ever had the temerity to refer to any of them by the fancy name of "Mackinack" some resentful lumberjack would have knocked him down, and left the imprint of his calked boot on the offender's face.

In winter, the old lumberjack wore a mackinaw—a combination of peajacket and reefer made of thick, honest wool, that was a yard wide and about an inch thick and in colors that made the northern lights look pale and anemic. He also wore mackinaw shirts, and mackinaw pants, mackinaw socks, and mackinaw boots—all guaranteed to give long wear and full protection against the cold of a Mackinaw winter or a dunking in icy waters during the spring log drive.

The majestic old side-wheeler which plied those waters with its loads of summer tourists and happy honeymooning couples was also the *City of Mackinaw*—not the *City of Mackinac*. The youth of that age also had a mild expletive for use on special occasions. It was "Holy Mackinaw!" and not "Holy Mackinac." The latter would have sounded silly, and there is a suspicion that the name "Mackinac" was invented in later years as something extra fancy to lure the tourist trade.

But a simple respect for the memory of those old lumberjacks and fishermen ought to inspire Michigan authority to preserve the old name and the old pronunciation, and that's Mackinaw and nothing else. That's the name that preserves all the romance, all the history, and all the old tradition. It's utterly impossible to be sentimental over anything called Mackinac. But the name "Mackinaw" can bring up wonderful memories.

New York's Governor on Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINIFRED C. STANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Miss STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered at the New York State Federation of Labor Convention held in Buffalo, N. Y., by the Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York. Governor Dewey's message is expressed with admirable clarity and forcefulness:

[From the American Federationist of September 1943]

NEW YORK'S GOVERNOR ON LABOR

Great, stirring victories have come to the armed forces of America. All of us have been deeply proud of the achievements of our fighting men. After long months in which our Army and Navy were handicapped by lack of material, we have seen the tide turn. We have seen American airplanes sweep the skies in overwhelming numbers above enemy territory. We have seen the courage and ability of our troops at length backed up by the weight of weapons needed to roll back the aggressors upon their own soil.

These victories on the fighting front abroad were made possible by victories previously won on the production front at home.

Too often, understanding is one thing and action on that understanding is another thing. We know it will take great sacrifices to win the war. But it is easy to let the other fellow make the sacrifices. We know that winning the war is greater than the issue involved in any strike. Yet it is too easy to let little issues become big issues which roll up into strikes.

With such fateful events hanging upon the continued outpouring of arms from our factories here at home, we have a single task ahead of us. We must redouble our every effort. We must be vigilant against the relaxation which is so apt to follow initial success. We must be vigilant against the human impulse to slacken effort in the face of a hard task long continued. We must be vigilant against those who would impede our production by dividing us against each other. The stream of supplies must flow to the fighting fronts not only in equal but in ever-increasing volume and without cease. Of these things, organized labor in the State of New York has shown its deep understanding.

Accordingly, we can all take particularly great pride in the fact that there have been no industrial strikes of any moment in the State of New York. There have not even been any industrial controversies here which are worthy of the name. The New York State Federation of Labor can point with similar pride to its record of having authorized no strikes in the industrial shops where it represents the worker. Labor in this State has kept its no-strike pledge.

In other parts of the country the production of coal, the production of steel and the production of other essentials to the machines of war have been critically hampered by industrial disputes. That has not happened in this State. In New York there has been no interruption in production.

At the height of the war effort, the people of the State changed administrations. They brought a different party into power and a complete new set of State officers. And with that change there was not one second's interruption of the public service or the production of goods, services, and food for war. On the contrary, I can confidently say that this State is more vigorously in the war effort in every department than ever before.

In the entire session of the legislature which ended last March, there was not one provocative incident which might impair the war effort. Not a single law was recommended by the executive or passed by the legislature affecting either industry or labor which would cause dissension affecting the war effort.

In this critical year we have had no contest between the executive and the legislative branches of the State government.

We have had no squabbling between department heads in the public prints, or, to let you in on a secret, in private. In order that the Nation might fight better abroad, we made certain that in this State there should be no fighting at home.

Yet not for one moment has there been an impairment of the two-party system of free discussion or of differences of opinion. There have been plenty of differences. But we have settled them after full debate in the American way and then got along with our job.

In the same way, and perhaps for somewhat the same reasons, labor has kept to the job. Of course, there have been differences between workmen and employers. Of course, there have been hotheads among both. But among men of good will there have been earnest discussions and peaceful settlements. And the men of evil will have not lasted long in important positions.

There has been little or no disposition among our leaders of labor to use the war to advance their personal power or their private ideologies at the expense of the people as a whole. Aside from limitations imposed by the war, through the National Government, the rights of workingmen of this State have been scrupulously preserved—even advanced—and the welfare of the Nation as a whole steadily served.

This free society of ours can wage total war and remain free. This we are proving in the State of New York. I am sure that you will wish to share some of the credit for this with the several State agencies that mediate between industry and labor. They have lived up to their responsibilities as you have, disinterestedly and intelligently.

The prime reason for the lack of major internal friction in our State can be put in one word—teamwork. We have had in New York a reasonable and cooperative attitude by enlightened employers devoted to free enterprise. We have also had a reasonable and cooperative approach by enlightened leaders of labor who also see in the enterprise system the only economic society we know under which labor can advance and remain free.

There was nothing magical about the teamwork which averted interruptions in production within our State. It has been achieved by hard work and the employment of common sense and good will. It is founded upon the basic principles of this free republic—a decent respect for the welfare, the opinions and the rights of every citizen whether he be in the majority or the minority, whether he be rich or poor, white or colored, employer or employee.

Democracy in a republic is not merely a word or a formula.

It is not something for which we cheer on public occasions and which we then go home and forget.

We cannot achieve it just by voting occasionally and considering that to be the end of our duties.

Good free government must be a habit of our lives from day to day.

It is good democracy in industry for free men to get together and solve their problems as freemen. That means to solve them man to man, without force, without violence, without coercion. It is good democracy in government for freemen to get together and solve the problems by which they govern themselves as freemen without force, without violence, without coercion.

In other words, democracy is a faith and a political philosophy, which we practice in a constitutional republic. Its principles rest upon the ideas that should guide us in all our human relations, the relations between neighbor and neighbor, the relations between electors and the people they elect, the relations between employer and employee.

We are sometimes told that the growth of America, the great development of its industries, has made impossible the human understanding that used to prevail when the boss knew every soul that worked for him and called him by his first name, and was called, in turn, by his first name. It is true that the early, friendly period was followed by unhappy days when labor relations were decided at meetings of a board of directors far distant from the plant. This is not true today and what has been happening in New York State is proof of it.

Both labor and management are increasingly learning to have competent, trained men on the job where the work is done. Each learns the problems of the other. Differences are adjusted by people on the spot, by those closest to the problem. That is a condition we need to encourage and expand not only in industry but in government. Good government in a free republic depends inevitably upon good local government. By the same token good relations between industry and labor are being steadily built by good human relations between those on the job, united in the will to do a good job for their country.

The war has inexorably brought us closer together in the solution of our common problems. We are learning that free men, living in mutual respect, can solve any problem. We are also learning to lift our eyes above immediate irritations of the day and look to larger objectives. Today those larger objectives are all submerged in the winning of the war. Tomorrow let us make sure we keep our eyes lifted up to the objectives of a happy and productive peace. It is not too early to discuss the direction in which we want to go when that time comes.

Under the pressure of war we have all willingly submitted to restraints by the National Government which are foreign to our most vital principles. In fighting total war we have learned we must mobilize our every resource and our every moment. A multiplicity of Federal regulations have been promulgated, governing hours, wages, and conditions of employment. In large measure these regulations supersede the functions of collective bargaining. They have superseded private management and, in some cases, have even taken plants away from their owners when the owners were without fault.

In time of total war such an abridgement of our rights is probably inescapable. But it is a condition which can only be justified by the sacrifices of war. We are fighting to make sure that such totalitarian conditions cannot exist in time of peace.

For, whether we recognize it or not, the peacetime effect of government control over the terms and conditions of labor would inevitably be to regulate out of existence the whole purpose of labor unions.

It is a fundamental truth that there is no place for genuine collective bargaining in a regimented economy. We have seen that strikingly demonstrated in the Fascist economies against which our whole Nation is today fighting. Collective bargaining is a right of free labor which can only be exercised by free labor. And there can be no free labor except in an enterprise economy conducted by freemen.

It will take vigilance and understanding to make certain that the wartime change in the relations of government to organized labor is not carried over into peace.

The hard-won rights of labor which have been abridged by wartime controls are as fundamental as freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Like these other rights, they must be restored intact to a people who have temporarily yielded them in the cause of freedom.

We can be sure of this only if we make certain that the regimented economy of war is succeeded by a peacetime economy of freedom under law. We can preserve it only in an economy of full production and full employment. For we can never, as a nation, consume more than we produce.

So that we shall truly regain and keep the vital freedoms for which we fight today, I invite you to join with all your vigor in the struggle to restore them at the end of the war. We can be neither free nor strong in a peacetime regimented economy. We can be both free and strong if we recover for labor and enterprise the dignity and unfettered strength which only free men can enjoy.

We are all fighting for the same thing—total victory. Workers and employers are equally interested in that goal. They are all gladly making every possible sacrifice to win the war and to win the peace after the war. An indispensable part of that peace will be continued progress in all our relations—the relations between labor and management, between both and Government.

The teamwork that we have set up in New York State must not be a temporary arrangement. It must be something that will last—that will enable us to live together and to work together, more keenly alive than ever to the ultimate truth that what benefits one group will benefit all.

America never turns back. Whatever our calling, we Americans look forward to the sharing of an ever greater future.

Renegotiation of Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Ways and Means Committee is at this time considering the important subject of renegotiation of contracts, I thought that not only the members of the committee but other Members of the House would be interested in a speech delivered on this subject by Lucian W. Shaw.

Mr. Shaw is a tax attorney, who up to 1940 was Senior Attorney in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Treasury Department. Since then, he has been assistant to the comptroller of Lockheed Aircraft Corporation and is considered an authority on tax matters.

The speech follows:

There is general agreement in the United States that we do not wish anyone to realize excessive profits from the war. Businessmen fully subscribe to this statement. This has been demonstrated by conservative dividend policies; to the extent that profits are desired, they are not for creating war profiteers but to achieve a firm footing to withstand the difficult period which looms ahead after the war ends. Despite the loud wails that emanate from particular concerns when the amount of their own alleged excessive profits is being discussed, there is general agreement with the basic purpose of the renegotiation statute which is to prevent excessive war profits.

It is not a mere accident that, according to the Truman committee, in nearly a year since enactment of the statute, only a handful of cases have been closed. The explanation is in the basic unworkability of the procedure. The situation bears a striking resemblance to the situation which arose with respect to the provision for certificates of nonreimbursement in connection with amortization, as provided in the Second Revenue Act of 1940. It is still an unhappy memory that after a year under that statute only about a dozen certificates had been issued, due to the basic impossibility of determining whether nonreimbursement existed. After two attempts at improvement by way of amendments, the departments finally recognized that the thing would not work and prevailed upon Congress to repeal it completely, which was done early in 1942.

The renegotiation statute was enacted April 28, 1942. In March 1943 the Truman Committee reported that 85,000 contractors were eligible for renegotiation. Of these only 203 cases, or one-fourth of 1 percent had been closed. Even if the exemption for volume were increased from $100,000 to $500,000, as recommended by the War Department, there would still be 20,000 elegible contractors, of which 203 cases settled is about 1 percent. One-fourth of 1943 had passed by and 1 percent of the cases were closed, with another 20,000 cases building up for 1943.

There is some reason, therefore, to believe that renegotiation is not workable. Let us proceed to an examination of its defects. Are they so profound, as in the case of nonreimbursement, as to indicate that the process cannot be made to work, regardless of changes and improvements? There seem to be two basic defects:

A. Lack of standards: The only guidance furnished by Congress in connection with renegotiation is that excessive profits are to be eliminated. After concluding in 1940 to deal with war profits by taxation, through an excess-profits tax, Congress spent 64 pages trying to define excess profits, without notable success. And yet, in the renegotiation procedure, a large group of administrators in the departments has been directed to determine excessive profits of many thousands of concerns, large and small, with no guideposts to go by other than those two words themselves, "excessive profits." As a result, hopeless confusion, both in the minds of Government administrators and of contractors, is unavoidable and will doubtless continue.

Formerly, when constitutional law was given more attention than it is now, one of its important concepts was that the legislative branch should not delegate its authority to administrators unless adequate standards for the exercise of the authority were provided. There was good sense to this; it is the place of Congress to determine the rules of the game; hundreds of thousands of administrators cannot be expected to achieve any degree of equity or uniformity if they have no rules to follow. This involves no criticism of any particular group of administrators; it is simply a basic principle.

Nor is there any hope of remedying this situation by more specific definition of excessive profits. Experience with the excess-profits tax clearly indicates the hopelessness of achieving exact definitions; and even if we did, how do excessive profits differ from excess profits? The departments have at last agreed upon a general statement of principles and policies on renegotiation, but it is of substantially no assistance in reaching a decision in any particular case.

B. Lack of review: Renegotiation is necessarily causing the establishment of a large administrative organization. It will doubtless grow larger and larger in its efforts to cope with an unworkable situation. Despite this fact, and assuming (which is not clear) that the departments have authority to force their decisions upon contractors, no appeal from, or review of, these decisions has been provided. It is sometimes necessary in wartime to deviate from the established democratic principle that a court review of administrative decisions is necessary. This, however, is too large a problem, involving too

much control over our economic welfare, to permit such deviation here.

This argument cannot be answered merely by providing for a court review of renegotiation decisions. To do so would clog the courts and it would take years to reach final decisions. This would impose such hazards and uncertainties upon busy war contractors that they would find it impossible effectively to carry on their war efforts for an extended period. A mere administrative appeal would offer no substantial improvement.

The two basic objections to renegotiation which cannot be surmounted can be aptly illustrated by an analogy of taxation. Suppose Congress in 1940, in its struggles to define excess profits, had thrown up its hands and said, "We can't do it; we will give the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the job of collecting a 50-percent tax on excess profits and he will have final authority to decide what excess profits are." A justifiable howl of protest would have swept the length and breadth of the land. Yet this is exactly the effect of renegotiation, except that the 50-percent rate is not even specified; that, too, is left up to the administrators.

In addition to the basic difficulties with renegotiation, there are other serious problems which it presents.

1. Does renegotiation encourage efficiency? Government officials have recognized publicly that if renegotiation does not reward efficiency, its basic justification is missing. Evaluation of efficiency of one contractor as against another is a herculean task. With thousands of contractors to deal with, how can the Government officials find sufficient time to make an adequate study of all of the obstacles encountered by each manufacturer, and its relative efficiency. How can the efficiency of one aircraft manufacturer making fighter planes be measured against another making an entirely different plane? The answer would seem to be that the decision must be based on more or less offhand information which is not a satisfactory basis for a decision perhaps involving many millions of dollars. To go further would require an enormous staff so that each contractor might be individually studied for many months.

If it is true that Government renegotiators are faced with making decisions as to efficiency without the opportunity for adequate study, then contractors cannot be convinced that they will be rewarded for hard work and cost reduction. They cannot escape the conclusion that the more they reduce costs, and hence increase profits, the more they are expected to refund on renegotiatiton. This leads to the same unfortunate psychological effects as the old cost-plus contracts and eliminates the incentive for efficiency which might otherwise be of benefit to the Government in the form of future price reductions.

2. Are book profits an adequate basis for determining excessive profits? Renegotiation proceedings are based on book profit figures. There are many new products being produced and complete changes are occurring in manufacturing methods with which scientific accounting cannot keep pace. As a result, book figures for any one year are subject to so many uncertainties that they cannot properly serve as the basis for refunding huge amounts to the Government. And yet, if the book figures should subsequently be proven to be wrong, it is not possible to reopen renegotiation and obtain a refund. For example, some large war contractors believe that their inventories are largely overstated; they cannot stop war production to take an actual inventory and check up; if they subsequently verify their fears after they have completed renegotiation, they have no remedy. This problem cannot be solved merely by leaving the renegotiation open; that would work both ways and would make permanent the uncertainty which now exists as a result of not having completed renegotiation when annual earnings statements are prepared. Stockholders and managements cannot operate successfully with a permanent renegotiation ax hanging over their heads.

3. Enormous waste of time: The unending confusion which is inevitable because of the lack of a measuring stick for excessive profits is most wasteful. Renegotiation is probably the most important single transaction faced by most contractors; their top executives must devote their best efforts to it. Adequate information on the operation of renegotiation on other contractors is not available, due to the present secrecy of administration. Because of the confusion, management's efforts will be never ending and the distraction from productive activities will continue for the duration of renegotiation as a procedure. This unquestionably interferes with the war effort.

Assuming that renegotiation will not be able to serve the very proper purposes which are supposed to justify its existence, can we simply cry "Off with its head," in an Alice-in-Wonderland manner? The answer, of course, depends upon the seriousness of the problems of excessive profits. If we agree with the basic policy that excessive war profits are to be avoided, their extent and the adequacy of other controls must be considered. It would appear that a twofold program relying on careful future pricing by the departments and taxation of profits already earned, should be adequate:

1. Future pricing. The departments have now learned a great deal about procurement methods and price determination. It cannot be denied that when we entered the war, there was no adequate opportunity to insure the reasonableness of prices. Products were new, the effect of enormous volume expansion on costs was unknown, and the departments themselves were growing very rapidly. All of these factors made for prices which proved to be unreasonable. Perhaps this would furnish a justification for leaving it in effect permanently.

The period of enormous expansion of the war program is now over. In connection with their renegotiation efforts, the departments have learned a great deal about costs and prices. There are not so many new products. There is no reason why a large part of the control over profits cannot be exercised in the normal manner, by keeping prices reasonable. Most contractors are beginning to have some kind of cost figures which can be used to check prices. The departments themselves, and the Truman committee, have indicated that more careful pricing is to be expected. This result would be insured if the efforts now being devoted to renegotiation were devoted to still greater efficiency in procurement. A large and capable staff of businessmen has been assembled for renegotiation; if their energies were devoted in full to assisting in the bargaining with contractors on prices, still further control of profits through prices would be achieved.

The problem of controlling subcontractors' prices is, of course, a difficult one. One solution would be to provide some supervision by the procurement agencies over prices charged to prime contractors by their major subcontractors. Efforts of renegotiators would be better spent on this type of activity than in the hazy field of recapturing profits previously earned.

2. Taxation. Assuming a substantial reduction in excessive profits which is already resulting from improved procurement methods, taxation should be adequate to deal with the remainder of the problem. There does not seem to be much hope of developing a beautiful new formula of taxation to solve the problem; all possible avenues of approach have been pretty well considered. The present excess-profits tax of 90 percent with an 80 percent ceiling would appear reasonably adequate. Certainly, if the rate were increased by 5 percent sufficient control should exist, always assuming adequate supervision of procurement. If the small proportion of profits remaining after taxation at such rates is still too much for a particular contractor, the fact should shortly become evident to the procurement officials who can reduce his further profits. If it be argued that they wouldn't discover him it can probably be replied that he is so buried among the 85,000 contractors subject to renegotiation that he won't be found by renegotiation either.

The foregoing remarks are made in all humility. The more one studies this subject the more in doubt he becomes. So far it appears that renegotiation cannot work in a manner which will produce reasonable fairness and equity and avoid the waste of enormous amounts of time. If this view is wrong, then renegotiation should be retained, for, as a matter of principle, it seems to have advantages which cannot be otherwise obtained. But if renegotiation is doomed to ultimate failure because it is unworkable, then the quicker that fact is generally accepted and the situation rectified the better it will be for the war effort.

Oil Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday when the President's message was being read to the Congress I was surprised and amazed when, in referring to oil production in his message, he made the following statement, and I quote:

> Since the outbreak of the war in Europe we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent.

It is apparent that the President has been wrongly advised in arriving at such conclusion and that if this statement is allowed to go to the country without correction, it places in a false position many of the Members of Congress who have been urging the extreme necessity of greater oil production and who have recommended a price raise in crude oil to help bring about such production. It also places in a false light the majority of independent oil producers of the Nation and many of those who are directing the affairs of major companies who have gone on record time and again pointing to the alarming conditions which the administration has allowed to develop with regard to the production of oil which sees the Nation now in the midst of an oil shortage with gasoline rationing throughout the land that is disturbing the morale of the people and retarding our war effort. I have written the President asking him to give the Congress the facts upon which he based his statement.

The plain facts are that the increased demand caused by the war for petroleum products for our tanks, planes, and ships has increased over production so rapidly during the past year that every producer and refiner of oil in the Nation has become disturbed for fear the supply of oil, if the war is to last a year or 2 longer, may not be sufficient for the military forces even with more severe rationing on the home front.

As a further proof that our oil production has failed to keep pace with consumption, possibly the best witness that can be called now, is a member of the President's Cabinet, Petroleum Coordinator Ickes. Let me quote, in part, from a statement he read to our congressional committee in Chicago, on August 13, when further rationing of gasoline was being discussed with our congressional committee.

I quote from Mr. Ickes' prepared statement of that date on pages 4, 5, and 6. This is what he read to the committee:

During the last 4 years, we have used our known reserves much faster than we have discovered new sources—twice as fast, as a matter of fact, for while we have been using our known supply at the rate of one and one-half billion barrels, new discoveries have approximated only three-fourths of a billion barrels per year.

This is the basic reason why a curtailment of civilian consumption of gasoline is necessary—in fact, inescapable—in the Middle West and the Southwest.

This statement will very likely seem incredible to most people. For years, we in the United States had been led to believe that we had all of the oil that we could possibly use, and probably would continue to have plenty for an indefinite number of years to come.

We have finally come to the disturbing realization that this is not true. On the basis of known military requirements—let alone such unexpected additional requirements which may develop—many an oilman is worried about the question of whether we shall be able to produce enough crude oil this year and next to satisfy the demands of the military, plus war industry, agriculture, and essential civilian needs, to say nothing of the relatively less essential requirements.

Unless important new discoveries are made, the natural decline in the productive ability of the fields in the United States—a decline that ranges from 1 to 2 percent each month—a widening gap between the production capacity of the United States and the anticipated crude-oil requirements will develop.

In the Middle West, which produces about 25 percent of the United States total, production has been falling off substantially as many of the oil fields enter their period of decline, hastened in many instances by wasteful production methods. I feel sure that you will be discouraged by the detailed record on this point, which members of my staff will present.

The stocks of crude oil above ground in the Middle West, available to make up for the deficiency in production have declined since Pearl Harbor. Those stocks have declined from 29,000,000 barrels to 19,000,000 barrels between Pearl Harbor and July 1943.

The total crude-oil production from district 2 has declined from a daily average of 1,180,000 barrels per day in December of 1941, to 940,000 barrels per day during July of this year. Production experts see little hope in sight for reversing this trend in the light of the meager results of exploratory efforts of the past several years. Oklahoma, Illinois, Indiana, and Nebraska, which together account for 570,000 barrels of our current daily production are steadily declining. Kansas, Michigan, and Ohio, which account for 370,000 barrels of our current daily production, are holding at levels of the recent past. Only in Kentucky, which accounts for 23,000 barrels or only 2.4 percent of current production, have there been any recent increases.

Although the search for new reserves and new productive capacity is continuing and is, in fact, being accelerated throughout the district, the results have been disappointing and the decline is expected to continue so that daily production will drop another 100,000 barrels by the first quarter of next year.

That is Mr. Ickes' testimony. He should know the facts.

The very fact that we have gasoline rationing Nation-wide is the most positive proof of the seriousness of the oil shortage that is now upon us. The responsibility of this man-made oil shortage rests directly upon the President and his advisers who have insisted on keeping the price of oil down to such a low level that such a policy has driven countless thousands of independent oil producers out of business. The price of oil today is only about 60 percent of parity. The oil shortage becomes more acute in the Nation. It cannot be waved aside by a general statement from the Executive that oil production has increased 66 percent.

That is a strange assertion to those of us who have been noting with alarm the rapid depletion of our producible reserves of petroleum, warning of the impending shortage, and finally witnessing the arrival of the shortage against which we warned.

The President has been given some erroneous information. No such increase in the output of petroleum has occurred. The outbreak of war in Europe is generally given the date of September 1, 1939, when the German troops marched into Poland. In that September, the output of crude petroleum from the fields of the United States was 3,608,000 barrels per day, and in August of this year it was but 17 percent higher. It is a fairer assumption that the demand for gasoline and petroleum products has increased by over 66 percent, but not the supply.

The statistics which someone supplied to the President would indicate a healthy condition. To move forward from the base figure of September 1939 the application of such a percentage of gain would mean that our fields are producing nearly 6,000,000 barrels per day. Would that it were so. We would have plenty of oil for all purposes. The several Federal bureaus which have a hand in regulating petroleum, from the drilling of a well to the rationing of the gasoline, would not then be issuing statements that they have allotted a trifle more to run the school busses or a modicum of increase to enable the farmer to raise the food for the Nation and to bring it to market. There would not be evident the concern I have heard in some quarters as to how the products will be provided with which to fill and operate to capacity that $75,000,000 pipe line, financed with taxpayers' money, and now nearing completion from Beaumont, Tex., to the Atlantic coast.

Nor could the President have meant that we had increased our "output" by taking it out of the tanks throughout the Nation. True, we have had to draw on such reserves; we have used up some 58,000,000 barrels of that above-ground stockpile of petroleum and products since September 1, 1939, on the basis of latest official figures. We continue to withdraw from stocks. For the past 2 months we have withdrawn at the rate of 100,000 barrels per day. Substantial as was this draft and frightening as this is as a symptom of our growing impoverishment in petroleum; to win the war and to have something with which to set about our work of conducting the Nation's economy when war shall have ended, this form of "output" still is not 66 percent.

I have tried many combinations of figures and dates and I still cannot find the 66-percent increase—nor in the figures I have examined is there basis for that comfort which some of the Government turnkeys of the petroleum prison loudly proclaim from time to time.

We have been given the entire range of explanations and rationalizations. There is nothing to add. First, it was a deficiency in transportation. That one we all understood. Next, rubber conservation. On both these points we have been given reassuring statements in recent weeks. The oil companies, with much rearrangement of their pipe lines, barges on inland waterways, and with herculean efforts on the part of the railways, and with the expenditure of $160,000,000 of public money to build two of the largest capacity pipe lines ever built, have provided for the movement of enough petroleum and products from the Middle West and the Southwest to take care of the eastern needs. William Jeffers has finished his job and has gone home, telling us that the rubber program is well along.

But the oil supply has been allowed to fail. No, it has been made to fail. Over in the Petroleum Administrator's office they now say it is scarcity that is the trouble. They hint at scarcity in heating oil this winter and they are quite positive that the gasoline supply will not improve.

Why did supply fail? Because the oil producer was "frozen" along with his income. He was the first victim of the "freeze." Leon Henderson and his doctors of philosophy put oil prices in the quick-freezer back in 1941 and they are still there. They chanted, did these learned men, that there would be plenty of oil for all purposes, never bothering to learn the first rule of maintaining and increasing oil supply which is that new drilling must be carried on consistently. Instead of drilling more, the producers have been handcuffed and hobbled by price and denial of materials, with costs going up all the time, until their effort is now half what it was in 1941. In Illinois, near the great consuming centers and the great industrial regions, the

search for new pools—what is known as wildcat drilling—will be about three-fourths this year what it was in 1942, according to the figures of the Illinois Geological Survey. Total wells drilled in 1942 in Illinois were not much more than half the number drilled in the year before and this year they will fall still further—probably not more than 80 percent of the number drilled in 1942.

Our Illinois production in September 1939—at the outbreak of the war in Europe—was 348,000 barrels daily. It is now 100,000 barrels daily less, and it is 180,000 barrels less per day than it was when we entered the war. Oklahoma is off about 100,000 barrels a day from the amount this great oil State was producing when our country entered the war. Kansas has increased, but the State conservation authorities have already served notice that the rate cannot be maintained. In State after State the story is the same—the producers cannot keep up the pace they have been setting.

As I have said, they have increased by 17 percent the amount they were producing when the war began in Europe—not 66 percent—but the war demands have increased in far greater proportion. And, to effect the increase that has been made, the industry drew upon a reserve that was created in pre-war years; a reserve not brought about as the result of anything done by the emergency authorities but solely through the operations under a system of free enterprise.

Let the blame be placed where it belongs. The record is clear. The oil industry and a large number of the Members of Congress have tried in every reasonable way to ward off the present distress. No heed has been given to their efforts by those who control oil and oil policies during this emergency. The situation will become a debacle if allowed to continue.

In Opposition to the Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a telegram signed by a number of prominent constituents of mine in opposition to the Fulbright resolution, indicating a fear that this resolution may be used as a loophole by President Roosevelt to involve us in foreign commitments in defiance of Congress and the Constitution.

The point made by the signers of this telegram, that in the last analysis the American people should be afforded the final determination on all foreign policies and on any commitments that might involve us in military alliances and war commitments, is correct.

We should win the war first, and then when we know the peace aims of all our allies and have given our returning soldiers an opportunity to express their views, it will be time enough to enter into any foreign commitments, particularly if they are to change our traditional foreign policies and independence of action.

The telegram follows:

NEWBURGH, N. Y., September 21, 1943.

HON. HAMILTON FISH,

House of Representatives:

We the undersigned wish to record our protest against the Fulbright bill. We oppose any bill or proposal past, present, or future, which commits the United States to the assumption of post-war responsibility for military, economic, or any other European maintenance. We feel no such enmeshing legislation should be passed without a referendum to the returning service men. The undersigned feels violently on this subject. It is not a mere parlor pastime. Every family represented has members in the armed forces, and incidentally, American citizens ranging from three generations to the *Mayflower*. We do not want any permanent alliance or commitments to Great Britain or anyone else, nor any discussions of it until after the war when much will be clearer than it is now. In our opinion this bill is a neat opening wedge for cat's-paw politics. Its innocent appearance and noble sentiment cover most damnable potentialities if not intentions.

Eva Thompson Purdy, Mable and William Alwood, Thomas Merritt, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Maharay, Beatrice McKay, Harrison; Elisa Coutant, Norman and Audrey Coutant, Harrison; C. and Catherine Coutant; John S. and Mary Evans; Mr. and Mrs. Frank Bell; C. Scott Satterly, New Windsor; Charles and Margaret O'Neil, Stuart and Helen G. Satterly, Meadowbrook; Clarence Warford, Edith Warford, Charlotte Bull, Nathan Brewer, Walter Brewer, Helen Biedecap, Barbara Beidecap, Ethal Biedecap, Jean Biedecap, Mrs. Edna Corwin, Louise Corwin, and George Corwin, Newburgh, N. Y.; R. Speidell and A. L. Gillam, Port Jervis, N. Y.; H. Franklin Waltman and Carolyn Waltman, Dover Plains, N. Y.

Letter of Hon. John J. O'Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to enclose a very interesting letter from a former distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable John O'Connor, which I am sure will prove very interesting reading to Members on both sides of the aisle and especially to those Members who are lawyers by profession.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *September 16, 1943.*

HON. FRED BRADLEY,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: In his belated message to Congress, on its reopening on September 14, the President continues his planned campaign of disparaging the legislative body, the only remaining curb to his dictatorial ambitions.

In his attempt to garner, for 1944, every communistic and radical vote in the country he castigates the Congress for daring to even suggest that those "pinks," Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, be separated from the Government pay roll on November 15, unless the President and the Senate decide to retain these Stalinites.

In his diatribe, against the House of Representatives especially, the President reiterates the statement, which someone undoubtedly fed to him months ago, that the act of Congress relating to these radicals was a bill of attainder.

The cold fact is that this act of the American Congress is no more "a bill of attainder" than Roosevelt is a Democrat.

Section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, relating to the powers of Congress, provides: "No bill of attainder * * * shall be passed."

In his message the President says: "The Supreme Court has defined a bill of attainder as a 'legislative act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial.'"

There can be no question but what he refers to the case of *John A. Cummings* v. *The State of Missouri*, decided by the Supreme Court in 1867, and reported in 4 Wall. 277, and 18 Law Edition 356.

While the expression quoted by the President appears in the majority opinion, written by Mr. Justice Field, a careful reading of that opinion will readily distinguish that case from that of the three "pinks." Four of the nine judges dissented—Justices Miller, Chase, Swayne, and Davis—as they likewise did in the case immediately following in the reports, *Ex Parte A. H. Garland* (4 Wall 333, 18 L. Ed. 366).

The Cummings case involved the constitutionality of a provision of the constitution of the State of Missouri, which required a certain form of oath to be subscribed to by priests and ministers before they could practice their calling.

Father Cummings refused to take the oath and was indicted, tried, convicted and fined $500. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction and held the Missouri test oath unconstitutional.

Father Cummings' counsel were Reverdy Johnson, David Dudley Field, and Montgomery Blair. For Missouri, there appeared G. P. Strong and J. B. Henderson. Mr. Justice Field wrote the opinion in both the Cummings case and the Garland case.

The oath required Father Cummings to state, in effect, that he had not taken any part in the Civil War against the Union.

Mr. Justice Field points out that "Fine and imprisonment are prescribed for holding or exercising any of the offices * * * without taking the oath." Congress has made no suggestion, yet, that our modern three radicals shall go to jail.

Mr. Justice Field also said (L. Ed., p. 361):

"Many of the acts, from the taint of which they must purge themselves, have no possible relation to the fitness for those pursuits and professions."

This is not the case with Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, who are now holding policy-making positions in the very government which they would undermine.

The Garland case involved an act of Congress, of January 24, 1865, which prescribed a test oath for the admission of attorneys to practice before the Supreme Court, and which included an affirmation that they had never voluntarily borne arms against the United States.

In an opinion by Mr. Justice Field, five justices held the act void. Three justices joined Mr. Justice Miller in a dissenting opinion in which he also discussed the Cummings case. Following his statement that the Cummings care is the first Federal definition of

"a bill of attainder," Mr. Justice Miller proceeds to adopt the English, and only existing definition, that an "attainder" is " 'the stain or corruption of the blood of a criminal, capitally condemned; the immediate inseparable consequence of the common law, on the pronouncing of the sentence of death.'

"The effect of this corruption of the blood was, that the party attainted lost all inheritable quality, and could neither receive nor transmit any property or other rights by inheritance.

"This attainder or corruption of blood, as a consequence of judicial sentence of death, continued to be the law of England, in all case of treason, to the time that our Constitution was framed and, for aught that is known to me, is the law of that country, on condemnation for treason, at this day.

"Bills of attainder, therefore, or acts of attainder, as they were called after they were passed into statutes, were laws which declared certain persons attainted, and their blood corrupted so that it lost all heritable quality. Whether it declared other punishment or not, it was an act of attainder if it declared this. This also seems to have been the main feature at which the authors of the Constitution were directing their prohibition; * * *."

The present act of Congress directed against the three Moscovites says nothing about their blood. Congress stopped short of that. As Mr. Justice Miller says (L. ed., p. 373):

"It is not claimed that the law works a corruption of blood * * * this leading feature of bills of attainder."

Any suit brought after the firing day, November 15, under the aegis of the President, or otherwise, should be most interesting, even though it was not foreseen by our founding fathers that the executive would make a practice of taking the legislative branch of the Government to court.

You and your colleagues in Congress may be assured, however, that there are still some of us, including lawyers, not afraid of some tests who will gladly volunteer, as party or attorney, to test out the question should the occasion arrive shortly after the Ides of November.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. O'CONNOR,
Former Congressman.

Aviation Problems and the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., August 25, 1943:

My subject today is aviation, but I do not wish to imply that the airplane will supplant other forms of transportation; instead, I believe that a further strengthening and development of all forms of transportation, air, highway, rail, and water, each in its own proper field, is essential to the continued progress of America.

There are few, even among those now engaged in the field of aeronautics, who have a full conception of the terrific impact with which post-war civil aviation will strike our world civilization. Its giant strides in pre-war development gave only a glimmer of what is yet to come, and are puny steps in comparison with the many new and startling aviation discoveries emerging from the inescapable urgency of our struggle for survival.

Technological advances since Pearl Harbor have been so vast that they are difficult to comprehend. More important, we have trained and trained well, hundreds of thousands of our best young men in various branches of aviation. The results of this program have already become visible for all the world to see.

American skill, plus American courage, aided by Allied strength, has battered the once mighty Luftwaffe into a quaking shell, unable today to do more than struggle weakly against the inevitable tomorrow when it will be swept from the skies. Boastful, strutting Mussolini has been blasted into black oblivion. The arrogant Jap, trained to welcome death before surrender, fled from Kiska through the fog. On fronts the whole world over American airpower is demonstrating its supremacy in a manner that will shorten the war by years, perhaps by decades, and save millions of American lives.

When the conflict is over, when these discoveries and trained men turn to the useful purposes of peaceful society, civil aviation will come into its own, in a manner that will affect the daily lives of all humanity. Because so much of its development is American, its greatest effects will be felt here, and because of its vast scope, its impact will be as great in the field of law, perhaps, as in any other profession.

Development of the railroad in the last century offers a classic example of how a new form of long distance transportation can influence your profession. We are meeting today in a city that became powerful because geography and the call of the steamboat whistle on Lake Michigan made it the greatest railroad center in the world. Think of the many knotty legal questions that accompanied the railroad's growth, of the problems that required solution before such growth was possible. What, then, of the far more complex legal problems which post-war civil aviation will present for your solution?

Consider the relative speed of development. In less time than it took to push the first railroad from Chicago to Aurora, the Army's Air Transport Command has built a global network of flying boxcars that probably carry more ton-miles in a week than all of the railroads emanating from Chicago did in their first 5 years of existence, to say nothing of the passenger traffic involved. When the war is over, much of these facilities, and the men to operate them, will be ready for rapid conversion to the works of peace, but the question of their ultimate ownership and regulation has already arisen. Are you ready to tackle even this one problem? I came here from the Twin Cities of Minnesota, where I spoke before the Midwest Global Air Conference. In attendance were more than 500 representatives from cities throughout the Middle West, gathered to consider the changing relationship between their communities and the rest of the world that is coming from the global growth of civil aviation. One of the major problems was airport construction. I doubt if any citizenry has ever built an airport large enough; requirements for space and facilities seem invariably to grow more rapidly than cities are able to purchase land and build ports.

Today, Chicago is a great railroad and manufacturing center, but it is hundreds of miles from the nearest seaport. Tomorrow, it may well be the hub of a world-wide aerial network through which traffic from much of America is routed to remote destinations all over the globe.

Here I ask your indulgence while I digress for a moment about the potentialities of this city which is our host. This metropolis is blessed by geography as are few of the world's cities. With equipment in existence today, it would be possible to leave this room, walk to the Michigan Avenue Bridge, step into a launch, 10 minutes later board the clipper and begin an aerial voyage that can terminate any place on earth in less than 60 hours, following the great circle routes which are the global airways of the future. By the great circle, much of Europe is closer to Chicago than to most of the Atlantic seaboard, just as most of Asia is nearer to it than to the Pacific coast. Yes, I predict that Chicago will be one of the world's leading air terminals, but there will be others just as important to be builded throughout America.

Aerial argosies of the future will fly with a degree of safety and dependability of schedule hitherto unknown. We will have better and more efficient planes, with more powerful and dependable power plants. We will know much more about the elements; at the same time, bad weather will be much less of a problem, with stratosphere flying becoming commonplace.

Thanks to war-spurred advances in the science of radionics, fog has ceased to exist so far as it affects the operation of a properly equipped plane. The pilot of the future will look into the end of a radio tube and "see" his way as clearly through dense fog or black night as through brilliant sunlight. He will be in constant touch with land bases by two-way radio, and the exact position of his plane while in flight will be determined with another radionic device. I predict that global air traffic of the future will be as safe and dependable as that known today by any form of transportation.

Parallel to the expansion of this type of traffic will be an unprecedented growth of domestic aviation. The air lines we know today will multiply and expand, with thousands of new cities added to the list of those with improved airports. There will probably be glider trains rendering local service over long runs with tow planes that do not land at intermediate points; gliders will cut loose from the train and glide to earth at stations along the way while the tow plane picks up new gliders on the fly. This will develop along with a similar type of feeder service which has brought daily air mail to 115 communities in 6 mountainous Eastern States for the past several years. By this system the plane sets out with mail for a number of cities along its course; at each city it swoops low, drops a sack of mail, picks up another on the fly, and continues on its way, landing only when it reaches its terminus at a junction with one of the major air lines. A number of mountain communities in West Virginia receive this daily service; few of them are equipped with airports, and at least 2 of them do not even have rail service. Applications are now pending from 15 different companies to give similar service to more than 2,000 communities in 39 States.

I have barely scratched the surface in discussing the future of aviation, but there is enough here to pose some very complex questions for the legal profession. Sooner or later the lawyer will run into the question of jurisdiction, with its content of constitutional controversy, conflict between Federal and State regulation, and complications in criminal and civil remedial laws.

In the area of administrative law and regulation his labors have been made immeasurably easier by the excellent Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and by the Board's announcement on December 18, 1938, of its plan to separate its functions of judge and prosecutor in the handling of regulatory cases.

The administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act calls for the highest technical and professional skill of the lawyer. Just to mention some of the subjects: air-carrier regulation; the application for and obtaining of certificates of public convenience and necessity, involving the intricate matters of competition and priority of air space; permits to

foreign carriers; rate making; air-mail transportation and rates therefor; regulation of business practices and prevention of unfair competition; registration and recording of aircraft; safety of transportation and equipment; and airport regulation.

For some time to come, no doubt, such matters will be committed to specialists in aviation law, but it will not be long before the general practitioner, or so-called business lawyer, will master some of the complexities of the practice.

The sphere of activities of the attorney will be greatly enlarged, both in Federal and State taxation. Interesting and complex questions will undoubtedly arise under the Federal income-tax law, and in connection with such other tax legislation, which will, no doubt, supplement the income tax to meet the stupendous burden of war. Many important questions will arise in State and local taxation. One occurs to me, namely, to what extent will the States extend the principle of taxation of migratory tangible property, based upon the average number of days present in the taxing area, as announced in the Johnson Oil Refining Company case, or some other average basis, which ought to be interesting and profitable to the lawyer.[1]

While somewhat restricted and local in character, the law affecting airports, their establishment and operation, will pose new problems. Even in a narrow field as zoning, there will be many interesting questions. One has already arisen in Maryland where zoning ordinance restricting the height of structures within specified distance of the perimeter of an airport was held repugnant to the constitution of Maryland, and for that reason invalid.[2]

Where the general practitioner and the business lawyer will be called on most will be in the enlargement of commercial transactions and the vast increase of passengers, freight, and express transportation which will flow from the certain expansion of aviation. New problems under old principles will arise. There will be need of pioneering. The law will be elastic enough, as it always has been, to adjust itself to the new conditions, and I believe that you will avail yourselves of the opportunity for business and for service to the community in this fascinating field.

The contraction of the world and the elimination of great distances between countries, especially between North and South America, will result in the exchange of legal ideas and concepts and will call forth the highest skill and capacity of lawyers, not only those specializing in international law but the ordinary practitioner as well.

It has been said that insurance is the handmaiden of industry. Certainly, as lawyers concerned with insurance problems, you recognize immediately that the growth of commercial as well as private flying will to a considerable extent be directly affected by the type of insurance benefits available, the cost of such benefits, and the ease or difficulty with which aviation liability problems generally can be solved. If all branches have efficient insurance machinery available, civil aviation will be encouraged. If, however, the machinery is inefficient, the growth of civil aviation will be hampered.

Those of us in Congress who are interested in promoting the fullest possible growth of civil aviation, and who have long been interested and active in this field, are particularly aware of the increasing attention which must be given to aviation insurance problems. Several bills have been introduced touching upon various phases. Other bills undoubtedly will appear when Congress reconvenes. We must decide what to do with these bills. To do that we must have clearly in mind the general principles which are to guide decisions on specific pieces of legislation. In all of this the Congress needs, and I am sure will welcome, the advice and suggestions of a group such as your own.

The problems, of course, are not wholly legal. Many underwriting and actuarial matters must be considered. The lawyer, however, has a unique opportunity to make a contribution in this field. His knowledge of legislative and administrative procedures, and pitfalls and his practical contact with the various business phases of insurance, place the lawyer in a unique position to be of aid.

I do not presume to be able to indicate what the so-called solution should be. I can, perhaps, point up what appear to be some of the most pressing questions which require immediate attention.

One problem, for example, which I know has had the consideration of some of you, and which is far from solved, involves the question of whether or not there should be enacted by the Congress a national workmen's compensation act. It would, perhaps, be patterned along the lines of comparable legislation in the railroad field, which would establish uniformly the rights of employees and the obligations of employers for all types of injuries or fatalities in the field of air transport employment.

The application of many State workmen's compensation statutes to the new field of civil aviation is not clear. What provisions of the existing statutes apply to aviation employees and how those provisions will be interpreted in the light of the novel situations presented are not clear. The provisions of the laws themselves differ substantially. Efforts to bring about uniformity have not been successful. There should be no doubt as to what the worker rights are or what the employer is obligated to pay in the event of an employee's injury or death. Yet such confusion exists. This uncertainty may become greater as the number of employees increases and business becomes more complex.

The proposal for a Federal statute has much to commend it. A Federal plan should be relatively simple. It would necessarily bring uniformity of benefits and liability. Much of the confusion would be eliminated. What form the bill could take and what are the advantages and disadvantages of the various proposals which have been made present technical problems on which the Congress will need your constructive suggestions. Perhaps some satisfactory alternative to Federal legislation is feasible. There would be wide interest in a pragmatic solution to this pressing problem, which must be dealt with effectively as a necessary job of bringing stability to civil aviation and making employment in that industry attractive.

Another special problem, and one of which the solution has been already too long delayed, is that presented by those who advocate the enactment of a Federal aviation liability act. We recognize that we do not have in our body of common law or in our existing State legislation principles which are sufficiently definite, precise, or inclusive to enable anyone at the present time to state the rules of liability in the field of civil aviation. Many novel types of liability are created by this new development—aviation. Of course, if sufficient time is permitted to elapse, the nature of this liability and the rules of law which control will be slowly whittled out through numerous court decisions and patchwork legislation. This is an expensive, unscientific, and cumbersome process. We should, on the basis of our experience, be able now to determine what these rules should be and to establish rules which will be fair and equitable to all concerned.

It is obvious that aviation presents a special problem and that a separate approach to it is necessary. The air lines have indicated a willingness to assist in working out a satisfactory solution. They have not objected to compulsory insurance and they are willing to accept definite rules which, for practical purposes, will impose liability upon them in many doubtful cases, asking only that such liaibility be limited by statute to reasonable amounts.

Many of you undoubtedly are familiar with the report prepared by Mr. Sweeney, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, dealing with this complex subject. He suggests that in Federal legislation lies the solution of the many difficult questions of aviation liability. Whether the solution lies in State or Federal legislation is a problem which must be decided soon. There can be no doubt the problem exists.

Another question receiving congressional attention involves the special field of liability insurance for air transport companies. It is obvious that the growth of air transportation, both domestically and abroad, can be accomplished only if adequate and efficient insurance and reinsurance coverage can be readily obtained at proper cost by American flag air lines. If adequate insurance protection is not available from private sources, it must be made available through governmental machinery. There is no reason to believe, however, that private groups cannot supply this insurance, except, of course, war risk insurance, where obviously the Government must cover the risk. Private insurers, however, writing air-transport insurance, must be continually alert to the changing conditions. They must keep ahead of the industry and encourage its development. They must suggest modern types of policies which are designed to meet the air carriers' needs. They must be willing to open their records to the fullest disclosure so there may be constant scrutiny of profits and the type of practices followed in reinsuring risks abroad.

There has been some discontent in airline circles with the existing insurance machinery. The whole problem is being thoroughly reviewed and a practical solution can and should be worked out. I am certain appropriate committees of Congress will watch these developments with genuine interest. Whatever solution is achieved will be one which must withstand the most careful examination.

The types of problems which I have mentioned will come before the Federal legislature. There are many related problems which are constantly requiring the attention of the States. I feel, however, that, looking at the picture as a whole, we must recognize there is need for centralizing the bulk of the regulatory and legislative activity in the civil aviation field in the hands of the Federal Government. This is a policy which the American Bar Association has supported. It is welcomed by various aviation interests, and which is a well-established national policy as evidenced by the Civil Aeronautics Act. When one considers regulatory problems in the field of aviation insurance, however, a conflict arises. While aviation is committed to a Federal policy, insurance groups have consistently shied away from Federal legislation. They fear, perhaps with justice, the encroachment of the Federal Government and seek a continuance of State jurisdiction. However desirable and right such a policy is with respect to insurance generally, the peculiarly Federal character of civil aviation must not be overlooked in dealing with aviation insurance matters.

The Federal Government, by reason of the broad national aspects of its program for civil aviation development, may be expected to take steps to eliminate any serious obstacles which inadequate insurance or insurance regulation places in the way of continued development. Immediate and careful consideration of aviation insurance problems, if coupled with concrete affirmative

---

[1] *Johnson Oil Refining Co.* v. *Oklahoma*, 290 U. S. 158.

[2] *Mutual Chem. Co.* v. *Mayor and City Council of Baltimore et al.*, Baltimore Daily Record, Jan. 27, 1939, p. 2.

action designed to eliminate the existing difficulties, will obviate the necessity of any drastic legislation in this field. All groups concerned, including lawyers, must recognize the challenge and get to work. A great opportunity is presented.

No discussion of post-war aviation could be complete without some comment on the world of tomorrow, which aviation will help us build. I believe that the time is long since past when we should use such labels, or epithets, if you will, as "isolationist," "interventionist," or "internationalist." For better or for worse, we have been propelled into a new conception of our relations with other nations. At war's end the United States will be by all odds the most powerful nation on earth, and so, for better or for worse, we will largely be responsible for the nature of the post-war world.

I would like to make it very clear that, both as a private citizen and as a public official, I approach this problem as an American, and only as an American. More than 3 years ago I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives directing the President to begin negotiations with Britain and France for the acquisition of their possessions off our Atlantic seaboard in partial payment on their debts from the First World War. The measure did not pass. However, I am today more certain than ever that these islands, which are geographically part of our domain, should come under our jurisdiction, and that we should begin negotiations for their acquisition immediately.

I do not believe in piracy, but, on the other hand, I do not believe we should permit our just claims to be dismissed with a suave smile by the owners who rightly can thank us for their continued free existence, coupled with their own courage.

When I introduced this resolution in 1940 I did not mention Greenland, because in the Virgin Islands transactions we had specifically waived all claim to that vast Arctic island. Moreover, in the hands of peaceful Denmark it seemed safe enough.

Today, however, the picture has changed. We were forced to assume de facto sovereignty of Greenland when Hitler swallowed Denmark, and Greenland has rapidly come to have enormous strategic value to the United States. First, it is today our secure source of cryolite, an aluminum compound which is essential in our present method of extracting aluminum from bauxite. Second, its 700,000 square miles of smooth ice cap make it a perfect intermediary base for air transport between the United States and Europe, in peace or in war. Third, by routing flights over Greenland, there is no over-water hop longer than 500 miles.

We must be realists in looking at post-war Europe. In our hands, Greenland is worth a thousand pursuit planes as a defense against any hostile European nation; if controlled by a hostile nation it is worth, to him, a thousand bombers. I believe, therefore, that we must make some type of agreement with post-war Denmark which will give us Greenland. It will not be long until we return to the Danes the freedom of their own country; is it too much if we ask them to give us Greenland as an expression of gratitude, and as assurance that in the remote future we will again defend them against alien dominance? And why is not gratitude for lend-lease, and for the coming restoration of France, reason enough for us to be given all British and French possessions in our waters?

On the same basis, I believe we should insist on retaining the Pacific islands which have threatened our safety in the past, and the air bases we are building as a means of winning this war.

I repeat: I approach the post-war world strictly as an American. I welcome eagerly the new concept of world relationships which global aviation forces upon me; I believe in international cooperation; I do not believe in piracy. But I believe we should insist on retaining the margin of superiority which we are forced to build in order to win the war; that we should disarm only as others disarm, retaining always this managing supremacy; that we should never again permit strategic points which might one day be used against us to remain in the hands of other nations; that from now on we should retain the power to quickly punish any nation anywhere that threatens our peace and safety; and finally, in necessary and desirable collaboration with other peaceful peoples America can best serve itself and world humanity by keeping always its identity—that history and heritage so fundamentally founded on justice.

Air Transportation and the Future of America's Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on the occasion of Oklahoma's Aviation Day, 1943:

This war is presenting, as one of its principal byproducts, a challenging issue to every community in America, particularly to the smaller communities not now receiving air transportation service.

Every load of bombs carried over Germany shows us something more of the possibilities of air transportation as a carrier of people and goods through all kinds of weather, day and night, at high speeds, for short and long distances.

Every sortie by our intrepid airmen in Africa—and now, thanks to their prowess, in Sicily and the Italian boot—shows us something more of the possibilities of air transportation as a means for enriching our communities through a new, faster, safe, and more pleasant means of travel.

Every thrust by the Fortresses and Liberators on the vast expanse of the southwest Pacific toward our ultimate goal in Tokyo shows us something more of the possibilities of air transportation as a tie which will knit the communities of our Nation more closely together in the unceasing quest of a free America for the fuller life for our millions.

For this war has proved, even to the blindest among us, that air transportation is just as much a part of our transportation picture as rail, motor, or water transportation. In the America of the post-war world, transportation by air will become an essential vehicle of our Nation's economy.

It is necessary, therefore, that every community give serious thought and make necessary plans for those steps which will assure that it is a full participant in the benefits of air transportation. It is just as important that there be brought to each of our communities the benefits of air transportation as it once was that the lines of steel rails be laid to them or that the highways of concrete and gravel be threaded through them.

The community which is asleep, or which, by the failure to exercise diligent foresight, lets the march of air transportation pass it by, will find in the next decade or so that it is a forgotten eddy in the rush of the great stream of America's national life.

To the American community, large and small, of tomorrow the airport will be one of the most important utilities in its possession. To and from that airport will come all of the travel of more than a hundred miles or so and much of the small package cargo and virtually all the mail, save for the shipments and mail between nearby points. The airport will become the principal point of contact between the average community and the great world lying over the horizon.

When I say contact with the world I mean precisely that. With the slower surface transportation it is waxing too poetical, perhaps, to speak of contact between the average community and the whole world. But the speed of air transportation will so revolutionize our habits and our thoughts and our interests that it will become a matter of course for the ordinary citizen to take an occasional trip to our neighboring nations, or even to other hemispheres. It will be no more startling to take off from some one of our communities in the Midwest bound for Buenos Aires than it is now to go to the railroad station for a trip to Minneapolis or Seattle or Atlanta.

If we read some of the history of our country of fifty or a hundred years ago, it is not unusual to find reference to communities, then important, which have either been forgotten or have disappeared, or which have now become insignificant. In each case the explanation of their decline can be found in their failure to secure for themselves the advantages of modern transportation. This waning in the position of a community can still occur and in fact will occur for those of our cities which fail to assure themselves a place in the great air transport network in the years to come.

There are three indispensable conditions to a proper development of air transportation for the benefit of all our communities.

The first is that the regulation of air transportation shall take place under fair and uniform conditions without sectional and regional discrimination. This can be accomplished only through a centralized regulation under the Federal Government. The speed, the complexity, and the mobility of air transportation are such that the problem of regulating the basic conditions under which it is to be conducted cannot be adequately handled by the various States, as in the case of the slower motor or rail transportation. State regulation would only tend to create barriers making it more difficult for an individual community to assure that it is adequately connected with its sister communities throughout the Nation. State regulation would only lead to competition between State regulatory agencies to secure a favored status, with inevitable harm to the growth of the industry for the benefit of all, provoking retaliation and discrimination. State regulation would be inefficient and present cumbersome red tape, multiplying governmental requirements—of which in this day and age we should all be heartily sick—which could serve no useful purpose.

The second condition is that the development of air transportation should be left free of control by competing surface carriers. Today there is a strong movement, on the part of many surface carriers to move into the air transport field. This effort is understandable. These carriers are naturally worried lest the competition from air transportation might affect their own traffic and revenues. But it is of supreme importance that these different modes of transportation be kept separate, and on a truly competitive basis. One of the saddest chapters in our history was the tendency on the part of transportation enterprise in an earlier day to combine into great monopolies stifling the interests of local communities. It was this effort to monopolize transportation which was one of the evils leading Congress to adopt the antitrust laws beginning in the latter part of the nineteenth century. But recently railroad interests have been seeking to be relieved of

such laws and of other guaranties of competition, and to secure legal permission to construct great systems of transportation by every means—land and air—under common ownership, on the plea that such integration as it is called will result in economies and improved service. The plea is false. By theoretical talk about operating economies, it is sought to delude us into surrendering to the dominant interests the determination of the future of our transportation development. There is no more possibility of operating economies, in any real practical sense of the term, through combinations of rail and air carriers than there would be through combinations of a grocery store in Maine with an oil field in Oklahoma. The operating problems of the two forms of transportation are just as different as the wheels of a locomotive are different from the wings of an airplane.

Strong, vigorous competition between the two forms of transportation, in the traditional American way, must be maintained if this young and coming industry of air transport is to realize its rightful place. By strict requirements that the older means of transportation keep hands off, we can assure that the growth of the one will not be stunted by the vested interest of the other, and that American communities everywhere, no matter what the private interest of the other carriers might dictate, will enjoy the advantages of the swiftest and most modern of all transportation media.

The third condition for the proper growth of air transportation in the best interest of all of our communities is an active, intelligent interest on the part of the local community itself. It would be a wise investment if the citizens of each of our communities should band themselves together into a local organization in each city, through their own chambers of commerce or otherwise, with the specific purpose of planning for and securing adequate air transportation as soon as it is practicable to furnish that transportation. One of the first concerns of any such a group should, of course, be an adequate local airport, properly zoned so as to assure freedom from dangerous obstructions to flight to and from that airport. Also such a group should make the surveys and studies which will be most beneficial in showing its immediate and future needs for air transportation and the amounts of trade and travel which it can expect to generate. Likewise it should encourage a continued interest on the part of the youth of the community in the art of flight in order that there can be available locally the skills to engage in various aeronautical pursuits which will attract aeronautical industry to its borders. In these and other ways, such a group can assure that its community will not be left in the wake of our progress in the air.

With each of these three conditions a bill pending in Congress deals in a constructive manner. It provides for Federal regulation, with proper provision for the cooperation of State and other local agencies. It provides that surface carriers will not be permitted to capture air transportation. And it provides numerous means for encouraging and aiding States and municipalities in airport construction and airport zoning, in aviation education, and in other such activities.

It is to be hoped that this bill may become law in the near future. This war will one day be over. It may not end this year or next. But whether it continues for 2 or 3 or even 4 years, it is not too soon to begin now to plan for the future place of air transportation in the community life of every American city. The problems of air transportation are complex and difficult. The industry is new and the engineers are still performing miracles of invention which cause in its technology overnight changes of revolutionary importance. This state of technical flux enormously complicates all the problems in connection with its successful development. Therefore, our best minds are needed to solve its problems, and we must take plenty of time in order to be sure that we do not make too costly mistakes. That is why we need now the legislation in Congress which will do all our lawmakers can do to assure that the three basic and indispensable conditions for the sound development of the industry are taken care of. The rest is up to the cities of America, and to the young men and women in this new industry.

Insurance for Employees of Certain Organizations

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on the first day after the summer recess I introduced in the House a bill to establish and provide for a system of old-age and survivors' insurance for employees of religious, charitable, educational, and certain other organizations, and for other purposes. This bill has now been numbered H. R. 3204.

This proposal is designed to provide old-age and survivors' insurance protection for the secular lay employees of nonprofit tax-exempt institutions and agencies.

The bill embodies most of the features of the present title II of the Social Security Act; but in order, first, to give due recognition to their nonprofit functioning—affording public services without gain motive—with its attendant financing problems, special needs and limitations, and, second, to safeguard the traditional tax-exempt status of nonprofit organizations, includes certain special features.

It proposes under a new title II–a that every tax-exempt organization—as defined in this title—which is an employer, shall secure Federal old-age and survivors' benefit for its secular lay employees by insuring such employees in a separate trust fund to be known as the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund for employees of religious, charitable, educational, and certain other organizations.

It attempts to distinguish clearly between contributions required under the plan and general taxes levied by the Federal Government. The payments to be made are denoted as "premiums" and these premiums would go directly into the fund without passing through the general funds of the Treasury and without requiring appropriation by Congress. The Social Security Board has been designated the collection agency, but it would be possible under the provisions of the bill for the Board to arrange that the Bureau of Internal Revenue do the actual collecting.

Benefit payments are identical with those provided under title II, but premium rates are one-half percent lower. Nonprofit agencies have no means of passing on the cost of the insurance to their beneficiaries or to those they serve. It is likewise believed that this lower rate is sound in the light of experience.

These distinctions are desirable and sound. The proposal is a constructive one, and with the text proper, subject to perfecting alterations, will afford desired protection to the many employees of such organizations and at the same time continue the long-established and deep-rooted recognition of the vital contributions the churches, the charitable and community agencies, and the private schools and colleges have made to our country and its people, and assure that these services shall not be threatened but fostered.

Argentine Debt Repatriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce:

ARGENTINE DEBT REPATRIATION

Argentina's decision to redeem 500,000,000 pesos of its Government bonds held in Great Britain, out of its huge accumulations of blocked sterling balances in London, will favorably affect the financial and economic position of both countries for the immediate future.

The funds for this operation will be raised through the sale of Government obligations within Argentina. This financing will absorb surplus purchasing power, and thus abate the inflationary pressure which has been becoming increasingly pronounced. At the same time, the reduction in the Argentine external debt will reduce that country's foreign debt service further, and thus strengthen its balance of payments position after the war when imports of both consumer and capital goods are likely to be quite heavy for a time, so that the trade balance may turn unfavorable.

The money that will be raised through the sale of refunding obligations within Argentina will be used to pay off the Argentine exporters who hold sterling balances, while the bondholders in Great Britain will be paid off out of the sterling balances frozen in that country. The Argentine business concerns involved will thereby be placed in much stronger liquid position, which should strengthen their credit standing for the postwar period.

Great Britain, also, will be favorably affected for the near future. Blocked sterling balances due Argentina, it has been estimated, would have increased to £42,000,000

by the end of this year, owing to heavy British imports of meats, hides, and other products, and subnormal exports of manufactured goods to Argentina. These balances had caused so much concern that special provision for their gradual liquidation had been included in the American plan for an international stabilization fund. The redemption of the Argentine bonds held in Britain will reduce these frozen balances by some £32,000,000, or more than 75 percent. This will facilitate stabilization of the pound after the war.

It should be noted, however, that over the long run redemption of Argentine investments held in Britain reduces that country's ability to buy Argentine products. In the past, Great Britain has paid for her heavy imports of animal products and grain from Argentina in part with interest and dividends received on investments in that country. Repatriation of these investments will reduce such receipts sharply, and the British will have to sell more manufactured goods to Argentina if these imports are to be sustained. In view of the industrialization going on during the war, it remains to be seen whether the Argentine will be willing to buy more from Britain over the long run.

A Fighting Sailor Commends a Fighting Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to call attention to a most interesting experience of a colleague, Hon. MELVIN J. MAAS, which appeared in the Northwest News under date of September 15, 1943:

One day early this month, MELVIN J. MAAS, blunt, outspoken Congressman from Minnesota's Fourth District, home for a much-needed rest before returning to a strenuous congressional program in Washington, was called on to defend his voting record in Congress. His questioners and bitter critics were 28 legislative chairmen representing Minnesota C. I. O. local unions.

The rotund, fast-moving, little solon lost no time in informing his critics just where he stood. He read from a printed sheet, handed him when he entered the closed meeting room in St. Paul, Minnesota's St. Paul Hotel, his record which had aroused hostility among C. I. O. members. He promptly told them that he thought he had voted in the interests of all the people and that he would vote the same way again on any and all bills that have been presented to Congress.

Robert Madigan, chairman of the C. I. O. Victory committee, presided, and gave MAAS the floor first. Madigan said union members gave up the right to strike and said the record of the last Congress is one of "vacillation, refusal to grasp major issues, failure to mobilize the home forces behind the armed forces, a retrogression from progress and measures to improve morale were undermined."

MAAS said, "I stand absolutely on my record. I never intentionally ducked a vote and in the several cases I am not recorded I was investigating congestion of transportation and housing and lack of food in vital areas such as Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif."

The Congressman said he was absent when the vote was taken on the Hobbs anti-labor-racketeering bill, but would have voted for it, if he had been present.

He said the $25,000 limitation of incomes bill, which the group severely criticized, strikes at Americanism. "When you establish the principle that a man is limited to any amount you destroy initiative. That's the fair way to limit incomes anyway. We would have no surpluses to build industries that create jobs, if you limit income."

When the discussion was most heated, a big, brawny sailor in active white service uniform applied for admission. Glad to accommodate a fighting man from Uncle Sam's armed forces, the gob was allowed to enter and sit down. After listening for some time, the big, broad-shouldered Navy man asked permission to speak, which was quickly granted.

What the sailor said and what followed threw the meeting into turmoil, bewildered the gathering, and caused the little Congressman to puff his inevitable cigar white hot. Hailing from Duluth, the Navy man said his name was Nelson. Home on a furlough after service in the southwest Pacific, where he said the name MAAS is a byword among Navy men, he happened into the hotel lobby, heard MAAS was speaking, and strolled in for the express purpose of shaking the Congressman's (member of the potent Naval Affairs Committee) hand.

Sailor Nelson said he was ashamed of the group; that they should be ashamed of themselves for wrangling over insignificant, petty things when there is so much of far greater importance to consider. "Boys in the armed services are out there in hell fighting for your freedom and mine, while you fellows sit at home with nothing better to do than pan a Congressman for trying to honestly represent the interests of all the people, rather than the selfish interests of a minority."

While Nelson was speaking a motion was put to "stop this foolishness and ask this man to get out." The motion was lost, however, in other shouts from the floor, "Let him continue." Sailor Nelson, in the prime of excellent physical condition gained from the Navy, was not inviting trouble, nor did he expect to be thrown out of the meeting. It is doubtful, though, if there were any 3 men together out of the 28 present who could have or would have attempted to forcibly eject the big fellow.

Nelson told the gathering that, "It is a sad commentary on American democracy and free speech and you fellows above all, as proponents of liberalism, who won't allow a fighting man to have his little say and perhaps the last say I'll ever have, I'm going back into that hopper of hell in a few days."

Nelson described the sensation of a rolling, pitching, rocking battleship under heavy fire with bombers flying overhead dropping fire and hell on deck and said: "It takes real guts to stand up under such terrifying punishment, but damned if I can understand what it takes to pull what you fellows are pulling here tonight. If there's anyone here who would like to change places with me let him stand up."

One out of the 28 got to his feet, whereupon the big sailor grabbed the hand of the lone taker in a hearty shake. "I am proud of you," Nelson said. Then walking over to the astonished Congressman, the sailor accomplished the purpose for which he had sought admission to the meeting—to shake the hand of Navy's Congressman MAAS, which he did with, "God bless you, Congressman," and "Good night, gentlemen."

Sailor Nelson was lost in the night and so was the rest of the critical meeting, the sum total of which left the Minnesota Congressman with a high vote-right average of nearly 98 percent.

With a parting shot from the Congressman, "If you fellows can find only 15 bills out of 400 to kick about I think that's a pretty good record in my favor. I challenge you to go out and defeat me if you are not satisfied," the meeting adjourned.

Ex-House Member, Wounded in Pacific Area, Eager to Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of September 19, 1943:

EX-HOUSE MEMBER, WOUNDED IN PACIFIC AREA, EAGER TO FIGHT

(The following story was written by Technical Sgt. Dan Campbell, a Marine Corps combat correspondent, and distributed by the Associated Press.)

SOMEWHERE IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC, August 15 (delayed).—Oklahoma's fighting ex-Congressman asked for action, got it with both barrels, and now wants to go back for more.

As soon as his wounds are healed, Maj. Phillip C. Ferguson, U. S. M. C., of Woodward, Okla., expects to rejoin what he calls "the fightin'est outfit in the south Pacific." He is a marine raider.

Major Ferguson, who served in the House from 1935 to 1941, is recovering at an island hospital from machine-gun bullet wounds in the wrist and hip incurred when marine and Army units wrested Enogai Inlet from the Japs.

Asking for assignment (it's a volunteer job) to a marine raider outfit is asking for extra trouble, but the major was ready for it. Wiry and tough as a rawhide quirt, weathered and tanned as a piece of saddle leather, he marched in the van of a 6-day forced jungle trek across Dragon Peninsula on New Georgia Island.

While tough raider youngsters half his age were finding the jungle a mean opponent, the rangy Oklahoma plainsman was taking it in his stride—a long one. It kept him at the head of the reconnaissance column until July 8.

"We were approaching Enogai and I was just going back to report the disposition of our troops when the Japs attacked," he said. "I got caught in the spray of a machine gun. I crawled 50 yards and two corpsmen (Navy medical corpsmen) helped me back to the command post."

Major Ferguson joined the Marine Corps in 1938 because he believed "war was coming."

His wife, Mrs. Martha Ferguson, and two daughters live on their ranch at Woodward, Okla.

No Oversight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, without undertaking an exhaustive discussion of

the subject, and under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call your attention and that of the Congress to an article in the Washington Daily News of September 20, 1943 by Raymond Clapper relative to assistance rendered the cause of freedom by the French. Notwithstanding the fact that the statements made therein are substantially correct, I am certain that our President did not purposely fail to make any reference to the Free French and those French people whose resistance to the despots extends to every corner of France. Since the President's report concerned primarily the accomplishments and statistics of our country it can easily be seen why no reference was made to France. However, in the victories of north Africa, the French Army rendered great assistance to the Allied cause and we may be sure that French forces will be fighting on newer fronts ever nearer to France as the war progresses. I feel confident that at the opportune time the President for himself, and on behalf of the American people and our allies, will pay just tribute and give full recognition to the French.

The fact that Americans respect the French tricolor which the Germans have temporarily torn down is demonstrated by the plan to issue a new United States postage stamp this month in honor of France. This tribute goes to a nation which is temporarily on its knees but which will rise again in all its former splendor from the ashes of this great holocaust.

Mr. Clapper's fine remarks in behalf of the French are as follows:

IMPORTANT OVERSIGHT

(By Raymond Clapper)

The last message of President Roosevelt was such an admirable and helpful report on the war that one hesitates to find any fault with it. Yet the silence about our relations with the French committee was disappointing.

We are going to need France. Even if a miracle should bring victory without an invasion of France, the French people would still be a most important factor in achieving allied peace and security.

In his message to Congress, Mr. Roosevelt praised the Russians and the Chinese and distributed words of encouragement to all the victims of fascism and to the little satellite peoples longing for freedom in Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria.

But no word to the French. No word to the French Committee of National Liberation whose divisions we are arming to help in France. No word of explanation or friendship toward the Frenchmen who have kept alive the spirit of resistance in France.

Why not say the friendly, encouraging things to General de Gaulle? Why are we so careful not to say the words that will give the French people a greater feeling of pride in him and a stronger feeling of confidence that allied forces are working together, and not against each other, for the liberation of France?

Russia has recognized the French committee fully, instead of grudgingly as we have. And Moscow says kind words about General de Gaulle. If we fear that he is slipping into too close relations with our ally Russia, where else have we been driving him by our scowling attitude?

This French affair has a long history. And it would be a good deal better for all of us if we would just let that history go into the safekeeping of the historians and devote ourselves to the present. Do we have to go on forever insisting that it was right to deal with Darlan? Most people think it was a good deal. Why not let it go at that? Nothing but a guilty conscience could keep anybody defending the Darlan deal this length of time. It got us what we wanted, so let's get on. Now it is General de Gaulle who can get us what we want—or come nearer to it than any other Frenchman.

What do we want? We want the French people to get up on their hind legs and kick the hell out of the Nazis as soon as the Allies come in. We don't want them to become all tangled up like Badoglio and the little King did in their own spaghetti, and disappear from sight.

General de Gaulle is temperamental. He annoys even such a patient man as Anthony Eden, who has been in his corner. He has exasperated Churchill and Roosevelt beyond words. But there are also some others in the war, some other Allied leaders, who are not exactly easy to get along with. Yet we try to be patient and understanding, and we certainly overlook no opportunity to tell them what a great thing they are doing.

Now, General de Gaulle, with all of his temperamental faults, is the only Frenchman in sight who has any political force, who has anything of what it takes to lead mass French resistance to the Nazis. He has an excellent military man in General Giraud—a man who is organizing what evidently are efficient French divisions. He has no interest in political leadership and no flair for it. But with de Gaulle rallying the French people, and Giraud as the military commander, we have a team that can pull a good deal of weight in the allied boat. And when we try to crack France, every bit of it will be needed.

The talk goes around that President Roosevelt is even more critical than the State Department people of General de Gaulle. He could very well take opportunity to leave no room for doubt and to work energetically to knit good relations with the only responsible group of Frenchmen the allies have. That is what he is doing with regard to Russia. Some of the same effort should go into preparing the French for the day when they can fight with the Allies.

For instance—the French ought to be part of the Mediterranean Allied Commission, which thus far includes only ourselves, Britain, and Russia.

The Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken. Yes, through their Representatives in the Congress of the United States on Tuesday, September 21, 1943, when the House of Representatives, by a vote of 360 to 29, adopted and passed the Fulbright Concurrent Resolution 25, introduced by Congressman J. W. FULBRIGHT, a freshman Member from Arkansas, a Rhodes scholar, and former president of Arkansas University. The resolution is significant in its simplicity. It reads as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

It is a plain and simple statement of basic principle. As a leading world power, America must lead the way in establishing a foreign policy that will bring everlasting peace among the nations of the world.

Following World War No. 1, a few isolationists in the United States Senate were able to defeat the Woodrow Wilson peace proposals. We then accepted the Versailles Treaty. The result, World War No. 2. The policy of isolationism following World War No. 1 has been and will be a costly lesson in blood and money to the American people. We must profit by the grave errors made by American statesmen following World War No. 1. It is my firm conviction that the Fulbright resolution is our first step in the right direction. Let me quote the remarks of the editor of the Washington Star as stated in the Monday, September 20, issue:

What we need now is a simple expression of our determination that, having won a global war, we shall live up to our responsibilities of maintaining global peace. This resolution will not settle the future of the world. But if the House gives it united support tomorrow, the representatives of the people will have outlined the pattern of the policy we are to pursue in international collaboration after the war. What most Americans want to see is some agreement among their representatives on where we are going after this war is won. Nonpartisan endorsement of this resolution by a solid House will tell them what they want to know.

I firmly believe that the overwhelming vote by which the resolution passed the House will hearten our allies and the free peoples throughout the world; it will serve as a grim warning to the Axis that the United Nations intend to work together in peace as well as in war to destroy the ruthless and savage forces of aggression.

I rejoice in being a Member of this Seventy-eighth Congress in that I participated in and voted for the passage of the Fulbright resolution to lay the groundwork in the first step to establish in this chaotic world a just and everlasting peace.

Powers of the Courts Must Be Restored To Review Regulations and Orders of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, when Congress created the O. P. A., and delegated power to the Administrator to

make rules and regulations to effectuate the act, it created an emergency court of appeals and vested in that court exclusive jurisdiction to pass on complaints and grievances and divested all other Federal courts of any power whatsoever to consider the validity of any order, regulation, or price schedule or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of the act authorizing the issuance of such orders and regulations.

Now read that again and you will observe that all Federal, State, and Territorial courts were divested of their jurisdiction and the power lodged in a special emergency court.

There was a theory behind this provision. The O. P. A. stated in a written memorandum when the bill was first under consideration in 1941 that such an emergency court would become expert in these matters; that it would relieve the congestion in the regular Federal courts; that the emergency court could be set up in divisions so that justice would be readily accessible to all litigants, whether rich or poor, and no matter where they might be located.

It was a noble theory but it didn't work. For one thing, sufficient Federal judges were not available to do the work. For another, the emergency court spent most of its time in Washington so that aggrieved citizens must trek to the Nation's Capitol and lose valuable time and incur heavy expense in seeking redress from the administrative orders of this agency.

Only recently were we treated to the spectacle of a very reputable business firm in Peoria, Ill., coming before a three-judge Federal court to secure a remedy against O. P. A. action only to have the court solemnly say that it had no power to provide a remedy because Congress had divested it of all jurisdiction under section 204 (d) of the O. P. A. Act.

The comment of one of the Federal judges was that—

> This is a culmination of a long series of acts depriving courts of jurisdiction, vesting decisions in various boards throughout the country * * * the act provides that no court, Federal or State, shall have power to consider the validity of any regulation of the O. P. A. or any price schedule and this court has no power to restrain.

There is the whole story from the lips of a Federal judge. His court has no jurisdiction. His court has no power to restrain. Thus, every citizen is at the mercy of an administrative agency unless he comes to Washington, first appeals to an administrator for redress, then to a special court. Consider the time, the expense, and the inconvenience involved in such a practice. The time has come to provide a remedy and permit the citizen to go before his appropriate Federal judge for relief from the unwarranted orders and regulations of a Federal agency.

Last week, we observed the anniversary of the Constitution. It set up a form of government and provided for a law-making branch, a law-administering branch and a law-interpreting branch. Congress has, however, rendered the law-interpreting branch, namely the courts, impotent in cases of this kind and denied to the citizen a ready access to the courts.

Today I am introducing an amendment to the O. P. A. Act which will remedy this condition and restore jurisdiction to our Federal courts to handle all matters coming under the O. P. A. Act.

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Star]

WHAT PRICE BUREAUCRACY?

Three Federal court judges, all estimable jurists, made a statement recently in a Peoria courtroom that was nothing short of historic.

It was a statement that they had no jurisdiction over a case in which an O. P. A. ruling restricting the business practice of a Peoria concern was being appealed.

In effect, it said that the people of this democracy were denied the right of redress by their Government under the terms of a war-born measure known as the O. P. A. Act, a so-called emergency measure for the purpose of price control.

We are not presuming to say that the judges were surprised at one section of this act which thus deprived the courts of their function and a petitioner from taking his case to the courts. But we know that certain attorneys were surprised, and we know that certain legislators, queried on the moot section, expressed surprise that it was in the bill.

This section says in essence that anyone who has a grievance, no matter how well established, cannot take his case to the regularly established Federal courts, or any other court of local jurisdiction. He must take his case to a special court, in Washington, and one that was set up under the very act that created the Office of Price Administration, from whose ruling he is appealing.

In addition, this court can keep the petitioner waiting, at 30-day periods, ad infinitum, while the O. P. A. official in charge makes up his mind.

Because the small businessman cannot, in times like these, go to Washington at will, this section is tantamount to denying anyone who disagrees with a bureaucratic ruling their day in court. It stymies the citizen completely.

It establishes the complete dominion of one agency or one man over the free thought and action of the American citizen.

This sounds so incredible it will be believed only by a few.

Yet the record is there, for all who will see it, including the Congressman who admittedly didn't know what he was passing when the bill sailed through both Houses of Congress.

One Federal judge, Hon. Charles G. Briggle, made this personal comment:

"This is a culmination of a long series of acts depriving the courts of jurisdiction, vesting decisions in various boards throughout the country * * * the act provides that no court, Federal or State, shall have power to consider the validity of any regulation of the O. P. A., or any price schedule, and this court has no power to restrain. The act also covers declaratory judgments."

Attorney John Cassidy declared that if any individual's private or personal action was deemed, at the whim of the administrator, to affect the price structure, almost any regulation could be put into effect without recourse.

"There never was a more cunning device contrived to deprive the citizen of his rights in court than this section which says that jurisdiction of such cases is in a special court in Washington," he declared.

We wholly agree with this gentleman. This unbelievable statute is the most vicious and un-American item we have ever seen. It is extremely significant in showing, again, how we are veering toward centralization of government.

This kind of a thing does not aid the winning of the war—which all true Americans want to win—it defeats the very purpose of our fighting overseas.

You don't just suspend democracy in the United States. You don't slap a piece of paper across the face of the United States Constitution and veto it in favor of some theory propounded by a bureaucrat.

At least you didn't used to. After the astounding revelation of this Peoria case, nothing will surprise us very much.

The Bill of Rights to our Constitution says quite clearly in article I, under the heading of "Personal freedom": "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble," and "* * * to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Let this outright and flagrant and arrogant violation of this traditional American right come as a dash of water on the face of American citizens. While our boys fight and die for freedom over there, we are losing it over here.

The time has come to wake up and fight on the home front.

This odious un-American thing—this section 204 of the O. P. A. act—must be wiped from the books as soon as Congress convenes. This can be done by the surging, indignant will of the people, leveled at their Representatives and Senators.

Otherwise, the function of the courts can become less than useless, an outright mockery of its honorable intent, and we shall have strayed far afield from the democratic traditions which have builded this Nation to its present eminence in the past century and a half.

[From the Peoria Star]

FIRST ROUND OF O. P. A. SUIT IS STARTED IN UNITED STATES COURT

An elderly lawyer sitting in United States district court this morning recalled the old opening phrase fo. Federal court sessions—"God save the United States!" He was there to observe a trial in which opposing sides were trying to do that very thing, each according to its own lights.

On one side of the counsel table sat Government attorneys representing the Office of Price Administration and the United States District Attorney. On the other side were John E. Cassidy and John F. Sloan, attorneys for the J. D. Roszell Co. and 26 milk haulers, who believe they have a better way of saving the United States than does the O. P. A.

The question was up before three Federal judges, the first triple tribunal here in a number of years. In the trio were Judge J. Leroy Adair, presiding judge of the Federal court here; Judge J. Earl Major of the Chicago circuit court of appeals, and Judge Charles G. Briggle of the district court at Springfield.

AMEND COMPLAINT

Involved was the Roszell dairy's petition with its milk haulers for an injunction against O. P. A. officials and the district attorney to restrain them from interfering with the dairy's better-service-award plan, O. P. A. approval of which, given last April, was reversed in August. The plaintiffs maintain that the plan is operated in the public interest, that it does not raise the retail price of milk products, and that the regulation cited by O. P. A. officials does not apply to this program—that in ordering the program abolished, O. P. A. is acting beyond the regulation's provision.

A confusion of procedure developed today at the outset of the hearing, which has attracted widespread interest because of the plaintiffs' attack upon the constitutionality of the Emergency Price Control Act under which O. P. A. is created.

Mr. Cassidy, attorney for the plaintiffs and former attorney general of Illinois, was allowed to file an amendment to his original complaint, this addition asking an alternative of a declaratory judgment declaring the act unconstitutional and its orders and regulations invalid.

Alex Elson, regional O. P. A. attorney from Chicago, contended that the amended complaint presented entirely different issues, that the Government was prepared to argue only on the first petition. The three judges were of the opinion that no different questions were involved, disliked the thought of postponing the hearing and returning here later.

Thereupon Howard Doyle, United States district attorney, asked for 10 minutes "to get this car back on the track."

It was allowed, after Mr. Cassidy asked, "Why split hairs and deal in hypertechnicalities? We've been in this controversy and we all know what we're going to say. We have three judges, and I'd like to say what I've got to say."

TO FILE BRIEF LATER

Judge Major told counsel that the general picture would be given here today, and then ample time would be given the Government to file later written briefs in answer to the amended complaint.

In the recess it was agreed to argue solely on the question of the original complaint, with its request for a preliminary injunction.

With that, Mr. Cassidy launched an hour and a half opening statement, explaining the better-service-award plan. He emphasized that the dairy supplies a large portion of the community with milk products and also provides milk for thousands of soldiers at Camp Ellis.

"No issues in this controversy," he stressed, "has any effect on what consumers pay for their milk—or on the basic hauling charges." He pointed out that the plan was meant only to increase the milk supply by obtaining new producers and stimulating present producers, and to maintain the quality and purity of milk. He dwelt upon the fact that a point system was used to grade haulers on their "doing and extraordinary" in obtaining producers, cleaning their trucks and insulating the truck boxes, using the Roszell name on the trucks, improving their personal appearances, etc. He said that haulers made considerable investments under the plan. They were paid directly by the dairy for these extra services, and not by the farmers who pay them for the actual hauling.

This program, said Mr. Cassidy, was approved April 8, 1943, by Dale Smith, district price officer, who wrote that it "does not seem to violate any regulation of the Office of Price Administration." It was then put into successful operation, under contracts made by the dairy with the haulers.

On August 7, "out of a clear sky," said Mr. Cassidy, two letters were received from O. P. A. saying that the plan constitutes payment for hauling services and that 15 days would be given for compliance with the regulation, with no further payment to be made to the haulers. This regulation is that no price higher than that paid for services in March 1942 be paid. The better-service-award plan did not exist until 1943.

"We were faced with this dilemma under the Government of the United States" exclaimed the plaintiff's attorney. "If you perform your contract, you will be guilty of violating the law. If you don't, the haulers will withdraw their service."

The dairy, therefore, did not pay. Pontiac haulers refused to continue their service, and on being told the situation, said Mr. Cassidy, they went to O. P. A. to demand that they be paid for their July services.

There, he said, they were told by Miss Bonham, an O. P. A. attorney, that they could receive the July payment since there had been no notification of the reversal until August, but that the plan could not be continued. Mr. Cassidy questioned this procedure, asked for written authority, was told it would come later. The dairy, he said, paid the July money to the haulers.

"If this is the law," he said, "we violated the law by performing our contract."

Haulers, however, wanted the plan continued, said they did not wish to continue hauling milk without it, said Mr. Cassidy. They were persuaded to continue, being credited with points but not paid until the issue is determined.

Mr. Cassidy declared that he pointed out to the O. P. A. official who wrote the August letters that the O. P. A. regulation did not apply to the better-service-award plan, that he was going beyond the regulation. The official did not agree, reported Mr. Cassidy, and also refused to take it up with his superior or to start injunction proceedings in court, saying a protest could be filed in Washington. Therefore the case was brought to court.

"That regulation," declared the attorney, "has no application to the facts of this better service award, no more than it does to how many trees I might plant in my yard or whether the milk was delivered in a Mack truck or a Dodge truck."

A CUNNING DEVICE

"There was never a more cunning device contrived to deprive the citizen of the availability of his courts than this section (204) which attempts to exclude jurisdiction by all courts of the United States upon its validity except a special court which sits only in Washington.

"The act," he continued vehemently, "provides that the Administration may issue regulations and orders, which amount to Federal statutes because they can subject a person to a jail sentence, or a large fine, and gives O. P. A. the right to sue for treble damages.

"The citizens," he said in contrast, "were put in an entirely different class, because whoever wrote it decided either that it was so unconstitutional it couldn't dare be put before a court or that citizens didn't have the moral right to invoke the remedies of their courts. They were allowed to file a protest with the Administrator, who can accept or reject it. If rejected, then the only place the citizen could go for relief would be to an emergency court of appeals of three judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. * * * While the case was pending, the Administrator could write a new regulation if he wanted to, and the citizen would have to start all over again with his protest.

"So a special court, presumably in Washington, is the only court on this earth to which a citizen can go for remedy, whether he might live in Illinois or California or Alaska, according to this.

"This was a pretty ingenious thing. If there was ever a cunningly devised channel for absolute and complete centralization of government, this is its acme and epitome of perfection.

"Regulations under an act of this kind should get a very rigid construction, since they are written by one man with no checks or balances or restrictions of any kind, and every employee in O. P. A. can do the same thing.

"If he can do that, the administrator becomes the general manager of the American people in every phase of their lives."

Court adjourned for a noon recess and was to resume this afternoon.

A bill relating to court review of certain orders and regulations of the Price Administrator

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of section 204 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals, created pursuant to subsection (c), or with the appropriate district court, specifying his objections and praying that the regulation, order, or price schedule protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part."

(b) The fourth sentence of section 204 (c) of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act."

(c) The first two sentences of section 204 (d) of such act, as amended, are amended to read as follows: "Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the district court provided for in subsection (a) or the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The district court provided for in subsection (a), the Emergency Court of Appeals, the appropriate circuit court of appeals upon review of judgments and orders of such district court, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals and of such district court or circuit court of appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 2, of any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, and of any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule."

Mr. Speaker, too long have some of the processes of democracy been suspended and I sincerely hope that the appropriate committee of this body will take immediate and favorable action on this proposal. It must not be delayed.

To amplify the case presented in Peoria, Ill., I am including a recent editorial from the Peoria Star and also a news article which sets forth the details in the case. A copy of the amendment as introduced is also included.

Now, note the language of the O. P. A. Act as contained in section 204 (c) and 204 (d):

(c) There is hereby created a court of the United States to be known as the Emergency Court of Appeals, which shall consist of three or more judges to be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States from judges of the United States district courts and circuit courts of appeals. The Chief Justice of the United States shall designate one of such judges as chief judge of the Emergency Court of Appeals, and may, from time to time, designate additional judges for such court and revoke previous designations. The chief judge may, from time to time, divide the court into divisions of three or more members, and any such division may render judgment as the judgment of the court. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this act; except that the court shall not have power to issue any temporary restraining order for interlocutory decree staying or restraining, in whole or in part, the effectiveness of any regulation or order issued under section 2 or any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of

section 206. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this act. The court may fix and establish a table of costs and fees to be approved by the Supreme Court of the United States, but the costs and fees so fixed shall not exceed with respect to any item the costs and fees charged in the Supreme Court of the United States. The court shall have a seal, hold sessions at such places as it may specify, and appoint a clerk and such other employees as it deems necessary or proper.

(d) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 2, of any price schedule effective in accordance with the provisions of section 206, and of any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule. Except as provided in this section, no court—Federal, State, or Territorial—shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or making effective any such price schedule, or any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

Then take particular note of the last sentence in paragraph (d) which states that—

Except as provided in this section, no court—Federal, State, or Territorial—shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation, order, or price schedule, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside in whole or in part, any provision of this act, authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders or making effective any such price schedule or any provision of any such regulation, order, or price schedule or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

Nothing more is needed to make the rule of bureaucracy complete.

The People's Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun of September 21, 1943:

THE PEOPLE'S CONSTITUTION

The campaign of isolationist reactionaries pretending to defend the Constitution against internationalists has reached the point of a so-called permanent lawyers' committee, with natal high jinks supervised by that trio of celebrated obstetricians, Robert R. McCormick, Dwight Green, and "CURLY" BROOKS, the Tribune's tame-tabby Senator. In the Halls of Congress the familiar voices—HOFFMAN and WOODRUFF, DAY and HAM FISH—are pounding away at the new line, in which this wrecking crew raucously postures as champions of American sovereignty. It was to pave the way for this that Republican tories stage-managed their little Mackinac declaration for constitutionalism in international affairs, but the stunt is strictly a phony.

We have heard this spurious brand of constitutionalism before. It comes today from the same people who argued that the Constitution forbade the National Government to do anything about mass unemployment and relief of the hungry; it comes from those who said the Constitution prohibited old-age pensions and decent housing to replace pestiferous slums; who claimed it was unconstitutional to set up the Tennessee Valley Authority to replenish wasted land and help break the stranglehold of the Power Trust.

It comes from those who whimpered about freedom of the press when the Government made them obey decent wage-hour laws and checked their employment of 10-year-olds as little merchants to sell papers on the streets, and we all remember the Liberty League, which, in 1935, branded the Wagner Act unconstitutional and advised businessmen to ignore it.

The reason is plain for the wrecking crew's frantic effort to stir up a constitutionality issue on foreign policy. The tory-isolationists have been beaten in the court of public opinion. The people don't want their sons dying in Italy and New Guinea merely to prepare the seeds of another war. They want the world organized with intelligence and good will, and they want America to take leadership and responsibility commensurate to America's power. The last chance of the isolationists is to muddy the waters by appeals to prejudice and misunderstanding.

Unless the Nation loses its common sense, they will not be able to make the Constitution a stumbling block to the Republic. The people have full power, through their elected Congress, to meet the problems of the new world, which technological progress has shrunk to small proportions. They can proceed and they know it, by perfectly constitutional means, to consider and approve treaties and conventions which make America a partner in arrangements for a sound world order.

To do this will not be sovereignty's destruction but the highest exercise of sovereignty. Marplots may scheme and rage, but the glory of the Constitution is that it is no burden on the people's back. It is still the great emancipating document under which for over a century and a half the people have met their new crises in a way to promote the general welfare and serve the deepest national interest.

Glance at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of September 22, 1943:

GLANCE AT THE RECORD

It is immensely edifying to hear accusations of treachery from the lips of Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini. The term has, apparently, its own very special meaning for them. Both of them are now quivering with indignation and injured innocence over their "betrayal" by the Italian people. Their attitudes transcend effrontery. Here is a morality so warped that it is impervious to shame, incapable even of a sense of guilt.

The record of their guilt, written in human blood, is unlikely ever to be erased from the memory of man. It is, by now, a long and tedious and familiar record—too long for full recital here. But some of its highlights are worth recalling briefly, if only to remind us freshly of the moral hideousness against which we are waging war. Here are some of the protestations of Adolf Hitler made in the days when there were still some who would give him credence:

"The German people have no thought of invading any country." (Berlin, May 17, 1933.)

"Germany has neither the wish nor the intention to mix in internal Austrian affairs or annex or unite with Austria." (Reichstag, May 21, 1935.)

"We have no territorial demands to make in Europe." (Berlin, March 7, 1936.)

"We are ready to acknowledge and guarantee these states (the Low Countries) at all times as inviolable neutral territory." (Reichstag, January 30, 1937.)

"We succeeded in arriving at an agreement (with Poland) which, for the duration of 10 years, basically removes the danger of any clash . . . We are two peoples. They shall live. One cannot annihilate the other." (Sportspalast, September 26, 1938.)

"The German Reich and the Kingdom of Denmark will under no circumstances resort to war or any other form of violence against each other." (Article I of pact signed in Berlin, May 31, 1939.)

"I will not war against women and children. I have ordered my air force to restrict itself to attacks on military objectives." (Berlin, September 1, 1939.)

"We (Germany and the Soviet Union) have, therefore, resolved to conclude a pact which rules out forever any use of violence between us." (Berlin, September 1, 1939.)

"In the spirit long existing of good German-Norwegian relations the Reich Government notifies the Norwegian Government that she has no intention, through her measures now or in the future, of infringing upon the territorial integrity or the political independence of the Kingdom of Norway." (Berlin, April 9, 1940.)

What happened on the heels of these protestations needs no repetition here. As for that satellite aggressor, Mussolini, who now whines that even his own followers have turned upon him, it is necessary to recall only Ethiopia, Albania, Greece—and the infamous "stab in the back," administered to stricken France. Such is the background of the men who now prate about "betrayal."

Willkie—How To Win in 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of yesterday carried a full-

page advertisement which read in part as follows:

ANOTHER LINCOLN?

Wendell Willkie is Hoosier, farmer, business executive, world traveler, author, defeated candidate, and leader of the opposition party. Is he also the man to "bind up the Nation's wounds" and achieve a "just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations" as next President of the United States?

America and her allies stand today in much the position of the North at Lincoln's second inaugural.

Victory is in sight, and while no one can say when the war's end will come, we can foresee as Lincoln did the great need that will follow it.

We know, as he knew, that the first job was to win the war—"to finish the work we are in," as he put it in his second inaugural address.

We can see also that, after this, comes the same need he defined in that same talk to his countrymen—"to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

The problems to be faced by our next President will not be merely the military and naval problems of winning the war.

They will be the even more difficult problems of winning the peace—of restoring domestic and world-wide economy—of uniting many factions on both Nation-wide and world-wide scale—of healing the wounds of depression-born class prejudice—of putting a great Nation back in smooth running order again in both its domestic and its foreign affairs.

Answering questions put to him by Look, Wendell Willkie has expressed himself on the most pressing problems to be faced by the country in the next 4 or 5 years.

He has outlined his idea of a liberal Republican platform, stated his belief as to what is the most important matter before the American public today.

With it are frank estimates of Willkie by shrewd newspaper correspondents of leading rank. There is a full picture biography covering Willkie's boyhood, his Army service, the campaign in which he was elected "President of 45 percent of the people," and his world-girdling travels since.

Does all this mark Wendell Willkie as a "second Lincoln" capable of leading us through the critical post-war period?

Are his views the views that can shape the kind of post-war world the American people want?

Since I am in very general accord and positive agreement with the positions he has taken and his answers made, and am sure that he is capable and the man to lead us as President through the critical post-war period, under permission heretofore granted I am including and inserting the answers of Wendell Willkie to the questions propounded by the magazine Look:

HOW THE REPUBLICAN PARTY CAN WIN IN 1944

(By Wendell Willkie)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The editors of Look asked Wendell Willkie to answer four questions. He agreed, with the stipulation that Look permit him to ask and answer another—the fifth in this article.)

1. WILL YOU BE AVAILABLE FOR THE REPUBLICAN NOMINATION FOR PRESIDENT IN 1944?

If the Republican Party intends to drive heart and soul for liberal objectives, such as I seek to outline below, I shall give it my complete and undeviating service, whether as the convention's nominee or as a worker in the ranks.

I shall do this because I believe these principles are inherent in the aims and ideals of the Republican Party, and that this party alone can realize them.

I shall do it because I am convinced that the administration, while giving lip service to some of these principles, does not understand them, does not really believe in them, and, therefore, cannot realize them.

I see within a liberal Republican Party the possibility of the formation of a real team, the members of which can work together for the accomplishment of common purposes. No such team exists in the Democratic Party at the present time, nor can it exist in 1944.

The Democratic Party is torn asunder by conflicting forces. In the past we Republicans have also been torn; but there is emerging a new spirit in our party, a spirit of progress and determination, promulgated by many leaders in many parts of the Nation, and warmly backed by the rank and file. The new spirit, I believe, is right now building a party fit to govern, a party that knows itself and its objectives. If those objectives are the liberal ones I believe them to be, I want to be on the team.

2. WHAT KIND OF PLATFORM WOULD BE NEEDED TO REESTABLISH THE LIBERAL LEADERSHIP OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY?

That is a big question which it is difficult to answer briefly. A great many issues pertaining to the conduct of the war, unconditional surrender, and the establishment of sound measures for rehabilitation will of course arise during the coming year. Without undertaking to speculate about these, I would say that there are five indispensable planks for a liberal Republican platform. Briefly, these are:

1. We must never forget that, while democratic government rests on majority rule, the essence of freedom is the protection of minorities. The Republican Party has always advocated equal rights for all, irrespective of race, creed, or color. Now, above all times, we must make these principles a reality, because the whole world is watching us. Only if we can make individual liberty a reality among Americans, can we hope to gain adherents to our cause among other peoples. We must not protect these rights fitfully, inconsistently, and with political purposes, as has the present administration.

2. We must have efficient, well-managed and economical administration. The more money we spend for government, the less we have available for new enterprise and the creating of new opportunities. Moreover, inefficient administration causes jealousy and bickering, with the powerful taking advantage of confusion to promote their own interests.

The entire executive branch of the Government, in my opinion, needs a very substantial revision to the end that it may give the people better government for their tax money.

3. We must have a rebirth of enterprise—real enterprise. This is where the liberal element in the Republican Party has such an enormous role to play. Some of the talk we hear about free enterprise or private enterprise is just propaganda on the part of powerful groups who have not practiced real enterprise in a generation, and have no intention of doing so.

We must distinguish between enterprise and private ownership. A corporation may be privately owned and still be the worst enemy of free enterprise. Unfortunately, some of our big corporations are in this class, and the Democratic Party, despite noisy proclamations, has done nothing really effective about it.

Of course, it is true that we must have private ownership in order to have enterprise, in our American sense. But private ownership is not enough—we must have competition, invention, expansion, lower rates, lower prices of manufactured goods. Only thus can we create more opportunities, raise the standard of living and—most important—maintain real jobs for all.

The trouble with the enterprise system has never been enterprisers, but men who talked about free enterprise and then went ahead and violated all the rules of enterprise.

This is something for the liberal Republicans to remember. We must prevent the further missue of the word "enterprise" by those who wish merely to preserve their idle capital and their vested powers. We must give the word a meaning for every American, whether big or little, and whether he owns his own business or not.

Workers on a production line are also enterprisers—or should have an opportunity to be. But this can only be brought about by making available to them a fair share of the profits derived from their efforts. A free enterprise system does not belong to a few at the top—that is a vested-interest system. A free enterprise system belongs to everybody in it.

4. While a courageous government may hope to check somewhat the disastrous ups and downs of the economic cycle, we cannot hope to do away with them entirely. This means that absolute guarantees must be provided by our society against unemployment—and against want because of old age, injury, or incapacity. In addition, our present social-security system must be reinforced and extended to cover those large elements in our society that do not at present enjoy it.

First, it must be the aim of a dynamic enterprise system to dispel unemployment by a continuing expansion. Thus government intervention is reduced to a minimum.

Second, all forms of social insurance, including protection against unemployment, must be taken out of politics. The exploitation of human fear and misery for political ends is a shocking crime. Hereafter, I am convinced, the people of the United States, in the name of humanity, will pledge themselves to protect the unemployed and unfortunate within their midst as a common and bipartisan public duty.

Therefore, all our Government insurance policies, for whatever purpose, must be set up on an actuarial basis, so that their costs will be predictable and shared by all alike on the basis of ability to pay.

5. Finally, the Republican Party, as I have said so many times, must take the leadership in formulating a new foreign policy, by which we and other nations can assure our future safety and promote our mutual interests. The biggest job that faces the party right now is to crystalize its thinking on the form that our participation should take in the post-war world.

There is not a moment to lose. Each advance of the United Nations' armies makes more urgent the announcement of an American policy toward conquered and liberated peoples and toward the nations of the future. The administration has no such policy to announce; it is all too clearly acting on pure expediency. The Republican Party must lead the way.

3. IT IS CONTENDED THAT, WHILE THE REPUBLICANS CAN SURELY IMPROVE OUR DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, THE NEW DEAL IS MOST ADEPT IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN RELATIONS. IS THAT TRUE?

The answer is "No." The proficiency of the administration in foreign affairs is a myth that will have to be carefully examined by the people before November 1944.

The cold fact is that before this war we were living in a balance-of-power world in which our enemies were calculating their chances against us. Yet the administration,

possessed of information that was available to no private citizen, never really looked this fact in the eye—until we were struck at Pearl Harbor.

For example, Japan raised a red flag when she denounced the naval limitation in 1936. She raised another when she attacked China in 1937. We know now—what the State Department then concealed from us—that Ambassador Grew repeatedly warned our Government of Japan's intentions.

Yet our foreign policy was such that we continued to provide Japan with vast quantities of scrap iron, oil, and other munitions to be employed against friendly China and, a short time later, against our own soldiers on Bataan. What kind of adeptness was that?

On the other side of the world, Germany detected more readily than the United States the declining power of France, and believed that the odds were in her favor. Naturally, our own unpreparedness during the 1930's was a factor in her calculations. She gambled on a swift war, with easy victory on both fronts; and it was Britain—not we—who foiled her plans in 1940 and 1941. The New Deal foreign policy did not face the Hitler facts.

Indeed, for the 6 years prior to the German attack on Poland—years measured by the beginning of the Nazi domination of Germany and, in this country, by the inauguration of the New Deal—the crying need of the world was for statesmanship that would avert the impending conflict.

Defeatists will say that nothing could have been done; apologists will contend that domestic opposition, much of it Republican, made a constructive course impossible. Still, the stakes were worth a major effort. And such an effort was never made. However adept our leadership in foreign affairs, we contributed substantially nothing toward saving the world from catastrophe.

It is time now, at last, for Americans to face this fact: That unless we do something about it we shall encounter in the future, as in the past, the balance-of-power problem. This time we shall not be blind to that problem. We know now that we are always exposed to enemies and that, if we are to be safe, we must act.

There are some who advocate that we should try to solve the problem by arming to the teeth, refusing to participate in any organization for collective security, and living in wary isolation. I have no hesitation in predicting that this course would lead directly to another war. History has proved that war cannot be prevented merely by the exercise of power. We must develop something new and different—and fundamentally American.

In my opinion, the Republican Party is drawing closer to unity on a post-war program every day. Mueh greater unity exists among To assume leadership in establishing a pracus than is found among Democrats, where high officials air feuds in the public press. tical program for world unity and peace is the greatest opportunity now open to our party.

4. CAN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WIN THE ELECTION IN 1944 AND, IF SO, WHAT SHOULD BE ITS FIRST STEP?

In my opinion, the Republican Party will have in 1944 the greatest opportunity in its history. But in order to seize this opportunity it must first win a victory within itself.

Under Abraham Lincoln the Republican Party took shape as the party of progress. The cornerstone of its doctrine was a strong union, and its ideal was the political and economic freedom of every American—big or little, black or white. For about 70 years, with only a few interruptions, our party led the American people to constantly expanding horizons. It raised the standard of living of every worker. It gave freedom a real meaning.

But, like any human institution that wields power for long, the party became corrupted by vested interests in its own ranks and by reactionary forces. It forgot its own great liberal traditions. It ceased to look ahead and plan for the interests of ordinary Americans. And so the people, who cherish freedom and opportunity, lost confidence in the Republican Party—and have never quite regained it.

So when I say that the Republican Party must win a victory within itself I mean that the progressive and courageous members of the party must now reestablish its great liberal traditions—and not only reestablish them, but carry them forward to solve the problems of a new world.

The Republican Party must become what it was in its origin, the great American liberal party, the party that not only speaks for freedom, but actually acts for freedom; the party that knows how to give freedom a meaning, politically, economically and in terms of human well-being.

In recent years, of course, the Democratic Party has claimed a monopoly of liberalism. In my view, it has failed to substantiate this claim. Yet, without arguing about the past, it has become a manifest political impossibility for the Democratic Party to provide the liberal leadership of the future. The Democratic Party is now a coalition of two major groups, neither of them liberal in outlook.

One group consists of southern Democrats, professional officeholders who completely control the South's political machinery by denying the vote to a majority of its citizens, white and colored. The other group is composed of the big-city political machines, such as the Kelly machine of Chicago, the Hague machine of Jersey City, the Flynn machine of the Bronx—and whatever is left of the Tammany machine of New York.

These political machines, indispensable to the survival of the Democratic Party, are among the most reactionary forces in our society, and we cannot look for liberal leadership in any party subject to their control.

Nevertheless, if the Republican Party thinks it can coast into power in 1944 without meeting the liberal challenge, it will be rudely disillusioned. For the entrenched elements of the Democratic Party are too strong to be ousted by mere political manipulation and "back to normalcy" doctrines. We must meet the liberal challenge, we must provide new liberal leadership, from the grass roots up. Only if we do so, can we win the confidence of the American people. That is why I say the first step toward victory in 1944 must be a victory of the liberal forces within the Republican Party itself.

5. WHAT IS THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION BEFORE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TODAY?

The simple answer to that is: The war. This is, of course, a military problem, primarily. I think the American people are fortunate to have such able commanders as General Marshall, General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, Admiral King, and Admiral Halsey. Considering how long we neglected our Army, Navy, and Air Forces, those men are performing wonders. Yet they cannot hope to succeed unless we at home give them our full support. Our job is threefold.

First of all, we must measure ourselves against our own soldiers. We must try as best we can to equal them in our ability to "take it"—and to "give it."

Secondly, we must win this victory in the shortest possible time. Every day that the war is prolonged means more American lives lost, more men wounded and maimed. Every man at the front has one hope shining in his heart—to get back home and to get back home as soon as possible. We on the home front must contribute fully to the realization of that hope.

Consequently, I cannot agree with those who belittle the importance of the home front. We are not heroes back here, but we have tremendous obligations to meet. It is a duty of our leadership (which has not been fulfilled) to see that no one uses the war as an instrument of profit, whether employer or employee, whether capital, labor, or agriculture, and whether the profit be financial or political.

The disgraceful manipulations in Washington have at times constituted a betrayal of our troops. Our home front should be administered along clear lines of authority, in accordance with the established principles of American management. A better management of the home front would greatly shorten the war.

Third, we must look ahead and prepare to make our victory mean something. Again I suggest that we use as our criterion the men who are under fire. Every soldier, sailor, and aviator is determined that his children shall be spared a war like this. And he is aware of certain terrible mistakes in the past which must not be repeated in the future. He knows of the triumph of Allied arms in France in 1918, and he knows that, somewhere along the line, political incompetence sacrificed the fruits of that great victory. In my view, that incompetence was the result of two factors.

On the one hand, we forgot that freemen must be strong. While tyranny and dictatorship were rampant all over the world, we in America failed to prepare and arm ourselves. We were poorly armed in airplanes, tanks, and ships, and our industrial preparations were everywhere neglected.

We even depleted our resources by plowing under our crops and slaughtering our livestock. Instead of a doctrine of plenty, which would have made us strong, we adopted a doctrine of scarcity, which made us weak. And we unnecessarily harassed honest business, without really correcting the practices of bad business. It is no wonder that the aggressors, seeing our weakness, went right ahead with their bloody designs. They felt certain we were not strong enough to stop them.

And, on the other hand, we forgot the real nature of freedom. We had the idea that freemen could exist alone, surrounded by international confusion, tyranny, and bloodshed.

In their military campaigning our men have now captured many enemy soldiers and have entered cities formerly dominated by totalitarian governments. Perhaps in many instances they have been surprised to be received, not as foes, but as liberators. But this is because those men of ours are freemen and bring with them the hope of freedom, which, all over the earth, is prized next to life itself. And they are learning the lesson which we must all learn—that freemen to stay free, must stand together.

These are the two big goals we must set for ourselves as we prepare for peace: We must see to it that the United States is strong, in economic as well as military terms; and we must work out a plan by which, in the future, freemen all over the earth can stand together.

Poultry Shows—Their Importance and Effectiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER H. WENE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. WENE. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to make a close study of one of our principal agricultural activi-

ties, and endeavored to ascertain just what some of the stimulating factors were through which it has contributed to our progress as a nation. At the same time I made it a point to learn how we may have been neglectful in applying the many phases of this particular agricultural pursuit in its relation to the well-being of our people.

The activity referred to is our poultry industry, the national income of which has increased in the last hundred years from $12,176,170, as shown by Government figures quoted in the American Poultry Yard by D. J. Browne, published by Saxon Co., of New York, in 1843, to $1,987,694,357, reported by the United States Department of Agriculture as the official Government figures for 1942.

I feel it is the duty of all of us who have the development and progress of our country at heart, to encourage the greatest possible production of every essential agricultural commodity. Such consideration should be given to poultry and egg production because of their great importance in America's subsistence.

The average farmer and especially every poultryman should be guided and educated to appreciate that purebred fowls are as superior to the average barnyard chicken as the Hereford, Shorthorn, and Angus cattle are to the common mongrel type of cattle that formerly roamed the prairies. When this is thoroughly understood, flock improvement, resulting in more economical production of both poultry meat and eggs should become the universal practice of our poultry industry.

Probably one of the most important factors in the development of the poultry industry in the United States has been the annual poultry shows held in different sections of the country. The first of such annual poultry shows was at Boston, Mass., in 1849. It is interesting in this connection to find that the suggestion which led finally to the development of the Boston poultry show, came from a letter by Dr. John C. Bennett, not a poultryman primarily, but a scientist with a mind trained on the importance of genetics and heredity. This letter was addressed to the editor of the Boston Cultivator, who also saw the value of improving breeds of poultry and who published the call for a meeting to discuss the subject. From that beginning, the holding of annual poultry shows increased rapidly and generally throughout the country for a number of years. These poultry shows created and stimulated interest in better poultry breeding methods, and largely as a result of these progressive activities, great strides have been made in the entire poultry industry especially among poultry breeders, by reason of the improved and constantly advancing methods of selection of the breeding stock, the very keystone of the entire poultry industry.

It is now generally recognized by all who are familiar with poultry raising that breed improvement is the very basis of success of all poultry activities and that neither good management, nor good feed, can make hens of poor breeding lay well.

The annual poultry show brought together the Nation's finest breeders, and competitive exhibition of their birds demonstrated knowledge, skill, and patience, while the ever-improving excellence of their breeds inspired other breeders to greater effort, all of which has done so much to bring about a clearer conception of the importance of good breeding. This has resulted in the annual increase in egg production per hen from 15 eggs of the wild jungle hen to 144, the average egg production per hen per year in this country, according to the United States Department of Agriculture.

In 1874, 25 years after the first Boston Poultry Show, there was developed a standard of excellence, now known as standard of perfection, which serves as a basis for guidance in selection for breeding operations and in properly judging the qualifications of the various breeds shown at the poultry exhibitions. This standard is revised periodically as new breeds and new points of excellence are discovered and developed. It is universally recognized as the authority on breed quality in purebred poultry.

However, despite the splendid efforts to promulgate high standards in poultry raising, an alarming situation has gradually arisen which threatens to retard the progress which has been made. Gone are the great annual poultry shows of Chicago, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Washington, Kansas City, and similar large centers of our population. In addition, there is a gradual disappearance of State and county poultry shows.

It is for this reason that I feel the time has come when we should awaken to the danger of national carelessness and indifference to the great value of competition and competitive activities in the promotion of our national poultry wealth and health program in which poultry shows have been such an important and contributing factor. It should be with pride that we look upon the long list of poultrymen whose untiring efforts, both physical and financial, have kept alive the Boston Poultry Show, the first and last of the really great national poultry expositions, and now the oldest of its kind in the entire world. For 95 years there has been an unwavering spirit to continue the activities of this annual exhibition of the best of poultry breeds originated and developed by our American breeders. This poultry show has carried on through four wars; through boom times and depressions, and has been a national institution. It has aided and promoted not only good poultry breeding, but other activities necessary to successful poultry production, such as artificial incubation, feeding and housing equipment, feed materials, medicinal products, biological and vaccine products for disease prevention, publications for the dissemination of information—in fact, every constructive activity for the furtherance of the successful undertaking and continuance of the poultry industry as a great national agricultural asset.

It is of such national importance that I believe Congress should undertake the responsibility of reawakening our country to the extreme importance of the annual poultry show to our agricultural prosperity. We simply cannot afford to wait until a national calamity overtakes us and be not prepared to meet the situation. Congress should and could encourage and assist in causing to be reborn the annual poultry show in every State, county, yes, if need be, in every hamlet where poultry is being raised.

Well might we consider and seriously study the pattern established, proven and kept alive these 95 years under which the Boston Poultry Show, which, instead of declining, is growing in size, attendance and usefulness to the poultry industry. Such spirit as evidenced by this important agricultural activity can well be considered a clarion call to the Nation and to those of us in Congress who have the interest of the country in our hearts and who have every desire and thought to aid in its progress to the benefit of all the people.

In all sincerity, I believe I am bringing to my fellow Congressmen a message of tremendous significance. If heeded, it could prevent a possible disaster since proper and successful poultry breeding is the very lifeblood of our entire poultry industry and the stimulus of competition between breeders which the poultry show makes possible, is a most important and tremendous factor for better breeding.

Such expressions may be interpreted as rather extravagant but a study of the national importance of the poultry industry, the value of the poultry show to the poultry industry and the decadence of poultry shows throughout the country is convincing proof that we may be in danger of losing an art in our national economic life which has been largely responsible for the development of the American Poultry Industry, one of the Nation's most important and most lucrative agricultural activities.

I am today introducing a resolution in the House authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to poultry shows and expositions in the United States and to report to the House not later than March 1, 1944, the result of its findings together with specific recommendations as to the best methods to be adopted for encouraging the continuation and expansion of poultry shows throughout this country.

Racial Discrimination of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am having printed in the RECORD as a

part of my remarks a resolution sponsored by the American Legion post at Northfield, Minn., on the subject of racial discrimination, which resolution was adopted at the American Legion State convention on August 21, 1943. I commend the sentiment expressed in the resolution to your attention. The resolution follows:

Whereas the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees equal protection, under the law, to all persons irrespective of race, color, or creed; and

Whereas one of the cardinal principles of the American Legion is its support of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, at its national conventional in 1942, the American Legion accepted as one of its war aims the following statement: We condemn religious prejudices, racial or national antagonisms as weapons of our enemies"; and

Whereas there appeared in the official publication, the American Legion magazine, for June 1943, an article entitled "Japs in Our Yard," by one Frederick G. Murray, M. D., which urged, among other proposals, that native-born American citizens of Japanese descent, without regard of proved loyalty or good character, be relocated on islands in the Pacific Ocean—in direct violation of our constitutional guaranties—and urged this, not as a military measure but as a social, political, and economic policy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Department of Minnesota, the American Legion, do vigorously protest against our national magazine being used to foster race discrimination and hatred, in violation of the constitution of the American Legion and the Constitution of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the officials in charge of the publication of both the American Legion magazine and the National Legionnaire, be instructed that it shall be their policy not to permit the publication of such articles as urge or advocate policies in conflict with the basic principles of the American Legion; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted to the national Legion publications commission at the national convention at Omaha, for adoption by said commission; and, be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be submitted to the National Legionnaire for publication in the first available issue.

Address of Gov. John W. Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Gov. John W. Bricker before the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution at Philadelphia over a Nation-wide hookup on September 17, 1943:

One hundred and fifty-six years ago this day, on this spot, the final draft of the Constitution was submitted to a waiting people. The enduring greatness of this work is proven by the history of those 156 years. It has served an agricultural and individual craft age. It has continued to serve during the greatest industrial and economical development of any nation of all time. It still serves to meet the needs of a great mass-production era. The Constitution has survived from the toll of the Liberty Bell heralding independence to the sweep of the human voice around the world in a flash.

There are critics who say that the Constitution was adapted only to the days of the frontier, that it was merely a pioneers' government. They contend that the Constitution was adequate only when businesses were small, towns were small, and when social problems were comparatively simple.

During the past 10 years our national leaders have been obsessed with the idea of a "mature economy." America had grown up, her industrial plant was built, they said. As the President put it, "our task now is not discoveries or exploitation of natural resources or necessarily of producing more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand." From that pessimistic point of view it was an easy step to managed economy and bureaucracy, in defiance of the Constitution, if necessary, to achieve their ends.

But the idea of economic maturity is a fallacy. In fact, it is not a new idea. It was entertained as long ago as the 1880's by some faint-hearted persons who could not see looming on the horizon such great new industries as the automobile, electric power, radio, and the airplane.

The error in the thinking of these defeatists is that they identified the frontier with geography. It is true that the geographical frontier has disappeared.

But while the geographical frontier has disappeared, there are new frontiers, in the opening of which we need the protection of constitutional liberties even more than did our forefathers. We are at the very beginning of a great new age of discovery and scientific development. Synthetic materials, plastics, electronics, radar, television, glass, prefabricated structures, and undreamed-of air transportation—these and many others are examples of frontiers yet to be opened.

No, the Constitution of the United States was not created for the days of the geographical frontiers alone. It was created for such eras as now lie before us when men need full opportunity to transform ideas into instrumentalities and tools for a better way of life and a higher standard of living. The extent to which we shall realize the constructive possibilities of the industrial and scientific period which lies ahead, depends not only upon economic and political stability in the world. It will depend also upon the elimination of economic confusion within our own land. It will depend especially upon the elimination of those arbitrary governmental restraints which kill initiative, and the lifting of the dead hand of bureaucracy which stifles creative action and creates unemployment. What we need in America is a real return to free enterprise under the Constitution.

Here at Philadelphia the founders did not create a State or write a Constitution designed to establish a tyranny of perfection, a despotism of efficiency, a utopia maintained by force. They brought with them the wisdom of thousands of years and from that wisdom sealed forever the right of Americans to govern themselves.

There have been other times, as now, when men have tried to avoid the restraints placed upon them by the Constitution. This Constitution restrains officials but not the people. Every official, however exalted, must function within the confines of the Constitution. The people alone can amend it to meet changed conditions.

The chief architect of the Constitution, James Madison, said, "An elective despotism is not the Government we fought for." Many years later Woodrow Wilson eloquently put it this way: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

The office of the Presidency was built around the character of George Washington, and throughout the century and a half of our national life the Presidency has been exalted. Yet even the President must serve within the powers granted under the Constitution.

The President of the United States initiates the foreign policy of this country. He may negotiate treaties and agreements. Yet no such commitment has final validity unless authorized by law, and, if incorporated in a treaty, it is not binding unless ratified by the Senate.

Today, all the world should know and appreciate that fact. For that reason the American people ought to be advised on all matters of national and international importance, excepting, of course, necessary military secrets, that their will might be understood and followed.

When an Executive functions outside the Constitution, those who deal with him do so at their own risk.

In recent years cunning cultists have attempted to change our form of government without amending the Constitution. By devious and often unsuspected methods they have brought about a bureaucratic system under which administrative departments of Government have been vested with policy-making powers. They have sought to accomplish by flanking movement that which they would not dare by direct and open attack. These boards and bureaus legislate by interpretations and regulations. The mass of law in the form of regulations, orders and directives coming from bureaus, boards, and commissions is as large as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD itself and constitutes half of the law of the land today. Adequate judicial review of such orders and restraint of arbitrary administrative action are necessary to maintain our freedom from the tyranny of government itself.

All of these boards, bureaus, and commissions have been placed beyond the vote and control of the people. Many of them are dominated in the background by invisible influences. A recent president of the American Bar Association pointed out that counsel for a commission frequently "drafts rules and regulations for his commission, directs an investigation, files a complaint in the language of an outraged plaintiff, presents evidence to the commission to support the complaint, writes the opinion of the commission sustaining the complaint of his outraged plaintiff in judicial language * * * and in event of appeal, moves heaven and earth to prevent a review of the facts." In one agency, a self-created bureau which was neither created by Congress nor the President actually received an appropriation. That is not constitutional government. Not long ago Congress instructed its agent, a committee engaged in writing the tax law, to gather data from the Treasury Department. The Constitution provides that the Treasury shall collect taxes, but that tax policy and tax rates are the business of Congress. The Secretary of the Treasury declined to permit the congressional committee to gather these data. That is not constitutional government.

When the Constitution is flouted by the servants of the State, when it is held in disrespect, when its specific provisions are ignored and when officials act, not according to law, but by whim, we are on the road to tyranny, to dictatorship and despotism.

If we are to continue to live under the protection of the Constitution of the United States we must take the policy making power of our Government from the hands of arrogant bureaucrats. We must restore it to the elected representatives of the people.

One of the most serious domestic problems facing us today lies beyond the present provisions of the Constitution. In fact it is inherent in bureaucracy. When a personal regime is long in power, job holders become more and more active in efforts to perpetuate themselves. In the 10 years of the present administration at Washington the number of civil job holders has mounted from less than 600,000 to almost three and one-half million. These job holders acquire a selfish interest in perpetuating and multiplying themselves. Their votes and those of their families constitute almost 20 percent of the voting population. This is one out of every five of our voters. This may easily represent the balance of power in a presidential election. To permit this to continue is to strangle republican Government.

The Constitution offers a way for curbing this growing power. It can be amended and I have suggested that it should be amended to limit the tenure of the President of the United States by constitutional mandate. I would favor a single term of 6 years. This question has been debated many times. It was discussed in the Constitutional Convention. It was suggested and followed by President Hayes. Such a provision was in the Democratic platform of 1912. Such a step would assure the people of this country that popular government is secure and that their basic freedom will be inviolate.

Whatever the merits of this proposal may have been in other times we have witnessed such an expansion of government that its adoption now would, in my judgment, be clearly in the public interest.

The framers of our Constitution were practical men of great judgment. They were also men of great vision. They foresaw the growth of our Nation as a world power. They wisely set up rules and controls governing the conduct of our foreign policy based upon their experience. They knew we could not live alone in the world. They wanted foreign policy guided by the President but always subject to constitutional control.

We face a situation today which calls more eloquently than ever before for a world-wide endeavor to remove the causes of war. We must be assured that the fruits of the vast sacrifices of this war shall not be lost through lack of foresight. This assurance is a sacred obligation of the Nation.

This is the assurance that sacrificing American fathers and mothers are asking of those to whom they entrust leadership and office. A positive answer must be given. That answer cannot be fulfilled with words alone, even words of noble aspiration and good intent. To win the war Americans will meet their tragic losses with God-given fortitude. The hour has struck when we must get beyond our good intentions and into the practical realities of our problem. What, as we face the world beyond victory, are our materials for action? Primarily, we have the aid of past experience. We need more than that, but history will be a helpful guide. Many people are telling us that our past is a record of selfishness, of self-containment, and of isolation. But, the facts belie that view.

Ever since Franklin, during the Revolutionary War, made an alliance with France, we have consistently carried on a vast variety of relationships with other nations. As an infant nation, this first citizen of Philadelphia skillfully guided our course amid the clash of great empires. His diplomacy, his courage and his resourcefulness helped establish our identity as a Nation.

As free nations arose in this hemisphere we created the Monroe Doctrine for mutual protection. Through that doctrine we have preserved the independence of our half of the world for more than a century. In 1881, a great Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, strengthened that doctrine with the ties of friendly cooperation. We participated with other great nations in attempting to lay the foundations of peace in the Pacific. We gave sympathetic aid in many of the problems of Europe. We fought a great war to preserve Europe and ourselves from tyranny. We gave liberally of our substance to feed and rebuild Europe. We labored for more than a dozen years after the armistice to reduce the threat and burden of armaments. And we joined in many international movements to promote human welfare over the world. This is not a record of selfish isolation. Unselfish was the service of Seward in maintaining the Monroe Doctrine and the peaceful purchase of Alaska, of Blaine who initiated the good-neighbor policy in this hemisphere, and of Hay, whose diplomacy helped stabilize Eastern Asia for a generation, and of Hughes who labored to promote disarmament among the great powers. It was Theodore Roosevelt who urged that the Nation be sufficiently armed to protect its world-wide interests and responsibilities so recently expanded under President McKinley.

It was with these facts in mind that I recently said that "America is not, never has been, and never will be an isolationist nation. America must deal with other nations of the world and America must assume leadership." I said further that the term "internationalist" is just as absurd. No sane man would think of wiping out our national lines. That is what the United Nations are fighting to prevent.

In geographic position, in the wealth of our resources, in the ingenuity and enterprise of our people, in our potential military strength, and in the character of our Government, we are the most fortunate and the strongest single Nation on the face of the globe. Therefore we have the greatest responsibility. If we do not, in the years following victory over the Axis Powers, exert every talent, effort, and means at our command to keep our own and other countries out of wars, then we are not worthy of our Christian heritage. From the hearts of millions of God-fearing people, members of every religious denomination, there is a daily outpouring of prayer that man may learn to rescue himself from the folly and iniquity of mass murder.

If we do not now, after the present most destructive of all wars, make a serious and conscientious effort to build a better understanding among the nations and the peoples of the earth, then, indeed, we must stand convicted before posterity as ignorant, heartless, and unworthy reactionaries.

The specific steps which we should take cannot at this time be detailed. No man in position of authority has attempted so to do. This war is not yet ended. As the tide of the world battle lines advance and recede, constantly changing governmental, economic, and living conditions arise throughout the world. No man is wise enough now to state with exactitude what this Nation's obligations to others may be at the conclusion of the war, or how they may best be carried out.

Our foreign policy should be based upon the absolute necessity for the preservation of our identity as a Nation and on our traditional freedom of action at all times. Only thus can we be strong in our help of others. The United States should adhere to a policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, and as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and in the making of international commitments.

In looking to our future foreign policy we shall be wise to formulate carefully those plans under which our Nation must live with other nations. People responsible for negotiating our foreign arrangements should be truly representative of the American people. Never again should our peace negotiations be directed by those from only one political party, from any one department of government or any one section of our national life. We do not want a one-man or a one-party peace. If we believe in collaboration among the nations we must put it in practice among Americans.

The exact forms of cooperation among the nations are not matters to be determined in a few days. It may well be that a more lasting peace can be achieved without a single supreme peace conference. It has been wisely suggested that many conferences may be more desirable. The making of a lasting peace may be a matter of many months or years.

This brings me to another essential of peace-making—the knowledge and consent of the American people. Consent of the governed is inherent in constitutional government. During the period, in which plans for permanent collaboration are being made, there will be time for each proposal to be considered by our citizens, debated in Congress and thoroughly examined in all its aspects. We want no treaties, this time, hastily written and thrust before us to be accepted without question. If we believe in freedom, we should act constitutionally in the spirit of freedom by showing full confidence in our own countrymen.

The position of the United States in the creation of world stability should be made known beyond the shadow of a doubt. Appreciation of our aid in the war will surely be succeeded by distrust and hatred if we encourage hopes or make promises that we cannot fulfill. If we do not know our own minds, we shall exhibit before the world a picture of vacillation and opportunism. Double talk and double dealing are not in the great tradition of American diplomacy.

We should retain an incomparable Navy and Air Force for our protection and for the protection of our interests which lie in the two great oceans of the world. We are definitely interested in the essential approaches to the Western Hemisphere. We must, in close collaboration with our neighbors, maintain an impregnable defense. And we must see to it that our military and naval technical services maintain themselves at the utmost frontiers of the scientific universe.

In the economic field we should sustain the faith of the world in its means of exchange by making sure of our own financial integrity. Our dollar must be a sound dollar wherever it goes. We must abolish the policies that encourage inflation. For we cannot have inflation at home and abundant trade abroad.

Our sons are offering their all in fulfillment of a sacred contract with those who shall guide our policies in the making of the peace. That obligation must not be lightly held, for it is a promise in the light of which we must live. In that light we must measure our words and guide our steps. We cannot offer clever substitutes for integrity.

The elements of that sacred contract comprise two broad obligations. First, we must preserve the heritage of a free republic at home, strong with the treasure of free enterprise, firm in the observance of political and religious liberty, and just and humane in its attitude toward the individual. Second, this Nation must with the other peace-seeking nations of the world, open the door to broad cooperative efforts to build a better world. The sad ordeal of two great wars has taught us the stark reality of interdependence. The intelligence of men is challenged by the need for a durable peace. In spite of our past failures, we must not flinch from the task ahead. We have a covenant with the future and with our sons. That covenant can be performed only if we determine our course at home and abroad by our charter of freedom, the living declaration of faith in man's capacity to govern himself, the Constitution of the United States.

War Frauds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Joseph Leib, together with a document which I think will be of interest to the entire Nation:

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORRISON: Would you be good enough to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the enclosed statement about war production inspection laxity.

It is self-explanatory and I am sure that it voices the sentiments of the men in the service. As a buddy of theirs I assure you that they want this situation corrected.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH LEIB.

LET'S DO SOMETHING ABOUT THOSE WARPED SOULS WHO WORRY MORE OVER PROFITS THAN ABOUT THE SAFETY AND WELFARE OF OUR SERVICE MEN

(By Joseph Leib)

How long will the people of this Nation tolerate defective products or defective assembly of war materials for use by American soldiers fighting in defense of the United States?

Why are patriotic American citizens turning their heads to the revolting scandals emerging from some of our great and powerful war plants?

Why are certain industrial tycoons protected by high Government officials?

Only recently the influential Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. got out of a Federal indictment by paying merely $20,000 fine for producing $5,000,000 worth of fraudulently tested defective wire for the Army. This left a tremendous profit for Anaconda.

What about the potent Carnegie Steel Corporation indicted for producing defective steel plates for warships? The Truman committee contends that an amazingly large number of freighters have been sunk because of poor material or improper welding.

Several weeks ago another gigantic corporation—the Curtiss-Wright—was cited for producing defective motors for Army planes.

There have been a number of other flagrant examples of this type of sabotage brought out in the public press. Yet, not in a single instance has there been meted out a stiff fine or a suitable prison sentence. Neither has there been heard any public condemnation from the so-called pious lips of Government officials who are under oath to protect the citizens of this Nation.

Why is this kind of sabotage allowed to continus unmolested? Why are these powerful corporations allowed to gamble with the lives of our soldiers?

What has happened to the intelligence of the American people?

In two flagrant cases the Under Secretary of War came to the defense of the accused companies for making defective war material. Your Under Secretary of War went out of his way to pat Curtiss-Wright on the back for producing defective motors for the Army Air Corps, and he reprimanded the St. Louis Star Times for printing details of a scandal which took place at the St. Louis ordnance plant. This plant was accused of producing defective cartridges. Your Under Secretary whitewashed the company in face of affidavits secured by the St. Louis paper from 12 employees of the plant testifying that faulty ammunition had passed through Army and company inspection. The Army has plenty, also, to cover up in the Curtiss-Wright incident for many War Department officials are involved.

Bitter criticism has been heaped upon the Truman committee for its sensational report on the aircraft concern but the whole story has never been told. Some day patriotic citizens will demand that all the facts be made available for public inspection.

Today, a clever and highly paid propaganda campaign is being waged by these selfish industrial leaders in an attempt to befuddle the public and accuse certain congressional investigating committees of upsetting the whole war program and slowing down production because of their startling exposures.

In this campaign they adroitly contend that stricter inspection requirements are delaying speedier production and hindering our victory in the war. The facts are, however, that these greedy industrial czars make tremendous profits when they are allowed to go unhampered. They may even go so far as to stage a sit-down strike in order to force a return to their old selfish practices. What care they about those brave men dying on foreign battlefields.

How many of our soldiers are lying in their untimely graves because of lax war production inspection God only knows.

Yes, what kind of a war are we fighting anyway? Is this really becoming a money crusade and the devil with the pretended ideals and principles of the "four freedoms"?

Will any fair-minded person say that greed and selfish interests have been playing a minor role in this conflagration? Certainly not.

Too many supposedly human beings are more concerned with making money rather than in winning and ending the war in the quickest possible time. Profits are becoming the prime factor behind this war. These people obviously care nothing for the feelings and desires of our soldiers. They are money mad. They are actually prolonging the conflict. Events point to the maddening conclusion that this war might be over quicker if all financial advantage were completely eliminated.

Has anyone heard a single one of the abovementioned big businessmen demand that we get this war over as quickly as possible? Of course not.

But these businessmen are kicking like the devil over the renegotiation of their war contracts. They say that taxes and renegotiation refunds will eat up their incentive to produce war goods to win this war. Could it be possible that the only incentive they have in this war is to make profits upon profits?

Why not set an example by really punishing these greed-crazy scoundrels who are truly sabotaging our war effort, endangering the lives of our troops, and gambling with final victory.

There is being exhibited in high places a callous indifference relative to inspection of war material. The famous glider crash in St. Louis last month in which a number of high public officials were killed is a glaring example of what has been taking place on the production front.

Here is what the War Department had to say about the glider accident on August 11, 1943:

"The Army Air Forces has acted to prevent any recurrence of the parts failure which resulted in the fatal glider accident at St. Louis * * * the War Department announced today in making public a summary of conclusions reached by the Air Forces investigating groups. The summary indicated that faulty manufacture by a subcontractor, faulty inspection by the prime manufacturer and inadequate enforcement of inspection procedures, combined to produce a fatal hidden defect in a wing strut metal fitting."

Imagine such incompetency and stupidity. Who are responsible for such an unfortunate predicament? Why wasn't strict inspection enforcement undertaken originally? This writer has been pleading for a revamping of inspection methods for over 2 years. Top Army officials have been called before several congressional investigating committees and on each occasion they have proclaimed a "no interference" policy from legislators, that they had the situation well under control and in capable hands.

Then to the amazement of the Nation, on September 12, 1943, Richard DuPont and other Air Corps experts met death in another glider tragedy claimed to have been caused by the same factors that crashed the St. Louis glider, not to mention hundreds upon hundreds of other service plane crashes.

The necessity for rapid production of war goods is, of course, vital at this time but no decent American can condone a system which under the guise of pressure of production tolerates, in fact encourages, and even overlooks defective manufacture and assembly of war material. Such a system is reprehensible. It must be stopped by force if necessary. The lives of our fighting men are worth more than all the profits and gold in the entire world.

Freedom From Bureaucrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over radio stations KGFF and KADA on September 17, 1943:

My friends and neighbors, I am grateful for this opportunity to greet you through the facilities of KGFF and KADA. In our hearts tonight we are aware of the heroism, the daring and the sacrifice of those on distant fields of battle who preserve us our country. No nation in the history of the world has come even comparably near to the miracle of America's achievement in war production. No nation faced with the sad and tragic task of war has carried forward so well and so speedily a national war effort. And this fact I cite to you out of a considered judgment, in full recognition of, and in spite of, the elements of waste and dilatation that are evident in our industrial production.

In freedom's cause America has opened up a battle front that stretches round the world. Like one continuous chain the soldier and the gun make up one front that circles all the world. In many and different areas in several and sundry climes the sons of America are on the march against the Axis hordes.

The achievement of the American soldier is all and more than reason could expect or hope anticipate. The certain winning of the war is but a question of time—a time that, however brief it may be, carries with it the weight of the grim and tragic realities of

war. This is a solemn hour. Our emotions are turbulent with anxiety and care, the heartache from separation, the fear of what the dreaded casualty list might bring, and the intense anticipation of what the unavoidable tragic side of the day's news may be. I do pray for a speedy end of this war.

To those who have some loved one on the field of battle I can only say that it is my anxious hope and my earnest prayer that he will return home safe to you.

To those of you who have your fireside circle broken by a supreme sacrifice, I find no message with adequate power to convey to you the thought and feeling that abides in my heart and mind. I wish I knew how to say something that might in some small way comfort and sustain you, but I know that words are too weak and futile to beguile you from a grief so overwhelming.

I cannot restrain my thoughts at the moment from clinging to the memory of one of my friends. His hand was raised to hold the flag of freedom in the sky. His every heartbeat was a drumbeat of love for liberty. His every thought was fortification for the democratic way of life. He gave his life for the preservation of this country and for the perpetuation of human freedom. The lamp of liberty shines brighter because he lived and where he lies is sacred ground. Every time I look at my country's flag I see him, a symbolic star, one of the white stars in Old Glory's field of blue.

"Missing in action," that's what the telegram said. And even a boy of 2 can feel what that means.

"Missing in action." Mom says you must be brave. It's what your father would expect of us. "You must be brave," she tells you. Then it's bedtime and your chin starts to feel shaky. Then she kisses you extra hard and turns her head away so you can't see her eyes.

You've never let her see you cry, not once since that telegram came and she twisted it all up in a ball, then smoothed it and put it in the desk.

Lying in bed you play pretend. Pretend you can't hear his steps as he comes up to your room. Pretend you can't feel his touch as he tucks the cover over you. And sometimes in the dark you can almost smell a cigarette.

We, all of us, wish there was something we could do. And there is. We can resolve that the plans your father had for you shall remain within your reach. You, son, won't hear these words and if you did they wouldn't mean much to you now, but your father's friend is making you a pledge, a pledge that the things your dad valued and gave his life to preserve for you shall remain secure. You may never hear this pledge from our lips, but if you were older you would recognize it in our faces. We are determined to keep America the kind of America your dad gave his life for. We are determined to keep America free. To keep it a land in which government is the servant, not the master of the people.

My friends and neighbors, I hope you can carry on with greater zeal, with higher courage and stronger determination, determination because of this boy of whom I spoke.

If you are convinced that democracy is worth saving you will be eager to discover and embrace the means by which democracy can be saved. It is of this then that I desire to speak. The soldier is winning the battle of freedom on the battle front. It is yours to look after the struggle at home.

Just now we hear a good deal about "four freedoms," but what of a fifth freedom? Freedom from bureaucrats. In that freedom is lodged a whole library of titles to liberty. To mention a few of them I should cite free enterprise, freedom of economic opportunity, freedom from regimentation. And in freedom from fear I could mention freedom from the fear of what the Government might do to us instead of for us.

We are all conscious of the wrongs bureaucracy has inflicted upon us.

Our liberties are stricken and wounded one by one. It is too much to hope that liberty is only wounded and not dead? Is it too much to hope that courageous citizens will demand and defend the individual liberties our Constitution guarantees?

Let us give intelligent thought to the encroachment of bureaucracy on our rights and freedom. Let us face the challenging fact that this is our problem and we must solve it with action.

Bureaucracy is no longer an overdrawn departmentalism. It has become a new concept of government. A concept that rests on the pernicious doctrine of implied powers. A concept that envisions a government of men to supplant our government of law. A concept that holds that government should be master not servant of the people; that holds that the government should control the people instead of the American philosophy that the people should control the government. A concept that holds that men should have the power to regiment and regulate us. To control our every enterprise and activity at the behest of their own unguided judgment and unrestrained and capricious whim or will. Bureaucracy is a Frankenstein that smashes our institutions and with wanton recklessness violates the sanctity of our rights. We have fast been losing rights which are fundamental and without which the American form of government cannot endure.

Centralization, through stealth and pretense, has broken down State lines, and by invidious invasion has captured the counties and communities and chained and manacled the individual. We have permitted the destruction of the sovereignty of States and substituted for that sacred thing an incompetent, extravagant, un-American control radiating out of Washington's bureaus.

Bureaucracy is a maze of amazement, a jungle of jumbles. Tons of pamphlets from Government presses grind out the unsolvable puzzles from umpteen thousands of pee-wee minds of bureaucrats in the vast caboodle of bureaus

You can philosophize all you want to, but when you get down to it, the decisions of men who occupy administrative chairs is our current government. Ours is a government of men. Bureaucracy has become a tyranny that robs each individual citizen of his liberty.

The Federal squeeze put on the farmer is intolerable. Some little tyrant has said that the farmer cannot kill his own pig. A farmer came to me and said, "What am I going to do?" and I said, "You can surrender just like Czechoslovakia or you can resist." You have got to make one choice or the other, and then he said, "But it's against the law for me to kill my pig," and I inquired, "What law?" I have been in Congress four terms. Congress is the lawmaking body, and Congress never passed any such law. There is the meat in the coconut. One must understand the difference between the law and an edict issued from the tyrannical mind of a pee-wee dictator whom we have come to refer to as a bureaucrat.

Well, I can't speak for all the farmers in America, but I am a farmer in my private life, and I'm going to kill my pig, and I'd like to see the color of the so and so's eyes that can stop me. You know sometimes down on our farm when we get ready to butcher, we shoot the pigs, and sometimes people knock them in the head with an ax. Of course, I reckon if a bureaucrat got his head between the end of the gun barrel and the pig at the instant I pulled the trigger, he might keep me from killing that pig, at least with the first bullet.

Yes, a druggist told me that it was against the law to sell a 29-cent bottle of alcohol without a doctor's prescription, but I asked him "What law?" And, the filling station man told me that he couldn't sell me any gasoline 2 minutes after 8 o'clock because he said it was against the law, and again I inquired "What law?" Yesterday I saw a sign on the highway which said speed law 35 miles an hour. That sign is a lie. Congress never passed any such law, and neither did the State legislature. It may be a good thing but it is no law.

Everybody hates a coward, and one would be a coward if he submitted to such tyranny or surrendered to such aggression against American democracy. Maybe I'm just an unreconstructed rebel, but I can't understand how a self-reliant, self-respecting citizen could surrender to the absurdity of an autocrat regulating the intimacies that are our personal lives. The individual in America must never be the creature of any arbitrary power.

Bureaucracy is a tyranny ruthlessly stamping out every right and every liberty. Indifference, acquiescence, or surrender cannot conserve our liberty. We must resist. It is the plainest of our duties. Do not delude yourself with any false security. Do not depend on others to save your liberty for you. We ourselves, each and all of us, must save our liberty and safeguard our freedom and defend our rights. If you love America, if you believe in liberty, if you have faith in freedom, if you are devoted to the rights of man, then now is the time to resolve an eternal determination that freedom will be preserved; liberty protected, and rights retained.

This constitutes a test of our capacity for self-government.

To keep our American ideals of government, to preserve our American system of government, that is our struggle. It is the struggle in Congress, it the struggle for the States, and for the individual citizen; a struggle to keep what rights we have, and get back if we can, those that we have lost.

I plead for the right of every American to determine his own conduct and own mode of living and earning a livelihood as long as he does not wrong or hurt his neighbor, or injure or endanger society. For a long time we believed the best government was the one which halted, harassed, and hampered only the man of crime and wrong; a government that was a breastplate of armor to the good citizen and not a leaden burden on his back.

If our remonstrances against senseless regulations and our petitions to bureaucracy has availed us nothing, we are constrained to resort to more determined steps to preserve personal liberty.

We have got to invoke a new declaration of independence; independence from bureaucracy. Then let us denounce the curse of bureaucratic favoritism, of bureaucratic incompetence, of bureaucratic dictatorship. Let us unite against every attempt to convert bureaucratic authority into intolerable interference and excessive conrol.

Let us stand solid and unyielding against every denial of rights and liberty.

Let us reaffirm our inalienable rights.

Let us proclaim an emancipation from bureaucracy.

Regulation, regimentation, and coercion are unsuited to the minds of a free people. I hate tyranny. Be it fell foreign power or the home grown variety. I deplore the everlasting annoyance of Federal inspectors and investigators, often irresponsible and incompetent, prying into business which ought to be private and into affairs which are personal, exercising supervision and demanding reports of every conceivable kind. Bulldozing the businessman, harassing the farmer, and regimenting all mankind.

Are we in America to accept without resistance the rule of arbitrary edict and be ordered as bureaucratic whims may dictate without even a day in court? As a free people we must maintain our right to decide for ourselves whether we want these restrictions on our liberties or not.

Let us have an end to regimentation and bureaucratic control. Above all, let us not permit it to go any further. This as I see it is this hour's call to battle.

Let us adhere to the great truths that remain to guide us. Let us cling to the fundamentals of the American way of life. Let us halt the bureaucrat and drive him back lest he pervert all our ideals and destroy all our institutions. Let us pledge a new allegiance to our faith in the people's right to rule. and march out on a high resolve to restore to the people the right to decide the questions that determine their welfare and direct their fate.

Our Government is getting too big for us to control it. Government is the growingest thing in the Nation. Thousands of Government buildings cover hundreds of acres like vast monumental mausoleums, and millions of Government employees go in and out like great swarms of drones in their beehives. Bureaucracy demands a total war effort from everyone but its own 3,000,000 employees. The fact that winning the war is our first objective is no reason for us to tolerate this cancerous growth. The fact that winning the war is our first objective is no justification for leaving undefended the very principles for which we are fighting.

When a people permits the officials of government to forget that they are the hired hands of the people, permits them for one moment to depart from the principle that the people should control the Government, democracy is lost. Intolerance and tyranny, error, wrong and despotism have always resulted from the theory that government should control the people.

I do not know whether supine public indifference or sheer usurpation has been the chief factor in bringing us to our present plight, but our liberties have been progressively whittled down and steadily taken away.

We cannot afford to let the Government regulate our every endeavor. Regulate our economic moral and spiritual activity, yet we have a government of bureaucracy that would do just that.

We cannot afford to let government so interfere with business that it puts the cold hand of death on the creative initative and competitive inpulses of free enterprise.

We cannot afford to let government regiment agricultural endeavor, and bind and chain the farmer.

Bureaucracy is jeopardizing both our prosperity and our liberty. The bureaucrat has us all in a straight jacket. If his edict were law he would have succeeded in making criminals of us all.

All the money in the world wouldn't make a decent down payment on what bureaucracy has cost us.

You know what the farmer ought to plow up? He ought to plow up the Department of Agriculture. He ought to plow up the bureaucrats, plow them up and plow them under.

We do not side-step the duties of our personal lives. We do not straddle the issues of our family affairs. We do not dodge nor deny the responsibility in our homes. Then why is it that so many citizens shrug their shoulders and expect somebody else to preserve their rights, their freedom, and their liberty for them?

We need to have faith in democracy. I do not mean faith in the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. I do not mean faith in the House or the Senate or the court or the Executive; I do not mean faith in any group or clique, or man or men. We need faith in democracy as an ideal. We need faith in democracy as a principle. We need faith in the American philosophy of government. We need faith in the individual citizen and faith in the people as a whole, not just a talking faith or a passive faith, but a thinking faith and a fighting faith.

Let me tell you, my friends and neighbors, the crisis has come. The menace to our liberty makes necessary a common effort to protect them. I pray in an anxious heart that you can see this.

We have got to settle this question as to whether or not the people are going to control the Government or whether the Government will control the people. That's the greatest domestic issue that we have faced since the Civil War. You know what I'm for. I am for making it unpopular and unhealthy to be a bureaucrat. William Lloyd Garrison wanted to abolish slavery. I want to abolish this new form of slavery under bureaucracy. I want to rid this country of every bureaucrat. Stamp them out and tromp them under. I pray out of an anxious heart that you will see the importance of fighting the bureaucrat just as we are fighting the other enemies of our country, because I earnestly, anxiously believe that we must destroy bureaucracy or it will destroy our system of government.

Boondoggling on a Global Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a most timely article by Mr. Henry J. Taylor which appeared in the August 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest:

BOONDOGGLING ON A GLOBAL BASIS

(Excerpts from Men in Motion)

(By Henry J. Taylor)

I have just returned home after observing the impact on European minds of American promises regarding what the United States will do for the people of the world after the war. In our deep anxiety to be helpful to the world, we are making promises and assuming superior attitudes which America and the world will deeply regret. We are speaking and writing glowingly about post-war matters concerning which we shall actually have little, if anything, to say.

The problems abroad are astronomical. They are deep-rooted in historic tensions, charged with local prejudices and ardors which date far back, and full of cross-currents and contradictions. Any one of these local problems—economic, social, political or military—is enough to baffle any European. Yet American words and pens are distributing promises everywhere.

Once you leave our shores, the only voices you hear speak about a better world order are either German, Japanese, or American. The American governmentalists in Washington are in strange company. And if our leaders were less vain they would see that, whereas the world resents the German idea of world influence as being repugnant to all free men, our own Government's idea of excessive internationalism is also unacceptable.

We cannot solve Europe's basic problems or "make the world free." The destiny of Europeans is within themselves. And so is the destiny of their world-wide colonial system.

Talking about colonial freedom is one thing. Insuring that freedom is quite another. Eighty percent of the colonials of the world could not, or would not, use freedom to maintain freedom. Eighty percent of the world's people simply are not ready for what we are talking about.

For a country whose own cities are in the most deplorable condition in their history, with vastly rich areas like Boston, Detroit, and Philadelphia facing financial crises in spite of maximum employment and maximum taxes, our Government planners go far afield in trying to solve the colonial problems for the world.

The attitude of some of our politicians and speechmakers concerning our allies' colonies, mandates, and dominions is already building up vast problems in these places. America's social theorists, tying themselves to our war effort in the colonies of our allies, are creating vast confusion and disturbance abroad. Their folly is working against every solution which our allies may find for their own problems in their own lands.

In support of stubborn schemes for America's better world order, the credit and substance of our citizens are being expended now and pledged for the future in the same irresponsible way which made a scandal of the W. P. A.

Having abused the sound principle of emergency public works at home by using public moneys to buy votes and political power and to stimulate political machines throughout the country, these same determined men have now put boondoggling on a global basis. Nothing restrains them.

We set wage scales for labor abroad which make it impossible for anyone else to hire a native man or woman wherever the American Boondoggling Corps operates—and they are everywhere. Authorities in these distant communities, who have the long-term responsibility for peace and safety, are outraged. It is one of the most deep-seated cleavages among the governments of the United Nations.

For example, the Eskimos in Labrador have always lived by fishing and trapping for furs. In this way an Eskimo family earns $8 to $10 per week. The work is productive and the community life has always been peaceful. In came the American boondogglers. They paid such high wages for labor and so much for furs that overnight the income of the Eskimo family became $80 per week. When an Eskimo got as much in a few days as he used to make in a month he quit work. The supply of furs decreased at once, there was a famine of fish, and the willingness of the Eskimos to work on American air bases disappeared. In order to get the Eskimos to work the boondogglers had an inspiration—they boosted their fur and fish prices and their wage scales still higher. They ran the Eskimos' income to $120 per week.

That soon stopped all trapping, fishing, and work for sure. So next they put the price down. And when they did that the Eskimos couldn't understand it. Serious dissatisfaction and unrest spread in Labrador. And then the American boondogglers turned to the local Newfoundland authorities to put the Eskimos in their place.

"They're out of hand," they said. "Control them. We're spending a lot of money here."

If you were mayor of Okkak, Labrador, or Governor of Newfoundland, how would you feel about that?

All the way from Bermuda to Sydney local administrators are asking themselves, "What will happen when the Americans leave?" Who would say that this is the path to peace in the world?

There is the same hodgepodge duplication of Federal offices abroad as in our own country. Nobody can make sense out of the swarm of United States Government employees. They are a mystery both to the natives and to each other. They conduct negotiations independently of our ambassadors or ministers. They pay American cash to local politicians who are in opposition to the governments of countries friendly to the United States. They put such opposition "leaders" on their pay roll and stage political vaudeville acts which they have thought out overnight. If their ideas run counter to the policy of our State Department or embarrass the friendly nation's president or prime minister, as well as our ambassador, that is just too bad.

"This is a smart man's war," I heard one of them say. "We've got to be plenty smart with these foreigners. The thing to do is play along with both factions. You know, play both against the middle."

Another brash young employee of the United States Government asked me one day, "What do you think of Steinhardt? Has he got anything on the ball, or do you think we ought to get rid of him?" This young whippersnapper was referring to the distinguished American Ambassador to Turkey, Laurence A. Steinhardt, who for 10 years has spoken for his country so ably in Stockholm, Lima, Moscow, and Ankara.

"Do you know Mr. Steinhardt?" I asked.

"No," he said, "but he's making it hard for the Office of War Information in Turkey, and I think he's got a hell of a lot of nerve. I'm for canning Steinhardt."

Anything may happen when the representatives of our various and sundry Government agencies show up. Take Bolivia. One-fourth of the world's tin is produced there. Tin is sorely needed in the United States now. The Bolivian contingent of the American boondoggling corps has a program in Bolivia which has so much politics and so little economics that it is doubtful whether Bolivia's tin will not stay in Bolivia for the balance of this war.

Coffee bulges all Latin-American warehouses. We have allotted to each coffee-producing country a quota for export to the United States. The reason we do not get more coffee is not because there are not enough ships. It is because no one in the Board of Economic Warfare has had gumption enough to authorize lifting the quota whenever an empty ship was in any port where the quota had been filled.

Meat abounds in Australia, for the shipping lane to England—formerly the market for Australia's mutton and beef—has been struck by the Pacific war. Because of this, American meat is sent to England. A constant flow of American vessels transports men and equipment to Australia, but for the most part these ships come back empty when they could bring Australian meat. The global boondogglers, planning the world, are too busy looking at the forest to see such trees.

The Government's policies abroad are undermining the morale of our troops. This is not the time to pay an American workman $1,000 a month to fix electric wires on the airfield at Accra while privates in the United States Army, working on the same field, are paid $50 a month. This is not the time to build immense bases such as we are building in Eritrea with an understanding that only union labor be sent abroad. This is not the time to play into the hands of labor racketeers who require that any skilled American civilian electrician working overtime in Algeria be paid more per month than General Eisenhower is paid. This is not the time for anything but victory.

What would you think if you were an American soldier in north Africa or Eritrea? Well, that's the way our soldiers feel about it everywhere. They believe that a great injustice is being done by our Government in permitting labor extortion in this war. They have no patience with the political ambitions of the men who make this possible. These soldiers will return bitter and mad, and they will demand a reckoning.

As for our devious plans for a better world order—whatever that may mean besides the impoverishment of the United States itself—our fatuous assumption that we can set all well with words and dollars and a police force is a thoughtlessly impossible undertaking, as misleading as Chamberlain's Munich statement of "Peace in our time."

Here at home we shall be faced by every sort of readjustment. We must provide jobs for the returning American soldiers and for our present war workers. We must work tirelessly to regain our solvency and to recover from the present huge drain on every resource we have. In this alone we face the greatest task in our history. We shall be in no position to lift the standard of living in China, in Russia, among 400,000,000 impoverished people of Europe, desirable as that is. There is no possibility whatever of our succeeding in such an attempt. There are a hundred places to start and no place to stop.

There is a limit to the failures Americans can absorb. At some point our statesmen failed, or we should not have suffered as we did in the depression. At another point our statesmen failed, or we should have been so strong on land, on sea, and in the air that there could have been no war. Now they fail again if they saddle our citizens with the astronomical burdens of all the world.

Our citizens cannot give to the world (1) freedom of speech and expression, (2) freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, (3) freedom from want, and (4) freedom from fear. The whole conception of giving or infusing the "four freedoms" universally is preposterous. It is not idealism. It is sheer political buncombe, and is so recognized abroad.

On the narrower question alone, the question of freedom from want, anyone must know that the politicians of every country in the world will be pulling on us in a tug-of-war to get the most out of America's international W. P. A., exactly as our local mayors camped in Washington to get the most out of our W. P. A. at home. We will be asked to provide freedom from want to at least a billion people, most of them in primitive surroundings and 400,000,000 of them in Europe. One hundred and thirty million Americans are in no position to do this. The promise of the United States is utterly fantastic.

Yet this airy approach to reality is promulgated at the very time when the solemn and high purpose of the United States should be to have the people of all the world believe in us—what we say, what we do, and what we intend to do.

By immodest promises and visionary plans many of our leaders immensely increase the possibility that the people of America will wash their hands of everything outside the 12-mile limit, good or bad, at the earliest possible moment, as they did after the last war.

If our leaders persist in their present course, we shall fail the world. We shall be unable to do what our leaders say we should do. In these circumstances we shall make enemies of our friends. No one will thank us for starting down the road, going as far as we can, and then chucking the whole business through the revulsion of our own people to a program which Americans know in their hearts is unsound and untrue.

The fundamental error of our theorists is that they have never understood the place which integrity has in all the ramifications of life. They believe that to say a thing is the same as to do it, as though speech were capable of modifying the tendencies, habits, and character of people, and as though verbiage were a substitute for will, conscience, and education. They proceed by bursts of eloquence or of lawmaking; they believe they can legislate the nature of impulses, and in so doing they produce disintegration.

The obligation to assist toward a better world and the value in doing so are obvious. Our duty, however, is to be useful, not according to our desires but according to our powers. We should recognize our own limitations and abandon the impertinent idea that a world is to be built in the American concept. We should put a limit on our total post-war aid, both in time and in dollars, and require that any aid should be restricted to whatever nations took certain elementary steps in their own behalf. Only thus can we make good our promises. Only thus can we maintain our own integrity and win the respect and friendship of the world.

The global concept, stimulated by the war itself and by the new idea of the world's size in the age of air, is one of today's basic developments. It is one of the great generating thoughts in the history of man. But how could anything be more evident than that the process of achieving universal freedom and prosperity must be slow, and that to promise it overnight is a great disservice to the world? Our policy of exaggerated internationalism is as dangerous, foolhardy, and destructive as narrow isolationism.

Our War Heroes Deserve the Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we cannot at this time put too much stress and importance on plans and programs to aid and help our returning heroes who, some day in the near future (as we all hope and pray), will be coming home as victorious warriors.

It will be the blood, sweat, tears, work, sacrifice, and loyalty of these brave men that will save these United States, and thereby preserve the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

We must see to it that every one of these brave souls who were willing to sacrifice everything at home, and even their lives abroad, shall have the opportunity to recover that which they lost when they left.

Most members of the armed forces will want a home more than anything else. I, for one, favor the setting up of the necessary legal machinery to provide each member with the opportunity to own a home with a very small down payment, if necessary, and 30 or 40 years in which to pay at very low interest rates, tax-free for the first 10 years.

Nothing but the best kind of treatment will be good enough for these heroes. Each member should have the opportunity of selecting a special training course in a special trade school or other school

to be set up by the Government in order that he or she can learn that particular trade they most desire.

Many youths were taken from high schools and from colleges. They, being more worldly experienced, will not want to go back to the same school and there mingle with students much younger in age and experience. Separate schools and colleges should be provided for those who want to finish their education.

Our present hospital facilities are not sufficient to care for all the wounded, sick, and crippled soldiers. It will be necessary for a great hospital program to be instituted so that every returning hero, no matter how bad his physical condition may be, will have the finest medical service and the finest hospitalization in order that everything humanly possible be done to mend his ailing body.

And above all else we must see to it that every returning hero has an opportunity to secure a decent job or be put in a position to earn a decent livelihood. The day of returning soldiers selling apples on the street corners shall remain a shameful thing of the past rather than of the future.

There are several bonus bills in Congress already. I have had the privilege of being the author of one of them. There will be many more introduced in the future and it will be up to this body to provide a fair, equitable, and decent bonus not 10 years after we win this war, but immediately after this war, in order that the members of the armed forces will receive timely the greatest good from that bonus.

While the big job and real duty of this country at the present time is to win this war and win it as quickly as possible, still we must not lose sight of the fact that one of these days our heroes will be returning. We must be prepared to help them as they have helped their country. This we must not lose sight of or overlook.

War Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of an address delivered by me before Rotary Club No. 1 on August 17 at the grand ballroom, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, on war costs:

Mr. Chairman, Rotarians, and friends, it is indeed a pleasure to come back to the old Chicago town and to talk to a group of Rotarians and businessmen. Chicago has meant much to me because it gave me an opportunity to lay the foundation for the work which I have been trying to do. It was here that I received my education. I worked at night trucking boxes and trunks for the American Express Co. I worked Saturdays in Marshall Field's old store. I worked during the day and went to school at night. I worked at night and went to school during the day. It was a proud day when I stood on the platform of what was then the new Patton gymnasium with a degree of bachelor of laws in my hand from Northwestern University. There was no N. Y. A. or student-aid fund then, but we had something then that meant more than all the alphabetical orders of today. We gave a young man an opportunity to work and develop the best that was in him; to educate himself, and in working and educating himself he developed the qualities which might have never been discovered under a system of paternalistic aid and help. For the opportunities Chicago has given me, I am profoundly grateful. Whatever service I have rendered in the past or may render in the future could not have been and would not have been rendered but for the training I received during those days more than 30 years ago.

I want to talk to you today about war costs and war debt. Before I do so, however, and to avoid any possible misunderstanding and at the risk of repetition, I want to state my position clearly.

I BELIEVE IN THE PROFIT SYSTEM

I believe in the capitalistic and profit system. I believe in free enterprise. I believe a corporation or individual engaged in business, whether public or private, is entitled to a reasonable profit including an additional amount for reconversion to peacetime industry. I believe in a high standard of wages and a high standard of living. No nation ever was prosperous in peacetime which paid starvation wages to its workers or which insisted upon starvation income for the millions of investors who are depending upon corporate profits for a livelihood. On the other hand, I am opposed to excess war profits, whether those excess profits be corporate profits or individual profits, whether such excess profits are being made by industry or whether they are being made in the form of excess wages paid to labor. Congress has reduced the income-tax exemption as low as $500. This reduction of income-tax exemption applies alike to all, whether it be a worker in a factory, on the farm, or whether it be a widow whose only source of income is small dividends on stock or interest on bonds which she may have purchased with the lifetime savings of her dead husband and herself. No one can justify the taking of that tax and paying it to industry or labor in the way of excess profits. I am sure we can all agree on these principles.

WHAT WILL THE WAR COST?

What the war will cost the American people in terms of dollars and lives cannot be determined until the last soldier and the last dependent of the soldier has passed away. Until recently we were paying compensation to a dependent of a soldier of the War of 1812. America always has and always will take care of her soldiers and their dependents. The cost of such care must be considered as a cost of war. Calvin Coolidge once said that World War No. 1 would cost the American people what was then considered the tremendous sum of a hundred billions of dollars. Today we can only measure that cost in terms of expenditure of money and in debt. I want to give you a few of the facts which will give some idea of what the war is costing us. Before I do so, however, I want to give you a yardstick which will help us to understand just where we are going financially in this country of ours.

ASSESSED VALUATION OF UNITED STATES IS $150,000,000,000

I recently compiled a table giving the latest figures available on the assessed valuation of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. The total assessed valuation of the 48 States and the District of Columbia is just a few dollars more than $150,000,000,000. This valuation includes every piece of property, real and personal, tangible and intangible, which was placed on the assessment roll by the assessing officer of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. While I realize that it is not the actual value, it is the only case I know of, where an officer is charged by law with the duty of fixing and actually places a fixed value on a specific piece of property. That value may range from 40 percent to what some States contend is 100 percent. Value after all is a relative term. Million dollar apartment houses were torn down during the depression to make way for parking lots because the income was not sufficient to pay operating expenses and taxes.

THE PRESIDENT HAS $285,000,000,000 TO SPEND THIS YEAR

The President in his first message to the present Congress gave some revealing facts. He stated that he had on hand an unexpended balance of $170,000,000,000. This amount exceeded the assessed valuation of every piece of property in America by $20,000,000,000. He asked Congress for an appropriation of $109,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year. Subsequent budget estimates brought his requests to $115,000,000,000, which he was given. The President has therefore, for expenditure from and after January 1, 1943, the tremendous sum of $285,000,000,000 or a sum that is almost twice the assessed valuation of the country. On July 8, 1943, the national debt including $4,000,000,000 guaranteed obligations, exceeded $141,000,000,000, so when we consider these combined figures, a $300,000,000,000 national debt is not only a possibility, not only a probability, but is almost a certainty.

EXPENDITURES

(a) According to the latest figures furnished me by the clerk of the Appropriation Committee, the total appropriations made by Congress for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, 1943, and 1944, aggregate $319,000,000,000. This does not include reappropriations.

(b) Expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, totaled $78,182,348,000, and the excess of expenditures over receipts was $55,900,000,000.

(c) The public debt increased during the fiscal year from $76,900,000,000 to $140,796,000,000.

(d) The total appropriations for 1944, including reappropriations, exceed $138,000,000,000, of which the War Department received $71,507,000,000; the Navy Department received $32,422,000,000; lend-lease received $6,273,000,000; National War Agencies, $2,911,000,000 and supplemental Navy appropriations, $3,836,000,000, so we find, of the one hundred and thirty-eight billion, one hundred and seventeen billion is directly for war work, leaving twenty-one billion for other work, which includes some additional war work done by other departments, such as Conciliation Service, Treasury, etc.

UNITED NATIONS WAR EXPENDITURES

The latest available figures, according to the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Congressional Library, on war expenditures show the total amount expended by all United Nations for 1943, translated in United States currency, was as follows: Total expenditures last year, one hundred and five billion, of which the United States expended $67,534,000,000 up to June 12, 1943, or almost twice as much as the other Allied Nations put together, while the United Kingdom spent a total of $19,553,000,000. The United States figures are preliminary figures. The actual figures show that the United States actually expended, as I stated before, over $78,000,000,000, last year's figures.

YOUR SHARE OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

On May 29, 1943, I placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement giving the following information: Column 1, the name of each of the 48 States; column 2, the population of each State; column 3, the assessed valuation of each State according to the latest available figures; column 4, each State's share of the $300,000,000,000 debt on a per capita basis; and column 5, the percentage that that share was of the assessed valuation. The assessed valuation of the State of Illinois according to the latest figures then available was $5,240,430,000.

Illinois' share of the $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $17,989,914,000, or approximately 342 percent of its valuation. If the people of Illinois were compelled to vote upon themselves a bond issue of nearly $18,000,000,000, or nearly 3½ times the assessed valuation of every piece of property, real and personal, placed on the assessment roll by various assessing officers, would the people of Illinois be as apathetic toward waste and extravagance in the future as they have been in the past. The population of Chicago, according to the 1940 census, is 3,396,808. Chicago's share of the $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis would be $7,712,928,524. Would the people of Chicago be as apathetic toward waste and extravagance if they had to vote upon themselves a bond issue for this tremendous sum?

MR. ICKES SAYS WE ARE WORTH $12,000,000,000,000

According to Mr. Ickes, however, we have nothing to worry about. He stated, in a recent magazine article, that the United States was worth $12,000,000,000,000, that each person was worth $89,000. The population of Illinois, according to the 1940 census, was 7,897,000, so if each person in Illinois is worth $89,000, as stated by Mr. Ickes, then the State of Illinois is worth $702,833,000,000, so why worry about a mere $300,000,000,000 national debt, Mr. Ickes argues. In 1940 the population of Chicago was 3,396,808. According to Mr. Ickes, Chicago is worth $302,315,912,000.

I received a letter the other day from a man who has a wife and 10 children. According to Mr. Ickes, this man is a millionaire because each member of his family is worth $89,000 and this man is worth $1,068,000. Yet this man complained to me that he was getting pre-war wages with 25-percent war deductions and 30-percent wartime price increases. Mr. Ickes' trillions isn't helping him buy bread or pay his income tax or grocery bill. The fact is that Mr. Ickes has out-Longed Huey Long, out-Townsendited Dr. Townsend, and out-ham-and-egged the ham-and-eggers of California. There is, however, a serious danger that Mr. Ickes may be right in the future, if the present administration continues its spending policies. The country may some day be worth $12,000,000,000,000, but they won't be the same kind of dollars that you and I are using now. Germany, at the conclusion of the last war, talked of trillions of marks and they found it was cheaper to paper houses with German marks than with wallpaper. The Ickes dollar may have the same kind of value as last year's Sears, Roebuck catalog hanging on the side wall of the famous building referred to by Chic Sales in his Specialist. However, speaking seriously, it is a tragedy when a Cabinet member tries with methods such as these to blind the public to the real dangers of inflation and spending.

WASTE AND GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

Not only millions, but literally billions of dollars have been wasted in the war effort. While war is waste and while some waste is inevitable in wartime, there comes a time when waste impedes progress. Waste can never win the war, but waste could help lose the war. I have taken the position that the taxpayer is entitled to value received for his tax dollar, that it is the duty of Congress not only to appropriate money, but to see to it that the taxpayers receive as nearly as possible a dollar's worth of value for any one dollar spent. It is impossible for any one individual to lay his finger on all sources of waste. With all the work I have been able to do, I was able to merely scratch the surface. I want to comment on some of this waste.

CANTONMENT WASTE

In October 1940 a clerk of the Appropriation Committee asked me to approve a $466,000,000 cantonment construction bill, without full committee action. This I refused to do. A few minutes later the House convened and the bill was brought to the floor under a unanimous-consent request. I stated that in view of the emergency that, inasmuch as housing would have to be provided for selectees, I would not object to the bill being considered in that way. I stated, however, that I would hold the Army accountable for every dollar of the appropriation that was wasted.

On January 16, 1941—13 days after the Seventy-seventh Congress convened, I made a statement on the floor of the House that the Army would have a deficit in this construction program of approximately $330,000,000. From the facts I was able to obtain then, I estimated that the building program was running behind about 71 percent. I had already made my tour of the cantonments when the Army came in with a deficiency bill for $338,000,000. This was long before the Truman, May, or Vinson committees came into existence. Some of you have undoubtedly read the story in the press. They called it a one-man investigation. Time will not permit going into detail. I do want to mention just a few of the many instances of waste and excess cost.

Camp Blanding

At Camp Blanding, Fla., I found 40 percent of the building area below the level of a lake. Building foundations were below the water mark on the nearby trees. Six hundred and fifty thousand cubic yards of black muck was removed and replaced with sand. One thousand five hundred tent frames were built and then had to be moved and the ground filled in before they could be used. The chief construction quartermaster admitted that more than $5,000,000 had been wasted because of the camp site which was chosen. Excess labor costs, excess road costs, a railroad with old 60-pound rails which are too light to carry modern equipment; these and many other excess costs were found there.

Camp Meade

Camp Meade, which is a few miles from Washington, was a World War camp where 40,000 World War veterans had been housed and trained. The old site was selected because of its drainage and sandy soil. Highway grades, railroad grades, building sites, warehouse sites were all laid out and graded and millions of dollars could have been saved, had the old site been chosen. A sewer system sufficient for a camp of 40,000 men was in excellent condition, 8 miles of concrete road and miles of gravel road could have been reclaimed at a small cost. However, instead of using the old site, they used an entirely new one on a location that had poor drainage and clay soil and which was not fitted for that purpose. They built a completely new sewer system, they built new roads, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in grading, dug out stumps and trees; they built a hospital unit on one side of a hill and an antitank battalion unit on the opposite side and connected the two with a 1,200-foot tunnel. Forty percent of the building material of these two units had to be hauled on the site with a caterpillar tractor in mud boats. When I asked the engineer why they had not placed these two units on the old site, he informed me that they had recommended the old site, but the Army had refused to follow the recommendation. When I asked the camp construction quartermaster why the Army had rejected the site, he told me that he stood on the old site with the corps area commander, a Major General, and pleaded with him not to place it in its present location, but to use the old site. The corps area commander replied, "Not by a d— sight; over there is where I said it is going and that is where it is going," and that is where it went. I asked the engineer how much could have been saved had they placed the two units on the old site and he replied "$3,000,000." When I spoke on the floor of the House, I said that the officers who were responsible for this waste should be "court-martialed and kicked out of the army" and I meant just that. It cost the taxpayers an average of $17,360 to build a 63-man barracks at Camp Meade under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. It cost a little more than half that amount to build the same kind of barracks in the same climatic zone with the same material with a higher wage rate at Camp Dix where they had a competitive bid system.

Indiantown Gap

Camp Indiantown Gap in Pennsylvania was built at the foot of the mountains on solid rock where every trench, every post hole had to be drilled out of solid rock. It cost us $15,000 to put termite shields on buildings. I found a wooden building on the camp site that was built in the year 1690 and according to the construction quartermaster, no termite had ever attacked it. He told me that he recommended that the termite shields be left off, but the Washington office called him the next day and told him to put them on. It was easier to spend $15,000 for termite shields than to unwind the red tape. I cannot take time to continue. However, the whole story of my cantonment investigation can be told in one paragraph. The Graham committee appointed by Congress to investigate World War waste reported that there was great waste in the building of World War No. 1 cantonments, that it cost $206,000,000, waste and all, to build the cantonments where 4,000,000 men were housed and trained in World War No. 1; it cost the taxpayers of America $800,000,000 to build the cantonments where the first 1,200,000 men were housed and trained in this war. Succeeding cantonment construction was still higher.

PENTAGON BUILDING

At the beginning of the emergency, the War Department wrecked a $3,000,000 apartment house to obtain a new office building on Virginia Avenue in Washington. The project cost millions of dollars. The building was not yet completed when the Chief of Supply came back to our committee and asked for an appropriation in the amount of $35,000,000 to build an office building to house 40,000 employees. The committee was told that the $35,000,000 would cover the building cost with the exception of $1,000,000 for converting the airport into a parking lot. The last figure I had some months ago was that the project will cost $70,000,000. They spent more for landscaping, bridges, roads, and grading than the original project was supposed to cost. The original plans called for 5,600,000 square feet of gross space with 4,100,000 of net office space, the project to cost $35,000,000. The President ordered the building reduced. The plans as they were last September called for 5,600,000 square feet of gross space, 2,600,000 of net space—cost $70,000,000. More alterations were made later. The building consists of 5 rings of buildings each within the other; 3 rings had

4 stories, as I recall, 2 rings had 3 stories. The building was just about completed when they ordered the new roof torn off 2 of the 3-story rings, added another story and a new roof. It is my judgment that the Pentagon Building project when complete will cost $100,000,000, instead of $35,000,000 as represented to the committee. Where did they get the extra money that Congress refused to provide? From highway funds and from special funds given the President for other purposes.

WASTE IN WAR PRODUCTION

Perhaps the factor which has contributed more toward waste in war production has been the practice of measuring the progress in war production by the number of dollars spent. The industry which spent the most was given credit for having done the best work. News releases were issued and the people were educated to believe that the more money we spent, the more progress was made. We are bound to learn by the bitter experience that to be the arsenal of democracy means that we are the financial angel of democracy. The people are learning fast. Everytime they talk to the tax collector they are realizing more and more that after all the money which we are giving away and wasting, must be earned. I sincerely hope we can learn our lesson before we are committed to a program of international W. P. A.-ism.

Ever since I have been in Congress, I tried to make a study of costs. As you already know, I spent 44 days going through 47 defense plants engaged in war production during the past winter. I spent weeks more classifying and preparing the enormous amount of material I gathered. The factory pay rolls of the companies whose plants I visited and whose reports I was able to obtain, including General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler, but excluding Government arsenals, had an aggregate pay roll for the calendar year of 1942 of $2,316,041,747. The total number of employees working in the plants of these companies aggregate 850,522, while the companies themselves had more than 800,000 stockholders or a stockholder for almost every employee. The total number of hours worked for the calendar year was over 1,706,484,931. This will give you some idea of the extent of the survey I made. I was not able, of course, to visit all of the plants of each company, but I was able to obtain the pay-roll figures and other information for each company. I found companies operating on a shoestring making exorbitant profits. One company with $65,000 capital stock and surplus operating in rented plants and buildings and equipment owned by the Government took a net profit before taxes of 60 percent on over $50,771,000 sales of war materials to the Government after paying themselves $3,000,000 engineering and management fees through another small company which this little group also owned. After paying back over $23,775,000 under renegotiation, including 50 percent of the fee and paying $4,800,000 more in taxes, this company earned after renegotiation and after taxes $1,889,000 with only $65,660 invested.

Another company organized in November 1940, with $100,000 capital and paid-in surplus, showed earnings, after taxes, of $1,740,000. After paying 3 of the 4 principal owners $116,000 salary each and after giving $944,000 Christmas bonus to employees and after paying $6,000,000 income and excess profits, this company showed net earnings, after taxes, of $1,740,000 on $100,000 invested in October 1940. These cases are in the minority. From a study of 48 corporations which I surveyed, 20 earned less than 10 percent in 1942, 16 earned from 10 to 20 percent, 11 earned from 20 to 53.88 percent, while 1 made no report. There is no question in my mind but what millions of dollars are paid out in excess profits, some of which will be recovered through renegotiation and taxes, but much will never be recovered.

LABOR COSTS

Millions of workers are frozen at pre-war or nearly pre-war wages, while millions of others are frozen at many times pre-war wages—all by the same Executive order. I found machine-gun assemblers drawing as high as $8,740 a year; janitors making more than engineers; high-school girls, 18 years old, drawing more than majors in the Army. On the other hand, I found workers who are being paid pre-war wages with wartime deductions which, with the new withholding tax, will reach in some cases 25 percent, while they must face increased living costs of some 30 percent. I received hundreds of letters from all over the country informing me that the conditions I mentioned were found in their section of the country and verified everything I said on the floor of the House.

INFLATION

While we are talking about inflation, I want to read a few of these letters. From Chula Vista, Calif., come two advertisements from the Minneapolis Tribune:

"Wanted laborers for northeastern Canada, wages $300 per month guaranteed, no lost time due to inclement weather or sickness, plus overtime, board, room, and one issue of clothing furnished free."

Signed by the United States Employment Office, War Manpower Commission, 407 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.

The other reads:

"Waiters, dishwashers, kitchen men. Wages $250, board and lodging. Olympic Commissary, 25 South Washington."

From another California town come the following advertisements:

"We are paid at least $214 a month while we learn to weld and soon earn over $270 a month as journeymen. Ten percent extra for the swing shift, 15 percent extra for the graveyard shift."

The second advertises for women 18 to 40 years and reads in part as follows:

"We will train you to weld and pay you at the rate of $214 a month during a short training period. Soon you will be equipped with knowledge that will win you promotion to pay $270 a month."

From a farmer in Dayton, Ohio, comes the following:

"My farm hand who has farmed my place for several years receives $25 a week and he doesn't live on the place. His son, whose best job had been an auto mechanic, works at ------ and makes $100 a week."

From a doctor in Tulsa, Okla., comes the following:

"There are many instances of people who a few weeks ago were working for $15 a week now make over $100 a week—young girls and boys with 2 or 3 weeks' training in riveting make more money than graduates from universities with a doctor's degree. It ain't right, Congressman, and something should be done about it."

From Ontario, Canada, comes this letter:

"I am an American citizen and live in Illinois. Last winter I was amazed at the unheard-of wages girls were making in ordnance plants—$50 to $70 a week for unskilled labor. In Canada a girl living here in the capital considers herself lucky even with a college education to be a grade 2 clerk with $90 a month to spend in a country where everything is high."

In one factory in the East, where I found machine-gun assemblers were paid as high as $8,741 a year, I asked for and obtained the annual earnings of 25 of a group of these workers, taking the highest and lowest worker alternately until I had obtained 25. I asked for these figures for 1941 and 1942 broken down into straight pay—that is, 40 hours a week—the amount paid additional each year for overtime and bonus. Out of the 25 machine-gun assemblers in this high-low group, 5 earned in 1942 from $8,000 to $8,741; 7 earned from $7,000 to $8,000; 7 more earned from $6,000 to $7,000; 4 earned from $5,000 to $6,000; and out of the 25, only 2 earned less than $5,000 during 1942—1 who earned $4,959.72 and 1 earned $4,788; 12 out of the 25 received more than $7,000; and 22 out of the 25 earned more than $6,000, all in 1942. These men assembled .50-caliber machine guns, each one assembled a certain part of the gun. The average number of hours worked per employee in 1942 was 47.9 per week. The $8,741 a year paid to the highest paid of these machine-gun assemblers is $241 a year more than the base pay to Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, the Chief of the Service of Supply of the entire United States Army, who is charged with the responsibility of procuring and furnishing and supplying on every front in the world what we are told may be an army of 9,000,000 men with clothes, food, fighting equipment, ammunition, etc.

Think of paying a machine-gun assembler $241 a year more than the base pay of Lieutenant General Stilwell, who commands the armed forces in the Chinese theater. The total earnings for these 25 employees for the year 1941 was $87,017.64. These same employees earned in 1942, $171,915.32, or approximately twice the amount they earned in 1941. Their straight earnings in 1941 for a 40-hour week were $71,926.47, and in 1942, $134,775.52. Overtime in 1941 was $10,954.94, and in 1942 overtime was $28,674.25. Other bonuses in 1941 were $4,236.23, and in 1942, $8,465.55. I also took the record in the same factory of 44 .50-caliber machine-gun filers. Of these 44, 2 were paid in 1942, $8,000 and $8,230; 5 between $7,000 and $8,000; 10 between $6,000 and $7,000; 18 between $5,000 and $6,000; 6 between $4,500 and $5,000; and 2 between $4,200 and $4,500; and 1 of the 44 was paid $2,928. Out of the 44, only 9 made less than $5,000 during that year.

I am also enclosing the break-down of the pay roll of these 44 men. This break-down shows that the aggregated total earnings in 1941 was $155,858.34, and in 1942 these same men earned $260,503.62. Their straight earnings for 40 hours per week for the year 1941 were $129,727.32, while their straight earnings for 1942 were $201,275.84. Their overtime earnings in 1941 were $19,500, and in 1942, $44,020. Their bonuses paid them in 1941 were $6,630, and 1942, $15,207. In case after case these people earned more than twice as much in 1942 as they earned in 1941—and then we talk about inflation! These are not isolated cases, as you will find similar cases in other companies. Let us take some of these facts into consideration when we talk of inflation, roll-back of prices, and subsidies. This gives us an illustration of inflation through pay rolls. We try to close the inflationary gap with bond purchases and taxes, while at the same time we keep open that inflationary gap by increasing the purchasing power through excess profits and doubling wages on factory pay rolls. No such policy can succeed.

Fulbright Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it is as essential in war to prepare for peace as it is in peace to prepare for war.

The pending concurrent resolution is not only brief but unique. It is the first

time that the House of Representatives has taken the initiative in promoting and maintaining peace. The initiative with respect to peace has heretofore been taken by the Senate, but both the Senate and the House must declare war. There is nothing to prevent both the Senate and the House from promoting peace.

The resolution is an expression by Congress in favor of creating appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world and as favoring participation by the United States therein through its constitutional processes.

The resolution is not only the first step but it is in the right direction to maintain peace. War has been the heritage of mankind in all the centuries. The United States has fought a war approximately every 25 years since the Republic was founded. The First World War was fought to end all wars. The United States cooperated with the Allied Nations to win the war, but the failure of the United States and the Allied Nations to cooperate after winning the war lost the peace. We must not repeat the mistakes of the First World War.

OBJECTIONS

The opponents of the resolution have asserted that the resolution is meaningless. Such is not the case. It cannot be idle or meaningless, as we wage the greatest of all wars, for the Congress to express itself in favor of the creation of machinery to establish and maintain the peace. It cannot be without meaning for Congress to express itself as favoring participation. The expression will stimulate our armed forces and will encourage the nations who fight with us. It will promote the morale of our home people, and it will aid in the buying of bonds, in the collection of taxes, and in the sacrifices essential to winning the war.

Again, it is maintained that the resolution contemplates an international supergovernment with power and authority over the people of the United States. There is no foundation for the view. If this objection obtained, there would be no common war by the United Nations. As has well been said, we are the masters of our destiny.

The resolution is neither a statute, a joint resolution, nor a treaty. It is an expression by the Congress that will bring hope and promote victory.

The details of the international machinery must be worked out later. The agreements must be subsequently negotiated. They must be approved by the Congress. The constitutional processes will obtain.

Those who maintain that the resolution authorizes or contemplates a supergovernment are logically forced to the admission that a supergovernment obtains now in war in the common cause of the United Nations. It is just as sound to assert that we have sacrificed our sovereignty by fighting in war as it is to claim that we would sacrifice our sovereignty by cooperating after the war.

LEADERSHIP

The United Nations are looking to the United States for leadership. The policy of the good neighbor obtaining between the United States, Mexico, Central and South America is being extended to other nations. We seek no territory. We disclaim all aggression either direct or indirect. It is time for leadership not only in war but in peace. The oppressed peoples and the United Nations are looking to the United States for leadership not only in the war but in the peace. The purpose of the resolution is to give to all peoples and to all nations who suffer from the greatest of all wars hope that a just and lasting peace will follow victory.

We fight to preserve America, but peace is essential to the preservation of the United States. Universal peace may be a dream, but if the peace of the world for a century or a half century can be promoted, the present war will not have been fought in vain. Nations are not perfect, but if wars can be ended for a century or a half century, the road to a just and lasting peace will have been constructed.

FORCE

Without the strength of the United States it would be difficult to conquer the Axis nations in the present war. Without the United States it would be difficult if not impossible to make or maintain an effective peace.

As police officers in the city are essential to preserve peace, international machinery is essential to outlaw aggressors and nations bent upon conquest. The people of the United States know that the United States must participate by cooperation and collaboration if peace following the war is to be established and maintained. They also know if provisions are made for police by cities, provisions must be made for force in which the United States shall participate to establish and preserve the peace. The United States must not only do its part in fighting, but it must do its part in cooperating and collaborating to enforce the peace. The passage of the pending resolution will encourage the armed forces of the United States and of the United Nations to greater efforts for a speedy victory. There can be no peace without power to maintain peace. Secretary of State Cordell Hull was right when he said recently that an international agency or machinery must be created which "can—by force if necessary—keep the peace among the nations of the future."

The Possibilities for Chemical Development of Our Natural Gas and Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, at a special meeting in El Dorado, Ark., during the recess, the Arkansas congressional delegation and other citizens of our State had the privilege of hearing one of the most interesting and revealing discussions by Mr. W. M. Carney, chief chemist of the Lion Oil Refining Co., on the subject The Possibilities for Chemical Development of Our Natural Gas and Petroleum. Mr. Carney is widely known and a specialist in this field. In order that everyone may have the benefit of this fine speech, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include it herein as follows:

A discussion of the possibilities for chemical development of south Arkansas is considered synonymous with the chemical development of the petroleum industry. It should be considered in two phases: First, development and production of war materials and, second, the development and production of materials for peacetime consumption.

At the present time we have considerable production of petroleum and natural gas in Arkansas but more production is needed. We have refining facilities in this area designed for the manufacture of peacetime products, much of which has been converted to the production of the necessary materials required for mechanized warfare, and a large ammonia plant producing the vital products required for the manufacture of explosives. We have under construction in this area, and nearing completion, additional facilities for the production of aviation gasoline and butadiene. Butadiene is the principal ingredient used in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, Buna-S type.

We will first discuss the development and production of materials for war:

The art of war, since the birth of Christ has been changed and molded to entirely new patterns by only two great influences; namely, gunpowder and petroleum. There is no weapon of offense or defense in modern war that does not require petroleum. We have the evidence that two-thirds of all the entire tonnage consumed in expeditionary forces, including their transportation and protection is petroleum. Whichever side best supplies its armed forces with proper petroleum products, when and where they are needed and comes nearest to denying them to its enemies, when and where needed, will ultimately win. We have the greater part of the world's production of oil, as well as the facilities and "know how" for refining into the various vital products necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and the transportation necessary to place these products at the battlefront wherever it may be.

In this war in which our Nation is engaged there are four main fronts: (1) the fighting front, (2) the factory front, (3) the farm front, and (4) the home front. All are indispensable to victory and oil is indispensable on all these fronts. Ships are indispensable, but the battleships, submarines, or merchantmen would be but a mass of steel without oil. Aviation gasoline is the lifeblood of all aircraft, including bombers, fighters, transports, and trainers. When a plane takes off it uses a runway topped with asphalt furnished by oil industry, and it rolls on wheels equipped with rubber made from products manufactured by the oil industry. The synthetic rubber also serves hundreds of other war purposes on all the fronts stated above, being used on the trucks, tanks, and all other motorized military equipment, on ships, and in many ways in essential civilian activity. A tank without fuel is but scrap iron for the enemy.

Rear Admiral W. B. Young, of the United States Navy, recently stated that "strategically, the petroleum industry is one of the most important in our entire production

program, and it is handling its difficult assignment with outstanding success. The laboratories of the industry have succeeded in developing the finest products for ships, planes, and other equipment and the results in quantity and quality have been magnificent."

The participation of the oil industry in the prosecution of the war does not stop merely with helping to keep our ships sailing, planes flying, tanks rolling, and guns shooting. Upon the industry depends the critically needed lubricants that keep the wheels of war production turning. It supplies the indispensable cutting oils for the metal-working trades that fashion the tools of war. It furnishes petroleum-derived chemicals for various manufacturing processes, huge quantities of oil products for maintaining farm activity, transportation, and industrial operations. Virtually every normal petroleum product is now a war product.

Some of the vital products furnished by the oil industry and their uses are high-octane gasoline, a superfuel which makes it possible for our engineers to design faster and more powerful planes; toluene, the base material for TNT used in shells, depth bombs, and torpedoes; butadiene, for synthetic rubber, to be used in tires, balloon cloth, bullet-proof linings of airplane gasoline tanks; motor oils and fuels. In addition to these well-known products, we have solvents necessary for paints, primers, lacquers, and other protective coatings essential to the implements of mechanical warfare; asphalt for airplane runways and ordinary roads; waterproofing; rust preventives derived from petroleum to prevent deterioration of guns and other equipment exposed to the elements; oils developed by the industry for treating the wool used in blankets and uniforms; other oils used in the manufacture of rope and rope products, such as fiber conditioning oils, jute-treating and cordage oils; anti-slick grease for submarines, used to lubricate the fins without leaving oil spots, as the grease sinks instead of floating. The petroleum industry supplies various oils used in processing and packaging foods for shipment to our armed forces and allies, such as refrigerator oils used in the necessary refrigeration to keep food fresh; insecticides for control of mosquitoes, flies, and otner pests; salves and light mineral oils of many kinds are used in speeding recovery of our wounded; oils for soaps and toilet preparations to keep the men clean and healthy; low-temperature greases for aircraft which remain fluid at 60° below zero and yet function at 200° above; hydraulic oils for activating turret-gun mechanisms; a liquid is provided to impregnate shoes against war gases; a special emulsion has been developed to protect sandbags and tents against mildew; proper greases to lubricate and lengthen the life of wire rope; special turbine oils containing such petroleum derivatives as butylated paracresol, naphthenic acid salts, and sulfurized cracked hydrocarbons; veterinary medicines containing light oils and petrolatums; livestock sprays; lubricants for delicate airplane instruments; Diesel fuel for submarine and other Diesel powered boats; medicinal preparations for prevention of athlete's foot; oils for dust-laying; oils for large-gun recoil mechanism; lubricant for gun muzzle and oils for protecting shells; leather-treating and preserving oils for waterproofing leather. This is by no means a complete list of the products furnished by the oil industry but enough to show the important contribution to the war effort being made by the oil industry.

The ammonia plant is using natural gas as raw feed stock to produce anhydrous ammonia and ammonium nitrate, and all the important explosives being used contain ammonia as one of the principal ingredients.

In discussing natural gas produced in south Arkansas, we may mention that the gas as produced, contains from 1 to 4 tons of recoverable sulfur per million cubic feet. This sulfur is considered a valuable product in view of developments which have been made for its recovery and purification, and the decline in sulfur production in south Louisiana and Texas.

Looking beyond the war we foresee an abrupt drop in the production of some war materials, while others will find a peacetime demand. Toluene, so necessary for the production of explosives, will be converted to help make aviation gasoline blending agents. The peacetime volume of aviation gasoline capacity will be tremendous. There will be higher quality gasoline for the ordinary motorist, as well as plenty of aviation gasoline for expanded civilian use of air lines and private planes. It is predicted that soon after the war, new automobiles will be manufactured which will require 90–95 octane gasoline. Technical men say that automobile gasoline mileage can be increased 50 percent or power 70–100 percent by using the aviation-type fuel developed for war use. To get the most out of the new gasoline will require new motors which will be smaller and probably made of light alloy steel and the bodies made of plastics made from petroleum feed stocks. Some of the most revolutionary developments of research during the war period have been kept secret for military reasons; for example, one major oil company has been testing a new aircraft grease designed to lubricate at minus 100° F. which is expected to have useful post-war applications in refrigerator equipment.

The future, according to petroleum chemists, will see 100,000 mile tires, 20,000 mile lubricating oil, 50–70 mile-to-the-gallon gasoline and sealed cooling systems with petroleum product liquids in both cars and planes. A now unbelievable volume of crude oil and natural gas will be diverted to raw materials for plastics, for textiles that will replace linen and wool, as well as silk and for commercial solvents and synthetic resins. As both petroleum chemistry and the oil industry mature, conservation will become more important. No survey of petroleum chemistry's part in war and its prospective part in peace can overlook the role of gas, both natural and refinery gases. Natural gas, usually found in the search for new oil fields, is about nine-tenths methane. We have enough proven reserves at present rates of consumption to last from 30–60 years. The ammonia plant, using natural gas as feed stock can produce formaldehyde and methanol, among other things, and formaldehyde has become industrially important as feed stock for bakelite and urea resin plastics, Petroleum gas fractions are useful in making plastics, synthetic rubber, synthetic fabrics, such as rayon, solvents, explosive and aviation gasoline. Ethylene, a petroleum gas, can be used to make ethyl alcohol, plastics, styrene used with butadiene to produce rubber, as a surgical anesthetic, to produce aviation gasoline, and in many other ways. Methane gas heated with steam breaks down into carbon dioxide and hydrogen may be converted into oil. Paraffin wax, one of the by-products can be oxidized to make fatty acids for soap, or in combination with synthetic glycerin into edible fats.

Oil as an industry is rich enough and progressive enough to raise a large family of healthy new infant industries from the thousands of new products incubating in its research laboratories, to result in the modification of a large chemical company's slogan, to "Better things for better living through petroleum chemistry."

Double Taxation—Its Blighting Effects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, "the present method of taxing corporate incomes is grossly unfair"; so declares a former Under Secretary of the Treasury. He is referring to the double taxation of corporate dividends, which he says, "should be stopped." He is right.

The great inequity in the corporate tax system arises from the double taxation of income paid out in dividends. Such dividends are taxed to the individual recipient like any other income, such as salary or interest.

However, salary and interest are deducted by the corporation or individual who pays them; hence, these items are taxed as income only once.

Corporate income today is subjected to a tax of 40 percent, composed of normal tax and surtax.

The surtax on corporate earnings is merely a subterfuge disguised to enable the collection of a tax on the interest on certain Federal bonds, which are subject to surtaxes only. The surtax is merely an addition to the normal tax. It is so admitted by those responsible for its enactment. In no other country, to our knowledge, is such a tax levied.

Corporations are permitted no deduction or credit for dividends paid. Hence, the dividend income which a common stockholder receives has already been reduced by nearly one-half by the heavy income taxes—40 percent—paid by the corporation. Upon these dividends he receives—already reduced one-half by the corporate income tax—the stockholder then pays the usual normal tax and surtaxes in his income brackets.

Dividends are thus much more heavily taxed than interest or salaries; with a long train of unfortunate consequences and blighting effects set out below.

Let us go back to the fall of 1913, when the first income-tax measure became law, following the adoption of the sixteenth amendment.

The scene is the floor of Congress. Members are confused by this new form of tax. A prominent member of the House Ways and Means Committee is answering questions. He solemnly assures Congress that "There will be no double taxation. Of course, if a corporation pays a tax on its income, there should be no tax imposed on the dividends received by persons from that corporation."

What has happened to that solemn promise? It has gone down the drain.

The British income tax has served as a pattern for much of our tax legislation. Since our fiscal experts so frequently refer to British taxes, it might be asked, Why have we not followed the British plan in taxing corporate earnings?

Under the British plan, the tax may be said, in reality, to be a tax on the stockholders, which is collected at the source.

Stockholders are given credit for taxes already paid on income distributed as dividends.

Stockholders who receive dividends pay no additional tax on these dividends, unless their total income, before exemptions, exceeds £2,000, $8,000. If their income exceeds that amount, they become subject to the surtax at rates ranging from 10 to 47½ percent.

On the other hand, if their total income, after exemptions, is less than £165—$660, they are entitled to a tax refund from the Government.

In Britain, a single tax is imposed—corporation profits in the United States are taxed twice. Is that justice?

The largest corporations in this country are owned by hundreds of thousands of stockholders—in some over 50 percent of the stock is held by individuals with average holdings of 1 to 10 shares each. Corporate taxes are paid indirectly by these stockholders—because of the 50-percent reduction in dividends.

The following are some of the blighting effects of our American plan:

First. The system, being unsound to start with, cannot distribute fairly the severe increases in tax burdens which corporations have been and will be required to bear.

Second. A tax which reduces dividends by half, is in substance a 50-percent tax on stockholders' income—a pretty high rate even under present conditions.

Third. No account is taken of the fact that corporate income has already been heavily taxed as such, and may have been subjected to excess-profits taxation as well.

Fourth. This discrimination against corporate income is perhaps the most serious offense against fairness in the present tax law.

Fifth. The present corporate normal income tax and surtax—40 percent—have nothing to do with individual capacity to pay, is justifiable only as an excise tax for the privilege of doing business in corporate form.

Sixth. So viewed, the rates are excessive for the privilege enjoyed.

Seventh. What is more serious, however, the tax rests with disproportionate severity upon stockholders with small incomes, and the inequity increases with increases in tax rates.

Eighth. Owners of small enterprises must weigh carefully whether the advantages of a corporate charter, chiefly limited liability, are worth the cost in Federal and States taxes. We do not believe that Congress deliberately intended to discourage the use of the corporate form by small business—yet that is definitely the consequence of the present tax method.

Ninth. This system encourages debt financing rather than stock financing. For tax purposes, bonds, notes, or debentures are altogether better as a part of corporate capitalization than stock. Interest on bonds, notes, or debentures are deductible expenses.

Tenth. This policy is in direct contrast with that enforced by such regulatory bodies as the Securities and Exchange Commission and State utilities commissions. They have urged the reduction of debt and have discouraged debt financing; they have encouraged equity financing by all possible means.

Eleventh. The publicly regulated corporation, therefore, is placed squarely in a dilemma. If it retires bonds and issues stocks, its financial position, from the tax angle, is much worse. It may come under an excess-profits tax liability which it would not otherwise have had to bear. It may even arrive at a point where further financing for new construction is almost out of the question, because of its low earnings ratio.

Twelfth. Finally, the structure, in its discrimination in favor of debt financing, fosters capitalization of a type generally agreed to be undesirable—a type which has been the major cause of the difficulties from which many of our corporations, such as railroads, have suffered.

The present scheme of taxing dividends twice and all other income once cannot be justified on any grounds.

What is the remedy? There are several—all very simple.

Why not follow the British plan? It has been tested and proved satisfactory. We have readily adopted other features of the British system.

Or, we can return to the original procedure, prior to 1936. Give a credit either to the corporation against its normal tax and surtax for the dividends it distributes, or to the individual against his normal tax for the dividends he receives.

If the former were adopted, much of the loss would be made up by additional dividends, subject to taxation in the hands of the stockholders, and made possible by corporate savings due to credit.

A corporation should be regarded as a conduit for transmitting earnings from the business to its owners, not as a tax-paying unit entirely apart from its owners. If the corporation has already paid a normal tax on its earnings, a second normal tax should not be imposed on the same earnings distributed as dividends.

If it is convenient and appropriate to collect a normal tax from the corporation on its earnings, stockholders should be credited with their pro rata shares of the taxes so paid. In this way, dividend income will not be discriminated against; it will be treated, in effect, like bond interest.

Corporations would be free to choose whether to issue bonds or stocks on the basis of good business—not tax—reasons.

Finally, with this tax reform put into effect, the present high corporate rates would not bear with such extreme severity on the small stockholder and the small corporation.

The present policy, if continued, will be very expensive to the national economy.

Former high Treasury officials strongly urge this reform.

A recent report of the National Industrial Conference Board, titled "Effects of Taxes Upon Corporate Policy," contains substantial evidence to support the foregoing statements.

Senator GEORGE, distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, in discussing recently the question of "double taxation," arising out of present corporation and individual income tax provisions, stated "it may well be considered in the tax simplification bill."

I commend to my colleagues of the House Ways and Means Committee their earnest consideration of these views.

The forthcoming tax bill should scrape off many of the barnacles that cling to our tax structure. Double taxation of dividends impedes the smooth flow of business. Removing such impediments from the tax structure would encourage and increase dividends and thus augment revenues flowing into the Treasury.

No one would be hurt. The Government would benefit. The smaller taxpayer or poorer member of society, for example, the laboring man, would not be penalized for the benefit of the more prosperous member of society.

You would not interfere with the principle of taxation in accordance with ability to pay.

A Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter which I am mailing to some of the people of my State. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am writing you this letter to ask you for your vote and your support in the coming Governor's election to be held on January 18, 1944.

You, of course, realize that I am far better known all over Louisiana today than in the last Governor's race. My backing is more substantial than ever before. Then, too, my service here in Congress has enabled me to demonstrate that I can be of real service to the people and leaves no doubt in your mind that I will make the kind of Governor you want. Even my worst political enemies praise my work here in the Nation's Capital. If I can assist you at any time I hope you will feel free to call on me.

This is not the time to burden you with my platform, possibly you have read it or will read it in the near future. It may be that I will not have the opportunity to see you and talk with you before election, so that is why I am writing you this personal letter asking for your vote and support in order that we will win a great victory on January 18, 1944.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—If I can be of any service to you please write me either in Hammond, La., or in Washington, D. C.

Regards,

JIMMY.

Resolutions of the Livestock and Feed Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include resolutions adopted by the livestock and feed conference, Thursday, September 2, 1943, Kansas City, Mo. Two thousand persons, representing all phases of the livestock and meat industries, were present and approved of the resolutions unanimously. The States represented included the West-Central and Southwest range States and the Corn Belt or feeder sections of the country. I am sure they will be of interest to every Representative in the Congress.

PREAMBLE

We have a dual purpose in this meeting:

First, to present the picture of the livestock industry to the country, in order that immediate corrective steps may be taken before further serious damage is done our industry and our country; and

Second, to acknowledge the major and direct interest the consumers of the country have in what we are seeking to accomplish here today.

We need the consumers—the consumers need us.

RESOLUTION 1

WAR MEAT BOARD

Whereas from the very beginning of the imposition of price ceilings on meat, the net result of confusing and conflicting orders and statements has been to bring chaos to one of our Nation's greatest and most necessary industries; and

Whereas the livestock and meat industry, at a conference held in Chicago early in April 1943, unanimously adopted a meat management program which, in its opinion, would go far in controlling black markets, encouraging maximum production, and insuring better distribution of meat available; and

Whereas the War Food Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of the Quartermaster General approved the general principles of the plan as submitted by the industry following the Chicago meeting, and by agreement set up the War Meat Board to administer the war meat management program; and

Whereas despite such approval, the War Meat Board has not been given an opportunity to carry on the program outlined but, instead, there have been continued threats of live animal ceilings, allocation of supplies, and even Government purchase of all livestock and meats: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge the responsible Government agencies dealing with the war food program to clear the track so that the War Meat Board can properly function, and in the meantime to see that threats of further Government controls which would hamper rather than help be immediately stopped.

RESOLUTION 2

CEREALS AND VEGETABLE PROTEINS AS MEAT SUBSTITUTES

Whereas provincially minded people, completely failing to grasp the importance of livestock in our national economy, and ignoring the detrimental effect of a reduced meat diet on our national health, have urged that we must turn from the long-established practice of feeding grain and protein concentrates to livestock, to a new national program which contemplates far greater direct use of cereals by the human population, and to some extent the substitution of vegetable proteins for animal proteins in the diet, utterly ignoring the fact that animal proteins are far superior to vegetable proteins in stimulating and supporting the human body processes; and

Whereas 55 percent of our national acreage is in grass and only through its use by livestock can it be efficiently processed into human food; and

Whereas the nutritional basis of Anglo-Saxon success is the reliance on a meat diet, the importance of which is attested by the demands of the Army for meat far in excess of normal civilian per capita consumption: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we strongly protest the loose thinking and loose talking of those who, in the name of the war emergency, would seek to make impractical changes which would be disastrous to the country as a whole and could only seriously hamper the war effort itself.

RESOLUTION 3

SUBSIDY ROLL-BACK

Whereas, in order to appease those whose buying power is greater today than ever before in the history of the country, the subsidy roll-back program applying to meats and butter was initiated some weeks ago; and

Whereas, as anticipated, this program was immediately reflected in the livestock markets with packers making strenuous efforts to buy on a substantially lower basis, and it is now clear that in many instances the price already has been rolled back on the producer and feeder; and

Whereas the use of subsidies for such purposes, necessitating, as they do, even greater taxation than the heavy burden now being borne, is frowned upon by the rank and file of the people of this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge Congress to take such action as would insure a discontinuance of the present subsidy roll-back program and put a stop to the efforts to expand it.

RESOLUTION 4

GOVERNMENT BY DIRECTIVE

Whereas there has been a decided trend toward government by Executive order, directives from the White House being issued in increasing volume and with the full force and effect of law; and

Whereas these directives are often developed by staff employees with little, if any, practical experience in the field of operation to be governed by such orders: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge Congress, the direct representative of the people, again to assume the responsibility of lawmaking, and that there be a cessation of lawmaking by Executive order except in cases of extreme emergency.

RESOLUTION 5

CONGRESSIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Whereas we deeply appreciate the presence here today of many State Governors, United States Senators and Representatives, thereby attesting to the recognition of the seriousness of the meat problem confronting the Nation today; and

Whereas the recommendations of the livestock industry as to how to terminate the present chaotic condition have been largely ignored by the administrative officials in Washington and particularly by the officials of the Office of Price Administration: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we urge the Senators and Representatives here today to take it upon themselves to form a joint committee, of which they will be the nucleus, and that this committee devote itself to the current problems of the livestock industry and demand that the administrative officials take immediate steps to restore confidence in the industry, and to assure maximum meat production during the coming feeding season. We believe this can best be accomplished by putting into effect immediately the meat management program which the War Meat Board was set up to administer.

RESOLUTION 6

CANCELING CONTRACTS FOR PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation, in recently announcing the new and substantially higher schedule of prices for protein concentrates for the 1943–44 crop, also arbitrarily canceled all existing contracts for old-crop cake and meal, although offering to resell the contracted product to the same users at an advance in price of $10 to $12 per ton, the profit resulting therefrom to go into the fund of Commodity Credit Corporation, and

Whereas such cancelation of existing contracts will cause many feeders of livestock to take substantial losses on operations planned months ago, without any chance to protect themselves from such losses, and

Whereas this action is resulting in many feeders emptying their feed lots and refusing again to assume the heavy risk of feeding livestock unless action is taken to reimburse them for losses suffered on bona fide contracts: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, urge the Commodity Credit Corporation to honor claims filed by feeders for the amount of loss suffered under such bona fide contracts.

RESOLUTION 7

LOW BYPRODUCT PRICES

Whereas for more than a year rigid price ceilings have been maintained upon dressed-meat products, and in the case of beef these ceilings are relatively low compared with the long-time relationship between beef and other meat products; and

Whereas the cost of labor, grain, and protein concentrates has advanced substantially without a compensatory advance in the meat ceilings themselves being permitted; and

Whereas it is recognized that any move to decrease fat-cattle prices below levels existing today would inevitably further discourage feeders and retard beef production: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That as a partial measure of relief the ceilings on hides and other by-products should be immediately raised to a reasonable level.

RESOLUTION 8

PROTEIN CONCENTRATES

Whereas during the past year there developed a serious shortage of protein concentrates not due to any decrease in supply but only to sharply increased demands and poor distribution; and

Whereas now all is confusion as to the program—if program there is—for the distribution of these protein concentrates during the coming season; and

Whereas it is of first importance that both producers and feeders should be able to plan now—immediately—for their operations

during the coming winter, in order to determine the size of the herds to be carried over or the amount of feeding to be done; and

Whereas unless producers and feeders are enabled to purchase these products in reasonably adequate supply within the next few weeks, it will of necessity cause substantial liquidation of breeding herds and reduce feeding operations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, urge the Commodity Credit Corporation to make an immediate announcement of a program for the equitable distribution of protein concentrates from the 1943–44 crop, and that producers and feeders be allowed to buy the product in the customary form and protein content.

RESOLUTION 9

PACKER MEAT QUOTAS

Whereas the rationing of meat to consumers and the set-aside order to packers make entirely unnecessary the continuance of the packer quota system covering volume of meat to be made available for civilian use; and

Whereas the operation of this quota system has tended to encourage black markets and has unnecessarily increased the transportation burden because local packers in surplus livestock producing areas are not permitted to slaughter in volume sufficient to meet the local ration coupon demand, causing livestock to be shipped out, processed, and the product returned for distribution: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we commend the War Food Administration for its action yesterday in suspending these quotas for 60 days and urge that the suspension be made permanent.

RESOLUTION 10

MEAT PRODUCTION

Whereas with so much publicity on the shortages of meat which developed this spring, it is not generally realized that the livestock industry has tremendously expanded meat production, setting a new record for total production in 1940, 1941, and 1942, with every indication that this year's total production will exceed the all-time record set last year; and

Whereas despite this record of great production, administrative agencies have resorted to charges that the livestock industry was responsible for the shortages so much publicized by hoarding livestock which should have gone to market; Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we protest this unfounded charge of hoarding, which was nothing but a smoke screen to cover up the bungling of the said administrative agencies.

RESOLUTION 11

LIVE ANIMAL PRICE CEILINGS

Whereas over a period of 50 years or more the livestock industry of this country has developed an intricate system of marketing which enables producers in any section of the country to make immediate spot-cash sales in public markets, auction markets, concentration points, or, in many instances, right on the home farm or ranch; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration, unaware of the confusion that would result from disturbing this marketing system, has repeatedly threatened to impose live animal price ceilings which would completely upset this whole marketing structure, make necessary a complicated and unworkable system of allocating supply, and would in effect merely extend to the producing end of the industry the same confusion that has existed in the processing end ever since the imposition of the first price ceilings; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, That we are unalterably opposed to any tinkering with our marketing structure and demand that the threat of live animal ceilings be removed from the livestock picture at once.

RESOLUTION 12

ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITY

Whereas it has been clearly shown that both feeders and producers have made every effort to expand meat production; and

Whereas unfortunately, administration tactics have leaned largely toward the pyramiding of regulations instead of toward cooperative effort that would bring far greater results; and

Whereas there are in the country record numbers of livestock, and prospects are for production of fairly adequate supplies of coarse grains and protein concentrates; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Livestock and Feed Conference, in session at Kansas City, Mo., September 2, 1943, desire to call the attention of the consumers of the country to the fact that if under these conditions there should develop, next winter and spring, an even more serious shortage of meat, and particularly beef and lamb, than was the case last spring—and such a situation now seems possible unless administrative agencies move quickly along the lines long recommended by the livestock industry itself—that the full responsibility for such a meat shortage must be accepted by the administration.

RESOLUTION 13

BLACKSTRAP MOLASSES

Whereas there is a definite shortage of proteins (cottonseed cake, soybean pellets, etc.), as well as grains (corn, etc.); and

Whereas blackstrap molasses is increasingly important as an ingredient in dairy, range, and poultry feeds: It is hereby

Resolved, To request the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chemicals Division of the War Production Board, Washington, D. C., to reconsider W. P. B. Order M-54, with the object of providing additional quantities of blackstrap molasses for general feed use, and permitting a more flexible administration of the order through increasing the use of molasses for feeding purposes.

RESOLUTION 14

SUGAR BEETS AND THEIR BYPRODUCTS

Whereas in the sugar-beet-growing sections of the country a large and very important livestock-feeding business has been developed by feeding of beet byproducts; and

Whereas the uncertainty of the sugar-beet program and the out of balance of prices fixed on sugar beets in relation to other farm crops have resulted in a curtailed acreage, thereby reducing the supply of our essential sugar and meat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon the War Food Administration, first, that there be no restriction in the planting of sugar beets; and, second, that a price be set on sugar beets that will encourage a normal planted acreage.

The New Deal and Diocletian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech delivered before the Rotary Club of Gulfport, Miss., by Mr. Clayton Rand, a country editor, on The New Deal and Diocletian.

I wish every American might have the opportunity to read this sound and thought-provoking speech. It contains the kind of material which should in this troubled world of ours give us assurance that the urge for liberty in the breasts of men cannot and will not be destroyed. It follows:

THE NEW DEAL AND DIOCLETIAN

(By Clayton Rand)

I preface these observations on the New Deal and Diocletian, with a cogitation on Caesar and the Third Term, written in August 1940.

"Caesar was born in wealth. His mother was of a distinguished family, and when his father died his mother trained him for a political career. Caesar was a pampered child, reared in the lap of luxury. He was noted for his extravagance and political intrigues. When the masses were enfranchised, Caesar played to the crowd and became a popular idol. He joined forces with radical parties, and as soon as he came into full power the Roman constitution ceased to exist.

"Caesar spent tax money lavishly. He provided public entertainment, like W. P. A. theaters, and sponsored many projects to 'relieve unemployment.'

"Caesar proposed a digest of all laws, founded libraries, drained marshes, built dams, enlarged harbors, and dug canals. He made financial proposals for the relief of debtors and in a 'great emergency' he took steps to restore agriculture. He even changed the calendar. As his spoils system spread throughout the republic, he became so popular with the people that the Roman Senate granted him the sole right of disposal of funds from the public treasury—blank checks as it were—and finally gave him the power to declare war and make peace.

"Caesar preserved his writings for posterity in a special vault. He feasted and feted the people with prodigal extravagance, until they called him the great humanitarian of his country. Caesar's 'person was declared to be sacred and, of course, he could not appear in public debate with any common mortal.

"In Caesar's fifty-seventh year, he aspired to be king in name as well as in fact. As Shakespeare described it: Antony set a crown upon his head. When Caesar put it by Antony offered it to him again, then he put it by again. But there was a columnist present named Casca who was keen-sighted, and Casca reported: "To my way of thinking he was very loath to lay his fingers off it. And then it was offered the third time and as he refused it, again the rabble shouted, and clapped their hands, and threw up their sweaty nightcaps.' And Casca went on to say that he, 'durst not laugh out loud'."

Under Julius Caesar the power of the Roman Senate declined—his followers so emasculated it that it became but a symbol.

PLANNED ECONOMIZERS

The past is the only criterion by which we may anticipate the future. The chaotic times in which we strive for a planned economy have many counterparts in history.

In the spinal column of my last sheet I made this observation on planners:

Sir William Beveridge, of London, with his womb-to-tomb post-war plans has been visiting in Mississippi. Congress has shelved Uncle Frederic Delano's cradle-to-grave scheme and has appointed a committee of its own to concoct a perfect world. And the more these planners blueprint the future the darker the present becomes.

The trouble with these planners and plotters is that they all appeared on the scene

too late. They should have started in the Garden of Eden.

It must be a great disappointment to God that He didn't have some of these experts on hand to help Him when He planned creation.

From the time the Lord created the earth, man has monkeyed with divine purpose. The Ten Commandments are rather comprehensive. They were so well planned that God has not seen fit so far to amend a single one of them. If they were ever adopted by a legislature or a Congress, however, some "planning economizer" would attempt to improve upon them.

There is nothing new in planned economy. From the time of which we have any record attempts have been made in every civilization and in every age to provide short-cuts to social security and perpetual prosperity.

I heard a businessman make a speech before the New Orleans Rotary Club on postwar planning. He threw out the fact that Louisiana, the twenty-first State in the Union in population, was second only to New York in bonded indebtedness.

He did not say it, but the $180,000,000 debt of Louisiana, and the staggering load in New York are largely the creations of Huey Long and Franklin Roosevelt, whose political careers and domestic ideas so closely coincide.

Huey Long and Franklin Roosevelt lifted a page from the Caesars and Diocletian. Neither of them, either on his own or with the aid of his economists, professors and experts, could have "thunk" up these things without the help of history.

It may be a pessimistic thought, but Augustus Caesar established a Roman peace, which was to be perpetual.

The Roman highway system began as a defense measure but ended in a W. P. A. project. The empire's colonization scheme began in an effort to create military outposts and ended in farm resettlement projects for indigent peasants and votes. Theater projects were staged to amuse the masses and then perpetuated to relieve unemployment.

The agrarian bill or resettlement project of Tiberius Gracchus in the second century before our era, like the corn law of Gaius Gracchus, which provided for the sale of grain below the market price to the needy, were paternal or vote-catching measures.

By the middle of the first century B. C., 320,000 persons in Italy were receiving doles of corn from the state. If one politician could gain votes by providing corn, why not free olive oil, free shows, and free baths?

There isn't anything in the New Deal's controlled economy that was not tried out first by the Caesars except Harry Hopkins' privy program. And the only idea promoted by the Romans not undertaken by W. P. A. was public baths.

DIOCLETIAN'S EDICT

For this occasion I call your attention in particular to one of the super-super planned economizers of all history. Diocletian became Emperor of Rome in 284 A. D. In an unprecedented depression and a great emergency he sprang a New Deal on the Empire in 301. Under him the Roman senate became politically impotent and the last traces of republican institutions disappeared. Diocletian was of the opinion that social security could be permanently established and the economy of the Empire forever stabilized by the creation of federal bureaus and commissions. Diocletian was vested with absolute authority and he fixed by decree, he thought for all time, in supposedly fair relationship, the intricate processes of society.

The prices of all commodities, wages, and other activities of the people were in complete control of the state. Price ceilings were engraved on tablets of stone and were set up in the market places. Even to this day fragments of this edict are being unearthed in remote places once embraced by the Roman Empire. In all, 800 articles were included in the edict: cereals, wine, oil, meats, vegetables, skins, leather, furs, shoes, timber, clothing, poppy seeds, snails, goat's flesh, underwear, and Numidian mantles were given a fixed selling price. Wages for services rendered from common laborer to dancing teacher and professional advocate, were determined by directive and a bureaucracy regimented everything from the number of acres a farmer could plant to the maximum hours labor could be employed. There was rationing, rent controls, and a kind of interstate commerce commission covered transportation down to the "rent for a laden ass, per mile," which in our coinage was 1.8 cents. Unless the transportation agency of the time carried more than two persons per ass, there was no chance of showing a profit. And the asses that they employed then could not carry more than two passengers.

Rome flourished, its population increased, with the multiplicity of bureaus and coordinators. There were as many stonecutters in Rome as there are stenographers in Washington. The law of supply and demand was repealed and the economic and social life of the people was so completely regulated that a perfect society flourished. A kind of Plato's New Republic or Moore's Utopia or Roosevelt's New Deal or Huey Long's Every Man a King was organized in the Eternal City.

WHAT HAPPENED?

What happened to this strange experiment, this effort to socialize and regiment an empire? We have the verdict in history. Diocletian and his new deal failed to reckon with one significant fact, that neither he nor all his legions could control human nature. Despite the fact that Diocletian punished by death or deportation all violations of his price-fixing agency, the scheme collapsed. Black markets flourished to traffic in meat. Overcharges made by merchants and the money changers who exacted usury were checked, but production also stopped.

Absenteeism became common with labor, merchants closed their marts and went on vacation. Competition disappeared and men neglected to manufacture, to buy and sell, to exchange commodities for services. Farmers ceased to till their land, moved to the cities and society became decadent.

What happened? Individual freedom was destroyed. The essential fires of enthusiasm were extinguished, individual and collective initiative perished. Diocletian took the fun out of work. Authoritative regulation crushed ambition in the masses. However good might have been the emperor's intentions, his attempt to regulate everything that could be controlled to meet a great emergency was disastrous, ultimately fatal, in its effect.

Diocletian stated, in part, in the introduction to his edict, "Inasmuch as there is only seen a mad desire without control, to pay no heed to the needs of the many * * * it seems good to us, as we look into the future, to us who are the fathers of the people, that justice intervene to settle matters impartially, in order that that which, long hoped for, humanity itself could not bring about may be secured for the common government of all the remedies which our care affords. * * *"

Writing of Diocletian's New Deal more than 1,600 years ago, Lactantius wrote, "He tried to fix by law the price of articles offered for sale. Thereupon for the veriest trifles much blood was shed, and out of fear nothing was offered for sale, and the scarcity grew much worse, until, after the death of many persons, the law was repealed from mere necessity."

The passing of Diocletian marked the decline of local self-government and the growth of a centralized system. Probably no Roman emperor proposed so many sweeping reforms. Diocletian completely reorganized the government, set up new systems of coinage and taxation and redivided the provinces. It is interesting to note that a New Dealer has recently recommended dissolving the States and subdividing the Republic into districts and departments. Out of the Emperor's experiments and those that preceded him, sprang the socialistic schemes of later times.

Diocletian ruled for 20 years. The New Deal has run its course for only 10 years, but at the pace it runs, give it 10 more years and it will outdo Diocletian.

TURNING POINT

The collapse of Diocletian's edict also marks an important turning point on the highway of history, for there followed in the wake of his experiments a thousand years of night. From the year 300 almost to the year 1300, that period in civilization is rightly called the Dark Ages. During that night of a thousand years, what was once the Roman Empire produced not a single poet, historian, orator, painter, sculptor, architect, or builder. The practical effect of the decree was to stop the flow of goods into the markets and suspend the activities of the empire. There were no banks, no insurance companies, no transportation companies, no mail service and no newspapers. During this long night society slipped into slavery, human nature became depraved, men became selfish, base, and dishonest. The world was managed by priests and police. They took charge of the taxing power and production. Famines were frequent and the status of the human race, in its fight for food, was little better than that of the beasts of the jungle.

The Roman Empire was built before the coming of the Caesars. For 750 years the Roman citizen had enjoyed more freedom than man had ever before experienced. Under the planned economies of the Caesars it took 150 years to accomplish the complete disintegration of the Empire's commerce and agriculture, and expose it as easy prey to the barbarians. We have been 300 years carving this Republic out of the wilderness. How long will it take the streamlined bureaucrats to destroy it with their regulation, red tape, edicts, and directives?

Despite this bitter lesson of experience, planned economies continued. Frequent upheavals on the European Continent are historic reminders of the countless efforts to regulate and regiment its peoples—authoritative attempts to destroy their freedom and build by a false economy of scarcity. Occasional economic recovery in Europe can be traced down through the centuries in terms of spasmodic freedom.

FREEDOM

I shall not burden you with any recitation upon humanity's periodic recoveries, which came with the Renaissance, political and industrial revolutions, the conquest of the New World, or the Elizabethan age during which the people of England enjoyed a little freedom and went forth with it to build an empire. For the purposes of this presentation let us rush on to the birth of this Republic, for despite England's Magna Carta, freedom, as we understand it, was reborn in the American Revolution against King George II, his planned economies, and his authoritative pressure on the nerve centers of a people determined to be independent.

For 170 years before 1776, the roots of a transplanted, newer freedom were spreading on the North American Continent. American liberty is the product of the soil and genius of the open spaces and open minds of a freedom-loving people who made a covenant with God to release themselves, body and soul, from the ancient bondages of bureaucracy.

Step by step the colonists had severed themselves from European concepts. Full expression was given to the individual's bottled up energy and potential initiative. There developed a new philosophy of government under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and Thomas

Jefferson that found expression, first in the colonists' indictments against the King in our Declaration of Independence, then in the adoption of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights. I doubt if there is a problem of personal conduct that one will not find an answer for in Poor Richard's Almanac. I doubt if there is a problem of state, or of our relationship with other peoples, that we will not find a solution for in the writings of the Father of our Country. Did he not warn in his third address to Congress, "Be at all times prepared for war; leave nothing to the uncertainty of procuring of warlike apparatus in the moment of danger." If we had heeded that admonition have you any doubt in your mind that either Japan or Germany would have dared attack us? What will the gross negligence of our Government at Pearl Harbor cost the country in blood and treasure? Thomas Jefferson put our newer freedom into a pungent paragraph when he said, "agriculture, manufacture, commerce, and transportation the four pillars of our prosperity, are most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise."

OF THE SPIRIT

When we parted ways with European ologies and isms, we did much more than establish the 10 freedoms that are embraced in our Bill of Rights, the first amendment to the Federal Constitution. The all-comprehensive freedom born on these shores, under the leadership of American patriots, was primarily our freedom to venture. It was not in the letter of the law; the Bill of Rights was but the crystallization of some fundamental ideas. When this Republic was established, it was not in the letter but in the spirit of freedom that the American eagle spread his wings to a new destiny. The fires of freedom that were kindled on these shores were of a red, white, and blue flame glowing in the heart. Born of the emotions, it was a spiritual fire which became a great energizing influence in the releasing of man's latent initiative and creative ingenuity.

I do not believe that the American colonists or their immediate descendants were a superior people. We were of European extraction, but we were superhuman to the extent that we were free to act, to dream and build, to venture, to rise and fall. As free agents working together we built here on this continent more happiness, health, prosperity, and abundance than man had ever known before.

Under the Roman Empire, western Europe with its potential wealth was as much of an opportunity as the North American Continent. Western Europe was populated by barbarians, was rich in natural resources, but was undeveloped because the urge of freedom was nonexistent in the people. The European, under authoritative pressure, had never learned the sublime secret of taking command of himself and dominion over the earth. Bathtubs, plumbing, telephones, phonographs, sewing machines, automobiles, radios, motion pictures, and flying machines are products of the imagination of American genius, byproducts of the freedom to venture, generated by our forefathers who sought and found upon this continent a new freedom, our richest inheritance.

We hear a lot of loose talk about freedom in these times and actually have less of it than we have ever known before. There is more talk of security and less security than America has ever experienced.

"FOUR FREEDOMS"

More recently the catch-phrase of the "four freedoms" has been given currency. They were not all inspired by a people on fire with purpose. Freedom of speech and religion were bought with patriots' blood. Freedom from want and fear were voiced by a planned economizer who for 10 years has limped along the path where Diocletian stumbled. If we translated these "four freedoms" into their more practical application, under democracy's newer dispensation, they would more likely be freedom for politicians, freedom for spendthrifts, freedom for bureaucrats, and freedom for crackpots.

Certainly we shall not find freedom from want and fear along the path of a politically planned economy. Freedom from want and fear are the fruits of the freedom to produce. Every planned economy, from Diocletian to the New Deal, has ultimately led to poverty and fear. Educated fools who would build a fool-proof world, build instead a fool's paradise.

Inch by inch, if not leap by leap, freedom as our forefathers fought for and enjoyed it has been obviously passing out in this Republic. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many other commissions in our bureaucratic control paved the way, but planned economy came into its own under the New Deal. Bureaucracy reaches its fullest fruition under these modern Diocletians who believe that they can form a perfect society with edicts and directives. The regimentation now upon us was not born of the World Wa . Under the strain and stress of war, we expect regimentation and discipline to the limit of our endurance. But we were pretty well regimented before Pearl Harbor and there are planners and plotters in Washington in uncounted thousands who are looking to peace as another golden opportunity to completely socialize the Republic, destroy what little freedom there is left, and convert this dynamic Republic into a static state, just as the palsied hand of Diocletian reached out from Rome to paralyze and impoverish a rich empire.

Rose Wilder Lane, in her book The Discovery of Freedom, outlines some of the planned economies of the Old and New Testaments, tracing them on their way to poverty, to dictatorship, and to war. Anyone familiar with history can easily prophesy that this Republic will have a new birth of freedom or blood will flow again as it did in 1776 and 1861.

RESOLVE

I have striven to stay a jump ahead in my thinking. I am no alarmist—neither am I pessimistic, for I am determined to do something about the present situation and the threatening future.

Only the indifference, the apathy of the American people can destroy our independence and freedom. Given the facts, I believe the people will become aroused. Once in articulation, our animation and militancy will spread into a contagion and public opinion will salvage the Goddess of Liberty and our American freedom from what has become the Old Deal and the World War.

I light my torch at Runnymede, Concord, Lexington, and, as a southern Democrat, at Appomattox.

There is nothing fixed about freedom. Once gained, it is easily lost. Men and women have fought for it through the ages and will fight again. The crusade for the freedom of the individual will continue as long as there prevails the pursuit of human happiness. God not only made man in His image, He breathed into him the breath of life and kindled within him the infinite spark and he will be free—if he desires freedom above all earthly things.

Let us thank God for the unusual opportunity that comes to us—to keep the flame of liberty alive in a world in which millions are enslaved. The cardinal crimes in America are greed, cowardice, and indifference. First among us are they who have the courage of their convictions, the urge to serve and the will to act.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1787, "What country before ever existed a century and a half without a rebellion * * *? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure."

The little freedom man has enjoyed on the face of the earth he has gained by resisting autocratic authority and bureaucratic regimentation, and there is already evidence of a rebellion in the land.

Let us, then, on with the war to a victorious end—united and militant. And free from foreign invasion, let us resolve with peace to crush the sinister influences within that would destroy our individual freedom, our traditional independence, and our American way of thought.

The World War will be of short duration—the fight for freedom will go on into the generations, for liberty is easily lost and is only regained through great sacrifice and heroic effort.

Destroy Individual Ambition and Initiative and You Destroy This Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of J. B. Johnson, of Lorain County, Ohio, at a meeting reecntly held near the city of Elyria.

This memorandum represents this writer's personal opinion. It is presented to you at this meeting because it seems some Members of Congress are of the opinion that the basic premise upon which this country was founded and which we have followed in this Nation for more than 160 years should be abandoned and another one substituted for it.

The real function of government as it has been understood until recent times was to provide opportunity for the individual to develop according to his ability, to make him a free and individual man, not a part of a mass. Starting from this premise, we became the richest Nation the earth has ever known in a period of a little more than two men's normal life times. The idea seems to be growing that this scheme of things is all wrong and the function of government should be to provide security to the "masses" and have the Government assume the economic function of all the individuals. I submit for your consideration that such a program will destroy this Nation by destroying individual ambition and initiative, by destroying self-respect and freedom, by destroying its accumulated wealth and debasing its currency, by producing a dictatorship which will finish this Republic. It has well been said that "any society which cannot prevent the development of masses is irrevocably doomed." Certainly then, any society which encourages development of masses writes its own death warrant. You may recall that Benjamin Franklin once said something to the effect that anyone who would sacrifice freedom for temporary security did not deserve freedom and would lose the security.

In this room are a group of businessmen. Whether or not their business is successful depends upon the ability of its management and likewise, the conduct of a Nation's affairs depends upon the statesmanship of its leaders. Statesmanship is just another name for management. The management of business has the obligation to make it successful for the people who invest their savings in it and devote their lives to it, be it one or many, and successful also for the people who work as a part of it so they may have opportunity for

advancement and livelihood. The Nation's statesmen have the obligation to all the people which is contained in the preamble of the Constitution. I read it over again today and it doesn't say a thing about any Government obligation to support the people.

Bearing on this subject, let me give you a very brief quotation by former Premier Daladier, of France. "Actually that part of the French population which creates wealth, which labors for the future, is continually diminishing, while that part which directly or indirectly lives on the state is constantly growing. There is a steady fall in the number of Frenchmen who are ready to bear the risks of enterprise and creation." After it was all over and France had fallen, old Marshal Petain said: "The spirit of pleasure has prevailed over the spirit of sacrifice. The people have demanded more than they have given. They wanted to spare themselves effort Now, misfortune has come." I respectfully also call your attention to the Holy Bible, the fifty-fourth, fifty-fifth and fifty-sixth verses of the twelfth chapter of Luke, which read as follows: "When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say * * * There will be heat, and it cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time?"

What I have been leading up to is this: The kind of planning which contemplates that the Government shall guarantee the care and support of the individual is fallacious and destructive to any kind of freedom. "Power over a man's support is power over his will." The function of government is to guarantee the right to work, not guarantee support without work.

Government made a hideous mistake in trying to take over the internal economy of our country in the decade of the thirties. It will make an even more hideous mistake in this decade if permitted to take over the individual economy of the citizens of our country. There is a sinister purpose back of any promise of something for nothing. We are being tempted to buy something without knowing what we may have to pay for it.

Respectfully yours,

J. B. JOHNSON.

A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, 39 years ago today—September 22, 1904—a great American, a native American, passed on to his happy hunting ground.

His life forms a part of our America and I am taking this occasion to briefly present this great character whose remains now rest in the cemetery at Nespelem, Wash.:

CHIEF JOSEPH'S LAST STAND—YOUNG JOSEPH, HIS PEOPLE, AND HIS MARVELOUS RETREAT OF NEARLY 2,000 MILES

(Foreword by Donald MacRae)

About 15 miles to the south of the Great Northern Railway tracks at Chinook, Mont., a historic battlefield lies almost forgotten among the ravines and gullies that line the high bluffs of Snake Creek near its junction with the Milk River in the Bear Paw Mountains. Its trenches and earthworks have gradually fallen into decay and the wild flowers and tall prairie grass have nearly obliterated the graves of its historic dead.

Few people today, save possibly those living close by or those interested in Northwest history, can tell you the name of this place or of those who so gallantly fought here; yet less than 50 years ago on this very spot the white man and the red were fighting one of their last great battles.

Chief Joseph and his band of Nez Percé warriors had successfully defeated General Howard's men on the Lolo trail, fought a drawn battle with General Gibbon at Big Hole and were rapidly retreating by a circuitous trail to join Sitting Bull in Canada, but the telegraph of the white man was working against him. Unknown to this Indian chieftain, Colonel (later General) Miles was rapidly marching to the Northwest to intercept him before he could reach the border. Had Chief Joseph known of this he could have easily escaped with all his people as he crossed the Missouri a full day ahead of Miles, but the Three Daughters of the Night decreed otherwise and the opposing forces met at this spot on the 30th of September, 1877.

Three days later General Howard arrived upon the scene and, on the 4th of October, Joseph surrendered with 87 warriors, of whom 40 were wounded, 184 squaws, and 147 children. This was the pathetic message of surrender he sent to General Howard:

"Tell General Howard that I know his heart. What he told me before—I have it in my heart. I am tired of fighting. Our chiefs are killed. Looking Glass is dead. Too-hul-hul-sote is dead. The old men are all dead. It is the young men now, who say 'yes' or 'no' [that is, vote in council]. He who led the young men [Joseph's brother Ollicut] is dead. It is cold, and we have no blankets. The little children are freezing to death. My people—some of them—have run away to the hills, and have no blankets, no food. No one knows where they are—perhaps freezing to death. I want to have time to look for my children, and to see how many of them I can find; maybe I shall find them among the dead. Hear me, my chiefs, my heart is sick and sad. From where the sun now stands, I will fight no more with the white man."[1]

This remarkable Indian had accomplished a feat that will be long remembered as a military exploit of the first magnitude. His small force, which at no time numbered more than 300 warriors, had retreated for nearly 2,000 miles through an enemy country, carrying with them their squaws and children. They had met United States troops 11 different times and had fought 5 pitched battles with them, of which they had won 3, drew 1, and lost 1, a feat that is more remarkable when you learn that the total force opposing them was nearly 2,000 men. But greatest of all is the fact that this campaign was conducted without the destruction of property and the murdering of settlers that usually was a part of Indian warfare.

CHIEF JOSEPH

Young Joseph—he bore this name for a long time as his father was also called Joseph—was the last of the great warrior chieftains. He was a wonderful specimen of the Indian, standing 6 feet tall, straight as an arrow, and wonderfully handsome, his features being as clear-cut as chiseled marble. The New York Sun of September 24, 1904—in commenting on his death—says he was a great orator and though he never spoke a word of English, some of his sayings, translated, have become famous. He is reported to have said, "Look twice at a two-faced man," "Cursed be the hand that scalps the reputation of the dead," "The eye tells what the tongue would hide," "Big name often stands on small legs," "Finest fur may cover toughest meat."[2]

Of his early life not much is known save that he was born in eastern Oregon about 1840. He was the eldest of old Joseph's two sons and the hereditary chief of the lower Nez Percé Indians. His early childhood was most likely spent learning the usual war and hunting arts common to his people, though he did spend some time at Reverend Spaulding's school—Reverend Spaulding was a missionary who spent many years among the Nez Percé Indians.

From his father he learned to be careful when dealing with the whites and to never sell or sign away the lands of his people. This he never did, and it was cause of his taking charge of the nontreaty Indians and consummating his marvelous retreat through the fastness of the Rockies and over the Montana plains nearly to the Canadian border; although he took no part in the massacres that were the immediate cause of the outbreak.

This retreat was a masterpiece of military strategy, his men often holding superior forces at bay while a small detachment of them slipped around one side and cut off the enemies' supplies. His warriors—although the Nez Percés had been at peace for years—were perfectly trained in all the arts of war; in fact, at one time he formed 40 of his men in columns of 4 and in the dusk of early night pulled a surprise attack on Howard's troops—the sentry thinking, by their orderly formation, that they were part of General Howard's cavalry. Gen. O. O. Howard, in his book about the Nez Percé and Joseph's retreat, says of this particular in-

---

[1] American Fights and Fighters, the Nez Percé War, by Cyrus Townsend Brady.

[2] In early years, when the young Joseph appeared before the Government commission to plead for his people and his lands, the commissioners were amazed at his wonderful oratorical powers. This seemed to be a natural gift among the Indians. At the Portage des Sioux (the point of land lying between the confluence of the Missouri with the Mississippi), where in 1815 a treaty was signed which pacified the western Indians, Standing Elk, the great chief of the Maha Nation, delivered his historic address over the grave of the Teton chief, Black Buffalo. "Do not grieve," said the red orator upon that occasion; "misfortune will happen to the wisest and best men. Death will come, and always comes out of season; it is the command of the Great Spirit, and all nations and people must obey. What is past and cannot be prevented should not be grieved for. Be not discouraged or displeased then that in visiting your father here you have lost your chief. A misfortune of this kind may never again befall you; but this would have attended you perhaps in your own village. Five times have I visited this land, and never returned with sorrow or pain. Misfortunes do not flourish particularly in our path; they grow everywhere. [Addressing himself to Governor Edwards and Colonel Miller:] What a misfortune for me that I could not have died this day, instead of the chief that lies before us. The trifling loss my nation would have sustained in my death would have been doubly paid for by the honors of my burial—they would have wiped off everything like regret. Instead of being covered with a cloud of sorrow, my warriors would have let the sunshine of joy in their hearts. To me it would have been a most glorious occurrence. Hereafter, when I die at home, instead of a noble grave and a grand procession, the rolling music and the thundering cannon, with a flag waving at my head, I shall be wrapped in a robe—an old robe, perhaps—and hoisted on a slender scaffold to the whistling winds, soon to be blown down to the earth; my flesh to be devoured by wolves and my bones rattled on the plain by the wild beasts. [Addressing himself to Colonel Miller:] Chief of the soldiers, your labors have not been in vain; your attentions shall not be forgotten; my nation shall know the respect that is paid over the dead. When I return I will echo the sound of your guns."

stance that, "At the Camas Meadows, not far from Henry Lake, Joseph's night march, his surprise of my camp and capture of over a hundred animals, and, after a slight battle, making a successful escape, showed an ability to plan and execute equal to that of many a partisan leader whose deeds have entered into classic story."

Even in his last battle he held out for 4 days against a force that out-numbered his two to one, and his quiet dignity and forbearance at the time of his surrender won him the respect and friendship of General Miles.

"Thus," says General Sherman, speaking of Joseph's surrender to General Miles, "has terminated one of the most extraordinary Indian wars of which there is any record. The Indians throughout displayed a courage and skill that elicited universal praise; they abstained from scalping, let captive women go free, did not commit indiscriminate murder of peaceful families, which is usual, and fought with almost scientific skill, using advance and rear guards, skirmish lines, and field fortifications." [3]

After his surrender, he and his people were sent to Fort Leavenworth and later to Baxter Springs, Kans. In these places many of the Indians died, but it wasn't until 1885 that the sorry remnant of this audacious band was sent to spend the remainder of their lives on the Colville Reservation, in northern Washington, a country similar to their beloved Valley of the Winding Waters and a place where they could live in peace in a climate that they were accustomed to.

For 12 years Chief Joseph lived quietly on this reservation; but in 1897, becoming alarmed by the encroachments of the whites in their reservation, he again took up the defense of his people, this time by going to Washington and pleading with the President. Again it was General Miles—the only white man that he believed and trusted—who promised him that his people would be unmolested in the lands they now occupied.

Returning to the reservation, he again settled down to enjoy the peace and quiet of old age, making only one more trip, this time a friendly visit to the President and his old friend General Miles—for a part of the time during this trip he took part in Cummin's Indian Congress and Life on the Plains during that show's exhibition at the famous Madison Square Garden—and a year after this trip he dropped dead in front of his tepee on September 22, 1904.

In speaking of his death, C. T. Brady, in his book about the Nez Percé War says: "The other day a gray-headed old chief, nodding by the fire, dreaming perhaps of days of daring and deeds of valor, by which, savage though he was, he had written his name on the pages of history, slipped quietly to the ground and fell into his eternal sleep. Peaceful ending for the Indian Xenophon, the Red Napoleon of the West." [4]

CHIEF JOSEPH'S OWN STORY

(With an introduction by the Right Reverend W. H. Hare, D. D., bishop of South Dakota [5])

I wish that I had words at command in which to express adequately the interest with which I have read the extraordinary narrative which follows, and which I have the privilege of introducing to the readers of this review. I feel, however, that this apologia is so boldly marked by the charming naivete and tender pathos which characterizes the red man, that it needs no introduction, much less any authentication, while in its smothered fire, in its deep sense of eternal righteousness and of present evil, and in its hopeful longings for the coming of a better time, this Indian chief's appeal reminds us of one of the old Hebrew prophets of the days of the Captivity.

I have no special knowledge of the history of the Nez Percés, the Indians whose tale of sorrow Chief Joseph so pathetically tells—my Indian missions lying in a part at the West quite distant from their homes—and am not competent to judge their case upon its merits. The chief's narrative is, of course, ex parte, and many of his statements would no doubt be ardently disputed. General Howard, for instance, can hardly receive justice at his hands, so well known is he for his friendship to the Indian and for his distinguished success in pacifying some of the most desperate.

It should be remembered, too, in justice to the Army, that it is rarely called upon to interfere in Indian affairs until the relations between the Indians and the whites have reached a desperate condition, and when the situation of affairs has become so involved and feeling on both sides runs so high that perhaps only more than human forbearance would attempt to solve the difficulty by disentangling the knot and not by cutting it.

Nevertheless, the chief's narrative is marked by so much candor, and he is so careful to qualify his statements, when qualification seems necessary, that every reader will give him credit for speaking his honest, even should they be thought by some to be mistaken, convictions. The chief, in his treatment of his defense, reminds one of those lawyers of whom we have heard that their splendid success was gained, not by disputation but simply by their lucid and straightforward statement of their case. That he is something of a strategist as well as an advocate appears from this description of an event which occurred shortly after the breaking out of hostilities: "We crossed over Salmon River, hoping General Howard would follow. We were not disappointed. He did follow us, and we got between him and his supplies and cut him off for 3 days." Occasionally the reader comes upon touches of those sentiments and feelings which at once establish a sense of kinship between all who possess them. Witness his description of his desperate attempt to rejoin his wife and children when a sudden dash of General Miles' soldiers had cut the Indian camp in two. * * * "I thought of my wife and children, who were now surrounded by soldiers, and I resolved to go to them. With a prayer in my mouth to the Great Spirit Chief who rules above, I dashed unarmed through the line of soldiers. * * * My clothes were cut to pieces, my horse was wounded, but I was not hurt." And again, when he speaks of his father's death: "I saw he was dying. I took his hand in mine. He said: 'My son, my body is returning to my mother earth, and my spirit is going very soon to see the Great Spirit Chief. * * * A few more years and the white men will be all around you. They have their eyes on this land. My son, never forget my dying words. This country holds your father's body—never sell the bones of your father and mother.' I pressed my father's hand, and told him I would protect his grave with my life. My father smiled, and passed away to the spirit land. I buried him in that beautiful valley of Winding Waters. I love that land more than all the rest of the world. A man who would not love his father's grave is worse than a wild animal."

His appeals to the natural rights of man are surprisingly fine, and, however some may despise them as the utterance of an Indian, they are just those which, in our Declaration of Independence, have been most admired. "We are all sprung from a woman," he says, "although we are unlike in many things. You are as you were made, and, as you are made you can remain. We are just as we were made by the Great Spirit, and you cannot change us; then why should children of one mother quarrel? Why should one try to cheat another? I do not believe that the Great Spirit Chief gave one kind of men the right to tell another kind of men what they must do."

But I will not detain the readers of the Review from the pleasure of persuing for themselves Chief Joseph's statement longer than is necessary to express the hope that those who have time for no more will at least read its closing paragraph, and to remark that the narrative brings clearly out these facts which ought to be regarded as well-recognized principles in dealing with the red man:

1. The folly of any mode of treatment of the Indian which is not based upon a cordial and operative acknowledgment of his rights as our fellowman.

2. The danger of riding roughshod over a people who are capable of high enthusiasm, who know and value their national rights, and are brave enough to defend them.

3. The liability to want of harmony between different departments and different officials of our complex Government, from which it results that, while many promises are made to the Indians, few of them are kept. It is a home-thrust when Chief Joseph says: "The white people have too many chiefs. They do not understand each other. * * * I cannot understand how the Government sends a man out to fight us, as it did General Miles, and then breaks his word. Such a Government has something wrong about it."

4. The unwisdom, in most cases, in dealing with Indians, of what may be termed military short cuts, instead of patient discussions, explanations, persuasion, and reasonable concessions.

5. The absence in an Indian tribe of any truly representative body competent to make a treaty which shall be binding upon all the bands. The failure to recognize this fact has been the source of endless difficulties. Chief Joseph, in this case, did not consider a treaty binding which his band had not agreed to, no matter how many other bands had signed it; and so it has been in many other cases.

6. Indian chiefs, however able and influential, are really without power, and for this reason, as well as others, the Indians, when by the march of events they are brought into intimate relations with the whites, should at the earliest practicable moment be given the support and protection of our Government and of our law; not local law, however, which is apt to be the result of special legislation adopted solely in the interest of the stronger race.

WILLIAM H. HARE.

---

[3] Massacres of the Mountains, p. 660, by J. P. Dunn, Jr. Harper & Bros., 1886.

[4] P. 40, Northwestern Fights and Fighters, Cyrus Townsend Brady. Doubleday, Page & Co.

[5] This story first appeared in the North American Review for April 1879 and later in the book Northwestern Fights and Fighters, written by Cyrus Townsend Brady. It is through the gracious permission of Messrs. Harper & Bros., the present publishers of the North American Review, and Doubleday, Page & Co., the publishers of Mr. Brady's book, that this story has been reproduced here.

Revised Text of Draft Agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Draft of September 20, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State has provided members of the Foreign Relations Committee and

members of the Foreign Affairs Committee with copies of a revised text of the draft agreement for a United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. I understand that the draft agreement has been considerably modified during the last 3 months as a result of restudy of the text by this Government and negotiations with other governments. The Secretary has informed the members that this revised text is now being presented to the other United Nations and the nations associated with them in this war with an expression of the hope that all of these nations will wish to join in signature of this agreement in the near future.

The text of the draft agreement is as follows:

REVISED TEXT OF DRAFT AGREEMENT FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—DRAFT OF SEPTEMBER 20, 1943

The Governments or Authorities whose duly-authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

Being United Nations or being associated with the United Nations in this war,

Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

2. Subject to the provisions of Article VII, the purposes and functions of the Administration shall be as follows:

(a) To plan, coordinate, administer or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services; and to facilitate in such areas, so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief, the production and transportation of these articles and the furnishing of these services. The form of activities of the Administration within the territory of a member government wherein that government exercises administrative authority and the responsibility to be assumed by the member government for carrying out measures planned by the Administration therein shall be determined after consultation with and with the consent of the member government.

(b) To formulate and recommend measures for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments for the coordination of purchasing, the use of ships and other procurement activities in the period following the cessation of hostilities, with a view to integrating the plans and activities of the Administration with the total movement of supplies, and for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of available supplies. The Administration may administer such coordination measures as may be authorized by the member governments concerned.

(c) To study, formulate and recommend for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments measures with respect to such related matters, arising out of its experience in planning and performing the work of relief and rehabilitation, as may be proposed by any of the member governments. Such proposals shall be studied and recommendations formulated if the proposals are supported by a vote of the Council, and the recommendations shall be referred to any or all of the member governments for individual or joint action if approved by unanimous vote of the Central Committee and by vote of the Council.

ARTICLE II

Membership

The members of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be the governments or authorities signatory hereto and such other governments or authorities as may upon application for membership be admitted thereto by action of the Council. The Council may, if it desires, authorize the Central Committee to accept new members between sessions of the Council.

Wherever the term "member government" is used in this Agreement it shall be construed to mean a member of the Administration whether a government or an authority.

ARTICLE III

The Council

1. Each member government shall name one representative, and such alternates as may be necessary, upon the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which shall be the policy-making body of the Administration. The Council shall, for each of its sessions, select one of its members to preside at the session. The Council shall determine its own rules of procedure. Unless otherwise provided by the Agreement or by action of the Council, the Council shall vote by simple majority.

2. The Council shall be convened in regular session not less than twice a year by the Central Committee. It may be convened in special session whenever the Central Committee shall deem necessary, and shall be convened within thirty days after request therefor by one-third of the members of the Council.

3. The Central Committee of the Council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, with the Director General presiding, without vote. Between sessions of the Council it shall when necessary make policy decisions of an emergency nature. All such decisions shall be recorded in the minutes of the Central Committee which shall be communicated promptly to each member government. Such decisions shall be open to reconsideration by the Council at any regular session or at any special session called in accordance with Article III, paragraph 2. The Central Committee shall invite the participation of the representatives of any member government at those of its meetings at which action of special interest to such government is discussed. It shall invite the participation of the representative serving as Chairman of the Committee on Supplies of the Council at those of its meetings at which policies affecting the provision of supplies are discussed.

4. The Committee on Supplies of the Council shall consist of the members of the Council, or their alternates, representing those member governments likely to be principal suppliers of materials for relief and rehabilitation. The members shall be appointed by the Council, and the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make emergency appointments between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. The Committee on Supplies shall consider, formulate and recommend to the Council and the Central Committee policies designed to assure the provision of required supplies. The Central Committee shall from time to time meet with the Committee on Supplies to review policy matters affecting supplies.

5. The Committee of the Council for Europe shall consist of all the members of the Council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the European area, and such other members of the Council, representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the European area, as shall be appointed by the Council; the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make these appointments in cases of emergency between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. The Committee of the Council for the Far East shall consist of all the members of the Council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the Far Eastern area, and such other members of the Council representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the Far Eastern area as shall be appointed by the Council; the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make these appointments in cases of emergency between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. The regional committees shall normally meet within their respective areas. They shall consider and recommend to the Council and the Central Committee policies with respect to relief and rehabilitation within their respective areas. The Committee of the Council for Europe shall replace the Inter-Allied Committee on European post-war relief established in London on September 24, 1941 and the records of the latter shall be made available to the Committee for Europe.

6. The Council shall establish such other standing regional committees as it shall consider desirable, the functions of such committees and the method of appointing their members being identical to that provided in paragraph 5 of this Article with respect to the Committees of the Council for Europe and for the Far East. The Council shall also establish such other standing committees as it considers desirable to advise it, and, in intervals between sessions of the Council, to advise the Central Committee. For such technical standing committees as may be established, in respect of particular problems such as nutrition, health, agriculture, transport, repatriation, and finance, the members may be members of the Council or alternates nominated by them because of special competence in their respective fields of work. The members shall be appointed by the Council, and the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make emergency appointments between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. Should a regional committee so desire, subcommittees of the technical standing committees shall be established by the technical committees in consultation with the regional committees, to advise the regional committees.

7. The travel and other expenses of members of the Council and of members of its committees shall be borne by the governments which they represent.

8. All reports and recommendations of committees of the Council shall be transmitted to the Director General for distribution to the Council and the Central Committee by

the secretariat of the Council established under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 4.

ARTICLE IV

The Director General

1. The executive authority of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be in the Director General, who shall be appointed by the Council on the nomination by unanimous vote of the Central Committee, the Director General may be removed by the Council on recommendation, by unanimous vote, of the Central Committee.

2. The Director General shall have full power and authority for carrying out relief operations contemplated by Article I, paragraph 2 (a), within the limits of available resources and the broad policies determined by the Council or its Central Committee. Immediately upon taking office he shall in conjunction with the military and other appropriate authorities of the United Nations prepare plans for the emergency relief of the civilian population in any area occupied by the armed forces of any of the United Nations, arrange for the procurement and assembly of the necessary supplies, and create or select the emergency organization required for this purpose. In arranging for the procurement, transportation, and distribution of supplies and services, he and his representatives shall consult and collaborate with the appropriate authorities of the United Nations and shall, wherever practicable, use the facilities made available by such authorities. Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General. The powers and duties of the Director General are subject to the limitations of Article VII.

3. The Director General shall also be responsible for the organization and direction of the functions contemplated by Article I, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

4. The Director General shall appoint such Deputy Directors General, officers, expert personnel, and staff at his headquarters and elsewhere, including field missions, as he shall find necessary, and he may delegate to them such of his powers as he may deem appropriate. The Director General, or upon his authorization the Deputy Directors General, shall supply such secretariat and other staff and facilities as shall be required by the Council and its committees, including the regional committees and subcommittees. Such Deputy Directors General as shall be assigned special functions within a region shall attend meetings of the regional standing committee whenever possible and shall keep it advised on the progress of the relief and rehabilitation program within the region.

5. The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Central Committee and to the Council covering the progress of the Administration's activities. The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the Central Committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential; if a report affects the interests of a member government in such a way as to render it questionable whether it should be published, such government shall have an opportunity of expressing its views on the question of publication. The Director General shall also arrange to have prepared periodic reports covering the activities of the Administration within each region and he shall transmit such reports with his comments thereon to the Council, the Central Committee and the respective regional committees.

ARTICLE V

Supplies and resources

1. Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute to the support of the Administration in order to accomplish the purposes of Article I, paragraph 2 (a). The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies. All such contributions received by the Administration shall be accounted for.

2. The supplies and resources made available by the member governments shall be kept in review in relation to prospective requirements by the Director General, who shall initiate action with the member governments with a view to assuring such additional supplies and resources as may be required.

3. All purchases by any of the member governments, to be made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency.

ARTICLE VI

Administrative expenses

The Director General shall submit to the Council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration. Upon approval of a budget by the Council the total amount approved shall be allocated to the member governments in proportions to be determined by the Council. Each member government undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses so determined.

ARTICLE VII

Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area, and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary. The determination that such hostilities or military necessities exist in any area shall be made by its military commander.

ARTICLE VIII

Amendment

The provisions of this Agreement may be amended as follows:

a. Amendments involving new obligations for member governments shall require the approval of the Council by a two-thirds vote and shall take effect for each member government on acceptance by it;

b. Amendments involving modification of Article III or Article IV shall take effect on adoption by the Council by a two-thirds vote, including the votes of all the members of the Central Committee;

c. Other amendments shall take effect on adoption by the Council by a two-thirds vote.

ARTICLE IX

Entry into force

This agreement shall enter into force with respect to each signatory on the date when the Agreement is signed by that signatory, unless otherwise specified by such signatory.

ARTICLE X

Withdrawal

Any member government may give notice of withdrawal from the Administration at any time after the expiration of six months from the entry into force of the Agreement for that government. Such notice shall take effect twelve months after the date of its communication to the Director General subject to the member government having met by that time all financial, supply or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it.

A Proposed Supermilitary Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a speech I delivered at a meeting of the Great Lakes-Cincinnati Supermilitary Highway Association in Asheville, N. C., September 10, 1943. It is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and friends, H. R. 56 introduced in the United States House of Representatives January 6, 1943, and now before the Committee on Roads, provides for the construction of a military highway running from the Canadian line near Minot, N. Dak., southward to points near Chicago, Cincinnati, Knoxville, Birmingham, thence to the Mexican border near El Paso, Tex., thence northward through New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and Montana to the Canadian line near Glacier Park. The idea is to extend the Alaskan Highway from near Minot, N. Dak., to connect with the Pan-American Highway at or near El Paso, Tex., and from there west of the Rocky Mountains, but not nearer than 150 miles of the Pacific, to the Canadian border with the hope that the Canadian Government will extend the highway from there to Templeton, Canada, where it would connect with the Alaskan Highway.

In addition to the main road it is contemplated there will be at least three auxiliary highways, possibly more on the east; one running from near Cincinnati, Ohio, to Boston, Mass.; another from near Knoxville, Tenn., to Charleston, S. C.; and a third from near Birmingham, Ala., to Pensacola, Fla. On the west there would be three, one running from Los Angeles, another from San Francisco, and a third from Seattle, all connecting with the main highway. It should be noted that two will touch the Atlantic, one the Gulf, and three the Pacific, with possibly a number of other auxiliaries.

One of the objectives in this proposal is not a new idea. After the War of 1812, when our Navy had given a surprisingly good account of itself, both Army and Navy experts were of the definite opinion there was an outstanding military necessity for a better transportation system leading from the grain fields and industrial cities of the Midwest to the southeastern seaboard, and it was considered sufficiently important to warrant construction at the expense of the Federal Government. Andrew Jackson, hero of the battle of New Orleans, and later President of the United States, felt about the matters the same as the experts, although he was of the opinion that such a transportation system should run from the Great Lakes to the Gulf or from Canada to Mexico and was very definite in his conviction that this same system should touch some outstanding and improved port on the Atlantic seaboard.

Charleston, S. C., being the most prominent port in that section at the time, he suggested the system should run from that port first to Cincinnati, Ohio, and from there to Canada or the Great Lakes. He felt the military necessity for such a transportation system so strongly that when he became President he appointed Army engineers to make surveys with the idea of constructing a double-track railroad system from Cincinnati, Ohio, to Charleston, S. C. A number of routes were considered but Colonel Long of the Engineer Corps recommended that the most feasible and strategic route would

be from Cincinnati direct to Knoxville, Tenn., thence to Maryville, Tenn., and from there via Walhalla, S. C. to Charleston, S. C.

Both military experts and national leaders felt that such a system would insure the Government the necessary materials for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war, a supply of coal and equipment sufficient for our Navy and the transportation of an army from one section of the country to another. Naval experts insisted shortly after the War of 1812 that if this country should again become involved with any of the countries of Europe it would probably be a naval fight and the scene of action would be along the Atlantic seaboard. Our experience for the last 12 months has shown their prophecy was not far wrong, for the progress of our defense in the present war has probably been interfered with by enemy U-boats and submarines more on the Atlantic seaboard than any other section of the world.

It is considered by many that if it becomes necessary to defend the Monroe Doctrine our South Atlantic and Pacific coasts will certainly furnish the rendezvous for our military activities, the loading place for our Navy supplies and the storehouse for every implement of war, and that there should be no delay in providing transportation facilities to the scene of operations, for speed, distance, and direct transportation are extremely vital factors in any defense program. But regardless of where the attack may be the proposed superhighway will mean extraordinary service from every standpoint in meeting the enemy anywhere on the Western Hemisphere. It will facilitate the transportation and concentration of many essentials that will be indispensable should an attempt be made to attack the United States from any direction; it will afford easy access to those sections where, on account of climatic conditions, our soldiers are trained in peacetime and assembled in wartime; it will afford better connection with munition plants, iron and steel plants, storage plants, aircraft plants, and other supply centers of war implements; it will furnish quick service in the delivery of coal, iron, and other materials to plants engaged in the manufacture of implements of war; it will furnish an outlet for transportation from every section of the country to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and solve the highway problem of transportation to Canada and Alaska on one end, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the other. It will mean that all the steel mills, munition plants, airplane factories, packing plants, grain elevators, cheese factories, garment factories and every other industrial and essential enterprise will all be nearer the base of concentration of our Army and Navy. In addition to facilitating transportation, it would make a tremendous contribution to the efficiency of our air forces by having runways or landing fields thereon at points at regular intervals to accommodate the landing and taking off of any type of airplane.

Well designed and constructed highways have always been considered an essential factor in war or a military campaign. History discloses that such highways have proven to be as effective in prosecuting and winning a war as other outstanding factors. The construction and maintenance of such roads date back to ancient and medieval days. They contributed much to the development and history of ancient Babylon, which was famous for its numerous military roads. One of the most celebrated paralleled the southern boundary of the Assyrian Desert between Persia and Media as far as the Caspian Gates and then down the Parthian Mountains to Bactria. It is referred to by Greek historians as "The great military road" and is said to have been used by Alexander the Great in his expedition against the Bactrians.

Although stone-paved roads were constructed in Egypt, Cyrene, Crete, and other countries, the first system of paved highways for either commercial or military use was built by the Carthaginians when they developed a scientific constructed road system which was so complete and well arranged for military purposes the Carthaginians were able to defend themselves against all enemies for a period of more than 400 years, and it was here that the Romans learned both the art and the value of paved roads in time of war.

Probably one of the greatest engineering accomplishments in highway construction is found in the Inca Road of Peru which extended from Quito in Ecuador to Tucuman in Chile, a distance of over 4,000 miles in length. It traversed some of the most mountainous areas in the world, scaling mountain ranges 14,000 to 15,000 feet in height, crossing canyons thousands of feet deep and traversed vast and burning deserts. Like the highway system here proposed, there were a number of branch or auxiliary roads leading off from the main line; one of which paralleled the western coast of South America for a distance of over 2,000 miles. Historians tell us that this remarkable system of highways was used primarily by the ancient Peruvians for military purposes. It may be interesting to observe that throughout the system, sentry stations, watch towers, and forts were established. In addition there was a system of signal fires and lights located in such a manner that they could be used in transmitting messages from one end of the system to the other in an incredibly short time. Army supplies were stored at irregular intervals along the main road. To illustrate the rapidity of commercial traffic over this road, even before the use of wheeled vehicles, it is said that fresh fish could be caught in the Pacific and delivered in the Incan capital of Cuzco within 30 hours, a distance of more than 300 miles and over mountains 15,000 feet high.

Napoleon I is credited with inaugurating the modern system of military highways in France and in countries conquered by him. Perhaps the most famous road to be constructed is what is known as the Simplon Pass over the Alps into Italy, which was constructed primarily to overcome the difficulties in leading his armies over the St. Bernard Pass in order to attack the Austrians nearly 150 years ago. It is reported that over 30,000 men were employed at one time in the construction of this road, which necessitated upward of 600 bridges and ascended a height of more than 6,500 feet. It was one of the great engineering accomplishments of modern days and contributed immeasurably to the success of his invading armies. This was well recognized by his enemies, and after his downfall they attempted to destroy this highway lest it might prove a monument that would outlive the fame of his military victories.

One of the first outstanding programs undertaken by Adolf Hitler in preparing for the Second World War was the inauguration of a program providing for the construction of highways designed to meet the needs of speed of 100 miles per hour or more over long distances. His original plan called for a little more than 4,000 miles of roadways suitable for fast military transportation purposes, but the program later was expanded to cover upward of 6,000 miles. These roads were separate and distinct from the long-established road-building policy of the Imperial Government and were designed from the standpoint of location to be of strategic military value; the standard width for such roads was 80 feet and constructed so as to carry the heaviest possible load at the highest possible speed. There are in Germany what is known as the Autobahn or motorway highways, and, according to Roger Shaw, over 3,000 road workers representing the state organization known as Autobahn met in Berlin in December 1938 to celebrate the completion of the first 3,000th kilometer in the superhighway system of the Third Reich, and he points out that the principal object in building these roads was purely military, and the roads are "designed to shuttle troops here and there at dizzy speeds." He says that this "system enables motor vehicles to travel at high speed from north, south, east, or west across Germany without passing through a single village or meeting a cross road."

According to the Infantry Journal, 250,000 men were employed on or for the Autobahn in 1935, and by 1939 Germany was extending its military road construction into Czechoslovakia and thence through Rumania to the coastal city of Odessa, in the Soviet Ukraine.

From a standpoint of European military highways, R. M. Smith points out that some of the construction requirements by the German trunk roads were the following: (1) Separation of opposing traffic streams, accomplished by the construction of dual one-way traffic ways with grass boulevards between them; (2) total exclusion of pedestrian, cycle, and animal traffic; (3) separation of all grade crossings by the use of over or under bridges; (4) suppression of all advertisements, poles, and other objects near the highway which might distract the attention of drivers; (5) installation of a clear, simple system of road signals. The construction of these roads was financed by gasoline taxes and funds from the general levy which might otherwise have been used for the dole or relief.

In a speech before the German Reichstag September 30, 1942, Hitler referred to the inadequacy of roads in Russia and boasted of the work being done by the German Organization Todt in constructing gigantic roads in Soviet territory overrun by the Germans, and in June prior thereto the head of the Todt organization acclaimed that a network of super highways had been constructed to carry supplies to every possible front on the western European coast.

THE ALASKAN HIGHWAY

The construction of a highway from the United States to Alaska was discussed for quite a number of years, but no definite proposal for a route was made until about 1928, when Donald MacDonald, associate engineer of the Alaska Road Commission, proposed a road from Hazelton to Fairbanks. Mr. MacDonald organized an international highway association and obtained official support for the project from Mr. Hoover, President of the United States, and Premier Tomlie, of British Columbia, in 1930. In 1933, the first American commission was appointed to study the proposed highway to Alaska and report estimates as to cost of construction. It appears that the road was on the verge of construction when it was lost to the general uncertainties of the depression existing at that time.

But in 1938, the President, under authority provided for by an act of Congress, appointed five men to the Alaskan International Highway Commission to cooperate with a similar commission appointed by the Dominion of Canada to study, survey, and locate what is now known as the Alaskan Highway.

With the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the invasion of the Aleutian Islands by the Japanese, the necessity for the United States to build a military road to Alaska became evident.

On March 6, 1942, the Canadian Government announced its approval of the recommendation of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense—United States and Canada—that a highway be built, and accepted the offer of the United States to construct it. On the same date Maj. Gen. Eugene Reynolds, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, addressed a request to the Federal Works Agency that the Public Roads Administration cooperate in the location and construction of the highway. An agreement was reached under which the Public Roads Administration was to make reconnaissance and loca-

tion surveys, prepare plans, award contracts, or otherwise arrange for construction, and supervise construction.

The War Department was to construct a truck trail road, following as near as might be practicable the route selected after reconnaissance surveys.

Largely by the use of aerial reconnaissance, a route was quickly determined to serve the dual purpose of a supply line to Alaska and a feeder road to a chain of airports established in 1941 through Canada and Alaska by the United States and Canadian Governments. Covering vast stretches of unmapped wilderness, the 1,671-mile international highway from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, was opened within about 6 months, an engineering feat of first magnitude. Begun in March 1942, the road was ready by October for truck traffic over its entire length.

Seven Army engineer regiments comprising about 10,000 men, two topographical engineer companies, two light pontoon companies, and several other smaller service units were employed in the construction of this road, besides a varying number of civilian employees, probably running to a maximum of 6,000, under the direction of the Public Roads Administration.

Bridge building presented peculiar problems including the construction of one bridge 2,400 feet long, and another over the White River which, contrary to the usual custom of rivers, freezes upward from the bottom. The difficulties of building along the mountainous coast according to the first plans were avoided, however, by the adoption of a route inside the coastal range, such a route being, furthermore, much more easily defensible from invasion.

Altogether the construction of this road in so short a time in spite of varied difficulties has been one of the most brilliant achievements of the Corps of Engineers.

In July 1943, Fergus Hoffman wrote in the Christian Science Monitor: "It may be years before the Alaska Highway is the answer to the tourist's dreams, but even now it is the answer to the Army's dream—a usable supply route to Alaska."

About the same time, Hon. George Black, K. C., M. P., wrote in Industrial Canada, regarding the future economic value of this road: "Contractors for Public Roads Administration of the United States are now following up the preliminary work of the American Army and making it a permanent highway.

"That highway and the piping of Canadian oil from Fort Norman to Whitehorse, where an oil refinery is being built, and piping it thence to Fairbanks, Alaska, will develop that vast unprospected, unexamined northern country, some of it as not yet mapped, faster and more thoroughly than we have ever dreamed of it being done."

THE PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Writing in the Geographic Review in January 1943, Mr. William E. Rudolph said of the Pan-American Highway: "Most important of all strategic highways, from the long-time point of view, is that connecting the United States with Latin-American countries." This system of routes designed to connect all the countries of the Americas will be, when completed, a means of knitting together these countries, facilitating the interval exchange of commodities and otherwise developing national economy.

The first suggestion for a pan-American system of highways was made at the Fifth International Conference of American States which met in Santiago, Chile, in 1923. A resolution of this conference called for an official Pan-American Highway Congress. This congress, comprised of engineers from 19 Latin-American nations, met in Washington in 1924. The Pan-American Highway was the inspiration of the group. A series of conferences, resolutions, official visits, and reconnaissances have followed.

Until 1942, that part of the Pan-American Highway which is located in Mexico and Central America, known as the Inter-American Highway, was being financed and built mainly by the countries through which it passes, but with some technical and financial assistance from the United States. Each affected country had constructed some part of the road. Three-fifths, or nearly 2,000 miles, of the approximately 3,400 miles of road from Texas to the Panama Canal had been opened for all-weather travel in unconnected sections.

In 1942 negotiations were completed and construction was started which will open an emergency truck road largely on the final line, but with some alternate sections, through Central America to the Canal Zone. It is expected that a $29,000,000 construction program will be fully under way in 1943, and that by June 1944, continuous main-line or alternate sections of the Inter-American Highway in Central America will be in shape for emergency trucking operations on a scale that is expected to meet probable demands.

On May 1, 1941, President Roosevelt commended to the favorable consideration of Congress a report from the Secretary of State and a draft of proposed legislation to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American republics in Central America in the survey and construction of the proposed Inter-American Highway within the borders of those republics. The report pointed out the value of such a highway as an aid to national defense, and called attention to other desirable outcomes such as (1) improved transportation within and between the several countries and the United States, (2) development of new lands and new natural resources, and increased consumption of American imports, (3) increased employment and maintenance of economic structure, (4) increased tourist traffic, and (5) increased market for American automobiles, parts, and garage equipment.

A considerable part of the funds needed to close gaps in Central America was made available through the Inter-American Highway Act passed by the Congress of the United States in 1941. This act authorized the appropriation of $20,000,000 to be used in closing gaps in the section of the highway from the southern border of Mexico to Panama. Because of the importance of the Inter-American Highway in giving access to raw materials and tropical products, as well as for continental defense, our War Department is spending more than $20,000,000 in building 600 to 800 miles of pioneer road along other Central American sections of the highway which could not be immediately built under the cooperative program.

The completed highway will open up a large area of the North American continent capable of producing many commodities for which the United States has been dependent on the Far East—rubber, wool, hard rice, tea, cinnamon, camphor, quinine, copra, oils, varnish gums, abaca hemp, and others. Together with lateral roads that are developing from it, the highway will greatly stimulate the productive capacity of Central America and facilitate an exchange of production among the various Central American countries.

In the Panama Canal Zone the Inter-American Highway connects with the Trans-Isthmian route between the terminal cities of the Canal, Cristobal and Balboa, and also between the two Panamanian cities of Colon and Panama. Working day and night, the United States Public Roads Administration completed, in 1942, two highways of great value to the defense of the Panama Canal, namely, the Trans-Isthmian Highway and the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway, a section of the Inter-American Highway leading to important air defense for the Canal.

In 1941 about three-fourths of the South American section of the Pan-American Highway system was passable at all seasons. Although the mileage added to the system in fiscal year 1942 was not impressive, a firm basis was laid for more definite future progress.

Over the completed portions of this highway system a growing commerce has already developed. This intercommunication has caused a meeting of minds and the beginning of a common culture, and has made possible an extraordinary solidarity against aggression.

THE BURMA ROAD

Probably no strategic highway of today has so captured the public imagination as the Burma Road. Built within 14 months by about 200,000 Chinese men, women, and children, using only the crudest of tools, the road extends from Lashio, Burma, to Kumming, China, over a distance of 726 miles. After the Japanese cut off China's sources of supply from the China Sea, this road was constructed to serve as a munitions supply artery from the outside world.

Known as China's lifeline, the road was officially opened in March 1939. Except while closed by the British from July to October 1940, it was used as a truck route until again closed, this time by the invading Japanese, in April 1942.

Following the outbreak of the war in eastern China in July 1937, the Chinese Government determined upon the construction of a military road to Burma. The difficulties, however, seemed insurmountable. Two routes were considered, both necessarily crossing a number of mountain ranges separated by some of the deepest canyons in the world. The longer route was chosen because it could make use of about 263 miles of provincial road already constructed. The new sections were built through rugged mountain country. Within one 40-mile stretch the route dips from 7,200 feet to 2,500 feet and rises again to 7,500 feet.

With a subsidy amounting to less than $2,000,000 from the Central Government of China, the Yunnan provincial government took charge of the construction of the road. Most of the work was done by the people of the province, each country being responsible for building its section of the road and furnishing its own quota of workers. The completion of the task was the more remarkable because of the lack of modern machinery. An American engineer studying the construction is said to have exclaimed, "My God, they scratched these roads out of the mountains with their fingernails."

The wisdom of a planned international highway system as a basic part of a war program has been exemplified by the Burma Road. However, observers who have compared this road with finished sections of the Pan-American Highway, such as those in Peru and other American republics, rate the Burma Road as really a back-county, grade-D highway. Yet in 1941 the Burma Road provided 20,000 tons of vital military and hospital supplies per month for the fighting Chinese armies.

When the Burma Road was first opened its capacity was limited to about 5,000 tons a month. Despite lack of machinery and equipment, lack of organization, technical difficulties, lack of fuel, inadequate surfacing, and an unremitting rain of Japanese bombs, this artery continued to function until Burma was conquered by the enemy. Over this road moved strategic materials

such as tin, antimony, tungsten, wolfram, lead, quicksilver, tung oil, mica, acids, and TNT. Other items reported to have been trucked over the road included heavy and bulky material such as iron, steel, railway parts, shipbuilding parts, and copper.

The favorite jibe at the Japanese by Chinese humorists on the road was that a Jap bomb cost $1,000—the hole it made in the road cost 8 cents to repair.

Leaders of the United Nations have continually stressed the fact that the present world conflict is basically a war of transportation. Every medium of transportation is included in this battle line. These lines of communication are the very fiber of world strategy. And in the vast interplay of movement of men and machines on the global battle fronts, military highways, long and short, are playing a significant wartime role.

Our final victory over Japan will be made possible by the long survival of war-torn China at the end of heroic supply routes such as the Burma Road and the reconstructed Silk Route.

On the other hand, a North American Newspaper Alliance war correspondent from the southwest Pacific has pointed out that largely because of their failure to construct adequate military highways, the Japanese have recently been compelled to yield territory which they conquered, saying that during the major part of the ground fighting in Guadalcanal the Japanese had great superiority in both manpower and firepower, but for lack of useful roads through the jungle they were never able to deploy and maneuver effectively, and were unable to bring their superiority to bear upon the point of attack.

The Alaskan Highway and the Pan-American Highway would prove to be of inestimable military value to the United States should an invasion of any kind be attempted, but so long as the connecting link between the two roads is not constructed they cannot reach maximum military importance, nor can they be of the greatest commercial value in peacetime. The proposed highway from Minot, N. Dak., to El Paso, Tex., or a road serving the same purpose, is indispensable, and our failure to construct it would be nothing less than an exhibition of bad faith in light of the interest we have manifested up to date in the construction of the two roads through our neighboring countries to the north and south of us.

Congressional Tactical Experts With No Tact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, one who comprehendingly reads history must repeatedly be struck by the analogy between all old wars and this, the biggest of all wars, insofar as congressional interference with the military and naval authorities is involved. We are running true to form.

There are those today in Congress, as there always have been in every war, who assume to know much better how to run the war more efficiently from a naval and military and strategic standpoint than any or all of those military and naval experts who have given their lives to the study of how to meet and to solve such problems as now confront us.

If war in itself were not such a terrible tragedy, this effort, so often indulged in by those so absolutely incompetent, to try to direct the strategy for the determination of our destiny would be funny. As it is, it is a sad commentary on the lack of good judgment shown.

Those who have the burden and responsibility of determining how and when and where, at the least cost in sweat and blood and treasure and tears the war may be quickest won, should not be embarrassed by those whose superficial knowledge, exploited, has only a nuisance value. For example: For anybody to suggest that powerful interests—meaning the British Prime Minister—are trying to get rid of and to demote our Chief of Staff, General Marshall, by having him promoted to the head of a unified command as the commander in chief, to assume responsibility for, and to directly control the strategy and the operation of the war, world-wide, is about the silliest thing I ever heard to come out of any war as yet.

It is not true, which is obvious, and for that reason there is no occasion to prove an axiom.

As Walter Lippmann so well said this morning, "Did anyone ever before hear of a plot to remove a general by giving him supreme command?" And he goes on to say, "It has been bad enough to drag the name of one eminent American general into partisan and factional politics during this war, and that any attempt to drag General Marshall's name into politics also will be strongly resented and resolutely resisted," which is equally as true.

There is too much politics already in this war. Why not let the competent military and naval leaders determine the strategy, and then hold them responsible?

I have the greatest confidence in General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Leahy, Admiral King, and others in the high command. I know them to be brave and fearless and wise. I know they will not hesitate to insist that their plans for operations shall be carried out if they are to be held responsible to the American people therefor.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, our greatest fear or dread is what Russia might do or fail to do—it is not so much what Germany or Japan plans.

O'HARA, of Minnesota, gave the perfect vote of "present" on the resolution. A goodly number felt just that way.

The chances of the Senate's even considering the Fulbright resolution at this time are about 10 to 1 against it.

The message from the White House was presented to Congress on Constitution Day without the slightest reference to the day.

After reading every word of the Churchill speech we are again convinced by his penetrating conception and his wholesome frankness.

The three home-front heroes of this war are Harry Byrd, Harry Truman, and Westbrook Pegler. Their fight has been to hold the runaways.

We take off our hats to the four silver stars on Generals Marshall, MacArthur, and Eisenhower, eternally. We wish they could be given the "four freedoms" to lead our fighting.

There are 800,000 civilian men between 18 and 38 in the War Department and over 400,000 in the Navy. Surely, General Marshall, all the single ones are not essential there.

One thing we forecast at the kick-off on the Wendell Willkie personal campaign: If he is not renominated by the Republican Convention he will support F. D. R. for his fourth term.

C. B. Baldwin, recently Farm Security Administrator, who promoted the bringing of the hillbillies to the plains is now Area Director of Economic Operations for Italy. He knows his hills.

If the House Foreign Affairs Committee put in play the Fulbright resolution all by itself as they said, it was the first time in 4 years that the quarterback had not passed them the ball.

Our first deficiency appropriation was $18,500,000 and is to take care of the underestimated war babies of last spring. The estimate for the year is 700,000. The national average is 2,200,000, but next year it will be 3,000,000.

The Functions of Congress in Today's and Tomorrow's Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include a speech in favor of House Resolution 19 which I made before the Rotary Club of Evansville on August 3, 1943:

It is very difficult for a person holding a political office to speak before a nonpartisan group without being charged with wrongfully abusing the privilege either to promote his personal political welfare or to intrude the philosophy of the political party which he represents into his discussion. I think it is true that some people really do not attempt to avoid this danger, but welcome the opportunity afforded them to advance their own interests and therefore abuse the hospitality which has been extended to them. Please believe me when I say that it is my

earnest intention to avoid using this occasion either to enhance my own political fortunes or to intrude matter which is peculiar to the philosophy of my party into this discussion. I shall leave it to you to judge from my remarks whether I have acted in good faith.

Certainly I think you will agree with me that this is not the time or the place for me to discuss specific legislation or my votes as an individual upon the legislation which was acted upon during the time that I have been a Member of the National House of Representatives. Therefore, I have selected as the title for this talk The Functions of Congress in Today's and Tomorrow's Problems. In treating this subject it will be necessary for me to ask you to re-examine with me the historical function and purposes of the Congress of the United States in our political system, including also the evidence of that function which is expressed in the written Constitution of this country, which sets out in writing the machinery for implementing the political philosophy under which this country operates.

The men who were the delegates to the convention which created the Constitution of the United States were men who were well grounded in the philosophy of the eighteenth century and educated by the system of classical education of that century under which they had all developed. They agreed almost unanimously in the proposition that the policies of government should be created by elected representatives of the voters. They definitely believed in the philosophy that the power to govern should be vested as closely as possible to those who were to be governed. They understood that the magnitude of a national government, even for their time, presented problems too great and that difficulties of travel which were likewise too great to permit the creation of any pure democracy, such as was then exemplified by the New England town meeting. They created the nearest thing to this pure democracy, namely, the choosing of representatives by the voters who were to be Members of the National House of Representatives to serve for a term of 2 years, at the end of which time these representatives were to appear before the voters again and submit the records which they had made for the voters' consideration, in order that the people, who were being governed, could then pass upon those records and approve or disapprove of them by the election or rejection of their Member of the House of Representatives, upon the record which he had made as such a Member.

It would be a perversion of history if I did not point out, however, that all of the members of this Convention did not have complete confidence in the capacity of the people of that day to govern themselves through representatives of their own choosing. Indeed, they did not have a complete understanding of the nature of democracy, in that they provided that the electors for representatives should have the same qualifications as the electors for the most numerous branch of the various State legislative bodies; but in many of these States, the ownership of property was a qualification upon the right to vote. It was not until a short time prior to the election of Andrew Jackson that these qualifications had been sufficiently removed by the various State governments to broaden the electoral base so that it became much more closely representative of the thinking of the masses of the people. It is also true that in providing the manner of the election of Senators, the majority of those who wrote our Constitution felt that the people of their time were not qualified to choose directly their legislative representatives of that branch of the Congress.

Nevertheless, and subject only to these limitations, it is manifest that it was the belief of a great majority of the delegates to our Constitutional Convention that legislation should be initiated in the Congress of the United States; that the legislative body was the most important body of our Government; and that freedom of the people depended upon the proper functioning of that body and that it should continue at all times to be closely connected with the people so that they might, by the exercise of their ballot, veto, in effect, or override within a period of 2 years, the national policies of our Government which our founding fathers assumed would be created, not by the executive branch of the Government but by the legislative branch of the Government—the Congress of the United States. Indeed, we find written evidence of this philosophy in the instrument itself, for immediately following the preamble to the Constitution the first article of that document deals with the legislative branch of the Government and the first section of that article declares:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

In other words, those who created our Constitution clearly placed first things first.

Six months in Washington convinces me that we, as a people, have fallen into the grievous error of assuming that simply because we have declared in writing in an instrument, known as the Constitution of the United States, that the policy and lawmaking power—that is, the power to create policy through the enactment of laws to which the people must conform—shall be vested in the Congress, we need to do nothing more about the matter. The error is the obvious one which always exists when people forget the injunction that "Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom." Today freedom, which can only exist under law—the freedom, which can only exist when the laws are created by the regularly elected representatives of the people—is more fully in danger than at any time in the history of this Government.

Now I think I shall surprise you, for I am going to place the bulk of the blame for this danger to our freedom squarely upon the Members of the Congress of the United States themselves. I shall develop my thinking upon this subject more fully in a few minutes. Before doing so, I shall point out that today there are many persons; yes, there are too many organized groups both in government and without government, who do not believe or fail to understand that freedom can exist only under law; who are impatient with democratic processes and who would gladly see the legislative branch of the Government destroyed or rendered ineffective either by direction or indirection. If I were to deny this, I would merely be closing my eyes to the things which I have thought were going on over the last half dozen years—things which I now have seen and observed in the last 6 months.

But, if the people lose their freedom, it will be because of the failure of the Congress to effectively perform its functions and it is only the Congress, the representatives of the people, who are now elected directly by the people in both branches of the Congress, which can save itself, and thereby preserve democracy in this country. To me it is both futile and cowardly for the Congress of the United States to yelp about bureaucrats, to protest against the growth of policy-making power in the executive branch of the Government when the only effective way of meeting this encroachment is for the Congress to equip itself to perform its functions in the complicated society which now exists in America.

Do not be misled by propaganda which stigmatizes the caliber of the men in the Congress of the United States. The Congress of the United States is still a rather representative cross section of the people of the United States; generally it is equipped with men capable of constructive thinking, capable of analysis, and capable of effective action. But the problems of policy which confront the Members of the Congress are so numerous and complex that no one man, even though he be an expert in a certain line, can find the time, today, to gather the factual data and to give the intensified study necessary to work out by himself and on his own time, a completely coordinated piece of legislation, even upon a specific policy of government. I think I may be entitled to personalize this talk to the extent of saying that I have never worked more intensely or under greater strain than I have during the time which I have spent in Washington.

Yet, despite a very earnest effort upon my part to acquire information, I do not believe that I have ever been completely satisfied that I had all the information that I desired upon any subject upon which I had been called to vote. Perhaps this feeling is due to the fact that as a practicing lawyer I had standards, acquired from experience, whereby I could pretty well tell whether or not I had exhausted the research material available upon any legal question. As a Member of the Congress, to date I have never felt that same feeling of security which comes from a firm conviction that you had had before you all the available material upon the subject which you are called upon to decide.

I have been told by people who are friendly to me that it would be political suicide to come back to Indiana and make a confession such as I have just made. I do not believe that this is true. If I may personalize again—generally I have attempted to be frank with people most of my life, and I see no reason for abandoning that policy and substituting for it one of political expediency.

What, then, is the solution to the problems which confront the Congress of the United States and the individual Members thereof? The problem is not incapable of solution. Representative government and individual freedom under law can be preserved if we, as Members of the Congress, will act promptly, courageously, and forthrightly upon this problem. What is needed is to provide the Congress with a set of tools to perform its duty of equal caliber and efficiency as those now possessed by the executive branch of the Government. When I speak of providing the Congress with tools, I mean this: There must be set up as an agency of the Congress a body of lawyers, who can be called upon to thoroughly brief questions of law; a body of economists, who can be called upon for impartial information; a body of statisticians, engineers, and other experts, solely employed by, and answerable to, the Congress and instructed to render to the best of their ability their impartial, factual, expert opinions upon any questions submitted to them by the Congress, its committees, and its Members.

Fortunately there is pending in the Congress of the United States a resolution known as House Resolution 19, introduced by Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, which has as one of its purposes the ultimate creation of just such a staff of men which I have been discussing. Among other things, this resolution takes note of the fact that the Congress of the United States has authorized the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government and the agencies thereof. And it points out that "the expansion of Federal functions and the magnitude of the operations of the Federal Government (which prompted the reorganization of the executive branch) make it desirable and necessary that there shall also be a survey

and study of the structure, functions, and procedures of the legislative branch of the Federal Government for the purpose of determining in the light of present and future problems and responsibilities how the structure, functions, and procedures of the Congress may be modified, revised, augmented, or strengthened."

This resolution also calls for the appointment of a special committee which shall do many things, with all of which I am in agreement, but specifically, the committee is authorized and directed "to investigate and study the structure, functions, and procedures of the legislative branch for the purpose of determining * * * and provide for a means by which the Congress may better equip the legislative branch with facilities and information requisite for the initiation of legislative policies."

Ths resolution has been before the Rules Committee of the House since January 6, 1943. It is my positive opinion that it should be favorably acted upon by that committee. Eventually this action must be taken and since the need is so great, I am convinced that eventually this action will be taken. I am convinced of this because it is inconceivable to me that the people are incapable of ruling themselves through their own representatives. I refuse to believe that representative government is destined to disappear from this continent, and thereby from the face of the earth. I do not condone the actions of those, whether taken openly or surreptitiously, who would destroy and do away with the Congress of the United States or the philosophy of checks and balances which is inherent in our theory of government. But I must admit that the Congress of the United States cannot stand idly by and permit itself to be destroyed by its refusal to understand that it is being overwhelmed simply because the perplexities of this civilization are too great for any one intellect to harness; that it is being overwhelmed because it is being fought by an adversary with better tools and equipment, when at the same time it has the means within its power to equip itself with similar or superior tools.

The struggle which is going on in America between the Congress and the Executive and his departments, commissions, and bureaus can well be likened to the battles which are taking place in the world. It is as futile to pit human flesh and bones against superior weapons of steel as it is for a body of men of tremendous inherent capacity and earnest patriotism to pit themselves, without a source of expert information available to them, against an executive branch of the Government which, if anything, is overequipped with such facilities. As a matter of fact, it is rather asinine for the Congress to appropriate millions of dollars, yes, even billions of dollars, for the staffing of the executive branch of the Government with lawyers, statisticians, engineers, and economists, and fail to have the courage to set up a similar body for themselves and to appropriate ample funds for obtaining the best impartial body of experts in America upon any and all legislative subjects.

If Congress takes this step, then article I, section 1, of the Constitution, which I have read to you, will again become a living, vital section of the Constitution. If it is not done, you could chisel the words of that article and that section in letters a hundred feet high and 20 feet deep across the face of the greatest mountain in America and they would no more preserve the constitutional mandate that laws and policies shall be made by the Congress than if they had never been expressed or written into it.

The philosophy expressed in article I and section 1 is immutable. If it should fall, then some future generation of America, eventually becoming aware of the tragic effects of the loss of freedom inherent in personalized government, will redeclare those principles and restore them. Of this I am as certain as I am of life itself. But it would be tragic if we of this generation should permit the eternal truth expressed therein to die because of our failure to provide the means by which it may live. The duty of the Congress to act in this matter transcends any idea of enhancing its own stature. Its failure to act will destroy the people's right to the certainty of freedom, which can only exist in a government of laws, not of men.

Judge Julian W. Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Judge Julian W. Mack, I lost a friend whom it was my pleasure many years ago to nominate for the circuit court of Cook County, where he demonstrated his ability and fearlessness. Later, appointed to the Federal bench, he was recognized as one of the greatest jurists who ever served in that branch of the judiciary.

It was my pleasure to have worked with Judge Mack during the year of 1917 on soldier insurance, compensation, and similar legislation, he possessing great ability in that field. I could dwell at length on his career and the humanitarian contributions that he made to help the underprivileged. Therefore, I take pleasure in inserting as part of my remarks an article appearing in the Washington Post which pays him splendid tribute and which, in a measure, portrays the life of this great, patriotic, and sincere public servant. Yes, in him I lose an old and devoted friend, and the country and the Congress an outstanding citizen. The article is as follows:

JUDGE MACK

The great judicial career of Judge Julian W. Mack began almost 40 years ago when he was elected to the circuit court of Cook County, Ill. Because of his known interest in social problems and child welfare, he was soon asked to preside over the newly established juvenile court in Chicago, the first juvenile court in the world. Before that he had taught law at Northwestern University and the University of Chicago and had acquired a reputation as a teacher who knew not only law in books but law in action. Previously, while still a student in Harvard Law School, he with Beale, Williston, Wigmore, and McKelvey were responsible for the establishment of the Harvard Law Review, a review managed by student editors, which ranks with the case system as an outstanding contribution to legal education.

In 1911 he was appointed to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. A few years later he was assigned to the short-lived commerce court and after its demise he would accept assignment to any circuit where he was needed. Although one of our ablest appellate court judges, he has a fondness for trial work, and as a trial judge he probably had no equal. It became the practice to request him to preside over the trial of particularly long and difficult cases. He had the rare gift of being able to deliver his charge orally to the jury, even in the most complicated case, with scarcely a reference to a note.

In view of his interest in social welfare, his assistance was sought when we entered the First World War, in framing security legislation for the soldiers. He was largely responsible for the drafting of the bills introduced into the Congress and subsequently passed providing compensation for the dependents of servicemen and enabling servicemen to obtain war-risk insurance. He was also a member of the board of inquiry on conscientious objectors. A young farmer from Tennessee who had difficulty reconciling fighting with his religious belief asked one evening to talk with Judge Mack. They talked long and seriously. The next morning he reported he did not wish to claim exemption. The young farmer was Sergeant York.

Few men gave themselves so completely to good causes as Judge Mack. His kindliness, his helpfulness to others whose capacity for good works he liked to esteem more highly than his own, obscured his own very great accomplishments. While Judge Mack was active in behalf of the downtrodden of all races, as a Jew he was particularly affected by the plight of the Jews and labored incessantly to secure equal justice for them in all countries and a homeland in Palestine for those who wished to go there. He was chosen to act as chairman of the Jewish delegations at the Peace Conference in 1919. Those who really knew Judge Mack will cherish his memory not because of any opinion he wrote or any position he held, but because of the time he took out of a busy career to give help and sympathetic understanding to others to get their start and to have their chance for a good life.

The O. W. I. Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Morning World recently, entitled "The O. W. I. Boys":

THE O. W. I. BOYS

Poland's Foreign Minister, Tadeusz Romer, delivered his exposé before the National Council in London.

The world, especially Poland, is entitled to know Poland's aims and rights, the world, especially Poland, is entitled to know what Secretary Hull has to say about America's war and peace.

Mr. Romer's address contained the following passage:

"We see no adequate reason why, after a common victory, Poland should make any further sacrifices, either in territory or in population, in addition to those she has already made and is still making in her steadfast defense of her own freedom and that of the whole world. Such a course would be immoral and alien to ideals, for whose triumph we are fighting. Therefore, the Polish Government stands firm for the integrity of the Polish territory."

Mr. Romer spoke in the name of our ally—Poland.

When a Polish representative of the Ministry of Information in New York attempted to read the above quoted excerpts from the Foreign Minister's address over short waves to Poland, quoting from the New York Times,

a censoring official of the O. W. I. stopped him, explaining that the statement may be misinterpreted by —— —— our allies!

What does this mean?

We fail to understand it.

Since when and why does O. W. I. impose silence? Why are public statements, made by the foreign minister of an allied country, suppressed by an office so closely connected with our Government?

How should we classify such methods?

Was it done in the name of our Government or is it merely a whim of displeasure of the omnipotent hirelings of the O. W. I.?

We protest against it and shall insist that this contemptible underground work of the O. W. I. boys be stopped.

We demand a thorough investigation and appeal to our readers to write to their Congressmen requesting that the whole bunch of O. W. I. stooges and meddlers be chased out before they grow Gestapo feathers and cause irreparable damage.

P. Y.

Dr. Ales Hrdlicka

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I announce the passing of Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, world renowned anthropologist, and former curator of the Division of Physical Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, who served in that capacity since 1910. It was my pleasure and honor to become acquainted with this fine man shortly after his arrival in this country. Born in Bohemia and coming to this country as a boy he, through his own efforts, achieved the highest recognition in his field. It was with pleasure that I read in one of the Washington newspapers a short sketch of his life and I am glad to insert it as a part of my remarks in tribute to this great man. The article is as follows:

DR. HRDLICKA, SCIENTIST, DIES AFTER ILLNESS—ANTHROPOLOGIST OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION WAS BORN IN BOHEMIA

Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, world renowned anthropologist, who entered America a penniless boy, by his own wish, throwing the equivalent of 15 cents in New York Harbor as his ship docked, died yesterday at 3 a. m., following a week's illness brought on by a heart attack. He had been curator of the Division of Physical Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, since 1910 and was vice curator 7 years before that.

Born the son of a cabinetmaker in Humpoletz, Bohemia, part of Czechoslovakia before the war, he was mainly self-educated in this country and began in 1898 to lead yearly expeditions to far places where he unearthed and studied skeletons of prehistoric men and the higher primates. He visited American and Asiatic Arctic regions, China, Japan, Pacific isles, Egypt, Central and South America.

In 1937, he also landed on Nicolosky Island, Russian possession in the Bering Sea, off the Alaska coast, after being first refused entry by Russian officials.

Entering the business world at 13 and studying English and business subjects in his spare time, the tide of his life was turned when illness brought to him both the ministration and friendship of a medical doctor, who helped him to enter the profession. He was graduated from the New York Eclectic College in 1892 and 2 years later from the New York Homeopathic College.

STATE HOSPITAL INTERN

He practiced medicine for a short time and then as an intern in the New York State Hospital for the Insane, where he was permitted to engage in research, began to interest himself in anthropological science.

His researches and publications brought Dr. Hrdlicka to the attention of the head of the State commission on lunacy, Dr. Carlos MacDonald, then organizing the Pathological Institute of the New York State Hospitals. Dr. Hrdlicka was invited to join the institute as an associate in anthropology, which he did after first going to Europe for further studies.

He spent a year at the medical school and school of anthropology, the Sorbonne, in Paris.

Dr. Hrdlicka maintained that prehistoric man did not exist on the American Continent, but migrated here from Asia via Alaska, and frequently presented his views to Washington audiences from the lecture platform.

INDIAN DESCENT PROVEN

Commenting on his collection of 16,000 skulls and skeletons 2 years ago, he said he had definite proof that American Indians were descended from Asiatic tribesmen in the remains he had collected on both continents.

While in Russia and Siberia, Dr. Hrdlicka not only was impressed with the scientific results of his expedition but with his discovery of the Russian attitude toward Americans.

Some weeks after his return in 1939 he told of the love the Russian people bear America and all things American.

"They look at us as apart from the rest of the world, inhabitants of a vast country like their own. Everywhere you go you hear, 'Make room, make room; hurry, here is an American!'" he said.

"I thought—I heard I would be watched," he added, "but all the time I was in Moscow I saw just one policeman."

A PROLIFIC WRITER

A prolific writer for scientific publications, he founded and edited the American Journal of Physical Anthropology. He was a member of many scientific and scholarly organizations and was an honorary and correspondent member of many foreign academies and societies as well. He was president of the American Association of Physical Anthropology, 1928-32.

His writings were responsible for establishment of the division which he headed at the time of his death. An article stating needs of American anthropologists for an institution where material might be officially deposited, a research laboratory and reference library, caused Smithsonian officials to enlist his services in setting up such facilities.

Honored abroad as well as at home, the Huxley Medal was awarded to him in 1926 by the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland for his "great services to anthropological science not merely in America but throughout the world."

In 1924 Mme. Veverka, wife of the then Minister of Czechoslovakia, painted his portrait to be hung at the University of Prague, in his native land. Dr. Hrdlicka had assisted the university with gifts.

Dr. Hrdlicka considered many questions in connection with man's behavior and physique. In 1939 he announced that the potential criminal does not differ in physical appearance from the noncriminal, that crime is not physical but mental.

Importation of Intoxicating Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have received numerous letters and petitions from many good people in my district urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, which was introduced by our respected friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

The American people everywhere are concerned and disturbed about the great quantity of liquor now being made too easily available to workers in our war plants to the end that production of war materials is being noticeably affected by inefficiency and absenteeism because of it.

Will someone please explain to the American people why all this intoxicating liquor is permitted by the administration to come into our country from all over the world when the Congress found it necessary almost 2 years ago to stop the manufacture of alcoholic liquors by the American distilleries, except for industrial and medicinal purposes?

Must we, Mr. Speaker, permit cargo after cargo of intoxicating liquor to flow freely into this country almost duty free in order to keep friendly trade relations with other nations especially at a time like this? If so, I shudder to think of the final consequences, for certainly the threads of the "ties that bind" such a relationship with any nation of the world most certainly will not stand the test, either in peace or war.

This thing is becoming a serious matter and we, the Congress, should take effective action to remedy this scandalous situation once and for all and do it now.

World Police Force Can Insure the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial, World Police Force Can Insure the Peace, which appears in the September 22 edition of the Toledo (Ohio) Times:

WORLD POLICE FORCE CAN INSURE THE PEACE

The House of Representatives yesterday went on record as favoring a cooperative peace.

The House Members, by a vote of 300 to 29, voted to enforce the peace.

This is a new and encouraging attitude. While the Fulbright resolution is broad in its aspects there can be no mistake about the application of its principle.

House Members voted their sentiment in favor of working out a joint peace to be maintained after the war. What is really meant is that the House Members favor policing the world.

While the resolution now goes to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, along with other similar resolutions, there is no doubt about the attitude of the American people. They want peace, and they want the privilege of seeing that it is respected.

If the United States follows this policy, as it probably will, it means that we shall keep a large navy, air force, and army in readiness.

The House resolution would put the United States, along with other victors, in the position of maintaining a fair peace by force if necessary. If any nation upsets the peace, the police force of the peaceful nations will be obligated to step in and restore order.

This is all right. Everyone knows that if the peace agreement made at the end of the last World War had been enforced, there would have been no Second World War. Germany would not have been permitted to rearm.

A combined police force maintained by several nations does not assure peace. It must be administered fairly, and there must be complete and permanent unity. Combined strength often divides and destroys itself. We cannot let that happen.

In these days the only way to keep order seems to be through the maintenance of a respected authority which has the power to put down disorder. That is the way communities maintain order. That is the way all organized groups maintain order. It is the best way to maintain order after the war.

The Senate should adopt a similar resolution. The whole world will be much better behaved if it knows there is a cop on the corner ready to enforce the laws of good international conduct.

The Capitol's Dome Should Carry the Stars and Stripes—No Other Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, to me, as a Member of Congress, has been put the question, "Should Congress vote now to join in world collaboration?"

Collaboration means joint action. If the question is as to whether we are, in the war effort, to work jointly with those nations which are at war with either Germany or Japan, then the answer is an emphatic "yes."

If the inquiry is as to whether we are, during the war or afterward, to act jointly with, engage in joint enterprise with, become a partner of, all the nations of the world in a program of world reformation, of remaking the world along financial, educational, industrial, governmental lines, then the answer is an equally positive "No."

It must be assumed that the advocates of world joint action wish Congress to commit itself to a policy, not of talk, but of action, and that that action by Congress means not only joint action in war efforts, but in all other activities in which nations and people engage. In short, establish and become a member of Union Now or some similar organization.

Until this war has been won, until every armed enemy has been decisively defeated, we have neither the time, energy, nor the resources to waste on a program of either world reformation or world rebuilding.

Whatever may be the advantages or the desirability of educational, economic, or financial collaboration, this war covers so much territory, involves so many millions of men using such great quantities of munitions, that its successful prosecution demands our every thought and effort.

For 8 long years, our forefathers fought to give validity to the Declaration of Independence and, from that day to this, every American worthy of the name has proudly boasted of his independence as a citizen of the United States of America.

What are we now asked to do?

We are now asked by financially and politically powerful organizations to join in immediate world collaboration—world joint action.

One, Federal Union, Inc., by petition in January of 1942, asked Congress to pass a resolution requiring the United States to join with other nations, both in the Old World and the New, unite on a world federal basis, surrender our independence, adopt a declaration of interdependence—the antithesis of the Declaration of Independence—form Union Now and become a member of a superunited states of the world.

About the same time, the other well-financed group, World Fellowship, Inc., requested every Member of the Congress to give to President Roosevelt, as a birthday present, $100,000,000, to be spent at his discretion in forming a council of internationalists to draw up plans for a united nations of the world. It also asked that an additional billion dollars be given the President to be passed on by him to finance the council's activities.

Each of these plans, as every other plan for a similar purpose, involves a surrender of our sovereignty, that is, of our independence, of our national existence. That surrender is the meat of world collaboration.

The overwhelming majority of our people today, as in the past, sincerely believe, and have acted upon the conviction, that the Constitution outlines the best form of government ever devised.

Experience has shown, and the people of the world, by their migration to this land of ours and its form of government, have demonstrated that under it men can and have obtained for themselves more of freedom, happiness, and prosperity, than in any other land, under any other form of Government.

So, I ask you, it being admitted, as it must be, that we have here the best there is in the world, why should we, even for the laudable objective of helping others, surrender what we have, when the result, as we know, will be but a lowering of our own standards; a weakening and undermining of the foundation upon which the advantages which we now possess securely rest; and which we must keep if we are to help either ourselves or anyone else?

As well might the seed wheat brought by our forefathers from across the seas have been made into flour to be consumed in the first winter of their famine, and thus have prevented the growing of subsequent crops, as for us to now surrender our independence, the keystone in the arch of our security.

A greater degree of freedom of action as well as of religious liberty, a free press and free speech, more of prosperity and happiness for the individual, a greater advance in intellectual attainments; more people sharing in more of the luxuries, as well as the necessities of life, are the fruits of our national independence, our adherence to our constitutional form of Government.

As well cut down the fruit tree and expect a subsequent crop as to surrender even a part of our independence, of our national sovereignty, to a super united states of the world or any other form of world government in which these United States of ours would be but a part.

If the advocates of Union Now, of United Nations are sincere—and let us assume that they are; if they believe in America and her institutions—and they must; otherwise they would not assume the position of lending a helping hand to less fortunate peoples and nations—then let them adopt the plan of Colonel McCormick, and, with the United States maintaining its independence, invite these other nations which wish to be helped and aided, to come into the United States of America as States.

The advocates of a superworld government base their plea upon the proposition that, to have peace throughout the world we must act jointly with all other countries.

The plan is to make Uncle Sam the Santa Claus of the world. Our resources, our money, our men, are to be used to rebuild the ruined cities of the world when comes the peace.

The plan includes the proposition that the United States of America, 133,000,000 people, are to feed, clothe, and furnish homes for some 400,000,000 people who will be in need.

Already we have constructed throughout the world harbors, docks, warehouses, airports, railroads, highways, and factories, at a cost of billions of dollars, for which we will have no use and which we will not be permitted to use after the war is over. All these, together with billions of dollars worth of food and clothing, are to be given freely to the people of other lands. To speak lightly, we are to pay the fiddler while others dance to the music.

The planners would give us international boondoggling. And our men—your sons, brothers, and husbands—are to join in policing foreign lands, while the men of other countries keep order here. Not a pretty picture.

The adoption of the plan means that the American worker, the American farmer, and the American taxpayer will,

for countless years to come, be paying for the gifts which we make to others.

Why, in addition to those gifts which we have made, and which we will make, should we surrender our sovereign right to keep our own independence—work out our own destiny?

If we are to pay the fiddler, if we are to act as Santa Claus, if we are to establish throughout the world a world-wide W. P. A., if we are to build in other lands industrial enterprises, wherein the laborers of those lands, living on a pittance, will compete with our own workers, then let us be the head of that superworld organization and let those who want to join come in as States.

Our people are not yet ready to pauperize themselves, to become industrial slaves, agricultural serfs, in order to carry out the plans of those who dream of world government.

This is true, not because our people are not sympathetic or charitable but because they are practical, because they realize that the task is an impossible one, because they know that they cannot build a superstructure of that size or weight without breaking down and destroying the foundation—which is our independence—our Constitution.

Even if this idea of world cooperation were practical, there is another reason why it should not now be adopted by the Congress. The executive department has demonstrated that when Congress gives it an inch it will take a yard. Congress should not give to the executive department—to the dreamers and the visionaries—any possible excuse for unconstitutional and detrimental action.

If Congress at this time formally announces that we should collaborate with other nations of the world, that action will be seized upon by the wasteful, extravagant, experimental, visionary New Dealers as an unlimited license not only to spend billions of American money—most of it borrowed from our taxpayers through the sale of bonds or by the printing of fiat money—on a glorified world-wide W. P. A., but as a directive to educate and control people everywhere—Indians, Hottentots, and Bushmen—in what these dreamers conceive to be the better way of life.

Our men are fighting under the Stars and Stripes. That is the flag which on the battlefield cheers them on to action and gives them courage and determination. That is the flag under which they fought in the First World War. That is our flag.

Our men are fighting for the principles for which that flag stands, for the homes over which it waves.

They are fighting for the United States of America, and, while six or eight million of them are in the service, it is unfair to adopt a policy which means the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes, the substitution of an international flag, the loss of the freedom and the liberty for which so many of them are giving their lives.

Let us wait until the boys come home, when they will have an opportunity by their votes to aid in determining the form of government under which they and their children shall live.

Stalin and the Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun:

STALIN AND THE CHURCH

The Nazi propaganda ministry and the American saboteurs of cooperation with the U. S. S. R. have reason to be disturbed—as they clearly are—by the rapprochement between the Russian Government and the Orthodox Church.

Since the German invasion of Russia there have been successive steps—including the suppression of the Militant Atheist League—toward religious toleration. Now an accord between Stalin and the Orthodox leaders has been followed by the first election of a church primate since the revolution. Further expansion of church work is predicted in Moscow dispatches. The Communist Party remains officially atheistic, and much remains to be done if full religious liberty is to be enjoyed in Pussia. But an impressive beginning in liberalization certainly is under way.

Why? Some propagandists interpret it as a mere Stalin trick to win pan-Slavic backing in the Balkans. Doubtless the Russian Premier believes it will strengthen Soviet diplomacy in that region. But there is no law against his seeking good will in the Balkans.

Simplification in Reverse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waynesboro (Pa.) Record Herald:

SIMPLIFICATION IN REVERSE

If there is not a revolt, when the people come to prepare the first of their quarterly income-tax estimates between now and September 15, it will mean that the American citizenry has become a race of mice, not men.

Since the first income-tax return began harassing a few of the most prosperous in our population, nothing like the current orgy of statistical complication has been inflicted upon us as a people.

There is almost certain to be a bitter revulsion. So let's clear up the record right now in advance, and see that anger is directed against those who deserve it. These quarterly estimates, followed each March 15 by a final return, arise out of the pay-as-you-earn tax law adopted by Congress this summer in response to demands for the Ruml plan. Attempts will be made to blame the confusion and trouble on the Ruml plan. Don't be misled.

The almost unconceivably intricate collection system probably cannot be simplified under the statute enacted. But the tax law was not the Ruml plan. It was a compromise modification which, whether deliberately or through ineptitude was made a caricature of what it purports to be.

There is about the law no slight vestige of scientific construction except for that trace of the pay-as-you-earn principle that was left after Congressmen, bedeviled and misled by Treasury "experts," had swept the pantry shelves into a pot of dishwater and labeled the product soup.

When you and all your neighbors go berserk trying to comply with the requirements of the new income-tax law, and you get out the trusty old ballot box to go looking for victims, keep one thing clearly in mind:

Your troubles are not inherent in the pay-as-you-earn tax principles. They were tossed in by those who couldn't bear to see a simple, workable, scientific tax law minus a lot of and/ors, whereases, wherefores, and notwithstandings—by those who weren't willing to concede that a sound, practicable tax law might come out of a nonbureaucratic mind.

Don't vent your spite on the pay-as-you-earn principle. Vent it upon the men who betrayed that principle when the existing law was written.

Under Cover and What One Organization Thinks of It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 17, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Workers League, founded in 1938, expresses its opinion of one of the latest smear efforts as follows:

The book Under Cover, written by the refugee Derounian, alias Pagnanelli, alias Carlson, and who was financed by the magazine Fortune, which in turn as shown by evidence presented to Congress by United States Senators in 1940 was financed by Thomas Lamont, international banker, to promote war propaganda, bears the familiar pattern of intolerance usually associated with internationalism.

By and large, the type of Americans interviewed by this author were those who believe in a return to constitutional ways of government in America, and who believe that the trend of the past 10 years can only lead if unchecked to some form of totalitarianism with its accompanying loss of democracy in everything but name.

It is a simple matter for that small minority known as international bankers to find hirelings in any walk of life, who will utilize the unlimited channels of publicity open to wealth for the purpose of discrediting those who resist their schemes to fasten upon our country policies that are intended to progressively restrict our sovereignty, and of course primarily benefit themselves. They have coined the term "isolationist" to make odorous any American who opposes their plans in any degree. They have not hesitated to finance the basest moral charges against prominent elected representatives of the people who dared to thwart their immediate wishes. Their true natures are revealed by these attempts to fasten upon their opponents the one crime which they must, at any cost, keep the public from associating with themselves. They must, to be successful, convict

their opponents of the crime to which they themselves alone are guilty—treason.

We have heard the Vice President of the United States smear as Fascist any American who chooses to sit with the administration's opponents. It matters not whether he is loyal to his country—he is un-American. Fools and morons may succumb to this totalitarian approach, but any true believer in democracy will recognize that such statements by any public official reveal the same quality of intolerance as practiced by nazism and communism. He realizes such a mind is trying to use democratic processes to destroy, through officially created terror, the deepest foundation stone of American democracy—free speech.

It is an easily established fact that the majority of American smeared in this book are individuals who have, without hope of financial gain, devoted their lives to the thankless task of selling America to Americans. They consider it the highest type of Americanism to love their country more than they love themselves or the almighty dollar. The percentage of crackpots (yes, and anti-Semites), in their midst is probably no greater than found in our two major political parties.

I can think of no greater aid to the cause of American nationalism at the present time than placing this book on the market for a fraction of its present cost. It is my hope that the forces financing Under Cover will accept the challenge.

Address of Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, on the National Radio Forum, conducted by the Washington Evening Star WMAL, Blue Network, Inc., Wednesday, September 22, 1943:

My fellow citizens of the United States, thanks to the public-spirited facilities of the Washington Star, I am permitted to report to you upon the vitally significant foreign policy recommended to America by the unanimous action of the Republican Advisory Council in its recent epochal meeting on September 6 and 7 at Mackinac Island, Michigan.

In all my long experience, I am proud to say that I never knew a political group to labor in more earnest, devoted, and impersonal dedication solely to the common welfare of our country in this tragic hour of crashing worlds; I dare to believe the day will come when the sturdy decisions of this council—conveniently referred to as the Mackinac Charter will be viewed as another historic landmark in American foreign policy, and as the creation of a pattern which invites united America to her right place in effective world relationships when this global war has brought the United Nations to conclusive victory.

The Republican Advisory Council is frankly a partisan political oracle in the first instance. Our system of representative government requires the vigorous maintenance of these political mechanisms. But partisan politics, as such should stop at the water's edge; and I can assert, with total truth, that this Mackinac Charter, in respect to foreign policy, was framed with complete disregard for partisan considerations, and with precisely the same devoted hope, as expressed 1 week later by the eminent Secretary of State, that it may substantially invite the allegiance of all Americans, regardless of party, so that partisan bitterness may be eliminated from foreign policy discussions, and we may move forward as the United States in fact as well as name.

I think I should say that this Republican Advisory Council was appointed by National Chairman Spangler purely as an advisory body to counsel with the ultimate platform makers of the next Republican National Convention in 1944. It consists of all the Republican Governors, representing practically half our States and two-thirds of our people; 15 representatives of the House and Senate, appointed by the respective minority leaders; and 10 members of the official Republican National Committee. When such a thoroughly representative group—representative not only of our national geography but equally representatives of widely differing foreign points of view—when such a group can unanimously recommend a general foreign policy, I submit it is a profoundly significant and prophetic phenomenon in the life of the Republic, and deserves the open-minded consideration of all Americans.

The Mackinac Charter vigorously covers many domestic issues as well. It is by no means confined to foreign issues. But I discuss only the latter tonight because it is the point at which we so sadly need enlightened American unity; and because I happen to have served as chairman of the Foreign Policy Committee, along with Senator Austin, of Vermont, Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania, Governor Green, of Illinois, Congresswoman Bolton, of Ohio, and Congressman Eaton of New Jersey. The well-known pre-Pearl Harbor divergence of views among this group is the conclusive answer to any petty, cheap, and groundless snarl, by an occasional external critic, that the committee was "stacked." It was the exact opposite of "stacked." Yet if it had been "stacked" it could not have finally been more enthusiastically unanimous nor more spiritually unified. That its report should have similarly won the practically unanimous approval of the Nation's editorial opinion is the final, spectacular endorsement of its creed.

It is my view—and you will understand that these are personal reactions not binding upon my colleagues—that the Mackinac Charter has done one basic, superlatively important thing—which is sadly needed if we are to have any sort of common national vision in foreign policy. For the first time, it has plainly been put down in black and white the indispensable doctrine that Americans can be faithful to the primary institutions and interests of our own United States and still be equally loyal to the essential post-war international cooperations which are required to end military aggression for keeps and to create a post-war world in which organized justice shall protect freemen. By the same token, it has put down in black and white the basic truth that Americans can constructively contemplate their world duties without sacrificing their American allegiance. Indeed, their appropriate world duties can become part of their American allegiance when the result is a body of international law and practice which bless us fully as much as they bless others.

In my view, this is what the average American has been waiting to hear. He is perfectly willing and anxious to accept his proper international responsibilities in the peace to come. But he wants to feel that legitimate American interests shall be preserved; that independent American institutions shall be protected; that the Constitution shall be impregnable, and that the Stars and Stripes will stay on the dome of the Capitol. He does not want us and our resources to be overpromised to the post-war world, as some of our more extreme "do-gooders" constantly conspire. With these reliable assurances—such as Churchill never fails to give the Britons, nor Stalin, the Russians—this average American will faithfully take his full share of organized international responsibility to stop military aggression forever and to find some better way than force to bring justice to this torn and distraught earth. He will do his full part in a foreshortened world which denies isolation to any of us, whether we like it or not. He will do his full part so long as he knows that America is to remain America.

These parallel and simultaneous objectives are not incompatible except in the agitated confusion of those who have an ulterior purpose to serve. Our chief trouble has been that we have tried to make them so. Their dual authority is the true key to American unity—as the enthusiastic reception given the Mackinac Charter proves.

If it be argued that men of seemingly divergent minds must have expediently sacrificed their principles in order to have unanimously agreed at Mackinac, I reply that no principles are sacrificed when there is candid and mutual recognition of basic validity in principles which cease to be divergent when honestly and fairly analyzed.

Yes, there will still be degrees of difference in ultimate interpretations—a phenomenon, by the way, not confined to Republicans. But, I repeat, I believe the Mackinac Charter has performed a national service which transcends any partisan service, when it proves that men of good faith can agree (1) that American interests and institutions—and, above all, her due constitutional process—shall be scrupulously preserved; and then (2) that America shall participate in full vigor to help put and keep the post-war world in responsible order.

And now, my fellow Americans, I read the Mackinac Charter and I am happy to let it speak for itself:

"The members of this council are aware of the gravity of the problems our Nation faces. We are fighting a desperate war, which must be won as speedily as possible. When the war is ended, we must participate in the making of the peace. This puts upon the Nation a triple responsibility.

"(A) We must preserve and protect all our own national interests.

"(B) We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world.

"(C) We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations.

"At this time a detailed program for the accomplishment of these great objectives will be impossible and specific commitments of this council of the Republican Party, or by the Nation, would be unwise. We cannot know now what situation may obtain at the war's end. But a specific program must be devolved in the months to come as events and relations unfold.

"Therefore, we consider it to be our duty at the beginning of our work as an advisory council of the Republican Party to declare our approval of the following:

"1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

"(A) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis.

"(B) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war.

"(C) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

"2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world.

"In making this recommendation we ground our judgment upon the belief that both the foreign policy and domestic policy of every country are related to each other so closely that each member of the United Nations (or whatever cooperative organization perpetuating existing unity, may be agreed upon) ought to consider both the immediate and remote consequences of every proposition with careful regard for—

"1. Its effect upon the vital interests of the Nation.

"2. Its bearing upon the foreseeable international developments.

"If there should be a conflict between the two, then the United States of America should adhere to the policy which will preserve its constitutionalism as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution itself, and the Bill of Rights, as administered through our republican form of government. Constitutionalism should be adhered to in determining the substance of our policies and shall be followed in ways and means of making international commitments.

"In addition to these things this council advises that peace and security ought to be ultimately established upon other sanctions than force. It recommends that we work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversy; and the attainment of a peace that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations.

"In all of these undertakings we favor the widest consultation of the gallant men and women in our armed forces who have a special right to speak with authority on behalf of the security and liberty for which they fight.

"It is determined that this Council make complete examination of the means by which these ends may be fully achieved with due regard for all American interests and responsibilities.

"The Council invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness."

This ends the quotation. I submit it is the vibrant voice of a confident America which intends to maintain for itself all of its own self-determination and its own benign domestic standards in the post-war world. But equally it is the wise voice of American intelligence and enlightened American self-interest which understand that a bad world for others cannot be a good world for us, and which reliably intends to do its full cooperative share in helping to sustain peace and progress in a happier world. So long as both of these objectives remain inseverably linked we can unite America on foreign policy. When they are divorced we inevitably fall apart.

It is the same spirit in which our own sons have gone to war again. They fight to free the world from a global curse; but they fight first to preserve their own America. In long-distance analogy it is the same spirit which moved General Pershing, in World War No. 1, to maintain the independent integrity of his own American fighting units while throwing them into total and brilliant cooperation for our common allied cause. I remind you also that Secretary Hull did not hesitate to speak specifically for sovereign nations in his last speech, delivered a week after Mackinac.

There are those who are striving to prove that somebody got plowed under at Mackinac—either the so-called interventionists or the so-called noninterventionists of yesterday. The answer is that nobody got plowed under. There was a rational, tolerant meeting of patriotic minds upon wholly compatible philosophies of action which complement each other That spells dependable unity. It is the only source of unity. Only those who have their own reasons for fearing unity will distort this enormously invaluable conclusion.

I emphasize this point again and again, because it is of such vital importance in the thinking of all our people. We can maintain continuing, organized post-war cooperation with the United Nations to permanently curb international pirates by cooperative force—and then to seek the sanctions of justice as a substitute for force—without sacrificing our essential independence and without, for an instant, giving up the captaincy of our own American destiny or the mastery of our American fate. We can go far forward in our deep anxiety to help others without any necessity for agreeing with those quixotic and irresponsible spendthrifts who promise the world infinitely more than we can deliver and who thus invite the world to an ultimate disillusionment which will beget the bitterest of hates. Mr. Walter Lippmann bluntly warned the President the other day that, while our people "will almost certainly endorse a policy of limited liability," they "most certainly will not endorse a policy of general and unlimited liability." We can believe wholeheartedly in international aid to those who help themselves without believing in a gigantic international W. P. A. at our expense. On the other hand, we can believe in our own America; we can believe in the maintenance of our own high American standards, the Vice President to the contrary notwithstanding; we can live forever under our own flag and still discharge every obligation which we owe to civilization and humanity. And that, my fellow countrymen, is, in my humble personal opinion, the message of the Mackinac Charter. It will not satisfy extremists at either end of the line. But it charts the great middle course of sanity and reason to which 95 percent of our people can subscribe not only with their lips but with their hearts and souls.

Some say that the Mackinac Charter is too indefinite in details. Let them hunt for details in the so-called Atlantic Charter. Let them hunt for details in the exposition of the Secretary of State 1 week ago Sunday night. Let them hunt for details in the well-known Fulbright resolution. Let them hunt for greater details in any pronouncement by any other great political party. They will hunt in vain. Details are impossible, among prudent statesmen, until we know the precise nature of the post-war world; until we know the undisclosed minds of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin in respect to peace; yes, and until we know what 10,000,000 American soldiers and sailors think about these global relations of which they are now an integral and deadly part.

Why is America alone—or Mackinac—expected to produce the premature blueprints of the hereafter? Mr. Raymond Moley, once a high prophet in this administration, wrote the other day: "Those who complain that the resolutions adopted by the Republicans at Mackinac are too general might try a little exercise; they might try themselves to write a statement of foreign policy." Yes; and then try to get a unanimous approval from some thoroughly representative and responsible parliament like that at Mackinac.

Yes; as the famous Mr. Pitt once put it in the British Parliament: "Accept these ideas if they are worth your notice; strengthen them with your wisdom; mature them with your experience; or, in their room, establish a more adequate formula."

Remember, too, that this was only the first meeting of the council. It is a continuing body. It can proceed subsequently with more details as time and events may warrant. Meanwhile, I think I am entitled to say that all responsible statesmen among the United Nations have warned our Senate Foreign Relations Committee against contemporary specifications lest we disunite the war effort by premature attempts to unite the peace effort.

Blueprints today are impossible. Details depend upon events. But the Mackinac charter is specific in its ideals and its objectives. It bespeaks the promise and the aspirations of a free people who intend to remain free but who are prepared, within simple reason, to be good neighbors to the world. The New York World-Telegram summed it up when it editorially said:

"We like the unanimous foreign-policy declaration of the Republican post-war advisory council at Mackinac. We think most Americans will like it because it points in the direction they want to go. They want a strong and free America, taking full part in the cooperative building of future world peace and justice. * * * We are convinced that the people will support vigorously the general aims of the Mackinac declaration, which are exclusively neither Republican nor Democratic, but American."

The Washington Star editorially declared: "The President and those disposed to ridicule what the Republicans have done would be well advised to consider the importance of removing the question of this country's post-war international stand from the realm of purely political debate. Instead of belittling the Republican program, it might be better for them to concentrate on persuading the Democrats to do as well."

The New York Times did not hesitate to say: "The Republicans who met at Mackinac have made a contribution to the unity of the Nation on questions of foreign policy and to the cause of post-war reconstruction."

The Detroit News added:

"The resolution itself invites all Americans to adhere to the principles here set forth to the end that our place among the nations of the world and our part in helping to bring about international peace and justice shall not be the subject of domestic partisan controversy and political bitterness. That invitation—as good an evidence as any of patriotic sincerity—should be accepted in the spirit inspiring it."

I could quote countless other editorial endorsements. These typical samples suffice. The Republican advisory council has pointed the way to national unity on a foreign policy which neither deserts America nor neglects her unescapable part in the creation of a better world. God helping us, we can do no other.

The O. P. A. Undertakes To Supersede the Courts and To Suspend Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a newspaper clipping relating to a statement made by me:

Referring to the fact that the judges of a United States district court in Illinois found themselves helpless to afford relief

because jurisdiction over O. P. A. is specifically withdrawn from the established courts by the act itself, Representative PLUMLEY of Vermont said: "I told you so." I opposed the original act to establish the O. P. A. and what I said about it being un-American is a matter of record, and more true today than then.

Among other things, under one of its provisions, no court, Federal or State, has power to consider the validity of any regulation of the O. P. A., or any price schedule.

I agree, as you must, that there never was a more cunning device contrived to deprive the citizen of his rights in court.

It is vicious and un-American; it defeats the purpose of our fighting to win the war; suspends democracy, and is a flagrant and arrogant violation of the traditional Constitutional American right of the individual to "petition the Government for a redress of grievances." It should be repealed.

This provision should be wiped off the statute books at once, and Prentiss Brown, O. P. A. Administrator, should back wholeheartedly the proposal to do that very thing.

The Wheat Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, wheat is the one important agricultural commodity, the price of which is below parity at the present time. Wheat prices are below parity by reason of the fact that the Office of Price Administration, in defiance of the expressed provisions of the Price Control Act, has imposed a ceiling on flour at a price which will not permit wheat prices to rise to parity.

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation has recently approved a report submitted to that body by a special committee appointed at the last annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation to make recommendations on a wheat program. The chairman of this special committee was Dr. O. O. Wolf, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau Federation and a member of the board of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The recommendations of this special committee and the statement on wheat adopted by the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation are constructive in their nature and offer a sound and practical program. Under permission to extend my remarks, I am herewith enclosing a copy of the statement and the recommendations of the special committee:

This Nation is blessed at this critical hour with a great backlog of food supplies. In addition, our Nation's farm soil fertility is at a high level. We take pride as a Nation-wide farm organization in the fact that both the food supplies and our production facilities have been brought to this high state largely through the functioning of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and companion laws which we have helped to formulate and have consistently supported.

The present policy of the Government in holding the price of wheat below parity through the device of ceilings on flour at a time when all other basic food commodities are at or above parity, is grossly unfair to the wheat producer. Wheat constitutes a most vital part of the food supply of the Nation, of our allies and of occupied territories. This food supply is being hazarded by impractical and arbitrary controls.

The American wheat grower jealously guards his right of private initiative and free enterprise and is willing to sacrifice on either of these principles only insofar as it is necessary to maintain a program compatible with the broad general interest of agricultural activities and of food production.

We do not regard incentive or subsidy payments as sound where parity can be achieved in the market place, especially when the cost of food constitutes the lowest percentage of industrial workers' income of any time in history.

With these thoughts in mind, we recommend the following 7-point program:

1. We favor the retention of the basic principles of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and particularly class as essential the mechanics of the act to adjust production upward in times of need for greater supply, and to adjust acreage downward in times of excess reserves. We support needed changes and modifications to meet increased needs of the war effort, with consideration for necessity of recognizing long-range soil-conservation principles.

2. We favor a program for wheat which will yield producers parity prices.

3. We oppose price ceilings on any food commodity processed from wheat having the effect of forcing the price of wheat below parity.

4. We favor releases by the Commodity Credit Corporation of limited amounts of wheat for feed purposes, at a figure not less than corn parity or not less than the market price of corn, whichever is higher.

5. We urge provision of adequate appropriations to continue the crop-insurance program on wheat, with the request that studies be made as to needed amendments, and changes in the operating plans, as will put crop insurance on a more practical and self-supporting basis.

6. We urge that every measure be taken to effect all practical industrial uses of wheat through proper research to the end that wheat and its products will occupy their proper place in war industries and in post-war economy.

7. We recommend continued cooperation with other wheat producing and consuming nations in an international wheat agreement.

A Message to the Italian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the text of an address delivered by me in the month of August 1943 in New York City, in cooperation with the Office of War Information, and broadcast short wave to the people of Italy.

The address is as follows:

I speak to you, people of Italy, as an American who loves your country, the land of his birth. Italy must be saved, and the Allied Nations cannot stand by and watch it die. That is why they are in Sicily now.

I, LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI, represent the people of New York in Congress. I came to America from Cosenza, where I was born.

In America, I have seen true freedom, the freedom you yearn for and do not have. As long as you ally yourselves with Germany you can expect nothing but slavery and dishonor. Hitler takes all from you and returns nothing but false promises he cannot hope to fulfill.

The Allies wish you no harm. They ask and want nothing of you. But for you they desire liberation and peace. Their soldiers have invaded Italy only because the Fascist government threatens democratic freedom. It is your government, not your people, they seek to destroy. If you will deny the Axis we can live again in harmony, as God meant us to do.

Lack of Coal and What the People Think About It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the following is a resolution adopted by the Hastings (Barry County, Mich.) Chamber of Commerce. It is typical of the feeling throughout the Fourth Congressional District. It is as follows:

HASTINGS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
September 15, 1943.

Newspaper and radio publicity starting early last spring urged all coal users to get in their coal early. Many heeded the warning and ordered their coal as early as last April for the coming winter; nevertheless even all their orders have not and cannot be filled. Do not blame the local coal dealers—they have been and are doing their best. This is a situation beyond their control.

The recent cold spell has focused our attention on the local situation: There is no coal to be had from the local dealers. Their yards are empty. Such coal as they are receiving is prorated amongst their customers. By all means do not let this situation lead you to order coal from all the dealers and then cancel them later, thus adding to the confusion. Stay with your regular dealer. One dealer has orders for 11 carloads; another for over 18 carloads; and another for over 350 tons. Some of these orders are for churches and schools.

This situation started with the coal strike. The strikes and chronic absenteeism of mine workers caused the shipping schedules to become badly delayed. The following are quotes from letters received by local dealers from various mining companies: June 30.—"Uninterrupted production of coal from here through the rest of the year should provide enough fuel for householders, and the industry is, of course, making every effort to conduct its affairs in such a way that the difficulties of rationing may be avoided." September 1.—"Under order No. 4 of the Solid Fuels Administration, schools and domestic dealers are last on the list, lakes, byproducts, etc., taking priority over everything. This order is mandatory and there is no way by which we can evade it." This means shipping to lake ports will continue while the Lakes are open before rail shipments will

start. September 9.—" * * * The Solid Fuels Administrator for War has issued some very rigid instructions governing the distribution of our entire production between September 7 and November 7. These instructions require that all lake and byproduct commitments be brought up to date immediately and kept there for the balance of the lake season, regardless of the urgency of any other orders on our books. We are further required to restrict shipments to retail dealers to not more than 5 percent of our screened-coal production during the September 7–November 7 period. This means that we will have practically no screened coal available for shipment to rail accounts prior to November 7; we cannot estimate a shipping date. We are booking no new business." September 8.—"It is not for us to question the wisdom of governmental wartime regulations issued in an effort to level stocks, utilize water-borne transportation while available, and service existing shortages."

So again, may I say—do not blame your local dealer. But, if I may make a personal observation, I strongly question the motives of a certain labor leader whose truce ends October 31 when industrial and consumer use of coal will be at a peak. At that time the coal mine operators will be most vulnerable to another strike, and the Nation's homes will want coal to such an extent that Washington politicos will capitulate in the face of angry demands by their constituents for heat for their home, churches, schools, and hospitals.

CHARLES R. ANNABLE,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, when will the O. P. A. and the W. P. B. begin to think of the winter, which is coming in Michigan?

War Department Must Not Become Global Political Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed. With the lives of millions of our boys at stake in this global war, there are those in Government today who would play politics with the War Department.

I have seen a blueprint of a plan which would presumably streamline the War Department, but in reality its intent is to convert that great department into a New Deal political organization. In my opinion the activities of the men behind this plan are nothing less than treasonous.

I know nothing about what authority Gen. George C. Marshall will have as global Chief of Staff. All I know is that he has built up a General Staff that has functioned well and, on its record, should, with one or two exceptions, remain intact. I feel that General Marshall is a great leader, and I do not believe that he is the type of man who will permit himself to be jockeyed into a phoney position.

Congress cannot and should not attempt to interfere with the proposal to make General Marshall the global Chief of Staff. Such a move should not be criticized until it is shown at least that he is not to have full authority in that position. I prefer to think his promotion is a fine recognition of his ability.

Congress, however, is in a position to prevent the conversion of the War Department into a New Deal political W. P. A. It is in a position to prevent the appointment of a political general to succeed General Marshall as Chief of Staff and thus thwart the carefully laid plans of the administration's fourth-term strategists.

Congress should see to it that those generals who have so ably served under General Marshall are retained and that the new Chief of Staff shall be one of those best qualified to serve in that important post.

I make this statement merely to serve notice as a Member of Congress and of the House Committee on Military Affairs, that I do not intend to sit idly by and permit the Hopkins-Niles-Rosenman regime to turn the War Department into a global political organization.

The Petroleum Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, for many months now, the best brains in the petroleum industry, as well as the best-informed men in Government, have been warning this country of an impending petroleum shortage. A subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House has investigated the petroleum situation. The Small Business Committee of the House has investigated the petroleum situation. Mr. Ickes, as head of the Petroleum Administration for War, has investigated the petroleum situation. All congressional committees investigating the situation, as well as the Petroleum Administrator for War, have strongly urged an increase in the price of crude oil as the best possible means of stimulating increased production. Still nothing is done.

In April of this year the Office of Price Administration, in refusing the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War for an increase in crude oil prices, stated that a program would soon be announced to relieve the petroleum shortage. Five months have passed and still nothing has been done.

In order to forestall a petroleum famine, and in order to save the small independent oil producer from bankruptcy, something must be done.

The following editorial appearing in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of Sunday, September 12, graphically states the seriousness of the problem:

FACTS ABOUT THE OIL PRICE

In recent months, it has been shown that even more people outside the oil industry than had been imagined either know little about how oil is found and produced or what they do know is terrifically wrong. This astonishing ignorance of the country's most vital resource—and doubly vital in wartime—extends even to high Government officials and to ranking industrial experts and business economists, who ordinarily would be expected to be reasonably well-informed as to an industry upon which depends not only victory in this war but the continued welfare of virtually every form of private enterprise.

But the fact seems to be that a great many important and powerful people in the Government and elsewhere still regard the oil business as a sort of fabulous realm which operates in Alice-in-Wonderland fashion, having no relation to such prosaic matters as prices and costs which they realize govern every other business. Recognizing the fact that all other industries must possess a certain degree of parity with respect to one another if they are to live, these otherwise realistic experts apparently still imagine that oil is produced by the stroke of a pen or, at least by no more effort than pushing a button to start some sort of machinery.

Because of this strange obtuseness on the part of so many who apparently have the power to direct Government policy according to their delusions, this Nation in the midst of war is facing a paralyzing shortage of oil which is as necessary to war as gunpowder and fighting men. At the same time, we are facing a colossal disruption of our production and transport in this country, since both are based on a plentiful supply of oil.

It is presumed that leaders in business and government have not risen to their positions of prominence and power without the ability to read and understand figures: For the benefit of these, the following basic facts pertaining to the present condition of the oil industry are offered:

Since January 1, 1938, we have consumed 7,575,741,000 barrels of crude oil, while in the same period our discoveries of new oil amounted to 4,631,000,000 barrels.

In other words, our potential oil supply for all the future has decreased nearly 3,000,000,000 barrels in 5½ years, and since our present annual consumption is about a billion and a half barrels, the result is that our expectation of oil for the future has been shortened by about 2 years.

Today our total oil stock—crude, gasoline, distillate, fuel, and lubricating oils—amounts to 515,132,000, as against 689,166,000 barrels in 1929. In other words, in 14 years our stock is down 174,034,000 barrels.

Our reserves are being drawn upon this year at the highest rate in history, and, because of the essential nature of oil in war, the rate of withdrawal must continue to increase. The danger that we shall overdraw our oil account before we win the war is no longer something imagined; it is looking us right in the eye and from a very narrow distance away.

Admitting that oil is the one commodity we cannot do without, what are we doing about the situation in which we find ourselves scraping the bottom of our gasoline tanks?

There are two ways to make our oil supply last longer. One is to cut down on consumption, which we cannot do without hurting our chances of victory in this war. The other is to go out and find new oil to add to our reserve supply.

We are not doing the last. The new reserves found in 1938 amounted to 1,894,000,000 barrels. That was the last year in which discovery exceeded or equaled consumption. In 1942 new oil found amounted to 260,051,000 barrels, and in the first half of 1943 the figure was 171,000,000, less than one-fourth of the amount taken out through the wells.

There is a direct relation between decline of discovery and decline of drilling. In 1937 the number of new wells drilled was 31,106 and 22,143 of them were producers. In 1941 the number of wells drilled dropped to 29,070; in 1942, to 17,934; and in the first half of this year the number was 7,823. The percentage of failure in 1941 was 24, in 1942 it was 31, and in the first 6 months of the present year it was 34 percent.

In 1937, the peak year of recent drilling, 1 productive well was completed for each 57,868 barrels of oil produced. In 1941 the ratio was 1 well to 73,052 barrels produced, and in the first half of 1943 it was 1 well to 164,880 barrels produced.

It is obvious that in every way our petroleum account is dwindling. We are taking out more and faster than we are putting in.

The key to the whole situation is the "wildcatter," which is the industry's term for the man who goes hunting oil where it has never been found before. War emergency officials who have to date opposed a price increase for oil assert that the wildcatting program is normal. But normality is not enough in wartime. No other industry—and none of them is so important in war as oil production—has been held to normal. A normal number of ships, normal food production on the farms, normal output of coal, iron, copper, would not win the war, and steps were taken to raise all above normal. All except oil.

Wildcatting, of course, is not the sole answer to the oil shortage. The output of currently producing fields can be stimulated in several ways, all costing money. Here, again, price is the thing.

Costs of producing oil have mounted since the United States entered the war, as have costs of all other kinds of production. Material costs are higher, wages are higher, taxes have increased. Everything the oil producer does in the normal course of his business costs more money. His income has not increased.

In 1939 the cost of discovering oil, expressed in terms of barrels, was 12 cents; in 1942 it was 40 cents. Average weekly wages of labor in oil production now stand at $48.25, an increase of $7.95 since 1942 and $11.88 since 1941.

These figures show how the oil producer is being squeezed on the cost side. On the price side, the Department of Commerce's index, on July 17, showed all commodities at 102.9, all raw materials at 113.4 and wages at 170.4, with crude petroleum at 62.2 and petroleum products at 62.5, all these figures being percentages with 1926 prices taken as 100. Thus, in relation to other prices, the oil producer must trade two-thirds more oil for his dollar in 1943 than in 1926 and his 1943 dollar buys for him one-sixth less materials and one-third less labor than in 1926.

These are the factors on which informed people in the oil industry 2 years ago warned of the shortage impending. Correction then would have averted the shortage and removed the danger to our military effort and to our domestic economy. Now the shortage is here, and correction has not yet been made.

The O. P. A. has stood in the way for 2 years and seems determined to continue to stand in the way. If Congress does not awaken to the danger, we shall inevitably sustain irreparable damage even if we manage to get through to victory with enough oil to move our planes, tanks, and ships.

Address to American Bar Association by Robert M. Hutchins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, since the words of the presidents of our great universities are always of general public interest, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered at the last meeting of the American Bar Association by President Robert M. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since war is for the sake of peace, the success of a war depends upon the kind of peace which follows it. Though brilliant military operations may be necessary to success, they by no means guarantee it. It would be hard to say who won most of the major wars that have afflicted the world in the last 150 years. It would be as hard to say who is winning this one.

In order to fight a successful war, you have to know what kind of peace you want, and you have to wage the kind of war that is likely to give you that kind of peace. As far as appears on the surface the American people simply want peace, which they think of as the absence of disturbance. Fascists are disturbers. If we can get rid of them the chances of quiet will be improved. Mussolini was one of the three symbols that we were fighting against. Now, Mussolini has disappeared and we are still fighting Italy. This suggests that we are not entirely sure what, or whom, we are after.

The notion that you go to war to put a period to the ambitions of disturbers has been popular for many years. Napoleon and the Kaiser were discussed in the same terms as the Fascists today. It may be that one reason why we have the most vicious of all disturbers in our own day is that previous generations thought of nothing but getting rid of disturbers in theirs. If we think of nothing but getting rid of disturbers now, future generations will not thank us for the tremendous effort we are making in their behalf. We shall destroy Hitler; we may set the stage for one far worse than he. And yet when anybody suggests that we ought to try to figure out the kind of peace we want, the answer is: "Let us get on with the war." The reply might be: "Get on where?"

We must fight for something and we must know what it is. We may here disregard the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. Their inadequacy is revealed by the fact that nobody has thought of mentioning them to Italy. No, the word to Italy is unconditional surrender, the most direct expression of naked power.

We have a mystical notion that all the issues that perplex us are going to be settled by improvements in transportation. They will give us one world. A colleague of mine has asked, one world, but whose? We may also inquire, one world, but how long? And one world, but what kind? One world which brings in closer contact the sparks of greed and ambition is sure to be in constant explosion. One world under one tyrant, or one association of tyrants, would be worse than many. In many worlds there is at least the chance of escape from one to the other.

But let us suppose that by one world we mean one good world. Will we stop to ask what one good world involves? It involves, unless we propose to kill them all, the Germans, Japanese, and Italians. If we are to fight a war for one good world which will include the Germans, Japanese, and Italians, we ought to conduct the war in such a way that their incorporation in one world will be as painless and complete as possible. If this is what we are aiming at, the words unconditional surrender, as the sole, exclusive, and final offer to the people of Germany, Italy, and Japan, seem an unpromising beginning. Mr. Churchill's talk of searing and scarring Italy does not automatically lead to the conclusion that the United Nations are dedicated to the brotherhood of man. The bombing of Hamburg may hasten unconditional surrender, but it is likely to have other consequences unfavorable to the formation and duration of one good world. And the present excitement about so-called war criminals has melancholy connotations for those who remember Lloyd George's disingenuous slogan, "Hang the Kaiser."

In the last war we said we were fighting against bad governments, not against the peoples who happened to be suffering under them. We have made no such distinction in this war. The Russians have; we have not. yet the distinction is not only fundamental to one good world. It is simply common sense. Governments pass; peoples remain. If you say that the peoples of the Axis must be incorrigibly bad because their governments desire world domination, I answer, first, that if we can associate only with peoples who have never had governments desiring world domination, our contacts with Europe will be limited to the Swiss; and second, that we may well recall in this crisis what Edmund Burke said of us in another: "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people."

One good world involves tremendous sacrifices. Mr. Churchill says to his people, "We will keep what we have." Queen Wilhelmina says to hers, "Our empire after the war will be greater than ever." These statements are appropriate to belligerents fighting to keep what they have or regain what they have lost. They are hardly harbingers of one good world, unless we assume that the status quo ante bellum portrays the ideal toward which we should strive.

One good world will demand the sacrifice of the political independence of every sovereign state. A world at peace must be politically one. A world that is politically one may not be at peace, for it may be afflicted with civil war. But if it is not politically one it cannot be at peace. Sovereign nations must have disputes, and disputes among sovereign nations must be settled by war. If they are settled in any other way, the nations are not sovereign.

It is possible for victorious nations to get together to hold down the conquered by force. This has always been tried and has always failed. It has, at any rate, nothing to do with one good world. A very bad world may be obtained in the same way. It may be supposed that an international police force has some connection with one good world. It has none in the absence of world law and world government. In the absence of world law and world government the armed forces of the conquerors assert their right to maintain an order acceptable to the conquerors, and that right is based on power and power alone. Conquerors asserting a right based on power alone are no more entitled to the name of police than Himmler's men in Czechoslovakia.

Every American schoolboy knows why the Articles of Confederation did not work. It may be said that even the Constitution of 1789 did not work, because a great and bloody war was necessary to establish that this was one Nation and not a collection of independent States. Union Now, regional confederations, or a world confederation cannot work any more than the Articles of Confederation did, and their sole usefulness would be that of the Articles of Confederation, namely, to demonstrate to the feeblest intelligence the necessity of a more perfect union. The American States were fairly homogeneous and very remote. Both their enemies and friends were too preoccupied to bother them. They had the safety valve of a new country and the western lands. More than all, they had completed a successful war against a common enemy, not against one another. Everything was on their side except one thing, and that was the form of political organization they had selected. No organization which contemplates the continued existence of independent sovereignties can produce a lasting peace, and to assume that it can is to deceive ourselves and suffer a disillusionment proportionate to our hopes.

In one good world every man is our neighbor, because every man is our fellow citizen. The commands of the political community supplement the demands of charity. One good world is a world of free trade and free immigration. The goods and the people of China, India, and Japan must have the same right to enter this country as the goods and people of Illinois have to travel through it. Two weeks ago the council of the American Federation of Labor, in response to the suggestion that China was our ally, voted to reaffirm its support of the Chinese Exclusion Act. Mr. William Green took the occasion to announce that "A Chinaman is still a Chinaman." If this is so, the one good world at which Mr. Green doutbless aims is still far off.

Our traditional attitude toward the rest of the world has been expressed in the old question, "Should foreigners be abolished—or should we save some to sell things to?" We have been dedicated to a policy of high tariffs and no immigration. Fifteen years ago we regarded national relief of the unemployed as revolutionary socialism. Our system of social security is only 8 years old. We are not yet ready to give national aid to the education of underprivileged American children. And yet, in one good world, we should be called on to support, to educate, to buy from, and to receive as fellow citizens, men of every race, creed, and color, at every economic level, and at every stage of ignorance or enlightenment.

One good world requires more than the sacrifice of ancient prejudices. It requires the formulation and adoption of common principles and common ideals. It requires that this be done on a world-wide basis. A world organization cannot be held together simply by fear. Not transportation but communication lies at the foundation of any durable community. Transportation hastens consolidation; there is no doubt about that. In the last century it has hastened consolidation of the most unstable and disagreeable kind, consolidation by conquest. One good world presupposes that the moral, intellectual, and spiritual foundations of the community have been laid. Otherwise the improvement of transportation must simply mean more frequent and terrible wars leading to the despotism of that power which discovers how best to apply the latest inventions in transportation to the destruction of its neighbors. In the absence of general agreement on the purpose of the state and the terrestrial end of man the world must be literally at cross-purposes.

I do not want to exaggerate the role of common principles in producing a durable community. We all know that there is an interaction between institutions and attitudes. This is what the Greeks meant by saying that law is an educational force and that the city educates the man. The Constitution of the United States has educated the people of this country to believe in and support the Constitution of the United States. But the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself show that common ideals animated our forefathers and made it possible for them to bring e pluribus unum. The different fate of the French Revolution is to be explained in part by the drastic revisions which separated the ranks of the people in France, who were united only by a desire to throw off absolute rule, and who, when it was thrown off, could be brought together again only by the despotism of Napoleon.

The ultimate goal is world democracy, for only democracy recognizes the humanity of man, his destiny on earth, and the state as the servant of that destiny. The principle is that all men are equal before the law, and that all men, because they are men, have the right to participate in selecting their governors and in framing the laws under which they and their governors shall live. Any limitations on this principle must be temporary, and they must be uniform. If, for example, it is felt that nobody should vote for a representative in the parliament of the world unless he can read and write, then free schools must be established in every part of the world, and the illiterate in Alabama must suffer the same disqualification as the illiterate in the Congo. If you ask why I insist that any durable world society must be a democratic society, I reply that a durable world society must be a just society; for people will fight until they get their rights. Only a democratic society is a just society, for only a democratic society acknowledges those rights which human nature carries with it.

It is this view of a democratic world community, and not my professional bias, which makes me attach overwhelming importance to education. Education is the chief means by which the community seeks to work out and clarify its principles and make them common to its members. If every person in the world is to be free, then he must be educated for freedom. The virtue and intelligence of every man must be so trained that he is prepared to rule and be ruled in turn for the good life of the whole community.

The mere mention of these as the aims of education shows not merely what great financial sacrifices but also what enormous intellectual and moral effort they will demand. In our own democratic country these are not the aims of education. In three words the aims of American education are health, wealth, and recreation. We may admit the importance of all three and still assert that the American educational system is not educating our own citizens for freedom and is not prepared to play a leading part, as Mr. HENRY WALLACE has proposed, in the reeducation of the Germans and the Japanese. The Germans and the Japanese already have educational systems adequately directed to health, wealth, and recreation.

One may be permitted to doubt whether America is in any sense prepared for world democracy. Though we are the most democratic of nations, we have yet to get rid of certain beams in our own eye that must distort our view of democracy on a world scale. The divisions among us between those who work and do not own and those who own and do not work; the poll tax; racial discrimination, from which the American Bar Association is not free; government by pressure groups rather than the rule of all for the good of all—these things must go far to thwart any commitment on our part to a world society in which they must disappear, a society which cannot emerge in even embryonic form without our aid.

These things also militate against the most effective use of America's greatest power, the power of example. Other nations cannot be forced to be democratic, much less to remain peaceful members of a democratic world society. They must be persuaded. Surely the most persuasive argument, the argument which proves that democracy is not an unattainable or an undesirable ideal, is the practice of democracy in one great country and the justice, the unity, the peace, and the happiness which it brings with it. This involves a series of very painful operations, the removal of the beams from our own eye.

If we must give up our political independence, if we must suffer a threat to our material well-being, and if we must alter our habits of thought and action to obtain one good world, can its early arrival be expected? Certainly not. We are not prepared for these sacrifices. But we may as well face the issue. If we mean to have one good world, we must make these sacrifices. If we do not mean to make these sacrifices, then let's stop talking about one good world. Let us look forward to centuries more of carnage, each made more terrible than the last by the greater and greater power which technology will place in the hands of him who is ready to grasp and to wield it. For even if we and our allies and our enemies were all committed to a peaceful, unified, democratic organization of the world, even if we had the ideals and institutions calculated to create and sustain it, those institutions would have to pass through many long, distressing years before our dreams could become reality. The reformation of the world's political system and the renovation of its moral, intellectual, and spiritual atmosphere cannot be accomplished in 2 or 3 months around a peace table or 2 or 3 years in a palace at Geneva. We can expect no miracles. But we can decide what we want. We can fight the war in terms of that decision. We can make a peace that takes us some short distance along the path to permanent peace. We can refuse to join in the enforcement of any peace that is unjust, undemocratic, or unlikely to lead us toward our ultimate goal. And, above all, we can prepare ourselves. If we can become convinced and comprehending citizens of a country that understands and practices democracy, it may be—who knows?—that our children's children, or perhaps their children's children, will be loyal Americans and at the same time citizens of one good world.

World-Wide Conditions Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on Friday, September 10, 1943, Associate Justice William O. Douglas delivered an address before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco on the subject World-Wide Conditions Today. I have received several requests that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I now ask that it be so printed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are living in an era of fundamental change. One age is giving way to another. The process of change was set in motion before the present war began. The war is indeed a violent chapter in its history. But this war—huge and disturbing as it is—is hardly the last chapter in the transition.

The war is a challenge. It is a challenge not only to our ability to produce guns and tanks and planes, and to use them in the field. If that were all, we would not be talking and thinking about the future as we all are doing today. But the war is more than the immediate challenge of military might which we are meeting so triumphantly. It is part of a continuing challenge to our whole way of life.

Military victory will not automatically provide a solution to those problems. Something more will be required of us Our moral stamina as well as our fighting strength is being tested. For it is up to us to prove that our democracy can adapt itself to new circumstances, yet carry with it the values it has achieved in the past. This war is a test—a test of our wisdom, and our strength, and our faith.

China, Britain, Russia—each passed the test of survival. Their successes were not lucky accidents. They were genuine victories, earned by millions of people. They demonstrated a basic principle of history. Each battle proved that national integrity is a prerequisite of national survival. The cases of China, Britain, and Russia show that, in time of supreme national crisis, when a people have only their faith left to fight with, they can—if they feel they must—convert and transmute their national integrity into a decisive weapon of national defense.

We need not be concerned when the minds of the American people are in a ferment of doubt. Trial by doubt is an ordeal from which nations, like men and women, gain both wisdom and stamina. Nor should we be frightened when a world crisis provokes a mood of self-questioning among us. This doubt, this self-questioning, is not mysterious nor humiliating. On the contrary, it is a challenge which a vigorous and healthy people must always welcome. It is a challenge which should make us glad to be living at a time when so much is demanded of us, when entire nations can rise to heroic heights. In the history of mankind turbulent years are more nearly normal than placid ones. Societies either advance or they disintegrate. That is, perhaps, the first law of life.

Any era of transition or change provokes uncertainties. The old dogmas are no longer sure. The old truths seem to have been refuted. At such times—and especially when the climax of a great and bloody war is approaching—the whole basis of life is invariably altered. We cannot know what will come to take its place. But we may all be sure that the end of this war will be the signal for the beginning of a new struggle * * * a struggle of a different kind. It will be on the moral and social front.

Upon our skill and wisdom in that endeavor will depend our chance of building successfully a new America; of shaping her to our historic ideals; of making her new stature a guaranty of freedom, of strength, and of promise to the world; of saving a new generation from the terrible necessity of having to fight another World War.

We cannot escape the test nor evade the issue by pretending that the familiar world of the past 60 or 70 years is more than a memory and a tradition. We were brought up to live by its facts and ideals. We honor our past, and we propose to live by our traditions, not blindly, but selectively and intelligently.

America has never stifled life; it has always grown. America has never worshipped any imaginary absolute of perfection. As a people we have understood that a gulf must always separate what men have from what men want. That is why we are tireless in our pursuit of the better.

America has endured, America has remained true to herself because she has changed many times. The men who created this country knew that empires and eras, like people, grow old, become feeble, and die. The men who have spoken for this country in every chapter of her growth have known it, too.

In the same spirit of reverence for our dynamic past, with the most profound determination to use the great American tradition as a living guide to the world about to be created, we must admit frankly that the world into which we were born has died. We will dishonor our past if we deny the challenge of today. We, the generations now living, have a great historic chance to preserve the ideals we inherited. It is the same chance our fathers had. But it is also up to us to discover new goals, to find the new truths which the new age we are moving into will need, if the Americans of the future are to be proud of their history and traditions.

The task will not be easy. We'll have to make up our minds to live with our doubts and with our worries, with the problems to which no one today can give a simple or positive answer. While we must not underestimate the job, neither must we let its complexity * * * its immensity * * * appal us. This is not a country of men who are refugees from the past. This is not a nation of men and women who cling to the past because they do not understand the present and because they fear the future. Nor is it a country of men who are willing to sell their souls for a promise of security. This is a country of men and women who will accept the challenge of what lies ahead—all of them ready to do their part; all of them living with a sense of responsibility to their children and to the American creed they want to hand on to their children's children.

The last great period of change and growth which America went through, some 80 years ago, was more like our own than we have been brought up to think.

The 1840's and 1850's were a time of social ferment and intellectual probing. People were beginning to reexamine the values that their parents and grandparents had lived by. New religious groups sprang up just as new political ideas did in our day. And the period was climaxed by a war as bitterly fought and as fundamental in the changes it brought about as any in history.

Abraham Lincoln was not only the protagonist of his age. He was the symbol of all its inner meaning. No man could have been more tortured by doubt. No man could have felt more deeply the consequences of the action he knew he must take—action that he was sure was right—and yet which destroyed a way of life and meant death for thousands of young men.

Lincoln met the challenge of his own time successfully. But no one knew better than he that there would be new challenges to meet, new periods of change and doubt, new ages of transition and revaluation. Some of the problems of his age still face us. Lincoln left us no panacea, no lifeless and entire peace. He handed down to us, rather, an opportunity to preserve America in its own image, an opportunity to build anew. What he felt and thought and suffered is a barometer of all the spiritual striving and search of his era and a measure of its heritage for us.

Out of the confusion and disorder of that day came one of the most vigorous and lusty periods the world has ever seen. The age of crude growth and ruthless strength is not one that we want to repeat. But the vitality and the promise of our post Civil War life were as real as its crudeness. There is no reason for us to think that America cannot experience such growth again. Out of our own experience can come a spirit as powerful but wiser, a purpose equally determined but even better fitted to the world of tomorrow.

The decision of the Civil War that all labor in America would be free labor ushered in the greatest, most dynamic of all industrial revolutions. To some, looking back today, it is a golden age of enlightened self-interest and free enterprise. To others, it is the dark story of the marauding barons of high finance, of exploitation, and nothing more.

Neither of these views tells the story, which is far more dramatic than any special pleading can make it. The last 80 years saw us grow from a sprawling adolescent, importing economy to an industrial power greater in many ways than all the rest of the world put together. Our wilderness became farm land; our frontiers were transformed by blast furnaces and machine shops and factories of every kind. We were needlessly wasteful of our resources, and we left problems and evils in our path. But we made more things than any nation had ever made before and we gave more of them to more people. We were America. We were the trail blazer of the world. We pictured abundance to succeed scarcity. And we groped toward that goal.

But what we gave to our people—what our people made and took for themselves—was not just wealth and material things. We also made new liberties. No nation has ever been free as we have been free. Nor did any nation ever dare dream of growing as free as we did. The immigrants from Europe who came to our shores had heard stories—incredible stories—of gold in the streets, and shoes for everyone. But it was the other stories they heard, the stories that had the word liberty in them, that also brought them across what was then the wide Atlantic. It was the news that you could say what you wanted, and think what you wanted in America; that you could worship your God or argue about Him as your conscience told you to; that you could become a citizen and vote for the people who governed you; that you did not have to cringe before officers in uniform, that your children could go to school, free school, and learn to read and write and grow up to be somebody. They learned that civil liberties meant not only their right to say what they liked and the other fellow's right to say what he liked. They learned that the true meaning of those liberties was the right of the other fellow to say what they did not like.

Because of these things they learned to live together with other people whose fathers their fathers had always fought in the Old World. They and their children became Americans. They came, and they worked, and they fought as they are fighting now. They learned how to speak their minds and make their needs and desires felt while accepting the equal right of people of different views to do the same. They made themselves a place alongside the descendants of the older waves of immigrants. Because they could do this, because it was the freest land in the world, America became the richest.

That is the primary lesson we can learn from the earlier era of American development. Our people won new liberties. They did not reach utopia. No one ever will. But within the wide framework of those new liberties we were able to produce the good things of life more abundantly than any other nation. Our wealth and our power have been a direct outgrowth of our freedom.

In that connection let us not forget that in the last century we offered the common man something few other nations did—opportunity. He was not bound by inherited class distinctions. He could make money, win professional distinctions, acquire political power within the framework of a republic, or simply pursue his own idea of

happiness as he wanted within the bounds of a reasonable penal code.

Those are the ideals of freedom and liberty that have made us the inspiration of the world.

Those are the ideals of liberty and freedom for the individual which we must never lose.

Now that our position in the world—our very existence as a nation—is being challenged, all Americans are considering what our policy toward the rest of the world should be when the war is won.

Some say the rest of the world is no concern of ours, that we ought to let it stew in its own juice while we devote ourselves to solving our own problems. Others feel that our problems are merely a part of international issues and that we must take on the responsibility for solving those international problems before we can expect to get anywhere with domestic questions.

Each group is convinced that only the attitude it advocates will protect our liberties, and that to follow the rival course would ruin democracy in America.

If we look at the influence on the world that this country has had in the past, we may get a clue to how we ought to behave in the future. It is perfectly true that our domestic problems are part of a larger picture. All that we do to solve our problems at home is immediately radiated out to the rest of the world.

At the same time, we should not forget that every other nation knows more about its own troubles and problems than we do or ever can. No matter how high our ideals or motives, we can hardly qualify as managers of the affairs of other nations. What may be good for them may be anathema to us or vice versa. The history, the traditions of people vary throughout the world. Each must work out its own destiny. We should let others have the same free choice which we reserve for ourselves.

Even if we wanted to, we could not assume sole responsibility for solving international problems.

Moreover, we must not disparage and underestimate other peoples' ability to help themselves.

But there is a great deal we can do. We cannot force other countries to act as we wish or to emulate our way of life. But if America continues to be a country worth following, she will be followed. If our standard of life and our respect for the individual and his freedom are still vital and inspiring, they will inevitably awaken similar desires in other lands.

But other peoples must feel that our attitude toward them is friendly. We must show them that we are more than a great tutor; that we can learn as well as teach.

Above all, our word must be good.

The world is going to need—and it will welcome—as much competition as the people of America have always insisted on at home.

Liberties cannot be forced upon people. But we can kindle the imagination of the citizens of other continents with the idea that they would do well to achieve such liberties for themselves. After all, nothing succeeds like success.

We cannot expect our prestige throughout the world to rise above the level of our own accomplishment at home. Our world problem, far from conflicting with our domestic job, should stimulate us to do it better. If we want the security of friendship with like-minded neighbors, we will show the world that our democracy can outperform any other system. No counterpropaganda can stand against that.

In the era now ending we have been the inspiration of the world, the symbol of progress to even the most progressive countries. To keep the American tradition alive, we must continue as the trail blazer of the world in the age now dawning.

During the crisis of Lincoln's day, the political party in power in England was ready to enter our Civil War against the North. It was the common people of Britain who stopped the move. The war meant hardship to the textile workers of Manchester, thrown out of employment because the northern blockade was cutting off supplies of cotton. But although the British Navy might have broken the blockade and put them back to work, although gentlemen across the sea who were supposed to be so wise were for war, the textile workers protested. America was not just the country that sent them their raw material. America was a dream in their hearts. They would not fight her. They would not let their rulers make war upon her

Those people are allies worth having. They are the ones who said in England 4 years ago, "We will have no more appeasement. We will honor our obligation to Poland." They are the ones who 3 years ago stood up when hell rained on London and Coventry, on Bristol and Portsmouth.

They are the Chinese farmers who turn soldier by night, who keep Japanese rifles hidden in their huts and blow up bridges with home-made hand grenades and risk torture that China may live.

They are the Russian people who held at Stalingrad and today roll back the Nazi hordes toward Berlin.

Those silent millions are our real neighbors in the world now being born. They are taking the place of the decadent and irresponsible castes that traditionally controlled old-world politics. They have moved closer and closer to the council tables where power politics has always flourished.

Those silent millions—the common people of the world—are paying for the war, as they have paid for all wars, with their blood and their suffering. They insist that the world of tomorrow offer more to youth than the creed of cynicism. They insist that the world of tomorrow not make a mockery of those killed and sacrified in this war.

We failed in 1918. We must be wiser this time. We must attain new maturity if we are to make our victory in this war a fitting end to the struggle that achieved it. Our chances of success increase with the ascendancy of these silent millions to a greater position of power.

To fight in the manner of the Allies, a nation must have more than a fine army and good equipment. There has to be an idea in the hearts of the people, soldiers and civilians, that will give them something to balance against the supreme sacrifices of war.

The fighters and the working men and women of the Allied Nations are not waging war on the basis of lies and deceptions and false promises. They have ideas about what they expect their world to be at the end of the war and how they want to improve it. Those ideas are largely private and unexpressed, but they are there. You might call them individual war aims. But they are private and personal only on the surface. Underneath they are so widespread and universally held that they point to fundamental change in the shape of the world, to more freedom and better material conditions for all.

That combination, that determination to gain new liberties and higher standards of living at the same time is very American. If the fiery hope for freedom is the heart of the dream, the material gains are its outward symbol. Today that American dream is burning all over Europe and Asia. It burns brightly in the lands successfully closing in toward victory. It burns sullenly and obstinately in the hearts of the conquered who await a new day. It has now been kindled anew in Italy. With the end of the war it will shape itself into a drive of such force that it can be ignored by none.

On the material plane we see first of all irresistible pressure for a universal rise in living standards. There will be a demand for material necessities and luxuries of life even from the most backward economies. To meet that demand new industrial areas will appear and old ones will grow larger. What happened in America 60 and 70 years ago will begin to happen in other nations throughout the world.

That new industrialization need not be a threat to us. The increased productivity of one nation can profit all its sisters. A higher standard of living in Europe and Asia and Latin America will mean enormously increased markets for our goods.

Nothing could be more fallacious than the ancient theory that backward peoples can be exploited as outlets for industrially produced goods. Even if backward peoples want such goods, they do not have the money to pay for them. Profitable trade can exist only between countries on a fairly equal footing economically.

We should not be disturbed if the other nations of the earth begin to grow more like our own. In fact, America can expect to profit from the economic gains other continents are sure to make in much the same way as our industrial East is bound to gain from our development of new productivity here in the West.

With more and more things in common with other nations we can come closer and closer toward a real and functioning community of nations. And we must not forget that any real community of nations can exist only among equals. Our own history proves that.

Some think our period of leadership in the world is ended. Some say we shall have to yield our position of trail blazer to some other more dynamic power. But I cannot agree. I believe that we will go on to realize a way of life better than has ever existed before. America is not decadent. It has never been so strong. Its truly great achievements lie ahead of it.

The future will be strange to us. Its problems will be new. They will be more difficult than any we have had. None of us knows what new thing we shall make together here in America during the years of trial and struggle ahead.

But of one thing I am sure. What we make will not be a denial of our past. America will reverence freedom as it always has We shall not surrender or compromise our ideals of liberty and freedom for the individual. We shall not lose the basic civil liberties guaranteed at the birth of our country in the Bill of Rights and supplemented during the years of our growth by Congress and the courts. Those rights are the touchstone of what we must demand from the future. As long as our citizens are free to think, to write, to speak, to vote as they please, we can never be untrue to ourselves and our past—and we can never fear to compete with any nation for a position of moral leadership in the world.

Address by Mayor Walter Chandler at the Dedication of the Kenneth D. McKellar Airfield at Jackson, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an address delivered on the 5th day of July, 1943, by Hon. Walter Chandler, at one time a Member of Congress from Tennessee, and now mayor of the city of Memphis, Tenn., on the occasion of the dedication of the Kenneth D. McKellar Airfield at Jackson, Tenn.

At this time I desire to call attention to one or two observations which were made by the speaker on this occasion concerning my colleague with respect to air mail service in the United States. I quote from a portion of the address of Mayor Chandler as follows:

One of the earlier and most important acts of Senator MCKELLAR, after becoming a member of the United States Senate, was to sponsor the first air mail service in the United States. And that became the first scheduled air mail service in the world. It took a fight on the floor of the Senate to carry this measure. In the course of the debate Senator MCKELLAR said: "I have no doubt that the time will come when we will use them (airships) for a hundred different purposes, and that the world will feel that it could hardly get along without them."

Since that time, Senator MCKELLAR has never relaxed his interest in and support of aviation in all its branches, including legislation for the development of landing areas, and air navigation facilities, as military necessities and for civil uses.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The arrangements committee for this occasion is most courteous to invite me to return to my old home and take part in the dedication of this splendid airport named for a distinguished citizen of my present home. Those who made the decision to honor Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR in this most appropriate way have recognized not only the outstanding public service of one who has represented the State of Tennessee in the United States Senate longer than any of her other illustrious sons, but whose unexcelled record for the promotion of aviation in all its phases richly deserves permanent acknowledgement such as you are beginning today.

The suggestion of one of your leading citizens, Mr. Clarence E. Pigford, that this airport be named for Senator MCKELLAR was not intended just as a compliment to a loyal friend and faithful public official of high accomplishments. It is timely recognition of the extraordinary leadership of Senator MCKELLAR in the development of military and commercial aviation, and domestic, insular, and foreign air-mail service—a record not equalled by any Member of Congress at any time.

As early as 1917, while a Member of the House of Representatives, and on the Committee on Military Affairs, Senator MCKELLAR advocated and secured an appropriation of $9,000,000 for aviation. At that time, he said significantly, "Regardless of cost, we ought to have planes. We ought to build up this service. It is an instrument of warfare we must have, and we must never be found without it."

One of the earlier and most important acts of Senator MCKELLAR after becoming a Member of the United States Senate was to sponsor the first air-mail service in the United States. And that became the first scheduled air-mail service in the world. It took a fight on the floor of the Senate to carry this measure. In the course of the debate, Senator MCKELLAR said:

"I have no doubt that the time will come when we will use them (airships) for a hundred different purposes, and that the world will feel that it could hardly get along without them."

Since that time Senator MCKELLAR has never relaxed his interest in, and support of, aviation in all its branches, including legislation for the development of airports, landing areas, and air-navigation facilities as military necessities and for civil uses. All the great appropriation measures dealing with military and civilian aviation during the last 10 years have passed through the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and Senator MCKELLAR, as the ranking majority member of that powerful committee, has had the responsibility and satisfaction of carrying those measures to success.

Moreover, Senator MCKELLAR is entitled to high praise and unlimited commendation for his untiring efforts in the development of our foreign mail service. American mail planes have spanned the Atlantic and Pacific in the extension of our international postal service, and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, Senator MCKELLAR has been in the forefront of every effort relating to the transportation of foreign mail by aircraft.

Thus, not only this truly fine airfield but airports throughout America very properly can carry the name of KENNETH D. MCKELLAR.

To me, it is a matter of genuine pride to see the city of my birth, which I still love, with all the recollections of my childhood, go forward in every way. You already have a strategic rail center and a favorable industrial situation. The city is large enough to take care of very substantial expansions. You are situated where you can derive fullest benefits from the T. V. A. program. You have excellent water facilities, and as fine people as can be found anywhere. Jackson is located in the heart of a farming territory which is bound to become a dairying, trucking, and livestock section. You pioneered under the leadership of Sam Lancaster in the building of farm-to-market roads, and now you are entering the field of aviation.

You have taken time by the forelock. You have not waited until the post-war era, which the prophets are prophesying will be the air age. You have recognized presciently that the aviation facilities of a city and county will be a true criterion of the enterprise of that community. An airport like this is the hallmark of a city.

Your municipal and county officials; your Congressmen, Herron Pearson and TOM MURRAY; the members of the airport committee; your most progressive newspaper, the Jackson Sun; and your chamber of commerce are entitled to heartiest congratulations and lasting gratitude for their foresight and intelligent persistence in going forward with this most comprehensive aviation program. No one can foresee all that will take place with aeronautic progress, but it is safe to predict that the most optimistic viewpoints will prove to be conservative and realistic even in the generation in which we are living, not to mention the coming generation of young Americans, all of whom already want to learn to fly.

In the air lanes between earth and sky miles become fractions of a minute. Winged engines purr us onward, demolishing time and space and reducing the globe to a community. Young in years is mankind's air life, but it is saving years and is the "solvent of our geography as well as the disturber of our complacency and the defender of our security."

In such a scheme of things Jackson must not be in second place. With this auspicious beginning you have thrilling opportunities for the future. Today the Kenneth D. McKellar Airport is doing its part toward winning the war. Tomorrow you will see air mail and air passenger service for foreign as well as domestic ports. Local and express aircraft will link the cities of America into one great network. Areas adjacent to airports will become industrial sites and freight depots for air cargo users, and the rates of express and passenger travel will be lowered to meet automobile, truck, and rail transportation costs. As air traffic does not follow sea lanes, but chooses the shortest distance between points, the great commercial centers of the world can be reached from this port.

Yes; this is only the beginning. The ultimate will depend on the courage and determination of those who now and in the approaching years have the destiny of Jackson in their hands. Boldness of action is necessary. No timid, creeping advances will suffice. Experience already has developed safe and sound principles of aviation, and the Federal and State Governments are attacking the problem of aviation planning so efficiently that the advice and guidance of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Tennessee Bureau of Aeronautics should be sought at frequent intervals. Keep abreast of the most progressive developments. The race for commercial and industrial supremacy is already on, even in the midst of the most terrible war in history. Men of action in all lands are vying for position in international trade, well knowing that all through history the means of transportation have had marked effects on the economic and cultural living within nations as well as among the countries of our earth.

To you who are receiving your training on this field for the purpose of serving our country, may the lessons received and the experience gained equip you well to meet and defeat the enemy. Make certain that he dies for his country rather than you for yours. Thus far, advocates of victory by air have proven their case. While I still believe that the last great battle of this war will be fought on land by tired men, the Air Corps will furnish not only aerial observation but the flying artillery support that is essential to success in modern warfare.

In this picture we cannot overlook the Navy—the mistress of the seas—but we must recognize the arrival of the master of the air; and, henceforth, world peace will depend preeminently on the power of military and commercial aviation to reduce the size of the world so that those who may design to conquer will have to look to other worlds than ours.

So we dedicate this airfield to the promotion of aviation and all its possibilities; to the future—with ever more speed—five to six hundred miles per hour, daily planes to Europe with hundreds of passengers, safe flight, weather regardless, and little planes for you and me.

May this investment of the people of Jackson and Madison County pay big dividends in success and progress; may its name be written high in the sky, and may the new horizons to be seen from the air open for us all the vision of a better world for mankind everywhere.

In Defense of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "In Defense of Freedom," delivered by State Senator Robert E. Brokenburr, at the dedication of a plaque to men from Highland Place neighborhood in the armed forces of the United States, at Indianapolis, Ind., on September 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At least 116 young men of our neighborhood have joined the armed forces of our great and good country. They have thereby become a part of that larger body called the armed forces of the united powers of the world.

Finer young men were never born. They are among the best products of ages of progress of the human race. They are the pride of this good, patriotic neighborhood. They have gone forth to make our great and good State proud of them. They intend to make our illustrious Nation an expanding, vigorous Democracy glad that they are hers. They have left behind them loved ones with whom they would delight to live forever, but these very loved ones, their neighbors, their neighborhood, State, and country are in danger and they have gone forth to save them by crushing their ruthless foe. Although we hope that this will not come to pass, it may be that in the fight they will lay down their lives. Be it remembered that greater love hath no man than this, that he lay down his life for his friends, his neighborhood, and his country.

These are our boys in a very personal sense. We have contacted many of them daily. We have made many suggestions to them about their personal affairs and they have done the same to us. We have received from many among them a smile that has set us right for a hard day's work. Often at eventide a joke has come from those among them, the effect of which has lingered long and made us happier and better neighbors. Their voices, their whistles, their style of dress, and their mannerisms were and are the common property of this neighborhood.

By their conduct these young patriots will be cumulative evidence supporting the thesis of those who brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, and therefore equality before just and righteous laws, equality of opportunity to make the best possible man, woman, or child of him or herself; equality in freedom of speech, freedom of movement, freedom from fear, freedom from want, and freedom to accumulate according to will and capacity, shall not be denied anyone.

These young men are now giving their lives solely that this Nation and freedom shall not perish from the earth and that freedom and righteousness shall prevail all over the world. In doing this they answer the call of the world's greatest Nation and the call of the God of the universe. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should have this dedication.

However, we must not go away from here feeling that dedicating this plaque is a sufficient expression of our pride and interest in and appreciation of these boys. We must make this an occasion of rededicating our lives to a continuing all-out fight of everybody to win this war and thereby defeat forever our enemies, the enemies of progress and of our God. Then will our Nation have a new birth of freedom and righteousness. It will not perish from the earth, but will cooperate with the nations of light against the forces of darkness and lead the world to peace and good will.

Lest We Fail Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, last Memorial Day Hon. John Brett, assistant district attorney for the western district of Oklahoma, delivered an address at the city of Bristow, Okla. The subject was Lest We Fail Again. Because of the outstanding character of the address, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled here to wreathe the graves of our soldier dead with garlands of flowers. We come not in tears—to do so would detract from their courage, and would be a manifestation of our weakness which they did not possess. These men and women of our military forces were not afraid. They met the end, not with cringing fear but wrapped the mantle of death about them like one who lies down to pleasant dreams. Gladly did they live because they had eternal values for which to live—gladly did they die because they had eternal values for which to die. They loved life because they enjoyed their freedoms. They embraced death to preserve and perpetuate the freedoms for others. They did not falter in defense of the things they believed to be bigger than themselves—the things without which life is not worth living. They demonstrated that they were worthy of life—its liberty and its happiness—by being willing to die to preserve the principles upon which these things might be perpetuated. When the time came for them to choose, they did not hesitate or measure their sacrifice in terms of their own personal loss. Who knows, had they not been cut down by the vicious and indiscriminate hand of war, they might have scaled the heights to fame; they might have made rich contributions to science and invention; they might have revolutionized the trends of human thought. Yes; they might have ruled the destinies of men and nations. But what are the incidents of time and of place, of fame and of fortune, when duty demands its rendezvous with death. All these material things, as well as the sacred ties of love and affection for those closest to them, meant nothing to them when measured by the priceless rights of men and the eternal verities of life.

It was this appreciation of values that endure, and this sense of honor and of devotion to duty, that inspired all our military heroes to erect their altars of sacrifice. Thus it has been throughout all of human history, with men who fought for the principles of democracy. It was so with those Englishmen who died on the field of Runnymede. It reaches in our own history in golden links of achievement from Valley Forge to Chateau Thierry; from the carnage of Bataan to the battle of the Coral Sea; from the conquests of the Solomons to the bloody heights of Tunisia. It is this sense of honor and devotion to duty which will drive others on to victorious sacrifices. It is from such sacrifices that the fruits of victory are wrought. It is because of this thoughtlessness of self that wars are won.

But too often the ideals of those who sacrifice and fight and win are laid aside by conniving statesmen, as tarnished and outworn tools. In the last war we found it so. We veterans of that conflict who still live made small sacrifices; but those who died made the immeasurable sacrifice, to make the world safe for democracy. Both the living and the dead sacrificed, only to find their ideals had been forgotten by erring statesmen. Yes, forgotten before the broken bodies of some of the wounded had mended, and before the bodies of our dead comrades had returned to earth. Forgotten by statesmen who considered peace—the fruits of victory—with all the pettiness of selfishly spoiled children playing a game of anagrams, each drawing from the common pool—a letter to complete the spelling of their national aspirations.

France was the first to draw her letter, necessary to the spelling of her national aspirations. She drew the letter "S" and spelled out the word "security."

Germany next was permitted to draw the letter "U" and spelled out the word "unity," the thing she craved most.

Italy next drew the letter "I" and she spelled out "imperialism" and sought restoration to the grandeur of the Caesars.

Russia drew the letter "C" and then completed the word "communism."

The United States drew the letter "I" and spelled out the word "isolationism."

England drew the letter "D" and then proceeded to complete the word "divide" and conquer.

Japan, the last to draw, drew the letter "E," and then completed spelling the word which expressed her national aspiration in "expansion." And when they had finished drawing in this game of international anagrams, they had succeeded in spelling out the word s-u-i-c-i-d-e—suicide. And while both we who fought, and you who held the home front, slept in the Garden of Gethsemane, a little band of international traitors sold the peace of the world into crucifixion. And thus those who died in the First World War shall have died in vain, unless we who once slept in that Garden of Gethsemane are awake to prevent its repetition. Unless we awake, peace will again be crucified at the conclusion of this war. If we sleep again when this war is ended, a new band of conspirators who place personal profit above peace will again sell for a mere pittance the world's security. Unless we determine now, as the little band of Spartans of Thermopylae, that they who seek to steal the peace shall not pass.

Oh, that those who died in the last World War, and those who will die in this, might rise from their silent dust and cry out, "You shall not again lose in selfish ignorance what we died to achieve! You shall not crucify our sons and the sons of the future upon the cross of political expediency!" Oh, that their cry may haunt you—you who would destroy the hopes of men; you who would tear down the temple of faith in the hearts of men; you who would seek to close the portals of freedom of speech and freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear, to all but yourselves; you who would deny the world our weight in the scales of international justice; you who would establish yourselves as superior nations, and defeat justice with intolerance.

God grant that the soldier dead may haunt you, you who would follow the Prince of Peace—follow Him afraid and afar off, and place your individual hatred above the welfare of men. If those who died could but speak, they would ask you, "What is a name, whether it be Roosevelt, Willkie, Smith, or Jones, but a mere incident when measured in terms of eternal things?" Do you not know, that regardless of their names, that men are

but instruments in the hands of God, through whom He must move and manifest Himself? Men like Washington, Lincoln, and Wilson. Do you not know that men die but that the principles they advocate may be eternal? Do you not know that God's plans for humanity may be delayed but not destroyed? Do you not know that His plans can only be delayed through people who are blind to enduring values? Again, let these dead heroes rise to haunt you, again and again. Let those who yet live, rise to challenge you, you who say you profess Christian convictions, but at the council tables deny us the ideals of the Prince of Peace.

My friends, I fear for the future when I think, after this war—then what?

I fear, because recorded history makes me fear. I fear when I remember that Caesar had his Brutus—just when he had concluded his will—a document most favorable to the Roman people.

I fear, when I read that America had her Benedict Arnold at a time when our independence hung in the balance. I fear, when I recall that Woodrow Wilson had his traitors who knifed him when the most noble soul sought to lead America to assume her righteous responsibility in the establishment of governmental machinery for the enforcement of world peace.

Yes; I fear, when I remember that even the Prince of Peace had His Judas Iscariot when He sought to teach men the way of life.

But then, my hopes are rekindled, with the afterthought, that none of these failed; that it was not He who died on Golgotha's bloody cross that failed, but only those failed who refused to follow in His footsteps. I would remind you today that the end of men's dereliction toward the Prince of Peace and His precepts has not been written. It will not be written, until countless millions shall lie beneath the sod in unmarked graves. It shall not be written until the hosts of error that visited upon us this carnage have been beaten from the earth. It shall not be written, until men grow big enough to banish from their hearts the littleness which blinds them to the truth. It shall not be written, until mankind becomes worthy of the privileges of life and of freedom from war, and is willing to share them with his neighbors. It shall not be written, until men are able to see through the mists of hate and can see that the ideals of those whom they would assassinate are bigger than the assassins themselves. It shall not be written until dreamers cease to make dreams their master. It shall not be written until idealists learn to temper their idealism with the stark facts of reality.

Thus, let those who sit in the next parliament of nations to consider peace approach their tasks. Let those who send them demand that they not assemble like selfishly spoiled children, but that they meet like deeply moved men of destiny. And, when the second game of international anagrams has been ended, let us trust that France may have drawn the letter "F" and then let her complete spelling the word "faith." May she find that though she has been broken upon the cross of internal corruption, in her resurrection may she find incorruption. May she learn that salvation comes through faith in the values that endure. May she find that morality is a necessary spring of popular freedom and that morality cannot prevail in the exclusion of religious convictions. May she find reconsecration in the faith of her fathers—the faith without which in others she would have been crushed never to live again.

May Germany draw the letter "R" and then spell out the word repentance, repentance that comes from deep conviction of sinfulness, the first essential to salvation. May she realize that salvation comes only through self-purification, and a break with the past. Let her forsake her false philosophies, and forget Nietzsche and his doctrines of a superior race. Let her put her faith in the Nazarene and in His examples and precepts of peace. May she be made to remember that superiority of race cannot be attained through ideologies, but only through the attainment of superior concepts of service. May Germany cease to worship the false god of conquest. May she be reminded of the fact that though the conqueror may strut on his stage for a fleeting hour, in the end he is scourged like the quarry slave to the dungeon of remorse. Remorse which she will experience for the atrocities which she has permitted a false leadership to perpetrate upon innocent conquered and defenseless people. In remembering the mass murders of the Jews and other innocent people because of race and creed, let her conscience kindle and burn her perverted philosophical concepts before her eyes. May she realize that these crimes have not been committed because of superiority but rather because of inferiority. May she remember that as there is a law of compensation regarding righteousness, there is also an inexorable law of retribution exacting its penalties by way of vengeance. Vengeance which though the exclusive prerogative of God will be visited upon her by Him through the tolerant and just peoples of the earth. Thus having endured the immutable penalties of nature and of God, may she turn in worship to the true God, and seek after righteousness and she shall find all other things that endure shall be added unto her.

Next, may Italy draw the letter "E" and spell out "equality." May she have found from bitter experience that there is no gain in subjugation of weaker nations. May she realize that the grandeur of the Caesars is dead. May she find that the only imperialism that pays is that which springs from peace, where every man, regardless of race, color, or creed, wears the crown and wields the scepter of democracy. May she have learned that kingship is not to be found in the tawdry robes of imperialism, but through kinship of equality. May she have discovered that there is no inequality among nations except for those who would break the peace.

May Russia likewise choose the letter "E" and then finish the word "equity." May she come to know that equity is the mother of tolerance, and, knowing this, may she remember that the virtue of tolerance is in allowing one to hold beliefs different from her own. May she have learned in her hour of travail that fear by others of her own intolerance may have cost her millions of stalwart sons and caused their mothers to have suffered much. May Russia remember that he who would have equity must do equity.

Then let England select the letter "D" and then complete the word "divine." Thus choosing, let her recall that forgiveness is divine and though she may have been bombed mercilessly, may she remember that the "quality of mercy is not strained. It falleth like the gentle rain, from heaven," whence also, came her strength to bear her cross. May she write her destiny in the language of Divinity, and in terms of righteousness.

Then let America choose the letter "O" and spell out the word "opportunity." Let us thus remember the great moment of leadership we missed in the last war. Let us approach the problem of peace with the determination that it shall not be said of us again, "You failed to help establish the mechanism of international justice." Let us write on the scroll of time an achievement which shall stand out in eternity like a mighty peak above the rest, second only to the name of Him who taught the way of peace.

Last, let Japan meditate much upon the selection of both her letter and her word. Let her remember the misery she visited upon herself and her sister nations. Let her remember that she, too, must endure the penalties of the inexorable law of retribution—that as she has meted out misery to others it shall be returned unto her. Then let her choose the letter "M" and spell out magnanimity. Thus, she may lift herself from the bog of an inferiority complex and littleness. May she find a new state of being marked by greatness of spirit and of mind. May she assume a loftiness of spirit and of ideals which will enable her to look up, and not down. May she thus acquire self-respect. May she be able to disdain injustice, forget littleness, abhor revenge, and learn to act and sacrifice to noble objects. With the acquisition of magnanimity, may she find a new concept of honor and a new sense of integrity.

Thus in the world's next game of international anagrams may the nations of the earth succeed in completely spelling out freedom—freedom in all its enabling aspects.

Thus may the nations of the earth approach the peace table with faith in the future, repentance in their hearts for the wrongs they have committed; may they sit together in equality, endeavoring to promote both political and economic equity among men and nations, invoking divine guidance—seeking to find opportunity for service to mankind; may they magnificently, in truth and in fact, spell out freedom and thus give life to peace everlasting.

God grant that in memory of our honored dead, our statesmen, regardless of party labels, may lay aside their personal differences and political hatred—lay them aside regardless of whomsoever the people may have elevated to the Presidency of the United States—and grant that they may prove themselves worthy of the trust reposed in them; that they may write on the tablets of time, at the end of this bloody commentary on war, "Never again—it is finished."

In this way we will prove ourselves worthy of the heritage which was handed to us by those who have died in the cause of justice, freedom, and democracy. In this way we may prove ourselves worthy of kinship with those who shall yet die to preserve that heritage. In this way alone shall it be written of us, "They, too, did not fail."

Handling of Camp Followers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. OVERTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Handling Camp Followers," published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of September 19, 1943. The editorial deals with problems surrounding the various Army camps throughout the United States. The subject is very well presented, and the editorial is very informative.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDLING CAMP FOLLOWERS

It is unfortunate that some national publicity has pictured Leesville, La., as the horrible example of failure of civilian communities to provide various facilities which might be desirable for Army camps suddenly thrust upon them by the exigencies of war. It is especially unfortunate because, when the war is ended and the whole story is told, it is doubtful if many towns in the United States will be able to show a per capita record of greater improvement or more determined effort to face the problems produced by army camps than will Leesville, La.

There have been two particularly regrettable instances of national publicity along the line that Leesville is the last place in the world for either a soldier or a member of his family to go. One was a full-page article in the Washington Post by Mrs. Agnes Meyer. The other is a recent spread of pictures in Look magazine, in effect telling any who care to read that Leesville is afflicted with something in the nature of a leper's touch—or worse.

Mrs. Meyer spent a matter of hours in Leesville and either failed to get or failed to understand the vast amount of information that certainly was available to her from the military authorities at Camp Polk, particularly concerning results obtained on venereal disease control as a result of close cooperation between Army and Leesville civilian authorities She took conditions which Leesville frankly admits existed at one time and presented them as a continuing environment, failing completely to recognize that past evil of which she wrote had been or was being remedied as rapidly as was humanly possible.

No one questions Mrs. Meyer's motives. But throughout most of a page of type she failed to see that the past was not the present, and only a line or two mentioned success and achievement attained by both the Army and the civilian leaders in meeting Leesville-Camp Polk problems. She wrote on a small foundation of past fact, with no thought of the existing structure and of the additions to it that were under way. Probably she did not mean to isolate Leesville as the only place of the kind she thought it to be, for Mrs. Meyer and the Washington Post have conducted a vigorous antivice and housing-conditions drive in their own city of Washington, D. C., the Post describing the Nation's Capital as "infested with rats and syphilis."

But, Mrs. Meyer completely missed the story of Leesville, which is the story of a small and economically lethargic town awakening, with Army assistance which its people readily acknowledge, to launch an all-out battle against obstacles and problems seemingly impossible to defeat. Success has come on many sectors—but neither the Washington Post nor Look recognized that even an effort was being made, much less that tremendous success had been attained.

Leesville concedes that conditions were bad and almost got beyond control in the early days of the Army influx. It couldn't have been otherwise. Leesville was a civilian town of 3,000 population with an economy as cut over as the one-time lumber land surrounding it. Suddenly some forty thousand to fifty thousand hale, hearty, husky, young American males were dumped at its doors. That is the equivalent of a city with a total population of perhaps 750,000 persons—men, women and children, old and young. (Maneuvers periodically jumped the soldier total by tens of thousands.) There probably isn't a city in the United States—much less a small lumber town—that could have handled such an influx of young male humanity, with the inevitable advent of families also in many cases, and done it in a manner that would be considered fully successful.

Error lies not so much in unpreparedness to meet such problems, but in failure to try to meet them.

That is where both Look and Mrs. Meyer missed the story completely. They built up the unpreparedness for a problem no one ever dreamed would come, and forgot both the effort to meet it and the extent of success of that effort. As well say that we lost this war because its unexpectedness caused our forces to surrender at Bataan as to say that because a town of 3,000 civilians wasn't ready for 50,000 soldiers when mobilization came 3 years ago means that it has done nothing since to meet problems thus created.

As for the picture spread in Look: We have, over the personal signature of Col. J. K. Boles, Camp Polk commander, his statement that some of Look's pictures were not even taken in Leesville and that in other pictures people were recruited to make up scenes that did not actually exist. That is fake, reprehensible, unfair journalism; and it could come pretty close to having a sabotaging effect—even though perhaps unintended—on some parts of the war effort.

There is one angle in all of this problem of small towns and Army camps that many recognize but few seem willing to discuss. That is that if people insist on being camp followers, they must take what they can find and not expect towns and cities already overrun with their own war effort to be able to provide especial conditions on demand. By camp followers we mean the wives and relatives of men in uniform, for that is the Army designation for them and is in no way personal reflection.

When a man is called to uniform in time of war he is at war from the moment he walks out of his own home to go to camp. He should be looked on as probably sacrificed, so far as personal association is concerned, the minute he leaves home—whether he is to be stationed in this Nation or overseas. This may seem a cruel viewpoint; no one can help but sympathize with the desire of a wife to be with her husband every possible minute before he goes overseas, or with the desire of a mother to be with her son. But war is cruel throughout every minute of its existence and its cruelty extends from the battle line to the family and home left behind. If wives and relatives wish to be camp followers, they have the right. But, they must not expect someone always to be looking after them. That's their own job—while the men of the house are in uniform. They must take what is available if they elect not to stay at home.

That applies to housing, social life, recreation. So far as vice conditions go, the Army is seeing to that and in most cities and towns—including Leesville—rarely finds occasion now to complain. No humans can end sin. They can only reduce or alleviate it.

The problems that have been Leesville's have been those of camp towns and camp followers everywhere—New York, Maine, California, Florida, Oregon, etc. There have been many successes, many failures. We hold no brief for those who try to alibi failure with "we're no worse than the others."

The point is that Leesville makes no alibi and needs none It has won a lot of battles and is moving right ahead to new fields. Only citizen complacency could lose for it now. If it can continue to bypass that obstacle the story of Leesville at the end of the war will be what its people actually are writing now—not the story of horrible example, but of splendid achievement. That should be recognized by all.

The Value of a Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Value of a Job," delivered by State Senator Robert Lee Brokenburr on September 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A job is to be held, cherished, prized, and appreciated as one of the most important possessions. Any kind of a job should be thus regarded. A man without a job and needing one is in an awful fix. This situation is bad enough if he has only himself to provide for. If he has a wife and children dependent upon him, such a man faces tragedy. Every man should pledge allegiance to his job and to the things for which it stands, and keep that pledge. To neglect or do violence to a job is not wise. It is foolish. This does not mean that a man should not better himself. It does not mean that he should never be justly reprimanded, disciplined, or fired on a charge of incompetence, dishonesty, or failure to make good. It does mean that he will habitually report for work on time and not watch the clock, but watch and do his best work for a full day every day. It does mean that he will not be guided or influenced by bad leadership. Yes; it means that he should treat his job so well that he doesn't need a boss even though one is present; that the boss will always find him a source of delight and high inspiration, and only parts with him at the end of the day because he has the joy of expecting him tomorrow. Such an attitude reduces waste to a minimum and makes unnecessary a strike for higher pay, better working hours and conditions, because the rank and file of employers will show their appreciation of and respect for an efficient, good man by voluntarily giving him every possible advantage. Such an attitude will raise one from the dead level of a hireling to the living perpendicular of a coworker with the boss and to the security of a spiritual partner in business.

It is difficult to picture such a man being fired if there is any possible way to keep him. I have heard of jobs being made for men like him because the boss knew that such creative workers would make them pay.

The proper love for his job will cause a man to always seek intelligently to know all about it. There is no job so simple that a casual attitude toward it will result in much knowledge about it. One can't expect to hold a job against a man whom his employer believes will take more interest in it and thereby learn more about it than he. He can't learn all there is to be known about the simplest job unless he rests when he should and lives a sensible wholesome life because he won't have the energy to do it. Always in the long run the best man wins if he has the patience and intelligence to make every opportunity count. With every job goes many opportunities to prove one's self. Most people pass them up because of impatience, stubbornness, and pride and

charge their failure to a prejudice that could have been overcome.

When the lights go on again all over the world their glare will show up many a worker who has just gotten by during the war because of labor shortage. Don't be one of them.

Fear Versus Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fear Versus Faith," written by T. E. Murphy and published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEAR VERSUS FAITH

(By T. E. Murphy)

The tie that binds the United Nations together, in the minds of many people, is a temporary one: The simple wish to defeat the enemy. But if the tie is to endure after the war, when the strength of all the Allies will be needed in the rebuilding of the world, that tie must have the toughness of common understanding and common purpose.

It is not enough to say now that we are fighting to save democracy or that this war is a fight of good against evil. The term "democracy" has no common meaning among those who fight with us, and the conception of this conflict as a fight of good against evil is an oversimplification. Deeper than evil is fear. Deeper than goodness is faith.

The wellspring of all evil is faithlessness. If you have known the hardened criminal, the cruel, the hateful and the depraved, you will know that more basic than their badness is their faithlessness. They have no sense of dignity, of individual worth, and they have no faith in themselves or in others.

The fountain of all goodness is faith, in oneself, in one's personal dignity, in the dignity of all living things. When you think of St. Francis of Assisi, you do not conceive of him as merely good. In addition, he had an intuitive sense of the value of all life as the work of an Omnipotent Being. To him, even the wolf could be brother.

This, then, is the great fundamental difference between the countries now at war, the two great camps into which the human race has been split. The split has not come on the basis of dogma, race, or skin color. The Filipino and the Chinese fight on the same side as the Dutch, the English, and the American. The German and the Italian are comrades in arms with the Japanese.

One group has a fundamental faith in the human race; the other believes that people cannot be trusted—must be ruled by the force of fear.

Faith defeated Germany in the skies over England, and faith created the miracle of Dunkerque. Fear has reddened the soil of the earth from Amsterdam to Hong Kong with the lifeblood of innocent men, women, and children.

Fear is the main motive power of the Axis, not only in the control of subjugated countries but in their homelands as well, and because fear is a negative thing—the abnegation of creativity—it carries within itself the germ of destruction. That is why Germany must lose—has lost—the war.

Since the last war the record of Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, England, and the United States—nations that honor human beings—has been one of honest notable achievement. Most were not endowed with either wealth or empire. They earned their wealth the way millions of honest, frugal men have earned their substance—through work and faith in the future.

Meanwhile Germany had been draining dry the resources piled up by its brief republic, ruining its universities, prostituting its scientific brains, and poisoning the intellectual and moral wells from which it bade its young to drink.

But these things were obscured by the vast armaments piled up by Germany, demonstrating an ostensible strength that made the democracies look weak and decadent by contrast. We did not realize our strength—nor do we yet.

This country was founded on faith. Men came to the wilderness of America more than 300 years ago to found this country because they had faith, and to our shores have since streamed millions of human beings who found fulfillment of their dream—a world in which the human being was a creature of dignity and worth. These founders were deeply conscious of this irrefutable truth—that faith shall conquer fear; a philosophical truth, a psychological truth, a theological truth, a military truth. The whole history of the world and of every great man who ever lived gives strength to its credibility. Each of us at some time has proved it in his own life.

And yet, this is the sword not yet unsheathed, the weapon still unused. Somewhere along the tortuous road traveled by this generation, the vision has dimmed, the flame has flickered. People in a country such as ours do not fight savagely, die willingly, sacrifice graciously merely for words or phrases or shibboleths, or even for the hatred of an abstraction. This country has been builded on affirmation, not negation. We fight better for something than against something.

What that something is, curiously enough, can be seen with startling clarity by those who have received least from America. The wonder is that those of our country who have been batted from pillar to post by discrimination, injustice, and prejudice have stuck by their country as well as they have. Logically, as Hitler predicted, we should have broken up into a dozen warring groups.

We did not, and we shall not, because Hitler, in surveying the internal tensions of this country, overlooked the important fact that those who founded this country set a goal. It has not been reached, but it is starkly clear for those who will see. Millions of those who are farthest from it have faith to pursue it. This faith sustains them now, and will help win the war for all of us.

Mr. Willkie's Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and in his absence, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Has Willkie Signed His Own Death Warrant?" published in the Philadelphia Record of September 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS WILLKIE SIGNED HIS OWN DEATH WARRANT?

Wendell Willkie has crossed the Rubicon of Republican politics.

His declaration of intention to run for the 1944 G. O. P. Presidential nomination is far and away the most progressive and liberal statement of policy and principle to come from any major Republican leader since Theodore Roosevelt.

That declaration, published in Look magazine, excerpts of which appear elsewhere in The Record today, shows that Willkie has grown these past 3 years. He is one of the few Presidential candidates to gain rather than lose stature in defeat.

Yet this statement, by its very liberalism, almost certainly means Willkie has lost any chance of gaining the Republican nomination in the old-fashioned way—by winning blocs of delegates here and there.

In turn that means Willkie's only chance for the G. O. P. nomination is to get it the hard way—by building up popular sentiment so strong it will virtually force the G. O. P. professional politicians to accept him.

The prospects of that—despite his strong showing in Gallup polls—are not much better than the prospects of Mussolini reconquering Africa.

If "that man in the White House" makes the G. O. P. Old Guarders sob and shiver, at least he's a Democrat. Guess for yourself what they are thinking and saying after reading Willkie's statement that—

"We must distinguish between enterprise and private ownership. A corporation may be privately owned and still be the worst enemy of free enterprise. Unfortunately, some of our big corporations are in this class, and the Democratic Party, despite noisy proclamations, has done nothing about it."

Figure how that would set, say, with a Joe Grundy.

"We must prevent the further misuse of the word 'enterprise' by those who wish merely to preserve their idle capital and their vested powers."

Can't you hear 'em saying in the Union League: "Is that damn Willkie guy the same one that was head of Commonwealth & Southern?"

"Absolute guaranties must be provided by our society against unemployment and against want because of old age, injury, or incapacity."

The groans are from Hoover. That thud is TAFT passing out.

More's the pity that in making this forthright statement and giving the G. O. P. really sound advice, Wendell Willkie probably has signed his own political death warrant.

What he's talking about is not what the G. O. P. band of brothers have in mind for 1944.

Willkie's program seems blithely indifferent to some of the political realities, even those of his own 1940 campaign. For example, he says:

"The Democratic Party is now a coalition of two major groups, neither of them liberal in outlook. One group consists of southern Democrats, professional officeholders who completely control the South's political machinery by denying the vote to a majority of its citizens, white and colored. The other group is composed of the big-city political machines, such as the Kelly machine of Chicago, the Hague machine of Jersey City, the Flynn machine of the Bronx."

As a newspaper which has fought the Hague machine when the Republican Party

wouldn't, we feel free to ask Willkie who he thought rolled up those 22,000,000 votes for him in 1940?

Who did his work here in Philadelphia but the Pew-Harris machine, which was a veteran organization when Hague, Kelly, and Willkie all were in diapers.

What's more, it is likely to be the Pews and their ilk, the Republican machine bosses, who will keep Wendell Willkie cooling his heels at the G. O. P. convention doors while they cast about for a candidate who won't annoy them with ideals or principles.

The big difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties is that in the Republican Party the political machines keep the liberals in their place.

And in the Democratic Party the liberals keep the political machines in their place.

The Rich Get Richer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Rich Get Richer," published in the New Republic of September 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fat cats of American war industry are not satisfied with their cream ration. They have raised such a howl about the beating they are taking from present excess-profits-tax rates and from the present Contract Renegotiation Act that the House Ways and Means Committee came back to Washington a full week in advance of the rest of the Congress to open hearings on this whole question.

When you look at the corporate-profits figures for last year and the years just before, and at the estimates for this year, it is hard to see what kind of argument industry could offer in support of decreasing its share of the general financial burden of this war. But a look back at the flimsy arguments that have recently been camouflaged with a twist of a statistic or the turn of a phrase to present the American worker's pay envelope as our one inflationary threat makes it easier to guess what arguments Congress will hear on its tax policies during the new session from one section of industry at least.

A large-scale and subtle program of tax propaganda has filled the press and the air for months now. It soaks into your skin if you don't watch out. American industry—the private enterprise your soldier wants to come home to—if you believe the tax-exempt ads—is taking a beating. It gets the stuff there on time, but Uncle Sam takes no notice of that when tax-collection days come round, and in spite of 90-percent tax rates on excess profits industry is not allowed to pile up the reserves it wants to use to guarantee a job for your boy when he comes marching home again. It is subject to renegotiation of its contr..cts without allowance for reserves and before taxes are deducted.

The facts do not exactly jibe with this propaganda. Take profits, for instance. Authoritative estimates indicate that corporate profits for 1943, before taxes, will amount to approximately $23,000,000,000; 1942 profits were slightly over $19,000,000,000. That increase does not seem to be any signpost to the poorhouse. Profits for all corporations in the previous peak year of 1929 were $9,300,000,000. After taxes, 1943 corporate profits are estimated at $8,500,000,000, as compared with $7,500,000,000 for 1942. Nineteen twenty-nine yielded $8,100,000,000 in corporate profits after taxes. Thus this year, in spite of the terrible "beating" industry has been taking, its profits will be $1,000,000,000 more than last year and $400,000,000 more than 1929 profits.

Propaganda aside, it is not too hard to understand how this can be. Last year's tax law prohibits taxing a corporation more than 80 percent of its total profits, and in the many cases where a company's profits are 6 to 10 times the normal rate, even an 80-percent tax leaves a healthy margin. One special study of 29 big corporations made recently showed that all but 6 at least doubled their normal peacetime profits, after taxes were paid, last year. Several of the companies studied multiplied their earnings 4 or 5 times, and 1 reached the stupendous figure of almost 100 times its normal prewar (1936–39) level.

When we entered this war we remembered all the cases of profiteering from the last war which had been aired through the twenties and resolved to prevent their recurrence this time. We would not have the war millionaires and the public scandals our former wars produced, or so Congress told the people. That was no new resolve. Between February 1919 and 1942, some 170 bills and resolutions aimed at preventing war profiteering were introduced in Congress. Only two inadequate measures had been passed before the Renegotiation Act became law on April 28, 1942. The statute gives authority to four executive agencies to renegotiate their contracts and subcontracts whenever it appears that excessive profits are being realized under present terms. There is great flexibility in the method. Each case is determined on its own merits, and there is no standard yardstick. Price adjustment boards of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission conduct investigations and make decisions. Up to May 31, 1943, the War Department board alone had recovered or adjusted in prices on contracts $2,100,000,000. The members of these boards could not by any stretch of the imagination be accused of a New Deal bias, or even of progressive prejudices. The chairman of the War Department Board, which handles much the highest percentage of cases, is the president of the Jewel Tea Co. (Lehman Bros.). These three agencies and the Treasury testified to the extent of thousands of pages of records before congressional committees last session that the present renegotiation system is equitable and workable and that any industry plans for amending the present law to provide for including post-war reserves as costs before renegotiation and for deducting taxes before renegotiation must be considered as unworkable and inadequate.

Yet industry is going forward with these very plans and will present them and urge them at the Ways and Means Committee hearings now going on in the House. One Representative, HAMPTON FULMER, of South Carolina, respected on both sides of the House for his integrity, has already exposed this pressure play: "War contractors and war industries are operating under a guaranteed plus-profit contract. When the war ends they are guaranteed against any losses. The only safeguard that the Government has in connection with plus-profits contracts is the renegotiation provision passed by the Congress. Those who operate under Government contracts, especially the large, monopolistic groups, are now flooding Congressmen and the country with tons and tons of propaganda urging the repeal of the renegotiation provision, having in mind being in a position to get away with untold profits."

The groups referred to by Representative FULMER are not putting all their eggs in the congressional basket. While they are waiting for revision or repeal of the nonprofiteering law, they are using other techniques for evasion of their full tax responsibilities. Dividends are very low, less than in 1936 or 1937, for instance. Earnings thus retained become additional invested capital either in the form of reserves or as the basis for mergers with companies short on resources but long on unused excess-profits credit; that is, companies which earned more in the normal profit years 1936–39 than they are earning now. Automobile-finance companies are especially good subjects for this kind of deal. For instance, the west coast auto-finance company, Pacific Finance, was recently purchased by Lockheed Aircraft, a heavy profit maker, for $3,750,000. The large excess-profits credit Pacific brings with it as dowry will greatly decrease the amount of taxes Lockheed will have to pay this year.

The estimates Government representatives are planning to bring into the congressional hearings as to corporate reserves should knock the props out from under the industry case for modification of the Renegotiation Act to provide additional finances for reconversion. The figures show that by the end of this year $20,000,000,000 in undistributed profits will have accumulated as reserve in the war years—a record amount of "seed corn"—almost four times the total accumulated reserve for the 1936–39 period. But record reserves are evidently not enough for record profiteers. The National Industrial Conference Board, sophisticated sister to the N. A. M., has recently brought out a study on reserves and reconversion which supports the position that reserves should not be considered as excess profits in renegotiation proceedings. Tom Girdler's Consolidated Aircraft Corporation is leading an aircraft drive for this proposition. The N. A. M.'s journalist friends are grinding out copy, and the push for repeal is steaming along in spite of the present generous allowed reserve of 10 percent of excess profits.

The 1942 tax law has a tremendous loophole for reserve-minded taxpayers. It permits corporations to claim refunds for 2 years after the war for post-war losses—that is, earnings below normal peacetime profits. Pay now; collect your refund when you are up against reconversion later. Some companies have gone in for the less imaginative device of special pension funds for executives—setting aside undistributed profits with which to buy large annuities for their top men after age 65, when their income tax will amount to far less than the one based on their full compensation now. (The Treasury now frowns on this procedure.)

Representatives of the men and the organizations who want repeal of the Renegotiation Act and drastic slashes in even the present weak tax program are already swarming over Capitol Hill, though the session is only begun. Talk of a Federal sales tax is current. The Treasury is shy about revealing what its program for next year is to be—if any. The C. I. O. has issued its statement on tax policy which, among other things, calls for increasing corporate-profits taxes from 40 to 55 percent, controlling the various tax-evasion devices now in practice and especially for wiping out the refund provisions of the present tax law which would in some cases return $140 or $150 for every $100 paid in.

The tax fight is certain to be one of the major battles of this new session. The trend of this first series of House Ways and Means Committee hearings will be a good indication whether or not a few weeks with their constituents have made Congressmen change their tax views in any major respect.

Transfer of Victory and Liberty Ships to Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, so much interest has been manifested, and very properly so, with reference to the transfer to foreign countries of some of the Liberty and Victory ships that, on behalf of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I addressed a communication to Admiral Land asking about the situation. There follows a letter from him to Senator BAILEY, chairman, Committee on Commerce, and to me as chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which explains the situation, and was considered of such importance that it was printed for the benefit of the committee as Committee Document No. 29. The letter follows:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 27, 1943.

Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

Hon. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: The size of the American fleet has increased by 250 percent since Pearl Harbor. It will continue to grow at a rapid rate during the next 12 months. So far, we have been able to man this fleet, but it is clear that we can expect an increased strain on our training facilities during the coming months.

The nature of the problem can best be presented by saying that in 1940 there were approximately 65,000 seamen and licensed personnel required to operate the coastal, intercoastal, and overseas American-flag merchant fleet. At the end of June 1943 approximately 85,000 were required. We calculate that this number will increase at the rate of about 7,500 each month over the next 12 months, to a total at June 30, 1944, of about 175,000. To meet this demand will stretch the resources of our far-flung training program, especially in respect of licensed personnel.

While our fleet has been growing and is expected to grow further, the fleets of some of our maritime allies have been shrinking; indeed, they have dwindled in size by many millions of tons. As a result, each of these nations has a pool of unemployed, experienced seamen and licensed personnel. Because the British losses have far exceeded the losses of our other allies, they have the largest pool. It numbers about 10,000.

It is evident that manpower will be conserved and that we will be provided with a sorely needed insurance against excessive burdens upon our ability to provide an adequate supply of trained men through the employment of these pools of skilled seamen.

Great Britain, by the fall of 1941, had laid out a greatly expanded shipbuilding program. After Pearl Harbor one of the general arrangements made by the President with the Prime Minister was that we, the United States, would be the merchant shipbuilder for our cause, while the British yards would be devoted largely to the construction of naval vessels. In accordance with this scheme, the British merchant ship program was very substantially reduced. A number of persuasive and compelling considerations dictated this arrangement: First, we had the raw materials; second, we had the manpower; third, we had developed a technique which enabled us to produce in mass and with unbelievable speed a vast tonnage of merchant ships; fourth, the cargo was here in the United States to be moved to the various theaters of war.

Any other arrangement would have meant a costly wastage of ship time, for it would have been necessary to move the raw materials across the Atlantic, there to fabricate them into steel structures and other essentials. There finally, after a great lapse of time because of a slower technique, the finished ships would be dispatched westward in ballast to our shores to pick up the cargo that was waiting for them.

For all these reasons—first, to conserve manpower and to provide us with an insurance against overtaxing our capacity to man our expanding fleet; second, to carry out in good faith an advantageous wartime arrangement that had been made during the early weeks of our participation—the President has instructed us to bareboat, for the period of the war only, tonnage to the Norwegians, to the British, and to others of the United Nations. Title in each case will remain in the United States Government.

We have to the Norwegians already bareboated 80,000 dead-weight tons, and may bareboat more. These ships will be under the Norwegian flag and will be manned by Norwegian crews. Title will remain in the United States Government. Their employment will be subject to our control. Thus no carrying capacity has been sacrificed; indeed, actual carrying capacity may have been increased as a result.

We are contemplating bareboating to the Dutch Government three vessels on similar terms. Title will remain in the United States Government.

To the British, arrangements have been made to bareboat for the duration of the war only from 15 to 20 ships a month for the next 10 months. Five ships have already been bareboated to the British. All these vessels will be manned by the British and will fly the British flag. Title will remain in the United States. Their employment will be subject to the control of the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board. The great bulk of these ships on their initial voyage will be employed in long turn-arounds in lieu of our ships that have been employed in these services. No carrying capacity will be lost by this arrangement.

To the Greek Government in due course two ships will be bareboated. The provisions of the arrangement will be similar to those made with other governments. Title will remain in the United States Government.

Very truly yours,
E. S. LAND, *Administrator.*

Later, and since the recess, my attention was called to the fact that other ships would be delivered in addition to those covered by the preceding letter, and again I acted in my capacity as chairman and addressed a communication to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission making the following inquiry:

I shall be very glad if you will supplement your letter of July 27 by a comprehensive statement of all types of ships that are presumed to be delivered to any foreign government.

The answer to that letter follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, September 18, 1943.

Hon. S. O. BLAND,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of September 15, 1943, with regard to allocation of ships to foreign governments.

As you are aware, the No. 1 point to bear in mind is the fact that title does not pass but remains with the United States Government.

As a matter of general policy, allocations of the character under consideration will be made from Liberty ships insofar as new ships are concerned. There may be exceptions to the foregoing when the merits of the case justify and, as an example, two C–1 ships with Diesel-engine installations were allocated to the Norwegians because their crews are particularly expert in motor-driven vessels.

With reference to the C–1 ships on the west coast, you are advised that this allocation was made on the basis of high military strategy, at the direction of high military authorities, and conforms to strategic military requirements.

Sincerely yours,
E. S. LAND, *Chairman.*

I submit further, as an extension of these remarks, a release of the War Shipping Administration dated September 7, 1943, disclosing the release to the Chinese Government of two Liberty ships. This release is as follows:

Completion of arrangements for the assignment of two Liberty ships to the Chinese Government, placing the Chinese in the trans-ocean-shipping trade for the first time in history, was announced today by the War Shipping Administration.

Bareboat charters of the vessels, which will be named the *Chung Shan* and the *Chung Cheng* in honor of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, were signed by Dr. T. V. Soong, Chinese Foreign Minister, and by Admiral Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator.

The vessels will be manned by Chinese seamen and operated under the Chinese flag for the duration of the war. In view of the present lack of Chinese merchant officers, American officers will be carried until the Chinese are able to train replacements.

The Chinese seamen will be recruited in the United States from among those who have survived sinkings in the United Nations war service.

The ships, which were chartered to the national government of the Republic of China through China Defense Supplies, Inc., will be employed in carrying supplies for the war against Japan, and particularly supplies for China.

Catching Up With the American Radical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address by Julian S. Myrick, second vice president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of

New York, delivered at a meeting of the Boston Chapter of Chartered Life Underwriters, entitled "Catching Up With the American Radical":

I certainly appreciate the privilege of talking with you today, particularly because the subject I'd like to discuss with you revolves around a challenging article by Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University, which appeared in the May issue of the Atlantic Monthly. The article is called Wanted: American Radicals, and I think you will agree with me that it gives a rather alarming preview of the kind of people who may run this country of ours from Washington in the years to come. In considering what I have to say, however, please remember that I am speaking as an individual.

Here are two paragraphs from Dr. Conant's article. Listen to them carefully, because if Dr. Conant's American Radical takes over the reins of government, it will seriously affect every one of you in this room. Here they are, and I quote:

"First of all, like all radicals and also all reactionaries, in his extreme moods he will be utterly impractical. In general, however, being rooted in the American soil he will be endowed with a considerable amount of earthly common sense and a certain willingness to apply to the changes which he effects the typical American question, Does it work? and to take up cheerfully another trial if the answer should be 'No'."

"No one needs to be told that the American radical will be a fanatic believer in equality. Yet, it will be a peculiar North American brand of doctrine. For example, he will be quite willing in times of peace to let net salaries and earnings sail way above the $25,000 mark. He believes in equality of opportunity, not equality of rewards; but, on the other hand, he will be lusty in wielding the ax against the root of inherited privilege. To prevent the growth of a caste system, which he abhors, he will be resolute in his demand to confiscate (by constitutional methods) all property onc a generation. He will demand really effective inheritance and gift taxes and the breaking up of trust funds and estates. And this point cannot be lightly pushed aside, for it is the kernel of his radical philosophy."

In other words, "You can't take it with you," as the saying goes—and you can't leave it, either. If such people as Dr. Conan describes actually should get control of our country, then we and our children and their children shall have to adjust our entire concept of thrift and of security for the family and find a substitute for the incentive and initiative which today are the mainspring of whatever success we may achieve.

But before discussing the possibilities of a new way of life in America under such a radical philosophy—a way of life that presumably would throw millions of citizens upon the state for their security—let me quote from another enlightening article. It appeared in a magazine called the New York Certified Public Accountant and quotes Dr. Joseph Klein, former president of the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants and one of our leading tax authorities. This article deals in present-day facts—in a situation which exists today, not 5 or 10 years from now—and I think it shows us pretty conclusively that the hot breath of Dr. Conant's American Radical already is upon us. Here it is, and again I quote:

"The relationship of the current fiscal phenomenon to us may be illustrated in connection with the possibility of our clients or ourselves creating a competence. That's an old-fashioned notion, for as long ago as the turn of the last century Pope wrote:

" 'Reason's whole pleasure, all the joys of sense,
Lie in three words: health, peace, and competence.'

"Under 1943 Federal income and estate-tax rates, there is practically no longer an opportunity, starting from scratch, to create a competence by the standards of yesterday. Try some calculations for yourself on assumed earnings not subject to the capital-gains tax. How much would you have to earn annually for 10 years or for 20 years, after allowing for modest living expenses, to leave your heirs, net, $100,000 or $250,000 or $500,000, or, forsooth, $1,000,000?

"To leave net, after taxes:

	It would take—	
	Annual earnings for 10 years	Annual earnings for 20 years
$100,000	$85,000	$32,000
$250,000	600,000	190,000
$500,000	1,270,000	550,000
$1,000,000	2,130,000	1,075,000

"Obviously," Dr. Klein says, "some normal ambitions of yesterday have gone with the wind. But what of the morrow?"

Those figures are astounding, aren't they! If you want to leave $100,000, exclusive of life insurance, for the protection and security of your family 10 years from now—and remember, there are relatively few people who at some time in their lives haven't hoped or expected to accumulate that much money, which invested today will only produce an income of around $200 or $250 a month—you'll have to earn a total of $850,000 to do it!

Let's look at that picture a little more closely before we go back to that new way of life which Dr. Conant's American Radical would map out for us—or perhaps already has mapped out for us. Here are figures which show how much money a married man with two dependents must make each year to create a given general estate, how much he must save, and how much he may use for ordinary living expenses. For estate tax purposes the initial figure is the value of the estate after deductions for funeral and administration expenses but before exemptions and credits have been allowed. Let's assume that the 1943 tax rates will remain constant—and that's a pretty broad assumption!

CREATION OF A $50,000 ESTATE

Number of years to build estate	Net estate desired	Values of estate before payment of estate taxes	Annual earnings before payment of income taxes	Amount of income taxes	Amount required to create estate	Amount available for living expenses
10 years	$50,000	$50,300	$7,500	$1,502	$5,030	$968
20 years	50,000	50,300	7,500	1,502	2,515	3,485
10 years	50,000	50,300	10,000	2,387	5,030	2,583
20 years	50,000	50,300	10,000	2,387	2,515	5,098
10 years	50,000	50,000	15,000	4,537	5,030	5,433
20 years	50,000	50,300	15,000	4,537	2,515	7,948

CREATION OF A $100,000 (OR LARGER) ESTATE

10 years	$100,000	$107,000	$85,000	$58,000	$10,700	$16,300
20 years	100,000	107,000	32,000	15,000	5,350	11,650
10 years	250,000	320,000	600,000	538,000	32,000	30,000
20 years	250,000	320,000	190,000	153,000	16,000	21,000
10 years	500,000	700,000	1,270,000	1,149,000	70,000	51,000
20 years	500,000	700,000	550,000	491,000	35,000	24,000
10 years	1,000,000	1,530,000	2,130,000	1,928,000	153,000	49,000
20 years	1,000,000	1,530,000	1,075,000	972,000	76,500	26,500

Assumption that taxpayer is married with two dependents.
Income taxes include Federal income, Victory, and New York State income.

Well, there you have it. There's a picture of today's problem so far as leaving a competence for your wife and children is concerned. Of course, there's a war to be won and war takes money—astronomical amounts of it. And I believe in taxes and more taxes in order that we may pay as much of the bill as humanly possible as we go along. But I question the wisdom, economically and socially, of taxing a man's income and estate so heavily that it is impracticable or impossible for him to leave a fair competence for his widow and children; I seriously question whether or not it is economically sound, as we understand the meaning of the term today, in effect to confiscate all property once a generation, as Dr. Conant's American Radical would do.

I raise this question because I have always believed in the personal liberty of the individual—the God-given right to work, to save, to provide for one's family and for one's self. I have always believed in the initiative and incentive which personal liberty inspires and in the obligations to society which personal liberty demands. I believe in the equality of opportunity which since the founding of America 167 years ago has brought reward to the humble and to the proud alike and has provided the incentive to achieve personal success and security—attainments which in turn have contributed so largely to the progress of this great country of ours. If I didn't believe in these things I wouldn't be in the life-insurance business, which certainly has its humanitarian roots down deep in the fertile soil of personal liberty, personal initiative, and maintenance of the home.

There can be no denying the right to tax and to tax heavily in times of national urgency and for the purpose of raising necessary revenue. But, again, I question any tax which is levied for the sole purpose of social reform; which in effect denies to a widow the right to live in security as the result of her husband's personal initiative and thrift; which may deny to the children the right to an education and a helping hand at the threshold of their maturity.

Of course, if a man is in good health and otherwise insurable, he may create his entire estate through life insurance, rather than through stocks, bonds, real estate, or other property, and his life insurance estate at present will enjoy certain nominal tax advantages. Certainly life insurance is the obvious way to create an estate today; isn't it? There could be no more convincing reason for its use than I have shown you. But there again, what of tomorrow? No one

knows for certain what tomorrow's tax laws may provide, and if recent action may be taken as any criterion, then we may expect that the imposition of additional taxes upon a man's life insurance estate certainly will continue to occur to our legislators. Already we have seen the specific $40,000 exclusion wiped out.

At such time as the matter of further life insurance taxation again may come up, however, our tax experts should remember this: Life insurance is indemnification in character. Its purpose is to make no one rich; to reap no profits for the beneficiary, but simply and solely to indemnify a widow and children against the loss of income occasioned by the death of the breadwinner.

Happily, a few of our outstanding legislators realize this, and their testimony in behalf not only of life insurance but of the right to leave a competence for one's family lends encouragement to the hope that American traditions of personal liberty may continue to prevail in years to come.

One of these legislators is Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, who says this:

"Frankly, aside from my home, a small farm in New Hampshire, my life insurance represents most of my life's savings. I have three boys; one is now in the armed forces in foreign service; two are in the public schools. The insurance I carry gives me assurance that my sons will be brought to manhood. It is my way of providing security for them, assuring them of an education, clothes, a home, and other necessities of life, regardless of what may happen to me.

"The protection which I have afforded them gives me comfort day by day as I go through the hazards of life. I am fortified by the realization that whatever tomorrow may bring I have done the best I could to safeguard the future of my children.

"Today with the world in the greatest chaos of all time what can a man cling to but the stable, substantial things of life? What greater comfort can any man have than the knowledge that come what may his family shall not suffer?

"Security and protection stretch beyond the grave and extend a helping hand to loved ones after the physical support of the family breadwinner ceases to be a functioning element. That is life insurance. But as great as life insurance is, it cannot be considered a thing mechanical. It is human in its entirety. There is the personal, individual understanding that must be reckoned with in the scheme of things * * * even for a factor as strong, as powerful, as complete as life insurance."

Another is Representative WESLEY E. DISNEY, of Oklahoma, member of the House Ways and Means Committee, who says:

"There was only one way I could provide for my wife in the event of something happening to me—so I started my life-insurance program; a too limited one, I realize now. It was the only way a public official dependent upon a small monthly income, could provide an estate. My chief regret is that I did not, in those earlier days, enlarge my program of insurance. I waited until later to do that, and in consequence I am absolutely compelled to carry for the protection of my family in its present station in life, an insurance program that is expensive. I am paying for my lack of foresight. Upon this experience, my advice to the younger generation is to start your insurance plans early and enlarge them to completion before middle age.

"As I have said, since those days the life of a prosecutor in Oklahoma has become less hazardous; but I moved on 10 years ago to Congress and then was elected to Ways and Means, the Tax Committee—so I might still be classed as living a dangerous life, particularly when taxes are the subject matter of conversation. But I'm still a policyholder and still interested in what happens to the life-insurance business. I am interested first because I have put my own money into it these last 30 years, and the future security of my family rests in the hands of the management of the insurance companies. That is almost literally true. Beyond that, I'm interested in life insurance because I've seen it in action, seen the part it has been compelled to play in the development and preservation of the governmental and business principles of our democracy."

Representative DISNEY speaks of "the future security of my family," and that brings me to the "so what?" of my talk here today. I started out by quoting from Dr. Conant's article on American radicals who would resolutely "demand the confiscation, by constitutional methods, of all property once a generation" (and remember that life insurance is property), then I showed you how impracticable or impossible it is adequately to provide for your family under today's tax schedule other than through the medium of life insurance, which itself certainly is not and has not been immune to increased taxation, but which today appears to be about the only way in which a fair competence may be passed on.

Now I don't necessarily say that the present tax situation points up a trend or holds a threat for the future; but I do say that you had better start thinking about how you are going to leave a fair competence for your family—whether through stocks, bonds, real estate, life insurance, or other property—and start talking with your legislator friends about the problem so that there may be no misunderstanding whatever when this war is over.

Furthermore, I believe that in order to guarantee that the family may continue to exist as the principal unit of our civilization from generation to generation, we must be prepared to oppose vigorously any attempt which might in the future be made to break up trust funds and estates of a reasonable amount, through tax means or otherwise. And in view of the obvious fact that today the amount of so-called "spendable funds" available for the creation of a competence for widows and children will go further in life insurance than in other forms of saving, I believe that a deduction for life-insurance premiums up to a reasonable amount should be allowed in calculating income tax; that the recent exclusion of $40,000 of life insurance from estate tax should be immediately restored; and that, in order to help families conserve whatever estate they may inherit and promptly pay their taxes on it—and this point is most important—life insurance specifically earmarked for payment of estate taxes should not be included in the taxable estate. This would not only benefit the family, but the United States Treasury as well, for it would definitely assure the Treasury of its estate-tax revenue, no matter what the structure of the estate might be.

The progress of this great and enduring country of ours ever since it was born on that glorious day 167 years ago has been based upon one thing and one alone: The will to work and to save and to provide security and freedom for the family. And freedom, gentlemen, is not only a right but a hard-won heritage which constantly must be fought for to be preserved. If we ourselves are to be denied by law the privilege of providing security for the family, then others must provide it. And every time people accept a guaranty of security from others they surrender an equal amount of freedom.

South Dakota Pheasants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of Outdoor America, national sportsmen's magazine published as the official organ of the Izaak Walton League of America, appears the following article, which will be of interest to hunters, sportsmen, and conservationists throughout the country. Along with bumper crops of corn, grain, hogs, beef, poultry, and sheep this year, South Dakota has a bumper crop of its official State bird—the South Dakota pheasant.

Anybody in America who loves the thrill of a day afield and enjoys the challenge of hunting upland game birds is cordially invited to South Dakota this year during the open season on pheasants, which started last Saturday, September 25, and runs until January 31, 1944, in many sections of the State. Bag limits this year are seven birds, three of which may be hens. Hunters visiting this sportsmen's paradise this year should bring their own shells, but local citizens will cooperate in finding ways for them to reach the hunting areas through share-the-hunt-and-save-gas clubs and other means. With an abundance of moisture the past 2 years, lakes, ponds, rivers, and streams are full of water, so duck and goose hunting are expected to be unusually good in addition to the unprecedented plethora of pheasants, which is attracting world-wide attention to South Dakota as a mecca for all devotees of dog, field, and gun:

SOUTH DAKOTA PHEASANTS

South Dakota leads the States in sale of nonresident licenses, and the pheasant is the cause of it. An estimated kill of 4,500,000 pheasants was chalked up for last year in South Dakota, and this represents in excess of 9,000,000 pounds of edible meat. That is a little item in the Nation's food supply that governmental agencies might well ponder before they permit restrictions in gasoline and ammunition to interfere with the taking of this year's crop. But the problem is even more involved: Unless hunters are permitted to crop the pheasant, the pheasant will crop an appreciable part of the farmer's grains, so you can add another 10,000,000 pounds or so to the Nation's food losses.

Abrogation of Cremieux Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following petition to French Committee of National Liberation to set aside abrogation of Cremieux decree:

General CATROUX,
Gen. CHARLES DE GAULLE,
Gen. HENRI GIRAUD,
THE FRENCH COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL LIBERATION,
Algiers, Africa.

GENTLEMEN: On March 14, 1943, General Giraud announced "for the same purpose of eliminating all racial discrimination, the Cremieux Decree, which in 1870 had established a difference in the position of the Moslem and Jewish natives, has been abrogated."

Much water has gone over the dam since that deplorable action. The French Committee of National Liberation has been formed. Furthermore, there has been set up a new provisional consultative assembly which is to start its regular meetings on November 3, which assembly is to collaborate with your committee on national policies in the same sense that a parliament works with a cabinet. These are creditable liberal moves. Furthermore, recent appointments to French Committee of National Liberation indicate a strong desire to purge the French Empire of so-called collaborationists, Vichyites, and the underminers of the French Republic's Constitution, and all men of uncertain loyalty. We are given to understand that the "purge" generally means that the so-called Petain government and all its acts shall be deemed illegal.

All these steps have met with wholehearted approval in the United States and uttermost sympathy.

It must, therefore, seem pertinent to ask why the order abrogating the Cremieux Decree still stands. That order is quite inconsistent with the aims and aspiration of the French Committee of National Liberation.

As a member of the Congress of the United States, I, therefore, humbly petition that the Cremieux Decree of 1870 be reinstated with all possible speed.

It can readily be seen that the unwillingness of the Arab, who can upon request be admitted to French citizenship, to depart from his special status which includes such practices as polygamy, forced marriage, and the succession in the male line only, all incompatible with French laws and customs, and the deprivation of the Jew of his cherished right of citizenship in no ways serves the purpose of "removal of racial discrimination." What "racial discrimination" is there as a matter of actual fact when only approximately 30 Moslems have sought naturalization each year? The Arabs considered their own naturalization an offense to their religion.

When in 1870 it was decreed that "The native Jews of the departments of Algeria are declared French citizens," the Algerian Jews were reaping the benefits of their undisputed loyalty to the cause of France, from which loyalty they have never departed.

The loss of citizenship is one of the gravest punishments imposed upon a wrongdoer. Why are the Jews being punished?

Half the population of the three departments of Algeria is composed of hundreds of thousands of Spaniards, Italians, Maltese, the Syrians of Catholic, Protestant, Moslem, and Jewish religions. Since 1870 they have flooded into Algeria and have become naturalized. Surely, it is most unjust that of all these naturalized persons, only the Jews, on the basis of racial equality, are selected for deprivation of citizenship. Moreover, the abrogation of the Cremieux Decree was a violation and cancelation of the French law of nationality of 1927. You must surely take cognizance of the fact that the grandchildren and great grandchildren of the native Algerian Jews of 1870 who were collectively naturalized are today French, not because of the effect of this naturalization, but by all that is signified by "born of French parents in France," in the Nationality Act of 1927.

Thus, if the Arabs are unwilling to embrace collective naturalization, justice is not served by a reduction in the political status of the Jews. When, moreover, the illegality of the abrogation of the Cremieux Decree is clearly apparent, you will agree no reason exists, whatsoever, in permitting such abrogation to continue in full force and effect.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, New York.

Resolution of the Chenango County (N. Y.) Board of Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in and by its act of September 20, 1941, effective October 1, 1941, section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code, levied an annual tax of $10 on each pool table, billiard table, and bowling alley, contained in any place or room where such games are played, except in private homes, and

Whereas said act applies to and requires payment of said tax by various charitable and noncharitable organizations, clubs, and fire companies, any of which have or maintain a pool or billiard table or bowling alley in its meeting rooms for the recreation of its members, organized and existing without thought of financial gain, and

Whereas it is well known that practically all organizations, afore-mentioned, maintain and operate their necessary meeting quarters and clubrooms from funds supplied or donated by themselves, and that maintenance of such meeting places is necessary in order to maintain the morale and effectiveness of such organizations, and that such fire companies, fraternity orders, clubs, and similar organizations, maintain one or more pool or billiard tables, or bowling alleys, in their meeting rooms for the pleasure and recreation of their members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors, of Chenango County, State of New York, considers the said tax, insofar as it applies to volunteer fire companies, fraternity orders, clubs, and similar organizations, to be obnoxious, unwarranted, and un-American, and an improper exercise of the tax-levying powers of the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be and hereby is petitioned with all respect to repeal or amend the said act, insofar as the same applies to the afore-mentioned organizations and orders; and that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable JAMES M. MEAD and Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senators; and to the Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, United States Congressman. Seconded by Mr. Brown and duly adopted.

Twenty-Two-Billion-Dollar Campaign Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Thursday, September 23, I desire to include the following newspaper article, written by William K. Hutchinson for the International News Service. The information contained in this article should motivate this Congress to investigate the contemplated reorganization of the Army's production front.

ARMY SHAKE-UP PLOT PERILS 16 COMMANDS

(By William K. Hutchinson)

A group of influential White House advisers are planning today to give Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell personal control of the expenditure of $22,000,000,000 in the coming year by a complete reorganization of the entire Army production front.

This domestic coup d'état is the objective behind the cabal's efforts to oust Gen. George C. Marshall from his post as Army Chief of Staff and "kick him upstairs" to a glorified but powerless world command over Anglo-American forces.

Informed sources say the motive is to use the Army's vast production program, excepting aircraft, as a political weapon in the 1944 Presidential campaign. Aircraft production, now bossed exclusively by Gen. H. H. Arnold, Army Air Chief, may be included later.

Some observers believe the cabal also intend to build up Somervell as an Army running mate for Mr. Roosevelt on a fourth-term ticket to offset the possible Republican nomination of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

There is no evidence whatever that either President Roosevelt or General Marshall has ever heard of the purpose or potential effect of the plot. Knowledge of it, however, has spread terror through the highest ranks of the War Department.

It can be stopped by the President refusing to oust General Marshall from his present control of the Army. Marshall's friends know he would prevent any political manipulation of Army affairs. That is why the cabal is determined to oust him.

It can be stopped by Congress regardless of Marshall's fate.

The group sponsoring this plan is composed of high-ranking civil and Army officials who are known to be the political protégés of Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter.

The coup d'état is to be accomplished by abolishing all production activities by the seven highly skilled technical supply services and transferring their $22,000,000,000 purchasing power to the Army Service Forces, which Somervell now heads. All these technical services are now grouped under Somervell, but he has no control over their expenditures, contract negotiations, or production schedules.

Actual regulation of production will be turned over to the Army Service Command. But the present nine service commands are to be abolished and six new ones created in various production areas, with six political generals named to command the new areas.

The nine service command generals whose districts are to be abolished are:

Maj. Gen. Sherman Miles, Boston, Mass.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Terry, New York City.
Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, Baltimore, Md.
Maj. Gen. William Bryden, Atlanta, Ga.
Maj. Gen. Fred C. Wallace, Columbus, Ohio.
Maj. Gen. Henry Aurand, Chicago, Ill.
Maj. Gen. Frederick Uhl, Omaha, Nebr.
Maj. Gen. Richard Donovan, Dallas, Tex.
Maj. Gen. Kenyon A. Joyce, Salt Lake City, Utah.

The present technical experts, heading the seven technical supply services, will be made "armchair generals," handling routine paper work. They are to be stripped of all authority over production of the war instruments in which they have specialized for years. The cabal made this certain by preparing a new form of contract, which eliminates the technical services from all contacts with construction matters. This elimination was made doubly certain by a notation on the new form itself, which reads, according to one person who saw it:

"No copies of these contracts will be sent to the offices of the chiefs of the technical services for review or any other action."

The heads of the seven technical supply services who will have their powers slashed: The Quartermaster General, Maj. Gen. E. B. Gregory; the Chief of Ordnance, Maj. Gen. L. H. Campbell, Jr.; the Chief of Chemical Warfare, Maj. Gen. W. N. Porter; the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. E. Reybold; the Chief Signal Officer, Maj. Gen. D. Olmstead; the Surgeon General, Maj. Gen. J. C. Magee, and the Chief of Transportation, Maj. Gen. C. P. Gross.

Leaders of the cabal will defend their plot by contending that they propose to streamline "antiquated War Department production machinery" in order to speed up production. But their actual proposal is to eliminate the present commodity organization production system and substitute a functional organization.

Prominent industrialists long have derided any claim that a functional organization can outproduce a commodity organization. The Army's present commodity organization was drafted from the successful production practices of the Sears-Roebuck, Ford, General Motors, and du Pont de Nemours companies. Industrialists say most functional organizations have failed.

The greatest production failure of all time was that of the War Department itself in the First World War. It failed to get a single American-built airplane to France before the Armistice; no American artillery ever reached United States troops in France, forcing them to borrow French 75's; no American-made artillery ammunition ever reached them. And the War Department operated on a functional organization basis in production. It was because of the system's frightful failure that the Department subsequently adopted the present commodity organization system after long conferences with successful industrialists.

On top of this the seven technical supply services have been negotiating contracts locally through regional officers scattered all over the United States. This practice has served to eliminate red tape, delay, and bottlenecks, the result being a stupendous increase in production.

The cabal would eliminate this successful decentralized procurement program, centering final authority back in Washington and making six service command generals responsible for production in their own areas. This would be a complete reversal of General Marshall's conviction that—

"Decentralization of authority was an imperative requirement for the tremendous war expansion."

One nationally known industrialist, asked for his opinion as to the effect of shifting Army production from a commodity to a functional basis during wartime, replied:

"It will lose the war. It would be the most monumental mistake in the history of our country. Only fools or worse would advocate it. It would bring production to a state of collapse within 6 months. It would cost us the price of victory."

There is one fact that links the cabal's plot to give Somervell a $22,000,000,000 "kitty" during an election year and the cabal's plot to oust General Marshall as Chief of Staff.

It is a secret order, issued through Somervell, directing that the new production system be placed in effect on September 15 last. This order was issued after the Quebec conference, at which the President and Prime Minister Churchill agreed to make Marshall commander in chief of all Anglo-American forces.

That secret order was withdrawn before September 15, in even greater secrecy, with further action on it postponed from day to day after the fifteenth dead line passed. This delay in reissuing the order is attributed by responsible authorities to the President's failure to announce Marshall's removal as Chief of Staff and transfer to the glorified desk job in London.

There was one development right after Quebec that may only be a coincidence, but it may be the reason why both the Marshall ouster and the Somervell coup d'état have not yet been consummated. It is the fact that Prime Minister Churchill came to Washington from Quebec, spent a week end here, then went to Boston, and out of a clear sky washed his hands of any complicity in the Marshall plot. It may have been he learned the details of both plots on that friendly week-end visit to Washington.

Peace River Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, on my return to Washington from my home in Alaska recently, I traveled over most of the Alaska Highway, constructed, under the supervision of the Army engineers, between Delta Junction, which is about 100 miles south of Fairbanks, Alaska, and Dawson Creek, British Columbia. The total distance from Fairbanks to Dawson Creek is approximately 1,631 miles. Later I expect to address the House on the subject of the highway, but at this moment I desire to present the remarks made by Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, commanding Northwest Service Command, and by Col. K. B. Bush, chief of staff of that command, at the dedication of the Peace River Bridge near Fort St. John, British Columbia, on the Alaska Highway.

This bridge is an integral part of the highway and is a monument to the sound judgment and the engineering skill and ability of all who participated in its construction. The opening remarks of Colonel Bush and the inspiring dedicatory speech of General O'Connor follow:

OPENING REMARKS OF COL. K. B. BUSH, CHIEF OF STAFF, NORTHWEST SERVICE COMMAND

I would be remiss if I did not open this program with a brief message of appreciation to the men, soldiers and civilians, whose efforts have made possible this magnificent structure over one of Canada's great rivers. It is their achievement which we honor today. The ceremony about to begin is merely symbolic of what they have accomplished.

I also want to thank the distinguished visitors of both Canada and the United States who have come long distances to attend this dedication of the Peace River Bridge. Their presence here together is further indication—if such indication were needed—of the solidarity and good neighborliness of our two nations.

The dedication of this imposing bridge marks a new era in the development of the far northwest. I believe it deserves to rank with that historic morning 45 years ago when Inspector O'Brien of the old Northwest Mounted Police led northward through this very region the detachment of scarlet-coated men who were to bring law and order to the Yukon.

In concluding these introductory remarks, I want to express the gratitude of the Northwest Service Command to the men and women of this section of Canada who have cooperated so wholeheartedly in the many undertakings for our joint defense and security which have been started here.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. JAMES A. O'CONNOR, COMMANDING NORTHWEST SERVICE COMMAND

It is both an honor and a privilege for me to speak briefly on this historic occasion as the representative of the United States Army. This great bridge across the Peace River fittingly symbolizes the 1,630-mile highway of which it is a part. Beyond the northern tower of the bridge stretches the vast wilderness of the Canadian Northwest, and beyond that the strategic Territory of Alaska; and beyond Alaska lies the immense battleground of the North Pacific Ocean, where inevitably the armed forces of the United Nations will punish the Japanese aggressors.

Off to the south, beyond this span's opposite abutment, are Edmonton, Winnipeg, Minneapolis, Chicago, and countless other North American cities where the weapons of democracy are being produced in ever-increasing quantities. The Peace River Bridge, which we dedicate today, may almost be said to be a link between the productive centers of freedom and the battle front where freemen will at last bring the Japanese to book.

It is particularly fitting that today's ceremony should be attended by high officials of the two great countries of the North American Continent. We are honored by the presence of a cabinet minister of the Province of British Columbia. We also have the pleasure of being host to a delegation of leading businessmen from the great Canadian city of Vancouver. We are similarly honored by the attendance of a committee of distinguished Members of the United States Senate, who have come to see for themselves the results of American handiwork, tenacity, and resourcefulness.

A wise philosopher once said that history was made subconsciously. I wonder how many of the men, soldiers and civilians alike, whose heroic effort went into this bridge and the road it carries, actually realized that they were participating in events of historic magnitude? Who here can measure the future significance of the first land route to Alaska?

Perhaps this is the beginning of a network of roads penetrating the farthest reaches of the American Northwest. The highway on which we stand today is a military road. It was authorized under the impact of urgent military necessity. Its two-fold purpose is essentially military in nature—first, to supplement, supply and anchor the air route to Alaska, and, second, to provide an alternative thoroughfare to the North Pacific in case the sea lanes should be lost.

This road accomplishes that twin objective. Yet in the years to come, other objectives will surely be recognized. Alaska, the Yukon, the Northwest Territories, Northern Alberta and Northern British Columbia—who can estimate the natural resources which these immense domains hold in trust? Across the roof of the world a new artery of travel is in development, an artery which may link us more securely to our allies in Asia and the East.

Before I conclude these brief remarks, let me tell you a few facts about the imposing span we are about to open. The over-all length of the Peace River Bridge is 2,275 feet, nearly half a mile. It is thus one of the great bridges of the Dominion of Canada. The main span, from tower to tower is 930 feet long. The width of the roadway is 24 feet, ample for a constant flow of two-lane traffic.

This bridge cost $1,750,000. It was designed by the United States Public Roads Administration; the superstructure was built by John Roebling & Sons, and the smaller substructure was the product of the Dufferin Company of Canada. Construction was started in November of last year. Construction was carried on throughout last winter, when the temperature often dropped to 55 degrees below zero. This bridge represents not alone steel and concrete, cable and timber. It also represents human talent, skill, persistence, and heroism.

I think we may safely predict that this line on the Peace River Bridge, where soon the dedicatory ribbon will be severed, is a historic threshold in the development of our continent. And I believe we all owe prayer and thanks to God for making possible this advanced stage in our task. We pray to Him that this great bridge, spanning one of Canada's mighty rivers, will prove of use and benefit to mankind—now, in the stern job before us, and later in the peace to come.

Does Our Foreign Policy Require the President's Reelection?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein a speech made by H. Alexander Smith, Republican national committeeman from New Jersey, over the radio on September 19, 1943:

In the critical times through which we are passing there can be no place for petty partisan politics. We all need vision and statesmanship of the highest order if we are to unite our country and give our all for the war effort and post-war reconstruction. It is in this spirit that we must approach the answer to the question that is before us.

If we should take the position that our foreign policy required the President's reelection, it would logically call for the abandonment of all elections in time of war. At the darkest hour in her country's history Great Britain changed leadership. Under the responsible British system, Chamberlain resigned and Winston Churchill was chosen to lead the nation. We are all loyal to our President as Commander in Chief in time of war, yet, because of this fact, we are not precluded under our free American system from having minds of our own. The very cause for which we are fighting negatives the thought that Americans should be regimented and told to rubber stamp the leadership and policies of those who for the moment are in command.

We must not confuse the conduct of the war with foreign policy. Some people seem to feel that some way, somehow, the efficient conduct of the war will be impaired if we change leadership while the war is going on, or in the common expression, "if we swap horses while crossing the stream." No one for a moment can suggest that a change in the Presidency at this time would in any way impair the war effort, would in any way change our military, naval, and air force organizations, would in any way affect our cooperation with the other United Nations. We are all Americans before we are partisans, but at the same time we are free Americans and we reserve the right to determine whether the war effort and our post-war foreign policy would be strengthened by a change in our national leadership.

It is an unfortunate fact that the New Deal administration is using the war emergency and the indispensability of a single man as a disguise to bring into our American life a new form of government. Two fundamental philosophies are struggling for the control of the America of the future. The one is the planned economy under which the individual is subordinated to the State. The other is the free economy under which Government is the servant of the people and under which equality of opportunity for the individual is the keynote. This is a fundamental and important issue. Already, because of the threat of war, we have violated our Presidential two-term tradition. We are surely justified in being on our guard against any further challenge to our freedom.

The next President of the United States, elected in 1944, will undoubtedly be in office when the war comes to an end. If our foreign policy demands the reelection of the President at this time, it means that we, as a people, are willing to trust the New Deal leadership in the making of the peace and in determining the place of the United States in the new world.

To say that the present administration is indispensable is to ignore and brush aside the patriotism and the ability of millions of Americans who are outside of and not sympathetic with the bureaucratic domination of the New Deal. We of the opposition very properly are apprehensive of extending the New Deal philosophy into world affairs. We do not believe that the world can be brought back to sanity by international W. P. A.'s, or by the paternaltistic condescension of the stronger nations. Just as we oppose the planned economy at home with all its demoralizing effects on the morale of our people, we likewise oppose the attempts of a few intellectuals to plan for the whole world and to determine what kind of governments other people shall set up.

No; our American foreign policy does not require the reelection of the President or the continuance of the present administration. On the contrary, our American tradition insists that no man or group of men are indispensable. Our highest loyalty to our country requires us to demand the most efficient and businesslike prosecution of the war effort and the enunciation and carrying out of an American and not a New Deal foreign policy.

A very real danger in the fourth term of candidacy of the President is the certainty of bitter division throughout the entire country. It would mean much to us all if he immediately removed this divisive issue by withdrawing as a candidate and permitting his party to nominate his successor. Irrespective of who was elected President, Mr. Roosevelt would be a welcome and important member of the peace negotiators. Such an act would prevent misconstruction abroad of our election results. No greater contribution to the unity of America could be made at this time.

Question No. 1: Does the Republican Party favor a special post-war alliance with Great Britain?

My reply must be considered purely personal as I have no authority to speak for the Republican Party.

The question presents the interesting distinction suggested by such important commentators as Walter Lippmann and others between special alliances with friendly nations and some sort of world league. My own judgment is that we will ultimately move toward a world organization as distinguished from special alliances, but for the immediate future our logical course for positive, effective action and for our own safety lies in the further extension by alliance, if necessary, of the activities of the United Nations.

If hostilities were to cease tomorrow with unconditional surrender of all Axis Powers, it seems inevitable that we must continue the full cooperation of the United Nations and especially the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China in preserving the peace while we are endeavoring to bring some order out of the chaos that will inevitably ensue.

I like the Hoover-Gibson expression, "trustees of the peace," which suggests the principle of "trusteeship" during a "transition" period, evolving ultimately into a world organization to preserve the peace and to substitute the rule of law for the rule of force in international affairs.

Question No. 2: Do you favor letting the German people organize their own educational system after the war if they set up a democracy?

The statement of the question emphasizes my fear of a New Deal foreign policy. We have heard New Deal expressions implying that we should tell other nations what kind of governments they should set up, and that we should direct their educational systems. The New Deal philosophy of planning is here seen in its most dangerous aspect. Obviously, if the German people do not organize their own educational system after the war, some nation or group of nations, must select, train, and send educators to teach the German children. The very statement indicates the utter impossibility of any such proposal. We cannot and must not try either to organize or run other countries. We must do all that we can to help them help themselves.

There is a real distinction between the principle of "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to obtain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world," as declared by the recent Republican conference at Mackinac Island, and the suggested New Deal foreign policy which contemplates a social and educational program imposed on a reluctant and suspicious world by force.

We will fail in the big objective of the war if we deny freedom of self-expression to any nation or group of nations.

The Great Books Are Being Closed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

THE GREAT BOOKS ARE BEING CLOSED

REMARKS TO A HIGH-SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS IN MAY OF 1943 [1]

I am glad to be able to come here on your graduation day to meet with you and your parents, your relatives, and your friends, because my friend and your board president, Mr. Schmidt, and your supervising principal, Mr. Wentland, asked that I do so. But I also have a selfish reason. I wanted to see a high-school class of 1943 graduate, and to make a record of certain facts I think should be said on such an occasion, in the presence of those whose tax dollars paid the costs involved. And particularly I wanted to witness this 1943 graduation and to make the record I want to make, in a school building paid for by local funds and directed by the local representatives of those whose money built it. Your handsome building happens to have been built with local money; your local representatives, let it be recorded to their honor, are at least attempting to direct what goes on within its walls.

Home community control displaced by non-local bureaucracy

Our early schools were so built. They were directed by the representatives of those who paid for them. The results appear the more attractive the closer we compare them with those of the methods and controls that have been substituted.

Your supervising principal suggested that I might appropriately bring you "a good definition of success in the true sense of the word." I could attempt to do that, but I hope that what I have indicated I want to say for the record before a high-school graduating class in the summer of 1943 will result in your framing for yourselves a sound definition of success.

Your supervising principal very kindly gave me three alternative subjects, moreover. The first was to tell you what chance you have of becoming famous. I am hoping that when I have made the record I want to make here, you will be able to decide soundly for yourselves about fame, also.

The next alternative subject suggested by your supervising principal was to tell you of "my observations of people and offer my judgment as to their value in society." While I shall not name names, I am hoping that nevertheless you will be able to make some excellent guesses in connection with this alternative when what I have to say is in the record.

Burn the great books—neglect them—close them: All three spell out the same tragedy

The final alternative suggested by your supervising principal is the one I have selected. It is that I speak to you on any subject "upon which I might like to enlarge."

When you have heard the statement I desire to place on record, here under the specific circumstances I have mentioned and believe to be peculiarly appropriate, I am confident you will agree there is urgent need indeed to "enlarge upon it."

Let us remember that in this summer of 1943 the great books are being closed

For this is that statement: This summer of 1943, the great books of learning are being closed to the average student in all the colleges, and even in some of the public high schools. Plutarch's Lives, Aristotle, Milton, the Gospels, Horace, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Ovid, the Old and New Testaments, Cicero, Plato—all down through that luminous list that measures our most priceless heritage—being closed for the duration only, perhaps, but being closed. Of course they are not being closed all over the world—in China, in England, in Russia, in Canada, for example, they remain open—but here in our schools and in our colleges, they are being closed. In Germany and in Italy they have of course been closed—and in some instances also burnt—ever since our enemies, the Fascists, seized those countries.

The liberal arts are being blocked out

This means the study of the humanities and of the social sciences—all that broadening education to which the liberal arts are the foundation—is being practically blacked out all over the land: History, literature, the fine arts, philosophy, religion, anthropology, economics, education, geography, international political science, psychology, sociology—all blacked out, except for a gesture here and there, elementary and perfunctory, in the direction of history and geography, and some indications of recognition of psychology.

The small privately controlled liberal-arts colleges are being starved out

As the great books are closed, different books are being opened in great profusion. These are the detailed books of how to do this and that—from how to weld to how to run drill presses—the technical books for training in skills. And the big colleges are to be training centers for the mechanical trades; the small privately controlled colleges, which have perhaps most effectively educated in those studies that prepare men to be free, are evidently not going to be given a chance even to survive as training centers.

Now it goes without saying not only that we must concentrate on winning the war, but that we must give first place to that concentration. It is as obvious that we must perfect ourselves in the skills necessary for the production and operation of the machines of war.

But certainly it is clear that it does not follow that it is necessary to close the great books of learning, to blot out the small liberal arts colleges in order to accomplish this necessary end.

Who among us are blacking out the small liberal-arts colleges?

This fact is so evident, indeed, that of itself it suggests there are among us some who wittingly or unwittingly are moving to black out the small liberal-arts colleges, practically to discard education in the humanities and the social sciences, and to intensify technical instruction.

At least we can discover whether or not a bit of consideration of the past so indicates.

Education with a purpose over and beyond mere technical training

First, we might profitably recall the education typical of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was education to give the strength necessary to live in a hard world. It centered in small towns, like your towns in this joint school district. It was under home control, the type of control your school board and its president, Mr. Schmidt, would prefer to be able to prescribe on your parents' behalf. And that it produced great leaders we all know.

Now it will be plain to you why I wanted to meet a 1943 graduating class in a school built entirely by local money, as these earlier schools were, and this school of yours is the only one of which I happened to know.

Education to increase the power of the mind, not merely the dexterity of the hands

There were no frills dangling to the educational program of the days to which we are looking back; and it was not vocational. The students studied, among other subjects, the old languages—but they studied them as a means to an end, this end being, first, the acquisition of a certain mental toughness under a learning process which was not easy; second, to be able to analyze the political wisdom of man's outstanding efforts to improve society.

They studied faults that they might acquire sufficient understanding to guard against them; they studied in order to train the mind to think and the tongue to speak; they studied truths in order to be able to apply them during their own lives to man's quest for truth and happiness. In short, they studied to increase the power of the mind, to gain for themselves the power to think and to evaluate, to focus the learning of the past on the present.

Yes, they studied homely virtues, but in terms that would aid them make the social relations of their lives more fruitful and just. Some of these virtues Aristotle handed down to them, it is true—prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance. And from Christianity they took several, there is no doubt—for example, liberality and courtesy.

No, their study of homely virtues and the accomplishments of the past was not to gain merely a superficial, useless, impractical veneer. Instead, its purpose was sound preparation for the assumption of leadership of their fellow men, if they happened to be called upon to lead; sound preparation for meeting individually the day's problems growing from the issues of man in relation to his fellow man and the State; sound preparation to acquire courage and control.

We black out as our boys fight the results of the same black-out overseas

There are disciplines in that sort of education — uncompromising disciplines. That, indeed, is why it creates ability to distinguish right from wrong, fact from fallacy; to say "No" when "No" should be said, and to say "Yes" only when "Yes" should be said. And it is liberal education, right education appropriate for freemen—men free in mind as well as socially free and economically prosperous—a type of education conceived by Plato and the Greeks, perfected by Cicero and the Romans, incidentally the type of education we are blacking out at home while our boys fight against what blacking it out has created overseas.

A temporary backsliding capitalized by the enemies of liberal education

But—as we all know—as the country's dollars-and-cents wealth grew, this sturdy type of education was frequently brushed aside. It became popular to make the educational process pleasurable. Discipline—doing something difficult—was now secondary. Students began to know so much less about so much more that they were quite convinced that they, like some of their teachers knew all the answers.

Frills and isms then of course blossomed from one end to the other of the educational field. Snobbishness characterized some of the large eastern institutions; mass-production methods marked the large western universities supported by public funds. Fraternity folderol, social goings-on, and hippodromic athletics were additional educational ab-

[1] The class of 1943, Arbor Vitae-Woodruff High School, joint school district No. 1 (Oneida and Vilas Counties, northern Wisconsin). F. J. Schmidt, president of the board; C. R. Wentland, supervising principal.

normalities of this passing period during which much of education admittedly fell to the level of mere supervised entertainment. As Woodrow Wilson observed at the time: "Side shows have taken the place of the main tent."

A corrective reform was already under way before the war

Yet, in fact, this was but a passing period. The awakening was apparent before the present war opened, and a steady trend of reforming improvement was already apparent. England had gone through a somewhat similar period, and was already coming to her senses. And while all of this was going on, day-by-day in the smaller liberal arts colleges many earnest students were being effectively trained in the abstract principles that underlie, and in the long run shape, the course of human existence.

What is more important, these small, privately owned liberal arts colleges had never wandered into devious bypaths. Year in and year out, these, the very institutions which are now marked for liquidation, continued to supply that liberal education which is necessary to produce citizens who are capable of clear, independent, disciplined thinking. Perhaps the explanation is that they neither had the money nor the leanings toward "isms" necessary to these educational aberrations, but I like to believe they resisted—and at any rate, the decisive fact is that they did not succumb.

Ever since 1852 the drive to implant the German educational system has persisted

This passing period of educational backsliding has, however, been energetically capitalized by those who seek to introduce the German educational system into this country. To achieve this end they have been, ever since 1852, endeavoring to black out the small privately controlled liberal arts colleges.

But it was apparently unsuccessful—until the war gave its instigators new opportunities

Six distinct drives have been made by these earnest believers in trained hands and brains educated in technology but not in thinking power; drives to wipe out the liberal arts colleges in order to clear the way for concentrating higher education in this country on purely scientific subjects and to pattern it after German intellectualism. And all six of these drives failed.

Indeed, when the present war broke, there were many indications that healthy reforms correcting the extremes of the backsliding period in liberal education, and a growing realization that a democracy requires citizens who are not merely technological experts, were combining at last to rout the powerful forces driving for the extermination of the small liberal arts colleges in order to replace them with mind factories for the production of specialists.

Our entry into the war, and the lowering of the draft age to 18, however, reversed the situation completely, and gave those interested in publicly controlled education or higher education along German lines, an opportunity to accomplish more in months than they had previously been able to bring about in decades. They could now, on the one hand, capitalize effectively the wartime need for technicians, and on the other adroitly provide for training in skills at Federal expense under set-ups which in practice eliminate the small liberal arts colleges while enriching the large educational institutions, particularly, in point of numbers, those supported by taxpayers' money.

How adroit schemers were now able to stack the cards against the small liberal arts colleges

They could even blandly suggest in one breath that higher education was at last to be provided for all in a truly democratic manner, while, in the next, warning that if the small liberal arts colleges were given assistance, doing so would amount to a subsidy ruinous to the democratic foundations they cherish. Rushing directly into the armed services' educational activities in officers' uniforms, while their fellows secured important civilian posts on the other side of the fence in Washington, opportunists among educational administrators and energetic representatives of the larger educational institutions were in a position to dominate the situation completely. The heads of the small liberal arts colleges had neither the time nor the money to move to Washington; they had no places in this wartime educational picture enabling them to do so at public expense.

Events now moved quickly toward the closing of the great books. The Army's and Navy's educators in uniform decided soldier and sailor students could only be instructed in groups large enough to justify a complete military or naval command set-up. Therefore, even though a gesture was made of qualifying small liberal arts colleges for use by the Army and the Navy, a convenient excuse for actually selecting mainly only large institutions was simultaneously provided. Nearly 600 universities and colleges were officially approved for supplying instruction at the expense of the armed service—by a group on which the armed services' representatives had two-thirds of the membership—but the armed service could decide which on these lists actually to use. Thus, the elaborate motions of "approving" became practically meaningless gestures, and those representing the armed services were placed in a position to follow their individual educational inclinations, which obviously evidently do not favor the smaller, privately controlled liberal arts colleges The approved list is long, in other words, while the list of small liberal arts colleges on it which have so far been selected for actual service is short, very short indeed.

Will the War Manpower Commission act in time?

The War Manpower Commission had—still has the challenging opportunity of both differentiating between man-power and brain-power needs—on battle-fronts and supporting home-fronts alike—and of providing logically for industrial and civilian brain-power requirements while at the same time enforcing induction programs truly selective according to the intentions of the Congress. The armed services have shown a curious obliviousness to the obvious dependence of the battle lines on the home-front lines, and the Commission has it in its power to cure this lapse.

The Commission, in the course of meeting this challenge, also could have afforded the small liberal arts colleges an opportunity to serve in wartime, and to survive for vital post-war service. So far, the Commission has failed to meet this challenge, a failure which, if not speedily rectified, must not be forgotten when the day comes for finally casting up the records of those who were in a position to act when action meant the preservation of the Republic.

The Army even called into active service students for whom it had morally, but not specifically in writing, assured completion of their educational programs as reservists. The Army also insisted on taking all students 18 years of age or older out of college and putting them through basic combat training, with a prospect of their returning to take the specialized educational program.

How the Army plan for specialized training helps along the black-out of the liberal arts

Strange as this procedure was on its face, it became grotesque when in actuality the specialized program emerged as a scheme under which only professors or instructors, high school graduates, those speaking a modern foreign language fluently, or college students who had concentrated on mathematics, physics, or psychology, could normally qualify.

In other words, not only were the male students taken out of the liberal arts colleges, but it was to all intents and purposes arranged that liberal arts college students would be denied the Army's specialized educational training made available to high school graduates, to sons of the foreign-born—fluent for family reasons in a modern foreign language—and non-liberal-arts college boys. Since the demand for officers is understood to be practically filled, the liberal arts college student was in effect made a living example of the alleged uselessness of the type of education which all-around experience has demonstrated to be the most effective for developing leadership qualities.

Courses for training mechanics sketchily become the order of the day

And the courses prescribed for the specialized Army training are essentially elementary, and of course principally consist merely of instruction in skills. The Navy's record, both in respect to its moral obligations to student reservists and the type of instruction prescribed, is better than the Army's, but hardly so in regard to utilizing the facilities available in the small liberal-arts colleges by organizing small units that do not require elaborate gold-braid-command establishments. In fact, the Navy has in effect evicted citizens and students needlessly from their quarters in order to use colleges located conveniently in respect to the elaborate command set-ups both it and the Army evidently make the deciding factor in selecting the colleges to be utilized. These quarters are then reequipped at the taxpayers' expense and with critical materials, despite the existence of thousands of furnished rooms under the control of small colleges.

We are following the pattern enforced in Germany by Dr. Robert Ley

So, in this summer of 1943, with their students uprooted—and all but branded mental outcasts under the Army's educational program—and apparently with no opportunities available to them hereafter for securing sufficient students to keep their doors open, it would seem that the liquidation of the small liberal arts college, so long envisioned by those public-pay-roll educational administrators who favor higher education along German lines, is practically an accomplished piece of studied, insidious educational perfidy and miscreance. The great books of learning are being closed; education of the individuality for self-reliance is being sacrificed to training in techniques exactly as in the Third Reich under Dr. Robert Ley, and our public schools are being turned into mere technological training centers.

We shall not go down the Nazi path

Yet there is sound reason for hope that these small colleges and liberal education may still be saved. But this is so only because elimination of them, while our public-school system is turned over to technological training, would surely mean that we had set about creating here in America the kind of society the Nazis envision. And hope can certainly be held—must be held to the last—that America is not going down that path.

For that is the path away from self-reliance; the path toward allowing ourselves to be told what to do, what we should hear, what we should read; the path toward idolizing, and supinely depending on, a man and his bureaucracy instead of following the elected leader of a democracy and his elected associates; the path Germany, Italy, and Japan followed.

What we want and intend to have

It is the path those would lead us down who argue that the basis of freedom is entirely economic and that therefore training for an occupation is the only justifiable purpose of education. But we know that a job—economic independence—merely implements freedom, and is not the source of freedom, for freedom is of the mind. We therefore intend to have not only the job and the economic independence that goes with it, but as well—and first, if need be—that freedom of the mind which comes from a sense of perspective and historical relationships, from a comprehension of the relation of man to society, which no amount of technical or scientific training will ever give, has ever given.

These dangers we know

For we are alive to the dangers along this path foundationed on the premise that equality is to be measured solely by incomes and application of skills. We have learned that true equality is instead measured by an understanding—not only of the present but of the past—which is a franchise of the mind, not of the pocketbook, and one independent of creed, color, or social status. We recall that Aristole said: "It is not the possessions but the desires of mankind that must be equalized, and this is impossible unless a sufficient education is provided by the state," and we know both that the great civilizations of history have been the best educated, and that education does not mean special training to do particular jobs.

And we have common sense enough to realize that it follows that if we must live alone in the terms of the applications of skills, our existence as a civilized nation has run its course. For we have seen what has happened in Germany, where a few are selected for leadership and all the rest trained as technicians.

And these are facts we do not forget

We do not forget that we have not had a great statesman who was merely a technological expert. We think it is therefore sensible to conclude that the survival of a democracy depends on the intelligence of the electorate, and not at all on the technical training of experts staffing a bureaucracy.

Essentials of democracy we intend to keep alive

In short, we intend to keep alive liberal education and the spirit of liberal learning—the liberal arts, those appropriate for freemen, men responsive to timeless values and to public responsibilities.

We so intend because of our conviction that our dominant need as a people is a unity of outlook and purpose so generally recognized it acquires authority sufficient to resolve the confusions and the conflicts endangering the Republic. Having seen the authority of theology, and later of science, fail to fill this need for us, we hold that development of this unity and adequate acknowledgment of its authority, both depend now on the disciplines of liberal education.

By so holding, we do not contend that study of man's ancient gropings in the past as such, of dead languages as such, or of any particular number of books—styled classics—as such, supplies the appropriate education. What we do contend for is a distillation, a sifting out of knowledge in the fields of the humanities into methods and applications meeting present-day problems and necessary to the development of ability to cope with the problems of the world today to the maximum satisfaction of student and society.

What opportunists among educational administrators are proposing

And we intend to reopen the great books of learning in our schools as well as in our colleges, for we agree with Louis B. Wright when he warns: "In the emergency, opportunists among educational administrators are proposing a scheme that plays diabolically into the hand of Fascist sympathizers. They propose to discard all pretense of humanistic education for the duration of the war and to turn the vast school system into training centers in subjects useful to the war effort—they betray either gross ignorance of the democratic needs of a democratic state, or a Machiavellian design to undermine the fundamental sources of democracy. Wittingly or unwittingly, they are seeking to place the kind of education necessary for leadership beyond the reach of the laborer's son who must attend public schools and cannot afford to enroll in a private institution where he might acquire fundamental knowledge necessary for intelligent citizenship in a democracy * * * attempting to persuade the American public to adopt the educational policies of Dr. Robert Ley and the German Reich."

This indeed would be a tragic paradox

And with Ernest M. Hopkins: "It would be a tragic paradox if, as the result of the war, we were to allow our system of higher education to be transformed into the type of education which has made it so easy for a crowd of government gangsters like Hitler's outfit to commandeer a whole population."

It would amount to losing the peace before we have gained it

And with Irvin Edman: "If the humanities, or the humanistic temper which they promote, are permitted to lapse now, we shall have lost the peace before we have gained it, and the real victory after the war will be to the way of life, inhuman, tyrannical, mechanical, of those whom we shall ourselves have conquered."

A crime comparable with the burning of the books by the Nazis

And with Wendell Willkie: "The destruction of the tradition of the liberal arts, at this crisis in our history, when freedom is more than ever at stake, would be a crime comparable with the burning of the books by the Nazis. And it would have approximately the same results. Burn your books—or what amounts to the same thing, neglect your books—and you will lose freedom, as surely as if you were to invite Hitler and his henchmen to rule over you."

There is a basis for hope, but without action it is groundless

These being intentions, there is indeed still good reason for hope. But if no action is taken, our intentions will not be realized, and our hope will become groundless. Those who, knowingly or unknowingly, plan to keep the great books closed are not now inactive, will not be inactive in the future. They already plan, for example, a supereducational post-war project for imposing the German educational system on the country—perhaps, indeed, on the world, for I understand it is to be called the University of the World or something like that—and to use for this purpose the buildings and housing built during the war.

The first necessary steps

The immediate steps for realizing our intentions, to the end that our democracy and the type of education upon which it depends may be saved, should be those necessary to preserve the smaller, privately controlled liberal-arts colleges.

One bit of assistance which can be given to the liberal-arts colleges

The large universities, public and private, should be concentrated on the heaviest educational demands of the armed services. They can support themselves handsomely at this remunerative task, and should be glad to have a few dollars flow to the small liberal-arts colleges, even if doing so involved carrying their own liberal-arts faculties as overhead for the duration, busying them with post-war planning. All other normal students would then become available to the small colleges, giving them at least an opportunity to pick up a limited amount of more or less usual income.

Another practical method for utilizing the liberal-arts colleges

A fund should be provided by the Congress—at the request of the War Manpower Commission if it elects, at last, to act, and otherwise at the suggestion of the new Office of War Mobilization—sufficient to defray the cost of educating suitable small units in the liberal-arts colleges to meet selected governmental, industrial, and civilian needs. The War Manpower Commission should be directed by the Congress to establish the procedure for the selection and education of these groups, in order that the elaborate command arrangements the Army and the Navy prescribe will not be involved, and wasteful induction misjudgments prevented. This fund will not be a subsidy, but merely a practical means of assuring the small colleges exactly the type of wartime income the large units are enjoying. Moreover, the legislation providing the fund should direct that contracts already made with educational institutions be renegotiated, to the end that no profit, direct or indirect, results from them, and that all recoveries be credited to the fund.

Charging on a per capita basis for educational facilities opens up big profit possibilities

Apparently the profits in wartime educational contracts given to the large universities have been so marked that voluntary reductions have seemed wise to some educators directing large privately controlled institutions—when dormitory rooms are rented to the Government for three times the annual normal rentals, classroom space charged for on a per capita basis, telephone service billed to the extensive uniformed command personnel put by the services, to fighting the war in residence on campuses, and even a levy made for each serviceman's use of athletic facilities, profits should certainly result, particularly if a considerable portion of the faculty pay roll has been shifted to Government pay rolls.

But the publicly controlled institutions have probably not yet offered to reduce their charges, and, because they have public money, anyway, to spend, it is their figures which offer peculiarly interesting renegotiation possibilities. And there is not only every reason to save all that can be saved in connection with these contracts, and by the same methods exercised in respect to commercial contracts for war materials, but there is the added attraction that any savings could, under the plan suggested, be used to the advantage of the smaller liberal arts colleges.

Another logical and helpful step

The Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate and the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives should, by a suitable resolution, be empowered, and provided with adequate funds, to conduct for the duration as a joint committee, a continuing investigation of all current educational proposals and practices for the purpose of keeping the Congress advised and placing it in a position effectively to control the administrative offices involved.

Still another step both sound and helpful to the war effort

The new Office of War Mobilization should at once implement methods for assuring the preservation of liberal education and, specifically, the utilization in wartime service of the facilities and the faculties of the smaller privately controlled liberal arts colleges.

These facilities and faculties in the aggregate are, both tangibly and intangibly, extraordinarily important. As physical assets, they mount into thousands of acres, tens of thousands of beds, and millions of dollars invested in useful buildings and equipment. The faculties represent an educational know-how invaluable in wartime. A Smaller College Corporation is certainly as appropriate in the wartime organizational picture as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and obviously would erve as important national needs. The small colleges not only do not seek a subsidy—will starve before they accept one—but they do want to serve, and they possess assets needed in the war effort.

Failure means just this

These are specific steps necessary to realize our determination to keep the great books of learning open that our democracy may be protected from the very thing which has created the enemies we are fighting. Only education that is not merely technological training, and the sort of leaders which that type of education alone can provide, will save us now from destruction at the hands of our own people, misled by racial and religious intolerance, individual and group selfishness, widespread indifference to the basic principles of democracy, and politicians and bureaucrats willing to incite group against group, to the hazard of the Nation as a whole, in their lust for personal power.

Late it really is

That is how late it really is—victory will be disaster unless we preserve the opportunity to teach the principles of democracy and the philosophy on which it is based.

And that opportunity depends on keeping the great books of learning open; on halting the blacking out of our smaller liberal arts college; in providing more in our schools than a robot education in skills.

But time runs short.

A generation in terms of higher education is a few score months only.

Adults can easily and rapidly drift under current pressure into complete disregard of the humanities.

While it would be surprising indeed if the high-school age does not under present job and induction enticements become completely disdainful of all but the scientific and the vocational—perhaps, in fact, it has been so blinded already.

So the soil is fallow for the educational seeding which will produce a crop no different here than it has in Germany; this seeding is, as we have seen, already under way.

And what everything depends on now

Whether the baneful crop is harvested or plowed under and the good American soil reseeded for the salvation of the Republic hangs on the action of the moment.

WHEELER SAMMONS,
Publisher, Who's Who in America.

First Lt. John Coffee Braswell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Athens (Ga.) Banner-Herald regarding the posthumous award of the Legion of Merit to First Lt. John Coffee Braswell "for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service."

This splendid young man, by his months of research and experimentation, solely on his own initiative, made an outstanding contribution to aerial-ground force communications by developing a procedure and device to enable air observers to pick up written messages from moving ground vehicles.

While perfecting his procedure Lieutenant Braswell lost his life on April 29, 1943, in the crash of an airplane in which he was flying as an observer.

Lieutenant Braswell had the admiration and respect of each and every enlisted man and officer of his organization, as well as of all his associates in college and in his work before entering upon active duty in the United States Army.

His memory will ever live in the annals of a grateful Nation in whose service he paid the supreme sacrifice.

The article follows:

LEGION OF MERIT IS GIVEN FIRST LIEUTENANT BRASWELL

By order of the President, the War Department announces that First Lt. John Coffee Braswell, Athens, has been posthumously cited for the Legion of Merit award "for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service."

First Lieutenant Braswell was an officer in the Cavalry of the United States Army and was commander of Headquarters Company, One Hundredth Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, Twentieth Armored Division, under Maj. Gen. Stephen G. Henry, stationed at Camp Campbell, Ky. He was fatally burned April 29, 1943, while demonstrating an aerial communications device he invented.

An alumnus of the University of Georgia and a Reserve officer, First Lieutenant Braswell entered the service in January 1942, when he reported at Fort Riley, Kans., later transferring to Brooks Field, Tex., where he received his wings as an aerial observer. Following a brief period at Fort Knox, Ky., he was assigned to Camp Campbell in January of this year. Recommendation by his superior officers that he be advanced to the rank of captain had received favorable action and his new commission would have been conferred last June.

Prior to entering the armed services the young officer, only son of Mr. and Mrs. Earl Braswell, of Athens, was advertising manager of the Athens Banner-Herald. His wife, the former Miss Nellie Goldstein, and their two children, reside with her parents at Griffin, Ga.

ON OWN INITIATIVE

Official citation of First Lieutenant Braswell declares that "solely on his own initiative and beyond his assigned duties he gathered data and perfected a procedure and device, flying at low altitudes and working in collaboration with moving ground vehicles" which was regarded as an outstanding contribution to aerial-ground force communications.

Following his death, General Henry wrote the parents of the young aerial observer that "we will do all within our power to carry on what your son started and to see that he did not labor in vain." Continuing, General Henry said that it is the determination of the armed forces that victory shall be attained and that "when this hour of victory comes I have the firm belief that your son will stand with the top rank in receiving due credit for the contribution he made."

GENERAL HENRY'S LETTER

In a letter to Mr. and Mrs. Braswell concerning the award of the posthumous citation, General Henry wrote as follows:

"The posthumous award of the Legion of Merit to your fine son, First Lt. John C. Braswell, warmed the heart of every officer, every sergeant, every corporal, and every private in the Twentieth Armored Division, of which he was such a vital part. To each and every one of us the great honor that has come to him is a challenge to do our best.

"During our present training and in combat, the spirit of John C. Braswell will ever shine as a beacon of light and hope and courage. Our future record should be a promise to your son that we are keeping the faith. I like to think that we will be worthy of all he stood for."

The citation says that Lieutenant Braswell first began final testing of his communications device in February 1943 and in subsequent months, when not engaged in other duties as an officer, he carried on additional experimentation on his own time and "displayed outstanding initiative, ability, and resourcefulness."

TEXT OF CITATION

The full text of the Legion of Merit citation follows:

"First Lt. John C. Braswell, Cavalry, United States Army. For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service. In February 1943 he developed a procedure and device to enable air observers to pick up written messages from moving ground vehicles. In February, March, and April, 1943, solely on his own initiative and beyond his assigned duties, he gathered data and perfected a procedure and device, flying at low altitudes and working in collaboration with moving ground vehicles. During this period Lieutenant Braswell displayed outstanding initiative, ability, and resourcefulness in meeting the problems connected with the aerial pick-up of written messages from moving ground vehicles. On 29th April 1943, while engaged in perfecting his procedure, the aircraft in which he was flying as observer, at a low altitude crashed and burst into flames. Lieutenant Braswell lost his life as the result of that crash."

The pilot of the plane, Staff Sgt. George O. Cline, Charlevoix, Mich., died on August 7 from burns received in the crash. Last month Staff Sgt. Frank W. Patterson, Lewisburg, Tenn., was awarded the Soldier's Medal for rescuing Lieutenant Braswell from the plane in which he received the fatal burns. Other soldiers rescued Sergeant Cline from the burning aircraft.

Fair Play for Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the part that has been played in the present war by the heroic seamen of Norway should command the interest and attention of every American. Norway's contribution to the war effort in ships, fighting men, and merchant seamen has been given scant recognition. How we are to compensate these brave and heroic people for the tremendous losses which they have

sustained should be a paramount consideration.

As bearing upon this question, I am pleased to incorporate in these few remarks a speech delivered by Mr. Erling D. Naess, Norwegian director of shipping and head of the Norwegian shipping and trade mission, delivered on August 10, 1943, over station WNYC, New York, Fair Play for Norway.

The part played by the Allied merchant fleets in this war is less spectacular than those of the armies and the navies, and has less news value. For this reason, the importance and performance of the merchant ships are apt to be subordinated to the other services, both in regard to volume of publicity and prominence of display.

But when the history of this war comes to be written, the merchant ships which kept the supplies moving to Great Britain in the dark days of 1940 and 1941, and to all the other fronts in the brighter days of 1942 and 1943, will be allocated one of the foremost places. I need only remind you how essential sea power and sea transport have been in this war—more essential than in any previous war in history. Looking at the first period of the war, which we might call the defensive phase—namely, 1940, 1941, and part of 1942—What would have happened to Great Britain, if her supplies across the ocean had failed? What would have been the outcome of the Battle of Britain, if an ample supply of aviation gasoline had not come forward across the submarine-infested waters of the Atlantic? Looking at the present period, which we might call the offensive period, we see a number of amphibious operations, in which the merchant ships are an integral part of the invading force itself. In stressing the importance of merchant fleets, the official Allied naval story of the Sicilian invasion, released a few days ago, said, "An invading army cannot live upon the country. Food, and even water, may have to be provided by sea. Even air force cannot operate without fuel carried in ships."

It has been stated that about 800 merchant ships participated in the invasion of north Africa, and even more in that of Sicily; but, apart from these figures, which derive news value from their spectacular size, we have heard precious little of the countless feats of heroism, perseverance, and daring displayed by the merchant ships and their crews. Furthermore, what little information has been given the public, quite naturally concerned almost exclusively American ships in the United States—just as, in Great Britain, it concerned British vessels. It is understandable that the American and British publics prefer to hear about the achievements of their own merchant navies, of which they are so justifiably proud; and it would be far from my intention to grudge the merchant seamen of the United States and Britain the slightest fraction of the publicity they receive. It is far too little, as it is.

I hope, however, that my listeners will bear with me for suggesting that the nature of the part played in this war by Norway has resulted in its being overshadowed by the more conspicuous services and, for that reason, its importance not being generally realized.

The reasons for this may already be clear to you.

Firstly, Norway's main contribution to the war effort is her merchant fleet, and the part played by the merchant fleets is generally being overshadowed by the other services.

Secondly, Norway's closest allies happen to be the two foremost mercantile shipping nations in the world—who, quite naturally, are chiefly interested in telling the story of their own fleets.

For these reasons, Norway has been thought of too little as an active belligerent ally, and too many people think of her only, or chiefly, as an imprisoned friend awaiting liberation.

The part played by the Norwegian merchant fleet in the defensive phase of the war is best described by reminding you that about 40 percent of the oil requirements of Great Britain was, in that crucial period, supplied by Norwegian tankers. If this is not an important and active contribution, I would like to know what is. I think it is safe to say that the Battle of Britain might not have been won, without that supply. When Sir Arthur Salter recently paid his dramatic tribute to the United States for having twice saved Britain, I am sure that there also passed through his mind a thought of the Norwegian fleet which rendered its service during the time while American ships were still forbidden to enter the war zone.

The part played by the Norwegian merchant fleet in the African war is illustrated by a news dispatch from the British Broadcasting Company's correspondent with the British Navy in the Bona area, which I will quote to you. He declares that "the battle of Bona was won by the courage of 13 Norwegian, 12 British, 5 Dutch, and 2 Polish merchant ships, escorted by units of the Royal British Navy, all of them fighting shoulder to shoulder and with superhuman courage and endurance." "The holding of Bona," he says, "depended upon the success of the merchant ships in landing sufficient supplies for the forces there. The Germans and Italians had supremacy of the air at that time, as well as bigger forces at sea. In the beginning, Bona was a hell on earth, the towns and piers being a sea of fire through which the ships had to carry their highly dangerous cargoes. The ships would have to fight their way in—continue firing at planes, day and night, while unloading—and then fight their way out again. Gradually, however, the Allies gained air supremacy." "When the history of the victory of Bona and the Sicilian straits is written," he concludes, "it will contain a long honors list of previously unknown ships, and high on this list will figure the names of 13 Norwegian ammunition ships which, for the moment, are known only under a number in the lists of the Norwegian merchant marine."

Now, let us look at the other side of the ledger. The achievement gained by any one service in this war is never without cost. The most active—or, rather, the most continuously active—service will almost unavoidably suffer the greatest percentage of losses.

The Norwegian merchant marine entered this war with a total number of Norwegian crews of about 23,000 men. So far, over 2,200—or about 10 percent—have lost their lives. One out of every 10 Norwegian seamen has lost his life—and still, those who remain carry on their hazardous but essential work of carrying war material to every fighting front.

Turning from losses of manpower to losses of material, we find that Norway's merchant fleet, when the war started in 1939, totaled about seven and one-half million tons deadweight.

What is left of this fleet now? Only about 500 ships, of about three and six-tenths million tons deadweight. You will see that the loss amounts to over 50 percent of the tonnage, but we—unlike you—have been unable to replace this loss.

What do you think this means to a country like Norway? Even if she had been a powerful country with large natural resources, this would have been a serious loss. To Norway as she is, the loss is staggering.

Norway is dependent on her merchant marine to a greater extent than any other country in the world. Before the war she raised only 25 percent of her grain. All of her sugar was imported, and nearly all of her coal. As for fats, she imported about 20 percent of her consumption. All these and other imports—vital for Norway's economy and not of the kind which can be easily dispensed with or cut down—have to be paid for; and it is the function of the merchant marine to pay for a large part of them. Before the war, earnings from the merchant marine paid for about 40 percent of these imports. This gives the merchant fleet a place of much greater importance in the national economy of Norway than in any other country. As Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Breckinridge Long, so ably put it before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on March 5 last:

"Considering the relation of ships to Norway's wealth and the necessity of them to Norwegian national economy, we have considered Norway in a position different from any other government. They have contributed what is practically their entire national wealth, and we have agreed with them that we would consider, in the language that I wrote awhile ago, that they should be assisted in replacing ships lost in the service of the United Nations."

During the same hearings Senator NYE made the following statement:

"Mr. Secretary, it is unbelievable to me that the conditions under which we have had access to the Norwegian ships would find the Congress saying 'No' or anything other than an enthusiastic 'Yes' to any legislative proposal which would offer to make right any part of the losses the Norwegians have suffered and make ships available to them."

Thus, Norway has thrown into the battle her entire merchant fleet, without regard to risk and without regard to the fact that she has not, within her borders or otherwise under her control, the means to replace this fleet. While Norway loses ships, replacement facilities are concentrated mainly in the United States and have been made available to her only to an insignificant extent. So far, only eight vessels of altogether about 80,000 tons dead weight, have been placed at Norway's disposal, out of the mighty flood of ship construction emanating from the yards of her great American ally. At the present rate of output, eight vessels represent only 1½ days' output of these yards. It has given Norway replacement of about 3 percent of her losses.

This lack of replacements has created a great problem. Hundreds of highly skilled navigating officers and engineers have been deprived of their ships and thrown back on the maintenance pay of the Norwegian seamen's pools.

What will happen to these men, and to Norway's future, depends largely upon the understanding and cooperation of the United States and Britain, in the rehabilitation of the fleet, and upon the realization of the constructive peace aims, so well expressed by some of the leaders of the Allied Nations.

These men hope and expect that these aims will come true, since, otherwise, they will have fought this war in vain. I am sure that, when it is more generally realized what part Norway has played in this war, fair play will prevail.

The Country Talks Up to Its Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I am inserting herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL REC-

ORD an article written by me and appearing in the September 1943 issue of the Republican. While the Republican is the only Nation-wide magazine issued by, of, and for Republicans and has sometimes been referred to as the voice of the minority it does not limit itself to partisan discussions and its policy is to preserve self-government and promote the American way of life in this Republic.

Mr. Richard Nowinson is the editor of this magazine, which is published at 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. Upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the founding of this magazine nearly 500 congratulatory letters and telegrams were received from political leaders and public officials throughout America commending Richard Nowinson on his persistent progress in promoting better government in this country.

The article follows:

THE COUNTRY TALKS UP TO ITS CONGRESS

(By KARL E. MUNDT, Member of Congress from South Dakota)

With the passage of the so-called "lame duck" amendment, the country won a dividend in that it was no longer subjected to legislation passed by Members of Congress who had been defeated by the folks back home, but it also lost a significant feature of representative government in this Republic in that sessions of Congress became longer and opportunities for personal conferences by voters with Members of Congress became less and less frequent.

Since no formula has been developed as yet for adjourning or recessing sessions of Congress before the expiration of the full 2-year terms which they can run, there has been a growing tendency for sessions to conduct their business in leisurely fashion and for them to run on for month after month, with the result that members living more than a few hundred miles from Washington seldom have the chance to visit around their districts or to listen in at the grass roots in order to keep in tune with the desires and the attitudes of the folks for whom Congress, after all, exists and functions.

The Seventy-eighth Congress, however, decided to remedy this unsavory situation, at least to a small degree. It felt, and rightfully so, that the folks who pay the taxes should have an opportunity to visit with the folks who spend the taxes, and so a 6-weeks recess was declared, ending on September 14. Almost without exception, Senators and Representatives availed themselves of this development by returning to their homes and conferring there with as many of their constituents as possible, either individually or in groups.

Judging from the reactions of many Members with whom I have talked or corresponded since the recess was declared, the country has appreciated this opportunity to get first-hand information on Washington activites and to give first-hand recommendations to their Representatives at the Nation's Capital. It is likely to result in more frequent congressional recesses in the future, and it is probable even that some congressional formula will be developed which will set such adjournment dates in advance so that the country may know that, at specified times, its Representatives will be back home to report and to receive the reactions of the folks for whom, in America, government serves.

Due to a combination of circumstances, it happens that my own official duties during the recess took me not only into every section of the First District of South Dakota, which it is my pleasure to represent, but also into the following States of the great farming section of the Middle West—North Dakota, Minnesota, Wyoming, Montana, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Kansas. In each of these States I met with Members of Congress, with Senators and Governors, and with private citizens who were called together in meetings for one purpose or another. None of these meetings was political in nature and some were presided over by elected Democratic officials; it follows, therefore, that the reactions observed are probably typical of general sentiment in this nine-State area. If this deduction is accurate, and I think it is, it also follows that the New Deal and the administration of President Roosevelt have hit an all-time low among the rank and file of private citizens who comprise the bone and sinew of this Republic.

BUREAUCRACY IS DOOMED

First specific reaction one gets in conferring with the folks of the Middle West is that they seem more eager to get on with the war than is official Washington. Midwest Americans are realists. They realize that, once in a war, the only thing to do is to get it won with the least possible cost in lives, in money, and in human liberties. They are resentful over bureaucratic bungling, which retards the war effort, and with conflicting and confusing policies which disrupt the production activities on the home front and increase the ultimate cost of the war through prolonging its existence. They are willing to pay higher taxes and eager to buy bonds, but they bitterly resent governmental extravagance, whether it be in connection with the war effort or in the social planning stratospheres of the New Deal.

Efforts of the O. W. I. and other agencies to play politics with the war situation are readily detected, energetically scorned, and emphatically rejected. People with sons on the fighting fronts or in training camps en route to the war zones are impatient with rhetorical efforts to sugar-coat the sacrifices they are making and with unnecessary withholding of information concerning the progress of the fighting. Bad news is not wanted, but it is taken in stride and it is preferred to roundabout assertions and delayed dispatches which please for the moment but eventually rise up to plague their authors.

Second definite reaction—after a keen realization that, if there is any lack of awareness that there is a war to be won, it is in Washington and not in the Farm Belt—is the fact bureaucracy, run wild in the Capital City, has dug its own grave, and that Mr. John Q. Citizen is simply biding his time until the next election to change administrations and to issue the mandate that there be less bureaucratic bungling and less unnecessary interference with the business, professional and farming operations of this country.

Not since his election in 1932, have I heard so much direct criticism of the administrative ineptitude of Franklin Roosevelt, nor have I observed such a widespread realization that the only way to dismantle topheavy bureaucratic government in America is to dismiss from office the President, who in the final analysis appoints, directly or indirectly, the army of appointees who are today trying to impose upon this Republic a rule of directives, decrees and edicts rather than to govern it by traditional legislative measures.

The Office of Price Administration is perhaps the most unpopular Government agency in the Middle West. Strangely enough, there is general agreement that price regulation is desirable in wartime, and the public is ready to accept such regulations provided they are orderly, understandable and logical. Judging from almost universal reactions observed in nine States, however, the present procedures and administrators of O. P. A. are not considered to have either of these three qualifications.

TOO MANY LAME DUCKS IN SOFT NESTS

In too many States and in too many Federal positions, the administration's policy of appointing lame-duck Senators, Representatives, and defeated New Deal candidates for office has been so blatant and so widespread that even nonpolitically minded citizens are resentful about the effort to provide soft nests for lame ducks in positions where, above everything else, it is imperative that there be no politics.

Many who formerly criticized Leon Henderson while he was O. P. A. director now credit him with having refrained from appointing political favorites to large-salaried jobs, and they point to changes in personnel in administrative positions which have taken place since the resignation of Mr. Henderson and provide the political biographies of the new appointees to prove their point that being right politically has seemingly become an all-important qualification for a responsible position in the O. P. A. Constantly changing regulations, unworkable price schedules, nebulous and indefinite orders also confuse and confound the public.

With the labor situation in the Farm Belt as serious as it has become, many Members of Congress, including your correspondent, donned work clothes and spent some time working in the harvest fields. Our contribution to the Nation's food supply may have been unimportant, but such activities did provide a most significant opportunity to pick up unbiased and deep-rooted reactions from the food producers in America. My own experience and the reactions I have checked with others convince me that, if the farmers of America were the only citizens to vote in 1944, President Roosevelt would go down to defeat in his anticipated fourth-term bid by an emphatic majority.

The mishandling of farm-machinery production and allocations, the continued attempt to impose the unwanted and unworkable food subsidy and price roll-back scheme, the unsound relationships between price fixing on livestock and their food crops, the apparent disregard in Washington for the alarming shortage of manpower on the farms, the break-down of the rubber program (following the President's veto of the farm-products rubber bill well over a year ago), which in many areas has caused work on the farm to be stopped because of a lack of rubber tires for farm equipment, the coddling of strikes in war industries, and the President's veto of the antistrike bill—all these and many other conditions have caused the farmers to conclude that the forgotten man of 1943 is the farmer on his farm, and they have made up their minds to vote Republican in the next election, war or no war, fourth-term campaign or not.

In North Dakota, I spoke with Senator NYE and Congressman LEMKE; both Members of Congress recounted reactions very similar to those I have recorded as coming from the folks of South Dakota. In Montana, livestock raisers and businessmen demand an end to bureaucratic bungling and government by directives; they believe that if the New Deal will take the brakes off food production and abandon needless regimentation, the bread baskets will fill up, and the waste baskets will empty out. In Wyoming, I attended a meeting with well-liked and able FRANK BARRETT; here again, the demand is for action rather than adjectives, and the stockmen of Wyoming want to ride herd on steadily increasing numbers of cattle rather than to be herded by steadily increasing numbers of Washington political appointees.

In Iowa, popular and hard-working CHARLES B. HOEVEN, first Republican to represent the Sioux City District for many years, told me a similar story about the reactions of the farmers and producers of the Tall Corn State. In Iowa, especially, the memory of the killing of little pigs and the plow-under scarcity

program of HENRY WALLACE still galls bitterly as America begins to feel the short rations which inevitably accrue from a program of planned scarcity.

In Kansas, in Nebraska, and in Missouri I found the same refrain—give us the tools and we will do the work. And they say it with an emphasis which leaves no doubt about their sincerity in giving substance to the phrase. Midwestern America has its heart in the war and its hand on the plow; all it asks is for government to get off its back and to take off the hobbles. A fair price for a full crop and a sudden end to the steady stream of puzzling and perplexing administrative proposals are all that is needed for the Farm Belt to produce what is required to feed America and to provide vast quantities of foodstuffs for shipment to our allies across the seas.

FORMULA FOR FACT FINDING

Perhaps the most elucidating and informative experience this correspondent had during the congressional recess, however, came through attendance at what is likely to provide all Members of Congress with a new formula for fact finding in future recesses of Congress.

This was a public meeting, called under the leadership of experienced and far-sighted AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota. It was held in Minneapolis on August 16 and 17, in the Radisson Hotel of that city, and resulted from a call issued by Mr. ANDRESEN to to the Members of Congress and the farmers, businessmen, and professional people living in the States of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Iowa. Sixteen Members of Congress attended the 2-day conference and nearly 3,000 private citizens availed themselves of this unprecedented opportunity to air their troubles and make their recommendations to those who represented them in Washington.

In Washington Congressman AUGUST ANDRESEN is considered by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle as one of the most articulate, active, and able Members of the House of Representatives. His nine terms in the House have taught him much about the procedures and practices of representative government, and his native ability has equipped him to provide his State and Nation with superior service. Early in August this year he detected a condition of affairs back home unparalleled in his long congressional experience—a great undertone of dissatisfaction with Executive edicts seemed to be sweeping through the professions, the business places, and the productive farms of southern Minnesota. After conferring with some of his associates in Congress, he decided to call a strictly nonpolitical conference, to which Members of Congress from the five-State area were invited without regard to politics and to which the general public of all political and of no political affiliations were invited to discuss their problems, to criticize or commend, to abhor or applaud, as their convictions and experiences indicated.

The 16 Members of Congress who responded to the call for a clearinghouse of ideas and an exchange of suggestions were Senator SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota; Representatives AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, ANDERSEN, GALE, JUDD, KNUTSON, O'HARA, PITTENGER, and HAGEN, of Minnesota; Representative LEMKE, of North Dakota; Representatives CUNNINGHAM, GWYNNE, and TALLE, of Iowa; Representatives STEPHENSON and HULL, of Wisconsin; and Representative MUNDT, of South Dakota. The morning session of the first day was devoted to a discussion of the agriculture situation; the afternoon session to a conference with businessmen; the evening session to a meeting with the doctors, dentists, and druggists of the 5-State area.

The second day of the conference was devoted to the livestock and feed interests. Nearly 3,000 citizens attended 1 or more of the 4 sessions, all of which were conducted with a candor and courage which was refreshing in these days of double talk and evasive statements. Every man was given his opportunity to be heard. Some speakers represented organizations of merchants, farmers, or professional men, ranging up to memberships of 45,000; others spoke only for themselves and of their own specific problems as individual operators.

The conference was conducted after the manner of a congressional hearing. Each speaker stated his case or made his recommendations and was then interrogated by the Members of Congress. All meetings were entirely open to the public press. The whole affair was an encouraging demonstration of democracy in action. After the meetings, all agreed that the procedure developed by Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN might well be emulated in every congressional district in America; it provided a welcome and unusual opportunity for the folks at home to confer with their Members of Congress in a frank and full discussion.

Probably no meeting in this country in 1943 has provided a better cross section of what the people actually think and want than did this Minneapolis conference. It did more to advise Members of Congress than 10,000 letters; it did more to enable private citizens to bring their recommendations to Congress than a hundred trips to Washington; it was a better reflection of the public attitude than a dozen Gallup polls.

To detail the discussions at this conference would require a complete edition of the Republican. Suffice it to say that the reactions and observations depicted in the first part of this article were all stressed and substantiated at this conference. Criticism of the administration was so vigorous and so pointed that, despite the fact that the meeting was open to all, that other than Republican Congressmen were present, and that numerous executive appointees were in attendance at the conference, the Democratic big-wigs of Minnesota woefully wailed that "a Republican preelection campaign meeting has been held in Minneapolis." It may be true that the sentiments expressed augured an ill wind for the Democrats in 1944, but, if so, such expressions came from the rank-and-file voters who will determine the election and not from officeholders or party workers in any political party.

Biggest criticism of the agricultural speakers was perhaps their attack upon the President's pet proposal for a food-subsidy and price-roll-back program to shift present-day grocery bills upon future taxpayers, including the returning soldiers who are now fighting at the front. Not even the most ardent Roosevelt follower at the conference dared to say a word in support of this proposal.

Businessmen condemned primarily the bungling in the administration of O. P. A. and the inattention shown by W. P. B. to essential civilian needs for materials and machinery in the food industries. The professional men and druggists concentrated on the growing menace of big government and collectivism, as did most of the other speakers. Doctors and dentists stressed the danger to public health encompassed in the President's "cradle to the grave" program of socialized medicine and collectivistic security.

What has happened in the nine great farm States herein enumerated has undoubtedly happened throughout America during the congressional recess. The country has been talking to its Congress. No official censor has sugar-coated the language. No O. W. I. rewrite man has colored the recommendations. The conversation has been face to face and straight from the shoulder. It has been made increasingly apparent to Members of Congress that the land of the free and the home of the brave is still the home of the brave and that it intends to retain or regain its freedom—whichever is indicated as necessary!

It is expected that as Congress resumes its activities on September 14 that its Members will respond to the desires of the country and insist upon functioning as a coordinate branch of the Government in fact as well as in name. If such an eventuality results, it is the opinion of this writer that the congressional recess of 1943 will have paid a great dividend to this Republic, and that it will provide a precedent for more frequent opportunities for the country and the Congress to meet each other face to face.

Address of Roane Waring, National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an address by Roane Waring, the national commander of the American Legion, on September 17, 1943, to the southern and western Governors' Conference at Denver, Colo.:

Your Excellencies, the Governors of our sovereign States, as national commander of the American Legion I have had the unusual opportunity during the past year of traveling all over this country. I have spoken to many large groups of citizens, both Legionnaires and non-Legionnaires. I have had the opportunity of exchanging views with thousands of everyday Americans, coming from all walks of life. I have talked to many thousands of soldiers, both here in the training camps at home and on the fighting front in Africa. And so I feel that I have a pretty thorough understanding of what many Americans, both civilians and soldiers, are thinking about. I know their views about the problems of the war and the peace that will come after it and about what this America of ours should be like in the future.

The problem which concerns them most is the one that I am discussing with you tonight. It is the fear of the ever-accelerating and dangerous trend in this country toward paternalism and toward a centralization of power within the Federal Government. In the minds of many of these Americans there lies uppermost, this fear concerning the usurpation by the Federal Government of the sovereignty belonging to our sovereign States and of a definite and alarming drift toward rule by bureaucratic directives instead of legally enacted congressional laws.

They are frankly apprehensive also of the current tendency by Government to submerge the personal endeavor of the individual and to suppress the free initiative of the citizen and to make of him the recipient of a regimented life dictated and planned by Government bureaus.

Thinking Americans know that the proudest heritage of American citizenship has been its freedom from either government or private compulsion. They do not want that freedom swept away. Such a catastrophe would wipe with it their other freedoms. It would end representative self-government in these United States. These fears have been expressed to me privately, and I have

also heard them discussed publicly. There is no escaping the fact that a large segment of the thinking people of America is definitely uneasy over these sinister developments that are casting ominous shadows over the future of all of us.

These people to whom I have talked are fundamentally sound. They are courageous, they are seeking a means of checking this unhealthy growth of paternalistic philosophy that is so at variance with the faith of our fathers. They want to preserve and protect their cherished American heritage, the right of every American to live his own life as he pleases within the bounds of decency, law, and the consideration of the rights of others.

But these people need leadership. They need voices to express open and defiant opposition to this un-American tendency. To no group can these worried citizens turn with greater propriety and with more confidence than to you, the Governors of the sovereign States in which they live.

There is ground for their fears. There is justice in their indignation. The sovereign rights of their States are being invaded and that invasion is gathering momentum. With each State right that is lost, there comes an abridgement of the sovereignty of the American citizen.

This invasion of States' rights is but a part and parcel of a movement underway for more than a decade to convert our capitalistic system of government into a socialistic or a communistic one.

It is well that we recognize once and for all that ours is a capitalistic system of government. By capitalistic system I mean the system that recognizes free enterprise, the right of the individual to labor in his own behalf, and to take and use for himself the income from that labor. Under this system, the mechanic and the farmer, with their tools, are just as much capitalists living under the protection of our capitalistic form of government as the man who owns a railroad. Agitators and dreamers to the contrary, there is nothing terrifying about the word "capitalistic." It is the essence of Americanism. It is the recognition of the right of the individual to take and use for himself the fruits of his own labor in the furtherance of his own progress.

A capitalistic Government such as ours protects private enterprise. It encourages personal initiative. It rewards personal efficiency and it insures every man who wants to stand on his own merits a job, and not a dole. This system has made America great. It has made it a land of unlimited opportunities where every man can start with an equal chance and go as far as his own ability, his brain and energy can carry him. Under this form of government we have reached the unparalleled development and the industrial growth which makes America today the arsenal of the world, and this industrial growth is not a subsidized growth.

In the comparatively short life of our Government we have achieved this greatness. We have reached this industrial capacity. We have accumulated this wealth by the efforts of the individual citizen, protected by the law of the land, in the exercise of his freedom of action, of his liberty and of his property. Our people have always been the Government. Lincoln described it as a Government founded by the people, controlled by the people, and exercising its authority solely for the people.

In combating this problem of the ever-increasing encroachments of the Federal Government and its numerous bureaucracies upon the sovereignties of our States and our citizens we must ever remember that our Federal Government is one of limited authority only. It has only such control and authority as is expressly ceded to it in the Federal Constitution by the sovereign States.

Many of these encroachments have come about as the result of the depression, when the Federal Government began giving aid to State and local governments, in dealing with problems aggravated by the economic crisis. Unfortunately, this aid always carried conditions with it. Whenever the Federal Government helped out with a single dollar, there were demands for the surrender of certain State and local powers.

This story of Federal aid is the story of the rise of Federal bureaucracy. Year by year it has sunk its tentacles deeper into local control, until now it is reaching into almost every activity of the private life of the American citizen.

These bureaucrats call themselves planners. They are striving for a planned economy under which freedom from want, freedom from economic insecurity, and freedom from fear of the future will be achieved. These freedoms are the freedoms which the American citizen can achieve through his own individual effort. They are the freedoms that have ever been the incentive for honest, hard work. They are the freedoms that have enabled Americans in the past to take pride in the fact that they were self-made men.

These czars of a so-called planned economy would now guarantee to every individual these freedoms, without effort on his part, but in exchange for his individual independence. They would deceive the gullible and unthinking with visions of a Utopia. "This Utopia will be yours," they say, "If you will but let us plan for you, look out for you, and decide everything for you. We know better than you what is best for you." These planners seek to indoctrinate America with a false philosophy under which everything would come from and be controlled by the state, and the individual would have nothing then to worry about.

This is an un-American philosophy. It would destroy the spirit of our people. It would destroy ambition. It would wipe out their independence, sap their strength, and rob them of their God-given rights as sovereign citizens.

Ever must we remember that this planning requires powers. It will require more and more powers which come from directives and not from constitutionally passed laws. Eventually these so-called planners will be satisfied with nothing less than all power. If America is reduced to such a planned society, then freedom and liberty will be gone and we will have become a totalitarian state, by whatever name that state may be known. The surest road to dictatorship is the road to Federal paternalism.

This tendency toward regimentation and Federal power has been accelerated by the war. Everyone, of course, realizes that in wartime it becomes necessary for the citizen to cede many of his rights and for the State to cede some of its authority. That is all right, and no one can object in wartime. But our danger lies in the fact that power-hungry bureaucrats find in this war an ideal opportunity to extend and consolidate their controls. They will seek to carry wartime regimentation into peacetime planning.

It is urgent time that every good American and particularly that you, the Governors of your sovereign States, stand as a bulwark against these encroachments upon self-government; that you, the Governors, champion the recovery of lost States' rights. It is urgent that every State now clearly pronounce its unswerving adherence to the fundamental principles of our Constitution—that the State, in the proper exercise of its power is supreme, and limited only by the provisions of its own constitution. It is imperative that Congress assert its own authority and assume its proper constitutional responsibilities as the law-making branch of the Federal Government.

Our first job, when peace returns, is to return our Federal Government to its normal functions, to take it out of social work, out of private industry, and out of other fields of activity not contemplated by the Federal Constitution. It means that we the people, with our local and State governments, must reassume our responsibilities which we have shirked when the going was tough. If we expect to remain sovereign in our citizenship—to retain our rights and freedoms, we must assume and discharge the obligations that go with them. Only by being vigilant can we remain the masters, and not the slaves, of the Government.

Today we celebrate Constitution Day. Let us remember that under that Constitution we have rights, but that also we have responsibilities.

War Efficiency at Pacific Coast Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I invite attention to the following editorial, War Efficiency at Pacific Coast Ports, which recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner.

This editorial gives recognition to the ability of Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath, United States Army, who has played such an important part in developing the outstanding service to our Nation now being rendered by Pacific coast ports.

WAR EFFICIENCY AT COAST PORTS

When the war struck at Pearl Harbor suddenly nearly 2 years ago, the ports of the Pacific States, north and south from the great central harbor at San Francisco, were found weakened by comparative idleness.

Immediately these ports had to be put to their fullest utilization. That was done.

It is with a feeling of satisfaction that the seaboard cities know that with the growing importance to war of these ports, the port facilities not only have kept abreast of the demands made upon them but have been ahead of the requirements.

True, they had natural advantages and traditions of efficiency, but the depression and the curtailment of oriental trade during the Chinese-Japanese war had kept them dormant.

But they awoke. Now, officially, all the various armed services use the Pacific coast ports as a yardstick of efficiency in the handling and shipment of men, matériel, and supplies. And the men in the front lines, on land and sea, on the other side of the Pacific are grateful to these ports and the way they are operated for the expeditious sailing of all these supplies the forces and the Allies need.

In fairness it should be realized that credit for the great accomplishments of these ports should go largely to Maj. Gen. Frederick Gilbreath, who had the vision to see what the needs would be, and the ability to assemble the engineering and planning skill needed for the job—the best in civilian and military talent required for the work.

The extent of the accomplishment cannot be described in detail, for military reasons. But even a casual comparison between conditions and capacities of 2 years ago and today shows a result in transport accomplishment

worthy of place beside the best examples of American wartime enterprise.

It is added satisfaction to the Pacific coast to know that General Gilbreath was a resident of this area long before he took over this particular job of logistic. That makes the achievement fully linked by Pacific coast men and resources.

Drafting of Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Representative JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, over station WTOP, Columbia Broadcasting System, September 14, 1943:

The question for discussion this evening is one of great concern to the whole country. We of Congress who have just returned from our constituencies have found it to be so. Pre-Pearl Harbor fathers are concerned, for they do not know how to plan for the future. Employers having to set up manning tables and replacement schedules likewise are left confused. There should be a clean-cut and well-defined policy to clear up the doubt and confusion now existing.

In the beginning let me say very definitely that I am not opposed to the drafting of fathers, if and when it becomes necessary. I believe the fathers themselves and the country generally hold that same view. Furthermore, with me it is not a matter of sentiment but purely a matter of logic and reason, remembering at all times that in successful warfare today there is more than just a war front. The production front must be preserved, and essential civilian needs must receive consideration.

Before fathers are taken, the necessity of taking them should be clearly shown. That has not yet been done. In fact, certain actions seem to negative such need. I have in mind, for instance, the stubborn refusal of the armed services to take persons with only slight physical defects. For a long time public opinion has shown itself clearly opposed to this attitude. At one time the Army started to take such persons and to put them on limited service. Later, however, when the Navy started procuring its men through the draft boards and insisted on its usual high physical standards, the Army actually raised its standards so that men in even greater numbers were rejected on physical examination. People throughout America wonder why men, for example, strong enough and sound enough to play professional football and baseball, are physically unfit for the armed services. No criticism is intended of such men, but of the unduly high physical standards demanded by our armed services. Recently the Army has announced the elimination of limited service altogether, and the discharge of many of those formerly so assigned.

This same condition applies as to illiterates, the test of literacy being a fourth-grade education. The armed services simply refuse to take more than a very small percentage of illiterates.

In recent weeks the Army has also announced the forced retirement of hundreds of able-bodied officers regardless of their physical condition or the excellence of the performance of their duties, just because they have become 60 years of age. Several weeks ago we saw press reports to the effect that boys who had been called after they had started senior R. O. T. C. training but before finishing the course were being sent back to college. All of these actions would indicate a plentiful supply of manpower.

The order to start drafting fathers October 1 was issued, unfortunately, while Congress was in adjournment. After all, draft policies are for Congress to assert. No one, surely, could be mistaken as to the attitude of Congress. The record speaks for itself. The House Committee on Military Affairs favorably reported and the House passed the Kilday bill which took into account occupational deferments and then placed all others in categories, with fathers at the bottom of the list. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported the Wheeler bill which would stay the drafting of fathers until the whole manpower problem could be studied. There had been an expression on both sides indicating strong disapproval of drafting fathers at this time.

As a matter of fact, the principal purpose of this draft-fathers order is not to get fathers into the armed services. This is clearly shown by the Baruch manpower report, according to press reports. I have not seen the Baruch report itself but news articles have given the findings. I quote from one of these:

"The War Manpower Commission's order authorizing drafting of fathers was required to give the Government some control over half of the 7,000,000 draft-age fathers engaged in nonessential jobs. In granting deferments, Selective Service should emphasize occupation rather than dependency."

The professed purpose is to do something never intended by the Selective Training and Service Act—that is, to use it as a club to force men to leave their jobs and go into so-called deferrable jobs. The Selective Service Act was intended as a means of procuring in a fair and orderly manner men to go into uniform for the armed services and nothing else. The effect of its presently proposed perverted use is indirectly to draft fathers within draft ages for work in certain designated jobs. And in thus drafting them we are denying to them the various benefits that we give to our other draftees—benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, postwar job security, and many others. Yet we take them away from established businesses and out of jobs of long standing with no promise of restoration when the new job terminates at the end of the war. We make them give up all of the rights and security they have built up in their present jobs. If conditions are such as to require the drafting of men to fill jobs, let us meet that situation squarely and in an orderly manner by enacting a law legalizing such action and giving to such persons so drafted certain benefits and assurances under the law. If the time is here for national service legislation, let us tell the people so frankly and not try to avoid it through any such subterfuge as is now proposed.

The statement was made in the Baruch report, and has often been made, that the criterion of deferment should be occupation rather than dependency and it has been stated even further that dependency should be ignored. This is the effect of the draft-fathers order requiring fathers in nondeferrable jobs to be drafted by order number without regard to number or degree of dependency. Again I say it is the responsibility of Congress to set the policy, and time after time Congress has stated that dependency should be taken into consideration. The people back home, too, I believe, feel that dependency is a factor. They know the problems of family hardship, dislocation, and juvenile delinquency.

Let us take an example to show the inequity of this order. The example I use is purely casual and illustrative only. Many others of like nature could be given. If I recall correctly, some of the deferrable and nondeferrable jobs, a newspaper reporter 21 years old with one child under the present order would not be taken whereas a 37-year-old father of 6 children, all under 10 years of age, who happened to be the sole owner and operator of a grocery store from which the family made its living would be taken. To the average American this simply does not make sense, and all of the theorizing about dependency not being the proper gage will not cause it to make sense to Americans, who have been accustomed to and who expect fair treatment.

May I say again—I am in favor of taking fathers when it becomes necessary—and I am sure the fathers are, too. We are in this war to win and we are willing to do whatever is necessary to win. But let us be fair and frank with the American people. Let us not needlessly break up homes, step up delinquency and dislocate society, simply to avoid national service legislation. Let us not take fathers while hoarding manpower behind draft deferments, nor while allowing the armed services almost ruthlessly to waste manpower.

The whole manpower situation is muddled. A study of the manpower resources and needs should be made by Congress through the appropriate committees of the two Houses in order to see just where we stand. Such a study will require only a few days. The armed services will not suffer while that is being done. The people want to know the story. If it is found that some compulsory action is needed to get people in essential jobs we can then enact legislation for that purpose. If, on the other hand, it appears that fathers will have to be taken to meet the requirements of proper military needs, we can tell the American people so. A fair and equitable demand on them then based upon facts and not on merely an arbitrary order will meet with a response that will not be at all disappointing.

Silver Famine Hits Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article on silver from the Reno Evening Gazette of September 18, 1943:

SILVER FAMINE HITS MEXICO; MONEY SCARCE—LARGEST PRODUCER CANNOT MEET NEEDS FOR DOMESTIC USE

Demand for silver by all the Allied Nations indicates that silver is gaining increased recognition as the money of the people. In Mexico the price of silver has reached 87½ cents an ounce.

Mexico is not producing enough silver to meet its own currency and commercial requirements and wants to borrow some of the United States silver under the lend-lease plan which it formerly sold to us at 45 cents an ounce.

To satisfy the popular demand for silver coins, Mexico is minting an average of 12,-

000,000 silver pesos a month, according to Eduardo Suarez, minister of finance.

Remelting of coins for industrial purposes and hoarding had placed such a heavy call on the Mexican mint that it was forced to suspend its silver shipments to the United States and use the metal for coinage purposes.

The finance minister estimated that on the basis of the first 6 months of the current year Mexico's silver production would be only 72,000,000 ounces but predicted that the traditional 80,000,000-ounce figure will be reached by the end of the year.

Financial interests in Mexico report that the peso coins have been either hoarded or melted down almost as fast as they are coined because speculators have been getting more for the silver bullion than the face value of the coins.

The Mexican Government, it is reported, has obtained from the United States Government an agreement to set aside temporarily the metal pact signed early last year until the present situation can be rectified. The pact provided for the United States purchasing Mexican surplus silver at 45 cents an ounce.

In a move to halt silver speculation the Mexican Government has decreed that all silver must be delivered to the Bank of Mexico for allocation to manufacturers, thus preventing direct purchase from producers by speculators.

The decree also imposed an export tax of $8.41 a kilogram on all jewelry and silverware, which previously was export-free.

The heavy tax is for the purpose of curtailing speculators from melting silver coins and manufactured articles, which in some cases have been melted and exported to the United States upon payment only of the 30 percent United States ad valorem duty.

Improper Government Controls Are Killing the Forces Which Make It Possible To Produce Livestock and To Distribute Meat

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want all Members of Congress, and all officials in the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration to read and study the practical suggestions made by Mr. Jay Hormel, of Austin, Minn., to solve the chaotic meat situation in this country, largely caused by the application of improper and unwise Government controls. Mr. Hormel is one of the outstanding meat processors of the United States, and knows what he is talking about. He has submitted his suggestions to Hon. Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator.

The statement of Mr. Jay Hormel follows:

As a war measure, a system of controls has been developed over meat and livestock.

These controls are killing the very forces which make it possible to produce livestock and to distribute meat.

While these same types of controls may work beautifully on hundreds of other items, they will not work on meat. This fact is difficult for many people to understand, because they may have seen these same controls work successfully on other products. But these controls will not work on meat.

Meats are not, never were, and cannot be handled like any other products.

Crackers or umbrellas, drugs or automobiles don't change prices very often. Their prices are planned for a period of time—a season, a year, or more.

The kind of controls that may work beautifully on such products will destroy the system for producing and distributing meats.

The demand for meat comes three times a day. It fluctuates with all the changes that come in our day-to-day living.

The supply of meat changes from day to day. It is affected by all the changes that come into the lives and businesses of 6,000,000 livestock producers, 1,500 meat packers and sausage makers, and 300,000 operators of retail food stores.

Both the supply of and the demand for meat literally change as often as the weather.

The umbrella manufacturer can set a price on his umbrellas, and if he doesn't sell them during the shower today, he can sell them when it rains next week or next month.

Not so with the meatman and the livestock producer. If he has to sell today, he has to sell today.

That's why the meat and livestock business has always been transacted on the auction block.

IN THE MEAT BUSINESS IT'S NOT MERCHANDISING, IT'S BIDDING

The butcher bids for the meat he wants. The packer bids for the butcher's business. The livestock producer sells on the basis of the bids he receives.

It is this constant bidding that adjusts the meat supply to the changing demands which take place in one meat market as compared with another, in one town as compared with another, and with the changes in the meat available in their various sources of supply.

BIDDING IS THE POWER THAT PRODUCES AND DISTRIBUTES MEAT—THE ONLY POWER THAT CAN

When you take away the fluctuating price differentials that are brought about by daily competitive bidding, you destroy the only system which will produce the meat this country needs.

When you tamper with or destroy this process of bidding, you destroy the only system that will distribute meat and provide the right shares of the available meat supply to the armed forces, to lease-lend, and among civilians.

Bidding has been destroyed.

That's why many meat markets are short of certain kinds of meat.

That's why many communities have not had their share of meat for months.

And that's why even our armed forces and lease-lend have been actually short of meat from time to time.

In handling the situation there are several things we must accomplish:

OBJECTIVE NO. 1. MAKE SURE THE GOVERNMENT GETS THE MEAT IT NEEDS

That means you and I use less meat than we would like.

Each of us is glad to do that. But how do we go about it?

Wrong way

Restrict the amount of meat each packer can sell into the domestic trade? No. That won't work, because there is no assurance that what will be left over will be enough to supply the Government needs each week.

The Army went short week after week while depending on the restriction order.

Require each packer to give a certain percentage of his production to the Government? No. That won't work, because again there is no assurance as to what quantity of meat will be produced each week. Such a system does not have elasticity.

Under any such rigid procedure the packer has less opportunity—and less incentive—to bid for the live animals. The Government, in turn, has no opportunity to bid for the meat. There is nothing to make the meat move to market.

Right way

You and I agreed that we would be glad to use less meat than we want in order to make sure the Government gets the meat it needs.

But how much less? Someone must tell us how much of each kind of meat each of us can use without taking some of what the Government needs.

Telling us how much is the proper function of a rationing system.

Each of us has only so many points to spend. If because of war needs we should buy pork chops sparingly, their point price must be set high. If we may buy spareribs more freely, their point price should be low. Up to now we have been able to have all the pigs' feet we want without interfering with the war effort, so pigs' feet have no point value at all.

In other words, we start by using ration tickets as a guide to tell us what we should not buy freely. The point value tells us the extent to which we should not buy each item.

If Uncle Sam is running short of something, the point value on that item goes up. When he has more than enough, the point value goes down again.

When you and I understand what point values mean and why, we simply do not buy those pounds of meats which Uncle Sam needs.

If we don't buy it the retailer can't sell it. If the retailer can't sell it he won't buy it. That means the packer can't sell it to anyone except the Government, because the Government is the only buyer left. That is the way it should work. That is the way we should sell to the Government the meat for Government needs.

Thus, through rationing—properly applied—you can know that the meat you don't buy is the meat which goes to the boys who are doing our fighting for us.

OBJECTIVE NO. 2. MAKE SURE EVERY CIVILIAN GETS ALL THE MEAT HIS RATION TICKETS CALL FOR

When dollars were our only ration tickets, the meat always went to the dollars. Since we got price ceilings all this is changed. A-town gets all the meat it needs. B-ville is short week after week.

Wrong way

Depend on ration tickets? No. Neither the retailer nor the packer nor the livestock producer can use a ration ticket for cash. So neither the consumer nor the retailer nor the packer can use the ration ticket to bid for meat or livestock.

Give each packer a civilian quota? No. Even if you gave higher quotas to those packers doing business in communities which are short of meat, there is nothing about a quota to say which dealer or which housewife has less than a fair share of the meat available.

Give a quota to each dealer or to each housewife? No. That is just another word for rationing, which does not guarantee anybody any meat because ration tickets won't make meat move.

The thing which makes meat move is money.

Today we are doing business on the basis of price ceilings, but the cost of doing business varies from town to town and even from store to store.

By the time the packer figures his salesmen's expenses, delivery expenses, and all the other costs of doing business, he finds that in selling in A-town he has as much money left as he could get by selling anywhere else. A-town continues to get plenty of meat.

In selling in B-ville, that packer always ends up with a little less money, not much less, perhaps, say, the difference is only one-quarter of a cent a pound. One-quarter of a cent a pound is more than the packer's average profit. So the packer stops selling in B-ville, and B-ville is habitually short of meat.

Of course, B-ville may develop a black market, but that's bringing money back into the picture again.

B-ville will never get its meat legitimately under any system of quotas, restrictions, or allocations, because the meat business moves too fast, and rigid plans just won't work.

Right way

Remember, the thing which makes meat move is money.

Nobody knows how much meat is needed in B-ville except the people in B-ville. The B-ville dealer has a pretty good idea how much his customers will buy with their ration coupons, but the only way the B-ville dealer can get meat for his customers is to bid a price which will cover the cost of bringing meat into B-ville and into his store.

You remember that, restricted by ration tickets, we in A-town simply did not buy those pounds of meat which Uncle Sam needs. That left meat in the hands of the packer. He had only two places to sell it, to the Government or to B-ville, where the people still have unsatisfied ration coupons. If the Government buys this meat at the ceiling price, at the same price the meat market in B-ville can pay, the higher cost of going to B-ville makes it unprofitable for the packer to sell it there, so B-ville continues short of meat.

Obviously, the Government can't control this situation by the quantities it buys from day to day because it has no way of knowing each day how much of each kind of meat each of the various B-villes need. But the Government can know that as long as it buys at ceiling prices, all the A-towns can get their meat, while the B-villes more or less go without.

If the packer's extra cost in going to B-ville is one quarter of a cent a pound, the Government can send meat to B-ville by the simple expedient of buying its own meat at one-quarter of a cent less than the ceiling price. That means the packer can get as much for his meat in B-ville as he can by selling to the Government. Most packers prefer to hold their domestic trade if they can. If the Government lowers its price so that B-ville's bid nets as much as the Government bid, the packer will sell to A-town first, to get the market profit there. He will sell to B-ville second in order to maintain his domestic trade. The Government will be the only buyer for what is left, and that is just the way it should work because the rationing point values on each kind of meat were set so as to leave the Government all it needs of each kind.

The answer, then, is to put dollars back to work as the force which makes meat move. This can be done only when we have fixed things so the ceiling price doesn't stop one from bidding dollars for the meat to which his red stamps entitle him.

As long as we have ceilings this can be done by having the Government bid less than ceiling prices for the meat it buys.

That is all there is to the problem of making sure there is always enough of each kind of meat so that each civilian can get all that his ration tickets call for.

OBJECTION NO. 3. HOLD THE LINE—PREVENT INFLATION

We are agreed that prices must be held in line, and that the price level from time to time must be that price which is set by the considerations of good public policy.

Wrong way

Establish retail ceiling prices? No. That doesn't really work, because the chiseler can cheat on price ceilings until the enforcement officials catch up with him.

Establish wholesale price ceilings? No. In the meat business, wholesale prices normally vary from place to place and from day to day—even from hour to hour. The demand for meat and the available supply of meat change with the weather. The thing which makes meat move is money. So if the price relationship from place to place can't change as often as conditions change, we won't ever have the meat exactly where we want it.

Livestock ceilings? No. That's worse yet. When a packer needs livestock to operate his plant, he has to bid for it. If ceilings stop his bidding, he doesn't get his normal share of the livestock. The packer who is shortest of livestock is often the packer who is located in a defense area. If he doesn't get livestock, he can't supply his area with meat. If he is short of livestock, his men have short hours. If a short pay check makes Bill and Joe hunt other jobs this week, Tom and Jim next week, that packer simply won't have the help to run his plant to capacity when the livestock runs start this fall. That, in turn, means there will not be enough packing house capacity to handle all the livestock coming to market.

Price ceilings are not the answer.

Right way

If you and I, guided by our ration tickets, do not buy the meat the Government needs, the packer has no other choice than to offer that meat for sale to the Government. If you and I don't take it, there is no other buyer than the Government.

The Government thus becomes able to buy that meat at whatever price it chooses.

If good policy is to hold prices steady, the Government simply buys at the existing price levels.

If good policy calls for lower prices, the Government simply bids the market down to the desired level.

Whether it be to put prices down, or up, or hold them steady, the national price level in meat can be set each day by the price the Government itself chooses to pay.

You remember that the packer didn't go to B-ville when the business there was showing him a loss. If the business in B-ville is showing a profit, the packers will want to sell there. Packers would bid for the privilege.

No one packer would permit his competitors to have the B-ville business as long as he, himself, could find an advantage of a fraction of a cent a pound in selling to the B-ville merchant instead of the Government.

Retail prices also would be held in line by price competition among the retail stores. Without ceilings, without quotas, and without restrictions, packers would be free to sell retailers all the meat for which their customers had tickets. The business of each retailer would be limited, not by the quantity of meat he could buy, but by the number of customers with tickets he could attract to his shop.

Price competition, as always, would hold prices in line—the actual prices people pay for meat—which constitutes the cost of living.

Price control by price competition really does hold the line.

NOTE ON MEAT MANAGEMENT

This system of setting national price levels in meat by the prices which the Government pays for the meat it buys has come to be known as meat management.

Meat management as contrasted with meat controls.

Meat management can be aimed at any single objective.

For example, the price which the Government pays can be made to control the retail price, the wholesale price, the price of livestock, or it could even be made to control the price of feed.

Neither meat management nor any other system can control all these prices, because if any one of them is fixed, the others must fluctuate around it.

Meat management can be aimed at any group of objectives which are not inconsistent with one another, but, for example, neither meat management, nor any other system, can hold the price of cattle down and at the same time encourage increasing production of beef. Where two possible objectives are in conflict, we must take our choice and use meat management only to effectuate the one which is most desirable.

OBJECTIVE NO. 4. MAKE SURE WE GET FULL PRODUCTION OF THE NEEDED KINDS OF LIVESTOCK

This Nation faces a beef shortage starting in January and lasting into July 1944—unless—unless we do the right things, and do them quickly.

This Nation faces the danger of a falling off in pork production which may begin to be felt in May and June, and which will become serious in the fall of 1944—unless we start doing the right things now.

We must make sure to maintain our livestock production.

Wrong way—beef

Set wholesale price ceilings on various grades of beef? No. Fixed-price differences on various grades of beef mean fixed-price differences on various grades of cattle. At present the difference in price between "fed" cattle and "grass" cattle is so small that the cattle feeders cannot afford to stay in business.

This fact is just beginning to show itself in the statistics. We now have fewer cattle on feed than we had a year ago. The situation is getting worse every day.

Range cattle must be sold when the grass dries up. If the feeder doesn't buy them, they go to slaughter. That is what is happening right today. Each 1,000-pound critter which goes to slaughter now means that much more beef available now. But it also means one less 1,250-pound animal available to us after the turn of the year.

After the critter has bypassed the feed lot and has gone to the slaughtering pen, there is no opportunity for the feeder to do any second guessing. If we want the cattle feeder to think he can afford to stay in business, to produce beef for us this coming year, we must act quickly.

Right way—beef

We have agreed that point prices on beef should be set so that you and I don't buy the beef the Government needs.

If restrictions were removed, each retailer would be able to get all the beef his customers would buy, and he would be able to get whatever grades his customers preferred.

Now, at present wholesale prices, A grade beef costs 19 cents, B grade 17 cents. This is not a natural price spread between A and B grades of beef at all times of the year.

Meat management means that these price differences between grades should be the natural differences—the competitive differences.

If the Government follows meat management, let's see what happens.

First, let's say that the aim of meat management in this instance is to maintain this wholesale price for A grade beef. That means the prices of other grades must fluctuate around that 19 cents according to the relative price you and I are willing to bid for these other grades.

The Government should bid less and less for B grade beef, until it has reestablished

the natural competitive price difference between the two grades of meat. The Government can't bid the B grade too low because you and I will bid, too, when the price difference interests us.

The cattle feeder has always operated on a basis of estimating the relative demand for various grades of beef. He plans his operations on his judgment of what the public will be willing to pay.

Meat management would reestablish operating conditions in which the cattle feeder has confidence.

One other thing.

The price of cattle is too low as compared with the price of hogs. This disparity must be corrected. It can be corrected in any one of several ways. One way would be to raise beef prices. Another way which was recommended by an advisory group of livestock and meat men is to permit a rise in the price of byproducts—hides, tallow, and so forth.

Wrong way—hogs

Establish a "support price" below which live hogs will not be permitted to go? That depends on how it is done.

Hogs will get down to the support price only when there are more hogs than the packer can handle. Who then will say which producer may market his hogs today when it is pleasant and which one must market his tomorrow when it is stormy? Who will say which producer may go to the nearby market and which must go to that which is farther away? The regimentation necessary to enforce a support price is unthinkable. The producers—particularly the marginal producers—who were unable to market their hogs when it was to their advantage to do so, would become discouraged. Hog production would be decreased.

Have the Government undertake to buy the hogs and resell them to the packers? No, that involves the same difficulties, but worse. If the Government should establish a contract price, the inferred obligation would be to provide a full market each day at that price. The ability of the packers to slaughter the hogs and process the meat would become an obligation of the Government, and, therefore, would become a matter for Government regulation if not for actual Government management. Certainly, the Government is not equipped to undertake such tasks as that, nor the tasks of allocating markets to farmers—and farmers to markets.

Right way—hogs

Meat management can be used to fit any single aim.

If the aim is to control the price level of each of the pork cuts, the Government can do that by setting the red-point value of each cut so as to control the volume of the civilian demand for it, and then buying what's left over at the price level it wants to maintain.

If the aim is to control the Chicago price of hogs, that, too, can be done by anyone who is experienced in the wholesale meat business. If the packers start bidding the price of hogs up, the Government will simply bid the price of pork meat down. An experienced man in charge of the Government pork buying should be able to hold the Chicago hog price.

But—by meat management or any other system, you can maintain only one in a group of price markets which normally vary in their relationship to one another. If you are going to maintain the Chicago price, you let the other markets find their prices around that Chicago base. If you would rather control the price at Des Moines, you can do that. But neither meat management nor any arbitrary system can fix the relationship between them.

And—all hogs do not normally sell at the same price, and no system will make them do so, on a satisfactory basis.

Normal price differences by normal weight ranges would retard any exaggerated marketings, which would rob us of pigs which should come to market next spring.

Normally, hog prices change by 10- or 20-pound weight ranges. The present support price range is 200 pounds to 270 pounds. At times this would be as much as 95 percent of all the hogs coming to market. There will be days when the market can't take all the hogs.

It is for this reason that, whether it be meat management or any other system, the support price must be applied to a natural and normal market weight range sufficiently narrow to give the farmer an option based on price as to which weight hogs he will market now and which weight he will market later; whether to market his hogs today or tomorrow; near at home or far away, etc.

If the producer has no price basis of choice, a black market will grow up to give him that choice and in the meanwhile the situation will present such difficulties as to discourage the marginal producer—even the good producer on his marginal numbers—and cause reduced pork production.

Only meat management can control price levels in such a way as to maintain normal price differentials, and only by maintaining normal price differentials can we avoid the disruption of this Nation's livestock producing and processing capacity.

OBJECTIVE NO. 5. ELIMINATE THE BLACK MARKET

It is said that 25 percent of the Nation's meat supply is now passing through the black markets. Certainly, this must be stopped.

Wrong way

Issue more ration tickets than there is meat? No. People are bound to think they are entitled to buy meat as long as their red stamps hold out. If they can't get what they want from their regular dealer, some of them will start shopping down the street. And when they get to the black market, they forget to ask the price.

Enforce price ceilings? That would do it, but we haven't enough policemen.

License slaughterers and processors? No. Again, we haven't enough policemen. We already have so many rules and regulations that most people in the business have not even been able to read them. But every time a new regulation comes out, the chiselers find a new way to cheat, and the black market goes merrily on.

Right way

Take the profit out of the black market.

How?

First. Be sure that point values on each kind of meat are high enough to leave all of each kind of meat which the Government needs.

Second. Let the Government bidding for the meat it buys be the means of controlling the price level.

This will leave the packers always bidding for the retailer's business. Each retailer will then be able to get all the meat he can legitimately sell. And he can get it at right prices. The black-market operator no longer will be able to get patronage by selling meats which a dealer needs in order to stay in business, or in order to satisfy the ration tickets of his customers. Thus much of the black-market's profit opportunity will have been taken away. This will not kill the black market, but it will make it awfully sick, because the black market can operate only at an abnormal profit.

This procedure will also make sure that every person can usually get all of any kind of meat he wants, as long as his red stamps hold out.

Third. Be sure the public understands that the only purpose of rationing is to tell each one of us what our fair share of meat is, in order that the Government may have the meat it needs.

We know we can't police every consumer or every retailer—nor even every packer. We don't intend to. We don't have to. Rationing is the fair means by which each of us gives up that which we should give up in order that our boys shall have meat.

When we understand that there will be be very little cheating on ration tickets.

When we restore bidding throughout the meat business, markets will not be short of meat—various communities will get their fair shares—and the supply for our armed forces and lend-lease will be assured.

Those Wartime Pennies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Times-Herald entitled "Those Wartime Pennies" omits the reason why we'll just have to take the new wartime pennies and try to like them—the steel composition ones, we mean, which are almost the size of dimes and look much like dimes. Whether we like the steel-composition pennies or not, we can endure them far better than our soldiers can face the deadly instruments of death suffered and permitted to be shipped to the Japanese by the Roosevelt Administration under its appeasement program.

The shipment of refined copper from the United States to Japan during a period of 5 years fully explains our shortage of this very vital and essential war material, of which the United States is now desperately short:

Refined copper exports to Japan

	Pounds
1936	5,355,471
1937	10,838,709
1938	217,879,738
1939	249,277,000
1940	233,897,000
Total	717,277,918

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

THOSE WARTIME PENNIES

Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, says we'll just have to take the new wartime pennies and try to like them—the steel-composition ones, we mean, which are almost the same size as dimes and look much like dimes.

THEY LOOK LIKE DIMES

It seems that it is impossible to allot the 4,600 tons of copper needed annually for normal United States copper-penny production; that all available copper is needed for the war effort.

So that would seem to be that. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these pennies are a nuisance to almost anybody whose eyes are not 20/20. It is rather embarrassing, for instance, to hand a taxi driver what you think is a dime tip, only to have him give you a sad and reproachful look because it's one of the ersatz pennies.

What would be the matter with punching a hole in the middle of the new penny? That

would not only make it instantly distinguishable from the dime but would also save a fair-sized wad of steel per year.

As we understand it, it is not practical to change the shape of the new penny, because of the chaos such a change would produce in numerous penny vending machines. But to drill a hole in it seems entirely practical.

Nor is this a novel, unheard-of idea. The Chinese for centuries have had coins with holes in them, and the custom has worked out well.

Mr. Speaker, our boys fighting in the jungles have had to take it. Why cannot we?

Centralization of Power in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a significant document. It is written by Dr. Robert A. Millikan, American physicist and Nobel Prize winner. As a great scientist, Dr. Millikan outlines for America the greatest danger that confronts us. Many people have looked for a scientific appraisal of the New Deal, free from political prejudice or emotional partisanship. Dr. Millikan has suplied it.

[From the New York Times of September 23, 1943]

On August 22, 1938, I wrote a brief statement for the Time Capsule. Since then the threatened storm has broken and mankind is now in the midst of the greatest crisis in human history.

But today there is every reason to hope that at least one of the two great threats to world freedom and world civilization envisioned by the great thinkers of the past, namely, the external threat arising from the attack of bandit nations bent on world conquest, is not this time destined to succeed.

However, the second, or internal, threat arising from too great centralization of power in Washington, and the internal corruption that it inevitably breeds, followed as in all Axis countries and some non-Axis ones by the replacement of a people's government by a party government indistinguished from despotism, that menace is certainly greater today than at any time in American history. It is devoutly to be hoped that the American voter has read the lessons of history better than have some college professors who have been recent administrative advisers.

Spinoza, whom history has shown to have been right more frequently than most philosophers, warned particularly, about 1670, against letting education get into the hands of the central government, for he held it to be inevitable that those in power would use the schools to perpetuate their control, i. e., to indoctrinate the rising generation with views which would inevitably be a reflection of the philosophies and interests of the rulers. Such indoctrination has been practiced in this century in Europe on a tremendous scale and with disastrous consequences to mankind.

SAYS MONTESQUIEU SAW DANGER

But it was Montesquieu who saw and stated most clearly in 1748 these dangers that now loom so threateningly on our horizon. His words, so influential with Jefferson and the makers of our Constitution, should be equally influential with us today. He wrote:

"If a republic is small, it is destroyed by a foreign power; if it is large, it destroys itself by an inner vice. So it is very likely that men would have been forced to live always under the rule of one man had they not imagined a constitution which combines the advantages of a republican government and the external force of a monarchy. I mean a federal republic. Made up of small republics, it enjoys the high political quality of each, and toward other powers it has, by virtue of a federation, all the advantages of monarchies."

Watchman, What of the Peace!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein an excellent commencement address made by Col. Edward A. Fitzpatrick on June 8, 1943, at the Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis.:

1914—AND AFTER

Would you end war?
Create great Peace.

* * * * *

But that which we call Peace?
This monstrous machine that weakens millions in factories,
This lust of money for its own sake: To swell one's social stomach larger than one's neighbor's.
This poor little personal strife and family pride,
This softness of muscle and cowardice of spirit.
Is this Peace?
Is merely keeping alive, Peace?
Better the young die greatly than live weakly.

Would you end war?
Create great Peace,
The Peace that demands all of man,
His love, his life, his veriest self;
Plunge him in the smelting fires of a work that becomes his child,
Coerce him to be himself at all hazards: With the toil and the mating that belong to him:
Compel him to serve.
Give him a hard Peace: A Peace of discipline and justice.
Kindle him with vision, invite him to joy and adventure:
Set him to work, not to create things
But to create men:
Yes, himself.
Go search your heart, America.
Turn from the machine to man,
Build, while there is yet time, a creative Peace.
While there is yet time!
For if you reject great Peace,
As surely as vile living brings disease,
So surely shall your selfishness bring war.

—*James Oppenheim.*

There will be a peace. That is the simple fact—and coming from unknown depths we approach clear mountain tops from whence we can see the promised land, all of whose ways are pleasantness, we hope, and all of whose paths are peace. It is a glorious picture that is in our minds against the terrible realities of war with its casualty lists, with its blood, toil, sweat, and tears, with its sacrifices and its losses. What rejoicing there will be when this is over. There will be rejoicing, but we cannot assume that all will be well. The brutalities and barbarism which Belgium and Holland and Norway know and have suffered, which Poland and Czechoslovakia and France have experienced would be our present fate were we not engaged in war. But our concern is that for our children and our children's children; the stupidity and barbarism of war will, we hope, be a thing of the past, and men, while growing in years, will grow in wisdom.

The lamps of reason were extinguished on the highways of the world. In those days we did not see, as a people, too clearly what was happening, nor did we realize at all adequately the world conspiracy against everything that America, civilization, and religion stand for. The war is no chivalrous gladiatorial conflict. It is the Junker's idea of a nation in arms. It had long and cunningly been prepared for. It was camouflaged by the phrases and devices of expediency and deceit. It is totalitarian war. Women and children are as much a part of it as men. There is no distinction between civilian and military. Hospital ships were to be destroyed. Mercy and fair play were taboo. This is the nature of the war in which we are engaged, and accepting the gage of battle, we match Coventrys and Londons and Pearl Harbors, with Dortmunds, Dusseldorfs, Essens, and Wilhelmshavens. In doing this we are glad to see the great spirit of freemen manifesting itself in the young generation who fight our battles on land, on sea, and in the air.

But even from totalitarian war waged by madmen with their visions of world conquest and world domination without any sense of international responsibility and without the remotest idea that they might be defeated as they trampled nations under foot, looted them of all their great cultural possessions, moved their populations to become slave labor, and perpetrated unspeakable crimes on women, on children, and on men too old, or too young to take up arms. Even from such war there must be peace, but what a vengeful retribution will follow in the immediate wake of that peace. But a peace will come.

There will be a period of transition when hostilities are over. There will be glad reunions of families all over the country, and there will be moments of recollection and of the sense of loss, for men young and old, who gave on some foreign soil, the last full measure of devotion. The Nation is already planning for the demobilized soldiers. We want them to return in an orderly fashion with separation pay and with unemployment benefits as far as possible; we want to provide opportunities for further special training along vocational lines and for the continuation of the education which service to their country interrupted. We want to take account of those other soldiers of the common good, men and women, who made the airplanes, ships and guns, bombs, and munitions of war who will also be demobilized. The demobilization of both the industrial workers and the armed forces must be carried out in terms of the actual social and economic condition at the end of the war so that new maladjustments will not be created, a new depression will not be in the making, and the men who fought and worked for victory shall not be denied its fruits.

This is the demobilization relating to things, and materials, aiming at an improvement of social and economic conditions and securing the physical adjustment of men to their environment. It is essential and it is important. It must be achieved, and the Governments of the United States and of the

States, and private industry will by a wholehearted cooperation bring it about.

But the demobilization has spiritual aspects as well as material aspects. We go back to our old habits and our old outlooks. We tend inevitably to return to normalcy. We do not always learn in the bitter school of experience. It is amazing that even in the midst of this holocaust that we offer to the god of war, we do not realize our idolatry. Certainly talk of stalemates, and negotiated peace, and a sentimental forgiveness of the sins of nations and their leaders indicates that we do not learn, nor do we read history. If you would understand Germany you must read—if you can read—its history. Read about Stein and Bismarck, or go back to him of the red beard, in the Black Forest, Barbarossa, if you would understand what has been happening in Germany since 1933, and what followed in 1940 in "die ganze Welt." It is not an excrescence or a temporary insanity of the German or at least the Prussian personality, but an expression of its dominant mood, its seemingly ineradicable spirit.

It was natural, therefore, that Hitler should engage in a vast scheme of education as Bismarck had done before him in his flank attack on the Socialists. Hitler devised the most comprehensive and effective scheme of national education that has yet been devised. It made over the nation. It is an echo of Fichte, but it is malevolent, more inhuman. It has been properly called an education for death. It dehumanized human personality. It robbed it of everything we called cultivated, humane, educated. It trained men as wild animals are trained. It subordinated mind and soul to body and a narrow brutal creed. With all its veneer it was a return to the jungle.

It is really about the spiritual aspects of the demobilization that I wish to speak. It has often been said that the war is an ideological war. It is a conflict between fascism or nazi-ism and democracy. Such labels are too simple and too vague. It is not merely a conflict of political creeds, it is a conflict of philosophies of life. It goes to the very heart of what we call civilization. It is a challenge to religion. It questions our concept which we got from the Greeks, of free human personality. We have set up the "four freedoms" as the essence of what we fight for—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. We declare our objectives as the Pope did for Christendom as—

(1) a respect for and a practical realization of the dignity and rights of the human person,

(2) a social unity, promoting the unity and cohesion of the family—that cell of the people,

(3) a recognition of the dignity and prerogatives of labor derived from the moral nobility of work, and including labor in a genuinely human and fraternally Christian solidarity,

(4) the creation of a juridic order which guarantees men a definite sphere of rights immune from all arbitrary attack, and finally,

(5) a conception of the State which makes it subordinate to the rights of human personality which regards the State as a means to an end, which teaches, even in matters of the world, that the deepest meaning, the ultimate moral basis and the universal validity of "reigning" is in serving. On this Christian basis there can come a renovation of society.

The general renovation of society must be brought about by Christian principles dominating the hearts and moving the wills of men. This is both a moral and intellectual achievement for men. It is not the easiest way whose end is the everlasting bonfire. It cannot be achieved by drifting. It cannot be achieved by avoiding responsibility nor by the acceptance of gods who will put upon us no responsibility which we do not like. What we must have is a peace of discipline, a hard peace, a peace that will meet every challenge of our higher natures, a peace that will make men and reveal their divine nature. That is the kind of peace Oppenheim describes:

"Would you end war?
Create great peace.
The peace that demands all of a man,
His love, his life, his veriest self;
Plunge him in the smelting fires of a work that becomes his child,
Coerce him to be himself at all hazards: with the toil and the mating that belong to him:
Compel him to serve.
Give him a hard peace: a peace of discipline and justice.
Kindle him with vision, invite him to joy and adventure:
Set him to work, not to create things
But to create men:
Yea, himself."

It has been our wont, in our easy way to say nonchalantly—our education system will achieve that—any social objective—then go about our private way seeking our private ends. We had a false idea that education was always good; that it could be an evil hardly entered our minds, and yet on a national scale, we said, in Nazi Germany, a thorough educational system achieved the national, and almost the world-wide malevolent design of evil men in a single decade. This was done not only by the education of the school, but by the education of the whole social life. We saw, too, in Soviet Russia, the transformation of a revolutionary state into a national state through an education in the school and in the social life.

We have done a tremendous job in our educational system in achieving literacy, even though we are shocked at the present extent of illiteracy as revealed by Selective Service. But literacy is not education. It is not the intellectual and moral formation of men. Without expressing a judgment on education prior to 1941, it may safely be said that it will not be equal to the responsibilities of a peaceful world of the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, nor the Christian renovation of society.

The war has created new problems, and quite properly subordinated education to the cause of civilization in its death throes in 1941 and 1942. It has subjected educational processes to imperative narrow social ends; it has subordinated the training of free human personality to a specific task—which, however, would make the development of free human personality a possibility for others. Education was put to war work, and it was forced out of its ruts, to get, perhaps, into other ruts.

The great advantage of education of its wartime experience is that it is challenged in its traditions, its customs, and its trends. Its very philosophy is challenged, its objectives, its methods, and its curricula. This opportunity may be seized or we may take the easiest way and go back to the old rooms, the old texts, the old methods. If so, we shall be even less effective than we were prior to World War No. 2.

What are some of the things we must do?

The post-war education must meet the intellectual and moral challenge of a world that in losing its soul may have found it. It cannot go along dawdling. It cannot consume its precious time in the study of textbooks. It must not lose itself in verbiage, but find meaning and hope in life itself. It must make men and women disciplined, having highest hope and steady vision.

Post-war education must create universities that are the highest expression in our secular life of man's intellectual and moral aspirations. The university, as we have known it, has generally been a pathetic institution. The potpourri that the war is making of our universities only emphasizes the "intellectual cafeteria" aspects of its prewar condition.

It would be too radical a proposal to make the social order itself an environmental factor of tremendous educational force, emphasizing what is presumed to be going on in the school and the home. This will include a renovation of the family with a new conception of parental responsibility and new utilization of the home as a center of social contacts of educational value.

In the same spirit we may come to realize that the ultimate products of factories are men and women rather than shoes and autos or airplanes, and the human welfare as well as their economic and physical welfare may be a factor in determining the productive processes.

I need not labor any more over the function of a new daring education in the processes of making men and women. That is the only true educational objective—and it is the objective of vocational education as it is of liberal education. It is the end of the whole social process. The justification of the social process is not conveniences and comforts; it is the quality of the men and women it makes.

The education of women will feel more significantly even than the education of men, the new impulses, the new challenge. I like to think that here in Mount Mary we had been moving in the direction we must go, that we had conceptions of education more virile and which met, perhaps slightly, these new educational trends. You girls—young women who graduate today, had some picture of what was going on in the world presented with a frankness that was not too popular 2 years ago. The issue was presented clearly then when there was so much fog. The grave issues of this age were clearly placed before you. You have now to meet as few generations of college students have been required to meet, the social responsibilities of their age. In this fire your mettle will be tested. You have had here almost all that education can do for you. It is you that will be tested—and whatever you have gotten from your education.

Go into this world, be not overwhelmed by it, but bravely face it, bring to it the order of your mind and your life. The confusion is external and seeming; you are the reality and the world will take on the order of your thinking. Help your Nation, which means the men and women you come in contact with to accept the responsibility of upholding an international organization founded on realities, not excluding justice, and love, and sustained by an international law recognizing the unity of mankind and by a concert of power making what happened in Germany and Italy and Japan forever impossible. Let us make, too, the Latin-American countries and Canada our good neighbors because we are good neighbors. Let us not forget, too, to help the men or women we meet on the street or in our neighborhood or in our parish church, to give him consolation and solace, to enter his world to help men, to cheer him for the boy or girl who did not return from the war, to help him find a new job in the transition to peacetime.

We are taught in this college that the important world is the world of human beings. We want to help make better human beings. We want to make them worthy of redemption, knowing they are born not of flesh nor of the will of man, but of God. In that serene faith, in that hope, in the human charity which knows no distinction of men as to color or race or creed, I say to you Godspeed in a world you will make better because you lived in it. You, too, must search

your hearts and I conclude as I began with Oppenheim's words:

"Go search your heart, America,
Turn from the machine to man,
Build, while there is yet time, a creative Peace.
While there is yet time!
For if you reject great Peace,
As surely as vile living brings disease,
So surely shall your selfishness bring war."

Impressions of Jim Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Tuesday, August 10, 1943:

MORE OR LESS PERSONAL

(By William J. McNally)

IMPRESSIONS OF JIM FARLEY

A large, bald, amiable man with quick, penetrating eyes, stood behind his chair for an hour or so last Saturday while a group of Twin City newspapermen tossed questions at him as rapidly as they could think them up. The occasion was a luncheon given by Tom Moore for a former cabinet officer who happened to be passing through town. And anybody who knew newspapermen could see that the attention they were according the guest of honor was in no sense perfunctory—for once they were having a thoroughly good time. There was something about the speaker that got them.

The man was Jim Farley, who is said to have more friends than any living American. No one in the room would think of doubting it. He had made a friend of every newspaperman present before he had talked 15 minutes * * * and most of them had never seen him before. Farley has engaging qualities of a sort which win sympathy for him universally and yet which are rather difficult to describe for all that.

What you meet up with in Jim Farley is a very extraordinary ordinary man. Everything about him seems ordinary. His vocabulary is ordinary, his dress is ordinary, his humility is ordinary. There is no touch of the actor in him. He likes to chat about prize fights and ball games, and apparently there hasn't been a world's championship prize fight or a world's series game in the last 30 years that he hasn't seen. He lacks any pose of the elder statesman, and lays claim to no special information. He is not even a hail-fellow-well-met. People call him "Jim" on very short acquaintance, but he is reticent about replying in kind. While he has poise, and talks up readily when questions are put to him, he is anything but forward, and you feel, if anything, a certain shyness in him. He neither smokes nor drinks, and the sense of personal dignity that he conveys is unostentatious, yet nonetheless unmistakable.

The ordinary things about Jim Farley are discernible at a glance; the extraordinary things seep into you in more leisurely fashion. In spite of his associations as political manager, he is curiously free from partisanship, from prejudice, or from rancors of any kind. He weighs his words carefully; he will not tolerate any indiscriminate condemnation even of an enemy; it is instinctive with him to be just. The whole bent of his mind is objective. Naturalness, directness, and simplicity are qualities which public men tend to lose as soon as they become institutions. With Farley naturalness, directness, and simplicity are so much a part of him that he wouldn't be able to lose them even if he wanted to; not, of course, that he would. The impact on you of such naturalness, directness, and simplicity as he possesses is to leave you a little startled. You feel like pinching yourself again and again to make sure that you are hearing him aright. It then dawns on you that Farley has made a tremendous political success mainly because, from beginning to end, he has remained an unpolitical animal. He is not a politican, in the commonly accepted sense of the word, at all. He is a man of principle. No matter how long he may have lived in the hurly-burly of politics, he has never lost his integrity as a human being. That is the secret of the incredible hold he has on individuals in every one of the 48 States of the Union. If it's true that they will go to hell for him, it's not because he's a mere good fellow; good fellows, after all, are a dime a dozen in any ward in any town that you can name, but that instinctively they size him up for a modest man, a good man, and a big man. It's respect for rare and unusual qualities that has won Jim Farley his legions of friends—that and nothing else. Farley's ordinariness is just one of the great myths of our age. What seems to be ordinariness is merely a cloak draped around a man of uncommon ability and uncommon fineness of character.

Resolution of Southwestern Oklahoma District Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

MANGUM, OKLA., *September 13, 1943.*

Hon. CLAUDE WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture;
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator,
Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Congressman, Seventh District, Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Resolution passed by the District Farmers Union Southwestern District of Oklahoma, at Warren, Okla., August 7, 1943:

"Whereas every item of expense in producing the 1943 cotton crop is the highest in the past 20 years; and

"Whereas the present price of cotton is far below the cost of production; and

"Whereas, the ceiling price on all manufactured products has been set high enough to give said manufacturers and distributors a handsome profit after paying the highest wages in the Nation's history; and

"Whereas more labor goes into the production of raw cotton per dollar value than any other farm product: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the national Congress to pass legislation for parity prices which will include all labor cost in agricultural production; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and each Member of Congress of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress as soon as the Congress convenes."

R. L. THURMOND,
President, Eldorado, Okla.
S. F. LANCASTER,
Vice President, Grimes, Okla.

Attest:

HENRY WORTHINGTON,
Secretary, Mangum, Okla.
WOODIE SNIDER,
Blair, Okla.
WALT GOIN,
Crawford, Okla.
W. D. HARRIS,
Carnegie, Okla.
A. HERRON,
Mangum, Okla.
BYRON DACUS,
Gotebo, Okla.
Resolution Committee.

Farley Visit Recalls Secret Trip of 1931

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Saturday, August 14, 1943:

FARLEY VISIT RECALLS SECRET TRIP OF 1931

(By Charles B. Cheney)

One summer day 12 years ago, a stranger from the East dropped in to spend a few hours in the Twin Cities. He sought no publicity—avoided it, in fact, so well that it was not generally known he had been here until a long time afterward. That visit started the ball rolling for Franklin D. Roosevelt in Minnesota.

The caller was James A. Farley, then, as now, chairman of the New York State Democratic Committee. He was on a scouting trip to line up delegates for Roosevelt in 1932. Here he met, at a luncheon arranged by Joseph Wolf and given by Otto Bremer, of St. Paul, a dozen keymen of Minnesota Democracy. He sold them Roosevelt, and from that meeting stemmed the preconvention campaign that gave F. D. R. the 22 delegates from Minnesota in the national convention.

This was one of the first States to declare for Roosevelt. But for the 22 from Minnesota and the other western delegates lined up by Mr. Farley the year before, it is unlikely that Roosevelt would have won that 1932 nomination.

Jim Farley sold himself as well as Roosevelt, as he went from State to State. He was self-effacing to the point of sacrifice, but his fine personality and upstanding honesty, so well eulogized on this page the other day by William McNally, made warm friends for Farley everywhere.

He is still making them, as he did when in Minneapolis last Saturady. He was honored guest then at a luncheon given for newspaper men by his friend and busines associate, Tom Moore. This time it was not a political powwow. Much water has run over the dam since 1931.

After piloting the Roosevelt craft through two national campaigns, Farley felt that two terms were enough for anybody. With assur-

ance that his chief would not be a candidate again, Mr. Farley aspired for the 1940 nomination himself. We all know what happened. The third-term nomination came with Farley in the role of the defeated candidate. He quit the Cabinet and the national chairmanship to recoup his private fortunes in business.

Damon Runyon said the other day that Jim Farley was one of the few men who never told him an untruth. Such is Farley's reputation throughout the country, comments the Redwood Falls Gazette. "It could just possibly be that the very things that made that reputation for Jim, also made it difficult for him to continue his connections with the Roosevelt administration."

Bill of Indictment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of September 20, 1943:

BILL OF INDICTMENT

The State Department stands indicted in the eyes of the American people on the following counts:

Indicted because its chieftain, Secretary Hull, despite his good qualities, is unfit by temperament or by intellect to create the dynamic policies needed in these blazing times. His mind is closed to the fresh breezes of human thought that are blowing through the world today. This was pathetically obvious in his recent speech.

Indicted because the Department has not a single figure, since the dismissal of Sumner Welles, who has the stature and imagination to deal with the challenging problems of wartime diplomacy, and because the Department itself is tackling a job of twentieth-century diplomacy with nineteenth-century equipment and outlook.

Indicted because the Department, sometimes justifiably in the interest of military expediency and sometimes with no apparent justification, has dealt with Vichyites, with Franco, with Fascist ex-monarchs like King George of Greece—a booby in the bargain—while ignoring or snubbing men like General De Gaulle in whom the very hopes of oppressed Europe lie.

Indicted because the Department consistently follows a policy of refusing to take the people into its confidence. Unlike Woodrow Wilson, who published every note he sent to Germany in the First World War, Secretary Hull left the people unready for Pearl Harbor, though later publication of the diplomatic notes made it plain we had reached an impasse with Japan.

Indicted because the Department, set apart from the robustness of American democracy, and evidently afraid of democracy, refuses to formulate and make public either the country's war aims or its post-war plans, though the American public yearns for their precise definition. For want of such definition of aims and plans they turn in hunger to the speeches of Henry Wallace, to Wendell Willkie's book, "One World."

Indicted because, although military expediency first explained the deal with Darlan, we continued to play along with French Fascists and Jew-baiters, such as Peyrouton, until long after we had need to do so; because recognition of the French Committee of National Liberation was delayed and then only half granted; and because—if the State Department follows the same pattern it has in the past—it may even take to its bosom Marshal Badoglio and the moronic little king.

The State Department stands indicted because Secretary Hull and the State Department have permitted relations with Soviet Russia to deteriorate to a dangerous point. Russia suspects that the American State Department is so fearful of a strong Russia after the war that it is willing to risk antagonizing that comrade-in-arms which has made by far the greatest contribution to the defeat of Hitler.

Indicted because the whole bent and direction of State Department policy—with its Munich-minded pre-war appeasement of Japan, with its long courtship of Vichy, with its tenderness toward Franco, with its affection for royalty-without-portfolio like Peter of Yugoslavia and Archduke Otto of Austria—show a preoccupation with the world that was, not with the world that is to be.

Indicted because American foreign policy should spring from America's great and fiery tradition—the tradition of Samuel Adams, of Thomas Jefferson, of Thomas Paine, of William Lloyd Garrison. Instead, our foreign policy has tugged at the coattails of European Fascists and reactionaries to the amazement and consternation of the captive peoples of Europe.

And finally, the State Department stands indicted because, out of all this timidity, stupidity, excess caution, and reaction, we are hurting our war effort, we are failing to capitalize the great virtues of American democracy. We are failing to lay the groundwork for the brave new world that must come unless we are willing to face the monster of a third world war.

This is the case against the State Department. It is a case, too, against President Roosevelt. Cordell Hull and the State Department, are only his agents.

(From an N. B. C. program of yesterday, carried by KSD, entitled "The Editors Speak.")

O. P. A. Kangaroo Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Maumee (Ohio) Advance-Era, of September 24, 1943:

O. P. A. KANGAROO COURT

Last Saturday, at a Constitutional week dinner in Ottawa, Ill., Attorney General George F. Barrett denounced O. P. A. kangaroo courts. He said, "If the O. P. A. doesn't abolish its un-American kangaroo courts, where citizens are denied rights guaranteed them under the Constitution, Congress will do it for them. This is not true American justice as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

"An American citizen accused of a violation of law is entitled to a public trial in a court of law, to be informed of the nature of the accusation, to question the witnesses against him, to have his own witnesses heard, and to have the assistance of legal counsel.

"The O. P. A. theory is that those accused of violation of rules and regulations decreed by its bureaucrats are not entitled to rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The O. P. A. even denies the right of appeal from its bureaucratic decisions.

"It appears that the people, through their representatives in Congress, are about to perform a major operation on the O. P. A. body bureaucrats. It will not be long before the American people will rise up and hurl from their high thrones of usurped power the bureaucrats who are contemptuous of the people's rights and powers."

A few weeks ago we pointed out in these columns that United States District Court Judge John P. Barnes had disqualified himself from hearing a case involving milk distribution because he and his wife owned a small farm which sold some of its milk. He remarked at the time that he hoped no violations were taking place on his little farm. It was our observation that, where a doubt existed in the mind of a learned judge, it could be believed that the ordinary citizen was telling the truth when he claimed his so-called violations had been unintentional.

Last Thursday Judge Barnes rendered a highly important decision concerning proceedings under the administrative law used by the O. P. A. The O. P. A. regional counsel at Chicago had summoned a group of meat dealers to appear before an O. P. A. hearing examiner with all their records. The meat dealers demanded an open hearing and the benefit of counsel, which was denied to them by the hearing examiner, and the proceedings terminated in an appeal to Judge Barnes' district court.

Many times in these columns we have pointed out the unreasonable procedure under which administrative law operates today. The decision of Judge Barnes should go a long way to clarify these O. P. A. hearings, and, in the end, might prevent the collapse of the O. P. A., as predicted by Attorney General George F. Barrett in the speech from which we quoted several paragraphs above. Judge Barnes declined to compel the meat dealers to attend what the judge referred to as a "star chamber session." He decided that the hearing should be a public hearing, held in a public place.

Judge Barnes made it plain that the statute under which the O. P. A. hearing examiner was functioning did not allow the examiner to function under the secret powers of a grand jury. The judge pointed out that if it had been the intention of Congress to invest these grand jury powers in O. P. A., Congress would have said so. Congress did not say so, and the judge decided that O. P. A. should operate under ordinary court procedure in a public place in accordance with a tradition which is distrustful of "secret meanings and proceedings."

Judge Barnes' ruling in this case should be put into practice wherever administrative law requires the American citizen to appear for a hearing. This will eliminate the possible abuses which might result from the secrecy which these grand jury hearings afforded these O. P. A. examiners. It will also give to these hearings the character of an open court and guarantee to those being heard the benefit that might come to them from open publicity.

We believe that any procedure under which a defendant cannot be heard by his fellow citizens with a counsel to present his case cannot endure long in this country. Judge Barnes probably has saved the O. P. A. from joining the dead "blue eagle."

Railroad Employee Pay Increase Rejected by Stabilization Director Vinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to Hon. Fred Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, and his reply thereto:

LAKE CITY, MICH., *August 11, 1943.*

Hon. FRED VINSON,
Economic Stabilization Director,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I am writing you with regard to the request of the 15 nonoperating brotherhoods of railway employees for an increase in pay of 8 cents per hour.

As you know, I recently visited 47 defense plants and made a report to Congress which I hope you will have time to look over. On page A3697 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find excerpts from some 40 letters verifying the conditions I reported on. These are only a few of the hundreds of letters I received. Millions of workers are being paid pre-war or near pre-war wages with a definite increase in living costs which has been estimated as high as 30 percent. This is particularly true of the railway employees. I am informed that a section man in the Ludington, Mich., area has $22 a week left after wartime deductions, and that a yard clerk with 20 years' experience has $25 a week left after similar deductions. This was before the withholding tax became effective. A week ago today, I talked to a railroad conductor at Ludington. He has been in the service 28 years. I personaly saw his check after deductions. He had $96 left for half a month's pay. The engineer on the same train had $146 left after similar deductions for half a month's pay.

On the other hand, I found machine-gun assemblers who were being paid as high as $8,700 a year, and girls with little or no experience being paid $65 a week.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD above referred to, I included two advertisements by the United States Employment Service which read in part as follows:

"Wanted laborers for northeastern Canada, wages $300 per month, no lost time due to inclement weather or sickness, plus overtime, board, room, and one issue of clothing. United States Employment Service Office, War Manpower Commission, 407 South Fourth Street, Minneapolis, Minn."

The other reads:

"Wanted waiters, dishwashers, kitchenmen, wages $250 per month plus board and lodging. Olympic Commissary, 25 South Washington."

From California I found two other advertisements from a local paper both signed by the United States Employment Service. Each has a picture of a young lady, who testifies:

"We are paid $214 a month while we learn to weld and soon earn over $270 a month as journeymen, 10 percent extra for the swing shift, 15 percent extra for the graveyard shift."

The second advertisement in the same paper advertises for women 18 to 40 years of age and reads in part as follows:

"We will train you to weld and pay you at the rate of $214 a month during a short training period. Soon you will be equipped with knowledge that will win you promotion paying $270 a month."

These advertisements were signed by the United States Employment Service.

All through the plants I visited I found unskilled labor being paid as high as $100 a month after 4 to 6 weeks' training with the approval of the Government. Here we find one Government agency advertising for unskilled labor at a wage as high as $300 a month, while the Stabilization Director rejects an increase of 8 cents an hour for employees of the railway who have as little as $22 to $25 a week left after wartime deductions to meet an increase of from 20 to 40 percent in the wartime cost of living.

I have known you personally as a Member of the House of Representatives. I have always admired and have had a great confidence in your good judgment. I am writing this letter in order that you may have the benefit of some of the facts as gathered first-hand, I sincerely hope you can find your way clear to allow this small increase for the 15 nonoperating brotherhoods of the railways of America.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., August 16, 1943.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
Member of Congress, Lake City, Mich.

DEAR ALBERT: I received your letter of August 11, 1943, informing me of your interest in the nonoperating railway employees' wage-increase case.

Under date of June 22, 1943, I disapproved the recommendation of the emergency board. For your information, I am attaching herewith a press release which incorporates the order I entered and the opinion which I rendered.

With personal regards and every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director.

Walter M. Pierce on the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article carried in the Salem Oregon Statesman, written by Walter M. Pierce. "Governor" Pierce, as he was commonly called by his colleagues, had the privilege of serving in the Congress of the United States for 10 years. He was a faithful member of my committee, the House Committee on Agriculture.

It was a great loss to his State and to the country when he was defeated. Although he has outlived his three score years and ten, he was alert, always on time in attending committee meetings, and you could rest assured he was occupying, during practically every session of the Congress, a front seat, where he would be able to take in everything that was said and done. This was because of his great interest in his people and his country.

He was not only a well-educated man, but he was a man of considerable practical experience, born with that qualification that means so much in private life and especially in Congress: common sense. He was one Congressman who did not worry about any type of propaganda that might come into his office, in a great many instances written by or at the request of selfish groups.

He did not lose any time thinking about playing politics, and during all these years never was there a time that you would find him sitting astraddle of the fence. He was always able to make up his mind, and he operated on a basis which was in line with his conscience and deep conviction, having in mind the best interests of his people and his country.

One of his major concerns was doing something about putting an end to the ruthless destruction of our forest resources—one of the greatest resources in his State, as well as in that great area of the United States. I would not be surprised if his defeat was not brought about because of his activities in connection with trying to remedy this serious situation.

He was the type of Congressman that should have been able to serve the balance of his days in the Congress. I know I speak the wishes of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle in wishing him many more happy years.

Because of the great distance between his home State and mine, it may be possible that we may never see each other again on this earth, but I am happy in this thought: We shall have the privilege of meeting each other again when we shall have answered the last roll call, in that I believe he has so lived and served his people and his Maker that it will insure his abundant entrance into that beautiful home prepared for those who love the Lord.

WALTER M. PIERCE ON THE JAPANESE—LETTER TO EDITOR, SALEM (OREG.) STATESMAN

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR AND FELLOW EX-GOVERNOR: I read with interest your column about my speech, before Salem Rotary, on the Japanese. I thank you for the opportunity to place my reply before those who have read your column. Discussion of this subject of disposal of the Japanese after the war is most timely. It is a matter of deep concern to the thoughtful citizens of the whole Nation, and is of transcendent importance to the Pacific Northwest and the coast, which faces Japan. This is the most serious threat in our history and it comes from an aggressive, militaristic nation. Arguing before the Supreme Court recently, United States Solicitor General Fahy said: "Japan * * * intended to conquer the United States. There is no doubt about that—and Japan still intends to conquer us." He told the Court that Japanese on the Pacific coast lived in colonies and had not been assimilated; that 10,000 youths had been sent to Japan for education—a proportion not reached by any other racial group. The letter from the gentle young Japanese girl was appealing, but she can have no influence on her nation which, under its doctrine of dual citizenship, will always claim her fealty. They are enemies in our midst; this war is just a dress rehearsal, a sortie for supplies. We are now up against the question as to which race will dominate this beautiful section.

If you would talk with the best citizens of Hood River County, where they know this situation intimately, you would learn that it is not the "rabble" which is aroused. That

designation "rabble rouser" which you give me is a compliment, as it was applied to Sam Adams and Patrick Henry, and to scores of others who have aroused citizens by their appeals to Americans when they had fears for their country. It is a privilege, in my old age, to endeavor to stir men to action in the face of Japanese penetration of the United States during the past 40 years, and the statements of their government as to future plans.

While we rejoice over our costly victory on Attu, we must mourn over our defeat in Malheur County, Oreg. In the midst of this bloody war, Japanese agents have bought 10,000 acres, so it is estimated, of most fertile sugar-beet land which was irrigated by our Government at a cost of $13,000,000, on the plea that American farmers needed more land. Was any other government, at any other time, so criminally negligent as to allow the sale of its very soil to people of an enemy nation, set out to conquer them and killing its youth? I have been told Japan does not give the privilege of land ownership to any other nationals. Australia and New Zealand forbid residence to the Japanese and they are willing to fight to keep their country free, just as our Army is doing. Why should citizens lag, behind the lines? The man who makes the first sale to Japanese is foully unpatriotic, as he creates a Japanese settlement in which Americans cannot live and rear families. The first sale imperils other landholders, and they have no alternative but to sell. The neighborhood sinks to the Japanese level and becomes an outpost for penetration. It is not true that white labor cannot raise sugar beets. It is a question of fair division of the huge profits between the sugar barons and the producers. We brought Negroes to America for cheap labor, and we have one difficult race problem. Greed should never again be allowed to saddle our country with undesirables because they furnish cheap labor. Oriental and occidental cannot live together. Shall we surrender to Asiatics the country which has been won with so much sacrifice and is the finest flower of white civilization?

In 20 years, the Japanese have acquired 40 percent of the best pear and apple lands of the Hood River Valley, largely through evasion of our land laws. Thirty-five percent of the profits this year are credited to the Bank of Yokohama, to be paid, after the war, to those we are now supporting in concentration centers. I am told that they own 60 percent of the best Wenatchee fruit land.

You point to Japanese accomplishment at Labish. When I was Governor, this was called "Little Tokyo" and it looks like it now. Any passerby would know Americans did not live in those huts. White farmers from the South would do the same and leave no problem. The white race has pioneered this land, leveling all barriers in its 3,000-mile path, lined with schools, churches, hospitals, and American homes. Our civilization has developed along lines which will always be foreign to the Japanese. Our people are not the kind who sink hospital ships and execute prisoners of war. The Oregonian editorially called them debased barbarians, just yesterday. It is not only the yellow skins and the slant eyes, but it is the ruthless nature, the cruel heart, their traditions which take the place of religion, their methods of living, dual citizenship, and their aggressive nation—all these factors point to the desirability of carrying out the missionary enterprise among them in their own land, if they will allow it.

You speak of after-war business with Japan. Business will be possible without the shameful appeasement which kept scrap iron moving from Portland to Japan right up to December 7, 1941. That business was profitable, but it exacted a fearful toll from American youth. There are things more important than business, as our businessmen and farmers have conceded, in their cooperation to win the war. Other nations have learned how to do business with the Orient without granting insolent demands. I would preserve the flow of trade and international relations, while keeping our country free from colonization.

The alien Japanese must go back to Japan. If necessary, we must amend our Constitution so that the accident of birth will not give American citizenship to those whose parents are not eligible to citizenship through naturalization.

WALTER M. PIERCE.

SALEM, OREG., *May 22, 1943.*

The Farmer After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 22, 1943

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by James P. Pope, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority, entitled "The Farmer After the War," before the meeting of the Cherokee County Farm Bureau, Centre, Ala., August 13, 1943:

Farmers are mostly plain folks who work hard long hours at the job of supplying the food we eat and the raw materials for the clothes we wear. They are doing this now not only for the 130,000,000 American people, including the millions of fighting men at the front, but for the many millions of other people who are associated with us in this war, or who have been impoverished by the enemy.

There may be differences of opinion as to how much this or that industry may be contributing to the war, but there is no difference of opinion as to the completely essential character of the work the farmer is doing to win the war. And there is no doubt as to the vital part he will play in rehabilitating the starving millions that have been and will be wrecked by this war. Upon the work of the farmer will depend largely the kind of peace settlement there will be after the war, the stability of human society in the days to come, and the sort of civilization the world will have tomorrow.

NOT TO DWELL ON WAR-TIME PROBLEMS

It is not my purpose today to discuss the immediate wartime problems of the farmer. They are serious. Some of them have to do with the exceedingly difficult fight against inflation. All of us recognize that with about $80,000,000,000 of purchasing power in this country in the hands of consumers, and only about $60,000,000,000 of civilian goods and services available, inflation is a dire threat. Nobody wants to see prices rise 70 times as is the case in China. Nobody wants to pay $4 for one orange or $200 for a sack of flour. Nobody wants to see prices, wages, and salaries spiraling to dizzy heights. Only distress could follow such a catastrophe. No tolerable sacrifice is too great to avoid it. Yet neither the farmer nor the industrial worker nor the salaried man wants to make sacrifices that would ruin him, but certainly all of us must be and are prepared to make any reasonable sacrifices. We must be prepared to accept less—a good deal less perhaps—than we feel we are entitled to. Businessmen must be prepared to receive less profits, workers less wages, farmers lower prices, and consumers less goods and services than they want—if the inflation line is to be held. I feel sure that the rank and file of farmers are willing to make their share of sacrifices to avoid runaway inflation.

PEACETIME PROBLEMS

But these trying war problems will not last long. The end of the war will come within a comparatively short time, whether it be a matter of months or of years. There will undoubtedly be new farm problems after the war, but I venture to say that the toughest ones will be those which have plagued us in the past.

There is the problem of production—the problem of an adequate and efficient farm plant. This plant consists of the land, the livestock, and the facilities on the farm. How can the farmer overcome the continuous depletion of his soil? How can he improve his plant? How can he in the long run produce for everybody enough to eat, enough to wear, and a good house to live in? How can the business of farming be made efficient and profitable?

Upon the answers to these questions depends in very large measure the whole future of our civilization. It is an old story. History is filled with examples of nations that have decayed due to the wastage of the land. Until a few years ago the farm lands in the United States were being eroded at a rate that would have made the Nation bankrupt in a few decades. While progress has been made toward the prevention of soil losses, these are still greater than the Nation can afford. The farmers, with the help of the National and State Governments, including the farm demonstration program, have made a good start toward the restoration of the land. But it is only a start and there is a long way to go. The great problem remains for the farmer after the war to hold and to improve his plant if humanity is to have a chance to reach higher levels of well-being.

And there is the peacetime problem of markets and prices. The farmer wants and is entitled to a living price for his products—a price in harmony with the general price structure of the country, in harmony with industrial wages, in harmony with the prices he has to pay for things he buys. To use a modern term heard much in recent years, he is entitled to parity. But it is not about this that I desire to speak today.

BALANCE OF AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

I want to talk about another problem that will face the farmer and everybody else after the war, and particularly the people of the South. This is the problem of a balance between agriculture and industry. The farmer knows as well as anybody else that we can never go back to the days when 90 percent of the people of the country were engaged in agricultural pursuits. In 1939, only about 21 percent of those gainfully employed were engaged in agriculture, forestry, mining, and fishing. All the rest were in manufacturing industries, in trades, and other services. Modern industry, with its mass production methods, has come to stay. It has helped to raise the standard of living to a higher level generally than ever existed before. And, through the application of science and still more efficient methods of operation, it will help to raise the standard still higher. But a progressive agriculture in the same way has its contribution to make to this end. Indeed, agriculture and industry must move forward together if the best results are to be achieved. All the parts of our economic machine—agriculture, manufacturing, and distribution—must be strong and integrated in operation. All the cogs must mesh. There must be a fair balance all around if there are to be improved standards of human well-being.

The first question is what is a fair balance. It is the task of agriculture and industry to supply the physical needs of everybody with the comforts and conveniences of modern life—in an advancing civilization. There must be an economy of plenty and it is the job of our economic system to supply that plenty. This cannot be done if the parts of the system are unbalanced; if any of them is operating under artificial handicaps. The same thing is true if one or more sections of the country are operating at a disadvantage as compared to the others.

RESOURCES VARY

It is recognized at the outset that nations vary greatly in climate, in soil, and in other natural resources. Some nations have great natural disadvantages. These disadvantages may not be overcome, but certainly they should not be increased by any artificial barriers or discriminations against them. In some countries the natural resources are limited, and in all certain indispensable resources are lacking. In some countries, like Norway for instance, the land is not suitable for agriculture. There the people must depend largely upon fishing, shipbuilding, and the operation of a merchant marine. In others, like England, an industrial pattern has long been set where the country is largely industrialized and depends upon imports for most of its raw materials, and upon the exports of its manufactured goods. In such case there can be no balance between agricultural or raw material production and industry within the national boundaries.

This situation indicates very clearly that foreign trade is not only desirable but absolutely essential, if the nations are to survive and prosper. It indicates that world-wide economic well-being can be had only with the largest possible freedom of trade. So interdependent economically have the nations become that the idea of economic isolation or economic self-sufficiency has little place in the modern world. Economic Chinese walls are about as obsolete as the famous third century structure.

SOME SECTIONS ADAPTED TO BOTH

In large countries, like the United States, China, Russia, or India, there are sections that vary in climate, soil, and natural resources as they vary among nations. This indicates the importance of free exchange of products within such countries. Some sections have natural disadvantages as compared to others. This is perhaps less true of the United States, with its temperate climate than of the other great nations. There are large sections in the United States in which the conditions are suitable both for agriculture and for industry. There is in them good climate, ample rainfall, and a richness and variety of natural resources. When these conditions exist, no one section should have a monopoly of industry or of agriculture maintained by artificial barriers.

Notwithstanding these facts, a pattern has been established in this country where manufacturing is largely concentrated in one section, the Northeastern States. There a great preponderance of capital has been invested in manufacturing enterprises. There, of course, can be found most of the industrial workers, the largest cities, and the greatest density of population. The people of the South and West, on the other hand, are engaged mostly in agriculture and the production of other raw materials. These are shipped largely to the Northeast for processing and manufacturing, not because natural conditions are not suitable for processing and manufacturing in the South and West but because of traditional social and economic patterns that have grown up.

It is true, of course, that in the processing and manufacturing of finished goods there is employed a higher percentage of skilled, highly paid labor than in agriculture, and industrial wages of unskilled labor are generally considerably higher than in agriculture. Profits are higher and the return on capital investment in industry is greater than in agriculture. This has been the basis for the colonial policy of England and of some other European countries, and this is the main reason for the concentration of manufacturing in the Northeastern States. To create and maintain this advantage artificial barriers have been set up, such as the tariff and the present freight-rate structure, which discriminate against the raw-material sections of the country.

Where there are large regions suitable for both agriculture and industry, then the matter of a balance between them is of vital importance to the welfare of such regions as well as that of the country as a whole.

TENNESSEE VALLEY ADAPTED

All who have studied conditions in the Tennessee Valley area agree that it is well adapted for both agriculture and manufacturing. It can produce an abundance of food, feed, and fiber products. It has a good climate and an ample rainfall. It has an exceptional supply of streams and lakes for the production of fish and for recreational purposes. It has a variety and in some cases an abundance of minerals and metals. It has an unusual supply of coal, and great quantities of low-priced electric power. It has good transportation facilities.

But this region is now, and has been since the beginning, predominantly agricultural. Its population is largely rural. Most of its people live by farming and by extraction of raw materials from the land. It has a serious deficiency in manufacturing industries. It ships out a large balance of raw materials and ships in a large balance of manufactured goods. While all the natural conditions for a fair balance of agriculture and industry exist in this region, yet there is a serious imbalance.

Taking the United States as a whole, there is an opportunity for a pretty fair economic balance between agriculture and industry, and such a balance has been attained to a far greater degree than in many sections of the country. In the year 1940, in the country as a whole, 20.8 percent of the gainfully employed were working in the production of raw materials—that is, farming, forestry, mining, and fishing; 23.4 percent were employed in manufacturing industries, and 55.8 percent in all other forms of employment.

DENMARK AND SWEDEN EXAMPLES

Let us now compare this with two European countries which had, before the war, about as good an economic balance as could be found. They are Denmark and Sweden. These countries were outstanding examples of sturdy people and of generally prosperous conditions among all population groups.

Denmark, in 1930, had 35.2 percent employed in extractive employment, 27.1 percent in manufacturing industries, and 37.7 percent in all other trades and services. Sweden had 37.1 percent in extractive employment, 30.8 percent in manufacturing industries, and 32.1 percent in all other trades and services. While these percentages in Denmark and Sweden relate to the people as a whole rather than the gainfully employed, the difference would not be sufficient to substantially affect the figures for purposes of comparison.

It will be noted that a much larger percentage is engaged in extractive employment in these countries than in the United States, and that a much larger percentage is engaged in manufacturing than in this country. The greatest difference, however, is in the number engaged in other trades and services. Over 20 percent less people in these countries are engaged in these other trades and services than in the United States.

It is a remarkable fact and something more than a mere coincidence that in the year 1932—the year of deepest depression throughout the world—while the United States had unemployment of over 12,000,000, or about 10 percent of the total population, Sweden had only about 1 percent of its population unemployed and Denmark only about 2½ percent, and, so far as I can determine, there was not a bank failure in either of these countries during the depression, while in the United States thousands of banks failed. These facts speak eloquently for the balanced economy that existed in these countries.

Another significant thing is disclosed by these employment percentages; that is, the great difference between the percentage of those engaged in trades and services other than agriculture and manufacturing. They indicate that the proportion of middlemen—those between the farm and the factory and between the factory and the ultimate consumer—was far greater in the United States than in these well-balanced countries. Just why should it take so many more middlemen in the United States than in Sweden and Denmark?

This may have a good deal to do with the vast discrepancy between the prices of agricultural products on the farm and the prices that have to be paid by the consumer for manufactured goods. It may have a good deal to do with the price of pork which the farmer receives and the price of pork chops the consumer has to pay. It may have a good deal to do with the difference between the price of corn on the farm and the price of a package of corn flakes to the consumer. The problem of distribution in this country is still one of the most important that the farmer and the consumer have to face after the war.

TENNESSEE VALLEY UNBALANCE

Now let us consider the population percentage of employment in certain regions of the United States. In the northeastern States, known as the official freight-rate territory, the number employed in agriculture and other production of raw materials was 11.2 percent; in manufacturing, 30.8 percent; and in trades and services, 58 percent. These percentages are, of course, out of all proportion to the country as a whole. The raw materials employment is less than half the National average. The manufacturing employment is about one-third higher. As compared to Denmark and Sweden, the discrepancies are still greater.

In the Tennessee Valley region the unbalance is striking. In 1940, 34 percent were engaged in raw-material production; 18 percent in manufacturing, and 48 percent in trades and services. This region had a manufacturing percentage of only a little more than half that in the North and East, and an agricultural percentage of three times as much. As compared to the country as a whole, the Tennessee Valley region had about 25 percent less in manufacturing and over 60 percent more in agriculture.

This unbalance is the great problem the South, including the Tennessee Valley region, faces in the days to come. It affects all the people of this region—the farmer, the manufacturer, the businessman in every line, and the tens of millions of consumers. It affects the health, the education, and the well-being of the people.

IF BALANCE WERE ACHIEVED

In the country as a whole, it is found that $188 of the $579 of per capita income is contributed by manufacture. In the Southern States only $96 is added by manufacture. This means a deficiency of $92 per person in the South. If per capita manufacturing income were brought up to the national average in the Southeastern States, it would mean an increase of nearly $2,500,000,000.

And on the basis that at least $4 of capital investment is required for each dollar of increased income, the additional value in plant investment would be in the order of $10,000,000,000.

This would mean not only the employment of hundreds of thousands of men in new manufacturing industries, but would mean large additional employment in all other businesses, trades, and services. It would mean better markets for agricultural products. It would mean largely increased per capita income, perhaps comparable to the national level. It would mean more money for schools, for public improvements, for medical care, for better homes. It would mean the keeping on the farms and in the community many more of the young and talented who have in the past been attracted by opportunities elsewhere. It would mean generally better living conditions.

BALANCE MEANS MORE

But a balance of industry and agriculture means a great deal more than a mere balance of employment statistics. If the new industries that were needed to create the balance were to be centralized in a few of the larger cities of this region, if they had no relation to the development of the resources here, if there were no correlation between them and the agricultural interests, and if no provision were made for the employment of members of farm families in the vicinity of the plants, there would still remain a serious maladjustment or imbalance in the region. As industry has developed in some other sections of the country, the breach between the wages of industrial labor and agricultural labor has not only not been closed but has actually been widened.

The zone of human relations must enter into any right concept of balance. Such a concept would include industry that would process the farm products of the region, industry that would utilize the products of the forests, of the mines, and of the streams. It would include the building of sound cooperative industrial units around the products indigenous to the region. It would include a policy and practice of all-time or part-time employment for members of farm families residing within convenient distance of the plants. In order to carry out this concept it would be necessary for such industries to be distributed throughout the region. This would mean the location of industrial units in small towns and villages. It would mean the diffusion of industry among many communities. It would mean a correlation of agriculture and industry to a degree hitherto unknown in this country.

The experience of T. V. A. in its construction projects, scattered along the Tennessee River and its tributaries for a distance of a thousand miles, is in some respects quite analogous to the idea here suggested. The Authority before the war recruited its unskilled labor on a project from the people of that neighborhood—usually within a radius of about 50 miles from the project. These unskilled employees recruited from the neighborhood were as good workers as could be found anywhere. The record-breaking performances in dam construction have been made with this labor. And the effect of the distribution of wages of these employees in the communities is a matter of common knowledge. It has increased farm-family incomes, increased the business of local merchants, and swelled the public revenues. It has helped to pay off loans, and to improve the homes and farms. It has improved living conditions all around.

The widespread distribution of electricity to the homes and farms carries out the same general idea. The time was, not so long ago, that the power companies operating in this region preferred to, and did, serve the cities, towns, and more prosperous communities, with very little effort to extend their lines into the less remunerative farming communities. Through the R. E. A. and the T. V. A. in this region, particular attention has been paid to this matter, with the result that the percentage of electrified farms has been increased since 1933 from less than 3 percent to over 18 percent. This has meant a large increase in the business of generating and distributing electricity, and a large increase in the business of manufacturing and selling electrical appliances. Outside of the T. V. A. territory, the power companies have adopted a much more liberal policy of extending their lines into farming communities and of supplying R. E. A. cooperatives operating in rural sections, with the result that the amount of electricity generated and sold has been largely increased, and the market for electric appliances has been largely extended. The benefits of this extension and diffusion of electric business into farming communities are now recognized on all sides.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, as you know, has sought to assist farmers and householders by the invention and adaptation of electrical appliances for the more beneficial use of electricity. It has sought to provide farm devices other than electrical for the benefit of the farmer. You are all familiar, I think, with the various electrical and farm devices that have been and are being made available. In connection with the use of such things, T. V. A. has encouraged their manufacture and distribution in this region. It has dealt with private manufacturing concerns and with cooperatives to accomplish this purpose.

T. V. A.'S CONCEPT

It has never been the policy of T. V. A. to encourage the removal of industries from another section of the country to the Tennessee Valley area. It has never urged the advantages of low-priced power upon any manufacturer as a reason for any such removal. It has made studies of the natural resources of the region, of transportation facilities, of markets and marketing opportunities, and of other location factors, and has supplied such data to any persons or business concerns which have requested it.

T. V. A. conceives of an agricultural-industrial balance in this region, not brought about by the uprooting of established industries anywhere else, not by creating an unbalance in any other section, not by a centralization here of large industries unrelated to the resources of the region. It conceives of a balance brought about by the building up of industrial enterprises, distributed as widely as possible among various towns and communities of the region, that will process the raw products of the farm, of the forest, of the mine, and of the stream.

T. V. A. conceives of a balance that will revitalize the rural life of the region, that will largely increase the purchasing power of the rural communities, upon which the larger cities and towns depend for their existence and permanent prosperity. It conceives of a balance that will promote the increasing welfare of the family, which is, after all, the economic as well as the biological unit of society. It conceives of an enduring economic and social structure, resting upon the firm foundation of a sturdy, God-fearing people, serving one another in growing, in producing, in manufacturing, in distributing in plenty the good things that men live by.

This is the concept, we believe, that will best serve all the people in the days to come.

Palestine: Roadway to Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over Mutual Broadcasting System, Saturday, September 25, 1943:

It would seem most plausible, would it not, that compassionate humanity which had set into motion the Evian Refugee Conference, the Bermuda Refugee Conference, the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees to ease in any practical measure the travail of the suffering minorities in Axis-dominated countries, as well as the more fortunate who had escaped to neutral territories would seize avidly and without prejudice any course that would help in the solution of the festering problem. But no. Folly, greed, and power politics continue in disregard to human rights.

In the East, a small area of the Land of Zion, mandated Palestine, stands ready, like a welcoming beacon, to take the driven Jews unto itself, grant to them the dignity and security denied to them by all others, democratic countries and otherwise.

But the British Foreign Office would blackout that beacon. Very slyly it seeks to create public opinion in this country and Britain to speed its determined purpose to liquidate Palestine as a homeland for the Jews. So * * * if events are not unfavorable to the Zionist cause—create them. All news and dispatches coming from the Levant must be cast in such a mold as to discredit and impoverish the spirit of unity and cut into shreds the aroused sympathies of interested spectators.

Here in Palestine is a trial of two confessed gun-running English soldiers. Why not use it as a vehicle to show up the deadly schemes of the Zionists who are buying up a stock pile of guns and ammunition for the coming war against the Arabs? Levantine anti-Semites lick their chops. The acquisition of arms by the Jews shall be high lighted. No mention, of course, shall be made of the purchase of arms by the Arabs. This being a military trial, the presiding brass hats can steer the proceedings at will. By no means allow any evidence to seep in to show the need for the Jews to arm, to defend home, hearth, and dear ones. Any attempt to recall the Moslem pogroms of 1920 in Jerusalem, in 1929 in Jaffa, Kfar-Saba, of Hebron, Mozza, and Safed in 1929 and the pogroms of 1936 and 1937 shall be ruled out of order. Arab uprisings against defenseless Jews shall be no matter of defense. It dare not be revealed that the British Colonial Office refused to allow the Jews to acquire arms for self-defense. In the pogroms of 1929 and 1936–37, they were mowed down and massacred by the Arabs—with the very guns refused the Jews.

Does the Colonial Office believe they are fools, that they can defend themselves against brutal assaults with bare knuckles?

It is not the first time that accusations have been brought against the Jews to serve the more sinister purpose of screening what actually goes on behind the scenes. It is an old stunt. The rulers in the Middle Ages blamed the Jews for the plagues; the Czars aroused the populace against the Jews by charging them falsely with ritual murders in

order to hide their own foul deeds. The French trumped up the charge of treason against Dreyfus to veil their own noxious activity. So now in order to develop a public opinion against the Jewish agency, directed by the mandated powers to take care of Jewish affairs in Palestine, and ir order to discredit Palestine as a homeland for the Jews this gun-running trial has been used to camouflage the real purpose behind it. The British Colonial Office, and it is no secret, wants Palestine liquidated forever as a Jewish homeland. It seizes upon any pretext, even to the arousing of dormant anti-Semitism of its audience, to gain its selfish ends. Caesar tried it, so did Hamman in biblical times. It stood the Romanoff Czars in good stead. Why not use the dodge again? What if the means are spurious, false coins, so to speak?

Unfortunately, one of our well-known newspapers, wittingly or unwittingly, has become a coconspirator in this campaign to discredit Palestine and all that is implied therein. It is most strange, and perhaps no mere coincidence, that this same paper has as a publisher who presides over its destinies a convinced anti-Zionist. The newspaper dispatches which ran in that paper were opinionated and colored according to the point of view of that publisher. Such conduct hardly comports with the dignity and important achievements of that paper.

Moreover, it is significant that every time a royal commission of inquiry has gone to Palestine, the Palestine government officials have been charged with anti-Semitism. It is a shocking revelation to know that anti-Semitism should run rampant in an office under British democratic control.

How farcical is this trial when the Jews remember with fear and trembling the Arab treachery of 1929 and the failure of the government to provide adequate precaution against recurrence. Small wonder the Jews must implement an unsurpassed fortitude and will to die for Eretz Israel with machine and tommy guns and Garand rifles.

Those who have steered the frame-up in Palestine into channels designed to undermine and defame the Jewish agency in Palestine have neglected to take cognizance of the true facts that stand as a matter of record and of which all interested America and England are quite aware. It is no simple matter to poison the wellsprings of public opinion, as the Germans, to their everlasting humiliation, have learned in their Anglo-American operations. It most certainly cannot be done with the obvious farce now being played at the gun-running trial in Palestine.

The facts stand out as large as life that Jewish Palestine is the only effective ally the United Nations have in the Near East. Did Iran, Syria, Lebanon, the Kingdom of Saudi-Arabia, in even the tiniest measure, place what resources they had in the hands of the Allies? Pro-Axis they remained until, craftily, they saw the tide turn in Allied favor. It is now widely known that Jewish Palestine is democracy's arsenal, its granary, and storehouse in the Near East. Thousands of factories, small and large, are turning out essential supplies and war materials, ranging from optical goods to heavy equipment, which, together with the food raised on Jewish farms, would have had to be transported thousands of miles were they not produced on the spot. This was of inestimable value to the cause of the United Nations, especially so at the time when the Mediterranean was closed to Allied shipping. In addition, 30,000 Palestine Jews, out of a total of 550,000, have voluntarily enlisted in the British Army and that enlistment continues. This is 6 percent—equivalent to an enlistment of 8,000,000 in the United States. Those who have seen service have covered themselves with glory in every campaign from Greece and Crete and Ethiopia to the great victories in north Africa and Sicily, a service which has been acknowledged in terms of highest praise by Churchill and by the greatest of Britain's military leaders. Can a gun-running trial in Palestine obscure these facts?

Pandering to Arabs, the British Colonial Office should have learned by this time, is no guaranty of Arab friendship. When in 1939, the British, no longer able to ward off knowledge of a world marching to war, and aware of the strategic importance of the Near East, promulgated the infamous MacDonald White Paper, limiting and then closing Jewish immigration into Palestine in an effort to gain the partisanship of the Arab, the results were anything but what have been bargained for. On the contrary, the Arabs, under the influence of the Grand Mufti, who even now is carrying on his nefarious activities via radio from Berlin, have done everything possible to hamper the United Nations' war effort. Because of their ill-concealed hostility, the Arabs have made it necessary for the British to maintain armed forces in the Near East. It is no secret that the British had a larger army watching the activities of the Arabs than they had facing the Germans and Italians in Egypt. Moreover, it has been substantiated time and again that Arab gun-running has gone on all the time and that the trial of Arabs for this crime has been a frequent occurrence. Nevertheless, the authorities have not seen fit to give this conduct on the part of the Arabs any publicity of the type through which they have attempted to stigmatize the Jews.

Mr. Malcolm MacDonald's White Paper, restricting Jewish immigration into Palestine to 75,000 within a 5-year period, beginning 1939, and thereafter prohibiting it, did not gain the friendship of the Arabs, but the death warrant to Zionism still stands.

At the time when Hitler had reached the zenith of his power, climbing on the rungs of a ladder built upon the overwhelming sorrow of the tortured Jew, Palestine, the one roadway to rescue, was closed by a nation girding itself to fight for the freedoms and humanity. The voices of many, high in position, however, were not stilled. Churchill called it a "breach of faith." It was condemned by Lord Wedgewood, Lloyd George, Herbert Morrison, the great premier of British South Africa, General Smuts, and by members of the Conservative party and of the Labor and Liberal opposition. The Mandates Commission, to which it had been referred for approval, not only refused to approve it, but unanimously rejected and condemned it, stating that the new policy "was not in accordance with the interpretation which, in agreement with the mandatory power and the council of the League of Nations, the commission had always placed on the Palestine mandate." The Geneva decision was ignored. Immigration was restricted in accordance with the White Paper. Jewish land purchases were prohibited in most of the areas of Palestine and the outbreak of the war obviated the necessity of reporting to the Mandates Commission. Thus it stands today, negating the Balfour declaration which was dedicated to facilitating the building of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine, a declaration which was issued by the British government after consultation with the Allied and associated powers on November 2, 1917, and agreed to the mandate accorded to Great Britain in 1922, with the consent of the 51 members of the League of Nations, together with the unanimous approval of the Congress of the United States.

But yet, in accordance with the terms of the MacDonald White Paper, in 1944 all Jewish immigration into Palestine must cease, and unless nullified in the spring of 1944, we shall find the one realistic avenue to the solution of the Jewish problem forever blocked.

Of course, Hitler is providing a partial answer. Millions are dead and the end is not yet in sight. What of those still in the hands of the henchmen? Whither shall they go? Is there a land that will accept them gladly, out of pity and humanity, save Palestine? What is their guilt, save that of being born Jew?

We can never afford to lose sight of the fact that while it is not our wish to view Jewish refugees and potential refugees as different from others, that difference has been thrust upon us. The lot of the Jews is not comparable in horror, ferocity, and destruction to that of others. The Polish peasant, the Dutch merchant, the Czechoslovakian farmer all have the opportunity of life and labor, hard as that may be. The fate of the Jews is hopeless. Hitler attempts to exterminate the Jews and make Europe Judenrein. When liberation with Allied victory comes, all others will savor the lifting of oppression, the freedom to return to life and liberty, save the Jews. The non-Jews have, at least, a shred of hope of survival denied the Jew. Doom stalks wherever he may be. The non-Jew is in a prison; the Jew is in a death chamber. It must not be denied again, as it was denied at the Bermuda and Evian conference on refugees, that the Jew is a special problem and calls for special measures of rescue.

There is still the chance to heed the dictates of conscience. Out of the otherwise abortive efforts of the Evian conference on refugees held in France in 1938 was born the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees now functioning in London. Its feeble heartbeat has been revived by the dire necessity for action. If that, too, is permitted to sink beneath the weight of diplomatic palaver and indifference as the hollow Bermuda conference on refugees, which refused even to consider Palestine as a possible haven, then will be written some of history's blackest pages. Future generations will write the bill of indictment. They will say with justice, "They denied the dying and the dead."

The Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees must recognize how imperative it is this time that Palestine be considered as the haven for Jewish refugees. The limitations of the MacDonald White Paper must be revoked. To keep it off the agenda, to smother it in silence is to speed the doom of millions awaiting succor, to negate decency, honor, and faith. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "It is a wicked thing to be neutral between right and wrong."

It is hoped that this Inter-Governmental Committee will act with vision and compassion and will not approach the problem in any cold-blooded manner, subservient to the diplomatic protocol, knowing no master but its conscience. It will not, we fervently trust, be "the beadle who always agrees with his rector." We are given some hope by the statement of Viscount Cranborn in the House of Lords' debate on refugees which took place on July 28, 1943, who, when asked if Jews were to be associated with the reorganized Inter-Governmental Conference, replied that, and I quote, "Jews will be associated with it." That and nothing more. I take it that it, nevertheless, means accredited Jewish organizations will be permitted to have representatives at the committee, which representation was denied them at Bermuda.

Public sentiment is forging itself into a mighty instrument of action. While I am confident our leaders are aware of the urgency for rescue of the tortured and maimed we must let them know we are all behind them. The Axis savages are reeling under the blows of our military machine, our moral machine must be no less in might and achievement.

The work of the Christian Council on Palestine under the leadership of Dr. Henry A. Atkinson and the work of the diverse Jewish

groups will surely not be in vain. All turn to Palestine as the one hope. Indeed, what other is there?

King Ibn Saud, ruler of Saudi-Arabia, recently in an article in Life, was featured as opposing any more Jewish immigration into Palestine.

Opportunely Emir Feisal, his third son, will soon be received by President Roosevelt. He will be eager, no doubt, to gain the friendship of the United States now that Allied victory is no longer a debatable question. It is inevitable that the question of Palestine arise in the conversations between the two. Only recently has our President reiterated his views favoring the establishment of Palestine as a homeland for the Jews. That the Arabs and the Jews can live side by side in mutual consideration of each other's needs in fostering the prosperity and well-being of their lands (without the British colonial policy of divide and rule) I am certain will be stressed by President Roosevelt. Surely he will point out that no reason exists for the restriction of Jewish immigration into Palestine other than power politics. He cannot fail to remark that at the same time that the Jewish population has expanded from 55,000 to 500,000 within the past decade, the Arab has increased his population from 600,000 to 1,100,000, and thus Arab increases have occurred precisely in the areas where the Jews have created their most significant improvements in agriculture and industry. Emir Feisal will not have to be told, since he must know it well, that in no other area of the whole Near and Middle East have the Arabs experienced such great advances in education and in social and economic welfare as has been demonstrated in Palestine. Finally he must be told that no one has been hurt with the exception of the Arab landholder, mostly absentees, who have been paid enormous prices for the lands which they have sold to the Jews, but who much prefer to retain their ancient feudal grip on the Arab fellahin or peasants in the Holy Land. It must be remembered, too, that the interests of the inarticulate Arab masses are as entitled to consideration as the ambitions of Arab princes.

Most devoutly it is hoped that out of these conversations will arise a better understanding that will cut the Gordian knot that is the Jewish problem.

If I have been harsh in my strictures against the British Colonial Office, it does not follow that I am unaware of the wondrous achievements that are Great Britain. Indeed I have the highest regard for them, but I am here reminded of the words of Churchill: "Never give in, never, never, never, never, to anything great or small, large or petty, never give in except to convictions of honor and good sense."

I shall never, never give in to accepting and approving the MacDonald White Paper. I shall never cease to fight until that infamous document is buried full fathom five in the sea.

Disposal of Surplus Property After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee, opened hearings this morning on a very vital subject—the orderly disposal of surplus plants, tools, equipment, and material which will be owned by the Government at the end of the war.

This is a question which is perplexing large and small business alike and is now the subject of considerable informal discussion in many places.

Due to the flood of letters and requests from small business firms asking that our committee give serious consideration to this problem from the viewpoint of small business, it was decided to initiate hearings on the subject immediately with a view to doing this in a leisurely fashion until the views of a large cross-section of both industry and government could be heard on the matter.

This morning we were favored with some very illuminating figures and testimony by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce and Federal Loan Administrator, under whose jurisdiction are held billions of dollars' worth of this type of property. I will not attempt to list here any of the things told us by Mr. Jones, but will submit for the RECORD in a few days a transcript of his testimony in the belief that it will be of interest to the majority of the Members in this connection.

Mr. David E. Castles, president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, submitted a very thoughtful statement to our committee on this problem, a copy of which is appended herewith. I offer this statement of Mr. Castles for the RECORD in the hope that what he has to say will also be of real interest to the Members on this problem which is already upon us:

The disposal of surplus war goods is of deep interest to the retail automobile dealers of the United States not only as it affects their businesses but also as it affects the general economic welfare of the Nation. For that reason the post-war planning committee of the National Automobile Dealers Association has attempted in an extended study to explore the subject in its broadest aspects. Committee recommendations which I shall present will, it is believed, apply equally advantageously to the distribution of all nonperishable goods whether they be automobiles, clothing, shoes, metals, and other materials. It is the hope of the motorcar dealers that their program may prove generally helpful because there surely exists the utmost need for a strong peacetime business America.

These recommendations do not represent merely the opinions of a few hand-picked committeemen. They are the result of a national survey among dealers. The committee asked dealers to say frankly just how they thought the problem could be met and solved and they did.

In passing, I might say that we think that in approaching motorcar dealers we were going to experts on the subject of saving retail business from ruin. They have come as near being wiped out during the last 2 years as any group ever has. Much credit is due the House Small Business Committee for the fact that more than 80 percent of the dealers who were in business at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack still are doing business at their old stands. The Murray-Patman Act put us on our feet, and we have been fighting ever since to keep going. So we know something about weathering unusual situations.

No one knows, of course, how much surplus goods will be on hand when the war stops. Furthermore none knows where these goods will be located. We do know, however, that there will be a vast amount of them. It has been estimated there may be as much as $50,000,000,000 worth. We also know that if these goods are sold in hit-and-miss fashion at sacrifice prices like so much junk in a back lot the taxpayers will lose vast amounts of money and every retail line represented in the surplus will be seriously injured by a rush of speculators to cash in on their bargain purchases.

The primary recommendation which we have to offer is that for the benefit of business, Government and taxpayers surplus goods be sold in an orderly manner and at fair prices through established retail outlets. We earnestly urge that the slip-shod method of auctioning and dumping through fly-by-night speculators followed in many instances after the last war be studiously avoided. The records of the sale of that relatively small amount of surplus goods from World War No. 1 comprise a sorry page in Government business transactions. To follow similar methods now when the volume of surplus goods will be so much greater than it was 25 years ago would be little short of tragic.

Not only will the volume of surplus goods to be sold after the peace be greater than ever, but the need to help retail business get back on its feet also will be greater. The records of this committee show in a minor way what is happening today to small retailers everywhere. Their empty shelves from coast-to-coast tell an even more impressive story. The fact is that most small dealers today are just hanging on to their places of business by the skin of their teeth. Thousands never will survive to see the peace. Add to the back-breaking load of those who do survive the surplus goods competition from gyp speculators and you will slaughter thousands more. Give them and their employees returning from the service an opportunity to deal in these surplus goods and you will have rendered a real service. You will have denied a few wealthy opportunists chances to harvest big fortunes overnight, but you will have helped small businessmen and their help immeasurably.

It is in an effort to help small business survive and to give the taxpayer a decent return on his investment in surplus goods, that the National Automobile Dealers Association offers the following recommendations:

1. The distribution of surplus war commodities should be directed by a committee created by Congress of appropriate size, of which one-half of the members should be selected from Government and the other half from business.

2. An inventory of surplus war commodities should be prepared as soon as possible and kept current throughout the duration of the war.

3. Immediately upon the termination of the war all Government-owned surplus war commodities should be frozen with the exception of perishables, agricultural products, and foodstuffs.

4. Distribution of surplus war materials should be governed by the following considerations:

(a) The distribution should be at the rate which would not unduly disrupt trade.

(b) Goods should be distributed at a price low enough to make goods move and high enough to recover a fair return for the Government in order to reduce the national debt.

(c) Distribution should be solely through proper trade channels. Acquisition of an abnormally large supply for speculative purposes should be avoided, probably through some governmentally directed inventory control. It is not contemplated that the commodity manufacturer should be prevented from buying, but the price to the manufacturer should be made the same as to a retailer.

(d) Prices of commodities sold by the Government should be as uniform as possible.

(e) The right of the Government to dispose of surplus commodities to any Federal agencies should be acknowledged. It is the intention that gifts or sales outside of the Federal Government and the usual trade channels should be prevented.

(f) Reimported surplus war goods should be sold through regular channels and at the same price that surplus war goods in this country are sold by the Government.

Particular emphasis should be placed on the proposal to have sales directed jointly by a Government-business board. This sales problem will be so large and the types of materials so diversified that no one man, regardless of the honesty of his intentions, could discharge it satisfactorily. Initially fearless Government men of unquestioned integrity and practical sales and distribution experience and top-flight businessmen should be named as sales administrators. Finally, and of great importance, special subcommittees composed of experienced men from the different lines affected should be appointed to work with the main committee. Only with such informed control can this gigantic job be done.

Various bills looking to proper control of these sales have been introduced. Suggestions similar to certain recommendations N. A. D. A. offers are contained in some. N. A. D. A. has no pride of authorship or ideas and any bill which covers the ground as indicated will have the hearty support of dealers generally. They are pleased that this House Small Business Committee is seeking to develop fully the facts in the situation. Out of these efforts dealers hope, will come a sound measure all can support.

The automobile dealers of the Nation—still more than 30,000 strong and located from crossroads to metropolitan centers—are anxious to devote all of their talents and treasure to a strong peacetime America. They feel they can do this best by returning to their pay rolls some 250,000 former salesmen that war conditions forced them to let out, and thousands of other employees now in the service.

Acceptance of recommendations made, dealers believe, will help put these people back to work. Establishment of gyp competition, as surely will follow unless Congress legislates otherwise, will only delay the restoration of thousands to dealer pay rolls. In this respect, what is true in the motor car trade doubtless is true in other lines.

Analysis of Veterans' Benefits Under H. R. 2703, Now Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that H. R. 2703, Seventy-eighth Congress, "A bill to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes," was passed by Congress and approved by the President and became Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943.

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which I am chairman and which reported the bill after hearings on various bills pertaining to World Wars No. 1 and No. 2, has received numerous calls and letters regarding the new act. Although a detailed analysis of the bill was contained in our Committee Report No. 463, May 18, 1943, because of the length of the act, 17 sections, and the numerous provisions which are basically administrative but indirectly affect benefits to veterans and their dependents, I requested that a brief statement of benefits to World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 veterans and their dependents under the act be prepared by the Veterans' Administration. That simplified statement together with the detailed analysis, corrected to include Senate amendments approved by the House, and instructions thus far issued by the Veterans' Administration under the act should be most helpful to Members, and I have requested that this material and my introductory statement be incorporated in the RECORD under extension of remarks:

The matter referred to follows:

WORLD WAR NO. 1 AND WORLD WAR NO. 2 BENEFITS UNDER PUBLIC, 144, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, APPROVED JULY 13, 1943

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation conducted hearings May 13 and 14, 1943, on bills to grant benefits to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans of World War Nos. 1 and 2. The bills were principally directed (1) to granting additional benefits in World War No. 2 cases comparable to benefits granted in World War No. 1 cases, and (2) to increase benefits pertaining to both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. Following the hearings, H. R. 2703, Seventy-eighth Congress, containing 17 sections, was reported favorably by the committee, House Report No. 463, May 18, 1943. The bill became law July 13, 1943, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

Briefly, the act provided the following benefits pertaining to World War Nos. 1 and 2:

1. Liberalized the presumption of soundness at time of examination, acceptance, and enrollment for service for the purpose of determining service connection of disability by (a) removing the requirement of 90 days' service for application of the presumption, and (b) by limiting the rebuttal of the presumption by the Government, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of examination, acceptance, and enrollment, to those cases where clear and unmistable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service.

Prior to this amendment World War No. 2 veterans must have had 6 months' service in order to apply the presumption, and the rebuttal, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of examination, acceptance, and enrollment, was by evidence or medical judgment warranting a finding that the disease or injury existed prior to acceptance and enrollment.

This amendment also has the effect of making the full wartime service-connected rates available to any veteran of World War No. 1 where service connection under part 1 of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a), as thus amended, is established. This will include some cases where the disability is service connected under the rebuttable presumption of soundness under Public, 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, but where the compensation under Public, 141, is less than that provided under part 1 of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, because of the provision in Public, No. 141, reducing the compensation by 25 percent where service connection is based upon statutory presumption.

2. By placing service in World War No. 2 within the provisions of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, in addition to the benefit described under 1, World War No. 2 veterans are now entitled to the rebuttable presumption of service connection for chronic disease manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 1 year from separation from active service on a parity with World War No. 1 veterans.

3. In the hospitalized and domiciled cases of single veterans without dependents, the reduction of monetary benefits in the case of service-connected disability before the enactment of law was to $15 per month and in non-service-connected cases to $6 per month. By virtue of the provisions of this new act, the $15 per month rate was increased to $20 in service-connected cases, and in non-service-connected cases, as to World War No. 1 veterans, the rate of $6 per month was increased to $8.

4. The act also provides for payment of pension for disability from the date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge. This provision, which particularly affects World War No. 2 veterans at this time, is similar to that which permits payment of death pension or compensation from date of death if claim is filed within 1 year from death. This law removes injustices where there is delay in filing claim due to no fault of the veteran and payment could otherwise be made only from date of claim, thus depriving the veteran of necessary financial assistance based upon his service-connected disability.

5. The act also makes it possible to pay the wartime rates of disability or death pension in the cases of cadets and midshipmen based upon disabilities incurred in line of duty on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war. The act makes service as a cadet or mishipman, during such period, active military and naval service in World War No. 2 for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Previous to this enactment peacetime service-connected rates were payable in such cases even though the disability was incurred as the result of war service.

6. The act also increased the World War Nos. 1 and 2 service-connected death compensation and pension rates for widows and children. The following table shows the increases granted by the act:

PUBLIC, NO. 198, 76TH CONG., JULY 19, 1939

Widow—no child

Age under 50 years	$38
Age 50 years or over	45

Widow—with child or children

Widow's rate, with $10 additional for first child up to 10 years of age, increased to $15 from age 10 with $8 for each additional child up to 10 years of age, increased to $13 from age 10.

Rates for children (no widow)

1 child	$20
2 children	33
3 children	46
Each additional child	8
Total amount may not exceed	83

RATES UNDER SEC. 14, PUBLIC, NO. 144, 78TH CONG.

Widow—no child

Irrespective of age	$50

Widow—with child or children

Widow, 1 child, with $13 for each additional child	$65

Rates for children (no widow)

1 child	$25
2 children	38
Each additional child	10
Total amount may not exceed	100

7. More equitable provisions are included in the act with respect to concurrent payments of compensation or pension or of such gratuities and active-service or retired pay. As an example of one of the inequalities under the prior law, a widow entitled to death-pension benefits under the general or service pension law or Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, could receive such benefits concurrently with active-service pay as a member of the Women's Reserve of the Navy or Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard or as a United States Army nurse, whereas a widow entitled to death-pension benefits under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the Veterans Regulations, as amended, or Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, was precluded from receiving such benefits while in receipt of active-service pay. This and similar inequalities arising under existing laws were corrected by Public, No. 144.

8. Public Law No. 144 also liberalized the definitions of child, parent, mother, or father under Public Law No. 2 and the Veterans Regulations, thus affording monetary benefits to additional groups based upon World War No. 2 service.

9. Provision was also made to pay compensation, pension, or retirement pay to the wife of an incompetent veteran, having no guardian, for the use of the veteran and his dependents and to permit payment of death benefits directly to a minor widow, having no guardian, for herself and minor child or children, notwithstanding her minority.

10. As to World War No. 1, amendment was made to the income limitation in Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, granting compensation to widows and children of veterans of World War No. 1 where the death of the veteran resulted from non-service-connected disability. The act provides that payments made by the United States Government under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration because of disability or death shall not be considered in determining annual income of the widow, child, or children of a deceased World War No 1 veteran. This particular amendment also permits payment of benefits to a child or children notwithstanding the fact that the widow is barred by the income limitation.

The rates of pension for widows and children based upon peacetime service-connected death were increased by this act. This increase took into consideration the increase granted the wartime service-connected death cases and is approximately 75 percent of the new wartime service-connected death rates; the act also contains a number of administrative provisions, for example, concerning renouncement of pension or compensation; forfeiture of accrued or future benefits under laws pertaining to gratuities for veterans and their dependents by any person shown to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or its allies but provides for certain payment to dependents; termination of benefits to any person not a citizen of the United States located in the territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or any of its allies with provision for payment to dependents in the United States or in a place not occupied or controlled by the enemy and provision for payment under certain conditions on the basis of a new claim by the person whose award was so terminated; a more satisfactory and liberal provision regarding the payment of pension, compensation, or retirement pay to which a person was entitled prior to his death and not paid during his lifetime; and a provision governing the effective dates of awards. Greater uniformity in the administration of laws pertaining to veterans is established by this law because many of the provisions are made uniform as to various groups of veterans and dependents, with certain protective provisions to avoid injustices.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISIONS OF H. R. 2703, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, WHICH BECAME PUBLIC, 144, ON JULY 13, 1943

Section 1: Section 1 of the proposed bill would make the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and veterans' regulations, as now or hereafter amended, applicable to benefits provided under Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and under laws reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended. Notwithstanding certain legislative enactments and regulatory measures designed to insure uniform application of these provisions to benefits provided under these separate acts, complications tending to create injustices and inequalities have arisen, particularly in administering the provisions of Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, which clearly indicate the necessity for the legislative action proposed to establish uniformity in the manner stated. One result of this provision would be to extend entitlement to pension under the general or service pension laws to the child of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, or Boxer Rebellion until the child attains the age of 18 years or marries, or to age 21, if he is pursuing a course of instruction in an educational institution as the term "child" as defined in paragraph VI, Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series, would be for application. As the rates payable to a child or children under the general or service pension laws are higher than those payable for wartime service-connected death, provision is made for payment to the child or children in such cases at the rates payable for World War No. 1 non-service-connected death under Public, No. 484 Seventy-third Congress, as amended.

Section 2: The purpose of the amendment proposed by this section is to provide uniform application of the provisions of section 21, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and of Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 12, 1935, which pertain to safeguarding of estates of veterans derived from benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and to afford more flexible administrative action in certain types of cases wherein the present provisions of section 21, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, are too restrictive. The amendment would extend the provisions of these laws to retirement pay of Reserve Officers, United States Army, payment of which is made by the Veterans' Administration, although the question of eligibility is determined by the War Department under Public Law No. 18, Seventy-sixth Congress, April 3, 1939. It would also authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his discretion, to make payments of compensation, pension, or retirement pay to the wife of an incompetent veteran, having no guardian, for the use of the veteran and his dependents, and permit payment of death benefits directly to a minor widow, having no guardian, for herself and minor child or children, notwithstanding her minority. This last provision is for the purpose of applying, where indicated, the principle of emancipation by marriage which is recognized by a considerable number of the States.

Section 3: Section 3 would amend paragraph XXI, Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series pertaining to renouncement of pension. The language follows the existing regulation which now applies only to any person entitled to monetary benefits under the provisions of title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, or section 20, Public, No. 78, Seventy-third Congress, but extends its provisions to any person entitled to pension or compensation under any law or veterans regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration. Under this paragraph, as amended, any person entitled to pension or compensation, upon written application over his signature may renounce his right thereto, and from date of receipt of such application payment of such benefits and the right thereto are terminated. This renouncement, however, does not preclude the person from filing a new application for pension or compensation at a future date, but no payment may be made for any period prior to the date thereof.

Section 4. Section 4 of the proposed bill provides for forfeiture of all accrued or future benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to gratuities for veterans and their dependents, by any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies, but permits apportionment and payment of any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

Section 5: This section would authorize termination of the award of compensation, pension, or other gratuity under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States located in the territory of or under military control of an enemy of the United States or any of its allies and provides that such person will not be entitled to any such benefits except upon the filing of a new claim accompanied by evidence satisfactory to the Arministrator of Veterans' Affairs showing that the claimant was not guilty of any of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of the act, and then only prospectively, as such benefits would not be paid for any period prior to date of such new claim. It permits the Administrator to apportion and pay any part of the benefits to which such person would otherwise be entitled, to the dependents of such person who are in the United States or in a place not occupied or controlled by the enemy not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead. The purpose of this section is to bar accrued or future payments of gratuities to persons guilty of any of the offenses enumerated in section 4 of the act or alien enemies and to prevent the building up of large estates in favor of those residing in countries at war with the United States or in countries under military control of the enemy. While payments of such gratuities which have already been made in favor of persons located in foreign countries controlled by the enemy and which have been deposited in the special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States entitled "Secretary of the Treasury, Proceeds of Withheld Foreign Checks" under the act of October 9, 1940 (Public, No. 828, 76th Cong.), as amended, will not be affected by the provisions of this amendment, payments which may have accrued in favor of any person while he is located in territory controlled by the enemy will be barred as any such benefits to which such person may be shown to be entitled upon the filing of a new claim may only be paid prospectively.

Section 6: This section would amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, so as to define the term "widow of a World War No 2 veteran." Service in World War No. 2 is not now included in part I,

Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as wartime service, hence the eligibility requirements governing payment of pension for disabilities incurred in peacetime service or deaths resulting therefrom must be applied in World War No. 2 cases, although wartime rates are payable by virtue of the provisions of Public, No. 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941. As a result, the definition of the term "widow of a peacetime veteran" is now applied in determining eligibility of a widow of a World War No. 2 veteran. Section 9 of the bill would amend paragraph 1 (a) part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to include service on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as wartime service. The effect of this amendment is to apply to veterans and the dependents of veterans of World War No. 2 the eligibility requirements governing payment of pensions based upon wartime service, as contained in part I rather than those now governing their eligibility as contained in part II of this regulation. As a definition of the term "widow of a peacetime veteran" would no longer be applicable to widows of veterans of World War No. 2, it is essential that the term "widow of a World War No. 2 veteran" be defined for adjudicatory purposes. No material change is made in the definition of the term "widow of a peacetime veteran," now applicable in World War No. 2 cases in establishing a definition for the term "widow of a World War No. 2 veteran."

Section 7: Section 7 would amend paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10—Series to establish a definition of the term "child" for purposes of Public, No. 2, and the Veterans Regulations, as amended, comparable, generally, to that applied in World War No. 1 cases under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and reenacted by Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress. The effect of this amendment is to include within the definition of that term, a stepchild, and an illegitimate child under certain conditions, permitting in the latter connection recognition of an illegitimate child, but as to the father only, if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the putative father of such child.

Section 8: This section would amend paragraph VII Veterans Regulation No. 10, so as to define the term, "parent" and include within the definition of that term and the terms "mother" and "father" as now defined in this paragraph, persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year. It is identical with the definition of these terms as contained in the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and similar to the definition of the terms "father" and "mother" as contained in the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, except that the latter includes stepfathers and stepmothers. Such persons, although not included specifically in the proposed amendment, may, if the facts so warrant, establish entitlement as persons who stood in loco parentis. The amendment would establish greater uniformity and permit payment of benefits in certain meritorious cases where it is not now possible to make an award under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress and the veterans regulations, as amended. The amendment would further limit recognition in any case to not more than one father or one mother, as defined, and give statutory preference to such father or mother who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of entry into active service by the person who served. Such limitation and direction as to preference are considered desirable in order that administrative complications, where there are contesting claimants, may be avoided.

Section 9: This section under paragraph (a) would amend paragraph 1 (a), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, so as to extend to veterans and to the dependents of deceased veterans entitlement to pension for disability or death resulting from service on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress on a parity with veterans and the dependents of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, and of World War No. 1. While pension, at wartime rates, for service-connected disability or death based upon service in the present war is payable under Public, No. 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, the eligibility provisions governing payment of such benefits are those contained in part II of said regulation, as amended, applicable to peacetime service. By including World War No. 2 service in paragraph 1 (a), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, the eligibility requirements would be those established for wartime service rather than those established for peacetime service. As to the former, paragraph 1 (b), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, at present provides that for the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) every person employed in the active military or naval service for 90 days or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where evidence or medical judgment is such as to warrant a finding that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment.

The amendment made by this bill removes the 90 days' service requirement for application of the presumption of soundness and limits the rebuttal of the presumption by the Government, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of examination, acceptance, and enrollment, to those cases where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service. This modification of the eligibility requirements would affect veterans of World War No. 1, the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, and Philippine Insurrection who meet the requirements of paragraph 1 (a), part I, of this regulation as well as veterans of World War No. 2. The provision of paragraph 1 (c), part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, governing service connection of chronic diseases becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within 1 year from date of separation from active service, now applicable to those who served in the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, Philippine Insurrection, or World War No. 1, would be applicable to World War No. 2 cases.

Section 10: This section would recognize service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy, on or after December 7, 1941, and before a termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, as active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Under the general pension law, cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy were considered eligible for pension if disabled by reason of any wound or injury received or disease contracted while in the service of the United States and in the line of duty, there being no distinction between wartime or peacetime service, or active service requirement. Further, such cadets and midshipmen had long been held to be officers of the Army and Navy within the meaning of the general pension laws. They were not pensionable under the service-pension acts solely on the basis of wartime service while pursuing courses of instruction at these academies unless they were assigned to duties which constituted war service as practice cruises during a period of hostilities. Cadets and midshipmen disabled by reason of wounds or injuries received or disease contracted while pursuing the prescribed course of instruction at the academies and in line of duty are entitled to pension at peacetime rates as prescribed in Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part II, and if so disabled while assigned to duties constituting war service, which includes practice cruises at sea but excludes practice maneuvers at West Point, to the wartime rates authorized under part I of said regulation, if otherwise entitled. If suffering from permanent total disability not connected with any period of service, the pension rates prescribed in part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) are payable if the service requirements thereof were met while they were assigned to practice cruises or otherwise actually assigned to active duty during a period of hostilities as enumerated in said regulation. There is no authority under Public, No. 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, to pay pension as provided in section 5 of Public, No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, to the dependents of a cadet or midshipman otherwise entitled to pension under part II, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) or the general pension law where his death results from injury or disease received in line of duty while pursuing his prescribed course of instruction at the academy and such death occurs while the United States is engaged in war, for the reason that their service is not active military or naval service.

As many of those who are now being enrolled or inducted in the active military or naval service are continued or enrolled in schools for prescribed courses of instruction as a part of their military training for service during the present war, it is believed that cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy and cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, particularly in view of the intensive training programs prescribed for these groups, should occupy a similar status and that their service while pursuing courses of instruction at these academies for any period on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to termination of hostilities incident to the present war, should be considered as active military or naval service.

Section 11: This section would amend section 1 (c) of Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended by Public, No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to provide that any payments made by the United States Government under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration because of disability or death shall not be considered in determining annual income of the widow, child, or children of a deceased World War No. 1 veteran. The law prohibits payment of benefits thereunder if the income of the person entitled exceeds a certain amount but provides that payments of war-risk term insurance, United States Government life (converted) insurance, and payments under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, and the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, as amended, shall not be considered in determining annual income. It does not specifically include, for exemption, payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act

of 1940, as amended, which were authorized by a subsequent statute.

The amendment, without designating any specific benefits, by the general language employed, would comprehend the benefits now excluded in determining annual income, as well as payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and any other analogous benefits now or hereafter payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The law would be further amended to provide that where payments to a widow are disallowed or discontinued, payment to a child or children of the deceased veteran may be made as though there is no widow. Under the existing law, where there is a widow with child or children, whether in her custody or not, the rights of such child or children are governed by the rights of the widow and where her entitlement is barred because of the income limitation, it is not possible to award benefits to the child or children. It is believed that this was not intended and the amendment will permit payment of benefits to a child or children under such or similar circumstances and result in more equitable administration of this law.

Section 12: This section would amend paragraph V, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), which pertains to payment of pension, compensation, or emergency officers' retirement pay, to which a person was entitled prior to his death and not paid during his lifetime. The amendment would limit the amount payable to that which was due and unpaid for a period not to exceed 1 year prior to date of death, whereas now there is no limit as to the period prior to death over which the amount due may be computed. It would also authorize payment under ratings or decisions based upon evidence in file at date of death whereas at present payment may be made only under ratings or decisions existing at date of death. In specifying the persons to whom payments may be made and directing the order in which each shall be eligible, certain changes have been made with a view to clarifying and facilitating uniform application of the provisions under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Where there are no persons entitled to such benefits, within the classes thus enumerated, the regulation authorizes payment of such amount undue and unpaid at death as may be necessary to reimburse the person who bore the expense of burial. The amendment would permit similar reimbursement to the person who bore the expense of last sickness as well as the expense of burial. The amendment would further provide that a check received by a payee in payment of pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall, in the event of the death of the payee on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, become an asset of the estate of the deceased payee. Under the regulation, such checks, other than for pension payable under laws relating to service prior to April 21, 1898, and those reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, must be returned and canceled. Cases have arisen wherein substantial justice would require that the amount of the check received but not negotiated by the payee during his lifetime be considered as an asset of his estate.

Section 13: This section would amend paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (c) by modifying the provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B), repealing subparagraph (C) and substituting a new subparagraph (C) in lieu thereof and by adding a new subparagraph (D).

The effect of the proposed changes would be to make veterans of all wars and the regular establishment subject to the limitations on payment of pensions, compensation, or retirement pay contained in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), except that the pension of any disabled veteran who is an inmate o. the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home on the date of the enactment of the amendment may not be reduced or discontinued by reason of the provisions of (A), (B), or (C). The proposed changes will insure uniform administration as to all persons furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

The principal changes which would be effected are as follows:

(A) At present, the amount payable to a disabled veteran, having no dependents, while he is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof is limited to $15 per month where benefits are payable for service-connected disability, and $6 per month where benefits are payable for non-service-connected disability. However, in the case of any such veteran entitled to pension on account of service prior to the Spanish-American War who is being furnished such treatment or care by the Veterans' Administration, $15 per month is payable. The amendment would authorize payment of $20 per month in all these cases, except where the veteran is entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability under part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, but would increase the rate from $6 to $8 per month in such cases. This is in cognizance of the increase of pension for permanent total non-service-connected disability under part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, from $30 to $40 per month. The effect of the amendment would be to authorize payment of pension in Spanish-American War cases on a parity with Civil War cases at the rate of $20 per month where the disabled veteran without dependents is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof.

(B) The changes proposed by this subparagraph would permit consideration of funds derived from any source when the estate of an insane disabled veteran, having no dependents, who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, equal or exceeds $1,500, whereas at present only funds derived from payments under certain laws administered by the Veterans' Administration may be considered under this limitation when discontinuing further payments until the estate is reduced to $500; extend the limitation to cases where the insane disabled veteran is maintained at his own expense in an institution, but make provision, in such cases, for payment of any additional amounts otherwise payable as would equal the amount charged for his care and maintenance in such institution not exceeding the amount the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines to be the charge as fixed by an applicable statute or valid administrative regulation. This latter provision is designed to prevent circumvention of the statute and the accumulation of large estates for the ultimate benefit of remote heirs or next of kin on death of the veteran, in those cases where he is removed from an institution where he is being maintained by the Government to an institution whose maintenance charges may be paid from his estate, thus avoiding operation of the provision for discontinuing payments in cases subject to the limitations of this subparagraph.

(C) In view of the foregoing provisions, the present subparagraph (C) relating to the amount payable under the regulation where benefits are based upon service prior to the Spanish-American War is not required and a new subparagraph is substituted in lieu thereof, which provides that any veteran subject to the provisions of subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be deemed to be single and without dependents in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary. It further provides that in no event shall increased compensation, pensions, or retirement pay of such veteran be granted for any period more than 6 months prior to receipt of satisfactory evidence showing such veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent.

(D) As the purpose of the proposed amendments to paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended, is to insure uniform application of the limitations prescribed therein where any disabled person is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof, provision has been made in subparagraph (E) for the repeal of those laws or parts of laws regulating the amount of pension which may be paid to any disabled veteran while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or any National or State soldiers' home. It is proposed, however, by the new subparagraph (D) to save from reduction or discontinuance, the pension of any such disabled veteran who is in the United States Soldiers' Home or any National or State soldiers' home on the date of enactment of the amendment where such reduction or discontinuance would be caused by the operation of the provisions of (A), (B), or (C). Any disabled veteran thereafter admitted would, of course, be subject to the limitations prescribed therein.

(E) This subparagraph provides for the repeal or modification of any law or regulation in conflict with the foregoing provisions.

Section 14: Section 14 (a) has for its general purpose the simplification of wartime service-connected rates of death compensation or pension to widows and children by elimination of the differential in rates based upon age, and adoption of the higher rates for all ages, with some adjustments within what are considered to be conservative and equitable limits. The rates under existing law, Public, No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, and the rates proposed by this bill are set forth for convenience below:

PUBLIC, NO. 198, 76TH CONG., JULY 19, 1939

Widow—no child

Age under 50 years	$38
Age 50 years or over	45

Widow—with child or children

Widow's rate, with $10 additional for first child up to 10 years of age, increased to $15 from age 10 with $8 for each additional child up to 10 years of age, increased to $13 from age 10.

Rates for children (no widow)

1 child	$20
2 children	33
3 children	46
Each additional child	8
Total amount may not exceed	83

PROPOSED RATES

Widow—no child

Irrespective of age	$50

Widow—with child or children

Widow, 1 child, with $13 for each additional child	$65

Rates for children (no widow)

1 child	$25
2 children	38
Each additional child	10
Total amount may not exceed	100

With respect to the elimination of age differentials as to widows and children, while the facts supporting such principle are recognized, experience has shown that an age limitation produces inequitable results; that widows under age 50 generally have minor children, and responsibility for their care and supervision precludes their being employed on a permanent and full-time basis, and in many instances they are not qualified for sufficiently remunerative employment to warrant the differentiation. The age differential as to children was established in the veterans regulations promulgated by the President under the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, and while it is generally true that the cost of maintaining a child under 10 years of age is undoubtedly less than for a child of 10 years of age or over, the particular age limitation in this instance also produces inequitable results as circumstances exist in many cases where the importance of the differential is materially reduced. One of the most important considerations in connection with the proposed change is that the age differentials require adjudicative actions involving administrative cost and impede prompt adjudication of death compensation and pension claims. These results offset the savings effected by establishment of age differentials. Further, although administrative complications should be avoided at any time, the exigency of the present war makes it imperative that any provisions of law which are not shown to be justifiably necessary and which serve to hamper adjudications of claims should be changed.

Section 14 (b) is designed to accomplish the same purpose with respect to peacetime-service-connected death pension benefits. The rates which would be authorized are approximately 75 percent of the rates which would be authorized under section 14 (a) for wartime-service-connected death. This ratio has been consistently maintained in the laws or veterans regulations establishing monetary rates for disability or death resulting from wartime or peacetime service. Paragraph (c) relates to the effective dates of benefits or increased benefits authorized under this section.

It is estimated that the cost of the proposed equalization of rates of compensation or pension to widows and children of veterans whose deaths resulted from wartime or peacetime service would amount to approximately $4,536,000 the first year. This estimate is based upon the following statistical data:

	Number of cases	Estimated cost first year
Wartime-service-connected:		
World War No. 2 [1]	2,100	$349,000
World War No. 1	34,000	3,516,000
Spanish-American War	1,000	66,000
Total wartime	37,100	3,931,000
Regular Establishment:		
At peacetime rates	7,350	510,000
At wartime rates	750	95,000
Total Regular Establishment	8,100	605,000
Total estimated cost	45,200	4,536,000

[1] Based on cases on rolls Mar. 31, 1943.

This additional expense, it is believed, would be offset to some extent by savings effected through simplification of adjudicative actions, which, as stated above, now result in considerable administrative cost due to complicated adjustments in awards necessitated by present age differentials.

Section 15: This section would amend paragraph XIII, Veterans Regulation No. 10, and repeal certain laws relating to concurrent payments of compensation or pension or of such gratuities and active service or retired pay, and provide more equitable provisions with respect thereto to be uniformly applied under all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The statutes relating the concurrent payments of pension under the general or service pension laws, or compensation under the World War Veterans Act, 1924, as amended, which were continued or restored with limitations by Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, or pension under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the veterans regulations, as amended, or such benefits with active service or retired pay are not uniform, and Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, contains no provision either permitting or prohibiting payment of benefits thereunder to any person in receipt of compensation or pension under any other law. As the result of the variance in these laws and administrative interpretations thereof, certain inequalities exist which justify immediate correction by way of legislation. For example, a widow entitled to death pension benefits under the general or service pension law or Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, may receive such benefits concurrently with active service pay as a member of the Women's Reserve of the Navy or Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard or as a United States Army nurse, whereas a widow entitled to death pension benefits under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and the veterans regulations, as amended, or Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, would be precluded from receiving such benefits while in receipt of active service pay. These and similar inequalities arising under existing laws will be rectified by the proposed amendment.

Section 16: This section provides that the act shall be effective from date of its approval and that necessary adjustments in awards shall be effective, unless otherwise provided, the first of the calendar month following adjudicative action, or the first of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is earlier. In all other cases, benefits authorized by virtue of any of the provisions in the act will be effective from date of receipt of claim therefor except that death compensation or pension will be effective as of the day following date of death of the veteran if claim is filed within 1 year after the death of the veteran. This provision conforms to similar provisions in sections 2 and 4 of Public, No. 690, Seventy-seventh Congress, July 30, 1942. This section also provides that payments authorized under this act shall not be made for any period prior to date of its enactment.

Section 17. This section provides that pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Definition of the term "child" under the acts enumerated in section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

For the purpose of making effective the provisions of section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instruction is hereby issued:

1. It is provided by section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, that the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and veterans regulations, (as now or hereafter amended, shall be applicable to benefits provided under Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, March 28, 1934, as amended; Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; and under laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as amended: *Provided*, That where solely as a result of the definition of the term "child" in paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10 series as amended by this act, the child or children of a deceased veteran of the Spanish-American War, Boxer Rebellion, or Philippine Insurrection would be entitled to benefits under the general pension law or service pension acts reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, the rates of service pension applicable to such child or children shall be those provided in Public Law No. 484, 73d Congress, as now or hereafter amended.

Section 7, Public No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10 series issued under Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the instruction issued under that section defining the term "child" will be for application under the laws enumerated in section 1.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 12, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 2

Section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Review of central office death claims affected by section 1 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

For the purpose of effectuating the provisions of section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instructions are issued:

1. Cases to be reviewed: The budget officer and chief of statistics will supply the dependents claims service with a list of central office cases in which a widow and child or child is receiving death pension under the service pension acts reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, or Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III.

2. Award action: Based upon the list furnished by the budget officer and chief of statistics the dependents claims service will request the case files for review to determine in each case whether additional or increased benefits may be awarded. If, upon review it is determined that entitlement exists by virtue of section 1 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, appropriate amended award action will be taken on supplemental award brief face, form 552c, and the payee notified by means of an award letter.

3. Effective dates: (A) Awards to widows with children whose names were on the rolls July 13, 1943, under the act of May 1, 1926, as reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, will be amended to include the additional $6 monthly for each child effective—

(1) The first of the calendar month following adjudicative action or the first of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is the earlier, in those instances where the child became or will become 16 years of age on or after July 13, 1943, and prior to the first of the calendar month following that in which adjudicative action is taken; and

(2) The sixteenth birthday of the child in those instances where the child will become 16 years of age on or after the first of the calendar month following that in which adjudicative action is taken.

(B) Awards to children (no widow) under 16 years of age whose names were on the rolls July 13, 1943, under the act of May 1, 1926, as reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, will be amended to reflect the rates provided in Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, as outlined in R. & P. R-2634 (B) (2), effective in the same manner as stated in (A) above.

(C) Awards to children (no widow) whose names were on the rolls July 13, 1943, under

part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), wherein the service requirements of the act of May 1, 1926, are met, will be amended to reflect the rates provided in Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, as outlined in R. & P. R-2634 (B) (2), effective as of the first of the calendar month following that in which adjudicative action is taken or the first of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is the earlier, provided they are otherwise entitled. It should be borne in mind that the income restrictions contained in Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, are no longer applicable to children who are continued or placed on the rolls under the pension laws as reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, at the rates provided by Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended.

4. Should a case be encountered in the course of the review in which a child was on the rolls with the widow or in its own right, to or for whom payments were discontinued prior to July 13, 1943, because of attaining the age of 16, and who is shown to be under 18 years of age at the time of the review of the file, appropriate action will be taken to ascertain the child's eligibility to be restored to the rolls under section 1 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

5. Previous determinations on which an award was predicated will be accepted as correct in the absence of clear and unmistakable error or fraud.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
SEPTEMBER 20, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 2, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Payment of compensation, pension, or retirement pay to wife of an incompetent veteran having no guardian.

For the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to compensation, pension, or retirement pay, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 2, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, by adding a new section No. 4, which provides in part that any benefit payable or paid by the Veterans' Administration shall be subject to the applicable provisions of Public Law No. 262, Seventy-fourth Congress (U. S. C., title 38, secs. 556a, 454a), as now or hereafter amended: *Provided*, That in any case of an incompetent veteran having no guardian, payment of compensation, pension, or retirement pay may be made in the discretion of the Administrator to the wife of such veteran for the use of the veteran and his dependents.

2. It will be observed that pursuant to the provisions of the preceding paragraph compensation, pension, or retirement pay due an incompetent veteran for whom no guardian has been appointed may, in the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, be paid to the wife of such veteran for the use of the veteran and his dependents. It will also be noted the amendment of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), paragraph VI, as amended by section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, among other things, authorizes payment of compensation, pension, or retirement pay to the wife while the veteran is hospitalized or furnished institutional or domiciliary care. The procedure outlined under R. & P. 5201 (A) will be followed in both classes of cases.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 19, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 3, Public, No. 144, 78th Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Renouncement of pension or compensation.

For the purposes of Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 3, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph XXI of Veterans Regulation No. 10 series to read as follows:

"Any person entitled to pension or compensation under any law or veterans regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration may renounce his right thereto. The application renouncing the right shall be in writing over the person's signature and upon filing of such application, payment of such benefits and the right thereto shall be terminated and he shall be denied any and all rights thereto from date of receipt of such application by the Veterans' Administration. The renouncement provided for herein shall not preclude the person from filing a new application for pension or compensation at a future date but such application shall have the attributes of an original application and no payment will be made for any period prior to the date thereof."

2. It will be observed the provisions of the preceding paragraph permit renouncement of pension or compensation payable under any law or veterans regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration.

3. By reason of this amendment the procedure outlined in R. & P. R-2554 covering renouncement of pension is applicable on and after July 13, 1943, the date of the approval of this act, to both compensation and pension.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 12, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Sections 7 and 8, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Definitions of the terms "child," "parent," "father," and "mother."

For the purposes of Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and the laws reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 7 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 10 Series to read as follows:

"The term 'child' shall mean a person unmarried and under the age of 18 years, unless prior to reaching the age of 18 years the child becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, who is a legitimate child; a child legally adopted; a stepchild if a member of the man's household; an illegitimate child but as to the father only if acknowledged in writing, signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to the child's support or has been, prior to his death judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be the putative father of such child: *Provided*, That the payment of pension shall be continued after the eighteenth birthday and until completion of education or training (but not after such child reaches the age of 21 years), to any child who is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn."

2. Section 8 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph VII of Veterans Regulation No. 10 to read as follows:

"The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided*, That not more than one father and one mother, as defined, shall be recognized in any case, and preference shall be given to such father or mother who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of entry into active service by the person who served."

3. Since section 1, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, makes the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulations, as now or hereafter amended, applicable to benefits provided under Public Law No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and the laws reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, the above definitions are for application under Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, Public, No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and the laws reenacted by Public, No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, on and after July 13, 1943, the date of the approval of the act. It is to be noted that the term "child" includes an illegitimate child and prescribes proof to be supplied as to the father. Proof of birth is all that is required as to the mother.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 18, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 9 (a) and (b), Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

For the purposes of section 9 (a) and (b), Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instructions are hereby issued:

1. Section 9 (a) of Public No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph 1 (a), part I, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, to include therein as war service, active military or naval service on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of Congress.

(a) The amendment of paragraph 1 (a) in this manner makes all the other provisions of part I, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, except paragraph III thereof applicable to World War No. 2 service. Determinations as to whether a disease or injury was incurred in or aggravated by World War No. 2 service, as defined in Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part I, paragraph 1, as amended, or that death resulted therefrom, as to entitlement to disability or death pension for periods on or after July 13, 1943, will be made in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 1 (a), (b), (c), and (d), part I, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, and the regulations and instructions issued pursuant thereto. Part I and appropriate paragraph will be cited in the rating code, instead of part II, as heretofore required and original awards will be prepared on Form 553.

2. Section 9 (b) of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph 1 (b), part I, Veterans Regulations 1 (a), as amended, as follows:

"For the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) hereof every person employed in the active military or naval service shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such active military or naval service."

(a) Ninety days' or more service is no longer necessary under paragraph 1 (b), as amended, also that the provisions thereof are applicable to all war service as defined in paragraph 1 (a), as amended. Under paragraph 1 (b), as amended, sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service may be rebutted only by notation of defects, infirmities, or disorders at time of examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease, though not noted, existed prior to acceptance and enrollment. Regarding notation at enlistment, only those defects, infirmities, and disorders actually found as a result of examination are to be considered as noted. History or complaints volunteered by or elicited from the veteran at the time of examination do not constitute notations unless confirmed by proper notation of the examining officer as result of his examination.

(b) "Clear and unmistakable" means obvious or manifest. Accordingly, evidence which makes it obvious or manifest, that the injury or disease under consideration existed prior to acceptance and enrollment for service will satisfy the requirements of the statute.

(c) Regardless of the period of war service, medical judgment alone, as distinguished from well established and accepted medical principles, is not sufficient to rebut sound condition at the time of entrance into active military service, nor will admitted history of prior disease by the veteran or members of his family suffice, although they may serve as leads for further development.

(d) The provisions of (a), (b), and (c) hereof are subject to the following: There are certain medical principles so well and universally recognized as definitely to constitute fact, and when in accordance with these principles existence prior to entrance into service is established, no further additional or confirmatory facts are necessary. For example, with notation or discovery during service of residual conditions, such as scars, healed fractures, absent or resected parts or organs, supernumerary parts, congenital malformations, fibrosis evidencing formerly active tuberculosis, with no evidence of the pertinent antecedent active injury or disease during service, the established facts are so convincing as to impel the conclusion the residual condition existed prior to entrance into active service, without further proof of this fact. Similarly manifestation of lesions or symptoms of chronic disease from date of enlistment, or so close to that date that the disease could not have originated in so short a period, will be accepted as clear and unmistakable proof that the disease existed prior to entrance into active service. Likewise, manifestation of disease within less than the minimum incubation period after enlistment will be accepted as showing inception prior to service.

3. It is contemplated that in claims based upon recent military or naval service and discharge on account of disability, development of evidence as to prior existence and severity of injury or disease, either by correspondence, social survey, or field examination, will not be undertaken when the acceptable evidence of record, including well-established and generally accepted medical principles will permit either favorable adjudication or denial. Development by correspondence, etc., will be resorted to only when there are definite indications in file of a disabling condition at the time of enlistment, as severe as, or more severe then, the condition at discharge, which, however, require confirmation by clear and unmistakable evidence to be acceptable. Under no circumstances will a claim be developed merely to establish prior episodes of disease or injury which may have cleared up leaving no actual disability at the time of enlistment.

(a) Where notation or clear and unmistakable evidence shows that a disease or injury existed prior to service, service connection on the basis of aggravation will be conceded in case there is any increase in disability during active service resulting from the injury or disease manifested on the record, except where contrary to clear and unmistakable facts, including medical principles.

(b) In considering the question of aggravation, attention is invited to the fact that by reason of the amendment of paragraph 1 (b), part I, regulation 1 (a), greater weight attaches to the report of examination at the time of entrance into active service than heretofore. Also, that paragraph 1 (d), part I, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), is modified to the extent that medical judgment alone, as distinguished from well-established and accepted medical principles, is no longer sufficient to support a finding of natural progress. Further, that medical or surgical treatment furnished during service for preexisting conditions does not of itself establish increase in disability; however, increase in severity necessitating treatment, unless actually improved thereby, may do so. Discovery or notation of healed residuals of former injury or disease, without evidence of active pathology during service, does not reflect increased disability. Mere recurrences within a short period after entrance into active service, as of epileptic seizures, seasonal asthma, recurrent dislocations, etc., do not establish increase in the degree of disability. There are certain diseases, including new growths (including most endocrine disturbances, but not hyperthyroidism or diabetes mellitus), epilepsy, arteriosclerosis, and hypertrophic (degenerative) arthritis, commonly designated osteoarthritis, which in the absence of pertinent local injury or abrupt and sudden pathological developments do not of themselves reflect increase in severity. On the other hand advancement of conditions such as peptic ulcer, atrophic arthritis, diabetes mellitus, active pulmonary tuberculosis, bronchial asthma (not established as seasonal), and dementia praecox (with any sudden alteration of personality), can be expected from the unusual exertion, exposure, emotional stress or strain, or other adverse influence of the service. Acute infections, as pneumonia, active rheumatic fever (even though recurrent), acute pleurisy, acute ear disease, and sudden developments, as hemoptysis, lung collapse, perforating ulcer, decompensating heart disease, coronary occlusion or thrombosis, cerebral hemorrhage, occuring in service are service-incurred or aggravated unless shown by clear and unmistakable evidence that there was no increase in severity during service. Even though prior existence of a condition not noted by report of examination at time of entrance into active service may be established by clear and unmistakable evidence, the records and affidavits of physicians, hospitals, or institutions cannot be accepted to controvert the report of examination at the time of entrance into active service as to the severity of the preexisting condition, unless the evidence constitutes clear and unmistakable showing to the contrary.

(c) Under Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part I, as amended, no pension is payable if the disability is the result of the person's own misconduct. Hence question of service connection for misconduct conditions either by incurrence or aggravation under Veterans Regulation 1 (a), part I, as amended, is not involved. In the event question of innocent incurrence or aggravation of misconduct condition arises, cases will be submitted to central office, attention director of the appropriate service, for disposition.

4. Determinations as to service connection for chronic diseases on account of World War No. 2 service will be made in accordance with the provisions of Regulations and Procedure R-1080 and 1086. Hospital confirmation of diagnosis of chronic disease initially made after discharge from World War No. 2 service will be required, in disability claims.

(a) In considering the listed chronic diseases, the following points should be borne in mind: Rheumatic fever has no causative relationship to atrophic or hypertrophic arthritis. Epidemic encephalitis is an acute infectious disease having a period of incubation limited to 3 weeks; however, early episodes may be mistaken for influenza or other acute infectious disease. Endocarditis and myocarditis, as active diseases, are acute, prostrating complications of infections, particularly rheumatic fever; chronic types are rarely, if ever, recognized; inactive types, as valvular lesions, myocardial damage, etc., must be considered for service connection on the basis of the status of the disease when active or on the basis of actual decompensation during service. Glomerular, or parenchymatous, nephritis is a complication of acute infectious disease. Nephrosclerosis, or interstitial nephritis, is closely associated with arteriosclerosis and is typically chronic. Among the organic diseases of the nervous system, many, for example, anteriopoliomyelitis and spinal meningitis, are typically of acute onset. The psychoses must be viewed in relationship to the disease, if any, with which they are associated. No type of psychoneurosis is included in the list of chronic diseases.

5. The discussion of "reasonable doubt," page 2, 1933, schedule for rating disabilities, will be borne in mind in resolving doubts in favor of veterans when applying the policies and principles outlined above as to sound condition at the time of examination, acceptance and enrollment, and aggravation. Also, in all matters of service connection, due consideration shall be given to the places, types, and circumstances of the veterans' service.

6. The application of the foregoing instructions carrying into effect the purpose and intent of section 9 (b), Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, will be in full accord with the principles involving clear and unmistakable evidence and burden of proof enunciated in Public, 141, Seventy-third Congress.

7. The effective date of ratings and awards made pursuant to paragraph 1 (b), part I, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, will be determined in accordance with the provisions of instruction I, sections 16 and 17, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEPTEMBER 4, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 10, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Service as a cadet or as a midshipman.

For the purposes of section 10, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instructions are hereby issued:

1. Section 10 provides:

"Service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the

United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress shall be considered active military or naval service in World War No. 2 for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

2. By reason of the provisions of section 10, service as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy or as a cadet at the United States Coast Guard Academy on or after December 7, 1941, and before termination of hostilities incident to the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress, is active military or naval service in World War No. 2. Accordingly persons performing such service will be entitled to all benefits provided by Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, as amended, if otherwise in order.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 12, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 12, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Accrued apportioned awards.

For the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to pension, compensation, or retirement pay, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 12 amends paragraph V, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), to read in part as follows:

"Pension, compensation, or retirement pay authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to which a person was entitled prior to the date of his death, and not paid during his lifetime, and due and unpaid for a period not to exceed 1 year prior to death under existing ratings or decisions, or those based on evidence in the file at date of death, shall, upon the death of such person, be paid as hereinafter set forth:

"(a) Upon the death of a person receiving an apportioned share of the veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay, all or any part of such unpaid amount, to the veteran or to any other dependent or dependents as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

2. Upon the death of a person receiving an apportioned share of a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay the accrued amount due the apportionee at the time of death will be awarded to the veteran except where the evidence of record indicates this would work a hardship upon other dependents, in which event the complete case file will be forwarded by the adjudication officer or chief, claims division, with appropriate recommendation as to the exact disposition of the apportioned share through the director, veterans' claims service, to the assistant administrator in charge of compensation, pension, and vocational rehabilitation, who will determine the person or persons to whom the accrued apportioned share will be paid.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 12, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Adjustment of awards of members of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home.

For the purposes of section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instruction is hereby issued:

1. With respect to disabled veterans who were inmates of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home on July 13, 1943, subparagraphs (D) and (E), section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, provide as follows:

"(D) The pension of any disabled veteran who is an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home on the date of this enactment, shall not be reduced or discontinued by reason of the provisions of (A), (B), or (C) above.

"(E) The provisos of section 3 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 383; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364b), and of sections 2 and 4 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492, 493; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 365a, 365c); that part of the proviso of section 5 of the act of July 3, 1926, extending to and ending with a semicolon (44 Stat. 807; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 321a); the second proviso of section 5 of the act of June 9, 1930 (44 Stat. 530; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 321c); the third proviso of section 1 of the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 786; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381–1); the first proviso of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370c); and all other provisions of law or regulation in conflict with the foregoing provisions are hereby repealed or modified accordingly."

2. The provisions of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) are applicable where the initial admission or return from furlough of 30 days or more is on or after July 14, 1943, and the reduction of pension to $20 monthly in service-connected or service pension cases, or $8 monthly in part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) cases specified therein is for application where there is no wife, child, or dependent parent as defined by the amended instructions. The full amount of pension otherwise payable will be continued if the veteran has the required dependents as currently defined.

3. Those veterans who were inmates of the homes specified on July 13, 1943, are protected from the reduction provisions of subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C). If, however, such a veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent, the full amount of pension otherwise payable will be awarded from the first of the calendar month following receipt of claim for such increase, or the first of the calendar month following adjudicative action, whichever is the earlier.

4. Where the inmate of the home is deemed insane by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and has neither wife, child, nor dependent parent, the chief attorney, upon receipt of an account from the fiduciary or at the regular accounting period, will notify the proper adjudication agency whether the estate, derived from any source, equals or exceeds $1,500. Where an award action is necessary, for any reason, the chief attorney will be requested to advise the adjudicating agency as to whether the value of the veteran's estate, derived from any source, equals or exceeds $1,500. No increased benefits will be awarded until the necessary evidence is in file. Reductions otherwise in order will, however, be made, pending receipt of the evidence requested. The instruction issued under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) will be applicable where the insane veteran is maintained at his own expense in an institution.

5. The veteran and his representative, if any, or his guardian will be notified of the action taken under section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, and of the right to appeal.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
AUGUST 3, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 2

Section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Payment of Pension, Compensation or Retirement Pay While Receiving Hospitalization, Institutional or Domiciliary Care.

For the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to pension, compensation, or retirement pay, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 13 amends paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended, to read as follows:

"(A) Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, any pension, compensation, or retirement pay shall not exceed $20 per month: *Provided*, That the amount payable for any such disabled veteran, entitled to pension for non-service-connected disability under the provisions of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, shall not exceed $8 per month. Where any disabled veteran who is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, has a wife, child, or dependent parent, the pension, compensation, or retirement pay may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent, in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator.

"(B) Where any disabled veteran having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent is being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, and shall be deemed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be insane, the pension, compensation, or retirement pay for such veteran shall be in the amounts specified in (A) above: *Provided*, That in any case where the estate of such disabled insane veteran derived from any source equals or exceeds $1,500, further payments of such benefits will not be made until the estate is reduced to $500. Any such veteran without such dependent or dependents, when maintained at his own expense is an institution, shall be paid such amount otherwise payable as equals the amount charged for his care and maintenance in such institution not exceeding the amount the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines to be the charge as fixed by any applicable statute or valid administrative regulation: *Provided further*, That all or any part of the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of any such veteran may, in the discretion of the Administrator, and in accordance with instructions issued by the Administrator, be paid to the chief officer of the institution wherein the disabled veteran is maintained, to be properly accounted for by said chief officer and to be used for the benefit of the disabled veteran; or may be paid to the guardian of the disabled veteran in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; or, in the event the disabled veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent, may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be paid to his wife or apportioned on behalf of such wife, child, or dependent parent; or otherwise be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended.

"(C) Any veteran subject to the provisions of subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be deemed to be single and without dependents in the absence of satisfactory evidence to the contrary: *Provided*, That in no event shall increased compensation, pension, or retirement

pay of such veteran be granted for any period more than 6 months prior to receipt of satisfactory evidence showing such veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent."

2. It will be observed that on and after July 13, 1943, the date of the approval of the act, veterans without dependents of the classes enumerated being furnished hospital treatment, institutional or domiciliary care by the United States or any political subdivision thereof are entitled to payments not to exceed $20 monthly, in lieu of $15 monthly, for service-incurred disability, $20 monthly, in lieu of the rate formerly received, for non-service-connected disability for which pension is payable under other than part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, and not to exceed $8 monthly, in lieu of $6 monthly, for non-service-connected disability under the provisions of part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended.

3. It will be observed that under paragraph (B), as amended, when the estate of a veteran deemed insane by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who is without dependents of the classes enumerated, derived from any source, equals or exceeds $1,500, further payments of such benefits will not be made until the estate is reduced to $500. It will also be noted that under paragraph (B), as amended, when any such insane veteran, without such dependents, is maintained at his own expense in an institution, the limitations of paragraphs (A) and (B) are for application, but there shall be paid, in such cases, such amount otherwise payable as equals the amount charged for his care and maintenance in such institution, not, however, exceeding the amount the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines to be the charge as fixed by any applicable statute or valid administrative regulation.

Upon receipt of notice by the adjudicating agency from the chief attorney, as provided in Regulation and Procedure 5326 (A), the following awards action will be accomplished:

a. When notice shows veteran's estate derived from any source equals or exceeds $1,500, and veteran is not maintained in an institution at his own expense, any payment of disability compensation, pension, or retirement pay being made will be discontinued.

b. If notice shows veteran's estate derived from any source equals or exceeds $1,500, and the veteran is maintained at his own expense in an institution, the information furnished by the chief attorney under Regulations and Procedure 5326 (A), will be used as the basis for an award in the veteran's behalf.

c. If notice shows the veteran is being maintained in an institution at his own expense and monthly payments are in order under paragraph (A), the information furnished by the chief attorney under Regulations and Procedure 5326 (A), will be utilized in determining the amount, which, together with the amount allowed under paragraph (A), if otherwise payable, will be awarded in the veteran's behalf.

4. It will be further noted that under paragraph (C) any veteran subject to the provisions of paragraphs (A) and (B) will be deemed to be single and without dependents in the absence of satisfactory proof to the contrary; and that in no event will increased compensation, pension, or retirement pay be granted for any period more than 6 months prior to receipt of satisfactory evidence showing veteran has a wife, child, or dependent parent. In those instances where the required proof of dependents is not of record, sworn statements, on Form 404 or otherwise, as to dependency status will constitute a prima facie showing thereof. The veteran will be informed of the necessary additional evidence and that in the event it is not submitted within 60 days the award will be adjusted on the basis of a veteran without dependents effective from the date of admission to the institution.

5. Section 13, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, amends paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation No. 6 (a), as amended; accordingly, except as otherwise provided in the instructions issued under Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the provisions of Regulations and Procedure, Veterans' Administration, pertaining to definitions of relationship, dependency, jurisdiction, appeals, effective dates of awards, discontinuances, etc., insofar as applicable, will continue under this instruction.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
AUGUST 21, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 14, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Review of central office death claims affected by section 14 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

1. In order to carry into effect the provisions of section 14 of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the budget officer and chief of statistics will furnish the dependents claims service with a list of cases in which a widow and/or minor child or children are in receipt of death compensation or pension based on the veteran's death having been due to service.

2. Based upon the list supplied by the budget officer and chief of statistics, the dependents claims service will request the case files in numerical sequence beginning with the lowest number. Upon receipt of the case files they will be reviewed and in each case where title to increase exists by virtue of section 14 of Public, No. 144, appropriate amended award action will be taken and the payee notified by means of an award letter. It will not be necessary to show the rates in effect prior to August 1, 1943.

3. As to those persons found entitled under the provisions of section 14 of the act of July 13, 1943, who were on the rolls or who were awarded death compensation or pension thereafter based on claims pending on July 13, 1943, the effective date of the increased rates will be August 1, 1943.

4. Upon review of a case in which death compensation or pension is being paid to the fiduciary of a widow because of her minority, appropriate action will be taken to award payments direct to the widow as provided in the last proviso of section 2 of the act of July 13, 1943.

5. Previous determinations on which an award was predicated will be accepted as correct in the absence of clear and unmistakable error or fraud.

6. Cases comprehended by this instruction will be reviewed as promptly as possible consistent with the proper conduct of current adjudication activities.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
JULY 21, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 2

Section 14, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Adjustment of awards of service-connected death compensation or pension to widows and/or minor children of deceased veterans, under section 14, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress.

For the purposes of section 14, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instructions are issued for the information and guidance of field stations having authority to adjudicate claims for death benefits:

1. Review of cases with running awards of service-connected death compensation or pension.

(A) In order to effect expeditiously the increase in rates of service-connected death compensation or pension to widows and/or minor children, as provided in section 14, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the adjudication division will be furnished with a list, prepared from the abstract cards, of all cases in which widows and/or minor children are receiving payments of wartime or peacetime service-connected death compensation or pension.

(B) Based upon the lists made from the abstract cards, the adjudication division will obtain and review the corresponding XC–files. If, upon review it is established that the payees are entitled to the increased rates provided by section 14, Public, No. 144, appropriate amended award action will be taken on supplemental award brief face, form 553c, with the following notation under "Reason for amendment": "To increase rates under section 14, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress." It will not be necessary to show the names or dates of birth of the veteran's children; however, a statement should be made to show the number of beneficiaries involved, for example, "W & 4C" (widow and four children). It will not be necessary to show any of the rates in effect prior to August 1, 1943. The payee will be notified by appropriate form letter of the increased rates awarded. An initial supply of form letters will be forwarded under separate cover to each field station having adjudication activities. Additional supplies will be requisitioned in the usual manner.

(C) As to those persons found entitled under the provisions of section 14 of the act of July 13, 1943, who were on the rolls or who were awarded death compensation or pension thereafter based on claims pending on July 13, 1943, the effective date of the increased rates will be August 1, 1943.

(D) Should a case be encountered in which service-connected death compensation or pension is being paid to the fiduciary of a minor widow, appropriate action will be taken to award benefits direct to the widow notwithstanding that she may be a minor. (Second proviso, sec. 2, Public, No. 144, 78th Cong.)

(E) In any case in which there is an apportioned award for a widow and minor children not in her custody, it will be necessary to prepare amended awards for all payees to reflect the increases authorized by section 14, Public, No. 144. Appropriate notation concerning the apportionment will also be entered under "Reason for amendment" on the award brief face.

(F) Previous determinations on which an award was predicated will be accepted as correct in the absence of clear and unmistakable error or fraud.

2. Rates payable on or after August 1, 1943.

(A) Wartime service-connected death rates:

	Per month
Widow but no child	$50
Widow with 1 child	65
(With $13 for each additional child.)	
No widow but 1 child	25
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	$38
(With $10 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided.)	

As to the widow, child or children, the total amount payable under this subparagraph shall not exceed $100. As to the widow, and child or children not in her care and custody, any amount payable under this subparagraph may be apportioned as prescribed in R. & P. R–2591 and R–2592.

(B) Peacetime service-connected death rates:

	Per month
Widow but no child	$38
Widow with 1 child	49
(With $10 for each additional child.)	
No widow but 1 child	19
No widow but 2 children (equally divided)	28
(With $8 for each additional child; total amount to be equally divided.)	

As to the widow, child, or children, the total pension payable under this subparagraph shall not exceed $75. As to the widow and child or children not in her care and custody, any amount payable under this sub-

paragraph may be apportioned as prescribed in R. & P. R-2591 and R-2592.

3. The foregoing rates are not applicable to cases in which payments to a widow or child are authorized solely by section 31, Public, No. 141, Seventy-third Congress, as amended (A. D. 415). However, the rates set forth in subparagraph 2 (A) of this instruction are applicable to all cases in which widows and children are entitled to wartime service-connected rates by reason of the provisions of Public, No. 359, Seventy-seventh Congress.

4. The Director, Dependents Claims Service, should be notified of the veteran's name and claim number in all cases subject to review under this instruction in which the XC file has been temporarily transferred to central office, in order that appropriate amended award action may be taken therein. Should a service-connected death case be encountered wherein the case file has been permanently transferred to central office but the payment cards, Forms 511, were inadvertently retained by the field station, prompt action should be taken to transfer the payment cards to central office and the case brought to the attention of the Director, Dependents Claims Service.

5. Cases comprehended by this instruction will be reviewed as promptly as possible consistent with the proper conduct of current adjudication activities. A report will be submitted as of the last day of each month to the Director, Dependents Claims Service, setting forth the total number of cases listed for review, the number of cases reviewed during the month, and the balance remaining for review at the end of the month. This report shall be discontinued immediately upon completion of the review.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

JULY 21, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Section 15, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Limitation on awards:

For the purposes of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 15 amends paragraph XIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10 to read as follows:

"Not more than one award of pension, compensation, or emergency officers' or regular retirement pay, shall be made concurrently to any person based on his own service. The receipt of pension or compensation by a widow, child, or parent on account of the death of any person, or receipt by any person of pension or compensation on account of his own service, shall not bar the payment of pension or compensation on account of the death or disability of any other person. This paragraph is hereby made applicable to all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Section 4715 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 25) and any other laws in conflict herewith are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

"Pension, compensation, or retirement pay on account of his own service shall not be paid while the person is in receipt of active-service pay.

"The third proviso of paragraph 2 of section 1 of the act of March 3, 1891 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 26); the last proviso of paragraph 2 of section 3 of the act of January 28, 1915 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 27), and any other provision of law or veterans regulation contrary hereto is hereby repealed or modified accordingly."

2. It will be observed that while a veteran can receive only one award based on his or her own service he or she can, in addition to such award, receive an award based on the death or disability of another person.

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

AUGUST 12, 1943.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, INSTRUCTION NO. 1

Sections 16 and 17, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress (act of July 13, 1943)

Subject: Effective date of awards.

For the purposes of sections 16 and 17, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the following instructions are issued:

1. Section 16, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides as follows:

"This act shall be effective from the date it is approved and necessary adjustments in awards shall be made effective unless otherwise provided herein, the first of the calendar month following adjudicative action, or the first of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is the earlier. In all other cases benefits authorized by virtue of this act shall be effective from date of receipt of claim therefor under this act and subject to the provisions that death compensation or death pension shall be effective as of the day following the date of death of the veteran if claim is filed within 1 year after the death of the veteran: *Provided*, That in no event shall payments authorized by this act be made for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act."

Section 17, Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, provides as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, pension payable for disability shall be payable from date of discharge if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge."

2. Accordingly, except as otherwise provided in Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the effective date of an award of monetary benefits authorized solely by reason of the provisions of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall be as follows:

"Original or increased awards of disability pension, compensation, or retirement benefits shall be effective as of the first day of the calendar month following date of approval of the award, or as of the first day of the calendar month following date of receipt of claim, whichever is the earlier, but in no event prior to July 13, 1943, the date of approval of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress: *Provided, however*, That when an initial claim for disability pension is filed on or after July 13, 1943, and within 1 year from date of discharge from service the effective date of the award of disability pension shall be the date following the date of discharge, the date the evidence shows entitlement, or July 13, 1943, whichever is the later: *Provided, further*, That where the claim was in a pending status as of July 13, 1943, the effective date of an original or increased award shall be the date of the approval of Public, No. 14, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943. No general review is authorized for the purpose of applying the provisions of Public, No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress."

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

AUGUST 12, 1943.

Commentators Confusing People by Sharp Variance of Their Expert Opinions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Griffin from the Boston (Mass.) Sunday Post of September 26, 1943:

COMMENTATORS CONFUSING PEOPLE BY SHARP VARIANCE OF THEIR "EXPERT" OPINIONS—COLUMNISTS ALSO ADD TO MUDDLING AS PUBLIC WONDERS WHERE ALL THE "INSIDE" STUFF IS COMING FROM

(By John Griffin)

There is quite a row going on at the present time between one of the big broadcasting chains and an organization composed of radio commentators over the decision of the chain to restrict the commentators to news rather than opinion. The commentators hold that freedom of speech is being impaired by the ruling, and the radio company insists that their facilities should not be available to a few men for the purpose of trying to swing listeners to their opinions.

Perhaps out of the dispute may come some sort of a plan that will place such broadcasts on a workable basis which will react to the benefit of listeners if not to the immediate financial benefit of the broadcasters.

Eventually such a development will have to come, if for no other reason than the fact that listeners generally are now completely bewildered by the mass of opinion which flows nightly from the mouths of the "experts" who address themselves to millions of people.

HAD SUDDEN GROWTH

Not only radio commentators, but also some of the big syndicated newspaper columnists, have grown too big for their britches. The syndicated columns, as well as the broadcasting commentators, are a peculiar growth, fed on the hunger of Americans for information.

They have a chance to serve the public well by giving information about things that are going on in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere. But they have dangerous possibilities, too, for not all of them are strictly concerned with accuracy. In fact, competition among them is so great that there is a strong temptation for them to rush into print or onto the air with material that has not been adequately checked.

The fact that it might turn out to be wrong does not daunt them, for they can produce another item equally sensational to turn attention away from the first mistake.

Perhaps the old style of Washington correspondence left much to be desired and had to make way for modern methods. But at least the Washington correspondent of a few years ago, before the development of broadcasting on its present scale and before the growth of the big syndicated newspaper column, had a real regard for facts, even though he maintained a spirited competition with his rivals from other papers and press services.

The gossip columnists of the New York tabloids, whose idea of a great story was the announcement that some widely known couple was about to break up a marriage or the proclaiming of an impending "blessed event," were the forerunners of the present syndicated political commentators. And they operated in much the same way.

That is to say, they made themselves valuable to people "in the know" and received tidbits of gossip and rumor which they accepted as real news.

HAD TO BE RIGHT

The responsibility that confined the earlier Washington correspondents to facts made them continually aware of their duties. They knew they had little in the way of a come-back. If their stories were discredited by facts, they didn't last long. They had to be right.

The modern style of columnist and radio commentator, however, is not cramped in that fashion. He has his sources of information which are almost always nameless,

and he prints what comes from them. This is not to say that all of them operate without making any effort to check their information, but it is pretty clear that most of them go ahead whether or not they can make an adequate check-up.

Inasmuch as the commentators address themselves to millions of persons, and some of the columnists serve hundreds of newspapers, their potentialities for effecting harm are at least as great as their capacity for doing good.

Competition among them is terrific. Some of them have to get out a column every day. Some have to be on the air every night. And some undertake both of these assignments.

In the nature of their work they have to have stories or opinions that startle else they finding themselves fading. Under such conditions it is probably only human that they have a tendency to print or broadcast stuff that has more than a touch of the phony about it.

To put it mildly, it is surprising that the listeners or readers do not say to themselves, "Well, this fellow is interesting all right, but how can he possibly know so much about every subject under the sun?" or why they don't decide, under the constant barrage of the broadcaster's setting forth conflicting claims and opinions, to give up trying to maintain their mental balance.

NOBODY ELSE KNOWS

One gets the impression, listening to the commentators or reading their stuff, that neither the President nor the Secretary of State nor the General Staff know half as much about what is going on in the world as do the commentators themselves.

Regardless of the subject, whether it is the state of relations between Russia and the United States or the military and naval possibilities and probabilities in far corners of the world, the commentators have an opinion and usually express it in such a manner that seems to leave no room for any other version.

Have you ever tried listening to them on a day when there is not much doing in the news? They have a certain amount of time to fill and they manage to use it, but the sum total of their remarks amounts to nothing. When a period of several dull days comes along they feel they have to say something that sounds important and exclusive, and they don't let themselves be hampered too much by facts.

Considering the complexities involved in their position as the wise men of the world and the necessity for them keeping themselves excited, it is small wonder that during a period such as the Quebec conference they became desperate.

QUEBEC AN EXAMPLE

There was no news at Quebec. There couldn't be. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill could not possibly have divulged what went on in their meetings. Undoubtedly the average newspaper reader and radio listener fully appreciated this, and didn't expect anything startling. After all, you don't tell your enemy what you are going to do.

But the syndicated columnists and the radio commentators fell all over themselves explaining just what the big problems were and what was being done to solve them. To read the stuff or hear it, one would think that each of them had some real inside stuff, but a little thinking on the part of readers and listeners would have shown that it was all guesswork.

If it wasn't, then there is no escaping the conviction that secrets were being given away free to anyone who wanted them, whether he be enemy or patriot.

The one hope in the situation now is that these great minds are confusing the enemy as much as they are confusing the American people.

Bugs Might Win the Next Round

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pacific Rural Press of September 18, 1943:

BUGS MIGHT WIN THE NEXT ROUND

Truck crops loom increasingly important as the vital role of vegetables in nutrition is recognized. War and domestic needs make greater demands. Acreage is increased. Crop values go up: California, 1940, $104,000,000; 1941, $118,000,000; 1942, $169,000,000.

Grower problems become more difficult, particularly pest control.

What happens? Congress and the policy makers cut the U. S. D. A. budget for pest-control investigations.

The field laboratory at Ventura, studying control measures for certain lima-bean insects, is closed.

The laboratory at Modesto, working on the sugar-beet leaf-hopper problem, is closed.

The laboratory at Alhambra, investigating insect problems of several important vegetable crops, now operating with a reduced staff, is cut to a skimpy budget of about $17,000. The trained entomologists do not have the funds to work effectively, to do field follow-ups, or pass along their fact findings to growers.

The University of California is not doing much truck-crop insect-control work in southern California. By agreement this has been left largely to U. S. D. A. workers to avoid duplication.

Serious insect damage to cabbage has occurred this summer. A vast amount of work needs to be done on tomato insects. The diabrotica beetle, feeding on most vegetable crops, needs first-hand attention. Thrips on beans, peas, tomatoes, onions, are of serious consequence. Wireworms continue a vexing source of loss. Flea beetles cause damage. There are some unanswered aphis-control puzzles. Freezing of vegetables calls for highest quality—leaf miners can ruin a crop of spinach. Mites of cane berries and strawberries worry growers. And so on. Problems of immediate importance.

Great progress has been made in production of new insecticides. But not much headway on methods of application. What type of equipment to use? What stickers are best? What are the most desirable diluents? Are there environmental factors, temperature, etc? Plenty more questions. Answers needed. Kill bugs effectively, economically; save food, labor, investment.

Some of these problems seem not very difficult of solution, but they need attention, and that takes men, materials, money.

Congress and the policy makers have muffed this one. Curtailment of investigational work important to food production, when need for practical answers was never greater, is poor judgment at best. Continued research to prevent bug harvesting crops would help, rather than hinder, the progress of the war. Increased grants should be made available, or transfers from non-essential activities should be made. Millions of dollars are being thrown around, much of it with reckless abandon. Let's put a few thousands, mere small change these days, to work controlling bugs. They might win the next round.

D. M. RUTHERFORD.

Peace in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Walter Lippmann is one of the best I have read on the subject.

Mr. Lippmann sees clearly in his book, United States Foreign Policy, that we must not make international commitments that we are not prepared to back up with force if necessary. He makes clear in this article the fact that if our country did not intend to be a force in the Orient we should have abandoned the Philippines long ago and that if we had abandoned them we probably would have avoided war in the Pacific; and, on the other hand, if we intended to hold our interest in the Orient we should have been prepared with adequate force and policy to maintain that position.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to take a position of vital interest in the Pacific after this war is won then we must surround that position with a firm and active policy definitely understood by all, and absolutely back up that policy by proper and adequate distribution of our fighting forces. It means the maintenance of land; sea, and air bases in the Pacific adequately equipped and manned; it means the firm occupation of the necessary lands; it means definite commitments among nations with like interests.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we will be looking down the throat of the greater east Asia coprosperity sphere for a long time to come. Nature abhors a vacuum. If we and our allies do not do that the Japs will take over.

If we wish to abandon the Pacific to the Japs, then we should get out and stay out, instead of having a timid tentacle stuck out there to get hurt. The question of policy must be decided and positive action taken one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, the peaceful people of the world must not sit back and relax again after this war is won. We must see to it that the predatory people do not get coiled to spring upon us and we must see to it that any who may prepare to attempt it are promptly and efficiently knocked out of that position before they strike. Thus may we live in peace until the millennium when the Golden Rule shall prevail on earth. Mr. Lippmann's article follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

GENERALITIES ARE NOT A POLICY

The Senators may well be right in not wishing to debate now the abstract and general proposition laid down in the Fulbright resolution. The action of the House is a clear and unimpeachable expression of public opinion, and the next step is to move from the general principle to the particular and practical application of it.

Though little attention has been paid to it as yet, something happened last week which will compel Congress to face the real issues of our foreign policy, or admit that it is not interested in them. By an agreement reached by President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, and President Quezon, a resolution has been introduced in the Senate by Mr. TYDINGS and in the House by Mr. BELL, of Missouri, to give the Philippine Islands their complete independence at any time within 30 days of the passage of the resolution. Under existing law, known as the Tydings-McDuffie Act, the Philippines become an independent sovereign state on July 4, 1946.

This action is being taken to counteract the Japanese move to set up a Quisling puppet government in Manila.

Since no one will pretend that the Philippines alone are capable of defending themselves, the question must be faced as to how the Philippines are to be defended after the United Nations have recovered them from the Japanese. Under the existing act, the United States retains its "naval reservations and fueling stations" after full independence is granted and until a treaty dealing with them has been negotiated with the Philippine government But the land and air defenses of the islands pass at once out of our hands.

It is evident that this act, which was passed in 1934, takes no account of the fact, so amply demonstrated at Hawaii and Singapore, that a navy cannot defend a naval base. It places upon the Filipinos an implied obligation to defend, though they lack the means, our naval bases; and it places us in the position where we have a naval base at a distance of 7,000 miles to which we cannot guarantee an assured defense.

Regardless of what Japanese propaganda or Filipino Quislings may make of it, this is not a statesmanlike solution of the problem. Senator TYDINGS says that we must take this action as a propaganda measure. It would be better propaganda, because far more convincing to the thoughtful, if we took the position that the effective independence of the islands must be accomplished by the formation of a reliable regime of security in the Pacific.

A Filipino who does not see that is not fit to govern an independent state. An American who does not see that is making the fatal error of creating a distant entanglement without providing the necessary means to carry out the commitment.

For what earthly good is independence to the Philippines if the United States is incapable of defending them? And how can the United States afford to retain the commitment, which the naval bases as well as considerations of humanity would entail, if no agreements have been reached which make secure the whole region in which the islands lie? We cannot withdraw entirely, and wash our hands of the Philippines, without washing our hands also of China, the Netherland Indies, Australia. The Philippines are the strategic center of that whole region. If it were our intention to leave the Far East, we need not have had a war with Japan in 1941.

On the other hand, we cannot take the tremendous risk of staying there with just enough force to get into trouble and with not enough force to be invulnerable. If Bataan and Corregidor have not burned that lesson upon our minds, we are hard to teach when it comes to foreign affairs.

The Philippine question is, therefore, inextricably bound up with the whole settlement in the Pacific and eastern Asia. If it is advisable to pass the Tydings bill now, let it be done. But let it not be done without our making it clear that we are aware of the problem and of its immense consequences. To act as if we thought the independence of the Philippines were something which could be enacted by a congressional vote would be reckless and imprudent to the last degree.

The independence of the Philippines, the kind of treaty which would have to be negotiated with the Filipinos on the subject of their defense, cannot be separated from the agreements we reach or fail to reach with all the other great powers of the Pacific. In the absence of adequate agreements with China and Russia on the Asiatic mainland, with the British and the Netherlands Empires, the United States cannot, except at exorbitant cost and danger, project its power 7,000 miles across the Pacific Ocean. To attempt to do that without even having a clear knowledge of what will be Filipino foreign policy, and Filipino military policy, would be sheer folly.

So now that the President, the Secretary of State, and President Quezon, haxe raised the question in such a way that it must be acted upon, the era when high sounding generalities could pass as a substitute for foreign policy comes abruptly to an end. It has come to its end also in Europe, and we must move now from debating abstractions to the negotiation of agreements with the other great powers.

Oil Workers Go on Record for Scientific Monetary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I include with my remarks the following very effective and thoroughly set forth resolution passed by the recent convention of the Oil Workers International Union:

PROPOSITION NO. 57 SUBMITTED BY H. L. SAVAGE, VICE PRESIDENT, LONG BEACH LOCAL NO. 128, OIL WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, C. I. O.

Whereas it is an established and self-evident fact that in order for a Nation of people to enjoy economic security and freedom, it is imperative that Government shall have the sole power to create and regulate the value of the Nation's money; and

Whereas the founding fathers of this great American Republic recognized this fact and specifically provided for the Government of the United States of America to have the sole power to create money and regulate its value by making it mandatory on Congress as provided in article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America, "To coin money, to regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures," and

Whereas among other great Americans we find that the scientific-minded Benjamin Franklin, the democratic Thomas Jefferson, the noble George Washington, the martyred Abraham Lincoln were all advocates of the powers vested in Congress, by article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is a widely known fact that Congress has violated its own oath and trust to support the Constitution by delegating to private bankers its powers to create money and regulate its value thereof; and

Whereas the private bankers, and in particular the heads of the Federal Reserve banks (private banking institutions), have abused their powers to create money and by regulating its value to destroy money as well, have caused widespread unemployment, economic chaos, loss of homes, farms, business' savings, and paved the way for world warfare; and

Whereas it is a positive matter of record that the overlords at the top of the money world deliberately planned and viciously carried out the program to cause the depression, widespread unemployment, loss of homes, farms, and savings after World War No. 1; and

Whereas the same people have the same power to do the same thing after World War No. 2 unless Congress restores to itself the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas the overlords at the top of the private banking institutions can continue to exploit the American people and the resources of this Nation so long as they have the power to create our Nation's money and regulate its value thereof; and

Whereas it is a widely known fact that our Government is compelled to borrow its own money from private institutions and pay interest tribute to private banking institutions for the use of its own money; and

Whereas the national interest-bearing debt is growing larger and larger because Congress has delegated its power to create and regulate money to private banks; and

Whereas the United States Government does not own 1 cent of stock in the Federal Reserve banks; and

Whereas even when the war is ended with full and complete victory for the United States of America and her allies there can never be a secure and lasting peace so long as a few ruthless, cold-blooded, brutal private bankers have the power to bring on a condition which will cause continued economic chaos and eventually bring about either a revolution or another world war; and

Whereas our representative form of government is in the very gravest danger of being destroyed and a dictator form of government in one of its various forms being instituted, because the intent of the blueprint for representative American democracy is being grossly violated by those sworn to uphold and defend it; and

Whereas many sincere but uninformed Americans are being seduced into embracing foreign ideologies and philosophies of economics and government due in large part to the violation of article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly necessary that American trade-unions crusade for the American ideal of living; and

Whereas American labor unions can never gain their goal or objectives by simply bargaining collectively in the matter of hours, wages, and general working conditions until Congress restores to itself the power to regulate the value of the buying power of the wages bargained for, any attempt to bring about economic security for wage earners being futile while the New York Stock Exchange and the overlords at the top of the money world set the value of the buying power of the dollars earned; and

Whereas an amazing revolution has taken place in the science of production, no change, in any way commensurate, has taken place in the financial mechanism; and

Whereas it has become increasingly necessary for the United States of America to institute a scientific, non-interest-bearing, constitutional monetary system; and

Whereas, this scientific monetary system should have its supply of money so regulated as to prevent any material decline of the domestic average wholesale commodity price; and

Whereas the Government-created money interest free at source of origin used scientifically would prevent inflation, deflation, repudiation; and

Whereas an equitable and scientific Government controlled monetary system should be based on a balance being constantly attained in order that distribution, exchange, and consumption shall keep pace with production; and

Whereas the volume of money should be increased year by year to match growth of production; and

Whereas it is an established fact that an honest, scientific, constitutional monetary system must have these essential principles:

1. It must be created and controlled by Congress.

2. It must be free from interference by politicians and private bankers.

3. It must be interest free at the source of origin and be based on the total wealth of the Nation and not on the bonds or basic metals owned by private bankers; and

Whereas one of the main contributing factors to our present unsound monetary system is the practice of the so-called fractional reserve requirements; and

Whereas in order to secure a sound monetary system it will be necessary to institute a 100-percent-reserve requirement on demand deposits held by banks, or, in other words, a dollar for dollar or 100 percent reserve being mandatory; and

Whereas it is common knowledge that many and probably a majority of the Members of Congress are ready to restore to Congress the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America when they are convinced that they have the support of their constituents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates of the Oil Workers International Union, in convention assembled at the city of Fort Worth, Tex., respectfully request Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, to immediately call upon Congress to restore to Congress the powers vested in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to immediately enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore to Congress the sole power to issue money and to regulate its value, as provided in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to immediately enact legislation to provide for non-interest-bearing, constitutional United States Government money; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to seriously consider the monetary bills introduced by Congressmen JERRY VOORHIS, PATMAN, and others, and, in particular, the following: H. R. 112, H. R. 118, H. R. 373; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to carry out the intent of the qualifying clause of article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States of America, to wit, "and regulate the value thereof," we go on record urging the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled to set up a "value stabilization committee" of its own Members, together with representatives of labor, industry, agriculture, the professions, etc., the purpose of said committee to immediately plan, devise, or work out an equitable, just, and stabilized price schedule or value on all property, goods, commodities, and services; and be it further

Resolved, That we earnestly request and we go on record urging each C. I. O. international union, each A. F. of L. national organization, each national railroad brotherhood organization, each legitimate national independent labor organization, the national executive councils of the C. I. O., A. F. of L., railroad brotherhoods, legitimate independent labor organizations to adopt this resolution and to urge immediate action on the part of Congress to carry out the intent of this resolution.

How Far Can We Go in Organizing Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject How Far Can We Go in Organizing Peace?, delivered by me in Christ Church, New York City, on September 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How far can we, the people of the United States, go in organizing peace?

The question is timely and practical. It deserves a specific and practical answer. I shall, therefore, break it into three parts. First, how far can we go within the United States? Second, how far can we go within the Western Hemisphere? Third, how far can we go on a world-wide basis? In each case the question is how far can we go toward establishing and organizing a just and lasting peace that will live and grow with us?

1. WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

Our internal stability within the United States, for years to come, will be vital not only to ourselves and as one element in world-wide stability, but also as an outstanding example of the practice of the principles we preach.

As America turns from the governmentally financed war production during her first total war to the far freer privately financed peacetime production of useful goods, she will do so under the heaviest taxes in her history and under a national bonded debt 10 times heavier than at any time before the war.

We must take these burdens in our stride. These bonds are held by every church, insurance company, bank, trustee, and practically every family in America. We must pay the interest on them. We must pay enough of their maturities to enable us to refund the rest. These bonds are evidence of our national credit. To carry on, we must produce a larger national income in real wealth than at any time before the war. We can do it, because in this war we have discovered new productive strength within us. Our stability will depend upon our use of much of this new productive strength. Our ability to do it depends, in turn, upon cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture and Government in a spirit of mutual helpfulness coupled with increased development of the resources and markets of the world.

To fail to develop such post-war prosperity would mean a shortage of food, clothing, shelter, and all sorts of goods in the midst of a world capable of producing much more than enough to meet the shortage. Such a disaster after this war, with the taxes that we have on us, would make our last depression look like comparative prosperity. It would force upon us such regimentation as would make us wonder whether we had won or lost the fight against totalitarianism.

To develop this post-war prosperity, we must have peace, stability, reasonable assurance of stability, and a readiness to develop new discoveries and opportunities. I speak in terms of aviation, radio, electric power, diesel power, automotive power, possibly atomic power, electric welding, light metals, improved housing, chemistry, chemurgy, plastics, wood, glass, soy beans, sulfa drugs, and countless other "acres of diamonds" available close at hand.

Using aviation as a specific example, we find that 3 years ago America produced $280,000,000 worth of planes; 2 years ago $1,800,000,000; 1 year ago $6,400,000,000. This year it will be $20,100,000,000. Our automobile industry at its peak produced only $4,000,000,000 of automobiles a year. I cite this not because I expect us to continue to produce 4-engine bomber planes at this rate in time of peace, but because for a short time following the day of military victory we shall have available a capacity in plants, tools, skilled workmen, skilled supervision, pilots, ground crews, and air bases sufficient to revolutionize the transportation and communication systems of civilization.

This capacity can make savings in time and money of infinite value and can open new resources and markets of equally immeasurable worth. This industry is but one of many that can develop tremendous new values if it has the opportunity to do so. It should be noted also that its greatest value lies in its longest trips. Its internal value to America depends in large part upon its world-wide success. Let us bear it in mind that this is characteristic of the opportunities of today when all the world is a neighborhood—a newly formed neighborhood full of new opportunities.

2. IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Of extreme value to us is the development of stability in the Western Hemisphere. In this hemisphere, all the nations are at peace and most of them are allies in the fight against totalitarian slavery. Improved transportation and new industrial production will increase the prosperity of the other people of North, Central, and South America in a way that will benefit both them and us if the Western Hemisphere can have peace, stability, and reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead. Under such conditions private industry will prosper in this new neighborhood "like a tree planted beside a river of water and it shall bring forth its fruit in its season."

3. WORLD-WIDE STABILITY—ITS FOUNDATIONS

This brings us to consideration of the foundations for world-wide lasting peace. It has been well said that "nations can blunder into war, they cannot blunder into peace," and I would add, much less can they blunder into a just and lasting peace that will live and grow with us. That is common sense because war is like an explosion or a disaster that can be caused by many kinds of mistakes and accidents. But peace is more like a building. It must have firm foundations, well thought-out plans, practical specifications, skillful workmanship, and after it is built, careful maintenance. First come the foundations.

The foundations must be so placed that every part contributes to the support of the rest and all must rest upon the rock of human understanding and good will toward men.

Mutual support is essential to the strength and survival of the United Nations. This became tragically clear when the sovereign, independent and freedom-loving nations of Europe one by one lost their sovereignty, independence and freedom as they attempted separately to face the assault of the enemy.

But when the last few free nations of the world, in their extremity, united their forces, the enemy was stopped and the tide of battle turned. Today the United Nations are winning in every part of the globe. On the day of final victory, the United Nations will have demonstrated their ability, when united, to establish military stability in the world for the cause of freedom and justice. Likewise, it will be clear that as long as that winning combination of the United Nations remains intact, at least that long will the military stability of the world remain secure. At least, that long there will be peace from military aggression. On the other hand, at any moment that that championship team disbands, there will be an end to the demonstrated certainty of military stability established by the war. While, thank God, it would not necessarily mean immediate war among the allies, it would end an important assurance of peace which otherwise would have existed. Any relaxation of the military unity of the United Nations introduces a new uncertainty that calls for military measures to offset it. In practical terms, every relaxation in the assured unity of the United Nations means correspondingly increased armaments or other means of defense against an unnecessary and self-created risk.

UNITED STRENGTH OF THE UNITED NATIONS

What then is the first foundation structure for lasting peace? It is the multiple arch of unity between all the United Nations. It exists now. We must continue, in some form, this assurance that the United Nations will remain united in peace as well as in war. If we can have this assurance of peace among the United Nations, including the assurance of their unity in resisting attacks from without, then we will have retained at least that degree of military stability that will have been won on the battlefields of this war. The form of this unity is not nearly as important as the fact of it. The first responsibility of the United Nations is to make sure that they as nations and their people as individuals, realize that in unity there is strength and promise of peace, but in disunity there is weakness and danger of war.

This unity is important also to the economic and social stability and development of each of the nations of the world, including our own. Unless each of us is freed from the burden of producing great quantities of nonproductive implements of war, we will find that the cost of them in taxes will handicap our industrial recovery, and that the manpower and materials needed in the production of them will be taken from the production of articles needed not only to raise the standards of life but even to supply essential human needs for food, clothing, and shelter.

THE SPECIAL VALUE OF AVIATION

If we examine further into the feasibility of maintaining military stability through the unity of the military forces of the United Nations, we find encouragement springing from the recent advances in aviation. The increased speed of travel by air will make it possible for an international air force to reach any outbreak of trouble before it can gain dangerous headway. This speed of military aviation tomorrow means as much to the prevention of war in the world of tomorrow as the speed of modern fire departments means to the prevention of conflagrations in our cities today. If a modern fire department reaches a fire at its start it can put out nearly any fire at once with a bucket of water or a single fire extinguisher. Never has it been possible until now for the forces of civilization to reach a distant danger spot until after the danger had started an international conflagration so great that generally it became necessary to let it run its course. Today, the international air force could reach practically any local explosion within less than 60 hours and long before the situation was out of control.

INTERNAL AND REGIONAL STABILITY

With this unity of the United Nations as a foundation, how far can our Nation go now in organizing peace? First, to develop our own internal stability as a local foundation for lasting peace, our Government should initiate meetings at once between industry, labor, agriculture, and Government. Those attending these meetings should devote themselves not merely to planning such postwar policies as public construction and public relief. They should devote themselves primarily to the encouragement of such type and volume of private industry and employment as will prevent the coming of the depression and thereby eliminate or reduce the number of its victims before they become its victims. The prevention of any disaster that damages its victims is far better than the relief of its victims, necessary and vital as that is.

Likewise, in our Western Hemisphere, our Nation should initiate meetings between industry, labor, agriculture, and Government. The opportunity for the development of production and prosperity is ours if we direct our efforts toward it rather than toward the restriction of individual initiative to the point where we lose the very freedom for which we fight and induce the very disease we seek to cure.

In seeking world-wide stability it is quite as important that we do not do now those many things that should not be done as it is that we do do now those several things that should be done. To this end Senate Resolution 114, introduced by Senators BALL, HATCH, HILL, and myself, advises that the Government of the United States initiate meetings among representatives of the United Nations to propose a form of organization to deal with the utilization of all resources in the prosecution of the war; the establishment of temporary administrations for the government, relief, and rehabilitation of occupied territories; the establishment of procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disagreements between nations and the provision for a United Nations military force to suppress any future attempt at military aggression by any nation. Similar meetings might also deal with such subjects as international aviation and international monetary stability that should be acted upon immediately and that need not be included in the final peace treaty. Such of these questions as will directly and seriously affect nations whose governments are now in exile and such of these questions as call for a treaty subject to constitutional ratification by two-thirds of our Senate need not be brought to formal conclusion at this time.

On the other hand, much is to be gained by establishing a method of orderly procedure in dealing even with these questions which will wait until a later date for their formal conclusion. The important thing is to go as far as we can on immediate issues and that the gate be open and the way be clear so there shall be no moment of disorder in proceeding with the rest. The declared intent of the United Nations to travel a road of peace and cooperation will lend strength to their conduct of the war and confidence to all the world that the fruits of victory this time shall be fully worth the price paid for them.

DECENTRALIZATION

In the field of international relations it is important also to recognize that many changes have taken place even within the past 20 years emphasizing the value of the decentralization of many international questions among groups of nations especially concerned with them. The Pan American Union for example is peculiarly fitted to the needs of the Western Hemisphere. Its form probably would not meet the needs of Central Europe. On the other hand, some form of association among nations of Central Europe, far closer than that among members of the Pan-American Union, might prove to be of great permanent value in separating the internal problems of that area from those of the world as a whole. In this way the problems remaining for world-wide consideration would be reduced in number and in difficulty and the organization of the United Nations of the world might be simplified.

I have spoken thus far in the practical terms of immediate and tangible objectives and I shall return in a moment to the practical steps that we may take today and tomorrow on the road toward them.

However, under the inspiration of this great forum in this Church of Christ that is dedicated to the eternities of God and Man, I cannot resist lifting your eyes and mine to a glimpse toward the distant horizons of the years, decades, and centuries ahead. Only the skyline can be seen, but it looms in magnificent proportions. If we will but turn upon it our telescopes of faith there is much for us to see. Almost in the foreground is the stern and rugged peak that guards the road beyond. It is the peak of world-wide law and order rising directly from the foothills that represent the armed forces of the United Nations in this war, uniting their great strength to form the physical foundations for the peace of the world. Beyond, to the right, we see the green summit of economic stability rising from the fertile fields of fair-trade relations, which recognize both the needs of the individual producers of the world and the benefits that come from the widespread sharing of the resources and the markets of the world. Beyond, and to the left, is the domelike peak of political stability rising like a temple of justice above the crags of national and racial conflicts and prejudices. Still further and straight ahead are the sweeping heights of a great range of innumerable peaks of social and cultural development. These mark the goal to be reached beyond the others. Finally, if we will raise our eyes to a still greater height, we can see above them all the snow-capped peak of spiritual stability. It rises like a symbol of everlasting hope above the mists of the earth into the radiant light of Heaven and over it glows the rainbow of "Peace on Earth and Good Will Toward Men."

But coming back to earth, what is the action that should be taken in Congress so that we may follow Lincoln's infallible rule for peaceful progress which is to move ahead 5 percent of the way at a time?

ACTION NEEDED

In the House of Representatives, the point of view that I have recommended is expressed in general terms by the Fulbright resolution. The early passage of this by the House would be helpful. In the Senate, this point of view is expressed in general terms by the Vandenberg-White resolution, and more clearly and fully in Senate Resolution 114. Individual support of action by the Senate and particularly by its Committee on Foreign Relations along any of these lines will be helpful. The development of popular interest in these measures is of substantial importance now and becomes increasingly important as the issues become more specific.

SENATE RESOLUTION 114

As to Senate Resolution 114, it is not its serial number, its sponsors, or its form that is important. The important thing is the taking of the steps it recommends. The important thing is that meetings of representatives of the United Nations shall take place to prepare and to submit to the United States

Senate and to the other United Nations an agreement presenting some practical program that will preserve the unity of the United Nations in peace. The issue must be lifted above all partisanship, personalities, and prejudices. There is no room on this issue to consider anything but the best interests of the United States of America as a whole. That in turn will serve the best interests of all humanity.

SOVEREIGNTY

As to the sovereignty of the United States of America and of each nation of the United Nations, this sovereignty exists in order to be used in the interest of the people from whom it is derived. One of the most important uses of sovereignty is in the making of treaties of mutual advantage to the parties to them. It is only through the international meeting of minds that the principle of peace on earth and good will toward men can be applied on the heroic scale that is now both necessary and possible since God has given men voices to speak, ears to hear, and wings to fly around the world. By virtue of these new powers, men have, for the first time, means adequate to organize the peace of the world. It is for us to prove that we are deserving of these new talents which are the evidence of God's increasing faith in man. The opportunity is ours, let us have the faith of our forefathers to develop a solution equal to the need.

In closing, I wish to tell you of a simple letter a young soldier recently wrote home to his mother.

Among other things, he said, "Please don't change the furniture in the living room, please don't change the pictures on the wall, please don't change a thing on the mantelpiece. I want to see home, when I come back, in the way I think of it and dream of it." If we just enlarge that picture, we can see that what that young soldier wants is to see America when he comes back in the way he thinks of it and dreams of it. He wants to see a land of opportunity where he and his wife and their children and their children's children can live and develop higher standards of living with peace, stability, and a reasonable assurance of stability for many years ahead, giving them a chance to work always toward their highest ideals. He wants a victory worth the price even of his own life and of the lives of his comrades.

It is for us as citizens of the United States to unite and dedicate our minds, our hearts, and our souls to the establishment of such an America that all our soldiers, sailors, and flyers who shall return to it, may find here that America of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

James E. Van Zandt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 23, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I join with my fellow Members of Congress in expressing my regret in the loss to the Congress of the services of a valuable Member.

Nothing that I can say can in any way add to the luster of the public service record which the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, retiring Member of this House, has established.

It has been my good fortune to have served with Congressman VAN ZANDT on a number of committees. More recently he and I served in the field as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, charged with the duty of investigating production in shipyards throughout the country. Our work brought us in close contact and I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the general qualities of the Congressman.

Imbued with an ardent patriotism, chafing at the bit because of his burning desire to get into the actual fight and capable by training to do so, he chose to disassociate himself from the greatest legislative body in the world in order that he might see active action. I share the opinion, which is universal amongst the Members of this House, that the resignation of Congressman VAN ZANDT from this body, while a loss to the Congress, affords to the Navy the acquisition of the services of a trained veteran naval officer.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the prayers of his many friends, that JIMMY VAN ZANDT return to us after this conflict is over, to resume a useful and constructive public career.

Address by Senator Wiley to the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by me before the Catholic Knights of Wisconsin at their convention at Beaver Dam, Wis., September 9, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Modern society is confronted with a lethal challenge. It is not the challenge of Adolf Hitler, brutal and deadly as that challenge is. It is not the challenge of the Japanese war lords, cynical and ruthless as that challenge has proven. It is the challenge of war, itself. It is the challenge which says bluntly to some 2,000,000,000 human beings who now inhabit this planet—

"Either find a way to live in peace or face the inescapable consequences."

We all know the story of that last night in the garden when Judas came out with the mob to betray the Master. We all recall that the Master said to one of His followers who tried to protect Him—

"Put up again thy sword into its place; for all that take the sword shall perish by the sword."

Christian philosophers have explained to us the difference between a just and an unjust war. They have told us that all those who take up the sword ruthlessly to impose their will on others are flouting divine justice. They have told us that against such wanton aggression, decent men and women not only have a right to defend themselves, they must defend themselves. For only if they do defend themselves can those moral values which they recognize as decent and civilized standards of conduct be perpetuated.

But if it has always been true that those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword it is now more dreadfully true than ever that whole populations shall perish with them.

This is so because modern war is total war. It mobilizes not only the young men of fighting age, it mobilizes the old men, the women, yes even the children. And since entire populations are mobilized for total conflict, entire nations and continents become battlegrounds.

Time was when the Peace of God and the Truce of God protected in a major measure the civilian populations against the ravages of war. Time was when wars were fought by small bodies of professional soldiers.

But those were times of an agrarian economy, of a handcrafts industry. They were times of simple tools, simple tools of peace and simple tools of war.

The modern machine age has changed all this. It has provided us with unprecedented power with which to produce, process and distribute the riches of the earth. It has enabled some 2,000,000,000 human beings to live on an earth which until the opening of the eighteenth century had never been able to support more than 600,000,000.

But mark this, it is the great fact of our time, only a minority of the 2,000,000,000 has direct access to the first fruits of the earth. The vast majority must depend for its livelihood on processing and distributing those riches. It must depend for its livelihood on the smooth and continuous functioning of the vast and intricate machine system of the age.

In the olden times the ravages of war destroyed only part of the annual production. In the Middle Agres the truce of God protected the peasants during the planting time and the harvest time, protected also the growing mercantile class. And the small professional armies of the later centuries spread their destruction over only limited areas. Nor did millions then live in great cities and work in great industries and in far-flung transportation systems.

But in these modern times not only are entire populations mobilized for war, but acres of great factories are razed by war, entire great cities are reduced to rubble by war, and the men, women, and children who live in them are uprooted or destroyed by war. Not only in the smooth functioning of the machine age utterly disrupted by war, the machines themselves, and the buildings which house them, the individuals who work them, are destroyed by war. The teeming and closely interdependent life of the crowded earth is shattered, atomized by modern war.

Modern man, the creator and builder of the modern machine age, has developed unprecedented tools of production. For the first time in history man has the tools in his hands with which to build a lush abundance. But these same tools in the same hands may and do become engines of an unprecedented and terrifying destruction. For the intricate and powerful tools of modern peace become with a few simple changes the powerful and devastating tools of modern war.

I need not tell this audience of a Catholic fraternal order how your present pontiff has warned of the dangers of this modern age, how he has worked untiringly for peace. I need not point out to you how he has warned that when man permits the tools of the modern world to become his master he invites his own destruction, how he has urged again and again a return to that natural order among men which rests on a recognized relationship between an all-powerful

Creator and his creatures. I need not point out to you how this national order is a Christian fraternity which has for its sanction Christian justice not only among men but among nations.

"A fundamental condition of a just and honorable peace," he tells us in his Christmas message of 1939, "is to assure the right to life and independence of all nations, large and small, strong and weak. One nation's will to live must never be tantamount to a death sentence for another."

But the nations cannot know justice, he tells us in his Christmas message of 1941, unless they recognize that higher moral law "which the Creator Himself has manifested by means of the natural order and which He has engraved with indelible characters in the hearts of men."

From this juridic order, he tells us in his Christmas message of 1942, from this natural order willed by God, "flows man's inalienable right to juridical security, and by this very fact to a definite sphere of rights, immune from all arbitrary attack."

Nor has he neglected to warn us of the dangers of the reconstruction era, dangers which are the final heritage of war and its most lethal challenge.

"We therefore regard with alarm," he says in his 1939 Christmas message, "the tremendous amount of work that will be necessary when a world tired of fighting wishes to restore peace—to break down the walls of aversion and hatred which have been built up in the heat of the strife."

We know, of course, the long history of man is a bleak and bitter record of war and the ravages of war. We know that no single century of which we have knowledge has passed without war, and often great wars, being waged. And knowing this, many sincere and well-meaning persons insist that it is mere wishful thinking to talk now of banishing war henceforth.

Let us grant the force of the historic argument. Let us even grant that we cannot hope in the present stage of development of humankind to banish war entirely But granting all this, are we then to throw up our hands in despair? Are we to mark time meekly and with bowed heads until the next war has engulfed us? Are we to do nothing while such civilization as has been passed on to us is torn to fragments about our heads?

To ask the question of free and Christian men and women is to answer it. We realize the difficulties confronting us. We realize the tremendous task we will face when this war ends. We recognize the dismaying prospect of building an order of Christian fraternity and justice on the rubble and the hatreds and the aversions of six continents.

But we realize, too, that unless we win the peace which will follow this war, this modern world of ours—this crowded, interdependent world of ours—may commit world suicide.

Mark this, however: We must recognize the validity of the historic argument at least to the extent of not indulging in wishful thinking; we must build our new world on the old world as we find it.

To do that we must recognize frankly and face openly the hatreds and distrusts and aversions which are our heritage—and our major problem. Men of good will and nations of good will can accomplish much if they face their problem with good will—and if they recognize their problem clearly.

Involved in this war against the Axis tyranny are some 30 nations, large and small. Four of them, the United States, the British Empire, Soviet Russia, and the Chinese Republic, are now bearing the brunt of it.

When war ends these major powers, and we may include emerging China as among the major powers, must bear the brunt of restoring order. If there should be disunity among the major powers, the world will once again start to break into rival armed camps and the way will be paved for a third world war. It is imperative, therefore, that these powers find common ground on which to work together in the vast task of rebuilding.

Whether such common ground may be found depends not on one or two of these powers, it depends on all of them. Or putting it the other way, since the close cooperation of all is necessary, the refusal of any of them to attempt to find such common ground will be disastrous. This is particularly true of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia which have together the modern mechanical tools of war and peace in sufficient quantity to be decisive.

It does not follow that these three or four major nations should attempt to "boss" the post-war world. On the contrary, since they are all major powers, theirs is the major task of post-war reconstruction, theirs is the major obligation of building up a new international order of law and justice and fraternal freedom. They should invite the cooperation not only of all their associates, they should invite the cooperation of all the peoples and states which pledge to work for peace and law. They should welcome a reborn France and a new Italy and finally a new Germany and a new and chastened Japan.

Nor is it necessary to build some immediate superstate to accomplish a new reign of world law. As a matter of fact, talk of such a supergovernment only creates confusion and distrust on the one hand and wishful overconfidence on the other.

We have learned to our bitter cost that mere constitutions and covenants are meaningless unless the will and purpose which give them sanction is present. We have learned to our disaster that they may well be mere facades behind which evil men may plot and scheme for war while giving ready lip service to peace.

We are not, however, without a foundation on which to build a new world order. Not only have we such lessons as we have learned from our more recent experiences, we have a well-defined system of international law and international procedure which we have inherited.

This inherited system must be revised and brought up to date. It must be made to fit modern conditions. It must recognize and accept modern imperatives. Above all, it must recognize very frankly and declare very bluntly that no nation can live unto itself alone. It must insist that all nations must live under international law and that any nation or any group within a nation which undertakes to challenge orderly international procedure shall be held to a strict and immediate accounting. Unless there is national and international "will" to insist on such fundamentals, all talk of international fraternity and justice is dangerous nonsense. This "will" results from understanding, enlightenment, and common need, and is mental and spiritual in character and not primarily political or economic.

In other words, the machinery we may devise for international post-war purposes is not nearly so important as the determination to make post-war world law itself meaningful and purposive. Modern men can make modern world law meaningful and purposive only if they reexamine the final meaning and purpose of their own lives, only if they frankly accept that higher moral law which is final sanction for all decent worldly values, only if they recognize that man has final meaning and purpose and inalienable rights because he was endowed with them by an all-powerful Creator.

The Victory Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 25, 1943.

DEAR FRIEND: A few days before I left for Washington, I received a petition bearing your name, calling on me to do everything in Congress within my power to back the Victory program.

I assure you I am working with all the energy at my command to this happy end.

Please feel free to call on me whenever I can be of service to you in the Nation's Capital.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Your Congressman,

EDWIN A. HALL.

Policing the Axis—The German Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, last spring I was asked by the Washington branch of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace to prepare an article entitled "Policing the Axis—the German Phase."

This article was prepared and made public in April 1943. Since it is of public interest, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The policing of the Axis in or for Germany presents three problems: The policing which must take place as each German-controlled land is freed of the German military and the gestapo; the policing of Germany during the period of occupation before the peace begins to operate or world organization is set up under treaty; and the policing and inspection of Germany under the terms of the peace.

Germany demanded colonies before the war started. Her theory of conquest was to get control of the sea by controlling all the land that bordered on the sea. That meant fighting out at all times from the German center. The control of Germany from a military standpoint constitutes the same military maneuver—Germany's trying to widen her size and her enemies attempting to narrow it. Thus the problem of policing Germany is an European one. It is, therefore, more simple than that of Italy or Japan. If the Axis succeeds, of course, the European

world would be run from Germany. Since Germany herself has not assumed a world-wide or hemispheric-wide war, she can be defeated in Europe, and she will be controlled as a European problem, in spite of her widespread U-boat activity. The U-boat phase of the war must end as soon as the U-boat bases become controlled or the ships destroyed.

The first phase of policing the freed territory will be complex. It should follow lines which will permit the rapid reestablishment of a civil government which the people will respect. If the first land freed is Norway, the Norwegian Government should be restored; honest Norwegian judges should be placed back on the bench, and the punishment of wrongdoers among the conquerors and the traitors should be left to these judges and their courts. Thus, France should act in the French way; Poland in the Polish way, and so on. The reason for this is two-fold: The process will build up the local governments and bring a stability that the people understand at the same time.

The Norwegian military should not operate outside Norway, or the Belgian military outside Belgium; the complex restoration must remain in the hands of the nationals whose governments have been destroyed. But these different national forces must be sanctioned and directed by a single force or a single command. The command must be the general staffs of the United Nations, or if in the war process one nation should be given supreme command of the European part of the world-wide war effort, that nation should continue to control all. Only thus can unity of action and unity of ideal be maintained.

As for Germany herself, absolute unconditional surrender is the first essential. There must be giving over of swords as a sign of defeat. There must never be any doubt in the minds of the German military about their having been whipped. There must never be a new steel-helmet organization, and the growth of the notion that the military fell because the people ceased to support it. Such a situation would simply mean disorder or civil war and would plant the seed of another war of conquest or aggression. The military force which gets control of Germany must be single in its command; and its first duty should be to overcome completely the Nazi party and Hitlerism, then set up whatever civil control can be trusted among the German people. The military should not be withdrawn for some little time after the courts are restored to administering justice and not political action. The military must remain in control until the peace force of the United Nations is operating or world organization is functioning with its ability to call on some force universally recognized. The single-purpose command must continue under one head. The great mistake in occupying Germany after the last war was made when certain districts were given over to the French, the Italian, the English, and the Americans, with no unitary control. Different methods were used in different places, making for a trading of one against the other in bargaining for the removal of the military, if not for utter confusion.

Unconditional surrender will, of course, imply practical disarmament, and the first principle of peace should rest upon the right and the duty of inspection to see that disarmament remains honest.

Adjustment from this phase of control may come as rapidly or as slowly as world organization commences to function. The world peace force, or the United Nations peace force, need not be large, but it must have definite sanction, with freedom of action under the direction of the world organization in limited spheres. Germany must be given and guaranteed the right of peaceful intercourse and trade under the Atlantic Charter theory, and the world peace force must maintain Germany's rights, as well as imposing upon her the responsibilities of observing her obligations.

Thus we move on to the third aspect of the problem of policing Germany—after peace is established and the world organization is functioning. Germany under an unconditional-surrender status may give us the characteristics essential to successful world government.

To date in international organization the world has failed because it has denied to that organization the essential factors of government. In order for any government to function properly, that government must, by its own law, administer over land and people. We can have no government unless there are land and people and organization to direct both. Give to world organization or the United Nations the responsibility of policing and inspecting Germany for a number of years, and we shall develop world government and a token force large enough to ward off aggressors wherever the aggressor may again raise his head.

That does not mean a super State. That does not mean a world force with sanction to enter any government which has not been, and is not, an aggressor against a neighbor. The United Nations' peace force will have narrow and specified duties. The power of our Federal Government in operating within the States is not great in quantity. A United States marshal represents a force, though, that is respected. His jurisdiction is greatly limited, but that does not interfere with its effectiveness. The same is true with the world or United Nations' peace force. The nations of the world need not fear this power, but the wrongdoer among them will.

The Axis Powers have proved themselves not of being unable to govern their own lands and peoples, but of being untrustworthy as neighbors. That is Germany's greatest wrong. The death and destruction which has followed that lack of trustworthiness is Germany's crime. She has lost her right to absolute freedom of action among the nations, and until the world regains confidence in her, she must be made to suffer for her wrongdoing. If this fact is recognized by all, it will not take a great force to curb her.

Bring a United Nations' peace force into operation with definite tasks and definite sanctions, and the path of peace will be assured.

Confusion and Uncertainty Among Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. MOORE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, my attention has been directed to a newspaper clipping carried under a Washington date line of August 17, 1943. This article was sent to me by a former automobile dealer, who now is a major in the Ordnance Department of the Army. I should like unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD, together with a letter which I received from the former automobile dealer, now a major in the Ordnance Department, and my answer thereto.

I am omitting names and places for the reason that I do not desire to bring reprisals upon men of business who today are engaged in all-out war effort in the interest of winning this war and men who have given up their business in order that they might be helpful in this battle for survival, but who, at the same time, after the success in the war, hope to return to business and hope to keep a government that will permit them to do so. I am placing these expressions in this RECORD with the hope that the dissemination of such sentiments as those expressed in this letter may give courage to others of such a character as is manifest by this former businessman and present major in the Ordnance Department, and that this may be an inspiration for further determination on the part of millions, to the end that business on the home front shall be preserved as is guaranteed by the Constitution.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FIGHTS STRIKE OF AUTO DEALERS—FIRMS REFUSE TO PART WITH 100,000 CARS LEFT IN STOCK—INCOME TAX DODGE—O. P. A. WANTS ALL MODELS OFF MARKET BY 1944; ORDER IGNORED

WASHINGTON, August 17.—An Office of Price Administration excutive disclosed tonight that the Nation has only 100,000 new cars left out of a stock pile of 500,000 in January 1942.

At the same time, the high-placed official revealed that O. P. A. authorities are at work on plans to end a sellers' strike caused by the refusal of dealers to part with the new machines to holders of ration certificates.

According to schedule, the O. P. A. executive declared, the 100,000 new cars were to have been exhausted by the end of 1943, leaving the country without a single new automobile for sale by January 1.

REASONS GIVEN

But with the dealers' strike now in full swing there is no indication as to when the current stock of unused cars will be wiped out, it was explained, even though O. P. A. plans to issue enough ration certificates to account for the entire 100,000 machines by the end of the year.

At least two factors are responsible for the sellers' strike, the O. P. A. official asserted. First, some dealers are reluctant to dispose of their new cars because additional sales now will put them into higher income-tax brackets.

Secondly, others have declined to sell new cars to ration-certificate holders unless the latter have old cars to trade in. The reason for this, it was pointed out, is that dealers not only can keep their sales staffs busy in the used-car field, but also can realize greater profits via trade-in sales because of the high prices prevailing in the used-automobile market.

Meantime, automobile owners eligible for new cars, themselves, prefer to sell their used machines in order to take advantage of the high market for those vehicles.

A number of methods to force dealers to sell their new cars are under contemplation, the O. P. A. executive said, although plans are yet only in the formative stage.

MAY REQUISITION CARS

The proposals include action to requisition new-car stocks where necessary, forcing re-

calcitrant dealers out of business by taking away their licenses to sell, making ration certificates mandatory, and cutting down the new-car ceiling prices.

Persons eligible for new automobiles include physicians, clergymen, dentists, public health nurses, school teachers, veterinarians, Red Cross workers, certain Federal and State officials and employees, and others, provided a car is necessary to enable them to carry out their essential duties.

The W. P. B. has insisted that after the present supply of new automobiles has been distributed no new cars will be manufactured until the end of the war.

Hon. E. H. MOORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MOORE: I respectfully refer you to the attached news item that, I assume, appeared in many other newspapers over the country.

It seems to me that this so-called O. P. A. executive should be made to understand that automobile dealers in general are just as honest and as patriotic (perhaps more so than he is) as other good citizens of our country.

To state my own case briefly, which I believe is a fair sample: In the early part of 1942 along with all other automobile dealers our business was the first to feel the effects of rationing. We did not complain, realizing that our factories had to turn to producing munitions of war.

However, many dealers liquidated their businesses, feeling that they could not survive financially without new car supplies. Some of the more courageous made their plans to stay in business throughout the duration. We hoped to retain our investments in a thoroughly legitimate field that we had built up over the years. This reasoning would probably appear traitorous to this particular O. P. A. gentleman.

Further, we had an obligation and a service to perform for the people who had bought our cars, to see to it that they kept running. We had a responsibility to our employees to continue their employment in a business that since has been called essential to the war effort and in which many of them had spent a good part of their lives and knew more about than they did other lines of work.

In the early part of 1942 some of us had large stocks or could buy from our factories stocks of new cars for future sales. Without knowing at that time what the rationing rules would be and having no buy-back guaranty from the Government or anyone else, the writer decided to invest in approximately 400 new Chevrolet cars that were available. Then as nearly as anyone could guess the end of the war, we planned the sale of these cars over a 3-year period. From the start and now we are operating on that basis. What is there unfair about it? Is that a "seller's strike" or is it good business planning which permits us to continue to serve our owners? Certainly if we had not had the courage to make the investment originally in new cars we could not have kept our service department open.

Of course, we prefer to take in trades because we make some profit on used cars under present conditions and are enabled to hold together the employees in that department of our business as well as to continue to sell transportation in used cars from us because they at least think we are honest and responsible. We have sold and will continue to sell some of our cars without trade-ins.

The question of income-tax evasion had nothing to do with our original planning or our present operation. Anyway, since when has a merchant been forced to temper his business plans and policies to assure the highest possible tax yield used to some extent, unfortunately, to assist in carrying on the Government pay roll such obviously irresponsible people as the quoted O. P. A. czar?

Do you believe that threats such as forcing recalcitrant dealers out of business by taking their licenses to sell and others in the clipping should be enforced or even permitted to be made? Has Congress really delegated this life and death authority to the O. P. A.? If so, it is time for Congress to act before it is too late.

As an honest automobile merchant among many thousands of such, and a man who voluntarily is doing what little he can for his country, I am wondering if perhaps this particular O. P. A. employee, with his peculiar thinking should not have some regulating along with so much, and in my opinion, too much in many of our lives.

I should like to have my business to go back to when the war is over.

A reply will be appreciated.

Very respectfully,

——— ———.

I have your esteemed favor of September 25, enclosing a newspaper clipping of the International News Service under a Washington date line of August 17. This article quotes a high-placed O. P. A. official and has to do with the conduct of the sale of cars by all automobile dealers throughout the country. It reveals to the mind of the O. P. A. authority a sellers' strike caused by the refusal of the dealers to part with their new machines to the holders of ration certificates. It complains that there is now no indication as to when the current stock of unused cars will be wiped out and indicates the great disappointment of the O. P. A. plans that they will not be wiped out by the end of the year 1943.

The O. P. A. has discovered that the reluctance on the part of dealers is probably due to a desire on their part to avoid being placed in higher income tax brackets. The O. P. A. has also discovered that some will not sell their cars to those holding ration certificates unless they have old cars to trade in. It has also been discovered by the O. P. A. that the reason used cars are kept in stock is that the dealers may keep their staffs busy in the used car field and may realize profits in trade-in sales because of the high prices prevailing on the used automobile market. It develops, according to the O. P. A. authority, that those eligible for new cars may sell their own used cars in an active used car market.

The O. P. A. discloses that it has in contemplation plans that as yet are in the formative stage to deal with automobile salesmen, such as action to requisition new car stocks where necessary, taking away their licenses to sell, making ration certificates mandatory, and cutting down new car ceiling prices.

It is understood also that after the present supply of new automobiles has been distributed, there will be no others manufactured until after the war. Having accomplished these purposes, as contemplated in the formative plan, the automobile dealers will then be entirely out of business. To the O. P. A. and to the bureaucratic mind generally, this seems to be a desirable thing. It seems to them that the more businesses that can be destroyed under the cloak of war necessities, the simpler it will be to socialize all businesses in this country.

It is legitimate for men to conduct their business along such lines as will minimize the tax burden. It is recognized that taxation can be made so burdensome that it will become confiscatory. The courts have upheld the right of businessmen to do all legitimate things in avoidance of excessive and ruinous taxes. The business mind in this country has never found fault with one who has supplied himself with stocks of goods to meet a contemplated market, and he who has been courageous enough and forethoughtful enough to so supply himself and who does find a ready market for the future, has usually been commended and rewarded by such practices. If he has made a mistake, the businessman has always had the courage to pay the penalty for such mistakes. He, therefore, should be entitled to the reward that his move proved to be wise. That wouldn't conform to the kind of thinking of our bureaucrats, but the bureaucrats are wasters and the businessmen are producers. The bureaucrats are theoretical and impractical, while the businessman is realistic and understanding. It is the business and business practices, and all forms of free enterprise in this country that have made it what it is. If it hadn't been for the good sense and sound thinking of the businessmen, the war effort would have bogged down in chaotic despair. The businessmen and the business interests, and the free enterprise system, should be entitled to an everlasting debt of gratitude of the whole world for its work done, and done in spite of the interferences and hindrances of American bureaucrats. These bureaucrats are the product of the socialistic, communistic Roosevelt administration, ably directed by the Frankfurters, Rosenmans, Lehmans, Hopkinses, and others constituting what is generally understood as the "palace guard."

We shall win this war and the credit for winning it will be due to the private enterprise system and its determination in spite of all the irritations and annoyances by bureaucrats in all the activities of the people. The American people still believe in business, and believe in it as conducted under the capitalistic system. This belief is shared by those today who make up the fighting forces of our country. We can depend upon them to become an invincible force against the onrush of socialism initiated in the last decade by the ruling classes of the present regime. This invincible spirit of the American people is not crushed, and the invincibility of the New Deal administration will be as completely exploded as that of the supermen and dictators of the aggressor nations. This spirit will rise and manifest its power at the first opportunity the American people have to express themselves.

The character of the smear article that you refer to is typical of the propaganda against business, and it is the most contemptible of tactics ever foisted upon a free people. The experience related by you is applicable to hundreds of thousands of other people in your line of business, as well as in many other lines of business. The intelligent and determined resolution of business itself to handle the great business of war in a business way gives us assurance of a successful termination of the war, the preservation of peace, and the return to constitutional government. We shall yet become a great people with a character that all peoples will want to emulate in the future as they have in the past. When we shall have restored our Government to the people and to the institutions provided by the Constitution, the New Deal will be remembered only as a bad dream.

You ask, "Has Congress really delegated this life and death authority to the O. P. A.?" This is a pertinent question. In answering it we must remember the people can have the kind of government they want. They can choose between state socialism or constitutional government. If they choose the latter, they will see to it that such men are sent to Congress as represent the will of the people. Congress has abdicated its responsibility, but the people have a right, and as yet an opportunity, to change that—I have every confidence they will exercise that right.

With kindest regards, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

E. H. MOORE.

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. President, as additional reasons to show why the people are confused and uncertain, and why they lack confidence in their Government, I read what the President stated in his recent message to Congress. He said:

> Since the outbreak of the war in Europe, we have increased our output of petroleum by 66 percent.

This shocked the oil industry and all others who are familiar with our domestic oil problems. It is not known on what basis the President's calculations were made, but it is safe to say that the members of the industry can find no figures that will produce any such results. The President has been misled either by those wholly ignorant of the facts or by those who seek to conceal the true facts. As a total refutation of the accuracy of the President's statement, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have had prepared with reference to the present status of the oil industry.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech which I made, which was broadcast over the Columbia network on the program Congress Speaks, under date of August 10, 1943, from Tulsa, Okla., because I think it pertinent and apropos to the consideration of these matters that are of such vital importance to the people throughout the country.

It is well known that since 1938 there has been an alarming decline in the discovery of new fields. According to estimates of the Petroleum Administrator for War, the industry is credited with the discovery of new fields in 1938 containing recoverable reserves of 1,894,000,000 barrels; in 1939, 943,000,000 barrels; in 1940, 945,000,000 barrels; in 1941, 361,000,000; and in 1942, 317,000,000 barrels; or a decline over the 5-year period of approximately 84 percent. During the same period the total annual production increased from 1,214,000,000 to 1,385,000,000, but it is obvious that, in view of the severe decline in the discovery of new reserves, a substantial portion of our 1942 production was the result of heavy withdrawals from reserves discovered prior to 1938.

On August 1, 1941, the industry was drilling 3,605 wells, as compared with 2,391 drilling wells on August 1, 1943—a decline of over 33⅓ percent. During December 1940 there was an average weekly completion of 476 wells as compared to 273 wells for the month of December 1942, or a decline of approximately 43 percent.

On January 1, 1941, inventories of crude petroleum and products on hand showed 570,000,000 barrels. On January 1, 1942, inventories had dropped to 560,000,000 barrels, and on January 1, 1943, to 500,000,000 barrels. The industry now estimates that by January 1944, total crude and petroleum products inventories will have dropped to 435,000,000 barrels, with an anticipated increase in demand for the first quarter of 1944 of 500,000 barrels per day for crude petroleum, creating an all-time high demand of 5,000,000 barrels of crude per day.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America has pointed out that the Bureau of Mines figures indicate an approximate increase of crude production since the outbreak of the war in Europe of approximately 17 percent, but everyone in the industry knows that the increase has been largely due to stepped-up withdrawals from the older fields and not from new discoveries.

On February 27 of this year, the American Petroleum Institute announced that the total estimated known underground reserves of petroleum, as of December 31, 1942, were estimated at 20,082,793,000 barrels, which was an increase of 1,878,976,000 barrels over the estimated known reserves at the close of 1941; but, at the same time, the institute stressed two important factors; first, that 1,618,925,000 barrels of the increase was attributable to additional development in old fields, leaving 260,051,000 barrels attributable to new fields, which compares with the average estimate of 559,243,000 barrels for each of the past 5 years, and second, that the availability of the known reserves was dependent upon the rate of production. The report of the institute's committee warned that—

> As a matter of fact today's known oil can be recovered only over a period of many years and at gradually declining rates, as has been widely demonstrated by past performance under all kinds of operating conditions.

A possible explanation of the President's statement might be found if the month of August 1939 were used as a basis of comparison with current production. Such comparison is wholly inaccurate and misleading. Practically the entire production of petroleum in the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Kansas, New Mexico, and Arkansas was shut in by orders of the State regulatory bodies during the last 15 days of the month of August 1939. This unprecedented shut-in was due to economic conditions existing in the industry and would afford no basis of comparison with normal productive periods.

Petroleum is essential to winning the war. Petroleum is as essential as guns, ammunition, and manpower. A mobile army is dependent upon petroleum and its products. The continued denial of a fair price for oil by the bureaucrats is another example of New Deal incompetency and bungling. The people are about fed up with such nonsense. The condition existing in the oil business is what happens to all industry when bureaucratic control displaces private enterprise.

I have full confidence that we will discover additional petroleum reserves sufficient for our domestic and wartime purposes. All the oil industry needs is a fair price for its production and relief from bureaucratic control.

If I speak on this program for Congress, I speak for the people. This is a people's government, and they can keep it a people's government. They have a right to govern themselves, and I think they will exercise that right.

Those who wrote the Constitution knew that the people's government might be seized by those entrusted with power. They knew that this power might be abused. They were just fresh from an experience of living under the rule of a king. The people had been regimented, and their every activity had been interfered with, just as they are today. So this great charter of government was devised, and it guaranteed a people's government. It guaranteed the maximum of individual liberties to the people and constituted a beneficent government. Individual liberty and freedom and opportunity were safeguarded, and the State itself could not deprive the people of these liberties and freedoms. It carried out the principle that men are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Government was divided into three branches, each independent of the other and a check upon the other. The powers granted to the Federal Government were limited, and all other powers were reserved to the individual States.

Members of the Congress were to be elected by the people of the States, under laws provided by the States. The term of office was fixed and the qualifications were set up. This could not be deviated from except as the people amended their Constitution.

The Constitution provided for a Supreme Court and authorized Congress to create other courts, if and when needed.

It provided for a President to be elected, and his qualifications and tenure of office were fixed.

Congress was given the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, to levy and collect taxes, and to authorize expenditures from the taxpayers' money, and Congress was given the sole power in this respect. No one else had any such power. It was assumed that the people would insist that Congress not abuse this power, as Congress was immediately responsive to the will of the people.

The Constitution also gave to Congress the power of impeachment and removal from office of members of the executive and judicial branches of the Government, for misbehavior in office. The procedure for trial and impeachment seemed to guarantee against an abuse of that power.

It seems, therefore, that the people could not lose their Government or their power to govern themselves unless they just wanted to lose it I don't believe they will lose it.

We read in a nationally circulated magazine a statement by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, a very distinguished, honorable, and experienced statesman a Member of the United States Senate during all of the Roosevelt administration, a man who is a scholar, experienced in business, a great American patriot, and one in whom the people of the country have a supreme confidence. We might be frightened by the question he poses: "Are we losing our freedom?" If we are losing our freedom, it is by usurpation by the executive branch of the Government of the powers of Congress.

Senator BYRD carries the thought throughout his article that Members of Congress want to give the people the kind of government they want. I don't think that a Member of Congress should wait upon the people to direct him, but I think the Congressman should advise with the people, and should lead the people in the direction that their rights will be safeguarded. He was elected to represent them because they thought he was qualified to understand and act in their interests.

The people now know that Congress has vested too much power in the President, and that Congress was remiss in its duties when it allowed the executive branch of the Government to become so powerful through the building of a bureaucracy which has become a substitute for constitutional government. Congress must accept the blame. It abdicated, to the great detriment and injury of the country. The people know that now, and in the last election defeated

many Members in both Houses who had become mere rubber stamps for the executive branch of the Government.

The people know that the Senate never rejected the executive appointment of one of those defeated Congressmen whose name has been sent to it for confirmation. The people did not think these men ought to be given another place in the Government when they defeated them at an election on a fundamental issue in government. These repudiated Members of Congress have been appointed to govern over vast activities of the people. This has destroyed the people's confidence in the Government, and that is one of the fundamental things wrong with our country today. Senator BYRD says that the people do not necessarily need to defeat these Congressmen for failing in their duties but they should give them new directions. I believe the people will defeat them. They won't trust them. They should not trust them. It won't make any difference to the people what party they belong to. They are not going to be concerned about party when the issues are so important.

Another very distinguished Senator, Senator O'MAHONEY, says in a recent magazine article: "America is being made over", made over by Executive decree, and these decrees have reached nearly 4,000 during the Roosevelt administration. This number about equals all of the laws passed in that period of time. These decrees are contrary to the limitations fixed by the Constitution. Congress failed to do its duty when it delegated such power to the executive branch of the Government.

Senator O'MAHONEY says that "Congress has entered the executive agencies' calculations only when funds were needed" and when funds were denied, these executive agencies, without authority of law, circumvented Congress. He cites an instance when Congress refused to make an appropriation for a downtown office building in Washington, but the building was put up and paid for from a fund that had been provided through a blank-check practice on the part of Congress. Through this means, Government funds to the amount of $890,000 were spent for this building which was built after Congress had denied its authorization.

Yes; we need new Congressmen who have a different concept of duty than those who have failed the people. Congressmen, who have either supported or acquiesced in the practice that has been going on in our Government during the last 10 years should and, I believe, will be defeated.

The people are more concerned about losing their Government at home than they are about winning the war. Of course, everybody knows we will win the war; that is not a subject for discussion. Our generals, admirals, officers, and all of the boys in our fighting forces are winning it. Of course we will win it, and of course everybody wants to win it as soon as possible, and of course they want the kind of peace that will insure, as far as possible, against a repetition of war.

The people are terrorized by tyrannical, dictatorial bureaucrats, hindering their efforts in every kind of business. We have the much-titled Harold Ickes, with brazen effrontery, stating publicly that he is a bureaucrat and that it is not the bureaucrats and New Dealers who have been running this war, but the dollar-a-year businessmen, and that those who think the war effort is being bungled should blame them. He mentions men like Knudsen, Nelson, Stettinius, and many other able men of business. This is obnoxious and disgusting. These New Deal bureaucrats have done everything within their limited capabilities to hinder the war effort. Ickes, himself, is one of the most flagrant examples of this New Deal, bureaucratic type. In a book, either written by himself or by someone else for him, he calls himself "the old curmudgeon," which probably signifies that he is a miser for power.

The President has vested in Ickes the management and control of the oil industry, and nothing could have been done, that we can think of, that would have constituted a more inane and senseless conduct of a business. It has resulted in a shortage of crude oil, a vital war material for this country in its peace economy as well. Ickes sounds off with statements that are inane, meaningless, ill-considered, and unreliable. He talks about the wealth of the country now running into the trillions, with each man, woman, and child worth about $89,000, represented mostly by undiscovered and unmined coal.

This "old curmudgeon" has been vested with the administration of some 18 agencies of government. Nobody understands how the President expected him to hover over all of these agencies. It reminds one of the story of Lincoln about a boy who reported to his mother that he had put 40 eggs under a hen and that he did it just to see her spread herself. This comparison between these two hens will probably be understood by all, unless it is the economists and theorists in the departments in Washington.

Ickes wants control of the oil industry. He has not been sincere in this matter of trying to obtain an increased price on crude oil. Andy Rowley, oil editor of the Tulsa (Okla.) Daily Tribune, one of the leading newspapers in the Midwest, is an authority on the oil industry. For a number of years he was editor of the Oil and Gas Journal, which is the oil man's bible, and has an international circulation. Speaking from his memorandum more than 2 years ago, the Phillips Petroleum Co. requested permission to increase the price it paid for crude. Oil men throughout the country supported this request and no one opposed it. Data was supplied to establish its justification, but the "old curmudgeon" was discourteous to all who tried to discuss with him these matters. He was not only discourteous, but positively insulting to men who had traveled throughout the length and breadth of this country to aid him. But he is not receptive to aid. He is a dictator in spirit and an ignoramus in practice. He made a recommendation to Prentiss Brown for an advance in the price of crude oil but he made this recommendation as a gesture and just a day before the President issued his freezing order on prices and wages. He had had 2 years in which to be advised, but you can't advise a man like that. He is past hope. When he recommended the price of crude oil be advanced he knew it would not be, and he knows now that it won't be. He is not on the level at all.

The obsession with Ickes to take over the oil industry is not new. It dates back to 1933, when he was appointed czar of the petroleum industry under the now defunct N. R. A. The oil business was the only big business placed under separate control of a Government official outside of the N. R. A. Nathan R. Margold, an attorney from the East Side of New York, was made Chairman of the Federal Oil Conservation Board, which was the agency running the oil industry. Margold was then, and still is, Solicitor of the Interior Department under "the old curmudgeon." One of Margold's first actions was to set up a work sheet of control of the entire petroleum industry, with himself as head. He asked oil men how much Walter C. Teagle, then president of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) made a year. When told Teagle's salary was $125,000 a year, Margold is reported to have said: "Well, if Teagle makes that much for running one oil company, I should get more for running the whole industry." On his work sheet was a staff of 15 lawyers which Margold would pick. Margold was working under Ickes then, and still is. Margold denied he ever prepared such a work sheet but prominent oil men were shown it and discussed it with Margold. It can be documented so as to show it to be an undeniable fact.

Now, in view of this, who would believe Ickes? I am positive of what I am saying. It is well known to informed men in the industry. Of course he is now being appeased because of his power and because of fear of reprisals that it is the policy of the New Deal bureaucrats to practice against the taxpayers of the country. These tyrants are not moved by any efforts at appeasement. The only salvation for this country is to get rid of them and we will depend upon the people that this may be done.

Such things as I have recited not only affect the oil business, but the farming and stock-raising business, and all other business activities of the people. The people are talking about them, they will keep on talking about them, and they will act when they have an opportunity.

Increased Food Production—Availability of Farm Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the increased food production being asked for, accompanied as it is by dire lack of farm machinery, leads me to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from R. A. Lathrop, secretary-treasurer of the North Dakota Implement Dealers' Association, on the subject of the availability of farm machinery.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA IMPLEMENT
DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Hope, N. Dak.

Mr. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. JONES: We wish to present some phases of the 1944 food production program, particularly as it applies to the farm equipment situation in this State. Our farmers are being asked to greatly increase their acreage, the report being that our 1944 quota will be 10,000,000 acres of wheat alone. That is second only to Kansas, and two to three times that of the other wheat-producing States.

The program should not rest only upon added acres, but also upon increased yield per acre. To accomplish this with run-down equipment is a long-shot gamble in this State where (outside of eastern 20 percent) we have to raise crops with less than needed rainfall. The purchases of the past 2 years have centered on replacing the power-producing and grain-saving machines, especially tractors and combines. That was no doubt good policy, as the lack of funds, due to the drought of the 1930 decade, made it impossible for the farmer to make all needed replacements, even if machinery had been available.

Even yet there are many 10- to 20-year-old tractors on the farms, and still a shortage

of combines. However, the immediate problem, as we see it, is to provide tractor plows, and to make sure that grain drills will be provided for 1944.

While preparing this letter we went out on the street and asked the first 12 farmers we met the ages of their plows and drills. The average was 13 and 16 respectively, and this area was not quite as badly hit by the drought as was two-thirds of the State.

The foundation of our 1944 crop should be good plowing this fall and good drilling next spring, to get the grain down to the subsurface moisture. This is the only assurance of even a fair crop, unless it happens to be a very wet year, which is the exception rather than the rule. Whether we do a real good job may make a difference of from fifty to one hundred millions of bushels in the total of our crops.

Even though North Dakota is so regarded, it is not a wheat State, as 60 percent of our acreage is in other crops. We rank first in rye and flax, are tied for first in barley, in hay acreage we equal Illinois, we are sixth in potatoes, and raise 70 percent as many acres of corn as Michigan. Outside of flax all our crops enter directly (or indirectly via livestock) into the food picture. To show that we do have some livestock, in the worst drought year we had to reduce our cattle population by 900,000 head. So it may be seen that North Dakota is really an important factor in the food production program.

While it is the writer's job to try and advance the interests of the retail farm equipment dealer, as to this particular problem my first thought is that our State's response to Uncle Sam's call for more food shall be 100 percent. The sale of two or three extra plows and drills per dealer will not greatly affect their welfare, but, as we have already stated, it may make a very great difference in the total food production of our State.

The immediate need, as we see it, is that tractor plows in sufficient quantity be immediately shipped to North Dakota, to assure a good foundation for our 1944 crop—and plowing is just that. Also, that our farmers be assured that they will get sufficient grain drills to properly plant the acres they do prepare. A careful investigation should be at once made as to the condition of all the different machines that enter into the growing and processing of our crops, and that they will be available when needed. The situation in this State is abnormal, due to low replacements during the 1930 decade. Fortunately, the farmers are now in financial condition so that they can make the necessary replacements, if permitted to do so. And, they may be safely trusted to buy only such equipment as they do need.

Let's make sure that the supply of farm equipment is balanced to the requirements for growing the crops most essential to the winning of the war—and of a worth-while peace.

Very truly yours,

R. A. LATHROP,
Secretary-Treasurer.

A Challenge to Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address entitled "A Challenge to Americanism," delivered by Henry J. Taylor, author of Men in Motion, before the Indiana Republican Editorial Association at French Lick Springs, Ind., on September 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Fellow Republicans, fellow working members of the press:

In February 1918 an important event occurred for the State of Indiana, the Republican Party and the Nation. Will H. Hays was elected chairman of the Republican National Committee. The House and Senate were overwhelmingly Democratic at that time and the war with Germany was at its height.

All the Democratic horses were being paraded back and forth in the middle of the stream. The rivers were flowing and overflowing with worthies and semiworthies who seemed to base their claims for continued acceptance on the thesis that having gotten into the middle of the stream they were so far unable to cross it.

But even our glorious victories overseas were not enough to redeem these water-soaked equine against the forthright and straightforward campaign for better government conducted by an honest man from Sullivan, Ind.

At the height of our war victories, at a moment when all the world echoed the name of a Democratic President who was considered indispensable both in war and in the coming peace, at a moment when the country rocked with one victory after another, in fact, as you know, within 1 week of the victorious armistice itself, the Republican campaign resulted in the election of a Republican majority in both the House and the United States Senate.

Now, what was the magic of Will Hays' campaign? I believe Mr. Hays would be the first to admit that there was no magic at all. But there was truth, intelligence, forthrightness, and burning desire to let the people speak again and have their way.

Seeing the obvious parallel between our situation today and the problem 25 years ago, and in coming to this meeting in French Lick, I have gone back over the record of that campaign. Here, for example, is something Will Hayes said in a speech to the Michigan Republican State Convention in Grand Rapids in this same month of the year 25 years ago—September 1918. I quote him: "There always should be in American affairs at least two great parties, both strong and vigorous. But I insist that our politics be open and acknowledged and on a plane and of a character that needs no substitute, and that there be no politics in anything that touches the war.

"Has it occurred to you, my friends," he said, "what it means to the country's cause for the minority party to make it its one chief business to try to excel the majority party in support of the war? Have you estimated what it means for the sake of that cause for the minority party to strive continually to outdo the party in power in every war activity and actually to lead in its unqualified support of all war measures? This is the mission of the Republican Party at the moment," said Mr. Hays in 1918. "It is its high privilege and duty."

How could those words of September 1918 be more appropriate than they are for September 1943? And how could it be more clear that if we are equally forthright today, equally clear-minded in our recognition that we must be an opposition party, act like one, talk like one, and fight like one, we can serve this Nation as it will be served in no other way! It is simply not politically true that we have to endorse our opposition to beat our opposition. I do not notice our opposition endorsing us!

I believe we can take in new hands the determination of the necessary changes to preserve the principles of freedom and individual self-faith that our national traditions requires, and I believe that we must do so or we cannot win this war and safeguard the peace in the American manner. For our Government today is Europeanized. We are not changing a personality, we are changing a basic philosophy of government. Communism is the red, fascism is the black. We are shepherded into a blending. We are both reddish and blackish. We are a brown. For the fundamentals of the Government idea brought forward in our country, and now to be expanded from here, were already prepared in a combination of the polyglot doctrines of Europe.

For 10 years, in the name of a strong personality, our national socialists have practiced in wider and wider measures a strange mixture of sheer opportunism, emotional economics, and reckless adventure along with a hard-headed political program of making the labor unions and farmers of our Nation so dependent on special favors from them, that they could control both of these two groups and thus maintain themselves in power indefinitely.

In this, from the very beginning, they have performed a profound disservice. For one of the political venoms communicated from abroad is that even America now wonders whether democracy will work. We are losing faith in our system at home while we battle the system of our mortal enemies abroad.

The first desire of the human heart is to find something on which to lean. And this is the desire which is capitalized by Europe's totalitarians and America's national socialist leaders alike.

Thus, while Europe's totalitarians cut a cruel and violent gash in the very web of civilization itself, America's national socialist New Dealers perform a sad unraveling. For civilization rests upon individual self-faith. Civilization is first and foremost an individual thing. Without the worship of truth, rooted in the action of its leaders, and depending on the individual faith of its citizens, no government can exercise national virtue, and no war or peace can have a truly moral basis.

Neither rhetoric nor clever conditioning of the public mind, nor brilliant formulas which disguise a group's plans while this is being done, not even the goodness of the cause which is disguised, can maintain the edifice. The ultimate ground on which the strength of the nation rests is the spiritual quality within the people and their confidence in themselves, and in the integrity of their government. Integrity is what upholds all and the whole is menaced whenever the government sets that example.

In our present government the separation of enlightenment and virtue, the separation of thought and conscience, was at the bottom of America's failure in any way to direct the world toward peace from the time Hitler came to power in 1933 to the outbreak of war in 1939. As our leaders pressed their views and expanded their words and promises at home, they fell further and further away from the ability to enforce any peace abroad.

For 6 years, while the world smoldered, ready to burn under the torch of the madman Hitler and the historic flame of pan-Germanism, knowing and being warned by such men as Mr. Hull, that war was coming, our National Socialist leaders still tampered with the spiritual and intellectual honesty of our Nation.

Our Government was run then, as it is now, by a small group thoroughly familiar with the power that such organization gives

for the attainment and retention of influence and position. The tongue and pen were the cogs of the machine, just as they are today. A masterly camouflage of spoken morality was daubed over the grim reality of partisan politics. Side by side with the misuse of speech, they entered into their vast pretense of "making democracy work."

These men did not operate for democracy, for their measures and orders, their appointments to the judiciary, their witch hunts and purges, were the antithesis of any confidence in democracy. They operated for the purpose of ruling the Nation as they—in their wisdom—saw fit. They pursued the same program which led to such bitter trouble abroad—the elaborate suppression of facts and the doctrine of hate to suit a secret policy.

Are these men competent to conclude this war in justice to the American people, and to conclude the peace in justice to the world? That is a fair and honorable test, more important than ever in wartime, mercilessly exact. The answer is a clear and roaring, "No."

I have just come from Charlottesville, Va., to debate there at the University of Virginia, "America's Town Meeting of the Air," "Should the Atlantic Charter Be the Basis for the Peace?" If the Republican Party will take these men at their word, and point alone at the eight clauses of the Atlantic Charter, clause by clause, the bankruptcy of even foreign policy—a policy which, as far as I can see, is nonexistent, uncontrollable, and unlimited—can be and should be mercilessly exposed in the interests of our people and in the interests of a lasting peace for the world.

The preliminaries to a lasting peace are confidence and integrity. This greatest of all nations is without these two qualities in its leadership today.

Turning to our position at home, these 1943 horses who are in the middle of the stream clutch the banner of liberalism and wave it hard on high.

Now, you know as well as I do that the term "liberal" has grown so out of hand that an honest use of it is impossible.

Like many of your friends and mine, I have long since stopped saying I am a liberal. I answer that I am an American and let it go at that.

National socialists stole the liberal label and falsified the concept.

It is typical of national socialism that it calls itself liberal when it is, in fact, reactionary. It is reactionary because it turns back the course of man's advance to the liberal social order which it seeks to overthrow. Its enemies are Chatham and Burke, Fox and Pitt, Palmerston and Cobden, Bright and Gladstone, and, on our side of the Atlantic, Washington and Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Clay, Webster, Lincoln. Where in all history can be found a group of names like these, and in what teachings have there been more fruitful influences in the thoughts and institutions of mankind?

Instead, there had been various sorts of incompetents, like Karl Marx, preaching the doctrine of national socialism for the better part of a hundred years. But they were not listened to until the sudden growth and distortion of the mechanistic network, when new industrial, social and economic problems began to force us with such force and in such a bewildering manner that, separated from the good earth, we hesitated to act in terms of what had, since the early immigrations to America, been the fundamental, underlying convictions of free people.

History will never forgive America's national socialists for having used their opportunities in abusive ways which led to weakness and cleverness when mankind all over the world had so much at stake in an American example of sobriety, stability, and integrity.

If our national socialists were honest with us, and with the world we seek to help, they would agree that it is moral principles, and moral principles alone, by which any individual's accomplishment should be tested. But they are herd-minded and they have a special interest in the advancement of national socialism.

Second to the exposure of our foreign policy, how can we fail to expose the fact that the struggle of the Republican Party is really the struggle for freedom in this of all countries from which the best hope for freedom must come. This issue is profound, and it is our issue, for the responsibility rests on us as it has rested on others at earlier times in the history of the world.

The Roman Republic rose against the despotic world as America rose against the religious and economic limitations of Europe. The banner of freedom passed from tired Athens to Rome, for the early Roman Empire was a republic, res publica, a public affair, the product of the Hellenic idea of freedom—the rights of individuals against arbitrariness.

Rome occupied the successive states of the Asiatic Middle East, but this Asiatic world gradually stifled the spirit of Roman freedom and Rome's political spiders did the rest. The process was similar in its extension from Sulla to Diocletian—a transition to rule by appointment, to absolutism, to tyranny, and to the downfall of Roman freedom.

But at the moment when freedom seemed to die and Roman citizens were converted into subjects of the Caesars a profound agitation broke upon the distracted world from Palestine. To redeem and liberate an enslaved and despairing humanity with a new Gospel of God, Jesus walked among men.

As a shining light, the Gospel revealed the principle that each human soul comes into existence once, is unique, immortal, and that the will is free, and through its action man shapes his destiny on earth and in the hereafter. The idea of man, the concept of freedom and personality, was reawakened by Christianity just when state omnipotence had reached its highest development, and the struggle of Christianity is still against all who see the future of man in terms of government omnipotence.

We have the resources and the temperament for our greatness. But they are ours. They were not free to us, and they are not free to squander. They are not common property. An honorable state cannot give them away because they do not belong to the state. They belong to us.

America is incomparably better off than the rest of the world, and it is the solemn duty, the prime duty, of our Government to see that we remain so. We obtained this position by coming here in the first place, then working hard and honorably after we got here.

We have been fortunate in our location. But, remember, we made our location. It was not delivered to us. Our blessings did not come easily.

From the days of the first immigrants, through the days of Concord and Lexington, of the wilderness of Indiana, from the days of the Great Lakes, the days of the new California, and the great Pacific Northwest, through the tragedy of the last war and of this one, we have built our Nation with more idealism and less greed than any people on earth. It has been a long and difficult struggle, the combined struggle of a great and successive body of free men. It has been a continuing process.

The result: America is the greatest Nation on earth. How true you find that as soon as you leave our shores. As a people, we are more productive, we ask less and give more, we are more generous and more open-minded, more tolerant and more forgiving, than any group on earth. Our men are the most versatile, our women the most beautiful and free, our children the best educated. As a nation we are plagued by neither infancy nor old age. From the banks of the Wabash to the waters of both seas, we want only to work and play, live honestly, love deeply, and die in our time.

Our hopes may not be important to national socialist officeholders. But our hopes are important to us. We cannot live in debt, and many of us never have. We cannot take on obligations for others until we have fulfilled our own. Neither can our country.

It is difficult at best for most of us to make our way and provide for our families. We have no surplus. We have no certainty of our future. We have great problems, great sadnesses. It will take us generations to overcome the mistakes already made at home, and to overcome the effects of this war.

We shall be faced by every sort of readjustment, deep privations. We must provide for the returning American soldiers, for the desperate and the wounded of our own land. We must work tirelessly to regain our solvency and to recompense the huge drain on every resource we have. In this alone we face the greatest task in our history. We are in no position to lift the standard of living in China, in Russia, among 400,000,000 impoverished people on the overpopulated peninsula of Europe, no matter how desirable that may be. One hundred and thirty million Americans are in no position to do this, and there is no possibility whatever of our succeeding in the attempt. There are a hundred places to start and no place to stop. We simply descend into the morass of repudiation or continual war. Our citizens deserve a better destiny than that.

In the process of our national life we have already been incredibly charitable to the rest of the world. We have asked no thanks for this, and sometimes it seems as though we have received none. But the record stands. We need not be ashamed of our generosity to the rest of the world.

The obligation to assist toward a better world and the value in doing so are obvious. Who does not know that? Our duty is to be useful, however, not according to our desires but according to our powers.

Our national socialists' idea is that our Government promises to arrange freedom and prosperity for the people of the world. This is a thoughtless undertaking—how thoughtless no one knows. Yet this airy and fatuous approach to the reality of the world is promulgated at the very time when the solemn and high purpose of the United States should be to have the people of all the world believe in us—what we say, what we do, and what we intend to do.

On the narrower question alone, the question of freedom from want—anyone must know that the politicians, good and bad, of each and every country of the world will be pulling on us in a tug-of-war to get the most out of America's international W. P. A., exactly as our local mayors camped in Washington to get the most out of the "don't change artists" disastrous, boondoggling W. P. A. at home. The "middle of the streamers" who do not want to be changed are referring to at least a billion people, most of them in primitive surroundings, and 400,000,000 of them in the Europe I have attempted to describe. Will they succeed? Their promise in the name of the United States is utterly fantastic.

Yet the Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal of England, representative of the Inter-Allied Committee on Post-War Requirements, announced in the House of Lords that the United States Government had already requested from all Allied Governments and governments in exile estimates of their food, clothing, and housing needs for the first 18 months after the war was over, along with supplementary lists of raw materials, machinery, and industrial goods which all these various countries of the world will need.

The Viscount Cranborne, says the Associated Press, reminded the House of Lords that, while Prime Minister Churchill had already promised that "Britain would do all she could to help," the principal supplier can be only the United States; England herself, he pointed out, will need much.

The Archbishop of York protested over the omission of certain countries of the world in the report. Lord Cranborne corrected this promptly. "Russia, China, Burma, Malaya, and the Netherland East Indies," he said, "will state their needs."

Now, it is no discredit whatever to the Viscount Cranborne and the Archbishop of York that they talk this way, or to the Inter-Allied Committee on Post-War Requirements to meet and make their arrangements. They have been educated to do so by the promises of the official spokesmen of the United States who, after a parade of broken promises and colossal stupidities at home, now make new promises to the world.

Our national socialists now in power shall fail the world. We shall be unable to do what they say we should do, and probably unwilling to do it. And in these circumstances we shall make enemies of our friends. Voices will rise against us in panic and denunciation, precisely as voices rose against us after the last war, when our leaders promised much less.

Our national socialists commit a national sin in the folly of their promises, for the promises we make should be honest and within our reach. Then we should live up to them, set our example, and in that way establish our place in the world of freemen.

No one will thank us for starting down the road, going as far as we can, and then chucking the whole business through the revulsion of our own people to a program which Americans know in their hearts is unsound and untrue.

The success of the hope for a better world depends on reestablishing the self-faith of the American people and the integrity of the United States through the Republican Party.

The fundamental error of our collectivists is that they have never understood the place which integrity has in all the ramifications of life. They have always believed that to say a thing is the same as to do it, as though speech were final, as though rhetoric were capable of modifying the tendencies, habits, and character of real beings, as though verbiage were a substitute for will, conscience, and education. They proceed by bursts of eloquence or of lawmaking; they believe they can legislate the nature of impulses, and in so doing they produce disintegration. They have never understood the first line of Montesquieu: "Laws are necessary relations, derived from the nature of things."

They will not see that their inability to organize liberty comes from their own nature; from wrong notions which they have of the individual, of society, of races, of law, of duty. Their way is to plant trees downward and then be astonished at the result.

This means perpetual wavering between confusion and tyranny, between the red and the black, between Danton and Loyola.

Again, the evidence of their history is mercilessly exact. Through long years they have been wasting and abusing the liberties our ancestors won. Conceived in liberty they have distracted our people from the stern fact of liberty, the first element of which is that we supply ourselves with good government.

When President Roosevelt said, "We do not need to abandon our democracy to match the strength of aggressors," he spoke the truth. We do not need to abandon it, but we do need to go back to it.

The immediate war measure and the primary post-war task of the United States in behalf of itself and the world is to return to its moral and intellectual foundations and believe in them again.

The heavy foreboding which many note in the hearts and minds of thoughtful men and women, the strange failure to rejoice and be electrified by the mere thought that one day the war may be over—what does it mean? It means we see a fate coming closer and that we know we have been made weak in our own house.

Our Nation has been weakened because ordinary Americans have not been trusted.

Our Nation has been weakened because every bulwark of integrity we have has been tampered with. The oath-bound leaders of our Government cannot circumvent the purpose of law, destroy the authority of contracts, belittle the fundamental postulates by which all honorable men live, the sanctity of the spoken word, the clarity of the written word, whether it be between Government and citizen or citizen and citizen, and in this way make us strong.

Our Nation has been weakened because of haphazard and bureaucratic planned economy, which was, in essence, the substitution of an unplanned economy for the virility of self-faith and manly enterprise. Instead of freeing the creative power of America under a triumphant affirmation of its ability and power, Americans were shackled to bureaucracy.

Under the disguise of modifying our economy, which was really a witch hunt, the creative impulses of countless millions were destroyed. After toying with the most explosive features of racial questions at home, fomenting class prejudices, inciting pressure groups, agitating the young and the old, and foundering in a purchasing-power policy which collapsed for all except middle-of-the-stream office-holding horseback riders themselves, they contemplate healing the world.

They contemplate healing the world when they are not decently governing themselves.

The reality of this demands the elimination of their domination in the United States, or the future ability of the United States to help the world is nil and the ability of the world to be helped is negligible.

It will take a new honoring of first principles to get back to self-faith and to reestablish the integrity of our Nation. To do this, to turn our backs on political opportunists, and to resist the inevitableness of no change, requires a courage which is the equivalent of the courage of Indiana's pioneers. For in their principle of self-faith and integrity is the only hope of our country this side of intermittent war and permanent national distress.

Over the mantelpiece of the Union League Club in Philadelphia is a legend which many Indiana editors have seen. It reads: "We join ourselves to no party which does not follow the flag and keep step to the music of the Union."

Gentlemen from Indiana, the Republican Party does not follow the flag and the Republican Party does not keep step to the music of the Union.

The Republican Party carries the flag and makes the music of the Union.

The Unity of Interest of West and South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, last week a historic conference of western and southern Governors was held in Denver. Governors from the West and the South and numerous nationally prominent Americans delivered addresses. One of the ablest, most timely addresses of the conference was delivered by the youngest Governor and perhaps the most dynamic figure in the United States today—Gov. Ellis Arnall of Georgia. Because of the widespread interest in Governor Arnall's excellent address I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD where it may receive the official consideration which it merits.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this manuscript will make approximately two and two-thirds pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $120 which is two-thirds of a page more than is permitted without a printer's estimate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the Governors of the Southern States, are seeking to end discriminations against every section of the United States. We believe in the doctrine of Americanism under which, and by which, every section of our Nation is due the same consideration from the Federal Government, is due equality of treatment and fairness of opportunity.

The Governors of the Southern States invite the Governors of the Western States to join in this fight because many of the discriminations which work so monstrously against the South likewise, in the same manner, impede the progress of the Western States. Our battle is not sectional. It is a fight for common fairness to every section of our common country. In its very essence, therefore, the contest we are waging is a fight for national justice.

In seeking to abolish sectional discriminations that, in their ultimate and inevitable effect will bring "Balkanization" of the United States, the West and the South have such a unity of interest that unity of action is essential if we hope to succeed in our effort to redress those wrongs.

It does not require a gift of prophecy to foresee the dismal results to the entire American Union of the destruction of the American principle of equal economic opportunity, of free enterprise, of the right to engage in any business that is lawful, decent, and socially desirable.

Unless we turn our attention to the acute need for decentralizing industry in the United States through the application of the natural laws of economics, there will come about inevitably an America like this: divided into an exploting central region, drawing its sustenance from exploited colonies held in subservience by economic pressure and, perhaps, by physical force; wasted natural resources and manpower; a system of centralized government, administered by a bureaucracy ignoring all sense of responsibility to the people; seething discontent in every section as stratification into classes becomes the natural corollary of stratification into regions.

To the South and West, comprising three fourths of the territory of the Nation within their 30 States, this is a disheartening picture, not of something that probably could happen, but of something that already has actually begun to happen.

To the East, which is supposed to profit by this division of our Nation into imperial dominion and colonial dependency, the change will bring but little comfort. For though the East garners the wealth produced in the South and West, destroying and wasting in swiftly passing weeks the natural resources that might support the Nation in dignity for generations, the more favored East does not become rich.

For, as such exploitation continues, West and South are able to trade less and less with the East. Their mills become idle. Their

workers go upon relief, not "relief" in the American sense, but with the stigma of the dole in the European sense.

With the whole economic picture out of focus, with all men, rich and poor alike, trapped in the meshes of their own misdoing, collapse of political freedom becomes inevitable.

It is a dark and gloomy picture. It is a picture of what we must avoid.

There is yet another possible picture. There is the picture of an America mobilizing all its wealth and power, all its capacity for production, all its accumulated resources, and storing them away in a small, densely congested and dangerously vulnerable region. And then some foreign enemy, undisclosed as yet, swooping down and rendering the whole Nation helpless by seizing and occupying this small segment of our continent.

That, too, is a dismal and unpleasant picture. It could have happened, however, in 1941, if the Nipponese had taken the greater but wiser gamble of attacking the production centers of the East with their "sneak punch" instead of attacking the fleet at Pearl Harbor. Our narrow escape from that desolation is either a dispensation of Providence, or an example of the stupidity of the enemy. It is not proof of invulnerability upon our part. It is a vision that even now we shudder to contemplate.

How can these things be avoided? How can our Nation escape from the strangulation of bureaucracy and centralization? How can we restore free enterprise in America?

There is but one way. That is for the people of the West and South, by economic and political action, to restore the conditions that are the essential predicates of freedom of individual responsibility.

There are three theories of the function of government.

One is that government owns every citizen—owning, I presume, the whole of the citizen: his life, his fortune, and his honor. That has been tried in totalitarian countries of Europe. Under that philosophy the life of the citizen was short, his fortune small, and his honor sadly compromised.

The second theory is that the government should act wholly and solely as an umpire, metaphorically sitting back on a well-cushioned, stately, and impressive bench, twiddling its thumbs until some dispute arises which the umpire is petitioned to adjudicate.

The third concept is that government should perform for the citizens those services that can be performed more cheaply, more efficiently, and with smaller hazard by collective action than by individual exertion.

This last is the American concept. It epitomizes what we have learned to define as the American way of life.

That concept can be translated into action, however, only in circumstances where the function of government is not distorted; only when freedom of individual initiative, individual opinion, and individual thought exists, and only when competition is liberated from restrictions that hamper its freedom.

I am opposed to governmental control over every phase of life.

I am opposed, also, to government tipping the scales against any competitor in any honest enterprise.

Most of our fallacies and muddled thinking in recent years have grown from an inability to recognize the distinction between what is government and what is private initiative.

One of the most dangerous cankers on American life today is the wholly unwarranted discrimination against West and South in freight rates.

It is assumed by many that railroads are private concerns, existing because of private initiative.

That is wholly and completely false.

The fact that railroads have private investors, who own their bonds and their stocks, does not make them private enterprises. By that argument, indeed, you could plausibly assert that the Federal Government is a private enterprise.

Primarily the railroads are instruments of government. For example, they have been granted one of the highest attributes of government: the tremendous right of eminent domain.

They recognize themselves as a kind of government. In a startling document filed by the carriers in the eastern or so-called official territory, those railroads admitted with a disarming cynicism that their section was "hemmed in on the South, the Southwest and the West by territories seeking to market their products within the territory served by official lines. In many instances such commodities come into direct competition with the commodities produced in that territory. Official lines, therefore, are in duty bound to protect the geographical or other natural advantages possessed by shippers or producers on their lines, and as a matter of justice and equity, they may not be required to join in such low bases of interterritorial rates as to nullify or neutralize these natural advantages."

They have arrogated to themselves the authority, wholly denied to Congress and to the State governments by the Constitution of the United States, of setting up internal tariff walls within our Nation.

The basic facts about freight rate discriminations in the United States are too well known to everyone to require elaboration.

The United States is arbitrarily divided, by a law decreed by the railroads themselves, and not by the people or their government, into five horizontal sections. In Eastern or official territory are grouped the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, a portion of Virginia, as well as the coal-producing State of West Virginia and the industrial States of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio.

South of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers and east of the Mississippi lies the southern territory, comprising eight States and the remainder of Virginia. Across the Mississippi lies the southwestern territory, with four States: Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, and, to the north, the western trunk-line territory, containing the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, and fragments of Wyoming and Colorado.

The remaining fragments of partitioned Wyoming and Colorado, together with the other nine Mountain and Pacific coast States, compose what is known as the "Mountain-Pacific" territory.

Around those territories the railroads have carved the map of the Nation that is our common inheritance. They have erected a structure of freight differentials, to serve as a barrier which has paralyzed our industry and retarded our commerce.

It is against this malignant growth that we strongly protest.

The cost to the carrier of moving freight is apparently lowest in the Southwest, with all factors of operating expense taken into consideration. It is highest in the eastern or official territory. Yet the rate structure is so arranged that shippers in official territory receive lower freight rates than those in the South and West. This means that every item that we in the South or West produce or sell is discounted by those discriminatory rates, designed for the further enrichment of the most populous and already most highly industrialized section of our country.

Our industry is precluded from development. Accordingly our income standards in the South and West are kept constantly depressed in relation to the income levels of the balance of the Nation.

Let me document a few of the typical items in these charges.

The study of railway freight costs, made for the Interstate Commerce Commission from 1940 through 1942 under the direction of Ford K. Edwards, is based upon certain assumptions that, if they may be said to favor anyone, are favorable to the official territory carriers.

This analysis discloses that, under any possible condition, total service costs are prevailingly lower in the southern and southwestern territories than in the official or eastern territory; that for any normal operation, costs are lower in the Mountain-Pacific territory than in eastern territory; and likewise that upon medium and long hauls at below-average loadings, western trunk-line costs are below those in the East.

Upon the basis of a 600-mile haul of a 40,000-pound net load, the per car cost to the carrier in the southern area is $18.60 less than in official territory. This scales down to $9 for the Southwest, $3.20 for the western trunk-line section, and $7.40 for the Mountain-Pacific area.

That is conclusive on the subject of relative costs. These differences arise from many factors. In the South, for example, one factor is lower terminal costs. Another is lower maintenance costs on the great Coastal Plain, where no severe cold weather occurs.

Despite the lower cost to the carrier of transportation in the South and the West, the freight rates are higher; and they grow progressively higher whenever we endeavor to manufacture anything either for our own use or to ship beyond our borders.

To reach our own markets requires a haul of an assumed 300 miles. That is to say that, to reach a profitable market, a manufacturer in southern territory marketing his product wholly within that territory, would ship it that average distance.

To reach eastern markets requires a haul of an assumed 1,000 miles, which is the approximate average distance that a larger manufacturer, selling a substantial part of his product in the East, would have to ship.

These estimates of 300 and 1,000 miles respectively are based on southern experience and conditions, rather than on those in the West. Because the States west of the Mississippi are of tremendous area, with broad spaces to be traversed, the plight of a western manufacturer in these particulars is even more acute.

At 300 miles southern freight rates are 40 percent above those in official territory; southwestern rates are 53 percent higher, and Mountain-Pacific rates are 47 percent above official tariffs.

But when you reach the thousand-mile haul, although the rates for southern and western trunk-line territory stay at about the same level as those for 300 miles, those for the southwest and the Mountain-Pacific areas jump to 65 percent and 83 percent, respectively, above official or eastern rates.

I have cited class-rates, which are the rates upon manufactured goods. The Southern Governors' Conference, which is presenting the case for southern industry before the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the famous class-rate investigation begun in 1939, and still pending, has repeatedly cited those examples as well as many more instances of discrimination.

To those recorded facts, there is a frequently presented rebuttal that the rates upon the raw products of the South and West are low and that such rates are a great advantage. It is not always stated just to whom they are such an advantage.

We must put an end to these illicit transactions under which every shipper in the West and South to whom is issued a freight bill of lading, is in fact receiving what only amounts to a pawn ticket that serves to perpetuate the financial supremacy of the East.

It is true that some commodity rates are low—when those commodities are needed to keep eastern plants running. These commodity rates are subsidies to eastern plants, and nothing else. If they did not exist, in their present form, it would be necessary for

prudent investors to establish their plants where the raw materials are to be found, instead of wastefully transporting them half way across America for fabrication.

That can be proved only by inference, by circumstantial evidence. But circumstantial evidence, fairly considered, is the best evidence, since it does not depend upon any bias or misjudgment upon the part of any witness.

Here is some of the incontrovertible circumstantial evidence.

Lead is a commodity much desired in the East. Therefore it moves from southwestern territory on an 11-percent rate advantage. But when a manufacturer in that territory decides to make lead battery plates and ship them west, up leaps the rate to 34 percent above that in the East. Let him try to manufacture printing type and the rate handicap then becomes 52 percent.

Cotton moves from southern territory at the same rate that it moves in official territory. But turn it into cloth. Unfinished fabrics pay a 10-percent tariff. Bleaching adds 11 percent. In consequence there is not a single fine-fabrics bleachery in Georgia. Oilcloth makes the tariff 54 percent—a wall that cannot be surmounted.

As was eloquently pointed out by Gov. Prentice Cooper, the distinguished chief executive of Tennessee, at a meeting of the Southern Governors in Atlanta last April:

"It is clear that the discriminatory freight rates now in effect operate to discourage and exclude industry in the South and to keep the South a raw-material-producing region, and consequently a low-income region, and thus contribute to produce the economic ills of the South."

Let us take another striking illustration:

Defense contracts have been awarded with prudence. The public officials responsible for the awards and the businessmen who patriotically turned their attention to manufacturing supplies for our armed services, alike, desired to do a good job, an honest job, and an economical job.

They located only a few war industries outside official territory, even though they recognized that heavy concentration of industry was tempting a considerable strategic jeopardy. Believing that our defenses in the air and on the sea would hold, they took this dangerous strategic gamble rather than pay the excessive costs of transportation—and then, unfortunately, they wound up with both an enormous added cost and a very critical risk.

I do not have available the complete figures on war-contract awards for the year just past, but they are even more one-sided, I am convinced, than those that I now cite.

Although shipbuilding in the South and on the Pacific coast, and the huge airplane production of these two areas, must be taken into account in these figures—despite the fact that in these industries freight tariffs cannot deprive us of them because we can sail the ships and fly the planes away without paying tribute to freight agents, more defense awards were made to factories in the little States of Maryland and Connecticut than in all the States in southern territory or all the States in western trunk-line territory. And if you deduct the shipyards and airplane industry of California, more awards were made to the single State of Michigan than to all the States in the mountain-Pacific area. That tells the wartime story of our industries.

The freight rate discriminations are a pattern of the burdens under which South and West alike have so long suffered. Similar unjust discriminations are also met in the distribution of Federal assistance to old-age pensioners and dependent children.

Just as the freight rates bear heaviest, perhaps, upon the West, the "matching system" of Federal grants bears heaviest upon us in the South.

The present system of distributing Federal funds—for public assistance, for public health, for highways—in the main is based, not upon human values and human needs, but upon the ability of the State to put up an equal amount of money.

It is callously brutal to assert that, because our people's earnings are low, because our State's income is low, the health of a Georgia child or the hunger of an aged man or woman in Georgia is not equally as imperative, or is less important to our Nation, than are the elements of health or hunger in a more prosperous section. Yet that is the formula under which our participation has been measured.

The system that freezes us into a colonial status, prevents our expanding our industry and thereby increasing the incomes of our citizens actuates itself to bestow upon the section profiting on the premiums of injustice, a greater share of Federal allotments than goes to those areas where the need is greatest and most appealing to every instinct of humanity and fair play.

Against this, the South protests. Human needs must be the measure for the distribution of funds raised by taxes imposed upon a national basis.

The South and the West must unite to meet the challenge of these discriminations.

I do not believe that we should ask for all that, on the surface, we may seem entitled to. Deeply as I sympathize with those whose indignation at the mistreatment we have endured leads them to demand that freight rates be based upon costs, I do not concur in this view.

I recognize certain aspects of fairness in the proposal. I recognize likewise that it would give to the West and South, generally speaking, the very same freight rate advantage that the East now has. This would further disturb the equilibrium which must be our ultimate goal.

I believe on the other hand that what is necessary is complete equality, not an advantage for any section or combination of sections.

But, by the same token, I cannot agree with those who express a belief that we should temporize in our demands for immediate justice.

The reason is fairly obvious. I will give one illustration.

The woolen textile industry of the United States is largely outmoded, with obsolete equipment and many marginal mills that ought to be replaced, and which would have been replaced before the war had they not existed entirely upon the freight rate subsidy at the expense of the South and West.

The woolen textile industry is concentrated, of all odd places, in New England.

It has three natural places to exist: in the center of our own sheep raising country; in the Southeast, where South American wools may be shipped cheaply by water on a much shorter haul; on the Pacific coast, where Australian wools can be procured and which are within reach of the domestic supply.

In the Southeast we have a trained labor supply, familiar with textile processes, that can move from a lower wage scale—where the scale is based on the "value added by manufacture"—into a higher wage scale, by turning to the manufacture of a more valuable product.

If we delay readjustment of freight rates until new mills are built in the East, we will have disrupted the true economy of the Nation. We will have destroyed the possibility of American initiative, courage, and industry coping with the problem. We will have created a condition where a vital industry must forever live under an economic oxygen tent supplied by some species of public dole.

It does not make the least difference whether the dole is paid in cash by the Government, or in cash by the railroads, it is a dole—nothing more.

Equality of opportunity is the American dream. It is the foundation of the edifice we have erected. It is the bedrock upon which private industry rests. Once it is abridged, governmental regulation in some drastic and more dangerous form, will be inevitable.

Some day in the not too distant future, the guns will be silent. The drone of the last bomber will be stilled. The men of the armed forces, now dispersed over six continents and the islands of all the seven seas, will begin their long and triumphant voyage home.

There will be ringing of bells and throwing of ticker tape and rejoicing crowds to watch parades.

Then will come, with terrific impact, the problem of readjusting our national economy, our social structures, our way of life for a world at peace.

Then will come the stirring challenge that the South and West must meet, if we are to become equal partners in our national enterprise.

Then will come the struggle to develop new industries in the South and the West, and the equally difficult and important struggle to retain those industries that have been developed as a result of the war. It depends upon our action at this time whether we shall be able to quote as true prophecy the inspiring words of John Temple Graves, one of our distinguished southern journalists:

"'They came for war and remained for peace'—so let it be said of the industrial increases they have come to the South in the war's course: 'They came for war and remained for peace.'"

A wise union of the South and West to combat the conditions I have described is the surest safeguard against a new and more vicious menace to our security and national solidarity.

The full and reasonably complete employment and utilization of all our resources of manpower, capital, and natural wealth is an absolute essential for our future prosperity and safety.

By no other means can we escape from rapidly sinking into a deep depression when once the boon of fabulous war orders is ended. And, as many wise economists have predicted, if America sinks into such a new form of economic disaster we may drag the whole world down. In the words of Stuart Chase, "if we move forward to build a more splendid America, we can lift the world with us."

The South and West, natural allies, were united, politically and economically, through the period of our Nation's greatest growth. I shall not review the tragedy that severed the alliance that brought the United States from a handful of sparsely settled States cowering on the Atlantic seaboard to a great Nation occupying most of a great continental land mass. That tragedy must be forgotten in a new day when we again join forces to remedy old abuses and to realize at last the dream of a great America of freedom of opportunity where all men shall be able to achieve economic independence through the full enjoyment of the fruits of their efforts.

And so it is that we, the Governors of the Southern States, are striving to demolish artificial man-made barriers which so long have separated section from section. We fight not only for the South, but for all sections, and for a Nation indivisible and just. We invite the Governors of the Western States to join us in this cause.

And this time we must never stop until that cause is won.

Land-Use Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from E. J. Haslerud, director of extension and chairman of the North Dakota Agricultural Advisory Council. Mr. Haslerud is actively interested in cooperative extension work and in agriculture and in home economics in the State of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., *September 20, 1943.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The North Dakota Agricultural Advisory Council at its last meeting passed the following resolution with the request that it be passed on to Members of Congress and heads of various Federal agencies involved:

"Whereas various forces and factors are now at work that threaten an unwarranted and undesirable land inflation; and

"Whereas land inflation, if uncurbed and not controlled, will only result in future disaster and blight for agriculture: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we recommend immediate steps be taken by the Government to invoke such controls as will prevent an unwarranted land inflation.

"As possible aids in such control, we recommend ceilings be placed on all farm lands to be based primarily on past and prospective production value.

"We recommend further that all transfers of land be subject to a permit approved by local committees consisting of actual farm operators and persons sincerely interested in the development and future well-being of our agriculture.

"We recommend that all acts or steps and regulations to be imposed be of such nature as to encourage owner operation in family-type units and discourage corporate and absentee land holdings."

This resolution was drafted and sponsored mainly by the farmer members of the council.

In order to clarify matters, I believe I should explain what the North Dakota Agricultural Advisory Council is: When the program of land-use planning was being developed, it was necessary to set up a State land-use planning committee made up of a majority of farmers and also including the heads of the various agencies of the department of agriculture. Later, a system of selecting the farmer members was developed. Therefore, the farmer members as shown on the attached list of council members, were selected from the various farming areas of North Dakota, mainly by the county land-use committees of the counties in those areas. When the B. A. E. funds for land-use planning were lost, the members of the council decided to continue as such because even now considerable land-use planning is being done in the counties.

This council has been active in the various food programs, and has been assigned, particularly, duties in connection with determination of feasible production goals for the State and determination of the distribution of these goals in the State. This assignment was given the council by the War Board.

The council also has taken under consideration from time to time various problems that come within the sphere of land-use planning. Particular emphasis is given to proposals made by the farmer members, and when it comes to resolutions, the matter is largely left up to the farmers. The farmer members of the council are an outstanding group of men.

Yours sincerely,

E. J. HASLERUD,

Director of Extension and Chairman, North Dakota Agricultural Advisory Council.

Poultry and Dairy Feed Situation in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Charles R. Hopkins, of Greenfield, N. H., enclosing minutes of the meeting of New Hampshire feed mixers and dealers held on September 11, 1943, in Concord, N. H., containing suggestions for certain corrective measure, together with other data incidental thereto.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

E. C. & W. L. HOPKINS, INC.,

Greenfield, N. H., September 21, 1943.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: Enclosed find a report on the meeting of New Hampshire feed mixers, held at Concord, Saturday, September 11, to which you were invited but could not attend. This invitation was extended in an attempt to keep you informed on the poultry and dairy feed situation as it exists in New Hampshire.

In response to War Board requests plus the normal incentive of large profits, New Hampshire's poultry and dairy industry was expanded by a large percentage during the current year, the same as in other States. This has developed a shortage of milling-plant capacity which has been aggravated by selective-service demands on manpower and it has also developed a Nation-wide shortage of feed ingredients.

The ingredient shortage has been further aggravated by O. P. A. regulations which have drastically upset price relationships. This is particularly true in the case of corn, our major ingredient, which normally makes up 25 to 30 percent of the tonnage used.

The facts: We can pay only $43.60 per ton for corn raised by United States farmers, but because we cannot buy corn in quantity (it being fed more profitably to western hogs or sold via black-market operations near where it is grown), we are forced to buy substitutes—wheat, which is subsidized by C. C. C. at the rate of about 50 cents per bushel, oats at a cost of $60 per ton, or barley at a cost of $55 per ton. It seems unbelievable that we would be denied the privilege of paying over $43.60 for corn to our own farmers, but be forced into paying the Canadian farmers and the Canadian Government $55 and $60 for barley and oats. Incidentally, about one-third of the money we are paying the Canadians is going to their Government in the form of an export fee. This week the fee amounts to 31 cents per bushel on oats and 43 cents per bushel on barley.

We suggest the following corrective measures:

1. That the ceiling price of corn be readjusted to a reasonable relationship to the price of hogs and to the grains we are using as a substitute for corn.

2. That following such adjustment, the reopening of the future market on corn be permitted, in order to offer an opportunity to elevators and grain shippers to hedge their purchases and thereby permit the building of a visible supply of corn on any movement of the new crop.

3. To encourage the importation of Argentine corn (where it is being burned for fuel). It is rumored among the trade that one reason we have not imported Argentine corn is because of a desire on the part of the State Department to "spank the Argentine." This would be cutting off our nose to spite our face.

We believe the present plans for distributing the high protein byproducts such as linseed meal, soybean meal, beef scraps, and the like is as good as any that can be worked out at this time.

The manpower problem referred to in the second paragraph is fast becoming paramount. In our own plant we stand to lose 5 to 7 men out of 22 operators. This because they are under 38 and classed only as laborers even though our industry is classed as essential.

There are not any men available to replace these laborers. Women cannot be used as the work is too heavy (i. e., handling 100-pound bags of feed all day). The United States Employment Service cannot furnish us with any men, as we have already asked them. If the Army needs the men more than the world needs food, then they should be taken, otherwise every worker in the milling and mixing industry should be exempted.

Respectfully yours,

CHAS. R. HOPKINS.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NEW HAMPSHIRE FEED MIXERS AND DEALERS, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1943, CONCORD, N. H.

Present were: J. Ralph Graham, chairman, Durham, N. H., New Hampshire State U. S. D. A. War Board; S. W. Tyler, Cayuga, N. Y., the Beacon Milling Co., Inc.; R. F. McLeod, Boston, Mass., Charles M. Cox Co.; P. E. Newman, Cayuga, N. Y., the Beacon Milling Co., Inc.; E. S. Winslow, Concord, N. H., G. N. Bartemus Co.; C. E. Merrill, Londonderry, N. H., Oliver Merrill & Sons; G. M. Cookman, St. Johnsbury, Vt., Purina Mills; D. S. Keller, West Springfield, Mass., Eastern States' Farmers Exchange; E. E. Fowler, Suncook, N. H., Fowler Bros.; G. Tilton, Concord, N. H., Stratton & Co.; A. E. Johnson Potter Place, N. H., R. P. Johnson & Son; E. E. Gannon, Concord, N. H., Park & Pollard Co.; F. S. Deyo, Boston, Mass., Park & Pollard Co.; Donald W. Hopkins, Greenfield, N. H., E. C. & W. L. Hopkins, Inc.; T. B. Charles, Durham, N. H., Poultry Department, U. N. H.; W. E. Wakefield, Laconia, N. H., Farm Service Co.; Charles H. Towers, Manchester, N. H., Food Distribution Administration; Charles R. Hopkins, Greenfield, N. H., E. C. & W. L. Hopkins, Inc.; Thomas H.

Sherman, Concord, N. H., E. C. & W. L. Hopkins, Inc.; D. J. Truland, Lancaster, N. H., F. B. Spaulding Co.; R. C. Ringrose, Durham, N. H., Poultry Department, U. N. H.; H. A. Keener, Durham, N. H., Animal & Dairy Husbandry, U. N. H.; M. H. Clark, Concord, N. H., Merrimack Farmers' Exchange; R. E. Parmenter, Concord, N. H., Merrimack Farmers' Exchange; L. Clavton Berry, Lebanon, N. H., L. C. Berry; Errol C. Perry, Durham, N. H., Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

Mr. Graham acted as chairman of the meeting which had been called by the New Hampshire U. S. D. A. War Board. The purpose of the meeting, he stated, was to acquaint the New Hampshire feed industry with a number of proposed orders designed to spread out the inadequate supplies of oil meals, to indicate the added responsibility which these orders would place on the war board, and to point out the need for assistance from the industry.

Proposed Food Production Order 9 (Set Aside Requirements and Forward Selling and Inventory Limitations on Oilseed Meal) and Commodity Credit Corporation Order 6 (Restrictions on Purchases and Use of Soybeans) were read and discussed. Mr. Graham also read and explained the procedure which war boards will probably follow in distributing oil meals to the mixers and dealers under the set-aside provisions of the expected new orders.

Mr. Graham stated that it had been extremely difficult for the war board to properly distribute the small amounts of high protein ingredients available in the past and that the problem would be greatly complicated in the future because of the larger quantities concerned. The war board had done the best it could but needs the knowledge and experience available only to the industry. He asked the group to set up an advisory committee to assist in this task suggesting that it consist of both local and out-of-State mixers and representatives of the State experiment station.

In the dicussion which followed, a number of factors complicating the problem were mentioned. It was stated that outside feed mixers have in the past, and must continue in the future, to supply a large proportion of the New Hampshire needs; there has been a great increase in the demand during recent months; and it is evident that the feed supplies of the country are not sufficient to carry the livestock industry if it is maintained at the present level. In regard to the increased demand, one New Hampshire mixer indicated that they were now mixing 265 tons in the same period where formerly they mixed only 150 tons. An illustration of the expansion in poultry production is a case where 1,400 broilers were found in the basement of a New Hampshire city home.

It was agreed that a feed advisory committee should be appointed which would—

1. Consider the needs of both out-of-State and local mixers in the allocation of feed ingredients
2. Determine preferable uses for feed materials distributed through the War Board, and
3. If necessary, make suggestions regarding the final allotment of feed supplies to farmers.

A nominating committee consisting of J. Ralph Graham, Andrew L. Felker, T. B. Charles, Robert M. McLeod and Charles Hopkins was appointed. They immediately met and proposed the following:

New Hampshire Feed Committee: J. Ralph Graham, New Hampshire, U. S. D. A. War Board; Andrew L. Felker, New Hampshire, Commissioner of Agriculture.

New Hampshire mixers: Roy Peaslee, Merrimack Farmers' Exchange; Edgar S. Winslow, B G. Bartemus Co.; Edward Fowler, Fowler Bros.

Out-of-State mixers: C. D. Kendall, Eastern States Farmers' Exchange; Arthur Hopkins, C. M. Cox Co.

New Hampshire Experiment Station: Dr. H. A. Keener, animal nutritionist; Dr. R. C. Ringrose, poultry nutritionist.

The committee was unanimously approved with the understanding that the companies represented might appoint different representatives if they prefer. It was also agreed that in the event the committee found it desirable to add to its membership, the proposal could be presented to the industry at a meeting called for that purpose.

The question of the most desirable use of the small supplies of corn now available was then taken up and it was unanimously concluded that corn should be reserved for incorporation into mixed rations, preferably poultry mashes.

The meeting then adjourned.

ERROL C. PERRY,
Secretary pro tempore.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Durham, N. H., September 14, 1943.

To the Feed Mixers Supplying Feeders in New Hampshire:

Last Saturday, September 11, the feed mixers of the State met at Concord, N. H., to consider the feed situation, to listen to proposals made by the Government and processors for a method of equitably supplying each State with its share of protein ingredients and to select a committee to work with the New Hampshire U. S. D. A. War Board in allocating each of the mixers supplying the State a fair share of the ingredients that will be available.

The following committee was elected: Arthur Hopkins, of Charles M. Cox Co. of Boston, Mass.; C. D. Kendall, of Eastern States Farmers Exchange at West Springfield, Mass.; Roy Peaslee, of the Merrimack Farmers Exchange at Concord, N. H.; Edward Fowler, of Fowler Bros., Suncook, N. H.; Edgar S. Winslow, of Bartemus Co., Concord, N. H.; Drs. H. A. Keener and R. C. Ringrose, of the University of New Hampshire Experiment Station, Durham, N. H.; and Andrew L. Felker, Commissioner of Agriculture for the State of New Hampshire, Concord, N. H. These men were selected to act as members of the committee to work with the war board in mapping out a program of allotting any feed that is allocated to New Hampshire by Commodity Credit Corporation.

The committee met after the meeting and decided that if they were to be able to do the right kind of job in allocating these ingredients it would be necessary for them to have certain information from the different mixers. Therefore, it was suggested that I write you requesting you to send to this office the tonnage distributed by your company during the last 6 months of 1942 and the first 6 months of 1943. It will be necessary to have by months the amount of poultry mash, scratch feed, dairy ration, and miscellaneous rations that you mixed during the months mentioned above.

It will also be necessary for the committee to have this information if they are to do a fair job of allocating these cars that are directed to us by Commodity Credit Corporation. This office will also need to be informed of the amount of protein ingredients that you receive through the regular channels of trade. I am suggesting that at the end of each month you give us this information.

The committee is reluctant to request any information that would cause anyone extra work in these times when office forces are depleted and everyone in general is really overworked, but the committee is very much in earnest about doing the best kind of job possible with these critical ingredients, and I hope it will be possible for you to aid them by sending us this information.

Very respectfully yours,

J, RALPH GRAHAM,
Chairman, New Hampshire
U. S. D. A. War Board.

Estimated feed requirements of livestock in New Hampshire from October 1943 to September 1944

(Prepared by Dr. H. A. Keener, livestock nutritionist, New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station and Dr. R. C. Ringrose, poultry nutritionist, New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station)

Kind of livestock	Estimated number	Total	Feed requirement in 1,000 tons	
			High protein feed	Oil meal
Dairy cows and heifers	70,000	59.5	11.5	7.1
Other cattle and calves	46,000	20.7	3.3	2.2
Hogs	[1] 80,000	12.1	1.5	.6
Sheep	9,000	.3	.03	.03
Horses	14,000	14.5	.4	.4
Hens and pullets	2,099,000	104.2	52.1	15.7
Replacement brooding	3,800,000	65.1	44.4	14.2
Commercial broilers	1,200,000	7.8	5.6	1.9
Turkeys	72,000	2.7	1.7	.5
Total		286.9	120.53	42.63

[1] Hundredweight.

The Bastille of Tyranny Is Falling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Bastille of Tyranny Is Falling, delivered by me in August 1941, to the National Society of the Ahepa at Cincinnati, and appearing in the Ahepan for September–October 1941.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASTILLE OF TYRANNY IS FALLING

From Florida, from beautiful Tarpon Springs, the most Hellenic city in the United States, I bring most cordial greetings to a distinguished American institution — the Order of Ahepa.

As a citizen and a Senator of the United States, I bring you the greetings of a Nation which is grateful for the loyalty, the public spiritedness, and the wholesomeness of its Greek citizenry. You, of course, are justly proud of the record of a people which is the most law-abiding of all emigrant stocks in the United States—a people who, by War Department records, were more numerous in the United States Army in the World War than any other foreign racial element in the United States—a people who produced an immigrant boy, George Dilboy, one of the outstanding heroes of the World War, awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor and in whose memory stands today a commanding monument in Somerville, Mass.

These distinctions are not new to the Hellenic name and tradition. Where in history

has liberty and the sentiment of freedom found firmer lodgment than in the Hellenic world?

MONROE'S MESSAGE

For more than a hundred years it has been the privilege of the United States to lend a helping hand to the heroic struggle of the Greek people for freedom in their own ancient land. President Monroe, in a great message to Congress on December 2, 1823, said:

"A strong hope has been long entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare. Although no power has declared in their favor, yet none, according to our information, has taken part against them. Their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might ere this have overwhelmed any other people. The ordinary calculations of interest and of acquisition with a view to aggrandizement, which mingles so much in the transactions of nations, seems to have had no effect in regard to them. From the facts which have come to our knowledge, there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all dominion over them; that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes."

How tragic the necessity for another message by another American President—President Roosevelt—when your Supreme Lodge of the Order of Ahepa, on April 25, 1941, visited the President at the White House. Said the President:

ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE

"The heroic struggle of the Hellenic people to defend their liberties and their homes against the aggression of Germany after they had so signally defeated the Italian attempt at invasion has stirred the hearts and aroused the sympathy of the whole American people.

"During the Hellenic War of independence more than a century ago, our young Nation, prizing its own lately won independence, expressed its ardent sympathy for the Greeks and hoped for Hellenic victory. That victory was achieved.

"Today, at a far more perilous period in the history of Hellas, we intend to give full effect to our settled policy of extending all available material aid to free peoples defending themselves against aggression. Such aid has been and will continue to be extended to Greece.

"Whatever may be the temporary outcome of the present phase of the war in Greece, I believe that the Greek people will once more ultimately achieve their victory and regain their political independence and the territorial integrity of their country. In that high objective the people of Greece and their Government can count on the help and support of the Government and the people of the United States."

Was the glory that was Greece ever more illustrious than the glory that was Greece in the last tragic year? The whole world opened its heart in unrestrained admiration to the gallant heroism of the Greek Nation which, in the face of overwhelming odds, chose to die heroes rather than to live slaves. Against this tyrannical assault how many times did an admiring world speak again and again the words of Lord Byron, who wrote the patriots of Greece who waged the same fight in an earlier age:

"The sword, the banner, and the field,
Glory and Greece, around me see!
The Spartan, borne upon his shield,
Was not more free.

"Awake! Not Greece—she is awake!
Awake, my spirit! Think through whom
Thy lifeblood tracks its parent lake
And then strike home!

"Seek out—less often sought than found—
A soldier's grave, for thee the best;
Then look around and choose thy ground,
And take thy rest."

BE NOT AFRAID

If on the other side of the river of life the heroes of an earlier day who gather together to tell the epics of their time were privileged to look down on the Hellas of 1940–41, what homage they must have paid to those who bore with luster unsullied the proud Hellenic name. Be not afraid. The moving finger which has written another sad chapter in your long history will move on yet to write again other chapters of other golden ages which shall be worthy of your Pericles. It is not too much to say that those who look back upon these sorrowful days will see more clearly than we can see now that it was again from the heart of Greece that came the first bright rays of a new dawn for the race.

Yet, it is only natural that you who have so translated the beauty of the spirit and the mind into those things which the eye could see and the ear could hear should be among the most steadfast defenders of those intangible realities which are the souls of men. You know how true, countless ages beyond the measure of time, it has been the inside of man which made him real and of moment, and not the outside. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he" has been the truth in every age and land.

Jail the spirit of man and no liberty of the body can make it free. Leave free the spirit and no shackle can bind man.

You know that it is those inner satisfactions for which men make the great struggles and, if needs be, the last sacrifices. Deny that honor and peace to the man within and all life is but sounding brass and tinkling cymbal. Your whole history is an epic of the race's struggle toward the Holy City of the spirit. It is a long hard road. It is strewn with the bones of many pilgrims. Monuments of heroes line the long avenues which wind back to a misty past and for immeasurable distances beyond that lie the unknown and the unsung. The echo of their many marching songs comes back again and again. Why is the way so long? The struggle so hard?

THE BLOODY HAND

Today other men are dying to preserve those things which are theirs in the sight of God against a devil's assault. The sword of tyranny again smites the earth. The bloody hand that wields it defies every sentiment which expresses the refinement of man and the progress of civilization. No Satan ever in fantastic imagery held writhing sinner over devouring flame with more fiendish satisfaction than does that heartless man, whose name is twisted into a curse upon every Godly tongue, destroy those who would dare defend against him their sacred homes, the graves of their fathers, their own mountains or valleys, the integrity of their minds and hearts.

He has prostituted modern science with which a beneficent God has blessed the race and made the human family his slave. He has made the lie his chief weapon, and enthroned vice as a goddess to be worshipped. He has torn down the temples and profaned the altars of those who sought their God. He has driven out of the pulpits and chained to the concentration camps those who are the messengers of the spirit. He has ravaged the intellectual virtue of every being he could touch. He has plundered and robbed and murdered the helpless and unoffending. Every commandment he has violated. At last he has torn from the heavens every vestige he could reach of that God to whom every human heart is lifted and builded as high as he could the graven images of savage Gods who are dull-eyed, motionless and feelingless pagan Gods of the ancient forests.

Yet this horrible spiritual monster claims to be the Messiah to bring a new order to the earth.

Of what material does he build this new order? All the sorrowing tear-dimmed eye which gazes upon the spectacle of what he has wrought can see is broken pledges, broken people, the blended bodies of the enslaved, the wan, ghostlike remains of what were happy and healthy children, mangled bodies strewn over a continent, the pattern and the heart of the world torn and bruised into the ugly shape of the mutilated.

And hardly a one whom he would convert by his engines of war to his new order but curses the thought of his name, and writhes and prays to gain deliverance from his cruel bondage.

MAMMOTH BEASTS

From your long past you know that those things which this wicked man now calls new are but the tyrannies against which man has struggled from the dawn of time, and those things by which he wreaks his wrath on the race are but the vices against which the virtue of every age has spent itself in mortal assault. Countless times in the long years of your forebears have you seen such a monster raise his head to devour all who came within his bestial reach. Yet, always, however long it took, however great the sacrifice, however painful the struggle, these mammoth beasts have been overthrown, their captives liberated, the traces of their bloody triumphs washed away, the fair fields scorched by their fiery breath brought to life again, the valleys and the mountains over which rolled the tumultuous echoes of desperate struggle and the sad sights of death come to rest again in the arms of a soothing peace.

The good, the brave, and the steadfast have at last been the victors. If the good, the brave, and the steadfast have in all these older struggles of the race been the victors, shall it not be so in this age, in good time? Those things for which they fought are no less precious now than then. They ar still the pearls of such great price that they cannot be purchased, let alone taken away. Surely we who are the heir of every gallant one who has lived, every brave one who has died, are not less worthy stewards of their precious things than they.

Today the world of the oppressed and the free has new hope from those momentous events of the last days. Like ancient giants, two men rose to Olympian heights while a breathless world waited. At last came their thrilling words to a thrilled world. In language and thought as clear as the blue ocean sky under the vault of which they met, they laid down the commandments of a new world. They spoke not for governments, not even for nations but for mankind. Like Moses of old, who communed with his God, these mortals, both from their own communion with nature and nature's God, raised words of new purpose and new policy for mankind.

TWO AGING MEN

They spoke as men with authority, because they were speaking truths eternal. They gave eloquent expression to those hopes which were maturing in the hearts of men everywhere.

In this great ocean, under this blue sky, they thought not of selfishness, but of selflessness. Two aging men thought of the human family and the countless millions yet to live upon earth. They thought of the kind of a world it ought to be, of the kind of a world it could be. They dreamed dreams of the long-promised land. They felt the mellowing spirit of what was right. They were moved by the impulse of justice.

They forgot not little nations or little men. They forgot not the problems of little nations or little men. They forgot not the

fears that little nations and little men shrink from, neither did they omit consideration for those things which besides bread are the staff of life.

In this testament of faith those who bear the galling yoke of slavery, those who are hard beset by mighty assault, those who are threatened and those who contemplate the dreary future all found renewed hope and new determination.

MAN'S LABORS

Man is always best when he dreams. We are all indebted beyond measure to these men who in the midst of a chaotic and bloody world dared to choose to dream dreams of the quiet ways of peace. It will be for the world for which they labored and dared to dream to determine whether those dreams shall come true, or whether they shall be shattered on the shoals of selfishness. Another dreamed for mankind a quarter of a century ago and held up the torch of a new hope for the world. He labored long and mightily to build a temple to house justice for all nations and all men. He toiled mightily to lay down, to point out the way which men might follow to the paths of peace.

Yet a little group of willful men, selfish, vain politicians, greedy, avaricious men, and, alas, a tired and shortsighted people, broke the heart and the body of the dreamer, and soon the dreams of Woodrow Wilson, like his tortured, broken body, were strewn in miserable wreckage in a chaotic world. Not the dreamers have had to pay the price for shattered dreams, but those for whom the dreams did not come true.

But these ways of peace which Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill have dreamed for us they knew lay far over the distant horizon; between us and the realization of those dreams lies the hard ways of struggle, the bitter dregs of pain and suffering sacrifice; for many, death. For so hideous a monster, so colossal a giant as the force of tyranny which today menaces the world, can be thrown back only by the most heroic and determined effort of those who would oppose them. Already millions have given themselves as hostages to the destruction of these evil forces. They have given all that these wicked things might be destroyed.

OUR GREATEST EFFORT

We all know that no less than our greatest effort has hope of avail against these satanic powers. Each in every free land must do his or her part without a thought of self, or selfishness, and in every one of those weary lands upon whose neck rides the galling yoke of slavery there too must the fight be continued.

Daniel Webster once said, "God grants freedom only to those who love it and who are always ready to guard and preserve it." How sad has been the spectacle of a government pledging its troth to a dictator who has ravaged its fair people. Who is not heartened, however, by the signs that France—ancient glorious France—is stirring out of its lethargy and that the indomitable French spirit is rising in irresistible wrath to strike down this modern Caligula who has tortured it.

You Greeks of America, I know, would want to have your part in lifting America, your chosen land, to the incomparable challenge which it today confronts. Upon what this Nation does, must you well know, shall hang the destiny of the world. This unsurpassed power, which a beneficent God has cast upon us, we hold in stewardship for mankind. America is no longer, thank God, a land of sluggish conscience and callous heart. America is today the land of the Puritan, the land of the crusader, the moral land which wills to do right because before God it is right. Which is not afraid because it knows its cause is just, which counts not the cost because the end cannot be measured by cost.

This America has planted itself across the path of tyranny and defied every tyrant upon the face of the earth. This America has rallied good men, godly men, honest and decent men, noble and heroic women, hopeful children all over the earth to the side of those who love liberty, respect men, and revere God.

And America pledges its faith that those paths which shall destroy tyranny shall not be used to father new tyrannies anywhere in all the world. Rather shall these forces which in good time shall emerge the master of the earth be employed to make a better home for the race, richer lands, fuller fields, better homes, healthier lives, wider horizons for every human being.

A NEW ORDER

There is to be a new order, we agree. But it is to be the new coming of the old things, the old virtues, the old good life, the old faith, the old brotherhood, the old spirit, the old God, and in the old way these old things new come back shall rule upon the only thrones which are permanent—the hearts of men.

These old things in their new raiment shall shine more richly than ever before, for they bear the scars of more sacrifices, the crown of more glorious deeds.

This is the message which you men of Hellas, I know, would give to the world. Teach us all to be men of faith, who do not fear, who are steadfast. Meanwhile, know that you are not alone in your faith, and others with you wear the red badge of courage. Know that the giants of the earth are stirring from their slumbers; the timid are coming out of their hiding places; the uncertain are beginning to feel sure of themselves; the ground is moving under the march of rallying men; the roar of machines, out of which comes the illimitable volume of weapons, is rolling across the hills and the oceans; banners which men follow are waving in the breezes of many continents; the earth is rising against the tyranny of hell; Armageddon is being fought, and the hosts of the Lord are advancing along the whole front.

Although you of Hellas and others who share your sad plight can only say now what Tennyson said of you in Ulysses:

"We are not now that strength which in old
days moved earth and heaven; that which
we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in
will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

Yet be of good cheer. The old days are breaking anew over the horizon. The Bastile of Tyranny is falling.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, at Meeting of Indiana Democratic Editors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at a meeting of Indiana Democratic editors held at French Lick, Ind., on September 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to meet with the Democratic editors of my neighbor State of Indiana. The people of Indiana are no different from the people of Illinois, my home State. We are a part of the great Middle West, that section of our country which has contributed so much and can contribute even more to the continued well-being of our democracy.

I feel that in talking to you, as writers, I am speaking to what is perhaps the most representative group of Indiana's culture and contribution to Americana. The Hoosier State has both figuratively and literally written American history. Its sons and daughters, James Whitcomb Riley, Booth Tarkington, George Carey Eggleston, Jean Stratton Porter, and others too numerous to mention, have drawn word pictures of the American scene that are unforgettable. The famous Hoosier painters have added the exquisite colors to the American panorama. But, working in the background, constantly and faithfully observing and reporting the everyday life of typical Americans, the big things and the little things, the trouble, the struggle, the hopes, and the fears of the common man, have been the newspapermen of Indiana. I have often commented on the unusual number of fair, intelligent, and outstanding men Indiana has given to the national and the international press. I have met them not only all over this country, but in other lands. Today one of your native sons, Elmer Davis, sits at the controls for the agency that disseminates every item of information on the war effort. His is a crushing responsibility, and he is discharging his duty with a degree of conscientiousness and patience that is amazing in view of the criticism and unpleasantness to which his post exposes him.

Washington, as you know, is in some aspects an isolated place. Of course, the radio, the telegraph, and the mail bring us information and news from all parts of the country, yes, all parts of the world. But really to know how the people of this Nation feel, what they are interested in, and what they are thinking about, it is necessary to go to the people. That, of course, is one of the blessings of our form of government. It is democracy at its best. But in going to the people, we as representatives of a democratic form of government, should go with clean hands. We should be honest with the people. They in turn should be honest with us. If one goes merely as a politician, seeking only information that will aid his own political fortunes, or the party he represents, then such a meeting accomplishes little. Unfortunately, you and I witnessed some such meetings last summer while Congress was in recess. These meetings were organized by some Republican leaders who were thinking primarily of holding the political line. This political plot was hatched in Washington. Such an objective is not in keeping with the obligations public servants owe to the people, especially in time of war.

In peace or in war you and I share a mutual responsibility. I am the servant of my constituents and represent them in the Nation's Capital. I should say at this point that, like every other sincere Member of Congress, I do not feel that I serve only those whose vote enabled me to go to the Senate, but rather that my concern is the welfare of the whole State regardless of party. It goes without saying that the welfare of the State is inseparably fused with the welfare of the Nation.

Your responsibility as the liaison between the Government and the people is a serious one. The Government depends upon you not only for the news but to make articulate the views, the problems, and often the unspoken feelings of the American people. The people in turn look to you for a fair and full report on the manner in which their Government is functioning. Thus we share a duty in our Government, a responsibility that has grown more significant and more grave as the internal and external problems mount during this world-wide crisis.

Strange as it may seem this Nation's external problems have been complicated by the very advancement of science which has brought happiness and comfort to the American people. The existence of these external problems upon such a gigantic scale has also complicated our internal problems. The war of today is unlike the war of yesterday. In the past war has been more or less localized. It usually arose from a dispute among rulers and was carried on to a great extent by professional soldiers. This conflict encircles the globe. Every nation and every national has felt the impact of this war, even those who heretofore have been virtually cut off from civilization. When the outlaws in the family of nations seized the highly developed machinery of science, which has so enhanced our peacetime progress, and turned it into an instrument of destruction they unloosed pandemonium on every shore and in every secluded spot in the world. The enormity of this global convulsion makes it difficult for us all to comprehend the functioning of our war program.

This world catastrophe with all of its implications hurls into the face of democracy its greatest challenge for existence. Thank God the leaders of this Nation are conscious of that fact. In a remarkably short space of time we have recruited and trained the largest army in our history, our production of planes, tanks, ships, and guns has been little short of marvelous. It is our genius and capacity for production of implements of war which have raised the hopes of mankind throughout the world. These implements of war are placed in the hands of men who are thoroughly and adequately trained.

Notwithstanding the constant chatter of a few Fascist-minded Americans to the effect that we are muddling the war effort, it is a signal fact that never before in American history has there been a war conducted with such expert generalship. Every leader at the front knows war first-hand. Any mistakes made by Roosevelt, Marshall, King, Eisenhower, or MacArthur have been influenced by our desire to save human lives.

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, it was my privilege to hear General Vandegrift, commander of the Marines, who first invaded and held the Solomon Islands. He told us dramatically of the caution they took in protecting the men under fire. Little or no hand-to-hand fighting was involved. He concluded by saying that Americans fight to live while the Japs fight to die.

Let me add that each campaign has been carefully planned. Our military leaders have not been stampeded by armchair strategists at home. We have accomplished the greatest results with the least cost in blood.

But I would not be true to my trust if I did not say that in reality we have only begun to fight. We shall have reverses. Our casualty list will be long, but in the end democracies will triumph and our fighting men and women will march through the streets of Berlin and Tokyo.

I repeat, I must urge you my fellow citizens to lay aside any optimism of an early end of the struggle. The hard days for the armed forces lie ahead. Instead of taking things easy here at home, we should strengthen our program of self-discipline. It is no idle statement to say that this is a serious hour in the affairs of this Republic. It is the time for every American to ask himself, "What further contribution can I make to win the war, what contribution can I make to win the peace?" An enlightened public opinion is one of the bulwarks of a free people. The hour calls for fearless, honest men—men who place country above any consideration. And in this hour of one victory after another upon the far-flung battlefields of the world, it is the duty of every American, worthy of his name, to give unfailing loyalty, unflagging support to our Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

My friends, the mention of this great statesman's name takes me back to the summer of 1937. A bridge on the outer Michigan Drive in the city of Chicago is being dedicated. Words come through the microphone, "The peace of the world and the welfare and security of every nation today is threatened. War will come unless aggressor nations are quarantined." The statement made upon that occasion stunned the average American. It was difficult to believe. But this voice was attempting to stir the imagination of the American people to the impending dangers. It was a voice that was speaking with authority. It was the voice of a man who had four sons subject to military service in the event of war, our own beloved President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

He was one of the first Americans who saw in the long ago the machinations of the Axis Powers. He had the vision to foresee the coming events. He had the courage to warn his people that war was possible at a time when they wanted to think of nothing but peace. As a result of this vision and courage, he was subjected to fierce and penetrating criticism. In spite of this criticism he never wavered in his determination to give America and her institutions an adequate national defense. Even today, with victories everywhere on the military and naval fronts, a few men in both public and private life seize every opportunity to snipe at this good man and his administration. The latest attempt to smear the administration in the conduct of the war deals with the controversy over Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army. Some partisan Republicans, hungry for an opportunity to make the headlines in the press, had the temerity to say that Marshall was being demoted and relieved of his post of duty because the British do not like him. It was one of those absurd canards that frequently come to life in the Nation's Capital. The instigators had no facts upon which to base this statement. It made no difference to them that such a rumor might disturb the friendly relationship between England and America. It was of no concern to them that such demoralizing statements tend to impair and frustrate the war effort. It meant nothing to them to strike savagely at the reputation of General Marshall, one of the great global military experts of all time. The truth of the matter is that the war has been going too well for some of the little men and women who from the beginning have criticized the conduct of the war. Obviously, I do not contend that everything is perfect.

Mistakes have been made—mistakes will continue to be made. That was inevitable in a democracy which turned its peacetime econom, to all all-out war machine over night. Errors were bound to creep in and they will continue to in a great democracy like ours.

But, my friends, history is only repeating itself. All through the American Revolution, appeasers, political enemies, kickers, the lazy, and selfish, who shrank from sacrifice, nagged and sniped at George Washington. Shrewd Tories, masked as patriots, spread defeatism by whispering that Washington was a blunderer and incompetent.

During the struggle between the States, Abraham Lincoln was bitterly assailed. Vilification of a President reach an all-time low in venom and vulgarity. They called him a gorilla, tyrant, an ignorant backwoodsman, and a warmonger. But the immortal Abraham Lincoln received the criticism with a charitable spirit and quietly mumbled, "Lord forgive them, they know not what they do."

Let me ask the people of Indiana this simple question, Is there anyone who believes that Japan would not have started her undeclared war against us if Wendell Willkie, your Hoosier copatriot, had been elected President in 1940? Does anyone believe that Wendell Willkie could have kept the peace of this Nation, in view of what we now know about the treacherous conspiracy of the Axis Powers?

Had Wendell Willkie been the people's choice in 1940, war would have come, Congress would have delegated to him, or any other President, the same wartime powers we delegated to Franklin Roosevelt. Rationing would be necessary, price control would be here, and there would have been imposed all the Government rules and regulations which now interfere with your daily life. Hardships have always been felt in time of war. Liberty has always been curtailed. It is more so in this war because of its global character. But after every war the people have regained their liberties, and this coming post-war period will be no exception to that time-proven practice, notwithstanding the 10-year-old cry of dictatorship by the die-hard leaders of the opposition.

Yes, we have made mistakes, but how many mistakes do you think Wendell Willkie would have made, as President, if you use the mistakes he made in his campaign of 1940 as a yardstick?

Turning from Editor Willkie to the editors assembled here, let me emphatically say you have that highly important role of presenting to the people throughout the Nation, the legislators, and the administrators of the Government the truth. Yours is the responsibility because you are at the core of local, national, and international affairs. You comment and you illuminate as much as is possible upon what you see or hear. However, there is a very important line that should be maintained between the news and comments, one of which most editors are well aware. Yet, as in all forms of endeavor, there is the occasional one who fails to observe and respect, either unintentionally or intentionally, the distinction between news and comment.

I doubt that there ever was a time in our history when it was more important that the canons of journalism should be respected. Fidelity to the public interest is all important at any time, but it seems to me to assume greater significance than ever in this gruelling global crisis through which we are passing. News as it is found is what the people need. Obviously, news in the finest sense of the word is what is required. That the press of the Nation realizes its responsibility is conceded. Newspapers throughout the country have established an unequaled record for loyalty in the manner in which they have guarded those aspects of our economic life and public action which required secrecy so as not to give information to the enemy. The newspaper men in Washington respect the requests of men in high public life. You can give them an off-the-record story for their own information, and they will keep it out of public print. What is true of Washington reporters is true of the press throughout the country. The newspapers have given and will continue to give support to the war program, advocating purchase of

bonds, establishing of blood banks, encouraging welfare work for the armed forces, devoting much space to acquainting their readers with wartime regulations, and serving in innumerable other ways.

We all know that it is the duty of the newspapers to support enthusiastically the war until Nazi, Jap, and Fascist tyranny is destroyed. We also understand that during the war it becomes necessary for the press to discuss the winning of the peace. Here, there can be an honest difference of opinion as to what should be done in the future to eliminate war once and for all. I maintain that every American agrees with the objective. The only question which arises is the mechanics for the enforcement of a lasting peace.

Americans everywhere hope that out of this debacle of blood, tears, and toil a better world awaits us. But it will not come to us unless we plan for it. Law makers and administrators look to the press to learn the attitude of the people. And they hope to get from the press, not only the private views of the publishers or the editors, but the views of the people as evidenced by their activities. It is not my intention to minimize the contribution which the editors can make in interpreting and presenting views, for by virtue of their position of listening post for the country they are well qualified to observe and to focus attention. That is their job in every community.

It has been accepted that we will by no means return to the normal as we knew it in 1933, 1935, or at any time before the war. A new norm will be established. We all hope that economic equality, social equality, and tolerance will not be merely catch words, merely dreams on the international scene, but rather that they will be the basis and fundamental issues upon which a new world order can be created from the chaos of the past. Our role when peace is declared will be to point the way and to help nations achieve that degree of civilization which will assure more than a generation of peace.

It is evident that we are making headway in the Congress. It seems to me that we have reached the turning point. That conclusion is based upon what the House of Representatives did on Tuesday last when the Fulbright resolution was overwhelmingly passed. The near unanimity of action in the House of Representatives, when the House passed this resolution, was befitting the Representatives of a great people who have seen the light. That resolution merely proposes appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace. We are to be a part of that international machinery through duly constituted processes. The passing of this resolution demonstrated beyond peradventure of a doubt that the isolationism of the pre-Pearl Harbor days is dead forever. This action upon the part of one branch of Congress is a recognition of a great responsibility that we cannot shirk in the days to come. There will be great rejoicing by the people of the earth to learn that at last America is willing to take her place in an organization that has for its purpose the keeping of the peace of the world. It is pure balderdash for anyone to say that any part of the American sovereignty is being destroyed through this kind of a resolution.

My friends, America is a Nation of destiny, and under this resolution we shall still be the masters of our own destiny. To follow any path other than some type of world collaboration means another war in 20 years. If we want to enjoy the "four freedoms" so pointedly expressed in the Atlantic Charter by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, we must design some type of international machinery which will insure freedom from war.

It would be a sad commentary, indeed, upon the wisdom of the United Nations if, after sacrificing millions upon millions of men, utilizing untold billions of wealth, all in the cause of freedom, we do not some way succeed in writing the final chapter to barbarism and brutality. But I am firmly convinced that modern warfare with all of its implements of human destruction by land, air, and sea has convinced the leaders and the peoples of the earth that a continuation of war, with all of the modern equipment, means the end of civilization.

As one of your representatives in the United States Senate, one of the last citadels of parliamentary liberty, let me say in conclusion that my fervent hope is that two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate, backed by the determination of the American people, will enter into some kind of an international collaboration with the Allied Nations which has a basis for enduring and lasting peace. Whatever course we adopt must be a long-time course if we are to remove the causes of war. The day has passed when this Nation or any nation can live alone. The individual who believes that we can defend ourselves in modern warfare against a combination of any world powers is thinking in the limbo of the long dead past. In the momentous days to come may we as Americans stimulate clear thinking upon the national and international picture before us. Let us do away with petty and selfish considerations in our mental toil. Patriotic Americans must consider the problems of tomorrow. They will strive mightily to find the right if they are willing to consider the future welfare of their country and all mankind. And those same American patriots will pray to God that He will uphold and defend that right.

Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an interesting and timely article which appeared in yesterday's New York Times. The article is entitled "Russia Is Forcing Issues as We Delay Post-war Plan." The article was written by Mr. James B. Reston, whom I consider to be a reliable authority.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA IS FORCING ISSUES AS WE DELAY POST-WAR PLAN

(By James B. Reston)

LONDON, September 26.—The decision of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to defer consideration of any international peace plan until some time in the future has not produced any noticeable increase in the unity of the United Nations governments that are operating in this part of the world.

While officials of the British and refugee Governments in London fully sympathize with Senator TOM CONNALLY'S desire to avoid any "illconsidered debate with regard to subjects of vital interest to our allies," they do not share his confidence that postponement of these international problems will contribute to their solution.

The truth is that Russia's aggressive diplomacy is forcing these countries to choose up sides; they are being asked point blank by the Russians to make treaties such as the forthcoming Soviet-Czech treaty, and the Soviet Government is making it quite clear that Moscow expects Britain and the United States to give evidence at the forthcoming conference of the three great powers that they are prepared to talk turkey on detailed questions of spheres of influence and boundaries and to make clear what our policy is on the so-called world authority about which so many people are talking and writing in the United States.

Nobody here is trying to interfere with the internal affairs of the United States, the complexities of which startle them into silence; this is particularly true of British officials.

BRITISH ARE WORRIED

While it is their fondest hope that they will be able to coordinate their post-war foreign policy with ours, they cannot ignore the fact that Russia is pressing them most urgently to make definite decisions on all kinds of questions that the United States Senate is apparently unwilling even to discuss.

Two overwhelming fears dominate the minds of British officials—first that they will be unable to work out with the United States and the rest of the world some kind of international trade and financial organization that will give their people full employment after the war (that is why Baron Keynes is in Washington now); and, second, that they will be forced into a position of choosing between Russia and the United States instead of working out a world authority that all nations can agree upon.

Like Senator CONNALLY and his colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, the British also would like to postpone the day when they have to put the chips down on a specific foreign policy—like ourselves, the British also have a genius for postponing decisions and a hatred of violent division and controversy—but they are in the middle between us and the Russians, with the Russians pressing them to decide now and we are pressing them to temporize and generalize until some more favorable unidentified day.

There is reason for saying, and it is necessary to report, that this issue of declaring ourselves now or postponing all definite discussions is almost certain to come to a climax at the meeting in Moscow among representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia.

The agenda drafted for this meeting by Russia on one hand and by ourselves on the other indicate clearly the dilemma in which the British find themselves. The Russians want to speak frankly now and at least reach a basis whereon the future Europe will be decided.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill in the House of Commons has said that on his part no questions would be barred, though he did not guarantee any specific answers. We on the other hand have so far indicated that there are certain questions that we would like to bar and this division clearly has serious implications.

Most objective observers in London agree that a great deal of nonsense has been spoken in the past about how we and the British have not been willing to cooperate with the Russians in the conduct of the war. The fact is that the British have run all over the world at the drop of a hat to talk to anybody about anything and President Roosevelt has shown unprecedented patience in his at-

tempts to arrange a meeting with Premier Joseph Stalin.

OUR POLICY HELD ENIGMATIC

Once this is conceded, however, it must also be stated that in the last few weeks Washington's foreign policy has been even more enigmatic than Moscow's.

We know that Vice Foreign Commissar Andrey Y. Vishinsky will represent Premier Stalin on the allied political commission to deal with Italian and other Mediterranean questions and that Harold Macmillan, Minister to the French Government in Algiers, will represent Britain on this same body. We know that Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden will represent Britain and Foreign Commissar Vyachesloff M. Molotov will sit in for Mr. Stalin on the "foreign secretaries conference" in Moscow. But we do not know who will represent the United States at either of these vital conferences and we do not know anything about what our policy will be on the commission or at the conference when we do make up our minds who is to attend.

Nor are these the only questions being asked about America's intentions by officials in this part of the world. The long delay by Washington in settling the case of Sumner Welles has naturally led to a great deal of discussion here. So have reports that are not mere speculation that at this critical point we are debating about changing our Ambassador in Moscow. So have our announcements that we were establishing committees to deal with the rehabilitation of areas belonging to our allies.

All these points have led to a great deal of uncertainty about the United States and where she stands, and while this is not exactly a new experience among the diplomats of the world, it is particularly urgent now, due to the pressure from Moscow. The right of the United States to take any unilateral decision it likes is not denied here, but at the same time it is pointed out that by choosing to do so we are encouraging the Russians to establish a unilateral European policy of their own.

Shipbuilding and Merchant Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the work of shipbuilding in the present war has been one of the most outstanding achievements in the history of the world. I extend my remarks by including herein a statement made by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy (retired), Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, on September 24, 1943, which is a report to the American people on the progress of the merchant shipbuilding program for the past 2 years. The progress is remarkable, and is one in which every American should take the greatest pride. I hope that any person interested in this speech may also read my remarks yesterday on Victory Fleet Day.

The statement of Admiral Land to which I refer to above is as follows:

This is a report to the American people on the progress of their merchant shipbuilding program for the last 2 years and an invitation to them to join the men and women of the shipbuilding industry in celebrating Victory Fleet Day on Monday, September 27, second anniversary of the launching of the *Patrick Henry*, number one Liberty ship.

Victory Fleet Day has a deep intrinsic meaning to those who have been actively engaged in this the greatest 2-year shipbuilding program the world has ever known. By their sweat and their brains and their determination to see the job through, they have delivered into service with steam up a fleet of more than 2,100 oceangoing cargo ships, whose deadweight tonnage of more than 22,000,000 tons is double the size of the Nation's pre-Pearl Harbor fleet.

So vast is this new fleet that should it be strung out at intervals of little more than a mile apart it would stretch a bridge of ships across the Atlantic all the way from America to Europe. Considering that each vessel in war service is making an average of three round trips a year, the new fleet could deliver in one 12-month period enough war materials and other strategic supplies to fill more than a million and a half freight cars, each carrying 40 tons—the equivalent of about 30,000 average length American freight trains.

In September 1941 when the *Patrick Henry* slid down the ways as the first Liberty ship to taste salt water, there were 21 shipyards with about 100 ways employed in the oceangoing merchant shipbuilding program. Today approximately 70 yards, with more than 300 ways, are delivering more than 5 ships a day. These yards are expected to step up production still further so as to deliver 6 ships a day in the near future.

Two years ago the industry employed about 200,000 men. Today three-quarters of a million men and women are employed in shipyards alone, and more than a million others in plants throughout the Nation are producing materials for ship construction.

As ship production has risen during the past 2 years, going up from 7 vessels in September 1941 to about 170 this month, cost per ship has steadily decreased. In the last war, when America was startling the world with its production of the famous Hog Island vessels, ships cost the taxpayer $210 per ton. Today Liberty ships' costs have been slashed until they are now built for about $160 per ton. This difference is in spite of the fact that present-day shipyard workers earn a base pay of $1.20 an hour, as compared to 80 cents an hour for workers of the last war period.

High production at lower cost has been accomplished through three main developments. They are standardization, centralization and prefabrication. A fourth is "no changes." Standardization of design of the various types of ships being built made possible the centralized procurement and control of material flow from factory to shipyard. Today, all the power and speed of prefabrication has been brought into play so that the actual shipway is the end station of a vast assembly line reaching into more than 1,200 factories and dipping into the natural resources of the 48 States. With perfection of assembly line construction methods Liberty ship production time has been cut from more than 200 to less than 45 days since the program began.

There has been much discussion about the post-war use of Liberty ships. No definite plans can be made for their final utilization. It should be remembered, however, that Liberty ships were designed and are being constructed for one reason and one reason only—as emergency vessels to deliver the goods necessary to win the war. Without Liberty ships, it would be impossible for the Allies to prosecute the war to victory. When victory has been won and the world is again at peace, the Liberty ships will have served the purpose for which they were built.

Liberty ships were designed and constructed because, with existing materials and equipment, no other design of vessel could be placed into mass production. Today, as more modern propulsion equipment is being made available, some shipyards are switching from production of Liberty ships to the modern speedy Victory ships. A complete change cannot be brought about overnight, or even in a single year, unless existing conditions change, so while yards will soon begin delivery of Victory ships, Liberty ship construction will not be abandoned in the near future.

If the past 2-year record looks bright, the future looks even brighter. Present production records call for the completion, from the inception of the Maritime Commission's long-range program, by the end of 1944, of approximately 50,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant ships. This means that by the end of 1944 American shipyards will have constructed a fleet of ships whose deadweight tonnage is greater than the pre-war fleets of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Japan, and Norway combined.

On this Victory Fleet Day America owes a special debt of gratitude to that small group of experts who formed the nucleus of the present shipyard personnel. When the United States was forced into its huge war shipbuilding program it had comparatively few men who possessed the "know-how" necessary to build ships. These men were spread throughout the industry to train and supervise hundreds of thousands of inexperienced workers.

The fact that American fighting men are attacking on the battle fronts of the world is firm attestation that our shipbuilders and ship operators are doing their job. America had to win the first phase of its shipbuilding battle before our armed forces could attack successfully. Next Monday shipyard workers from coast to coast are pledging to their fighting forces that they will continue to deliver the ships necessary to win the war and to bring our men back home.

Mr. Speaker, I also extend as part of my remarks a release of the War Shipping Administration under date of September 24, 1943, showing the response that is being made throughout the Nation to the appeal of Admiral Land to give merchant seamen a place of equality with other members of the armed forces on town and community honor rolls. There are no people more deserving of such recognition, and it is the earnest hope of all who are connected with the merchant marine that this course will be followed.

Governors all over the Nation are pledging wholehearted support to an appeal by Admiral Emory S. Land, War Shipping Administrator, to give merchant seamen a place of equality with other members of the armed forces on town and community honor rolls, the WSA announced today.

Admiral Land made his appeal in personal letters to Governors of the 48 States and of United States Territories and possessions as a result of a flood of letters from families and friends of merchant seamen who said that in many communities they were not counted among the Nation's war heroes. Land pointed out that Congress has officially recognized the outstanding services of these men by providing medals for distinguished service and other honor awards. He also called attention to a declaration by President Roosevelt that the work of our merchant seamen is just as important to our ultimate victory as the men in

the armed forces. That theirs is a most dangerous job, Admiral Land declared, is attested by the grim toll of their lost and injured.

"This is a war of transportation; these men are doing a big job—a tough job—in keeping open the vital life line between our industrial front and our battle fronts. Without it we could never hope for victory," Admiral Land said.

Responding quickly to his appeal, Governors are taking action by calling the attention of communities in their States to the role merchant seamen are playing. Many have notified the War Shipping Administration that they are preparing proclamations and others are calling press conferences.

Typical of letters received is one from Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, who said, in part:

"I agree entirely with you that these men, performing outstanding services during the present crisis, rightfully deserve recognition along with those others in the armed forces. Certainly these men are doing a splendid job and are contributing their all to the cause; therefore, there should be no differentiation."

Post-War Employment Opportunities for Disabled Veterans in the Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming, United States Civil Service Commission, before the annual meeting of the Disabled American Veterans at Hotel New Yorker, New York City, September 18, 1943:

It is a real honor and privilege to be able to address this annual meeting of the Disabled American Veterans.

In a recent address before the Department of the District of Columbia of the American Legion it was my privilege and opportunity to explain the attitude of the Civil Service Commission relative to employment opportunities for veterans in the Federal Government after the war.

Today it is my purpose to deal specifically with the subject of employment opportunities for disabled veterans in the Federal Government after the war.

It is recognized, of course, that this is not exclusively a post-war problem. Disabled veterans are returning every day. Consequently, many of the observations which will be made relative to action to be taken after the war are equally applicable to current conditions. But in order that we may look at the whole problem the emphasis in this talk is on the situations which will arise after the war.

We believe that there is no question but that preference must be and will be extended to veterans by both public and private employers.

A grateful nation would not have it otherwise. In the words of the President of the United States:

"The members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problem."

A realistic nation knows that it cannot be otherwise. Over 10,000,000 men and women cannot be uprooted from their normal pursuits in order that their nation may be preserved, and then, when this objective has been reached, be expected to pick up their normal pursuits again without any help or assistance. Life just isn't that simple.

The Federal Government, as an employer, should strictly enforce preference for veterans in the following manner:

1. Whenever it is necessary to reduce the number of employees on the Federal pay roll, the Civil Service Commission should see to it that no honorably discharged soldier, sailor, or marine, whose efficiency rating is "good" or better, is separated while a nonveteran in competition with him is retained, regardless of efficiency ratings and length of service.

2. Every employee who left other than a temporary position in the Federal Government to enter the armed forces should be placed back in his old job, or, if his old job has disappeared, in a job of like seniority, status, and pay. This must be done irrespective of any other personnel adjustments it may be necessary to make.

3. Veterans, following the war, should have the opportunity to compete and should be given preference for the career civil-service positions for which they had no opportunity to compete because of their service in the armed forces. This will be possible because, as a result of recommendations made by the Civil Service Commission to the President, all appointments to these positions since March 16, 1942, have been for not to exceed the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. One of the primary reasons for making this recommendation was to make it possible for returning veterans to compete for these career positions.

4. Appointing officers who pass over veterans in considering names submitted to them by the Civil Service Commission should continue to be required to state their reasons in writing for so doing. But, in addition, the Civil Service Commission should have the authority to decide whether or not the reasons are acceptable.

That is a summary of the position of the Civil Service Commission. Let us discuss each one of these points with particular reference to the problems of the disabled veterans.

Our first point dealt with the granting of preference to veterans in connection with reduction in force programs. In this area there is no special problem as far as the disabled veteran is concerned. But we do want you to know that the Civil Service Commission intends to do everything within its power to enforce the regulations which grant veterans a preference in connection with any reductions in force. Where veterans or representatives of veterans feel that either the letter or the spirit of our regulations on this matter has been violated, they are not only invited but urged to appeal their cases to the Commission.

Next, there is the problem of the proper placement of persons who left other than temporary positions in the Federal Government for the purpose of entering the armed forces.

The Selective Training and Service Act specifies that persons who have left positions in the Federal Government and have entered the armed forces shall be restored to the positions they left or to positions of like seniority, status, and pay.

Up to this point the obligation of the appointing officer is clear. If any appointing officer of the Federal Government does not act in conformity with this obligation, something should be done about it, and something will be done about it. The Civil Service Commission will ask the head of the department or agency to take appropriate action. If such action is not taken, a recommendation for appropriate action will be submitted by the Commission to the President through his liaison officer for personnel management. In our judgment, however, the times when it will be necessary to take such drastic steps will be few and far between. The great majority of appointing officers will recognize their obligations and act accordingly.

But this isn't the complete story as far as the Selective Training and Service Act is concerned. The act specifies that the veteran who formerly worked for the federal Government has a right to return to his old position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay if he is still qualified to perform the duties of such position.

This provision could be interpreted to mean that the Federal Government, as an employer, is under no obligation to a former employee who becomes disabled and who is unable to perform the duties of his former position.

Such an attitude upon the part of the Federal Government would, in the judgment of the Civil Service Commission, be intolerable. Certainly former employees of the Federal Government who become disabled in the service of their country are, if anything, entitled to more consideration, and not less consideration, than their comrades who were not disabled.

And yet, at the same time, we do not want to put former employees of the Federal Government who return as disabled veterans in just any kind of a job. They do not and will not want to be treated in this manner. They do and they will want us to place them in the kind of a job where they know they are making a distinct contribution to the carrying on of the Government's work.

This won't be easy. In many instances it will mean that before they are put back to work in the Federal Government it will be necessary for them to be trained to do things which they have never done before. In other instances, it will mean that, after they have been placed in positions, it will be necessary to provide them with special training.

Fortunately, the Federal Government, through the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Security Agency, the Army, the Navy, and the War Manpower Commission, seems determined to provide such veterans with this type of training. The Commission, as the representative of the Nation's largest employer, welcomes the work that is being done, and looks forward with real hope to the work that will be done in the field of rehabilitation. If the Government's rehabilitation programs are successful, it will be possible for the Government, as well as private employers, to place the disabled veterans who formerly worked for them in jobs where they will know that they are making a vital contribution to the work of government and industry.

This, however, is just one part of the total problem. The biggest problem is to convince appointing officers that there are jobs in their organizations which can be filled by physically handicapped persons.

The Civil Service Commission has been working on this phase of the problem for over a year. We have surveyed over 2,500 different positions in the Federal service to find out what jobs can be filled by handicapped persons. After all, very few jobs require all of the abilities and faculties of a worker.

In our surveys we have found out just what abilities and faculties are needed in particular jobs. Then, we have taken persons with these abilities and faculties, even though they may have other handicaps, and have persuaded appointing officers to use their services. Since October of last year

over 15,000 physically handicapped persons have been placed in Federal positions as a result of this program.

Our next step is to make a study of the manner in which these physically handicapped employees have carried on their work. This study will be completed within the next few months.

Our objective is clear. We are determined to put ourselves in a position where we can demonstrate that specific jobs require specific abilities and faculties. We also intend to be in a position where we can demonstrate that persons with these abilities and faculties, even though they may have other handicaps, are capable of doing just as effective a job as persons who are not handicapped.

We believe that once we are armed with this type of factual information we will be in a position to render a very real service to the former Government employee who has been disabled as a result of his service in the armed forces. We will work with him in finding jobs which can be filled by persons with the abilities and faculties which he possesses, even though he may at the same time be regarded as a physically handicapped person.

We will then call to the attention of the appointing officer concerned the fact that this former employee of the United States Government is entitled to preferential consideration in the filling of the job concerned. In most cases, this will be enough. The disabled veteran will be given the job.

But, once we have gone this far, we believe that any appointing officer who shows any tendency not to do so should be required to select this former employee—now a disabled veteran—for appointment, unless he can present reasons for not doing so which are acceptable to the Commission.

In this way, and only in this way, can the Federal Government fulfill what, in our judgment, is a solemn obligation to place in the right jobs all of the persons who left other than temporary positions in the Government to enter the armed services.

Next, we turn to the question of opening up positions for veterans who prior to the war did not work for the Federal Government.

We believe that thousands of returning veterans should have the opportunity to compete for career civil-service positions for which they had no opportunity to compete because of their service in the armed forces, and that they should be given preference in the filling of these positions.

When disabled veterans appear on the Civil Service Commission's lists of eligibles as a result of these career positions being thrown open to competition, we will be confronted with virtually the same kind of a problem which confronts us in the case of a former Federal employee who returns as a disabled veteran.

Here again we will present to appointing officers disabled veterans who have the faculties and abilities needed to perform particular jobs, irrespective of any other physical handicaps which they may have.

But what is going to happen to these disabled veterans after we have presented their names to appointing officers?

This question leads us very naturally to the fourth part of our program. Appointing officers who pass over veterans must now submit in writing their reasons for so doing. The Civil Service Commission believes that it should have the right to determine whether or not these reasons are acceptable. Any determination by an employee of the Commission that a particular reason was acceptable would be subject to appeal by the veteran or his recognized representative. In the course of such appeal, the veteran would, of course, be acquainted with the reasons advanced by the appointing officers for failing to appoint him, and then would be given the opportunity of presenting his side of the case.

Under such a procedure, if an appointing officer asserts that a disabled veteran cannot perform certain types of work, the Commission will be in a position to consider whether or not his assertions are justified in the light of what our studies have revealed as to the faculties and abilities which are needed to handle particular jobs. In addition, we will be able to point to concrete evidence indicating persons who possess certain faculties and abilities, even though they may not possess certain others, have demonstrated on the job that they are capable of rendering just as fine a service as those who do not have physical handicaps.

So much for policy. In addition to policies, however, we must be organized properly in order to carry out the policies.

With this in mind, the Civil Service Commission has recently established in its central office an organizational unit charged with the responsibility of devoting all of its time to veterans' problems. Mr. Charles R. Anderson, who is favorably known to veterans in all parts of the country, is in charge of this unit. Each one of our 13 regional directors will have on his staff a counterpart to Mr. Anderson.

The creation of these special units, however, is not a device for relieving the rest of the Civil Service Commission's personnel from the responsibility of dealing with veterans' problems. Mr. Anderson and his colleagues will develop the plans which, when accepted by us, will be executed by the entire organization. And you, and veterans everywhere, can rest assured that this responsibility will be discharged with the same determination and enthusiasm which has been characteristic of the Commission's personnel throughout the war period.

Throughout this talk reference has been made to the fact that war service appointees will have to make way for returning veterans. There is no question in our minds but that such a policy will be followed. And yet, this does not mean that we are blind to the fact that this will create serious problems for many civilian employees of the Government who have made a major contribution to the war program, just as have millions of civilians who have been working in our war industries. We must devise plans which will enable these loyal and efficient workers to bridge the gap between war activities and post-war activities. In this respect, Government, as an employer, faces the same problem that thousands of private employers will face. Government, as well as private employers, must actually face the problem in an effort to work out a sound solution and not simply recognize the existence of the problem.

When this tremendous problem is coupled with the many difficult situations which we know will confront all of us in connection with the placement of veterans, we recognize that the period of adjustment which awaits us is one which will truly try men's souls. And yet, I believe that a large percentage of the persons who will be charged with the working out of proper solutions to these problems will have as their sole motivation the desire to render the maximum of service to their fellow men. If this is the case, the problems will be solved.

Finally, I want you to know that even though today we have been discussing some of the problems which will confront us after the war we are not among that group which feels that the time has come to relax our efforts in connection with the war program and concentrate on post-war problems. Grim days lie just ahead. The time when all of our resources should be concentrated on our present job is at hand. If they are not so concentrated, we may be responsible for the needless loss of thousands of lives. This is no time for civilians to think about leaving war jobs, and obtaining jobs which they think will give them greater security in the days which lie ahead. Such persons are forgetting the part which they must play in saving the Nation, in a vain effort to save themselves. There will be no such thing as freedom from want or security for any one of us, unless all of us dedicate all that we have to the war, and do not let up for one second until the war is actually won.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, in Tribute to Defenders of Poland

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at the Tribute to Poland Day meeting in East St. Louis, Ill., on September 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout America patriotic citizens in every walk of life have paid tribute to the defenders of Poland, which 4 years ago this month was invaded and overrun by the Nazi army under the leadership of Adolf Hitler.

It is fitting and proper that the people of this thriving and patriotic community, people of all political parties and people of all religious faiths, should join in remembering what happened on September 1, 1939.

It was 5:45 in the morning on that eventful day when, without warning or a declaration of war, Poland felt the might of the Nazi army. The Poles were still asleep. Their anti-aircraft guns were not manned, their planes were drawn up in rows on their air fields. Nazi bombers caught them completely by surprise, bombed them unmercifully, and destroyed much of the Polish air force on the ground in the first 3 hours of the war. You ask me why Poland was caught by surprise, and my answer is that 3 days before the Nazi invasion Hitler had agreed to have Poland send an emissary to Berlin with full powers to settle the Polish question. Before Warsaw had time to send an emissary to Berlin, or even to receive Hitler's terms, the Nazis had begun their ruthless invasion. For 6 years Hitler had been promising Poland peace. And the request for the Polish emissary was only a ruse to set the German war machine rolling at the proper time. Over a period of years the leaders of the Axis Powers successfully pursued this same course of duplicity and hypocrisy.

On September 18, 1931, without warning or a declaration of war—with the identical technique of surprise treachery—the Japanese had invaded Manchuria, thus opening hostilities on China.

On December 7, 1941, without warning or a declaration of war, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. All of these surprise attacks bore every earmark of systematically planned

campaigns—all were smoke-screened by suspicion-lulling protestations from the aggressors of no territorial designs and peaceful purposes.

This was the new "blitzkrieg without warning" on an unsuspecting neighbor. When asked, following the invasion of Poland, how the Germans justified it, Gen. Alexander Loehr, then commander of Hitler's air fleet southeast, said: "It is our new philosophy of war. It is the most merciful type of warfare. It surprises your enemy, paralyzes him in one blow, and shortens the war by weeks, maybe months."

He might well have been speaking for all the Axis Powers. This is a prime example of specious Axis argument—traitorous murder of the weak by the strong justified on humanitarian grounds.

The method has not shortened the war by bringing about a realization of Hitler's or Japan's imperial ambitions.

It has succeeded only in arousing 32 nations to the solemn determination, backed by their colossal armed might, that these traitors to human decency shall be hammered to unconditional surrender. Already in Europe and in the Pacific, Poland, Manchuria, and Pearl Harbor begin to be avenged.

Yes; we are aroused. We are fighting mad. We are utilizing our manpower, our natural resources; in fact, all we have to defeat the treacherous foe. In retrospect we realize how unfortunate it was the Allied Nations pursued their peaceful ways while the Axis Nations prepared to conquer the world. Peaceful nations, like England and France, living next door to Germany, apparently underestimated what Hitler and Mussolini were planning as they feverishly prepared for war. But that, my friends, is now water over the dam. This is no time to assess blame for what occurred in the past. We in America were under the hypnosis of peace in the Pacific. No one dreamed that Hawaii would be pulverized by the bombs of the unspeakable Jap. And so people who loved peace and hated war sat silently by, living on hopes and false information as to what would happen next.

But today, my friends, America and the Allied Nations thoroughly understand. All of the underbrush has been removed. Our course is set, our terms of unconditional surrender have been made. In victory we will quarantine the aggressors and strip them of their military power. In defeat we would become slaves, denied the right of free speech, freedom of worship, and all our unalienable rights.

That we will be victorious is now a certainty. But no one who is in his right mind can doubt that the roads that lead to Berlin and Tokyo will be marked by a tremendous sacrifice in human blood, destruction of property, and tears and heartaches by the millions. But with it all, Americans can take it. We know that our liberty is at stake. No longer does the boastful Hitler and the savage Tojo talk about making peace in the White House. No longer do these leaders, drunk with power, shout to the world about the weaklings of America. The leading democracy in the world has demonstrated to all mankind that it can function in a great global crisis. Three years ago we had 1,744 naval planes of all types, and many of us in Congress at that critical hour were being condemned because we wanted more. Today we have more than 18,000 planes, dive bombers, torpedo bombers, fighters, patrol ships, and planes of all types. Three years ago we had only 1,076 vessels and many less after the raid of Pearl Harbor. But today our fleet is composed of 14,072 vessels, including 613 warships. Three years ago our Army was composed of 440,000 men. Today our Army is around 7,300,000. Three years ago our ground air forces had 2,906 planes. Today the number is a military secret. However, it is safe to say that our total is many, many times what it was 3 years ago.

Let it be understood that these men in all branches of the service are the best equipped, best fed, best paid, and have the best medical care. The American Army is the finest Army that was ever sent forth to do battle against a common foe. This is the answer to the Axis Powers who understand nothing but might. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Mussolini is the first upon whom the promise of that biblical injunction has been visited. Hitler will be the next victim, then our might will be felt in the Pacific where our troops, our tanks, and other fighting equipment, backed up by planes and the most powerful Navy in all time, will wrest the beaches from the enemy and ultimately restore the property they have stolen to its rightful owners. The Japs, too, will perish by the sword.

In the vanguard of our fighting men and women can be found Americans who trace their ancestry to every nation in the world. America is, America has been and always will be the land of opportunity and freedom. Since long before the Revolutionary War, men who sought the free way of life, who hated the shackles of tyranny, left their native land to become Americans. This is the melting pot of the world, and with every race and religion represented here, we have been able to show the world how people with different tongues and conflicting backgrounds could live in peace with one another. If it can be accomplished in America, it can be achieved throughout the world. It may take time, you and I may not live to see that wonderfull day—but it is certain to come if civilization continues to progress. If I am wrong in this prophecy, then civilization must perish.

History tells us that Polish citizens were found in each of the Thirteen Colonies. One of the first citizens of Poland to make a name for himself in this country was Thaddeus Kosciusko. He came direct from Poland to enter the United States Army in the Revolutionary War. He volunteered in 1776. So distinguished was his record as a military genius in the battle of Yorktown and in New York that Gen. George Washington promoted him to the rank of colonel in the field artillery. He became known as the Father of American Artillery.

In that same struggle for independence, another citizen of Polish birth came to America to participate in this righteous cause. His name was Casimir Pulaski. So distinguished was his record as a military man that he was promoted to brigadier general in Washington's army and thereafter became chief of the dragoons in 1777. He was a brave man. He was always out in front and it was while leading his troops in the storming on the fort at Savannah, Ga., that he was killed.

Americans of Polish ancestry have fought in every war in which the United States has been engaged. They have contributed to the advancement of American commerce, industry, art, and education. Today Americans of Polish origin are giving as wholeheartedly of the war effort, both on foreign fields and on the home fronts, as they have given to the peaceful development of this Nation. There are Poles in the R. A. F. They are recognized by their comrades in arms as being among the best fighting men in this war. When they are in the air, they never forget the bombs of defenseless Warsaw. The Polish Navy took part in the naval operations in the Sicilian landing. Yes; the dauntless descendants of Kosciusko and Pulaski today fight even as they fought for the liberation of enslaved peoples. They fight for the destiny of mankind.

While speaking of the Revolutionary period, it is well to recall that Marquis de Lafayette, one of the dearest friends that General Washington ever had, came from the country of France to aid the colonists in their Revolutionary conflict. He had lived under one of the most despotic regimes that history has ever recorded. His soul, however, was aflame with the theory that all mankind is created equal and so he came to America as a crusader in a noble cause.

Your own county of St. Clair is filled with corresponding history of men who hated military despots. Hecker, Korner, Carl Schurz, and Siegel were leaders of a German group of citizens who fled from tyranny to come to the great Republic of the West. These men, in those early days, walked the streets of your cities and made the hearts of the whole Middle West thrill with their noble championing of liberty, union, and national security.

German immigrants, Polish immigrants, French immigrants, Italian immigrants, yes, immigrants from almost every nation in the world fought for the Union Army in the struggle between the States. These, my friends, are only typical examples of leaders who represented millions of their race, who fled from despot rule, and who when the time came were ready to fight for the preservation of liberty. And today if the leaders of these various groups were living, they would be in the vanguard fighting Nazi, Jap, and Fascist tyranny to an unconditional surrender.

On this anniversary of the invasion of Poland, it is well to remember that Poland was the first nation to oppose armed resistance to the Nazi onslaught. She refused to surrender. No nation has suffered more at the hands of the brutal conquerors. Cardinal Hinsley, broadcasting to the Polish nation on Easter Sunday 1940 said: "The real brutality, and the like cruelty of exterminating hate, the world has never seen before." But, my friends, Poland is not defeated. Her suffering will not be in vain. The fact that little Polish children are so weak from lack of food that they cannot play or laugh will not be forgotten in a world where civilization is on the march. What is true of the children in Poland is true of those in Greece, Belgium, and every other conquered country that now lies prostrate under the ruthless rule of the wicked Hitler.

General Sikorski, Polish Prime Minister and Commander in Chief of Poland in September 1939, recently said: "Poland will continue to fight until final victory. True to her traditions, she is fighting for the realization of her oldest maxim: 'The union of the free with the free, on a basis of mutual equality.' Regardless of overwhelming odds, Poland was the first to challenge brutal aggression. She will be the last to leave the field of battle."

In those words the general was telling the world that Poland even in exile continues to fight. She has a tremendous number of soldiers in the Middle East, an air force, a navy twice the size of Poland's pre-war navy, a merchant fleet, the tonnage which has not decreased in spite of the war service it has seen throughout the world. And so Poland carries on, true to her traditions of the past. She anxiously awaits the hour of redemption.

Not only does Poland await for the crucial hour of peace to come, but wherever liberty is lodged in the breast of human beings, there too that eventful day is anxiously awaited. But I would be untrue to you if I did not say upon this occasion that, in my opinion, the end of this world-wide conflict is not in the immediate future. One needs but to turn to the beaches of Salerno, Italy, to learn how desperate the remaining struggle will be. The well-trained and experienced Nazi, however, learned that the Americans can and will fight to the bitter end. The righteous cause and the courageous ability of General Clark and his Fifth Army of green troops were demonstrated as they withstood and finally pushed back some of Adolf Hitler's best and experienced troops. There was no

Dunkerque at Salerno; there will be no Dunkerque with the American forces. We strike only when we are adequately prepared.

The nonmilitary critics continue to wail about military strategy and tactics. But insofar as I am concerned, I am duty bound to follow the timetables of the American Army and Navy. Our success in the Pacific and Atlantic has been little short of marvelous when one realizes how totally unprepared we were in December 1941. I recently predicted that the war would end within 18 months or 2 years. That was before the battle of Salerno. I see no reason to amend that statement. And in the meantime the casualty list will continue to grow as the Axis Powers deteriorate under our devastating bombs and the thundering artillery.

People in conquered countries will continue to die day after day for lack of the necessities of life. Those who survive in these countries of want and despair will never be the same. A vigorous mind can function only when it is supported by a healthy body. It will be years, many years, before these helpless people again produce a sturdy race.

From our own lands we are sending the flower of youth. Thousands are already resting in eternal peace, thousands upon thousands have been wounded, many of them so seriously that never again will they meet the foe. We are building hospitals to care for the sick and the disabled. We are planning a program of education and rehabilitation for thousands upon thousands of veterans of this war. It is our duty to give employment to our returned soldiers in the event industry cannot absorb them. Our material resources have been depreciated, our national debt reaches a sum that fairly staggers the imagination.

Mothers who send their sons to war constantly ask if these sacrifices will never cease. They cry out, "Is there not some way by which the leaders of the world can stop this blood letting?" You and I, my friends, stand in the pitiless limelight of tomorrow, for what we do today and in the years following the war will be judged by our children and our children's children. There is not a single person in this audience who will not say that this debacle must not happen again. But the question that is constantly in the minds of the American people is, "How can future wars be prevented?" This is the most serious and gravest question that has ever been considered by the American people. There are some who say that it cannot be done. But, my friends, those who do not try to solve the ubiquitous problem which has been the bane of all mankind since civilization took root are failing their country and failing humanity in the most critical period of the world.

America will come out of this war as the leading nation of the world. She has the confidence of peoples everywhere. America is a nation of destiny. Ours is a great responsibility. We cannot shirk that responsibility; we cannot be unprepared for the judgment of tomorrow. To follow any other path in this world of human events to come will mean another war in 20 years. My friends, I cannot believe that Russia, China, England, or America wants another war. And if we are to have freedom from fear, as outlined in the Atlantic Charter, war must be eliminated. If we have freedom from war, all other freedoms are secure. Surely these four nations are strong enough to protect the weaker nations from being attacked by the stronger. Each nation, however small in the family of nations, should have the right to live in an atmosphere of freedom and independence.

We have a model in the United States. It can be duplicated throughout the world. Poland should have a right to live without fear of Germany as the little State of Rhode Island has nothing to fear from its next-door neighbor, the large State of New York. We have all kinds of people, different countries, and different nationalities in the Western Hemisphere. Our quarrels and our wars have been few indeed. I know of no nation in the Western Hemisphere that can be classified as an aggressor. They all desire to live in peace. Our good-neighbor policy is strengthening the bonds of unity and friendship. What has been accomplished in the Western Hemisphere can be the pattern for the peoples of the world.

It would be a sad commentary, indeed, upon the wisdom of the United Nations if, after sacrificing millions upon millions of men, utilizing untold billions of wealth, all in the cause of freedom, somehow, some way, we do not succeed in writing the final chapter to barbarism and brutality. I am firmly convinced that modern warfare, with all of its implements of human destruction by land, air, and sea, has convinced the leaders and the peoples of the earth that a continuation of war means the end of civilization.

As one of your representatives in the United States Senate, one of the last citadels of parliamentary liberty, let me say in conclusion that my fervent hope is that two-thirds of the Members of the United States Senate, backed by the determination of the American people, will enter into some kind of an international collaboration with the Allied nations which has a basis for enduring and lasting peace. Whatever course we adopt must be a long-time course if we are to remove the causes of war. The time has passed when this Nation or any nation can live alone. The individual who believes that we can defend ourselves in modern warfare against a combination of any world powers, is thinking in the limbo of the long-dead past. In the momentous days to come may we as Americans stimulate clear thinking upon the national and international picture before us. Let us do away with petty and selfish things in our mental toil. Patriotic Americans must consider the problems of tomorrow. They will strive mightily to find the right if they are willing to consider the future welfare of their country and all mankind. And those same American patriots will pray to God that He will uphold and defend that right.

International Bimetallism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday September 15), 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Bimetallism Held Needed by World," published in the New York Times of Monday, September 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIMETALLISM HELD NEEDED BY WORLD—AMERICAN SMELTING CHAIRMAN WOULD USE SILVER TO ASSURE ADEQUATE MONEY SUPPLY—STABILIZATION CALLED DIM—PACT BY LEADING COMMERCIAL NATIONS IS ADVOCATED BY FRANCIS H. BROWNELL

To assure an adequate supply of monetary metals for the post-war period, Francis H. Brownell, chairman of the American Smelting and Refining Co., urges adoption of international bimetallism by agreement of the leading commercial nations of the world. In a statement for publication today, he said the plan would retain every advantage of the international gold standard and yet assure an adequate supply of monetary metals for the post-war period.

Mr. Brownell declared that the currency inflation going on almost everywhere today, and particularly in Europe and the Far East, would result in an era of unprecedented monetary disorder when the war ended. Thus, he pointed out, "an early effective stabilization of their moneys is an urgent and absolute prerequisite to both internal recovery and the revival of foreign trade of these countries."

"The need for monetary stabilization is clear," Mr. Brownell asserted. "International collaboration is required to achieve it. We must make sure, however, that the standard adopted to assure such stability is sound and adequate, so that stabilization will be lasting."

Reviewing the break-down during the thirties of the international gold standard and the unhappy experiences of many peoples with paper currency, Mr. Brownell maintained that the extended periods of monetary stability in the past had been associated invariably with the use of gold and silver as monetary standards. He added that even if plans were adopted to economize in the use of gold through international clearing plans he doubted that there would be sufficient gold to carry on the expanded world trade.

GOLD STOCKS OF WORLD

"The monetary gold stocks of the world," Mr. Brownell explained, "do not greatly exceed $30,000,000,000 at the prevailing price of $35 an ounce for the yellow metal. The monetary gold stock of the United States amounts to $22,000,000,000, which is more than 70 percent of the world stock. Obviously the $8,000,000,000 or so of monetary gold owned outside the United States is very far from adequate to permit the other nations of the world to return to any type of workable gold standard.

"The world's monetary gold stock today is less than 1,000,000,000 ounces, of which the United States owns more than 70 percent. The world's monetary silver stock is well over 5,000,000,000 ounces, of which the United States holds between 50 and 60 percent."

Mr. Brownell held that adoption by agreement of international bimetallism as the world's monetary standard, with or without an international stabilization fund to economize on the use of monetary metals in settling international balances, would have the following far-reaching advantages:

1. The volume of standard money would be immediately increased, particularly outside the United States, to meet the larger needs of the post-war world. This would enable nations to maintain the stability of their currencies even if an adverse balance of payments should compel substantial shipments of gold and silver for a time to other nations or to the international stabilization fund.

2. The yearly addition to the world's stock of standard money would be expanded, for the normal annual output of some 40,000,000 ounces of gold would be supplemented by production of some 250,000,000 ounces of silver.

3. The stock of monetary metal could be expanded further, if found necessary, through drawing in considerable quantities of silver from the arts.

4. Nations whose populations desired would be able to restore coinage of standard money on a large scale. This has become progressively less possible as the gold shortage has caused all governments, including the

United States, to withdraw the yellow metal from circulation.

5. If a world-wide shortage of standard money should again threaten, it could be corrected through stimulating silver production and lowering the ratio of silver to gold by international agreement.

UPHOLDING STABILIZATION

6. Adoption of international bimetallism would not make the international stabilization fund plan unnecessary, but rather would help assure the success of any such plan by facilitating each nation's ability to replenish its credit on the books of the international fund through its power to deposit silver, as well as gold, for the purpose.

7. This is the only monetary plan that assures that the world at large will possess an adequate stock of monetary metals, no matter how large domestic and external trade becomes, and no matter at what points world prices are stabilized.

8. A much larger number of nations would be themselves producers of standard money under international bimetallism, and thus would be aided in maintaining the stability of their currencies through the production of monetary metals within their borders. The Western Hemisphere, chiefly Latin America, produces about three-fourths of the world's silver, while the Eastern Hemisphere turns out about three-fourths of the gold.

General Marshall's Religious Beliefs and Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have received from Mr. Ray D. Brown, adjutant and public relations and welfare secretary of the Salvation Army, a letter enclosing a copy of The War Cry, the publication of the Salvation Army, containing an article pertaining to General Marshall. I ask unanimous consent for the publication of the letter and the article entitled "The Christian General," in regard to General Marshall.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SALVATION ARMY,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Military Affairs Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of this week's issue of our War Cry which, I think, will be self-explanatory in view of the present rumors affecting Gen. George C. Marshall.

I can only speak as an individual and not for the organization which I represent, but I can say, without qualification, that the sentiment of every Salvationist, both at home and on the battle fronts all over the world is unquestionably against any shift in the present leadership of the United States Army.

Most of us feel that the general has brought our armed forces the type of inspirational Christian leadership which has made our fighting men examples to the civilized world of good behavior and of that spirit which only freemen possess.

You might be interested to know that the Southern War Cry has a circulation in the 15 Southern States of some 60,000 copies.

This letter is not designed to be a pressure instrument, but merely to give you the opinion of people who have long been known as admirers of true Christian character in the men who guide the destinies of our country.

I would appreciate you inserting this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe it presents a phase of the general's character not usually emphasized. I might also mention that Lt. Commissioner John J. Allan, who signed the introduction, was formerly in the office of the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Army.

Very sincerely yours,

RAY D. BROWN,
Adjutant, Public Relations and Welfare Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

THE CHRISTIAN GENERAL—AN INTIMATE INSIGHT INTO THE PERSONAL RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY'S CHIEF OF STAFF

(By William L. Stidger)

(I am delighted that Dr. Stidger has given our War Cry readers this intimate picture of General Marshall, whom I have known for many years. Efficient but unassuming, kindly but firm, conservative but daring, demanding the best and ever giving it, he is beloved and respected by all who know him. General Marshall is not only America's number one soldier but, in my judgment, the Army's number one Christian. His feeling in regard to the religion of the soldier may be summed up in his own words, as follows: "My hope for the soldier when he shall return from the battle is not only that he shall return better physically and mentally, but with a keener appreciation of the ideals for which the church stands." We can all safely trust our boys to such leadership, for the general's influence for righteousness percolates through the ranks—Lt. Commissioner John J. Allan, Central Territorial Commander.)

I recently spent a week in Washington, D. C., as the house guest of Justice Frank Murphy, of the Supreme Court. One evening we got to talking about Gen. George C. Marshall, who is the executive head of the largest Army that was ever assembled in the history of the United States of America.

Justice Murphy said to me: "I do not see why it is that we Americans talk about Chiang Kai-shek as the Christian general and are carried away by that well-justified slogan in describing him, and still do not seem to be very appreciative of the fact that our own General Marshall is also a Christian leader.

"Perhaps it's because we expect our generals to be Christians, and we do not expect Chinese and oriental generals to be Christians," I suggested mildly, inwardly delighted to find Justice Murphy that much concerned about the nonchalant way in which we in the United States regard the fact that the head of our armies is a Christian gentleman.

Then he added, "I don't know what that middle initial 'C' stands for in General Marshall's name, but if it is not descriptive of 'Christian' then I don't know men and I don't know what being a Christian means."

"Maybe we'd better nickname him 'Gen. George Christian Marshall,'" I suggested.

"It would not be inappropriate, added Justice Murphy with evident deep sincerity, "for he is much more than a fine soldier, a great executive, and an experienced Army man. He is a Christian gentleman in the finest sense of the phrase. I'm positive for I know him."

"To just what denomination does he belong?" I asked.

"He is an Episcopalian and proud of it. He's not like some leaders whom I know who are members of churches but who try to keep the matter a deep dark military secret.

"General Marshall's church membership is no military secret. He is proud of being a church member, attends church regularly whenever his duties permit and worships reverently."

That was enough to make me intensely interested in General Marshall, and I know that if I, a mere bystander, am interested, every father and mother, child and wife of every soldier in our Army will be even more interested.

In other words, it is highly important to every home in this Nation that the general who has the final authority over the lives of our boys, be a Christian in a personal sense.

When we know that fact, we know the most important fact about him, for we have confidence that the President of the United States and the Government behind him would not select a man to organize, equip, and train the largest Army that this Nation has ever raised unless that man were fit for the responsibility.

If a man has a real knowledge of his job—and of his God—that man is hard to beat. General Marshall has the characteristics of Oliver Cromwell, George Washington, and Chiang Kai-shek; and we Americans are glad to know that fact in these crucial days.

Among the confidential facts that I obtained in Washington to buttress this ideal are these excerpts from statements made by General Marshall himself:

"The soldier's heart, the soldier's spirit, the soldier's soul are everything. Unless the soldier's soul sustains him he cannot be relied on and will fail himself and his commander and his country in the end.

"Today total war is not a succession of mere episodes in a day or a week. It is a long-drawn-out and intricately planned business, and the longer it continues the heavier are the demands on the character of the men engaged in it.

"With each succeeding month, with each succeeding year, it makes always heavier and more terrible demands on the mental and spiritual qualities, capacities, and powers of the men engaged in it.

"War is a burden to be carried on a steep and bloody road; and only strong nerves and determined spirits, like unto the spirit of a Man who long ago carried the heavy burden of a cross up a steep and bloody road to His own crucifixion, may endure.

"It is true that war is fought with physical weapons of flame and steel; but it is not the mere possession of these weapons, or the use of them, that wins the struggle.

"They are indispensable; but in the final analysis it is the human spirit that achieves the ultimate decision.

"It is not enough to fight. It is the spirit which we bring to the fight that decides the issue. It is morale that wins the victory, and morale means a use of the spiritual powers inside of every soldier. Without that we fail.

"We are basing the discipline of the individual on respect rather than on fear; on the effect of good example given by officers; on the intelligent comprehension, by all ranks, of why an order has to be and why it must be carried out; on a sense of duty; on esprit de corps.

"This new discipline enables me to leave with all parents the assurance that the men in this Army which we are building for the defense of a Christian Nation and Christian values, will fight, if they have to fight, with more than their bodies and their hands and their material weapons.

"They will fight with their souls in the job they have to do, and we who have them in charge, want their parents and friends to know that everything, ultimately, depends

on the soul, for 'out of the heart are the issues of life,' as our Bible puts it."

I, as a Christian minister, say that this is sincere speech. And what is more, I know enough about General Marshall to realize that he means every word of it, down deep in his heart.

He practices what he preaches; and he does it with a vengeance, as all Army men know.

Two statements which have been made about General Marshall by chaplains who have served as his aides and who were close to him for years, have convinced me that these public utterances are true.

The first was made when a chaplain was complaining because he did not have enough physical equipment (a matter which was and is being remedied rapidly under General Marshall's personal direction): "A good chaplain does not require a church; a poor one will empty a cathedral."

It seems to me that this applies to everyday civilian preachers as well as wartime chaplains, and it would be a significant statement to carve in stone on every church and cathedral in this Nation for all time.

The second statement concerning General Marshall that a chaplain gave me is this one: "The General hasn't much sympathy with religion that is a mere lip service, formality, or ritual, in spite of the fact that he belongs to the Episcopalian Church which specializes in form and ritual.

"I once heard him say: 'I don't give a hoot for a man's religion either in war or peace if it does not set him on fire with a passion to do and die for Christ.'"

Gen. William Arnold, Chief of Chaplains, said to me when I asked him what real sympathy he got from General Marshall in his Christian work:

"I first became acquainted with General Marshall about 5 years ago. General Marshall, who at that time had not yet been appointed Chief of Staff, called on me in my office.

"He had recently come to Washington, D. C., from Vancouver Barracks, Wash., where he had taken a personal and lively interest in his chaplains and their work.

"He spent considerable time discussing freely the chaplains he had observed, and emphasized time and again his appreciation of the fact that the chaplains are definitely spiritually minded.

"Promotion to the position of Chief of Staff, combined with the advent of our national emergency, naturally increased General Marshall's responsibilities and duties.

"With this added responsibility also came an accompanying increase in his interest in the religious welfare of the servicemen. The many problems which are related to the religious needs of the soldiers were almost personal problems with him.

"He conferred with me often in order to arrive at the best possible solution. He was intensely interested in the chapel-building program, and when the initiatory ceremony was held for the first of our modern chapels, he was present to accept the chapel on behalf of the Army."

There is something even more personal in General Marshall's religion. This fact has been illustrated by several incidents which have been told to me by chaplains who have worked with him.

One remarked: "General Marshall was always a faithful attendant at church services. He and his wife and the members and families of his staff set a fine example for all the members of the command.

"He used to delight some of the soldiers' children who stayed for church when he would squeeze into the same pew with them, giving them his affable smile.

"They would always be as proud as peacocks to have the General sit with them, and would behave like little soldiers. In fact, those were the only times when the chaplain could be sure that those particular children would behave.

"Perhaps that was the reason he did it. But, in any case, we all knew that the children loved him in every post in which he served."

Continued the chaplain: "At one city where we had been located for many years there was a good, faithful Christian woman who had completed 25 years of service in teaching Sunday school at the barracks.

"A special service was arranged in her honor. Although the busy summer training session was at its height, General Marshall not only attended that service, but also paid her a personal tribute in a very gracious, kindly, understanding, and sympathetic address.

"He did something similar at Christmastime when all the boys and girls in the garrison were assembled for their Christmas service and party. He did not speak at length; but, as many remarked, he certainly realized and expressed most admirably, the true significance of the holiday season."

Then that old-time chaplain added these words: "General Marshall's spiritual interest did not rest entirely in providing material equipment for religious worship.

"Under his direction a very sound program for relieving want, aiding in sickness and helping in other emergencies, was provided for the personnel of his command.

"Then, too, he had a thorough understanding of the psychological and spiritual problems involved. He never refused to help.

"In one instance it was his letter to a famous clinic that made it possible for a soldier's crippled child to visit that clinic; this act resulted in the child's eventual cure.

"When he was thanked, General Marshall blushed a little, became embarrassed and said shyly, 'I never forget that our Master once took little children into His arms, blessed them and said "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."'"

When, from the General's associates, I learned about these personal characteristics of this militant director I experienced a feeling of reassurance.

What better commander could our men have then a God-believing, God-directed one such as Gen. George C. Marshall—a leader led by God?

These words ring out in clarion sharpness, melodic beauty and a strange, sure comfort as General Marshall stands before our men: "I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go; I will guide thee with Mine eye."

Labor Laws—And Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week for September 11, 1943:

LABOR LAWS—AND LOGIC

It is much too simple to dismiss the Connally-Smith War Labor Disputes Act as a badly drafted law and let it go at that. Testimony that there is something wrong with it can now be offered by more than 200 employers on the basis of direct experience. In a little over 2 months of the law's operation, unions have used it 214 times to put pressure on an employer, or through him on the Government, for some concession that was being refused. And the use of the law by organized labor for this purpose is increasing at an accelerating rate.

The line-up on the bill when it was before Congress led industry to believe that it had a vital and positive interest in the measure's passage. With a remarkable unanimity, organized business and its allies in the House and Senate fought hard and long for its enactment. The unions and their cabal in Government opposed it to the limit of their strength and the end of their stratagems.

Conceived as an instrument that would divest organized labor of some of its power as a pressure group and eliminate some of the frictions in employee relations, the law has had a directly opposite effect. It serves a purpose completely alien to that which was intended by its sponsors. Instead of curbing labor's bargaining strength, the section of the act that provides for plant seizures in the event of labor trouble or the threat of labor trouble has armed the unions with a new weapon.

Instead of neutralizing labor's political influence through its inclusion of a ban on direct political contributions by the unions, the act has been responsible for a resurgence of political activity in the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. which promises to make itself felt distinctly in 1944.

Instead of discouraging wildcat stoppages by its provision of penalties for strikers and leaders, flash strikes and quickies have increased since June.

Most important of all, the famous 30-day cooling-off period which must now elapse between announcement of intent to strike and the taking of a strike vote has become in practice a heating-up period during which compaigning and agitation have precipitated the employee relations of more than one important war plant into chaotic disorder.

Allis-Chalmers, Curtiss-Wright, power companies in Michigan and Ohio, and Newark trucking firms are representative of the employers who have already learned that the Connally-Smith Act is a two-edged sword. They were led to expect that it would be a valuable employer defense weapon, but with the exception of the token punishment administered to insurgent coal strikers in Pennsylvania, they have yet to see it wielded in the employer's behalf. And any of these employers will tell you that he has a much more serious problem to deal with when the United States Government steps in and plasters plant bulletin boards with sample strike ballots than he had when his union held a closed meeting in the local Odd Fellows hall to discuss whether or not to call a strike. If the old method was harmful to morale, the new one is, by comparison, disastrous.

Even so, if there existed some evidence to suggest that the Connally-Smith labor trouble was simply the old trouble in new dress, it would be possible to say that the law had provided an alternative outlet for the same head of steam and that, consequently, the sum total of labor trouble an employer has to deal with has not increased. But this easy assumption appears baseless. The number of strikes has increased rather than declined. The number of cases coming before the National Labor Relations Board in which unions seek certification under the Wagner Act as exclusive bargaining agents is at an all-time high. The National War Labor Board and its regional units are handling an increasingly heavy volume of disputes. The unions have abandoned none of the established devices for advancing their interests; they are using them all to the full. The Connally-Smith Act adds another string to their bow.

It is popular to say now that this inversion of the law's purpose came about because,

while the idea behind the measure had been long considered and discussed, the bill itself was hastily written to take advantage of the favorable legislative opportunity for its enactment that was presented by John L. Lewis' feud with the Government. This explanation is dangerously simple. It assumes that a different drafting into law of the Connally-Smith intent would assure the attainment of the desired end. This might be true, but it is by no means certain. It is dangerous doctrine because it focuses on the mere language of the law that attention which business should be giving to the theory behind it.

The fundamental question is, How much can be done by legislation to influence a social dynamic-like labor relations? We have, by judicious lawmaking, regulated strong-running currents. The Sherman Act and the law creating the Securities and Exchange Commission are examples of such regulation. But when we legislate in the hope of reversing a trend and in so doing make a too radical attack on established patterns, we risk intensifying the very hazards we seek to escape.

In the intensely practical but delicately balanced competition of labor relations, the concepts of politicians written into law may have unpredictable and intolerable consequences. The interests of business will best be served by leaving the details of collective bargaining and personnel policy to its industrial relations experts. Better than anyone else, they know what hazards inhere in further Government intervention of any sort.

THE EDITORS OF BUSINESS WEEK.

The Food Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER, of the Twelfth Missouri District, before the Western War Emergency Food Conference, in Fresno, Calif., Sunday, September 19, 1943, at 9:30 p. m. This speech was delivered in the Fresno Memorial Auditorium and broadcast over the Pacific coast N. B. C. network. Congressman PLOESER through his activity as a Member of the House of Representatives has developed a well-earned national reputation as a champion of small business and private enterprise and as an uncompromising opponent of bungling bureaucracy.

Mr. Hadeler, members of the Western War Emergency Food Conference, fellow Americans, you have made a most auspicious beginning for your 3-day food conference. The results of the War bond sales efforts today are a compliment to your ever-active patriotism. It is a proud American who addresses you tonight. Proud, because no matter where you find Americans—East, Middle West, West, North, or South—they are not only willing to produce for victory, but they are also willing to give or lend their all to Back the Attack of their heroic sons.

Upon you rests the all important job of backing the attack on a most important front, and in a most important battle—the food battle.

I take advantage of the graciousness of your California hospitality by digressing from my main theme to praise you and to appeal to our radio audience. This opening meeting of the War Food Conference has purchased about $400,000 in War bonds. That is splendid. We Americans meeting here, appeal to you Americans listening to immediately join us by writing your check tonight for a War bond. We must not fail to provide the fifteen billion needed—now—to Back the Attack.

We Americans on the home front face a most serious and heavy responsibility. It is our duty to supply our armed forces all over the world with equipment for war and with food. It is our duty to maintain within reasonable degree a normal and necessary economy on the home front. People who deal in food—either producers, processors, wholesalers, jobbers, transporters, retail distributors and governmental regulators—share a specific duty, which carries a responsibility as heavy and as important as any other in the fight for victory. Medals, official recognition may not be yours. But, lack of intrinsic tokens of honor will not in any way lessen your responsibility or importance.

From my service in the Congress I have clearly observed that the farmer has taken his duty in a determined stride. Processors and distributors of food have been performing their duty to the best of their ability. The consumer has taken rationing in a most commendable manner as one of the necessities of war. I have, unfortunately, observed that the one place where constructive cooperation in the handling of food has been lacking has been in the governmental controls which have been placed around your industry. The war effort on the fighting front, ever since that fateful day at Pearl Harbor, has been handled magnificently by our Army and Navy and auxiliary forces. The war-production effort on the home front has been the most outstanding world demonstration ever made—by American industry, management, and labor. Again, the governmental effort on the home front in the field of food has been notably mismanaged. But, my fellow Americans, Government bungling does not lessen or in any way diminish your responsibility as distributors of food. Regardless of the thousands of bad rulings by the Washington bureaucrats and the procrastination and political maneuvering in the administration's handling of the food problem, you must carry on and produce and distribute.

The people have become increasingly aware of the fact that it is not the fault of the food industry and that there have been extreme dislocations in the production and distribution of food. These dislocations have caused unnecessary shortages and sharp price rises. The people of America can charge these sharp food price rises to the failure of the Price Administration. They are not chargeable to the food industry. I do not mean to imply that the food industry is perfect. I am not claiming that your industry is entirely free from exploiters and professional war profiteers. Every industry and every administration will have a few.

Your Government has attempted to carry out a program of price control. Your Congress erected the foundation for a program in the second price-control law. This law is specific and clear in providing safeguards against evils certain to rise if price-control authorities attempt to leave the well-marked trail and follow paths which lead to the disruption of normal business channels of distribution. Notwithstanding the foresight which was displayed in the revision of the price-control law, and notwithstanding the clear and specific prohibitions therein, the Office of Price Administration insisted upon ignoring the law. The result has been chaos.

The main fault with the Office of Price Administration, including the Food Division, is the incompetency of the higher officials. For the most part they have been impractical professors with theories of their own and without any practical business experience. They refused time and again to follow practical business recommendations. Occasionally, practical men would get recognition. However, once convinced they were in error, O. P. A. seldom took any immediate action to rectify a situation. They would let the situation rest for months while they wrangled among themselves or with another department. Meantime, retailers went out of business or suffered serious loss. Greatly needed food crops have been allowed to rot in the fields while O. P. A. and other departments delayed and fought among themselves.

There was a glaring California example. When Edmund F. Maher left his position as O. P. A. Chief of the Food Price Section for five Far Western States, he wrote an article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "O. P. A. Need Not Have Failed." Bakers were closing their doors in San Francisco at the rate of approximately one per day, while he sent weekly memoranda to Washington advising them of the seriousness of the situation. This started in March of 1942. During the summer of 1942 he phoned Washington and was told that O. P. A. headquarters would immediately send out questionnaires for a Nation-wide survey. Finally, in January 1943, a new bakery schedule was issued, permitting bakers to equalize prices with cost. Such procedure seems to be typical of O. P. A.

The Office of Price Administration administrators have also taken a very bad attitude toward the consuming public. Mr. Pixley, an administrative officer in O. P. A., has stated that half of the population of Ohio made so many errors in their applications for ration book No. 3 that they will just have to go without their butter and prunes. It is astounding to know that a man in that position could be so insensible to public reactions as to think that more than 3,000,000 persons would sit calmly by while bureaucratic big shots denied them such things as shoes, coffee, sugar, butter, and prunes, when the citizens knew a supply was available. He would deny them food because the O. P. A. couldn't prepare an understandable application blank. This statement is as infamous as Marie Antoinette's words, "If they can't get bread, let them eat cake."

One of our most important foods is meat. The question of meat supply for America has been and is most critical. Mismanagement upon the part of the Administration has brought it to the point where we can expect a glut in the civilian market this fall and a probable famine next spring. The handling of this problem is typical. After months of work and argument with the Office of Price Administration I took it upon myself, in the closing days of last June, to get together with competent representatives of the meat industry. In the light of all current conditions and factors, both poliical and economic, we drafed a program. On Saturday, July 3, I addressed a letter to Economic Stabilizer Fred Vinson, to War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, and to Price Administrator Prentiss Brown. This letter embodied a program which I suggested to relieve this false meat shortage. The President had asked for a suggested program instead of criticism. I have criticized and I have also proposed a constructive remedy.

The Ploeser meat plan emphasizes the need for the retention in the meat industry of all normal, customary, and traditional channels of distribution. It safeguards against destructive price squeezes. It protects the feeding costs of live animals and allows for deficiencies in the proportionment of the over-all price range—from producer to consumer—to be aided if, and when, necessary by incentive Government assistance. It protects the independents in the meat industry by equitable allocation of available supply.

If we must have subsidy, then let's put it to work as an incentive for production, which is the only point at which it will do any good. There is not a shortage of livestock. Lacking proper consumption and normal distribution, a more critical situation will develop.

None of us welcome the idea of an over-all managed economy in any line of trade. But, we must realize that we are not living in a free economy during the war. Whether we like it or not, we must be realistic if we are to feed the Nation. You and I would have managed the entire program differently from the beginning. Now we must accept the fact that we are not at the beginning—we are in the middle—in the middle of a muddle—with certain unrelenting politicial conditions which cannot be corrected overnight or within the next few weeks. If around these conditions we can build a program which will at least start into action the marketing and normal distribution of meat—then that is the program we must, at least temporarily, demand. This program, I believe, will permit all branches of the meat industry to live; and not only to live, but to feed the people and supply the armed services and lend-lease.

Has the War Food Administration adopted this program? Has it adopted any other program? It has not. What has it done? It has procrastinated. We have a War Meat Board at Chicago, Ill. Has it authority over the meat situation? No, it has not. It can advise and does. Is its advice taken by the War Food Administration? It is not. The livestock industry has developed a war meat program called meat management. Has this program been adopted? It has not. When this administration asked for suggested programs instead of criticism it lacked sincerety. It was merely fencing for time. Time grows short, while the War Food Administration procrastinates.

About the time one gets the O. P. A. around to adopt what appears to be a practical program, one finds that they do not have the authority. Authority has been divided. We now have a procrastinating, political, counter-action on the part of the War Food Administration.

Rarely are bunglers fired in official Washington. A New Deal bungler merely moves to another post—frequently a post of greater responsibility. There is no real attempt in Washington on the part of the administration to clean out these bunglers. You may read in the newspapers where we have a change here and there on the surface, but they are political changes. The bunglers are still in action behind the scenes. It appears that we will go from one mess to another on the home front until this entire disturbing crowd of pay roll leeches are run out of Washington by the votes of the people. Our votes will be our national salvation.

While the farmer and the food industry of America fight valiantly to win the food battle, the administration, by its pitiful mismanagement, fights a counter-action.

If the Oil Producers Are Given a Fair Chance There Will Be No Necessity for the Further Rationing of Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to submit for the consideration of the Congress a letter which I recently received from the Danciger Oil & Refining Co. of Fort Worth, Tex. The letter reads as follows:

DANCIGER OIL & REFINING CO.,
Fort Worth, Tex., September 4, 1943.
Congressman JAMES V. HEIDINGER,
Fairfield, Ill.

DEAR SIR: No problem with which you will be confronted during this session of Congress will be more serious than winning the war.

The oil price index of 59.2 is 57 percent below the all-commodity index of 103.8. Why this glaring discrimination against the most vital of all war products?

Foremost in importance will be the assurance of an adequate supply of the fast-dwindling material that makes the wheels go 'round—petroleum and its derivatives. Our domestic supply has reached a stage of diminishing returns, and uneconomic methods are being employed to stifle the incentive to augment it.

This is an oil war. We are busy supplying an abundance of tanks, planes, ships, and guns; but without crude and its derivatives not a wheel can turn. Now is the time to be concerned, before we are compelled to tear our hair in anguish at some of our short-sighted policies.

Screaming editorials in millions of words by those "in the know" have put the country on notice of the impending shortage of crude oil and refined products. You do not have to be a crystal gazer to prophesy what will happen shortly to the war's most critical material.

Present petroleum reserves are being depleted at an ever-increasing rate, and as the tempo of war is stepped up, the shortage will become still more acute. As surely as night follows day, we will find ourselves without the means of successfully combating the enemy for the want of this vital fluid, if some action is not taken now to establish a price that will justify increased production.

Your prompt action, in stimulating the drilling of more wells and the discovery of more producing fields, will save the lives of thousands of our American youth by giving them an adequate umbrella of protective aircraft while on the battlefield.

What if the major companies made an extra profit? Are we going to weigh this against the lives of thousands of our brave boys, willing to make the supreme sacrifice, but when everything is considered do they profit when compelled to pay a higher price for a larger quantity of crude than they themselves produce?

The much publicized "big steal" is in reality a theft from the independents in the industry, since independents are predominantly wildcatters and discoverers of new fields; and do not receive sufficient compensation for the crude they produce to cover their losses.

Because of the present inadequate price on crude oil the independents are retiring from the industry in droves, many of them receiving less than cost for their properties, a very unhealthy condition at this critical time.

The ceiling on everything that enters into the production of petroleum has skyrocketed like a gusher, except oil itself, which is nailed to the bottom of the hole.

Independents in the petroleum industry have on several occasions solicited various departments of the Government for relief, but for some unaccountable reason they receive no relief.

As a last resort we are now appealing to you and other Congressmen and Senators to assume jurisdiction over the petroleum-price situation before it is too late, and place the products of independent producers, refiners, and marketers on the same parity basis enjoyed by the products of other leading industries.

If we hope to have sufficient petroleum to successfully prosecute this war, there must be more of an incentive than is offered by the present price, to search for and produce it. With more planes to be manufactured and kept in the air, we cannot stress too strongly the importance of a petroleum price increase to stimulate production, as without a sufficient supply of gasoline many of our planes will be grounded for the duration.

In this connection, may we suggest that for each 35-cents-per-barrel raise in the price of crude oil, 42 cents should be realized from each barrel after refining. If the parity between crude oil and refined products is not maintained, all independent refiners would be forced to close their plants, since to ask them to absorb any part of a raise would be economically unsound.

Please refer to the attached sheet for parity index numbers of prices received by a dozen other important commodities and see how they compare with the abnormally low price of petroleum, the most important of all. Is justice no longer a cardinal principle?

We believe and hope this statement will stimulate some action on your part.

Sincerely yours,
DANCIGER OIL & REFINING CO.,
By DAN DANCIGER.

AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICES AND INDEX NUMBERS OF COMMODITIES, JUNE 1943

The Bureau of Labor Statistics index wholesale commodity prices for the month of June 1943 as compared with 100 percent par in 1926:

	Index numbers, June 1943
All commodities	103.8
Farm products	126.2
Food	109.6
Hides and leather products	117.8
Textile products	97.4
Fuel and lighting materials	81.0
Metals and metal products	103.8
Building materials	110.6
Chemicals and allied products	100.0
Housefurnishing goods	102.8
Miscellaneous	91.8
Crude petroleum:	
Midcontinent field	59.2
Pennsylvania field	79.7
California field	85.2
Gasoline: Midcontinent field	56.7

Address of Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, at Dorchester, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the gentleman from Massachusetts [JOHN W. MCCORMACK], majority leader, House of Representatives, at a luncheon held by the Dorchester Board of Trade, Dorchester, Mass., on September 9, 1943:

This summer the pattern of our victory has taken shape. The mighty military blows which we have been preparing since the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor are beginning to fall. I can promise that in the coming climax of the titanic struggle which engages us the world will witness such a show of concerted and coordinated strength as our foes had never dreamed of in their most

monstrous nightmares of global domination by the bomb and the bayonet.

The immensity of this growing power is not the achievement of our armed forces alone. The American people have played their full part in mounting the great offensives and moving them swiftly forward to the crescendo of fury which we are loosing against our enemies. The scope of warfare has been so enlarged and the power of destruction so vastly increased by modern weapons—even over what we knew in the first World War—that armies alone cannot wage it.

Such a war as we are fighting today requires the energy of whole peoples—those at home feeding their productive skill into creating the sinews of war which crush opposition on the battlefield. Even those Americans who do not contribute directly to the firepower of our armies play their integrated role in maintaining an adequate economy through necessary civilian services. By their enterprise and devotion to their tasks the workers in the fields and the factories are left free to concentrate on the sole objective which engages the Nation's attention—victory.

It has been my responsibility as majority leader of the House of Representatives to watch the unfolding of this great cooperative endeavor of the American people—in uniform and in civilian dress—as it has been implemented by legislation in the Congress. It has been my privilege to hear the periodic reports of progress which military and civilian leaders bring frequently to the committee rooms on Capitol Hill. There, in sharp focus, I have seen the complex pieces of the victory pattern take shape in a design of concentrated might.

Only by seeing the whole picture can proper perspective be gained on the distance we have come since Pearl Harbor and the distance which remains to go. I should like today to show you this picture as I have seen it. I should like to show it not only in terms of our military progress in the field, but of our gigantic feat of production which has made our victories possible.

Let me take first the production picture, and I think I can heighten its effect if I compare figures—when comparison is possible—with the figures of the World War in 1917 and 1918. Then, too, you remember, the Nation was called upon to deliver its full strength against an ambitious foe. Yet seen in detail and in perspective, the current struggle has called for an incomparably greater effort from the American people. In the unified drive we have tapped reserves of energy never called up in that earlier struggle.

In money, in numbers of weapons, in goods, in ships, in manpower we are driven to the utmost of our resources to provide what must be provided if our historic liberties are to be preserved from the fate which has overtaken nations less fortunate than we.

Let me begin with the men. On June 30, of this year, our Army numbered approximately 6,800,000.

This, in itself, has represented a gigantic undertaking. You cannot simply order 6,800,000 men to arms and have them spring from the ground caparisoned and equipped for battle. Land must be surveyed and cleared for camps and airfields, roads laid, barracks built, sanitary facilities installed, hospitals constructed. The last great budget which came before the House provided for the maintenance of 4,500 posts, camps, and other installations.

Funds to maintain over 900 airfields were also provided in that same budget, with runways in excess of two and three quarter million square yards, and with parking aprons and taxiways exceeding two and a quarter million square yards. The paved roadway alone constructed by the engineers in the last 2 years would build 4 separate highways from New York to San Francisco 20 feet wide.

This represents a huge task of construction and of organization, for each of these camps is a self-sustaining city in itself with its own hospitals, churches, theaters, service clubs. Before ever men could report to them, their quartermaster stores had to provide sleeping quarters and bedding for the men, food in the mess halls, and all the thousand-and-one little items which represent the ordinary comforts of ordinary living in an Army camp as well as in the houses and apartments of a city. And before these items could be issued to the men, they had to be manufactured. You see how complex and far-reaching this process is when you consider its ramifications.

All this expansion of the Military Establishment began with the passage of the Selective Training and Service Act in September 1940. On June 30 of that year, our Regular Army totaled 264,035 men, with an additional 214,612 in the National Guard and 119,869 in the Reserve. A year later, on June 30, 1941, with the National Guard in the Federal service and many of the Reserves called to active duty, the Army had grown to 1,350,000 enlisted men. Its strength had doubled by June 30, 1942, when our force numbered 2,865,000. In the 12 months ending June 30, 1943, it more than doubled again to reach its total of approximately 6,800,000.

The slower growth of the earlier months of the war was conditioned by the fact that this Nation was unprepared for the gigantic task which it had assumed. The foresight of the President and the Congress had done much to make us ready for the blow which was to fall in December 1941. But we are a peaceful people. Until the intent of Hitler on one side of the world and of Hirohito on the other became fully evident, I doubt that there were many Americans who envisioned that this Nation would be plunged inevitably into an engulfing war.

Once that design was made clear—once the traitorous attack on Pearl Harbor committed us to the necessity of defending our national existence—then the enterprise of the American people was turned into the channel of swift, relentless preparation to strike such a blow for liberty as the world had never seen before.

The camps grew and the men poured in, donned their uniforms, took up their weapons. It was a familiar pattern at first to those of us who remember the last war. There was the same type of cantonment, the same spectacle of citizens being turned into soldiers, the same grim air of determination.

But in the developing preparations of those early months, it became swiftly apparent how far the technique of war had advanced in the quarter century since 1918. We took our mechanized progress to France in those days—we had trucks to carry some of the men and supplies; we had a few planes and a few tanks. But the spectacle of a mechanized army of high mobility remained undeveloped to the end of that first World War. No army had acquired sufficient momentum to propel a force-in-motion capable of rolling back the defensive structure of its enemy.

The demand on our factories in 1917 and 1918 was small for this very reason in comparison with the sudden and unprecedented needs of modern warfare. The figures develop this comparison graphically.

For example, Army Ordnance spent $17,300,000,000 for artillery, tanks, motor vehicles, bombs, ammunition, rifles, machine guns, and aircraft cannon in the fiscal year 1943. This vast expenditure becomes more readily understandable when I say that, coupled with earlier expenditures, it has provided one piece of artillery for every 45 soldiers in our entire Army. In World War No. 1—when our striking power appeared by no means small—we had but a single piece of artillery for every 1,110 soldiers. In April 1943 alone this Nation produced three times as many pieces of field artillery as in the entire 19 months of World War No. 1.

Our total production of machine guns has reached one and one-half million, as compared with a delivery of slightly less than 200,000 in the first World War.

We have reached the 5,000,000 figure in production of shoulder weapons—the Garand rifle, the M1 carbine, and submachine guns. Our small-arms ammunition has mounted until we have produced 22,000,000,000 rounds, as compared with one-sixth of that amount in the earlier war We have produced five and one-half million demolition, general purpose, and armor-piercing bombs to June 30, 1943, whereas our production of this important weapon in the first World War was 192,000.

About 40,000 tanks had been received at the half-way mark in 1943. During a recent month almost twice as many were produced each day as in all of the first World War. More than 19,000 pieces of self-propelled artillery have been delivered so far. This is a startling figure when it is placed beside the simple 10 we had produced by Armistice Day, 1918.

Since the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor we have shipped 24,000,000 tons of cargo to bases overseas. In 1917 and 1918 our total shipments to the troops in France were 9,000,000. During the first year of this war the Army shipped overseas 6 times the volume of supplies and two and a half times as many men as were transported in the first year of World War No. 1. We have made this great accomplishment despite the fact that the distances traveled are over two and a half times as great as in the previous war.

Aviation was in its infancy in the first World War. The old DH-4 observation and bombardment planes, which we thought were so fine, reached an all-out speed of 125 miles an hour. Today's nearest comparable fighter, the Warhawk P-40, has a maximum range of over 900 miles and a top speed of approximately 390 miles an hour.

We spent a total of $503,000,000 in the last war for Army airplanes, engines, and spare parts. In the present war, up to June 30, 1943, allotments to the Army Air Forces totaled $40,000,000,000. Let's get the picture of what that money is going for. During the calendar year 1941 a total of 16,651 planes was accepted by the Army. During the 18 months from January 1, 1942, to July 1, 1943, the Army accepted 73,132 planes. For that 18 months' period, total monthly production under Army contracts averaged slightly over 4,000 planes.

Today aircraft production in this country is averaging more than 7,000 planes monthly, and production charts call for a steady upward climb during the months ahead. Some of these planes go to our allies in the United Nations under lease-lend, some go to the Navy—by far the largest share goes to our hard-hitting Army Air Forces. I daresay that the Army receives 4,500 or more planes out of each month's total.

How does this compare with our enemies' production? The best figures I have seen indicate that the Axis is not producing more than 4,000 planes a month. This is divided up between Germany, which produces 2,200, Japan, which produces 1,200, and Italy, 600. Quite apart from our own mounting production, Great Britain and Russia together are now turning out more aircraft than the enemy.

There is plenty of striking power left in the Luftwaffe and in the Jap air fleets, as our pilots are learning over Europe and in the southwest Pacific. But the situation has changed astonishingly since those days of the battle of Britain when the might of the

German air force was overwhelmingly superior to all the strength the democracies could muster.

These figures—and I think you will agree that they are astonishing figures—represent a great part of the huge momentum this Nation has rolled up in the 21 months since Pearl Harbor. The cost has been huge. From April 1917 through April 1919 Army expenditures were about $14,000,000,000. From July 1941 to July 1943 Army expenditures were about $56,000,000,000 and we had obligated $101,00,000,000.

This is a portion of the stake which America has been forced to provide to halt the ambitious progress of three men—Hitler, Hirohito, Mussolini. One of these three has now been eliminated. How long will these other two stand out against our growing might?

To that question, no man can give an answer, and the Nation is poorly served by those who believe that our recent and stunning victories on both sides of the world have driven the fight out of our enemies. Such speculation can only work harm to our cause. The fact is that all of our energies must remain committed to this war until the final conclusion of hostilities, when the Swastika and the Rising Sun are both hauled down from the slave states over which they fly. We cannot—we dare not—relax our effort, for then we shall permit our enemies time to recover from the smashing blows we are delivering. We shall permit them time to regroup their forces on new lines and, perhaps, time to gather new strength for counterblows which will delay the end by months if not by years.

I have heard rumors that all this production I talked about a few moments ago had progressed so favorably that now we could even begin turning back some of our efforts to civilian industry. Lieutenant General Brehon Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces, which procures all its equipment and supplies for the entire Army, took notice of them when he appeared before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to discuss the budget for the new fiscal year.

"At the present time," General Somervell said, and I am quoting, "the production is such that we have had to limit to a very serious degree the amount of equipment that we can put in the hands of the divisions which we have in training. * * * So far from having a surplus of equipment, there is not enough in sight, even if we do meet the programs which are laid out now, to provide the equipment that the Army needs. * * *"

General Somervell had some interesting things to say about the uses to which funds have been allotted which indicate the development of our Army into an effective fighting force. He pointed out that year before last we used approximately 47 percent of our total equipment for the initial equipment of our troops. This year it is about 29 percent, and next year that figure will have been reduced to 19 percent.

But, General Somervell added, and I shall quote again: "That does not mean that the total over-all output in our production program is reduced. It only means that there is a change in emphasis on the type of maintenance we are making. In other words, once we get enough cannon to supply all our troops, we must make more cannon for replacements, and the more cannon we have on the firing line the more ammunition we must manufacture."

You can readily see from General Somervell's words that in spite of our huge production for war the demands of this global war are greater. If we let down our production for an instant, men on a distant firing line will want for guns, for ammunition, for food.

Let us see for a moment how far we have come along the difficult road to victory.

What we have done up to now is prelude for the greater military adventures which are to come. It has been a mightly prelude, but the reconquest of Europe and of the vast empire which the Japs have snatched for themselves in the Pacific is an adventure of the greatest magnitude. Do you believe that the grasping, voracious dictators of Germany and Japan will permit their nations to collapse while their armies in the field remain unbeaten?

I have no doubt that the German people have been made intensely uncomfortable by the terriffic bombings which they are suffering from the British and American planes. I feel equal assurance, judging by some of the comments by Japanese radio commentators which we see reprinted in our press, that the people of Hirohito's island homeland are dreading the shadow of our planes against the clouds.

But these people have been disciplined by the hard philosophies of their leaders, conditioned to privation and suffering. They are surrounded and cowed by legions of police who, they well know, will put down any suggestion of revolt against the established order with ruthless cruelty. Only the other day you read what the nervous trigger fingers of the Nazi overlords did to the gentle people of Denmark.

These men of Germany and Japan had gone far in their first headlong plunge. Before this Nation ever entered the war, Germany had overrun the entire continent of Europe. Before we could transport a sufficient force into the southwest Pacific, the Japs had carried through their own well-laid plans of conquest.

With these two enemies firmly entrenched, the wonder is that we have done so well in our 21 months of war.

We have transported more than 2,000,000 of our men to stations overseas. We have wrested Guadalcanal and New Georgia from the desperate hands of the Japs. We have driven them from a large part of their conquests in New Guinea and are now engaged in delivering the death blow at Salamaua. We have sunk a prodigious amount of their shipping. We have downed their planes at an increasingly favorable rate, culminating in the holocaust of destruction which caused them to abandon their forward base at Wewak and retire to Hollandia in New Guinea.

But the road in the Pacific is long and tortuous. We must drive the Japs from other strongly held island defenses. We must take Burma back, and open the Burma Road to China's interior. We must bring our might to bear against the homeland of the Japs itself—on the sea, in the air, on the land.

The Japs show no signs of weakness. We have given them plenty of indication that our American troops can be as tough and as crafty in jungle warfare as they are. But the fight remains strong in the men of Hirohito. We learned it at Munda. We learned it again on Attu. And because the Japs abandoned Kiska we have no reason for assuming that it was through fear. To remain would have been the hysterical, mass suicide of madmen. No military purpose could have been served by leaving a force to its annihiliation.

In Europe the prelude is over. The big show is about to begin—in fact, it has begun—with the landings on Italy's mainland. I do not need to rehearse the steps by which we have made the Mediterranean ours, driven the Italians and the Nazis from their conquests in north Africa, expelled their armies from Sicily until at last we have begun to batter against the citadel of Europe itself.

We must not be impatient for these greater events to unfold. It requires time to mount gigantic offensives. Three thousand ships took part in the invasion of Sicily, carrying 160,000 troops with 1,800 guns, 600 tanks, 14,000 vehicles, together wih the supplies and provisions to keep this great force on the move. It takes time to assemble all these parts of the invasion picture. It takes time to plan the split-second schedule of landings by which they are brought into the beaches. It takes time to batter down the resistance of seasoned troops and crush their will to resist.

And if you are tempted to impatience, if you hear the armchair strategists drive their fists into their palms and bellow for a frontal assault on Hitler's greatest defenses before the operation is militarily feasible, remember that in this war we are winning victories with an economy of casualties. In the 19 months of the first World War we lost 265,000 men killed and wounded. In the first 19 months of this war, including missing and prisoners of war, the Army alone suffered 65,000 casualties.

The toll of war is great and it is inevitable. Our leaders are keeping it to a minimum by the skill with which they prepare the men for battle, by the stepped-up firepower of their weapons, by the miracles of medical care which are performed on the battlefield and in the aerial transport which brings the wounded quickly to base hospitals. To show you what that care is doing, let me cite another comparison between this war and the last. In World War No. 1 the ratio of soldiers dying from wounds was 7.2 percent. We have come close to cutting that in half, for in this war the percentage is 3.8.

That, gentlemen, gives you the picture as I see it today. I cannot tell you how long this war will last. But let me repeat that if Americans on the civilian front relax their effort for a moment now, the end will be agonizingly delayed. Our military progress is proceeding now in carefully timed, skillfully planned offensives against the enemy. They have brought us into Europe. They will not stop until our troops are in Hitler's Germany.

This global war is a gigantic undertaking in which every man and woman plays their part. It is not the Army's war or the Navy's war. It is your war and my war, and our duties are as definitely assigned as those of any soldier on a hostile Italian road today.

He depends on you and on me to see that the effort at home never ceases. He depends on you and on me to help him gain our victory. Not till it is won can he come home.

American Recommitment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a poem written by William Stanley Dunford, of Provo, Utah, the father of Pvt. Paul O. Dunford, who died in the service of his country.

Mr. Dunford is a lawyer in my home town of Provo, Utah, and is one of Utah's leading and best-known lawyers. I feel sure that not only the people who have sons in the service but the public generally will deeply appreciate this very splendid poem. Such poems as this, it seems to me, make it easier for all of us

to do our share in the winning of the war.

AMERICAN RECOMMITMENT

I must not fail! This little life of mine,
So dear to me, and those who give me love,
Is no more mine to hoard or keep secure
Than rain distilling from the clouds above!

The heritage of ages fills my veins!
I am not me because I willed to be,
But since when dawn of human time began,
Strange forces focalized to make me—me!

I know that in forgotten ages past,
My fathers stood with fearless, blazing eyes,
Defiant of the foes that stalked their paths,
And shouted challenge into hostile skies!

I know, because, within my little life,
No progress e'er was made without a fight!
Whatever is most worthy in my days,
I've taken by my wits, or by my might!
The essence of my fathers' dreams is mine!
I have in me the filt'rings of their souls!
Their stamina is mine to keep me sane!
I'm strong, because, by strength, they reached their goals!

I dare not fail! The eyes of ancient sires
Are focused on the life I now must live!
What service to my world of living things
Is in my pow'r to give—I now must give!

Oppressed were they, in cob-webbed hist'ries gone,
Their comforts and their affluence despoiled,
But through their beatings—and their hearts' distress,
Their spirits ne'er were cowed—nor ideals soiled!

But, rising on the ashes of their homes,
They stood erect, with hands upstretched to God,
And pledged the sacred life blood in their veins,
To keep oppression from their sacred sod!

They never stopped to count the carnal gain,
An ideal saved was, richly, their reward!
If, by their death, they saw their aims confirmed,
What matter that they died by fire—or sword?

I shall not fail! The sacred blood they spilled
Ordains me to the valiant cause they won
I'll not be worthy my heroic sires
If I should pause before my task is done!

MY PLEDGE

No tyrant's heel will ever tread this ground,
Enriched by sacred martyr's holy blood,
As long as life shall pulse within my veins,
As long as I can take my cause to God!

—*Wm. Stanley Dunford.*

PROVO, UTAH.

Army-Navy Electronics Production Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, with great concern about apparent irregularities, politics, and injustices in a joint division of the Army and the Navy to which my attention has been called, I wish to speak on that situation.

While the House Civil Service Investigating Committee has been conducting an inquiry into the affairs of the Army-Navy Electronics Production Agency, my personal interest has been aroused in the functioning of this agency, and I have been making my own investigation. Although the committee's probers are still engaged in their work on the conduct of the Army-Navy Electronics Production Agency—to which I shall hereafter refer as A. N. E. P. A.—I have obtained sufficient facts from several sources outside the committee to be able to anticipate that the report of the committee's investigators will be very revealing.

I understand, indeed, that the facts gathered by the committee's investigators are of so serious implications that the committee contemplates hearings on A. N. E. P. A.

It may be of significance that, in the midst of the committee's investigation, the chief investigator has been extended an appointment with the War Manpower Commission in the State of Georgia, which will take him from his important position with Representative RAMSPECK's Civil Service Investigating Committee and possibly leave his work unfinished. This development has been heretofore deplored publicly by George D. Riley, conductor of U. S. and Us, a nationally read column in the Washington Times-Herald, who last week wrote that "Dillar Lasseter, committee director, was going like all get out" and "was scratching pay dirt."

Mr. Riley added:

We generally look twice when a congressional committee is getting busy investigating civil service and some of the strange goings-on in important places. So many have failed to bring up the worms into the sunlight.

I am hopeful, however, that Mr. RAMSPECK and his committee will give A. N. E. P. A. an exposure to the sun.

My feeling is the result of what I have learned independently.

In commenting at all, I have but one interest, not of impeding our war-to-victory program, as mapped out by the military experts, but like the purpose for which A. N. E. P. A. was brought into being, to expedite the prosecution of the war.

A. N. E. P. A. is one of the biggest things in the war program. It was created by the Army and the Navy—by Gen. Brehon B. Somervell for the Army—to expedite the production and delivery of electronic devices which are vital to the waging of the war, like radio, radar, and all communications equipment.

I am personally perturbed about the charges I have been hearing with reference to A. N. E. P. A.—charges of politics, inexperience, mismanagement.

If "$6,500 is being paid to men for reading funny papers," as Mr. Riley said in his Times-Herald column, for that reason alone, if for no other reason, you and I in Congress will want very much to know about it, even though the agency affected is a branch of our Army and Navy, to which we properly delegate the military determinations. Paying men $6,500 a year and neglecting to see to it that they have something better to do with their time as civilian employees of the military services than to follow the adventures in picture-strip of Mutt and Jeff is no contribution to the solution of our manpower problem.

We should wish to know, too, why A. N. E. P. A. is top-heavy with high-salaried personnel, why many of the employees are receiving much higher salary than they were paid in private industry, why the agency has been lacking in ability to supervise, why so many of its workers are not qualified by prior experience as expediters, why Civil Service Commission qualifications for personnel were not acceptable to A. N. E. P. A., why politics seems to have entered into selection of personnel inasmuch as several A. N. E. P. A. officials are former Detroit automotive men and a large number of the employees are from the Detroit area.

According to testimony by General Somervell before the House Civil Service Investigating Committee on June 16 last, the Western Electric Co. "have something like $400,000,000 worth of work with us"—and General Somervell explained that he "wrote the president of the company, asking for the loan" of the vice president's services for 6 months. It was shortly after the Western Electric vice president, Fred C. Lack, had signed a contract with the Signal Corps of the War Department for a $74,000,000 job to be expedited by A. N. E. P. A. that Mr. Lack became head of A. N. E. P. A. Thereafter, "another man from the same outfit"—this quotation is also from the testimony of General Somervell—F. D. Tellright—has succeeded as the present head of A. N. E. P. A.

The entire electronics program, including the wire and cable program, should be rigidly investigated, and the Government personnel which have had to do with it should be investigated as to qualifications and integrity. Several billion dollars of our taxpayers' money is being spent for the procurements involved.

It is desirable, I believe, that the entire business of A. N. E. P. A. be explored not only by the House Civil Service Investigating Committee but also by other committees of Congress, and that officials of A. N. E. P. A. be made to explain many things.

The Church and Racial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL ELLISON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an extract from an address made by the Reverend W. W. Judd on the subject of the Church and Racial Relations.

The address was prefaced by this statement from The Message of the Oxford Interchurch Conference 1937:

"The Christian sees distinctions of race as part of God's purpose to enrich mankind with a diversity of gifts. Against racial pride or race antagonism the church must set its face implacably as rebellion against God. Especially, in its own life and worship there can be no place for barriers because of race or color. Similarly the Christian accepts national communities as part of God's purpose to enrich and diversify human life. Every man is called of God to serve his fellows in the community to which he belongs. But national egotism tending to the suppression of other nationalities or of minorities is, no less than individual egotism, a sin against the Creator of all peoples and races. The deification of nation, race, or class, or of political or cultural ideas, is idolatry, and can only lead to increasing division and disaster."

The extract from the address follows:

"THE REFUGEES AND THE JEWISH PROBLEM

"Anti-Semitism is a festering sore, even in the supposedly liberal and tolerant Canadian scene.

"According to the religious census of Canada, 1941, there are 168,377 Jews, only 1.46 percent of the population. With such a comparatively small group, and with the tolerant and happy attitude of the English people during past generations as an example to us, one would imagine that there would be no anti-Semitic feeling among us.

"But there is. To generalize briefly, it is attributed to three alleged causes: (1) A general aggressive attitude of Jews in social and other departments of life. (2) Sharp business practices. (3) An international attitude not acceptable to some persons. Dr. James Parkes, a priest of the Church of England, probably the best contemporary Christian authority on this question, assumes that the first is a psychological attitude, the self-defensive mechanism working as a result of centuries of persecution and, therefore, our fault; that the second is not more apparent in Jews than in so-called Christians—there being good and bad Jews and Christians. The charge of emphasized international longings is surely an inheritance from the best of the Jewish prophets and is in line with the best of Christian visions for a decent world order wherein there shall be peace and brotherhood in a realized kingdom of God on earth.

"Without doubt the narrow attitude of the Jewish community to intermarriage with Gentiles is a contributing factor.

"It is sad to state, but an undeniable fact that there are evidences that this anti-Semitic attitude flames more brightly today. It is a repercussion from Europe. I need not mention the smaller evidences of this—personal and family dislikes, the attempts to bar Jews from certain city areas, the barriers placed covertly, if not overtly, against them by certain universities, medical societies, etc. Nor do I want to whitewash Jewish people entirely. They are to blame. But the greater blame lies with us as we review the history of age-long persecution and as we recall the whole Christian challenge to love our neighbors as ourselves.

"Sufficient to say that the Christian church people as such have to acknowledge their failure to sympathize and to help sufficiently to overcome this ugly spirit in our midst. If we do not do so, citizens generally will certainly not learn to do so. We must never forget that in Germany anti-Semitism was used as the first weapon to later attack all religion.

"A specific part of this problem which must be faced today is that of the refugees of religious and/or political persecution. They are both Jew and Gentile. In Europe today there are eight to ten millions of displaced persons of all races and all creeds, victims of Nazi persecution. Around the Mediterranean there are collected an estimated 200,000 seeking a permanent home in Palestine, north Africa, South America, or wherever they may be received. In Lisbon, the still neutral port of Europe there are always from ten to fifteen thousand ready to be rescued. Portugal can take no more, but receives from over the Pyrenees continually more who continue to keep the group up to about that norm.

"To her everlasting honor be it said, Great Britain has some 200,000 refugees, some arrived just before the war broke out, most at the time of Dunkerque or since. Some 60,000 of those are Jews. There are still being rescued or allowed to filter into Britain nearly a thousand a year. Today there are groups of Christian people in Britain pressing on government to allow more to enter, and to rescue them. Government is sympathetic but faces the difficulty of shipping facilities, the ability to feed more population, and so forth.

"These 200,000 are there in spite of the grave privations that the English people are themselves facing. Nevertheless the whole refugee community in its various national groups is participating in the war effort constructively and helpfully.

"British leaders are stressing the fact that this is not merely a Jewish problem, though they are keenly aware of what is happening to the Jews in Poland and in all Nazi-dominated territory. Nor is it a German problem, though there are German exiles, and probably thousands, if not millions of Germans still in Germany who suffer and irk under Nazi tyranny. It is a human problem.

"This brings me to what I want to emphasize. From the sheer humanitarian point of view, for sweet charity's sake, for Christ's sake, that is, for attempting today to give some reality to His gospel of love, Canada should open her doors immediately to many of these who might be rescued—whose lives may be saved, to put it bluntly—and should face her responsibility for a large-hearted admission after the war of a fair share of these people, Jew or gentile. The present writer is convinced that, in addition, such a policy will prove to be sound economically and contribute to cultural betterment. In fairness, too, to Britain we might well relieve her of some of the responsibility she so liberally assumed. On the highest grounds, however, Canada ought to take a vast share in lifting this burden of Europe's and Jewry's sorrow.

"This is a challenge to members of the Christian church. Officially, as far as pronouncements are concerned and so far as church officers are concerned in their endeavors to arouse public opinion, our Church of England in Canada has been in the lead in this regard. Since 1938 we have sought the good will of the people. Your social service department has assisted national committees in every way possible. But Canadian opinion is hard to arouse. We, in our secure western world, have become very complacent as a people; labor groups, recalling the depression, have fought against immigration (we believe that such an effort is against sound economic policy); some religious people, even religious groups, in their dislike of the Jews have overemphasized this element of the picture. And Government has, in the opinion of many, been very niggardly in its acceptance of responsibility.

"This truly is a challenge to the Christian conscience and will.

"All this reference to refugees is to a particular problem and must not lead us from our acceptance of a responsibility to our present Canadian Jewish compatriots.

"Malvern says, 'We urge that use be made of the opportunity provided by the presence of so many citizens of other countries in our own to make personal friendships with them and to learn more fully to understand the outlook of those nations. Recognizing the gravity of the Jewish problem, we urge all Christians to take their part in seeking an effective solution even at real cost, and in all circumstances to check the growth of anti-Semitic passions.'

"While we forever must preach Christ as the only Savior of the whole world, we must learn to live as citizens in happier relations with our Jewish brethren.

"I plead for better understanding, the forming of personal and family friendships, between Jew and gentile, collaboration in all good movements which look toward better relations with the Jews in our midst. In the United States for some years the very rabid anti-Semitism of parts of the community have been offset by the good work of the Conference of Catholics, Protestants and Jews. In Canada, for this 5 years past we have the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews. We as church people should do all we can to strengthen that movement."

Resolutions of Commercial Club of Albia, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a number of bills proposing to take from the Interstate Commerce Commission the power of fixing railway rates on interstate shipments and lodging this power with the Congress are now before the appropriate committee. The task of writing freight rates at the hands of 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate would be colossal and it may be doubted if this function could be handled as efficiently and as well as we find it being done by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include resolutions adopted by the Commercial Club of the city of Albia, Iowa, dealing with this subject:

Whereas there is now pending before the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, approximately 14 bills or joint resolutions, proposing to correct alleged freight-rate discriminations and urge passage of legislation proposing to provide for uniform freight-rate bills throughout the United States; and

Whereas if passage of said uniform freight-rate bills and resolutions were enacted, the Congress would assume virtually all of the fundamental powers which heretofore have been placed under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has functioned since its inception or in 1887 and has been given latitude as an agency of Congress to pass judgment on rates after full hearings into the facts of a particular case, which procedure has been of definite advantage to shippers, in that the Commission has passed upon rates according to the individual situations and facts controlling them, and such policy has met the general approval of shippers of the entire Nation; and

Whereas if uniform rates were prescribed by Congress, such rate structures would become fixed and inflexible and thus leave the Commission and carriers without discretion in setting rates to particular shipping or territorial needs, and would, therefore, handicap and restrain commerce; and

Whereas the board of directors of the Albia Commercial Club, Albia, Iowa, being located in south central Iowa, in what might generally be termed the industrial section of the State, and said community being located on four of the larger railroad lines operating within our State: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Albia Commercial Club, of Albia, Iowa, by its board of directors in regular board session, does hereby register its objections to certain pending legislation which proposes to provide uniform freight-rate bills throughout the United States, and in support of such resistance, the board respectfully points out that such proposals are a definite departure from regulatory principles, which under the present rate-making plan under the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission have left all shippers free to present their complaints for a determination by the Commission's judgment, and if such pending legislation were approved by Congress, then such substituted plan would impair the valuation of regulation to the shipping public; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be provided United States Senators GUY M. GILLETTE and GEORGE A. WILSON, of Iowa, and likewise be provided the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE, Congressman from the Fourth District of Iowa in which the city of Albia, Iowa, is located.

Dated this 7th day of September A. D. 1943.

ALBIA COMMERCIAL CLUB,
By JOHN H. HESS, *President*.

Attest:

HUGH W. LUNDY,
Secretary.

Passed and approved this 7th day of September A. D. 1943.

Fire Losses Are Menacing War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, in the proclamation issued by the President designating the week beginning October 3, 1943, as Fire Prevention Week, the President stated that the Nation's war program is menaced by an alarming increase in preventable fire losses and that fires are bringing costly delays in the production and transportation of airplanes, ships, tanks, and guns—delays that mean a postponement of victory and the lives of many of our men on the fighting fronts.

I would like to call the attention of the Congress and our people to three very alarming facts in connection with this important matter to which the President so definitely refers in his proclamation—fire losses.

First. The National Fire Protection Association reports that there were more large-loss industrial fires in 1942 than in any year in our history. Also, that there were more large-loss industrial fires in the first 4 months of the present year—1943—than in all of 1942. The total fire loss in the United States in 1942 approximated $314,295,000. But these figures do not reveal the loss of life and production, and the destruction of critical war materials and equipment caused by these fires.

In the first 6 months of 1943 the total fire loss in this country is estimated at $190,514,000. At this rate, fire will devastate an even larger segment of American industry than in 1942, and the total 1943 fire loss may exceed $400,000,000. Such fire losses cannot be permitted to continue to impede the ever-increasing flow of vital materials demanded by our armed forces.

Secondly, the United States is burning its homes faster than they are being built. In 1942 approximately 350,000 dwelling units were constructed in an all-out effort to solve the country's acute war-born housing problem. During the same period 395,000 dwelling units were attacked by fire, many of them totally destroyed.

The tragedy of this staggering fire loss is the fact the great majority of fires are preventable—are primarily due to carelessness and ignorance. Thus, it is important to carry on our educational efforts—through Federal, State, local, and private agencies—even more intensively this year than in previous years. For homes burned today are replaceable, if at all, only at sacrifice to all-out war effort.

Thirdly, although the curve of industrial fire loss in 1942 swept sharply upward—and more homes were destroyed or severely damaged by fire than this country was able to build—it is very gratifying to observe that the trend on America's farms was reversed—turned downward. Farm fire losses were approximately 10 percent less than in the previous year. The United States Department of Agriculture, the State agricultural extension colleges, and the county agents and extension workers should derive a great deal of satisfaction from this record as it is due in a large measure to the educational activities carried on.

"Fire prevention is essential to conservation on the farm," according to Dr. David J. Price, president of the National Fire Protection Association. Pointing out that America's fire losses are on the upgrade and that farm losses, even in peacetime, amount to millions of dollars' worth of materials and equipment yearly, Dr. Price urges complete cooperation of all farmers in the observation of Fire Prevention Week. "Food burned in the barn is of no help to our fighting men overseas," says Dr. Price, "and the destruction of equipment by fire reduces the Nation's food production capacity."

Farm fires at any time are serious. In dollars, the loss runs into many millions—$200,000,000 annually from fires on farms and in rural communities, with an annual loss of 3,500 lives. But farm and rural fires today are infinitely more serious. War-born food shortages have turned farm fires from local tragedies into national, yes, into international calamities.

What do our farm fires mean today? Fires mean delay in delivery of food to our armed forces, our Allied Nations, and the nations of Europe which our armed forces are now occupying. Fires add to an already serious food shortage on the home front. Fires mean the destruction of hard—if not impossible—to replace homes, barns, and machines. Fires mean loss of life and timetaking inquiries at a time when every life and every hour spent on the production of food is so essential to victory.

Mr. Speaker, we must fight the enemy by fighting fire. We must reduce our industrial fire losses and our food shortages. We must demand preventive action now.

At this point in my remarks I would like to insert the President's Proclamation for Fire Prevention Week:

FIRE PREVENTION WEEK, 1943

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A proclamation

This Nation's war program is menaced by an alarming increase in preventable fire losses. Since Pearl Harbor the destruction caused by fire in the United States has been comparable to the damage caused by all enemy bombing over England during the first 2 years of the war. The loss to this Nation is just as real as if the destruction had been wrought by enemy bombers over America, or by saboteurs.

These preventable fires are being measured in thousands of workers killed and disabled; vast destruction of critical raw materials, food, and other vital supplies for our armed forces and civilian population; the ruin of war plants, factories, homes, and machinery—in many cases for the duration of the war. Fires are bringing costly delays in the production and transportation of airplanes, ships, tanks, and guns—delays that mean a postponement of victory and the lives of many of our men on the fighting fronts.

Today it is vitally necessary that we prevent destructive fire. Every State in the Union shares this responsibility. Every community must make an extra and thorough effort to detect and eliminate fire hazards. Only by this united endeavor can America guard her productive power against fire and eliminate a major hazard that threatens seriously to reduce supplies of war materials, food, clothing, and other essentials required by our fighting men overseas and by our civilians at home. The cause was never so clear; the need was never so great.

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning October 3, 1943, as Fire Prevention Week. I earnestly request the people of the country to take unusually active measures during that week, and throughout the year, to conserve our human and material resources from destruction by fire. I call upon State and local governments, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Fire Waste Council, upon all business and labor organizations, the pulpit, educators, civic groups, the press, the radio, and the motion-picture industry to initiate programs that will vividly bring home to all our people the dangers of fire and the methods of controlling it. Further, I direct the Office of Civilian Defense, the Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, the protective services of the War and Navy Departments, and other appropriate Federal agencies to

lend their active support and assistance to the attainment of these objectives.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 30th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1943, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

By the President:

CORDELL HULL,
Secretary of State.

Assuaging Flood of Raging Blood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

ASSUAGING FLOOD OF RAGING BLOOD

The flood of blood has long been raging
Throughout the Eastern Hemisphere,
But now sure signs of its assuaging
Are seen and welcomed over here;
For we've been sending, 'cross the waters,
Both men and implements of war,
To help exterminate the slaughters
That friends of freedom all abhor.

The peace-inspired United Nations
Have, through their efforts, kept so far
The western world's civilizations
Safe from this nation-wrecking war.
Words are inadequate to measure
The sacrifices freely made
By our own land, in men and treasure,
That this disaster might be stayed.

With Italy's complete surrender,
Her people are delighted, for
Her erstwhile foe is her defender
In this tyrannic, savage war;
And, though we with a voice like Sherman's
Too cry out, "War is hell," we'll drive
From out of Italy the Germans—
Not one, now therein, shall survive.

With multiplied determination,
We will continue our advance
Till we effect the liberation
Of overpowered, conquered France;
Then we will focus our attention
On freedom-loving little Greece,
That, through the Allies' intervention,
She once again may dwell in peace.

Then we will drive these fierce marauders,
Mad Hitler's bloody-handed bands,
From out the erstwhile peaceful borders
Of all these lately conquered lands—
Then we must strike, in all directions,
These tyrants, and we must not cease
Till Germany, with hushed objections,
Shall through surrender sue for peace.

But, let us suffer no delusion—
While we're succeeding, still we are
Far from the coveted conclusion
Of this titanic, tyrant war.
Long as the war lords of the Germans,
And of the Japs, are in control,
They'll turn deaf ears to prayers and sermons,
And wreck the world to win their goal.

This is no time for celebration—
The clouds beyond are black with dread—
This is the time for consecration
To those great tasks that lie ahead—
The well-informed United Nations
Know, through their leaders, near and far,
That victory means obligations
Upon the victors in this war.

Though every single operation,
That we shall plan and carry through,
May cost beyond our expectation,
If it helps make our dream come true,
When we shall see the troops disbanding,
Rejoicing 'neath their flags unfurled,
The peace that passes understanding
Will set at rest the weary world.

Our troops must have the best equipment
That's ever been devised by man—
Yea, to make each succeeding shipment
Of weapons better is our plan.
It's good economy to borrow,
Today, if by it justice thrives,
And it becomes the means, tomorrow,
Of saving many soldiers' lives.

The quicker this war's won the better—
The sooner we spend what we must—
Though we become a bankrupt debtor,
Thank God, we know "In God We Trust"—
The fewer lives upon the altar
Of Hitler's war we'll sacrifice.
In God's strength, stronger than Gibraltar,
We'll win, regardless of the price.

The Nation's makers of munitions
And uniforms and cots and tents,
And miners, with their fixed ambitions,
Are our great first line of defense.
As long as these all pull together,
Led by the feeders of us all,
However foul or fair the weather,
We, under God, can never fall.

Among our World War women workers,
Responsive to war's stern demands,
Are found but few, if any, shirkers;
But they with willing hearts and hands
Into this Nation-wide endeavor
Are putting all they have and are—
And they expect to slow down never
Until we shall have won the war.

The Nation's needs today are greater
Than they have ever been before—
We've got to look to our Creator
For strength and wisdom, more and more,
That we may make and spend discreetly,
As He would have us make and spend,
That we may do His will completely,
In bringing this war to an end.

Nobody knows the day nor hour
When this war shall come to its close;
But we do know the greater power
We use against our savage foes,
Today, in every way, the quicker
Will Hitler's fighters have to cease,
And war's last ray of hope will flicker,
And go out—and there will come peace.

Then will begin world reconstruction,
Which will call on men, everywhere,
For such a season of production,
In which they all will gladly share,
That life's law, "Do ye unto others
As ye'd have them do unto you,"
Will lead us all to live as brothers,
And God will make our dreams come true.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Unity at Home—Victory Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Unity at Home—Victory Abroad," broadcast by me over station WMCA on September 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, 4 years ago today Hitler's panzer divisions rolled across the frontiers of innocent Poland. The flames of war have since crossed the Atlantic and the Pacific, to engulf our peace-loving land and people.

Two self-styled "master races"—the Nazis in the west and the Japs in the east—set out to rule by force the destinies, lives, and property of every other people on earth, of every land, creed, and color. This drive for world domination has been stopped. Every great raid over Germany, every blow struck on land, sea, or in the air by the United Nations, is bringing home to these master races the growing might of freemen to resist and to destroy their power for evil.

Our boys are taking the measure of the enemy on the field of battle. How do we shape up on the home front?

After 4 years of war, Hitler has called upon Himmler, his No. 1 trigger man, and his Gestapo thugs, to keep in line the German people and their millions of enslaved workers from every part of Europe. We need no clearer confession that the Nazi home front is in serious danger.

In our own country, the home front is likewise composed of men and women from many lands; but they came of their own free will, in search of liberty and the chance to make good. Here in the metropolitan area reside more than 2,000,000 people who were born across the seas; and, in addition, almost 3,000,000 native-born with one or both parents born abroad. The majority of New Yorkers are thus only one generation removed from the Old World, and the bulk of these had a mother tongue other than English. Here in New York we have also a half million citizens of the Negro race.

Throughout this war, as in the years preceding, this diverse population, with very rare exceptions, has shown remarkable unity and cooperation. Without regard to race, creed, color, or country of origin, they share and cherish a common devotion to America, and their sons fight shoulder to shoulder in a common democratic cause. They are Americans all.

This unity on the sidewalks of New York is symbolic of America's strength. Only in a democracy would we find citizens of a minority race such as the Negro, serving with distinction as judges, and police officials, in legislative and executive positions, in the city and State of New York. Only in a democracy could people, drawn from the four corners of the earth, live as citizens and neighbors, uniting their efforts in the progress of our city and Nation.

Where this picture of harmony and good will is marred by some minority incident or problem, it simply shows that our performance does not quite come up to our sincere ideals.

In the recent Harlem outbreak, the physical damage caused by lawless individuals resembled the damage that might be caused by an enemy air raid. But the difference is this—while air-raid damage would have strengthened our unity, the damage that occurred in Harlem uncovered an element of disunity and a weakness in our armor of defense.

No race riot or conflict between races occurred, nor were enemy agents involved, in the Harlem outbreak.

Those individuals guilty of crimes must be punished; but no law-enforcing officer worthy of the name and no self-respecting community would stop at that. It is plain common sense, as well as good government, to correct the underlying causes of this disturbance.

We do not need more investigation so much as we need to apply remedies already well known, from past investigations in city, State, and Nation. At the root of such outbreaks, we find well-known conditions of segregation, discrimination, insecurity, overcrowding, and bad housing. In the last 10 years, with sympathetic leadership in New York City and State, and in the Federal Government, much progress has been made in improving these conditions. As an example, the Federal public-housing program, which I sponsored in Congress, allotted more than one-third of all its peacetime funds to Negro housing throughout the country, including a number of New York City projects. Yet this is but the beginning of what needs to be done, through public funds and private capital. Better housing, along with better city planning of recreation and other facilities, will go a long way to reduce antagonism, and cut down the cost of police, fire, and health protection. I am proposing in Congress now a far-reaching program of Federal aid to cities to assemble land for better neighborhood development and more slum clearance.

In every other field, the picture is the same; the continuing need overshadows what has been accomplished. More remedial action must and will be taken, especially in combatting discrimination in war industry and in the armed forces.

The heart of the Negro's economic problem is the limited opportunity for a job in private employment. And when the war ends will the Negro worker, who was the last to be hired, then be the first to be fired? Will returning American soldiers of the Negro race find their heroism unrewarded by a chance to earn their own living? Will these tensions, in various parts of the country, develop to the serious racial conflicts that followed the First World War and threatened every minority religion and group?

These are not mere post-war issues to be laid on the shelf for the time being. The manpower needs of the armed forces and war industry continue to increase. Throughout the world thoughtful men and women are coming to understand that real peace and security can only be achieved by extending the frontiers of liberty, by elevating the standards of living for all. Those who scoff at these goals breed an isolationist approach to world problems and a reactionary, intolerant approach to domestic problems.

Every agency of government shares a continuing responsibility for sound action. Effective results will often depend upon the attitudes and practices of the citizens, labor unions, and industries in each community. Therefore, independent of public authority, I would like to see public-spirited citizens of every race, creed, and color organize committees to marshal the forces of tolerance and goodwill. The whole course of American history has been a steady advance of these goals. We of this generation must do our part in making democracy work on a 100 percent basis.

Freight Rate Discrimination Against the South and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the problem of freight-rate discrimination against the South and West, delivered at Nashville, Tenn., by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] over a national radio hook-up on August 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The growth of population in the South has reached the point where it seriously taxes the economy of the region to support it. Times have changed rapidly in the course of 40 years. Experience has demonstrated that the economy of the South does not function as well as it should, based upon the region's natural potentialities and the needs of an ambitious, capable, and growing population. We are in fact problem No. 1 in this respect. The time has come, therefore, when serious and sustained thought should be given to the discovery and correction of the underlying causes for our economic deficiencies. Much research has already been devoted to this subject.

The South's problems have been classified in some quarters into two categories. First is the type which has an intraregional origin, such as land erosion, wastage of natural resources, excessive tenantry, lack of adequate public health programs, insufficient reservoir of skilled labor, and so on. The other problem, however, originating in whole or in part on the outside, operates against the South by external force. This second problem, by its very nature, defies solution through local initiative and effort alone. In dealing effectively with it we must look for affirmative action by those agencies and powers, both private and public, which owe us the duty to act in our behalf. It is within the latter category that the freight-rate problem rightly falls.

The transportation problem of the country has many angles. The angle, however, which most seriously concerns the South is the regionalization of the freight-rate structure. Throughout all the discussion of this subject pro and con in recent years, I have never seen any attempt to deny the actual existence of regionalization in freight rates. Regionalization suggests rate differences. If there were no differences in rates or rate structure, there would be no regionalization. With this self-evident truth in mind, it ought not to be difficult to follow the thread of logic through all the meanderings of freight-rate adjustments to the ultimate conclusion that something is wrong in this field.

The first freight-rate study of a comprehensive nature was made by the T. V. A. in 1936. That study was published as a congressional document and received wide distribution. It was prepared for T. V. A. by the Honorable J. Hayden Alldredge, now Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It simplified this question so that an intelligent layman could understand it, and it showed beyond doubt that the South is at a substantial disadvantage. Later, the Board of Investigations and Research made a special study of this subject and filed a report with Congress, which is also being published as a congressional document. This report confirmed in all essential respects what had been said previously by the T. V. A.

In the interim, Congress had taken note of the situation and had amended the basic law so as to prohibit unjust and unreasonable discrimination between sections, regions, and territories of the United States.

Coupled with the amendment of the basic law just mentioned was a congressional mandate to the Interstate Commerce Commission to remove any of the prohibited discriminations found to exist. The Interstate Commerce Commission instituted an investigation which has produced another study of tremendous significance. In the course of its investigation the Interstate Commerce Commission put its staff of cost accountants, headed by Dr. Ford K. Edwards, to work on this subject and produced a monumental study. This study was introduced in evidence before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Realizing the significance of it, I introduced a resolution in the United States Senate to have it published as a Senate document, and it will soon be ready for distribution.

The stock answer for years to all the complaints of regional difference in rates as between the South and West and the North has been that because of a greater volume of freight in the North the railroads in that region can haul freight at a lower cost. Dr. Edwards was able to prove conclusively that costs of transportation in the South are lower than in the North. This controversial question, therefore, is now at rest. It has been established as well as any fact in the realm of economics could be proved that the differences in freight-rate structures as between the South and the North are not based upon differences in cost of rendering transportation service.

Do these freight-rate differences really hurt us economically in the South? An array of evidence has been gathered on this score also. The first T. V. A. report marshaled quite an array of statistics in support of the thesis that these differentials are an economic handicap. Another report by that organization has been filed with Congress which amplifies the previous study on this point. All sorts of evidence has been gathered in recent years, to show that these differences are not idle dreams, that they are not merely talking points for men in public life, but that they are real and are hampering and restrictive in their effect upon the industrial progress of the southern region.

The freight-rate differential is a fundamental problem It will remain so until it is finally solved. However there is a noisy element among us, even here in the South, who tell you it is not a problem; that everything about it is just as it should be, and that politicians especially should leave this intricate subject severely alone. You know who these people are; you know just what ax each one is trying to grind, and you know that if we should commit our economic destiny to the nurture of their philosophy we would continue to see a large percentage of each rising generation in the South migrate to other regions in quest of economic opportunity which their native region failed to grant; our people would continue to fight an uneven battle to keep up with the progress of civilization, and nature's rich endowments would continue to flow out of here in a raw or semi-finished state to enrich others more than ourselves.

Sometimes it is necessary in order to find the truth in a given proposition to reason from effect back to cause. That is one way to find the truth here. We have not developed industrially in the South and West as fast as the region north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers and east of the upper Mississippi, which we ordinarily call the North. Everybody who has traveled knows that to be true without looking at statistics. It is in evidence everywhere. Authenticated Government statistics show very clearly that the North has manufactured, in terms of value, almost 75 percent of the Nation's industrial products since the statistics of this nature were first gathered. The northern region is in truth and fact the workshop of the Nation. It produces by far the greatest income per capita in the country and it supports the greatest proportion of population. It is not, however, the richest region from the standpoint of natural resources. Why then this great concentration of industry, of population, and of man-made wealth? There is, of

course, more than one single cause; but when we find that all that tremendous industrialization and growth have taken place in the region enjoying the lowest level of freight rates in the United States, it is not hard to believe that freight rates have had a good deal to do with such economic phenomenon and with the correlative fact that the South as well as the West are far behind industrially.

What is the real significance of this problem of regional freight rate differences? This question can be answered in simple terms. For well over a century the South has lived and struggled under a raw-material economy. All of us know that. But we have also learned by long and hard experience that such an economy produces a low per capita income. Not only that; it stimulates an excessive exhaustion of natural resources. Such a combination of forces inevitably means, if they are not checked or thwarted, that the South will remain relatively poor forever. A realization of these stern facts has convinced those who have the public interest at heart that a change should be made; that the economy of the South should be recast so as to take some of the emphasis off raw-material production by increasing the manufacture of high-grade industrial products.

Academic acknowledgment of the desirability of such a change in the economy of the South as I have mentioned is not sufficient. Affirmative and positive action must be taken; the way must be cleared; obstacles must be removed. And right here lies the source of some of the opposition of a small group of our own citizens as well as a larger group located in other regions. Some manufacturers of raw materials and semifinished products in the South have been the beneficiaries of relatively low rates—rates that do not yield, as Dr. Edwards very clearly shows in his study, the full costs of transportation which reasonably can be attributed to them on a distribution basis. They are fearful that any reduction in the rates on high-grade manufactured articles will bring about increases in their low rates. They are, therefore, unwilling to grant other shippers, both present and prospective, any of the privileges which they enjoy. On the surface they would be entirely content to see the natural resources of the South exhausted without leaving here a sufficient residue of productive wealth to justify the attendant reduction in the South's natural capital.

Some of our railroad managers are fearful, on the other hand, that reduction in the rates on higher-grade articles cannot be compensated adequately by any revision in the rates on raw materials, and they oppose a change for revenue reasons.

I am aware of the fact that these railroad managers express a willingness to adjust their rates to meet the legitimate needs of any new industry that may come along. These good intentions, however, are subject to several limitations. In the first place, no matter how anxious a traffic manager of a southern railroad may be to enable an industry on his line to reach the great markets of the North, he must have the concurrence of northern railroads before he can do it.

Another thing should be mentioned. Our friends in the North, even the present young Governor of the great State of New York, Governor Dewey, have made a great fuss over the effort of the South to equalize freight rates because they fear the South will get many of their most valuable industries. Governor Dewey said: "You know, that if the South secured lower and equal class freight rates, many New York manufacturers might leave the State." We of the South are seeking no advantage; we are not undertaking to destroy industry in any other region; we are simply asking for a free and unhampered opportunity to apply our native skill to the utilization of our own natural resources so as to advance our own progress and welfare. We aspire to build, not to destroy; we ask for equality, not preference; we seek the recognition of rights, not the granting of special privileges.

The O. P. A. and the Cheese Industry of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by a very distinguished New Dealer of my States, Mr. C. E. Broughton, whom I like very much. He publishes a newspaper, the Sheboygan Press. Every once in a while he writes an editorial taking me to task because of some statement or speech which I have made.

But C. E. Broughton is a newspaperman. He knows it is the business of the press to furnish unbiased facts and information to the public. He knows, when he steps aside and in his editorial column "takes a crack" at a political antagonist, that it is only fair and good newspaper sense to permit his opponent to reply and use the columns of his paper for that purpose. Consequently, every time he "wrote me up," I was privileged to publish my side of the case in his newspaper.

I have never found Charlie Broughton vicious, nor is he a "paint-pot artist," indulging in personalities.

He generally stands up for his convictions. It has been difficult for him to see anything wrong in the present administration. However, on September 24, 1943, he published an editorial in his paper entitled "O. P. A. Has a Duty To Perform." It begins with this idea:

We do not believe that O. P. A. would intentionally strangle the cheese industry here in Wisconsin, but this is happening as a result of discrimination under order M. P. R. 289.

It is a good old editorial. It is factual. He tells of O. P. A. receiving notice of the situation but doing nothing, and he asks:

How can you have greater production when a stifling hand is at the throat of the producers who in turn see a great dairy State laid on the altar of sacrifice?

It is time—

He continues—

that an awakened Washington, whether it be O. P. A. or Senators and Representatives, offer assistance, if war production is to be maintained and encouraged.

[For editorial in its entirety, see p. 7828, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1943, House proceedings.]

Address by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines Before Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, at the forty-eighth national convention, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, at Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., on September 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commander Kaufman, distinguished guests, delegates, and members of the forty-eighth national convention, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, I appreciate very much the privilege of again addressing your national convention. Thank you, Mr. Commander, for your complimentary introduction.

It is always a pleasure for me to be present at veterans' conventions, and I am particularly happy to be at this one.

First, because I am an honorary member of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and naturally the organization occupies a special place in my heart; second, your organization is, in point of age, the oldest veterans' group in the United States with the exception of the gallant but fast diminishing groups of the Grand Army of the Republic and Confederate veterans; and third, because occasions such as these are significant for the opportunity they afford me to speak briefly of the tremendous part that those of the Jewish faith have played in the drama of American independence.

The history of Jewish patriotism and valor in America is well known to me. History reminds us of the unselfish service and patriotic devotion of Americans of the Jewish faith to our country, who love America better than their own lives.

In all the wars of our Republic, your coreligionists have made splendid contributions to our armed forces, and the present war is no exception. Your roster lists the names of some of America's outstanding heroes: The supreme token of American heroism, the highest decoration for gallantry in action, the Congressional Medal of Honor, is worn by your national commander, Ben Kaufman. I know that you will have glorious pages to add to your history, when the present conflict is victoriously concluded.

The record of the Jewish War Veterans on the home front since Pearl Harbor is most commendable. It was gratifying to learn that your national commander has pledged to Secretary Morgenthau that the Jewish War Veterans will sell $12,000,000 worth of bonds during the third war-loan drive. Knowing the enthusiasm and patriotism of your organization and its auxiliary, I am certain that you will exceed that goal.

Your purchase of war planes has been commendable, and is appreciated by the Government. Another patriotic endeavor is your gift of 13 ambulances to the War Department, and I am told that this is only the beginning. The activities of your members in Red Cross work, blood donations, and civilian defense

are so well known as to require only a passing mention at this time.

All of you, I am sure, have young relatives or friends serving in uniform in the present war. You would naturally be interested in learning something about the benefits which may be available to them through the Veterans' Administration.

To begin with, I would remind you that our laws affecting the present war follow the general pattern of those governing disability and death as a result of service in the last war—that nearly all of our key personnel have worked at the Veterans' Administration for many years, and so we have a trained and efficient organization, ready to meet whatever problems arise in the administration of benefits growing out of the present war.

In every instance, we are attempting to take advantage of the experience which we have gained, and so facilitate the administration of our present laws that there will be no cause of complaint on the part of those whom they are designed to benefit.

We have worked out a procedure with the Army and Navy so that, when a man is discharged from the service, that all of his papers, including his claim for pension, are forwarded to the Veterans' Administration office nearest the place of discharge.

That office immediately sends the papers to the Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction of the territory in which the veteran resides.

This office adjudicates the claim on the records received from the Service Departments, determining his entitlement to pension and the existence of a vocational handicap, and then when the veteran is notified of his pensionable status, he is advised of his rights to file claim for vocational rehabilitation.

The form for the claim is inclosed with the notice, and then if he is found to be in need of training to restore employability, vocational advisement proceeds and entrance into training follows thereafter. He will be trained as near to his home as possible.

His pension will be increased during the period of his training up to $80 a month, if single, $90 a month if married, and with additional amounts for other dependents.

We are not setting up training centers of our own but are, on the contrary, making contracts as required with well-equipped and tried educational, agricultural, and industrial establishments and institutions. We expect that there will be a considerable amount of training on the job leading to employment.

I hope that you will convey this message to your young friends or relatives who may be disabled in the service in the present war: The future is not necessarily dark for the disabled man who keeps up his courage and is willing to meet the changed conditions which confront him. Even serious disability may be overcome with the training we will give him, and the employability which had been lost may thus be regained.

I would remind you that after the last war 128,000 disabled men completed training courses awarded by the Veterans' Administration and that many of these men have achieved success in their new careers.

The National Service Life Insurance, which protects the dependents of men in the present war, has now had twelve and one-half million applications, for a total face value of $90,000,000,000. I do not need to impress upon you the enormous size of this figure. Suffice to say it is more than double the amount of insurance taken out during the last war, and in addition it is about two-thirds of the total amount of private insurance which was outstanding at the beginning of the present war.

As you are aware, this insurance must be applied for by the man, and the premiums are deducted monthly from his pay. It is the lowest-priced insurance of its kind in the world. The limit a man may take is $10,000, and beneficiaries are restricted to his immediate family—wife, child, parents, brother, or sister.

There has been no great demand for beds in our hospitals as yet by veterans of the present war. However, as the Congress has already provided that they may be hospitalized without regard to service connection for disability, it is quite probable that a considerable expansion of our hospital facilities may be required to meet the future potential requirements of these younger veterans.

You may recall that a recent law signed by President Roosevelt removed the age differential in service-connected cases of widows and children and increased the rates, which now are: $50 a month for a widow regardless of age; $65 for a widow with one child and $13 a month for each additional child.

An orphan with no mother now receives $25 a month; two orphans, $38 a month, equally divided, with $10 additional for each additional orphan, equally divided.

The total amount which may be paid to widows and children in service-connected cases has been increased to $100 a month from the former limit of $83.

This new law applies to widows and children of the Spanish-American War, the last war, and the present war.

After the victory has been won, if we are to have a happy nation, our citizens must be gainfully employed. The nearer we are to having all of them employed, the nearer we will approach the highest ideal of a strong democratic nation.

The men who are now serving are entitled to preference in obtaining jobs.

Our efforts should be directed primarily to doing all that can be done to make sure that every veteran is gainfully employed. In this I am confident that the Jewish war veterans can be of very material assistance.

There has come to my attention a recent episode from the north African front. It concerns Dr. Ferdinand M. Isserman, who in private life is the rabbi of Temple Israel, St. Louis, Mo. He was on leave as special representative of the American Red Cross in north Africa, when he wrote about some of his experiences there. I will read a few excerpts from his writings at the front that I feel sure you will be interested in hearing. I now quote Dr. Isserman:

"I was sitting in my office at the north African headquarters of the American Red Cross when a young American Army major walked in. Before I could see his insignia, I noticed that his garrison cap had been crushed, and so I knew that he was attached to the Air Corps. On second glance, I saw the silver cross, the chaplain's insignia, on his open shirt collar. It was Chaplain James Davidson, Jr., formerly religious leader of students at Leland Stanford University, and now in charge of the chaplains at an air base in north Africa."

" 'Will you do me a favor?' he asked.

" 'Doing favors for the Army is the business of the Red Cross,' I replied.

" 'At my post,' he said, 'there are scores of Jewish boys, one of whom has just been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for dropping his bomb load after being seriously wounded. I have conducted Jewish services for them, but these boys have not had a service by a rabbi all the months they had been in north Africa. When can you come to our base?'

" 'I can leave this evening,' I said, 'if you could have me back here by 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.'

" 'I am leaving in a B–17 from the airport at 7 o'clock,' Chaplain Davidson said. 'Meet me there. I shall bring you back in the Fortress.'

"I went to the Red Cross Club, took a 300-year old Torah that had been loaned to the United States Army for the duration by a Jewish family in north Africa, took the Jewish chaplains' flag which had been issued to me by the United States Army for my use at Jewish services, and soon found myself in a Flying Fortress on my way to an air base.

"We decided that the service would be interdenominational in nature, along the lines of the fine fellowship developed by Jewish and Christian clergy in America—so uniquely American and so expressive of its finest traditions.

"The chaplain showed that he could work with lightning speed. He telephoned a number of units; communicated with various chaplains under his command and secured their cooperation; and cleared with the Red Cross to make certain that the Red Cross Club would be available.

"The next afternoon the altar was set up in the Red Cross Club, where Protestants and Catholics also hold services.

"In the center stood the scrolls which had been flown over in the Flying Fortress.

"The congregation sang America. I then read from the scrolls in Hebrew, and Chaplain Davidson did the translation in English.

"In the course of my sermon to these pilots and their coworkers, I said: 'This is the first time in history that a Torah has been flown in a Flying Fortress that it might be used in a religious service. At first it seemed strange to have these sacred scrolls in this most modern fighting plane. It seemed strange that the law of justice and of love should be placed in this dreadnaught of the air which went on missions of destruction and desolation.

" 'But I have changed my mind. You men who fly over the territory of Axis nations are in a sense not bringing desolation and destruction The bombs you unload are striking shackles from the hands and feet of the enslaved peoples of Europe. In a true sense, you are not bringing death and desolation, but liberty and justice. You destroy the prison house that men might be free. Whenever you go on such errands, you are carrying out the goals of liberty and justice—the kernel of the teaching of the Torah.

" 'A torah in a flying fortress—the law of justice and of love in the bomb bay of a war plane—not a contradiction nor a clash. Under the guidance of Allied aviators, the flying forts are bringing justice and liberty and are obeying that commandment of the torah inscribed years ago on the Liberty Bell: "Proclaim ye liberty throughout the land and unto the inhabitants thereof." ' "

I do not think that I have ever heard a finer tribute to true Americanism—to the tolerance and understanding of others' problems and sympathetic aid in their solution, which is the mainspring of our strong American national unity.

American tolerance—that, I believe, is our greatest national asset, our surest source of strength—a tolerance which is so conspicuously lacking in Nazi Germany—a land where intolerance has led to tyranny, first within her own borders, then against peace-loving nations.

This intolerance will lead to Nazidom's undoing in the end, and through disunity, speed her ultimate defeat.

When President Roosevelt lays his wreath upon the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, he does not know nor does he care what the religion of that immortal American hero might have been—whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jew.

All he knows is that there at Arlington lies the remains of an American patriot who gave his all for his country's sake.

That is the spirit in which all of us must approach our present great problem, which is to win this war as speedily as possible and with a minimum loss of life.

To accomplish this end we must back up the war plans of President Roosevelt. That will make our unity so strong that nothing can stand between us and victory.

Commander Kaufman, I thank you for the privilege of addressing this convention.

Post-War Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, at a very delightful luncheon given yesterday by the Federal Bar Association of Washington in honor of the members of the Conference of United States Senior Circuit Judges, the Honorable John Biggs, Jr., senior judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, delivered an address on the subject Post-War Plans. The address was well considered and well received, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Roosevelt has said: "There is a longing in the air." He was referring to the hope that lies in all our hearts that a just and lasting peace may come out of this holocaust.

In seeking the solution, the question becomes, How much of our sovereignty—our very precious possession—shall we yield?

We stand at the crossroads of history. On the signpost are 5 signs. One sign reads "Isolationism"; another, "Imperialism." One is marked "Treaties." The fourth has on it the single word "Confederation," and the last points to "Union with other nations."

SOVEREIGNTY IS A VITAL ISSUE

The way of isolationism requires no curtailment of sovereignty. We can try to imprison ourselves inside a Chinese wall. We tried this before. We were not very successful. We can try it again. If we succeed we will be a historical phenomenon of the first order.

We can become imperialists. If we do so we shall not be very popular with our present friendly neighbors to the north and south. Sooner or later we shall encroach upon their lands and upon their peoples. Our long undefended borders will become heavily fortified frontiers and it will be as difficult to go from New York to Montreal as it was to go from Paris to Hamburg just before the war, when Hamburg was still a city. Some of our neighbors are strong-minded individualists who think they are as much entitled to the good earth as we ourselves. Ultimately our unlimited imperalistic sovereignty would be curtailed by force.

To arrive at lasting world peace three ways are open. These roads are really two, for if we make treaties with enough of the nations of the world to insure peace, we shall become in fact a member of a confederation. This would entail some loss of sovereignty. To use a figure of speech, it would not remain as full as the full moon or as round as the earth. If we joined in a union of other nations our sovereignty would be still further curtailed.

With the history of the last four decades before us, I can hardly believe that the people of this Nation will not compel—yes, veritably compel—our leaders to embark upon some cooperative effort toward a world order, whether by treaty, by confederation, by union, or by some other device. We have spilt the blood of our sons in two wars on three continents. We have spent more than $250,000,000,000. The tale is yet to run. The last peace was simply an armistice between two wars. If a lasting peace is not made following this conflagration World War No. 3 will be on our doorstep before our children's children are fully grown. In Europe, from 1930 until the early spring of 1937, you could scarcely find a person in France or England, in Holland or in Belgium, who would believe that the second World War was already on its way. There was no concerted action against any aggressor nation. We had rejected the covenant of the League of Nations for fear that we might impair our sovereignty. We wanted to be in the world, but not of it. We had the earnest desire to eat our cake and have it too.

How pale the controversy in respect to the famous section 16 of the League covenant, "sanctions of pacific settlement," now seems in the light of the past 5 years. We were so concerned lest participation in the League would project us willy-nilly into a future war. Many of our citizens were convinced that if we became a full party to the covenant of the League of Nations we would be automatically precipitated into the next world conflict and our young men would be sent again to fight on foreign soil. We desired to escape this consequence at almost any cost. The opponents of the League—and I believe them to have been honest in their convictions—foresaw a day, if we joined the League, when the youth of the Nation might fight not only in France, but in Africa, in China, even in Japan. American participation in world affairs, said they, would have to be strictly limited to our own concerns and they visualized these as being circumscribed by the territorial United States or at least by the continents of North and South America. The very things which they feared the most have come to pass, but not because the United States joined the covenant of the League of Nations.

The League is or was (I don't know whether I should use the past tense or the present) a confederation of sovereign nations precisely as our earliest attempt at cooperative government in this country consisted of the confederation of the Thirteen Original States. Like our original confederation the League was not perfect, but it did possess machinery for effecting peace. The "sanctions of pacific settlement" provide that if a member resorts to war instead of to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Council of the League shall "recommend to the several governments * * * what effective military, naval, or air force, the members * * * shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League." In short, the Council has to meet and designate the members and strength of the posse designed to ride forth and punish the offending nation before anything can be done. The Council is empowered only to recommend the force to be supplied. The signatory nations are not bound to supply that force. The burden imposed on sovereignty by section 16 seems slight when viewed 20 years after the League was proposed and in the light of subsequent historical developments.

Section 16 demonstrates the weakness of a confederacy whose peoples possess no common citizenship or common system of laws and hence no common police force. This need not be the case but it has so turned out from the early Greek city-states to the Covenant of the League of Nations.

A union of sovereign nations, patterned along the lines of our own Federal Union, would obviate most of these difficulties. The citizens of the sovereign nations would be citizens of the union and a common system of laws would be applicable to all. A standing international police force to maintain peace within the union and throughout the world would follow naturally. Who would control the international force? The executive government of the union.

If the United States joined such a union our sovereignty would be impaired. For example, the power to declare war given to Congress by section 8 of article I of our Federal Constitution would be limited. Other powers conferred upon our executive and judiciary likewise would be curtailed.

Would either a strong federation or a union bring lasting peace? No man can say. War might be necessary to preserve the federation or union even if the members comprising it were most carefully selected. Such organizations might invoke jealousies from nations without the pale. Neither league nor union may be the best thing. They might be ineffective. Some other form of international order, based perhaps on purely economic principles, might supply the answer.

But this much I think is certain. The United States must go forward to meet its destiny. Otherwise destiny will move to meet us in some far less palatable form. Two world wars have come to us despite our isolationism and despite our preservation of unsullied sovereignty. Our untrammelled isolationism and our unsullied sovereignty were in existence for 150 years and today we find ourselves involved in the greatest war in history and fortunately possessed of alliances with so many nations and governments that most of us cannot even name them all. Our isolationism and our demand for unlimited sovereignty now look like the inside and the outside of the same cloak, a garment which either didn't fit us very well or was nonexistent.

Binding treaties between the English-speaking nations of the world to maintain the peace, if necessary by force, seem to be the irreducible minimum. A confederation between the democratic nations of the world, including those which will be reconstituted after victory, seems more desirable.

Treaties with Great Britain, Russia, and China, looking to the establishment and maintenance of peace and the creation of an international police force, should not be avoided. The United Nations are united in war. Why should they not be united in peace? Strong treaties effect a confederation. Still stronger treaties will effect some form of union. It is obvious that a standing police force would be of much greater value than a posse. The difference is one between established order and vigilante law.

I do not know the answers to these questions. History alone can answer. But a confederation such as the League of Nations is not chimerical or idealistic, nor would a confederation strong enough to amount to a practical union be unrealistic. Nothing is more unrealistic than the belief that we can go on pouring out our blood and treasure in recurrent world wars and retain our democratic system. The writing is on the wall. Some measure of our sovereignty, however small, must be given up if a lasting peace is to be brought to the world today. In the curious and complex world in which we are living, it is a paradox that the war and the peace can be won only by binding our strength into the strength of our friends and allies, and their strength into ours.

The future is in our hands. We may do with it what we will.

Marshall to Supreme Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Marshall to Supreme Command," published in the September 23, 1943, issue of the Daily Register-Mail, of Galesburg, Ill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARSHALL TO SUPREME COMMAND

The report that Gen. George C. Marshall, United States Chief of Staff, has been agreed upon by American and British Governments as supreme commander of Anglo-American troops appears to be authentic. At least there have been no speedy official denials of the story. And in spite of rumors and adverse speculations, it appears to us that this is a sensible, logical step, made in the interests of swift and sure victory.

Rumors of some contemplated change in the status of General Marshall have been current for days. They were taken cognizance of in the authoritative Army and Navy Journal of recent date, which took exception to the report that the Chief of Staff was to be transferred from Washington to a field command, presumably as head of the Allied forces now being primed for a full-dress invasion of the Continent from the west.

It was the opinion of the Army and Navy Journal that he was to be sacrificed to "powerful interests which would like to eliminate Marshall from the Washington picture and place in his stead an officer more amenable to their will." A Washington newspaper reported that General Marshall has been in conflict with the British over the plan of future operations, that Marshall had been pressing for an invasion from Britain while the British were holding out for the Balkan route. On the floor of Congress legislators have asserted that General Marshall was to be "kicked upstairs" because of his alleged conflict of opinion with "powerful interests" over the conduct of the war.

But these rumors and reports do not appear to fit in with the facts, if, as now appears to be the case, Marshall is to be made the Allied global commander in chief. It would appear, as the basis of his recent announcement, that the American forces have now reached the peak of their training and are ready for deployment in all sectors of the war fronts. Thus his job of organization and preparation of the American Army is complete. Add to this Churchill's announcement that there would be an Allied invasion of Europe from the west and President Roosevelt's assurances that the tempo of operations against Japan is to be stepped up on a grand scale, and it would appear that the time has at length arrived for the appointment of a supreme Allied commander to organize and direct this vast offensive in all its phases.

Marshall has been preeminent in the field of operations and organization and therefore would appear to be the logical supreme commander. It would appear that those who feared he might be relegated to some field command post are mistaken and that as global commander he will be in a place for which his experience and talents eminently fit him. It is a well-known fact that General Marshall, in the higher ranks, has never been a battle officer, but that his military reputation is built upon the solid achievement as an organizational, tactical, and operations genius. Moreover, it does not seem logical that the political leaders would run the chance at this stage of the game in transferring the American Chief of Staff from a type of work with which he is so familiar to field operations. In that category the Anglo-British have the redoubtable Montgomery, Alexander, Eisenhower, and MacArthur, any one of whom has a well-established reputation as a field and battle commander. It seems within the bounds of reason that if Marshall is to be in supreme command, some other field commander will be named to lead the invasion of Europe from the west. General Eisenhower is doing well in the Mediterranean, and to remove MacArthur from his present theater of action might be a tragic mistake.

Ordinary citizens are in no position to know the reasons, motives, or the circumstances which prompt the political leaders of the respective countries to decisions on the shift of command reported. They do know, however, that the operations of our armies are now moving successfully forward and that a very large share of the credit for this improved Allied situation is due to the work of General Marshall. There is no reason to believe that the creation of a supreme command with General Marshall at its head could do anything but speed up the day of final victory.

Plan for Post-War Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Post-War Government," printed in condensed form from a broadcast over station KPRO.

There being no objection, the address was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR GOVERNMENT

(By W. L. Gleeson)

(Condensed from a broadcast over KPRO)

All the world leaders seem to be of one mind when it comes to the necessity of forming some kind of international government to control the relationships between the nations after this war is over. Yet, none of them have come forward with a concrete plan for setting up such an international government. The League of Nations failed and is not acceptable to most nations and peoples, so, of necessity, a new kind of international government is necessary; one that all the peoples of the earth can rally around and trust; one that will administer justice equally to all the nations of the earth and yet not be subject to domination by any individual or group of individuals.

It seems to me that the people all over the world, whether they be among the United Nations or the Axis Nations, are waiting for someone to propose a solution to the problems of the world, a plan that they can work in and trust to guide them in their future lives. That government must be patterned a great deal after the American form of government in order to afford the necessary checks and balances to keep it from ever falling into the hands of selfish individuals or groups.

Therefore, it should be formed of a legislative body made up of two houses. The international assembly should be composed of one elected representative from each state or province of each member nation. The senate should be composed of two senators elected by the people of each nation. Thus, the assembly gives all the people of the world a voice; the senate gives each government of the world a voice in the legislative branch. The terms of office should be 6 years for the senators and 4 years for the assemblymen, the terms to be staggered.

The executive branch of the international government should be composed of president, vice president, and secretary, whose terms of office should be for a period of 6 years, and who would be elected by joint session of the assembly and senate from among the members of these two bodies.

The international cabinet should be appointed by the president, with not more than two such members to come from any one nation.

The nations from which the three executive officers come would appoint new members to take the places of their members in the international congress who had been elevated to the executive positions. These appointments would be made by their legislative bodies or by congress.

The congress or legislative branch of each member government would appoint for life one justice of the international court of justice, which would be the international judicial body. The members of this international supreme court would elect from among them one who would be the supreme justice of the court.

This arrangement would give a well-balanced international government, charged with the job of creating and administering international law among the nations of the earth. All disputes between member nations, after having run their course through the lower courts, could have their final appeal to the international supreme court. The legislative body would make the international law and the executive branch would carry out this law All member nations would be required to join in suppressing hostile acts on the part of any nation, whether that nation be a member or not.

All matters of a national nature would be reserved unto the nations to settle in their own way among their own citizens, similar to the relationship of the States within the United States.

Such an international government would very quickly correct the evils that have led to so much bloodshed, such troublesome problems that lead to war, as tariffs, immigration restrictions, great money combinations, international monopolies of raw materials, cartels, and the manufacture in secret of materials of war to be used on neighboring nations. These evils would be regulated by this one government and, the causes of war once eliminated, with an international language and world money system instituted, the world should be on its way out of its troubles.

The present war debt of all nations—both Allied and Axis—should be assumed by this new international government, since all people are to blame for the war and they should all pay for it. The schools of the world should start teaching true history to clear up the confusion and ignorance that have plagued the peoples of the earth and brought on war in the past.

I am of the opinion that whoever picks up this plan and proposes it to the American people and the nations of the world will find that a majority of people will rally around it.

The Axis Nations can be invited to lay down their arms and come into the united nations of the world government on equal terms with the United Nations themselves when they disband their present governments and elect representative governments, and elect their representatives to the international government.

If this plan is proposed in a concrete and forceful manner it will help to restore order and bring peace quickly without further bloodshed.

Negro Aviators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 29 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, some time ago, when the training program of our military forces was being expanded, I offered an amendment to provide for the training of Negro aviators.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Lt. Col. B. O. Davis, Jr., at a press conference in the War Department pressroom, Pentagon Building, September 10, 1943, and made a part of the record of the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee on Senate bill 763.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I put down a few notes here simply for the reason that I would like to present some facts in as orderly a manner as I can. I am not prepared to make any set speech here this morning, but I would prefer to refer to these notes so that the story will be told in a comprehensive manner.

I have had the honor and the pleasure of commanding the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron from August 27, 1942, until September 2, 1943. During that period I saw 27 pilots and two-hundred-and-fifty-odd enlisted men develop from a relatively untrained state to a combat team of which anyone serving with the organization could justly be proud.

I said that I had the pleasure to command this unit—actually that pleasure was realized only when it became apparent that the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron had taken and could maintain its proper place in the northwest African theater of operations. Very little pleasure existed prior to that time.

Just what a colored pilot in a P–40 would do when antiaircraft fire burst about his ship, or when an enemy aircraft was strewing cannon shells and machine-gun bullets about his cockpit was a matter that was really conjecture in the minds of some of these high-ranking officers in the Army Air Forces.

SQUADRON WAS EXPERIMENT

The Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron therefore was an experiment to determine whether the colored pilot was physically, mentally, and emotionally suited to the rigors of combat flying. It is a very significant fact, I believe, that all members of this organization were impressed at all times with the knowledge that the future of the colored man in the Air Corps probably would be dependent largely upon the manner in which they carried out their mission.

RESPONSIBILITIES HEAVIER

Every man in the Ninety-ninth will go through any ordeal concocted by combat or garrison existence to assure the successful completion of the experiment. At all times, every man realizes that the pleasures and relaxations that are available to men in other organizations are not available to him because his task is far greater, his responsibility is much heavier, and his reward is the advancement of his people.

Now it is necessary that I invite your attention to this philosophy in order that you may better understand the reactions of the individual officer and soldier of this organization.

I shall now relate to you our experiences overseas. These same experiences would be indeed commonplace if they were related about a white fighter squadron. For this squadron every step was a dramatic one.

I should like to state at the outset, and I consider this very important, that from the time this squadron left the continental limits of the United States, and that was on April 15, 1943, to the present time, there has not been a single circumstance or incident which could be regarded as discriminatory by the most rabid race leader.

The first act of the drama began the day before we sailed. The passenger list showed the transport commander that I was to be the senior line officer on board the transport. I wa directed to pick a staff consisting of an adjutant, mess officer, police and prison officer, a provost marshal, and then report to the transport commander as executive officer.

TRANSPORT STAFF, COLORED

This staff of colored officers carried out the orders and policies of the transport commander despite the fact that of the 4,000 troops on board, less than 15 percent were colored. After the first 24 hours or so of curiosity and wonder at this unusual staff of the transport commander, everything proceeded smoothly and without incident for the remainder of the 8-day voyage.

During all this time the members of the squadron basked in the awe of the attention paid them by other soldiers on board and succeeded admirably in creating the impression that the colored pilot and colored soldier are not so very different after all.

It was here also that the entertainment section, which isn't in any table of organization, was born. This section, under the capable direction of the acting special services officer, Lieutenant Letcher, went a long way toward effecting cordial public relations for the squadron.

This entertainment section provided an excellent show for units within traveling range of all of our bivouac areas from the port of debarkation in Africa clear on through Sicily.

Again the impression created in the minds of the audiences was that these men who were giving these shows are just about the same as the men in "my outfit," and this was not by accident because the men who participated in that show are intelligent men and they realized that at all times instead of just giving a show they were doing a job for the Ninety-ninth.

Upon landing in Casablanca we were met by the assistant A–3 of the Northwest Training Command, Colonel Allison, Air Corps. This officer, who is now on his way back to the States for a well-deserved rest, assured me that he would be available at all times for the solution of any problem that might arise.

MUST PREPARE FOR COMBAT

The following day he took me and my operations officer, Captain Roberts, in to see General Camp who informed us that we would remain in the area until we would be satisfactorily equipped for combat and that we would not move into the combat zone until I felt that everything possible had been done in the way of preparation.

He sent us on a preliminary reconnaissance of our new station, located about 150 miles inland. This station was located in French Morocco. Nearby was a service command station and the commanding officer of this station, Colonel Phillips, now in Sicily, was most cordial in his offers to ease any supply problems that might arise.

There was also at this station a fighter-bomber group commanded by Colonel Stevenson, whom I had the pleasure to know at the Academy. We moved to this station by a French train and covered 150 miles in about 17 hours, and when we complained about the slowness of the train we were informed that we were lucky to move at such a fast rate of speed.

Our stay there was probably our most pleasant stay overseas. We were there about a month. Most cordial relations existed between the members of the squadron and the members of the fighter-bomber group nearby. The pilots of the two organizations engaged in impromptu dogfights to determine the relative superiority of the P–40 and the A–36, and we were very happy to verify our belief that the P–40 was vastly superior in this phase of aerial combat. Enlisted men of the two groups got together very well in all types of athletic contests and other means of recreation.

FEZ HOSPITALITY RECALLED

The town of Fez was found to be one of the most delightful spots that any of us had ever visited. One unusual feature of our stay there was that members of my organization and members of these other organizations visited the town of Fez every night for a period of over a month and not one single unpleasant incident arose.

The officers of the squadron were made socially secure in the town by the visit of Josephine Baker. Miss Baker insisted on presenting several different groups of our officers to the prominent French and Arab families in the town. All in all Miss Baker was very largely responsible for our most pleasant social relations in the town of Fez.

It was during our stay here that four P–39 pilots whom we had met on the boat on the way over, came to visit us. They were ferrying some P–39's from Oran to Casablanca, and en route they, of their own volition, simply stopped over to pay us a visit. I mention this simply to indicate that a considerable bond exists among those who fly regardless of color or race.

GIVEN BRAND NEW P–40'S

Our equipment was of the best. We ferried in 27 brand new P–40's, and all of us experienced for the first time the thrill of flying a brand new airplane. Lt. Col. Philip Cochran—the Flip Corkin of Terry and the Pirates—was our most capable instructor. He imbued all of us with some of his own very remarkable fighting spirit, and in addition to that he taught us what to do and what not to do in aerial combat.

We all remember with a smile his opening commentary on the slowness of the P–40. "The P–40 pilot never yet ran away from a fight—because he couldn't." Yet we all know that the P–40 has a more remarkable combat record in this war than any other fighter airplane except possibly the British Spitfire.

The P–40, we jokingly say, has three important characteristics. The first one is turn, which enables you to present a very difficult target to an enemy fighter; the second is turn, and the third one is also turn. In aerial fighting this characteristic is naturally of great importance.

We had two other instructors who were with us until we left for Tunisia, a Major Keyes and a Captain Fachler. Both of these officers had had extensive combat training, one in England and one in African campaign, and both had just been returned to the training command for instruction purposes. These officers worked unceasingly to make us ready for the real test, and all of us felt very grateful for their efforts.

FINAL PHASE BEGAN MAY 31

On the 31st of May we took off for the Cape Bon Peninsula and the final phase of the experiment. I personally believe that no unit in this war has gone into combat better trained or better equipped than the Ninety-ninth Fighter Squadron. We were weak in

one respect only and that was simply that the squadron commander, myself, and the flight commanders had had no actual combat experience.

That is a very desirable feature because it gives a good bit of confidence to those who are led that the man who is in charge of the formation knows what he is doing and frankly I didn't know initially, nor did my flight commanders.

On the other hand, this deficiency was balanced by the fact that my pilots averaged about 250 hours in a P–40, and a young pilot in these days who has 250 hours in a P–40 before he goes into combat is a hard man to find.

All of us were a little on edge because we were going into something that we hadn't experienced before. This transition was eased by Col. William Momyer, who commands a very famous fighter group which is now located up at the front. We were attached to his group for operations and attached for operations means just one thing and that alone, simply that every night the group operations officer telephoned to my operations officer the missions set up for the next day.

I might explain that a little bit differently—the set-up in the African theater consists of the strategical air force and the tactical air force. We were members of the tactical air force. Under the tactical air force headquarters there is an air support command and this air support command doles out the daily missions to the groups.

HAD ONE-FOURTH OF MISSIONS

A squadron, although it is the basic fighting team in an air force, is actually a small unit, and consequently it would be much better for a single squadron to get its missions from a group headquarters rather than a large air support command headquarters. Colonel Momyer, in giving us the missions, treated us exactly as one of his squadrons. He had three of his own and we had one, that being four squadrons.

We got one-fourth of the missions given by his air support command. Colonel Momyer suggested initially that my flight commanders and myself fly as wing men on one of his missions so that we might get some experience initially before attempting to lead our own men into combat. He also advised me very completely on the details of running a squadron in a combat zone.

At that time, shortly after the 1st of June, the Pantelleria show was going on and our first missions were over that island. We dive-bombed objectives on the island every day until its fall on the eleventh of June. We had our first bomber escort, B–25's, B–26's, A–20's, and some British Baltimores, to the island.

Six of our pilots had their first brush with enemy aircraft during this show but the remainder of us experienced only some of the very inaccurate brand of flak that the Italians throw up. After Pantelleria, Colonel Momyer's group moved to the island and we received our operational control from a fighter group commanded by Colonel McNorris.

From the 1st of July to the 9th of July we escorted bombers to Sicily and these were our most active days. On every trip we were attacked by superior numbers of enemy fighters. The tactics employed by the enemy fighters were to draw off the escorts so they could get to the bombers. Actually they were not particularly interested in shooting down enemy fighters, so we had to take some action to prevent them from shooting us down.

GERMAN AIR TACTICS CHANGED

I would like to say just a word about the German air force. Its tactics have changed quite a bit since the Tunisian campaign. Its pilots are not as eager as they used to be: They have undoubtedly lost the best of them and they no longer press their attacks, as I hear they did in the past.

Whereas, formerly they would stay down and lap it up, they now make one ineffective pass and head for home. On the other hand, the pilots of my squadron who were initially uncertain of themselves, had now developed a very strong fighting spirit and were eager for an opportunity to meet the Germans and really fight it out.

An interesting sidelight in this connection is perhaps the growth of religious feeling among the pilots. Toward the end of the Sicilian campaign I had very little trouble getting together an audience for the visiting chaplain, Colonel Pinnel. He always had a nucleus of pilots to speak to.

Lieutenant Bolling, one of my pilots, was shot down by flak in the Mediterranean and forced to sit in his dinghy for 24 hours and he said to me, "You know, Colonel Davis, when you sit out there that long, shivering from cold at night and trying to hide from the heat of the sun by day and always hoping against hope that somebody is going to see you and pick you up, you just pray automatically."

MEN EAGER FOR BATTLE

After the middle of July we had a squadron of pilots whose fondest dreams were no longer about the girls back home. Instead they dreamed about a German pilot who would be foolish enough to slug it out in aerial combat. At our chosen altitude we had the better airplane, but the German has learned his lesson and now makes his pass from out of the sun, coming down at 350 or more miles an hour and gets on out. We get a fleeting shot as he passes by.

The most interesting engagement took place on a bomber escort mission to Sciacca, Italy. Actually, it probably shouldn't have been as interesting as it turned out to be. The controlling factor is that the leader of the bomber formation couldn't get his bomb bay doors open on the first run over the target.

This necessitated his going around two more times and it gave enemy fighters, who didn't know we were coming, the opportunity to get off their airdrome and come up and get us. We actually saw enemy fighters scramble and climb, and they really do climb.

Our ships were close escort for the bombers that day and we were right with them. The bottom, medium, and top cover was provided by another group of fighters, so we absorbed all of the attack of this 20-plus ME–109's, Macchi 202's, and FW–190's, and on that day we lost a couple more and damaged three.

ONE PILOT MAY BE PRISONER

We believe that one of our pilots is a prisoner of war. Incidentally, on that day General Eisenhower visited our field and during his stay congratulated Captain Hall, one of our flight commanders, on his and our first confirmed victory.

Our field was often visited by high-ranking officers of both the British and American Army. Among the visitors were such men as Air Marshal Cunningham, in command of the Tactical Air Forces; Lord Trancher, of the last war; General House, commanding general of the Twelfth Air Support Command; General Doolittle, who is in command now of the Strategic Air Force; General Spaatz, commanding general of the Northwest African Air Force; and many others which I won't name.

After ditto for the Sicilian attack the 10th of July, we provided cover for the landing beaches on southeastern Sicily. We escorted C–47's, which moved the air echelon of the various units to new bases on the island. On the 19th of July we moved to a base on the southern coast, and we provided air support for the ground troops by dive bombing. We strafed strong points, holding up their advance—trucks that were bottled up on the very few roads on the northern part of the island.

HAD TO TRAIN REPLACEMENTS

After the fall of Sicily we devoted our time to training replacements that reached us from the States. We got new combat crews and the men in charge of the training got a good bit out of the new responsibilities of the responsible places in the formations which they had to fly.

On September 2, I received orders assigning me to the Three Hundred and Thirty-second Fighter Group, and left for the States. I believe that the men that I left behind, instead of being the fledglings they were on the 1st of June, are now seasoned veterans of a combat experience that all of us may well be proud.

That concludes the statement which I planned to make, except for the following remarks: I can tell you that the men of my squadron and my other comrades at the front are just as interested in what you are doing back here as what they are doing over there. They are hitting hard—all of them, of all races, colors, and creeds.

To follow through, there is one big thing those at home can do. That is to "back the attack" with War bonds. I earnestly hope every colored person in America will do his part in the Third War Loan to keep their faith with our fighting men over there.

Let's Plan Now for Our Returning Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, September 29, 1943, over radio station WMAL in Washington, D. C., the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] delivered an address on the most timely and pertinent subject, Let's Plan Now For Our Returning Soldier. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is no new thing for governments to take care of veterans after wars are over. This practice started in ancient times. Soldiers have always been beneficiaries of the governments they have protected and of the governments they have helped to set up. But seldom have governments planned for the care of the veterans while the war was still on.

After 10 years of experimental planning in other lines, it is natural that our Government should turn to plans to better conditions for the returned soldier. If we do not plan hardship will follow. Injury will be done to millions of our men and women and their families. The war and post-war adjustments are bound to affect the whole economic structure of our land. Chaos, hard times, and unemployment of the gravest character may follow. That we must assume because the past has proved it. Not to be prepared would be a political blunder of omission which our people should never forgive.

Few realize the magnitude of our present war undertakings. While we have been in the process of adjustment to war industry

for over 3 years, still our industrial economy is not stable. With that fact in mind, it must never be forgotten that it is easier to adjust to a war economy than it is to change from a war economy to one of peace. The problem in adjusting to war is a simple one. It merely means turning all endeavor toward the defeat of the enemy. But the problem of adjusting from war to peace will be a complex one because that means the stopping of a single endeavor and the returning to the complex objectives of our national peacetime economic life. If, with pressure of war upon us, it has taken over 3 years to reach the position we have now, I think we can assume that it will take even longer than 3 years before our land attains a normal economic procedure again when once the war is over. I repeat, it would be a political crime not to plan in the face of these facts.

I have mentioned only general adjustments. Let us remember that the individual's adjustment will also be complex. After 3 or 4 years of war service, men's natures will have changed, their ideals, their outlooks, will be different, and society may change even in its attitude toward these men. Never forget Kipling described things right when he wrote:

"It's Tommy this and Tommy that and Tommy how's your soul,
But it's make way for Mr. Atkins when the drums begin to roll."

U. S. O.'s will not thrive when the war is over.

If the men and women in our Army and Navy have been fighting to preserve what we call "the American way of life," surely the Government which wants to maintain the American way of life, because that is what it is defending, should plan that that way will not be lost in the adjustment after the war when our soldier men and women have saved it through war. President Roosevelt tells us that we must not only win the war but we must see that it stays won. By that he implies a proper international organization for the preservation of peace. But, that is only half the task.

The preservation of the decent life domestically is quite as essential as the preservation of the peace for our Nation internationally. For a nation to be defeated by poverty, disease, and unemployment is quite as disastrous as to be defeated by a military enemy. War is the greatest of all wasters, but a loss of wealth and happiness through shiftless inertia on the part of Government is the next greatest waste. Let us never forget that fact. One brings death by murder; the other by suicide.

Everyone in the United States rejoiced that our President saw this problem as it may affect our fighting men and women. He has put forth his plan. That plan has been criticized by certain elements in our political life as being offered at this time for political reasons and for political purposes. Political indeed! Only those who do not know American history would so charge. The President d'd not mention the fact, but he might have said that most of that which he recommended was already our national policy and that his suggestions will be merely an expansion of what our Government has already put into law.

It is not entirely improper that I should be asked by the Evening Star to occupy this time on their forum in regard to this subject because one of the amendments to the Selective Service Act which I offered, and which I was successful in having accepted by the Congress of the United States, was an amendment giving to those who were called under that act into service a promise that the Government of the United States would see to it that those men who left jobs for this service would have their jobs back when they returned to civilian life. The guaranty of a job then became national policy by law. Being sure of a job is the greatest step toward restoring the individual's economic well-being.

When I showed that amendment to one of our leading Senators, he said it was a fine idea, everyone would be glad to see that the boys had their jobs back, but the amendment was patently unconstitutional. It never dawned on me that anyone would assume that if under the power of the Constitution we had a right to take a man from his job, we might not have a right to restore him to his job afterward. The Constitution of the United States is, of course, our fundamental law, but to me, in its final analysis, the Constitution is merely the people's companion in the accomplishment of the people's purposes. Those purposes may at some time be social, at some time economic, at some time political; they may even, when it comes to the defense of our land, be extremely personal. Under the Constitution, government may take away the property of one for the good of all. It may cause a man to lose his life. Surely, then, it seems to me the Constitution may protect a man in his job if government has been responsible for his loss of a job.

Now, of course, such musing is not constitutional law as such, but that is the way I felt and that is the way I argued. I will not turn to the exact constitutional argument I made on the floor of the Senate in defense of the amendment, but I will say this: The all-embracing war powers under our Constitution are so great that I doubt very much whether anyone will test those powers when they are exerted in a constructive way if they do not test them when they are exerted in a destructive way. This much, though, as a constitutional argument I will say: The Constitution of the United States confers upon Congress the express power to raise and support armies. That power is all inclusive. The Constitution likewise provides that Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary to carry into execution its delegated powers.

When we guarantee the boys called into the service their jobs in the Federal Government, no one could possibly question that right. The right to force a State to return a job to one of its employees is, of course, questionable. Therefore the amendment in this particular was merely advisory. The great question was whether the Government had the power to ask a private employer to give back to a soldier boy his job; and in a constitutional way this question, then, was simply whether the requirement that private employers restore to their jobs men who had been called to military duty was properly calculated to aid in the raising and supporting of an army. Of this there can be no doubt. The knowledge upon the part of men drafted for the service that their jobs would be open upon completion of their military duty is without doubt a highly important factor in sustaining and improving morale during their period of service. Likewise, the imposition of such a requirement upon employers will play a significant part in lessening economic maladjustments which inevitably accompany the conscription of an army. By reason of these considerations, as well as others of a similar nature, it was plain that a provision to assure the restoration of employment after military service was necessary and proper in the constitutional sense in the exercise of a power to raise and support armies, and is therefore valid under the Constitution.

Further, I think it is proper to say that if the Congress of the United States is not interested in making secure the lives of the citizens of the United States in every particular before, during, or after an emergency, Congress would be thoughtless about the welfare of the citizens of the United States.

What I personally want to avoid is distress of such a nature that will cause us to turn to make-work panaceas. I brought out on the floor of the Senate the blueprint law, providing for the making of blueprints and the gathering together of specifications and the full completion of plans for a works program so that our cities will be ready to inaugurate such a program in case a period of unemployment follows this war. Our experience in the depression showed that it took about 2 years to get ready to hire men on a great public-works project. The blueprint bill was designed to overcome this waiting period when men are desperate for lack of work.

As I remember the last war, the aftermath was worse than the war itself. It is pretty hard to urge patriotism on a group of men who have been called to defend their country and explain that it is a patriotic duty to work on some unnecessary project. You see, war has been with nations so long that all the honors which nations have been able to bestow upon men are given to our fighting men, but few nations have moved forward to that plane where they plan a peacetime happiness for those same men.

We have built and we are continuing to build hospitals for the sick and injured. We will provide vocational training for those who are not prepared enough to enter into their life's work. We will give bonuses and we will make jobs which are so close to ordinary charity that we will break the spirits of men. We will do all those things because we have done them. But surely, have we not enough of a social memory to realize that we will have to do those things and that, therefore, we might just as well plan to do them properly instead of haphazardly? In those plans can we not take care also of those men and women who have been fortunate enough to have missed injury in the war but who have not been fortunate enough to rehabilitate themselves economically in the peace? Think of all the things we do for the man or the woman who is called into the service. Is it fantastic to assume that government has an obligation to these same people when they are mustered out? It is a serious thing to take 3 or 4 years of a young person's life during the time that he or she might be getting a high school or college education. It is hard ever to go back. Young ambitious spirits almost refuse to go back. It is well that they do because there is always a generation following which is cheated or retarded by the preference of the generation of returned soldiers for whom special places are being made. The learning time naturally comes in our premature years. To cheat a man out of the opportunity to prepare for life is a sad cheating in very deed. Yet war does that, for it cheats not only the returned soldier but it also cheats the next generation by giving it the extra competition of the returned soldier.

Of course, our taxpayer associations will say we cannot afford it. Cannot afford good health. Cannot afford education. Cannot afford economic stability. Cannot afford purposeful, happy living. We may also be accused of being paternalistic. If we can afford billions and billions of dollars to destroy, we can afford thousands and thousands of dollars to build up. The economic well-being of our Nation demands it. Our social sensibilities demand it. The logic of the situation demands it. America can no longer say she cannot afford to do some good for her citizens when those citizens have done so much for America.

To a thoughtful person the saddest aspect of war, as that war is related to the people under a government, is that governments find ways to do anything for the benefit of persons during wartimes; persons, therefore, seem to be more valuable in times of war than in times of peace. Are they, though?

Even in times of great emergency, even for the soldier who fights more than all of his other twelve or thirteen million companions in arms, the time spent in actual battle is insignificant compared with the time spent in training and getting to and from the battle. Thus, even in wartime, the training of men is an all-important factor. Without it we would be defeated.

Should not the training for citizenship be reckoned quite as much worth-while? Is not a man, just because he is a man, important in the sight of any democracy? Or, is he to be thought of as the former Kaiser thought of him, merely so much gun fodder? How is it that in a democracy we sometimes slip to that place where we think it is economically unwise to build up and make strong our citizens?

Let me give you one illustration about how universal educatior and alert health measures in peacetime actually pay in wartime. In the testimony of one of the leading personnel officers of our Army before one of our committees it was pointed out that one-half of all the men called for the draft were rejected; that is, 5 out of every 10 men called were rejected for some reason or another. In those States where educational requirements were low, where school nurses were unheard of, and where health regulations were just average 7 men out of every 10 were rejected. But in those States where educational requirements were high, school nurses were furnished, and health administration was on a State-wide basis only 3 out of 10 men were rejected. In addition to that, the acceptance ratio of those persons who enlisted in our armed forces was very much higher in the States of high educational and health standards.

That is a lesson for all of us. Did the States who paid well for the education of their youth and for the improvement of health waste money? Certainly not. There is not greater waste in wartime, or in peacetime for that matter, than a man who, because of lack of educational qualifications or because of health conditions, which could have been remedied easily, proved himself unacceptable for military service.

No matter how glorious we assume war to be, no matter how wonderful the sacrifice of those who give their lives for their country, war must be marked down as an economic waste. It is a destructive process. The economic good that comes from it is merely accidental and not a result of planning. Any person who would plan an economic advantage for his people by way of the war process would be criminal indeed, especially when so many other ways are open.

Now let us stay in the realm of simple economics for a minute or two because when our boys come home and when we try to plan measures for their welfare, there will be those who say we cannot afford it. Isn't it strange that there is no one saying that we cannot afford all of this money that we are deliberately spending for destructive purposes? Hasn't the time come when it will be recognized as the most elementary kind of thinking to say that it is wiser to spend to build men and communities up than it is to spend to destroy men and communities?

I want to see the "four freedoms" enjoyed by us. I want them carried to the rest of the world by those of us who are convinced that the "four freedoms" pay from a dollar-and-cent standpoint. I want all mankind to recognize the worth of the individual life, and to realize that the bigger we can make that life the better it will be for all persons. The American people believe in that doctrine whether they recognize it or not. Most Americans have savings bank accounts. Most Americans believe in insurance. Most Americans have bought Government bonds. There are but few Americans, and they surely are not worthy of being called Americans, who do not realize that a happy neighborhood is a better place to live than one of squalor. When cities zone, they zone for the simple reason that man does not like to be questioned every minute of the day as to whether or not he is his brother's keeper. A happy neighborhood allows him to live his life out with less concern than if each day he must go to his place of employment through filth, squalor, unhappiness, and poverty.

Merchants like to establish their stores in places where people can buy. Do not tell me that the American people do not actually believe in high standards of life for everybody. The little soul who years ago thought that poverty was justified because it caused those of us who were not poverty stricken to express a sense of pity and thus built up our souls failed to realize how worthy of pity such souls were. This manner of argument shows that I believe that the proper care of our returned soldiers is a moral responsibility. I am deliberate in that because this Nation of ours is one built upon faith—and faith in its final analysis demands actions based upon moral reasons. Americans really want to see our Government act because it is right to act. They want right action, not just expedient action. This holds for our international as well as national relations.

I am deliberately making this case a moral issue because the war we are fighting is basically a moral one. The "four freedoms," if they are to be attained, can only be attained through a proper moral attitude, and when morality comes into our economics, then life becomes worth while. The day of the exploiter, the advantage taker, has not gone by any means. Men are not perfect. But show me, from one end of the United States to the other, where we honor today the advantage taker, the exploiter, the man who lives his big life by treading down the small lives of his neighbors. That day has gone in America. Even self-seeking colleges who like to increase their endowments by honorary degrees do not bestow those degrees on exploiters any longer.

Service to one's community and to one's fellow men is demanded of all. The soldier boys, when they return, will be taken care of. There is no doubt about that in my mind. The Government has already made it its policy, and the American people have given this policy their approval. Woe to the politician who goes in front of his people expecting votes who attacks his opponent for thinking of the welfare of American men, women, and children. The dollar-and-cent candidate, when it comes to taking care of our soldier men and women in communities where there are free elections, is a thing of the past in American politics.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, our national debt in this fiscal year will be increased $70,000,000,000.

Is it typical of the abundant life, making a penny look like a dime, or is it that it now takes a dime to get a penny's worth?

Is it possible that the students in the schools set up by Executive order to rule conquered countries will be called carpetbaggers?

It is estimated that by December it will take 80,000,000 envelopes to supply the armed forces each month. Our boys can both fight and write.

A bureau supervisor here ranks according to the number of persons under him. It is being revealed that it is an incentive for hoarding manpower.

Our future foreign policy is not intricate. It is simply a question of whether the ideas of the first President or the last one shall prevail.

We are hearing more and more of the United Nations and less and less of the old U. S. A. The latter is beginning to belong to the "horse and buggy days."

Mr. Stettinius is a capable man, but the only experience he has had officially with other countries is giving them lend-lease money. Naturally the question is raised, where will he be should someone shoot this end of Santa?

Is the Republican Party going to be forced to match the "Nudeal" in benefits from the Treasury to succeed? The urge is there. The future of a sound democracy is not guaranteed even if the fourth term is prevented.

Leaders of union labor are horrified in Kansas because they have been denied the right to organize State employees. In the great Empire State, where union standards have been permitted to lead the world, labor has not had the temerity to attempt to invade that field.

Last Letter of Lt. J. D. Franks, Jr.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a short statement from the Columbus (Miss.) Commercial-Dispatch with reference to the death of Lt. J. D. Franks, Jr., whose father Rev. J. D. Franks, is a leading Baptist minister at Columbus, in the district I have the honor to represent, together with a letter Lieutenant Franks wrote to his father on the day before he embarked on the bomber raid on the Rumanian oil fields, from which he did not return.

This letter was left with a friend with instruction that, if he did not return, it should be forwarded to his father.

I hope every Member of the House will take the opportunity to read it. I wish every citizen, every person under the flag, could read and reread this young hero's last message to his father. It would do more to inspire patriotism and to sell War bonds than all the ballyhoo in America.

It reads as follows:

When Lt. J. D. "Red" Franks, Jr., took off in his Liberator bomber for the August 1 mission over the Rumanian oil fields, a raid from which he failed to return—he was fully aware of the dangers ahead, but was equally proud of the opportunity to be of real service to his country, his family and friends, and

the Columbus, Miss., he had loved since childhood.

It was during the past week that his parents, Dr. J. D. Franks, Sr., pastor of the First Baptist Church here, and Mrs. Franks, received official notice that their son was killed in action on August 1. Earlier, Dr. Franks received a letter from the son, dated July 31, telling of his assignment for the next day, pointing to the importance of the mission in the victory effort, asking his father not to feel bitter "if anything should happen" and declaring, "I hope you don't get this letter."

His July 31 letter follows:

MIDDLE EAST, *July 31, 1943.*

DEAREST DAD: I want to write you a little note before our big raid tomorrow. It will be the biggest and toughest we have had yet. Our target is the oil fields which supply Germany with over three-fourths of her oil. We will get our target at any cost, and on a raid we never can foresee all that will happen. Our plans are made for high altitude bombing, but this time we are going in at 50 feet above our target so there will be no second trip to complete the job. We will destroy the oil refineries in one blow. Hitler cannot run his planes, tanks, and trucks without this oil, and the war will be shortened, they tell us, by a year after the raid and may knock Italy clear out of the picture.

Dad, if anything should happen—don't feel bitter at all. Please stay the same. I remember how happy you were when I did decide to go to the seminary and then again when I joined the Air Corps in preference of staying at the seminary. You are the best Dad in the world—always too good to a boy who was a pretty bad little redhead at times. I am glad that I am in this group and will get a chance at this important target. I know that it will save many lives from the results, so any cost is worth it. So, Dad, remember that and, the cost whatever it may be, was not in vain. I don't want you to think I gave up before I ever got in the air. No, that is not the reason I am writing this at all. We are all fully aware of the danger of this raid and I always want you to know that I love you and am so proud to be your son and can do this, even though my part is little.

Remember me to all the folks back home. Everyone has always gone out of their way to be nice to me. I love Columbus—everything about it—the people, town, and the spirit behind what makes it such a wonderful place to live. I love everything there.

Take good care of yourself, little Sis, and don't let this get you down, because I would never want it that way. Never change—be the same swell Dad always. Remember, you are doing the best job in the world now and you always have done the best one.

Hope you don't get this letter, but one never knows what tomorrow will bring.

YOUR DEVOTED SON.

My favorite chapter is ninety-first Psalm.

Rent Control and Adequate Milk Supply for New York City Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters sent by me recently to O. P. A. Administrator Prentiss Brown and War Food Administrator Marvin Jones. These letters deal with two vital wartime problems affecting the people of the city of New York: rent control and an adequate supply of butter, milk, and other dairy products so essential to the health and morale of war workers and their families. Since my letter to Mr. Brown was written rent control for New York City has been established. However, the terms of this control are such as to continue to work a hardship on thousands of families, whose rents while not having been increased substantially since March 1, 1942, did go up tremendously prior to that time. The other problem—that of an adequate supply of dairy products—is one of utmost importance to the maintenance of the health and morale of war workers and their families.

The letters follow:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1943.

Administrator PRENTISS BROWN,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: I am writing this letter to urge speedy and favorable action upon the petition of Mayor LaGuardia and others for the establishment of a system of rent control for the city of New York. I represent a district in east Harlem where rents were exorbitant even before the beginning of the war, but where now even these rents have increased at a rapid rate. By October 1 it may be expected that a desperate crisis will face thousands of families in east Harlem, who live in crowded tenements, who have received no substantial increases in wages, and who find food costs 25 and 30 percent above the level for September 1942. If the anticipated increase in rentals goes into effect in October, we may expect several thousand evictions in my district alone.

Many thousands of my constituents are engaged in vital war work at the New York Port of Embarkation, the Federal Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., at Picatinny Arsenal, and in other war enterprises. It is a distinct hardship for these war workers to face increased costs for food and shelter and to face possible eviction in the next few days. In the past few days I have talked with many of these workers, who are definitely alarmed at the prospects of rent increases or evictions, or both, and who are insisting upon effective rent control for New York City.

I cannot urge too strongly that the Office of Price Administration not only act favorably in this matter but that as well that such favorable action should be taken immediately in order to alleviate the fear and worries of thousands of New York City families engaged in vital war activity. The immediate establishment of rent-control procedures will be a notable contribution to the war effort in New York City.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1943.

Judge MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE JONES: Recent action by the Office of Price Administration in raising the ration-point values of butter and other dairy products has served to accentuate the already acute problems of homemakers in my district to provide a wholesome and balanced diet for the war workers of the family and the family's children. This action has served as well to indicate the need for immediate action on the part of the War Food Administration to accomplish greatly increased production of dairy products in the New York milkshed.

I am aware that you have indicated the establishment of a feed subsidy program for the dairy farmers. The plan for this subsidy thus far revealed seems in my opinion to be a good beginning, but even yet not adequate to meet the very crucial problem of milk shortages in urban areas of New York.

It seems clear to me that the subsidy provided farmers in the New York milkshed must be sufficiently large to provide genuine incentive to them to increase production, to engage in all-out war production. In the final analysis substantial increases in dairy foods can be looked for only from among the thousands of small family-sized dairy farms in New York. This is evident because larger farms already face a severe manpower shortage which is not likely to be sufficiently improved to provide for substantial increase in production. On the other hand a genuine incentive to the family-sized dairy food producer can result in the full utilization of the manpower and facilities of such small units.

I am aware that present plans are for a subsidy of 25 cents per hundred pounds of fluid milk for the New York milkshed to be distributed indirectly; and, that the underlying reasons for this program are said to be the good hay crop in the New York region and the increased costs of direct distribution of the subsidy.

I am writing this letter to urge most earnestly that the amount of the subsidy be increased and that payments be made directly to the individual producer. A larger subsidy will have the effect of definitely spurring production among the small family sized dairy farms. Direct payments will, in my opinion, prove cheaper in the long run because they will guarantee the achievement of the goal of increased production. It would be lamentable, indeed, if even after provision of a meager subsidy inexpertly distributed there still existed a milk shortage. Such a state of affairs would furnish fuel to opponents of subsidies; it would create a deep crisis in our wartime food problem.

It is for this reason that I am writing to urge an effective subsidy in order to provide real guaranties of increased production. At the same time an effective subsidy will have the effect not only of providing adequate supplies of dairy foods but of keeping the costs of these foods within the reach of the low-incomed families in urban communities. Both objectives are vital to our war effort.

I will appreciate your reaction to my suggestions.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

Physically Handicapped Given Chance During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a short statement pertaining to work which the physically handicapped are today doing for our Government.

Mr. Jerry Kluttz presented these facts in his Federal Diary published several weeks ago in the Washington Post:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED GIVEN CHANCE DURING WAR

To the physically handicapped, the war has been a real blessing. It has given them a chance to make a decent living. Employed here recently by Federal agencies are an armless phone operator, a one-armed teletype operator, a truck driver without feet, one-armed chauffeurs and truck drivers, a blind mechanic, and many others. In the past 6 months more than 2,000 physically handicapped persons have been placed in Federal jobs by the Civil Service Commission Physical handicaps are no longer considered. The only test is: Is the person qualified to do the job and can he do it without hazard to himself or to his fellow workers?

The blind are finding it fairly easy to get jobs There are now blind dictaphone and card punch operators. War Department has trained blind persons for inspection work. The blind, with an acute sense of feel, have proven to be excellent inspectors of clothing and other materials. A totally blind teacher recently was hired by Civil Service. The War Department recently offered to set up an office where all blind persons would be employed. However, some of the blind leaders objected to segregation. They insisted that the blind be treated as any other workman. The deaf hold many types of jobs, machine operators, clerical, professional, and labor jobs.

Prevention of Future Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at Springfield, Mass., August 19, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, we have come here today to talk to you about the consequences of this war in which all our energies and resources are now engaged. You all believe, as I do, that we shall win the war in due season—soon or late. You may believe as I do that at least in Europe very significant developments are already taking place which might lead to far-reaching military consequences, and will certainly lead to far-reaching political consequences.

Just as in 1940 I was much concerned that we be prepared for war, now in 1943 I am concerned that we prepare for peace, and that our peace be a victorious, fruitful and durable peace. What is the alternative? It is that as our young men are losing their lives today to make our country safe from foreign aggression, our sons and grandsons will lose their lives 25 or 50 years from now in the same cause. If this happens, our dead will indeed have died in vain.

If we are prepared to look upon repeated wars every generation as the inevitable product of our society then let us take immediate and realistic steps to put our whole civilization into the bowels of the earth where the flying fortresses shall not strike it by noonday nor the bombers by night. For in the wars of the future nothing above ground will be safe. Cities of a million people will be reduced to ashes overnight, their surviving inhabitants squeaking and gibbering, as Shakespeare said, in the ruined streets.

Fortunately we are today in a position to outbuild our enemy in planes and to keep enemy planes mostly from over our cities. Mostly, but not entirely, for, as we all know, the island of Oahu was destructively bombed in December 1941, and enemy shells have fallen within the limits of the continental United States. Every city, town, and hamlet in the United States has today, as you all know, an organization against air raids, and any day one of them may face a real, even a crucial test. Nothing seems more certain than that the bombing planes of the future will be far more powerful and devastating than those of today. They will carry for a far longer distance a much heavier load of more highly explosive bombs, aimed with higher accuracy. We must not imagine because our cities have escaped destruction in this war that they will necessarily do so in the next. In the nature of things no country can be wholly immune from attack. Think of the gratitude which the people of Hamburg and Cologne must feel to Air Marshal Goering for his assurances, no doubt entirely sincere, that no bombs would fall on German soil. The bombing which almost knocked England out of the war only 3 years ago was child's play to the bombing of today. If you can have those changes in 3 years, what will be the changes in the next 30 years?

I am arguing that we want to keep this country out of future wars. But I don't think that you will disagree with me about this. You will say, "Sure, keep us out of war, but how can you do it?" Well, by far the best way and the only sure way to keep the United States out of wars is not to have the wars. How can you abolish war as an institution? That is not such an easy question. It is a good deal easier to describe several ways in which you can't abolish wars. You can't abolish wars by passing resolutions and forming societies, either select and learned societies or large and popular ones. You can't abolish wars by acts of Congress like the Neutrality Act which Congress passed in 1935. That famous piece of legislation was passed on the theory that if we looked the other way whenever there was a war, or held our hands in front of our eyes, and had no truck with the combatants, we should be perfectly safe. It soon developed that this view was the reverse of the truth.

The only way to keep out of a major war is to make sure in advance that aggressor nations are always outnumbered, outgunned, and outarmed by nonagressor nations. Perhaps you will say "This is the old bankrupt idea of the balance of power." But the idea is not to see the forces of righteousness and the forces of unrighteousness just teetering the scales even. It is to see the scales tip down so heavily against military aggression that military aggression can never rise to its feet It would be better to call this the doctrine of the preponderance of power rather than that of the balance of power. Here in Springfield you do not maintain an even balance of power between your city police and the thugs, and robbers, and pickpockets, and murderers, and dope peddlers, and white slavers, and so on. On the contrary, you try to keep the hand of society so heavy on these lawless elements that they know in advance that they can never get away with their foul deeds This is the way we have got to approach the problem of an international society.

That, at any rate, is the way some of us feel in Congress and that is why we are here talking about it to you good people. We are not here as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans whose first thought is not some vague, far-off, fantastic ideal, but the integrity and security of the United States of America.

The object of any foreign policy of this country is the integrity and security of America. There have always been some people in this country who have thought that a foreign policy was a luxury not to be thought of until complete perfection had been attained in all domestic arrangements. One of these people wrote me the other day. He was a successful grocer in my district and what he said boiled down to very plain English was something like this: "Here are all of us grocers getting the tar kicked out of us by the O. P. A., which is today the greatest evil in the country, and here you are running around talking about a foreign policy. Why can't you put your mind on something practical nearer home?"

I said to my friend in plain English something like this: "Suppose you keep your shirt on for a minute and do a little thinking. The reason you are plagued with the O. P. A. is that we have rationing and price control. The reason we have to have rationing and price control is because we are at war. The reason for our being at war now is that we failed to make suitable arrangements at the end of the last war to prevent this one. I want to make suitable arrangements now to prevent the next one. I shall do all I can now to help you with the O. P. A., but I don't want your son to be either a soldier in a new war or a grocer with new O. P. A. trouble. If the United States Senate had done a better job in 1919 and 1920, you wouldn't now be bothered by the O. P. A."

There have been several plans put forward in Congress to consider the position of the United States in the post-war world. We have a resolution in the House, the so-called Fulbright resolution unanimously reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee. This simply provides that "the Congress expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring the participation by the United States therein." This resolution will probably come up for a vote in the House next month or the following month.

In the Senate we have pending a more specific comprehensive resolution introduced by two Republican Senators, BALL, of Minnesota, and BURTON, of Ohio, and two Democratic Senators, HILL, of Alabama, and HATCH, of New Mexico. On account of the coincidence of the initials the newspapers have chosen to describe the resolution as if it were a chemical formula, B_2H_2. This is a handy term and I shall use it.

B_2H_2 reads like this:

"Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority:

"(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis

"(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

"(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

"(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

"(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

"That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations' organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional

specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement."

As to (1), prosecuting the war against the Axis and using all our military and economic resources for the job, there can be no difference of opinion. The same goes for (2) and (3). No one doubts that as we occupy territories that have been under the German yoke we must govern the territories, feed the hungry, and generally take the necessary steps to restore the functioning of economic life and government in the country.

(4) Procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements is the idea of international arbitration which is centuries old and which has been quite generally accepted ever since the days of the Hague Court.

I suppose the debate on B_2H_2 will center around (5), the international police force. This is where the Wilsonian League broke down. As the lawyers said, it had no sanctions. Laymen said it had no teeth. The police force is the teeth. I think that there must be some such international force to keep the peace, to constitute what I have called the preponderance of power.

Opponents of this police force will do everything possible either consciously or unconsciously to misrepresent its nature. They will tell you that this force will conscript your sons and take them into foreign lands for long years at a time. It will do nothing of the sort. Such a police force could be and should be recruited by voluntary enlistment or enrollment. It could be and should be highly paid. It should have at its disposal the preponderating part of the world's military air force, and the world's navies. How the force should be composed is a question to be worked out. Mr. Ely Culbertson, for one, has made very specific, interesting, and reasonable recommendations. But one does not need to be dogmatic.

The only vital thing is that we collaborate with our allies to provide for the future policing of the world for the prevention of acts of aggression. At this point someone may say, "What is an act of aggression?" I do not think that we need spend much time on abstract definitions. It generally isn't very difficult to determine which of two parties to a quarrel started it. Ethiopia was not the aggressor against Italy, China against Japan, or Poland against Germany.

Another idea that people have is that when we work with other nations all we do is to give away the assets of the United States and get nothing in return. Of course, if we are stupid enough to do that, we deserve no sympathy from anyone. The idea of collaboration with other nations for the peace of the world is not to have the United States run an international W. P. A., to pay the Eskimos for raking the leaves which we furnish them to rake, or anything of the sort. This idea of collaboration is to keep America secure, but recognizes that to keep America secure you have got to have some friends. Populous and powerful as this country is, we have only around 7 percent of the world's population. Productive as it is, a Europe completely united against us or an Asia completely united against us could outproduce us in all the essentials for making war. Rich as we are in resources, we are far from being independent of the rest of the world. In fact, we must recognize that this country is not so rich in natural resources as it once was. The iron is running low in the Mesabi Range. The oil supply will not last forever. The future is with the vegetable matter that grows, not with the mineral deposits that are depleted. And you can grow as much on any other continent as you can on ours.

This is no time for America to be arrogant. Where should we be today if the British had not won the Battle of Britain? Where should we be today if the Russians had given in at Stalingrad? Remember the simple historical fact that we have become involved in every world war. Even in Colonial times the European wars caused reflex wars here like King Philip's War, the French and Indian War, and so on. We fought France rather informally in the earlier days of Napoleon. Later on we switched in 1812 and fought the British in a war that gives us little cause for pride or satisfaction. We failed to keep out of the First World War though we had at the head of the State Department in the person of William Jennings Bryan the greatest pacifist in our history and in the White House in the person of Woodrow Wilson a man with a religious abhorrence for war.

In 1939 we kept saying that this was not our war, that the Yanks were not coming, and so on. But all that changed on a quiet Sunday morning in Oahu. The Axis knew it was our war, even if we didn't. Some people will say, "Think about peace when the time comes. When the war is over. When the tumult and the shouting have died. When the captains and the dictators have departed."

The answer to that is in the old couplet: "When the devil was ill, the devil a monk would be; when the devil was well, the devil a monk was he." If we don't forge our weapons and weld our metals in the hot fires of war, we shall not do it in the cool days of a vapid normalcy. It was the policy of normalcy that got Hitler and Hirohito to planning the overthrow of our Republic. I ask you now to help us who are working in Congress for a wiser policy which will bring to our sons and grandsons not death but life. You will then be following the motto of this Commonwealth, whose sword has ever sought "a tranquil peace under liberty."

Dedication of Guntersville, Ala., Public Use River Terminal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hon. JOE STARNES, master of ceremonies at dedication of Guntersville Public Use River Terminal, Friday, September 24, 1943, broadcast over MBS through station WJBY:

Fellow Americans, we are assembled at the southernmost point on the Tennessee River at Guntersville, Ala., to dedicate with appropriate ceremonies the opening of the Guntersville Public Use River Terminal. It is one of the four public-use terminals constructed by the Tennessee Valley Authority to provide docks, storage, and other terminal facilities for the ever-increasing volume of river traffic on the Tennessee River. In the magnificent audience present are national leaders in the fields of motor, rail, and water transportation; shippers of agricultural, building, industrial, and petroleum products from the Great Lakes, the Midwest, the Ohio Valley, the Gulf Coast, and the Southeast; public officials representing local, State, and National Governments which include members of State legislatures, Governors, and Members of Congress from the Tennessee Valley area. We have also the Chairman and the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Chairman and members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the president of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and The Adjutant General of the Army representing the War Department, representatives of the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. The presence of these representatives of business and government indicates the importance and the character of these ceremonies.

In this spacious harbor, with its sylvan setting, supplies of grain from the Midwest, motor-combat vehicles from the Detroit area, and petroleum products from the Gulf are being unloaded. From this point will be shipped cotton, pig iron, building material, and other products of the region. Although the giant Kentucky Dam near the mouth of the Tennessee will not be completed until early in 1944 and the first 200 miles of the river has only a 6-foot channel the growth of water traffic over this stream has been phenomenal.

At present the T. V. A. and the area it serves has gone to war. All the resources of this region—and they are varied and immense—as well as its people, are dedicated to winning the war for freedom. Half of the aluminum for our plane program, elements for production of synthetic rubber, food, and fiber for victory, and the greatest chemical warfare arsenal in the world, and vast explosive manufacturing plants are a part of our contribution to the safety and security of the Nation. The electric power made available on this the second largest power-producing stream in the New World has made it possible to attain production goals which guarantee victory and freedom for our people.

The use of our inland waterways and this port with its modern terminal facilities has saved our Government hundreds of thousands of dollars in carrying charges on war equipment. This use has helped to relieve our railways, which have done a magnificent job, and has saved precious rubber and gasoline.

We have here a perfect example of what a unified transportation system of motor, rail, and water can do to develop the resources of a region and promote the national economy. These facilities and this system can serve in war and in peace. In the postwar period the Nation can well afford to include the improvement of its inland waterways and develop its hydroelectric power possibilities as a part of a program to develop our natural resources and provide needed employment. The hope of the industrial development of the South with the consequent raising of its standards of living and its income to the national level lies in the development of its inland waterways and its hydroelectric possibilities. The T. V. A. has given us a shining example of efficiency and economy in operation. Its program of developing the natural resources of a region by coordinating the forces of nature for service to the human family heralds the dawn of a new era for the South and the Nation.

Increase of War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, American labor and American management are doing a fine war-production job. They will continue to cooperate to the utmost until the dictators come to their

inevitable surrender. Labor and management are not looking for praise for their efforts. They know full well that it is their patriotic duty to do their bit on the home front while their sons and brothers are risking their lives on the battle fronts.

They are looking, however, for all the cooperation they can get which will aid them in increasing even more their record output of the materials of war. It is imperative, especially because of the manpower shortage, that management, labor, and Government make the most efficient use of our present working force.

This can largely be accomplished by improving working conditions in plants through providing advice to labor and management on programs of prevention and control. Government can help industry and workers to solve the problems relating to accident and health protection, medical care, proper food, housing, transportation, shopping, and child care. Solution of these problems, even in part, will go far toward stepping up our war production.

Such a remedy is provided for in the proposed Working Conditions Service of the United States Department of Labor, for which President Roosevelt is asking a supplemental appropriation of $709,000. Provision will be made by the Department of Labor to assist individual war plants so that management and labor can solve their specific problems and meet output schedules with a fully productive work force.

The Department of Labor has been highly successful in its preventive work and it can be made more effective by a supplemental appropriation.

The National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries, set up by Secretary of Labor Perkins before Pearl Harbor, has done a splendid job in reducing industrial accidents and in training supervisory personnel in proper safety methods. Since July 1940, 21,525 war plants have been serviced by the committee and approximately 39,000 key supervisors have received safety training in 116 engineering colleges in different parts of the country.

In terms of accident prevention, over a million man-days were saved to 10,500 war plants serviced by the committee in 1942 alone. Over two-thirds of these plants have markedly reduced their accident frequency rates. During the first 6 months of 1943 this percentage increased to nearly 75 percent.

Contrast this record with that in the 70,000 war plants not yet serviced by the committee for lack of funds and personnel. The core of war production is manufacturing; this industry accounted for 20 percent or 497,970 of the more than 2,300,000 job injuries estimated to have occurred during 1942 in the United States.

The Department of Labor may well be proud of its accident-prevention work. It has been definitely in the interest of increased war production and is so recognized by management and labor. Such a preventive program should be expanded at this time so as to take in the entire field of a working-conditions service for the benefit of a Nation engaged in total war. The requested supplemental appropriation would be of tremendous value to this end.

High Lights on United States Navy's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Cornwall, yeoman second class, United States Naval Reserve:

In the course of American history, two events of outstanding importance took place on the date of October 27. In 1775, on that date, a bill providing for the construction of the first ships of the Navy was presented to the Continental Congress and, therefore, that date may be considered the birthday of the American Navy. October 27 is also the anniversary of the birth of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, who did so much for the upbuilding of American sea power and the establishing of sound national policy for the country. It is because of the above facts that October 27 was selected as the date for the annual observance of Navy Day.

On November 1, 1775, a letter from George Washington was read in the Continental Congress. In it he deplored the lack of naval strength. Next day an appropriation of $100,000 for the construction and equipping of a naval force was authorized. A committee was appointed to administer naval affairs.

Later that same month the tiny *Alfred* and *Columbus* were commissioned—the first ships in the Colonial Navy. Saltonstall was the captain of the *Alfred* and Whipple was captain of the *Columbus*. The *Providence* was the last of the fleet to be commissioned in the Continental Navy. Her captain was Tom Hazard. The total number of vessels which served the Continental Congress was 42.

The day he got his papers, John Paul Jones, flag lieutenant of *Alfred*, repaired to the Hall of Congress, where John Hancock gave him a commission and the new flag that was to be the standard by sea of the United Colonies—13 stripes, alternate red and white, with a canton bearing the rattlesnake of Carolina coiled round the pine of New England and the motto "Don't Tread on Me!"

The original naval committee (Silas Deane, John Langdon, Christopher Gadsden, Stephen Hopkins, Joseph Hewes, "Light Horse Harry" Lee, and John Adams), was succeeded by a second, which suggested a fleet of 13 vessels to be ready by March 1776, and recommended appointment of a third committee to supervise construction and equipment. The Congress adopted this report and a Marine Committee was appointed with 13 members, 1 for each colony. The Marine Committee, the forerunner of the Navy Department, administered naval affairs until December 1779, when it was succeeded by a Board of Admiralty. In 1781 the cumbersome administrative functioning of committees was realized and authority finally vested in 1 man, Robert Morris, Agent of Marine. After 1784, when Robert Morris retired to private life, the affairs of the Navy consisted only of settling accounts. There were no ships and no establishment to administer.

The early American Fleet was commanded by Esek Hopkins, who, on December 22, 1775, was granted a commission by the Continental Congress as commander in chief of the fleet. When Hopkins surrendered his command a year later the commission he had held was not passed on. During the remainder of the Revolutionary War the only commissioned officers in the Navy were captains and lieutenants.

In the chaos that followed the Revolutionary War the Continental Navy disappeared. By 1786 the United States had not a single armed vessel. Soon it was evident that a navy cost less than tribute to pirates and the necessity for one began to be felt. On March 27, 1794, the President of the United States signed an act providing six frigates for the purpose of protecting United States shipping from the ravages of Algerian pirates. The act states specifically that there was no intention of inaugurating a permanent navy, though, in fact, it did just that.

With renewed activity, due to the act of 1794, the War Department took over the handling of the Navy's business. Officers were appointed to the new service, and the building and equipping of the frigates went forward under the War Department administration. The need for a separate Navy Department was soon apparent, and on April 30, 1798, Congress passed the legislation establishing the office of Secretary of the Navy. The Navy Department, as we know it today, began to function on May 21, 1798, when Benjamin Stoddert took office as the first Secretary of the Navy.

The history of the Navy is replete with action. The quasi-war with France, 1798–1801, saw its baptismal fire. Tripolitan pirates next brought it into the Mediterranean. Then came the War of 1812. Suppression of the slave trade necessitated considerable activity.

As it passed from sail to steam, the Navy made its contribution in the campaigns of the Mexican War and in the more peaceful propagation of occidental civilization by the visit of Commodore Perry to Japan.

The lessons of the Confederate War established more definitely than ever the importance of adequate naval armament. Despite these lessons, the canvas on the masts of the Navy's ships flapped aimlessly for 15 years in the doldrums of post-war antipathy.

The first step toward a new Navy came under the administration of President Garfield, when an advisory board was appointed to report on the needs of the Navy. President Arthur, in his first annual message in 1886, declared: "I cannot too strongly urge upon you my conviction that every consideration of national safety, economy, and honor imperatively demands a thorough rehabilitation of the Navy." In spite of the reluctance of Congress to accede to his views, the birth of a new Navy occurred in his administration.

Later, under the leadership of President Theodor Roosevelt, naval development went forth apace. The World War No. 1 added another chapter of expansion. In June 1940 the phrase "two-ocean navy" was heard for the first time. This was when France fell and the fall of England seemed imminent. Under the leadership of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, we have now the largest navy in the world. The present global conflict has emphasized the capital importance of the American Navy.

We have built a new Navy since December 7, 1941. Four years ago the Navy had a total officer strength of about 10,000; today more than 185,000. Four years ago it had 3 aircraft carriers; today—despite battle losses—dozens. Our ships have stood the

test of battle. Initial weaknesses in anti-aircraft armament and in fire-fighting equipment have been remedied. American ships today are tough; they mount more armament—particularly more antiaircraft guns—than those of any other nation.

Sea battles have proved the basic soundness of American naval tactical doctrine; that soundness was tested at Midway and Coral Seas.

Americans are traditionally proud of their Navy, and they have good reason to be, for throughout its stormy, illustrious existence it has remained a powerful and courageous striking force. The fanatically loyal spirit of Navy men is the result of an unbroken stream of tradition transmitted from hand to hand from the Revolution to the present day.

Former American Ambassador Speaks at Polish Commemorative Program in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by former American Ambassador William C. Bullitt, which appeared recently in the Polish Catholic Press Agency's Weekly Review:

At a meeting of the Polish Relief Committee of Philadelphia, in the Academy of Music on Sunday September 12, 1943, Hon. William C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to France and Soviet Russia, delivered an address on the occasion of the fourth anniversary of Poland's entry into the war.

In his address the former Ambassador gave a clear description of Polish political affairs, from 1914 when he was war correspondent in Poland. Since then he has seen "Poles at many tragic hours facing death with clear eyes, calm souls, and faith in God." Much has changed since that time but two things have not changed: "the spirit of Poland and my conviction about the future of Poland. Poland will rise again and live, free and independent, the spirit of the Poles is unconquerable."

"Polish policy," continued the Ambassador, "was firmly based on the simple principle that no Polish Government would ever give up an inch of Polish soil or submit to any new partition without a fight. This fact was known to every statesman in Europe and America.

"The Poles have learned through the centuries that peace cannot be sought by appeasing a dictator—any dictator—that each concession is followed by new demands, that each partition is followed by a new partition until there is nothing left to partition.

"Before Hitler attacked Poland, he knew that Poland would fight. That first act of Polish courage made possible the hope of freedom that exists today for all the nations of Europe. And it is to the eternal honor of the Poles, that, of all the peoples of the world they were the first to dare to face the forces of evil incarnate in the Nazis.

"At the end of the war, the devastation in Poland will be even greater than the devastation at the end of the war in 1914; and the massacre of millions of Poles, especially of leaders in all walks of life, will place before the people of Poland a task of reconstruction of terrible proportions. I believe that the people of Poland will be equal to the task.

"Poland will live again," concluded Mr. Bullitt, "because each Pole has at the core of his being the determination that is expressed in the first words of the Polish national anthem: 'Poland is not dead while we live!'"

MANY CITIES HONOR POLAND

New York City paid a glowing tribute to Poland at the civic manifestation held in Town Hall under the auspices of the American Women's Voluntary Services, attended by more than 1,200 persons. The Star Spangled Banner was sung by Miss Emily Roosevelt and the Polish national anthem by Sgt. Pawel Prokopieni, the singer of Tobruk. Miss Regina Zaorska, chairman of the organization committee, introduced Mrs. Edgar Leonard, who presided. The speakers were the Honorable Michael Kwapiszewski, Polish Minister Plenipotentiary, who represented His Excellency the Polish Ambassador; Maj Cora Bass, W. A. C., Mr. William Agar, president of Freedom House; Mr. Henry Noble Hall, war correspondent, and Prof. Oscar Halecki, director of the Polish Institute of Arts and Science. Prof. O. Halecki congratulated the organizers on having chosen the 12th of September to commemorate Poland's heroic resistance and to pay tribute to General Sikorski, her great leader, for it was the anniversary of a glorious Polish victory won by the Polish King Jan Sobieski before Vienna when European Christendom was saved from the Ottoman invaders more than 250 years ago.

Poland's resistance to Hitler's unprovoked aggression in September 1939 was commemorated at a mass meeting in the Veterans' Auditorium in Syracuse, N. Y. The Reverend C. Piejda delivered the invocation, Attorney John Chmiel presided. Mayor T. E. Kennedy, the Reverend J. Kociela, and Douglas Drummond, of the United States Treasury, were the principal speakers. During the program selections were rendered by Polish refugee artists, Miss Eva Jaxa Debicka, pianist, and Mr. Z. Protasiewicz. War bonds amounting to $51,000 were sold to Polish members of the audience.

Similar programs were arranged during the past week in Passaic, N. J.; Bayonne, N. J.; and Bronx, N. Y.

Post-War Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on post-war planning which I delivered last Friday at the New York Times forum on post-war foreign policy, in Times Hall, New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two events of far-reaching importance in determining American foreign policy have taken place this month.

On September 7 the Republican Post-War Advisory Council declared unanimously in favor of "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

Last Tuesday, September 21, the House of Representatives passed, 360 to 29, the Fulbright resolution favoring the "creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring United States participation therein."

The value of these two actions is that they constitute a recognition, first, of the tremendous urgency and importance of determining what shall be the post-war foreign policy of the United States, and second, that peace can be maintained in the world only by joint action of many nations and that the United States must and shall assume its share of responsibility.

We recognize that neither of these declarations constitutes a clear and definite statement of United States policy. They state an objective, the maintenance of world peace and justice by cooperative action, but the policy, the specific steps necessary to achieve that objective, must still be decided. The next step is to decide the form and degree of international cooperation we in the United States are prepared to support.

Unless we decide these questions by positive action of Congress now, we face a grave danger that the tragic epilogue of World War No. 1 will be repeated after World War No. 2. Our people then were overwhelmingly in favor of our participation in cooperative international efforts to maintain peace, but the issue was drawn, not on that broad objective but on the specific means of attaining it, namely the League of Nations. And it was drawn even more closely on certain specific articles in the League covenant.

The same thing will happen after this war, in fact already is happening. Our militarists, imperialists, and extreme nationalists are all in favor of the principle of international cooperation to maintain peace today, but they oppose now and will oppose later any specific policy or program to attain that objective. Our best hope of winning the lasting peace all of us hope for is to fight out and decide this all-important question of specific policy now, while the terrible cost of war is close to us and before scores of extraneous problems can be dragged in to becloud the main issue.

Once we accept the principle of international cooperation, there are two further basic decisions to make. First, shall our machinery of cooperation consist of a system of alliances or pacts, or of an organization? And second, what minimum authority and power must this machinery possess in order to do the job?

The four authors of Senate Resolution 114, two Democrats and two Republicans, sought to put into plain English the very minimum degree of international cooperation we believe is necessary to prevent World War No. 3 from happening.

We decided the first question in favor of an organization. Alliances are unstable, it is doubtful whether the people of the United States would ever accept them, and almost inevitably they tend to become imperialistic, balance of power devices, leading eventually to war. Organization, with strictly limited authority in clearly defined fields, is the democratic method of meeting this problem, and we are, after all, fighting this war for democracy and peace, and against tyranny and aggression, which is an exaggerated imperialism.

The United Nations, with provision for admission of other nations to membership, is the obvious nucleus for the international organization, whatever its eventual name may

be. The United Nations will win the war and write the peace. We also propose that the United States take the initiative in getting the United Nations organized now. The reason for that is simple. Our action in repudiating the League after World War No. 1 is still fresh in the minds of our Allies. They can hardly proceed effectively with post-war plans until they know with some assurance and definiteness what our position will be. Only a clear and definite directive from Congress can provide that assurance.

One basis for opposition to a specific statement by the Senate now is that we do not know what England or Russia wants. It might be answered by the simple fact that we know more about what position Britain and Russia are likely to take than they do about our position. The United States position is the biggest single question mark today in post-war international planning.

But fundamentally, the views of other nations have nothing to do with the initial determination of United States policy. What we are trying to decide is the kind of specific international program to maintain peace the United States will support. The program finally adopted will be hammered out in conference with our allies and will in due course be presented to Congress for acceptance or rejection. If the United States takes a clear, positive position, that position will have tremendous influence in shaping the final program, but our influence will be much less if we have no such clear policy.

Building a just and lasting peace is the greatest single task facing us and the world today. It is our obligation to ourselves to state as clearly as possible what we believe to be the best answer to the problem and then do our best to gain international acceptance for as much of it as possible.

Having decided on an organization with the United Nations as a nucleus, what is the minimum authority such an organization must have to maintain world peace? We state them in the resolution as follows:

"To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

"To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

"To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

"To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation."

Why are these the minimum powers? The two functions of relief and temporary administration are with us already. All of us who have watched governmental institutions evolve and develop realize that the policies followed in relief and temporary administration activities will to a very large degree set the pattern for the post-war peace. If that peace is to be a United Nations peace, those policies should be United Nations policies. Perhaps if there had been some such agreement among the United Nations, or even Britain, Russia, and the United States, before north Africa, Russia's attitude might not be the question mark it is today.

Establishing procedures, principles and machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes is imperative if we really mean to outlaw war as a method of settling them. There is not much argument over this function or over the first two for that matter.

The real dispute is over the question of whether our international organization shall have military force at its command to stop future attempts at military aggression or whether we shall rely in the future on the forces of individual nations being used to stop such attempts at aggression.

The League of Nations tried the later method. It did not work. Individual nations, once the bitter lesson of this war has faded with time, are likely to do just what they did in the thirties—refuse to fight or risk war simply to save the peace of the world. It is particularly true of democracies, where the people's hatred of war is a powerful influence, that individual nations are extremely reluctant to even risk war except when their own security is threatened vitally, and sometimes they are reluctant even then.

Certainly it would be futile to expect individual nations to order their own forces into action against an aggressor without assurance that other great powers would do likewise. Just how much chance would there be of winning agreement to war against an aggressor among all major powers and how long would it take to get it? And what would a determined aggressor be doing while the debate took place? The tragic history of the thirties is our answer.

We seek to establish international law and order, and no government, however, limited its scope or powers, ever proved effective unless it had somewhere at its command the force to make its rules of conduct binding on would-be outlaws. Why, in the face of the League experience, proceed on the assumption that by some miracle men and nations will change overnight and clever, unscrupulous aggressors will no longer exist?

This would, of course, involve a delegation of limited sovereignty to the international organization. The United States would agree to outlaw military aggression and authorize the United Nations to use force against any nation which attempted it, ourselves included.

Those who oppose this delegation of power, it seems to me, must base their opposition on one of two assumptions. One is that the United States may at some future date wish to attempt military aggression. The other assumption is that the authority to use force solely to stop aggression would be perverted by the majority and used against the legitimate interests of the United States or other member nations in a minority.

Both of these assumptions to me are incompatible with a fundamental faith in democracy, the cause for which we are fighting. As long as the United States remains a democratic republic, I do not believe there is the slightest chance of our becoming an aggressor. And the very heart of the democratic process is the belief that the majority of men and women want to be decent, to do what is best for all the people and protect and defend the rights of their fellows. Without that belief and faith, Hitler's attacks on democracy would be true. And what is true of individuals, is likewise true of nations. If we proceed to set up our machinery to maintain peace on the assumption that scoundrels among nations are in the majority, we are licked before we start. Our only hope is a firm faith that the great majority of nations and peoples want peace, decency, and justice and that it is the outlaw minority against which we must be on guard.

Plea for Stoppage of Subversive Practices Retarding the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio speech which I have prepared and delivered for release in Oregon.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, fellow Oregonians. Since the convening of the Congress nearly 3 weeks ago, the great subject of debate has been the manpower problem. To win the war General Marshall and Admiral King have testified that they need 10,709,581 men and women serving in various capacities in the combat forces of our country by December 31 of this year.

Most of us in the Congress accept these figures because we have confidence in the knowledge and purposes of the present Chief of Staff of the Army and of the present Chief of Naval Operations. We believe them to be men of exceptional ability, intelligence, and patriotism and that they are experts in their particular public duties. When they state that to carry out their over-all war program they need so many men by a certain time, the safety of our country demands that the Congress, the President, and the people cooperate unitedly to meet the requirements specified.

The question then arises, where are we going to get the required number of men by the time indicated without disrupting the continuous flow of ships, airplanes, munitions, clothing, food, and matériel of all kinds. Unless our combat forces are constantly supplied with needed material things at the time and place they are required, their efficiency as fighters is impaired, and they may be, and sometimes are, defeated as a consequence.

The surrender of our unprovisioned troops on Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines, and the slaughter of our inadequately armed soldiers at Dutch Harbor, while strikes and slowdowns were in operation in a number of war and essential industries, are sad examples of this fact. Moreover, our obligations as the arsenal of democracy to supply our allies under the lend-lease arrangements, as well as to furnish the vital necessities of the American people, themselves, require continuous and ample production, if we are not to make the fatal mistake of forsaking our allies who are depending upon us, or of breaking down on the home front.

Various Members of the Congress have insisted that a thorough resurvey of the noncombatant manpower consumed in the various Federal bureaus under the President, where there now are in excess of 3,000,000 payrollees, be made; and that the total number of such payrollees be reduced to the absolute minimum which efficient and economical Federal administration requires. Moreover, we demand of the President and his executive departments that those men then remaining in the Federal bureaus and departments who can qualify for combat service, and who can be spared from governmental occupations, be released for military, naval, or other services where they may be more usefully employed.

In all this proposed shifting and allocating of manpower, the WACS, the WAVES and the SPARS offer a very useful, needed, and effective service. As a member of a number of Senate committees which have much to do with the conduct of the war, I desire to record the Nation's gratitude for, and high appreciation of, these fine, noble, and patriotic girls. It would be well if all of us at home, in and out of war industries, would emulate their fine example of efficient, patriotic service to the Nation in time of war.

Next, we demand that inspections of war industries and other essential operations be made, to ascertain the facts relative to hoarding labor, enforcement of and participation in strikes, slow-downs, subversive shop practices, and any other activities which unnecessarily and inexcusably retard, or withhold, needed supplies from reaching our soldiers, sailors, and marines in the combat areas.

I cannot understand why public opinion silently countenances the treasonable practices which prevent supplying promptly our Army and Navy with every needful thing we have or can get. The cruelty of drafting fine young men into the combat services and sending them into battles all over the world, while many of those in safe employments at home refuse to work, and to work diligently, is reprehensible. An aroused public opinion manifesting its disapproval of labor hoarding, fomenting or engaging in strikes, slowdowns, and subversive shop practices can effect a reform of these unpatriotic activities overnight. Why are our people and many persons in Government itself so complacent about these things?

Moreover, do we not learn anything from history and even very recent history? The international bankers and traders of England, France, and America, seeking their profits, financed and supplied Germany with everything Germany needed with which she was known to be preparing herself for war. War against whom? Why, war against the very nations—England, France, and America—of which the international bankers and traders were themselves citizens. Where now are the profits of those selfish and unpatriotic internationalists?

The sit-down strike originated in France. The French laborer was persuaded into believing he was advancing his own welfare, or he was coerced, into engaging in strikes, slow-downs, and subversive shop practices at a time when the Government of France was feverishly trying to prepare for the conflict which her wisest statesmen foresaw in the actions of Germany. Where now are the social gains of the French workingmen? If we lose this war, we all lose all.

What has happened in France can happen in America. If we do not all—labor, capital, and citizens—cooperate unitedly for winning this war, disaster will surely overtake us. This war is not yet won, and every day and every hour of every day which it continues thousands of fine American men and boys are being killed or disabled or maimed for life.

When this Second World War was declared, there were, and still are, in the veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation many patriotic Americans who were wounded and broken in body and mind 23 years previously in World War No. 1. I know whereof I speak on this subject, because I frequently visit the veterans' hospital in Portland.

When the budget for combat manpower was being compiled by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, and the Draft Act was under consideration, it was estimated that there would be 1,000,000 casualties to our American troops, alone, in the calendar year of 1943. For month past the sick and wounded men and boys of the American forces all over the world have been returning, unannounced and unheralded, to our shores. Our available hospital space is being depleted rapidly, while we have just begun the heavy fighting by massed armies.

In my opinion, he who now idles, foments, or engages in strikes, slow-downs, labor-hoarding, or subversive shop practices not only is jeopardizing his own liberty and freedom, as those in France did, but he also is endangering the success of our war efforts and most selfishly and heartlessly causing many American men and boys to lose their lives, or to linger for years in pain and distress in more and more veteran and other overcrowded hospitals. You who are listening to me have a vital interest in this strike and slow-down business which follows the vicious activities of those racketeers of labor who, as parasites, profit from the earnings of the workers, and by force and violence and other means of intimidation compel many patriotic and naturally industrious workingmen to engage in inefficient shop practices and other subversive acts which delay and make unnecessarily expensive, our war-production efforts.

Not only that, but by these subversive practices our entire Oregon area is now designated erroneously as a congested industrial labor area and the various new industries and Federal projects which your Oregon congressional delegation has secured, and others which they now are trying to get, or others which already are in operation, are being denied both orders of work and authorizations to proceed with operations, by Presidential directives or by administrative-bureaucratic policy.

By the declaration of the executive department that the entire Oregon country is a congested labor area more than 100,000 kilowatts of Bonneville power are being wasted day after day, week after week, month after month and year after year. This available, but unused, cheap power should, long before now, have been in use furnishing the power to make vitally needed munitions and a multitude of products of many kinds for our combat forces, our allies, and for the necessities of the American workers at home.

Not only that, but after the war when our surviving boys return to their homes, they will be seeking jobs. Also, many of those who now are employed in stimulated war industries will then, too, be looking for jobs. Moreover, the boys and girls who now are in high schools and colleges—they also will be looking for jobs. Where are we going to find all these jobs after the war if we cannot now establish and encourage established industries with their needed pay rolls in the Oregon country?

Is the war effort to be denied the benefit and our domestic economy to be stifled, by the failure to utilize now the unrivalled advantage of Bonneville's cheap power and the abundance and variety of raw products available in Oregon which can be fashioned into every conceivable thing to supply our combat forces and provide for the ruined and hungry people throughout the world? This Federal department ruling that the entire Oregon area has a real labor shortage is far reaching in its ruinous effects.

Perhaps there is not so much a shortage of labor in Oregon as there is a shortage of laboring in some of our war and other essential industries. I hold the very highest Federal politicians in the executive branch of the Government, and the profiteers, and the racketeers of labor, responsible for this supremely selfish, heartless, and unpatriotic situation.

The officers in the Army and Navy maintain the discipline which is necessary for combined, cooperative, and orderly successful effort because the President, as Commander in Chief, and the laws and regulations in force, support the officers in their plans and methods but, in domestic productive effort, that support is exerted in encouragement of the racketeers of labor; which in turn brings about confusion and shortage of production and impairment of the war effort.

The common citizen can do something about it. He can make it his patriotic business to ascertain just how productive is the effort of everyone—employer and employee alike—who is receiving remuneration in war and other essential occupations; and if the record does not disclose a reasonable productive result, ascertain the reason why, and place the responsibility in each case on the person where the responsibility belongs; then demand a constructive reform, in the name of humanity, success in our war effort, economy and efficiency in federally financed activities, and in patriotic devotion to American ideals.

In a democracy an aroused public opinion can accomplish anything. Let your voice be heard and your deeds be constructive, unselfish, encouraging, and solely patriotic. Do nothing in malice; but from this day forward let us all—every American citizen—make his greatest possible contribution in maximum personal service to winning the war at the earliest possible moment at the least possible cost in lives, matériels, funds, and taxes.

In desperate earnestness, a marine in the combat area under command of General MacArthur was inspired to write:

"And if our lines should form, then break
Because of things you failed to make—
The extra tank, or ship, or plane
For which we waited all in vain
And the supplies which never came—
Will you then come and take the blame?
For we, not you, will pay the cost
Of battles you, not we, have lost."

Tribute to the President and His Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, from a source to which no political significance can be attached, I offer a tribute to the President and the present administration for their management of the war and the home-front activities—a page ad appearing in the Washington Times-Herald, and sponsored by a local store.

This ad I might say, is characteristic of other ads appearing throughout the country, and they are all genuine tributes to the management of the war. This commendation is shared by the majority of the American people not actively engaged in political propaganda. Statements are made in this ad that the President is doing a splendid job in the direction of the war on the battlefields, as well as on the home front, in the supervision of the war agencies, control of the cost of living, direction of war production at amazing peaks, and the moving of troops and material on schedule. In my opinion, if there is any fault-finding from the standpoint of the management of the war or of economic conditions, such criticism does not emanate from the average citizen, but is prompted by political prejudice.

The contribution of billions of dollars to the purchase of bonds for the management of the war is a tribute in itself. The spontaneity and the willingness of the people to buy is a vote of confidence in the management of the war.

The patriotic fervor exhibited at the bond meetings, the eagerness of the people to enlist and participate in the war activities, and the stoic reserve with which the people have met the casualties of close relatives or the few reverses of battle, are all conclusive evidence of the wholehearted support of the American people of our great President and his assistants.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, we think you're doing a swell job, not only on the battlefields but on the home front as well.

It's easy to criticize, easy to censure, easy to call those war agencies of yours so much alphabetical nonsense, but facts speak for themselves, and it is by facts that we can measure the value of these agencies. It's a fact that the O. P. A. has, after more than 20 months of war, kept the cost of living far lower than it was after 6 months of the last war. It's a fact that the W. P. B. has helped plan and control in such a manner as to keep war production at amazing peaks. It's a fact that the O. D. T. has helped keep war transportation smooth, with troops and matériel constantly on the move. It's a fact that these and the other war agencies are fulfilling their functions. These agencies cost money. It's a good investment in our own futures to support them.

They do their part. Let's do ours.

Let's back the attack with everything we've got.

Buy more War bonds today.

This space contributed to the Third War Loan drive by:

MORTON'S FASHION STORE
FOR MISSES AND WOMEN.
MORTON'S GIRLS' STORE.
MORTON'S BABYLAND.
MORTON'S BOYS' TOWN.

Shortages in the National Milk Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR CAPPER
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, calling attention to serious impending shortages in the national milk supply, a national policy in opposition to subsidies was adopted on Wednesday of this week by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation in their national emergency meeting in Washington.

The federation policy was immediately brought to the attention of nearly 150 Senators and Representatives at a congressional dinner.

The federation's policy statement was presented to the members of the Congress by John Brandt, of Minneapolis, federation president.

Adoption of the policy was unanimously approved at the afternoon session of the federation's emergency meeting, which was attended by representatives of the 64 member units of the federation from 23 States.

Text of the statement of policy, which I ask be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A serious impending shortage of the national milk supply now confronts the American people. Increase of the number of ration points on butter to 16 per pound or double the number of points originally set by the Government, and the recent freeze on sales of fluid milk, are but surface manifestations of a critical condition whose advent was predicted early in the year by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. Failure of the Government to provide means whereby dairy farmers could pay for advancing production costs, including higher farm wages and feed costs, is the cause of this national crisis with respect to the milk supply. An arbitrary policy of holding down prices of some dairy products and beating down the prices of others without regard to its consequences, now brings the people face to face with the stark reality that violation of the eternal principle of supply and demand coupled with rationing of relatively low-priced commodities leads to scarcity.

Instead of following the simple and natural course of adequate pricing to obtain adequate production, the Government has chosen the hard way of attempting to freeze prices, freeze the free movement of producers from one outlet to another and to substitute instead various types of subsidies, to give producers partial compensation under terms and conditions which greatly inhibit their freedom.

At this time we will not attempt to discuss the relative demerits of the different types of subsidies. We limit our comment to the broad question of subsidy in lieu of adequate prices at a time when the vast majority of the people of this Nation are amply able to pay for the food which they are now eating. Such a policy is open to many objections, among which are:

1. Food subsidies represent a constantly increasing public debt which will be transferred, when they return from the war, in large part, to the men in our fighting forces, the majority of whom are now serving for $50 per month.

2 Food subsidies are inflationary. The printing of bonds to pay for food is not unlike the printing of currency to pay for governmental expenditures when the governmental credit has run out.

3. Food subsidies imply that the Government intends to share more or less permanently the payment of the grocery bills of its citizens without regard to their capacity to pay their way through life.

4. The new milk subsidy, which we are informed is being worked out on the basis of individual subsidy payments to some 3 million producers of milk, will strengthen bureaucratic control over the lives of the farm people.

The payment of subsidies has developed an elaborate scheme of interlocking controls, so that the terms and conditions of receiving a subsidy constitutes the exercise of policing power not contemplated by existing law. Thus government by regulation is constantly supplanting government by law; and government by regulation rapidly emerges into government by fear. Knowledge is without our possession of many instances wherein this type of governmental compulsion is being exercised coordinately by various branches of officialdom to require persons to obey regulations through pressure tactics and to make them fearful of entering the courts to protect their constitutional rights.

While one branch of the Government is putting an iron hand upon food cost, another branch of the Government is continuously telling the Congress that the people have so much money unexpendable that it must be taxed away from them and that compulsory savings must be inaugurated; and various plans are offered to utilize the increasing take-offs from the incomes of individuals. We hold that a line of distinction should be drawn between those who are able to pay their own grocery bills and those who for various reasons, such as old age, dependency, disability and lack of sufficient skill, and workers in educational, ministerial, and kindred types of employment are not able to earn a sufficient amount of money to provide a decent standard of living. For such as these we concede that the Government should in some degree supplement low-standard earnings with relief payments. But for the remainder of the people it seems to us only common sense that they should pay their own way through this war and not transfer their present living costs to the returning members of the armed forces. If Congress intends to subsidize living costs for those who can afford to pay, let it make cash payments to those consumers who are to benefit; and let those beneficiaries shoulder the responsibility of this stigma. Farmers do not desire such payments. They seek only fair prices.

A large percentage of America's remaining dairy farmers can and will survive the distress under which they now labor. Many will abandon dairy operations. More will curtail dairy production so as to reduce their losses to a minimum; but enforced self-protection of this character will not maintain enough production of milk and its products. The choice, therefore, lies with the people as to whether they will prefer to pay moderately increased prices for dairy products or severely curtail and in some instances do without these products until the time comes when dairy production can be revived.

We are confident that the Congress is aware of this serious economic situation. We therefore offer to the Congress the suggestion that it immediately enact legislation which will direct the responsible agencies of the Government to provide reasonable price ceilings which will at least compensate milk producers for their increasing costs of production and enable them to meet the competition of alternative opportunities in farming.

Experiment in World Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Experiment in World Freedom," published in an issue of recent date of the Chicago Times. I desire to call attention to one sentence appearing in the editorial. In that sentence reference is made to the gentleman from Arkansas, Representative FULBRIGHT, as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT was attacked because as a Rhodes scholar he had gone to Oxford to "learn to betray his country and deprive it of its independence."

I regret exceedingly that the sentence appears in the editorial. I do not agree with the matter contained in quotation marks. Representative FULBRIGHT is a patriotic and loyal American citizen, and certainly it is no disgrace to have been a Rhodes scholar.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPERIMENT IN WORLD FREEDOM

The wheezy oracles of isolation were given an ignominious brush-off by the American Legion national convention in Omaha last week. Speaking for more than a million veterans of World War No. 1—"the war to end all wars"—the Legion adopted this resolution:

"Our own national interests must ever be our first concern and we believe that our Nation can best serve and protect its national interests, commensurate with its power and responsibilities, by participation in the establishment and maintenance of an association of free and sovereign nations, implemented with whatever force may be necessary to maintain world peace and prevent a recurrence of war."

The first law of preservation for any nation is to be first concerned about its own best interests. Conscientious isolationists who felt the two oceans were our protection from attack changed their minds a few minutes after they heard about Pearl Harbor. Their sentiments are now well expressed in the Legion's endorsement of American participation in an "association" of powers that will maintain peace by the use of force if force becomes necessary. The nations in the association are to be "free" and "sovereign."

OUR EXPERIMENT IN FREEDOM

In the light of our experiences in the two world conflicts, with their great sacrifices in life and treasure, the self-interest of the United States demands freedom from war. Isolation didn't give us that freedom. Our association with other free nations may. The Legion wants to try the experiment. When we instituted our democracy we were experimenting in freedom, too. A world association probably will go through all the growing pains that our American form of government has experienced.

It is something to put on record that the politically minded die-hards among the isolationists didn't dare to pitch into the Legion the way they went after Representative FULBRIGHT. FULBRIGHT's resolution, just adopted by the House by the whopping vote of 360 "yes" to 29 "no," is closely akin to the Legion's document. They're twins in sentiment, though the Legion's words are stronger.

WHERE DID LEGION LEARN TO "BETRAY"?

Mr. FULBRIGHT was attacked because as a Rhodes scholar he had gone to Oxford to "learn to betray his country and deprive it of its independence." Do the critics of FULBRIGHT want to tell us where the Legionnaires learned to "betray" their country? The Legion's sentiments about the prevention of war come from battlefields, from hospitals where Legion buddies lie crippled and helpless and from cemeteries were Legion comrades sleep. If there is any betrayal, it's from advocates of the irrational doctrine that no matter how serious the consequences may be to present or future generations, nobody who is Republican should agree with any policy of the Roosevelt administration.

LIKE THE FIGHT AGAINST SLAVERY

Narrow, disgusting partisanship was repudiated by Republicans at their Mackinac conference. The Mackinac resolution is a parallel document to FULBRIGHT's and the Legion's. The situation resembles that of 1858. Lincoln in the Freeport debate with Douglas explained that the northern, central, and southern Illinois Republicans each had adopted resolutions against the spread of slavery. Lincoln said that they did not agree with one another in everything but they had one feeling and sentiment in common—they were all against the perpetuation of slavery. The solidarity of the antislavery people threatened the politics that Douglas typified. Said Lincoln:

"I'll tell you what he (Douglas) is afraid of. He is afraid we'll all pull together."

Today there are as many views and resolutions against the perpetuation of war as there were in Lincoln's day against the perpetuation of slavery. The important thing is the agreement on the common sentiment against the perpetuation of war as a means of settling international problems.

The isolationists want the Democrats on one side and the Republicans on the other. They're afraid we'll all pull together. To destroy the President, they would destroy the possibility of world peace.

At Freeport, Douglas ridiculed the Lincoln doctrine that "A house divided against itself cannot stand." The verdict of mankind is that Lincoln was right and Douglas was wrong. The American people believe that the Lincoln doctrine now has world-wide connotations which must be discovered. They believe there must be a formula for getting along with other free peoples so that Americans can enlarge their own freedom rather than diminish it.

The wheezy isolationist oracles, groaning against the inevitable, are playing the Douglas role. As they thrust the political ax into every plan for permanent peace, they even ape Douglas in misusing the word "sovereignty" as a smoke screen.

The New 1-Cent Piece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, after receiving a number of complaints from my constituents in Kansas about the "war pennies" which look so much like dimes when they first come from the mint, I wrote the Secretary of the Treasury asking if it would be possible to have these coins made in a different size, or that the pennies be differentiated from the dimes in some other way.

I received an answer from Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, which gave such complete and interesting information on the subject, that I ask unanimous consent to have her letter printed in the appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 9, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Topeka, Kans.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Your letter of August 3, 1943, to the Secretary of the Treasury in regard to the resemblance of the new 1-cent piece to the dime has been referred to my attention.

It is unfortunate that the color of the new coin as it comes fresh from the press does somewhat resemble that of the dime (although not more, I suggest, than the 5-cent piece resembles the quarter).

You of course, are aware of all of the conditions that induced the change of content in the piece. Copper had been completely withdrawn by the War Production Board and it was impossible to obtain from the Board a commitment guaranteeing any other material for the coinage than that which was adopted. Enough zinc for coating the coin was allotted because common steel rusts. Plastics which were considered were denied as strategic material needed for war purposes.

You will also recall, doubtless, that the act which authorized the change of content of the minor coins carried an amendment directing that "* * * in determining such physical properties, the Secretary shall take into consideration the use of such coins in coin-operated devices." Obviously, the unadaptability of an enlarged coin would have violated that mandate and the mere mention of it as a possibility would have aroused vigorous protest from manufacturers and operators of these machines all over the country.

Many persons have proposed punching a hole in the coin. That recourse also would have rendered it unfit for use in vending machines by reason of altered weight; another obstacle was that it would have required a change of design. A hole in the head of Lincoln would undoubtedly have been displeasing to the public. So urgent was the need for 1-cent pieces when the new material was adopted there was no time for developing a new design, a step which takes much more time than is generally realized and entails many mechanical problems when adopted.

You will be interested to know that the Mint has been making experimentations over a period of months to determine whether a darkening treatment could be given the coin to overcome its shiny appearance when new. (It soon turns dark with handling.) It has been found that many processes produce excellent results in the laboratory, but when tried on large-scale production are unsatisfactory.

Letters coming into the Department indicate that as the public becomes familiar with the dire need of copper for armaments and what the release has meant to the war effort, of that which was consumed in the 1-cent piece, their impatience over any inconvenience they suffer by reason of the color of the substitute is much abated.

Knowing as I do your own reasonable attitude toward matters of this kind, I feel confident that you will grasp the difficulties that have beset the Mint in producing with unsuitable and undesirable materials a coin acceptable to the public.

With assurance of my high esteem for you, I am,

Yours sincerely,

NELLIE TAYLOE ROSS,
Director of the Mint.

Gallup Poll on International Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD a report of the Gallup poll appearing in the Washington Post Sunday, September 26, on the question whether th people of America favor an international police force to maintain peace. In taking this poll, the Gallup Institute made sure that every person polled knew at least one argument for or against an international police force, and the results of the poll show 75 percent for, 17 percent against, and 8 percent undecided.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD POLICE IDEA IS GIVEN WIDE SUPPORT

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., September 25.—The House acceptance of the Fulbright resolution looking toward American world cooperation after the war accurately reflects the opinion of the American people

In all public opinion surveys on various aspects of international cooperation the institute has found substantial majorities in favor of having the United States play a more active role in world affairs after this war than she did after the last war.

The most recent test of sentiment on the subject, just completed by the institute, concerns the widely discussed question of an international police force.

Opponents of the police force proposal which is incorporated in the Ball-Burton-Hill-Hatch bill pending before the Senate, claim that the American people as a whole have not really weighed the arguments for and against a world police force.

A SPECIAL TEST

In view of this charge the Institute has conducted a special experiment to determine whether persons most familiar with the subject are for or against the world-police-force idea and how their opinion differs from the average attitude.

The survey followed the procedure of making all persons interviewed prove whether they know what is meant by the term "international police force," and whether they can cite at least some of the arguments that have been presented for and against the proposal so far.

All persons who could pass the information test and were able to name at least one argument for or against, were then asked:

"Taking into account the arguments for and those against, how do you yourself stand—are you for or against an international police force?"

The vote came out almost precisely the same as that recorded in a recent survey of the whole Nation.

The vote of the "informed" is:

	Percent
For	75
Against	17
Undecided	8

When the Institute recently polled the whole country the vote was 74 percent in favor, 14 percent opposed, and 12 percent undecided.

When the informed vote is analyzed according to Republicans and Democrats, no fundamental difference of attitude is found. Republicans favor a world police force by 73 percent, Democrats by 78 percent—indicating that for the present at least the issue is one which transcends party lines.

CHIEF ARGUMENTS

The chief argument in favor of an international police force, in the opinion of the informed group, is that it would hold down aggression or prevent wars from starting or spreading.

Other arguments advanced are that it would protect smaller countries from aggression, and that some kind of world police force is necessary to put teeth into any post-war league of nations that may be formed.

Among the chief arguments listed in opposition to a world police force, it is interesting to note that only a few people mention either loss of American sovereignty, fear that America might become embroiled unnecessarily in other people's quarrels, or fear that a police force might some day be turned against the United States.

Rather, the chief arguments center around two things—that the police force idea would be hard to administer from a practical point of view, and that it would lead to resentment on the part of the countries being policed and would therefore be likely to upset world peace rather than maintain it.

As for practical difficulties of enforcement, many voters express fear that there would be sharp differences of opinion as to when a police force should go into action. They say that if aggression breaks out, jealousies among the world powers might prevent the police force from being used, just as there was widespread controversy over the use of league sanctions before this war.

Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there has been some criticism of a statement delivered on September 2d last by Mr. James P. Mitchell, Director of the Industrial Personnel Division of the War Department. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mitchell's statement may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that it may speak for itself, and that accompanying Mr. Mitchell's statement there may be printed a very brief statement of his background.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should like to withhold consent to the request until the background referred to is read. I should like to know something about Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. HILL. I shall be very glad to read the background, as it has been furnished to me by the War Department. The following is the War Department's statement of Mr. Mitchell's background:

Mr. James P. Mitchell is the Director of the Industrial Personnel Division of the Army Service Forces. He was formerly personnel director of the Western Electric Co. at Kearney, N. J., before he came to the War Department.

Mr. Mitchell came to Washington in 1940 to help set up the training within industry program, and he has been with the War Department since December 1940. He is a very well-known industrial relationist and his services were sought among others to help establish the training within industry program.

Mr. Mitchell came to the War Department as Chief of the Labor Relations Section of the Construction Division under General Somerville. Then under the reorganization of the Army on March 9, 1942, when Services of Supply were set up, he became Director of Industrial Personnel Section. The Services of Supply Division has since been changed to the Army Service Forces.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. Of course, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whenever the Nation's manpower problem is discussed, somebody inevitably questions the size of the armed forces. The question is valid, but when it is presented as the whole manpower issue to the exclusion of all the rest somebody is befogging the issue.

The plans of the Army and Navy have never called for a total combined strength which would exceed 17 percent of the country's labor force. Complete preoccupation with 17 percent of the problem to the neglect of the remaining 83 percent is cutting off the view of the forest because of a few trees. When one considers the additional millions of persons of working age who should be in the labor force and are not, the total role of the armed forces is even smaller.

Two major steps were involved in determining the manpower objectives of the armed forces. First, the strength requirements were measured on a basis of strategic military plans. Secondly, the desired strength was carefully measured against the manpower available in the Nation and the needs for both military and civilian production. The data clearly show that the manpower available in the United States is more than sufficient to meet the needs of the armed forces, war production and essential civilian production.

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission was right when he testified before Congress 2 weeks ago that there is no over-all national manpower shortage. Here are some factors which contribute to the appearance that we do have one:

1. The American people are not yet mobilized for war. A far smaller proportion of our population of working age is either at work or in the armed forces than in any other major nation at war. A substantial reserve of idle labor, principally women, remains unused.

2. In spite of this reserve, our civilian labor force during 1943 has remained below the level reached last year. New additions to the labor force have failed to match the withdrawals for the armed forces and the Census Bureau reported that in August the civilian labor force was 1.3 million below what it had been a year ago.

3. Although a tremendous increase has taken place in war employment and the size of the armed forces, we have hardly touched the vast reserve of potential war workers in nonwar manufacturing, construction, trade and services, or in agriculture, which has increased its employment. On balance these groups have changed little and have contributed virtually nothing to the war labor force. In other words there has been virtually no net movement of workers from nonessential to war activity. The expansion in direct war activity has come almost exclusively from the unemployed and from new entrants into, or additions to, the labor force.

4. Manpower is maldistributed. While there is enough labor available to meet all requirements, there are acute shortages in some areas at the same time that great surpluses exist in others. According to the latest classifications of the War Manpower Commission, there are 59 important labor markets where "current acute labor shortages" exist while there are 91 important labor markets where "labor supply is and will continue to be adequate to meet all known labor requirements." For instance, in California where much of our vital airframe industry is concentrated, there will be a shortage of 92,500 workers even after all potential re-

serves are used; but in Texas there is a net surplus of 182,500.

These situations and other difficulties, such as turnover, cannot now be cured without a national service act. Such legislation is badly needed today. The War Department will continue to advocate a National Service Act as a basic essential tool, employed by every other major nation at war.

However, we are not under the illusion that such legislation alone will solve our difficulties. Even when such legislation is obtained, there are other fundamental responsibilities which must be discharged by employers, labor and our communities, or the problem as a whole will continue acute. We will devote ourselves here to two such major responsibilities.

LABOR UTILIZATION

In wartime it is the solemn obligation of every consumer of manpower, as well as materials, to keep his need to an absolute minimum. The Army tries to meet its own obligation by continual study of its needs and the development of techniques for conservation. Since we set our original goal, the Army has reduced its demands for military manpower by more than a half-million. This was achieved by a careful analysis of every spot where a soldier could be spared. Defensive installations in the Western Hemisphere will be reduced by approximately 2[illegible] 000 and 80,000 men will be saved by r[illegible] tions in overhead and in our replac[illegible]nt and school program.

The Army is also a large consumer of civilian manpower. In June 1943 we had 1,347,000 civilian workers in our arsenals, depots, ports of embarkation, modification centers, etc., throughout the United States. Since that time, by improvements in techniques and careful study of every job we have cut that figure by 144,000—more than 10 percent! It was not easy; it took ingenuity, and drastic revision of methods.

We are continuing to examine every possible device to save manpower, but the Army, with its combined military and civilian personnel comprising less than one-sixth of the labor force, cannot solve the entire manpower problem. The major portion of this burden necessarily falls upon you and the forces you represent—management and labor.

Management and labor have already shown that a vast amount can be done to increase productivity. It is the actual accomplishments in some establishments which we take as our guideposts to what can be achieved generally—not theoretical goals worked out on blueprints. One aircraft company, making heavy bombers, reduced the number of man-hours per bomber from 110,000 to 27,000, and is now producing four bombers with the labor previously required to make one. Numerous other examples might be given.

The changes which have taken place are of an infinite variety: Shifts in plant layout, job simplification, upgrading of workers, redesigning of machines, short cuts in transportation of materials, etc. Sometimes it was just a matter of improving morale. Moreover, in many cases conservation of manpower went hand in hand with an improvement in quality.

Many of such improvements result from better labor-management cooperation, effective labor-management committees, and suggestions from individual workers.

These accomplishments indicate the tremendous possibilities for improvement elsewhere. When one firm can reduce its labor requirements per unit by 35 percent, one naturally questions the failure of another firm to improve at all. The record is uneven, and much remains to be done.

Obviously, one of the simplest techniques available is for one firm to learn from another. Records of comparative man-hours by firms making similar products immediately reveal striking differences. The experience of the more efficient company should be made available to the others. The media for exchange of management experience should be enlarged. And you can depend on the War Department to help clear the channels for such exchanges.

The Ordnance Department has demonstrated the practicality of such technique in its Government-owned, contractor-operated establishments, where exchange of information between the more and the less efficient firms has in some instances improved the latter's efficiency by as much as 40 percent.

Many employers have told us of large increases in labor efficiency resulting from small improvements in plant facilities for workers. Making available hot meals, short rest periods, recreational facilities, and better light or ventilation, giving the worker a greater sense of participation through inviting his suggestions and keeping him informed of plant progress and change, have all been found by some plants to contribute to higher efficiency.

In concluding this item, I want to emphasize that one of our most important manpower reserves lies within our own plants. There are two ways of making manpower ends meet: One is to bring in more labor, the other is to reduce our need for labor by increasing the productivity of the labor we have. Without a national service act, we are approaching the limits of the first possibility. We must fully explore the second. A 10-percent increase in labor efficiency is equivalent to a 10-percent increase in your labor force—only it's more effective, more lasting, and under present conditions more practical—and it's a job only you can do.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND SUPPORT

In time of war at least, the number of people who will work in a particular plant (or enter the labor market at all), as well as worker efficiency and rates of turn-over and absenteeism, depend upon conditions of life outside as well as inside the plant.

The number of in-migrant workers who can be moved into a community is dependent upon the amount and type of housing available for them to live in. Workers' preferences as to plants will frequently depend upon the relative adequacy of transportation facilities. Rates of absenteeism are often related to the availability of shopping, banking and other personal-service facilities during nonworking hours. Efficiency at work, as well as absenteeism, is closely linked to the availability of recreational facilities during leisure time. And everybody now recognizes the relationship between the adequacy of child-care facilities and the number of mothers in a community who are willing to take jobs and stay at them.

These things are largely dependent upon the community—not only what facilities it has, but the adaptation of those facilities to the exigencies of war. The War Department has seen striking examples of the differences in production between a community fully backing the war and a community following its normal peacetime patterns.

The proportion of women at work in some communities exceeds the proportion in others by as much as 25 and 30 percent and the reasons are apparent. In one community a woman is proud to work in a war plant because the general atmosphere is such that she is regarded as a slacker unless she is at work. In other communities we find a hostile attitude toward the woman worker; she is accused of being greedy for war wages or neglecting her children, or it isn't socially acceptable for a woman to do factory work.

Go into Wichita, Kans., which is a war-boom community if ever you saw one—the population has doubled since 1940—and you find it is successfully meeting its production and manpower problems. One of the reasons is plain. Stores and banks are open at night, movies run midnight shows, there are dances for late-shift workers; transportation schedules have been adjusted to the convenience of war plants; ample new housing facilities have been provided. A worker does not have to take a day off to shop or to find some relaxation. He does not quit his job to go to another community because his living conditions are bad. All resources of the community have been mobilized to recruit every potential worker for miles and miles around. The press, the schools, the churches all cooperate.

In other communities where our production was failing we have generally found that these things were not being done. The community was indifferent.

In this type of community the War Department has sometimes had to remove contracts as a means of self-protection—protection to more vital contracts whose timely performance was threatened by manpower difficulties. We cannot continue to place contracts in an area where manpower problems are so acute that essential war production schedules may not be met. We do not like to remove contracts. It is difficult; it throws our schedules out of line; it causes delays; it is costly. But we are forced to when a plant or a community, or both, fail to meet their own problems.

Who is the community? You, its leaders. Business, labor, industry, the press, and radio. The leadership you exercise, the pressures you apply, the interest you show, will determine whether management and labor in a plant will work in a community environment which will interfere with your job, or one which will ease and help solve your production problems.

Seven months ago the War Manpower Commission officially advised the War Department that it would be impossible to obtain sufficient labor in Dayton, Ohio, to meet its production goals. The War Department considered the removal of some of its contracts. When word of this reached the people of Dayton they got to work in their own community to lick what was in effect an artificial shortage. Today the War Department is no longer considering the withdrawal of contracts from Dayton, and the War Manpower Commission has reclassified it from group I to group II. The Dayton story is a valuable practical example of how community action can help industry and labor solve production problems.

As the war continues, manpower stringencies will get tougher. The war industries of the country and the armed forces require several million more persons before leveling off. The three chief sources of manpower remaining are (1) idle persons, chiefly women, who are not in the labor force; (2) persons engaged in nonessential activities; and (3) the more efficient employment of those already in our plants. National service legislation is essential for the mobilization needed for earliest possible victory. But the tasks outlined here—maximum utilization of labor and vigorous community action—are equally significant, and these depend on us.

Our Duty Is To Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in a newspaper in my district while I was on the coast, and it impressed me as one that is very opportune at this time:

OUR DUTY IS TO SERVE

Twenty years of suppression of the rights, freedoms, liberties, of free speech and free

press in Italy, as introduced by the Fascists and enforced by their now deposed leader, Benito Mussolini, is reaping its reward, a reward that swept them into oblivion politically, and will eventually end in the trial of the bandits and for some of them the death sentence False doctrines enforced upon peace-loving Italians, and equally false leaders who attempted to chain the rank and file of the people could not last and could only have one end—repudiation. Today Italy is all but on the verge of ruin, its world empire gone, allies who are in reality enemies, like Germany, desperately trying to absorb what is left, and the powerful forces of the United Nations standing ready to administer a knock-out blow

Italy never was strong, but it was made weaker by a bombastic, swaggering, strutting, clanking, gold-braided political upstart in Mussolini, who was willing to stoop to the tactics of an assassin He betrayed his country by taking up the cause of Adolf Hitler after his defiance of the League of Nations in his brutal invasion of north Africa in carrying out his attempted theft of Ethiopia He could have and would have been stopped then had it not been for the weak-kneed attitude of League members. Had he there might not have been a Second World War But having gone so far another murder could not hurt his conscience, so he buried the dagger to the hilt into the back of France when it was staggering from the blows of Germany.

False prophets there will probably ever be. But in the fate of Italy, which permitted the nullification of all rights and freedoms won with sacrifice over centuries, only to be swept away by skilful reformers, there is a significant moral that other countries in this world are not likely to ignore nor forget. Dictators—those who seek to center all power within themselves—must suppress the freedom of the rank and file of the people if they are to survive. And when the people in unconsciousness or through unconcern, permit their liberties to be taken from them, they pave the way for their own destruction. It is their duty to the country they love and to themselves to be ever watchful and zealous of those freedoms.

Outright Lying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZEBULON WEAVER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday September 30, 1943

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein an editorial which appeared in the Asheville Citizen-Times, Asheville, N. C., under date of September 19, 1943.

The editorial is as follows:

OUTRIGHT LYING

Perhaps the most demagogic and the most dishonest argument of current circulation is being used by the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in their campaign for the elimination of the poll-tax requirement for voting in Federal elections.

Here is one relatively tame example of this half-lie, half-truth reasoning as indulged in by the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax:

"The poll tax locks the ballot away from 10,000,000 white and Negro citizens in eight Southern States. In 1942 an average of only 3 percent of the population in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia voted. The poll tax prevented the others from voting. The average in the non-poll-tax States was 25 percent."

This argument is cunningly, even fraudulently, designed to foster two conclusions:

1. There are 10,000,000 citizens of these eight Southern States who are disbarred from voting by the operations of the poll-tax requirement. (The Southern Conference for Human Welfare which is just an echo of the national committee blurts out as much: "When we abolish the poll tax, we release 10,000,000 more votes for democracy.")

2. The poll-tax requirement solely explains why only 3 percent of the residents of these Southern States—against an average of 25 percent in the other 40 States—voted in the 1942 congressional elections.

Neither of these conclusions is correct. They possess only a minimum of truth to make them plausible to the ignorant and the unwary and a maximum of falsity to make them positively contemptible.

It is true that in these 8 Southern States there are, according to the 1940 census, 13,500,000 citizens of voting age. It is also true that in the 1940 Presidential election these States cast only slightly more than 3,000,000 votes. The difference between these two totals is, of course, approximately 10,500,000.

But there is no warrant in fact, however, for the assumption, cleverly and even dishonestly conveyed, that all of these 10,500,000 nonvoters were prevented by the poll-tax requirement from voting. If that conclusion be correct, then how do you account for the fact that 27,000,000 citizens of voting age in the 40 nonpoll-tax States failed to participate in the 1940 election?

The poll-tax requirement does have the effect of disfranchising many citizens who are unwilling or unable to pay the tax. That fact must be admitted by friend and foe of the voting stipulation. But it only partly explains why 10,000,000 citizens of the 8 Southern States did not vote in the 1940 election. There are other factors—some of those same factors which account for the failure of 27,000,000 voting-age citizens of 40 non-poll-tax States to discharge the first duty of good citizenship. Something should be pardoned to civic apathy in the South when so much must be pardoned to civic slothfulness in other sections of the Nation.

Only less important than the poll tax requirement as a bar to more general voting in the South is the absence of a virile opposition party. Citizens, North or South, are not apt to rush to the polls to vote when the outcome of the election is a foregone conclusion. The National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax declares that only 829,088 votes were cast in the 1942 congressional elections in the eight poll-tax States. In the Presidential election of 1940, these same States cast over 3,000,000 votes. The poll tax had little or nothing to do with the appalling shrinkage. The explanation is to be found in the fact that the Democratic candidates for Congress had little, or no opposition, in 1942 general election. The vote in North Carolina—which happily is a non-poll-tax State—dropped 55 per cent from 1940 to 1942 despite the very determined opposition which the Republicans offered in two or three districts.

Are the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare advocating the establishment of a strong opposition party in the South? Certainly the Southern Conference has no such interest for it has openly derided the very intimation that the South might find some virtue and some praise in Republicanism.

The National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax indulges in indefensible demagogy—to use a mild phrase—by singling out certain Southern Congressmen and Senators from the eight States and arguing by inference that the poll tax requirement is solely responsible for their presence in Congress.

If the poll-tax requirement is responsible for the fact that Congressmen DIES of Texas and SMITH of Virginia are in Congress, then by the same reasoning the absence of a poll-tax requirement must be responsible for the equally significant fact that non-poll-tax States are represented in Congress by such worthies as Congressmen HAMILTON FISH, CLARE HOFFMAN, and VITO MARCANTONIO, and Senators WHEELER and NYE.

The National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax pushes its irresponsibility to shocking lengths when it declares: "There are 79 poll-tax Representatives and 16 poll-tax Senators in the United States Congress. They control by chairmanship 17 of the 47 standing committees of the House, 11 of the 33 of the Senate. The poll tax perpetuates them in office. They grow in power as seniority rights give them control of more and more committees every year. Their bloc of votes in Congress, combined with the opposition, is used at every opportunity to defeat the administration's progressive and win-the-war policies and measures. On the floor of Congress they defend lynching, anti-Negro discrimination, and anti-Semitism. They are the fountainhead of legislation against aliens, against labor, against war production, and for inflation."

This argument is not only dishonest, it is despicable. It undertakes through the slimiest insinuations to create the impression that every Member of Congress from eight Southern States defends lynching, anti-Negro discrimination and anti-Semitism, votes against the win-the-war policies and measures of the administration, opposes war production, and favors inflation.

The National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax draws any prestige to which it may pretend from the distinguished men and women who have loaned their names to it as sponsors. Among these sponsors are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, William Allen White, Father John A. Ryan, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Bishop Paul Kern—to mention only a few of an impressive list.

Unless and until these sponsors emphatically repudiate such arguments, they can not evade all responsibility for them. Woodrow Wilson laid down the fundamental proposition that corporation directors should be held accountable for the malpractices of their corporations. That same standard of morality should be applied to sponsors. Distinguished citizens who are disposed to lend their names as collateral to organizations might do well to repair to their dictionaries and to ponder the definition of "sponsor."

Foes of the poll-tax requirement for voting have many fair and honest arguments to support their position. Their case is not so fatally defective that it must be bolstered with foul insinuations, loathsome charges, and fraudulent conclusions. No one ever serves the cause of democracy by seeking to win votes for a democratic reform with arguments that appeal to mischievous prejudices, draw false conclusions, and libel individuals. Religious leaders do not advance the cause of religion by lending their reputations as credentials for falsehood. Educators do not aid in the search for truth when they permit their names to become associated with mendacious propaganda calculated to obscure the truth.

Resolution To Welcome the People of Italy to the Family of Liberated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, wars are not won entirely by bullets and cold steel. Strange as it may seem, wars may be won, or, to put it more correctly, wars may be partially won, by kindness.

That is the reason why I say that we are not using all of our resources in waging this war. We are shooting at the Axis governments with only one barrel when we should be using both. While we continue to carry on our military operations unceasingly we should be doing more by good-will efforts to create a split between the peoples of the Axis-dominated countries and their tyrannical governments, and that is where we should bring into use the other barrel—the barrel of friendship and kindness—the Good Neighbor barrel.

While we are pouring lead into the armies and munition plants of the enemy, let us give the people of the home fronts in the Axis-ridden countries some intimation of the kindness we truly feel for them, as differentiated from their unconscionable rulers. We can do this in a spirit of the utmost sincerity, as our quarrel is not with the genuine folks of the enemy countries but with their totalitarian masters, who grind and enslave them.

No one is more anxious to see the United Nations win this war quickly and completely than I am. I would give my right arm if the boys could be homebound by Christmas, bearing the palm of victory. And I believe that the responsibility of this country of ours will not stop at the war's edge. For that reason I voted for the Fulbright resolution. We are up to the eyebrows in the world war and we cannot escape our responsibility to participate in the postwar reconstruction.

The point I am trying to make is that I sincerely believe we can win the war about twice as quickly if we will show to the peoples of the enemy countries—and prove to them—that we stand for a better world after all of this agony is over; that we stand for peace and law and order and for self-determination and free enterprise and for keeping the lanes of opportunity open to enable human beings everywhere to order their own lives. Let us give Hitler and Tojo unstinted hell, but while we are doing so let us be kind to the innocent peoples who are their victims and we will win this war much sooner than otherwise. When the enemy peoples really understand the purposes of the United Nations in respect to making a better world the home fronts in Germany and Japan will crack and that will be the beginning of the end of Hitler and Tojo.

Our purpose in this gigantic world conflict is not tinctured with the slightest scintilla of selfishness. We are putting into the struggle vast treasures of men and money for the one and only purpose of helping to make a better world. Words cannot describe the priceless stake we are investing, and now let us arise to the heights in spreading the gospel of kindness among the real people of the earth in order to create an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding which is necessary to make the future of the world secure. For the reasons stated, I have believed, and I still believe, that the United States should take the lead in the formulation of a statement of United Nations peace aims which would give all of the victims of totalitarianism a clear conception of the better world which we hope for, and that this statement should be broadcast to the world and dropped by millions over enemy and enemy-dominated countries.

In harmony with the philosophy above expressed and in order that the people of the United States may be brought into closer friendly relations with millions of human beings who have suffered under the totalitarian yoke, I have introduced in the House a concurrent resolution which reads as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 42

Concurrent resolution to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations

Whereas a recent broadcast unintentionally and unfortunately placed the United States in a false light before the people of Italy; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States, democratically elected by the people, is in a position to convey to the people of Italy, the victims of Fascist rule, and to down-trodden, oppressed peoples everywhere, our Nation's sympathy and friendship for them and our purpose to help them: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people who elected it, welcomes the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. We congratulate them on the overthrow of the horrors and slavery of fascism. We sympathize with them in the struggle that is before them in reclaiming their country from the Nazi invader and in reconstructing their nation and we want to help them. In the cosmic evolution that is going on the might of America is pledged to support by all reasonable and constitutional means the freedom, peace, and security of all right-thinking and right-doing men. We hail the overthrow of fascism in Italy as the dawn of freedom for all of the Axis-ridden countries and as pointing the way to the final consummation of a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

The adoption of this resolution by both Houses of Congress would be more than a mere gesture. It would be a meaningful expression of the good neighbor feeling that is enshrined in the hearts of all Americans. Its effect on the public opinion of the Axis nations could not be otherwise than helpful. It would correct the mistake that unfortunately was made by the "moronic old king" broadcast.

This resolution is an appropriate corollary of the Fulbright resolution, which the entire Nation applauded. It was most encouraging to the people of America to find when the Fulbright resolution was under consideration that Congress has an awareness of its responsibility in respect to international relations. The adoption of the resolution I propose would meet with the same popular acclaim that greeted the Fulbright resolution. The people expect their Congress to assert its responsibility in international affairs.

I hope the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will give early and thoughtful consideration to my resolution and that they may see their way clear to send it to the floor of the House with a unanimously favorable report.

Why Shouldn't the Price of Crude Oil Be Fixed At a Parity With Other Commodities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter which I have received from N. V. Duncan, of Fairfield, Ill. Mr. Duncan is a man of broad business experience and for the past few years has been a successful independent oil operator. He has drilled many wildcat wells and knows the problems of the independent oil operators. His letter is as follows:

FAIRFIELD, ILL., *September 25, 1943.*

Hon. J. V. HEIDINGER,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was very glad to note that you introduced the bill known as H. R. 3203 which would provide for an increase in the price of crude oil. This oil production is so vital to the war needs that nothing should be left undone to insure ample supply.

The facts and figures compiled by the most reliable authorities clearly prove that the reserves and supplies of crude oil are dangerously diminishing, due to the fact that the market price does not justify sufficient investment to correct this situation, and the only remedy for it is to immediately raise the price of crude oil to a level that will get investment capital again interested in wildcatting and developing, and I hope that your bill will receive immediate and favorable consideration.

Yours very truly,

N. V. DUNCAN.

Free Enterprise Must Prevail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 14, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern in this country that

there are some in high places in this Government who would, if they had the power, change our form of government from our present system of free enterprise, which has made our national economy the highest in all the world, to a socialistic or communistic form of government.

Some people even contend that our President holds such views, but in none of his spoken or written statements have I ever found the slightest indication of any such ideas. I do not believe that President Franklin D. Roosevelt has ever held such views, or would under any circumstances tolerate or permit any such views to prevail, if within his power to prevent their adoption. I consider President Roosevelt a real friend of small business and our system of free enterprise.

Let me warn any person or group who hold such thoughts or aims or desires that neither this nor any subsequent Congress is going to allow them to put over their pet destructive theories as against the tried and true policies on which this Government has been built.

Our country was founded on freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of opportunity and enterprise, and freedom of fear. Under this system we have grown to be the richest Nation in the world, in many ways the strongest, with the highest living standards. The United States with 6 percent of the world's population has 30 percent of the wealth of the world by reason of our fine system of free enterprise.

Most large business firms in the United States were at one time small businesses, and in nearly every case they have grown through the industry and foresight of plain, ordinary American men. Many of these men were born and reared on our American farms.

A TYPICAL ILLUSTRATION

As an illustration, I want to cite the case of a firm in my home State of Texas, which just recently celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary—the Duncan Coffee Co. of Houston. This business was founded by its president, Herschel M. Duncan. He came to Houston at the age of 19, directly from his father's farm at Fountain Run, Ky. Mr. Duncan's first job was in the plant of a coffee roaster in Houston.

Eleven years later, through his grasp of that business, he was able to start his own company on an extremely small scale. He was joined by Lester Bland, the present secretary and treasurer of the company. Their common practice was to put in 16 hours a day building it up. I have been informed the first day's sales of this new firm was $2.62, and the second day $5.63.

Through the ingenuity of these two young men and of Mr. Duncan's brother, Charles, who joined them 3 years after the business was started, the Duncan Coffee Co. has grown to be one of the largest independent coffee roasters in America. This growth did not just happen. These men and their employees worked for it.

To make their business the largest of its kind in all Texas, they, of course, had to establish a reputation for making fine products but, just as important, they had to establish a reputation for fair dealing and civic consciousness that is best disclosed through this letter by the Governor of Texas to Mr. Herschel M. Duncan on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Duncan Coffee Co.:

HAS CIVIC CONSCIOUSNESS

STATE OF TEXAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Austin, Tex., August 10, 1943.

Mr. HERSCHEL M. DUNCAN,
President, Duncan Coffee Co.,
Houston, Tex.

DEAR HERSCHEL: May I take this occasion to congratulate you on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Duncan Coffee Co.

Your business is typical of free, independent American enterprise that has made our American economy the highest in all the world, and it is American management such as yours, together with your employees, that has enabled our country to "go over the top" on every war loan offered by our Government.

Your action each year for more than 20 years of annually sharing the profits of your company, by your yearly practice of paying each salaried employee 10 percent of their annual pay as a Christmas bonus, is well known in Texas, and surely indicates that American business has a heart.

Your action, at the height of the depression in 1933, of discarding automatic machinery in order to put additional men and women to work received wide commendation throughout the Southwest, and was a further indication of the civic consciousness of American business.

I sincerely wish you, your associates, and your employees many more years of happiness and prosperity.

Sincerely yours,

COKE STEVENSON,
Governor.

The progress of the Duncan Coffee Co. is typical of thousands of localized, independent business institutions in every line of activity which have been developed from a small beginning to grow gradually until they become substantial additions to the commercial well-being of this country.

Many others were pioneers in their respective lines of endeavor by taking their chances with the growth and progress of the United States. In many cases they have been under the management of several generations of the same family. As these companies progressed, they likewise contributed to the growth and progress of concerns in other lines of business, on the basis that one feeds another. It is this cooperation that has made this country the commercial and productive giant that it is.

This enterprise should not be interfered with by any new-fangled ideas intended to revolutionize concerns like the Duncan Coffee Co. Such companies are an asset that should be scrupulously protected against any attempts to destroy a system which has earned, by years of effort, a rightful place in the business sun.

WANT TO LEAVE GOOD NAME

Enterprises of the type of the Duncan Coffee Co. will never consent to a socialistic or communistic form of government. It is upon such companies we must depend to ward off any attempts to substitute some ism that is untried for one that has been given the acid test over many decades.

Mr. Speaker, today just as was the case 50 or 100 years ago, the businessmen of America are not only concerned with leaving an estate to their children. To them leaving a good name is just as, or more, important. This is something that some of our advocates of radical business changes apparently do not know or have not taken the trouble to learn.

A great many years ago Abraham Lincoln said:

> It is a struggle for maintaining in the world that form and substance of government, whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men, to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all; to afford all an unfettered start.

As long as we maintain free enterprise in America, steering clear of monopoly, we shall afford all an unfettered start toward progress.

We must continue to improve, safeguard, and protect free enterprise, neither controlled nor operated by the Government.

The Plight of the Pacific Northwest Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the dairy industry in the Puget Sound area of the State of Washington is poignantly acute. The dairymen in that region have solicited the aid of the Washington State congressional delegation to the end that its influence be employed in an effort to secure relief for the dairymen of the Seattle-Tacoma milksheds and for the State of Washington as a whole.

In the spring of 1943 the dairymen realized it would be necessary to get price increases this fall. In pursuance of that need the Seattle Milk Producers' Association, in cooperation with other dairy organizations, the Washington State Grange, and the Washington State branches of the American Farm Bureau Federation, requested Washington State College to make a survey on the cost of producing milk in the State of Washington. The dairymen felt that the men identified with the Washington State College were best qualified to make a fair and unbiased survey, being disinterested and objective, and capable of making a dispassionate appraisal of the situation.

The preliminary analysis was completed the first part of August 1943. This

was submitted to the O. P. A., accompanied by a request of the dairymen for an increase in price. Attached hereinbelow, and by this reference made a part hereof, is a copy of this petition directed to the Office of Price Administration on behalf of the dairymen of the Seattle-Tacoma milkshed. The O. P. A. thereupon set out to check these figures with their own accountants. The dairymen gave them all the assistance and cooperation possible. The O. P. A. sent its recommendation to the regional O. P. A. office at San Francisco early this month.

The Seattle O. P. A. office informed the dairymen that the Office of Economic Stabilization, effective September 1, 1943, ordered the O. P. A. to make no adjustment in price to either the producers or consumers until some national plan could be worked out. Hence, the dairymen now find themselves in the grave position of having prices frozen on a much lower level than dairy prices obtaining in California, although the same ceiling prices are placed on alfalfa hay in California as in Washington.

This situation cries out to high heaven for immediate remedy. There is no logic or reason in permitting this injustice to continue without change. The dairymen are all opposed to subsidies. They feel that the method of subsidy is not the proper procedure to employ in ameliorating the conditions under which they must work. The dairymen insist that consumers have the greatest income in history and are spending the lowest percentage of their income for food. The people are faced with the very serious situation of having to secure more milk from the sources that normally go into manufactured products. These manufactured products are earmarked for lend-lease and for the military forces. This may best be illustrated when I point out that milk for Seattle consumption required the purchase, in September, 2 years ago, of 13,431 pounds per day from outside sources, as contrasted with 55,052 pounds of milk per day purchased outside the Seattle milkshed area 1 year ago, and 115,855 pounds of milk per day purchased outside the Seattle milkshed area this month. This is 9 times as much outside milk as was purchased 2 years ago.

The enormously increased demand for milk was brought about because of the presence of more people with more money and by the drying up of the milk supply in King and Snohomish Counties of the State of Washington, representing a drop in such milk production of 15 percent of what it was 1 year ago.

Dairy farmers are very much discouraged by the attitude of the United States Government. Dairymen feel that of all people they have been hit the hardest by governmental policies. Consumers in the Puget Sound area are still paying the same price as they did in December 1941, but dairymen are paying twice as much for feed and labor. Demand for labor in that area is possibly the greatest of any place in the whole United States. The increase in population means that these additional residents want milk and other dairy products. The dairymen are anxious to produce it if the Government would give them the least bit of encouragement. Dairymen look to Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, as the only hope left.

To me it is all too apparent that a reasonable price increase in butterfat and milk products should be granted at once by the O. P. A., pending subsequent adjustments. The dairymen have a real cause, as is shown by the attached petition, which is a copy of a letter sent by the Seattle Milk Producers' Association to the O. P. A. and which incorporate the essential arguments and data explanatory of the whole situation.

SEATTLE MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
Seattle 99, Wash., August 13, 1943.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Seattle, Wash.

GENTLEMEN: We are submitting this supplemental petition specifically for a price increase for the producers of milk for the Seattle fluid-milk market. This request has been delayed until the survey conducted by the extension service and experiment station of the Washington State College was completed. A copy of this survey is in your hands under the general request for price increase to dairy farmers. We believe that this survey has been especially well conducted and analyzed.

Let us point out that the dairymen adjacent to Seattle show as efficient and economical a production as the dairymen for the State average. Table 2 in the college report shows that fluid milk for bottling cost 80.2 cents per pound butterfat (1942) or 6.1 cents per pound butterfat more to produce than milk for manufacturing for the State as a whole. We have figured the cost of fluid milk in table 2 to comply with our local conditions for increased labor and feed costs. A copy of this is attached hereto as exhibit 1. This shows a cost of $1.083 per pound butterfat for city milk at farm. At present the maximum price allowed our organization to pay producers is 87 cents per pound butterfat f. o. b. Seattle. The average hauling cost from the farm direct to the city plants is 5.16 cents per pound fat. This would leave an average net price at the farm of 81.84 cents, or the difference between the price received now and the adjusted cost of milk in table 2 (108.3 cents) of 26.46 cents per pound butterfat. Figuring that the average test of the milk coming into Seattle is 3.8, this figures approximately $1 per hundredweight of milk. We are, therefore, asking that the producers' price to the dairies be advanced $1 per hundred pounds of milk. This is in addition to the 90 cents per pound butterfat now charged for a day-to-day service on class I milk.

This is an urgent request, requiring prompt action. We have possibly delayed too long in trying to get a clear picture of what the supply and prices of both feed and labor were going to be this fall and winter. We should know not later than August 20 that this price request will or will not be approved by the Office of Price Administration to be effective September 1. Dairymen and feed dealers are now making arrangements for their winter feed, both hay and grain, while the harvest is on in eastern Washington. Hay is now being baled, and grain is being threshed. Storage space, man-hours, and dollars can be saved by shipping direct from the fields to this territory. If there is no prospect in sight for a price to pay the increased production costs, many dairymen will not bother to arrange for their winter feeds as they will reduce their herds or sell them. Between now and September 1 most dairymen will decide their course for the coming year.

The figures submitted in the college report show that dairymen's costs have advanced sharply during the past year. At best, Seattle will experience many difficulties in securing a milk supply for this winter. If production and sales follow the normal course from now until November, Seattle will be short 100,000 pounds of milk per day of city-inspected milk by November. Let us point out that the O. P. A. has set the same ceiling price on hay for Washington, Oregon, and California, and approximately the same prices for concentrates. We also note that O. P. A. has just advanced the ceiling price on soybean cake and meal to $11.50 per ton, $10 a ton on cottonseed meal, and $2 a ton for linseed-oil meal. According to the latest Government reports, farm labor is higher in Washington than in any other State in the Union. Feed prices in California and Washington are practically the same. Hay costs less in Los Angeles than it does in Seattle. (See attached feed-cost table, exhibit 2.)

We are sure that these comparisons justify a price advance. In addition, let us point out that the average price for home-delivered milk in the 25 leading milk markets in the United States is 14.84 cents per quart while Seattle's price is only 14 cents for 4-percent milk. The price of 14.84 cents per quart in the 25 cities averages less than 4-percent butterfat. (See exhibit 3.)

Indications are that the demand for labor in Seattle's territory is increasing faster than any other city of the same size on the Pacific coast. The following figures indicate the recent trend. Column inches of help wanted advertisements in—

	July 4, 1943	Percent	Aug. 1, 1943
	Inches		*Inches*
Seattle Sunday Times	301	20+	371
Portland Oregonian	482	26−	355
San Francisco Chronicle	386	10−	346
	Aug. 9, 1942	Percent	Aug. 8, 1943
	Inches		*Inches*
Seattle Times	139	------	470

NOTE.—Reported by the Seattle Public Library.

This does not include special ads.

You will note that Seattle is increasing in column inches while Portland and San Francisco show a decline in the last month.

At least 90 percent of the men, women, and children working on farms producing milk for Seattle are within easy riding distance to war plants. Please consider that the hourly wage rates figured in our figures in the cost of producing milk are 50 cents an hour for family labor and 75 cents per hour for the operator and hired help. The facts are that farmers are paying $1 per hour and dinner for harvest hands. Practically no industrial plants pay less than $1 per hour for experienced help.

The Government in its war food production program has recognized the part price plays in getting essential foods produced. Under the program, it has increased prices to get these foods produced. This year the minimum prices set by the Government on peas was $17.50 per ton more than last year, and the floor price for potatoes was $45 per ton. These and other cash crops are competing for dairy lands. With the removal of the Japanese, the growing of vegetables has grown more profitable, due to the public's being willing to purchase vegetables with no ceiling at a price that

will pay the operator more profitable rates than dairying. This was verified at three meetings held at Auburn, Duvall, and Snohomish on June 1, 3, and 4, 1943. The farmers were asked how many farms they knew of that were used for dairying last year and were not being used for dairying this year. There was a total of 29 farms reported, with 2,263 acres that supported 981 cows last year. This acreage is now in cash crops or supporting beef cattle.

Hay crops in the Seattle milkshed are about 10 percent short of last year so that much more hay will have to be purchased and used at a price that is 60 percent above last year.

A suggestion has been made that other milk supplies in factory sections could be drawn on. Let us point out that any milk brought from these sections means less butter, cheese, canned milk, and powdered milk to be manufactured for the armed forces and Lend-Lease. It will not add to the total production of dairy products. In addition, there are a lot of difficulties presented in this. First, let us point out, that the manufacturing plants do not find it profitable to divert any of their milk to Seattle at the full price of 90 cents per pound fat. Second, the O. P. A. in the amendment M 13 to MPR 329 prohibits, without the approval of the regional officer, the paying of a higher price than was paid these particular shippers in January 1943.

With the price to the city shippers in these territories frozen and the manufacturing price not frozen, the premium for city milk is not enough to justify the producers changing over to produce city milk under the city health requirements. In addition, there is the physical difficulty in getting new tanks and receiving equipment for cooling to transport this milk to Seattle. There has been a big change in the State during the past year in this direction already. These figures show the change and are taken from the report of Mr. R. S. Waltz to the board of directors of the United Dairymen's Association at the meeting of June 16, 1943. This is a comparison of the 7 months' sales from November 1, 1941, to May 31, 1942, and the same period from November 1, 1942, to May 31, 1943. This showed a drop in evaporated milk of 46 percent, 1943 from 1942. Butterfat in raw milk for bottling increased 42 percent. Butterfat and sweet cream dropped 16 percent, butter dropped 10 percent, and cheese dropped 41 percent. This covers 50 percent of the State's production. This change-over from manufacturing to city milk has already reached a dangerous point. It seems more advisable to keep the production up in the regular fluid milk territories close to the fluid milk markets.

There is another factor that is a vital one. That is the attitude of the dairymen themselves. Most of them have reached the stage where, if the Government continues to hold down dairy prices, they are ready to change over to projects and crops, in which their land and their labor, including their family labor, will give them greater dollar returns. Some of them have already done this. With the difficulties of securing feed and labor facing them, dairymen are possibly not as much concerned as the public would be if the public understood the real picture. This is readily understandable when both their land and labor can be used to give them many more dollars than dairying will at the present prices.

In justice to the citizens of the city of Seattle and the dairymen, we feel that the price asked would insure the public of milk and allow the dairymen to continue to operate. We feel that the public is willing to pay whatever increased price is necessary to maintain a supply of bottled milk. Bank deposits have increased from November 30, 1941, to June 30, 1943, approximately 67 percent; from $572,305,230 to $955,380,828. Milk to the consumer is still the same price as on November 30, 1941.

We therefore ask your prompt action on this and trust that we will receive the same.

Very truly yours,

SEATTLE MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT COWAN,
Secretary-Manager.

EXHIBIT 2.—*Feed prices*

	Seattle		Auburn, August 1943	Hynes, Calif., Aug. 6, 1943
	August 1942	Aug. 11, 1943		
Ground oats	$40	$60	$57.00	
Ground barley	34	55	54.00	$59.00
Soybean	50	65	[1] 66.00	
Linseed oil				52.00
Dairy feed		60	60.00	54.50
Alfalfa:				
No. 1	26	37	37.00	33.50
No. 2 leafy	26	36	26.00	31.00
No. 2			24.50	

[1] Linseed-oil meals and soybean milk are practically unavailable. The same is true of mill run. The dairy feeds this year are 15 to 17½ percent of protein against 18 to 20 percent last year.

EXHIBIT 3.—*House-delivered prices and butterfat test*

[From United Dairymen's Association Fluid Milk Prices in City Markets for July 1943]

Market	Buying prices per hundredweight 3.5 percent	Home delivery	Prevailing test of milk sold
Los Angeles	2.71	14½	3.5
Sacramento	Not listed	15	3.
San Diego	3.95½	16-17	4.2
Chicago	Not determined	16½	(1)
New York City	3.99½ to 4.21½	17	3.5-3.7
St. Louis	Not determined	15½	3.6-3.7
Seattle	3.15	14	4.

Not listed.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Costs incurred in producing milk on Washington farms according to the type of market outlet used,* ——— *1942*

Type of market	Number of records	Average size of herd	Average fat per cow	Average cost per cow																		Cost per pound fat	Received per pound fat
				Building cost	Equipment cost	Feed for cows						Hired	Family	Operator	Total	Sire costs	Young stock costs	Miscellaneous costs	Total, all cost	Deductible costs	Net cost of milk		
						Hay	Succ. rough	Conc.	Pasture	Other	Total												
		Cows	Lb.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.
1. Fluid	102	30	320	18.00	6.69	51.74	10.12	43.83	16.36	1.46	123.51	25.80	13.06	34.59	73.45	3.59	27.06	33.13	280.82	24.20	256	0.202	0.693
2. Mfg	53	20	283	17.41	5.32	37.54	8.89	37.09	17.47	.91	101.90	17.94	8.85	42.39	69.18	3.79	19.44	23.01	241.00	31.68	209	.741	.576
3. Sweet cream	2	19	308	10.79	5.26	40.79	------	62.10	20.26	1.58	124.73	2.90	11.84	43.42	58.16	6.32	7.37	12.90	223.68	21.05	203	.658	.590
4. Sour cream	8	15	239	8.00	3.33	52.25	7.75	25.83	11.92	.67	98.42	22.50	5.00	38.74	66.24	1.92	15.00	15.08	201.67	21.67	180	.753	.486
Fluid milk only, No. 1 above (average price of units used)						18.74	[1] 5.19	40.96	------	------	------	.44	.25	.50	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Number of units per cow (from table 3, fluid milk)						2.76	1.95	1.07	------	------	------	58.4	52.2	69.2	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Current prices and values per unit						$30.00	$10.00	$59.00	------	------	------	$75.00	$50.00	$75.00	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------
Cost at current prices						$82.80	$19.50	$63.13	$16.36	$1.46	$183.25	$43.80	$26.12	$51.90	$121.82	$3.59	$41.88	$33.13	$384.56	$37.77	$346.79	$1.083	$0.8163
Percent of increase						------	------	------	------	------	48.3	------	------	------	65.8	------	54.8	------	------	------	------	------	------

[1] In computing the price received per pound fat no credit was allowed for the value of the skim milk retained on the farms of sweet and sour cream producers. Under present price levels for milk solids not fat a credit of from 9 to 10 cents per pound fat seems justified for this item.

Fuel Oil for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from the officers of the Farmers Union of Peake, Local No. 1541, at Pleasanton, Nebr. This letter indicates that the farmers of Nebraska are having difficulty in getting fuel oil to keep their tractors operating. It is generally understood that many small refineries are forced to close because under Government regulations they are not permitted to operate to their full capacity. It further demonstrates the necessity of getting the price of crude oil raised to that point which will encourage the drilling of new oil wells and which at the same time will permit the pumper wells to operate at a reasonable profit.

If the farmers are unable to get fuel oil to run their tractors there will certainly be a serious shortage of food in 1944. It is estimated that the United States lacks about 50,000,000 acres of having enough harvested acreage to produce sufficient food to maintain the American standard of living. We cannot expect to supply food for lend-lease and foreign countries with the shortage of food on our own American tables.

The primary question of 1944 is going to be the production of enough food to sustain the people of the United States. I have every confidence in the ability of the American farmers to produce the needed foods if they are assured a reasonable profit, sufficient machinery, farm repairs, and an opportunity to plan their production without governmental interference.

For the farmers of the Midwest to produce food they must have tractor fuel. I urge upon the Members of Congress to recognize the problems set forth in the letter from this farmers' union in Nebraska. This should be of particular interest to the people in the consuming East if they are to have food sufficient for their needs in 1944.

PEAKE LOCAL NO. 1541,
Pleasanton, Nebr., September 27, 1943.

Congressman A. L. MILLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: The Farmers Union members of Peake Local No. 1541, of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of Nebraska, in their regular September meeting were discussing the tractor fuel situation, as we have had some difficulty in getting fuel to keep our tractors going.

Our National Cooperative Refinery Association at McPherson, Kans., is only able to operate at about 60 percent of capacity due to Government regulations. It's hard for us to understand why we are not allowed to operate at 100 percent. Is there a shortage of crude oil? If so, why have the Washington authorities been cutting the production of crude oil? Why isn't some inducement made for the discovery of new supplies or the price of crude oil raised?

We maintain that farming is an essential war industry. Probably the biggest war industry. The farms are stripped of young men The middle aged, the old, the infirm, and the women are left to produce the food for a mighty and ever-expanding Army and Navy. The people left on the farms must have tractors if food is to be raised in sufficient quantities. Tractors require fuel, and this fuel is just as important as fuel for fighting tanks and planes.

We ask you as our Washington representative to do what you can toward correcting this situation and avoid a serious food shortage here in the United States.

Sincerely yours,

VERN DOROTHY,
President.
MRS. ALBERT KROTZ,
Secretary.

The Book, Christian Bases of World Order, by Vice President Wallace—Review by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of the book, Christian Bases of World Order, containing notable and outstanding addresses by our distinguished Vice President. The review was written by me and appears at page 619 in the autumn number of the magazine Religion in Life.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRISTIAN BASES OF WORLD ORDER

(By HENRY A. WALLACE, Francis J. McConnell, et al.)

The Merrick lectures for 1943 of Ohio Wesleyan University point the way to the good earth which good men everywhere want after the war. Vice President WALLACE, whose spiritual insight is a distinctive characteristic of his wisdom, in the first lecture, Practical Religion in the World of Tomorrow, strikes the note and tone of the whole series.

The other 11 lecturers—a church leader, the president of a theological seminary, a professor of philosophy, a college president, a religious worker, a professor of economics, an intelligence officer in the Planning Division of the Office of War Information, a research director, a professor of public health in the Yale Medical School, the chairman of the governing body of the International Labor Office, a professor of eduction with peculiar understanding—discuss fundamental Christian principles as related to the individual and a social order and such factors as race economic freedom, the land, politics, health, justice for workers, and human character, in a world order.

The 12 lectures taken together show the conception of Christianity in its essential nature and character, and then the application of those concepts to the conduct of men and nations of men. The fortunate reader readily follows through the series the thread of the Christian ethic. It is easy to see that a faith, a creed, an attitude which makes the individual better, can better the world. In fact, it is obvious that only some great inner force which can restrain the strong fires within men can prevent devastating conflagration around man's whole world.

Moreover, one sees that the effective way to control men is not from the outside, but from the inside, to tether them by their own consciences. If men hope to have a better world, they must want a better world, and rationalize such a hope upon the understanding that such a world really offers larger satisfaction than any other.

It is clear that the universal recognition of the principles of the brotherhood and dignity of man, which are fundamentals of the Christian faith, would promote peace. And the practice of the Christian virtues by individuals and nations would prevent war. From these concepts would also flow human conduct within nations as well as among nations which would reconcile, if it did not prevent economic conflict and promote such distribution of economic assets, or at least economic opportunities, as would make for the kind of an order for which most men have ever yearned.

A real compassion for humanity naturally stimulates provision for man's health, his education, the kind of home he lives in, the chance he has to work, the sort of recreation open to him, and the institutions with which he may identify himself in his reaching out after the things which pull him upward. The Christian regard for human life, of course, abhors murder, whether it be homicide or aggressive war. Regard for another's property, also a fundamental of the Christian ethic, will protect the goods, the land, and the homeland of all.

These lectures, with their penetrating analysis, give one the feeling that all human experience has proved the rightness of Christian principles, not only as a creed but as a code of human conduct. They who have ridiculed the claims of the Christians that Christianity must be the spirit of a better world on earth are at last coming to see that these Christ followers were not religious zealots proselyting their faith. They were statesmen. By the test of experience, then, by age-old trial and error, by the understandable principles of cause and effect, punishment and reward, men everywhere are feeling that of a truth crime, individual or national, does not pay, and good works and the good life almost universally do.

Once men are moved only by the desire to do right, the way of right is not so difficult to find. For if men respect one another's possessions, if they appreciate the dignity of one another, if they really desire to do one another no harm, if they are moved to succor one another against misfortune and to give each to the other his due, all manner of difficult matters can be resolved and men can get on together, so that all may find in living some comfort, satisfaction, and exhilaration.

And these principles, the basis of private conduct, are no less applicable to the relations of nations, for these entities very peculiarly have the vices and the virtues of individuals.

These able lectures, then, have told us only a little differently what Christ told us, that He is the "way, the truth, and the light." Christianity will work. In fact, everything else has failed. Christianity, squared by human experience, is the only foundation upon which men may ever hope to build a fruitful and peaceful world for healthy and happy human beings.

The publishers of Christian Bases of World Order are to be commended for bringing to statesmen and citizens these moving voices which call us to a better world.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, August 23, 1943, one of the largest synthetic rubber plants that has ever been constructed commenced the production of synthetic rubber near Beaumont, Tex. It was my privilege to attend this opening and to witness this giant plant come into production according to plan. Mr. George W. Vaught, vice president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., the concern that constructed and is operating the plant, delivered an address at a dinner that evening in Beaumont, which disclosed some very interesting information, I commend its reading and study to any person concerned about the present rubber situation.

The address is as follows:

THE JAPANESE PLAN

In America we have known for many years about the Japanese knowledge of human anatomy, demonstrated by their skill at jiujitsu.

We learned on December 7, 1941, of their knowledge of economic anatomy, demonstrated by their action in severing our 10,000 mile rubber life line from the Far East, the most effective possible single blow which they could strike at the then sleeping American industrial body.

For more than 100 years we accepted rubber as a matter of course. We used some 35,000 products made from it, and, we committed what came close to being a fatal error—we took rubber for granted. We had given little, if any, thought to rubber from the strategic angle. I suspect that we didn't realize how important it was in that respect.

But the Japanese knew. They knew that today's land armies have an almost insatiable appetite for rubber—that it required 1,750 pounds of rubber for a medium tank—3,200 pounds for a 10-ton ponton bridge.

The Japanese knew that air power can't be sustained without rubber—a modern bomber of one type needs 2,200 pounds of rubber, used in literally dozen of its parts.

The Japanese knew that no naval force can carry on without the service that rubber performs—a heavy battleship requires 150,000 pounds of rubber. That is enough to equip more than 2,000 automobiles with tires and tubes, including spares.

The Japanese knew that the mills of industry, heavy and light, need rubber in countless ways to keep them going. Conveyor belts, transmission belts, hose of a thousand kinds, insulation, gaskets, gloves. They knew how dependent we were upon rubber-borne vehicles for the essential movement of goods and persons from one point to another in this country and from home to factory.

So when they slashed down through Malaya, Singapore, Sumatra, Java, and Borneo—taking over areas from which nine-tenths of all the world's rubber had come—they felt they had practically a death grip on our economic jugular vein. This was economic jiu-jitsu in finished form.

They had caught us with a bare year's supply of rubber on hand—about 600,000 tons—and we can thank the stock-piling program of our Government for our stocks being that large instead of only about one-fourth that amount, which was a normal inventory. They knew that the amounts of tree rubber we could scrape up from other regions—such as Ceylon, India, Africa, and South America—would supply only a pitiful fraction of our needs. Undoubtedly, the Japanese knew, too, that all the domestically grown vegetable rubber sources we could dig up—the guayule bush, the cryptostegia vine, the Russian dandelion, and all the rest—wouldn't add up to a "hill o'beans" actually, so far as meeting the rubber appetite of this Nation was concerned.

Yes; the Japanese were very smart. They planned it that way. But the fight wasn't over; that is, the rubber fight wasn't over because there was one thing that the Japanese didn't know, or couldn't appreciate. That is the tremendous ability of that once peace-geared American industrial machine—and of the American people.

PROGRESS OF AMERICAN RUBBER PROGRAM

Today the national rubber program is well under way.

We are going to win—we are going to win the main event of this war, and en route to that victory we're going to win the battle of rubber.

And it is to celebrate one of the longest advances the Nation has made along the highway to victory in this battle that we meet here today—to mark the opening of the largest synthetic rubber plant in the world.

This reminds me that one of the sorriest miscalculations the Japanese made was due to the fact that they didn't know about Texas!

Certainly they didn't figure that, inside 2 years after Pearl Harbor, this one State would have in steady operation plants with an annual capacity of 255,000 tons of rubber—almost half as much as this whole country's normal consumption in prewar years.

Yet, that is what the Texas share in this national synthetic-rubber production program amounts to. The actual start of production in the plant at Port Neches brings the Lone Star State close to its eventual position as the largest single factor in the national rubber-producing program. This total State capacity of 255,000 tons per annum will be more than one-third of the total national production of Government financed synthetic rubber.

The two main ingredients of this man-made rubber, butadiene, and styrene, are home-grown in Texas. One of the most striking examples of adapting the great petroleum resources of this State to serve the Nation's needs for rubber is right here at Port Neches, where the magnificent new plant of the Neches Butane Products Co. produces butadiene and feeds it through a pipe line only a few hundred feet to where it begins getting the polymerization treatment.

Well, it would seem certain that the Japanese must not have known about Texas.

For that matter, I believe that even America didn't know her own strength, especially her ability to make rubber on a large scale. Certainly the miraculous expansion of synthetic rubber production facilities to the point where it can now be safely said that they are going to fill the bill, in quantity and quality, has pleasantly astounded many of us who were much closer to the situation than the Japs were.

For my part, if someone had told me 3 years ago that in August of 1943 I'd be in Texas to attend the opening of the world's largest synthetic rubber plant, I probably would have thought that he had "a touch of Texas" in his head.

On second thought, though, that wouldn't have been an illogical prediction because certainly there was some discussion going on, even then, about the desirability of our country meeting at least a part of its rubber needs by making rubber synthetically out of materials native to this land. And it surely would not have required a crystal ball to foretell that when, as, and if America did go into synthetic rubber in a big way, Texas would play an outstanding part.

ACTION IN 1940

It was just 3 years ago last June—almost exactly 18 months before Pearl Harbor—that public attention was first focused on the weakness of our Nation's rubber position—and the creation of a synthetic rubber industry as a form of national defense insurance was proposed.

I remember the reception in a New York hotel on June 5, 1940, when B. F. Goodrich announced that it had started manufacture of automobile tires made with its own synthetic rubber, Ameripol, and offered them for general sale. That was the first commercial venture in synthetic automobile tires in this country—and in fact the only one up to the release a couple of months ago of the first tires made with Government rubber.

At that time—June 1940—general-purpose synthetic rubber was a brand-new material, hardly out of the laboratory stage. Our company president, Mr. John L. Collyer, explained that he felt called upon, in the interests of national preparedness, to take a step which under normal conditions would not have been necessary—and, in fact, was unwarranted from the strictly commercial viewpoint. For normally there was no place in our economy for general-purpose synthetic rubber, because of the cost differential with natural rubber.

The primary significance of that June 1940 meeting was that it did center both public and official attention upon the fact that the Nation was at the mercy of anything that might happen to interrupt the flow of rubber from the distant East. We then were getting 97 percent of our supply from that part of the world.

We resorted to a little dramatization to get that point over, projecting upon a screen a rubber-laden ship being torpedoed en route from the Far East to this country. I recall that all of the guests were rather impressed, though many indicated they thought we had overdone it a bit. But as it turned out, we hadn't.

That meeting attracted attention, also, to the fact that synthetic rubber provided the only means by which this country could, quickly enough, win its independence of remote sources for this indispensable material.

And the lessons learned in the commercial manufacture of tire-type synthetic rubber, and from the on-the-road testing of those tires, unquestionably played a large part in enabling the Nation to embark with confidence upon the staggering large-scale synthetic program when war came along and more than fulfilled the direst apprehensions about rubber supply.

Now this summer, week by week and month by month, we are seeing the actual bringing into being of a national production program that doesn't contemplate leaning upon any outside sources for rubber supply. The program is already rolling in a number of locations—it's beginning to roll right over there at Port Neches—and aiming at such a scale as few of us, even those responsible for that 1940 meeting in New York, quite visualized then.

TEXAS AND THE RUBBER INDUSTRY

That brings us down to today and to Texas, and what synthetic rubber means to this State—and what this State means to the synthetic rubber program and to this Nation at war.

Texas and the rubber manufacturing industry have had much in common for many years. Not only cotton, but carbon black and sulfur, two of Texas' most distinctive natural resources, are basic ingredients of manufactured rubber.

Maybe you didn't realize it, but normally one out of every 13 bales of cotton used in this country goes into tire fabric and tire cord. Rubber needs cotton to supply its tensile strength in hundreds of things—belts and hose and clothing, and tires.

Nearly nine-tenths of all the carbon black made in this country is used by the rubber industry. More than 80 percent of this comes from the sour natural-gas wells of the Texas Panhandle. It's the stuff that makes tire treads black, and it also gets a major share of the credit for the greatly increased resistance to wear or abrasion, that modern tires have. This, by the way, was one of the many contributions of B. F. Goodrich scientists to the rubber industry.

And, of course, you know about rubber and sulfur * * * sulfur is the indispensable material that makes possible the vulcanization of rubber. The rubber industry is one of the largest consumers of sulfur used "as is."

But what is happening this summer is that, under the spur of war necessity, Texas is going far beyond her role as a supplier of ingredients and coming into her own as the leading producer of the main product itself—man-made rubber.

For some years now Texas has been in the process of emerging from the role of raw materials supplier into one where a healthier proportion of actual manufacturing and processing operations contributes to the State's economic well-being. The well-known slogan sums it up: "What Texas Makes Makes Texas."

The creation of this huge rubber-making industry down here unquestionably represents an important milepost in the transition of Texas into a State that makes things.

Because, even though the end product here is still a raw material, the extent of the "value added by manufacture" (through jug-

gling molecules) in this case is tremendous. Consider that only a few years ago butadiene and styrene were produced in very limited amounts and were not much more than laboratory curiosities.

I believe it should be made clear, at this time, that the location of this large capacity of synthetic rubber production in this part of the country was not based on market potentials, present or future. It was—and there is no secrecy about this—strictly a matter of military logistics: getting the raw materials together for quick and large production, and with a minimum of cross-haulings.

FUTURE OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER PRODUCTION

Cost comparison with natural rubber

I am not unmindful of the questions that have been raised about survival of this country's synthetic rubber industry after the emergency; questions stimulated by the possible difficulties in competing on a straight-out price basis with natural rubber under normal commercial conditions.

No one can give the complete answer to this now, but to me it seems inevitable that the American people—regardless of a price differential—will insist on continuing the operation of these plants after the war, just as they will insist on retaining air bases, military aircraft, and battleships.

Even if the cost should be somewhat higher than natural rubber I firmly believe we should keep these synthetic plants intact and in operation at least on a limited basis so that the insurance policy which we have created will not be allowed to lapse and so that we may progress further in the manufacture and use of synthetic rubber.

I believe that those responsible for the Nation's defense, after the war is won, will want to continue to specify synthetic rubber in national defense equipment in sufficient amounts to assure this continuing operation. This will provide the Nation with adequate production capacity for use in an emergency, and at the same time afford protection against high prices of natural rubber.

Actually, in the long run, the cost differential may not be as great as some now anticipate. There are indications that the continuing application of American ingenuity and research will accomplish the same marvelous cost reduction and quality improvements in production of this material that we have seen take place in numerous other commodities and products

In the short time that volume production of synthetic rubber has been under way technical advances have run so well ahead of expectations—both as to capacities of given plants and in the adaptation of the material to necessary uses—that estimates of its eventual ability to compete with natural rubber are being favorably revised every day.

As a matter of fact, I was discussing this cost problem just this afternoon with the man who has been responsible for the construction and now for the operation of more synthetic-rubber production capacity than any other man in the world, our own Mr. Arthur Kelly. He tells me that it is his firm belief that competitive private enterprise will be able to make synthetic rubber in the postwar period at costs not materially above and may be competitive with the costs at which natural crude rubber can be profitably delivered to these shores.

The history of the rubber industry over more than a hundred years has been marked by extraordinarily wide swings in the price of crude—from a high of $3.06 per pound in 1910 to a low of 2⅝ cents per pound in 1932. Several restriction schemes and other unnatural factors contributed to this, yet in the long run it has been the inescapable law of supply and demand that finally prevailed. So the existence of a ready and able synthetic-rubber industry after the emergency would serve as one of the most effective possible guaranties against future skyrocketing of natural-rubber prices.

World production and world consumption of rubber

Another important question has been raised that needs our attention. When we have a synthetic-rubber production in this country of more than 1,000,000 tons a year, and when we recapture the far eastern rubber lands, with a capacity of 1,700,000 tons per year, this will make a total production capacity of about 2,700,000 tons, which is 2½ times as much as the average world absorption for the 3 peak years of 1939, 1940, and 1941. This was an average of 1,100,000 tons per year.

As businessmen, you can see instantly the problem that this might create. Only a tremendous increase in demand for rubber products could absorb this potential surplus. Instead of offering an answer to the question that this problem poses, let me give you some statistics to dream about. It is possible you will find a satisfactory answer.

First, United States, with a population of 130,000,000, has in recent years consumed more than one-half of all the world's rubber production—about 10 pounds per annum per capita. China and India have a combined population of 810,000,000—more than 6 times as great as ours. The per capita consumption of rubber in those countries was only 0.03 of a pound during the last year for which statistics are available. Russia, with almost another 200,000,000 population, consumed approximately one-third pound per year per capita. Now, in these 3 countries alone there is a population of more than 1,000,000,000 people.

It can be quickly figured that if an improvement in the standard of living in these three countries alone raised the rubber consumption by 1 pound per capita per annum, it would actually change the prospect of an oversupply to the possibility of a world scarcity of rubber as a long-range prospect. Now, the possibility of this new market for rubber will depend upon two things: First, improved standard of living, which we read so much about, and, second, a low cost price of the commodity. A stable low price for rubber, I believe, will contribute more than any other one thing to the prospect of world consumption requiring this large production, and, certainly, low-cost synthetic rubber will peg the price of all rubbers to prevent the runaway prices of our last 25 years' history.

PRESENT USES FOR SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Synthetic rubber as a material has emerged from the question-mark stage. It is being widely used now. Within a few months the technicians of the rubber industry will be able to say, with the backing of experience, that it can be satisfactorily used interchangeably with natural rubber for nearly all purposes. Just the other day the Navy reported that by September 1 it will have converted more than 60 percent of its crude rubber requirements to synthetic rubber, including such articles as submarine battery jars, flotation gear, rubber boats, gas masks, rubber-jacketed wires and cables, and fully 75 percent of its mechanical goods. Even the tires for the Navy's smaller passenger cars, jeeps, and trucks have been wholly converted to synthetic rubber and they are proving highly satisfactory, the Navy said.

Passenger-car and light-truck sizes of tires, recent ones made with 99.8 percent synthetic, have proved in tests and in actual use that they'll deliver service and mileage comparable to that expected of naturals. With the larger sizes for trucks and busses, there are still some problems, arising from the fact that such tires are commonly subjected to overloading, and long, fast hauls—conditions which cause high tire temperatures—and, though synthetic rubber itself has greater heat resistance than natural, it does generate more heat under flexing and that puts a greater strain on the fabric elements of the tire.

This problem is under concentrated attack and steady progress is being made. The industry feels that a solution is simply a matter of time and further experience.

Meanwhile synthetic rubber has already proved its adaptability in sources of vital war products. In some of them—like bullet-sealing fuel cells, gasoline hose, carburetor diaphragms, and hydraulic accumulators—synthetic is no mere fill-in, but is absolutely indispensable, making possible things that couldn't be made with natural rubber alone. And in many others it has been used successfully by B. F. Goodrich combined with natural rubber in varying proportions—in airplane and military ground vehicle tires, conveyor belts, endless-band tracks, inner tubes, life rafts and pontons, gloves, etc.

That's just a smattering of what synthetic rubber means to this Nation at war. You, here, are getting a first-hand glimpse of the early stages of what synthetic rubber means to Texas——and that's a long and, I hope, a pleasant story that reaches a lot farther and deeper than any of us can see right now.

WINNING THE BATTLE OF RUBBER

Developments have been much faster than any of us thought they would be. Seeing the veritable forest of towers out there today I was reminded that one of your Texas papers, commenting on our B. F. Goodrich "Ameripol" announcement in New York 3 years ago, actually went out on a limb and discussed the possibility of Texas, because of its oil and gas resources, becoming what he called a modern rubber plantation.

Well, that's what we've got right here today—though I doubt if even the writer of that prophetic article anticipated that those "plantations" would spring into being, and on such a tremendous scale, within 3 years.

There is some danger that in taking note of the truly marvelous achievements that have been wrought in bringing this synthetic rubber industry into being, we lose sight of the fact that, as of right now and for at least several months into the future, this country is still in a critical situation with regard to rubber supply.

The fact is that this country is heading into the last half of 1943 still in the grip of a rubber crisis. Stocks on hand have declined steadily, and will continue to do so for several months. Our reserve stocks and the rubber contained in finished products must bridge the gap until these giant synthetic plants are actually keeping pace with the United Nations' tremendous wartime rubber needs.

The most recent report of Rubber Director Jeffers mentioned that there would be some 5,000,000 passenger-car tires of synthetic rubber produced this year, and another 30,000,000 in 1944. He made it clear, though—and it bears reemphasizing—that although this sounds like a lot of tires it is actually a rock-bottom minimum necessary to the maintenance of essential transportation.

So there is no justification for relaxing our vigilance in protecting and extending the life of every bit of rubber that we have. Mainly, that means practicing all the rules for tire health, sharing your car, and confining your mileage to the essentials.

As for the immediate problem of producing enough synthetic rubber to keep the United Nations rolling toward victory on the battle fronts and sustaining essential civilian transportation, the Jeffers report indicates that that problem is fairly well in hand. It estimates that about 250,000 tons of synthetic rubbers of all types will be produced this year in the United States, and the production in 1944 should be 750,000 tons or more, which definitely means that we are winning the battle of rubber.

General Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., for September 23, 1943, concerning General Marshall. The editorial follows:

GENERAL MARSHALL

No other military commander in the history of America's wars has enjoyed such public and official backing as Gen. George C. Marshall. That goes for George Washington and Ulysses S. Grant, who solidified their support after rather than before their victories. And in no other country in the present warring world, save possibly China, is there a captain to approach his particular position.

Russia is without a known over-all strategist, unless it is Stalin himself. Various able Russian generals have been mentioned and have passed from attention. Britain has muddled along so far as her military commanders are concerned. Through the hard test of battle, Generals Alexander and Montgomery, and Lord Mountbatten, have come to prominence, but more as field commanders than as over-all strategists—except, possibly, in the case of Alexander. So also in the case of Japan, particularly since the death of Yamamoto. And, of course, Germany is in that category also, where commanders have died or disappeared abruptly and where there is no approach to a Bismarck, Hindenburg, or Ludendorff—only confusion.

In regard to our own military picture, it is natural there should be extreme admirers of General MacArthur and of General Eisenhower. But even the partisans of these field commanders will seldom be found arguing against General Marshall so far as the general command and the strategy of the war are concerned. From the very beginning of our active part in the war—through all the meetings of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill and of the joint war councils—word has been leaking out that General Marshall was the strategic brain. Both the President and the prime minister have publicly paid him compliment on that score. And since, at the same time, his simplicity, self-effacement, forthrightness and consecration, have won Congress and the country, he is placed in a position wholly unique in our military history.

Meanwhile, let us all be determined to give full credit to the British Government and to the British war cabinet if they actually do accept General Marshall as the supreme commander in chief—as now seems to be the issue. Early in the war, the report was that the British people, in view of their exposed position, never would be able to accept anyone but a British commander for the direct invasion of Europe—someone fully aware, from the British viewpoint, of how completely the British isles would be denuded in case of defeat, and of how important this would be. If now, General Marshall is accepted as the supreme commander, probably operating, to begin with, from London headquarters, this will be a compliment and vote of confidence which has no precedent and certainly should not be underestimated.

Frank Michael O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in the death, on September 22, of Frank M. O'Brien, distinguished editor of the New York Sun, the city and State of New York, as well as the Nation, lost a great man and a great American; the loss to American journalism, at its best, which his luminous talents had served with unselfish industry, integrity, strength, and grace for the better part of his 68 years, remains profound and irreparable.

Ever since 1926, when he succeeded to the editorship so notably discharged by his renowned predecessors, the late Charles A. Dana and Edward P. Mitchell, Mr. O'Brien met and maintained the full measure of his responsibility to them, to his profession, to his community, and to his country with such modest distinction and self-effacing all-absorbing devotion that he is forever enshrined as the peer and companion of his famous forerunners, the third of a noble triumvirate, the last of an illustrious dynasty.

Born in Dunkirk, N. Y., of that Irish immigrant stock whose sturdy and sterling virtues have enriched our Nation throughout its entire history, Frank Michael O'Brien brought to his task those qualities of character which are always associated with the Irish—a warm abundant vitality, energy, and sense of humor, a wide range of human sympathy, a quick intelligence and tenderness, a deep loyalty to the highest ideals in thought and conduct, the courage of his impulses as well as the courage of his convictions, a pure love of God and of his fellow men, an uncompromising passion for the truth and an equally uncompromising contempt for sham, hypocrisy, humbug, and dishonor.

According to his obituary notices, it would appear that, as a boy, Frank O'Brien aspired above all else to the occupancy of the engineer's seat in the cab of a locomotive. This ambition, we are told, faded into oblivion on the day he got his first newspaper job. Nevertheless, if I may take issue on this point, I believe with all my heart that, in the final analysis, his long and distinguished career in American journalism was essentially that of an engineer of the American mind and soul, directing and driving a powerful locomotive, the most powerful in the world—the engineer of free and untrammeled thought in the locomotive of public opinion.

As head of a great American newspaper, Frank O'Brien was ever vigilant at the throttle, jealously watchful of our American heritage of liberty of opinion and speech, scornful of the threats and pressures of special interests and selfish seeking, an unrelenting foe of everything and everybody false, pompous, and anti-American.

That record of his service to his job and his fellow citizens is surely the record he himself would wish to be remembered by. When Frank O'Brien climbed down from his engineer's seat and turned in his report on his last run to the Supreme Engineer of us all he must have been greeted with a warm welcome as he entered into his well-earned rest and reward:

When earth's last picture is painted, and the tubes are twisted and dried,
When the oldest colors have faded, and the youngest critic has died,
We shall rest and, faith, we shall need it; lie down for an aeon or two,
Till the Master of all good workmen shall put us to work anew.
And only the Master shall praise us, and only the Master shall blame,
And no one shall work for money, and no one shall work for fame,
But each for the joy of the working, and each in his separate star
Shall paint the thing as he sees it for the God of things as they are.

[From the New York Sun of September 23, 1943.]

FRANK M. O'BRIEN

"Full big he was of brawn and eke of bones," but bigger still of mind and heart. To those most closely associated with Frank M. O'Brien in the daily conduct of this newspaper he was, first of all, a friend, and after that a supreme master of their craft. It would violate all his canons of professional propriety for them to indulge in extravagant lamentation over his passing. They can but acknowledge the depth and soreness of their loss.

Simplicity and integrity were the keys of his character. Though he was vigilant to note and evaluate the most minute shifts in trends of popular thought, he was nevertheless a helmsman and not a weathervane. By the polar star of his own carefully pondered convictions he steered a well-charted course across every sea of controversy. He had the highest respect for the readers of his newspaper; he held in profound distrust all roarers and rabble rousers and demagogs. He once wrote this in a letter to a critic who had complained that a leading article opposing a city sales tax had not been sufficiently exclamatory:

"The Sun has never found it necessary to bellow at its readers or to treat them as if they were 12-year-old children. It credits them with reasoning processes which enable them, when a subject is well illuminated, to arrive at their own decisions."

Although the arena of debate was not his favorite field, he never hesitated to enter it when occasion seemed to call. He could break a chivalrous lance with any worthy foe, but when it came to deadlier combat his favorite weapon was the rapier, never the bludgeon.

Few men of Mr. O'Brien's native shyness and modesty have managed to scale the professional heights to which he attained. Although over the years his influence upon public opinion has been enormous, the circle of his intimates was small and he did his best to keep it so. He rarely attended public dinners and assemblies. An invitation to dine with visiting royalty, whether of rank or of fame, almost invariably found him equipped with a previous engagement. It was never easy for any passing potentate, however well armed with letters of introduction, to pass through the door of his private office. He once told a friend that he didn't

care much to meet so-called important people. If anybody said or did anything really important, he explained, he would hear about it or read about it anyway.

But he did seek acquaintances among the common run of folk. He believed that the poor have a better grip on the realities of existence than the well-to-do. The poor, he was wont to say, come face to face with these realities almost every day of their lives and have no language with which to speak of them save that of unvarnished candor. He knew many of the working people with whom he came into occasional contact, could call most of them by name, remembered whom and when they married, how many children they had, how they were getting along, whether a friendly hand might give a needed lift over a hard place. He helped but never patronized.

He knew the politics of New York City and State as an industrious schoolboy may know his primer. His memory for names, quotations, and incidents was prodigious. He knew something—and sometimes a great deal—about most of the city's politicians, from leaders to party hacks—knew to whom they were indebted for favors, how much they did or did not contribute to party funds, what jobs they were after, what friends they might be expected to assist, what causes had claimed their allegiance in the past. He could forecast the results of an electoral campaign with something approaching clairvoyance. He never forgot a man known as a keeper of his word; he neither forgot nor forgave a breaker of promises, a betrayer of trusts. He told the truth himself and expected others to do likewise; once he made up him mind that somebody was undependable or a trifler with veracity, he was against him for the rest of his life, no matter to what station that person afterward might ascend.

Whatever Mr. O'Brien wrote he wrote with sparkle. He had a trenchant, sometimes a mordant, wit, but his editorial utterances were characterized by a clear, compact, and luminous style which marked a fine sense of proportion and fitness of things. He never used four words where three would do the job; he never wrote a pretentious word when a simple one would serve. Sham he abominated; pomposity he loathed; intellectual dishonesty was to him an unpardonable sin. Whenever he encountered any of these imposters he lashed out with phrases that bit and stung. Yet there were occasions and themes upon which he could write with amazing tenderness. In his personal relations with coworkers and subordinates he was more than fair; he was considerate in a way that revealed a sincere and affectionate good nature.

The Sun is proud of its long line of editors, from Dana through Mitchell to O'Brien. It is the opinion of Mr. O'Brien's colleagues that in every respect he was the peer of his illustrious predecessors. Most of them will say that they are better newspapermen for having sat at the feet of Frank O'Brien. All of them will say that to know him was to be strengthened in faith in the innate dignity of the human race.

[From the New York Times]

"He was a newspaper man's newspaper man." Frank M. O'Brien, whom our neighbor, the Sun, has just lost as editor, could hardly be described in any better phrase. He had worked his way up through nearly every rung of the ladder. He had been, on various papers, proofreader's assistant, local reporter, correspondent, political reporter, news editor, city editor, editorial writer, columnist and editor. He had a gift for mordant humor under which many a victim smarted. But he also had a depth of feeling that won him the Pulitzer Prize in 1921 for his article on the burial of the Unknown Soldier. The other qualities of his writing—his accuracy, terseness, sureness of touch—had been arduously mastered out of a wide experience. He will long be revered by younger writers on the Sun as he himself had revered his own predecessor as editor, Edward P. Mitchell. His death is a profund loss, not only to the Sun but to American journalism.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

In the death of Frank Michael O'Brien, editor of the Sun, American newspaperdom loses one of its ablest figures. He was a modest man, not widely known to the public; in his own profession, however, he was recognized as a master. It was said of him that he could do anything in a newspaper office that needed to be done, and that he could do it well. His long and distinguished term as editor of his paper won him recognition as a worthy successor to those other two exceptional journalists, Charles A. Dana and Edward P. Mitchell.

Mr. O'Brien, as a writer, was known for his unusual clarity. There was never anything slipshod or slovenly about his style, and he could not abide these traits in other writers. He well deserved the Pulitzer prize, which he won in 1921 for his editorial on the burial of the Unknown Soldier, which to this day remains a model of simplicity, feeling, and genuine eloquence. Likewise, his The Story of the Sun was perhaps, as Mr. Mitchell said of it, "the first real biography of a newspaper itself," and it will remain good reading as long as people are interested in newspapers and the people who make them.

There was a great deal more to Frank O'Brien than his knowledge of affairs and his professional competence, great as these were. He possessed that valuable quality which can best be summed up in the word "character"; this quality was evident not only in his own life but it left its mark, as it inevitably would, upon the newspaper whose policies he directed. He had the scholar's contempt for shoddy and devious writing, and the gentleman's hatred for shabbiness and indecency wherever found. If the making of newspapers is a noble profession—and we believe it is—then men like Frank O'Brien made it so.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTES TO LATE EDITOR OF THE SUN IN OUT-OF-TOWN NEWSPAPERS

[From the Hartford Courant]

The death of Frank M. O'Brien, editor of the New York Sun, leaves the profession of journalism in the United States distinctly poorer. City editor of the Buffalo Express at the early age of 21, Mr. O'Brien was an active newspaperman for 43 years, and not far removed from news work during the years he served as secretary of Mayor George B. McClellan of New York, between 1906 and 1910. He had occupied the post of Dana and Mitchell, one of the most distinguished in the Nation, since December, 1926.

Despite the anonymity that must shroud the work of an editor or editorial writer, Mr. O'Brien's writings were easily detected by many of the thousands who daily scanned the Sun's pages. Once, to the honor of the profession he adorned, that rule of namelessness was broken, when his unforgettable editorial on "The Unknown Soldier," written in 1921, was singled out for a Pulitzer prize award. The article is now required reading in every American school of journalism worthy of the name.

To many a layman unversed in the ways of sanctum and city room, Mr. O'Brien became known and appreciated through his book, The Story of the Sun, published in 1918 and still considered a model history of an individual newspaper. By his deft descriptions of Charles A. Dana, of his doughty managing editor, Amos Cummings; of Selah M. Clark, the Great American Condenser, who for years as head of the copy desk taught so many now famous authors how to pack their punches; of "Boss" Lord, Sam Wood, the ship-news poet; the irrepressible Frank Ward O'Malley, who really discovered Broadway, and the other characters that made his chosen paper the delight of New York, he revealed the real romance that lies behind the daily production of a newspaper. If the Sun has been for these many years, a newspaperman's Bible, credit is due in no small degree to Frank O'Brien.

[From the Baltimore Sun]

Save on such occasions as that in 1921, when his editorial on the burial of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington won the Pulitzer prize, few people outside the newspaper profession knew much about Frank M. O'Brien, editor of the New York Sun, who died yesterday. But all mature men inside that profession knew about him and his high competence, day in and day out.

Not all his work was done on the Sun, of course. He was the sort of writer and reporter for whose services newspapers competed among themselves, and he was employed by perhaps half a dozen of them before he settled down to be the elder statesman of the Sun. The paper which got him knew in advance that it would acquire cool and mature judgment, technical skill, and human warmth, and with these a self-effacing modesty, a willingness to merge his identity with that of the journal of which he was a part. He was no prima donna.

Yet because of his judgment and his skill, his personality shone through the cloak of anonymity which he chose to wear. Practiced readers could pick his work out of the mass and, even when he forbore to write, the imprint of his method was there. Hasty, scrabbled writing, like hasty, scrabbled opinion, was difficult in any office of which he was a part.

In the maintenance of its standards journalism probably suffers from more handicaps and more temptations than most callings. Frank O'Brien was one of those practitioners whose professional pride kept the newspapers with which he was associated from giving up hard-won ground.

[From the Syracuse Herald]

Frank M. O'Brien, whom death has removed from the editorship of the New York Sun, was the inheritor of a great tradition which he revered and worthily carried on.

This native of Dunkirk had been a reporter in Buffalo while Charles A. Dana was serving his last years as head of the newspaper for which he won national recognition. * * *

It was said of Mr. O'Brien that he could do anything to be done about a newspaper office and do it a little better than anyone else. He avoided the spotlight of personal publicity, concentrating on his job. He was a forceful editorial writer, known for his clarity. His integrity of character was reflected in the newspaper he directed.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express]

In conferring an honorary degree on Frank M. O'Brien the late Cardinal Hayes cited him as "the complete journalist—a man whose identity is usually concealed in the customary anonymity of journalism, but whose pen is a source of needed guidance to this topsy-turvydom."

If Frank O'Brien preferred the traditional anonymity of his craft as far as the reading public was concerned, he was no dim and shadowy entity to other newspapermen. It

would be difficult to find an experienced American newspaperman to whom the name of Frank O'Brien is unknown.

Indeed, the late editor of The Sun of New York had become almost a legend in his profession while he still lived. He was a great newspaperman, one of the greatest of his times. It is a source of pride to the Courier-Express that Frank O'Brien began his brilliant career as a cub reporter on the old Courier and later became city editor of the old Express—and therefore might be termed doubly an alumnus of this newspaper.

Post-War Employment—A Job for Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Oregon Labor Press, the same being a statement of S. Eugene Allen, editor and manager. The editorial is as follows:

POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT—A JOB FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(Statement of S. Eugene Allen, editor and manager, Oregon Labor Press (A. F. of L.) to JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, conducting hearings in Portland for the Post-War Planning Committee of the U. S. Senate)

I appreciate the opportunity to make this brief statement to your committee, Senator.

At the outset I want it made clear that I don't believe there is any pie in the sky. What we have—or what we will get—will be what we work for and what we pay for. Whether or not we get our money's worth in any enterprise, be it post-war planning or something else, depends largely on how well we understand what we are doing and on knowing what we want so that we can set out to secure it by the most direct route.

One of the lessons that we surely have learned from our experiences during the past 12 years is that, in the main, "made work" and even legitimate public works are unproductive. Such work is in the nature of a service and not of production; and standards of living depend upon productive enterprise. In other words, I am saying that the philosophy of providing employment to citizens by government has served to enable those citizens who received the employment to live, but it has not solved the fundamental problem of unemployment and it has been carried out by use of our national credit without increasing productive capacity.

I hope that private enterprise and free labor will combine their talents and resources to build an expanding economy and thus raise standards of living when peace comes. I have no faith in the philosophy of the economic state expanding its activities and bringing better living standards. Rather, I think, it will contract standards and that with the contraction will come abandonment of free institutions.

Neither labor nor industry has been entirely unselfish in the past, and I think it highly unlikely that they will be in the future. Nevertheless I am sure that both groups have learned lessons. They have seen that the solutions to their problems lie in the preservation of free institutions and in genuine collective bargaining. Both are learning that the remedy for the ills—real or fancied—that they suffer is not to hasten to Washington and demand a law but to sit down with mutual confidence and solve their own problems. Full employment at high wages, with capacity production at small profits per unit but a large volume of unit sales is essential to an expanding economy and a higher standard of living.

Now, then, I apprehend that there must be some continuing controls of business and industry. These ought to be kept at the very minimum, and they ought to have only one end in view—protection of the public against unethical and uneconomic practices. In the long run neither labor, management, agriculture, nor finance may indulge in such practices and retain the confidence of the public. And lack of public confidence means repressive legislation that may well strike at fundamental liberties.

Despite my conviction that we must rely upon private industry and free labor and agriculture to provide a secure future and an increasing standard of living, I know that governmental agencies must take a large—although, I hope, temporary—part in the immediate post-war era. While plant reconversion and expansion is taking place our people must have employment. I do not have a detailed plan in mind, but there are two or three factors that I think cannot be ignored in this connection.

In 1932, we found the State and local governmental subdivisions had largely exhausted their credit and were without funds. The Federal Government, on the other hand, was in excellent financial position and had sound credit. In my opinion, this situation is likely to be reversed when hostilities cease. State and local governments are getting debt retired and building up reserves. The Federal Government is burdened with a tremendous debt. This fact must be borne in mind when making postwar calculations. The pattern is not the same as it was in the emergency days of 1932.

Now then I said in the beginning that we have to pay for what we get. There are, of course, many methods of payment. Past experience indicates that most of us would rather have someone else pay the bill. I think serious consideration ought to be given to the possibility of whatever public works programs are undertaken being placed upon a self-liquidating basis, as far as possible.

Such projects might include roads, tunnels, bridges, waterway improvements, and projects of that character. Of course, certain projects such as schools and municipal improvements which are not capable of being handled in that manner should supplement such self-liquidating projects.

It seems to me, also, that the whole question of taxation and public finance ought to be reviewed and definite areas defined for Federal, State and local taxation. This must be done if we are to avoid costly and duplicating revenue systems, and no fair basis of taxation can be arrived at without consideration of this aspect of the problem. Certainly it would be a proper one for consideration now.

This is a very brief discussion of only a few major points, but they are matters that I consider important and upon which decisions must be made in order to formulate a sound policy. I want to emphasize again that I think that most Americans hope that governmental enterprise will not become entrenched and that Government will turn its resources to development of an expanding economy by enabling private enterprise to build up reserves now for that day and to preserve the free institutions that make private enterprise possible.

Georgia 4-H Club Liberty Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since mid-April the 110,000 4-H Club members in Georgia, led by county and home demonstration agents, have been selling and buying War bonds to pay for a $2,000,000 10,000-ton Liberty ship. At least, they started out to sell that many, and ended up with enough bonds bought and sold to pay for more than four such ships—more than $9,500,000 worth.

To make the program more complete, they are raising food projects in their 4-H work to fill the ship with food to go to our men in the armed forces. Actually, of course, this ship will not be loaded with the food, but the club members are growing enough food to sell to fill one or more ships, and this food will be released into commercial trade channels.

On September 17 this ship was launched in Savannah, and Sallie Cook, a Newton County 4-H girl, christened it. Also, attending the launching were more than 300 outstanding 4-H members who had helped in the bond selling and food-production drives. Many of the boys and girls were seeing a ship for the first time and were amazed at the size of their contribution to the war effort.

To reach every man, woman, and child who might be interested in buying a bond the club members spent their spare summer hours going from house to house in the rural areas, and from one business house to another in towns and cities. In some counties 4-H members led the bond drives for 1 or more months.

Each bond purchaser received a certificate bearing a picture of a Liberty ship and stating that Georgia 4-H'ers appreciated the help given to their campaign. County and home demonstration agents, who distributed the certificates, reported that many 4-H members bought bonds in the drive.

The Georgia 4-H'ers named their ship for Georgia's former senator, Hoke Smith, because he was coauthor of the act creating the Agricultural Extension Service, of which 4-H work is a part. Already South Carolina clubsters are conducting a similiar campaign to pay for a sister ship, the steamship *Asbury F. Lever*.

Congratulations to the Georgia 4-H'ers on their outstanding work have come from the United States Treasury Department. The Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, realizing the value of the idea in selling bonds in rural areas, has sent an explanation of the name-a-ship idea to all State etxension services in the Nation.

And already several other States are making plans to name a Liberty ship. North Carolina Club Leader L. R. Harrill has indicated "We probably will go to sea, too." And Oklahoma 4-H'ers are paying for a number of bombers with bonds. Plans for 4-H members in other States to name and pay for Liberty ships are under way.

In their fill-a-ship and food-for-fighters campaign, the Georgia 4-H Club boys and girls are producing seven important food products needed by men in the armed forces. These are beef, pork, poultry, eggs, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, and peanuts. All of these can be produced throughout the State, and club members in each county are attempting to grow enough of these products for sale to feed the servicemen of their county for a year.

Records based on service units are being kept on these food-production projects. A service unit is the beef, potatoes, or any other of the foods one man in the armed forces eats in 1 year.

The average man in the armed forces eats yearly 150 pounds beef, 80 pounds pork, 45 pounds poultry, 35 dozen eggs, 250 pounds Irish potatoes, 25 pounds sweetpotatoes, and 250 pounds shelled peanuts.

Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in the pursuit of better legislation for our people and in our effort to improve our standard of living we must not overlook our first obligation as Americans, namely, the winning of the war. Whatever our purposes are or may be in regard to better domestic laws, the facts are that success along these lines will mean little or nothing if we lose the war.

The Townsend members throughout the country are sincere, patriotic Americans. Their sons and daughters are serving their country in combat areas and on the home front. They are doing their good part in such organizations as the Red Cross, the U. S. O., civilian defense, and other groups in behalf of the war effort. Especially have they been active in the sale of War bonds and War stamps. With true American heritage and patriotic devotion to the American way of life they will continue their utmost efforts along these lines until victory is ours.

While military success is our first objective, we as good citizens also have on the home front the responsibility of maintaining our way of life. We must preserve our American institutions and make sure that when the soldier boys return home they will have a job and the opportunity of free enterprise.

To the end that a maximum number of jobs may be provided after the war, that our democracy may be continued, and to meet humanitarian needs, I urge the Congress to enact the principles of the Townsend plan into law. This plan is before the Congress in the form of a bill, H. R 1649, known as the Cannon bill, and was submitted on February 2 of this year. This bill has been and is now in the Ways and Means Committee.

This plan provides for national uniform annuities for senior citizens and those incapable of employment. The costs of these benefits are to be paid by a tax of 3 percent on the gross income of persons and companies, excepting incomes up to $100 a month. The amount collected by this tax, less administrative costs, will be prorated monthly to those qualifying.

This plan of providing for old age and for total disability has many advantages over our present unfair, cumbersome, and inadequate social security, which, if continued and extended, will create a caste system no democracy can tolerate. Perhaps one of the greatest of these advantages is that it treats everybody alike, all are taxed at the same rate on business volume—less exemption—and disbursements are made equally to annuitants, regardless of their previous position or station of life.

The senior citizen retiring from gainful occupation, whose income had been $100 a month, would receive the same annuity as the person who had received $250 a month. No economic royalty pension class would be possible under the Townsend plan provisions.

Millions of good American citizens believe the Townsend plan should be given a trial; at least it is entitled to a fair hearing and debate on the floor of the House. Fair play, present and post-war conditions demand our honest and sincere recognition of the good American principles set forth in H. R. 1649. Now, while the Congress is rather inactive, is a good time to delve into this subject of social security. I urge that something along this line be done without delay.

The Government of the United States Should Do Its Part in Providing Men for Our Armed Forces and for Our Essential Civilian Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, many Americans were shocked when it was revealed recently by members of the Military Affairs Committee that there are 300,000 single men and married men without children, between the ages of 18 and 37, working for the Government and not in the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, can it be possible that the bureaus, boards, and agencies of this Government are a party to draft dodging? The necessary functions of this Government can be run without those 300,000 men. They are not indispensable. The preservation of this Government is not dependent upon those 300,000 people's being kept on the Government pay roll. Before the homes of America are invaded and fathers of small children taken into the armed forces, these 300,000 men in Government service, who are qualified physically, should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, it is my observation that the people back home are making things go with a minimum of help. Farms, factories, offices, stores, shops, restaurants, and every type of enterprise are getting along with little or no help. Men and women are working hard and long hours. To meet the needs of the armed forces for more men, the various Government boards, bureaus, and agencies should be called upon to do as well as the people back home are doing.

A very thoughtful editorial, published in the Omaha World-Herald on Sunday, September 26, 1943, has made a suggestion in reference to manpower, which merits the consideration of this Congress. I extend my remarks by including that editorial:

MANPOWER PRESCRIPTION

To ease the manpower shortage this newspaper offers a constructive suggestion: Fire 1,000,000 civilian Federal employees.

There are more than 3,000,000 of them today. Before the war program started rolling in 1939 there were only 925,000, although many people thought the bureaucracy was somewhat overstuffed at that time.

If 1,000,000 were dismissed, there would remain more than 2,000,000—more than twice as many as in 1939.

There would still be more than one civilian employee of the Government for each five military employees. The ratio of 1 to 5 prevailed in the first World War.

True, some of the million who might be discharged are women, and men not eligible for military service. But presumably every released Government worker would be able to hold a job in private industry. Thus the plan would make 1,000,000 additional pairs of hands available for the main task at hand.

But perhaps you argue that the Government couldn't spare 1,000,000 employees. Perhaps you can prove it.

Almost every business firm now operating can prove with pencil and paper that it couldn't function with the number of employees it now has. But all of them manage somehow.

The Byrd Economy Committee said:

"The Government finds itself in the peculiar position of advocating and sponsoring a full labor-utilization program within private industry but neglecting the same problem insofar as the Federal service is concerned."

Obviously no such program will be put into effect by the bureaucrats concerned. They are constantly clamoring for more employees, issuing more rules and regulations which require more clerks and executives, increasing the red tape which binds the Nation's managed economy.

The needed reduction can be made only by the arbitrary action of Congress.

Granted, such an order would cause some confusion until the bureau heads had made the necessary reorganization.

But in the long run we believe it would make for greater simplicity, less confusion,

and more efficiency. W. M. Jeffers gave a demonstration of that when with a mere handful of employees (by Washington standards) he made the rubber administration the most successful and productive agency in the Capital, in 1 year's time.

A drop of 1,000,000 Government pay rollers could quickly be translated into 1,000,000 more soldiers or 1,000,000 more workers in the undermanned war industries.

We submit it is worth trying.

Grits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, in the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina hominy is a favorite food at every table. In most of the rest of the country the word hominy means the big, whole grains of corn. But in my district when we speak of hominy we mean hominy grits, a wholesome cereal food which when properly prepared is a dish fit for a king. We all eat hominy—white, black, rich, and poor. We find it equally good for breakfast, for dinner and for supper. Now, it is almost impossible to buy grits in my district. They have disappeared from store shelves. One reason for this, I am informed, is that millers can get more corn meal than grits from corn and, the price being the same, they grind meal instead of grits. The Office of Price Administration should remedy this situation by some means. Deprive us of anything except our grits. It may be necessary for the sake of the war effort to take away most of our gasoline and to tell us when we can buy a pair of shoes and a pound of sugar and when we can kill our hogs and drive our automobiles. That may be necessary to win the war. But I believe that in some way the grits bottleneck can be broken and that we can win the war and have grits too.

In the following letter I have asked Mr. Brown of the Office of Price Administration to help find a solution to this problem:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Director, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: At the present time it is almost impossible to buy hominy grits from any merchant or any crossroads store in the Fifth District of South Carolina. Although corn is bountiful and the small millers are willing to grind it, there is some fault in the price or distribution plan which makes it virtually impossible to buy this inexpensive staple food which is so popular in our section of the country.

This shortage evidently is not confined to my district as I have heard complaints from other areas as to the difficulty met in purchasing grits. I am informed that the ceiling price on grits is the same as that on corn meal, and it may be that millers are grinding only meal as they can get more meal than grits from the corn. There may be other reasons for the shortage also.

It seems to me that the ceiling price on grits could be raised slightly or the ceiling price on meal lowered slightly or some other correction in the present distribution plan made to meet this situation. Small though it may seem in the war program, this is important to the people of my district. I should appreciate any assistance you can give in working out a solution to this problem.

Sincerely yours,

J. P. RICHARDS,
Member of Congress.

A Letter From An American Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by a young soldier from my congressional district to his people, relating a most harrowing experience after having been shot down over Italy. I present it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that the people might know first hand the sacrifice, the heroism, the courage, and the dangers which the young men of our country are enduring in order that this Nation might live.

To him and to his comrades in arms and the men in our armed services the world over, we of the Congress of the United States can assure them that their Government and its entire resources are pledged to support them to the utmost.

We honor and salute this young hero, Lt. Robert Kurz, for the heroic part he has already played in the greatest struggle that has ever faced mankind. As the Representative of the Seventeenth Congressional District of Michigan, I am proud of him.

AUGUST 8, 1943.

DEAR MOM, CARL, JANE: This is about the first chance I've had to write a letter in over 2 weeks, and this time I have the best excuse in the world, as you'll soon see. What I'm about to tell you has me stumped whether I should tell you or not, but I figure you may hear about it and worry, so here goes.

This all happened recently, and I can't give you some of the facts, as it's against War Department regulations. To start off, we were shot down over Italy by antiaircraft fire. It set our plane on fire, and all of us had to bail out over the Mediterranean. I'll just give you a story of what happened to me, as that is all I'm allowed to do.

The first thing that happened was my chute failed to open. I finally tore it open, and that silk over my head was the most beautiful sight I've ever seen. When I hit the water the chute was over me, and I was all tangled up in the shroud lines. I finally released myself after a long struggle and then pulled the cord to inflate my Mae West, but the thing wouldn't inflate. I tried to blow it up by mouth, but the valve was stuck and I couldn't get any air in the darn thing. I started shedding my clothes, and after about a half hour I had everything off but my undershirt. All this time I think I drank about half the water in the sea. I started to go down about three times, but every time I did I'd think of you, Mom, and I'd start paddling again. After keeping afloat for about an hour a swell took me up in the air, and way off in the distance I saw a life raft with two fellows in it. I whistled as loud as I could, and they heard me and started paddling over. When the ship hit the water and exploded, it threw one of the life rafts out and the radio operator picked it up when he landed near the wreckage.

About this time a shark about 12 feet long made a pass at me and I kicked him in the face. For about a half hour he kept pestering me and every time he got close I had to either hit him with my fist or kick him. Let me tell you I was never so scared in my life, I knew saying "Please Lord, don't let me die this way." The raft finally got within hailing distance and I told them to hurry up as the sharks were around and I was exhausted from staying afloat for over 2 hours. They couldn't paddle very fast as only half the raft was inflated, the other half had a couple of holes in it. They finally pulled me into the boat and it's a good thing because I couldn't have lasted much longer. For a while we had to blow up the raft by mouth but we finally found a hand pump. The inflated part had a small leak in it and we had to plug it up with our finger. Nothing much happened that day and night only it was cold as hell during the night. Half the night I layed on Chris's lap and the other half on the radio operator's lap. I had an awful pain in my side. The pain finally went away and my arm and two fingers stopped bleeding. Oh yeah! I forgot to tell you the shark nipped me a couple of times, they were small cuts and are O. K. now.

The next day we tried to paddle toward Italy but it didn't do any good as the current was taking us to the southwest. Just before sundown we saw a plane in the distance and shot up one of our flares. He saw us and came over and for the next hour he circled us. During this time he dropped some objects in the water about a mile from us and we later found out it was five life rafts for four members of our crew. Enemy planes chased the plane away and we were pretty disgusted. The next morning at sunrise we saw two men on a raft and when we paddled over it was the four members of our crew. That morning we were spotted again and later on we were picked up. We were pretty exhausted after 44 hours in the sea. We spent a couple of days in the hospital and now are back with the squadron again.

Our crew is through with combat flying and we are now "sweating out" whether they are going to send us home or not. Maybe I'll be seeing you soon, who knows. At any rate don't worry about me in the least as I'm feeling like a million after a little rest.

About all the dope for the present so take it easy and don't take any wooden nickels. You can show this letter to Dot and Kathryn so I won't have to write it over. Say hello to them for me.

Love,

BOB.

Aluminum Development in the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 28, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Pacific Northwest are in-

tensely interested in the development of the light metals industry in that area. In that favored section, nature has given us an abundance of cheap hydro-electric power and has filled our mountains and our soils with aluminum bearing clays. Efforts are being made by public spirited citizens to persuade the Government to make possible and encourage the establishment of an aluminum test plant in the Pacific Northwest for the use of local clays, employing recognized processes. This pilot plant would develop a practical process for the utilization of clays indigenous to that area as the base from which aluminum could be made. Despite the united efforts of public spirited citizens, every obstacle has been thrown in the way of the establishment of such a plant. The War Manpower Commission charges there is a shortage of labor. Before that excuse became current, it was contended there was no feasible process for the manufacture of aluminum from aluminum bearing clays. I suspect that the Aluminum Trust is again exerting its powerful influence to curtail or eliminate all potential competition.

The Tacoma Daily News-Tribune, of Tacoma, Wash., in a recent issue carried an editorial which is illuminating. I append such editorial herein below and also attach a statement on the aluminum situation made by Roe E. Shaub, chairman of the Pacific Northwest Alumina Committee and president of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce. The editorial and article are as follows:

THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

Aluminum is one of the most important metals in the world today. Its use in airplanes makes it a war essential. Besides this, it is employed in countless other ways in these critical times. When peace comes, there will be dozens of new products into which it will go.

Aluminum now is made from a substance which is found in this country in Arkansas. Quantities of it are brought from Latin America, and yet there are great supplies of a clay in the Northwest which will furnish by a new process, alumina, from which the finished product, aluminum, is made.

Northwest communities are naturally interested in projects to utilize this great supply of native clay. We already have an aluminum plant in Tacoma; there are several others in the Northwest. These plants, in all probability, cannot survive peacetime competition, for their supplies will have to be brought long distances and the cost will make the operation here too expensive. It seems like a common-sense proceeding to utilize the big clay deposits hereabouts in a new process to keep these aluminum plants going. It would furnish employment after the war and would mean the continuation of the industry here when peace comes.

Plans had been made for a test plant in the Northwest using local clays. Then the War Manpower Commission stepped in and refused to give clearance to the plant, because portions of the Northwest have been designated as acute labor-shortage areas. The new alumina plant would probably employ only about 150 workers—certainly a number which would have little bearing on any so-called manpower shortage.

A committee representing the three States of the Pacific Northwest has been organized to combat this ruling of Commissioner McNutt. It is headed by Roe Schaub, president of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce. "Both Washington and Oregon State directors of the Manpower Commission are ready to certify that there is ample labor without disturbing any labor markets in any or all of the tentative sites that have been selected for the plant," said Mr. Shaub in a statement last week. "The fight for alumina industry in the Pacific Northwest is even more important than appears on the surface. If we are licked on this one, we are going to be licked on a lot of others."

The so-called manpower shortage in the Northwest was largely in the Boeing airplane plant at Seattle. This was really due to wage differentials which the Government for a long time refused to adjust. Workers in the airplane plant were not paid a scale comparable to the shipyards. Consequently, the industry lost many prospective workers to the shipyards. Thus the shortage was largely of the Government's own making. Instead of frankly correcting the situation, for a long time the Government tried to close other lines of business and thus indirectly force labor into the airplane plants.

There is another reason why this matter is of the utmost importance. The aluminum industry is controlled by a giant combination. Naturally, this combine does not want to see competition after the war which would upset its hold on the market. Northwestern clays, using a process already in successful operation in other countries, might force trade changes of great economic importance. This, also, probably has an important bearing on Washington, D. C.'s refusal to permit this test plant to be constructed.

THE ALUMINUM SITUATION

(By Roe E. Shaub, chairman of Pacific Northwest Alumina Committee and President of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce)

Two years ago representatives of the United States Bureau of Mines, the War Production Board, and other interested Government agencies, approached Northwest business leaders pleading with them to stir up interest in the producing of aluminum oxide from Northwest clays.

They pointed out that existing domestic supplies of bauxite, source material for aluminum under present processing methods, are dwindling and may last less than 5 years. They pointed out the submarine danger in importing bauxite from the Guianas, the source of two-fifths of our present supply, and stressed the military necessity of having ready a substitute for bauxite when the supply is exhausted.

They called attention to the huge beds of alumina-bearing clays in the Northwest, and urged that a process be perfected by which this alumina could be commercially extracted.

Thus appealed to, Pacific Northwest leaders organized the Columbia Metals Corporation, backed by some of the most able and substantial citizens of the area. Working with the Chemical Construction Corporation, one of the Nation's outstanding engineering firms, they spent 2 years and much money in analyzing the clay beds and perfecting a process for working them commercially.

Today the process has been successfully demonstrated over a long period at a pilot plant. The first 50-ton-per-day unit of a commercial plant, to cost $4,000,000, has been approved by all governmental agencies except the Manpower Commission. It has been refused clearance there because some portions of the Northwest have been designated as acute labor areas.

Actually, surveys have shown that establishment of the plant at any of the four tentative locations—Longview, Wash.; Troutdale, Oreg.; Canby, Oreg.; or Salem, Oreg.—will not disturb the labor situation elsewhere.

An unrecognized factor in the so-called critical areas seems to be that the shortage is largely in unskilled labor, and that there is an abundant supply of most kinds of skilled workers. Another factor was the manpower shortage at the Boeing Aircraft Co. plant, but that situation is improving rapidly since an adjustment was made in the wage scale.

Every pound of imported bauxite, as well as the domestic supply mined in the East and South, must be shipped 2,500 to 3,000 miles by rail as alumina before it can be fed into the reducing pots of the big aluminum plants here in the Northwest.

More than half of the pig, or ingot, aluminum that comes out of these plants is reshipped by rail another 3,000 miles across the country, to be rolled into sheets.

Rolled into sheet form, much of this aluminum is shipped a third time across the country, to be built into war planes by the many Pacific coast airplane plants.

Are we going to continue to permit operation of a foolish and unnecessary system that requires three trips across the Nation, tying up needed rail equipment and trackage, before bauxite can be turned into one of the war's most needed metals—aluminum?

When the Nation faced a shortage in rubber, the public was taken in on it. The public demanded action—and got it. Wheels began to turn in high gear on an experimental synthetic-rubber program, and today our rubber difficulties, in the main, are solved.

Eventually it will be necessary to substitute Northwest clay for bauxite as a source of aluminum, to meet the Nation's need in the light metals post-war era. If the substitution were made now, it would insure a permanent supply of this vital war metal, in case the war continues to a point where bauxite is exhausted.

Pacific Northwest alumina will help win the war faster.

And its availability will be insurance against losing the war.

President Versus Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Versus Press," published in the Washington Times-Herald of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT VERSUS PRESS

President Roosevelt at his Tuesday press conference attacked what has come to be called the Hearst-Patterson-McCormick press, though there is no connection between the Hearst and Patterson-McCormick papers.

A POLICY OF INTIMIDATION

The President's purpose, obviously, was double-barreled: (1) To intimidate the Hearst and Patterson-McCormick papers, and

through them all the other newspapers and magazines in the United States, into obsequious subservience to his will; (2) to further his ambition for a fourth term. When, and if, he gets a fourth term, he will be our one-man ruler, our despot.

Mr. Roosevelt's method of belaboring the Hearst and Patterson-McCormick papers was funny and, we thought, inept. He took as the occasion for his attack some rumors printed in these papers about an impending transfer of Chief of Staff George C. Marshall to command of an Allied invasion of western Europe. These rumors, said the President in effect, gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

That, of course, is improbable. It can matter very little to Hitler who is Chief of Staff in Washington. What matters to him is how many United States troops are in the European war theater, and who commands them there. Nor can it matter much to Tojo whether Marshall or anybody else is Chief of Staff in Washington.

However, if it does matter, the President's rebroadcast of these rumors through the world-wide amplifier of a Presidential press conference must give the enemy far more aid and comfort than if the President had ignored the rumors. Further, his statement that he could not confirm or deny reports of a Marshall transfer for 10 days, 10 weeks, or 10 months is pretty sure to unsettle, we should think, the officers of the General Staff.

RESPECTABLE HERALD TRIBUNE

Mr. Roosevelt quoted with approval, thereby making them his own utterances, two recent editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, attempting to chide us for alleged divisionist and obstructionist tactics. This so pleased the Herald Tribune that it reprinted both of these editorials yesterday. The Herald Tribune, said the President, is a respectable newspaper.

Respectable, but not popular. The New York Herald Tribune is the smallest, as to circulation, of the 4 New York City morning newspapers. According to the latest Audit Bureau of Circulation's statement, its daily circulation for the 6 months ending March 31, 1943, was 293,304; its Sunday circulation, 546,705.

The paper is the mouthpiece of the New York and vicinity genteel moneyed crowd—the select coterie which feels that things British are superior to things American; that the noblest aspiration an American can have is to become the father-in-law of a British title; that American gentlemen in peace years should spend considerable time and money in Great Britain, clinging to the fringes of British high society.

The Herald Tribune is Republican; but it is for Wendell Willkie for our next President—Willkie being Roosevelt's alter ego on foreign policy and author of a book advocating United States surrender of independence to some sort of world superstate. Willkie wrote this book after a trip around the world aboard a United States Army bomber kindly furnished to him by Mr. Roosevelt.

How did the Herald Tribune get to be an Anglomaniac newspaper? Well, its titular head is Ogden Reid, son of the late Whitelaw Reid and brother of Lady Jean Templeton Ward. Whitelaw Reid took over the New York Tribune in 1872, on the death of Horace Greeley.

Of Whitelaw Reid, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:

"In 1905 Reid relinquished his active editorship of the Tribune, but retained financial control. * * * In 1897 he was special Ambassador of the United States on the occasion of Queen Victoria's jubilee; in 1902 he was special Ambassador of the United States at the coronation of King Edward VII, and in 1905 became Ambassador to Great Britain. In 1881 he married a daughter of Darius Ogden Mills (1825–1910), a prominent financier. He died in London on December 15, 1912."

At this time he had been Ambassador to England for 7 years, under Theodore Roosevelt and William H. Taft.

This was the gentleman from whom Ogden Reid inherited the New York Tribune. These salient details from the life of Whitelaw Reid may throw some light on the question why today the New York Herald Tribune worships everything connected with Great Britain and the British Empire, is somewhat mortified by the Declaration of Independence, and feels no visible qualms about a reunion between the United States and the British Empire.

Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace," delivered by me in Denver, Colo., on September 15 before the Social Science Foundation of the University of Denver, in cooperation with the Rocky Mountain Radio Council in their presentation of Journeys Behind the News.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A permanent world peace is the heartfelt desire of every decent human being, but before any durable plan is advanced the problems likely to be encountered should be understood and thoroughly considered.

Naturally, too much detail would result in endless haggling, while a hush-hush policy casts suspicion. I feel that a frank consideration of post-war conditions everywhere as a sound basis for post-war collaboration might avoid a series of tragic blunders. We cannot know too much about this involved and complex matter.

For the problems of peace domestically and internationally are far more difficult than war itself. In war we dare not permit selfishness or difference of opinion to crop out. In peace precisely the opposite will be true unless we reach an understanding beforehand.

In Asia and Europe hundreds of millions of human being are slowly starving to death. Throughout the globe economic, political, and social revolution is the order of the day. That is a gloomy outlook, but the world is in a gloomy predicament and we must have the courage to face it.

The moment war stops the full impact of this terrifying situation will sweep us off our feet unless we are prepared for its devastating challenge. Demagogs, political theorists, opportunists, and empire builders will take full advantage of our dazed disunity when peace comes suddenly; and peace, whenever it comes, will come suddenly.

In our own country we face not merely the threat but the reality of demoralizing inflation which, one way or another, must reap a terrible toll in suffering and chaos. When the war ends the Federal Treasury will be hopelessly bankrupt with debt service charges consuming our total annual revenues.

Our one hope for preserving this Republic, in my opinion, is that private industry operating under the free enterprise system will somehow provide the opportunity whereby we may tediously toil and produce our way out of an almost impossible economic wilderness.

We are spending more money in this war than all of the United and Axis Nations put together, but that is no indication that we can make a similar peacetime contribution. There is a bottom to every barrel. Much as we may desire it, we cannot rehabilitate the world when the war ends unless first we rehabilitate ourselves. Improvidence at home will decree impotence abroad. When the world discovers that we are only poor relations, they will lose all interest in our theories. Uncle Sam will learn to his chagrin what every former rich man learns about friendship when he goes broke.

Instantaneous world-wide radio communication and vastly improved transportation facilities have made spiritual, cultural, social, and commercial isolation utterly impossible in our one world. So far as I know, no responsible person in the United States is advocating such isolation. However, in the family of nations, every nation has its own conception of international morality and its own private problems that only it is competent to judge and adjust. Subscribing to such vital considerations and acknowledging their existence is not obnoxious nationalism; it is merely good, old-fashioned honesty and common sense.

Both Stalin and Churchill have frankly dropped some pretty broad hints as to their objectives, and the emphasis has been on what they expect to get and not on what they expect to give. As I get it, both are laying the ground work for a policy of unrestricted imperialism and empire building.

What I am trying to develop is that we must not enter into an alliance with any empire builder nor attempt too much in trying to dictate to the other 93 percent of the world's population how the world shall be managed if empire building be the objective of our powerful allies. I am not pleading for aloofness. I am urging an honest approach to a stupendous task and I am urging a modesty in keeping with world statistics. No tail has ever successfully wagged a dog for very long, and justice must in the end prevail.

How much better it will be for our peace of mind, our own institutions, and civilization itself, if we attempt a reasonable and honest program and fulfill that program with something to spare rather than to try to run the whole world, and fail through conceit, disloyalty to our ideals, and insufficient substance. It is just as disastrous to attempt too much as it is to attempt too little, and an abandonment of our ideals in the post-war period will ruin us. Accept what we do not like if we must, but may we never stoop to the approval of a wrong.

Whether we like it or not, the post-war world is to be divided into spheres of influence. Russia at this moment appears destined to dominate all of northern continental Europe including Germany, France, the Balkan States, and the Baltic States.

I am far from happy over this outlook, and I am not advocating approval nor am I advocating a policy of appeasement toward Russia, but unless the United States wants years and years of war we must graciously accept inevitables as inevitables.

Britain will likely dominate the Continent of Africa, and the Mediterranean states. Australia will muddle on as before with more and more independence and India will never know that the war for freedom has been fought.

The Japanese islands should be turned over to China, and China should be given every encouragement and assistance, but I doubt that Britain and Russia will agree. The Philippines should be freed by us in accordance with plans already agreed upon, and the East Indies and Indochina should no longer be reserved for the special exploitation of European Caucasians. The Orient should be left to the orientals once the Japanese have been completely liquidated.

Our own particular sphere of influence will likely be the Western Hemisphere. In that case the Monroe Doctrine needs to be revitalized in view of the new era of European imperialism, and whatever steps necessary should be taken to protect the Americas and all of them from European exploitation.

The good-neighbor policy of Secretary Hull in any instance must be perfected and extended as our foreign policy. Latin America, however, should neither be pampered nor exploited by us, and our silly patronizing assumptions of racial superiority, and the playing of the role of Santa Claus should, out of respect for them and ourselves, be abandoned forever. International friendships like private friendships stem from mutual understanding, mutual respect, mutual esteem, and mutual interest, and are not purchased in the market places.

Full cooperation with other nations, and especially the proposal to enter into postwar alliances with Britain and Russia is very attractive to America, since we are so anxious to win a permanent and durable peace. However, we should always remember that peace, to be durable, must be built upon righteousness and justice, and not on alliances. If we are going to enter into alliances we should insist that our proposed confederates meet our ideals and standards of international integrity and decency. If they will not accept our theories against nonaggression and against the dominance of so-called inferior people, frankly, we ought not to enter into an alliance with them. That should be our price.

Russia, Hitler's former ally, has proved herself a valiant and valuable war partner since Hitler divorced her. Hitler's perfidy has saved the world and doomed him to certain defeat. Russia has been restored to respectability as a world power by her magnificent response to Hitler's effort to double-cross her and loot her, and every American is proud and grateful to have her on his side in this war, regardless of how she finally got lined up with us.

Russia has never attempted to deceive us. She is anti-Christian, antidemocratic, and anticapitalistic, and does not pretend to be otherwise. If we misjudge her and misunderstand her, the fault is ours, not hers. Many of our own leaders, however, for reasons best known to themselves, are trying hard to deceive us about Russia.

If she persists in her pagan philosophy and her newly found policy of imperialism and continues to spread communism by revolution all over the world, the Western Hemisphere may one day come into open conflict with her, but that possibility must be glossed over at the present time. It can be met by future generations.

Stalin's speeches and Stalin's course of action, in Russia and out, do not make comforting and reassuring reading to any capitalistic nation, but we hope that with added responsibilities he may become less radical, more democratic, and less anti-Christian.

Thanks to our policy that she can commit no wrong, our other powerful ally, Great Britain, will doubtless realize her opportunity of empire expansion which she has sought for centuries in the dark continent of Africa and in the Mediterranean. She, with or without an alliance, will remain our good neighbor and friend because it is the salvation of her empire to do so.

Our perfect relations with Canada cannot be improved. Everything points to a long continuance of this Jonathan-and-David, idealistic, international friendship because it is based on justice, mutual interest, and understanding.

Our ties with Australia and the Pacific southwest are most comforting. We have no ambition to fly our flag over one acre of additional territory, unless it be a few island outposts necessary to the protection of the Americas and I honestly believe that we want justice to prevail everywhere and among all peoples.

The United States can and will, if she devotes herself to such a cause, weld the Americas into the finest and most wholesome international relationship ever to exist in all history. In time, if we are patient and prudent in their exercise, we can gradually extend the system of good neighborliness and cooperation to other countries if we insist upon international justice everywhere. Do we have common sense, judgment, integrity, and stability enough to play the game that way, or must we forever be enchanted by the political intrigues of Europe, and despise our own true destiny?

Americans who advocate policing the world have not consulted history sufficiently. Empire building and exploiting the world and policing the world will always go hand in hand. We must refuse to be a party to such a role.

For instance, if we should substitute policing for the good-neighbor policy, our leadership in Latin America built up so painstakingly by Secretary Hull would be at an end within the hour. Let's be brutally frank. Citizens of the United States in a private capacity are not above exploiting peoples of neighboring nations. Many influential persons in America have a financial interest in the production of sugar in Cuba with substandard labor. Strike out justice in international affairs and all you have left is force. We must make a choice.

We should cooperate in every possible way with every nation on this earth to establish a just and understanding world. More than that, we should assume the leadership in that glorious adventure. But, we must proceed in an honest and sensible way to accomplish this desirable objective, and not sound off with a lot of silly platitudes with our heads in the beguiling clouds of European intrigue, and our feet bogged down in the clay of the Amazon swinging a policeman's billy.

Speak Up, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able address delivered on October 1, 1943, by former Gov. Alf Landon over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject Speak Up, America.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is now time for plain talk in view of the obvious attempt to present the American people an alliance with Great Britain as an accomplished fact. Also considering that the President's message to Congress is tantamount to suggesting a blank check for his future handling of foreign affairs.

The American people know what they want, but are not sure of the best way to get it.

We are all one in fighting the war. Outside of a little fringe of extreme internationalist and extreme isolationist, the bulk of us are trying to make it plain that we are prepared to do our part and more in helping maintain peace in the post-war world.

Most Americans are willing to do that, but only if the post-war world we are asked to guarantee collaborates with us in helping remove the seeds of another war.

Unlike our Vice President I reject, with considerable feeling, the idea that America is most likely to do any "double crossing."

Now is the time to make sure of our basic principles in post-war international policies. There never has been and never will be any integrity in power politics.

By making a military alliance, however temporary, with one country, America abandons her traditional impartial role of peacemaker and becomes a partner in the imperialism of Great Britain. Before doing that we have a right to know what Britain's future plans are beyond the fact that she "intends to hold her own."

We want to work with Russia and Great Britain.

What is more important we must work with them. But also it is just as vital to them—if not more so—that they work with us.

We should use our admitted power and influence, to restrain imperialism. But how can we talk to Russia about the rights of small nations while we are talking about a partnership with imperialistic Britain?

If the British-American alliance were to continue "for a good many years" as Churchill suggests, how are you going to unscramble the eggs when, if ever, it ends.

We should push the permanent settlement of the Jewish problem. It is not a Jewish problem alone. It is not one for Britain alone. It is a world problem in building the foundation for a lasting peace.

We should uphold the rights of China. It is not a simple question between the Chinese and the British, but a question of removing the dragon's teeth of another war.

How India's longing for self-government is met will be evidence to all the world of the effective sincerity of the Atlantic Charter.

We must insist on "open covenants openly arrived at" regarding the whole colonial question with Holland and Great Britain.

We must support the rebuilding of a powerful France. Before we underwrite the British Empire "as is," we must know more about the British plans for a fair and reasonable settlement regarding the future of the native populations—not only in the British Empire—but others that she may be seeking to acquire.

If we are to help establish a peaceful world, colonies must not be mandated to one nation, but a committee of nations, and that committee should consist not simply of the great powers alone. Small nations such as Sweden should be a part of it.

In other words, no military alliance with one country simply maintaining the colonial status quo means a peaceful world. It must be fair, just, and mutually beneficial to Asiatics, Slavs, Latins, Jews, and Teutons, if you please, as well as Anglo-Saxons.

If it isn't that, we will never do away with war very long.

There are conclusive signs that China and Britain and Russia do not see alike on highly important post-war questions.

Stalin is giving rather conclusive signs that Russia is going its own way.

I believe that now is the time for America to be hard-headed, realistic, fair, and plain-spoken if a lasting peace is to be established.

But our efforts are being weakened both at home and abroad by the President's mismanagement of our foreign affairs and by the hallelujah policy that America will clothe, feed, educate, and rebuild the world.

Any administration with a record so unsympathetic to democratic processes and customs as Mr. Roosevelt's has been in domestic affairs must not be trusted with any more blank checks either at home or in foreign policies.

Mr. Roosevelt has a long record of irregular governmental short cuts. He has attempted to eliminate Congress from its constitutional place in our Government. Time and time again the President has either ignored the clear mandate of our legislative branch, or expanded legislation beyond the manifest intent of Congress. He has subsequently ignored his own statements or the statements of his representatives to the Congress and to the country at the time the legislation was being debated.

In view of candidate Roosevelt's record, hailed by neurotic liberals as the acme of responsible statesmanship—in view of Mr. Churchill's suggestions for a common citizenship, which certainly implies generations rather than years—in view of the Treasury's plan which surrenders America's financial post-war leadership to Great Britain—in view of the universal bewilderment regarding the administration's foreign policy—in view of all those facts I fear the mind of the American people is being conditioned as the bureaucratic New Dealers cynically put it—for the old-fashioned balance of power alliance that will hang like a millstone around the neck of generations yet unborn.

In further reply to the President's hint for another blank check let us take a brief look again at the record.

We have had the B. E. W., the O. W. I., the O. F. R. and R., the Lease-Lend, etc., all carrying on a bitter political fight behind the battle front.

We have the President carrying on important conversations, if not actually making agreements without the knowledge of our Secretary of State.

When the State Department should be running the whole show, we have had the leftist-rightist fight going on behind the battle front. I hope the recent reorganization of conflicting agencies will clear up the confusion. But our past experiences with the many reorganizations so characteristic of this administration does not warrant our confidence in beneficial results. Politics between the New Deal bureaucrats has not ended at the water's edge.

Who speaks for America? This babble of voices is making us a laughing stock before the world.

Thank God regardless of all the administration's bureaucrats' confusion and bickering behind the battle front, we have the Army and Navy doing America's job on the battle front, and doing it magnificently.

The mad world we are living in calls for sound planning and common-sense thinking similar to that our forefathers used building this great Nation.

When the American taxpayer realizes that the world expects lease-lend to be continued for years after the longed for peace comes, he is likely to put his hands in his pockets and walk off from a lot of world chores that could and should be done—especially so when he realizes that lease-lend means an outright gift.

The British are confidently counting on our newly built merchant-marine ships being shared with them on a lease-lend basis. They also expect that we will make agreements with them sharing world trade and world business on a cartel basis.

Now, if anyone raises these skeletons of European empires or American post-war donations at the feast of post-war planning a few may accuse him of playing Hitler's game of dividing our victorous war coalition.

But no one can rightly claim that the hush-hush policy is clearing the atmosphere of distrust between Russia, Britain, China, and America. Furthermore, the administration's evident approval of the post-war British-American military alliance forces the discussion of empires and donations.

Which is the worse—keeping still and misleading our allies as to real sentiment in America, or speaking out in the hope that the world will realize that American public opinion will not in the end support the global programs of the "spenders"?

We must not allow the spenders to give away everything around the home place or do us the injustice of giving the impression that we will stand for a permanent policy of "give away."

Recently a Member speaking in the English Parliament voiced his alarm—and rightly so—that England might not be so fortunate as to have Roosevelt and Wallace to deal with after the next election in "divvying up" our merchant marine. Therefore this Member of Parliament urged that the divvying up should be done immediately.

If the world is planning for us to be its post-war sugar daddy with lease-lend, W. P. A., relief and rehabilitation, etc., etc., it is evident that America is likely to turn in revolt not only on the hallelujah program, but along with it, on the program highly necessary on the whole of reasonable world collaboration and cooperation.

Do we want a part in creating another war a generation hence by hush-hushing these unpalatable questions I have been talking about?

Especially are we concerned when it is proposed that we become a partner with a highly imperialistic nation. It is a tragic "mistake not to face the difficulties as they actually exist and try to work something out on a practical basis."

Britain's, and also Russia's, intentions toward China, India, north Africa, Poland, Palestine, France, are vital questions that must be settled in fairness and justice before there is any hope of any international cooperation succeeding permanently in establishing peace—especially by way of the proposed military alliance with one country.

The failure to meet these highly important and inflammatory questions prepares the seed bed for the next war—force or no international force.

We must help rebuild a world worthy of our sacrifices. The goal of America is a stable and peaceful world. We can and must work to that end without expecting to right all the wrongs of the world in one treaty. But we at least must get started in the right direction—in the direction of Woodrow Wilson's 14 points which have been given only lip service by our allies. Before we make post-war commitments is the time to reanimate these points. The groundwork for a peaceful world must be laid now by removing some of the causes of war.

Let there be no easing up in the war efforts of our mighty and victorious coalition. Plain talk will help clear the air of suspicion, and it will strengthen rather than weaken the natural association of England and America and the solidarity of the Allies, not only for the present, but in the future.

It will help us bring about the more decent world on which lasting peace depends.

Russia Poses First Great Crisis of the Peace

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker told us some time ago that communism was leaving Russia and was coming to the United States. I understand he says now that Russia is moving rapidly toward a saner system of government, as well as a saner system of economy, and a saner way of life.

We are told that Russia has abolished the Trotsky commissars, those misrepresentatives of the Russian people who attempted to meddle with the affairs of the Army and to control the Army officers.

We are told that Russia has abolished the Comintern, that detestable, despisable, damnable system of anarchy that was attempting to stir up revolution in every country in the world, including our own.

We are told that she has torn down the streamer that Trotsky placed across the gates of Moscow, that "religion is the opium of the people," and has opened up the churches of Russia.

We are told that since getting rid of the Commissars, Russia has gone back to a decent military system, and that instead of every man greeting his superior officer merely as "comrade" and denying him any other recognition, she has reestablished military discipline, restored the insigne on the shoulders of the officers of her Army, even on down to the corporals. Captain Rickenbacker tells us now that they are among the snappiest soldiers in the world.

They are breaking away from the old communistic system and are paying men and women according to the amount of work they are doing in the various plants manufacturing war materials, and the results they produce. One step seems left for Russia to take and that is to restore the rights of private property, the right of the people to own their homes and their lands; and I predict that the Russian soldiers who are doing the fighting will see that done when the war is over, just as surely as the world stands.

But the international situation, as it affects the future of Europe, is becoming more and more complicated, as will appear from the following article by James B. Reston, which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times, under a London date line, entitled "Russia Poses First Great Crisis of the Peace."

It reads as follows:

RUSSIA POSES FIRST GREAT CRISIS OF THE PEACE—QUESTIONS CONCERNING HER AIMS AND OUR INTENTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED

(By James B. Reston)

LONDON, October 2.—The preeminent aim of the British people and the major long-term object of their foreign policy is to attain se-

curity—by which they mean peace and full employment—through cooperation with the United States and Soviet Russia.

Coincidentally, their greatest fear is that instead of bringing the United States and Russia together with China and the British Commonwealth into an effective "world authority," they may get caught between their two strongest allies or may be forced to choose between them.

The British are fond of describing themselves as a bridge between Moscow and Washington but they do not want to be attached to only one side of the river, and they certainly do not want to get stranded in the middle of what promises to be a pretty turbulent post-war stream.

The British are not yet faced with the dilemma of choosing between the United States and Russia. They have not been developing the art of the compromise for a thousand years to get caught in any impetuous one-sided decision at this late date in their history; but they see the possibility of that dilemma approaching and it is possible, though not entirely probable, that they will be faced with it in October when they meet with representatives of the United States and Russia in the three-power conference.

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE SEEN

It is becoming increasingly clear that we are approaching in this conference the first great political crisis of the peace. Within the next 30 days the Russians expect us to put forward definite proposals, not only about the time and place of our attack on the west coast of Europe, but on our policy for dealing with Germany and other European powers after the war.

They want to know where the Allied armies are going to attack and when; they want to know how we propose to deal with Adolf Hitler, or the German Army, or some other faction that may attempt to make peace on behalf of the German Reich; they want to know what we intend to do when and if liberal elements within the countries now occupied by the Germans revolt and attempt to take over the power—and the property—held by the former ruling groups within these countries; they want to know whether we insist on having a say in the restoration of eastern Europe and the Balkans, and if so, what we think of their collaborating in the reconstruction of western Europe.

We and the British have a few questions ourselves. We want to know whether the Russians intend to respect the sovereignty of the small nations and the right of those nations to settle their own internal affairs; we want to know how dead is the Comintern which they killed after they said it did not exist; we want to know when and if they intend to open "the fourth front" against Japan after our third-front and our second-front help in the destruction of the German Army; and, of course, we want to know, too, what the Russians think about the future of the Baltic States, Poland, the Balkans, and other countries of Europe, the Middle East and the Far East

In other words we have reached the "$64 question" stage in the relations between the Allies, and while that does not necessarily mean that the grand alliance will not continue to function if everybody does not get satisfactory answers to his questions it does mean that we are faced with the first real opportunity we have had, first, through the Allied political commission which will meet probably next week at Algiers, and, second, through the tripower conference of foreign ministers, to guide relations between the three great powers into constructive channels.

WAR QUESTIONS

So far as questions relating to the war are concerned the British are clear as to their answers to the Russian questions; it is true—in fact, it is one of the remarkable accomplishments of the war—that their politicians and soldiers and ours have reached a degree of understanding and unity on the complex problems of this conflict that is unprecedented in the history of coalition warfare. Our answers to the Russian questions about the war will not always satisfy Vyacheslaff M. Molotov, Soviet Foreign Commissar, but at least the British know where they stand with us on these questions and that is all that they ask.

It is on the political and post-war questions that the British approach their dilemma. It may be true, as Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle has assured us, that the State Department is eager to discuss any questions that the Russians and the British raise, although that does not explain the differences in the Russian and American proposals for the agenda for the tripower conference.

But discussion is no longer enough for the Russians; and the views of the Senate are even more important than the views of the State Department; they do not want words, but a specific declaration of policy on such questions as the future of the Baltic States and the boundary of Poland, and with all the good will in the world it is difficult to promise that Secretary of State Cordell Hull or Under Secretary Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., is to be specific about these things until the Senate gives the State Department some indication as to where it stands.

The British may be able to stand out against Russia's political demands this month; they did so once during the negotiations for the Anglo-Russian Treaty when Mr. Molotov demanded recognition of the Soviet Union's incorporation of the Baltic States, and they may be able to do so again, but it must be recognized that Britain is in a far less favorable position to stand out against any other great power today than she was before the war.

The days of Britain's splendid isolation are dead; for centuries they have relied for their immunity on their island position and their naval and industrial power and on the division of power on the Continent; but these and many other things have changed and Britain must and is changing her policy to meet the new events.

The very nature of power, which in the end determines almost all international political policy, has changed.

In the days of Disraeli, when communications were slow and nations were virtually self-contained and education and political consciousness were restricted, power could be based in this island on a small army and a powerful navy and on the skill of craftsmen and the abilities of a privileged class.

THE INDUSTRIAL POTENTIAL

But today, as the Political and Economic Planning Club in London recently pointed out, "the elements of power have radically changed." Power now rests on industrial potential; on the ability to control or insure the supply of vast quantities of raw materials from sources scattered throughout the world; on a high order of technical and administrative skill; and, last but not least, on the ability to command continued and active allegiance of the increasingly individualized and politically conscious masses.

These qualifications only a bare handful of the greatest powers can command, and it follows, therefore, that the world is moving irrevocably toward a new international system—a system in which the political life of humanity will be organized in a few large and relatively integrated groups under the leadership or domination of the principal great powers.

The British not only see and accept this as a fact but are inevitably driven for their own protection into a policy of collaborating much more than they ever did before with other great powers. The hard, inescapable facts of their changed economic position and the changing economic position of the world have driven them to this.

They know, for example, that their now almost stationary and aging population of less than 47,000,000 is only a little more than a third as large as ours and less than a fourth of Russia's; they know that they cannot in the last half of the twentieth century count on being the workshop or the financial or shipping center of the world, as they were in the latter half of the nineteenth century; even their Navy is no longer undisputed mistress of the seas.

MERCHANT SHIPPING

It has not escaped the attention of this people either that the United States will build almost half as much merchant shipping this year as Britain had before the war, or that our industrial production will be a third greater than it was in 1939, or that a great part of their foreign investments are gone, or that the United States will, in 1944, produce 25 percent more rubber than she ever bought before the war, or that even before the war the center of gravity of the world's heavy industry had moved from this island westward to the United States where, in 1937, we were able to produce 51,000,000 metric tons of steel to Russia's 19,000,000 and Great Britain's 13,000,000.

In consequence of these and many other factors for which there is no space in this dispatch it is becoming clearer that Britain and her Commonwealth are determined, if possible, to work out an economic system with the United States—note Lord Keynes' mission in Washington—and with Soviet Russia and the Continent.

There is a growing realization here that Britain cannot get the two things she wants above all—peace and full employment—without cooperation from other powers, and this means particularly the United States.

But if she cannot get this cooperation from the West then, to save herself, she will have to turn to Soviet Russia and the continent of Europe.

That is the dilemma she hopes to avoid either this month or next year; that is why she hopes Soviet Russia will not press her to choose now; and that is why she hopes to get guidance from the Senate as to where the United States stands.

World-Wide Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
September 21, 1943.

S. J. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Air Lines Committee for United States Air Policy,
Washington, D. C.:

You have my permission to release contents my letter September 13, which read as follows: "I have studied with great interest

the declaration of policy on world-wide aviation as advocated by the 16 signatory air lines. It is my firm belief that the basic policy involving free competition under reasonable governmental regulation will be necessary to insure the development of a sound and efficient post-war foreign air-line system. I pledge my active support to the over-all effort now being put forth to assure American supremacy in international air-line operation through the American principle of competition."

DONALD W. DOUGLAS,
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Congress and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech by Josephus Daniels over a national hook-up on Sunday, September 26, 1943:

Mr. Muhlenberg, the first Speaker of the House of Representatives and all his successors would have regarded the demand of that body for a voice in international affairs as revolutionary. The fathers in framing the Constitution conferred the exclusive right on the Senate to have a part in agreements with foreign nations. But on Tuesday the Members of the House "riz up" and declared that the time had come to end delay, and shilly-shallying and tell the world that the people of the United States favor participation by their country in the setting up of international machinery "with power adequate to establish a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world."

It was revolutionary and without Constitutional warrant. But it was glorious and heartening. It showed that public sentiment is king in America. Fresh from their constituents, the Members supported the resolution of Mr. FULBRIGHT, a new scholar in politics, who is wearing the mantle of Woodrow Wilson, the great scholar in politics, who pointed the way to permanent peace during and after the World War.

There was only one fly in the ointment. Having taken an extra Constitutional step to win the vote of the Mackinac Island straddle, there was added to the original resolution the surplusage of four words "through its constitutional processes." The objection to that phrase is that it opens a door through which a four-horse team of obstruction can be—may be—driven. It only befogs the original clear-as-crystal resolution. From time out of mind when opponents of any act wish to defeat it without disclosing their real motive they raise the bug-a-boo of "It is unconstitutional." When is a law or resolution unconstitutional? A distinguished jurist once said: "The Constitution is what the judges say it is." Experience proves that statement, as witness the fact that a majority of the Supreme Court declared the income tax and the Child Labor Law and other reforms unconstitutional. Later they were reversed. The extra words added to the resolution of the House which was made without Constitutional mandate, carried with its a suggestion that the President and the Senate might try to put over some unconstitutional pact upon the people. Judging by what happened in 1919, there may be some justification for that fear. But, though the Senate is hampered by archaic rules and one-third of the Senators can thwart the will of the people, let us hope and believe that the present Senate will as promptly and as patriotically respond to the popular demand as the House has done.

Notwithstanding the added words. America salutes the House of Representatives for responding to the demand of the men fighting to end war and their comrades on the home front that there shall be no such betrayal of the aspiration for peace after this war as disgraced us after the 1918 armistice. The action of the House ought to be followed by a constitutional amendment requiring the joint vote of the House and Senate for the ratification of treaties. The reason for associating the Senate with the President in treaty action ended when the membership of the Senate became large. One compelling reason for including the House in treaty ratification is that one-third of the Senate, plus one, can now, as they did in 1919, block the road to peace. The Senate in that period kept us out of the League of Nations. By that act they insured the fulfillment of Woodrow Wilson's prophecy made in St. Louis in September 1919. He said:

"There will come, in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the freedom of the peoples of the world."

In the light of the literal tragic realization of the holocaust forecast 25 years ago, it is unthinkable that Congress should fail to grasp the opportunity now offered of making this conflict truly a war to end war. That deliverance is within our reach.

Petroleum Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. STREETT BALDWIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am just in receipt of a copy of a speech made by Mr. Bruce K. Brown, Assistant Deputy Administrator, Petroleum Administration for War, before the National Petroleum Association at its meeting in New York on September 22, 1943; and because it contains such a comprehensive explanation of the shortage of gasoline and petroleum products in the United States and answers so many of the questions which are now being asked of my colleagues in the House, I would like to insert the speech at this point in the RECORD, for their information:

I want to talk to you today of petroleum hydrocarbons, but I promise that I shall not embark on a scientific discussion, nor shall I invoke any plea for greater production for war.

Science proceeds apace and, as I have told you before, I think almost every month that has passed since Pearl Harbor has induced a hothouse growth in technology as great as that which we experienced in a whole year of the last decade preceding the war. I could talk of that technology, but I shall not today.

I could implore each of you to reevaluate your present operations in the petroleum industry to detect and correct any faltering in maximum production for war—for much yet remains to be done before it will be possible to evaluate today in the terms of a hoped-for peace in the tomorrow. You will be hearing more from the Petroleum Administration concerning maximum production of war products—but not today.

Today I would like to discuss petroleum hydrocarbons only from the standpoint of what is happening to them. That subject is one which is certainly of common interest to the petroleum industry and to the Petrcleum Administration. You and I are mutually distressed, I am sure, over the lack of appreciation on the part of our friends, our customers, and our masters—the American public—of the part that petroleum must play in winning this war.

Let us consider these petroleum hydrocarbons—refined products ready for use—on exactly the same basis as we now have to consider everything else—manpower, womenpower, food, textiles, metals, shipping, and dollars. Let us consider how much of our petroleum products must go to war and how much can be retained for home use. Hydrocarbons drafted for war can't stay with us but the American public wants to know just what is becoming of those precious petroleum products upon which they have so long relied for their well-being, their comfort, and their pleasure.

First of all, let us go back 25 years in order to get a good running start on our problem. During the First World War we refined and had available each day in the United States about 200,000 barrels of gasoline. We sent less than 37,000 barrels per day overseas at the peak of activity in 1918—less than 20 percent of the total available. According to Capt. Paul Foley of our Navy, the total requirements of "aviation spirit" (the forerunner of our 100-octane aviation gasoline) by the United States, Great Britain, France, and Italy for the last half of 1918 was scheduled at about 7,000 barrels per day. The United Nations in this war will be producing and burning that much aviation gasoline in the interval between this moment and the time I finish delivering this brief paper.

Oil was very important in the First World War and it seemed awfully important to civilians too. Prices rose and there were "gasless Sundays." As to the military importance of oil this same Captain Foley (in Petroleum Problems of World War) said:

"Reviewed in the perspective of 6 years, it is clear that next to the physical number of bayonets on the Western Front, the factors contributing most to victory were the impetus conferred on those bayonets and the flexibility given them by gasoline. Tank, tractor, and aviation activities all were measured in terms of gasoline. It evacuated the wounded and effected replacement of combat troops. * * * Not in exaggeration was it said that a drop of petrol had been the equivalent of a drop of blood. The torch borne high on Flanders Field was a gasoline torch."

But however important oil may have appeared to be to the civilian population in 1918, it was fully eight times as important in the year before we entered World War No. 2. In 1941 we used about 4,600,000 barrels of crude oil and natural gasoline in our refineries each day and made available to the public about 1,600,000 barrels of gasoline. Very little gasoline was consumed by the military. Very little aviation gasoline was consumed.

In the present month and for an undetermined future number of months, we hope to refine in this country about 10 percent more crude oil and natural gasoline than in the pre-war era. Thus, it might be reasonably expected that we should have more gasoline available than ever before, and that assumption is correct. Gasoline production

is currently about 1,800,000 barrels a day—that is all types of gasoline for all purposes.

"But," the public says, "where is it?" "Why can't we use it?" "Why shortages?"

The answer is, of course, that petroleum is going to war. We know that. The public knows it. Unfortunately, however, the separation of petroleum from its normal associates, the civilian public, brings protests which to me seem more violent than any I have heard raised against sending other commodities to war. For this reason it is incumbent on us all to explain the situation patiently, again and again.

Statistics are uninteresting. The old adage "Figures don't lie but liars 'figger' " seems well forward in the public mind. Furthermore, the shroud of secrecy necessarily cast over overseas shipments of petroleum products and over present and ultimate productivity of critical war products, such as aviation gasoline and toluene, tends to confuse even the best informed. However difficult the task, it is necessary that we keep plugging, within the limits of military secrecy, at the job of telling and retelling the story of petroleum products in the war, because it is extremely important to public morale and to the standing of the oil industry that the story be well told and well understood.

What I have to present to you today is not a new set of statistics but merely a somewhat different way of telling the story. Instead of spreading numbers throughout my talk I shall give you all of the principal figures at once and then put them together in a way which, I trust, will bring out the story.

Restating the petroleum side of it, we are currently using each day about 4,400,000 barrels of crude oil and natural gasoline and we are turning it into about 3,800,000 barrels of products. The balance goes into refinery losses, refinery fuel, and crude export. The amount of crude exported is quite small and is diminishing. Out of these raw materials we produce each day about 1,800,000 barrels of gasoline and 2,000,000 barrels of all other products. The Petroleum Administrator recently stated that the military services had to be supplied with about 600,000 barrels per day of gasoline. High officials of the services recently stated that the total military demand for all petroleum products exceeded a million barrels a day. In this present month about 32 percent of all petroleum refined products are used by the military. The figure will rise to 40 percent before many months.

The above figures are all that are really needed to provide a base for an easily comprehended story of where our petroleum hydrocarbons are going.

But I have more figures to point up the story. None of them are secret and few are new.

In the halcyon days prior to Pearl Harbor we had about 27,500,000 passenger automobiles. That number has now dropped to about 24,500,000. That drop-off of about 11 percent represents cars worn out and not replaceable because no new passenger automobiles have been manufactured for many months.

No one would be foolish enough to think that because there are 11 percent less automobiles on the road, those that are left should have more gasoline than ever because everyone realizes that the automobile companies did not really stop producing automobiles. Instead of Chryslers, we have produced tanks; instead of Willys-Overlands, jeeps; and instead of Fords, aircraft engines, bombers, and the like. Among such little items the President recently announced the production of 123,000 planes, 53,000 tanks, and 1,233,000 trucks. Those numbers will rise. Further, most of our citizens know instinctively that our military vehicles are greater gas eaters than civilian automobiles and trucks. They are more powerfully motored; they are bigger; they go faster, they go farther. The comparison is particularly striking in the case of automobiles and planes. In 1 hour's travel at the legal speed of 35 miles per hour, a passenger automobile will burn about 2.5 gallons of gasoline. But a fighter plane will travel 10 times as far in an hour and will burn about 60 gallons of gasoline. Our great bombers use several times that much. That part of the story has been told before, told better, and with more illustrations. The telling of it has allayed some protests but we all know that the motorist is far from convinced. If he accepts such explanations, he does it to be a good sport—not because he is completely satisfied.

A very considerable part of our available foodstuffs has to be diverted to military use at home and overseas. Bearing in mind that the military currently requires only 600,000 barrels of gasoline daily, or approximately one-third of what we have available, and that the quantity of all petroleum products still available for civilian use is 64 percent, the corresponding figures on food are of interest. According to the latest figures available to me, the following percentages of foods are available for civilians:

	Percent
Butter	78
Beef	74
Pork	67
Cheese	58
Potatoes	89
Sugar	84
Coffee	77
Salmon	43
Sardines	39
Raisins	50
Prunes	54

And the average of canned beans, tomatoes, corn, and peas, 64.5 percent.

Compared to these figures, an availability of gasoline to civilians of 66 percent does not seem too bad.

Why is it, then, that our friends, our customers, and our masters—the great American public—submit so patriotically to short rations on some foods and, at the same time, seem critical of any shortness in petroleum supply?

The need for food is universal and universally recognized. Within narrow limits rich man, poor man, soldier, civilian, American, Briton, Chinese, Russian, Frenchman, or Italian can and does, if it is available, consume about the same amount of foodstuffs. Our people are inherently generous and they do not really contest the need for allotting 30 percent or more of our available food to military and overseas use. Why, then, is it so difficult to explain that 30 to 40 percent of petroleum must likewise be employed?

Of course, there is one small difference which we note immediately.

In the case of food, no one attempts to influence the citizen to protest. Fortunately, our States have not taxed the consumption of food, and hence the shortening of civilian consumption in the States does not affect tax revenues so directly as a shortening in the civilian consumption of gasoline. Further, there are no organized societies or associations of food eaters whose welfare depends upon a continuous availability of ample quantities of prunes or beans or whose officials rise up and denounce the Food Administration or the food industry, because a storm ruins a peach crop or because water wells run dry.

However, I do not think that outside stimulation accounts for any considerable part of the honest perplexity which we note in the minds of our friends as to the shortness of petroleum supply. I have another theory about it, and I can best introduce it by suggesting a possible analogy in the field of food.

As I have previously stated, it looks as though we civilians could make use of 67 percent of the pork available and 50 percent of the raisins. We now have almost 67 percent of the gasoline still available to us, and I doubt that we will ever have to get along with less than 50 percent—the same as our "current raisin ration," to make a bad pun.

Let us suppose, however, that in addition to eating raisins, we civilians used raisins as a raw material to make plastic articles, and suppose further that the essential demand for plastic articles was such as to require one-quarter of the whole raisin crop. In such a case the diversion of 50 percent of the raisin crop to the military and the continued use of 25 percent for a civilian purpose, that is making plastics, would let us have only one-fourth of our normal peacetime ration of raisins for dietary purposes—not one-half.

Applying this analogy to petroleum supply, I think we can discover the missing chapter in the story which we simply must make our citizens understand. To the pre-war passenger car driver, gasoline was something to be bought at the corner pump. He bought it in company with his peers and fellows. Trucks, busses, taxis, municipal cars, and farm tractors did not block the entrance of the station driveway. The auto driver was hardly conscious of the nonpassenger car use of gasoline. Had there been a serious and mysterious shortage of gasoline in some area and had all of those other vehicles piled into the service station driveway, the average American motorist would have graciously admitted that those other vehicles needed gasoline worse than he did. It is late in the game to point that out to him now, but it must be done.

Reverting to the approximately 1,800,000 barrels of gasoline which we produce every day, only a small proportion can safely be used by civilian passenger automobiles. As stated by Petroleum Administrator Ickes, the daily military demands already are at the rate of 600,000 barrels. That leaves 1,200,000 barrels. Exhaustive surveys indicate that trucks, busses, and taxis simply must have 450,000 barrels each day. Failure to provide it would mean a break-down in essential public transportation services. That leaves 750,000 daily barrels of gasoline to be divided between industrial use, farm use, and civilian passenger automobiles. It should be obvious to all that nonessential industries have been pretty much discouraged by lack of priorities for raw materials and by manpower problems so it is not asking too much to urge confidence in the idea that there is little waste of gasoline in present industrial use. The farm situation speaks for itself.

And so—there it is. We have only so much gasoline and it must be divided up. The ever-expanding military use is easily understood and cannot be criticized. But it is a serious mistake to assume that all that is left is available for A, B, and C coupons. When that individual who never purchased his gasoline except at a service station erected for his express convenience is brought to realize that there was always—even in peacetime—and still is a tremendous consumption of gasoline by trucks, busses, taxis, tractors, and farm equipment which is just as vital to his welfare as convenient personal transportation, we shall have gone a long way toward winning him to the view that petroleum is going to war.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to include the following short statement which gives us some idea of the use to which gasoline and other petroleum products are being put at this time:

First. It takes 12,000 gallons of gasoline to train one pilot.

Second. Tanks of one division use more than 10,000 gallons in traveling 100 miles.

Third. One thousand Flying Fortresses use 400,000 or more gallons of gas in a single 4-hour mission.

Fourth. It takes one-third of a tank car to fuel one Flying Fortress.

Fifth. One airplane engine burns its weight in gas every 2 hours.

Sixth. General Covell stated recently that 65 percent of all supplies shipped to Africa were petroleum products; 50 percent of all tonnage going overseas now is petroleum products.

Seventh. General Somervell stated several weeks ago that the requirements for the military for the remainder of 1943 would be 1,000,000 barrels of oil per day, not including aviation gasoline and aviation lubricants.

Eighth. Thirty and one-half percent of all gasoline products east of the Rockies goes to the military.

Ninth. There will be enough gasoline for all essential driving if the public will only conserve on less essential driving.

Critics Are Useful Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have called attention to the tendency on the part of all too many New Dealers toward the suppression of criticism. Free criticism is implicit in freedom of speech. It is only natural for men in positions of authority to resent any criticism of their omniscience as they drive toward important goals, but unless we have a full and fair appraisal of the actions of our public leaders, even including the self-anointed ones, we will not have an informed public opinion.

Unless we have an alert and informed America we have failed in laying the groundwork for a just peace. The executive department is unwilling to treat the American public and the American press as adult partners in the coming enterprise of winning the war. Being unwilling to recognize the value of telling Americans as much as possible about the war, they must expect continued criticism for this lack of candor and for a deplorable want of faith in the good judgment of the citizenry.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post:

CRITICS ARE USEFUL ANIMALS

Back in the dark days of 1941, a mid-ranking New Dealer was complaining about criticism of the administration. He thought something should be done to shut it off. Somebody suggested that the Bratish didn't feel that way and that, even in the midst of a war, Mr. Churchill had to take a shellacking in the House of Commons whenever his critics thought he was holding out on them. "Perhaps," said the young man of the New Deal, "that is why the English aren't winning the war."

The right of free speech and free criticism has to labor under such illusions even among its friends. The Bill of Rights is too often regarded as a pleasant conceit in a schoolbook but a hindrance to the efficient carrying out of large affairs. The eager New Dealer, cited supra, is not alone in believing that people who ask inconvenient questions ought to be suppressed because they interfere with winning wars, extending social gains and other worthy causes.

Well, let's look. Now that the British, plus the rest of us, are winning the war, it might be asked whether the fact that Mr. Churchill had to pause in his exacting tasks to answer criticism may not have had more practical use than we are accustomed to think. For one thing, America was watching the war very closely in those days, and the fact that Mr. Churchill could be criticized in Parliament and in the newspapers undoubtedly had its effect in reconciling America to the necessity of playing a role in the conflict. More important was the fact that a people which knows that its leaders are under constant scrutiny by its representatives and a watchful press has a basis for confidence and for "blood, sweat, and tears" which is lacking when the only contact with government is through propaganda and arbitrary orders.

The real obstruction to better understanding between Russia and the democratic nations is the fact that we have no means of knowing what the Russian people think about things and they have no way of knowing what we think. As between us and the British people, no such barriers exist, despite the efforts of the bureaucrats to create them. When we object to imperialism, the English know it; and when they complain that we are sometimes a little hard to take at close quarters, we hear about it. The people of Russia today have no idea about the doubts which exist in this country over Stalin's post-war plans, and there is nobody in Russia who can demand that Stalin make himself clearer. Because Russia is a dictatorship, unity with her is difficult and tortuous, even when we know how vitally we depend on keeping relations friendly.

So we say again, "freedom of speech" is not just a pious expression tossed off by a group of elderly gentlemen in wigs and knee pants. It is a concept of government which takes full account of the fact that its exercise will often make our governors restive, but which has paid off over a century and a half in the development of a people which has learned to respect leadership, but also knows that a leader who cannot endure criticism should retire from the scene.

Lorain, Ohio, Exceeded War Bond Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal:

ADMIRAL KING: MISSION ACCOMPLISHED—LORAIN

E. J. KING, *Commander in Chief, United States Fleet, Washington, D. C.:*

Lorain exceeded its third War bond campaign quota of $3,015,168 on September 23, 10 days ahead of schedule.

Then with your encouragement, we raised our sights to a new goal of $4,000,000. Today, the final day of the campaign, your home town respectfully reports the mission accomplished. More than 16,000 Lorain residents have subscribed a total of $4,447,912 to help bring "confusion and ultimate disaster to our enemies." This is 44 percent more than the original quota and represents an average of 1½ purchases for every family in Lorain. In dollars, it averages a $100 bond for every man, woman, and child in the city.

YOUR FELLOW LORAINITES.

The Stepchild of World War No. 2—The Cotton Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, one of the paramount issues that most Congressmen living in a cotton farming district found out during the recent recess was the cotton farmer's feeling of resentment for the way he has been kicked around, abused, and discriminated against.

He is certainly correct when he names himself the stepchild of World War No. 2. With high wages for industrial workers, with high wages for most employees, with high prices for many farm commodities, the cotton farmer as regards the price for cotton is ignored. With the high cost of fertilizer, farm labor, seed, machinery, and so forth, necessary to produce one of the most essential materials for the war, that is, cotton, a reasonable person would expect that cotton producer to receive a price commensurate with the cost, and so forth.

That is not the case in regard to the cotton farmer. Washington bureaucracy governs the prices of all manufactured and agricultural products. In comparison with all classes of products in both fields of production, the cotton farmer stands practically alone, as the most discriminated against of them all. He is not comparable with any of the other producers when it comes to the price of his product.

This legislative body, of which I am a Member, passed legislation that would give the cotton farmer approximately 25 cents per pound instead of the 18 cents that he is getting today. Unfortunately this badly needed legislation was vetoed, for what reason we all still wonder.

The cotton farmer should be getting 35 cents per pound for his cotton if he were getting fair treatment and a price in comparison to the present price of most agricultural producers and industrial producers.

The cotton farmer's costs have doubled in most instances and in some they have increased threefold, yet the price for his cotton remains the same. He cannot make the fair profit that he is entitled to. He knows, just like we know, that some manufacturer is getting

the profit that he deserves and there is no argument that the cotton farmer needs it far more than the manufacturer. Any investigation of the true facts will show that.

Just how long is the cotton farmer going to continue to play the unfair and unwanted role of the South's persecuted problem child No. 1?

How long is the South's leading crop going to be a political football to be kicked around unreasonably?

How long is the South going to be discriminated against by having its largest and most productive crop—King Cotton—dwarfed into a midget when it comes to price?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when this body should act in fairness to themselves and in fairness to those abused and persecuted cotton farmers. A bill has been introduced by me which can remedy the situation. The cotton is now being picked and ginned. If we act now we can save the situation. If we delay, it will be fatal for whom—the cotton farmer, the stepchild of World War No. 2. I urge you to act and act quickly.

Pupils of Coxestown School, Harrisburg, Pa., Work for Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter from Miss Mildred E. Crouse, describing in detail the work which has been done in one of the smaller schools in Dauphin County. It seems to me that this school has made a remarkable record of achievement in all lines of endeavor connected with the war. I believe that anyone who reads this letter may perhaps find suggestions which could well be adopted by the schools in their district. I delayed inserting this in the RECORD until this time in order to obtain Miss Crouse's permission. In her last letter to me she advises that the complete sale of War bonds and stamps has reached the sum of $6,821.25 for the school year:

DEAR MR. KUNKEL: I was wondering if you might like to hear what one of the smaller graded schools in Dauphin County has done as its "bit" in the Schools at War program, during the fiscal school year. Now when I say smaller, I mean that our building, which is located on Greenawalt Lane, Harrisburg, in Susquehanna Township, known as the Coxestown School, has 3 rooms in use, and an enrollment of 75 boys and girls, in grades 1 to 6.

Our first project, of course, above all others, has been the sale of War bonds and stamps. The total sales starting September 22, and including this past week, amounted to $6,614.05, and $5,356.35 of that has come in since March 2, when we started a Buy a Jeep campaign.

The children completed a large, brightly colored, knit afghan, and sent it to the Coatesville Hospital to be placed on the bed of a World War No. 1 veteran from Harrisburg who is a patient there.

Forty-five crossword puzzle and scrap books were made and given through the Y. W. C. A.-U. S. O. to the WAC's, as they left Harrisburg to go to their various fields of duty several weeks ago.

Approximately 3,600 old silk and nylon hose have been gathered to go on their way for parachutes, etc.

Old papers, rubber, tin cans, and metal have been salvaged by the children and turned over to the several scrap drives.

The last Saturday of each month the boys spend going about the community collecting fats for victory.

Just before each registration period for ration books, etc., the teachers would hektograph instructions, etc., concerning the high lights about same, then the children would distribute them to the homes in the community, thus avoiding much turmoil on days of registration in the school.

You may have received many such letters as this and it may not interest you, but being our Representative in Congress at Washington, I thought we would like to let you know, even though we are small, that we can and will do our part for victory.

MILDRED E. CROUSE.

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, this is the opinion expressed of those in charge of the national rationing program and should bear weight with the Members of Congress, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation:

SEPTEMBER 21, 1943.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLOESER: I have been connected with a rationing board since November of last year, and during the regime of the various chairmen in Washington, the boards have always been advised that things would be simplified from an operational point of view, but, instead, we are continually getting more and more requests which complicate rather than simplify the work of local boards.

I am enclosing herewith a letter from the administrators of the southern California board, which expresses the sentiments of the members of the board extremely well, probably much better than we could have written it, and I assure you that all the statements therein can be readily verified should anyone care to take the time to do so.

I would like to add the thought that the O. P. A. has continually stressed the great amount of black-market gasoline which is available throughout the country, and, in my opinion, due to the fact that there are two separate units issuing gasoline rations, viz, the O. D. T. and the local rationing boards. Most of the black-market gas is made available through a surplus of T-type coupons, because of the fact that the O. D. T. is extremely liberal in the rations allowed to truckers. It would seem that when truckers run short of gas, it is no trouble at all for them to get additional rations to supply their slightest whims and wants and, of course, having an abundance of coupons, they do not hesitate letting their friends in the filling stations have a sufficient amount to meet their needs.

I am sure that anything which you can do to call to the attention of the various Members in Congress the great abundance of additional work and more hours which are continually being thrust upon the boards, and anything which can be done to alleviate the situation will be greatly appreciated by thousands of volunteers and board members.

The most recent plan which is causing us in the administrative capacity to shudder, is the one whereby some men totally strange to the community and totally disrupting our files, check each individual ration issued, and ask a board member to recheck. This presents a task so destructive to the routine and morale, and so Herculean in scope that if it is carried to its ultimate conclusion it looks very much as if a whole new rationing board will have to be appointed.

The point which the board members fail to recognize is how some total strangers to the community are in a better position to ration gasoline to individual members of the community, and we feel that when this work is completed there will still be the same percentage of errors as at present exist, or perhaps even greater, and in the final test, of what benefit will this be to the community which we serve?

Very truly yours,
A DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF A
WAR PRICE AND RATIONING BOARD.

AN OPEN LETTER TO O. P. A. AT WASHINGTON, AND TO ABOUT 200 RATIONING BOARD CHAIRMEN IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AND THROUGHOUT THE NATION

It is hard to believe what we Rationing Boards have been through, needlessly, during the past few weeks. What follows here is hard to put down in writing.

That a rationeer's revolt has not yet set in outwardly and in fact, as it has inwardly and in spirit, can be laid to the loyal stick-to-itiveness of weary board members and staff members, paid and volunteer. O. P. A.'s latest blunder has severely strained every one's loyalty.

The make-over of B and C books, following the summer load of A book renewal, provokes this letter, and now that some of the smoke has cleared away, some big and rather ugly facts stand out boldly. One is clear, that O. P. A. has little intention of keeping its oft-made promises to streamline the programs to "ease up the work of the boards"—"to give more authority and control" and "grant more paid help to the boards".

The writer heartily wishes that he could believe in those promises. But they have been made and broken too often for us to be misled, even though the promises come from a different voice or spokesman—no matter whether in the press, over the radio, or in the letter pages of Green Book inserts. The effect is almost always the same—a promise to "ease up" is usually a softening tap preceding a heavy blow. A lot of palaver over board "sacrifice"—deep gratitude and sweet words invariably are followed by some newer and clumsier confusion.

This make-over of B and C books, with its complete waste of a full complement of coupons, is still in the class of world mysteries. Its justifiable benefits are in the limbo of guesswork. It cannot be denied that millions of books have been totally wasted,

millions of weary work hours thrown away and millions of tire-miles burned up needlessly by car-owners getting their books changed.

Have you seen any gain worth the effort? Was it worth all this scrambling just to get A, B, and C coupons to look alike? Was it worth it just to get the old ones out of circulation on an exact fixed date to the utter confusion of boards, car owners and gas industry alike? O. P. A. could have demanded that the license numbers be written on the face of old B and C coupons and made them valid that way, saving all the needless work and waste. Such writing had been done by many thousands anyway. This program would have saved the mad rush of switching.

Will it lessen the black market? The only reason advanced for this supreme blunder of all O. P. A. blunders has been the black market. Will it turn that trick? What makes any rational person believe it will? It has created more ill-will, despair, and confusion than anything since rationing began, and we do not leave out any of those hectic hourly changing programs either. It seems so wholly unnecessary and work-wasting. It came out just at the time of lowest volunteer working staffs. The new food calculation (and coupons) for cafes, etc., had just been thrust onto the boards; stove rationing, with its new forms and a volume of new regulations, arrived at the same moment. In 3 issues of the Green Book within 10 days—over 600 pages of new matter came for digesting.

As one who has been constantly on the chairmanship job, full time, unpaid, since November 1942, we believe that O. P. A. has again fully demonstrated its inability to learn by experience. It proves its incapacity to plan suitable programs, and effect them, without making weltering blunders, so many of which we have groaned under during these 10 months. The waste material and time has been tremendous. At first, when O. P. A. was new, this may have been excusable. Now it is little short of criminal wastefulness of manpower and material in a time of all-out war.

We still believe in rationing as much as ever, but we deplore the gigantic and far-reaching tragedy of errors for which administrative O. P. A. is responsible. We ration boards have borne the brunt of the errors; we have been the goats in every case. Washington O. P. A. makes the rules; we have to interpret them but always working against the trend of punitive regulations—or what is worse—the uncertainty of interpretations and directives; and the certainty of confusing delays, changes, and news. We want to be fair—to do our sworn duty in upholding law. We want also to fairly and intelligently guide the rationed public, whose servants we are in this matter. But confusion, delay, and complicated programs make this impossible. Confidence is shattered; the whole ration structure is endangered because of the blunders at the top layer of authority.

Board members elsewhere, who have been consulted, express themselves in somewhat the same terms as above. Not one defended the many recent mistakes and failures. The kindly patience of last winter, when rationing was new and all of us were green, has given way to a despairing wish that something might be done about it—perhaps some giant bursting blunder to end all O. P. A. blunders.

If Washington O. P. A. does not know that the repeated blunders are striking at the very heart of public-ration morale—at the core of their acceptance of controlled price and supply regulation—then O. P. A. must indeed be stupid and incapable.

The mental attitude of rationing-board members, affecting as it does the staff of paid and volunteer workers, and above all, the rationed public itself, is a highly important factor. And, in spite of loyalty and patriotism, which cannot be questioned, despite the full fervent wish to help win the war, despite the thousands of sons and daughters of "rationeers" who are in service, it becomes increasingly apparent that O. P. A. is steadily breaking down the very staunchness and willingness of the unpaid (in money) and devoted hundred thousand or more men and women who have been drafted by their communities (not by Washington) to do the job which O. P. A. freely admits cannot be done without this citizen force.

Of course, O. P. A. might create a complete change-over of membership. Plenty have quit in disgust. But the vast majority stay on the job because they could only be forced out—costly though it is for them to serve. Plenty of us would not quit, tired as we are, short of a demand by the communities who put us there or a Supreme Court decision ousting us. It is our fight and this is our way to help win it. So we'll stick. But we want things changed. What can we do about it? Well, we can tell Washington what we think, instead of just grumbling. (Copies of this are being sent to Washington O. P. A.) We can tell our Senators and Representatives how we feel about it. So we are sending copies to them. You know they have facts and influences wholly unknown to us laymen. Of course, they might say this protest is "all wet." Copies of this are going to every board chairman in southern California, to district O. P. A., to regional at San Francisco, and to one or more ration boards in every other State. I am sorry I cannot send more.

Needless to say, the writer is sending this out entirely at his own expense, not using any O. P. A. help or facilities or material, and paying the postage because he believes that something should be done to get the boards to confer with one another, or at least express themselves to Washington on the many factors which so vitally affect the boards, as well as rationing itself. As the boards go, so goes rationing. If we believe in it, let's help straighten out the kinks and twists. Further than this, the writer has no wish.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. LIPPMAN,
Chairman Board 82.7.5,
Palm Springs, Calif.

P. S.—I'm glad I wrote this before I read Green Book No. 52—master sheet news letter, paragraph 4—that Himmleresque plan leaves me wordless!

September 10, 1943.

Coal Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is about time the War Labor Board changed its attitude toward the rank and file of the coal miners of the Nation and began thinking of getting coal to keep the people from freezing this winter rather than to continue dodging the issue in an effort to embarrass the labor leaders who represent the miners. If the War Labor Board and the Government are willing to give up their pet peeve, settle the coal mine dispute, and get greater production of coal for our citizens and the war effort they now have their chance.

The United Mine Workers of Illinois and the coal operators have reached an agreement on the proposed 8½-hour day. All the War Labor Board has to do now is to approve such agreement. Doubtless, if this Board will approve this agreement, its terms will be accepted throughout the Nation with a new wage contract entered into between the mine workers and the operators. It is to be hoped that the President and the War Labor Board will see the urgent necessity of such action. I refer to the President because there is little question but that none of the bureau heads, in an important matter like this, would make a decision without his approval.

Without the renewal of a wage contract the coal miners have carried on with the exception of a short time out on strike, and they have done a good job in production for the Nation. As a class they have not received the consideration and credit that is due them. It should have been evident from the beginning that with the increase of the cost of living that the wages of the miners, either by allowing portal to portal pay or in other ways, must be increased.

Their scale of wages has been far below the scale of wages in the munitions factories. Their work is and has been more hazardous than that of most industrial workers. All over the Nation women with no experience and with only a few weeks training have been drawing higher wages than the miners who have spent years in acquiring the skill of their trade. It should have been evident to those in charge of the War Labor Board that you cannot keep a group of men, who are organized and whose ranks number into the hundreds of thousands, at a wage level far below what their neighbors are making in less hazardous work and in better working conditions than are those of the miners. It is to be hoped that the War Labor Board will abandon its hard-headed attitude and that peace may come to the mining industry with a greater production of coal because our output now is lagging behind production goals by over 500,000 tons per week.

This Nation faces a serious fuel shortage during the coming winter. Thousands upon thousands of American homes will be cold because of an inability to obtain fuel. The responsibility for this fuel shortage must be accepted by the War Labor Board, inasmuch as its unreasoning attitude toward the miners is as directly responsible for the strife in that industry as the refusal of the miners to work under conditions which they regarded as intolerable.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the great majority of the Members of this House, if they had an opportunity, would vote for the proposal that is now before the War Labor Board. I am sure the coal miners have the sympathy of the majority of the Members of this House who recognize their hazardous employment and who also recognize that this group of men has been underpaid for many months when taking into consideration the high

cost of living and the wage standard set for other industrial workers.

It is to be hoped that the War Labor Board will abandon its arbitrary policy, approve this agreement, and stop the uncertainty and strife in the mining industry in the interest of the men who work in the mines and in the interest of the war effort and our civilian economy.

The Subsidy Roll-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the question of subsidizing the consumer's grocery bill on many items will be decided in Congress before the end of the year. Only a short time before the recess of Congress, the House, by a few votes, failed to override the veto of the President on the Commodity Credit Corporation extension bill, which carried a provision prohibiting subsidy payments for the purpose of rolling back prices to the September 15, 1942, levels on certain foods. In order to authorize the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, a compromise was reached which permitted the payment of consumer food subsidies to January 1, 1944. Since Congress reconvened, the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, has repeatedly asked that Congress extend food subsidies in order to reduce the cost of living.

While the outcome of the legislation is in doubt, both sides are marshalling forces for a fight to the finish. The anti-roll-back group is attempting to obtain a two-thirds majority of both Houses against the proposal, feeling that the President again would veto any measure outlawing these payments. The proponents claim that they have enough votes to continue food subsidies. Until the final roll calls are held it will not be known what effect the recess and the visits by Members of Congress with the people of their districts will have on the outcome.

Farm organizations oppose roll-back subsidies as unsound in that the people would be passing on to future generations grocery bills which can better be paid now by the consumers with the high wages they are receiving.

The whole problem comes down to this—whether America wants to continue the socialistic trend of the past several years by creating another bureau in the National Government at the expense of individual freedom and independence and placing additional swarms of Federal overseers on the top-heavy pay rolls at a time when the manpower problem is becoming more acute than at any time in the country's history.

The Federal pay roll could be cut one-third, and the result would be more efficiency.

It was proposed originally that the prices be rolled back on certain meats, on butter, and on coffee. The savings on the food bill on these items would approximate $3.92 annually per person, while it is estimated that the cost of the program in salaries, retirement of bonds, and in interest payments would be $9.15 per person. Our children and our children's children will pay more than double the amount saved in current food costs under the plan.

Bank deposits are in excess of $100,000,000,000 at this time. Currency in circulation in the United States is about $15,000,000,000, which is three times what it was only a few years ago. The national income in 1943 will be from one hundred and forty to one hundred and forty-five billion dollars, which is nearly double what it was 5 years ago. Bearing in mind these facts, it seems logical that we in America are in a better position to pay our food bills now rather than defer a part of them until after the war is over.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the war emergency has brought the O. P. A., O. D. T., W. P. B., O. W. I., W. F. A., N. H. A., and innumerable other alphabetical bureaus, but it has also given the Federal Government an excuse to inflict, or attempt to impose, many and sundry controls over the individual citizens such as the roll-back subsidy and grade labeling. The latest scheme to regiment America is the Wagner bill, which has been termed the "cradle to grave" security proposal. It is a broad bill, covering many subjects. This legislation was proposed in the report filed by the now extinct National Resources Planning Board, headed by Frederic A. Delano, an uncle of the President. Among its provisions it would place in the hands of one man, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, the right and power to employ doctors and set up the amount of pay they would receive, determine fee schedules for services of physicians, establish qualifications for those who specialize in any particular medical field, decide upon the number of patients for whom any physician may serve, determine by bureaucratic directive the particular hospitals or clinics which would be eligible to provide service for patients.

If the sweeping provisions of this legislation are enacted into law, the result would be to destroy the private practice of medicine. The doctor with all his training and skill would be at the mercy of one man, whose mandates and decrees would be issued from Washington, making the practice of medicine subservient to the will of the state and the politicians.

Under the present free American system medical science has developed continuously through the years, dreaded diseases have been conquered, and the lives of our people spared. Political control or Government control of the practice will mean medical care through physicians who are politically amenable instead of those who are more learned and skillful. The doctor serves humanity regardless of whether his patient is rich or poor. The Government doctor would come when called or fail to come. He would be supervised and managed to such an extent that a good part of his time would, of necessity, be consumed in studying Government regulations and unraveling red tape. It is estimated that the cost of the program would amount to $3,000,000,000 a year, or the total amount of money expended by the Republic of France in 1938 for all purposes.

If this socialistic crystal-gazing scheme should be enacted into law, it would be the forerunner for the establishment of centralized Federal control of all the professions and all private business.

Available Acreage for Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, Carl H. Wilken, educational director of the National Association of Agricultural Commissioners and Secretaries, delivered a very able address entitled "Available Acreage for Production" at the National Food Conference at Chicago a few days ago. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, Thomas Edison said, "All wealth comes from the soil."

The theory today is that all wealth comes from government.

This meeting and the food shortage that looms on the horizon can be blamed almost entirely to our failure to use common sense, arithmetic, and the soil of the United States.

Our economic education has been a mass of theory, neither based on facts nor on a foundation of fundamental economy.

During the past 50 years our economists have practically forgotten that raw material, especially farm production, is the foundation of our national economy. They forgot that the farm produces 65 percent of all raw materials and that the farm income is the origin of all national income.

An analysis of 30 years of the United States as a business reveals that a drop of 1 percent in the initial farm income will translate into 1 percent unemployment, and a loss of 1 percent in factory production, and a loss of 1 percent in national income. The records

of the United States Government, our Department of Agriculture, our Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor, have been used in making the survey.

In the past 12 years from 1930 to 1941 the failure to maintain farm prices at par with finished goods caused the Nation to suffer a loss of $463,000,000,000 of potential income, or an average of approximately $38,000,000,000 per year. I realize that this sounds unbelievable and fantastic, but if we stop to think and realize that the record in 1940 gave the national income as $77,000,000,000, with farm prices below par, and that in 1942 we had a national income of $119,000,000,000, with the general commodity index almost exactly the same as in 1926, facts become stranger than fiction. This difference in national income in the 2 years was $42,000,000,000. And if we look further, the record reveals that we had $39,000,000,000 of national income in 1932 and one hundred and nineteen billion in 1942. This is a difference of eighty billion a year. Economic education that permits that sort of variation in 10 years' time, in the same nation, with the same supply of raw-material resources, the same people, and the same government ought to be discarded and replaced by arithmetic that for centuries and centuries has been the foundation of all science. The classics tell us, "Remember, O stranger, arithmetic is the most accurate of all sciences, the mother of safety." The reason for this huge loss is a simple factor of a trade turn of the farm dollar in trade channels. This trade turn of the initial farm dollar ratio varies with definite mathematical exactness as farm income is exchanged for other goods and services.

From 1921 to 1940, each dollar of farm income created, on the average, $7 of national income. Most economists cannot believe that the farm income is first even though the record proves conclusively that unemployment and loss of factory production follow the drop in farm income. Our good old-fashioned common sense ought to prove that it takes about 6 months on the average for raw materials to go to the factory and from there through our trade channels to the ultimate consumer as finished goods. Common sense ought to prove that if the producer of raw materials is paid 75 percent of parity, that when the factory wishes to market its product that it can sell only 75 percent as much as if he had been paid 100 percent. The facts of the case are—and they can be proved from the record of the Nation as a business—that industry determines its market for finished goods at the relative price level that it pays for its raw materials.

Once we recognize that fact and realize that it's a mathematical law of exchange, then we will stop guessing and hoping for an answer to our economic riddle. In all our efforts to solve the so-called farm problem we did everything that man could dream about except maintain 100-percent parity in the way of price. Finally, through war, the price of farm products was restored to par. That is an indictment of our economic thinking Coming back to the seven times turn of the farm dollar, it means that for each billion dollars of farm income that was lost in the period when farm prices were below par the Nation lost $7,000,000,000 in income or purchasing power. We worried about the cost of maintaining proper farm prices when we should have been thinking of the loss that we are having because we did not maintain them. It is high time that we learn this one simple fact: that to operate the Nation as a solvent business to employ our labor and to maintain a national income to consume our production, a foundation of parity prices for farm products must, because of the laws of mathematics, be our first step.

Once we build that foundation, bureaucratic government and government planning by trial and error and retrial and more error becomes unnecessary. Because of the loss of income resulting from low farm prices during the so-called depression and the resulting underconsumption our economists developed a surplus complex of overproduction. All expansion of production was held in abeyance even though our annual increase in population requires approximately an increase of 3,000,000 harvested acres per year if we wish to maintain an American standard of living.

The failure of our economists to recognize the importance of agriculture also resulted in a failure to recognize the fact that our harvested acreage is the foundation of all farm production. Production of livestock, dairy products and poultry as well as raw materials for our industrial processing of farm products depends on seven principal crops: corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, and cotton. They constitute over 85 percent of all harvested acreage in the Nation. Let us, therefore, examine the foundation in order that we may know how large a plant we can build.

Using 1910 as a basis of 100, our harvested acreage in 1943 will have increased 6 percent. During the last war we plowed up submarginal land in the areas of low rainfall and in 1919, we harvested 12 percent more acres of farm crops than in 1910. With the drop in farm prices in the latter part of 1920 much of this acreage was abandoned as unprofitable. Through drainage of bottom land in areas of rainfall, and reclamation through irrigation, by 1929 we had increased our harvested acreage to 255,000,000 acres or approximately 8 percent more than in 1910. Since 1929 our failure to expand the foundation of harvested acreage and our surplus complex which took harvested acreage out of production, we have dropped back to 106 percent of the 1910 acreage.

During that same period we had an increase in our domestic population of 42 percent and added to that an increased demand for farm products by industry in producing finished goods other than food. Let me drive that fact home to you. Since 1910 our foundation of farm production harvested acreage has been increased 7 percent and our population has increased 42 percent. Today, instead of being a surplus-production nation, we are deficient in the basic acreage to feed and care for our own Nation on what we like to call our American standard of living. It is only natural that you ask, Well then how did we produce enough to get by? In the first instance, with a loss of thirty-eight billions a year because of subnormal farm prices, a third of our population was just existing, rather than enjoying an American standard of food, clothing, and other materials made from farm products.

In the second instance, again going to the records of the Department of Commerce, the record reveals that from 1925–41 inclusive, we had a net import of farm products to supplement our own production. In the period from 1925–29 we averaged a net import of approximately $350,000,000 per year, foreign valuation. These net imports contributed to the breaking down of farm prices in 1929 and the resulting depression. Even in 1932, with 15,000,000 unemployed, because of low farm prices, we had a net import of $7,000,000 worth of farm products. In 1934–41, when our theorists really got under way, we paid our farmers approximately $1,000,000,000 per year not to produce and increased our net imports to an average of approximately $700,000,000 per year, foreign valuation. We use the term "foreign valuation" because imports are recorded in terms of prices paid in foreign countries. When translated into domestic values and units of production the net imports from 1934–41 were equivalent to 50,000,000 acres per year.

With shortage of shipping, as a result of the war, many of these imports have been shut off. The recovery of the American price level has removed the surplus from underconsumption even to the point of rationing. Lend-lease supplies have increased the demand for exports of farm products. The result is shortage and a shortage that is equivalent to at least 50,000,000 acres. The only source of increasing our harvested acreage is through reclamation of swamps or irrigation of farm lands in areas of low rainfall.

Both of these methods are, of course, not available on short notice. Efforts should be made, however, to initiate such a program of reclamation because our normal increase in population will require an expansion of about 3,000,000 acres per year. We can plow up some of the submarginal acres. Shortage of farm machinery, labor, and low prices will tend to prevent this source from being used. Acres now in cultivation can be made to yield more by the use of fertilizers. But again shortage of fertilizers tends to prevent an increase in production from that source.

As a result, more cries from Washington and paper planning for more production will be in vain.

Failure to recognize the basic factor of harvested acreage in the production of farm products has resulted in an over-expanded livestock, dairy, and poultry program. The production of these products will have to be curtailed by liquidation in the next 6 months. This will result in a shortage of food in 1944.

Not to the point of starvation but to an extent never experienced in the United States. All because of the simple fact that we did not use arithmetic in analyzing the foundation of harvested acreage, the foundation for all farm production.

We have made many commitments to our allies in the way of food products. We do not have the basic foundation to produce these products and our promises will be like those of the bragging upstart, promising that which he couldn't deliver, because he never had it to give.

In closing, I wish to state, without reservation, that in the post-war era, if we maintain farm price parity, we cannot have a depression in the United States. We can have a solvent Nation and help the rest of the world organize a prosperous economy, instead of one that exploits, booms, and busts.

But, always we must remember that our form of government, our freedom and our future of tomorrow rests in the soil of the United States and that the crops from the harvested acreage determines employment, income, and expansion for our Nation. A prosperous United States can and must precede all international cooperation. When we have that, and not until then, will we have a foundation for peace.

The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the Treasury Department recently issued an "anonymous editorial" in connection with the recent bond drive. This editorial, entitled "The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak," was widely published, and excited much comment and praise.

As a result of the great interest created by the publication of the article it has become known that the author is Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YOUNG DEAD SOLDIERS DO NOT SPEAK

Nevertheless they are heard in the still houses; who has not heard them?

They have a silence that speaks for them at night and when the clock counts.

They say, We were young. We have died. Remember us.

They say, We have done what we could but until it is finished it is not done.

They say, We have given our lives but until it is finished no one can know what our lives gave.

They say, Our deaths are not ours. They are yours; they will mean what you make them.

They say, Whether our lives and our deaths were for peace and a new hope or for nothing we cannot say; it is you who must say this.

They say, We leave you our deaths; give them their meaning; give them an end to the war and a true peace; give them a victory that ends the war and a peace afterward; give them their meaning.

We were young, they say. We have died. Remember us.

The Contagion of Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a former prosecutor, I had occasion over a 15-year period to become familiar with the excellent work done by the better-business bureaus throughout the country. Their activities in the prevention of frauds have saved countless people from racketeers and unscrupulous promoters.

Under leave granted, I include a letter from the chief of the division of securities of the State of Ohio to Mr. Hugh Smith, manager of the Philadelphia Better Business Bureau, and I also include an address given by Mr. Smith before the National Association of Securities Commissioners at Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 2, 1943:

STATE OF OHIO,
DIVISION OF SECURITIES,
Columbus, September 11, 1943.

Re National Association of Securities Commissioners Cincinnati convention.

Mr. HUGH SMITH,
Manager, Philadelphia Better Business Bureau, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. SMITH: After taking time to reflect upon the type and quality of the address which you presented to the securities commissioners in Cincinnati, I have become more appreciative of your cooperation and that of the better-business bureaus in maintaining business ethics at a high level. Your address was thoughtful and constructive and voiced a sense of responsibility much needed in these times. The work of the better-business bureaus and our work as administrators of securities laws overlap at many points, but at no place more than in the work of fraud prevention. Your remarks relating to the dangers of dissipation of War bond funds were most appropriate. I am sure that all the commissioners deeply appreciated your time and effort and contribution.

In addition to the address which you gave, we appreciated knowing you and having you participate in the functions of our association. We have long enjoyed pleasant relationships with the better-business bureaus and your coming to this twenty-sixth annual convention added to the great fund of mutual helpfulness which we have long enjoyed.

Most cordially yours,

PAUL L. SELBY,
Chief of Division.

Some years ago, a prominent writer published an essay in which she spoke of the contagion of folly. She said that like other forms of contagion it is spread by personal contact. I selected her phrase for the title of my talk, not because I want others to pursue my folly in going about making talks, but because it seems to me to depict a condition which we may face in the securities field in the post-war era.

Most confidence games and securities swindles which victimize the public are handled through personal appeal by clever high-pressure salesmen. The contagion is often spread by the victim himself, who, in good faith, sends the salesman to relatives or friends. He may even conduct a sort of fifth column of his own by mentioning his good fortune to others who, in turn, become infected and clamor to be "taken." It is a cycle with which we are all familiar. Ponzi was one such classic example.

Already there are signs of potential dangers. These may not take the form of the usual stock and bond type of security. Their device will still be essentially a security in a somewhat different garb.

One of our western coast bureaus reports they are already learning that promoters of not too savory character are now working in defense plants, principally for the purpose of developing private sucker lists for current and later use in the sale of oil lands or leases.

Within the past few days we received an inquiry at our office about one company, a reputable one, which is collecting money on a direct selling basis from householders in connection with the sale of silverware. This silverware is not available for delivery now, but will be furnished after the war. Purchasers have been given certain types of certificates or receipts which are to be redeemable for the merchandise.

In the hands of a responsible company this is a reasonably safe transaction. It is an exaggeration of the lay-away plan commonly used in legitimate merchandising.

On the other hand, I believe you can see the possibilities in such a procedure in the hands of irresponsible or unscrupulous sellers. It's like buying a ticket to your own funeral. The interim certificates used in this particular transaction are being directed to the attention of our State securities commission and to the Securities and Exchange Commission to see if they come within their definitions of securities, since they most assuredly are evidences of indebtedness.

This is mentioned merely as one possible variation of enterprises which we may encounter.

None of us is wise enough to foresee how our present business and industrial structure, which has been adapted to winning the war, will be changed to meet the needs of peace. There are, unquestionably, many complex situations which we will face, and some of them will bring financial hardship to people who have, during the war, known unaccustomed prosperity. It is natural that they should grasp any opportunity to combat the situation. Sharpers always take advantage of such conditions.

When our soldiers return, they will want to get back into civilian life as quickly as possible. They will feel a need to accelerate their efforts to make up for the precious years they have devoted in the protection of their country. The promoter who offers them speedy access to business partnerships, executive jobs and ground-floor opportunities in industries which allegedly have boom tendencies, will probably find many ready takers. As of yore, the hook will be that the prospect must put up money to show his good faith, or he must buy an interest in the business.

But even if all the psychological factors were right, the situation would still be sterile for the promoter if his prospective victims didn't have the money to make his schemes profitable.

Probably the greatest accumulation of wealth that has ever been in the hands of the public now exists, not as a promoter's pipe dream, but as a reality. According to the figures secured from the United States Treasury Department, the holdings of Series E, F, and G War and Defense Savings bonds in the hands of the public through July of this year were $19,304,515,000. This, of course, does not take into consideration savings accounts, money in safe-deposit boxes, old socks, and chimney corners, and the host of tangible things which people have acquired.

It doesn't need market surveys by alleged experts to point the way. The sharpers know the direction and are getting ready for the kill.

These bondholders represent many people who never previously owned securities. Some of them are young—boys and girls who, until they were suddenly catapulted into the war effort, had never been employed. They are uninitiated into the normal type of business transaction. This is also true of many men and women who enlisted in the armed services and who have set aside a part of their earnings to purchase War bonds. In addition, there are those who may have been familiar, to some degree, with investment transactions before the war, but who have now been away for several years, have been thinking of entirely different things, and who may have moved permanently to new locations. Such people need a refresher course in the principles of personal financial protection.

You know, of course, as well as I do, that the chances for organized crookedness in the securities field, or the operation of securities frauds on a large scale, such as prevailed after the last war, is practically nonexistent today. At the close of the last war fewer States enjoyed the protection of securities legislation. Since that time many States have not only acquired such laws but the officials appointed to enforce them have become skilled and experienced in their tasks. Some of the laws then existing, as well as later legislation, have been subsequently amended and strengthened. The Securities Exchange Act was passed and the Commission which it created has become well established in its field.

Then, too, consider the great accumulation of information in the files of every member of your association about the past performances of men whose character and conscience would allow them to indulge in the barbecue of sucker flesh now turning on the spit. I learned that the securities violations section of the Securities and Exchange Commission, up to July 31, 1943, had approximately 45,000 individual records of men and companies whose past records reveal attempts at financial black magic.

There is also available the tremendous reservoir of records in the files of the Federal

Bureau of Investigation. While many of these records do not concern the securities field, others may and do, and they lend strength to performance in this field.

In 1918 there were 8 better-business bureaus. Today there are 83—83 fraud-fighting organizations welded into a national protective association of great strength.

It is readily seen that the sharper who expects to prey upon holders of War bonds, and also upon those who have enhanced their financial position during the war period, will face more formidable barriers than his predecessors faced in previous years. We will, of course, have with us the free lancer, the hit-and-run opportunist, the subdivision real-estate racketeer, the business breaker instead of broker, the business opportunities artists, and others of the same ilk.

Fortunately, there have been important developments in methods of education and communication. The radio was in comparative infancy in 1918. It has now grown into a means of communication which penetrates into nearly every home. There has been a marked development, both in and out of our educational institutions, on courses of instruction for consumers. These courses not only embrace facts about vitamins contained in various foods, and how to take care of the baby, but they also deal intelligently with the financial and investment problems of the family. There are favorable factors, and we must apply them to the problem.

Just as the swindlers are anticipating the post-war market for their spurious wares, so should all of the protective agencies, working together, now prepare their plans to meet such attacks. This entire subject was given serious consideration at the annual conference of the National Association of Better Busines Bureaus held in Omaha early in June of this year. We concluded that this should be a period of education, so that by the time the onslaught arrives, the public will be on its guard, and will recognize the earmarks of dangerous schemes. They should also be familiar with the functions of the governmental agencies in the securities field and know how to avail themselves of their protection.

The essential and basic function of your department is, of course, the registering of dealers. This in itself is a great protection to the public. The fraud aspects of securities are not disengaged from this main function. But they are or should be a specialized feature of it. The most effective way to fight fraud is to prevent it in the first instance.

I realize that most securities commissions do not have an appropriation in their budget for publicity or educational purposes. In fact, many commissions are not adequately staffed at the present time to carry on the executive and investigational work necessary for the full enforcement of their laws. This should not prevent us, however, from studying the problem carefully and utilizing every available source of reaching the public with this message.

We in the Better Business Bureau believe that our activities will help to temper the legalistic aspects of agencies entrusted with the enforcement of securities acts. It would be a great gain if every securities commission had a statement available, in common language, explaining the securities law for the man on the street, telling him how he can avail himself of the facilities and authority which now alienate him to some extent by their detached formality.

The formality followed by many commissions in answering inquiries from citizens of their respective States does not encourage intimacy. I have seen some of these letters. They are brief, official, and legalistic in language, stating that the party named is, or is not, registered in accordance with section such-and-such, of article so-and-so, of the act of such-and-such a date. Sometimes, but not always, a printed copy of the law is enclosed. This is too much for the ordinary person, who, if he were able to interpret the law, might not have found it necessary to make inquiry in the first instance.

For years, better business bureaus, each working in its own locality, and frequently joining hands in more widespread educational efforts, have been urging the public to heed the slogan—"before you invest—investigate." This has brought tremendous dividends over the years and as we all know, many schemes which would have been serious violations of the Securities Acts, and which might have caused great financial loss to the public, have been nipped in the bud because they were brought to your attention and because your subsequent swift action curbed them. The power of publicity is still one of the most protective measures in the world.

Recently, many of our bureaus (and I speak for the Philadelphia bureau because I know first hand about this effort) have been distributing hundreds of thousands of small leaflets of a size for insertion in pay-roll envelopes. These have been furnished without charge to industrial plants, large offices, stores, and other business firms, for distribution to their employees. They carry educational messages such as "Before you invest—investigate." The recipient is asked to be on the alert for any scheme which comes to his attention, and he is asked to report it promptly to his local better business bureau. The results in our case, and I know in that of other bureaus, have been amazing. These small leaflets turn up some interesting inquiries and reveal the activities of many individuals about whom we might not hear for months or until they had accomplished great damage.

Every consumer who writes into our better business bureau on any subject, usually receives, in addition to the reply to his specific inquiry, some educational literature about other schemes which he may encounter. In this way, people are put on their guard.

Envelope inserts, or posterettes, one of which I show you, are given wide distribution. This one, pertaining to War bonds, reads: "The promoters have their eyes on your War bonds. Their propositions will sound good—they'll promise you quick profits. Unfortunately, the promoter is the only one who profits. If you are urged to cash your bonds for investment in an unknown proposition—investigate. Your War bonds are one of the best investments you can make, and the best interests of your country are served if you keep them." This is a message which we must get into the hands of every War-bond holder. We are preparing it in poster form for the bulletin boards of industrial plants and offices. Many other types of posters are used by better business bureaus in their own cities, and many more are in preparation.

One comparatively unrecognized and undeveloped medium which reaches large numbers of employees, most of them holders of War bonds, is the house magazine or employee publications. The extent to which this field has developed was a great surprise to me. An article in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal reports that house magazines now reach 40,000,000 readers, and that $50,000,000 spent in a year on these publications were considered a good investment.

Many better business bureaus have available to them the constant use of radio facilities, advertising space in newspapers, suburban and neighborhood papers, trade publications, and other media. Thousands of speeches are given every year before classes in high schools, colleges, and universities, as well as before foremen's associations, employee groups, women's clubs, and consumer gatherings.

Some years ago the Pennsylvania Securities Commission prepared for use a statement written in nontechnical language, about the securities law of our State, its protective facilities, and how to use them. We published this in our bulletin, which has a wide distribution in a diversity of sources, many of which, in turn, are distributing agencies of their own. We reprinted this article in a leaflet and gave it a wide distribution. We also included it in every letter answering inquiries on the subject of securities. So important did we feel this place of educational literature to be that we recently asked the Pennsylvania Securities Commission to revise the article bringing it up-to-date. We shall then reprint it in quantity, and get it into the hands of as many War-bond holders in our State as possible. This is a job which might well be worth consideration in other States. These are just a few ideas to stimulate further thinking about the many avenues open to us. We have only to avail ourselves of these opportunities.

On behalf of the National Association of Better Business Bureaus, which I have the privilege of representing here, I convey to you our appreciation for the splendid cooperation which we have received from your group over a long period of years. It has been a very happy relationship. We know that when the post-war problem begins to take its definite shape, it will find us working more closely together for the public protection than ever before. Right will prevail on the side offering the most effective educational facilities. Together we can thwart whatever devious plans the swindlers may prepare. In so doing, the contagion of folly will not have the opportunity to breed or to spread.

A Great Citizen Passes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I announce the passing of an outstanding public servant and distinguished jurist.

From a little community named Black Jack in St. Louis County, of my district, came a man named Julius R. Nolte. His family were pioneers. During the 64 years of Judge Nolte's life he distinguished himself as an outstanding lawyer, a most able jurist, and a great humane citizen.

In memoriam, I extend an article to his honor from the St. Louis County's Watchman-Advocate:

CIRCUIT JUDGE NOLTE, 25 YEARS ON BENCH, DIES AT THE AGE OF 64—MEMBER OF PIONEER COUNTY FAMILY WAS ADMITTED TO BAR IN 1906—SERVED AS MAYOR OF CLAYTON

St. Louis County and the State of Missouri lost one of its outstanding jurists and most highly respected citizens in the death early Tuesday morning of Circuit Judge Julius R. Nolte, of division No. 1 of the St. Louis County Circuit Court.

Judge Nolte, of 307 North Bemiston Avenue, Clayton, prominent lawyer and a former school teacher, who once served as assistant prosecuting attorney of St. Louis County and was a former mayor of Clayton, died from

uremia, at Deaconness Hospital, at the age of 64 years. He became ill about a month ago, rested for a time at his home, and then returned to the bench, but only for a short time, when he was removed to the hospital.

A native of Black Jack, Judge Nolte throughout his active career was a stanch Republican, and because of his legal ability and sterling qualities was appointed by Gov. Sam A. Baker, in 1928, as provisional judge of the St. Louis County Circuit Court to fill the vacancy caused by the illness of Judge James C. Kiskaddon. During the same year he was first elected to the judgeship and was reelected for 6-year terms in 1934 and 1940.

Judge Nolte is survived by his wife, Mrs. Julia Wilson Nolte, and a sister, Mrs. Ruth Couch, of Flat River.

Funeral services were held Thursday afternoon at Bopp's Funeral Church in Clayton, with Rev. Walter Langtry officiating. Interment was in Black Jack Cemetery.

The following named members were appointed to represent the St. Louis Bar Association as honorary pallbearers at the funeral of Judge Nolte:

Marvin E. Boisseau, William W. Crowdus, Samuel W. Fordyce, Arthur J. Freund, James E. Garstang, Elmer H. Grimm, Lon O. Hocker, Arthur V. Lashley, John S. Marselek, Barak J. Mattingly, Walter R. Mayne, Thomas F. McDonald, David L. Millar, Glen Mohler, Roland F. O'Bryen, J. Sidney Salkey, Spencer M. Thomas, Alva C. Trueblood.

Judge Nolte was born at Black Jack, August 25, 1879, a son of Robert and Josephine (Leber) Nolte, pioneers of this country. His father was engaged in farming and fruit growing and for many years was active in school work. The judge graduated from Kirkwood High School in 1897, followed the profession of a school teacher in his early years, and was later appointed a deputy circuit clerk.

Judge Nolte studied law at the St. Louis Law School and was admitted to the bar before the supreme court, January 17, 1906, and was enrolled in the Supreme Court of the United States March 2, 1926. He served as assistant prosecuting attorney of St. Louis County from 1909 to 1910, and in 1922 was elected mayor of Clayton, retiring at the end of his term.

The marriage of Judge Nolte to Miss Julia Wilson, who survives him, occurred June 17, 1903. She is a daughter of the late Dr. C. C. Wilson of Cape Girardeau.

Letters to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three letters which I am sending to my constituents, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR TEACHER: I am writing this letter for a twofold purpose—first, to tell you what I have done here in Washington in a conscientious attempt to help and aid you in your problems, and second, to ask for your vote and support in the coming Governor's election to be held January 18, 1944.

In the last Congress preceding this, the present Seventy-eighth Congress, the Federal aid bill for State schools, which means so much to each of you, died with the ending of that 2-year session, having laid dormant in committee for 2 years.

In this term of Congress the same bill was introduced both in the House (H. R. 2849) and in the Senate (S. 637). Up until September both bills have been inactive in committee. After discussing the matter with representatives of the Louisiana Teachers Association in Louisiana, I was determined not to let this present bill receive the same fate as in the preceding Congress.

I, therefore, on September 20, 1943, proceeded to secure a discharge petition for the House bill (H. R. 2849) and my signature is No. 1 on this petition. Two hundred and seventeen additional signatures are necessary to bring the bill from the committee to the floor. It is my opinion that the needed signatures will be secured shortly.

Since the House differs from the Senate in that there is no discharge petition remedy in the latter, I have taken Senate bill (S. 637) up with several Senators personally and they agreed to take the Senate floor and demand action by the Senate committee. In this way the bill can be brought to the Senate floor for consideration.

Thus I am convinced that both Houses will take action on these bills in plenty of time to bring them to a vote and enact this bill into law.

This act would vitally aid the school systems of Louisiana. The bill provides that the United States Government will not supervise the spending of the money by the State school systems.

Under the terms of this act $20 and more per educable child in Louisiana is guaranteed. The teachers would get a 35-percent increase in pay. Since more than 4,000 teachers have quit teaching in Louisiana, this act would not only help you, but prove an incentive in securing additional teachers to relieve the present shortage. Today as our school system in Louisiana now operates, the school teachers are the poorest paid group in the State. This is shameful. Louisiana's present annual share of these Federal funds under this proposed act is $3,000,000. The maximum share in the future goes as high as $7,000,000.

I intend vigorously to support this bill so that no stone will be left unturned in order to enact the bill into law in this session of Congress, which will continue for approximately 1 year and 3 months longer.

I have consistently voted for all bills directly or indirectly aiding schools, and, on the other hand, have fought and voted against all bills directly or indirectly adversely affecting our school systems.

I did not attempt to write a school program into my platform for Governor, feeling that same could be done in a much better fashion by your association. It is my suggestion that if you have any ideas or recommendations for the school program in my Governor's platform, please write or contact Mr. Howard Wright, the secretary at Baton Rouge, in order that he can in turn pass them on to me.

You, of course, realize that I am far better known over Louisiana today. My backing is more substantial than ever before. Then, too, my service here in Congress has enabled me to demonstrate that I can be of real service to you and other citizens of Louisiana and leaves no doubt in your mind that I would make the kind of Governor you want. Even my worst political critics praise my work here in the Nation's capital.

If I can further assist you individually, or as a group, at any time, I hope you will feel free to call on me.

It may be that I will not have the privilege to see you and talk with you as I had hoped to before election on account of my many duties here in Washington, so that is the reason I am writing you this personal letter, asking for your vote and support so that we will win a great victory on January 18, 1944.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON.

P. S.—Enclosed you will find my speech of recent date, which I hope you will enjoy. I also enclose article by Director Edgar L. Morphet, of administration of finance, Florida State Department of Education.

Best regards,

JIMMY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I know that there are times that one must appeal to his friends. You were one of my very close friends who thought so much of me that you donated to my campaign for Governor in 1940, and by so doing made possible perhaps the most scintillating and colorful campaign the State ever saw. I still have that card with your name and address on it, which I shall always keep and cherish.

As you know, I am in another campaign. It is not my purpose to ask for another donation, but rather to express my deep appreciation for your kindness in the last campaign and to ask you for something that is far greater than money—your support in this coming Governor's election, which will mean so much to both of us.

Being a lot better known throughout the State at this time, and having recently had the opportunity of serving the people in Congress, I believe that we will all win a great victory on January 18, 1944, which, of course, is election day, and it will give me the long-awaited chance of being of personal service to you.

It may not be my good fortune to see you personally, as I hope to, but I am going to count on you to help organize your community and put your shoulder to the wheel once again in order that victory will be ours.

I will be in Louisiana soon to begin the campaign.

Looking forward to seeing you then, I am
Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—Enclosed is a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, The Gold Dust Twins, which I hope you will enjoy. Best of luck.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: A mutual friends of ours was telling me about you the other day. I told him that I was going to write and ask you for your vote and support in the coming Governor's election, January 18, 1944.

You, of course, realize that I am far better known all over Louisiana today than in the last Governor's race. My backing is more substantial than ever before. Then, too, my service here in Congress has enabled me to demonstrate that I can be of real service to the people. Even my worst political critics admit this. If I can assist you at any time I hope you will feel free to call on me.

I may not have the opportunity to see you personally, so am taking this means to tell you that I would certainly like to count on you for your support.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

JIMMY MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—Enclosed is a copy of a speech made on the opening day of Congress, after the recess. Please especially note that part about the St. Lawrence waterway and how it would affect New Orleans and Louisiana.

Best regards,

JIMMY.

Visit by Senators to the Fighting Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of October 3, entitled "War Tour by Senators Promises Wide Benefits," and also an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of this morning entitled "Men Who Justify the Existence of America," relating to the tour recently taken by several Senators who visited the various war fronts where our troops are engaged, with particular reference to the report recently made on the floor of the Senate by the able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 3, 1943]

WAR TOUR BY SENATORS PROMISES WIDE BENEFITS—CARE AND RESTRAINT IN THEIR COMMENTS INDICATE CONGRESS WILL GET VITAL DATA ON OUR EFFORTS ABROAD—LODGE REPORT CONSTRUCTIVE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 2—The parliamentary pilgrim among warriors, on inquiry bent, has always been a figure of fun, a source of irritation, or both. Anecdotes that drift back to the capitals concerning him are frequently contemptuous. He is expected to make reports to his colleagues and his constituency that are ignorant and foolish, often destructive, after looking into things for himself and for them.

Typical of the traditional species of legislator as "a chiel amang ye, takin' notes," was Kipling's character, Pagett, M. P. Not a wandering legislator, but virtually the same, was the author's Lord Benira Trif, for whom Mulvaney, Ortheris and Learoyd staged a fake peril and rescue and transformed his projected criticisms of the army in India to grateful praise.

But the five Senators who returned to Washington this week from an air trip around the world, during which they visited every theater of combat in which Americans are active and talked with every field commander and numerous members of the rank and file, have shattered the comic tradition. What they reported on and off the record, after they came back, made sense.

A VARIETY OF REPORTS

Particularly cogent, informing and thought-compelling was the testimony given by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts, the youngest of the group. And very keen anticipatory interest attends the report which Senators JAMES M. MEAD, of New York, and RALPH BREWSTER, of Maine, will make for the Truman committee, of which they are members, on the activities abroad of Washington war agencies, including the propaganda and informational services which are operated by the Office of War Information.

It may be that before the record is complete one or more of the globe-trotting Senators will say or write something that will fall into the traditional pattern of the inept or the destructive. But nothing that has emanated from any of the four that have reached Washington—Senator A. B. CHANDLER, of Kentucky, is still on the way home—belongs even remotely in that category.

The Senators, from whom RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia acted as chairman, saw organization and action—military, naval, and air. They observed at first hand what they agree to be the most cohesive inter-allied combat machine of history—the Anglo-American. They discussed with commanders problems of strategy and supply, and with private soldiers their human problems. Colleagues who have listened to them thus far in public and in private have been much impressed with the value the tour will have for all other legislators, for the Executive, and for the American public. This seems to be the beginning of a new American tradition.

Among the important subjects which the Senators brought back for discussion and action, and on which they have contributed and will contribute information, are these:

The merger of all combat activities—military, naval, and air—into one service, under control of one department and one high commander and staff.

A resurvey of supply, particularly with respect to petroleum, to determine whether it is longer necessary or desirable that the United States, which produces only 25 percent of the world supply, shall furnish 60 percent of that used by the United Nations. The President has announced that he has asked for a complete report as to this situation.

PRODUCTION OF SUPPLIES

The present petroleum and rubber production schedules of the British in contrast with what could be produced of these essential supplies.

The propaganda of O. W. I. in friendly countries, posing a question whether this is well done, valuable, or even worth while in the war effort.

The welfare of our troops, "involving (as Senator LODGE stated it) not only their food, clothing, equipment, medical care, and dependency allotments, but also the leadership which they are receiving and, if possible, the fighting qualities which they displayed in combat and the obstacles they had to overcome."

The general and specific problems of strategy, with their bearing on the post-war problems they will raise. The work of the American Military Government of Occupied Territories, as exemplified by the present operations in Sicily of former Lt. Gov. Charles Poletti of New York.

The censorship policy of the Government, concerning which the Senators found much complaint among the troops for being—again in the words of Mr. LODGE—too "favorable and laudatory" and "completely out of tune with the realistic attitude which our young men have toward this war. * * * Comments which I heard range all the way from criticism of the cigarette advertisements, which always portray field soldiers as clean-shaven and neatly pressed, to disagreement with the practice of portraying all our allies as being perfect."

The disposition after the war of the great airfields which have been built and paid for by Americans and American capital all around the world.

Increase of reverse lend-lease, an example of which would be afforded if the British were to divide with the United States their control over great areas in which the cable systems are now all in their control.

PROBLEM OF BASES

The military value of Russia's Siberian bases, from which we are now barred by reason of the fact that Russia is not at war with Japan.

A more liberal policy of relieving troops after they have served a certain length of time in arduous and perilous duty with our forces overseas.

These are important matters, fit for responsible legislative inquiry and suggestion for improvement. They lie properly within the province of Congress, which appropriates the funds for the war, and they are of the deepest interest to the American public, which is supplying the manpower and materials of combat They belong in the realm of constructive discussion, and that is the spirit in which the Senators thus far have dealt with them.

The four who have reported publicly up to this time have also carefully refrained from including views and information they assembled on the journey which, if projected before making a complete check and formulating remedies, would have an adverse effect on Allied cooperation and the most effective conduct of the war, and at the same time would bring about no improvements in conditions.

They have preferred to seek solutions in private, if possible, with the responsible military and civilian executive authorities in Washington. In sum, what the Senators have said and done up to this writing is the reverse of what was feared and has been very often predicted.

AN EXAMPLE SET

The episode is an excellent illustration of what can be done by Congress by the use of an effective and responsible committee system. The five Senators acted informally as a committee for their colleagues, and if they returned with flaws to point out and corrections to suggest, they returned also with proof satisfactory to Congress that many tales it has heard about our affairs abroad are not to be accepted as true.

The tone and content of Mr. Lodge's first statement to the Senate were especially constructive and clear. He spoke as a good reporter writes, in the light of high journalistic standards, having had his pre-Senatorial training in that field.

[From the Baltimore Sun of October 4, 1943]

MEN WHO JUSTIFY THE EXISTENCE OF AMERICA

Few people think of turning to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find romance, the poetry of great deeds, and singing chronicles of the high heart. But in that part of the RECORD devoted to the proceedings of the Senate on September 30 is the transcript of certain paragraphs of Senator LODGE's speech in which he referred to the men he had met in his recent tour of the battle fronts. The Senator was not trying to be eloquent. His words were plain, his sentences undecorated. He simply told what he saw; but what he said, not how he said it, makes it a glowing page.

He told of terribly wounded men in the hospitals, utterly serene except for the one fear that they may never be allowed to fight again. He told of Lieutenant Miller, of the Navy, left on a Pacific beach so certain he was dying that he gave his shoes and equipment to his comrades, but who later revived, took grenades from a dead Japanese, with them destroyed an enemy patrol, and held his position for 42 days, coming back loaded with weapons and captured Japanese documents. He told of Colonel Flickinger, Army doctor, who parachuted alone down to the spot where a plane had crashed in the jungle and took care of the injured.

He told of Bernt Balchen, who, flying a seaplane, found another plane forced down on the Greenland ice cap, and realized that its crew must be rescued at once or die. There was a place where the ice had melted, hardly more than a large puddle, but Balchen set his seaplane down there. He knew that if he stopped his plane would freeze to the

slush ice a few inches under the water, so he taxied around and around, and every time he passed the group, too weak to help themselves, with his giant's strength he snatched one of them into the plane, and so finally brought them all away.

After reciting these and other stories like them, the speaker commented:

"We can see the justification of the United States in the men it sends into battle. Their conduct is a peremptory command to us to leave no stone unturned in order to be worthy of their sacrifice."

The word "justification" is well chosen. These men are saving the country, but they are doing more—they are, in fact, justifying its existence before mankind and in the eyes of generations to come.

America Must Not Be Shackled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at the public meeting held in connection with the fifteenth annual scientific assembly of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on October 1, 1943:

Mr. Toastmaster and fellow citizens, it is a pleasure and a privilege to address a group of individuals whose lives are devoted to efforts for easing and curing the ills of mankind, and advancing the science of medicine.

No one can come to this splendid gathering of physicians without sensing in full appreciation the contribution men and women of your profession have made to humanity. It can be truly said no profession has made a greater contribution to the progress of humanity.

The war has made terrific demands upon you. A great number of your associates have given up profitable private practice to minister to the medical needs of the men and women in our armed services. It is a source of great hope and comfort to the American people that such advances in medicine and surgery have been made since the last war, that fewer casualties are expected to be permanently incapacitated. Many who in earlier wars would have died will live because of the triumphs achieved by medical science.

Those of you whose lot it has been to remain at home are carrying an immense burden in caring for the health of the civilian population. No class of our people has labored under a greater strain of urgency or performed a more valuable service than the medical groups.

Through centuries of effort you have progressed from the humble herb-and-folk practice until today, through the application of modern science, you heal diseases which heretofore would have been fatal. Through your efforts it is possible for the blind, the stricken, and the crippled to be able to live useful lives. You have been able to increase materially the life span of the average man and woman.

This you have been able to accomplish because your profession has been free. It has been free to dare. It has been free to progress. You have had the assurance of great personal satisfaction in rendering indispensable services to your fellow men. You could expect some measure of material reward for your investment in years of education and hard study and devotion to your profession.

Under the harsh necessity of war, your law-making body, the Congress, has delegated enormous powers to the several branches of the executive department of this Government. There was no escape from this procedure. The details of war activity must be administered by the executive machinery. But having yielded these powers, the Congress has a covenant with the people of America carefully to watch the exercise of these vast powers and be ready to curb and correct any abuses. Congress must be ready to amend, restrict or even to recall any authority it has granted if new conditions, or the abuse of power make it essential to the public interest to do so. Above all, it is the solemn responsibility of Congress, if we are to keep faith with the people, to revoke these enormous powers when the war is over. It would be a futile victory if we were to win a war over dictatorship abroad only to have a permanent dictatorship fastened upon America at home.

For some years, a small but powerful group in this country has endeavored to undermine American institutions, American ideals, and our American way of life. These people are as clever as they are determined. They have promoted their cause in the public press, over the airwaves, on the platform, and in books and pamphlets. I do not believe it is an exaggeration to say they are represented in every department of our Government. They have tried to destroy the confidence of the people in their own special instrumentality of control over their Government, the Congress. They have gone so far as to hint that the Congress has become a sort of fifth wheel, an outmoded, cumbersome branch of Government, which has outlived its usefulness.

In their subtle campaign to undermine the American system, they have ridiculed the founding fathers as mercenary and selfish individuals. They have declared the pioneers who helped to make this country the greatest industrial empire in the world were actuated by nothing but greed and personal aggrandizement. Men who have made great contributions to the building of America have been pictured as pirates and exploiters of humanity.

The purpose, of course, of these plotters in attempting to tear down American institutions and our form of government is to substitute some brand of state socialism in this country.

Are we going to let them succeed? The answer is an emphatic "No!" They cannot succeed if the American people are aroused to their schemes. We are willing to fight to save the American way of life.

Let me remind you that if we should lose our American form of government, it will not be by accident; it will be by deliberate design of groups who have set out to socialize this country for their own purposes of becoming an entrenched bureaucracy, and to achieve permanent personal power.

I do not need to remind you that one of these groups would radically change the status of your profession. Instead of leaving you free, they would regiment you under a rigid system of governmental controls. They would curb your opportunities. They would arrest your progress. They would deprive you of your freedom. And they would do all this under the specious plea of aiding the unfortunate and giving all people security.

These misguided individuals evidently forget that if you regiment men and women, if you eliminate the opportunity for individual progress, you kill individual initiative at the same time.

A ward of the state, with specific limitations and a fixed income, operating under the direction of a bureaucrat who may himself possess no scientific knowledge, would not, except in rare instances, put in the long hours of intensive study and experimentation necessary to blaze the way for progress. A physician on a fixed salary and in a treadmill practice would not have the same urge to watch zealously over those in his care as the physician whose patient is his personal, individual responsibility. By destroying initiative and progress, we might well be sentencing vast numbers of people to earlier death because we could not as intelligently cope with disease.

Every one of us has a definite interest in seeing that every child, every woman and every man secures adequate medical aid and care We can and we will, as a government, discharge out full obligations to the sick, the aged, and the unfortunate, unable to pay their own way. But we must do it in the American way—in a way which will preserve the spirit and the initiative of the men and women of your profession. They must be encouraged to go ahead with studies and experiments; to make new and greater scientific discoveries for the benefit of mankind. And we must care for our ailing ones in such a way that every patient will not be a ward and pawn of an all-powerful state.

We must not shackle your great profession and restrict the service it can give to the world. If we give to some bureaucrat the power to regulate the practice and fix the fees of a physician and to govern the hospitals, we will shackle the science of medicine. We must make sure every man and every woman retains the right to select the doctor of his or her own choice. That has been a great American right and the people of this country want to keep it.

To place the practice of medicine under bureaucratic control would not affect medicine alone; it would constitute a long forward step in putting the other professions and all American labor, industry, and agriculture permanently under the direction of a Washington bureaucracy. By whatever name we might call it, it would be a form of state socialism.

You plainly see the threat hovering over your own profession, and you are not alone in your anxiety. Other classes in our national life face a similar perfl.

All professions and all business, big and small alike, face the menace of a new era in which private enterprise will no longer have a free opportunity to flourish.

Only through an aroused people, determined to preserve our free way of life and the private enterprise system which has given so much to every American, regardless of race, color, religion, or social status, can we save our heritage.

Let us constantly remind ourselves that while it may have faults, the American system has provided its people with more happiness and more of the comforts of life than have ever been enjoyed by the people of any other land.

Let us review briefly the situation which faces the small businessman. Small enterprise, which is the backbone of the American system, has, for the most part, had a difficult time during the war. Small business has found it hard, in many instances, to get war contracts; it has been harassed by inability to secure priorities for materials; it has come off second best in the competition with big industry for labor supply. If the small businessman has been able to make any money, heavy taxation has taken away much of his profit. He has had great expense and worry because of the flood of questionnaires and reports thought up and

demanded by the Washington bureaucrats, many of whom might be more usefully employed elsewhere.

The small businessman faces a desperate battle for survival; yet, on the whole, he has borne up under huge burdens like a good soldier. He realizes we are in an all-out war and that heavy sacrifices are demanded of us all.

He is, however, very properly concerned about the future. He is faced with renegotiation of contracts; cancelation of orders at the end of the war; the problem of reconversion from war production to the making of civilian goods when the fighting ceases. The way in which we meet these three vital problems of our industrial life will in a large measure determine what kind of an America we are to live in after the war.

If the handling of these problems is wise and judicious and is carried out with the sympathetic objective of preserving private enterprise, we may well rejoice. We could enter into a period of great prosperity; we would be able to solve the post-war employment problem; and with full confidence in the ability of our great Nation to advance to a new era of progress and prosperity; we could cope with the shocks of an enormous debt load, taxation, and the dislocation incident to transition from war to peace.

These momentous decisions must not be left to those hostile to the American way. They must not be based on class hostility. We must defeat any efforts to curb private enterprise and to put all business and the professions under the domination and direction of an all-powerful bureaucracy. To fail to preserve our American way will mean we shall have lost the war, regardless of how complete may be our victories over our enemies abroad.

The bureaucratic encroachment in the business field has vastly expanded. It is estimated the Federal Government owns 75 percent of the 1,500 plants which have been built in the last 3 years to gear war production to its highest speed. This has cost over $20,000,000,000.

The magnitude of Government holdings is clearly revealed in the simple statement that the Government will control more than 50 percent of the aluminum capacity of the country, 92 percent of the magnesium, 10 percent of the steel, 100 percent of the synthetic rubber and high-octane gasoline, 50 percent of the machine tools, and 90 percent of the aircraft-construction capacity.

The Government's ownership extends further into almost every phase of our industrial life through Government loans. It is clear, therefore, that if the Government's policy is to be one of hostility to private ownership, it could, through the application of pressure, establishment of prices and regulation, bankrupt any business in the country. It could create any kind of economic life it might desire.

Sensing this danger, those of us who believe in a free and strong America must be on guard to prevent any misuse of the power which has been achieved over industry in the war effort.

Put the farmer, industry, and the professions in a strait jacket of regimentation and bureaucratic control, and the only possible result would be we should lose the way of life which has given the people of this Nation more of the worth-while things than have been attained by the people of any other land.

What are we to do about it? We cannot sit idly by and watch this system disappear before our eyes. We cannot permit the inefficient and the incompetent, the crystal gazers and the experimenters, to ruin this America of opportunity for all of us.

The people look for protection to their Congress. I believe they have, in their lawmaking body, a confidence that has been vastly increased of late because the rubber stamp has been scrapped. Congress must not betray that confidence. We must not, as direct spokesmen for a great people, permit bureaucrats, lustful for power and possessing no direct responsibility to the people, to overstep their constitutional authority and, through administrative regulations and directives, write the laws of this land.

In a republic all men and all women must be granted equal rights. If we do not adhere to this great fundamental principle of Americanism, we are not worthy of the proud privilege of being American citizens.

There should be equality in the administration of the law; there must be justice in the distribution of the tax burdens. A square deal to all must be the cornerstone upon which we build a continuously progressing America.

Congress must be more definite in laying down the rules for the renegotiation of contracts. We should be prepared to supply the blueprints for the cancelation of contracts at the end of the war. The Congress must also outline the policies which will govern reconversion of industry from war to peace.

I believe Congress will accept the great American challenge of our generation. We shall not permit the bureaucrats, as someone has said, to be the "masters of the people from the cradle to the grave."

I do not believe the people, or their Representatives in Congress, will permit business, agriculture, and the professions to be permanently controlled by the bureaucrats through regimentation.

We can and we must preserve the full freedom of private endeavor. We can and we will give aid to the socially handicapped without destroying the rights of the States and their responsibilities, and without building up an ever-expanding Federal domain. We must provide adequately for the aged and the unemployed.

We can meet these demands and at the same time retain our American framework of Government. Let us insist it be done this way.

Let us look briefly at some of the accomplishments of a free America. Here the airplane was born. The sewing machine had its development in this country. The steamboat was developed here. The railroad was brought to its highest state of efficiency. The contribution of one American, Thomas A. Edison, to the progress of humanity was the phonograph, the incandescent lamp, the motion picture camera. Alexander Graham Bell gave the world the telephone, while Morse perfected the telegraph. The automobile reached its flower under the free enterprise system of America.

No one can possibly deny that it is in the fertile soil of free government, with the benign impulse of free enterprise to fertilize it, and with a free society ever ready to reap and use, that the greatest contributions in the last 150 years have been made to the spiritual, the cultural, and the material progress of the whole race.

Is it not incredible that any sane man or woman should want to change a system which could produce so much in less than a century and a half for the progress of mankind? We can improve our American way, but there is no adequate substitute for it.

Fervently we pray that the day may be hastened when millions of American men and women will be trooping back from the battle fronts to their homes. Other millions will be pouring out of the shipyards and the arsenals of war.

These men and women will want jobs; they will want opportunity. They will want the American kind of opportunity, not Government hand-outs. They will demand the freedom and the security for which they have endured the ravages of war, sacrifice, and privation. The only sure way to provide this is through the development and expansion of our peacetime productive capacity. This must be done through an expanding private enterprise.

Let us prepare now to make certain that the policy which we follow at the end of this war shall be an American policy, one which has been demonstrated through years of fruitful experience to have brought the best results.

The vast majority of our people are essentially sound thinking. I feel sure I know what their decision will be.

Millions of men and women are engaged today in the world's most gigantic struggle for security and freedom. They fight a cruel, aggressive, and resourceful foe. But thank God the dictators are on the run. At the beginning of this war we passed through some black days. But never for a moment did we doubt our ability to win—and winning we are. It is now no longer a question of whether we shall win, but how long will the enemy be able to resist our valiant Army and Navy and those of our allies.

We are proving once more in the field of battle that free men and women, fighting for the preservation of freedom, cannot and will not be defeated.

And in the years to come we will once more demonstrate to all the world that it is through freedom of enterprise and freedom of opportunity people can make their greatest progress.

Our free American system has, through its wonderful capacity for expansion, turned out the planes, the guns, the ships, the ammunition, and all the materials which will make victory possible.

This same American system in the field of plastics, aviation, transportation, agriculture, manufacturing, commerce, and science will secure for the people of America the opportunity of a new golden era.

Let us go forward with courage and confidence. We will win the war; we will make an enduring peace; we will rebuild a battered and war-torn world; we will give to humanity more happiness and more of the good things of life.

The world looks expectantly to us—the people of America. We must not, we dare not, we will not fail to meet this great challenge.

A strong, solvent America, true to the American way of life, will be able to lead the world to a better and a finer civilization.

Termination of War Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable Edward J. Kelly, mayor of Chicago, by James S. Knowlson, chairman of the Post-War Economic Advisory Council of Chicago. The letter deals primarily with the treatment of cancelation of war contracts in the post-war era and is exceedingly interesting.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR ECONOMIC ADVISORY
COUNCIL OF CHICAGO,
September 22, 1943.

The Honorable EDWARD J. KELLY, *Mayor,*
City Hall, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MAYOR KELLY: Initial studies by your post-war economic advisory council of the problems attending stabilization of employment after the war indicate conclusively that one of the most important, and certainly one of the first, problems that must receive adequate consideration centers about the procedure to be followed and the treatment to be accorded industrial concerns in the cancelation of war contracts.

Few persons realize what total war such as we are fighting at present actually means in terms of manufacturers and their products. The manufacture of most civilian goods has ceased entirely so that with the cessation of war work, industries and manufacturers must start from scratch to rebuild their civilian markets. And in order that there may be the least possible dislocation in the reemployment situation the orderly adjustment of contract cancelations is more than ever important.

At a recent hearing of the council there appeared representatives of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and the Chicago Association of Commerce who made a full presentation of work being done by those organizations along this line. In addition, the council conducted an independent study to discover what plans and procedures have been or are being formulated by various governmental agencies having to do with the termination of war contracts. A copy of the council's report on this subject is herewith enclosed.

According to available figures there are at the present time more than 300,000 war contracts outstanding, with money involved totaling more than $75,000,000,000. Of these many thousands have been placed and are now on the books of industrial concerns in Chicago. The tremendous amount of capital involved in these contracts, even ignoring other factors, is in itself a situation that demands the most careful handling. There are countless cases, for instance, where the present war material inventories of manufacturing plants have mounted to many times the total of working capital of those concerns—and this does not take into consideration contract commitments on orders on the books but not yet started.

Obviously the cancelation of these contracts must include some plan of immediate reimbursement for war material both finished and in process, as otherwise many of the manufacturers thus involved will automatically be thrown into bankruptcy or forced to close down entirely, thus bringing about inevitable widespread unemployment.

It is apparent from a close study of the plans and procedures for contract cancelations so far contemplated by Government agencies that the safeguards which they offer are entirely inadequate.

Under the procedure laid down recently in Army Ordnance Procurement Regulation No. 15, payment would be made on canceled contracts through a negotiation process. While this is pending manufacturers would have recourse to a form of V loan, the amount of which, still to be definitely determined, would be anywhere from 75 percent to 90 percent of the total due manufacturers on work completed or in process.

Time is a most important consideration, and it is apparent that successful and speedy termination of such negotiation would depend almost entirely upon the individual personalities and cooperation—or lack of it—of those entrusted with such negotiation. In this connection it is significant to note that in negotiation on contracts in the last war some of these negotiations were finally completed 20 years later.

In the opinion of the members of your council delays from such procedure are potentially disastrous, not only endangering the life of manufacturers in the Chicago area but threatening the entire economic structure of the Nation.

It is the considered opinion of the members of your council that:

1. It would not only be unfair to all manufacturers to require them to borrow money through their banks to finance Government obligations; but it is feared that the smaller companies at least might have almost as much difficulty in this procedure as they experienced in their initial efforts to get into war production. Such procedure would force them to enter the post-war period under an unnecessary handicap that would also indirectly affect labor and employment unsatisfactorily.

2. Any settlement dependent on negotiation procedure with its attendant delays would be unsatisfactory and would entail possible serious financial losses to manufacturers operating under the war contracts, unless it provided for immediate payment by the Government of the highest possible percentage of amounts due on work completed and in process on such contracts.

3. It is therefore essential that the Government establish a standard practice, which will apply to all war contracts, with a program of immediate reimbursement.

4. Such practice or procedure, which would protect the best interests of manufacturers holding war contracts, should be provided by congressional action rather than by independent determination by separate governmental war agencies.

5. It is strongly urged that such procedure provide for the retention of able, key men with an intimate knowledge of the war contract and general economic situation, in order to avoid the possibility that these settlements so important to post-war progress be entrusted to individuals who would be untrained and inexperienced in this field.

6. As a substitute for negotiation procedures it is suggested as a logical solution that a procedure be set up similar to that employed by the Internal Revenue Department in the filing of income-tax returns. Realizing, that the Government, however must be accorded protection as to accuracy and honesty on the part of manufacturers petitioning for payment on cancelled contracts, the procedure formulated by Congress could very well set up penalties for falsification, sufficiently stringent to ensure adequate safeguards to the public interest.

Determination of this problem so vital to the continued successful operation of our national economy is looked upon by your Postwar Economic Advisory Council as of paramount importance; in fact should it not be satisfactorily resolved the result would be to render futile any comprehensive program for post-war progress seeking to stabilize employment.

Immediate consideration of this matter is therefore urgently recommended, with the view to such action as you may think proper or advisable.

Respectfully submitted.

J. S. KNOWLSON,
Chairman.

Not a One-Way Street

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, those who advocate that we enter an international alliance to police and maintain the peace of the world by force, if necessary, should tell us how far we are going, what, in the way of money, material, and men, we are to contribute. They should also have in mind what other nations are doing looking toward the same end.

The Senators who just returned from a more than 40,000-mile journey to the war front are opening the eyes of Americans as to what some of our partners in the international, superworld state are doing.

The following is an editorial from the Chicago Tribune commenting on one of Senator LODGE'S statements. While we may not agree with all of it, it certainly should cause those who want us to go the limit in establishing a United States of the World to give some thought to what Britain and Churchill, Russia and Stalin intend to do when this particular war is over.

The editorial is as follows:

Senator LODGE'S reports to the American people on what he saw on his worldwide inspection of the war fronts provide proof of what most of the American people have long suspected. Our country is giving its allies unstinted support and is getting only insignificant support in return.

Mr. LODGE'S comment on the war against Japan was particularly timely. It came only a few days after Earl Browder, the Communist leader in this country, had declared exultantly that the Russians were going to do nothing which might save American lives across the Pacific. For lack of bases on Russia's Pacific coast, Senator LODGE said, our war against Japan is being fought under a cruel handicap. Many thousands of our sons and brothers, in effect, have been sentenced to death by Stalin's refusal to treat us as an ally. The Senator was too tactful to say so bluntly, but the fact is that Russia, instead of serving as our partner, is actually conducting herself as the warm friend of Japan. We are forbidden use of bases in Kamchatka and the maritime provinces, from which Japan could be attacked; and at the same time Russia has renewed a treaty of friendship with the enemy that gives the Japanese important food supplies and spares her the necessity of spreading her forces thinner.

Russia has nothing to lose from giving us the use of her bases. We aren't going to keep them. If the Japanese should retaliate by attacking Russia in Asia, the Russians would have no reason to doubt that any territory lost would be restored once the victory was achieved. Russia, as Japan's near neighbor, has every reason to fear her aggression. Russia, as the beneficiary of enormous gifts of arms and food from this country, ought to feel some sense of obligation to us. None of these considerations has counted with Stalin. He wants to make America bleed and mourn her dead.

The worst of it is that our administration has allowed him to get away with it. Our diplomacy is all put and no take, in relation not only to Russia but to all our allies. As the Senator said, we are taking no steps to assure us the use of the airfields overseas we are building with our men and money. We are exhausting our own oil resources while encouraging the British to conserve theirs in Persia. We are fighting the war in the Pacific not as an American war, but as a war for the restoration of the British and Dutch Empires.

The anger of the American people is rising at this official indifference to the honor and welfare of our country. The American people did not have to be reminded by Mr. LODGE of what the Japanese have done to us. Americans remember not only the slaughter

and ignominy of Pearl Harbor, but also the beheading of our flyers, the slaughter of our wounded, the horrible crimes against the prisoners of Bataan, the bestial treatment of our women. These things and many more like them have burned into American minds the sacred duty to rescue our prisoners from the Japanese hell; to pour vengeance for our dead upon the heads of Tojo, Hirohito, and all the other men who bear responsibility for Japanese aggression and brutality; to restore the Philippines.

Americans have cleared the Mediterranean for the British and have lavished upon Russia the supplies without which she long ago would have been brought to her knees. We have saved Australia and New Zealand from conquest. It is time that we got something substantial in return. Certainly it is time that American strength in full measure be put forth in the American war against Japan.

The States Take Hold of the Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri River, the longest river in the United States, remains today as the one great undeveloped river potentiality in this Republic.

Under the able leadership of Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, a determined and enlightened program has been developed for the harnessing of the Missouri River so that its mighty force may be used for constructive purposes rather than continuing as in the past to be a great destructive factor contributing heavily to the flood hazards not only of the lower end of the Missouri River Valley but also to all reaches of the Mississippi River Valley below St. Louis, Mo.

The following article was written by Governor Sharpe and appeared in the September issue of the South Dakota Hiway Magazine which is edited by Aileen Tolles in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. It gives an interesting and informative bird's-eye view of the plans for Missouri River development and improvement.

THE STATES TAKE HOLD OF THE MISSOURI RIVER

(By M. Q. Sharpe, Governor of South Dakota and chairman, Missouri River States Committee)

The development of the Missouri River has lagged far behind that of other great river valleys of the country because of lack of unified action by the States to secure it. This condition will now be changed. The eight Missouri River States—Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming—have now organized a Missouri River States Committee for the express purpose of securing a valley-wide development of the entire Missouri River system for the multiple purposes of power development, irrigation, flood control, navigation, and related improvements. The general purpose of the committee is to secure unified State action toward accomplishment of this plan of development. It means that the Missouri River States are going to act from a State cooperation standpoint instead of each State trying to get some individual State projects constructed along the river valley.

For more than a hundred years the National Government has been spending money on Missouri River development. Most of it has been spent on local projects such as flood-control dikes or levees and occasionally some channel aid for navigation in different stretches of the river. One of the larger projects was the construction of the great Fort Peck Dam in Montana. The successful construction and operation of this latter project has demonstrated the practicability of a plan of development involving the entire Missouri River system so as to extract from it the utmost possible benefits from a scientific correlated plan of construction and improvement of the entire system. Such a plan is being prepared by the United States Army engineers in collaboration with the Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, and other interested agencies.

They have calculated the area involved; they have conducted the stream gaging operations; they have made numerous soundings up and down the river for footings and sites; they have done this work accurately and skillfully, and vast sums of money have been expended on it. They now have the data from which successful plans and designs can be made. When they tell us that this river can be taken under complete control and its floods at any time of the year can be converted into stores of still water which will be dealt out in whatever quantities and at whatever times desired, they are telling us things that they know are not only accurate but entirely practicable. We know that they can go still further than this. They can now calculate with reasonable accuracy just how much the whole plan will cost and just how much actual financial benefit it will repay each year. We know further that this will show a financial statement on which any banker would loan money and on which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other Government agency or on which any committee of Congress can with perfect safety advance or appropriate public funds, knowing with reasonable certainty that the project will rapidly and surely liquidate its own cost from the actual cash revenues it will produce. We also know that engineering science and proper accounting practices can establish accurately the interests of each State in the watershed in all the cash revenues produced by any structure or installation in any part of the watershed so that each one of the Missouri River States will participate in the actual cash benefits of all structures or installations in the valley whether located within the boundaries of the State or not.

This activity has resulted from a valley-wide interest and demand throughout the Missouri Valley for something similar to the Tennessee Valley, Colorado River, Columbia River, and other great river-valley developments of the country. The general idea is that a series of multiple-purpose dams below Fort Peck, plus dams on the tributaries, and a series of levees in the lower reaches of the river, would provide an effective plan of flood control and at the same time furnish aids for navigation, irrigation, and power development. It is also probable that the project would be self-sustaining and would pay its own construction costs from power, irrigation, flood control, and navigation benefits.

The Missouri River States Committee is the general steering and liaison committee for the eight States. It consists of two members from each State appointed by the Governor of the State. It was organized in December 1941, and has been active ever since. Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota, is chairman of the committee and George S. Knapp, of Topeka, Kans., is secretary-treasurer. The various States have contributed to its expenses. The committee has just completed eight district meetings, one in each of the States, held during the latter part of August 1943, as follows: Pierre, S. Dak.; Bismarck, N. Dak.; Miles City, Mont.; Sheridan, Wyo.; Sioux City, Iowa; Nebraska City, Nebr.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Topeka, Kans. In each State the Governor of the State presided over the meeting, and the objectives and proposed plans of possible development and the methods of securing it were discussed in a preliminary way. Col. Lewis A. Pick, of the United States Army Engineer Corps, Mr. W. G. Sloan, representing the Bureau of Reclamation, and Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, chairman of the committee, attended all of the meetings and assisted by explaining the general preliminary objectives and procedure and by assisting in the discussions. Congressman KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Halvor Halvorson, of North Dakota, attended all of the meetings and assisted with conduct of the same. As a result of these meetings a valley-wide common understanding of the objectives, procedure, and possibilities has been secured.

The plan would aid greatly in a post-war adjustment program because of furnishing a large number of positions for skilled and technical workers, tradesmen of all kinds, and a great amount of common labor. It would also be able to utilize much National Government machinery which may become idle after the war. None of the money spent would be lost to the country. It would be spent in the country and at the same time pay for building a valuable internal improvement which the country would still have and which apparently would have the financial ability to pay its own construction costs and then to contribute toward payment of the national debt.

The Missouri River States seem to be united in support of the project. A general meeting of the Governors of the States and their members on the committee is now being planned for some central location in the valley yet this fall so as to make further plans for securing congressional designation of the project and consideration of the reports of the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, and other agencies interested, which reports are expected to be ready for public consideration later in the year. This meeting is expected to promote further active State cooperation and action toward getting the development started toward actual construction. The Missouri River States have taken hold of their project in a methodical, intelligent way and as a result the prospects for final success appear to be good.

The Senate Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 4 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, in the June issue of the American Political Science Review, David G. Farrelly, of Princeton University, published a most interesting and valuable historical review of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is well worth preserving. I ask unanimous consent that it may be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: QUALIFICATIONS OF MEMBERS

(David G. Farrelly, Princeton University)

In many of our modern industries, aptitude tests are given to new employees in order to determine the type of position for which each worker is best fitted. Unfortunately, in legislative bodies committee assignments are dependent upon several factors, only one of which is specialized ability.[1] To serve the public best, however, no one can truthfully deny that individual competence ought to be the basic reason for placing a legislator on the committee which can make the most advantageous use of his particular training and experience. Putting an international lawyer on an agriculture and forestry committee would be a sheer waste of talent. With these thoughts in mind, the Senate Judiciary Committee has been studied for the purpose of determining the qualifications of the 219 men who have been members of this body since it was established in 1816.

The Committee on the Judiciary is one of the most important committees in the United States Senate. The type of bills and resolutions coming within its province makes it a strong and responsible guardian of the Nation's laws. Indeed, the powerful position of this committee leads one to suggest that it could well be termed a "congressional supreme court."[2]

Thus we have a Senate committee which possesses weighty jurisdiction. Membership on this committee is limited by considerations of party harmony, seniority of service, geography, personal preference, and individual experience. There emerges this question: Has the Judiciary Committee been characterized by competent personnel despite the fact that ability is not the only determinant in gaining an appointment?

In order to answer this question, several indexes of ability have been set up. Each of these hypotheses represents a qualification which, if possessed, should make an individual better suited to serve on this committee than, for example, the Finance or Foreign Relations Committee. In terms of these criteria, the committee's personnel has been analyzed.[3]

I. PROFESSIONAL-TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS

What are the qualifications which a prospective member of the Judiciary Committee should have? At the outset, the very name of the committee indicates that persons with training in law would be valuable as members. Equally significant would be judicial experience and/or knowledge gained as prosecuting attorneys and in legal administration. Other qualities will be considered, but the above-mentioned seem of primary importance.

Lawyers: It is a commonplace that Congressmen are lawyers. Thus it has been shown that slightly over 60 percent of the Senators elected to the Seventy-seventh Congress were lawyers by profession.[4] Indeed, lawmaking by its very nature attracts those trained in this field; and it is a remarkable fact that throughout the history of the Senate Judiciary Committee there has never been a member who was not a lawyer. Not all of these 219 men actually practiced their chosen profession. Many were early attracted to politics and spent their lives in this calling. Still it is quite safe to estimate that the vast majority engaged in handling lawsuits at some time prior to their becoming United States Senators. We can conclude that an essential prerequisite to service on this committee is knowledge of the law as evidenced by admission to the bar.

Where did the various committee members learn their law? This question is an interesting one, as the answer to it reflects the increasing importance of institutional education in this country. The earliest method of getting a legal education was to attach one's self to a man already a practicing lawyer. By working in a law office or by studying alone from lawbooks, the earnest young man gathered his knowledge of the intricacies of the law. Of the first 70 members of the Judiciary Committee, 63 received their legal education by following such a procedure. In other words, only 1 in 10 of the members of this committee down to the Civil War went to school to learn law. The famous Litchfield Law School produced 4 graduates who became members of the Judiciary Committee during this early period.

Fifty-eight different Senators became members of the committee during the period from 1861 to 1900. Eleven of these had been graduated from a law school. Thus approximately one out of five new faces on the committee represented a person who had derived his knowledge of the law from attendance at college. No one school had a monopoly of alumni. Harvard had three graduates who sat on the committee during this period. The University of Virginia supplied two, while six other schools had one representative apiece.

Since 1900, the names of some 91 individuals have graced the roster of the Judiciary Committee. Forty-four of these persons attended law school, with Harvard, Michigan, and Virginia contributing one-third of the number. Almost 30 other schools were represented by at least 1 alumnus.

Taking the membership of the committee as a whole, 28 percent have been lawyers who first saw the "legal light of day" via the law school; although this percentage becomes of less importance when cognizance is taken of the increasing place of the law school in preparation for the bar. Prior to the Civil War, 1 out of 10 Judiciary Committee members was a law-school graduate; during the last 12 years, 6 out of 10.

Judicial experience: Throughout the history of the committee, there has been a steady flow of Senators with judicial background. Approximately 1 out of every 3 members of the Judiciary Committee has possessed this advantage. The positions held have run the gamut of State and Federal court hierarchies. Many occupied posts on more than 1 court before being elected to the Senate; 38 out of 70 members with judicial experience had been on the bench of their highest State court.[5] Our hypothesis that judicial experience should be one of the qualifications for appointment to the committee has been amply sustained by experience.

Participation in constitutional conventions: Participation in the proceedings of a State constitutional convention should be some indication of an individual's capacity to perform the functions of a Judiciary Committee member. Between 1814 and 1900, no fewer than 27 constitutional conventions were held for the purpose of framing a basic law preliminary to admission of a State, and many more conventions were held to revise State constitutions. After the turn of the century, there were relatively few State constitutional conventions. Hence a Senator today will usually have had but little chance to attend one.[6] While 16 percent of all Judiciary Committee members have attended such meetings, a more significant showing is made if only those Senators who became members of the committee during its first century are taken into account. One hundred and twenty-eight individuals were selected to positions on the committee between 1816 and 1900. Of this number, 31 had been members of State constitutional conventions. While the fact of having served at a constitutional convention was, during the nineteenth century, a good indication that a person would be of value on the committee, such experience can hardly be expected of current and future Judiciary Committee members. Hence this test of eligibility is no longer significant. Because so many of the earlier committeemen had this background, it is included for historical reasons.

Prosecuting attorneys and legal administrators: As a fourth index of competence, the experience a man has had as prosecuting attorney or as a legal administrator ought to be given some notice when places on the Judiciary Committee are allotted. Although there is a wide range of difference in the experience one would get as a city solicitor and as a State attorney general, both posts have this in common: Political and/or administrative ability is needed in addition to legal knowledge.

Upon examining the record of all persons who have served on the Judiciary Committee, it was discovered that slightly over 50 percent of them had occupied such positions of trust. To state it in other terms, one of every two members had held at least one of the following offices: City solicitor, county attorney, State's attorney, State assistant attorney general, State attorney general, assistant or regular United States district attorney, Attorney General of the United States. About one in four was a county prosecuting attorney at some time early in his career. Sixteen had been attorneys general for their respective States. William Pinckney, Reverdy Johnson, William Evarts, and Philander C. Knox had each been Attorney General of the United States. The vast majority of those with this legal administrative experience had performed their service within some State; only about a dozen had been connected with the United States Department of Justice in any official capacity.

The House Judiciary Committee: Another index of a Senator's competence to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary rests upon whether or not he had been a Member of the House of Representatives prior to becoming a Member of the Senate. If he had served in the House, had he been appointed to its Judiciary Committee? This is our fifth test.

Sixty-two of the men studied had been in the House before entering the Senate. Eighteen of these had served on the House Judiciary Committee. Without an immense amount of research, it would be impossible to

---

[1] For methods and considerations used in the Senate to fill committee vacancies, see G. H. Haynes, The Senate of the United States, I, pp. 292–293, and E. Dennison, The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pp. 4–10.

[2] Among the main duties of the Judiciary Committee are: (1) General original control over practically all proposed amendments to the Constitution; (2) approval or disapproval of Presidential nominees for positions on United States courts; (3) consideration of changes in the Federal court structure; (4) advising the Senate on matters relating to trusts, extradition, bankruptcy, Federal prisons, etc.

[3] Biographical material was compiled from several sources, but mainly from the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1927, and the Congressional Directory (editions from 1850 to 1942).

[4] M. McKinney, The Personnel of the Seventy-seventh Congress, in this Review, February 1942.

[5] David Davis, indeed, had been an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

[6] According to The Book of the States, 1941–1942, p. 45, only 21 out of a total of 189 State constitutional conventions have been held since 1900.

discover those members of the House Judiciary Committee who, upon entering the Senate, did not there become a member of the corresponding committee. It is easier to hazard a guess and point to the fact that Daniel Webster was on both committees. It still remains true, although not of great import, that 1 in 13 Senate Judiciary Committee members served on the corresponding committee in the House of Representatives.

Compendium of technical qualifications: So far, five factors have been emphasized as furnishing a guide to the selection of qualified personnel for service on the Judiciary Committee. If one unit is assigned to represent a single qualification, what picture emerges as to the competence of committee members? The following tables show the record:

TABLE I

Qualification:	*Number of members*
Lawyers	219
Judicial experience	70
Legal administrators	102
Members of constitutional conventions	35
House Judiciary Committee members	18

TABLE II

Members	Units	Percentage
0	5	0
6	4	3
47	3	21
113	2	52
219	1	100

Looking back over the 128 years that the Senate Judiciary Committee has been in existence, one summary observation is in order. This committee has been distinguished by competent personnel. Seventy-five percent of the members have possessed legal and practical experience other than mere training in the law.

II. ADDITIONAL INDEXES OF ABILITY

There are other qualifications which may make a legislator valuable to a committee in addition to the specialized, technical knowledge which he possesses. The members of the Senate Judiciary Committee have, on the whole, rated high on these other scores. Two such elements of worthiness are previous legislative experience and education.

Legislative experience: As to the first, well over one-half of the committeemen had been in their own State legislatures or in the United States House of Representatives before entering the Senate. Sixty-seven percent were, therefore, not novices in the ways and wiles of legislation. One hundred and twenty had served in State legislative bodies; 62 had been Congressmen; 45 had a background of experience at both State and national levels. A table shows the percentages:

TABLE III.—*Legislative experience*

	Either State legislature or U. S. House of Representatives	State legislature only	U. S. Congress only	Both State and National experience
Number of men	146	120	62	45
Percent of total committee membership	67	55	28	21

Education: College-trained men are not by any means the only educated individuals in the world, but attendance at some seat of higher learning does give a fairly certain indication that a person is above the average in intelligence and learning. Other qualifications being equal, it would be safe to assume that a committee of university graduates would possess more perspective and factual knowledge than a group of grammar-school graduates. A survey of the Senate Judiciary Committee membership shows that 146, or 67 percent, attended colleges or universities.[7]

An overwhelming majority were college graduates, but mere attendance was counted in computing the results. Almost 90 colleges were represented, and these were scattered throughout the country. The "Ivy League," for example, could claim only 20 percent. Further to illustrate the diversification, one need only note those institutions which had the largest number of alumni. Yale University was exceptional—15 of her sons appeared on the Judiciary Committee; Princeton had 6; Center and Brown had 5 each; Dartmouth, Williams, Michigan, William and Mary, and Bowdoin had 4 each; Union, North Carolina, Vermont, and Dickinson had 3 each; 13 institutions had 2 each, while about 60 had but 1.

Outstanding personalities: Thus far the committee's membership has been treated in terms of impersonal qualifications. Only by bringing to notice the names of some of the leading members can one really discover the wealth of talent which has been attracted to the committee. Three committeemen (Buchanan, Pierce, and Van Buren) were destined to be elected to the Presidency; two others, Hendricks and Fairbanks, later served as Vice President. For John McKinley, L. Q. C. Lamar, George Sutherland, Howell Jackson, and Hugo Black the committee was a stepping stone to a post on the United States Supreme Court. Two other committeemen, Roscoe Conkling and William Smith, of South Carolina, were offered positions on this Court which they declined to accept. George Badger was formally nominated, but not confirmed.

It is interesting to note that at least a dozen members were associated with the teaching of law. Nine taught law in one school or another before being elected to the Senate; others became professors of law after leaving the Senate.

William Pinckney and Daniel Webster were so well thought of that both were placed on the Judiciary Committee almost as soon as elected—in both cases before they had even journeyed to the National Capital.

With such a list of well-qualified committeemen, it is interesting to speculate on the best combination of members. Mr. O. O. Stealey, Washington correspondent of the Louisville Courier-Journal during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, has observed that in the period of the Fifty-fourth Congress the Senate was "intellectually stronger than it has ever been since."[8] As for the Judiciary Committee, Stealey asserts that the Fiftieth and Fifty-first Congresses deserve the honor of having the best qualified combination in the first 85 years of the committee's history.[9] From 1888 through 1891 the committee was composed of nine great lawyers: George Edmunds, of Vermont (chairman); J. J. Ingalls, of Kansas; George Hoar, of Massachusetts; James F. Wilson, of Iowa; William Evarts, of New York; James L. Pugh, of Alabama; Richard Coke, of Texas; George Vest, of Missouri; and James Z. George, of Mississippi. This list of names is truly impressive in terms of legal ability. As many of these men served for a number of years during the eighties and nineties, it is logical to conclude that this period was the flowering era in the long history of the committee.[10]

The Senate Judiciary Committee is a lawyer's committee; only men with legal training have been admitted to its membership. By far the majority of members have been well qualified to perform the tasks falling within the committee's jurisdiction. New members commonly have come with good education, with legislative experience, and with a background of judicial service and legal administration. The ability and talent of past members indicate that a place on the committee is a badge of honor; membership stamps a man as a lawyer's lawyer. On the whole, the committee has had, since its origin in 1816, a personnel record of which it may be proud.

[7] Attendance at business schools or seminaries has not been included in this tabulation. Those Senators who went to more than one college have been credited with attending a college. Members who received a law degree from a school, but whose record has given no indication that they studied other subjects, have not been included.

[8] O. O. Stealey, Twenty Years in the Press Gallery, p. 127.

[9] Ibid, p. 62.

[10] Important legislation passed by the Fiftieth and Fifty-first Congresses included (1) authorizing writs of error to the U. S. Supreme Court in capital cases; (2) authorizing a review by the Supreme Court of all judgments and decrees of inferior courts in respect to the question of jurisdiction of the trial court, and regardless of the amount in controversy; (3) passing the Sherman Antitrust Act; and (4) establishing the Circuit Court of Appeals and defining the jurisdiction of United States courts generally.

How We Can Avoid Federal Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Edgar L. Morphet, director, administration and finance, Florida State Department of Education. The article is as follows:

Practically all educators and laymen are agreed that we must avoid any system of Federal aid or support that is likely to result in Federal control of schools or of any part of the educational program.

For several years the question of Federal aid for schools has been considered a controversial issue. Yet there is no valid reason why it should be. Many persons have assumed that any system of direct Federal aid for schools is certain to bring Federal control. Because of this assumption there has been much confused thinking. Many who sincerely believe the wealth of the Nation ought to be used to assure an adequate education for all its children have opposed Federal aid because of the fear of Federal control.

The question of Federal financial support, if it could be divorced from the possibility of control, should be noncontroversial. The State with least wealth, almost without exception, have the largest percentage of children. Those States are now making a greater financial effort to support their schools, are taxing themselves higher in proportion, than the more wealthy States. Yet these poorer States are not providing and cannot provide adequate educational opportunities for their children. Statistics show, moreover, that when the children in these States have grown

into adults, many of them migrate into the more wealthy sections of the Nation because of the greater opportunities to be found there. Because of the differences in birth rate the States with least adequate schools are now supplying a substantial proportion of the citizenship found in other States. Thus the entire Nation is being handicapped by the extent to which the poorest State is unable to maintain satisfactory schools and to prepare citizens who are physically and mentally fit to carry their proper proportion of the Nation's military, economic, and political responsibilities. The only way in which this handicap can be overcome in any reasonable period of time is to use the wealth of the Nation to assure a proper education for its citizens regardless of the State in which they live. Federal support for schools is imperative.

But how can we have Federal support without Federal control? Surprisingly enough the answer is simple. The best way to avoid Federal control of education in this country is to establish a comprehensive system of direct Federal aid with adequate funds apportioned to the respective States on an objective basis to be administered under their respective constitutions, laws, and regulations.

So far we have refused to establish any such system of Federal aid, apparently largely because of the assumption on the part of many that by this failure to face the problem we are avoiding any danger of Federal control. An examination of recent trends and developments, however, proves the assumption to be wrong, dangerously wrong.

Comparatively few people realize that for the last several years we have been moving rapidly in the direction of Federal control of education largely because we do not have any comprehensive system of direct Federal aid. In fact, we already have a very large measure of Federal control of education in this country. Trends and developments indicate clearly that the only way to reverse this trend is to face the problem frankly—that is, to provide direct Federal aid for schools—rather than to ignore it.

It should be helpful to examine briefly some of these recent developments and trends toward Federal control of education and to determine some of their more obvious implications. While tendencies toward Federal control without Federal aid have existed for many years some of those which have occurred during the past decade should be of greatest interest:

1. During the depression schools in many States and particularly in the less wealthy rural areas ran into serious financial difficulties. Congress might have faced the problem frankly and established a system of Federal aid for schools at that time, but it did not. By 1934 the situation became so serious that the Federal Government felt impelled to do something to prevent a complete collapse in certain areas. The indirect method was used. Some of the funds set aside for relief were made available to the schools, but the Federal officials prescribed detailed conditions for using the funds. For example, where schools could only be continued with the use of Federal funds, teachers could be paid salaries only at the rates prescribed for persons on relief. The Federal Government thus took away from the participating States and communities during that period the control of a vital phase of school policies. It determined the salaries to be paid individual teachers and saw to it that those salaries in most cases were lower than established local standards. But even more significant controls were yet to come.

2. The need for nursery schools and kindergartens and for various types of adult education has existed for many years. Some communities have sufficient wealth to provide at least some of these services, but many others do not have. A few years ago Federal agencies began to sense this need. Relief funds were made available to establish these services on a limited scale. But again there was no direct appropriation for education. In fact, the funds that were used in many cases were not even made available to established State educational agencies. Instead a parallel, and to some extent, at least, a duplicating agency was established in each State. The Federal Government thus was controlling certain aspects of educational policy in each State by determining the functions for which funds could be spent, the communities in which they could be spent, by hiring personnel, and by spending the funds.

3. The poorest communities have always had the most difficulty in providing adequate school buildings. The Federal Government also became interested in this field—and is likely to become interested again. But the system of aid which was established through the P. W. A. tended to help the wealthy communities more than the most needy because of the matching requirement. Moreover, the funds were not made available to established State educational agencies, but the Federal officials dealt directly with the communities, sometimes even encouraging the construction of buildings at improper locations and contrary to State standards. Thus, for several years, we had a very real Federal control of school-building construction, often to the consternation of State and sometimes local educational authorities.

4. The recently abolished N. Y. A. was established several years ago to serve the very worthy purpose of helping needy but capable youth to continue in school. But what happened? The funds were not made available to the States to administer. The Federal Government set up its own elaborate organization to administer the program. But the matter did not end there. After a time the N. Y. A. began to establish federally operated schools of its own. Students were paid to attend these schools. In many cases the N. Y. A. schools competed directly with established vocational schools for students, teachers, and equipment, sometimes even buying up and storing for future use equipment seriously needed for war-training courses. The N. Y. A. thus sought to control education directly by establishing a duplicate, competing system of schools. Finally after much controversy and by a very close margin the N. Y. A. was abolished.

5. Within the past 2 years the Federal Government has had an excellent opportunity to face the problem directly instead of indirectly because of the urgent needs in numerous war-industry and training centers throughout the Nation. In many communities the population has been doubled, trebled, or even quadrupled while vast amounts of valuable property have been taken over by the Government. Clearly the resulting school financial problem was not of local origin. Once more, however, instead of facing the educational problem directly, Congress has chosen the method which results in greatest Federal control. Funds were made available through the so-called Lanham Act to assist in maintaining normal community facilities in those areas. From the beginning pressure groups have tended to dominate the situation, resulting in a mad scramble for funds. The F. W. A. has largely ignored the recommendations of established State and Federal educational agencies regarding educational phases of the program. Perhaps without intending to do so, they have established so many objectionable and arbitrary controls over the educational program that educators throughout the country have practically revolted. Yet F. W. A. blandly wonders what the objections are all about, assumes that the problem can be solved if it exercises even more direct administrative controls, and continues to promote projects involving substantial sums, with little regard for established State educational policies. While most of these projects are urgently needed, some of the F. W. A. activities seem designed to provide a more obvious basis for maintaining, and perhaps a more subtle basis for perpetuating, a large and aggressive staff. That is the situation today.

A detailed study of these and other developments resulting in noneducational Federal agencies tending to exert increasingly greater and more objectionable controls over various phases of the school program of the Nation leads to the following conclusions:

1. The Federal Government can never be expected in the future to ignore completely the educational needs of the Nation or to refrain entirely from any effort to supply funds to meet those needs. In fact it seems evident that existing and new needs will be increasingly recognized during coming years and an effort will be made to see that they are met in some manner.

2. As long as funds for schools or for any phase of the school program are made available indirectly through noneducational agencies we must continue to expect to have to face the problem of increasing Federal control of the school program. Some of the reasons are:

(a) The very fact that these agencies are noneducational in organization and nature means that they have other interests which are primary and which will receive major attention and consideration. Education thus will tend to be subordinated to these interests, which means that an effort, whether conscious or not, will be made to see that it is regulated accordingly.

(b) Many undesirable controls will be imposed through ignorance of the implications of these controls. Noneducational agencies cannot be expected to have a well-rounded or even a defensible philosophy of education. Many decisions will accordingly be based on expediency rather than on the needs of a properly organized program of education.

(c) As long as the funds are indirectly made available for some phase of education largely on a hobby or vested interest basis, the plans for apportionment and administration cannot readily be written into law. Most of the requirements will tend to be subjective, subject to change through pressure, and to result in many unfortunate, perhaps not intended, controls, as in the case of the F. W. A.

3. Recent tendencies to try to meet educational needs indirectly through noneducational agencies, if continued, are certain to result in increasing confusion and further misunderstanding of the real issues involved. More and more Federal agencies are finding educational needs which they think should be met through the schools. These agencies are not familiar with existing educational machinery and tend to ignore it. They establish their own administrative agencies in the States to deal directly with local schools, without regard to what the United States Office of Education or State departments of education can or might be doing. Thus, the existing educational structure may be further weakened instead of strengthened and the organization will become more complex instead of simpler. The confusion that has tended to develop during recent years is well illustrated by the fact that some of the large daily newspapers in certain sections of the country have used the situation created by the Lanham Act as an argument against any system of Federal aid for schools. Increasing

confusion would mean that it would be increasingly difficult to isolate and face fairly the basic problem of Federal aid for schools.

4. The only way to avoid further Federal control of schools and to eliminate some of the present control by noneducational agencies is to establish a definite plan of direct Federal aid. If we can establish a comprehensive direct system of Federal aid for schools administered through the various States as it should be administered, we can be prepared to face issues directly. If any tendency toward Federal control of education should develop, we can be in position to combat it, whereas with the indirect and piecemeal system of Federal support, we can seldom get the issues out in the open so that any one agency or group can be held fully responsible for the undesirable tendencies.

Any system of direct Federal aid for schools should meet the following requirements:

(a) The funds should be apportioned to the States on the basis of an objective formula written into law and not subject to interpretation or modification by any Federal agency or individual except the courts.

(b) The funds should be made available to the various States to be used by them in strengthening and improving their own educational systems in accordance with the provisions of their own laws.

(c) Each State should be held fully responsible and accountable for the proper expenditure of the funds in accordance with the objectives and standards written into the Federal law. The Federal Government should, of course, have the right to audit the State accounts to see that the funds are expended for the educational purposes for which they are authorized.

(d) The States should probably be expected and required to meet certain objective administrative standards that are incorporated in the law. These standards should tend to safeguard the interests of the children of the State and yet would not subject the schools to any type of undesirable control.

The people of America are definitely opposed to any Federal domination of the school program. That fact constitutes the greatest possible safeguard against undesirable Federal control of schools. As long as Federal funds continue to be made available on a piecemeal basis through non-educational channels and used for indirect and for specific phases of the school program, we are almost certain to continue to have a growing type of Federal control which cannot successfully and satisfactorily be resisted by the people because they have no basis for understanding what is happening. If, however, Congress will establish a comprehensive system of Federal aid for education involving grants to the States on an objective basis to be administered according to State law, with the States having to deal only with the United States Office of Education, the people can be on the alert for any untoward tendencies or evidences of Federal control and will quickly rally to the support of their ideals of education as a function of the State if those ideals are violated.

If all the millions of dollars which have been spent on various educational functions by the noneducational agencies of the Federal Government during the past decade could have been made available to the States through a satisfactory system of Federal aid for schools, our State systems of education would today have been far stronger; the educational program would have been far better; many objectionable controls would have been avoided; and the people would be in far better position to resist successfully any further tendencies toward undesirable controls by Federal agencies.

Navy Day: October 27, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Roy Miller, vice president, Navy League of the United States, and State chairman for Navy Day:

Once again we are privileged as American citizens to observe Navy Day, which annually occurs October 27 on the birthday of that great American, the late Theodore Roosevelt, who deservedly is recognized as the father of the modern American Navy.

Organized over 20 years ago, the Navy League of the United States has justified its existence by its constant and persistent advocacy of a Navy large and strong enough to protect our country and to safeguard the traditions and principles which constitute the foundations of our national life. The part which our glorious Navy, with its rapidly increasing power and might, is playing in the global war for freedom needs neither comment nor elaboration. It is indeed our spearhead of victory and its certain contribution to final victory is recognized with gratitude by every American citizen.

Despite the diabolical treachery of Pearl Harbor, a spectacular and unprecedented building program has already created as our spearhead of victory the greatest and most powerful Navy that ever sailed the seven seas. Its thrilling exploits have already written the most brilliant chapter that yet adorns the pages of our proud history.

It is unnecessary, as it would be superfluous, to attempt to inventory our Navy's stupendous power. Suffice it to say that in ships that sail the seas, in those demons of destruction that operate beneath the waves, and in that powerful arm of aerial might, the composition and component parts of our vast Naval Establishment, still in process of building and expansion, stand unequalled and superlative in matchless supremacy.

There was a time when the warnings and pleadings of the Navy League of the United States received but scant attention and little consideration. Now every thoughtful American realizes that but for the unconquerable power of our Navy the whole issue of victory or defeat in the world-wide conflict, into which unwillingly we have been thrust, would be hanging in the balance. We shall, therefore, celebrate and observe Navy Day this year with gratitude and thanksgiving for what our Navy has done and is doing to insure our security and our freedom. We shall pledge to it anew and without stint our help and support, our loyalty and confidence, in any and every way in which we as grateful civilians can serve.

I am sure, therefore, that Navy Day this year will be observed by all of the people of Texas, and that commercial, civic and patriotic organizations and luncheon clubs, as they have in the past at their meetings nearest Navy Day, will observe the occasion with appropriate programs. I especially request that the mayors of our cities and towns, by appropriate proclamation, will call upon the people generally to make some observance of the day. I trust also that in our public schools and other educational institutions appropriate programs will be arranged so that our young people may be given some insight into the significance of the occasion.

When victory comes, as surely it will, we shall have a fuller knowledge of the part our great Navy has played in assuring it. One lesson at least we shall have learned, which is that regardless of other obligations we may assume America shall possess and maintain a navy large and powerful enough to guarantee our complete safety and the preservation of our democratic institutions against any enemy or aggressor or combination of enemies or aggressors that may or can be raised against us in any quarter, from any source, or for any cause.

This high resolve shall do no violence to our traditions or the eternal principles that made us a nation. Never in the future as in our proud past, will the might of America be used for aggression, exploitation, aggrandizement, or selfish purpose. We shall only demand, as we now seek to assure, world-wide recognition of our right to the full and unhampered enjoyment of those priceless blessings of freedom and peace which constitute the American way of life. We realize now as never before that a navy, the most powerful in the world, constitutes our surest guaranty for the preservation of our civilization, our democracy, and the freedoms which have made America the greatest, richest, and most powerful Nation of all time.

In this spirit and with this fixed determination we Texans, together with all other grateful Americans, shall observe and celebrate Navy Day on October 27.

Words Versus Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Record of September 27, 1943:

WORDS VERSUS DEEDS

Last July President Roosevelt delivered a fireside chat, one portion of which was relayed to the men in uniform by the Army news service.

That portion was a six-point statement of what Mr. Roosevelt intends to do, or to have done, for the discharged servicemen and women when the time for demobilization shall have arrived.

It was quite a coincidence that this propaganda—for of course it was nothing else—went out at the very time when arrangements were being put under way to organize and garner in the absentee soldier and sailor vote, which may amount to some 10,000,000 prospective ballots in the forthcoming elections.

It was also noticeable that Mr. Roosevelt plausibly put pressure upon Congress by saying:

"May the Congress do its duty in this regard."

The obviously implied idea was that if the veterans of this world war should be discharged as penniless men and women "into an environment of inflation and unemployment, to a place on a breadline or on a corner

selling apples," that would be strictly the fault of their Senators and Representatives.

Mention was not made of the fact that the present Congress was already quietly at work on veterans' legislation. As for himself, Mr. Roosevelt unctuously said:

"I have assured our men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down when the war is won."

It is therefore perfectly proper that two questions be plainly asked—and as plainly answered:

What has been the record of Mr. Roosevelt in regard to the veterans of the First World War?

Does that record of his give anybody any sound reason for having any confidence in what he promises now?

The fact is that every official action that was taken to help the veterans of the First World War to reestablish themselves in civil life, or to care for their disabled comrades—to set up insurance funds and pension systems for them, or to assist them financially in times of distress when thousands of them were jobless and their families were in want—every such action was taken ether by Republican administrations which preceded Mr. Roosevelt's or by the Democratic Congresses of Mr. Roosevelt's own administration in actual defiance of Mr. Roosevelt himself.

The fact is that when Mr. Roosevelt assumed the Presidency in 1933 he found the Nation willingly caring for its faithful First World War veterans, according to their needs, at a cost of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year, and that Mr. Roosevelt, in the guise of fulfilling a campaign pledge of economy in Government, coldly deprived the First World War veterans of nearly half of this.

The fact is that Mr. Roosevelt went even further back than the First World War in his opposition to veterans' benefits, and deprived American soldiers who had fought in the Spanish-American War of $125,000,000 a year which their country had been gratefully providing to them because of their services and their sufferings.

The fact is that Mr. Roosevelt went still further back than that, under arbitrary powers unwisely delegated to him by his first Congress, and cruelly reduced the scanty pensions being paid to aged men who had answered Lincoln's call in 1861.

The fact is that, when Congress in 1935 passed an adjusted-compensation (bonus) bill for the benefit of veterans of the First World War, President Roosevelt vetoed the bill and caused its final defeat in the Senate by 8 votes.

The fact is that, when Congress in 1936 passed another veterans' bonus bill, President Roosevelt again exercised his veto power, and the bill become a law only because Congress repassed it over the President's veto.

The fact is that, during his Presidency to date, President Roosevelt has vetoed no fewer than 18 bills passed by Congress for the benefit of veterans, and it has been Congress and not the President that has put any of these bills into effect.

All that would be a doleful record for a politician to recite in seeking soldiers' and sailors' votes for a fourth term.

So, naturally, Mr. Roosevelt ignored his own record in blithely saying he had "assured our men in the armed forces that the American people would not let them down when the war has been won."

Neither the American people nor the American Congress will fail their returning soldiers and sailors in this World War, and the soldiers and sailors may be confidently assured of that.

For the people and the Congress have made their record in the matter of veterans' legislation, exactly as Franklin D. Roosevelt has made his own.

Actions always speak louder than words.

The Low-Down on Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Blair Moody, from the Detroit News of October 3, 1943:

THE LOW-DOWN ON WASHINGTON

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—Bitter revolt is flaring in Congress against President Roosevelt's new $10,000,000,000-plus tax bill, even before it reaches Capital Hill.

Right-wing Senators protest that its stratospheric rates, as revealed privately in advance, are excessive, not justly balanced, and threatening to the entire economic base of the war effort.

Liberal Congressmen are asking sharp questions: First, Where can that much more money be raised without crippling effect? Second, Is another tax bill at this time really necessary at all?

The program goes to Congress, Monday. Its slogan is to soak everybody. It will be read before the House Ways and Means Committee by Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury.

Morgenthau will ask fast action, so the higher rates can take effect January 1. He will call the proposal vital to combat inflation and soundly finance the war. He will leave the inference that since action is inevitable, Congressmen would serve their own interests by acting at once. The sooner the new rates become law, the more chance for voters to become numb to their pain by election day, 1944.

But this program will not become law by January 1, or any other time. Not a single Member of either the House or Senate tax committees could be found today who does not privately feel that the proposed surtax rates—up from 13 to 26 percent on the first $2,000 and other brackets higher in proportion—would be destructive.

No one thinks Congress will swallow them. Not even the Treasury really expects to get what it will ask.

But most Congressmen assume they will have to pass a new tax bill.

NEW BILL CUSTOM

For years Congress has been taking for granted that if the administration asked for more taxes, a bill had to be passed.

This was a strange mental process. For in no other respect has it shown the slightest confidence in downtown's tax recommendations.

When Morgenthau tried to use taxes as a means to economic reform, as in his spending-tax scheme in 1942, he was openly scoffed at. When Congress in the middle 1930's did agree to a novel revenue measure, the undistributed-profits tax, it was promptly repealed at the next session. Time after time, the Treasury has been told, in effect, to put on a dunce cap and stand in the corner—Congress would write its own tax law.

Yet when someone solemnly intones: "This is a new session; that means a new tax law," Congress falls in line like so many sheep. They kick and balk about the total money asked. They usually fall short of the revenue goal set up by Morgenthau. But they always come through with something.

They never seem to inquire into the basic question of whether higher taxes will be a good or bad thing for the country. They never seem to dare to vote white or black. It's always grey—a compromise.

Therefore, all the administration had to do at any time was ask for twice what it wanted.

REAL ISSUE IS CLEAR

It goes without saying that the American people are willing to pay whatever taxes are necessary to win the war. It also goes without saying that they do not want their incomes drained away needlessly to serve an erroneous obsession conceived in some obscure Washington cubbyhole, and adopted by default because no one in Congress has the imagination, insight, or courage to check into the facts.

The real issue before Congress next week will not be what means should be taken to raise how much money, but first, whether it is now necessary—whether it is even desirable—to raise any more money at all.

There are two reasons advanced by the administration for higher taxes. Neither one stands up.

The first is that they are needed to head off inflation and higher costs of living.

The American people are expected to earn $142,000,000,000 in 1943. Only about $91,000,000,000 worth of tangible consumers goods will be available because so much of our productive effort is going into weapons. The pressure of these extra dollars—theoretically—will bid up prices as competitive buyers rush for goods. The only solution, say the heavy-taxers, is to drain off as much as possible of the excess by taxation and compulsory savings.

That's the theory. In practice it is not working out that way. The people are saving their money without being clubbed into it. (If the White House or Treasury doubts this, let them consult the Government's own latest "economic box score"—O. W. I. release No. 2538, which they can obtain from Elmer Davis.)

Not only have all war loan drives boomed over the top but life-insurance premiums and personal savings have climbed to their highest points in history. Savings deposits in banks alone have reached $30,000,000,000. Consumer credit has been cut nearly 40 percent in a year. And much spending is going into football games, traveling, and other intangible goods, which helps to absorb the so-called inflationary gap.

For months now, national income has been careening along ahead of tangible goods available. But in the first 19 months of the war, from December 1941 to July 1943, the cost of living rose 12 percent. That compares with roughly 30 percent in the first 19 months of World War No. 1. And in the last 3 months prices have been moving not up but down.

There is but one answer to this. O. P. A. has done a swell job. All brickbats to the contrary, Prentiss Brown's organization has overcome the handicap of a farm bloc constantly harping for higher prices, and in an era of unprecedented national buying power has not only checked the inflationary price movement but reversed it.

Brown has had help from absorption of buying income by personal taxes, which will amount to sixteen billions in 1943. But now all he has to do is hold the line, and he is holding it. There is no need for higher taxes for that purpose.

HIGHER TAX ARGUMENT

The other argument for higher taxes now is to finance a greater proportion of the war currently to keep the national debt from going too high.

The maximum Morgenthau could squeeze into his request was $12,000,000,000. If Congress votes anything, it will be nearer six. Either of these figures is a mere drop in the bucket when compared to the cost of the war. It cannot conceivably have any effect on the Government's credit or anything else, either now or later.

What difference will it make whether, when the war ends, the debt is 270 billions or 280? What would be the odds whether it was 323 or 333?

The cold fact is this: If at the end of this war American industry and labor and Government have the foresight and common sense to cooperate on a program of private enterprise which will make our economy come up to its full potentiality or even close to it; if we have a high level of employment and heavy production of consumer goods and decent wage standards so that the people who make the goods can also buy them, then the national income will be ample not only to service the debt but pay it off at present tax levels or lower.

If, on the other hand, we fall apart into short-sighted, selfish, bickering factions—as we are wont to do—if we accept the defeatist philosophy that after the war we must resign ourselves to a period of drastic readjustment; if too many capitalists continue to play dog-in-the-manger, too many labor unions insist on restricting production and too many bureaucrats fight for personal power instead of for the Nation's interest—then our national income and buying power will drop with a crash that will make 1929 sound like the tinkle of a Christmas chime.

SUPERFICIAL VIEWPOINT

The declaration of need for higher taxes, then, is superficial and mistaken. But that is not all.

Chop too deeply with a dull ax into the living standards of millions of American families and the social and economic effects will be felt for many years.

Prevent millions of others, now for the first time attaining standards that decently may be termed American, from establishing a firm financial base at the higher level, and irreparable damage has been done, not only to those families but to the country.

Senator VANDENBERG, ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, made this comment after hearing Morgenthau outline his measure:

"What difference does it make whether you are 87.2 percent broke or 87.7 percent broke?

"We have reached the point where the size of the debt ceases to be the primary concern. The most important thing is to maintain a healthy domestic economy.

"If there is money that should be taxed and is escaping, Congress will want to find it. But we must stop piling taxes on the same old targets or we may impair our whole structure."

A potent Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee is Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Detroit. DINGELL has a consistent New Deal record. His comment:

"I am not convinced that any new taxes are needed. It's about time we called a halt on this business of jacking up taxes automatically every few months. Our structure can be wrecked by drastic deflation even more rapidly than by inflation."

A few months ago, the most vehement opponent of a severe compulsory program of draining off income from the public was Morgenthau. A phalanx of Presidential advisers bucked him, but he won out. His argument: We can do it voluntarily by selling War bonds. How can you expect people to use their extra cash for War bonds if you take it away from them?

Care of Disabled Veterans

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an article by Bill Cunningham, appearing in the Boston Herald of yesterday, deals with the post-war problems that must be faced, particularly with what is to be done in the way of caring for the discharged veterans of this war who have been disabled. I am deeply concerned because, as I said last week, the backlog of World War No. 2 cases in the Veterans' Administration is large. Forty-three hundred cases in the Boston area alone tell the story. Claims have not been handled properly, and many claims have not been found, due to shortage of personnel. Also, the Veterans' Administration could do more in the rehabilitation of the veterans. These men should now, as they come out of the hospitals with disabilities, receive their training and employment from the Veterans' Administration. Certainly the employment of these veterans should start at home in the Veterans' Administration, where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, the hospital construction program is not going fast enough and enough new construction has not been authorized by the Board of Hospitalization. The Congress has passed legislation for all necessary construction. All that is necessary is for the Board of Hospitalization to recommend the needed construction. Those of you who were following the care of the disabled remember the time it took to secure an adequate number of beds. Having that in mind, the Congress has passed legislation in order to have the hospitals for the men as soon as they return to America. The Congress has passed legislation for rehabilitation, for compensation, and for insurance, and for other benefits for the World War No. 2 veterans.

There is no possible excuse for laxity in carrying out these laws. The men and their families will suffer enough without the distress of waiting for beds and proper care. The wounded and shocked cases are returning at a rapid rate to the United States; more rapidly and in greater numbers than people realize generally. I have kept in constant touch with the Veterans' Administration to have the machinery for veterans' care set in motion, including an adequate staff of doctors and nurses and other personnel to run that machinery. The Veterans' Administration for some reason has failed to do this.

[From the Boston Herald of Sunday, October 3, 1943]

POST-WAR PROBLEM THAT MUST BE FACED—SERVICES' HONORABLY DISCHARGED RATE COMMUNITY HELP NOW

(By Bill Cunningham)

The honeymoon is just about over for us in this Nation.

Now we move in with the in-laws of war, or, more properly, they move in with us. They're the problems, the byproducts, the wreckage, the waste. It's a sobering thought but it has to be faced, and the sooner we start facing it the better.

The cold truth of the matter is that the war has been sugar-coated for most of us thus far. Millions among us haven't even been touched. Of course, we miss the boys. Being human, we sympathize with the people we know who have lost a son, a brother, a husband. But being human, even that sympathy slides swiftly behind us as we turn again to our own affairs.

Oh, we know there's a war, and we're deeply concerned. We talk it, we read it, and we feel strongly about it. We miss free use of the car, the beef, the butter, and things of that nature. That's war, and war's terrible.

REACTION TO PICTURES OF DEAD ONE OF PROTEST

But the point is that we don't know how terrible. We haven't as yet been given the optical evidence, nor even the stories in the raw and bloody original. A little of that was tried recently when the Third War bond drive began to drop speed. The O. W. I. decided that possibly a little shock might goad the public to the bond-sellers' windows, so it let some of it ride with the invasion stories from Salerno. It quoted the Germans as claiming they'd killed 10,000 Americans and brought to use the dread name Gallipoli in citing a comparison.

And to United States newspapers, for the first time they released official photographs of United States dead. One was a group of American paratroopers, apparently killed en masse as they descended on Sicily. Another showed American bodies lying face down on a beach at Buna, the feet of one awash in the tide, another half covered with sand.

Most papers didn't print them. Some did, and the reaction from readers was interesting. Whether typical or not is another question. But the reaction was one of violent protest. One letter a paper published accused the O. W. I. of deliberately faking the paratrooper picture. The letter writer didn't endeavor to claim that the men weren't dead, but he professed to see evidences in the photograph proving that the soldiers weren't slaughtered as claimed, but that the bodies had been gathered from over an area and deliberately arranged.

The Buna photograph brought a bitter protest from a reader who said it was "a sickening and a revolting picture" that had no place in a family newspaper. We all know war is terrible, he said, and we know men are killed, but why should anybody have to see such things in a newspaper? What good could it do but make everybody miserable? Was it even fair to the dead? he asked.

And possibly he was right—concerning pictures of the slain.

But we haven't, as a nation, even yet met the wounded. We have many of these, and many even now in this country, but the public hasn't seen them. They are brought back by ship, are transferred to hospital trains, and are run straight through to Devens or Walter Reed or wherever designated.

We haven't seen the empty sleeves, the pinned-up pants legs, the maimed, the blind on our streets as yet. Most of these haven't had time to get out among us yet. Thus most of us haven't yet met the war. And yet the war is already meeting us. Its major problems already have started to move in on us.

The first of these is scarcely recognized and almost wholly without any plans for handling. Yet it's here, and it's only a foretaste of what's coming.

That's what to do about the honorably discharged veterans of this war, principally, the so-called C. D. D.'s—those sent home with "certificates of disability discharge." The

President, and sundry Congressmen, some undoubtedly sincere, others with an eye to the service vote, have talked in generalities about what's to be done for the veteran. Communities and relief agencies have done some general considering.

All this, to date, has been in terms of the future. It seems to presume that there'll be some veterans some day, and that ways and means must be provided for their readjustment and rehabilitation.

Future be damned! They're already here, and the battle casualties of these initial skirmishes aren't even out of the hospitals. The casualties of the tremendous campaigns to come are a projection of the same mighty problem, the limits of which can't be even guessed from where we stand.

PICTURE IS BEAUTIFUL—ON PAPER

But many thousands we already have with us, some from wounds, disease, or injury incurred in line of duty, others discarded by the Army in training because they simply couldn't stand the gaff, the discipline, or make the necessary adjustments.

Take the case of the typical C. D. D. That carries with it an honorable discharge. The man has done his best, and he's either been injured beyond further use or he has proved incompetent, often mentally incompetent. Everything medicine and science can do for him has been tried before the Army gives up. There are 4 doctors for every 1,000 soldiers in the Army and such things as teeth, tonsils, nerves, eyes, and other points of trouble get much finer and more conscientious attention than they ever do in civilian life.

The Army does its best, but if it's no good, it's no good. The man is handed his C. D. D., a certificate of honor and his fare home is paid.

That's the end of it with his outfit. He's back in the home town's lap.

In many localities that may be the end of him altogether as far as the Army's concerned. In this locality it isn't, for the First Service Command staff, at the orders of Gen. Sherman Miles, has organized itself to lend the discharged veteran as much advice and assistance as it can.

It at least can consider his case and provide him with such information as applies to his case. For example, it can give him complete information about his Government insurance and the disposition of his War bonds. If he is entitled to compensation for disability, it shows him how to file his claim with the Veterans' Administration. It shows him how to call on the Red Cross, Army Emergency Relief, and, in Massachusetts, soldier's relief. From some of this he can receive temporary assistance, financial or otherwise.

It can send him on to other Federal agencies such as the United States Employment Service with its 35 branches in Massachusetts. It can remind him of the reemployment program of the Selective Service System. The Veterans' Administration is supposed to have a complete rehabilitation program.

The picture is beautiful and complete—on paper.

As a matter of fact it is shot full of holes, and the veteran who gets more than some expert advice about filing any claims he has and a little temporary financial assistance is the isolated exception rather than the general rule. Getting the thing that every veteran wants and is entitled to—a worth-while job—is, as matters stand now, an extremely difficult matter for a C. D. D. Unless, that is, he knows some employer willing to take him on through personal friendship in some private line of work, or in some little place.

In terms of customary employment, his chances are very, very slim.

Why?

CIVIL WAR PRODUCED PRIZE CROP

We might as well be frank about it. He runs smack into the insurance companies. They underwrite workmen's compensation insurance for the employer. Of course this is Federal legislation. The insurance companies' doctors won't ordinarily pass the man. if the Army has medically discharged him, that's prima facie evidence there's something the matter with him physically or mentally. At least that's the way the insurance doctor is bound to regard him. The doctor's job is to protect the insurance company. Each employee who breaks down and has to be paid is a mark against the doctor.

The C. D. D. walks up to that desk with at least two strikes and a half on him.

What does he do then?

Well, he can rustle for himself, as matters stand now, or become a professional veteran. We've always had plenty of the latter, the Civil War probably producing the prize crop of all. Everybody of any years can remember the veterans of that tragic struggle wearing their little caps to the ends of their usually lengthy years, and living on pensions and claims, many of them scandalously phony, to the end of their days.

One reason why nobody wearing the mantle of the Republican Party ever will carry the South is because the South considers Civil War pensions the core of the Republican Party, and considers that the South was ruined and kept ruined in order to pay them. Confederate veterans had none and could get none. They and their sons and grandsons have considered themselves in slavery ever since, a slavery of providing pensions for the victorious and merciless damyanks,

He can go in for some of this and he can hit a terrific lick, if he doesn't starve before the rest of his buddies get back, because there will be some 10,000,000 of them, at least, when the war is over. That's a powerful voting force and veterans' legislation is certain to be terrific—unless something is done now in the form of a system or a plan.

Those who've studied the matter, including the Army Emergency Relief officers who've already been at grips with the problem, think the job of rehabilitation properly reverts to the community. The community took the man from the job and sent him away. The community, they think, should, and most easily can, fit the man back into the same job, or one equally acceptable.

They think the local ex-servicemen's organizations, the rotary clubs, chambers of commerce, and similar groups should take the initiative in forming a local veterans' council, or bureau, and take the case of the returned boy as a straight civic project. They should let everybody in the community know where they are, what they have, what they're trying to do.

They should advise every local soldier and every local soldier's family that theirs is the place for him to come. They should have advice, help, and a placement system ready. Army Emergency Relief stands ready to extend the immediate help necessary, but the community should have the job, the permanent place, the process of reassimilation into the home neighborhood.

They claim this would be the greatest and most valuable war memorial any community could possibly erect, one better than monuments, bridges, or permanent rolls of honor.

SOMETHING THAT CAN'T BE DUCKED

What they could do about the insurance doctors, nobody at present seems to know. Maybe the Government eventually will handle that by a system of subsidies.

There are many thousands of these cases already, with the battle casualties yet to come, as heretofore stated, and one bad feature is that many of these are neurotic cases. Some of these are a result of action, or of service, but the vast majority are civilian neurotics the Army took a chance with and had to let out.

It's no secret that many defectives the Army ordinarily wouldn't have considered were taken when things looked a lot worse for us than they do now. Up to this past June, the military leaders were by no means certain that things weren't going to be pretty desperate for us, and in an effort to get men and more men the bars were lowered deliberately. Taking the chance that some might prove out, many known and suspected defectives were deliberately taken on trial.

Then the military and naval situation changed for the better considerably, the bars went back up and the defectives dropped. That's a byproduct of this war's unprecedented emergency, and it creates an unprecedented problem. These men are now veterans, entitled justly to full consideration. That they couldn't make soldiers is no fault of theirs. But trying to replace them after official medical discharge is a harder task than it would have been in the first place.

There is at present a bad gap between the day a veteran is discharged and the day when his compensation, if any, starts to come through from the Veterans' Administration. Army emergency relief bridges it if he knows how and where to apply. After that, as matters stand now, there is nothing.

Some communities are already alive to the situation and are doing something. Stoneham, Andover, and Natick are three. But real organization and service either along the lines sketched above, or by the State or Federal Governments should be begun now—not tomorrow.

For the C. D. D. is with us now. He can't be ignored and his problem is acute. If proper means are found for the handling of his personal problem, much trouble and probably much wild legislation will be cut out of the future. If nothing is done, tragic difficulty is certain to ensue.

And the time is now. The honeymoon is over. Post-war problems already are with us, in this particular, despite the fact the war really has yet to be fought. There'll be more and more of these men. And then, when it's over, the avalanche will start to pour. If something stout isn't ready, the entire structure will be buried.

Civic leaders and community organizations should move this subject to the tops of their agendas. It can't be ducked. It has to be met and it won't wait around for an answer.

Meat, Copper, and Sugar Beets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the cowboy, the copper miner, and more recently the sugar-beet farmer have all contributed to the welfare of Montana and the Nation. They have developed a new and untamed land and through their efforts have brought into use some of the treasures which this Nation possesses. Because each of these groups are facing serious problems today I am bringing to the attention of the Congress the picture of the cowboy, the miner, and the farmer as I saw him in Montana this summer. Their problems are not only peculiar to Montana but to other areas as well and I am hoping that Members from other States will see fit to bring about some program which will rectify some of the difficulties I am about to discuss.

In 1940 our total production of beef, veal, lamb, mutton, and pork was 18,994,000,000 pounds; in 1941 we set a new

record with a production of 19,494,000,000 pounds; in 1942, again a new record of 21,680,000,000. It is estimated that the production this year will be 23,214,000,000 pounds; it is interesting to note that, whereas beef and veal increased from 7,182,000,000 pounds in 1940 to 8,095,000,000 in 1941 and to 8,835,000,000 in 1942, the estimate for this year is reduced to 8,674,000,000, despite the fact that there was an increase of some 3,000,000 cattle shown on hand January 1, 1943, as compared with the revised figures for a year earlier.

An average of 248 cattle, hogs, and sheep were slaughtered per minute last year in the United States and meat production averaged 58,800,000 pounds daily. These figures give some indication of the way the Nation's livestock growers and feeders have responded to the wartime demand for meat. The slaughter of meat animals during 1942 totaled 130,161,000 head—the greatest, by far, for any year in history. It included 17,652,000 cattle, 9,456,000 calves, 77,680,000 hogs, and 25,375,000 sheep and lambs. Meat production totaled 21,680,000,000 pounds—2,000,000,000 pounds more than in 1941, and represented an all-time high record. This was the third consecutive year in which an all-time high record was established. The per capita consumption of meat was 146.5 pounds per person, including the meat consumed by the men in the service. This was a gain of 2.6 pounds per person over 1941.

The number of livestock now on hand is at a record high. The probable movement of all classes of livestock to markets for the remainder of this year will set an all-time mark in numbers but possibly not in total tonnage. With the uncertainty facing livestock feeders and growers this large number of head to be shipped will place a great strain upon transportation, stockyards, market, and meat processors.

The feeding of cattle is going to be extremely difficult this year. War Food Administrator Marvin Jones recently stated that the present outlook on feed indicates that a substantial reduction in livestock numbers will be necessary during the next 12 months. He indicated that the total slaughter of meat during this period will average about 50 percent more than for the years 1936 through 1940. The number of cattle in the United States is now at an all-time peak of over 80,000,000 head. Pork output during the next 12 months, he said, is likely to be 65 percent above the 1936–40 level; beef and veal, 38 percent; and lamb and mutton, slightly higher than those years.

Despite the above figures which indicate a sound meat supply for the Nation there has been, and is, a serious shortage as far as the consumer is concerned. Ordinarily, the consumer reacts to such factors as supplies, prices, holidays, weather, whims of appetite, and so forth, in the amounts of meat which the processors can sell. It is the consumer, under ordinary or peacetime circumstances, who backs up to the feed lot, farm and ranch.

While in Montana this summer I had the opportunity to visit some of the State's range areas. I saw the fine animals we had in the Flathead, Broadwater, Deer Lodge, Flint Creek, Beaverhead, and Big Hole localities. I saw thousands of fat cattle and wondered what was going to happen to them and the ranchers because of the meat-rationing system now in operation. I talked with the ranchers and found out that hay was being sold for as high as $20 in the windrows and I wondered where the feed was going to come from if the cattle were not moved off the range by fall. I heard of the greatly increased cost in the price of feed concentrates. I was informed that the War Food Administration was contemplating no increase—and possibly a decrease—in our sugar-beet acreage and I was worried because of the difficulties facing not only the cattleman but also because of the troubles affecting the beet grower whose crop is important to the livestock industry and who has had a significant part in the development of the economy of Montana.

I thought of the miners in the Butte copper mines and I wondered why these men who worked in the toughest holes in the world, who went down into the earth over 5,000 feet, who endured the copper water, copper dust, and heat, who worked in extremely dangerous raises, drifts, crosscuts, stopes, and rills, and who were producing a metal more precious than gold and more necessary than steel in the furtherance of the war effort, should not be given the necessary amount of meat to carry on. Why should they be put on an iron ration when their work was so important and copper was so necessary? Why should miners in other parts of the State—and the United States—living under comparatively healthy conditions be given greater meat allowances? Why should the Butte miners not be given the consideration which is their due and why shouldn't the excess cattle in the Big Hole—right on their doorstep—and in other parts of the State be used to keep up their physical well being so that they could continue to produce? Had so much meat been needed for lend-lease and the armed forces that our soldiers of production had to go without? Let us see.

Lend-lease requirements last year had little to do with the food shortages that developed in this country. Lend-lease food exports in 1942, as a whole, represented a small percentage of our total food supply. Of our supply of beef we exported under lend-lease only one-tenth of 1 percent. We exported two-tenths of 1 percent of our veal, lamb, and mutton. Of the meats under rationing, pork was the only one of which we shipped considerable quantities and that amounted to about 10 percent of our total supply. The lend-lease meat figures for 1942 follow:

[In millions of pounds]

	Lend-lease exports	Supply	Exports in percent of supply
All meats	1,134	22,742	5.0
Beef	18	9,155	.1
Veal	0	1,110	0
Lamb and mutton	4	1,068	.4
Pork	1,112	11,409	9.8

For the first 7 months of 1943 we exported under lend-lease 1 percent of our beef and veal, 15.6 percent of our lamb and mutton, and 12.2 percent of our pork. The War Food Administration has tentatively allocated food produced from July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, in the following manner:

	Percent
To the civilian population	75
To the armed forces	13
To Lend-Lease Administration	10
To U. S. territories and special needs	2

I have been unable to find the exact figures on a percentage basis, for the amount of meat used by our armed forces. Members of the armed forces are eating more than they did as civilians. While the average American civilian eats about 3½ pounds of food per day, the average man in uniform eats about 5¼ pounds per day. The resulting increased consumption is equivalent to adding 4 or 5 million persons to our population. Many Americans not in uniform are also eating more and this is due in part to increased purchasing power and in part to the diversion of purchasing power to food from other articles which can no longer be purchased.

The demands upon our food supplies are going to increase even, perhaps, after hostilities cease. But, in the matter of meat, it appears to me that due to our enormous supplies we can and should lift some of our restrictions to balance the inequality existing on the basis of costs, season, and needs. I am happy to note that some steps have been taken in the right direction with the announcement on September 1 that the War Food Administration suspended all quota limitations on the slaughter of livestock for a 2-month period and on September 3 by lifting the restriction on inventories. This will enable packers to freeze and store beef for future civilian consumption thereby conserving feed and providing a market for livestock off pasture now flooding the market. I feel it would be in the best interests of all concerned if enough meat was frozen and stored to last well into next year so that it could be used to advantage in supplementing the inadequate supply of fresh meat which is due to confront us from time to time. In this way a balance would be struck between producer, processor, and consumer.

Earlier in my talk I mentioned the sugar-beet situation in Montana. I am sure the same situation applies to all our beet-sugar States. We know that beet sugar within the continental United States has contributed significantly to the success of our sugar-rationing program and has made possible the diversion of ocean-shipping facilities from commerce in overseas cane to the urgent tasks of war. We know that normal acreage of sugar beets will produce, through the use of byproducts as feed for livestock, 300,000,000 pounds of meat each year and that these products are vitally important to the preservation of dairy herds and the maintenance of cattle- and sheep-feeding operations. We know sugar is needed for canning and preserving other foods and we also know that sugar beets will produce more human food per acre than any other crop

grown extensively in the Temperate Zone. This important food crop will produce, it is estimated, one-third less in 1943 than in 1942. The State of Montana is one of the largest producers of sugar, ranking fourth with a normal production in excess of 80,000 acres of beets or about 3,000,000 100-pound bags of sugar. In addition to the sugar produced, the byproducts from each acre of beets will produce about 300 pounds of beef or mutton or a total potential production of about 24,000,000 pounds of meat.

It is the only large agricultural industry in the State that produces and refines its product entirely within the State, thereby furnishing employment to large numbers of skilled and nonskilled labor. The coal, coke, limerock, and other products necessary to the refining of sugar are all the products of domestic labor. The production of commercial fertilizer has, through the beet industry, become one of the large industries of the State.

The livestock industry of Montana is largely dependent upon the beet farmer for a market for his unfinished livestock, and in times of drought literally thousands of cattle and sheep would be forced upon glutted markets or left to starve on the range were it not for the great amount of feed produced by the sugar-beet farmers.

The recent announcement of the purchase of Cuba's 1944 sugar crop of 4,000,000 short tons by the Government exceeds that of last year by 1,000,000 tons. This, in effect, doubles her prewar share of the American market. During that period, sugar consumption in the United States amounted to 6.8 million tons a year. If we add to the Cuban crop the tonnage produced in Puerto Rico and Hawaii, we can see that these three areas could supply all our sugar needs and drive our beet-producing States out of business. This is something we cannot allow because of our duty to the American farmer and our belief that the American market is his first and all the time.

Because of its real need, it is imperative that sugar-beet acreage be increased for 1944 not only to satisfy our own civilian economy but also to supplement the needs of our armed forces and rehabilitated countries as well. A worthwhile industry such as this needs encouragement and not discouragement, and I hope the War Food Administration will see fit to raise substantially the acreage allotment of this vital productive industry.

So much for this discussion about meat, sugar beets, and copper. Perhaps to the layman these seem to be widely separated subjects. Such is not the case. As a matter of fact they are related to one another as I have endeavored to bring out, in the economy of Montana and to a lesser extent on a national scale. The copper miner needs meat, the sugar-beet farmer furnishes feed, the cattle and sheep ranchers furnish one commodity and use the other, and, consequently, the economy of all three are related to each other. The factors which I have tried to draw to your attention merit our most serious consideration, and, in line with what I have said, I should like to make the following recommendations:

For the meat producers:

First. More common sense in handling the prodigious supply on hand.

Second. Requesting the Commodity Credit Corporation to announce immediately a program for the equitable distribution of protein concentrates from the 1943–44 crop.

Third. Creation of a council representing producer, middleman, and consumer with power to advise and counsel with the meat division of O. P. A.

Fourth. Keep demand in balance with supply.

For the sugar beet producers:

First. Designation of sugar beets as a war crop.

Second. Urge the elimination of restriction on sugar beet acreage.

Third. Urge that a price be set to encourage planting of normal acreage.

For the copper miners:

First. A decided increase in the meat ration at the earliest possible moment.

These recommendations are made in a spirit of helpfulness. I am fully aware of the difficulties which face any program in wartime but I feel that after a program has been in existence for a reasonably long period of time the inequalities should be ironed out and changes made where necessary so that the common good of our people will be best served. This is my only reason for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress at this time. These problems are serious and are deserving of our most serious consideration. The power to correct is in our hands. Let us use it wisely, judiciously, and carefully in behalf of our people.

Alaska—The Land of the Midnight Sun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the prosecution of the war the Territory of Alaska is making an outstanding contribution. As I heretofore reported to the House, during the recess of the Congress I had an opportunity to make an inspection trip in that strategic Territory as a member of the House Committee on Territories and also the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources. Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, commanding Northwest Service Command, Col. K. B. Bush, chief of staff, and Capt. Richard L. Neuberger, aide-de-camp to General O'Connor, gave me every aid and assistance while I was on this inspection trip.

On September 27, 1943, at Vancouver, B. C., the Vancouver Board of Trade sponsored a luncheon for these Army officials on the occasion of the presentation to the city of Vancouver by Brigadier General O'Connor of a copy of the Buckley Telegraph Trail Journal. This original journal is in the possession of and treasured by the Portland Public Library. It is the record of the achievements of the heroic men who blazed the Telegraph Trail and explored British Columbia in 1865. It was indeed the forerunner of the Alaska Highway which follows this trail over a portion of the 1,600 miles it traverses from Fort St. John to Fairbanks.

As I have stated in the House before, this achievement of the United States Army engineers and their civilian aids will be recognized by historians as the greatest accomplishment in military road building in the shortest space of time under adverse conditions. Brigadier General O'Connor at the luncheon referred to made a noteworthy address which I include as a part of these observations. The address is as follows:

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. JAMES A. O'CONNOR, UNITED STATES ARMY, COMMANDING NORTHWEST SERVICE COMMAND, AT LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY VANCOUVER BOARD OF TRADE

Mayor Cornett, President McKeen, members of the Vancouver Board of Trade, my friends, the worn phrase "better late than never" may truly be applied to this visit of ours to your great city. For many months we have been promising ourselves the privilege of a trip to Vancouver. The warm hospitality of the Vancouver Board of Trade has now made that promise a reality. We are very glad to be here, indeed. To all of you, for your very generous invitation, I wish to extend my grateful appreciation.

You know, history is a difficult thing to keep pace with; it moves on as we sleep, as we eat, as we go about our daily lives.

I am reminded of a very famous anecdote in the annals of our American far West. There happened to be a professor in an eastern college who believed it was impossible to teach history convincingly unless you had lived through the historic experiences yourself. To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, he felt that history taught vicariously was like "homeopathic soup made from the shadow of a pigeon that had starved to death."

So the professor set out to follow the trail of the great frontiersmen, Lewis and Clark, through the mountains of Idaho and Oregon. He dressed in buckskins like the stalwart argonauts and ate their meager fare of pemmican and cornmeal.

At last, late one afternoon, he staggered down Agency Creek in the Bitter Root Range, hungry, footsore, and exhausted. Before him loomed the cabin of a ranger station. Eagerly he knocked on the door. The pine boards swung back and the ranger stood there.

"Have you some bread and milk?" gasped the hungry pedagogue.

The ranger stared at the gaunt apparition before him. "What are you doin', stranger?" he inquired.

"I'm following Lewis and Clark," answered the professor.

The ranger scratched his head, then thought a moment, "Stranger," he said, "You're awfully late. They was through here about 115 years ago."

I am not one to telescope historic events as compactly as that forest ranger, yet I feel that in the past 18 months we have seen a great deal of history take place in the Canadian Northwest and in the Territory of Alaska. I came on duty at Fort St. John, British Columbia, early in May of 1942. Since that time I have been privileged to see many events occur. Outstanding among them has been the completion of the first land route ever constructed between the interior of North America and the Territory of Alaska.

Auxiliary to this development have been such other occurrences as the first telephone

line ever strung into the Yukon, and the construction of barracks, repair shops, and garages along the route of the Alaska Highway. We also have seen extended and improved a chain of military airports linking our Alaskan bases with the airplane manufacturing centers of both Canada and the United States.

There are those who question the wisdom of such undertakings. They wonder why any overland communication or transportation need be developed to Alaska. Such skeptics always remind me of the people who referred to the purchase of Alaska in 1867 as "Seward's Folly." There were men and women who lined the Hudson River to watch Robert Fulton's *Clermont* sink like a stone. "Fulton's Folly," they called it. Yet, somehow, it kept afloat and moved upstream, and so the course of history was changed.

I imagine there are men living here in Vancouver who remember when the building of Canada's transcontinental railroads was called foolish and wasteful. When Lewis and Clark returned from their notable exploration, certain leading citizens of New York City attacked Thomas Jefferson for authorizing the exploration and predicted that no one would ever trek to the Pacific coast again.

Yet I think history will record that the development of transportation routes has always encouraged settlement, migration, and prosperity. The path of empire has followed railways, roads, and highways to all the points of the compass. Every State in the American Union has been enriched and developed as a result of the transportation routes expanded within its borders.

One road or railway has invariably stimulated the construction of feeder roads and subsidiary routes. In the days to come, when peacetime reconstruction will develop the far North, perhaps it is not unreasonable to believe that the Alaska Highway will be only part of a network of roads extending to the Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Alaska.

In this connection, I want to tell you about a road which was first conceived late last year under a directive issued by the commanding general of the American Army Service Forces, Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell. This road is the Haines Military Road, built from Haines, near the head of the Inside Passage, to a point on the Alaska Highway, 108 miles north of Whitehorse. The setting is historic, for the road commences within a few rods of Chilkoot Barracks, the first American Army military post ever built in Alaska. Many illustrious American soldiers have served their apprenticeship there.

From the junction of the Haines Military Road and the Alaska Highway, it is 520 miles to Fairbanks. Between Haines and the junction it is 160 miles. This means that the distance from Haines to the city which is the hub of Alaska, is 680 miles. The Haines Military Road cuts off the long open-sea haul across the Gulf of Alaska. It makes maximum use of the inside passage, that fabulous mountain-protected arm of the Pacific Ocean, which may be navigated by barges, tugs, and small inland steamers. This road is of great significance to you of Vancouver, for the bulk of shipping up the inside passage originates either here or at Seattle, with additional cargo hauled from another British Columbia seaport, Prince Rupert.

The Haines road follows the route of the Chilkat and Three Guardsmen Passes, ascending the Chilkat River from the ocean. This is the famous old Jack Dalton Trail, a celebrated path in Alaskan history. Along the road still stand the crumbling cabins where the Royal Mounties "checked in" the gold seekers as they rushed toward the Klondike. For many years people dwelling on the Pacific slope have visioned a transportation thoroughfare along this route. In 1913, three decades ago, the Alaska Railroad Commission recommended to William Howard Taft, then President of the United States, that a railway be built along substantially the same route now followed by the Haines Military Road.

Let me quote to you several statements which have been made about this route by Gov. Ernest Gruening of Alaska: "The Haines road will provide an alternative to the all-land route, will permit the use of the protected waters of the inside passage to barge supplies from Prince Rupert, Vancouver, and Seattle. The Haines cut-off will make close contact between the Alaska Highway and southeastern Alaska. It will permit supplies unloaded at Haines to travel by truck directly to their destination, provided that destination is on the Alaska Highway, or on one of its branches or extensions."

And, following a recent trip over the Haines road, Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL of the State of Oregon told the press that this highway will be "an important arterial route, utilizing the inside passage for transportation to Haines from the Pacific Northwest and then by a direct connection with the Alaska Highway, giving a quick through route to Fairbanks."

It is satisfying to be able to tell you today that the Haines Military Road is now in actual operation. Trucks have gone all the way from Haines to the junction with the Alaska Highway, 108 miles north of Whitehorse. In 14 hours trucks have traveled the 268 miles from Whitehorse to Haines. The road will be entirely completed some time in December, but already it is in use.

Hope of a land route to the far North goes back a long way, nearly beyond the time of any man now living. As early as the 1850's farsighted people talked of a telegraph line across the roof of the planet which might link the Western Hemisphere with Asia and Europe. In 1865 such an undertaking was actually attempted.

This was the Telegraph Trail, an expedition which was to string telegraph wires through British Columbia, through Alaska, and into Siberia and Europe. This was one of the first expeditions ever to explore the immense and scenic mountain wilderness of northwestern America.

President Lincoln authorized American participation in the undertaking. Queen Victoria granted a right-of-way through British Columbia. The Russians built a line 7,000 miles across Siberia to join our efforts.

Recently we have found the original journal kept by Col. Charles S. Bulkley of the United States Army Engineers when he led that historic adventure. It has been photostated by our War Department, and I am pleased to have a copy with me today to present to Mayor Cornett for the archives of the city of Vancouver.

The attempt made in 1865 to extend a telegraph line from the United States to Europe, via British Columbia, Alaska, and Siberia, presaged other events besides the present highway. It forecast, as Prime Minister Mackenzie King said last February, the mighty alliance of America, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth of Nations. Just as the Telegraph Trail was a joint undertaking of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain, so is the conflict in which we are now engaged a common task that those unconquerable peoples will conclude victoriously.

The Telegraph Trail was an effort to bind the Eastern and Western Hemispheres across the Arctic roof of the world. And recently in Toronto, James A. MacKinnon, Canadian Minister of Trade, declared that the Alaska Military Highway will eventually lead into Asiatic Russia and the Orient itself. Nearly eight decades later, we are following Colonel Bulkley's trail-blazing march through the Northland.

Part of Colonel Bulkley's journal is the map he used. It is listed in the ledger as "Map of Russian America, or Alaska Territory, compiled from charts and surveys of Western Union Telegraph Expedition, Charles S. Bulkley, engineer in chief." On the map appear many places easily recognizable in Alaska today, even though the spelling has slightly changed: Fort Kodiak, Fort Sitka, Fort Wrangell, Fort Youkon, Bristol Bay, Mount Fairweather.

The Lewes River, on which is located Whitehorse, one of the main bases on the Alaska Highway, appears as the Lewis River on Colonel Bulkley's map. The Andreanof Islands appear as the Andreanoffski Islands. But most points are instantly familiar to us—for example, the St. Elias Mountains, Umnak Island, Norton Sound, Cook's Inlet, and the Taku River.

The Telegraph Trail did not accomplish its mission, because an easier route for wires to Europe had been found. Yet it played a vital role in America's acquisition of Alaska, a step of immeasurable historic significance, particularly in the light of contemporary events.

It is most appropriate that the Bulkley Journal should become a part of the archives of British Columbia's principal city. Colonel Bulkley and his gallant men left their imprint indelibly on this Province. The Bulkley River and Bulkley House were named for the colonel himself. When the Telegraph Trail Expedition laid its cable across the Fraser River near New Westminster, Gov. Frederick Seymour, of British Columbia, met the party in his launch and assisted actively in the task. The story of the Telegraph Trail is intimately associated with the development of British Columbia as Canada's open window on the Pacific.

And so we of the Northwest Service Command of the American Army are most happy to come here today to make this presentation. To you, President McKeen, I wish to give a mounted piece of the ribbon that was cut at the opening of the Alaska Highway last November. To you, Mayor Cornett, I present, on behalf of the officers and men of the Northwest Service Command a copy of the Journal kept by Colonel Bulkley when he led the Telegraph Trail Expedition eight decades ago. And to all of you and particularly Mr. M. E. Nichols of the Vancouver Daily Province, who took an early interest in this occasion, we wish to bring our most sincere appreciation of this generous welcome.

In the back of Colonel Bulkley's Journal is a copy of the map which was on Secretary of State William H. Seward's desk the historic day that he purchased Alaska from the Imperial Russian Government. Future generations of Vancouver's people will see this map and note the vast strides which have been made since it was drawn by one of Colonel Bulkley's cartographers. Let us hope that the future will witness progress as notable as that to which we have been heir.

I thank you again for your hospitality and kindness.

REPLY OF BRIGADIER GENERAL O'CONNOR TO PRESENTATION OF HISTORIC VOLUME BY CITY OF VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Mayor, in appreciation of this generous gift, I want to tell you and your associates that it will become a very valued possession of the Northwest Service Command. We of the American Army are deeply conscious of the historic background of the Canadian Northwest—a background which Canadians and Americans alike have helped to enrich.

This book, with its facts and information on the deeds of British Columbia's early explorers, will serve to acquaint us more intimately with the difficulties and hardships overcome by our predecessors. The Telegraph Trail Expedition, I think, is a very real tie between the past and present in this part of our continent.

We shall take pride in knowing that the record of Colonel Bulkley's achievements is part not only of the archives of the Dominion, but also of the records of Vancouver and

British Columbia. And you may be sure that this book will be equally treasured by us of the United States Army. I think that the men who blazed the Telegraph Trail and explored British Columbia would consider this fitting indeed.

I should like to thank particularly Mr. Bruce McKelvie, the distinguished British Columbia author and historian, who, I understand, is responsible for discovering much of the data contained in this splendid volume. He is one of the outstanding authorities on the development of your great Province.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you all—you, Mr. Mayor; you, President Stanley S. McKeen—for your hospitality. We of the Northwest Service Command are delighted that we could be hosts to members of the Vancouver Board of Trade last month. And we feel that on such occasions as this, the eternal friendship between our two lands is given vitality and fuller meaning.

Address by Hon. Paul V. McNutt Before American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, before the American Legion Convention at Omaha, Nebr., on September 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A year ago when we met in Kansas City, the tide of battle was still running strongly against us and our allies. The atmosphere was fairly tense.

We were not unduly pessimistic. We knew that eventually we would come through to a victorious finish.

But we knew that the military situation was not good.

At that time the push through the jungles at Guadalcanal had just begun. North Africa was still in the future. Sicily was still in the future.

And few of us would have dared predict that within a year the Italian Government would have surrendered unconditionally to a gentleman named Eisenhower, who is among other things a life member of his Legion post.

Now, however, the situation is materially changed. The tide of battle is running in our favor.

For this reason, a great many people are beginning to assume that the rest of the way is all downhill.

There could be no more dangerous error. The beachheads at Salerno are a grim warning of what is yet to come.

We are only just now beginning to face the real enemy. And that enemy is strong—with reserves of many heavily armed divisions—and the will to resist.

To fight our way up to and through the inner ring of the German defenses will tax us to the very limit of our fighting capacity.

And there is still Japan. We shall have plenty of rough going before we are able to close in for the final kill.

On both these fronts we must be prepared to throw in masses of men such as we have never had to use during the First World War.

We must be prepared to accept casualties such as we never had to take during the First World War.

I can say these things to you who yourselves have been through the sweat and grime of battle.

You men of the Argonne, of Belleau Wood, of Chateau-Thierry, know that war is a cruel and murderous business. And that unless you crush your enemy he will crush you.

Right now we are in the midst of a Nation-wide debate as to whether it is necessary to draft fathers into our armed forces.

I dare say that here in this convention there are some very honest differences of opinion on this subject.

I know that many people throughout the country believe we shall never have to use even the forces we have already mobilized in order to defeat Hitler and Japan. And that to add further to those forces is an entirely unnecessary procedure.

Those people should study our military situation with a little more care.

There are others, however, who believe it is basically wrong to draft men with dependent children. And particularly that it is unfair to take them while so many single men—or married men without children—are in war production jobs.

This latter argument has given rise to much heated discussion. Examine it quietly and dispassionately.

This is a total war—the first total war we have ever fought.

The old rule, the old beliefs, and, may I say, the old prejudices can no longer be sustained.

In total war the home front is every bit as important as the fighting front.

It is important to fly a bomber over Berlin. But we must first build that bomber—and keep building more bombers.

It is important to take a cargo ship through the paths of the submarines. But we must first build that cargo ship—and keep building more cargo ships.

It is important to face a critical counter-attack with your finger on the trigger of a machine gun. But we must first make that machine gun—and keep making more machine guns.

You may say that it takes less guts to build bombers than to fly them. It does. But that is no longer the point.

The point is we shall win this war, not merely because we are sending into action the largest and most efficient fighting force this country has ever seen—but because so far we have given those men everything they have needed in the shape of tools to fight with.

But if victory is to come within a reasonable period we must not only maintain this rate of war production, we must meet constantly increasing schedules.

And that today we are failing to do.

You know what is happening out on the west coast. We are not producing the full amount of planes and munitions needed to insure accomplishment of our military program.

The same thing is true in copper, lumber, zinc, aluminum, metal castings—and other industries vital to the war effort.

And the reason: In many areas where much of our essential war production is concentrated there are acute shortages of labor.

We have over 63,500,000 men and women actively engaged in industry or serving in the armed forces—the greatest number of persons at work we have ever had in this country. And we are reaching the end of our available manpower supply.

And we still have to find large numbers of men to fill the calls of our Army and Navy and to meet the increasing needs of war industry.

We can recruit more women for war jobs. Yes. We are doing that.

We can channel more men and women from less essential activities into war jobs. Yes. We are doing that.

We can make every effort to reduce turnover—and see that our present labor force is employed at the highest possible degree of effectiveness. Yes. We are doing that.

But none of these is the full answer.

By October 1 most single men and post-Pearl Harbor fathers will be in uniform. Those who have been deferred are chiefly skilled workers who are holding down jobs vitally important to war production or some essential civilian activity—and who cannot readily be replaced.

Suppose we take from his job and put into uniform one of these so-called key workers. True, by drafting him we are absolved from the necessity of drafting a man with children.

But because he is a keyman—and because he cannot readily be replaced—we strike the very heart of the production schedules of that industry in which he is engaged.

To a somewhat lesser extent—though still important—this holds true for many unskilled or partly skilled workers in areas where acute labor shortages exist. These men, for the present, are being deferred because of the difficulty of finding other workers to take their place.

Multiply any one case by the hundreds of thousands and we have dealt a paralyzing blow at the production of those airplanes, ships, and other munitions of war which our men overseas so desperately need.

And these munitions must be produced in increasing quantities if those men are to carry through to victory.

Here is a vivid picture of the tremendous rate at which our materials of war are being used up.

In the Sicilian campaign alone the record is as follows: 13 percent of all 155-millimeter howitzers landed by the Allies; 46 percent of all 57-millimeter guns put into action; 13 percent of all 37-millimeter guns employed; 8 percent of all medium tanks, and 7 percent of all light tanks; 54 percent of the carriages for the 37-millimeter guns; 36 percent of the motor carriages for the 75-millimeter guns; 22 percent of the carriages for the 105-millimeter howitzers.

And that, mind you, was Sicily, where we met only a fraction of the opposition which we are now getting from the Germans on the Italian Peninsula, or will get as we move against the inner ring of the Nazis' defense.

If that doesn't spell the importance of production schedules, I do not know what does. If that does not spell the importance of those men capable of carrying through those production schedules, I do not know what does.

In the light of this ask yourselves, in all sincerity, whether this Nation can afford to take off the job even one vitally essential worker in order to keep, let us say, a furniture-store salesman out of uniform merely because he has dependent children.

That is the nub of the situation. That is the crux of the problem.

Remember, no other country fighting this war has granted exemption to any of its citizens solely for the reason of dependency.

From the very opening of hostilities those fathers of draft age who were not engaged in some occupation vital to the war-production effort were held liable for induction into the armed services.

Again let me say we are fighting a total war, and I will repeat what I said once on a previous occasion.

No man is a slacker simply because he is not in uniform.

In this war every man of draft age must accept the assignment given to him—the spot where he can best serve the war effort. That spot may be in a copper mine, in agriculture, in an aircraft factory, or in the Army. We are all in the same boat.

And, also, we are still a long way from either Berlin or Tokyo.

It has been no easy matter to say to hundreds of thousands of fathers that they must now be prepared to serve in the armed forces of the Nation.

No one appreciates better than I the dislocation of families, the breaking up of homes, the individual hardships which this involves.

But a stern logic prevents any other determination.

This country is at war. And every man of draft age must help see the war through.

I had not intended to spend so much time on this matter, though I think you will understand how imperative it is that no opportunity be missed which may help clarify this issue.

But in the time remaining I want to touch upon a subject that is very close to my own heart and to the hearts of all of you.

That is the sort of deal we are going to give our returning soldiers.

It may seem that I am rather premature in bringing up this subject, particularly since I am insisting that we still have a long hard war to fight.

But it will do no harm to do a little advanced thinking on the matter.

First of all, I suspect you will all agree that it is up to our Government to make a better record than it did at the end of the last war.

We cannot solve this problem—as we then tried to solve it—by giving a demobilized soldier $60 and turning him loose to find a job as best he could.

This time we must make sure that the job is there.

This time government must take the responsibility for seeing that business and industry are ready and able to provide the job.

In other words, we must make certain that the transition from a war economy to a peacetime economy is accomplished without an intervening period of disruption.

We cannot afford to permit the old each-man-for-himself method—and each-business-for-itself method—to prevail. For if we do, we shall suffer the same uncertainties and hardships that we suffered in 1919, 1920, and 1921.

This country has done a magnificent job in converting its industrial resources from peacetime to wartime production. And it has done it through the voluntary cooperation of management and labor working with government.

I say this with all due recognition of the inevitable and increasing pressures concerning which I have just been talking. And with all due recognition that it may yet be necessary to exert some more stringent form of regulation—if only to bring into line certain noncooperators, both workers and employers.

But, even so, I believe this basis of voluntary cooperation will prove the answer to this question of post-war economy.

Certainly labor and management will have a golden opportunity to prove that even in peacetime they can work together for mutual advantage. And government, as a planning and directing force, will have a chance to offer a genuine sense of security not only to our returning soldiers but also to the millions of war workers who must be demobilized.

Most of us, at one time or another, have played football or baseball. And we know that in the last analysis it is the teamwork which counts.

MacArthur's men in New Guinea have learned this is true. Eisenhower's men in north Africa and Italy have learned this is true. And the men who are turning out our planes, our ships, and all our other munitions of war have learned this is true.

Let us all keep that in mind.

For teamwork is the one sure way by which we can avoid the mistakes of the last post-war period. It is the one certain way by which we can say to our returning soldiers: "Pick your job, fellow. You go on the pay roll tomorrow."

But even with the promise of all this, there will be plenty of work for Legion and other leaders of public opinion to do.

The return to civil life of so many ex-service men will still be a local problem.

Local opportunities for employment must be developed to the maximum—and those young men who have been so long out of touch with civilian developments should receive all the counsel and assistance which it is possible to give them.

Committees of local leaders should be prepared to work with the Veterans' Employment Division of the United States Employment Service to assure each veteran of the greatest help possible in locating a job.

I am proud of the development of the Veterans' Employment Division. We all know of its success in securing jobs when jobs were hard to find.

And no matter how carefully this time we plan to make jobs easier to find, there will still be plenty of tough days ahead for many of our ex-soldiers.

During these days they should be amply protected by insurance against the hazards of unemployment, old age, and death. They should have as sure a protection against these risks as we have provided for those who have remained in industry and been covered by the Social Security System.

We must see that every one of them gets a genuine break.

Let me go back to what I said a few moments ago. For I do not want any of you to think I am looking at recent developments on the fighting front entirely through smoked glasses.

Every American has the right to be proud of what we have accomplished during the last 18 months. No American need have any fear that we shall not win through to final victory.

But whether that victory comes within a reasonable period of time—or is unduly postponed—rests to a considerable extent upon decisions we are making today.

We must put behind the war effort every ounce of our fighting and production strength. We cannot permit sentiment or prejudice or undue optimism to vitiate that strength.

We shall get to Berlin and Tokyo.

But let us all make certain that we get there earlier rather than later.

For Whom Does Earl Browder Speak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, American gratitude for the gallant courage displayed by the Russian people in the defense of their homeland and for the gratifying series of defeats they are administering to Hitler's hordes must never permit us to put ourselves in position where the destiny of this Republic depends alone upon the hoped for goodwill and charity of the Russian Kremlin or its leader, Joe Stalin. In this connection there is important food for thought in the recent utterances of Earl Browder, who for years has faithfully preached and practiced the party line of the Third Internationale, both in this country and abroad.

The following editorial from the October 2 issue of the Washington Evening Star recognizes the importance of this country's developing a foreign policy and a peace program which will be American in nature and which will prevent this Republic from becoming the dependent post-war stepchild of any other great power, Russia included.

Every citizen who is still proud to call himself American should also read a copy of the alarmingly frank radio broadcast made by Upton Close over WOL and its associated radio stations of the Mutual network.

In our zeal to be helpful to others, this Nation must not so weaken itself that after victory has been won we shall have ceased to be the great power for peace and good-will which has for so long been the happy position of this Republic.

Unless some of our New Deal global star-gazers quickly change their pattern and their practices, however, there is grave danger that we shall find the wagon of American destiny hitched to the red star of Russia with the stars and stripes folded and hidden under the wagon and with no American even included as a welcome guest on the driver's seat. Let us hope that nobody anywhere in high authority has planned it that way.

Let us hope, too, that the focal point of communistic power will not be shifted from Russia to the United States under circumstances which will permit that aethestic doctrine to dominate government over here after the manner in which it has for so long controlled Russia. If it is true as we all hope and as some believe that Russia has gone capitalistic let us make sure that the United States does not go communistic as part of our lamentable habit of adopting in this country the totalitarian practices which have already proved themselves unworkable and unwanted in so much of Europe.

However, before accepting the high-pressure publicity that Russia has deserted communism we should look for more convincing proof than the fact that the Archbishop of York has visited Moscow and that officers of the Russian Army are permitted to wear the insignia of their rank upon their uniforms. National naïveté is a state of mind which America can not afford to manifest in these history-making times.

BROWDER'S LATEST

The ineffable Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, has surpassed himself in intemperate arrogance. That is something, as the saying goes; because for years he has been trumpeting the party line, always for the Communist interest and in complete disregard of other considerations.

That party line has been a devious one. Down to Hitler's rupture of his agreement with Stalin, the struggle in Europe was an imperialist war waged by Britain and France against Germany; so Browder proclaimed that "the Yanks aren't coming" this time. Then, literally overnight, the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union in June 1941 transformed the conflict into a sacred cause which America must enter forthwith. The nature of our actual entry through Japan's attack upon us at Pearl Harbor made no change in Mr. Browder's concept of our strategy, which called for disregard of the Japanese foe and

complete concentration on Europe in aid of the Soviet Union. So the Communist Party spokesman has ceaselessly demanded the opening of a second front in western Europe, regardless of cost.

A striking example of Mr. Browder's technique is the speech delivered by him at a Communist "second front" meeting held in New York City early in September, immediately after the Quebec conference. Asserting that such an attack was perfectly feasible, he stated that if the British and American general staffs did not so act "it can only be because as military experts they have been overruled by themselves in the capacity of politicians subject to reactionary influence." And he coupled this open accusation of bad fatih with a warning that, unless the second front was opened immediately, Anglo-American relations with Soviet Russia would "deteriorate sharply."

Neither Russian victories nor Allied successes in the Mediterranean have changed Mr. Browder's tune. His speech at Chicago last Monday evening sets a new high for his effrontery. Again he demanded an immediate second front as the prerequisite to consolidating good relations with the Soviet Union. And we had best do it, if we know what is good for us, because "the cold, hard truth is this, that unless we get down off our high horse * * * there is not the slightest prospect for us to emerge from this war with anything that can properly be called victory." Mr. Browder made another interesting comment when he called attention to the steady advance of the Russian armies and "the prospect that it opens up a decisive Soviet victory in which Anglo-Americans arms will have no major share."

However, Mr. Browder's most significant point was his ridicule of the idea that America or Britain might expect any Soviet aid in the Far East. It is sheer illusion, said he, for us to expect that the Soviet Union "will be able or willing also to undertake the burden of the military struggle against Japan. All chatter about the Soviets giving us bombing bases in Siberia is harmful nonsense with only one aim in mind—to try to give the Soviet Union similar tasks in the Far East which she has performed in Europe, namely, to win the war for us. Well, it is always salutary to know where one stands. And, so far as Mr. Browder is concerned, our relations with the Soviet Union are an emphatically jug-handled arrangement, with Moscow holding the handle, getting everything and giving nothing in return. Of course, Mr. Browder does not officially speak for Moscow. He is the head of the Communist Party in the United States, which is technically an independent organization. But neither Mr. Browder nor his party comrades ever say or do anything which they deem displeasing to the Soviet Union, and they strive faithfully to echo the Soviet viewpoint and serve Soviet interests. Hence, Mr. Browder's remarks deserve notice and careful consideration.

The Franking Privilege

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Members of the House of Representatives, I am including in the RECORD the following extracts from the Postal Laws and Regulations, 1940:

CHAPTER IV—FREE MATTER IN THE MAILS—MATTER TO BE FRANKED

(P. 608)

609. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or any part thereof, or speeches or reports therein contained, shall, under the frank of a Member of Congress, or Delegate, or Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico or the Philippines, written by himself except as provided in section 185 of title 44[1] be carried in the mail free of postage, under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

612 (3). All franked matter shall be forwarded like any other, but when once delivered to the addressee may not be remailed unless properly franked again. A bulk package of franked articles may be sent by a person entitled to the franking privilege, to one addressee, who, on receiving and opening the package, may, on behalf of such person, place addresses on the franked articles and remail them for carriage and delivery to the respective addresses. This section relates to matter entitled to free carriage under sections 608 and 609.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear that any Member of Congress may send out any speech he may make, or any extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the franking privilege, and he may also send them in bulk to individuals, who then have the right to address and mail them. This has been the custom and practice for many years, and should continue to be so, as in many instances it is the only way of getting speeches distributed, as Members of Congress do not generally have mailing lists or staffs sufficient to address them.

For example, if some Member made a speech that would be of interest to bankers, there is no reason why he should not send them to be addressed by someone engaged in the banking business. Exactly the same procedure applies whether the speech is to be sent out to businessmen, farmers, railroad men, organized labor, or other groups.

I was taken to task recently by the American Legion for alleged abuse of the franking privilege because some individual whom I have never met or seen received and mailed some of my speeches. He had a perfect right to do so, just as I had to have my speeches sent out for addressing and mailing. It makes no difference whether the individual to whom they are sent is black or white; Protestant, Catholic, or Jew; indicted, arrested, convicted, or in jail or out of jail.

It is essential that there be no attempt to repeal or limit the franking privilege of Members of Congress, particularly in these days of totalitarian ideas and attempts to limit freedom of thought and expression, of speech and of the press. If the franking privilege of Members of Congress is limited or abridged, Congress might just as well adjourn, as it would no longer have the power to safeguard our free institutions, the Bill of Rights, and to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. In accordance with the preamble of the American Legion, the first of its fundamental purposes is "to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America."

It so happens that the speech I sent out, to which the Legion objected, was on proposed amendments to the Alien and Sedition Act to make it conform to the Bill of Rights and the Constitution in time of peace. As long as I am in Congress, or out of Congress, I shall do everything in my power to preserve and protect and uphold our free institutions, and particularly free speech and a free press and our representative and constitutional form of government. Without our free institutions, free America ceases to exist. It seems to me that is exactly what we are fighting for all over the world, and we must preserve it at home, particularly in time of peace, even for people and groups with whom we do not approve and are in fact opposed in every way.

[1] Title 44, sec. 185, U. S. C. (p. 184)—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; extracts for Congressmen; mailing envelopes:

"It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver, upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof. The Public Printer may furnish without cost to Senators, Members, and Delegates, envelopes, ready for mailing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or any part thereof, or speeches, or reports therein contained. Envelopes so furnished shall contain in the upper left-hand corner thereof the following words, to wit: 'Senate, United States (or House of Representatives, United States). Part of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Free.', and in upper right-hand corner the letters 'U. S. S.' or 'M. C.', and the Public Printer may, at the request of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate in Congress, print in addition to the foregoing, the name of the Senator, Representative, or Delegate, and State, the date, and the topic or subject matter, not exceeding 12 words. But he shall not print any other words thereon, except at the personal expense of the Senator, Member, or Delegate ordering the same except to affix the official title of a document. All moneys accruing under this section shall be deposited by the Public Printer in the Treasury of the United States, etc."

Letter From Army Officer in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NAT PATTON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following personal letter I received from my friend and constituent, an Army officer in north Africa:

UNITED STATES ARMY,
North Africa, September 23, 1943.

MY DEAR COUSIN NAT: While I have a little breather I'll try to answer your most welcome letter of July 29 (written at good old Crockett) which came in due course and would have been answered sooner but for the

fact I'm kept pretty much on the move in connection with my duties of supply officer. You see things have to be done and there are any number of items which aren't available in your immediate theater but which, nonetheless, have to be had, so it's my duty to see that they are procured—and they are. I shall have to leave again later on in the week to get some other items which are now available which we haven't had heretofore.

I think events of the past few weeks speak rather well for themselves and we know you folks at home have little or no reason to be anything other than satisfied. Together with our fine allies, the British, we are now over in these toughies backyard doing our pitching at rather close quarters and they are now learning at first-hand just how this business is done. I recently had the rare privilege of talking to two young officers who were in the assault force which landed on the Italian mainland, and what those lads told me of the behavior of our boys would make you so damn proud that you're an American your chest—and head—would just naturally expand several inches, and stay in that condition. Yes, these boys were Texans, hence I was more than ordinarily proud of them. They've had their baptism and are now "going to town."

Among other things they told me was of hearing remarks from their boys such as, "Hell, I came over here looking for Germans, let's get going." And get going they did, as the Germans know to their sorrow now. We should always bear in mind that the valiant Eighth Army of the British rendered us noble and timely assistance. If no other worthwhile thing comes out of this, the mere fact that we have fought and died with such people as the British, with the common understanding and ideals it has brought out between the two largest branches of the English-speaking peoples of the earth, will be one of the most cherished. Make no mistake about it, the British are good, and they are reliable. I've had many dealings with British officers and have yet to find one who would not cooperate with you wholeheartedly and gladly. Their men show American officers the same deference and respect they show to their own officers and never seem able to do enough for us. We, of course, reciprocate.

NAT, now that things have turned in our favor, there are just a few thoughts I, as an American citizen, and not as an Army officer, would like to offer as suggestions to one of our chosen representatives in Washington. I am not overly expert at putting into readable English what is in my innermost mind, but will attempt it anyway. We want you men in Congress to bear a few facts in mind when Adolf and his gang of hoodlums begin to leave the sinking ship, which won't be long in coming now. One thing is that, when this fanatic was put in power in Germany, he had something over 78 percent of the votes cast. Therefore, the German people are, in cold, hard fact, just as much to blame for the present state of affairs as the Nazis are, and perhaps even more so, as they haven't made the slightest attempt whatever to rid themselves of his rule. We should never forget that when the German is top dog the world has never seen a more ruthless and arrogant tyrant. However, when the tables are turned on him, he cringes and knows only too well how to yell "Kamerad." To permit them the means to manufacture tools of war is only to assure yourself that you will be faced with another war within a generation.

There are thousands of us men over here and elsewhere who were in the other fracas with these people and, without wishing to appear conceited at all, we do know them, and when the time comes to even consider an armistice and subsequent peace that our Government should take such measures as will insure that we can return to our homes, loved ones, and our business with positive assurance that our sons will not have to undergo the same experience we've twice had within our generation. To us, Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo are nothing more or less than Sam Bass and his gang on a much larger scale, and you are well acquainted with how our forebears dealt with his ilk. We are quite certain in our own minds that to do anything short of completely depriving them of the means of making war in the future is only to invite disaster.

You gentlemen will have any amount of pressure brought to bear on you to show mercy and compassion for the poor German people. Please, for God's sake, just remember one quite simple thing when that begins, i. e., no government in the world, without the solid backing of its people, could possibly have wrought the misery and destitution these gangsters have wrought the past 4 years. I've been in many large cities over here, NAT, and I've yet to see any sort of a store with anything like a stock of goods. You see lines of people on the sidewalks and streets waiting for some store to open which has somehow or other gotten hold of something to sell. I've seen people wearing clothes they've had for 4 years and can't get any more. When you enter a store and ask the reason for the empty shelves, the answer is invariably the same, "The Germans took it all." When you ask if they paid for it, you get a blank stare of astonishment—you know, that inquisitive expression which says plainer than words, "Can you possibly be that dumb?" Oh, yes; they paid for it all right—with money they printed themselves with the name of Bank of France on it—a bald-face counterfeit. It is the same everywhere they've been. It therefore boils down to simple banditry on a national scale.

To show such people any consideration whatever is but to convince them they were quite right in taking anything they wanted without the formality of paying for it, which, in turn, will lead them to do it again at the very first opportunity. We cannot, we must not, leave them in a condition which will lead to a repetition. We may later learn that Italy should probably be dealt with differently, as it is rather apparent to us that a vast majority of the Italian soldiers never did have any zest for conflict. Benito's association with Adolf has cost his country five armies now, as well as the total loss of their African empire, and they've shown a total lack of capacity for governing other peoples. I, for one, think that the hardships we've undergone—and will continue to undergo—entitle us to some expression of our thoughts as to what ought to be done, and we hope they'll have some weight in the decisions which will have to be made within the foreseeable future. I haven't seen my wife and children, now, for over 6 months, and don't expect to for another 18 months or 2 years, and if anyone imagines that's an easy experience to endure without affecting your work, they've certainly something to learn. You get so homesick and heartsick at times it is almost overwhelming, but, then, you have to remember at all times you are an officer and a leader and must not, ever, give the slightest indication of your real feelings. To do so would be to invite certain disastrous effect on the men with whose welfare you are charged. If we were not quite certain in our own minds that this time we'll put an end to this sort of business, you can well imagine the result. Please pardon the length of this letter, but those are the thoughts of one American, and they are a sample of what many over here and elsewhere are thinking. Write me as often as you can. Your letters are always appreciated and are most helpful, I assure you. Meantime we'll get on with the job and won't miss a stitch or trick.

Sincerely,

MACK.

Conscription of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. Victor A. Olander, secretary-treasurer of the Illinois State Federation of Labor. Because the letter expresses the view of the Illinois State Federation of Labor on a vital subject, I believe that it will be of genuine interest to all Members of Congress as well as those who read the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Chicago, Ill., October 1, 1943.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The sixty-first annual convention of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, which adjourned its sessions on September 25, expressed the view that enforced labor as contemplated in proposed draft legislation is a form of slavery, definitely and clearly prohibited by the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution.

The issue involves the most basic of all liberties—that of the freedom of the person in the field of labor. That is the fundamental freedom from which all other liberties flow and without which they are of no avail. The moment we agree to accept the principle of enforced labor, we then consent to slavery.

The thirteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibits involuntary servitude. The historical aspects of that amendment, easily traceable through the history of the first half of our national life, show that it covers the whole field known to common law as that of master and servant.

Beginning with our colonial experiences in the holding and regulating of indentured servants, which penetrated far into our constitutional life, and the chattel slave system, which remained in full swing until the Civil War, we learned the true essence of slavery so well that we provided a sweeping constitutional provision forever outlawing the power of men to hold others in personal service or labor.

That this end was a part of the original plan is indicated by a series of events beginning with the political philosophy stated in the Declaration of Independence, followed by the adoption of the Ordinance of the Northwest Territory a few years later with its provision against involuntary servitude, in language that long afterwards became the thirteenth amendment.

Then decade after decade, whenever the issue of the admission of new States, or the formation of new territory arose in Congress, the prohibition of involuntary servitude and slavery was invariably presented in various motions and resolutions.

In 1865, the thirteenth amendment was adopted. The immediate automatic effect was that labor contracts became unenforceable in the sense of specific performance. In other words, men could not even voluntarily sign away their right to leave the service of another.

In 1900, Congress was confronted with the problem of applying the Constitution to the

newly acquired Territory of Hawaii, where great numbers of laborers were held to service by contracts. The problem was met by the insertion of a clause in the Territorial Act declaring all contracts for personal service or labor containing a time element as null and void and terminated. Another clause provided that there should be no remedy for the breach of a contract for personal service or labor other than a civil suit for damages.

In 1912, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered what I believe to be the most important labor decision in the history of that great tribunal. It was in the case of *Bailey* v. *Alabama*, and indicated quite clearly that no man could be held to labor against his will regardless of contract even by indirect action on the part of the State. The Court said that what the State cannot do directly it cannot do indirectly.

In 1913, Congress inserted a clause in the Clayton Act holding that labor is not a commodity or article of commerce. The meaning, of course, was that labor is not a thing subject to change of ownership.

In 1929, the United States declared its adherence to the International Slavery Treaty by including a reservation that because of its Constitution it did not agree to a clause which permitted forced labor even though limited to public purposes.

All of the events which I have cited tend to indicate quite clearly, I believe, that such legislation as is proposed in the labor draft bill is prohibited by the Constitution, as interpreted up to the present.

There are few who will insist that the Constitution may be set aside even in war, but what the advocates of the proposed labor draft now offer is a new interpretation of the Constitution. That interpretation, once accepted, cannot be limited to the duration of the present war emergency.

If that procedure is followed, we will then have accepted the theory that men may be held in service whenever in the opinion of the governing authorities there is public need for such action. The road will then be wide open to the gradual reestablishment of slavery in its worst forms.

It will be a shocking thing if in a war to establish the freedom of other nations we sacrifice the freedom of our own people.

In the discussion of this subject a great many very earnest citizens are troubled by arguments holding that it is no worse to conscript men to work than it is to draft them for fighting purposes.

Recently there has been broadcast a most insidious question on this point, namely: "If some men may be conscripted to fire the guns, why may not others be conscripted to load the shells?" That question overlooks the very pertinent fact that the auspices are not the same in both instances.

The question may be clarified by rephrasing it, as follows: "If it is right to conscript some men to obey the commands of a General MacArthur on the battlefields, why isn't it equally right to conscript others to work under the orders of a Simon Legree in the cottonfields?" The answer is obvious, of course.

Military conscription is permitted by article I of the Constitution. There has never been much agitation about it anywhere, for the very plain reason that the genius of man has never discovered any way to carry on war except by arbitrary action, cruel and ruthless, allowing no time for discussion and argument, but calling for instant obedience to orders. There is no other way.

On the other hand, it is a well-recognized fact that the historic struggle of the working people of every land through the ages has been upward from the depths of personal slavery. There never was a slave except for the control and use of his labor.

Labor is a continuous thing which never ceases, for, without it, whether at peace or war, civilized or savage, men cannot live. The rise has been one from the status where it was held that the masses were born to serve the classes, to that of contract under which it was found necessary to prohibit the individual from enslaving himself by so-called voluntary action, namely, by providing that he could not sign away his personal freedom.

Theoretically, the Army is always at war. That is to say, large or small, it must always be ready. Enlistments, therefore, even in the most peaceful times, are for definite periods with penalties for desertion. This is necessary, and those who serve are held in high honor and esteem. But if that same relationship were established in industry, as between employer and employee, who will deny that it constitutes slavery?

In conclusion, let me say that I believe it is the duty of every citizen to give the fullest measure of service in industry during the war. We have been outspoken on this subject.

It is axiomatic that the willing service of freemen is far more productive than the forced labor of others driven under compulsion.

A thoroughly popularized voluntary plan, designed to create a sense of personal responsibility in the mind of every American citizen and particularly among the workers, would bring far greater results than anything that can be achieved through the application of force and fear.

If what I have said herein has attracted your interest sufficiently to raise questions in your mind which you think must be answered, perhaps you will do me the honor of letting me know what they are.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR A. OLANDER,
Secretary Treasurer.

Jobs for Soldiers After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have today listened with a great deal of interest to the very spirited debate which has taken place between two very able representatives of the people, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. They spoke of millions of men in uniform. After the war millions of men will be discharged and returned to civil life. We are interested in those men on their return. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times, issue of October 1, 1943, dealing with employment for the men who will be returned to civil life in our country after the war.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN PEACE "ATTACKS" THIS NATION

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt returned from her 20,000-mile visit to Australia and other southwest Pacific areas to call a special press conference which was unusual in its make-up, because she specifically asked men reporters of Washington to be present, although her press conferences normally are limited by her to the feminine representatives of the press.

The purpose of the press conference, she said, was to make it known that everywhere she went in her many travels she found men in uniform concerned chiefly with one question—aside from winning the war. That question is, Mrs. Roosevelt said, "Will we have jobs when we get home?"

There can be no question that when they aren't thinking about killing or keeping from getting killed, men in uniform are wondering what they are coming back to in this country, what they have been fighting to preserve. We have seen, in confidence, too many letters from the front in which fighters expressed their thoughts privately to members of their families and we have talked privately with too many returning men—wounded and well—not to realize the truth of what Mrs. Roosevelt reported.

The question is What kind of jobs? That question also seems foremost in the minds of men at the front, but Mrs. Roosevelt did not mention it. It is natural to assume that Mrs. Roosevelt speaks of jobs for returning men in uniform in the philosophy and the background of the present Washington administration—a philosophy which turns to Government administration control over citizen enterprise, with a further background of constantly increasing Government "benefits" which actually are simply new and greater taxes in disguise with less and less of citizen responsibility, of enterprise, and of self-initiated progress.

We doubt very much if men in uniform at the front are thinking along those lines when they wonder about jobs when they get back home. We believe they are thinking—when they have time to think of such things—as much from the standpoint of what kind of jobs as well as merely getting on a pay roll—which might be or become merely a Government pay roll controlled politically for political purposes.

It was coincidence, that within a matter of minutes after reading what Mrs. Roosevelt had to say, the wife of a captain serving in the Army overseas came in with a letter from her husband. He had ideas of his own about jobs and he said that the question was discussed considerably by his fighting comrades in their spare moments when out of action. This, in effect, is what he had to say:

"We wonder sometimes whether this war is really worth fighting. It won't be if we go home and find that a lot of the plans being talked about are in effect—plans about jobs. We want jobs of our own, jobs we get ourselves to work for ourselves. We don't want some big shot sitting around telling us when and where we can work and what we get for it and what we must do with it."

It is an amazing thing that virtually everything that comes out of the Washington administration concerning post-war jobs deals openly or in its hidden recesses with what amount to New Deal doles often obviously vote catching, with further Government control of and socialization of the right of a free American to work for himself, and with gifts for people not needing or not deserving them; all of this to be paid for through constant passing of the tax collection hat among the people as a whole.

What about working jobs?

What about planning for the millions who are certain to become very suddenly unemployed when war ends—jobs for them rather than gifts to keep them idle instead of productive?

What about working jobs for the returning soldier at honest pay in honest employment, instead of guaranteed benefits which can only be character-destroying and nation-destroying pittances?

Government statistics show that in peacetime this Nation has not employed more than 11,000,000 men at one time on factory pay rolls. The Department of Labor states that there will be 18,000,000 on factory pay rolls by early next year. When war ends, at least 5,000,000 of these will be thrown out of work at once, the Government statisticians estimate. In addition, there will be about 7,500,000 rather quickly returning men in uniform, with some 2,500,000 left in uniform for an indefinite period.

That means 5,000,000 home factory workers and about 7,500,000 men in uniform simultaneously shifted from fighting forces and production forces to the army of the unemployed—a total of 12,500,000 suddenly unemployed. As testimony to the home estimate, the Government points out that sudden ending of war specifically would mean 2,000,000 persons dropped from explosives factory pay rolls, 2,000,000 more dropped quickly from aircraft factory pay rolls, another 1,000,000 from shipbuilding, and a second 1,000,000 from shipbuilding as quickly as vessels under construction could be completed.

What is the Washington administration doing about this problem? So far as the public knows it is talking about social security doles for men when it should be turning toward plans which will let men make jobs for and give jobs to their fellow men—and which will permit a man to work honestly as he sees fit at honest and fair toil without paying tribute to a boss, political or otherwise.

As an example of the fact that little is being done by the administration except along political lines and socialization lines, take the case of Packard Motor Co., typical of all of the huge auto industry which must convert from war to peace. George Christopher, its president, states that Packard could start reproduction on its 1942 models—few of which ever reached the public—within 4 weeks after the end of the war, but—

"Before we can go back to making cars somebody has got to tell us what to do with all the Government equipment now filling our plants," says Mr. Christopher. "If the war ended tomorrow we couldn't move a stick of our own property back into production from storage. The contracts section of the War Department put us into war work but no one in the Government seems to know who is to get us out when the time comes."

That's the story everywhere today in industry. It won't be able to move until the Government clears the way.

In other words, a sudden end of the war now or in the near future would find the Washington political controllers as unprepared, as confused, and as incapable of taking the first steps in peace as they were in taking the first steps in war when Pearl Harbor was bombed.

It is about time for Washington to think of this—to think of the day when peace will attack this Nation and to be prepared for it instead of being helplessly unprepared—as we were when war came.

Science and Technology

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New Republic of September 20, entitled "Science and Technology."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Natives of India are not at present allowed to become citizens of the United States—a handicap which they share with the Chinese and other orientals. They are permitted to enter this country only under special conditions, with great difficulty and constant insecurity regarding their tenure. Apparently our Government believes that Indians are inferior to Albanians, Turks, Armenians, and many other races which are permitted free access and free citizenship.

This country does not, however, scorn to take advantage of the numerous and important inventions and discoveries of Indian scientists, whether resident in this country or in India. These inventions and discoveries are playing a valuable part in helping to win the war.

For example: Our troops have been greatly aided by the invention of unbreakable containers in which even liquids can be dropped from airplanes upon hard ground without being shattered. These containers are the work of Prof. Sir Shanti Swarup Bhatnagar, director of the recently established All India Board of Scientific and Industrial Research. Sir Shanti is also the inventor of a widely used stove hardly larger than a matchbox, which gives off intense heat for 12 hours from a single filling of solid fuel. He has produced fabrics and other materials resistant to poisonous gases, and cotton cloth with the insulating properties and warmth of wool.

In these days when food is scarce, there is great importance in a new process which preserves cantaloups almost perfectly while being stored or shipped. This is the work of Dr. Jagan Nath Sharma, an Indian chemist who lives in Los Angeles. Another of Dr. Sharma's processes artificially colors oranges without harm to the fruit and has increased the annual income of Florida growers, on good but dull-looking oranges, by $45,000,000. He has done important work on other vegetables and fruits as well.

The deadly new flame throwers that the American Army used against the Japanese before Munda have undoubtedly benefited from the work of another Indian in America, Dr. Alamjit D. Singh, of the University of Illinois. He has also made important contributions to camouflage. This subject has likewise received attention from an Indian chemist of Detroit, K. N. Kathju, who has collaborated with Hexter and Shepheard in developing green and other paints that cannot be told from surrounding vegetation even under infra-red photography.

American and British soldiers in the jungles of Burma are endangered by the very serious fever known as kala azar. For its treatment we are indebted to another Indian, Sir Upendranath Brahamachari.

The proportion of distinguished scientists among educated men in India is exceptionally high, probably because the situation of India under British rule makes other outstanding careers abnormally difficult. The proportion of scientists among Indians in the United States is still higher. In relation to their total numbers, Indian scientists outnumbered British ones here by 16 to 1; French, 26 to 1; Germans, 36 to 1; Spaniards, 70 to 1.

In a brief article such as this, one can mention only a few of the Indian scientists in America and their researches. Dr. V. R. Kokutnur is making important contributions to chemical warfare; Dr. Beram D. Saklatwall is working in metal technology; Dr. Sharat Kumar Roy, Dr. Yellapragada Subarrow, Prof. Subramanyam Chandrasekhar, and many more are all doing valuable work.

Some of the Indians in India who have engaged in scientific research have won world-wide renown. One thinks of Sir Jagdish Chandra Bose, Sir P. C. Ray, Sir C. V. Raman, S. Ramanujan, Prof. M. N. Saha, Prof. P. C. Mahalanobis, Sir Ramnath Chopra. The notion that men like these are unfit for American citizenship that is freely granted to the most backward and ignorant Balkan peasant is so absurd that it needs no comment.

Crisis in Lamb Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report that attention of the War Food Administration is being given to the serious situation that has been developing in the lamb market. Officials of the Livestock Division, War Food Administration, will meet in Chicago, Thursday, with the industry's advisory committee to canvass the feed situation and to explain the market now available through the purchasing of carcasses for lend-lease without requiring boning.

Growers in the West and Northwest have been genuinely alarmed by the lack of buyers and the shortage of feed for fattening lambs. Ordinarily the demand for feeder lambs far exceeds the supply. Today no buyers are in the field. The shortage of feed is one cause. The year-around ceiling is another. Feeders cannot look forward to a seasonal advance.

Growers have been at the mercy of the buyers because it has not been generally known that Government procurement agencies were authorized during the summer to purchase lambs in the so-called half-fat or range-finished condition, lambs weighing from 60 to 75 pounds that would dress out from 30 to 45 pounds.

Officials of the National Wool Marketing Association and growers in my district have expressed the thought that if 10 to 20 percent of the lambs are sold this way, feed demands will be lightened and the pressure will be off the market.

Officials in the Livestock Division of the War Food Administration say that a heavy run of southwestern ewes and a shortage of labor in the packing plants have added to the crisis. With a shortage of help to bone lambs, the packers could point to heavy shipments in the yards unslaughtered and push prices down. The approval for shipping lambs in carcass without boning, obtained last week, is designed to help meet the labor problem.

Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator and W. O. Fraser, Assistant Chief of the Livestock Division, have assured me that the situation will be watched carefully. Mr. Fraser and Harry Reed, the Chief of the Division,

will attend the meeting in Chicago, Thursday, where both the feeding and marketing situations will be canvassed.

I hope that this conference will produce results and make unnecessary any appeal for an investigation by the Packing and Stockyards Administration.

The Bayous of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am certain you will agree with me, that it is with justified pride that I today direct my remarks to you and my colleagues.

Tomorrow from the Nation's presses comes one of the most fascinating, understanding, and inspiring stories of a people close, not only to my heart, but close to the heart of everything that is America—the Acadians.

Most of you first came to know the Acadians during your school days when you were enthralled by the immortal Evangeline from the pen of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. I am sure that even today there hums through your subconscious mind the beautiful rhythm of those opening lines:

> This is the forest primeval, bearded in moss and garments green.

In the tempo of modern times there has come another story of the Acadians. This time it is not in poetry but in the narrative language of the historian. This time the story is revealed through the eyes of the modern newspaper reporter.

Mr. Speaker, today Harnett T. Kane, himself a native Louisianian, gives to the world The Bayous of Louisiana, the story of that intriguing, fascinating, spirited history which is Louisiana.

I said I directed these remarks to you today with pride. I am proud for several reasons. I am proud that in my veins flows the blood of these noble, devoted, and loyal people. My forebears were among those driven to the warm, understanding, comforting bayous of Louisiana from the village of Grand Pre. From my paternal and maternal ancestry there is an unbroken line of names associated with the early settlers of the bayous of Louisiana. My father and mother and their fathers and mothers before them grew to manhood and womanhood on the dreamy bayous of Lafourche and Terrebonne Parishes in south Louisiana. I am proud that I am of this Acadian stock.

I am proud that tomorrow, October 6, my mother has lived to see the publication of this story of her people on the seventy-third anniversary of her birth along the banks of one of these bayous which Harnett Kane so vividly portrays in this never-to-be-forgotten book.

I am proud that The Bayous of Louisiana has not only come from the pen of a native Louisianian but I am further proud that I have worked alongside Harnett Kane as a fellow newspaperman, as a fellow reporter. I have seen Harnett Kane grow great in stature in his chosen field and today he stands alongside of such Louisiana historians as Grace King and Lyle Saxon. In two books he leaves no doubt that he will be accepted as one of Louisiana's outstanding narrators.

Harnett Kane's first book, Louisiana Hayride, is well known to you. In The Bayous of Louisiana he has taken another direction in the history of Louisiana but he has not changed his masterly presentation or his understanding of his subject.

For the first time, to my knowledge, a full-length volume offers a completely sympathetic and truthful interpretation of the fabulously rich scene of south Louisiana, and of the generous-spirited people who live along and about its distinctive waterways, the bayous. Mr. Kane refers to these people as "the Free French-Americans of Louisiana," and he has struck a happy note and offered a theme of some import in the present strife-torn world.

The inhabitants of many of the Louisiana waterways are descendants of the Acadians, who moved from France to Canada and lived in the latter area for many years. The Acadians' forefathers were victims, during the eighteenth century, of a cruel destiny such as has been suffered repeatedly by men and women of current years. They were gathered together and expelled overnight from the homes that had been theirs for generations. "Families were sometimes separated at the shore," Mr. Kane tells us, "children shrieking as their mothers pulled into boats without them; old women were held back as their sons were taken on other vessels. They were to understand that there was nothing left behind to which to return—from the water they could see the outlines of their homes in flames. The dikes that their fathers and grandfathers had raised were being broken." Does not this have a familiar ring to men and women of today?

The Acadians were to be scattered among the American Colonies on the Atlantic seaboard—to be dispersed as a people, their identity to be forever lost. But these victims fought back, quietly but surely. Many, of course, died of cold and of hunger, or of the weight of tragedy that hung upon them. But, as Mr. Kane puts it, they "held fast to their hopes and to their small possessions"; they never forgot and they held together. A scant band or two heard of far-away, friendly Louisiana, and they came to it and were welcomed. "And now," he declares, "the fertile acres of Louisiana near the Gulf of Mexico became the promised land of the Acadians."

Here the people set to work, day and night. At the back of their thoughts was a resolution—here, in Louisiana, there must grow up and remain a citadel of their own. The bayous of Louisiana became their places and their ways were fitted to their scene. It is a watery locale, this south Louisiana, a place of many water passages, of large bayous and small ones, lakes, lagoons, some of them tiny outlets; others, in the words of Mr. Kane, "celebrated in gallant song and gay anecdote." He describes graphically the bayous themselves:

> Prodigal in number and in combination, they make a kind of lacework out of land, curving, twisting, curling back, branching to meet others, splitting, resplitting.

They have thus set the design within which these Louisianians lived and enjoyed their lives. The waterways were the original highways; in many places they still remain the main routes of movement. The banks of the bayous were the main stretches of dry land—often the only such stretches for many miles—and on these ridges the men and women built their homes. They lived by the waterways, traded on them, visited along them, adapted their ways to their streams.

The result, Mr. Kane notes, is a "culture without parallel in the United States, warm and rich in values, fitting no mold but its own." Here, he says, there "ensued a near-miracle of growth and revolution, a demonstration of the power of the human will." It is fertile area, sometimes amazingly fertile. As the author puts it:

> From the bayou and its land comes rich produce of thick black soil, warm air, and the slow waters themselves—a varied life on stem, on paw, on wing, on gill, that may be overwhelming in range, in teeming numbers, and in lush variety.
>
> Nature is in a free-handed mood in this South Louisiana. From these places of concentrated fertilizing, the washings of many soils, come jumbo shrimp and Spanish moss and tabasco peppers imported originally from Mexico, soft-shell crabs, alligators and diamond-back terrapin, salt and other minerals in great buried pillars, the largest number of amphibious creatures of any part of the continent. And the soil produces three crops a year, while some localities boast of four.

Some may, however, have seen the prevailing wetness, felt the discomfits of isolation, or feared the hazards of the scene. The Acadian saw wealth before him and worked to achieve its promise. To quote further from The Bayous of Louisiana:

> He tugged at his strips of land and his water edges, changed them, improved them, and extended them, turning semiliquid wastes into flowering gardens. * * * Then he turned to marsh and water and air for the indications of wealth that each held. His became the economy of the little collector. He fished, trapped, hunted, picked moss, made a series of part livings through the years. The country remained one of small men at small occupations.

Separated from the rest of the world, the Louisiana Acadian lived a life that was little different, in many respects, from those of his forefathers. But these Acadians were Americans, even though many of them, isolated as they were, knew only the French tongue. They have fought in every war of the American Republic since Louisiana became part of the United States in the early

1800's. They have taken a large role in peacetime in the affairs of their State, contributing their sons to the ranks of Louisiana Governors and lawmakers and representatives in Washington. They have clung to many of the gallant traditions of France; and yet they have become true Americans.

Mr. Kane sums up the situation in apt phrases:

> The case of the Acadian may, in fact, be one of the answers to impatient and intolerant men who cry, in the name of Americanism, for quick and complete absorption of all differences into a common whole. Such partisans, desiring a leveling down to a flat monotony, forget that the ideal of the Nation's good life is the sum total of many contributing forces, of many origins.

Meanwhile the south Louisianian has enjoyed himself. His has been a philosophy of "joie de vivre," an appreciation of life's good things—an enjoyment of life's jokes and its pleasures. He has been no dour Puritan, but a man of tolerance and understanding. He has not sought to force others to conform to a narrow pattern of his own; he has made allowances for differences among men and their ways. Mr. Kane, in a series of striking chapters, tells of his observations as he lived among the good-humored folk of the bayous, enjoying their warm-natured sociability and their pleasant humors.

Yet the bayou people can be serious and earnest when the times call for it. As Mr. Kane tells it, these children of the Acadians are sending their sons across the sea today to fight another and worse tyranny than their ancestors suffered, and are working to liberate their people's former home, France, from the clutches of nazidom. The book is dedicated to these free French-Americans.

The volume is a richly packed panorama of a striking American scene—the salt marshes along the gulf, the "garden bayous" along which great lines of massive oaks grow in splendor; the expanses of the prairies; the meadows of the Evangeline country. Mr. Kane tells of present-day Acadians who are "share-croppers in fur, in a semitropical fur empire that is greater than that of the Frozen North," gathering more furs than the hunters of Canada or Alaska. Others sometimes spend lonely months in houses that are "only boxes on stilts above the water" and suffer the forces of hurricanes that "break men and houses to bits, crushing islands into ruins of sand." Others work as sea-going oil men in fields that stretch out into the water. On the small bayous, long lines of houses extend in single file, with a "life that has the flavor of another Venice—a Main Street on the water." The author describes shrimp-fleet blessings: long trips among men who work many hours, day in and day out, at the back-breaking work of oyster cultivation; of buggy weddings in the prairie sections, in which a file of 40 or 50 vehicles extends across the grasslands, and of pathetic funeral processions by water.

All in all, it is a sympathetic, deeply appreciative picture of a place and people, such as has seldom been offered. In advance of publication, incidentally, the book has been having a large sale, several times greater than that of Mr. Kane's earlier work, the widely acclaimed national best seller, Louisiana Hayride. This, together with warmly laudatory advance reviews, is indication of a wide public approval. It also means that my country and my people of South Louisiana will be better understood by other Americans of other States. Louisiana and the South as well will owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Kane for this masterful work of interpretation. America, in these troubled times, as perhaps never before, needs such sympathetic interpretation of one group of Americans to another. The Bayous of Louisiana is the kind of book, based on intelligent observation and written in masterly style, that helps dispel un-American tolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to you The Bayous of Louisiana by Harnett T. Kane.

Excerpts From Radio Address by Lisa Sergio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from broadcast delivered by Lisa Sergio, September 28, 1943, over Station WEIL, New York City:

Roughly speaking, the major points at issue between United States and Great Britain on one side and the Soviet Union on the other are: One, the question of Russia's boundaries; two, the question of Russia's cooperation in fighting Japan; three, the question of the role that the populations of the world, as masses, are going to be allowed to play in rebuilding the world. The view held by the leaders on both sides differ considerably. Russia is seeking European boundaries which constituted an improvement on those she had in 1939. This would mean, no doubt, a portion of Poland, of Finland, of the Baltic States to be included within the Soviet Union.

Now, there do exist pledges on the part of the United States and Great Britain to the effect that all countries will have their boundaries restored. The pledges are not detailed. Both London and Washington have carefully steered very clear of detailed commitments on boundary lines, but even so on the Polish question, in particular, Poland's demands are known and so are Russia's intentions. And they do not tally. In fact, as Edgar Mowrer pointed out in his column in the New York Post this morning, the future of Poland will be one of the major points of discussion at Moscow no doubt. Poland is not going to be represented at those discussions. Let us remember that one of the events of recent history which made the Soviet Union very suspicious of the democratic sincerity of the western powers, was the famous Munich affair. It will be remembered that the one country whose fate hung in the balance, Czechoslovakia, was not represented at Munich.

It has always been the Kremlin's contention that France and Britain should have not only asked Russia to join that conference because she was pledged to defend Czechoslovakia, but should have refused to discuss with Hitler unless Czechoslovakia, too, was represented. The Kremlin said that the Munich Pact was the total betrayal of democracy. No one, I am sure, could differ with Moscow on this point. Now, Poland's fate is to be discussed, and Poland is not going to be represented, or at least there is no indication that she will. Would Russia not have greater respect for the British and American Powers if they refused to discuss Poland unless Poland were represented? If the Kremlin refused to have a Polish representative it would still pay the western allies to stick to their guns and insist further. Russia is a realist in her policy.

If the Anglo-American powers do not yield to her demands in spite of pledges they have made which conflict with Russian demands, Russian respect for the democracies will increase, rather than decrease. If the reverse occurs, that is our yielding to all Russian demands and thereby forfeiting our promises to other nations would indicate that the promises and pledges of Britain and the United States were not to be trusted, Russia would not trust them herself where such promises might concern her. And the whole of Russian policy would so far seem to indicate that they would be much more solid, much more reliable if they were embedded in the cement of the determination shown by both sides to uphold pledges made and ideals extolled. Russia could hardly intend to fight a war against Britain and America for the sake of the boundary of Poland. In fact one will respect us much more if we show a willingness even to fight for the sake of promises made to that country or to any other. Russia has been willing to forfeit good will in London and Washington to uphold General de Gaulle through thick and thin. There are millions of people all over the world who admire Russia for that as much as they do for her military might. So we have a chance in Moscow to redeem a record in this field which is not as good as it might be. Let us hope if the chance comes that we shall not pass it up.

Unskilled Workers, $214 a Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by me for and appearing in the September issue of the Reader's Digest:

UNSKILLED WORKERS: $214 A MONTH

(By ALBERT J. ENGEL,[1] Member of Congress from Michigan)

We are making war on inflation everywhere except at the spot where it starts. It starts at the point where the Government pours money into the cash drawer of the makers of war goods. If not checked there,

[1] Mr. ENGEL is donating the payment he received for this article to Army welfare purposes.

it will be extremely difficult to check elsewhere.

I am a member of the House committee which looks after War Department appropriations. I believe it to be my duty not merely to provide funds for this war but to see what is being done with them. To find out why a 30-ton tank costs $90,000 and a 105-mm. gun costs $21,000, I have visited 47 war plants, interviewing personnel and inspecting books.

What I saw has made it abundantly clear to me why our war is costing so much and why inflation is on the march. The story of inflation is to be found in the pay rolls of our war factories. The figures I use here are not figures I got from a fellow who got them from another fellow. I have certified copies of the actual pay rolls.

When you look at a pay roll you see names, wages, and occupations—welders, drillers, filers, assemblers, and so on. This looks like highly skilled labor. But when you go into the plant and see and talk with the people at the drills and machines, you find out that a lot of it is not skilled at all. Workers who are really skilled should get high wages; but in our war plants excessive wages are being paid to people with little or no skill.

Many plants have training courses where they turn a housewife or a youthful cornhusker into a welder or driller or even an electrician in a couple of weeks or a month. Here is an advertisement which has been put into many newspapers by the United States Employment Service—Government operated—and which tells its own story. It is topped by the picture of a beautiful girl. Then follows:

"This is Louise Blank, Badge No. —, who won beauty contests before the war. Now she is helping to win the war by welding on Liberty ships in the Richmond shipyards. Changing over from a housewife to a welder has left her smile intact."

Then comes the meat in the coconut:

"You can do what Louise is doing! We will train you to weld and pay you at the rate of $214 a month during the short training period. Soon you'll be equipped with knowledge that will win you pay up to $270 a month."

Is it hard work? Can a frail woman handle a heavy welding torch? Another Government ad shows a smiling girl in evening clothes, who says:

"I find my work no harder than a good day's housekeeping. My welding torch weighs only one pound. I earn $270 a month. There's a job like that waiting for you."

If she or he works on the swing or early night shift there is a 10 percent wage increase; on the graveyard or late night shift the addition is 15 percent. Translated into weekly earnings, this means that an 18-year-old girl just out of high school or a grocery clerk can get $49.28 a week while learning and then soon earn $62.30 regular weekly pay, $68.50 on the swing shift, or $71.69 on the graveyard shift. Wages suitable for highly skilled artisans who have spent years learning their trades are being paid to people for work which they can do after a few weeks' training on a one-purpose machine tool.

Machine-gun assembler. That sounds like a very skilled occupation. But a buck private in a machine-gun outfit must know how to knock down and reassemble a machine gun to the smallest part—and do it blindfolded. Pay: $50 a month, board and lodging. But here in a war plant a man gets from $4,700 to $8,741 a year for the same work—minus the risk. If Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, who heads the whole supply division of the Army, were to throw up his job and take to gun assembling, he could get a pay raise of $241. He gets only $8,500.

These rates, so far as I can learn, are not union rates. I found plants paying twice the union rates. I asked about this. I was told those rates were obsolete.

In one plant I took the names of 25 filers on machine guns. These men are now getting from $4,200 to $8,004 a year. I compared their earnings in 1941 and 1942. In 1941 they earned collectively $87,000. In 1942 they got $171,000—just about double. I found similiar conditions elsewhere.

Totally unskilled workers are also getting fat pay checks. One elderly gentleman told me, "I am 67 years old. I was a pensioner at 40 bucks a month. Now I am a sweeper in the factory at 40 bucks a week. Easy money, eh?" In one plant I found two elevator men getting more than $60 a week. A janitor in one plant was getting $61 a week—more than some of the lower-bracket engineers. Another advertisement of the United States Employment Service reads: "Dishwashers, waiters, and kitchen men. Wages $250 a month, board and lodging. Olympic Commissary."

There is no special skill required of a stock chaser. It is the kind of work for which industrial plants pay from $25 to $35 a week. Yet I found stock chasers getting $201 a month with $283 overtime. Total: $484 a month—$5,808 a year. I found another plant where the average pay of the whole plant is $5,100 a year with big Christmas bonuses in addition.

All this not only adds to the cost of the war, but it is bad for morale. The people who work in these war plants at these high wages live next door to people who still hold down jobs in civilian plants at very little above the old levels. What is going on in the minds of people who are getting the old wages, now frozen? In the mind, for instance, of a girl getting $13 or $25 in a store while one of her former fellow saleswomen gets $67 a week?

The mistake we made was to let wages get outrageously out of balance before we froze them. For instance, the 15 nonoperating railroad and steamship brotherhoods—clerks, station and express employees—say bitterly that they have gotten no raise at all since the war, that their wages are frozen at prewar levels and they have agreed not to strike. Our Government gets piously indignant at coal miners who must work hard at a highly skilled and dangerous occupation to earn $40 a week while that same Government offers $250 a month, board and lodging to dishwashers, and pays girls $55.80 a week to learn how to mend shoes at a Government arsenal. The Government cannot create these wide differences in wages and expect the people to like it.

The flood of excessive wages in our war plants is creating a vast excess of purchasing power, putting a pressure on prices which O. P. A. seems powerless to control. This results in inflation. At the same time, excessive costs force the Government to engage in excessive borrowing, which is also inflationary. This situation is extremely dangerous.

The administration and the leaders in business and in labor must rise to the heights of the highest courage, bring the whole menacing spiral to a halt, and then seek as quickly as possible to revise it.

Address by Archbishop Spellman at Holy Name Rally, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a deeply moving and eloquent prayer delivered by Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, at a great religious and patriotic Holy Name gathering of 75,000 people at the Polo Grounds in New York City, Sunday, October 3.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I ask you to continue to pray for our beloved country that she may be in the forefront of nations that under God stand for liberty and justice for all men, especially the persecuted, the oppressed, and the minorities. Every country and every race has contributed to the building of America; and America, grateful, has given of her heart, her head, and hands, has given of her body and her soul to help all men, to help all nations both small and great.

I beg you to pray for our President, for all our duly elected and appointed officers of government, that they may be guided aright in these perilous times, that they may be strong in the courageous doing of their superhuman tasks.

I ask you to pray—I need not ask you—for our boys in the armed services, the millions of them from all parts of the Nation, the hundreds of thousands of them from our city and State, the 126,584 from this archdiocese of New York. Particularly will you pray for those soldiers, sailors, and marines who are on foreign duty in the battle areas. From moment to moment they are facing death, bravely accepting dangers for America and for us. You will pray for the wounded in hospitals, who have so gallantly performed noble service for our country's life, our country's ideals, and our country's future. Nor need I ask you to remember and to pray for all our honored dead, whose crosses dot the hillside and vales around the world, 572 of them from our archdiocese.

POPE'S DANGER RECALLED

I ask you to pray for our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, as he with sorrowful heart looks with appeal to his children in all the world; not that he be spared to life, for death to him in his agony of suffering would be a mercy, and a martyr's death for him would be the traditional following of the way of many who have sat in Peter's chair. Not for him therefore do I plead, but for his cause, the cause of Christ, the cause of right, the cause of civilization. I beg for prayers that Rome, the city of the soul, eternal Rome, be spared destruction; and above all that Rome be not destroyed by us by baiting us. And from our soul's deep depths we plead again for our beloved land.

AMERICA, REBORN

Lord, lift this mighty host that is America;
Reconsecrate us in devotion to Thee.
Too oft have we forgot our heritage of faith—
The mess of pottage to our eyes was dear,
The gold within our coffers deadened us.
We, who by nature are between the earth and sky,
Earthward have sunk, and drunk of miraged visions.
But now, reborn,
We lift again to Thee our nation's soul.
Behold, we are Thy wheat,
Nurtured beneath the sunshine of the plains;
We are Thy grapes from vineyards in the sun,
And timber from Thy forests;
Ours are the iron sinews torn from earth's deep breast,
And oil from her rich arteries.

O God, we build anew and dedicate again to Thee
The host and temple of America—
Many we are, in space wide worlds apart,
But we are one today,
Made one by this, our common will:
That righteousness again shall walk among the sons of men.

Now, welded of our pain,
We would again be what our forebears were,
Men who did worship Thee,
And mindful of Thy Fatherhood,
Could reach to brothers o'er the sea a brother's hand.
In every man we found Thy image then,
And, finding, wrote our nation's creed,
A pledge that made us the Samaritan
To the oppressed and lowly of the earth.
In those far days, our soul was young and clear
We opened arms to all who suffered wrong;
We bowed not, in our youth, however strong the foe,
For we were strong in loyalty to Thee,
And strong in faith that all men should be free
And worship Thee in liberty, as conscience should direct.

And now,
Amidst the ruins of a world that strove
To prosper and to live apart from what was bought
On Calvary by Christ, Thy Son—
Now we come back by that well-trodden way
That prodigals of every age have walked,
Back to our higher destiny—to Thee,
Our Father and our God,
And, kneeling in the valley of our grief,
Rededicate (both we who here must work
And those, our sons and brothers overseas,
Who still perhaps must die,)
Rededicate ourselves to the great task that still remains,
That on the altar of our common victory,
Not to a god of war,
But to the Lord of Peace,
We give ourselves anew within the wounds
Of Him in Whom all men are one—
For all may yet redeem their faulty past,
Held in these wounded Hands of Christ, our Great High Priest.

We are a single host of grateful love for Thee,
A single will for universal peace for men,
A single soul of righteousness to come!
Lord, lift this mighty host that is America,
Reconsecrate us now in Thy Son's Holy Name.
Amen.

The Phenomenal Growth of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "The Phenomenal Growth of the Navy," delivered by me at the John Barry celebration, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., Sunday, September 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

So much has been written and spoken concerning the life, achievements, and services of John Barry that there is little new information available. His life story, however, will bear repetition, for it will serve to prompt our people to emulate the high ideals and fine courage of this naval hero—frequently referred to as the father of the American Navy.

The great patriot, whose memory we recall tonight, and who received from none other than President Washington himself the commission of captain, was born in Ireland, probably in 1745.

Though his native land had never been very conspicuous as a seafaring country, yet John Barry was possessed to a marked degree of the great versatility which is characteristic of the Celtic race, for he followed the sea from his childhood. Inspired by a burning spirit to fight for personal liberty and disheartened by the distressed condition in his native land, he came to America as a young man.

When the American Revolution broke out he was in command of a merchant vessel, *Black Prince*, owned by John Nixon, of Philadelphia.

Later, when the Continental Congress authorized in the early days of the Revolution the fitting out of two armed vessels of 10 and 14 guns, respectively, and Barry, upon offering his services to the Government, was promptly given command of the *Lexington*, one of the two purchased—the beginning of American-owned naval vessels.

After the *Lexington* sailed out of Philadelphia with Barry in command, on March 31, 1776, he encountered off the Capes of Virginia the *Edward*, an auxiliary vessel to the British man-of-war, *Liverpool*. Barry opened fire and after a desperate fight of an hour and twenty minutes he captured her and brought her into Philadelphia. This was the beginning of a glorious naval record which continued till his death, 25 years later. Continuing in command of the *Lexington* until October 18, 1776, he captured several privately armed vessels.

From the *Lexington* he was given command of the *Effingham*, to which command Congress appointed him while the vessel was being built.

For a brief time there was a lull in naval activities against the enemy so, accordingly, Barry recruited a group of volunteers for land service and took part in the important Trenton campaign under the command of General Washington. Barry, with the volunteers and marines under him, was assigned to assist in the defense of Philadelphia and all military operations in the upper Delaware.

In another year his strong love for naval combat service sent him back to naval activities. Early in 1778 he captured the armed vessel *Alert* and two other ships loaded with supplies for the British Army.

We next learn of him in command of the *Raleigh*, a man-of-war with 32 guns, which vessel sailed from Boston on September 25, 1778, and 2 days later was attacked by three large British naval vessels. After a 9-hour running fight with the enemy he was obliged to run the *Raleigh* ashore on an island near the mouth of Penobscot Bay. Fortunately and miraculously, he escaped to the mainland with his crew. Although he lost his ship, he was highly commended for gallantry.

It was not long before he was again on the seas, for in November 1780 we find Barry ordered to command the Continental frigate *Alliance*, also a vessel of 32 guns. Among his duties at this time was that of taking a high Special Commissioner to France through seas infested by the enemy men-of-war. On the way to France he captured the privateer *Alert*, and on his return voyage he captured the two British ships, *Mars*, with 26 guns, and *Minerva*, with 10 guns, both of which he promptly made international prizes and brought to port.

The following year, 1781, the naval records record the fact that Barry, after hours of desperate fighting, captured the British war vessel *Atlanta* and later the fighting craft *Trespassy*. During the engagement with the *Atlanta* he was wounded, but notwithstanding he continued in command of the *Alliance*, taking enemies' prizes during the years 1781 and 1782.

It was in March 1783 that the last naval battle of the Revolution was fought by Barry. He was in command of the *Alliance* and took as a prize the *Sybil*, but while en route to port he was set upon by an entire British squadron, and while able to escape himself with his vessel intact, he had to abandon his prize.

Barry's name, deservedly, has a high place in the history of the armed deeds of the American Navy. His is an outstanding record of boldness, gallantry, and achievement. His fearlessness is particularly notable, for he frequently attacked squadrons of vessels when he was greatly outnumbered. If he did not overpower or capture the enemy with whom he came in contact, he invariably put them to flight.

After the Revolutionary War Barry returned from the sea and took a special interest and formidable part in securing the ratification of the Constitution which by that time had been written and promulgated by the Federal Convention.

Later Congress appropriated the money to fit out six ships to form a new navy and Barry was appointed first on the list of American captains. His commission was signed by General Washington and marked "No. 1."

Subsequently he supervised the construction of the large frigate *United States*, equipped with 44 guns, and was placed in command of that vessel.

In the following year, acting under instructions sent him by the Navy Department, he captured four French vessels which had been threatening the shipping of our Nation.

During the subsequent years Barry was repeatedly honored by the Government by being designated to carry out special missions abroad. He landed envoys in France, awaited dispatches from Paris and returned them to America. He also commanded an American squadron in the West Indies.

In 1801 his health began to fail, but he did not cease even then to render conspicuous service to his country. Though his health was impaired, his indomitable American spirit continued to assert itself, for we find him at work proving guns for the Navy Department as well as for the Army.

His health from now on failed rapidly and on September 13, 1803, he died at his country home, Strawberry Hill, Philadelphia. He was buried with all the honors the American Government could confer in the hallowed churchyard of St. Mary's Church, in the city of Philadelphia. Thus ended the career of one of America's greatest naval heroes, so illustrious in its exploits that it has served in the years that have intervened since his time, as a model and example for the many great heroes of the American Navy down to our own time.

It is interesting to note the comparison in size between the meager fleet of Barry's time and the overpowering fleets our country now has in service, not only on the seas, but under the seas and in the air. The present Navy bears witness to the process of phenomenal growth which we have accelerated in the last few years to meet the desperate war emergency and this growth has occurred with regard to all categories—with regard to personnel as well as ships and planes.

It has, of course, been accompanied by vast expenditures which to us a few years ago would have actually been incredible. This year we will spend $42,000,000,000 in naval building.

While military secrecy forbids full disclosure of detailed information, this program embraces the construction of many hundreds of vessels of all types and kinds. A general summary will be interesting.

In September 1939, the Navy was engaged in a shipbuilding program which contemplated the construction of 17 combatant vessels and 38 auxiliary vessels and small craft in 21 shipyards, which included all our navy yards. Today the naval-shipbuilding program contemplates the construction of between 1,000 and 2,000 combatant ships and hundreds of auxiliary vessels, patrol and mining craft of various types in more than 300 shipyards.

In September 1939, approximately 50,000 workers were engaged in naval shipbuilding, whereas today, exclusive of ship-repair workers, there are over 600,000.

In the current year we will complete 5 times as many combatant vessels as during the full year preceding Pearl Harbor.

At the end of 1939 our Navy comprised 1,091 vessels of various types and sizes. At the end of 1944 it will comprise 41,179 vessels—an almost phenomenal figure.

Equally impressive also has been the increase in naval personnel which on June 30 this year was almost 14 times larger than on June 30, 1939.

At the current rate every 3 months we turn out as many men from our naval training schools as constituted the entire active strength of the Navy in 1939.

It is also a notable fact to illustrate the stupendous personnel growth—that during several months of 1942 we recruited the equivalent of the full normal peacetime Navy.

This huge expansion has also extended to the Marine Corps and to all other branches of the Navy, including the Coast Guard.

Naval aviation has been tremendously accelerated since the war in Europe began. The Navy at present is operating on a training program with an input of 30,000 pilots and 100,000 enlisted men in aviation schools a year. On August 1, 1943, the entire aeronautic organization of the Navy was 3 times larger than it was at the same time last year.

More than 9,000 planes—two and one-half times the Navy's 1941 production—were built for the Navy during the first half of 1943.

The course of instruction for naval aviation is now approximately 16 to 18 months. Only men of the highest caliber, physically perfect, mentally alert, and of excellent character, have been accepted in naval aviation. It is these men who have already won many decisive victories over the enemy in the Pacific and in months to come will be in the front ranks of any offensive action.

When the average American thinks of our Navy he thinks in terms of ships and men. He forgets the third and equally important component, naval bases. None of the three can function without the other two. Trained men, powerful ships of the ocean and the air and adequate bases from which to strike—these are our Navy. These bases extend all the way from where we gather here in Boston tonight to the shores of the seven seas.

Since the starting of the emergency on July 1, 1940, to June 30 this year, nearly $5,000,000,000 worth of shore installations have been completed as compared with only $189,000,000 spent for this purpose in all of World War No. 1.

It is interesting to note in connection with the naval public-works program that the Navy has completed, or initiated, construction for drydock facilities with a capacity greater than the entire world's drydock facilities in 1939, including our own.

Let me take this occasion to sound a note of warning and to appeal to the American people not to repeat at the end of this war the grave mistake which was made at the end of World War No. 1.

At that time we had the greatest Navy in the world but we unwisely entered into agreements with the great powers of the world to limit our naval armaments, with the result that when the present World War broke out our Navy was reduced greatly in size and was far below the strength we were entitled to have even under the treaties made with the great powers. These treaties turned out to be a fraud upon the American people in that they provided only for limitation in a few categories of naval vessels, all the nations being left free to build as many naval vessels in all other categories that they saw fit, for the treaties imposed no limitation upon building of destroyers, submarines, cruisers, and fighting aircraft. We were lulled into the belief that the other powers were sincere in their desire to maintain peace by limiting the naval strength of all nations. As to the folly of these agreements, we did not awaken until the beginning of the war in Europe, which found us greatly unprepared, and these treaties were one of the contributing reasons for the difficulties our Navy experienced in the early days of the war in combating the German submarine menace.

At the end of this war we must resolve to maintain a strong, powerful Navy—the greatest in the world. Our Navy is not only our first line of defense but an unmatched naval fleet, both on the sea and in the air, is our surest means of securing and maintaining peace for ourselves and peace for the world.

Countless men of Irish blood, together with Americans of every racial group are still emulating in this present World War conflict the bravery, gallantry, and devotion to duty that was exemplified by the immortal John Barry. So long as our Nation produces men in the armed service of our country of the caliber of Barry and who exhibit his daring, his fearlessness, his intrepid conduct, we need have no fear of our security and naval supremacy.

It is most fitting that tonight all Americans, and particularly men and women of foreign ancestry, reverently pause to commemorate the deeds of this great American hero and to acknowledge the everlasting debt this Nation owes to him. It is for us to revitalize his spirit of sacrifice and renew his stanch, noble, American idealism by repledging to our beloved country the same self-sacrificing service and loyalty that he gave so unselfishly. It is in this way that we can best assure the swift, efficient prosecution of the war and the earliest possible return, in triumph, of our youths to their homes.

In these troublous times, with problems at home and abroad of more momentous character than any our country has ever before been confronted with, let the sterling Americanism of John Barry be an example and our guide.

Our task, however, at this time is not only to overpower our enemies in Europe and in Asia, but we must crush the evil and subversive forces in our own midst who seek, consciously or unconsciously, to destroy the great fundamental principles of government which men like John Barry and the founders of our Republic bequeathed to us.

The Fight for Quality Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MON C. WALLGREN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Fight for Quality Production," delivered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] at Shenandoah, Iowa, on October 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today we are engaged in total war. Victory or defeat depends upon our armed forces, but they, in turn, are dependent upon what we give them with which to fight. They are risking their lives. They are entitled to the best that we can give them.

Their needs are determined by the procurement officers of the Army and Navy. The Army and Navy specify what war materials they want, and ask business to produce them in accordance with the Army and Navy specifications.

Business contracts to supply materials that conform to these specifications. Common honesty requires that business should not foist off upon the Government materials that do not conform to contract. But more than honesty is involved here. Our soldiers and sailors are dependent upon those materials for their lives, and our Nation is dependent upon them for its liberty, and even for its continued existence.

For these reasons, the committee of the Senate, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, has considered itself obligated to check charges that come to it from Government inspectors that certain corporations are delivering war material that does not meet specifications. These Government inspectors are patriotic men. They are honest and conscientious. They make no profit from the sale of the war materials. They gain nothing by making unfounded charges, and by complaining at all, they risk their jobs.

The committee has investigated a number of such charges. Unfortunately, it has found several outstanding examples in which they were true. In all such cases, the committee has insisted that the corporation involved should correct the situation, and that it should either produce material according to specifications, or obtain the approval of the armed service using the material for the delivery of substandard items to be paid for as substandard material and used only where it can safely be used.

The committee will continue this policy. It will not accept excuses from management, except where it is convinced that management is acting promptly, and in good faith, to remedy the situation and to discharge those responsible for the fraud upon the Government. By the latter, the committee does not mean the little fellows at the plant who pass the materials, but the plant superintendents who, through carelessness and incapacity, are responsible for the existence of the situation.

Such a policy seemed to the committee to be so clearly right and necessary that it expected that the press and radio would join it in requiring management to conform to Government specifications, and in telling defense workers that they would receive support in their efforts to make good war material.

This is not asking too much. Practically all of industry is producing good, high-grade material. The great mass of companies are giving our Government what it pays for. Only a very few of our large corporations have strayed from the path. And honest business and industry have been unanimous in condemning such practices. I want it perfectly clear that I have no criticism of industry or business in general. The few whom I have had to criticize are the exceptions and not the rule.

By and large the committee's efforts have received such support. The press and radio deserve a great deal of credit for this, because the companies which have had to be corrected include several of the largest corporations in the United States. They spend millions of dollars for advertising, which the press and radio risk if they publicize their mistakes.

These corporations also employ staffs of publicity men, who occupy themselves in attempts to confuse the issues and obtain public comment favorable to the companies

based on a misunderstanding by the press or radio of the underlying facts.

A few of our better known newspapers and one popular radio news columnist have misunderstood the situation and by their reports to the public have unwittingly assisted in creating a false impression.

For example, the committee found that the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, the principal subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation, was producing steel plate for the Navy and the Maritime Commission and Lend-Lease in its Irvin Works, and that the physical tests to which the finished steel plates were subjected to determine their tensile strength were faked and falsified. The company men in charge of the operation of the testing machines testified that about 5 percent or more of the tests were deliberately faked for the purpose of falsely reporting that the steel plate was in accordance with specifications. To do this they instructed the testers under them to cheat.

The case required particular emphasis because of the improper and obstructive attitude which was taken as to it by the Carnegie-Illinois Corporation when the matter was first brought to its attention. Instead of cooperating in an investigation of a serious situation, which had arisen by reason of the carelessness and negligence of the management, it attempted to delay and obstruct the investigation by refusing access to records and an opportunity to examine witnesses. When it became impossible to continue such tactics, it resorted to attempts to minimize the importance of the dishonesty which it was forced to admit had been practiced by its employees. The presentation of its case before the committee was marked by a lack of frankness and candor.

The situation was so bad that Mr. Fairless, the president of the United States Steel Corporation, stated to the committee: "We are just as shocked to get these facts as you and we are just as desirous of correcting them as you are," and "I consider it was very, very poor management."

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, executive vice chairman of the War Production Board informed the United States Steel Corporation that:

"Although the evidence adduced to date does not prove that the culpability for the falsification goes higher than the chief metallurgist, Mr. McGarrity, it does nevertheless indicate, in our opinion, poor management on the part of the officials of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation.

"Needless to say, this entire situation has deeply disturbed us at the War Production Board, and we are determined, as we feel certain you are, too, that immediate steps shall be taken to put an end to all falsifications, to take appropriate disciplinary action with regard to those responsible for such practices, no matter how high in the organization they may be, and finally so to readjust your organization that, in the future, we can look forward with the fullest confidence to effective, efficient, and straightforward operation of your corporation and its subsidiaries."

Mr. Wilson could not have used plainer language, and he acted only after consulting with the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission and being assured that they concurred in his opinion.

This was not the first time that Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation had been guilty of faking tests on steel supplied to the Navy. Forty-nine years ago, in 1894, the House Naval Affairs Committee investigated charges against the Carnegie Steel Co. and found the following charges to have been proven:

"False reports of the treatment of the plates were systematically made to the Government inspectors.

"Specimens taken from the plates both before and after treatment to ascertain the tensile strength of each plate were stretched without the knowledge of the Government inspectors, so as to increase their apparent tensile strength when actually tested.

"False specimens taken from other plates were substituted for the specimens selected by the Government inspectors.

"The testing machine was repeatedly manipulated by order of the superintendent of the armor-plate mill so as to increase the apparent tensile strength of the specimens."

The similarity between the frauds practiced today and the frauds practiced 50 years ago is so striking that a single report might well have served to summarize both investigations.

The committee believed that it was time that such practices should stop and was extremely surprised when a leading Pittsburgh paper ran a scare head all the way across the front of its paper as follows: "Steel slump blamed on Truman—Committee's bungling slows war output."

The story referred to an exhaustive independent inquiry just completed by that newspaper. In all this exhaustive inquiry the newspaper had not once contacted the committee for any information. The article proceeded to say that although official production figures for April were not available:

"Preliminary and informal reports to the W. P. B. on production trends show that instead of April being the month in which all records for steel-plate production would have been broken, this month's production may fall seriously below previous months—possibly fall off as much as 35 percent."

As I understand the newspaper article, it was a charge that because the Senate had dared to require the United States Steel Corporation to be honest we were going to lose up to 35 percent of our steel-plate production, and that that loss should be attributed to the committee's bungling.

This article with its prediction of a 35-percent slump for April was published on April 16, after half the month had expired.

The fact is that after the month had ended and the figures were in, the War Production Board announced that April was a record-breaking month, and that the steel industry produced more steel plate than it had ever before produced in a similar month.

I wonder, and I think you will wonder, who told that newspaper that there was going to be a steel slump and why was such a ridiculous rumor circulated.

Shortly afterward the committee found that the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, a subsidiary of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, was guilty of selling for installation in Army and Navy planes airplane engines that were not in accordance with specifications.

The engines in question were made at Lockland, Ohio, near Cincinnati, in a plant designed by Curtiss-Wright, but built by the Government at a cost of more than $140,000,000.

I want to tell you just how this investigation started and was conducted. In order to make sure that the engines being produced could properly be used in our military aircraft, both Curtiss-Wright and the Government employed many inspectors, at a total cost of several million dollars a year. The committee received letters from a number of these inspectors, particularly the Government inspectors, complaining that they were being forced to pass parts and engines which were not in accordance with the specifications. Now, these specifications were prepared by Curtiss-Wright itself, and approved by the War Department. Curtiss-Wright has never claimed that the specifications were needlessly made too strict.

A committee investigator was sent to Cincinnati. He found that the majority of the Government inspectors looked to the Senate to correct a situation which they had lost hope of having corrected by Curtiss-Wright. In fact, one of the inspectors broke down and cried as he told his story, saying that he had two nephews in the Air Forces. Before our investigator had finished, not only a majority of the Government inspectors, but also a number of the Curtiss-Wright inspectors made the same charge, namely, that the inspectors were not being permitted to reject parts and engines that failed to conform to specifications.

These men had come to the committee only as a last resort. They had tried to tell their story to Curtiss-Wright. They had tried to tell their story to their own superiors in the United States Army. The only reward of those who attempted to do this was that they were transferred under a cloud, or otherwise penalized. Morale was almost completely destroyed.

Their complaints were unanimous. There were no discrepancies. They had been forced to accept bad materials. In many cases where they attempted to reject material which was clearly bad, Curtiss-Wright succeeded in having them overruled by appealing, over their heads, to their superiors.

They did not charge their superiors with dishonesty—they simply pointed out that, again and again, material which was clearly and dangerously bad, had been accepted. They were able to show our investigator defective parts which had been accepted. They were able to point out engines which had been accepted with defects.

The committee did not make any public announcement of the conditions which its investigator had found, because it wanted to be absolutely sure that it was fair to Curtiss-Wright and to the Army. What the committee did do was to call in both Curtiss-Wright and the Army, and give them each a week or two within which to make their own investigation of the inspection procedures at the Lockland plant. Both later reported to the committee that they had found nothing. Some of the Curtiss-Wright personnel, who claimed to have made an investigation, have since been discharged or removed from their jobs, and the Army has instituted court-martial proceedings against some of the officers upon whom it relied for an investigation.

A subcommittee of the Truman committee then went to Cincinnati to inspect the plant and to hold hearings. Before it finished, it had heard scores of witnesses. One witness would suggest several others. A group of inspectors would go out, voluntarily, and dig up a number of other inspectors who had the same story to tell. The subcommittee took 1,200 pages of testimony, and found a situation which was appalling.

At the subcommittee's invitation, an Army officer accompanied it, and was at its hearings. At his request, the testimony taken by the subcommittee was made available to the Army, which also made a further investigation of its own. The Army and the committee are in substantial agreement that the situation at the Lockland plant was extremely bad, and required drastic corrective action.

General Arnold, commander of the Army Air Force, recently complimented me on the accomplishments of the committee at Lockland and informed me that the committee's action had been of great value and assistance to the Army Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles Branshaw, commanding general, matériel command, at Wright Field, recently informed Senator WALLGREN, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aircraft, that in his opinion the situation was three times worse than the committee had said it was.

The committee leaned over backward in this case to be certain that it was fair to Curtiss-Wright. It even submitted its report to Curtiss-Wright, as well as to the Army, in advance, so that both would have

an opportunity to present any evidence they desired, and to suggest any changes which they thought might merit the approval of the committee. I do not know how we could have been more fair.

Very significantly, Curtiss-Wright confined itself to a few generalities. It could not discuss the detailed facts themselves because they did not admit of argument.

The committee issued a report to the Senate to force Curtiss-Wright and the Army to take further additional corrective action, and to take it promptly.

In its report, the committee specifically called attention to the fact that Curtiss-Wright, through the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, was producing and causing the Government to accept defective and substandard material and that this was accomplished in the following ways:

"1. By the falsification of tests.

"2. By destruction of records.

"3. By improperly recording results of tests.

"4. By forging inspection reports.

"5. By failing to segregate substandard and defective material.

"6. By failing to promptly destroy or mutilate such defective and substandard material.

"7. By orally changing tolerances allowed on parts.

"8. By circumventing the salvage committee set up to pass on the usability of parts outside of tolerances.

"9. By allowing production to override the inspection force, thereby destroying morale of both company and Army inspectors.

"10. By skipping inspection operations."

The committee found no evidence that Curtiss-Wright was deliberately disregarding the specifications for the purpose of sabotage. We understood that the reason why some of its officials wanted lax inspection was that they were not able to produce engines in quantity that conformed to the specifications. For these reasons, the committee expected that the rate of production of engines would fall off when the plant was required to produce engines which conformed to Curtiss-Wright's own specifications. In other words, to get the quality which both the company and the War Department thought was necessary for engines going into military aircraft, it would be necessary to sacrifice quantity until Curtiss-Wright could improve the management and the procedures at the Lockland plant. Of course, this was distasteful to the plant managers whose negligence and incapacity were being demonstrated, and to Curtiss-Wright which would suffer a financial loss because less engines would be accepted and paid for by the Government.

Most newspapers and radio commentators thoroughly understood this situation, but a few of them allowed themselves to be confused by Curtiss-Wright officials who wanted to make it appear that it was the Senate, and not themselves, who should be censured for their inability or unwillingness to produce airplane parts and engines in accordance with their own specifications.

These newspaper articles and radio talks insinuated and, in some cases, stated: First, that the loss of production at the Lockland plant was due to bungling by the Truman committee which had caused inspectors to reject parts that should have been passed; second, that the committee's report was unnecessary and issued only for sensational purposes because Curtiss-Wright had already corrected the situation; third, that in any event, all the defective parts had been found before the engines were finally accepted for use in airplanes; fourth, that the quality of the engines was demonstrated by the job they were supposed to have done in the Tokyo raid; and fifth, that airplane production was going to suffer for lack of these engines.

You may be interested to know that the same man who predicted for the Pittsburgh paper the steel slump that never materialized somehow got himself substituted for a well-known radio commentator. For several days he attacked the Truman committee over the radio for daring to call Curtiss-Wright to account.

If these reporters were not duped, I suggest that they were, themselves, the sensation mongers. It is very significant that no official of Curtiss-Wright has ever publicly to you, or privately to the Senate committee, made any such statements as these.

Let us look at what Mr. Guy Vaughan, president of Curtiss-Wright, had to say as to the charge that production was lowered because the inspection procedures were too rigid:

"Question. The stoppages you refer to are your own stoppages which you have had to instigate to correct a situation that was not right?

"Mr. VAUGHAN. That is right.

* * * * *

"Question. Does the company, through you now, publicly take the position that the reason for your reduction in production is the fact that the Army inspection service is blocking production by its inspection procedure?

"Mr. VAUGHAN. No; it could not.

* * * * *

"Question. And any articles to that effect you would repudiate as not being in accordance with the facts?

"Mr. VAUGHAN. Publicly, internationally, any other way."

Mr. Vaughan could not take any other position because Major LaVista, resident representative of the Army for the Lockland plant had just testified that he had contacted three of the principal officials of the Lockland plant and that they had been unable to point out any cases where their production had been held up by being forced to comply with inspection procedures.

The suggestion that Curtiss-Wright had taken full corrective action before the committee's report was equally unfounded.

"Question. You do not disagree with General Echols in his conclusion that the management of the company at present is not satisfactory.

"Mr. VAUGHAN. I will agree to the fact that we have had a number of things that are not called good management, but I won't agree that the people who have been building up this thing have done a bad job. I think it can be made better as time goes on. It has got to be made better."

Major General Echols, in charge of matériel for the Army Air Force, officially testified on behalf of the War Department that:

"General ECHOLS. In my opinion, the management which has been there for the past several months has not shown itself qualified to accomplish the job as laid out by that plant."

General Echols further testified that:

"General ECHOLS. The Government has had discussions with the top management of the Wright Aeronautical Corporation with regard to getting men to strengthen the management in this plant.

"Question. You mean by that, I take it, General, that in addition to the question of the top man in the plant you are dissatisfied with what you might term the management group in the highest brackets in the plant and have desired that they be strengthened by the addition of other qualified men.

"General ECHOLS. This is my opinion. They should be.

"Question. Why has not the Wright Aeronautical Corporation, of its own volition, provided that kind of management?

"General ECHOLS. I don't know.

"Question. What reasons have they given you for their failure to do it?

"General ECHOLS. The reasons they have given me were that they believed that the present management could work the problem out."

Thus, 6 weeks after the committee had issued its aircraft report, Curtiss-Wright had still failed to provide good management at the Lockland plant, and the situation was still so bad as to require both the Army and the Truman committee to give the company the ultimatum "produce or get out."

As to the suggestion that the engines produced were not defective, Major LaVista testified:

"Three engines which were on the shipping dock, finally inspected and sealed, ready to ship to the destination, were brought back, disassembled, and reinspected 100 percent. Everyone of the three engines were found to be in such a condition that they could not have been installed in an airplane. In fact, the conditions found were bad enough that the company immediately ordered 89 engines, which were ready to ship, returned to the assembly department to be completely disassembled and reinspected 100 percent."

Major LaVista also testified that over 400 engines were turned down on final run due to high oil flow because no effort had been made to maintain a close tolerance on the connecting-rod bearings. When 33 engines out of these 400 were reassembled with a proper fitting, all 33 went through the penalty run without trouble. Major LaVista also testified that parts which had been rejected and which had not been found suitable for salvage were discovered in the so-called green assembly line ready to be assembled into engines.

Major LaVista concluded, and I quote:

"It can be readily seen from the above facts that production could be completely bottled up until such time as these engines and parts are out of the way."

Since the Cincinnati hearing the Army has torn down and reexamined 64 of the 89 engines referred to by Major LaVista. It has also called in 100 engines as a sample selection of the engines produced from January to April prior to the committee's report. So far 10 of these have been torn down and reexamined. The results were obtained from the Army by the committee, in confidence, and I would like to set them forth here for your information as a direct, final, and conclusive answer to the contention that the engines produced were not defective and were fit for use in airplanes.

However, Under Secretary of War Patterson has specifically requested that this information not be made public. Without his consent, I will not make it public.

Since this speech was announced, further conferences have been had with officials of the Army, including Under Secretary of War Patterson. The Under Secretary stated to the committee on Saturday, "Investigations made by the Army confirm the findings made by the Truman committee as to the construction and inspection of engines." I am happy to say that the Army officials have reiterated their views that the Truman committee has performed the most worth-while service in connection with the Curtiss-Wright plant at Lockland.

Under Secretary of War Patterson and other officials of the War Department agree with us that the results of the investigation made by the Truman committee, the matters about which we complained and which we pointed out, were matters of serious import and concern. We also agree that, happily, through vigorous efforts of the Army and the Truman committee, these conditions recently have been largely corrected. Since the committee's report the Curtiss-Wright Co. has installed much better management and procedures of every kind. Rigid inspection is now required, not only by the War Department but also by the company itself. Fathers and mothers

of American boys who are pilots, and the boys themselves, can be assured that the Truman committee, the Army, and all branches of the armed forces will continue the most careful scrutiny of every plant in order that the lives and safety of our boys may be protected as far as it is humanly possible.

As to the contention that the Lockland plant must be good because its engines powered the Tokyo raiders, the fact is that Mr. Vaughan, president of Curtiss-Wright, has written the committee apologizing for that assertion. When he checked up—and it is to his credit that he checked up—he found that none of the planes raiding Tokyo had an engine manufactured at Lockland.

The suggestion that the requirement that these engines be made properly in conformance to Curtiss-Wright's own specifications is holding up airplane production is likewise unfounded. The War Production Board informs the committee that these engines are used in eight types of planes, and that deliveries of completed aircraft have been affected in only one instance, a Navy flying boat.

Let me repeat, I am very glad to be able to tell you that since our report Curtiss-Wright has taken drastic action and recently has made real progress. It has obtained some experienced personnel from other industries. Curtiss-Wright has hired a new senior vice president, who is giving all of his attention to correcting the situation. It has obtained a new manager for the Lockland plant and has relegated the former manager to other work. It has fired some of the principal assistants. It has sought and obtained outside advice as to how to better its inspection and production procedures. The improvements have borne fruit. Production is better and is expected to become much better.

These steps are all to the good, and the committee will support fully every effort of Curtiss-Wright to produce good planes and engines. It will unhesitatingly call attention to any failures where it believes that Curtiss-Wright or any other company is failing to produce good material and is slow or unwilling to take action to correct its failure.

A constructive and timely investigation of failure to conform to Government specifications may be painful to the businessmen involved, but it may also be very useful even to them. Some weeks ago there was a most unfortunate accident to a glider, which resulted in the loss of a number of lives, including that of the mayor of St. Louis and the president of the company manufacturing the glider. I checked on the cause of this glider crash and was informed that it was due to a strut fitting which had been improperly machined down to a point far below Government specifications. As a result it broke under stress and caused the glider to crash. Had we checked earlier and criticized the company for installing these defective parts the president of the glider company might, like United States Steel and Curtiss-Wright officials, have resented it. But he would have been alive today.

The committee will disregard newspaper articles and radio programs which confuse the issues and seek to absolve corporations for their failures. The next time you read such an article or hear such a program, I would appreciate it if you would write me. I will send you a copy of the report of the public hearings in question. After you have read them, if you disagree with the committee, I would appreciate your writing and telling me so. If you disagree with the newspaper or radio commentator, I would appreciate your writing him and telling him so.

Post-War Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Helen Essary, a Washington writer, a supporter of many New Deal plans, a personal friend of Mrs. Roosevelt, Sunday, October 3, wrote a column based on the report of the Senators who just returned from a trip abroad. In it for Americans, because of Helen Essary's political background, there is much food for thought.

The column is as follows:

"If the United States is going to pitch in big-league international politics, it is time it learned to play ball within its own country." This in simple American is the general opinion of the five United States Senators who returned last week from an official tour of the war zone in the south Pacific.

"This means," said Senator RALPH BREWSTER, of Maine, in talking about the 46,000-mile senatorial journey, "that we have got to learn teamwork. More than this, we've got to copy the superb teamwork of the British. Everywhere we went, we found the British agencies pulling together in harmony—for the British.

"Naturally, the British are pulling meanwhile for the United Nations. There is no doubt about that. There is also no doubt that the United States is scattering its resources and brains—and forgetting to which country it owes first allegiance."

Indeed, some of the foreign goings-on of the United States are so harebrained that the people whom this country most wants to help are suspicious of our purpose. This is another conclusion the visiting Senators reached. Especially is this true in Australia.

There, when Senators BREWSTER and MEAD held a press conference, they had to answer these questions: "Has the United States imperialistic intentions? Does she wish to acquire more territory? If she doesn't, why is she spending so much money outside of her own country?"

Our generosity, our determined Lady Bountiful attitude is disturbing the governments of our allies, who in self-protection try to minimize United States aid and to hint to their people that Americans are unstable and changeable.

A year ago when most of the world was terrified of the Japs and Nazis, our allies were happy to accept our aid. Now, so the touring legislators report, many foreigners wish that we would proceed more cautiously with our plans for relief and rehabilitation in occupied, war-shocked countries.

One of the most important officials of a country recently freed from Axis control told the Senators that he was frightened at the headlong rush of the United States to move in with help where it wasn't needed.

That lend-lease magnificence of ours gets twisted up a little here and there, so Senator BREWSTER discovered.

For example, Dr. H. V. Evatt, Minister of External Affairs for Australia, and recently a visitor in Washington, was asked by Australia Prime Minister Curtin to retract a statement he had made on the excess of Australia's lend-lease aid to the United States as against our lend-lease aid to Australia.

Dr. Evatt probably forgot about the retraction for he repeated his original statement to Senator BREWSTER. Later he remembered that the correct lend-lease figures are 600,000,000 from the United States to Australia as against 200,000,000 from Australia to the United States.

The lack of correct information abroad about America's part in the war is another grievance not pridefully pitching, Senator BREWSTER declares. In Chungking our embassy receives every morning from Reuter's, the British news agency, a report that frequently overlooks the importance of some United States war effort.

Three or four days later the American news agencies produce their reports. But who wants to read an old report? The situation got so bad in Chungking that the American Embassy there protested to Anthony Eden about certain articles in Chinese papers, extremely embarrassing to the United States and very favorable to Britain. Mr. Eden said he was sorry, but he "couldn't interfere with the freedom of the press."

Distorted news reports get into Africa, too, the returning Senators say. The natives and troops are fed stories of strikes and dissension in the United States. Senators BREWSTER and MEAD complained to both General Eisenhower and General Spaatz.

These doughty fellows said the news stories were read and approved by them daily, but they had no control over the selection or playing up of the material by the British press and broadcasting companies.

The British Broadcasting Co. controls practically all the South Pacific and in Iceland, where we have as one investment $17,000,000 lend-lease air base, the natives are told tactfully by broadcasts, "Watch out for Americans; you can't trust them." This dears, is the sort of thing brought back here by a United States Senator who has been out on the road to see.

India is one country about which the American legislators have very definite ideas. Leave India alone, they say. It's a hot potato—England's hot potato, not ours.

They wonder, too, how it happens that the O. W. I. has 100 agents in India, selling the Indian people on the American way of life. What right, they ask, have we to propagandize in India? We got pretty angry when a recent Russian Ambassador propagandized in the United States.

Well, I have been trying to tell you some of the discoveries Senators BREWSTER, RUSSELL, LODGE, CHANDLER, and MEAD made on their voyage. It was a thrilling journey. It must be made a useful one.

I should like to have the American people know what the travelers learned. It is time, indeed, that we learn to pitch for America first in this country.

It is not disloyal to the war effort to suggest this. Nor is it disloyal to say to Congress: You have the United States ball in the international game in your own hands.

It's up to you to clear up the confusion and lack of teamwork reported by the representatives you sent abroad. You can't blame everything on the President. Don't you hold the purse strings?

Economy in Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House

for the next several weeks will be busily engaged in hearing testimony and in giving study to the requests of the Treasury Department for additional taxes in the amount of approximately $10,500,000,000. The Treasury Department has submitted its plan for raising such sum. The committee will undoubtedly hear considerable testimony from experts from the Treasury Department as well as the testimony of many interested taxpayers. With expenditures in the fiscal year in the neighborhood of $120,000,000,000 and revenues from all present ascertainable sources amounting to only approximately $35,000,000,000 it is obvious that additional revenues to the Government must be made available by new and additional taxes. Inasmuch as several weeks shall elapse before a tax bill is reported there is ample time for the Ways and Means Committee to give careful study to the all-over tax situation, with a view of making the tax burden fair and equitable to all taxpayers. I am certain that the Ways and Means Committee, confronted with a gigantic task, has an intense desire to do this.

While the Ways and Means Committee is in continuous session and working hard at the problem of providing new revenue, is it also appropriate for a suggestion to be made at this time to the Appropriations Committee that a subcommittee thereof be selected to thoroughly investigate and explore the possibilities for economy? From present indications the House shall not be extremely busy for the balance of the year. Soon after the House convenes on January 3 requests will reach it from various departments and bureaus for their annual appropriations for the next fiscal year, and undoubtedly in some instances for a deficiency appropriation for the current fiscal year. I do not claim to be an expert, but it does occur to me, as the result of my observation and experience, that it is possible to effect substantial savings in the cost of government today. We witness much waste, overlapping of bureaus, and the duplication of functions. We have an all-time high of 3,000,000 persons on the Federal pay roll, and this is being continually increased. We are told that there is a serious manpower shortage in civil life, that our production record is in serious jeopardy. I do not know of a more worth-while task in behalf of soldiers, citizens, and taxpayers than to at this time begin a careful study of this problem, with a view of making recommendations to the Congress at the opening of its next session. With a prospect of the war running into at least 2 years yet, and preparations are made in that direction, a sound and realistic appraisal of our fiscal affairs is certainly in order, and I earnestly hope that the Appropriations Committee will be prepared at the opening of the next session of Congress to make sound and constructive recommendations for substantial economies and a more efficient functioning of our Government. Now is the time to begin that task.

Why Subsidies or Higher Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 30, 1943:

WHY SUBSIDIES OR HIGHER PRICES?

The War Food Administration is asking another half billion dollars for subsidies to guarantee higher prices for 1944 farm crops.

On the whole, the farm bloc legislators have opposed these subsidies. Their stand is not as queer as it sounds, however. They see in the Government subsidies a device to increase farm prices a little and then hold them there. They would prefer no subsidy—and no ceiling on farm prices.

There is insufficient evidence that either new farm subsidies or higher prices are needed. Prices are now high. Production is excellent. Farmers are making more money than in many years. They have more cash than in decades. They are reducing their farm-mortgage debts at an unprecedented rate with some of their increased cash income. They are buying War bonds.

In fact, the farmers are doing their share in the war effort in a grand way.

We do not believe that the rank and file of American farmers are demanding subsidies or higher prices. But it cannot be expected that they will rise up and protest against the actions of some farm politicians to get such increases for them. That would be asking a good deal.

The real factors keeping farm production from reaching still higher levels are shortage of manpower, lack of farm machinery and fertilizer. Subsidies and/or higher prices cannot solve these problems. Farmers now cannot get the men, the machines, or the fertilizer, no matter how much money they have—that is, they cannot fill these needs in appreciable amounts. With more money, one farmer might hire a farm hand away from his neighbor, and so on and so on in an ascending spiral of farm wages. But war industry cannot spare workers to go back on the farms, no matter what the farmers pay at this moment.

We believe that the farmers of this country will continue to produce all they can at present prices, if they can sell all they produce. They are doing well, for themselves and for the Nation, and they know it.

There is little excuse for the subsidies being asked or for increased farm prices.

Blanket Doesn't Fit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of October 4, 1943:

BLANKET DOESN'T FIT

It isn't the fault of Paul J. Winkler, manager of the district office of the Office of Defense Transportation. It is just another case of the impossibility for somebody in W shington to lay down an over-all rule, know nothing about conditions and sentiments in individual communities, and make the rule fit.

The Washington office of O. D. T. has ruled that milk must be delivered four times a week and that no deliveries shall fall upon consecutive days. As a result of this order, milk must be delivered every other Sunday.

Now it so happens that a great majority of the people of this area have no objection to Sunday delivery of milk. But another large section of the people do object to it on purely religious grounds. They have protested, sent a large petition to the proper authorities in Washington and to our Representatives in the Congress. They have held a conference with Mr. Winkler who has explained patiently that he is merely carrying out the orders of his superiors and has no choice but to obey those orders.

This is one case which very easily could be corrected. It is necessary only that milk be delivered on both Friday and Saturday. That would avoid the delivery on Sunday but would insure those who need their milk on Sunday of a fresh supply.

Fact is, of course, that with modern methods of milk delivery and of refrigeration after delivery, three deliveries a week probably would take care of everybody. But the higher ups of O. D. T. have ruled there must be four deliveries a week the country over and that no deliveries shall be made on consecutive days. That's what makes the trouble for those who object to the Sunday delivery.

The great weakness of most of our bureaucratic system is that somebody in Washington insists on trying to place a blanket over the entire country. It can't be done. Some discretion should be left to the local managers or directors or administrators or whatever they may be called.

In this case if Mr. Winkler had the power to make a ruling he could cause the delivery to be made four times every week on Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. Then there could be no objection on the part of those who now object and there would be much less confusion which will now be the case with deliveries coming on different days on succeeding weeks.

Congress Must Act To Avert a Serious Milk Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, "Nero fiddled while Rome burned!" Today, the executive agencies of our Government do nothing while the Nation's milk supply is drying up.

Congress knew, when it passed the Price Control Act, that some adjustments would have to be made in the price structure of certain farm commodities. We said, in as plain language as we could,

that where it could be shown that due to increased labor costs or for other reasons, the farmer was not receiving a fair price for his product, that prices should be adjusted upward.

Apparently an act of Congress means nothing to the O. P. A., when it conflicts with O. P. A.'s interpretation of a directive from the President. "Hold the line" is a good football phrase, but we are not playing football with Germany and Japan. No good quarterback would try to hold the line with four or five men off-side. If he did, his team would be penalized just as the American people will be penalized if milk prices are not adjusted at once.

This morning I received the following telegram from the general manager of the Connecticut Milk Producers' Association which speaks for itself:

Dairy feed prices skyrocketed again today. Eastern State Farmers' Exchange 16 percent protein dairy ration rose 2.80 per ton again this morning; 14 percent ration, which most farmers are being forced to use, rose 3.20 per ton. No corn being available, this ration has been made largely of Canadian barley and oats. Due to congestion at lake ports we understand Canada has placed an embargo on barley, forcing our feed mixers again into American barley market on which there is no ceiling. Our State milk price hearing last May established the absolute necessity for a minimum rise at one percent per quart in the Connecticut milk price. Since that hearing grain costs alone have increased the equivalent of one-third percent per quart for an efficient Connecticut milk producer. We do not believe that it is a proper function of the legislative branch of our Government to interfere with day-to-day executive or administrative operations. It is quite obvious to all, however, that, so far as the public's milk supply is concerned, the executive and administrative operations have broken down, and the Congress must step in and give them some new orders if we are to avert a disastrous milk shortage.

Berlin Lake Saves Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of September 26, 1943:

BERLIN LAKE SAVES VALLEY—STEEL MEN SAY RESERVOIR AVERTS SERIOUS DROUGHT—PAYING FOR ITSELF—UNITED STATES RESIDENT ENGINEER ASSERTS IT'S HELPING WAR OUTPUT

Berlin Lake saved the Mahoning Valley from a devastating flood last winter and now is saving the Mahoning Valley from a severe drought which would have seriously reduced the steel plants' output of war steel, local steel executives say.

"Berlin Lake," said Edward J. Tripp, resident engineer of the United States Geological Survey, "is doing a good job of paying for itself this year in increased war production."

ONE AND THREE-FOURTHS FEET FROM TOP

He pointed out that Lake Milton had only 4,500,000,000 gallons of water September 24, 1942. Milton held 8,400,000,000 gallons Friday and is only 1¾ feet from the top of the spillway. Berlin still has 6,400,000,000 gallons left of the more than 23,500,000,000 gallons with which it started last spring.

Nearly four times as much water is flowing down the Mahoning as at this time last year. Tripp said 280,000,000 gallons were released daily from Milton Lake during most of August and up to September 8. The flow now is 200,000,000 gallons daily.

Last year, sixty-one to sixty-three million gallons daily were released from Milton up to September 2 when the flow was reduced to 58,000,000 gallons. On September 9, it was cut to 48,000,000 gallons daily for the rest of the month.

The cleaner water not only has given workers in steel plants better working conditions, but has provided more efficient cooling, thus saving steel plant equipment.

Here is a table of temperatures reported at Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.'s Campbell Works, which gets the least benefit of improved water conditions:

	1942	1943
	°	°
Aug. 1	110	105
Aug. 25	106	100
Aug. 28	111	100
Aug. 31	109	97.5
Sept. 2	115	101.5
Sept. 7	108	93
Sept 9	112	92
Sept. 16	114	96.5
Sept. 20	100	93
Sept. 24	105	95

RAINFALL REDUCED

Rainfall during August and September was only about half the total rainfall of August and September 1942, Tripp said, which would have helped to make conditions worse here if it hadn't been for Berlin.

Meander Reservoir, the domestic supply for Niles and Youngstown, is down only a couple of feet. However, Ohio Water Service Co. lakes which supply raw water to the local industries are down substantially because of lack of rain.

Mosquito Creek Reservoir, the Trumbull County flood control and low flow control basin now being built by the Army engineers, will be well filled this winter and will release its storage water next summer and fall to insure even further improvement in cooling here, Tripp said.

Fiscal Commando Raid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important problems in the post-war period will be to maintain the internal stability of our Nation. To this end it is important that Congress prepare now to properly control the expenditure of Government funds.

My colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] has recently introduced three bills to help effect this very necessary end. These measures would enable the Congress to appropriate money more efficiently and to check upon the manner in which these funds are spent.

A recent editorial upon this problem and the proposed measures which appeared in the Dayton Herald on September 27, follows:

FISCAL COMMANDO RAID

In girding for what he describes as a commando raid on Government wasters, Congressman ROBERT F. JONES, of Lima, calls attention to some serious shortcomings in government. To correct them he has introduced three bills—each of them pointing in the general direction of giving Congress more authority over the manner in which appropriations are spent.

Congressman JONES' idea is eminently sensible. It is that Congress, which is called upon to appropriate sums running into astronomical figures, should have facilities for seeing that the money is spent as directed. Also it should have facilities for determining the need of various Government departments for the appropriations they seek. Therefore, Representative JONES proposes that the Bureau of the Budget, now responsible to the President, be held accountable to Congress; that $20,000,000 be appropriated with which the Comptroller General will make investigations, reports, and recommendations on the receipt and disbursement of public funds; that the Comptroller General be authorized to start making disallowances and withhold credits where expenditures are made illegally and to report to Congress on any overlapping functions of Federal agencies.

That Congress should appropriate billions without having the power to oversee their expenditure simply doesn't make sense. The result is that only the executive branch of the Government gets the real over-all picture of the fiscal side of the Government. Congress gets information piecemeal, either by personal investigations or the work of special committees; the complete view of the problem is denied the men who must vote on the appropriations. Today the complexities of government demand that the Congress receive full and adequate information from agents responsible to it alone and not from agents of interested parties in the executive departments. That there is frequent conflict between Congress and the executive departments over what should be considered official public information is evidenced today by the current squabble between the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department, which have been at sword's points over data regarding taxation.

Perhaps when Congressman JONES puts through his three bills to improve Government fiscal management Congress will give attention to another and even more sensible proposal along the same line: That is to integrate the work of the Appropriations Committee (which approves desired expenditures) with that of the Ways and Means Committee which raises the money for the appropriations.

Address of Hon. Walter E. Edge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address

made on September 28, 1943, by the Honorable Walter E. Edge, formerly a Member of the Senate from the State of New Jersey and Ambassador to France, on the occasion of his acceptance of the Republican nomination for Governor of the State of New Jersey:

Mr. Chairman and my fellow Americans, I deeply appreciate this gracious, and I know, sincere, reception.

May I, at the outset, express my thanks and appreciation for the loyalty and unselfishness you have all so decisively demonstrated through the weeks and months leading up to the primaries and this convention? I know it is unnecessary for me to repeat that I have not returned to public service inspired by any personal or selfish ambition. I have made no promises or commitments to any individual or to any group. Neither have I nor will I make any pledges as to appointment to office, beyond the assurance that I will assume personal responsibility for my every action in this regard. If elected Governor, I shall be free in every way to serve the people of New Jersey to the best of my ability. Now that you have nominated me to head the ticket in our great State, I propose with your help to win and I visualize in the future a splendid opportunity for real constructive leadership. In addition to administering the office of chief executive, I recognize a further responsibility to the Republican Party and I hope, if elected, as I confidently expect to be, that with your assistance and cooperation we can present a program that will be a real instrumentality for public good and retain the confidence, respect, and esteem of all classes of our citizenship. I consider this responsibility a trusteeship for the people.

May I assure you that the progressive spirit and demands of this era are fully recognized by me and coupled with the safeguards of experience we will march progressively forward. You of the younger generation of men and women must and will carry on, always responsive, I trust, to enlightened public opinion.

The returns from the primary election unfold several interesting situations. The primaries have proved conclusively that labor will vote as American citizens, free and untrammeled and not at the dictation of labor bosses. The only State-wide candidacies were, of course, those of my opponent and myself standing for the nomination for Governor. The unofficial returns indicate a total vote, Democratic and Republican, of approximately 395,000. Hudson County contributed 111,000 to this total. This is nearly one-third of the entire primary vote in the State.

In other words, one county with a population in 1940 of 650,000, representing less than one-sixth of the population of the State, is accredited with nearly one-third of the total votes cast. Compare, for instance, Essex County, my opponent's home county, with Hudson. The population of that county in 1940 was 837,000. The primary vote Tuesday in Essex was slightly more than 50,000, less than half the Hudson total notwithstanding Essex's population is almost 25 percent larger.

This Hudson vote was 4,000 more than given to the Democratic candidate for Senator a year ago and yet thousands of men and women of voting age have left in the meantime to join the armed forces. Over 50 percent of my opponent's total came from 1 county in the State.

There are only 2 possible deductions to take from these figures—either the voters in the other 20 counties of the State are unconcerned as to the character and policy of their State government, or there is something radically wrong in Hudson County. I make no charges but I pledge this convention and through it the people of New Jersey that if I am elected Governor, no stone will be left unturned to get to the bottom of this unsavory situation. Apparently the only machine working in New Jersey Tuesday was that of the undisputed boss of Hudson County. Perhaps he overplayed his hand.

I demand that the Republican Party courageously meet and endeavor to solve the problems of the coming years. The party must be strong and independent and function as a single entity. I am opposed to bipartisan trading and patronage deals. Mr. Hague will be no part of my administration.

I was amused at a gratuitous suggestion from my opponent that I should refrain from bringing the national administration into the campaign. I can well understand why our friend would be pleased with such a policy. No; I have no intention of neglecting the national administration's domestic policies in this campaign. They are much too closely associated with the everyday life of all classes of our citizens to be ignored. For instance, consider the Unemployment Compensation Commission. I am not only for it but I am for extending its benefits. It was a social reform absolutely in the right direction but, again, I must file a protest when it has become so plainly evident that Washington must be the unchallenged depositary and administrator of this tremendous fund.

In New Jersey alone the fund exceeds $300,000,000. The workers of this State have contributed to that amount over $100,000,000; more than a third. Surely, New Jersey is very interested in the disposition of this fund, that it is not distributed to less enterprising sections. Remember, labor in only four other States contributes to it.

One cannot make a turn today without running afoul of some Federal policy regulating our very existence. I shall discuss all our State problems and propose to refer to several today, but in the meantime you can be assured the Washington merry-go-round will receive proper attention.

Of course, a successful termination of the war transcends all other responsibilities. Our victory in the war must be the beginning and not the end of what we are fighting for.

The inspiring reports from all war centers have thrilled America and her allies, and we pledge every resource in our power to cooperate, praying for a speedy and all-victorious conclusion.

I want to take this occasion to present to this convention and to the public my convictions as to various State and national issues; and, in view of the fact that upon this program, as it were, I will present my case to the electorate of New Jersey, in the interest of accuracy I will read to you the planks upon which this appeal will be made.

May I highly commend the Republican Members of the United States Senate and Representatives for their vigilant services in opposing policies of the national Democratic administration directed toward further centralized and bureaucratic regimentation of home-front activities.

May I also express my deep personal appreciation of the unselfish services of the retiring chairman of the State committee, H. Alexander Smith. He has administered this difficult responsibility with great zeal and tact, and we express complete confidence in his most exacting duties as our national committeeman.

Also, may I congratulate the State committee on its unanimous selection of Lloyd B. Marsh and Mr. Smith's successor. Mr. Marsh, as my personal campaign manager, has been indefatigable in his highly successful efforts to unify and unite the Republican Party and has inspired its membership with complete confidence in a glorious victory.

The recent conference of Republican leaders at Mackinac was most heartening. The unity of action on the outstanding issues of national and international responsibility, together with the clear exposé of Washington's bungling domestic bureaucracy, serves as a rallying message to Republicans everywhere.

THE WAR FRONT

I repeat, our first obligation is to win the war—quickly and decisively.

For this purpose we place every resource of money, materials, and manpower at the disposal of the President, the Congress, and the men of our armed forces.

THE HOME FRONT

We pledge the same full support to the home front that we pledge to the war front and will work toward the end that much of the uncertainty, capriciousness, and mismanagement of domestic affairs during the past 2 years may be eliminated.

The fantastic operations of the O. P. A. and Manpower Commission have been especially detrimental to our people and to the war effort. It must not be allowed to continue. The multiplicity of directives, questionnaires, regulations, inspections, audits, and investigations emanating from Washington have been as damaging to production as absenteeism, and must be systematized, simplified, and reduced.

Disruptive controversies among those in high Federal positions that so continuously impede the war effort reflect upon the qualities of responsible officers. We are opposed to successive terms that entrench bureaucratic cliques in key positions of influence and make them responsive only to their own ambitions.

The constant effort to identify wartime restrictions with social reform and weld the control devices of the emergency into a "new order" for America must be stopped now. It is our duty to warn New Deal cohorts and spendthrifts that we do not intend to allow the establishment in our country of totalitarian principles which we are fighting to destroy in other lands, and that we are not to be silenced by smearing, intimidation, and threat. We will support to the utmost the men of our fighting forces, but as to government—we know the kind we want and we intend to speak for it at all times and fight for it when necessary.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

The right of the State to function as a sovereignty must be restored. The systematic destruction of the sovereignty of our State, which has patterned almost every major act of the present administration both before and since the war, is the greatest threat to American democracy since the eighteenth century. It is far more than a redistribution of authority as between the States and the National Government. It means the ultimate abandonment of private enterprise, the disruption of organized labor, the abolition of local education, and the elimination of fundamental democratic controls.

This issue affects the lives of every one of us. It affects the pocketbooks of every one of us. It raises the question as to whether the citizens of the American States are to govern or be governed.

Under a long series of catchwords, such as "economic planning," "new nationalism," "socialized industry," "consumption economy," and "public investment programs," the present administration has issued Executive order after Executive order, each one trespassing on the rights of the sovereign States.

These are the great lessons in unpopular government and we pledge every effort to make New Jersey self-sufficient in her own responsibilities and vocal in the fight for a return to American federalism.

THE POST-WAR FRONT

The next 3 years will be a period of war and, we devoutly hope, post-war adjustment;

and at no time in our history has there been more need for enterprise, judgment, and understanding. We must not fail to satisfy the three essential conditions of our way of life: Full employment, a protected standard of living, and effective social security.

In meeting these tremendous responsibilities we solemnly pledge our every effort to assure that during the post-war period:

There shall be a steady and unbroken transition to peacetime occupations, employment at decent wages, and work in each man's special skill or profession.

There shall be opportunities after the war for training every demobilized man and woman from our armed forces and for every civilian worker engaged now in war industry and in this connection we must be always mindful of the large numbers of young men and women too youthful to be in the armed services but who will shortly be ready to enter industrial life.

There shall be a sound and sensible program of public works and services sufficient to cushion a transition period of reemployment. This program will be built around highways, parkways, housing, potable and industrial water supply, health service, recreation centers and airports, and these works and services will be planned to add permanent and productive values to our State. Wherever possible or practicable, they should be developed through the employment of private capital.

Conversion of factories from wartime production to the turning out of peacetime commodities will, I am informed, require a period of from 6 to 12 months. The post-war program I have outlined is designed to provide useful temporary employment pending such conversion.

Every effective resource shall be directed toward the most modern methods of physical and mental rehabilitation of those who return home in need of such services.

We shall support adequate unemployment insurance, retirement plans, and, for those who meet economic misfortune, direct relief. But these can never replace full employment opportunities under our system of private enterprise, nor can they reward, even remotely, the tremendous services that our armies and workers are giving their country today.

We believe that those men and women who served in the armed forces of our country deserve the undying gratitude of a grateful America, and therefore advocate—

1. Adequate compensation for incapacitated service men and women and unstinting aid to the dependents of deceased service men and women by the Federal Government;

2. Physical rehabilitation of the disabled by the Federal Government in cooperation with State governments;

3. Economic rehabilitation of all veterans of the armed forces of America by the States with the assistance of the Federal Government, for the reason that only the States and their subdivisions fully know their own industrial and business needs and the actual economic opportunities available to citizens within their own borders, and can bring such economic rehabilitation close to the men and women defenders of American freedom.

These are our great objectives for the post-war period in New Jersey and we pledge every resource at our command to their complete fulfillment.

THE INTERNATIONAL FRONT

We believe that the United States will emerge from this war the most powerful and influential Nation in the world.

We believe that this great power and influence carries with it responsibilities that we cannot safely ignore and that, still more important, we cannot morally ignore.

American isolation from the rest of the world is ended forever. A new period of international cooperation is necessary to avert future world catastrophe.

New Jersey will, however, be affected by these developments. Trade agreements may influence employment; international exchange may affect wages; excessive post-war foreign commitments may increase Federal taxes.

We pledge ourselves to be ever watchful of these developments in the interests of security at home and a better world abroad.

LABOR AND BUSINESS

We confirm our long-established position that labor has an inalienable right to organize, to bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing, to strike lawfully in peacetime and to be free from administrative and judicial restraints that embarrass these rights.

We believe in free enterprise, which means that regulation by government should be restricted to the stimulation of production; to the maintenance of fair competitive relations; and to the protection of any group or groups from economic exploitation.

We believe in competition that accepts the profit motive as the most effective means to develop individual initiative; and in progressive compensation for progressive risk as the surest way to provide opportunities for a fuller national life.

We are opposed to monetary juggling that threatens to unbalance budgets, wage scales, and employment; to a public policy of underproduction that is incompatible with the working habits of America; and to the expenditures of public money on nonessentials.

The Republican Party joins with the rank and file of labor itself in condemning the recent excesses of some labor leaders who have callously disrupted war production and imperiled the safety of our armed forces. There is no right to strike in favor of our enemies, at any time or anywhere.

We are proud of New Jersey labor. Its great membership has always voted as it thought, never as it was told. No one can deliver the vote of any group of our citizens. As long as there are free elections in New Jersey, as provided by the Constitution, no one ever will. Labor, made up of free men and women, especially resents the effort to regiment it at the polls in the coming election.

AGRICULTURE

We promise every encouragement to the maximum production of agricultural products at a fair profit to the farmers.

We oppose the unnecessary interference in New Jersey's agricultural affairs by Washington bureaucracies, and approve the substitution therefor of the regional and State administration of farm problems.

We pledge full support to farmers' cooperative markets and to State policies encouraging the establishment of auction markets and city markets to the advantage of both farmers and consumers.

We promise vigorous action to relieve farm labor shortages and to release supplies, materials, and equipment to meet the full needs of the emergency.

We pledge the further extension and development of farm-to-market roads and airway landing strips at frequent intervals throughout our rural sections.

We will give the fullest support and encouragement to the State department of agriculture, the experiment station and extension division of Rutgers University, and particularly recommend improving and modernizing the facilities for scientific research.

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

We believe the constitution of our State should be modernized and liberalized to conform with present-day requirements and that it should be particularly revised by providing for (1) a more efficient judicial system; (2) a 4-year term for Governor, a strengthened veto power, and responsibility over administrative appointments; (3) biennial sessions of the legislature; (4) extension of the terms of senators and assemblymen; (5) a more readily available method for the submission of constitutional amendments at general elections without the expense of special elections; (6) such other necessary and timely adjustments that will make the constitution conform with present-day requirements.

In the matter of reorganization of State departments, I can speak from experience. My election as Governor in 1916 followed the creation of the economy and efficiency commission. This commission proposed the elimination of some thirty-odd boards, bureaus, and commissions and their consolidation into five or six major departments. This program was successfully accomplished through legislative enactment. I proposed to carefully review the present admitted overlapping responsibilities with the same definite determination.

Revising or changing the constitution rests solely in the hands of the voters. This is the one activity of government wherein the people rule directly and not through their representatives. The only question to be decided now is one of method.

At the general election to be held in November a referendum will appear on the ballot, which will give the people the opportunity to indicate whether or not they wish the 1944 legislature to prepare a revised constitution and submit it, for the people's approval or disapproval, as a whole at the general election of 1944.

The opportunity for this expression of the people's will was made possible solely by the votes of the Republican members of the legislature.

As I have frequently publicly stated, I will vote "yes" on the referendum and personally hope the people of the State vote likewise.

RAILROAD TAXATION

The income from railroad taxation is vital to the support of government in New Jersey. The old railroad tax structure, however, produced more litigation than revenue.

After a study of the problem by a citizens' group, including a representative of labor appointed by the Governor and by a joint legislative committee, a solution was enacted based on the then existing economic status of the railroads and the State's need for revenue from this source. Immediately upon its enactment, the new tax formula began to yield for the State millions of dollars more in tax revenues than were ever levied and collected under the old law.

The compromise of the tax arrears due under the old law did not reduce the principal, but interest penalties were forgiven. The constitutionality of the compromise legislation is now pending before our Court of Errors and Appeals, and no further action would be constructively effective until a final decision by this court.

If this legislation is held unconstitutional we propose to use every means at the State's disposal to collect every dollar to which the State is legally entitled.

However, in the period since this legislation was passed, the financial condition of the railroads has been greatly improved and the State is now collecting from them greater revenues than ever before. When the court finally clarifies the situation, we propose to re-examine the whole problem as it then presents itself and to determine whether, in the light of the improved financial status of the railroads, the State is receiving the maximum justifiable tax yield from this source.

In any event, we pledge ourselves to treat the railroads as the State should treat any and all other taxpayers. I will meet and solve this problem in a business-like—not a demagogic manner.

EDUCATION

We will make education a major factor in post-war rehabilitation and development.

We want the benefits of education to reach every educational need; and to this end we favor broadened courses of study, more flexible standards of admission to high schools and colleges, and closer correlation between preparation and job opportunity.

We favor equalized educational programs for every child in New Jersey, and pledge a re-examination of the amount and distribution of State school aid to the end that a sound foundation school program is available in every school district.

We endorse the principle of teachers' tenure; pledge the maintenance of the teachers' pension and annuity fund on a sound actuarial basis as it was originally placed by a Republican legislature and Governor Edge.

INDUSTRIAL AND POTABLE WATER

The necessity of increased industrial and potable water supplies has become an acute problem in the northern section of the State.

A plentiful supply of potable and industrial-use water is indispensable. The continued expansion of the State, residentially and industrially, is dependent upon the solution of this complex and troublesome problem.

The solution must not only serve the needs of the State but must treat equitably the public and private rights of our municipalities and citizens owning property and residing in areas in which water supplies are available.

Exhaustive investigations to ascertain available supplies have been made and numerous reports and recommendations submitted.

We feel all necessary information has been obtained, and a final, definite policy should be speedily determined.

The Republican Party pledges the preparation and completion of such a constructive program.

AERONAUTICS

The progress of aviation during the war has demonstrated that airports in the future will be as necessary as railroad stations. New Jersey is so located geographically that with proper development its airports will be the terminus of great passenger and freight lines.

These airports should be built not only as a means of finding employment but as a step in the industrial progress of the State.

THE STATE CIVIL SERVICE

The Republican Party believes the spirit and principle underlying the merit system in public employment should be the sole guide in the administration of the civil-service law. We believe that the persons selected to administer the civil-service law should be appointed solely on the basis of qualification and character, without regard to political considerations.

We condemn the circumvention of the established seniority rights of faithful public employees by pretended departmental reorganizations.

We particularly condemn the countenance or encouragement of strikes against governmental agencies on the part of public employees, maintaining that grievances can and should be adjusted by a properly administered Civil Service Commission. In all civil-service xaminations veterans should have preference.

HOUSING

I believe that no citizen of this State should lack adequate, safe, and sanitary housing. Large areas of our cities must be replanned and rebuilt, and such housing brought within the purchasing power of the lowest-income group.

We propose that all public housing projects in New Jersey shall be subject to State and municipal guidance and supervision, as contrasted with past Federal domination of local housing authorities, and that as far as practicable they should be self-liquidating.

MUNICIPALITIES

The Republican Party believes in the principle and practice of home rule to determine local policies which will best fit local ways of living.

We are opposed to mandatory charges upon local government which are not justified by a public interest of State-wide character.

We shall protect the credit position of all New Jersey municipalities through safeguarding our cash-basis laws.

We pledge every effort toward strengthening local government as the home ground of democracy and as the basis for all popular government.

PENSION AND RETIREMENT FUNDS

The Republican Party's long interest in pension and retirement systems is well known. We established the State teachers' pension and annuity fund and laid the ground work for the State employees' retirement fund.

These two funds have been sound since their establishment and remain sound today. As the next Governor of New Jersey I shall see that they remain so.

Our municipal pension and retirement funds have not, unfortunately, enjoyed the same stability as our State funds. Several comprehensive studies have been made of this situation and proposed remedies have been before the State for many years.

The fact still remains, however, that our local pension and retirement funds are not on a sound actuarial basis and that the future economic security of many faithful public employees is no better protected than the exigencies of annual appropriations will permit.

As Governor, I pledge my best efforts to remedy this situation, in the interests of both our county and municipal employees and the efficiency of our local governments.

FINANCE

The Republican Party is fully aware of the great fiscal pressures that will arise with the post-war period.

We are likewise aware of the staggering Federal taxes that are a necessary part of the war effort and that will doubtless continue beyond the emergency.

We believe that additional taxes at the State level will be an impossible burden;

We pledge, therefore, the following fiscal policies:

A constructive application of such funds as Congress may make available to the State for post-war development.

The systematic encouragement of private enterprise to use its capital in post-war projects as part of the State reemployment program.

The strictest economy and efficiency in State administrative services, and the more adequate control of State appropriations and State expenditures.

SOCIAL SERVICES

New Jersey has always been zealous in its care and attention to its unfortunate residents and citizens.

The board of charities and correction, now known as the department of institutions and agencies, which was created on a nonpartisan and nonsalary basis during my former term, has performed a fine service and is meeting this grave responsibility in an intelligent, constructive manner.

Likewise, the relief agencies of the State have met this difficult duty in a masterly way.

The Republican Party believes that all welfare and social services should be more closely coordinated.

It further believes that provision for rehabilitation, vocational training and retraining, employment services and all special services which may be established to assist our returning service men and women should, as far as practical, be centered in local welfare departments under State supervision and guidance.

We favor wider coverage under the unemployment compensation law, to reduce the number receiving relief while temporarily unemployed, and the extension of unemployment benefits to provide compensation for unemployment caused by illness.

We favor the timulation of local health centers, including general hospitals, convalescent areas, and group health clinics; and will promote experimentation in the field of State health insurance.

We are opposed to the federalization of unemployment compensation funds as detrimental to the interests of the employers and employees of New Jersey. We favor, on the contrary, each State's custody of its own trust fund under Federal supervision and audit.

Under stress of wartime tensions, the problem of juvenile delinquency, particularly in our larger war-production areas, has increased. Because of its significance in the development of adult criminality, this is a problem which should be met by vigorous and cooperative action on the part of all individual agencies and organizations concerned with the training and guidance of children. We favor the creation of broad preventive programs on a municipal and county level and pledge the utmost cooperation of State welfare and correctional agencies in the formation and coordination of such efforts.

The Republican Party feels that these needed social changes can be brought about within available financial resources, and are a necessary and vital part of the post-war program.

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

The Republican Party is aware of the tremendous part women are playing in the war effort; the part that they will occupy in the economy of the post-war period; and the part they will take in the public life of the State and Nation. We favor this movement of women into places of responsibility and influence and will provide ways and means of maintaining these opportunities.

MINORITY GROUPS

A world at war has brought home once again the aggravated problems of minority groups. Where force is dominant, where prejudices are armed and powerful; where power is in the hands of those who identify it with their own superiority; then race, creed, and color are too easily made the basis for discrimination and even atrocity.

Never before has it been so important that we guard against this terrible force. Never before has it been so vital to our unity that we make tolerance, understanding, and equality of opportunity the basis for every public policy. America has been built on these concepts, and America can only survive by holding fast to these concepts.

The Republican Party was founded on such principles, and the Republican Party will always maintain them.

I realize this constitutes a very heavy and extensive program. So did the pledges made when I was a candidate for Governor during World War No. 1, but the record shows we carried them through.

In conclusion, may I reemphasize my determination to wage this contest on a high plane, to fearlessly discuss issues, problems, and their possible solution. I refuse to adopt any other policy and will not be swerved from that determination. The unity of our party as compared to our opposition is an inspiration to your nominee and with your loyal cooperation victory is assured.

Will the American People Be Able To Recapture the Liberties Which They Have Surrendered During the War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAL HOLMES

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Judge N. K. Buck, of the Superior Court of the State of Washington before the Spokane Chamber of Commerce on July 7, 1943.

Judge Buck is an outstanding lawyer and jurist of the State of Washington.

WINNING ON BOTH FRONTS

I was a small boy in Lewiston, Idaho; and my father had a team and wagon. What he needed them for I don't know, but he had them, and I liked to handle them. There was one of our neighbors who wanted to move some household furniture and my father offered the services of myself and the team. That suited me just fine because there was nothing I liked better than driving, unless it was riding horseback, and that goes to this day, and is true of any man or boy who learns to love horses. There is no greater exhilaration than that which comes from the feel of the reins drawn over the backs of a good team of horses. No wonder, then, that I was elated to find myself in charge of such an outfit with its accompanying responsibilities.

A neighbor went with me, a boy slightly older than myself, but I drove. I got into the yard but then I faced the job of getting the wagon backed up to the door, and there was a barn, a chicken house, a wood pile, and various other obstacles. All at once I found myself bewildered; I didn't know how to back the wagon around to the necessary position. The older boy saw his opportunity and suggested that he take the lines long enough to get into position. I consented, and right there made one of the many mistakes of my life. He took the lines but refused to give them back and I have never been more mortified than to thus find myself done out of that proud position of driver.

How did I get myself into that unfortunate situation? Why couldn't I recover that which I had lost? Because I had voluntarily surrendered my rights and I didn't have the two-thirds majority necessary to get them back.

And that's just where the American people find themselves today. They have surrendered the reins of government because they have been told that they are incapable of defending themselves in time of attack. The question is, Will they ever get back that which they have lost?

We are winning the war against Hitler; we will win against Hirohito; there isn't a doubt as to the outcome of this conflict, but what is it costing us? It seems almost treason to ask that question because we are importuned to forget the cost and to bend every effort toward winning. Good advice, but there is a limit beyond which the American people cannot go if they are to win something more than a shadow of victory.

Of what avail will it be to win against Hitler if we lose against Hitlerism? In our war against Hitler we have valiant allies without whom the outcome would be more than doubtful. Russia, China, Britain, and America are standing shoulder to shoulder to rid this world of the brand of dictatorship represented by Germany and Japan, and it is in part due to such aid that we are so confident of the outcome.

But as against Hitlerism, we can have no allies; the battle for freedom on the home front must be won by every people unaided by any other, because the very nature of freedom is such that they who hold it only with the assistance of others do not have it at all. And so I say that it will avail the American people nothing if they win against Hitler in Europe and lose against dictatorship in America.

Is there any foundation for such fears? Is this the time to express them?

I was in Hollywood some months ago and there learned something that sent a chill down my spinal column. I learned that not a line of script can go onto the screen, not a sentence can be spoken; the young hero cannot tell the heroine he loves her unless the words are first submitted to and approved by a United States bureau chief.

If one wants to know how far the American newspapers and magazines have been put under control, let him read how tough is the American censorship in the April Harpers. Twice during the last year direct quotations from justices of the Supreme Court have been deleted from articles prepared by American correspondents. Permission to publish them was refused. Gentlemen, the bureau censor did not want th world to know what the United States Supreme Court justices said to the American people.

Unless something is done to stop this tidal wave, it will not be long before there will be stationed in the office of the Spokesman-Review, the Chronicle and in every weekly newspaper office in this broad land of ours a Government censor who will blue-pencil articles of news which the editor thinks should be given to his readers. That censorship will not be negative only; it will tell the owner what he is to print as well as what he is not to print. That censorship will suppress free expression of editorial opinion, and will require that views be expressed in conformity to what the Government wants the people to think.

A few weeks ago your own Dr. Warren of Whitworth College came to Yakima and I heard him give his experiences covering a period of several years while he was a missionary in Japan. That was some years ago but even then the war spirit was growing in that island kingdom. Dr. Warren said, "I asked the people over there whom I met, 'Why do you want to go to war with America?' The reply was, 'We don't want to go to war; we don't want to fight America but America is getting ready to fight us, and we must be ready; we must strike first. We know that is true because every newspaper says so, every radio broadcast.'" In Japan every means of communication is under strict control of the government; the people hear what the officials want them to hear and nothing more.

But, gentlemen, even in such an autocracy as Japan, the powers that be do not dare to altogether flout the will of the people; they know that in order to fight any kind of war they must educate the people to the point of hating an imaginary foe; and they know that by control of sources of information and of opinion, they can bend the people to their own will. We are now at war in the Pacific because the press and radio of Japan have been government controlled for many years.

This is the danger which is facing the American people today. Is it a danger which can and should be avoided?

Ours is a constitutional form of government, and the way to test any policy and any alleged usurpation of government is to compare what is being done with the provisions of the supreme law of the land. If the Constitution says certain things can be done, then they can be done without violence to the rights of the people; if the Constitution does not expressly provide for such authority, then its exercise is clear violation of the law; and he who perpetrates such action is a public enemy.

What does the Constitution say about freedom of speech and of the press; that Congress shall make no law cutting off freedom of speech and of the press? No; not that; it says Congress shall make no law abridging such freedom.

What does abridge mean? It doesn't mean eliminate, abolish, or to do away with. It means such freedom shall not be curtailed in the slightest; it must not be foreshortened; the corners must not be trimmed; such freedom must not, under the Constitution, be abridged; and when Congress permits and authorizes such abridgment then Congressmen are not true to their oaths of office.

Is there anything else that makes me fear we are losing the war against Hitlerism? Yes; many things.

Look again at the Constitution; and I do not apologize for urging that the Constitution be carefully and continually read, because unless the American way of life is safeguarded by the American Constitution, then it is not safeguarded at all. The Constitution is the bible of liberty and freedom, and just as the Bible must be continually referred to by those who would live within its precepts, so must the fundamental law of the land be continuously rehearsed by those who would resist any encroachment upon the liberties of the people.

When Moses gave out the Ten Commandments he told his followers to teach the law to their children, and to write it upon the foreheads of the people; in other words, to get the law into the skulls of those who are most concerned with it.

So we must get the Constitution into our minds and keep it continually before us if we hope to defeat Hitlerism.

In the light of such necessity, ask yourself whether there is authority under which Congress can tell you how much rent you can charge for your house or building; under what constitutional provision is Congress given authority to require you to ask permission before you can raise the wages or salary of an employee? Where is there authority for limiting what a man may receive for his services?

About a year ago I heard it announced that a new policy would soon be adopted, and that if a man were found more useful in milking cows than in doing something else, he would be compelled to milk cows for the duration. To say I was shocked and skeptical would be to put it mildly; but that time has now arrived.

Yet 80 years ago another war was going on in this country, and out of that war came the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, and that provides that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude except as punishment for crime shall exist within the United States.

What is milking cows to a man who would prefer to be a carpenter? It is involuntary servitude, nothing less; and the inauguration of such a program is just as much a violation of the thirteenth amendment as it would be if Congress replaced the shackles on the colored people of the South.

But these are wartimes, we are told; the country is facing an emergency, and emergency powers must be called into play to save our Government. One should, of course, respectfully listen to such comment, but the speaker should be reminded that there isn't a line in the fundamental law of the land granting any more power to Congress or the Chief Executive in wartime than in the time of peace. Those who excuse what is going on upon the ground of emergency powers are either totally ignorant or are attempting to cover up the real issue.

The Constitution is not a difficult document to understand; its language is clear and simple, and therein lies its greatness. Any man who can read can understand what

it says. In order to understand it, however, one should keep in mind what happened during the time it was being considered for ratification by the people.

Before they would consent to adopt the Constitution the people insisted that certain things be ironed out; and so they compelled the submission of what is known as the Bill of Rights as amendments, and those amendments were adopted soon after the Constitution itself was ratified; and without those rights being insured, the Constitution would never have received approval. Keep that in mind when considering this matter.

One of the things upon which the people insisted when they demanded amendments was a limitation upon the right of Congress to pass laws upon certain subjects. So this is what was approved and it is a part of the Constitution, one of the most important parts—perhaps the most important clause in that instrument:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Nothing could be simpler, nor more effective so far as language can protect the people from dictatorship. Unless you can place your finger upon the direct authority in the Constitution, there is no such authority given to Congress. It's just that simple; when in doubt as to any Federal law, look for the express authority to pass it, and if such authority cannot be found, the law is unconstitutional.

But again we are told the Government is facing extinction; the people are facing slavery, and if we are to defeat the foes of free government we must not quibble over the fine points of personal liberty; we must ignore the Constitution for the present in the interest of victory, after which we will return to the government of our fathers.

There are three things wrong with that statement. In the first place, it assumes that a democracy is incapable of self-preservation; that it cannot win a war against totalitarianism. With that I will not agree; if it be so, then free government is but a snare and a delusion, and Hitler is right in his concept of the relative places of people and state.

In the second place, if that theory is accepted then America has already lost the battle against Hitlerism; for there has never been an instance in recorded history in which a government usurped authority and ever returned it to the people short of a revolution. Whatever rights are taken away from the people in the name of liberty are lost forever.

In the third place, I refuse to admit that the Constitution is weak in not providing for every emergency. There is not and cannot be a single emergency which justifies violation of constitutional provisions.

In order to set myself right I want to make it plain here and now that I am as all out for victory as any man can be; and I realize that to make that victory certain there must be a unification of authority to an extent never before dreamed of. Personal rights must give way to a national emergency.

I believe Congress and the President should be given all the authority they are now exercising, and more besides; the difference being that such authority should be conferred as provided in the Constitution itself.

How can that be brought about? By amendment. When I suggest that to some people they are shocked beyond telling. They say we must not put such things in the Constitution because then they would be permanent; we must let the President exercise unauthorized power, and then he will return it after the war.

But I am not willing to risk our liberties upon any such uncertainty. I would lawfully place whatever authority is necessary in hands that are capable of exercising it, and then I would lawfully take the power away when the emergency is over, thereby leaving nothing to the whim of any man or group.

How can the Constitution be amended to provide for any such crisis as that through which we are now passing? Let me word such an amendment for you.

"Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution to the contrary, Congress may by joint resolution, supported by a two-thirds majority of both Houses, bestow upon the President such power and authority as may be necessary to insure the defense of the Government or to meet any national emergency, such authority and power to be strictly limited to such period as may be fixed by such resolution, not to exceed 2 years from the date of passage; and such authority may be revoked at any time by a joint resolution supported by a majority of the Members of both Houses. The power of revocation herein granted shall extend to such extraordinary power and authority heretofore granted as Congress may by majority vote indicate."

What would be the result of that amendment?

No. 1 effect would be that all authority anybody could ask could be given to the President or to a war commission. Such authority would be limited in time not to exceed 2 years, and then would be automatically canceled unless renewed. Such authority could be taken away any time by a bare majority. In other words, it would take a two-thirds majority to take away even temporarily the rights of the people, but such rights could be restored by a mere majority.

That would result in putting our Government for the time being on the same basis as that of Britain, that is, a parliamentary system; but it would at the same time insure the advantages of our own constitutional Government.

But another objection is that we can't stop to amend the Constitution. It is said it would take years to put through an amendment. That is an argument put forward either in ignorance or in an attempt to confuse the issue.

Our Constitution could be amended in 30 days. Let's take a look at what the instrument, itself, says about amendments. An amendment may be proposed by a two-thirds majority of Congress, no approval by the President is necessary. It may be ratified by three-fourths of the States either through legislatures or by conventions as may be decided by Congress. If Congress were to see the matter in its true light a simple amendment could be proposed in a week's time, conventions could be called in 2 weeks' time, and the trick would be turned.

To summarize: there is an admitted need for enlarged powers to be given to the Chief Executive, there is provision in the Constitution under which such change could be brought about, and it should be done the constitutional way rather than by tearing our fundamental law to shreds.

The people are surrendering their reins of government; if they ever expect to take those reins again into their own hands, they would do well to move quickly.

Economy Not an Increase in Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President's demand for $10,560,000,000 in new additional tax money brings the suggestion that too long Congress has waited to force the administration to quit wasting the taxpayers' money.

That it is being wasted almost everyone back home knows, for they see the evidence all around them. From the Democratic South comes the Mobile Press Register and, under date of September 18, gives us an editorial entitled "Waste in Federal Spending at Home Causes a New Flare-Up in Congress." That editorial is as follows:

Dispatches from Washington a few days ago stated that Congress soon may be asked to increase the national debt limit to $300,000,000,000. Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, commented that the current rate of Government spending—which he estimated at between seven and eight billion dollars a month—is approaching the present statutory debt limit of $210,000,000,000.

This picture of the Nation's fiscal situation becomes a powerful argument for Government economy in nonessential expenditures. Two or three days before Chairman CANNON's remarks, another member of the House Appropriations Committee—Representative JONES, of Ohio—had quite a lot to say on the floor about the need for "a commando raid on the wasters in the Federal Government."

Mr. JONES suggested an appropriation of $20,000,000 for the balance of this fiscal year to better equip the Office of Comptroller General Warren to supply Congress with reports and recommendations by which both manpower and money might be saved.

"The people," remarked the Congressman from Ohio, "are quite satisfied with the progress at the fighting fronts, but they are miserably disappointed with the conduct of the war on the home front. * * *

"We must admit that we have not begun to start to commence to cut waste of manpower and money on the home front; even if we have the will to do it, we do not have the manpower in Congress to get the job done properly. Since we are in war I am quite willing to use the facilities of the General Accounting Office, the agent of the institution of Congress, and I think their manpower ought to be available to any Member of Congress who wants to put his shoulder to the wheel to attack this waste on the home front."

If he had not already received it, Representative JONES evidently heard an earful from the folks at home during the grassroots vacation which Congress recently ended, for he told his colleagues that "the American people are expecting and depending upon the Congress" to eliminate waste and duplication of effort.

He argued that the $20,000,000 appropriation he proposed, together with a bill he has prepared to broaden the duties of the Comptroller General's office, would be "an effective step in the right direction to arm us with the manpower, facts, and original data for a commando raid on the wasters in the Federal Government."

Mr. JONES described $20,000,000 as "a parsimonious sum when compared with the enormous expenditures of the executive department for research in the political-science and social field." So far as we have seen or heard, nobody—not even a bureaucrat—has challenged that statement.

We do not know how much economy might be effected by Congress through appropriating $20,000,000 to increase the facilities and functions of the Comptroller General's office, but if it led to a real, effective curb on unnecessary and wasteful expenditures in domestic operations of the Federal Government, it would be a good investment.

The morning papers here in Washington tell us that the President's demand has caused a new flare-up in Congress. Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, says that some of the suggested increases in excise taxes are utterly indefensible. These flare-ups in Congress are becoming an old story and so far they have all died out, not only before any fire was really built under the administration but before even a smoke was discernible.

Congressmen did, as suggested in this editorial, get an earful when they were home during the recent recess. Congressmen at that time were told in no uncertain terms some of the things which they should do. They came back to Washington filled with fire and fight but Congress itself folded up like a punctured paper bag and is now back in the old rut, letting the spenders and the planners waste the people's tax money, continue with their plans for the remaking of America and the feeding of the world, regardless of either our constitutional provisions or our ability to pay.

Comments on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, many people in America are perturbed about the apparent collaboration between the United States and discredited Fascist elements in Italy and in Europe generally. Many sincere people are concerned as to what are the real aims of our Government in connection with the war. Do we really favor truly democratic policy for the occupied countries of Europe? The Soviet Union is very suspicious of the A. M. G.—Allied Military Government—set-up by the British and the United States, which follows our conquering armies to take over civilian administration. What is the scope and function of the A. M. G.? Is it a purely temporary agency, or is it instituted for the purpose of imposing long-range influence over the areas taken from the German armies? What assurance have we that Russia agrees with our program? Is the A. M. G. actuated by democratic philosophies or is it intertied with imperialistic planning?

One of America's great newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, printed in its September 24 issue an impressive and provocative editorial in this connection, which speaks for itself. Here it is:

MOSCOW TALKS DEMOCRACY

In a dispatch remarkable for its astonishing implications, David M. Nichol, Moscow correspondent of the Post-Dispatch and Chicago Daily News, sets forth Soviet opinion on American and British policy in occupied countries. The most astonishing and disturbing implication is that the Soviet Government favors a more democratic policy toward these countries than the United States or Britain.

There are many question marks in Soviet circles, as well as in this country, concerning A. M. G. (Allied Military Government), set up by the British and ourselves to follow the conquering armies and take over civil administration. In the first place, is A. M. G. a purely temporary instrument or is it designed to exercise long-range influence over the future of the areas taken from the German armies? Are its functions for the military purpose of keeping order until popular elections can be held, or for the political and imperialistic purpose of directing the course of European events for several years to come?

These questions might well arise from a natural suspicion, from a certain Russian jealousy over the spheres of European domination after the war. But the Soviet magazine, War and the Working Classes, explains its point of view in this way: "Restoration is the affair of the people themselves. A program can only be determined by their sovereign will for defense of which the United Nations took up the sword."

Here is a mouthpiece of Stalin actually talking good democratic doctrine—a doctrine implicit in the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms to say nothing of a doctrine implicit in 700 years of British freedom and 167 years of our own. While our own State Department plays around with European Fascists, reactionaries, and unemployed monarchs the principle of self-determination is trumpeted from Moscow.

The Soviet Government's main war aim is to crush fascism in Europe and, in order to do this, it feels that not only should the "master criminals" be punished, but that retribution must be visited upon the "brutal underlings"—the Gauleiters, the Gestapo, and the administrative forces of nazi-ism, and their equivalents in Italy. That assumedly is our policy, too. Why, then, comes the ringing question from Moscow, does A. M. G. with its authority complete and unquestioned, keep subsidiary Fascist officials at their posts, as it is doing in Sicily? Is A. M. G. not backed by the Allied armies' might?

Moscow feels further that A. M. G. aims are too closely linked with "security for Anglo-Saxon banking, industrial, and trade circles." "If this charge is true," writes Mr. Nichol, "if political problems will be subordinated to the preservation of the property values of the Nazi occupation period—it is not difficult to see an affinity between such ideas and those, for example, of the frightened industrialists who backed the Vichy Government in France and collaborated with Hitler rather than see France reborn."

Is this not the deadliest of comparisons? Here we are, in what has been called a people's war, yet we are suspected—as conquerors—of having so tender a concern for property, while millions of men are shedding their blood, as to deal with the minor architects of the war. It is a Moscow view, true, yet it brings up a question that should be answered in the most forthright way by President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull. Even the suspicion that we are befouling our war aims should be promptly and categorically denied, if it is not true.

Of course, we Americans and British may well suspect that Russian policy toward Europe has ambitious motives, despite all the assertions that the Soviets have no interest in the post-war set-up so long as fascism is destroyed and so long as the peoples of the various countries are allowed to elect their own governments in a democratic way. It may well be that Moscow wants to make them her next of kin economically, socially, diplomatically, establishing over them a hegemony almost as tangible as actual incorporation in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

It might be said parenthetically here that the best way to keep people from wanting Soviet domination or protection is to prove by word and deed that we wish to extend to them our own democracy. Our foreign policy, however, has so far failed to capitalize and dramatize democratic principles in Europe.

On the authority of what he calls competent observers, Mr. Nichol says there is a conviction that Moscow has no desire to bolshevize Europe. He says that such a charge is one of Goebbels' most telling inventions. Russia, to be sure, has territorial ambitions. She wants the borders that existed before the Hitler attack, including Bessarabia, White Russia, the western Ukraine, and the Baltic republics. This is a question of Russian security. She may want parts of Bulgaria and Finland.

Beyond this, Soviet policy, according to Mr. Nichol, seems to be that the Moscow government does not care particularly what types of governments arise so long as they are free expressions of free people, undominated by Fascist elements and unhostile to Moscow. To this, the Post-Dispatch would like to add that it learns on very high authority that Stalin definitely does not want a bolshevist Germany after the war. This is because he fears that, once Germany turned Communist, the old pan-Germanic elements in Germany would try, as did Trotzky, to start a world-wide Communist movement that might reduce Stalin's stature and perhaps threaten his position. He fears that the dynamism of the German people, which made nazi-ism a world menace, would function with even greater intensity if given the vehicle of Marxian doctrine.

In any case, regardless of sincerity of motives, what ghastly confusion it must be for the conquered peoples of Europe to find Soviet Russia preaching the democratic doctrine of self-determination, and then to turn around and find the United States and Britain, with their historic tradition of freedom, flirting with the Darlans, Peyroutons, Badoglios, little kings, and the ragtag and bobtail "brutal underlings." This ironic spectacle must strike them with wonder and dismay.

Legislation for Post-War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Maj. A. L. BULWINKLE from Air Transport for September 1943:

LEGISLATION FOR POST-WAR—LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW TO PERMIT SOUND PLANNING SO THAT CIVIL AVIATION MAY MOVE FORWARD RAPIDLY AND GIVE WIDESPREAD EMPLOYMENT TO OUR RETURNING SOLDIERS

(By Maj. A. L. BULWINKLE)

The development of air transportation in years past has required the combined efforts of government and industry. Neither, alone, could have made America's civil air transport system the greatest in the world. Together, they have veritably wrought wonders.

But we are determined that however proud our past achievements, they will be far surpassed by those of the future. With that aim, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives has spent the greater part of its time during the present session in work on a bill, introduced by our chairman, the Honorable CLARENCE LEA, of California, to revise our civil-aviation legislation so as to be prepared for the post-war period of growth.

No discussion of civil-aviation legislation can be complete without acknowledgment of Mr. LEA's leadership in constructive legislation for air transportation. During his 26 years of unbroken service in Congress he has been unfaltering in his devotion to the cause of assuring for America the full benefits of this new means of transportation.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN LEA

At the close of the First World War he participated in an exhaustive investigation of the part played by our air service in that conflict. The report he then wrote is still regarded as one of the greatest expositions of the practical problems and accomplishments of a fighting air force ever written. And it closed with a stirring call for energetic development by America of a civil-aviation industry as one of the surest guaranties of preparedness and as a means for adding greatly to the welfare and prosperity of a peacetime America.

Nor did he stop with prophecy and exhortation. He immediately set to work for proper legislation. His efforts were at last rewarded in the Air Commerce Act of 1926, in the framing of which he was largely instrumental. That act has stood the test of time. With but little substantive amendment it remains today, as incorporated in our Civil Aeronautics Act, the basic framework for our Government's promotion of civil aviation and regulation of air safety.

Again in 1935 he set to work for further legislation, this time to add to the law a charter of economic stability for air-transport enterprise. And with great pains and infinite patience he pursued the objective, often in the face of apathy and even hostility, until success again crowned his efforts with the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. With that act civil air transportation was given full recognition as an essential adjunct of the national defense, and its development and economic stability became a confirmed objective of our Government policy.

Now that air transportation has demonstrated by actual accomplishment its inestimable value to our Nation at war and offers such rich promise for advancing our trade and commerce in the days to come, Mr. LEA has again brought forward a legislative proposal to strengthen America's civil air arm. Once again, looking forward to the need for the steady, sound growth of air transportation, he has presented a statesmanlike measure for suiting the laws of the land to the needs of a new industry, that it may be further fostered as the public interest requires

FOR CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION

In the committee's work, under Mr. LEA's leadership, to present to the House the best possible legislation, there has been manifest a genuine concern by both parties for aviation's future welfare. The great problems involved in aviation's development do not present party issues. Both parties are striving together conscientiously to frame the most constructive measure. And the senior Republican member of the committee, the Honorable CHARLES WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, no less than Mr. LEA, has given unstintingly of his time and has contributed without limit of his extraordinary legal knowledge and ability in guiding our committee to wise decision.

The pending bill proposes a number of steps of particular importance to the future of air transportation. Each deals with a problem which is generally recognized to merit special treatment.

FEDERALIZATION NECESSARY

Foremost is the extension of Federal regulation so that it will cover air commerce for hire between points within a single State as well as between points in different States.

At first blush this proposal might seem to be an infringement upon States' rights. However, careful study of air transportation's problems will show that the proposal is a necessary means for most fully protecting the interests of the several States and for advancing the development of air transportation for the benefit of the whole country.

For more than 20 years there has been complete unanimity, among students of aviation, in the view that air transportation can develop as it should only under a legal framework which is uniform throughout the country. One of the groups which has given most disinterested study to the problem of aviation law is the Committee on Aeronautical Law of the American Bar Association. This committee has been active in the field ever since 1921. During a large part of that time the committee has assisted in drafting and seeking to encourage adoption of uniform State laws affecting aviation. However, after nearly 20 years' experience the committee came to the conclusion that the desired end could be satisfactorily achieved only through an all-embracing Federal regulatory law. The committee's reasons are convincingly set forth in its reports and in a very lucid communication which the committee sent to our committee.

CELESTIAL NAVIGATION REGULATED BY STATES?

The fact of the matter is that the House of Representatives came to the same conclusion in 1926 when it adopted the first air commerce bill. That bill, as adopted by the House, recognized that air commerce is a unit and does not regard State lines. While certain modifications were made in the scope of that bill as finally worked out in conference, every year's experience in the growth of air transportation since 1926 has confirmed the wisdom of the view taken by the House so long ago.

Air transportation is not like surface transport. It is not confined to a fixed roadbed, as in the case of rail transportation. It necessarily uses the entire air space as its highway, depending upon federally provided facilities as aids to navigation. In fact the day is coming when, even within the continental United States, much of air transportation will be navigated by facilities provided by the stars in the heavens.

Furthermore, the speed of air transportation is such as to place it in a category entirely different from surface transportation, and the profound technological developments during the present war will vastly accelerate the pace of our entire air commerce. It is a plain matter of physics and of engineering that the area of a State, in relation to air transportation, is hardly larger than the area of a county in relation to transportation by motor vehicle. There are many counties in this great Nation which could not be traversed by a motor truck in the time it takes a transport plane to cross even one of our larger States.

Moreover, the costs of air transportation are such that it would be economically impossible to seek to develop air transportation routes confined to points within a single State or confined to intrastate traffic. Consequently, even the most conventional view of the extent of Federal jurisdiction would require the application to all these routes of Federal regulation. To add to that regulation duplicating or conflicting State regulation for a portion of the traffic transported on the same airplanes and subject to the same costs would seriously burden the industry, and gravely impair needed coordination in the air-transport system, without accomplishing any compensating public good.

Therefore, to save the taxpayer's money, to avoid unnecessary red tape and multiplication of Government regulation, to promote a coordinated system bringing the benefits of air transportation to all parts of the Nation, inclusion of all air transportation within the scope of the single Federal regulatory act is essential.

ZONING IMPROVEMENT NEEDED

A second vital problem with which the proposed bill deals is that of airport zoning. The inquiries of the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents brought sharply into focus the grave need for assuring proper airport zoning. Years ago accidents in air transportation due to some mechanical failure in the aircraft or to some trick of the weather were predominant. However, with the industry's progress accidents of this nature have well-nigh disappeared. Today accidents in air transportation—fortunately very rare—are more likely to occur in connection with landing or taking off at the airport. And even where the accident itself does not consist of encountering some structure near the edge of the airport the presence of a structure may contribute to the accident through its psychological effect upon the pilot.

We all know that the safety of air transportation has within the span of 10 or 15 years made as much progress as has the safety of other forms of transportation in the course of 50 or 100 years. And those who have studied the problem carefully are confident that it is within our power to make air transportation just as safe as, if not safer than, older forms of transportation. But our power to assure this end must be exercised. And the most effective single step that we could take to hasten the day when air transportation becomes as safe as sitting in our own front yards, is to provide the legislative means necessary for clearing and protecting the approach paths to airports.

REGULATION OF OBSTRUCTIONS

The pending bill, in its present form, sets up machinery whereby the Federal power of condemnation will be made available to the local airports to assure the clearance and protection of the approach paths with proper compensation where property values are adversely affected. The bill contemplates a great Nation-wide program worked out in cooperation between the Federal authorities and the agencies of the several States and municipalities, with every encouragement given to the local agencies to take the initiative and to solve the problem in their own localities.

It may be that this provision for airport zoning will not prove adequate. It may be that at some time the Federal Government will find it necessary to apply to the air space the same kind of regulation of obstructions which it has applied to the navigable water since 1890 whereby the Federal Government itself can directly regulate the nature and extent of such obstructions. However, the proposal in the pending bill does provide a necessary machinery so as to assure that every State and municipality will have the needed power to accomplish a sound zoning program, and further provides for assistance to be extended by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to the various localities in formulating sound zoning standards. This would seem a commendable approach.

The importance of airport zoning, of course, goes far beyond the question of making air transportation safer and more efficient. The employment of our military aircraft, as well as the safety of private flyers, equally depends upon proper zoning of structures in the vicinity of airports. If such zoning is not accomplished we may some day find, when faced with a national emergency,

that, despite the investment of millions of dollars in airport facilities, fatal obstructions have been permitted to arise in the approach paths making it difficult and dangerous for our military air forces to be employed wherever they may be needed for the national defense.

A further point of special interest to the future of air transportation dealt with in the bill is that of economic regulation for the contract carrier by air. The bill follows, for such regulations, the same general pattern established for contract carriers by motor vehicle in title II of the Interstate Commerce Act. It provides that the air contractor must secure a license, must file and adhere to tariffs showing reasonable minimum rates, and must submit to proper regulation of his minimum rates in the case of domestic air commerce.

Such regulation is an essential step in any program for sound post-war development of air transportation. If such regulation is not provided our whole commercial air system will be faced with economic chaos upon the war's end. If we were to stand by and to permit without any restraint whatsoever the use of hundreds or thousands of second-hand aircraft in miscellaneous contract operations, willy-nilly, depending upon the whim of the operator, we would invite a disastrous depression in our aircraft manufacturing industry and seriously set back the progress made in recent years toward a sound economic foundation for the growth of air transportation. Adequate steps must be taken to encourage and protect responsible operators who have the ability to discharge the obligations of serving the needs of air commerce, whose service will assure permanent development and will provide a dependable and growing market to sustain the aircraft industry.

WOULD STRENGTHEN PRIVATE FLYING

In many other respects the proposed bill would promote the sound development of air transportation. Equally important are its numerous provisions which will encourage and strengthen private flying. Provisions for an airport-development program, a continued civilian pilot-training program, a new broad program of aviation education, and other important steps, have been recognized as constructive and far-sighted.

Taken altogether the several items in this bill will, if adopted, furnish a worthy supplement to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The bill is inspired by the thought that civil aviation requires intensive development and determined encouragement. We know that the destiny of civil aviation cannot be realized without hard work and careful planning by our Government and by those in the industry. We know that the immediate post-war years will be most critical from the standpoint of our Nation's future, because then we must be alert to avoid a crippling deflation in aviation which might do permanent harm to the future position of our Nation.

New York Grand Jury Finds That the Safety of the Country Is Being Jeopardized By Undesirable Aliens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a recent report of a Federal grand jury in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York on the question of aliens and immigration is worthy of consideration by every Member of this Congress. The jury after having investigated the question for a long time reached the "unanimous opinion that the safety of this country and its institutions is being jeopardized by undesirable aliens." While I may not agree with all that is said in this report, I do hope that the membership of this House will read this grand jury report and give serious consideration to it. Under unanimous consent, I include this grand jury report in my remarks.

PRESENTMENT TO THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(Submitted to and accepted, approved, and ordered filed by court, September 17, 1943)

Whereas the undersigned constitute all the living members, and former members of the third May 1942 grand jury of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York; and

Whereas there was presented before this grand jury certain testimony and evidence in the so-called German-American Bund cases; and

Whereas this testimony and evidence has led this grand jury to certain conclusions deemed proper and imperative to be brought to the attention of the Congress and the executive department of the Government for such action as may be necessary or appropriate, the undersigned members of this grand jury respectfully show and allege as follows:

1. The jury is of the unanimous opinion that the safety of this country and its institutions is being jeopardized because (a) undesirable aliens have been and may be admitted into this country as immigrants and naturalized as citizens; and (b) the supervision and education of aliens and the facilities for continued education of naturalized citizens by the Government of this country are not adequate.

2. This conviction was arrived at by the jury after hearing, over a period of months, the testimony of a great number of naturalized citizens, many of whom had been living in this country for a long period of years.

Some of these witnesses were virtually unable to speak or understand English. Many could not read or write English. Others appeared to be wholly illiterate.

An alarming number of these witnesses was found to be completely ignorant of the basic principles of our form of government and devoid of any concept of the fundamental duties and rights of citizenship in this country. Some manifested a disbelief in and a contempt for our constitutional form of government and had obviously taken the oath of allegiance with no intent to observe it. Others, who may have taken the oath in good faith, appeared to have been lured back to their former allegiance. Most witnesses openly stated that they would not bear arms for the United States against the country of their origin.

With consternation and a sense of shame the jury also heard the testimony of native Americans, whose parents or grandparents had been immigrants, who were not grounded in American history or American principles and whose testimony revealed them to be disloyal and dangerous citizens.

3. The jury has not made a study of the statutes governing immigration and naturalization or the procedure by which immigrants are prepared for citizenship and naturalized. However, in the light of the situation disclosed by the facts above recited, it believes that the safety and welfare of this country require either the enactment of new legislation or the improved administration of existing legislation covering the subject, or both.

4. The jury believes in immigration, but in selective immigration. It affirms the principle that in all legislation governing immigration the paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, not that of the immigrant. It recommends that only those be permitted to immigrate who are likely to contribute directly or indirectly to the welfare of this country and who may be readily assimilated as citizens.

5. The jury believes that better education of immigrants is urgently needed, regardless of whether the privilege of naturalization is exercised. It recommends that only those aliens be naturalized who are able to speak, read, and write the English language on at least eighth-grade level, who have satisfactorily passed an examination with respect to the fundamental principles of our American form of government and the traditions of its democracy, and who manifest sympathy with and loyalty to such principles and traditions.

6. The jury further believes that, upon the termination of the present world conflict, this country will face a wave of proposed immigration of proportions unprecedented in our national history and that, unless the dangers inherent in the situation are now anticipated and guarded against, the welfare of this country and of its institutions will again be placed in gravest jeopardy.

7. In view of the considerations herein set forth, the jury recommends that the Congress again study the subject of immigration and naturalization, consider the extent to which existing legislation and procedure should be revised, consider means for improved administration of existing laws and regulations, and take such action as to the Congress may seem necessary or appropriate for the protection and welfare of the country: Now, therefore,

The grand jury respectfully petitions the court to accept this presentment and order it filed, to authorize the Federal Grand Jury Association for the Southern District of New York to print and send copies of it to the Members of Congress and to the proper officers of the executive department of the Government, and to permit such other use as may properly be made of this document.

Dated New York, N. Y., September 17, 1943.

A. Vere Shaw, foreman; J. Roy Allen; Ralph Seward Allen; Joseph M. Bing; Elisha Canning, Jr.; John L. Cleveland; Harry J. Fitzpatrick; David R. Gimbel; Byron E. Hughes; Alton S. Keeler; Henry H. Livingston; Raymond A. Lockwood; Jean Ellis Poletti; Winthrop Steele; Harold F. Strong; A. Stewart Walker; Gertrude Walsh; Edward Watson; John P. White; John P. T. Woodin; Roger M. Woolley; Ex-member Boyd G. Curts.

The Bureaucrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 5, 1943.*

DEAR AL: In your recent letter you asked me to give you the definition of a bureaucrat. The following definition, though not

listed in Webster, is the result of painstaking research, painful experience, and the testimony of victims.

A bureaucrat[1] (also known as a Fascist or Nazi, according to the natural habitat plundered by him) is one who lives off the fruit of other people's labor, under the pretense of performing essential supervisory functions over the man who labors and produces the fruit.

Characteristics: The bureaucrat is self-confident, bumptious, rude, superior, and overbearing in manner. He has only one answer to every question—governmental planning and the party is the one right, the one truth, the one finality, and individual freedom the one wrong and the one lie. In a true democracy he makes an excellent doorman, elevator starter, train caller, or official guide. He has energy, zeal, and a holy allegiance for red tape. He sometimes makes a splendid corporal or even a first lieutenant in the Army.

Under one-party government he is the stool pigeon, the snooper, the agent provocateur, the shouter of slogans; and a three-letter governmental agency is his glib solution for every human problem. He is the promoter of pressure-group demonstrations, the carrier, in other words, of the dirty work of his superiors in the party. He does it all the more readily because the party offers him compensations which he had perhaps never before known—it gives him a salary (plus expense accounts), an imposing title, power, an official passcard, importance. Indeed, it singles him out for special attention, and he comes to think of himself as a man of destiny.

He is patronizing to the people who had been his equal before political pull gave him power, but he is hostile to the people who had been above him—that is, to those who had risen in life through their own efforts and individual ability.

The bureaucrat hates everything he couldn't obtain in a fair contest to get ahead in the world. He would like to destroy capitalism and free enterprise so that he would have nobody except his immediate political boss over him. Pettiness is his chief characteristic, in intelligence, in character, in vision, in humanity, in everything but insolence and stupidity.

Yours,

HOWARD.

[1] A bureaucrat is not to be confused with the true civilian public employee, who quietly, conscientiously, and efficiently performs the many necessary tasks and duties essential to the operation of government.

A Challenge to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of September 28, 1943:

A CHALLENGE TO CONGRESS

President Roosevelt is entirely wrong, although probably within his rights, in expressing the view to Congress that its legislative ban on the continued Federal employment of three specified officers is "unwise, discriminatory, and unconstitutional."

And the President is especially wrong in asserting that, since he regards the act of Congress as an unwarranted encroachment upon the authority of the executive and judicial branches of the Government, it is not binding upon them.

The prohibition against further employment of the three officers was effected by a formal act of Congress.

It was signed by the President.

Hence it is the law of the land, in conformance with the established and only constitutional processes that exist for the enactment of law.

It is undoubtedly true, as the President says, that he did not approve of the act, and would have vetoed it if it had not been attached as a rider to other legislation he did approve.

But the inescapable fact remains that he refrained from exercise of the power of veto—the only constitutional power possessed by the President for the purpose of nullifying an act of Congress.

The President is clearly entitled to his opinion about an act of Congress.

He is not entitled to ignore or flaunt a formal act of Congress duly signed by himself.

He is not entitled to say an act of Congress, especially after it has his signature, has force only if he desires to recognize it.

If it should be true that the President can be bound only by such law as he approves, then, indeed, we have a dictatorship, as Representative DIES asserts would be the consequence if Mr. Roosevelt's position on this matter should prevail.

The great merit of the American system of government is not in any supposed infallibility of Congress.

But the remedy for possibly mistaken legislation is reconsideration by Congress, and repeal of the offending legislation when and if the facts warrant.

The remedy is never in the arbitrary and tyrannical assumption of powers that do not exist by the President.

There is more to the present case, of course, than the issue of whether the authority of Congress or the arrogance of the President is to prevail.

The three officers Congress seeks to remove from Federal employment are objectionable to Congress because of their purported sympathy and affiliation with subversive organizations inimical to the democratic interests of the country.

They are objectionable to an overwhelming majority of the American people for the same reason. As Representative DIES well says:

"Mr. Roosevelt apparently does not know the sentiment of the country. He is making a play for left-wing political support. But that is only a handful of Americans."

Nevertheless, the vital issue presented by the President himself makes the status of the three officers originally involved a secondary matter.

What must be determined is whether or not Congress can make the laws of the country, as the Constitution empowers it to do; or whether or not the President can accept or reject the acts of Congress according to his own judgment.

Upon this determination depends whether or not the United States is a democracy, or whether or not it is under a dictatorship.

President Roosevelt has raised the issue. Congress must meet it.

Why H. R. 2400?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. FULMER. I have today announced that the hearing before the Committee on Agriculture of H. R. 2400 will commence on Tuesday, October 26. This bill, of which I am the author, is designed to repeal all Federal excise taxes, license fees, and related restrictions on the manufacture and sale of margarine manufactured in this country.

WHY H. R. 2400?

For many years the following Federal taxes and license fees have been imposed on margarine:

Ten cents per pound on yellow-colored margarine.

One-fourth cent per pound on uncolored margarine.

Six hundred dollars per year on manufacturers.

Four hundred and eighty dollars per year on wholesalers of colored margarine.

Two hundred dollars per year on wholesalers of uncolored margarine.

Forty-eight dollars per year on retailers of colored margarine.

Six dollars per year on retailers of uncolored margarine.

H. R. 2400 is a bill to eliminate these Federal restrictions, disguised as a revenue measure, against domestic margarine by repealing:

First. The excessive excise tax of 10 cents per pound on yellow-colored margarine and one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored margarine.

Second. The additional and unreasonable annual tax of $600 for manufacturers, $480 for wholesale dealers, and $48 for retail dealers of margarine (if wholesale or retail dealers sell only uncolored margarine, the annual tax is reduced to $200 and $6, respectively).

Third. Related restrictive provisions. For example, a restaurant or boarding house that now serves margarine and colors it is classed as a manufacturer and forced to pay the annual tax of $600 in addition to the per-pound tax of 10 cents.

The Federal margarine tax and license fees were never intended to produce revenue, and in fact over a period of years have produced a negligible amount. H. R. 2400 repeals all taxes, license fees, and related provisions, regarding domestic margarine. A tax for revenue purposes would not be justified if levied only on one particular food product. It is certainly not necessary, however small, for the purpose of policing the margarine industry. The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and the definition and standard of identity for margarine, promulgated thereunder, provide sufficient protection to the consumer concerning the content and the labeling of the product.

This was the basis on which the standard was promulgated.

The bill does not affect, and the consumer will continue to enjoy the benefit of, the method by which margarine is now manufactured and labeled under the definition and standard of identity for margarine administered by the Federal food and drug authorities "to promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of the consumer."

Two-thirds of the Nation's retail grocers cannot now handle margarine because of the existing taxes; consequently, millions of consumers are now deprived of the opportunity to purchase a low-cost, healthful table spread, and a substantial market is closed to important farm products and vegetable oils, the major ingredients of margarine.

The enactment of this bill will also free the consumer from the time-wasting job of adding color to margarine in her own kitchen—a manufacturing process which should be done at the factory.

Margarine, a wholesome and nutritious food, is entitled to the same legal rights and should be subject only to the same legal responsibility under Federal law as all other foods. This bill, if enacted, will accomplish that result.

Whatever may have been the purpose of enacting this trade barrier, no valid reason for its maintenance exists today. It is a product of American farms; it is made from the oil of cottonseed, soybeans, peanuts, and beef cattle. It is fortified with vitamins, properly labeled, and is recognized as having a rightful place in the American diet by all nutritional authorities. Indeed, fortified margarine is included in the Government's nutrition program as one of the seven basic foods necessary for an adequate daily diet. Aside from the fact, therefore, that it is a product entitled to a market free of artificial legislative restrictions in peacetime, in view of the Government's nutrition program and the inadequacy of table fats, the present taxes actually hinder the war effort. An editorial in the September 27 issue of the New York Times on the proposed milk subsidy makes this interesting observation:

A milk subsidy, from this standpoint, makes more sense than the existing butter subsidy. It makes no sense at all to subsidize the richer man's butter while taxing the poorer man's oleomargarine, which is precisely what the Government now does.

The Poll Tax Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an editorial appearing in the Fort Smith Times Record of Fort Smith, Ark., under date of September 29, 1943. This editorial bluntly states the fundamental issue involved in the present effort to fix by Federal legislation the qualifications of voters in the respective States in defiance of the plain provisions of the Constitution to the contrary. The editorial is as follows:

THE POLL TAX AGAIN

The poll-tax bill is bobbing up again in Congress. The Senate Judiciary Committee will hold hearings about a month from now on the bill already passed by the House which would abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting for Federal officials. The chief issue in the hearings will be the constitutionality of the bill.

Eight States in the South still have poll taxes as a qualification for voting in primary and general elections. Most of the States had poll taxes or something like them originally. Gradually, the poll tax has been abolished in all but the eight Southern States, and systems of registration have been substituted as a means of determining who are qualified voters.

A majority of the States do not have poll taxes The representatives of the non-poll-tax States in Congress far outnumber the representatives of the poll-tax States. A majority of each House may be expected to vote to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting.

The trouble with the poll tax bill is that it attempts to do by majority vote something which the Constitution prohibits. Substituting a majority vote for constitutional guaranties is no new thing. It has been attempted over and over, especially in the past 10 years. It has succeeded in some degree, through new interpretations by the courts of what the Constitution means.

We think the Federal Constitution assures to the States the right to determine whether they shall have a poll tax or a registration system or some other method of listing qualified voters. We think the poll-tax system in Arkansas is none of Congress' business. When we get ready to abolish the poll tax in Arkansas, we may do so by amending our own State constitution. Until we decide we want to do that, and do it by a majority vote of our own people in a regular election, any effort to do it for us by a congressional act is a violation of our rights under the Federal Constitution. If Congress can do that, then it can otherwise fix qualifications of our voters. Our law says that a resident must live in the State 1 year, the county 6 months, and the voting precinct 30 days before he is qualified to vote, he must be 21 years of age and he must have paid his poll tax within the time specified by the legislature. There are other qualifications. For example, he cannot vote if he has been convicted of a felony and not pardoned. If Congress can change one of these qualifications, it can change the others, and the State's control over its own elections goes glimmering.

There are reasonable arguments both for and against the poll tax as a qualification for voting. Our people in Arkansas have approved the poll tax by majority vote by rejecting a recently offered amendment to abolish it.

The issue as to the pending poll-tax bill in Congress is not whether a poll tax is sound or unsound. It is whether the Constitution means what it says, whether the Constitution sets up rights which majorities of Congress cannot overturn at will, whether we shall continue to have constitutional government or scrap the constitutional limitations and have government by majorities of the moment.

An Open Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cambria Dispatch, Portage, Pa.:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

We charge that you are playing politics with the selective service. That title no longer applies to the draft law because you have made an absolute farce of the selective part of it. You are making every effort to lower the whole plan on a basis of class and that is just what selective service is designed to guard against. In this effort you are making the 18-year-old boys to bear the brunt. From a political point of view this action can be termed as being expedient, since the youngsters cannot vote, but from a fair, just, and moral point of view it is vile. This Congress, because of its attitude, will live to see the day when it will bear a stigma of shame which will cause its Members to wish they had not been Members of it.

The short-lived vociferous agitation against lowering the draft age was thrown to the winds after the compromise brought it down to 19 years. The 18-year age was then hit upon and Congress and the military gave the impression they had made a find which brought them into a veritable frenzy comparable only to that exhibited by the prospector when he makes his strike. These boys were immediately classed as worthy of no consideration. Jam them into service without abandon is the rule.

Inconceivable as it may seem you even refused to pass a law under which these boys could be deferred to complete their high-school education, the one ambition of a boy who desires to continue studies, and the denial of which is nothing short of criminal. Those who return, being unable to show a high-school diploma, will be handicapped for life, because of your lack of moral sense. At your door must be placed the blame for the lack of opportunity which is the right of every youth, particularly in a country which professes to have a democratic form of government.

You are now being primed to pass a law giving blanket deferment to fathers to make a still greater farce of what you still insist is selective service. No sane person wants to see anyone go to war, but you passed a selective-service law under which to procure the forces to fight the war and now you are bent upon destroying every vestige of fairness attached to selective service in practice, by making 18-year old boys the goats. True, ordinarily a father with a family should be below single eligibles for draft, and selective service honestly operated would do just that. Selective service would make it selective and place each case on its own merits. A blanket deferment of fathers would force the boys to fight for the protection of fathers who never earned the right to that title. Is that fair?

Then, too, your position is inconsistent. In and out of Congress and with Mrs. Roosevelt, who has attained an important place in Government, in spite of the fact that she is not an elected official, is a large segment of people who strongly encourage marriage among men in service, claiming it will give them an incentive for which to fight. How

can you argue sense into the proposition that married men shall be deferred under a blanket law, but that it is well for them to marry after they are in the service.

You squelched horribly and proved false to the boys of 18, when after you succumbed to putting them into the draft, you backed down on your demand that they be given a year's training before they leave this country. That is a provision in the draft law of England, but you failed to have enough consideration for your own boys to demand the same thing. In an effort to ease the slur upon you for not holding to that demand you stated that you were assured by the military that this would be done but that they did not want to be bound by law. Why did they not want to be bound by law? Because they then had determined to do what is now being done, shipping these mere boys overseas within 3 months after they have been taken into the service.

Without a murmur you permitted a change in the method of registration which is discrimination against the boys of 18 years resulting in many of them being put into service far ahead of young men who had registered long before.

The 18-year-old boys have been placed in the war plan to give the impression that they are worthy of no consideration, that it is they who have been hit upon to stand the brunt of this beastly war. Taken from homes at that age, deprived in many instances of a completed high-school education, the first experiences of life they get are the exceedingly severe rigors of training only more matured persons should be subjected to and then they are plunged into the horrible engagements of war. Every moral code dictates against it but you have not raised your voice in opposition.

For propaganda purposes the Government plays much upon the age of some Germans and Italians who are taken prisoners, calling them mere boys. According to many reports, these mere boys are near the 20-year mark. Is it your suggestion that an 18- or 20-year-old German or Italian is a mere boy, but that an American of that age is a matured man? Shame upon those who deal in such trash and call it news.

You can still make amends to some degree, but not to the extent that you can wash away a stain which is upon you and which will haunt you through years to come.

The question you will some day be required to answer is, "Where is justification for the claim that the burden of fighting this war is upon the teen-age boys?" What will your answer be?

Removal of Farm Labor From Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a summary of the opinion of the State of Missouri farm labor committee expressed at a meeting of the committee at Columbia, Mo., on September 17, on the farm-labor situation in the State of Missouri, which I am sure is representative of conditions in other sections of the country, as follows:

The farm labor situation in Missouri is very tight with the loss of every year-around worker from now on meaning a curtailment in food or feed production. This was the opinion of the Missouri Farm Labor Committee at its meeting in Columbia on September 17.

In the southeast part of the State cotton picking is under way with some shortage of workers indicated. Several hundred recruited pickers from nearby areas hard hit by the recent dry weather have gone into the Cotton Belt to help fill the demands for pickers. Rains have slowed picking considerably.

In the apple-growing areas of the State picking is moving ahead with growers reporting that they could use more pickers but managing to get most harvesting done without excessive loss. In the apple section near Waverly a heavy windstorm recently shook off many apples, some of which were entirely lost because not enough pickers could be obtained to move the apples as rapidly as needed.

Northwest Missouri farmers are reporting a relatively good crop of corn and are expecting to need 600 to 800 pickers from outside the area to aid them in shucking the much-needed crop. An effort will be made by the Agricultural Extension Service to secure small groups of workers from Ozark counties where they can possibly be temporarily spared at this period of the year for corn shucking in northwest Missouri.

In northeast Missouri a big crop of soybeans is expected to increase the need for day-labor workers in that area.

Dairymen in many parts of the State have indicated that they will require helpers soon or they will have to curtail production by selling cows. The shortage of dairy workers is particularly acute around Kansas City, St. Louis, Hannibal, and Springfield.

The committee pointed out the big part taken by farm women, children, and older men and women in aiding agriculture to scrape through the year so far without serious total losses of crops. It was pointed out that some loss had occurred because crops were not harvested or planted at the best time, and that a number of farmers are planning to shift to a less intensive type of farming in the future in order to get by with the labor available. Reports read at the meeting indicated that the already depleted number of hired farm workers on farms had dropped another 16 percent in the past year. A survey made on September 1 showed that farm operators were working an average of 13.7 hours per day.

J. H. Dinwiddie, district supervisor of the Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission, stated that investigation showed there was no hoarding of farm labor in Missouri and that farm laborers who could not be placed immediately on farms were made available for industrial use by the Extension Service. He stated also that the recent rulings of the Commission were to the effect that farm workers no longer could become free agents available for city jobs simply by laying out of work for 30 days.

Scott Meyer, of Hannibal, vice chairman of the State Farm Labor Committee, pointed out that the job of the farmer in this war was to run the food-producing factory, and that to keep this factory going requires a certain amount of manpower. With the reduced farm labor supply, the farmers of Missouri can supply food or men, but not both. The Federal Government should make the decision as to which is needed most. It should make little difference to farmers from a profit standpoint since most of them will be lucky to break even now.

The Extension Service announced that during the past 3 months it had made 42,717 placements in Missouri, 3,743 of which were year-around ones and the remainder seasonal.

Members of the committee present included Scott Meyer, Hannibal; Ronnie Greenwell, Hayti; John Plassmeyer, Loose Creek; C. E. Klingner, Sr., Fair Grove; Ernest Wray, Maryville; Charles Peterman, Miami; H. Baxter Hall, Clarence; J. W. Burch, Rocheport; J. D. Monin, Jr., Columbia; Max McNulty and J. H. Dinwiddie, Jefferson City; A. C. Mussman and K. G. Harman, Columbia.

Members of the Armed Forces Should Get a $5,000 Insurance Policy Without Premium Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3376, for the purpose of amending the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide that, notwithstanding any other provisions, all persons in the armed forces shall have in force the amount of $5,000 insurance without the payment of premiums. The bill is as follows:

That (a) notwithstanding any provision of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, any person in active service on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of all hostilities in the present war shall be deemed to have applied for, and to have been granted, national service life insurance as of the date of enactment of this act or of entry into active service, whichever is the later, in the amount of $5,000. Premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this act and ending 6 months after the termination of all hostilities in the present war, and any person entitled to the benefits of this act shall pay premiums during such period only on such amount of national service life insurance granted to him as exceeds the sum of $5,000. At the expiration of such period the insured may reduce the amount of such insurance to not less than $1,000.

(b) If any person entitled to the benefits of this section dies before designating the beneficiary or beneficiaries of such insurance, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner stated in section 602 (d) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, if application for such benefits is filed within 1 year after the date of death of the insured.

SEC. 2. Any person in active service on and after December 7, 1941, who has died prior to the date of enactment of this act without having in force at the time of death National Service Life Insurance, insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or insurance under the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000, or without being entitled to the benefits of section 602 (d) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted insurance as of the date of entry into active service or December 7, 1941, whichever is later, in the aggregate sum of $5,000. So much of such sum of $5,000 as is granted by this section shall be payable in the manner stated in section 602 (d) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, if application for such payment is filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to transfer from time to time from the National Service

Life Insurance appropriation to the National Service Life Insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under this act.

SEC. 4. The term "active service," as used in this act, shall have the same meaning as when used in the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

Why Taxes Are High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOBLE J. JOHNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the administration is now asking for an increase in taxes. I think the following editorial from the Terre Haute Star of Saturday, October 2, very graphically tells one reason why taxes are high. The editorial is as follows. I quote:

WHY TAXES ARE HIGH

The Washingtonian was telling, over lunch, why he was on leave looking for a job in a private industry, though he now is receiving from a Government agency the highest salary he ever attained.

"I like the work," he said, "and I think it is of major importance. It is being carried out efficiently, intelligently and without politics. I like my associates and my superior. If I find another job, probably it will involve a reduction in my income.

"But here's the difficulty: I haven't anything to do. Circumstances have changed since I went to Washington a year ago, and our agency now can carry out its duties with less manpower. Much of the time I sit around with nothing to do—and I'm not old enough, yet, to enjoy that.

"Last summer I tried to resign. I told my superior why—that I didn't have enough work to keep me busy. He was sympathetic. But he didn't want me to leave. So he offered me an assistant."

We laughed, it seemed very funny. Offering an assistant in order to retain the services of a man whose only complaint was lack of work.

"It isn't as funny as you think," retorted the Washingtonian. "There was logic in the offer. What he really was doing was offering me a raise if I would stay.

"Under civil-service regulations, the only way I can get a raise is by bossing my subordinates. One more helper, and my salary could be increased. That is why I was offered an assistant."

"But why," we asked, "is your superior so anxious to keep you, if there isn't enough work? Is it on the basis of personal friendship?"

"No," said the Washingtonian. "We are friendly enough, but not that pally. I suppose he wants me to stay for the same reason that he offered me an assistant—because his status, too, depends upon the number of subordinates he has. If I left, he would have to find somebody in my place or he would drop a step in the hierarchy, which might have financial implications for him."

There are many reasons why taxes are high. Among them is the cost of the war. But multiply this incident many thousands of times, and there is another reason.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government would stop its waste, extravagance, bungling, and boondoggling, an increase in taxes would not be necessary. This administration fails to realize that economies in governmental operation would be just as effective as new taxes in the same amount.

The people are willing to pay whatever taxes they are able to pay and which are necessary, but they are strenuously opposed to having a tax burden heaped upon them on account of needless and useless Government expenditures just to satisfy the bureaucracies and to keep the politically faithful in fat salaried jobs.

There never was a time when the people were taking as much interest in their Government as at the present. The people have become thoroughly disgusted with bureaucratic control and mismanagement. They are rightfully demanding that the Congress assume its full responsibility; they are sick and tired of the results brought about during the past several years by the majority in Congress who were subservient to practically every legislative wish of the Chief Executive, even to the point where they were commonly referred to as "rubber stamps."

The people want and expect their representatives in Congress to be alert and independent. They consider Congress as the people's branch of government and expect, through their representatives, to have a voice in shaping the course of their Government.

There are over 3,000,000 officials and employees on the executive pay roll of the Government, but only two of this number, the President and the Vice President, are elected by the people.

The people realize that Congress is their only hope and they are demanding that Congress stop issuing blank checks and delegating its authority, and return to Congress its constitutional powers and responsibilities.

As cited in the above editorial, there are many more Government employees than are needed. Even Paul McNutt, War Manpower Commissioner, admits there is great waste of manpower in governmental departments, but frankly says he is going to do nothing about it. This expresses the general attitude of the bureaucrats, and, while they do not intend to do anything about it, it is my prediction that the people will do something about it in November 1944. They are determined that waste, extravagance, bungling, and regimentation be stopped. They are thoroughly convinced that this will never be accomplished under the present administration.

The Cotton Farmer Deserves a Better Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 3375, for the purpose of placing a floor under the price of cotton at 40 cents per pound. The bill is as follows:

That clause (a) of paragraph No. (10) of the act of May 26, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 40 cents per pound in the case of cotton, and at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year in other cases."

SEC. 2. Section 302 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "at rates not less than 52 percent and not more than 75 percent of the parity price of cotton as of the beginning of the marketing year" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the rate of 40 cents per pound."

SEC. 3. Section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "or (5) in the case of cotton, 40 cents per pound."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "or", and by inserting after clause (2) the following new clause:

"(3) In the case of cotton, 40 cents per pound."

(b) Section 3 of such act is further amended by inserting after "the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2)" the following: "and (3)."

(c) Clause (1) of section 8 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 40 cents per pound in the case of cotton, and at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year in other cases."

American-Slovaks Inspired by Sgt. Matej Kocak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest heroes of World War No. 1 was Sgt. Matej Kocak, United States Marine Corps, a humble American-Slovak. The heroic deeds of Sergeant Kocak have been an inspiration to all Americans. For his gallantry, Sergeant Kocak received the Congressional Medal of Honor, and Marshal Foch decorated him with the Medaille Militaire and the Croix de Guerre.

In memory of the heroism of this great American-Slovak, Sergeant Kocak, the American-Slovaks throughout the Nation, united in the Slovak League of America, were inspired to undertake their drive, now in the stages of completion, to raise $6,000,000 in War bond sales to purchase three fighting ships to help crush the Axis.

As part of my remarks, I am happy to include the exclusive story of Sergeant Kocak's heroism as disclosed by Maj. Louis Cukela, United States Marine Corps, to Joseph G. Pruša, managing editor of the Slovak Record, the voice of opinion of the American-Slovaks:

EXCLUSIVE STORY BY MAJ. LOUIS CUKELA, WHO SHARED HEROISM WITH SGT. MATEJ KOCAK IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

OFFICE OF THE POST QUARTERMASTER,
MARINE BARRACKS, NAVY YARD,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 16, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. PRUŠA: I have just received your letter and am replying immediately since you desire the information on Sgt. Matej Kocak for the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death. First, I want to thank you for your very interesting letter and at the same time commend you and your Slovak organizations for your efforts in paying a sincere tribute to a most gallant hero and a former buddy of mine.

The following account, I trust, will be of some assistance to your publication:

On June 9, 1917, the First Battalion of the Fifth Regiment of United States marines was formed in the city of Philadelphia and embarked for overseas on the 11th of June 1917 in a convoy of 42 transports and warships. Among those of this battalion, Sgt. Matej Kocak and myself were members. This convoy landed in France on June 26 at the port of St Nazaire.

On the way over there were several incidents, one of these to be noted happened on June 22, 1917, off the southern coast of Ireland. German underboats or submarines as they are called attacked our convoy about 10:30 at night. The transport on which we sailed was the U. S. S. *De Kalb* and was one of the first transports to open fire on the enemy submarines.

Sgt. Matej Kocak was a member of the 5-inch gun crew which were a part of the guns that opened the fire. The order from the flagship came to disperse, which was carried out immediately, some ships of the convoy took a southern course to the Azores, some a northern course to England, and others proceeded to France. At 8 a. m., June 23, the flagship radioed to assemble and by 12 noon all the convoy was intact proceeding to France. Later on it was found out by German reports that one of their two submarines was sunk by the American convoy at 11 p. m., June 22. The afternoon of the 26th we entered the port of St. Nazaire, France.

Drilling and training there for about a month, and then ordered into lines of communication. After a short duty we were ordered into regular training in the town of Breuvanes, a small town in the vicinity of Neufchateau in the Province of Vosges. After this intensive training period we were transferred to Naix au Forge and from there directly to a quiet sector of Aix near Verdun facing the enemy.

March of 1918 found us skirmishing with the enemy for about 2 months in the L'Esparge sector. From here we were transferred about May 15. On the road to Meaux which on June 22 led us in the vicinity of Belleau Woods where the marines fought so splendidly and so successfully to save Paris, and which shall not be forgotten by any Marine that participated in that operation. On June 6 the Fifth and Sixth Regiments of Marines formed the Fourth Brigade of the United States Marine Corps belonging to the Second Division.

Taking the Belleau Woods and accomplishing our task with losses amounting to on June 6 alone, 65 to 70 percent casualties in the Fourth Marine Brigade. On July 15, after a few days rest behind the lines, reconditioning and replenishing our ammunition, supplies, and other necessities, we embarked in 1,200 camions (trucks) driven by Indo-Chinese drivers, The evening of the 17th of July found us in Villers-Cotterets, south of Soisson, it was in this battle where my buddy, Sgt. Matej Kocak, distinguished himself and won America's highest honor—the Congressional Medal of Honor. His citation is as follows:

"Kocak, Matej, Sgt., Company C, Fifth Regiment Marines, Second Division, Albany, N. Y., Soissons, France, July 18, 1918. When the advance of his battalion was checked by a hidden machine-gun nest he went forward alone, unprotected by covering fire from his own men, and worked in between the German position in the face of fire from an enemy covering detachment. Locating the machine-gun nest, he rushed it, and with his bayonet drove off the crew. Shortly after this he organized 25 French colonial soldiers who had become separated from their company, and led them in attacking another machine-gun nest, which was also put out of action."

On July 19 in this melee he commanded some French Moroccan units who got detached from their own units and accomplished great success in enveloping the enemy's right flank killing many Germans and capturing an entire company.

For this deed he was decorated by Marshal Foch with the coveted Medaille Militaire and the Croix de Guerre with palms.

From there we had been together in the major operations of St. Mihiel and Champagne Sector in which both of these engagements Sgt. Matej Kocak fought heroically and commended by his officers for his military deeds, when on October 4, within a distance of less than 100 feet from me, Sgt. Kocak was killed by fire from a German machine-gun nest which he was attacking.

I sincerely repeat that Sgt. Matej Kocak was the inspiration to his men and his platoon which he commanded. A sober young man, very religious and ready to give advice to his men at any time called upon.

It is men like Sgt. Matej Kocak, my fallen Slovak comrade, that I cherish his memory in my heart, and many others that have contributed their all for the freedom of the U. S. A.

I am sorry to say that I have no picture of Sergeant Kocak, and inclose one of myself taken sometime ago as a captain which I would appreciate it very much that you return after it has served its purpose.

Thanking you for your best wishes and assuring you of my willingness to serve you, I remain

Very sincerely yours,
LOUIS CUKELA,
Major, A. A. Q. M., U. S. M. C., Retired.

Congress Must Simplify Income Tax Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been in session 3 weeks, but has accomplished little. I am sorry because I returned to Washington imbued with the enthusiasm to do something which only my contact with the home folks can inspire.

For one thing, there is the foremost problem of straightening out the income tax mess. Congress must simplify the present tax law so that taxpayers can understand it. Why should people have to worry about the difficulty of figuring out their taxes in addition to raising the money to pay them.

The present confusion is an outrage and it seems to me that we could at least be tackling this subject so our people will be relieved of a tremendous burden.

The Food Situation in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH A. BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of the food situation in South America, delivered by me at the National Food Conference, Chicago, September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is an oft-quoted statement, "Food will win the war and write the peace."

With this statement, I am in accord. I come from a Midwestern State, Nebraska, and I know how important food is to both the war effort and to the settlement of post-war problems, which must hinge on food for the devastated war lands.

I have just returned from a 20,000 mile journey by air, during which I visited all of the Latin-American republics. While there I had an opportunity to observe the food situation in all of the Central and South American countries.

In discussing this problem, I should start by correcting the popular impression that there is a general abundance of food in all these countries. Apparently everyone has heard so much of Latin-American agricultural surpluses and agricultural exports that people have assumed those countries have more food than they know what to do with. These surpluses, however, are not, for the most part, the basic foods capable of sustaining life. On the contrary, most of them are food and beverage specialties like coffee and cocoa, or agricultural raw materials such as cotton and mahogany lumber. In reality, only 4 or 5 of the 20 Latin-American republics have actual food surpluses. The rest do not grow enough for their own needs. And, in fact, it is the extreme concentration on a few commercial crops for profitable export at the expense of the cultivation of basic food crops, which is, in part, responsible for the semistarvation conditions in many of the southern countries.

For purposes of rough classification, these Latin-American nations might be divided into three agricultural groups. First, there is the small group which have exportable food surpluses. This includes only Argentina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and the Dominican Republic.

Second, there is the equally small group which, while heavily dependent upon imports for food deficiencies, do export single commodities such as coffee, cocoa, and cotton.

These items, be it noted, are not in the category of basic foods.

Third, there is the remaining majority of countries who are without sufficient food to meet their own needs. Of course, at times, advantageous circumstances, such as a bountiful rainfall, alleviates this condition, but even with the most advantageous agricultural conditions the variety necessary to a normal and balanced diet is lacking.

Repeatedly I have been asked, "Why is it that these Latin-American countries are not able to supply their own agricultural needs?" The answer cannot be simply expressed, for it is a mistake to look upon all Central and South America as a single area with a single problem. It should be understood that each Latin-American country is different from every other geologically, climatically, temperamentally, and in production possibilities. These differences apply to agriculture as well as to every other phase of their national lives.

A short review of some of the principal factors in the food situation of a few of our southern neighbors will help to make this clear.

For example, El Salvador, though still deficient in some basic foods, comes close to meeting her over-all internal needs. She has many small farms and truck gardens and produces a considerable variety of foodstuffs and does actually export some. With her own agricultural experiment stations and studies showing progress, she may be expected to solve her problems internally and become a large exporter of agricultural commodities.

Cuba presents, as a contrast, the picture of a nation which has concentrated so heavily on a few crops for export that production of food necessities has been sacrificed in the process. There is plenty of productive land in Cuba, much of it still undeveloped. The Cubans are industrious and intelligent farmers. But the whole national policy has been so directed toward provision of sugar, tobacco, and a few other special products for the American market that the average peon does not produce his own food and must depend on imports for such basic products as rice, flour, and lard. Even the large vegetable production in Cuba is intended for the early vegetable market in the United States, not for the Cuban peasant. Although the evils of this one-crop economy have been pointed out again and again, no substantial effort has been made to reorient Cuban agriculture toward a more independent, self-supporting basis.

Brazil is another nation which has come to rely too heavily on foreign markets for one or two plantation-produced specialties. Her people are almost wholly dependent on the prosperity of one or two agricultural industries, such as coffee and cotton. Yet Brazil's vast area, larger than the United States, offers every opportunity for development of an adequate, balanced agricultural program. This development awaits only recovery from the jungle of millions of acres of rich, virgin soil. If her people had a sturdy and ample diet, Brazil could be rich, powerful, and independent, for the other vast natural resources of the country, rich in mineral deposits, could be developed by a well-fed, energetic people.

Paraguay, half-starved, poverty-stricken little country that it is, nevertheless has opportunities for development equal to those of any other country on the continent. The people there are almost the poorest in the world. Yet, there is ample land for food production, the country does not suffer from overpopulation, and the subtropical climate is ideal for producing a wide variety of foods. Paraguay needs only development of her land resources and improvement in transportation facilities.

Bolivia is at the opposite extreme. Her mountainous terrain would make it difficult to produce enough food for the population under the best of circumstances. Although the eastern section of the nation is a rich, undeveloped jungle, the bulk of the people are concentrated in the western mountainous area and have almost no means of livelihood except work in the tin mines. Often a Bolivian has to choose between keeping his llama for transportation or eating it. It seems likely that Bolivia will have to continue to depend to a large extent on selling her tin and importing a large part of her food supply, although the inadequate transportation makes even that remedy difficult.

Primarily, I believe the problem is one of lack of development and need for technical assistance. For example, in Honduras, agricultural development is at such a low level that the people of Honduras do not have enough to eat. In periods of drought, such as the one which they have just experienced, the people of Honduras turn to bananas and plantin, but poor transportation facilities make it very difficult to get even these.

While I was in Honduras, I was told that right now, this fall, unless some 50,000 sacks of corn could be procured for the people of Honduras in the back regions of the country, thousands of persons might suffer. And yet, when I talked with a well-educated able young agricultural technician in Honduras, I learned that there was no real excuse for the existence of such a condition. He described land that was available and sufficiently fertile to grow enough food in Honduras for the entire populace. He defined the problem as one of need for more technical assistance and for popular agricultural education along practical lines.

In many of the countries of South America there are great barren stretches which seem to be an awesome obstacle to the people who live there. But they need not be, because scientific study shows that many of them could be brought into fruitful production if irrigation projects were developed, for in many cases the water is available. It is my feeling that if the United States as a matter of policy wants to see increased food production in the other Americas, our task would be to demonstrate how these semiarid lands can be brought into production.

For instance, in Yucatan, a Province of Mexico, there is a vast area of flat land where irrigation, if properly engineered, would bring hundreds of thousands of acres into production. In and around Merida, the principal city of Yucatan, I motored for many miles and saw evidences of water as close as 30 feet from the surface. Indeed, right in the city of Merida, some of the people have tapped this water supply and have built swimming pools for themselves. It would be as easily used for irrigation. The common people of Yucatan eat principally beans and corn, yet with well-planned irrigation systems, a vast area could be opened up for profitable growing of a variety of food crops.

Sometimes the problem is not solely that of land development, but merges with political considerations. In Peru, where there is a shortage of food, I learned that the Incas in the pre-Spanish period had more land under cultivation, grew more food, and fed about three times the population that occupies Peru today.

I learned further of one agricultural project in Peru which involved some 300,000 acres that could be brought into effective production quickly with perhaps less than a $5,000,000 expenditure. This in itself could solve the food need for a large part of the population. This project was undertaken, so I was informed, by a previous administration but political consideration of the following administration stopped the project. Consequently, there is insufficient food in some areas of Peru.

Transportation is another factor to be considered. Even with a substantially increased production these countries will still have difficulty in adequately feeding the people. The lack of roads, or other means of travel makes it almost impossible in some areas to transport food any distance except in very small quantities.

Most unfortunate of all is the feudal psychology which permits large segments of a populace to live in an undernourished condition while it exports in large quantities the very foods needed to feed its people.

There are millions of peons, landless, living and working as serfs on the edge of starvation in many of the countries to the south. This situation exists even in parts of the Argentine. Yet, normally Argentina exports beef and grain in large quantities. It is not uncommon to see underfed children whose parents are too poor to buy meat in the Argentine—the second greatest meat-producing country in the world. This situation exists in several of these countries.

No summary of the food situation in the South Americas, in my opinion, would be complete without some reference to the Argentine beef and grain situation. This, I recognize, is a highly controversial subject, but I should like to say that from my own observance the Argentine produces a completely adequate food supply for itself and some of its neighboring nations both of grain and meat. I should think that they would find it to their interests to deal with their neighbors and distribute much of their surpluses in their own adjacent area.

However, the feeling in the Argentine is that they want to get their products into the United States markets and into other world markets to compete with our agricultural products because of higher prices which exist in those markets.

In the Argentine, the contention is strong that the United States excludes their beef because of economic considerations. They stoutly contend that we are guilty of hypocrisy in excluding their beef. They say that it is not true that we keep their beef out because of hoof-and-mouth disease.

However, I saw hoof-and-mouth-disease-infected cattle in all parts of the Argentine where I visited, which were in six or seven different and well-separated areas.

Not only did I see evidences of hoof-and-mouth disease in various places in the Argentine, but it was also freely admitted to me by cattle raisers themselves that it existed, that it was widespread, that it was universal, and that they didn't ever expect to overcome it. Furthermore, many of them even held the viewpoint that it was not serious.

A peculiar admission was made by a high official of the Argentine in discussion of the hoof-and-mouth question. He said, "We do not have hoof-and-mouth disease in the Argentine. We only have a mild form of it."

Right at this time Argentina has no legitimate complaint about beef marketing. We in the United States have directly or indirectly helped her market, or have bought outright a tremendous portion of her entire production. Our Army and Navy have bought untold quantities of her beef as canned beef. Through lend-lease we have aided Britain in the purchase of additional vast quantities and through lend-lease shipped to England, Africa, and other fighting zones a huge volume of chilled beef and various meat products from the Argentine.

One final cause of the prevailing malnutrition I would like to call to your attention, and that is the extreme emphasis that is placed upon one or two crops for export

In virtually every Latin-American country the productive energies of the people are diverted toward expansion of some product that can be sold abroad for cash, while the production of food to meet the most vital needs of the people is neglected.

In Brazil, coffee, cocoa, and cotton cultivation have been pushed to this uneconomic point. In Cuba, the big cash crop is sugar; in Peru, Long-Staple cotton; in Ecuador, cocoa; in Colombia, coffee; and in several of the Central American countries, bananas or coffee. In all these countries the pattern is nearly the same. The good lands, those that are in condition for immediate cultivation, are in the possession of corporations or large landholders who are interested primarily in plantation agriculture for a cash profit. The peasants, finding no land immediately available or lured by the prospect of money wage, work these holdings for a small pittance which is hardly sufficient to buy enough of the expensive foreign foods to keep them and their families alive. The profits of the operation go to those who control these holdings, and are used to purchase foreign luxuries, instead of the purchase of food that is so desperately needed by the people.

This extreme concentration on a single money crop has been encouraged by our own national administration through our foreign-trade policy of so-called reciprocal trade agreements. In each of these countries production of the money crop has been stimulated by the belief that the United States would provide a market for the surplus. Thus Cuba, for example, has been granted a tariff reduction on sugar, a liberal quota, and United States Government loans to perpetuate her one-crop economy, while her production of food for native consumption has declined and, at the same time, our own sugar production has been severely restricted. Certainly the first step toward leading Latin America toward a more diversified agriculture must be the withdrawal of our support of these inflated industries.

To sum up the food situation in Latin America:

There is an inadequacy of food produced, there is insufficient variety of food to make up a normal and healthy diet, agricultural methods are backward, the need of machinery is intense, more economical farming is a major need, and distribution facilities for food produced must be developed to enable a fair and equitable distribution.

And this problem of nutrition to a large extent underlies many other problems of Latin-American development. The basis of their progress must be a sound agriculture and improved health. Otherwise, these peoples by and large will not have a sufficient degree of physical and mental vigor to do much for themselves.

The conditions I have just cited are being combated, it is true. There are a number of state projects for food production in Brazil and some of the other Latin-American countries. But the total effect of such measures cannot be great in view of the limited resources of Latin-American governments, and they can hardly be expected to make any fundamental difference in the over-all picture. Such a tremendous job of national development as this can hardly be accomplished by a government bureaucracy. Any program of economic expansion which does not use the tremendous energy of individual initiative and private endeavor cannot be expected to do the job.

That question, however, is primarily one that is up to the governments concerned to face and answer. It is their responsibility and their opportunity, not ours. Any attempt on our part to dictate their methods, must surely create ill-feeling and meet with rebuffs. That, I think, is something that should be remembered by some of our administration theorists who are trying to foist state socialism on Latin America under the name of hemispheric solidarity.

Our role, however, need not be entirely passive. What we can do to assist directly in the solution of this food shortage is extremely limited. Yet, it is quite obvious that if we expect to get substantial production of strategic materials and minerals, the workers must have food enough to maintain production. What we can do is to help those nations to help themselves. I have tried to point out that much of the difficulty stems from the primitiveness of agricultural methods, the inefficiency of the agricultural system, and the lack of knowledge and technical improvements. Wherever we can make available technical advice, training of agricultural students in this country from those countries, and information of improved agricultural methods, we can contribute substantially to increased food production and maintenance of a continuous basic supply.

There is a great market for farm machinery, tools, and implements of all kinds. It was suggested that in several countries some enterprising businessmen from the States might very profitably help groups in South America to organize into community groups and rent tractors and other equipment which one farmer alone as an individual could not afford to buy. This may be a possibility that would be of considerable help to food production in which some American interests might engage.

What we should not do, in my opinion, is to attempt to make up the Latin-American deficiency from our own limited supplies, as has been suggested by some. I could not approve a program which involves our giving away the substance we need, which our military forces need, which we need in other parts of the world in connection with our strategic moves. Nor do I favor a program by the United States Government to assist our neighboring republics in food production to a point where they will have competitive exportable surpluses. However, whatever approach we do make must be based on a willingness to continue it to a successful conclusion, for if we undertake only "flash in the pan" measures of stop-gap food providing, then in some future emergency we will either have to increase our aid in one form or another, or incur great enmity among our friends in the neighboring republics.

Our present administration is establishing food-distribution centers, undertaking food doles, setting up model farms, establishing experiment stations, operating or encouraging the "collectivist" farming scheme.

It has taught them to be dependent upon loans, grants, and other assistance from our Government in case of need. It has first led them to depend upon the foreign market, and then made them believe that if that fails, Uncle Sam will always come to their help. What we should be doing instead is teaching them how to help themselves by growing their own food for themselves.

An energetic program of home production of their food needs would probably mean the end of the old plantation system, with its startling extremes of wealth and poverty, with its strange paradox of food exports from countries whose poor lack the necessities of life. We can all agree that these contradictions will have to go.

But these discrepancies seemingly have impelled our administration favorites in Latin America to sell socialism to those countries. What we ought to be selling them is efficiency instead of socialism. That doesn't cost so much, and it might direct the attention of those governments to the real roots of their problems, and lead them toward the real solutions of a more diversified, more productive agriculture.

This Bill Provides That Any Railroad Man May Retire After 30 Years' Service Regardless of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD a bill I have just introduced to amend section 2 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, relating to eligibility for annuities. The bill reads as follows:

That subdivisions 1 and 2, and the first paragraph of subdivision 3, of section 2 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"ANNUITIES

"SEC. 2. (a) The following-described individuals, if they shall have been employees on or after the enactment date, shall, subject to the conditions set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d), be eligible for annuities after they shall have ceased to render compensated service to any person, whether or not an employer as defined in section 1 (a) (but with the right to engage in other employment to the extent not prohibited by subsection (d)):

"1. Individuals, without regard to age, who on or after the enactment date shall have completed 30 years of service.

"2. Individuals who on or after the enactment date shall be 50 years of age or over and either (a) have completed 20 years of service or (b) have become totally and permanently disabled for regular employment for hire, but the annuity of such individuals shall be reduced one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that they are under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue.

"3. Individuals, without regard to age, who on or after the enactment date are totally and permanently disabled for regular employment for hire and shall have completed 20 years of service."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall not be applicable with respect to annuities for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Address by Frank E. Gannett at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by the Honorable Frank E. Gannett at the National Food Conference, Chicago, Ill., on September 16 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the heads of the agricultural departments of 16 States urged me to call this National Food Conference and act as chairman. I am glad I was able to accept this call, because I believe that food is the most important subject before the Nation today. We cannot win this war or write the peace without an adequate supply of food. Food is as essential as tanks, planes, guns, and ships. It is our patriotic duty to see to it that there is sufficient food for our men in our fighting forces and for our people at home who are producing the necessary war material. We are called upon to provide food for our allies and for the starving millions who have been and will be released from the Nazi yoke.

Never was there such a demand on a people as this need for food. The utmost that we can produce will not be enough.

It may be well to remind you that this terrible war in which we are engaged is due fundamentally to the lack of food. Wars over the centuries have been caused by the need for food. For self-sufficiency in food, Mussolini grabbed territory in Africa. For the same reason Hitler attacked Russia and drove into the rich Ukraine. It was for the lack of self-sufficiency in food that Japan began her gangster seizure of adjoining territory and finally attacked Great Britain and us in the Far East. Thus you see the importance of this subject before us cannot be exaggerated. It must be given our first consideration if we are to win the war and write the peace.

I am delighted to see this great interest in this meeting, and on behalf of the commissioners, secretaries, and directors of agriculture, I welcome you here today. The presence here of such a large audience is proof that the agricultural leaders who conceived this idea of holding this conference were correct in their view that there was a crying need for a full discussion of this vital subject.

In their petition to me a number of the commissioners said, and I quote:

"The programs of food production, rationing, price ceilings, and distributions are showing steady day-by-day deterioration. It is apparent there is bungling and confusion in the wartime food program on the part of the numerous duplicated agencies dealing with this vital problem. This confusion is causing uncertainty, apprehension, and distrust in the public mind, thus militating against our country's war effort.

"At this time there is urgent need for a national food conference at which all aspects of the food situation, including increased production, processing, rationing, price ceilings, and distribution may be openly discussed."

There is need, as these commissioners say, for a thorough discussion of these great questions before us. In order to deal with every phase of this important subject, we have arranged a wonderful program. I don't believe there ever has been anything equal to it. Six United States Senators are to speak to us, and we are to hear from nationally recognized authorities on the various phases of food at each of the five sessions.

Let me say right here that our program has been arranged so that we may get all the light possible on the food situation. We want to find out how we can produce more food and how we can best distribute it to consumers when it is available.

I am sure that the fine addresses we are to hear at this conference will stimulate our thinking and encourage us to greater efforts to meet the crisis that we face. I am sure that out of the discussions will come some sound, practical suggestions for improving the whole food situation and solving this great problem.

As a result of unexpectedly favorable weather, the indications are that we shall have this year a far better crop than was expected. The indications are there will be a decrease of only about 10 percent from last year's figures. This production has been obtained in the face of great handicaps and gives the farmers of America good reason to be proud of the remarkable job they have done.

Last spring I sent out a questionnaire to thousands of farmers, editors, and publishers. More than 5,000 farmers and a thousand editors replied. Ninety percent said that lack of trained help was the farmer's biggest problem; 89 percent blamed the Government's interference for decreasing production; 83 percent said that price ceilings were too low; 79 percent said lack of machinery and repairs hindered production most.

If it had not been for these obstacles, what an amazing supply of food we might have harvested this year. Of course, it is too late now to alter production for 1943, but we must begin this minute to make our plans for 1944 if we are to have increased production. The obstacles that the farmers face must be removed.

Our war plants have done an amazing job in the production of material. Never has there been anything like it. The Government has given industry all possible encouragement to make this great achievement possible.

But in the production of food that has not been the case, in spite of the fact, as I have said, that food is just as important as the product of any factory.

So far the Government has not even had a program, and so far as the general public knows, there is no program for next year's crucial production. Farmers are winding up the season with no definite knowledge of what their plans should be for next year, except for a few goals specific only for wheat and for official recognition of the already obvious fact that triple-A restrictions are out of the window, farmers know nothing of what the attitude of the Government will be for 1944. They have been given no specific assurance on prices, labor, transportation, feed, fertilizer, farm supplies, and a dozen other items necessary for successful food production. The "desk" farmer in Washington doesn't seem to realize that farm production cannot be turned on and off like a spigot. They don't understand that farming is a continuous operation that must be planned ahead some 6 months to a year and in many cases even longer.

Planting time for winter wheat and other small grains is at hand, but the farmers don't know yet what to do. Every day lost means a loss in food production.

For these reasons it was especially appropriate that we should have a discussion here which would center interest on the food situation and reveal to the public the great need for action. We hope that this conference will create such strong public opinion that results will promptly follow.

In order that we may crystallize the thinking of this conference, I am going to appoint a committee to draft resolutions after they have heard the subjects discussed. These resolutions will be submitted to the conference and, if acceptable, will be passed on to the Congress in the hope that it will bring about the legislation that will be needed to correct unfavorable conditions.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a notable address on the subject Post-War Problems, delivered by the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, before the New York Board of Trade on September 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For the first time since Hitler invaded Poland in 1939, we are justified in a feeling of optimism about the trend of world news. That does not mean that the war is nearing an end, for there is much tough going ahead. We have hardly set foot in Europe, and every step of the way to Berlin will be won at great cost and great sacrifice. When Germany has been defeated we will still have our hands full in the Pacific.

We do have the enemy on the defensive, but the price of victory will still be very, very dear. We do foresee the destruction of the Axis' threat to rule the world, and, while the day of victory may yet be further away than we like to think, the day of peace will come.

It is necessary, therefore, that we be in a position to shift from war to peace without too much lost motion in the shifting. There lies the responsibility of business and industry, as well as Government.

We must be prepared to give jobs to the men and women now in the armed forces, and many others engaged in war work. This is what I mean by post-war planning. There is no mystery about it. It is just as necessary to prepare for peace as it is to prepare for war. They both mean work, and more work; planning, and more planning, as the scene changes.

Many people think that the war slipped up on us, but let's go back and see what we did, looking to the possibilities of war.

Beginning in January 1940, the President asked Congress for more than $7,000,000,000 to expand our Army and Navy, and Congress voted the money. In his speech before the Congress, May 1940, the President asked that we prepare to build facilities that could construct 50,000 airplanes a year. Few people thought this possible. June 1940, Congress gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation extraordinary powers to build war plants, and to buy and stock-pile critical and strategic materials. Under this authority, the R. F. C. has authorized the expenditure of more than $24,000,000,000 for purely war purposes, building plants of all character, and buying critical and strategic materials in all parts of the world. We have substantial stock piles of every material needed to prosecute the war, including natural rubber, and our synthetic-rubber industry, started 2½ years ago and accelerated immediately after Pearl Harbor, is already producing almost to the capacity of our former requirements.

September 1940, Congress passed the Selective Service Act, and October 1940, the President traded 50 over-age destroyers for American air bases on British island possessions.

December 1940, the President pledged that the United States would be the arsenal of democracy.

In 1941, at the request of the President, Congress passed the Lend-Lease Act, with an initial appropriation of $7,000,000,000. Aid was extended to Russia. Congress rewrote the draft act and revised the Neutrality Act, so as to enable us to maintain the flow of military supplies to those nations fighting the Axis. All of this planning, mind you, was before Pearl Harbor. For a democracy in which only Congress can declare war, we were doing very well in preparation, for what, to the President and Secretary Hull, was the inevitable.

Since Pearl Harbor, we have met the demands of total war. We have seen all our forces mobilized. We have seen warfare on a gigantic global scale. We have seen military campaigns mapped out as never before were conceived by the mind of man. We have seen brilliant world military strategy.

We have also seen the stupendous victory won by private enterprise. The achievements of American industry have made possible the conquering march of our armed forces.

These achievements represent the ingenuity, the efforts, and the patriotism of a people nurtured in the philosophy of free enterprise, and trained in the school of private business.

This magnificent achievement by private industry shows what we can do when forced into war, and what we can do in returning to peace.

But we must prepare. We must find new jobs, new markets, new outlets for the vital energies of our people. Our post-war planning must take into account other countries, with particular consideration for those which have been overrun by the enemy. It must include the reconstruction of their enterprise as well as their people. We must literally bind the wounds of a war-torn world.

By this I do not mean that we in the United States can shoulder the whole load. But we must so plan as to give our own people work, and, in cooperation with the other United Nations, be of every possible assistance to the people of those countries which have suffered most.

To be able to help others, we must first be strong ourselves.

This is the challenge that industry and government will face in the post-war period. Private initiative alone cannot do it. In many instances government must continue to have a hand in business. It must make investments and take risks where private capital cannot afford to, just as government had to take risks and do most of the financing for expansion of our industrial facilities to meet the demands of war.

In addition to the billions spent by the War and Navy Departments, and the Maritime Commission, in building for war purposes, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through its subsidiary, Defense Plant Corporation, has authorized more than $9,000,000,000 for the construction, equipment, or expansion of 1,753 plants throughout the country for the production of war supplies.

These include 534 plants for the manufacture of airplanes, airplane engines, and parts; 84 plants for the production and fabrication of aluminum; 35 plants for the production of aviation gasoline and related products; 116 plants for the manufacture of machine tools; 40 plants for the production and fabrication of magnesium; 60 plans for the mining and production of minerals and metal products; 75 plants for the manufacture of ordnance; 98 plants for the manufacture of radio and other scientific equipment; 65 plants for the construction of ships, ship engines and parts; 164 plants for the production of iron, steel, and related products; 60 plants for synthetic rubber and the chemicals and materials necessary to its manufacture; 14 plants for the manufacture of jewel bearings and diamond dies; 43 for the production of hemp and rope fiber.

We have built 6 pipe lines for the transportation of petroleum products.

We have opened or financed 2,000 mines for the production of critical materials in our own country.

I enumerate these to indicate the extent to which Government is in business, and some of the industries in which it has a large stake. Thus, it is clear that Government and business must find a solution which will be fair to both.

When the war is over, Government should get out of active industry as soon as it can, without too much unnecessary loss. And business will do well to recognize the taxpayers' investment, when negotiating for Government-owned plants, properties and supplies, and not expect too many bargains.

Many of our war plants can be converted to the production of peacetime requirements, and to avoid monopolies and too much concentration, local people should have the first call on such plants. A substantial amount of our excess plant facilities and supplies can very properly be used in other countries, if means can be found to finance them, and I think they can.

Obviously, what to do about Government-owned facilities and supplies will be a matter for the President and the Congress to determine. The solution will not be an easy one, and those of us in administrative positions, aided by business and industry, must present plans, suggestions, and ideas that will be helpful to them in making their decisions. The future of our economy will depend, in substantial measure, on how the post-war world is organized, but I see no threat to business.

Personally, I have stated, and here repeat, that I have no fear but that government will deal fairly with industry because I am convinced that our people want to maintain the principle of free enterprise which is the foundation upon which our economy has been built.

But until the day of victory we must bend our backs to the production needed for war. We must not let the military advantages we have won fool us into thinking that the war will soon be over. False optimism that slows down the flow of materials which we must maintain to every fighting front will result in the loss of thousands of lives.

Our men are fighting wherever duty calls them. They are supporting our highest patriotic traditions. They are offering their lives that our country may endure. They ask no questions and shirk no duty.

They only demand of us that we supply them with things to fight with, and bring them back to the kind of country they left and that they are fighting for. We at home would be unworthy of the sacrifices they make if we fail them. We will not.

If we are to judge by the results of polls, by expressions in Congress, by the editorial opinion throughout the country, the public view has shifted radically in the last 3 years in favor of political and military collaboration with other nations for the preservation of peace. Whether public opinion has shifted in the same sense, in the direction of post-war international collaboration in the economic field, is not so clear. Yet it is apparent that political and military arrangements cannot preserve peace if we have economic warfare.

Therefore, the good-neighbor policy which, with the approval of the President, Secretary Hull has been developing these past 10 years will become of increasing importance.

In the decades prior to the depression we were too busy supplying our own needs to properly develop our foreign trade.

With some rare and very successful exceptions, American businessmen had regarded foreign trade as a byproduct. They had not made the same effort to cultivate and advance it that other nations did. This was particularly true on this hemisphere.

The war has emphasized that the nations of the Western Hemisphere should develop their social and trade relations and further cement the ties that now bind them together. This can be done in perfect fairness to people of other parts of the world.

In doing this we cannot expect our neighbors to deal with us if we do not attempt to meet and anticipate their needs. We must supply them with what they want—not just what we want to sell them. And we must be prepared to develop markets for them in this country.

That is the way in which American business can back up our Government in the furtherance of the good-neighbor policy, and to its own advantage.

The opportunities which will open with the coming of peace are almost inconceivable.

There are few enterprises which will not face tremendous demands. Take our own country alone. We need new houses, new roads, new automobiles, household appliances, furniture, refrigerators, gas and electrical appliances, etc. These constitute just a few of the items which will be needed in vast quantities. If we buy War bonds with our excess earnings, and save them, we will be able to buy the many things we have been denied during the war, and that will create a demand which will provide work and make business.

We shall have a healthy infant industry coming to maturity in airplane travel and shipping.

There is probably not a State, county, or municipality that will not need to extend or repair its facilities—schools, streets, waterworks, sewerage, fire protection, etc.

Railroads, bus and truck lines will need to repair and replace their equipment. Public utilities will need overhauling, and there will be the reconstruction problems in the countries that have been overrun. People in the farthest outposts have learned that there are new things to be had that will improve their living conditions. They will want as many of these as they can get, and there will be the normal advances of science and invention that are continually contributing new things to improve our living standards and make work.

The United States will be called upon to supply goods and services for many parts of the world.

Business and government will necessarily have to cooperate in this great task.

The Department of Commerce, established to foster and promote our trade and commerce, will be available to business.

In closing, I should like to emphasize that we have nothing to fear if we carry into the future the confidence, the courage, and the ability with which we have always met any situation.

Food for 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Food for 1944," delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, at the National Food Conference, Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After nearly 2 years of war, the Nation finds itself without visible evidence of a consistent food policy. Food is more necessary than munitions as material of war. It can be a powerful instrument for shaping the peace. Needless risks are being incurred with respect to the character of the final victory, and needless chances are being taken with civilian morale. An orderly and understandable food program, projected into 1944 and 1945, could greatly lessen the gamble.

Little definite information has been made public as to the food draft expected for either the Allied or occupied countries.

Farmers find themselves short of machinery, of labor, of fertilizer, and of supplies. As producers they are confronted with confusions and uncertainties and entangled in red tape and restrictions.

Domestic consumers, including war workers, find themselves presented with time-taking regulations, puzzling contradictions, black markets, and sometimes useless ration coupons.

There can be little reason to expect that those whose exceptional talent for confusion has been its main cause will be able to bring order out of widespread chaos.

A fresh start needs to be made. There is one possible way by which this might be done.

Congress has reassembled this week. Most of its Members are well aware of the most disturbing aspects of the food situation. They probably do not expect that its many complexities, already compounded by administrative confusion, can be straightened out, nor that a food policy can be created, by any direct act of legislation.

Congress could, however, provide for bringing the full facts to light and for prompt initiation of a correct program.

One method would be to require the appointment of an independent committee of eminent Americans. This should be a committee of the caliber and character of the Baruch Committee on Rubber. It should be instructed to get at the truth and to recommend the necessary actions. Such a committee, created and confirmed by Congress, would certainly command public backing of such power as to bring obedience to its recommendations.

The value of such a report would be measured by the stature and public acceptance of those who prepared it. No precaution should be neglected to assure that the members, if such a committee is chosen, be individuals whose independence and integrity instantly command the respect of all classes of Americans.

I know of no other practicable method for bringing quickly into the full light of the national day the force of truth necessary to assure maximum production and distribution of war food.

That the food problem has been mishandled beyond excuse is apparent from even a casual view of the facts.

No foresight was required to be aware of one thing. In a total war of world size, no matter how much food is produced, there cannot be too much. Probably there cannot be enough. Few mistakes can be afforded.

Those who have first-hand acquaintance with agriculture in the United States know that modern farming is a skilled occupation. They know that foodstuffs, any more than dollars, are not picked from bushes without previous effort. In Washington their practical voices were ignored.

Draft, labor, and price programs were initiated which promptly and tremendously reduced agriculture's manpower.

For manpower there is a partial substitute in machinery. It was promptly decreed that for 1942 there should be available for machinery less than one-fourth of the amount of steel normally required. Apparently never more than about 3 percent of the total steel output has normally been required for farm equipment. It is possible that more steel has been wasted in needless extravagances than could have been used to build more than the normal farm machinery output. Grudgingly the allotment of materials for farm equipment has lately been moved up to around 80 percent of normal. Now, it does not seem unreasonable to presume that since there cannot be too much food and there can be too little, since farm manpower has been drastically reduced, and since new and up-to-the-minute machinery can tremendously expand food production, the sensible procedure now might well be to double the normal output of machinery rather than to continue to curtail it. Metals are vital on the food front, as well as on the fighting fronts.

Perhaps others on this program will speak of the incredible lengths of Government interference which made even the restricted equipment output stupidly difficult for farmers to procure. The Washington experts thought, for instance, that they knew more than either farmers or the machinery trade about where the machinery ought to be delivered. Consequently they sent cotton machinery where there was no cotton, fertilizer drills where there was no fertilizer, and otherwise managed to intrude their own special confusions into farming, into the equipment business, and into transportation.

The procedures affecting the meat supply have been equally revealing. No farmer could stay in business if he followed Washington ideas of livestock operation and economics.

The Nation's output of meat and of such livestock products as milk, butter, cheese, and eggs is made possible by constant and understanding human attention to animal needs. Productive animals receive attention daily, frequently two or three times daily, through most of their lives. Little of importance can be done for them by inexperienced, part-time help.

Although machinery can considerably expand production of field crops, the most necessary factor in the output of animal products probably is still experienced manpower. The experienced manpower is increasingly absent or aged.

While the competition for the grand championship in the confusion makers' class is not yet closed, the Washington blunderbund offers no contenders more promising than the creators of the meat situation.

Feeder cattle and lambs are reasonably abundant in the range States, where their early growth can be put on with the most natural economy of resources. Last year saw the record crop of all time in the Corn Belt, and this year's crop is better than could have been expected. Corn makes meat. The lean young creatures of the range, normally moving to the feedlots of the Corn Belt, there blossom out with pounds and quality. Other corn makes pork, and usually there is plenty left to be shipped into the skilled hands of the northeastern dairy and poultry farmers to make milk and eggs.

But the Corn Belt feed lots are relatively bare of cattle and lambs. The Northeast's granaries are desperately short of feed.

We have the young cattle and the lambs, we have the corn, we still have the dairy cows and chickens. It would appear that we should have an excellent prospect for plenty of good meat, milk, and eggs.

What is lacking? Only common sense in the Washington agencies. Monkey wrenches in the price machinery, crowbars in the production machinery, and impertinence instead of expertness have nullified the patriotic efforts of a million farmers and ranchmen. There can't be too much food nor too much meat. There will be vast quantities less than might have been produced had not the rash power of Federal ignorance been intruded.

The excuse for interference has been that prices have to be controlled to restrain inflation. Few will take issue with the purpose.

What has been consistently ignored is that plenty is the surest barrier to inflation. The administration's total of cross-purposes, crude mistakes, and deliberate politics adds up dangerously near to more promotion than prevention of inflation.

Run-away inflation follows scarcity of goods and excessive debt. The administration has steadily contributed to both causes. The necessities of war are bound to cause scarcities and to pile up debt. Interferences with production by stupid and confused direction are making the scarcities worse than they have any need to be. Combined with that, the administration squanderlust heaps up the costs of both military and civilian goods. If the tragedy of inflation is added to the tragedy of war, Washington will be its Pearl Harbor.

No more amazing product of upside-down thinking and fourth-term politics has yet been offered by the mystery minds of the administration than the program for subsidies and roll-backs. The net effect is to feed war-prosperous consumers by borrowing grocery money from the pockets of the future veterans of this war. It is a deceptive plan to increase Government debt, which will burden the earnings of our fighters during all the years after they put off their uniforms. It is a scarcity-promoting scheme, since it proposes to subsidize the consumption of those food items of which we have least in proportion to need. It ignores the common sense of farmers who do not ask for subsidies when none are needed and no constructive purpose can be served. If the program is advanced because the administration is timorous in the presence of certain labor leaders, let the high political command recall that Americans are primarily concerned at present with winning a war and saving a nation for its greater future.

There is no occasion for side-stepping the central fact regarding this whole sorry picture of confusion over the food situation. It is the direct consequence of disorderly administration. The Chief Executive delayed appointing a food administrator until months of time were lost. Since then he has appointed three. With none has he exercised the plain common sense of making their authority equal to their responsibility. He has continued fragments of authority over food production and distribution in widely scattered agencies. In most of these agencies inferior appointees exercise authority inferior to their responsibility, and exercise it with knowledge of agriculture inferior to their zeal for power.

It is because this is the central fact of the problem that I have ventured to suggest that Congress assume the initiative by providing that a distinguished committee shall report the facts as they are and make recommendations that cannot be ignored.

This war means too much to the future happiness of Americans to permit any faltering. Critical shortages of food can prolong the war. Conditions in the Old World are such that there is no possibility that more food can be grown in the United States than will be needed here and over there. Food may conceivably become one of the most powerful instruments for strengthening the American hand in laying the foundations of an enduring peace.

We are concerned, therefore, not merely with the food supply of the immediate present but with what can be produced in 1944 and in 1945 and for years still further distant.

Farmers are tremendously anxious to do everything they possibly can. They have worked long hours, taking pride in each extra bushel and pound of output. They have resorted to every expedient to make their equipment extend its service over additional years and additional acres. They have understood that a warring nation cannot supply them with every production need. While the prices of their products have risen, the costs of every item entering into production have risen faster. They have worked patiently with inadequate and often inefficient labor. Farm labor has often more than doubled in cost because it has done less work at higher wages. Farm wives and children have toiled extra hours.

Their patriotism and determination clearly demonstrated by their achievement, should entitle the farm people of America to the right to use their own judgment and to make their own decisions. They know how they can best accomplish the maximums of production. Their work should no longer be hampered by the excesses of Federal obstruction. Their output should not be retarded by the desire of those in power to exercise controls, to write checks, and to establish political security for themselves. With a war to win, such luxuries cannot be afforded.

Unless a miracle of change takes place, little can be expected from piecemeal corrections of past mistakes. Either the stage must be set for a fresh start along more workable lines, or 1944 and later years will find the food power of the Nation less than it can well be made.

Farmers ask only for the least possible interference, for the most possible machinery, labor and supplies, and for prices at levels which will permit them to produce to the utmost and stay in business to produce again in future years.

The more nearly this simple principle is observed, the less rationing Americans will have to endure, the less want will have to be suffered by the victims of war abroad, the more lives will be saved, the stronger will be the Nation for war and for peace.

Food is indeed fundamental.

Freight Rate Legislation Will Not Fix Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Freight Rate Legislation Will Not Fix Prices," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal for September 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREIGHT-RATE LEGISLATION WILL NOT FIX PRICES

The report of the special board appointed by President Roosevelt to study the Transportation Act of 1940 bears out all of the contentions of southern spokesmen before the Interstate Commerce Commission on the advisability of equalizing the national freight-rate structure.

The three-man board which reported on Friday bore out the contention of counsel for the Southern Governors' Conference that railroad operation actually costs less in the South than it does in the Northeast.

Now that this point has been sufficiently debated so as to render it useless as a major railroad argument, the roads have adopted a different tactic. Although reductions in some class rates were made to the South a year or so ago, through the appeal of the Southern Governors' Conference to the I. C. C., the basic principle of regional discrimination has not been tackled by the Commission. The southerners, therefore, with general support from the West, have prepared to ask Congress to instruct the Commission to abolish the principle of regional differentials.

But at a recent meeting of southern and western Governors, called largely at the request of the southerners to plan for a common front on freight rate legislation, a surprise speaker appeared in the form of William Jeffers, the former Rubber Coordinator now returned to the presidency of the Southern Pacific Railway. Mr. Jeffers, delivering a solemn warning against permitting Congress to enter the "price fixing field," apparently so impressed the westerners that no united action was agreed upon. Mr. Jeffers was, of course, merely voicing the latest concerted opinion of the powerful railroads and in doing so was lending himself to a somewhat disingenuous campaign. None of the bills which stand any chance of adoption (most of them probably will be rewritten into one embodying a short general principle) authorize Congress to fix freight rates or to enter the price-fixing field. They merely provide that Congress shall authorize the I. C. C. to abolish regional differentials.

But just as they stuck firmly by the plea of higher costs in the South until it was thoroughly discredited, the railroads apparently intend to wave the terrible banner of congressional price fixing wherever it will do the most good. It is not likely to impress the South, however, and it has not impressed the three members of Mr. Roosevelt's Board.

William C. Bullitt's Candidacy for Mayor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD two oratorical gems and misstatements of fact made last night in Philadelphia by the well-known chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Spangler. They are to be found in an article published in the Philadelphia Record. I hope the Members on the other side of the Senate will keep Mr. Spangler in Philadelphia until the mayoralty election is over.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPANGLER VISITS CITY TO AID G. O. P. MAYORALTY RACE—NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CHAIRMAN RIDICULES BULLITT AS "A KING JESTER"

(By Thomas P. O'Neil)

The Republican high command yesterday brought G. O. P. National Chairman Harrison E. Spangler, of Iowa, into Philadelphia as part of its campaign to defeat William C. Bullitt, Democratic candidate for mayor.

Spangler went to fantastic lengths to accomplish his mission.

He ridiculed Bullitt as "a King Jester."

SENT BY "NEW DEAL CROWD"

He declared the Democratic candidate was sent to Philadelphia to take over control of the city government by "the inner New Deal crowd."

He predicted that if Bullitt is elected the pay roll would be tripled, taxes increased, and Philadelphia would have "government by directives instead of by ordinances."

MAKES TWO APPEARANCES

The Republican national chairman made two appearances here—before about 1,000 division committee men and women in the afternoon at Town Hall and before the twenty-fourth ward Republican Club's fortieth annual banquet at the Bellevue-Stratford in the evening.

Spangler spoke extemporaneously at the afternoon session.

"When your city chairman, Mr. David W. Harris, invited me to come here," he said, "I debated whether it would be entirely proper for a person from a distant State to participate in even a small way in your local election.

SO HERE HE IS

"But when I heard the opposition was importing a nonresident of Philadelphia to run for mayor, I thought I had as much business here as he had—so here I am."

Spangler charged the New Deal wants to capture Philadelphia "because it is the only one of the great cities of America that has not faltered" in its Republicanism in city elections.

He declared the New Dealers "are looking hungrily at this stronghold and want to impose their kind of government on the people of Philadelphia.

"So the inner New Deal crowd sat down to pick you a candidate for mayor," Spangler continued. "Harry Hopkins was there. So was HENRY WALLACE, the boomerang man. And Frankfurter was there, too."

HOPKINS FIRST CHOICE

According to Spangler, Harry Hopkins was first choice for mayor of Philadelphia, "but they decided against him because he is so good at giving things away they thought they'd better continue to let him handle lend-lease.

"Then," Spangler added, "they decided upon a man known around Washington as one of the king's jesters.

"If he is elected—and I know he won't be—there would be an immediate tripling of the number of your public officials. Your streets would be overrun with men on the pay roll—just as they are in Washington. And these pay-rollers wouldn't do anything but draw their pay—just as they do in Washington.

CREDITS ECONOMY TO G. O. P.

"Your taxes would be suddenly increased, as they have been in all the New Deal cities. You now have the lowest tax rate of any large city in the country. That's because the Republican Party which controls your municipal affairs believes in good government, efficiency, and economy."

Finally, Spangler conjured up a vision of "government by directives" in the event of a Democratic victory here.

Winding up his address to the division workers, the G. O. P. chairman said:

"Judging from everything I get, Philadelphia will be more Republican after the November election than it has been for many years."

CHARGES NEW DEAL PLOT

At the twenty-fourth ward dinner, Spangler said "the palace guard of the White House is seeking to New Dealize Philadelphia by sending one of the Federal yes-men into the city to seek the office of mayor."

"They have said to you, the people of Philadelphia," said Spangler, "that you are no longer competent to choose your own elected officials.

"Do you believe for a moment that if William Bullitt were elected as your mayor he would consider himself the servant of the people of Philadelphia; that he would battle side by side with you to restore local self-government in America?"

ADDS ICKES, GUFFEY, AND FLYNN

Spangler retold his story of the "inner New Deal crowd," adding Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes and United States Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY to the list of those he said were present.

GUFFEY, he said, proposed Bullitt, but nobody would "second the nomination." He thereupon telephoned to "Boss Ed Flynn in the Bronx," Spangler said, and Flynn gave his approval to "this millionaire playboy."

PREDICTS HIGHER TAXES

Spangler warned against loss of self-government in Philadelphia in the event of Bullitt's election and predicted waste rather than economy in Philadelphia government and higher taxes.

"Under the New Deal nationally," he said, "there are today more than 3,000,000 Federal employees. Election of Bullitt would bring to your city the philosophy that government is the art of adding more and more people to the public pay roll."

Election of the Republican candidates for office, he predicted, would mean a government dedicated to service of the people of the city, economy in government, and "constant obedience to the principles of republican government upon which our Nation was founded here in Philadelphia."

WAGE-TAX CRITICS DENOUNCED

Critics of Philadelphia's wage tax were denounced by Acting Mayor Bernard Samuel as "municipal mongrels."

"I call upon all civic-minded people of Philadelphia to get together and gag these howlers with ballots," Samuel urged.

Washington Community War Fund Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the timely and able remarks delivered by Mr. Preston Delano, Comptroller of the Currency, now the chairman of the Government Division for the Community War Fund, made by him at the opening of the Government division mass meeting held on Monday, October 4.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Jennings, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, this meeting marks the opening of the 1944 Washington Community War Fund campaign. We who are gathered here today represent the Government division of that campaign, which has for its purpose the raising of funds for three great causes:

First, the aid and comfort of our armed forces at home and abroad;

Second, assistance to our fighting allies and to those unfortunate people who lie under the domination of a ruthless enemy; and

Third, the relief of that portion of the local citizenship, which, less fortunate than ourselves, needs a helping hand.

This year the Community War Fund is faced with the necessity of raising a sum far greater than ever before, and the Government division is asked to carry its share of this increased burden. There is little need to explain the reason for the heavier task. The world drama in which we live provides the answer. We shoulder the responsibility willingly, but with the poignant realization that it is one of unusual difficulty. It calls for determined resolution.

We are appealing to our fellow Government workers at a particularly unfortunate time, when they are already heavy laden with other demands and obligations. Only the extreme urgency of our case justifies our course. But the case is urgent and no cause ever more just.

To meet the gravity of this situation, there has been assembled a great organization of Government personnel—some 7,000 in number—of which you here today constitute the leadership. You are the striking force. A comprehensive program has been laid out for your use. There are the usual forms and reports—some good literature has been prepared which you have already received. I believe over a million and a half pieces have been distributed. Others will talk to you of these technical details.

I have mentioned the difficulties. They are heavy and yet they should be swept aside by a realization of the significance of the thing we are attempting to do. We are not seeking a dole for charity. We in this division are members of a Government at war. Each individual has his or her share in this vast Federal machine which includes the military and naval arms. These fighting arms face special hardships and dangers. It is simple justice that we behind the lines should give up a trifle of our present comfort to our fellow workers who have drawn the harder lot. Our Government provides its fighting men with the best weapons and equipment in the world but it is our responsibility to see that they have that little something more which is so important—a bit of sympathy and comfort, that touch of home without which the strain and risks of war become unbearable.

This young and very imperfect civilization of ours is rich—rich because it has time in its purse. In its growth there is the pledge of a better future. It is perhaps unfortunate for us that we do not live in that future. Yet we can contribute to it. It seems to be the task and responsibility of this generation to hold fast to certain principles painfully established and without which we perish. Unless we do stand fast, there can be no future. It is a hard post to which we are assigned, but it is one of great honor.

National War Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the President last evening in connection with the national war fund.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends and fellow Americans, we, the people of the United States, know now that ultimate victory is certain, but that it is still a long way off and that for it we are paying and shall have to pay a great price.

In the genius of the American people—for freedom and decency and friendliness among neighbors—lies one of our best weapons for that victory, and certainly our greatest insurance for a peace that will be just and lasting. Our men and our allies know they have made no covenant with our Government alone. They know they have the backing of all the resources and spirit of the American people themselves. In that conviction alone lies the winning morale which no slave of a dictator can ever know.

That is why I am glad to speak to you tonight about the National War Fund. It is a philanthropic federation with three simple aims: First, to determine the nature and the extent of the war-related needs; second, to see that everybody has a chance to contribute to the funds required; and, third, to channel the sums raised for its member agencies wherever American help is currently most needed—enough and on time.

The National War Fund has the hearty approval and support of all the Government agencies concerned with our management of the war. For the National War Fund, by its unity, its economy, its competent management, and its elimination of waste, duplication, and delay, is playing a part in our total war effort which all of us in Washington regard as an absolute essential.

In its unity of purpose, and its federation of agencies without surrender of State and local freedom of method, the National War Fund combines the American genius for organization, the American capacity for economy, and the best of our American tradition for giving freely, promptly, and in proportion to our means and the need.

For these reasons, when your local War Fund or Community Chest asks you to give—for our own forces, for our allies, and for the needs at home, I ask all of you to think about it carefully before you give.

I ask you to remember that the U. S. O. is your share of what we are doing for our own fighting men, and the forces behind the lines. I ask you to consider that War Prisoners Aid does what no government can do. I ask you to think of United Seamen's Service in terms of the people's debt to the men who took our ships across in the darkest hours of the war. And I ask you not to forget that the people of Russia and China and of all the other United Nations—and especially the unfortunate, hungry men, women, and children of all the overrun and enslaved countries—see in your personal and friendly concern the brightest ray of hope and the greatest power for good in the world today—the

sovereign voice of the people of the United States.

I ask you, therefore, to give thoughtfully, and generously, and proportionately—remembering as you give, that a share in the National War Fund is a share in winning the war, and in winning the right of freemen to live in a better world.

Beheading of an American Flyer by the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from today's newspapers giving an account of what the President said in his press conference yesterday regarding the beheading of an American flyer by the Japanese.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHEADING OF ALLIED FLYER CALLED BARBARIC BY PRESIDENT

President Roosevelt yesterday described the Japanese beheading of a captured Allied flyer as barbaric conduct which proves that Japan lacks civilization, and he reported at the same time that the Japanese military position in the entire Solomons-New Guinea area is weakening.

His remarks came at a news conference after the State Department made it plain that the Jap officers responsible for the execution will be brought to judgment by the United Nations if possible.

He labeled the Japanese uncivilized in response to a question about the beheading of an Allied flyer—whose fate was revealed in a diary taken from a Jap prisoner in Salamaua, New Guinea.

(The diary related that the flyer was forced to sit on the edge of a bomb crater, his hands tied, while the local Japanese commander beheaded him with a sword in accordance with the Japanese Samurai code. It said that after the victim was executed in the presence of Jap troops, his abdomen was laid open with the same sword by an enemy seaman.)

JAPS LACK CIVILIZATION

Mr. Roosevelt was deliberate in saying that the Japanese lack civilization, explaining it is the worst epithet he could possibly hurl at them because it is the one thing that gets under their skin.

He said the people of the United States are drawing their own conclusion over this instance of barbaric Japanese conduct.

Mr. Roosevelt also spoke of other instances of cruel treatment by the Japs, but declined to elaborate. It was recalled, however, that last spring he branded as inhuman and barbaric the Japanese execution of some of the American flyers who raided Tokyo and vowed that those responsible would be brought to book.

On that occasion this Government formally warned Tokyo that acts of "criminal barbarity inflicted upon American prisoners in violation of the rules of warfare" will be avenged.

Yesterday the State Department called attention to that note in response to inquiries concerning the latest atrocity.

After the execution of several of the flyers, who participated in the Tokyo raid, Japanese broadcasts proclaimed Japan's intention to deal likewise with any airmen taken prisoner during raids on her territory and said Premier Hideki Tojo's government "regretted" that the United States did not support its "new international law in matters of aerial warfare."

Japanese broadcasts also pledged that every American flyer participating in future raids on Japanese territory "has a special pass to hell—and rest assured it is strictly a one-way ticket."

(The Tokyo government itself ignored the United States protests and refused to furnish details on the execution of the flyers.)

REDS CONDEMN HITLER

Meanwhile the Soviet Information Bulletin disclosed that Russia is just as determined as the other United Nations to mete out "stern punishment" to Adolf Hitler, leaders of his government, and other German officials responsible for wartime atrocities.

The Soviet attitude was set forth in an article which said criminal responsibility for atrocities attached to Hitler and his cabinet ministers, the Nazi Party leaders, the German Army command, and Hitler's commissioners and representatives in the occupied areas.

It said heads of financial and industrial concerns supporting them are the "organizers of these crimes and associates with them."

Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on many occasions during the recent debate on the important measure which has just been passed, the name of Bernard M. Baruch has been mentioned in commendation for his faithful service and the excellent work which he has done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four brief editorials in commendation of the excellent service rendered by that distinguished American.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial of September 29, 1943]

SUPPORT MARSHALL, OR—

Bernard Baruch, in whom the country has great confidence, pleads with Congress and the people either to give General Marshall what he wants—that is, the men he asks from the draft—or to throw him out.

"The man in charge of the job should be given unqualified support. No cheese paring. No trading down. Give him what he needs. In such a matter it is better to be safe than sorry."

Mr. Baruch's appeal was made to a congressional group considering the Wheeler bill, which would defer drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers at least until January. General Marshall, Admiral King, and other high military and naval experts previously had urged that Congress do nothing to interfere with the drafting of the men now programmed for induction.

If, after all the arguments that have been made, General Marshall and Admiral King insist, on their own initiative and not out of loyalty to nontechnical superiors, that they need 1,221,000 men during the last third of 1943, they should have them.

We must have confidence in somebody to decide such questions on the basis of knowledge that cannot be shared with the lay public and of military education and experience that only the best of the brass hats possess.

There is ground still for grave doubt whether, if the armed forces are built up to the size projected, industry will retain sufficient manpower to supply them with all the shipping, equipment, and supplies they need. But in the end the Chiefs of Staff must decide that.

If laymen, including Congress, were to interfere and make a mistake, the consequences would be too terrible to consider. On the other hand, if the Chiefs of Staff are permitted to rule and they prove to be overoptimistic, the sin will be on their heads.

It is doubtful if Congress should or will override the insistent demand of General Marshall and Admiral King. But that demand is not for pre-Pearl Harbor forces; it is for a specified number of physically capable men.

The Selective Service System must decide whence the recruits shall come. This is not of the same highly technical character as the other question. Laymen have a right to insist that before pre-Pearl Harbor fathers are drafted, every other resource shall have been exhausted.

That has not yet been done. In this field Congress still has room to function as guardian of the people's rights.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of September 25, 1943]

NOTHING ELSE TO DO

It remained for Bernard M. Baruch, wise and patriotic South Carolinian, to say the last word to the Senate committee about the Wheeler bill to defer the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. Mr. Baruch had just completed a carfeul study of the manpower situation. He knew a lot about it before he made the survey. It was somewhat absurdly rumored at Washington that Senator WHEELER expected Mr. Baruch to save his bill from defeat—although later WHEELER said he had little hopes of this because "Mr. Baruch is an administration man." One thing Mr. Baruch is not is a WHEELER man, insofar as the attitude of this Nation to international affairs is concerned. Baruch was no isolationist. He did not go into details about the drafting of fathers. He told the committee that if Gen. George C. Marshall said it was needed for the success of the Army, that was enough for him and ought to be enough for the Senators. "If you don't give him what he wants, then throw him out," advised the plain-speaking associate of War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes.

If General Marshall and Admiral King and the men over and under them agree on the view that it would be a backward step at this time to defer the drafting of fathers—and they do agree on it—Congress should be guided by their advice. These men have been appointed to direct the military phase of the war and they will be held responsible for it. We depend on them to get the greatest possible results at the smallest possible

cost. A man who fought bitterly for isolationism whenever opportunity offered, Senator WHEELER, of Montana, introduced a measure for the arbitrary deferment of eligible men on the ground that they were fathers. The generals and admirals tell us they cannot afford to have any such exemption granted now, that it will upset the military schedule and prevent taking full advantage of the successes we have gained, which means lengthening the war. Why should Congress hesitate a moment to reject WHEELER'S leadership and advice on such a subject and to accept the advice of men like Marshall and King? That is the substance of what Bernard M. Baruch had to say to the Senate committee. There is nothing else to do and there is every indication that Congress will do it.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of October 1, 1943]

BUDGETING MANPOWER

One point made by Bernard M. Baruch in his recent report on manpower has received comparatively little public consideration. This was his approval of the so-called budget system of apportioning manpower in war industries, as practiced particularly on the Pacific coast. Available labor, under this plan, is pooled and the various industrial plants are given quotas on which they may draw. Workers themselves are assigned to jobs according to production needs of the locality.

An essential feature of the budget plan is the establishment of local control to adjust the available workers to available jobs. Mr. Baruch made the point that successful local administration is the key to the manpower problem. Local authorities are best equipped to know the needs of the community, to keep count of the available workers, and to know where and when they can be used to best advantage.

When properly organized, the budget system prevents overlapping of jobs and the accumulation of surplus manpower at any one point. It removes the temptation for one concern to bid against another for the services of workers. It is a simple device, in short, to spread manpower evenly over the war production areas of the country.

A corollary feature of the budget system is the adjustment of Government contracts to the labor supply of the community. It furnishes a check by which to balance Government work against the facilities for performing it. It ends the indiscriminate award of war jobs, in which one community may have more than it can handle while some other community has a surplus of workers. It brings the whole business within scientific proportion.

War plants throughout the country, we understand, are gradually coming to the budget system. Until it is generally adopted, we cannot say that we are making the best use of our manpower, either for industry or for military service.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press Gazette of September 27, 1943]

A JOB WELL DONE

Lack of rubber was expected by our foes to be a mortal blow to us. But we appear now to be secure.

Mr. Roosevelt cannot be blamed for getting off on the wrong foot in respect to this material. The claims were so conflicting they would have confused anyone. They necessitated a specialized investigation.

Correctly the President called in Mr. Baruch when he found himself pretty deep in trouble. Mr. Baruch did that very essential thing immediately, he got the facts straight. Then the President called in a competent, though swearing, director named Jeffers, president of the Union Pacific Railroad. And the great work began of constructing on our own soil plants for the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Not so long ago Mr. Jeffers, his work concluded because he could see all the machinery going and the end in sight, retired to his railroad job. Col. Bradley Dewey, his successor, told the American Chemical Society recently that the "specter of collapse from rubber shortage is gone." He elaborated with the declaration that by the end of the year we will have established a rate of production of 850,000 long tons of rubber annually, more than we need to keep rolling. Already our rate of production is past half of that amount.

No dictatorship under the sun could have handled this delicate problem more efficiently since the appointment of Mr. Baruch. For that let us say, well and good.

But let us not forget that when this war is over we are going to have quite a decision to make in respect to rubber and synthetic rubber, whether to aid South and Central America in the production of this highly critical war article, make it from our own agricultural products, or continue the very old-fashioned method of going clear to Asia for it.

Lame Ducks in Ermine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lame Ducks in Ermine," published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of October 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAME DUCKS IN ERMINE

In the Senate at Washington some months ago, bitter but unsuccessful opposition was raised against President Roosevelt's appointment of former Senator H. H. Schwartz (Democrat, of Wyoming) to be a member of the National Labor Mediation Board.

Senator EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, Republican, who defeated Schwartz in the election, in November 1942, was joined by Senator E. H. MOORE (Republican, of Oklahoma) in charging that the former Senator was being rewarded, by a Federal appointment, for 6 years of rubber-stamp approval of New Deal policies.

But such rewards are, of course, commonplace—almost automatic—under the New Deal regime.

One might fill whole pages with instances wherein Democratic Congressmen, Governors, and other public officials have been emphatically repudiated by the voters of their States, only to be accorded high honors by the Chief Executive through an exercise of the appointive power.

One such instance occurred as long ago as 1939, not long after senatorial elections in the State of Wisconsin, wherein the voters had stingingly repudiated New Deal Senator F. Ryan Duffy's bid for a second term.

No sooner had the people of Wisconsin turned thumbs down on Senator Duffy, emphatically signifying that they desired to have no part of his notions of government expressed on their behalf in Washington, than President Roosevelt went to the patronage wardrobe and procured for Duffy a judicial robe.

Thus a Senator who had run a poor third in a field of six in his attempt to succeed himself on Capitol Hill was made a Federal district judge, assigned to the very State whose citizens had declined to continue him in office, and enabled, in certain cases, to preside over courts elsewhere.

In the November 1988 elections in Wisconsin Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican (the present incumbent), came close to scoring a clear majority of the votes cast for six senatorial candidates.

Wiley polled 446,770 votes. His next opponent (Ekern, the Progressive candidate) polled 249,209. Senator Duffy (now Judge Duffy) received zealous New Deal support, but was able to muster only 231,976.

Thus, WILEY, whom the smear brigade subsequently listed as a despicable "isolationist," and as among the company of "illustrious dunderheads," won a nearly 2-to-1 victory over his New Deal "rubber stamp" opponent, Senator Duffy.

In that same election, three minor candidates polled a total of something under 10,000 votes, to produce a total of 937,503. Duffy's share of the Wisconsin suffrage in that election, therefore, figured out to less than one-fourth of the total.

There were many who supposed that the popular verdict, as expressed at the polls, would mean that Senator Duffy, upon completion of his one term (1933-39), would go quietly back to Fond du Lac to resume his law practice, perhaps engaging (as formerly) in Democratic politics "on the side."

But the dopesters' hunch that a plum would be passed Duffy's way proved to be the right hunch. Scarcely had the gentleman from Fond du Lac become ex-Senator Duffy, early in 1939, than the President commissioned him as Judge Duffy.

The President's decision cannot have been anything but highly pleasing to the Fond du Lac lawyer who had unsuccessfully endeavored to multiply 6 years of senatorial service by two.

For, when he became Judge Duffy, he became judge for life.

But the Duffy case, we repeat, is by no means exceptional or extraordinary; it is, rather, an extremely familiar and quite characteristic example of New Deal procedure.

There have been numerous other such instances in all parts of the country.

In 1940—2 years after Senator WILEY defeated Duffy et al., in Wisconsin, and in the same year in which "isolationist" Senator BOB LA FOLLETTE was overwhelmingly reelected from that State—an upsurge of anti-administration feeling here in Indiana retired New Dealer Sherman Minton from the Senate, and sent RAYMOND E. WILLIS, Republican, to Washington as Minton's successor.

Four months after the expiration of Minton's one and only term in the Senate, the President appointed him to the United States Court of Appeals.

Skipping a number of similar cases, we come down to the election of November 1942—and less than a year ago—when a whole galaxy of New Deal rubber stamps went forth to smear their opponents, and fairly to froth at what was alleged to be the stupidity and "dunderheadedness" of all pre-Pearl Harbor opposition to the New Deal's foreign policy—and some of its domestic policy, as well.

Everybody but the New Dealers—and, no doubt, even some of them—must have a fairly vivid memory of the results of that desperate smear campaign. It failed—utterly, miserably, and wretchedly.

A whole flock of badly spanked lame ducks went squawking from the polls—in a beeline to the pie counter.

Nor did their hopes for Presidential balm and soothing sirup go unrewarded.

Prentiss M. Brown, who had bawled and bugled all over the place in behalf of the whole New Deal program, got a terrific sock at the polls in Michigan.

But there had been no fading, crisping, or yellowing of the day-after-election newspapers recording Brown's ouster from the Senate, when Brown was affectionately tapped by Mr. Roosevelt to be national czar of the price-fixing, ration-regulating Office of Price Administration.

Similarly, that rubber-stamp of rubber-stamps, the breast-beating Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, was yanked out of the Senate by the disgusted voters of his State last November—only to be promptly coddled with an appointment to the Civil Aeronautics Board, despite the fact that he knew next to nothing about aeronautics.

It's all quite according to the strange New Deal Hoyle.

Washington Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the Secretary of the Interior commenting on an article which appeared originally in the magazine Nation's Business, was copied in condensed form by Reader's Digest, and reprinted by the department of governmental affairs of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for general distribution:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, September 30, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: The inquiry by telephone from your office presents a welcome opportunity to tell you about the Board on Geographical Names and its part in the war, and to inform you that the article in the Reader's Digest is a succession of gross untruths, quotations made up by the author, and malicious distortions. The man who wrote it, though informed that the Board is engaged largely in services for the armed forces and other war agencies, chose to say nothing whatever of that and to try to make the Board appear ridiculous.

The Board on Geographical Names is not a new agency. The original Board was established by President Harrison in 1890 at the request of the map-making agencies of the Government, to provide official forms and spellings of place names in governmental use and thus to eliminate the endless confusion resulting from the use of different names for the same place or feature, such as mountain peaks and rivers, or the use of the same name for different places or features, even within the pages of a single publication. The tremendous amount of military mapping required by our global war was not anticipated early enough to permit in advance the solution of the complicated place-name problems involved, especially in the treatment of names from foreign languages not using the Roman alphabet, such as Chinese, Japanese, Malay, and Arabic. Neither were there ready for use the voluminous gazetteers and place-name indexes necessary for rapid identification of literally millions of inhabited places and natural features whose locations and proper designations may be needed at a moment's notice by some branch of the armed forces. The task of making ready these geographic tools of war is not unlike that faced by the manufacturers of airplanes in that the goal which must be achieved would have been considered fantastic before the war.

As a consequence, the war agencies requested that the Board be enlarged and reorganized to provide for the immediate performance of the services urgently needed in connection with the military mapping program. This has been done. More than a million names are being transcribed into Roman characters from the characters of Japanese, Chinese, and other Oriental languages. The work is being carried on by the Board and by other agencies in accordance with standard procedures promulgated by the Board. The Board has prepared, and is in the process of reproducing for the use of the armed forces in the field, place name finding lists to accompany several series of military maps covering areas of present and possible operations. These lists will enable an officer in the field to identify rapidly and positively on his maps a village or river referred to in an order or other communication. It may be mentioned in this connection that relatively minor or obscure features become of major importance when battles are fought for them.

The Board is also putting together very rapidly a master alphabetical file of place name cards, including varying forms, spellings, and locations of names of inhabited places and natural features in areas of immediate interest, so that questions concerning them can be answered with maximum speed and accuracy. Inquiries concerning these places come to the Board at the rate of hundreds per week from the branches of the armed forces and the war agencies. While the most difficult tasks imposed on the Board by the war are those relating to foreign names, the Board is also being called upon to render more domestic place name decisions this year than have been rendered in the entire period 1890–1943. A cumulative report which will contain for ready reference all the decisions of the Board to date is being edited and is nearly ready for publication. The last cumulative report was issued in 1932.

The pronunciation service, which has been requested by the radio industry and which has been found particularly useful by it, is only a byproduct of other work, and is not done to tell people how they must pronounce place names but to inform them how the inhabitants pronounce them. The pronunciation and grammatical forms of geographical names in foreign languages must be known in order that they may be written on maps and in intelligence reports in such a manner that they will be spoken as nearly correctly as possible. While this may not seem important at first glance, upon more careful consideration it will be obvious that reference to hills, rivers, villages, and many other military objectives must often be made by the spoken word and if such names are mispronounced in such a way that they cannot be identified, or are mistaken for other objectives, the consequences may be serious. Since pronunciation of foreign names must be known anyway, it is very little trouble to provide these pronunciations for the benefit of broadcasters. Furthermore, the more widespread is the knowledge of the proper forms of foreign names the fewer will be the discrepancies in their use which would cause trouble later. However, it is most unfortunate that this minor feature of the work is emphasized out of all proportion by this article. This does not begin to compare in importance with the problems posed by the variation in the application of names of features along certain foreign coasts which are or soon may be the scene of combined sea, land, and air operations by the armed forces. You will appreciate that in these cases it is imperative that the greatest consistency and accuracy of geographic nomenclature be achieved at once, and it is to such problems that the activities of the Board are now principally directed.

If you would like to observe in detail the work of the Board, you will be welcome at any time.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Synthetic Rubber Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, one of the most notable executive achievements in this Nation's participation in preparing for the effective prosecution of the war was that of William M. Jeffers, formerly administrator of the rubber program. Mr. Jeffers has now returned to his normal duties as head of the Union Pacific Railroad, but the work he has done is still the subject of public approbation. In the Philadelphia Record today there appears a statement by Mr. Jeffers on the synthetic rubber program which I feel is deserving of reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editor of the Philadelphia newspaper a few days ago published an open letter to Mr. Jeffers entitled "What Happened to Rubber?" Mr. Jeffers' statement was in response. I ask that the editorial, the statement of Mr. Jeffers, and the reply editorial of the Philadelphia Record be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAPPENED TO RUBBER?

WILLIAM M. JEFFERS, Esq.,
President, Union Pacific Railroad,
Omaha, Nebr.:

A month ago today you resigned as Rubber Director.

You told the President: "The big job covered by the recommendations of the Baruch report is done."

You added: "The greatest contribution that I can make in the present emergency is to return to an on-the-job handling of the operation of the Union Pacific Railroad."

We now learn that the big job has not been done. We are not getting enough synthetic rubber tires. The Nation faces a possible break-down in rubber-borne transportation.

In view of these facts, hadn't you better return to your job as Rubber Director and stick to the job until it is done right?

Perhaps you didn't see the Associated Press survey from Akron, printed in Sunday's newspapers.

Executives of five major rubber companies, leaders in the industry, warned that immediate and drastic steps must be taken to avert the threatened collapse of motor transport.

One official warned that the tire industry normally operates with a stock pile of 16,000,000 tires. The reserve is now less than 3,000,000 tires.

Another, referring to the Government demand for at least 30,000,000 passenger-car synthetic tires in 1944, declared that unless precautions are taken there is "great danger of a serious break-down in our transportation and a consequent disruption of our war production effort."

Another declared: "It is going to be impossible to produce enough tires to keep freight and passengers rolling satisfactorily until difficulties in processing synthetic rubber into finished tires are solved; until manpower and equipment shortages are eased and unless we avert a developing fabric shortage."

These aren't Army and Navy "loafers" or "expediters" whom you once criticized. These are hard-headed businessmen, like yourself.

You may say that your job was only to get synthetic rubber factories started, that you had nothing to do with the finished product.

That wasn't all of the job the President gave you.

The President's directive gave you "full responsibility for and control over the Nation's rubber program in all its phases."

As Rubber Director, you were given authority to direct other Federal "departments, establishments and agencies" and the President directed that "full compliance shall be accorded such directives by the Federal agencies concerned."

You had the courage to fight the farm bloc over use of cotton instead of rayon, and we applauded you. You fought with the Army and Navy over priorities, with Elmer Davis over publicity.

Why didn't you fight for enough manpower and equipment to see that tires were made?

Saying your job was done when the synthetic plants were set, but before enough tires were being produced, is like a man in charge of famine relief calling it a day when the wheat is planted—before it's harvested and made into bread.

If you think the charges of a crisis in rubber aren't true, tell us.

If the situation is the fault of someone else, tell us.

If you weren't through, come back and finish your job.

Sincerely,

THE PHILADELPHIA RECORD.

JEFFERS SEES GOVERNMENT MAKING TIRES—KNIFING OF SYNTHETIC PROGRAM MUST STOP, HE SAYS

William M. Jeffers, who put the synthetic rubber program on its feet, declared yesterday that "it may be necessary" for the Government to go into the business of manufacturing tires and other rubber articles.

DEPLORES BICKERING

That action, he said, may be forced in order to "provide acceptable tires at a fair price" and to "do away with continual bickering and knifing" of the synthetic-rubber program.

Jeffers' statement—the first since he resigned as Rubber Director a month ago—was made in a telegram to the Record.

It was in answer to an editorial published Monday, and sent to Jeffers by wire, suggesting that he erred in stating he had finished his "big job" at the time of his resignation.

CRITICIZES COMPANIES

The former rubber czar criticized the rubber manufacturers and the War Production Board in his statement, which reviewed the present situation with regard to tires—a situation described by manufacturers as critical enough to threaten the collapse of motor transport.

Jeffers said the taxpayers of this country have invested $750,000,000 in synthetic-rubber plants, an investment which can and should pay dividends.

WANTS INVESTMENT UTILIZED

"I am a firm believer in private initiative and private business," he continued, but declared that in order to protect the investment and save the program Government manufacture of rubber goods may be necessary.

The American people, he declared, will insist on their investment being "utilized for the good of all, rather than being manhandled for and by a few."

Jeffers, who returned to his job as president of the Union Pacific Railroad after leaving Washington, made it clear that responsibility for success of the rubber program, in his view, now lies with the manufacturing companies and Government agencies, such as W. P. B. and the War Manpower Commission.

JEFFERS' MESSAGE

Jeffers' telegram in full said:

"In my letter of resignation to the President I said: 'The big job covered by the recommendations of the Baruch report is done'; and that is exactly the situation. You say, 'Hadn't you better return to your job as Rubber Director and stick to the job until it is done right?'

"As to the Associated Press survey from Akron quoting the views of the executives of five major rubber companies, I doubt that the chief executives of all of the rubber companies made any such statements. Regardless of whether they did or not, it is of interest to note that the executives of the five major rubber companies have finally appreciated their responsibilities in keeping this country on wheels."

SOME NEGLECTING TIRES

"The American people think of rubber in the manner in which it is largely used, namely, tires. Some of these rubber companies are devoting too much of their manpower and facilities to other than making tires for military or civilian use.

"Some 6 weeks ago I invited the executives of all of the rubber companies, as well as the officers of the rubber workers' union to meet with me in Washington to discuss what I considered at least a 20 percent lag in production.

"Curiously enough the rubber workers' union was represented by their international president and the presidents of some 32 locals. The rubber companies were represented by 2 presidents of small rubber companies and the so-called major companies were represented by subordinate officers, most of whom were of the production expert type rather than the men at the top."

SLOW-DOWN EVIDENT

"I hold no brief for the rubber workers' union in this situation for the reason that there were two strikes which seriously interfered with the production of tires that should not have happened. Second, and again admittedly, there was a slow-down in production. But that is not the whole story.

"The question of adequate intelligent supervision on the job, the matter of keeping machines in proper condition and keeping material up to the man at the machine, the matter of using more of the available manpower on the production of tires and less hoarding of labor in other departments not engaged in tire production, are all contributing to an unsatisfactory output.

"The officers of these unions attended this meeting ready and willing to commit themselves to doing a job if the proper cooperation was forthcoming from the rubber industry."

LABOR SHORTAGE ISN'T SERIOUS

"While there is a shortage of manpower in the rubber industry it is not nearly as serious as the shortage of manpower on the American railroads. These railroad men in maintenance and particularly in transportation, train and enginemen and yardmen, are not confining themselves to 7 hours per day as they are in the mines while the country is faced with a coal crisis. They are working 10, 12, 14, and 16 hours per day in an all-out effort to keep traffic moving in support of the war.

"As to the tire-fabric problem, in my letter to the President I said there was a shortage of tire fabric for which the War Production Board was responsible. The Rubber Director, as such, was completely without authority to correct the tire-fabric situation because the Chairman of the War Production Board personally had held it up for reasons best known to himself.

"The question of shortage of manpower in the rubber industry was repeatedly called to the attention of the War Manpower Commission.

"The increase in the military demands for tires in the larger sizes for the handling of mobile artillery, as well as for the larger sizes for the heavier planes that are now being turned out, further complicated the situation."

CITES INDUSTRY'S DUTY

"This, however, is war and it is duty of rubber companies as well as every other industry in the country to think more about winning a war and getting the job done, and less about what their position might be postwar.

"Rubber companies still have salesmen on the road who ought to be making tires in the plants. Your attention is directed to the type of advertising of some rubber companies with which you are or ought to be familiar, praising the synthetic tire. Seemingly now they want to reverse themselves and talk up their difficulties in turning out synthetic tires.

"Colonel Bradley Dewey, who worked with me for the past year on the rubber program, understands this problem thoroughly. With him in his organization is Tompkins of the U. S. Rubber Co., whom I consider tops in the rubber industry. Babcock, of Firestone, who is in Dewey's organization, is one of the Nation's top men in developing the use of synthetics in all types of tires.

"If Colonel Dewey will continue to not only ask for, but demand, the ultimate in support of the rubber program from these rubber companies, from the War Production Board, and from the War Manpower Commission, the rubber program will come through."

SHOULD PAY DIVIDENDS

"The taxpayers of this country have an investment of three quarters of a billion dollars in the synthetic rubber plants. Here is an investment that can and should pay dividends. I am a firm believer in private initiative and private business, but in order to protect this investment and make certain that there is no unnecessary interference with the rubber-borne transportation on the highways of this country and to assure the manufacture of acceptable tires at a fair price, and, at the same time, to do away with this continual bickering and knifing of a program, it may become necessary for the Government to go into the manufacturing of tires and rubber goods generally.

"In short, the American people, I am sure, will insist upon the investment of these tremendous sums of money being utilized for the good of all rather than being manhandled for and by the few.

"I note statements in the press from a Dr. Phillips, of the O. P. A., who is now experting on the rubber program. This is just another instance of the Phi Beta Kappa boys trying to get themselves into the spotlight. There are practical men in the O. P. A., who, if given the opportunity to head up the rubber problem within the O. P. A., will do a job."

A WARNING FROM MR. JEFFERS TO THE TIRE MANUFACTURERS

On Monday the Record printed an editorial addressed to William M. Jeffers, who resigned a month ago as the Nation's Rubber Director.

We cited testimony from executives of five major Akron rubber companies (Goodyear, Goodrich, Seiberling, General, Firestone) warning of a possible break-down in rubber-borne transportation because of a threatened lack of synthetic tires.

When Mr. Jeffers resigned, he said that "the big job was done." The Record editorial suggested he should return and finish the job if the Akron claims were true.

Mr. Jeffers' reply, which appears elsewhere in today's Record, is thoroughly honest. It concedes there are still many things wrong with the synthetic rubber tire industry; that there is a 20-percent lag in production; that the whole job hasn't been done.

The blame he places elsewhere, out of his jurisdiction.

The question of manpower—held chiefly responsible for the crisis in the Akron statements—he said was "repeatedly called to the attention of the War Manpower Commission."

The question of shortage of tire fabric is the responsibility of the War Production Board "because the Chairman of the W. P. B. personally had held it up for reasons best known to himself."

But most of the blame he puts on the Akron tire manufacturers, and hints they are more interested in post-war advantages than in producing to win the war.

Six weeks ago, Jeffers says, he invited executives of all the rubber companies to meet in Washington to discuss the lag in tire production.

The United Rubber Workers Union (C. I. O.) sent its international president and presidents of some 32 locals.

The rubber companies "were represented by two presidents of small rubber companies and the so-called major companies were represented by subordinate officers."

While he blames the union for previous strikes, Jeffers declares: "The question of adequate, intelligent supervision on the job, the matter of keeping machines in proper condition and keeping material up to the man at the machine, the matter of using more of the available manpower on the production of tires and less hoarding of labor in other departments not engaged in tire production, are all contributing factors to an unsatisfactory output. * * *

"It is the duty of rubber companies as well as every other industry in the country to think more about winning a war and getting the job done, and less about their post-war position."

As for the remedy—

Jeffers, president of the Union Pacific Railroad, is a strong advocate of private initiative and free enterprise.

But he warns that to stop bickering and knifing of a program it may become necessary for the Government to go into the business of manufacturing tires.

The people will insist, he says, that their present investment in synthetic tire plants be used for the good of all and not mishandled for the good of a few.

Those are strong statements coming from the head of one of the biggest—and most progressive—of American railroads.

The Record is glad to have raised this issue if it will lead to increased tire production and solving of the threatened crisis in transportation. The tire manufacturers have had their warning, from an able American businessman. We trust they get down to the business of producing tires for the Nation's war machine.

Renunciation of Extraterritorial Rights in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the renunciation of our extraterritorial rights in China.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the decision of the United States Senate to make available as a Senate document my brief work on the history and significance of our relationships with China in the field of so-called extraterritorial rights is one which may help to spread in the United States a greater understanding of this subject.

It may be said that in one sense the recent treaty between China and the United States makes extraterritoriality a dead issue, because the former inequality is now ended. But in this viewpoint the treaty is considered as the end of something which existed in the past, and there is a larger viewpoint. In the greater sense, the treaty marks the beginning of something precious and sacred, the formal recognition of the full sovereignty and equality between two republics founded on the same fundamental principles.

It is particularly appropriate for the Senate to take this action at this time, because it coincides almost to the day with the thirty-second aniversary of the birth of the Chinese Republic October 10, 1911, symbolizing to the Chinese people what July 4, 1776, symbolizes to the American people. This decision, therefore, may be considered, among other things, a special tribute by the Senate of the United States to China in the celebration of her great anniversary.

Even though at this moment part of the territory of China is occupied by our common enemy and that our great ally has suffered and sacrificed during the past 12 years in a heroic way, this anniversary is the brightest in the history of the Republic. For this aniversary occurs at a time when the war has shifted decisively and the unconditional surrenders of Japan and Germany are as certain in the future as the unconditional surrender by Fascist Italy, which is already an accomplished fact.

Today the allies of China are redeeming every promise which has been made, and the overwhelming might of the United Nations is beginning to take form in the Pacific and in Asia.

The immortal founder of the Chinese Republic, Sun Yat-sen, knew at the time of his death that his great work was just beginning. He would be happy on this aniversary to know the glorious future that is assured for China as a sovereign nation and as a member of the sisterhood of free nations and the brotherhood of free people.

Again History Repeats Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, at the opening of the one hundred and ninetieth year of Columbia University, September 29, 1943:

AGAIN HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

(By Nicholas Murray Butler)

Nearly 65 years ago James Anthony Froude in his brilliant volume on Julius Caesar[1] wrote these words, which read as if they were written of the United States in 1943:

"The younger Gracchus brought forward and carried through, with enthusiastic clapping of every pair of hands in Rome that were hardened with labor, a proposal that there should be public granaries in the city, maintained and filled at the cost of the state, and that corn should be sold at a rate artificially cheap to the poor free citizens. Such a law was purely socialistic. The privilege was confined to Rome, because in Rome the elections were held, and the Roman constituency was the one depositary of power. The effect was to gather into the city a mob of needy, unemployed voters, living on the charity of the state, to crowd the circus and to clamor at the elections, available no doubt immediately to strengthen the hands of the popular tribune, but certain in the long run to sell themselves to those who could bid highest for their voices. Excuses could be found, no doubt, for this miserable expedient in the state of parties, in the unscrupulous violence of the aristocracy, in the general impoverishment of the peasantry through the land monopoly, and in the intrusion upon Italy of a gigantic system of slave labor. But nonetheless it was the deadliest blow which had yet been dealt to the constitution. Party government turns on the majorities at the polling places, and it was difficult afterward to recall a privilege which once conceded appeared to be a right. The utmost that could be ventured in later times with any prospect of success was to limit an intolerable evil; and if one side was ever strong enough to make the attempt, their rivals had a bribe ready in their hands to buy back the popular support."

Obviously, there is nothing new about what is now taking place in the economic life of

[1] Froude, James Anthony, Caesar: A sketch (London: Longman's, 1879; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1879; Harper Bros., 1881), p. 25.

various modern countries including our own. Until we really learn that history repeats itself we shall not be able to make effective progress, based upon the teachings of human experience.

The fact that history does repeat itself has been recorded over and over again for more than 2,000 years, and yet its fundamental lessons remain to be learned. Human nature does not substantially change, but environment alters in evolutionary—and sometimes revolutionary—fashion. What this means is that he who wishes to understand the present and to look forward to a genuine knowledge of the future, must first of all study the lessons of the past. He must learn to look backward with wisdom in order to be able to look forward with intelligence.

There could be no more important course of instruction at the present time, either in secondary school or in college, than one on the development of free institutions and free government. This course would go back over several thousand years. It would take account of the amazing happenings in the Far East long before western history began. The significant book by Jawaharlal Nehru, entitled "Glimpses of World History,"[2] gives to the western reader, probably for the first time, some insight into the thought, the institutional life and the accomplishments of far eastern nations for centuries before there was a western world. The outstanding fact is that this unchanging human nature is called upon to deal with rapidly changing experiences. Unless we know how present-day conditions had their beginnings and what were the forces which brought them into being, we cannot expect to be able to deal with them effectively. Once again it must be repeated that in order to understand the present, one must first of all understand the past which brought it into being.

History has become the most important instrument of liberal education. It, and it alone, can give us a comprehension of the world in which we live, as well as a view of those problems which are developing to face us in the world of tomorrow. It is fantastic to suppose that the facts of the moment, as recorded by the newspaper press and by the radio, can give us anything beyond an invitation to try to find out what those facts mean.

Unfortunately, the most important books which are written in this field frequently fail to attract the public attention which they deserve. It is a quarter century since Dr. Spengler wrote his outstanding work entitled "The Decline of the West."[3] It was read with attention, but without enthusiasm or full comprehension and often with sarcastic comment. Nevertheless, the happenings of the years which have followed its publication have illustrated and justified its argument. The truly great histories of liberty which have come from Croce, Pareto, Ferrero, and Mosca in Italy, and from Ortega in Spain, have attracted comparatively little attention among English-speaking readers. Nevertheless, these works are the chief contribution of this generation to a genuine knowledge of how our free institutions, as we call them, came into existence, of what they really mean and how they can best be protected and advanced. The most important educational task of today is to teach an understanding of the present and a comprehension of the possible tomorrow by an accurate knowledge of yesterday.

[2] Nehru, Jawaharlal, Glimpses of World History (New York, John Day Co., 1942).

[3] Spengler, Oswald, Decline of the West (New York, Knopf, 1939). (Originally published as Der Untergang des Abendlandes, Munich, 1918; first translation into English in 1926 by Charles Francis Atkinson.)

Motion Picture Star, John Garfield, Comments on the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the eminent motion picture star, John Garfield, some time ago, made an address in the city of Los Angeles, at a great mass meeting in the Shrine Auditorium in that city, at which I was a principal speaker, in which Mr. Garfield spoke feelingly of the contribution made to victory in this war by the Soviet Union.

I believe his remarks are worthy of the attention of the country and should be given wide circulation.

Because of my respect for Mr. Garfield's histrionic attainments, I am inserting his brief speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech is as follows:

These few words on the epic struggle being waged by the Soviet people can add little to what we already know and what we feel. But I do want to say a word about the specific subject of this panel—cultural relations between ourselves and our colleagues in Russia.

I am not a politician or a statesman. I'm supposed to be a tough guy on the screen. Right now we're all tough, but the fact of the matter is that like all people, I'm a peaceful citizen interested, as you are, in peaceful pursuits. Culture comes under the heading of a peaceful pursuit. It's a fancy way of saying that you enjoy a book or a piece of music or a movie, or history. Sometimes it's hard to acquire culture because there are always those who try to keep others in ignorance. And while a lot of us did have a chance to enjoy Russian culture, through reading or seeing movies, a great many of us dismissed Russia because we were ignorant of the country and listened to those who had a conscious or unconscious purpose in spreading lies about the people of Russia. Well, I'm interested in facts. And since Russia was invaded by Hitler, we've had an opportunity to find out some of the facts.

The facts are simple. Two hundred million people have, in 25 years, merged themselves into a bulwark against fascism. Twenty-five years ago the Russians were an illiterate people. Today, illiteracy has disappeared All those stories about Russian terror boil down to this. The terror of ignorance has been liquidated and the horror of poverty executed. Once we know that, and we know it because men like Ambassador Joseph Davies, Wendell Willkie, Harry Hopkins, and others have brought home these facts, then we can start investigating and understanding Russian culture and cultural conditions. For one thing, I find that all art belongs to the people and you can't have people's artists unless the artists are part of the people.

We in Hollywood have finally gotten our chance to be part of the people. We've gotten it the hard way. It took a war to bring us in contact with the people and the problems of the country. We aren't privileged to carry guns and we are not face to face with the enemy. But we are part of the war effort, an effective part. And my hope is that we will be part of the peace effort, just as all citizens must be.

By that I mean that our job isn't over when Hitler is defeated. We engage in all these drives because we believe in this war. And we believe in this war because we believe in the peace that must follow. One thing that peace must do is to continue the relationship between the American people and the Russian people, otherwise there will never be a complete and final peace. We can accomplish this if we continue to be allies and friends. And I'd like to see the actors in Hollywood say to the actors in Moscow: "Friends, we applaud you in wartime. Let's see more of you and I hope you will see more of us. Let's not break off this relationship. Let's pledge ourselves to eternal friendship. Governments maintain international relationships. Well, let us do the same thing. We're together in tough times, let's not lose each other when times are better.

"In other words, artists of the Soviet Union, shake."

Court Quorum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 4, 1943:

COURT QUORUM

The judicial term upon which the Supreme Court commences today will bring a number of significant cases up for review. Operations of important war agencies of the Government, including the Selective Service System and the Office of Price Administration, will be submitted for judgment. In addition the docket contains several pleas involving questions of minority rights. Wartime pressures inevitably place strains upon our ordinary legal processes and give rise to questions centering around the exercise of extraordinary governmental powers. The decisions of the Supreme Court are never more essential or urgent than in such a time as this.

Yet the Court is handicapped in the discharge of its obligations by the antiquated law which stipulates that no fewer than 6 of its Justices are required to constitute a quorum. This requirement has remained in effect since the days when the Court had 10 members. Now that it has only 9, a quorum could reasonably consist of a simple majority of 5 Justices. Such a change has been proposed in legislation introduced by Representative HATTON SUMNERS, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Chief Justice Stone testified last spring to the fact that some change is necessary if the Court is to dispose of 2 important cases on which it has been unable to take action because of liability to secure a quorum of 6.

These cases concern application of the antitrust laws to the Aluminum Co. of America and application of the "death sentence" provision of the Utility Holding Company Act to the North American Co. Four Justices have disqualified themselves from acting in these cases because they had connections with them before ascending the bench. Since the Court now has three former Attorneys General and one Solicitor General in its membership it is entirely possible that these Justices will feel impelled to disqualify themselves from other litigation for the same reason.

Such inability of the Court to act amounts to a frustration of justice. The remedy is simple and logical. Congress should act promptly to give the Supreme Court the relief prescribed by Congressman SUMNERS. This would enable the Court to dispose of the old problems inherited from past terms and to avoid new dilemmas of the same sort in the future. There can be no reasonable question as to the validity of judicial proceedings conducted before five Justices.

Ceiling on Hogs

REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to read a statement of Mr. Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and member, board of directors, American Farm Bureau Federation:

Yesterday, October 4, might well be termed "Black Monday" by hogmen throughout the Nation, for it was then that Washington specialists deemed that free marketing of hogs should come to a close. The specialists say $14.75 a hundredweight, less than 15 cents a pound, is the limit beyond which packers must not pay if they expect to remain out of prison, though these same packers paid an average of 40 cents a hundredweight above this top on the market day just preceding. Farmers are wondering if this is the Government's E award for excellent production.

This decree, by the stroke of a pen, denies free enterprise to the hogmen of America. It is but another of the misdirected philosophies conducive to bare meat platters on the tables of this Nation, and is contrary to the recommendations by the National Meat Board, whose members represent producer, packer, and consumer interests. The decree represents nothing other than governmental control founded on theory rather than the practical.

SAYS UNITED STATES BROKE FAITH

Never has the Government broken faith with American farmers more than under the present decree. A year ago the urge went out for greater hog production. Farmers responded with 126,000,000 head of hogs, which is far beyond any previous production. Nothing was said about ceilings by Government ruling until the crop was well on its way to market, and then it was held off until the flow of finished hogs started to the receiving yards.

Farmers are keen enough to realize the unfairness of feeding industrial workers who are on a time-and-a-half-for-overtime-pay basis supported by the Government, while they at the same time, receive no pay for their extra 30 hours a week. The breaking of faith and the monetary loss are factors most disturbing to the morale of farm people; however, something more is at stake—free enterprise has vanished under such a system. The top of $14.75 for hogs—a ridiculously low ceiling as compared to all other phases of our economic society—means the high-quality hogs and those of low quality will sell at the same figure. It will penalize efficiency and premiumize inefficiency. Thus, the poor herdsman will profit equally with the progressive and the public will pay the same price for poor and good meat. In fact, the incentive to produce good meat has been eliminated.

MEANS HOGS ARE HOGS

The public open markets have been the places where producers and packers met to bargain and to establish livestock prices according to volume and grade. Both these groups have labored for years to establish premiums for good livestock, to pay the good herdsman for his extra care and knowledge, and to bring a higher quality product to the consuming public. The new decree means that hogs are hogs; it means that farmers no longer have anything to say about the price of their products, and it means that since all packers will bid the top price it seems certain that Government agencies will have to step in and allocate which packer gets what and how much.

Back of this whole program probably is the plan to force subsidy payments to farmers and to provide cheap food for the industrial workers of the Nation. Congress is facing concerted effort to force the subsidy payment program. Farmers are against such programs that will cause the soldiers who return from the battle fronts to pay the grocery bills of those who stayed at home and received time-and-a-half for their war work.

CHARGES DISCRIMINATION

Since agriculture has received but about one-eighth of the increase of the national income since 1939, it has become apparent that no abnormal earnings are accruing to farmers and that there is no reason why the industrial workers of this Nation should have a portion of their grocery bill paid by the whole of the taxpaying public.

The fact that the Federal Government has seen fit to slap a ceiling price on hogs after the work has been done, not at the beginning of the season, has far-reaching influence. For instance, the price of corn was established at a trifle above $1 a bushel after it was produced, which may have given the idea that farmers would go ahead, anyway. Ceilings were placed on beef, which, in effect, is a top on live cattle. The program outlined by the Government for the coming year seeks an increase of 19 percent in cattle slaughtering and a 3-percent increase in corn.

WARNS OF FUTURE

Certainly corn ceilings at around $1 a bushel is small incentive for expansion, and anyone acquainted with the cattle industry knows that but few cattle are coming to the Corn Belt feed lots. While increased cattle slaughter is now recorded, let no one be misled, for in this act the public is eating well into next year's supply of beef about 8 months in advance of normal procedure.

Farmers are patriotic in times of peace and in times of war, but at the same time they, too, are caught in the entangling mesh of heavy taxation and support of public affairs. Ten years ago farmers produced and sold hogs at around 3 cents a pound, when the streets were worn thin by the shuffling feet of the unemployed. Today they are asked to feed a nation of workers who are now paying by far the smallest percentage of their income in all history for food, and at the same time to lose the free initiative that has characterized agriculture.

Government and Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent, which I have received from the House, I am presenting for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial published on October 4 in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin:

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS

The Republican leader of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., cites Government ownership of many defense plants as a possible threat to the future of free enterprise. He promises that Congress will be on guard against the encroachments of Government bureaucrats, who are suspected of designs on our system of private ownership.

No Government bureaucrat brought about the investment of public money in defense plants. Private capital, for understandable reasons, did not wish to risk funds in the creation of large industrial capacity which might be of no use after the war. Since an expansion was absolutely necessary if the Nation was to be defended, the Government had to put up the money.

There is little use in trying to read ideological motives into the expansion of Government activities in wartime. Such a growth of Federal power is inevitable.

Representative MARTIN reflects the general desire of most Americans that our expanded industrial capacity shall be used by private enterprise after the war. But scheming bureaucrats are not going to be the main obstacle. If private business shows that it can use our increased plant and machinery to give jobs to millions and raise our standard of living, no bureaucrat will stand a chance of blocking such a program. Only when business declines the challenge will Government step in.

Suggested Steep Liquor Taxes—More Bootlegging—Prohibitionists Again on the Rampage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has suggested that there be an increase of six to ten dollars per proof-gallon on distilled spirits. Ten dollars per proof-gallon would mean a tax of $2.50 per quart of 100-proof spirits.

As one who has lived through the horrors of prohibition, I want no recrudescence of wholesale bootlegging and moonshine. I feel that this drastic increase would be sufficient incentive to bring about the return of bath-tub gin, ginger jake, hair-tonic rye, and needled beer. Bootlegging would be revived on a huge scale, and I question whether the Treasury Department would get a dollar of increased revenue. The members of the Ways and Means Committee should think most maturely before bringing about this enormous increase. It must be remembered that the tax recently was increased from four to six dollars, and now it is proposed to increase it to $10.

The whisky industry has been producing solely for the war effort. All distillers are making alcohol for rubber and smokeless powder. There is probably only a year and a half's supply of potable whisky. Beverage whisky, both rye and

bourbon, is mighty scarce. It is axiomatic that as the supply of whisky diminishes, the greater the bootlegging racket becomes. That was indeed the lesson of prohibition. It was the absolute scarcity of legal liquor that gave rise to Al Capone's ascendancy.

Because of the 1½ years' supply, the sales, of necessity, will be at low ebb. I do not understand how the Treasury expects to get increased revenue, especially, if illegal liquor will take the place of legal liquor.

In the fiscal year 1942, the collection of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages exceeded in the beginning $1,000,000,000. This was an increase of 33⅓ percent over 1941. In the fiscal year 1943, there was another 40-percent increase in the collection of these taxes, the total being $1,423,481. That is a rather tidy sum to get out of liquor. While it may be true that the traffic can stand some increase, it cannot stand increases up to $10.

Furthermore, Cuba is not so far from the United States. In fact, it is only a stone's throw by airplane. Neutral spirits can be manufactured quite cheaply in Cuba, and the inducements for bootleggers to run rum to the United States would be great.

The distillers asked recently for a furlough to enable them to make a small quantity of potable liquor so as to replete the diminishing supply. They were denied this right, although Cuban and Puerto Rican rum distillers were bringing in their liquor in vast quantities. In fact, Cuba has increased her alcohol production, which was twenty-five to thirty million gallons a year to seventy million a year. This is an increase of more than 100 percent. This increase has been at the expense of our own distilling companies.

Furthermore, large quantities of tequila have been imported from Mexico.

PROHIBITION AGAIN ON THE RAMPAGE

The prohibitionists are endeavoring to bring about national dryness not by any cataclysmic change like the eighteenth amendment. They are striking with might and main, inch by inch, as it were, by means of local options. Township after township, county after county are being conquered. Liberal and responsible men everywhere should be on their guard. It is dangerous to say, "It cannot happen again." They ignore the evident signs of danger. Oklahoma and Kansas are old offenders and remain dry, but 76 out of 120 Kentucky counties have been "dried up" by local options.

One-half of the 54 counties of Texas have voted dry. In North Carolina and Utah there is dangerous support of enlarged prohibition forces. The prohibitionists do not hesitate to take advantage of the men in the armed forces who are not home to vote. Just like in the last war, many of the men who might have voted against local option or local prohibition are on the high seas or in war theaters of operation or in cantonments. The drys use the slogan "Protect the young men in the armed forces." These men really need protection against the blue noses.

The increase of taxes, as aforesaid, would cause a revival of hijacking and bootlegging, play right into the hands of the drys. This is the type of ammunition that the drys can readily use. They take political advantage of the presence of juke joints, moonshining, and hip-pocket flasks.

I have an interesting letter sent by the publisher of Liberty magazine to the conference of alcoholic beverage industries.

AUGUST 3, 1943.

Mr. FRANK KANE,
Conference of Alcoholic Beverage Industries, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KANE: In the Vox Pop column of the May 8, 1943, issue of Liberty magazine, a letter from one of our readers was reproduced, the text of the letter being as follows:

"BROOKLYN, N. Y.

"I want to go on record as opposing soldiers and sailors—officers are the worst offenders—visiting night clubs and wasting their time and money—drinking and watching floor shows.

"There should be a rule that men in uniform could not be admitted to such places for the duration.

"R. C. WINSTON."

The first 10 days following, over 800 letters had been received, largely from servicemen, and in the next month another thousand letters came in from all over the world.

There were lots of V-mail letters, and there were some letters from wives and mothers of servicemen, and letters from fighters back home in hospitals. These letters were unanimous against the viewpoint of Mr. R. C. Winston, and in reading them you got a clear understanding of fighting men and their families taking this item not as an end in itself, but as exemplifying a viewpoint toward their rights as citizens.

I am calling this to your attention with the thought that you will undoubtedly be interested in the violent reaction on the part of men in uniform against any attempt to legislate away their liberties in their absence. Reading these letters, one cannot fail to realize how resentful these men would be if we were to permit prohibitionists to bring back a repetition of the Volstead era. One of the letter writers enclosed a copy of a recent editorial from Stars and Stripes, the official newspaper of the A. E. F., with the following paragraph encircled:

"We can remember the days of prohibition, when moonshine whisky made fortunes for bootleggers, crooked politicians, and dishonest police officials. As a result, we claim we know what we want in the way of liquor legislation and feel those at home should wait until we return before initiating further legislation on liquor control."

I think that one paragraph capably sums up their attitude toward prohibition activity at this time.

Best regards.

Yours very truly,
LIBERTY MAGAZINE,
PAUL HUNTER, *Publisher.*

Furthermore, it is interesting to repeat part of a statement that appeared in the book, Under Cover, by John Carlson, published by E. P. Dutton & Co. I insert parts of pages 516 and 517 thereof:

Nazi agents will miss no trick to foment discord. The current cries and agitation of the drys to bring back prohibition—and with it "hootch" and its effect on war morale—is highly pleasing to the Nazis. Their agent in Switzerland, "Dr." Robert Hercod, is secretary of the Nazi-subsidized International Bureau Against Alcoholism. Hercod wormed his way into the confidence of Americans and became correspondent for The Voice, organ of the Board of Temperance Union of the Methodist Church; as well as the American Issue and the Union Signal, official organs of the Antisaloon League and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Hercod's Nazi propaganda crept into numerous articles he wrote for American consumption.

Quick to take advantage of the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, Nazi agents spread about the lie that the surprise attack was due to the fact that our men were in a drunken stupor—a lie which was believed in and disseminated by some prohibitionist factions. And bootleg Americanism on behalf of prohibition has been propagated consistently by Kullgren's Beacon Light, Garner's Publicity and Winrod's Defender.

Captain Edward Page Gaston, reserve officer and director of the World Prohibition Federation, helped promote the dry cause in Washington. I first interviewed Gaston, founder of the Patriot Guard of America in 1940, in New York, and after I had told of my membership in the Mobilizers and the Nationalist Party, he commended me as an "upstanding young American who loves his country." He then offered to speak for the Mobilizers, gratis, or any other patriotic group I named. I interviewed him again in Washington in February 1943, and learned that he was a personal friend of Hercod, whom he had met in Paris.

Certain prominent drys were mentioned as his (Gaston's) supporters.

An Act of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

AN ACT OF JUSTICE

Repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, under the terms of the Magnuson-Andrews bill now before the House and Senate Committees on Immigration, would be an act both just and gracious. The Chinese people are our allies in war. They have won the admiration of Americans by their gallant struggle against the more powerfully armed forces of Japan. An awakened China in the postwar period promises to be a powerful influence in world affairs. If the world is to live at peace, there must be bonds of friendship between the Orient and the Occident.

More than 60 years ago this country raised a barrier against Chinese immigration. It has been continued ever since. The barrier became necessary because employers of labor in this country sought to enrich themselves by the importation of Chinese coolie labor. The coolies were brought in by the thousands, until the people of the West cried out against the practice. This coolie labor was willing to work for far less than our own workmen. It worked longer hours and lived on less food. It was a threat to American standards of living.

Repeal of the exclusion laws today does not mean lifting the bar to unlimited immigration. It means placing the Chinese on the same footing with other nations, under the immigration quota system, which limits immigration from all other countries. Indeed, the number of Chinese who would be permitted to enter this country as immigrants would be limited to 105 a year. Not by the wildest stretch of imagination could this number affect the living standards of the American people.

Representative MAGNUSON, of Washington, Democrat, introduced his repeal bill last April,

and Senator ANDREWS, of Florida, Democrat, offered the same measure in the Senate last week. No good reason exists for delay by Congress. Many reasons can be found for prompt action. The first is the removal of a stigma against the Chinese people, which quite naturally rankles in the hearts of Chinese leaders. A second lies in the fact that China of the future is bound to be a great field for the expansion of international trade, of which the United States should have its full share.

The peoples of the Orient are stirring. Under the leadership of President Chiang Kai-shek the Chinese will make great strides. All that can be done in reason to help cement the friendship between the East and the West should be done—if a future war, perhaps more devastating than even that of today, is to be avoided.

This country, because of the tremendous flood of immigration from all parts of the world which was bringing to these shores more than a million aliens each year, adopted the quota system, under which each foreign nation is limited in the number of persons it may send here. Today the maximum immigration possible in any one year is 153,774 persons. The Magnuson-Andrews bill does not seek in any way to break down the quota system. It merely extends it to the Chinese. To do this now—not waiting until pressure after the war—would be a friendly act that would be appreciated.

Chicago—Water and Polio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of September 30, 1943:

CHICAGO—WATER AND POLIO

Chicago has thought up a new "reason" for demanding diversion of more water from Lake Michigan.

Tests of water in the drainage canal, spokesmen say, show the presence of the infantile-paralysis virus. If Chicago is to be saved from an epidemic of the disease, it is added, sewage must be flushed more rapidly into the Mississippi.

This is just another of those arguments, and the House Rivers and Harbors Committee should recognize it as such. If the poliomyelitis virus is dangerous in water, there surely is no national advantage in speeding it down a river lined on both shores by hundreds of cities and villages.

The best that diversion could do would be to help Chicago at the expense of other cities. The argument is as empty and as selfishly conceived as all the other arguments brought forward by the Illinois metropolis.

There is just one proper way to handle sewage—and that is so to treat it that it is harmless. Chicago, defeated year after year in its diversion attempts, has made a start at such treatment—using Federal work-relief money for the worthy purpose. What it should now do—just as other Lake Michigan cities have to do or should do—is to use some of its own money to complete modern sewage-disposal facilities.

Nobody wants Chicago to have an epidemic of infantile paralysis or any other epidemic. Neither does anybody want epidemics to visit cities down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers. Chicago should be told what its obligation is. It should be told that it must purify its sewage before emptying it into an interstate and navigable watercourse.

If Chicago does this, danger from waterborne epidemics will cease—and the whole health argument for diversion will be unnecessary.

No Entanglements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Parkersburg News of September 26, 1943:

NO ENTANGLEMENTS

Inspired by international star-gazers, administration leaders, and a must bill, the House ignored the advice of Washington, scrapped the Monroe Doctrine, ignored the real wishes of the American people, and prepared a bed in which John Bull and Uncle Sam will retire.

When these gentlemen emerge from the bedroom, Winston Spencer Churchill will be wearing Uncle Sam's trousers, with the money in the pockets, and Franklin Roosevelt will be clad in a brief pair of shorts, clutching an armload of promissory notes and a few hundred billion dollars in war debts. The promissory notes will be as worthless as the First World War debt, but the few hundred billion will have to be paid by the American taxpayer.

Having just returned from a vacation in which the various Members of Congress had an opportunity to feel the pulse of the down-to-earth men and women, and returning to their duties with the real impressions and wishes of the great mass of our citizens, they should not be influenced by the opinions of a few prominent citizens who gained their impressions from top-notch radio commentators and columnists who do so much of the thinking for our people, and feed the same brand of soothing sirup little men who were never elected to office spoon out.

The average American citizen is not adverse to sharing his blessings. However, he does not want to go out and police the world, feed the world, lower tariff walls, and destroy his own way of life to do so. His main wish is to win the war, bring our boys back home and forget the entire sorry mess. He does not want any part of WALLACE's milk route other than to see that the needy and undernourished children and aged of the United States receive enough to eat, cover their nakedness, and have a place to shelter them from the storms. They prefer to do that themselves if this Government will allow them to work and not destroy our economic structure by trying to provide for nations which have been at war for over a thousand years. Nor to protect any boundary lines for nations who have held millions of people in thralldom for the last few hundred years. And they also want to see the rest of the world devote the first few years of peace to raising the food and fiber to clothe and feed themselves instead of having Uncle Sam do it while they rehabilitate themselves so they may compete with the United States for world trade.

There will be many upsets in world economy and dominance coming out of this war. England will emerge as top dog. The conquest of Africa assured the world of that. With that vast empire added to her dominions an undreamed reservoir of raw materials will fall within her control and any one who knows England knows how this material will be used. If she desires to hold the former French territory in Africa for England, will the United States be expected to clean up that mess?

From all indications Russia will become top dog in Europe. If she revives the old czarist ambition of going through Afghanistan and taking India, will the United States be supposed to clean that up? Can you picture the English lion taking a nice juicy bone from the Russian bear with the American eagle acting as referee? What will India do? Will we aid Britain in holding 400,000,000 people in thralldom? If this is a war for true democracy will England hold India after it ends, or will the right of self determination be granted India? If so, will we help whip India into line for the English yoke? Winston Churchill has declared that he was not elected as Prime Minister to dissolve the British Empire. That is sufficient warning, to anyone who can read or think or hear, of England's post-war ambition. However, nothing has ever emanated from our own Government as to what we will do about that.

Will the Dutch East Indies be returned to Holland against the wishes of the inhabitants of those treasure houses in the South Pacific, or will the inhabitants be allowed to determine the form of government they wish to follow, or whether they will be allowed to govern themselves?

These are questions which should be answered by our own Government, not after the war is won but before any world peace plans are formulated and thrust upon an unwilling people. Those who claim that citizens of the United States are willing to assume this responsibility do not know what they are talking about. Harry Hopkins may have been right when he said the people were "too damned dumb" to understand, but they are not too damned dumb to understand that this Nation is not either able or willing to feed, clothe, and police the world.

Why not win this war, disarm the gangster nations and turn them over to Europe and Asia, and wash our hands of the entire mess? If Europe and Asia cannot handle two hundred million Germans, Japs, and Italians, let Europe and Asia suffer the consequence and not saddle their burdens on the United States for the third time. This is no time to destroy our ways of life and the things our forefathers have fought to preserve and obtain for us over a period of 175 years.

Forget all First World War debts. The debtors never intended to pay them at the time they were contracted, and by all means give a receipt in full for lease-lend. Then we will not be called Uncle Shylock by the nations we save.

Keep a standing army of 3,000,000 men—maintain a two-ocean navy and do not turn our millions of returning soldiers and sailors loose to stand in bread lines and be fed by community soup kitchens while they search in vain for jobs. Rather, let the American people set to work, protected by the provisions of our own Constitution, instead of the sick theories of the New Deal, discharge our national obligations, and restore our way of life. American industry and labor can accomplish that miracle and are willing and anxious to assume the responsibility. And these groups will be backed by all the people of the United States.

In these days of bitter quarrels between bureaus and Congress; bureaus and bureaus,

the President and Congress, labor and capital, race riots and racial groups, friction and divisions within our own country will only aid the enemy. Peace talk and plans before the war is won are just as deplorable and criminal as over-confidence and optimism caused by a few victories.

It would seem that a statement of the intention of the administration is due the American people at this time instead of after the war. It would be better to forget these controversial issues and concentrate on winning the war and saving America for Americans.

We wonder what the Senate will do with this hot potato.

Good for Men, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, much criticism is heaped upon the fourth estate. Some of it, of course, is entirely justified. It is encouraging to me to be able to have the following included, by unanimous consent, in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is good advice, intended for the women of America, but good for men, too:

THE GENTLER SEX—KEEPING UP WITH CONGRESS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

(A resolution for any woman who doesn't think the country should be "turned over to the politicians.")

I resolve to write during the present session of Congress at least one letter to a Senator or a Representative expressing my views on some important legislation. I will do this—

Because whether or not I have a vote, I do have a voice, and it is my obligation as a member of a democracy to assert that voice.

Because with so many men absent in war service, it is my special responsibility to take a part in government at home.

Because one of the causes contributing to Rome's decline was the fact that men citizens were away in battle so much of the time and women were either so politically inept or so engrossed in their personal affairs that they let the control of the farms and the government get into the hands of usurers and politicians.

Because the Fascist virus, as Herbert L. Matthews points out in the recent book, The Fruits of Fascism, developed in a political vacuum caused by the Italian people's indifference to political affairs.

Because the German people have successively been under the heels of the Prussian militarists and the Nazis, and precipitated two tragic wars on themselves and on the world, due to their long-continued failure to take any interest or hand in governing themselves.

Because Congress at this session will deal with matters of tremendous importance, matters vitally affecting my life and the lives of those who come after me.

Because its action on peace plans and this Nation's post-war relations with other countries will make it an instrument of destiny in the world, and because I must necessarily share the responsibility for whatever action it takes.

Because I have no right to remain silent and disinterested now and sit back later and say complacently, "Congress was to blame."

Because if everybody thought, "I am only one and no one will pay any attention to what I say," we would cease to have representative government.

Because Members of Congress who take courageous, unselfish, enlightened stands—often against personal interest—need the encouragement and approval of citizens who understand and appreciate what they are doing; and because the bolstering of a man's confidence stimulates his creative power.

Because Members of Congress who are undecided on momentous issues may be helped in making up their minds by the response from citizens.

Because in a time of war when the executive branch of the Government must be necessarily dominant, the legislative branch should be strengthened—and my interest in it may help in a small way to do this.

Because in the controversial issues to be decided in this session Congress will receive tons of form and rubber-stamp letters from pressure groups and special interests, and because a single independent letter from a conscientious citizen will have just that much more meaning.

Because throughout the Nation the uninformed, the misinformed, the prejudiced, and the ignorant, egged on by demagogues, will be expressing themselves to Congress, and because a letter from me, if dictated by conscientious thought and honest conviction, may help to tilt the scales on the side of reason.

Because I myself need the practice and the discipline of participating in government.

Because by writing a letter to Congress I will be sharing its perplexities and its burdens—instead of standing aloof as a carping, critical onlooker—and because my own heart and mind will be enlarged by the experience and I will feel more thoroughly a part of my Nation, and know in fuller measure the blessing of being a free-speaking citizen of a democracy.

The Present Food Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received recommendations of the Michigan Food Conference, an organization of farmers, processors and distributors, who met at Lansing, Mich.

One of their recommendations is "unification of the whole food production, processing, and distribution program under one Government agency," as recommended in H. R. 2739, known as the Jenkins bill, and H. R. 2837, known as the Fulmer bill.

The people are looking to Congress for a remedy in the tangled and oppressive food situation. Our food problem is plagued with the same muddled frustration which the Baruch committee described in the rubber fiasco as "administrative procrastination, indecision, conflict of authority, clash of personalities, lack of understanding, and failure to act." Congress did provide relief in the rubber famine by passing a bill in July of 1942 requesting the President to appoint a committee for the production of synthetic rubber, which resulted in the appointment of William Jeffers, who brought order out of chaos in our muddled rubber situation.

The people are looking to Congress to pursue the same course in providing a solution to the present food crisis in which 10 or more agencies are all thwarting not only each other but every other agency in the production, processing, and distribution of food. Congress now has before it a great opportunity for constructive action. The people are looking to Congress for this action and one of the biggest steps in that direction will be an early passage of the Fulmer bill, unifying the production, processing, and distribution of food for our fighting forces and the American people.

The following recommendations are in line with that ideal, and express the sentiments of those who are familiar with the problems confronting us:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MICHIGAN FOOD CONFERENCE OF FARMERS, PROCESSORS, AND DISTRIBUTORS, AUGUST 9, 1943, AT LANSING, MICH.

PREAMBLE

Ill-advised activities and propaganda by various agencies, public and private, are resulting in programs that are adversely affecting production, distribution, and processing of food. Producers, processors, and distributors of food are experiencing unnecessary costs and hindrances as the result of unwarranted and destructive machinations and bungling. All of this is resulting in higher prices to and less food for the consumer.

The situation has reached a stage where all food industry groups are being obstructed seriously, with resulting discouragements in their efforts to grow, process, and distribute food for our armed forces, our allies, and for civilian needs. The entire food program will be defeated if these matters are not corrected soon. It may even result in serious food shortage, with accompanying hunger in this country and the starving of millions in foreign lands. In the light of the above, the recommendations of the conference are:

1. Unification of the whole food production, processing, and distribution program under one Government agency.

2. Recognition of all branches of the food industry as essential to the war effort to the same respect and to the same degree as is the production and handling of armaments.

3. Administration of a price program on the basis of encouraging production, and elimination of price ceilings which tend to have the opposite effect.

4. Solution of the inflation problem on a constructive basis by encouraging production and siphoning off the ever-increasing purchasing power of the American people through taxes and enforced savings by additional purchases of War bonds.

5. Elimination of subsidies and discontinuing their use as a means of controlling inflation and prices.

6. Requirement that Government agencies making announcements affecting the food program do so in conformance with the terms of the 1942 Price Control Act, and only after consulting with those familiar with the practical phases of food production, processing, and distribution, and sincerely receive their suggestions.

7. A return to constitutional government with the Congress, the elected representatives of the people, functioning as the policy-making, legislative branch of government, as opposed to government by directives from the administrative branch.

8. Approval for all essential expenditures by Government for the prosecution of the

war. Elimination of the waste of money and duplication of effort by Government agencies, or permitted by them in the war effort.

Michigan Food Conference of Farmers, Processors, and Distributors, C. L. Brody, Lansing, chairman; Michigan Allied Dairy Association; Michigan Allied Poultry Industries; Michigan Bean Shippers Association; Michigan Canners Association; Michigan Chain Stores Bureau; Michigan Elevator Exchange; Michigan Feed Manufacturers Association; Michigan Independent Packers Association; Michigan Live Stock Exchange; Michigan Milk Producers Association; Michigan Potato Growers Exchange; Michigan Retail Grocers Association; Michigan State Farm Bureau; Michigan State Grange; Michigan State Millers Association; Midwest Producers Creameries, Inc., Michigan district.

Canadian Feed for Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Judge Jones to the majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, in reference to House Joint Resolution 155. It is hoped the Ways and Means Committee will give this resolution immediate consideration:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 1, 1941.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Majority Floor Leader,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: This responds to your letter dated September 23, 1943, transmitting a copy of House Joint Resolution 155 and requesting an expression of views with respect to the resolution. The resolution would suspend for a period of 90 days all import duties on wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, or hay, or products thereof imported into the United States from Canada, to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock.

The objective of the resolution is to make feed available to livestock producers in the United States in greater quantities and at lower prices. During recent months acute shortages of feed have developed in many sections of the United States and feed prices have advanced sharply as supplies have been reduced in relation to livestock numbers. I am, of course, strongly in favor of any legislation which would be effective in making available to producers feed in greater quantities or at lower prices, and to the extent that House Joint Resolution 155 would be effective in this respect, I favor its enactment.

During the 12-month period ending July 31, 1943, almost 100,000,000 bushels of oats and barley were shipped from Canada to the United States, and during the past 2 months about 20,000,000 bushels of wheat and some additional quantities of oats and barley have been shipped into the United States from Canada for use as livestock feed. We hope that during the coming year it will be possible to bring in substantially larger quantities of grain for feed. The limiting factor in the importation of grains for feed from Canada, however, is transportation rather than price. The transportation situation is such that it may not be possible to bring in sufficient supplies from Canada to reduce materially feed grain prices in the United States and thereby bring about lower feed costs to livestock producers. However, any additional amount that might be brought in would be helpful.

I believe that a brief statement of my views as to the effect of the enactment of the resolution upon each of the commodities listed would be helpful.

Hay: We understand that there are some surplus supplies of hay near the border in eastern Canada. This hay is very much needed in the drought areas of this country. This surplus hay could be used particularly in the drought area of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and West Virginia. Removal of the duty on hay would tend to facilitate the importation of hay and would, we believe, be reflected to some extent in lower prices to producers of livestock products in this country. Since this hay is in eastern Canada and the principal transportation bottlenecks on imports from Canada are in connection with feeds brought in from the western Provinces, we believe that transportation can be arranged for the supplies of hay which might be obtained from eastern Canada.

Flax: Flax, as such, is not used as feed or as an ingredient of feed. Moreover, flaxseed is seldom used as feed or as a feed ingredient, and, in view of the protein feed shortages existing in Canada, we do not believe that there would be substantial stocks of linseed-oil meal available for shipment to this country. As we interpret House Joint Resolution 155, the exemption from duty would apply only to flaxseed if it were to be used as such as feed or feed ingredient, or to linseed meal if it were imported as such into the United States for use as feed. In other words, the exemption would not apply to flaxseed imported for processing into oil and linseed meal. Any other view of the meaning of the bill would compel the conclusion that wheat for milling could be entered duty-free since mill feed is an important product of the milling. Even if the bill were amended or interpreted so as to exempt flaxseed imports from import duties, we question whether livestock producers in this country would be benefited thereby. In view of the critical shortage of protein feeds in this country, it is probable that all linseed-oil meal produced would continue to sell at the ceiling price and, therefore, the only effect of the removal of the duty would be to increase the margins of flaxseed processors or dealers or to increase the price that our processors or dealers would have to pay in Canada for flaxseed.

Rye: We have on hand in this country substantial stocks of rye which could be used as feed if it were practicable to do so. Rye, however, is not usually regarded as desirable feed for dairy cattle or breeding herds. Until ways and means are found of using at a faster rate the domestically produced stocks of rye, there may not be much interest in importing rye for feed.

Barley: Barley produced in Canada cannot be exported without export permits, and on September 21, 1943, the Canadian Government discontinued the issuance of export permits, in view of the reduced production of barley this year and the increased need for this grain in the eastern Provinces. At the present time, therefore, it would not be possible for purchases of barley to be made regardless of the amount of the duty in effect. It is not anticipated that very large quantities of barley will be made available for exportation to this country prior to the harvesting of the next crop. The Canadian Government has imposed an equalization fee on barley exports to this country which represents the difference between the ceiling price in Canada and the market price in the United States less the import duty. On September 21, 1943, when issuance of export permits was temporarily discontinued, the equalization fee being levied was 39 cents (Canadian funds) per bushel on barley shipped from exit ports west of Fort William and 43 cents (Canadian funds) per bushel on barley shipped from Fort William and exit ports east thereof. It would be helpful if Canada could find it possible to modify the equalization fee.

Oats: Substantial quantities of oats will be available for shipment into the United States from Canada but here again the supply in Canada and transportation facilities rather than the import duty are the limiting factors. As in the case of barley, an equalization fee is also being collected with respect to oats and removal of the import duty would probably merely mean an increase in the equalization fee, with the benefits of the removal of duty going to the Canadian producers. The equalization fee on oats has been increasing gradually, and on September 24, 1943, the amount of the equalization fee was 25 cents (Canadian funds) per bushel on oats brought in from exit ports west of Fort William and 34 cents (Canadian funds) per bushel on oats brought in from Fort William and exit ports east thereof.

Wheat: To facilitate the importation of wheat for feed, the President, by proclamation, issued on April 20, 1943 (No. 2584), authorized the importation from Canada of wheat and wheat flour by the War Food Administrator or persons designated by him without regard to the quota limitations established by the proclamation of the President, issued May 28, 1941 (No. 2489). The War Food Administration, through Commodity Credit Corporation, is now bringing into this country for use as feed all of the wheat for which we have been able to arrange transportation. This wheat is being sold at the feed wheat prices authorized by the Congress; that is, on the basis of the parity price of corn.

While I am entirely in accord with the objective of House Joint Resolution 155, to make feed available to livestock producers in greater quantities and at lower prices, the resolution may not accomplish as much as we would like, except as to hay. At the same time we favor its enactment.

In view of the time limitations involved, we have not submitted this letter to the Bureau of the Budget so that we can make no statement as to its relationship to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

Sweden Protests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of October 6, 1943:

SWEDEN PROTESTS

What is happening to the Jews in Denmark today is but the tragic repetition of

what has happened to the Jews of every country which the Nazis have occupied. Blamed for the militant opposition which has developed in Denmark to the German occupation of that country, they have become the latest victims of Nazi savagery. They are being taken from their homes, separated from their families, and deported to the wastelands of Poland, there to be enslaved and ultimately destroyed.

The picture is the all-too-familiar picture of insensate barbarism which Hitler has painted from one end of Europe to the other. It has only one bright spot, namely, the reaction of the Swedish Government and people to the plight of these Danes of Jewish faith. From one end of Sweden to the other strong objections to Germany's action have been made, even such a Hitler lover as Sven Hedin joining in the chorus of protest. And the Swedish Government, to its great credit, has not only sent a formal note of protest to the German foreign office, warning the Reich that "serious repercussions" will be felt in Sweden, but has also offered to give refuge to the deportees. In taking this stand Sweden is not only living up to its own enlightened tradition, but is also serving as the spokesman of humanity.

For the Unconditional Surrender of Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith present a letter addressed to me by James Loeb, Jr., executive secretary of the Union for Democratic Action, as well as a statement from such organization:

UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
New York, N. Y., October 1, 1943.

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Enclosed is the text of a statement issued last June from this office. You will note that you were one of the four Congressmen who signed. Unhappily, the situation foreseen in the statement seems about to be effected. We would, therefore, urge you to do everything possible on the floor of the House to repeat the warnings contained in this statement.

We believe it essential to distinguish between the acceptance of military aid and the granting of political power. As Count Carlo Sforza has so well stated in his interview in the New York Times this morning, support for the Italian monarchy by the United Nations would have a disastrous effect in alienating the sympathy of the large anti-Fascist masses of Italy.

We cannot believe that the demoralized and disorganized Italian Army can be of such value as to warrant paying this horrible price. We are convinced that the Nazis will be driven from Italy by the combined might of the American, British, and Canadian armed forces, together with the enthusiastic cooperation of an Italian population disgusted with monarchy and dictatorship and aspiring to a genuine democracy.

This is indeed the crisis of the war.

Cordially,

JAMES LOEB, JR.,
Executive Secretary.

FOR THE UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER OF FASCISM

We are engaged in a total war against fascism.

American lives, among others, are being sacrificed in that total war.

Our Government, through the voice of our President and Commander in Chief, has pledged that the war will be carried through to the unconditional surrender of the Fascist enemy.

But Fascists are always for sale. As the overwhelming power of the United Nations becomes more apparent, they will become increasingly for sale, and at a seemingly decreasing price.

But whatever the legal terms, the price in the end will be a totalitarian Europe and World War No. 3.

To pay that price would be a crime without name.

To pay that price would be betrayal of those who have fought and died and of those who have fought to live.

To pay that price would be betrayal of those countless millions in the conquered lands to whom we have repeatedly appealed in the sacred name of freedom, who have fought unremittingly against Fascist barbarism, and have looked to us for liberation.

To those of us who believe these things current rumors regarding new Darlans in Europe are more than disquieting. These rumors are particularly strong in Italy. Such men as King Victor Emmanuel, Count Ciano, Dino Grandi, Crown Prince Umberto, and General Badoglio are being mentioned as possible collaborators with the Allied cause, as non-Fascists, and even as anti-Fascists.

We respectfully submit that men such as these who have faithfully collaborated with fascism for more than 20 years can hold no positions of control in a democratic order in Europe.

We must not pay their price.

Were it not for previous policies and actions of our Department of State which have aroused doubts throughout the democratic world, all these rumors might be ignored as the inevitable accompaniment of a global war.

We feel that it is opportune now, before policy has been fixed, for the free citizens of an embattled democracy to reiterate their profound belief that there can be no compromise between fascism and democracy, between Fascists and Democrats.

We trust that the Allied armies, now poised to strike at the heart of fascism, will be victorious not only as military conquerors, but as armies of liberation.

William Agar, Luigi Antonini, Henry A. Atkinson, George Baldanzi, Robert Bendiner, G. A. Borgese, W. Russell Bowie, Dwight G. Bradley, Louis Bromfield, Van Wyck Brooks, Henry Seider Canby, John Alden Carpenter, Congressman Emanuel Celler, John L. Childs, Congressman John M. Coffee, Albert Sprague Coolidge, Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge, Congressman Daniel Ellison, Irving Engel, Waldo Frank, Walter Frank, Christian Gauss, Frank P. Graham, John Green, William Green, Ernest Graham Guthrie, Mortimer Hays, Marion C. Kilpatrick, William H. Kilpatrick, Freda Kirchwey, Jack Kroll, Max Lerner, J. A. MacCallum, Alonzo F. Myers, W. W. Norton, June Proyines, A. Philip Randolph, Elmer E. Rogers, Congressman Will Rogers, Jr., Waverley L. Root, Lisa Sergio, Guy Emery Shipler, Robert G. Spivack, Johannes Steel, Maurice Stone, R. J. Thomas, Clifton M. Utley, Oswald Veblen, J. Raymond Walsh, Max Zaritsky.

Individual Control Necessary to World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Judge William H. Wadhams, of East Jewett, N. Y.

Judge Wadhams is an international lawyer, has had offices in Berlin, Paris, and New Delhi, India, and is permanent adviser to the Chamber of Princes on the Federation of India.

As a member of the executive committee of the League to Enforce Peace, Judge Wadhams worked on the plan for a League of Nations, and observed at close range the cause of its failure. He is presenting a new and more hopeful approach to securing an enduring peace in this article.

The Government Printing Office informs me it will cost $112.50, which is $22.50 in excess of the allowance.

The article follows:

Mr. President, ladies, and gentlemen, doctors of medicine are the fighters of death and the conservers of health. You look into the eyes of men and women throughout this State, and you learn their innermost thoughts, and you have glimpses into their souls. You know that these people are determined, first, to win the victory over the enemies we are now engaging, and then by some method to see to it that this fatal disease, this terrible calamity of war, which from time to time inflicts mankind, shall not continue in the world. You work to save lives, yet one bombardment of one city by 4-ton blockbusters kills more people in an instant than you could save in a hundred years.

The tragedy is great. The remedy must be severe, and it must be applied. I was holding court in New York, when the messenger came in and said, "Armistice! Armistice! Armistice has been signed today." The court adjourned, and everyone rushed into the streets. The war was over, the killing was finished, our boys were coming home, peace reigned again in the world. We formed a procession. We marched up Broadway. The people all came out of their offices, and they fell into each other's arms. There was dancing and rejoicing, for the war to end wars had been won. It was going to be a new and a better world, and we were going to have peace on earth and good will among men.

Some of us had been working on a proposition as to how to bring that about. We had an organization called the League to Enforce Peace. Ex-President Taft was its president and Lawrence Lowell, of Harvard, was the chairman of its executive committee. We formed a committee to organize a plan, and we drafted what we called a League of Nations. We went about talking about it. There was a pretty general approval, and we had a great dinner in Washington at which the heads of all the elements in the United States, the clergy, the leaders of industry and of labor, the doctors, the lawyers, the professions, and all classes and conditions of men were present.

This program which we had prepared was presented to President Wilson, and he adopted it, and worked on it, and took it over to Paris with him. There had been some modifications in it; the teeth had been drawn. I had

the privilege of being in the clock room at the Quay d'Orsay when he presented it to the peace conference in the form of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The delegates and the ambassadors could only take in one guest apiece, and I had the good fortune to be taken by our Ambassador as his secretary: so I clung to his coattails, and found myself sitting next to Orlando, of Italy, on the one hand, and Jules Cambon, of France, on the other.

As President Wilson arose slowly and solemnly, he seemed to look into the future, offering peace to mankind through his League. There was a moment when it appeared that he was the savior of men, for all the peoples of the world were longing for peace. When he had finished reading, there were many speeches of approval. However, as he sat down, after reading the Covenant, Clemenceau, the Lion of France, who had done such wonders in the World War but who had no peace vision for the future, turned around and looked at Cambon, who was sitting beside me, and winked. That wink told the whole story of the future of the League of Nations.

Having an office abroad, I had the opportunity to follow the League's course, and to see its failure and collapse. Let us hold an autopsy. What was the cause of the death of the League? An autopsy is only valuable for another patient, in case we find out how we can apply the reasons of death that we have discovered. The cause of the death of the League was that it was not a peoples' league; it was a governments' league. It was a league of diplomacy. The Covenant was as good an instrument for the expression by a League of Nations of the common and unanimous will of the governments of its members as could well be drawn, yet it failed.

Before we go further and investigate what were the defects of its provisions and what may be a cure, I wish to warn you that the establishment of peace is not a thing that can be done overnight. First the victory must be won, and nothing must divert our attention from winning that victory, because until the aggressor has been vanquished there can be no peace. There can be no peace until we have utterly routed a people who have been educated to believe that hate is a virtue and that was is a normal condition. After the victory we will have to clear up the ruins—and such ruins as have never been contemplated. There are no kitchen utensils left for the women in their kitchens in France. The leather has been torn from the chairs, and the sofas, everything that is movable, everything that they can lay their hands on, the Germans have carted off to Germany, including my library; and the last I heard the Frigidaire had also gone after the library. Factories are gutted, the machinery is gone, and that which is there is being used to the utmost and will be worn out and valueless. The populations are being removed and scattered over the face of the globe. Children are being sent apart from their parents to unknown places, and their names changed. The mere work of trying to gather together the scattered remnants of what lives is in itself a tremendous task. Epidemics and starvation such as have never been known threaten the peoples of the world, starvation that looks for a crumb of bread. The Germans have not left these countries yet, and I tremble to think of what they will do before they leave them. Collaborationists saved Paris, but who knows what will happen to Paris and all the other occupied places before the enemy leaves?

Restoration is the first work before anything else can be set up. Industry must be started, trade begun again, and transportation put in order. Employment must be found. We will have to do a large part of that unless we want to live in a world of corpses.

Then after that, what? After that, the beginning of cooperation. Cooperation will form itself by reason of necessity. The victorious nations will have to establish and maintain order in the world by reason of the conditions which will confront them. That cooperation will lead to something else. It will finally gather together the nucleus of a new order to maintain the peace which has been won.

And now I speak of what is very, very dominant and very important to you all and to all the people who want peace. I have read all the speeches, I have read Vice President WALLACE's speeches, I have read Mr. Willkie's speeches, I have examined the reports of groups which are studying the new world organization, and I do not find in them an examination of the cause for the failure of the League of Nations.

It would seem reasonable, would it not, that when we have had examples before us of efforts to maintain peace and to organize states in combination, that we should examine those organizations to find out why they fail, and then, having found out why they have failed, to see if we can apply a cure that will make them work?

They say—and I speak of the scoffers, and the timid, and the unbelievers, and the doubters—how can it ever work? How can any world organization ever work in view of human frailties, of the competition and jealousies of nations, of the inimical force of politics, and of the ambitions of rulers and of politicians? How can it ever be made to work?

If those who establish the post-war organization follow the old League lines, if they follow the old methods of attempted national cooperation, if they follow the plans that seem to be now in contemplation, they are bound to fail, and that in a very short time. The reason they are bound to fail is because of the very structure of such combinations of states or nations. Let us examine two examples.

We had in this country a United States of America before our own was organized. It was called the Confederation. It was composed, as you know, of the Thirteen Colonies. They were combined in a league, in a United States, but they lasted only 8 years. Why did they fail?

It was interesting to me, having worked on this problem on my own account, to find that I had support in very high quarters; and that support comes from Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton told the Colonies why they failed, and what the cure was. It was not a people's league; it was a league of States. This is what Hamilton had to say on the subject: "The great and radical vice in the construction of the existing Confederation is the principle of legislation for States or governments in their corporate or collective capacity as contradistinguished from the individuals of which they consist." This was the defect, and in the Constitutional Convention they found the cure and formed a more perfect union.

If you smuggled something into the port of New York under this new and better union that was formed, and should say to the customs officers, "I am a resident of the State of Massachusetts. I appeal to the State of Massachusetts," it would not do you any good. Why? Because the 20 powers given to the central Government of the United States are controls over individuals. You, as an individual, are brought up before the court, not as a member of a State. The Government deals directly with you as an individual. When the Constitution of the United States was established it did not say, "We, the Thirteen Colonies," or "We, the thirteen States," or "We, the thirteen nations." No, it proclaimed, "We, the People." We, the People, have organized this Government to establish justice. And so it must be with any league of nations if it is to endure.

We are held together here by what I call an impersonal concept: our love of justice and our love of freedom, which thrills in every American heart. You have an impersonal concept in your medical society that binds you together in unity: your individual obligation to the whole, as individuals. If you are going to have peace in the world, you must have an organization or a government of peoples having in their hearts the concept, "We will no longer submit to being destroyed by war. We will set up a body of law which will say 'This thou shalt not do because it leads to war'," and so we pass from the field of diplomacy into the sphere of law, and have a hope for life.

The League had its chance and what happened? The first opportunity was with Manchuria and Japan. Japan marched into that country without any just reason, yet the League did not even attempt to apply sanctions. Nations could not agree just as the Colonies could not agree. They had been brought to disaster because each Colony was first for itself and the devil take the hindmost.

Then came Italy and Abyssinia. Now the theory of the League was plain enough. These sanctions were: First, sever all diplomatic relations; second, sever all commercial relations; these would bring any country to its knees at once.

What happened? The traitor, Laval, went to Italy, and he came back with a formula, "easy sanctions gradually applied." That suited many interests in several countries, and they went on selling to Italy what she needed. Although we were not a member of the League, we could have done something, but we kept on selling them oil. The Italians went over to Africa, and they did not have a war; they just burned up the poor Abyssinians with their poison gas, and charred corpses were strewn over the desert, while the peoples of the world said, "The League has lost its authority. Are these traitors more important than this organization which we have set up to maintain peace in the world? Are these traitors going to abandon the effort until war is upon us again?" Well, the war is again upon us, and here we are in the midst of it.

It is said that if the United States had gone into the League this would not have happened. We could have taken part without being in it; and it did happen. Is our Government so superior? Are our representatives so exalted in their ideas and their ethics? Are we so willing to make sacrifices for the common good and peace of the world?

It is said that if the League had had teeth it would have succeeded. Let me tell you what happened. The League would not even apply the commercial sanctions which were provided. Do you think they would have applied military sanctions, which is what "teeth" means? If they had been there, would they have gone to war with Italy when they would not stop trading with her? Certainly not. This claim that if they had had teeth in the League it would have succeeded is sheer nonsense. There is something much more serious the matter with the League than that. It is the basic principle of such an organization that counts. There was a fundamental defect in the League's structure.

You can examine all the national and international combines, and you will find that if this defect is present they—all of them—fail, and when it is not present they succeed. That is why all the leagues that have been formed upon the personal-obligation principle, dealing directly with the individual, have succeeded, and when they rely upon nation dealing with nation they do not succeed.

And why not? It is because of the virtue of nations. I repeat, the virtue of nations.

A nation has been a very useful thing in the organization of mankind, but what is the duty of those in charge of a nation? To make the nation the most powerful, the richest, and the greatest country in the world. We hear a lot of that here. We enjoy waving the flag and letting the eagle scream. The duty of those in charge of a nation is to protect and promote the interests of its individuals. Very good. That is a very noble virtue, yet, in the hands of foreign offices, state departments, and government agencies, it immediately blocks any cooperation by a league because all the others are thinking the same thing. They are thus bound to come into conflict, and it is impossible for them in the nature of things to agree. History proves it. Legislation by a league is merely a proposal. It has to go back to the nations that form the league, and then, in order to get it adopted, you have to persuade them—you have to persuade them through diplomatic channels. The proposal is referred through its foreign office to a careful executive and to a jealous legislative body and to a debating committee, and in the meantime the aggression goes on and the countries take sides, and the war proceeds. This is the inevitable result of the formation of a league along the old lines. It does not deal directly with the individual; it deals only with governments. Governments need take no affirmative act to defeat the league plan. All they have to do is to sit down and do nothing, or, as in the case of Italy, present an evasive plan.

When you consider what is at stake you will realize the importance of a proper foundation for any new order. How are they going about it now? Are they going along the old league lines that always fail? How are they thinking now? The old league had a general mandate to maintain peace based upon treaties between the nations.

The new league, whatever it is, will have definite and limited powers enforceable by law. What will those powers have to be? We have heard about the "four freedoms." We know that the "four freedoms" are a glorious thing to have. Are you going to rely upon moral suasion to get them? If so, you will join the ranks of the wishful thinkers who are expecting by their wishfulness to obtain peace in the world. If you don't get them by moral suasion, are you going to get them by treaties, pacts, agreements among nations? The mere mention of the Kellogg Pacts raises hilarious and bitter laughter. War was banished by those pacts. Who forgot that? Are you going to rely upon balances of power? The trouble with power is that it does not remain balanced. The very conception of a balance of power is the antithesis of peace for the reason that by balancing power you are building up strength just as the German strength was built up to balance power in Europe, and when one of the parties obtains the upper hand, and the government is in the hands of ruthless and determined and ambitious leaders, your balance of power leads inevitably to war.

A league has to act through persuasion, and how are you going to do the persuading? A country's agents, of whatever party or whoever they are, who undertake to carry out a resolution of a league which is apparently a disadvantage—a temporary disadvantage—to their country, would have no chance of success. A jingo press would make it immediately perfectly clear to everyone that it would be an outrage for the nation to go forward along the lines of the league's resolution. It would be easy to create a national clamor, a national demand to break away from the league. That is what Lord Bryce pointed out. He said, "There are two kinds of leagues." One is "a league in which a number of political bodies, be they monarchies or republics, are bound together so as to constitute for certain purposes, and especially for the purpose of common defense, a single body. The members of such a composite body or league are not individual men but communities. It exists only as an aggregate of communities and will therefore vanish as soon as the communities which compose it separate themselves from one another. Moreover, it deals with and acts upon these communities only. With the individual it has nothing to do."

Such is the structure of leagues which, like the League of Nations, fail to maintain peace. As Lord Bryce says, they vanish. The second form of leagues, those which succeed, is a union of the people of nations which compose it. It does not deal through the government of those nations, but directly with their citizens, demanding individual obedience to its laws.

There is no use in blinding our eyes to the situation. It is not that I am condemning governments or their agents. They do the best they can even when they are in the hands of devious politicians and ambitious men. They do the best they can, and it is human nature that they should, because otherwise they would not remain in office; they cannot resist organized pressure and the people are unorganized. The people cannot express themselves sufficiently, clearly, promptly, and energetically enough to prevent the acts which produce wars. We did not want this war. We did not cause it. We did not enter upon it because we were after anything in the world. We had to go into it to defend ourselves. We know that. But we are looking forward to other aggressors in the future who, like this arch fiend of hell, may put all the world into the devouring jaws of death. We have the power to prevent it, but only if you really want to prevent war. Are you really enthusiastic enough for freedom? We give our money, we give our sons, we give our people, we give everything for war; but what are we willing to give for peace? How much peace could we have bought with what we have expended? What years of millennium could have been purchased with this enormous waste of billions of dollars and millions of men?

Do we really want peace? Then organize for it. We, the people, we insist upon a government of law; we insist upon establishing a league that will assure us the Four Freedoms by giving it the necessary power over individual violations of its laws. I have not the time to discuss these laws with you. However, I will mention some examples. One of them concerns freedom from fear. We all live in fear. We don't know when a bomb is coming here. Those who live in the war-stricken areas are momentarily in fear of bombs that may be dropped from the skies, or, if sailing on the sea, in fear that the unseen submarine may destroy them. All the peoples long for freedom from fear, freedom from the fear of the monsters of the world, freedom from fear of the education of hate and war.

How are we going to stop this insane horror? By control of those who make the wars; by control of those who make the machinery of war. Everybody is agreed that we must stop this business of building these terrible instruments of destruction. But don't think we can stop it by acting through governments. History shows we cannot. But we can stop it by acting through law. Let me give you an example.

Supposing at some future time some future Mr. Goering started manufacturing arms and that it is against the law of nations for anyone to manufacture arms unless he has a license from the league created to see to it that the people shall have peace. Under the old league form, the council of the league would pass a resolution and through its diplomatic channels would address the government in which Mr. Goering lived. That government would say, "Thank you very much. We will make an investigation." Perhaps weeks or, more likely, months later would come a reply to the league, "We have investigated this matter very carefully, and we regret to say we find a grievous error has been committed. Mr. Goering is not manufacturing arms; he is manufacturing agricultural machinery."

What are we going to do about it? If we reject the reply of the government in which Mr. Goering lives, we are attacking his nation. We are promoting a crisis which, if Mr. Goering persists, can only be overcome by force, and that means war.

What is the other alternative? The other alternative is to do what they did in the case of Italy: Swallow our pride, forget it, let Mr. Goering go on manufacturing arms and build up his war machinery, as well as other Mr. Goerings, until again the flame of war bursts upon the world; and so our league has also failed, whichever course it pursues.

Now supposing you had a real people's government, a league which pursuant to law had power to arrest individuals who violated its laws. The military police would swoop down in an airplane, arrest Mr. Goering, and take him to the nearest court, where he would be tried. It would be his offense, not the offense of the country in which he lives. Such a league deals directly with the individual, the individual who is stopped from doing the forbidden act. All acts of government, or of corporations, or of companies are performed by individuals. That is the way we stop crimes in the United States. As you know, there are only about 20 powers that by the Federal Constitution are given to the Federal Government, and they are all to prevent disobedience by individuals. To obtain freedom from fear we must stop armaments. We never will stop the production of armaments by nations through treaties, pacts, or agreements, or through any league based upon such foundations; but we can stop such production immediately, by league action against the individual.

That will give us freedom from fear. And now we come to freedom from want. I am reminded of something that concerned this city of Buffalo. At one time I was counsel for the New York Produce Exchange. We looked upon the Great Lakes and found no boats were moving on them. The Great Lakes had dried up. And why? Because the railroads had made the freight rate from the foot of the Lakes, from Buffalo and Erie to Boston, New York, and Philadelphia so high that they had forced all freight to come all rail from the West, thereby depriving the shipper of cheap transportation on the Lakes. I went before the Interstate Commerce Commission and presented the case, and they changed the rate and made it a reasonable rate from the foot of the Great Lakes to the Atlantic seaboard, and the boats began to move again on the Great Lakes. To do that I did not bring in the State of Illinois, I did not bring in the State of New York, or the State of Ohio, or the State of Massachusetts. No, I brought in the railroads; the individuals had to obey the order of the court.

To insure freedom from want, control transportation and trade so that the raw materials may go where they are absolutely needed, and so that there may not be great congestions of produce burned up in one spot while people are starving in other places; prevent the suffering and distress that cause new wars; bring the steamship companies into court. We will never obtain freedom from want by relying upon the voluntary actions of national governments.

Freedom of the press and the freedom of speech may be protected in the same way by requiring individual obedience to protecting laws. Any man who is oppressed ought to have a chance to be heard. At present there is no international court where he may apply for protection. There was no international bill of rights.

As nearly as we have come to it so far, the "four freedoms" and those expressed in the Atlantic Charter are a draft of the Bill of Rights. That is what the people are longing for, because it contains in it the rights that man must have if he is to enjoy peace and freedom. Therefore, it is our obligation to see to it that this is a government of the peoples with responsibility of the people to obey. We made this Government a government of laws and not of men. That has been the trouble with France. France collapsed because it has been a government of men. They followed their leaders in the French Revolution. Then they followed the glory of Napoleon. Now some of them followed Vichy and its leaders. They were divided into factions and they were working for one purpose—for themselves, not for France. They had no moral force to hold them together. The motto of the French Government, "Liberty, equality, and fraternity," was mere words, a slogan. No; there was no unity in France; and if we are going to have peace in the world we have got to have unity in our people, a unity insisting that the people obtain a real organization of law to maintain peace.

Listen and watch. Listen to the speeches. Watch the proposals. See what speakers are talking about—whether they are talking about boundaries, or about big and little countries, or about forms of government, or about regional groupings. If you have a law of nations, it does not make any difference whether you live this side or the other side of a boundary; you are bound to obey the law. The boundary line is no obstacle to putting in such a plan. There is no objection to regional groupings, Pan American Unions, the Danubian Union, or even a United States of Europe, providing all the citizens, the nations of such unions, are also bound to obey the law of nations to preserve peace. It does not make so much difference what the form of the government of each nation is, much as we would like to promote the democratic idea. Whether you are living under the common law of England in Massachusetts or under the code Napoleon in Louisiana, it makes no difference; you are bound by that central law just the same, and the size of the state has nothing to do with it. If you are a citizen of Delaware or of Texas, you have the same obligation to obey the central law. The local law of the States and the size of States are no obstacles. Forms of government are no obstacle. If you are a subject of His Majesty the King Emperor, or if you are a citizen of the Soviet Union, or of the United States of America, you are equally bound as an individual to obey the law of nations. I believe the Russians would be for it; they want peace; after this war they want a law that will say a man cannot do this if it is going to interfere with the peace of the world. You can agree upon this fundamental: that every individual, no matter where he lives, has got to obey the law of nations and not do those things which make for war. So I draw to a conclusion and say, we, the people, shall insist upon a law of nations, which each one of us will uphold and will obey; otherwise I see the hordes of Genghis Khan sweeping the world, rushing from Asia over Europe; I see the thousands of horsemen of the Huns destroying civilization again; and I see the most terrible of all these calamities, the burying of all that is precious in dust and ashes.

Liberty-loving men, freedom-loving men, watch what is being done. If they are talking in the terms of sanctions by nations against nations, sanctions imposed to maintain world order in the future, if they are talking of pacts and treaties, they are talking in terms of failure. Such methods failed before and will fail again; so let us as the people insist not upon dreams but upon the will to live in peace established by law so that at last mankind may rise to its destiny.

Tort Claims Against the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, in these days of crisis, when all our thoughts and all our efforts are concentrated upon winning the war and establishing peace and justice for all, we may find it difficult to divert our attention even for a few moments to a relatively minor problem. But because it concerns an improvement in our system of justice, I do not think the subject of which I desire to speak is out of time or place. I refer to a needed and long-overdue improvement in the remedies available to our citizens who are injured in limb or property by the negligence of Government employees. The desirability of improvements in the field of tort claims against the Government was made the subject of a special message from the President in January 1942, and bills to provide for suits on such claims were considered quite extensively during the last Congress. Indeed, tort claims bills of one type or another have been under the consideration of Congress durthe past 20 years. Nevertheless, a statute providing a comprehensive and adequate procedure still remains to be passed.

We have progressed a long way since the maxim that the sovereign can do no wrong first entered our law. It was sensed almost a century ago that this doctrine of sovereign irresponsibility should have only a limited application in America. During the past century Congress has slowly but surely peeled away from the Federal Government its protective mantle of immunity from suit in court for the wrongful acts of its agents.

As early as 1855 Congress established the Court of Claims and permitted suit to be brought against the United States upon contract claims and also upon claims arising under Federal law or regulation. In 1887 the United States district courts were given concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims up to $10,000. Soon consent to suits against the Government was extended into the field of torts. For example, in 1910 Congress permitted the United States to be sued in the Court of Claims for patent infringement. During the First World War, when the Government took over the operation of the railroads and other utilities, Congress made the United States subject to the same liability for property damage, personal injury, and death as the private owners would have been. A few years later, in 1920 and 1925, suit was permitted in the district courts on account of damage or injury caused by Government vessels, without limitation as to amount.

But despite all the progress that has undeniably been made in this field, there still remains a large and important class of wrongs for which there is yet no satisfactory remedy—the ordinary common-law tort, such as personal injury or property damage caused by the negligent operation of a Government automobile by a Government employee while carrying out some official task. Thus, while the Government may now be sued for breach of contract, patent infringement, or admiralty tort, it still is immune from suit for a common-law tort. The victim of a collision with a post-office truck now has only two sources of redress: he may seek a very limited administrative award from the Federal agency concerned, or he may attempt to obtain a private act of Congress for his relief. The first is often inadequate and gives him as a matter of grace that which he should have of right; the second is time-consuming and unfair to both Congress and the claimant.

The power of administrative adjustment is decidedly limited. The act of December 28, 1922, authorizes the heads of the executive agencies to settle claims up to $1,000 for property loss or damage caused by the negligence of their employees, and to certify the award to Congress for payment. A few Government agencies are specially authorized to make similar administrative adjustments of claims for personal injuries up to $500. While the remedy given by these statutes is better than no remedy at all, it is generally recognized that the present procedure for administrative adjustment is inadequate. Not only is the permissible maximum settlement below the level which would permit justice to be done in the more serious type of accident, but the claimant has no right to test in court the accuracy or fairness of the award. It is of course usually no comfort to the maimed or damaged claimant that he can sue the Government employee who was at fault, because not infrequently the employee is not financially capable of meeting a sizable judgment, and as a rule the loss or injury occurs in situations in which the Government should in all conscience bear the responsibility.

The ultimate recourse of a claimant who fails to obtain satisfactory administrative relief is to seek a private relief bill. During the past 20 years the system of redressing Government torts by private bill has been the subject of strong criticism by Members of the Congress, including those on the Claims Committees who have had the most direct contact with such bills. In committee reports, in speeches and debates, Members of the Congress have urged that relief of Government employees' torts by private bill is unfair to the claimants and excessively burdensome to the Congress. More than 2,000 private relief bills are introduced in each Congress. Any single bill has little better than a 15-percent chance of being enacted, and even these may require diligent pursuit of the matter for years. As the reports and statements of the Claims Committees show, the limited time available for consideration of each private bill renders impossible a full hearing to each claimant, and there is no opportunity for examination and cross-examination of witnesses or receipt of testimony. The result, according to these sources, is a hasty investi-

gation generally entrusted to a single committeeman, consisting in most cases of an ex parte presentation of the facts by affidavit. After the bill is considered and approved by the full committee, it must be considered and sometimes debated in the pertinent House of Congress. This process is then repeated in the other Chamber. In view of the short period allocated to the Private Claim Calendar and the pressure of matters of greater public importance, a private claim bill frequently fails to pass both Houses in the same session, requiring its reintroduction in the succeeding session. The foregoing criticisms come from the statements and writings of members of the Claims Committees. This is what those who have the present responsibility think of the means we have provided for discharging those responsibilities.

The widespread recognition that the present procedure is burdensome and inadequate—which is shared not only by Members of Congress but also by legal scholars and authorities—has led to a number of attempts to provide an adequate remedial procedure in place of private relief bills. The first proposal that tort claims be remitted to the courts was made in this Chamber in 1919, and since that time a number of bills to this effect have been introduced and considered in both Houses of Congress. In 1929, a Federal Tort Claims Act was actually passed by both Houses, providing for administrative settlement and judicial review of tort claims, but it was vetoed for procedural reasons. In the Seventy-sixth Congress, this body passed a Federal tort claims bill providing for administrative settlement of claims up to $1,000 for personal injury or property damage caused by the negligence of a Government employee while acting within the scope of his employment, with jurisdiction in the Court of Claims and the district courts over such claims up to $7,500. In the last Congress, a similar bill covering claims up to $10,000 was passed by the Senate and favorably reported, in somewhat modified form, by the House Judiciary Committee, but the pressure of more important business during the closing days of the Congress prevented enactment of the bill into law. This bill was reintroduced early this year by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], as H. R. 1356, and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. It would authorize Federal agencies to settle tort claims up to $1,000 for death, personal injury, or property damage, with jurisdiction in the district courts over such claims up to $10,000.

Gentlemen, I urge that this bill be given serious consideration by all of you. It is a sound and necessary step in removing the archaic and unjustifiable immunity of the Government for the wrongful conduct of its agents and employees. Especially in these busy and hectic days, which witness a steadily increasing use of automobiles and other mechanical equipment capable of causing damage to persons and property, the absence of a satisfactory procedure for redressing wrongs is a grave defect in our social policy.

The bill will supply a well-defined, continually operating machinery to redress tortious wrongs arising out of Government activity in place of existing procedures, which are admittedly inadequate and burdensome to the Government and the claimant. It will remove an existing inequality in our law which permits suit to be brought against the United States for certain types of tort claims, such as admiralty and maritime torts, and yet precludes suit on the ordinary common-law type of tort, such as personal injuries or property damage resulting from negligent operation of an automobile. It will place the United States, in respect of torts committed by its agents, upon a footing of real responsibility to its citizens, with certain limitations required for the protection of important governmental functions. By removing a large number of private tort claims from Congress and the Claims Committees, it will give the National Legislature more time to devote to matters of wider importance, and will thereby benefit the public as well as claimants and Members of the Congress. To quote from the President's message to Congress of January 1942, recommending the passage of legislation similar to the Celler bill, "we should grant the responsibility for handling such matters" as tort claims, "to those equipped with year-around facilities and time to dispose of them."

I believe that a thought expressed by President Lincoln in his first annual message to Congress on December 3, 1861, adequately expresses the justification and sound policy underlying the bill:

> It is as much the duty of Government to render prompt justice against itself in favor of citizens as it is to administer the same between private individuals. The investigation and adjudication of claims in their nature belong to the judicial department.

Unemployment After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from 2 months spent in my district during the recent recess. I traveled extensively over the area I represent in the State of Washington, and made 66 addresses during the period.

Some of these addresses were made on the invitation of various Townsend Clubs. I found these groups holding well-attended meetings. Their membership rolls are being well maintained, and their interest in the movement is at a high level. They have quite a number of very capable and intelligent leaders who are doing good work in the cause they represent.

When the war ends, which we all hope will be soon, there will be a great problem to solve with the millions of men and women released from the armed forces and from the production of war materials. In this connection, it is interesting to consider the suggestion recently made by Mr. Beecher Hess of the National Townsend organization, which follows.

I am quoting Mr. Hess: "Our young men and women will be returning from foreign service, our wartime factory workers will be looking for peacetime jobs. We may keep 5,000,000 in our armed services, perhaps another 10,000,000 may be used in arsenals, military supply plants and in other Government service, another 20,000,000 will be used in production of peacetime commodities. We still would have some 15,000,000 unemployed. Some authorities have estimated 20,000,000. The progressive increase of commodities made by scientific methods and machine production using less and less manpower will continue to enlarge this unemployed group. Now, if we are going to have this unemployed class, is it not commonsense to plan now who shall be included in it? The tempo of modern-day production has been so stepped up that youth and middle age only can qualify. This leaves the aged as the logical group to be designated as the unemployed class. The Townsend plan will provide some 12,000,000 of our seniors with monthly annuities sufficient to maintain a substantial purchasing power and a market for the products of mine, factory, and farm. Retiring the aged from gainful employment will afford jobs for the youth and middle-aged. This is a sound, economic plan to meet the obvious post-war conditions."

Newsprint Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News, September 24, 1943, concerning the subject Newsprint Shortage:

NEWSPRINT SHORTAGE

A grave situation will arise next year in the matter of the newsprint supply if the figures of the War Production Board can be accepted. There is no reason to believe that they are not accurate.

During the next several years there will be greater need of a full free press than ever before in the history of the Nation. The daily press is the greatest medium for the crystallization of public thought that there is in the Nation. This medium for a meeting of the public minds exists, not so much in the newspapers' own opinion columns (its own editorials, the columnists, and letters from readers) as in a fair and impartial

presentation of the news for the public's own decisions on basis of facts. Every publisher knows—every observing reader knows—that the volume of legitimate news varies greatly from time to time. Never in our history has there been as much significant news—news that the public ought to know—as there is today, and as there will be during the next few years. There will come the critical and then closing episodes of World War No. 2 and the rising volume of news relating to the after-war peace plans.

Every day we read or hear that this is a shrinking world—a world of rapid transportation and communication—in which every man is neighbor and fellow citizen to every other man in the world. It is true, and by the same development the obligation of every man to keep abreast of world affairs has been greatly increased. The American press—and especially a free and unlimited daily press—must play a greater role than ever before in keeping the public informed.

The press can be just as effectively limited by a paper shortage as it can be limited by law or dictator's decree. The bottleneck at present is lack of manpower to gather the pulpwood. Our own National Government has cooperated by making wood-pulp production an essential industry. Canada, which holds a monopoly on production of most of the newsprint used in the United States, has not done so. The answer must be found in greater effort to produce pulpwood in the forest areas this side of the Canadian line, including our east Texas. The production and gathering of pulpwood in east Texas, since the establishment of the two large paper mills at Lufkin and Houston, could be developed greatly as a remunerative farm avocation—something that has not been fully realized in the farm program of this State. Large and small newspapers and periodicals should lend their assistance in putting such a program into operation. It would help meet a war emergency. It would lead eventually to freeing this country from dependence on Canadian wood-pulp supplies, and it would contribute to present and future full and free dissemination of world news and crystallization of democratic thought.

The American System Briefly Stated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich., of October 1.

This short and succinct statement includes the foundation and the principle on which the American system of free enterprise has been built. If the people did not have the right to sell their skill, their labor, and their ability for the best price obtainable, free government in the New World could not exist. It is on that principle that the Republic of the United States has been established, has expanded, and developed into the most progressive and powerful Nation on the earth. Of late years this system has been under attack and many thoughtful people, including many Members of the Congress of the United States, have witnessed this attack with much misgiving and serious concern.

If this system of the American people is destroyed, their form of government will be destroyed with it. May the American people in their wisdom not only encourage but preserve forever their American way of life.

The editorial follows:

WE NEED SEED MONEY

Every once in a while, in some discussion of taxes, I see the expression "seed money." Do you know what it means?

If it were not for seed money the majority of the people who read these words would not have the jobs they now occupy. For most of our present-day industries exist because (1) somebody had an idea; (2) somebody was willing to take a chance; (3) some seed money was dug up to start a new business or enlarge an old one.

Everybody knows now that a few men who risked money in the Ford Motor Co. made tremendous profits. But nobody guaranteed them. And while one company was making good in an unparalleled way, others, which seemed to have just as good ideas or had just as much thought, effort, and money put into them, failed. The investors in those lost everything.

Seed money means "that part of profits which is 'plowed back' into a business."

Most of the talk about seed money these days comes from people who are arguing that the Government should not take too much of business profits in taxation. They assert that if industries and business are going to reconvert promptly to peacetime operation, they will have to have money with which to do it. They will not have this if it has all been taken in taxation.

How the plowing back of profits works to create employment is shown by the following statement by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. It says:

"American improvement is essentially a Joe Doakes affair. Here's how it works:

"1. Joe invents something and invests seed money in equipment and materials to make it.

"2. People buy it.

"3. That makes good-paying jobs.

"4. Joe invests more seed money to improve his product or his method of making it.

"5. More people buy it.

"6. That makes more good-paying jobs.

"7. Joe invests more seed money in more and better machines to get volume production.

"8. So Joe lowers his price.

"9. Still more people buy.

"10. That makes more good-paying jobs.

"Try to figure out any other foundation for American wealth, leisure, culture, fighting strength, or material possessions.

"This simple progression, multiplied by millions of instances, explains why seed money is so important in our national life."

The First Lady's Contribution to the Winning of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, returning from one of his political long-distance trips through the United States, President Roosevelt said in substance that the people of Washington were less conscious of the war and its obligations than any other community.

Beyond question he was correct, and the First Lady, his wife, seems to be the one who leads in that indifference to war's actualities.

The morning mail brought me a letter from a resident of my district, asking that his son be given a furlough and returned to this country for a short rest period. His boy, who enlisted, who had very little training, has now served continuously for more than 18 months in a malaria-infested battle area, and we know that that boy needs a rest.

Yesterday's mail brought a letter from another father, whose wife, because of worry over her son's absence, is in danger of becoming permanently mentally deranged and confined in a public institution. This boy has been in the service for 2½ years. He has been overseas for 2 years. He has never had a furlough since joining, but his application for one has been denied.

Now it may be true that the exigencies of war require the continuous service of these boys and thousands of others in similar situation on the battle front. But if that is the situation then it is time that the Roosevelt family, Harry Hopkins, and some others of the Washington advocates of war and the use of our money, material, and men by foreign nations, begin themselves to use a little common sense, make some worth-while contribution toward the winning of the war, devote their energy to that end rather than to the establishment permanently of the Roosevelt family in the White House.

If your son, brother, or husband is serving abroad; if he has been serving there for a year or more and cannot be released temporarily from the fighting area to in a measure regain his strength and fighting skill, neither his morale nor yours is increased by the perambulations, the "galivantin' around," the escapades of the First Lady.

Westbrook Pegler, in a recent piece, gives us some news of her latest trip. That article is as follows:

NEW YORK, October 4.—The Newspaper Advisory Committee of the Office of War Information has decided that the American public is not being informed adequately about the war. As to military matters, this committee obviously is better qualified to pass judgment than any layman, but any layman can see that adequate information concerning Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's latest expedition has not been given.

The people have not been told who initiated this personal junket or who paid for it, and it is perfectly plain that the proceeds of Mrs. Roosevelt's newspaper column, a private enterprise, cannot pay the cost. She went in a great four-engined bomber, manned by two captains, three master sergeants, and a staff sergeant, who took 23,000 feet of film, and was attended by George Durno, a Washington journalist, who is now a major of the Air Transport Command.

The salaries of these men would be a considerable item, and the rental of the plane on any reasonable basis, plus the gasoline, would be an appalling obligation for even the richest columnist. The public is completely uninformed as to these costs, and a vague statement that Mrs. Roosevelt would repay

the American taxpayers by turning over the proceeds of her column to be divided between the Red Cross and the American Friends Service Committee belittles the intelligence of even the blindest personal devotee of the tourist who, this time, went so far as to refer to herself as the wife of the "ruler" of the United States.

The Red Cross and the American Friends Service Committee, whatever their worthiness, are not the United States Treasury, which paid the cost of the journey with money derived from taxes paid by the sweat of everyone who toils and from bonds sold ostensibly to pay only legitimate and necessary costs of the war. There is no obligation reduced to figures, but there is an implied admission in the fuzzy promise to pay a couple of other fellows that the junket was not undertaken in the public interest.

No person who travels in the legitimate interest of the United States Government is expected to pay his own costs.

It would appear that Mrs. Roosevelt became a field service worker of the Red Cross only for the purpose and duration of this trip and, in that case, it would be the Red Cross which conferred a favor on Mrs. Roosevelt, and at a sacrifice, incidentally, of a degree of public confidence in the organization under the management of the President's political house pet, Norman H. Davis.

Inasmuch as Mrs. Roosevelt is an active, subtle, and indefatigable politician and in view of the delicate political situation surrounding Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the Red Cross, by the connivance at a pretext, has permitted itself to be drawn into politics, and that is bad not only for the Red Cross but for those who, in the end, look to the Red Cross for its services.

In a speech a few months ago, President Roosevelt, counseling the people at home to endure patiently the rationing of gasoline, illustrated his plea with the information that a Flying Fortress consumed 1,110 gallons of gasoline in a bombardment mission of about 700 miles from north Africa, the equivalent of about 375 A ration units and "enough to drive your car five times across the continent." On this basis, Mrs. Roosevelt, in a flight of 26,000 miles, consumed 41,070 gallons, representing 130,875 A coupons, and 185 trips in your car across this continent. Moreover, in the fragmentary developments of the story, it has now been disclosed that the plane had been remodeled inside and fitted with seats and a bed.

All this, too, is aside from the fact that Mrs. Roosevelt traveled by automobile in Australia and New Zealand, using fuel imported, every single drop, over vast stretches of perilous ocean in tankers, and is always attended on her journeys by other cars hauling the official retinue and the sightseers. That happened many times at home, even when citizens of good conscience were willingly denying themselves all unnecessary mileage.

The interference with the work of the busy generals, admirals, and other officers fighting a war undoubtedly was real and seriously detrimental, but, of course, it is not measurable, and no officer could admit that his work had been impeded without abandoning all hopes of promotion.

Mention of the 23,000 feet of film suggests that when the fourth-term campaign really warms up, the American taxpayers and bond buyers will discover that they have paid for just that much political propaganda, fed to them as tonic for their morale. A civilian can't buy a 50-foot spool of film these days.

Pat Robinson, the I. N. S. correspondent at Guadalcanal, wrote that Mrs. Roosevelt kissed her radical political protégé, the inveterate professional youth of rising 30 summers, Joe Lash, for whom strenuous efforts were made to obtain a free commission in the Navy, now a sergeant in the Army.

Robinson also said he asked Pvt. Martin Bazar, of Providence, R. I., how he felt about being visited by the President's wife, and that Bazar replied: "I'd rather be visited by my own."

O. W. I. Is Discredited by Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting article depicting the attitude of the American press toward the activities of Elmer Davis and the Office of War Information:

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

(By John O'Donnell)

At long last, the American people are getting the cold facts on the thoroughly discredited and misnamed Office of War Information which they are now keeping in an administration love nest at the cost of about $50,000,000 a year.

It now develops that Mr. Elmer Davis' O. W. I. has been two-timing its congressional sugar daddies who ladle out the taxpayers' dough on Capitol Hill.

From what happened last week in Washington—particularly as a result of the blast from leading Washington correspondents, chiefs of wire services, and heads of bureaus—it is reasonable to predict that the unhappy Hoosier Davis will quit his job and that Congress may toss the whole O. W. I. set-up out the window, abolish it in toto, and start in all over again.

And this would be the healthiest gesture that could be taken if the Congress is sincerely interested in seeing that the American people get an honest count on their war.

These are the O. W. I. developments of the last few days:

1. O. W. I.'s very own advisory board, made up of newspaper chiefs personally friendly to Director Davis, have bluntly stated that O. W. I. has fallen down on the sole job for which it was created. Chairman Roy Roberts, managing editor of the Kansas City Star, wrote the report, signed by his editorial colleagues, which declared:

"It is the judgment of the Newspaper Advisory Committee to the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. that the American people are not being adequately informed about the war."

2. Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Republican, of Massachusetts, returning from a global tour of every combat area, reported to his Senate colleagues his contempt for O. W. I. propaganda activities in friendly foreign countries. The Senator regretted that he had opposed cutting down O. W. I.'s money for this work 6 months ago, now thinks he was mistaken, and charged that O. W. I. representatives overseas were doing propaganda work "never contemplated by Congress and for which no clear-cut executive policy exists."

Meanwhile, lusty roars were going up in this Capital because we reporters had been forced to sit on information which later broke in London—in great part by the speeches of Winston Churchill. The result was that important war news reached American ears, not from Washington, where it should have been released if Davis was effectively on the job, but from London.

In other words, London has become the news source of the war so far as the American people are concerned. Churchill, speaking to Parliament, handed out war news which Roosevelt, speaking to the Congress a few days earlier, kept secret.

The newspapermen's trade paper, Editor and Publisher, did a bit of good reporting on the situation and collected the opinions of a representative group of high-grade, respected Washington correspondents.

Almost without exception, they agreed that the O. W. I. had fallen down on its job, that the American people were not getting the whole truth about the war, and indicated that Davis' outfit was taking publicity orders from the White House and White House-controlled sources.

And White House publicity these days, as all Washington knows, is geared directly to the fourth-term campaign of F. D. R.

The most forthright statement on the situation comes from the veteran Jesse S. Cottrell, of the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, whose 30 years in the press galleries were broken only by 8 years in the Diplomatic Service and 3 in the Army during World War No. 1. Caustically Cottrell states:

"Elmer Davis' O. W. I. is a delusion and a fraud—the biggest bulletproof haven for New Deal draft dodgers in the world * * *. Washington correspondents are unnecessarily somewhat cowed and bluffed—we have outdone ourselves to cooperate patriotically. There is little we can do about it."

Arthur Krock, chief of the bureau of the New York Times, thinks that London will continue to beat Washington on news, "including news in which the United States has a special interest," until, among other proposed solutions, "Elmer Davis, by resigning, brings the issue officially into the open."

The Christian Science Monitor's bureau chief, J. Roscoe Drummond, surveying the present news situation in the Capital under O. W. I., warns that "there is a greater danger today of an under-informed democracy than an over-informed enemy."

He charges that "Elmer Davis, of O. W. I., is too frequently vetoed" by higher-ups on thin grounds of security.

United Press Bureau Chief Lyle Wilson thinks coldly that Churchill scoops Elmer Davis' O. W. I. for the simple reason that Churchill gets the news and O. W. I. doesn't have access to it.

The President's biographer, Ernest Lindley, Washington editor of Newsweek, points out that Churchill has "unquestionably been scooping us on our own stories * * * does it almost every time he makes a speech." Lindley thinks that "Churchill's judgment as to what can be told without aiding the enemy is more sensible" than the controlling judgment in Washington.

Several of the correspondents put the blame for the deliberate withholding of war news from the American people directly on the White House doorstep and their caustic phrases indicate the wide gulf of mutual dislike which now separates Franklin Roosevelt from the professional news gatherers in Washington.

Krock, of the New York Times, for example, coolly thrusts at F. D. R.'s self-proclaimed knowledge of journalism with the urbane observation that the situation will not be remedied until "the President learns to know what news is to which the public is entitled, and how to tell it or take counsel from those who do."

He suggests that F. D. R. take counsel from Churchill and "deal with Congress, the American public, and the press as adult partners in the war instead of as trustworthy subordinates and mental minors."

In the same vein, Arthur Sears Henning, of the Chicago Tribune, suggests that "It may be that Mr. Churchill is an abler reporter than Mr. Roosevelt." With gentle sarcasm, the veteran Henning points out that the President "does not profess to know news, his lectures to us reporters being confined to the proper way to write a story."

Columnist Ray Tucker, of the McClure Syndicate, points out that Churchill "believes in treating and trusting his people like grown-ups, whereas Washington feels that Americans are only babes in arms. But this may derive from the human fact that the British statesman has been an experienced world reporter for 40 years, while Mr. Roosevelt was merely editor of the Harvard Crimson."

Helen Essary, of the Washington Times-Herald, also puts the blame on F. D. R. and his White House press conferences.

Says the lady: "Mr. Roosevelt's trick of turning aside legitimate questions on international policy with bright quips is becoming a habit, and not a pretty habit when men are giving their lives for his country and theirs."

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, Benjamin Harrison said, "We have no commission from God to police the world."

It takes 83,000 employees in the Treasury Department to gather the quid pro quo and then disburse it and the borrowed.

Milk, butter, and beef will be definitely reduced in production next year, the principal reason being too much male cow in the O. P. A.

The whole country would like to hear the full report of the seven Senators whether or not parts of it conflict with the O. W. I.

Industrial Connecticut last Monday held elections in 143 towns, 127 going Republican. Two years ago their House delegation was solidly New Deal.

Organized labor is not making any attempt to repeal the Connally-Smith antistrike bill. There is evidence that the 30-day "cooling off" provision is really cooling.

Two days after the globe-circling Senators said that Great Britain was furnishing little or no oil from Persia, the Mediterranean suddenly became open for navigation, on radio.

A Cabinet member testified this week before a House committee that certain new groups of Government workers were being "brigaded in." That means two or three regiments at a time.

When 500 rabbis were met on the outside Senate steps and their petition was heard by the Vice President and Senators, they were bringing to Congress their plea in our American way.

Kimmel and Short have waived the statute of limitations on their court-martial. There is a general belief that they will never be tried by this administration. It is difficult to believe but that they had orders which made them seem treasonably negligent.

The world series, with its 70,000 daily in New York, gathered from hither and yon without travel limitations, is luckier than the annual Army-Navy football game to be played up the Hudson. It was limited, by Executive decree, in attendance to a 10-mile radius. This is war.

Congress Gets 1944 Food Plan This Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news item which was in the Washington Post October 3, 1943:

CONGRESS GETS 1944 FOOD PLAN THIS WEEK

Important changes in the Nation's agricultural pattern will be outlined to Congress this week by the War Food Administration in 1944 farm production schedules calling for the use of every available acre of land and the use of every farming facility.

Direct food consumption foods such as dry beans and peas, soybeans, peanuts, wheat, vegetables and potatoes will get first claim in the program and lower-yielding types of feed crops will give way to those with higher-output possibilities.

Because the over-all feed supply anticipated will be 18 percent smaller per animal unit, the goals will call for a reduction in some types of livestock—particularly hogs, broiler-type chickens, and turkeys.

INCREASES FORECAST

The goals presented by W. F. A. with adequate growing conditions, should bring the following percentage increases above the 1942 yield: wheat, 26; soybeans, 22; sugar beets, 42; fresh vegetables, 10; vegetables for processing, 6; dry beans and peas, 18; milk, 3; beef cattle and calves marketed for slaughter, 19; corn, 3; hay, 3; eggs, 1.

Decreases will be suggested as follows: hogs, 17 percent; sheep and lambs on farms, 4; farm chickens, 3; commercial broilers, 20; turkeys, 4; barley, 2; sorghums, 5; oats, 9; rye, 3; flaxseed, 1.

No change is anticipated for cotton and rice, but a 10 percent increase will be recommended for tobacco to meet a sharp increase in foreign and domestic demands.

These goals will call for the use of 380,000,000 acres of crop and by far the largest ever utilized by this country. Considerable land now idle will have to be cultivated and record amounts of fertilizers will be needed.

MILK CONTROL EXTENDED

Other food-front developments yesterday included:

1. Extension of Federal control over milk sales to eleven new metropolitan areas in Ohio, Illinois, Kansas, and Missouri, the program to go into effect Tuesday.

2. Announcement by W. F. A. that civilian supplies of tea have been increased one-fourth as a result of better shipping conditions.

3. A joint announcement by W. F. A. and O. P. A. that a subsidy program to reduce the price of peanut butter from around 33.1 cents a pound to an average of 26.5 cents had been agreed upon.

A rebate of 4½ cents a pound will be made to manufacturers on amounts of the food sold for home consumption. Commodity Credit Corporation, sole buyer and seller of farmers' stock peanuts, will make the payments.

The program will be effective as soon as administrative details can be completed, it was said.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been one who believes that the people of this country can be fed properly when decreases in production of food of various types or forms are suggested from time to time. Furthermore, according to this article it is not apparent to me that the program of restriction on the amount of cotton to be grown by small family-sized farms is to be removed.

International Bimetallism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 5, 1943

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement entitled "International Bimetallism," published by Francis H. Brownell, chairman of the board of directors of the American Smelting & Refining Co.:

INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM—THE MOST SUITABLE MONETARY STANDARD FOR THE POST-WAR WORLD

WHY STABLE MONEYS ARE ESSENTIAL

A nation can never be healthy when its currency depreciates sharply and fluctuates erratically in value from day to day. We have only to remember the economic chaos and human misery that spread over the continent of Europe after the First World War, before currencies were stabilized, to realize that people must have confidence in the money they use if industry and agriculture are to function normally and employment is to be provided the people.

If the purchasing power of a nation's money, be it the dollar, pound or any other unit, is declining rapidly, so that prices of goods soar skyward, an economic collapse, unemployment and social unrest will inevitably follow. When the foreign exchange value of a currency depreciates, international trade cannot be conducted along orderly lines and high trade barriers that choke commerce are the result.

At the end of the present global war, what will be the purchasing power of the moneys of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and Yugoslavia, inflated as they have been under German occupation? What will be the buying power of the currencies of the defeated Axis nations, Germany, Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria? Can the internal economies of these nations and of the countries of the Far East, China, the Dutch Indies, the Malay Peninsula and Japan, revive while their peoples use highly inflated moneys of doubtful value? Can international commerce with these countries, and between them, be resumed on a large scale without monetary stability?

Every businessman knows that an early, effective stabilization of their moneys is an urgent and absolute prerequisite to both internal recovery and the revival of the foreign trade of these countries. The need for such immediate currency stabilization has been recognized by the governments of the United Nations, representatives of whose treasuries have been conferring continuously during recent months to evolve a plan to assure the earliest possible stabilization of currencies through international agreement.

The need for monetary stabilization is clear. International collaboration is required to achieve it. We must make sure, however, that the standard adopted to assure such stability is sound and adequate, so that stabilization will be lasting.

WHY WE MUST RETURN TO A METALLIC STANDARD

We all know that the international gold standard broke down during the thirties. This largely resulted from the unsound provisions of the peace treaties following World War I, which made the monetary gold stock of the world inadequate. Economic nationalism, reparations and war debts and other consequences of these peace treaties finally caused so marked a maldistribution of existing gold among the nations of the world that survival of the gold standard became impossible.

The use of the precious metals as standard money is one institution which has worked well through the ages. Gold and silver have been used as money in ancient, medieval and modern times. Peoples have learned to have confidence in gold and silver coins, and in monetary units that are anchored to gold and silver and are convertible into these metals.

On the other hand, the nations of the earth have had repeated unhappy experiences with paper money. Hence mankind has always preferred "hard money." In our own Civil War of the 1860's, United States paper currency fell to a substantial discount and, when peace came, there was an insistent demand to "resume specie payment."

History abounds in examples of paper moneys deteriorating in value and at times becoming worthless as the result of wars, revolutions and other vicissitudes of the issuing nation. But we do not have to turn to history for examples of the unhappy consequences of inconvertible paper-money issues. We have only to look at the nations of Europe and China today to see the tragic consequences when they are flooded with huge issues of paper money rapidly depreciating in value toward the point of worthlessness.

IS THERE ENOUGH GOLD?

Extended periods of monetary stability in the past have been invariably associated with the use of the precious metals, gold and silver, as monetary standards.

The international gold standard was dominant in the leading countries of the world through most of the nineteenth century and the period down to World War I. Many urge a return to it after the war. But that standard had broken down long before the present war began. Gold had disappeared from circulation and the price had been increased from $20.67 to $35 an ounce, thus in effect increasing the volume available. This failed to solve the difficulty, however.

The monetary gold stocks of the world, according to the best available estimates, do not greatly exceed $30,000,000,000 at the prevailing price of $35 an ounce for the yellow metal. The monetary gold stock of the United States amounts to $22,000,000,000, which is more than 70 percent of the world stock. Obviously, the $8,000,000,000 or so of monetary gold owned outside the United States is very far from adequate to permit the other nations of the world to return to any type of workable gold standard.

Furthermore, it is not enough that each nation have some gold to make the international gold standard workable. Each country must have a gold reserve that is large enough to take care of adverse contingencies as they arise. A nation should be in position to export a considerable quantity of the yellow metal to cover a temporary deficit in its balance of international payments without being forced to suspend gold conversion and abandon the standard.

How much yellow metal would be needed to make possible a lasting return to the gold standard by the peoples of the world after the war?

The amount of gold reserve desirable for each country will depend upon its price level at home and the volume of trade and other transactions that it carries on with other countries. The higher the price level, the larger the gold reserve required for domestic purposes.

After the war, commodity prices probably will be higher than before the conflict, since a drastic deflation would not help reconstruction. The expressed policy of the British Government, as stated by Sir Kingsley Wood, Chancelor of the Exchequer, in his 1943 budget speech before the House of Commons, is to retain the then price level after the war, and this level was 60 percent higher than it was in 1939. Similar considerations will probably cause this country to follow the same course and seek to maintain the existing wage and price levels in the post-war era.

The larger a nation's foreign trade and financial transactions with other nations, the greater the metallic reserve required for these purposes.

It is essential for the welfare of the peoples of the world that foreign trade after the war should be far larger than in the pre-war period. The general determination of nations to lower trade barriers, develop economically backward regions, and cooperate in global reconstruction all point to a vast expansion of commerce between nations. The larger the volume of such trade, the greater the disequilibrium that may develop in the balance of international payments in any one year, and so the larger the amount of gold needed in any attempted return to an exclusive gold standard. Hence, regardless of the fact that the gold stocks sufficed for the world's needs for a monetary metal to settle international balances before 1914, and for a few years in the 1920's seemed adequate with the help of the artificial mechanism known as the "gold exchange standard," plus large foreign loans by the United States, there is every reason to believe that a serious shortage of gold for post-war needs looms ahead. This shortage will arise even apart from the fact that the existing supply of the yellow metal is so unequally distributed among the nations of the earth. What is evidently required, therefore, is the expansion of the present monetary gold stock through the addition to it of the other great monetary metal, silver.

THE WHITE AND KEYNES PLANS

Recognizing that the inadequacy of the present gold supply, and the small gold holdings outside of the United States, bar a general return to the gold standard after the war, the American and British Governments are preparing plans for economizing on the amount of gold required to achieve monetary stability. These plans, and the American White plan in particular, are nothing more or less than efforts to return to a partial international gold standard with a smaller amount of gold. The Keynes plan does not necessarily require any gold. The International Stabilization Fund, under the White plan, would give each nation a considerable credit on its books against which only a fractional deposit of gold need be made. Both plans are, in effect, types of managed currency.

Commentators on these plans, almost without exception, have pointed out, however, that when a country's maximum credit on the books of the proposed International Stabilization Fund has become exhausted, the same problem will arise as when gold holdings are all exported under the international gold standard. The inadequacy of the medium for settling international balances will thus again become apparent.

If a plan like the White or Keynes schemes is ultimately adopted, therefore, every practical measure should be taken to increase the ability of a nation to maintain its credit balance on the books of the International Stabilization Fund, and thus the stability of its currency, even though its balance of international payments turns unfavorable for a considerable period of time. This calls for an expansion of the volume of settlement media beyond the limit imposed by the amount of gold available.

ASIA AND AFRICA

Both the single gold standard and the White and Keynes plans ignore the preferences of the silver-using peoples of Asia and Africa. The humble status of countless individuals devoid of banking facilities or without need of them, who use the rupee, the yuan, or the tael as their medium of exchange and as their store of wealth, makes silver the most desirable coinage for their needs. Unlike gold, silver can be minted into coins of small denominations adequate to the modest requirements of myriads of farmers and tradesmen who, from one year-end to the other, seldom earn through hard labor more than $100 in our money. Nor will they willingly accept paper currency, which they distrust for many reasons, not the least, if the latest, of which is the experience of China. The average Asiatic does not aspire to the possession of gold, which is beyond his reach. Silver is what he wants, because silver is the gold of the masses.

Any post-war monetary system must recognize the situation of these people, who constitute approximately 1,000,000,000 human beings or nearly one-half of the estimated population of the earth. The importance of this section of the world in the future from a commercial standpoint will be much greater than in the past.

INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM

Silver has been in use as a monetary metal as long as gold, and over a large part of history and a large portion of the earth's surface it has been preferred to gold.

Before 1816 all countries, and until the 1870's all countries except England, had a bimetallic monetary system. But they never established identical ratios between gold and silver When transportation improved, this difference in ratios led to arbitrage. When gold was overvalued, gold coins were melted down or exported, and silver became the sole money in use. When silver was overvalued, it was driven out of circulation by gold.

Economists have pointed out right along that this basic difficulty encountered by bimetallism would not arise if the same ratio were adopted by the leading commercial nations of the world by agreement at the same time. The great English economist Alfred Marshall, probably the outstanding social scientist in the English speaking world of the past century, said in his great work on Money Credit and Commerce, "An agreement entered into by all the commercial countries of the world to keep their mints open to gold and silver at almost any reasonable ratio would tie the values of the metals to that ratio, so long as the agreement lasted." He urged that currencies be made convertible into gold and silver together, with an ounce

of silver considered equivalent to one-twentieth of an ounce of gold.

The world's monetary gold stock today is less than 1,000,000,000 ounces, of which the United States owns more than 70 percent. The world's monetary silver stock is well over 5,000,000,000 ounces, of which the United States holds approximately half. Were the nations of the world to agree upon international bimetallism, with a fixed and permanent ratio of 20 to 1 established between silver and gold, as Marshall suggested, there would be an immediate increase of more than 25 percent in the aggregate stock of standard money. If we take the countries outside of the United States alone, their holdings of standard money would be increased by some 50 percent. A ratio of 10 to 1 would double the above percentages. But the actual ratio should be determined by a commission advised by experts—economists, bankers, geologists, mining engineers and others qualified—after full investigation of the many factors involved. They should particularly consider the amount of metallic money desired and the possibility of increased silver production at various price levels.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that in 1940, the last year for which full statistics were made available, the world produced about 41,000,000 ounces of gold and about 273,000,000 ounces of silver. The production ratio was thus approximately 7 ounces of silver to 1 ounce of gold in that year.

ADVANTAGES OF INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM

The adoption by international agreement of international bimetallism as the world's monetary standard, with or without the use of an international stabilization fund to economize on the use of monetary metals in settling international balances, would have the following far-reaching advantages:

1. The volume of standard money would be immediately increased, particularly outside of the United States, to meet the larger needs of the post-war world. This would enable nations to maintain the stability of their currencies even if an adverse balance of payments should compel substantial shipments of gold and silver for a time to other nations, or to the international stabilization fund.

2. The yearly addition to the world's stock of standard money would be expanded, for the normal annual output of some 40,000,000 cunces of gold would be supplemented by production of some 270,000,000 ounces of silver.

3 The stock of monetary metal could be expanded further, if found necessary, through drawing in considerable quantities of silver from the arts.

4. Nations whose populations desire would be able to restore the coinage of standard money on a large scale. This has become progressively less possible as the gold shortage has caused all governments, including the United States, to withdraw the yellow metal from circulation.

5. If a world-wide shortage of standard money should again threaten, it could be corrected through stimulating silver production and lowering the ratio of silver to gold by international agreement.

6. The adoption of international bimetallism would not make the international stabilization fund plan unnecessary, but would rather help assure the success of any such plan by facilitating each nation's ability to replenish its credit on the books of the international fund through its power to deposit silver, as well as gold, for the purpose.

7 This is the only monetary plan that assures the world at large will possess an adequate stock of monetary metals, no matter how large domestic and external trade becomes, and no matter at what points world prices are stabilized.

8. A much larger number of nations would be themselves producers of standard money under international bimetallism, and thus would be aided in maintaining the stability of their currencies through the production of monetary metals within their borders. The Western Hemisphere, chiefly Latin America, produces about three-fourths of the world's silver, while the Eastern Hemisphere turns out about three-fourths of the gold.

The United States should support international bimetallism because, without lessening or impairing the use of gold or damaging the monetary situation in any country, such a system would serve best its economic interests and those of the Western Hemisphere.

International bimetallism will escape all of the disadvantages that arise when any one nation resorts to the use of two standard monetary metals, instead of gold alone.

International bimetallism retains every advantage of the gold standard, but possesses a number of additional advantages over gold.

The end of the war and the launching of a cooperative effort by all nations to restore monetary stability with the return of peace provides an unparalleled opportunity to bring this superior international monetary standard into effect, thus assuring a more effective and lasting monetary stability in the post-war world.

Germany Must Be Held to Strict Compliance With the Terms Imposed by the United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by David Lawrence from the United States News of October 1, 1943, entitled "And So We Resolve Again."

At this time I wish to compliment Mr. Lawrence on the able and forceful arguments and sound suggestions that he has so convincingly presented in his article.

While I have not at all times agreed with Mr. Lawrence in the opinions carried in his articles and have differed with his views on some subjects, I feel that his résumé of the conditions described in his editorial are most constructive and enlightening. I do not know the reasons for his going as far as he has in his article, but with one exception I endorse same as he sets forth conditions that cannot be truthfully contradicted. The exception is to his statement that harsh treatment was accorded Germany by the Versailles Treaty, and I hope his statement is not made for the purpose of urging that, after the defeat of Hitler and his Nazi gangsters, Germany be given more liberal consideration at the hands of the United Nations.

I concede that Germany suffered after the First World War; however, is it not true that she was responsible for that war, just as she is responsible for this war that has already cost millions of lives, and misery and suffering beyond description to many more millions of people? I concede that the masses in Germany suffered but Mr. Lawrence should be aware that German capitalists and industrialists have not lost, but have utilized their great wealth even during and after the war by means of ingenious manipulations of the Farben cartels in investing tremendous sums in nearly every outstanding industry not only in the United States but in every section of the world.

They have arranged working agreements in violation of the law with many corporations, such as the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, General Electric, the duPont Co., and many others too numerous for me to mention. They are not interested in rehabilitating the masses in Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I for one, shall insist that when Hitlerism is completely defeated, which I hope will be shortly, the provisions in the Treaty of Versailles be enforced, and that Germany, as well as Japan, will never be permitted to rearm and will be made to comply strictly with the letter of this treaty or any future treaty finally granted them by the United Nations.

AND SO WE RESOLVE AGAIN—

We have resolved through the Atlantic Charter.

We have resolved through the Mackinac Charter.

We have resolved through the Fulbright resolution.

We have resolved by Presidential declaration to establish the "four freedoms"—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from fear, and freedom from want.

And we have said that there shall be no more war, that aggression shall cease and that righteous nations must band together to enforce the peace by every means at their disposal.

We have resolved again to make a "lasting peace."

But of what avail are these resolutions when the ones we made in the midst of World War No. 1 were rendered meaningless after the war?

Anybody drafting a post-war resolution or endeavoring to set up a charter for a world association or organization to maintain peace is respectfully referred to the speeches, resolutions, round-robin petitions, and pledges made by both Republican and Democratic spokesmen in and out of Congress in 1918 and 1919.

Anybody seeking to preserve American sovereignty as against a superstate is respectfully referred to the debates in the Senate preceding the vote on the League of Nations Covenant which was offered as an integral part of the Versailles Treaty.

And anybody wishing to find all the words and the phrases needed to commit the nations of the world—by national or international police force—to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and independence of every country, large and small, need only to read over again article X of that same Covenant of the League of Nations.

We said all that could be said at the end of the last war. We adopted a constitution for the world which had in it every element of moral and physical obligation. The League Covenant remains today as splendid an expression of world idealism and practical

collaboration as it was when President Woodrow Wilson submitted it to the Senate in 1919 only to have it rejected by a coalition of Democrats and Republicans though accepted by Britain and France, and, subsequently, by Russia and Germany.

It is not resolutions with high-sounding phrases that we lack.

We need only one word. And that word—translated into actuality—is character.

Of what avail are resolutions, pledges, promises, or virtuous expressions if our elected leaders are not ready as yet to sacrifice the customary political maneuvers of the hour, the personal ambitions, the quest for material gain, and the greed for autocratic power which today as yesterday seems to dominate the governments of the principal allies in this war?

We are failing today not in the writing of general resolutions but to be frank about our post-war aims—frank with our own people or with the people of other countries.

Resolutions will not fool anybody—not even the American people, who have learned something about foreign policy these last 20 years.

Nor should we be deceived by the cry that America has had no foreign policy for 50 or more years, but that the British have had a foreign policy, and that the answer to the world's ills now is a new military and political partnership with Great Britain.

The truth rather is that the American people are not ready to accept imperialism and the British people are not yet ready to abandon imperialism.

We need no written alliance with Britain committing ourselves indefinitely to London's maneuvers in world politics.

We have given ample proof that we stand ready—as we have twice demonstrated—to give our blood to preserve the English-speaking civilization and culture as against militarism and tyranny and dictatorship.

We have gone to war twice now to try to make the world safe for democracy—safe for representative government, safe for nations to trade with one another in good neighborliness and mutual respect.

But what we have not demonstrated—neither we nor the British governments of the last 2 decades—is that we have the character to carry out our pledges, to make our words come true.

The first prerequisite to the attainment of character is fundamental honesty. We must not only be honest with other peoples but honest with ourselves.

Why, for instance, do we persist in telling our own people that the League of Nations Covenant was a failure when it wasn't this document or its resolutions or provisions that failed, but the governments which, due to politics and pacifism at home, refused to support that League—we being the principal shirkers?

Why do we tell our own youth that the trouble last time was that we didn't march to Berlin in 1918, that we didn't drive home the lessons of defeat?

Is that honest?

For anyone who will take the trouble to go back to the files of our newspapers in 1918 will discover that the German Navy was completely defeated and what remained of it was ordered surrendered under the terms of the armistice. It will be found, moreover, that the German Army was completely demobilized, and Germany was disarmed--forbidden to build big warships or war planes or submarines or to raise armies. A small police force of 100,000 men was all that was permitted Germany, and provision was made for an international commission—on which Britain and France were represented—to inspect and make public reports.

We also declared to the whole world the guilt of the German leaders and wrote this into the Versailles Treaty where all could read it.

These were the words. But what action did we fail to take to make the words mean what they said?

We—that is, the Allies—imposed an impossible reparations burden which the German people could not pay. France took all the raw materials she could extract from Germany as "payment in kind," and we left the struggling republic a ready victim of economic anarchy and chaos so that by 1923 Germany went through her terrible inflation—bankruptcy affecting the assets of 80,000,000 persons.

That was the year Hitlerism won its first victory—not in 1933 when Hitler, as a symbol of a nation's desperate groping for economic equilibrium, assumed actual control. The German people had sunk to the lowest point in economic suffering. Any leader who promised any relief thereafter was welcomed.

And as Hitler saw that Germany needed more territory, needed areas from which raw materials could be stolen, the British and French Governments sat idly by and let him build up a war machine. From 1933 to 1939—during 6 whole years of Hitler's regime—what did Britain and France and America do? What was behind the failure of Britain and France to see what was happening under their noses? They were close by—after all, we were 3,000 miles away.

Did the British and French resume the building of their own armament so as to enforce the terms of the Versailles Treaty? Did they stop Hitler when he marched into the Rhineland? Or did the British conservatives, anxious to preserve their capital and their trade, join with the British pacifists in ignoring the threat to the world of a new aggressor? Wasn't selfish materialism more important then to the British and to ourselves? Didn't we by action of both Houses of Congress in 1935 pass a law, signed by President Roosevelt—just before his second election—which barred the weak democracies from getting arms from our shores? Of what avail are resolutions about world peace when, after winning a great war and disarming the enemy, the same victorious conquerors allow their military forces to disintegrate and refuse to allow their arsenals to be used to meet the threats of tyrants wherever they arise?

Was the British foreign policy in respect to Italian aggression in Ethiopia, in respect to Japanese aggression in Manchuria, in respect to the noble efforts of the loyalists in Spain, a foreign policy which thoughtful Americans approved then or now? Are we asked to accept that kind of characterless behavior as the basis for a future alliance?

There were in Britain then, as there are today, men of character who cried out at this chauvinism, who begged for a different distribution of economic resources in the post-war world of the 1920's, for a peace built not on hate or revenge but on the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule—based on tolerance, mutual respect, unselfishness, and honesty.

We do not need more resolutions. We need humbleness, penitence, reexamination of our true motives, and the courage to rehabilitate the conquered as well as to restrain the conquerors.

We need, in brief, a dedication to spiritual values and a commitment not just to the words or rituals but to the actual practice of a Christian philosophy.

For the key to character is to be found in confession of error and reappraisal of our inner purposes and not in denunciations or hypocritical phrases.

We must honestly recognize that neither we nor the British nor the Russians are the sole proprietors of this world but merely temporary trustees obedient to the will of God. He created human beings everywhere equal—not to live under master rulers or a system of vested privileges. He gave to all persons irrespective of creed or color the right to enjoy freedom of opportunity—the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Covenant of the League of Nations still lives. It is built into the existing treaty structure of 44 nations. Let the United States ratify that covenant and pray God to give us the will and the courage to make it at last an effective instrument of international cooperation. For by its provisions, special alliances are expressly forbidden and, instead, the member nations are equally obligated to use all their force and resources as against aggressor states—whether members or nonmembers—to enforce and maintain the peace of the world.

DAVID LAWRENCE, *Editor.*

Modern Explorers and Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, September 15), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Modern Explorers and Pioneers," delivered by me over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Thursday, October 7, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, we are living in an age which requires that we lift our sights—enlarge our horizons—if we are to be fit to meet the challenges of this and the coming period.

Television, radio, radar, the telescope, the airplane, and the microscope, and other advances in the physical sciences have enlarged our horizons.

We on the home front, as well as our boys on the far-flung outposts on the battle lines in the British Isles, Italy, India, Burma, Guadalcanal, Africa, Persia, and the Aleutian Islands are beginning to comprehend why we are fighting. We are beginning to comprehend our job—and some job it is—the obligations and the opportunities to make the earth a better and a safer place to live in.

As the hope of the world, America is the most significant Nation on earth. As the most powerful Nation, America must make sure that wisdom from on High is hers to guide her decisions and her steps. We cannot escape world responsibility.

Whether we like it or not, we are, as a nation, in a commanding position. What we do in our dealings with world affairs now and when the war is over and victory is ours—whatever we do will determine the direction of the peoples of earth for generations to come. Mere mechanistic systems, materialistic ideals will not be adequate. Among our leaders personal, private, or open selfish ambitions and antagonisms must be laid aside. It is for us to be fully responsive to our job for world building and world reconstruction—facing every problem honestly, courageously, and with vision. That is basic. We now come to the problems.

What part will America play in the political reorganization of the world?

At the Mackinac conference the Republicans of the Nation answered that question dynamically and sensibly. They said in part: "We must preserve and protect all our own national interests. We must aid in restoring order and decent living in a distressed world. We must do our full share in a program for permanent peace among nations. A specific program must be evolved in the months to come, as events and relations unfold."

The advisory council specifically approved the following:

"1. Prosecution of the war by a united Nation to conclusive victory over all our enemies, including—

"(a) Disarmament and disorganization of the armed forces of the Axis;

"(b) Disqualification of the Axis to construct facilities for the manufacture of the implements of war;

"(c) Permanent maintenance of trained and well-equipped armed forces at home.

"2. Responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world."

The Mackinac declaration stated further—"We work toward a policy which will comprehend other means than war for the determination of international controversies; and the attainment of a peace, that will prevail by virtue of its inherent reciprocal interests and its spiritual foundation, reached from time to time, with the understanding of the peoples of the negotiating nations."

The second problem that confronts us might be phrased this way—what direction will America take, political and economic, within her own borders? In other words, what are our plans for employing not only our boys who come back from the services but the fifty-odd million of our people who are now working on the farm, in war production plants, in the civilian economy, and in Government? Will we turn to state socialism, as a solution, which means that the state will practically own and control all the means of production?

What is to be done with the thirty-odd billion dollars that the Nation has invested in war-production plants, and so forth? Will there be less or more centralization of government? This tremendous problem on the home front is the problem of each one of us. It is a job, for every citizen. Yes, each of us, can do his part to see that jobs come into being; demand of Government demobilization of useless Government agencies; increase necessary production; keep thinking straight, and remain free from race and class hatred; practice tolerance and keep the racketeer out of American life.

Government can be helpful in post-war planning, but unless we are going the way of state socialism, we must make sure, that the Government is the servant and not the master. It must not hold the economic reins. It must not termite legitimate initiative. Laws must be so executed, that the citizen will not be handicapped in his legitimate efforts to produce wealth and build industry. I repeat, this is a job for every citizen.

On August 3, 1942, I spoke in the Senate of the need of government as part of its tax program permitting reserves to be built up in industry, these reserves to be utilized if necessary for reconversion of industry back to peacetime activity and for the maintenance of labor during the post-war period.

I again suggested the same idea to the Senate on September 14, 1943. At the same time I brought out this idea which I think is fundamental, that we must get rid of those individuals who profit by division, who create antagonisms between management and labor, who build their house on Hitler's tactics—divide and conquer.

In the post-war period it is emphatically necessary that we work in harmony. Only that way will provide the opportunity for high adventure and solution of our problems. Only in that manner will we be able to successfully negotiate the political and economic bumps.

Nothing more detrimental could happen to labor than to have state socialism imposed upon America, and certainly labor is interested, together with management, in seeing that private enterprise is maintained as a going concern in America.

Every thinking person knows that it was the energy and the genius of the average citizen that built America. Such citizen knows that when the industrial life current is interrupted we get poor times. The way to keep that current flowing steadily is for every citizen to look after the job at hand, which primarily calls for a manifestation of cooperation.

When this war ceases we will probably have a national debt of over 250 billion, with an interest charge of $5,000,000,000 per annum. That item, together with the expense of government, will make it imperative that we have a substantial national income to keep America solvent. The job can be done if we recognize—we of the farm, the factory, the office, of the little town and the big town—that we are all in the same boat and have to pull together. This is a fundamental fact, and if we fail to pull together it will be to the detriment of the heritage that our children are entitled to have transmitted to them intact and unimpaired.

I have a great hope and faith. With God's help—the help that will make us see straight and build constructively—we will bind up the wounds of the Nation. These wounds are more than physical.

A new age of pioneering is upon us. We will break new trails in science. We will discover ways of bringing the peoples of the earth to live together in harmony. We will develop new means of power. We will prove to the nations that the role of the Samaritan makes for peace and concord. A great adventure for America is up ahead if we Americans will prove ourselves equal to the task. My faith tells me that we will.

In the peace era let us proceed with circumspection and with faith, with buoyancy and expectancy, in this great new opportunity for world conquest; a conquest not by fire and sword, but by lifting the fallen and downtrodden, teaching the ignorant, and making whole the discouraged and fearful.

What a job. Yes, a new age of exploration and discovery is upon us. As we proceed, new vistas will open up. This way, leads to world liberation from the chains of hatred and fear, the chains that the centuries have forged.

Truly before us, up ahead, there is a glorious future for our beloved America and the world. Modern explorers and pioneers, I salute you.

I thank Station WOL and the Mutual Network for this opportunity of using its facilities. This is ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin, saying good-night.

This Should Help Oklahoma Greatly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade or longer the Soil Conservation Service has rendered invaluable assistance to the farmers of America, and especially to farms and farmers of Oklahoma, in the splendid, efficient service it has given. Its supervision of the several organized soil-conservation districts in Oklahoma; the surveying, construction, and supervision of thousands of vitally needed terraces on many of our State's watersheds; its strip planting and other soil building, as well as soil-conservation practices, as well as the assistance the service has given thousands of individual farmers of Oklahoma, is to be highly commended. In fact, the Soil Conservation Service has been a godsend to many appreciative farmers, as well as to many sizable farm areas of our State. Moreover, in any post-war program that may be considered, there is no question but what the conservation of our fast-diminishing topsoil in many farm areas and the checking and holding of the precious moisture where it falls will undoubtedly become of vital and extreme importance.

Under the leave granted me, I am including, herewith, as a part of my remarks a portion of an editorial recently appearing in the Oklahoma City Times, which presents much food for thought on the subject of water and soil conservation. It follows:

THIS SHOULD HELP OKLAHOMA GREATLY

Suddenly the American people realize that we need to save our topsoil, for food is really getting scarce, and it has been shown that soil conservation will produce an immediate increase in food production to the amount of anywhere from 20 to 40 percent.

One great trouble with the Federal soil conservation program is that the A. A. A. has wedged in a department that overlaps on the fine original Soil Conservation Service by establishing an elaborate system of benefit payments. In Oklahoma there are as many as 44 different practices, including the drilling of wells and planting of gardens, for which subsidies are paid, and many of these have nothing to do with the big job of keeping the soil from washing into the ocean.

The original Soil Conservation Service gets $20,000,000 a year, and this is the agency that sets up conservation districts, with expert supervision, but with no subsidies. The subsidy agency, under A. A. A., gets $300,000,000 a year. This puts the emphasis on the wrong place.

The newly established program for the treatment of soil erosion in the Washita Valley of Oklahoma—the second of its kind in the United States—seems to start in the right direction.

The Oklahoma water resources division of the State planning board is cooperating in this project, and the specifications provide for complete watershed treatment of the tributary uplands of the valley, at an estimated cost of $11,243,000.

There may be uneasiness as to how the Federal Government can get money for even such a worthy purpose, but at any rate it can be said that the principle is far better than dambuilding or the payment of millions of piddling individual subsidies, many of which really accomplish nothing.

The spending of Federal money for watershed treatment is a legitimate function because flood control is necessarily an interstate matter, and the whole American public is vitally interested in the saving of the soil and water resources of the Nation. After a number of false starts elsewhere, it seems that the Washita project really proposes to

get somewhere with the vexing problem by working to hold the water right where it falls.

* * * * *

There still may be some question as to spending so much of the taxpayers' funds when individual farmers have shown themselves to be willing to spend their own money in terracing and otherwise treating their own lands, but the Washita project deserves the benefit of the doubt until and unless it proves to be wasteful, or subversive of individual effort. At any rate it has the enormous argument on its side that it begins at the right spot, in stopping both floods and soil erosion.

Poland Fights On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN GORSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a radio broadcast by the Honorable Francis Xavier Swietlik, dean of the law school of Marquette University:

Four years ago Hitler marched into Poland. For days representatives of many nations made frantic appeals to the Nazi dictator in the hope of averting the calamity which threatened the world. All these appeals fell on deaf ears. Hitler was determined to resume the struggle for world domination which his predecessors began in 1914 and which they so abruptly brought to an end 4 years later. Poland was chosen as the first victim of his aggression. It is therefore fitting that we Americans and all United Nations pay tribute on this fourth anniversary of the world conflict to this gallant ally.

Poland's determination to survive as a nation, and especially her contribution to the common cause of the United Nations under most trying conditions, imposed upon her by a ruthless enemy, will constitute one of the brightest pages of her heroic past.

In spite of a serious disadvantage in numbers and armaments, as compared with the might of the enemy, Poland resolved to resist the unwarranted and unprovoked attack upon her sovereignty. She proclaimed to the world that the honor of a nation is more sacred than peace at any price. Her people, soldiers and civilians alike, fought heroically in the face of overwhelming odds. After several weeks of Spartanlike resistance her armies were overcome by the might of the invader.

And yet, although seemingly conquered, Poland fights on. The terroristic and repressive measures of the Nazi geared to break the spirit of the Polish Nation served only to inflame the people to greater resistance. Poland today presents a tragic picture. Her fields are laid barren, her cities are a mass of ruins, her people wantonly and wilfully despoiled of their property and herded off to restricted areas and concentration camps; her food is confiscated by the enemy, her youth and intellectuals are ruthlessly exterminated, her seats of learning, churches, and convents are defiled, and her helpless and unoffending university professors are taken from their classrooms and rushed in trucks to concentration camps. This ruthlessness, however, has not broken her spirit. Poland is seething with unrest. Sabotage, anti-Nazi posters, underground publications read by millions of people at the risk of losing their lives, all serve to keep the spirit of resistance alive and will no doubt prove a decisive factor in the defeat of the common foe when the zero hour arrives. This underground activity compels the Germans to garrison Poland with a large number of troops which today could be used to advantage by the enemy on the various fighting fronts.

The contribution of the Polish armed forces to the common war effort is no less effective than the struggle of the people in the occupied areas. After the debacle in France a large contingent of Polish soldiers escaped to Great Britain, where they are awaiting the time when in comradeship with their allies they will return to the Continent of Europe to come to grips with the Nazi. An army of about 100,000 soldiers has been organized from among thousands who had been prisoners of war in Russia and today constitute an integral part of the Allied forces in the Near East under the command of General Anders. The Polish Army is today the fifth in size among the Allied armies. Polish soldiers are fighting on every front wherever the enemy can be found, ready and willing to offer their lives in the common struggle for freedom.

The exploits of the Polish Air Forces are a familiar story to all of us. It accounted for approximately 500 certain and 250 probable enemy planes. Sixty-two Polish bombers took part in the raids over Cologne and the Ruhr Valley. This air force was responsible for the destruction of 17 percent of the German planes shot down over England and the English Channel in the memorable Battle of Britain.

The Polish Navy and merchant marine, though small in size, are playing a vital part in exterminating the submarines and in carrying needy war supplies to the fighting forces on the front.

It is strange that present-day aggressors do not heed the lessons of history. They may succeed to temporarily erase the geographical boundaries of a smaller nation; they may eject hundreds of thousands of its people from their homes and confiscate their possessions; they may colonize the land and homes stolen from others with their own people, but they cannot crush the determination of a nation to live and to resist until her God-given freedom is again restored to her. Poland stands today as a supreme proof of the indestructible power and determination of nations to survive.

In the meantime, Poland is enduring untold hardships in the firm hope and belief that when this war is over she will be restored to the fullness of her rights as a sovereign Nation.

We must bear in mind that we are fighting this war for certain principles of right and justice. Unless we establish these moral principles as a fundamental motive of all our actions in formulating the future peace of the world we cannot expect a durable peace.

The President of the United States announced to the world that this war is being fought for the purpose of establishing four fundamental freedoms in all parts of the world—the freedom of worship, freedom of expression, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

The architects of the post-war world must go further, however, than to merely assure to the individual the enjoyment of the fundamental rights embraced in the four freedoms. They must assure the strict compliance by every nation of the terms of treaties solemnly entered into. The occupation of the territory of smaller nations by forcible aggression must be forever outlawed. The policy of appeasement, a compromise with right and justice for the purpose of military or political expediency, must be abandoned. Nations in their relations with each other must scrupulously observe the same principles of right, justice and morality which we expect every individual to observe in his dealings, with his neighbors. Unless such a foundation of morality underlies the future conduct of nations toward each other, we cannot expect a permanent peace.

Statements recently emanating from official Soviet sources that after this war is over the Baltic States and the eastern half of Poland will be formally annexed to the Soviet Union, furnish some justification for fear on the part of the smaller nations of the united front that this moral issue may be straddled for the sake of political expediency. It would be most unfortunate for the future peace of the world if the rights of any small nation were to be sacrificed in order to satisfy the appetite of a more powerful ally.

Most Americans are convinced today that in order to assure a permanent peace our participation in world affairs after this war is over will have to be greater than it was in the past. The experience of the last two decades must make us realize that our own security as a Nation is vitally affected by what happens to other nations of the world. Nothing would be more likely to persuade the American people to return to their traditional pre-war aloofness from all participation in world affairs than would a departure from the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter, and as further implemented by statements of our President and the State Department. We have reason to believe that this country will never consent to become a party to an exparte settlement of the soverign rights of any one of our allies. It is our traditional policy to protect the rights of the weak and to refuse to recognize the taking of territory by force. As a Nation, our Government recognizes the fundamental principle that all men are equal before the law. The humblest of our citizens is protected in the enjoyment of his inalienable rights set forth in the Bill of Rights.

In our relations with other nations we have always refused to recognize the taking of territory by force. The Kellogg-Briand treaties, initiated by this Government, make that policy clear. That policy was constantly adhered to by our State Department. Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson refused to recognize the illegal occupation of Manchuria by Japan. Our present able Secretary of State Cordell Hull refused to give like recognition to the annexation of Ethiopia and Albania by Italy, and in the summer of 1940 Mr. Sumner Welles, as Acting Secretary of State, refused to recognize the occupation of the Baltic States by Russia. This policy of refusing to give cognizance to aggression is clearly set forth in the Atlantic Charter, which is subscribed to by the Allies. The Atlantic Charter contains solemn obligations entered into by the United Nations in the solemn moment of war and constitutes in outline the foundation upon which a permanent and just peace can be established.

In all occupied countries struggling men and women are looking to the United States with hope and assurance to lead them out of chaos to a brighter day. Let us assume that leadership, and true to our historic past, let us carry the blessings of freedom to all parts of the world and establish a peace founded on the recognition of the just rights of every nation, large and small.

Allowances to Dependents of Servicemen

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate passed Senate bill 763 by a unanimous vote, 69 to 0. Before doing

that the Senate adopted an amendment offered by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado to increase the amounts paid by way of allowances to dependents of servicemen. The main feature of that amendment is to increase the amount to be paid to a wife and one child to $80 from $62, the present rate, and to provide for $20 in addition in place of $10 for each additional child.

From the evidence which I have heard at hearings held before the House Committee on Military Affairs, I believe Senator JOHNSON is well warranted in selecting the amounts placed in his amendment. This bill will come from the House committee before long in some form. If it does not come in a form providing as large allowances as the Johnson amendment—and I believe that it will provide for $5 less per month for the first, third, and additional children—I propose to offer as an amendment the terms of the Johnson amendment when the bill is so reported.

Living expenses are extremely high today. By law we are requiring fathers, young and old, to enter the armed services and to go far from their homes. Many fathers will be unable to provide for their loved ones out of their own resources. The evidence introduced in the hearings clearly demonstrates that in most parts of the United States the allowances under the Johnson amendment will provide no more than maintenance for the dependents at the average American standard of living. It is not fair to compromise on less, taking food or clothing from little ones. I urge you to support the Johnson amendment.

Government Insurance on Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thought the House might be interested in examining the modus operandi of the Government insurance on ships. I am inserting a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I received from Mr. Lindsay Warren in answer to an inquiry I made in regard to the steamship *Effingham*. I expect to broaden my observations on the entire program in a few days, but for present purposes I wish the membership to examine this letter to see the extent of insurance money over and above the price paid for the ship that a certain company collected after it was sunk.

You will note the letter says that the price paid for the ship per deadweight ton was $5. The insurance paid per deadweight ton was $75. The sales price for the ship was $48,470; the insurance paid for the ship was $727,050.

If any one of you insured your home and tried to collect any excess value from an insurance company, I have always understood you would go to jail.

I now wish that you would examine the letter of Mr. Warren, Comptroller General:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES, M. C.,
Appropriations Committee,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JONES: I have your letter of July 21, 1943, requesting certain information in connection with the construction and operation of the steamship *Effingham*. The data requested are as follows:

Steamship Effingham: Year built, 1919; deadweight tons, 9,694; cost, $1,966,849.35; year sold, 1932; purchaser, Lykes Bros. Steamship Co.; sales price, $48,470; price per deadweight ton, $5; mail-pay, 15 voyages, April 15, 1943, to May 4, 1937 (approximately), $247,000; operating subsidy accrued 1937-40, $139,209.43; voyage profit, 1941, 1 voyage to Red Sea, $326,300.72; lost in 1942, insurance paid by War Shipping Administration, $727,050; insurance per deadweight ton, $75; depreciated value, residual book value, $48,020.

The records of this office show that the entire amount of operating subsidy ($5,612,050.45) paid to Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. on all of its vessels so operated, which amount includes $139,209.43 accrued on the steamship *Effingham*, is subject to recapture by the United States Maritime Commission pursuant to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

The Old Army Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, several years ago Hon. E. Y. Mitchell, Assistant Secretary of Commerce in the Cabinet of Franklin D. Roosevelt from 1933 to 1935, made startling revelations of corruption in that Department and loss to the taxpayers of millions of dollars through questionable deals between administration officials and private interests controlling the big steamship lines and the merchant marine generally. Mr. Mitchell's reward for this public service was to be kicked out of the President's "little cabinet." The revelations of this former New Deal official were carefully documented by him and in 1936 included in a book entitled, "Kicked In and Out of the President's Little Cabinet."

In normal times the Mitchell book would have unseated a national administration. However, in recent years we have become so accustomed to repeated and daily scandals of great magnitude, we have become so used to having facts concealed from us, from having facts misrepresented to us, so used to being browbeaten, insulted, penalized, robbed, regimented, and kicked in the pants by Washington officialdom that the public consciousness has become numbed, callous, and indifferent to many things which merit congressional investigation and impeachment proceedings against important figures in the executive department.

The situation in the shipping industry, perhaps the greatest racket of the modern age, has grown steadily worse since Secretary Mitchell was silenced by removal from the stage of public affairs. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article from the Sunday, October 10, 1943, Washington Times-Herald, showing how these ship deals are costing the taxpayer $60,000,000 which must be made up in increased taxes on the forgotten man:

SHIP DEALS COST NATION $60,000,000—YEAR-OLD REPORT REVEALS FINANCIAL MANEUVERS

(By Willard Edwards)

A confidential report to the Comptroller General, disclosing a bewildering series of financial maneuvers which have cost the Government more than $60,000,000 of taxpayers' money, was brought to light yesterday.

The report has lain in the Government's files for more than a year, never having been forwarded to Congress, although the law specifically requires the Comptroller General to report to Congress every contract and expenditure made in violation of the statutes.

DEALINGS REVEALED

Revelations contained in the report involve the dealings of the United States Maritime Commission and its predecessor, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, in connection with the American President Lines.

Former Assistant Secretary of State Henry T. Grady is now president of the steamship company, having run the line at a $25,000 yearly salary since the death of chairman of the board William Gibbs McAdoo, former Senator from California, in November 1940.

A supplemental report on the American President Lines for the period 1938-1941 shows a total profit of $13,429,000. The total accrued subsidy was listed at $8,958,000 and a net profit to the lines was $6,861,000. The balance on deposit as of December 31, 1941, in capital and special reserve funds was $4,413,000.

OBSERVERS STARTLED

In view of these figures, observers have confessed themselves startled, to put it mildly, at reports that the 90 percent of stock is to be sold for a minimum figure, one rumor fixing the sales price at $250,000.

The Maritime Commission is now about to dispose of the 90 percent of stock in the steamship corporation which it acquired in 1938. This stock, valueless at the time, has become valuable by reason of the millions paid in subsidies and the sale to the Government of ships at fabulous prices, according to the report, the charter of vessels for war uses at exorbitant rates, and insurance assumed by the Government on lost vessels at 10 and 12 times their worth.

GRADY REPORTED INTERESTED

Among the private interests bidding for the stock is said to be a group headed by Grady. The Commission announced last week that it has before it several proposals calling either for operation or outright purchase and that an announcement may be expected soon.

The story in the report goes back to 1924 and 1925 when the corporation, then known as the Dollar Steamship Lines, purchased from the United States Shipping Board 12

combination passenger-cargo vessels built by the Government in 1920 and 1921.

These fine, new ships had cost the Government $62,037,459 to construct, an average of more than $5,000,000 per vessel. The Dollar Lines got them all for $9,475,000. The Government—and the taxpayer—took a loss on that deal of $52,562,459.

In 1938, according to the report, the Dollar Lines was insolvent and about to discontinue its service when the Maritime Commission created in 1936 to succeed the United States Shipping Board, brought about a reorganization of the company, changed its name to American President Lines, and installed Senator McAdoo as chairman.

PROTESTED AND DENOUNCED

The reorganization was protested and denounced by two members of the Maritime Commission, but it went through and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was induced to loan $2,500,000 for operating expenses of the company. The Maritime Commission loaned another $2,000,000 for reconditioning the aging vessels which made up the company's fleet.

In the next 4 years, from 1938 to 1942, according to the report, the company enjoyed Federal operating subsidies totaling $7,919,-119, along with benefits flowing from income tax deferments and exemptions in respect to statutory funds established from earnings and capital gains.

These statutory funds were established on the basis of supposed agreements for replacement of obsolete vessels, according to the report, but such agreements did not exist and had never, in fact, been required by the Commission.

ACQUIRES STEAMSHIPS

When World War No. 2 broke the Maritime Commission acquired for the War Department, for war purposes, three of the old steamships, the *President Cleveland, President Pierce,* and *President Taft,* which had been bought by the Dollar Lines in 1925 from the old Shipping Board for only $3,375,000, although they had cost the Government $19,-118,961 to construct in 1921.

The War Department paid to the Commission for these three vessels $2,400,000, according to the report, but the President Lines demanded more and the War Shipping Administration, headed by Admiral Emory S. Land, who is also Chairman of the Maritime Commission, offered $3,000,000.

Under the plain terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the report noted, the three vessels are obsolete and have only a scrap value of $477,951.

SEEKING MORE VESSELS

The report added that the Maritime Commission has been acquiring many other vessels for war purposes at prices and values far in excess of those permissible for payment under the law, and that other vessels taken for use in the war effort are under charter at rates far in excess of legitimate earnings. Excessive insurance values have also been fixed on vessels which have been taken and are being used in the national emergency, the report stated.

All these financial deals have enriched the value of the once valueless stock which is now being sought by private interests and the report raises the question whether the new owners of the stock will reap the reward of the funds paid out in operating subsidies and other benefits which the Commission has, in substance, been paying to itself as owner of the majority stock.

Congress has been assured on several occasions by Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren and other representatives of the General Accounting Office that transactions involving shipping companies, including the American President Lines, are under investigation. But no report has been made to Congress thus far.

Citrus Fruit Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a portion of a letter I received from a very good friend of mine which gives some very interesting facts on citrus fruit prices:

You are aware of the fact that the ceiling price the past navel season was navels $3.43 and on valencias $3.99 f. o. b. As much as we are now shipping valencias, let's talk about that ceiling and put some figures down to illustrate the point.

The legal and law-abiding operator is permitted the following mark-ups, according to the order as written: $3.99 f. o. b. plus freight and refrigeration, and if sold through a broker, 1½ percent may be added providing brokerage is paid. That is your total delivered price to any purchaser, whether it be a wholesaler or service jobber.

Now, to this price if the purchaser is a wholesaler, it is my understanding he can add 9½ percent mark-up, and if he sells to a service jobber, and a service jobber is defined as one who handles less than carload lots, then the service jobber can add another 21 percent mark-up. I could elaborate to a greater extent, but briefly that is the set-up if everyone abides by the order.

Now, taking the delivered price and working it back to an f. o. b. basis, and then breaking it down on a field box basis to the grower, if there isn't any chiseling anywhere along the line and the grower's fruit runs on an average of prevailing crop of valencias, all that anyone can hope to return to the grower is approximately $3.60 per hundredweight, maybe a nickel more or less, depending on the quality. So much for the legal and legitimate operation.

Now, let's get into the black-market angle. It has been common practice for many eastern black-market operators to move into the citrus industry this season and pay as high as 4½ cents per pound on the trees net to the grower. As I understand it, there are many methods being employed to evade the law and enable the purchaser to pay that much more than the ceiling.

I will enumerate a few of them. An eastern operator who had a 21 percent mark-up can move into the picture and say, for instance, go to a broker or any individual in the citrus industry, get him to buy direct from a grower and incidentally, there isn't a ceiling on the grower, it is only applicable to the packer, so the grower is within his rights to sell his fruit at any price he sees fit. Now, if the purchaser goes to the grower with say a 4½-cent offer and gets the fruit, then he can go to a commercial rate of so much per box and then use part of his mark-up of say 21 percent on the legitimate legal ceiling to help offset part of the overpayment made to the grower.

Or, another angle that can be worked is an eastern buyer can take part of his mark-up and give it to a buyer for cars and show it as a service charge for buyer's efforts in securing supplies for him. You can see with the enormous profit available that if the eastern buyer should give an agent on this end of the line as much as $200 or $250 per car, it would be a very attractive deal for both parties concerned. I could elaborate indefinitely on this subject, but I think what I have pointed out gives anyone interested a pretty good idea of how the order can be evaded if one sees fit to do so.

Farm Labor Tight in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the Missouri Farm Labor Committee:

The farm-labor situation in Missouri is very tight with the loss of every year-around worker from now on meaning a curtailment in food or feed production. This was the opinion of the Missouri Farm Labor Committee at its meeting in Columbia on September 17.

In the southeast part of the State, cotton picking is under way, with some shortage of workers indicated. Several hundred recruited pickers from nearby areas, hard hit by the recent dry weather, have gone into the Cotton Belt to help fill the demands for pickers. Rains have slowed picking considerably.

In the apple-growing areas of the State, picking is moving ahead with growers reporting that they could use more pickers but managing to get most harvesting done without excessive loss. In the apple section near Waverly, a heavy windstorm recently shook off many apples, some of which were entirely lost because not enough pickers could be obtained to move the apples as rapidly as needed.

Northwest Missouri farmers are reporting a relatively good crop of corn and are expecting to need 600 to 800 pickers from outside the area to aid them in shucking the much-needed crop. An effort will be made by the Agricultural Extension Service to secure small groups of workers from Ozark counties where they can possibly be temporarily spared at this period of the year for corn shucking in northwest Missouri.

In northeast Missouri, a big crop of soybeans is expected to increase the need for day-labor workers in that area.

Dairymen in many parts of the State have indicated that they will require helpers soon or they will have to curtail production by selling cows. The shortage of dairy workers is particularly acute around Kansas City, St. Louis, Hannibal, and Springfield.

The committee pointed out the big part taken by farm women, children, and older men and women in aiding agriculture to scrape through the year so far without serious total losses of crops. It was pointed out that some loss had occurred because crops were not harvested or planted at the best time, and that a number of farmers are planning to shift to a less intensive type of farming in the future in order to get by with the labor available. Reports read at the meeting indicated that the already depleted number of hired farm workers on farms had dropped another 16 percent in the past year. A survey made on September 1 showed that farm operators were working an average of 13.7 hours per day.

J. H. Dinwiddie, district supervisor of the Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission, stated that investigation showed there was no hoarding of farm labor in Missouri and that farm laborers who could not be placed immediately on farms were made available for industrial use by the Extension Service. He stated also that the recent rulings of the Commission were to the effect that farm workers no longer could become free agents available for city jobs simply by laying out of work for 30 days.

Scott Meyer, of Hannibal, vice chairman of the State Farm Labor Committee, pointed out that the job of the farmer in this war was to run the food-producing factory and that, to keep this factory going, requires a certain amount of manpower. With the reduced farm-labor supply, the farmers of Missouri can supply food or men but not both. The Federal Government should make the decision as to which is needed most. It should make little difference to farmers from a profit standpoint, since most of them will be lucky to break even now.

The Extension Service announced that during the past 3 months it had made 42,717 placements in Missouri, 3,743 of which were year-around ones and the remainder seasonal.

Members of the committee present included Scott Meyer, Hannibal; Ronnie Greenwell, Hayti; John Plassmeyer, Loose Creek; C. E. Klingner, Sr., Fair Grove; Ernest Wray, Maryville; Charles Peterman, Miami; H. Baxter Hall, Clarence; J. W. Burch, Rocheport; J. D. Monin, Jr., Columbia; Max McNulty and J. H. Dinwiddie, Jefferson City; A. C. Mussman and K. G. Harman, Columbia.

Self Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Matthew Adams:

SELF SECURITY

(By George Matthew Adams)

There is a great deal of idealism dealt out in every plan proposed for social security. I have never liked the name, however. I like self security better. That is what has made every successful man or woman and every great nation. Self reliance is a twin brother to it.

If every human being born is assured, as soon as he reaches understanding, that he is to be cared for, from the cradle to the grave, and that he has nothing to worry about, imagine what a race of dependents this world would have! Those who first came to this western world, discovering, inventing, and sacrificing, had no other capital than self security in mind—self security for themselves, and because of this individual independence, to pass on the example to their children.

The weak, ill, and those who have unavoidably been misfortunate, surely deserve all the security possible to comfort and care for them throughout life—but not the able-bodied and the healthy. They have the opportunity to gain self security which should be the pride of every human being given is chance in this world. It's that chance that should be assured him under a free form of government.

Food and comforts that are earned, through work, enter into the very muscles, the brain, the heart, and every stream of blood that courses through one's veins. And the will to live and to be useful inspires such a one with the love of life itself and all its opportunities.

Take incentive away from a human being and you rob him of his greatest asset. You dismantle his dreams. You cheat him out of the fun of achievement. You feed him the substance of which idleness is composed. You take the rudder of life from his sailing craft.

It is so much easier to succeed than it is to fail. But if you hand the tools of success to one, without his having earned them, he is most apt to dull them into uselessness long before he has learned to make them serve him and his fellows.

There is no heritage quite so precious as that of one who feels in his heart that he has been born, not only to enjoy this beautiful world, but so to work and live that he may cause no unhappiness to anyone, and glorify in the fact that he can look after his own life and see it safely through to the journey's end.

Resolution of Lions Club of Endicott, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas conservation of food, gasoline, and critical materials is vitally necessary to the war effort; and

Whereas the rationing program instituted by the United States Government and administered by the local war price and rationing board is the only possible means of conserving these materials and of securing their fair distribution among all; and

Whereas the members of the Western Broome County War Price and Rationing Board are serving our cause, our Nation, and our public in this highly important task, in a manner that should command the praise and appreciation of all their fellow citizens; and

Whereas these men and women are patriotically performing this essential service at great personal sacrifice, for no other motive than contributing toward victory and for no other compensation or reward than the satisfaction of making such contribution: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Endicott, N. Y., publicly thank the members of the Western Broome County War Price and Rationing Board for ceaseless and unselfish labors to advance the day of victory, and for our individual and national welfare; be it further

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Endicott, N. Y., hereby pledge its support and cooperation to the Government rationing program and to the Western Brome County War Price and Rationing Board, and urge similar public support and cooperation to the end that the rationing program may be fully successful in its purposes, and its ends speedily achieved.

Child Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and schedules submitted by Alonzo G. Grace, commissioner of education, State of Connecticut:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
HARTFORD, CONN., *October 6, 1943.*

The Honorable BOLESLAU J. MONKIEWICZ,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MONKIEWICZ: On September 14 Representative LANHAM, chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, concerning the program of child care under the Lanham Act. General Fleming reported that the program, which for the most part has been in the hands of school systems, has thus far been disappointing. He cites as a reason the fact that the program is not federally operated.

I am transmitting herewith three schedules which indicate our point of view on this matter. These are as follows:

Schedule A. Policies have changed overnight.

Schedule B. Lengthy delays have been encountered.

Schedule C. General Fleming's assertions are misleading.

It is our opinion that the difficulties lie largely in the administration of the program. I sincerely hope when these matters are considered by Congress the trend in legislation will be toward an expression of greater confidence in the capacity of States to do a job. I am transmitting the schedules herein mentioned to each one of the Senators and Representatives from this State.

Sincerely yours,

ALONZO G. GRACE,
Commissioner of Education.

SCHEDULE A. POLICIES OF F. W. A. HAVE CHANGED OVERNIGHT

Every change listed has added to the cumulative total of uncertainty. The people will have no faith in this program for some time even if it should now become stabilized.

The following examples of changes in policies, with the date of notification to this office of each change, indicate what school officials have been up against:

1. PROPORTION OF COSTS TO BE ALLOTTED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

June 13, 1942: To allot net costs (gross costs minus fees).

June 22, 1942: To allot gross costs.

September 16, 1942: To allot net costs.

February 13, 1943: To allot 100 percent of equipment costs plus 50 percent of current costs.

2. LANHAM FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR EQUIPMENT

June 13, 1942: Lanham funds available for 100 percent of equipment costs.

August 31, 1942: No funds except fees for equipment.

December 18, 1942: Lanham funds available for 100 percent of equipment costs.

December 21, 1942: No funds for equipment. Must be purchased with local tax moneys.

December 26, 1942: Lanham funds available for 100 percent of all costs.

February 13, 1943: To allot 100 percent of equipment costs plus 50 percent of current costs.

3. ELIGIBLITY OF TOWNS FOR FUNDS

September 30, 1942: All towns with war need are eligible.

October 23, 1942: Local budgets and tax rate are considered.

December 26, 1942: All communities with war needs are eligible.

4. SPONSORSHIP OF PROGRAM

June 13, 1942: Can be either board of education or department of welfare.

September 11, 1942: Funds available only for boards of education.

December 18, 1942: Funds available for boards of education or departments of welfare.

SCHEDULE B. LENGTHY DELAYS HAVE BEEN ENCOUNTERED

The application of the Windham Board of Education indicates the extent of delays encountered in securing Lanham funds for child care.

Windham began to plan its child-care program early in the spring of 1942, and filed its formal application for funds on September 11, 1942. On September 14, we were informed that the Government had changed the application forms to be used. On September 18, one of our staff members went to Windham with a representative of the Federal Works Agency to fill out the new forms. The Federal representative then insisted that the whole plan be reviewed, this despite the fact that he was not a specialist in nursery schools while our staff of specialists had spent months planning the project (and other projects which eventually received Government approval). On December 15, the application was filed on the new forms. The revised application, planned with a representative of Federal Works Agency, was held up by F. W. A. because costs of the project were too high. The plan was revised. On April 15, the application was filed again by a disillusioned board of education. To insure that the budget would be approved, the budget and all proposed local contributions had been discussed in detail with the regional office of Federal Works Agency. On June 14, the local board of education was notified that a Federal allotment of $4,640 had been granted, but that there had been a complete change in services which could be counted as contributions so the board would have to appropriate local funds to meet 50 percent of operating costs.

The Windham Board of Education decided not to accept the Government offer.

SCHEDULE C. GENERAL FLEMING'S ASSERTIONS ARE SOMEWHAT MISLEADING

1. THE ASSERTION

Only half the centers approved by the President have been put into operation.

The facts

(a) Many W. P. A. nurseries and nursery schools were taken over under the Lanham Act. These did not always provide the most satisfactory and convenient centers for children of working mothers.

(b) The Federal Works Agency has encouraged cities to apply for funds for centers to be located throughout the community before the need in all areas has become acute; the community can then open centers as needed without the months of delay encountered in applying for an allotment.

(c) Communities using Lanham Act funds for child care have been so much discouraged by Federal red tape connected with operating centers that they are hesitant about opening others.

(d) So much delay occurs between application for funds and the actual grant of funds that facilities originally to be used for child care are sometimes used for other purposes by the time the Federal funds become available.

2. THE ASSERTION

Facilities in operation were being used as of August 11, to less than half of capacity.

The facts

(a) On August 11 many children on vacation from school were caring for younger brothers and sisters who would otherwise enroll.

(b) On August 11 many parents were vacationing with their children. Other mothers had quit work for the summer months and were free to care for their children.

(c) The low standards set by F. W. A. have caused parents to withdraw children from centers and not to enroll others.

(d) The threats made by F. W. A. that certain centers would be closed caused parents to make other plans for caring for children.

(e) The draft of fathers will increase the demands for care.

3. THE ASSERTION

Operation, for the most part in the hands of school systems, is deficient.

The facts

(a) F. W. A. refuses to support sufficient staff to carry the program even when the local community agrees to pay its share and meet 50 percent of the operating costs of such program.

(b) F. W. A. refuses to support adequately certain essential phases of the program such as counseling with parents, health services, supervision, and clerical service.

(c) Some school systems are required to carry a W. P. A. staff selected because of relief needs rather than professional ability.

(d) School officials are disgusted with the whole program. The red tape and delays extinguish any enthusiasm.

Are Chickens Coming Home To Roost in Butter Deal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, many months ago dairymen and milk distributors in California warned that certain practices of the O. P. A. and other governmental agencies would result in milk and dairy product shortages. Also, some of my congressional colleagues made the same predictions. Illustrating what the situation is in California I am, by unanimous consent, inserting as part of these remarks an editorial from the Sacramento Bee:

ARE CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST IN BUTTER DEAL?

Commencing next Sunday, the American housewife will have to plunk down a full week's allotment of ration stamps for a pound of butter.

This means butter virtually will disappear from the American dinner table or a large part of the population will go on a vegetable diet, because, obviously, it will be impossible to stretch the coupons to cover both butter and meat.

If this is a war necessity, there will be no griping or grumbling. But so many conflicting statements have been made concerning the butter deal that the average person is not convinced—only confused. And the confusion is not being helped by the lack of any authoritative explanation from Washington.

A short time ago the public heard that butter supplies were at an all-time high, but would be needed in the event of an invasion of Italy.

Now the industry contends the Government has piled up a backlog of butter sufficient to satisfy all requirements until March.

And in San Francisco Francis Carroll, district director of the Office of Price Administration, is quoted as saying: "The 1943 production of dairy products will be even greater than the record 1942 output."

If these facts are true, it is difficult to justify a further restriction of butter consumption by increasing the ration-point requirements.

Irrespective of supplies on hand, and notwithstanding some statements to the contrary, the plausible explanation is that butter production has fallen off to a perilous level and existing stores must be preserved.

This was predicted several months ago when the Government declined to take steps to stabilize the dairyman's production costs while pegging the price of his commodity. Dairymen everywhere, unable to withstand the rising costs of feed and labor, went out of business and slaughtered their cows for beef, thus drying up sources of milk supplies.

And so the chickens are coming home to roost.

Increasing ration-point requirements for butter is no solution to this problem. It will not increase production and may have the corelative effect of inspiring extensive black markets, which will defeat the purpose of curbing consumption.

What seemed so obvious months ago to the industry and the laymen must have been equally plain to Government officials, else they are wilfully blind or inexcusably stupid.

It is too bad these situations arise in the wartime food program because, all in all, the O. P. A. is doing an effective job in holding living costs within bounds. To continue the good work the O. P. A. must have the confidence of the public, and confusion such as exists in the butter situation does not help, whether the O. P. A. or the W. F. A. or some other agency is responsible for it.

A Well-Deserved Rebuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD. I include therein an editorial from this morning's New York Herald Tribune expressing opposition to Secretary Morgenthau's new tax proposals.

The Treasury Department have admitted that the increased income of the country is at least 80 to 90 percent in the hands of the lower income group, but instead of approaching this situation realistically they still seem to feel that if they take anything from labor they must offset this as a political measure by taking a much greater proportion from the higher income group without considering the fact that these groups have had practically no increase in income whatever.

I have always been and still am in favor of a sales tax which, apparently, should be in the form of a retail sales tax to prevent it from pyramiding. Such a tax would not only be spread equitably through all groups but at the same time would to a large degree prevent inflation.

The article referred to above follows:

A WELL-DESERVED REBUFF

When Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., presented his $10,500,000,000 tax program before the Ways and Means Committee last Monday we ventured to suggest that it would bear little resemblance to the 1944 revenue measure that would finally be enacted. We were convinced that the con-

gressional committees in charge of tax legislation had too high a sense of public responsibility to place their stamp of approval on a program so flagrantly political in its approach to the war finance problem.

That confidence has already been abundantly vindicated. The Ways and Means Committee, after listening politely, if coolly, to Mr. Morgenthau and Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, has let it be known that it means to write its own bill; and on Saturday Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, declared that he would not support a program which released between 9,000,000 and 11,000,000 taxpayers from their obligations in an election year and which bestowed special benefits in the way of rebates on several millions more. The Senate's leading authority on tax matters indicated that if the Victory tax, which was his contribution to the 1942 Revenue Act, was dropped he would urge the enactment of a sales tax in its stead.

The Morgenthau plan has two outstanding defects, both of which carry the unmistakable odor of political opportunism. One of these is that the program, while put forward primarily as an anti-inflation measure, makes no serious attempt to absorb the purchasing power which Mr. Morgenthau himself admits constitutes the chief inflation threat. The other is that it fails completely to distinguish, in its incidence, between persons of fixed incomes, on the one hand, and those who are receiving windfall wages, on the other. While canceling the tax liability of more than 9,000,000 taxpayers through elimination of the Victory tax, it adds enormously to the already heavy burden now carried by the numerical minority in the middle and upper tax brackets. It has been estimated that under Mr. Morgenthau's schedules every taxpayer with a taxable income of more than $6,000 would be called upon to turn over half or more of it to the Government, while tax analysts have demonstrated that many taxpayers in New York State would actually find themselves, what with State and Federal imposts combined, paying out more than 100 percent of their incomes.

Taxation merely for the sake of taxation, even in wartime, cannot justify itself. There is no point at which one can say, without considering carefully the effects of the tax program on individuals and on the economy as a whole, "This measure is not enough," or "This measure is too big." A $10,500,000,000 revenue measure which will really strike at the danger of inflation would not be too large, but a $10,500,000,000 measure which is merely aimed at a redistribution of the national income may well do much more harm than it will good. The tax program presented by Mr. Morgenthau constitutes a striking demonstration of how the progressive income tax, in the hands of an administration which places its own political advantage above a sound national economy, can be employed as an instrument of tyranny over a minority of the people.

Address of Hon. Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Jan Ciechanowski, ambassador of Poland to the United States of America at the banquet of the Pulaski memorial committee at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, on October 10, 1943:

The war has entered its final phase. Victory is by no means around the corner, but it has become a certainty. The time is ripe for constructive thought on the subject of the future peace. Even if we are not prepared to set up at this time a detailed blueprint for a peace settlement on a world scale, it is essential and urgent at least to clear the decks by exchanging views, by eliminating differences of opinion among the United Nations on that all-important subject of the future peace.

In referring to the United Nations, I mean all the United Nations, not just the four principal powers.

It appears to me that there are several reasons which ought to encourage us at this period of the war to apply ourselves to such a task. However different may be the views and policies of respective nations in time of peace, they are united at present by the one common aim of winning the war, and this community of aim, coupled with an urge for real security, creates the most favorable basis for the planning of a peace system which would ensure their collaboration in peacetime as the logical sequence of their collaboration in war.

In this unprecedented world conflict, we, the United Nations, have come to act collectively. Let us go one better. Let us learn to think and to plan collectively for the common good of mankind. Whatever the differences of opinion between the United Nations may be, there can be no differences regarding the real aim for which they are fighting today. That vital aim is security. All other considerations are subordinate to this one basic aim.

The absolute necessity for security becomes more evident in wartime when security does not exist. In wartime the great advantages of a collective system of security compare favorably with narrow and selfish conceptions of security individually pursued by single nations on a regional scale.

There is also the following reason of a psychological nature for laying the foundations of peace and security while the war is still in progress: It is a remarkable paradox that the purest idealism and the most noble principles have to be invoked to stir up nations to fight a war—that most dreadful and inhuman thing in the world, while history shows that mostly selfish and cynical motives prevail in establishing peace, that most natural and ideal state of human relations. It is therefore advisable to plan the peace which is to follow victory, while we are still inspired by the principles and ideals for which we are fighting.

However, one thing is essential if we are to approach the problem of peace in the right spirit of constructive statesmanship and collaboration. We must learn to think and to plan in terms of really effective security.

In 1910 Lord Haldane, then British Secretary of War, undertook his fateful mission to Kaiser Wilhelm which convinced Great Britain that Germany was preparing a first world war of aggression. That First World War was never fully won by the Allied and Associated Powers, for Germany was not completely defeated or crushed in that war but only temporarily disabled.

Then followed a 20 years' period of insecure peace, made up of idealistic principles, unsupported by realistic means for enforcing their respect. Bold statesmanship was lacking. Appeasement raised its futile head. Wishful thinking became rampant. The forces of good had disarmed, the forces of evil were allowed to rearm. War once more became inevitable and finally broke out. And it has now lasted for 4 years of fighting, of untold suffering, of unprecedented cost and sacrifice in human life and happiness.

This means that since 1910, for the last 33 years, the world has never for one moment enjoyed real security. Events were allowed to outdistance statesmanship. As a logical consequence statesmen have been driven by events to take palliative measures at best calculated to prolong an insecure peace rather than to reestablish the durable foundations of security. Thus, statesmen have become so accustomed to plan in an atmosphere of insecurity that they have difficulty in adjusting their mentality to the requirements of a really secure world. Planning in an atmosphere of insecurity naturally discourages bold thinking and prevents creative and final decisions.

After a war of this magnitude and after such unprecedented suffering, no just and durable peace can be conceived on the basis of timid thinking, of opportunism, of patchwork statesmanship, of attempts at precarious concepts of regional balance of power.

These two last wars, in both of which the United States was forced to participate in defense of its own security, have taught us that in modern times no war can be localized, and that there is no possibility of isolation in times of conflict. It logically follows that peace likewise cannot be localized, that it cannot be regionally secured, that, in fact, peace and war alike are indivisible and therefore collaboration on a world scale is as essential in peacetime as it is inevitable in wartime.

Much has been said and written about restricting the peace settlement to a close alinement of the three or four great powers in a sort of permanent coalition for the preservation of peace. According to this theory, the so-called small nations would become passive satellites of the great powers in respective spheres of special interest.

Not only is such a conception contrary to the principles for which we have declared that we are fighting and which tend to regard all nations as equal before the law, equally entitled to enjoy freedom and independence and to share the responsibility of defending peace, but, apart from these important considerations, such a system could not achieve the desired result of a just and permanent peace. It would be in fact but a somewhat revised form of the Axis conception of a new world order, based on power politics and conducive to imperialism.

Nothing is wider of the mark than to say that differences between small nations are responsible for wars. In the course of the 20 years of the Versailles peace, uncertain and insecure as that period has been, all conflicts or differences of opinion between the smaller states or between small states and great powers were either solved or kept in bounds by the League of Nations, however imperfect might have been the League. On the contrary, it was the great powers, now constituting the Axis, who refused to accept the rulings of the League of Nations and are responsible for this World War. Thus Japan violated Manchuria in 1931, Germany gradually violated all the peace clauses and left the League of Nations, whose rulings she was decided to disregard. Italy, also a great European power and a charter member of the largely advertised Four Power Pact, set out on the conquest of Abyssinia regardless of League of Nations warnings and sanctions.

I would venture to say that the small nations, who suffer most in wartime, have a right to expect that this time the great powers will so adjust and settle the problems dividing them, that their differences, involving basic policies, will be eliminated from international relations as the most likely source of possible future conflicts. No safer way exists to bring this about than collaboration of all the United Nations in a common system of security.

It is heartening to note that there is the prospect that the close collaboration of the two great English-speaking nations in this war will continue after victory for the establishment and safeguarding of peace. There is no other way of building real world security than such a collaboration between the two great western democracies. The alinement of the United States with Great Britain for peace preservation is in fact the only real, tangible basis of world security. Such a British-American association assures the active collaboration of the two most powerful navies, of the two most powerful and most modern armies, of the two most powerful and most modern air forces in the world. It groups together the greatest number of the most effective sea and air bases scattered the world over. It eliminates all conflicting problems existing between these two greatest world powers by uniting them in permanent collaboration as the soundest basis of the system of world security.

With such a basis of world security it would probably never be necessary actually to use force. It would be in the direct interest of all peaceful nations to adhere to such a coalition and actively to support it. No imperialist power could afford to oppose it. To the great aims expressed in the Atlantic Charter and in the President's conception of the four freedoms, it would add the realism indispensable to apply them in practice.

This war is a mortal conflict between the forces of good and evil. We now know that the forces of good are certain of victory. If they are powerful enough to win the war, then they surely are powerful enough to be sufficiently bold to introduce a certain indispensable degree of idealism and respect for human principles in building the peace. It simply means that the realism which has convinced us all that security is the only aim for which we are fighting, must be blended with the principles of basic justice for all nations and peoples regardless of their size.

Only real security on a world scale, based upon the close permanent collaboration of the United States with Great Britain, will inevitably draw other powers and all smaller nations into a system of United Nations collaboration. Only such a system of world security, founded on permanent international collaboration, can eliminate the tendency of some of the great powers to seek the establishment of their individual security by means of territorial annexations, conducive to conflicts and contrary to the principles of the United Nations concept.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LEWISBURG, PA., *May 11, 1943.*

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The writer was on the verge of writing you several months ago, but desired to be absolutely sure of his stand before confronting you with this serious problem.

We have in our Federal penal and correctional institutions many hundreds and perhaps several thousand young men from 18 to 37 years of age. These young men have been confined to the various institutions prior to Pearl Harbor. The offenses of these men, generally speaking, would come under the classification of "depression crimes." They are far from being habitual criminals and are sincere in their love of this country. Real patriots at heart, they desire an opportunity to right a wrong. They ask for the tougher assignments and are willing to undertake the impossible. Before the war is over, our armed forces will have need of men who are willing to pay the supreme sacrifice. Many times I have overheard, "If we could only get a chance to retake Kiska or Attu." Everyone fully realizes that you are the only person able to grant them the privilege of serving their country. You can rest assured that if given the opportunity to fight, they will do everything in their power to be a credit to the United States and repay society a just debt.

A classification committee composed of men really interested in rehabilitation or men of broad experience could readily select these worthy individuals. A "cadre" system could be established to eventually drain off all worthy individuals. By the leadership of the Federal Government, State institutions would naturally follow suit. To begin with, a few months of regular Army routine at one central Federal institution would equip the men for basic service. All prisoners would be paroled into the custody of the United States Army.

If only as many as 3,000 Federal prisoners could be converted into helpful soldiers and citizens, it would make available hospitalization space badly needed for the armed forces.

The men of whom I have spoken are not bad. A good many were meted out severe sentences under the Dyer Act. Others consist of liquor-law violations. Some are of the armed hold-up variety. They committed a crime and are serving their time. Had it not been for the world-wide depression, most of them would have been on the fighting fronts months ago.

Your wife, who recently visited San Quentin, can describe her reaction of the average prisoner today.

The writer is 33 years of age and the father of three children. My wife is a Red Cross nurse instructor. I come from a family of nine living children and was reared in the steel district area of Youngstown, Ohio. My first job at the age of 15 was in a tin mill at Farrell, Pa. During my 4 years of college I was an honor student and a member of the varsity football and track team. For the past 11 years I have been in daily contact with all classes of people in most every walk of life. My judgment of men has always been considered good and my employment records should verify that statement.

I am willing to assist in placing these men on the fighting fronts and would be more than glad to serve with them.

There are many more points involved and I could not attempt to cover them by this letter. The plan for the release of these men definitely would not be harmful to society and if you see fit to consider the matter, I shall only be too willing to render whatever aid I can.

Let us get away from the legalistic conception of this thing and try a plan that takes into consideration the life motives and heart feelings of these men. They want a chance for redemption. Why not give it to them?

Needless to say, this letter is written without the knowledge of any person either in the Bureau of Prisons or any interested inmate of the Lewisburg Federal Penitentiary.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. KEATS.

Fire Insurance Immunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., carried an editorial relative to immunity from prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act. The Capital Times has the largest circulation in Wisconsin of any newspaper outside of Milwaukee. The attention of the membership of the House, and especially of the Judiciary Committee is invited to this editorial:

FIRE INSURANCE COMPANIES ASK SPECIAL IMMUNITY

The Capital Times for some time has been carrying on a campaign for an investigation of fire-insurance rates and practices without much success.

During the last legislature this newspaper supported a resolution introduced in the assembly calling for a committee investigation of fire-insurance firms' rates and practices in this State. The reactionary controlled assembly, reinforced by the private insurance lobby, summarily rejected the resolution.

Meanwhile, The Capital Times has been watching with growing interest the activities of the Federal Department of Justice in connection with the fire-insurance companies.

Last year the Justice Department obtained indictments against some 198 fire insurance firms and 27 of their officials in the Federal District Court in Atlanta, Ga.

The litigation there, based upon the Sherman Antitrust Act, revealed monopoly practices by the fire-insurance companies and inordinately high rates charged the public for fire-insurance protection.

We now learn that the Department of Justice is looking into the fire-insurance picture in New York and California with a view toward invoking the antitrust statutes.

It was not to be expected that the fire-insurance companies and their well-organized and well-heeled lobby would remain quiet when the Department of Justice turned on the heat.

The Justice Department's move to get at the facts as to whether the public was being fleeced by high fire-insurance rates brought a Nation-wide counter attack from the fire-insurance corporations. The big insurance lobby is now accusing the Department of Justice of trying to sabotage the fire-insurance business and interfering with State's rights.

The fire-insurance interests are demanding that they be put in a special privilege class, and that legislation be passed in Congress exempting them from the Sherman Antitrust Act. Such a bill has actually been introduced under the authorship of Senators VAN NUYS, of Indiana, and BAILEY, of North Carolina.

Insurance agents all over the country are being circularized by the fire-insurance companies and urged to write thei Congressmen demanding enactment of the Van Nuys-Bailey bill. Newspapers are being flooded with publicity material full of the old scare propaganda that legitimate business is being persecuted.

The Capital Times questions the sincerity of the fire-insurance interests in this controversy.

Why should they expect to be put in a favored class and declared exempt from antitrust statutes which apply to other businesses?

Why are they so indignant at being investigated by competent public agencies—are they afraid of what will be disclosed?

Here in Wisconsin the figures on fire-insurance premiums paid by the public and the losses paid by the companies indicate that the fire-insurance rate structure is away out of line.

During the 6 years, 1936–41 inclusive, fire-insurance companies operating in this State collected more than $128,700,000 in premiums.

During those same 6 years, these fire-insurance companies paid out losses totaling $52,575,000.

The excess, therefore, of premiums collected over losses paid for these 6 years was $76,125,000, a margin so huge that it leaves only one conclusion—the public in this State is being forced to pay millions of dollars in excess premiums and more than is necessary for payment of dependable and adequate insurance protection.

Bringing the figures right down to Madison, the figures for last year show $400,000 was paid out in premiums for fire-insurance protection, and losses paid were less than $80,000.

This happens to be fire-prevention week, an event sponsored by the National Fire Protection Association which in turn is tied in with the National Board of Fire Underwriters.

Fire-prevention week is an educational device calculated to encourage carefulness and the elimination of fire hazards. Everyone, of course, will support these objectives, but we sometimes wonder if these annual fire prevention weeks are altogether altrustic in design.

Have the fire-insurance companies an eye out to make even larger profit margins by reducing fire hazards? We haven't noticed successful fire-prevention drives being followed by rate reductions in fire-insurance policies.

The Capital Times hopes that Congress will not be shanghaied into exempting the fire-insurance business from antitrust legislation, which in effect would leave the public at the mercy of these agencies.

We hope, too, that the Department of Justice will continue its survey of fire-insurance rates and practices on a Nation-wide basis.

There is nothing sacred about fire-insurance companies, any more than there is about banks, investment houses, or other corporations.

Sycophantic Archibald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3875, a Member has submitted a criticism in verse of the Members of Congress written by the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish.

Mr. MacLeish warns us not to offend the poets and particularly reminds us that the poets—presumably including himself—write histories.

There is so much implied praise of Mr. MacLeish and so much criticism of the Members of Congress in Mr. MacLeish's doggerel that one of my constituents has been moved to reply in the same medium. She does not, like Mr. MacLeish, claim eternal glory for her poem, neither does she pretend that her verse transcends his. Nor does she expect that her poetry will have any more effect in subduing Mr. MacLeish than Mr. MacLeish's effusions will have in subduing Congress:

SYCOPHANTIC ARCHIBALD

(By Charlotte C. Starr)

The poets who can take a name,
And make it great, for future's fame,
Are not the poets Archie knows,
For men who write great poems, or prose,
Are not concerned with politics—
The kind that showers stones and sticks,
In verse, or prose, against good men,
Who would preserve their country, then,
As now; from little men like Archie,
And all his would-be poets, starchy
With New Deal artificial power,
Which will not last their shortening hour.
So, Congressmen in either House,
Be not affrighted by a mouse,
Who, by appointment, keeps your books;
You'll find the average voter looks
Not to the poets, but the press,
(The greater oft o'ershades the less).
'Tis no offense to honest rhymers
That one's regard for five-and-dimers
Like sycophantic Archibald
Is somewhat less than none at all.

Pulaski Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on October 10, 1943, at the seventh annual Pulaski Memorial Day program, Hotel Waldorf-Astoria, New York City:

In the 167 years of our country's history, we have almost invariably maintained a policy of strict isolationism. That may have been natural since we felt secure behind the broad oceans on either side of us. But what was considered good foreign policy in yesteryear does not hold today. It is interesting to note that had the peoples of other countries maintained the same attitude as ours, we might not be a free and independent Nation today. We received considerable assistance from peoples of other lands in our war for independence. Of all the foreigners who participated in our battle for freedom few were more outstanding and none gave more than Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, whose death we commemorate on this occasion.

The leading motive of General Pulaski's life was his love of liberty. He fought valiantly for the liberation of his native land and, in the course of that struggle, saw his father and his brothers and other near relatives killed and his home and his property destroyed. He himself was finally driven from his native land as an exile. All this pain and suffering and hardship did not quench his thirst for liberty. When he learned of the American struggle for independence, he offered his services, dedicated his talents, and finally his life to the cause of American freedom.

General Pulaski is considered the father of the United States Cavalry. During the first 18 months of the Revolutionary War, our forces had no regular cavalry corps, and there was none until Congress commissioned Pulaski to organize one. He trained the cavalry upon sound military lines, and there is no doubt that the knowledge he brought to the task was passed on to other cavalry leaders. General Pulaski's handbook for cavalrymen is still widely used in military schools. His training of the cavalry was undoubtedly as important to that arm of the service as that of Baron von Steuben's training to the infantry.

General Pulaski used the remnants of his own personal fortune, estimated at about $50,000, in getting additional equipment for the men he led during the Revolutionary War. His untimely death, at the age of 31, from wounds suffered at the Battle of Savannah is known to us all.

Throughout his service in the Continental Army, General Pulaski endured the hardships and deprivations in common with George Washington and his men and in the end gave his all. We can draw a helpful lesson from his life.

General Pulaski was born of noble blood, reared in wealth, and comfort, protected against the hard knocks of life; yet he chose to cast all of these aside and join the forces which fought the battles against oppression and tyranny.

Poland's position today is parallel to what it was in Pulaski's time. Today, as then, she is under the heel of an oppressor. Today, as then, her valiant people are scattered over the globe. Today, as then, the hope for her restoration is strong in the hearts of all liberty-loving men.

Now we are engaged in a global war against a barbaric totalitarian tyranny. Today, for the second time within a generation, the sweat, blood, and tears of our people are being drawn in combat with nations that are imbued with a lust for power and world domination. Will we, or our children, have to endure this hell and torture again within the span of another generation? The decision rests with us.

We are winning this war. We are confident that we will win it, but it is not yet won. To make certain that we shan't have any recurrence of the pain, suffering, and heartaches that go with sacrificing the flower of our manhood, we must defeat our enemy decisively and completely. To hold to a minimum our losses of dear ones, we must bring the war to a victorious conclusion as early as possible. To realize these ends, each and every one of us must be willing to do his part, whether it be in the battle or in the production field. Each and every one of us knows where his duty lies, but no one of us should ever feel that he is doing enough. We should never cease trying to do more and better. We must drive on and on until the day of victory is realized.

A decisive victory over our foes will not only remove the threat of a future attack upon our own shores but will also restore to the enemy-dominated, freedom-loving people their rightful heritage by expelling from their borders the tyrannical and barbaric Axis hordes who have been inflicting upon these peoples sufferings and cruelties more terrible than those experienced in any other era in the history of mankind. No civilian peoples in Europe or anywhere else have been more brutally treated or suffered greater casualties and more heartaches at the hands of the Axis "supermen" than Poland.

It is not sufficient for us, however, to win a victory. That is only half the job. After victory is won we must then make certain that we shall enjoy an enduring peace. Never again should we allow ourselves to withdraw from our responsibilities. Never again should we permit ourselves to be deluded into believing that we can remain at peace when turmoil and unrest exists in other lands.

We are the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth. As Winston Churchill recently stated, greatness and power carry with them definite responsibilities. We have a responsibility to our men engaged in this war to exert our full influence to that end that it shall not happen again. It is our duty and obligation to collaborate with the other freedom-loving peoples of the world to establish and maintain peace for all men of good will. In doing so we shall keep faith with General Pulaski and the other great men who gave their all since the beginning of the history of our country.

Free Enterprise Success Key

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement entitled "Free Enterprise Success Key," taken from the Humboldt (Tenn.) Courier-Chronicle, and reproduced in the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

FREE ENTERPRISE SUCCESS KEY

The tremendous job, now being successfully accomplished, of equipping and munitioning a great army and the supplying of the armies of other nations associated with our own country in the subduing of outlaw forces seeking to dominate the world, is not just the result of Government orders and Government financing and directives, but rather by the vast foundations laid under our free system of enterprise, which has for 150 years been growing and developing.

America has been able to work industrial miracles because of free enterprise carried on under free competition. It means that free enterprise and free competition have developed both our craftsmanship and our facilities, discoveries, and inventions to a point where we can amaze the world and destroy the puny engines of war that the war-mad nations of the world have been to extremes to produce, and on which they so much depended to carry through their wild scheme of world dictatorship.

Democracies, we were told by the "superior race," could never organize, unify, and work unitedly to one great end. Democracies, said the Axis leadership, have too many fingers in the pie—too many bosses, too many contrary elements, to ever do any job requiring national effort wholly put forth, as it must be in an all-out war. These philosophers of tyranny and regimented people now see and will long remember that freemen, acting in a competitive way, but driven on by their desire to remain free, can work such wonders as to put slave labor, driven on by the lash, to utter confusion.

The United States has produced war goods of every sort faster and more abundantly than even our own people believed possible, and these things of war are turning what appeared as early defeat into the magic of early victory.

We cannot attribute our amazing production to the spur of Government direction and Government spending, though both of these were necessary, but rather to the American way of mass production, and the American spirit which declares that there is no such word as "can't" in our lexicon.

AMERICAN WAY PROVES WORTH

It was necessary to create vast industrial plants, and our engineers and our trained labor built them in record time. Powerful machines to fabricate things in a new and really wonderful way were quickly designed and built. These were built because our men, trained in competitive production, were able to produce them, and to improve upon designs of machines made when business was lighter and our mechanicians had more time in which to think out and to experiment. To these talents the war gave a great impetus, and so many schemes and ingenious contrivances have resulted we are astonished ourselves.

If anything were needed to tell us that our forefathers were right when they set about forming a government which would give opportunity to all men to bring out their best, production tells it. Our free-enterprise system of rewards and incentives continually impels us to develop every talent we have, and, better still, to use it, to the end that we and our children may live better and easier than other peoples throughout the world have ever lived.

To abandon or hog-tie our enterprise and to slow down to the tortoise pace of the older and more backward nations means that we too may soon be among the "have not" nations.

And there is a class in the United States which advocates with fanatical frenzy the aping of the slow and uncertain ways of the poor and backward countries where there must be rationing and doling in order for the under half of the population to exist at all.

We need no European or Asian policy of security or protection. Most every person of even meager gifts of strength or ingenuity cannot only live, but live well and build for old-age competence here, if he wills and works.

With all our abilities and with great examples plentifully about us, we have a constant hue and cry for security and for Government interference in our private lives and business. These folks are scared cats; most of them have not lived in America long enough to get the ichor of beggary and fear out of their blood.

This Nation has abundantly proved its right to live and our constitutional guaranties are sufficient, if we do not allow them to be trampled upon, to insure we will recoup from the waste of this great war and rebuild better and grander than ever before. But to do this, we must continue our free enterprise and continue, also, every incentive necessary for the exertion of our entire strength to build and to develop. We must let it be known that every property right will be sacred, and what a man produces and saves will surely be his to have and to hold.

OUR OPPORTUNITY NOT RESTRICTED

Men do not slave voluntarily day and night to produce for others who may be idle, but rather that he and his may sit in the shade and rock in the old rocking chair.

This is not a country of castes and barons, but one in which the sons and daughters of poor fathers and mothers may achieve to the highest places and the greatest wealth.

We have no classes. We continually build up from the bottom, and sink down from the top.

He preaches wrong who preaches that this is a country of rich and poor, of honored and shackled. No place is too high for the sons of the humblest to aspire and to achieve, and no place is too low that the worthless, though brought up in luxury, may not sink if he fails to make each shining hour shine still more brightly.

This war is to be won by our arms, because we deserve to win, and because we have trained in a system that makes success easy to those who strive to win.

We must fight for a continuance of our American way and our freedom, when we triumph over our enemies. The second fight is as important—may be more so than the fight against totalitarianism and tyranny.

Allowances to Dependents of Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have caused to have assembled information regarding the matter of allotment and allowances to dependents of men in the armed services. This information has largely been assembled by the Library of Congress and it refers to laws affecting this subject in force in all of the great European countries, both friendly and hostile. As the amendment to the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act is set on the calendar to be debated by this House on this coming Wednesday, I believe this matter should be available to every Member of this body as well as the Nation as a whole. I therefore ask that all of this data which has been prepared in memoranda form be printed in this RECORD as a part of the extension of my present remarks:

ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF MEN

BELGIUM

(The franc in 1939 was usually converted at 3⅗ cents)

By royal decree of October 27, 1939, allowances to the families of soldiers were established as follows:

Payable for each day of service: 8 francs for a wife, plus 5 francs for each legitimate or recognized child under 16 years of age or incapable of self-support.

If the man is single, widowed, or divorced, with or without children, his father (or in case his father is not living, his legitimate mother) receives an allowance of 8 francs.

The dependents of a man will be eligible for allowances when the net total of their own resources of every kind and origin, plus the actual resources of the soldier for a period of 12 months, is less than the minimum exempt from the tax on earnings increased by the exemptions for family responsibilities. (Monthly Labor Review (U. S. Department of Labor), Washington, December 1939, vol. 49, No. 12; 1362–1363.)

BULGARIA

The families of mobilized men whose total income per month is not above a specified amount (varying according to the locality of their residence and the composition of their families) are entitled to a monthly allowance and, where necessary, to a housing allowance of an amount fixed by the mayor and local

committees. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, January 1941, vol. 52, No. 1:92.)

CANADA

(The Canadian dollar is now converted at 90.9 United States cents)

On January 1, 1943, various improvements in the provisions for dependents, allowances to Canadian men and women in active military service became effective. Among these revisions were increase in the allowance rate and additional grants for large families.

Allowances are granted to the following dependents of men and women on active duty in Dominion armed forces, irrespective of rank:

(a) A wife, or, in her absence, a woman relative who has the care of his dependent children.

(b) A dependent son under 16 or daughter under 17; the age limits are raised to 19 if the child is undergoing approved instruction, and are waived altogether if the child is infirm.

(c) Other dependent relatives.

It is provided that soldiers shall assign part of their pay to their dependents receiving allowances. The assignment of pay by officers is voluntary. Married officers are eligible for marriage allowances as well as allowances for dependents.

The minimum assignment for a private is $23 per month. The basic rates for children's allowances are the same for all rates of servicemen, but the grants for wives and other relatives vary according to the servicemen's rank. From the beginning of 1943, as many as six children have been made eligible for allowances, the respective monthly rate for the third being raised to $10, and $8 each being allowed for the fourth, the fifth, and sixth child. A relative may earn as much as $40 a month without necessitating a decrease of his or her allowance.

From the beginning of 1943, the allowances for wives and children and the assigned pay are supplemented by a cost-of-living bonus. For childless wives the bonus is in proportion to the rise in the cost of living after October 1941. For wives and children the bonus is 25 cents for each 1 percent rise. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, June 1943, vol. 56, No. 6: 1114–1116.)

FRANCE

(The franc in 1939 was usually converted at 2½ cents)

A mobilized man is entitled to only one principal allowance for the whole group of persons dependent up him. Such persons are admitted to benefit in the following order: (1) his legal wife, (2) his children, (3) his nearest relative in the ascending line.

The decree fixes the amount of the principal allowance at 12 francs per day in Paris and the Department of the Seine, little less in other departments. For a dependent child under 16 years of age the principal daily allowance is increased by 5½ francs in Paris, 4½ francs elsewhere. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, December 1939, vol. 49, No. 12: 1363–1364.)

GERMANY

(The mark is usually converted at about 40 cents)

The wife and legitimate children of a mobilized man are unconditionally entitled to an allowance and are not obliged to prove that they are dependent upon him. Another group of beneficiaries includes relatives in the ascending line; this second group of beneficiaries also includes illegitimate children, if paternity has been established.

Family members who apply for these grants must prove that they fulfill the conditions for such allowances.

The amount of the grant is determined on the basic principle that it should enable the family to meet its every-day needs.

Special allowances will also be made in order that mobilized men and their families may maintain their life insurance contracts entered into prior to mobilization. (Monthly Labor Review Washington, December 1939, vol. 49, No. 12: 1364–1365.)

The new system created by order of October 2, 1939, gives the right of option between a grant based upon family responsibilities and cost of living in the applicant's place of residence, and a variable allowance based on the wages last earned by the person called up for service.

In a large town the basic amount accorded to the wife of a mobilized man is 64 marks per month. The grant for a child under 16 years of age is 19.50 marks, and the supplement for rent is 30 marks, making a total of 113.50 marks per month. This sum, however, may be granted in full only when the net monthly wage of the mobilized man was at least 133 marks, the difference of 15 percent being considered necessary for the mobilized man's own expenses.

This method of computing family needs and the allowances to cover them takes into consideration the applicant's income from all sources, especially from wages.

If in the example cited above, the mobilized man's wife was herself earning a monthly wage of 60 marks, one-third of this amount would be exempted from consideration in estimating the family's income. If there is a child under 16 years of age in the family, the nonexempted portion of the worker's earnings would be reduced by one-half.

On the other hand, according to the decree of October 2, 1939, persons eligible for an allowance may ask that such grant be based on the latest monthly earnings of the mobilized man instead of on cost of living and family responsibilities. Under this scheme the allowance is 40 marks per month, when the income was from 100 to 110 marks per month, plus 4 marks for every additional 10 marks of income. In cases where the income was more than 580 marks per month the allowance is fixed at 200 marks. A rent allowance is also granted, as well as a supplement for one or more children under 16 years of age. The children's supplement must be at least 15 marks per month for each child. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, March 1940, v. 50, no. 3: 602–603.)

GREAT BRITAIN

(The shilling is usually converted at 20 cents and the penny, 1⅔ cents)

The rates of the allowances to the dependents of members of the men's and women's forces in Great Britain have been increased and at the same time the rates of the allotments which members of the forces must make from their pay as a condition for the grant of dependents' allowances have been reduced.

The amount of the allotment is related to total pay and increases as the member of the forces proceeds up the pay scale. Allotments are required from members of both the men's and women's forces claiming allowances, the minimum contribution for men being at present 7s. a week and for women 4s. 8d. It is now proposed to reduce all contributions of 7s. and upwards by 3s. 7d. and contributions of 4s. 8d. by 2s. 4d., the difference being made good by the Exchequer.

The new rates for dependent children will be 8s. 6d. for the first child, 6s. 6d. for the second, and 5s. 6d. for each other child.

Dependents other than wives or children who are eligible for family allowances may claim an allowance varying with the amount contributed to the dependent's support by the member of the forces before joining up. (International Labour Service Review, Montreal, May 1942: 582–583.)

SOUTH AFRICA

(The shilling is usually converted at 20 cents and the penny at 1⅔ cents)

In South Africa dependents of volunteers in the armed forces are provided for by the state, by employers, and by other schemes.

The grants made by the state for the dependents of enlisted men are made possible through general taxation. The volunteer himself, however, must not allot less than half of the pay received in his particular rank. The allowances are on a uniform scale.

Allowances are made to legal wives, separated and divorced wives for whom a court order has decreed maintenance, legitimate and illegitimate children, stepchildren living in the enlisted man's household, and the legal guardian of separated children. The total allowance of 4s. 6d. per day for wives is based on an allowance of 2s. 6d. for quarters, a family allowance of 1s., and an allowance of 1s. for rations.

In order to qualify for such allowances the volunteer must allot not less than half of his basic pay for his rank to his dependents; secondly it is necessary to establish proof that the volunteer contributed to the support of his dependents and the amount of such support; thirdly that he (and, if married, his wife) is unable, under present circumstances, to continue such support; and finally, that the dependent is actually in need of the allowance. The general principle laid down is that the allowance together with the allotment shall not exceed the amount contributed by the volunteer prior to the enlistment.

No married rates of pay are applicable to the members of the Women's Auxiliary Air Force or the Women's Auxiliary Army Service. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, October 1941, vol. 53, No. 10: 889–892.)

SOVIET UNION

An order, published by the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union of October 10, 1939, provides allowances for the families of soldiers in the military service. The rates of allowance are as follows: 80 rubles (1 ruble is 19 cents) per month to a family without self-supporting members; 120 rubles to a family consisting of two persons; 160 rubles to a family consisting of three or more persons. These rates are reduced 50 percent if the family lives in a rural district.

Family members considered as being without support are children up to 16 years of age, or 18 years if attending school without a scholarship and their parents are unable to work; a father over 60 years of age, or a mother over 55 years; a wife and other disabled relatives unable to perform any kind of work. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, February 1940, vol. 50, No. 2; 328.)

SWEDEN

(The krona is usually converted at 25.8 cents)

An allowance of 2.25 kroner per day is stipulated for an able-bodied mother with 1 child; for an able-bodied mother with 2 or more children 3 kronor; for a less able-bodied mother with 1 child 2.75 kronor. An able-bodied woman without children may also receive aid—the rate is 1 krona per day.

All families receiving the above grants are also entitled to a rent allowance based on the cost of living in the locality in which they reside.

Consideration is to be given only to the income of the person called up, his wife, and his children under 16 years of age during the period of service. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, December 1939, vol. 49, No. 12: 1367.)

A new system of regulating allowances to families of men called to the colors was inaugurated by a Swedish Royal Order of April 17, 1940. These grants are of four different types: For the maintenance of the members of the mobilized man's family; for the upkeep

of his home; for the carrying on of his business; and aid to members of his family when they are ill.

The allowance for maintaining the members of the mobilized man's family is paid for a wife if the man is living with her, for his dependent children under 16 years of age, and for his father and mother if he is obliged to support them and was actually doing so when he was called to the colors. Under specified circumstances the person in charge of the man's household may also receive allowances.

The grant for maintenance consists of a basic part which is paid in all cases without proof of need, and another part which is granted only if the proper authority judges that the need for it has been proven. The basic part is granted only for a wife and children under 16 years of age, and amounts to 1 crown per day for the former and 0.40 crown per child. The order provides a maximum which must not be exceeded under any conditions. This maximum varies according to the cost of living in the locality in which the beneficiary resides. For a wife the range is from 1.75 to 2.25 crowns per day; for other members of the family, from 1 to 1.50 crowns for persons over 16 and from 0.70 to 0.90 crown for persons under that age.

Housing allowance: Usually the rate of the allowance paid in this connection may not be more than the rental and cost of heating the dwelling.

Allowance of maintenance of individual's business enterprise: A grant is made when it is thought possible that an independent business enterprise carried on by the mobilized man can be maintained by the employment of wage-paid labor. When such grant is made to families of men who were supporting them, the maintenance allowance is not paid. The amount of the allowance may in general not be more than 200 crowns per month.

Sickness allowance: In case of sickness in the family the payment shall cover only the expenses actually incurred on account of sickness. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, January 1941, vol. 52, No. 1; 91–92.)

SWITZERLAND

(The franc is usually converted at 23.2 cents)

By order of October 17, 1939, provisions were made for assistance for the families of soldiers. In deciding upon the amount of aid to be granted, consideration is given to the capital and income of all persons in the household of the mobilized man during his service period. The earnings of his wife, however, are not taken into account unless they are above 3 francs per day; any earnings above this sum are counted in full when there are no children in the family, but only 50 percent of such earnings when there are children in the household. All of the earnings of any other family members in the household are taken into account, as are also sickness benefits and public or private insurance benefits other than those intended to include the cost of accident or illness.

Among the circumstances under which no allowance is payable are the following: (1) When the mobilized man is in receipt of unemployment benefit from a military insurance fund; (2) when the mobilized man is paid his full wage during his service period; (3) when the combined income of the mobilized man and his family provides sufficiently for the support of the family during his service period, so that state aid is not justifiable; and (4) when the mobilized man was earning nothing previous to his period of military service. In the same way when an unemployed man is called up for service, aid may be granted to his family provided definite proof is available that he would have been able to get a job had he not been called.

Allowances are payable only during the actual service period. In principle, the aid granted is not to be above the amount which the man paid to his family before he was mobilized.

The daily allowance to the family of a married man may not be greater than his average earnings per day after deducting the presumed daily cost of his own maintenance—2 francs. This allowance for maintenance may be cut to 1 franc if the man's earnings are low and his family large.

An unmarried man living with his family is generally treated as a married man, but his maintenance cost is fixed at 3 francs per day. If his earnings are meager and he is the sole support of a large family, that cost may be reduced to 2 francs.

Three-fourths of the expenditure in connection with the aid to families of mobilized men is met by the Swiss Confederation and one-fourth by the cantons. (Monthly Labor Review, Washington, March 1940, v. 50, no. 3: 603–604.)

Flood Situation in the Middle Rio Grande Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I want to include a resolution of the Albuquerque, (N. Mex.) Chamber of Commerce relating to the flood situation in the Middle Rio Grande Valley. This organization is keenly aware of the danger which exists in that locality.

In the Southwest along the irrigated valleys, water is our greatest friend or our greatest enemy. It can supply the necessary lifeblood to our growing crops, but when it gets out of hand at flood stage it can destroy our farming valleys, our farm homes and the cities that we have built up to serve the farming areas.

The Middle Rio Grande is now in a dangerous condition. Above my home city of Albuquerque, there is a protection dike in the neighborhood of Alameda. When the conservancy district was constructed in 1928, it was felt that this protection work would safeguard the city for all time to come. But in the intervening 15 years there has been such rapid aggradation of the river bed that today the Alameda Channel will carry only half as much flood water as it would have carried when the project was finished.

The effects of this are obvious. If we have a flood which reaches anything near the levels that several previous floods have reached, the water will go over the protection works and down through an old channel which leads through the heart of the city of Albuquerque.

The citizens within the Middle Rio Grande Valley have spent more than $2,000,000 on the construction of flood-protection devices. This is an interstate stream, and it is our belief that the cost of interstate stream control should be a burden of the Federal Government and not of the individual property owners along a flooded section. At the present time three-fourths of every dollar which comes into the treasury of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District for the operation and maintenance of that district is used for protection against floods, but it all ought to be used for the cleaning of ditches, the rebuilding of headgates and irrigation structures, and for those agricultural activities which would help to produce food required in the war effort.

If this situation is to be remedied, it must be remedied now. Studies of the river have been and are being made by the Army Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of Reclamation. Sufficient information is now at hand to permit the Federal Government to outline a course of action which will bring the river under proper control. I hope that such action can be taken by this Congress and taken promptly.

The following is the resolution of the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce:

Whereas the levee flood-control system along the Rio Grande within the counties of Sandoval, Bernalillo, Valencia, and Socorro, has been severely damaged by floods during the past several years and its present effectiveness so reduced as to be entirely inadequate to control flood waters of this river, and thus seriously menace all property within this valley; and

Whereas this situation has become increasingly grave from year to year, due to rapid aggradation of the river channel, so as to cause said channel to shift continuously and to shift the current of this stream with each succeeding flood, so as seriously to threaten destruction of the entire levee system and other flood protection works along the river within this area; with resultant imminent danger of heavy losses of property, destruction of large areas of highly productive lands, and even loss of lives; and

Whereas present levees and other flood protection works so threatened with destruction constitute the only protection for a modern irrigation and drainage system serving 125,000 acres of highly productive and thickly settled farming areas; the central business district of the city of Albuquerque and a large portion of its residential and suburban area, with a population of approximately 75,000 within a radius of 5 miles of the Albuquerque post office; as well as numerous towns and villages within the area above defined; the population of the counties above named according to the 1940 census being 114,956, or 21.6 percent of the population of the entire State; and

Whereas there pass through this area main lines of the Sante Fe Railroad running east and west and north and south; and also main highways for motor travel, the uninterrupted operation of which is vital to the national safety at this time; and

Whereas there are located in the city of Albuquerque two important air bases, Kirtland Field and Albuquerque Air Depot Training Station, which are dependent upon the above-mentioned railroad and highway traffic lanes for movement of supplies, equipment, and men in the military service; and

Whereas the area above defined is subject not only to seasonal floods in late spring and summer, during the run-off of melting snows in the high mountain areas of the Rio Grande watershed, but also to even more dangerous flash or sudden floods caused by heavy rains or cloudbursts in such mountainous areas; and

Whereas such seasonal flood periods occur every year, always with resultant heavy dam-

age; and such flash floods may occur at any time with grave danger of a disaster of major proportions; and

Whereas the property owners of the counties above named and of the cities and towns therein are without funds adequate to construct permanent flood protection works; and

Whereas existing irrigation, drainage and flood protection works within said area were constructed with funds derived from a bond issue of which more than $8,000,000 are now outstanding; a major portion of which outstanding bond issue is owned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and

Whereas a devastating flood, such as is likely to occur at any time due to the conditions above recited, would not only destroy productive lands, city and town property and transportation systems now vitally needed, but also would destroy the sole security upon which said outstanding bond issue is based; and

Whereas the Rio Grande is an interstate and an international stream, and the Government of the United States is bound, by its approval of treaties between the States of New Mexico, Colorado and Texas; and between the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico to allocate and deliver specific portions of the normal and flood-water flow of said stream to irrigated areas within said States and the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas, by reason of its interstate and international character and the existence of the treaties above referred to, proper control of the flood waters of this stream is within the power of the Government of the United States to provide: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, That a grave and immediate state of emergency exists within the Rio Grande Valley in the counties of New Mexico above named and that the said Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce is prepared at any time to demonstrate the existence of such danger and present emergency, through reports of competent engineers and other comprehensive data such as will convince any agency of the Federal Government that immediate relief is necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions by the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, properly certified by their officers be forwarded immediately to the Honorable CARL A HATCH and the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, Members of the United States Senate from New Mexico; and to the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON and the Honorable ANTONIO FERNANDEZ, Members of the House of Representatives from New Mexico, with out urgent request that they present to the Congress the critical situation described in the above resolutions, with the further urgent request that they prepare, introduce, and seek enactment by the Congress, at the earliest possible time, emergency legislation which will provide for the construction of permanent flood protection works within the area herein defined, and that funds for such construction be appropriated in such amount as the Army engineers, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, or such other agency as the Congress may designate, may find necessary.

Are We Yet a Free People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a concern in Minnesota that is engaged in the production of shells for the United States Army that reveals an amazing situation and one that would not be tolerated in any other country under similar circumstances. I am wondering what the President and his advisers are doing about this and similar situations. The letter follows:

We have a contract for the production of shells for the United States Army Ordnance. This contract requires a certain rate of production every week, so that the flow of shells to shell-loading plants will be continuous.

Our production has fallen behind schedule. We have a group of inspectors at that plant, all belonging to a C. I. O. union, who are refusing to work overtime, which is necessary in order for us to meet the schedule. Various reasons are given for their refusal to work overtime; such as, they want more money, they want inspection put on piece work, they are willing to work but the union will not let them, etc.

I wonder what would happen if some of the men on the firing lines at the battle fronts would tell their superior officers that they refuse to work overtime.

We have a contract with the union which expires next December, and which was opened up last December in accordance with the terms of the contract, relative to wages only.

Our case has been heard before conciliators of the Labor Department and is now before the War Labor Board.

The men draw time and a half for overtime, week days; and double time Sundays, providing it is the seventh day of work. Last Sunday they were willing and did work at double time, but we do not propose to operate next Sunday and pay double time, as our production is cut back so far we are already operating at a loss. Just at the moment, we are at a stalemate and are gradually falling further behind.

These matters have all been brought to the attention of the local governmental authorities.

The Aftermath of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to do some planning in the post-war domestic field. The great aftermath of war is going to be a very critical period in American history, and planning to meet the emergencies of those days cannot be accomplished overnight. It is essential that we get busy now.

The average American today is thinking just as much about the problem of jobs for the next few years as about the problem of mapping out a lasting peace. In a recent survey made by the American Institute of Public Opinion 58 percent of those interviewed named jobs or economic readjustment of the country as the most vital long-range issue ahead for the next few years.

What are we going to do with the millions of men and women returning from the armed forces and the defense plants of the country when the war is over? We want no bread lines in America. These people are all entitled to a job and a living wage.

Ninety-six specific post-war recommendations are made in a Report on Demobilization and Readjustment of Personnel prepared by representatives of various Federal agencies in a report submitted to the President on June 30. The report gives the following six-point program to alleviate hardships for demobilized members of the armed forces:

1. Three months' furlough at regular base pay, not to exceed $100 a month, plus family allowances.

2. Beyond that time, if necessary, unemployment insurance for 26 weeks for those who register with the United States Employment Service.

3. Special aid and counsel regarding readjustment and rehabilitation.

4. Special provision, including tuition and allowances, for those who wish to pick up the broken threads of their education or follow some special course of training.

5. Veteran's credit for old-age and survivor's insurance on the basis of service in the armed forces.

6. Opportunities for agricultural employment and settlement to be provided for a limited number of qualified servicemen.

Regarding war workers in industry and Government, specific recommendations were made for setting up readjustment centers through which counsel, assistance, and retraining may be made available for readjustment to other jobs and for strengthening the existing employment agencies to carry their heavier load. These recommendations are all very good and are most worthy of careful study by this Congress.

It is estimated that some 6,000,000 persons will be released from industry when the war ends. These include youths who would have been in school; persons beyond the normal working age; and women who would customarily be in the home. Some 8,000,000 persons will be demobilized from the armed forces, leaving about 2,500,000 in the services.

A moderate policy with regard to continuation or cancelation of war contracts must also be considered. We must avoid the dumping of millions of workers on an overstocked labor market. This is essential in the orderly process of demobilization and conversion to peacetime pursuits.

Many other problems, too numerous to mention, will confront post-war America. Among them might be mentioned the post-war financial problems of the Government, including the questions of economy, reducing taxes, and paying off the national debt. The public is demanding economy in Government and has done so for a long time and certainly they will demand a lowering of taxes when the war is over. If, after the war, we are fortunate enough to have a financially responsible administration, it may be possible because of the size of the national income to start balancing the budget. Just now that seems to be in the realm of the impossible.

Always at the end of a war there is a public reaction against having so much Government regulation. In fact, such reaction has already gained sizable proportions. After the war this reaction almost certainly will be stronger than usual. The average American citizen does not want to be regulated and regimented. He is a creature of freedom. He resists the domination of Federal Government over his business and his personal affairs and wants to throw off the yoke at the first opportunity.

Post-war freedom of opportunity which is so rapidly disappearing from the American way of life must not be forgotten. What are we fighting for? Isn't it self-preservation? This means protecting our individual freedoms and our way of life against our enemies and also against hostile philosophies that might subvert our established beliefs.

In order for the American people to be happy and contented they must have jobs, fair wages, a high standard of living, and freedom of opportunity. No one will exchange this freedom of opportunity for the dole or into becoming a ward of the state if he can help it. Therefore, in order to retain our constitutional democracy it must be made possible for business and industry to provide jobs, fair wages, and a high standard of living.

Government encroachment during the emergency of war in many instances has proven to be a destructive invasion of our constitutional guaranties of the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The American people want a Government of laws and not of men. Under the American system of free enterprise we have always had the cooperation of a free people which has expressed itself so magnificently in the days gone by.

I think that we can truly look forward to a greater and prosperous America if the American people will now awaken to the great problems which will confront them in the aftermath of war. The time for action on domestic post-war planning is now, and it is the duty of the representatives of the people in this Congress to get busy and do the job. Responsibility lies on our shoulders.

The New Wagner Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a very timely article by Dr. Felix J. Underwood, executive officer of the Mississippi State Board of Health and also president of the American Public Health Association, on the proposal to socialize medicine. Dr. Underwood is outstanding in the field of medicine and public health, not only in Mississippi and the South, but in the Nation at large. He points out some of the dangers that should be considered by this Congress before embarking into this new field of socialization and regimentation. The article, which appeared in a recent edition of The Mississippi Doctor, is as follows:

ANENT THE NEW WAGNER BILL

(By Felix J. Underwood)

On June 3, 1943, Senator WAGNER (for himself and Senator MURRAY) introduced a bill, S. 1161 (an identical replica of H. R. 2861 was introduced in the House on the same day by Congressman DINGELL), extending the provisions of the Social Security Act and including a section, title 9, setting up a system of Federal medical, hospitalization, and related benefits.

This bill, if enacted, will effect revolutionary change in the practice of medicine and put the Federal Government in virtual control of the practice of medicine and of the practitioners of medicine and also of hospitals.

Every employed person in the country and his dependents would be eligible for the medical benefits of the system. This means, of course, that only the relatively small segment of the population who are self-employers and do not elect to be voluntary participants would remain as potential patients to be cared for in accordance with the present method of rendering medical care. It also means, except for a very few physicians, that the profession in order to obtain a livelihood would be obliged to become a cog in the wheel of the system.

Under the provisions of the bill payments to general practitioners for services shall be made on (a) a fee basis, (b) a per capita basis, (c) a salary basis, and (d) a combination or modification of these bases as the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service may approve. Specialists designated by the Surgeon General shall be "entitled to the compensation provided for specialists. * * * The services of specialists shall ordinarily be available only upon the advice of the general practitioner.

The administrator of the program shall be the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who, under the bill, has virtually dictatorial powers. It is true that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service will have a national advisory medical and hospital council (referred to as the council). Your attention is directed to the extracts dealing with the composition and appointment of this council. It will be noted that the appointments are made by the Surgeon General. There shall be 16 members "selected from panels of names submitted by the professional and other agencies and organizations concerned with medical services and from among other persons, agencies, or organizations informed on the need for or provision of medical, hospital, or related services and benefits." There is nothing in this section which states that any of these 16 members shall be physicians.

To support the purpose embodied in the whole bill, which is to establish a "unified national social-insurance system" the employer and the employee shall each pay 6 percent of the amount of the employee's salary or wages.

Under this provision, all physicians in private practice shall pay a social insurance contribution equal to 7 percent of the market value of services in self-employment up to $3,000. This means that physicians earning $3,000 or more in any calendar year will pay 7 percent of the $3,000, or $210. If their earnings are less than $3,000 it will be 7 percent of whatever amount they have earned.

The public must be served, it is true. In my considered judgment, this section of the bill introduced by Senators WAGNER and MURRAY and Representative DINGELL is both unwise and unnecessary. It is my honest belief that the setting up of such a system of compulsory medical care would be detrimental to public health and welfare and would result in a lowered quality of medical care throughout the country.

This system if enforced (and I do not take it very seriously because there are so many deductions already that doubtless Congress will hesitate to impose additional ones at this time) will be destructive of the time-honored existing method of medical practices under which have been developed the highest standards of medical care and public health of any large country of the world.

This bill, I think, has been introduced in the turmoil of war without consultation with the official representatives of health and medical professions and related agencies.

I have been president-elect of the American Public Health Association for almost a year and no one consulted me relative to such legislation.

It is my feeling that this is an effort to enforce upon the United States Public Health Service and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service the administration of a law which I do not believe they want any more than the State Board of Health of Mississippi desired that all the charity hospitals of the State, including the mental disease hospitals, be turned over to the State board of health to administer, as advocated by several splendid Mississippi lawmakers during the 1942 session of the Mississippi legislature.

I am sure that the leadership in medicine and public health of this country found out about this bill only after its introduction by its authors.

Personally, I intend to discuss the bill with our Mississippi Senators and Congressmen to the end that everything possible be done to defeat this section of Senator Wagner's bill.

I am also of the opinion that neither the president and secretary of the American Medical Association nor any other officers of that organization, and neither the president and secretary of the American Public Health Association nor any other officers of that organization were consulted at all during the preparation of this bill.

I seriously doubt if the Surgeon General or any member of his staff was consulted by the authors of the bill.

However, it is not too late for physicians and health workers in all of the States and Territories to give their Members of Congress the benefit of their thinking relative to this legislation. The physicians of this State have been unselfish and patriotic in carrying out necessary programs in venereal-disease control and tuberculosis control which constitute sound public-health practices. Most of the hospitals of the State and the majority of the physicians of the State are cooperating in taking care of the wives and infants of privates, corporals, and plain sergeants who are members of the fighting forces of this country and receiving a rate of pay that justifies hospitals and physicians alike to make financial sacrifices, when necessary, for them. The cooperation of the medical profession was expected and received without stint in the previously named programs.

As a physician and as public-health man serving as State health officer and responsible by law for the protection of the public health of this State, I feel that it is my duty to point out the dangers and extreme undesirability of title 9 of Senate bill 1161 (H. R. 2861), which proposes to set up in this country a system of Federal medical, hospitalization, and related benefits.

Mighty influences are at work to effect epochal changes in the complexion of medical practice. We are bravely trying to face

realistically the trends in national and international social and economic structure—trends directionally signaled by already established sign posts, such as social security, sick benefits, unemployment insurance, and old-age compensation.

That we as physicians and health officials are intimately involved with these plans is clearly demonstrated by certain recommendations that the Government in cooperation with the medical profession take action to enable the individual to budget medical expenses over a reasonable period and contribute toward the cost of care according to his ability, and that the Federal aid be extended toward developing an adequate system of regional and local hospitals, maternal and child care, and other measures to insure adequate health care for all, regardless of place of residence or income status.

It is apparent to us all, I think, that the old status of medical practice will be considerably modified. We consider this in line with essential progress, but title 9 of the new Wagner bill is far too revolutionary for the present day.

It would seem that this system has been largely copied from the British system; much of the British system inaugurated by Prime Minister David Lloyd George was copied from the Bismarck system in Germany back in 1870.

It is about time that we become more original in our thinking in this country and quit being copycats of countries which allowed so little freedom in the years past that our forefathers were forced to flee from their shores to preserve for themselves and their descendants liberty of thought, speech, and action—and in many instances their very lives.

Final Message of Department Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the final message of Department Commander Glen S. Locker before the twenty-fifth annual department convention of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, at Faribault, Minn., on August 22, 1943. I commend a reading of this able and timely statement to every loyal American who places country before self:

In these days when loose talk, intemperate and uninformed speech can do so much harm, I believe every American audience has the right to know by what authority any speaker stands before them. During this past year I have served you as department commander and it has been my privilege to do some traveling, and to talk with many different kinds of people. From these experiences I have drawn some conclusions which I would like you to hear at this time, the occasion of my final message, before joining the ranks of the "has beens."

So I come to you today with a message which I feel is pertinent to this hour in our national history, and important because we, as legionnaires, have said that we will preserve the freedoms of this country for those sons of ours who are out there fighting for them.

First of all, I wish to say that industry, after several years of abuse, and after fighting indictments that never went to trial because there was no proof—but merely obtained to get headlines in the papers and the attention and prejudices of unthinking people—finally emerges as at least 50 percent the salvation of America's freedom—the other 50 percent being our sons who use and shoot the weapons that industry makes. This industry of which I speak has been fighting for its life during the past 10 years, through a jungle of opposition consisting mostly of those who, having failed themselves to successfully compete in the rough and tumble of private enterprise; who never met a pay roll; who never borrowed money from a bank and worried about the notes that were going to come due; who have never sold or created or transported or distributed a single thing in their lives; who have never created anything, and hence have wanted to destroy what some one else ha. successfully made; who, under cover of the war activity, where any resistance to it could be made to appear unpatriotic, have attempted to inculcate a curious form of absolute government control of every phase of our business and social life.

Yes; they're already talking about licensing business, and if it ever comes to that, we'll be on our knees, because it means out-and-out political management, and when a politician can take away your license, he can take away your very life.

As I have gone into war plants and seen the enormous transformation that has taken place, I can't help but think of those who have attempted to destroy industry simply because it is big—forgetting that it had become big because it deserved to be—because it had served the American public well—and that only because it was big did we have better and better homes, automobiles, radios, electric refrigerators, washing machines, and heat equipment—not at higher and higher, but at lower and lower prices, which is the history of American industry—constantly improved products at constantly reduced prices. How we wish these politicians, who have attempted to rip American industry apart would just humbly and thankfully follow the example industry has set for them and give us the job American industry has done in converting from peacetime to wartime production, which ranks along with the seven wonders of the world.

For the sake of returning servicemen, after this war, I hope we have learned some things of late. I hope we have learned that there is no substitute for brains, nor for intelligence, which is the use we make of the brains we have. There is no substitute for successful experience. And it does not necessarily mean a man is a rascal just because, when he was young, he spent time in the classroom studying to fit himself for a successful business career, and then got a job and worked long hours to create a value for himself—and learned the business and saved money, invested it in a small enterprise—blew the breath of life into it—held his hands around the flame of that business to protect it until it got a good start, and finally, developed an enterprise locally that provided a pay roll and supported hospitals, schools, and contributed toward the community chest, plus a product that added nationally to the health and happiness of our people. I hope we have learned there is no substitute for creative ability, because if it were not for the things that imagination has brought us, we would still be in log cabins, going to the wood pile for heat and risking our lives every Hallowe'en in our former type of outside facilities.

So In December 1941, we did not have enough arms in all America to resist the attack of 10 armed divisions, if the Japanese had known what they had accomplished at Pearl Harbor and had just kept on coming. You can talk about fighting them with sticks and stones and courage, but that won't work against machine guns and bombs. Yes, we might well ask where we would all be if it were not for the American businessman, with the skill and vision and courage, who, literally speaking, has reversed the Biblical injunction and has beaten our plowshares into weapons. No aviator who brings down enemy planes, and no troop of soldiers with tattered and honored colors has a right to greater pride than these factories which, in less time than anyone could have believed, and in far less time than Germany guessed, have given us mass production in fighting planes and bombers, and ships, and tanks, and ammunition. It was Hitler's and Hirohito's one great miscalculation—they did not believe it could be done.

And so, this war is real to American industry because industry, like a sock, has turned itself inside out and converted itself to war-making. There is no way for business to be better off today because of its country's agony. Today business consists of five classes of men in this country.

First—Those who have already gone out of business—who paid with their business lives, so to speak, and have seen all their work and planning of past years go into the discard—and their families get just as hungry and their insurance policies lapse just as quickly as the worker who loses his job during a depression and then depends upon a Government subsidy. But I hear of no small businessman asking that his normal pre-war business profits be maintained out of the Government treasury.

Second—Those who are going out of business this coming year, sitting in the death house, living on the tag ends of inventories that are left—knowing that when that's gone, there will be no more, and they are worried about the education of their children and how they're going to get along.

Third. Those who are staying in business and losing money, and can stand it for a while out of surpluses and reserves of past years in order to maintain their identities and be here when the war is over.

Fourth. Those who stay in business and manage to break even.

Fifth. The "top crust" that make money, as far as the gross profit is concerned, and then pay back 80 to 90 percent in taxes. Yes; this war is real enough to business. But it still is not real to many millions of Americans. Sure we hear the news broadcasts that contain every favorable item. We see the headlines in the paper. We get the idea that not a single Russian soldier is losing his life in the present offensive. We don't hear about our losses until long afterward—our cities have not yet been bombed—we have not as yet dragged the bodies of American men and women out of the debris of destroyed cities. We have not as yet sustained any of the agony of this war, not unless you have already suffered the loss of a son.

This war is not real to the point of being a personal war as long as farm organizations and their political leaders are still thinking in terms of the highest possible price, instead of how much food they can raise to feed our armies and our people. It is not real as long as labor leaders think in terms of getting the highest possible wage rates and premiums paid for every single hour of overtime, instead of the weapons they can make. It is not real as long as any business or industry puts profit above production, nor as long as politicians think first in terms of getting elected. This war cannot be real to people who think in terms of what they can get out of it.

I'll tell you where this war is real. Just 5 minutes ago, in the Solomon Islands or in Sicily, there was an American boy alive. He's hardly yet tasted the joys of living. He's there where he is and had no choice in the matter. He got his induction papers from the draft board. He didn't say, "Now just wait a minute, Uncle Sam—the hell with you. What kind of a deal are you going to make? How much are you going to pay me? How

many hours am I going to be on duty? What! Twenty-four hours! Well, how much extra am I going to get for every hour I fight? Do I have to fight on Saturday? What about Sunday? What about my comforts? What about my privileges? What about my standard of living? What about my education?"

He's there, away from home and relatives and friends; his education interrupted, his job impeded. He's there in the filth, blood, and strangeness. And for $50 a month. And because he's thinking about that thrill-packed moment when he will get off that train and, in that milling crowd, finally pick out his dad and mother—and his sweetheart, and go home, arm in arm, for good old American fried chicken dinner where they can be proud of him and at last hear of his experiences. Every day and every night, he keeps thinking of home—and what he's going to do when he gets back there. That was 5 minutes ago, when I started talking about him. And right now, he's dead. Right now. How I wish every American could see the reality of it. He's dead, his body torn by a shell, or burned in the crash of a plane; some Jap has plunged a bayonet through his lungs, or he drowned, a cold, lonesome death.

And if you could be there where he is—not here, comfortable, with a good lunch under your belts—be there and see that boy die and witness his courage before death releases him from his agony, and then be home with his father and mother weeks later, when they get the news from the War Department—by the Eternal God, you'd know where war is real. And for nothing he got out of it—for no premium paid—he didn't spell patriotism—p-a-y.

In spite of all the effort of this American Legion, during the past 25 years, to develop and teach the true spirit of patriotism, we have some rather superficial ideas about it even today, in the midst of this war. It is not enough to stand up when they play the Star Spangled Banner, repeat the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and to applaud it in the news real. That is not enough. Patriotism now means pain and sacrifice, and that's the word that American people do not yet know the meaning of. Let's not confuse inconvenience with sacrifice. We must omit from our minds any thought at all of what we might hope to get out of this war and think only in terms of what we can give and do.

We made a fundamental mistake at the beginning of this war. We thought it would be like the last one. Well, that's natural because that was the only war we knew much about. We thought it would be fought by our armies and navies, away off somewhere, and we would cheer them on and buy some bonds. But, in the meantime, in the mind of the farmer, "$2.20 a bushel for wheat again"—in the mind of the labor leader, "We've got the country over a barrel now and we'll make advances both in wages and personal power that we never could get in peacetime." And in the mind of the businessman. "Too bad, but I didn't start this war. I made some money out of the last one and maybe I can make more out of this one." You know very well that's the way a lot of fellows felt. Well, this war is not like the last one. This is the war of an indulgent, luxury-loving, soft and unprepared America against a lean, hard-hitting, well-trained and still powerful Germany, the overlord and master of all Europe, with slave labor of all its conquered millions making weapons for its master, and, as far as the over-all military situation is concerned, up to now, an almost completely victorious Japan. We are facing, too, an entirely new and different type of enemy—an enemy with horrible, bestial, and utterly soul-destroying ideas—an enemy backed 100 percent of the time by every man, woman, and child, and every pound of materials, for just one single purpose, namely, the waging of war and the destruction of every decent thing. It is certain that the defeat of this enemy can be brought about only if we are willing to work and fight as hard as he, and do without with as much fortitude. This is no part-time war. But that's the way we have fought it up to now.

Not for one moment would I take out of your minds the hope and encouragement that came out of Guadalcanal, north Africa, and Sicily, together with Russia's successful offensive. We must have hope. And yet, we must restrain our optimism until a hopeful beginning has actually become a successful finish.

The most dangerous thing that can happen to America today is the relaxation that would come about—the return to selfish thinking and planning, the increased absenteeism, altogether too prevalent among war workers—if we permit ourselves to regard a German collapse as imminent and that, with Germany out of the way, it would take only a few weeks to finish off Japan. We need to understand just how badly we've been defeated and to get away from that comfortable feeling that, while we may lose at the start, we're bound to win in the end. We've lost every round of this fight so far, and I'm not forgetting Coral Sea and Midway and Guadalcanal. Those blows were good ones, and they brought blood, but they were not rounds, not decisive victories, because, while we were striking with some devastating power at Japan's Navy, that selfsame Japan was gaining still more ground on land in China, entrenching herself in Burma and capitalizing on all of the enormous raw material conquest in the Dutch East Indies and the South Pacific. And so, we have lost every round of this fight and we still comfort ourselves that it doesn't greatly matter because, of course, we're going to win the war anyway. You don't win fights by continuing to lose them. If you lose enough of the early rounds, you can lose the last one, too. A few hard, successful punches have brought us 300 miles nearer to Tokyo, in the South Pacific, but it is still 3,000 miles to Tokyo.

There's no referee to judge this fight. There will be no draw decision. This is for keeps. It's just a matter of win or lose. The sobering thought is that, although Germany, Japan, and Italy started this war, positive that they could not lose, since they knew more about our resources than we knew about theirs, they miscalculated on one point—and it will be their undoing. They failed to judge correctly the unconquerable spirit of united America that thinks in terms of giving and not in terms of getting, and to take into account what America can do when America once knows what it must do.

Every man, woman, and child is a soldier in this fight, some in uniform, in danger, suffering and dying, and the rest of us supplying the food and weapons and dollars. No war in history has ever been fought that carried such high stakes and such fearful penalties to the loser. The dearest possessions of mankind, freedom, home, safety, liberty, religion for us, if we win, and degradation and slavery, and a blacked-out God for us, if we lose. Losing is something that no American can contemplate, and we won't, but any effort comprising less than all we've got may not be enough. If we lose, it won't be a matter of settling by indemnities, or giving up Hawaii and the Philippines—not this time. We'll be absolute and literal slaves of that enemy just as sure as France, Poland, Greece, Denmark, Holland, Burma, and the islands of the Pacific are today. What a bitter yoke that would be for America.

There were two letters in the bulky envelope marked "Passed by naval censor," which Mr. and Mrs. Henry A. Glorch of Chicago opened with trembling fingers. The first was in the familiar handwriting of their son, Henry, aboard a ship in the South Pacific. The second was in an unfamiliar script. Naturally they first read the letter from their son. The other letter was from Henry's buddy, John Demarsky, who said he was carrying out instructions in mailing the letter. "I don't know just what to write," Demarsky said to the family. "You've lost a very fine son and I've lost a very fine buddy."

Well, what price is the life of a boy like that? That courage, that heart, that mind? What price? What is it worth? Did he bargain with his country for his services? Did he put it on the basis of time and a half and double time? Any labor leader who calls men off work, making arms to protect boys like that sells out his country just as sure as Judas took the 30 pieces of silver.

Well, what's this all about, this appeal I'm making today? Just one thing. It's for this thing we call America. Have you ever thought of what it really is, this America you have taken so much for granted, that you read about in the papers, hear about over the radio, talk about, and ask God to bless, in Irving Berlin's song? Let me bid you goodbye, officially, as Commander of the Department of Minnesota, and thank you all for the wonderful cooperation given to me, by telling you what I think America is—and I mingle the words of H. I. Phillips with my own.

America is the sleeping giant of nations—suddenly transformed by a bomb at Hawaii into a smashing colossus. It's joy-rider turned Paul Revere. It's the jazz band becoming the fife and drum corps. It's Hollywood and Broadway suddenly warmed by the spirit of Bunker Hill and Lexington. It's the night club and the country club discarding the play clothes for uniforms and jumpers, and the sign of the Red Cross. It's waltz music and the rhumba shifting to the blare of the bugles; it's all the trivial ditties of Tin Pan Alley welling into "Mine eyes hath seen the glory of the coming of the Lord" and "Oh, say can you see by the dawn's early light." It's the soda clerk dying for democracy; the youth on the tennis court flashing through the air to bomb a hostile battleship—a Colin Kelly. It's the cry of "Gimme, gimme" changing to "Up and at 'em" and the slogan "Every man for himself" and "What do I get out of it" becoming again, "Don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes." It's the Stork Club playboy turned parachutist; the grimy coal-town laborer leading a suicide squad to retake Manila; the village ne'er-do-well on a mine sweeper in a raging sea; the tap dancer, stripped to the waist, in a blazing gun turret; the ex-gangster suddenly finding his soul in the emulation of Ethan Allen and Sergeant York. It's a club car turned into a jeep car, the deluxe Pullman into an ammunition train, and the porter into Gunga Din; the street idler winning a citation for valor; the boy who "wasn't much use" sticking to the guns of a flaming cruiser, taking one last defiant shot before a cold and pitiless ocean closes over him to strangle out his life. It's the three-hours-for-lunch fellow turned minute man.

It's Bossy Gillis and Bill Knutson, Alfalfa Bill Murray and Sergeant York, Colonel Lindbergh and General Pershing, Louie the Lugg, Jimmie Durante and Bishop Manning. It's Carrie Nation and Hiram Walker, Israel Putnam and Fibber McGee, George Washington and Jack Benny, Benny Goodman and Alexander Hamilton, Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee, Henry Ford, Bill Green, Tom Girdler, Al Smith and Herbert Hoover, Franklin Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie. It's the messenger with a singing telegram, delivering instead, the 1943 message to Garcia.

It's self-interest become self-sacrifice. It's the spirit of indifference become again the

spirit of '76. It's the homestead turned cathedral because of the prayers of mothers there; the dingy town become a flaming symbol because it has given birth to heroes; the prophecies of Holy Writ become events . . . the moment and the human heart turned torch and beacon to light the way to freedom and liberty for all of the oppressed peoples of the world.

That is America, for whom we give up something we might like to own or wish to sell; for whom we work—and pray—and fight! And unto whom—and I have done it, too—we surrender up our sons!

God bless America, the members of this great organization, the American Legion, and may you serve her now, even better, with your efforts, your influence, and your dollars.

Some Candid Comments by Upton Close

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday October 3, Upton Close, noted commentator on foreign relations, made the following broadcast over the Mutual radio network. Last night Mr. Close supplemented this broadcast with some equally thought-provoking reports. It is hoped that those both in and out of our Government who seemingly are ashamed to call themselves Americans and to defend the independence and integrity of this Republic will ponder the observations of Upton Close most carefully.

If the United States is to emerge from this war relatively as great a Nation as it was when it went in, somebody soon is going to have to devote some attention to the protection and promotion of American interests. With other Nations proudly and rightfully putting their own concerns first and with our country placing the interests of others ahead of our own, there is real danger that in the post war era the United States may find itself divested of its logical position at the head of the parade.

The broadcast by Upton Close follows:

I had prepared for you for today a presentation of the views of Harold Laski and other influential British radical leaders, and of the growing Canadian Commonwealth Federation, the party which is likely to bring socialist government to our neighboring country in the next elections.

I'm going to put off all but a touch of this material because of the ominous drift of our relations with Russia through the past week. The government in exile of Czechoslovakia and the patriots of Yugoslavia have shown indications of leading a parade from London to Moscow of the very nations we are fighting to free. The billing on the British-American conference with Stalin has slipped during the week from an all-star performance of state heads in Moscow to a road performance of military men in London. But the most important news of the week, no matter whom one loves or mistrusts, was this—"the State Department has been informed that Russia is not interested in a separate peace with Germany, but that the picture can change unless another front is opened." This pregnant little dispatch was carried by Associated Press, reporting Ambassador Admiral Standley's return and report to the President. It was dropped from the wire services like a hot potato and buried by a press, more inclined to editorialize over national newspaper week and the theory of free speech than to get into the realities of contemporary history.

This gloved ultimatum highlights our precarious situation with our ally, Russia, beyond carp, cavil, or sentiment. It released, as from the State Department, something men have betimes been threatened with being put off the air for reporting.

The friends of the Soviet and probably Moscow authorities now see Russia in for a very hard winter which they insist could have been spared Russia had we opened our western European front in time. For the delay they chiefly blame British First Minister Winston Churchill. They assume that without Churchill's restraint, our Chief of Staff Marshall would have crossed the channel. In consequence, they reserve for Russia the possibility of formal or informal cessation of hostilities with the German army. They do not go into the question of whether an invasion of western Europe would have been disastrous or not. Nor do they ask, as Churchill and Hull must ask, whether Britain and the United States, in the absence of true good faith or any written agreement worthy of the name could trust Stalin not to unload the Germans on us as soon as we were on the Continent in force. Friends of the Soviet do not ask these questions because they are for Russia first, with Britain and the United States getting what is left of their loyalty after Russia, whatever program or aim, is taken care of.

Now comes Communist Browder with the impudent warning in his Gary speech of last Tuesday that it is an illusion for the United States to expect Russia to fight Japan, and harmful nonsense to expect the Soviets to furnish us with Siberian bases, although contrariwise they furnish Japan with weather stations. This was reinforced from official Russia by the finding of a bald announcement that a number of our expensive bombers and a large number of highly-trained airmen who were on the sadly ineffective raids on Japan's Kurile bases had been interned in Siberia. Both we and Russia have, of course, ignored niceties of international law when we really wanted to help our friends.

It happens that what Browder said with an innuendo of impertinence this week, is what I reported in an entirely friendly and reportorial way after interviewing Maxim Litvinov for my network as he stepped from a trans-Pacific plane on December 6, 1941. I made my comment on the following day, December 7, and stated that my impression was that if Japan suddenly attacked us in the Pacific, Russia would follow her own political advantage. A few minutes after I said this came the flash that Pearl Harbor had been attacked. Then came an attempt to put me off the air for daring to suggest that Russia would not march right by our side in the Pacific * * * but then, I'm not a Communist. Probably I couldn't even get a penitentiary sentence commuted, if I should land in the clink!

After Litvinov arrived in Washington and was installed as a member of the United Nations steering committee, he showed himself afraid to give us confidence. Our diplomats and military experts in Russia were treated with such galling lack of official trust and warmth that cooperation with the Kremlin, beyond the one-sided lend-lease, became impossible. We are now about to enter the crucial stage of discovering whether or not such a confidence ever can be developed. As we enter this stage we and the British and the Chinese and the French and the little nations find ourselves very much in Russia's power. We got there under our own steam, following British leadership.

There is no use to dim our vision with blind rage about it. We must now face the fact firstly that Russia holds the balance of power between rival nations and races in both Europe and Asia. That goes for rivals lined up against one another in the present wars and rivals who for the moment are on the same side in these wars. We must face the further fact that the Soviet leaders hold the balance of power not only between mutually resentful races and rival empires, but they hold the balance of power between rival class interests in our own American society and British society and Chinese society and many other societies. They hold this through organized Communist parties which act virtually as Moscow's agents and through sympathetic organized labor groups such as the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the C. I. O. and Maritime Union, whose sympathies are dominantly with Soviet Russia in any situation. Russia has a further hold on Anglo-Saxondom through Socialist political parties which are non-Communist, such as the Canadian Commonwealth Federation in Canada, but which would never support war against the Soviets. Russia has yet a further hold through a vast network of organized cultural groups from writers' groups to the Russian Chamber of Commerce. In addition, there are large Russia-sympathetic motion-picture and publishing interests among us, and last but not least, there exists a vast, unorganized, pro-radical, and pro-Russian sentiment in the English-speaking world and among the United Nations generally.

Pro-British influences within Britain and the United States, not to mention in the other United Nations, are sufficient to make any thought of use of force against Russia utterly unrealistic, unless in cooperation with Germany, and a war against Russia under any circumstances now foreseeable is beyond the ability of any British or American Government to prosecute. Russia's position is so strong that even an Anglo-American military alliance is pathetically inadequate to counterbalance her. Open expression of that alliance would only make Russia relatively stronger, by scaring into Moscow's arms the Chinese and French and many other peoples who don't want an English-speaking world at all.

The attempt of a bullheaded faction or simple-minded statesman to handle Russia by war or threat, would tear Anglo-Saxondom to shreds before a single American regiment could ferry across one of the two wide oceans to open a front against the nation which stopped Napoleon and Hitler. The now modernized and machine-powered Russia has a larger population than the United States and the white population of the British Empire together and sprawls across two continents over a rapidly developing area more than three times the size of continental United States. When we consider these things we may understand a little of the robustious quality of Joseph Stalin's humor. He and his people have paid well for their laugh—the last laugh in the three-cornered duel of Europe of this century which our internationalists entered so cocksurely. Now, our internationalism and anglophilism have played into the hands of Russian imperialism and world socialism, and we must decide what next.

First, in the name of sanity, let's call a halt to the silly talk going through our services and business circles that we'll "have to fight Russia next!" You will not hear such talk in British circles. The British have been as negligent as we are at getting themselves in a jam but once in it you always find them setting their minds rationally toward getting out, and making best use of friend and foe to do so.

That's why Churchill, proposing a British-American union, eyes Moscow not Washington

to see the result. That's why British diehards such as Beaverbrook, the arch capitalist, and Hoare, who counterplotted against Russia in Spain, have told Churchill point-blank that regardless of what else, understanding must be had with Russia. At the radical end of English thought, the ex-pacifist Bertrand Lord Russell, mathematician, friend of the radical Laski, writes in the October issue of the New Deal magazine Common Sense, that if a compromise by negotiation is not reached with Russia, war between Russia and the United States will occur, and that Britain under a Labor Government might line up with Russia against the United States. He says everyone else would, of course. I'm wondering what it is we have to compromise with Russia—in the view of British radicals. I'll give you more of this next week if possible, but buy the magazine Common Sense and read it for yourself.

Last night George Bernard Shaw capped the climax by repeating in effect what Churchill said after the last war—that our whole moral and historical conception of the European contest is wrong and that our part in it is idiotic. Also the British censor allowed this court jester of the Empire, who, however, is no fool, to be the first Britisher to say to the world that Britain would have to preserve and build up Germany again. George Bernard Shaw, Lord Russell and their kind, of course, count on our ever remaining international fools, spending our substance getting ourselves tangled up in world rivalries, dissipating our men and wealth over the globe in a fashion beyond Alexander the Great, or the old Spanish Empire, although without their practical purpose, instead of doing as Russia does, that is, making herself impregnable in her own sphere and challenging enemy or friend to come—if he dare. Perhaps it is time our internationalists took a lesson from the Russia they but recently so admired. Some of them, of course, planned it this way to take the world to state socialism by making us as well as the Tory British helpless in the hands of Stalin. Professor Laski and Henry Wallace bank on Socialist conquest of Britain and the Dominions after the war. The Horoscope, English magazine of astrology, prized by Mr. Wallace, says that Socialist revolution is in the stars for Britain, and Churchill will pass. It will be "a case of the man and the moment."

In view of this, the leftists will bear with Mr. Roosevelt's present rightism like martyrs and try to elect him again. When Britain goes left, they can take him back home with them. If he is now no longer the man of the moment in their minds, he is the best available man to lead up to that man.

But there is a vast, paying and bleeding American citizenry in and out of uniform who are neither Rightists nor Leftists—neither pledged to the British Empire nor baptized to Moscow. And they still have an entire war to fight in the Pacific. This paying and dying, rather than planning, public wonders if Americans may not, at long last, take hold of themselves and become as much masters of their own destiny as, before their eyes, the Russians have become sole masters of their destiny.

United We Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently conducted a timely and spirited Nation wide essay contest on the subject of United We Conquer. Young people from every State in the Union participated. I take pride in learning that 2 weeks ago the national winner was announced as 15-year-old E. E. (Pat) Murphy, Jr., of my home town of San Angelo, Tex.

For that signal honor and accomplishment young Murphy was awarded the first prize of $1,000, which he immediately invested in a war bond. The essay is timely and thought provoking. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED WE WIN

(By E. E. (Pat) Murphy, Jr.)

Hitler's most sinister weapon is not his Luftwaffe, his Panzer divisions, or his shock troops; the power behind his Munichs as well as his Dunkirks is the insidious and insatiable theory of divide and conquer. If the Axis Powers had faced unified opposition they could have goose-stepped through no conquered capitals. If there had been unity of purpose and action among the peaceful nations of the earth the dictators' troops could have never marched. But they did march, and before they marched their victim was weakened by rumor, doubt, disunity, and confusion. Just as fleeing civilians clogged the vital roadways of France, hampering their defenders, so did political disunity, diplomatic impediments, and blind isolation check opposition to the Axis.

At the outset of this struggle we were a divided people—divided in politics, race, social standing, and ambition. But as the four horsemen began to ride over the whole of Europe, Asia, and Africa a spirit greater than the military cohesion of the Axis grew in the minds of liberty-loving peoples. A common cause and a common enemy gave us our strongest weapon—unity.

With the roots of our tradition deep in the Magna Carta, the Petition of Rights, the Mayflower Compact, the Declaration of Independence, and our Federal Constitution, it was only natural that we should unite to further the cause of liberty. And so we did. The Atlantic Charter of August 1941 proclaimed the joint desire of America and England "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations."

On January 1, 1942—a few days after the Japanese blow had made America fighting mad—representatives of 26 nations pledged cooperation and a unified command. January 3, 1942, saw President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill planning a joint military strategy, with the British general, Wavell, in command of the southwest Pacific and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek commanding the Chinese area. On March 30, 1942, a permanent Pacific War Council was established in Washington, with members from the United States, Australia, New Zealand, China, the Netherlands, Canada, and Great Britain conferring together for the common cause. Looking ahead, Vice President HENRY WALLACE has proposed a world council after the war.

These, and the events which grow out of them, are great strides toward unity among the United Nations. They directly reflect the spirit of the citizens of the nations, who realize that England's fight is America's, that Russia's loss hurts every member nation, that defeat of the totalitarian principle is a victory for all of us. Inside our own borders our perspective has changed. Even through the haze of confusion and distrust the Axis carefully prepared, we have begun to see the truth. We see who are our friends and who are our enemies; we see the great task ahead; we see that each of us must work tirelessly if we all are to win. We have found our weapon—unity. Not chained together by artificial links of race hatred and greed, but with our hearts welded into one, with common aims, against a common enemy, we have armor that is proof against the theory of divide and conquer.

Although this Nation has taken a lead in the equality and mutual understanding which promote unity, the movement has hardly begun. In America we have a complication of racial, social, and economic problems which handicap us in our search for national and international unity. Eleanor Roosevelt said in The Moral Basis of Democracy:

"First of all we are a great Nation of 130,000,000 people. We cover about 3,700,000 square miles * * *. Our people stem from every nation in the world. We include Orientals, Negroes, Europeans, Latin-Americans. We are in truth the melting pot of the world. Our solidarity and unity can never be a geographical unity or a political unity. It must be a unity growing out of a common idea and a devotion to that idea."

We have a foreign-born population of 13,000,000, a first-generation population of 25,000,000 and an alien population of 5,000,000. These people came to the United States largely for freedom, security, and equality, just as the first settlers did. We must guarantee them that which they seek. We have 12,800,000 Negroes in America. We must support their freedom. We have 4,000,000 Jews. We must give them security here, although the Nazis would slaughter them. We must treat all races as equals. Our national achievements are products of the ages and of the world; America is vibrant while other countries are decadent, because of our influx of new ideas and new blood. All our people have a common idea in this war; victory and a just peace. We can achieve unity by common devotion to that idea.

History did not end with Napoleon, and it will not end with Hitler. We must plan for a better world after the war. As Americans we must perfect our national solidarity, then extend our horizons to include the nations which will help us win the war and perpetuate the peace. We must assume our responsibilities as a democratic nation. As citizens we must do all we can to win the war; we must buy bonds, join in the conservation program, cheerfully give up rationed luxuries, and give our time to war work. We must be tolerant and sympathetic with the ideas of others. We must study carefully to understand the issues of the war and the peace to follow. We must make ourselves useful citizens, for in strengthening the home front and by uniting with our neighbors and our allies we can hasten the day of peace and justice for all the world. Divided, we can be conquered; united, we win.

An Interesting Contrast in Government Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have, without regard to party lines, joined in support of all appropriations needed to win the war. These appropriations have properly gone not alone for weapons of war but also for things which will make

life easier and more certain for the soldier. Into this latter category falls a Government publication which has just come to my attention. Its title is "Jungle, Desert, and Arctic Emergencies." It is an interesting contrast to a booklet just issued by the O. P. A. and entitled "Uncle Sam Keeps Your Rent Down. You Must Keep Your Home Up." The latter booklet contains many helpful suggestions but, I fear, goes beyond the purposes of government as defined in the Constitution of the United States. It is a booklet which should not be published at public expense.

In these days when the administration is calling for more and higher taxes it behooves us to examine closely the spending activities of all Government agencies. Those activities which are not directly related to the war effort must be curtailed. They will be curtailed before I will vote to levy additional taxes on the already tax-burdened American citizen.

With permission of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following paragraphs taken from a column I write and which is published each week by some 30 newspapers in my congressional district.

LIFE IN THE ROUGH

Jungle, Desert, and Arctic Emergencies is the title of a fascinating 150 page booklet now being placed in the emergency kits of all Army aviators. The booklet might well be entitled "Every Man a Crusoe." It harks back to the Boy Scout Manual and contains helpful suggestions on countless subjects. The cover of the book is vermilion so it can be readily seen against jungle or desert background if lost. The binding glue contains insect-repellent powder and pages are water resistant. The type face and illustrations are especially designed for reading under adverse lighting conditions. The book itself fits easily into the hip pocket.

Ingenious instructions, compactly presented, tell how to turn a parachute into a tent, a cistern, or a fish net. Flyers are told not to be afraid of wild animals which will generally be as much afraid as the man. Much more to be feared than serpents or leopards are insects. It is pointed out men can benefit from watching monkeys. A man can eat anything a monkey eats. Also, man can eat the monkey. Those who are lost in the jungle are told they can't see through or over it but by getting down can see under it. They are told how to make fires without matches, snare small birds and animals, and to eat the entrails to obtain vitamins. They are told that termites, beetle grubs, grasshoppers, and crickets are considered a rare delicacy by jungle natives and taste like roasted chestnuts.

Aviators lost in the desert are told their chances of rescue are good but not to eat the contaminated food offered by friendly Arabs. In the Arctic it is pointed out that the cardinal principles of survival are to get plenty of sleep and rest, avoid tight clothing, eat plenty of fat and to keep dry. Also polar bear livers are said to be poisonous and a continued diet of rabbit will produce sure starvation.

SUPERGOVERNMENT

The home front is not being neglected by the booklet makers in Washington, though it can hardly be said that booklets available to civilians are as useful or justified as the one described above. The O. P. A. gave birth to a new booklet last week at the Government Printing Office. It is entitled, "Uncle Sam Keeps Your Rent Down. You Must Keep Your Home Up." Did I say a booklet? Two million of these booklets have been printed at a cost to the taxpayers of $8,000. These booklets are being distributed to tenant groups, labor unions, civic groups, etc., in regions where there is rent control, and all distribution is "at the local level" in Washington double talk.

The booklet has 15 pages and contains approximately 80 suggestions to the householder. Some of the recommendations from Uncle Sam are: Keep children from writing on your walls; do not throw paper or debris where it will plug drains; curb your dog; don't use an ice pick to hurry in defrosting the refrigerator; food should always be stored in sanitary vermin-proof manner; lighted cigarettes must not be thrown out of windows; oil your squeaking hinges; mop up spilled water; be sure you know where you want to hang the picture before driving the nail in the wall; turn water faucets off fully each time they are used; if the toilet clogs up clear it with a plunger.

I don't know how we ever managed to get along before the Office of Price Administration was created to regulate our daily lives and tell us how to behave with regard to the complexities of life. It's a good thing most people can read even though this new O. P. A. booklet is profusely illustrated for those who may have difficulty in turning off faucets a la Washington.

Concrete Ship Venture Ends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, on September 6, there was an article appeared in the Washington Times-Herald which I think ought to have the attention of Congress and I, therefore, am inserting it in the RECORD in the hope that a comprehensive investigation and report may be made by an appropriate committee:

CONCRETE SHIP VENTURE ENDS—ILL-STARRED PROJECT HAS MYSTERY WIND-UP

(By Willard Edwards)

Quietly, almost furtively, the United States Maritime Commission is folding up a $150,000,000 concrete-ship program which was initiated under mysterious circumstances and accompanied by scandal in the performance of contracts.

The figure of Harry Hopkins, No. 1 White House adviser, hovers in the background of developments concerning this ill-starred venture which became known for the first time yesterday.

CANCEL CONTRACTS

The Maritime Commission has ordered the cancelation of contracts for the building of 32 concrete vessels, leaving 33 still to be completed. The program last February called for the construction of a total of 115 ships of this type.

The program was authorized despite the demonstrated "utter inefficiency and failure" of concrete ships during and near the close of World War No. 1 and the statement of Admiral Emory S. Land, chairman of the Commission, that he had "no enthusiasm" for concrete-ship construction, that they were being built purely as "a matter of insurance for people that could build them but could not build steel ships."

REMARK SIGNIFICANT

Admiral Land's statement becomes highly significant in view of developments to be revealed in this article.

A contract with the MacEvoy Shipbuilding Corporation, of Savannah, Ga., for the construction of 23 concrete barges was revised by the Commission to 7.

The Truman committee early this year exposed the MacEvoy deal, revealing that the contract had been issued to a corporation with no assets, that the Government had spent $7,000,000 on the project without receiving even one barge, and that MacEvoy was the type of man who rented a $447 station wagon to the Government at the Savannah shipyards at the rate of $2,400 a year.

ACTION "RELUCTANT"

A contract for the building of 20 barges with McCloskey & Co., at Houston, Tex., was slashed to 4 ships. No cut was made in the 22-ship contract with Concrete Ship Constructors, of National City, Calif., which has delivered only 7 ships.

The Commission, in making these cancelations, noted that the original contracts were awarded "reluctantly" during the summer of 1941 when the east coast war faced with a severe oil shortage. Additional steel now has been made available, along with sufficient propulsion machinery, to make construction of steel tankers advisable instead of concrete barges, it added. Furthermore, the Commission's decision to convert 102 Liberty ships into tankers had "helped the general situation."

"The question of greatly increased costs over original estimates, serious delays in construction, together with engineering and material difficulties, plant facilities, etc., were fully considered by the Commission in canceling contracts," it was reported.

HOPKINS ACTIVE

The part played by Harry Hopkins in the concrete ship program may be deduced from the following set of circumstances, uncovered by an investigation.

On July 26, 1941, Hugh E. MacBeth, chairman of the Negro National Concrete Ship Construction Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., addressed a lengthy telegram to the White House, of which portions follow:

"We earnestly petition you [President Roosevelt] to give necessary orders for the immediate creation of a Nation-wide defense project for construction of hundreds of concrete ships. Unemployed, experienced colored American concrete workers are ready to rush into construction of concrete ships for national defense the very moment you give the green light.

"By this project you will take from the totalitarian enemies of democracy one of their strongest and most effective weapons of propaganda in the outer world, to wit, that this democracy does not live up to its Declaration of Independence and its Constitution as witness the treatment of racial minorities, that democracies are as racially intolerant as they are, but the democracies are not as honest as they are.

"In this respect alone your immediate creation of this defense project will take the sting of hypocrisy from our Nation's claim to true democracy. It will particularly hearten our Latin American neighbors to the south of us, millions of whom are of the some racial admixture as your native colored citizens."

REMARKABLE TELEGRAM

What happened in the White House as a result of this remarkable telegram is not known, but 15 days later, on August 11, 1941, Admiral Land notified the board of harbor commissioners at Long Beach, Calif., that a conference to consider the building of concrete ships would be held, noting, however, that "the commission is fully aware of the lack of efficiency of this type of vessel due to its great weight."

The Concrete Ship Constructors, of National City, Calif., got its contract, the only one which has not been slashed under recent

orders, despite the expressed distrust of concrete ship efficiency by Admiral Land.

On April 9, 1942, the Assistant Director of the United States Office of Education, on official stationery, wrote to Harry Hopkins:

"Probably due to your efforts, the Maritime Commission authorized the construction of 100 concrete barges of 8,000 tons deadweight capacity some months ago."

This train of events is also said to explain the somewhat irritated report of James L. Bates, Director, Technical Division of the Maritime Commission, on October 15, 1941, that—

"A surprising amount of interest has developed in this (concrete ship) program. This has shown itself in hearty cooperation from a number of strong companies, but it has also developed a somewhat embarrassing interest from regional and political sources."

The General Accounting Office, it was learned, conducted a thorough examination of the Commission's concrete-ship program and investigators recommended that funds be withheld as the ships were not suitable for conversion to the needs, requirements, and uses of the Navy as required by law.

WARREN OPPOSED

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren ruled against these recommendations, however, asserting that it would be an invasion of the administrative field.

As for the concrete barges delivered, Admiral Land is on record as to their eventual use. Questioned by the House Appropriations Committee in executive session about the program, after it had been noted that the British would not spend taxpayers' money on concrete vessels, Land asserted:

"If you have no other use in the world for these barges after the war, they are splendid portable storage tanks."

Nevada Leads the Nation in Rapid Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, of October 1, 1943, disclosing that Nevada leads the Nation in rapid growth:

NEVADA LEADS THE NATION IN RAPID GROWTH—POPULATION TOTALS 144,000, SURVEY REVEALS

Nevada's population has been increasing more rapidly than the population of any other State.

That was revealed at Carson City yesterday when Henry S. Coleman, inspector of the Nevada liquor tax department, released population estimates of civilian population compiled by the Allied Liquor Industries.

Those figures showed that Nevada now has a population of at least 144,000—an increase of more than 34,000 since the 1940 census.

While not a single State exceeded Nevada's rapid growth, placed by the figures Coleman released at 22.4 percent, the District of Columbia where the Government's huge war machine is centered did show a slightly more rapid increase, or 27.5 percent.

Neighboring Western States, while increasing in population, were far from matching the growth shown in Nevada. Arizona came the closest to equalling Nevada's record with a jump in population of 15.5 percent. California's increase was only 7.7 percent; Washington's, 7.2 percent; Utah's, 6.2 percent, and Oregon's, 4.9 percent.

Aside from the increase since 1940 when the last official census was taken, Nevada's population increased in the last year by more than 14,000, it was shown. The report indicated that in 1942 the State had a population of 130,000.

Nevada's jump in civilian population came in the face of a national trend which saw a decrease of 2.4 percent between the 1940 census and April 1 of this year.

The population estimates released by Coleman were based on registrations for war ration books in the various States, it was explained.

The increasing population estimates were further indicated by the increase in automobiles in Nevada—an increase which it was indicated would give the State its largest motor-vehicle registration in history in 1943.

The registration of automobiles in the State also went counter to the national trend, which had followed the national civilian population decrease.

During the first 8 months of this year the number of automobiles in the State was more than 1,500 greater than it was for the first 8 months of 1942.

Right of Citizenship and Protection of Minor Citizens of the United States—House Joint Resolution 61

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am very glad to include herewith an article which recently appeared in the Los Angeles Daily Journal. The article is by William L. Chitty, who collaborated with me in preparing House Joint Resolution 61. His discussion of the principles underlying that measure is, I believe, sound and worthy of the attention of Members and readers of the RECORD:

THE UNGUARDED DOOR OF DEMOCRACY

(By William L. Chitty, of the Los Angeles Bar)

There is much talk, from day to day, of "the post-war world" and of preparation for it, of changes in the old and of new things, of readjustments; and plans more or less comprehensive and elaborate are exploited, particularly in economic life.

We cannot look into the future and see, with clearness, through the vaporings over the boiling cauldron of the present, what then, in that post-war world may be the conditions in economic or social or political life, and undertake to lay down rules and regulations therefor.

We should, however, contemplate and study the past, intelligently and carefully, and, like Patrick Henry, by the light of experience learn what therein was wrong and what right, that we may "hold fast to that which is good" and "do the right as God gives us to see the right."

The subject of first importance is not economic but social and political, and particularly the democratic character and foundation of the Government as one "of, by, and for" free people, governing themselves, and, still more particularly, that large and important segment of the body politic, the minor citizenry, upon the democratic integrity of which the perpetuity of Government and of democracy depends.

This is not a pure democracy, a government operated by the people directly, but a representative democracy, a government operated by those whom the people choose to act for them for that purpose, each of the several States, and the people of each, acting as, at the same time, a separate entity and a part of a national entity, constituting a republic, and each separate entity and the national entity acting under powers and limitations specified in a Constitution adopted by the people of the several separate entities, respectively, and in a Constitution adopted by the people of all of the separate entities acting as such. This is a trite statement of our system of democratic government

Such formulation of Government is necessitated by the extent of territory and the number of people therein; which, however, does not alter the democratic character of these Governments, State and National, as based upon the principle of the common equal right of each and every member of a society of free people, and of free States to govern and to be governed by themselves under laws established by themselves in their free exercise of such right.

Such Government of ours, through social and economic activity, has developed from its original simplicity into an intensive and extensive complexity and a maze of bureaucracy in administration, largely due to a competitive and overreaching individualism in economic life, and largely due also, in the past 30 years, to the exigencies of two world wars, necessitating the concentration of governmental power which war brings, for defectiveness, in prosecution and defense.

Much alarm is expressed, in Congress and out, over this bureaucratic development, as confusing and opposing, if not threatening, the democratic character and life of our Government and of democracy, and this is no light threat.

It is not the purpose now to consider that large problem, except as this important social segment of our minor citizenry may be involved in its development and in its solution.

The fourteenth amendment declares that all persons "born * * * in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

Without considering the question when a person is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States within the meaning of this amendment, it is sufficient for the present purpose to assume that such jurisdiction exists.

It may be taken as natural law that minor citizens are wards of the people and of the people's Government, in democratically organized society, and are entitled as such wards to the care and protection of the Government during the years of their more or less irresponsible minority, and such is the people's and the Government's correlative responsibility and duty.

To this inviting land of opportunity flock thousands of the opportunityless the world over, all kinds of people, good and bad, virtuous and vicious, with all kinds of ideas and customs, alike varied, and many of which are antagonistic to, if not incompatible with, our democratic ideology.

Youth, susceptible and responsive, is open and alert to this great new thing called life, into which it has been born, and, if not prone to evil, is often attracted by it in its designedly attractive form, assumed for its own evil ends, to which evil influences youth is oftentimes more receptive than to good influ-

ences in life. And unprepared democracy is "open field" for political faginism.

The totalitarian powers, now arrayed against democracy, have shown the "wisdom of the serpent" in their care and training of their youth, for many years past, now their strength, threatening democracy's ruin if not combatted with all the strength which democracy can muster, presently and decisively.

In the absence of any law in our constitutional government designed and calculated for the full protection and care of our minor citizenry, such citizenry has grown up, subjected to all the viciousness of totalitarian influences, existing and propagated for many years past in our country, until it attained its responsible maturity of citizenship, and entered the framework and substance of the governmental structure, either as new unseasoned timber or timber infected with political termites, threatening the stability and permanency of the structure, and the demoralization and ruin of democracy.

And such totalitarian influences cannot be said not to have entered into our economic life and problems.

In our form of government, the protection and care of youth is a social responsibility and duty, particularly, of the State and a political responsibility and duty, particularly, of the National Government, to the end that a State itself and the people thereof may have adequate sanction and guaranty against evils, common to all of the States, which a State alone may not adequately control.

While, doubtless, power of legislation to deal with this evil has existed in Congress for all these years, Congress has not undertaken to exercise such power; and there is no definite authoritative declaration of our democratic citizenship, or the principle thereof, upon which to base such pertinent and adequate legislation.

There is now pending in Congress, before the House Judiciary Committee, a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 61), proposing a constitutional amendment declaring that "citizenship in the United States and the several States thereof is exclusive of that in any other nation and imports a common equal right of each and every citizen thereof, as free people, to govern themselves under laws established by themselves in their free exercise of such right."

The exclusiveness of our citizenship may be a question in the far-off post-war world, but it is not a present or imminent one. This declaration is not one of isolationism but of independence. The fraternity of nations and peoples of the earth is yet to be developed. Civilization grows by stages, as does life, and both expand by time into eternity and perfection.

Applying to our minor citizenry, the democratic principle of citizenship stated, the proposed law declares further that "no person shall inculcate, teach, or induce any minor citizen of the United States in derogation or contravention of such citizenship, or conspire thereto, or participate in any such inculcating, teaching, or inducting," saving other application of said principle and full exercise of religious liberty, and leaving to Congress enforcement of the law, under its general powers, by appropriate legislation.

Such law will not, it is believed, conflict with freedom of speech in academic or cultural instruction or in discussion for the sake of knowledge of the nature and form, merits and demerits, of different kinds of government.

Freedom of speech or action is not absolute or a license, and there is a reserved power of the state "to insure orderly living, without which the constitutional guaranties of civil liberties would be a mockery."

When speech or action, of citizen or alien, transcends a decent respect for the law of the people among whom one lives and enjoys the advantages and hospitalities of such association, and such speech or action is so directed as, or necessarily tends, to pervert or destroy the political character and virtue of a minor citizen in derogation or contravention of the sound principle of democratic citizenship stated, it is, in its nature, treasonable, and the person guilty thereof, even the minor citizen himself, of legal reason and judgment, should be subject to prosecution and punishment, as Congress may prescribe.

This minor citizen segment of the body politic is the constant, perpetual vital element thereof, renewing itself day after day, and day after day merging into the responsible citizenry of the State and Nation.

No part of such citizenry of State or Nation is more important or of more concern to either or more vital to the existence and the permanency of either or, for these reasons, more commanding of constitutional sanction and guaranty of protection and care, than this minor citizenry of the body politic.

Its fundamental character and importance in democratic government demands its inclusion in the Constitution.

As a part of the Constitution such law will have weight and force, domestically and internationally, a national pledge in the development of the minor citizenry, stabilizing the Government, as an enduring structure, in base and framework and substance, against which time or crime shall not prevail.

Subject to improvement in form, perhaps by such amendment as the committee may determine, the law is sound in substance. It is of present importance as indicating what we are fighting for and of importance to the post-war world of democracy as closing the door to totalitarian influence and activity.

Calls Republicans Anti-isolationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial appearing in the New York Times of October 9 by the Honorable William Allen White, as follows:

CALLS REPUBLICANS ANTI-ISOLATIONIST—WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE DECLARES PARTY HAS DEFINITELY DRIFTED TOWARD WORLD COLLABORATION—AIDING WILLKIE OR DEWEY—EDITOR DOUBTS ISOLATIONISTS COULD NOMINATE MACARTHUR, THINKS BRICKER IS WEAK

(By William Allen White)

EMPORIA, KANS., October 9.—Within 5 months the Republicans in State primaries and in State conventions will begin choosing delegates to the national convention where they will write a platform and choose a candidate for President. Only one thing is settled—the drift toward collaboration with the United Nations will be manifest in the Republican platform.

Naturally there will be face-saving denunciations of President Roosevelt and a chloroforming phrase stressing "constitutional methods" and "no loss of sovereignty" to appease the isolationists. But it will be a collaborationist platform. Otherwise it is fairly certain that the two candidates most likely to win at the polls, Wendell L. Willkie and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, will not run on the platform.

Governor Dewey, who has shown such signal independence in demanding an alliance with Great Britain, and Mr. Willkie, who has said that he will only take the nomination if the platform is liberal, certainly are not anxious enough to lead a forlorn hope on a straddling platform.

The Republican Party has been coming to its view on collaboration since before Pearl Harbor. The Republican National Committee nearly 2 years ago adopted a resolution pledging the party to participate after the war in maintaining and establishing peace. After that every avowed Presidential candidate, except Gov. John W. Bricker, declared strongly for collaboration.

USUAL SOOTHING SIRUP

Last month at Mackinac Island the Republican platform committee set up by Harrison E. Spangler, chairman of the National Republican Committee, made a strong commitment for collaboration with the United Nations, with the usual soothing sirup dropped by "constitutional procedure" and "without loss of sovereignty" for the isolationists. After that JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, led an overwhelming majority of the Republican Members of the House in voting for the Fulbright resolution, which is also a commitment for collaboration.

Therefore, it seems certain that the collaborationists will take the platform and the isolationists the pain-killing phrases instead of the other way around.

Under those circumstances it is easy to see why Messrs. Dewey and Willkie lead in numerical strength in the polls as Republican Presidential favorites. It was inevitable that Governor Bricker's star should begin to wane. Yet, the isolationists' strength in the Republican convention which will come from the Middle States around the Great Lakes will be a powerful, well-organized minority. Even though they have lost hope and faith in Mr. Bricker, the isolationist group is holding Senator ROBERT A. TAFT in reserve and, after Mr. TAFT, their real ace in the hole is Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

No one knows exactly what General MacArthur believes on any subject, but he would run as a military hero and, of course, would be a shouting supernationalist who would subtly and persistently poke knives into the ribs of the British and take up the fight where George Washington dropped it at Yorktown.

MAC ARTHUR MOVE DOUBTED

But unless the war is over, that line of strategy would be fatal. To get on the ticket as the isolationist white hope, General MacArthur would have to conquer and annihilate Japan and be the savior of the Philippines. At this time, it seems a rather remote possibility that within the next 9 months before June 1944, Japan and Germany both will have accepted unconditional surrender.

It seems likely, therefore, that either Mr. Willkie or Governor Dewey will win in the convention. Mr. Willkie must win in the first four ballots, if at all. His strength is in New England and the Eastern Seaboard States. His friends are working hard. They have an organization now in more than half the States. They have an office in New York from which workers are going out and campaign literature is being prepared. They are trying, and with some success apparently, to crystallize into delegates a strong popular feeling for Mr. Willkie that is manifest across the country.

By the same token, the enmity of the Republican isolationist group from Col. Robert R. McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, to Representative FISH is concentrated on Mr. Willkie. Mr. Willkie's friends say that he has with him considerably more than half the Republican National Committee. But a

minority group of politically active and competent members of the committee are against Mr. Willkie. They will try to control the southern delegates, as that group has controlled the southern delegates in most Republican conventions. It was the southern delegates who formed the nucleus of President William Howard Taft's strength in 1912, when he defeated Theodore Roosevelt in the convention.

WILLKIE INFLUENCE IN SOUTH

But here the parallel between Theodore Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie ends. Mr. Willkie, as head of the Commonwealth and Southern Public Utilities Co., has done business in the South. Mr. Willkie knows the southern Republican politicians. He is as competent as his enemies on the National Committee, and there is some reason to believe that Mr. Willkie will show up with his full share of the southern delegates. If he can control a majority of them plus a solid eastern seaboard strength, with scattering parts of delegations across the country, he will have a strong bandwagon lead in the convention.

At least that is his hope today, and the position of Governor Dewey is both a strength and a weakness to the Willkie candidacy. Mr. Dewey's position weakens Mr. Willkie because too many of his friends who are interested in Mr. Willkie's position on foreign policy hold Mr. Dewey as their second choice. In politics, when a man has a second choice, he has no real first choice, which is not so good for Mr. Willkie. But Mr. Willkie's strength lies in the fact that Mr. Dewey's declaration that he will not be a candidate makes it impossible for Mr. Dewey to go into the States looking for delegates where Mr. Willkie will have a clear field. Mr. Dewey's nomination must come after the fourth ballot as a compromise.

So the Presidential situation boils down to this in the Republican party: The isolationists cannot expect a bandwagon nomination. The drift of the times is the other way. Every public manifestation of American opinion for 2 years has been steadily anti-isolationist. The irony of the isolationists in this situation is that they are regular Republicans. They never bolt. That is their boast. They would accept Mr. Dewey grudgingly and Mr. Willkie with agony, but in the end they would swallow him rather than vote for President Roosevelt or for any other Democrat.

Nevada Is Leader in Collection of Fats and Greases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Nevada State Journal, Reno, of October 3, 1943, disclosing that Nevada leads in the collection of fats and greases:

NEVADA IS LEADER IN COLLECTION OF FATS AND GREASES

Nevada led the Nation in collection of waste fats and greases in August, Bernard Hartung, executive secretary of the State salvage committee announced today.

Data received by Hartung from W. P. B. headquarters showed Nevada collected an average of nearly one-half pound of grease for each of the occupied dwellings in the State.

Total fat and grease collections were said to be in excess of 15,000 pounds for the State.

Smaller War Plants Corporation Protests Cancelation of Pacific Coast Contracts and Gives Reasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to include with my remarks a resolution passed by the Board of Governors of the Fourteenth Regional Office of the Smaller War Plants Corporation concerning the alleged critical manpower shortage of the Pacific coast and the threatened and to some degree actual cancelation of contracts in that area.

I need not reemphasize here the points brought out by the Board of Governors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, except to say that I am in hearty agreement with every one of them. I cannot refrain from adding, however, that I have a veritable mountain of testimony from people who are employed in some of the shipyards and aircraft factories of southern California to the effect that some of these companies, particularly where they are operated on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, do not make effective use of the labor force they now have, and that there are many of their employees who are dissatisfied because they are not given more vital and continuous work to do. On the other hand, many of the smaller plants producing things no less vital to the war than ships and planes may be shut down as a result of these rulings unless some modification is made. And by and large these small plants, many of which I have personally visited, have made excellent use of such labor as they had and every man has been working right up to his capacity.

It, therefore, seems manifestly unfair to put into effect for the benefit of those who have not made efficient use of labor, a ruling which will penalize employers and workers alike in industries which have been working at top efficiency.

Furthermore, the time will come when the emphasis of this war will shift to the Pacific area. Does it make sense to cancel or fail to renew contracts on the Pacific coast, possibly put a good many small companies out of business, make necessary the provision of substitute facilities in other parts of the country, and then have to ship long distances over terribly congested rail lines many of the things that will be absolutely necessary to the fighting of that Pacific war?

Finally, those of us who represent Pacific coast districts want to do everything in our power to prevent our communities from becoming one-industry towns, the bad consequence of which in the post-war period is too obvious to require discussion.

All of this is said without the slightest intention of detracting from the great credit due to the aircraft and shipbuilding industries of the west coast for the remarkable production they have achieved. The resolution of the Board of Governors of the S. W. P. C., fourteenth region, follows:

Whereas it is said that additional labor is required for the immediate production of aircraft and ships for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the Office of War Mobilization is said to be considering drastic curtailment and cancelation of contracts in Pacific-coast factories that are now producing other materials for war and goods for essential civilian use, in an attempt to provide additional workers for aircraft factories and shipyards; and

Whereas the full operation of a regulation providing that all contracts should be placed east of the Rocky Mountains and not in the Pacific coast regions would tend to close our smaller plants, perhaps for all time, thereby destroying the basic economy of this region both as to investment of capital and as to the means of livelihood of thousands of workers;

The Board of Governors of the fourteenth region, Smaller War Plants Corporation, meeting today at Los Angeles, presents to the Office of War Mobilization, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Small Business Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, the procurements agencies of the armed services, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C., the following pertinent facts:

1. The fourteenth region, Smaller War Plants Corporation, comprising southern California, Arizona, and Clark County, Nev., is predominantly a region of small industries. Eighty-five percent of its skilled craftsmen are employed in small plants, and it is doubtful if they could be transferred to the assembly lines of wartime shipyards and aircraft factories.

2. Through the efforts of the Smaller War Plants Corporation many hundreds of small manufacturing plants in the region have been put to work on highly essential war materials at a time, during the past year, when they were faced with shut-downs and probable extinction.

3. These smaller war plants are today making a valued contribution to the war effort in the production of many critical items for the offensive action of our armed forces throughout the world.

4. Many of these smaller plants are now working on contracts for the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission and other procurement agencies, and they should, for the success of the war effort, be permitted to complete these contracts without interruption.

5. Many of these small plants, being especially well equipped by facilities and skilled manpower for the war work they are now doing, and being highly desirable to the procurement agencies, should, we believe, be permitted to obtain new or continuation contracts for the same sort of work they are now engaged in.

6. Many of these small plants are performing valuable and valiant service as subcontractors, making parts and assemblies for big prime contractors, and this contribution to the war effort should be encouraged and not interrupted.

7. Many other small plants have peculiar adaptability to the manufacture of civilian items which are necessary to the proper maintenance of morale on the part of all workers, and such small plants should be

encouraged, as a vital part of the war effort, to engage in, or continue in, the production of these essential civilian items.

Therefore, the Board of Governors of the fourteenth region, Smaller War Plants Corporation, representing both large and small business in southern California and Arizona, believing that the small plants of this region should be permitted to continue in those lines of business at which they are most proficiently contributing to the war effort, both for the present and for the post-war period when soldiers will be returning to civilian employment in small industries, and

Believing that not only the future of this region but also its immediate present will be seriously threatened by any drastic abolition of its varied industry and the attempted herding of all workers into the two wartime industries of aircraft manufacture and shipbuilding and further

Believing that all reasonable means of exhausting the local labor market should be thoroughly explored before the present operation of the smaller plants is in any way interfered with:

Resolved, That the Office of War Mobilization, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Small Business Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, the Procurement Agencies of the Armed Forces, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C. be earnestly requested to give due consideration to the war necessity of continuing these small plants in their present lines of production, rather than permit them to be closed in the unproved and uncertain belief that their workers, skilled in other lines, can be shifted to employment in the shipyards and aircraft factories; and

Resolved, That the Smaller War Plants Corporation, both nationally and in each of the affected Pacific-coast regions, be represented by adequate membership on the Committee on Urgency and the Committee on Manpower to defend the interests of the smaller manufacturers in the alleged manpower crisis; and

Resolved, That these facts and resolutions be spread upon its minutes and presented forthwith for the consideration of the Office of War Mobilization, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Small Business Committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C., before any further action is taken.

Plan for the New World Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following plan for world order:

No supergovernment and the retention of complete sovereignty of every nation;

Establish a world court to be composed of proportionate representatives of the several nations, with an international world commission with power to settle international grievances and prevent aggression and invasion of any nation, implemented with an international army and navy, each country to have proportionate representation on the commission and supply a relative quota of the policing force;

The nationals of any country not to be permitted to serve in the country from which they came;

The commission to maintain freedom of the air and seas with universal disarmament;

No nation to be permitted to maintain a navy or armed force above its domestic policing requirements; and

All international disputes to be settled by the commission under the rules of judicial procedure with right of appeal to the world court, whose decision shall be final and enforced by the international commission.

B'nai B'rith Marks Century of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "B'nai B'rith Marks Century of Service," which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 10, 1943:

B'NAI B'RITH MARKS CENTURY OF SERVICE—BORN IN AN ERA OF NATIONAL CRISIS, IT WAS PREPARED FOR THIS ONE

It was 1843, the sixty-seventh year of American independence. John Tyler was in the White House, shaping the destiny of the Union grown to 26 States and 19,000,000 people, including some 50,000 Jews, descendants of those who had helped build the Nation.

A mild boom was under way in the wake of the panic of 1837 as the growing country spread westward in the lee of the first great wave of European immigrants that brought the record total of 104,000 newcomers to these shores in 1843.

These immigrants were deeply moved by the excitement over the dedication of Bunker Hill Monument and the opening of the first telegraph line, linking Washington and Baltimore, both of which occurred in 1843.

Public mourning in 1843 over the death of Francis Scott Key and Noah Webster introduced these newcomers to great names in the American tradition.

Everywhere the immigrants heard talk of the proposed annexation of Texas, which in 2 years was to lead to war with Mexico, and saw signs of the irrepressible conflict over slavery that was to end in the War between the States 18 years later.

B'NAI B'RITH IS FOUNDED

In that atmosphere of patriotic fervor, growth, progress, and imminent crisis, 12 young newcomers to America, inspired by the vision of American democracy, met in a gas-lit coffee shop in New York City on October 13, 1843, and made a covenant with the land in which they had found a sanctuary from the tyrannies of the Old World.

These men were the founders of B'nai B'rith (Hebrew for Sons of the Covenant), oldest and largest national Jewish service organization in the United States.

October 13 B'nai B'rith marks its one-hundredth year, proud that the pledge of its founding fathers, binding themselves and their heirs to serve the best interest of America, humanity, and the Jewish people, has been faithfully redeemed by every generation of B'nai B'rith, which, in the words of President Roosevelt, "effectively served the well-being * * * of the Nation" with a program that "fortifies the effort to keep America safe for democracy."

ITS WAR SERVICE

Appearing on the American scene 2 years before the War with Mexico in 1845, B'nai B'rith, during the dark days of the War between the States, acquired a reputation for war service that has been sustained uninterruptedly through the Spanish-American War, World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

When B'nai B'rith swung into speedy action for war service a few hours after Pearl Harbor, it did so with a smooth efficiency born not only out of more than a year of activity in national defense but out of a century of experience in mobilizing its manpower and resources in every national emergency.

In the months since Pearl Harbor B'nai B'rith has converted into deeds of service the pledge of its president, Henry Monsky, of Omaha, Nebr., made to President Roosevelt on December 8, 1941, that B'nai B'rith would "spare neither toil, blood, nor treasure" in prosecuting the war to victory.

The record proves how well that pledge has been kept. More than 17,500 members of B'nai B'rith and its youth affiliates are in the armed forces, 101 have died in service or are missing in action, 17 are prisoners of war, and 67 have been decorated for bravery.

RECREATIONAL WORK

Over 38,000 B'nai B'rith members have given blood to the Red Cross; nearly 50,000 are actively engaged in civilian-defense services; B'nai B'rith groups have sold $150,000,000 worth of war bonds; 18,000 B'nai B'rith women and girls are working in Red Cross production units and have turned out 3,750,000 surgical dressings and knitted and sewn garments.

More than 550 recreational facilities have been equipped by B'nai B'rith for the armed forces; 47 ships of the Navy are being provided with recreational equipment; over 1,000,000 servicemen have been guests at B'nai B'rith functions; hundreds of thousands of gift packages and 5,000,000 packages of cigarettes have been sent abroad to fighting men; 39 pieces of mobile equipment have been contributed to the Red Cross, and more than $700,000 has been given to the Red Cross and other war-relief agencies.

These figures represent but a few of the ways in which B'nai B'rith has been fighting for democracy.

By keeping pace with the kaleidoscopic social, cultural, and political changes in the century between 1843 and 1943, B'nai B'rith has grown to a family of 175,000 men, women, and young people, organized in 1,500 groups in every city and virtually every town of any size in the United States and Canada.

FIVE MILLION DOLLARS FOR RELIEF

Representing a cross-section of American Jewry, B'nai B'rith has played a decisive role in the history of the American Jewish community and has contributed much to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Its hospitals, orphanages, old folks' homes, and community welfare services, on which B'nai B'rith has spent some $20,000,000 in the past century, bless humanity in every corner of the land.

Its projects in support of education, Americanism, and youth welfare, for which it has given another $10,000,000, have made it an integral part of the fabric of every community where a B'nai B'rith unit functions.

Long allied with the Red Cross (one of whose founders was a B'nai B'rith leader)

and antedating it in extending help to oppressed and stricken peoples regardless of race or creed, B'nai B'rith has contributed more than $5,000,000 for the relief of distressed humanity in every corner of the globe.

In furthering the cultural advancement of the Jewish people, B'nai B'rith has established a network of 124 Hillel foundations and counselorships to care for the spiritual and welfare needs of Jewish college students on the American campus and to provide similar services for Jewish student Army and Navy trainees; created the Aleph Zadik Aleph, the B'nai B'rith youth organization, with its program of community service, patriotism, and educational activities for youth between 14 and 21; conceived a far-reaching vocational service program for youth and adults, and contributed largely to the growth of libraries and educational institutions.

NO FORMAL CELEBRATION

Through its Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith has fought not only against prejudice, intolerance, and mistaken ideas about the Jewish people but has made a major contribution to American unity by exposing alien-minded forces of hate and stimulating efforts toward interfaith amity and brotherhood.

The famous statue to religious liberty, which stands in Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, a stone's throw from Independence Hall, was the gift of B'nai B'rith to the people of the United States in 1876 on the centennial of American independence.

B'nai B'rith had looked forward to a Nation-wide celebration in observance of its one-hundredth anniversary. But instead of any formal or public celebration of its centennial, B'nai B'rith is commemorating this landmark in its history by a reaffirmation of the ideals which it has practiced and preached for 10 decades and by an even greater mobilization of its strength and resources to help bring closer the inevitable day of victory.

Contributing mightily to the preservation of what all Americans cherish as their way of life, B'nai B'rith enters its second century of service rededicated to the welfare of the Nation and the Jewish people, which it has served since 1843.

Activities of the A. A. A. Committee in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL K. HOCH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter from the Agricultural Adjustment Agency of Pennsylvania, and an editorial from the Potter County Journal.

Some time ago I was led to believe from the remarks of one of my colleagues that the potato crop in Potter County, Pa., would be negligible because of failure of the Federal Agricultural Administration to furnish machinery to the farmers in that county.

Now that the potato crop has been harvested, I made inquiry of the A. A. A. committee in Pennsylvania, and received the following reply:

HARRISBURG, PA., *October 6, 1943.*

DANIEL K. HOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am happy indeed to have a Member of the Congress make inquiry of the program operations of the A. A. A. Committee in Pennsylvania. These programs were authorized and financed by Congress, and it is not only wise but entirely appropriate that Congressmen make inquiry from time to time to determine if and how the will of Congress is being administered and interpreted.

It is true that the Potter County potato program was given every material aid, not by, but through, the instrumentalities of our office and the various related offices and agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture. In fact, the Potter County potato program is an outstanding example of perfect coordination by the many agencies created and financed by the Congress.

It is also true that the A. A. A. Committee of Pennsylvania carried the food goals message of the Secretary of Agriculture to the farmers in Pennsylvania to enlist their best efforts toward reaching unprecedented goals for 1943. The A. A. A. committeemen of Potter County heard that appeal from a member of our State committee at a conference in Lock Haven early last spring and they decided to organize the farmers of their county to reach or even overshoot the goals set up for them.

The members of the A. A. A. Committee of Potter County enlisted every agency and activity within their jurisdiction to accomplish their purpose. The county agent has been a live wire in agricultural promotion for many years. They called on him to set up production districts and surround service centers with efficient producers so that the minimum amount of critical material would be needed for maximum production. They called community committeemen together to develop community groups for potato production and then they used the Production Credit Association of Potter County and the Farm Security Administration personnel to develop a program of finance for the orderly and equitable retirement of debt loads for individuals and communities.

A member of the board of directors of the Pennsylvania Cooperative Potato Growers Association took on their responsibility of locating machinery available and partly assembled for a group of cooperative spray rings and the farmer fieldman for the State A. A. A. committee carried the application for priorities to the U. S. D. A. War Board of Pennsylvania for approval before having it submitted to the War Production Board for final action. All of these things were done in February.

This remarkable program was immediately approved by the Pennsylvania War Board. It called for 13 large-sized rubber-tired tractors. Rubber tires were required because these tractors had to cover many miles in moving from farm to farm as a community farm implement. Thirteen double-tank, 10-row sprayers to be mounted on tractors to provide a short-wheel-base unit adapted to Potter County hillsides. Ten thousand bushels of certified seed potatoes to replace native seed potatoes blighted and diseased by unfavorable crop conditions in 1942 in Potter County. One hundred and two thousand dollars in Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans to provide machinery, seed, fertilizer, and labor for the 1943 crop.

The military demands of the Nation early this year cut into the steel supply normally used for the manufacture of agricultural implements. The failure of the British to stop the Rommel advance in Africa was redeemed only by the arrival of the General Grant tanks from the United States. The urgent demands for General Grants as a military necessity called for the maximum of sacrifice by American farmers to forego the purchase of a new tractor so that another tank should be provided to win the ultimate victory of Tunisia. The War Production Board had to study every application for machinery with utmost care so that every agricultural unit might be used in the most efficient and far-reaching manner to get maximum results in food production.

An application is not a very convincing document. Answers to a questionnaire carry no particular character or personality. The Potter County farmers are not questionnaire farmers. They put heart and soul into the things they do. Consequently when I visited Coudersport early in March these ingenious go-getters were fretting for action. They wanted those tractors so that they could use the balance of their long winter to equip them in their heated garages and farm shops. They wanted to know how they might persuade the War Production Board that they had the formula for the greatest combined use for machinery to get the maximum of results. In other words, they wanted to go to Washington to prove that they had the answer to the thing Washington wanted next to military victory—food.

On the following day these rugged mountaineers carried me to Washington. A delegation consisting of A. A. A. Chairman Roselle Leete, County Agent Bert Straw, Potato Farmer Ed Fisher, and A. A. A. Farmer Fieldman Lloyd Olewine completed the delegation. We got to Washington on Saturday morning, March 13, and arranged to see ex-Gov. M. Clifford Townsend, of Indiana, then Deputy Food Administrator.

Governor Townsend is a good student of human nature. He was slightly startled when the delegation was announced as a group ready to deliver a million bushels of potatoes. In answer to every question, the farmers had a direct and plausible answer. They showed that they were organized, knew what they wanted, and knew how to get it. They further showed that they know how to do the job they set out to do. Governor Townsend believed in those farmers. He faced the responsibility of being accused of discriminating against farmers elsewhere when he allocated 13 rubber-tired tractors to one small county in Pennsylvania because rubber was a very vital and precious article in March 1943 with steel and assembled machinery as vital and precious to machinery hungry farmers. But these farmers were not dreamers, they were not faddists, and they were not rich men who evaded the draft nor possessed with sudden zeal to accomplish wonders in a field of uncharted experience. They were dirt farmers with a realistic understanding and they got the equipment.

Today, as you infer in your letter of inquiry, these Potter County farmers have completely vindicated the faith of Governor Townsend. They have come through as is indicated in the attached editorial from the Potter County Journal. The 13 tractors were assigned to 13 cooperative operators whose duty it was to circulate from farm to farm and spray and in some cases cultivate between 150 and 200 acres of potatoes. These 13 "spray rings" made it possible to put 2,000 new acres of Potter County land into production of potatoes and every acre was sprayed every seventh or eighth day during the growing season.

The remarkable thing about this potato crop is the growth and culture of them in the short growing season. The tractors arrived April 22 on the day of the last snowfall on the Alleghenies but potatoes were not planted until June 10. The first killing frost on these mountainsides was September 10 so it must be understood that this crop was produced in 3 months of summer weather.

Last year's crop of potatoes in Potter County was under 400,000 bushels. The season was unfavorable and their equipment was below standard. This year's crop will exceed

2,000,000 bushels because of favorable growing weather, a will to do things and the tools of victory. Congress should feel congratulated that the tools they authorized were effectively allocated and used in our food-for-freedom campaign. I am proud to report to you the accomplishments of those who worked with the A. A. A. committee in achieving this goal.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. SMITH,
Secretary, State A. A. A. Committee.

MILLION BUSHELS OF POTATOES HARVESTED IN POTTER COUNTY BY END OF WEEK—BIGGER YIELD PER ACRE THAN ESTIMATED EARLIER—IDEAL WEATHER CONDITIONS UP TO PRESENT TIME—LABOR EQUALS DEMAND AND PROVES SATISFACTORY—SOME SHIPMENTS ARE MADE AT $1.05 FOR RUN OF FIELD

The potato harvest is in full swing in Potter County.

Given good weather the remainder of the week and 1,000,000 bushels will have been dug, picked up, and placed in storage. This is estimated to be half of the acreage.

Earlier estimates placed the season's crop at 1,600,000 bushels, but as the harvest has progressed the estimate is boosted to 2,000,000 bushels.

The yield per acre is greater all through the county than experts guessed a few weeks ago, and this is cheering news.

With imported help, boys and girls from various schools, and many non-potato-growing farmers assisting in gathering the crop, the labor situation is sufficient, with everybody busy and everybody happy.

Outside help in the potato harvest has proved very satisfactory as a whole. Occasionally a worthless worker was found, but that is to be expected. The ruling price paid is 8 cents per bushel, and that surely means splendid wages for the man, woman, boy or girl who really digs in and picks up the tubers.

Some potatoes are being sold, run-of-the-field, at $1.05 per bushel, but the big bulk of the yield is going into storehouses, to be properly graded and packaged later for the market.

New storehouses are going up at several points. One being erected at Gold is being built by 10 growers each with certain compartments for their individual use.

The season of planting this year was very late and the outlook to produce a record crop was a gloomy one. Thirteen heavy new tractors were released for planting, cultivating, spraying, and harvesting. To this force were added nine tractors not new. Nearly all of the operators have proven themselves efficient and willing workers, and blight has been controlled almost 100 percent.

The rainfall was copious and well spaced and there were no storms of deluge proportions. Old Man Gloom has been banished and there is joy in the potato fields, a joy reflected to all Potter Countians.

Southwest Washington Is Fighting Hard With Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to the bond buying performance of my congressional district, the nine counties of southwest Washington, during the recent third War loan drive. The Third Washington District purchased a remarkable total of war bonds and again demonstrated that, individually and collectively, its people are fighting mad and fighting hard to win this war.

As an example of what I mean, I want to tell you about what I believe is the bond-buyingest logging crew in the whole country. The October 2 issue of the Aberdeen (Wash.) Daily World carries a front-page picture of 6 husky, grinning loggers standing beside their trucks, which are loaded with huge spruce logs that will be converted into plywood fighting planes for the United Nations. The trucks have paused on a hand-made log bridge across the upper Queets River in the wilds of the great Olympic Peninsula. The picture shows Mr. Joe Zderich, a logging rigger, receiving a check for $6,400 from Mr. Werner Mayr. Others in the picture are W. M. Carlyle, Harry Blinkman, Roy Talley, and Harry Fry, all loggers or log truck drivers among the 30 men employed in this operation by Mayr Brothers, of Grays Harbor.

All told these 30 men earn about $8,000 each month. Please note that figure. During the bond drive they bought a total of $6,400 worth of War bonds, or 80 percent of their aggregate income for the month. I challenge anyone to cite a finer example of home-front patriotism than these loggers have shown. But they are not alone in their efforts. The front page of this same paper carries another story that the Schafer mill crew in Aberdeen signed up 100 percent to purchase 1 or more War bonds during the drive. I could cite scores of other instances in my district where all groups of people—loggers and mill workers, farmers, businessmen, clerks, truck drivers, aluminum plant workers, and virtually every other employment type—put their hearts and their dollars into making Uncle Sam's third War loan drive a smashing success. Believe me I am proud of the way the people of southwest Washington came through. And I know that they will not stop buying bonds merely because the formal drive is over. You will find southwest Washington in there fighting every minute of every day until the Axis is whipped to a frazzle.

Crop Insurance, Basic and War Crops—H. R. 3364

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 3364 to amend the present Federal Crop Insurance Act, so as to broaden and extend its provisions. I am firmly of the opinion that the present program should not only be revived, but should be made to benefit a much larger proportion of our American farmers. The benefits under the present program have been limited to the growers of wheat and cotton and a majority of these have failed to avail themselves of the protection afforded because of the high rates involved. The amendments which I am suggesting in the proposed legislation would bring about the desired result because 12 crops instead of 2 would be included, and the premium rates on the basic crops would be reduced 50 percent, while no premiums would be collected on war crops.

In these amendments provision is made for insurance of field corn and tobacco as well as wheat and cotton, which are now provided for. These four crops would be called basic crops. In addition, provision would be made for the insurance of Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, peanuts, soybeans, dry beans, dry peas, flax, and hemp as war crops. With insurance on these 12 crops, insurance would be available to a very large proportion of the farmers in the country. The experience gained on wheat and cotton insurance would in large measure be applicable to these other crops.

The amendments I have proposed would use the experience gained in crop insurance during the past 5 years to increase agricultural production to meet wartime needs. Crop insurance should be tied in with the other war food programs of the Department of Agriculture. For the farmer's cooperation in these war programs, he would be given free insurance on war crops and a credit of 50 percent toward payment of his insurance premiums on basic crops. Producers of war crops are entitled to this protection free. I am not asking for a guaranty of profits such as is given to war contractors, those engaged in producing implements of war, manufactured products for the Army and Navy and for lend-lease. For instance, those operating under war contracts are guaranteed full prices paid for raw materials, high wages, including waste, millions for advertising, and in a great many instances expenses for entertainment, with a profit. I am only asking that the farmer producing war crops, which are just as necessary in winning this war as an army and implements of war, be guaranteed on his actual investment. Basic crops are also needed. They are essential. Many farmers have not been able to afford crop-insurance protection on wheat and cotton because of high premiums. If the Government carries half of the premium cost, nearly every farmer should be able to afford insurance protection.

Because of the need of expanding acreage and production during the war period, insurance of investment in the crop has been suggested in these amendments. It is believed that the acreage planted would be increased if the farmer were guaranteed his investment in the crop. Under the present insurance the grower is guaranteed 50 or 75 percent of the average yield of wheat or cotton for his farm. Under the proposed amendment he would be paid 75 percent of any loss on his investment as reflected by the cost of producing the crop. It is believed

that the insured should carry part of the loss in order to provide an incentive for him to produce a crop whether that be a basic crop or a war crop rather than to collect an indemnity.

With the expanded program the authorized capital would be increased from $100,000,000 to $300,000,000. Authorization would be made for appropriations to cover indemnities on war crops and for half of the premiums on basic crops. However, I believe that the Government would be justified in making this increased expenditure of money in view of the benefits to be realized, especially as they relate to obtaining an expanded acreage and the desired production of food and other products of the farm, so essential to the winning of the war. I have offered this proposed legislation with that thought in mind in the hope that its adoption and enactment into law would be helpful in the present emergency.

I regret exceedingly that the Congress saw fit to cancel the insurance program after 1943, regardless of any losses in connection with the operations of the insurance program up to this date. As a matter of fact, prior to the insurance program, Congress, in the way of relief because of destruction of various crops in various sections of the country, expended considerably more relief money than the losses under the operations of the insurance program. This insurance program should be extended over a period of years, with the hope that out of the experience of the operations of the program, we may be able, and I am sure that we will be able, to work out a successful program whereby the various basic crops will be fully covered by insurance. By so doing, I am sure that the premium rate would be so small that all farmers would be glad to operate under such a program and it could be carried on without any losses to the Government.

America's Conscience Sounds a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith a broadcast delivered by Norman Thomas, last night. Mr. Thomas has frequently been referred to as the conscience of America. By inserting this talk, No Peace by Alliances, in the RECORD I do not necessarily imply that I agree with all of the points made by Norman Thomas, but I do feel that his arguments contain real food for thought and that they should either be answered or considered by those engaged in global planning for the world of tomorrow. It follows:

There is now on exhibit in New York City at 457 Madison Avenue, a brilliant and terrible description of the war in pictures. It is the work of that artist with the camera, Therese Bonney. There is in the exhibit no picture of a gun or marching army. The war it celebrates is seen through the sufferings of mothers and children in Spain, in France, in Finland, everywhere in Europe. This, it says, is the glory of war—heartbroken mothers and starving children.

In World War No. 1 a world's generosity, through the Hoover committee and later the International Red Cross, saved 10,000,000 lives. There has been no equivalent work of mercy in this war. We face the building of the new Europe with those who must build it broken by hunger and hate.

It is idle to say, "but think of what we soon will do in that new world we're building!" In the first place, if the war in Europe continues as long as our leaders are now warning us that we must expect, and if the English and American Governments, led by Mr. Churchill, still refuse to let the governments in exile do with their own funds for their children what by agreement with the Germans they have inadequately permitted to the Greeks, hundreds of thousands of children and refugees will not live to greet the dawn of a bright tomorrow. In the second place, our callousness to the suffering of the children is just one evidence that gradually we are ceasing to dream of any brave new world, but are getting ready to content ourselves with the kind of victory which makes new war inevitable.

Of this the greatest proof is the sudden outbreak in high quarters of talk, not of some cooperation of free peoples, but of power politics alliances between the United States and Great Britain, or of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia. Men and women who preached intervention to us before Pearl Harbor as the one way which would bring us not only victory but the end of militarism and war, now seem willing to settle for one more try at the age-old scheme of alliances which has always nurtured war.

The great enthusiasm of the preachers of alliances is for some kind of degree of Anglo-American unity. Forrest Davis, writing in the Saturday Evening Post under the title "The British Get Out of the Doghouse," clearly indicates that the growing support of this sort of alliance is directed to the post-war restraint of the Soviet Union. What Mr. Davis says is important not merely because of the circulation of the magazine for which he writes, but because, on one or two previous occasions, he has been presumed to speak semiofficially for the administration. Most of the preachers of alliances, however, with more or less emphasis, favor the inclusion of Russia. Some would add China, now or a little later. Most of them follow Walter Lippmann, at least nominally, in hoping that the alliance, in some way that they cannot describe, will ultimately become the nucleus of a world order. This, for instance, seems to be the idea of one of Henry Luce's mouthpieces, John K. Jessup, who, using the magazine Life for his pulpit, went just a little further than Mr. Lippmann in suggesting very indefinitely some more inclusive cooperative arrangements to supplement an alliance of the Big Four.

When Winston Churchill talks about alliances he knows exactly what he means. He means that he wants the United States permanently to underwrite the British Empire and the rule of London over many times as many people in that Empire as there are English speaking peoples in the whole world. He means to take America in as partners—a very junior partner—because otherwise England cannot hold what he calls her own. (I doubt if she can do it for many decades with our help.) Mr. Churchill also hopes to get at least the acquiescence of Russia in guaranteeing the British Empire. Other peoples less versed than he in the history of power politics and less skilled in its practice may honestly believe that alliances can be the beginning of a larger world cooperation. Actually they can only be a substitute for it. Their life's span will not be long, but they will not die before they have brought forth new war.

I say this confidently because this is one lesson overwhelmingly taught by history and sound logic. I challenge any believer in post-war alliances, particularly in the Anglo-American alliance, to show me one example in history, from the times of the shifting alliances of the Greek city-states against one another, clear down to our own day, of any alliance which fostered a just and lasting peace. The glory that was Greece perished in the wars these alliances bred and her orators were as eloquent in rationalizing them as any of our modern statesmen to whom the radio has given the world for an audience.

Two facts stand out in all the history of alliances. They are impermanent and shifting, they are designed not for peace but war. To give examples from within the memory of living men, Japan and Italy were our allies in the First World War. The Anglo-Japanese alliance lasted down to the Washington Disarmament Conference. France and Britain, close allies in the First World War, worked at such cross purposes between two wars as to encourage the rise of Hitler to military power. Stalin was the quasi-ally of Hitler until the latter attacked him, and Italy was Hitler's ally until popular Italian opposition to the war and the signs of impending German defeat made those completely unprincipled Italian rulers, the King and Marshal Badoglio change sides.

Walter Lippmann argues that the Monroe Doctrine was tacitly an Anglo-American alliance and as such long and successfully dominated our foreign policy. He either ignores or mistakes the facts which were that Great Britain herself far oftener than the rest of Europe put together broke or threatened to break the Monroe Doctrine by territorial demands on Guatemala, Argentina, and Venezuela, by her support, for a time, of Maximilian's venture in Mexico, and her very considerable aid to the secessionist movement during our Civil War. Insofar as the Monroe Doctrine did work out as an Anglo-American alliance, it was for Great Britain as a line of defense for Canada and a bulwark against the expansion of her European rivals.

It was, like all alliances, directed against some actual or potential enemy.

That is why alliances can never work positively for peace. They are based, often very cynically, on a temporary common interest, usually a common hatred, which in a mutable world is subject to change almost without notice. Even in the midst of this war it is notorious that there are sharp differences of opinion and interest among the major allies. If I refer to those differences it is not because I think they cannot be dealt with and certainly not because I attribute perfection to my own country. But the facts must be faced. Britain wants at all costs to her allies to keep and perhaps increase her empire. Stalin has a sounder and more realistic approach to the German problem than Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt, but thus far he is opposed not only to a United States of Europe but to any strong regional federation of his neighbors such as most Americans favor. Russia also has many latent or not so latent territorial quarrels with Poland and Finland in Europe and China in Asia. It is not likely, moreover, that Stalin has ever forgiven Chiang Kai-shek for his defection from Russian overlordship and his slaughter of Chinese Communists.

Out of this situation, especially after the removal of the German and Japanese menace, there will scarcely grow any enduring alliance, much less a nuclear alliance which will automatically develop into a world order.

What alliances there will be will be of the power politics variety between allies who will protect each other's imperial interests as far as possible at the expense of outsiders, and, failing that, by maneuvering against each other for power and advantage. If America plays this game, she will be the goat because we Americans have nothing to gain except fool's gold by our own imperialism let alone by underwriting British dominion over India, Malaya, Burma, Hong Kong, and most of Africa, or Stalin's new boundaries at the expense of Finland and China. Our prosperity lies in the development of our own economy here at home and a normal, peaceful trade with our neighbors. Our best service to the world lies in the development of our own democracy as proof that democracy will work. And that's an impossible task if we are to play the ugly game of international power politics with our money and resources, and most of all with our conscript sons as pawns for ambitious rulers.

Probably, if we play that game at all, we shall tend to approximate Clarence Budington Kelland's appalling scheme for a series of alliances as additional protection to an America which will make the Pacific Ocean its lake, acquire Dakar and Casablanca in Africa, and set up a five-ocean navy and other armaments that would probably cost us $25,000,000,000 a year. Our allies would not allow us to make the Pacific our lake. Having annexed Dakar to protect America, we should then have to annex Africa to protect Dakar. Mr. Kelland's scheme would involve such armaments that we should crush ourselves much as the ancient dinosaurs sacrificed brains to toughness of hide and skull. Yet this preposterous plan has been praised as marking the conversion of a former isolationist.

But some of you will say, that in this judgment of an Anglo-American or other alliance, I am overlooking the solemn protestations of our leaders concerning their faith in the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter for the whole world. Well, other alliances have had equally noble—and equally sincere—professions. Listen to these words from the articles of an older alliance: "The precepts of justice, Christian charity and peace * * * must have an immediate influence on the councils of princes, and guide all their steps." That the monarchs who signed the document would accordingly "remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity," and "on all occasions and in all places lend each other aid and assistance" while "regarding themselves toward their subjects and armies as fathers of families" and as "members of one and the same Christian nation."

Perhaps you have already guessed or remembered that I am quoting from the articles of the famous Holy Alliance of 1816 between the Czar of Russia, the King of Prussia, and the Emperor of Austria. This alliance also was nuclear. It was signed in the end by every European sovereign except the Pope, the Sultan of Turkey, and the Prince Regent of Great Britain. As a diplomatic alliance it never really became effective, but it had moral force as an agency of tyranny and oppression against rising liberal movements for almost a half century. No words chosen by Messrs. Churchill, Stalin, and Roosevelt will be more effective than the eloquence of the monarchs in removing the curse from the principles of alliances.

One thing and one thing only would have made Winston Churchill's strong hint of alliance in his Harvard speech acceptable. That would have been a solemn guaranty, first, of true freedom to all colonial peoples with the setting up of machinery to give effect to the promise; and, second, a pledge that to the benefits of this Anglo-American alliance every people would be admitted who would accept the economic and political conditions necessary for lasting peace. No such guaranties were in Mr. Churchill's speech or his mind.

I do not minimize the difficulties of working out a world confederation, not based on vengeance or imperialism, which will avoid the dangers of a police force alliance on one hand, and a highly centralized world state on the other. But such a confederation offers fewer difficulties and infinitely more advantages than any scheme of alliances. If the basic principle of cooperation for peace with all peoples can be adopted, a way can be found. That way will never be the way of power politics alliances which will be a literal sentence of death to our children and their children unto the third and fourth generations.

The test of peace will be the emergence of enough cooperation between nations to permit them to abolish universal military conscription and heavy aggressive armaments, and, in harmony, turn what have been instruments of death to the enrichment of life by the universal destruction of poverty. For this, America should work. And if her efforts should fail, she should at the very least refuse to underwrite any imperial deal while she develops her own democracy in friendship toward all races and peoples.

Ten Points of Political Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I invite your attention to an important but little known speech made by Hon. William Jennings Bryan, the Great Commoner, to the new voters in Baltimore, Md., on April 24, 1915.

The political wars in which he had led partisan armies had long been finished. The heat of the many battles had been cooled by the passing winters, and he viewed the issues with a poise and objectivity achieved only in the test tubes of the laboratory of memory. So we have here the distillation of his political philosophy on the subject under discussion. And who is better qualified to have or to enunciate such political philosophy? It was born of his great heart and mind, tested in the fires of long adverse experience, and tempered by the perspective attained with years.

If ever a man had reason to doubt the wisdom of the voters, that man was the speaker. Few have ever had so much cause to question the expressed will of the majority: none other, three times, when the issue was the Presidency of the United States. Yet he stresses the necessity of "absolute acquiescence in the decision of the majority" and declares "The man who raises his hand against the carrying out of the will of the majority is a traitor of the institution of free government."

So, not only because of intrinsic wisdom, beauty and clarity of expression, and timelessness of the subject, but also because of the brain, the character, the experience, and the example of him who made the utterance, do we well to "read, mark, and inwardly digest" the philosophy set forth in the speech from which I quote:

We need, in a country like ours, to have brought home to the citizens the fact, the important and impressive fact, that citizenship carries obligations as well as privileges. And at no time can the lessons needed be stated with more propriety than when one speaks to those upon the very threshold of a citizen's career.

I would describe political success as the conjunction of preparedness and opportunity. The preparedness is wholly in the hands of the citizen; the opportunity is a thing about which many have to be consulted. But in the smaller areas the question of politics does not have full control. As we come to the questions nearer home we are less and less disposed to be governed by a man's position on national questions.

A century and a third ago certain truths were presented which were self-evident. They were not always accepted then, even when proof was given. They can be repeated today with even greater confidence. Popular government is making its majestic march around the world. Some of you here may think that the nations of the world are not moving toward that ideal. If there are any of you who think that there is an interruption now I would say to you that the march of humanity is not an uninterrupted march. We do not march off so many miles a day. There may be times when we may seem to be marching backward.

We are told that a monarchial government is the strongest; that an aristocracy is the wisest, and that a democracy is the most just. If this were true, I would still prefer the democracy, for what is wiser or stronger than justice? The democracy is the strongest because it dares, discarding the instruments of terror, to build its citadel in the hearts of men.

Popular government is growing. Take your stand on the side of it, young man. If necessary, wait. Tomorrow is yours.

Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority is, as Jefferson declares, the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle an immediate parent of despotism. New voters, let me urge upon you to remember this vital principle of republics—acquiescence in the will of the majority. The man who raises his hand against the carrying out of the will of the majority is a traitor of the institution of free government. And the man who engages in conspiracies to prevent the free exercise of the people's will is a near relative to the man who resists the will of the people when it is expressed.

There is no doctrine of a political character that needs more to be emphasized in a country like ours than respect for the will of the majority. Does it mean that the majority is always right? I could not admit that. For right does not vacillate as majorities sometimes do. I could not admit that the majority is always right without admitting that that which is right today may be wrong tomorrow.

No; I do not say that the majority is always right. I do not say that the majority will make no mistakes. But the theory of free government is that the majority have a right to make mistakes and that no few have a God-given right to make mistakes for the rest of the people. You cannot escape mistakes by departing from the theory of popular government. In monarchies, unlimited monarchies, the king makes mistakes for the rest of the people, and history shows that kings have lived fully up to their opportunities. In aristocracies the few make mistakes for the rest of the people, and sometimes the few find it so profitable to make mistakes for the rest of the people that it is

difficult to get them to correct the mistakes they have made. But the people will never intentionally make a mistake, for it never pays the people to make a mistake, and when they find they have made one, they correct it as soon as possible.

The Baltimore Sun, in its article that appeared the next day, says of the speech:

He condemned the idea that politics is contaminating, condemned those who advise young men to avoid politics, and condemned those who, holding to the right, hesitate to battle for it.

In this article Mr. Bryan is quoted as having said:

You say that you will not go into a caucus and fight for the right because you will be voted down. I say to you that you lack faith. If you have the faith you should have, you would dare to put to the test the power of one honest man among dishonest men.

In the course of his address Mr. Bryan gave these 10 points of political principle:

1. The social ideal toward which the world is moving requires that human institutions shall approximate toward the divine measure of rewards, and this can only be realized when each individual is able to draw from society a reward proportionate to his contribution to society.

2. The form of government which gives the best assurance of attaining to this ideal is the form in which the people rule—a government deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

3. The chief duty of governments, insofar as they are coercive, is to restrain those who would interfere with the inalienable rights of the individual, among which are the right to life, the right to liberty, the right to the pursuit of happiness and the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's conscience.

4. Insofar as governments are cooperative, they approach perfection in proportion as they adjust with justice the joint burdens which it is necessary to impose and distribute with equity the incidental benefits which come from the disbursement of the money raised by taxation.

5. Absolute acquiescence in the decision of the majority is, as Jefferson declares, "The vital principle of republics, from which is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism."

6. As acquiescence in the existence of a wrong is not to be expected among an intelligent people entrusted with participation in government, it is the duty of every citizen to exert himself to the utmost to reform every abuse of government and to eradicate every evil in government, remembering that abuses and evils are more easily corrected in their beginning than when they have become fully established.

7. In his incomparable speech at Gettysburg President Lincoln appealed to his countrymen to consecrate themselves to the unfinished task that lay before them; that a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people might not perish from the earth." That task is still unfinished, and it is the duty of every citizen to carefully study the principles of government, the methods of government, and issues as they arise, and then give to his country the benefit of his judgment and his conscience. To this end he should not only express himself at elections but faithfully attend primaries and conventions where candidates are chosen and policies enunciated.

8. The government being the people's business, it necessarily follows that its operations should be at all times open to the public view. Publicity is therefore as essential to honest administration as freedom of speech is to representative government. "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none" is the maxim which should control in all departments of government.

9. Each individual finds his greatest security in the intelligence and happiness of his fellows, the welfare of each being the concern of all, and he should, therefore, exert himself to the utmost to improve conditions and to elevate the level upon which all stand.

10. While scrupulously careful to live up to his responsibilities, the citizen should never forget that the larger part of every human life is lived outside of the domain of government, and that he renders the largest service to others when he brings himself into harmony with the law of God, who has made service the measure of greatness.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an excellent series of four articles by Mr. Robert Lasch entitled, "Towards Security," analyzing S. 1161, introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself in the Senate and by Representative DINGELL in the House of Representatives. The articles appeared on the editorial page of the Chicago Sun, October 1–4.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD SECURITY

(By Robert Lasch)

I

A single social insurance system, with a single set of books and a single pay-roll tax, broadened as to the number of persons covered and expanded as to the kind of protection offered—this is the objective of the Wagner-Dingell bill, loosely called the "American Beveridge plan," now before Congress. The bill is based upon recommendations by the Social Security Board. It may become a major issue in Congress this winter. So let's have a look at it.

Under present legislation, about 2,000,000 needy persons over 65 receive public assistance, or "pensions," the cost of which is borne about 50-50 by the Federal Government and the States out of general tax revenues. These payments range from an average of $8.30 a month in Arkansas to $36.47 in California ($26.42 in Illinois). The national average for 1942 worked out at $21.83.

SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIX THOUSAND GET PAYMENTS

That's not much to keep the wolf from the door. Public aid of this sort was an emergency measure, born of the great depression. The Social Security Act of 1935, while providing this immediate aid, undertook also to set up a long-range plan of old age retirement benefits which, once it got going, might eliminate the need for much public assistance of the charity type.

The act established the social insurance principle that workers and employers together should contribute to a fund from which the worker, after retiring at 65, would be paid an annuity sufficient to keep him and his wife during their last years. Amendments to the act in 1939 provided that at some future date the Federal Government should become a third contributor to the fund.

Annuities now being paid are relatively small, for the system is still young. Last June, monthly payments totaling $13,600,000 went to 686,000 beneficiaries. Almost that many other persons were eligible to receive benefits, but had gone on working because of the war. When these people retire they, too, will receive monthly checks, the amount depending upon average wages and the length of time each person worked in covered employment.

Today the worker pays for his retirement benefits a tax of 1 percent on wages under $3,000 a year (none on wages over that amount). The employer pays a like sum. For a man earning $35 a week, the tax in each case is 35 cents a week. A man earning more than $57 a week pays 1 percent of his wages until he has received $3,000 for the year, when the tax stops. Nobody's tax averages more than 57 cents a week at present.

EIGHTY-FIVE DOLLARS A MONTH LIMIT

Under existing legislation the tax will go to 2 percent next January 1. Senator WAGNER proposes to raise it, instead, to 6 percent. Thus a man earning $35 a week would pay $2.10 a week. The maximum payable by anybody would be $180 a year, or an average of $3.46 a week. Employers would duplicate these payments, and the resulting fund, to which the Government would also contribute eventually, would finance not only retirement annuities, but also unemployment compensation, disability and maternity benefits, and a complete system of medical care—all in one basket.

As the law now stands, retirement benefits are limited to a maximum of $85 a month. The Wagner bill would increase them all along the line from $5 to $20 a month, setting a minimum of $20 a month ($30 for a man and a wife), and a maximum of $120 or 80 percent of the person's average monthly wage. It has been estimated that a man who averaged $40 a week for 20 years would earn a life annuity after 65 of $72 a month, or $108 if his wife were living. Almost everybody who had worked steadily through his best years could count on a reasonable retirement income.

Moreover, the bill would bring into the fold some 15,000,000 persons now excluded from coverage—farm workers, domestic servants, employees of nonprofit institutions, and self-employed farmers, professional men, and small businessmen. The original act excluded these people mainly because of difficulties in collecting their contributions and maintaining their records. Seven years of experience have convinced the Social Security Board that they can now be brought within the system.

II

Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii now have unemployment compensation systems under the Social Security Act. Senator WAGNER's bill for expansion of the social security system would merge all of these into a single national fund, paying more benefits longer to more workers.

The idea of unemployment compensation is to provide a continued, though reduced, income for a limited period when a worker loses his job. Under present legislation, employers pay a State tax averaging 2.1 percent of each worker's wages under $3,000 a year. (In Illinois, the tax this year is 1.2 percent.) The money goes into a State fund from which are paid benefits to those insured workers who lose their jobs. Illinois benefits now average $15.55, and are paid for a maximum of 15 weeks.

WHAT OF POSTWAR ERA?

So far most of the State funds have worked out all right, but they have had to face no widespread, major unemployment crisis. At the peak, in June 1940, benefits of more than $53,000,000 a month were being paid throughout the country to 1,200,000 workers. In June of this year payments had dropped to $6,000,000 for 100,000 of the 40,000,000 covered workers. Because of high employment, reserve funds for future benefits are well heeled at the moment.

But what of the post-war period, when millions will be changing jobs or unemployed while plants shift over to peacetime production? The Social Security Board says the best way to meet that situation is to consolidate the 51 separate funds, with a uniform tax and more satisfactory benefits. Since the risk of unemployment varied widely by States, some funds may now be excessive and others inadequate. Although the fund as a whole is increasing rapidly, says the Board, "the reserves of some States would be threatened with insolvency under strains which must be anticipated in post-war years."

To the worker, a single system would guarantee uniformity of benefits, whereas he now might receive $11 a week in one State and $17 in another. To the employer, federalization would guarantee equality of compensation costs between himself and competitors in other States. As with many forms of labor legislation, competition among the States to attract industries exerts a downward pressure on compensation standards.

BETTER PROTECTION

Instead of paying an average of 2.1 percent of his pay rolls below $3,000, plus 1 percent for old-age retirement—which becomes 2 percent next January—the employer under the Wagner bill would pay a blanket tax of 6 percent. The worker would pay the same amount, compared with the 1 percent he now pays for retirement, which becomes 2 percent in January. Thus the employer's tax would be raised an average of 1.9 percent, the worker's 4 percent, beyond levels provided by existing legislation.

In addition to higher retirement benefits, disability benefits, maternity benefits, and medical care, the worker would get for his money better protection against unemployment. For example, benefits for a $35-a-week man with a wife and three children would run $28 a week, and continue for a maximum of 26 weeks, or 52 weeks if funds are found to be sufficient.

The worker would also get the help of a national employment service in finding a job. He would be required to register with the service, report regularly, and accept suitable work if found. As a condition of receiving prolonged benefits the board might require him to undergo retraining for a new type of job.

As with old-age insurance, the bill extends the coverage of unemployment compensation to large groups now excluded, such as seamen, farm workers, domestic servants, employees of nonprofit institutions. All employers of one or more persons would be brought into the system, whereas many States now cover only employers of eight or more (in Illinois, six or more).

III

On the assumption that good health and loss of income through poor health are the proper concern of a Social Security program, the Wagner-Dingell bill goes far beyond present legislation in the sphere of medical care. You will hear a lot about socialized medicine when the measure comes up for debate.

In addition to increasing and extending benefits for retirement and unemployment, the bill provides new benefits for temporary and permanent disability and maternity leave.

MEDICAL, HOSPITAL AID

If an insured worker became permanently disabled and unable to work, he would be entitled to benefits substantially the same as those received on retirement at 65. If he suffered a temporary disability, he would draw benefits for a limited period comparable to those paid during unemployment. A married woman worker would receive benefits at the same rate for 12 weeks while having a baby. All these payments would come from the same fund, to which the worker and employer would each contribute 6 percent of annual wages under $3,000.

A more drastic departure from familiar forms is the bill's broad program of medical and hospital insurance, to be set up by the United States Surgeon General and the Social Security Board in consultation with an advisory council of 16 doctors nominated by professional societies.

This plan calls for establishment of social-security medical panels in each community, individual doctors being free to join the panels or not. When an insured worker needed medical care for himself or family, he could go to any doctor on the panel, and the Social Security Board would pay his bill.

Panel doctors would have the right to accept or refuse individual patients, to choose whether to be paid by fee or salary, and to carry on regular private practice in addition to their work for the Board. Specialists would be supplied by the Board on recommendation of the general practitioner, the patient in this case being required to accept the Board's choice. In case of hospitalization, the Board would pay $3 to $6 a day hospital expense, up to a maximum of 30 days.

FEE FOR FIRST CALL

Necessarily, the bill sketches only the broad outlines of the plan, giving the Board power to modify and adapt it as experience indicated. To prevent abuses, for example, the Board is authorized to require payment of a fee by the worker for the doctor's first call or to limit the number of calls a worker might receive "on the cuff." No payment is included for home medicines, private hospital rooms, or any care receivable under workmen's compensation laws. Dental and nursing care are also excluded; but the bill provides that these subjects be studied by the Board and legislation recommended within two years.

Senator WAGNER emphasizes his intention to safeguard freedom of medical practice. He says the scheme does not disturb existing arrangements for choosing a doctor and obtaining medical care except to provide for payment from the insurance system. In practice, many doctors would probably combine work for the social-security panels with care of their own patients, while others, particularly young men not yet established, might choose to do all of their work for the panels on salary. The general intention is not to displace the present system, but to guarantee every insured worker and his family of a certain minimum of medical care financed by contributions to the social-security fund.

One-fourth of the entire social-security contributions would be set aside to meet costs of medical-hospital insurance, the remaining three-fourths financing retirement, unemployment, disability, and maternity benefits.

IV

What would it cost? That question is frequently asked about the expanded Social Security System proposed by the Wagner-Dingell bill. Many reactionaries do not stay for an answer; they are sure the cost would be too much, no matter what it were.

Looked at from the individual's point of view, costs are best measured by the pay-roll taxes to be paid. Under existing legislation these taxes, beginning next January, will average 4.1 percent for the employer and 2 percent for the worker, levied against that portion of each man's wages below $3,000. The Wagner-Dingell bill raises the contribution rate to 6 percent for both the employer and the worker.

THREE DOLLARS AND FORTY-SIX CENTS MAXIMUM

Thus a worker earning $35 a week will pay 60 cents a week next year under existing legislation; under the Wagner-Dingell bill he would pay $1.80 a week. A man earning $50 a week now pays $1; under this bill, $3. Anybody earning more than $57 a week now pays $1.15; under this bill he would pay an average of $3.46, the maximum. Employers would pay a like amount for each worker. Self-employed persons would pay 7 percent of the fair value of their services below $3,000.

Anybody who has studied the benefits which this tax buys—retirement, unemployment, disability, and medical care—will agree that at this price they are a bargain.

At some time in the future, Government contributions may be required in addition to those made by workers and employers. That holds true of existing legislation, not only of the Wagner-Dingell bill. Senator WAGNER declares that the Government contribution, payable from general taxation, would not begin for 10 or perhaps 15 years and would never amount to more than one-third of the total cost.

And what about total cost? The best way to figure it is to estimate future obligations on the basis of reasonable forecasts of population and employment trends. R. Clyde White, professor of social service administration at the University of Chicago, has made such an estimate for the Chicago Sun. Assuming full employment with an effective labor force of 57,000,000 (compared with 52,000,000 in 1940) and making various other fair assumptions as to population trends, Professor White estimates that in 1955 the probable costs of the Wagner bill would be as follows:

Old-age and permanent-disability benefits	$2,859,503,000
Unemployment compensation and temporary disability benefits	1,466,300,000
Medical care	2,535,000,000
Public assistance	1,049,760,000
Administration	537,556,000
Total	8,448,119,000

These figures may be high, for Professor White has tried to hit upon a maximum rather than a minimum estimate. Assuming fairly full employment in 1955, his figures show that the entire cost of benefits in that year would be met from pay-roll contributions, with something like $1,800,000,000 left over to meet future obligations. The only possible deficit, says Professor White, would be in the medical care budget; he suggests as a remedy an amendment providing a direct Government contribution for medical care.

WE CAN STAND THE COST

So it looks as if the Wagner-Dingell bill will be perfectly feasible for a period going well beyond 1955. Costs will vary as incomes, employment, and other factors vary, but a reasonable estimate on the basis of figures supplied by Professor White and Senator Wagner is that the maximum cost in any foreseeable year (some time after 1955) would be around $12,000,000,000.

Can we stand a social security cost beginning at, say, one billion immediately after the war, rising to perhaps seven or eight billion in 1955 and to a maximum of twelve billion at some date beyond that? The plain answer is that we can. For social security costs are not net deductions from the national product. They do not represent a dead weight on the national income, as so

many short-sighted conservatives pretend, because they themselves represent income to the beneficiaries.

Five or eight or twelve billion dollars collected from the working population means five or eight or twelve billion dollars distributed to those who for some reason are not working; it is spent by them to buy the sustenance whose creation keeps the working population at work. In short, social security does not reduce the national income; it does affect its distribution. A national income of 120 billion after the war can well support a redistribution of five or six billion, particularly when this five or six billion helps to keep the total up there at 120.

Conservative estimates show that 10 years of depression in the 30's cost America $282,000,000,000 in lost income—income which would have been produced had our men and plants been fully employed. The cost of social security can be fully met by preventing the scandalous social waste of unemployment and social security benefits will play a large part in preventing it.

Address by Leon Todd at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short speech delivered by Mr. Leon Todd, of the National Poultry Defense Committee, Trenton, N. J., before the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, held at Chicago, Ill., on September 16–17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Poultry and egg producers of the United States have been asked to take an important part in our war food program through increasing production of these products for greater civilian consumption, for our armed forces and for lend-lease. This industry has grown up to become a $2,000,000,000 enterprise, second only to dairy products in national importance.

This industry has been commercialized on many farms, and in addition, the poultry flock has been given a more important place on our vast number of general farms. Egg and poultry meat producers have met every production goal established for them. This has been done under difficult circumstances as to feed supplies, labor shortages and price interferences.

It is fully recognized by egg and poultry producers that some government regulation would be necessary to carry out the war efforts; however, it has been disappointing that this industry, like most others, was not given the job of helping to plan these regulations in a rational manner. We have served on Government advisory committees which were not taken seriously as shown by regulations which followed the assembly of such committees.

We are pleased to have in the making, however, a national organization which, when perfected, will include all major poultry and egg groups of the country, from producer to and including distributors.

We believe such over-all bodies are essential to speak for an entire food-producing industry. This becomes all the more important when we study one of the proposed 1944 farm and food programs which has never been announced in its entirety. It included—

1. Complete Government contracts covering everything the farmer produces.
2. Complete Government purchase of these products.
3. Resale of those products at lower than cost prices.
4. Advance loans up to 90 percent of the value of the products to be produced.

This is not an accumulation of impressions; we saw the document and we have a deep conviction that such a plan has no place in American agriculture.

FEED SUPPLIES

The present rates of production of eggs and poultry meat cannot be maintained because of the policy on feed prices and distribution. The ceiling of $1.06 Chicago base for corn actually increases the cost of producing eggs, poultry meat, and milk, etc.

The fundamental fact is that low ceilings keep the feedstuffs near the vicinity of production and therefore many thousands of producers have had to use substitute ingredients which are both higher in price and less efficient. All of this can lead to decreased production for 1944.

The poultry industry has offered to assume its reasonable share of any necessary liquidation, provided a sound and equitable national policy on feed supplies is established. A disorderly liquidation of our farm animals would be disastrous to the war food program. It would jeopardize the supply of foods which are of critical importance in maintaining a balanced diet.

There are those who would have the Government parcel out all feedstuffs. This would create complete regimentation of the feed industry and we believe many of our producing plants throughout the country would not be in full operation.

This industry has approached both governmental officials and Congress for:

1. Adjustments in corn prices and the price relationships associated therewith.
2. That larger quantities of animal proteins be imported from South America. We have used vegetable protein feeds, much of which will not move away from livestock feeding areas.
3. That boat space be allotted for the movement of substitute grains from Canada. This requires fast action before lake shipments are curtailed for the winter.
4. That the feed industry be permitted to retain its present manpower.
5. It is extremely important that programs and policies for our industry be developed and announced as soon as possible.

PRICE CONTROL

Let us first analyze the food situation from the egg and poultry meat producers viewpoint.

The consumer is our customer. We have spent much time, effort, and money in the past 25 years to give the consumer a better product through breeding, care of the product on the farm, and through more efficient distribution. Unfortunately, and quite beyond our ability to understand, there are some persons who would blame the farmer for shortages and for creating so-called inflation.

The actual figures do not accuse the farmer of causing inflation. From 1939 to 1942 the rise in the national income was $49,000,000,000.

	Total rise (billions)	Percent of total rise
Going to agriculture	5.8	12
Going to nonagriculture	43.2	88
Total	49.0	100

These data substantiate the fact a given quantity of food today takes a smaller proportion of the pay check of the average consumer than at any time since records became available. We are anxious that our producers and the consumer have a better understanding on this point.

At present retail prices the cost of a standard food budget takes 16 percent of the average per capita income, the lowest figure for any period in the last 30 years for which data are available, and substantially lower than the range of 24 to 31 percent during World War No. 1.

This industry had one roll-back on several classes of poultry meat and one on eggs. In spite of this, it is often proposed to give producers a subsidy payment.

As a solution of our industry problems as well as of the inflation problem subsidies fail for several reasons.

1. There would be utter confusion because it would be impossible for the Government to purchase the eggs and poultry meat from 6,000,000 producers as stipulated in the unannounced 1944 farm program, and equally impossible to pay direct subsidies to that number of producers. The cost and manpower required in either program would detract from the war effort. In actual practice, a portion of these commodities would by-pass the subsidy and thus be more expensive to consumers.
2. Consumers would have more spending power to exert pressure on black markets operations and on commodities not covered by price control.
3. The official price index would be held down by the use of subsidies, but the index would mean just that much less. It would be just the same as changing the price figures issued by the Bureau of Labor Standards, and then claiming inflation had been prevented.

Therefore, the poultry industry which has met all goals, does not see any justification for subsidies to producers and because of the present relationship between food prices and incomes, there seems to be no need for subsidies in the future.

We do know, however, that small groups of farmers whose political philosophy is contrary to those of us who believe in and work for a democratic America, have also asked for subsidies.

Many of our well-established distributors have suffered from a lack of even an operating margin. We need these agencies and so do consumers, as evidenced by several periods of scarcity of poultry meat in our larger cities.

MANPOWER

We believe in the judgment of our military staffs to determine the needs of our armed forces to win this war. It is our duty to point out that any further drafting of men from our farms, processing plants, and many food distribution channels will interfere with our food program. Even though the eggs and the chickens are produced, they must be processed and distributed, and we have reached the point where any further drain on the manpower in this industry will prove costly.

In conclusion, let us look at the average poultry farmer. On his farm of 2,500 to 3,000 laying birds, he had one hired man before the war. Today he works longer hours, his wife and children have really "pitched in" and as a family, without the services of a hired man, they have maintained the flock without

overtime pay, but with a lot of other restrictions. He has been blamed for helping to cause inflation which the figures disprove; he has heard and read statements that the prices of his products are out of line, while a given amount of food takes a lower percentage of the average pay check than at any time on record; he cannot make new and better feeds for his birds but uses inferior substitutes.

But he and his family will keep doing their utmost because he has a profound faith in the freedom of American soil and in his fellow farmers to accomplish the most critical job they have ever tackled.

Rift Among Poles Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article from the New York Times:

RIFT AMONG POLES DENIED—NATIONALS SAID TO BE FIRMLY UNITED IN OPPOSITION TO GERMANY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your London correspondent's cable published in the Times of October 1, under the heading "Rift among Poles beclouds parley" unfortunately creates a false picture of the situation in Poland. Your correspondent justifies the conclusion given in the heading on the basis of the following allegations:

1. That the Poles in eastern Poland are divided in two factions: One, the so-called Partisans supporting Russia, and the other the organized Polish underground forces opposing Russia.

2. That the pro-Communist Polish Partisans have a radio station called Kosciuszko.

3. That these Partisans are fighting the Germans, while the "Polish military underground is known to have saved arms," in order to oppose Russia.

OPPOSED TO GERMANS

All these allegations may succeed in befuddling American public opinion. In reality the following is the true situation as it exists in Poland:

1. The Poles in eastern Poland are not divided but constitute, as the rest of Poland, one compact force of 4-year-long unyielding opposition to the Germans.

2. The so-called Kosciuszko Radio Station, the alleged organ of the Polish Partisans, is located in Moscow. Its chief aim is to interfere with the Polish station in London, and counteract the instructions sent to underground Poland by the Polish Government and the Allies. The instructions of the Polish Government directing the organization of planned sabotage and the preparation of a general uprising when the hour strikes are sabotaged by the Kosciuszko station, which calls for unorganized revolutionary incidents calculated to produce general disorder and chaos. One must bear in mind that all the great acts of sabotage, such as destruction of munition supplies, railroad trains, and blowing up of bridges and locomotives are exclusively the work of the Polish military underground action.

3. The statement that the Polish underground forces are saving arms instead of fighting Germans is contradicted by two outstanding and universally accepted aspects of Poland's stand in this war.

SUPPORTING UNITED NATIONS

First, the Polish Nation is the only one of the occupied nations that has rejected and still rejects all German proposals for cooperation, the last one being the proposal made in 1943 that a Polish army be created to oppose Russia. Second, Poland's losses in her 4 years' struggle against Germany amount to 3,200,000, according to Polish official figures. This figure represents 10 percent of Polish population, whereas the war losses in the eastern theater of war of the three largest Allied Nations, including Russia, amount to 4,000,000, which represents barely one-half of 1 percent of their population.

In spite of the crimes suffered by the Poles at the hands of Soviet Russia—a million and a half deported and suffering in destitution, tens of thousands shot—the Polish Nation, which before the war rejected Hitler's proposal for a joint attack on Russia and thus exposed itself to the horror of war, has risen to its greatest self-sacrifice, and has done everything within its power, barring the loss of honor and its territory, to further the good-neighbor policy with Russia and thus to serve the supreme war aims of the United Nations.

M. F. WEGRZYNEK,
President, National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent.

NEW YORK, *October 2, 1943.*

RIFT AMONG POLES BECLOUDS PARLEY—BRITISH ASSERT FACTIONS MAY INTERFERE WITH SUCCESS OF MOSCOW TALKS—EUROPEANS EYE FUTURE—OBSERVERS IN WASHINGTON SAY SMALLER NATIONS NOW FEAR DOMINATION FROM OUTSIDE

LONDON, September 30.—The scene of the proposed tripower conference was still Moscow late tonight. It may be changed to London in the interests of United States Secretary of State Cordell Hull's health, but so far the Russians have not agreed to our proposals on this score. Meanwhile questions are arising for the three powers which are more urgent and important than the venue and the personnel of the conference itself.

One of these questions concerns the reaction of Poles when the Germans reach the line that divided Poland and Russia at the outbreak of the war in September 1939. The headlong rush of the Russian Armies and the retreat of Germans to within about 120 miles of the old Polish frontiers have brought up this question quicker than had been expected.

Ever since Germany and Russia divided Polish territory in 1939 the Poles in the east of that unhappy country have been divided into at least two factions: Those favoring Russians, the so-called Partisans; and the Polish military underground, which has opposed the Russians.

Each of these two factions has been increasing its organization and military supplies for more than a year now; each has its own radio station, "Koscivscko" for the Partisans; and "Swit" for the military underground.

POLISH FACTIONS WATCHED

Ever since Russia broke off diplomatic relations with the Poles these two stations have spent most of their time not condemning Germans but condemning each other, and the feud between the two factions has now reached a point where it has attracted the interest of officials here in London.

While the Polish Partisans have apparently spent most of their resistance against the Germans in the last 4 years, the military underground is known to have saved arms, and the fear here is that they plan to use them or threaten for diplomatic reasons to use them when and if the Russians cross the Polish boundary set at Versailles.

Such an act on the part of the Poles would not stop the Russian advance or German retreat. The Polish military underground is not that strong, according to what little objective information there is about the Poles these days. But it would not take much resistance on their part to infuriate the Russians and make the settlement of the problems in eastern Europe even more difficult than they now are.

PARLEY GROWS IN IMPORTANCE

The more one studies the problems to be discussed at the forthcoming conference of foreign ministers the more important the conference appears. Among the questions to be discussed are not only such questions as the future of Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic States, and the Balkans, but what to do if Germany offers to make peace and how to deal with her after she makes peace.

The only thing that equals the importance of the conference is the fear that the three great powers will not be able to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the meeting of foreign ministers to outline the basis of the coming peace. These hopes and fears were well expressed in a remarkable editorial in this week's Economist, which says:

"There is a time when the great flood of human affairs, after moving slowly for a space through familiar country, gathers speed and plunges forward on a new and unknown course. Such times are full of tremendous possibilities. The new direction of the flood can be canalized or left to work destruction. A few right or a few wrong decisions taken in these times can mold the history of a century in such a crisis as is upon us now. * * * The next weeks, the next days, may decide whether this tide, taken at the flood, will lead on to the future or whether through distrust or plain incompetence it will be allowed to sweep forward, carrying on it boulders and wreckage to break down any possible peace."

Washington News Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

WHAT ARE CARTELS?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot about cartels in the days ahead. We are told that cartels will be an issue in next year's campaign. Vice President WALLACE has raised this cartel straw-man issue and is already charging upon it with his lance. In fact, he has started out on a crusade against cartels. To the average man a cartel is some form of European monopoly. We have fought out the issue of monopolies time and again during the past 40 years. Now the same old chestnut bobs up again under a new name, "cartels." Monopolies are illegal in this country. They are outlawed by the Sherman Act. We "busted the trusts" under Teddy Roosevelt. Later we outlawed monopolies by the passage of the Sherman Act. Now we have WALLACE, the modern Don Quixote, tilting his lance against cartels.

The A. A. A. is a cartel to control agricultural output and maintain prices. It was established under Government authority and is Government-operated. WALLACE had a great deal to do with its establishment and its operation. I suppose the A. A. A. is a good cartel because it is his brain child. Raymond Moley, an original new dealer—now a repentant and reformed man—and a former ghost writer for Franklin D. Roosevelt, holds up this straw man that WALLACE is fighting and points out how foolish the WALLACE crusade against cartels is. Moley sums up the danger from cartels in these words:

Experience would probably show that even the wisest bureaucrat would not be able to protect American interests (from cartels) better than our big companies have done in recent years.

OUR POST-WAR FUTURE

There are two schools of thought in Washington concerning our post-war future. The first is the socialistic school, headed by Frankfurter, Wallace, Hopkins, and their followers. Their entire program for our post-war future is based upon government control of all business and industry. This school of thought advocates a government program of made work—another boondoggling era—to tide us over the slack period they expect after the war. They believe we should tax away all the profits of industry and renegotiate or cancel all war contracts in order to get the money to pay for the proposed boondoggling program. The other school of thought is headed by Jesse Jones, Jimmy Byrnes, Fred Vinson, Cordell Hull, and others. They believe we should preserve the American system of free enterprise, should look to and expect American industry to reconvert from wartime production to peacetime production with the least possible loss of time, and while doing so keep employment at a high level.

This reconversion of industry would be made possible by reserves that industry had been permitted to build up during peaktime production for that very purpose. This school of thought bases its program upon a huge reservoir of consumer demand that has been dammed up during the war period; an immense buying power that will be accumulated as a result of high wages and forced savings to implement that consumer demand; and industrial reserves that should be allowed to accumulate large enough to tide over the industrial reconversion period. To which school of thought do you belong?

THE A. F. OF L. ATTITUDE

The executive council of the A. F. of L. went on record recently at a meeting in Chicago in favor of a definite post-war program and against another boondoggling era. The executive council declared that private industry when the war is over must provide the jobs to take care of the returning soldiers and must also be ready to give peacetime jobs to the millions now engaged in wartime work. The council was equally insistent that capital be encouraged to bring about an industrial expansion in order to create these jobs. In expressing this view, it used these very significant words:

The Government should not only permit but it should stimulate opportunities to make a reasonable and fair profit for business firms that are willing to increase production and employment. These business firms must be given assurances that they will not be taxed to death.

When American business and American labor team up and insist that the Government should encourage and not discourage business expansion; that the Government should permit a fair profit to capital, and that the Government must not tax business to death, then the post-war outlook can be considered encouraging, indeed. The executive council of the A. F. of L. is to be congratulated upon its constructive pronouncement covering the post-war future.

A Letter From Somewhere in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, some of our boys "over yonder" who are up against the stern and stark realities of war, looking death in the face every day of their lives, are sending letters home that will rank as the great human documents of this global war.

I have received such a letter, which I regard as a classic. It comes from "somewhere in north Africa." The writer is Master Sgt. C. Arnold Ray, of Indianapolis:

Mr. Ray, one of our very capable young Indianapolis men, gave up a future of great promise in the business world when he entered the service of our country as a private.

I do not recall when I have ever read a better or more meaningful letter than the one he has written to me. With clarity and vision it points out the necessity of self-sacrifice to preserve all we hold dear.

I believe Sergeant Ray's letter could be read with profit by everybody in America, and I have obtained unanimous consent to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Thinking that perhaps you would be interested in hearing from someone from Indianapolis serving here in north Africa and also perhaps interested in knowing what the average soldier thinks and believes about this war, I write not as an individual but as representative of the whole. Since leaving the air base at Richmond, Va., much has transpired and many new experiences have been gained.

At the moment, with the north African victory fresh and under the stimulus of a hard job completed, we rest for a moment to count the score and decide the future strategy. But, in counting this score and reviewing our accomplishments, we find our thoughts wandering back home. I find myself in a strange position of a self-critic. I find myself taking a new and more definite view of many things that during peacetime seemed so trivial and unimportant. I remember the much overworked phrase "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" in every speech or in every editorial, and how much of an accepted fact it was. Now that's all changed. It has taken on a very certain, serious meaning, driven home by the most brutal of all teachers—war in all its grim reality. For we, who are thousands of miles from our homes and country, find life a matter of one sunrise to the next; liberty, the ultimate prize of all our efforts (even to the cost of life), something that we must, of necessity, forego to attain our goal; and last "the pursuit of happiness," something, at the present, almost a mockery. It is something that we had but failed to appreciate its full meaning Yet we are quite willing to accept the unpleasant and grim task to have again the opportunity to return to a country blessed with all the rich endowments of a generous God and a bountiful nature, that have been spread before our very eyes, yet apparently unseen.

No; we are not complaining of our job. We realize that we must carry on. We are proud that it has fallen to us, this responsibility. We realize that we must not only combat the enemy but loneliness, homesickness, disease, and the temptation to quit when fatigue becomes almost unbearable. Full well we know that we are constantly menaced by sudden death, but the work must go on and the job be well done.

There is one question on the lips of many over here. Do our folks at home truly realize the meaning of being an American? We wonder if they understand the real seriousness of the loss of life, liberty, or the pursuit of their own free will: praying to their God as they choose, seeking a home where they will, in any part of a land that will provide them with comforts and luxuries that are unknown in other parts of the world.

Those who cry out against excessive hours of labor; those who would falsify the necessity of sacrifice; and those who would profit by war as a business should, by actual experience, know the meaning of sleepless nights; to eat or sleep on mud, dust, or sand; to fight malaria-carrying mosquitos, scorpions, snakes. They should feel the pangs of thirst or pain or see the horror of seeing beautiful homes and buildings blown to bits. And by contrast they should see the joy of people freed of such bondage. If all this were possible, Mr. LUDLOW, I assure you that the safety and security of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution will never be endangered, nor shall our Nation again close its eyes to the opportunities that are ours, and America shall always be as it always has been—God's incomparable gift to mankind.

My very best wishes for your good health and kindest regards.

C. A. RAY.

The Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, after having been virtually ignored for many years the northwestern part of the North American continent is coming more and more to the attention of the people of the United States and Canada. In the

past, the region has been practically unknown by reason of the lack of facilities and transportation in all that vast area. That lack is now being overcome by the development of air transport and by the construction of the Alaska Highway. The effect of what has been done and the promise of the future have nowhere been better stated than in an address made on September 26, 1943, by Brig. Gen. James A. O'Connor, of the United States Army, commander of the Northwest Service Command, broadcast over Station CBR, Vancouver, British Columbia. General O'Connor's address follows:

The men and women of Canada have shown an interest and pride in the Alaska Highway which we of the American Army greatly appreciate. To my desk come many letters—from your maritime provinces, from the prairie, from British Columbia's uplands. These letters inquire about what we have done, what we hope to do, what we are doing.

Through the courtesy of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, I had an opportunity 10 months ago to tell you something about the construction of the Alaska Highway. Now, the pioneering phase of our task is ended. The first land route in history to Alaska has been built. You will want to know how the highway is being operated and what kind of a line of supply it really is.

Let me begin by telling you that the Alaska Highway is 1,630 miles in length. This is more than half the width of our vast continent. Twelve hundred and ninety of those miles are on the soil of Canada. The wilderness of British Columbia and the Yukon is the land bridge which ties the United States to its largest territorial possession.

The 1,000-mile stretch between Dawson Creek, British Columbia, and Whitehorse in the Yukon is the first extended portion of the Alaska Highway to be placed in actual and practical use. Traffic is rolling through the mountain and forest solitudes between these far-flung points.

Along the highway we have built garages, barracks, repair shops, and similar facilities. No road 1,630 miles in length could be operated unless it were "nailed down" with points where trucks could be serviced and fueled, where drivers could sleep and eat, where cargo could be transferred and accidents repaired.

Approximately every 100 miles the United States Army has permanent camps. At these camps drivers are fed and rested, and in the evening they can see movies in the camp theaters. Control stations guard the highway at such points, and military police are constantly checking to see that the road is put to the essential military use for which it was built.

This unique chain of supply requires many subsidiary details. There are 10 large post exchanges on the road and 45 branch exchanges. These exchanges sell our soldiers everything from toothbrushes to presents for the folks at home. The most popular items with our soldiers are cigarettes, candy, soft drinks, and—believe it or not—gold nuggets.

Along the highway, the special service branch of the Northwest Service Command operates one of the longest movie circuits in existence. A motion picture shown at the Muncho Lake camp one night is sent by truck to the camp at Cold River, 89 miles north, the next night.

Last week mail service was started between Dawson Creek and Whitehorse. Busses now cover this distance in 48 hours. Alongside the highway is a telephone line, the longest open-circuit telephone system anywhere in the world. Within a few months this line will reach all the way to Fairbanks. For the first time there will be telephone communication by land between Alaska and the United States.

These developments emphasize the fact that the Alaska Highway is more than merely a road. It is an artery of transportation and communication in the same sense as such natural arteries as the Mohawk Valley, the Columbia River Gorge, and your own Fraser River Canyon. The highway consists of many separate features. Primarily, there is the road itself. Then, there are the telephone system and the distributing gasoline pipe lines which extend from Whitehorse to Watson Lake and Fairbanks. Dotting the road at scattered intervals are strategically situated airports. In fact, there airfields determined the location of the road. All these features combined make up the Alaska Highway system.

This system has been developed for two vital military reasons. One is to anchor, supplement, and supply the air route to Alaska and the north Pacific theater of war. The other is to provide an alternative line of supply to Alaska in case control of the sea lanes should be imperiled.

That this undertaking has been completed so rapidly is merely one more demonstration of the everlasting friendship between Canada and the United States. Where else on earth would one nation be allowed to construct a vital military road for 1,290 miles on its neighbor's soil and be given such outstanding cooperation? We of the American Army are deeply indebted to the people and government of the Dominion of Canada for their willing help and assistance.

Last week the Northwest Service Command was privileged to be the host to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada and his official party. This was an outstanding event. The Governor General traveled on the narrow gauge White Pass & Yukon Railway, which is now operated by an American military railway battalion. He was our guest at a luncheon, where toasts of Yukon River water were drunk to the President of the United States and to the King. He exchanged swagger sticks with Colonel Bush, our chief of staff, and he was kind enough to present me with autographed portraits of himself and Her Royal Highness Princess Alice.

The episode was a happy symbol of the good will which has characterized this task.

Development of transportation has invariably resulted in progress. The history of mankind is studded with the names of great arteries of travel—the Roman road, the Oregon Trail, the Union Pacific, the Burma Road, the Khyber Pass, the Cariboo Road, the Trans-Siberian. Men in both your country and mine opposed construction of the first transcontinental railways. A famous New Englander said he would not give a silver dollar for all of Oregon. Yet these skeptics lived to see a vast migration, the forerunner of empire, follow the line of steel toward the setting sun.

When roads and railways have been blazed, adventurous men have used them. That has been the story of civilization. The first railroads in Canada and the United States were constructed through bleak solitudes. But farms began to dot the countryside. Then villages and settlements appeared beside the rivers. Soon sprawling towns occupied the entrances to valleys and the hills above harbors. By and by, these towns became great cities, and the countries which you and I know began to take shape.

In the far North—in Alaska and the Canadian Northwest—transportation is in its pioneering phase. The Alaska Highway is a pioneering project. Yet who can prophesy what lies ahead, in the distant years when we must turn to peaceful reconstruction after final victory has been won? Men will be seeking new opportunities. Their eyes will be on the horizon, turned toward the frontiers. Perhaps the most important frontier of our time will be in the North.

I was brought up in the white pine region of Michigan, not far from the Ontario border. I first visited the great Canadian West in 1910, more than 3 decades ago. In fact, that visit took place right here in Vancouver. I remember an eager, enthusiastic spirit and hopes for an extensive metropolis which appear to have been realized to a welcome degree. This same spirit has been evident in the men—soldiers and civilians alike—who have built the Alaska Highway. The job has been a universal one, a product of a cross-section of America's people.

I have come to Vancouver on this occasion with several members of my staff at the kind invitation of the Vancouver Board of Trade, and to present to the city of Vancouver and to the Province of British Columbia certain historic documents symbolic of the long-enduring friendship between Canada and the United States.

Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—Negroes, Indians, and whites—boys from the great cities of the East and from the lonely farms of the West—men who had been blacksmiths and men who had been clerks—all toiled together to hack a road through the wilderness to Alaska. Negro soldiers built a timber bridge across the Sikanni Chief River in 84 hours. Lt. Roland Small, a Jewish engineer officer from New York, lost his life on the northern sector of the road and his comrades spontaneously dedicated a bridge to his memory.

The people of our two Nations have always been bold pioneers. No continent has been settled as rapidly as North America. It is difficult to realize that less than a century ago a young captain in the United States cavalry was writing to General Phil Sheridan that all the land west of Kansas was a barren wilderness. Now, in that land we have such great American centers as Salt Lake City, Los Angeles, and Seattle; and such Canadian metropolises as Vancouver, Edmonton, and Calgary. America has indeed come of age in a hurry.

The Alaska Highway is a product of this pioneer spirit. Despite the hundreds of bulldozers, the countless steam shovels, the many pile drivers, the innumerable trucks, the job could not have been accomplished without the resolute will and genuine enthusiasm of the men engaged in the task.

This pioneering still goes on. Other roads are being built as cut-offs and feeders for the Alaska Highway. As I speak to you tonight, American workmen are toiling on the lofty peaks of the Chilkat and Three Guardsmen Passes. Across those alpine summits will stretch the Haines Military Road, a 165-mile cut-off connecting the Alaska Highway with the Inside Passage. This link between the highway and salt water is of great significance to southeastern Alaska and to your Pacific coast seaports of Prince Rupert, Victoria, and Vancouver.

And I might add that the Haines Military Road taps some of the loveliest scenery on the North American Continent, scenery which veteran mountaineers compare with the Columbia River Gorge and Banff and Jasper Park.

When this war is ended and the despots have been crushed, there will undoubtedly be other roads and routes in the north country. Perhaps the Alaska Highway will be only the beginning. During the last century the men and women of the United States and Canada faced west. There the new frontiers lay. Now, they may look toward the north. Perhaps this is the frontier of the future.

The Alaska Highway is an affirmation of the determination of our people to be free. At the time the road was commenced, a critical situation confronted us all. The

American Fleet had suffered heavy losses at Pearl Harbor. The Japanese barbarians were sweeping triumphantly across the Pacific. The waters of Alaska were in danger. The inception of the highway was a bold step, even in time of war. An alternative route to Alaska was imperative. A few months delay in its completion might have been fatal. Under these circumstances, the commanding general of the Army Service Forces, Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, authorized the project and engineer troops began the task.

We may thank Almighty God that the grave crisis looming in the north Pacific was averted. Today, the combined might of Canadian and United States troops has driven the last invader from American soil. We must stand firm now against further attack and we must organize our far-flung resources for assault on the enemy. The construction of the Alaska Highway and its allied projects has demonstrated again our capacity for joint effort and effective cooperation. In a war-torn world, the two great lands of North America are privileged to hold before mankind a shining example of neighborliness and understanding.

I thank you and good night.

Parity Prices of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas every item of expense in agricultural production for 1943 is the highest in any year in the past 20 years; and

Whereas the ceiling price on all manufactured products has been set high enough to give said manufacturers and distributors a handsome profit after paying the highest wages in the Nation's history: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the National Congress to pass legislation for parity prices which will include all labor cost in agricultural production; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and each member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress.

Passed by the Kiowa County convention of the Farmers Union without a dissenting vote.

W. G. BOWMAN, *President.*
CHARLES W. HOLMAN, *Secretary.*
W. G. BOWMAN, Mountain Park, Okla.,
BYRON DACUS, Gotebo, Okla.,
TOM SMITH, Gotebo, Okla.,
Resolutions Committee.

Trucks and Trailers to Deliver the Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I took occasion to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to the fate that was fast approaching for our vital highway transportation. At the time I suggested an investigation (H. Res. 232) to look into the situation and determine the facts. Today the facts are available in abundance and while I still urge the investigation it can only ascertain who was responsible for the highway transportation break-down that is upon us.

Farm, trade, business, and daily papers are constantly referring to the lack of trucks and trailers to move the cattle, hogs, and grain from the farms and the manufactured products from the mills and factories.

America has the greatest improved highway system the world has ever seen. To fail to make the maximum use of these roads to help move the food and machines necessary to supply the war effort and the civilians on the home front is gross negligence. But the rolling equipment in the form of trucks and trailers must be provided.

There was an adequate supply of trucks and trailers to meet the demands for highway transport at the time of the infamous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. But, while wartime demands for the movement of goods have multiplied, the actual supply of trucks and trailers has dwindled. Perhaps 20 percent of those operating on December 7, 1941, have worn out and been scrapped.

Manufacture of trucks and trailers stopped shortly after Pearl Harbor and except for some few specifically authorized there has been no manufacture of same for civilian use since. The stock pile on hand has been doled out to those showing exceptional need—but the stock pile was wholly inadequate and now is all but exhausted.

In some respects it is wrong to refer to these trucks and trailers as for civilian use because, while operated by civilians, they play a vital part in the war effort. Practically all factories are turning out implements of war, yet the transfer of parts and materials is mostly accomplished by the so-called civilian truck or trailer. The civilian highway transportation is so interwoven with the war effort and the civilian economy which is supporting the farmer, that we might well refer to it as war transport.

Today we are confronted with a war transport system that is creaking. Trucks and trailers are forced to operate longer hours without overhauling in order to move the maximum amount of production. The units are wearing out more rapidly than in normal times. And in normal times we annually added 375,000 new trucks and trailers as replacements. For 2 years now, except for the doling out of the stock pile and the manufacture of a few special units, nothing has been added to the fleet.

ONE MILLION TRUCKS AND TRAILERS

To catch up with the loss the past 2 years and to adequately provide for the war transport there should be manufactured and made available in 1944 a minimum of 1,000,000 trucks and trailers. That may sound fantastic to some but please remember highway transport is the very lifeblood of the American commercial and civic world just as much as war transport is the lifeline of a military operation.

With the railroads taxed to capacity there is only one avenue of increasing the amount of goods transported, and that is by additional use of the highways. It is penny-wise and pound-foolish not to provide the rolling stock essential to its use. With adequate trucks and trailers the United States could truly say that there was no such thing as a transportation bottleneck.

Now let us look at what the War Production Board has scheduled to take care of United States war transport for 1944. On September 10, 1943, it announced through press release WPB-4209 as follows:

The War Production Board today announced approval of initial truck and trailer programs for 1944 which will permit production of 22,859 medium and 10,993 heavy trucks, and 14,067 trailers.

Now, gentlemen, that is just like digging the Panama Canal with hand shovels, or building Boulder Dam with wheelbarrows. My State alone could utilize all of the production of trucks and trailers thus authorized and yet not rehabilitate its highway transport system.

In this connection I wish to call your attention to an editorial which appears in the October 1943 issue of the Farm Journal, under the title "Farm Trucking Crisis." It reads:

Last week the National Agricultural Transportation Committee met in Washington with representatives of O. D. T., W. P. B., W. F. A., and O. P. A. It wasn't a cheerful meeting. Those present took a good look at farm-transportation facilities, and didn't like what they saw. They pretty well agreed that a break-down will have to be reckoned with next year unless steps are taken soon to prevent it. Working together, the Committee and O. D. T. will soon undertake a survey of various sections of the country, similar to the survey made last spring of farm machinery and equipment, which resulted in an increase in manufacture. This survey is intended to develop facts about the condition of farm trucks and trucks used by those who serve farmers. From these facts recommendations will be made for a new and greatly expanded production. Only a few big trucks are being made now for civilian use. Some medium trucks are scheduled for later in the year, but no light ones (1½ tons or less).

The farmer's interest in this situation is as plain as the nose on your face. Practically every pound of farm products must be moved by truck at one point or another. Farm supplies reach the farm in most instances by truck.

First to turn the light on the seriousness of the farm-truck situation was the Studebaker Corporation, which called attention several months ago to a crisis in farm transportation, and proposed a plan for effective use of farm trucks. The Studebaker plan urged pooling of trucks; avoidance of part loads, cross hauling, and duplication; location of used trucks by dealers, for sale to farmers needing them; enlisting the owners of nonfarm trucks for emergency farm needs; better care of trucks already in use, to make them give better service and last longer.

Only a few weeks ago the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal carried reports from farmers in different States, indicating that the trucking situation is rapidly nearing the desperate stage. "The real crisis," said one Iowa farmer, "will come this fall when soybeans

are being combined." Said a Kansas farmer, "We can't get our stock to market when we want to move it. The trucks can't handle smaller shipments—too busy with the larger shippers. We just have to wait and wait."

Mr. Speaker, certainly this problem of highway transport is of sufficient importance to warrant the personal attention of War Production Board Chief Donald Nelson and Office of Defense Director Joseph Eastman. Between them they should be able to place the problem in the hands of some reliable and responsible personage who could smash the bottlenecks and get an adequate truck- and trailer-production program under way.

Agriculture at the Peace Table—Crawford County (Pa.) Pomona Grange Adopts Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, adequate production and equitable distribution of foodstuffs will continue to demand attention for an indefinite period after peace is restored. In addition to agriculture, there will be many other interests which will demand and will receive earnest consideration as plans are made for the post-war period. But agriculture, which is the basis of our food and clothing supply, is definitely of prime importance. A seat for American agriculture at the peace table is not only perfectly in order, but highly desirable.

While it is hoped that eventually the living standards of all the people of the world will be brought more nearly into harmony, yet, at the same time, such should be accomplished by raising other standards without lowering ours. In order to maintain American standards of living, and proper wage scale of American labor, American agriculture must have the benefit of the American market within its ability to supply. Our surplus should then be exchanged in the markets of the world for those things which either we cannot produce at home or which we cannot produce as economically as we can purchase from abroad.

The following resolution of the Crawford County (Pa.) Pomona Grange is timely and no doubt representative of much agricultural sentiment Nationwide and is worthy of fullest consideration:

AGRICULTURAL PEACE RESOLUTION

"Whereas all agriculture realizes the need of agriculture being represented at the peace table, and that its representative should be one thoroughly acquainted with the problems of agriculture and devoted to its interest; and

"Whereas the one man on whom all agriculture can rely, and in whom they have explicit faith, through his proven efforts in the best interest of not only agriculture but the Nation and the world, is Albert Goss, master of the National Grange: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the legislative committee of Crawford County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, working on the authorization of Pomona, urge the Pennsylvania State Grange to take the lead in being certain that agriculture is represented at the peace table, and in presenting the name of Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, to the proper authorities as being agriculture's representative; and further be it

"*Resolved*, That we ask all other granges of Crawford County to add their approval by adopting this resolution within their own subordinate grange; and also, that copies of this resolution be sent to the master and secretary of the Pennsylvania State Grange, the master and secretary of the National Grange, and to the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

Respectfully presented to the 1943 sessions of the Pennsylvania State Grange, asking their action and support.

Signed by the legislative committee of Crawford County Pomona Grange.

W. S. WISE, *Chairman*.
Mrs. C. R. ST. JOHN.
ARDEN DEAN.

Adopted this 5th day of October 1943.

Best Soldier of His Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, out at Fort Huachuca, Ariz., a few days ago a contest was held to decide who is the best soldier of the Ninety-second Infantry Division.

Corp. Andrew R. Johnson, a constituent of mine, of Indianapolis, Ind., won the contest and he is being widely acclaimed as the division's best soldier. A recent issue of the Buffalo, official organ of the Ninety-second Division, presented a picture of Corporal Johnson on its front page and with it in large letters the caption "Best soldier."

In announcing the award the Buffalo says:

Happiest soldier in the division this week—and he has reason to be—is Corp. Andrew R. Johnson, whose picture appears on the front page of this week's Buffalo. Corporal Johnson was adjudged as the best soldier in the Ninety-second Infantry Division for the second cycle.

Corporal Johnson is a member of the Ninety-second Division Reconnaissance Troop, a Negro unit.

Indianapolis is proud of Corporal Johnson. During his career in the Army I have watched with constant admiration his zealous, earnest, and determined efforts to rise to the highest standards of military excellence. As he once said in a letter to me:

My ambition is to be a true, hard-working soldier, who gives his all and all.

A very distinguished and outstanding honor has been conferred upon Corporal Johnson in being adjudged the best soldier in his entire division.

Railroad Employees of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of this Congress today to a matter that should have consideration which affects one of the finest groups of laboring men in the Nation who have backed the war effort to the limit and who have not cost their Government the loss of 1 hour's time during this war by calling a strike. They need our moral support now.

I refer to the railroad employees of America.

There is probably no group of laboring men in the Nation who have rendered a greater service to the people of the Nation and to the war effort than have the men who belong to the various railway brotherhoods and nonoperating organizations who, by their long hours and constant effort, have delivered the greatest amount of freight and passenger traffic over our American railway systems that the world has ever known.

During World War No. 1, at the peak of business in 1918, railroads almost broke down in handling 405,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight and 43,000,000,000 passenger-miles.

With 35 percent fewer locomotives and 26 percent fewer freight cars, last year in 1942, the American railway men put over the road 638,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight, an increase of 58 percent over the 1918 movement. In the same year they moved 54,000,000,000 miles of passenger traffic, extending the 1918 volume by 26 percent.

It is estimated that in 1943 our freight traffic will reach 725,000,000,000 ton-miles, representing an increase of 80 percent over the business handled under Government operations during World War No. 1. The passenger increase is even greater.

Mr. Speaker, had it not been for over 1,000,000 employees of the railroads who are known as the nonoperating class, this outstanding record could not have been accomplished. This class of railroad men start with the maintenance men, some of whom are known as section hands, and continues on into the railroad yards and shops with the boilermakers, boilermaker helpers, machinists, and machinist helpers, car repairers, blacksmiths, and so forth. They are the men who have kept the roadbeds in shape, who have repaired and kept the rolling stock in such condition as to get this transportation over the road.

It may surprise you to know that a great amount of this unskilled labor during these war times and during these high prices start as low as 36 cents an hour and that the top pay for machinists in railroad work, which represent a body of the finest mechanics in America, is only 95 cents an hour.

These men are subject to the same taxes and are up against the same high cost of living as are the more fortunate millions of workers in the war factories of the Nation, who, in most instances, draw twice those amounts in salaries. You know the type of men I am referring to. There are thousands of them in my district who are among our most conservative and respected laboring men. In my district they make up a part of the citizenry of Centralia, Salem, Mount Vernon, Effingham, Palestine, Mount Carmel, Bluford, and other cities. You have them throughout your districts throughout the Nation. They are among our best citizens, they support the schools, the churches, and the bond drives.

These men are underpaid and have been since war was declared. They are asking for more money now and their plea has been almost utterly disregarded up to the present time in the face of the fact that the railroad companies, due to their heavy volume of business, are making more money than in the many years past, because of such increase in business and in increases granted them in rates.

The railroad men of this Nation have given the country little trouble with regard to work stoppages. There has not been a major railroad strike since 1922, a period of 21 years. Due to the fact that living has increased rapidly since the war began, on September 15, 15 organizations representing 1,000,000 nonoperating employees served notice on the companies that they expected an increase of 20 cents an hour with a minimum hourly wage of 70 cents. This request was denied by the management and later referred to the local mediation board. This board failed to agree and the President, by Executive order, appointed an Emergency Board to take the matter under advisement.

On May 24, 1943, this Board recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour. On June 22, 1943, Mr. Vinson, who was appointed recently by the President as Economic Stabilization Director, denied the increase as recommended by the Emergency Board. On August 7, the railroad management and representatives of the various crafts negotiated an agreement based on the findings of this Emergency Board. Mr. Vinson, the President's right-hand man, who apparently is following the dictates of the President, has consistently refused to approve this small raise, and the railroad men have been refused the meager sum of 8 cents an hour increase.

Every fair-minded citizen who will give any thought to the situation knows that the price of living, within the past 2 years, has increased to a greater extent than the 8 cents an hour raise now refused to the railroad men. The pay of this great group of our citizens is below the average standard pay for the class of work they do and it is hard to understand why Mr. Vinson, who speaks for the President, continues to turn his back against this great group of men who have contributed patiently and loyally to the enormous task of railway transportation in this country.

It is to be hoped that the President and Mr. Vinson will take note of the unjust treatment these men are receiving and grant this meager raise in salary. If they do not the blame should be placed where it belongs. The President and Mr. Vinson, and no one else, must be held responsible.

Investigating the Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley, from the Wall Street Journal of October 5, 1943:

INVESTIGATING THE F. C. C.—THE COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION NEEDS A CONTINUATION OF THE AIRING BEGUN BY REPRESENTATIVE COX

(By Raymond Moley)

The resignation of Representative EUGENE Cox as chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission presents to the House and its leaders one of the hottest issues since its election last year. If the leaders want the confidence of the country, they must provide for the pursuit of this inquiry to the end. The faintest suggestion of whitewashing will carry the activities of the F. C. C. into the only forum left, which will be the 1944 campaign. For the F. C. C.'s activities, as revealed to date, include some of the most serious threats to freedom of expression which have appeared in years.

The attack upon Mr. Cox involved a question of official conduct entirely unrelated to the subject of the inquiry. But public opinion is most definitely interested in find-out out why, after recommendations by all the high authorities of the Army and Navy, including the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, the activities and personnel of the F. C. C. engaged in confidential war activities were not transferred. It is still more concerned with the question of whether the F. C. C. in its methods of licensing radio stations, has so intimidated the companies that freedom of expression on the air is, in fact, limited by a Government bureau beyond fair and lawful considerations of taste or morals.

The vigor of Mr. Cox and of the committee counsel, Mr. Eugene Garey, in conducting the inquiry was appropriate to the inquiry's gravity and to the well-known capacity of certain Government agencies to resist legitimate public inquiry into their activities. Mr. Fly and members of his staff have complained bitterly, but this complaint must be discounted in light of the fact that administration agencies have shown similar vigor in investigating private persons, companies, and associations. As this column has mentioned before, this is no tea party. It is an inquiry into a matter involving the liberties of the people of this country.

As to the charges made against Mr. Cox, the matter comes down to a judgment of the propriety of official conduct. The House makes laws to cover that and, where law does not apply, the House applies its own disciplinary measures. Speaker RAYBURN said, with reference to Mr. Cox, that "his friendship, his love, and confidence remain." Of even more significance was Majority Leader MCCORMACK'S tribute to Mr. Cox's truthfulness, honesty, and integrity.

The charge against Mr. Cox has been in the Department of Justice for some time, and no definite action has been taken by it. Instead, a newspaper, magazine, and letter-writing persecution has been carried on. This is hardly a sound way to get at the facts.

The temper of the House of Representatives is very warm with respect to the doings of the F. C. C. It will insist upon an investigation which goes to the very heart of it. This will put upon the new chairman the duty of carrying to a finish the work begun by Mr. Cox.

Shall the People of Italy Rule?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech delivered by me over Station WWDC, on the subject Shall the People of Italy Rule?

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fortunately the question as to the key problem in Italy is perfectly clear and simple. It is simply a question of whether the new government to be organized there shall concern itself with the basic needs of the Italian people as a whole or whether such government is to be another tool for insuring special privileges to the few. To repeat, this is again the centuries' old struggle of the basic needs of the many versus special privileges for the few.

All realize how tremendously enormous and complex are the operations involved in the conduct of a global war. I am afraid that very few people understand that the problems of victory are even greater and more complex which will demand of us even greater vigilance and greater thoroughness of preparation and understanding if the military victory we have won shall not be turned into plowshares for burying still deeper the very causes for which we have fought and for which we have paid so dearly in "blood, sweat, and tears."

The way the Allied Nations handle the victory in Italy will undoubtedly show to a large measure whether they have the capacity to cope with the complex social, economic, political, and military problems that inevitably follow the conclusion of a world war. It is well at this time to remind ourselves that the First World War was lost following the military victory and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the Second World War is merely a prelude to a third world slaughter.

As to Italy, this country is unique among the Fascist nations. In that country lives also the traditions of Matteotti and Garibaldi. There is, therefore, no need to force democracy on the Italians. They are already a liberty-loving people. Our task will rather be one of making it possible for the Italian people to choose their own representatives and their own government. We must help the Italians to salvage their own economy and to clean the Fascists and any other predatory group from their long-held roosts.

We cannot temporize in this lest we lose the faith and confidence of a world so eagerly begging for liberal leadership.

Our responsibility is plain. We know the direction we must travel.

Where do we stand now? Italians, wherever or whenever they can, are cooperating—even to the Fascist. Obviously the Fascists hope to retrieve some of their power on the spoils of their collaboration. We must not become so beholden to them that we protect them from justice at the hands of those they have bled so long.

As for the Italian people themselves. Remember how unwillingly they fought. Badoglio, a professional soldier and Fascist hireling, carried the surrender to our generals. Well and good. Labeled poor soldiers by Nazis and United Nations alike, the Italian people have given testimony that they have never had any stomach for the system oppressing them. While bearing arms against us they were our unwilling enemies. There were popular demonstrations against the Fascisti even before the capitulation. Note that I said popular demonstrations. Note also that unlike Germany there existed in Italy at all times a weak but articulate opposition to fascism.

As to the Italian situation so far, this can be said. The allies have in the space of a year turned what appeared to be imminent defeat in Africa into an amazing victory not only in Africa but in the Mediterranean. We are still fighting a war in Italy. There is still time in which to make policy.

If the Allied Nations are sincere in their expressed determination that a better world shall follow the military victory, it is up to the allied people to decide now just what kind of world they want to live in. This is your world and what will be done with it is up to you. Most emphatically, your responsibility does not end with the building of planes and tanks or the provision of money. Vast and costly as these contributions are, they are merely preliminaries—the first attack, so to speak.

If government of the people, for the people, and by the people shall not perish from the earth, every man and woman who understands the significance of this challenge must dedicate all they are and all they have.

America's Salvation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "America's Salvation," delivered by me at the annual conference of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, Columbus, Ohio, October 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S SALVATION

America's salvation is in deep faith in her people. Lincoln had that faith. It was the key to his greatness. The present national administration lacks it. That is the key to its weakness.

For 10 years the present administration has placed less and less faith in the people. For 10 years the present administration has been assuming more and more direction over the people. The time has come for the people of America to throw off such government and to resume governing themselves.

The founders of our Nation intended that it be governed by laws rather than men. Yet if the newly styled directives now being issued with little or no notice by appointed Federal administrators after private conferences, are to be substituted to an increasing degree for laws enacted by the elected representatives of the people after public hearings, we must recognize what is taking place for what it really is. To the extent that such administrative directives are substituted for constitutional legislation, a government of men is being substituted for one of laws. A republic whose policies are made by directors appointed by its chief executive rather than by legislators elected by the people to that extent takes on the character of a dictatorship. The degree of dictatorship increases with the degree to which the chief executive can dictate his own party renomination, and then by use of governmental funds and employment bring about his own continuance in office.

LINCOLN'S DEFINITION OF DEMOCRACY

When Lincoln was asked to define democracy he wrote this statement: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." In effect what he said was, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master of someone else to be my slave." He believed neither in slavery nor in dictatorship. He believed in the free man and in the free man's ability to govern himself.

Lincoln's statement answers equally the false philosophy of communism and the false philosophy of fascism. It declines to accept either the shackles of slavery or the scepter of sovereignty. It combines the spirit of personal independence with that of the Golden Rule. It is the creed of the free man and the pioneer. It is typically American and typically Republican. It is needed today.

THE THIRD AND FOURTH TERMS

One of the most obvious illustrations of the present administration's lack of faith in the people was the insistence of the Chief Executive upon renomination and reelection to a third term in office. When President Washington completed his second term in 1797, the Nation was in a critical situation calling for its utmost strength and its best leadership. Washington, as the father of the Republic, was, however, more interested in the permanent strength and stability of the Republic than in any temporary improvisations of policy. He had faith in the Republic and in the ability of its people to govern themselves if they were given that opportunity and that responsibility. He knew the dangers of extended executive control. He refused a third term. He established a precedent that gave strength to the Nation for over 140 years. His example did wonders to strengthen the faith of the people in their own ability to govern themselves.

Similar action in 1940 would have done more for our country and for the cause of democracy than could any possible improvisations of personal policy. Time is making this clear. The tragedies of over-extended bureaucracy appear on every hand.

The obvious ease by which an administration in office can dictate a third or fourth term candidacy for itself is the best evidence that such an extended term in office conflicts with free self-government. It is the essence of self-government that the people themselves shall have the opportunity to direct it and therefore shall have the responsibility for it. It is only thus that they can develop the leadership and the strength to carry it forward from generation to generation without dependence upon any one man or set of men. This is the policy expressed in our Declaration of Independence.

BUREAUCRACY

A second illustration flows naturally from the first. It is bureaucracy. The long continuance of one administration produces the inherent vices of bureaucracy. It leads to overloading the pay rolls, inefficiency in service, wastefulness in expenditures, arbitrariness, favoritism, nepotism, political use of the civil service, and ease in concealment of frauds.

The appointive power reaches not only throughout the executive branch of the Government, but with even deeper effect into the Federal judiciary. Already seven of the nine justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and great numbers of the judges of the lower Federal Courts have been appointed for life by the present administration. This influence of one man upon the character of our courts of final jurisdiction already is contrary to the best interests of the system.

The civilian personnel in Federal employment has risen to 3,000,000 employees. This is 5 times the number when this administration took office 10 years ago. This administration shows every indication of increasing rather than reducing this number.

It is hard for any administration, even if it wishes to do so, to get rid of incompetents appointed by it. This administration moreover has become particularly infamous for its unwillingness to drop from Federal employment anyone whom it has once put into Federal service. The Nation also has suffered recently from extraordinary administrative ineffectiveness due to overlapping jurisdictions within the continually increasing hastily improvised bureaucracy, to say nothing of the personal controversies between bureaucratic officials themselves. The effect of this excessive pay roll is not only to waste the taxpayer's money but also to promote political support of the administration at the taxpayer's expense. The only sure cure for these ills is the election of a new administration dedicated to economy and efficiency and free from the obligations of the present administration to its own appointees. Here is the opportunity of the Republican Party.

EXTRAVAGANT PLANNING

As a third example, we have the extravagant planning of the National Resources Planning Board. This board had a congressional appropriation of about $3,000,000, but it spent twice that amount by obtaining special funds from the President's unallocated funds. It then produced programs not only at an expense greatly in excess of that contemplated but programs neither requested nor desired by Congress as the constitutional policy-making body of the Government. The plans of the Board call for practically unlimited Federal expenditures carrying forward a program of ever-increasing Federal control over the lives of the public at the taxpayer's expense.

Instead of representing a policy of faith in the people to govern their own lives and to establish their own policies, these programs of the National Resources Planning Board are evidence of a lack of faith in the people and tend to encourage dependence on public funds. The cost of the program apparently is not seriously regarded. The program minimizes the value of initiative and exaggerates the value of unearned governmental payments. The program is a typical symptom of the domination of an administrative government over its people and the use of that domination to distribute benefits among certain members of the public paid for out of the funds of other members of the public. It is advertised as a form of social security but it leads to the financial instability of the Government and the personal bankruptcy of the taxpaying producers. Living on borrowed capital is

easy while it lasts but it leads to ruin. We need more of a policy of fair return for work done and less of a policy of getting something for nothing. Whenever someone receives more than he earns someone else retains less than he earns so as to make up for it. A square deal is the only deal that is good for everyone.

A genuine government by the people for the people will promote economic and social gains for the benefit of the whole people as long as those gains are consistent with the ultimate welfare of the whole. The people, as distinguished from a bureaucracy, will hesitate to sacrifice the long-term future of the whole in order to improvise temporary and unearned benefits for the present. It was typical of arbitrary power to coin the phrase "After me comes the deluge." When people as a whole actually govern themselves they do so not only for themselves but for their children and their children's children. They build carefully for permanent stability as well as for temporary gain. That should be the policy of the Republican Party.

A REPUBLICAN PROGRAM PROPOSED

What program is recommended? The answer is that the Republican Party should dedicate itself to a government based upon faith in the people as a whole. The Republicans, therefore, should—

1. Fight the war with even greater vigor, efficiency, and unity than has been shown, and create a greater determination by everyone to bring it to the most complete and quickest victory possible.

2. Oppose a fourth term for this administration with every vigor they can command.

3. Demonstrate determination to administer public funds with economy and efficiency, and eliminate unnecessary Federal interference, agencies, and employees.

4. Outline a program of post-war policies for the encouragement of increased production in industry and in agriculture that will represent the views of industry, labor, and agriculture working in full cooperation with each other and their Government.

5. Develop a positive foreign policy to insure peace and stability for many years ahead.

POST-WAR INTERNAL RECOVERY

While recognizing the need for Federal or local aid to communities or individuals that may face post-war emergencies and hardships, the Republicans should direct their constructive program primarily toward eliminating the cause of such emergencies and hardships. Prevention of disease is better than any treatment for its ravages. A program for increased industrial and agricultural production is the only program that will enable the public to carry the post-war burdens of debt and taxation. The Republicans should encourage especially the development of new fields of production which have been opened through the scientific advances of the past decade, but which have not yet been permitted to feel the benefits of private initiative coupled with a reasonable assurance of peace and stability.

I am speaking in terms of aviation, radio, electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, possibly atomic power, chemistry, chemurgy, plastics, wood, light metals, glass, electric welding, improved housing, soybeans, improved agricultural equipment, sulfa drugs, and many other "acres of diamonds" near at hand.

Following the war America will face her greatest crisis. It will be the supreme test of self-government to reestablish the internal stability and prosperity of America. It will involve not only the stability of America, it will stand as an example to the world of the practical application of the principles we preach.

We shall be returning from the governmentally controlled and financed economy of total war to what should be the far freer privately financed economy of established peace. In America we shall face this test under unusual handicaps. We shall be obliged to carry the greatest burden of taxation in our history. Our national debt will be ten times greater than before the war. It will be absolutely essential that we carry these burdens and take them in our stride. We must pay the interest on these bonds and pay enough of them at maturity to enable us to refund the rest for many years to come. These bonds are held by every church, trustee, bank, and practically every family in America. They are the best evidence of the credit of our country. To pay the carrying charges on them, it will be necessary for us to develop a national income greater than any we knew before the war. If we fail to do this we shall be unable to carry the tax load and the bonds. We will find ourselves faced with a financial depression that will make the last one seem like comparative prosperity. We must not fail to produce an increased national income if we are to escape a regimentation of scarcity in this country which will make us wonder whether we won or lost the great war against totalitarianism.

I believe we can do this. During this war we have discovered within ourselves a capacity for greater production than we dreamed we had. Coupled with the opportunities for the development of new real wealth along the lines previously indicated, America can well meet the post-war emergency, provided there is peace, stability, and reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come.

This places upon the Nation the responsibility of securing international peace, stability, and a reasonable prospect of stability not merely for the benefit of the world but as the very foundation for America's own internal stability.

FOREIGN POLICY

Here, then, is an opportunity for the Republican Party to serve the best interests of the Nation and of the world by putting forward and supporting a constructive commonsense foreign policy. It must be worthy of such outstanding Republican leaders of foreign policy as Presidents William McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt and such outstanding Secretaries of State as James G. Blaine, William R. Day, John Hay, Elihu Root, and Charles Evans Hughes. It must recognize the conditions which have reduced the world substantially to a neighborhood and made every part of it dependent upon every other from the points of view of safety, economics, and human welfare. The people of the United States are entitled to have a foreign policy that is understandable and consistent with the needs and principles of this Nation. They should not be required to rely upon the improvisation of policies from time to time to meet the needs of the moment.

The Republican Party, on behalf of the people, should call upon the Chief Executive of the United States, to develop a foreign policy for the United States in the manner contemplated by the Constitution; namely, with the advice and consent of the United States Senate and in appropriate features with the help of both Houses of Congress. While under the Constitution it is recognized that the Chief Executive shall conduct negotiations on behalf of the United States Government with foreign nations, it is equally clear that treaties so negotiated shall not be binding upon this Nation without the advice and consent of two-thirds of our Senators present when the vote is taken. This provision assumes that the Chief Executive, at all times, will feel a faith in the people of his country and a faith in the elected representatives of those people. Any failure on his part to work with the Senate as the policy is being developed handicaps America. The world knows only too well from its experience following World War No. 1, that a President of the United States who does not cooperate with his Senate in the development of his foreign policy cannot be depended upon to make good on his proposals.

While the Republican Party, therefore, need not anticipate the details of the negotiations, it should require cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our own Government and also cooperation among the United Nations with whom we are winning the war. A policy of world-wide stability is needed. It should be a strong, cordial, restrained, and common-sense policy. It should be far short of global boondoggling but as positively constructive and as fully up to date as are flying fortresses, transoceanic clippers, and world-wide radio broadcasts.

UNITY AMONG THE UNITED NATIONS

The Republican Party will do well to make it clear that it recognizes that continued unity among the United Nations in peace, as well as in war, is the very foundation for the peace of the world. In the words of its Post-War Advisory Council, the Republican Party looks forward to "responsible participation by the United States in post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world." This looks to an understanding among the United Nations.

They will adapt its form in the years to come to the needs of those times. To be binding upon the United States of America treaties on this, or any other issue, will require constitutional approval by two-thirds of the Senators present. Whoever, therefore, is to bear the responsibility of our Government must be prepared to act on this issue.

We should seek an orderly means of adjustment of international disagreements and policies without war, and we should retain at least such a unity of military strength among the United Nations as is comparable to the unity which has demonstrated its priceless value during the fighting of this war. We should say so. Failure to preserve that degree of military unity among the United Nations would be a serious mistake. While such a failure would not mean immediate war among the United Nations, it would introduce a substantial and unnecessary uncertainty at once into their future relations. This uncertainty would force each nation to offset its possible dangers. It would lead to military armaments and economic measures otherwise unnecessary. At the very time when each nation would need most to reduce its taxes it would be forced to increase them. The taxes not only would be burdensome to us, they might even stop our chance of internal recovery. The tragic experience of two wars in one generation should be enough to convince the world that some policy different from that followed after the First World War must be followed now, not only by the United States but by all of the United Nations, so as to give greater assurance of continued peace. The need for an up-to-date constructive foreign policy that will make our victory worth the high price paid for it is a need that must be met by the Republican Party. We should not hesitate to meet it. The men and women in the service have a right to expect this and we should lead the way toward it.

The Republican Party can meet its obligation to the country and to the young men returning from the war if it will dedicate itself to taking a leadership both in internal and external affairs that will promote internal peace and stability and will give reasonable assurance of international peace and stability for years to come. This policy already has been stated, but I summarize it here again:

1. A square deal to everyone, big or small, industrialist or laborer, farmer or consumer, regardless of race, color, and creed.

2. A record-breaking recovery of private industry based upon carefully planned reconversion of plants, the development of new products, a freer economy, a positive regard for the public welfare, and cooperation between industry, labor, agriculture, and government.

3. A determined unity of the United Nations to insure the continuance of peace and of our common right to the freedom we shall have won.

Thus can the Republican Party save for all the people of America the land of freedom and of opportunity of which our soldiers dream and for which our soldiers fight.

Address by Hon. Howard Leonard, Director of Agriculture for the State of Illinois, at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address by Hon. Howard Leonard, director of agriculture for the State of Illinois, delivered at the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, held at Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have often wondered why there should be any discussion as to the place that food has in our economy. Certainly it is clear to any thinking person that food is the first prerequisite of life. The first effort of all animals after birth is to find something to eat; babies cry for food, and so it is throughout life. There is a constant struggle for food in order that we may live and fulfill our mission here on earth.

The producers of food are fully aware of the hazards inherent in their occupation, they know that farming is no longer a simple process of seeding and harvesting but has become a very skilled vocation. The individual farm must be studied and its possibilities appraised in order that the maximum production may be secured. They know that it takes long-time planning because it takes 3 years to produce a dairy animal or a choice steak, and that it takes at least 18 months to produce pork chops for the table. They know that it takes a year to produce a crop of wheat which then must have additional time for processing into flour before it can appear on the table in the form of a loaf of bread or pastry.

After listening to radio broadcasts and reading various propaganda press releases, I am convinced that the great consuming public does not thoroughly understand what is necessary as to time and effort in the production and merchandising of food. It is certainly fitting that here in the great Middle West there should be held a conference whose primary object should be to present to the public not only the necessity for food, but to present authentic information concerning its production and distribution.

This area is comprised of 12 States, and, collectively, they are frequently referred to as the Grain Belt. They extend from Ohio to Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. That area of 750,000 square miles is larger than any country in Europe, except Russia. In fact it is larger than Germany, France, Spain, and Italy combined.

These 12 Grain Belt States comprise about 25 percent of the total land area of the United States but have 38 percent of all the farm land and 49 percent of all the crop land. The value of their farm land and buildings represents 51 percent of the United States total.

Last year these 12 Grain Belt States produced 59 percent of the total wheat crop, 76 percent of the total corn crop, 82 percent of the total oats crop, and 91 percent of the total soybean crop. No wonder it is called the Grain Belt of the United States. The value of all cereals grown in these 12 States represents about 66 percent or two-thirds of the value of all cereals grown in the United States.

This area also makes an impressive showing in livestock and livestock products. At the beginning of this year of 1943 it had 47 percent of all the cattle of the country as well as 47 percent of all the milk cows; 53 percent of all the horses; and 68 percent of all the hogs; however, it had only 31 percent of all the sheep. The chickens in this area were 48 percent of the United States total.

According to the census of 1940, the sales of cattle in this area represented 51 percent of the United States total sales, and sales of hogs represented 76 percent of the total. Thus, this area might also be called the Hog Belt of the United States as well as the Grain Belt.

Production of milk in these States, according to the census, comprised 52 percent of the total sold in the United States; and sales of cream or butterfat, 75 percent of total United States farm sales of cream or butterfat.

	United States	12 States	Percent, 12 States
Wheat produced in 1942.....bushels..	981, 327, 000	588, 682, 000	59.2
Corn produced in 1942.....bushels..	3, 175, 154, 000	2, 424, 916, 000	76.3
Oats produced in 1942.....bushels..	1, 358, 730, 000	1, 122, 823, 000	82.6
Soybeans produced in 1942...bushels..	209, 559, 000	190, 864, 000	91.1
Total acres harvested...bushels..	339, 848, 000	184, 581, 000	54.3

Illinois, because of its location and because it is one of the largest exporters of food grains, is particularly interested in a more complete understanding of the farmer's problems.

The urban housewife has been accustomed through the years to find on the shelves of the grocery stores row upon row of canned goods, an assortment of fresh vegetables, and the various cuts of meat from which she can make her selection.

Now, under the stress of war conditions, many of these items that were available are not there, and I find that it is the tendency of these urban buyers to criticize the farmer and ascribe to him various selfish motives because the articles she wants are not available.

Before criticism of food producers becomes too severe, it might be well for us to refresh our memory on the number of tillable crop acres available in the United States and what has happened in the last 40 years. The harvested crop acreage for 1943 will be only 6 percent more than acres harvested in the period 1910–14. At the same time our domestic population has increased 42 percent over the same period.

Before the present war the United States for several years had been a net importer of agricultural products, so that any loose statements that the United States can feed itself, contribute substantially to the food requirements of the Allies, and provide food for the conquered nations is not borne out by the facts.

This country has developed and grown strong because its citizens were well fed with an adequate amount of meat and cereals. A slack in our domestic food supply or any radical change of eating habits would be disastrous to the Nation.

Farmers and livestock men of the United States will plan to produce in 1944 every pound of meat and grain that is possible with the facilities available. Given adequate labor, the necessary farm machinery, a reasonable supply of fertilizer, assurance of an equitable share of the national income, and with the aid of a favorable growing season they will produce the greatest volume of food products this country has ever known.

I regret that Governor Green is prevented, by prior engagement, from being here and giving you the address of welcome. I esteem it a privilege to welcome you in behalf of Governor Green to the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, and trust that out of this meeting and others of similar character there may come much that is beneficial and a better understanding can be reached in the solution of our food problems.

Political and Economic Disintegration in Nazi-Occupied Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in my opinion one of the great features of the Washington Evening Star is a column written daily by Mr. Constantine Brown, who comments most intelligently upon national and international affairs. In the issue of the Star of October 9 I read one of his most interesting articles. His articles appear under the heading "This changing world."

I wish to read to the Members of the Senate the concluding paragraph of the article:

Under these circumstances it is obvious that the restoration of Europe on a sound basis will offer a problem at least as delicate as the defeat of Hitler.

Mr. Brown there refers to the differences existing today in many of the countries which have been subjugated by the Axis Powers, and in some of the countries which have been or are about to be liberated. For instance, we know in Italy at this hour a deadly controversy exists between the black-shirt Fascists and the Communists, which is having a serious effect on the country. We likewise know that in Yugoslavia there are factions which are fighting one another for ultimate power in Yugoslavia when at a later date she will be lifted from beneath the heel of the Axis oppressor. I recommend

a reading of the article by Members of the Senate, and respectfully ask that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

So long as the fighting to defeat the Germans continues in full swing little attention is paid to the political and economic disintegration in the Nazi-occupied countries.

The general impression in the United States is that there is only one thing that matters to the people of Europe—to get rid of Hitler and his gang and start life afresh.

The true picture is quite different, however. Even now, when the enemy has not yet been defeated and appears to have a good deal of fighting power left, there is a "dog eats dog" attitude in all the conquered territories.

Important capitalists in the Western European countries are of two minds about a victory of the Allies. In France, for instance, the big industrialists, bankers, and businessmen are living in fear that an Allied victory would mean the domination of Europe by the Communists who are supported by the Moscow Government.

According to reliable reports, the rest of the working classes in France and the Lowlands have been won over completely by the communistic ideology and hope the doom of Hitler will permit them to establish a system of government on the pattern of the original Lenin ideology.

LEAN TOWARD COMMUNISM

Even the peasantry, generally regarded as a strong conservative class, is inclined to lean toward the Communist doctrine. Thus while western Europe appears divided between a pro-Nazi totalitarian and Communist philosophy there is little feeling for the type of democracy America and Britain are standing for.

A French underground leader who escaped from France only 3 weeks ago and managed to reach the United States says reports are being spread by antagonistic underground elements among the French population that the Americans and British will be far more harsh and overbearing when they enter their country than the Nazis themselves.

This group tells the people, "The Nazis have taken your food and your possessions, the Americans will take your hide."

The underground movement in western Europe is divided into two groups—the most important being anti-Ally. These groups are fighting each other.

In southern and eastern Europe, from the Adriatic to the Russian border, there are nationalistic, communistic, liberal, and loyalist trends.

INTERNAL DISSENSION

In Yugoslavia, for instance, Drug Tito, leader of the partisans, and General Mihailovich, chief of the Chetniks, until recently, considered it more important to destroy each other's forces than to fight the enemy.

Strongly supported with war materials and a good publicity campaign by the Soviet Government, the partisans now hold the advantage. General Mihailovich's men, who represent the legitimists—the official government of King Peter in Cairo—are now at a disadvantage. They hope, however, to receive larger quantities of supplies soon and start their push against the Nazis.

But the principal object of General Mihailovich and Drug Tito, appears to be reciprocal extermination.

The Yugoslav people are divided among themselves, and there are groups led by politicians in that heterogeneous territory who see their salvation in a continuation of cooperation with the Nazis.

A DELICATE PROBLEM

So far as the United States and Great Britain are concerned these groups stand far behind in the hearts and the minds of those people. The Chetniks feel that we in this country have let them down because some official agencies such as the Office of War Information have made themselves the spokesmen for anti-Mihailovich propaganda while the Partisans resent the alleged partiality of the Government itself for the Chetniks and the official Yugoslav Government in exile.

A similar schism exists in Greece where the Communist-sponsored Republican Party is now in the ascendance. Moreover, King George's government is accused of imperialistic views by its neighbors, the Albanians.

The situation is said to be equally as bad in Poland, where a number of political groups have been formed. Only few have any use for the Government in exile and its official supporters—American and Britain.

Under these circumstances it is obvious that the restoration of Europe on a sound basis will offer a problem at least as delicate as the defeat of Hitler.

Address by Hon. C. Wayland Brooks, of Illinois, at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short speech delivered by me at the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers, held at Chicago, Ill., on September 16–17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Gannett and fellow Americans, I am delighted, indeed, to have the opportunity to follow the distinguished agricultural leader from our State in helping to welcome you to the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, because all of us who were born and reared and still live in Illinois think it's God's country. I am very happy to have you call this conference in our State, and I am happy to welcome you and the distinguished Members of the Senate who are here to address you. These men have been working constantly and devotedly and faithfully in the interests of our national welfare, devoting their efforts constantly to the agricultural problem. I want to congratulate you on this meeting. I see it has already had results, for the President called in representatives of the four leading farm organizations yesterday, and, so far as I know, it is the first time that the directors of our stabilization and war mobilization and food production have been in conference with the real farm leaders of this country thus far in the war. So you can feel proud that you have already obtained results.

Senator THOMAS will bear me out, when we were concerned in the early days in the raising of this vast and unprecedented Army in the United States, with the effect it was having on agriculture, and in studying the manpower problem, we called before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, upon which I had the honor to serve with him, the heads of all the departments that had to do with the war. We had the Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army, of the Navy; we had the head of the Lend-Lease Administration, Mr. Stettinius; we had Mr. Lehmann; and everyone of them testified that at no time during the entire consideration of the mobilization of the effort of this country for war did they once have the representatives of agriculture in the discussion.

Apparently they felt that agriculture would muddle through, and we called to their attention at that time the danger of the shortage that would come in this, the most vital weapon of freedom-loving people of adequate supply. We learned then that in the first move into Africa one ton out of every six of food was required to feed the people of that depleted area, and that was the least depleted area in which our armies must move, and we impressed them then with the necessity of providing more metal for machinery, more fertilizer, less drafting of the men and draining of the men from the farms by the high prices paid in industry. When you consider that the American farmer has been subjected to all these restrictions and restraints and draining influences, never in the history of the world has any group of men and women been more patriotic and devoted and measured up to a finer degree than those who maintain the farms of the United States of America. We were told then that it would be our requirement in this country to raise more than we did in 1942, which was represented as being the bumper year of our Nation's history. Then when we pointed out that there were men in every county selling their herds because they couldn't maintain them, many of them were closing their farms because they couldn't hire the help, and they themselves were going into the industrial world at unprecedented high wages, their lack of machinery, and the millions of bushels of grain that were not to be harvested and other food that could not be canned, finally they decided that they would yield a bit and give us some help from the armed services, but that was only a token of what I think is going to have to be done.

You can count on these men; I vouch for them who come here from the Senate; I have watched them; I am proud to be a part of their effort; they are guarding the interest of the farm, as such; also they are guarding the interest of the liberty-loving people of the world, for food is the No. 1 weapon of free men fighting the tyrants who would take their liberties and food from the people of the world to bring them into submission. You are doing a splendid job in this conference; I am glad to have this moment, and I would be glad to have the final report and then go into conference with these other Senators to see what we can do to help you uphold the hands of those God-fearing men and women who do not strike, who do not sit down, who do not idle, who from early morning until way in the night till the soil and handle the crops and the stock that is the hope of the future happiness of a freedom-loving people everywhere.

Address by J. E. McDonald at National Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an

address delivered by Mr. J. E. McDonald, Texas Commissioner of Agriculture, before the National Food Conference, Chicago, Ill., on September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apparently, the general public does not realize the gravity of the food situation. The public does not understand that American agriculture is being called upon to produce not only food for America's civilian population but also for our armed forces, our war allies, Allied war prisoners, and peoples of conquered nations presently controlled by the armies of the United Nations.

This places responsibility not only upon the American farmer but on the American people as a whole, necessitating a spirit of cooperation and unity of all the American people, if hunger is to be averted.

The calling of this conference in the great city of Chicago by the Honorable Frank E. Gannett is timely and worthy and has possibilities of rendering a constructive service at a critical time both nationally and internationally. Therefore, I express my sincere appreciation to Mr. Gannett for his untiring efforts in making possible this food conference.

The accomplishments of our soldiers are a source of pride to every American citizen. Our armies have been under the direction of officers who were trained in the most skillful war tactics known to man. The war has been conducted in a manner which has achieved the maximum results with the minimum loss of life. Our armies have conclusively proven to the world that true Jeffersonian democracy and the American way of life are worth fighting for.

The three essentials of war are men, implements of war, and food. It is the last of these essentials that brings us together today.

We who are attending this conference, as well as the millions at home, want to cooperate with the farmers, with War Food Administrator Marvin Jones, and with the United States Department of Agriculture in outlining an agricultural program which, in 1944, will give the maximum production.

Given the proper Government cooperation and assistance, and left to use his own initiative, the farmer has demonstrated time and again that he is capable of meeting the emergency. This is evidenced by the fact that in normal times the farmer has American warehouses bursting with food and fiber and, in peacetime, the main concern is to hold him back so he will not smother himself in his own overproduction.

The farmer knows his job. He is patriotic. He is not a miracle man and cannot do the impossible. He must have the necessary essentials, such as farm implements, repair parts, competent farm labor and an abundance of finances if he is to meet the critical food situation with production so vitally needed in our war effort.

The farmer does not want exorbitant prices for his products. He does not want subsidies or incentive payments. These are offensive to him. What he does want is stability for his business and true parity prices for the crops he produces, that is, parity prices which include labor costs and all the expenses incidental to efficient farm management and production. These the farmer is entitled to, in either peacetime or wartime, and in wartime, it is imperative that the Government give the farmer every assistance possible in providing him with the manpower, machinery, and farm implements necessary to produce for wartime needs.

Not only is food vitally necessary in winning the war and writing the peace but it must and will play an important part in post-war reconstruction and rehabilitation of nations who have been ruthlessly torn asunder by the invading armies of bloodthirsty dictators.

God intended that agriculture should be the fundamental and basic industry of all nations and all peoples. It is the farmer who annually creates new wealth which is turned over to transportation for delivery to processing plants, there to be processed and packaged and given back to commerce for distribution to meet the needs of mankind.

Agriculture is the only indispensable vocation of man. It is agriculture that produces food and fiber with which we fill our stomachs and clothe our backs. Tilling the soil is a vocation which enables man to more nearly provide the essential things of life than any other vocation known to man. Agriculture, of course, includes farming, horticulture, dairying, livestock and poultry raising, etc.

When agriculture is prosperous and happy and the farmer has purchasing power with which to support other essential American industries, we have very few financial, social, and economic problems.

When the fighting ceases and war plants are closed we will have a homecoming of soldiers and war workers, the true conception of which staggers the average mind. Millions will be in this homecoming and when the "howdy" and "howdy-dos" are over, these millions will want homes and employment.

Agriculture can and must absorb a great portion of these homecomers. Now is the time to prepare for this great homecoming, beyond the waving of banners, blowing of whistles and throwing of confetti. We must not allow our soldiers to return and find that while they were on the battlefronts, fighting for their country and our American way of life, we failed to provide for their rehabilitation and future.

It is imperative for the Congress of the United States at once to take steps to provide for the maximum number of homes for families on the land. Placing the maximum number of families in farm and ranch homes reduces the ranks of the unemployed and lessens the competition for industrial jobs.

Families established in farm homes and given the proper Government assistance and protection become valuable assets to their community, State, and Nation. Such families, in the improvement and maintenance of their homes and farms, would provide a continuous market for industrial products, and also furnish employment to those skilled in nonagriculture, such as carpenters, plumbers, mechanics, and professional men and women.

It is true that huge sums of money will be needed for rehabilitation and the placing of the maximum number of families in farm and ranch homes. This money will have to be provided by or through the Government but will be far less expensive to the taxpayers than maintaining relief rolls and other forms of doles.

I suggest that the Congress appropriate a sum of money, adequate in amount, which would be used as a revolving fund for establishing properly approved families on properly approved farms and ranches. Such loans should be of long tenure and a low rate of interest.

Establishing these families on farms and ranches is not enough. Provision must be made that they receive true parity prices for that portion of their crops domestically consumed and then be left free to produce any amount in excess of their allotments to be sold in foreign markets at world-market prices. This would be extending to agriculture the protection and benefits comparable to those the tariffs provide for the manufacturer. In other words, a two-price system for marketing agricultural crops similar to the two-price system which the tariff provides for the manufacturer in marketing his goods.

Parity prices was one of the five major agricultural objectives of the present administration and are generally accepted as being practical, fair, and equitable. In meeting this parity price objective it is imperative that the Congress provide a Government formula to be used by the administrative branch of the Government in determining parity prices. This Government formula should be so simple and understandable that a sixth-grade pupil could take the formula and figure parity prices.

In calling this food conference, we have accepted a responsibility and, at the same time, have provided an opportunity to render a constructive service. Our boys are presenting a united front on the battlefields of the world, and we on the home front should be equally as diligent in presenting a united front. Let's let the world know that we are an undivided America.

New Process Keeps Milk Powder Fresh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, of interest to the scientific world, to food processors, to our allies who look to us for foodstuffs, and to everybody concerned with the impact of war stimulated new food developments upon peacetime eating habits is the announcement in the October 9 issue of Science News Letter of findings recently made by the MacDonald College Laboratories in Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec. These findings indicate that whole milk powder containing small amounts of wheat germ oil and edible acids will stay fresh approximately twice as long as untreated milk. The ramifications of this new process, if this new method is expanded fully, may have far-reaching effects not only in our shipments of foodstuffs to hungry people overseas, but on the whole business of milk distribution in this country after the war.

In fact, it is no longer unreasonable to envision the day when people in our larger cities will be able to buy their milk at greatly reduced prices in compressed packs of powdered milk which will keep without refrigeration and which will dispense with the present costly and inconvenient methods of distributing milk to the individual consumers.

Members of the House may recall that on last June 6 and again on May 7 I addressed the House on the subject of new food developments and elaborated on some of the steps which had been taken and on those which should be taken so that the processes of food compression and food dehydration might make their full contribution to winning the battle of shipping in this war. At that time I mentioned the new development whereby the addition of wheat germ oil was employed to protect the freshness in whole milk powder. It is gratifying now to see a confirmation of this fact come from these famous Quebec laboratories and to read about it in Science News Letter.

At some later date, Mr. Speaker, I expect again to address the House on these

new type foods which are now proving themselves so valuable in this war. Remarkable progress has been made since early this spring in the expanded use of these new type foods. Many are now being supplied Great Britain. The Russians have recently requested that henceforth vegetable shipments destined for the Soviet Republic be sent in compressed form. New compression units are being established in dehydrating plants throughout the country and the science of new food development has made great headway during the past 6 months in meeting the challenges provided not alone by shipping but by warehousing needs, by internal shipping problems, and by shortages in critical wrapping materials.

The article in the Science News Letter on whole milk powder follows herewith:

KEEPS MILK FRESH—ADDITION OF WHEAT GERM OIL AND EDIBLE ACIDS KEEPS WHOLE MILK POWDER FRESH TWICE AS LONG—WOULD EXTEND USEFULNESS OF SUPPLIES FOR OVERSEAS

Whole milk powder containing minute amounts of wheat-germ oil and edible acids will stay fresh about twice as long as untreated milk, research at MacDonald College laboratories, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec, shows. If the simple, inexpensive method proves out, it could be employed to extend the usable life of the quantities of dried milk being shipped to war zones from the United States.

Dried milk is so light as to offer striking military advantages, but its use has always been limited by danger that the butterfat would turn rancid. For this reason, the Canadian Research Council asked Dr. W. D. McFarlane of MacDonald College, McGill University, to study natural food materials which gave promise of delaying rancidity in milk powder. Dr. McFarlane now reports that "very striking results" were obtained by adding wheat-germ-oil formula to the milk equivalent to 0.1 percent of the butterfat content. The oil is extracted at low temperatures and combined with minute amounts of edible hydroxy acids producing a formula more effective than wheat-germ oil alone, which has long been known to improve the keeping quality of less stable fats.

The wheat-germ-oil formula is simply homogenized into a small amount of skim milk, which in turn is poured into the liquid whole milk to be dried. So slight an amount is used that no change can be detected in the color or taste of the milk powder. The wheat-germ oil harmlessly oxidizes instead of the butterfat, delaying rancidity and helping to retain the vitamin A content. Dr. McFarlane found that this doubled the life of milk powder, and even before these findings could be published, the Canadian Navy began to use the formula in milk powder tablets for emergency rations.

The immediate military significance of this discovery stems from the fact that so little wheat-germ oil is used that our entire dried milk output could be protected with it from existing supplies of the oil. Besides, no new machinery is needed to mix it with the liquid milk. Dried milk would still be packed for export in vacuum cans, but the wheat-germ oil would give added protection. This would be especially valuable after cans are opened, and in warm climates.

United States production of dried milk in 1943 is expected to reach 150,000,000 pounds, breaking all records, emphasizing the importance of keeping qualities.

Dr. P. H. Tracy, authority on milk powder at the University of Illinois, has also been working on the problem, and confirms that "wheat-germ oil was found to retard the development of an oxidized flavor in powdered whole milk." Dr. Tracy emphasizes that wheat-germ oil cannot substitute for fine quality in milk powder—that it is simply an added protection.

In connection with this improvement in milk powder, officials of the Food and Drug Administration have pointed out that they know of no barrier to the addition of so slight an amount of pure food materials to milk powder, since no standard for dried whole milk has been set up under the 1938 law.

My Victory Garden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "My Victory Garden," prepared by Mr. F. Hiner Dale, a distinguished jurist residing at Guymon, Okla.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your chairman has asked me to talk to you tonight on gardening.

He told you that I was an expert on the subject. To save him the trouble of trying to prove it, I will admit it. All my life, I have often wondered what I was fit for. Now I know. In court we have three classes of witnesses: Liars, damn liars, and experts. I am glad that I qualify as an expert.

For more than 50 years, I have been gardening, and each year I have had as good a garden as I now have, but no one ever saw anything unusual or extraordinary about my garden until our chairman made me a visit and I gave him a tomato and he immediately discovered that I was a great gardener. He ranks with Christopher Columbus and Admiral Byrd in making discoveries. Guymon, no doubt, has many eminent men, who have never been discovered. We are not appreciated by our neighbors. A prophet is not without honor save in his own country.

I work in my garden to relax the muscles of my body, while I make talks to Lions Clubs to rest my mind.

I am glad this is a stag party. Women are so much superior to men that I never feel at ease in their company. Their minds are cleaner, they change them oftener. There are no marriages in heaven, that is why it is heaven.

When our chairman came here from Texas, I told him to get into all the organizations in town before they became acquainted with him. I told him to join the Lions Club. He did. He told me recently that some of the Lions wanted him to resign, and that one Lion had offered him $50 to resign. I told him not to do it, he could get more money.

Gardening is an ancient and honorable profession. Our forefather Adam was a gardener. He raised fruits and vegetables and got along fine until Eve came along and got him to eat the forbidden fruit. If you hope to succeed in gardening, keep your wife out of the garden until it comes time to gather the vegetables for the table.

You don't have to have much intelligence to be a good gardener. In fact the less sense you have the better gardener you will make. I can think of no good reason why you Lions would not make good gardeners. In fact most of you ought to be experts at it. Most of what I know about gardening I learned from a person who has served a term in the insane asylum at Fort Supply, Okla., and who gardened while there.

Gardening is a spare time job. When you have nothing to do, you garden. Two or 3 hours in the morning and 3 or 4 hours in the evening is all it takes to have a good garden. Be sure to quit work in the evening in time to hear the 10 o'clock broadcast. The best time to work in the garden is in the morning. I prefer the time from daylight until sun-up. You have all seen a sunset and know how beautiful it is. I don't suppose many of you have seen a sunrise. A sunrise is far more beautiful and gorgeous than a sunset and you should see one, so go into your garden at daylight and work until the sun comes up and you will see a sight that you will long remember and never forget.

I may lose my garden. It has been hinted that the War Department is planning to take it over to have a place to train the soldiers in jungle warfare.

Our soil is as rich as the valley of the Nile. However, it is not rich enough to grow vegetables, such as you would like to produce. When you plan to start a garden, the first thing you should do is to get a load of well rotted fertilizer; and spread it over your garden plot an inch deep. Don't go to a feedstore to get your fertilizer; go to a cow lot. Then plow or spade your ground as deep as you can, the deeper the better. After you plant and your crop comes up add more fertilizer. As your crop grows pile it on higher and deeper. Vegetables make an enormous demand on the fertility of the soil, and it is hard to get your soil too rich. We have no garden soils in this country but what will benefit by the application of a fertilizer.

After you have your garden fertilized and plowed or spaded good and deep, the next thing to do is to lay it off in straight rows 3 feet apart. While it is true that more garden sass will and does grow in crooked rows, the men who judge gardens seem to prefer straight rows. A yardstick and a string are the tools you will need in laying off your garden in straight rows. You next make a furrow or trench under the string deep enough to convey the water from one end of the row to the other. I use a furrow or trench about a foot deep as it will tend to fill up as the season advances. Soak your seed 24 hours and plant them in the bottom of your furrow or trench and cover your seed lightly and then firm the ground over the seed. Turn on your water from the hose and let it run slowly down the furrow until it reaches the other end of the row. Cover your seed again lightly with dry earth. You won't need to water again until after your seed come up and it may rain in the meantime.

If you will put the hose in a gallon bucket laid on its side, before you turn the water on slightly, the bucket will prevent the force of the water washing a hole in the ground. The slower the water runs down the row, the deeper it will sink into the ground. Once a week ought to be often enough to water your garden even in dry times.

To spray your garden with the nozzle of a hose is the height of folly and failure will follow in your footsteps if you do it that way.

Planting seeds of vegetables in furrows or trenches is a new idea to town gardeners. Our farmers have been listing their ground for row crops and planting their wheat with deep furrow drills, since the time that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. Our farmers are no fools and have learned by

trial and error and bitter experience what it takes to grow crops in this country. They taught me to plant my vegetables in furrows, and if you don't learn how, your cupboard, like Mother Hubbard's will be bare. Don't flat plant or plant on the ridges, but plant your seed in furrows or trenches and your table will groan with the products of your garden. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I will make this solemn prediction—within 3 years every garden in Guymon will be planted in furrows or trenches.

There are three vegetables, not generally grown here, that I can recommend for you to try.

1. Edible soybeans (a garden plant) produces enormously. One plant produces enough beans for one meal for one entire family. We now have them every day for dinner. You pick the beans off and they come on again. The hotter the weather, the better the beans set on. By all means plant a package of edible soybeans. They taste good.

2. Brussels sprouts are like little heads of cabbage. They sell at the grocery stores at a fancy price, when the stores can get them for their customers. What celery hearts are to celery, brussel sprouts are to cabbage. They are easy to raise and 12 plants will supply a family from now on until real cold weather. They grow 3 to 4 feet tall and will stand light freezes, which helps their flavor. The people of England are eating brussel sprouts three times a day now, and more than any other plant, it is keeping them from starvation and making them physically fit.

3. Kohlrabi is another member of the cabbage family that we have liked so well that we have eaten all that we planted. That is why I have no sample to show you. You won't have any of this plant to give away to your neighbors, because you will eat them all yourself.

Some gardeners are bothered with worms and insects. I am not. Every year, I raise a brood of young turkeys in my garden. If you hatch your turkeys with a hen, keep her up and let the little turkeys run in the garden; they will pick off the worms and insects as soon as they are hatched from the garden plants. They go up one row and down the next and work for you from daylight until dark ridding you of sharecroppers in your garden. A turkey will not taste bad at Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Tomatoes are the best vegetable grown. We now get one-half bushel off of two rows, every other day in our garden. Don't buy your tomato seed, get them from someone in your community, who has made a success growing tomatoes. Plant the seeds early in a window box. When danger of frost has past, dig holes three feet apart, in the furrow, where you have prepared to transplant them. Before you set your plants in the holes, drop a handful of fishing worms in each hole and set your plant on top of them. I raise my own fishing worms to plant with my tomato plants, however, you can get them by the gallon by going to the sewer ditch north of town in the early spring. Fishing worms dig tunnels four to five feet deep under your tomato plants, which lets the water down to the subsoil. They keep your soil aerated and pay big dividends.

Now is the time to start a fall garden. The moon is right and what is more important the soil is soaked. There are a dozen kinds of vegetables that you can plant now and harvest before frost.

Eat all you can out of your garden and can all you can't eat.

Our Government is planning to feed a starving world and it is up to you and me to feed ourselves out of our gardens.

Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I do not think a finer man is to be found in America today than Maj. Gen. James A. Ulio, The Adjutant General, United States Army. He is aggressive and active, and extremely popular, I believe, with all Members of Congress, and certainly with the American people. He has made a brilliant record for himself.

I read with interest in last Sunday's Washington Star an article penned by Mr. Bernard Godwin under the heading "America's war leaders." It is a character sketch of General Ulio. I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S WAR LEADERS

(By Bernard Godwin)

Rowing-race fans, accustomed to seeing tall, muscular youths come from the State of Washington to pull shells in the Poughkeepsie intercollegiates would spot General Ulio at sight as another native of the land where mountains reach to the sky and fruit grows luscious. And they would hit the nail squarely, for the tall, powerfully built adjutant general first looked upon the joys of this world at Walla Walla 61 years ago.

Early in life he set his mind on a military career, and, even without a West Point training, worked his way from a private at Fort Brady, Mich., to today's top ranking. Thirty-nine years of intelligent and diligent application to every job to which he was assigned bore the fruit and steady advancement and distinction. For his leadership in the success of the Fourth Army Corps in the battles of St. Mihiel sector of World War No. 1 and his service in evacuating French civilians in territory occupied by the enemy, he received a Distinguished Service Medal. Other awards bestowed upon him include the French Legion of Honor, Montenegrin Order of Prince Danilo, Panamanian Medal of La Solidaridad, Serbian Order of the White Eagle With Swords, and the Greek Order of the Redeemer.

Face to face, General Ulio is a striking, attractive man with an imposing head covered with steel grey hair. His hands are those of a musician, exceptionally well formed and shapely. To me they appeared sensitive and highly trained. His expressive countenance changes with his moods from cold sternness to warming smile in a jiffy.

There is an intriguing character to his personality, especially appealing to me, his practical self attempting to hide his esthetic instincts.

He is most particular concerning his dress and grooming, and always looks dressed-up.

The general's own simple formula explains clearly how he achieved by the hard way a really phenomenal military career: "My intense interest in my work regardless of the rank and the desires to give a little more than was expected of me and in the best way I knew how, was my creed." It's a creed for every youth to keep in mind in whatever he may undertake.

During the Army's campaign in the Philippines, 1906 to 1908, young Ulio served as a second lieutenant with great credit. Some years later he served with the 1st Infantry in Hawaii and in 1917 joined the 23d Infantry at El Paso, Tex., going to France in March 1918. Among his important posts over there was chief of the statistical division and in charge of the central records office.

He spent 6 months in Athens, Greece, in 1923 as chief, administrative division, American Red Cross, and later was assigned to headquarters, Second Corps Area, New York. For a time he was aide at Honolulu. After a period as chief of staff, Hawaiian Department, he returned to this country and by 1938 was executive officer in the Adjutant General's Office. Designation as brigadier general came in 1939 and on March 1 he became a major general and The Adjutant General of the Army.

Address by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida, to Young Democratic Clubs of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by me before the Young Democratic Clubs of West Virginia, at Wheeling, on September 12, 1941.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am glad to be in West Virginia, because, as in other crises, people of West Virginia are standing by the President, the flag, and the country.

When the history of this era is written it will record not what the arguments were, not why we did it so much, but whether, when the very foundations of America were being assaulted from every side, and undermined, too, whether we helped our President or whether we stood in his way and added to his load.

Neither the Revolutionary War, which established our freedom, nor the Civil War, which made us a single Nation dedicated to freedom, meant more to America than does this earthquake which the evil Hitler has brought upon the world. If this upheaval can be stopped, if its mighty rumble can be silenced, it will remain the kind of a world in which America, as Washington and Lincoln gave it to us, can continue to live.

If these destructive forces continue to gain momentum and might, America as we know it will be as dead as Pompeii smothered in the convulsions of Vesuvius.

The things for which we struggle, therefore, are no less than the right of our people to retain this, their native land; to worship their ancient God; to speak and to write the sentiments of their heads and hearts; to work as freemen and to work together with other freemen; to be not the servants of the state but to be "the captains of their fates," "the masters of their souls."

What a moving sight it is to see America rising from its lethargy, stirring itself like an awakening giant, beginning to stand up in the world like the Olympian figure she is.

America has quit running from tyrants and bullies. She has quit quaking before the threats of dictators. America is standing her ground. Those magnificent words of the President last night came out of his own eloquent mouth and brave heart, but they also were the words of Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and Wilson. They came as well out of the mouth and heart of America.

While it is sad to march in the valley of shadows, yet it is those great experiences which ennoble the souls of men; it is from such valleys that both men and nations rise to mountaintops. The eyes of the world, the eyes of history, are upon America as she gathers to her side under the banner of her leadership oppressed men and women everywhere, as she lifts up those who are stricken down, as she heals the wounds of the afflicted, as she rallies the sinking hearts of the discouraged, and begins the long journey toward one of the mountaintops of history.

America is keeping her rendezvous with destiny. Those who follow her shall see the promised land.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. Tully Williams, of Hankinson, N. Dak., dealing with the matter of old-age pensions.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANKINSON, N. DAK., *October 4, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have just received your letter informing us of the status of the old-age pension cause—for which accept our thanks. And we will lose no time in complying with your request for our views on same. So will offer a few suggestions that we believe fairly convey the consensus of thought on the subject among the people here.

The Townsend movement is organized in every State, and in practically every county in the Union, so we suggest all minor efforts get behind the Townsend plan—"In union is strength," and another thing that should be brought to the attention of Congress.

Perhaps you remember some years back we circulated an old-age pension petition for you, and practically everyone approached signed gladly, and from that fact and their general attitude, we cannot escape the conclusion that the number of people that believe in the old-age pension principle far exceed those that have declared themselves in its favor.

As to the age pensions should start and about husband and wife drawing pensions, and the amount, perhaps any suggestions we could make would only confuse the issue and we believe those details can safely be left to the deliberations of Congress, but one point we would not overlook on a bet—that is the proposition of the pauper's oath and especially liens on property.

As regards the first—right off the bat, old-age pensions were not conceived as charity, but as the inalienable rights of all citizenship, and the lien and pauper's oath idea was inserted by the plan's enemies, to discredit the plan and humiliate and discourage applicants, and furthermore the lien on property is a step in the direction of socialism, pure and simple; establishing the principle of the right of the State to levy on and confiscate private property. Every transfer would leave the people poorer and the State richer.

Look at our own North Dakota; the State bank has taken ownership of untold thousands of acres of privately owned tax-paying land, and transferred the taxes they should yield to the burden of other poor devils. A process that will hasten the day when they will, in their turn, be dispossessed. So I would as soon see the movement fall flat as go in with the pauper's oath and lien features.

No presentation of the case can be complete without envisioning the economic conditions that will prevail at the end of the war. No economic crisis in all history will even approach it in extent and severity, as the entire world will be involved; with millions in war industries out of employment, and more millions discharged from military service all the world around at once, it will undoubtedly be the greatest economic crisis in the world's history. All statesmen sense that—as evidence, the proposed farmers' subsidy and the $100 a month pay to discharged soldiers and countless other schemes, but the only one that offers any permanent solution or has any sort of financial basis is the Townsend plan.

With all good wishes, as ever,

TULLY WILLIAMS.

The Contribution of the American Businessman to America's Production Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, without the pay-roll makers there would be no jobs for the pay-roll workers, and without the producers, there would be no war industry, no food, clothing, housing, or other essential industry.

There was a time in this country when the farmer and the businessman were respected in American political expression and by the Federal administration for their abilities, patriotism, integrity, and the great contribution which they make to the public welfare and the safety of the Nation.

I still hold to that ancient faith of the horse-and-buggy days, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which an American businessman in Utah recently addressed to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO.,

Ogden, Utah, October 7, 1943.

Hon. RUFUS HOLMAN,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLMAN: I hesitate to write you at this time from the viewpoint of an American businessman. However, I feel so strongly that there are important matters to which we have to turn our thinking, and for that reason am doing so. Victory, of course, is the primary object of all American thinking and activity. Victory should not be the end of our thinking, nor is it a single aim which excludes or should exclude all other considerations. We are told by our leaders and asked to believe that victory is essential to preservation of democracy as a way of life. Belief in this concept is the motive power behind all of our present activity. To preserve is to maintain something possessed as distinguished from the acquisition of something new and never before possessed.

We have possessed and enjoyed the advantages of democracy. We are not struggling to preserve that way of life against substitution of a new way of life dictated by our enemies. We have permitted the democratic processes to be temporarily in suspension in the interest of the war effort. This we have done willingly and in full good nature. But, to those of us who believe we are fighting for the preservation of democracy, it is plain that plans must now be afoot for the projection of democracy, saved by victory, into the post-war years.

Meantime the fight goes on and irresistibly the pressure of our armed might brings nearer the destruction of our enemies. There is ample credit for all. There is no need to belittle the efforts of any group to magnify the importance of another. Chief credit must go to the officers and men of the armed forces. But is is because those men are fortified by the superior productive power of our people as a whole that they and our allies will prove themselves invincible.

Without intending any slight to any other group in our society we press the claim that the American businessman is a prodigious contributor to the success of our production effort. Large and small, business has shown a magnificent resourcefulness and genius for teamwork. It is the genius and resourcefulness of American business which largely measures the difference in capacity to produce between ourselves and our enemies when both are put to the test of the long pull and the grand struggle.

That genius and resourcefulness is quite properly one of the main hopes for the continuation of the democratic way of life in the post-war years. Business must make the same contribution to the ways of peace that it has been and is doing to the production of the necessities of war. It will not fail in that duty but it must have and is entitled to some encouragement. It asks for an attitude which is not hostile and it requires sufficient freedom from unreasonable restraints and interference to permit the play of its great capacity.

Business, as we commonly accept the term in this country, embraces the production, transportation, and exchange of goods with all of the numerous activities dependent upon and necessary to that work. Business requires to be relieved of unwarranted and hurtful criticism. It is not an evil or predatory thing. It should not be dangled before the populace as something to be feared and hated. It should good-naturedly accept necessary and reasonable restraints, but it should not be continued in existence as a whipping boy for the satisfaction of the whims of any group.

It should, as soon as the war is over, be freed from the invasion of countless government agencies bent upon the imposition of endless rules and regulations so involved and confusing, and oftentimes so complicated, as to make compliance on the one hand, and continued operation on the other, almost impossible. To this end there should be an orderly but rapidly closing out and dissolution of all but genuinely essential regulatory agencies and bureaus. The power

of the bureau has grown so great as to seriously challenge the best intelligence and the highest fortitude of Congress; but Congress will not demand victory by the armed forces in the field and then on the home front succumb to the pressure of the ever-multiplying bureaucrats.

This would relieve business of useless and hampering interference and at the same time separate hundreds of thousands of unnecessary persons from the public pay roll. It would accomplish the break-down of a power great enough to challenge and ultimately dominate the will of Congress. It would, at the same time, result in a great cut in the cost of government and the corresponding relief to business in its effort to take the place of government in the establishment and maintenance of pay rolls.

Business must continue to be the principal financial support of government through the payment of taxes, and at the same time it must be the source of those great pay rolls, without which there can be no happy and prosperous people, and without which government steps in and the democratic way of life expires. These demands upon business can be met only if business has the resources and earnings with which to meet them. Allow business only its operating expenses, siphoning off nearly all revenues in excess of expenses in the way of taxes, and shortly there will be neither pay rolls nor taxes.

Taxes are essential for the servicing and reduction of the public debt and the current cost of government. A sound economy requires that both must be reduced. Reduction can be accomplished only through economy and taxation, but tax levies upon business must be tempered to the necessities of a thriving business. Business, made anemic by excessive taxes, will not, in the long run, yield sufficient revenues, no matter how severe the tax levies may be. Business must accumulate reserves to enable it to take up the slack resulting from the cessation of war activities. The change-over will require vast capital and the demands of the Government should harmonize with that necessity.

Any increase in the normal tax rate on business at this time will be detrimental to the post-war program, and it is questionable whether it will return a substantial increase in revenue in the long run. The present normal tax rate of 40 percent plus the excess-profits levy allows no more than enough, in most instances, to pay a small return on legitimate capital investments.

The challenge to business to keep the wheels humming during the reconstruction period is already heard throughout the land. Business will take up the challenge and make the fight to the bitter end because it knows that the alternative is Government enterprise in the place of private enterprise. Call Government enterprise what you will—socialism, communism, or fascism—it is not democracy and it is democracy that business, including management and labor alike, is committed to preserve.

Business, like all other elements in our society, is and has been essentially honest and it should not, in the interests of the total welfare, longer suffer unwarranted and unfair criticism. It is unfortunate that, in the minds of so many, groups of citizens are set off and classified one against the other as if their interests were fundamentally hostile, one to the other.

I am sure that you are mindful of the thoughts expressed herein and I am confident that you appreciate the seriousness of the situation our economy is confronted with. I am hopeful that Congress will accept its responsibility in connection therewith.

Yours very truly,

H. A. BENNING, *President.*

Treasury Tax Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Frank R. Kent, in his column, The Great Game of Politics. The article, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of October 11, 1943, deals with the new Treasury tax proposals.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

Two strong indictments have been made against the new Treasury tax proposals, to neither of which has any adequate answer been given. They have been made in both Democratic and Republican papers, by both Democratic and Republican Members of Congress and by nonpartisan and disinterested economists.

It is beginning to seem that there is no answer, and the absence of any is practically a confession of guilt. At any rate, the charges are sufficiently sustained by the facts as to justify resentment and shake confidence in the high-mindedness of the administration.

The first charge is that the Treasury's proposals are clearly political, in that they calculatingly relieve of taxes a total of 23,000,000 people, in whose hands are four-fifths of the dangerous money, the absorption of which—if inflation is to be averted—the Treasury itself asserts to be essential. It is pointed out that the manner in which the Treasury would relieve these 23,000,000 taxpayers is, first, through abolition of the Victory tax and, second, by its new device of a refundable tax.

It is further pointed out that this relief would come just before the 1944 convention in which Mr. Roosevelt will be nominated for a fourth term, and that the 23,000,000 are voters.

SMALL GROUP HIT HARDEST

Still further, while relieving this vast body of voters who have most of the "dangerous money," the Treasury proposes to soak still harder the small body of voters already taxed pretty close to the limit. All of which would enable the fourth termers to make their usual demagogic appeal in the campaign.

On its face, this is one of the most brazen pieces of politics anyone can recall.

The second charge is that, while the Treasury correctly states that $10,000,000,000 additional revenue is needed to prosecute the war and keep the Federal financial structure from sagging, both the Treasury and the White House, paradoxically, set their faces firmly against the two simplest, soundest, and most obvious methods of raising this revenue. One of these is the general sales tax, the other is economy in expenditures.

A great many years ago one of the great Greek philosophers said, "Men do not realize how great a revenue economy is." Certainly that is true of the men in this administration. Now, asking for $10,000,000,000 more revenue, they make no calculation whatever of how much of this might be raised by curtailing waste, and will make no effort along that line.

It is an attitude that cannot be defended. It ought to be understood by the citizens sweating under the tax burden now—and who are going to sweat a lot more next year—that while there have been some governmental economies since Pearl Harbor, none was due to executive initiative. On the contrary, all were made either through congressional action or forced by congressional pressure.

Such was the case with the liquidation of the W. P. A., the C. C. C., and the N. Y. A. Such also was the case with the domestic branch of the O. W. I., and such will be the case with the O. C. D.

So far from the national interests having suffered by curtailment of these agencies, the national interests have been distinctly served. The thing to be regretted is that the cut did not go deep enough—and was not made sooner. This question of "revenue in economy" soon will be brought again to the front in Congress. Senator BYRD is determined to get light upon the reason for the holding in the Treasury of $23,000,000,000 of unexpended balances—enough to finance the war for 2 years without the appropriation of another dollar. And members of the Ways and Means Committee propose to call Army and Navy officials to see whether much of this huge sum cannot be saved.

SALES TAX FAVORED

Sentiment, in Congress and outside, grows both for the sales tax and economy. Despite Executive opposition, the first may be incorporated in the bill and progress may be made in the second. It does seem that a courageous and nonpolitical administration would be urging these things instead of trying to block them.

It is not likely the Treasury proposals will be accepted, but the danger is that, the politics of the executive branch begetting politics in Congress, the result will be another compromised and confused law, which will wholly avoid realities.

The sad truth is that the administration's wartime financial leadership is political, hypocritical, hollow, unsound, and inadequate. It reflects credit upon neither the President nor Mr. Morgenthau. It would be fine if Congress could measure up to the situation in this vital business, but the chances are not very good.

Budget Bureau Questionnaire 49–R112

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished citizen of Lancaster, Pa., Mr. H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co., has written me a most interesting letter regarding some of the unnecessary burdens which are placed on business in requiring the filling out of innumerable questionnaires. Mr. Prentis' letter is most illuminating and I quote it as a part of my remarks:

ARMSTRONG CORK CO.,
Lancaster, Pa., September 21, 1943.

The Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: As I understand that a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee are now studying proposed amendments to the renegotiation act, I wish to call your attention to a questionnaire approved by

the Budget Bureau—Form No. 49-R112—and particularly to section R, on page 5.

The form includes 145 questions. Many of them have no bearing on renegotiation problems and to answer them would require a stupendous amount of work on the part of our already overburdened accounting staff. Here are some that are included under section R:

Question 124: Principal stockholders, either individuals or corporations, indicating percentage of ownership if over 10 percent. Set out separately the ownership by managing officers.

Question 126: Brief description of important plants, including locations, type of construction, square feet of floor area, products manufactured, percent of output on war business. Also for the entire company give average number of employees now and in peacetime.

Question 127: List of major customers and approximate dollar value of products purchased from company during the latest closed fiscal period.

Question 128: List of major companies for which company is a subcontractor, and dollar value of such sales by company.

Question 129: Dollar value and list of your principal subcontractors, method and extent of your handling them with reference to materials, supervision, inspection, and financing.

Question 131: Labor relations, union or closed shop, wage increases, number of shifts run, stated as X percent for second shift and X percent for third shift, with statement as to increased executive personnel to handle extra shifts. Piecework and bonuses for the same.

Question 132: Significant contracts or orders received on competitive-bidding basis, extent of competition, and how company's low costs and efficient operation offset territorial and freight differentials. Comparison of important high- and low-cost producers in same line.

Question 133: Dollar value for latest fiscal period of significant raw materials and subassemblies, and from whom purchased.

Our company manufactures approximately 360 regular products, exclusive of the many munitions items that we are now making for military purposes. We have 16 factories in the United States. One of them covers more than 50 acres. To answer question 126, having to do with the "type of construction, square feet of floor area, etc.," would require a small book. Again, what earthly bearing on renegotiation has question 127 which asks for a list of our major customers and the approximate dollar value of products purchased? We have thousands of customers and why we should be asked to pick out the major ones and supply information of this kind, which would be of value to our competitors but which has no bearing on renegotiation, is beyond my comprehension.

The manufacturers of the United States are being urged to speed up military production. Our company certainly is doing everything in its power to do so. We had 10,000 employees in 1940, we have lost 3,000 to the armed services, and have almost 18,000 today, the increase being due entirely to the operations of our munitions division. Our supervisory, engineering, production, and accounting resources are stretched to the limit. It will take weeks and months of valuable time to go through the renegotiation process anyway even though this year on total business aggregating $100,000,000 we are not likely to earn net after taxes much more than $3,000,000 against average earnings of about $5,000,000 on $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 worth of business before the war. So why, I ask you, should this company and other American manufacturers similarly situated be burdened with the necessity of answering a questionnaire of this description?

Anything that you can do to have this questionnaire modified and simplified would be deeply appreciated.

Yours very truly,

H. W. PRENTIS, Jr.,
President.

Look Who Is Talking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a recent editorial from the Marion (Ohio) Star. This editorial is most timely. It recognizes the need of combatting the great organized movement directed by those who do not believe in constitutional government and free enterprise. It is a demonstration of opposition to the foul means that are being used to destroy the Congress. So long as the Congress remains the people can, through frequent elections, have hope of restoring liberty in the United States and preventing our country from going the way of the totalitarian dictatorships of Europe.

I congratulate the writer of this editorial for his timely and valuable contribution.

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

Whenever it questions an administration position Congress is accused of playing politics, a charge that will be made frequently as next year's national election comes closer.

It will be pointed out—and with good cause—that Congressmen are building political fences with an eye to next year's votes.

But since when has it been a political misdemeanor for Congressmen to square accounts with voters? That is the way representative democracy works. That is the way a government responsible to the people it governs is supposed to work.

Before the accusation that Congressmen are running for office and devil take the hindmost is taken too seriously it is important to know who's talking. Who is blaming the representatives of the people for trying to decide what the majority of the people want and trying to give it to them?

The accusers are found in two classes. In the first class are those who know exactly what they are saying and intend to keep right on saying it. Their aim is to discredit Congress with the people. They want to develop a strong executive government at the expense of anything that happens to stand in the way—the judicial branch or the legislative branch. They are the bitter-ending new dealers who once exulted in a campaign to make Congress a "rubber stamp." They are the minority in the United States that needs watching—the minority that claims it alone knows what is good for the people and what they should get.

In the second class are Americans who have fallen into the bad habit of copycatting slanders on Congress without realizing what they are doing. Instead of being grateful for a chance to be represented in legislative debate and action, they betray their own interests by criticizing their representatives—accusing them of playing politics as though the only politics played in the United States Government was by Congressmen. Everything about Government is politics of one kind or another, and it is time right now to dispense with the vicious propaganda that it is wrong for Congress to perform its duty in the system of checks and balances that keeps the Republic from turning into an autocracy.

Department of National Defense and Permanent Peace Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials published in the Raleigh News and Observer of October 2, 1943, from the pen of its distinguished editor, former Secretary of the Navy and former Ambassador to Mexico, Hon. Josephus Daniels. One editorial, entitled "Seeing the Light," ably discusses the question of a Department of National Defense. The other is a timely editorial entitled "Will Santa Claus Fill It?", dealing with the subject of a permanent peace resolution, and action now.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEEING THE LIGHT

Upon their return from a visit to all fronts the four Senators, who were eyes and ears for the legislative bodies, have made report of what they saw in courage and also in the need for changes to advance toward victory. In an address in the Senate, Mr. LODGE told his associates that "there is a surprising amount of sentiment among the older men for a single Department of War, with autonomous land, sea and air services."

For more than a dozen years the News and Observer has been advocating the abolition of the offices of Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy, to be replaced by a Secretary of National Defense under whom air, land, and sea operations would constitute a single and perfect direction of preparedness in peace and operation in war. At present we have half a dozen or more navies and branches of aviation and separate land forces. It is expensive and prevents training together in peace, which is essential for the best cooperation and highest efficiency in war. They do not work together in getting ready for war and when war comes it takes time to secure united action. One glaring example of disunity and defeat was emphasized at Pearl Harbor when the Japanese swooped down and wrought destruction and brought us into the war The land forces and the Army air forces were under the direction of a general and the sea and naval air forces were under the direction of an admiral. They did not even confer, much less coordinate, and they were not on the alert when the situation demanded alertness and readiness to meet any attack. Both officers were removed but still there is lacking unified command of all forces. In the stress of war, after much talk and time wasted in conferences. these forces work together efficiently.

But it takes time for two separate branches to be brought together as a unit.

In the early days of the Wilson administration the Secretary of the Navy worked out what he thought were good plans to promote economy and secure perfect cooperation between the Army and the Navy. When he presented his plan to the Secretary of War, that able and distinguished militarist said: "I don't care a damn about the Navy and you don't care a damn about the Army. You run your shop and I'll run mine." That sentiment was expressive of what most high-ranking Army and Navy officers felt. And nothing was done for unity until a cooperative Secretary of War was named who saw the necessity of close cooperation. When the World War began there was a division of marines trained and equipped, ready to go. But some Army officers thought land fighting was an exclusive Army function and didn't welcome sending the marines among the first fighting troops in the American Expeditionary Force. However, the Secretary of War and other officers welcomed the marines as a part of the land forces and they went early to France and proved themselves worthy comrades of the men in the Army.

It is gratifying, after the long and almost perfect separation and some jealousy, to learn from Senator LODGE that on the fighting fronts "there is a surprising amount of sentiment among the older men for a single department of war."

They are beginning to see the light!

WILL SANTA CLAUS FILL IT?

A Republican Senator is quoted as saying that the Senate will have ready a permanent peace resolution by Christmas. Evidently hoping that Santa Claus will bring a resolution that will be "clear, forcible, and to the point, but perfectly noncommittal" in line with the Mackinac Island deliverance, these Senators depend upon Santa's reindeers to fill their stockings with a resolution the committee seems unwilling to draft or bring into the open Senate.

Other Senators predict that no action will be taken by that body, that it will not concur in the Fulbright resolution, but will draft one of its own. There have been half a dozen or more resolutions pledging participation in a world organization to prevent future wars. They seem to have been placed in cold storage while the world wonders if the Senate will repeat its attitude of a quarter of a century ago, declaring for a League of Nations but demanding reservations that would nullify the peace they claimed to favor.

The people of America, including the armed forces, are tired of delaying and shilly-shallying. They demand action in the shape of a forthright declaration that this country will make such full contribution to prevent war as may be necessary to prevent a recurrence of the present holocaust.

Some Senators are jealous of the Senate's prerogative as a treaty-making body and resent the desire of the House to have a voice in international affairs. The Constitution ought to be amended so that treaties that obtain a majority of both legislative bodies could be ratified. The ability of one-third of the Senators plus one to defeat the will of the people, as was done 25 years ago, is a deterrent to securing peace. That veto of the will of a majority by a small minority of Senators should not exist in a republic based upon majority rule.

If the Senate is unwilling to accept the Ball-Hatch-Hill-Burton measure which has been before that body for months, the least it can do is concur in the Fulbright resolution which commits us to an international organization for world peace. It could then later settle upon the details. But a solemn pledge to attain the goal of lasting peace should be made by both legislative bodies without further delay.

Fly's Fresh Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop:

FLY'S FRESH TALK

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The radio broadcasting industry is just about the timidest and most chicken-hearted that ever developed in this country. Otherwise, it would stand up and swap punches with James Lawrence Fly, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, while it still has a chance to save itself from full governmental domination.

True, Mr. Fly and his six fellow commissioners have the power of life and death over radio already. That is, they have it because radio let them take it.

The law of Congress says the F. C. C. may grant or take away broadcasting licenses according to its own judgment of public interest, necessity, and/or convenience.

That phrase "public interest, necessity, and/or convenience," is so broad and meaningless that it can be, and is, used to alibi just about anything the Commission wants to do.

And radio just continues to go around making beautiful noises and hoping to appease. People like Chairman Fly of the F. C. C. don't appease. Mr. Fly is out to control the traffic that goes over the radio waves, and he knows just how he intends to do it.

An excellent sample of his method was freely given at a luncheon before the Radio Executives Club in New York City October 7.

He there and then told the radio operators that he ominously disapproves of their refusal to sell radio time to people wishing to solicit memberships and support for political and economic causes. And he raked them over the coals because they edit and regulate the programs of the stations' and networks' hired commentators.

Of course, radio gives time to cause-expounders, but Fly wants such time sold over the counter. He says the present system is undemocratic. He said:

"Here in the United States today we have freedom to an almost absolute degree. Our radio receivers have free-turning dials and band switches, and there is no law which hinders listeners from tuning-in the program of their choice—or from turning off the radio altogether.

"The listeners, however, are shackled by a few outmoded conventions which in reality the (radio) industry should never have inflicted on its audiences. Radio is the greatest medium thus far created for the dissemination of information. Those entrusted with the facilities of radio cannot impair the freedom to listen by restrictions imposed at the transmitter end."

Now you need to be only a little familiar with the double talk of such witch burners as Fly to know what he means by all this. Turn it upside down, sideways, look it up in Webster's, or consult your nearest dealer—it remains as follows in plain English:

"It is true that people in this country can switch off or on any program they like. But, by cracky, you broadcasters haven't equal freedom to broadcast what you think you can best get them to listen to. You've got to make up your traffic according to F. C. C. ideas. Or else!"

That's all it is. It isn't any more. Or less.

Here is a Government agent telling an institution of free speech—the most powerful in man's history—that he doesn't like the way it is using its freedom.

Well, he has a right to do that. He even has a right to try to put the muzzle on radio and control its traffic according to his ideas. He has a right to try.

But the radio broadcasters also have a right to tell him to mind his own business—which he certainly is not doing today. The real job of the F. C. C. is to hand out broadcasting licenses to American citizens in such a way that one program does not jam another at the listener's loudspeaker, and to protect all parties from one another as they battle out their place in life over the airways.

Its job is not to meddle with the composition of radio broadcast traffic. That is between the broadcaster and the listener.

Radio should tell Fly to shut up and stick to his job, which isn't so much when you consider what it really comes to.

But will radio do that? Radio has always shown a chicken heart in its meetings with the F. C. C.

So we may now expect Mr. Fly & Co., progressively, to move in and start editing radio to suit their own little plans. Said plans being—Government boss everybody, all the time.

Threat of Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I extend an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Thursday, October 7, 1943, which is a most constructive contribution, and is a sound, logical analysis of portions of the Wagner-Murray bill:

THREAT OF SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

The Wagner-Murray bill to broaden the Social Security Act was introduced in the Senate last June. It is known as bill 1161. Among its numerous proposals to regulate us from the cradle to the grave, in accord with the recommendations of the National Resources Planning Board's "American Beveridge Plan," is the particularly insidious one that would abolish private medical practice and turn the medical profession over to the Government. Here is dangerous socialization, entailing a centralization of authority in the hands of a single person—the Surgeon General of the United States—who would have the power to do these things:

To hire doctors and establish rates of pay—possibly for all doctors;

To establish fee schedules for services;

To establish qualifications for specialists;

To determine the number of individuals for whom any physician may provide service; and

To determine arbitrarily what hospitals or clinics may provide service for patients.

Under the guise of furnishing free general medical, special medical, laboratory, and hospitalization benefits for an estimated 110,000,000 Americans, the bill, if adopted, would virtually wipe out the private practice of medicine and turn over to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service the vast sum of $3,000,000,000 annually with which to exercise personal control over the Nation's

doctors. This is a preposterous undertaking, but this is what the Wagner-Murray bill contemplates.

The measure calls for increased social-security taxes by both employer and employee. Wages up to $3,000 would be subject to a 6-percent tax imposed on both employer and employee. Every self-employed individual would pay a 7-percent tax on the market value of his services up to $3,000 per year; and Federal, State, and municipal employees, under certain conditions, would pay a tax of 3½ percent. It is estimated that the total revenue under the bill would be $12,000,000,000. Of this sum the medical care and hospitalization account would be allocated one-fourth, or approximately $3,000,000,000.

The national physicians committee for the extension of medical care, which is fighting the bill, says the Surgeon General could break down the fund thus:

Allocate 20 percent for administration costs, or $600,000,000.

Hire every effective physician in the United States at an average annual salary of $5,000, for a total of $600,000,000.

Hire every available bed in every non-Government owned hospital (368,046), 365 days each year $5 per day, at a cost of $671,683,950.

Pay $2.50 per day for each and every Government-owned hospital bed (1,051,781), 365 days each year, at a total cost of $959,750,162.

Spend for drugs and medicines, $168,565,887.

If the Surgeon General is made a dictator in fact in matters concerned with national health, it is obvious that the initiative which has made the medical profession outstanding will be destroyed. What incentive will there be for research? When American doctors are made subservient to political considerations, which is one of the chief dangers of the proposal, what is left except hack service?

The prospect of state medicine is made more threatening because of the war which has called 50,000 physicians to the colors. Dr. Ross T. McIntyre, Surgeon General of the Navy, estimates that at least one-third of this number will remain in the services after the war, because military needs will be great and the life comparatively comfortable.

Today many communities are virtually without a doctor, and the general situation many grow worse before peace comes. This will give the planners of a fantastically regimented America the "in" which they now seek.

The medical profession should be supported in its fight to thwart the considered move to make it a slave to a socialization scheme that masquerades under false colors of humanitarianism.

War Prohibition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution forwarded me by Miss Lillie Eckard, Bucyrus, Ohio, that was unanimously adopted at the September 27, 1943, rally in the Epworth Methodist Church, Bucyrus, Ohio, relating to enactment of H. R. 2082:

Be it resolved, That we, an assemblage of citizens gathered at a rally meeting in the Epworth Methodist Church of Bucyrus, Ohio, this 27th day of September 1943, declared ourselves in favor of the war prohibition bill, H. R. 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, which bill prohibits the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war, and until demobilization is completed.

We petition our representatives to work and vote for the speedy passage of this bill.

R. T. LOWMAN.
E. J. ELLIS.

(This resolution was unanimously adopted by the congregation at this meeting.)

Wheat for Flour, or Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Iola (Kans.) Register, which is a timely discussion of a situation apropos a threatening shortage of wheat for human consumption—flour:

DOESN'T MAKE SENSE

It is hard to understand why Government does some of the things it does.

Food, as you may have heard, is one of the major shortages confronting the country and the world. Wheat, a rather well-known item of food, is becoming shorter every day, chiefly because so much of it is being used for the manufacture of industrial alcohol for explosives and synthetic rubber.

If, therefore, it were possible to substitute blackstrap molasses for wheat as a basis for industrial alcohol, the high desirability of such a procedure would seem to be self-evident. An effort to do this has just been concluded—in failure—in Washington.

A Cuban delegation had come there in an effort to sell our Government some 180,000,000 gallons of molasses. No sale was made because the Government refused to pay more than 5⅝ cents per gallon and the Cuban producers refused to sell at that price. Last year our Government paid 13 cents a gallon and the O. P. A. ceiling price this year on domestically produced molasses is 18 cents.

Will someone please explain why our Government—in time of war when nothing matters but victory and the saving of human lives—can afford to pay 18 cents a gallon for domestic molasses but can't afford to pay even 6 cents a gallon for Cuban molasses?

On a purely dollar-and-cents basis of what it costs to distill alcohol from wheat, the Government could pay as much as 35 cents a gallon for molasses. But far more important is the fact that every 4 bushels of wheat saved will provide one person with foodstuff for a whole year, or will provide enough feed to produce 35 pounds of pork.

Next year we shall need nearly a half million gallons of industrial alcohol. There will be, according to Government research, enough West Indian molasses available by June 30, 1944, to make 190,000,000 gallons of that quota. If all this could be used, it would save enough wheat to give bread to 13,000,000 people for the entire year.

A couple of months ago the Office of Economic Warfare made a survey of the industrial alcohol situation which stated that the "immediate necessity" of conserving wheat now being used for industrial alcohol called for "prompt and decisive action."

But this "prompt and decisive action" is currently being held up by price haggling over a few cents a gallon. It doesn't make sense to me.

Price of Milk at Denver, Colo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

DENVER MILK PRODUCERS, INC.,
October 7, 1943.

Hon. MAYOR AND COUNCILMAN
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo.

GENTLEMEN: We are writing to inform you that unless the producers of milk supplying the Denver, Colo., market receive a raise in the price they are being paid for their milk not later than November 1, 1943, we will be forced to divert the major portion of the milk to manufacturing plants. When the transportation is considered, these plants can pay us more than we get in Denver as they are not under the same price control order the fluid distributors are.

Our feed costs have advanced 85 percent in the past year and labor from 35 percent on some farms to 100 percent on others, while the same per quart price (13 cents) has prevailed for 2 years and the Office of Price Administration has refused to recommend to the Director of Economic Stabilization that our price be raised. Our dairy farmers are operating at a loss. We can save some of the loss through diversion to manufacturing plants and this we must do unless we can get more relief than offered us.

The War Food Administration has announced a milk subsidy program that is not satisfactory. If we get the maximum subsidy, it will not be sufficient. We do not know when we will get it or how much it will be and we must have the advance now to pay our increased feed costs, and the subsidy is only temporary.

We have a great deal of milk produced closer to manufacturing plants than Denver. They can handle our milk and net us a higher price than we are now getting.

We respectfully submit this to you with the request that you promulgate an excise tax of 2 cents per quart of milk to be paid milk producers, as has been done in other cities to avoid the catastrophe we now face.

Very truly yours,

W. C. MOORE, *Manager.*

DENVER MILK PRODUCERS, INC.,
Denver, Colo., October 7, 1943.

DR. DENNIS A. FITZGERALD,
Deputy Director Food Production Division, War Food Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FITZGERALD: We desire to place before you the unusual dairy feed situation facing the Denver, Colo., milk producers at this time.

Under normal conditions the major portion of our dairy feeds are produced on our own farms but that condition does not exist this year.

Our principal roughage crop is alfalfa hay. Some was lost this year through plowing up of some fields due in part to support prices established for potatoes and dry beans which would net the producer more than his hay has been netting him. About 60 percent of the first cutting was lost from greenbug infestation. The second and third cuttings were about normal but more hay is required this year on account of our increase in dairy herds made necessary to take care of the milk needs of an increased civilian population and to supply seven Army camps with milk as well as the largest Army hospital in the United States. Our milk production in April this year was 26 percent above April last year.

All of these factors make it necessary for us to reach out beyond our normal hay production area for the hay required and to get this to our dairy farms it must be baled at a cost of $4.50 per ton and the longer haul adds almost as much more for trucking.

The Army purchased large quantities of the hay in the State to take care of their horses and mules at Camp Carson, Camp Hale, and Camp Fort Robinson. Because of drought in other areas in United States, hay buyers have come into the State and are purchasing hay and shipping it out causing a very large increase in price. Hay that was purchased in the Platte Valley northeast of Denver last year at $6 per ton in the stack cannot be purchased at less than $16 per ton in the stack this year. To this baling and trucking must be added.

Barley is our main dairy grain and we had a large crop of it but at the time of harvest there was no corn in the Missouri River markets and they came into the Denver market and purchased large quantities of our barley at a higher price than we have ever had before. Last year barley was purchased from the combines at 80 cents per hundred. This year it was $1.80 and the market has advanced a great deal since then. The feed dealers in Denver are now charging $2.55 per hundred for whole barley. The following quotations on feed will give you the information as to the comparison between the 2 years:

	1942	1943
Hay.....ton..	$10.00	$26.50
Barley.....per hundredweight..	1.45	2.55
Dairy mix.....do....	2.15	2.95
Yellow corn.....do....	1.75	2.34

In September 1942 our blended price for the Denver market was 63 cents per pound butterfat, while in September 1943 it was 76 cents per pound butterfat. It can be readily seen that our feed prices have advanced way out of proportion with our milk prices, and based on these figures we feel that it is absolutely necessary that this area be granted a full 50 cents per hundred subsidy, and we hope you will approve this amount.

Very truly yours,

DENVER MILK PRODUCERS, INC.,
W. C. MOORE, *Manager*.

Chinese Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution 285

Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the immigration and naturalization laws in such manner as to permit the entry of Chinese into the United States of America, and grant to them citizenship privileges

Whereas the Chinese people have earned the undying admiration and gratitude of the United Nations by their heroic resistance to the aggression of the common enemy—Japan; and

Whereas it is the announced policy of the Government of the United States of America that the peace of the world after the war can be maintained only upon the basis of the future harmonious cooperation of the people of the United Nations upon equal terms regardless of race or creed; and

Whereas the immediate removal of racial discrimination in the immigration and naturalization laws would render incalculable aid to the cause of the United Nations by bolstering the fighting morale of our ally—China: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu:

SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to enact the legislation to amend the immigration and naturalization laws in such manner as to permit the entry of Chinese into the United States of America, and permit them to become citizens of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. Copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Committee on Immigration of the Senate of the United States, to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

Date of introduction September 28, 1943, Honolulu, T. H.

Introduced by M. D. Beamer, J. M. Asing, Chuck Mau, Victor K. Boyd, M. C. Pacheco, N. T. Teves, Philip N. Sing.

Approved September 29, 1943.

LESTER PETRIE,
Mayor, City and County of Honolulu.

Mail That Murders Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we know from the men themselves in Australia, Alaska, and Alabama that they wait anxiously for mail from home and rejoice when it is received. We have witnessed in movies or painting the excitement and anticipation that mail call arouses. But from our distance and by our separation, we do not know the scene which follows the opening of the mail. Too often it is one of dismay, disappointment, or disgust. Philip M. Hannan, writing in the Columbia magazine for September unveils the scene and demonstrates that too often the letters should not have been written. The author has been for several months the only Catholic chaplain at an Army Air Force basic-training center in which there were more than 11,000 Catholic men. He has had unusual opportunity to deal with many men whose problems stemmed from imprudent correspondence. Note, then, what he says:

MAIL THAT MURDERS MORALE

(By Philip M. Hannan)

(The author has been for several months the only Catholic chaplain at an Army Air Force Basic Training Center in which there were more than 11,000 Catholic men. He has had occasion to deal with numerous cases where difficulties were caused by imprudent correspondence.)

It has been said that morale should be spelled mail. It should also be added that morale is good or bad accordingly as mail is good or bad. Apparently about 10 percent of the population does not realize that a letter can inspire suicide as well as encouragement, and this article is an attempt to reach at least some portion of that population.

A chaplain's office is a sort of filter for the troubles of the soldier, and every day soldiers come in who are walking apparitions of dejection because of letters they have received from home. These letters can be divided roughly into wife-husband letters and family-son letters.

First there is the letter from the selfish wife who has somehow convinced herself that separation from her husband is a far greater matter than the fate of the Nation. The following is a typical letter of a selfish wife to a husband in the Army just about 7 weeks (a soldier is eligible for a furlough only after 6 months service in the Army):

"I am so terribly disappointed to hear that after all these months you are still not able to get a furlough, I am getting to the point now that I don't believe you want to come home and that you don't care for me or your home.

"Since you left for the Army, our neighbors' sons have been on furloughs twice and each time for over the week and your brother has been home several times. So small wonder, dear, that I am convinced that you are changed and that in a short time the Army will be breaking up our home. We hear so much today about keeping up our morale, but I often wonder if the Army ever considers the morale of the mothers and wives left behind and what it is doing to our home life.

"I most certainly would not like to see our home broken up by the Army, after being so happy together, but unless you make some attempt I'm afraid it shall come to that."

It might be stated that such letters can break up homes; such colossal selfishness disgusts any soldier.

"JUST HAVE A GOOD TIME, DARLING"

Then there is the letter of the sick wife. She knows that the Army grants emergency furloughs to soldiers whose immediate relatives are critically ill. She writes:

"I am glad to hear that you are happy in the Army and interested in your work. So they are going to send you to airplane mechanic's school. I know you'll like it because you always wanted to do it.

"I went to see the doctor yesterday about my illness, and he told me it was just my nerves. He told me that I would be much better off if I got something to do. But you know, darling, that he just can't be right. It's got me now so that I haven't eaten for 2 days and don't care to eat. I just sit and cry and wonder when the war will be over. This morning I thought about committing

suicide. Maybe I shouldn't write this way but I just couldn't help it. Honest, dear, if you don't come back soon I hope I die. That's just the way I feel about it. Can't you speak to your officer or somebody so that they will let you come home?

"But, honest, honey, I don't want to make you feel bad I want you to work your way up in the Army just the way you told me you wanted to do. So go right ahead and don't worry about me. No matter what happens to me I want you to be happy in the Army."

Those who "just can't help writing" such letters can at least help mailing them. Frequently soldiers show me letters that are a quick succession of deathbed farewells and wishes for the happiness of the soldier; after tragically assuring their husbands that they are soon going to die (reason not stated) the wives build up a magnificent act of abnegation and avow that, dead or alive, they only wish their husband's happiness. Unfortunately, the censors can do nothing about deleting such cheerful and encouraging news. After the soldier has consulted the chaplain about his trouble the chaplain sits down and writes a sharp, short note unmasking the crude histrionics of the wife who is only craving sympathy and who is just about as unselfish as a racketeer. The chaplain's note infuriates the wife who suddenly rouses herself from her death torpor and replies in a perfectly menomous letter.

If you don't love your husband, for the sake of your husband, for the sake of the country, for the sake of the chaplain, and for the preservation of your life, don't use the tragedy of war as a convenient opportunity to slip out on him. And never plead such a course on the grounds of honesty to soldier. There is nothing honest about deserting your husband, and don't delude yourself that he will calmly accept it. He will fight the proposal with every means available and at the first opportunit, he will effectively fight the man for whom the wife is being "honest."

As may be expected, there is a very great deal of trouble arising from sudden war marriages. The pattern is the same: Joe is just 19 and to be drafted; he and Susie, still in fourth-year high school, have been seeing each other for a few months, and he, recently rich from a defense job, has delusions of grandeur; they both begin to dramatize their first separation by war—he to go God knows where, she gradually to wither from frustrated love at the advanced age of 17; they get married and 1 month later he goes to the Army.

The aftermath is often not so heroic. The letters they exchange at first are ecstatic, but she can't live on his $50 monthly allowance, and, of course, she gets a defense job. Shop talk and conversation develop with the other workers, some of whom have always worn pants. One of them drives her home: "Why not come with us? It's patriotic to save gas." As the rides increase the ardor of the letters to the husband decreases. The letters decrease in number—she doesn't have time to write, she is too tired. Finally, there is a week or two of no correspondence; the soldier calls frantically by phone She is cold, unresponsive, says she can't tell him by phone, she will write. She writes a blunt, crushing confession. She has found that she no longer loves him. It was all a mistake. She is sorry.

Remember, a young married soldier's whole sustenance is his home tie. Remove his home and you have removed his spirit. Of course, there are not so many broken recent marriages as to constitute a national morale or moral problem, but there are enough to make us take cognizance of the situation.

It must not be thought that because I have treated only of soldier-wife letters that they are the only source of problems. The majority of harassing letters arise from families unloading their problems on the already burdened shoulders of the soldiers. A soldier's pack is generally heavy enough; don't make it heavier.

LETTERS WRITTEN WITH TEARS

Weak-willed parents must be taught to fight the war with their soldier sons. No matter what they feel, they must not write with tears. Imagine how the following letter bolsters the determination of a home-loving boy:

"We certainly hope and pray that you are well. I pray all day that soon you will be able to come home or be sent somewhere in this section. We are glad to hear that you are well and that you have met some nice boys from near home. There are almost no young men left in the neighborhood, and when we go to church we only see old people and women.

"We miss you very much. I feel pretty well, but if you could only see how your father has changed since you left. He doesn't say anything, but I can tell he's always thinking and worrying about you. Sometimes when he goes off to work in the morning he looks as though he ought to be going to bed, he looks that bad.

"The other night your Uncle Frank and Aunt Elsie came to see us and talked about their sons in the war. Uncle Frank says it's going to last 10 years and never expects to see Bill and Jack again. Isn't it awful? As they left they told me I ought to do something about Pa because they think he might die.

"I am so worried now I don't know what to do. If they would only send you near home so you could come home every week end, we'd feel much better. There are a lot of jobs you could do here at the airport. We're always praying and thinking of you."

A constant barrage of such letters may land the soldier in a psychopathic ward. Unloading such worries on a soldier son will no more relieve the mother than infecting her son will relieve her of meningitis. The solution of a mother's problem rests with herself and her determination, and she must realize that she is definitely adding to her son's chances of returning some day by helping to ease his mind.

The climactic example of a soldier harassed by his family was one who received four special delivery letters every day, each one from a different member of his family and one from his wife. Apparently the battle in Europe was a picnic compared to the battle at home and each combatant wrote the soldier every day condemning the actions of the wife or other members of the family. After about 3 weeks of this the soldier didn't know front from back, and began having attacks of hysteria. The soldier asked for a furlough to arrange for ending the war at home; it was refused, the authorities rightly insisting that such a furlough might precipitate countless other domestic troubles in the homes of soldiers. The soldier came to the chaplain, who suggested a telephone call home and suggested a few points that should be put across. The soldier made the telephone call and knocked out the war by an 18-minute verbal barrage that completely silenced everyone. The wife came down in a week and the soldier promptly regained his mental equilibrium.

Of course, a good deal of the hysteria over troubles at home is caused by the feeling of dependents that their plight is simply ignored. Every dependent of a soldier must remember that the Nation is making a sincere and successful effort to help him or her. Of course, the burden of war falls unequally on the citizens and only the good God can fittingly reward them for their sacrifices, but the Government is supporting in a material way those left destitute by the war. When difficulties arise that cannot be met by resources at home, soldiers' dependents should appeal to the local branch of the Red Cross or to the Army Emergenc Relief; or they can have the soldier make the appeal. Acquaint these organizations with your problems, but don't worry the soldier with a burst of hysterics—they are not needed to secure help. If you feel that your case is not receiving proper attention, any chaplain will be glad to help you receive it. One of the pleasures of a chaplain is to help a deserving family secure the help owed to it by the Government.

War is grim and heart-rending; it demands strict discipline. It must not be thought that a chaplain is being cruel when he urges discipline, for it is the greatest guarantee of survival. War cannot be fought with tears, and when strength is needed it is folly to indulge in weak sentiment. The Army goes to extraordinary pains and expense to get the mail to the men; cooperate by sending encouraging letters. In the invasion of Africa we are told that the mail was carried up to the front lines to the men, and some of the soldiers lost their lives in delivering the mail. I often wonder, recalling many of the letters I have seen, what irony of fate it may have been to have soldiers sacrificing their lives to deliver letters that completely unnerved the soldiers receiving it, and may have resulted in the loss of their lives.

A few simple thoughts will help when writing letters. Don't write simply what you feel like writing; write what will help the soldier. The letter is intended primarily to help him, not you; it is intended to encourage him, not relieve you. The difference in letters makes the difference in the remarks I overheard a few days ago after mail-call; one soldier groaned, "There's no sense in my fighting this war," and the other one whooped, "Getting my letter is just like getting a loaded refrigerator."

Are We Ashamed of Americanism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Monday, October 11, 1943, entitled "Are We Ashamed of Americanism?":

The return of a group of United States Senators from their battle-front tour has served to emphasize a lack in American foreign policy that is becoming increasingly apparent. That is, the absence of vigorous Americanism in our dealings with foreign nations.

The testimony of these men is unanimous on a point which this newspaper, among others, has been insisting upon for a long time. That is, that the policy of every country with which we have any dealings, friend and foe alike, centers in the advancement of national self-interest. The United States alone in the entire family of nations, pursues an official foreign policy of internationalism. Our officials are the only ones in all the world who seem willing to sacrifice the interests of their own people for an international ideal.

The reports of our returning Senators emphasize something else; something less pleasant to talk about in the midst of war. That is, that England in particular is looking

out for the welfare of England, and that official Washington seems to be almost completely under the domination of British influence in the formulation and application of foreign policy. It is unpleasant to talk about this because of the close collaboration between England and the United States in the war, our close natural relationship, the similarity of many of our ideals, etc. There always is the danger that frank discussion of practical statesmanship in the realm of world relations will be construed as a thrust at United Nations solidarity in prosecution of the war That danger, however, must be risked, if we are to avoid the complete submergence of American interest in the post-war period.

Among the things we learn from the Senators referred to are: That the British, in control of most of the means of communication, have been disposed to emphasize the achievements of their own forces and to soft-pedal American accomplishments; that the United States not only has provided 60 percent of the oil used in operation of the war by the United Nations, although possessed of less than 25 percent of the oil resources, but that American oil is being used in areas which British-controlled sources could more easily supply, and that civilians in parts of Asia have more American oil at their disposal than Americans have; that England has removed American identification from supplies received under lease-lend from this country, and sent the goods to Turkey as British goods; that England, even in the midst of waging war, has been vigorously protecting foreign markets and building them up for post-war use.

We have no criticism of this to offer. The British Government is simply doing what we believe it is the duty of any Government to do—protecting and advancing the interests of its own people. Our criticism is of the American Government for failure to do the same thing; for being too preoccupied in the first place with the vision of a world of milk and honey established through some selfless scheme of international collaboration, and for being too susceptible to British influence in the second place.

The power of this British influence over Washington certainly is not to be doubted by any thoughtful American. It made its appearance very early in the Roosevelt era when the economic doctrine of the Keynes school of thought found such favor in official quarters. It mounted steadily in the pre-Pearl Harbor period of the war, and has been even more marked since our active belligerency. It resulted in the strategy of concentrating on Germany while prosecuting a somewhat guerilla type of warfare against Japan, a policy which has found high disfavor among our military leaders in charge of the Pacific phase of the war, and which was the subject of particularly caustic criticism by one of the senatorial tourists, Senator CHANDLER. It is responsible in part at least for the lack of cordiality in American-Russian relations.

And it has manifest itself upon several occasions in the revelation by Mr. Churchill of important decisions or developments involving the United States of which the American people were in ignorance until Mr. Churchill spoke. All of us, no doubt, will recall that the first the American people heard of the international food conference scheduled for and subsequently held at Hot Springs, was when Mr. Churchill told the world about it. And as late as last Thursday, it was London, not Washington, that announced the submission of an American Treasury plan for an international reconstruction bank to operate in the post-war period. Incidentally, it might be observed in passing, that the terms of this proposed scheme are so extreme as to evoke the description "economic imperialism" by respected American financial authorities.

What it all adds up to, in our viewpoint, is the necessity of the American people adopting a sound policy of enlightened nationalism in world affairs, and of placing in charge of that policy men who believe more in the realities of international relationship than in any fuzzy global dream. We need, in short, what Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, one of the battle-front tourists, described to the West Virginia Bar Association at Charleston on Saturday as a "tough all-American team" to protect the Nation's diplomatic and economic interests now and in the future. We can't recruit such a team from those softened up by foreign complexes or obsessed with the notion that there is something crass and ignoble in Americanism.

Here's Mud in Your Eye!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, I am including as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Carmie Democrat, of Carmie, Ill., under date of September 23, 1943:

HERE'S MUD IN YOUR EYE

They say oil will win the war, and America's petroleum producers are eager to do their part to supply the fuel to crush the Axis nations. The time has come when some powerful knight errants had better start breaking some lances in behalf of the independent oil producers if we expect to get this bloody job done anyways soon.

Representative JAMES V. HEIDINGER'S bill to prohibit any governmental agency from fixing the price of crude oil at less than $2 a barrel will find lots of backers among reasonable people who know that the largest percentage of new oil fields are found and developed by the independents. These same reasonable people will tell you that the reason for a gasoline shortage is the lack of a profit incentive to get new oil fields.

William Allen White's famous Emporia Gazette stepped forth the past week as a knight errant and broke one of those sorely needed lances for the independents. Here, in part, is what the newspaper said:

"The independent oil producers who have been bumping their heads against a mossy stoned price ceiling for crude wish the O. P. A. chieftains would give them as much profit-motive consideration as for the distillers and distributors of whisky.

"As to the whisky price comparison with oil, an Emporia authority on both offers a few figures:

"1. Whisky, 100-proof bourbon, $3.50 pint.

"2. An oil barrel of 42 gallons equals 336 pints.

"3. Oil barrel full of whisky, $1,176.

"4. Whisky's half water, actual barrel cost, $2,352.

"5. Crude oil, no water in it, average gravity, $1.17 barrel.

"6. Difference between O. P. A. value of oil and whisky, $2,350.83 barrel.

"The independent oil operators also argue convincingly that 90 percent of the war effort depends on oil. They concede that 10 percent of the war effort may depend on whisky after listening any week end to the array of invasion tactics of the uniformed lounge chair generals and admirals in the Kansas City bars.

"Anyway, here's a slush pond mud ball in the O. P. A. boys' eyes."

The Man Who Astonished Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Saturday Evening Post of October 9, 1943:

THE MAN WHO ASTONISHED WASHINGTON

(By Robert Humphreys)

MICHIGAN'S CONGRESSMAN ENGEL, SCORNING SWIVEL-CHAIR LEGISLATION, ROAMED FACTORIES, TOURIST CAMPS, AND HAMBURGER JOINTS, GETTING THE FACTS THAT ENABLED HIM TO SAVE MILLIONS IN TAXES

One icy morning last January, Congressman ALBERT JOSEPH ENGEL, of Michigan, Washington's demon one-man investigating committee, climbed into his automobile, after checking the antifreeze mixture, and set a zigzag course across the country on a trip that was to take him into 48 war plants in 44 days. In a paper sack on the seat beside him were an apple and a couple of sandwiches put up by his wife the night before, and near by lay a tattered old briefcase. The briefcase was packed tightly with notes and documents that he had gathered in the Capital. A portable typewriter rode on the floor of the car. The time was 3:30. ENGEL believes in getting up early.

There was no fanfare or advance publicity about his trip, as ENGEL is unorthodox enough to believe that when you are investigating someone it is stupid to tell him when you will come poking around. Early in the war ENGEL got the notion that a lot of extravagance could be stopped in the production of military equipment if somebody would just take the trouble to look into things, instead of swiveling about in a chair in the Capitol. He is a member of the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee and it pained his frugal conscience to vote billions of tax money away without knowing where it was going. And he didn't like the idea of putting guns into the hands of American young men without determining, personally, that the weapons were the best obtainable. As a consequence of his strange passion, he has reformed the light-artillery program, reduced the cost of producing the Springfield rifle and tangled with the War Department over construction of the Pentagon Building. He overturned the contract-letting system for Army cantonments and battled with the industrialists over war profits and pay scales. He has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars and doubtless has helped to save the lives of many men in the armed services.

On the trip, which began in January, ENGEL drove like mad, his squat, 235-pound, 5-feet-7-inch frame wedged tightly under the steering wheel. To keep his quarries from knowing where he would strike next, he followed a policy of putting up in tourist homes and obscure hotels, so that no routine check of

hotel registers would betray his presence in a neighborhood. His car broke down from overwork in Detroit and he left it behind for repairs, bought a new one, and headed into Ohio. He must have been concentrating too hard on his investigative work, for he neglected to watch a railroad grade crossing and a train came along and batted his fine new car into a mass of wreckage.

An ambulance rushed ENGEL to Akron, where he was found to be suffering from shock and lacerations of the scalp. He also had two black eyes. The emergency-room doctor ordered the anesthetist to get to work, so he could do some stitching.

"No anesthetic," ENGEL protested. "I'm in a hell of a hurry."

So the doctor put in the stitches without any anesthetic, while ENGEL, out of the corner of his mouth, kept warning a hospital clerk to have the bill ready as soon as the last stitch was in. An hour later, with 22 stitches in his hide and his head all bandaged up, ENGEL sat up and yelled for his trousers. He paid his bill while sitting on the edge of the operating table. Then he took a taxicab to the railroad station and was on his way once more, with the loss of only one automobile, 3 hours and 28 minutes of his time, and a quantity of blood. Recovering his original car in Detroit, he completed his trip, visiting places like Willow Run, Chrysler, General Motors, Continental Motors, Colt Arms, the Springfield Arsenal, and the Rock Island Arsenal.

When he got back to Washington he turned in a typical ENGEL expense account—a total of $359.42, of which $220 was for 4,400 miles of driving, at the Government allowance of 5 cents a mile. To colleagues who grumble that this made their own expense accounts look bad by comparison, ENGEL explained: "I like $10-a-day hotels as well as anybody, but I've never been able to find out anything in 'em."

When ENGEL took the House floor in June, after spending weeks digesting his notes and analyzing corporation statements, he shocked his colleagues with his findings.

He had discovered war workers making more than the base pay of a lieutenant general, ex-ribbon clerks drawing more than majors, and janitors getting 33 percent more than captains. Naming plants and their locations, he described countless cases where workers had doubled their pre-Pearl Harbor pay and listed instances in which elevator operators were drawing more than highly educated engineers in the same plant. The operators were getting $3,200 a year.

On the corporate side of the picture, he disclosed that one company with a capital investment and paid-in surplus of only $100,000 earned $1,740,839 last year, or 1,700 percent. This after paying $6,000,000 in taxes, charging off $173,680 for depreciation, paying its three top officers $116,000 each, its workers an average of $5,172 each for the year, and distributing Christmas bonuses totaling nearly a million dollars. Another small company, with virtually all the stock in one family at $5 a share, had a return against par value of 7,500 percent; while larger and older corporations showed profits ranging up to 53.88 percent.

As all the plants investigated were handling only Government contracts, ENGEL held that the whole thing, both from a labor and a corporate standpoint, smacked of a gigantic raid on the public till and should be more thoroughly policed.

His goal was a general tightening of the renegotiation law, by which the Government recaptures excessive profits, and the creation of public sentiment to keep the ceiling on wages and the bars up against inflation.

Here is the way ENGEL worked his miracles of investigation. He would drive into a war industries town at dusk, head for a tourist home near the plant which he intended to inspect, and put up for the night. More often than not he found workers from the plant living there. Before they realized it, ENGEL would engage them in a conversation notable chiefly for his casual questions and deep absorption in all that was told him. Midnight would find him in neighborhood hamburger joints to talk to workers coming off the evening shift. Early the next morning the fireworks really would commence.

When ENGEL hit the plant superintendent's door after a few hours of sleep, the element of surprise would offset the fact that his congressional and War Department credentials would give away his identity. Clerks would be sent scurrying for the company's books, its articles of incorporation, its pay roll, and its file of Government orders. Working with a stubby pencil on ruled yellow paper, ENGEL would make voluminous notes, looking up only to ask that copies of this intricate financial statement, or that complex war order, be made for him.

By the following day the superintendent, wondering what the sputtering human dynamo could possibly want next, would find himself accompanying ENGEL through the plant, with such scenes as the following occurring as described in the House in June: "I walked through a plant with the superintendent. I pointed to a young girl welding and the following conversation took place:

" 'Question. How old is that girl?'

" 'Answer. Eighteen years old.'

" 'Question. Where did she come from?'

" 'Answer. Kresge's dime store, selling ribbons.'

" 'Question. How much does she make?'

" 'Answer. Sixty-five dollars a week.'

" 'Question. How much experience does she have to have?'

" 'Answer. From 2 to 6 weeks.' "

Down in ENGEL's notebook went this and hundreds of items like it, to be transcribed late that night on his portable typewriter. So furious was his pace that plant auditors and accountants found themselves required to lunch with him so he could question them without losing so much as a minute.

War has always played an outstanding role in the Engel family. ENGEL's father and mother, natives of Alsace, got married and left for America the day after the Germans marched in, during the Franco-Prussian War. In the First World War there was an Engel fighting on the side of France, one with the Germans, and one—ALBERT JOSEPH, of course—with the Americans. And there's an Engel in this war—Albert Joseph, Jr.

The immigrant Engels settled in New Washington, Ohio, and it was there that the present Representative of Michigan's Ninth District was born, on New Year's Day, 55 years ago. There was nothing particularly precocious about him as a boy save the fact that his mother managed to keep him in long curls until he was 7. He did, however, learn piano, fluent French, and conversational German from his father, a school teacher, who spoke seven languages and taught organ, piano, and violin.

The senior Engel later moved the family to the north woods of Michigan, and young Albert helped clear land which he today owns. The lure of the logging camps caused him to quit school after completion of the eighth grade, and he still bears skull dents indicative of the two-fisted life he led, and scars where the ax took more of his leg than tree.

Eventually he landed in Chicago, and in his desperation to get a job, this tough youngster from the logging camps actually worked behind the cosmetics counter at Marshall Field's. Three years had passed without further schooling, and ENGEL was beginning to regret it. He enrolled in a Y. M. C. A. night school, and made up his high-school credits while working in the auditing departments of an ice house and two Chicago railroads. It was on these jobs that he learned to grasp the meaning of financial statements and to look for the bugs in them.

In 1907 he enrolled at Northwestern, working nights on an express truck and doing auditing jobs on the side. He compressed a 4-year law course into 3, and spent the next few years in Chicago and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan trying to attract clients with an attorney's shingle.

In 1916, having settled in Lake City, Mich., his present home, he found the incumbent prosecutor announcing from billboards that he was seeking reelection "because of the insistent demands of my many friends." This so outraged ENGEL's forthright soul that he at once announced his own candidacy with signs which read: "Nobody asked me to run. I am running because I need the job. Vote for ALBERT J. ENGEL." They did—right into office.

He volunteered for service only 5 weeks after American entrance into World War No. 1, was commissioned a lieutenant and was headed for France in October when someone got the idea he might be pro-German. For a week before his sailing date, he was allowed to wander around New York with a Government agent trailing him. ENGEL—whose own brain was working, too—had conceived the idea that he might be suspect and he quickly spotted the tail. Walking up to him, ENGEL handed him a written chronicle of his life and sympathies, together with his personal schedule for the day, which included a world series baseball game. The tail O. K.'d his personal history and sent it to Washington, and then took ENGEL to the world series at Government expense.

In France he was soon attached to General Pershing's staff and, because he could speak excellent French, frequently was assigned to substitute as speaker for staff generals at minor public events. Promoted to captain by the end of the war, he entered Germany with the Army of Occupation and there conducted his first one-man investigation. The 32d Division had 1,000 men listed as missing. With painstaking thoroughness, ENGEL reduced the list to an even 100.

On his return to the United States, he married Bertha Bielby, a sheriff's daughter, who was to bear him two daughters and a son. In her, ENGEL discovered a companion with tastes as simple as his.

In 1920 he was elected to the Michigan Senate and promptly turned rebel. Although a Republican himself, he fought the policies of the Republican State administration in power and in 1921 blew a prison scandal wide open with the first of his political one-man shows. In Marquette, with a senate committee, ENGEL went out to the prison and demanded to see the books. Digging away for nothing in particular, he found that a trial balance had not been struck in 2 years, and by the time he had taken one a $250,000 "surplus" was discovered actually to be a quarter-million-dollar shortage. Indictments followed.

Three more terms in the State senate found him still fighting the G. O. P. organization and its Detroit and Grand Rapids bosses. The quality of his adding-machine mind was tested in the 193? State convention when, on the final roll call, the chairman in a single breath announced that the organization candidate for the State board of agriculture had "won" and that the convention was adjourned. ENGEL, an opposition delegate, raced to the platform as fast as his thick, short legs would take him, seized the teller sheets, and according to his calculations the organization candidate had actually lost by 30 votes. A protracted legal battle

was terminated only when the Michigan Supreme Court refused to look behind an "adjourned" convention.

ENGEL ran three times for Congress before he finally made the grade, in 1934. His first year in Washington was typical of the average obedient freshman in Congress and his efforts were mainly confined to negotiating the passage of two insignificant private bills.

But Albert Joseph was watching and learning, and before another year had passed he was to attract plenty of attention. Late in 1935, a hurricane struck the Florida Keys, swept 300 persons, mostly war veterans and their families, into the sea, and chalked up a toll of lives that appalled the Nation. The veterans had lost their lives because trains did not arrive in time to remove them from a special project which the New Deal was financing as part of its relief program.

Congressional Republicans sought to pin the disaster on New Deal incompetence. Three separate investigations had been ordered and the issue was rapidly coming to boil in the House, when one day ENGEL suddenly took the floor.

The new Michigan Member began by saying that you cannot hold a government responsible without holding the men who represent the government responsible. Then for the next hour, ENGEL proceeded to detail the performance of each Government official on the keys. With exasperating conclusiveness, he had prepared a 10,000-word chronology of the acts of each official between 5:48 a. m. and 10:30 p. m. on the day of the disaster, recording train speeds, storm warnings, barometer readings, the exact moment of each official telephone call, and the time required to turn locomotives around, switch coaches, and lower drawbridges. When ENGEL had finished his log of events to the House, his conclusion that the catastrophe was an act of God brought whoops of relief from the Democratic side of the aisle and the personal thanks of Speaker Joe Byrns.

A few months later ENGEL again took the floor and once more his passion for facts and figures proved more beneficial to Democrats than Republicans. With the 1936 elections at hand, the Townsend old-age pension plan had the New Deal in a sweat. ENGEL, displaying charming disregard for the political effects of his act, delivered what was probably the most devastating speech ever made against the plan.

Using dollar-velocity charts and simple cross-roads store arithmetic, he showed in elaborate detail just how many times the Townsend transaction tax—which was to finance the Utopia for the aged—would have to be paid in the space of a single day by (a) the farmer, (b) the wage earner, (c) the manufacturer, (d) the retailer, and (e) the Government itself. He placed the cost for the Nation at $24,000,000,000 a year; the cost for his home State of Michigan at $944,000,000, and the cost for a man, wife and four children at $1,440. Democratic Members of Congress, at their own expense, had more than a half million copies of this speech distributed, one Californian alone ordered 100,000, and ENGEL himself nearly went broke trying to meet the mail demand for it.

About this time the Democrats made a major faux pas—they let the Republicans put ENGEL on the Appropriations Committee. ENGEL's first move was to visit every agency of the Government for which he would be expected to vote money. His was no front-office inspection; he went deep into the vast catacombs of bureaucracy. Wizened career clerks told him that in all their years in Government service not a Congressman had ever crossed the thresholds of their vested domains. Before he finished, ENGEL found that investigators for the exalted Bureau of the Budget, which is supposed to sift all money requests down to their irreducible minimum, were not as zealous as they should be and that the bureaucrats, as a consequence, were getting away with fiscal murder.

When a W P A official, relaxing in the luxury of easy-come, easy-go testimony before the Appropriations Committee, attempted to pass off a Government-made propaganda picture as "documentary," ENGEL promptly tripped him by rattling off the names of the professional actors who had been hired to dig into garbage cans for food, and the amounts they were paid for helping convince the nation that people inescapably starved unless immediately put to raking leaves at Government expense. The picture was never released.

When the appropriations for the Post Office Department came up, Big Jim Farley, Postmaster General and major-domo of the Democratic Party, explained an $88,000,000 deficit away by blaming it on free mail for Congressmen and "other nonpostal items," ENGEL who had been working on the subject for weeks, let go with both barrels. "Nonpostal items," he said, were actually "Government-franked mail and propaganda," which amounted to 669,352,068 pieces compared to 29,000,000 pieces franked by Congressmen," or to put it in terms of lost revenue, $32,236,000 against $751,000. Congress thereupon enacted a law forbidding departments to distribute unsolicited pamphlets, booklets, and similar bureaucratic literature.

When the National Labor Relations Board tried to pad its pay envelopes by an extra $50,000 through an old-and-tried bureaucratic trick, ENGEL caught them at it so fast that no other agency has attempted it since. Under Civil Service regulations, jobs are classified, and regular pay increases come automatically as the years of service grow. Thus, when a $3,600-a-year employee quits or dies, the pay scale for his particular job reverts or lapses to its starting point, several hundred dollars lower. The N. L. R. B. had simply passed out in the form of pay increases $50,000 worth of lapses in a single year. Caught cold in the act, N. L. R. B. officials ordered $50,000 worth of pay reductions without even bothering to put up a defense.

In 1940, when the Capitol Architect condemned the sprawling roofs over the Senate and House chambers and ordered a lattice of steel supports to be installed, only the menace which hung over the legislators would have held the headlines had not ENGEL started poking around. With steel workers already a month on the job, Albert Joseph wondered why things weren't progressing faster. Demanding to see the pay roll, he discovered that the agreed wage scale was 33 percent greater than for the same kind of work in other cities, that there was one pusher, or straw boss, for every six workers, and that they were taking turns laying off on Thursday and Friday so they could work on Saturday and Sunday at double overtime. Pay envelopes which in some instances had bulged to the extent of $267.50 in a single week were speedily deflated.

With war in the offing, ENGEL's talents were turned to more far-reaching matters. Naturally, before he could vote to buy a tank or make a gun, ENGEL had to satisfy ENGEL that these weapons would run and shoot, respectively. As a consequence, he was soon touching off 8-inch cannon at Aberdeen in the morning, taking glider flights in the Cumberlands at noon, and caroming like a billiard ball in tough little jeeps at Fort Belvoir toward dusk.

In no time at all he was leading a congressional fight for the Garand rifle, which was to make the Yank the best-armed soldier in the world, and was questioning the Army's program to "modernize" the standard light-artillery piece, the old 75-millimeter gun, at $8,000 per gun. ENGEL, who had watched these guns used in World War I, argued that their size had been dictated by the maximum cannon which horses could draw, and contended that any enemy worthy of the name would have bigger ones on caterpillar tractors.

He was sitting in the lobby of Washington's Willard Hotel one night when a man approached him and started a conversation. "I knew he was Prussian the minute he started talking," ENGEL said. The stranger developed the conversation so cleverly, pumping ENGEL for information which he might conceivably have as a member of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, that the Congressman quickly became convinced he was dealing with a spy. ENGEL led him on, giving him obscure facts that had already been published in committee hearings. Before long he had egged the stranger into boasting that Germans had abandoned their 77-millimeter guns for 105's.

ENGEL confronted our generals with this information at a subsequent committee hearing and demanded to know what they would do when faced by this gun, which would shoot twice the size shell fired by a 75 and project it almost twice as far. The reply was, "We'll have twice as many 75's."

"Hell," exploded ENGEL, "what you mean is you'll have twice as many casualties."

As a result of his persistence, the Army a few months later abandoned modernization of the 75's and started the production of 105's. Considering that this occurred in 1939, plus the fact that thousands of outmoded guns and tons of useless ammunition would have been accumulated, the savings in costly months of preparation, dollars and lives can scarcely be calculated.

When the Army's cantonment program was launched 3 years ago ENGEL was soon stirred by a suspicion that a lot of money was going into swollen contracts and wage scales instead of cantonments. With a 28-year-old camera, his portable typewriter, and his notebook, he hopped into his car and started visiting camps from Massachusetts to Florida for a first-hand look.

He came back with figures showing that $250,000,000 of the $800,000,000 spent up to that time had been wasted, and his disclosures so rocked Washington that both the Army's contract personnel and its award system suffered a shake-up from top to bottom.

Between more spectacular probes, ENGEL also found time to point out that Army red tape required 43 papers to be filed before a check could be written, and 11 more to be made out in duplicate, triplicate, etc., before the contractor could cash his check. He prodded so many generals about the $60-unit cost of producing a Springfield rifle with its 29 forged and machined parts that the number was reduced to 6 and the stamped parts increased proportionately with the result that the cost per gun dropped to $34.

Where is this man ENGEL going? Well, at present he is content to drive out to his suburban Washington home each night, sleep a few hours, and get up at 4:30, to lay brick. It seems he borrowed some masonry books from the Library of Congress and started building a 6-foot double brick wall around his house. According to the notebook which he habitually carries in his vest pocket, he's laid 14,391 bricks, and he isn't through yet.

In Congress, many of his colleagues believe he is going far. Some think he would be the ideal chairman for that inevitable peacetime probe into war expenditures which follows every conflict. Their one fear is that ENGEL may liquidate the job before he can take it, for at his present rate it's possible he will have investigated the war single-handed before it ends.

Why Butter Is Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Ulm Daily Journal (New Ulm, Minn.) issue of Wednesday, October 6, 1943, entitled "Why Butter Is Short":

WHY BUTTER IS SHORT

For more than 2 years this newspaper has been preaching that the present farm policies of the Federal administration were bound to create shortages in foods. Ours was even a lonely voice when the Stassen administration felt the answer was newspaper publicity and pennants. Now we see there will not be many pennants given out this year because farm production generally is slipping.

It did not take a wise man or a farsighted individual to see why shortages were coming. Our troubles were not due alone to the fact that we had to feed millions of soldiers overseas and we had promised a feast to the starving in every land which would embrace the "four freedoms." Our troubles stem from an unwise farm policy framed largely by men down in Washington who did not understand the farm problem. Many of them were economists who never lived on a farm and couldn't tell a hayrack from a statistic.

They took farm boys into the Army and into defense plants who were desperately needed on the farms to raise food. Then they made it almost impossible to buy farm machinery and they kept down the prices on farm products while other prices and wages soared. They scrambled up the natural forces of the marketing place until now the stores haven't any meats although millions of additional cattle roam the ranges.

Butter has been one of the great surplus foods in America. For years the amounts of butter in storage were staggering and for a long time they depressed the butter prices. Now this surplus is being used up and butter ration points have been raised from 12 to 16 points Even then there isn't going to be enough butter to go around and in many stores it isn't going to be possible to buy butter even if you have these points.

Why is there a butter shortage? There are many reasons but the best explanation we have seen was expressed by John Brandt in an advertisement his Land O'Lakes creameries recently published. Here is his illuminating explanation:

"1. Production decrease. Butter production is always off in late summer and fall months because there is less pasture, but this year's decrease is greater than usual. Due to an inequitable relationship between dairy prices and other farm prices, dairying is less profitable to farmers than other farm effort. That fact, plus inability to get adequate manpower and equipment, has discouraged butter production.

2. Government storage holdings are at an all-time high, estimated at 235,000,000 pounds. This butter would normally have been yours, but now it is set aside for our fighting men and allies. Remember, "butter is as important as bullets."

3. Increased buying power has brought about an unprecedented demand for butter. Many people who have never eaten butter regularly are demanding it now.

"4. Unequal distribution. Butter is rationed on red stamps with meats, cheese, cooking fats, lard, and substitutes, and the lowering point values of other foods in this group—or the shortage of some of these foods makes more points for the purchase of butter. This also means that areas nearest the production points buy up the supply before it can be distributed equitably to all parts of the Nation.

"5. Lack of price control of cream for purposes other than making butter. Cream brings a higher price as cream than it does as butter. There is the equivalent of many millions of pounds of butter now being hoarded as cream. This is not available as butter to our armed forces, lend-lease, or you."

John Brandt is not a fault finder. He also suggests the remedies. Here is what this man who has spent his life in the butter and dairying industry believes should be done about it:

"1. Correct the farm manpower situation.

"2. Make farm machinery and equipment available quickly.

"3. Adjust dairying prices—dairying is at the bottom of a list of 10 basic farm products for income per hour expended.

"4. Ration butter separately.

"5. Take off the butter subsidy. Farmers don't want it, and it saves the average American only 60 cents per year—if he can buy his ration allotment of 12 pounds of butter. Why put off paying our national grocery bill? Each of us will pay much more than the cost of the subsidy in years to come—in taxes, interest, and handling charges.

"6. Recognize, in action instead of words, the fact that food is America's No. 1 weapon and encourage rather than discourage its production."

Treasury's Tax Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a 4-minute prepared statement that I used last week on the American Forum of the Air over the Mutual Broadcasting System:

There is an old saying that nothing in this world of ours is certain save taxes and death.

Yesterday it was my privilege to hear the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, present the administration's proposals for $10,500,000,000 additional taxes. The Secretary mentioned the fact that we need additional taxes for our war effort, but he emphasized the need of levying additional taxes on our people to draw off what he called "excess spending money." This statement and the entire proposal by Mr. Morgenthau convinces me that he has not consulted the average citizen in preparing his recommendations. They seem to have only one preventive and that is taxes and more taxes. There is an all-powerful weapon against inflation—the power to curtail unnecessary spending. It may surprise you, but not once in his prepared statement did the Secretary make this suggestion. We can reduce our Federal expenditures and reduce them in a way that will not interfere with our full prosecution of the war. The Byrd committee recently reported that we could remove 300,000 Federal employees from the Federal pay roll without impairing our war effort. Why not do this and save hundreds of millions of dollars? Then, too, let us remember that a war-conscious and anxious Congress has in the past 3 years voted $200,000,000,000 more for war purposes than has yet been spent. No one would favor restrictions on expenditures that would in any way hinder the war effort, but I am convinced the time has arrived for Congress to demand from our military leaders full justification for the money we have entrusted them to spend.

Every citizen knows there has been altogether too much unnecessary and inexcusable waste of Federal funds in preparation for our war. Another suggestion that would be most helpful in removing our so-called surplus purchasing power is an increase in the supply of civilian consumer goods. The Secretary failed to mention this. The administration's program seems to be one of less and less of civilian goods, but more and more of taxes. Let's have a program that will give the housewife more milk, butter, meat, and other essential food items. Let's give the farmers sufficient farm machinery and equipment to produce those items. These two suggestions would remove any so-called excess spending power. The bureaucrats who are in direct control of our war food administration seem to be more concerned about rigid rationing controls and subsidy payments than increased food surpluses. They are proposing a billion dollars for food subsidies. No one will deny that this is most inflationary. Under this program the Government would be borrowing money to pay our grocery bill at the time of our Nation's highest national income.

Like Chairman DOUGHTON, I am frank to say that I do not see how we can hope to increase taxes much more. Our people are now burdened with the highest taxes in all history and our capita levy is the highest in all the world. This new proposal by the Treasury places the chief burden on those who have the least with which to pay. Do you realize that our personal income taxes will be 2,500 percent higher in 1944 than they were in 1940 if we enact the proposal submitted by the Treasury?

Dead Cows Don't Give Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 7, on page 8178, can be found a copy of a telegram that I received from Holdrege, Nebr., in reference to their milk situation. The principal dairy there was about to close unless something could be done to raise the price of whole milk to the farmers within 10 days.

I immediately wired the Office of Price Administration at Omaha, Nebr., regarding this matter. The district director at Omaha advised me that a situation such as this was under the jurisdiction of the War Food Administration. I, therefore, immediately turned this telegram over to Mr. Marvin Jones, War

Food Administrator. The 10 days are about up.

If these cattle are sent to slaughter while the bureaus and agencies of the Federal Government do nothing, it will not only distress this fine community, but it will add to the shortage of dairy products in the United States. For more than a year the Office of Price Administration has closed its eyes to the fact that dead cows do not give milk.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including a telegram that I have today sent to Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 12, 1943.*
Hon. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

On October 5, 1943, I received a wire from the city of Holdrege, Nebr., advising that within 10 days that city of 3,500 people would be without milk unless they secure some action that will enable their dairies to pay the farmers a higher price for whole milk. The Omaha office of the O. P. A. advised me by wire that this matter was under your jurisdiction. Therefore, I transmitted that Holdrege telegram to you. What are you going to do about it? Do you want this dairy to close? You may be interested in knowing that all six members of the ration board in that county have announced they will resign on the ground that the Federal agencies will take no action to save the milk for the children of their city.

Congressman CARL T. CURTIS.

Do Farmers Get Too Much?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks debate has been raging in Congress, in labor circles, and elsewhere over the relation of farm prices to the cost of living.

I call the attention of the Membership of the House that one authority has made this statement: "If farmers gave away all of their food products the cost of living could not be reduced more than 20 percent." This statement on behalf of farmers and producers was originally made by John Brandt, representing creameries in a Midwest State. This statement has been challenged, and recently that challenge was responded to in a very interesting manner by Mr Brandt as follows:

Farm prices have little to do with the high cost of living. The cost of living is the sum total of things the consumer buys: the food, the clothing, the electric-light bill, transportation, taxes, insurance premiums, and all the other things—necessities and luxuries—for which people spend their money.

Food is an important item in arriving at the cost of living. Yet on the average only 21 percent of the consumer's income in March 1943, according to the 1943 United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics Bulletin, was spent for food. This is an official figure, widely published and readily available to all, including editorial writers who may thus be saved the embarrassment of bad guessing.

Now by no means does all of this 21 cents spent for food go to the farmer. There are retailers and wholesalers, processors and distributors, transportation, packaging costs, license fees, taxes, and wages for labor in addition to other items before the farmer gets his money. As a matter of fact, what the farmer receives is only a little more than half of what the consumer spends for food. The figure is 55 percent, as of July 15, 1943, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. So of the 21 cents from the average consumer's dollar that is spent for food, only 11½ cents is ultimately paid to the farmer.

Therefore, those who have challenged my statement that, if the farmers of America gave away all of their products absolutely free, the cost of living would not be reduced more than 20 percent can readily see that I have erred. My mistake has been in being too conservative.

I recommend the reading of the Brandt argument to the membership of the House in order that once and for all the farmers—the producers of our food—who are making such a gigantic contribution to our war effort will no longer be charged with being solely responsible for the higher cost of living.

Traveling Men's Association Protests Reduction in Gasoline Allotment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter received from a traveling men's association at North Platte, Nebr.

Mr. Speaker, the traveling men of America are being forced off the road by the further restrictions in the amount of gasoline they are permitted to use. I have this day written the Office of Price Administration asking the following questions:

Is it your desire to prohibit the traveling men from calling on the merchants of this country?

Is it your desire to liquidate the small businessmen of the country?

Mr. Speaker, the activities thus far of the Office of Price Administration has been one of eliminating many small businesses in the United States. The salesman of America is the merchant's best friend. He not only helps the merchant to get a small amount of goods which may be available but assists him to understand the complicated directives which come from the Office of Price Administration. No honest attempt has been made to give the traveling man any consideration. His work is important and essential. He should be given encouragement and sufficient gasoline to carry on his essential occupation.

Unless the Office of Price Administration can be administered in a more practical manner, then this Congress ought to perform a major surgical operation upon this bureau, and I am sure that no tears would be shed should there be a large funeral for a certain part of their activities.

The letter referred to follows:

SHARE-YOUR-RIDE-CLUB,
North Platte, Nebr., October 8, 1943.
Dr. A. L. MILLER,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. MILLER: Knowing that as our elected Representative you would and should be genuinely interested in and concerned with the feelings and reactions of the people of this part of the State as regards to recent further restrictions in the use of gas for business purposes, and knowing also that only by honest and sincere expressions from the public can these problems be brought to light, we wish to express our honest opinion on this cockeyed mess. We have on other occasions written letters couched in reserved and diplomatic language expressing our thoughts on these matters and have in turn received many sympathetic replies. At this time, however, and stripped of the verbal niceties commonly used in letters of this type, we wish to state that we are just damned well fed up on this gas mess as applies to salesmen and would at this time like something more than sympathy. We want justice.

We are fed up with the asinine attitude held in high places that the salesman is not essential. Any individual of even average intelligence and with any knowledge of the economics of agricultural States such as ours and an understanding of our problems of distribution should know that salesmen are as much a part of that system as the manufacturer and the carrier.

One cannot pick up a paper today without reading where some Congressman or public official is very much concerned over the plight of the small businessman. Under conditions which he has to operate today the small businessman and merchant would be in a much worse fix than he is if it were not for the salesman. It is only through the conscientious effort of the salesmen that merchandise is distributed evenly over the entire territory and through all the merchants instead of ending up all in one favored community or in the hands of a few rich operators. Today's problem is one of fair distribution of scarce goods over all the country and the only practical way to do this is through the salesmen who know the merchants over all the territory and wants to help keep things going so he will have a job after the war. The salesman today is the merchants' best friend. He spends half of his time trying to get him enough goods to stay in business and the other half of his time explaining ambiguously worded limitations and directives so as to keep the merchant out of jail.

As far as we know there has been no honest effort by Federal agencies to understand our problems. We have simply been lumped off as a group and no study has been given problems as they exist in this part of the country. We want honest consideration given our plight by men who understand our problems in this part of the country.

In short, our work is important and essential and is doing much to keep our strained economic system working, and we are damned tired of trying to do a man's work on a boy's rations. Western Nebraska cannot be covered on a hundred miles of driving a week, and it is essential that this territory be covered. We ask for only what we know is necessary and cannot understand the mental frame of

mind which allows any A card holder two-thirds as much gas for pleasure as a traveling man gets for business. Frankly it seems to us that this last cut has some rather sinister political implications and we definitely do not like it. We don't mind carrying the twenty-thousand-odd Federal employees in this State on our backs, but we do dislike very much being beaten on the head while doing it. Give us just a small fraction of the gas used on Eleanor's recent 23,000-mile jaunt and that wasted on other Federal foolishness, and we can continue to carry on this essential work and make an honest living and still buy our bonds. Otherwise the traveling man is sunk and a lot of small merchants along with him.

Any help you can give us on this urgent matter will be greatly appreciated and not soon forgotten. However, whatever is done must be done soon, as we are going to be forced off of the road by this last cut. The only other alternative is black market gas, and we definitely do not want to be placed in the position where we will either have to be broke or be crooked.

Sincerely yours,

NORTH PLATTE TRAVELING MEN,
RICHARD N. DAVIS, *Secretary*.

Arkansas Valley—T. V. A. Yardstick—Post-War Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all looking forward to post-war readjustments, and developments. It is the hope of everyone that in the post-war period we may enjoy an endless era of full employment, full production, peace, and prosperity for all.

If we are to enjoy such conditions in this country, it is going to be necessary to develop the Nation's water-power resources, along with navigation, flood control, and soil conservation, and to distribute that power to the people of this Nation, including every farmer in America, at rates they can afford to pay.

In 1921 the people of the United States used only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity. At that time the farmers of the country, the people living in the rural districts, used practically no electricity at all; they were entirely outside the picture.

This year, 1943, the American people will use about 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity and there are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours' annual production of undeveloped water power in this country that is absolutely going to waste.

The farmers of the Nation last year used less than 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, or less than 1 percent of our annual consumption. And yet we are depending upon the farmers, not only to feed and clothe the Nation, but to furnish an extremely large percentage of our fighting forces.

By developing our potential water power, and supplying it to every farm home in America at the T. V. A. yardstick rates, we could make this the richest, the most prosperous, and the most powerful agricultural country in the world, and at the same time the farmers would be using less than 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year at a time when the people of the country as a whole will, in all probability, be using 500,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year—or less than 2 percent of the total.

One of the areas now crying out for this development is what is known as the Arkansas Valley area, which would reach the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. The development of this great project would supply a yardstick that would force rates down to the T. V. A. levels.

Those yardstick rates are as follows:

T. V. A. yardstick rates

RESIDENTIAL

Rate:

First	50 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 3c	per kw-hr.
Next	150 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 2c	per kw-hr.
Next	200 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 1c	per kw-hr.
Next	1,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 0.4c	per kw-hr.
Excess over	1,400 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 0.75c	per kw-hr.

Minimum monthly bill: $0.75 per meter.

COMMERCIAL

Rate:

First	250 kw-hrs. per month @ 3c	per kw-hr.
Next	750 kw-hrs. per month @ 2c	per kw-hr.
Next	1,000 kw-hrs. per month @ 1c	per kw-hr.
Excess over	2,000 kw-hrs. per month @ 0.8c	per kw-hr.

INDUSTRIAL

Rate:

Demand charge (based on 30 minutes demand):
$1.00 per kw. of demand per month—first 1,000 kw.
.90 per kw. of demand per month—over 1,000 kw

Energy charge:

First	10,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 10	mills per kw-hr.
Next	25,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 6	mills per kw-hr.
Next	65,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 4	mills per kw-hr.
Next	400,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 3	mills per kw-hr.
Over	500,000 kw-hrs. consumed per month @ 2.5	mills per kw-hr.

Charge for energy in excess of 360 times the demand shall be subject to a reduction of 0.5 mill per kw-hr. from the otherwise applicable rate.

While these rates may seem high compared with the Ontario rates, or the Tacoma, Wash., rates, they are far below the rates imposed on the power consumers of this Nation, as a whole.

If these rates had been in effect in the States I have just mentioned during the year 1942, the people of Arkansas would have saved $7,865,000; the people of Colorado would have saved $10,032,000; the people of Kansas would have saved $14,300,000; the people of Louisiana would have saved $15,300,000; the people of Missouri would have saved $27,200,000; the people of Oklahoma would have saved $14,044,000; and the people of Texas would have saved $42,500,000.

Shall we sit supinely by and permit this condition to continue, not only in the Arkansas Valley region, but in every other section of the United States outside of the Tennessee Valley area, the Columbia River Valley area, and that portion of the far West served by Boulder Dam?

Potentially one of the richest sections in America is that area, which I call the Arkansas Valley, for the want of a better designation. In this area is included the watersheds of the Arkansas, the Red River of Texas, the White River of Arkansas, the St. Francis, and their tributaries.

From the standpoint of minerals it is one of the richest areas in the entire country. It has abundant quantities of petroleum, natural gas, bauxite, zinc, lead, iron, helium, phosphate, coal, clays and lime, as well as precious metals, and the only diamond mine I know of in the New World.

Billions of dollars worth of these raw materials have been shipped out of the area to be processed elsewhere. However, the past extraction of these minerals for shipment has not been efficient. For example, gas has been wasted in sufficient quantities to heat the entire Nation, and only about one-third of the oil has been recovered from the underground pools. It is also rich in forests and agricultural lands. It is one of the garden spots of the world.

POWER RESOURCES

This area is also rich in water power which can and will in the future be developed, along with navigation, soil conservation, and flood control. The White River and its tributaries, and the tributaries of the Arkansas, all of which come from the Ozarks, have abundant power possibilities.

From the reports which have been made on these prospects I offer a very conservative preliminary table. This is offered only as an indication of the possibilities, as it is realized that further detailed surveys are needed before new authorizations are presented.

Projects with excessive overflow costs have been eliminated from compilation at this time.

From such a conservative appraisal of power resources it is evident that at least 400,000 kilowatts of high class or prime hydro power and the same amount of good secondary power can be further obtained in this valley. This is power that can fit into a future load curve when the region is developed up to the sustaining point of its resources. The amount of secondary power can easily be increased by further generator installations after the dams are completed. This secondary, or flood water, power comes in the wintertime, just when it is most needed.

Arkansas value flood control—hydro power possibilities

COMPLETED PROJECTS

River basin	Prime base continuous kilowatts	Installed kilowatts	Additional at load factors	
			30 percent	50 percent
Arkansas (Grand-Neosho)	16,000	60,000	[1] 80,000	[1] 50,000
UNDER CONSTRUCTION WITH POWER PROVISIONS				
Red (Dennison)	14,000	35,000	35,000	22,000
White (Norfork)	13,000	35,000	17,000	11,000
UNDER CONSTRUCTION WITHOUT POWER PROVISIONS				
White (Clearwater)	3,000	None	16,000	7,000
POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS				
White River Basin	200,000	None	675,000	330,000
St. Francis	8,000	None	30,000	12,000
Arkansas	100,000	None	650,000	350,000
Red	60,000	None	300,000	170,000
Total potential	268,000		1,655,000	862,000

[1] 4 wheels installed, 15,000 kilowatts; 2 empty pits, 30,000.

PRESENT POWER INSTALLATION

The present installed dependable electric generating capacity in this area totals 1,800,000 kilowatts in round numbers, of which 6 percent is hydro, 19 percent coal, 5 percent oil and 70 percent gas generation. The present annual peak demand of the same area is 1,600,000 kilowatts, which leaves 11 percent for reserves, a very low figure, in view of the small amount of hydro and the large amount of gas generation included in the total. It is therefore evident, that in 1943, this region will be operating on its power reserves, a situation that cannot long continue in view of the types of equipment used.

The broad distribution of all types of energy sources in this richly endowed area calls for full coordination in the use of hydro and steam power. Because of this favorable situation it is extremely profitable to develop hydro power beyond the limits of firm continuous capacity, and to use such power to take over the peak portions of the load curve, similar to the existing operations of the Susquehanna water-power plants, serving Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington.

Therefore, firm hydro capacity is not the economic limit of development, and secondary power has a substantial place in the over-all potential picture. Present costs indicate that 6 percent hydro capacity in such a situation is too small a component. It should initially, at the very minimum, be 20 percent of the total, and increased with the elevation of fuel costs. Such an operation fits the run-off characteristics of the principal streams of the area. It must be realized that in the long-range picture the predominant gas generation will decrease, as this type of fuel is definitely exhaustible. Coal can be mined in the area and delivered to a number of generating plants, at prices economically comparable with gas. Therefore, it is evident that steam generation will always have a large place in meeting energy requirements, but the proportionate part of hydro will greatly increase if this regional development is fully carried out. This presents a situation well adapted to a sound hydro development in connection with flood-control provisions of the 1938 act.

ECONOMIES OF THE REGION

This region has a population of 7,500,000, with a total gainful employment of 2,450,000, with a low proportion of 9 percent engaged in manufacturing. As a result the average income per capita is only half of what is warranted by the region's resources, and is 40 percent below the national average. This unfavorable situation affecting the people of a region so rich in resources is the result of lack of balance between manufacturing, agriculture, forestry, and mining, unnatural barriers, and discrimination in transportation rates. The same general situation applies in other sections of this country, and a careful examination will show that in all such cases this condition prevails where natural resources are shipped out of a region in a raw state. The amount of regional manufacturing is far too low and agricultural production is beyond the point of home consumption. Industrialization must be increased if these people are to become full consumers of the agricultural products; and in order to do that freight-rate discriminations must be eliminated.

There are 450,000 farm families in this region which would be greatly benefited if manufacture is increased, and farm production diversified, such as increasing rice irrigation, which in turn requires large amounts of cheap power. In addition, as a start, the benefits of cheap electricity should be given to every farmer in the area as early as possible.

THE BARRIERS

The main artificial barriers that prevent this great region from developing with its resources, are unfavorable freight and power rates.

The out-bound freight rates on raw materials, and the in-bound rates on finished products are extremely low, whereas in-bound rates on raw products, and out-bound rates on processed products are extremely high. This results in a drain of raw materials, and permits outside processed products to undersell home production. This even prevents local processors or distributors from selling economically in the local markets. It is obvious that a fundamental revision of the region's freight-rate structure is needed.

This Nation cannot continue to exist half slave and half free.

A casual inspection of Federal Power Commission's electric-rate comparisons shows that the region's electric rates are exceedingly high. Domestic electric rates in the Arkansas Valley are 66 to 100 percent higher than in the T. V. A. region, and commercial and industrial power rates are 100 to 150 percent higher. The effect on home processing is apparent. In my opinion the Arkansas Valley area cannot be brought into a developed state of full productivity and full employment and prosperity until existing barriers are removed. The purpose of my remarks today is to offer helpful suggestions in this direction, as I feel that, from my own experience with such a program in the T. V. A. and the Columbia River areas, I can discern what is needed and thereby propose a safe and sound solution.

What I am proposing for the Arkansas Valley area should be done in every other section of the country. We should wipe out all unnecessary discriminations in transportation charges, develop our water-power facilities, and see that electricity is provided to the ultimate consumers at the T. V. A. yardstick rates—or at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

We should electrify every farm home in America at these rates, and in that way bring to the people of the entire country, in the post-war period, an era of progress and prosperity surpassing anything the Nation has ever known.

A. F. of L. and C. I. O. Hit O. W. I. as Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Frederick Woltman, staff writer for the New York World-Telegram, published in that newspaper on Monday, October 4, 1943.

This article reveals that the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have for almost a year protested jointly to Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of Office of War Information, that the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I. has been broadcasting daily over its short-wave radio programs Communist propaganda to the people of occupied Europe.

These charges are serious and should be read by every Member of Congress with a view to possible congressional action to prevent Government agencies from becoming nests of Communist propaganda here and abroad. If these charges are true, certainly the facts should be presented to the proper committee of the Congress for immediate action. It is almost unbelievable that the taxpayers' money is being used by Communists and fellow-travelers to broadcast world-wide communism in defiance of our Constitution and our republican form of government and of Congress itself.

I trust every Member of Congress will read this article and determine for himself what action should be taken in the interest of America. It seems to me the time has come when Congress should place the interests of our own country ahead of those of any other, and insist that Communist propaganda, aimed to destroy our own free institutions, should

not be circulated by Federal employees who are holding high-salaried positions on the Government pay roll.

The article follows:

A. F. L., C. I. O. HIT O. W. I. RADIO AS COMMUNIST

(By Frederick Woltman)

The C. I. O. and A. F. L. 10 months ago protested jointly to Elmer Davis, O. W. I. Director, that the O. W. I. Overseas Branch had been regularly broadcasting Communist propaganda in its daily short-wave radio programs to the labor populations of occupied Europe, the World-Telegram learned today.

They charged also in a written list of specifications that many of the O. W. I. labor broadcasts were trivial and showed a strong anti-A. F. L. bias

As a result, after 8 months of futile negotiations, the A. F. L. and C. I. O. liquidated their labor short-wave bureau. The bureau, the first and only joint venture of the two rival labor organizations, had been set up by them to collect nonfactional news about American labor and turn it over to the O. W. I. as broadcast material.

The reason for closing the bureau, they informed Mr. Davis late in August, was that they could reach no basis of cooperation with the O. W. I. in eliminating the alleged Communist influence and that, therefore, Labor Short Wave could no longer perform a useful function.

MAN ASSIGNED

They acted after Joseph Barnes, one of Mr. Davis' top aids who runs the O. W. I. Overseas Branch, assigned a man to the O. W. I. labor broadcast desk whom both the A. F. L. and the C. I. O. considered entirely unacceptable because of his association with the Communist faction in American labor. Previously Mr. Barnes had asked their opinion of the man, which they sent him after an investigation of his labor connections.

Nevertheless, today Mr. Barnes' choice, Travis Hedrick, appears as the official O. W. I. representative at some of the principal labor events in the country.

The protests and consequent negotiations over O. W. I.'s labor broadcast policy were made from the start by Milton Murray, American Newspaper Guild president, acting as personal representative of Philip Murray, and by Matthew Woll, second vice president of the A. F. L. Both headed Labor Short Wave for their respective organizations, the aim being to help arouse European labor to the cause of the United Nations.

SURVEY MADE

Mr. Woll and Mr. Murray first conferred with the O. W. I. Director last November. They handed him a survey, prepared by their staff, of a cross section of the O. W. I. labor broadcasts. They considered the brochure prima facie evidence of their case.

They charged that the O. W. I. labor desk was refusing to cooperate with Labor Short Wave. And they contended the survey proved the O. W. I. broadcasts—

1. Put a disproportionate emphasis on the role of Communist labor leaders in America and the unions they represented;

2. Showed a pronounced bias against the A. F. L.;

3. Until the invasion of Africa, repeatedly represented the C. I. O. as a proponent of the species of the second front agitation which the Communists were demanding at the time. The labor broadcasts continually played up minor second front resolutions passed by left-wing unions;

4. Failed to discuss the real questions of interest to labor, such as manpower, wage stabilization, etc.; and

5. Constantly overemphasized human interest trivia that might appeal to an American audience but not to a European audience listening to their radios under threat of the death penalty.

They also charged that Peter Lyons, head of the labor desk, had past Communist labor associations. Mr. Lyons was eventually taken off the labor desk and put elsewhere in the O. W. I. set-up.

O. W. I. Director Davis was deeply impressed and greatly disturbed by the charges and by the survey presented him. He appointed an O. W. I. committee to investigate.

It developed that the labor broadcast desk under Mr. Barnes had broadcast to Europe songs of the Almanac Singers, who are virtually the official songsters of the American Communist Party.

Before the Nazi invasion of Russia the Almanac Singers were loudly proclaiming the Communists' antidefense doctrines with such tuneful slogans as:

"Plow under every fourth American boy."

MISTAKE ADMITTED

And with reference to selective service:

"It's C for the Congress that passed that goddamned bill."

The O. W. I. subsequently admitted this was all a mistake and took them off the air.

As a solution to the Murray-Woll charges, Mr. Davis proposed that the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. agree on a labor man in whom both had confidence as a non-Communist to head the O. W. I.'s overseas labor output.

Believing fully in Mr. Davis' sincerity and not wishing to injure the O. W. I., Messrs. Woll and Murray decided to work along and not make their charges public. At one point, it is reported, they even turned down overtures by Dies committee representatives who wanted to get the story.

At length they proposed a candidate, an A. F. of L. man who had been in the labor movement for years. (Incidentally, it is the fixed policy of such other agencies as O. P. A., W. M. C., W. P. B., and O. C. D. to sound out the C. I. O., A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods before appointing men to key labor spots in the Government.)

A voluminous exchange of correspondence ensued. After months, the O. W. I. still did not see fit to make the appointment, the chief explanation being that of "budgetary difficulties."

Finally in July Mr. Barnes wrote Mr. Woll and Mr. Murray that he had found just the right man, someone who was already in O. W. I. and had considerable labor experience. He inquired how they felt about it.

Mr. Barnes, who is in charge of the O. W. I.'s vast Overseas Branch, with its headquarters in New York City, is a close adviser of Wendell Willkie and accompanied him on his famous round-the-world flight last year.

NEVER DEVELOPED

He has frequently been accused privately of loading the Overseas Branch with Communists and fellow-travelers, and Mr. Barnes has been investigated at great length by the F. B. I. and the United States Civil Service Commission.

The charges, however, have never developed to a point of public action.

His candidate was Travis Hedrick, who joined O. W. I. this June as news editor in the news and feature bureau.

In their reply the C. I. O. and A. F. of L. representatives wrote their inquiry showed that Mr. Hedrick had worked for the hosiery workers union for 18 months, where he came to be regarded as a Communist fellow-traveler.

They point out that Mr. Hedrick later was employed as publicity director of the Communist-controlled C. I. O. Oil Workers Organizing Committee. Subsequently the C. I. O. high command broke up the Communist domination of the O. W. O. C. and forced out Edwin L. Smith, its director, and Milton Kaufman, his assistant. Mr. Hedrick lost his job also in the shake-up.

Thereafter Mr. Barnes apparently showed the A. F. of L.-C. I. O. letter to Mr. Hedrick, who then tried to get letters of recommendation from labor leaders. He did obtain one from a high hosiery union official who was unaware of the previous protests against the appointment.

ATTENDED MEETINGS

In the meantime Mr. Hedrick appeared last July as O. W. I. labor representative at the conventions of the A. F. of L. International Longshoremen's Association and the C. I. O. National Maritime Union. At the latter he was frequently seen attending conferences of the inside Communist leadership of the N. M. U. from which the newspaper reporters were barred.

Two weeks ago he represented the O. W. I. at the convention of the C. I. O. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers.

At that time he complained to several persons about the Woll-Murray letter. As a result the entire story came to the attention of this newspaper.

In applying for his O. W. I. job Mr. Hedrick gave as references Len DeCaux and Edwin L. Smith. Mr. DeCaux is publicity director of the C. I. O. and one of the leaders of the minority pro-Communist faction within the C. I. O.

Mr. Smith, whom the C. I. O. ousted as head of the Oil Workers because of the Communist machine built up there, was formerly a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

OFFICES CLOSED

In 1941 President Roosevelt refused to reappoint him to the board in the face of charges that he was a Communist.

He is now executive director of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship.

Labor Short Wave, Inc., meanwhile, has just closed its office at 9 East Forty-sixth Street. During its lifetime it functioned through the national war-relief agencies of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.

Israel Moses Sieff, Distinguished Englishman, Replies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 21, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Israel Moses Sieff is the vice chairman and director of the very distinguished company known as Marks & Spencer, Ltd., which operates 236 retail chain stores in Great Britain. He is a man of vast business experience, of the highest integrity of purpose, with the reputation for unquestioned fair dealing. He is a British subject.

His intense patriotism and interest in the war effort of the United Nations are eloquently testified to by the fact that both of his sons are in the British Army. One son, Marcus Sieff, rose from the ranks to become a lieutenant colonel. He has served with General Montgomery's Eighth Army from the beginning of the war and is still with that gallant hero. He has been with him in the African, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns. He has

been recently decorated for bravery beyond the call of duty. His other son, Michael, was also recently promoted from the rank of major to that of lieutenant colonel and is now in the theater of combat operations. The only other male member of Mr. Sieff's family is his son-in-law who is also a member of the British forces.

A man of that stamp and caliber when visiting this country is assuredly entitled to the uttermost respect. He was asked to devote his talents and services to the Office of Price Administration temporarily, particularly with reference to his experience on the working of the grade labeling act in England. Furthermore, while with the Office of Price Administration as an expert in price control, he rendered invaluable service in that bureau in its efforts to curb the inflation spiral.

He was called before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce engaged in examining certain practices of the Office of Price Administration. A perusal of the record of his experience before this subcommittee clearly indicates that his treatment was neither hospitable nor friendly. On the contrary, an attitude was assumed by the committee, in whole or in part, that was quite inhospitable and quite unfriendly. If the tables were reversed and a distinguished American were to be similarly treated by a committee of the Members of Parliament, it would deservedly be the subject of much critical remark.

Moses Israel Sieff, at considerable personal sacrifice to himself, traveled from city to city, addressing boards of trade and other interested groups and persons in order to tell America of the British experience with price control, subsidies and parallel items that occupied the attentions of the Office of Price Administration. In the course of his journeys he received letters of highest commendation from various officials of these groups. These warmhearted and highly commendatory communications appear hereinafter.

It is for the purpose of giving Mr. Sieff's reply to certain insinuations and charges that I have asked for permission to put into the RECORD the statement of Israel Moses Sieff which he also filed with the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I also asked permission to put into the RECORD the pamphlet entitled "Planning for Liberty" to which reference had been made in the questions propounded to Mr. Sieff.

I am aware of the fact that members of committees in their zeal and in their desire to render service and in the heat of argument may at times place themselves in the position of a prosecuting attorney. That type of attitude is forgiveable when the one interrogated is represented by counsel and at least is given an opportunity to give appropriate answer. But Mr. Sieff was not privileged with counsel and was not given fair opportunity of reply.

It is not my purpose to criticize unduly the actions of any of my colleagues. My primary purpose is to set forth and highlight the position of Mr. Sieff who is a most worth-while gentleman and entitled to our uttermost respect. My sole purpose is in the interest of equity, so that the reputation of Congress for its dignity of character and traditional open mindedness may not be, in any wise, discredited.

I, therefore, herewith offer the letter of Moses Israel Sieff addressed to me under date of August 10, 1943, the statement of Israel Moses Sieff, dated July 1, 1943, and excerpts from the article Planning for Liberty:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 10, 1943.*

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I attach to this letter my statement which I filed with the secretary of the Lyle Boren committee. I think I ought to mention that I was called to give my testimony on four different occasions. Only on one occasion was I heard. To my surprise, instead of being asked to offer testimony on the workings of the Grade Labeling Act in England, for which purpose I had been told that I was invited to appear before the committee, I was subjected to a personal investigation, which, according to my view and that of my friends, was of a very unfair character.

From my statement you will see that the questions to me were based upon wholly inaccurate and often distorted statements, which were torn out of the context in which they originally appeared. Indeed, insofar as the document which had been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 1934 by Congressman McFadden was concerned, I had never heard of it until the moment when I was questioned by the committee about it.

I do not wish you to infer from this that the chairman of the committee was averse to hearing me, but it does seem odd that I was not asked to reply to the base insinuations of the questions to which I was subjected.

Sincerely,

ISRAEL M. SIEFF.

[Enclosure.]

STATEMENT OF ISRAEL MOSES SIEFF FILED WITH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

When I first appeared before this committee on June 16, 1943, Mr. BOREN, the chairman, asked me whether I had prepared a statement to submit to this committee. Since I was under the impression that I was to be asked to testify on British experience in grade labeling in time of war, I had prepared no statement. I felt that such a statement would be unnecessary, as I expected to answer questions on that subject ex tempore and to the best of my ability. That had been my experience when asked to testify before the Senate Committee on Small Business, who addressed questions to me on British experience in that field of their inquiry.

The questions put to me when I last appeared before this committee were not concerned with British experience with grade labeling, but rather took the form of an implied attack upon me and upon Political and Economic Planning, a British organization of which I now happen to be vice chairman.

As I stated at the last hearing, I am vice chairman and assistant managing director of Marks & Spencer, Ltd., which operates 236 retail stores in Great Britain. In addition to my practical experience as a merchant and distributor, I acted as the chairman of the independent textile retailers committee attached to the Board of Trade in England at the beginning of the war, which helped in framing the first price-of-goods act of Great Britain. It was, therefore, not only as a result of my experience as a merchant in Great Britain but also because of my experience as a large retailer in finding practical solutions to some of the practical problems of price fixing and rationing in Great Britain that I was invited to make myself available to officials in the O. P. A. who might have questions to ask with regard to British experience in these matters.

I may say that it was at considerable sacrifice to my private interests that I gave up the time necessary to make myself available in Washington to answer many inquiries. It was at the cost of personal inconvenience and discomfort for me to travel to many cities in the United States on behalf of the O. P. A. to tell American businessmen of British experience under the impact of war. I may say that many of the business groups which I addressed took occasion to tell me by letter and telegram that they appreciated the insight which I had given them into British experience.

I hope that I may be forgiven reference to several of those letters.

On August 22, 1942, Mr. Edward C. Moomaw, secretary of the Roanoke Merchants Association, of Roanoke, Va., wrote me, saying:

"I want you to know * * * that it was a very real privilege to meet you and hear your interesting and stimulating address."

At the invitation of the Controllers Institute of America, I addressed that organization at their meeting in Chicago in September 1942. On September 25, Mr. J. A. Donaldson, president of the Controllers Institute of America, 1 East Forty-second Street, New York City, wrote me, saying:

"I want to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation and also that of the Controllers Institute of America for your participation in the program of our eleventh annual national meeting here in Chicago last Tuesday morning. We of the institute feel that you contributed an important part of the success of this meeting.

"It was a happy situation when Mr. Whitaker suggested your name for this program. Your business background, as well as your experience with price control in England, made your appearance on the program one that was eagerly anticipated by our membership. I can assure you that this anticipation was fully justified. I want you to know that I have had complimentary comments on your presentation from many members of the institute."

I was invited to address a convention of the Super Market Institute, Inc., at St. Louis. That institute is an association of supermarkets throughout the whole United States. On October 9, 1942, Mr. M. M. Zimmerman, executive secretary of the Super Market Institute, Inc., wrote me, saying:

"I don't believe it is necessary for me to tell you that when you appeared before our audience at St. Louis, you faced a responsive and sympathetic audience. I can't begin to tell you how deeply appreciative we are for your contribution to the success of our program. Your message was timely and most enlightening, and so important that we had a copy of your speech, as you delivered it before our audience, mimeographed and sent out to every member of our institute."

At the invitation of the Purchasing Agents Association of Chicago, I addressed their convention in Chicago on the ordnance-day program in November 1942. On November 18, 1942, Mr. R. F. Stiles, president of the association, wrote me:

"I am taking this means of advising you, on behalf of the Purchasing Agents Association of Chicago, that we feel our ordnance-day program, in which you so kindly participated, was a great success, due in part to your kind offices in addressing our group.

* * * * *

"I heard any number of favorable comments about your share in the activities, and hope

that sometime in the near future, I will have the privilege of hearing you again."

On December 15, 1942, Mr. Sidney Vlock, chairman of the American Council of Dress Manufacturers, Inc., 152 West Forty-second Street, New York City, wrote me saying:

"Do, please, accept the thanks of the council and my personal appreciation for your presence at our dinner meeting. Your remarks were truly inspirational and helped so much in conveying to those present the urgent need for a unified force in the dress industry of this city."

On March 3, 1943, Mr. Kemp Fuller, manager of market research of the United States Steel Corporation, wrote me saying:

"It was a great pleasure to have you with us at dinner last Thursday at the Duquesne Club. I have just returned from St. Louis and am taking this first opportunity to thank you for your splendid talk which aroused a great deal of interest on subjects of prime importance at this time.

"Your discussion of world markets was quite appropriate for that dinner group of market research and sales promotion men, and I knew from their comments that your efforts were well appreciated."

On March 24, 1943, Mr. G. B. Dealey, chairman of the board of the Dallas Morning News of Dallas, Tex., wrote me saying:

"Just a line to tell you of our sincere appreciation of your visit to Dallas and of the fine work that you did while here. It was a great pleasure personally for me to meet you, and I thank you most sincerely for your cordial reception and for the nice things you had to say about me.

"I hope your visit to Dallas will be repeated at an early date. If our newspaper can aid in any specific way that you can think of, I hope you will let me hear from you."

I would be less than honest if I did not say that the reception which I received at the last hearing before this committee was unexpected and in certain respects seemed to me to be inquisitorial.

I can readily understand and appreciate the point of view of those Americans inside or outside of Congress who view with concern any attempt on the part of a foreigner to shape the policy of a Government department. I can readily realize the hostility which would meet such a foreigner if he or any organization with which he was identified urged any changes in the fundamental Constitution of the United States.

I do not question the good faith of the members of this committee who interrogated me.

I therefore welcome this opportunity to remove any doubt whatever which may be in the minds of Americans regarding my attitude and that of the other members of P. E. P. I want to make it as clear as I can that at no time, either orally or in print, did P. E. P. or any of its members recommend or even suggest any change, or even the need for a change, in the Constitution of the United States. No one can point to a single instance. P. E. P. is, and always has been, concerned only with the solution of British problems.

May I also make it clear that I had nothing whatever to do with shaping the policy of O. P. A., either under Mr. Henderson or under Senator Brown. I wanted nothing to do with preparing policy. Indeed, I was prevailed upon to accept Mr. Henderson's invitation only for the expressly limited purpose of making British experience available to those who desired such information.

The last time I appeared before this committee Mr. HALLECK referred to a document called Freedom and Planning and asked me whether it was not true that in 1932 or 1933 P. E. P. published that document. I had never heard of that document before, and as I said at the last hearing, I was altogether unfamiliar with it. Since the last hearing I have had occasion to read the document, which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 8, 1934, by former Representative McFadden, of Pennsylvania, at pages 10891 to 10896, inclusive. I want to state categorically that the article entitled "Freedom and Planning" was not prepared by me or by any other member of P. E. P. whilst I have been a member of that organization. Mr. McFadden's statement that the article is a "secret document issued from the inner council of the members of Political and Economic Planning, otherwise called P. E. P." is, as far as I know, without any foundation.

Mr. McFadden does not offer any proof whatever of his assertion that this document was published under the auspices of P. E. P. His reference to the article as a secret document is refuted by the fact that all of P. E. P.'s documents were published and made available to all who were willing to pay 1 pound a year for the privilege of receiving approximately 26 broadsheets per annum. Copies of P. E. P. broadsheets are available in many libraries in this country. I have examined all of the broadsheets issued by P. E. P. from the first to the last and find nowhere in the index of articles published during the lifetime of P. E. P. any reference whatever to the article inserted by Mr. McFadden in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first issue of Planning, the broadsheet issued by P. E. P., is dated April 25, 1933. It would appear from that portion of Mr. McFadden's statement appearing in the second column of page 10898 that the article in question may have been published in Lord Beaverbrook's publication called the Week End Review, with which P. E. P. had absolutely no connection whatever.

Notwithstanding the fact that neither I nor my colleagues in P. E. P. had anything whatever to do with the article referred to by Mr HALLECK, I think that as it has been made the basis of certain questions at the last hearing, it is right to point out that that article deals only with the British economy and does not even remotely concern the politics, economics, or Constitution of the United States. Far from being a Socialist or Fabian document, it is evident even upon a hasty reading that the author of that document is opposed to Socialist ideas, notwithstanding the fact that the document is full of exaggerated language and rhetorical hyperbole.

The writer's opposition to Government interference with business is stated at several places in that essay. Here are several short excerpts from the document, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which prove this point:

"Economic nationalism is no solution. On the contrary, it is among the main causes of the world's troubles."

"Communism is a tremendous extension of government and consequently a great encroachment on liberty."

In referring to bolshevism and fascism, the author of the essay says:

"Both repudiate the claims of personal and individual freedom. In this country [Great Britain] we hold fast to the concept of freedom as one of absolute validity."

At the last hearing Mr. HALLECK read an excerpt from the document just referred to (S. M. P. 1279), from which it could be inferred that the author of that essay considered the 500,000 or more retail shops as being wasteful. I venture to suggest that an attempt was made to mislead Mr. HALLECK, for it should be said that the excerpt handed to Mr. HALLECK was taken from its context and distorts the very idea which the author presents. The paragraph from which the excerpt was taken and a subsequent paragraph, which appear at page 10893 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1934, read as follows:

"Methods of retailing cannot indeed be left entirely unchanged in the face of twentieth century needs. The multiple shop and the chain store are already bringing about notable modifications. The waste involved in the 500,000 or more retail shops—1 shop for every 20 households—cannot be allowed to continue to block the flow of goods from producer to consumer. And reorganization of retail methods is necessary to achieve adequate organization of production. In general, however, it will probably be found that there is a large place in the business of retailing for the continued play of individualism and personal enterprise. The individualist consumer and his free choice call for some corresponding individuality of outlook in the retailer who caters to him.

"Not so in the sphere of production. The business of production must be planned if it is to possess adequate means of keeping the volume and quality of the goods produced in reasonable relation to demand."

The whole tenor of this section is a plea for mass production by British manufacturers.

Far from preaching or encouraging the destruction of the small farmer or businessman in England, the author of that essay warned against the results that would follow if those small farmers and businessmen permitted themselves to be taken over by Communists or Fascists.

Later in the same essay (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 8, 1934, p. 10896), the author says:

"Indeed, the Socialist or the Communist will condemn our planning as mere tinkering with the outworn machine of capitalism. To him it will appear as a hopelessly conservative and anemic attempt to stave off the red-blooded revolution which alone would satisfy him."

At page 10896 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. McFadden states, and I quote him:

"This political economic plan, as it is also called, was prepared under the direction of Israel Moses Sieff, an English Jew, the director of a chain-store enterprise in England called Marks & Spencer."

As I have already said, there is no truth whatever in Mr. McFadden's statement that this document was prepared under my direction. I never saw it and knew nothing about it until my attention was called to it last week. Mr. McFadden offers no proof whatever to support his quoted statement. He does not refer to any other document or to any other source of information. We merely have Mr. McFadden's unsupported statement and that, I say, is not true.

Mr. McFadden then goes on to say that my company paid a 40-percent dividend in 1933 because it handled almost exclusively all imports from Soviet Russia, thus being able to undersell established British competitors. The statement that my company dealt in Russian goods is untrue, because we did not purchase a single penny's worth of Russian merchandise. In any case, Mr. McFadden does not offer any evidence to support this statement.

Although Mr. McFadden does not indicate the source of this statement, those who are aware of the propaganda put out by Herr Dr. Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi propaganda minister, will have no difficulty in tracing this statement to its source. From the very beginning of Hitler's ascension to power in Germany, his propaganda minister, Goebbels, launched attacks upon many large companies in Great Britain, including my company. His propaganda was published in English in Great Britain by Oswald Mosley's Blackshirts, the British Fascist organization. As you, of course, know, Mosley is now in prison for treason. But the dissemination of these lies did not cease with the imprisonment of Moseley. Lord Haw-Haw, the British traitor, who broadcasts from Germany, has time and time again repeated the same lies. Within the past 2 weeks the American traitor, Ezra

Pound, broadcast similar stories from Rome. What credit can be given to these untrue propaganda statements which emanate from such sources? Pound has likewise been indicted for treason in Washington, D. C.

Not long ago an organization in this country calling itself the Constitutional Educational League republished these Nazi lies in a pamphlet called Famine in America. I am advised that the chairman of that organization is Joseph P. Kamp, who, to quote a prominent American journalist, is "a professional rabble-rouser, whose organization was named by the Department of Justice as being a mouthpiece for many indicted seditionists—some of whom have been convicted." Within the past few weeks a series of articles appeared in a chain of newspapers throughout the country. All of those articles are complete distortions of easily ascertainable facts. There is no basis in truth for any of the attacks upon me and upon P. E. P.

It is unfortunate that at this late date any journalist or public figure in this country could be taken in by such lying propaganda.

Mr. McFadden inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1934, at pages 10896 to 10900, inclusive, a statement which he says he quotes from a Paris publication entitled, "Revue Internationale des Societes Secretes," under date of January 25, 1931. Then follows a report allegedly appearing in the Evening Standard under date of November 1, 1930. The Evening Standard was then and now is owned and published by Lord Beaverbrook. That statement was an attack upon government by Fabians and an attack upon the Fabian Society. Nowhere in that article, however, is there a single reference to me or to P. E. P. There is not the slightest evidence to support Mr. McFadden's conclusion that "The Political Economic Plan group is a branch of the Fabian Society." I said at the last hearing and I repeat now that P. E. P. has had no connection with and indeed is opposed to the principles of the Fabian Society.

Mr. McFadden displays his ignorance of the British scene when he refers on page 10899 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the fact that "perhaps the first and only publicity the organization has had was in the Daily Herald April 28, 1933, which published an article referring to a private dinner given at the Savoy by the Political Economic Plan on March 29 at which the chairman, Israel Moses Sieff, and the secretary, Kenneth Lindsay, made speeches. The caption in the Daily Herald was 'Mystery group out to replan British industry; P. E. P. at work on new control'." The Daily Herald is the recognized British Labor Party newspaper. If anything, that group would be sympathetic to the ideas of the Fabian Society How, therefore, could anyone expect such a newspaper to attack P. E. P. if it were as Mr. McFadden erroneously states "an outgrowth of the Fabian Society"? In point of fact, many of P. E. P.'s broadsheets and reports have been approved and commended in the editorial columns of such newspapers as the London Times, the Daily Telegraph, and many other prominent British newspapers.

After the article dealing with the Fabian Society, Mr. McFadden again makes the gratuitous unwarranted and unsupported statement that—

"In the fall of 1932 the following people joined the Political Economic Plan: Sir Arthur Salter; Sir Oswald Mosley, the head of the new British Union of Fascists; Lord Eustace Percy; Lord Melchett, the son of the late Alfred Mond; and Sir Christopher Turnor."

The nonsense uttered by Mr. McFadden becomes apparent when he groups together such people as Sir Oswald Mosley, whom he describes as the head of the British Fascists, Lord Melchett, and me. Anyone who read the British newspapers at that time, or who is aware of the facts of life in England, would have known how absurd it was to associate Mosley, with Lord Melchett, and me.

At the last hearing, Mr. Brown asked me (S. M. P. 1325) whether at any time, in answer to inquiries or in giving a statement to members of P. E. P. I said "Let us go slowly for a while and wait until we see how our friends carry out in America." I denied that I had ever made such a statement. The basis for the question is evidently the statement made by Mr. McFadden which appears at page 10899 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where Mr. McFadden says:

"About 3 months after the passage of the National Recovery Act of the United States, when Israel Moses Sieff was urged by members of his committee to show more activity, he said, 'Let us go slowly for a while and wait until we can see how our plan carries out in America'."

Mr. McFadden does not offer the slightest bit of evidence to support that statement, because there is not one word of truth in it. He does not even indicate its source.

At pages 10899 and 10900 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, 1934, Mr. McFadden made attacks upon a number of outstanding American personalities. All of you are familiar with the facts and with those personalities and may compare them with the statements made by Mr. McFadden in attacking those Americans.

The members of this committee will know, therefore, what value to place upon any unsupported statements made by Mr. McFadden regarding me and my associates in P. E. P.

The philosophy of P. E. P. is set out in its broadsheet, No. 9, of September 12, 1933, entitled "Planning for Liberty," a photostat of which is annexed hereto, from which the following excerpts are taken:

"Our broadsheet merely seeks to clarify and emphasize the course of action which is made inevitable by powerful forces that will destroy or distort civilization if we fail to take command of them now.

"In all the surviving democratic countries fascism or national socialism is a growing threat to the complacency of static governing groups. Under this threat there is a visible rapprochement between politically alert people of the left and the right, or of no traditional alinement, who wish to set against the pattern of Communist or of Fascist dictatorship a pattern of rapid and businesslike reconstruction achieved through cooperative and democratic means.

"With all these huge exhibits before it (the Blue Eagle campaign of the United States, the second Russian 5-year plan, and the Fascist movement of Italy), public opinion is rapidly outgrowing the assumptions of laissez faire, but laissez faire has meant too much to Great Britain to be abandoned in spirit without the assurance that those of its features which have long held the British imagination—its appeal to enterprise and adventure, its world-wide outlook, its confidence in the ultimate social benefits of a rising standard of life—are preserved in the new model."

At the last hearing Mr. BOREN read an excerpt which was handed to him from the July 2, 1935, issue of Planning, the P. E. P. broadsheet. I indicated at that time, and on rereading the broadsheet I found, that the quotation was torn from its context which distorted its entire meaning. Broadsheet No. 54, entitled "The American New Deal," a photostat of which is annexed hereto, was a review for members of P. E. P. of American experience with the National Industrial Recovery Act. That review was condensed from a survey made by the Brookings Institution of Washington. The fact that the broadsheet is based upon the Brookings Institution survey is stated in the first paragraph on page 6 of the broadsheet.

The digest of the Brookings Institution survey is preceded by a short editorial which critically analyzes the N. R. A. The occasion for the review, indeed, the reason for the publication of the broadsheet dealing with the American New Deal, as stated in the broadsheet itself, was the decision of the United States Supreme Court on May 27, 1935, declaring the N. R. A. to be unconstitutional. In his critical analysis of the N. R. A., the editor, who gathered his facts from the Brookings Institution survey, had these statements to make:

"The act had been from the outset an experiment for a brief and limited period—namely, 2 years. It had served its purpose and as the first-rate survey by the Brookings Institution (on which we have largely relied in this broadsheet) shows, beyond all possibility of dispute, the results have been largely negative. No reasonable person would have wished to renew the N. R. A. as it stood, except perhaps for fear lest worse befall. So far as dispatching the N. R. A. went, the Supreme Court deserved gratitude, not least from those who were committed to trying to continue the experiment.

* * * * *

"All the same, the New Deal is much too big to be killed by any court, however absolute its decree. The N. R. A. formed a stop-gap compromise at a time when there was no basis for anything better. Any attempt at a new structure could only be begun with a certain amount of agreement, and as agreement could not be obtained for sound and well-digested policies it had to be obtained for unsound and undigested policies or not at all. Disappointment inevitably followed, but there are worse things than disappointment, and undoubtedly the N. R. A. has helped, in spite of all its shortcomings, to educate opinion and to build up a nucleus of experience and of seasoned personnel which remain as national assets in spite of the Schechter decision.

"Administratively the scheme was unworkable. * * *

"Economically also the attempt to expand employment and to step up purchasing power with a jerk by abruptly and arbitrarily altering hours of labor, wage rates, and prices, simultaneously was a crude and unsatisfactory experiment. Purchasing power could not be increased in that way, nor did the method help appreciably toward restoring equilibrium. The issue of redistributing the wealth and income of the United States had to be more directly faced, and it remains to be seen whether the American Nation will be able to improve on the method adopted in this country of promoting redistribution by steeply graduated taxation and by a wide range of social services."

"The alarms and excursions of the past 2 years may look serious at the time, but they are negligible in proportion to the issues raised by the New Deal, and in relation to the time that will be needed for working these issues out. Twelve years ago Lord Birkenhead said to American lawyers, 'The decision is premature whether you, and those who agree with you, have been right in trying to control the free will of a free people by judicial authority, or whether we have been right in trusting the free will and a free people to work out their own salvation.' It may well prove that the readjustment of the United States to modern conditions will only be possible after transforming out of all recognition the first American Constitution which has stood for the past century and a half. Yet even the question of keeping or scrapping the Constitution is subsidiary to the main issue, which is what type of society the new America is going to

adopt. Negatively the New Deal has already answered this question. It is never again going to be the type of society which looked so flourishing and immutable as recently as 1929 For a more positive answer we must still wait. Whatever the outcome, the whole world gains by the fact that men have emerged in positions of leadership in America who know what social responsibility means, and who are not afraid to experiment boldly and vigorously in attempting to find permanent expression for it in the new structure which they are beginning to build."

I respectfully submit that the foregoing quotations, which I believe include all of the excerpts quoted at the last hearing, are a fair and considered review by a British editor, for British consumption, of the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the Schechter case. It is obvious in reading the whole context of the last paragraph quoted that its author is asking a number of questions which arise out of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Schechter case and the problems posed by Lord Birkenhead when he addressed American lawyers in 1923, which was 10 years before the enactment of the N. R. A.

There is not one thought in that broadsheet which can support those, both inside and outside of Congress, who point to that broadsheet as evidence of the fact that the modification or undermining of the Constitution of the United States is advocated.

I am sure that with the facts before you, you will revise your notions regarding the desire of any member of P. E. P. to meddle with the United States Constitution. I can sympathize with the position of those members of Congress who are given garbled or incomplete excerpts from documents or speeches which, taken out of their context, distort the author's meaning. When that is done in England, we say that "It isn't cricket." The idea of fair play is also part of the American way of life. Many years ago former President Theodore Roosevelt said "the principles for which we stand are the principles of fair play and a square deal for everyone." I am confident that with the facts before you, P. E. P. and its members will be assured of fair play and a square deal.

Since the attacks upon P. E. P. and upon me are without foundation in fact, they must fall to the ground.

[From Planning, London, England, of September 12, 1943]

PLANNING IS ON THE MAP

WHAT THE WORLD IS SHOWING US

Although it is not yet 5 months since this broadsheet first went out, a substantial change in the British attitude to the idea of planning is already observable. No credit on this account need be claimed for P. E. P.—our broadsheet merely seeks to clarify and emphasize the course of action which is made inevitable by powerful forces that will destroy or distort civilization, if we fail to take command of them now. The dismal failure of the World Economic Conference, due to its inability to face the situation analyzed in our issue of May 23, has helped to convince the hesitant that there can be no more looking backward. The birth of the German totalitarian state, in circumstances which have proved extremely unpalatable to English ideas of fair play and humanity, has shown the risks of drifting until a disillusioned and embittered submerged element in the population gets out of hand. In all the surviving democratic countries fascism or national socialism is a growing threat to the complacency of static governing groups. Under this threat there is a visible rapprochement between politically alert people of the left and the right, or of no traditional alinement, who wish to set against the pattern of Communist or of Fascist dictatorship a pattern of rapid and businesslike reconstruction achieved through cooperative and democratic means. In America the great gamble of the Blue Eagle campaign has captured the imagination of a large number of people, who see in it the bold leadership and vigorous action of which they feel themselves starved by the traditional parliamentary approach. Even ad hoc methods and big blunders on the way will not alienate this moral support which President Roosevelt has won, provided that mistakes can be frankly admitted and changes of direction carried out without the drive and straightforwardness of his experiment being lost. Rather further from the foreground, against immense difficulties, the second Russian 5-year plan goes on. Fascist Italy is in a position to advertise a comparatively successful resistance to the economic blizzard.

With all these huge exhibits before it, public opinion is rapidly outgrowing the assumptions of laissez faire, but laissez faire has meant too much to Great Britain to be abandoned in spirit without the assurance that those of its features which have long held the British imagination—its appeal to enterprise and adventure, its world-wide outlook, its confidence in the ultimate social benefits of a rising standard of life—are preserved in the new model.

LIBERTY PLUS ORDER—THIS IS EVERYONE'S JOB

Forced by events to renounce this particular pattern of British individualism, the Nation is groping for a way of expressing it in a new form compatible with contemporary conditions. Liberty is having to come to terms with order in the economic field as it did long ago in the political field. There is no reason to doubt that a solution will be found. History shows how the English and Scottish Nations have emerged from a state of turbulence and violence which impressed even Renaissance observers as extreme into a reign of law and order which is an example for the world. We have outgrown political anarchy by our own efforts, and we shall outgrow economic and social anarchy as successfully, now that we are compelled to do so. This is a need of the Nation, and it is also a need of the world. Everywhere models are being set up of narrowing regimes of order based on politically immature civilization. It is the plain task of Great Britain to set against these absolutisms a new type of order, springing from free cooperation, which will solve the historic conflict between self-government and effective action. Already more progress has been made along this road than is commonly understood, but time is slipping past, and whether further areas of the continent fall to fascism may be determined by the speed with which a new lead can be given from London to match the leads of Rome, Moscow, and Berlin. Because our task is the reconciliation of the new claims of the community with the old claims of the individual, because we are bound by our tradition to seek a solution through democratic means, every person who is alert and aware must play his part. No one in Whitehall or anywhere else can do our thinking for us if we are to remain our own masters. Let us therefore search our minds and see that we are not holding back the attainment of ordered liberty by clinging to the assumptions of an anarchy which has had its day.

PLANNING FOR LIBERTY

WHY DO THEY HESITATE?

It is unfamiliarity rather than any more positive objection which at the present time is responsible for the hesitation of a large number of people in accepting the case for political and economic planning. The difficulties of foreseeing how a single new measure or institution will react upon others, and upon the people with whom it deals are sufficiently large. It is not surprising that when drastic changes are proposed all along the line they should frequently be resisted simply through a vague fear or suspicion of the consequences of so far-reaching a disturbance. It sometimes happens that while, say, half-a-dozen specialists in different fields may all be convinced of the need for some sort of planning within their own fields, they may at the same time be skeptical about the advantages of living in a community subject to planning over a large part of its activities.

It is most important that this prejudice should be overcome in the only satisfactory way, by focussing discussion upon the actual position of the individual in the planned community, so that all can decide for themselves whether planning necessarily means a curtailment of desirable freedom. In the following article it is proposed to review what has already been put forward in previous issues of the broadsheet, and to indicate how the ordinary individual would be likely to be affected by the adoption of schemes of this type.

THE "SMALL MAN" STOOD FOR LIBERTY

The prejudice against planning, which undoubtedly exists, seems to spring from the fear that the wider and more complex any organization becomes the more it spells something like slavery for those engaged in it. Rightly or wrongly, it is felt that the "small man" stood for liberty—liberty to choose the occupation he liked best, liberty to leave if he wished, liberty—while he was engaged in it—to carry on his business by the methods best suited to his own idiosyncrasies or his own desires. We see the "small man" in almost every walk of life, being overshadowed by the big organization, changing from an owner to an employee, driven to buy from limited resources and to sell through restricted channels; and we fear that any increase in this tendency must necessarily mean a corresponding decrease in individual liberty.

We need not here consider whether or not the unrestricted and uncoordinated liberty of the small man did, in fact, spell happiness, either for himself or for the community. But we believe that the previous issues of this broadsheet will sufficiently demonstrate that we believe in planning precisely because we regard it as the only means of escape from the intolerable restrictions upon individual liberty and freedom of choice which the political and economic developments of recent years have produced.

BUT HE IS LOSING THE BATTLE

At present the small man in industry, in agriculture, in retailing, and so forth, is either fighting a losing battle or is holding his own at the price of accepting sweated conditions. The success of modern transport in bringing into his market competing products from all parts of the world, and the growth of new types of competing or overlapping selling agency have enormously and permanently increased the risk which the small man has to face. At any moment the price of a farm product may be broken by the production of something quite different in a remote part of the world of which the farmer, growing the original product, has never heard. Cutting his loss and turning to the production of something else, he helps to cause a glut in the product which has attracted him and has probably attracted thousands of others for the same reason at the same time. As total consumption is unlikely to expand so fast now that population increase is slowing down, it is almost certain that, even if the depression should miraculously end at once, farmers would be in just as desperate a state the next time that changes of taste or new developments forced any large number of them to go over from one crop or product to another.

COMPETITION HAS BECOME ANARCHY

This same calamitous increase of risk applies in factory production. A small firm engaged in the efficient manufacture of some product may suddenly find its market destroyed by the efforts to gain a foothold of one or more other firms, whose own market has been lost through, say, Japanese competition. So long as world population was steadily multiplying and competition was confined to units of roughly similar type and scale, there was no doubt much to be said for the classical economic view that this process was a healthy one. But now that power equipment, modern economic organization and communications have replaced competition in a number of more or less simple and distinct markets by competition between units of totally different type and scale operating in one vast confused market, the risk for the small man or the small firm has become intolerable. Whether a job is done well or badly has ceased to determine survival, which depends more upon the accident of invasion or of temporary immunity from invasion by new and devastating competition from a producer hitherto operating in a different economy, or in a distinct branch of the same economy.

SAUVE QUI PEUT IN BUSINESS

While communications and technique were poorly developed, definite limits were set to the range of competition, so that its operation was selective. Now that these limits are broken down, their stabilizing influence has disappeared, and we are nearer the position where every product and service competes with every other. The chemical industry needs a very brief period to extend its ramifications into the building industry (through the development of a new product competing with traditional materials), into the fuel industry (through a new process being rendered commercially feasible by Government action), and perhaps into other important industries as well. The falling birth-rate forces manufacturers of goods demanded for babies to strike out into new fields. The Salter report and legislation arising from it throw manufacturers and users of all types of commercial vehicles into confusion, from which emerges a market radically changed by belated and abrupt Government intervention. There is no need to multiply examples. The conclusion is plain. It is no longer a question of planning destroying the nineteenth-century pattern of healthy competition; that pattern is already utterly and irrevocably destroyed, and to look at contemporary conditions in terms of it is an anachronism. Our present problem is to replace not "healthy competition and individual initiative," but the chaos which has destroyed them, by a more stable system which will revive so far as possible their good features within the framework of social responsibility. The contemporary champion of laissez-faire regards himself as a man struggling nobly to hold back the flood of interference. He does not realize that interference has reached saturation point already, and that his efforts only obstruct those who are trying to build a new and sounder structure in order to conserve the liberty which he prizes.

ONLY COOPERATION CAN MAINTAIN LIBERTY

There are two ways of coping with risk. One is to minimize it by appropriate action, and the other is to insure against it. This is what the small producer or distributor should be urged to do. It is by no means an innovation in England. The underwriters who frequented Lloyd's coffee house began generations ago to develop a cooperative organization for the spreading of the risks arising from their own business, for the collection and issue of information, for the inspection of vessels and for many other common purposes which has won world-wide prestige as the corporation of Lloyd's. Here is one example of a spontaneous and successful effort to combine individual liberty of action with high standards and limitation of risk. The individual underwriter preserves his liberty through a cooperative organization, and there is no visible reason why the individual shopkeeper or farmer should not do the same.

THE OLD LIBERTY WITH A NEW BACKGROUND

The small man, therefore, should regard planning not as a menace to his liberty but as, perhaps, the only instrument for preserving it in contemporary circumstances. Undoubtedly he must specialize more in future, but the choice of field must remain his own, and within it he may be more securely his own master than anyone can be at the present time. Only if he loses his spirit of enterprise and fails to fulfill the function he has chosen has he to fear being crowded out by larger organizations. The worst enemy of the small man is the supporter of old methods regardless of the misery which they have brought. The new task is not to eliminate the small man, nor to preserve him as a picturesque anachronism, but to work out and apply methods by which he can hold his own through better serving his function. On the surface, no doubt, his role will appear very different—fundamentally he stands to gain rather than to lose in liberty once the give and take demanded by the new order has become settled practice.

LIBERTY FOR THE EMPLOYEE

There are in the economic field other issues of liberty besides the liberty to produce and sell on one's own account. The liberty of the employee is equally important, and equally menaced by the new increase of risk which undermines the security and peace of mind of millions of families. In the issue of this broadsheet dealing with employment policy it has been urged that the unwanted leisure which has been thrust on many hundreds of thousands of workers might be converted into socially beneficial leisure through pensioning off many elderly or physically unfit members of the labor force, through controlling the intake of young workers by half-time education between 14 and 18, and through shorter working hours. Socially the advantages of such an arrangement as compared with the present system are manifest, but action is blocked by reluctance to face the dislocation and the many new arrangements which would be needed.

ENGLAND UNDERSTANDS GIVE AND TAKE

The most obvious difficulty is that too many different parties are concerned. It is impossible to negotiate separately with every individual employer and every individual employee, while the alternative of a governmentally imposed readjustment supervised by a bureaucracy does not look any more attractive. This difficulty would be minimized if every industry could be persuaded to establish a single representative body capable of concluding binding agreements between employers, employees, and the State, of a much more comprehensive type than the agreements over wages and labor conditions between employers' associations and trade unions which have become a settled part of the British social and economic fabric. Anyone who observes the difficulties which the Roosevelt national recovery experiment has met through the absence of any tradition and machinery for large-scale collective agreements in the United States must recognize that at least in this respect Great Britain is much more favorably placed. Our long experience in this field would enable such organizations to be launched and operated with every chance of success.

THE END OF THE LABOR MARKET

In course of time the individualist view, which regarded labor as a commodity to be bought and sold, has gradually been rejected by the British nation. Great Britain preferred to abandon the gold standard rather than to face the savage reductions in the price of labor which orthodox economics asked of it. Unemployment insurance and many other factors have turned the labor market into a meaningless phrase, so far as it is applied to contemporary Britain. But while the labor force is subject to policies which destroy the effectiveness of old-fashioned adjustments, it is not yet subject to a constructive plan. Mass unemployment is the expression of this refusal to choose either the method of laissez-faire on the one hand or the method of planning on the other.

INSECURITY CAN BE REMOVED—RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE WORKER

In a previous broadsheet we sketched the effect upon industry of a planned employment policy; here we are concerned with its repercussions on the individual. The first and most obvious of these lies in the reduction of risk. Given control over imports and control of the intake and retirement of workers, it is possible to eliminate the risk of unemployment occurring on anything like the scale to which we have grown accustomed. With all its shortcomings, the British experiment in universal unemployment insurance has shown the practicability, even at the present low level of national income, of maintaining the population through full-time productive employment of a minority of its members. It is undoubtedly practicable to reduce very substantially the excessive numbers of the labor force by excluding from it large numbers of the elderly, the unfit, and the young, whose maintenance can be borne through other channels than wage earning. For the individual worker this means removing the atmosphere of insecurity in which he has lately had to live. He enters the labor force with a definite status which cannot be threatened by excessive competition or by the bad organization which certain industries have persisted in using to the detriment of their employees. His risk of being unemployed through no fault of his own can be reduced, and in many cases eliminated. The improvement in the status of the worker resulting from a planned employment policy is one of the most generally beneficial reactions to be anticipated following the creation of a planned economy. The principle of devolving responsibility must not be restricted to executives; all workers or teams of workers by hand or by brain should be free to arrange their own work as they find best, subject to the satisfactory performance of their function insofar as it affects the rest of the organization to which they belong. As the casual worker disappears, and the picked labor force which remains becomes more secure, the rapid improvement of the status of the worker will follow.

THE BRIDGE FOR THE SOCIAL GULF

The trend of industrial civilization has for many years been steadily reducing the importance of ownership in economic affairs, and enhancing the importance of management. In extreme instances the owners of a concern may run into hundreds of thousands, and all initiative has passed to a small number of highly paid executives, whose position, however powerful they may be, is fundamentally more similar to that of the wage earner than to that of the old-fashioned capitalist who could do absolutely as he liked with his own. This managerial class, in its new shape, makes a bridge by which the bad, old, social gulf may be spanned. To ensure, by training and selection, an adequate supply of first-rate executives, to improve the opportunities for recruitment to the higher posts from among those who serve in the ranks, and to reduce

the sense of class distinction in industry, are essential to the working of the new system, which must rely for many of its benefits on its success in making or finding more good organizers and in giving them full scope for their abilities.

HOW ABOUT THE CONSUMER?

Whether he is an employer or independent worker, a manual worker or an executive, a pensioner or a dependent, the individual is closely interested in economic planning from a quite different angle, in his capacity as a consumer. It is on this score that some of the most familiar objections to planning are raised; it is alleged that planning will mean that the consumer will pay more, or that he will find himself at the mercy of a tyranny which will ignore his tastes and force him to take what he is given; or, at any rate, that apathy will set in and the pace of improvement will slow down. It is important to consider what truth, if any, these criticisms contain.

Undoubtedly faulty planning can send costs of production up instead of down, and may, in this way, by reducing income per person employed, offset any other benefits which it may bring. But this danger is only serious where the plan is so enthusiastically directed to some noneconomic end that a rise in costs is considered worth while, or else where there is gross incompetence or dishonesty in its execution. In order to avoid this danger and to insure that planning for planning's sake is not allowed to take the place of planning for a higher standard of life, we consider that the lowering of costs should, in most cases, be one of the chief objects and tests of successful economic planning.

PLANNING CAN GIVE BETTER VALUE

The argument that the consumer will become the victim of tyranny has less substance. In a great many cases competitive business has proved unable or unwilling to undertake the research necessary in order to ascertain what the consumer really wants and how best to supply it. The growing popularity of mass production and mass distribution indicates that value rather than variety at any price is what the consumer wants. No doubt the demand for craftsmen's goods, for specialties and luxuries will continue and even expand, but the individuality or quality of these products will have to be real in order to secure them a market. The large organization, able to pay for research and to make experiments before standardizing its products, will set the pace for the specialist, while through cooperative organization the small producer or distributor will be able to provide himself with equivalent services and information.

PLANNING MEANS MORE COLOR IN LIFE

There is no ground for assuming that the planned economy will be lacking in color or variety; on the contrary, the intelligent use of standardization in the parts will give scope for originality and freshness in the product composed of them which would have been unattainable for all but a privileged few so long as the drudgery of manual repetition and of fetching and carrying in the workshop absorbed a large part of the money which the consumer could afford to pay.

Housing is a good example. It is here that the contradictions of individualism and the possibilities of planning are most evident. The millions have clamored for their houses to look "different," with the result that they all look different in the same way. The cost has been high and the quality is abominable. Mass production has been scorned as something infra dig, although it could have given the average villa dweller a far better designed set of materials at a substantially lower cost, and the saving could have been applied to the creation of a true, instead of a bogus, individuality for his house by having it built to his needs from the standardized materials.

THERE ARE NO MONOPOLIES NOW—THE CONSUMER MUST REIGN

Nor will there be any shortage of incentive. If the consumer does not like a product or a service which happens to be a monopoly he will find those responsible far more sensitive to criticism and more anxious to meet legitimate complaints than a crowd of struggling competitors, none of whom holds himself personally responsible for what is happening. If, on the other hand, the product or service is subject to direct competition, as it usually will be, the consumer will be free to transfer his custom elsewhere. In fact, the competition between different products and services is already so complex that to talk of monopolies is an anachronism. Slackness or lack of enterprise in any activity will soon result in the transference of demand to quarters which might never have been expected to prove competitive; an unsatisfactory hotel service will lose its customers not only to hotels abroad, but to shipping through the cruise, and to the caravan or camp; dear or indifferent beer may permanently reduce the habit of beer drinking and transfer purchasing power to the cinema or dance hall; high-cost railway transport is menaced by road, air, and water competition; everywhere the reaction of one development on another is ample to discourage apathy. Apathy, in fact, is more likely to set in where unrestricted competition robs an industry of the fruits of hard work and enterprise by leaving it at the mercy of preventable dislocations outside its sphere, or where the essential capital of an industry is confiscated through taxation and spent by the Nation as current income as a result of unsound financial policy. The suspicion that the consumer in the planned economy will be too much regimented is unfounded; the mere existence of plenty, which is the basis for planning, makes it inevitable that the planned economy shall take its orders from the consumer and not vice versa.

Planning within the factory has made the reputation of firms which have become famous for the value which they give the consumer. Planning by industries as a whole will enable the consumer to reap even greater advantages through the further elimination of waste. Those who never tire of asserting that every planning scheme is a plot against the consumer ought not to be left unanswered.

PLANNING CAN KILL DRUDGERY

There is one more aspect from which the impact of planned economy on the individual needs to be considered, and that is its effect upon him as a citizen. Even if planning is compatible with freedom in enterprise and with the better satisfaction of the consumer's wants, it may still be argued, and has already been argued, that it will involve a more mechanical and less rich type of civilization. There are always people who regard any invention and any organization as a plot for enslaving mankind, but they are fighting for a lost cause. We have already chosen irrevocably for the world to embark on the experiment of a mechanized civilization based on power instead of on human labor. The better we can organize such a civilization the more opportunity it will afford for escape from the element of drudgery in making a living which has up till now bulked large in the lives of the majority of men. At this stage in the depression the most hardened praiser of times past can hardly look with complacency on the fruits of the traditional system.

ENGLAND MUST PLAN FOR LIBERTY

There is all the same a special problem for England in the creation of a planned community which shall not only preserve but greatly extend the liberty which has been won during hundreds of years of struggle. For us it will not be good enough to adopt a plan, however successful, which shares the narrowing tendencies observable in many contemporary efforts to achieve order. Our plan must be an instrument for enabling people to obtain more leisure and to use it as they please, and in their working time to meet fewer frustrations and less drudgery than they now have to suffer. Let those who are genuinely concerned over the outlook for liberty set to work thinking and discussing how planning can be made the vehicle instead of the enemy of liberty, for planning is inevitable, and it is a special responsibility of Great Britain to set an example to the world of a plan which will broaden the lives of those who participate in it.

NOTES

WHAT LONDON MAKES

Planning depends on knowledge, and it is difficult to find many industries or activities of which we can yet say that the material for any permanent plan exists. That, of course, is no excuse for inaction, but it means that everything now undertaken must be transitional and subject to readjustment in the light of further experience. At the same time, all who are engaged in recording or analyzing the behavior of the social and economic machine should redouble their efforts in the knowledge that the need and appetite for their findings among political and business executives is greater than ever before.

In fact, bad as our present information is, it is a great deal better than anything available 10 or 20 years ago. Great Britain has still no clearing house of information, no statistical authority, nor even a handbook comparable to the American Recent Social Trends, which was reviewed in the sixth issue of Planning. We have, all the same, a growing number of indices and partial or local surveys which supply us with vivid and suggestive, though often tantalizing, glimpses of what is taking place.

During the past few weeks two excellent examples of partial surveys have dealt with industries in the London area. The larger of these is the fifth volume of the great New Survey of London Life and Labour entitled "London Industries II" (P. S. King & Son, 17s. 6d.); the second is a free-lance effort by Dr. Douglas H. Smith called The Industries of Greater London (P. S. King & Son, 10s.). Both these volumes are full of up-to-date information ably presented, and both throw light on some of the live problems which confront the planner. There never has been, and we may hope there never will be again in Europe a mass of swarming population and unplanned development comparable to that which can now be seen on a fine still day from an airplane three or four thousand feet above St. Paul's. This mass, which is still growing every day, has overflowed all the boundaries which have been set to it; the late Victorian County of London appears as a small island in the London passenger transport area which represents the metropolitan district of 1933, and even Greater London of the metroplitan police is obsolete. Neither the New Survey nor Dr. Smith are aole to cope with the entire Wen. The New Survey area does not extend to Dagenham in the east, Croyden in the south, Ealing in the west, or Enfield in the north, so that it only covers the central London of 1933. Dr. Smith begins almost where the New Survey stops, and goes out as far as Hertford, Watford, and Slough, but he has found it necessary to limit himself to a single quadrant of the area—the northwest quadrant between Thames and Lea. The New Survey has the great advantage of constantly being able to make comparisons with nineteenth-century conditions through the pioneer work of Charles Booth.

A static account could not show, as this work does, the living forces which are operating. One of these is the shift of emphasis from production to distribution. In the

scope of this particular volume productive industries have increased their personnel by about 11 percent during the past 10 years, while distribution and personal services have increased by nearly 50 percent. Although half a dozen retail undertakings have more than 2,000 insured employees, the great majority are small units. Mechanization has had the effect of increasing the proportion of females to males, and in many cases of reducing the average age of employees. The food, drink, and tobacco industries which are strong in London are highly mechanized, but the Survey constantly has to draw attention to the survival of the ancient manual methods side by side with the power-driven machine. Particularly in the retail trade the small man shows considerable tenacity. It was recently found that "in a typical Broadway in the suburbs, * * * out of a total of 187 shops, 130 were independent traders' premises, 44 belonged to multiple companies, 11 were local departmental stores of one type or another, and 2 were cooperative stores. This gives 70 percent small shops and 30 percent multiple concerns or stores."

The Survey gives a sketch of the small retailer, which is all the better on account of the neat irony with which it is done. It remarks on the fact that the independent retailer always regards himself as being on the point of being crushed out of existence, but never actually succumbs, and analyzes very acutely the causes of his embarrassments and of his survival in spite of them. Dr. Smith shows reason to believe that the increase of factories and of workers in Greater London is only to an insignificant extent at the expense of other parts of England. It is predominantly an increase of light industries catering for the home market such as have always centered on London. What makes them conspicuous now is that they continue expanding when heavy or export industries are often stationary or actually shrinking. His analysis shows that of firms now manufacturing in the area covered, 243 have migrated outward from London, 20 from the United States of America, and 27 from the Provinces, while 82 have grown up gradually on the spot, and 232 are new companies started during the past decade. Of the 27 immigrants from the Provinces, only 14 come from the Midlands or the North, contrary to a widespread belief.

Out of a total of 135,000 workers in the northwest outer metropolitan area factories, about eighty to ninety thousands are engaged in the 7 groups of manufacturing cars and accessories, chemicals, electrical equipment, foodstuffs, musical instruments, stationery, and office requisites, and furniture. All these are industries in which London has a substantial proportion of the British total, and all are directly linked with the London market. On the other hand, for shirts and collars, hosiery, boots and shoes, stoves and pottery, leather, glass, and rubber goods, and other imported categories, the provinces have in general practically a monopoly.

The separate treatment of the various industrial districts allows significant comparisons to be made between the industries of, say, Slough, Welwyn, Southall, and Park Royal. That most of the recent sporadic growth of factories could easily have been guided by deliberate planning into a more orderly form is clear from the eagerness with which firms have settled where any definite nucleus has been provided for them in advance, as at Wembley Exhibition, Welwyn Garden City, the new arterial road fringes, and the wartime munition factory sites of Slough Trading Estate, the Hyde near Hendon, and Park Royal. In the last case there are two such sites and a bypass; even in the present depression the 130 Park Royal factories employ eighteen to nineteen thousand workers, and Dr. Smith considers that this may ultimately prove to be the largest single center of industrial activity in the southeast of England.

Such surveys are invaluable; they pave the way for action.

BUILDING IN THE DARK

One of the more depressing characteristics of an unplanned world is that no one starts thinking about some of the most obvious and fundamental problems until action upon them is seriously overdue. Then many months have to be spent in factual investigation and thought which could and should have been done years earlier, or the job has to be undertaken in ignorance of its essential bearings. No more conspicuous instance could be found than the housing problem. Interest rates have fallen, public opinion has been roused, posters have been splashed over hundreds of hoardings, a departmental committee has reported, building societies are thirsting for new fields to conquer, and local authorities all over the country are being pressed to produce schemes. In view of all this activity it is surprising to find that no survey has been attempted of minimum requirements as regards number and size of rooms, amenities, etc., of the poorest paid workers; of the amount of land available at various prices per acre; of the average and extreme sizes of holdings in urban and rural land; of the comparative all-in cost of every practical type of housing at different rates of interest; of the past effects of the various subsidies on the State, the municipalities, the tenant, and the building industry; of the effect of maintaining local services out of the proceeds of a house tax called rates; of the incidence of the various items in the final cost of a house and how far possible savings in each of them would reduce economic rent; of the possibility of reducing labor costs without reducing wage rates; of the effects of lack of coordination in the building materials industries, and of many other points which are equally relevant to the formulation of sound policy. It is safe to say that had this necessary work been faced a dozen years ago an immense waste of money, of amenities, and of potential economic values could have been avoided. The P. E. P. group which is working on this subject is fortunate enough to have the active help of several of the younger architects who are currently engaged in housing construction, and of experts in the legal, technical, industrial, commercial, and house property management aspects of the problem. It has access to a certain amount of information not publicly available, yet it finds itself seriously handicapped by ignorance of essential facts. Any readers of the broadsheet who may be able to contribute any useful material from their own experience relating to this subject are invited to get in touch with the secretary of P. E. P. at once.

AGRICULTURE—THE AMERICAN EFFORT

A lot is heard at present about the National Industrial Recovery Act which President Roosevelt is endeavoring to put into force. Much less appears to be known in England about the parallel Agricultural Adjustment Act, although this experiment is of particular significance in view of our own Agricultural Marketing Acts, 1931 and 1933, and of the Russian collectivization campaign, which between them are helping to change the face of the world's agriculture.

It is interesting to observe that the Americans, who are generally supposed to be ruthless innovators, have adopted an ad hoc scheme on a temporary emergency basis, with definite provision for its abandonment when the emergency ends. The British, who are reputed to be shy of whole-hearted reconstruction, have frankly recognized that what is being done amounts to the permanent overthrow of the traditional system.

The United States Act, whose results are now becoming apparent, is officially described as "An act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emegency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes."

As we have received a number of requests that we should reproduce in the broadsheet extracts from important documents not currently available, we quote in full the declaration of emergency and declaration of policy which define what the act is intended to do:

"Be it enacted, etc.

"TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT

"Declaration of emergency

"That the present acute economic emergency being in part the consequence of a severe and increasing disparity between the prices of agricultural and other commodities, which disparity has largely destroyed the purchasing power of farmers for industrial products, has broken down the orderly exchange of commodities, and has seriously impaired the agricultural assets supporting the national credit structure, it is hereby declared that these conditions in the basic industry of agriculture have affected transactions in agricultural commodities with a national public interest, have burdened and obstructed the normal currents of commerce in such commodities, and render imperative the immediate enactment of title I of this act.

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress:

"(1) To establish and maintain such balance between the production and consumption of agricultural commodities, and such marketing conditions therefor, as will reestablish prices to farmers at a level that will give agricultural commodities a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy, equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the base period. The base period in the case of all agricultural commodities except tobacco shall be the prewar period, August 1909–July 1914. In the case of tobacco, the base period shall be the post-war period, August 1919–July 1929.

"(2) To approach such equality of purchasing power by gradual correction of the present inequalities therein at as rapid a rate as is deemed feasible in view of the current consumptive demand in domestic and foreign markets.

"(3) To protect the consumers' interest by readjusting farm production at such level as will not increase the percentage of the consumers' retail expenditures for agricultural commodities or products derived therefrom, which is returned to the farmer, above the percentage which was returned to the farmer in the prewar period, August 1909–July 1914."

The United States, being mainly self-supporting, are not so strongly deterred as the United Kingdom from taking steps likely almost overnight. Scientific forest methods have replaced the old order of things. Fires that were purposely set each year have been fewer and fewer.

HOW IT HAS CHANGED THE LANDSCAPE

"Good telephone lines have been constructed, roads and trails now penetrate the innermost parts of the forest and are carefully maintained. Nurseries have been developed so that the native trees might once more take their place in the forest composition. Bridges have been built, dams constructed, the State parks have been fenced, thousands of acres have had silviculture treatment, and the fire hazards have been removed. Throughout the entire forested area steel fire towers have been erected. Everything has been done to develop the forest and to get it back to its original stage."

WE SHOULD LEARN FROM THE NEW DEAL

It will be observed that in this article little reference has been made to the Tennessee Valley Authority, one of the most significant of all the enterprises undertaken by the New Deal. The reason for this omission is that the T. V. A. raises a number of issues of special importance for Great Britain which we hope to discuss more fully in a later broadsheet. Here we may conclude by suggesting that, while particular aspects of the American New Deal are open to every type of criticism, the New Deal in America has made a great contribution toward bringing to light and helping to solve the problems of the contemporary world. We in Great Britain may doubt how far it would be wise to apply New Deal policies in detail in this country, but there can be no question that the constructive adventurous spirit which is being fostered in America through bold leadership is equally needed on this side.

[From Planning, London, England, of July 2, 1935]

IS THE NEW DEAL FINISHED?

On May 27, nearly 2 years after the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the United States Supreme Court gave a decision which wrecked at a single blow the entire structure of the National Recovery Administration and the hundreds of codes set in operation under its rules. The test case was insignificant in relation to the issues involved; in fact, it had been christened the "sick chicken case" because it hung on the appeal of the Schechter Poultry Corporation from their conviction for violating the poultry industry code by infringing its labor provisions and by various unfair practices which included killing and selling poultry unfit for human consumpton.

On this small issue the N. R. A. crashed. The Supreme Court held that Congress was constitutionally unjustified in delegating legislative power to private individuals, or in delegating that power even to the President without laying down more definitely the principles which it should follow and the circumstances in which it should be used. Further, the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government cannot legislate about wages, hours, prices, production, or other practices of industry except insofar as these practices directly affect interstate commerce. At the same time the Court declared invalid the Farm Mortgage Moratorium Act and a number of important Federal agencies, including the National Resources Board, which had been tackling the problem created by generations of reckless exploitation and neglect of the basic wealth of the United States.

AFTER THE SUPREME COURT DECISION—BLOCKING FUTURE ADJUSTMENT

There was joy among supporters of the old regime and consternation among businessmen and labor leaders who had been trying to work the codes, and who at least thought them better than anarchy. Both sides were inclined to say on the spur of the moment that the New Deal had been suddenly and unexpectedly destroyed. This, it is already clear, was an exaggeration. In the first place, the Recovery Act would in any case have expired within a fortnight, and there was no prospect whatever of its being reenacted in its original form. The act had been from the outset an experiment for a brief and limited period—namely, 2 years. It had served its purpose, and as the first-rate survey by the Brookings Institution (on which we have largely relied in this broadsheet) shows, beyond all possibility of dispute, the results have been largely negative. No reasonable person would have wished to renew the N. R. A. as it stood, except perhaps for fear lest worse befall. So far as despatching the N. R. A. went, the Supreme Court deserved gratitude, not least from those who were committed to trying to continue the experiment. The resulting uncertainty was no doubt troublesome, but the uncertainty existed anyhow, because the act was on the point of expiry without anything having been arranged to take its place. Where the Court wrought havoc was not in terminating the operation of the Recovery Act, which had outstayed its welcome and outlived its usefulness, but in blocking its recasting in any more effective form, and in laying down constitutional principles which forbade for the future any approach to social security or to public supervision of economic activities of any kind.

All the same, the New Deal is much too big to be killed by any court, however absolute its decrees. The N. R. A. formed a stop-gap compromise at a time when there was no basis for anything better. Any attempt at a new structure could only be begun with a certain amount of agreement, and as agreement could not be obtained for sound and well-digested policies, it had to be obtained for unsound and undigested policies or not at all. Disappointment inevitably followed, but there are worse things than disappointment, and undoubtedly the N. R. A. has helped, in spite of all its shortcomings, to educate opinion and to build up a nucleus of experience and of seasoned personnel which remain as national assets in spite of the Schechter decision.

SELF-GOVERNMENT WHILE YOU WAIT

Administratively the scheme was unworkable. However desirable self-government for industry may be as an objective, to try to create it in a period of a few months, without the necessary information, resources, personnel, or experience for its proper operation, is asking for trouble. It is significant that the codes which functioned best were those which had as foundations careful survey work done, information and statistics gathered, and institutions built up before N. R. A. was thought of.

REDISTRIBUTION HAD TO BE FACED

Economically also the attempt to expand employment and to step up purchasing power with a jerk by abruptly and arbitrarily altering hours of labor, wage rates, and prices simultaneously was a crude and unsatisfactory experiment. Purchasing power could not be increased in that way, nor did the method help appreciably toward restoring equilibrium. The issue of redistributing the wealth and income of the United States had to be more directly faced, and it remains to be seen whether the American Nation will be able to improve on the method adopted in this country of promoting redistribution by steeply graduated taxation and by a wide range of social services. In fact, President Roosevelt, in a recent message to Congress, has asked for sharply graduated income and inheritance taxes which, although an innovation in the United States, do not compare in thoroughness with those already in force in the United Kingdom.

WHAT SORT OF AMERICA NEXT?

The alarums and excursions of the past 2 years may look serious at the time, but they are negligible in proportion to the issues raised by the New Deal and in relation to the time that will be needed for working these issues out. Twelve years ago Lord Birkenhead said to American lawyers: "The decision is premature whether you, and those who agree with you, have been right in trying to control the free will of a free people by judicial authority, or whether we have been right in trusting the free will and a free people to work out their own salvation." It may well prove that the readjustment of the United States to modern conditions will only be possible after transforming out of all recognition the first American Constitution which has stood for the past century and a half. Yet even the question of keeping or scrapping the Constitution is subsidiary to the main issue, which is what type of society the new America is going to adopt. Negatively the New Deal has already answered this question. It is never again going to be the type of society which looked so flourishing and immutable as recently as 1929. For a more positive answer we must still wait. Whatever the outcome the whole world gains by the fact that men have emerged in positions of leadership in America who know what social responsibility means and who are not afraid to experiment boldly and vigorously in attempting to find permanent expression for it in the new structure which they are beginning to build.

THE AMERICAN NEW DEAL

INQUEST ON THE NEW DEAL—ATTITUDES FROM THE PAST

Probably it is still too early even to begin to assess the results of the New Deal. In any event an outline of some of the main issues is both possible and necessary. The New Deal sprang spontaneously from American post-war conditions. The immigration which had constantly been bringing in a fresh bottom story for American society suddenly ceased. The physical frontier which generations of Americans had delighted in pushing back could be pushed back no farther. The hectic exploitation of national resources in coal, in minerals, in oil, in timber, and in soil had reached a pitch where retaliation from Nature was bound to make itself felt. The expansion of power equipment, the scale of business undertakings, the credit structure, urban development, and many other sections of American life had reached proportions which were conspicuously beyond the mental and moral capacity of many of those nominally in control of them. Easy accumulation of wealth and automatic increases in population and markets encouraged materialism and the worship of bigness for its own sake. There was a persistence of attitudes carried over from smaller and more primitive communities in which alone they could be indulged without disaster. Well-known instances of such attitudes were the intolerance of internationalism, the refusal to accept the implications of having become a creditor nation, the reliance or a rigid constitution and on constitutional amendment for the curbing of human demands (as in the case of prohibition), and the stubborn individualism which showed itself in industry through refusal of social responsibilities and in social life through open lawlessness. Lack of effective criticism, lack of leadership, and lack of political education left the United States at the mercy of the currents of the moment. There were many sober and constructive minds at work, but in the twenties they could get no real hearing.

By March 1933 when President Roosevelt was inaugurated, 4 years of disillusionment with previously accepted leaders and patterns of thought, of savage credit deflation, of chronic and widespread unemployment, of bankruptcies and foreclosures, of plunging prices and soaring debt burdens had produced an extremely powerful but exceedingly vague demand for relief, recovery, and reform.

RELIEF, RECOVERY, AND REFORM

It was this demand which the Roosevelt New Deal set out to satisfy. Relief was held to be urgent and to justify many sweeping emergency measures, but relief by itself was not nearly enough. Recovery was essential in order to check the spread of panic and the further disintegration of the economic and social structure of the United States, but recovery even accompanied by relief would not have been acceptable without some attempt to prevent the repetition of such a catastrophe. This attempt implied reform. The

three tasks of relief, recovery and reform were all urgent and were all emphasized in varying degrees by different groups. Each in itself was colossal, and the difficulty of pushing through all three together was increased by the fact that they were to a substantial extent incompatible with one another.

The first and most important instrument of relief was devaluation. In April 1933 the gold standard was suspended, and a period opened in which the value of the dollar was deliberately forced down by one expedient after another in order to boost up prices, to relieve the burden of debts and to make production profitable. Further measures for the relief of debtors, including mortgages, were put through Congress. For labor, relief took the form of huge Federal disbursements to the unemployed and of a large-scale public works policy.

AIMS FOR RECOVERY

The main agencies in the drive for recovery were in industry the N. R. A. (National Recovery Administration) and in agriculture the A. A. A. (Agricultural Adjustment Administration). Broadly these aimed at increasing workers' purchasing power by spreading employment through shorter hours without reduction of wage rates and at increasing farmers' purchasing power by crop restriction designed to check overproduction and to force up commodity prices, in order to restore something like the predepression relationship between prices of farm and factory products.

To a certain extent efforts at reform were included in the experiments already mentioned. For instance, the C. C. C. (Civilian Conservation Corps) as a branch of the public-works program took up energetically the neglected task of conserving natural resources, especially forests.

AGENCIES OF REFORM

More specific efforts at reform were represented by such legislation as the Securities Act, which sought to check dishonest practices in finance and investment, and in such newly created agencies as the Tennessee Valley Authority, which set out on a long-term plan to show how cheap power and transport could be made the basis of a new type of rural-urban civilization. Throughout there remained in the background the great issue of redistributing the wealth and income of the United States, which was widely considered to have become concentrated in far too few hands. In discussing at slightly greater length some of the issues of the New Deal the enormous scale of the background and the complexity of the surrounding problems must constantly be borne in mind

The most prominent single agency of the New Deal has undoubtedly been the National Recovery Administration (N. R. A.). In Planning No. 20 we attempted a survey of this part of the New Deal as it stood at the outset of February 1934, but a brief recapitulation is necessary. In what follows we have relied very largely upon the admirable analysis of the N. R. A. recently carried out by the Brookings Institution. This analysis, which has taken years of sustained work to prepare, is one of the most impressive social and economic investigations of which we are aware, and is certain to prove of enduring value. Although highly compressed, it runs to 950 pages, and this gives some measure of the scale and complexity of its subject.

OBJECTS OF THE RECOVERY ACT

The National Industrial Recovery Act, signed by President Roosevelt on June 16, 1933, was put together in a great hurry from a mass of undigested and often indigestible material. Under pressure of the national emergency a compromise was reached between conflicting interests (notably of large and small concerns and of capital and labor) and between rival points of view.

"There was doubtless substantial agreement that the lowest wages were to be raised, that the total wage bill was to be increased, and that available work was to be spread among more workers. Beyond that each person had his own ideas of what should be done."

One of the most potent ideas behind the Recovery Act was that of the destructiveness of unbridled competition. It was argued that a measure of economic planning was needed, and that the state must come to the rescue by checking deflation, by expanding purchasing power and by spreading work over a larger number of workers.

A MAGIC INCANTATION

The act conferred on the President extremely sweeping powers, without indicating at all clearly how far and in what direction they were to be used. Indeed, so broad and vague was the act that it might be read as a magic incantation for restoring confidence. President Roosevelt declared upon signing it:

"It represents a supreme effort to stabilize for all time the many factors which make for the prosperity of the Nation and the preservation of American standards. Its goal is the assurance of a reasonable profit to industry and living wages to labor."

Of the three titles comprising the recovery act, the second, dealing with the public works and construction projects, and the third, dealing with emergency relief, may be disregarded in considering the N. R. A., which arose out of title I. This title declared a national emergency, and conferred upon the President for a maximum period of 2 years extensive powers for setting up new agencies and for enlisting existing agencies in the working out and administration of codes of fair competition which might be approved and made legally binding by the President if he were satisfied:

CONDITIONS OF CODE APPROVAL

(a) That there was no inequitable restriction upon membership of the code.

(b) That the applicants were truly representative of the trades and industries for which they spoke.

(c) That the proposed code was not calculated to promote monopolies or to oppress small enterprises.

And (d) that the proposed code would, in his judgment, tend to effectuate the policy of the law.

N. I. R. A. AN ENABLING MEASURE

Monopolies were prohibited, but the antitrust laws were not to apply to codes. Power was given to impose protection for consumers, workers, and others. If trade groups failed to act the President might prescribe a code for an industry. Fines were laid down for cases of violation of codes. In order to render codes effective, the President was given power to license or limit imports, and for a period of 1 year only to license business undertakings where necessary. Section 4a authorized the President to initiate or legalize voluntary agreements, and produced the famous blanket code; for which the blue eagle was first adopted. The still more famous section 7a obliged all codes to include provisions designed to safeguard labor standards, and to uphold the right of collective bargaining by employees through organizations of their own choosing. The President was given power to cancel or to modify any order made under the act. It was therefore an enabling measure, in the first place for the President, and secondarily for industry. Nothing need be done under it, but almost anything might be.

It soon became obvious that the working out of a new structure of industry under the Recovery Act must at best be a long-term job. In July 1933, therefore, Mr. Roosevelt appealed to employers voluntarily to subscribe to the President's Reemployment Agreement, popularly called the blanket code, under which some two and a third million temporary agreements to maintain wages and employment were entered into, and the working conditions of some 16,000,000 employees were temporarily controlled. This agreement, which was not enforceable at law, marked the first phase before the specific codes could be formulated and approved. The enthusiasm with which businessmen responded to the President's call was largely inspired by the hope of getting around the antitrust laws and of regaining a profitable position by putting up prices.

SOME STATISTICS ABOUT THE N. R. A.

By February 1935, 546 codes of fair competition and 185 supplementary codes had been approved, covering industries with a predepression labor force of some 22,000,000. Amendments and modifications of codes had been approved to the number of 685. Over 11,000 administrative orders had been issued to interpret and grant exemption from individual codes, and 585 code authorities, with several thousand regional and divisional subordinate agencies and with an aggregate authorized budget of some $41,000,000, had been established. The actual staff of N. R. A., which numbered about 400 in August 1933, had grown to 4,500 by the beginning of 1935, and its monthly budget then exceeded a million dollars. The full scope of this colossal machine can be better appreciated when it is borne in mind that the bulk of the orders and rulings under N. R. A. were supposed to have the full force and effect of law, that they touched at many points the daily activities of most businessmen, and that the N. R. A. machine carried on at the same time not only legislative and administrative functions but to a large extent judicial functions in which its own administrative decisions had to come under review.

GENERAL JOHNSON'S TECHNIQUE

Immediately upon signing the Recovery Act the President chose as Administrator Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, who controlled policy, subject only to the President's decisions, until the creation of the National Industrial Recovery Board on September 27, 1934. General Johnson has himself described the technique followed as "working in the dark. * * * We hammered. Sometimes we hit the nail, sometimes the thumb." The difficulties encountered were so many and so huge that space permits nothing beyond a brief mention of a few of them.

BIG CODES AND LITTLE CODES

First it proved impossible to keep down the numbers of codes to the comparatively manageable handful originally contemplated. The retail trade code, the largest of all, covered three and one-half million employees, and a third of the employees under N. R. A. were included under the first 3 codes in point of size. Two-thirds of all the employees affected came under the 21 large codes, each covering a quarter of a million workers or more. At the opposite extreme, 283 codes, each covering less than 5,000 employees, accounted for 54.7 percent of the codes, but only for 2.1 percent of the employees. The insignificance of some of these codes was staggering. The animal soft-hair industry, with only 45 employees, was the extreme case. The numbers of codes would have been far greater had not the N. R. A. refused to negotiate with some 4,000 regional groups putting forward code proposals and with an army of sectional associations. For example, some 30 codes of fair competition were presented by interests purporting to represent the coal-mining industry. Eventually some 550 basic codes emerged, covering almost the whole of the American industry and distribution, apart from certain public utilities and anthracite coal mining.

WHO THE CODE MAKERS WERE

The difficulty of sifting this mass of proposals can be imagined. The parties directly concerned were:

(a) The code committee representing the applicant group.
(b) The Industrial Advisory Board.
(c) The Labor Advisory Board.
(d) The Consumers' Advisory Board.
(e) The Research and Planning Division of N. R. A.
(f) The Legal Division of N. R. A.
(g) The N. R. A. Deputy Administrator responsible for dealing with the code in question.

HOW THE CONSUMER GOT LEFT OUT

Of these parties the 2 with the strongest bargaining power were the Deputy Administrator, who could advise the President for or against approval, and the code committee, who were alone familiar with the industry, and could, moreover, withdraw the proposed code if they felt so inclined. The labor representatives had also a certain amount of bargaining power. The Industrial Advisory Board tended to become a second line of support for applicants, except where diplomacy was called for between rival or neighbor industries. The Consumers' Advisory Board proved weak in bargaining power, partly because most of the affected parties regarded themselves as proprietors or workers first, and only secondarily, if it all, as consumers, partly because it alone had no great organized pressure group behind it, and partly because it had to try to cope with far too many difficult questions at once. The difficulty of collecting and analyzing the necessary data for a calm judgment and for constructive amendments in the consumer's interest can be appreciated from the fact that in one typical week the Consumers' Advisory Board was called upon to express opinions on the provisions of 73 separate codes, including among other subjects, the heavy forging industry, the powder-puff industry, funeral service, chewing-gum manufacturing, sawmill machinery, infants' and children's wear, and outdoor advertising.

SERVING 25 MASTERS

Demarcation between different industries proved an insoluble problem. While the great majority of codes were horizontal in character, covering a single stage of manufacture or distribution, others were vertical, covering a single product, such as petroleum, through a succession of stages, and yet others were circular, covering all products associated with a certain use—e. g., athletic goods or office equipment. Among the numberless difficulties arising from these demarcation problems were multiple coverage of single enterprises, or conflicting treatment of identical functions. Different workers in the same shop might find themselves working under 5 or 6 codes. A chemical manufacturing company might be subject to as many as 25 codes, being liable to help to support 15 code authorities, to operate 20 sets of minimum wage rates, to introduce 14 systems of cost accounting, and to market its products under 25 sets of trade-practice rules. On the other hand, the strict provisions of the trucking (road haulage) code have tended to encourage retailers to take business from trucking firms by operating their own delivery transport, which comes under much less stringent regulations.

ORGANIZATION TROUBLES OF THE NEW DEAL

As the extent of the operations of the N. R. A. was not foreseen in constructing it, the type as well as the scale of its organization proved inadequate and had more than once to be changed. In its early stages the one-man control of N. R. A. and the hurry in which it had to work made any effective and detached thought about policy impossible. Even after the individual Administrator was superseded by the National Industrial Recovery Board, the representation of interests on this supreme body and the overburdening of its members with outside duties reduced its value as an organ of policy and of impartial review. The possibilities of friction arising from the various emergency bodies created under the New Deal have proved immense. Decisions on wages or production might, and in fact did, upset building programs, public works, agricultural programs, etc. The absence of a clearly defined policy, the frequent changes of policy, and the clashes between bodies with large and undefined policy-making powers could only lead to confusion. The shortage of statistical and other data about industry was also a continual handicap.

MACHINERY WHICH DID NOT WORK

The Brookings Institution survey sums up the code situation in the early part of 1935 as follows:

"1. There are codes for which code authorities cannot be organized. These are very few.

"2. There are others which, though organized, lack the money or the will or power to perform their functions at all adequately. These are relatively numerous.

3. Full implementation exists under very few codes.

"4. Most codes contain provisions incapable of implementation or administrative supervision.

"5. The phase of preliminary organization and implementation occupied so long a period for most code authorities that experience in the actual performance of administrative duties is still very limited.

"6. The delays in organization have made subsequent administration much more difficult."

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION SUMMING-UP

"Code-making proceeded on a bargaining basis * * *. There has been built up a vast network of code authorities and subordinate authorities which constitute in effect a unique extension of the machinery of the Federal Government. The exact legal status of these bodies is much in doubt." (This has been shown by the Schechter decision to be an understatement.) "The propriety of attempting to administer a new body of law through agencies made up of representatives of the private interests to which the law applies is very questionable. * * * Policing is ill financed. Factional disputes are common. The multiplicity, vagueness and multiformity of the rules make it impossible to apply them reasonably. * * * Individuals learn with difficulty what their rights and obligations under the codes are. * * * Competitive pressures lead to widening circles of noncompliance."

ACTION VERSUS ACADEMIC ANALYSIS

The survey of N. R. A. administration concludes:

"As a case study in administrative law the N. R. A. appears destined to become a classic. As a phenomenon, it offers strong confirmation of the traditional prejudice against extensive delegation of legislative power to the executive arm of Government. The necessity for some degree of such delegation being, however, admitted, the peculiar warning is against following a principle of action unlimited by rational (academic) analysis of processes, clear definition of objectives, careful selection of procedures, and in general the appeal of experience."

THE FLAW IN N. R. A. OBJECTIVES

Whatever permanent mark N. R. A. may leave on the American social and economic structure, the Supreme Court decision undoubtedly brings to a close its palmy days. What is to be said of its results? The Brookings Institution study, after investigating the subject with a thoroughness and a detachment which are beyond praise, finds that far from assisting business recovery in the United States the N. R. A. has substantially retarded it. According to this analysis the basic N. R. A. theory that purchasing power can be increased by spreading work and by bolstering up wage rates was (a) economically unsound, and (b) proved unworkable in practice, because on the average prices rose ahead of wage rates, in spite of all attempts to curb them.

"There was even at the outset little reason to expect that the result would conform to the preconceived design. If the program represented planning, it was planning without any adequate means of execution.

"With real wages per hour averaging higher than in 1929, it is obvious that the decline in the aggregate real income of labor was generally attributable to unemployment, either partial or incomplete, not to low wage rates."

LABOR UNDER THE CODES

The codes stabilized the actual working week in industry and trade at an average of 38–40 hours—perhaps 10 hours a week below predepression levels. The division of work among a larger number of workers is estimated to have led to reemployment of one and three-quarter million workers, but a further 10,000,000 remained unemployed. While different groups met with varying fortunes, the distribution of the national income as between capital and labor has apparently been little changed. The bargaining power of labor has, however, been materially enhanced. Only 45 codes out of 400 examined contained express provisions for the establishment of a labor complaints committee and/or an industrial relations board, while the number of such committees and boards supposedly functioning at the beginning of March 1935 was only 23, with a coverage of some two and one-half million workers. The growth of trade-unionism was more impressive. Average paid-up membership represented by the American Federation of Labor grew from 2,100,000 in 1933 to about 3,000,000 by 1935. In June 1933 there was, for example, not a single union affiliated to the American Federation of Labor in the motor manufacturing industry; by autumn 1934 there were 104 such unions with a membership of possibly 50,000.

As an experiment in politics or as an experiment in economics, N. R. A. may be written down as a failure. We must not, however, overlook the fact that the situation in America in the first half of 1933 was such that hasty and drastic intervention had both been made inevitable and doomed in advance to frustration by the scale of the social and economic maladjustments which had been allowed to arise. No government could have failed to intervene and no government could have intervened in the circumstances with more than limited success. If, as seems probable, sounder leadership would have produced superior short-run results, the fact that leadership was forthcoming of an inspiring type and moved by a high sense of public spirit is a gain not to be ignored.

OUT OF THE LIMELIGHT

While hosts of businessmen and labor leaders raise their voices loudly over every move in the N. R. A. episode, and while farmers and housewives lose no opportunity of saying what they think of the A. A. A. (Agricultural Adjustment Administration) and its policy of raising farm purchasing power through subsidized crop restriction, other and probably, in the long run, more significant work is being done out of the limelight.

SOME LEADING DOCUMENTS

One example is the steady development of a technique of planning, of digested and reliable data on the Nation's resources and performance, and of a body of trained diagnosticians of social and economic maladjustments. This development had already begun during President Hoover's administration, when it produced such a notable experiment in measurement as Recent Social Trends. Since then it has become much more rapid, and the number and length of important American official and semiofficial documents bearing on planning have now reached a stage when it is almost impossible to keep abreast of them. Outstanding among recent publications are the 450-page report of the National Resources Board (dated December 1, 1934), with its many suggestive and informative maps and figures, and its summary of facts and recommendations on planning in general and upon land use, water use, mineral use, and mapping; and the more specific report on similar lines of the Mississippi Valley committee of the Public Works Administration (dated October 1, 1934), which was under the chairmanship of a leading power expert, and which gives some attention to the possibilities of establishing an electric grid on the British model. Another suggestive report has been issued by the New York State Planning Board (Summary Report of Progress, dated January 14, 1935), which brings together in 80 pages of maps, statistics, and narrative the fundamental facts of population, land use, forestry, power, water, minerals, highways, public works, recreation, housing, and planning which govern the future of the State of New York.

Yet other notable examples are the United States Department of Agriculture's Survey of Economic and Social Problems of the Southern Appalachians (January 1935), the report of the Committee on the Upper Monongahela Valley, West Virginia (November 7, 1934) and a number of publications of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In such reports the vast national resources and potentialities of the United States are for the first time systematically and constructively appraised.

A NEW DISCOVERY OF AMERICA

It is almost arguable that these reports, rather than the raids of Eric the Red, Cabot, and Columbus, or the hectic and blind exploitation of the past three centuries, mark the true first discovery of America. Certainly to read them is to find a new landscape opening out, which is quite as strange and as exciting as anything discovered by the primary exploration of countries off the map. Indeed, as the National Resources Board shows, only 25 percent of the United States is adequately mapped, and more than half of it is still not covered by topographic maps at all. It is not to be expected that any considerable advance in social and economic organization can occur before the elementary collection and digestion of data has been done, and before men and women in key positions have learned to understand and act upon them In the long run, therefore, this apparently "academic" survey work may prove of more constructive value than heroic but ill-founded "practical" efforts to find a short cut to prosperity.

It must not, however, be imagined that fundamental and long-term constructive work of a practical type is purely a matter for the future. Although the scale of recent events may have dwarfed them, some important initiatives have already been taken. The clean-up of crime, which is being carried through with ruthless thoroughness by Federal agencies, may seem remotely connected with planning, but, in fact, one of the greatest handicaps to effective organization has been the prevalence of looting and lawlessness, and the apathetic or hostile attitude which these induce toward cooperation for social ends. The lack of discipline and of social standards which has hung over from the frontier period of American history has now become a nuisance rather than the asset which it once was.

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

On this account the success, for example, of the efforts of the Civilian Conservation Corps may have far-reaching effects. The C. C. C. has a double purpose—first to take off the streets hundreds of thousands of boys and young men without employment who might otherwise become vagrants or criminals; and second, by means of a disciplined force thus created, to tackle many conservation and construction works of public value which would otherwise not be done, especially in connection with forestry, drainage, and prevention of soil erosion. Up to April 1 this year the C. C. C. boys, who number some 375,000 (in future there will be 600,000), were reported to have spent 15,000,000 man-days in fighting forest fires, to have built 50,000 miles of forest roads and tracks, to have planted nearly a quarter of a million acres with tree seedlings, to have made 800,000 erosion dams, and to have performed similar exploits with the sinking of wells and with mosquito control. There are now 1,457 camps, and over a million men have passed through them, mostly between the ages of 18 and 25. The value of work done up to the end of December last is put at about £70,000,000, and it is estimated that so far conservation has been advanced by about 20 years as a result of the C. C. C.'s efforts.

CRITICISMS OF THE C. C. C.

The camps are run by the Army, and this has given rise to accusations of militarism and fascism, for which there seem to be no real grounds. Military drill is forbidden, and the main criticism against the educational side of the C. C. C. is on the ground of its inadequacy in personnel and resources rather than of any marked bias. Although there has been a number of personal differences, and local break-downs of various types, the C. C. C. has on balance undoubtedly been a success. One important indirect effect has been that in order to qualify for C. C. C. help one State after another has greatly increased its publicly owned forest acreage.

To quote a Missouri forest officer reporting in the Forestry News Digest for May 1935:

"Since the coming of the C. C. C. the general forestry policy changed to result in increased costs for food and raw materials. If the attempt to raise farm prices is permanently successful, the immediate effect on world agriculture of the American initiative may be spectacular, but if the British model succeeds in lowering costs by reducing distribution wastes while leaving the farmer free to do his own job properly, its ultimate influence may prove at least as great.

Federal Personnel Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 13, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: In accordance with your telephone request of this date, there is presented below a statement indicating the total employment as of December 31, 1942, as compared with May 31, 1943 by (1) War Department, (2) Navy Department, (3) emergency war agencies, and (4) "Old Line" departments and agencies.

We have used the May figures for comparison purposes because in June 1943, the method of employment reporting and the coverage of the reports was revised in an effort to procure more accurate data from the departments and agencies. As a result of this change, the figures for June and subsequent months cannot be used for comparison with statistics for the previous months:

Comparative personnel statistics Dec. 31, 1942, and May 31, 1943

	December 1942	May 1943	Increase
War Department	1,257,014	1,381,890	124,876
Navy Department	559,590	634,530	74,940
Emergency war agencies	168,011	183,733	15,722
Old line departments and agencies	826,256	830,506	4,250
Total	2,810,871	3,030,659	219,788

It is also possible that the following statement may be of some interest or help to you. It is a list of the agencies in which there was a decrease in personnel reported on May 31, 1943, as compared with December 31, 1942:

Statement indicating agencies in which there was a decrease in personnel reported on May 31, 1943, as compared with Dec. 31, 1942

Name of agency	Personnel reported Dec. 31, 1942	Personnel reported May 31, 1943	Amount of decrease
Alien Property Custodian	1,118	1,083	35
War Manpower Commission	62,593	62,029	564
War Production Board	21,628	20,388	1,240
Office of Censorship	12,600	12,086	514
Post Office Department	324,529	315,189	9,340
Interior Department	41,739	40,583	1,156
Board of Investigation and Research	168	160	8
Civil Service Commission	7,349	6,307	1,042
Employees Compensation Commission	514	504	10
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2,427	2,263	164
Federal Power Commission	817	673	144
Federal Trade Commission	585	500	85
Federal Works Agency	26,647	22,834	3,813
Government Printing Office	7,868	7,733	135
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,474	2,273	201
National Archives	446	357	89
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	19	2
National Labor Relations Board	890	873	17
Panama Canal	31,673	28,348	3,325
Railroad Retirement Board	1,891	1,658	233
Security and Exchange Commission	1,365	1,302	63
Smithsonian Institution	809	751	58
Tariff Commission	355	306	49
Tax Court of United States	131	125	6
Tennessee Valley Authority	34,878	28,888	5,990
Veterans' Administration	44,549	43,848	701

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Commissioner.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, first things first in the war effort makes the frequent use of "relative urgency."

There are now 3,300,000 persons on the civil-service roll—a good place to start a roll-back.

No doubt confused and bleeding Italy, with her dictator gone, now envies Switzerland and Sweden.

The speeding of Philippine independence by the United States at this time, while on the whole a very serious matter, is not without its funny side.

A new tax bill by Christmas is the promise of the Ways and Means. Next year will not only hold a great deal of interest, but will gather a lot of taxes.

Retired Army officers for bureau directors seems to be more and more the vogue. They know their Commander in Chief and they care little for the reaction from the rank and file.

If the five "fellow travelers" who were all interventionists brought back a report such as they did, what would you think of sending over WHEELER, BENNETT CLARK, ELLENDER, NYE, and BROOKS, for a recheck?

There are now more than 9,000,000 in our armed forces. Early in the week before Pearl Harbor it leaked out here in Washington that they were planning a 10,000,000 Army. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of it.

There are now nearly 40,000 doctors in the Army, 10,000 in the Navy. The country's total is 173,000. We can thank our lucky stars that no great epidemic has broken out here at home or in our front lines.

Rome again becomes a center of special attention. For about 2,000 years at least, or since Apostle Paul took us there, we have followed her with interest. There will be wars as long as there are Caesars in every important land, pacts or no pacts.

Lend-Lease Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed editorial from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., was published in the issue of October 10, 1943. It most ably expresses the concern and apprehension with which the people of my State view the activities of certain Washington bureaus, all of which is done in the name and under the guise of war necessity. These good people believe that no necessary sacrifice is too great a contribution toward the effort of winning the war as speedily and decisively as possible. They believe that we should support our allies. They believe in the Christian doctrine of "Love thy neighbor." They are liberal minded and charitably inclined. But, above all, they believe that our real interest in this war, the reason we are fighting, is to preserve to America and for Americans the things that are ours; our lives, our homes, our businesses, our God-given natural resources, and our right and duty to develop and conserve them through the American system of free enterprise and individual initiative. They believe that our future is in, or should be in, the hands of patriotic, nationally conscious Americans. In view of this and because of the concern to all of us I submit the above-referred-to editorial:

INVESTIGATE THIS SCANDAL

The shocking and disgraceful mismanagement and incompetency in Lend-Lease Administration of such supplies as trucks, gasoline, and tires, as revealed by members of the special Senate committee returning from inspection of overseas fighting areas, should bring searching Senate investigation of the whole lend-lease set-up and of the gas-rationing confusion and inefficiency under Secretary Ickes.

The revelations of the Senators are flame-producing fuel on lend-lease fires which already have been smoldering in many directions, with obvious indications that Washington bureaucrats are using this war agency to play global Santa Claus for political self-glorification regardless of waste, extravagance, hampering of the war effort, or needless suffering in civilian and business life here at home.

Lend-lease shipping of 30,000 trucks per year to Australia for civilian use there, as reported in the Senate, while permitting only 15,000 to be made available to civilians here at home, is by itself a major scandal. Australia is a country with only 10,000,000 population against our 130,000,000 and our business, agriculture, and commerce are expected to take care of much of the world while Australia fundamentally has little more than its own small self to handle. These truck allotments are entirely for civilian use and not for uniformed forces—and certainly the small handful of United States troops in Australia would not necessitate any such great truck need, by comparison with our own here at home, to haul supplies in Australia for our fighters over there.

In the meantime there are literally thousands of farmers in this Nation whose food production for home and global civilian use and for our own uniformed forces and those of our allies is being hampered by truck shortage. There also are literally thousands of business firms either lacking trucks or operating with makeshift, run-down, rattletrap equipment. On those suffering the shortage here at home rests much of the burden of keeping our own domestic economy going so that our home front can do its share in winning the war and help maintain the economy of the nations fighting with us.

To add to the general incompetency and inefficiency, the senatorial report reveals such muddling as shipping of wrong-size truck tires overseas when our own people often cannot get tires even with a ration certificate showing that they are operating in war essential business. Elsewhere in Washington there are charges that many billions of dollars appropriated by Congress to other purposes have been diverted to lend-lease for its global Santa Claus role without any legalizing action by Congress and in addition to the billions of dollars which were appropriated by Congress for lend-lease.

This whole scandalous situation becomes even more amazing and disgraceful when it is added to the previous senatorial reports that civilians of French Africa have been allotted more gasolihe than is made available under Mr. Ickes' rationing set-up to civilians in some of our own domestic areas of the United States. On top of this comes a recent statement from the head of a British refinery saying his plant could increase gasoline production by a full 60 percent "if it became necessary." Of course, it hasn't been necessary—from the British view—because the blindly groping bureaucrats in Washington would rather take gasoline from our own civilian population and deplete our own national resources and give it away overseas than to even suggest to these foreign nations that they turn to their own resources and production facilities before calling on us.

On top of the senatorial reports come such additional revelations at recent dispatches from Italy describing agents of Washington bureaucracy as tossing chocolate bars to the Italian children along the roadside while our own American children here at home rarely can get a chocolate bar for either food or pleasure—and of shipment by the bureaucrats of long underdrawers to the Arabs, who throughout centuries were quite content with a sheet and a turban until the lend-lease Santa Claus began cavorting around their valleys and deserts. There are many other angles also, such as recent return of millions of cases of food sent to the overseas army, of shipping butter to Russia when it was little known there and we were short, of using our canning and packing factories for special food preparations for foreign civilians with resulting shortages in supplies of our own food for our own people. The same irrational policy, confusion, and incompetency have permeated our whole rationing effort, starting with sugar and coffee. There is plenty of indication also that the Army supply work under Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell also may have a lot of holes in it in connection with allocating our home production. General Somervell is the man now reportedly backed by the inner clique of new dealers for the Chief of Staff job of Gen. George C. Marshall if a way could be found to promote the latter to a global command.

The picture presented by these various revelations is not only shocking, scandalous, and ridiculous, but it is certain to break home morale and disrupt the whole domestic war front if it continues. There should be searching investigation, now, by the Senate under a policy of letting the chips fall where they may regardless of their size or of what officials may be hit.

As a policy of getting equipment to the fighting forces of our allies and of maintaining war-essential civilian strength overseas, the purposes of lend-lease may be excellent. As a practice of ripping open the welfare of our own American people here at home—the people whose taxes pay the cost of all of it—in order that a few bureaucrats may gain a few cheers from the British, the Arabs, the Australians, or anyone else, the whole thing is shameful and disgraceful.

North American Officials Plan To Step Aside in Stockholders' Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following article from the New York World-Telegram:

NORTH AMERICAN OFFICIALS PLAN TO STEP ASIDE IN STOCKHOLDERS' INTEREST

(By Ralph Hendershot)

If present plans are carried through to completion a few very competent corporate executives will be open for a proposition in the not-too-distant future. They include Edward L. Shea, president, and other top officials of the North American Co.

How come? They propose to kick themselves out of office. Yes; it is rather unusual. Most unusual, in fact. People just do not do that sort of thing. It usually requires a stockholder action, backed by proof that they had carried off the Brooklyn Bridge or something equally bad.

But these people have committed no crime. In fact, they have done an excellent job of management. And they have treated the public well, too. The base rates for electricity charged by the companies they manage are said to be the lowest in the United States.

What, then? Well, it's like this: Some years ago Congress enacted a law which made it mandatory for the public-utility holding companies to break up their properties. And North American is one of the largest of these holding companies.

SOFT BERTHS WERE AVAILABLE

Yes, you're right. It still is unusual that these men should step aside. They could very easily find nice berths for themselves among North American subsidiaries. The jobs would not be as big as those they now hold, but they would be attractive, and they could afford to pay pretty high salaries.

But Mr. Shea thinks that might not be in the best interests of stockholders. He proposes, instead, to split the properties up into four groups, each to be managed by present operating officials. A few properties, such as the building the company owns at 60 Broadway and a coal mine, would be sold and the proceeds turned over to stockholders.

When we heard about the plan we began to wonder whether any of our politicians had ever done anything even remotely comparable. If they have, it has escaped our notice. They usually go to any lengths to stay in office, whether or not to do so is in the interests of voters.

HAS-BEENS ARE PLENTIFUL

Competent as they are, it will not be easy for these North American officials to step into high positions in other corporations. Some of them, to be sure, are men of wealth, but some are not. And the woods are full of men who have never been able to stage a comeback.

We have heard a great deal in the past about princes of privilege and economic barons and a few terms even more derogatory. But we have heard very little of men like Mr. Shea who place their positions of trust as heads of large corporations ahead of their own personal interests. We think such men are entitled to a salute, Mr. Shea, the best.

Are We Again the Prize International Fools?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published on October 11, 1943, in the Centralia (Ill.) Evening Sentinel:

ARE WE AGAIN THE PRIZE INTERNATIONAL FOOLS?

This Nation would be doing far less worrying about our post-war future if those who represent it in present and future negotiations adopted a more realistic attitude, one more in keeping with facts as they are and now are so clearly foreshadowed among our principal allies.

The people in general are fed up with this big-hearted Harry stuff so prevalent in top official circles in Washington.

Americans can be, and naturally are, idealistic, and respond to the call of the humanities probably more than any other peoples. We believe they would wish to continue so.

But Americans also are a practical people, and can be canny. They are quite willing that their allies should also reach for the check in their turn and that the dinner should not always be on Uncle Sam because some of our leaders, ever searching for the show's spotlight, imbibe too freely of the heady stuff of egoism with which their glasses are slyly and purposely filled by our canny conference table companions, the British, Russians, and Chinese.

Winston Churchill didn't consider it inappropriate to frankly say that he did not become Prime Minister of Britain to break up the Empire.

Joe Stalin plainly indicates that which Russia gains it proposes to hold, and has already taken into his vast realm the little Baltic countries he is now in the process of retrieving by his armies.

And Chiang's whole fight has been on the basis of getting back, with the help of his allies, the Japanese occupied part of China's vast domain.

France expects us, with our allies, to regain her territory at the cost of many American lives and an unprecedented amount of our treasure. And the Balkan countries, Holland and Belgium, also expect us to do no less, and make good the Roosevelt promises to that effect.

As if the above were a small chore Vice President WALLACE glibly proclaims that it is also our duty to take on the whole world for reclamation, making it over according to the orists and dreamers. And hand you, the American taxpayer and bond buyer, the "check" for another impossible and grandiose experiment. Only Washington seems to be indulging in the platitudes.

Even the American constructed airports and naval bases built with your money all over the world, and which will be gravely needed also for the protection and promotion of post-war American interests seems now to have been airily waved aside by our impractical spenders in charge of these negotiations, according to the five Senators just returned from a wide trip of investigation to the war fronts.

Being realistic and practical is not selfishness. It is just plain common sense, of which it is indicated there seems to be an appalling dearth in high places in Washington.

America does not want more territory, and does not wish mandates. But neither does it wish to make itself again the prize international sucker it did in the last war. If the Presidential lend-lease scheme proves to be neither lend, nor lease, but an unnecessary gift, as seems finally now evident despite first statements to the contrary, the sooner Congress brings these grave facts into the open and does something about it, the more America's future billions will be protected.

To use a typical American expression this country expects not only a run for its money—but much, much more, so to know that American lives have not been sacrificed incidentally to aggrandize other more realistic allies when the debits and credits of the world holocaust have been finally cast up.

To be realistic on the practical side does not detract one whit from the idealistic side which is one reason we are in this war, in addition to the main reason of protecting our own country and our own liberties from European encroachment.

Americans wish to fight this war to the grim victorious finish in the prayerful hope this sacrifice will actually incapacitate and teach the Hun world-wide domination by any one people is impossible. They would not lessen the hitting power of the Allies one shot, but the contrary. To do so does not call for Americans to be fools.

Freedom in the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered in Baltimore, on Freedom in the Post-War World, at the industrial night dinner of the Baltimore Traffic Club, October 5, 1943, by Carroll B. Huntress, New York City, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., of Chicago:

When the dawn came up like thunder 22 months ago, and Hawaii was awakened by the roar of Japanese bombs, another era was born. Then the curtain for the big show went up. Then illusions were shattered. Then we learned the kind of world in which we live. That made us mad. Now we stand on the edge of a new world. Since December 7, 1941, a vast change in the Nation's life and mood has been wrought. We feel our giant strength; we're in our giant stride. Our muscles are flexed; we're in fighting trim, both on the battle front and the production line. What is more, we've learned to work in close unison with our allies, regardless of the fact we may not fully understand them. That's no reason we shouldn't like them. Most men don't understand their wives, but most men love them. It is pretty well established by now that each of our allies has a good many admirable and likable traits and a few traits, we have some ourselves, that are a little irritating to others. Nothing would be so irritating, however, as to have any other people perfect. We should then have nothing to criticize; and it would be a dreary world indeed.

The winning of the war is the subject which has triple-A priority. We cannot afford to lose the keen edge by which a bitter battle is won; and we realize that a hard road lies ahead. However, because, as Winston Churchill says, "The mellow light of victory now begins to play," it is high time to plan for a post-war period in which humanity may advance in social wisdom and maturity. From the disclosures of this war we should immensely profit. We are in a bad hole, but we are determined to get out of it. Babylon and other nations got into bad holes and stayed there because they did not have the capacity to capitalize their blunders and mistakes and ride them back to the road of safety and progress. That is the real strength of a civilization: that is our strength.

There is deep significance in the story of the prodigal son—a meaning beyond the life of the individual. That young man made a fool of himself but he didn't keep on making a fool of himself. When he got inside the hogpen he came to himself and came back. And this Nation is doing likewise, for there

are unmistakable signs of a return to sound thinking and to constitutional government, one of laws and not of men. Folks everywhere, even some politicians, are getting more or less frightened and saying, "Something must have happened to the Constitution." And they are as dead right as was a witness at an inquest over the remains of a man named Ole, killed by a railroad engine. The witness said, "When I was going home I went up the railroad track and saw Ole's hat; further on I saw his hand cut off; then I saw his foot; and on further I saw his head lying there. And then I said, 'Something surely must have happened to Ole.'"

Industrial leaders, in increasing numbers, are speaking out against a repetition of the errors of the 1920's. Reasons for the sharp swing away from constitutional government to bureaucracy are not obscure. That modern Frankenstein, as Senator BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, styles it, is not a creature of chance. Industrialists know why this Nation is being run by a "bunch of bureaucrats," as Chairman SUMNERS of the House Judiciary Committee puts it. They are aware of the shortcomings of the past and are determined they shall not happen again. They realize that private enterprise must promise more than high production and high employment. It must establish its right to public confidence if it is to survive, by guaranties that practices tending to defeat high production and high employment will be forever abandoned. And it is doing that very thing. Along that road lies the greatest good for the greatest number. Cerainly, what we seek is not to be found in glorified bureaucracy, despite the fact that Harold Ickes shouts, "I am a bureaucrat." To comprehend fully that menace, reference to Webster's dictionary is timely. Noah Webster says: "Bureaucracy—a system of government by bureau heads, responsible only to administrative officers above them, not subject to the law of the land; a system that lacks enterprise and resourcefulness."

An encouraging aspect of present business is its open-mindedness. Business cognizes that it must be informed on all sides, preach not only to the converted and listen not only to those who can put into the mind nothing that was not already there. Business under private enterprise cannot survive an ostrichlike attitude, respecting opinions of speakers and writers with which it disagrees. It is only human to favor the member of our clan, or church or lodge; but if a man who isn't a member tells you your home is on fire you'd better listen anyway. He might be right.

Reference has been made to the profitable lessons to be learned from wartime disclosures. They are numerous and diverse, in both the national and the international fields. We hear much lately of freedoms. There are many and their range is wide. But let us dwell tonight on the United States tradition of freedom, with emphasis on the freedom of enterprise, the keystone of all freedoms. The war spotlights the indispensability of that freedom, as to victory both on the battle front and the home front. First, let us define what we mean by private enterprise. Democracy is a brief answer, but so many professors have been broadcasting their ideas about that form of government that a more specific reply is called for. Napoleon once said, substantially, "I can always find a professor to justify anything I want to put over. Besides, they write in such an incomprehensible jargon that people can't understand what they are talking about." But one professor, namely, Harley L. Lutz of Princeton University, in these words, makes crystal-clear what is meant by the system of private enterprise: "It is one in which the production of goods and services is performed mainly by individuals or privately owned corporations. It is not comletely free in the sense of being completely exempt from any public regulation. Such has never been the case. It is free in the sense there are no barriers, legal, social, or political, no barriers of race, creed, birth, or breeding, which prevent anyone from engaging in some way in the activities or services performed by enterprise." With that definition in mind, let us relate that freedom to wartime revelations.

The might of our industrial machine has vividly shown what private enterprise, which built that machine, means to us. When the Germans decided to go all out for mechanized warfare they went right up our alley. They challenged us at our strongest point. They banked on their superior preparation as concerns immediate striking power. They failed to reckon on the adaptability of Americans and their industrial processes. It is fitting to stress the story of American achievement in the battle of production, so that our people will appreciate the secret and source of their strength, and also because they are now disposed to study the principles which safeguard that accomplishment. Only a few years ago the popular attitude was different. Then, in many quarters, distrust of business prevailed; people thought its leadership was weak and that there was something sinister about it. This difference between the present friendly attitude and the hostile attitude of a few years ago is, I believe, the difference between the restoration of individual freedom and the continuance of the trend toward totalitarian regimentation. We at home and the boys in the Army and Navy are learning of the performance of our guns and ships, of the production of billions of pounds of equipment by the greatest arsenal in world history; we see the visible evidence of the ability of our railroads to transport men and equipment in amounts and at a speed never before attained; of the output of our electric utilities reaching unparalleled heights. We are justly proud and justly we pay our tribute to private enterprise.

Every branch of industry has scored an impressive record. The railroads are great champs, but I should like to cite the record of another industry for the reason that it has more than served its time and its turn as a scapegoat and a whipping boy. Its demonstration of ability to meet the extraordinary demands of war as well as those of peace should prove that that industry was soundly conceived and developed, in the best tradition of private enterprise.

The electric-utility industry has participated importantly in every war effort. It has never been too little or too late. In common with other enterprises, except those of the Government which are tax exempt, electric utilities help to finance the war. Taxes take almost 25 cents out of every dollar of gross revenue, of which Washington gets the lion's share. From the construction and operation of the training camps and the war factory, through to the equipping of every soldier and sailor, electricity has played a vital part. In the production of every article it has made available vital energy every second of the 24 hours of every day. As of October 1, the grand total of electric power from all sources in the United States is 260,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, or 45 percent of the world's supply. This enormous supply has made possible these services to the war effort, not in substitution for but in addition to the continuance of service in the homes, the factories, the farms. Availability of an ample supply of electric power, as a result of development work mainly at the risk of private capital, largely accounted for the rapid growth of our war plant and its output. In short, that industry was ready. No weakness, no unsoundness there. The consuming public, as a whole, as well as industry, rejoices at the achievements of electric-power utilities. I refer to the fact that electricity rates are at an all-time low. In the last 4 years, residential rates are 10 percent off, as against an increase of 24 percent in living costs.

We are prone to regard figures, other than those pertaining to our own financial statement, as somewhat dry; but bear with me a minute while I offer a few more which reflect a high measure of credit on one outstanding creation of private enterprise. True, the Federal Government has inched its way into the ownership picture until, as of October 1, its plants produced 12 percent of the total public power supply. The bulk of Government power goes into the aluminum and magnesium industries but the private utilities are the ones which are turning the wheels of industry in the great industrial zones, in the shipyards and aircraft plants in the Baltimore area, for instance, as well as serving many heavy chemical industries. Since June 1940, the combined electric generating capacity of plants serving the public supply, independent of isolated industrial units, has grown by 8,000,000 kilowatts; and in December, that capacity will be a full 50,000,000 kilowatts. The margin between peak loads and generating capacity to carry them still remains about 10,000,000 kilowatts, the June 1940 figure. Because the power supply appears ample through 1943 and 1944, the War Production Board and the Office of War Utilities have canceled or postponed completion of 2,000,000 kilowatts of generating capacity that the private utilities were in process of constructing. That action is eloquent in the light of prediction by the Federal Power Commission that the power supply would be insufficient.

Here is an indication of the improved position of private utilities in popular esteem, which reflects a swing away from statism and back to private enterprise; hence, is worthy of note. In the decade ending in 1942 there were 1,039 elections, involving the choice between business and political management. In the first 3 years of that decade, 326 elections were held and 62 percent favored political management. In the last 3 years, 189 elections were held and only 33 percent were favorable to political management. To date, this year, there have been only 3 elections, all of which went against political management. These figures are revealing.

There are other wartime disclosures. Some of them relate to the services of hundreds of our leading businessmen, directing the huge production machine centered in Washington. Look at Ed Stettinius, Jr., former head of the United States Steel Corporation, then Lend-Lease Administrator and now Under Secretary of State. Those services belie the credo of demagogy that anyone connected with big corporate business is, per se, wicked, and antisocial. Annual corporation reports have also been illuminating. They show that, despite the new high records of business volume reached last year, the net income generally declined because of higher operating costs and higher taxes. Six of the big steel companies, which reported new high levels in production last year, all show a decrease in net income as compared with 1941, the combined total for the group being down 34 percent. The 1942 earning figures of the United States Steel Corporation are of more than usual interest. The corporation produced over thirty million tons of steel ingots in 1942, a new high record; yet the income of the company and its subsidiaries was less than $72,000,000, compared with one hundred and sixteen million in 1941. This is hardly the picture that one conjures up when one hears and reads glittering generalities about the wartime profits of American corporations. Industry is paying 75 percent of all taxes in the United States. In other words, it is the mainstay of government. Of course there is extreme danger in the present policy of the Government of deriving a

larger portion of its revenue each year from corporations. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, charges that the corporation tax policy of the Government is being used "for the destruction or conversion of our society into some idealistic state, and jeopardizes the opportunity of labor of obtaining employment under private enterprise."

In support of free enterprise, it's the duty of all of us to make clear the tax situation, so that the morale of the worker may not be lowered and that he may understand the social significance of the operations of his company. There is hope that the power of selfish ruthless interests and of those politicians who serve them will be broken by the unifying power of war. There is hope that the majority of the people will see the dangers and inconsistencies of certain policies designed to redistribute the wealth, in an economic revolution which attacks our traditional democracy under the cloak of war emergency, and which would make our Bill of Rights a relic of aspirations and ideals, not a solemn covenant for the use and progress of humanity. There is hope that workers will come to hold enough Government paper, in the form of bonds and stamps, to see the merits of a sound fiscal policy and the importance of profitable business as the basis for the tax revenue with which to redeem the bonds.

"We are paying a terrible price in blood and tears because we were unprepared for war; we may pay a devastating price if we are similarly unprepared for peace; and wishful waiting would put our freedom in the greatest jeopardy." Thus truly speaks Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation. Our industrialists are planning for the post-war period in the greatest possible degree without detracting from the war effort. They are not waiting for an economic Pearl Harbor after the armistice to prepare for problems that must be faced. Looking beyond victory day, they see an era in which there will be decentralization of manufacturing, and evolutionary rather than revolutionary changes in products and services. Comprehensive studies of post-war problems are being made by the National Association of Manufacturers, the committee on economic development, headed by Mr. Hoffman, and other agencies; and specific suggestions will likely be forthcoming shortly as to the best manner of meeting the problems involved in changing over from war to peace, of preventing job-destroying dislocations. Although some plans are hardly out of the fact-finding stage, the master charts embrace provision for 55,000,000 jobs, 9,000,000 more than there were in 1940, as soon as possible after hostilities cease. That would call for the production and sale of an annual output of goods valued at about $150,000,000,000. That objective can be reached only if plans are made now and if an environment favorable to free enterprise prevails. For industry, the job of winning the peace means creation of jobs for soldiers, sailors, and present war workers; and it is studying how to apply the design of war production to the needs of the Nation when peace production is resumed. This work is of prime importance. It concerns the urgent needs of this Nation's 35,000,000 families.

In any consideration of these post-war plans we must bear in mind the 10,000,000 or more men in the military personnel who will have a fundamental experience in common. And we must also remember that that experience will have been shared by the other millions who, if they have not actually fought in the war, will have shared it, as not only the most tremendous experience in our history but also as the affirmation of a faith. Far-sighted industrial leaders are not discouraged about the prospects. George A. Eastman, president of Armour & Co., expressed his opinion in a radio talk to our fighting forces overseas, in which he said: "If industry is permitted to expand in the American way and to make and sell the things that people will want, including many new items from war-inspired inventions, there will be work not only for those who are presently employed but also for the men who will be coming back." The big thing is to let business keep on being competitive. Nobody is going to a ball game if you don't keep score. Profit making is just keeping score. The essential ingredient for post-war prosperity will be perpetuation of the American system of government and of private enterprise. On that score, Senator O'DANIEL, of Texas, spoke yesterday at a New York City luncheon, declaring that the best chance of preserving the American system of free enterprise lay in electing to Congress sound Democrats in Democratic States and sound Republicans in Republican States. During the war, all of us can be influential in the conservation of fundamentals which will insure the perpetuation of that system after the war. We should now direct our energies into efforts which will insure a proper climate for business after the war, as the Committee on Economic Development phrases it; otherwise, we face a long cycle similar to that in which Russia has been operating since World War No. 1. Crackpot ideas of visionary business baiters would snatch from the people the opportunity to enjoy post-war material well-being on an ascending scale. Those business baiters seek to destroy private enterprise only that they may climb to power over its ruins. One thing is certain, and you can lay to that, if it is destroyed, our prosperity goes with it.

In no small measure the fate of our individual enterprise system will be determined by the success or failure of the plans which are being made to take care of post-war problems. Democracy will survive only if it succeeds in providing a high level of employment and an outlet for the ambitions of youth. American productive genius, as represented by both capital and labor, can meet the challenge better than any bureaucratic supergovernment. Industrial America will meet that challenge successfully because it is coming out of the war with a vastly stimulated intellect; and when that livelier intellect goes to work on the things of peace we'll see a new machine going down the road. Men are again thinking adventurously—the blinders are off:

Until recent days, every effort, for a thousand years, was bent toward reducing the power of the state over the individual; for there is no such thing as a beneficent state. Every state would absorb the individual in its iron bosom; for it is composed, at least in part, of those who seek unlimited power. Human beings, being what they are, are, in the main, not primarily beneficent but are self seekers, egotistic, and love power for power's sake. Inch by inch, in this fight to reduce the power of the state, the bloody ground was contested. In dungeons, in chains, on the rack, men had refused to submit. Thus was free enterprise born. To save that freedom of enterprise, along with others akin to it, we are now engaged in war production and are fighting on the seven seas. The purpose of the present struggle is identical to that for which men fought 25 years ago, namely, to save mankind from a mechanistic philosophy. This epical struggle is a struggle of the individual against the strangling power of the state; a struggle between nature, whose very law is individualism, and man-made absolutism, which is a form of insanity. The right to individual liberty is a divine law; a law written in the trees and the flowers, in the body and mind of man. Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker has this to say about rugged individualism: "We spent billions of dollars to take away initiative, imagination, and rugged individualism. We thought that a Government of the super few could plan for all of us. Now we are spending billions of dollars to teach our boys in the forces imagination, initiative, and rugged individualism."

No armed guard will bar the door to our liberty; there will never be a barbed-wire fence between us and opportunity to work and build and grow and make this life worth living, this war worth winning. The thunder and lightning of hell are let loose in this total war of total terror. The bully who is now whining in the Fuehrer's roofless fortress told the story on that soft summer evening of June 10, 1940, when, from the balcony of the Palazzo Venezia, he bellowed: "Fighters of land, sea, and air, Blackshirts of the revolution, we take to the field against the plutocratic and reactionary democracies. Conquer. It is a conflict between two ages, two ideas." Surely it is—the age of conquest and the age of reason; the idea of the slave world and the idea of man's freedom.

The American character, whatever its shortcomings, abounds in creative energy, courage, resourcefulness, and is bottomed upon the profound conviction that nothing in the world is beyond its power to accomplish. That conviction, with respect to industry, was dynamically expressed by Henry J. Kaiser when he declared, "It doesn't matter what can't be done, so long as we have to do it we can do it." In 1918 the Chairman of the War Industries Board put it this way: "It can't be done but here it is."

There is no exaggeration but rather only sober fact in the statement that, even as the defeat of totalitarianism depended on the stand which Winston Churchill and other gallant British leaders made in the fall of 1940, so does the cause of freedom, the American way of life, depend on the stand which American businessmen make today against the onrushing tide of state socialism. Before the war men who should have known better either approved by silence or accepted collectivist schemes designed to kill private enterprise. Two weeks ago Dr. Robert A. Millikan, American physicist and Nobel Prize winner, said: "This time the external threat to our freedom is not destined to succeed. However, a second threat, arising from too great centralization of power in Washington and the internal corrupation that it inevitably breeds, is greater today than at any time in American history. It is devoutly to be hoped that the American voters have read the lessons of history better than have some college professers, recent administrative advisers."

In other words, there can be no free or individual or private enterprise, call it what you will, unless we have a free political economy, such as provided for in the Constitution, with the principle of self-government kept in the powers of the States and local communities. Do you imagine that the political economy in the realm of the Tennessee Valley Authority is as free as is the economy in the St. Lawrence area, which, to date, has been spared such an authority? How free would you expect it to be throughout the country were the dozen or more proposed Federal authorities, modeled after the Tennessee Valley Authority, with their tens of thousands of employees, established from coast to coast? Conceive of the state of affairs should, for instance, the dream of those bureaucrats, plugging for Government ownership of the private electic power industry, come true. For refusal to obey a directive issued in a field outside the domain of a Federal bureau, arbitrary actions in the past indicate that the recalcitrant citizen might be penalized by having his lights turned off.

Almost invariably, political parties, although ultra sensitive to organized opinion, are remarkably insensitive to unorganized opinion, which, when it differs from their

own views, they are apt to dismiss as a form of inconvenient heresy. A new way of thinking, consequently, has to translate itself into some organized form of expression before it can begin to affect the statute books. Through all our affiliations, let us see to it that we leave nothing undone in that direction. Let us see to it that the organizations to which we belong speak up, not in the language of selfish interest, but in the cause of our way of life. Recent developments evidence increasing activity on the part of Americans to save America, but, however favorable the present signs, we cannot risk a let-down, for a frontal attack against free enterprise will likely be lustily launched when the armistice whistles blow. We must be prepared on all sides, for in the forest of this tormented world the trees have strange habits and twists. We shall be prepared, for these words ring true: "In rapture we ride the stormiest gale, for God's hand is on the helm and His breath is in the sail."

A National Military Cemetery Should Be Established in Every State

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I arise today to bring to the attention of the Congress the urgent need of a well-planned policy with respect to the establishment of appropriate and additional national military cemeteries in the various States.

At the end of World War No. 1 it was decided, partly out of deference to the wishes of the French Republic, to establish American military cemeteries in France for the final resting places of our heroic soldiers who died in battle there. That policy seemed proper at the time, but later events have raised doubts as to the wisdom of the decision. For one thing, it was not contemplated that less than a quarter of a century after their establishment that the German invader would again control the soil where our American cemeteries are located. Who knows what has happened to those shrines since the tragic events of 1940? What has happened to the metal fences which enclosed the cemeteries? These questions show the uncertainties that exist with respect to the hallowed places where our soldier dead now rest.

There are 8 American military cemeteries in Europe. One of these is in England, 1 in Belgium, and the other 6 are in France, where 30,902 American soldiers are buried. However, a total of 46,639 were returned to the United States from Europe after the last war in accordance with the expressed wishes of the nearest relatives. This proved even at that time that the predominant sentiment was to have our American heroic dead returned to their native soil.

As for the present world-wide conflict, with the battle zones extending into every remote corner of the globe, it would seem to be a wise policy to have all of our American heroes who fall in battle returned to the United States at the earliest moment after the end of the war to rest in eternal sleep within the borders of their native States, or in our national shrine at Arlington. This, I feel sure, is what the boys would want and will carry out the fervent hopes and prayers of their fathers and mothers. Such a policy should be well planned in advance, so that when the war ends, national cemeteries within the States will be sufficiently complete to avoid undue delay in the return of our honored dead to their native soil.

It is my thought that popular sentiment favors the establishment of new national military cemeteries in all the States which do not already have them. I know that such is the hope of the citizens of my own State of Delaware. In harmony with this sentiment a resolution was adopted at the last session of the legislature of Delaware urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for such a national military cemetery in the State. It would seem fitting also that these national cemeteries be located at or near the State capitals.

Such a program should be authorized by this Congress, the land acquired, an outstanding architect appointed, the architectural plans drawn, and the work undertaken by the appropriate authority in the War Department. Such plans should, of course, envisage the architectural harmony of the State capital where located, and should contain chapels of appropriate design.

An investigation discloses that there are at the present 20 States which do not have within their borders a national military cemetery. These States, with a total population of 31,165,600 are as follows: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. In addition, it is understood that there are 5 States with a total population of 24,391,619 in which the national military cemeteries are now filled, and thus new ones will need to be established or the present ones enlarged. These States are California, Florida, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

This gives a total population of 55,557,219 in the 25 States where new national military cemeteries are needed or where those now existing should be extended.

It is my hope that all Members of this body interested in the establishment of adequate and appropriate burial places for members of our armed services of all wars, will join in presenting to the proper committee a thoroughly studied plan for the establishment of carefully designed national military cemeteries in each State which will be in keeping with those established in France after World War No. 1 under the leadership of Gen. John J. Pershing, Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission. I feel sure that every Member of this House will desire nothing less than such a shrine in every State where their soldier dead may rest in eternal glory near the scenes and persons dearest and most intimate to each of them.

When completed, these national shrines will stand in perpetuity in all our States as the final resting places of the American heroes of all our wars.

Washington's Pentagon Building a Labyrinth—Guide Not Much Help—Diminishing Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives was considering the appropriation for the construction of the Pentagon Building, I opposed the proposal on the ground that such a structure would ultimately represent a vast waste of taxpayers' funds. By building an office so big that the guides employed to conduct the luckless visitor through it can get lost, we are wasting, first, manpower; second, wartime; and, third, tax funds.

These views are confirmed by the report of Mr. William F. McDermott which recently appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, which I ask leave to reprint in the RECORD:

MCDERMOTT GETS LOST—WASHINGTON'S PENTAGON BUILDING A LABYRINTH—GUIDE NOT MUCH HELP—DIMINISHING RETURNS

(By William F. McDermott)

You can get a vivid idea of the immense expansion of the military establishment by taking a walk around the corridors of Washington's Pentagon Building, the mammoth new structure for the housing of War Department activities. It sprawls over the tranquil countryside bordering the Potomac in such size that it is difficult to believe your eyes. I am told that 30,000 people work there, but I doubt if an accurate census has ever been taken.

It is not merely an office building, but a large, self-contained city, with its own restaurants, drug stores, dry cleaning establishments and post office. The main entrance hall is as spacious as the concourse of a great railway terminal such as St. Lazaire or Victoria Station.

No visitor is trusted to find his way alone in these labyrinthine passages. He might be lost for days. Professional guides are employed to prevent such mishaps. They are called escorts.

If you have a definite appointment with an individual occupying a chair in this wilderness of oaken desks you apply to one of the girls at the information counter. She takes your name and address, writes them down in a book, then telephones your man and, if he remembers you have an appointment with him, he sends out an employee from his office to conduct you in safety to his lair.

GIVES YOU A BADGE

The girl supplies you with a badge. You can't find anyone without a guide and you can't get in or out without a badge.

In the main entrance hall there is a service bureau which provides visitors with escorts.

I gather that these servants of the Government do nothing else but walk these halls all day long showing weary travelers the way they should go.

When I had finished my business in one of the Pentagon offices I had to repair to another part of the building and the problem of how to get me there arose. An escort was summoned.

There seemed some doubt about his professional competence and he was carefully interrogated as to whether he knew the location of the office to which I was to be taken. He gave assurance that he did.

The unpleasant truth was that he didn't. He walked me what seemed a distance of several miles over stone floors and wound up at the wrong end of the building. Then he asked directions, took bearings, and resumed circumnavigation.

GETS LOST AGAIN

On the way back he got lost again. We finally reached our destination, after footwearying wandering and by a process of empirical experimentation rather than by science.

I asked my guide, a Negro gentleman, how long he had been working in that capacity and if his feet weren't being killed by constant jolting on these inhospitable stones.

"I have been here," he said, "since the building was built. My feet used to hurt, but they don't hurt no more. You get used to it."

His feet had got used to the stone floors, but they had not yet got used to tracking with sureness to any given destination in this tangled jungle of offices and departments.

Where but in Washington could it be that a Government building should be so huge and complex that men employed as guides should still be getting lost in its intricate corridors after pounding their feet on its hard floors day after day, month after month It is fantastic and incredible, but so is much else in Washington.

OTHER BUILDINGS ARE LARGE

The Pentagon Building is only one of the immense structures occupied by the War Department. The Munitions Building on Constitution Avenue is not precisely a hut. The new War Department Building, a block north, is an imposing and populous structure. But the Pentagon Building is something to take your breath away. It is the concrete and bizarre symbol of the immensity of the war in which we are engaged.

You wonder if there is not a point at which size begins to yield diminishing returns. How much time is wasted by erecting a building so large that you must employ guides to get people in and out of it? Would not a number of smaller buildings have been more economical?

I suppose these questions have been threshed out by master minds and answered to their satisfaction. Anyhow there the Pentagon Building stands, in all its massive and formidable dimensions, and there is will continue to stand, like the pyramids of Cheops, immovable and incredible.

Realism Versus Wild Promises

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring into open discussion some of those things which the American people are thinking, but which the world-power politicians, and those who would like to establish a United States world W. P. A. unlimited, keep hush-hushing as though they were matters about which the American people ought not to think at all, and which should not be discussed in good society, or even in the sanctity of the home.

The American world-power politicians here, and the hordes of them scattered throughout the world, are busily projecting plans for us to rule the world; reform all the governments of the other countries of the world; provide food for the ill-fed; clothing for the ill-clad, and shelter for the ill-housed of the world. I pointed out in a recent broadcast that about half of the peoples of the world, outside of America, fall into the category of the ill-fed, the ill-clad, and the ill-housed, as we in America are accustomed to use the term. I also pointed out in that broadcast that we cannot hope—we of America—to use up our natural resources, our supplies of raw materials, our energy, and our labor, in supporting all of these hundreds of millions of people who are underprivileged or undernourished in other parts of the world.

Our international promisers are leading the peoples of other countries of the world to believe that the United States of America is going to intervene in their domestic affairs, not only to the point of supporting all of their unemployed and their incapacitated populations, but to the further extent of regulating their wages, working hours, and working conditions. Our five United States Senators who have just returned from a trip to the battle fronts of the world confirm my statements.

It is perfectly obvious to any clear-thinking American that we cannot do all of those things for all of these countless millions throughout the world. We may help them, over a long period of time, to help themselves; to fit themselves for self-government; to have an appreciation for liberty, and to know how to use it—and live it. Beyond that we in America cannot successfully go, and we can go that far only if we remain a sound, solvent, free, representative Government and people.

If there were any possibility of the United States using her manpower to police all the other countries of the world, particularly the countries under the domination of the Axis dictators, and if there were any possibility of our own American people working long enough and hard enough to supply these ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-housed multitudes in other countries, and if there were any possibility of our stripping ourselves of our raw materials in a world-wide charity movement such as has never been imagined by men before in the history of the race, then there might be some point in considering all of these broad promises now being made, and of refraining from taking a gloomy view of the probabilities of their fulfillment.

If we are going to be realistic and rational, we must project our thinking to the point when the war will be over. When hostilities have ceased, it is natural for the fathers and the mothers, the brothers and the sisters, the wives and the children of America, to want their loved ones to come back home as quickly as possible.

When the fighting has ceased, and the readjustment to peace has begun under the terms of an armistice, will it be natural for the American people to want to continue their sacrifices for years, under the rationing rules and the point system, in order to feed multitudes of the peoples across the seven seas? Every one of you listening to me this evening knows the answer to that.

After hostilities have ceased and the Axis Powers have been vanquished will it be natural, or probable, that the American people will want to continue increasing their own already crushing burden of taxation in order to put shoes on the Hottentots, or neckties around the necks of the Arab nomads of the deserts? You folks know the answer to that question.

When hostilities have ceased and the people of the United States are deeply engrossed in the multifarious phases of their own readjustment to a peacetime basis, in the problem of reemployment for their own people, for millions of returned soldiers and sailors and women of the uniformed services, and other millions of munitions workers dismissed from smokeless factories, is it probable that our people will then be willing to continue to interest themselves greatly in changing the hours, and the wages, and the working conditions of the peoples of the Far East, of the Orient, of middle Europe? You folks know the answer to that one also.

When all of our domestic problems, not one of which was solved, but all of which were obscured by the advent of the war, and all of which have been aggravated by the war, rise up and confront us with a demand for solution, will it be possible, not to say practicable, for the American people to neglect their own domestic affairs to solve the domestic problems of the millions of people in other parts of the world whose social customs, whose ancient traditions, whose religious beliefs, and whose philosophic doctrines make their lives in every way different from our own? You folks know the answer to that question.

Now I ask this one:

What is to be accomplished, what good does it do for some of our politicians to make these extravagant promises to the other peoples of the world when we realize, even now, that those extravagant promises cannot, to any appreciable extent, be fulfilled? All that can be accomplished by making such extravagant and unfulfillable promises is to reap for the United States of America the hatred of these other nations, growing out of their disappointment that we do not keep our promises, and their loss of confidence in our repeated pledges.

If we are going to be realistic and practical, we must realize that the end of the hostilities is not going to bring a brave, new, golden world into being, with a new era of brotherhood and cooperation suddenly growing out of the cessation of the greatest and most bitter struggle in

which men ever engaged on the face of this globe.

On the contrary, it will be the same old world with all of its old problems; with all of its old hardships; with all of its old griefs and disappointments accentuated; with all of its old cross currents of human desires, and conflicts of human will and selfishness; all of these, and a veritable avalanche of new hatreds, of new strains, of new hardships and sacrifices entailed in the devastations caused by the war, which will then confront us. At the risk of being criticized by those who like to talk about a brave new world, and how we are going to establish it, I say to you that it will only be by God's help that we can repair the old world and make it habitable and peaceful again. The great weakness in all of these visions for a brave new world after the war is that the dreamers who envision such a world do not take into account the flaws in human nature, the selfishness in human nature, the frailties of humar reasoning inherent in all peoples in all nations, which produced the First World War, and then brought on this second terrible conflict. The selfishness, the conditions generally which brought about this conflict are not going to disappear magically at the end of this war

Of course, the people of America would like to see a world free from poverty, hardship, privation, jealousy, selfishness, fear, economic insecurity, and wickedness. Of course, the American people will be ready when this war ends, as they have always been ready, ever since this Nation had its birth, to do all we can to bring about such a perfect world and such perfect mankind. But there is nothing to be gained; there is no point in deluding other peoples, and in fooling ourselves, by rash and extravagant promises, of what we will do to usher in the millenium after this conflict is over, when, at the first clear, sober glance we see that we cannot fulfill such promises.

It seems to me, my fellow citizens, that we can do much more to persuade the world back to sanity, peace, and prosperity, if we make only promises we have some fair chance of fulfilling, if we promise to help these people as much as we can, but we must make it clear to them that not only must they help themselves, but that it is their job and not ours to rid their own thinking of the hatreds and the prejudices and the desires for revenge generated by this and previous struggles.

There is no use closing our eyes to the fact that very great portions of the world will be in a state approaching anarchy and chaos when the war ends. Most of their governments will have been completely shattered. Most of their monetary systems will have been destroyed. Most of their economic systems will have been demolished. Most of their leading citizens will have been killed. In many of them their own populations are already divided into two classes—those who feel that they have been betrayed by their own countrymen, and those who will be accused of having participated in that betrayal. Under such conditions, it is entirely clear that temporary provisional governments will have to be established, after hostilities cease, in those countries which are in the condition I have just described. Their military authorities will not only have to set up such governments, but they will have to maintain such governments by the force of their troops. These facts, however, do not alter the other great fact that the people of America, when hostilities have ceased, will want their boys and girls back home just as soon as possible, and that that overwhelming national desire will constitute a political force that will be well nigh irresistible.

These international promisers do not take that great force into account. They apparently believe that the American people will be as ready to endure hardships and privation, regimentation, and bureaucratic pulling and hauling as they have been during hostilities. But that is not American human nature. It is not human nature at all. The American people have been ready, and they will continue to be perfectly willing, to make any sacrifices, to endure any privations which they feel are genuinely necessitated by the war. They will feel very differently when they are told they must look forward to further years of separation from their loved ones in the armed services, because those loved ones are to be kept in other countries for long periods to police the governments of other peoples; they will feel very differently, will the American people, when they are told they must continue to work, to sacrifice, to sweat and toil, to oe taxed and taxed while international power politicians continue, far down the years, to spend and spend on other nations and peoples

I give you this message tonight, my fellow citizens, not because I want to diminish by one atom the willingess of the American people to do all they can to help restore the world to sanity and peace. I give you this message, because I do not believe extravagant and unfulfillable promises made on behalf of the American people, by self-appointed spokesmen, will contribute anything to the restoration of the world to sanity, peace, and prosperity. Such promises, I believe, will constitute an impediment rather than a contribution to world-wide peace.

I, therefore, believe we should be rational, realistic, practical, and sensible in the promises we permit to be made on our behalf to the other peoples of the world.

It has been well said by a wise man that "One promise broken is worse than a hundred promises not made."

Vote at Every Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude" reads the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The right of election is the very essence of the Constitution.

Election day is independence day. So long as we retain the right to select our own public officials we retain our freedom.

Every time we fail to exercise the privilege of voting we forfeit our right to criticize those who have gained public office. Every time we find it more convenient to stay at home or discover that we are too busy to vote, we abandon our American heritage of freedom.

From indifference to the choice of public officials, it is only a small step toward indifference to our rights of free press, free speech, free worship. We cannot join the long and growing list of those nations which have forgotten all human liberties.

Municipal elections, town meetings, State and county elections, every one of these plays its part in the development of American history.

You owe it to yourself and to your Nation to vote at every public election.

Let the people of every city in America demonstrate by their votes that they cherish the love of freedom for which our country stands.

Let no election in our country go by default. If you are registered as a voter, go to the polls.

Let America continue to speak through a tremendous flow of ballots.

Vote at your elections November 2. It took thousands of years to win you that right to vote. Exercise it.

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have always entertained a very high respect and admiration for the Chinese race and especially since my close association with Chinese students at Cornell University. These students have since become recognized as outstanding statesmen of the world. I, for one, am proud that the Chinese are our allies in this great war to which we are committed in the Pacific. There are powerful and compelling reasons why we should remove the present ban against the Chinese which now exists in the immigration laws. I believe the Chinese are entitled to a quota. I think it is about time that as a Nation we attempt to make some atonement for the ghastly sin committed by those who have been in charge of our foreign policies for the last 10 or 11 years. I recognize that there can be no atonement that will wash out the bloody and inhuman part which

our shipments of war materials to Japan played in the slaughter of Chinese men, women, and children.

The brutality of the Japanese was not first revealed at Pearl Harbor. Those in charge of our foreign affairs had due notice of the barbaric propensities of the Japanese as early as December 12, 1937. It was on that date that the American gunboat *Panay* and three American tankers, sailing on the Yangtze River, were attacked and sunk by Japanese airplanes, killing several of our people and wounding a score of others. I admit that the Japanese, true to form, apologized, as is their practice, as they will undoubtedly do for recently beheading one of our allied aviators.

The indisputable facts with reference to the *Panay* were that the visibility was clear, that a large American flag was displayed on deck, that the Japanese authorities had been apprised in advance of the *Panay's* movements up the Yangtze River, that when the ship was sinking a motor launch approached and fired on her, that Japanese soldiers went aboard the ship, and that similar outrages were committed by the Japanese on British ships in the Yangtze River the same day.

This brutal affair and Japanese bombings of Canton in the spring of 1938 prompted numerous organizations to demand an embargo on the export of war materials to Japan.

I pointed out in the Seventy-fifth Congress that 54 percent of Japan's imports of war materials had been obtained from the United States and one-half of the gas and oil used by Japanese bombers in their attacks on Canton were sold by American exporters.

Mr. Speaker, without going further into the facts with reference to the enormous quantities of war materials, which I have heretofore placed in the RECORD, I wish to say that I realize that it will require more than a token quota and soft words to expiate the indefensible and ghastly sin committed by the Roosevelt administration against the Chinese people and Nation, but at least it will atone so far as the removal of the race discrimination can do so. Therefore I favor the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act.

Recentralization of Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of this opportunity to inform my colleagues that seven of our number have been designated as members of a House steering committee to act in cooperation with a similar committee of Senators in the matter of trying to recentralize heavy industry in the United States. The appointment of this steering committee, composed of Congressmen PATMAN, of Texas; TARVER, of Georgia; MANSFIELD of Montana; KING, of California; WINTER, of Kansas; CASE, of South Dakota, and myself, as chairman, was made under the authority given the able Senator from Nevada PAT MCCARRAN, by vote of the Senators and Representatives who attended a joint meeting held on Monday, October 4. This recent conference was preceded by a meeting of House Members, who, for some time, have been seriously concerned over the problem of working out a program of industry recentralization. At this first meeting it was arranged to meet jointly with a large group of Senators, in whose behalf Senator MCCARRAN suggested, earlier in the summer, the advantages to be derived from such cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, the question of recentralizing heavy industry in the United States is so broad in scope and embraces so many factors related to the economic development and self-sufficiency of various regions and sectors of this country, I would not presume myself capable of discussing it now, even if time permitted me to do so. It is a tremendous and vitally important subject. At the joint meeting of Senators and Representatives we were treated to a brilliant outline discussion of the major aspects of this problem by the learned Senator MCCARRAN.

It is only fair and proper, Mr. Speaker, that I point out that there are many of my colleagues who are fully conversant with many phases of the industry recentralization question. Individually, and sometimes as members of special or standing committees of the House, we have heard this subject ably discussed by Members on both sides of the aisle. My able colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], has been and is now deeply and constructively engaged in a study of the steel shortage, particularly as it affects the merchant marine construction program of the Pacific coast. As a member of the special steel shortage subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, chairmanned by the genial and industrious gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] has given that committee and the House membership tremendously valuable data relating to the steel shortage in its wartime and post-war implications.

In similar fashion, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] has drawn upon his many years of study of the steel and iron industry to enlighten the House on the subject at hand. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and many more whose names should be mentioned, are included in the large group of House Members coming from 26 States of the Southern, North Central, Northeastern, and Western regions of the country, who have already or could graphically portray how certain natural resources in the several States lie undeveloped and lost to the war-production program. In the Southwest and all through the western part of the United States, we have plants and factories turning out war and civilian goods; fabricated items that require steel, iron, aluminum, copper, lead, magnesium, and countless other alloys. Within the 26 States, encompassing the regions I have mentioned, we have all the resources, all the ores and the coal and other components required to furnish the basis for a great and thriving heavy industry development that will make these areas economically more self-sufficient, by far, than they are today.

Mr. Speaker, over half of the Nation's shipbuilding program is concentrated on the Pacific coast. This region provides much of the pig aluminum produced today. We could produce more. I could go on listing other examples if time permitted. Texas and Montana, South Dakota and California want to increase their contribution to the war-production effort. But our natural resources of all types are not developed or utilized in full except in rare instances. We can prove that a great steel industry can flourish in many of the regions I mentioned a moment ago. We do not have such an industry. An odd plant or two, yes; but they cannot even begin to feed the gaping maw of the shipbuilding industry alone with the steel it requires now and must have in the post-war era. West coast shipbuilding, to use the same example, depends upon Pittsburgh, Massillon, and Gary for most of its steel. We depended upon these steel centers in World War No. 1. We are still depending upon them. We have been thus dependent for too long. They have not been able to meet the full load imposed upon them by World War No. 2. They could not and should not be expected to do so. In many places throughout these 26 States steel plants should be going up right now. We can find the material. Transportation savings alone will justify the expenditure of manpower and critical materials needed to build the plants.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the steel plants or the aluminum plants and all the other plants which could be fed with the components of ore and oil and water power and coal, much of which lies unused, in greater or lesser degree, in these afore-mentioned States.

The President of the United States has been reported as saying he favors a decentralization of heavy industry. The House and Senate joint committee I have discussed here today favors a recentralization or decentralization of industry as a war measure and as a post-war program. We think it can be done. We are going to study the problem intently. We are open to assistance and cooperation from every Member of this House and every committee thereof. By the same token, we will help every Member and every committee of the House in connection with any phase of this program of study, analysis, and action. If there are any industrial monopoly interests blocking the logical development of competitive industries in the southern and western regions of the United States, we are

going to find out who they are and how they have been operating. We will then hope to find a way of making their opposition ineffective. If they have any dollar-a-year representatives in the Government still on their pay rolls we want to know who they are and just what they have been doing or may propose to do when faced with making vital decisions on these matters.

Mr. Speaker, we have a big job cut out for ourselves and we know it. Fortunately, we have been able to join forces with a group of Senators as determined to see this thing through as are we. We have a splendid joint spokesman in the person of Senator MCCARRAN.

Mr. Speaker, various special committees will be appointed by the seven-man House steering committee to study, in cooperation with the Senators, the multiform and manifold major questions which present themselves on all sides, in connection with the broad problem I have briefly outlined here today. In behalf of the House steering committee, I invite the cooperation of all Members coming from the areas most affected by an underdevelopment or complete lack of development of its natural resources. That area would generally lie west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio Rivers. Make yourselves known to the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], or the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], or any of the five others on the committee. We will welcome your participation. Though not functioning as an official committee of the House, we are not desirous of becoming an exclusive or select group. There is room and work for everyone. To all will come the credit and satisfaction of joining in the most concerted effort of its kind on Capitol Hill—an effort to give other areas of this country what only a few now enjoy to overflowing, namely, greater economic independence as contrasted with dangerous and growing dependence. Mr. Speaker, we have started the battle. We are determined to persevere until at least a measure of success is ours.

Sound Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in a recent edition of the magazine, Aero Digest, opposing the adoption of the Civil Aviation bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, illustrates the type of loose thinking about civil aviation problems against which we must constantly be on guard. Misinformation, misconception, and misrepresentation must be carefully winnowed out of our thinking if we are to provide for civil aviation the sound legislation it needs.

The argument of the editorial is briefly this: It states that we had only 350 planes on our domestic common carrier system when the United States entered the war whereas Hitler had thousands of transport aircraft, and South America had more than twice the route mileage and air-line stops, as did the United States. We may overlook, for the sake of argument, the inaccuracy of this statement. The editorial then goes on and says that the reason there were only 350 planes on the domestic air lines was that the air lines had to enter into long hearings before they could start any new service.

The editorial then contends that private flyers and flying schools had thousands of planes due to the fact that private flying was subject only to safety regulations and not to economic regulations.

Then the editorial proceeds with this extraordinary statement: "If the Lea bill passes, Federal control of all phases of civil aviation will be absolute."

The implication of this argument—although the editorial carefully obscures its point—seems to be that the Lea bill proposes to impose some Federal economic regulation on the private pilots and the flying schools.

Any such suggestion is false.

The Lea bill does not impose any economic regulation whatsoever on any aviation activity except commercial point-to-point transportation for hire. It does not, in any way, complicate or add to the safety regulation of private fliers or flying schools or other miscellaneous flying activities.

With respect to private and miscellaneous flying, other than commercial transportation of persons and property for hire, all that the Lea bill does is to bring the law into line with what is the existing practical situation.

As every aviator knows, as a practical matter, all private and miscellaneous flying must necessarily comply with Federal safety regulations. This is due to the fact that some time every plane and every pilot will either be crossing a State line or will be flying on an airway or will be flying in the vicinity of an airway and interstate traffic. In fact, the C. A. B. has already found it necessary, under existing law, to extend its safety licensing requirements so as to include all private and miscellaneous aviation. The Lea bill simply ratifies what has already been found to be necessary. And hardly a voice was raised in the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in opposition to the idea that safety regulations for all civil aviation must necessarily be uniform throughout the country.

Furthermore, the suggestion in the editorial that our domestic air lines were hampered by the economic regulations of existing law, prior to the present war, is groundless. No such objection has ever been made to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by any of the many witnesses testifying before it. The remarkable progress of our domestic air transportation system prior to the war is a matter of public record. Every informed person knows that our domestic air transport industry in its prewar development clearly led the whole world. We have been so far ahead of every other country in the world in terms of volume and standards that American air transportation is accepted everywhere as the very acme and it is equally common knowledge that credit for this great development has been given, by the leaders of the industry itself, and with absolute unanimity, to the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act in 1938.

Apparently the writer of Aero Digest's editorial would advocate that we repeal the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, take away the sound, tried, and tested economic regulation now in effect for commercial air transportation, and go back to those hideously chaotic days which had, by June of 1938, brought the air transport industry to the very verge of bankruptcy. Advocacy of any such step flies in the face of every lesson which history in this and in other industries has to teach us.

With respect to economic regulation, what the Lea bill does is to assure that the sound provisions of the present law will be extended so as to cover all commercial transportation of persons and property by air, and to prevent the possibility of burdensome pyramiding of unnecessary and conflicting State regulations on top of an entirely adequate and sound Federal regulation. This proposal is dictated by a deep appreciation of the peculiar requirements of commercial transportation by air, and the need to keep Governmental regulation as simple and as uniform as possible. The easiest way to prevent rapid and sound development of commercial transportation by air is to permit the growth of a complex maze of duplicating and conflicting regulatory laws.

The Lea bill is designed to prevent such a maze and its adoption, as we have been reminded through a resolution of the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association at its recent convention, is essential if we are to attain a sound basis for the most constructive regulation and development of this new industry.

Price of Crude Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the national security of this Nation is in peril. The lives of millions of our fighting forces are being subjected to a potential hazard which is fast approaching an actuality. I refer to the stubborn resistance of the O. P. A. to the demand for action in setting a price for crude oil that will enable the operators of stripper-wells to continue to produce this essential war material, a product admittedly vital to the success of our mechanized war. Let our Army be deprived of the oil nec-

essary to operate tanks, trucks, and planes on the fighting front even for a few hours and the consequence might well be the slaughter of many thousands of our men.

An oil shortage in a crucial struggle with the enemy for an hour could mean defeat instead of victory for our fighting forces. Yet, in the face of such a threatened calamity to our men in the field and to our prestige and honor as a Nation, the O. P. A. treats with contempt the appeal of the outstanding oil experts that immediate action be taken by the O. P. A. to save the existing oil wells and, furthermore, insure the discovery of other producing fields.

Oil to meet civilian needs as well as the imperative requirements of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and that of our allies, can be assured only by O. P. A. action now in granting a compensatory price increase which is strongly advocated by the Petroleum Administrator for War, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, who is entrusted with the grave responsibility of supplying additional oil and gasoline.

The failure to heed the advice and warning of those who are informed and who realize the danger to our war effort, should the production of crude oil be further hindered by bureaucratic stubbornness, is serious enough to demand direct action by Congress.

Let me enumerate here some of the steps that have been taken by those in the Government and in private industry in this crude-oil production controversy:

May 13, 1941: Independent Petroleum Association of America, in midyear meeting in San Antonio, Tex., calls attention to subnormal prices on petroleum.

July 26, 1941: Independent Petroleum Association of America filed statement with Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense and Office of Price Administration.

October 7, 1941: Phillips Petroleum Co. notifies Office of Price Administration of intention to raise crude-petroleum prices 25 cents per barrel.

October 10, 1941: Phillips Petroleum Co. asked by Office of Price Administration to delay price increase pending study of situation. (Study is still under way.)

October 22, 1941: Independent Petroleum Association of America, at annual meeting in Tulsa, by resolution, asserts need of higher crude oil and products prices.

October 27, 1941: Independent Petroleum Association of America presented second and more detailed statement and petition with Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense and Office of Price Administration for price increase.

October 21, 1942: Independent Petroleum Association of America, in annual meeting, in Wichita, Kans., insists on price correction and takes lead in forming crude-oil requirements committee, composed of producers' associations of the United States.

October 22, 1942: O'Mahoney committee makes report, based on extensive testimony taken at Casper, Wyo.; Artesia, N. Mex.; Midland, Tex., and Washington, D. C., and cites evidence that price adjustment is needed.

October 22, 1942: Congressman WILLIAM P. COLE, JR., writes letter to President, broadly outlining oil problem and warning that supply for war effort is in danger, and saying that "the cost of finding and producing oil is greater than the price for which it sells."

December 31, 1942: Lea committee—formerly known as Cole committee—makes report following hearings in Washington, asserting:

> The Government must so adjust the prices of petroleum and petroleum products that the petroleum industry is enabled to carry out its war tasks in full.

February 3, 1943: Petroleum Industry War Council recommends to Petroleum Administration for War that price ceilings on crude oil be raised 25 cents, with accompanying raises in products prices.

March 23–25, 1943: Crude Oil Requirements Committee meets in St. Louis, establishes committee of 21; report made and filed with Petroleum Administration and Price Administration.

April 2, 1943: Committee of 21 of Crude Oil Requirements Committee calls on Petroleum Administrator in Washington to urge price advance.

April 3, 1943: Interstate Oil Compact Commission, meeting in Wichita, Kans., by resolution, asks that crude oil prices be advanced.

April 7, 1943: Petroleum Administrator recommends to Price Administrator average raise of 35 cents per barrel in crude-oil price ceilings.

May 1, 1943: Price Administration rejects Petroleum Administration's recommendation of price increase.

May 5, 1943: Independent Petroleum Association of America, at mid-year meeting in St. Louis, Mo., by resolution again insists price increase imperative to provide for military needs and other essential uses.

May 10, 1943: Patman committee recommends immediate adoption of Petroleum Administrator's recommendation of 35-cent price increase. Patman committee had held hearings in April 1943.

June 10, 1943: Petroleum Administrator renews request for price ceiling raise of 35 cents.

July 3, 1943: Lea committee makes report, based on hearings of April 1943, again asserts need of price incentive to stimulate supply of petroleum.

August 7, 1943: Price Administrator again rejects Petroleum Administration's recommendation.

August 9, 1943: Petroleum Administrator appeals from decision of O. P. A. to Judge Fred M. Vinson, Director of Office of Economic Stabilization.

September 18, 1943: Conference of 16 Governors of western and southern States, meeting in Denver, telegraphed the President and Director of Economic Stabilization, urging 35-cent advance in crude-oil prices.

In addition to the foregoing, numerous individual declarations in favor of crude oil price advance have been made by Members of Congress, by Governors, by many oil producers' associations in all principal producing areas, and by the National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities. Several other committees of the Senate and the House have held hearings. A number of bills are pending in Congress to effect a price increase.

Mr. Speaker, the only mitigating circumstances, so far as the failure of the O. P. A. to act is concerned, would be a frank confession by them that they are simply the marionettes which move only when the strings are pulled by a "higher power" in the New Deal.

Unless Congress acts now to break this log jam there is a serious problem of supplying gasoline for our war needs, and the public may well become reconciled to the fact that there will be no gasoline for family driving and a drastic cut in the most essential driving next spring.

The O. P. A. has brought the country face to face with a situation that will make the present rationing seem like a wild and reckless hand-out.

Address by Senator Thomas of Oklahoma Before National Food Conference, Chicago

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the National Food Conference held at Chicago on September 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Gannett, members of the Food Conference, ladies, and gentlemen, at the outset I want to say that I am not a resident of the city of Washington. And a second statement—I am not a bureaucrat.

I want to compliment and congratulate whoever it was, or whoever they were, who conceived and brought forth this conference. This is the democratic way to present and consider problems. If we should have lost this war, this conference could not have been held, because in the countries that have been invaded and conquered two people can meet and confer unmolested, when three assemble a suspicion is aroused, and when as many as five get together, some man in uniform appears to disperse the assumed conspiracy.

WE WILL WIN THE WAR

I am glad to say that we are not going to lose this war. I do not know how long the war will last, but I have a conviction that we are now on the way to winning the war. If we should have lost this war, or hereafter if we should lose this war, the consequences would be too terrible almost for portrayal. The same thing would happen to us that has happened to the countries in Europe that have been taken over, and it is my opinion that the nation or nations conquering the United States would make of us an example too terrible to contemplate. However, the first thing that would be done would be to notify the people to bring in their arms.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF WE LOSE

If we should fail, the invaders would notify the people in Chicago, and in every city in the country, on a certain date, at a certain place, "Bring in your arms and surrender them," and if you do not, the penalty is possibly death. That is No. 1.

The second thing that would happen would be the taking over of all of the important facilities, storehouses, and transportation in the United States, and thereafter they would become the property of and would be under the management of the invader, so that the citizen, in order to secure food and clothing for himself and family, would have to appear at the management of some of these institutions and say, "Mister, what can I do to secure food and clothing for myself and my family?", and the citizen would be told exactly what to do.

He would be told where to appear and when to appear, and after he had appeared he would be told what to work at and how long he should work at that task, and when the task was completed he would be given a stipend at the discretion of the agent. That would be No. 2.

VALUE OF OUR FINANCIAL SYSTEM

No. 3. The invaders would take over the financial system of this Nation and perhaps some do not understand just what this financial system embraces. The financial system of America today is the basis for every financial system on earth. There is no monetary unit any place in the world, save in the United States, to which other nations can tie their currency. The dollar, and the dollar alone, is the only monetary unit anywhere by which other currencies can be valued and measured.

We have in this country today, in the Public Treasury, almost twenty-two and one-half billions of gold, and gold is the one thing that all nations, civilized and savage, recognize as money. We have that sum in gold in our public Treasury tonight. There is only about thirty billions of gold that has been discovered since we have record that is used for money, so we have, or you have, twenty-two and a half thirtieths of all the gold that is used for money in the civilized world, so far as we know.

That is not all. In our financial system we have over one-third of all the silver that has been discovered since the dawn of time and such silver is worth about $4,000,000,000 in legal money.

That is not all we have. Today we have in circulation something like eighteen and one-half billions of legal money.

But that is not all. Tonight when the banks are closed and the books are balanced, it will be found that all the banks of the Nation together have over $108,000,000,000 in credit or deposit money.

Add those figures—one hundred and eight billions of credit money, eighteen and a half billions of paper money, four billions of silver money and twenty-two and a half billions of gold. When you add those figures, you find it makes a total of over one hundred and fifty billions of the best money in the world, and if we should lose this war our banks and financial system would be taken over and that prize is enough to justify any bandit or outlaw nation, or any group of bandit and outlaw nations, to try to take over the United States of America.

But that is not all that would happen to this country. The profits derived from industry, the profits derived from the work of all our people, would be taken over by the invaders and such profits would not be used to make public improvements in America but that money would be sent abroad to rebuild the devastated countries now engaging in this war on behalf of the Axis Powers.

I am glad to appear upon this program very briefly with a number of my distinguished colleagues in the United States Senate. This morning we heard the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL]. Tonight you will hear two other Senators of the United States; you will hear Mr. BUSHFIELD from South Dakota and you will hear Mr. BUTLER from Nebraska.

Then this morning you heard your own distinguished Senator from Illinois, and let me say for Mr. BROOKS that there is no man in the Senate who better represents his State than does the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois.

These Senators that I have just mentioned come from the central part of the United States, Texas, Illinois, South Dakota, and Nebraska, so I am glad to appear on the program with them. They speak for the farming section of the United States and, without exception, they represent the viewpoint of the great mass of true Americans who make possible the central breadbasket of these United States.

NATURE OF CONFERENCE

I am glad to appear on this program and to hear the discussions that have taken place up until this hour. Some people criticize the Members of the Congress for talking too much. They say that the Congress should adopt a program and put it into effect immediately.

Well, let us see what has happened here today in this Food Conference assembled in the city of Chicago. We have heard speakers say that taxes are too high. Two of the speakers have made that statement—that taxes now are verging upon confiscation. Then we heard another speaker say that unless we raise taxes still higher and take this surplus money out of the pockets of people, we are going to have inflation.

Well, that raises an issue that could not be solved without some debate and argument.

SUBSIDIES

That is not all. We have heard on this platform today a condemnation of subsidies, yet the speaker who has just left the floor stated that while he was against subsidies he was fearful that subsidies would have to be agreed upon and provided.

My friends, I am against subsidies. I take my place on the side of those speakers who have condemned subsidies.

The only sizable plan to pay subsidies is upon farm products—that is, upon food. It is my understanding that the people generally have more money available now to pay for the things they need than they have had during my lifetime, and now while the people have the money and no place to spend it, it is proposed to drive prices down through a roll-back and to make up the difference between the rolled-down low price and what might be termed a fair price by paying the difference with cash drawn from the Public Treasury.

The Public Treasury is being drained right now just about as much as it can stand, and if this program of subsidies should be adopted you will have to draw checks upon the Treasury to pay the subsidies, and from whence are you going to get the money in the Treasury with which to meet those checks?

We cannot raise so much money by taxation, nor by the selling of bonds and stamps, so the only alternative is for Uncle Sam to print more bonds, place such bonds in the banks of the country, and then to begin to write checks against the credit thus created.

To the extent that additional bonds are issued the national debt will be increased and will have to be paid by those who come after us. Our people have more money in their pockets now with which to pay their bills than at any time in history; hence, in my opinion, they are not justified in demanding that their grocery bills be charged to either future generations or to the soldiers now on the many fighting fronts of the world.

INFLATION

It is my judgment that such a plan is highly inflationary. I am against inflation. I know of no one who is in favor of inflation, although for years I have, by some, been called an inflationist. On this point let me explain.

Away back yonder 10 years ago when cattle were selling for 3 cents a pound and less, when hogs were selling for 3 cents a pound and less, when wheat in my State was selling for 19 cents a bushel at Enid, when cotton was selling for 5 cents a pound throughout the South, I was in favor of higher prices, and to get higher prices I proposed that we take action to reduce the then high value of the dollar.

The value of the dollar governs prices. When dollars are high, prices are low. When dollars are low, prices are high. For over 10 years a number of the Members of the Senate and the House have been trying to get the price level up to 100. We started such program in 1933 and we did not accomplish that end until last November. The price level has been below 100 for almost 15 years, or from 1929 until November 1942, and that is all the advocates of higher prices demanded—that the price level be raised up to 100.

Now the price level stands at 102.6, or 2.6 above 100. This is all the inflation we have to date.

Before I get too far from the subject, I want to place in the RECORD my conception of the purpose of this conference—and I approve of the conference, I am glad to be here.

PURPOSE OF CONFERENCE

America and the world are face to face with food and feed shortages, if not actual famine. Everyone must admit that. Such shortages are due to world-wide wars, to reduced acreages planted, and to floods and droughts.

Yesterday, as I flew to Chicago from the South, in Illinois not far from this city, I saw fine bottom lands inundated with water. You cannot tell what crops are planted on those lands. I saw one valley water-covered and all I could see were the tops of trees, the tops of houses, and the tops of barns.

Last May floods destroyed millions of acres of crops in the United States. A million acres were destroyed in my State of Oklahoma. Productive lands in many counties have been converted into battlefields and here at home vast areas of farm lands have been converted into munition plants, airports, Army camps, rifle and bombing ranges, and training grounds. Because of the induction of farm boys and farm labor into the armed forces, manpower for food and feed production has been curtailed. Because of the need for steel for the war effort, the production of farm machinery has been restricted.

The production of food has been largely mechanized. Hence, productive land, ample machinery, and manpower are absolutely necessary to produce the food for the soldiers, our allies, our munition workers, our own people on the home front, and the peoples liberated by the Allied armies.

It is considered a better war strategy to equip and feed our Allied soldiers than to have to train, equip, transport, and feed our own soldiers to fight on foreign battlefields. This is the foundation of the lend-lease program.

It would not be humane, in my opinion, to drive the invaders from Allied lands and then force such liberated peoples to starve for the want of food.

By the end of the present year we plan to have almost 11,000,000 men in the armed forces of our country. These soldiers and sailors must be provided with ample food. To serve these boys will require the efforts of tens of millions of workers in our munition plants, upon the farms and upon the home

front. These producers, processors, and distributors of war supplies must likewise be supplied with food.

Because of the existing 4-year war, our allies whose lands have been invaded and destroyed have been unable to produce sufficient food for their own forces, so it has fallen to our lot—not through desire but through necessity—to furnish food and equipment or else some of our allies will fail, because men can't fight without food.

In addition to the necessity for furnishing food to the peoples mentioned, we are now taking vast numbers of prisoners of war, and under the law of nations we are required to house, guard, and feed our prisoners exactly as we expect our enemies to take care of our American boys who have been captured on the fields of battle.

It is obvious that as this war progresses, the land and manpower available for food production throughout the world will be still further restricted and curtailed. Hence, the present problem of food production is all-important. World conditions and developments as herein outlined are responsible for this National Food Conference, and the all-important question is, "What can be done to increase food and feed production, to serve the absolutely necessary demands not only of our own but of the entire Allied war effort?"

SUGGESTIONS FOR RELIEF

In connection with the solution of this problem, the following proposals should be, in my opinion, considered:

1. Additonal manpower must be made available for work on the farms and ranches of our country.

2. An additional supply of farm machinery must be produced and made available to those engaged in food and feed production.

3. Additional lands must be reclaimed and placed in production.

The reclamation of additional lands for productive purposes may be secured in two ways:

(a) Through the immediate completion of irrigation projects and systems now under construction; and

(b) The immediate construction of flood-control works to prevent much of our richest bottom land from being destroyed through disastrous floods.

Irrigation will increase food production through the placing of water on land at the proper time, and flood control will increase food production by preventing disastrous floods from overflowing and destroying not only the crops but even the land itself.

4. An adjustment of prices to farmers to the end that they may receive at least full parity for the products from their farms.

FULL PARITY FOR FARMERS

It is my conviction that if the farmers of America could secure full parity for the things they produce, they would not ask for more. We do not, in my opinion, have a fair parity formula in existence today. The formula that we have is not a written formula. It exists only in the minds of the men in one of the departments at Washington.

The Congress prescribed a general principle governing parity but the Congress did not write a definite parity formula. As a result, the men who have made up this parity formula, in their minds, have refused to include farm labor costs among the various elements going to make up parity prices and it is my conviction that until the farmers of America are given the opportunity of having placed in their parity formula the expense that they must be to in hiring labor and the expense that they must be to in the providing for the members of their own families that may perform work—until that time comes, we will not have a fair and just parity formula for the farmers of the United States.

It should be the policy of our Government, in my opinion, to guarantee in wartime sufficient wages to the producers of war supplies to cover costs of production and in addition a reasonable profit. This policy should be extended not only to wage earners, to factories, and plant management but, in addition, it should be extended to the producers and distributors of food.

Maladjustment of prices in each necessary war industry should be given consideration and equitable and fair adjustments at the earliest possible opportunity.

The proposals herein suggested and the program herein outlined, I feel certain, will be considered by the Congress which reconvened on the 14th of this month.

Before I proceed further let me make a statement that industry in this war has performed almost perfectly. I would not say perfectly because that is a superlative. Industry has done a wonderful job in production.

WHY WE ARE NOT PREPARED

We started with almost nothing in this war. When the last war was over, the people of this country believed that war was a thing of the past, would not permit their further war; that if trouble should come, in place of solving that trouble on the battlefield we would get the agents of the governments interested around a table and there we would discuss the problem and adjust it by arbitration and by diplomacy.

The people, believing that wars were a thing of the past, would not permit their Congressmen to vote appropriations to build battleships, to make cannons, rifles, and munitions of war. For 20 years we did not build a single battleship. For 20 years we did not make a single cannon. For 20 years we made not a single rifle.

So when this war came upon the United States we had only the remains of the supplies after World War No. 1 had concluded; hence we had to start with nothing that was modern.

The American people are not a warlike people, and that is evidenced by the fact that shortly before this war broke out in Europe we had an army of only some 113,000 men. That is all the men we had in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States. Then we had the officers running the number up to slightly above 120,000. We had a National Guard of something like 200,000, not adequately trained and poorly equipped. That is all the Army that we had so far as men were concerned.

Then we had the same ships that we had 20 years ago. We had cannons upon wooden wheels. By that I mean wooden hubs, wooden spokes, wooden felys, and steel tires—cannon made to be propelled by horses and mules. But today warfare is a mechanized institution. You can imagine what might happen if we should hook one of these cannon behind a truck, start down across the country at 40 to 60 miles an hour. Such a cannon with wooden wheels and steel tires would not last a mile.

It is because of these facts that I have just catalogued that we have not made better progress with our part of this war to date. We are just now starting in this war, so far as the United States is concerned.

INDUSTRY IS PRODUCING

I say industry has done a fine job. Already industry has produced over 115,000 planes, war planes, and many of those planes are now on the fighting fronts throughout the world Industry has produced to date more than 60,000 tanks, and those tanks are now scattered throughout the fighting world. Industry has made 175,000 new cannon, and those cannon are scattered throughout the world. Industry has made over 6,000,000 rifles of the repeating kind.

Until this war started, the only kind of a rifle we had was a single-shot rifle, the best rifle in the world 25 years ago, but when this war broke out we found that the Germans, Italians, and Japanese had a repeating army rifle. We did not have such a rifle, so we had to provide such a rifle for our Army.

Some people complain about the time it takes to get things done, because we have been slow in getting our equipment. Let me cite one incident. When we revised the plans and specifications for the new Garand rifle, we did not have sufficient factory equipment to make those guns. The Government advertised for bids, and the best bid we could get was from the Winchester Arms Co. This company required 14 months to make the tools necessary to make the guns. But to date we have more than 6,000,000 of these repeating rifles.

To date we have made more than 200,000 rounds of artillery ammunition. To date we have made more than 25,000,000,000 rounds of small-arms ammunition. We have made thousands of ships, and by the end of this year we will have 10,800,000 men in the armed forces of this Nation.

We are now planning to have an Army of 10,800,000 men; 8,300,000 of this number will be in the Army proper, which embraces the Air Corps, and the other 2,500,000 will be in the Navy, and the Navy embraces the marines and the Coast Guard.

So far as I can learn, it is not contemplated to have more than 4,000,000 men across at any one time. That was the program when I left Washington, now more than 60 days ago. I see in the paper today that they have now raised that estimate, and they hope soon to have 5,000,000 men across.

If we should be able to get 5,000,000 men across on foreign fronts and battlefields: Subtract 5,000,000 from 10,800,000 and that leaves 5,800,000 men to be retained here in the United States in army camps located throughout our country. These men are to be inducted, trained, and held subject to call for foreign service wherever and whenever needed.

Industry has done a good job in this war. The farmers would have done equally as well had they been encouraged as industry has been encouraged and had they had the same support from the Government that has been accorded to industry.

AGRICULTURE—A WAR INDUSTRY

To date, so far as I know, farming has not been publicly acknowledged by the Government as a war industry, yet in my opinion there is no industry more important to the war effort than farming. Our soldiers cannot live without food. The war workers in industry cannot live without food. The families of the war workers cannot live without food.

So unless we have food, the war effort fails. Of all the things I can think of, food is the most essential and the most important to the war effort. So we should all do what we can to increase the production of food.

To do that we will have to convert some of the opinions that now exist in Washington from what they now are to what they should be. I think that agriculture and farming should be recognized as a war industry and I think that the farmers of the country should be afforded and guaranteed not only cost of production but likewise a reasonable profit.

The policy in the War Department and the policy in the Navy Department is such that if a contractor secures a contract to make Army supplies or Navy supplies and if he loses money on such contract, he is invited to come back and secure a second contract

at a sufficiently higher price to make up the loss on the first contract and to give him a profit on his second contract.

I only wish the farmers of America had that policy extended to them.

I assure you that I appreciate the opportunity of being invited to this conference. I was born in Indiana, as has been stated by Mr. Gannett. I was not born in a city or even in a village. I was not born on even a section line. I was born and raised back in the center of a wooded section. I never saw electric lights until I was grown. I never spent a night in a city until I was as tall as I am now. I came from a farm. I represent a great farm State. Farmers make up our largest single group and unless farmers are permitted to prosper our Nation will falter and eventually languish and perish.

I can see vast good that may come from this conference. Already good has come from it. I note in the public press today that on yesterday some high officials in Washington took notice of what is going on here in Chicago because they had a conference with respect to food production. The results of that conference will remain to be seen.

Also, I note in the public press where the mayor of New York City made the statement that higher prices are necessary. Mayor LaGuardia is reported to have made such a statement. If we can in this short time get the attention and the ear of high officials at Washington, if we can get the attention of the mayor of New York City—and you must remember that the mayor of New York City represents a consuming population—it will be indeed an accomplishment.

Now consumers, as consumers, want cheap food and they want cheap clothing. Out here in the West, in the bread basket of America, we are producers and as producers we want high prices for the things we produce that go to feed and clothe the people of the consuming East.

The industrial East wants cheap food and cheap clothing; the producing West wants high prices for their food products and would like to have cheap prices for things they have to buy. This conflict of wishes and interests must be recognized and equitably adjusted.

So this forum, which Mr. Gannett and his associates have provided here in Chicago, wherein various viewpoints have been expressed, clashing and conflicting as they must, has developed the facts; hence, Mr. Gannett and members of the conference, I am confident that great good will come from this Chicago National Food Conference.

Airways for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. Edward Warner, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the current issue of Foreign Affairs:

AIRWAYS FOR PEACE

(By Edward Warner)

The first international air services were inaugurated in 1919. Twenty years later the independent states or major colonial possessions which did not have regular air connections with their neighbors could be numbered on the fingers of one hand. A large part of that service is still in active operation, especially in the Western Hemisphere. But it will be enormously expanded and much of it will be remade in the years immediately following the present war. If there is ever to be a fundamental change in the legal and political framework which had gradualy developed in the last 20 years the time for it will be when we shift from war to post-war conditions. We must decide now whether change is really desirable and, if so, consider what new forms might be substituted for the old ones.

The basic political features of the air transport situation before the war were as follows:

1. Each state maintained full sovereign rights in the air space above its territory.

2. Most states (though by no means all) had adhered to one of the two major international conventions governing air transportation, that of Paris (1919) and that of Havana (1928).

3. The parties to these conventions undertook to give certain general privileges to the aircraft of other ratifying states; and those which ratified the Paris Convention undertook to observe uniform practice in such matters as traffic rules and standards for licensing pilots and aircraft.

4. In practical application, the conventions created no rights to operate international air transport services.

5. Such international services were established either as a result of bilateral agreements between governments, or when interested air lines themselves secured concessions to operate into and within foreign territories.

Since 1918 little has been heard of the argument that the air should be free above a certain altitude, in the sense in which the seas are free beyond territorial limits. No one now seriously questions the fact that the full sovereignty of every state extends to the air space above its territory. All international agreements have taken it for granted. No one is likely to question it in future, unless as part of a general review of the privileges of sovereignty and of the possibility of abridging them by general agreement or of surrendering some of them into the keeping of an international organization. Freedom of the air as now conceived would be merely an agreement among sovereign states to restrict the exercise of their recognized sovereign rights.

The International Convention for Air Navigation, signed at Paris on October 13, 1919, had an effective membership in 1938 of 33 States.[1] The Pan American Convention, concluded at Havana in 1928, was ratified by the United States, Mexico, Chile, and Ecuador, all the states of Central America except Salvador, and all the Caribbean states (excluding the colonies of European powers) except Cuba. Few of the larger South American countries and none of those bordering the Caribbean on the south ever adhered to either convention.

Both of these conventions have been interpreted and applied in the sense most unfavorable to the free expansion of international air services. Both permitted a reasonably free movement of privately owned aircraft in the territories of member states, as well as of commercial aircraft not engaged in a regular scheduled service; but both have been interpreted so as to deny a corresponding freedom to the operators of regular transport services, thereby making the inauguration of regular services dependent upon special agreement. In the case of the Paris convention, a certain ambiguity in the text was resolved so as to limit the freedom of air transport. The Havana convention was less ambiguous. To most readers it seemed to say clearly that air transport should be free within the territories of the ratifying states. But it was not so applied.

Efforts were made from time to time to secure a more liberal interpretation of the Paris Convention or to modify it into a more liberal form. From the first, the British had favored a large degree of freedom in the operation of air services into and through all countries. So had the Dutch, who were like the British in possessing a small home territory, distant colonial territories, and an established tradition as carriers. Whenever the Government of the United States had occasion to make a declaration it supported freedom of operation.

In June 1929, a conference was held in Paris to consider revising the Paris Convention so as to permit greater freedom of operations. It was attended by representatives of the United States, Germany, and certain other states which had not ratified the convention, as well, of course, as by representatives of the adherent states. Only the United States, the British Empire, the Netherlands and Sweden favored the change. In opposition were 27 states (including Brazil, Cuba, Chile, Haiti, Uruguay, and Venezuela from the Western Hemisphere) Even the modest proposition that the ratifying states bind themselves not to prohibit the establishment of international transport services except on "reasonable grounds" (they themselves presumably being their own judges of reasonableness) mustered only 11 out of 30 votes.

Since no general privilege of international operation was recognized, there remained two procedures by which international services might be established—by bilateral agreement and by unilateral concession. The former has been the prevailing rule in Europe, the latter in the Western Hemisphere south of the Canadian border. Bilateral agreements varied widely in their provisions. In the case of two major powers they customarily provided for complete equality of privilege with respect to a particular route, which would then be operated by air lines of both states. Where a major and a minor power were concerned, the commoner practice was for the more powerful to receive the privilege of operating a through service between the principal centers of the two countries while the smaller received the privilege of operating certain international services of a more local character.

Sometimes the agreements fixed the maximum number of schedules to be operated daily or weekly by each carrier (as in the case of the trans-Atlantic services between the United States and the United Kingdom and the United States and France), but more often that was left for the carriers themselves. In fact, one can hardly appraise the significance of the intergovernmental agreements without at the same time allowing for the effect of the intercompany agreements, which usually were secret. Since most European air lines were in effect the agents of their governments, it was by agreements between them that rate and service wars were avoided. The extreme form of such intercompany arrangements was the pool, which involved the distribution of total traffic revenues in accordance with some agreed ratio. Pools were particularly favored by the Germans, the French, and the Swedes. The British shunned them.

Most of the international services to which American air lines have been a party have been authorized by concessions obtained directly by the carrier[2] from the government

[1] This included 7 of the members of the British Commonwealth. Of the remaining 26 members, 20 were in Europe. In the Western Hemisphere, Canada, Peru, Uruguay, and Argentina ratified (some others did also but withdrew subsequently).

[2] Pan American Airways, or its subsidiaries or affiliates, in practically every instance.

concerned but there were exceptions. The United States Government has had agreements with Great Britain (1935) and France (1939) covering trans-Atlantic air services, and with Canada (1939 and 1940) covering all air transport services across the border. Under the agreement with Britain, which remains in force until 1950, a designated carrier of each country may operate two schedules per week between the United States and the United Kingdom.

By 1939 the process of reciprocal exchange through bilateral agreement had developed so far in Europe that there was a close approximation to general freedom of passage. Although Germany was generally recognized to be holding the Damoclean sword of war over all her neighbors, German aircraft were being welcomed on daily services to the airports of the United Kingdom and most countries on the Continent. If it was considered dangerous to let the transport aircraft of potential enemies fly over your territory, and if it was that presumed danger which had brought about the defeat of a general agreement conceding the natural right of passage, the course taken failed to accomplish its purpose. The aircraft of potential enemies, and of all other States, were overhead at all hours.

On this side of the Atlantic, Pan American Airways or Pan American-Grace Airways had concessions to operate into every one of the American republics and into most of the South American and Caribbean colonies of the European states. The case of the United States and Canada is exceptional in that the length of the border and the grouping of many large cities close to it on either side make necessary a number of distinct international services. By an agreement entered into December 3, 1940, these were so allocated as to avoid any direct duplication.[3]

For the future, the following new alternative procedures appear possible:

1. Air transport might be operated internationally, either through a world monopoly or through a number of companies representing groups of nations interested in particular areas.

2. There might be general agreement on a body of principles defining in general terms the air transport privileges to be enjoyed by all countries. (They might go so far as to convey to every country the right to carry passengers and goods between any two points in the world; or the privileges conveyed might be much less extensive.)

3. Air transport might be conducted by privately or governmentally owned air lines, bearing national flags but operating subject to an international control and receiving from an international agency the certificate that gave them the right to conduct international services.

Alternatively, of course, bilateral bargaining might continue as in the past.

II

Proposals for the international operation or air lines first received serious attention in 1932 when the French delegation to the Disarmament Conference proposed the internationalization of civil aviation as a measure of security against the possible misuse of civil air fleets. Specifically, the French proposal was that international civil air transport services should be entrusted to continental, intercontinental, or intercolonial organizations which would operate them under the auspices of the League of Nations. Orders for the necessary equipment would be allocated among the aircraft-building states in proportion to their industrial capacity rather than with a view to securing the equipment, regardless of its source, which would permit the most economical and efficient operation. A few of the Continental European delegations favored the scheme but it received little support from people actively connected with air transport. These denounced it with vehemence, perhaps less because it would remove national characteristics from the air lines than because it might entail governmental direction and the restriction or elimination of private enterprise.[4]

Now that there has been another war and the world has seen what the bomber can do, the aims which the French proclaimed a dozen years ago, often to deaf ears or impatient audiences, will find new advocates. Looking back on the years from 1931 to 1939, many will proclaim the indivisibility of peace. Already the proposal to deprive civil aviation of all national quality has been revived, and it has found a surprising measure of support in Britain. Journals of such importance as the Times and the Economist have favored as much internationalization as can be obtained in the face of anticipated American opposition. Labour Party spokesmen are also favorable. In general, Conservatives are opposed, seeing in the development of air transport under British control an influence for the unification of the Empire. The opposition of those professionally engaged in areonautics is (with isolated individual exceptions) vigorous. The British Government has taken no position, but seems likely at least to give the possibilities of internationalization serious and respectful study. Even those who dismiss it as impossible on a world-wide scale often hope that some consolidation of interests in Europe may avert the rival operation of 15 or 20 companies with the active backing of as many governments.

In the United States the proposal has not aroused any such interest. Vice President WALLACE has sponsored it, but without attracting much response. American operators and the manufacturers of aircraft would certainly oppose it, as they would any scheme that was likely to bring air operations more directly into the hands of government, whether national or international.

III

If we intend establishing any general principles defining a natural right to participate in air commerce, we shall do this most easily as a part of a world convention on air navigation. After the war there will be a plain need for machinery to insure uniformity in aerial rules of the road and some other matters. Either the Paris Convention of 1919 will be extensively recast or it will be replaced by a new instrument taking account of experience on both sides of the Atlantic. Some specification as to the degree of freedom of transport operation that is to be generally conceded could be included. This would be easier than to try to build an air navigation convention on technical considerations alone and subsequently to attempt to secure general adhesion to a separate agreement outlining the right to participate in air commerce.

One general principle would establish the right of transport aircraft to make nonstop flights across the territory of foreign nations. Thus an air line that wished to operate from Sweden to Greece would have the right to cross the territory of the intervening states without special sanction.[5] A next step would be to extend the universally recognized right of nonstop passage to include stops of foreign aircraft for refueling. Such a concession, of course, would not in itself convey any right to pick up or discharge a single passenger or package.

That much, at least, should be hoped for. No country ought to claim the right to bar the passage of aircraft handling only through traffic and, therefore, in no way affecting its own commerce. To do so, and to refuse to let them use available ground facilities and purchase supplies, would be an outrageous exploitation of geography for purely negative and destructive purposes. It would be particularly outrageous in view of the rapid contraction of the earth's surface through the development of aviation. That sort of obstuctionism by countries which occupied strategic positions along important intercontinental routes was the greatest barrier to the development of international air transport between 1920 and 1938. Its recurrence should be discouraged.

If the decision were made to go still further, the next step might be a general agreement which allowed the aircraft of a member nation to discharge traffic which had originated in the metropolitan territory of that nation and to pick up traffic which would be delivered there. For example, a Canadian air line could then operate across the United States and on to the countries to the south, dropping off traffic of Canadian origin at the various points touched on the outward-bound journey and picking up Canada-bound traffic at the various points on the return. It would not be privileged, however, to handle traffic between the United States and the countries beyond. If it wished to handle traffic originating in any one of those other countries and terminating in another it would have to secure the right to do so by special agreements with the governments immediately concerned.

A likely limitation will be the reservation of cabotage rights. National companies thus will have the sole right to handle traffic which both originates and terminates within the national territory. The United States insists on this in its coastwise shipping laws and in analogous provisions in the Air Commerce Act of 1926. Many other countries have taken the same position, and the practice is likely to become even more general in the future. Before the war, continental air lines operating into England were allowed to carry passengers between British points. This seems likely to be changed, and, in addition, cabotage may be reserved not only for traffic in the United Kingdom but for traffic throughout the British Commonwealth as a whole, which would mean that all traffic both originating and terminating within the Commonwealth would be transported by air lines of the Commonwealth. Some British critics challenge the wisdom of such a policy, but it has two obvious appeals—the economic one that it would provide a substantial "home market" for British air transport, and the political one that it would draw the parts of the Commonwealth together into a single self-sustaining air bloc.

Much talk has been heard about "spheres of influence" as a basis for distributing postwar air traffic so as to avoid destructive competition. Generally the term implies that the globe should be divided into economic zones, and that traffic taking place entirely within one zone should be reserved for the

[3] The air lines of the United States traverse the border at seven points (not counting a landing in Windsor, only a few minutes by bus from Detroit); while the Trans-Canada Air Lines secured a privilege in which both it and the Canadian Government were particularly interested, namely, to operate nonstop between New York and Toronto so as to make connection with the Canadian transcontinental line to Vancouver.

[4] There have been a few cases of actual international operation, e. g., by the Russo-German company, Deruluft.

[5] The right of nonstop passage was contained in the United States-Canada agreement of 1939. It was stated in general terms and without reference to particular routes, although an exception was made as to nonstop services between the United States and Alaska across Canada.

air lines domiciled therein. Interzone traffic would be open to the enterprises of the zones involved, on terms to be determined. This device would bar American air lines from competing for traffic which both originated and terminated overseas, and might be expected similarly to bar European companies from handling traffic originating and terminating in the Americas. Complications would be presented, from our point of view, by the fact that several European states have wide-flung colonies, some of them in the Western Hemisphere. Britain, France, and the Netherlands might have a claim to a domicile in every zone.

Whatever rights of entry and passage a nation may concede to foreign air lines, it will impose certain restrictions in the interest of safety. The world's ports are open to peaceful maritime commerce, but a European vessel cannot enter New York Harbor without picking up a local pilot. Since it is impracticable for an airplane to pick up a pilot the captain will have to possess the qualifications of a local pilot for all the airports which he enters. He will have to know the local traffic rules, the radio procedures, the obstructions around the field, and the miscellany of detail which an airline captain must master before he is allowed to command even on a purely domestic flight. Language will often be a problem, for there must be some means of direct oral communication between the officers of an incoming aircraft and the traffic controllers in the airport tower. Such matters will be even more important in the post-war period than they have been in the past, for increasing traffic congestion will increase the necessity that every pilot shall understand local control methods and cooperate with them. The methods should be standardized to the greatest possible degree, but variations in the local terrain will always require some special local procedures.

Another proposal is sometimes heard—that the great powers assume leadership in the development of international air lines either by regions or on a world-wide basis, using their economic and political power to obtain unique privileges. Occasionally it goes so far as to assume that only a small number of states will be allowed to participate in international air transport. Our own consciences would hardly accept such a denial of opportunity to our weaker neighbors. The fact is, however, that large expenditures and great technical ability are required to develop air lines, and that this fact by itself will limit the number of countries which operate anything except short local routes.

In one respect at least leadership will be indispensable. Safe and efficient operation will demand that air-traffic rules and regulations as to airworthiness and other matters be standardized. The necessary agreements will be secured more easily in discussions between a limited number of nations having wide experience in aircraft manufacture and operation than in an assembly of all the sovereign states of the world. No question of appreciable national advantage is likely to arise in this connection. If a limited group will frame competent technical proposals they should receive universal and grateful acceptance.

IV

A strong motive among those who advocate the internationalization of air lines is their fear of what may happen if one of the alternative courses is adopted. British observers in particular foresee possible cutthroat competition, with extravagant or excessive operations maintained for prestige or indirectly for military purposes, and often supported by Government subsidies. They fear a subsidy race, with new international jealousies and dangerous tension as the result.

Many persons have put forward substantial arguments for the complete elimination of subsidies in air transport after the war, but there is little reason to expect that this can be achieved. Many States are likely to wish to maintain air communications on certain routes which would not produce sufficient commercial revenues to cover the cost of operation. In the general interest, too, air transportation should be made available to parts of the world where commercial advantage alone would not insure its maintenance. Countries where costs are high may also find it necessary, if they wish to serve as international air carriers, to provide subsidies to cover the cost differentials. The United States has done this for its merchant marine.

The economic effects of a real race in subsidies would be direct and immediate.[6] The political effects would be indirect. Nations will hardly be brought to the point of war by their efforts to maintain supremacy in the field of air transport at government expense. However, the spectacle of the United Nations engaged in such efforts would be a disheartening augury of their inability to cooperate in matters more directly connected with the preservation of peace. Both the economic and political consequences ought to be averted.

Publicity would help. The very full financial reports that each American air line submits to the Civil Aeronautics Board each month have aroused astonishment and admiration in other parts of the world. The British aircraft industry has suggested that all nations agree not to allow lines to engage in international operations unless they make regular public reports as to the sources of their revenue and their expenditures.[7] This excellent proposal might be supplemented by a universal undertaking to make public the terms of agreements between air lines and governments.

A direct limitation of subsidies by international agreement is often proposed but seems impracticable because of national differences in cost levels and because indirect subsidies may take an infinite variety of forms. Control might be applied more easily to the uneconomic consequences of subsidies, such as: (a) rate cutting; (b) maintenance of luxury services at normal rates; (c) maintenance of a volume of service beyond what the traffic actually warrants.

One way to prevent rate-cutting and other extravagant and uneconomic practices would be to create an international air commission having powers over international services analogous to those exercised by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the United States. Its functions could include the approval of tariffs, the setting of maximum limits on volume of service and the hearing of complaints regarding unethical or uneconomic competitive practices. It might even be given the power to certificate routes and determine which services should be operated by which carriers and how much competition there should be on particular routes. It might be a continuous or frequently recurrent session of representatives of the governments concerned in a particular area; or it might be a genuinely international agency, the members of which were chosen individually by some process designed to minimize the likelihood that they would turn out to be merely national advocates.

The two ideas are far apart. An agency of the first type would function through diplomatic adjustments; every issue would be resolved by compromise. If any agency of the second type lived up to its expectations, it would be a judicial body and behave as such, like the quasi-judicial agencies of national government now possessing similar powers within their respective territories. An agency whose members had no commitment or responsibility to any particular national interest would be clearly superior in theory; but to endow such a body with actual powers, as opposed to merely advisory functions, would mean a very sharp break with tradition, and any proposal of the sort would have to overcome a strong feeling against entrusting national interests to an agency composed largely of "foreigners."

Unless an international air commission of the judicial type is created there certainly will be need for frequent meetings among the aeronautical officials of states having common problems. Disputes over subsidy arrangements for competing lines can be reduced, if not averted, by frequent and frank exchanges of views among the governments concerned. Rates will have to be harmonized with conditions of service either by governmental regulation or by agreement among the carriers themselves. The need for governmental controls should not often arise. Commercial enterprises would be slow to start rate wars, for reprisals would be easy. But how the controls are to be supplied when they are needed ought to be planned in advance.

V

For aircraft operators, all the problems of law and diplomacy are less important than those of ground organization. They do not need a continuous right-of-way on the surface, but they do need bases and communication facilities on a much more elaborate scale than the layman often appreciates.

Where practicable, for example, it is advisable that there be well-equipped bases at intervals of some 500 miles along all major routes. They must have not only adequate landing surface and hangars and stores of supplies but also radio installations to give assistance in navigation and weather information directly to aircraft in flight. Additional radio stations, either off the course or at closer intervals along it, may be needed to supply supplementary aid. There must be a network of weather stations, in constant communication by wire or radio with a central point; and there must be the necessary organization to receive, map, and interpret the weather reports and to distribute them.

The war has created many bases in places the very names of which were almost unknown a few years ago. Some are on mid-ocean islands which, until the builders came were virtually uninhabited. Many of them have been built entirely or in part with American funds and with American material and labor in territories under the sovereignty of other nations.

Bases have been constructed during the war without reference to their post-war status. Considerations of sovereignty have not come in. Nothing, however, could be more certain to embitter the post-war relationships of nations now allied than recourse to the privileges of sovereignty to prevent civil aircraft from passing freely from one part of the globe to another. All question of wartime contributions aside, the selfishness of a state which refused to allow the aircraft of its friendly neighbors to stop and refuel at an established base—perhaps the only one available—would create a source of endless irritation in international relations.

Universal recognition of the general right of a civilian airplane to enter all territories, colonial or metropolitan, for refueling or other technical purposes, would eliminate all friction of that sort. This is the writer's strongest reason for hoping that a convention establishing such a right may be made and that it will receive unanimous approval. Above all, it should be approved by the

---

[6] It was a desire to guard against the consequences of unrestricted intranational competition that produced the Civil Aeronautics Act in this country and analogous statutes in some others.

[7] The Future of British Air Transport, a memorandum by the Society of British Aircraft Constructors, June 1943, p. 6. Similar proposals had previously been made by Sir Frederick Handley-Page, long known as a builder of large aircraft.

United States and all the members of the British Commonwealth, thus forestalling the development of what might otherwise become a very sore spot in Anglo-American relations. The advantages would be mutual. Americans desire to use bases in British territory for intermediate stops along various American routes; and the British and Canadians desire to have free right of passage, including the right to stop for fuel, over Alaska and in the American island territories of the Pacific.

Air bases must be kept up. Radio stations must be operated; weather observations must be made; and equipment must be modernized or supplemented from time to time. Great bases have been built for wartime purposes in territories where the local government may lack the inclination or the resources to assume the upkeep and where the local population may not be technically competent to carry on the necessary services. In such cases some form of outside assistance and supervision must be assured. This may create another occasion for joint action by the major aircraft-operating countries.

Bases should be open to the traffic of all countries on equal terms and their radio and other facilities should be available to all comers, of course within the limits of the safety provisions already described. The suggestion is sometimes heard that the time is ripe to go much further and to put the operation of air bases on a truly international footing. Unless we envisage the development of a much more centralized world organization than the League of Nations ever was, there would be no authority competent to undertake the operation of air bases in all parts of the globe. Much more restricted international associations, however, can be helpful. Already the South Pacific islands of Canton and Enderbury, which are important only as air bases, are under joint British-American control. In the course of developing air bases, the United Nations (to paraphrase Winston Churchill) have become pretty thoroughly mixed up with one another; and when the use of these bases is extended, either for international transport or international policing, or both, occasions may arise for transforming existing associations into permanent relationships.

VI

When the present war ends, security will be the paramount consideration just as it was in 1919. It will color all the talk about the future of civil aviation and dictate many of the decisions made in that connection.

The apprehensions which a nation feels regarding the civil air fleet of a neighbor generally spring from the possibility that it can be used for espionage from the air, or that it can be converted into combat aircraft, or that it can be used to carry an air-borne invasion.

The possibility of espionage will probably occasion less alarm after this war than it did 25 years ago. The arts of concealing and protecting military installations from air observation have been improved. Air lines can be required to avoid limited areas of particularly vital military significance. And the experience at Pearl Harbor, in an area which no Japanese air line had ever been allowed to approach, will remain as a reminder that there are likely to be more effective means of gathering military information than by operating a scheduled air transport service.

The fear of direct conversion of transport aircraft to combat types also belongs largely to the past. Although they have many parts in common, both types are too specialized for it to be possible to transform a transport fleet overnight into an efficient bombing unit. Operating crews are more readily interchangeable; and the closest approach to a real hazard may lie in a potential enemy's use of an air route to make pilots acquainted with targets they might later be called on to attack.

The possibility of surprise air-borne attacks by civil transport airplanes cannot be entirely excluded, at least in a close-packed area like Europe. This risk will have to be taken into account by those who plan security measures for the future. But even a very limited national defense force or a comparatively weak machinery of collective security should be able to isolate and destroy the largest body of troops that any civil air fleet could convey.

There remains the possibility that an air transport fleet might be a military air force in disguise. The disguise could not be long maintained. In any case, the problem of how to deal with an aggressive air force is a main security problem of the future. Armaments must be brought into balance and made available for the use of some collective security system, so that the present United Nations may be relieved of the fear of sudden attack by the regular forces either of their present enemies or of each other. The problem of how to prevent the misuse of transport equipment or the concealment of combat aircraft under a transport guise would be solved almost incidentally.

VII

The United States and Great Britain are likely to be the leaders in the development of international air transportation. Russia and China have great tasks ahead in building up air communications within their own vast territories. So do most of the British Dominions and the principal nations of South America. But while all these states will be conducting international operations to some extent, and sundry European states also, a very large proportion of the world's long-range international air-line operations will be carried on under the American or British flag.

For that and other reasons, the relations of Great Britain and the United States in this field need special consideration. What are the interests of each? And where may they conflict?

Both countries have a tradition of advocating the free use of the air. Whenever there has been an occasion for a formal declaration of principle, both have stood for removing restrictions and enlarging opportunities. With that background, they ought to agree easily to extend to each other on a reciprocal basis the right of innocent passage and the right to stop for refueling. Both will gain more by such an agreement than by a policy of mutual exclusion. Both peoples are travelers by temperament, and in both countries many persons look forward eagerly to opportunities for swifter and more convenient movement by air.

Each nation has great ambitions in the air. Aside from the general intangibles of national pride, and from the bearing which the possession of air-transport facilities has on security and trade, the mainspring of American interest in this connection is the eagerness of American youth to find a place in aviation. The same situation obviously exists in Britain. There it is supplemented by considerations of imperial unity, however, and by the necessity of depending upon the revenues of carrier services, both sea and air, to adjust the British balance of payments.

When British and American ambitions encounter one another in the air, the result may be either direct competition or the invention of some device to avoid it.

Competition might be avoided by an allocation of traffic or by an allocation of territory. The first alternative, which is the pool, has never been popular in Britain and certainly would not be in America. The idea of allocating territory, i. e., recognizing "spheres of influence," runs into difficulty along the border lines of the proposed zones. It also runs up against the psychological difficulty that the peoples of both countries have been learning to think in global terms. They will not be patient, either in Britain or in the United States, of proposals that they be fenced off from any part of the world.

Competition may make conflict, but it need not do so. Competition between British and American air lines should be as keen, but at the same time as friendly and as cooperative in matters where cooperation is mutually advantageous, as the competition between any two of the air lines within the United States. There will be no occasion for Britain and America to parallel each other's routes throughout. But the writer believes that a substantial amount of competition will be healthful to trade and beneficial to the traveler, and further that it will cause less friction than the measures that might be devised to avoid it.

Across the North Atlantic, at any rate, parallel American and British services may be expected between New York and London. If the situation causes any more friction than arose out of the three parallel nonstop services maintained by American air lines between New York and Chicago before the war, it will be evidence of a quite needless inability of the British and American Governments to cooperate in finding fair solutions for whatever problems of scheduling, rates, or alleged unfair competitive methods may arise. Most of the problems involved in the use of each other's bases would be solved by acceptance of the fundamental right of any transport aircraft to stop for refueling at any base, whatever the nationality, and by agreement on standard traffic rules and radio procedures.

An issue between the two countries might arise out of the fact that the United States is producing military transport planes at a great rate at the present time, while British production concentrates on combat types. There has been great anxiety in British aeronautical circles and in Parliament over the possibility that the end of the war will find Britain with no aircraft that could perform creditable transport service. The industry that has produced the Spitfire and the Lancaster can obviously develop transports, and good ones; but development takes time. The Deputy Prime Minister told the House of Commons on June 1, however, that arrangements were being made for the development of four new transport types, to be carried forward as rapidly as their subordination to the priority of military requirements would permit.

American builders have certain advantages. They have had more specialized experience with transports than the British have had, and they have been accustomed to working closely with a number of air lines instead of a single one as in Britain. American factories will be producing transports at the end of the war. However, they will be models built mainly for military purposes and a large surplus of these will have accumulated. It is unlikely that there will be any occasion to continue the production of these models, and as a result American factories, like the British, will be making ready to build newer types. While the newer types are coming through the preparatory stages both countries will operate air routes with existing equipment, which probably will mean largely with surplus military aircraft no longer required by the air forces.

There should be nothing in any of these problems to make serious trouble between the two countries. If all dreams could be fulfilled, Britain and America would each like to carry the air traffic of the world. Since neither can expect to do the whole job, each must prepare to deal with the other as a friendly and cooperative competitor. The Government must not be content merely to make a rigid initial agreement. The departments concerned with civil aviation must remain in constant communication to make certain that the agreements are working

properly and to expand them or liberalize them where necessary. As in the case of many another problem of British-American relations, the underlying spirit will be more important than the legal form of the solution. The only agreement that can be genuinely satisfactory to either party in the long run will be one which will be genuinely satisfactory to both. It must leave no sting or sense of defeat to either. Both British and American air transport operations can be of benefit to both countries, and to all the rest of the world. Success in handling the air transport problem will make success easier in other fields. And any advantage that either country might seem to gain in placing political handicaps on the air transport opportunities of the other would prove to have been indeed a pyrrhic victory.

Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio adress entitled "Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace," delivered by me on the Congressional Record of the Air program over station WHN, at New York City, on October 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A permanent world peace is the heartfelt desire of every decent human being in America, but before a durable plan is plotted the domestic and world-wide problems certain to be encountered in such a gigantic undertaking should be thoroughly explored.

Naturally, too much detail would result in endless haggling, but on the other hand the hush-hush psychology of "Let's win the war first" casts suspicion. I feel that a frank consideration of post-war conditions the world over as a sound basis for post-war collaboration now, will avoid countless unfortunate tragedies and blunders later.

So far as I know, no responsible person in the United States is advocating isolation. Lightning-quick, world-wide radio communication, and modern transportation facilities have made political, cultural, social, spiritual, and commercial isolation utterly impossible in our one world. However, in the family of nations, every nation has its own conception of international morality and its own private problems that only it is competent to judge and adjust. Accepting the existence of these vital factors is not obnoxious nationalism; it is common sense

In Asia and Europe hundreds of millions of human beings are slowly starving to death. Day by day malnutrition and diseases incident to it are reaping a terrible toll. Throughout the globe economic, political, and social revolution is the order of the day Mob violence and civil wars are smoldering beneath the surface all over the continent of Europe.

In this country we face not merely the threat but the actual reality of demoralizing inflation which, one way or another, must reap a terrible toll in suffering and chaos. When the war ends the Federal Treasury will be hopelessly bankrupt. Millions of war workers will be thrown out on the street and it will require superhuman skill and ability to convert American industry quickly to a peacetime operation.

The moment war stops the full impact of these terrifying conditions will sweep us off our feet unless we are prepared for their devastating challenge. Amid the shock and joy of a sudden peace, demagogues, political theorists, opportunists, and empire builders will take full advantage of our dazed disunity to serve their unholy purposes.

We are spending more money in this war than all the United and Axis Nations put together, but that is no indication that we can make a similar peacetime contribution. There is a bottom to every barrel. Improvidence at home in making war decrees impotence abroad in the post-war period. We cannot rehabilitate the world when the war ends until after we rehabilitate ourselves. When the world discovers that we are only "poor relations," they will lose all interest in our theories of milk for the Hottentots. When he goes broke, Uncle Sam will learn to his chagrin what every former rich man learns about friendship.

Our one hope for preserving this Republic, in my opinion, is that private industry, operating under the free enterprise system and aided by an understanding and sympathetic Government, will somehow provide the opportunity quickly whereby this generation and succeeding generations may tediously toil and produce their way out of an impossible economic quagmire.

The one hope of establishing permanent order in the world is an honest and humble and unselfish and frank approach toward the post-war world by the three great powers—Russia, Britain, and America. I say "honest" because we are fooling no one but ourselves when we proclaim the Atlantic Charter publicly and go about the business of empire building privately. I say "humble' because the military strength of the three great world powers does not give them a proprietary decree from the God of justice to dominate the world. I say "unselfish" because selfisl materialism is so obviously in the forefront in both camps in this war. And I say "frank" because no nation among the United Nations has yet said what the post-war aims of the United Nations are to be. If you challenge this last statement, I ask you: What of Finland, what of the other Baltic States, what of Poland, what of the Balkans, what of Africa, what of Palestine, what of India, what of Hong Kong and Burma, what of the East Indies, and what of the minorities and the other so-called backward peoples of the earth?

We have denounced aggression for everyone. Do we mean it, or is it merely clever, high-powered double talk? Is it enough to not practice imperialism ourselves? Can we, with a clear conscience, point with pride to our well-established policy of anti-imperialism and at the very same time employ our military strength to promote and insure the success of British and Russian imperialism? With what utter contempt must the small states and the so-called backward peoples of the earth about to be gobbled up, regard such shallow hypocrisy

Both Stalin and Churchill have frankly dropped some pretty broad hints as to their objectives in the post-war world, and the emphasis has been on what they expect to get and to hold, and not on what they are to give. These strong and realistic statesmen are laying the ground work for empire building and we knowingly are aiding and abetting them.

International friendships like private friendships stem from mutual understanding, mutual respect, mutual esteem, and mutual interest, on a voluntary basis. By the very nature of things, these vital factors cannot be made compulsory. Americans who smugly advocate policing the world with our military might have not consulted human nature sufficiently. Empire building and exploiting the world and policing the world will ever go hand in hand. Unless we abandon our traditional policy of antiimperialism, we had better proceed with profound thought in the dangerous field of cooperation by military force.

We should cooperate in every possible way with everyone to establish a just and understanding world. More than that we should assume world leadership—but we should put a price on our participation in such a glorious adventure. The price should be that the whole world enjoy freedom from exploitation and subjugation. Do we have enough faith in mankind and enough honor in our hearts to play the game that way or must we forever be enchanted with the political intrigues of Europe and despise our own true destiny of advancing the cause of freedom and the dignity of liberty?

Full cooperation with other nations on any basis, and especially the proposal to enter into post-war alliances with Britain and Russia is very attractive to America, since we are so desperately anxious to win a permanent and durable peace. However, we should always remember that peace to be durable must be built upon righteousness and justice and character and mutual interests, and not on alliances. If we are going to enter into alliances we must insist that our confederates-to-be meet our standards of international integrity and morality. If they will not accept nonaggression and nonsubjugation, frankly we ought not to enter into an alliance with them. That must be our price, and if we hesitate to assert it with determination and vigor now, we will not be true to our ideals.

Substitute force for justice in international relations and you are not above Hitler's beastly conception. If we should substitute policing for the good-neighbor policy, our leadership in Latin America, built so painstakingly by Secretary Hull, would go up in the smoke of battle within the hour. We made a choice on this point when we went to war with Hitler. We must stick to that choice in the post-war world.

One of these days I hope the Senate will bring out and pass a post-war resolution that will say precisely what it means and mean precisely what it says. We must be brutally frank with Britain and Russia as well as with the victims of Hitler, and stop fawning and double-talk and hypocricy. Churchill and Stalin are hard realists and we had better acquire toughness in dealing with them or give up the game of internationalism as too rough for our sensitive souls.

Suppose Russia declines to alter her rather well-defined objectives of conquest and aggression on the Baltic, in the Balkans and in middle Europe, and Churchill insists upon holding his own come what may, must we declare war on these great powers the moment Hitler and Tojo are finished off? No, indeed. I do not advocate anything of the sort. However, I would let them and the world know that we are retiring to the Western Hemisphere with this curt pronouncement: "Gentlemen, you must accept alone the terrible responsibility of your empire expansion program. The United States is checking the whole mess in the Eastern Hemisphere to you. We do not like your policies of aggression and subjugation and we will not be a party to them." Acquiescence and participation in policies to which we cannot subscribe will never square with American ideals and will not result in a permanent and durable world peace.

I have a profound admiration for Churchill and Stalin as military leaders and statesmen but neither of them has me either hypnotized or cowered. My mind is made up to not approve empire expansion by force, by Hitler, or

by Stalin, or by Churchill. I see no other honorable way to avoid disaster to ourselves and the world.

A total abandonment of our ideals in the post-war period will ruin all chances of a durable peace. How much better it will be for our peace of mind, our own institutions, and for civilization itself, if we demand a sincere and honest program for the whole world; and if that is refused by Russia and Britain, we must remain true to our ideals and to prove our sincerity and understanding actually put into full fruition such a program in the Western Hemisphere.

The United States can and will, if she devotes herself to such a cause, weld the Americas into the finest and most wholesome international relationship ever to exist in all history. In time, if we are patient and prudent in its exercise, we can gradually extend our system of good neighborliness and cooperation to every continent.

Above all come what may we must remain steadfast to our ideals of good will among men and nations.

Senators Urged To Support the Steel Program Formulated — Development of Native Iron Ores for Use by Local Industries Favored by 26 Governors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech by Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama,

It is gratifying to learn that the Senate has become concerned about developing our natural resources I understand there is soon to be appointed a committee clothed with investigative authority identical to that under which our House committee has operated continuously ever since its original appointment during the Seventy-seventh Congress. Like our group investigating the steel situation, these Senators also urge the conversion of our idle mineral resources by local industrial production for both war and peacetime requirements.

SENATE INTEREST MARKS OFF THE SECOND MILE

We of the House, therefore, may regard the recent gathering on the Senate side as constituting a genuine recognition that the work under way on the House side has made a genuine impression over the Nation. The fact is, this work is already well into the second mile.

We of the House invite them, as companions, to render all assistance possible within their own spheres of influence. They are also pledged to help in putting the scattered local iron ore resources to work. Where the natural development of local industries has been retarded by steel monopoly practices these Senators may well redouble the pressure for remedial action.

We of the House regard this expression of interest as clear recognition that in small business lies the hope of this Nation and that through local independent production of steel lies in a large measure the answer to the threatening problem of post-war unemployment in this land of plenty.

Such grass roots are now taking hold. Over the Nation, local businessmen, chambers of commerce, civic and labor organizations, and the alert editors are beginning to ask: "What about doing something real to employ our natural resources lying dormant beneath our feet?" For now every school child has come to realize that humble iron and steel, the master metals of war and peace, must be available in abundance in the locality where industry is to prosper.

Yes, the Governors of 26 States are actively backing our committee's work. Several have headed special delegations to Washington, while significant groups have petitioned for the adjournment of our committee to their locality to examine into their industrial situations.

THOROUGH WORK BY MEMBERS EXPLAINS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, you will recall, led the fight to have the whole steel shortage situation thoroughly examined. This finally culminated, but rather late, and not until the great Higgins contract calling for the construction of 200 Liberty ships at New Orleans was canceled on the ground that there was not enough steel.

Our House committee was then created specifically to go into the steel situation, and it has done well under the circumstances.

Since that time I, as chairman, have witnessed real accomplishments. Unpublicized remedial actions have taken place, for this group took its assignment in dead earnest.

We were most fortunate in the types of men chosen, for there was confusion, downright interference, and almost no funds.

Our work was especially benefited by the indefatigable labor of such fine public servants as Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH, of California, to Congressman FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of New York, who has since passed on; to Congressman GORDON CANFIELD of New Jersey, to Congressman HENRY JACKSON of Washington, Congressman WINDER HARRIS of Virginia, and Congressman MEYER of Maryland. Later, as the Seventy-eighth Congress convened, two additions were made to fill vacancies. The very able and helpful Congressman JOSEPH MANSFIELD, of Texas, who is better known as the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and Congressman CECIL R. KING, of California, who has headed a persistent probing into the iron and steel scrap situation facing war production.

Our committee is, of course, continuing its original inquiry into the steel situation. It intends to carry on with probing and prodding until genuine solutions are assured and until ships of steel and armaments pour forth in the volume needed to win the war. Then it intends to relieve the sanitary and other civilian and agriculture impairments forced upon us by this steel shortage crisis.

The defense minded remember Congressman WELCH who on this floor led the early fight in the decade past to restore shipbuilding on the Pacific coast. It was then as clear to this veteran champion of our American resources as it is now to us all, that our No. 1 handicap to effective service to this Nation at war was our steel situation. Yes, the ability of coast shipbuilders is well known. The records are unequaled in history, but little is it realized that every ship is still built under a tremendous handicap.

STEEL FOR HULLS MUST BE SHIPPED ACROSS ENTIRE COUNTRY

Little is it known that almost every pound of the steel entering these ship hulls has to be shipped out there across this wide and expansive Nation. Think of the needless waste of time and delays, the mounting inventory troubles and dispatching problems these shipbuilders must face in their struggle to help win this war.

These huge operations are in constant jeopardy; for that steel is not made from the rich ores that abound throughout our West. Instead that steel is made almost entirely east of the Mississippi. Then it is exposed to many weeks in transit over badly congested rail facilities.

In those early days the clamor for the building of steel plants on the coast fell on deaf ears. Certain shipbuilding interests, of course, frowned on the idea. The steel masters realized too that to make steel on the coast out of local iron ore, would put an end to their peculiar pricing system, formerly referred to as "Pittsburgh Plus."

Well, we lost then but only for a time. Some progress is of record. But the 600,000 ton output anticipated from the Kaiser Steel Plant cannot commence to meet the coast industries' requirements. A vast shortage of vital steel persists and unless more steel plants are built, it is certain to doom forever many a district to the fate of abandonment and endless unemployment.

SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS DIRECTLY DUE BOYKIN COMMITTEE LEADERSHIP

Recordings of the open hearings and the full outline of unfinished business of our committee will soon be released. I would, however, at this time invite your attention to two of our many accomplishments. Though unheralded, both significantly reflect a phase of our committee's approach.

The first is the process for making the iron metal from iron ore without the usual necessity of consuming any coking coal. You may know that as long as the steel industry, in making the iron metal out of the native iron ores, sticks to the use of but the one process, which requires huge blast furnaces and coke, our competitive economics require that the facilities and plants used must be near or accessible to the coking coal deposits. As these resources are found to exist in but a few sections of the country, the blast furnace and freight become forces that limit the development of metal industries to these few sections.

The Nation will, however, soon learn that an excellent quality of iron can be made commercially from ores without using any coal or coke—thanks to fertile minds and the will to dare something unconventional. Here is another H. A. Brassert production. After designing the largest steel plant known and building successful iron and steel facilities to reduce the local iron ores to the metal here and in a dozen other countries, this pioneer has now turned his talents to the growing problem of small business facing his own country.

Instead of coke or coal, this process is designed to use hydrogen. And it is to produce not pounds, but tons of iron—at a cost of production and with a purity that makes it easily competitive to pig iron for making the better grades of steels and alloys.

This winter the 35,000-ton iron plant using hydrogen at Warren, Ohio, commences operation. Here the hydrogen is obtained as a byproduct from a local gas source. Despite intense opposition from its inception, our committee has encouraged it and is carefully expediting this development. The reason is evident. There are many areas of the country that have local iron ore deposits. They also are capable of producing hydrogen from such abundant local resources as natural gas, the cheaper grade coals, lignite, peat, or electricity.

The perfection of this modern process and demonstration plant spells real hope for large sections of the country heretofore industrially retarded.

EXPLORATION OF IRON DEPOSITS ESSENTIAL TO SOUND STEEL PROGRAM

Our committee learned that the Senators were being asked to approve the meager Bureau of Mines request for $314,000 for the exploration of raw materials for steel production in only six States. This the BOYKIN

committee considered as woefully inadequate and too sectional in its benefits. So the second accomplishment culminated on this floor when it formulated a $2,000,000 substitute and promptly received an almost unanimous House vote, a genuine vote of confidence.

As a result every State in the Union endowed with substantial ore deposits is to benefit. Once this raw material for steel production is identified, located, measured by core drilling for its tonnage, and analyzed for quality characteristics—then and not until then can the engineers compute accurately the mining costs needed for advising private investors about plant locations in the area and other matters such as metallurgical processes and facilities to be used.

BUREAU OF MINES AND STATE COOPERATION TO EMPHASIZE SMALL-BUSINESS NEEDS

You will recall that our committee at that time made a pledge to the Congress, and it promptly got the support required. It assured the Congress that it would continue its persistent efforts for the next year, and it would serve in a liaison-supervisory capacity, to assist in perfecting a seriously needed program of cooperation between the Bureau of Mines and the different departments in the various States whose congressional districts are interested in expediting these timely explorations.

Let us not lose sight of the small business interests in this vital steel industry. I refer to the so-called nonintegrated companies, the producers of finished steel products who are still dependent upon the big steel companies for their raw materials, such as pig iron. Here they have repeatedly pleaded their causes with confidence. Here they regularly receive encouragement, sincere cooperation, and friendly counsel.

SENATORS ADD REAL STRENGTH

Now that the steel program is on its second mile of an eventful journey, our committee on the House side extends its congratulations to these fearless-minded Senators; for there is great work to be done. The country is becoming conscious of the need for decentralization—by the expansion of iron and steel making facilities at locations in the retarded areas of the Nation.

This profound objective alone is big enough to enroll the support of every Member of the Congress.

Our committee's freedom of action and the absence of red tape explains why the work of our House group has been so widely felt. The trail has already been blazed through, well past the first mile—the toughest part of the journey.

May these efforts on both sides of the Congress result in a greater realization that hand in hand with the right to earn a decent living through work is the recognition that America's genius must be free to produce and that there must be freedom of enterprise for small business.

Newspaper Advertising Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me to the Alabama Press Association at Birmingham, Ala., August 18, 1943, on Senate bill 723, commonly known as the newspaper advertising bill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Raising enough money to finance the war—hundreds of billions of dollars—is the financial task ahead of us. The two principal sources of revenue are taxes and bond sales. The Treasury Department handles both of them. The rate of taxes for each taxpayer is fixed by law; payment is compulsory. Bond purchases are entirely voluntary.

Great Britain and Canada are spending large sums of money buying newspaper space to use in urging the people to buy Government War bonds. They have had great success and are pleased with the program. Our Treasury Department has declined to use paid advertising to increase bond sales. I introduced a bill in the Senate, and later Hon. CLARENCE CANNON introduced the same bill in the House, requiring the expenditure of not less than $25,000,000 and not more than $30,000,000 each fiscal year during the present war for advertising in newspapers the sale of War bonds, and providing that at least one-half of the total amount made available shall be spent with weekly and semiweekly newspapers. There are in the United States approximately 9,000 weekly and semiweekly newspapers qualified for Government paid advertising, and about 1,800 daily newspapers, not including foreign-language newspapers.

NO THREAT TO FREEDOM OF PRESS

Some of the opponents of the Bankhead-Cannon bill have asserted that its passage will destroy the freedom of the press. It is claimed by some of the big papers—and a few small ones who sometimes accept the thinking of the big ones—that the purchase of space by the Government for advertising the sale of the largest series of Government War bonds in the history of the world constitutes a subsidy which is likely to sap and ultimately destroy the independence of the press. That claim has so little substance and so little justification based upon experience for 150 years that the implication promptly arises that it is being made by special pleaders in the absence of sound arguments with which to oppose the passage of the bond sale advertising bill. As one who has observed for many years the independent and honorable attitude of editors and publishers as a class, I am impressed that the objection to the bill based upon suspicion of convenient consciences or moral flabbiness is totally unworthy of serious consideration. There is nothing in the Bankhead-Cannon bill that threatens in any way the constitutional right of the press to maintain complete liberty and independence.

ADEQUATE SAFEGUARDS INCLUDED

Adequate protection and safeguards against unworthy efforts by the Treasury Department to exert improper influence on newspapers are contained in the bill. I quote the following provisions in the bill:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in cooperation with recognized existing publishers' associations to be designated by him (including one such association representing only daily newspapers, one representing only weekly newspapers, and one representing only newspaper advertising agencies), prescribe regulations for carrying out the newspaper advertising program herein provided for so as to—

(a) secure the best financial results for the United States consistent with such program;

(b) completely safeguard the freedom of the press;

(c) fairly allocate advertisements to individual newspapers;

(d) prepare material for submission to newspapers for use as advertisements;

(e) avoid interference in any manner with the independence of any newspaper or its responsibility in serving its readers;

(f) keep the war finance campaign in all of its phases as nonpartisan as possible; and

(g) protect editors and publishers in their right to publish criticism of the policies or conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury or of any other public official whenever they determine that such criticism is justified."

The requirement that the Secretary of the Treasury shall set up administrative committees composed of representatives of publishers' associations and newspaper advertising agencies was not included because of lack of confidence by the authors in the integrity of the officials of the Treasury Department. It was included to assure doubting newspapers that the program would be administered justly and also give all newspapers a fair division of the advertisements under regulations adopted and administered by the approval of their own representatives. That requirement was also included in the bill to assure an administration along the lines which are proving entirely satisfactory to the press and the Government of Canada.

SUBSIDY CHARGE ABSURD

Paid newspaper advertising of war bond sales has frequently been denounced by opposing newspapers as a subsidy program. Secretary Morgenthau has called it a subsidy. What is a subsidy? Webster's Elementary School Dictionary defines subsidy as follows: "A government grant to assist a private enterprise; any gift made by way of financial aid." Is it a gift to a newspaper when the Government pays it for the labor and expense incurred in printing an advertisement explaining the need by the United States for large sums of money in conducting the war effort and of the great value in raising much of the needed money by the sale of War bonds? Is payment for such services by a newspaper and the surrender by the newspaper of the necessary space a grant or a gift or a subsidy?

Very recently the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has announced that it will buy space in the newspapers to sell 10,000 homes under its control. I am wondering if the papers which get those advertisements regarded them as subsidies. It seems strange that some people believe that advertisements for the sale of War bonds sponsored and paid for by business corporations do not threaten the independence of the press and do not constitute subsidies, and that advertisements for the sale through a Government agency of Government-owned property do not endanger the liberty of the press and do not constitute subsidies, but that paid advertisements by the Government for the sale of War bonds create a terrible menace to the independence of the press and constitutes subsidies. That position is absurd.

NO LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE

Why do some editors charge that the sale of advertising space to the Government will weaken the convictions of editors and publishers of papers that accept such advertisements in the regular course of business and under a mandate by Congress that such advertisements must be placed in the newspapers? Before Congress passes the bill a majority of each House must decide that such advertisements are in the public interest and will help secure the money necessary to successfully conduct the war. The charge of loss of independence as a result of selling newspaper space under an act of Congress requiring the Government to buy such space is utterly ridiculous.

It is truly unfortunate that in so great a field of useful service as that of the press of this country—made up of thousands of men and women great in character and intellect—an effort should be made by a minority, however powerful that minority be, however

strong it may be in newspaper circulation and in finances, to defeat a proposed legitimate and much-needed advertising program by attempting to generate doubt in the minds of the people and of the Members of Congress about the ability of the newspaper fraternity to stand firm and true to its convictions and to maintain and retain the independence of the press in the event a business plan—similar to the one which has been working successfully for some time in Great Britain and Canada—is put into operation in this country.

The Government has from time to time this year placed advertisements with selected newspapers. The War and Navy Departments have placed a lot of paid advertising. Can anyone claim that such advertising has altered in the slightest degree the attitude of the newspaper carrying it in its relation to public affairs? I call on anyone who fears a debilitating effect on newspapers by so-called subsidizing advertisements to point a finger of scorn at such weak and erring publishers and identify them. Are the sponsored advertisements being used so generously throughout the country in whole-page advertisements by large taxpayers subsidizing and weakening the independence of the newspaper that solicits and gets such profitable advertisements from large corporations who have nothing to sell the public? I have heard of no bad turncoat effect on any newspaper.

PRESENT SYSTEM INADEQUATE

The system of sponsored advertising works well where the public has been convinced of the need for all-out cooperation and where there are corporations and firms who are accustomed to using large-scale advertising. However, the small city dailies and weekly newspapers do not enjoy their proportionate part of such business. The present system operates in its application and effect as a discouraging discrimination against such newspapers. Under the existing method of hit-or-miss sponsored advertising and the absence of an adequate number of such advertisements in small city and rural area newspapers, the need for all-out participation in war financing has not been sold to millions of good citizens. Four families out of ten—40 percent—have not bought a War bond. Millions of people do not read metropolitan newspapers. They read only small city dailies and weeklies. I submit that many sponsored advertisements not prepared or supervised by the Government do not carry an effective sales talk on the duty of everyone to buy War bonds if he possibly can. I do not mean to criticize the plan of sponsored advertisements. It serves a good purpose as far as it goes, and should be continued by all means, whether the Government enters the field of paid advertising or not.

GOVERNMENT ADS SUPPLEMENTAL

Government advertising should be supplemental to sponsored advertising. Government advertising should go into all the newspapers and not be confined to the newspapers that find sponsors for advertising. Government advertisements, prepared by expert advertising agencies and published where the large metropolitan papers do not go, would doubtless bring to the Treasury additional hundreds of millions of dollars by greatly increasing the total bond sales and thereby more widely distribute bonds among the people. Drastic steps should be taken to transfer a large part of the absorption of the public debt from banks to individuals. From March 31, 1941, to June 30, 1943, the increase in the public debt was $87,000,000,000. The net change in holdings (bond purchases) of commercial banks, Federal Reserve banks, mutual savings banks, insurance companies, Federal Government agencies, and trust funds was 51.5 billion dollars. All other investors acquired only 35.5 billion, or about 40 percent of the total. It would be exceedingly healthy and fortunate if these figures could be reversed. The bulk of buying should be switched from cities to the towns and country—from bankers to individuals. The population of small towns exceeds that of large cities. When the farm population is considered, the preponderance against the large cities is great. The bond sales campaigns should be brought to the plain people in small cities and rural areas with the strongest sales arguments, presented by media in which the rank and file of the people have confidence. Let the metropolitan press and the daily newspapers in large cities everywhere continue the good job they did in the last campaign. With Government advertising added to what they can do, and the effective appeals which smaller dailies and weekly papers can present to millions of small town and rural people through Government advertisements and such sponsored advertisements as they can get, and through their own editorial appeals. I believe it is safe to assert that newspapers generally, if aided and encouraged by some remuneration by the Government for purchased space, would render immediately more free service to the Government in promoting the sale of Government securities.

IMPRESSIVE PRECEDENTS

Fortunately, there have been important and impressive precedents in the matter of Government-paid advertising for raising money to conduct war. In England the Government has conducted a paid advertising campaign for the sale of its war securities for more than a year, with highly satisfactory results. The British Government during 1942 spent nearly $10,000,000 for advertising. In Canada advertising expenditures for war purposes in 1942 amounted to approximately $3,000,000. Much of the money spent in both of these countries was devoted to newspaper advertising.

The following statement made by Mr. H. R. Long, manager of the Missouri Press Association, was recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator CLARK of Missouri:

"One of the interesting sidelights on this question (Government-paid newspaper advertising) is that the Federal Gover ment is an old-time buyer of newspaper space and that in all probability the very first advertising campaign of truly national proportions was undertaken by the Treasury Department during the War between the States. At first the war-loan issues of that day found little favor with the public. The bond issue of 1862 was a failure until Jay Cooke, a Philadelphia banker, was called in by Salmon P. Chase, then Secretary of the Treasury, to handle the campaign. Cooke did the job successfully—by the means of advertising.

"In 1864 when Secretary Chase was succeeded by William P. Fessenden, bond sales had fallen off, and the Government again needed money badly. Cooke was called back. This time he selected Peaslee & Co., an advertising agency operated by L. F. Shuttuck, to handle the war-loan advertising. Advertisements were placed in every known newspaper in the Union, regardless of size. Altogether, war-loan advertising appeared in four or five thousand newspapers and was paid for by the Government at the newspapers' regular rates. Fessenden had with difficulty sold $133,000,000 in bonds in 7 months; Cooke and the newspapers in less than 6 months sold $600,000,000 worth.

"If the use of paid Government advertising in 1864 caused the newspapers to sell out to bureaucracy of that day, the records fail to show it. In fact, the robust, outspoken policies so characteristic of the newspapers of the reconstruction period definitely were not in keeping with the behavior to be expected of a kept press."

GOVERNMENT PAYS INDIRECTLY

The Government in an indirect way is paying for a large part of the costs for sponsored war bond sale advertisements, although it does not select the newspapers in which the advertisements appear and does not control the material and arguments that appear in such advertisements. The sponsors deduct the amount paid newspapers as a part of the cost of operating their businesses, thereby securing compensatory reductions in their income taxes. Where a sponsor is in a high tax bracket he gets pay from the Government in an indirect way for a large percentage of the amount paid newspapers on account of sponsored advertising. The amount of taxes lost to the Government as a result of the sponsored advertising plan is not an open public transaction. The amount of taxes saved to the sponsors is not shown by direct records in the Treasury Department. Each deduction as a part of the cost of operating a business is a concealed transaction. The amount paid by sponsors is a matter of agreement with the newspapers carrying the sponsored advertisements.

The Secretary of the Treasury is opposed to the passage of the Bankhead-Cannon bill. He is rejecting the crown (political power), either because he does not want to control the press or because he knows he cannot do so under the provisions of the plain, business-like program provided for in the Bankhead-Cannon bill. In other words, the Secretary has more confidence in the stability of the press than have some members of the press itself.

RIDING FREE HORSE TO DEATH

It appears, however, that the Secretary wants to ride a free horse to death. Appeals to patriotism have secured free and unlimited service for the Government's bond sale campaign by daily and weekly newspapers throughout the country. The Secretary wants to continue that free advertising in spite of adverse financial results that may accrue to countless newspapers lacking the advantage of adequate sponsored advertising. As a result, some papers favored with sponsored advertising are growing stronger and thousands of financially weak newspapers are growing weaker. The Government wants to use their space without compensation. Many of their former advertisers have discontinued newspaper advertising because they have nothing to sell or because advertising is totally unnecessary to find buyers for their reduced stocks. Material and labor costs have increased. Taxes are higher.

The weekly newspapers are the greatest sufferers from war conditions. Many weeklies have found it necessary to fold up. These papers are prized institutions in the towns and rural areas where they circulate. They have given to their Government until it hurts. They have not threatened to strike. They are going through to the end or as long as they can endure. It is not right for the Government to oppress them as is being done by sending them countless pamphlets, mats, suggestions, arguments, and sales material for publication but withholding all compensation for service and space acquired. These newspapers are close to the people and are capable of rendering far more service than the present uncompensated system permits.

Most of the corporations buying newspaper space, like the Ford Motor Co., have nothing to sell at this time. They are spending large sums for advertising, yet they want no orders. They are in position to select the newspapers from whom they buy space and to withhold future advertisements if the editorial attitude of a newspaper on subjects of business practices or of national policies does not suit them. Newspapers know that big

advertisers, as well as contributors to sponsored advertisements, are free to give a newspaper their business or to withhold it and place it with newspapers that agree with them. Under the Bankhead-Cannon bill the Secretary of the Treasury has no discretion about placing or withholding advertisements. He cannot react in placing advertisements to reflect editorial attitudes. He is not left free under the bill to place advertisements to suit his own fancy or objectives. He is required to fairly allocate advertisements to individual newspapers under regulations prescribed in cooperation with representatives of newspaper associations and advertising agencies. With complete freedom of representatives of special interests to give or withhold a staggering volume of advertising business it seems clear that such power is a greater threat of coercion and of loss of independence to the press than would be Government advertising under the protective and safeguarding provisions of the pending bill. If there is any group of thinkers in this country who ought to believe in the application of logic and consistency in the domain of public affairs, it is the newspaper editors. There is no doubt that an overwhelming majority of them favor the passage of a paid newspaper advertising bill, and they are clearly right.

SPONSORED ADS DECREASING

There is a growing reluctance by newspapers to solicit sponsored advertisements. I have information from several newspapers that there is an increasing resistance to cooperation in sponsored advertising. The Government pays for everything it buys and for all services rendered it in all phases of carrying on the war effort, with one exception—it declines to pay for newspaper space used in raising the money to pay for everything else.

ALL-OUT SUPPORT ESSENTIAL

Secretary Morgenthau in a form letter "to all newspapers" said:

"To be successful our effort must reach into every home in the land, because money must come primarily from individual Americans." Also:

"The people of your community look first to their newspapers for leadership when united action is needed and this loan can only succeed through such action." Also:

"We need this all-out support of newspapers to make this drive a success."

FOR BEST INTEREST OF PUBLIC

The passage of the Bankhead-Cannon bill will save the life and independence of many small city daily and weekly newspapers. The operation of a sufficient number of newspapers able to reach the masses of the people is almost as important as is the independence of the press, which has been safeguarded primarily for the welfare of all the people. In conducting the campaign to favorably publicize the staggering requirements of the Treasury of the United States newspapers are rendering tremendously helpful service. The Government, however, should in the public interest cooperate more efficiently and equitably with our "home town" newspapers.

Covenant of the League of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in connection with the post-war problems and resolutions which are being discussed, it occurred to me it might be a good idea to have printed, for the information of Senators, the Covenant of the League of Nations. The current issue of the United States News, whose editor is David Lawrence, contains the Covenant of the League of Nations, together with editorial comment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the United States News of October 15, 1943]

THE COVENANT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The Covenant of the League of Nations still lives. It is built into the existing treaty structure of 44 nations. Let the United States ratify this Covenant now and pray God to give us the will and the courage to make it at last an effective instrument of international cooperation. For by its provisions, special alliances are expressly forbidden and, instead, the member nations are equally obligated to use all their force and resources as against aggressor states—whether members or nonmembers—to enforce and maintain the peace of the world. (David Lawrence.)

The High Contracting Parties, in order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just and honourable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations.

ARTICLE 1

The original Members of the League of Nations shall be those of the Signatories which are named in the Annex to this Covenant and also such of those other States named in the Annex as shall accede without reservation to this Covenant. Such accession shall be effected by a Declaration deposited with the Secretariat within two months of the coming into force of the Covenant. Notice thereof shall be sent to all other Members of the League.

Any fully self-governing State, Dominion, or Colony not named in the Annex may become a Member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it shall give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military, naval, and air forces and armaments.

Any Member of the League may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the League, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal.

ARTICLE 2

The action of the League under this Covenant shall be effected through the instrumentality of an Assembly and of a Council, with a permanent Secretariat.

ARTICLE 3

The Assembly shall consist of Representatives of the Members of the League.

The Assembly shall meet at stated intervals and from time to time as occasion may require at the Seat of the League or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

At meetings of the Assembly each Member of the League shall have one vote, and may not have more than three Representatives.

ARTICLE 4

The Council shall consist of Representatives of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, together with Representatives of four other Members of the League. These four Members of the League shall be selected by the Assembly from time to time in its discretion. Until the appointment of the Representatives of the four Members of the League first selected by the Assembly, Representatives of Belgium, Brazil, Spain, and Greece shall be members of the Council.

With the approval of the majority of the Assembly, the Council may name additional Members of the League whose Representatives shall always be members of the Council; the Council with like approval may increase the number of Members of the League to be selected by the Assembly for representation on the Council.

The Assembly shall fix by a two-thirds majority the rules dealing with the election of the non-permanent Members of the Council, and particularly such regulations as relate to their term of office and the conditions of re-eligibility.

The Council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year, at the Seat of the League, or at such other place as may be decided upon.

The Council may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world.

Any Member of the League not represented on the Council shall be invited to send a Representative to sit as a member at any meeting of the Council during the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that Member of the League.

At meetings of the Council, each Member of the League represented on the Council shall have one vote, and may have not more than one Representative.

ARTICLE 5

Except where otherwise expressly provided in this Covenant or by the terms of the present Treaty, decisions at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

All matters of procedure at meetings of the Assembly or of the Council, including the appointment of Committees to investigate particular matters, shall be regulated by the Assembly or by the Council and may be decided by a majority of the Members of the League represented at the meeting.

The first meeting of the Assembly and the first meeting of the Council shall be summoned by the President of the United States of America.

ARTICLE 6

The permanent Secretariat shall be established at the Seat of the League. The Secretariat shall compromise a Secretary General and such secretaries and staff as may be required.

The first Secretary General shall be the person named in the Annex; thereafter the Secretary General shall be appointed by the Council with the approval of the majority of the Assembly.

The secretaries and staff of the Secretariat shall be appointed by the Secretary General with the approval of the Council.

The Secretary General shall act in that capacity at all meetings of the Assembly and of the Council.

The expenses of the League shall be borne by the Members of the League in the proportion decided by the Assembly.

ARTICLE 7

The Seat of the League is established at Geneva.

The Council may at any time decide that the Seat of the League shall be established elsewhere.

All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women.

Representatives of the Members of the League and officials of the League when engaged on the business of the League shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

The buildings and other property occupied by the League or its officials or by Representatives attending its meetings shall be inviolable.

ARTICLE 8

The Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

Such plans shall be subject to reconsideration and revision at least every ten years.

After these plans shall have been adopted by the several Governments, the limits of armaments therein fixed shall not be exceeded without the concurrence of the Council.

The Members of the League agree that the manufacture by private enterprise of munitions and implements of war is open to grave objections. The Council shall advise how the evil effects attendant upon such manufacture can be prevented, due regard being had to the necessities of those Members of the League which are not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety.

The Members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval, and air programs and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes.

ARTICLE 9

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to advise the Council on the execution of the provisions of Articles 1 and 8 and on military, naval, and air questions generally.

ARTICLE 10

The Members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

ARTICLE 11

Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

ARTICLE 12

The Members of the League agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to judicial settlement or to inquiry by the Council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the Council.

In any case under this Article the award of the arbitrators or the judicial decision shall be made within a reasonable time, and the report of the Council shall be made within six months after the submission of the dispute.

ARTICLE 13

The Members of the League agree that, whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement, and which cannot be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to arbitration or judicial settlement.

Disputes as to the interpretation of a treaty, as to any question of international law, as to the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of any international obligation, or as to the extent and nature of the reparation to be made for any such breach, are declared to be among those which are generally suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement.

For the consideration of any such dispute, the court to which the case is referred shall be the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in accordance with Article 14, or any tribunal agreed on by the parties to the dispute or stipulated in any convention existing between them.

The Members of the League agree that they will carry out in full and good faith any award or decision that may be rendered, and that they will not resort to war against a Member of the League which complies therewith. In the event of any failure to carry out such an award or decision, the Council shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto.

ARTICLE 14

The Council shall formulate and submit to the Members of the League for adoption plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. The Court shall be competent to hear and determine any dispute of an international character which the parties thereto submit to it. The Court may also give an advisory opinion upon any dispute or question referred to it by the Council or by the Assembly.

ARTICLE 15

If there should arise between Members of the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration or judicial settlement in accordance with Article 13, the Members of the League agree that they will submit the matter to the Council. Any party to the dispute may effect such submission by giving notice of the existence of the dispute to the Secretary General, who will make all necessary arrangements for a full investigation and consideration thereof.

For this purpose the parties to the dispute will communicate to the Secretary General, as promptly as possible, statements of their case with all the relevant facts and papers, and the Council may forthwith direct the publication thereof.

The Council shall endeavor to effect a settlement of the dispute, and, if such efforts are successful, a statement shall be made public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereof as the Council may deem appropriate.

If the dispute is not thus settled, the Council either unanimously or by a majority vote shall make and publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute and the recommendations which are deemed just and proper in regard thereto.

Any Member of the League represented on the Council may make public a statement of the facts of the dispute and of its conclusions regarding the same.

If a report by the Council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

If the Council fails to reach a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the Members of the League reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice.

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the Council, to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the Council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

The Council may in any case under this Article refer the dispute to the Assembly. The dispute shall be so referred at the request of either party to the dispute, provided that such request be made within fourteen days after the submission of the dispute to the Council.

In any case referred to the Assembly, all the provisions of this Article and of Article 12 relating to the action and powers of the Council shall apply to the action and powers of the Assembly, provided that a report made by the Assembly, if concurred in by the Representatives of those Members of the League represented on the Council and of a majority of the other Members of the League, exclusive in each case of the Representatives of the parties to the dispute, shall have the same force as a report by the Council concurred in by all the Members thereof other than the Representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute.

ARTICLE 16

Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard to its covenants under Articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other Members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a Member of the League or not.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval, air force the Members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

The Members of the League agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article, in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their number by the covenant-breaking State, and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of the Members of the League which are cooperating to protect the covenants of the League.

Any Member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a Member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred

in by the Representatives of all the other Members of the League represented thereon.

ARTICLE 17

In the event of a dispute between a Member of the League and a State which is not a Member of the League, or between States not Members of the League, the State or States not Members of the League shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purpose of such dispute, upon such conditions as the Council may deem just. If such invitation is accepted, the provisions of Articles 12 to 16 inclusive shall be applied with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the Council.

Upon such invitation being given the Council shall immediately institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the dispute and recommend such action as may seem best and most effectual in the circumstances.

If a State so invited shall refuse to accept the obligations of membership in the League for the purposes of such dispute, and shall resort to war against a Member of the League, the provisions of Article 16 shall be applicable as against the State taking such action.

If both parties to the dispute when so invited refuse to accept the obligation of membership in the League for the purpose of such dispute, the Council may take such measures and make such recommendations as will prevent hostilities and will result in the settlement of the dispute.

ARTICLE 18

Every treaty or international engagement entered into hereafter by any Member of the League shall be forthwith registered with the Secretariat and shall as soon as possible be published by it. No such treaty or international engagement shall be binding until so registered.

ARTICLE 19

The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by Members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world.

ARTICLE 20

The Members of the League severally agree that this Covenant is accepted as abrogating all obligations or understandings *inter se* which are inconsistent with the terms thereof, and solemnly undertake that they will not hereafter enter into any engagements inconsistent with the terms thereof.

In case any Member of the League shall, before becoming a Member of the League, have undertaken any obligations inconsistent with the terms of this Covenant, it shall be the duty of such Member to take immediate steps to procure its release from such obligations.

ARTICLE 21

Nothing in this Covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace.

ARTICLE 22

To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League.

The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions, and other similar circumstances.

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory.

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic, and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

There are territories, such as Southwest Africa and certain of the South Pacific Islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centers of civilization, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

In every case of mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by the Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.

ARTICLE 23

Subject to and in accordance with the provisions of international convention existing or hereafter to be agreed upon the Members of the League: (a) will endeavor to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labor for men, women, and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary international organization; (b) undertake to secure just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories under their control; (c) will entrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to the traffic in women and children, and the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs; (d) will entrust the League with the general supervision of the trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which the control of this traffic is necessary in the common interest; (e) will make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all Members of the League. In this connection, the special necessities of the regions devastated during the war of 1914–1918 shall be borne in mind; (f) will endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease.

ARTICLE 24

There shall be placed under the direction of the League all international bureaus already established by general treaties if the parties to such treaties consent. All such international bureaus and all commissions for the regulation of matters of international interest hereafter constituted shall be placed under the direction of the League.

In all matters of international interest which are regulated by general conventions but which are not placed under the control of international bureaus or commissions, the Secretariat of the League shall, subject to the consent of the Council and if desired by the parties, collect and distribute all relevant information and shall render any other assistance which may be necessary or desirable.

The Council may include as part of the expenses of the Secretariat the expenses of any bureau or commission which is placed under the dirction of the League.

ARTICLE 25

The Members of the League agree to encourage and promote the establishment and cooperation of duly authorized voluntary national Red Cross organizations having as purposes the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and the mitigation of suffering throughout the world.

ARTICLE 26

Amendments to this Covenant will take effect when ratified by the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Council and by a majority of the Members of the League whose Representatives compose the Assembly.

No such amendment shall bind any Member of the League which signifies its dissent therefrom, but in that case it shall cease to be a Member of the League.

(The foregoing is the full text of the Covenant of the League of Nations, with all amendments to date.)

Facts, Figures, and Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. DOUGLAS BUCK

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Facts, Figures and Promises," delivered by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] at the annual dinner of the Controllers Institute of America, New York City, September 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your organization, the Controllers Institute of America, is composed of men whose careers have led them to cultivate a passion for facts and figures. You appreciate the value of factual data. You have learned to dig out the facts and the figures. You know how to evaluate them and how to separate

the truly factual from the fictitious. And you have the ability to utilize this information so that it will present a valid picture upon which to base a plan of action. Conversely, you—above all men—can appreciate the helplessness of any enterprise, be it private or public, which is compelled to make decisions which are not predicated upon factual data, or which are based upon administrative regulations which lack a solid foundation.

Yet this latter condition is the one in which your Congress finds itself today. In order to perform its legislative function the Congress must have ready access to an enormous amount of statistical and factual information which will give its Members an accurate picture of the conditions confronting industry, agriculture, commerce, finance, labor, and foreign trade. But Congress is often handicapped in securing the facts and its Members frequently are forced to rely on information procured from administrative agencies which, either because of incompetence or deliberate intent, is sometimes found to be inadequate, inaccurate, and conflicting. Oftentimes the administrative branch of government refuses to give essential information to congressional committees, however much they may need it in order to arrive at the decisions they are expected to make. And never were the true facts more urgently needed than they are today.

Take post-war planning as an instance. You businessmen must not for one single moment overlook your vital stake in whatever plans are proposed and decided upon for redeveloping our national economy in the post-war period. Government, as well as business, is engaged in post-war planning. Did you know that 30 of the 245 agencies now engaged in post-war planning are Federal bureaus? They are financed through taxation—and much of their work involves duplication, overlapping, and the employment of unnecessary manpower. Some duplication is unavoidable, even necessary, but there is no reliable leadership to coordinate the work of these planning agencies.

Some of the Federal planners are drafting their proposals along the line of a "planned economy" which would revolutionize our economic and social system, in a manner that is alien to our American way of life. Their plans repudiate all our traditional conceptions of public finance, and our American pattern of governmental relationships with industry, business, and agriculture. These planners minimize the dangers of an unbalanced Federal budget and an ever-increasing Federal debt. They call for an expenditure of public funds on a level never before considered or dreamed of.

Not only do these "planners" regard cost as a secondary matter, they propose changes in our political system which they admit—and even boast—will curb our traditional liberties. Their "plans" ignore the fact that individual opportunity, properly established and protected, would make it unnecessary for the Government to do most of these things. They overlook the truth that our people do not wish to be serfs or wards of the state—and that men, standing on their own feet, made America great.

These planners of an alien breed maintain that we in the United States are really fighting two wars. One, they say, is abroad—against the Axis. The other is here, at home—and they call it the people's revolution

I am not crying "wolf!" These are facts, not fancies. The blueprints are already published for all to see. They call for the Federal ownership and control of our public utilities, of our transportation and shipping facilities, of our investments and even of our land. Nor are they blueprints only. Already the Federal Government owns $16,000,000,000 worth of manufacturing plants and equipment, much of it built during this war emergency. These Federal planners of whom I speak intend that the Federal Government shall retain the ownership of these plants after the war, and they plan to use them as an instrument to secure Federal control of our key industries.

And land? Already the Federal Government owns land aggregating almost 300,000,000 acres. That is an area equal to the combined areas of New England, all the Middle Atlantic States, including Maryland and West Virginia, as well as the entire State of Pennsylvania, the Southern States of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama, plus Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana. Twenty-one States, with enough left over to make 32 Districts of Columbia. One-fifth of the total land area of the United States.

The Federal Government—your Federal Government—has organized a vast and overwhelming bureaucracy. The Farm Security Administration, to cite one example (although it is a comparatively small bureau), has 15,000 employees. It occupies 2,700 separate local offices, for which the Government is paying rent and furnishing personnel—largely for the purpose of controlling the farmer's life, and (some say) to control the farmer's vote.

Think of the difference between our Office of Price Administration and its British counterpart. O. P. A. has 2,700 lawyers—500 of them in Washington and 2,200 distributed throughout the country to regulate and to see that the people are regulated. In Britain, the legal staff for the same operation totals only 10—with accomplishments which apparently please the British people better than O. P. A.'s do here.

Here is another set of facts and figures which should cause every American to "stop, look, and listen." Ohio, which has 25,000 State employees, has 90,000 Federal employees. Within the borders of Pennsylvania there are 44,000 State employees, as compared with 215,000 who are on the Federal pay roll. Wyoming, with only 1,100 State employees, finds 6,200 Federal employees in the State. With all due allowance for the fact that the conduct of the Federal system requires a substantial number of Federal employees in each State, there is an odious comparison between the records of the present and the records of the past.

I could go on ad infinitum citing figures of this sort. But I simply wish to call attention to the fact that the cost to the taxpayer is increased almost directly in proportion to the number of Federal employees we have. All of them have expense accounts—including travel, telephoning, and the like—and the total runs into millions of dollars. The bill for travel and communications for this fiscal year, conservatively estimated, will reach $100,000,000, and this does not include a single penny for the expenditures of the Army and the Navy.

The Joint Economy Committee headed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD has done an outstanding job in the interest of the taxpayer. Senator BYRD'S committee has pointed out practical ways in which Government expenditures may be reduced without the loss of efficiency.

After careful examination of the records made by the administration and Congress during the past 10 years, one can only conclude that they have as their objective the assumption of greater power and control by the Government over individual life. If these policies are continued, they can only lead to the destruction of the system of free enterprise and unhampered private initiative and the substitution of state direction and control of all the lives of our citizens.

That is the goal of the Federal planners. But, gentlemen, it is not the desire of the American people. In my trip across the United States, I found in every section that the people are beginning to recognize the importance of preserving private enterprise in this country. This recognition is not confined to the owners of business; it also comes from the intelligent labor leaders and intelligent workers in every State. They are beginning to realize that if we destroy the American system there is no place left for any of us to go, except to statism, under which we would be a completely regimented people subject to the orders of a single individual or of a small coterie of power-crazy men.

The American people must be told a lot of unpleasant truths in the most pleasant way possible. They must know the truth as to what the last 11 years have done to this Nation and then decide if that is the road they wish to continue traveling.

The people of America want to get back to the rule of laws, instead of the rule of men. They crave to be rid of these ill-informed bureaucrats who tell them what they can eat, what they can wear, and where they can go. Many of the people think they should tell the bureaucrats where to go.

They are tired of seeing Government establish rules for private industry which Government itself does not follow in the conduct of business. Government can cover up its losses. Private industry cannot. Government gets money through the power of taxation. Private industry must get it from the bank or private sources. Government, generally speaking, makes no return on its investment—and few of us, if any, ever know of the failures made by Government in business. Government pays no interest on the funds it invests in business, and through its multifarious departments can bury, unseen and unknown, very costly mistakes. Private enterprise cannot do this. Therefore, the yardsticks produced by Government for the purpose of regulating private industry are unreliable, misleading, and ofttimes destructive of private business.

Some law should be enacted by Congress requiring the Comptroller General to investigate and give a full and accurate accounting to the people on the operations of Government-controlled or Government-owned plants

The American people do not intend to allow anything to divide them. They will be united to complete victory—the kind of victory that will enable the Allies to make a sound and just peace in the hope that it may be a permanent peace. The mothers, fathers, and youths themselves expect us after this victory to do something we have never done before in establishing real and enduring peace. They do not wish to go to war every 25 years What that something is they cannot now say, but they want peace and security.

The American people don't mind hardship. They are willing to sacrifice in every way, to whatever degree is necessary, in order to win the war. But they want the hardship spread honestly and evenly among them. They don't want to cheat at home while the boys are serving honorably abroad. They want to be able to look these boys in the eye when they return and say, "We have preserved American institutions at home so that you may have the benefits of the system you defended on the field of battle."

What are we doing to make that welcome possible? Think, when the wars in Europe and Asia end, our economy will lose the customer who now buys half its output—the Government. Many of the 10,800,000 present members of the armed forces, plus nearly all of the millions in war work, will be returning to peacetime pursuits, eager for jobs.

They will insist on getting them—useful jobs at decent pay and with ample opportunity for advancement. Never again will doles and subsistence levels be tolerated. Jobs for these returning soldiers and sailors and war workers must be provided through the resources and ingenuity of business—or the Government will be forced to take over in a major way. And that is what the Federal planners are counting on.

They know that if we have too much unemployment for too long a time after peace comes, our free society can easily be supplanted by a dictatorial regime. It is a lack of jobs on a grand scale that gives regimentors their opportunity. Unemployment in Italy gave Mussolini his big chance. Hitler's gangsters were recruited from among the unemployed. It isn't plotters on the left who constitute the real hazard to our free society, but rather the pressures stemming out of widespread, unwanted idleness. If collectivism comes to American, it will be by default on the part of the good citizens rather than by design on the part of the revolutionaries.

How can we avoid that disaster? Well, we must do a number of things. We must reestablish the independence of the three great branches of government. We must get rid of excess bureaucracy and man-made directives. We must see that the States are protected in the rights which belong to them and which, under the Constitution, were never ceded to the Federal Government. And, unless we wish State socialism—the kind of government which controls the lives of the individuals and tries to divide property—we must get rid of subsidies, even those subsidies which help our own line of business.

Furthermore, we must see that intelligent men administer the necessary agencies of Government—men who recognize that cost of production must bear a fair relationship to any ceiling price. High cost of production and low ceiling prices which permit no legitimate and fair profit, constitute the pincer-jaws which can crush free enterprise to death.

We must also protect the right and duty of American citizens to criticize honestly and openly any regulations or controls of the individual life issued by a bureaucratic administration. We are asked in the name of the war effort not to criticize those in authority for bungling the job which involves not only the lives and health of our civilian population but also the lives of our fighting forces. But when our right to criticize ceases, then the lifeblood of a free people will cease to flow.

Of course, citizens in wartime recognize that the temporary surrender of certain rights and the acceptance of temporary regulation and restriction are necessary to victory. But they still must criticize, to the end that such regulations and restrictions will not interfere with the successful conduct of the war.

It is especially important that the businessman emerge from his shell of timidity and feel free to criticize and to present to his Congressman his ideas, his suggestions, and whatever facts he has which may help his Representatives in Washington to solve the momentous problems which confront the Nation. Despite a 10-year campaign of vilification of the American businessman conducted by the administration and its allies—and financed largely with the taxpayers' money—the majority of the Members of Congress still have a wholesome respect for the opinions, judgments, and facts presented to them by businessmen. This has become increasingly true during the past 2 years, as the result of the remarkable job done by American industry in the war effort. That is why businessmen should get together as much as they can, among themselves and with other groups, to develop recommendations on taxation, Government spending, labor legislation, post-war planning, and other related problems.

In advancing their suggestions on these matters, however, businessmen should be sure that they do not repeat the mistakes which they made in years gone by. They should keep first in mind the common good. And whatever they do must be done within the bounds of sound economics. After you decide your course, you must fight courageously for it, but never approve what seems popular when in your heart and soul you believe in another thing that is right—but unpopular at the moment.

Business must fight for the foundation of all freedom—the freedom of a man or woman to work when or where he or she chooses, union member or no union member. This is the basic freedom—individual initiative, and it is the foundation upon which depends individual enterprise, individual accomplishment, individual security, and the solvency of the United States Government. The main spring, which is a fair reward for work and accomplishment, and the development of genius, produces the only fruit from which taxation can be collected.

Labor is entitled to the right to organize, the right of collective bargaining, the right to strike lawfully in peacetime, and to legislation which is necessary to prevent unjust exploitation. Laws governing labor and capital must be just if they are to be effective. They must contain equity for all groups, and should never unfairly invade the constitutional guaranteed rights of personal liberty, free enterprise, private initiative, or the realm of lawful property ownership. No one with ill will toward labor or capital will accomplish anything worth while as a representative of the people.

America is labor and capital. Under the American system of freemen, every workingman should have the opportunity to fairly earn and save, so that he may become a property holder and owner of business, and a part of management as millions of our individual citizens have done under our American system. Examples without number could be cited. That is America, and anything which interferes with the operation of this system will help to destroy free enterprise. The watchword is "Justice to all and special privilege to none." If labor and capital, through failure to understand each other and to voluntarily cooperate, destroy the system of free enterprise and initiative, then each should now recognize that both must become the slaves of the state. We must not break the mainspring of American life—honest profit for hard work, for accomplishment, and for the use of genius in experimentation, research, and the development of the things required for the sustenance, recreation, and happiness of the human family.

American businessmen must do more than this. You must take part in the American system of government by acting now to reverse the trend in governmental affairs. That trend today, as outlined by the Federal administration—and up until now approved by the Congress—will lead ultimately to the destruction of States' rights, the socialization of the school system, of medicine, of the legal profession, and of business and industry. This is not a job for once a year or every 4 years. It is a job every year—365 days a year—and it requires the same kind of efficient organization which you build for the conduct of your own business. Recognize your duty now to see that the men who take high office in Washington and in your State capitals, in the executive branch or as legislators, be they Republicans or Democrats, believe in the things you are trying to save. You can't expect to save the American system of freemen unless your representatives in the Federal, State, and local governments sincerely believe and will follow through in saving the things you and I wish saved.

And, while we are on the subject of selecting the right kind of representatives, it is my firm conviction that every nation should scrupulously avoid doing anything that can in any way leave the impression with the people of one country that those in another country are interfering with the election processes of that particular country. We must not try to influence the vote or the will of the people in any other nation, except by our example at home. No other country must try to influence the will of our people or the vote of our people, except through their example at home. This is vital if we are to remain friends and cooperate on a great scale for the development and perpetuation of peace.

Always we come back to facts and figures, and sometimes we stack them up against the promises which distinguish the New Deal from the American Deal, where the cards are really on the table. Facts are usually strangers to the extreme internationalists in our country, but they are willing to be long on promises. They place the ideal ahead of the practical and would substantially sacrifice the national identity, character, and independence of the United States Government in exchange for a superstate or United Nations of the World. They do not explain how that superstate would avoid intrigue and coalition of groups within itself, if and when certain nations had to be denied something which their own people or leaders demanded. They do not tell us how they would overcome the innate selfishness of human beings, or how they plan to avoid the problems arising from international competition. Their desires and objectives are commendable, but their knowledge is far from convincing.

Midway between these internationalists and the relatively few pure, unadulterated isolationists to be found in all political parties, are those millions of Americans who believe in maintaining our independence, but who also feel that we can afford to enter into a definite agreement with Allied Nations for the purpose of enforcing the peace. This middle group, which contains the great body of our citizens, would recognize only those nations which acknowledge the sanctity of contracts and the obligation to fulfill them even when conditions become difficult. These Americans believe in fair-trade treaties, and wish to exchange the wares of one nation for those of another on a basis which does not needlessly disturb the markets for our own products. This basis of exchange, they hold, must consider cost of production and the established living standards of the people in the various countries involved. And they know that we must maintain peace and economic tranquility within our own borders if we would be strong enough to render real leadership service to the world.

This midway group believes the United States is justified in maintaining an Army and Navy of sufficient size and strength to help keep the peace, by force if necessary. It feels that this is like paying a small premium on an insurance policy of peace and in the light of the human lives lost and the hundreds of billions of dollars being spent for this war, that such a cost is a justified taxation upon the people.

I believe the great body of our American citizens today falls within this group three. They wish to know the facts before they take action, but they wish definitely to take action in the cause of building and maintaining a just peace for the benefit of mankind. I find myself pretty strongly linked to the reasoning and objectives of this group.

Quoting Shakespeare—

"There is a tide in the affairs of men
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries;
And we must take the current when it serves,
Or lose our ventures."

In the last analysis, the war will be won and the postwar victory achieved by standing on sound facts, figures and promises. We cannot win either battle by waving a magic wand or by idealistic hoping. This is a practical world, and it behooves you gentlemen and all Americans to recognize that the solution of our problem depends entirely on true facts and figures, and that we must not make promises which we cannot keep.

Promises are made by words. They must be fulfilled by acts Let not our words outdistance our acts. The easiest way to lose our friends and to make new enemies is to make promises which we cannot keep or which—worse still—we do not intend to keep.

We must keep faith with ourselves, otherwise we shall fail to keep faith with other nations of the world.

Admission to the United States of Racial and Religious Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made jointly on September 9, 1943, by the National Democratic Club and the National Republican Club of New York City, relative to admission to the United States of aliens who are racial and religious refugees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is overwhelming proof that the Nazis, carrying out Hitler's program as contained in Mein Kampf and as reiterated many times both before Germany entered the war and since, are systematically murdering the Jews in Europe within their control with the intent to bring about the complete annihilation of these Jews. This slaughter, which includes indiscriminately men, women, and children, is continued daily and the best available figures indicate that practically one-half of the Jews within the control of the Nazis have thus been wantonly killed. There is no basis for this slaughter except antipathy, and that antipathy, however expressed or camouflaged, is based on the fact that the Jews have and practice an ancient religion, peculiarly their own, which religion is offensive to Nazi leaders, once nominal Christians, but now open pagans. The right of the Jews to practice their own religion is recognized by all civilized nations. It is expressly recognized in the United States by the first phrase of the first amendment of the Constitution, reading as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Recently this has been reiterated in substance by the President of the United States in conjunction with leaders of other nations in what is known as the Atlantic Charter. Efforts are being made in various parts of Nazi-occupied territory, and even Germany itself, to end this slaughter. Naturally where pleas and appeals are made to people not completely lost to all normal dictates of humanity, even though affiliated with Nazi policies, efforts are made to explain, evade, and minimize the outstanding fact that these mass massacres are the most shocking of all brutalities which have occurred in modern times.

One thing often reiterated is that the United States, by a simple resolution of its Congress and without permanent change in its immigration policy could suspend immigration limitations in behalf of all aliens necessarily fleeing religious persecution in order to save their lives, such suspension to extend for only a few months after the conclusion of hostilities. Legislation of this sort should be passed by the Congress of the United States, and quickly. It is believed by well-informed people that unless something is done within the next 6 or 8 months, which months will embrace winter, none of the Jews native to Poland or Germany and still there or who have been removed to either Germany or Poland from Axis-held territory will be alive. The inhuman barbarities to which they have been subjected have so impaired their strength that those still living—scantily provided with shelter, clothing, and food, as they have been for months and years and will continue to be—cannot, even if they are not murdered, survive another winter. Those who die of starvation or exposure are just as much murdered as those who are shot down as so many are being daily

It is true that all of these Jews are outside the scope of direct assistance from any American agency. It is also true that responsibility lies primarily on the Nazis and their satellite governments. We are fighting a war for freedom and liberty, and one of our enunciated principles is freedom of religious worship. If people anywhere are being killed because of the exercise of their religious privileges, we can at least take action such that, during the progress of hostilities, any such people who escape with their lives from such mass murder can find an asylum in the United States. In the beginning our country was founded very largely by religious refugees and one of our proudest traditions of the past is the extent to which we have been a refuge for the persecuted and the oppressed. It is no answer to say that this proposed action relates to one class only; the complete rejoinder is that that is the only class which is being exterminated and that extermination for religious reasons is in direct defiance of American principles.

There is some talk of the financial burdens involved. The amount involved is so small that this is unworthy of discussion. Jews have been residents of the United States nearly 300 years and we are familiar with their capacity for self-support. Like every other class among us, certain of them are left destitute in infancy by the death of parents or become unable to support themselves by old age or (but this is very rare among the Jews) become incapacitated through bad habits. But all over the United States the outstanding fact is that Jews rarely become public charges for the reasons given or any others. Those becoming incapacitated are almost invariably supported by relatives or friends or in the large and adequate institutions erected and maintained for their care by their Jewish coreligionists.

We therefore call upon the Congress of the United States to pass without delay the attached resolution to express not in words alone but in action the unquestioned fact that these mass murders shock humanity, and that, so far as the United States is concerned, the victims, if they can escape from the countries where they are being murdered, can find an asylum in the United States.

Without going into details, the doing of which might be unwise and harmful, we are assured by those in touch with European conditions that the quick passage of such legislation would save thousands of lives.

* * * * *

We specifically and urgently request the introduction of legislation of the character which we have indicated and also specifically request immediate hearings before the appropriate committees, at which hearings we respectfully request to be heard.

WILLIAM F. FULLEN,
For National Democratic Club.
THOMAS J. CURRAN,
For National Republican Club.

Votes in the Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Votes in the Services," from the Chicago Daily News of Monday, October, 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTES IN THE SERVICES

Congress faces a test of its ability to do its work in the matter of soldiers voting in 1944. The hopeless botch made of the last tax bill and the crudely drawn Smith-Connally anti-strike bill are conspicuous examples of legislative jerry work, but there has been a whole lot of the same that has not had the public scrutiny deserved.

This war is being fought partly to preserve the principles of representative government, and so Congress is charged with the duty of showing that in times of stress and strain, American parliamentary institutions will work, and work right. To the extent that this is also a war for democracy, it is urgent that American democracy be not discredited by the disfranchisement of 11,000,000 of its defenders in the armies at home and abroad and on ships at sea.

But soldier-voting is a political process, and so the enactment of a law to provide for elections in the armed forces is a job surrounded and pervaded by the short-sighted selfishness of practical politics.

Congress must cast aside any considerations of partisan, class, sectional or group advantage in the enactment of a law to enable the soldiers to vote. The present makeshift measures must be abandoned outright. The clumsy State provisions for absentee voting also will have to be discarded.

The law must not attempt to do too much. The citizen at home rarely knows who he is voting for when he marks a blanket ballot for a long list of candidates for minor offices, so it is even more absurd to try to get the vote of Bill Jones, of the first tank brigade of the umpty-fifth armored division, now in

Africa and maybe in Norway by November 1944, on school commissions for the second high-school district of Silver Bow County, Mont.

To get a workable law we believe Congress will have to confine soldier voting to Federal offices—Presidential electors represented by the names of candidates for President, United States Senators, and possibly Congressmen. Complications and trouble are sure to result from attempts to include State elections.

The principle of voting by mail will have to be adopted without equivocation or attempts to hedge it about with cumbersome safeguards. The military elections, of course, cannot be held on a single day, and the votes should be taken as far in advance of the November election at home as may be feasible—say not later than September 15, 1944. We can ill afford the suspense and confusion attending a Presidential election, the outcome of which might be kept in doubt up to Christmas by delays in receiving and counting soldier votes.

The secrecy of the ballot simply cannot be maintained in its entirety in receiving, recording, and transmitting the votes of soldiers and sailors. Secrecy has become such a political fetish that some people doubtless believe it is a constitutional "must." But early American elections were largely viva voce, and this custom survived in Kentucky up to 55 years ago. Partially open voting will have to be revived, if the soldiers are not to be cheated of their vote. To assume that this would lead to coercion by military authorities is to assume a political zeal and bias by the officers that simply do not exist.

We are quite aware that in stating the conditions precedent to genuine soldier voting, we are laying ourselves open to charges of radicalism. That cannot be helped. Soldier voting, under our present military and naval forms of organization, in which territorial units have been eliminated almost 100 percent, requires radical measures simply because our existing election machinery and laws are based upon territoriality.

But there is nothing sacred about the territorial basis of elections. If the federal Commonwealth of Australia can devise means by which its soldiers vote all around the world, we can do it, too. And we may gain some valuable experience that can be applied to the reform and modernization of our peacetime election laws. There has been a movement for voting by mail for many years.

The Judge Is Still Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. ANDREWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and timely editorial entitled, "The Judge Is Still Tops," published in Collier's, issue of October 16, 1943, and having reference to the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDGE IS STILL TOPS

A lot of people, ourselves included, were sorry to see the able and experienced Sumner Welles quit the State Department. We cannot see, however, that Welles' resignation justified the attacks it brought on Cordell Hull, long-time Secretary of State. To us, "Judge" Hull is tops, as for many years.

Mr. Hull's main trouble (if you can call it that) is that when he is appointed to run a certain job, he likes to run it—insists on running it, in fact. He does not like to be bypassed, ignored, or double-talked out of any of the authority, or any of the responsibility, that goes with the job.

Given the immensely important job of Secretary of State, Mr. Hull proposed from the beginning to be Secretary of State, in fact as well as in name.

He has been a strong man in his own right. Americans have respected Cordell Hull for his honesty, his intelligence, his vigor, and his liberal opinions. Secretary Hull bridges the idealism of Woodrow Wilson with the progressive policies of President Roosevelt. He pushed the idea of reciprocal trade treaties relentlessly until finally public opinion of both major parties came to his support.

In his recent statement of foreign policy, Secretary Hull made audacious proposals, yet he expressed plainly the conviction that no foreign policy could be safely pushed beyond the point at which Congress and enduring public opinion will approve. The Secretary of State has never lost his contact with the voters. That explains his strength with the people.

We think that the Judge, as his fellow Tennesseans know him, came through his trials with dignity and integrity. We also think that his statement of foreign policy reflects, as accurately as any, the hopes and ideas of the American people.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following article which was published in the September issue of the Spectator—Life Insurance in Action:

Jim Farley's life is that of a boy and of a man born with a cheerful, fun-loving disposition, who derives his greater pleasure from intimate association with his fellows. He coupled this appreciative interest in the affairs of his friends with an ability to make their circle an ever-widening one to be bound, ultimately, in a countless group reaching the four corners of the earth. A natural charm with sincere modesty enables him to win and keep the affection of men from every walk of life. His biography, beginning at his birth at Grassy Point on May 30, 1888, evidences unending development along broad lines.

His public life began as a servant of his town and step by step brought him through county, State, and national offices. Socially, his gregarious nature makes him a typical American joiner and he is now a member of scores of organizations. His business acumen has led him into the directorship of many important business organizations. His grasp of public, social, and economic affairs more closely approximates that of the average American than that of any other man in public life. His honesty of approach to the solution of the problems they present has been recognized widely and nine universities have conferred upon him honorary degrees in token of their esteem.

In public life, of all men, James A. Farley, from a small town in Rockland County, N. Y., may be described as a practical idealist. There are many idealists in politics, who grandly plan and many practical politicians who ignore social inspiration, but no other man has succeeded as has Jim Farley in making dreams come true, mostly for others.

His simple, direct appraisal of life would mark him unquestionably as one who would recognize that a prime duty to his family was to guard the future as far as humanly possible against sadness and want. There is no surprise then that he should state that he "would always secure for them as much life insurance as my financial position would permit."

James A. Farley, a biographer might write, in his youth determined upon a code of personal ethics to govern his relations with his fellow man. To this code he rigidly adhered, the while he himself climbed the long hard trail which led from small town obscurity to the light that beats on a national character. Years of success, years of intellectual growth, years of an ever-broadening vista, have not altered by a hair's breadth his attitude toward the men and women who once gave him their confidence and their friendship. His plan of life permits of no compromise in his dealings because of wealth or influence.

He has not changed his smile to please the classes. He has not slackened the vigor of his handshake with the masses. Jim Farley has maintained his high idealism throughout his entire life and although he does not now hold public office, he is available still for counsel and service in behalf of an almost endless chain of charitable, philanthropic and patriotic causes. His genius in organization and his unwavering willingness to contribute his best for his fellow man make his leadership in constant demand.

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, Delegate from Alaska

REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the highest elective honor Alaska can bestow is the office of Delegate to Congress. I need not stand here today and extol the virtues of our beloved and able colleague, the Delegate from Alaska, Hon. ANTHONY J. DIMOND, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a splendid article from the publication Alaska Life about our beloved friend, TONY DIMOND, in which he has been signally honored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From Alaska Life of September 1943]

ANTHONY J. DIMOND, OF ALASKA

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

The highest elective honor Alaskans can bestow is the post of Delegate in Congress. America's largest territorial possession does not vote on President of the United States. Its Governor is appointed. It has no Sena-

tors. But it does have the privilege of sending to Washington one Member of the House of Representatives—a Member without a vote, it is true, but a Member with a voice on the floor and with a place on committees, where most legislation is actually decided.

For more than a decade the people of Alaska have given this solitary elective accolade to a tall, gaunt 61-year-old resident of Valdez, named ANTHONY JOSEPH DIMOND.

TONY DIMOND was born sixty-one years ago in Palatine Bridge on the Mohawk River in upper New York State and did not migrate to Alaska until he was old enough to vote. He attended public grade schools in Palatine Bridge and then went to St. Mary's Catholic Institute at nearby Amsterdam. He also taught school for several years. Around the turn of the century he began to read about the great gold strikes in the Klondike.

For a year or so, DIMOND resisted what dime novels and the first flickering movies were calling "the lure of the Yukon." But the more he heard of Alaska and the more lithographs of Alaskan scenes he saw, the stronger the lure became. In 1901, he crossed the country in a day coach and waited on the Seattle docks until he could get space on a ship headed north through the Inside Passage. He went down the gangplank at Valdez, 1,600 miles from Puget Sound, and found thousands of miners and prospectors preparing to cross the huge, coagulated mass of the Valdez Glacier on their way to the riches of the Yukon.

"I felt as alone as the Ancient Mariner," states DIMOND now. "I didn't know anyone in all that milling crowd. I guess I just couldn't bring myself to venture into the wilderness in that state of mind. I stayed in Valdez. Not many of my fellow cheechakos had formal educations, and jobs were easy to get."

Gold was discovered at Fairbanks, north of Valdez, in 1904. When DIMOND heard about this latest strike he strode into the wilderness. Gold so near was an irresistible inducement. He strapped a pack on his angular frame and hiked into the solitudes. For eight years he roamed the Alaskan wilderness looking for dust and nuggets to put in his chamois-skin poke. He soon learned that the wilderness provided lots of adventure and not much livelihood. For every prospector who struck it rich, a hundred failed completely. TONY sent down to the States for lawbooks, which he read in front of the campfire at night. Alaska is still full of pioneers to whom he gave free legal advice on the trail.

In 1913, DIMOND began to practice law. He put his pick and shovel and sifting pan in the woodshed and never used them again. As a loyal Democrat he qualified for the job of United States attorney at Valdez during the Wilson administration. In 1920 he was elected mayor of Valdez, and 2 years later went to the Territorial Senate. He held both posts until he was sent to Washington in the election of 1932. Valdez is still his home.

In a way, studying law was a necessity as well as a choice. While riding through the underbrush on a prospecting trip in the rugged Mount Wrangell country, DIMOND slumped from the saddle with a bullet through his left leg. The trigger on the revolver in his holster had been tripped by a stray spruce branch. It took him 4 months to recover from the long, vertical wound, and he realized that he had to undertake something less strenuous than prospecting. This old, accidental injury has ailed Delegate DIMOND for 30 years. It has required surgery a dozen times and, although he is vigorous and active, he still walks with a stiff limp.

TONY DIMOND is the Territory's most famous public figure. His loping stride with its slight limp is known in every hamlet and backwoods town. Few Alaskans have not at some time received a letter from him. His weekly reports appear in nearly all Alaskan newspapers. He is Alaska's voice and spokesman in the National Capital.

If the mail of Alaskans is indiscriminately censored, it is TONY DIMOND who rises on the floor of the House and protests. If Alaska fails to receive proper recognition in the appointment of Federal administrators, TONY DIMOND registers the Territory's complaint. If commercial interests are marauding the natural resources of the Territory, TONY DIMOND demands that exploitation give way to conservation.

"TONY DIMOND is a one-man congressional delegation," once observed former Senator Lewis Schwellenbach of Washington, now a Federal judge. "His voice is literally as the voice of 10."

From the standpoint of volume, TONY DIMOND's voice is not loud. In fact, it is low and calm. It is part of a shy and modest personality. Although he represents the most robust and vigorous sovereignty under the American flag, TONY DIMOND is mild mannered and quiet. His protests and complaints in the Halls of Congress derive their force from earnestness and sincerity rather than noise and bombast.

In these stern days, when Alaska is the only part of the Western Hemisphere where actual engagements with the enemy have occurred, TONY DIMOND is chiefly known as the man who long ago forewarned the Nation of the events now taking place. Alaskans remember that 6 years ago, a tall lean man with horn-rimmed glasses stood before a committee of his fellow members of Congress in far-off Washington, D. C., claiming that Japanese dories, ostensibly fishing for salmon off Alaska's rocky shores, were in reality manned by disguised officers of the imperial navy. These "fishermen," he said, might be wearing greasy dungarees and tattered denims but in their wardrobe lockers at Yokohama undoubtedly hung swords, epaulets, and caps with braided visors. And he insisted that the prize which the fishermen sought was not the flaky flesh of sockeye or pinks but information of the depth, defenses, and landmarks of Alaskan harbors.

"The Japanese," the tall man said, "know more about the vital Aleutian coast line than we do."

From Tokyo came an immediate and outraged protest. Such accusations were "utterly absurd," said the adjutant to Admiral Osumi, the minister of Japan's navy. Surely Americans would not be so gullible as to believe that a friendly power was taking soundings in Alaskan waters. "The statements," declared the incensed adjutant with finality, "are unworthy of denial."

An official of the Japanese Foreign Office said he was sure Americans knew that his country was not conducting espionage in the Aleutian Islands. "It is ridiculous that we would use fishing boats for that purpose," was his concluding non sequitur.

For a decade TONY DIMOND, as he is known to the inhabitants of his vast 586,400-square-mile constituency, has been a sort of congressional Nostradamus, prophesying practically everything that has occurred in the North Pacific since December 7, 1941.

From the time he set down his old black valise in the Washington station, DIMOND began demanding the fortification of Alaska. "Do you know," he asked an Idaho Congressman in 1935, "that there isn't a single cannon in the Aleutian Islands, which extend to within 716 miles of Japan?"

He buttonholed Senator HOMER BONE, of Washington, the State nearest to Alaska, and warned that what Alaska needed was "planes, planes, and more planes." He told the House at large a hundred times that Uncle Sam had better take the "welcome" sign off his Aleutian doorstep. And he spoke so frequently for a wilderness highway linking the United States with Alaska by land that some of his colleagues decided he was hipped on the subject and stole off to the cloakrooms when he took the floor.

The bulk of DIMOND's pleas were rejected by his fellow Members of Congress. The Old Guard in the Army and Navy turned him down, too. The State Department disregarded his warnings about the personnel of Japan's "fishing" fleet. But DIMOND campaigned until he convinced his colleagues. Prospecting for gold on Alaska's stern uplands makes a man tenacious. He estimates now that in speeches, letters, and reports urging an impregnable defense for Alaska he about matched the wordage of Gone With the Wind.

This perseverance produced results. DIMOND began to make converts. Two of them were highly important: Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, head of the Army Air Forces. In 1939, with war rocking Europe for a second time in a generation, they looked at War Department files and saw that the only military establishment in Alaska was a few companies of infantry at Chilkoot Barracks.

"And the guns there," DIMOND explained, "point toward our Canadian friends in the Yukon Territory, not toward our potential enemies in Japan. The Chilkoot post dates from the days of the Klondike gold rush. Alaska needs modern bases that fit the day of the long-range bombing plane."

Yet from the 1940 Army appropriation bill a House committee cut out $68,000,000, which included funds for the strategic Alaskan base at Anchorage. Dimond, Marshall, and Arnold argued with the committee for weeks, with no success.

"Then," says DIMOND, recalling the struggle, "we received help from a fellow named Adolf Hitler. He invaded Denmark and Norway."

The Congressmen got out their maps and globes and found that the Scandinavian Peninsula was just over the top of the earth from Alaska. Bombers could fly that distance. In fact, Russian planes had done it. The committee restored the Anchorage funds and added a lot more money for other Alaskan defenses besides. DIMOND believes that was the turning point. The arming of America's far northern outpost was really under way.

In the past year and a half Alaska's Delegate in Congress, who has a voice on the floor and a suite in the House Office Building, but no vote during roll calls, has seen the events he forecast coming to pass. Early in January he asked his colleagues: "If on December 7 we had on station in the Aleutian Islands at Attu 1,000 planes, including a suitable number of bombing planes, is it not pretty plain that there never would have been the assault of that day on Pearl Harbor?" Japan answered his question a few months later by directing at Attu the first invasion of North American soil in more than a century.

For years DIMOND sought to have Attu fortified. In Alaska, people now say that TONY DIMOND has been as right as Billy Mitchell, and in Alaska, that is considered right indeed. It was Mitchell who warned, "Whoever holds Alaska will hold the world, and I think it is the most important strategic place in the world. An air offensive against Japan from Alaska could be decisive."

TONY DIMOND has been so right that he is the uncontested overlord of Alaskan politics. He first was elected Delegate in 1932, ending a Republican regime. The Republicans have not been in the running for Delegate since. The territorial legislature, with its 16-member house and small, clubby 8-man senate, is overwhelmingly Democratic.

In fact, in the past two elections for Delegate, the Republicans put forth no candidate

of their own but supported DIMOND. He has become a symbol of the defenses, armaments, and development on which Alaska must depend for survival.

Seven years ago TONY DIMOND first advocated construction of an international highway which would link Alaska with the interior of the continent. "Alaska to all intents and purposes is an island," he pointed out. "It is as cut off from the industrial and manufacturing centers of the United States as an island would be. It can be reached only by planes or ship. Land transportation to Alaska is essential."

In countless instances DIMOND has been ahead of his time. He was among the first to demand development of aviation bases in Alaska. He read the early prophesies of Gen. "Billy" Mitchell and gave them voice in Congress. He lent constant backing to Gen. H. H. Arnold, another pioneer advocate of military air bases in the Far North. When Arnold, then a lieutenant colonel, led an Army flight to Fairbanks from Edmonton in 1934, and enthusiastically reported his findings and impressions in the National Geographic Magazine, DIMOND gave the report distribution and support in the House of Representatives.

Statehood for Alaska is TONY DIMOND'S greatest ambition. He wants the far-flung domain which he represents in Congress to be the 49th star in the American flag. As the first advance toward such sovereignty, he is sponsoring legislation now providing for the election of Alaska's Governor. At present the gubernatorial position is filled by appointment.

In Ottawa recently Tom O'Neill, a member of the Canadian Parliament from British Columbia's Kamloops Riding, said to me, "You know, lieutenant, the boundary line between Alaska and British Columbia isn't rigid enough to prevent us from often thinking of TONY DIMOND as practically a representative from British Columbia as well as his own constituency. In fact, we all remember the years when Tony was crusading for adequate defense of our whole north Pacific seacoast."

In Washington the DIMONDS do not take much part in capital social life. There are three Dimond children, two girls, and a boy who is in the Army. Mrs. Dimond is a former Valdez girl whom Tony married in 1916. Both she and her husband would rather eat moose meat and baked potatoes in the Fairweather Range than hors d'oeuvres at an exclusive Washington embassy party.

The fierce pressure of Washington in wartime has prevented TONY DIMOND from going home to Alaska for several years. But although out of sight, Alaska has never been out of his mind.

The Effect of Agricultural Machinery Shortage on Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the subject The Effect of the Agricultural Machinery Shortage on Production, by C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange. This speech was delivered by Mr. Cogswell at the National Food Conference of Consumers and Producers held at Chicago September 17.

Mr. Cogswell, whom I have known for years, is a progressive and successful farmer as well as a sound farm leader, and his remarks on this subject are worthy of the careful attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While no definite data is available to enable one to quote definite figures or percentages of decrease of production because of the shortage of agricultural machinery it can be definitely stated that there was a material loss, both in production and in the harvesting of that produced during the crop season of 1943. Every indication points to a greater decrease in the year 1944.

In practically every community where foodstuffs or grain is produced in quantities, there are examples of inability to plant, cultivate, or harvest because of lack of machinery or lack of repair parts for farm machinery.

Many farmers who this year took long chances during planting season have had experiences which caused them to resolve to not take such chances again. Many farmers have stated that they planted in quantities beyond that justified by their machinery supply They took a chance that if they got it planted they would be enabled to get repairs for machinery to cultivate and harvest it. In many instances they were disappointed, with the result that much of their crop was not properly cultivated and a considerable portion of it was never harvested.

There are unnumbered examples of equipment valued at several hundred dollars being idle as long as 8 weeks at a time because of inability to get a single repair part that could not be made locally by any machinist or where the old part could not be repaired.

In one of the richest and most productive agricultural counties in my State, farm owners, too old to operate their farms, who formerly were overrun with prospective tenants, are now advertising for tenants solely because of the shortage of machinery. Because of bungling this year experienced farmers have lost confidence in their ability to secure new machinery or necessary repair parts and are reducing their operations. Many are discontinuing farm operations. These are being replaced by inexperienced men from other industries to minimize their chances for induction.

There are many farms of sufficient acreage to justify two or more tractors where it is definitely planned to reduce acreage next year because one or more of the tractors used this year are definitely not to be depended upon for next season's work These farmers are planning to reduce acreage rather than take a chance on their machinery being in condition to cultivate and harvest as large a crop as they might be able to plant. In other words, farmers who were willing this year to take the chance on planting more than their machinery would cultivate and harvest are not willing to do so again.

Farmers are planning carefully and attempting to estimate the amount of acreage they may plant with the hope that the machinery on hand will hold out to cultivate and harvest it. They prefer to reduce the acreage and feel reasonably confident they can cultivate and harvest it rather than plant the full acreage and take chances on being unable to properly cultivate and harvest it because of inability to get farm machinery and repairs.

Two years extra use of the farm machinery which normally would have been replaced with new during 1 of these 2 years, coupled with the fine combing of old machinery lots and junk yards has greatly decreased the available, usable farm machinery in the heaviest producing areas of our country.

The farmers as well as other businessmen are having difficulty because of the necessity of operating with inexperienced and inefficient help. This has increased the necessity for additional repairs and shortened the period of usefulness of machinery, thus, contributing another cause for a reduction in operations. Many farmers prefer to plant only the amount they are able to handle by the operation of their own machinery rather than trust the operation of valuable machinery, which cannot be replaced, in the hands of inexperienced and inefficient operators.

In an effort to meet the quotas and demands of the Government in increased production of specific crops, especially flax and soybeans, many farmers have so changed their machinery needs that allocation policies have been greaty disrupted. The machinery successfully used in large fields of wheat and coarse grains is not adapted for use in the harvesting of flax and soybeans. It is practically impossible to satisfactorily combine either flax or soybeans with the larger size wheat and coarse grain machines.

There is a large shortage of corn machinery in the vast areas which during the drought years changed from corn to wheat and have now gone back to the production of corn.

All these factors combined with many others have made a tremendous reduction even in the year 1943. There is no doubt in the minds of those who have given the matter careful study but that the reduction will be much greater for the year 1944 unless something is done promptly to give definite assurance to the farmers of our land that machinery and repairs will be available in greatly increased quantities next year, and that they will be available on time. There is danger that farm machinery as well as many kinds of food and some war materials may be "too little and too late."

In order that those responsible for increased production of farm machinery and repairs, whether they be manufacturers, distributors, or those in charge of allocating and rationing materials, we will now make a few suggestions regarding corrections or improvements over what was done this year along these lines.

During the summer of 1943, soon after the W. P. B. increased the allocation of steel to manufacturers of farm machinery and the newspapers gave wide publicity to the order, we received a letter from the president of one of the large farm machinery concerns advising us that we should not be overconfident of receiving increased machinery and repairs. They stated that while allotments had been increased, the increased amount of steel had not been delivered and there was little indication that it would be possible to get delivery in time for use for the crop then growing. In a mild way they were attempting to tell us that it was impossible to manufacture farm machinery or repairs from allocations or W. P. B. orders.

The operator of one moderate-sized farm advised us that a valuable machine was out of use 8 weeks because of inability to procure a small but essential repair part. This was a standard machine manufactured by one of the best known farm machinery companies. Another small farm operator advised us that he had a $500 loss because of inability to secure repairs for his combine at harvest season.

Inexperienced help in the manufacture and assembling of farm machinery is apparent in the machines which are being delivered. This is causing a lack of confidence in the proper delivery of new machinery coming out under war conditions.

One dealer in a territory that normally requires from 45 to 55 combines annually this

year received an allocation of 10. Of these 10 not a single one was received with all the necessary parts enabling it to operate. Every machine had to wait delivery until missing parts were ordered and received from the factory or taken from the dealer's shelves. Several had been improperly assembled and it was necessary to take them apart and reassemble them before they could be operated.

The present plan, for the manufacture of sufficient farm machinery for use in 1944 to supply 80 percent of the 1940 or 1941 requirements, is the minimum which can be expected to encourage a normal planting for next year. The normal demand next year would no doubt be 50 percent greater than either of these base years because of excessive use during the past 2 years.

On July 10 last, one of the internationally known farm machinery companies sent notices to all their dealers informing them that all back orders of 60 days or longer were being cancelled and requesting that the dealer reorder any parts which had been back ordered that long and on which he still desired delivery. Such an order would indicate that the number of back orders, 60 days old, were tremendous. Actually they had so many of them they couldn't even keep them properly filed for filling. The dealer, handling this particular line in my home town, had more than 200 items affected by this order.

Some dealers are already advising their customers that they have been advised by their companies not to build hopes too high for the receipt of the 80 percent of their 1940-41 requirements since they still do not have the material in sight to manufacture it; that even if the material were on hand they would still face the necessity of finding men to do the work of manufacturing and assembling it. They do not manufacture farm machines on cost-plus basis as they do other war materials.

The change from horse power to mechanized farming solved some of the problems of production but it also created new ones.

It is not possible, as some would have us believe, to return to horse power—even if the horses were available, which they are not, it would still be impossible to get harness, shoes and other equipment necessary to use them. Then, too, horse power farming is limited to the number of horses available. You cannot work a horse overtime You cannot fill him full of hay when he has done a day's work and proceed at once to work him on through the night. If you attempt it you kill your horse and permanently lose your power.

Mechanized farming has forced dependence not alone upon machinery but also upon gasoline, kerosene, or other refined fuel. This fact definitely links gasoline shortage and rationing with the shortage of machinery.

Nature wisely placed ample supplies of these fuels near the areas most dependent upon them for the production of food. But men in other areas unwisely decreed that nature's processes must be changed.

If present gasoline regulations had been in effect two or three months sooner many thousands of bushels of grain would have been wasted in the fields. Under rules existing at the time heavy losses occurred because of delay in receiving supplies of fuel at the farms. Many service stations were entirely out of gasoline in vital areas for short periods.

Present regulations requiring refineries in central Kansas (also the center of a heavy grain-producing area) to ship both crude oil and refined products to eastern markets where the ban on pleasure driving has just been lifted is both unnecessary and uneconomical.

The fact that regulations from the same source permit these same refineries to ship in both crude and refined products from west Texas proves it unnecessary and the fact that such shipment could and would be subsidized by government proves it uneconomical. Why the double shipping and the double subsidy? Why not ship direct from west Texas to eastern markets and save both transportation and subsidy?

There is plenty of tangible evidence to justify the conclusion that unless more sound practices are put into effect for the allocation and delivery of machinery, repairs, and motor fuel to farmers, they cannot meet the production demands made upon them. They probably will not be able to meet the vital needs of our country.

It is just as important that changes be made in time so manufacturers can produce on time so farmers can get the machinery and repairs on time. A combine delivered too late is of no use until another year; a repair for a plow received after the soil is too dry to till is of little value and greatly reduces chance of production.

The farmer will not fail; he will continue to do his best. But, he must have the necessary equipment and he must have it on time.

Those who formulate and issue rationing regulations and directives from bureaucratic Washington must understand and appreciate this fact and do something about it—and they must act in time.

If they do not, serious shortages—perhaps actual famine—will stalk our own country in 1944.

Report of Subcommittee on Cost of Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER G. ANDREWS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith, by request, some observations having to do with the cost of crude oil:

The subcommittee on cost of production has been meeting for the past 2 days for the purpose of determining the cost of finding, developing, and producing crude oil as of June 30, 1943. Also to consider the effect that the 48-hour week will have on future costs and to determine the increased costs since October 1941, which was the date of freezing the price of crude oil.

The Tariff Commission report of cost of producing crude petroleum for the years 1939-40, and the 9 months ended September 30, 1941, is not a proper basis upon which to maintain the price freeze placed on crude petroleum by the Office of Price Administration.

It is historical and does not provide for replacement costs.

It does not include any provision for the cost of financing exploratory and development work. Interest on borrowed funds is a substantial amount.

It does not include any allowance for the thousands of operators whose individual production is small, and whose average production costs are substantially higher than the production costs of the few major companies and other large companies whose volume of production enables them to produce crude petroleum at a lower cost than the average producer and whose figures dominate the results shown by the Tariff Commission.

The finding and developing costs are based on the cost of the finding of discoveries and extensions of pools for the first 6 months of the year amounting to 437,963,000 barrels of oil. The operating costs are based on the cost of producing 709,342,000 barrels. It is estimated that the extensions and discoveries are 272,000,000 short of equaling the production for the first 6 months of the year. We realize that it would very likely cost more to find and discover the additional 272,000,000 barrels necessary to maintain reserves than it did to find and discover the 437,963,000 barrels, but no allowance has been made for this point.

We have estimated that the cost of finding, producing, and developing a barrel of crude oil as of June 30, 1943, was $1.244 which is an increase of 48 cents per barrel over the cost of the third quarter of 1941, as reflected by the Tariff Commission's Report. We further estimate that the 48-hour week will increase the cost at least 5 cents per barrel. This would bring the cost at the present date to $1.294, exclusive of interest for capital.

The costs are summarized below:

Finding costs	$0.578
Development costs	.320
Production costs	.388
	1.286
Less: Gas and miscellaneous revenue	.042
Estimated June 30, 1943, cost	1.244
Estimated additional costs caused by increased hours at overtime rate	.050
	1.294
Tariff Commission Report third quarter 1941 cost	.764
Increased cost since the freezing of crude oil prices	.530

The margin above cost should be sufficient to provide for:

a. Funds for the exploration needed to find adequate new reserves;

b. Funds to cover replacement cost;

c. A reserve fund for secondary recovery or other conservation measures;

d. A fair return on borrowed and invested capital, taking into consideration the extreme hazards involved in searching for and finding oil;

e. To maintain the industry as a healthy, going concern;

f. For Federal and State income taxes.

Post-War Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on Monday, October 11, 1943, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mr. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board of General Motors, delivered an address on the political and economic problems confronting the Nation in the post-war period. The address is so thought-provoking and well considered that I think it would be instructive if read by all elective and appointed members of our Government. I hope my colleagues will have

opportunity to read it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

It has been estimated by the Government Printing Office that the address will cover five pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that its printing will cost $225.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your organization. These are momentous days through which we are passing, not only in themselves but more particularly as to their implications for the future. I do not need to remind the leadership of the city of Detroit—which might well be called the capital of war production—that the war is not won. Our first job is to win the war. That you appreciate fully as well as I do. We must not be misled by the fact that the general trend of events at the moment is in our favor. Otherwise the war could never be won at all. But, as we work for victory, we must think beyond today and into the years ahead. This is essential if we are to win the peace as well as the war. My remarks this noon—post-war jobs—are based upon that premise.

Its purpose is twofold:

First, to point to a challenge that confronts the leadership of American enterprise. That challenge is to prepare now, and in a realistic manner, to meet the responsibilities it must face as the economy passes from war to peace. Also, to reemphasize the importance of all of us doing our part aggressively and with imagination. That is the approach that has made American enterprise the envy of the world, both in war and in peace.

Second, to attempt to express, in the attack on this objective, a point of view as to some of the more vital problems involved and the opportunities available for the production and distribution of goods and the utilization of the supporting services. This calls for consideration of what might be done in integrating business operating policies into the economic structure as a whole to insure a more rapid transition from war to a peace economy and, more important, to contribute to an expanding economy with increasing job opportunities and progressively higher standards of living in the years to come.

WAR-TO-PEACE PROBLEMS STAGGERING

We can start by saying that the problems the world faces, both political and economic, as it passes from war to peace, stagger the imagination. Many seem beyond the capacity of the human mind to grasp in their full significance—quite aside from the difficulties involved in the administration of proper solutions. Yet upon the finding of realistic solutions and their aggressive and imaginative application will depend whether or not the sacrifices of the war have been in vain. The winning of the war is not the end objective. The real objective is a sound and constructive peace. Winning the war makes such a peace possible. It provides an opportunity. That is all.

At Dunkirk our civilization stood on the verge of destruction. Only by what appears to be a miracle was it saved. The lesson to be learned stands out crystal clear. We had failed utterly to recognize the clear implications of the handwriting on the wall. We were woefully unprepared for the supreme test of war. Are we to repeat such a serious mistake by being unprepared for peace or, now that we are winning the war, shall we direct all available effort not demanded by the war itself, which must remain our prime purpose, to the real objective—the winning of the peace? And will we recognize in making that peace effort the many economic errors that so prejudiced our progress in the days before the war? Much can be accomplished now, notwithstanding the uncertainties involved. This is particularly true of those problems that lie in the area of enterprise where business is directly concerned.

But why this uncertainty as to the peace? Simply because our people do not and cannot be expected to understand the technical intricacies of the problems involved or appreciate the difficulties of finding the right solution. War is dramatic. A military or naval conflict fires our imaginations and stirs our emotions. We can in a way visualize the trend of success or failure as the tide of battle moves back and forth. Glaring errors will eventually be corrected by an aroused public opinion. But on the peace front it is vastly different. We often fail to interpret peace problems in terms of our daily lives. Hence there is grave danger of our being led into obligations and responsibilities we would not accept willingly if the real facts were appreciated by the people at large. We should therefore start to segregate and to discuss our post-war problems, and now. Not in generalities, but in concrete terms. What are these problems and what are we going to do about them?

There are two approaches. In aeronautical terms, one is in the stratosphere, so to speak, the other is on the sea level. There is already too much of the former, too little of the latter. Stratosphere planning attacks the problem from the top. It is the planning of the spenders. Much of it is based on the belief that a few years of war have brought about such profound changes in human reactions that we are to enter a new, different, and completely idealistic world. Starting from the top down involves a danger of regimentation, with an ever-expanding bureaucracy as a permanent factor in our economy. Sea level planning attacks the problem from the bottom. It is the realistic approach. It is the planning of the producers. Its foundation is the great force of individual initiative—the keystone of our system of free enterprise.

I believe every businessman should study these post-war problems from the standpoint of the particular set of circumstances involving his own business. That is a fundamental of free enterprise. Each must make his own contribution in his own self-interest—but with due regard to the broader objectives involved. American business leadership realizes that to produce and distribute goods and services, no matter how efficiently, is not enough. Consideration must be given to the impact of business policies upon our social and economic structure as a whole. Business leadership must take the form of industrial statesmanship. It enjoys a truly great franchise under our system of free enterprise. It must protect that opportunity. It must broaden the scope of its responsibilities.

In the general discussion now taking place about what is to happen after the war there is far too much Utopia—too little realism. We need to remind ourselves that we cannot devote such a large part of our resources and productive effort over several years to creating instruments of destruction that contribute nothing to our standard of living, we cannot place such an economic burden upon the present and future generations, and out of the destruction of wealth create a sound and lasting prosperity for all. Such reasoning does not make sense. There is a price that must be paid for the economic wastage of war. It will take hard work, greater efficiency, and considerable time to overcome the losses the war has created. It will call for intelligence of the highest order, as well as a realistic approach to many complicated problems, if we are to achieve the goals we seek and have a right to attain. Solutions of individual post-war problems, even intelligent solutions, are not in themselves sufficient. They must be coordinated into a well-developed and balanced whole.

THREE CLEARLY DEFINED OBJECTIVES

I am convinced that out of the mass of conflicting and confusing propaganda, out of the great variety of loosely defined objectives and the far too many glittering generalities that are being fed to our people as a preview of the post-war world, there arise three clearly defined "musts," the attainment of which would go a long way toward insuring our gaining the peace and making certain that the sacrifices we are making in winning the war will not be in vain.

They are:

1. Jobs for those who are willing to exchange their time and talents for a proper wage.

2. Means must be found to prevent further attacks on our civilization. There must be no World War No. 3.

3. Our international relationships in the economic sphere must be on the basis of a "two-way" street.

First, as to the problem of jobs, there is, I believe, much confusion in our thinking. It should be clarified. Some seem to believe that the number of jobs can be determined in the abstract by some arbitrary method. We must keep in mind that jobs are a result—not a means to an end—however desirable the objective may be. They are a result of the combination of capital, management and opportunity. The catalyst is a possible profit. The foundation is confidence in the future of enterprise as determined by national economic policy. Without these ingredients there can be no jobs in a free economy. Therefore the future trend of job opportunities is determined by the relationships of the component parts. An analysis of future possibilities involves a discussion of such relationships. The number of jobs available at any time determines the state of employment. Practically speaking, at the best a limited amount of unemployment is unavoidable.

The second means that force if necessary must be organized to prevent further wars. Our civilization cannot stand such a catastrophe every few years and continue to exist. The third means no world W. P. A. at the expense of the American taxpayer. No lowering of our standard of living to that of other countries. Our sovereignty must remain at all times unrestricted.

Jobs—challenge of post-war period

The challenge of the post-war period is jobs. But we cannot meet this challenge by adopting panaceas or by the conjuror's trick of pulling rabbits out of the hat. We have tried all that. It has failed us. The problem can be solved permanently only within the structure of sound economic policy. No nation, no political group, no industry, no leader can persistently transgress the dictates of economic law. Determining the route to be followed is not sufficient. It will require dynamic and imaginative leadership. It will demand of that leadership a comprehensive understanding of the relationship of each unit within the enterprise system to the system as a whole. And that broader understanding must be boldly applied in the policy making phase of business management. This is essential to the preservation of the American competitive enterprise system.

This challenge that our economic, industrial and political leadership now faces cannot be ignored. The American people whose standard of living is involved and whose economic security is at stake, have a right to a solution. Never again can we afford to take the risk to the stability of our institutions of a 50 percent utilization of our economic resources with millions of people out of employment and millions more working short

time, irrespective of what the underlying causes may be.

If the conditions are such that the enterprise system is unable to meet in a practical and realistic way this challenge of high employment, then the people will demand political action although it is perfectly clear that this would never prove a solution. But there is involved in the problem a responsibility we are apt to overlook. While management must actually do the operating job under our system of free enterprise, Government has a vital part in laying down national economic and fiscal policies to the end that the job has a fair chance of being done. At the advent of the war, existing national economic policies greatly prejudiced the expansion of enterprise. Our economy was frozen in a degree. This state of affairs has been lost sight of under the stimulation of the demands of war. Unless political wisdom prevails, similar handicaps will return to plague us and limit our possibilities when the war is over.

We should profit by past experience. We should do those things in a national way that will serve to encourage and stimulate enterprise in all its forms. The objective cannot be achieved otherwise. We must provide the necessary incentives. We must rebuild a foundation of confidence in the future opportunities of individual enterprise. Business cannot plan ahead with confidence if uncertainty exists as to the continuation of our existing economic system. Or if this system is to be hamstrung by those in power who believe in something different and act to prevent the system of competitive enterprise from working effectively. What I am saying is that all obstacles along the highway leading to the maximum of job opportunities must be removed. It is not difficult to identify those obstacles, but it is quite another thing to develop a sufficiently widespread appreciation of their importance so that corrective political action may be insured.

Need more jobs than ever

Our productive plant has increased actually and potentially as a result of wartime expansion. The problem of providing jobs will be greater in the post-war period. And before the war the problem had not been solved—far from it. Moreover, our productive efficiency tends to increase, due to technical progress. This process will continue, unless further restrictions are imposed on the effectiveness of management and worker Increasing technical efficiency means we must provide an increasing number of job opportunities, and in two ways. We must develop new things to produce. We must, in search of an ever-expanding market, produce existing things at always lower prices. If we do not, there are certain to be fewer jobs available instead of more as the years pass on. This must not happen.

The war effort has had a tremendous effect in intensifying business activity and employment. Total war requires the maximum of almost everything. War becomes the business of the entire country. Stimulation takes place along the entire economic front. No matter how mighty may be the resources of any country, there is not enough of anything. Higher wage rates, increased hours of employment, and high employment flow from the prodigious expenditures of Government in financing the war effort, thereby creating an appearance of prosperity in spite of lower standards of living for a large part of the people Such a situation is bound to raise the question of continuing Government expenditures to insure job opportunities in time of peace in the event that they are not made available within the structure of the private enterprise system, notwithstanding the futility of such an approach. The issue cannot be ignored. It is before us potentially at this time.

Deficit spending not the answer

Undoubtedly there are areas of opportunity where Government has operated and can continue to operate in the future without danger to the free enterprise system. Public works of all kinds come to mind. Harbor improvements, highways, and airfields are illustrations. But if we examine the scope of these possibilities we shall see that the aggregate effect of such activities in relation to the magnitude of the peace objective is entirely inadequate. It is important to recognize this fact. It will be even truer in the post-war period in view of our increased productive capacity and our goal of a greatly increased peacetime national income. It is clear that if we are to depend upon Government expenditures, or continuous deficit spending, as it is called, to maintain and expand employment and to increase the national income in times of peace, Government must operate in a far broader way than ever before. It would have to compete with private enterprise in the production of goods and services. Here arises a direct conflict between Government in business along a wide front and private enterprise. It is inherent in such an approach. It cannot be avoided. And, no matter how efficiently private business might be conducted, it could not continue to exist. Subsidies and other uneconomic policies would mark the beginning of the end—the end of the American competitive system as we have known it, the beginning of the socialization of enterprise. It is one approach or the other. It cannot be both. We must choose.

Government and private enterprise

Some of those advocating large governmental expenditures—continuous deficit spending, in other words—have convinced themselves that the old concept of debt no longer holds. They do not call it debt any more. They refer to it as "Government contribution to consumer purchasing power." They argue that a continually rising governmental debt is essentially a conservative program. The illusion that an ever-increasing debt is an ever-expanding national asset is a concept of economy that can and should be boldly and successfully challenged. The end of such a road is definite. It means an unsupportable public debt leading to repudiation in part, depreciation of currency or some other equally undesirable result. It is not to be inferred that Government deficits are not justifiable under certain conditions. War is an illustration. A great depression is another. These necessities lend no support to the theory of continuous deficits to stimulate productive enterprise.

I do not mean to imply that Government has no place in the operation of the economy other than to establish sound policies, thus keeping clear the road to greater opportunity. It has. Free enterprise cannot be maintained today under a policy of laissez faire. The field of opportunity must be not only established on a sound basis but maintained through proper regulation. There is a sharp distinction between establishing national policies affecting the economy as a whole and regulation of the individual units within the economy The areas included in central banking policies, tariffs, social-service programs, taxation, public works and protection against monopolies are illustrative of essential functions of Government. A sound establishment of the broadest field of opportunity means expanded job opportunities; maintenance of that field through constructive supervision of the system provides the means to compensate for the tendency to excesses, both booms and depressions, which tend in the final analysis to unstabilize job opportunities.

TWO POST-WAR PERIODS

In discussing the problem of jobs after the war, to avoid any misconception we must define what we mean by "after the war." There are two areas of time involved, very different in their economic background—the early years and the longer term. The early post-war years might be referred to as a period of shortages, with a preliminary interval of hesitation and transition immediately following the armistice. The long term will commence where the period of shortages tapers off.

Modern history records the fact that after all great conflicts there follows a period of great business activity. Only in duration and intensity does the pattern vary. All the circumstances point to a repetition of this pattern at the end of the present conflict, but on a greatly intensified scale. No former war has seen such a great concentration of economic forces directed toward a single objective and one not in any way concerned with the normal peacetime needs of the people. Moreover, in the 25 years since the last conflict our productivity has enormously expanded not only in aggregate volume but in variety. In World War No. 1 American industry was just preparing to change over to total war production at the time of the armistice. The present conflict finds it already completely converted. Our participation in the former war was for only a relatively short period, already exceeded in the present war. There will have been practically no consumer durable goods such as motorcars, electric refrigerators, etc., produced for several years. All such needs must be deferred in favor of the war effort. It is clear that an enormous potential demand for all kinds of goods and services is developing.

Purchasing power and shortages

Assuming the war continues until the end of 1944, it is estimated that wartime savings of individuals will be about $100,000,000,000. A considerable part of this will be in liquid assets—in banks, savings deposits, and War Savings bonds. Consumer indebtedness will have been largely liquidated so that the reservoir of installment purchasing power will be refilled. Similar accumulations by business and industrial corporations are estimated to add $30,000,000,000 more. Superimposed upon all this there will be in all likelihood a foreign demand resulting from the same fundamental cause—shortages—plus destruction resulting from the war, the amount of effective demand being limited however by the nature of the economic settlements of the war and the ability of other nations to buy, or our willingness to give. Hence, it appears to be clear that there will be ample purchasing power already created to keep our enterprise system active for a period of a limited number of years. To the extent, of course, that the price level is permitted to rise due to inflationary forces existing, the real purchasing power of these savings is correspondingly reduced.

Jobs in all likelihood will be available to insure high employment in the period of shortages. However, due to the fact that centers of war production have not always coincided with the centers of civilian production, important geographical problems of unemployment will of necessity arise. Also certain peacetime industries undoubtedly have expanded their wartime employment beyond any peacetime needs. Major adjustments will be necessary.

Control of inflation

The real problem of the period of shortages will be to control the inflationary influences of an abnormal reservoir of purchasing power in the face of what will be at first extreme shortages of consumer goods. Unless some temporary controls are maintained until production develops a better balance and the law of supply and demand can operate freely again, the consequences may be truly disastrous. At best this is a most complicated problem, because as peacetime production expands it creates additional purchasing power.

We all hate regimentation. We now know what it means. However, in times of war it is essential to a degree and we must accept the fact that regimentation will carry over into the early peace period, until goods available for delivery to consumers are in reasonable balance with the ability to buy.

A DRAMATIC POSSIBILITY

The economic circumstances existing in the period of shortages appear to present an opportunity for accomplishment in both magnitude and scope unparalleled in the history of American enterprise. They deserve our most serious consideration. All the essential economic forces are present to justify the conclusion that, if they could be aggressively, intelligently, and promptly capitalized, we would achieve a peacetime national income far in excess of any heretofore enjoyed. But, desirable as this may be, it is not the most vital point at issue. That is the long-pull position of American enterprise with reference to expanding job opportunities. Granted that the circumstances involved in the period of shortages are synthetic in origin, can they be used nevertheless as an instrumentality to repair the damages of war and to rapidly accelerate the rate of increase in our national income, thus, relatively speaking, reestablishing it permanently on a higher level and insuring a corresponding improvement in our standard of living?

This is, in my judgment, the most important question that faces business management. Academically considered, it would appear as if such an accomplishment were possible. Realistically considered, it would seem as if the answer would be found, first, in the willingness of management to take the initiative and assume the risk in adopting such business policies as would insure not only a maximum over-all utilization of our existing economic resources—raw materials, manpower and plant capacity—but also the expansion of such resources to a level of production possibilities commensurate with the progressively higher income level desired. Second, it would demand a different attitude as to the problems of business on the part of Government than has existed during the last decade.

One thing is certain. Such an accomplishment is impossible without the same all-out effort on the part of management along the whole economic front as has characterized the war effort. Even an all-out effort on the part of some will not suffice. If it be true that high employment is a "must" in the long-term post-war era as a vital component in the winning of the peace, then the opportunity here presented must not be ignored.

Passing to a peace economy

When war production is halted we must reconvert as promptly as possible our production facilities to the products of peace. Now what might be done to minimize the impact of this transition period as affecting the problem of temporary unemployment? And what might be done to minimize the later transition from the period of shortages to the long-range problems of the years ahead?

Undoubtedly the most dramatic attack on both these problems would be a governmental pronouncement of the Nation's firm belief in competitive enterprise and the profit motive as the keystone of the national economic policy, in such form as would carry conviction and hence serve to rebuild a foundation of confidence in the future of business. That may not be practicable. But what we can do and what should be done to this end is to identify and adopt such policies as demonstrate our convictions in practical terms. After all, actions speak louder than words.

Disposal of Government-owned plant

To illustrate, the Government has an investment of more than $15,000,000,000 in wartime industrial plants and equipment. What could be more helpful than a declaration of policy that, aside from such plants as might be needed as a standby for the future, the balance would be made available to private enterprise? And what could be more constructive than to establish the essential procedure outlining how that is to be done? Industry could then, where possible, integrate such plants into its post-war planning, thus placing them in productive use in the shortest space of time and expanding the number of job opportunities.

This problem presents real difficulties. Most of these plants are designed for a specific, highly specialized purpose, of necessity largely unrelated both in type and capacity to any peacetime needs. Their conversion to other purposes involves both a shrinkage in value and an investment of additional capital for different machinery in part and for retooling. Many plants are of such magnitude that few can afford to buy or effectively operate them at any price. But after all the real worth of this huge investment is not its cost, not its liquidating value, but the contribution it will have made to victory and the contribution it can make to a peacetime economy. Such are the facts. They should be faced realistically. We should establish the rules now, whatever they must be.

Production orders for maintenance and replacement of inventory

Some industries have no real reconversion problems. Their contribution to the war effort has been to make more of what they always made. On the other hand, our mass fabricating industries—motorcar, for example—are producing products entirely different from and but little related to the needs of peace. Such industries are in a way limiting factors during the period of reconversion. This effect may be cushioned by the fact that inventories required for the production of many peacetime goods have been liquidated and must be built up again during the period of shortages. Management should place orders promptly to build up stocks of supplies and parts while plants are being rehabilitated, to enable raw material suppliers to continue production, thus reducing the problem of shifting employment into peacetime channels.

Modernization of production facilities

Obsolescence and depreciation have been increasing at an accelerating rate during the war. Normal replacements have been impossible. Better instruments of production are now available. Better techniques are known. Maintenance has been deferred due to lack of materials and manpower. Management should plan to release orders promptly, to modernize equipment, and to bring maintenance up to normal standards.

Cancelation of war contracts

Then there is the problem of canceling war contracts. In the aggregate, the matter of contract cancelation is an enormous problem. A prompt clarification of the financial uncertainties as to procedure would allow business to plan more effectively. It might well contribute to a reduction in the loss of national income and employment in the period immediately following the war. While working capital is tied up in war inventories, industry will be handicapped in its efforts to reconvert. We should establish the rules now.

Disposal of wartime inventory and machinery

Billions of dollars of inventory and other billions of dollars of machinery that now are, or upon cancelation of contracts will become, the property of the Government must be moved out of existing plants before reconversion can be started. A parallel problem has to do with policies for the disposition of stocks of war goods in process and of materials usable for peace purposes. Action in planning for these contingencies is important.

Clearing plants for peace production

It has been suggested that some war production might be continued after the armistice to reduce unemployment during the transition period. That would be a very costly procedure. But in any highly integrated scheme of mass production a plant must be made completely available before the production of peacetime goods can be got under way. And in a group of plants the length of the period of reconversion might well be determined by the last plant turned back. A partial reconversion would mean in many cases a double reconversion with corresponding double interruption in employment. We should remember that when industry converted from peace to war, employment was sustained by new plants coming into production specially constructed for war purposes. That support is not likely to be available when the process is reversed.

Post-war reserves

Practically all businesses are involved, though some perhaps in a small way, in these problems of post-war reorganization. Generally speaking, those in the fabricating area of industry are involved in a very important way. The cost of reconverting plants is a legitimate cost of the war effort. Reserves for that purpose should be permitted as a business expense. While every case is different, if such reserves were limited in use to expansion or betterments or the specific cost of reconversion—in other words, used to expand job opportunities and to increase efficiency—it would be the best national investment we could make. This should be done.

Importance of new designs

The limitations as to new designs and new products in the early post-war period are self-evident. Yet it is important that we move forward as rapidly as circumstances permit. Technology has advanced in the war years. We can do a better job. Better technique should enable us to lower prices and thus stimulate consumption and employment. If industry could now be assigned material for research and engineering development in those instances where it would not detract from the war effort it would help speed up the introduction of new designs of existing things as well as of new things. The amount of material required for this purpose would be negligible in relation to the total. This should be done.

SECOND POST-WAR PERIOD—FIVE MAJOR PROBLEMS

The problems I have identified are merely illustrative of the many points of attack. They must be met sooner or later. Delays are both costly and dangerous. But the most vital question that faces the economy because of its long-pull implications is whether, after the deferred accumulated demands for goods have been satisfied, we can continue to maintain a rising national income with expanding job opportunities. Or must we accept a shrinkage, perhaps an economic collaps ?

The answer as I see it involves five major points: (1) The policies of government toward enterprise; (2) the intelligence with which enterprise conducts its affairs, not only as to itself, but in relation to the economy as a whole; (3) the relations of business with labor; (4) the success with which inflation is controlled during the war, and particularly during the period of shortages; and (5) foreign relations as affecting international commerce. Let us consider these problems from the objective of expanding job opportunities over the long-term position.

AREA OF GOVERNMENT ACTION

I have discussed our broader and more general post-war problems largely in terms of the principles involved. But business managers and all concerned with enterprise in its various forms can operate only under

concrete policies. We must get down to cases. We have seen that to reach our objective of high employment with a high national income, both in balance with other desirable factors, we must have constructive action on the part of both management and government. Government regulates the field of opportunity. Management discharges its operating function within that field. These relationships are by far the most important of the five points I have mentioned as affecting the long-term possibility of job opportunity. First, let us identify the more important problems related to maintaining a field of maximum opportunity—the responsibility of government, in other words. We can well start with the highly important question of taxation.

Post-war taxation

It can hardly be denied that our revenue policy, as judged by its pre-war structure, was a hodgepodge of inconsistencies resulting from emergency demands, compromises, and political expediency. It failed to reflect any long-range, farsighted considerations from the point of view either of meeting the increased demands of Government for revenue or of expanding the sources from which such revenue might be collected. In the pre-war years its effect was to penalize enterprise rather than to expand enterprise. It entirely ignored the concept that lower tax rates may increase total dollar revenue through an expanding economy, just as lower prices of goods will increase consumption by bringing into the market a greater number of buyers.

War taxation has little in common with peace taxation. Many financial problems arise in war as related to tax policy that do not exist in time of peace. Profits tend to expand during war. Because this results from the Nation's distress, the excess may be taxed to the limit, and justly so. But peacetime conditions are different. High taxes, such as existed in the pre-war period, tend to destroy incentive. It is no longer worth while to risk capital in new ventures or expand existing ones if the tax collector takes too large a part of the profits while the investor assumes the entire risk of loss. That is not the way to promote the venture spirit or to encourage the expansion of enterprise. Taxes on individual income must be sharply reduced when the war is over and rates established which are not confiscatory from the point of view of prejudicing the incentive of profit.

Encouragement for increasing technological efficiency

In the light of the urgent need for expanding enterprise and job opportunities and the important contribution that the capital goods industries can make both directly and indirectly toward that objective, we should examine the possibilities of some form of tax advantage to encourage the modernization of all instruments of production and service.

For years there has been a trend toward double taxation at increasing rates. Taxes are collected on the earnings of corporations and again on the stockholders as individuals. We should find a satisfactory substitute for the existing system. The profits of business corporations should be taxed but once. This means that business taxes should be reduced sharply to nominal rates to encourage expansion of enterprise. Beyond that amount the profits of business should be taxed only after they are distributed to business owners as individuals.

Capital should be free to flow from one type of investment to another. This is hampered by the capital-gains tax. Investors should be encouraged to move their capital from one investment to another with a minimum of restriction. The net revenue from the tax on capital gains is not important, hence we restrict the freedom of capital to little purpose. England, whose approach in such matters is far more experienced than ours, does not tax capital gains. Tax rates on capital gains should be reduced, preferably eliminated.

Labor relationships

The existing national policy regarding the relationship of labor and business is manifestly unfair. Both sides should be treated as equals in relation to their responsibilities and privileges. Every right-thinking businessman should support the principle of collective bargaining. But, recognizing the great gains in privileges labor is now enjoying, there must come a corresponding degree of responsibility for its acts. No man should be required by law or as a matter of national policy to pay for the privilege of having a job. A most serious cloud on the potential accomplishments of the immediate post-war period is the relationships of labor and management.

Such are a few of the components which, in the aggregate, determine the breadth of the field of opportunity as established by national policy within which the enterprise system must operate. We must expand that field both by eliminating all obstacles that now exist, thus clearing the highway down which we must travel, and by adopting such economic policies as will enable us to accelerate the rate of progress. Both approaches are essential.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MANAGEMENT

That, however, covers only one phase of the problem. Capitalizing the opportunity is essential. That is the responsibility of management. I have already made the observation that business leadership cannot limit its horizon of action to the physical production and distribution of goods and services. That will not meet the challenge of the future. It must have the courage and likewise the understanding to integrate its policies into the economic and social structure as a whole. In so doing it enlarges its own opportunity for accomplishment.

The importance of technological advance

Business must have customers. More customers mean more jobs. But customers must have money to buy. Hence, an expanding purchasing power is essential to expanding job opportunities. Approximately 85 percent of our total national income comes from wages, salaries, and other forms of compensation to employees or self-employed persons. Nearly 70 percent of the total is actually wages and salaries, mainly wages. Hence the wage factor is a fundamental in our formula for high employment. Too many believe that by increasing wage rates we increase purchasing power, thus creating more customers, and, therefore, more and better jobs. This is not true if the result is to increase costs. Costs largely determine selling prices, and with increasing selling prices increased wages may buy no more goods and services. Hence, increasing wages must be justified by improving our efficiency through technological progress—better machines and better production techniques. In other words, there must be more effective use of materials and manpower.

The influence of wage rates

If we increase wage rates among certain groups, not offset by improved efficiency, we raise selling prices out of balance with the purchasing power of other groups whose wages have not been correspondingly increased. If the wage rates of workers in one industry are higher than in other industries they may be supported, in an economic sense, by greater productivity made possible by a higher degree of mechanization. Even so, there is a point that must be reached, wherever it may be, where even a reduction in hourly wage rates will actually increase workers' annual income or increase the number of workers employed because total employment is expanded through the resulting influence of lower prices. From this we learn that, to contribute to the goal of high employment, wage rates must be set at such a point that the resulting selling prices will insure maximum consumption. We live by the year, not by the hour.

The need for incentives

I have emphasized the importance of incentive. I believe that applies not only to capital but to all workers, management as well as those receiving compensation on an hourly basis. Men are not created equal in their willingness to work or their ability to produce effectively. Those willing and able to produce more should be given the opportunity to earn more. That, after all, is the American way—opportunity to progress according to one's ability. Such a philosophy is contrary to the concept of some labor leadership. I would urge adoption of some plan that would do justice to those workers willing and able to produce more. Speaking in generalities, the economic result would be to lower costs and prices, hence expanding job opportunities.

While the most efficient instruments of production are essential to high employment through reducing costs with their effect on selling prices, there is involved another important consideration. There are job opportunities in producing these more efficient instruments of production. And there are still more job opportunities in the necessary services such as power and transportation required in support of their production. It is a fact little appreciated that the job opportunities in providing essential services are equal to those involved in the production of goods. If we will examine the record we see clearly that our production plant, speaking in terms of generalities, is obsolete from the point of view of the standards of present-day technology. There exists here a large reserve of job opportunities.

It has been estimated that jobs will be required for something like 55,000,000 people in the post-war period. About 25 percent of the total number of workers can be employed directly in manufacture. Another 25 percent in agriculture and construction. The remainder must find their work in the supporting services rendered to business and to the community at large, such as transportation, distribution, the professions, and in the Government service. But the productive part of the enterprise system, especially factory production, is in a degree the creative center from which radiate the economic forces that set the pace at which the wheels of the entire system revolve.

Research not limited to physical sciences

Closely allied to what has just been discussed is the need of improving efficiency from the point of view of the research function of management. The resulting benefits are of the same order as those which flow from more efficient instruments of production. Too often research is thought of as being limited to the physical sciences. But it is equally applicable to all the functional activities of management. Therefore we must not only intensify research as commonly termed, but we must further extend it into other operating functions such as distribution, labor relations, personnel, etc. All can serve to improve efficiency. And increased efficiency means lower costs, lower selling prices and expanded production.

New enterprises

Job opportunities must be further multiplied by creating new things. As our scientific knowledge widens, it opens up new vistas of opportunity. New processes are developed and new products created. Management should direct its research activities not only to the expansion of existing enterprises but to the creation of new ones.

Business savings

The disposition of the savings of business and individuals raises an important economic problem—one little appreciated. It is essential that we reinvest our savings promptly and productively. They must not remain static. An economic formula tells us that production is equal to consumption plus savings. To the degree that we freeze our savings we reduce our ability to consume by just that much; hence, we contract job opportunities.

Monopolies

We have heard a good deal about the restriction of enterprise through monopolies of one form or another. Any attempt, knowingly, to restrict output, to control prices or to limit markets in any way tends to destroy the very foundation upon which our system of free enterprise rests. This must be recognized as a fundamental concept of business itself. It applies with equal force to monopolistic and restrictive practices of all types—whether indulged in by labor, management, or any other group affecting production or distribution. Today no businessman can know with any degree of certainty what constitutes an unlawful practice. The antitrust laws should be clarified.

How best to use cost savings

This brings us to another consideration. If we make savings in costs, irrespective of their source, what is the most effective use of them in promoting more job opportunities? We can (a) increase wages, leaving selling prices the same, (b) reduce prices, or (c) increase profits. Time does not permit a discussion of these relationships. However, this can be said: Cost savings bring the greatest expansion of job opportunities if they are reflected in reduced consumer prices. In making this comment it is not to be presumed that prices should be reduced to the point of subnormal wage rates or of subnormal profits. Consideration must be given to these and other factors as well. The point is urged, however, that we cannot continue to produce unless we can sell. And we cannot sell an increasing quantity of goods unless we have expanding purchasing power. Reducing consumer prices as an economic policy contributes the most to that end.

Establishment of prices

I have stressed the importance of prices in stimulating demand which leads to increased employment. Overhead costs per unit of output vary up and down inversely with the volume of business. This means that in times of depression, when business is at a low ebb, these costs are relatively high. And in times of great activity, relatively low. Hence prices, to the extent that they are determined by overhead costs, tend to intensify depressions by curtailing demand and to stimulate booms by expanding demand. They are not wholly determined by overhead costs, and the extent to which they are so determined depends upon the accounting policies adopted by business.

Business should base its costs on an overhead determined by a practical rate of utilization over the long term of all the economic resources of each particular business as measured by a realistic estimate of its annual productive capacity. Under such a procedure, while profits still vary with volume—that is inevitable—costs and their influence on selling prices will not. Hence, the economic influence of the ups and downs of business volume as influencing prices through costs is eliminated. It is not to be assumed that prices can be arbitrarily established by any formula. But we can never do the best toward any objective, whatever it may be, unless we understand and are guided by the fundamentals involved.

International possibilities

Some organizations like General Motors have created large overseas markets. In these markets General Motors operates its own organizations. It delivers its products from its factories directly into the individual communities of every country where sales opportunities exist. In many countries it carries on semimanufacturing operations. In others it manufactures complete products and commands an important share of the market. General Motors exports its capital, its products, and its know-how. The result has been to benefit both the domestic and foreign consumer by making it possible to buy at lower prices resulting from large-scale production. Such a policy creates job opportunities both in production at home and distribution overseas. Large sums are paid in local taxes abroad. Profits are earned for General Motors stockholders. These profits are taxed here, and when spent domestically create more jobs through expanding purchasing power. Such an approach will contribute to progress in an orderly and sound way.

I have seen since the war of 1914 a trend in many countries toward economic self-containment. The export of motorcars, for instance, has been prejudiced by the desire, and a perfectly natural one, for other countries to keep to themselves the wealth created in the production of goods. Even if their people must pay higher prices for less desirable goods, and they do, nevertheless there may be real or apparent offsetting benefits for the nation as a whole. And then there is the problem of the development of industry from the point of view of national defense. I look for this trend to be accelerated as a result of the war. To use the motorcar industry as a case study, it will increasingly have to decide whether to enter the industrial scheme of other countries and manufacture locally or lose such markets to the domestic enterprise of foreign countries.

Normally, international trade is constantly expanding or contracting in line with the general state of the world economy. Its trend is affected by many influences—political, financial, and economic. It will always be so. But I am convinced that the forces I have just mentioned are certain to influence the trend downward unless offset by corrective measures. Stabilization of international exchange, adjustment of tariffs, elimination of quotas, more intensive promotion of foreign markets are cases in point. Management should put forth every effort, make use of every sound procedure, and Government should support the effort to export our labor and materials in the form of goods and services. But we can do more. If we examine into the record we find that as the countries of the world improve themselves economically, thus increasing their purchasing power by developing their natural resources, expanding their industries and improving their efficiency, their trade with other nations increases accordingly. Here is an opportunity. We can help others and earn a profit for ourselves by judiciously exporting our know-how and our capital through establishing productive enterprises. By so doing we benefit through the resulting general stimulus to international trade and through the profit return on our capital.

But there is one factor which must be reemphasized. It is common to all plans that contemplate exchange of goods and services with other countries. We tried to ignore it in the twenties and thereby learned a costly lesson. I refer to the fact that whether we export our goods, our services, or our capital and know-how, we can be paid only by accepting, directly or indirectly, goods and services in return. There is no other way. As our national income expands we shall need more of the products of other countries, for no nation is entirely self-contained. If we buy more we can sell more in return. But there is no avoiding this fundamental principle.

MORE THINGS FOR MORE PEOPLE IN MORE PLACES

I stated at the beginning of this discussion that its purpose was an attempt to point out the challenge that faces the management of American enterprise as the economy passes from war to peace and into the long-range position beyond, and to urge that it recognize and prepare to assume its responsibilities. And further, to emphasize the fundamental fact that, if there can be a prime objective in the economic area the attainment of which will make an important contribution to the winning of the peace, that objective is the ability of free enterprise to create jobs for those who are willing to exchange their time and talents for a proper wage. It is not an easy task. It has little possibility of accomplishment unless it is attacked with a dynamic and imaginative approach on the part of all concerned. It will not just happen. It will require that such an approach be supported by a recognition of the various forces, economic and others, that bear on the problem.

An attempt has been made to identify certain of these forces, both negative as now existing and positive as containing possibilities for future constructive action. It is recognized—and this point cannot be too greatly emphasized—that no abstract economic principle can be adopted blindly as an operating policy. It should be considered only as a part of a balanced whole—a guide to a better result. But, on the other hand, while it may not always be practical to adopt the course that is best economically, those who share great responsibilities can never form the right judgment without seeking the broadest possible understanding of what is technically right economically.

It must not be assumed that this post-war objective of expanding job opportunities is the responsibility solely of management. It is not. It cannot be attained by management alone. It demands the cooperation of Government. It demands the cooperation of labor. It requires an understanding on the part of management, government, and labor as to how the components must be reconstructed in order to take their proper part in the picture as a whole. It necessitates a recognition of the fact that the pressure group approach, political expediency, and a narrow viewpoint or understanding must give way to a far higher level of thinking based upon the concept that we must seek what is best for the greatest number—knowing that it is almost certain to be the best for each.

Such an approach does not contemplate a redistribution of wealth as it may exist today or tomorrow. But rather the marshalling of manpower, raw materials, production facilities, know-how, and all other economic resources to the end that more and more things are made available to more and more people in all places. This is the theory of plenty, in other words, with expanding job opportunities for all.

Plain Speaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared on the 8th day of October 1943, in the News Republican, of New Castle, Ind., which contains an analysis of our situation in this country during this terrible war. We must win this war, and every effort on the part of the people must be directed to that ultimate victory which must be ours. Those things which

operate as an obstruction to the war effort must be entirely eliminated. All useless and nonessential spending of the people's money must be stopped. If the New Deal continues its spending policies, and if those in power do not stop the waste and extravagance which has run rampant during the administration of the New Deal in this country, we may find ourselves without the funds to further prosecute the war to victory. There can be a financial defeat in this war, just as there can be a defeat upon the field of battle. The President, and his departmental heads, should realize that fact—and they should correct those ills before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "Plain Speaking," which is as follows:

PLAIN SPEAKING

Back in the carefree days of the W. P. A. Harry Hopkins was credited with carelessly blurting out the true philosophy of the New Deal in these nine impressive words:

"Tax, tax, tax—spend, spend, spend—elect, elect, elect."

As long as the myth prevailed that only the wealthy paid the taxes, the appeal to the general public was attractive, and under the guise of relief to the needy, the Federal Government was permitted to spend, spend, spend, to the tune of millions of dollars a year in extravagant public projects, which enabled the New Dealers to elect, elect, elect.

It was political patronage on a grandiose scale.

Through W. P. A. and the other New Deal patronage bureaus, Mr. Hopkins and the many other New Deal wastrels developed a rare skill in pillaging the Public Treasury year after year.

Came the war—and came a new deluge of spending.

When a nation has been attacked, there is no immediate thought to the cost of defense.

First it was millions for national defense, then millions for aid to our allies, and rapidly the millions leaped into the billions and tens of billions.

Not only have the American people been called upon to finance our own tremendous war program but also to give billions of dollars to aid our Allied Nations.

Nearly every fighting nation in the world today except Germany and Japan looks to the United States to meet a large share of its war costs.

It is just beginning to dawn on Congress—and the people—what all this means.

The bitter truth is that with a war far from being won, we are rapidly nearing the limit of our spending power.

If we are to achieve a victory that assures new security to our Nation and to our people, we must stop the profligate waste of public funds by a spendthrift administration.

The same wastrels that squandered our public funds in peace time are still in positions of authority, and they have brought many of their ilk into the Federal Administration.

Before the war they had millions to squander—now they deal with billions.

For all the legitimate needs of financial support to back our fighting forces overseas in speeding the day of decisive victory, the American people—through Congress—will gladly meet the costs.

The same applies to all the legitimate costs of aiding these fighting men to return to civilian jobs after the war, and to the generous care of the wounded and disabled.

It is only common sense that as much as possible of these heavy war expenses be paid now, through taxes, rather than defer them, through the sale of bonds, until after the war when they will be a crushing economic burden upon the very men who did the fighting.

But before Congress passes any new tax legislation, it should study realistically the fact that under the guise of wartime necessity, the wastrels in Washington are throwing away millions and millions of dollars for illegitimate and unwise purposes.

The war economy which the Government has imposed upon the people must, in turn, be imposed upon the New Deal spendthrifts.

Government bureaus must be shorn of all nonessential activities, and Federal pay rolls must be trimmed of all loafers and draft dodgers. The Federal Government itself has created much of the so-called manpower shortage.

All contracts for war supplies must be scrutinized for exorbitant profits and for purchases far in excess of actual needs.

Lease-lend gratuities must be sharply trimmed.

All the fantastic spending sprees to sugarcoat the world at the expense of the United States taxpayers must be brought to an abrupt halt.

If America is to survive as a strong Republic, all this riotous spending that does nothing to win the war must be stopped.

Our only protection against the New Deal wastrels and pillagers is the strong arm of Congress.

Let the full force of the public opinion be exerted now—before it is too late—to save America from its own despoilers.

Palmer Hoyt's Rule for War Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, October 6, 1943, entitled "A Play-by-Play Account." I mention this editorial because of the reference made to Mr. Palmer Hoyt, editor of The Oregonian, who heads the domestic branch of the Office of War Information, and who has performed splendid service to the War Information Office and the public generally.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A PLAY-BY-PLAY ACCOUNT

Few who lived through World War days can fail to have been impressed by the profound ignorance in which the home public was kept concerning the actual conditions on the battle fronts, or by the shock which came when the post-war flood of now-it-can-be-told books suddenly revealed something of the brutal truth. Mr. Palmer Hoyt, who heads the domestic branch of the Office of War Information, suggests that this shock was largely responsible for the mood of defeatist pacifism which filled the succeeding years, and on it he bases a plea that this war should not "be made to look like the pleasant, gallant, and chivalrous affair that it is not." Mr. Hoyt lays down an admirable general rule for war reporting: "If we but want to, we can produce a running, play-by-play story of the war, with pictures, with radio accounts, with newsreels, that will make each of us an eyewitness"—to the filth and horror, as well as to the adventure and heroism—without propagandizing in one sense or another

It is an admirable directive, and it is one, it seems to this newspaper, which the press, the magazines and book publishers, the newsreels and radio reporters, have tried to live up to and, on the whole, have fulfilled with remarkable success. We have a far grimmer and more detailed picture of life in a Solomon Island foxhole, on the Salerno beaches or in a Flying Fortress squadron than we had, during the last war, of life in the western front trenches. But if the picture is still incomplete, the fault does not lie primarily with the press, radio, and newsreels. For these find themselves laboring under two difficulties, both of which should be recognized.

One is ineradicable; it is the inveterate optimism and the inveterate want of imagination of a public which has never itself directly experienced war. A newspaper reporter, at imminent risk of his own life, can gather a vivid account of the sights and sounds of battle, of the casualties, the wreck, the terror; it still requires a sensitive and thoughtful mind to transmute his words into something of the actuality described. All the facts may be given—an ammunition ship blown up, six heavy bombers lost, a submarine missing—and many will still simply refuse to understand what those facts mean. This is a permanent factor in the problem of war reporting.

But the second difficulty need not be. That is the difficulty of a censorship which constantly tends not to release all the truth which can be told, but to manipulate opinion with the truths it does release. It is the tendency of high authority, both military and civilian, to be constantly feeling the public pulse, administering shots of optimistic fact when the pulse seems lowered or shots of gloom when it appears to be too high. There is no front-line correspondent who will not say that there is his greatest obstacle in the way of giving a straight play-by-play account of the actualities of war. Mr. Hoyt's remarks evidence his own desire to reduce the obstacle, and it is less now than it was in the earlier months of the war. But it is still more prominent than it should be.

Problems of American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABE MURDOCK

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, on October 7, 1943, Mr. H. A. Benning, of Ogden, Utah, president of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., and one of the West's most distinguished businessmen, wrote me quite at length concerning taxes, present problem confronting American business, and problems which will necessarily present themselves to American business in the post-war era. The statement of Mr. Benning is so timely and so

well thought out and presented that I feel it is worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I feel that my colleagues may very profitably read it. I therefore ask that the letter referred to be included in the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO.,
Ogden, Utah, October 7, 1943.

Hon. ABE MURDOCK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURDOCK: I hesitate to write you at this time from the viewpoint of an American businessman. However, I feel so strongly that there are important matters to which we have to turn our thinking, and for that reason am doing so. Victory, of course, is the primary object of all American thinking and activity. Victory should not be the end of our thinking, nor is it a single aim which excludes or should exclude all other considerations. We are told by our leaders and asked to believe that victory is essential to preservation of democracy as a way of life. Belief in this concept is the motive power behind all of our present activity. To "preserve" is to maintain something possessed as distinguished from the acquisition of something new and never before possessed.

We have possessed and enjoyed the advantages of democracy. We are not struggling to preserve that way of life against substitution of a new way of life dictated by our enemies. We have permitted the democratic processes to be temporarily in suspension in the interest of the war effort. This we have done willingly and in full good nature. But, to those of us who believe we are fighting for the preservation of democracy, it is plain that plans must now be afoot for the projection of democracy, saved by victory, into the post-war years.

Meantime the fight goes on and irresistibly the pressure of our armed might brings nearer the destruction of our enemies. There is ample credit for all. There is no need to belittle the efforts of any group to magnify the importance of another. Chief credit must go to the officers and men of the armed forces. But it is because those men are fortified by the superior productive power of our people as a whole that they and our allies will prove themselves invincible.

Without intending any slight to any other group in our society we press the claim that the American businessman is a prodigious contributor to the success of our production effort. Large and small, business has shown a magnificent resourcefulness and genius for teamwork. It is the genius and resourcefulness of American business which largely measures the difference in capacity to produce between ourselves and our enemies when both are put to the test of the long pull and the grand struggle.

That genius and resourcefulness is quite properly one of the main hopes for the continuation of the democratic way of life in the post-war years. Business must make the same contribution to the ways of peace that it has been and is doing to the production of the necessities of war. It will not fail in that duty but it must have and is entitled to some encouragement. It asks for an attitude which is not hostile and it requires sufficient freedom from unreasonable restraints and interference to permit the play of its great capacity.

Business, as we commonly accept the term in this country, embraces the production, transportation, and exchange of goods with all of the numerous activities dependent upon and necessary to that work. Business requires to be relieved of unwarranted and hurtful criticism. It is not an evil or predatory thing. It should not be dangled before the populace as something to be feared and hated. It should good-naturedly accept necessary and reasonable restraints, but it should not be continued in existence as a whipping boy for the satisfaction of the whims of any group.

It should, as soon as the war is over, be freed from the invasion of countless Government agencies bent upon the imposition of endless rules and regulations so involved and confusing, and oftentimes so complicated as to make compliance, on the one hand, and continued operation, on the other, almost impossible. To this end there should be an orderly but rapid closing out and dissolution of all but genuinely essential regulatory agencies and bureaus. The power of the bureau has grown so great as to seriously challenge the best intelligence and the highest fortitude of Congress, but Congress will not demand victory by the armed forces in the field and then on the home front succumb to the pressure of the ever multiplying bureaucrats.

This would relieve business of useless and hampering interference and at the same time separate hundreds of thousands of unecessary persons from the public pay roll. It would accomplish the break-down of a power great enough to challenge and ultimately dominate the will of Congress. It would, at the same time, result in a great cut in the cost of government and the corresponding relief to business in its effort to take the place of Government in the establishment and maintenance of pay rolls.

Business must continue to be the principal financial support of Government through the payment of taxes and at the same time it must be the source of those great pay rolls, without which there can be no happy and prosperous people and without which Government steps in and the democratic way of life expires. These demands upon business can be met only if business has the resources and earnings with which to meet them. Allow business only its operating expenses, siphoning off nearly all revenues in excess of expenses in the way of taxes, and shortly there will be neither pay rolls nor taxes.

Taxes are essential for the servicing and reduction of the public debt and the current cost of Government. A sound economy requires that both must be reduced. Reduction can be accomplished only through economy and taxation, but tax levies upon business must be tempered to the necessities of a thriving business. Business, made anemic by excessive taxes, will not in the long run yield sufficient revenues, no matter how severe the tax levies may be. Business must accumulate reserves to enable it to take up the slack resulting from the cessation of war activities. The change-over will require vast capital and the demands of the Government should harmonize with that necessity.

Any increase in the normal tax rate on business at this time will be detrimental to the post-war program, and it is questionable whether it will return a substantial increase in revenue in the long run. The present normal tax rate of 40 percent plus the excess profits levy allows no more than enough, in most instances, to pay a small return on legitimate capital investments.

The challenge to business to keep the wheels humming during the reconstruction period is already heard throughout the land. Business will take up the challenge and make the fight to the bitter end because it knows that the alternative is government enterprise in the place of private enterprise. Call government enterprise what you will—socialism, communism, or fascism—it is not democracy and it is democracy that business, including management and labor alike, is committed to preserve.

Business, like all other elements in our society, is and has been essentially honest and it should not in the interests of the total welfare longer suffer unwarranted and unfair criticism. It is unfortunate that in the minds of so many, groups of citizens are set off and classified one against the other as if their interests were fundamentally hostile, one to the other.

I am sure that you are mindful of the thoughts expressed herein and I am confident that you appreciate the seriousness of the situation our economy is confronted with. I am hopeful that Congress will accept its responsibility in connection therewith.

Yours very truly,
H. A. BENNING,
President.

Thomas Goode Jones, of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 14 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Hon. John S. Tilley, before the joint session of the Senate and House of Alabama, on June 23, 1943, on the occasion of the presentation to the State of Alabama of a marble bust of Governor Thomas G. Jones, author of the first lawyer's code of ethics.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS GOODE JONES, 1844–1914

AN APPRECIATION

It is given only to the discriminating adequately to appraise memories and traditions. Whether in the life of individual or nation, today, as always, these intangible forces wield a largely unappreciated influence. A man's heritage inevitably contributes materially to make or to break him.

And so, that nation which forgets its past is likely to forfeit its future. That people which fails to honor its great will eventually have no great to honor. To glorify courage and chivalry is to provide an incentive for future courage and chivalry. More than this, to pay tribute to our noble dead is indirectly to exalt ourselves; it is our blood-strain, our stock which produced them. Their worth is indicative of the stamina of that stock. Their achievements offer the promise that, given the setting and the demand, the breadth of vision, the virility of body, mind and soul which was theirs will at intervals crop out in those who are flesh of their flesh, blood of their blood.

THE SOUTH CONTRIBUTES TOWERING PERSONALITIES

The earliest biblical records recite that "there were giants in those days." Fortunately for humanity, the race has rarely lacked towering personalities. In the production of these outstanding figures certain epochs, certain groups have excelled. It is your and my proud boast, a claim amply buttressed by the record that in days gone by our Southland contributed more than its quota of national immortals. Recall the names of the pilots of our ship of state in that stormy period which marked the growth of this people into a mighty Nation. The Declaration of Independence, the leadership of the armies of the Revolution, the Constitution of the United States, all were the work of patriots of southern blood. Glance at the story of the decades which in-

tervened between our birth as a Nation and the War between the States; 4 of the first 5, 9 of the first 12, 10 of the first 16 Presidents of the United States were sons of the South. True, with the close of hostilities in 1865, there were also closed to southern statesmen the doors of national eminence. True also, that even after the passing of three quarters of a century this embargo on southern leadership in national affairs still remains. Be this as it may, the blood-strain is still here, the virility, physical, mental, and spiritual persists, and, while the field of operation is circumscribed, the call of opportunity will hear a ready and powerful response. Undeniable proof of the accuracy of this observation is supplied by the occasion which brings us together today.

ELOQUENCE OF DEEDS WELL DONE

Once more to these historic halls we have come to review a notable record, to crown again with the laurel the brow of one of Alabama's giants; one who honored and was in turn honored by his people. It is no occasion for empty eulogy. In such an hour mere fine phrases and rhetorical flourishes appear inane and cheap; for there is an eloquence beside which the mere eloquence of words loses its charm, namely, the eloquence of deeds well done, of a record freighted with distinction, of a noble life grandly lived.

And, what a record it is.

AN ARISTOCRAT OF CULTURE AND REFINEMENT

For Thomas Goode Jones the start was auspicious. He was a child of the red old hills of Georgia. It was his high privilege to be born of parents springing from the soil, and saturated with the traditions, of old Virginia. It was an imposing heritage, one the impelling force of which was to color his entire life. Thus it was his to be that most fortunate of men, a man with a background, and that background one of the best. He was to prove worthy of it. Not for him to choose merely to bask in the reflected glory of his past, nor to drift with that too-numerous company of those who, coming from something, are nothing; from first to last he earned for himself the right to Kipling's characterization, "a first-class fighting man." Born to the true aristocracy, the aristocracy of culture and character, he took his place in the ranks of those who "walk with kings, nor lose the common touch." Panoplied by nature to march in front of the crowd, there blazed ever on his shield that legend, that irresistible driving force which in the final analysis differentiates the real from the spurious aristocracy, "Noblesse oblige."

THE SOLDIER

Soldier of the Southern Confederacy

Hardly had he emerged from childhood when the storm, long threatening, broke in fury. A Virginia Military Institute cadet, he answered a call to Richmond to serve as drillmaster of soldiers for the Confederate Army. Entering the service as a boy-private, by the end of the struggle sheer merit had elevated him to the rank of a boy major. At the age of 17, as a member of the Virginia Military Institute corps of cadets he was one of Jackson's "foot cavalry" in the Valley of Virginia. His no less than seven wounds received on the field of battle tell their own story of the grimness of the encounters as well as the dare-devil nature of his and his comrades' courage.

Rides at head of Gordon's immortals

Toward the end of the war there came a day when Lee was to make his desperate attempt to break through the line of steel which Grant had forged at Petersburg; it was left to a picked 300 men to charge the Federal defenses and at their head rode a 21-year-old major of the staff of Gen. John B. Gordon. The major's name was Thomas Goode Jones.

Bears Lee's flag of truce

On that fateful morning of April 9, 1865, with his battered fragment of an army worn to exhaustion, no option was left the Confederacy's great chieftain; it was imperative that he send a flag of truce to General Grant. The bearer of the flag was Major Jones.

Long years after the guns were hushed, while lecturing in Montgomery, General Gordon paused to recount various instances of his former young staff officer's gallantry in battle. In 1914, upon receipt of news of his friend's passing, Col. W. Gordon McCabe, of Virginia, himself a distinguished former Confederate officer, wrote Mrs. Jones: "In the Army of Northern Virginia he was our beau ideal of the daring and skillful young soldier who, in homely phrase, would go anywhere and do anything."

When Appomattox was history, the young veteran turned to Montgomery where for a brief period he engaged in farming and in editing the Daily Picayune. There was hardly an interval ere arrived the next call to conspicuous service.

THE STATESMAN

Leads manhood of State against reconstruction

After starving the Confederacy into submission, an ungenerous conqueror blackened history with a chapter the utter shame of which brings the crimson to the cheek even of fair-minded men of the North. The Radicals set out to crucify an Anglo-Saxon civilization, unquestionably the proudest this country had boasted. Highminded statesmen everywhere recoiled in horror from a deliberate plan to enfranchise, even to enthrone in power in the South, its former slaves, thousands of them only a generation removed from voodooism and savagery.

A crushed and bleeding people despairingly cried out for leaders with capacity to know what to do and courage to do it. Under prevailing conditions resistance appeared sheer recklessness; yet, defying the might of the conqueror, scorning the bayonets of Federal forces of occupation, the manhood of the South staged a daring revolution. Disarmed and seemingly helpless, their leaders disfranchised and humiliated, the old fighting spirit reasserted itself and with their bare hands, as it were, the former Confederate soldiers redeemed their civilization. History records no nobler contribution to the reenthronement of intelligence over ignorance, the resurrection of ideals of government for which strong men were ready to die.

In the forefront of the struggle, with the same nonchalant disregard of danger which had characterized his soldier days, marched the former young major of Gordon's staff. The debt of the present generation to the intrepid spirits who wagered their lives to rescue their section from the barbarities of reconstruction defies exaggeration.

Councilman, legislator, speaker of the house

This assignment ably executed, his fellow Montgomerians placed him in the city council, where for many years he faithfully guarded their interests. Then he heard another call. His county chose him as its representative in the Legislature of Alabama. One single fact exemplifies the ability and the character of his activities in this field; 2 years after he took his seat his fellow lawmakers placed him in the chair of speaker of the house of representatives.

Limitation of time precludes a review of his statesmanlike career as a lawyer of integrity and prominence. Suffice it to record that he became president of the Bar Association of Alabama and respondent to an appeal to cooperate with important committees of the American Bar Association.

Author of first lawyer's code of ethics

It should be added that his unique contribution to his profession of law, one which won for him national recognition, was his authorship of the Alabama Lawyer's Code of Ethics, the first adopted in the United States. The document has influenced similar codes in many other States and supplied the foundation stone for the canons adopted by the American Bar Association.

THE GOVERNOR

Fearless and kindly Governor

Steadily growing in stature and influence, fate had destined him for further and higher distinction. In 1890, at the age of 46, the people of his State chose him as their Governor. Giving up a lucrative law practice to receive only a modest salary, he held the office for two terms. The record of his administration speaks for itself and speaks with impressive force. He charted his course with the iron hand, the utter fearlessness, the kind heart which had ever made him a marked man. Stormy situations there were in plenty, crisis followed crisis to test his stamina but, with a fortitude that did not quail, he met and mastered each obstacle as it arose.

His part in framing Alabama's new constitution

Another problem was presently to raise its head. Over a long period conditions had developed which demanded a restatement of the organic law of the State. With scrupulous care Alabamans selected their most representative men and sent them to a constitutional convention. The Second Congressional District, of which his county was a part, designated the former Governor as a representative in the responsible task of rewriting the constitution. Of his participation a later occupant of the gubernatorial chair was to write: "He easily ranked as one of its leaders; many of the wisest provisions of that instrument were incorporated through his efforts and will ever remain an enduring monument to his profound knowledge of constitutional law."

THE JURIST

President of United States calls him to bench

More and more the Alabaman was becoming known beyond the limits of his State. Perhaps the crowning honor of a career of distinction came when President Theodore Roosevelt sent to the Senate of the United States for confirmation his nomination of Thomas Goode Jones as judge of the District Court of the United States, Northern and Middle Districts of Alabama.

At great financial sacrifice he entered upon this service. And here, again, the uncompromising integrity of the man of background, the mastery of law of a life-long student, the rugged virility of the soldier, the breadth of view of the statesman combined ideally to fit him for this exalted post. An irresistible tendency to mercy tempered an inflexible devotion to justice. The vicious felt the weight of a mailed fist; the unfortunate, the victims of cruel giants of circumstance, came to know that within that glove of steel there was a hand as gentle as the hand of a woman.

For the man on the bench was no stranger to the poignancy of sorrow; over and over again the iron hand entered his soul and so, nothing human was alien to him. Under his guidance, in consequence, the Federal court became a true temple of justice, a bulwark for the law-abiding, a terror to the law breaker. An associate on the Federal bench, Judge William I. Grubb, thus evaluated his service: "He was one of the ablest lawyers and judges, and one of the purest and most lovable men whom it has been my good fortune to be associated with in any of the relations of life."

Passes into the great silence

After a public career extending over a full half century, in his seventieth year, at the very pinnacle of his matured effectiveness, the end came. Administered to by a faithful companion, the former Georgena Caroline

Bird, Montgomery's "Miss Gena," who carried out to the end her betrothal vow "to love and cherish until death do us part," surrounded by a devoted family, the tired and spent veteran of a hundred battles, battles of peace and of war, passed into the great silence. The entire South knew and appreciated its loss.

Alabama mourns her dead son

The chief executive of Alabama ordered the flag at half mast, the capitol draped in mourning. His former battle comrades, his beloved Montgomery Greys, other State militia, the band of his old regiment, the civilian authorities of city, county, and State, together with a throng of his neighbors and friends assembled tenderly to lay him to rest in Oakwood. Governor Emmet O'Neal issued an official proclamation in which, among other tributes, he wrote:

"The memory of his strength of will, his dauntless courage, his devotion to high principle, his eminent service to the State both in war and in peace, will remain to all Alabamians not only a source of patriotic pride, but an enduring inspiration. * * *

"When the scroll which contains the names of the great men of Alabama is unrolled, there will be none that will occupy a higher or nobler place than Thomas Goode Jones. The one grand tendency of his noble life and character has been to elevate the whole tone of the public mind, and to inspire a deeper sense of patriotism and a loftier conception of the duties of citizenship."

His name shines with honor

Of what other Alabaman is it to be written that on as many and as varied fields of service, the battlefield of his country, the profession of law, the council of his city, the legislature of his State, the gubernatorial chair, the constitutional convention, the Federal judgeship, his name shone with like honor? And to how few men is it given to live a life so worthily demonstrating the truth of the words of the great Galilean, "He who would be greatest among you, he shall be the servant of all."

Your Excellency, Governor Sparks, Judge Walter Burgwyn Jones, a worthy son of a noble sire, himself with a long and distinguished record of nearly a quarter of a century as presiding judge of the fifteenth judicial circuit of Alabama, today performs a public service in giving to his State this portrait in marble of his revered father. The creation of Herbert Adams, of New York, a sculptor of national renown, an exquisite work of art in its own right, this classic likeness will preserve for this and for generations yet to come the handsome presence, the dignity and manliness of one who loved his State and gave a life of service to his people.

I count myself highly honored to be privileged this day to present to the State of Alabama this memorial to Thomas Goode Jones.

Resolutions of the Poweshiek (Iowa) County Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a set of resolutions adopted by the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau, and in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the fact that Poweshiek County is in the heart of the richest agricultural region in the world, a section that is contributing enormously to the war effort in manpower, in the armed services, purchase of War bonds, and food production.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE FARM BUREAU—COUNTY ORGANIZATION GOES ON RECORD ON IMPORTANT ISSUES

The Poweshiek County Farm Bureau unanimously adopted the report of the resolutions committee at the annual meeting Tuesday night. The resolutions report had been presented at the township meetings for discussion and some resolutions were removed and others added on suggestions from these meetings. The report of the committee was as follows:

Be it resolved by the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau:

1. That we reaffirm our allegiance to the United States, the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, and the Iowa and American Farm Bureau Federation, and we will cooperate with them to the fullest extent.

2. That we pledge our wholehearted support to the churches and other organizations in the county working for the betterment of the community.

3. That we extend our wholehearted support to the National Government in the prosecution of the war effort and in so doing we will bend every effort to meet production goals established by the Department of Agriculture.

DRAFT BOARD COMMENDED

4. That we commend the Poweshiek County draft board for its efforts to maintain an adequate supply of skilled agricultural labor and for its insistence that deferred farm workers remain on the farm and not be allowed to shift to industry.

5. That we recommend the farm-to-market roads be so chosen as to provide an all-weather outlet to the most people, rather than an attempt to make through connections or establish standard width and quality roads.

6. That we recommend to the State Farm Bureau federation as much decentralization and democracy within the organization as possible. The officials of the federation be commended for their constant efforts to suggest improvements within the State organization but that the demand for action on these suggestions come from the townships and counties and that pressure and salesmanship from the federation be applied sparingly, especially, in face of opposition even though minor or local in character.

7. That we recommend that adequate funds continue to be made available for administration of the A. A. A. program but that there be more local control. State committeemen should be elected and ideas for the program should originate on the township and county levels.

8. That the suggestion for forming a Farm Bureau life insurance company be even more thoroughly investigated and that it be launched only when it becomes apparent that it has the wholehearted support of the majority of the counties.

SIMPLIFY TAX RETURNS

9. That the Federal income tax laws be simplified.

10. That the recent restriction on school bus travel be modified at least until all nonessential bus and truck travel is eliminated.

11. That we pledge ourselves to all-out opposition to any group attempting to organize farmers and collect dues by the check-off system or by any method other than voluntary.

12. That we favor Federal laws subjecting the accounts of labor unions, and other organizations, to an audit and that officials make available to members an account of yearly receipts and disbursements.

OPPOSE SUBSIDIES

13. That we approve inflation control through forced savings, bond purchases, higher taxes, and increased production, but that we oppose subsidies as an ineffectual method and one unfair to farmers.

14. That we favor the drastic curtailment of red tape, bureaus, and overlapping agencies and that politics be completely divorced from all branches of the Department of Agriculture.

15. That we favor action to assure the farmer of an adequate supply of unmixed proteins, so that we will not be forced to buy materials that he does not need to pay excessive prices for his protein supply.

16. That the Poweshiek County Farm Bureau thoroughly discuss the peace, post-war problems and adjustments, and be prepared to assist the State and American federation in counseling with the United States Government in assuming its responsibility in world affairs.

Youth Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News:

YOUTH CONTROL

We have seen, in the past decade, the tentacles of the gigantic Federal octopus reach out from Washington into every nook and corner of this broad land and seize control of many functions which previously for generations had been under local management.

A man farms these days on a pattern laid down by Federal planners; he eats, to a great extent, that which Federal planners decree he may have; he pays rent under a Federal control system; his working hours, wages, and places of employment are pretty much what the Federal Government says they shall be.

By means of many devices, including subsidies, rationing, labor legislation, and decrees, the Federal Government has regimented the American public to a degree that would have been termed preposterous if suggested not more than a dozen years ago.

The war is responsible for some of the regimentation, of course. And some of it is necessary to put efficiency in the conduct of the war.

But there is plenty of evidence that the Washington planners are looking beyond the war, are scheming to continue the regimentation program beyond the day it is needed to marshal our resources and efforts behind the war program.

They are of the school of thought who believe that everything should be managed from Washington, who would tell the American people what to wear, what to eat, how to spend their leisure hours, what to do with their money, what to read, and when and where to work, and for how much.

They are the boys who believe that the American people are not intelligent enough to work out their own destiny; who believe that thinking for the American people must be done in Washington.

They pose as "liberals," although in fact they are advocates of the oldest form of government in history, the totalitarian, in which

the people have nothing to say in how they shall be governed.

Strenuous denials have been made in some sources that such plans are being formulated. But there is too much evidence to the contrary to make these denials convincing.

There is, for instance, the attempt of the Federal Government, through the Office of Civilian Defense, to organize the youth of the country into a junior citizens service corps.

Under this plan, the volunteer war activities of such organizations as the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts would be combined, under Federal control. The members of these groups would be uniformed, would be pledged to devote a certain number of hours each week to war activities under Federal control.

There is nothing in the manual of the proposed Junior Citizens Service corps at which one could take offense. But, at the same time, there is no need, even under the present emergency, for a Federal youth movemen The organizations affected by the proposal have been operating efficiently in every war chore turned over to them.

And there is good reason, even if this were not the case, to be suspicious of any national youth movement, regardless of the guise under which it is proposed.

We have seen how the boys and girls of Germany, Italy, and Japan have been organized and regimented for de[illegible]ed reasons. We cannot take a chance on that happening here.

Regimentation is the mark of a totalitarian state. Regimentation of children is a device employed by dictators to train rising generations to submit supinely to the desires of a dictatorial government, to educate children to glorify war, to wean them away from ideals the human mind naturally establishes if education is permitted to proceed without political interference.

National control of children has been misused in so many instances that one is compelled to reach the conclusion it could happen here. Let's not provide the opportunity.

Address of Hon. D. Lane Powers to Graduating Class of Aviation Cadets at Napier Field

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Representative D. LANE POWERS, of New Jersey, who has done so much toward building up our air forces, was the principal speaker before the class of aviation cadets graduating at Napier Field, Ala., on October 1. At that time he had the happy privilege of pinning the wings on his son-in-law, Lt. Phillip McHugh.

Mr. POWERS' address follows:

Colonel Daniels, distinguished guests and members of the graduating class: It is a signal honor for me to be present today at the graduation of a class of officers of the United States Air Corps. It would be an honor to anyone to address you—but to me it is particularly gratifying to be invited here since I have closely identified myself with the efforts of our Nation to build a competent and effective air arm since my first year in Congress. Looking at you men today I see a fulfillment—a glorious fulfillment—of all of the hopes and all of the ideals which those of us had who first planned an improvement program for the Air Force.

May I, at the beginning, bring to you the personal greetings of my colleague, my friend, the distinguished Representative of the Congressional District in which Napier Field is situated. I refer to the Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL, of Alabama, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives and one of the most valuable legislators in this or any other Congress. Chairman STEAGALL asked me to present to you members of the graduating class his congratulations on the attainment of your wings and his best wishes for your success as officers of the Air Corps.

You men are on the threshhold of a new phase of active Army life. Until the present time you have been concerned largely with learning the elements of effective air warfare. From today on you men are going to put the training you have had into practice. Some of you will be flying transport planes, some will be teaching other eager young men the same lessons you have learned so faithfully and well. Others of you will go forth to the far-flung battle fronts of the world, there to come to deadly grips with the enemy—to meet him, to engage him and to conquer him!

The finest opportunities that this Nation can offer to any military man are your future. You are graduating as members of a splendid force. However, not only are you being honored today, but you are assuming a grave and serious obligation. You are now charged by the Army Air Forces to uphold the reputation of that branch of the Service, and to further the splendid record that Army airmen have made all over the world—whether as instructors, as transportation pilots, as individual fighters, or as members of bombing crews. That record has consistently been high and I am just as sure as the fact that today is Friday that you men will not only uphold that record but you will add to it new pages of honor and glory.

Your future duties will call upon you to cover almost every field of air activitiy in this war. You are the ones, as members of our fighting air force, who must spearhead the offensive that the latter part of this year and the early part of 1944 will bring. With you in your daily tasks go the interest of the public, the blessings of the country, and the approbation that everyone has for an individual who tackles a tough task and gets it done successfully.

The intensive military value of the Army Air Forces has been especially impressed upon the public and upon the high ranking military officers within the last few years. For that reason, as ranking minority member of the War Department Appropriations Committee, I can guarantee you and every man in the Service that the Congress of the United States will continue to appropriate every dollar, every thousand dollars, and every million dollars that are necessary to give you men the training you need and the fighting tools you require. Further, I can assure you that the Congress of the United States will not fail to record and reward exceptional merit shown by any flyer or any member of the Air Forces or any other military arm.

I have said that your presence here is a fulfillment of dreams that many of us had back in 1933 and 1934. It may interest you to know that in those days the War Department appropriation bill for all of the military needs each year would not amount to half a billion dollars. In those days many men who were imbued with the idea that this country could be supremely isolated, could blindly ignore the events in other parts of the world, would closely scrutinize each item requested in appropriations for the War Department. In those days my War Department Appropriations Committee would hold hearings lasting a month or more on a bill which would total two or three hundred millions of dollars. Then we would take that bill to the floor of the House, and for weeks Members of Congress who smugly believed that we needed no Army at all to protect this rich land of ours would do their best to cut the War Department appropriations to the very bone.

During that hectic period those of us who saw menace abroad, who believed that if you own a treasure like this land we live in, you should be equipped to protect that treasure from any or all predatory nations, agitated for a program of improvement for our Air Corps. Our efforts were hampered, ridiculed, and many times cursed by those who opposed our views. The only recognition and the only satisfaction that I require for those years we spent fighting the War Department's battle in Congress I have received today as I stand here and look at you men who are the embodiments of our aspirations. I realize, and the world realizes now, that we were right—but I can remember the time it took us 2 weeks to get the House of Representatives to approve $20,000,000 of dollars for airplane research and development so that, should war ever reach our shores, the men who took our ships aloft to meet and give battle to the enemy would be flying planes that could equal or surpass in maneuverability, in fire power, in speed, and in the same armor plating the planes of the enemy.

Fortunately, we won that fight for those 20 millions of dollars and at that time the first step was taken to make the planes of Army Air Force comparable to those flown by the flyers of the gangster nations.

Now the picture is different. Now when the Army Air Force or any other branch of the service requires sums of the taxpayers' money to use for the purpose of protecting the taxpayers' investments those appropriations are made by the Congress with little or no question. Where we used to spend 3 months on a $300,000,000 bill we new spend a week on a $72,000,000,000 bill. And I can assure you that, should it become a military necessity, the great war appropriation bill this year of $72,000,000,000 will be surpassed next year or the year beyond that or as long as may be required so that you men may be assured of the equipment needed to do your job.

During the 20 years prior to 1942 the United States Army trained 4,600 air cadets. Since the fiscal year of 1942 the United States Air Force has trained 44,000 cadets. Furthermore, the expansion of the air arm of the service is going to continue. I am not releasing any military secrets when I tell you now that plans have already been laid for 273 air groups, for the production of 99,740 planes, with reserve engines and spare parts for those planes.

We are ready for a decisive year just as you men are ready to play your parts in making this year decisive. This country is united as it has never been united before on the one thing—we must win this war, we must must win the war as quickly as possible and we must totally destroy the enemy so that future generations will not suffer as we are suffering, and will not be called upon to sacrifice as you men are sacrificing.

The Japs and the Germans have seen the handwriting on the wall. That writing is being done by bombs, by fighter planes. The Japs and the Germans who were so arrogant and so cocksure a year ago are now beginning to wonder if maybe they have not bitten off more than they can chew. Believe me, they have taken too big a bite, and I know you fellows are going to get a big thrill out

of doing your part to kick that bite right back in the enemy's teeth.

Statistics alone prove to us that the victory will be ours. We have not only superior plane production facilities, we have also superior planes—but more than that the United States Air Forces are turning out and putting up against the enemy the highest type fighting pilots in the world. Our airmen are second to none, and as each German plane goes down in flames over Europe and as each Japanese plane crumples in the Pacific—the Japs and Germans are learning the answer that you men are giving and that any freemen will always give to any nation which attempts to throttle their freedom.

In the days and weeks and months that are to come you men are going to play your part, and you are going to be a credit and an honor not only to the Air Corps but to your parents and sweethearts, to the instructors who trained you, and to the people of the United States. To you, in closing, may I say that there seems to be no more fitting phrase that can be said to any airman than was said at the recent graduation exercise by my friend and fellow fighter for the expansion of the Air Corps, Lt. Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold. If you remember nothing more of what I have said today but this, lock it in your hearts and keep it with you always. General Arnold said to your fellow officers, "Your men will look to you for justice, your commanders for faithfulness. Let neither find you wanting."

The Senators and the Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Senators and the Bases," which appeared in the Washington Post of Thursday, October 14, 1943:

THE SENATORS AND THE BASES

(By Walter Lippman)

Now that the traveling Senators have seen the great American overseas bases which have been constructed during the war, they would serve the country well if they made it their next business to understand what they have seen. A serious discussion of the future of these bases is long overdue, and it has been a serious fault of British and American diplomacy that this critical problem has been so long neglected.

For the bases raise in their most concrete and practical form the real issues of our foreign policy. If these issues are not dealt with wisely and soon, they will continue to be agitated foolishly and ignorantly.

The great fact about this war is that, so far as we are concerned, we have had to wage so much of the war from bases which are not in American territory. This is as true of the war in the Pacific as it is of the war against Germany. Yet for some strange reason, there are not a few of our people who cannot seem to remember that when we were driven out of our own bases at Wake, Guam, and in the Philippines, we fell back upon the British Commonwealth and Empire and upon the French Empire.

The bases which the Senators saw and are concerned about are situated in British and French territory across Africa, in India, in Australia, and New Zealand, and along the chain of islands which connect Hawaii with Australasia. When General MacArthur retreated from Bataan, he retreated into British territory in order to rebuild his forces for the reconquest of the Philippines. If, after Pearl Harbor, Britain had not also been at war with Japan and had not brought British territory into the war, we should be fighting Japan from the obviously inadequate bases in Hawaii and Alaska. General Channault and General Stilwell and all of China would be 10,000 miles beyond our reach if we could not get to them from British India.

So when we talk about the future of bases in the Pacific, let us not for an instant forget that we would not be able to fight Japan from those bases if Britain were not our ally. Yet there are Senators who seem to think that after this war it will be possible for us to keep the bases without continuing the British alliance. This is total nonsense, and the sooner they realize it, the better.

Some of them seem to have fixed their eyes upon the island stepping stones from Hawaii to Australia. But the most elementary knowledge of military strategy ought to make them realize that these islands are valuable only as the stepping stones to Australia and New Zealand. Without these British Nations as our allies at the other end, the stepping stones would be as useless and as unsafe as a bridge built way out across a big river, but never connected with the other shore.

Now no one, I suppose, is so idiotic as to think that we would desire, or that the Australians would cede to us, bases on the Australian Continent. That being the case, the little stepping stone islands are in themselves of practically no military value unless we have a firm military understanding with Australia. In other words, it is the alliance which makes the bases important. The bases without the alliance are a bridge hanging in mid-air.

The same principle holds in regard to bases in the Atlantic, Iceland, Greenland, Newfoundland, are vital to the defense of the North American Continent. But what real military value would they have if we could not count absolutely upon the support of the British Isles in the defense of these outposts? Without the substance and reality of an alliance with the sea and air power of Great Britain, Iceland is a military liability. With Britain, it is a vital link in the chain of our common security.

In the South Atlantic we now understand the importance to the whole Western Hemisphere of bases on the bulge of Brazil, in the Portuguese Islands, and in the French and British West African Empires. But since no one is lunatic enough to think that Brazil, Portugal, France, and Britain are going to be asked to cede these territories to the United States, it follows that the use of these bases must be based on a system of security alliances.

The Senators are quite right to be interested in the future of these bases. They are crucial to the defense and security of the whole Western Hemisphere. But they must see that the airfields and naval installations can be defended and maintained only with the wholehearted cooperation of the countries in which they are situated. What military value is there in an airfield in Africa unless Africa can be counted upon in case the airfield is threatened?

Without the equivalent of an alliance with the country, a "base" in that country is meaningless.

Now once the Senators have faced that fact, they are bound to see that there is no point in agitating themselves about any particular base. If we continue our alliances, we can obtain, by reciprocal agreement of course, not only the use of all the bases that could conceivably interest us, but also the support of powerful countries if ever we have to use these bases in a war.

It follows that to negotiate about the future of the bases is to negotiate about the bone and sinew of the alliances which are necessary to the security of the American republics. Without the necessary alliances, we might gouge out some real estate, but we could in no possible way obtain the certain use of the indispensable strategic bases. With the necessary alliances we shall have the bases in the way which gives them their maximum military value.

Columbus Day, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, October 12, was the four hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the discovery of America by that great Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus.

Any anniversary of the discovery of our land is cause for rejoicing, yet this particular one has brought with it events which by themselves have given great satisfaction to all Americans, and particularly those of Italian descent. No longer is Italy at war against us. In fact, she is now alongside of us, fighting our fight, so that our victory shall be her victory. At last reason and justice have prevailed, and we find the people of Italy where they should have been from the very beginning of this conflict.

Columbus Day brings to mind the great contributions made by the Italians to the growth and development of our country. Yes, America owes much to Italians. It was an Italian, John Cabot, who first explored its soil and an Italian, Amerigo Vespucci, who gave America its name.

Enrico Tonti, Alfonso Tonti, Paolo Busti helped found the great cities of Chicago, Detroit, and Buffalo.

Filippo Mazzei, close friend of Thomas Jefferson, penned the phrase "all men are by nature created free and independent" which was incorporated into our Declaration of Independence in the form "all men are created equal." Thus it was an Italian who put into words the principle which is the foundation of our democracy and the issue for which we fight today.

Col. Francesco Vigo, by the aid which he rendered to Gen. George Rogers Clark, made possible the expansion of the United States, west of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio. The United States Congress passed an act, the effect of which was to recognize the aid rendered by Colonel Vigo in this connection.

These are not the only Italians who have made great contributions to our country. We find them in the Revolution and the War of 1812, with Stephen Decatur when that great American naval hero destroyed the *Philadelphia* in the harbor of Tripoli—in the Civil War—in

the armies of both sides. Today it is reliably reported that about 800,000 Americans of Italian origin are serving in the armed forces of our country. Many have made the supreme sacrifice. Many have been given public recognition as heroes. Amongst them we find Sgt. John Basilone, who is the proud possessor of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When one pauses to consider the contributions of the Italians of our country he can understand the reason for the pride of the Americans of Italian origin.

Last Tuesday, in New York City, a citizens' committee, of which Generoso Pope was chairman and Judge John J. Freschi master of ceremonies, made arrangements to properly observe the holiday. There was a parade on Fifth Avenue and the marchers included the Honorable Fiorello H. LaGuardia, mayor of the city of New York, representatives of the armed forces of our country, of the New York City police, fire, correction, sanitation, and other departments, of the post-office employees, and many others. There were about 500,000 cheering spectators along the line of march.

At Columbus Monument the marchers passed in review before His Excellency, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, and other notables. Following the parade Governor Dewey, Mayor LaGuardia, Judge Freschi, and Mr. Pope delivered addresses commemorating the occasion.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the addresses delivered by Governor Dewey, Mayor LaGuardia, and Mr. Pope. Judge Freschi's address is not available to me at the moment, and I intend to seek permission to insert it into the RECORD at a later date.

ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR DEWEY

Great and stirring victories have come to the United Nations since we celebrated Columbus Day a year ago. Mussolini and his Fascist band who led the Italian people into a war they did not want, have been deposed. Once again the Italian people can fight on the side of freedom. Many of them already have taken up arms against those who would seek to destroy the dignity of mankind and to enslave freemen.

The war with Italy was not of our seeking. It was distressing and abhorrent to the American people, who have always been linked by ties of sentiment and culture with the Italians.

All of us in America believed from the very beginning that the war between Italy and America was not wished by the Italian people. Now, with the Fascists out of the way, we know that the people of Italy never wanted this war. From the day the United Nations' forces first invaded Sicily, it has been proved time and time again that we have never been at war with the Italian people.

There have been some bigoted people who have sought to question the loyalty of Americans whose forefathers came from Italy. Such people have lived to eat their words. In our first roll of air heroes in the Pacific, the list of Italian names was one of the longest of all. And now, it is no longer a military secret that in the gallant Fifth Army commanded by Lieutenant General Clark are several fighting units composed largely of Americans of Italian origin. The deeds of that Army will live long in both Italian and American history.

When the Fifth Army entered Naples our soldiers found a city which had been treated to a process we thought was forever obsolete in our civilized world. It had been sacked. The Germans left Naples as though it had been overrun not by an army of human beings but an army of savages. That destruction was not an act of military policy; it was not even an act of vengeance. It was nothing more or less than sheer barbarism

The Fifth United States Army found the people of Naples decimated, deliberately starved, and even deliberately deprived of drinking water. I am sure the Italian people will be found doing their part to bring justice to the Nazis for these crimes against them and their cities. I am confident the Italian people will, before long, rise in their wrath and join us with their full strength in wiping the Nazi curse from the face of Italy and Europe as well.

We have peculiar reason in this year 1943 to be celebrating one of our national anniversaries, Columbus Day, with feelings both happy and solemn. We are happy to pay our tribute to him as one of great vision at a time when others had no vision; as one who had great courage when others lacked courage; as one who believed, when others doubted, that he had found a new, rich home for humanity.

These past few years have again shown that this new world discovered by Columbus is truly the last refuge of freedom. For a brief, tense time, freedom hung in the balance. Its light was flickering low. It had flickered out, with few exceptions, everywhere in the world except in the land discovered by Christopher Columbus.

Since we last celebrated Columbus Day we have come measurably closer to ultimate victory. But that brings upon us a fresh responsibility. There is the responsibility of redoubling our every effort, of never permitting a moment of overconfidence. Every time we relax our effort here on the home front we prolong the war. We have the warning from every informed officer of our Military Establishment that the most serious and most dealy fighting lies ahead of our armed forces.

Let us celebrate this great day in our history by resolving that when we assemble here a year from today we shall each have done our share; our country shall be still further advanced on that difficult path to ultimate victory.

ADDRESS OF MAYOR LAGUARDIA

First I want to express our appreciation to his excellency, the Governor of New York State, for being with us today. I know that I speak for everyone present when I say that we are deeply honored to have him with us. I want to express, further, my appreciation for all those participating in today's celebration of Columbus Day.

And today every American of Italian descent has a really just cause to be proud. Never before in the history of our country has there been a greater or more complete and unanimous demonstration of loyalty and patriotism than the Italian citizens living in our country have shown. These Italian people have clearly demonstrated, since the very first days of the war, a loyalty and a patriotism that has been unsurpassed to America. Out of the hundreds of thousands of Italians living in this country, not a single subject of Italy has been a problem to the FBI. Never have the immigrants of Italian origin since they came to the United States, and since we have been at war with Italy, been a problem to America. And though we were at war with Italy there was at no time a question concerning their loyalty to the United States.

The people here in America know and understand that we found no fault with the people of Italy. They knew we were fighting a cruel government that had oppressed the Italian people for the past 20 years and had betrayed them in the last 3½ years.

Today we are celebrating one of the greatest events in the history of the world. Today perhaps for the first time in more than the hundreds of years since Columbus discovered America, we are finding that Columbus was not so wrong, after all, in his idea that he was discovering the shortest cut to Asia. And Japan can tell you that! Because, here in America, we have the short cut from the top of the world.

To this continent have come people from all parts of the world. When Columbus landed on these shores he opened a land that is the hope of the world. Columbus, when he landed, planted the flag of the Spanish dynasty. We supplanted that flag with our own. But Columbus also planted the cross of the Prince of Peace on the soil of this new continent—and that cross stands on high—a beaming light for all mankind. We're still holding that cross on high now We abide by the symbol of that cross.

This is the time to stand back of our Government, our armed forces, our Commander in Chief. The Army and Navy are in good hands. By working harder, by giving more, we will be able to destroy the Nazis and the Japs and what's left of the Fascisti. We still have a great way to go. But, in the words of a great statesman: "Our country, in her relations with foreign nations, may she ever be right, but our country, right or wrong!"

ADDRESS OF MR. POPE

I want to thank our Mayor for making it possible for us to march up Fifth Avenue, and from now on, I hope that we will march up Fifth Avenue every year.

My good friends, today we are celebrating the four hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the discovery of America. Little did Columbus think, 451 years ago, that today we would be fighting to give Italy back to the Italian people. The Allies are right now fighting alongside the Italians in driving the Nazis out of Italy.

Last year, if you will recall, we had only a few Gold Star Mothers among those of Italian origin. This year we have many, many more. To these mothers go our blessing. W are proud of them. And I want to say that their sons have not given up their lives in vain. Their boys are heroes, fighting for a great cause. We shall never forget their heroic and supreme sacrifices.

We of Italian origin are much happier this year as we assemble here today to celebrate Columbus Day. We see, on the other side, the Italians fighting side by side with the United Nations. We see the Italian flag flying alongside the flag of the United States. We see and read in the papers the heroic fight that is being made by the Allies to free the people of Italy and to give Italy back to its people.

This year, once again the Italian flag flies proudly alongside the American flag in Sicily and Naples and other parts of liberated Italy. And only this morning I read in the newspapers that the people of Naples had been given white bread for the first time in many years. Yes, the Italian people were betrayed and starved by Mussolini and his Fascists. Mussolini never gave the Italian people the things they needed because he had to take the money for himself and his gang. But we are liberating Italy today. Sicily is free. Naples is free. Tomorrow other areas of Italy will be free.

Today all of us are behind our Commander in Chief and the armed forces in the liberation of all the enslaved peoples of the world. These people are looking to America everywhere for help and guidance. And we, supporting our Government, our Army, our Navy,

and our Air Forces will give everything to preserve liberty and freedom for all people.

I want now to introduce to you the master of ceremonies who helped make possible the celebration of Columbus Day. Today 37 States legally celebrate Columbus Day. I hope that in the future all of the 48 United States will do the same. Here is Judge John J. Freschi.

Newsboys Doing Their Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days in praise of movie stars and other groups regarding their contribution to the war effort in aiding the sale of bonds. I want to pay tribute today to a group which is seldom mentioned, yet who are doing so much. The newsboys in many towns today are the spark behind any bond drive. Their door to door canvassing deserves more praise than most of us are giving. In one of my towns in my district, for instance, the newsboys sold $11,000 worth of bonds and stamps in 1 day. This is a small town of less than 10,000 people and represents more than $1 for every man, woman and child in that little town.

To give an idea of what these newsboys are doing, I ask leave to insert an article from the Merrill Daily Herald of Merrill, Wis. This article illustrates the praise which is due the newsboys of America:

Surpassing the expectations of the most optimistic, Herald carriers, with the complete cooperation of the citizens of Merrill, rang the bell Saturday with a total sale of over $11,000 in War stamps and War bonds.

From early Saturday morning until the final stroke of 8 Saturday night, Herald carriers visited the homes of Merrill citizens and brought them the direct appeal to buy War stamps and bonds to help build the aircraft carrier, *Shangri-la*, that will carry the war to Tojo's door.

Many interesting incidents developed as a result of this final drive by the Herald patriotic young businessmen, who, in spite of the fact that the day was their big day of the week, gave up fishing trips and picnics to turn the heat on Tojo.

Clifford Muschinske, 600 Genesee Street, topped all carriers to win the $25 War bond offered by the Herald. Dale Fischer, 1812 River Street, placed second; Jack Storm, 608 West First Street, came third. Other prize winners were Ray Chattin, Peter Olson, Jerry Proft, Lloyd Hinz, Ernest Kleinschmidt, Milton Pophal, Tom Bessey, La Verne Bochardt, Ed Neunast, Elroy Phingsten, Bob Tewes, Le Roy Rusch, Charles Bartlett, Robert Gruetzmacher, Patric Borst, and Jack Angus.

All prizes will be awarded at the Herald office at 6:45 p. m. Tuesday night.

Louis Schroeder will be awarded a special prize for effort. After contacting every home on his newspaper route, and after selling each home stamps, Louis decided that somewhere, someone in the city would buy some. By sheer effort in contacting people in the east-side business district he sold more than $20 worth of the stamps, some in the most unusual circumstances.

Joe Boettcher, 1705 Main Street, will also be awarded a special prize for extra effort.

One boy, walking down the street was hailed by a prospective bond buyer, whom the boy had never seen before; both came to the Herald office and all arrangements for the bond were made. The boy, happy, naturally, at such good fortune could not quite understand how he was so lucky.

Herald carriers want to thank the people of Merrill for their complete cooperation in their 1-day War stamp selling blitz. People dug deep, and the final total shows as a credit to the boys and citizens of Merrill.

When that aircraft carrier, *Shangri-la*, slides down the ways, the people of Merrill, and the boys who deliver the news to their homes, can feel that they personally have a stake in the ship that will help trip the Axis.

Kangaroo Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two editorials from the South St. Paul Daily Reporter, South St. Paul, Minn., entitled "Kangaroo Courts" and "A Dangerous Flaw":

KANGAROO COURTS

The American Bar Association intends to work in this session of Congress for the restoration to American citizens of their right to a fair trial in a court of law. "It is almost incredible," says the Chicago Tribune, "but it is true, that this fundamental right is being denied; that citizens are being convicted and punished by Federal administrative boards which disregard the time-tested rules of evidence and many of the other safeguards against arbitrary decisions, and that even the right of appeal to a court of justice has been so whittled away that little remains of it.

"As former Chief Justice Floyd Thompson of Illinois intimated the other day, the recent activities of the O. P. A.'s kangaroo courts have given a new impetus to the bar association's efforts. The association has long been aware of the evil, but the efforts to undo the work of the new dealers has been slow and difficult. Now that many more people than ever before are the victims of the New Deal's oppressive tactics, the hope of restoring to Americans their traditional rights under the constitution and the bill of rights is considerably brighter," continues the Tribune.

"The Tribune has long been enlisted in this fight against an intolerable abuse of power. We would have opposed the trend as dictatorial even if the denial of a fair trial to citizens had been of proved benefit to the people as a whole. In fact, of course, the arbitrary conduct of the administrative agencies has served only to harass and humiliate citizens, to foment class conflict, and to create in the minds of thousands of men and women a sense of distrust in their government. The bar association has no more important task to undertake than the correction of this great and growing evil."

A DANGEROUS FLAW

The decision of the American Bar Association to ask Congress for legislation to restore the citizen's right to his "day in court," when he has been subjected to restraint or penalty by an administrative bureau, is timely. We believe Congress will heed the request, says the Chicago Daily News.

The recent decision of the three-judge tribunal sitting at Springfield that it had no jurisdiction in a case involving an O. P. A. order interfering with a milk-hauling plan in operation in central Illinois, revealed that in the law under which O. P. A. was set up, Congress enacted a revolutionary measure, contravening the entire American doctrine of government. The petition for an injunction to restrain O. P. A. brought by former Attorney General John E. Cassidy, under the Horner administration, was of course entirely devoid of political color. The court said that it was a highly debatable question whether the 26 milk haulers seeking the injunction were violating any regulation of O. P. A., but the court was helpless because, in the words of Judge Charles G. Briggle, who read the court's unanimous opinion: "The district court is a product of Congress, which can grant or withdraw jurisdiction at will, and in this case they have seen fit to withdraw that jurisdiction. To my mind, it is a trend that is bad and not in conformity with the traditions of America."

That Congress can abolish all the lower Federal courts and can even take away from the United States Supreme Court all powers except the very limited ones exercised under the "original jurisdiction" provisions of the Constitution is a fact seldom recalled by Americans. It is a flaw in our scheme of government similar in its potential dangers to the "suspension clause" in the constitution fo the Weimar Republic, under which Hitler was able to install himself as dictator and do away with the republic with literal sanction of the law.

Only in the McArdle case after the Civil War, when Congress deliberately amended the original law defining the duties and powers of the United States Supreme Court in order to prevent that court from considering a petition for habeas corpus sued out by lawyers for a man imprisoned by the army, has Congress intervened in a lawsuit to decide the case by either abolishing the court or powers of the court. But what can be done once, can be done again.

Laws establishing the new Federal bureaus such as O. P. A., which prescribe that decisions of the boards shall be binding upon the courts, virtually abolish the courts in order to estop citizens from asserting their legal rights. If that isn't fascism, what is fascism? True, we have only a multitude of little duces instead of one big Caesar, but a horde of petty tyrants can be worse than a lone despot.

The Problem of the Feed Dealers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time for this House to take action to straighten out the feed mess. If we do not act quickly there are going to be a lot of hungry people here in America. The feed dealers and farmers of my district are expecting us to take action. If we fail them, there will be serious consequences. Our feed dealers must get feeds—they must get these feeds now. I hope this House will take action at once on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, to give an idea of what my feed dealers and farmers are up against, I ask leave to insert the remarks of Paul Gebert, Jr., a spokesman for the Central Wisconsin Feed Dealers Association, delivered at Tomahawk, Wis., a short time ago:

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Congressman, and friends, we have called this series of district gatherings in Wisconsin as a means of letting the voters in each congressional district meet and get to know the man who represents them in Washington. We feel that here is an opportunity to talk to the man who is on the scene in Washington, to let him know what our problems are, to let him know what we here on the home front are attempting to do to help win the war.

We trust that after this meeting, Mr. Congressman, you will be able to go back to Washington on September 16 with a better knowledge as to how our particular segment of your district feels on matters of national importance.

We want to impress upon you that the feed industry of this Nation, and especially the feed industry of Wisconsin, is doing its loyal share in helping to produce the food which is so vital to victory. The feed industry has worked under handicaps—handicaps of material shortages, handicaps of red tape, of bureaucratic control, and a maze of dictatorial regulation.

Despite the many difficulties, the feed industry has kept on the move, has successfully rationed scarce materials without Government control or direction and here in Wisconsin, especially, has seen to it that none if any farm animals suffered from a lack of sufficient protein. What the next 12 months will bring is very doubtful.

From where we sit it looks as if one of the biggest troubles in this country today is a penchant among bureaucrats for making too many plans which sound good for the accomplishment of a political end, but have not actually been planned at all because many of these goals are impossible of being filled.

As an example, consider the expansion program for livestock. When the livestock and poultry expansion program was laid before the farmer several years ago he was told that this good old United States was to be the bread basket of the universe—we were going to feed the world.

Plans were made for vast increases in farm animals not only for meat but also for eggs, milk, cheese, butter, and other farm products. All the planners could see were the astronomical figures of increased farm animal production. They forgot there was another side to this big program—the matter of feed to keep these animals alive.

It was here that the theorists failed to put feed before food. They evidently did not know that in order to produce food there must be adequate feed. They didn't realize what a large part the feed industry was already playing. Had they looked at both sides of the picture they could have realized that with present feed supplies we could never undertake the task of feeding the world.

Let's look at the crop prospects today. Present indications are for a good harvest, but still short of 1943 goals and 10 percent below that of the record year of 1942. Corn, the basic feed crop, was forecast in the Government July crop report at 2,706,422,000 bushels, some 470,000,000 bushels less than the 1942 crop.

Ordinarily this would be a bumper crop, but not this year when we consider the number of animals on farms. Production prospects of four major feed crops (corn, oats, barley, and grain sorghums) are some 14 percent smaller than last year and livestock numbers 10 percent larger than a year ago and still increasing so you can see what a crisis in food looms on the horizon.

The Government's policy of keeping feed prices low in relation to livestock prices has made it worth while for farmers to increase livestock production. Let's take a look at the farm animal population in 1943 with 1939, the first year of the war.

In 1943 we have 27,000,000 milk cows compared to 24,600,000 in 1939. We have 51,200,000 other cattle as compared to 41,400,000 in 1939. This represents 12,200,000 more head of cattle in 1943 than in 1939.

In 1943 we are raising 78,700,000 hogs as compared with 50,000,000 in 1939, a net increase of 28,700,000 hogs. We have 55,100,000 sheep and lambs compared to 51,600,000 in 1939. In 1943 there are 540,100,000 chickens on farms as compared with 418,600,000 in 1939, a gain of over 100,000,000.

Even now a decline in feed supplies is anticipated during this next feeding season, yet the index curve of animals on farms continues to rise. The danger in this situation is that with feed still relatively cheap, farmers continue to feed at about the same scale as during the past 18 months. When the pinch comes in 6 or 10 months, there is the danger of disorderly liquidation of livestock, such as occurred in the drought year of 1934. This could be a calamity with the Nation at war.

With the situation looming more acute, we should stop here a moment for the sake of our Congressman and sound a warning. It is altogether natural that when there is a shortage of feed some disappointed feeders might go so far as to accuse the feed dealer or the feed manufacturer of hoarding. They may complain to their Congressmen. Such comments might also be picked up by uninformed radio and news commentators who do not have the complete picture. They might in turn place the blame on the feed dealer and manufacturer when in reality there just isn't enough feed to go around.

This would be so far from the truth it would be pathetic. It would be a lie greater than to say that Hitler was the greatest benefactor of mankind. Which is some lie. The truth is that feed manufacturers, dealers, farm cooperatives, and agricultural colleges are working with the United States Department of Agriculture and other departments in Washington on a voluntary program which is distributing feed carefully and fairly.

It is important that feed supplies be continued to be distributed through the local feed dealer. The local feed dealer is the logical and natural source of supply for the farmer. He is in contact with the farmer almost daily. He knows the feeding problems of his own locality and in practically all cases has worked out a careful allotment plan to distribute present supplies of feed.

The local dealer is working under carefully restricted margins fixed by the O. P. A. With a ceiling on prices there is no incentive for the feed dealer to hoard. It would be tragic now to disturb the feed rationing program which has been worked out voluntarily by the feed industry. To have the Government attempt to ration feed would only seriously aggravate the distribution of present supplies and cause maldistribution.

For a moment let's turn to one of the alphabetical agencies which the feed dealer has to deal with. Because it is closer to all of us, let us look at the O. P. A. I believe every man in this room tonight is in strictest accord with the idea behind O. P. A. Each of us knows that the fight against inflation is one of the greatest battles of the home front.

But all of us, while sympathizing with the need of price control, do have legitimate criticism to make of the methods. We realize O. P. A. has a big task, but we also feel that O. P. A. has not done its job well.

In the feed industry, as in other fields, O. P. A. instituted the March 1942 freeze as a stop-gap measure until actual specific dollars and cents ceilings could be put into effect. This was to be temporary, but in the case of many feeds it looks as if it might be permanent.

It is true that some feed products have been given specific ceilings, such as mill feeds, soybean, cottonseed, peanut and linseed meal, meat scraps, etc., but every feed which has a specific ceiling there are perhaps two frozen at March levels.

As a result, the ceilings on the feeds frozen at March levels are working a hardship on many dealers. Ceiling prices on such items as malt sprouts, brewers grains, corn gluten meal, distillers by-products, and others vary from locality to locality. Jobbers of such products all have different ceilings, some high and some low. Feed dealers in the State who happened to have low ceilings in March 1942, have been at a disadvantage. We know of cases where feed dealers have had to pay as much and more than their retail ceiling in order to even obtain some feed ingredients. How can they be expected to sell at a loss?

Perhaps the O. P. A. bungling which has received the most attention from the public has been the situation on corn. The ceiling of $1.07 Chicago on corn has proved way out of line in relation to the price of hogs. It has thrown the price structure on corn out of kilter.

Today a farmer in the Corn Belt can get $1.30 to $1.40 per bushel for his corn when he feeds it to hogs whereas he can probably realize about $1 a bushel when he sells it to the grain market. No one can blame the farmer for holding his corn under these conditions, but what about the feed man and the farmer in the corn deficient areas?

We cannot say whether the price of corn should go up or the price of hogs should come down. But we can see that here is another example of how theorists in attempting to enforce a managed economy have tried to throw an established law of agricultural economics, namely the corn-hog feed ratio, out of the window and have been thoroughly frustrated.

What has happened in the corn market? For the past 6 weeks little or no corn has moved to the feed dealer through established channels. Some dealers in desperation, we know, have been paying as high as $1.40 per bushel to black-market truckers. But can you very much blame the dealer—his farmers are clamoring for feed. Which is the greater evil, to pay the black-market prices or to let his customers' farm animals suffer from a lack of good feed? You can decide that.

In the main, feed dealers have tried to live up to O. P. A. ceilings and regulations. Mr. Congressman you may be interested in this letter which was received by our association from a good member. We quote him:

"What are we supposed to do on this corn situation? We need corn for mixed feeds. Most of the corn, as you know, is being sold on the black market and the honest dealers are being penalized. My mother always taught me to be honest, but I am beginning to have some doubts as to whether or not it pays. Then, too, on the corn sold on the black market, actually the trucker does not enter on his books the full amount received and the Government is thereby cheated out of some income tax. What do you think we should do?"

Here is the type of feed dealer who is common in this area. He wants to abide by O. P. A. regulations but still feels he has an obligation to his farmers. We will skip our answer to his letter.

Perhaps the greatest criticism of the O. P. A. is its failure to understand business problems. We know that the men who actually work in the feed and grain section understand our industry problems, but we also realize that their hands are tied.

Their actions are controlled from above, possibly by a theorist who has no practical

business experience, but in more cases by political expediency. If the feed and grain section were left to do this price job properly and with full authority we feel sure our troubles would be few.

Another criticism of O. P. A. is its unwholesome penchant for making all regulations so legal that they cannot be understood by the average person. Recently the O. P. A. embarked on a policy of simplifying its regulations. Their first step was to amend a section of an order establishing maximum prices on certain bakery products to read as follows:

"All commodities listed in Appendix A are those known to the trade as such, exception therefrom such thereof, if any, while subject to another regulation." Does that make good sense to you?

Representative FRED HARTLEY of New Jersey in a national radio address made this charge:

"I charge that in practically every branch of the O. P. A. there are those who are using the war effort as an excuse and a means of promoting a collectivist policy within our Government, and under the guise of emergency orders, rules, regulations and interpretions of one kind or another are attempting to bring about socialization of every phase of our national life. There are those who desire to remake the economic system that has made America the land of plenty and substitute therefor a jigsaw economy, which in theory looks good but in practice falls apart.

"This condition permeates the entire O. P. A. set-up. Why is it that every phase of American business, every industry, every producer, marketer, and retailer is in a constant state of confusion? It is because the rules and regulations by which O. P. A. governs every phase of our economic life are being formulated by ex-college professors and young lawyers, few of whom have ever had a day's experience in the business or industry in which they are dealing. Defenders of O. P. A. will say 'Oh, we have industrial committees of men with business training.' That is true but these committee are simply for the purpose of window dressing. These committees are totally without authority on policies."

O. P. A. is an agency which prescribes the daily living rules for all citizens. It is a bureau which can tell all business what it can sell and what it can charge. It exercises control over human life from the baby carriage to the hearse, including the gas to carry you to your grave in a casket with an O. P. A. price tag on it.

An example of this type of thinking in O. P. A. is contained in the words of former Administrator of O. P. A., J. K. Gailbraith. Mr. Gailbraith is quoted as saying:

"New Deal methods during the last 10 years have brought into existence a totally different science of economics and business controls which are understood and can be managed only by the very young men free of the out-of-date theories of old-time economists and the working habits that practical men have learned from experience."

Listen to that statement and then think. True, pressure from logical men finally forced Gailbraith to resign. But did that end his public career? Oh, no, let me quote from an announcement dated August 14, 1943, issued by the Office of War Information.

"E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Lend-Lease Administrator, today announced that J. Kenneth Gailbraith had joined the staff of the Lend-Lease Administration and had been designated by the State Department and the Lend-Lease Administration for a foreign assignment."

It looks as if there is a reward for inefficiency.

Recently Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, wrote an article which appeared in American magazine. He has summed up very forcefully what the attitude of the average American is:

"The people of America are desperately anxious to win the war at the earliest possible time and to win so conclusively that the peace of the world will be guaranteed for generations to come. They are willing to make any and all sacrifices to accomplish this. They want every Member of Congress to vote for and support every measure for the early winning of the war and at the same time to vote against every measure that undermines our Constitution here at home.

"We must shake off the notion that any American who criticizes the war effort is a traitor. No man is a traitor who criticizes waste and bungling, who wants the war machine to function more effectively, who protests the obstinate and inept conduct of bureaucracy and who wants to live again in a democracy when the war ends. He actually is a patriot. Congress is moving now to attempt to restore government by the people and to unsnarl the tangle that is weakening civilian morale."

We trust that this is true. We hope that the boys now fighting this war can come back to a country which has preserved the ideals for which they are supposed to be fighting.

In closing we ask that our representatives do everything in their power to:

1. Clear up the muddle of the O. P. A.
2. Support all measures which will definitely help win the war.
3. Turn down all attempts at boondoggling.
4. Help preserve the right of free enterprise, the right to work hard and build a business you can call your own.
5. Keep the Government out of private business.
6. Recapture the legislative branch of the Government from the bureaus which have taken the law-making powers of Congress.

We ask that you as our Congressman feel free in asking us for advice on any problem related to our industry. We trust that we also can feel free in offering advice and constructive suggestions.

Winning the War and Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by our former colleague, Hon. Martin F. Smith, of the State of Washington, before the Sons of Norway at their annual Leif Ericson Festival held in Valhalla Hall, Jersey City, N. J., on October 9, 1943:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and my fellow members of the Sons of Norway—it is my happy privilege and I esteem it an honor to be able to thus address you due to my being an honorary member of Lodge Nansen No. 410, Staten Island, N. Y., which saw fit to confer honorary membership upon Mrs. Smith and myself, a distinction which comes to few and of which we are very proud.

It is now over 5 years ago since I had the pleasure of addressing your Twenty-fifth Biennial Interstate Convention held at the Winfield Scott Hotel, Elizabeth, N. J., May 7, 1938. At that time I had the good fortune of meeting many of you from Jersey City, and in addition to the delegations from New Jersey, those from the States of New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Maryland. It was a great and inspiring convention, from which my wife and I shall always have many happy memories. During the years which have followed we have enjoyed the hospitality and wonderful fellowship of our friends in Nansen Lodge on Staten Island and in Brooklyn on numerous occasions and, of course, the lodges out in the State of Washington, where we have our home. When we were home 3 years ago, in October 1940, I had the honor of presenting Hon. Carl J. Hambro, president of the Norwegian Parliament, to a large and enthusiastic joint public meeting of the Hoquiam and Aberdeen lodges on Grays Harbor, Wash. I also had the pleasure early this year of participating in the organization of our new Lodge, Washington No. 428, in Washington, D. C., in cooperation with Brother Iver Thorson, who, as you know, continues to be a real "go-getter" for the Sons of Norway.

I have mentioned these delightful contacts which we have had during the past 5 years as a sort of a report to show our good behavior and constant interest in our great fraternal organization, which I consider to be one of the finest and most useful of its kind in the United States.

Many important events affecting mankind have occured during this period, probably one of the most crucial periods in the history of the world. Since April 9, 1940, the date of the treacherous invason by the Germans, it has been a tragic period for Norway and the Norwegian people. Since December 7, 1941, when the Japs made their dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor, it has been a trying period for all of us in the United States. With our allies of the United Nations we are engaged in a titanic struggle with the common enemy and dealing him crushing blows on all battle fronts.

Some of our friends in Nansen Lodge, notably Judge Arne Foss and former President S. H. Gabrielson, have reminded me several times that in the speech which I delivered at their second-anniversary dinner-dance on January 15th, 1940, I pointed out the danger of an attack upon Norway by the unprincipled Nazi war lords because of its strategic importance and valuable natural resources. Three months later in the dead of night, without a word of warning, the cowardly blow was struck upon trusting, peace-loving, democratic Norway. The world will never forget the heroic resistance offered by the Norwegian people, although they were taken completely by surprise. They inflicted costly losses upon the Germans and the small Norwegian Navy won world-wide renown by destroying German ships with a combined tonnage greater than that of the entire Norwegian Navy. The Norwegian Royal House and the Government succeeded in leaving Oslo in time and it was found possible to save and remove the gold reserve in the capital's bank, thereby outwitting the invaders. More intensive, persistent, and systemized sabotage has been carried on against the army of occupation in Norway than in any other country and the Nazis have been compelled to maintain the largest number of troops there. The underground in Norway has been outstanding in activity and has made life miserable for Quisling and his followers.

As the time approaches for the opening of new battle fronts in Europe it is my opinion that one of the most effective will be through Norway, and that the treacherous and cowardly attack upon Norway in 1940 will soon be avenged.

There is a strong possibility that a powerful combined air, sea, and land offensive will be launched to drive the Nazis out of the fjords and coasts of northern Norway and ultimately out of the entire area of Norway. With northern Norway in our hands it would not be long until we would liberate the whole population and gain their active support in our actual invasion of Germany itself.

In our own country we have made a record of progress in production, turning out the weapons of war, training our vast forces, and

financing the cost of the war, of which every American has every reason to be proud. As Speaker SAM RAYBURN of the House of Representatives recently pointed out in a memorable speech, we have made a record of achievement which has never before been equalled by this or any other nation in the history of the world. Speaker RAYBURN stressed the fact, which must be gratifying to every mother and father, that our boys in the armed forces are today better fed, clothed, sheltered, equipped, and provided for in every respect than any other soldier in the world.

Here at home we are preserving inviolate the great human rights for which our men are fighting and dying on the battlefields of five continents. Attorney General Francis Biddle has eloquently expressed this truth in discussing the problems of national defense as they affect the civil rights of our citizens as well as our alien residents who are also shielded and protected by our Constitution. I quote from Mr. Biddle's report to Congress, bearing date January 3, 1942: "The caliber of Federal law enforcement is both a measure and a symbol of the democracy we seek to defend. Democratic strength inheres in the achievement of efficiency without the sacrifice of justice or the invasion of individual rights." This is a cogent restatement of the very essence of the axiomatic words of the Supreme Court in the celebrated Milligan case: "The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people equally in peace and in war, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances." The Department of Justice has successfully and vigorously prosecuted all cases of sabotage, espionage, and sedition, without the violation of civil and constitutional rights, and we have avoided the hysteria, which occurred in World War No. I. This is a creditable achievement and worthy of the high ideals and best traditions of our great democracy.

As we increase the tempo of our victories upon the land, the sea, under the sea, and in the air, our Government is wisely planning for peace and the post-war world. Secretary of State Cordell Hull's recent declaration of American post-war policy is a great state document. He approaches the subject from the viewpoint of our own national interests but with a due regard and consideration for the interests of the other nations and peoples of the earth.

After complete victory, which will require "efforts even greater than those thus far made," Secretary Hull favors a peace to assure our national interests, which he defines as "national security and the fostering of the economic and social well-being of our people." He states that "our task and that of our associates is to utilize this common interest to create an effective system of international cooperation for the maintenance of peace. * * * Those—immediate post-war—needs will embrace the task of taking practical steps to create conditions in which there will be security for every nation; in which each nation will have enhanced opportunities to develop and progress in ways of its own choosing."

Our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, summed up in his Ottawa speech what is undoubtedly the goal which all the peoples of the United Nations, including our own, are striving to attain. President Roosevelt said: "Every one of the United Nations believes that only a real and lasting peace can justify the sacrifices we are making, and our unanimity gives us confidence in seeking that goal.

"There is longing in the air. It is not a longing to go back to what they call 'the good old days.' I have distinct reservations as to how good 'the good old days' were. I would rather believe that we can achieve new and better days.

"Absolute victory in this war will give greater opportunities for the world because the winning of the war in itself is proof—certainly proving to all of us that concerted action can accomplish things. Surely we can make strides toward a greater freedom from want than the world has yet enjoyed. Surely, by unanimous action in driving out the outlaws and keeping then under heel forever, we can attain a freedom from fear of violence.

"I am everlastingly angry only at those who assert vociferously that the 'four freedoms' and the Atlantic Charter are nonsence because they are unattainable. If those people had lived a century and a half ago they would have sneered and said that the Declaration of Independence was utter piffle. If they had lived near a thousand years ago they would have laughed uproariously at the ideals of Magna Carta. And, if they had lived several thousand years ago they would have derided Moses when he came from the mountain with the Ten Commandments.

"We concede that these great teachings are not perfectly lived up to today, but I would rather be a builder than a wrecker, hoping always that the structure of life is growing, not dying.

"May the destroyers who still persist in our midst decrease. They, like some of our enemies, have a long road to travel before they accept the ethics of humanity.

"Some day in the distant future, perhaps—but some day it is certain—all of them will remember with the Master, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' "

These words of our Commander in Chief express the hopes and aspirations of a majority of the American people and of mankind everywhere, regardless of politics, class, race, color, or creed, and are worthy of our support.

My friends, we are celebrating tonight what is officially known as Leif Ericsson Day, in honor of the memory of the intrepid Viking and Norseman who in the year 1000 was the first white man to discover and set foot on American soil. In the centuries which have followed down to the present hour our countrymen and the descendants of those who first saw the light of day in the Scandinavian countries in northern Europe have made rich and lasting contributions to the cause of civilization and to the development and progress of the United States. Tonight upon a hundred battle fronts in every quarter of the globe, soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators of Scandinavian ancestry are by their deeds of valor and heroism adding another glorious chapter to the history of our Nordic race. They are helping to hasten the day when Norway and the whole world will be free—freer than ever before to continue their forward march to a happier, brighter era bringing peace, plenty, and prosperity to all mankind everywhere.

Remarks by John J. Sparkman Before Federated Women's Clubs at Scranton, Pa., September 21, 1943, and at Lewisburg, Pa., September 22, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks:

The question of our participation in post-war collaboration among the nations of the world may be considered from many different angles. To the economist it may present itself as a matter of trade relations, control of raw materials, cost of production, competitive conditions generally in the economic world. To the geographer it may concern itself primarily with altered national lines. The politician may think of it in terms of changed governments and governmental policies. And on and on through many, many points of view. My purpose today is to discuss the matter from one angle only. I want to discuss it as a means of preventing war in the future, and I want to discuss it objectively and realistically.

There is no need of my describing the horrors of war nor the harmful effects of war on the average community in America. If I understand correctly the objectives of your organization, you are particularly interested in community life and in doing those things that will mean the most to community life throughout this country.

Under modern war conditions community life is strained almost to the breaking point. There is not a community in America that has not been thus affected by the present war. The young men able to meet the physical standards have been taken for the armed services. The girls have gone away to work for the Government, or have enlisted in the uniform services, or have gone into war plants. Many of these boys and girls, confronted with the prospect of being apart for a long time, have married only to find themselves almost immediately separated for the duration without an opportunity to establish homes. All of this produces an abnormal community life. And now we are confronted with the further problem of having fathers of small children taken into the armed services. The inevitable result will be increased family hardship, social dislocation, and juvenile delinquency.

Many other conditions could be mentioned to illustrate the way in which community life has been affected. The farmers have felt it strongly, the housewife feels it every time she goes to market. In our everyday life we feel the effects of war and throughout America those dreaded messages beginning "We regret to inform you" are coming with an increased frequency.

These conditions and many more arising from the war are producing a shock to community life and to civilization so great that we are forced to the conclusion that we cannot stand it once every generation. Total war today is so all-consuming that civilization itself must fail unless we can put an end to war. Twice within a generation we have seen our finest young men offered up and twice we have seen the very foundations of democracy dangerously shaken. War has become more deadly, more total in its demands, and more costly. With a national debt already staggering in its bigness but destined to keep growing until it reaches perhaps $300,000,000,000 or even $500,000,000,000, we are made to wonder what our economic future can be. Every community, every family, and indeed every person must continue to feel the effects of this war for years and years after its end. We all and our children and their children must pay the bill not only through high taxes but possibly through a lowered standard of living. With interest on the national debt alone more at the end of this war than our entire governmental cost of only a few years ago, we shall for a long time be faced with the ever-present threat of inflation. Look at it as we may, we must decide that war is a destroyer of all that is good in your community and mine and that unless we eliminate it as a means of settling disputes between nations it must eventually destroy us.

While a war is in progress it is easy to resolve solemnly that we shall put an end to war. In the last World War our boys marched away from home to the strains of martial music with the stirring words ringing in their ears that that war was to make the world safe for democracy and that it was

the war to end all wars. We all believed that then. Our idealism was high and our purpose was good. Many a boy died in Flanders Field thousands of miles away from home and mother and loved ones—died there in the arms of a buddy, looking into the face and smiling as he died—believing that his sacrifice was not in vain and that his was a war to end all wars. How disillusioned must be those who returned only to have their sons when scarcely grown taken again to feed the maw of war. Our boys today are dying on battle fields and in the air and on the sea all over the world with the same high resolve—that war shall be no more in the land. In 1918 John McCrae wrote:

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard among the guns below.

We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

The same can be said of those boys of ours who are fighting and dying today, a quarter century later. Whether or not we keep faith or break faith with them is going to be determined by you and me and millions like us in thousands of communities throughout America.

Much might be said about our failure to take our part in the settlement of world problems following the last World War. We all have our own ideas about things that happened or failed to happen then and our responsibility in doing or failing to do certain things. I think it profits us little to dwell on those matters now but I do believe that we may well ponder while we are still at war what we can do to prevent a recurrence of this blood bath a generation hence. Ultimate victory for our side is now certain although the day may yet be far away. The current successes with which our arms have met are the result of carefully laid plans and well executed work a year ago—yes, 2 years, and even 3 years ago. As we planned a long time ahead to win the war, we must be planning now perhaps just as far ahead of time to win the peace when this war shall end. The part this nation has played in making that victory possible cannot be successfully denied. Just as important a part is ours at the peace table.

We must not shirk or in any way fail that responsibility.

To my way of thinking there is only one way to stop wars. Armaments will not do it nor will disarmament agreements entered into by only a part of the nations of the world. We have seen both plans tried and we have seen both of them fail. Killing the persons responsible for making war alone will not do it. There is now much agitation and rightfully so for the trial and punishment of those responsible and indeed we have promised the world that they would be so dealt with. We promised the same during the last war but we saw the Kaiser take refuge in a neutral country and there live to a ripe old age and finally die after being pretty well restored to respectability among the peoples of the earth. And mere threats against the right of refuge in neutral nations will not insure a different outcome this time. Unenforceable sanctions against aggressor nations have been tried and marked with dismal failure. Military alliances or combinations will serve but to align powers for or against us and to establish again a system of balance of power—a balance which inevitably becomes so delicate that only a slight shift may plunge the world again into war. Then there is another consideration to such alliances, that is that we cannot foretell what may happen to a nation within a few years. Who, for example, at the end of the last war would have seen Italy as a world threat, or crushed Germany as a menace, or Japan as a power arrogant enough to attack the United States? Or who then could have guessed that France would be overrun and completely defeated in every sense of the word within a few months after entering a war 25 years later? There was a time when England with her Navy could virtually rule the world. But who thinks that she can do that today though powerful she may be? Such are the changes of time that military alliances will no longer suffice. Then, too, we must not lose sight of the fact that isolationism against which we must fight in this country is but well served and strengthened by a military alliance, for such nations as ally themselves isolate themselves from the rest of the world.

There is only one way to prevent wars in the future. That is through an agreement among the nations of the world governing their dealings one with another. There must be a tribunal for trying disputes and rendering decisions enforceable by an international force by whatever name it may be called.

I well know that the great objection that is raised against this proposal is that of the surrender of sovereignty. Sovereignty resides in the people and means the right of the people to do what they want to do. If the people want to protect themselves against future wars by giving up a part of their freedom of action they can do so without destroying or in any way adversely affecting sovereignty. The history of our own Nation and the actions of our people offer many examples. In the Republican statement of policy at Mackinac Island this question was raised by Governor Sewall of Maine who asked "whether the phrase 'cooperative organization' among sovereign nations leaves the door open for us to yield some measure of sovereignty at some other time, should circumstances warrant." Senator Vandenberg replied: "The answer is that sovereignty possesses within itself the right to part with any portion of it by its own act of self-determination. That, of course, is an act of sovereignty."

By many it is felt that we should now put the world on notice that we intend to take our rightful place in solving post-war problems. To that end resolutions have been introduced in both House of Congress. The two that have received most attention are the Fulbright resolution in the House of Representatives and the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution in the Senate. The Fulbright resolution is a short and simple statement giving assurance to the other nations of the world that we will cooperate. Its wording is:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world, and as favoring the participation by the United States therein, through its constitutional processes."

The substance of the Senate resolution is similar but in more detail. It, too, is brief and is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

1. To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

2. To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

3. To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

The exact wording is not so important. What is important is that the American people, through their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress express themselves now. Details can be worked out later.

Under our Constitution an agreement tentatively reached at the peace table must be confirmed back home before we are definitely committed. Some commitments can become effective upon approval by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress. If the commitment is by treaty it must be ratified by a two-third vote of the Senate. Even in that event the House of Representatives must concur in making appropriations to carry out our part of the program. For that reason it is imperative that both Houses take a definite stand in making it known to the world that we are this time going to do our part. I assume that the final agreement terminating this war and setting up peace machinery will be by a treaty. This means that our part can be determined by 32 Senators, the number required for a veto of any proposed treaty. This makes it all the more important that the thinking of our people be aroused as to this problem.

Contrary to the thinking of many of our people, isolationism did not die at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. It was simply submerged for the time being. Many people even today fail or refuse to see that the position of isolationism, in the belief that a wide expanse of water on either side of us gives us security from all the rest of the world, is today absolutely untenable. The nearness of the nations of the world to each other today changes all of that. We are told that no point on the earth's surface is more than 60 hours from our own front yard. What goes on anywhere in the world today may be known everywhere in the world in an instant. We are indeed near each other, and with that nearness we have become more and more dependent one upon another. In the modern world isolationism is not possible, but we must continually preach its impossibility if our people are all going to realize it.

Our job—yours and mine—all over America is to build up sentiment in every community in favor of definite and emphatic action by our country to prevent war in the future. The Congress representing the people is the body to take that action. The Congress will respond to the thinking of the people back home and translate that thinking into action. And, after all, the thinking of the Nation is simply the composite thinking of the people of every community and of the individuals of those communities. Often we may think there is little that we as individuals can do. Let me, in conclusion, suggest in that con-

nection that we remember the words and thought of the Patriot's Pledge by Edward Everett Hale:

"I am only one
But I am one
I can't do everything
But I can do something
And what I can do
That I ought to do
And what I ought to do
By the grace of God I will do."

The Other Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, whenever I believed it needed it I have criticized the O. P. A. I will probably have occasion to do so in the future. I believe sincerely that certain modifications should be made in some of the practices governing our price-control program. I believe particularly that ceilings on farm products should never be below cost of production. And I am convinced that a good deal better job could be done in narrowing margins between producer and consumer. I have nevertheless been sincerely impressed by the following article entitled "In Defense of Price Control," which appeared in the New York Times on October 10, and I am asking unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD.

I do this because I believe it will be beneficial to Members of Congress to read this article. I want especially to call attention to Mr. Wilcox's third numbered paragraph where, referring to the action of Congress, he states:

It is less excusable, however, that instead of clearly defining the policies that should govern the agency, they should strike blindly at its appropriation, its program, and its personnel.

The article follows:

IN DEFENSE OF PRICE CONTROL

(By Clair Wilcox, professor of economics, Swarthmore College, formerly of the Office of Price Administration)

In conformity with the terms of the above proviso, a number of men who had previously served as professor of economics in American colleges and universities have been removed from positions of responsibility in the Office of Price Administration. Such men, in the words of their critics, "should never be permitted to make decisions." They have never "carried a precinct or met a pay roll." Their thinking "takes wing and soars through the clouds unimpeded by facts and unhindered by actuality." They are "phony," "half baked," "crack pot," "bumptious," "obnoxious," and "dangerous." In short, they are "long-haired professors."

They are professors, to be sure. But they are not long-haired. One knows of many politicians and businessmen who are better thatched. The adjective, apparently is not to be taken literally. It serves merely to emphasize the noun. The noun, of course, is serious. If a man was ever a professor it is supposed to follow that he is devoid of common sense; that he takes action without considering the facts; that he doesn't know what he is doing. Call a man a professor and you dispose of his case. Call him a long-haired professor and you demolish him.

This is a curious fact in a country that has invested billions in higher education, that sends its sons and daughters to college by the hundreds of thousands every year. If professors cannot be trusted to fix the prices of soap and spinach, they should certainly be forbidden to teach the science of economics to American youth.

Of course, nobody really believes any of these things. The professors—and, with them, the lawyers and the businessmen—in Office of Price Administration have been condemned, not because they have been impractical, but because they have been altogether too practical to suit their critics; not because they have acted without considering the facts, but because they have insisted on considering all the facts; not because they haven't known what they were doing, but because they have had the courage to do it.

The attack on the professors is but an incident in the attack on price control. It was preceded by a half dozen congressional investigations in which the inquisitors, concentrating their attention almost exclusively on 3 or 4 among the more than 400 price ceilings issued by the Office of Price Administration, sought to prove that the Office had acted without consulting industry, had altered business practices, curtailed corporate profits, destroyed small firms, interfered with production, and attempted, illegally, to perform the American economy and subject it to bureaucratic control. It was accompanied by legislation which cut $22,000,000 from the appropriation for Office of Price Administration, hamstrung the agency by limiting its power to specify and identify the articles which it must price, and sought to prevent it from employing subsidies as a means of holding down the cost of living.

By now, nearly every man, woman and child in the United States must be convinced that price control has been a miserable failure. Nothing could be further from the truth. Prices have been held much more successfully in this war than in the last. Electrolytic copper, which sold in 1918 for 37 cents a pound, sells today for 12 cents. Steel plates, which sold then for $180 a ton, sell now for $42. The wholesale prices of most industrial products have not risen significantly since 1941. The rise in the wholesale price and cost-of-living indexes is attributable principally to the rise in prices of agricultural products and foodstuffs, and this rise is attributable, in turn, to limitations which Congress has imposed upon the O. P. A. The cost of living, which had risen moderately during each month since the outbreak of the war, advanced sharply during the spring of 1943, but in June the rise was checked and throughout the summer the index actually fell—a major triumph for price control. Comparison of the inflation which has occurred in this war with that experienced in the last one indicates that O. P. A. had saved the Government and the consumer more than $30,000,000,000 by the end of 1942 and will save them as much as $90,000,000,000 by the end of 1943.

And this has been accomplished without inflicting real hardship on any group in the community. The average weekly wake of American labor is 35 percent higher than it was before Pearl Harbor. The net income of the farmer is 75 percent higher. Corporate profits, after taxes, are 90 percent higher than those earned in 1939 and 15 percent higher than those earned in 1941. Business mortality has fallen to the lowest figure on record. The period of price control has witnessed the greatest expansion of production that this Nation, or any other Nation, has ever known.

Why, then, has O. P. A. been attacked? The reasons are numerous. A few of the more important may be mentioned:

1. Public price fixing is traditionally unpopular. American business has always resisted control. Every regulatory law enacted, every agency established by the Congress has been denounced in its turn. The O. P. A. differs in but one respect. It has simultaneously imposed its ceilings upon nearly every price charged by nearly every trade in the economy. And it has been required, at the same time, to ration the consumption of meat and gasoline and many other goods. No agency that must meddle with matters which so intimately affect the daily lives of 130,000,000 Americans can expect to escape abuse. Price control may influence people, but it does not win many friends.

2. The O. P. A. has inevitably made mistakes. It has undertaken a gigantic and unprecedented task. It has been forced, upon occasion, to act without adequate information. It has sought to carry the whole burden of stabilization unaided by necessary implementation—by heavier taxation, by commodity standardization, by industrial concentration, and by the allocation of manpower and materials. It has failed to sell its program, to answer its critics, or to report its achievements in words that everyone can understand.

3. The O. P. A. has been granted wide jurisdiction and great powers. It is in action on all fronts and at all times. Its rules and regulations run into 10 thick volumes, all of them having the effect of law, none of them written by the Congress itself, a few of them productive of well-organized protests from powerful groups. It is understandable, therefore, that Members of Congress should be concerned. It is less excusable, however, that instead of more clearly defining the policies that govern the agency, they should strike blindly at its appropriation, its program, and its personnel.

4. The O. P. A., if it is to fulfill the responsibility imposed upon it, must generally refuse to raise its ceilings. But requests for such action are never ending, and these requests are frequently reinforced by letters, by telegrams, and by calls from Members of Congress, some of them polite, some of them insistent, some of them threatening. During the past spring and summer, Members of the House and the Senate asked the Office to raise the prices of meat, fish, poultry, milk, eggs, sugar, flour, bread, potatoes, beets, cabbages, onions, beans, lettuce, tomatoes, spinach, strawberries, honey, corn, cottonseed, tobacco, whisky, wool, mohair, furs, yarns, hosiery, workclothes, outer garments, ice, coal, crude oil, fuel oil, gasoline, logs, pulpwood, lumber, used trucks, brooms, and coffins.

If ceilings were to be raised in response to Congressional pressures, it is obvious that price control would become a gigantic pork barrel, price regulations would be produced by political log-rolling, and the battle against inflation would be lost. But if these pressures are resisted, it is equally obvious that O. P. A. will be attacked.

5. The O. P. A. provides a convenient target for enemies of the administration. It is in the forefront of popular attention. It is widely disliked. An attack upon it can be used to discredit the party in power. And, unfortunately, there are Members of Congress who are not above playing politics with economic stability.

It was in this context that the professor proviso was written into the appropriation act. Taken on its merits, the proviso is contrary to sound public policy. It violates the authority granted to the President by the Constitution to appoint and remove officials

of the executive branch. It involves, in effect, a suspension of the civil-service law and regulations. It attacks the fundamental principle that talent shall find the door open to a career in the public service.

It is the apparent purpose of the proviso to insure that the directors of the price-control program shall be competent. But competence in price control is a product not only of special training and broad experience but also of impartiality and balanced judgment. Some persons recruited from business, industry, or commerce will possess these qualities; others will not. Similarly, some persons recruited outside such fields will possess these qualities, while others will not. The line which the Congress has drawn is not one which is calculated to separate the competent from the incompetent. It is, rather, one which is designed to restrict the Price Administrator to the employment of the members of one group, regardless of their competence, and forbid him to employ the members of any other group, no matter how competent they may be.

The proviso rests upon a fundamental misconception of the nature of price control. It was evidently the view of its sponsors that the business interest is the only interest which is affected by the establishment of maximum prices. This is not the case. Maximum prices affect consumers as well as producers, buyers as well as sellers. Price control affects every man, woman, and child in the community. It should be administered with strict impartiality. A requirement which makes the direction of price policy the exclusive prerogative of a single group can only be interpreted as a declaration of intention that it shall not be so administered. The Congress might, with equal logic, surrender the Interstate Commerce Commission to the railroads, the Federal Power Commission to the utilities, the Securities and Exchange Commission to the stock brokers, and the War Labor Board to the unions.

The enemies of price control are children playing heedlessly with high explosives. The inflationary forces generated by our wartime expenditures are so powerful that once released they might well double, triple, or quadruple the general level of prices. Such an upward spiral, while it might bring immediate gain to a few, would risk ultimate disaster for the many. It would handicap military procurement by inducing speculative withholding of supplies, by provoking strikes, and by destroying business stability. It would add billions to the cost of the war and the size of the national debt.

It would defraud the holders of bonds, the depositors in savings banks, the beneficiaries of insurance policies and social-security payments, the dependents of our soldiers and our sailors, in order to reward the speculator and enrich the profiteer. It would impose a heavy burden upon the millions who work for fixed salaries and low wages. It would subject private enterprise, democratic self-government, and individual liberty to the greater hazards of post-war deflation.

These dangers are real. But if they are to be averted, conservative Americans must make their voices heard on Capitol Hill. If the able business men who have replaced the professors in O. P. A. continue, as they have begun, to hold the line, they, too, will be subjected to attack. And if they are to succeed, they must be granted a large measure of popular support.

In the meantime, the professor proviso should be repealed. It establishes too dangerous a precedent; already demands are heard that it be extended to other agencies of government, to minor positions in the executive hierarchy, to advisory as well as administrative posts. It smacks too plainly of the anti-intellectualism that characterizes the Nazi creed. In a land that grants to every citizen an equal opportunity to serve his fellows, it has no proper place.

Why Not Save Ten and One-half Billions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, an article recently appeared in the Indianapolis Times, by way of an editorial, which refers to the plan of Secretary Morgenthau to raise an additional $10,500,000,000 in taxes, which, added to the already high tax schedules, will impose almost an unbearable burden upon the taxpayers of this Nation. The New Deal has been the most extravagant administration in the history of the world. The hard-earned money of the taxpayers has been wasted, and it has been foolishly spent. Many agencies of government should have been discontinued by the New Deal, which are useless and unnecessary in time of war, but those in power continue to retain them and spend the money for such maintenance. All of these things are nonessential. The people know the facts, and they know that their money is being wasted and frittered away.

In analyzing our frightful situation in this country, the people are becoming disheartened and disgusted because of the frightful waste and extravagance they are witnessing.

May I say that instead of trying to extract an additional ten and one-half billion dollars from the downtrodden taxpayers in our country, the President and his crowd should begin trying to save ten and one-half billion dollars from waste and foolish spending. If some good business judgment should be exercised by those in power, instead of permitting their greed for perpetuation in office and in power to control, and get down to the business of winning the war, we would go forward as a united people in a common cause. As we find ourselves today, we witness confusion and discontent on every hand. The people are rationed and regimented in many instances far beyond the necessities of the hour; their opportunities to earn money with which to aid in the war effort have been taken away in part, and now they face a huge increase in their taxes. Is there any excuse for those in power to continue to waste the people's money, and then demand a huge increase in taxes, which many people will be unable to pay? That policy is wholly inconsistent. The people are greatly shocked because of those very destructive policies.

Mr. Speaker, a very enlightening and illuminating editorial appeared in the Indianapolis Times, of Indianapolis, Ind., on the 7th day of October, 1943, which I ask by unanimous consent to be included in my remarks herein.

It is my hope that all Members of Congress may read the editorial, which is as follows:

WHY NOT SAVE TEN AND ONE-HALF BILLIONS?

Secretary Morgenthau thinks we should realize there is a war going on. So he proposes ten and one-half billion dollars in new taxes. The fact that we're already paying 10 times as much taxes as we were paying 3 or 4 years ago doesn't faze the Secretary.

But Mr. Morgenthau also knows that an election is coming on. And apparently he is bothered by the realization that the number of direct taxpayers likewise has multiplied. Forty million taxpayers in voting booths could do wrong. So one of Mr. Morgenthau's proposals is that 9,000,000 people be relieved of the obligation of contributing directly to the Government's support. That would be done by the process of merging the Victory tax into the income tax in such a way that 9,000,000 of the Victory taxpayers would not become income taxpayers. The $30,000,000 loss in revenue would be more than recovered by higher rates on those who remain in the tax-paying fold.

Mr. Morgenthau's politics, however, run counter to his own statistics of income. He admits that four-fifths of all the people's income is received by persons getting less than $5,000 a year. Yet, Mr. Morgenthau's new tax program, like all of his others—and he has proposed at least one a year since he became Treasury chief—is aimed primarily at the other one-fifth of the total income.

It is about time for Mr. Morgenthau, the politician, to confess to Mr. Morgenthau, the revenue searcher, that after he has extracted all the blood out of that one-fifth turnip, he will still have to get the bulk of revenue from the four-fifths. Of course, most of the revenue he's now getting comes from the four-fifths, by indirect taxation.

One thing this country learned and taught the world is the lesson of mass production. A lot of wise guys tried to get rich manufacturing automobiles to sell for $5,000 with a profit of $3,000 on each vehicle. They all went broke. But Henry Ford became a billionaire making cars to sell for a few hundred dollars, with only a few dollars profit on each model T or model A.

If Mr. Morgenthau were thinking in terms of taxes for revenue instead of taxes for politics, he would frame a tax program to fit the market—to get the revenue where the money is. If the treasury is ever to get itself in a sound position, it will have to do as Henry Ford did—fashion a product which the mass of people will buy and pay for and believe is giving them their money's worth.

"Their money's worth"—ah, there's the rub. All the taxes that Mr. Morgenthau has persuaded Congress to enact add up to only a little more than one-third as much as the Government is spending. And if he were to get this additional $10,000,000,000-plus, that would still be less than one-half the spending. Present indications are that if the war ends 2 years hence the public debt will be around three hundred billions. At 3 percent interest, that would mean an annual carrying charge of nine billions—as much as the whole wasteful pre-war New Deal cost per year.

The people who get $1,000, $2,000, $3,000, $4,000 a year—which means more than 95 percent of us—are not so dumb but that they know this will mean food out of the mouths and clothes off the backs of all of them and their children and their children's children.

So we ask: Why is it that the United States is spending more money on this war than all of our allies combined? Why is it we must continue to pay cost-plus-fixed-fee prices for things the Government buys, and time and a half for overtime labor? Why not buy the materials of war at what they are worth, rather than submit to this hijacking? And why this swarm of bureaucrats feasting on our taxes and our credit while you preach sacrifice?

The people are willing to pay for every gun, every bullet, every plane, bomb, tank, cargo vessel, and warship, and all the food needed to supply our troops, and to provide our share of the supplies to our allies. We're ready to spend any amount of money

actually needed to save a single life or to shorten the war 1 minute. But couldn't we shed a few parasites from the pay roll and get just a little common sense management? Couldn't we adjourn New Deal politics for the duration?

Wouldn't it be a good idea for the Committee on Ways and Means, considering the 10½ billions in new taxes, to resolve itself into a committee on ways and means of not wasting 10 billions?

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill providing funds for the immediate construction of the Florida barge canal authorized by Congress.

I am still of the opinion that the completion of our Intracoastal Waterway system from Texas to the North Atlantic by means of this barge channel across Florida is the only solution to our petroleum situation. The Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for War, Mr. Ickes, has given warning that we can look for no relief in gasoline and fuel-oil supplies with existing transportation facilities. The Chief of Engineers has stated that if this waterway were completed, it would be capable of transporting all the petroleum supplies needed in the East.

I think by this time no one in the United States is unaware of the fact that unless we get additional transport means, not only the East must continue to suffer, but all other sections of the country as well. Had the project been begun last year it would now be well under way toward completion and the situation could have been relieved during the coming winter. Reduction in gas rations in the Midwest would not have been necessary and increasing amounts of all petroleum supplies would have been available for the East.

The objections formerly raised against the project that we did not have tugs and barges available for hauling petroleum can no longer be raised. Congress has authorized and the proper agencies of government have constructed and are now placing in operation large fleets of barges and tugs, which are now operating on the intracoastal waterway. If this connecting channel across Florida were open these barges could move all the way from the Texas oil fields to Trenton, N. J. This would free a very large number of tank cars for distribution purposes in the Middle West and to points inland from the Atlantic seaboard. If it is economical of steel and manpower to barge petroleum along the Gulf intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville to New Jersey, it is sheer nonsense to say that it would be uneconomical to haul it all the way by water via this short connecting link across Florida.

The Government has already expended much more than the cost of the canal and consumed many times its requirements of steel and manpower in operating fleets of barges and tugboats for piecemeal transportation. I think it is time we look at the matter realistically. It is not yet too late to prevent an increasingly serious and possibly disastrous situation.

The hope which some have entertained that the accessibility of the Middle Eastern oil fields would relieve the drain upon our Atlantic seaboard has been definitely quenched by official announcement that any oil which may be available to the allies from these fields will move eastward to the Asiatic area. Our petroleum situation is decidedly worse than it was this time a year ago, and I trust that the realization of this will cause Congress to approve the immediate construction of this obviously necessary facility.

Stop This Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of October 12, 1943:

STOP THIS TAX

Unless Congress does something to stop it, wage earners will have another 1 percent deducted from their pay envelopes beginning January 1 next. This is the old-age benefit tax. Employer and employee now pay 1 percent each, a total of 2 percent. This will be increased to 2 percent on each, or a total of 4 percent.

Under the law the increase would become effective automatically. Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan, sponsored amendments in 1941 and again in 1942, which held the rate to 1 percent for 1942 and 1943. Recently he raised the question of an increase in 1944 when he presented a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Social Security Board advocating the increase next year.

As of June 30, 1943, the old age and survivors' insurance trust fund held by the Secretary of the Treasury was well in excess of the maximum requirements stipulated in the law.

The existing law requires the board of trustees of the fund to report to Congress whenever the board is of the opinion "that during the ensuing 5 fiscal years the trust fund will exceed three times the highest annual expenditures anticipated during that 5-fiscal-year period."

The total assets of the trust fund as of June 30, 1943, were $4,268,000,000.

Disbursements during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, were $149,000,000 in benefits and $27,000,000 for administrative expenses, or a total of $176,000,000.

The chairman in his letter estimates a probable maximum expenditure of about $1,100,000,000 for the calendar year ending December 31, 1949.

With nearly $5,000,000,000 now in the fund there is no earthly reason why this tax should be doubled next year. Federal taxes are creating a distressing situation both for capital and labor. Despite the fact that the tax has not been increased for the past 2 years the old-age pension fund is growing by leaps and bounds.

With only 2½ months of the year left Congress should do something about saving the wage earner and his employer this additional tax next year.

Dairy Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was published in the Erie (Pa.) Dispatch Herald, Sunday, October 10, 1943:

DAIRY FARM SUBSIDY

To the EDITOR:

With disregard for the wishes and opinions of those most immediately concerned an attempt is being made to force a subsidy on the dairy farmers in lieu of a living price for their products. As long as I can remember, farmers have been strongly opposed to subsidies. This is true of all farmers and not merely of certain farm groups, as some superficial thinkers would have us believe. Farmers have always had to stand on their own feet. If they failed to make their farms produce their living it was just too bad. They ceased to be farmers, and someone who could make good took over. The idea of paying taxes to bolster up the business of someone who could not make good was and is extremely distasteful.

This attitude also has a historical reason. The farmers came here as pioneers. They literally grubbed and hewed their farms out of the wilderness. They built the roads and furnished the land on which to build them. They also maintained them for the use of everyone with little or no outside help until their use by the increasing number of automobiles made the burden too great. They still pay road taxes in addition to the taxes common to everyone.

This job of making the country livable required an almost fantastic amount of hard labor, when we consider it was done with little or no machine y. When my great-grandparents came to Erie County, the only mechanical power was that furnished by the water wheel and treadmill. Farming was the main business and everyone worked at it. The cobbler, the cooper, the doctor, the carpenter, the minister, all did some farming. They at least kept a cow. Grain was sown by hand, cut with a cradle and tied into bundles without the use of twine. It was threshed with a flail and winnowed by tossing it into the air and letting the wind blow out the chaff Hay was cut with a scythe, the swaths spread out to dry and then raked up with a hand rake. Clothing was made by spinning the wool of the sheep raised by the farmer. Firewood and building material were cut from the trees and prepared for use with an ax. Boots and shoes (and coffins) were all custom made for each user. All was done by hand labor. Gradually machinery has increased or multiplied the amount of work that can be done by a man. The farmer has been able to feed more people and thus free labor for other uses. The hours of labor were first from sun to sun, then

12, 11, 10 (6 days a week), until we have the present standards.

To a greater extent than in most other occupations, farmers are the direct offspring of farmers of the past generations. There is relatively little flow of young people from cities to farms, while if it were not for the flow of young people from farms to cities, the urban population would rapidly dwindle.

The farmers feel that since they themselves have created their business with their own efforts, and since they are engaged in an occupation as vital to winning the war as any other war job, they should receive as much consideration as workers in other lines. What would a worker engaged in making guns or shells think if he were told that instead of receiving the going wage, he would be paid but a fraction of it and if not satisfied he could take a day off and go to the relief board with a record of his daily expenditures, and perhaps he would receive a relief check to help make up his deficits? This is exactly what the farmer is asked to do.

The subsidy idea is particularly atrocious and obnoxious now, because the country as a whole is in a period of prosperity; everyone who will work is working. Subsidies and relief payments are unthinkable in times of prosperity. The farmer knows that if he must have a subsidy at a time like this, he will be utterly ruined when a retrocession or depression occurs.

He also knows that if his business requires a subsidy now, the subsidy idea cannot be abandoned in more stringent times, and that he will be doomed to eternal slavery to those having the power to set the subsidy. He knows furthermore that if the farmer is ruined and degraded, eventually the Nation will suffer the same fate. The fall of the mighty Roman Empire was due in no small part to the subsidy idea. As a result of giving the people wheat taken as tribute from conquered countries the farmers' business was ruined and when tribute failed there was no food supply to fall back on.

The subsidy idea is based on a fallacy. Any sound economist will tell you it cannot accomplish its purpose (if it has an honest purpose) since it is proposed to apply it to necessities, consumed in like amounts by all of us, it follows that a slight reduction of the taxes most universally paid would accomplish the same monetary result without the staggering cost of carrying through the program. Apparently, then, it is put out merely as a sop to some of the higher labor leaders, who must have a talking point in order to maintain their prestige. If a subsidy must be given let it be applied directly to those who are attempting to force it down the throats of the farmers.

H. S. LOOP, *North East.*

Induction of Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a constituent:

EUTAW, ALA., *September 17, 1943.*

Congressman PETE JARMAN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR PETE: As you know I am a married man with two children, a boy 8 and a girl 2. If the Army or Navy needs me to help win this war I am ready to go. I had much rather my wife and children be without a father than to live in a Nazi-ruled land.

If you want to vote for the immediate induction of fathers go to it; we are behind you in every effort to back the attack.

We had a bond sale here last night and raised $212,000, our quota was $194,000, so you see we went over the top in one night, and still going.

Respectfuly yours,

P. O. CLUB.

HORACE L. RICHARDSON.

Thought, Time, and Action Required

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks an article by Melvin Jones, Secretary General, Lions International, entitled "Thought, Time, and Action Required," which recently appeared in the Lions International Monthly Letter. It is a very timely article worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress and of the American people:

THOUGHT, TIME, AND ACTION REQUIRED

Lions have long led the way in activities. A Lions Club barely rounds out those things which pertain to its proper administration—arranging for a meeting place, setting a meeting date, and the organization of administrative committees—before it begins to lead the way in doing things for the good of its community and nation. This is amply borne out by records submitted by the clubs.

It is essential that Lions Clubs continue to do these things. The challenge to every member of a Lions Club, and more particularly to its leaders, is to lead in community accomplishments and in the maintenance of those things which go to make up the democratic way of life.

In time of war many of the privileges of peacetime undergo change. Some even have to be temporarily given up. As the war progresses and people learn to expect changes, they begin to make adjustments. But from time to time criticisms are heard concerning the changes which are made. This, perhaps, is a good sign. It may be taken as evidence that the normal ways of living are valued, and that people are looking to the time when those things which have been taken away may be restored to them. Lions, however, with their Lions code of ethics as a guide, are careful with their criticism and liberal with their praise. They do not criticize unless they can propose a better way in which to do the job.

Recently much criticisim has been voiced, principally in the United States, with the manner in which certain affairs of public interest have been handled. There has been some criticism of the Congress and some of bureaus and bureaucrats. Since this is a matter which concerns all Lions as well as all other citizens of the United States, we believe it should be closely examined.

Who are the bureaucrats, and where do they come from? They are our own people, and they come from among us. They are part of us. They are our relatives, our friends, our neighbors. Who are the Senators and Representatives, and where do they come from? They, too, are part of us. They come from among us. They are chosen by us, as are most of our leaders. Many bureau members are appointed because of recommendations we make. Indeed, some may be members of our own clubs. Why are they in Washington? They are there because of us. And why are they doing these things they have been chosen to do? It is because of us. We have unloaded—we back home have unloaded—on them, matters of various kinds. Now, every time the Government is asked to assume another responsibility or to participate in some business, or to put some money into it, an agency must be set up to see that the affairs are properly handled or that the money is properly spent, in line with the demands which are made.

It would seem from this that one of the vitally important things Lions can do to prove their leadership in business, professional and community life is to see to it that their own affairs of their community, city and State are so conducted that the Federal Government will not be asked to do special tasks for them, and thus obviate the necessity of the setting up of agencies or bureaus for that purpose.

Lions have led the way in many things, among them home gardening projects. As a result, the shelves in the basements of many of them are filled with canned goods—the fruits of their own initiative and labor. They have at least solved part of the rationing problem, and have taken care of their immediate and some of their future needs, while performing a great service to their Nation. They did not telegraph Washington requesting laws to compel them to do this. They did the job themselves.

One of the most important missions of the Lions is to lead, in every one of their communities, in doing those things which will help win the war in the shortest possible time; then to give much thought, time and action to the solution of post-war problems. We must assume, more and more, our own individual responsibilities, do more and more things for ourselves rather than to ask our government to do them for us. We must think for ourselves, act for ourselves, and help our neighbors to do the same, rather than have our government do more and more for everybody.

Mr. Morgenthau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of October 11, 1943:

MR. MORGENTHAU

Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau is not much of a matter-of-fact being. He belongs to the class whose feet are firmly planted in midair most of the time.

He blandly thinks all he has to do is whistle and all sorts of tax money will come out of hiding beneath blankets, in sugar jars, and other devious places.

He does not, as his immediate superior, President Roosevelt, believe that "tax money comes from the sweat of everyone who works for a living."

Mr. Morgenthau never had to work for a living. His father before him was quite well

fixed and Henry never had to worry where his next meal was coming from.

He is decidedly unpopular with Congress and that dislike is extending throughout the country to everyone who has to pay through his nose in the way of higher taxation.

Mr. Morgenthau last month was the spearhead in the sale of $18,000,000,000 worth of War bonds, and no sooner had the public taken a sigh of relief, than Mr. Morgenthau appeared before Congress with a program calling for $10,000,000,000 in additional taxation.

He will be lucky to get half that amount, for the general public is beginning to ask questions. Is wondering why it is necessary for this country to spend more than all the other belligerent powers combined.

Is wondering why other nations are looking ahead to post-war business expansion while this Nation is seemingly asleep at the switch.

The public is starting the question of why it is necessary to have so many hundreds of thousands of persons employed by the Government, and suggests that economy there will save billions annually.

The man on the street wonders, too, why the Treasury does not come up with a sound plan of taxation, instead of offering a hit or miss plan.

Morgenthau once publicly admitted he knew little or nothing about money. The public says "amen."

Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Barzynski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD regarding the splendid work done by Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Barzynski, commander of the United States Army Quartermaster Depot at Chicago, Ill., in his effort to secure cooperation of our American womanhood for service in the WAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and Marines, I include therein a letter he received from the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, D. D., archbishop of Chicago, in support of his work:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 14, 1943.*

Brig. Gen. JOSEPH E. BARZYNSKI,
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR GENERAL BARZYNSKI: I am told that you are intensely interested in securing the Nation-wide cooperation of our womanhood in our war effort. Whenever our freedoms have been attacked, and our men have had to go out to battle to defend and protect them, our women have done their full part on the home front, in the fields, and in the making of needed military supplies. It is true that in other wars woman's part was mainly to supply the men at home and to engage in providing war supplies. In our times, when war is mechanized and heavily drains our male population from the pursuits of production and commerce, the part of woman in our war effort has taken on a new phase. We find women in our factories producing the sinews of war, women in our hospitals nursing and tending our soldier sick, women everywhere a contribution can be made by woman without the sacrifice of her dignity and social vocation. Rightly we have shown our contempt for the degradation of womanhood in some countries, where they have been called to the roll of actual combatants, and have decreed that woman's contribution must be without the sacrifice of her dignity and prime social vocation. I am sure that your efforts will meet with success. Patriotism is fostered by woman in the home, and the mothers of our land who have given their boys to our armed services have made a mighty contribution. Our women will answer the call of their country and do all in our war effort which rightfully may be done by them.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

SAMUEL A. STRITCH,
Archbishop of Chicago.

The service of women in our armed forces is vital to our war conduct, and every effort that aids in recruiting and encouraging them, especially by the great churchmen of our country, should be known far and wide.

Brigadier General Barzynski before going to West Point was reared and educated in Chicago, and our city is very proud of the splendid work he is doing as Commander of the United States Army Quartermaster Depot, and in addition to and above his regular assigned duties, he has taken an intense interest in the cooperation of American women in our war effort and is doing a great work in recruiting them in the services.

Hog Ceiling Bogs Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Omaha (Nebr.) Daily Journal-Stockman.

Mr. Speaker, the ceiling price established for live hogs has been a mistake. Even the O. P. A. inspectors out in the field realize it but they have no authority to correct mistakes of the all-wise bureaucrats in Washington. It is apparent that the inner kitchen cabinet consisting of Harry Hopkins, and others—those bureaucrats whose decisions are final—will not admit a mistake or correct an error.

The scale for ceiling prices that has been set up for live hogs will eliminate many of the small interior markets in Nebraska. It is destroying the freedom of the farmer to market his hogs. It will drive livestock to the large terminal markets. The differential in price between these markets has too wide a spread and thus the interior markets, which heretofore have met the terminal market prices, with a resulting gain to the small farmer, will now not even be able to meet the competition and stay in business. The ruling is arbitrary, unnecessary, and contrary to that provision of the Price Control Act which states definitely that no methods shall be attempted which will interfere with the regular established methods of doing business.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it is not the intent and purpose of this inner circle to destroy individual initiative and to bring everything from shoestrings to hair tonic under the rationing program. It is time this Congress undertook to perform a major operation on that part of the O. P. A. which is unnecessary. We might well pray that the operation produce some first-class funerals among those whose directives are stifling free enterprise and thus hindering the production of food.

The editorial follows:

HOG CEILING BOGS DOWN

That O. P. A. blundered in its hog ceiling edict was clearly demonstrated the first week. Even some of the O. P. A. boys admitted that, privately. Well, then, why isn't some move made to correct the mistake? Perhaps it is not as simple as that. Probably those apparently in charge actually haven't the authority. If a higher O. K. has to be secured, getting it may not be so easy. A certain pride of decision is involved. Backing down is a hard road for the bureaucrats. But the pork is getting scarcer and scarcer and Government requirements for Army and other needs go on and on. If this situation gets bad enough, and it looks as though it would, the hog ceilings will have to be revised, pride or no pride. What with ceilings on pork, it would appear that "discarded" would be a better word than "revised."

In a speech last week, Harry E. Reed, head of the War Meat Board, said, "The Board is not an action agency, and authority has not been delegated to the Board as a body." The Board simply meets, threshes out problems, and makes its recommendations—but no Government agency is under any obligation to pay any attention to those recommendations. There is only one thing certain about them—they go into a file. And that is just the trouble—no centralized authority. If the War Meat Board had real authority, it is a safe guess that there would be no hog ceiling, and further than that the cattle feeding business wouldn't be in the mess it is. But, no. Things are not done that way. The important decisions are left not to practical men with some knowledge of the livestock business but to theorists, who may know their slide rules but who never came close to slopping a hog.

Men who know the livestock and meat business intimately warned and warned of the impracticability of a ceiling on live animals, but the wisdom of practical men seems to have no weight in the administration of food affairs. To men wanting to do their patriotic best that is as discouraging as it is aggravating.

Real Independence for Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted I include in my remarks an article on Philippine independence written by Vincente Villamin, author, a Filipino lawyer and economist. Mr. Villamin opposed Philippine independence in the past, but now favors it because he argues that Japan's defeat will remove the Japanese menace and because America has

pledged economic aid to his country after the war:

The Philippines presently will have independence not once but twice. One independence is granted by Japan in Manila and the other by America in Washington. The Manila government, following the example of Japan-dominated Burma, may declare war against the United Nations, while the Washington government may declare war against the Axis. Thus the two Philippine governments may find themselves on opposite sides of the fighting line

The Philippines were taken over by America from Spain as the result of a war. Then they were taken over by Japan from America as the result of another war.

When America remained in the islands after defeating Spain the cry went up that she was embarking on overseas expansion and imperialism. But through her liberal policies the Philippine experiment has become a monument to her generosity for which the Filipinos showed their gratitude on the battlefield. Now Japan is inaugurating her own experiment and the same cry of expansionism and imperialism is heard. The two experiments differ. The Japanese starts at the top with independence, while the American began at the bottom by preparing the Filipinos for the responsibilities of independence.

NOT FREE UNDER JAPAN

Japan's announced good intentions toward the Filipinos are being expressed in all media of modern propaganda and by elaborate plans of development, reconstruction, fraternization, and collaboration If the Filipinos are hypnotized by the Japanese, the Manila government, even without declaring war, might yet embarrass America by simply telling her not to disturb the peace in the islands by keeping out and staying out. But the Washington government, which is the only legitimate Philippine government, can truthfully say that those Filipinos who "cooperate" with Japan are not free agents and that the Manila set-up is only a makeshift affair instituted by Japan during her temporary military occupation of the islands.

The issue will be finally decided by the winner in the war, which means it will be decided by America. After Japan's defeat the Philippine government in Washington will be reestablished in Manila with the aid of America.

The grant of independence in Washington is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 81, dated September 24, providing for the creation of a separate and self-governing Philippine nation not later than 30 days after its enactment. Among other things, this means that American-Philippine relations will be on a diplomatic basis, that warlike aid to the Philippines will be under the Lend-Lease Act, and that Filipinos will be foreigners here instead of American nationals owing allegiance to America and enjoying certain rights and privileges as such.

SUGGESTIONS MADE

The resolution is deficient in some vital particulars and the writer wired members of Congress the following suggestions: First, that independence be automatic on approval of the resolution because Japan might grant independence before America and thereby acquire a propaganda appeal and legalistic priority; second, that the status of Filipinos here be defined on a liberal basis; third, that the selection of the officials of the new Philippine republic after the present term expires be clarified to avoid a government by decree; fourth, that a preferential trade relation with America be specifically provided for in the resolution to free it from the effects of the most-favored-nation-clause principle in commercial treaties, and fifth, that the preamble to the resolution include a statement similar to President Roosevelt's declarations committing the American Government to aid in the reconstruction of the Philippines.

The question of the declaration of war against the Axis was raised by the writer for possible remedial or perfecting action in a telegram to the President of the Philippines, as follows: "It seems logical that . . . the first major sovereign act of the Philippine republic should be to declare war against the Axis before it can properly negotiate with America on the prosecution of the war in the Philippines as provided in Section 3, that is, if it has the plenary power to do so, considering that in a constitutional republican system the power to declare war resides in the legislative branch of which the Philippine republic in Washington has none. However, if and when the declaration of war is decided upon it should be made clear that it does not extend to the de facto Filipino government which Japan might set up in Manila.

PREPARING FILIPINOS

Under the Philippine constitution, which has provisions for both the Commonwealth and the republic, President Quezon and Vice President Osmena will act as constitutional officials of the republic until Nov. 15, 1943, when the former shall vacate the office and its powers and duties shall devolve on the latter, whose term runs to 1945. The constitution was drafted by a Filipino constitutional convention in Manila in 1935, adopted by the Filipino people in a special referendum and approved by the President of the United States. It is the cornerstone of the government and should be kept solidly and firmly in place.

The Philippine republic will have the Commonwealth's $215,000,000 on deposit in America and can command the immediate services of 125,000 Filipinos here and in Hawaii. The Manila government operates on a budget of about $15,000,000 with Japanese printed money which has no metallic backing nor a government pledge of redemption

One of the most effective aids to the rehabilitation of the Philippines is to create a corps of trained Filipinos here for service in the islands after the war. The Japanese are training Filipinos in their code and it is essential to have Filipinos trained in the American technique and philosophy of action.

The Filipinos have a grand opportunity to build a greater country after the present unpleasantness shall have passed away. With the removal of the Japanese military menace, the deindustrialization of Japan and the assistance of America, the country can proceed confidently to the diversification of farm production, a rational amount of industrialization and the expansion of social and economic activities. With 17,000,000 aroused people and vast national resources, the new Philippines should be able to rebuild quickly, reconstitute her policies definitely, and recapture the promise of yet greater progress.

How Our Bureaus Harass Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, each day I receive complaints from business firms in my district regarding the "gestapo-like" and silly rules and regulations. With thousands on the pay roll who are not needed these bureaucrats try to earn their money by creating the impression that they are important and the impression that what they are doing is winning the war. The worst part of it is that there are so many that seemingly nobody in the bureaus knows where to get any information. Hence, there are scores of persons who harass a business firm by asking duplications of information.

They are a "gestapo" all by themselves seemingly bent on closing down all honest business in America. To give a clear picture of just what business is up against today, I ask leave to insert correspondence of Lyman Bretting of the Bretting Manufacturing Co., of Ashland, Wis. This correspondence points out what bureaucracy is doing to honest business.

And for what purpose does this go on? Merely to take materials from American businessmen and hand them over to some other country as the newspaper article at the end of these remarks points out. How long is this Congress going to stand for such gestapo tactics?

The correspondence follows:

C. G. BRETTING MANUFACTURING CO.,
Ashland, Wis., September 27, 1943.

Congressman A. O'KONSKI,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing a copy of a letter which we have just written to the Copper Recovery Corporation.

In all the years that we have been in business never have we been so antagonized by a lot of foolishness, and we thought that you might be interested in our bringing this to your attention.

Through so much red tape and foolishness which we encountered with the Copper Recovery Corporation we found it necessary to close down our foundry altogether and dispose of everything we had in the way of stock rather than be pestered to death with telegrams, letters, and reports.

We trust that this letter will prove of interest to you.

Yours very truly,

LYMAN BRETTING.

C. G. BRETTING MANUFACTURING CO.,
Ashland, Wis., September 27, 1943.

Mr. H. HIRSCHTHAL,
Unit Chief, Scrap Unit,
Copper Recovery Branch,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: In regard to your letters and telegrams which you have been sending to us, we are at a loss to understand just what it is all about.

We have been doing everything possible to help win this war, and as a conscientious taxpayer we certainly are disgusted with the manner in which you and your other chiefs have handled this copper situation. It certainly seems to us there must be some way in which all of you chiefs could get together and check over your files, where you will find that we have complied with all your requests up until the time you started asking for three and four duplications of information we had already furnished.

On April 22 we wrote you in detail and enclosed a copy of credit memorandum which we received from the Duluth Brass Works in payment of the brass and copper which we had in stock, other than the brass tubing and bronze bushings which we sent in to the Chase Brass Co. in accordance with instructions from your department.

We have no brass nor copper on hand as we have disposed of everything according to instructions as received from the Copper Recovery Corporation, and we feel that if you will simply check over your files you

will have the whole story. By so doing you might help the war effort and save some of the taxpayers' money instead of sending so many unnecessary telegrams and letters.

Yours very truly,

L. BRETTING.

C. G. BRETTING MANUFACTURING CO.,
Ashland, Wis., October 6, 1943.

Congressman A. O'KONSKI,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have received your letter and appreciate very much the attitude you have regarding the Copper Recovery Corporation. Of course, to us it is the most ridiculous thing that ever existed, and we sincerely hope that some draft law will be enacted whereby all these Government leeches can be put into the armed forces.

We are enclosing a copy of their last letter, together with a copy of our reply, as we think you might be interested in seeing what we are actually up against.

With kindest regards, we are,

Yours very truly,

L. BRETTING.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
COPPER RECOVERY CORPORATION,
New York City.

C. G. BRETTING MANUFACTURING CO.,
Ashland, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: We have your letter of September 27, 1943, and the writer has made a thorough search of all the correspondence and has found a credit memorandum dated April 5, to the Duluth Brass Works, of Duluth, Minn., showing the disposition of the large amount of various scrap material.

We wish to take this opportunity to express to you our appreciation for your cooperation in the war effort and regret that the invoice in question did not come to the proper division for the deletion of the scrap inventory, since your letter dated April 22 should have been forwarded to the writer for his attention.

There is only one other question which will assist us in closing your case on this scrap material, and that refers to the authorization permitting the Duluth Brass Works to purchase such material. If, however, they have acted in the capacity of a scrap-metal dealer it is in order for them to have purchased all of your scrap inventory.

Will you kindly advise us further as to the above.

Yours very truly,

H. HIRSCHTHAL,
Unit Chief, Copper Recovery Branch,
Scrap Unit, Copper Division.

C. G. BRETTING MANUFACTURING CO.,
Ashland, Wis., October 6, 1943.

Mr. H. HIRSCHTHAL,
Unit Chief, Copper Recovery Branch,
New York City.

DEAR SIR: We are in receipt of your letter of September 29 and are both pleased and surprised to know that you have been able to check over our correspondence records and find everything in order except in the last paragraph of your letter.

We have been asked to answer a lot of foolish questions, but to us this one is without a doubt the most ridiculous request we have had as yet.

On June 20, 1943, we received a letter from the War Production Board, Copper Recovery Corporation, advising us to dispose of our scrap inventory to a scrap dealer, brass mill, or any other person who had specific authorization to purchase such material. We contacted the Duluth Brass Works in regard to disposing of our materials and they advised us that they had authority to purchase this scrap from us. We did not ask them for any special affidavits or go through any red tape in order to determine whether or not they were authorized to purchase it, but just as any other good American citizen would do we accepted their statement, as we thought that the object of the Copper Recovery Corporation was to see that all idle surplus amounts of scrap copper and copper alloy was put into use for essential purposes.

As we advised you many times exactly what our set-up is, we trust that this last explanation will close your records as far as we are concerned. Your Department has succeeded in seeing that our brass foundry has ceased to exist, and we trust that they have accomplished their purpose.

Yours very truly,

L. BRETTING.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of September 30, 1943]

LEND-LEASE OF NONWAR GOODS RAPPED

CHICAGO, ILL., September 29, 1943.—While America is being starved for supplies, huge orders are being requisitioned for lend-lease shipments to Russia for long-range, post-war use, Miss Vivien Kellems, Saugatuck, Conn., industrial management expert, charged today.

Miss Kellems, operator of a cable grip company at Saugatuck who was defeated by Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE in a congressional race last year, made the accusation before the Chicago Rotary Club.

CITES RUSSIAN ORDER

She declared the administration is violating the spirit of lend-lease by requisitioning vital materials for foreign countries that are not actually required to fight the war.

"Through J. W. Flatley, Chief, Contract and Purchase Branch, Treasury Department, Procurement Division," she charged, "9,842,000 feet of long-distance telephone cable, 4,264,000 feet of power cable, 52,000,000 pounds of bare copper, and huge quantities of other vital material have been ordered in this country for Russia."

OWN COMPANY REFUSED

"It comes," Miss Kellems added, "under the President's direct supervision—it is a must."

"These orders for Russia," she said, "are for long-range, post-war development."

Complaining that her own company has been turned down on priorities by the War Production Board, Miss Kellems said other American manufacturers cannot obtain vital materials for actual war work or for machinery.

Journal-American—Penicillin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1943

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, much credit is due the Journal-American for bringing to the attention of Americans science's new miracle drug, penicillin. Through the efforts of the Journal-American last August this rare drug, which never before was released for civilian use, was obtained for 2-year-old Patricia Malone, who was stricken with a highly fatal type of blood poisoning. As a result of the publicity given the case of this brave child from Jackson Heights, N. Y., great public interest has been taken in this wonderful drug. It is hoped and expected that in a short time there will be enough penicillin for general civilian use.

The people of America owe a great debt to the Journal-American for the part it played in educating the public at large to the benefits of penicillin, the powerful germ killer.

American Losses by Sabotage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. HOCH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor of October 12, 1943:

AMERICAN LOSSES BY SABOTAGE—DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

If, before Pearl Harbor, you had asked the average well-informed American if the United States would suffer materially from enemy sabotage within, if we got into the war, the answer would have been in the affirmative. Our diverse population, our vast continental area, and the astute, carefully prepared Nazi and Japanese intelligence staffs would have been cited. Indeed, official Americans were braced for sabotage worse than anything during World War No. 1.

And yet today, nearly 2 years after our entry into the war, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., reports that thus far not a single sabotage crime on American soil could be traced to foreign origins. Our factories, our dams and bridges, our transportation systems, our other essential facilities, have operated undisturbed by the enemy's fire or explosion.

This remarkable state of affairs, I am told is due to the excellence of the F. B. I. and its brother organizations, which tracked down and smashed spy or saboteur rings even before Pearl Harbor, aided by national systems of registration and surveillance far better than during the last war. But however good the F. B. I. has been, this explanation is not fully satisfying. The Germans and Japanese are very shrewd and cunning. We had plenty of soft spots in our system. According to any calculation, we should have suffered losses by sabotage. Why didn't we?

The answer is that we did. We suffered severely from sabotage, and we are suffering more bitterly today than we did in the first onslaughts after Pearl Harbor. The sabotage against us is well organized, effective, and punishing. But it is not carried out with bomb and incendiary. It is mental sabotage, psychological or divisive warfare, and it is progressing exactly as planned beforehand in the strongholds of our enemy.

What are the evidences and effects of this sabotage? They are in the suspicions, confusions, and divisions in the Nation. They are the sorry fruit of seeds sown by Nazi propaganda. They are not necessarily the result of Nazi gold paid to a traitor, of a printing press bought, or a demagog bribed. It has not been necessary to do the job in that crude fashion. Instead, our Nazi and Japanese enemies have emitted lies into the world. They have sprayed forth falsehood, like poison gas. Some of it has clung.

There are powerful organs in the United States—newspapers and statesmen whose voices reach many millions daily—whose constantly repeated arguments are explicitly those of Berlin and Tokyo. I do not suggest

that these organs have been bribed or subsidized. That was not necessary. These organs have become the carriers of enemy falsehoods. The falsehoods are disseminated freely throughout our country. Our citizens are exposed to their contamination. And in many cases, their thinking is affected, their support of the war effort is weakened.

The result is less production in our vital arms plants—plants just as much a part of the war as the soldier at Salerno—less support of our war financing, less honor and honesty in upholding the standards of civic morality under domestic restrictions, less thinking about the needs of post-war planning. It adds up to a possible severe prolongation of the war, the tragic loss of American lives and resources, and actual danger not only to victory but to national survival itself.

Happily, these forces of sabotage probably cannot finally upset our hopes of military victory. But they could force us to lose the peace. By sowing suspicion and hate for our allies, Britain and Rusisa, they could pave the desperate road to a third world war.

There are men in Congress who have fought stubborn, shrewd, rear-guard actions against virtually all the essential proposals put forth for the conduct of the war by Gen. George C. Marshall and Admiral Ernest H. King, from Pearl Harbor to this day. This obstructionism has done harm. It has been sabotage. It has slowed up the war, delayed victory, sowed seeds for defeat in the peace.

There are big newspapers which have daily preached bitterness and hatred against our leaders and our allies. They have urged the immediate cessation of all war production, the withdrawal of our soldiers from some of their present battlefields. The purport of their argument, which they scarcely dare to put into words, is an early and separate peace by the United States.

Not many Americans have been fooled altogether by these attacks. But no sabotage is more effective than for a small percentage of production. And every delay, every confusion, every suspicion is a blow against us.

It is, I think, obvious that the enemy planned it this way. The absence of crude, physical sabotage is too significant. Herr Hitler and Dr. Goebbels counted on these very divisions from within. They boasted explicitly of it. They did not count in vain. And when will we wake up.

Safety in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Punxsutawney Spirit, Punxsutawney, Pa.:

SAFETY IN CONGRESS

Congressmen have recently enjoyed a long spell of getting first-hand information from the folks back home. They have found that their constituents are willing and anxious to help transfer the Nation's needs into realities—they have also found, if they have talked to Farmer Jones, Storekeeper Brown, and Manufacturer Smith, that in cases too numerous to mention these gentlemen are confused, discouraged, and restricted in their all-out production endeavors by endless and incomprehensible rules and demands of various Federal agencies with which they are confronted at every turn.

Our lawmakers have undoubtedly asked themselves: "Have our people reached a point where their every act, their every purchase, their every sale must be planned by some super bureau or bureaucrat in Washington? Is it not possible to get needed war legislation and regulation within the framework of our Government, and leave to the producer, the merchant, and the consumer some measure of self-regulation within prescribed limits? The people want to cooperate. Is it not possible to simplify the regulations under which they must operate? Are regulations which discourage production going to ward off scarcities and defeat inflation? Can subsidies ever replace prices sufficient to allow reasonable profits? Will the consumer benefit by constantly lessened supplies, as the result of restrictive policies which cut production?

"There must be a happy wage and price medium which we can help maintain to encourage the necessary functioning of American production and distribution in conjunction with wartime requirements of our armed forces and civilian population. As the duly elected Representatives of our people, we cannot shift our responsibilities to subordinates."

They Liked Not To Have God in Their Knowledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, each year the Catholic Lawyers Guild of Brooklyn, N. Y., sponsors a traditional service known as the Mass of the Holy Ghost to mark the opening of the courts. It is an ancient tradition intending to strengthen those who are part of the administration of justice—judges, lawyers, and others. This year that service was held on September 23 and the preacher of the occasion was the distinguished educator and scholar, Joseph R. N. Maxwell, S. J., president of the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.

I take the liberty of inserting the sermon delivered by him on that occasion. It is as follows:

Along the road that leads to ancient Athens, far removed from the lofty temples of the Acropolis and their throng of pagan deities, stands a very simple altar on which is engraved the inscription, "To the Unknown God." No statue, no flowers, no ornaments adorn this shrine. No one has ever paused before it to offer sacrifice. Lone and alone it stands, built to the honor of a god the Athenians did not know.

One day an unknown traveler stopped near this altar to rest. It was evident that he had journeyed far. His entire appearance made it clear to all that he was not a Greek. Silently and long he sat absorbed in the splendors of Athens. But as he gazed upon the magnificent panorama of that city he could not but recall all the religious errors of its people—all the moral laxity of the Athenians. Everywhere he saw manifestations of frivolity, immorality, corruption, unbridled sensuality, the degrading worship of idols. The streets, the houses, the temples were filled with sculptured lumps that in the minds of these Athenians represented their many gods. Sadly he thought of all this as he entered this god-filled but godless city. He moved into the crowded marketplace, and, mounting a platform he spoke to these people of the unknown God.

"Citizens of Athens," he said, "on my way into your city I noted the various statues of your idols, and I stopped before the altar inscribed to the unknown God. I am come to speak to you of this God whom you honor though you know Him not." With the fervid eloquence of a zealous soul this stranger, the great Saint Paul, spoke to this pagan people of the one true God. But Paul preached, you will remember, to the intelligentsia of Athens, and he received a very cold attention. The better class Athenians were a superlatively smart set, and they were notoriously eager for knowledge. Their usual greeting as they sauntered about the market place was, "What is new?" They were fond of any novelty, but Saint Paul was one novelty the Athenians did not welcome. He was too peremptory for their lounging, speculative minds. He did not speculate with them; he told them. He spoke to them of God, and of man who was created by God. He spoke of man's dependence on God, of his duty before God. He spoke of God's law, its origin, its binding force, its sanctions, but he spoke in vain. For Paul, in speaking to the Athenians, was addressing a people who were very smug in their own conceits.

They were bland skeptics, these Athenians, and in writing of them later Paul said: "They liked not to have God in their knowledge". In their lives and in their law they ignored the science, the knowledge of God, not merely for reasons of the head, but more especially for reasons of the heart. They were disaffected toward God. First He was ousted from their affection, and then He was ousted from their intellect. The thought of God and His law struck a somber note in their lives, and so they dismissed Him. They liked not to have God in their knowledge. And one day their speculative minds clashed with the might of the more practical Spartans. Might prevailed, and the lamp of freedom flickered and died out. Night settled upon Athens, and the glory of that fair city crumbled into dust. "Unless God build the house they labor in vain who would build it."

Centuries have passed and the pendulum of time has swung from the paganism of Athens to a modern neo-paganism.

Just a year or two ago the Boston Law Book Co., published a volume entitled, "My Philosophy of Law: Credos of Sixteen American Scholars". The book is a symposium in which these sixteen American philosophers of law express their views regarding the nature of law. All but one of these gentlemen seemed to agree that, in the explanation of law, there is no place for God. As far as the science of law is concerned "they liked not to have God in their knowledge".

In the neopaganism of today obstacles have been thrown across the path of those who would walk with dignity along the road that leads men back to God. An old philosophy with a new name stands like a giant colossus with one foot in ancient pagan Greece and the other foot in the new pagan Europe. It is the old philosophy of the absolute state. Its modern name is totalitarianism, and its name is its only novelty. It is a throw-back to another day when Caesar strode the stage, deifying the state he ruled upon the specious grounds of public policy, and calling for the complete annihilation of the human personality. To this public policy the state directs all its forces. It is the one thing necessary; it is the ultimate norm of truth; it is the final measure of right. Human life, its purpose, its dignity, its worth it puts in the scale with state utility. It evaluates the individual according to the manner in which he fits into the place

assigned to him by public policy, according as he conforms or fails to conform to the ideologies of the state. Might is substituted for reason, and law becomes organized lawlessness. The fire of human liberty is extinguished because man is conisdered as having no God-given rights; there are no God-given rights because there is no eternal law. Once again the old cry is raised: There is no God but Caesar. They like not, these frenzied builders of Babel, to have God in their knowledge.

Today throughout Europe bodies are broken, minds are bruised, liberties are strangled, and the land is offensive with the stench of physical and spiritual death. Another night is descending, and another ancient glory is eclipsed. A Christian culture is crushed into dust.

There is but one answer to any group of philosophers whether they are speculating about law, or government, or farming, or ships, and that answer is a very simple one.

During the past year I was working with a small group of educators for the purpose of restating the aims of a liberal education. Quite naturally the question of the place of religion came into our discussions and the president of your city college was asked: "How would you answer the question of the student who wished to know what is the end of man?" Promptly and simply the answer was given: "The end of man is God." In all its simplicity that is the answer to a host of difficulties. It is the answer to the 16 philosophers who would exclude God in their explanation of the law; it is the answer to those tyrants who would rule an absolute state; it is the answer to all social ills which are made of man.

It is certainly a very futile thing for man to discuss anything that is important to him as man until he has first determined the reason for his existence, the direction in which he is traveling, and the goal he is destined to reach. In that awful moment of creation when "God breathed and being blossomed in the barren wastes of chaos" man began his journey, and God gave him a law to show him the way, to direct him in his travels, to lead him to his goal. That law is called the natural law.

In simple language, this is merely man's participation in the eternal law of God, and its authority comes directly from God. It is not made of kings or cabinets, senates or congresses. Customs or policies, popular beliefs or fancies in no way influence it. It brooks no human sanction. It implies that we know with absolute certainty that we are the children of God, endowed with immortal souls, destined for eternal life, bound in conscience to pursue that destiny, and possessed of inalienable rights to enable us to do so. It implies that we know from our very nature that some things help while others hinder in attaining our goal. It implies that some actions are intrinsically right and that some are essentially wrong, and this regardless of the material consequences of these actions. It implies further that human laws and human governments are instituted among us, and administered by us, to safeguard our inalienable rights and to help us to attain with human dignity the divine destiny that is ours.

Surely there is no law without God. At the root of this neopagan decay there is godlessness and irreligion.

Opposed to the shriveled, frost-bitten ideologies of this neopagan cult is the wholesome philosophy of democracy. In the defense of this democracy our young men are at this moment giving their lives, and while they are doing this we know of 15 American philosophers of law who are hacking away at the foundations of the state, for in the explanation of the nature of the law they can find no place for God. What a travesty. Philosophies foreign to our democratic ideals are struggling for a foothold in the land of democracy, and there is danger that these godless mouthings may, if they are not stopped, shout down the voice of our democracy.

We speak much in this country of the personal dignity of man, but if I do not believe in God, to what avail is all my talk of the dignity of man? From where does man get this dignity? True, our Declaration of Independence tells us that all men are created equal and we speak much of this equality. But in what does it consist? Surely there is no question of an equality of mind or body, an equality of social position, but rather an equality of spirit that comes from the possession of an immortal soul which God has made in his own image and likeness Hence there is no question among us of race and creed, but rather a question of justice tempered, I trust, always with a genuine Christian charity.

We speak much of man's inalienable rights, quoting again from our Declaration of Independence. But without God how would man attain such rights? The mention of them in this document of our freedom does not confer these magic gifts upon us, nor did our Government create them. But our Government and any government has the serious obligation to recognize and respect these rights precisely because they are given to man by God.

God and His law are at the very foundation of democracy. If these foundations are destroyed or even tampered with, then democracy will cease to function, and the state will become absolute. If the state is absolute it can do no wrong, since it is responsible only to itself. It may make treaties today, and it may break them tomorrow. It may make promises today, and it may ignore them tomorrow. It may instruct its representatives to lie, and it may argue that, since this was done in the interest of the state, no fault is committed. In other words, since there is no place for God in its frame of reference, there is no place for morality.

And yet we know that, if we are to believe in democracy, we must first believe that there is a very exacting moral order. In a recent commencement speech one of our college presidents said: "If we are to believe in democracy we must first believe that there is a difference between truth and falsity, good and bad, right and wrong. Truth and goodness are objective standards, and political organization must be tested by conformity to the ideals of truth and goodness; for its basis is moral, and its end is the good for man. Only democracy has this basis. If we do not believe in this basis and this end, we do not believe in democracy. These are the principles for which we fight; these are the ideals by which we live."

Our battle against neo-pagan ideas is not confined to the theaters of Europe and Asia. Here in the land of democracy there are those who would laugh out of court the medieval notion that there is a natural law. To these fellow travelers the inalienable rights of man are so much metaphysical nonsense. The fact that anyone might feel bound in conscience to this or that line of action is quite ridiculous to men who look on morality merely as an expression of good taste. The word principles has gone out of their vocabularies, and it has been replaced by the modern shibboleth expediency. If a thing works, it is true; if it is convenient, it is justifiable; if it satisfies, it is right. Surely these philosophers are smug in their conceit.

As members of the legal profession you are trained to protect man's right in the interest of law and justice. To this task you have sworn your fealty. You respect the law because you reverence it in its origin. Man's rights you honor and defend as a gift from God. In the pursuit of your profession your course is clearly charted. It remains for you, in the face of organized opposition, to walk that way in the knowledge and love of God and man. There is no time for idle speculation. There is one fact that must be accepted. That fact is God.

In 1873, a member of the bench of the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin, speaking to the university law class, drew an excellent picture of the lawyer. He is a man who likes not only to have God in his knowledge, but who would bring him into his life that he might vitalize his profession. "This," he says, "is the true ambition of the lawyer: to obey God in the service of society; to fulfill his law in the order of society; to promote His order in the subordination of society to its own law adopted under His authority; to minister His justice by the nearest approach to it under the municipal law which human intelligence and conscience can accomplish."

As members of the bar, your responsibilities are as tremendous as your dignity is sublime. The alien philosophies which have devastated Europe are on the march in our own free land. Many years ago Emmanuel Kant separated the legal order from the moral order, and we know of 15 American philosophers who have rallied to his cause. These men and their doctrine rise up to challenge you, your love of country, your love of honor, your love of truth and justice, your love of God and man.

Bowed down with the humility that befits great men in high places, let your prayer rise to God that in the work of defending and administering His law He may be in your knowledge as a preceptor, in your hearts as a father, in your lives as a support and a defense.

The light of democracy is flaming white. With your hands in the hand of God hold it aloft forever.

Address of the Hon. Thomas A. Jenkins Before the Ohio Savings and Loan League on Monday, October 11, 1943, at Columbus, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Chairman, it is good to see such a splendid representation of building and loan men here today. In times gone by it was my privilege to attend these State meetings quite regularly. I attended one meeting just after the bank and building and loan crashes in the country. I was very anxious then to see Ohio do something in a big way to relieve that situation. But the State of Ohio failed to furnish the leadership that was needed then. I think that if the present State building and loan department was operating at that time some building and loan companies might have been saved.

Before the crash Ohio was probably the best building and loan State in the Union. Of course, those were strange and stressful times, but somehow I think that the State of Ohio and the building and loan department could have managed that situation more successfully. The department closed some institutions that could have been saved by intelligent and courageous action.

I am glad that there is an air of hopefulness among you and that the building and loan business in Ohio is on the up-grade. I hope that Ohio may soon regain her position of leadership in this important and necessary business.

A building and loan company must borrow money and it must also lend money if it is to be successful and prosperous. Whether the building and loan business will again be able to establish itself as a great and necessary business in our country will depend upon whether free enterprise is to be again permitted to prosper in our land or whether we are to be a nation controlled by edicts and directives from bureaus and boards in Washington.

The building and loan business is one of the most typically American of our financial institutions. It is truly a business of and by the people. It will never prosper under a bureaucratic government. It was organized as a neighborhood financial institution where the people of the neighborhood could deposit their money to be loaned by their trusted neighbors and to their trusted neighbors. It was never intended to be a business operated by strangers or by loan sharks.

From the printed program you will see that I am expected to discuss with you two very unpopular subjects—debt and taxes. Some fellow misread the program and thought the subject was death and taxes, and he said to me, "They surely have selected an unhappy subject for you. They say that death and taxes are the only two calamities that are sure to overtake us." And I said to him: "I think taxes are worse than death because a person only dies once while he is scared to death all the time about his taxes."

While the national debt and our national taxes are obligations that cause much concern and worry, they are positive proof that our form of government is working and that we are having our important part in it. Probably the strongest and most important reservation of power contained in the Constitution is that reservation that kept the power of the purse in the hands of the people. This is the power that we, the people, must keep inviolate and uncontrolled by bureaucrats or by tyrants. The Constitution gives to Congress the full and undisputed right:

1. To borrow money, thereby incurring debts.

2. To levy taxes.

No Government agency but the Congress can incur debts. The Congress frequently delegates powers to the Executive and to the departments and it is occasionally grossly abused. Congress is at fault frequently by being too free in delegating its powers. But Congress has never surrendered its power to borrow money or to levy taxes or to control the purse strings of the Nation.

Therefore if we cherish this great power of the purse which was so positively vouchsafed to the people, we must assume the responsibility that goes with it. We must finance the Nation and pay its obligations. We owe the national debt. All of us owe all of it. And all of us must pay all of it. It was our constitutional privilege to incur it. And it is our constitutional and patriotic duty to pay it. The payment of it will be proof of our honor and our patriotism. It measures our loyalty to our country, of which we are so proud, and for which many are now giving up their lives.

There are only three methods by which we can discharge our national debt. Only one of these three is honorable. These are the methods:

1. By inflation of various kinds.

2. By repudiation.

3. By taxation.

The first two methods would not be honorable. They would not be in keeping with the traditions of our Republic and our Government then could not long endure.

Uncontrolled inflation could burn its course right through the fabric of our Government, and printing-press money would aggravate the conflagration. Devaluation by changing the gold content of the dollar would also increase the fire.

Repudiation of our honest debts would be so foreign to the very genius of our Republic that if we resorted to such a dishonorable course to discharge our just debts our once proud Republic would perish from the earth and be remembered only for the glory that once was hers.

Our only honest course is to pay our national debt by taxation.

Can we pay it? We can if we are worthy of those who planted the seeds of liberty in this new world; and of those who have kept the tree of liberty alive for these many generations. To do it we must be resolute. We must determine to save our country and its honor. To do this we must:

1. Determine to restore private enterprise. Those who provide the capital and the management, and those who provide the labor and manpower must then work as we have never done before.

2. Eliminate all unnecessary expense and waste in government and in private activities. Wilful waste of time and effort will inevitably bring woeful want.

3. Place on ourselves the greatest burden of taxation we can carry and without unduly straining our capacity to produce.

There is a powerful school of thought growing up in our country that holds contrary to the views that I have just expressed. They maintain that so long as we owe our national debt to ourselves we need not worry. They hold to the theory that the Government has borrowed this vast sum of money from the people and that it has spent the money by distributing it among the people, and that the people now have much of this same money which is represented by their savings accounts, and that the Government should take these savings through compulsory legislation and use them to carry on public works to give the people employment. Some of these are those who developed the new philosophy of government that was so laconically expressed in the words: "Tax and tax; spend and spend; elect and elect." In other words, they claim that private enterprise has failed and that private capital will never again venture itself into industry because there will be no incentive since the country has grown up and there are no new frontiers. They are at least opposed to the profit system and hold that the Government should guide all spending, and keep the money moving. Under such a system it would inevitably follow that the national debt would get greater and greater until it would burst under its own pressure. Panic and distrust would overtake us and some dictator would then assume control and then our great country would go the way of all dictatorships.

My friends, the situation is serious. Be not deceived. There are many in high places now openly advocating compulsory savings. Although as I understand it, Secretary Morgenthau is personally opposed to compulsory savings, yet in his statement before the Ways and Means Committee last Monday, he recommended post-war credits for a certain group of taxpayers. This recommendation, if carried out, will be the opening wedge for compulsory savings. If he were advocating legislation requiring every taxpayer to save a portion of his earnings and deposit them in his own name in a bank or building and loan association for his own future protection, that might have some merit, but not enough to warrant its acceptance. But the Treasury proposes that the taxpayer turn over his earnings to the Government to be returned to him after the war and under certain conditions. This will lead to Government control of savings which is socialistic and very dangerous. I indicated my opposition to this plan to Mr. Morgenthau when he proposed it to the Ways and Means Committee.

How great is our national debt? It is so great as to be beyond the comprehension of most of us. Let me trace its growth and you will see how like a snake it is stealthily threatening to smother us to death.

When the First World War broke out, we owed a National debt of only $1,000,000,000. At the end of that war, we owed $26,500,000,000. This was then considered a tremendous debt. From 1920 to 1930 we reduced that enormous debt by $1,000,000,000 per year. Congress passed 4 tax bills in that time and reduced the taxes each time, but collected more money after each reduction. In the last 10 years, Congress has passed 16 tax bills raising the taxes each time and paradoxically increasing the national debt every year. Why the difference? The difference is found in the fact that during the first 10 years referred to, private industry and individual effort were being encouraged. The people had confidence in the Government then and were not in constant fear. Under the confidence thus instilled the production of commodities was greatly increased. Wealth was increased and wages and income were also greatly increased. During the past 10 years, public spending apparently has been the accepted policy of the administration. For every year since 1933, the Government has operated on a deficit. Its expenditures exceeded the receipts. It went into the red four or five billions nearly every year. In 1940, the debt was 43 billions. The national debt now is 161 billions and it is increasing at the rate of about two hundred millions per day. We take in about one hundred million a day and spend about three hundred millions a day. There are some who stoutly maintain that a huge public debt is a national asset. I am old-fashioned and I think a nation's liabilities are measured by its debts. Take your choice.

Our national debt will be at least three hundred billion by the end of the war. When we paid a portion of the national debt off at the rate of $1,000,000,000 per year from 1920 to 1930 we thought our achievement was marvelous. If we can do as well with the prospective debt it will still take at least 300 years to liquidate it.

Let us contemplate what our fixed expenses will be when the war is over.

As I have stated, we will owe about $300,000,000,000. The interest on this amount will be at least six billion annually. We will still be required to maintain a big Army and a powerful Navy with heavy accompanying expense. The widows and dependents of our armed forces and wounded men will require attention. How heavy this will be might be best estimated by considering what the expenses were following other wars. I shall read a table for you:

	Normal expenditures before the war	Normal expenditures after war
War of 1812	$9,000,000	$19,000,000
Mexican War	26,000,000	55,000,000
Civil War	60,000,000	322,000,000
First World War	696,000,000	3,914,000,000
Second World War	6,700,000,000	Probably 30,000,000,000

Secretary Morgenthau told us when he appeared before our Ways and Means Committee last Monday that our national income would be 157 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. The highest figure our national income reached in the prosperous days of the twenties was about 90 billion, reached in 1929.

In order for us to meet the tremendous expense necessary to carry on after the war even though we only carry the operating ex-

penses and interest on the debt, it will be necessary for us to have an annual national income of at least 100 billion. Even then it would require about 30 percent of our national income to carry our national debt and the operating expenses of the Government; while the other 70 percent would be left to feed, clothe, and maintain our whole population and to carry on business and to maintain State and local governments and many other expenses.

We cannot pay out if we are to continually be held under the fear that our system of government is going to be changed. We cannot prosper under this continuous, never ending, ever changing program of alphabetical scourges that are being inflicted upon us at the rate of two or three a month. Just last week when Assistant Secretary of War Patterson appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in an effort to defend the defenseless and tyrannical enforcement of the Renegotiation Act, against which so many businessmen are complaining, I said during my cross-examination of him that there never had been a time in the history of the Republic when the people were so much in fear of their Government as now. It is a disgrace to our once proud people that businessmen, big and little, are being persecuted beyond endurance. We can pay this enormous debt if we are free men, but we cannot pay it as slaves. We never have been slaves. We must not be slaves.

TAXES

Now let us discuss taxes. Until about 30 years ago the Government got its operating expenses largely from the sale of public lands and from tariff duties and from liquor and tobacco, etc. Now the amounts collected from these sources is less than 8 percent of the national revenues. Nearly 90 percent of our revenues now are received from personal and corporate income taxes. The increase in these income taxes has been little short of phenomenal. Let me give you some figures. First as to personal income taxes.

In the year ending June 30, 1940, the Federal Government collected less than $900,000,000 from personal incomes.

In 1941 it collected $1,300,000,000.

In 1942 it collected $3,200,000,000.

In 1943 it collected $7,000,000,000.

In 1944 it expects to collect $18,000,000,000, without regard to any increases which may be included in the new tax bill.

The amount collected in this fiscal year will be 1,800 percent of the amount collected only 4 years ago.

The facts concerning the increase in the corporate income taxes are equally striking.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, the amount collected from corporations was $950,000,000.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the amount collected was $1,600,000,000.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, the amount collected was $3,000,000,000.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, the amount was $4,000,000,000.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the amount to be collected is estimated at $4,000,000,000

But there should be added to this last estimate the amount of the excess profits tax which is estimated to be $10,000,000,000, which will make the total from corporations for the year 1944 amount to $14,000,000,000.

In addition there will be large sums secured this year from corporations under the Renegotiation Act which has been enforced against corporations making excessive profits from war contracts.

This year we will collect $38,000,000,000 from existing taxes. The Treasury is asking for ten and one-half billion more, which will make a total of nearly $50,000,000,000. To this must be added the $10,000,000,000 collected by State and local governments. This amounts to $60,000,000,000 or nearly 40 percent of the national income.

Without any change in the present law there will be two automatic increases next year—one of these will be the 1 percent increase in the social security tax, which means a doubling of the present rate. The other item is the payment of the 12½ percent of the 1942 tax carried over under the pay-as-you-go tax bill.

From these figures it will be seen that there is a justifiable reason for the opposition that the Ways and Means Committee members, both Republicans and Democrats, are voicing against the recent demand of the administration for an additional ten and one-half billions in taxes to be collected largely from individuals.

In the midst of all this clamor for these tremendous sums of tax money for Government spending there is not one word from the administration encouraging thrift or condemning waste. Never does the administration mention economy and never does it practice economy. It apparently believes in the philosophy of spending and is opposed to the philosophy of thrift. Many believe that the Congress should do something about waste and extravagance. Congress has spoken on this matter many times. I myself have taken much time in an effort to effect some plan that would compel economy. It must be remembered that it is the executive department that is responsible for expenditures. The Chief Executive has never shown any disposition to practice economy. Economies are not effected unless the Executive has an attitude toward economy.

Let us discuss briefly the proposed new tax bill. Before doing so in detail we surely have not forgotten that we have just been introduced to and have hardly had time to get acquainted with the pay-as-you-go plan with its 20-percent withholding and its many other innovations of forgiveness and windfalls. Likewise we have only had a brief acquaintance with the Victory tax. Both of these taxes have added tremendously to the troubles of many millions of our taxpayers and the employers and employees of the country. With these two new tax plans added to the already terrifically complex tax law, the people are not ready for another tax bill. But we are in a terrific war and the administration, in keeping with its custom, cannot forego a chance to ask for more money.

The Ways and Means Committee continues the custom of inviting the Secretary of the Treasury to come before it with such recommendations as he cares to make, but for the past 3 or 4 years the committee has not followed them to any great extent. He appeared before the committee last Monday and demanded the passing of legislation that will add ten and a half billion to the tax load of the people. His recommendations met with no warmth of reception. He attempted to strengthen his cause by calling to his aid Mr. Randolph Paul, his chief tax assistant, and Mr. Fred Vinson, the Chief Stabilizer for the Administration. His recommendations were not applauded by the people or by the press. Mr. DOUGHTON, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a strong North Carolina Democrat, gave out a very strong statement of opposition. Mr. DOUGHTON was supported by several other Democratic members. The full Republican membership had already expressed its opposition. In the face of this outspoken opposition, you might consider a further discussion by me as a waste of time. But the country is talking about it, and why not we?

The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury is a smooth, political document. He argues that we are threatened with wild inflation if we do not drain off from the earnings of the people at least 10½ billions. He claims that our national income payable to individuals will soon be 152 billions and that the value of all goods and services available to be purchased will be only about 89 billions and that there will be a surplus of money over goods of 63 billions. This is what they call the "Inflation Gap." They imply that there will be $152,000,000,000 competing with each other to get the 89 billions of goods and that this competition will be so severe as to drive all these goods sky high and we will be in an inflation similar to that which Germany experienced after the First World War. Much of this claim needs to be given careful study. These figures vary widely depending on who is handing them out. The tendency is to consider the American people as a lot of children around a candy counter with pennies which are burning their hands. They forget that out of this 63 billions, which they call dangerous money, must come all the bonds that the American people are buying, regularly, and in the bond drives amounting to 17 billions or more this year. They forget that the cost of living is terribly high and much higher than Government figures indicate. They forget that the already heavy Government personal taxes of all kinds must come out of this.

These amount to twenty-one billion or more. Also all the State and local taxes, which amount to ten billion. They forget that many people owed heavy obligations that were long past due which they are now paying out of their earnings. They fail to take into account the millions paid by the people for insurance and for interest on obligations. They forget also that while there are a few spendthrifts in the country that the great bulk of the American people want to save for a rainy day through building and loan associations and savings banks. Their savings are not inflationary. Money saved is not inflationary. Only spent money is inflationary. And the Government itself is the greatest inflationist among us for it is by far the greatest spender of all. It spends as much if not more than all the people put together. And it spends more wastefully than all the people put together. Wasteful spending is the most inflationary of all spending.

While I am not one to make light of the danger of inflation, still it is neither wise nor fair for the Treasury to advance untenable arguments The best antidote for inflation is increased production, but they never talk about it. Why would it not be wise to start a program of increased production of food so that there would be plenty of food which people could secure easily instead of forcing scarcity on our people which results in high prices and much discontent? I repeat, the safest way to prevent inflation of prices is to produce more commodities.

The Secretary takes a very inconsistent position in the statement which he made before the Ways and Means Committee. He says in one place in that statement that four-fifths of all the income of the Nation is being paid to people who earn less than $5,000 per year. This being the case, four-fifths of all the money earned in the country is in the hands of these people. He says that "the weight of the money in the hands of this group * * * can completely upset our entire economic system." Then later in his statement he advocates that the Victory tax be repealed, which if done will take off of the tax rolls 9,000,000 of these low-income taxpayers In one place he insists that the main purpose of his tax plan is to prevent inflation, and he says that the income in the hands of these low-income groups is the most dangerous threat of inflation, yet he proposes to permit a great percentage of this class to escape all taxes that would have been provided under his proposed measure. Despite the fact that persons with incomes of less than $3,000 receive two-thirds of the national income, the Treasury proposes that only one-fourth of the suggested 6.5 billion increase in personal income taxes be imposed on this group.

All the tax experts will admit that the tax burden in the top brackets is about as high

as it can be. If we are to relieve 9,000,000 low-income taxpayers, how then can we raise 6.5 billions? It cannot be done.

The Secretary seeks to soften this burden by the introduction of what I called in the hearings a sly way of commencing a program of compulsory savings. He offers to give to the low-income class what he calls a post-war refund. This is what I have referred to as compulsory savings. Because of the opposition which I and other members of the committee offered to the adoption of a compulsory-savings plan, it now appears that this may be abandoned. I was right when I said it was a sly plan.

The Secretary also recommends that the exemptions for married persons be reduced from $1,200 to $1,100 and that exemptions for dependents be reduced from $350 to $300. He intends that this will result in considerable increase of taxes.

The Secretary expects to raise an additional four hundred millions by reducing the exemption applicable to inheritance taxes and by raising the gift-tax rates. The Secretary evidently expects to rely on those enforcing the Renegotiation of Contracts Act to produce many millions, for he is only asking Congress to provide an increase of one and one-tenth billions from corporations.

The Secretary recommends that Congress raise the excise taxes by two and five-tenths billions. The principal increases in excises are as follows:

	Millions
Liquors, from $6 to $10 per gallon	487
Beer, from $8 to $9 per barrel	210
Wine	61
Cigarettes, $3.50 per 1,000 to $5	371.3
Chewing gum	46.2
General admissions, 1¢ per 10¢ to 3¢ per 10¢	327.2
Transportation of persons	212.7
Jewelry	167
Candy (new taxes)	140
Soft drinks (new taxes)	177

The Secretary recommends the repeal of the tax on the transportation of property. This will amount to a reduction in taxes of $189,000,000.

Summing up the recommendations for increases, they are as follows, in round numbers:

	Billions
Tax on personal incomes	6.5
Corporation taxes	1.1
Inheritance and gift taxes	.4
Excises	2.5
Total	10.5

Will the Ways and Means Committee follow the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury? It is not likely, for we have not been doing so for the past few years. I am frequently asked for my opinion as to what the committee and Congress will do. It is difficult to say for nobody can safely predict the action of Congress at this time. Much will depend on whether we go to some new form of taxes—say the sales tax. It is my judgment that we will not adopt a sales tax for several reasons. The principal reason is the time-old reason that the tax applies heaviest on those least able to pay. Another reason is that it will involve the employment of thousands of extra employees. Another is that it will not produce as much revenue as people suppose it will do. A 10-percent tax (which will be a heavy one) will only produce from five to six billions with no exemptions allowed. It will only produce between three and four billions if food is exempted. Another very good reason is that the elections are imminent. There are several reasons for the adoption of a sales tax but the principal one is that the country needs the money and that a sales tax applies the same way to all alike. If we do adopt a sales tax, there will not be much increase in other taxes—probably one or two billions. But if a sales tax is not adopted the new tax bill may reach four or five billions.

The Secretary also recommends the expansion of the social-security law to include farm labor and other groups and recommends an increase in the contributing rates of both the employer and employee. It is not likely that his recommendation will be followed. As I have previously stated, there will be an automatic increase of 1 percent each for the employers and employees in connection with the old-age insurance coming January 1 unless congressional action is taken extending the present rate as was done before. Ohio industry is much interested in granting such an extension.

Now, my friends, I am afraid that my story has been uninteresting. But the finances of the Nation, like the finances of the family, are very important. Let me discuss with you briefly two important tax matters concerning which I can bring you some good news.

The people have for years rightly complained against the terrible complexity of the income-tax-return blanks. I will let you in on a little story that has gotten into the paper lately. The internal revenue office in Washington sends up a couple of men to the Capitol every year for about a month before taxpaying time to help the Congressmen and Senators make out their returns.

The Ways and Means Committee has tried repeatedly to have these returns simplified. I have tried it myself, but all to no avail. It is impossible to make them simple without amending the tax law in many ways. The law itself is too complex. We have recently instructed the ways and means experts and the Treasury experts to bring out a simplified form. We have recommended amendments to the Victory-tax law to aid in this program. The change, it is claimed, will simplify the returns greatly. It is generally believed that the Victory tax will be repealed with the end of 1943 and the amount of taxes lost thereby will be integrated into the income-tax schedules.

The renegotiation of contracts is another matter in which many businessmen are much interested. The tactics employed by Government agents in carrying on these renegotiations has in some instances been tyrannical in the extreme. The Renegotiation Act was passed hastily and for the purpose of recapturing excessive and exorbitant profits made by war contractors. The purpose was laudable but its administration has been very unwise. The Ways and Means Committee is preparing several amendments that will effectively stop the tyrannical practices of which so many complaints have been made. I shall not go further into details.

Now, my friends, I have been highly honored by being invited to speak to you and am glad to bring you an idea of what Congress is trying to do. It is my hope that our great Republic will come out of this, her most critical period, stronger than ever. With the chaos that is all about us in the world, it is more necessary than ever that we retain our position of leadership. The world needs us. God has favored us and brought us to great stature financially and spiritually. Great is our power by God's grace and great must be our efforts as God goes marching on.

Willkie's Record Does Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAT ARNOLD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, on September 23 on the floor of this House a colleague on the right side of the aisle belittled and sought to smear one of our most distinguished citizens, and to befog the minds of the voters in a lengthy tirade and speech loaded with invective and oratorical satire.

I am a freshman. I have always heard that boys were to be seen, but must keep quiet. When I was elected from the First District of the Show-Me State, and took the oath of office on January 6, it was with the understanding that I represented the taxpayers, was their hired hand, so to speak, and would look after their interests.

But no, the taxpayer, while he built this great country, is now crowded out of the picture up here, and our time is largely taken up with nondefense spending, instead of economizing. Now, in the most critical time in our Nation's history, when there is a world of work waiting to be done, we are not working at the job. We ought to go ahead and bring a tax bill of our own, as our forefathers instructed us to do, and not wait around for the Treasury Department to come over here and tell us what to do.

Out in the great State of Missouri our State treasurer is an ordinary deck hand, and does not go over to the State legislature and tell them what to do.

We spend time discussing a probable candidate who has not formally announced for the high office of President of the United States, and who has no opportunity on this floor to defend himself from scurrilous attacks.

Who is this Wendell Willkie about whose record our Democratic friends are showing so much concern? He entered World War No. 1 as a private, and when he came back from the battlefields of Europe in 1919 he was a captain in Uncle Sam's Army. Why, bless your life, he is a genuine American businessman; he has operated a public utility and did a fine job of it; he gave his customers some of the lowest rates in American history; he looked after the interests of his stockholders, as well as those of his employees. He knows something about finance, because he handled large sums of money in the operation of his business. He knows the value of a dollar because he worked for it.

Those nine questions that were propounded to him a few weeks back did not fool the American people into thinking that Mr. Willkie wants a world state. He realizes, as we all do, that the airplane and the radio have made all nations our next-door neighbors, and that appeasement, isolationism, and unpreparedness have entangled our country in two world wars wholly unprepared and against our choosing.

The people are getting wise to the fact that we have not had a common-sense foreign policy since the days of Teddy Roosevelt, and that the oceans no longer protect us. Even if they did, our commitments in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii preclude the possibility now of any further protection.

No, Mr. Willkie does not advocate a superstate. But since we have a working agreement in war with England, Russia, and China which is getting results, he suggests that we continue that working agreement and preserve the peace after

we have won the war with the blood of our boys, our dollars, and materials. And why should not we listen to an American businessman who served in the First World War, has had experience in fighting a war, and knows what war is like?

Mr. Willkie does not have the opportunity of defending himself here against these attacks, but you can rest assured that the American people have a very fine sense of fair play, and that they will be heard in the defense of an outstanding American businessman who had 22,000,000 citizens behind him out of a total of 49,000,000 in 1940 in the last Presidential race, and that they will be joined by many millions more who are becoming thoroughly disgusted with an administration that has pushed the businesses of our Commonwealth around, and in doing so since it has come into power spent the taxpayers' funds to the tune of $80,000,000,000 before Pearl Harbor.

A More Perfect United Nations—How and When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "A More Perfect United Nations—How and When?" delivered by me in April 1943 before the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. The address appears in volume 228 of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, issue of July 1943, under the general caption "The United Nations and the future."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MORE PERFECT UNITED NATIONS—HOW AND WHEN?

(By CLAUDE PEPPER)

Although I have reached only the age of 42, which may be young or old as one looks at it, I have begun to derive considerable consolation and satisfaction from the sense of perspective. For example, a little while ago I became concerned about conditions in Washington in the midst of this great ordeal. But I got the book Reveille in Washington and Carl Sandburg's magnificent War Years, and from the chaos of the War between the States I obtained considerable optimism and encouragement that we are going to pull through this time.

Then a little while ago I attended a showing of that remarkable picture Fantasia by that remarkable man Walt Disney, and I saw depicted on the screen in that unique way the evolution of the earth as conceived by the creator of that film. I saw the bursting volcanoes, the flowing rivers of molten lava. One could almost sense the shaking and trembling of the convulsive earth. But after awhile the volcano became stilled. The rivers receded into their quiet channels. Grass burst forth from the earth. Trees sprang up and became alive.

Then at last came a strange monster whom the technicians call, I believe, Tyrannosaurus rex. This colossus was the master of all he surveyed, making victims of all he could reach and crush. But there came a time in the continuity of this interesting tale when this creature, who was antisocial in his time, also died. The world was safe again. That gave me much consolation that this Tyrannosaurus rex that we in the modern world call Hitler would also die. I knew that he and his evil power would be disrupted and destroyed, because he too is an antisocial creature.

Now, assured that there will come the happy day of victory, we are engaged in the consideration of events after the peace. There are some who think we should not discuss this subject: that it is too far away; that it is likely to divide our strength, to tear us apart in council and sentiment. There are others who say that it is impossible anyway ever to bring together the multitudinous human race into the friendliness of the human family or the cordial association of intimately related people. Yet again I derive encouragement as I look back through the pages of history, seeing how long and how firmly this idea of some kind of international organization that might keep the peace or promote the general welfare of mankind has persisted and what strides it has made.

HISTORIC EFFORTS TOWARD FEDERATION

For example, in the Old Testament Isaiah and Micah tell us of their dreams and aspirations of a world at peace, bound together under the fear of God.

Again, the city states of ancient Greece were formed into a league, and there was a similar organization of Latin city states under the general leadership of the city of Rome. We saw emerge the entity of the Roman Empire, and finally, upon its collapse, the next power of universal strength, the Catholic Church, which exercised temporal as well as spiritual authority.

Then the Dark Ages. In the 1300's we find a Frenchman writing of an association of nations governed by a common council.

In the 1600's, Henry IV of France, with his foreign minister, promulgated to the western world a rather remarkable proposal of a similar character—that there should be a federal association of the states of Europe governed by a common council. Of course, he envisioned only the Christian states in that concept; but there was another crusader about the same time, far advanced in his own age, who conceived that the non-Christian states also should be admitted into the association of nations.

After the Napoleonic wars came the concept of an ordered Europe out of the Congress of Vienna and succeeding congresses.

So from time to time almost every nation there has been some farseeing writer envisioning a unity of nations and people which would make possible a peaceable and prosperous world.

It may be interesting to recall at this time, when Germany has been so antisocial in her actions and concepts, that it was the philosopher Kant of Germany that was the first to suggest that the foundation of the federation of states must not be the sovereigns but the people themselves, who must associate themselves into an effective new order.

INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION

Here in this hemisphere, late in the nineteenth century, a very significant step forward occurred. That was the calling, by James G. Blaine, a distinguished American Secretary of State, of the First Pan American Congress. As early as 1815 a great American, too little noticed and honored, Simón Bolívar, in writing a letter to the British gentleman who had given him asylum in Jamaica, envisioned a time when the nations of this hemisphere should come together on the Isthmus of Panama, and representatives of the British Empire should be included in the conference.

This first conference, called by James G. Blaine, did not succeed, but the seed was planted for a system which, it is fair to say—and I quote the substance of another's remarks—"has given peace to more people over a longer period of time than any other system in the world"; and that is what we now proudly recognize as the Pan American Congress. These different peoples, of varied backgrounds, unequal in size and strength, each with its own peculiar associations and aspirations, have come together in an indissoluble union of American states almost all of which are today relentlessly and persistently waging war against the common enemy of the Americas and the race of man.

It may be interesting to note that when discussing in the Senate a proposed Inter-American bank, we were willing to invite our good neighbor, Canada, to be a member of that bank if she cared to belong.

PRIOR TO WORLD WAR NO. 1

Then in 1899 began the Hague Conventions. There were two of them, the second of which occurred about the beginning of World War No. 1. There was almost a universal attendance at this meeting devoted to the settlement of disputes by arbitration and dedicated to the principles of national disarmament. These conventions also failed, but they were in the direction of great events of the inevitable future, not so far ahead.

We often forget that when the First World War broke upon the earth, we had achieved an international stability which lured many wise men into the belief that never again could war smite the race of man and the fair earth. I believe there were only two countries in Europe that required passports, and that artificial barriers to trade were hardly an obstruction to the natural commerce of the Continent. Still, war occurred, and with its pitiful and painful devastation shocked the whole race of man into a consciousness of the necessity for at last doing something about this social institution of war. Dr. McCormick of the University of Wisconsin recently pointed out that war has become a recognized social institution, and he believes that the only way war can be abolished is by substituting for it some other social institution which will offer a legitimate opportunity for nations to achieve, or at least to seek, their aspirations and aims.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND UNITED NATIONS

The climax of all this long strugg e for a better world was the League of Nations. I am willing to take the considered judgment of Dr. Shotwell, a participant at Versailles, that in the 6 months within which the Covenant of the League was produced there was done one of the most creative jobs in all the history of the world. That documen. is one of which our generation may justly be proud. We may even boast that in our time there was seen on the shores of beautiful Lake Geneva the magnificent edifice where all together 60 nations adhered to that institution and covenant. All of us who have had the thrill of seeing the members sitting in the assembly, have heard the roll call of nations, and have understood the great things said and done there, know that that institution is destined to grow to ultimate success as one of the institutions of civilization. But it has for the moment failed, and again the earth has felt the shock of that failure.

Not long ago Dr. Bruening attributed the rise of Hitler to three essential factors: (1) The failure of the governments of Europe to keep statesmen in power long enough to solve adequately the challenging post-war problems; (2) the failure of the European governments to deal properly with the question of

stabilizing the currencies of Europe; and (3) the failure of those governments to remove obstructive trade barriers.

Recently Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden allowed the members of the Foreign Relations Committees of the House and Senate to question him. I ventured to ask if he had any comment, out of his long and valued experience, about the character of the League of Nations as an institution—whether it was adequate or inadequate I preferred to ask him that question rather than what kind of international organization we should strive to achieve. He said, in his opinion, the League of Nations had been too rigid in its structure; that perhaps we had placed too much emphasis on the form of the edifice and tried to fit everyone into it, rather than gradually building a house which might finally hold the community of nations.

But in mentioning the evaluation of an international order, I do not intend to omit perhaps the greatest step of all—the United Nations, formed on January 1, 1942. I wonder if we realize the significance of that alliance. More than thirty nations have actually signed a document in which they subscribe to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the most humane international document ever struck off in the history of the world. Even the 14 points of that beloved prophet of freedom, President Wilson, related to the removal of the yoke of oppression from the necks of nations, not individuals. The Atlantic Charter, profiting from a quarter of a century of humanitarianism, looks at human beings and proposes to lift the yoke of oppression from the necks of men, women, and children, and to lift all mankind to a new hope and dignity.

Shall we recreate the League of Nations, shall we continue the United Nations, shall we just put together some association of sovereign powers having no separate entity or what shall we do?

RESOLUTIONS PENDING

Of course, the daily papers are full of what is being suggested by private organizations and private citizens throughout the land, of the work being done by various study groups and quasi-public organizations, of the many resolutions pending in Congress, the repeated utterances by Cabinet members, by the State Department, by the President, and by the Members of Congress. One of the resolutions pending in the Senate, introduced by Senator THOMAS of Utah, proposes international collaboration in economic affairs after the war. Another resolution, by Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, suggests that there should be set up an advisory council of the State Department, the President, and Congress. Senator GILLETTE proposes that there be a treaty executed by the several powers which would implement the Atlantic Charter. And there are others.

The resolution gaining the widest currency is that by Senators Ball, Burton, Hill, and Hatch. In brief, it provides that there should be a world convention to begin immediately to fashion the form and the content of the international organization which is envisioned by the introducers of that resolution. I do not wish to venture an opinion as to what the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (which has all these resolutions before it) is going to do, or what the full committee will do when the subcommittee makes its report. I wonder, however, whether it is wise for us to assemble a formal conference to write the details of such a structure, of such momentous importance, now. There are so many things to be considered; so many details that might crop up; so many questions that might readily constitute bones of serious contention.

DEFINITE COMMITMENT DESIRABLE

Undoubtedly the Senate should do something to atone for its crime against mankind in sabotaging the League of Nations. Yet I think it is probably too soon to begin the formulation of this organization. I should hasten to say, however, that I think it will be unspeakably tragic if we fail to avail ourselves of this challenging opportunity to drive a nail at the present time into some kind of permanent structure or some kind of commitment for a permanent organization. What I mean is this:

The Atlantic Charter, to which we have already subscribed, refers to principles but not to any specific organization or to any post-war organization of the United Nations. Whatever it may have contemplated, intentionally or unintentionally, such provision was left out of the Atlantic Charter. I think what we should do is to get the United Nations to commit themselves that within a definite time after the conclusion of the war in Europe, they will become full participating parties to and in an international organization of acceptable character. I intend to introduce in the Senate the following resolution, which is designed to achieve that purpose:

Resolved, That the Senate (two-thirds of the Senators—that means of all of the Senators—concurring) advise the President to inform the several United Nations that the United States, in order to implement the Atlantic Charter, to safeguard its peace and promote its welfare by cooperating with other free peoples of the world, is ready to enter into a solemn pledge that it will, within 6 months after the conclusion of the war in Europe, become a full participating member of an acceptable form of United Nations.

Further, That the President invite the several members of the United Nations immediately to join the United States in executing such solemn covenant and pact;

Further, That the President invite the United Nations to join the United States in initiating immediately a study and exchange of ideas and suggestions as to what should be the specific form and detail of the United Nations to be formed.

I have purposefully used the words "acceptable form" because the study of the form of organization has not yet proceeded far enough for any country to commit itself to any particular form. It is to be noted, however, that I have provided for the President to initiate consultations as to what the form and character of such an organization should be.

EVOLUTION OR BLUEPRINT

It has been suggested that the building of this structure must be an evolutionary process. I realize that there are two sides to the question. Some may say that is not the way the Constitution of the United States was fashioned. But the Constitution of the United States succeeded the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation. It grew out of definite and known deficiencies in the Articles of Confederation, and the Delegates who framed it were confronted with the necessity for providing against those deficiencies. Four years elapsed between the formal conclusion of the Revolutionary War and the Constitutional Convention; and there were many, including the man who had made the Revolution a success by his unique character, George Washington, who feared that we might lose the liberties we had so painfully gained, and there was a necessity that drove those courageous and brilliant men to the dramatic and venturesome step of conceiving a constitution not only for a nation but for a continent.

We realize that there are two main methods of approach to these problems. One is the evolutionary process, and the other is what we refer to as the French method—the blueprint procedure—whereby the whole structure is created complete.

I am not sure that human conclusions are susceptible of such architectural methods. Therefore, I venture to suggest that if we let the people of the world know that we have put the decision to go into an international organization behind us, then our only concern should be the method, and our debate would be confined to form and content and detail. Then if that could be recognized as a forward, ascending step past the Atlantic Charter itself, we would be getting on with the question of building upon the good earth a better world than we now have. Of course the problems that lie along this path of effort are almost innumerable and immeasurable in immensity, and, to the timid, frightening in their import.

CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Yet I think it is an encouraging fact that the United States, Great Britain, and others of the United Nations are working seriously on the question of international stabilization of currency, in order to prevent another collapse of a nation's currency and economy, out of the confusion of which might come another Hitler. Many will remember seeing the scars of the fighting in Munich, from which 3,000 died in civil strife, victims of inflation after the conclusion of World War No. 1.

So we are proposing to put our gold—part of it—with the gold of other nations, our assets with their assets, and with planning and credit and cooperation to build an international institution to stabilize the currencies of the world. That, after all, is in many respects the most secure foundation for a stable world order—a sound economic base.

FALSE SECURITY

We must remember also the painful lesson of the world's failure from the failure of the League of Nations. I am one of those who pay tribute to that great citizen of the world and Ambassador of Russia, Maxim Litvinoff; for I remember reading in pre-Munich days of the warning hurled by him that if collective security were allowed to collapse, it meant isolation and war for all. Other nations of the League did not become aware of the seriousness of his prophecy; neither did we in the United States.

I remember the Senate the afternoon that France fell. All we did that afternoon, save the comment of one who ventured to mention the tragic fall of France, was to debate whether the tax on liquor should be $3 a gallon. We were neither agitated nor disturbed. Some said the oceans could not be traversed by the enemy; that airplanes could not reach to this continent; that submarines could not sink ships within sight of our shores; and some said we were safe against any danger. Now we have found out what follies these were.

We have seen an example of how nations have helped nations with such principles as lend-lease, hardly bothering to keep books about the technicalities of the transactions, because nobody ever really expected it to be paid back even as it was given. That means that we have come to the conclusion that neither boundary nor distance assures security.

APPROACH TO UNITY OF THOUGHT

Not only that, but the United Nations have come to work together in a global conflict as never before in human history. We have come to understand one another better than ever before. We have come to be more nearly of one mind in point of view. Today a speaker of international importance addresses by radio not only his own people but the world; and in various ways we have access to one another and to one another's minds.

Just a few years ago I attended the launching of the Yankee Clipper at Baltimore. That

was an event, to see an airship about to traverse the Atlantic. Now it is done in hours. We live in a new kind of world, and technical devices which are bringing us closer together physically are also molding a world opinion which did not previously exist.

I come from the South. How quickly the wounds of our tragic conflict have been healed, because of the way we have been thrown together and have come to know one another. We have an awareness of how nearly public opinion in the United States has become one state of mind. If you don't believe it, look at the similarity in the type of magazines and newspapers on every newsstand in any part of the country. Look at the Electoral College and see if the candidate who has won the Presidency since around 1900 has not won it by a very large majority, which indicates that American sentiment has become essentially one mind.

The same processes that have been going on here are now going on among nations, so that there is coming to be a body of world information and, I think I might add, a world conscience and a world aspiration. So today we of this generation have the chance to be creators of a future which may give to the human race the realization of its ancient dream of peace and cooperation.

AMERICAN EMPIRE?

I do not know what the spirit of America is going to be able to stand by way of temptation when this war is over, when we have ten or twelve or fifteen million first-class soldiers, when we have the world's largest navy, when we have a production of considerably in excess of a hundred thousand fighting airplanes a year, when we have a mighty nation of a hundred and thirty million people geared and tuned to the waging of war. If with victory in our strong hands someone should tempt and tantalize us with the exploitation of the resources and wealth of other peoples, then would come the testing time of America's spiritual strength.

I think we do not want a golden age of empire in American history. I think we might have it if we were willing to pay the price for it. If that were our national aspiration, I suppose we could achieve success in it. Yet I think we all feel that we have gone beyond a sophomoric period in American history. Our powers of appraisal are more sure and reasonable. I do not think our character will yield to that kind of temptation, nor do I believe we shall again be misled by a little group of willful men, concerned about their own or their party's political prestige and power, into betraying our dead or our allies. Nor do I believe that the people of our country will let any Senator vent his spleen upon any President by inducing the Senate to repudiate any treaty or order which ought to be participated in by the people of this country.

DECISION IS IMPERATIVE

It is well, however, nay, imperative, that we put behind us, as I have already said, the matter of a decision to go in. Let our people see the representatives of the United Nations gather around the council table and in solemn session pledge their faith and sacred honor to some form of international order within a brief period after the termination of the war in Europe. Then we shall know that the great decision is made. Thereafter we shall be concerned with the details and getting on with the task.

When once we cut loose from the moorings of isolation and turn our back upon those delusions and our faces to the new world of the future, then our destiny thereafter will be just a question of navigation, just a matter of courage, only the task of keeping on toward our noble aims. Thus our good land was founded; thus only can its preservation be assured.

Warren of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in this week's New Republic magazine, entitled "Warren of California." The article is well worth reading by every Member of this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARREN OF CALIFORNIA

Unnoticed in the news, William Randolph Hearst recently nominated his candidate for President of the United States—handsome, strapping Earl Warren, Governor of California. "Everywhere in the United States," to quote from an editorial in the San Francisco Examiner, "there is a growing awareness of and rising interest in Governor Earl Warren." Timing its announcement to coincide with that of the Hearst press, the Los Angeles Times has also begun to boom, in its own thunderous style, the candidacy of Governor Warren. The Saturday Evening Post of August 7, 1943, contained a piece in praise of Warren by Frank J. Taylor.

The Warren boom should receive careful attention, for it is not an idle or merely sentimental favorite-son ballyhoo. In case of a deadlock in the Republican convention, Warren unquestionably would be a likely dark-horse candidate for President. And, upon any reckoning, he is the most plausible Republican Vice Presidential nominee. For California is an extremely important State—worth more electoral votes than most of the inter-mountain States combined—and Warren is, at this writing, a popular political figure in the State. Just who is Earl Warren and what (or who) makes him run?

Years ago Warren was singled out for future political favor by the most powerful industrial and financial cliques in California. They have always regarded him—and quite correctly—as their major ace in the hole, their principal hedge against political disaster. For this reason, they have carefully built Warren up, as a political figure, over a period of years; and have seen to it that his record, on most major social and economic issues, is an almost perfect blank. He is not the type of candidate to be embarrassed by statements made, or positions taken, earlier in his career. He has made few statements and, while invariably compliant toward these interests, has artfully avoided public commitments.

At the same time, Warren is completely the creature of the Hearst-Chandler-Knowland clique in the Republican party in California; he is the darling of the Associated Farmers of California (although he is not too enthusiastic about their public support); and he is the particular pet of the great shipping, financial, agricultural, and industrial interests of California. In California these interests have long since been synchronized into what is perhaps the smoothest functioning big-business machine in the Nation. It took a long and bitter behind-the-scenes struggle—as the files of the La Follette committee eloquently attest—to make the die-hards see the light of day. It was only after much persuasion that they were forced to give way to clever public-relations advisers, adroit industrial-relations counselors, and such astute legal minds as Gregory Harrison (of the Waterfront Employers' Association). For these die-hards were used to the ruthless methods of the open shop, the red squad, and the labor frame-up. They had grown bold and arrogant in the school of bribery, thuggery, and the crudest variety of power politics. But with the E. P. I. C. campaign of 1934, the popular-front campaign of 1938 (which elected Culbert L. Olson), the spectacular rise of the powerful pension-plan movements and the increasing strength of organized labor, the smarter elements realized that ruthlessness must be eliminated in favor of cunning, that slickness must replace brazenness, and that dizzily conducted public relations must take the place of the old knock-their-teeth-out attitude. Nowadays such bastions of reaction as the Industrial Association of San Francisco and the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association of Los Angeles have been virtually eliminated. They have long since been replaced by the slickest streamlined front that big business has been able to create anywhere in the United States. Earl Warren is the front-man for this machine.

To groom him for this important role, the master minds of the new industrial alinement had to execute a skillful job of political face lifting. As a young lieutenant in the days of the old machine, Warren had become thoroughly enamored of the strong-arm methods that were then unquestioned. He had to be taught to smile, to beam, to be a good fellow; he had to be told the facts of life, such as, that labor baiting (old style) was passé; that the pension movement was not necessarily subversive; and that he could afford to mention the C. I. O. without sneering. He had to be taught to mouth—and it must have been a bitter tutelage for this essentially grim and hard-boiled individual—such phrases as "old-age security," "collective bargaining," and "social planning." But the advertising boys have done a pretty good job, and he can now turn in a fairly acceptable performance as the liberal statesman. But to those who know him, his performance is unconvincing. For to such people he has always been as he is today, the personification of smart reaction.

Two important episodes in his career serve to define the man behind the mask. On March 22, 1936, George W. Alberts, chief engineer of the freighter *Point Lobos*, was found stabbed to death in the cabin of the ship as it lay berthed across the bay from San Francisco. At this time the labor situation on the water front was extremely tense. Labor was insisting upon preserving the gains of the great 1934 strike; the waterfront employers were determined to smash the unions. No one paid much attention to the Alberts case, for the newspapers were full of labor news from the water front. Then, on August 27, three trade unionists—Earl King, Ernest G. Ramsay, and Frank J. Conner—were arrested on orders of Earl Warren, then district attorney of Alameda County. Conner was ship's delegate from the *Point Lobos*; Earl King was the leader of the Marine Firemen, Oilers', Watertenders', and Wipers' Association (which the Waterfront Employers' Association was trying desperately to alienate from the longshoremen); and Ramsay had organized the Fish Reduction Workers' Union. These men were charged, not with the murder of Alberts, but with having conspired to have him murdered. It was not charged that they had assaulted him or that they had so much as touched him.

Indicted with them was a strange character out of the murky water-front underworld of

the period named George Wallace. On the day Alberts was murdered, witnesses had seen Wallace on the *Point Lobos*. The King-Ramsay-Conner Defense Committee wanted to have Wallace tried separately, but their motion for a separate trial was denied. The committee then offered to provide Wallace with $5,000 for counsel fees, if he would obtain an able and independent attorney. The offer was refused and Wallace elected—the announcement was made by Earl Warren—to be represented by the Public Defender. The entire case hinged on this man's testimony and the San Francisco Chronicle observed that the district attorney, in cross-examining Wallace, did so "with the solicitous care of a policeman helping an old lady across the street."

The "jury" selected to try the case was, to say the least, remarkable. The jury commissioner who selected the panel testified that names were chosen from lists supplied by "various industrial plants," "various social organizations, business houses, the Bank of America, the American Trust Co., and the Central National Bank." He was asked if he had requested the Central Labor Council to provide a list; he had not. Had he gone to any labor organization for names? He had not One of the jurors finally selected was a Mrs. Julia Vickerson, who testified that she "scarcely knew" Deputy District Attorney Wehr (who conducted the prosecution under Warren's direction). Two months after both Wehr and Mrs. Vickerson had sworn that they scarcely knew each other, Mrs. Vickerson loaned Wehr $3,200. Other loans followed. In the course of 2 years after she sat on the jury that sent King, Ramsay, and Conner to San Quentin she had loaned Wehr the sum of $15,376, as shown by a creditor's claim that she later filed against his estate.

In a petition for writ of habeas corpus (Criminal No. 4440), pending before the Supreme Court of the State of California, it is now alleged that prior to the trial of the case Mrs. Vickerson had loaned Charles D. Wehr the sum of $8,500, held his note for this amount, and subsequently destroyed the note at his suggestion at the time of the trial. Introduced as an exhibit in the habeas corpus proceeding is a photostatic copy of a memo in the handwriting of Mrs. Vickerson, a portion of which reads as follows:

"The moneys owed me by Charles Wehr loan of $8,500, year 1936. Had note signed by Charles, but he advised me to destroy while the ship murder case was pending and then he would make a new note for me."

It is interesting to note that the Supreme Court, on July 7, 1943, appointed a referee to take testimony on the charges set forth in the petition for habeas corpus. The petition charges that the facts with respect to the Vickerson-Wehr relationship were well known to Earl Warren, then district attorney, and that he approved the concealment of these facts.

When the case came on for trial, it was assigned to the courtroom of Judge Edward J. Tyrrell. One morning, without explanation, the case was transferred to the courtroom of Judge Frank M. Ogden. Ogden was a political protégé of Earl Warren, had served for years as a deputy district attorney under Warren, and had been promoted to the superior court on Warren's recommendation. Counsel for the defense offered to stipulate that the case might be heard by any judge of Alameda County other than Frank M. Ogden. The offer was refused, and the case proceeded to trial. Judge Ogden's comments upon the evidence were enough to convict the defendants—he virtually told the jury to convict them. As to the interest of the shipowners in the case, subsequent investigation revealed that important prosecution witnesses had for months been receiving regular remittances from the shipping firm of Swayne & Hoyt, the owners of the *Point Lobos*. The pattern of the ship murder case—the King-Ramsay-Conner case—is almost identical with that of the Mooney-Billings case and the Modesto case of 1935 (which a committee of the California Legislature characterized as a frame-up). The man who engineered and supervised this prosecution (and who tried to conceal from the defense the important testimony of the witness Corrigan) and who still lovingly regards it as his major opus, is Earl Warren. (Before Governor Olson left office, the board of prison terms and paroles released King, Ramsay, and Conner on parole.)[1]

In the words of The Satevepost, this is the "serious-minded Horatio Alger character in flesh and blood" who still cherishes the membership card in the Musicians' Union which he joined when, as a youngster, he played the clarinet in a Bakersfield, Calif., band. It is a moving spectacle, this, of Warren taking out that old dog-eared trade-union card; of Warren reminiscing with the six children, without whom he is never photographed these days, about those hard-bitten days of his youth when he played the clarinet. In fact, he still plays the clarinet—in that sour-note Republican orchestra that responds to the rhythmically directed baton of William Randolph Hearst. It is, indeed, a remarkable orchestra; the aged and embittered Hearst on the podium; the aging Chandler at the base viol; with Hoover at the kettledrums and Joe Knowland (of the Oakland Tribune) and Phil Bancroft in the brass section; and Warren tooting the clarinet.

Prior to the administration of Culbert L. Olson, the Supreme Court had always been a lawyer's court. After you had served the vested interests in the State for years in fighting labor unions, defeating social legislation in the courts and squabbling over water rights, tradition dictated that your last years should be spent, in semiretirement, serving these same interests on the supreme court. Governor Olson determined to upset this tradition. One of his first nominations to the supreme court was Dr. Max Radin—an internationally famous legal scholar, for years instructor at the law school of the University of California, and a man respected throughout the State for his integrity and learning. But the appointment had to be confirmed by an advisory board of which Earl Warren, then attorney general, was a member. Shortly before his nomination to go to the court, Dr. Radin had written a letter to a district attorney in the State urging clemency for a group of liberal social workers who had been found in contempt of a "Little Dies" committee of the legislature for refusal to turn over to this committee the membership lists of the trade union of which they were officials. Seizing upon this letter, Warren, by his vote, succeeded in blocking the appointment. His unconcealed animus in this case reveals the type of person he really is.

But Warren cannot be disposed of by illustrating his mean-natured and vindictive character. For it is not Warren who is to be feared so much as the powerful coterie of interests who succeeded in palming him off on the people of California as a nonpartisan candidate for Governor. These advisers are responsible for the fact that Warren has made a popular Governor. The interests back of Warren realized that the pension movement in California had to be separated from its rather tentative alliance with labor. If this desirable end could only be accomplished at the price of increased pensions, then the price was cheap. So they permitted Warren to sign a somewhat liberalized pension measure which was obligingly approved by substantially the same legislature that had bitterly fought Olson's every attempt to obtain a more adequate old-age-pension system. The folklore of the State has it that "Warren knows how to work with the legislature," when, actually, it is a case of perhaps the most notoriously lobby-ridden legislature in America being obedient, now as always, to the interests that elected it. Warren's advisers also prompted him to declare a labor truce, since, with production booming, they wanted no collision with organized labor.

As Governor of California in these lush days, Warren has not faced a single problem of real magnitude. There has been no labor problem, no unemployment problem, no tax problem—even the ancient embarrassment of the Mooney-Billings case was obligingly removed by Governor Olson's pardon. The chief problem faced by Warren, in fact, has been the question of what to do with a disconcertingly large surplus of State funds. This problem he solved, quite in keeping with his past record, by reducing taxes instead of husbanding this windfall against the emergency demands of the post-war period. Under such circumstances, Miss Shirley Temple, aided by the same advisers and with the same newspaper support, could make a fairly popular Governor of California.

What Warren's advisers have succeeded in doing is to create the legend of an able administrator, a strong man and a good fellow. In the vocabulary of the Warren apotheosis, the word "able" is worked to death. "Able Earl" is, in fact, likely to be a campaign slogan in 1944. They have kept Warren—and this has been an easy chore—conspicuously silent on every important issue of the day. What he thinks about post-war problems, about the necessity of an international organization to preserve peace, about planning for full production, remain among the darkest mysteries of our time. "We must return to the fundamentals," he said in a recent speech (the Los Angeles Times, August 18); "we must reattach ourselves to the old moorings—the family, the home, religion, and free Government. The more I think of this war, the more I am convinced that it all reduces itself to the dream of every good man and woman—the desire to have a home and a fireside—to have happy, healthy children, taught by a good mother the virtues of mankind as she might choose to interpret them from the Good Book." Such utterances are really provocative and bold for Warren; in his usual able vein he sticks tenaciously to the Coolidge platitudes. As a member of the Water Project Authority, he never lost an opportunity to whittle away at the broad social objectives underlying the concept of the great Central Valley Project. In speaking before the recent Conference of Governors at Columbus, he selected as his topic (at this track meet of Republican candidates) the stupendously important problem of keeping the Japanese out of California. He not only wants the

[1] Since this article was written, the referee appointed by the Supreme Court has concluded the hearings on the petition of George Wallace for the issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. At these hearings Mrs. Vickerson admitted having loaned Charles D. Wehr sums in excess of $24,000. She has also admitted that she knew him when he made a contribution of $750, from funds advanced by her, to one of Earl Warren's political campaigns. She has also testified that on Thanksgiving Day, 1936, Wehr told her she would have to stay on the jury and that if she refused to do so, he would be unable to repay the moneys she had loaned. Aside from attempting to discredit her testimony under cross-examination, virtually no effort was made during the hearings to contradict her story. While it is true that direct evidence showing that Warren knew of these facts is lacking, still it will be interesting to see what, if any, effort he will now make to correct such an obvious injustice. The report of the referee, Judge Hartley Shaw, will be presented to the Supreme Court within the next few weeks. It is also interesting to note that not a single Los Angeles newspaper has carried so much as a reference to the hearings being conducted in San Francisco before Judge Shaw.

evacuees kept out of California for the duration, but he is unalterably opposed to any of them (including 70,000 American citizens) ever returning to California. This is not, however, such a bad political issue. It is one which, as a vice-presidential nominee assigned the specific task of swinging California into the Republican column in 1944, he can be relied upon to work overtime.

It is pure legend that this man is an "able administrator." He was a very mediocre attorney general of California. Despite his election pledges of an undying devotion to civil liberties, he refused to lift a hand when local law enforcement completely broke down during the Westwood lumber strike. Aside from this term of 4 years as attorney general, he has had no administrative experience. He has never practiced law (except for a few months); and his experience has been limited to that of Republican Party machine politics and his duties as perennial district attorney of Alameda County. He reveres policemen, deputy sheriffs and investigators. When confronted with a major problem, his first reaction is to propose some "tightening up of law enforcement." He has been very adroit and successful in his relations with organized groups and has shown far more political finesse than his predecessor. But even the few measures, statements, and acts for which he is rightfully entitled to credit are, in many cases, the inspiration of Robert W. Kenny, his successor as attorney general.

No one should discount the Warren candidacy because of this paltry record of achievement. For he is a possible Republican nominee for President and a better than 2-to-1 choice for Vice President. He has behind him the unified, coordinated, and powerfully articulated force of all the important industrial and financial interests of the State. He has perhaps the ablest public-relations advisers of any candidate in the field, unlimited funds, and the widest newspaper support. And at the moment he enjoys considerable prestige and popularity in California. Furthermore, by getting a delegation pledged to Warren in the field at this early date, the Old Guard hope to prevent Willkie from entering the California Republican primaries. (Willkie the other day called him "one of the great Governors"; let us hope that he spoke out of ignorance.) As a Republican Vice Presidential nominee, this "nonpartisan" Governor might well carry California for the party in 1944. President Roosevelt still retains much of his personal popularity in California, but the Democratic Party is nonexistent as a functioning political organization. It is shot through and through with feuds and torn apart by warring cliques and factions. The conservative Democrats (400,000 of whom voted for Warren in 1940) are, by and large, bitter Roosevelt haters. It also seems likely that Culbert L. Olson will attempt to reassert his leadership over the party in California by organizing a delegation pledged to the President. This effort is not likely to produce unity within the party. The one leader with sufficient ability, prestige, and popularity to accomplish this miracle is Robert W. Kenny, the present attorney general, who to date has shown no appetite for the assignment.

Republican Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 12, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on October 12, I requested and received permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Republican Policy," delivered by Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, at the annual banquet of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, at Columbus, Ohio, October 6, 1943. After submission of the address it was discovered that it would require more than two pages in the RECORD. Therefore I submitted a request for an estimate of the cost of printing. I now have that estimate from the Public Printer. It is estimated that the address will require approximately two and one-third pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $105. I again ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet here as Republicans, as representatives of a great party, planning how we can do better work in those places we now control and planning likewise how we can be fitted to even greater responsibilities after the next election.

Perhaps we are too prone to spend our time criticizing the present national administration. We are well agreed on the truth of the statement made by the young man in a speech class in Nebraska a short time ago. (Story of young man in extemporaneous speech class.) But seriously, friends, while we enjoy criticizing—and most of it is entirely honest—yet what the people want today is to be told the program of the Republican Party when it assumes power in 1945.

What are we going to do? What are we going to undo?

The problem that is today worrying the largest number of people is that of employment when this war is over. Even though we keep up a large standing Army, there will be seven or eight million returning veterans and an even larger number of war workers who will be seeking other employment.

Never has man seen such a large portion of the world completely torn from its previous standards, as it has seen during the past few years. Never before has there been a war which has caused such terrible physical destruction, but at the same time allowed science and technology to advance so rapidly. Peace will bring to the world the greatest problem of physical reconstruction in history, and just as mobilization for war here in our country has caused terrific readjustment, both of men and minds, so by the same token will a readjustment from war to peace bring other monstrous problems.

And we had better be realistic in our contemplation of this post-war future and recognize that deep as is the faith of the majority of our people in the doctrine of free enterprise, that sincere as is the desire of our young men for individual achievement, they will never again permit another period of terrific unemployment without making an effort to solve the problem by changing our economic and political system. Let us not blind ourselves to the fact that a minority of our citizens already feels that socialism, or communism, or complete Government control in some form, is better than a system of private enterprise, and that its members are working to see their beliefs inaugurated. Another serious depression would recruit millions for their ranks. In short, the free enterprise system, the mighty champion of our present struggle for survival, may be pounded to pieces before it has a chance to catch its breath, may be tumbled to ruin by the shock of post-war adjustment. At least, such a danger is evident to me.

I am sure that no system of Government operation can produce goods and raise living standards as does a system of private industry, but the political situation is such that we who feel that way must see that private industry is prepared to furnish employment to people when this war is over. We must make sure that the men taking off their uniforms and coming out of war plants shall have some place to go to work.

It is likely that during the period which will be required for changing war production into peacetime production, a program of public works will be needed to take up the slack of unemployment, but we must not for one minute permit ourselves to be lulled into the feeling that Government work or any kind of a public-works program will be a permanent solution. Private industry must take over and do the job.

But if industry, following this war, is to have a chance to make good, then certainly industry must have proper laws under which it can function. It needs tax laws which are written before the taxing period starts. It needs tax laws which are intended to help, not punish, and which permit industry to make a profit and use some of it for new developments. Our statutes must be in accord with economic law if our Nation is to prosper.

I believe it is the first desire of our men in service, once this war is done, to return to a nation whose domestic life is founded upon individual effort, whose economic system is based upon the working premise that private industry is able and eager to supply men and women with the material things they need for enjoyable, constructive living. In other words, I cannot believe that our returning soldiers want a jingle-jangle-jingle existence fed by synthetic work on a governmentally glorified W. P. A. program.

But if private industry is to advance and enlarge it must have an incentive—it must be able to see a profit. Our tax system must be adjusted, therefore, so that something can be gained by venture and it is time to speak out and say that if our economic system is to survive, there must be a decrease in our tremendously high income taxes. The best jobs are available in prosperous business concerns. This is sound economics and it is sound American doctrine.

If it is not sound, we shall have a pretty hard time explaining the growth of our country. Our agricultural greatness rests upon the thousands of people who took land and developed it in the hope of making a profit, and who were free to push ahead to the limit of their capacities. Our business strength comes from those who risked their few dollars, started a store or a restaurant or a warehouse, and hoped for profit and for growth. Our industrial might has been developed by those men who, tinkering over some gadget in the back end of a shop, at last scraped up capital enough to buy a lathe and milling machine and put the gadget into production. All these people hoped for profit. They took their risks, they grew, they hired people, and at last they had a pay roll. This is the way we created the power and the might, the high living standards and the commonly shared luxuries of our country.

Why should we fear a man who grows wealthy out of a factory he created? This envy and this fear, carried to the extreme, can only mean that we at last envy the man who makes five dollars a month more than we make, and so at last we ride on down to a dead-level uniformity. On that level, with neither incentive nor ambition to venture, our system dries up and in the end nobody has anything. What we should fear above everything else is this precise drying up of incentive. We have ample laws to correct the evils that face us. What we do not have, and never can have, is a law that will make a man take a chance if he has nothing to gain by it.

Following a war, it is natural that people should seek relaxation from the strain by desiring to return to the peaceful days they knew in the past. But if there be some in

this country who expectantly look for a return to normalcy, to them I convey my condolence. The normalcy they thought they knew will not be back. Progress is a stairsteps of change, each step followed by a plane of new normalcy. The task we face is not one of return. It is rather to take from our past the things we feel certain will be most useful in the new normalcy ahead.

We should all realize that we will be living in a changed world. We are not going back to the "good old days." In my judgment we will have social-security laws, laws protecting the rights of employees—many kinds of Government regulation will be continued.

In connection with these regulatory laws, however, I call your attention to one matter—the importance of which is often overlooked. It is this—that the general attitude and desire of the person administering any law can be a tremendous influence. I have found that if a person wants to do a certain thing, he will easily find excuses why it should be done. If he wants to find excuses why it should not be done, they are just as easy to discover. My wife even says that the same rule applies when I talk about going on a hunting or fishing trip. Under certain conditions, I can always find that I am not particularly busy and that anyway I have some business in that section of the country. By the same token, the attitude of the agency administering regulatory law is tremendously important. A Republican administration will insure that these laws assist private industry to function more effectively. The nation no longer needs those who are looking for reasons why private industry must fail.

Too many now making plans for the postwar period are merely planning for the spending of wealth and there is not enough attention to the creation of new wealth for everyone to share.

By now it should be an accepted truth that you cannot have more to divide among people when less is being produced. I am told that the decade from 1930 to 1940 is the only 10-year period in our history when this nation made no net gain in wealth. Scarcity and an increase in our standard of living do not go hand in hand.

Do not believe for one moment that we have arrived at a static economy in our country. To say that we have passed our peak growth and must now turn our attention to the division of what we have, rather than to the production of more wealth, is to say that the ambition and optimism and energy which have carried us so far in the last century and a half are no longer good. The control of great fortunes and the restrictions of undue financial power is generally accepted. But the philosophy of division and restrictions, the laws which check the free venture of ambition and capital, the tax system which penalizes growth—all these are foreign to our thinking. They narrow rather than enlarge our horizons, they close the door of opportunity, they reduce us to Old World limitations. There has been too much of this Old World thinking, as it relates to freedom of action, floating around this country during the last 10 years—too much fear, too much envy, too much threat.

When this war is over, we shall have a debt of tremendous size—a debt which cannot be handled unless our country operates at full capacity over a period of years, unless we stay on a very high level of production and income. Against that debt, all pump-priming methods are pitifully small and futile. What we must do is remove restrictive legislation, lower taxes, reopen the avenues of opportunity, take the hobbles off the American and let him stretch out his pace once again.

These are things we Republicans should do when we assume power; they are in fact the only solution to that most important problem—employment. The working man wants a goob job, at American wages, management wants good salaries, capital wants a profit; all are tied up together in the success of our private industrial system, and as Republicans we must assure that it have a fair opportunity to function.

What do we Republicans propose to do relative to the growth of government, its constantly enlarging personnel, its terrifying expense?

The United States needs an administration which will release thousands—and I mean thousands of thousands—of Government employees, turning them loose to do productive labor. We cannot go on as we were even before the war. Not long ago a huge, hulking, not-too-bright man took a job in a Nebraska war plant. He could hardly be considered as brilliant, yet he still had some notions of thrift. Never before in his life had he received a salary of over $75 a month but today he is receiving $50 per week. The company desired to enlarge its facilities and needing new capital, it put on a campaign among its employees trying to induce them to purchase stock in the company. This fellow, however, told the solicitor that he did not want to buy any stock. "Why, this company is going broke," he said. The solicitor argued with him and told him of the big contracts and the profits they were making, but the other man insisted, "No, sir," he said, "if they're paying me $50 a week, they're going broke." That is about the way our Government has been running and if our Government attempts to operate in the future as it has in the past, it too, is going broke.

What is needed is the greatest mass migration out of Washington, and out of Government bureaus scattered all over the country, the greatest migration the world has ever seen. I am proud of the record we have made in Nebraska. According to the annual report made by the Department of Commerce, the per-capita State tax collections, including property tax, gasoline tax, liquor tax, license fees—all forms of State taxes, the per capita tax collections in Nebraska are the lowest of all of the 48 States. We have kept our taxes low, the surest possible brake on public spending.

What do the Republicans propose in the way of foreign policy? I am proud of what was done by them at the meeting at Mackinac Island last month. We are all today agreed that this Nation cannot live by itself alone—that it is a great foreign power and we must take our place as such in the councils of the nations. I do not say that this is necessary in order to abolish war, because that may be an impossible ideal, but I do feel that we must work with other nations in time of peace just as we are today working with them in time of war. And while it may not be possible to abolish war, we can at least hold it to a minimum. Small wars may sometimes be necessary if we are to keep away from larger ones. The early use of force in Manchukuo might have stopped a terrible war covering the entire Pacific. The use of force in the Saar Valley while Germany was still weak, might have obviated the terrible European war which is being fought today. But in any case, if we are to keep away from future world wars, it will take the honest, God-fearing cooperation of the leaders and the people of the world's great nations. Sometimes it will be necessary that they give up a little of their national desires to the end that justice and peace may be promoted throughout the world. I have sometimes thought that there is too much talk of having a permanent peace—there should be more talk of maintaining justice, with peace being incidental to this greater cause. If nations understand each other and their leaders are of good will, however, both justice and peace will be the final result.

There is another thought I would like to leave with you. If you listen today, you will perhaps think that the election of the next President of the United States will solve all problems of foreign policy on this broad earth. That thought is simply untrue, and it will be just as important that we elect a right-thinking President 20 years from now as it is in 1944. In other words, problems of foreign policy are going to be continuous in the future and never will be solved permanently by any one administration. We have found during this war that the best way to plan strategy is for the heads of the governments, together with their staffs, to meet together. The same rule should apply in keeping peace and I am convinced that future Presidents, in all time to come, should plan to meet perhaps once or twice a year with the heads of the other great governments—keeping constantly on guard to see that small but critical problems do not grow into world-wide emergencies.

I am convinced that the common, everyday American is no longer susceptible to the theory that the United States is a cloistered household, destined to live alone. I doubt that the average American is ready to admit that he has brothers all over the world, and that he is their keeper, but most certainly he is beginning to realize that a head in the sand makes a tempting target, geometrically speaking. He is determined that his Government shall keep its eyes open and sand-free, and I feel that his determination is more than passing fancy.

In my judgment, however, it will be a long time before our people will be willing to approve of any international supergovernment giving orders to our Army and Navy, telling our boys where they are to go and whom they are to shoot. We must work with other nations. We are doing that today. We are fighting alongside of them, making joint decisions, carrying out joint programs. That plan must be continued in time of peace.

What this Nation needs is an all-American foreign policy—not a Republican foreign policy—not a Democratic foreign policy—and certainly not a New Deal policy. We need an American foreign policy that will not be changed by a change of administration. Politics should, in fact, stop at the water's edge, and men of good faith, in all political parties, should work toward that end.

The Republicans should nominate a candidate for President in 1944 who will be pledged to serve for only one term. It might be better as a permanent policy if the term be changed to six years; but without making any change in the Constitution, the Republicans can handle this problem in 1944 by nominating a one-term candidate. The problems which are going to face the next President will be terrific, and he should not waste one second of his valuable time in making plans for reelection. He should enter office willing to give 4 years of his life to serve this Nation and bring it back to sanity and stability.

The present war has been made more expensive and has been lengthened because of the desire of our President in 1939 and 1940 to be reelected. Certainly he knew then many things which were not told to us—things which should have been told us and which would have been told us if he had not desired to be elected for another term. As Republicans we should make sure that we are not guilty of the same offense during the next 4 years, and in proper time we can change the Constitution.

I hate to think of the effect of a fourth-term campaign. It will bring bitterness and hatred and even if the effort receives the approval of more than 50 percent of our people, yet it is apparent that it will receive the bitter disapproval of such a large percentage that the very campaign itself will throw a terrific strain upon our war effort. Yet there is nothing any of us can do. The decision to throw the Nation into that maelstrom rests in the hands of one man. We can do something concretely, however, to pledge at least one 1944 candidate to only one term, and a

man should be nominated who sincerely believes in that policy.

If the war is yet being fought, any person taking over the Presidency in 1945 should be careful bout upsetting the war management. It might be well, indeed, to continue Secretaries Stimson and Knox, to insure continuity. It is likely that the services of Secretary Hull should also be continued in some capacity, but surely prestige would be added to the Cabinet by drafting for an important responsibility the services of that great American, Herbert Hoover.

I feel that I can say without contradiction, however, that we would in no way impede the war effort if we dispense with the services of that horny-handed daughter of toil—Madam Perkins. Likewise the country might be able to stumble along in some manner without the super-brilliant leadership of such renowned executives as Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes, and Henry Wallace.

We are at war and we now do what we must do. We have a common purpose and we shall achieve that purpose. We surrender our individual and local rights; we uproot our old ways of living We stand in ration lines; we are inducted into the Army when our turn comes; we move over to war jobs upon Washington directive. We are now getting a taste of a regimented economy and a planned society; we do what we are told to do because we know it must be that way, because in war it can be no other way.

But when peace comes we must decide how much of this planned way of living we are willing to keep. We must decide that question because there are many enthusiasts in Washington who believe—and have believed for the past 10 years—that it would be wonderful if we could have strong Federal control over the people of this Nation on a permanent basis.

We used to talk of invisible government back in the days when we felt that great accumulations of wealth had too much influence in our public affairs. It is time to recognize the fact that we have had more invisible government during the past 10 years than at any other time in our history; the invisible government of men obscurely placed on the Government pay roll, so that they might work out their master blueprints of a changed America; the invisible government of men who hold no public office, but who feed constantly into our administration the Old World idea that equality and justice may be achieved by the method of binding all citizens to the hard wheel of the federal state. It is their idea, too, that in a democracy this may be best achieved by indirection and by evasion.

We need, above every other thing, again to place government out in the open; we need to restore the old barriers against the capricious use of public power. Changes in our Government ought to be honestly and openly proposed by men upon whom we can definitely place the responsibility of these proposals. If we, as citizens, reject those proposals, we then have the right to expect that they will not be pushed upon us by underground means of which we are not aware.

Our social planners came into power with a mandate to correct certain abuses and weaknesses in our system. They called themselves liberals struggling for the betterment of mankind. Yet we have had a curious shift of positions; for today, under the guise of man's betterment, they seek by every possible means to strengthen the control of the Federal Government over the life of the individual. They are quick to place the label of "reactionary" on those who oppose them, forgetting that liberalism implies the right to dissent.

These social planners today are in reality fighting for the vested interest of government as against the individual, precisely as some men in another day fought for the vested interest of great wealth.

Too much power is too much power, whether it be money or political office. There is no difference between a man who uses his wealth to control the life of a community and a bureaucrat who uses his power to control the life of that same community. Both are improper, both are reactionary, and against them we Republicans should protest with every power at our command.

Let us never forget that much of this Nation's greatness springs from our insistence that the hundreds of little desires of the individual have an opportunity for expression. Trivial as some of these desires seem—the urge to boo the umpire, to go fishing, to "tell off" the boss, to write the editor, to waste our money in running for office—trivial as they seem, the satisfaction of them and the hundreds like them is the ingredient that gives our American life its zest, its flavor, and its desirability.

Our need is for men who appreciate that democracy is not a mechanical vehicle to be streamlined with engineering proficiency to transport its people with the greatest possible speed to some coldly efficient, never-never land where living is done by national rote.

We can well afford now to fully grasp the plea of the poet:

"God give us men, a time like this demands
Great hearts, strong minds, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office cannot kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and will;
Men who love honor; men who will not lie."

We Republicans must furnish to the Nation leaders who recognize democracy as a thing of beauty, of local color, gracious and decent and understanding, for it is within democracy that can be found our firesides and our families. For it on every continent our men fight today; for its continuance we here at home have the duty to plan, and work, and pray.

Cost of Producing Milk on the Farm and the Proposed Milk Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the delegates of the United Farmers Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc., assembled in annual meeting at Morrisville, Vt., on October 8, 1943. The resolution refers to conditions in the dairy industry and expresses the opinion of the association in regard to the proposed milk subsidy.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The delegates of United Farmers Cooperative Creamery Association, Inc., assembled in annual meeting at Morrisville, Vt., on October 8, 1943, respectfully call to the attention of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration the conditions prevailing within this area which we believe to be similar to those prevailing throughout the Boston milkshed. The cost of producing milk on the farm has increased steadily to the point where it is burdening the producer with losses beyond his ability to bear; the indicated supply is decreasing while the rate of sales and demands on the part of the consuming public, the armed forces, and our allies is constantly and rapidly increasing; the price received is insufficient to enable the dairy farmers of this area to compete for feeds against the western livestock and hog growers; the rates we are able to pay for labor will not permit us to compete with industries and other lines with the constant result of increasing numbers of auction and dispersal sales of dairy cows taking place throughout the milkshed.

The result of these conditions is such that threaten the future supply and indicate a totally inadequate volume to meet the increasing needs; a continuing exodus of farmers from their dairy farms to other types of less vital service in this time of war; a reduction in the standard of living to those who continue their dairy farm operations with the resulting general decline of activity and interest in life in our farm areas.

We request that your respective Administrations adjust prices fixed by them for grain and feed in such way as to make the use of these items for production of dairy products as profitable as is the use of such grain and feed in other competing lines of agriculture, especially to eliminate the present discrimination against our industry which results from the so-called corn-hog ratio. We urge you to give full and careful consideration to the testimony and arguments presented in connection with the recent hearing to amend the Federal Milk Marketing Order for the Boston market and advance the price of class I milk to $5.03 per hundredweight, with the belief that anything less than this increase will be totally inadequate to accomplish the results your Administration is asking.

As an association, we further record our membership in opposition to the plan for creation and distribution of subsidies as a means for increasing production of milk, because such procedure suggests that the farmer is in need of more money than he is actually entitled to for the production of his product; it further suggests that the consumer is unable to pay the amount equal to the cost of production and reasonable profit, and further, that our Government has no concern for the total amount of bonded indebtedness that is placed upon the citizenry of the Nation.

We claim that subsidies as recently announced are humiliating to the farmers, because they provide for money to be paid to them, whereas the benefits are actually in the interest of the consumer; the consumer is earning handsomely at the present time and is not in need of such additional subsidies; the farmer is entitled to a fair price and maintenance of his self-respect; the subsidy method contributes to inflation because it adds the equivalent of money to the pockets of the buying public from whom the Treasury Department is seeking means and methods for further draining off huge excess; the plan of subsidy entails Government obligations payable in the future, which means that a great part of the burden will be thrown upon the shoulders of our returned servicemen after the war, the majority of whom are now serving their Nation at a wage of $50 per month; the plan further depletes reserves of the Nation so that the possibility for granting subsidies if they should be needed in the event of real depression following this war would be much more difficult to realize; the plan is contrary to American traditional virtues and particularly to the self-respect of the Vermont farmer who has long been recognized for his sense of thrift, self-reliance

and freedom of individual life and enterprise, and further, because we believe the acceptance of subsidies subjects us to the possible abuse through bureaucratic domination and may lead to the control of the individual and economic life of the American farmer to the prejudice of his fundamental constitutional rights and finally, that there is no authority of law for the payment of subsidies as now proposed and such payment, if made, will be in fact a violation of the Price Control Act.

(The above is the unanimous expression of the delegate body constituting our annual meeting and copies are ordered sent to the Honorable Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Chief of the Office of Price Administration.)

Are Consumer Subsidies Justified?—Are Republicans Forcing Inflation by Raising the Cost of Living?—National Issue Created Between Republicans and Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives reported out Thursday, October 14, 1943, a bill to extend the Commodity Credit Act. The bill provides that the act, which is due to expire December 31, 1943, will be extended to June 30, 1945. The committee, by a vote of 16 to 10, placed the following provisions in the bill regarding subsidies and support prices:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purposes under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, and section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed.

The effect of this amendment is to effectively prevent all subsidies after December 31, 1943, only 2½ months from now, and will not permit any new subsidies of any kind since the deadline for announcing subsidies under this bill was October 13, 1943.

In order to find out what the Honorable Marvin Jones, Administrator of the War Food Administration, thought about this proposal, I submitted it to him and asked his opinion. This request was made before what is known as the Wolcott amendment was inserted. The Wolcott amendment provides that no funds appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation "or any other governmental agency or agency owned or controlled by any governmental agency, shall make any subsidy or other payment, and so forth." For that reason the statement prepared by W. F. A. does not include comments on that particular amendment which will not only prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from giving subsidies but will prevent the R. F. C. and all other agencies as effectively as the Commodity Credit Corporation from giving subsidies or paying support prices.

The reply which was prepared by the War Food Administration at the request of Mr. Jones is as follows:

This is in response to your request for information as to the effect of the proposed amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Bill now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee.

Except for competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseeds, and the right of Commodity Credit Corporation to sell perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of substantial loss due to spoilage, the proposed amendment prohibits Commodity Credit Corporation from making any payments or absorbing any losses for the purpose of reducing or maintaining, or in lieu of increasing, ceiling prices on agricultural commodities or commodities processed in whole or substantial part therefrom. The amendment would compel ceiling prices on such commodities to reflect to the producer a price not less than the highest of the following prices: the support price, the parity or comparable price, or the highest average price for the commodity between January 1, 1942, and September 15, 1942.

The effective of this restriction upon the price stabilization program and the activities of Commodity Credit Corporation would be as follows:

1. Increases in maximum prices as follows:

(a) Such increases as might be necessary in the ceiling prices of pork products to reflect not less than $13.75 per hundredweight for good to choice butcher hogs, 200 to 270 pounds at Chicago.

(b) An increase of 5 cents per pound in the ceiling price of butter.

(c) An increase of approximately 4 cents per pound in the ceiling price for American cheese.

(d) Increases of as much as $1.20 per hundredweight on some varieties of dry edible beans.

(e) Such increases as would be necessary in the price of canned vegetables as to reflect increases in the prices of canned corn, tomatoes, green beans, string beans and peas, as to reflect increases of 25 to 50 percent in the cost of the raw materials.

(f) Increase of about $45 per ton in the ceiling price for prunes and raisins.

(g) Increase of ½ cent per pound in the ceiling price of sugar in order to reflect the present support price of sugar beets. This increase would apply to all sugar, although domestic sugar beets supply only one-fourth to one-fifth of the sugar consumed in the United States.

2. The discontinuation of the support price payment operations being carried out with respect to dry edible beans, canning crops, cheese, prunes, raisins, sugar beets, sugarcane, dairy feed, hay for feeding cattle in the drought areas of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina, and sales of wheat for feed at less than the cost of such wheat.

The ultimate cost to the Government of stopping these programs would be several times greater than the losses now being incurred. At the same time, many price ceilings would be more difficult to enforce.

This amendment would definitely tie support prices to ceiling prices. As a practical matter at best, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration would have to be heard and his problems considered by the War Food Administration, or on arbitration. Such a procedure would delay the announcement of price supports and possibly the announcement of any price supports except at levels too low to get necessary production.

REPUBLICANS OR DEMOCRATS

This brings up the question of subsidies as an issue between the two major parties—Democrats and Republicans. This is unfortunate. The Republicans on the committee—11—voted solidly against subsidies and they were joined by the Progressive on the committee, the Honorable MERLIN HULL, and 4 Democrats. The Democrats on the committee voted 10 to 4 in favor of supporting the President's anti-inflation program to keep down the high cost of living.

HOW SUBSIDIES WORK ON COST-OF-LIVING ITEMS

It is probable that the price of bread will soon have to be increased or a subsidy granted in order to prevent the increase. It is estimated that the Government can pay as a subsidy $70,000,000 and prevent the price of bread from increasing. If this is done it will save the consumers $350,000,000, since $1 paid in subsidies saves the consumer on an average of $5.

IS IT PAYING A PART OF GROCERY BILLS?

When a very few people paid the taxes toward the support of the Federal Government it could have been properly insisted that a subsidy to keep down consumer prices paid out of Federal funds would be causing the few people who paid the Federal taxes to help pay the grocery bills for those receiving the benefit of subsidy payments. Now, however, this cannot be consistently argued, since practically all people pay taxes in one form or another toward the support of the Federal Government. For instance, there is approximately a 100-percent sales tax on cigarettes and many other forms of tobacco; there is also approximately a 100-percent sales tax on gasoline. It would be almost impossible to find a person who did not pay taxes in some form to the Federal Government. Anyone who consumes gasoline or oils,

tobacco or soft drinks, candy, jewelry, chewing gum, or beer, liquors or wines, or attends picture shows or theaters, or who uses public transportation will necessarily pay taxes to the Federal Government. They also pay Federal taxes in other ways. Therefore, if the people of the United States can use $50,000,000 of their money to save themselves, the people of the United States, $350,000,000, it will certainly be a good trade for them. In addition to the saving to the consumer, the cost of living will be held down and demands for wage and salary increases successfully answered.

CONGRESS NOW ASKING PRESIDENT TO NOT CARRY OUT FORMER MANDATE TO KEEP DOWN COST OF LIVING

Congress in the passage of the Second Price Control Act, which became effective October 2, 1942, authorized and directed the President of the United States to stabilize wages, salaries, and all things entering into the cost of living as of September 15, 1942, insofar as practicable. At the same time authority was given the President to correct gross inequalities and inequities. The President has been trying to carry out this positive mandate of Congress and accordingly issued what is called the "hold-the-line order," and all agencies of the executive department have been trying to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, on prices, wages, and salaries. Now, if the Congress passes another law, such as proposed in the one herein discussed, that will compel the President to increase the prices of things that go into the cost of living, the President will no longer be able to hold salaries and wages down. The result will be that prices will increase, which will immediately run up the cost of living; then wages and salaries must be increased; then on account of wages and salaries being increased, prices will have to increase again. This will be a race between wages and salaries on one side and the cost of living on the other. The result will be just like putting a match under a thermometer—prices will go out the top, the sky will be the limit, and we will be faced with unbridled inflation.

CONGRESS OFFERS NO ALTERNATIVE FOR SUBSIDIES

The President has repeatedly told Congress that if Congress will suggest another way to hold down the cost of living without subsidies, and at the same time give the farmers a fair price and a sufficient price to encourage production of needed foods, he would gladly accept any alternative that would get the job done. Instead, Congress has offered no substitute and is offering no alternative, but in this bill would compel the President to immediately put into effect regulations that will cause runaway inflation.

WAR CAN BE LOST ON HOME FRONT

Our boys on the 55 battle fronts of the world are doing an excellent job. It is possible for us to lose the war here on the home front by permitting ruinous inflation.

It is contended that people are making more money than they ever made and therefore should pay increased cost for foods and other items. Probably about half the workers in the country are receiving much more than they ever received before, but the other half of the workers are not receiving any more than they received before the war; and besides there are 14,500,000 people who are dependent on old-age assistance, veterans benefits, compensation and allowances, and other fixed incomes that have not increased at all. These people will be the first to feel the increased cost of living that the Republicans are trying to force in this bill.

CORRECT STATEMENT ON PAYING ANOTHER'S GROCERY BILL

The argument is made that it is wrong for the taxpayers to pay a part of anyone's grocery bill. The correct statement would be that it is not wrong for a taxpayer to permit a part of his tax money to be used by his Government to keep down his food bill, if it will save him $5 for every $1 so paid and will at the same time prevent ruinous inflation.

OPPONENTS DO NOT OPPOSE ALL SUBSIDIES—JUST A FEW

Those who proclaim so long and loud that they are opposed to the Government paying any part of anyone's grocery bill are perfectly willing to pay certain subsidies. For instance, the Republican Members oppose taking off the subsidy on fuel oil to the New England States, which amounts to about $1 per barrel, thereby placing themselves in the position of saying it is all right for the Government to pay part of anyone's fuel bill, but wrong for the Government to pay any part of the grocery bill. Furthermore, our Republican friends are in favor of subsidized housing which results in the taxpayer's paying a part of the rent bill for each family who resides in one of these houses. So the net result is they are not against all subsidies—they are just against some subsidies.

It will be noticed that in the very provision written into this bill against subsidies, in section 3 at the end, there is a provision which recognizes subsidies for certain commodities and will permit their continuance. The exact language at the end of section 3 is:

Provided further, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed.

How can we consistently contend that the farmers producing peanuts, cottonseed, soybeans, and other such fats and oils shall be benefited by subsidies, and shall continue to receive them, but our farmers who grow other things shall not be so benefited by being permitted to continue to receive them? Another thing I cannot understand is why it is all right to have subsidies for fuel oil and pay part of one's fuel bill, and housing, and pay part of one's rent bill, and for peanuts and cottonseed and soybeans and other commodities, but it is absolutely wrong to pay subsidies on bread and other items that go directly into the cost of living that would cause a spiral of inflationary prices.

The dairy farmer has found himself in a squeeze. The prices of his feed have been going up but the price of his milk has remained stationary because of the effort being made to stabilize the cost of living. The War Food Administration has recently inaugurated subsidies that will give the equivalent of about 1 cent a quart in the form of a subsidy to the producer. It was contended that this should be made in the form of an increased price of 1 cent instead. If it had been, maybe the producer would have received it and maybe he would not, as it would have necessarily gone back through several hands before reaching the producer. In the case of dairy products, if the Government can spend $100,000,000—I am just using this arbitrary amount for the purpose of illustration only—and save the consumers $500,000,000, it looks like it might be a good bargain for the consumers who are also taxpayers, and therefore a good bargain for the taxpayers. The farmer is entitled to and must receive a good price, but I am sure he will not object if a part of that price is paid in a subsidy if it will give him just as much money and at the same time protect him against ruinous inflation.

BILL UP WEEK AFTER NEXT

It is probable that this bill will come before the House of Representatives for consideration the week commencing October 25. An effort will be made at that time to strike out section 3 of the bill.

Proposed Social-Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday, October 12), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very notable series of articles by Fred W. Perkins, of the Scripps-Howard press, on the social-security bill introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, and in the House of Representatives by Representative DINGELL.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News of September 27, 1943]

SOCIAL-SECURITY FIGHT

(By Fred W. Perkins)

The Social Security System was 8 years old last month. Its champions say this new link between Government and citizen has proved its worth, and that the time has come to move toward its completion and perfection, even though the Nation is busy with a war.

Here, they say, is a way to attain one of the "four freedoms" for which our men are fighting—freedom from want—by enlarging the benefits already provided by social security, by making them available to some 20,000,000 workers who now lack such protections, and by giving special consideration to the men and women who will return to civil life from the armed services.

A bill providing for a sweeping extension of the Social Security System has been introduced in Congress by Senator WAGNER (Democrat, New York), Senator MURRAY (Democrat, Montana), and Representative DINGELL (Democrat, Michigan). It is largely the product of study and recommendations by the American Federation of Labor, which is campaigning for it. The Congress of Industrial Organizations is also back of the legislation, and other labor groups are expected to help.

Support in general has been announced by the Social Security Board. Also lined up are the New Deal forces, headed by President Roosevelt, which get the credit for the original Social Security Act of 1935, sponsored by Senator WAGNER and others.

The known opposition, to the proposed changes has two principal centers: (1) A strong group of State officials expects to continue its resistance to federalization of State unemployment-compensation systems, and (2) the American Medical Association will continue to oppose "socialization" of medical and hospital care.

Other opposition, not yet highly articulate, is expected to become manifest among officials and citizens who believe that no enterprise, however worthy, should be allowed to distract attention even in slight degree from the war; and from those who still carry the banner against encouraging the individual to look more and more to the Central Government for his health, his upkeep in times of unemployment, and his security in old age.

Another target of possible opposition is the proposal that the many new proposed benefits be partly paid for by raising the social-security taxes of wage and salary earners from the present 1 percent (it would be 2 percent next year and 3 percent in 1949) immediately to 6 percent. With income withholding taxes already affecting tens of millions, this sharp increase might be expected to arouse some popular resistance, but both the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. say they are confident our people will go along willingly.

It is doubtful if the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill will get much congressional consideration before 1944. A main reason for that is the constitutional necessity for the House to act first on such legislation, because of its taxing features. And the House Ways and Means Committee is expected to spend most of the fall and early winter on a new tax bill and other pressing matters in its domain.

Some authorities hold that social-security legislation is not the proper vehicle for proposed benefits to members of the armed forces, but the bills propose to cover at least part of the subject.

One phase of the veterans'-aid program recently broached by President Roosevelt is directly related to social security—temporary unemployment compensation to all men and women of the armed forces who may be unable to get private employment immediately after the war. There is questioning as to whether another phase—disability benefits for those physically injured in the war—belongs in a social-security bill. Hence the possibility of separate legislation, which would take jurisdiction over all kinds of public benefits for the armed forces.

The Social Security Board holds that still another part of the general subject—protection of the retirement benefits built up in private employment by men and women now in the armed services—would be an appropriate part of an over-all extension of social security.

[From the Washington News of September 28, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

American social-security experts do not like the cradle-to-the-grave tag that has been applied to the Beveridge plan in Great Britain. They hope it will not be stuck on the great expansion of the social-security system that is projected in this country.

The American plan, as embodied in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills now pending in Congress, does not cover the full territory between the cradle and the grave, but some people have that impression because it includes a new provision of maternity insurance for working women, and also a number of proposed departures in Federal provision of health and hospitalization insurance.

Expansions formally recommended by the Social Security Board (in its seventh annual report to Congress) would provide:

1. Social-insurance protection for everybody who depends on wages or salaries (and for the self-employed also so far as possible), adding about 20,000,000 to the present coverage of 40,000,000 persons. Regular insurance benefits would partly recompense the worker and his family when—

(a) He loses his job and is temporarily unemployed.

(b) He is unable to work while temporarily or permanently sick or disabled (with some provision for hospital care for the worker and his family).

(c) When he is old and no longer at work.

(d) When he dies.

2. The cost of this insurance to be met through contributions from workers and their employers into one national insurance fund in the United States Treasury.

3. Assistance to all needy people who have no means of support through the Federal-State public-assistance programs under which monthly payments are now made to the needy aged, the needy blind, and dependent children.

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill goes beyond these recommendations in some particulars. It is thus summarized by the American Federation of Labor, one of its principal backers:

1. It broadens coverage to include millions of agricultural and domestic workers, self-employed persons, lay employees of educational and religious bodies; also, by request, hourly employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; also, under voluntary compacts, employees of local and State governments.

2. It grants unemployment-insurance compensation to all members of the armed forces who may be unable to find jobs in private industry after the war, and disability benefits for those physically injured in the war.

3. It would provide health and hospitalization insurance for the first time.

4. Also, for the first time, it would set up a system of temporary and permanent disability insurance.

5. It offers maternity insurance to working women.

6. It would extend health insurance and other benefits to the dependents of beneficiaries.

7. It would set up a uniform national system of unemployment insurance, to replace the present State-Federal system, and with extended benefits.

8. It would increase the maximum old-age survivors' and permanent-disability benefits from $85 under the present law to $120 a month.

9. It would provide a broad system of national employment offices to assist employers in finding workers for jobs, and to help workers find jobs.

To finance the program, the bill would levy a 12-percent tax on pay rolls, to be shared equally, 6 percent by the employer, 6 percent by the worker. The tax on employers would anticipate the 6 percent which goes into effect in 1949 under existing law. The tax on employees, which is to be 2 percent next year and 3 percent in 1949, under the present law, is sharply increased to help cover the cost of materially greater benefits.

An important recommended change, aiming at economy as well as convenience, would create a single national social-insurance system with only one contribution necessary for all the insurance provisions, thus requiring single payments by employers and workers, only one wage record for each worker, and one local office to serve all employers and workers.

[From the Washington News of September 29, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

If you are 1 of about 40,000,000 American earners of wages or salaries, you have a social-security card that promises you an old-age pension after you are 65 and retired—not enough to maintain you in country-club style, to be sure, but enough to avoid the drab necessity of going on the county.

But if you are 1 of about 20,000,000 other Americans, also working, you do not have such a card or promise, because when Congress enacted the Social Security Act in 1935 it excepted a number of large classes of employment.

In the present effort to extend the Social-Security System, one objective is to bring the missing 20,000,000 under the old-age insurance plan, which not only guarantees payments to the retired worker himself but provides for payments to his family after his death.

Under the present law, the old-age and survivors' insurance plan covers business and industrial jobs—that is, those in factories, shops, mines, mills, stores, offices, banks, hotels, restaurants, laundries, telephone and telegraph offices, and other places of business or industry operated by private firms, corporations, or individuals.

The broad classes at present excluded from these benefits, and which social-security advocates hope to bring in without unnecessary delay, are agricultural labor, domestic service, public employment, service for nonprofit and Government institutions, and self-employment.

Today a printer who works for a commercial publishing company is covered. Also a janitor who sweeps out a grocery store, and a stenographer employed by an industrial concern. But a printer for a religious organization is not covered. Neither is a janitor in an educational institution, nor a stenographer for a charitable group.

Agricultural and domestic workers were left out largely because the periodic and sometimes itinerant character of their employment was believed to make it too difficult to report their wages and collect taxes on them. It is now believed that this problem can be met successfully through the stamp-book plan adopted in Great Britain and other countries. The employer buys wage stamps, and when he pays off his help he deducts for the proper amount of stamps. The stamps are placed in the worker's stamp book, and when the book is full it is deposited with the social-security office and credited to his social-security account.

An apparent injustice to farm and domestic workers is that they frequently shift over for short periods into employment that is covered by the old-age insurance system. They are required to pay into the system, but in many cases they return to the noncovered occupations without having built up enough credits to entitle them to benefits.

A main reason for exclusion of employees of nonprofit institutions (including religious, charitable, educational, scientific, literary, and humane organizations, and students and student nurses) was the belief that many were already covered by private pension plans. But the Social Security Board has now found that this is true only with respect to one-third of workers in these classes.

It says that "a fourth of the regular clergy are without retirement protection; retirement plans of at least 15 religious organizations do not cover their lay employees; jani-

tors, charwomen, telephone operators, and other maintenance staffs of educational institutions seldom receive the benefits to which professional staff members are entitled."

It is pointed out also that private pension plans usually provide only retirement benefits for the employee, with no further provision of benefits for his family.

Many nonprofit institutions and their employees have changed their views on this subject, says the Board, which recommends that social-insurance protection be extended to them but with a provision against loss of other kinds of protection they now hold.

The self-employed group in the United States, estimated at 11,000,000, is made up mostly of independent farmers or businessmen, but includes also such extremes in economic status as professional men, on the one hand, and persons who make a living by renting rooms, dressmaking, selling magazine subscriptions, taking in washing, and selling newspapers at street corners. Many low incomes are included, and the Social Security Board has found other reasons why they need social insurance as much as the people attached to a regular pay roll.

As to governmental employees, the Social Security Board reports that only about half of those in the State and local agencies are covered by public retirement systems, and that in the Federal service large numbers of civilian war workers may lose the protection they earned in private employment without acquiring comparable protection in their Government jobs. The Board's recommendation is that full coverage be extended to these groups without harm to any protection they now have.

[From the Washington News of September 30, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

The Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, now pending in Congress and proposing a great extension of the Social Security System, uses 19 of its 90 pages to outline legislatively what it calls "Federal medical, hospitalization, and related benefits"—an enterprise which some opponents describe as socialized medicine, and which an unfriendly organization of physicians calls totalitarian medicine.

This is probably the most controversial part of the bill. Its advocates see in it a blessing for the millions of low-income families whose members delay or neglect visits to physicians and hospitals because of the cost. Its foes say it would abolish private medical practice and set up a vast new bureaucracy under which the head of the Public Health Service, with $3,000,000,000 a year to spend, would eventually become the employer of all the physicians in the country and the controller of all hospital beds.

However, doctors are divided. Some nationally prominent physicians support the general principles of this proposed legislation, and through their Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, Inc., have said it "provides a framework and a basis for discussion from which it is sincerely hoped that a constructive program for improved medical and health care of the American people may be developed."

Dr. George E. Bigge, Social Security Board member, says: "There is nothing in our recommendations or, so far as I can see, in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which would in any way affect the doctor or the hospital in their relations with their patients. The purpose of the proposal is simply to make sure that patients will have the money with which to pay their bills. I can see no reason why any physician should object to that."

The American Federation of Labor description of the proposed new health-insurance program is that it would extend "medical and hospital care to all persons covered under old-age and survivors' insurance and for their dependents.

"The bill assures free choice of any regularly licensed general practitioner, arrangements for use of specialists' services, and varied methods of remunerating doctors, with emphasis on maintenance and development of the quality of medical care, and provision for grants to aid medical education and research."

The National Physicians' Committee declares: "The provisions are so sweeping that, if enacted into law, the entire system of American medical care would be destroyed."

Says the A. F. of L. committee on social security: "We have no desire to interfere in the scientific matters of the medical profession, in which doctors alone are competent, but we are concerned to make medical care available to those who need it."

As to the other end of the plan, the A. F. of L. committee says: "Voluntary hospitalization covers around 10,000,000 people, while hospitalization insurance under social security should cover something like eighty to one hundred million."

[From the Washington News of October 1, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

Many Americans subscribe to private insurance policies under which, if disabled temporarily or permanently, they receive regular payments from the insurance companies.

The pending Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, for expansion of the Social Security System, calls for payments by the Federal Government to the temporarily and permanently disabled—payments out of funds collected partly from employers and partly from workers. The potential beneficiaries would be much more numerous than those who now deal with the insurance companies.

This proposal is backed by the Social Security Board, as well as by the labor and other groups that are advocating immediate extension of social security.

The Social Security Board's position is that permanent disability should be handled as if it were premature old age, while temporary disability should be handled like temporary unemployment.

Says the S. S. B.:

"With only one exception (Spain), the United States is the only country which provides insurance against old age without also providing against the risks of chronic or permanent disability * * *. There is no comprehensive system in the United States providing protection against wage losses due to temporary disability * * *. Twenty-eight nations now provide insurance protection to their workers against temporary disability."

The American Federation of Labor says:

"When a man is permanently disabled his wife and children need help as much as if he had died. No wage earner can afford to buy enough insurance from private insurance companies to give his family the help they require if he becomes permanently disabled. Only social insurance can make it possible for all of us to buy this kind of protection at a price we can afford."

Some complications in benefits for temporary disability are pointed out by the A. F. of L.:

"People who are out of work because they are sick need an income to make up for their loss of earnings just as much as well people need their unemployment benefits.

"Much of our experience with insurance against temporary disability," the A. F. of L. continues, "has come from the trade union or fraternal sickness-benefit societies and from other local sickness funds. In these small employee societies where people were acquainted with each other the trustees of the benefit funds knew when one of the members was laid up or too sick to go to work, and also when he was well again and able to go back to his job.

"When we exchange the personal relationships of the little group-sickness-benefit plans for the greater strength and security of a national social-insurance system, we have to substitute records for the members' knowledge of each other's affairs. In sickness insurance we have to know that the worker is sick, and not just taking a vacation or plain lazy. * * * For this reason a doctor's certificate of illness is needed, with periodic reports if the sickness continues."

The A. F. of L. also recommends maternity benefits for working women, a proposal on which the Social Security Board has taken no stand.

[From the Washington News of October 2, 1943]

FIGHT FOR SECURITY

(By Fred W. Perkins)

When Congress gets around to real work on the new Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill for extension of social security, it will expect a visit from State officials concerned about the bill's proposal to federalize the unemployment-compensation system, which is now a Federal-State enterprise.

The State argument will be that federalization of unemployment compensation would mean a further concentration of authority in Washington and a corresponding decrease in the States' authority.

The American Federation of Labor, backing the new bill, is lined up with the Social Security Board in advocating the shift to more Federal authority. The S. S. B., however, recommends that actual administration be "strongly decentralized, with representative advisory committees and appeals councils in all the States."

The A. F. of L. and the S. S. B. join in the view that State administration of unemployment compensation is so lacking in uniformity that a central coordinating agency is demanded.

After-war conditions are cited as probable reasons why the 48 States should not attempt to handle unemployment compensation without regard to the rest of the country; a Federal agency, it is argued, would have the broad view.

The same line of thought is back of the proposal for a national system of employment offices, about which there is less argument. Less spending of public money is involved in this case.

Numerous points of possible controversy are involved in the new social-security bill, which will come up first before the House Ways and Means Committee. Final congressional action on all phases of the measure can hardly be expected before the congressional elections in November of 1944.

Little if any opposition is expected for proposals to bring under the old-age pension system millions of agricultural and domestic workers and others not now covered.

There will be much opposition to a proposal that medical attention and hospitals be placed under Federal control. There will be congressional questioning also for proposals to set up a Federal system of payments for temporary or permanent disability of workers.

Despite the possible points of objection, A. F. of L. President William Green, declared:

"This is one of the most important legislative proposals of our times. It fortifies the American way of life against our great internal enemies—poverty, disease, and economic dislocation. Coupled with a program for vast expansion of our peacetime industries, it will constitute a guaranty that the American people will be spared from unnecessary suffering after the war is over.

"The great benefits of this bill are so manifest and so essential as to shame any petty, technical opposition into silence."

Much opposition is expected to center around the objection that social-security expansion should not be attempted in wartime.

"The answer to that," says Arthur J. Altmeyer, Social Security Board Chairman, "is that unless action is taken now there is grave danger that the post-war period will arrive before a well-rounded social-security system can be put into successful operation. It cannot be improvised overnight.

"The extension of social security now would not only not interfere with but would greatly aid in the successful prosecution of the war. The greater sense of security which would result would make the people of this great Nation more effective defenders of democracy. This has been amply demonstrated in Great Britain."

More for Everybody of Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 15 (legislative day of Tuesday October 12), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Edward Warren Brown, at Riverhead, Suffolk County, Long Island, N. Y., on Wednesday evening, October 13, 1943, to the Suffolk County Farm Bureau and other farm organizations. Let me add that Mr. Brown is president of the American Unity League, Inc.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have two wars on our hands—a world-wide military war abroad and a socio-economic war at home.

Since our unpreparedness for war 2 years ago, we have rearmed heavily. We may now reasonably expect victory in the military war. All bets favor the United Nations against the Axis Powers.

The socio-economic war at home, however, has developed intense disunity and confusion, to the extent of threatening our military victory. Politics for the next year is expected to influence the official acts of Government and Congress to provide campaign material for the Presidential election in 1944.

The pressure groups of organized labor, agriculture, industry, finance, and the many interests concerned with commerce and the professions, are battling with Congress, and with each other, for selfish gains and advantages at the expense of all citizens.

It seems fitting at this time to revive the quotation by an outstanding figure in our early history, the illustrious Thomas Jefferson: "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none." Now is the time to organize a national movement which will assure unity of purpose and action.

Such action must be nonpartisan and nonsectarian, and with the aim to achieve genuine social justice and universal social security for every individual, regardless of race, color, and religion.

Otherwise, we cannot foresee the effects of disunity on the home front. Disunity at home usually is the cause of disloyalty on the fighting fronts. It might cause confusion and delays enough to favor the enemy and cause us to lose the military war, the while we battle among ourselves on the home front, in our own socio-economic war. All signs now point to a multiplicity of group demands and strikes without end.

The kind of national movement I have in mind involves every family. The purposes and objectives of the national movement must be specific and definite, so that every individual will know what he and she stands for as an active participant in the crusade for right living. The incentives must be practical and adequate.

A comprehensive and practical economic master plan is the first essential. It should serve as our guide in our crusade for social security for every income group, from the bottom to the top of our social scale.

Please permit me to summarize our objectives for you by the reading of a pro forma full-page newspaper ad, which should be inserted by patriotic citizens in every community, to arouse the desire and determination in everyone to their duty toward their families and neighbors, and, also, to take the action recommended from purely self-interest motives:

"I firmly believe you, and every American, owe to yourself and to your family the opportunity to read the message of the surplus-wages system.

"This system is a new method of creating a new national income to pay for the war and to reduce war taxes now, and after the war, thus assuring more for everybody of everything.

"As a democratic people we need this self-help method to aid our Government to win the war quickly, and to save many lives; to provide the means for continuous employment for every American; to realize the American prosperity brand of genuine social security—not the foreign poorhouse type of the dictators. The bases for my convictions are these:

"That a majority of the citizens must organize for this purpose to apply this, or any other, self-help method to our everyday ways of living, of working, and of doing business;

"That before real social security and lasting prosperity come, there must come a moderate reconstruction of our social order;

"That there must be no industrial, financial, or political revolutionary tactics used to accomplish our purposes;

"That we must hold fast to present constitutional and democratic principles of liberty and civil rights in any modification of present methods;

"That a majority of American citizens must unite and act upon a comprehensive program, which must provide reciprocal benefits between all economic groups, and at one and the same time, without sacrifice by any one group to benefit another group;

"That our action, methods, and agencies must be nonsectarian and truly patriotic;

"That otherwise we will continue to pay the penalties experienced since 1929 and the depression years. When peace is declared, no one wants to see the return of the conditions prior to the present war. Then about one-third of our families were on the poverty danger line, through no fault of their own. They were ready, willing, and able to work.

"After the war, we will come to that again unless we organize and prepare to put all to work on private pay rolls assuring wages, salaries, and incomes which safeguard the American standard of living.

"America's distress prior to the war was due to managerial incompetence and economic inadequacy—inequitable distribution of the national income—insufficient individual incomes denying 'right living' to more than two-thirds of us.

"With America's great stores of natural resources, modern farming and manufacturing methods, up-to-date factory plants and equipment, skilled manpower in the arts and sciences and ownership of more than two-thirds of the gold of the world, we lack only unity of purpose by all economic groups and a sound method of operation to eliminate involuntary poverty.

"An organized, self-regulated, self-disciplined industry within society must succeed where political governments fail.

"With such rich human assets as we possess in America, I am convinced that there is a way to assure prosperity and social security to every American family.

"There is, however, no magic-wand or sweepstake-ticket route to our goal. Government has tried this but its many billions of money magic have failed.

"If we will recognize these facts, and organize properly and effectively for the big job ahead, I am confident we will succeed with the surplus-wages system.

"So I appeal to the good people of America, whether or not they are now employed, and however confident they are of their future, to wake up to the dangers we will face when the military forces of the world demobilize and bring about another critical economic situation.

"Read the message of the surplus-wages system in the book published by your own organization, the American Unity League, Inc. By doing this today you will serve your Government in the conduct of the war to a quick victory through unity of purpose and action by Americans of all income groups.

"And in addition to our own needs, do not forget that America must be strong and produce more and more for years to come to help the nations of the world in distress. We are the only hope for a war-torn world.

"THE SURPLUS-WAGES SYSTEM—WHAT IT MEANS TO YOU

"Farmers are assured adequate net incomes and expanding markets; workers are assured steady jobs at increasing wages and salary scales; old folks, freedom from economic insecurity and ample old-age pensions; youth, opportunities and advancement in private enterprises according to ability and ambition; business, steadily expanding demand for products and services yielding reasonable profits on invested capital; investors, safe investments and regular income with profit participation possibilities."

To the farmers and related industries of the country, it should become apparent that the surplus-wages system is a practical means of guaranteeing cost of production, plus a fair return on the capital and services used.

This principle must be followed, to benefit all the other income groups. Otherwise our farm population will have to pay disproportionate prices for goods they need, which they themselves do not produce on their farms. The problem of establishing ceiling and floor prices for farm and industrial products must be coordinated and reconciled to agree with the principles of humanity and democracy, which I again repeat in the words of Thomas Jefferson, "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none."

Now, gentlemen, you may have a mental picture of America's greatest war need—unity of purpose and action—and how the objectives desired by every income group may be realized.

The specific and definite ways and means which are embodied in the surplus-wages system involve many more hours of concentrated thought than we are able to give to their consideration at this meeting.

Therefore, I suggest that every member of your organizations obtain through your secretaries copies of my brochure entitled "Wartime Edition—Surplus Wages (A New National Income)," and the sequel to same entitled "Catechism for the Surplus-Wages System."

These condensed outlines of objectives and methods will aid you to understand how your interests will be favorably affected when the system is adopted and applied.

Questions addressed to me at Blue Point, Long Island, N. Y., will be answered as rapidly as facilities permit.